Appendix

Jefferson-Jackson Day Dinner Address by Hon. Theodore Francis Green, of Rhode Island

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 27, 1954

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an address I delivered at the Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner held at Providence, R. I., on April 25, 1954.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Mr. Toastmaster, Governor Roberts, Representative Roosevelt, Senator Pastore, Representative Forand, Representative Fogarty, our national committeewoman, Miss Cullinan, our energetic State chairman, Frank Rao, distinguished friends and fellow Democrats, we meet here this evening to honor two great American Presidents, Jefferson and Jackson. We welcome the distinguished son of a third American President, one whom most of us remember as the greatest of our time. Under the leadership of the late Franklin D. Roosevelt our beloved Rhode Island came out of the doldrums of depression, and went forward to become a prosperous and thriving State. I know that all of us are looking forward to the address of our principal guest, Representative Roosevelt.

Here in Rhode Island we are exceedingly fortunate in having a strong progressive and active administration under the leadership of that capable Democratic Governor, Dennis J. Roberts. Our State organization directed by that energetic State chairman, Frank Rao, I have every reason to believe, will again lead our party to victory at the next election. Of course, my friends, Frank Rao just cannot win elections alone, and it is up to us, his party workers, to lend our best efforts to assist him in every way possible, so that victory for all our Democratic candidates will be forthcoming next November.

We were all disappointed that our country did not elect a Democratic President in the 1952 election. You and I remember that the campaign of 1952 was full of rosy promises and guaranteed cure-alls but the Presiden and his party seem to have forgotten them. We have now had 16 months of their government by slogan, catch-phrase and confusion, seasoned with hysteria. The American people in 1952 listened to and believed the Republican presidential candidate when he said he would continue the social and economic programs developed in 20 years of Democratic administrations. President Eisenhower, then a candidate, said he favored social security, better housing, fairer labor laws, high farm prices, full employment, increased foreign trade, and many other goals attained under Democratic administrations. He practically promised to keep and improve them. He even promised to reduce taxes on the one hand, and the national debt on the other, all the while balancing the budget. The American people believed him, and liked him, and voted for him, and even voted into office with him a Republican Congress. At the 1st session of the 83d Congress, controlled in both Houses by Republicans, very few of these promises were kept. And note this: There was not a single constructive item in the President's so-called program which passed the Congress without Democratic support. I have in mind the extension of reciprocal-trade agreements, tax-policy measures, foreign-policy legislation, and Government reorganization. If left to the divided Republican Party in the Congress, the President's so-called program would have been completely lost. For any partial success he has had on Capitol Hill, he certainly should thank the Democrats. Whether he is grateful for this support, he has not stated. He has, however, with the help of the Republican Congress, given away tidelands oil, and he has also raised interest rates on Government mortgages and loans.

This administration now in control has done very little, if anything, for New England. It is true that with a great deal of publicity last December, the President, while on one of his numerous trips to Georgia, issued a memorandum relative to directing the Office of Defense Mobilization to assist the depressed areas. Frankly, very few Government agencies have paid any attention to this order. On department levels where contracts are considered, many of these Government officials never heard of the President's memorandum. A few contracts, of course, did go to New England, but that eloquent Republican Senator from Maine, Mrs. Margaret Chase Smith, in a statement on the floor of the Senate on February 18, made certain inquiries which I quote and which have not been answered by any administration spokesman. Mrs. Smith asked, "What has become of the promises made by the Eisenhower administration for more economy in our Government and for less waste in the operation of our defense forces? Just what sincerity is there in the claims emanating from the Defense Department of more defense per dollar? How can the Defense Department claim more defense per dollar when it deliberately ignores the lowest bidder and the best builder of destroyers in the history of our country, and awards the destroyer contract to another bidder at a cost of $6½ million to the American taxpayers?"

Those are the words, my friends, of a Republican United States Senator, who, I believe, is absolutely disgusted with the channeling of contracts by defense agencies and the ignoring of the President's memorandum supposedly issued to help depressed areas, and, in particular, New England.

There is increased unemployment in Rhode Island and there is increased unemployment in numerous other States—in particular, Massachusetts, Michigan, and also in other Midwestern and Western States. If the President's directive to channel contracts to depressed areas were taken seriously by his subordinates, some of those who prospered under Democratic State and Federal administrations and who now seek office on the Republican ticket, would not be seeking headlines by attributing unemployment to Democratic administrations. Yet the other day I read in the press a statement made by one of those who has held offices of honor and trust under Democratic administration, both in Rhode Island and Washington, but who now is a would-be candidate for some Republican nomination. This statement lays the blame for the present job decline to the Democrats. Such a misstatement seems to me to be evidence of disqualification for high public office.

Another matter which is of vital concern to New England is the silver question. As you know, I sponsored the so-called Green Silver Act which enabled our silver industry to obtain silver for war purposes during the war years. I have also sponsored legislation calling for the repeal of the Silver Purchase Act, and I did this after conferring with many silver users in New England and some of my friends in the industry here in Rhode Island. The repeal of the Silver Purchase Act would mean much to the silver users and producers and in the long run would aid employment not only in Rhode Island but other silver manufacturing States as well. In 1950 the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, reporting on my bill calling for the repeal of the Silver Purchase Act, recommended passage and reported that it would be in the public interest. The Secretary of the Treasury at that time recommended a few minor amendments to the bill and expressed an interest in the legislation being favorably adopted. Of course, the silver bloc, my friends, got busy, and I am sorry to say, the measure did not become law.

This year Senator Pastore and I joined with Republican Senator Bush of Connecticut in introducing another measure to repeal the Silver Purchase Act. This time the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System in a letter to the chairman of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency stated "it would appear that sound reasons continue to exist for revision of the present silver purchase laws." This is an endorsement of the bill. The Department of Interior, however, reporting on the bill, stated it was opposed to the enactment of the measure. The chief counsel for the Department of Commerce, reporting for Secretary Weeks of the Department of Commerce, a New Englander who is associated with those who are urging the repeal of the Silver Purchase Act, reported that "we have concluded that our interest in the subject matter of the bill is too remote to justify our offering for your consideration comments with respect thereto." This disappointing report from the Secretary of Commerce will be news to the New England silver manufacturers. Now, the Treasury Department, which previously under Democratic administrations did not hesitate to endorse the repeal of the Silver Purchase Act, in a letter to the chairman of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, reporting on the present bill states that "from the practical point of view, existing legislation relating to the purchase of silver does not now offer any serious embarrassment to this Department. Also, we believe the enactment of such legislation under today's special conditions would not be timely."

Here is "confusion worse confounded." The Federal Reserve System Board of Governors is consistent—it still favors the repeal of the Silver Purchase Act. The Department of Interior does not favor the repeal. The Department of Commerce declines to report. The Treasury Department, which previously favored the repeal, now does not favor it. It seems to me that the Cabinet officers and the heads of various departments in Washington under the present administration are talking out of both sides of their mouths on matters which are of vital public concern. This is a good illustration of the present lack of Presidential leadership.

In closing my remarks I want to urge all of you good Democrats present to work hard to get our new voters on the registration lists, so that we may confidently expect in November to elect a complete Democratic slate. We should send to Washington a Democratic Senator and two Democratic Representatives and again elect a Democratic governor with a complete slate of Democratic State officers.

Editorials From Florida Weekly Newspapers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 27, 1954

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I have long profited from reading the editorials which appear in the weekly newspapers of my district. Theirs is a sound, down-to-earth philosophy which reflects faith, optimism, and courage. I desire in particular at this time to call attention to the entire editorial page of the Holmes County Advertiser, published at Bonifay, Fla., and edited by N. DeVane Williams, and to a very fine editorial written for the Port St. Joe Star by Rev. J. C. Odom. The Star is published and edited by Wesley R. Ramsey, Port St. Joe, Fla.

The editorials follow:

[From the Holmes County Advertiser of April 16, 1954]

More Park Facilities Needed

The large crowd at the political rally at Wayside Park on Wrights Creek last Saturday night clearly showed that the existing facilities at the State-owned and operated park are not sufficient. What is there is fine, but what we want to know is why can't there be more?

At parks in similar locations in nearby counties the public has been given a lot more comforts. The people of Holmes County, and their friends, are entitled to the same consideration as our neighbors.

There is a dire need of restroom facilities, more tables, benches and outdoor cooking aids. There is sufficient space, and the natural surroundings are as fine as you'll find anywhere. Our people like the park—you'll find a large crowd there all during the summer, and part of the colder months. Our visitors like it too, for you'll find cars from Alabama, Georgia, and Tennessee there about any time you look. We appreciate what we have, but we want more.

In behalf of the people of this area, the Advertiser is calling upon the State road department, and those who have power with that body, to get busy and get something started there before the summer vacation starts.

A Good Neighbor

Easter time is here again, and the people of the Whitewater community again know what it is to have a good neighbor. Up there, L. M. (Lamb) Smith makes a practice of butchering a beef and hog or two and passing it out among his neighbors just to let them know that he appreciates their company and loves to live among them.

Mr. Smith doesn't know that this information has gotten out—and we doubt if he would like to have any mention of it—but something of this nature is so much different from what one usually finds in these days we think it only proper to tell our readers about his project.

Last year he butchered a 1,200-pound beef and one hog and gave it to his neighbors, and again this year he's furnishing meat for many an Easter table in the Whitewater community. Where else can you find such a demonstration of the good neighbor policy? Our hat is off to Mr. Smith and we wish he lives to enjoy many more years of his generous giving.

Against Fires

Spring, when the forests and the wooded areas are coming alive with the beauty of the season, is a good time to think about preserving that beauty by preventing forest fires. A cigarette carelessly tossed away, a match dropped in the wrong place, a campfire abandoned without being properly extinguished—all these things can result in forest fires.

Every year millions of dollars worth of damage is done. Even more tragic than the dollar loss is the valuable timberland which is blackened and made barren by the fires, the wildlife which is destroyed, and the natural beauty which is marred.

Visitors to the woods and travelers along highways which pass through wooded areas do well to pause and appreciate the beauty of the scenery. By exercising commonsense precautions they can make certain that no acts of theirs will contribute to costly forest fires.

Have you attended one of the political rallies in the country? If you haven't you are missing a wonderful opportunity to hear what the candidates for various county offices think. They are trying to reach all the voters and this method of holding rallies in the different communities is the best method. Make it a point to attend the meeting Noma Saturday night—and the others before the first primary. You'll learn something about your candidates—and meet many of your county neighbors.

Day of Triumph

This year, in the midst of our fears and tensions, the meaning of Easter is particularly significant and comforting. Easter is the celebration of the triumph of love over hate, of truth over falsehood, of the spirit over death.

The enemies of Christ were certain that they had destroyed Him, that they had once and for all put an end to the disturbing doctrines of love and gentleness He taught to the people with whom He lived and prayed. Some of His closest followers had been driven to deny Him. One of them betrayed Him for a handful of silver. He was falsely accused, scourged, spat upon, ridiculed and put to death on the cross. He was laid to His rest in a borrowed tomb.

Yet 2,000 years later the doctrines He proclaimed are the guideposts of civilization. The lessons He taught are still the best hope of mankind for whom He willingly gave His life.

Easter is a glorious holiday for in the victory of Christ all men in all times were made victorious.

Don't Be a Litterbug

Happily, a number of organizations are determined to find out—reasoning very wisely—that America the Beautiful must somehow keep that way. And without the continued waste of the important money now being used to sweep up after a comparatively few thoughtless, selfish people.

Prime leader among these organizations determined to check the senseless, filthy habit of tossing every unwanted thing from car windows, and the waste of public funds in trying to gather them up again, is the National Council of State Garden Clubs, and using the slogan "Don't Be A Litterbug," the council means to stamp its message indelibly on the conscience of thoughtless Americans everywhere.

From the clever pen of the Roadside Development chairman for Florida, Mrs. Edward H. McKeon, has come a very effective little book of verses—"The Litterbug Family," to supplement the education aids to combat the litterbug.

Pioneers in antilitter programs have had their spirits raised during the past month by news of the new Keep America Beautiful, Inc., organized by a group of the country's leading industrialists. Initiated by the can, bottling, paper and related industries—with an admittedly selfish interest in checking the unsightly and dangerous dumping of their containers along the roadsides—these companies are being joined by the oil and automotive interests, the cleanup-paintup-fixup bureau, representatives of parks and highways and all other agencies concerned with the problem. It has been said that all progress, all development, comes from challenge and a consequent response. In view of the encouraging response from these farsighted industrial leaders who are sponsoring the new Keep America Beautiful movement—thereby meeting the challenge to work with those who have long championed this worthy cause, real progress is virtually assured.

Ugliness and disorder cannot be tolerated on the dream "highways of tomorrow," which are gradually becoming a reality. Even many of today's highways can be salvaged, and protected against further roadside abuses, if enough of us care, and are vocal about it. Litterbugs must be summarily dealt with, as the menace to society which they truly are. The annual multimillion cost of their uncivilized behavior would pay for many of the new roads we want and need so badly. Let's all help to make the word "litter" not only obscene, but obsolete.

So much for the national scope of such a program—what can we do here in Bonifay, our own hometown, to stop the throwing of trash upon our very own streets. Ask yourself these questions: Do I drop my empty cigarette pack for it to blow anywhere? Do I teach my children not to throw their candy and ice-cream wrappers on our streets? When I'm riding around town do I carelessly toss out an ugly scrap of paper? Let's all cooperate in making Bonifay the foremost in keep America beautiful.

[From the Port St. Joe Star of April 15, 1954]

Victory

(By Rev. J. C. Odum)

We approach the Easter season with gladness of heart because of the hope that is ours as Christians. Our hope is in the living and ruling Christ who said, "I am the way, the truth, and the life." The freedom that passes human understanding belongs to the Christian. An unbeliever may question, "What is this freedom of the believer?" It is the freedom that is ours because our "in-Christ" relationship. Jesus said, "You shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free. * * * If the Son therefore shall make you free, ye shall be free indeed." (John 8: 32 and 36.)

Through Christ, the Christian knows why and for whom he is living. This knowledge is the key to everlasting life. Again Jesus affirmed, "I am the resurrection, and the life, he that believeth in me, though he were dead, yet shall he live; and whosoever liveth and believeth in me shall never die." (John

11: 25-26.) The eternal victory of the Christian is ours because of what Christ is and because of what Christ has done, not because of what we have attained through our own merit. Today He lives through his Holy Spirit in the hearts of all who believe on Him. Herein is our triumphant joy. Not in one that is without life and knowledge. Our Saviour is alive. He is at the right hand of the throne of God ever living to make intercession even for the vilest of sinners who will come to Him for forgiveness.

A missionary in a foreign country wished to teach a group of the native people the truth of the resurrection of Christ. He said, "I am traveling and have reached a place where the road branches off in two ways; I look for a guide and find two men, one dead and the other alive. Which of the two must I ask for direction, the dead or the living?" "Oh, the living" said a native. "Then," said the missionary, "why ask me to worship your idol which is a dead god, instead of the Christ who is alive."

The story has been told of a group of musicians who were participating in the final rehearsal of the production Messiah. The director was an old Christian gentleman and he was anxiously watching every note. The chorus sang to the point where the soprano solo takes up the refrain, "I know that my Redeemer liveth." The soloist rendered her part perfectly—so it seemed to the chorus. Her breathing, her notes, her enunciation was beyond criticism. Surely the director would be pleased. But, alas, he was not. Silencing the orchestra he walked up to the singer. "My daughter," he began in a sad tone, "You do not know that your Redeemer lives, do you?" "Why yes, I think I do," she answered. "Then sing it. Tell it to me so I shall know that you know. Sing it so all that hear you shall know that you know the joy and power of that great truth." The old director raised his baton for the orchestra to play again, and the singer repeated the refrain. But this time she sang out of her own deep Christian experience, and those who heard her wept. When she finished the old master again approached her. His eyes had tears. "Daughter you do know, for you have told me."

The greatest question before all mankind at this Easter season is—do you know the risen Christ as your personal Saviour If so, then Easter means everything to you. If you do not know him in your heart, then Easter affords no victory for you.

What World Needs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 27, 1954

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following editorial from the Boston Daily Record of Tuesday, April 27, 1954:

What World Needs

We can't remember when we heard better advice than Archibishop Cushing gave 950 friends of his charities Sunday night.

"Joy is essential to life, a necessity of life," the beloved prelate said. "Every man has need of joy; so, too, every man has a right to joy. It is indispensable to the health of soul and body; it is necessary to physical and spiritual industry; it is a condition of religious living.

"There is too much pessimism in the world in which we live. You hear about wars and the rumors of war. You hear about unemployment and the rumors of depression.

"Those closest to God are the most joyful people. In these precarious times, stay close to God, keep your soul a worthy dwelling place for the Lord."

Every fact-minded historian concedes that the growth of materialism and the simultaneous abandonment of spiritual values produced the great evil of communism.

Men, and particularly men directing the destinies of nations, thought they could do without God, even to the extreme of replacing Him.

In their blindness and stupidity they failed to realize that material things are transient and ephemeral—hardly more enduring than the lilies in the field and the clouds in the sky.

So it was only natural that these false leaders and their gullible followers experienced disillusionment when the material things lost glitter and substance like the automobile of 20 years ago which was an enviable thing then but is not quite so desirable now.

The only sensible solution is to do what the Archbishop prescribed when he told his charitable friends:

"Go back. Not back to the old times when there were no machines, no factories, no railways, nor airplanes, nor television, nor newspapers; but back to religion, to the spirit of faith, to a joyful view of life, to abstinence and self-conquest, to honesty, loyalty, and love."

Foreign Exchange Students

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 27, 1954

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, the appropriation bill for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce passed the House early in this session with a $6 million slash in funds for the educational exchange program. A Senate Appropriations Subcommittee is now considering restoration of these funds, and I wish to join with those who have earnestly and sincerely requested that the program be maintained at its present level.

In the institutions of higher learning in this country there is probably no more culturally broadening contribution to the American undergraduate than the presence on his campus, and particularly during classroom discussion, of students from foreign countries.

I personally recall being one of a group of businessmen, at a meeting of the Seattle Chamber of Commerce a few years ago, listening to several foreign exchange students attending the University of Washington. They were students from Thailand, Korea, Japan, and various other far eastern countries, and each spoke briefly of his native country and of his impressions of the United States. In that one meeting a great many misconceptions were corrected and a far better understanding of our neighbors across the sea was gained.

In like manner, when we send our own sons and daughters abroad, our neighbors learn more about us.

I also recall the remarks to this body last year of the gentleman from New York [Mr. Reed], pointing out the historical contribution of the Olympic games to international understanding. It was an inspiring message.

It seems to me that the United States is hampered in its dealings with other nations because our contacts are primarily with other governments. In most cases—particularly in Asia—the Government is far removed from the grass roots of the country. On the other hand, Communists concentrate on the level of the people, and try to achieve their purpose by playing on misunderstood notions, misinformation, and misconceptions about the United States, and ignorance of our customs and manners. We must, I think, do everything possible to combat such tactics in the only effective way, by putting young people who understand our country and our people in their midst.

Sending some of our intelligent young people to met and mix with the young people of other lands, and bringing their students to our shores, is a necessary part of the exchange of viewpoint on higher levels, as in the United Nations. And certainly at this time in history, when international distrust and fear are rampant, and when the desire for peace and good will is so strong, the opportunities for rewarding returns from such an investment urgently and eloquently argue for no curtailment of this program.

Where Will Materialism Lead Us?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 27, 1954

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the Record, I include therein a very provocative article by Robert Nathan, well-known critic and writer, which briefly compares the arts in our time with those of a previous era.

The article poses the questions: Are Americans putting too much emphasis on material things and too little upon the things of the spirit, the moral truth sidetracked for material gain?

Has sophistication replaced enthusiasm as a national characteristic?

Are we so much lost in the selfishness and greed of materialism that we have no time for the simple enjoyments of the creative spiritual world?

To what extent have these feelings affected our political beliefs and economic standards?

To what extent are they undermining the basic underpinning of American culture and civilization?

These are questions that should be carefully studied and pondered because in their answer may lie the key to American destiny. The article follows:

We had better times in those days. I don't mean that we were richer or better off materially, but we certainly were better off emotionally and spiritually. We were buzzing with life, like a beehive in spring; and even our griefs had a certain liveliness about them. Fitzgerald's heroes and heroines may have been a sorry lot, but they enjoyed themselves—for a while, anyway.

BETTER CORN THAN HARDTACK

All through the arts, there were fresh, exciting names: Gershwin, Prokofief, Stravinsky, Stokowski, Alex Brooke, Kunyoshi, Millay, Wylie, Mestrovic, Cabell, Milne, Lewis, Benet, Sandburg, Wolfe * * * how they engaged our minds and enchanted our hearts. That was before desolation became a word to admire; before brutality created its own surfeit and dullness, before music became dissonance, and poetry a ritual of solemn nonsense. Who is happy today? or dares to be? Who is enchanted?

And there were good novels in those days, and good novelists. Hergesheimer took us into his rich, romantic world; Cabell laughed at our solemn antics; Lewis thrust about him with his crackling sarcasm; Wolfe drew out his long and noble, though melancholy note. We read books, and enjoyed them; we talked about the books we had read, we felt that we—and they—were alive, and making history.

Today, "nobody reads any more." It is not surprising; for the taste of today's books is bitter. It is fashionable to be realistic; now, when Peter Pan turns to the audience to ask for help for Tinker Bell, everybody gets up and goes home. Of course, what dreadful corn.

But once outside, are they any happier?

Well—corn is corn. I don't think that we were innocents, exactly—or particularly childish. We just hadn't decided to feed our hearts on nothing but hardtack. We enjoyed life, and we liked the things that made it more enjoyable. Beauty, love, kindness; melody, harmony; line and rhythm; they all meant a great deal to us. Now they are synonyms for sentimentality.

But whose life is made happier, or richer, for their opposites? Are you any better off—you critics without gayety, you readers without pleasure, you listeners without wonder—for the hard, lean, muscled prose; the hard, lean, bitter thoughts; and the hard, lean, empty feelings, you profess to admire?

Is hardtack really a better staple than corn?

Hidden Tactics of Communists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. McVEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 1954

Mr. McVEY. Mr. Speaker, the question is frequently asked about the necessity of congressional investigations regarding the activities of Communists and subversive elements in this country. There appears to be a feeling in the minds of many people that the FBI is particularly concerned with this problem, and that congressional committees could well leave this subject to their investigations.

The answer to this question, which I have given many times, is that the Federal Bureau of Investigation does not make public reports of its findings, and that the people in general are not always aware of the activities of this splendid agency in the Government. Reports of the FBI are submitted directly to the President, and if he wishes to make use of them he is free to do so. However, if he wants to sit upon these reports and do nothing about them, the law does not require any action on his part. Of course, under the present administration the latter situation does not exist, but our country must always be prepared for the election of an Executive who might not fulfill his responsibilities in regard to matters of this kind.

An article written by Mr. David Lawrence, editor of U. S. News & World Report, on the subject Hidden Tactics of Communists, deals with a splendid message on this particular subject. I should like to make his discussion a part of the Congressional Record, in order that many people may have advantage of his intelligent reactions on this subject:

Hidden Tactics of Communists—Congressional Probes Called Only Way To Handle Problem—Due Process of Law Guaranty Held Misinterpreted

(By David Lawrence)

A study of the tactics of Communist agents—of whom, according to official information, there are at least 25,000 in the United States today—reveals many phases of their activity that are by no means understood by the American people.

Millions of Americans, including some officials not too familiar with Communist tactics, have been accepting the illusion that the whole job can be safely left to the FBI or to the Department of Justice. It is surprising how many persons do not know that the Communist agents are careful to avoid violating any laws. They make use of public instrumentalities to influence governmental action just like any other pressure group, but they conceal their sponsorship of such acts. They cannot be put in jail for getting well-meaning citizens to sign petitions on stationery of organizations with respectable-sounding names.

Anyone who knows how few of the rank-and-file members attend labor-union meetings at night can testify that a small group can put across the passage of a resolution while the actual majority never comes to the union hall to vote.

There is only one effective way to combat the Communist conspiracy, and that is by exposure. There is only one instrument by which that can be done without encountering technical barriers—the congressional investigating committee.

Had the statements of Whittaker Chambers, an ex-Communist, accusing Alger Hiss, been made outside a committee hearing, no newspaper or periodical could have printed the testimony without subjecting itself to a costly libel suit. There is no immunity for the press from libel for printing the facts about individuals, even though proof of those facts is available. It can mean costly litigation to prove the truth of the alleged libel.

But anything which a congressional committee reveals in its hearings can be printed and is immune from libel. This testimony is called privileged. If the investigative and publicity power of congressional committees were abolished or weakened, corruption could thrive and many Government scandals could never be uncovered.

It was the persistent questioning by the House Committee on Un-American Activities which exposed Alger Hiss and subjected him to a perjury charge, on which he was later put in jail. The Department of Justice couldn't prosecute him on any other charge because the limitation period had already passed within which a case in prosecution could be brought under any laws he may have violated.

Legal technicalities also applied in the Harry Dexter White case. He couldn't be indicted by a grand jury because much of the evidence gathered by the FBI against him, such as wiretap material, was not technically admissible. Thus, those who have talked about how White was never convicted in a court forget that the executive branch of the Government doesn't have to hold a court trial to fire anyone it considers a loyalty or security risk.

Lately the Communists have given momentum to a new phrase. It has been taken up by respectable and non-Communist personalities. It bobs up in the news with remarkable frequency. The phrase is "due process of law." It's a phrase that's in the Constitution, of course, and refers to the fact that no man's life, liberty, or property can be taken from him without due process of law. That means a court trial. Yet most of the witnesses called before a congressional committee coudn't be exposed or subjected to a court trial because the time limit of applicability of the law has passed or because the activity in question was not in itself unlawful.

If the congressional committee powers are restricted, however, or made to conform to the so-called due-process-of-law procedures used in courts—a plan to which former President Truman regrettably has just lent his influence in public speeches—then a repetition of the frustrating tactics of the courtroom such as occurred in the lengthy trial of the 11 Communists in New York, will prevent the complete exposure of the tactics of the Communist agents in America.

Eventual Massive Retaliation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 1954

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following editorial from the Boston Sunday Post of March 14, 1954:

Eventual Massive Retaliation

Last January, Secretary of State John Foster Dulles announced a basic decision to meet any Soviet aggression by instant massive retaliation by means and at places of our own choosing. This basic decision was given the label of the New Look in defense. It was to achieve more defense at less cost.

This basic decision was President Eisenhower's, and Dulles was merely the mouthpiece. It was not widely publicized at the time, but the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Admiral Radford, talked soon afterwards at the War College in Newport. The burden of his utterances was that the New Look was a very old hat because the Nation's defenses had to be planned to meet so many different kinds of aggression that it was impossible to have a New Look. In short, the Nation had to have muscles in all departments of defense.

President Eisenhower has now further complicated the defense situation. In his press conference last week, he said with considerable asperity that "there is going to be no involvement of America in war unless it is a result of the constitutional process that is placed upon Congress to declare it."

In consequence of this statement, the New Look in defense and its instant and massive retaliation means that while the Congress is debating the matter of going to war, the Red Air Force is expected to wait around on its airfields for Congress to make up its mind. Moreover, the United States, by the NATO treaty, is pledged to consider an armed attack against any member of NATO an attack against all.

President Eisenhower has practically outlined for the Soviet aggressors what kind of a war to start. Soviet military planners have only to make certain that Congress is not in session to launch an aggression and get in the first paralyzing blows.

There isn't the slightest doubt of the military sagacity of the President, who is also commander in chief of all our Armed Forces. There is grave doubt concerning his skill in handling political issues.

We submit that the New Look in defense was motivated by a desire to make the country think that defense would be cheaper, and that it was urged upon the President by half-baked politicians who have persuaded him that they know best how to run the White House.

We submit, in addition, that the President is talking like a politician, which he isn't, on the advice of the same clique, in response to a speech by Stevenson. And, finally, it is ruinous folly at this time, and in this period of danger, to play politics by juggling a hydrogen bomb and the safety and security of our country. The New Look is now modified to mean eventual massive retaliation instead of instant massive retaliation.

United Nations Charter Review

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 27, 1954

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record a fine address delivered by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Gillette] at the dinner of the American Society of International Law in Washington, D. C., on April 24, 1954.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

United Nations Charter Review

(By Hon. Guy M. Gillette, of Iowa)

Ladies and gentlemen, after the First World War the Senate of the United States failed to approve the ratification of the League of Nations Covenant. After the Second World War the Senate approved the Charter of the United Nations by the overwhelming majority of 89 to 2. This transformation is a measure of the progress which our Nation, in company with many other nations of the world, was able to make in less than a quarter of a century toward the goal of a world free from war and with substantial and dependable moral, spiritual, political, and economic securities.

Today we are prone to forget, when we accept so readily the evidence of the world's cooperative efforts in this direction, how very recently the nations, including our own, were unwilling to admit that the concept of a world organization for peace was even feasible.

We may still be far from the ultimate goal, but we have traveled an immense distance already, most of it within the past 25 years. How can we best hold to the course and maintain the pace we have set?

During World War II, with the lesson of the Senate's rejection of the League Covenant before him, Secretary of State Hull wisely determined to work in close collaboration with the legislative branch in developing the plans for a worldwide postwar organization for peace. It was my great privilege to serve with the nonpartisan group appointed by Senator Connally for this work—a group which was active and influential in obtaining Senate approval of the Connally resolution and later in helping draft the tentative document presented at the Dumbarton Oaks Conference.

The Connally resolution, adopted by a vote of 85 to 5, placed the Senate on record as recognizing "the necessity of there being established at the earliest practicable date a general international organization based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all peace-loving states."

On that basis we moved forward to the day when the Senate gave its consent to ratification of the United Nations Charter by an almost unprecedented majority.

Now, 8½ years later, we approach the point fixed in the Charter for the General Assembly to consider the advisability of convening a charter review conference. The question will be on the agenda of the 1955 session of the Assembly. Last August, Secretary of State Dulles indicated that our Government expects to support an Assembly resolution to convene such a review conference.

Meanwhile, the Senate has indicated its belief that certain preparations are essential.

First, if we are to avoid the mistakes leading to the 1920 fiasco, as we successfully avoided them in the 1940's, steps must be taken now to evoke, determine, and establish the general attitude and opinion of the American people toward possible changes in the charter.

Second, it is essential that the Senate reach firm conclusions, prior to formulation of the United States position, as to the general type of changes or amendments—if any—which it would be willing to ratify by the necessary two-thirds vote.

Third, it is essential that the Secretary of State be able to participate in such a review conference with assurance that the American people and their elected representatives stand behind and will support his efforts to secure the desired revision—if revision is desired—as well as his efforts to prevent adoption of changes which would not be acceptable to us but that may be proposed by other member nations.

In other words, we are moving toward a period, foreseen by the framers of the charter, when the 60 members of the United Nations will be engaged in making fundamental decisions with regard to the future of this great world organization. We would not only be foolish, we would be derelict in our duties if we were not adequately prepared to meet this approaching time of decision.

There is no doubt that the United Nations Charter can be improved. Principally, but by no means solely, because of the abuse of the veto power by the Soviet Union, the charter has failed to justify to the full extent our high hopes for it. Many of us have been greatly disappointed and deeply discouraged by the failure of the United States to exert every possible effort to correct, or attempt to correct, the inadequacies of the charter which have become apparent through experience.

The Senate itself has called for corrective action. It has formally urged a number of specific steps to modify certain procedures of the United Nations, to complete the implementation of certain articles of the charter, and, if these efforts prove unsuccessful, to review the charter. The Senate did this by adopting, on June 11, 1948, the Vandenberg resolution.

The Senate resolved that our Government should seek "voluntary agreements to remove the veto from all questions involving pacific settlements of internationl disputes and situations, and from the admission of new members," an agreement "to provide the United Nations with armed forces as provided by the charter," an "agreement among member nations upon universal regulation and reduction of armaments under adequate and dependable guaranty against violation," and finally "if necessary, after adequate effort toward strengthening the United Nations, review of the charter at an appropriate time by a General Conference called under article 109 or by the General Assembly."

The Vandenberg resolution, of course, also made recommendations with respect to United States participation in and contribution to regional defense arrangements, such as NATO. These recommendations were fully carried out. Yet, although nearly 6 years have passed since approval of the resolution, the record of accomplishment on the recommendations relating directly to the United Nations Charter is by no means as good. In fact, in comparison with the success in building NATO, the record in strengthening the United Nations is dismal. Moreover, there has been a marked tendency to look to regional organizations for collective defense instead of to the United Nations.

Recognition of the failure to correct charter inadequacies or to implement inoperative sections of the charter was my motivating purpose in introducing a resolution in January last year which urged the President to take immediate steps to call a charter review conference. This effort did not meet with the approval of the Department of State, which informed the Foreign Relations Committee that it anticipated a charer review conference would be sought in the 1955 Assembly anyway, and that development of the United States position would require careful preparation within the Government, advice from Members of Congress, private discussions with other governments, and full opportunity for the public to inform itself and to express its views.

I therefore waited a few months and then, on June 30 last year, took the State Department at its word and introduced Senate Resolution 126, directing a Foreign Relations Subcommittee to make a full study of proposals to amend, or revise existing international peace and security organizations, for the purpose of guiding the Senate in the fulfillment of its responsibility to advise the President with respect to foreign policy, and with particular reference to policy at the anticipated charter review conference.

The Department of State welcomed this second initiative and said that "such a study could result in a wholly constructive airing of the many problems connected with charter review, and could be of value in informing not only the Senate, but the executive branch as well, of the views of the American people."

The Senate moved swiftly and, in late July, adopted the resolution by a voice vote. A subcommittee on the United Nations Charter was appointed, under the chairmanship of Senator Wiley, with bipartisan membership consisting of 4 Republicans and 4 Democrats, and, after a delay caused by the autumn recess, began its operation in January of this year.

One of the first decisions of the subcommittee was to hold hearings at various cities throughout the country in order to take soundings of public opinion.

While committees of Congress hear witnesses almost daily in Washington, and have taken testimony in foreign countries on various phases of our policy, never before, to the best of my knowledge, has a committee of Congress sought the views of citizens in their own communities on a matter of foreign policy.

In Washington, necessarily, most nongovernmental witnesses represent our national organizations and speak in behalf of memberships which may number from a few hundred to several million. One characteristic of a typical committee hearing in Washington is the witness who, appearing in behalf of a large national organization, begins his testimony approximately as follows: "I represent the national blank association which has 5 million members. We are strongly in favor of (or opposed to) this measure for the following reasons:"

But when the subcommittee holds hearings outside Washington, we are more likely to hear witnesses begin their testimony in this way: "I don't represent anyone but myself. * * *" or "I have been asked by a group of my neighbors to tell you what we think. * * *" or "I represent the men's club at the local church. We have 50 members and have been giving a lot of thought to the United Nations."

I don't intend to draw a comparison between Washington hearings and hearings in other cities in deprecation of the splendid, and indeed essential contributions of the great national organizations which help form judgments in Congress. Their knowledgeable advice and counsel is of utmost value to the deliberations of every committee. But I do wish to point up the fact that it is helpful not only to the committee to draw on new sources of stimulating and sound ideas by listening directly to citizens presenting a cross-section of their community thinking, but also to the people themselves in bringing home to them the awful responsibilities which we as a Nation must face in the world.

After all, it is only to the degree that our foreign policy has the understanding and support of the American people that it can be strong.

Long ago Thomas Jefferson expressed this thought with his usual clarity:

"I know of no safe depository of the ultimate powers of society but the people themselves; and if we think them not enlightened enough to exercise their control with a wholesome discretion, the remedy is not to take it from them, but to inform their discretion by education."

The public interest in this subject of character revision is as phenomenal as it is heartening. My mail is heavy with letters from individuals and groups from all over the country, and I expect it to grow heavier as our work progresses.

After additional hearings both in Washington and other cities, it is hoped our subcommittee will complete its task by early next year, so that our findings and recommendations can be submitted to the Senate in full time to be of assistance in aiding formulation of the policy which our Government will pursue in the expected charter revision conference.

The subcommittee staff is preparing a series of careful studies of the principal problems that would be considered by such a conference, and I know how much the staff depends on the work done by the men and women gathered here this evening who devote their lives to international law and relations and the development of an international legal order by which we can live at peace.

There are a few matters which seem to me essential to bear in mind as we proceed with the study of this vast problem.

Some may feel that even discussing charter review is a useless occupation or one doomed to frustration. They base this feeling on the fact that no amendment can become effective unless it is approved by each of the permanent members of the Security Council, the so-called "big five." Since the Soviet Union would surely interpose its veto against any important amendment, they say, no review conference should even be called, and no attempt should be made to raise hopes that the Charter can be improved.

I respectfully beg to differ with this view.

It is easy to say that none of the Vandenberg recommendations relating to the United Nations has been carried out because of the veto power of the Soviet Union. But what effort was made to bring the implementation of the Vandenberg proposals to the point where the actually encountered a Soviet veto? Is the prospect of a veto sufficient justification for cessation of all effort to provide the United Nations with instruments required by the existing charter? Is the possibility, or even the probability, of a veto sufficient justification for a refusal to make every effort to improve the charter and to make the United Nations a more effective peace and security organization?

I fail to see how one can refuse to take action on the grounds of an anticipated veto of a proposal unless and until such a proposal has been made.

It is true that the General Assembly has made notable progress in strengthening the efficacy of the United Nations within the limited powers given to it under the charter. But when a document marks the high point of progress for civilized nations toward collaborative effort for world security, it is tragic to realize there has been such an apparent lack of effort, diligence, and determination to increase its value and assure its greater efficacy.

Unless and until we have taken every possible and proper step to implement the provisions of the existing charter, and to revise, alter, improve, or amend the charter, in the manner prescribed by the charter itself, we have no right and no reason to claim the United Nations is unworkable or to assert that we have done all in our power to save world peace through world law.

There are, of course, other ways of modifying the charter than by the formal amendatory process. No one examining the charter today would describe it as the same instrument drafted at San Francisco. Some of the articles have been inoperative, such as those related to placing armed forces at the disposal of the Security Council. Some articles have proved unsatisfactory and have been supplanted by other approaches within the framework of the charter. The "uniting for peace" resolution seeks to give a recommendatory power to the General Assembly which in some respects serves to circumvent the misuse of the veto in the Security Council. Other articles have been elaborated in practice and precedent. The simple provisions relating to the privileges and immunities of the organization, for example, have blossomed into a lengthy convention.

The United Nations Charter is not a rigid instrument. It has shown capacity for growth. It is flexible. It is a living document. Members have seen its possibilities and have used them. We may expect this type of growth within the existing framework to continue, though there would seem to be a limit to it at some point.

In seeking guidance in the formulation of an American position with regard to Charter amendments, we have a number of special problems. One is the matter of inconsistency in our own thinking.

Although the Vandenberg resolution called for voluntary withdrawal of the veto from the question of admission of new states to membership in the United Nations, only last year the Senate resolved that the Communist government of China should not be admitted as the representative of China: while Secretary Dulles and Ambassador Lodge have hinted strongly that our Government would resort to the veto, if necessary, to keep the Communist regime from representing China in the United Nations.

This poses in interesting dilemma: Are we willing to give up the veto in matters of admitting new members, only to insist on using it in matters relating to which regime shall represent a country already a member?

Another illustration: In recent years there has been much talk of abolishing the veto entirely, in the hope of thereby strengthening the United Nations. Many Americans have declared their support of such a proposition. Aside from the question of whether the veto is still of as great importance in the field of peace enforcement as it was prior to adoption of the uniting for peace resolution, I wonder how many Americans really would favor elimination of the veto if they understood such action might impose a legal obligation on the United States to send American troops for service abroad despite the opposition of our Government. Surely we should never accept an obligation which we do not fully intend to live up to.

Although the veto is the symbol of the United Nations failure to work as its founders had hoped, the gradual shift of power within the present charter from the Security Council to the General Assembly will probably raise a quite different set of questions—questions relating to whether voting in the Assembly should not be weighted in some manner, so as to give proportionate power to greater, middle, and smaller nations; otherwise, with retention of the one-state one-vote principle, situations will arise in which a majority composed of small, thinly populated states could determine United Nations policy on vital issues over the opposition of a few great powers whose population far outnumbered the total of all the small states combined.

Then, with respect to qualifications for membership, we have another knotty problem. One body of opinion favors universal membership to include all governments irrespective of their peace-loving character or type of regime. Another body of opinion favors much narrower membership than now exists. No less an authority than former President Hoover has suggested the United Nations be reorganized without the Soviet Union; thus, in effect, transforming the United Nations into an anti-Soviet coalition. Somewhere between these two positions there may be a common ground which would broaden membership yet not radically alter the membership qualifications. We must keep in mind that while a truly universal membership would undoubtedly enhance the qualities of the United Nations as a forum in which all views on earth could be heard, a narrower, more limited membership would probably improve the chances of enforcing the peace.

These are some of the questions we have to answer. Our subcommittee—and we hope a great and intelligently interested body of citizens—will be wrestling with them, and with others just as difficult, in the months ahead.

Before concluding, I want to allude briefly to another problem the subcommittee has encountered, which has little to do with charter amendment but a great deal to do with America's participation in the United Nations. At a recent hearing we had testimony which implied rather unmistakably that anyone who supports the United Nations is at best a soft-headed and at worst a potential traitor.

I certainly have no objection to people saying what they think. That is every American's inalienable right. But I also have the right to say what I think. Those who labored so long and so hard drafting the charter, and I am proud to have played a role in it, did not consider themselves visionaries, giddy minds, do-gooders, or thoughtless men, or men aligned with any group seeking to destroy the United States. The names of Vandenberg, Hull, Connally, Austin, Dulles, Stassen, to name but a few, are not those of men who can be charged with having had in mind anything but the best interests of their country. It was rather surprising, then, to hear it alleged that anyone who is desirous of strengthening, in the light of experience, the pact into which we entered with almost unanimous Senate approval is nothing but a visionary do-gooder who will permit handing over the

United States to any organization that would destroy this great country of ours.

I assert that any fair and objective analysis of the charter as it is, even before improvements are made, shows that it offers, if not the only, then certain the best chance of building cooperatively for durable world peace. The danger is not that the United Nations does too much, but that we ask it to do too little.

In recent years there has been a growing tendency to conduct our foreign relations outside the United Nations. This has gone so far that for some extraordinary and inexplicable reason there has been scarcely any but the most indirect and cursory mention of the United Nations in relation to the Indochina war, almost no evidence of any consideration of the role of the United Nations in this crisis, no sign of any intention to use the United Nations machinery to deal with this most dangerous threat to world peace. I have sought to do what I could to remedy this astonishing omission by introducing a resolution this past week calling on the President to take the Indochina war before the United Nations.

As a Senator sworn to defend and uphold the Constitution against all enemies, foreign and domestic, and as a citizen of the United States, it is my duty to place the interests of the United States above the interests of any other nation or any international organization.

In living through the two World Wars of this century in which our Nation has been involved, I have learned that the interests of the United States require that we cooperate with other nations not only to win military victory but to preserve peace once it is won. Many Americans did not learn that truth until the Second World War, but by the time that frightful carnage had ended, 89 out of 91 Senators voting on ratification of the United Nations Charter, demonstrated how well they, and the vast majority of their people, had learned it.

Now it has become so clear that all but the willfully blind must see that world war cannot be allowed to come again, because it threatens the annihilation of not only humanity itself but all forms of life on this planet. The security of our Nation and of the entire globe demands the cooperation of the nations of the world to prevent that ultimate catastrophe.

It was, as you may recall, the French philosopher Pascal who wrote:

"Right without might is weakness. Might without right is tryanny. We must therefore combine right with might, making what is right, mighty, and what is mighty, right."

The United Nations, at long last, has given us a way of putting might and right on the same side. In this atomic age we must not—we cannot—fail to accept the great challenge which this opportunity affords us.

Rights of American Citizens in Morocco

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD A. PATTEN
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 26, 1954

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a release of November 13, 1953, issued by the American Legion, National Public Relations Division:

WASHINGTON, D. C., November.—Asserting that rights of American citizens in Morocco have been jeopardized by lack of enforcement of the United States-Moroccan Treaty and an international court decision, the American Legion has officially reiterated its call for equal treatment of United States nationals and trade by the Moroccan Government.

The action was taken by the 35th American Legion national convention at St. Louis, Mo., September 3.

The convention approved by resolution the following policy statements in its foreign relations committee's report:

"We definitely oppose any modification or waiver of treaty terms by the executive branch of the Government without the consent of the Senate. * * *

"The American Legion has consistently endorsed the principle that treaty rights of the United States and its citizens cannot legally be changed or waived by executive action or by individual acts of United States officials. We have had reason to feel that the rights of American citizens in Morocco have been placed in jeopardy by lack of enforcement of the United States-Moroccan Treaty and of an international court decision. The American Legion reiterates its stand taken in November 1949 on the enforcement of treaty obligations."

The national executive committee of the Legion on November 5, 1949, unanimously adopted Resolution 62 stating:

"Whereas Morocco Post No. 1 on January 19, 1949, adopted a resolution complaining of practices of officials of the French Protectorate of Morocco, contrary to treaties between the United States and Morocco; and

"Whereas the study has been made and substantially justifies the complaint: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*—

"1. That the Government of Morocco be required to comply with all terms of its treaties with the United States; and promptly adjust claims arising from violations.

"2. That the Moroccan Government be required to cease all acts tending to place United States nationals and trade in Morocco in a less favorable position than those of any other nation."

Annual Report of Agriculture and Livestock Committee of West Texas Chamber of Commerce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 27, 1954

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the West Texas Chamber of Commerce has for many years been a civic force of tremendous value to the west Texas area. Agriculture is of great importance in this farflung area. The West Texas Chamber of Commerce accordingly devotes considerable attention to agricultural matters.

Some idea of the scope of its work in this field may be gained from the recent annual report of the agriculture and livestock committee. In many respects the activities of this committee during the past year set a pattern which might be followed with profit in other farm areas all over the Nation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the annual report of the West Texas Chamber of Commerce agriculture and livestock committee, with Mr. R. M. Fielder, of Abilene, as committee chairman, and Mr. J. C. Porter, of Wichita Falls, as chairman of the subcommittee on oil conservation, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ANNUAL REPORT—AGRICULTURE AND LIVESTOCK

The Agriculture and Livestock Committee has continued work on broad objectives in fields of major influence to our agricultural economy.

SOIL AND WATER CONSERVATION

A program was launched in the fall of 1952 by the WTCC in cooperation with the Texas Association of Soil Conservation District Supervisors and termed outstanding by the national association and recommended by this group as a pattern for other States and regions to follow. The popularity of this program gained the attention of the Soil Conservation magazine which is the official organ of the Soil Conservation Service of the United States Department of Agriculture. They discussed in some length the manner in which our program is carried on and its results.

Conferences have been conducted in 10 areas of the region thus far in which panel discussions have presented to businessmen the purpose and method of operation of their own locally governed soil conservation districts. Purpose of the conferences is to point out how business interests can best assist in the soil conservation movement.

In attendance at these area meetings have been 995 persons from 153 towns, including representatives of 65 banks, 70 local chambers of commerce, and 72 soil conservation districts.

Resulting from the area meetings sponsored by the WTCC, more than 50 local (single soil conservation district) meetings have been held to present the information to more people. It is the intention of the committee to continue this series of conferences until every soil conservation district in the region has been included.

BRACERO LABOR

Continuing its liaison with users of bracero labor, the committee called a meeting early in the year of representatives of more than 20 organizations and associations to discuss undesirable features in the contract between the governments of the United States and Mexico. It was the decision of the group to work toward a more satisfactory and workable contract.

Many favor the transfer of the bracero program from the Department of Labor to the Department of Agriculture in the belief that the Department of Agriculture has more understanding of the users' needs and of problems incident to the use of braceros. Several associations favor the adoption of a simple border-crossing card system to replace most of the present complex system. Negotiations have been completed and a new contract resulted between the Mexican Government and our Government which is virtually the same as that of 1953.

AGRICULTURAL CHEMICAL CONFERENCE

The first annual Agricultural Chemical Conference was held on January 13 and 14 at Texas Technological College, sponsored by the college, our committee, the Lubbock Chamber of Commerce, and the Texas A. & M. College system. The conference was designed to present information on the latest types of uses of fertilizers and agricultural chemicals to all persons who sell to using farmers and ranchers or who give counsel and advice to them.

Over 300 persons participated in our first conference representing 72 Texas towns and 20 out-of-State towns. Plans are already underway for a bigger and better program for next year.

EAT-MORE-BEEF CAMPAIGN

At the request of the Texas and Southwestern Cattle Raisers Association, at our committee meeting in March the WTCC initiated an eat-more-beef campaign in Texas in an effort to offset expected price declines resulting from heavier than normal marketing of grass-fed cattle.

The project was planned in July on a statewide basis, with representatives of the other regional chambers of commerce and of the State organizations of grocers, restaurants, press, radio, banks, utilities, railroads, hotels, advertising agencies, the United States Department of Agriculture, and the livestock industry.

Response and cooperation were excellent in the campaign which began September 15 and ended October 31. Many banks and utility companies used statement stuffers urging consumers to buy more Texas beef; railroads, hotels, restaurants featured beef dishes on their menus. The Production Marketing Administration distributed to newspapers and radio stations recipes for making tasty beef dishes from the lower-cost cuts of beef. The Texas Press Association and the Southwestern Association of Advertising Agencies cooperated in designing and advertising mats and distributing 522 of them to Texas newspapers; and grocers and others used the advertising to good advantage.

COTTON ACREAGE

Faced with cotton acreage control in 1954, the WTCC called upon the Production Marketing Administration to allow as part of the measured acreage to be included in the historical record of total cotton acreage upon which acreage allotments are based the acreage not planted because of lack of sufficient moisture. It has been estimated that in west Texas alone approximately 2 million acres normally planted in cotton were not planted this year because of the drought. The law allows for recognition of unusual weather conditions in determining totals, but the WTCC learned that in many cases this unplanted acreage had not been included. Representatives of the WTCC conferred with the State ASC committee and officials in Washington urging them to give recognition to those acres which were not planted because of abnormal weather conditions. We have received assurance that adjustments will be made for the control year of 1955.

ASSOCIATION ACTIVITIES

Close liaison has been maintained with associations and organizations representing various segments of our agricultural economy, and committee and staff representatives have participated in planning meetings and in presenting the program in many instances. Among these have been the American Cotton Congress, the Soil and Fertility Building Conference of the South Plains Irrigation District, annual meeting of the Texas Association of Soil Conservation District Supervisors, and the annual meeting of the Texas Ginners Association.

Everybody a Winner—In Support of H. R. 3879 for a Federal Lottery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL A. FINO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 27, 1954

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, in the first session of this Congress I introduced a bill proposing a Federal lottery, providing that the proceeds be used for Federal hospitals, the blind, recipients of old-age assistance, and disabled veterans. Under my bill, a commission would be constituted, the members to be appointed by the President, to conduct drawings and award prizes and to pay balances not awarded, to the worthy causes I have specified. All the proceeds would be managed through a fund entrusted to the Treasury. Tickets would be printed by the Treasury and distributed and sold by the Post Office Department, thus saving costs.

There are a great many benefits to be gained by our American society in using lottery proceeds for the advantage of the community rather than letting the money Americans now gamble profit men with no scruples for the general good. Hospitals receiving Federal support would receive increases. Veterans of our wars, the unfortunate blind, and our needy elderly persons could all enjoy better care and increased benefits without the necessity of going to the taxpayer for still more funds to operate such programs on a large scale. In Mexico, these purposes are identified so closely with the popular national lottery that the council administering it is established by law within the Ministry responsible for public health and welfare.

Not only would the direct beneficiaries of my bill derive good results from the operation of the lottery but the Government would derive a considerable sum in new revenue. One of the most attractive features of this form of collection is that it is entirely voluntary. It would become a form of voluntary taxation and everybody would gain as a result—not just the winners, and not just the beneficiaries. You might ask how? Through reduced pressure to increase taxes. This pressure would be reduced because this new form of voluntarily contributed revenue would go to meet the rising expense of Government.

Historically, lotteries are as old as America. They were used to raise support for founding and improving some of our most eminent institutions. Did you know that in their early days Brown, Columbia, Dartmouth, Harvard, Rutgers, and Yale, to choose a few examples, profited from judicious alliances with Lady Luck? Lotteries were run for these colleges, and others, when help was needed to grow. A display of historical documents recently set up by the Princeton University Library contains interesting and revealing Americana that confirms these uses of the lottery.

Today, Ireland is enjoying the fruits of an honestly run and strictly policed national lottery. You know the money collected through this lottery, after the payment of prizes, expenses, and taxes, is devoted to Ireland's Hospitals Trust Fund under an act of the Irish Parliament. The fund collects over £200,000 annually; that is well over a half million dollars.

A large share of this money comes from outside Ireland; no little portion of it from American pockets. Is there any reason United States hospitals should not benefit from the expenditure of this American money? No; especially when it is considered that a great deal of money is paid for sweepstake tickets that never passes the Statue of Liberty or comes near the Emerald Isle. It's a sad fact that counterfeit tickets to foreign lotteries are widely, easily sold in this country.

We are one of the very few civilized countries that does not sponsor a national lottery. Thirty or more European and Latin American countries support welfare activities with revenues so collected. France has netted from $15 to $30 million in recent years from her lottery and Italy takes in over $20 million a year. The Scandinavian countries have very successful lotteries operated under State supervision; the proceeds of which are used for various health and welfare programs. Both Norway and Sweden run multi-million-dollar programs.

These samples of the fruitfulness of national lotteries should give you an idea of what possibilities there are for this country where disposable income is so much higher than anywhere else. Why should our dollars go out to finance foreign enterprises? Estimated expenditure by Americans on foreign and domestic lotteries runs as high as $4 to $6 billion. Many of these lotteries have been corrupt. The government would perform a service to the people, and gain a handsome profit for doing so, if it established an honest lottery in which citizens could take a chance without violating the law.

Opponents of the Federal lottery claim to invoke some moral law forbidding it. But there is no Christian ethic behind their claim. Why, the Bible itself tells us that lots were often cast. To take only one example from the Old Testament, there is the passage in I Chronicles 25: 8:

> And they cast lots word against word, as well the small as the great, the teacher, and the scholar.

Rather a remarkable passage for Old Testament, do you not think? Therefore, appropriate to a discussion of casting lots in our country.

Campaigns against the corruption connected with illegal gambling are a good thing. One of the aims of my own proposal is to bring into the open and thereby clean up present-day gambling on the large scale.

On the small scale, we know that churchly approval did not cease with the beginning of our era. Games of bingo, benefit raffles, and other games of chance are sponsored by our most Christian folk. Their aims are worthy, as are those intended by myself and the many other supporters of a Federal lottery. The great weakness of the antilottery argument is the feebleness of legislated "morality." I need not cite more than the failure of the Volstead Act to make this point.

The whole argument is based on the naive assumption that things legally prohibited cease to exist. "That the proper exercise of Christian fortitude compels us to gag at a trading stamp but swallow a bookmaker." If it was proper to employ a lottery system in drafting our young men to fight for their country, what can be the objection to a similar system for entertaining them and supporting some of the Government's services to them as veterans? There is no doubt that they, and a great section of the entire population, do consider games of chance entertaining. In a poll taken some time ago, those who expressed an opinion were 80 percent in favor of lotteries run by the Federal Government. But polls do not provide the only evidence of the popularity of chance taking. In those places where gambling is already legal, we know that the circumstances surrounding it remain cleaner and that the proceds pay the way of a great many other activities too. Betting at racetracks has been on a rising trend for 25 years. In short, the evidence of our daily communities, our neighbors whom we respect, shows continuous proof that the great majority have no distaste for pooling small sums for the chance of winning a large one.

Assuredly those same neighbors, all of us, would gladly gratify this taste with doubled gratification in the knowledge that the system was honestly run, of service to our Government, and to benefit to less fortunate neighbors. Let us demand the establishment of a Federal lottery now. I urge your support of this legislation.

Award of Congressional Medal of Honor to the Late Lt. Col. George Andrew Davis, Jr., of Hale Center, Tex.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 27, 1954

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I have been notified by Brig. Gen. Joe W. Kelly, U. S. A. F., that the President of the United States, in the name of Congress, has awarded the Medal of Honor to the late Lt. Col. George Andrew Davis, Jr., of Hale Center, Tex. This award was made, according to General Kelly's statement to me, for conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity at the risk of his life, above and beyond the call of duty, in action with the enemy.

Lieutenant Colonel Davis was the son of Mr. and Mrs. George A. Davis, Sr., of Hale Center, Tex. His widow is Mrs. Doris Lynn Davis, of Lubbock, Tex.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the citation, signed by the President, which relates the inspiring story of this heroic Texan.

There being no objection, the citation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Maj. George Andrew Davis, Jr., 13035A, United States Air Force, distinguished himself by conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity at the risk of his life above and beyond the call of duty near Sinuiju-Yalu River area, Korea, on February 10, 1952. While leading a flight of four F-86 Saberjets on a combat aerial patrol mission near the Manchurian border, Major Davis' element leader ran out of oxygen and was forced to retire from the flight with his wingman accompanying him. Major Davis and the remaining F-86 continued the mission and sighted a formation of approximately 12 enemy MIG-15 aircraft speeding southward toward an area where friendly fighter-bombers were conducting low-level operations against the Communist lines of communications. With selfless disregard for the numerical superiority of the enemy, Major Davis positioned his two aircraft, then dove at the MIG formation. While speeding through the formation from the rear, he singled out a MIG-15 and destroyed it with a concentrated burst of fire. Although he was now under continuous fire from the enemy fighters to his rear, Major Davis sustained his attack. He fired at another MIG-15 which, bursting into smoke and flames, went into a vertical dive. Rather than maintain his superior speed and evade the enemy fire being concentrated on him, he elected to reduce his speed and sought out still a third MIG-15. During this latest attack his aircraft sustained a direct hit, went out of control, then crashed into a mountain 30 miles south of the Yalu River. Major Davis' bold attack completely disrupted the enemy formation, permitting the friendly fighter-bombers to successfully complete their interdiction mission. Major Davis, by his indomitable fighting spirit, heroic aggressiveness, and superb courage in engaging the enemy against formidable odds exemplified valor at its highest.

France Is Tired of Accusations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 27, 1954

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "France Is Tired of Accusations," which was written by J. M. Roberts, Jr., Associated Press news analyst, and was published in the Montana Standard, of Butte, Mont., on April 23, 1954.

In the article Mr. Roberts refers to Roger Seydoux, the extremely able Minister Plenipotentiary from France to this country, and to his speech at Fargo, N. Dak. I think it is well that the article be incorporated in the RECORD, so that the people will understand the real contribution France has made, and also will understand that the declaration made by the French on July 3, 1953, promising full independence to the Indochinese states, once the war was won, was made in good faith and in the expectation that independence would be granted to them at that time.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FRANCE IS TIRED OF ACCUSATIONS

(By J. M. Roberts, Jr.)

Roger Seydoux, Minister Plenipotentiary at the French Embassy in Washington, said in a speech at Fargo, N. Dak., Wednesday that American attacks on so-called French colonialism were fanning the get out of Indochina fires in France.

The Seydoux thesis is that France no longer has any material interests in Indochina or hope of profit from staying there.

He said France, with American help, is carrying a heavy burden of human and material losses in the war for the sole purpose of preventing southeast Asia from falling to the Communists.

"In all frankness," he said, "France is tired of all the accusations of colonialism one reads in the American press."

Other Frenchmen say repeatedly that, if the United States doesn't understand and doesn't like the way the French are doing, they will be glad to get out and let America take over the problem.

But Americans ask "if France is not materially interested, if she has actually foresworn colonialism, why doesn't she make the same promises to these people for after the war that Britain made to India during the last war? Why doesn't France tell them that, when they are no longer in danger of Red conquest, they can have complete independence, within or without the French union as they may freely decide? Because the French don't do this, isn't America becoming tainted throughout Asia? Isn't her traditional anti-colonialism being sidetracked, by association with France in this war?"

The new independence treaties with Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia do not meet American specifications. Not so much because they retain military command and the conduct of foreign affairs for France, but because they do not guarantee ultimate self-determination.

There may be an explanation for the French position, and a good one, which they are unable to publicize themselves because to do so would defeat an important policy purpose.

France has an army fighting Indochina. Its losses are heavy, and especially in officers the casualties are running ahead of production at St. Cyr, French West Point. Because of this, France has been unable to attend properly to her own security in Europe.

The material costs of the war in 3 months are equal to the entire remaining French commercial investment in Indochina, which has been heavily liquidated in recent years.

The burden is being carried by the army and by the people at home very largely because the war is for a part of the French Union. The government understands the other purpose, the containment of communism. But a war in far-off Asia for this purpose alone produces no more enthusiasm among the French Army and the French people than did such a war in Korea among the American Army and people.

Thus, removal or the definite promise of removal of Indochina from the French Union might finally cripple the government in the conduct of the war.

However correct this estimate of the position may be, the French are in no position to publicize it. For that would carry the inference that Indochina was being retained in the French Union only as a sop to army and people, to be turned loose when the crisis is over, and the result on morale would be the same.

Civil Works in the Red River Valley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 6, 1954

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the able speech presented by a brilliant military officer, Brig. Gen. E. C. Itschner, Assistant Chief of Engineers for Civil Works, at the annual meeting of the Red River Valley Association, held in Shreveport, La., on April 20, 1954. I feel this speech is of interest not only to those of us living in the Red River Valley, but to everyone in the United States because of the great importance of flood-control and civil-functions projects:

Since receiving your invitation to meet with the Red River Valley Association and to address you on this occasion, I have anticipated this event with keen interest. The activities of this association have long been known to me. However, this is the first opportunity I have had to see your organization in action. It has been an interesting and enlightening experience. So, I should like to talk to you today about the work of the Corps of Engineers in this area and about some of our mutual problems and interests.

Today our Nation finds itself in the unhappy situation of being forced to prepare for its defense against a continuously threatening and aggressive potential enemy. This is a situation certainly not of our own choosing, but one in which we find ourselves and which we cannot avoid. At the same time, there is the necessity to continue the development of our resources and to do so in an orderly and efficient manner, so that maximum use may be made of these resources over the longest possible period of time. Stating it more simply, we desire to safeguard for our people this country upon which providence has bestowed such bountiful blessings and to develop its resources to the fullest extent. These, I think, are worthy desires.

This condition creates many demands for each dollar brought into the Treasury through taxation. Our Government finds itself today with more justifiable places to invest its money than it has money to spend. So, the mere justification of a proposed expenditure is not sufficient. Our Government can afford to undertake only those public works essential to national defense, those which will produce an immediate cash return, a selected few which will produce the greatest benefits in developing our national resources, and those under way which can be completed more economically than they can be stopped. Because of this great need to consider projects most carefully before initiating their construction, it has become standard practice to reevaluate every authorized project in the light of current economics and changing local requirements before it is recommended to Congress for an appropriation.

This is the essence of the problem with which our country is faced. It is our problem—yours and mine. This means that more than ever we must examine with an increasingly critical eye the justification for each proposed expenditure if we are to meet our obligations to national defense and at the same time accomplish the most beneficial development of our natural resources. It means that all of us must unselfishly appraise our desires in the light of our means of accomplishing them, and that we must be willing to make local sacrifices for the overall good of our country.

At the same time we prepare for defense, we must not neglect the orderly and efficient development of our natural resources. Recent estimates have been made that the population of this country may double by the turn of the century, just 46 years from now. While this is happening, our standard of living continues to rise. Each of us consumes more products of all kinds, imposing increasingly greater demands upon our resources. So, it is not only by choice that we develop our resources. It also is a matter of necessity.

The Corps of Engineers is responsive to this situation. As an organization, it carries two enormous construction loads—one military, in preparing for national defense, and one civil, in the field of water resources development.

Here in the Red River Valley we can see illustrated vividly on all sides the necessity for resources development. We see a rapidly growing population. We see industry springing up and moving into this dynamic and progressive area. We see more land in use with more progressive methods of cultivation and higher crop yields. And all of this requires that we utilize more effectively the things we have to work with—our soil, our water, our people.

Since 1945 considerable progress has been made in protecting this valley from floods such as the catastrophe you experienced that year. Other authorized works are now planned. I am certain that you would like to see them constructed as rapidly as possible. I assure you that if there appears to be a slowing of progress it does not stem from any inability or indifference on the part of the Corps of Engineers but it is, instead, an orderly approach to the problem at the national level.

Many of you were present, I am sure, last Saturday when the dedication ceremony was held at Texarkana Dam. This is a magnificent structure on which splendid progress has been made. We shall continue to work vigorously to insure an early completion of this reservoir to bring additional flood protection to the Sulphur and Red River Basins. We expect also that Texarkana will join the ranks of other reservoirs in this area in becoming a popular recreation spot.

Specifications and plans are essentially complete for Ferrells Bridge Reservoir to be located on Cypress Creek. We consider it an excellent flood-control project and, in addition, approximately 30 percent of its capacity is allocated to the storage of water for consumptive purposes. As soon as funds are made available for its construction, I assure you that we shall begin work on it promptly.

As you are no doubt aware, we are making a further study of Millwood Reservoir as directed by Congress. We are anxious that diverse interests receive the utmost consideration, and we are hopeful for an early, sound solution to this many-sided problem affecting so vitally the well-being of the Little and Red River Basins.

Naturally, we are anxious to move along on the construction of the reservoirs in the project for Red River below Denison. Our levee grades are based upon their construction. Without them, the desired degree of protection is absent, and positive flood control is impossible of achievement.

In this connection, I should like to tell you something of proposed future work. In addition to a study of bank-stabilization works for Red River, authorized by congressional resolution and now under way, a report has recently been forwarded by the Chief of Engineers to the Secretary of the Army which recommends improvements for flood control in the Red River Basin in addition to projects already authorized.

This report recommends local protection works for Pauls Valley, Okla.; channel improvement, levee construction, and appurtenant drainage works along Brown Creek, Okla., and a diversion channel to Red River; channel improvements along Walnut Bayou, Ark., and a diversion channel to Red River; channel improvements along Maniece Bayou, Ark.; channel improvements along Posten Bayou, Ark. and La.; channel improvements and levee construction with appurtenant drainage works along McKinney Bayou, Tex. and Ark., including Barkman Creek, and a diversion channel to Red River. It also recommends the construction, maintenance, and operation of the following improvements in Texas: Cooper Dam and Reservoir on South Sulphur River; channel improvement and levee construction and appurtenant drainage works along Sulphur River, Cuthand Creek, South Sulphur River, and Middle Sulphur River; levee construction along North Sulphur River; and channel improvements along Brushy Creek.

I feel that the recommendations contained in this report will result in a practical plan for flood control below Denison Dam with great benefits to the Red River Valley and to the Nation as a whole.

Now, I would like to talk to you about cooperation. Today, with our Government as large and as complex as it is, with the necessity for the American people to make the most of what they have, with the very human desire of all of us to continue improving our standard of living, the word takes on more significance. It is especially important to those of us involved in the development of our water resources. Without cooperation, we can quite easily bungle the job. With it, we can retain the preeminent position of this country among nations.

In discussing this matter, I shall confine myself to the Red River Valley as much as possible. Of fundamental importance is the necessity for cooperation among members of your association, requiring that they work toward common goals. Then there is the cooperation which is essential between your association and other groups in this area, all of whom have a legitimate interest in continuing to improve this region.

Most important is cooperation between your association and the Corps of Engineers. And I know that I am on safe ground when I say that we receive excellent cooperation from this association at all times. And I can think of no better time than the present to thank you for it.

There is the cooperation we naturally expect between the offices of the Corps of Engineers jointly concerned with major projects. In the Red River Basin, the southwestern division, with headquarters in Dallas, through its Tulsa district, and the lower Mississippi Valley division, whose headquarters are in Vicksburg, through its New Orleans district, each prosecutes certain phases of the work. And I can tell you very truthfully that the highest degree of cooperation and coordination exists between these offices.

Next we get into the subject of interagency cooperation. Of especial importance is cooperation with the fish and wildlife sponsors and with the soil-conservation interests. At the outset, I should like to set the record straight by saying that the Corps of Engineers receives excellent cooperation from the governmental agencies concerned with these important aspects of conservation. I refer, of course, to the United States Fish and Wildlife Service and the Soil Conservation Service in Washington. I believe, too, that the Corps of Engineers extends to those organizations the highest possible degree of cooperation; certainly it is our desire to do so. But I regret that some persons, entirely without official status or backing, have, in their public remarks, created an inaccurate conception of the status of this relationship.

Here, in the Red River Valley, an undertaking of gigantic proportions is underway. We—all of us working together—are attempting to bring about the control of floods and to prevent their causing again, as they have so many times in the past, the ravages of inundation. Here are men helping themselves, bettering their lands, working together in a large community to accomplish something beyond the capabilities of the individuals.

In a project of this great magnitude, it is inevitable that gains in one respect can be made only at some expense to other interests. The surge of civilization across our country that resulted in the development of the West eliminated forever the tremendous buffalo herds that once roamed the plains and served so bountifully as a source of beef steaks for Indians and early settlers. Yet no one today would suggest that we demolish our plains cities and replant our farms to the original grass so that these buffalo herds could be restored. On the other hand, all of us would make great sacrifices if we could regain just a few pairs of the extinct passenger pigeon, which at one time was so plentiful but succumbed, not to civilization, but to the professional hunter. And today we would do everything in our power to increase the number of whooping cranes, since the species is in peril of extinction with only about 20 birds surviving.

It is true in the Red River Valley development that some losses have occurred to fish and wildlife habitat. However, I should like to point out that although some destruction to such habitat does occur, other wildlife advantages are created which may be superior. An outstanding example of this is found not far from here, where 4 million persons annually visit Lake Texoma. In 1953, 2½ million pounds of game fish and 1 million pounds of commercial fish were taken from this reservoir. I think you will admit that these are impressive figures—even for Texas.

On a national scale, in 1953 more than 41 million visitors enjoyed the resources of 150 project areas. More than 20 million pounds of fish were taken from 34 project areas where, before the projects were constructed, fishing was negligible. So, it seems to me to be grossly inaccurate to say that flood-control projects are destroying the opportunities to hunt and fish.

Public Law 732, enacted by the Congress in 1946, requires the Corps of Engineers to obtain the views of conservation interests as to what effect the proposed improvements for flood control, navigation, or major drainage will have on all forms of wildlife, including fish and migratory waterfowl. We consider these views in our planning and include them in our reports to the Congress.

The Corps of Engineers, in studying proposed projects, has observed the requirements of this law very closely. We have sought constantly to have incorporated in our reports reliable estimates of the effects of our proposed improvements upon wildlife. I must state frankly, however, that we have been unsuccessful in many of our studies in obtaining realistic and factual estimates. In many cases, the losses are estimated very vaguely as tremendous. And I think that none of us can place a value on that word. If those whose primary interest is the conservation of our wildlife could assess the losses which would occur and propose remedies in concrete terms, we would be in a position to evaluate more soundly the economics of the proposed project.

The policy of the Federal Government is to participate in helping to overcome floods, providing that it is economically justified. In doing so, we have taken some natural habitat for reservoirs, and by protecting other lands from frequent flooding have caused farmers to drain and clear them. We are not authorized by law to procure additional real estate solely to compensate for lost habitat, but we do endeavor to provide as much substitute habitat as possible on land which it has been necessary to acquire for project purposes. In some cases this has resulted in an improvement of wildlife conditions over those existing at the inception of the project. However, if legislative action is taken to require the acquisition of lands to replace in kind all wildlife values lost, many projects otherwise justifiable will lack economic feasibility and consequently will not be built.

Some middle ground seems desirable. The recreational values derived from conservation of our fish and wildlife are important. On the other hand, our Nation is growing; populations are increasing; more efficient use is being made of our lands, and additional lands are being developed. And if we are to retain the American way of life I think that none of us may deny the landowner the right to improve his own land if he so desires and to use it as he sees fit.

The solution to this problem is determined in each case by the Congress when it authorizes the project. But I should like to say that the Corps of Engineers stands willing at all times to cooperate in every possible way, insofar as is legally permissible, in the conservation of our wildlife.

If we are to achieve the ambitious goals we have set for ourselves, cooperation is vitally necessary. And it applies to other phases of resources development as well. For instance, it is necessary that there be cooperation between the soil conservation and flood control interests, among others. And here, too, there has been considerable misunderstanding. Most unfortunately, there are some persons, speaking in an unofficial capacity, who have left the impression that the Corps of Engineers is opposed to soil conservation practices. This is simply not true. We believe strongly that sound soil conservation programs are essential parts of river basin development, that they are vital to the preservation of our national strength and economy, and that they should be expedited on a nationwide basis.

On the other hand, I must tell you quite honestly that we do not agree with those extremists who view such measures as reforestation, terracing, revegetation, and gully control as the only solution to flood control. We deplore the manner in which the layman has been misled into this belief.

The use of measures such as these will contribute to flood control and reduce lesser flood flows. But, when watersheds are saturated by long-continued rains, there will be heavy runoff and there will be great floods.

A great deal of confusion has come about through the efforts of these extremists. For instance, "keep the water where it falls" has become a popular catch-phrase, but it is one which, when taken literally, is dangerous. And it is certainly contrary to nature's intentions. Water leaves the place where it falls by soaking into the soil, by returning to the air by evaporation and transpiration, and through runoff to cause floods. Sound soil-conservation practices will increase the rate of insoak and will aid in retarding runoff, but they will reduce runoff very little when major flood conditions obtain.

Another aspect of cooperation is looming ever more important as our Nation concerns itself more with economy in Government. This is the willingness of local interests to assume a larger share of the cost of providing for their flood protection and developing their resources. The President of the United States has recently pointed out that civil works should be on a partnership basis with appropriate sharing of cost between the Federal Government and the non-Federal interests which benefit from the work. This principle has yet to be spelled out in terms of specific programs. Its application in requiring a greater degree of local financial participation in civil works might in some cases slow down or defer these improvements, but if States and local agencies are willing to participate more heavily than in the past, this might offer the possibility of greater accomplishment, even with reduced Federal appropriations.

While on the subject of cooperation, I must commend local interests in the Red River valley for their willingness to cooperate and for their foresight in anticipating water needs and in making requests for water from reservoirs planned and under construction. The town of Denison, Tex., draws water from Lake Texoma. Texarkana Reservoir will supply water for domestic and industrial consumption, as will other reservoirs proposed to be constructed in this area. This seems to me to be a vivid demonstration of Federal-local cooperation, and one which is most commendable.

Visiting you has been pleasant and profitable to me. I have enjoyed attending your sessions and meeting your members. I hope that I may soon have the happy privilege of visiting you again and spending more time learning your flood-control and water-resources-development problems.

Unemployment in United States: Most Critical Problem Facing the American Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 1954

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following very interesting and factual survey of the effects of imports on the employment situation:

THE NATIONWIDE COMMITTEE OF
INDUSTRY, AGRICULTURE, AND LABOR ON
IMPORT-EXPORT POLICY,
Washington, D. C., April 26, 1954.

Hon. THOMAS J. LANE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN LANE: The alarming increase in unemployment in the United States is one of the most critical problems facing the American economy.

Particularly disturbing in the unemployment picture is the close relationship between unemployment, as revealed in the classification of labor distress areas by the United States Bureau of Employment Security, and the industries that have been hit by competition from low-cost imports produced with cheap foreign labor.

An estimated 300,000 American workers have lost their jobs in recent months because of import competition.

The President's recommendations for a 3-year extension of the Trade Agreements Act and for further reducing and broadening the application of United States tariff duties are now before the Congress. The Nationwide Committee of Industry, Agriculture, and Labor on Import-Export Policy, representing more than 50 organizations which need adequate protection against low-cost imports, is concerned that congressional approval of these recommendations will compound the problems of American industry and agriculture and touch off a new round of unemployment and declining business activity.

The nationwide committee has recommended, instead, that the Trade Agreements Act be permitted to expire on June 12, 1954, and that Congress repossess its constitutional authority to regulate trade with foreign nations.

In this connection, I am attaching for your information a survey of import unemployment, revised to April 8, which demonstrates the startling coincidence of unemployment distress and import competition.

I urge you to give full consideration to this survey and the facts it brings out in taking up the President's proposals on foreign trade and tariffs.

Sincerely,

O. R. STRACKBEIN,
Chairman.

Revised Survey of Import Unemployment, April 8, 1954

At least 300,000 American workers are jobless because of import competition, and unemployment due to imports is accelerating.

This was revealed in a survey of American industries, revised through April 8, by the Nation-Wide Committee of Industry, Agriculture and Labor on Import-Export Policy. The committee is made up of some 50 organizations which favor adequate protection for American industries and agriculture against cheap-labor foreign competition.

In estimating unemployment because of imports, the survey did not take into account part-time employment or the loss of man-hours and income resulting from foreign competition.

O. R. Strackbein, chairman of the committee, made the following comment on the survey:

The latest United States Government reports pile up new evidence that unemployment and business recession in the United States go hand in hand with competitive imports produced by cheap foreign labor.

Official government figures show that unemployment continued to rise during March. Normal seasonal gains in employment did not materialize. Instead unemployment hit 3,725,000, the second highest figure for March since 1941. Ninety percent of the United States labor market areas now have a surplus of workers. In 77 areas the situation is critical.

There is an unmistakable pattern of greatest distress where there is greatest import competition.

The impact is sharpest among industries producing critical minerals and materials. Smaller industries such as the watch industry, with precision skills that are essential to the national security in time of emergency, are withering under a creeping paralysis induced by imports.

During the postwar years, textile imports have risen steadily. Employment in the United States textile industry has declined some 300,000 in the same period. All this decline is by no means attributable to imports and no figure is included in the survey as the industry has made no compilation on textile unemployment due to imports. However, industry and labor leaders, alarmed over the critical situation in the textile industry, have called for adequate protection against imports that are undermining the domestic industry.

Textile spokesmen who have urged adequate tariff duties include Dr. Claudius Murchison, economic adviser to the American Cotton Manufacturers Institute; Spencer Love, Burlington Mills, Greensboro, N. C.; J. Craig Smith, Avondale Mills, Sylacauga, Ala.; F. S. Love, secretary-treasurer of ACMI, and John Chupka, woolen and worsted director, United Textile Workers of America, CIO.

Distress also has become acute in the mining industries.

Production of bituminous coal during the week ended March 6 was the lowest since March 26, 1938—16 years ago. An estimated 35,000 to 40,000 coal miners have been displaced by the dumping of foreign residual and crude oil into United States fuel markets.

Although lead and zinc are strategic metals the lead-zinc industry has virtually shut down in Utah, Idaho, Colorado, and other States. Copper is being progressively hit.

We are spending over $200 million a year for lead and zinc imports, and are financing the competition which is putting essential domestic industry out of business.

There has been a drop of 61,000 in lumber and wood products employment from a year ago.

Employment in the industry is the lowest it has been since 1947, the first year lumber employment figures were available. Some 15,000 are reported out of work in Washington and Oregon and the people of the Northwest have protested Government purchase of Canadian lumber. The hardwood, plywood segments of the industry have been severely hit by Japanese imports.

The petroleum and chemical industries are threatened by excessive imports and unrealistic tariff levels.

Since World War II oil production outside the United States, but excluding the U. S. S. R., has gone up 150 percent. American production has increased only 30 percent. Petroleum imports have tripled since 1946.

United States duties on chemicals are already among the lowest in the world. Foreign chemicals firms maintain strict limits on competitive imports through cartels. Their production capacity far exceeds their local consumption and they are looking for new markets.

Mass imports have imperiled other specialized American industries, including a number vital to defense such as scientific apparatus, watches, cordage, wool, and glass. Others important to the economy which are menaced by cheap-labor imports, include bicycles, fish, rubber footwear, wallpaper, insulation board, lace, motorcycles, almonds, walnuts, handmade glassware, jewelry, china and pottery, and wine.

A check of the Government's group IV areas of critical unemployment and the industries adversely affected by imports demonstrated their coincidence. Results of the checkup showed:

MASSACHUSETTS

Lawrence: Relatively most severe unemployment in Nation. Sharp curtailment in textile employment during past several years. Employment in industry dropped from over 20,000 in September 1950 to 8,700 in September 1953.

Lowell: Slightly more than half of the area's jobless workers are displaced textile workers.

New Bedford: Cotton textiles have been the historic mainstay of area's economy. During recent years, the industry, like most other New England textiles, has been declining. More than half the jobless were women; workers with textile and apparel experience predominated, although many had previous leather products experience.

North Adams: Layoffs in textiles and electrical machinery.

Webster: Unless unforeseen events boost textiles industry, there is little hope area will recover in predictable future.

Since September 1953, heavy unemployment has spread to three more Massachusetts communities directly affected by import competition.

NEW YORK

Gloversville: Difficulty in competing with foreign glovemakers has contributed to employment decline for a number of years.

Hudson: Permanent shutdown of one large textile mill, temporary closure of another, primarily responsible for recent job declines.

NEW JERSEY

Paterson: Recent employment losses led by sizable layoffs in textile and electrical machinery. Paterson was classified as an area of serious unemployment in March.

RHODE ISLAND

Providence: Providence was classified as area with substantial labor surplus prior to Korean conflict. Sharp slump in textile, lace, and jewelry employment is largely responsible for persistence of sizable unemployment.

PENNSYLVANIA

Pottsville: Dependent on coal mining, 1 in every 6 area workers is jobless. Nine-tenths of unemployed are men.

Scranton: Coal mining employed 17,800 workers in 1940. By September 1953, mining employment had dropped to 8,700.

Sunbury-Shamokin-Mount Carmel: Depressed conditions in the apparel, textiles, and lumber industries are largely responsible for high level of unemployment in area.

Uniontown-Connellsville: Coal mining, dominant industry in the area, has suffered depressed conditions for some time.

Wilkes-Barre: Area's employment totals continued to slump during past year, with most of decrease centered in coal mining.

Altoona: Jobless rolls include many workers with garment-making, mining, and railroad-shop experience.

Clearfield-du Bois: Prior to 1940 bituminous coal mining dominated area's economy. During recent years mine payrolls declined.

Indiana: Mining employment has declined precipitously from 7,000 in 1950 to 4,000 in November 1953.

Johnstown: Heavy unemployment in area stems largely from job declines in coal mining. More than 3,600 workers have been separated from industry's payroll in past year and a half with no improvement in sight. About 5,000 miners are on short workweek.

Kittanning-Ford City: Layoffs in glass and coal mining lead to substantial labor surplus.

Newcastle: Important center for glass, pottery, and chemicals.

Between September 1953 and March 1954, rising unemployment caused six new areas to be added to the areas of critical unemployment, doubling the number of Pennsylvania communities so classified.

WEST VIRGINIA

Beckley: Mining employment dropped 1,700 from a year ago.

Bluefield: Long-term declines in coal, resultant losses in railroads have been key factors in labor surplus.

Charleston: Glass, chemicals, and metal reductions pace factory losses. Sharp decline in bituminous coal mining.

Clarksburg: Sustained curtailments in coal, recent sharp declines in glass and electrical equipment.

Fairmont: Decline of 1,000 in mining employment during past year.

Morgantown: Glassware plants operating part time. Approximately four-fifths of the 1,600 unemployed workers are men, a majority of whom have coal-mining experience.

Parkersburg: Clay-glass products among industries hit.

Point Pleasant: Two-thirds decline in coal mining employment since June 1953. Decline expected in chemicals.

Ronceverte-White Sulphur Springs: Mining employment dropped over 25 percent.

Welch: Unemployment up almost 150 percent due to declines in coal mining.

Wheeling: Job losses severe in stone-clay-glass products.

Williamson: Sharp decline in coal mining employment.

Logan County: Employment down in bituminous coal mines.

The number of areas classified by the Bureau of Employment Security as having substantial unemployment increased from 6 to 13 in the last 7 months, the most serious increase in the country.

KENTUCKY

Corbin: Serious decline in lumber and wood products.

Hazard: Economy of area is dominated by bituminous coal mining, which has been declining since later 1948.

Madisonville: Area's economy has steadily declined for several years due to depressed conditions in coal mining.

Middlesboro-Harlan: Since June 1950 about 6,000 mining jobs have been eliminated, 2,000 of them since June 1952.

Paintsville-Prestonburg: Coal mine employment steadily declining. Many of the employed miners are on a partial workweek.

Pikeville: Most of unemployed are coal miners.

Henderson and Union Counties: Added to group IV areas on March 31. Coal mining employment hit.

OHIO

Toledo: Glass, glassware, and electrical industries among those hit.

Steubenville: Pottery and glassware industry seriously affected.

INDIANA

Michigan City; Bicycle industry among those affected.

Vincennes: Bituminous-coal mining has been declining for some time. Flat-glass industry also affected.

Terre Haute: Coal mine shutdown. Clay-products industry affected.

WASHINGTON

Tacoma: Diminishing supply and poor markets, particularly for plywood, have sharply curtailed employment in this industry for the past year.

Following is a breakdown of import unemployment within various industries, and the decline in employment in these industries from February 1953 to February 1954, as reported by the United States Department of Labor and other Government agencies. The compilation is based on estimates by the industries involved and on available data. The figure of approximately 300,000 is computed as follows: 93,900 in production industries and about 190,000 in supporting industries, occupations, and professions. The 190,000 reflects the present ratio of 2 workers in related jobs for each production worker.

Industry	Employment loss due to imports	Employment loss (February, 1953 to February 1954)
Stone, clay and glass products		32,600
Pottery and china	8,000	
Handmade glassware	1,500	
Flat glass	1,000	
Fabricated metal products		77,300
Wood screws	500	
Bicycles	2,400	
Motorcycles	700	
Instruments and related products		8,000
Scientific instruments	100	
Watches	4,000	
Textile-mill products: Cordage and twine	800	133,400
Paper and allied products: Wallpaper	300	[1] 1,500
Apparel and finished textiles		70,000
Hats	2,000	
Lace	2,000	
Handwear	2,000	
Rubber products: Rubber footwear	2,000	22,800
Leather and leather products: Luggage	400	24,700
Metal mining: Lead-zinc	10,000	3,600
Railroads	1,000	15,000
Coal mining	35,000	53,500
Fishing:		
East coast	4,000	
West coast	500	
Shipping	[2] 16,000	[2] 17,400

[1] Increase.

[2] June 1952 to February 1954.

Rt. Rev. Francis P. Connelly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 14, 1954

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, Brooklyn has long been spoken of as the City of Churches. Too infrequently, however, do we speak of its great churchmen.

One of its greatest, beloved by Brooklynites, regardless of their religious persuasion, is the Right Reverend Francis P. Connelly.

I am happy, indeed, to call attention to his choice as Brooklyn's Man of the Week by the Brooklyn Eagle and set forth in full the following article about him as it appeared in that paper's Sunday edition of April 25, 1954:

IT'S A GREAT DAY IN A PRIEST'S LIFE

(By Wendell Hanmer)

High spots in the life of a dedicated priest are his ordination, the celebration of his first mass and the golden jubilee of his priesthood. It is conceivable that of these three, the last must be most exalting—a recognition from the Giver of Life that one has served his purpose among mankind and is to continue doing so.

Today is the golden jubilee of the Right Reverend Francis P. Connelly, LL. D., V. F., pastor since July 1931, of Our Lady of Refuge Roman Catholic Church, the beautiful French Gothic edifice at Foster and Ocean Avenues, which he built in 1933–34.

Archbishop Thomas E. Molloy will preside today at the 11 a. m. solemn high mass which Monsignor Connelly will sing. The Reverend William J. Gately, of St. Vincent Ferrer, will be deacon. The Reverend James F. Kelly, of St. James Pro-Cathedral, will be subdeacon. The Right Reverend John J. Brennan, of Immaculate Heart of Mary, will preach the sermon.

Monsignor Connelly is a past State chaplain of the Knights of Columbus and he will be given an informal reception in the Columbus Club, 1 Prospect Park West, at 8 p. m., by his many friends of all faiths.

But his 5,500 Flatbush parishioners refuse to confine his jubilee celebration to this 1 day. They have arranged a dinner in his honor for 7:15 p.m., May 3, in the Hotel St. George and are making it, too, a nonsectarian tribute.

LABORING OVER HIS PAPERS

Seen the other day in the rectory adjoining his church, Monsignor Connelly gave the impression of being under great emotional pressure engendered by the coming momentous event. The rectory door was unlocked and no one barred the way to the opened door of a study on the second floor. Coatless, Monsignor Connelly labored over a pile of papers. Interrupted, he was brusque, but of a brusqueness not to be associated with resentment of the interruption. Several minutes passed before he completely relaxed and became what seemed to be his normal, friendly self.

He spoke freely and at length about his church and of related religious activities, but his laymanlike interests appeared limited to baseball, which was perhaps to be expected of one born on October 3, 1877, who had added numerous other religious duties to those of parish priest over a half century.

CALLED TO THE PRIESTHOOD

Born in Fall River, Mass., Monsignor Connelly entered St. Michael's College in Toronto, but for his senior year attended St. Francis College here, where he obtained his bachelor of arts. Throughout his college years he played baseball at first base, captaining both college teams. Valedictorian of his class, as well as an outstanding athlete, he might have turned to many pursuits, except that "early in life," he explained simply, "I felt a calling to the priesthood."

His ordination was preceded by 5 years of study in St. John's Seminary and followed by 13 years as assistant pastor of the procathedral, Jay Street and Cathedral Place.

The succeeding 9 years he was pastor of St. Agnes Roman Catholic Church in Greenport, Suffolk County, after which he returned to serve 5 years as pastor of the procathedral before assuming his present pastorate.

ORIGINAL CHURCH STILL THERE

Monsignor Connelly succeeded Father Robert O'Donovan, who was appointed when the parish was founded by the late Bishop Charles Edward McDonnell on December 8, 1911. Ground for a church was broken May 12, 1912, the small wooden structure which still stands in the middle of the block and in which the first mass was celebrated the following July.

Soon, the little church could no longer comfortably accommodate a growing congregation and Father O'Donovan was in the midst of a drive for funds for a larger one when he died. Monsignor Connelly completed the drive and, in consultation with Bishop Molloy and Henry V. Murphy, Brooklyn architect, worked out the plans for the present structure. The present church has been greatly admired. It has been duplicated on a smaller scale in Greensboro, N. C.

SERVES ON MANY BOARDS

Monsignor Connelly is diocesan director of the Holy Name Society, a vice president of the boards of trustees of Holy Family Hospital and of the Nursing Sisters of the Sick Poor, and a director of Ozanam Hall, which was razed for the civic center development and is to be reestablished in Bayside. He is also a dean of the Flatbush area of the diocese. But it is of his church that he speaks most feelingly.

Monsignor Connelly is the youngest and only survivor of 11 children. His father was a quarry superintendent. With a nephew, who also was a stonecutter, Monsignor Connelly visited the Massachusetts quarries and personally selected the Weymouth granite for his church. There was satisfaction and pride in his voice when he said of the church: "I built it."

New Dangers in Stream Pollution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 14, 1954

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I herewith include an editorial which appeared in the April 22, 1954, issue of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch entitled "New Dangers in Stream Pollution":

Secretary Oveta Culp Hobby gives a new and compelling reason for the Nation's streams to be cleansed of pollution from industrial wastes. The head of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare says the national water supply is being subjected to dangers from new chemicals. These chemicals, she declares, have not been sufficiently analyzed to determine their likely impact on public health.

Missouri and Illinois are exceptionally aware, at present, of the need for alleviating stream pollution. The Kaskaskia River in the latter State, where industrial wastes have recently been killing fish and making the water supplies of several communities offensive in taste and odor, has dramatized the problem. The prolonged drought in both States has pointed up their dependence on a pure water supply.

The new hazards of which Secretary Hobby speaks can best we dealt with the same as the hazards which have long been associated with stream pollution, and that is, by stopping the pollution before it starts, by building pollution control into the industrial plants themselves.

The Royal Netherlands Air Force

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. STUYVESANT WAINWRIGHT

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 23, 1954

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. As you know, Mr. Speaker, the First Congressional District of New York includes several great aircraft-manufacturing companies. The membership would undoubtedly be interested in the statement made by Col. Richard S. Abbey, United States Air Force, Chief of the Air Section of the United States Military Assistance Advisory Group to NATO at The Hague, Netherlands, on March 10, 1954:

> The Royal Netherlands Air Force, operating from bases only 14 minutes' flying time from the Iron Curtain, has achieved "a remarkable state of combat readiness only 4 years after beginning to rebuild from virtually nothing."
>
> That is the assessment of Netherlands air strength made by officers of the United States Military Assistance Advisory Group who have been working here for 20 months prior to July 21, 1951, when the delivery of Republic F–84G Thunderjets started the Dutch Air Force buildup.
>
> "The quality of Netherlands Air Force organization, training, and operations is comparable in almost every respect with that of the United States Air Force," declared Col. Richard S. Abbey, Chief of the Air Section of the United States Advisory Group.
>
> American operational methods are employed down through the squadron level, including communication in English between airborne pilots and control towers and aircraft, he said.
>
> More than 50 percent of the Netherlands pilots and many technicians have been trained at special schools in the United States, he pointed out, and these men have formed the core of a Dutch training system that now is judged capable of instructing about two-thirds of the special skills required in a modern air force, with training units still being expanded.
>
> The geographical position of the Netherlands is such, Colonel Abbey pointed out, that its air bases can be invaluable in providing tactical support for land forces that might be operating in Germany and as a valuable base for the conduct of the defensive battle. More than a dozen fields are now operational with facilities of such high quality that the Netherlands Government has declared it can readily accommodate units of the United States Air Force if such deployment is desired to further integrate northern European defense. Fuel pipelines to supply the bases from North Sea ports or from the large North Atlantic Treaty Organization pipeline network are under construction, he said.
>
> The bulk of the first-line air strength of the Netherlands is made up of several squadrons of the F–84 Thunderjets, backed by British-made Gloster Meteors serving in the air defense role, Colonel Abbey stated. He described the Thunderjets as the standard NATO fighter-bombers selected for their exceptional range and load-carrying capability. All are equipped for the new technique of in-flight refueling to extend their range. These are the same type of aircraft recently announced by the United States Air Force as being its first fighter-bomber capable of carrying nuclear weapons. The Meteors are the veteran jets used by the British at the close of World War II to intercept German "buzz bombs." Transport and reconnaissance facilities are in existence, and naval air forces are serviced by Lockheed Neptunes and Grumman Avengers.
>
> "The present state of combat readiness of the Netherlands Air Force is more remarkable when we consider the geographic size of the nation with only 10 million population and its urgent postwar problems, including the flood disaster of 1952," Colonel Abbey said.
>
> He also noted that the Netherlands, although a small European country, has a highly developed and important aviation industry. The large Fokker aircraft factory is scheduled to produce the British-designed Hawker Hunter interceptors which will replace the Meteors.
>
> Colonel Abbey cited the recent contract signed between Republic Aviation International and Industriemaatschappij Avio-Diepen N. V., of The Hague, for the overhaul and maintenance of RNAF Thunderjets as further evidenec of Dutch willingness to assume their proportionate share of NATO defense.
>
> "The Netherlands, which was first to ratify the European Defense Community and to approve the idea of delegating sovereignty to a supranational authority in Europe, has become one of the first NATO countries to undertake to bear expenses of maintaining the aircraft provided under the United States Mutual Defense Assistance Pact," he said.

Governors' Conference on Mental Health—Rise in Patients and Cost Must Be Met by Emphasis on Prevention, Not Custody

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 15, 1954

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, 10 Governors, among them Gov. Robert B. Meyner, of New Jersey, and representatives of 46 of the 48 States, met in Detroit, February 8 and 9, to consider the national mental health problem as it confronts the States.

At the conclusion of the conference, they adopted the following 10-point program based on the frank acknowledgment that with the ever-rising backlog of patients and costs which are almost entirely borne by the taxpayers, custodial care must give way to prevention through emphasis on intensive research and training:

> 1. By far the major share of a State's mental health resources must be used for the care and treatment of patients in State hosiptals for the mentally ill. Psychiatric treatment with the fullest use of existing knowledge can return many more people to productive and useful lives, increased appropriations for additional qualified mental health personnel (including psychiatrists, psychologists, social workers, nurses, and related personnel) and intensive treatment programs should be provided by the States at their next legislative sessions to increase the number of patients discharged from State mental hospitals.
>
> 2. Training and research in the field of mental health are essential elements of effective mental health programs. The serious accumulation of patients and costs can only be reduced by discovering new knowledge and new methods of treatment and by more adequate training and development of mental health personnel. State legislatures are urged to appropriate specific sums for training and research in addition to the regular appropirations for care and treatment.
>
> 3. Ultimate reduction of the population in State mental hospitals can be achieved by efforts to prevent mental illness. This requires facilities for early identification, for early treatment and for after-care and supervision of those on leave from State hospitals. State governments should take the initiative with both financial and professional assistance in stimulating local public and private agencies to participate actively in preventive programs.
>
> 4. At present it is estimated that less than 1 percent of total State mental health budgets is expended for research—$4 million out of a total expenditure of about $560 million. Based on a comprehensive survey of State mental health officials, it is recommended that the States should devote a much larger percentage of their total mental health budgets to basic and applied research in the biological and behavioral sciences and to the training of personnel in research methods.
>
> 5. Effective training and research programs cannot be achieved without effective organization. A position of director of training and research should be established within the mental health agency in each State to assume responsibility for the coordination of mental health training and research within the State's jurisdiction. A technical advisory committee, composed of scientists and educators in the field of mental health, cooperating with scientists in universities and industry, should be established in each State to advise and assist the mental health agency and other State departments concerned with the coordination of training and research activities.
>
> 6. State institutions which are not accredited for residency or as affiliate training centers for phychiatrists, clinical psychologists, social workers, nurses and other professional groups should receive support from governors and legislatures in their endeavors to raise the level of teaching and supervision in their institutions to secure accreditation.
>
> 7. The States should provide stipends for graduate training in the psychiatric field, should adjust salary scales and should provide educational leaves of absence so that State mental hospitals may compete effectively for the limited personnel available to fill treatment, teaching, and research positions.
>
> 8. One of the important obstacles to adequate evaluation of procedures and therapies is a lack of uniformity in statistical methods in mental hospitals and clinics throughout the country. All States should cooperate with the United States Public Health Service and the American Psychiatric Association in the adoption of uniform terminology for statistical reporting procedures in the field of mental health.
>
> 9. Joint action by groups of States may provide one of the most fruitful means of attacking mental illness. This can be partially achieved by periodic regional mental health conferences, regional programs such as that now sponsored by the southern regional education board, and by active participation in the interstate clearinghouse now established through the Council of State Governments by request of the Governors' Conference. The clearinghouse, in cooperation with existing public and private agencies, will provide a medium for exchange of pertinent information among the States, in organizing more effective mental health programs, and will help in developing interstate agreements so that groups of States can utilize to the fullest extent existing training and research facilities.

10. State and community mental health organizations should play important roles in educating the public to the problems of mental health and to the methods of improving psychiatric services. The States should encourage and support mental health education in the schools, good relationships between hospitals and their surrounding communities, and the provision of adequate community psychiatric services. These may, in the long run, be most important in determining the mental health of the Nation.

Gov. C. Elmer Anderson, Minnesota; Gov. Edward Arn, Kansas; Gov. Frank G. Clement, Tennessee; Gov. George N. Craig, Indiana; Gov. Frank J. Lausche, Ohio; Gov. William C. Marland, West Virginia; Gov. Robert B. Meyner, New Jersey; Gov. Johnston Murray, Oklahoma; Gov. William G. Stratton, Illinois; Gov. G. Mennen Williams, Michigan.

(Ex-Governor Driscoll and Commissioner Sanford Bates were other members of the New Jersey delegation.)

The Work of 25,000 Communists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 26, 1954

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend and revise my remarks, I include an article by David Lawrence appearing in publications throughout the United States datelined April 14, 1954. It is an excellent article:

HERE'S HOW 25,000 UNITED STATES COMMUNISTS FUNCTION TO WRECK THIS NATION

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON, April 13.—Just what do 25,000 Communist agents throughout the United States do every day?

Lately there has been a tendency in some quarters to say that 25,000 is only a small number out of an adult population of 100 million and hence the menace can be regarded as relatively insignificant.

This correspondent has just completed a survey among authoritative sources concerning the activities of the 25,000 Communist agents, as the facts have been given to officials in the executive and legislative branches of our Government.

In the first place, any cause or organization engaged in pursuing an objective would count itself lucky in having 25,000 full-time representatives to carry on its work.

For every one of these 25,000 is known to have at least 10 friendly contacts, bringing the circle of influence up to at least 250,000. These agents live in every State in the Union and influence opinion in every community.

The tactics of the 25,000 are varied. They range from the making of telephone calls to radio and television stations immediately after controversial speeches have been made to the constant writing of letters of propaganda to the daily newspapers.

In many instances this correspondent has answered letters of that type only to have them returned by the post office authorities with the statement that no one of the name given is known at the address.

If American newspapers published the addresses of persons who write them on highly controversial subjects, the neighbors could readily determine whether such letters are genuine or fictitious. This would reveal whether persons engaged in supporting Communist agents' activities are deceiving the press.

The 25,000 agents have their contacts in the press, the radio, the churches, and the colleges, but they are concentrating for the most part now on national and local organizations within which they seek to influence the passage of resolutions.

The latest edict from Communist headquarters to the 25,000 agents calls on Communists in all districts in the United States to launch a program bombarding newspaper editors with statements that the Communist Party does not advocate the overthrow of the American Government by violence.

In a few weeks from now many fellow travelers will take up this line and soon organizations which on their face are not connected remotely with the Communists will take up the cry.

The success of the 25,000 Communist agents in getting petitions signed and literature distributed is very marked. In the month of August 1952 there were 400,000 pieces of literature distributed on the Rosenberg case and 50,000 signatures obtained.

These petitions are never signed by the Communist Party itself but by some front organizations with respectable-sounding names.

The mailing lists are obtained from phone books and public records.

Subagents are given copies of mimeographed letters to be used by those replying, and resolutions are drafted for passage in labor unions, educational organizations, civic clubs, church groups, etc.

Whispering compaigns are a favorite form of Communist-agent activity.

Lately attention has been concentrated on rumors concerning the Indochina war, just as was the case during the Korean war.

As soon as a few American technicians went to Indochina, the Communist agents stirred up opposition in various ways.

Some idea of the control which the Communist leaders have over the rank and file can be derived from the fact that from December 27, 1952, to January 17, 1953, a large number of pickets on the Rosenberg case operated around the clock every day. They were aided by persons in other lands. Communications of protest came from 40 different countries.

The Daily Worker in New York, which is the organ of the Communist Party, sends instructions daily through its news columns to the 25,000 agents giving the line to be taken.

Long before other groups take up the line, the Daily Worker will have outlined the arguments to be used. The indirect contacts through intermediaries with Government officials, legislators, and the press constitute a baffling phase of the whole apparatus.

The Communist conspiracy inside the United States is real.

It is in operation every day.

The FBI alone cannot cope with it, because many of the activities are in themselves not law violations.

Hence exposure to the full view of the public is the only effective way to combat the conspiracy.

Congressional committees represent the only vehicle through which the publicity needed can be obtained to arouse the public to be vigilant and take countermeasures. The Communist agents lately, however, have succeeded in adding momentum to the drive to curb the powers of congressional committees.

There are many Americans who minimize the work of the Communist agents, but those in Government who really know the facts do not discount it. They fear it. It is a dangerous conspiracy which will require the aggressive services not of just one but of many Senators and Representatives to defeat the 25,000 conspirators who serve the Soviet Government inside the United States today.

Tariffs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 1954

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein an excellent summary and report on the subject of tariffs, dated April 7, 1954, by the New England Textile Committee:

SUMMARY OF REPORT ON THE SUBJECT OF TARIFFS

The subject of tariffs is of vital importance to the New England textile industry, one of New England's most important industries, employing over 220,000 workers.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The New England Textile Committee recommends:

1. That there should be no further reductions in tariff rates on any of the different classes of textiles.

2. That tariff rates should be raised on textile products where foreign imports cause or threaten to cause unemployment in any segment of the industry.

REASONS

The New England textile industry, consisting of over 1,500 establishments, is an industry of highly competitive small businesses and needs protection from low-wage foreign competition. Foreign wage differentials of 200 to 1,400 percent are not offset by superior productivity of New England mills, in part due to the sharing of technical know-how with our foreign neighbors.

Today the textile industry's rise from a state of depression involving widespread unemployment in New England is being hindered by increased imports of foreign textile products, duty-paid, at prices below those of United States producers. Meanwhile, displaced New England textile workers are experiencing difficulty in finding new jobs and are being carried on the rolls of the unemployed.

Our standard of living and national security will be severely injured unless some means is provided to grant relief to the textile industry as needed.

Unlike other industries, entrance and exodus from textiles is quick and the industry is subject to very rapid economic changes, which characteristics have to be considered in the formulation of tariff policies.

REPORT ON THE SUBJECT OF TARIFFS

The importance of tariff rates to the New England textile industry and the current activity of the Federal Government relative to same have prompted the New England Textile Committee to conduct hearings for the purpose of discussing and studying this issue. This statement of the position of the New England Textile Committee on the tariff issue, for presentation to our New England Governors, Congressmen, and to the general public, is the product of this careful study.

This report consists of a definition of the textile industry in New England, discussion of characteristics of the industry, the need for tariff protection, present tariff legislation, and recommendations of the New England Textile Committee.

NEW ENGLAND TEXTILE INDUSTRY

The textile industry is one of the most important industries in New England. New England mills constitute about 20 percent of the cotton, silk, and synthetic textile industry,[1] about 60 percent of the woolen and worsted textile industry,[2] and a sizable percentage of other textile industries including manufacturers of lace goods, felt goods, coated fabrics, cotton cordage and twine, hats, carpets and rugs, knit goods, thread and yarn. The New England Textile Committee represents all of the textile mill products industries.

Over 16 percent of the people employed in New England manufacturing industries are directly employed in textiles, approximately 220,000 people in 1953.[3] Another 220,000 people are indirectly dependent on the textile industry, as the loss of a textile job in a community may mean the loss of one additional job when the worker and his dependents cut their purchases from the grocer, the druggist, the department store, and the professions.[4] Thus, 1 in every 6 jobs in New England is directly or indirectly dependent on the welfare of the textile industry.

The New England textile industry represents capital investment in excess of $1½ billion,[5] value added by manufacture in 1952 of $1,154,000,000,[6] and would require investments of about $3 billion to substitute new manufacturing jobs for textile jobs.[7]

The textile industry is not only essential to New England, but is of great importance to the national economy. The total industry employs approximately 1.25 million workers, has an annual gross product value of $12 billion, pays taxes of $1.25 billion annually and had an investment at the end of 1952 of $5½ billion, with total assets of about $9 billion.

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE INDUSTRY

The characteristics of large employment, small size of units, geographical dispersion, high percentage of labor costs to other costs, free price competition, and military value make it mandatory that present tariff rates on textile mill products be maintained or increased in the interest of national welfare.

LARGE EMPLOYMENT

In addition to being one of the largest employers of labor, the industry is characterized by the fact that mills employ a relatively high proportion of the workers in the labor market area where they are located. Many mills are situated in small towns, where they provide either the sole or principal source of outside income to the community. Other mills are located in textile centers, such as Rockville and Danielson, Conn.; Sanford, Biddeford, and Lewiston, Maine; Fall River, New Bedford, Lawrence, and Lowell, Mass.; Manchester and Keene, N. H.; Woonsocket and Providence, R. I.; and Winooski, Vt., where they represent a large proportion of the total manufacturing employment in the area.

SIZE OF UNITS

The textile industry typifies small business which the Federal Government is currently trying to assist, on the one hand, through the Small Business Administration, and is permitting to be injured, on the other, through reductions in textile tariffs.

The average number of employees in textile mills is very low in New England as well as in all regions of the United States and in all branches of the industry. In the United States, 43 percent of the textile mills employ less than 20 persons and 73 percent employ under 100 workers.[8] The total industry is composed of over 9,000 mills, of which over 1,500 are in New England.

GEOGRAPHICAL DISPERSION

Only a relatively small number of textile mills are located in large metropolitan areas where there is a diversity of manufacturing and employment. Most of the mills are small, widely distributed, and located in small towns where a change or shift in demand for their output causes particular hardship on textile workers.

LABOR-ORIENTED INDUSTRY

The entire industry is noted for its relatively high percentage of labor costs to other costs. In 1953, salaries and wages of the wool textile industry represented 63 percent of the total value added by manufacture.[9] In the case of the cotton and rayon broadwoven fabrics field, salaries and wages represented 67 percent of the total value added by manufacture in 1952.[10] This labor cost is particularly important when one considers that raw material costs are just as low or lower to other producers throughout the world. Government price-support policies tend to raise the cost of raw materials to American producers above the prevailing prices in the world market.

Uncontrolled competition from low-wage foreign producers can seriously damage the New England textitle industry, the New England economy, and the national textile industry. In competition with foreign producers, the wage differential varies between 200 and 1,400 percent, and this in a labor-oriented industry.[11] As a result, during 1953 textile products were entering the United States, duty paid, at prices substantially below those of domestic producers.[12]

The Government considers an area with 6 percent or more unemployment a surplus labor area. As an example of what can happen in a short period of time in textiles, let us consider the case of the lace manufacturers, predominantly located in the Blackstone and Pawtuxet Valley areas of Rhode Island. In the 2 years following the reciprocal-trade-agreements program with France, in conjunction with the devaluation of the French franc, which in substance meant still further tariff reduction, the lace industry in Rhode Island found itself with 66 percent of its workers unemployed and the remaining 34 percent working on an average of 14½ hours a week.[13] This shows how quickly foreign competition affects the textile industry.

PRICE COMPETITION

The outstanding characteristic of the textile industry is its highly competitive nature with the resulting low free-market price of textiles to the consumer. In recent years textile profits as a percent of sales have been running below the average earnings of manufacturing industries generally. The textile industry is not making profits at the expense of the consumer under the protection of the present tariff.

MILITARY VALUE

Maintenance of a domestic textile industry is vital to our national security. During the 4 years, 1942–45, 51.4 percent of the production of cotton broad-woven goods in the United States went to the armed services.[14] In the woolen industry, during the peak production years of 1942 and 1943, 51.5 percent and 48.8 percent respectively of domestic production went to the armed services.[15] Any injury to the New England textile industry through tariff reductions could jeopardize national security.

TARIFF PROTECTION

In the interest of New England, our national security, and the national economy, present tariff rates on textile products must be maintained to protect the textile industry and its various segments from injury and unemployment caused by low-wage foreign competition. When foreign imports cause or threaten to cause unemployment in any branch of the textile industry, tariff rates on the goods imported should be raised to prevent further injury and unemployment.

Textile workers laid off as a result of mill closings find it difficult to find jobs. Older textile workers are experiencing considerable difficulty in finding new jobs and if total textile employment declines it will be increasingly difficult for them to find any sort of employment according to a recent survey conducted by Northeastern University.[16] Any reduction in tariff rates will only serve to aggravate the already serious problem of unemployment in some New England textile centers.

The textile industry is one of the first industries to develop in new industrial areas and in rehabilitated countries. Since World War II United States textile machinery manufacturers have equipped many foreign mills. As a consequence, many foreign producers have machinery which is more modern and more efficient than the older machinery in many mills in the United States. With low wages, modern machinery and techniques, foreign producers can and will capture our domestic markets. Any advantage we enjoyed in the past in greater productivity and effieciency has been equalized by sharing our knowledge with our foreign neighbors. Fine combed cotton goods from Western Europe and Japan, Italian and Japanese velveteens, English typewriter cloth, English tweeds, and other foreign textiles are coming into this country in increasing numbers.

Since the inception of the textile industry, the Government has provided protection against foreign producers through the medium of the tariff. Under these conditions the industry has grown and developed a scale of wages commensurate with the American standard of living. Through reciprocal trade agreements during the last 20 years there have been large reductions in tariff rates on textiles. Any further reduction would be injurious to the industry and New England. The New England Textile Committee favors protection for workers, stockholders, and the public from the low-wage competition of foreign countries.

TARIFF LEGISLATION

Under present tariff rates, textile products are being imported in increasing quantities while domestic industry suffers from unemployment. The woolen and worsted industry is the prime example of this situation.

The Commission on Foreign Economic Policy, popularly known as the Randall Commission, has recommended further tariff reductions to the President. The New England Textile Committee is opposed to any further tariff reductions on textile products.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The New England Textile Committee recommends:

1. That there should be no further reductions in tariff rates on any of the different classes of textiles.
2. That tariff rates should be raised on textile products where foreign imports cause or threaten to cause unemployment in any segment of the industry.

Footnotes at end of speech.

Footnotes at end of speech.

---

[1] Statement of the National Association of Cotton Manufacturers & Northern Textile Association on the subject of tariffs before the New England Textile Committee, March 10, 1954.

[2] Bureau of the Census, 1949.

[3] Statement of the National Association of Cotton Manufacturers & Northern Textile Association, March 10, 1954.

[4] Report on the New England textile industry by committee appointed by the Conference of New England Governors, 1952, May 1, 1953.

[5] Ibid.

[6] Statement of the National Association of Cotton Manufacturers & Northern Textile Association, March 10, 1954.

[7] Report on the New England textile industry, May 1, 1953.

[8] U. S. Department of Commerce and Federal Security Agency, County Business Patterns, first quarter, 1949.

[9] Statement submitted to the Commission on Foreign Economic Policy by the National Association of Wool Manufacturers, December 1953.

[10] National Association of Cotton Manufacturers & Northern Textile Association, April 1954.

[11] Ibid.

[12] Ibid.

[13] Testimony of National Association of Lace Manufacturers before the New England Textile Committee, March 10, 1954.

[14] Statement of the National Association of Cotton Manufacturers & Northern Textile Association, March 10, 1954.

[15] Statement submitted to the Commission on Foreign Economic Policy by the National Association of Wool Manufacturers, December 1953.

[16] Bureau of business and economic research at Northeastern University, January 25, 1954.

The Aircraft Employee Is King-Size Customer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STUYVESANT WAINWRIGHT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 23, 1954

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call to my colleagues' attention the statement recently made by Mundy I. Peale, president of Republic Aircraft Corp., published in the Machinist, March 1, 1954:

THE AIRCRAFT EMPLOYEE IS KING-SIZE CUSTOMER

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Everybody knows what an important part America's aircraft industry plays in keeping our country's defenses strong. But many people forget that the industry's employees also make a vital contribution to the economic prosperity of the United States. Recently, Mundy I. Peale, president of Republic Aircraft Corp., discussed the role of the aircraft employee as a wage earner, taxpayer, and neighbor in an address before the Los Angeles Advertising Club. Here are excerpts from his talk, What the Aircraft Industry Means to Every American.)

A great many of us have overlooked what to me is one really incredible aspect of the industry.

That is the part that this once-fantastic invention has come to play in our daily lives. Aviation now is a part of the closely knit web of American industry. It is linked to our well-being and prosperity, not merely from the military standpoint but from the economic viewpoint as well.

The aviation industry this year became the second largest employer of manufacturing workers in the United States. About 750,000 people now draw their paychecks directly from aircraft manufacturing—and I emphasize directly. Only the automobile industry now employs more workers.

And that's only part of the story. Even the figure of 750,000 people is small. For example, we know that there are many additional thousands of people in allied industries, like rubber, electrical, chemical, and glass, who are making tires, landing gears, cockpit canopies, instruments, and fuels, who properly can be said to earn their livings indirectly from aviation.

I don't believe an estimate of as many as two or three million people who earn their livings by doing aviation work would be too far wrong.

Let's look at what the rise of the aviation industry means to the area you are most familiar with.

The figures show that about 176,000 people are now employed directly in aircraft manufacturing in metropolitan Los Angeles. These are the people working for such companies as Douglas, North American, Lockheed, Hughes, and Northrop.

The fact is, that these 176,000 people—whose average earnings, incidentally, are higher than the average for manufacturing workers in other industries—draw paychecks amounting to $15 million a week. That's more than three-quarters of a billion a year.

Now you and I know that this makes for quite a market—that such a large group of people buy a lot of houses, cars, gasoline, food, Kleenex, Pepsodent, cigarettes, Vel, Tide, Draino, Lux, and Duz.

The story of what aircraft manufacturing means to the internal prosperity of the United States—as well as to its external security—is being written daily in retail shops across the Nation.

I think you'll agree that the aircraft worker is a king-size customer, a solvent citizen—and a very good neighbor.

We Commend Lester Johnson, of the Ninth District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER JOHNSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 1954

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert in the RECORD an editorial from the Thorp (Wis.) Courier. As some of my colleagues know, a month ago I attempted to get the House Agriculture Committee to take favorable action on my bill, H. R. 8388, to prevent Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Benson's order from going into effect, to lower dairy price supports from 90 to 75 percent of parity.

The House Agriculture Committee did not act on this matter and dairy support prices were lowered on April 1. More than farmers were and are concerned with this action by Benson. It has affected the businessmen in our district.

The editor of the Thorp Courier, Robert Elkins, points out very well in his editorial that reducing farm income is not the cure to the dairy farmeers' plight. I commend the editorial to my colleagues attention as follows:

WE COMMEND REPRESENTATIVE LESTER JOHNSON, OF THE NINTH DISTRICT

We commend Representative LESTER JOHNSON for his timely and forceful efforts in supporting his bill continuing support prices of 90 percent on dairy prices for 4 months.

He was on the floor of the House at least once each day of session in an effort to get the Republican majority to take action on his bill.

We point out why we believe such action is reasonable. In the first place, the administration is not today as a matter of Government policy offering dairy products on the world market at competitive prices.

Two things are required to sell anything. One of them is to offer the product for sale and the other is to make the price right. In the case of dairy products, as a matter of Government policy, the administration is not offering the commodities for sale in world-market channels and neither are we making the price competitive.

So long as these products are held on our domestic markets and within the United States, and so long as a matter of Government policy the administration is not trying to sell them, we believe Representative JOHNSON was clearly right in his efforts to postpone a reduction in existing farm income until something would have been worked out.

We agree we must use any farm commodity we support. We agree supply and demand must be tied together, but the farm income is not too high. We must correct the causes of our present problems and reducing farm income is not the cure.

Finland, Abandoned But Unbowed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL B. DAGUE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 1954

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, in common with most Americans I have been inclined to accept Finland as a republic that scrupulously honors her debts, but have given little further thought to the indomitable spirit which has enabled her to preserve her national honor in the face of inexorable pressure from the Russion colossus. In the security of our impregnable fortress we can have no conception of the nightmarish existence which is the lot of every Finn. Faced with necessity of having to do business with the Soviet bully and in the knowledge that her very life is subject to the whim of the totalitarian despot she remains a thorn in the troubled conscience of those free countries who continue to ignore her plight while maintaining normal relations with the international brigands who have despoiled her.

It was my great fortune to attend an anniversary dinner in my district last week when I was privileged to listen to a splendid address by Mr. Esa Arra who is the editor of the Finnish New York Times. The transcript of Mr. Arra's remarks, which follows, is marked by its restraint in the face of the intolerable wrongs which his country has suffered and it is recommended to you as a revealing chronicle of the tribulations of a great people who are the victims of unprovoked aggression:

Permit me first to thank this evening's hosts, especially my honored friend, Mr. G. O. Carlson, for whose kind appreciativeness I am in deep debt of gratitude for the honor they have bestowed upon me by inviting me to speak to you here in William Penn's and Benjamin Franklin's old domain. The invitation was the more welcome because the expeditions which began to arrive on these shores from Sweden in 1638 brought with them Finnish settlers as well. I feel a certain simple pride in the fact that Finnish axes were among those clearing the wilderness in Pennsylvania and Finnish hoes cultivated the land and helped make possible the development which has taken place here, in one of the oldest settled areas of the United States.

The Delaware Finns have long since been absorbed into the American blood stream, but I am sure that if they could reappear among us today from churchyards of Pennsylvania, Maryland, and Delaware, they would want to know about conditions in that distant north European land from which they or their forefathers set sail across the ocean. Since I am not at all sure that even among you, ladies and gentlemen, there are not some in whose veins flows the blood of Delaware Finns—for I have heard scientists claim that a large part of the old families of Pennsylvania, Maryland, and Delaware have partly Finnish origins—why should I not take the liberty of escorting you on a little trip to Finland?

I have noticed that all Americans know at least the following facts about Finland: That it acquired its independence as a result of post-World War I settlements, that Paavo Nurmi was a Finnish runner, that Finland has always paid its debts punctually, and that Jean Sibelius is a Finnish composer. In addition to these facts it is generally known that, during the winter war, Finland fought valiantly against the Soviet Union which has attacked it without any provocation whatsoever.

But there are many in America who have followed developments in Finland with amazing alertness. They know that Finland, which is situated in the eastern part of northern Europe, and is a neighbor of the Soviet Union, is slightly smaller in size than the State of California, and that its population is a mere 4 million. Despite its rugged climate and barren soil, Finland has made great cultural, social, and economic progress, especially during its period of independence. I am not referring only to the fact that travelers—among them also thousands of Americans—have lauded the beauty of Finland's white towns, green forests, and the blue lakes, but rather to what the Finnish people have accomplished through their labor, without infringing upon anyone else's rights. In the fields of scientific, social, and economic work Finland was, generally speaking, in 1939 on a par with other western countries, but then began the Second World War, in the first phase of which the Soviet Union attacked Finland for reasons of its own power politics. Finland was compelled to make peace with the Soviet Union in March of the following year, and to cede some of its territory in the process. In the summer of 1941 Finland became involved in a second war with the Soviet Union. Three years later, in the fall of 1944, Finland was forced to sign an armistice at terms that were extremely harsh. These included cession to the Soviet Union of her southeastern province, Karelia, an area especially dear to the Finnish people because during the past centuries the Russians have attacked Finland through Karelia some 25 times, each time wreaking destruction in the province. From this territory, which was ceded to the Soviet Union, and which comprised 12 percent of Finland's total area, some 450,000 persons—in other words, its entire population—were evacuated to other parts of Finland. New homes and new sources of income had to be found for them in a country impoverished by war.

In addition to Karelia, Finland had to cede to the Soviet Union the peninsula of Porkkala, which is situated some 10 to 15 miles from Helsinki, and which is now a strong Russian fortification. Imagine how we here would feel if a nation 50 times larger than we were our neighbor, and if its guns were on the shores of the Potomac, 10 miles from Washington.

In addition, Finland had to pay Soviet Union reparations totaling about $550 million. Economists have calculated that the reparation, together with the monetary value of the areas ceded by Finland to the Soviet Union, evacuee assistance and certain other payments, totaled about $1½ billion, or almost $400 for every man, woman, and child in Finland. This, then, was the price—if one does not include 80,000 killed, 40,000 permanently maimed, and tens of thousands of war widows and orphans—the price which the Finnish nation has most recently paid for the fact that fate in the dawn of history had led it to settle beside imperialist Russia.

All the problems resulting from these factors Finland has solved so successfully since 1944 that, in addition to reparations payments, reconstruction work, and resettlement of evacuees, it has managed to create a certain air of prosperity. Actually, it is more than just an air, for the standard of living in Finland is now higher than it was before the war. All this, may I remind you has been accomplished without aid from the Marshall plan.

Simultaneously, Finland has succeeded in keeping her own Communists within bounds, although in the fall of 1944 they dreamed of Finland's rapid bolshevization and received assistance in the form of carloads of Moscow-trained Red generals whose passports the Finns were not even permitted to inspect at the border. It is true that, as a result of the parliamentary elections of last month, the Communists still hold 43 seats in the Finnish Diet. Since the total number of seats is 200, the number of Communist representatives seems high, but the influence that they wield over the country's affairs is small.

To those who may wish further details on how Finland has succeeded in maintaining her sovereignty and democratic form of government both during and after the war, may I say a few words more. In my opinion, the Finnish Army under the leadership of Field Marshal Mannerheim resisted the Red Army so forcefully during both the winter war and its continuation, that Moscow did not consider the possible benefits of an occupation of Finland to be worth the cost. And after the war Finnish statesmen have acted with such wisdom that no situation has been permitted to develop that would prompt the Soviet Government to annex Finland to its sphere. On the other hand, it is true that even within the framework of the freedom which Finland has preserved for herself she is in certain respects bound closely to the Soviet Union. Symbolically, I may say that every administration in Finland must always bear in mind the guns in Porkkala. Secondly—and this is of prime importance—Finland had to sign a mutual assistance pact with the Soviet Union in the spring of 1948. This stipulates that, in the event that either signatory considers a threat from the West imminent, Finland must negotiate with the Soviet Union regarding defense measures and must grant the Soviet Union the right to take such measures also on Finnish soil. The pact ends in the spring of 1958, and 6 months earlier—in other words, the end of 1957—Finland will have to renounce or to renew the agreement. Under what national and international circumstances this decision must be made cannot yet be foreseen.

Thirdly, a word about Finland's economy, which recently has been the chief source of worry. In the course of fulfilling her reparations payments to the Soviet Union, Finland had to enlarge her metalworking industry considerably. And when the reparations were completed in 1952, the Finns had to decide quickly whether to continue full production, selling the products to whomsoever would buy them, or to scrap a part of the metals industry. If they had chosen the latter course, it would have made jobless at least 40,000 metalworkers. This number would be the equivalent in the United States of almost 2 million industrial workers. What American President would dare to deprive so many workers of their means of livelihood? Finland did not dare, either. And so she continued production at full speed, and because the markets elsewhere for metal products were few, Finland had to begin selling them to the Soviet Union and its satellites. Since the commencement of this trade in 1951, the volume of commerce between Finland and the Soviet Union and its satellites has grown considerably. The value of Finnish exports to the Soviet Union alone amounted to some $150 million during the last year. Thus far Finland has not benefited appreciably from her trade with the East, outside the fact that she has been able to obtain a market for her metal and shipbuilding industries. One of the main reasons for this is that the Soviet Union lacks suitable goods for exports. As a consequence Finland has been compelled to accept large quantities of wheat, oil, sugar, and other, chiefly agricultural products, in excess of her own consumption. In fact, there exists at present in Finland—as paradoxical as this may seem in respect to a country which never has been self-sufficient in grains—a very serious wheat surplus problem. Soviet wheat is stored in old freighters, oil cisterns, railroad cars, and many other odd places. Another disadvantage of trade with the Soviet Union is the inflexibility of Soviet trade policy. Prices must be fixed in advance according to the prevailing world market levels, and this leads to profits as well as losses—as well for Finland as for the Soviet Union—if prices should fluctuate during the trade-agreement period. Thus, in the case of grain, especially wheat, Finland suffered considerable losses in reexports to the West of such Soviet imports which could not be stored. And this was not all, as the Soviet Union was not able to provide enough goods for exports, Finland was accredited with sizable ruble accounts in Moscow, the value of which has thus far proved merely theoretical.

After the death of Dictator Stalin a little over a year ago, the new Malenkov regime inaugurated a worldwide peace offensive, which, as you well know, is presently in full swing. Soviet efforts have been particularly strong in the field of trade, their aim being to expand trade between the east and the west. This combined peace and trade offensive, I am happy to say, has not been entirely without beneficial results for Finland. Thus, in the trade agreement signed last November the Soviet Union agreed to reduce its prices and also the volume of its grain exports, which had become such a problem for the Finns. Moreover, in February the Soviet Union agreed to convert part of Finland's ruble assets to dollars and even gave Finland a $10 million loan.

It is thus clear that in the field of trade at least Finland has become tightly associated with the Soviet bloc. Obviously this association contains many deeply significant political aspects. Let us consider, for example, what would happen if the Soviet Union began to apply pressure by discontinuing trade; what could Finland do if all her trade with the East, which presently amounts to about one-third of her total world trade, would cease? Every Finnish administration, no matter what political party it represents, must take this fact into consideration and spare no efforts to prevent such a calamitous development. On the other hand, however, it is also obvious that the rulers of the Kremlin also think twice before embarking upon a policy the final consequences of which not even they are able to fully comprehend in advance.

Finland is a peace-loving nation which desires to develop friendly relations with all countries, in the west as well as in the east. In common with the other small nations of the world, the Finns are not able to shape history, they can merely hope that those great powers, which direct the course of the world do so as wisely as possible. In particular the Finns hope for a liberalization of world trade, for a freer movement of goods from country to country. This is only natural, as Finland is a nation dependent on foreign trade for her livelihood. The country is poor in many important natural resources, and some, like oil, are entirely lacking. On the other hand, the Finns have a great source of wealth in their vast, green forests. Finnish wood products have found their way to practically every country of the globe and are everywhere in high esteem for their good quality. To the United States Finland also exports large quantities of newsprint, pulp, plywood doors and other products of her large woodworking industry. The Finns hope for nothing more than to be able to increase this trade and to thus increase their meager dollar reserves. And—I should like to emphasize—this should also be in the interest of the whole Western World. Every dollar Finland earns is like a deposit on an account, the interest of which benefits the free world.

Before I conclude, I should like to discuss in a few words the relationship between Finland and the United States. With the exception of a few distressed years during the Second World War, there has always prevailed a true spirit of friendship and mutual understanding between Finland and the United States ever since the time when Adams was appointed first American representative to the Imperial Court of St. Petersburg and when the first American travelers to Finland began to publish their descriptions of this country in the Far North. This friendship has expressed itself not only in words but in deeds. Thus, when the young independent Republic of Finland faced a desperate food shortage in the year 1919, the man in charge of American relief work in Europe, who was later to become President of the United States, the Honorable Herbert Hoover, lent the Finns a firm hand of support. The Finns have never forgotten this magnanimous act. When Mr. Hoover arrived in war-devastated Finland on a brief visit in 1946, the Finnish Government, which then was under Communist and Soviet influence, did not dare to arrange an official reception for him. In spite of this fact, the news that Mr. Hoover was arriving had an electrifying effect upon the stolid Finns. Thousands lined the streets of Helsinki in a spontaneous welcome to the man who in their time of need had proved to be a true friend; also, during recent years the United States has rendered valuable assistance to the Finns in the form of loans and expressions of sympathy and encouragement. The Finns are aware that they can trust in continued American understanding and friendship, and even though they may not be able to offer much in return, they will, nevertheless, endeavor to fulfill all their obligations punctually and see to it that all debts, present and future, will be paid as they have been paid thus far. It is no more decorative phrase that the Finns in particular have always looked westward across the ocean to America as the promised land of freedom and human liberty. If evidence be required in support of this statement, I shall furnish one. When in a public poll a few years ago Finns were asked to what country would you migrate if you had to leave your fatherland, the great majority declared they preferred the United States; and not enough with this, even of those who said they had supported the Communists in the recent election, almost 40 percent said they wanted to go to the United States—only 3 percent chose the Soviet Union. In this connection I should like to make a suggestion: Why not find out how many of the Communists in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania would choose the Soviet Union? Let us offer them an all-expenses-paid one-way ticket for that trip, if they should like to make it.

I am proud of the fact, ladies and gentlemen, that I have had occasion to escort you on this brief trip to Finland. I also know that if the Delaware Finns, as I mentioned in the beginning, could today rise from the churchyards of Pennsylvania, Maryland, and Delaware to see the present conditions of the country of their forebears, they would share in my pride. From the time of their departure to the New World unto the present time Finland has acted and lived in accordance with their loftiest ideals, and their joy would increase manifold when they would discover that into the New World, which they had set out so bravely among the first to conquer for civilization, has grown a mighty nation—a nation which embodies the fulfillment of their dreams; a nation which does not only represent, defend, and develop the values of western civilization on its own soil, but whose powerful arm also is stretched out to defend the rights of the small and weak against tyranny and aggression. God bless America and keep her mighty.

The Predicted Recession of 1954 Headed Off

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NOAH M. MASON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 1954

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 8300, the tax-revision bill, has already headed off the recession that our Gloomy Gusses in the other body have been talking so much about. Following the line the CIO laid down, these Gloomy Gusses have been calling this tax-revision bill a "rich man's tax bill." However, the excellent prospects for the passage of H. R. 8300 have already accomplished three things, namely: First, encouraged investors to invest; second, inspired confidence in business leaders; third, caused industry to plan and prepare big expansion programs.

General Electric proposes to spend $175 million this year for an expansion program; General Motors will spend $1 billion "to meet the needs of an expanding market"; Du Pont will spend $135 million; and Standard Oil of New Jersey has a $500 million expansion program for 1954.

These are just a few examples of what is already taking place as a result of the improved tax climate H. R. 8300 promises for our business and industrial leaders.

Mr. Speaker, plant expansion means more jobs for the workingmen of America. When we encourage plant expansion and business expansion, the main thing we are doing is providing more jobs and bigger pay envelopes for American workers. Creating a favorable tax climate for American business and industry helps the workers of America directly, because the largest share of all factory output is paid out in wages.

Is H. R. 8300 really a rich man's bill then as the Gloomy Gus from Illinois and the Gloomy Gus from Minnesota would have us believe?

Mr. Speaker, our labor leaders, especially the leaders of the CIO, have dubbed H. R. 8300 "a rich man's tax bill" because it gives a little tax relief to stockholders on their dividend receipts, and it does not raise the $600 tax exemption to $700 or $800. Now, who are the stockholders of America? Are they rich men or poor men, capitalists, or workingmen?

According to Treasury reports 80 percent of all the stockholders of America are people that earn less than $10,000 per year. Are they the rich people that are being favored? And, according to Treasury reports, almost half of the stockholders of America are people who earn less than $5,000 per year. Are they the rich people that are being favored?

The United States Steel Corp. has 300,000 stockholders, more than half of whom earn less than $5,000 per year, and one-third of whom earn less than $3,000 per year. Are these the rich people that are being favored?

The American Telephone & Telegraph Co. reports that the average holdings of its 1,300,000 stockholders amounts to exactly 27 shares. Is the average A. T. & T. stockholder a rich man or a poor workingman?

The great majority of American coupon clippers are wage earners first and coupon clippers second. Any relief given to them in H. R. 8300 is relief given to the workers of America, not to the so-called rich of America.

SIGNS OF THE TIMES

Mr. Speaker, the following are a few signs of the times or straws in the wind—all indicating that the predicted recession has been headed off:

First. The Buick factory at Flint, Mich., is now working five 9-hour days per week—5 hours overtime per week.

Second. The Pontiac factory, Pontiac, Mich., is also working five 9-hour days per week—also overtime.

Third. The Cadillac factory, Detroit, Mich., is now working six 10-hour days per week, which means 20 hours overtime.

Fourth. Chrysler, Plymouth, Chevrolet, and Ford are also back on a full-time basis.

These examples of improved industrial conditions all give the lie to the Gloomy Gusses in the other body that have been predicting dark days ahead. And if these industrial examples of prosperous times are not enough, what about the price of hogs at $31 per hundredweight, the highest price pork has been in many years.

Mr. Speaker, there are prosperous times ahead, and no prophets of gloom can or will bring about a depression.

She Earned It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 14, 1954

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I herewith include an editorial which appeared in the April 22, 1954, issue of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch entitled "She Earned It":

SHE EARNED IT

Miss Doris Fleeson, whose syndicated column appears in the Post-Dispatch, is altogether a worthy choice for the Raymond Clapper memorial award. This award, which keeps alive the memory of one of the finest of political correspondents—lost, it is sad to remember, in a World War II airplane crash—goes each year to a newspaper writer whose work is marked by accuracy, integrity, and attachment to the fundamental principle that in a self-governing nation the people must be informed. Miss Fleeson's reports have all these qualities. In addition she is continuously readable and always concise. Moreover she gets out over the country from time to time to report the political news from the grassroots. The committee made no mistake when it chose this exceptionally able and well-informed reporter as the first woman to receive the Raymond Clapper Award.

A Bill of Particulars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 1954

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker in the following article Mr. George Sokolsky, one of the best informed Americans on China, quotes with approval a recent statement by Ambassador Lodge.

The reasons given by the Ambassador as to why Red China is ineligible to belong to the United Nations are positive and final.

No doubt can possibly remain in the mind of any fairminded individual that Red China is ineligible under the criteria and rules set up by the United Nations and that she is also ineligible under the moral code of all civilized people.

THESE DAYS

(By George Sokolsky)

A BILL OF PARTICULARS

Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., the American Ambassador to the United Nations, has made it clear beyond doubt that there are no monkeyshines about the American policy concerning Red China. At the Associated Press luncheon in New York, he indicted Red China of crimes and misdemeanors, succinctly and powerfully stated:

"Because it has repeatedly expressed open contempt for the purposes and principles of the United Nations, and the judgments of the international community.

"Because it stands convicted by the United Nations as an aggressor in Korea, where it killed and wounded many thousands of American and other soldiers who were defending peace.

"Because it continues to support aggression in Indochina, by giving substantial aid and by furnishing advisers and technicians to the Vietminh forces.

"Because it occupied defenseless Tibet and seized control of its government and resources.

"Because it sponsors guerrilla and subversive movements in Malaya and throughout the rest of southeast Asia.

"Because it committed dreadful atrocities against Americans and others fighting for the United Nations in Korea and subjected prisoners to physical and mental cruelty in seeking to extort military secrets and confessions of alleged guilt.

"Because it still holds 32 American civilians under barbarous conditions without published charges and subjects these innocent missioneries, journalists, and businessmen to cruel and inhuman treatment.

"Because it willfully fabricated and publicized false evidence of spurious germ warfare charges designed to blacken the reputation of the United States and otherwise carries on a deliberate hate-America propaganda campaign.

"Because it has executed millions of its captive subjects, and forced other millions into slave labor.

"Because it even stoops to an international extortion racket in squeezing millions of dollars from overseas Chinese who try to buy safety and protection for their relatives at home."

This bill of particulars, the most complete I have ever seen, is tantamount to announcing to the world that the United States will employ its veto in the Security Council if an attempt is made to smuggle Red China into the United Nations.

Were Red China admitted to the United Nations, public opinion in this country would beyond doubt demand that the United States withdraw from it. In many respects that would, at this stage of international relations, be a tragedy because, as Lodge pointed out, the alternative to talk is often war, and at this stage needs to be averted. If the United Nations performs no other historic service than to delay world war III, that will be a task accomplished. We have been on the verge of world war III since 1945, but it has not happened.

Undoubtedly a major impediment to any success of the United Nations is the extravagant propaganda that has been hurled at the world in favor of it. Too much was said for it; too much has been expected of it.

After all, as Henry Cabot Lodge said:

"Now, the wars that don't happen are not dramatic. But there is real satisfaction in working in a place where you feel that sometimes you have helped prevent fighting and bloodshed even if it requires some verbal toe dancing and walking on eggs and what, to most of us, appears to be pettifogging. There are some circumstances in international affairs when the best thing to do is to stall for time and give people a chance to cool off. * * *"

At most, the United Nations should be a parliament of nations, a meeting place, a vent for outbursts of anger, a bargaining counter for compromises. If the United Nations limited itself to this type of activity and gave up aspirations for world government, it would accomplish more without arousing so much suspicion, particularly among Americans who are not anxious to be governed by anyone but themselves.

Boys Never Coming Home?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FREDERIC R. COUDERT, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1954

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial which appeared in the New York Daily News, of April 17, 1954:

BOYS NEVER COMING HOME?

Ominous, we'd say, is the word for President Eisenhower's statement of yesterday, concerning the projected six-nation West Europe army to be formed by the so-called European Defense Community, or EDC.

EDC, we've all been hearing for a long time, is to enable the United States eventually to withdraw its troops from Europe.

But, since France and Italy go on stalling about ratifying EDC, the President yesterday pledged that the United States will keep troops in Europe, including West Germany, "as long as a threat to that area exists." It is hoped that this promise will spur France and Italy to sign on speedily with the other EDC nations: Belgium, Holland, Luxembourg, West Germany.

Apparently, then, EDC is not, after all, going to make it possible for us to get out of Europe within a reasonable time. As we read this as-long-as-a-threat-exists promise, it implies strongly that our troops will be there permanently.

Who is to decide when the threat is ended? Will nations where United States soldiers in large numbers are spending money in large amounts ever admit that the threat is past?

We think it is time for Congress to dredge up and act on the old Taft-Coudert resolution, declaring that Congress is to have the final word on tying up United States troops in other countries or increasing the number of those already stationed overseas. Or let's have some similar pronouncement from Congress. After all, as the people's elected lawmaking body, it should have a powerful—preferably, we think, a decisive—voice in saying where the people's sons are to be sent on police-patrol or more serious "peacetime" duty.

Industrial Facilities in Indiana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. BEAMER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 1954

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the attached resolution from the Legislative Advisory Commission of the State of Indiana signed by the chairman, Harold W. Handley, Lieutenant Governor, and Samuel T. Lesh, secretary of commission:

Whereas the State of Indiana possesses more than adequate industrial facilities for the production of defense materiel; and

Whereas some of these industrial centers are classified as critical unemployment centers; and

Whereas we, in Indiana, believe in a wide base of industrial activity for the purpose of defense production: Be it therefore

Resolved, That the industries in Indiana be given a larger proportionate share of national defense production; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be mailed to Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States; Charles E. Wilson, Secretary of Defense; Sinclair Weeks, Secretary of Commerce; James P. Mitchell, Secretary of Labor; and to each member of the congressional delegation from Indiana.

HAROLD W. HANDLEY,
Lieutenant Governor, Chairman, Legislative Advisory Commission of the State of Indiana.
SAMUEL T. LESH,
Secretary of Commission.

What About McCarthyism?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NOAH M. MASON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 1954

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, in view of the McCarthy-Army trial that is now being held, and in view of the attacks and insinuations that are being aimed at the Senator by left-wing commentators and columnists, perhaps the following sentiments will not come amiss. They express my own feelings in connection with Senator McCarthy and his work.

Mr. Speaker, I have been asked many times, "What about Senator McCarthy?"

I have always answered about as follows: "Senator McCarthy is a great American. He has done more to uncover, expose, and get rid of Communists in our Government departments than any other one man in America. Joe's batting average is extremely high, about 95 percent efficient."

Many unthinking people say, "Oh, I approve Senator McCarthy's objectives, but I do not approve his methods."

The answer to that criticism is: "If you are fighting in the ring, under well-established rules, with a referee to see that the rules are obeyed, then you fight according to the rules. But if you are fighting a bunch of gangsters and hope to get results, you follow no rules; you wear no kid gloves; you wear 'brass knuckles' if you have them; you swing a club if you can get hold of one. It is a fight with no holds barred—any method to achieve victory."

Senator McCarthy has tackled the worst and most dangerous gang of cutthroats in the country, a gang out to destroy our American heritage, our liberty, our religion. Any American citizen who hides behind the fifth amendment and refuses to answer "Yes" or "No" when asked if he is, or ever has been, a Communist, is not entitled to "kid glove" treatment. If you look at the record you will find that many "pinkos" given clearance by loyalty boards under Roosevelt and Truman—not once but several times—have been proved to be "subversive" by the McCarthy committee.

IS SENATOR M'CARTHY POPULAR?

Mr. Speaker, left-wing newswriters and commentators have made a great hullabaloo over the supposed mistakes of the Senator. The enormous service that Joe has rendered the American people is entirely ignored by our so-called liberals and socialists.

Senator McCarthy has 10 times as many invitations to speak as any other Member of the United States Senate. Len Hall, national chairman of the Republican Party, has booked Senator McCarthy solid for the 3 months preceding the fall election, and most of those speaking engagements are placed in doubtful Republican congressional districts. That is how popular Joe is with the American people. It also indicates how valuable an asset the National Republican Committee believes Senator McCarthy is to the party—in spite of the words of criticism Len Hall has uttered for public consumption.

By and large our American people are sound and sensible. Instinctively they know whom to trust and whom not to trust. The great majority of Americans today, Democrats and Republicans alike, believe in and swear by Senator McCarthy—in spite of the howls emanating from the Daily Worker, the left-wingers, and their dupes who stupidly follow the Communist party line.

WE ARE AT WAR!

Mr. Speaker, there is a war going on, a war between communism and Christianity, a war between communism and capitalism, a war between individual liberty on the one hand and dictatorship of the state on the other. It is a war to the death. We need more Patrick Henry's and Joe McCarthy's if we are to win this war and survive.

The Time for a Civil Defense Plan Is Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 1954

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, the time has come for some hard thought and then a fundamental decision about a civil-defense policy for this Nation.

The slogan-minded administration has referred to its "new concept of civil defense," but, just as in the case of military-foreign policy, nobody is quite sure exactly what this new concept is.

The terrible destructive power of the hydrogen bomb is not a newly known fact to our top defense officials. It has been known since November 1952. But the American public has known of it for just a few weeks.

What are the administration's plans for a civil-defense program? The public, especially those 67 to 68 million of Americans who live in the 70 critical target areas, have a right to demand the forthright presentation of a civil-defense program.

In the words of Edward A. Conway, writing in the April 17, 1954, issue of America, of which he is an associate editor:

> The time to acquaint the public with a definitive plan is now.

There is a $69 million request in the President's budget for civil defense. We must ask: Is this enough?

To aid in the discussion of our civil-defense problems, I include in the Record an editorial and Father Conway's article which appeared in America on April 17, 1954:

INACTION NO ANSWER TO WELL-GROUNDED FEARS

On April 5 two statesmen, one British, one American, discoursed on the H-bomb. Ex-Prime Minister Clement Attlee addressed the House of Commons. President Eisenhower tried to talk his television audience out of their multiplicity of fears.

There was a day-and-night difference between the approaches of the two. Mr. Attlee bluntly asserted his belief "that civilization today is in grave danger." The Labor Party leader said he thought fear of the H-bomb is a worldwide fear. "I think it will grow and I think it should be encouraged to grow. I want every man and woman in the world to be acutely aware of the danger they stand in, the danger that affronts civilization. * * * The only way open to us seems to be to make a new approach to world problems with the consciousness of this great danger." He feels that only when everyone realizes our mortal danger will exhaustive efforts be made to forfend it.

The President, on the other hand, sought to calm his audience by playing down the bomb. He treated fear of the H-bomb as one of many American concerns: the men in the Kremlin, loss of our friends to communism, possibility of a depression, internal communism, intemperate investigative methods, unemployment, and loss of lives.

Some will even say that the President's talk aroused a new fear—that our Government is not taking the H-bomb seriously enough. The President relieved no apprehensions by saying that it is not a threat in itself but only in the hands of an aggressor. People want to know if they can believe the implications in his next sentences: "And against that, then [the decision of an enemy to use the bomb], we have to make our provisions. To make certain that sensible men have done everything possible that they can to protect ourselves against that threat."

What about civil defense? The President assured us: "In that [legislative] program there [are] ample measures for defense. Civil and continental defense and for the deterrent effects of our atomic development."

Father Conway's article in this issue raises very grave questions about the adequacy and pace of our civil-defense program. Furthermore, does the President honestly believe that the $69 million he requested for that purpose is enough to implement his new concept of civil defense? For nuclear development, mostly for weapons, he budgeted $2.425 billion. Curiously, he did not even classify the $69 million under national defense, but under housing and community development.

The most striking and disturbing difference between the Attlee and Eisenhower speeches was the President's omission of any reference to disarmament as the only sure and permanent way of protecting ourselves against this threat. It is time to ask point-blank whether our Government is taking the search for disarmament seriously.

Why has the administration never named a successor to Benjamin V. Cohen, who resigned January 13, 1953, as permanent United States representative on the U. N. Disarmament Commission? Foreign Secretary Eden, referring to the reopening of that Commission April 9, promised that "we will put forward a detailed scheme for general disarmament in every sphere." Has the United States prepared any such scheme? Or will it offer once more what Walter Lippmann recently called bits and pieces and old chestnuts salvaged from the barnacled Baruch plan for control of the atom?

Just 1 year ago, in his straightforward address on foreign policy, the President declared that "we care nothing for mere rhetoric" but only for sincerity of purposes "attested by deeds." The President will inspire confidence in his leadership in these troubled days only when he can show his fellow citizens that sensible men are actually doing everything possible to protect all of us. He warned us against getting panicky. But inaction is hardly reassuring.

Let's Get Out of Here—What the New Look in Civil Defense Can Mean for You

(By Edward A. Conway)

Buried in the President's budget message of January 21 was a section on civil defense. It is newsworthy now because everyone is asking whether civil defense has any future, whether, in fact, our cities have any future.

The President made it clear that the Government had taken a new look at civil defense in the lurid light of the city-busting hydrogen bomb. In the old dispensation, the slogan was "Duck and Cover." Now it is "beat it." Mr. Eisenhower told the Congress "this budget reflects a new concept of civil defense which takes account of the destructive threat of modern weapons and which emphasizes improved warning of impending attack and planning for the dispersal of populations of potential target cities in advance of enemy attack."

WARNING SYSTEM

The administration's new concept of civil defense is more radical by far than the New Look in military-foreign policy. It is based on the assumption, which at least half of our population should start thinking about, that no one will survive in a city, no matter how large, that is struck by a hydrogen bomb. Is that assumption unwarranted? The fireball of the bomb detonated November 1, 1952, was 3½ miles in diameter. The H-bomb which surprised not only the President but the scientists when it was exploded on March 1 was four times as powerful. Theoretically, there is no limit to the power of the H-bomb.

So it is simply goodby to shelters, both communal and family-type. Carbon-monoxide poisoning from the fire storm would finish you even though you survived incineration, radiation, and burial under debris.

Obviously, in the H-bomb era safety depends on the time you have to get out of town. That in turn depends on the warning you are given. If H-bomb-laden Russian planes attacked across the Atlantic, you would probably have time to flee. But if they came by the Arctic route (the best route for the Russians), you could now count on, at the most, 15 minutes' warning. President Eisenhower asserted in his budget message that the funds requested for continental defense would "provide improved early warning of enemy attack."

But when? The President assured the Congress that "expenditures for continental defense in the fiscal year of 1955 are expected to be greater than ever before in our history." Even with these expenditures, we are told, we will not get a 2-hour warning of enemy approach for another 18 months. Two hours' notice is conceded to be the minimum time needed to evacuate even a medium-size target city.

The budget does not tell us how much is being spent on the early warning system. But suppose it is $200 million. With 70 American cities depending on it for survival, why not make an emergency appropriation of 10 times that amount? If technicians and material are at hand, we could have a 2-hour warning system by the Fourth of July this year.

CHRONOLOGY OF THE NEW LOOK

To be frank about it, this writer is scandalised by the leisurely way the new concept of civil defense is being implemented. The key date is November 1, 1952. Then, as the American public learned on March 31, 1954, a thermonuclear-test device was detonated in what was designated as Operation Ivy. According to the Federal Civil Defense Administration, it produced "complete annihilation within a radius of 3 miles, severe to moderate damage out to 7 miles, light damage as far as 10 miles." Furthermore, "it created the largest nuclear explosive fireball ever produced, 3½ miles in diameter at its maximum, enough to engulf about one-quarter of Manhattan Island. (With the Empire State Building as Ground Zero, the fireball would have extended from Washington Square uptown to Central Park.)" It is 50 city blocks from Washington Square to Central Park.

It must have been evident at once to the President, the National Security Council, the Federal Civil Defense Administration and the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy that all civil defense plans basaed on the A-bomb were the first casualties of Operation Ivy. Yet no hint of this fatful quantum jump in destructiveness seems to have been given during 1953 to municipal defense directors. They were allowed to go on enrolling volunteers, assigning shelters, training bomb-damage groups, as though they still lived in the atomic age.

The September 1953 Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists was devoted entirely to Project East River, a study begun August 1, 1951, on the vulnerability of the United States to atomic attack. Nowhere in its 16 articles is Operation Ivy of November 1, 1952 so much as mentioned. In a 6-page interview with Dr. Ralph A. Lapp, special editor of the issue, Val Peterson, Civil Defense Administrator, solemnly discussed one of the biggest problems we have in civil defense:

"We have on the one side the shelter idea, and on the other side, the early warning and evacuation idea. Now you can't, as I see it today, say that either one or the other is absolutely the answer."

It is inconceivable that Mr. Peterson had not been told about Operation Ivy. Security regulations must have constrained him to receive his interviewer. He thought we "didn't know enough about the effects of the atomic explosion upon our great cities," to justify an extensive communal shelter program. He continued:

"In FCDA we are sold absolutely on the importance and desirability, yes, the absolute necessity, of family-type shelters. We know, on the basis of experiments conducted out in Nevada, that these shelters can save lives under many circumstances, and we think they are absolutely sound and necessary."

This interview was tape-recorded for the Bulletin in July 1953, 8 months after Operation Ivy.

It must be said for Mr. Peterson that soon after the announcement on August 12 that the Russians had detonated a thermonuclear device, he began talking about taking to the hills as the only sure means of survival. But his own policy planners did not go along with him. As late as January 1954, one of them asserted that FCDA had no plans for urban evacuation. This despite the fact that a special report presented to FCDA in June 1953, raised the question whether, in view of Russian H-bomb developments, the shelter program should be continued, or other action taken.

FCDA ADVISORY BULLETIN 158

On January 18, 1954, only 3 days before the President told the Congress that the administration had taken a number of actions to deal with the serious problem (i. e., that a Russian hydrogen bomb, "if exploded over our American cities, would be capable of effecting unprecedented destruction") FCDA sent Advisory Bulletin 158 to State and local civil defense directors. It outlined the New Look in civil defense.

It also raised a fundamental question which should be settled at once. Assuming the necessity of planning for tactical dispersal (evacuation), should we stop at planning, or proceed to implementation? The question arises from the wording of Mr. Peterson's directive. Planning for tactical dispersal, he said, "should start immediately, but implementation is not recommended now because the success of an evacuation program depends on early warning." The likelihood of early warning "is not acceptably high at present" (0–15 minutes). "Therefore, until further notice, the public should take the best available shelter when there is a public warning of attack."

I disagree diametrically with Mr. Peterson's concluding decision:

"The FCDA will be working constantly with the military authorities and, as soon as adequate early warning can be anticipated, will recommend that the policy of dispersal be announced to the public."

The public, 67,750,982 of whom are now concentrated in the 70 critical target areas designated as such by the Federal Government on July 1, 1953, should be told at once about this "policy of dispersal." It will want to know as soon as possible how to get out of town if and when it has "adequate warning."

In his budget message the President correctly stated that "much planning, organization, and training remains to be done, however, to make this strategy of civil defense (population dispersal) fully effective at all levels of government." The time to begin, not only that planning and organization but that training, is now. Not only should the policy of dispersal be announced to the public at once, but training should begin forthwith.

CIVIL DEFENSE GLOSSARY

Planning and organization, fortunately, have at long last begun: On paper, everything looks salutary. But as Bernard M. Baruch once said, "No aggressor was ever stopped by blueprints." Nor was any target city evacuated by them.

This is the summary of the New Look given in FCDA's Advisory Bulletin 158:

1. Study of the feasibility of a dispersal plan.
2. Completion of the shelter survey to determine whether existing shelters, or present structures which can be strengthened, will prove adequate to the needs of those who cannot be removed.
3. Selection of loading perimeters, vehicle routes, and pedestrian routes.
4. Recruitment and training of auxiliary police who live or work along or immediately adjacent to routes and perimeters selected.
5. Extension of shelter surveys to outskirts, as well as along loading perimeters, to provide emergency shelter for people in transit from downtown areas.
6. Completion of recruitment and training of warden service to furnish guidance for dispersing population.
7. Preparation of transportation and care plans for each public and private school in event warning comes when school is in session.
8. Completion of an emergency transportation plan to insure prompt utilization of maximum movement capacity.
9. Preparation of welfare plans to meet conditions necessitated by application of dispersion policy.
10. Preparation of a public education plan to acquaint public with action to be taken when dispersal plan is effected.
11. Survey of public warning system's potential effectiveness in reaching people during actual dispersal.

This is a pretty adequate blueprint of what we must do as we wait for that adequate warning system. But have you ever heard of a loading perimeter? This is a point on the circumference of the downtown area of your city to which you will have to walk (or run, if possible) to reach transportation (buses, commandeered cabs, trucks, and private cars) which will whisk you away from incineration.

FCDA seems to assume that there will be a traffic freeze in the downtown area of a city, so that people will have to walk. That assumption is open to question. Remember, we are supposing a 2-hour warning. It should be possible to set up a traffic-control system which would give priority to vehicular transportation from the heart of a city (See A-Bomb Over Manhattan, America, July 22, 1950). The calculations of that article called for designation of both north and south one-way streets. Now every street in town should become outbound at the first warning. Fire engines within the devastation-area should have top priority. They will be needed in the far suburbs.

At the risk of being denounced as undemocratic, I would like to see doctors and nurses given a 5-minute head start. The same goes for the elderly, the sick, the handicapped and the school children. If this were put to a national referendum, who would vote against it?

Preparation of welfare plans conceals probably the most complicated and most essential of all evacuation procedures. It involves food, shelter, and medical aid for thousands, even millions, of evacuees by small communities on the periphery of the catastrophe. Now that we can determine on the basis of the blowout how far the most powerful H-bomb can reach, why should not each critical target city help these communities prepare to take care of its inhabitants?

Why shouldn't the Federal Government help? The President said in his budget message that the Government would limit itself to providing warning of impending atacks and to providing stockpiles of medical supplies. He asked appropriations for nothing else. What about our tremendous food surpluses? A bread-and-butter sandwich would not be considered surplus by a starving evacuee if he found it at the point of no return.

PUBLIC EDUCATION PLAN

It is now official FCDA policy to prepare a public-education plan to acquaint the public with action to be taken when dispersal plan is effected. This has been FCDA policy since January 18 of this year. The FCDA has had 3 months to work out its plan. Half of it could be salvaged from the hydrogenized plans for the atom age. The time to acquaint the public with a definitive plan is now. FCDA asserts that it will not enforce any measures, but our 70 critical target cities will welcome its New Look recommendations. The public apathy, so frequently alleged as the reason for failure of civil-defense programs, stemmed mostly from conflicting advice. It is no longer a question of shelters versus evacuation. It is evacuation versus vaporization. So let's get on with plans and training for evacuation.

The Lone Dissenter Had Firm Convictions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD B. RUSSELL

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 27, 1954

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the Atlanta Constitution of April 1 carried a very interesting editorial entitled "The Lone Dissenter Had Firm Convictions"—referring to the vote of Representative Fred Marshall, of Minnesota, against the excise-tax-reduction bill. I believe that vote and the editorial are worthy of receiving widespread attention, and therefore I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Lone Dissenter Had Firm Convictions

Occasionally a Congressman does something that makes one wonder whether he should be examined for sanity or whether he should be given a national award for courage. But in the confusion of making laws, it is always fascinating to see that brave individuals still are willing to buck the tide.

The House of Representatives voted Tuesday, 395 to 1, to cut excise taxes on a wide range of commodities by more than $999 million.

Now just who was the strange Representative who had the will to say "no"?

He was a Democrat, Representative Fred Marshall, Minnesota. He stood up and voted his convictions. Reading an interview with him by Columnist Bob Considine, one comes to the conclusion that he really might rate a medal for courage.

"We're never going to balance the budget," he said, "if we keep making little political overtures like this. * * * People who buy furs and jewelry don't have to worry much about paying taxes on them and I figure folks who backed away from buying things like that, because of the taxes, didn't suffer much hardship not having them.

"Something is wrong," he added, "when you come up with a deficit in the midst of tremendous income. * * * If we must cut taxes, let's find other places to cut, where real relief could be effected. * * * We shouldn't rush headlong into things like knocking $999 million out of the Treasury when it is no great burden on the people who are providing it."

Yes, sir, Representative Marshall voted his convictions. It is good to know that he had conscientious reasons for them. And, now serving his third term in the House, he must face the voters for reelection. At least they should give him at least one round of cheers for courage.

Indochina: Ugly Riddle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 1954

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, we Democrats do not comment on the Indochina crisis in a spirit of partisanship. We do not, and will not follow the example set by many of our Republican colleagues in their comments on the Korean war in recent years. We do not intend to make a political football of this problem so crucial to our own national security and to international peace.

On April 16, the Vice President of the United States made a "not for attribution" speech to newspaper editors in Washington which appeared to be a direct about-face from President Eisenhower's press conference remarks of a few weeks earlier in which he left the distinct impression that under no circumstances would American soldiers be sent to Indochina.

Mr. Speaker, it may be that the circular, zig-zagging policy on Indochina, insofar as it is revealed in the recent public statements of the President, the Vice President and Secretary of State, is designed to baffle and confuse the enemy. Perhaps it is the new look in phychological warfare. Yet in the process, Members of Congress and the American public, have been thrown into a state of confusion and perplexity.

We should not be the targets of such maneuvering. We have a right to expect a clear and forthright statement from the President on Indochina. We have had enough of trial baloons, hints, and calculated leaks to the press. The President should present to the Congress and to the people a coherent and persuasive policy on the far eastern situation. Only if this is done in a forthright manner can we in Congress make fundamental decisions which will reflect the will of the American people.

As an illustration of the confused attitude toward the Indochina situation, the Democratic Digest has compiled a brief digest of informed opinion on this subject. I include in the Record an article, The Ugly Riddle of Indochina, which appeared in the Democratic Digest of May 1954:

The Ugly Riddle of Indochina

"President Eisenhower," writes Washington correspondent Roscoe Drummond in the New York Herald Tribune, "has often remarked that he values his weekly press conference because it gives him guidance on the way people are thinking; what is worrying them."

A case in point is the mounting concern over the war crisis in distant Indochina, where America faces a situation that is potentially more dangerous than the Korean trouble.

"For several weeks now, there have been recurring questions on Indochina," Drummond adds.

"Does the war look bad?

"Is it looking better?

"Are we sending more aid?

"Isn't there danger we will get drawn into a hot war?

"One week's answers do not forestall the next week's questions.

"There is probably a very good reason why the questions outrun the answers.

"The reason, I think, is that the administration's answers do not really add up to a coherent policy, a persuasive policy, or to a course of action equal to the problem of Indochina."

American financial assistance now is the prop which keeps French military forces fighting in the Indochina jungles, in support of the pro-Western Vietnam Government, but the big question is what course the United States Government will take if American dollars and technical military aid do not turn the tables against the Communist-led native offensive against French colonialism.

The stakes are immense. The situation is one that could lead to full-scale American involvement in the hostilities or to loss of southeast Asia to the Communists. The uncertainty in American policy on Indochina is symptomatic of growing bewilderment over our entire Asian policy.

The war in Indochina is now going into its eighth grueling year, and the French are understandably weary of it. Ever since the Big Four agreed to hold a five-power conference on Asian problems (scheduled to start on April 26), there has been talk in Paris of little but the truce which the French hope will come out of it. All over the world hopes are high that the Alice-in-Wonderland war, as it's been called (a reference to the fact that the forces on both sides cannot go anywhere militarily becaubse it takes all their strength to stay where they are) will receive something better from the United States than an Alice-in-Wonderland solution.

There is evident concern, however, that Jabberwocky, the language of Wonderland, may become the official United States language in dealing with southeast Asia. In February, Admiral Radford, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, sent 26 B–26 bombers and 256 Air Force technicians to an airbase in Indochino which was in grave danger of falling to the forces of Ho Chi Minh, leader of Viet Minh rebels. When fear was expressed by Congress that this might ultimately lead to the involvement of our Armed Forces in the fighting between the Communist-directed Viet Minh and the Vietnam Government, the press began to discern the first faint accents of Jabberwocky in the bland reassurances of the administration.

"The administration says that defeat in Indochina would be a catastrophe, and our involvement in a hot war in Indochina would be a catastrophe," wrote one columnist. "The administration does not tell the country which it thinks would be a worse catastrophe."

"The United States started out to reassure the French and the Vietnamese that it was increasing its help," wrote another, "and ended up with a demonstration in Washington that the United States was determined to avoid intervention in the war at almost any cost."

"The net of it is," said the Christian Science Monitor, "that the first test of the new policy of 'instant retaliation' shows that it is not suitable as a solution for the only hot war going on in the world today."

The summary of the situation in the London Spectator has a flavor reminiscent of the famous croquet game in Wonderland, played with porcupine balls and human wickets which kept getting up and moving away:

"In order to reassure Senators who feared that an extra 200 Air Force technicians there might involve the United States directly in that war, the administration was obliged to state categorically that it has no intention of sending American ground forces to Indochina or of getting deeply committed there. Such a definite statement can only have the result of weakening the anti-Communist front, for it cancels out the psychological effect of the dispatch of the technicians, which might have been more encouraging to the French and even more deterring to the Communists than the practical help that they will give."

On only one point is agreement universal: the fact that Indochina is even more important in the world picture today than was Korea. The administration's spokesmen have stated clearly, as did Truman and Acheson before them, that a French defeat in Indochina would mean the establishment of Moscow's and Peiping's puppets not only in that country, but also in Thailand, Malaya, Burma, and Indonesia. It would mean, they say, the possible eventual collapse of the non-Communist Governments in the Philippines and Japan, and the fall of Formosa into Communist hands. If we lose Indochina, in short, we can say goodby to much or all of southeast Asia as well.

There's a reason why Indochina is so important—a reason beyond her 27 million people, her mineral supplies, her rice paddies (she exports one-fourth of all the rice in the world), and her geographical position. That reason is political, and has to do with the fact that after 100 years of French control (except for the period of Japanese occupation during World War II), the native peoples, who have almost no self-government at all, want complete freedom to rule their country. This goes for the natives who are fighting on the French side as well as for the followers of Ho Chi Minh, the leader of the Viet Minh, or League for the Independence of Vietnam.

The result is that Ho Chi Minh, though admitting freely that he is Moscow-trained and 100 percent a Communist, is able to appeal to many of the less educated people who believe that he fights only for their national independence. After all, they can see the French, while the Chinese and Russian Communists who supply arms and money for the fight have so far remained invisible. Throughout most of Asia, Ho Chi Minh is revered as the leader of the native peoples in their fight against colonialism, with the French the villains of the piece. Ho Chi Minh, of course, simply wants to substitute the colonialism of Moscow for that of France—but if we lost Indochina, through military defeat or through clumsy negotiations, part of the reason would surely be that the Communists appeared in the false light of liberators of a people struggling for freedom.

No one, not even the most isolationist of Senators, disputes Indochina's importance to our side. Confusion lies in what to do about it, though several schools of thought have gradually emerged.

There is the Secretary of Defense Wilson (or whistling-in-the-dark) school, which holds that "everything is going along fully as well as we expected it to do at this stage." The Secretary has in fact announced that "a military victory is both possible and probable," without any direct intervention by this country.

Foreign Operations Administrator Stassen returned from a recent trip to the Far East with a strong conviction that the free forces in the Far East are growing stronger while the Communist position is weakening. These views are the most puzzling of all. They are not shared by the military; they are not shared by the French premier, and certainly are not supported by press dispatches from Indochina, which tell of fierce enemy attacks, of far from inconsequential victories, and of desertion from the ranks of the loyal Vietnamese.

There is the President Eisenhower-Secretary Dulles wait-and-see school. This school has inspired the Richmond Times Dispatch to coin the adjective "Micawberish," after the character in David Copperfield who was constantly certain that something will turn up. The only something one can imagine turning up to solve the Indochina problem would be the total collapse of the Moscow and Peiping governments.

This school seems to have had, to date, only one definite thought on the situation to wit: "There is going to be no involvement of this country in war without Congress exercising its constitutional right and declaring it." Speaking for this school, the chairman of the Senate Armed Forces Committee, Senator SALTONSTALL, has announced that the 200 Air Force technicians who created the furor in February will be brought home in June.

As one columnist, writing in the Memphis Press Scimitar, has pointed out: "All the President's pledge means is that he has no desire for war and thinks he is keeping us out. Nobody doubts that. But that is not the issue. * * * Eisenhower recognition that a declaration of war is a congressional function is unlikely to change the result. That is not the way modern wars come. Congress did not get us into the Korean war. Nor did congressional decision put us into World War II, the Japanese aggressor did that, and Congress merely recognized the existing fact."

A third school of thought, not quite so vocal as the other two, holds that some clear thinking on Indochina is urgently called for and soon, certainly before the United States falls into the bear trap which will unquestionably be set by the Communists at the Geneva conference. Blair Bolles, the Toledo Blade's European correspondent, thus sums up the situation:

"The lack of a generally acceptable definition of what the Indochinese war is all about makes France almost a setup for such a Soviet diplomatic game. The Americans and the Vietnamese sects and Emperor Bao Dai and the French themselves need to confer together on the meaning of the war before there can be much hope of settling the issue."

The Alsop brothers put it more challengingly: "the Asian crisis is not the sort of thing that should be shoved under the rug."

American aid to the French-Vietnam forces, in the form of military equipment and supplies, now has reached the $1.3 billion level, but more critical than dollar aid at this point is the need for a clear and firm policy which the American people and their allies can understand.

Government Moves To Halt Creeping Socialism of TVA, but Taxpayer Gets the Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT GORE
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 27, 1954

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Government Moves To Halt Creeping Socialism of TVA, but Taxpayer Gets the Bill." The article was written by an outstanding young Washington reporter, and was published in the Memphis Commercial Appeal.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GOVERNMENT MOVES TO HALT CREEPING SOCIALISM OF TVA, BUT TAXPAYER GETS THE BILL—NEW YORK FIRMS WOULD GET GOVERNMENT MONEY FOR PLANT TO SUPPLY AEC POWER AT HIGHER RATES, AND THEY'D OWN IT

(By Morris Cunningham)

WASHINGTON, April 24.—Representatives of two private power companies moved behind closed doors with Government officials here this week to figure out what apparently will be another cost-plus contract to supply electric power to the Government.

The new contract, like the one that led to construction of the big private power plant at Joppa, Ill., will run into millions of dollars and over a period of years no doubt will yield the companies acceptable profits.

Dealing with the Government officials are representatives of Middle South Utilities, Inc., and the Southern Co., both headquartered in New York City.

If there is any competitive bidding in connection with the contract, it has not been announced.

Apparent purpose of the contract with the private companies is to halt the creeping socialism of the Tennessee Valley Authority, a Government-owned agency which until recent years has been supplying low-cost, profitless power to all other Government agencies in the area it serves.

TAXPAYER BEARS BRUNT

The actual effect—based upon the record to date—will be to increase the cost of power consumed by the Government-owned Atomic Energy Commission, the world's biggest power consumer. The taxpayer will pick up the check.

The record is the one made at the Joppa plant. There five private power companies formed a new company called Electric Energy, Inc., which is now competing and operating the plant. The companies are Central Illinois Public Service Co., Illinois Power Co., Kentucky Utilities Co., Middle South

Utilities, Inc., and Union Electric Co. of Missouri.

RATES UNCERTAIN

The plant was built under a cost-plus contract with the Government which provided for the sale of power to the Atomic Energy Commission at rates based upon the cost of the plant.

Since the plant was started the estimated cost has advanced from $139 million to $197 million, according to testimony by AEC officials before the House Independent Offices Appropriations Subcommittee.

Because of the various escalator clauses in the contracts, ultimate rates to be charged are in a fluid state and can only be estimated.

This week a spokesman for the Atomic Energy Commission estimated that when the plant finally is completed and a firm rate is placed in effect that it will be approximately 4.2 mills per kilowatt-hour.

This contrasts sharply with the TVA rate of 3.69 mills per kilowatt, a figure also supplied by the Atomic Energy Commission.

COMPANIES WILL OWN PLANT

Over an extended period of years the difference will mount into millions of dollars, at least $5 million a year and possibly more as consumption increases.

The difference will be paid by the taxpayers who provide the funds to operate the Atomic Energy Commission, the Government-owned agency that is buying the power. And when the contract expires, the companies—not the Government—will own the plant.

The Bureau of the Budget has refused to recommend funds to enable the TVA to build the necessary new generating plant. Private power companies are being relied upon. In this way the creeping socialism of the TVA is to be halted.

Details of hte new contract are scheduled to be worked out by Tuesday and are slated to be laid before the Senate Independent Offices Appropriations Subcommittee at that time. Site of the new plant, according to now general information, will be in the vicinity of West Memphis, Ark., if the contract is accepted by the Government.

Are We Adequately Guarding One of Our Greatest Assets, the Health of the Nation?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES R. HOWELL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 26, 1954

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, we all favor economy in Government and look for the day when our huge Federal budget may be reduced, or at least brought into balance. But we must observe that there are often some things that the Government cannot afford not to do.

The cutbacks in governmental funds for Federal grant-in-aid programs under the Republican leadership last year, 1953, have had their effects in many fields.

One of our Nation's greatest assets is the health of the people. The 1953 cuts in grants-in-aid have seriously affected public-health programs in many of the States. This has been particularly true in those States which have been unable to immediately assume a heavier burden of expenditures.

I include in the Record a summary of statements of State health officers on the effects of these reductions. This was prepared by the Association of State and Territorial Health Officers:

Summary of Statements of State Health Officers as to the Effect of Reductions in Federal Grant-in-Aid Programs for the Fiscal Year 1954

This is a compilation of reports by the responsible health authorities in the States and Territories and is being sent to the Members of Congress and certain other responsible Federal officials having to do with the budgeting, appropriating, and distribution of health grants-in-aid.

An analysis of the statements made by the State health officers reflecting the results of reductions in grant-in-aid programs for the fiscal year 1954 is attached. In order that this material might be summarized as briefly as possible, codes were used for standard programs affected and the degree of intensity to which such programs were curtailed.

It is virtually impossible to summarize in narrative form the reductions in the many States as a result of these grant-in-aid cuts, since no particular pattern was followed, and since the needs in the many States for specialized public health programs are greatly diversified, and the decision as to what cuts would be made was based on such needs.

I. Venereal disease program: It can be said, however, that the reduction in the venereal disease grant caused the discontinuance of clinics in 12 States, rapid-treatment centers in 3 States, and laboratory serology tests in 5 States. Such reductions will doubtless result in less case finding, treatment, and follow-up of venereal disease cases. In addition, in many States the distribution of antibiotics to physicians for treatment of venereal disease was discontinued. No less than 47 States were affected to some degree by the venereal disease grant-in-aid reduction, ranging from loss of personnel to complete discontinuance of the entire program. The Public Health Service estimates there are 2 million persons in this country who need treatment for syphilis. They also estimate that at least 102,000 civilians acquired syphilis last year although only about 10 percent reported for treatment; 243,857 cases of gonorrhea were reported last year, and actual cases probably were five times this number.

II. Cancer-control program: In many States tumor clinics were reduced or discontinued, which clinics were concentrated on the early detection of cancer. In some cases the reduction in cancer grants meant the elimination of the director of cancer control, the discontinuation of tumor registries, cancellation of subscriptions for the cancer bulletin furnished to physicians, consultation, and training of professional personnel.

III. Environmental sanitation program: Environmental sanitation services, supported by the general health grants and water-pollution grants were severely affected in many States. Significantly reduced in many States was inspection of water and sewage treatment plants, inspection of swimming pools, garbage collection and disposal plants, discontinuation of rodent-control programs, and severe reduction in the effectiveness of industrial hygiene and occupational health programs, ranging from discontinuation of inspection of hospitals, barber and beauty shops, food handlers, beauticians, etc., as well as a reduced program in the inspection of schools, meat markets, and public buildings, and in some cases the inspection of public water supplies. In all, some 24 States reported some degree of reduction in the sanitation program as a result of the reduced Federal grants-in-aid.

IV. Tuberculosis-control program: In most instances, the reduction in grants-in-aid resulted in the discontinuation of mobile X-ray units or the curtailment of the operation of such units to a fraction of the fiscal year; the end result being less case finding, reduction in case registries and follow up. In some States, commissions set up for the consultation and review of cases were discontinued and in many instances laboratory tests for tuberculosis were discontinued. Twenty-nine States reported reductions in the tuberculosis program ranging from loss of personnel to reduction in the number of mobile units in operation.

V. Vital statistics program: In some States the vital statistics program was reduced extensively, resulting mostly in loss of personnel. In some cases important statistical research programs were eliminated. In two States verification of birth certificates was discontinued.

VI. Maternal and child-health program: MCH program reductions consisted of discontinuing such things as vitamins for undernourished children, distribution of biological and immunization drugs, nutritional consultation and services. In one State, New York, important research programs in the prevention of German measles in pregnant women and other significant research was discontinued; diagnosis and consultation for children with hearing losses and deficiencies, epilepsy demonstrations, child-health and maternity conferences were also discontinued. Although there were fewer States that showed a reduction as a result of losses of MCH grants, those States which did report a reduction were carrying on valuable programs in the field of public health.

VII. Crippled program: Even fewer States reported losses or reductions in programs as a result of the cuts in the crippled-children grant. One State had to reduce the money available for appliances for crippled children, hospitalization, medical and surgical care for crippled children and medical and hospital care for rheumatic-fever children.

VIII. Heart-disease program: Those States which reported a reduction in the heart-disease program as a result of the grant-in-aid cuts indicate that the reduction affected case finding, followup, heart clinics, distribution of heart-disease bulletins to physicians, training of professional personnel such as physicians and distribution of health education material on heart disease. In some instances research programs were reduced or eliminated.

IX. Mental-health program: Mental-health programs were primarily affected by reduction or discontinuation of consultation and mental-health clinics brought about primarily through the loss of professional psychiatric personnel.

X. Dental health program: Some States reported reductions in dental health clinics, elimination of topical fluoride teams and dental corrective services.

XI. Other: In general, most States found it necessary to discontinue or reduce the training program for all professional personnel. Aid to local health units in unorganized public health programs on a county level was severely impaired and in many cases completely discontinued.

The distribution of health education material, purchase of films, pamphlets, and other matter was reduced. Some States found it necessary to reduce the hospital survey construction and licensing program by eliminating the director or by making the position of director part-time and by eliminating professional personnel, such as architects and engineers. In many States it was necessary to reduce the public health nursing staff, and in general, laboratory services were curtailed, and professional personnel severely reduced.

XII. Summary: As can be seen from the facts presented here, Federal health grant-in-aid reductions have reduced public health services throughout the United States. The ultimate effects of such reductions are difficult to assess at this time. At least the present level of Federal funds should be maintained until the President's Commission on Intergovernmental Relations has made its report and recommendations. The reduction of Federal health grants at a time when 34 State legislatures are adjourned for a period of 2 years places a burden on essential public health services that the States cannot shoulder, and causes the loss of many professionally trained public health workers and the training thus lost is as much or more disastrous than the services. The continued growth of our Nation will require more public health services to preserve the Nation's greatest asset—the health of its people.

The Reds Win the First Round in the Battle Over Red China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT GORE

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 27, 1954

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an article entitled "The Reds Win the First Round in the Battle Over Red China." The article, which was written by R. H. Shackford, and comes from Geneva under today's date, was published in the Washington News.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

THE REDS WIN THE FIRST ROUND IN THE BATTLE OVER RED CHINA

(By R. H. Shackford)

Geneva, April 27.—The battle over recognition of Red China is on here, and the United States lost the preliminary round.

Russia won for Red China a procedural position of equality with the United States in the Korean phase of the Geneva Conference.

Red China, to be sure, was denied the role as one of the rotating chairmen of the conference. But the compromise accepted to keep Red China out of the chairman's seat denied that role to the United States, and France, too.

IMPORTANT TO REDS

These procedural issues may seem unimportant, in view of the bigger issues at stake here, especially the ominous crisis in Indochina. In dealing with normal human beings, they would be unimportant. But the Commies have shown over the years that such issues are important in the conference game they play.

The Soviet objective here is to advance Red China along the path to big-power status. The Russians are willing to take advantage of the tiniest move in the direction of their objective. If they are denied an advance, then they demand, as in the case of the chairmanship, sacrifices from the West.

IMPORTANCE DENIED

The American delegation here claims this is not important—and that in any event it was not the issue upon which to force an early showdown that might have busted up the conference. The claim also is made that Secretary of State John Foster Dulles preferred to avoid procedural duties and devote himself to other matters.

Those claims are weak against facts and history. The chairmanship at such conferences as these involves no extra work; it only means chairman of the day presides and often can steer the proceedings in the direction he wishes.

This question of rotating the chairmanships at international conferences is an innovation started by the Russians at San Francisco in 1945. Before World War II it was customary for the host nation, if a participant, to act as chairman. But at San Francisco, the Russians insisted on the big powers sharing the chairmanship.

A snag occurred here when the West proposed to continue with the Big Four—the United States, Russia, Great Britain, and France, who were the inviting powers—sharing the chairmanship. But Russia insisted Red China be included, making it the big five.

COMPROMISE

The compromise finally adopted will rotate the chairmanship among Thailand, Russia, and Britain. The Russians claim it was their formula. Russia gave up her demand for raising Red China to top status; the West lowered the United States and France to Red China's level.

The American delegation tried to put the emphasis on the denial of the chair to Red China. Mr. Dulles had said he wouldn't sit in a conference headed by Red China Foreign Minister Chou En-Lai.

But now he has agreed to sit in the conference on the same basis as Chou En-Lai.

The seating arrangement adopted also gives both Red China and North Korea—branded aggressors by the U. N.—a seat of equality with other nations, big and small.

MOLOTOV SPURNED PARTY

Russia has shown at the outset that she has no intention of accepting inferior status for Red China here. French Foreign Minister Georges Bidault invited Mr. Dulles, Russian Foreign Minister V. M. Molotov and British Foreign Secretary Anthony Eden to call at his villa last evening for cocktails and an informal talk on Indochina. Both Mr. Dulles and Mr. Eden arrived—but not Molotov. He was said to have claimed he hadn't received his invitation in time. But no one doubted that he refused to acknowledge any special position of the Big Four—even socially.

The debate over Red China's position here has been going on since the Berlin Conference.

Mr. Dulles then explained his agreement to call the Geneva Conference by stating that Red China would come here not with big power status but as an aggressor to account for her sins before the bar of public opinion—not even on a status of equality with other United Nations who fought in Korea.

Russia has been denouncing that approach and insisting that Red China's role here would be on a par with other big powers. And on the first day, Molotov didn't do too badly.

Public Health Grants-in-Aid Amendments of 1954

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFTON (CLIFF) YOUNG

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 1954

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the members of the committee for the excellent job that they have done in carrying out the recommendation of President Eisenhower.

On January 18, 1954, he gave his message to the Congress in the field of health and made these remarks:

> The patchwork of complex formulas and categorical grants should be simplified and improved.

He proposed a simplified formula.

The formula for allocation of funds among the States is somewhat complicated. Only today did I receive word as to the effect it will have upon the district which I represent.

I should like to present to the House information contained in a letter received by me, prepared by J. E. Springmeyer, legislative counsel for the State of Nevada, in which he states:

> Financing is a key item in this matter. At the present time, each program has its own allotment formula. Under the tuberculosis control grant formula, for example, 20 percent of the funds are allotted on the basis of population and financial need, 35 percent on the basis of tuberculosis mortality, 35.7 percent on the basis of an evaluation of State program needs, and 9.3 percent in the form of a basic grant of $7,500 to each State. Under the mental health program, 20 percent of the Federal funds are allotted on the basis of population and financial need, with 70 percent on the basis of emotional and psychiatric disorders considered to be directly proportional to the population. Thus, an effort was made under each program to give some weight to the extent of the problem associated with a specific disease.
>
> Under the proposed allotment formulae, the special project grants would be made on an individual project basis rather than on any State-by-State allocation basis, and the extension and improvement grant would be made on the basis of population only. In the case of the support grants, however, Federal funds would be allotted among the States on the basis of the allotment formula used in the hospital survey and construction program. This formula takes into account the relative per capita income and the relative population of the various States with a greater weight being given to the financial need by a squaring of the per capita income factor. The objective of this allotment formula is to channel proportionately larger allotments of Federal funds into the States with the lower per capita income. The result of this formula is that the allotment to a very low-income State would be between several times that size of an allotment to a very high-income State with the same population.
>
> At present, the States are required to match each $2 in Federal funds with $1 from State sources for the general health and 5 categorical grants. Under the provisions of H. R. 7397, the matching funds required would vary inversely with the average per capita income of the State, and would range from one-third to two-thirds of total expenditures for the proved program. Thus, the lower-income States would be required to provide one State dollar to match $2 in Federal-grant funds as at present, while the highest-income States would provide two State dollars for every Federal-grant dollar. This will be helpful to some lower-income States which experience a large increase in their Federal allotment, but will be injurious to a State like Nevada, which has a high per capita income, but only a limited amount of funds available.
>
> It is obvious that Nevada's health programs will suffer exceedingly when they will receive only 50 cents in Federal money for every State dollar provided by the legislature instead of the $2 in Federal money which is received at the present time. It appears that the objective is to force the States with a high per capita income to carry a greater

share of the load for good health services. But, even though per capita income in Nevada is high, it has a population of only 180,000 people, and they must bear the entire burden of the cost of government at all levels, State, country, city, and school district. The taxable resources are already strained to the limit, and the legislature may have no choice but to reduce health services in Nevada if Federal aid is reduced.

The following indicates the amount of Federal aid provided for 3 fiscal years for public health services, excluding hospital construction and Childrens' Bureau programs:

1952-53	$105, 664
1953-54	77, 393
1954-55 (approximately)	79, 000

Approximately $79,000 will be available to Nevada under the provisions of H. R. 7397 (provided, Congress appropriates the $19,460,000 as suggested), but to get it, the Nevada Legislature will have to provide $158,000 in State money as compared to the approximately $40,000 provided at the present time in order to obtain $77,393.

The following indicates the amount of Federal aid provided for 3 fiscal years for Childrens' Bureau Services—Maternal and child-health program, and crippled children's services:

1952-53:	
Maternal and child health	$72, 046
Crippled children's services	66, 356
Total	138, 402
1953-54:	
Maternal and child health	$72, 046
Crippled children's services	66, 356
Total	138, 402
1954-55:	
Maternal and child health	$73, 515
Crippled children's services	66, 171
Total	139, 686
Under the new act:	
Maternal and child health (approximately)	$48, 000
Crippled children's services	43, 000
Total	91, 000

At the present time, approximately $95,000 of State money is necessary in order to obtain $138,402—$139,686 in Federal money, but under the new act, approximately $175,000 in State money would be necessary in order to obtain the same amounts of money.

It appears that if the new formula was on a population and per capita basis it would be satisfactory, but the squaring of the per capita income percentage is the unfair factor.

Section 2 of H. R. 7397 reads in part as follows:

"Each State shall be entitled to an allotment of an amount which bears the same ratio to such sums as the product of (1) the population of the State and (2) the square of its allotment percentage (as determined under subsection (h)) bears to the sum of the corresponding products of all the States. * * *

"(h) (1) The allotment percentage for any State shall be 100 percent less that percentage which bears the same ratio to 50 percent as the per capita income of such State bears to the per capita income of the continental United States."

Squaring the allotment percentage as determined by subsection (h) produces a sliding, weighted factor that results in a very heavy loss of Federal aid in Nevada, which has a high per capita income. It appears that some provision should be made in H. R. 7397 to alleviate the loss, in this State of small population that has such difficulty in finding total available funds to finance all levels of government.

It appears that the new formula is designed to unfairly increase aid to the States with a low per capita income; the benefits of Federal aid increase too greatly and too rapidly as the per capital income goes down. It should be noted that the State of Nevada is not participating in a number of Federal matching grant-in-aid programs, because the Nevada legislature has not been able to find the necessary State money for matching purposes.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, while the revised and simplified formula seems to solve the problem presented by the patchwork of complex formulas heretofore, it will in certain instances work a hardship upon certain States involved; namely, those with a small population, where there is difficulty in finding sufficient funds to finance all levels of government. I therefore am restrained to oppose the adoption of this formula until the development of a more equitable system of Federal assistance for States with small as well as large populations.

Centenary Salute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 1954

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under the unanimous consent of my colleagues, I insert in the RECORD an editorial that will be read 100 years from now. It will be part of a "time capsule" not to be opened until the people who are living in 2054, break the seal and read what we were writing as we thought of them.

Editorials from the various denominations, resting side by side for a century, and then brought to light and life again as truly as we would read the messages of 1854 to us.

We will have no way of knowing how history will judge us.

The people of 2054 will smile at some of our ways, and wonder how we could be so blind about so many problems that they will have solved.

Of course they will have new problems of their own, because the fate and the virtue of man is that he will always walk forward into the unknown, seeking eternity.

As he looks back for a moment toward us, I believe he will find some encouragement.

For in this editorial, and others, in the "time capsule" he will find that we were striving for that common area of understanding where all the rich variety of our faiths, our personalities, and our works forms a living tapestry of human progress.

In the American way that unites us.

We may be only half way through—in fact as well as time—the convulsions of this revolutionary century.

Society in 2054 will be much different in its externals, from life in 1954. But in its spirit it will be as close to us as the eyes that read the "time capsule" a century from now.

The Pilot, voice of the multitude of Catholic communicants in the archdiocese of Boston has been invited to contribute copies to be sealed in the capsule celebrating the centenary of the Washington Street Baptist Church in Lynn, Mass.

A fine and generous testimony to relegious fellowship that works both ways. I bring you a recent editorial from the Pilot appropriate to the occasion—an editorial that will also be read 100 years from now:

CENTENARY SALUTE

A hundred years is a long time in the life of any American community. Certainly the last century has seen a world transformed in such a way that we recognize, in the year 1954, as commonplace, operations of every sort which our ancestors could not have imagined possible. The conquest of space, the marvels of communication, the advances in knowledge, the growth of science—where would one begin to enumerate the change these last 10 decades have witnessed? When we pause to think about it there is no reason either why the century ahead may not have its equal share of surprises in the normal advance of civilization.

These thoughts occur to us as we are invited with this issue of the Pilot to contribute several copies to be included in a so-called time capsule, to be opened 100 years hence, which will be sealed this month as part of the celebration of the centenary of the Washington Street Baptist Church in Lynn. The idea is to contain within the capsule as many reflections of the life of these times as possible and we are happy to be able to speak, in a sense, to the people of this future day of the life of the Catholic Church in our times which they will find reflected in its pages.

For the church, of course, 100 years is merely as a day and we can be sure that the same realities that occupy our attentions today will be, in the flavor of later times, giving hope and inspiration in the century ahead. Even while the scenery changes and in one direction or another men seem to advance, the spiritual values on which our ultimate destiny depends remain everywhere constant. A resolute faith in the truth of revelation, a firm hope in the promises of Christ, and a life expanding in the love of God and man—these must stand as the key to success in every generation and in whatever century.

"M" Is for Murder Mission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 1954

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Speaker, the conscience of the world is shocked by the public revelation that the Soviets are using murder as an instrument of state policy. Although we are startled, we need not be surprised. Murder, mostly of the mass variety, has long been an instrument of the Soviet. I suppose the mind is better able to grasp a single planned murder, than it is able to comprehend genocide. In any event, the most recent desertion of Soviet agents, dispatched to Berlin on a murder mission, is a grim reminder of the nature of the enemy.

It is noteworthy, Mr. Speaker, that one of the 3 Soviet agents who defected to the West is a captain in the Russian secret police; the other 2 are veteran East German Communists. According to their own statements, they had been assigned to murder a man named Okolovich, a member of the anti-Soviet organization NTS in Frankfurt, West Germany.

Capt. Nikolai E. Khokhlov, 32, told authorities in the West that only a fervent plea by his wife dissuaded him from carrying out the killing. Mrs. Khokhlov remains in Moscow, together with their 21-month-old son and her 14-year-old sister.

According to Khokhlov, he and his fellow agents received special training in Moscow. He revealed that they were equipped with specially silenced electrically fired pistols and devices that fire lead pellets containing cyanide poison from a dummy cigarette case. The equipment has been turned over to the western police, and photographs of it have appeared in the American press.

Back in February Khokhlov and his companions slipped into West Germany from Switzerland, and Khokhlov immediately gave himself up. Then followed an interesting series of meetings until finally all three asked for protective custody. American intelligence agents, after checking the story, say they are satisfied with the accuracy of it.

With that Soviet murder assignment before us, Mr. Speaker, let us consider a Soviet kidnaping. On April 13, 1954, Dr. Alexander Trushnovich, leader of the NTS, an organization of exiled Russians, was kidnaped by hired Soviet agents. It should be noted that Dr. Trushnovich's "crime" was that he was the head of a humanitarian welfare committee. Several prior attempts had been made to kidnap or assassinate him. Before he was kidnaped on April 13 Dr. Trushnovich was brutally beaten. He was a marked man by the Soviets because he headed a Russian refugee group which assisted those who had made their way out of the prison camp that is Russia and into the freedom of the West.

Certainly the free world powers cannot stand by and allow such inhumane action by Soviet agents to pass without condemnation. Our Government and the United Nations ought to protest this kidnaping with all their strength, and their protest should be coupled with the demand that Dr. Trushnovich be returned in safety to the West.

Now to proceed just a bit further, Mr. Speaker, let us consider the case of the topflight Russian diplomat, assigned to Australia, who most recently sought political asylum in that country. He has revealed to Australian authorities valuable details on the Soviet espionage rings working in that continent and elsewhere.

These recent developments strongly indicate that there is plenty of trouble behind the Iron Curtain. It is only too apparent to those who wish to evaluate these events that, since the liquidation of Beria, there is a serious break in the ranks of the Soviet spy corps. From these surface cases, we can assume that intrigue is seething inside Russia and in several captive states. We are also well justified in the assumption that conditions behind the Iron Curtain must be intolerable when men of the rank of recent defectors are making the final break. These men are risking their lives in coming over to the West, and their dear ones, left behind in Russia, are now in jeopardy. Imagine what a turmoil their consciences must be in when they had to make a decision to risk all to be free of the dread mission of murder.

After this brief review, I want to pose several questions: Are our intelligence people making the best possible evaluation of all this evidence of Soviet defection? Are these evaluations being translated into top official United States policy? Are we closely comparing notes in these matters with top intelligence people and policymakers of friendly allied governments? I am just wondering, Mr. Speaker, wondering out loud, because I, for one, do not think that it makes much sense when we have evidence of such internal difficulties inside the Russian orbit for us to be easing trade restrictions which have the effect of taking the Kremlin off the hook. If we are making the most and the best use of all this evidence of Russian defections, then we will not tolerate even serious discussion of armistice by partition in Indochina. How are we playing all this on the Voice of America? Are the anti-Communist millions of the Soviet satellite states being told all these things from the outside?

Mr. Speaker, these are important days, eventful days. May God grant us the wisdom and the courage to make the most of the opportunities presented to us.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Printing and binding for Congress, when recommended to be done by the Committee on Printing of either House, shall be so recommended in a report containing an approximate estimate of the cost thereof, together with a statement from the Public Printer of estimated approximate cost of work previously ordered by Congress within the fiscal year (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 145, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on Printing, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

PRICE OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

The Public Printer is authorized to furnish to subscribers the daily RECORD at $1.50 per month, payable in advance.

Remit by money order payable to Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C.

DISTRIBUTION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

To the Vice President and each Senator 100 copies; to the Secretary and Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, each, 25 copies; to the Secretary, for official use, not to exceed 35 copies; to the Sergeant at Arms, for use on the floor of the Senate, not to exceed 50 copies; to each Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress, 68 copies; to the Clerk, Sergeant at Arms, and Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives, each, 25 copies; to the Clerk, for official use, not to exceed 50 copies; and to the Doorkeeper, for use on the floor of the House of Representatives, not to exceed 75 copies; to the Vice President and each Senator, Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress there shall also be furnished (and shall not be transferable), 3 copies of the daily RECORD, of which 1 shall be delivered at his residence, 1 at his office, and 1 at the Capitol.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Frank Brodie is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. The money derived from such sales shall be paid into the Treasury and accounted for in his annual report to Congress, and no sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized book dealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by book dealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

C

I

HON

IN THI

Mr.
ident,
printe
a very
dress e
blocks
senior
chairn
Inters
the tra
Hotel
meetin
of the
D. C.,
The
was or
as foll

(By Ho
Sena
mitte
merc

It is
pany o
portati
meetin
the var
meetin
The
ing Tra
by Mr.
in the
The Co
of thos
we nee
groups
users,
heads
At t
the ren
work t
very n
lated
Federal
necess
tory a
their in
into ro
the Am
ment
prefere
stantly
Since
inevita
Congre
become
such in
preserv
mode c
clearin
tation
of one
tually
port sy
Long
to opp
of su

Appendix

Clearing Transport Roadblocks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 28, 1954

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record a very instructive and interesting address entitled "Clearing Transport Roadblocks," delivered by the distinguished senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. Bricker], chairman of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, at the transportation luncheon held at the Hotel Statler, during the 42d annual meeting of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, at Washington, D. C., on April 27, 1954.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

CLEARING TRANSPORT ROADBLOCKS

(By Hon. John W. Bricker, United States Senator from Ohio, chairman, Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce)

It is a real pleasure to be here in the company of a group so well informed on transportation problems. I cannot recall any meeting more broadly representative of all the varied transportation interests than this meeting here today.

The general theme of this luncheon, Clearing Transport Roadblocks, was aptly chosen by Mr. Harold Hammond and his associates in the United States Chamber of Commerce. The Congress is now trying to remove some of those roadblocks. To do a creditable job we need the advice and assistance of the groups represented here—transportation users, transportation executives, and the heads of transport regulatory agencies.

At the outset we should recognize that the removal of transportation roadblocks is work that will never be completed. By its very nature, transportation must be regulated in the public interest. In addition, Federal promotion of transportation is often necessary. But no matter how wise regulatory and promotional policies may be at their inception, they are soon or later turned into roadblocks by the dynamic character of the American free-enterprise system. Equipment changes. Competition changes. The preference of transportation users are constantly changing in unpredictable fashion.

Since regulatory and promotional policies inevitably produce transport roadblocks, Congress should remove them before they become serious. Only by promptly removing such impediments can the Congress hope to preserve the inherent advantages of each mode of transportation. The penalty for not clearing transport roadblocks is a transportation crisis leading, first, to nationalization of one segment of the industry and eventually to socialization of the whole transport system.

Long ago transportation experts pointed to oppressive and discriminatory regulation of surface transportation. Unfortunately, Congress was slow in responding. The present financial plight of the railroads is one result. However, a thorough investigation of domestic land and water transportation was launched in 1949. Senator Johnson of Colorado was then the chairman of the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. I am very sorry that he will not be with us next year. We shall greatly miss his wise counsel on the measures inspired by the investigation begun during his chairmanship of the committee.

There is no impending crisis in air transportation. But I agreed with Senator McCarran of Nevada that it is better to review basic legislation before it breaks down rather than after. Accordingly, on April 6, we began hearings on Senator McCarran's comprehensive revision of the Civil Aeronautics Act, S. 2647. Because of the importance of this measure, hearings are being held before the full committee. We do not expect to complete action on the McCarran bill in this Congress. We do hope to build a very complete record that will facilitate the passage of legislation next year. Even though the need to rewrite the Civil Aeronautics Act is not acute, I believe that it should be modernized now to insure that American civil aviation will continue to lead the world in safety, efficiency, economy, and service.

One particularly senseless roadblock has been the inability of the railroads to abandon highly unprofitable services in intrastate commerce. Our committee has reported favorably to the Senate a bill (S. 281) giving the Interstate Commerce Commission power to authorize the discontinuance of intrastate services that represent an undue burden on interstate commerce. The Commission already has similar authority with respect to intrastate rates but not as to passenger, freight, and station services. Because of local pride, State commissions have compelled railroads to operate passenger trains that carry more operating crew than passengers. The burden on interstate commerce is obvious.

Another transportation roadblock has been the great time lag between increases in carrier costs and compensating rate adjustments. Our committee has reported to the Senate S. 1461, which is intended to expedite the handling of general rate increases before the Interstate Commerce Commission. In some instances more than a year has passed between the filing of a petition for a general rate increase and the final decision of the Commission. S. 1461 directs the Interstate Commerce Commission to grant interim rate relief occasioned by increases in wage and material costs but without prejudice to final Commission action on the petition for a general rate increase.

It has been estimated that ICC delay in authorizing rate increases has cost the railroads more than $1 billion in revenue during the past 7 years. It is impossible for the railroads to absorb future wage and material price spirals to the extent that they have in the past. Railroad earnings during the 6 postwar years ending in 1952 averaged only 3.6 percent a year on their depreciated investment. It is encouraging, however, to find a widespread concern about the railroads' financial condition, even among groups that stand to benefit temporarily from depressed freight rates. For example, the need to expedite rate decisions has been recognized by the United States Chamber of Commerce, by the National Industrial Traffic League, a nationwide shippers' organization, and by the National Grange.

Another major transportation roadblock has been the inability of the Interstate Commerce Commission to obtain adequate appropriations from Congress. The Commission has many less employees today than it had 10 years ago. It is trying valiantly to handle an increasing workload with a steadily diminishing work force. It may well be that carriers by rail, highway, waterway, and pipeline are overregulated. I think that is so. Too much legislation, and hence too much of the Commission's work, is based on the regulation of monopolies long since destroyed by the competition of new modes of transportation. But until the Congress relieves the Commission of its unnecessary work, failure to appropriate adequate funds hurts carriers, shippers, and the general public.

To further bolster the financial position of common carriers, the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce is considering two bills dealing with contracts between the Government and common carriers of passengers and freight. S. 906 establishes the finality of contracts agreed to by the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the Administrator of General Services. In addition, S. 904 provides for standard rates on household goods shipped by the United States Government for its employees. At the present time the Government negotiates for rates below those published by the ICC.

No consideration of transportation facilities or problems would be complete without some reference to the Merchant Marine and its troubles. This is an extremely complex question, to which our committee's Water Transportation Subcommittee, under Senator John Marshall Butler, has been devoting a great deal of attention.

We have too many old, noncompetitive vessels, and far too many cargoes, financed by American dollars, moving in foreign bottoms. We must modernize the American merchant fleet and keep vital shipbuilding facilities from complete collapse.

An administration program is promised for next year. That's fine—but next year may be too late to save our shipyards. We must begin some ship construction now.

Defense officials agree that we need large, modern tankers, in quantity. The Senate has done its part to advance the pending legislation. If the special-type vessels M. S. T. S. is requesting are not available elsewhere, we should build them. In addition, modern passenger ships are essential for defense. All these projects should have the necessary backing to assure them priority in the remaining weeks of the session. Our committtee will do all it can to assure such priority.

I could continue at length in discussing particular roadblocks created by discriminatory and outmoded regulation. It might be more helpful, however, for me to indicate briefly the general approach of the Senate Interstate Commerce Committee to this problem.

The wide range of conflicting opinion on the ills of the Nation's transportation system and of the remedies prescribed leads our committee to the conclusion that there is no single panacea for the ailment. And yet, despite the fierce competition between the various segments of the industry, the problems experienced by each differ not by type of carrier, as one might think, but rather by the sort of carriage service provided. Of all the conclusions we have reached in our recent studies, there is none more important, in my judgment, than the fact that the ills of the transportation industry of our Nation go across the board. The symptoms may vary in intensity, but they affect every regulated carrier. What may be crippling to one carrier is as yet but an annoyance to another, but the problems are identical.

We have also learned that the ills of each segment of the industry varied with the degree of Federal regulation under which each operated. It is perhaps a bitter commentary that the protecting arm of Federal regulation is bent in a stranglehold on many of the great carriers of the Nation.

The first and guiding principle of national transportation policy should be, simply, that all transportation should be regulated to the extent required in the public interest—and no more. Some have called this principle the "minimum" rule. Advocates for particular segments of the industry are quick to establish that the public interest to which the rule refers coincides exactly with the interest of their type of transportation, and that, therefore, regulatory restrictions on their competitors must be either retained or established. These others are equally vocal in an effort to show that there is, after all, no public interest in the suffocating restriction under which they labor. It is safe to assume that the truth lies somewhere between these two views.

I know I need not set out in detail the dependence of our national economy on the transportation industry. Our commerce moves on the rails, the highways, the airways, and the waterways of the Nation. As one student of transportation put it, in discussing production of defense items—"Until the gun has been delivered, it hasn't been produced."

The public interest, then, is the product of a complex equation. I am inclined to believe that the framers of our earlier Federal regulation tended to treat the interests of the shipping public as identical with the general public interest. The interest of the shipper in transportation is a factor in the determination of the public interest, but, as I have attempted to show, it is just as certainly not the only factor. The public interest includes, too, the interest of the carriers and the thousands of investors, but it does not necessarily follow that whatever measure is in the best interest of a particular carrier is in the public interest.

Federal promotional activities in transportation also require corrective action. The Federal Government has traditionally encouraged and protected newcomers to the transportation field, in order that they may not be crushed in infancy by strong and well-established competitors.

That protection takes two forms. First, new carriers are frequently subjected to much less onerous regulation than those already in the field. Second, new carriers may be granted, directly or indirectly, some form of Federal subsidy. The classic example of Federal subsidy is, of course, the air carrier, although others certainly exist. The railroads were initially subsidized, there is a substantial element of subsidy in our inland waterway transportation system, and there are some who claim that elements of the motor-carrier industry are subsidized through highway construction. Let me make it clear that I do not regard Federal subsidy as an evil in itself. I do contend that a hidden subsidy is, as a matter of public policy, indefensible, and a subsidy which ceases to be justified as soundly in the public interest should be promptly cut off.

The poor financial condition of any transportation group is the concern of the Federal Government only when such financial weakness results from Government action. If regulation were fair and impartial, if taxes were not so high as to discourage private investment, and if the Government's promotional activities did not give certain carriers an unfair competitive advantage, we would not be concerned today with distortions in the transportation picture. We could be sure that the inherent advantages of various modes of transportation were being determined by consumer preferences and reflected in their competitive positions. Such is not the case today. Federal taxation is at a confiscatory level. Regulation of transportation is not impartial. Promotional activities are discriminatory. So long as these conditions exist, Congress must be concerned with the future of all forms of transportation, for it can never be sure that the weakest link is not in fact the most essential.

When Government formulates transportation policy with a view toward creating what it deems to be an ideal or a well-balanced transportation plant, grave dangers are likely to result. No man or group of men is endowed with the wisdom to judge how many miles of railway or how many thousands of trucks will be required 10 years from now to meet the Nation's military and civilian needs. Had that economic philosophy prevailed in the past, the United States might still be riding on wagon wheels. If consumer preferences decree that we shall have half as many trains or twice as many trucks, or vice versa, I shall not object. Insofar as defense requirements are concerned, we have always supported the military on an industrial base, developed for the most part by a system of free, competitive enterprise. The results of the past more than justify our faith in the same policy for the future.

You and I inherited from preceding generations the most magnificent industrial plant and transportation network in the history of the world. It has been our privilege and our right as freemen to add, directly or indirectly, to the store of capital we inherited. As a result, the average American worker needs an investment in plant and equipment in excess of $8,000 to maintain his job and his pay. Our incomparable productivity is due far less to the bounty of nature than to the voluntary processes of capital accumulation. Nothing is more certain than that every factory, every truck, every locomotive, and every piece of industrial machinery will some day have to be replaced. Socialism and printing-press money have never yet succeeded in reproducing the capital required for an expanding economy. The experience of other nations in various degrees of socialistic experiment proves almost conclusively that they cannot.

Nothing is more difficult and more essential than that business subordinate artificial competitive advantages to the welfare of the entire industry and the general public. This is particularly true in transportation. Archaic regulation and unsound promotional activities have naturally created powerful vested interests. Too many beneficiaries of Government favoritism and subsidy tend to think in terms of "after me, the deluge." The far-sighted transportation executive, on the other hand, knows that threats to other segments of the industry are of vital concern to him. In recommending legislation to the Congress, he should have uppermost in his mind the principle "united we stand, divided we fall."

In this connection, I hope you will bear in mind a prophetic warning made 76 years ago on the floor of the United States Senate. Senator Benjamin Harvey Hill, of Georgia, spoke of the railroads at a time when Federal regulation was a burning political issue. Nine years before the enactment of the act of 1887, Senator Hill said:

"But sir, I have said I do not dread these corporations as instruments of power to destroy this country, because there are a thousand agencies which can regulate, restrain, and control them; but there is a corporation we may all well dread. That corporation is the Federal Government. From the aggressions of this corporation there can be no safety, if it is allowed to go beyond the well defined limits of its power. I dread nothing so much as the exercise of ungranted and doubtful powers by this Government. It is in my opinion the danger of dangers to the future of this country. Let us be sure we keep it always within its limits. If this great, ambitious, ever-growing corporation becomes oppressive, who shall check it? If it becomes wayward, who shall control it? If it becomes unjust, who shall trust it? As sentinels on the country's watchtower, Senators, I beseech you—watch and guard with sleepless dread that corporation which can make all property and rights, all States and people, and all liberty and hope its playthings in an hour, and its victims forever."

Passover Message by Rabbi Norman Salit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. IRVING M. IVES

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 28, 1954

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of a Passover message by Rabbi Norman Salit, president of the Synagogue Council of America. These inspiring words carry a timely message of promise and hope for world peace and liberty, and were prepared for dissemination throughout the world over the facilities of the Voice of America.

There being no objection, the message was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PASSOVER: CHALLENGE AND PROMISE

(Delivered by Dr. Norman Salit, president, Synagogue Council of America)

Passover is an ancient festival, perhaps 3,500 years old; yet, the passage of millennia has not dimmed its vitality. Its advent on April 17 next brings a timely, an imperative, and a hopeful message to the world today. That message is one of freedom—of man's irrepressible yearning for liberty, of the tyrant's inability to crush that desire, and of the nature of real freedom.

Passover's message is timely because the moral sights of mankind, only 50 years ago, seemingly fastened on principles strongly and beautifully expressed in the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States of America, seem to have shifted, in many countries and even in parts of our own. What was so recently reverenced as the cornerstone of the good society, namely, the freedom of the individual—to think, to speak out, to worship, to assemble, to have dominion over his property—has now comely largely into disrepute. Man, it appears, distrusts himself; in doing so, he denies God. That is the ultimate meaning of the oft-repeated phrase, in recent years, that all over the world the lights are going out. The light of liberty, the light of self-reliance, the light of faith in the Kingdom of the Almighty—these are the lights that were assailed, that one after one, in place after place, were snuffed out, that gleam less brightly and more fitfully, even in our country today.

Against this darkening scene, in this self-doubting and melancholy hour, the summons of Passover comes as a clarion call.

"Liberty is everything," it proclaims. "Rather starve in the desert as freemen than cluster about the fleshpots of Egypt as slaves." That was the spirit of the exodus—a determined forsaking of security and serfdom for adventure, hardship, and liberty. The ancient Israelites had no illusions about the consequences of their choice. They turned their backs on so-called civilization—on the temples and palaces and the fertility and food of the Nile; they turned their faces toward the barrenness, the asperities, the dangers and the challenges of the wilderness. There was no moral weakness in that epic decision, a decision which changed the course of history. There was no physical weakness in their indomitable march into the sea rather than yield to the horses and chariots and armed might of the tyrant. At times, it is true, there were doubting spirits who raised quavering voices and counseled return to safety and slavery—but those voices were in the minority, and did not prevail. Their whining only marked in greater contrast the resoluteness of the majority. The people as a whole had faith in themselves, in their future, in their divinely inspired leader, Moses—all of which means they had faith in God.

Is there any message the world needs more today than this message of Passover? Is there any other spirit more calculated to brighten the flickering lights and rekindle the extinguished torches? Is there any word more timely than this emphasis on the utter integrity of the human spirit, the indispensability of liberty in human life, the dominion of God in the affairs of men?

Passover proclaims also—and this is its message of hope—that in the long run, the tyrant is weaker than his victims. If history has any meaning, it is that. From Pharaoh to Hitler, the despot's success, brief or extended, has been temporary. Liberty, like truth, crushed to earth, will rise again—for the simple reason that liberty and truth are the same; they are obverse sides of the same coin; they are the indispensable climate for the free soul of man. The color of tyranny changes—brown shirts 20 years ago, red flags today; the methods of tryranny are always the same, and so is its end.

The tragedy of human history is that this truth has had to be proved on so many occasions, that the warning signs of the despot's ambitions have been so casually dismissed. The sensible man would not dream of listening to the rattles of a snake and standing unmoved—yet how frequently does history tell us of peoples who have done just that, disregarding the ugly warnings and then finding themselves in the serpent's coils. All slaveries are temporary; but so many of them, with their misery and bloodshed and setbacks of civilization, are unnecessary. This is the imperative note of Passover. Be on your guard. Bestir yourselves. Take action. At stake is your freedom. Eternal vigilance is still the price of liberty—in Europe or Asia or America, abroad or at home.

And, lastly, what is the liberty stressed in this message? It is not the liberty of license, of free-wheeling through the world or society without consideration of the rights of others. It is the liberty which crowned the miracle of the Exodus, the liberty which sealed the transformation of Egypt's slaves into a free people, the liberty which came to full flower at the foot of Mount Sinai—the liberty of law. Writers are fond of saying that it was ancient Rome which gave the world law. Rome did—but long before that, so had Israel, in the basic law of the Ten Commandments, accepted at Sinai, and in the expanded law of the Five Books of Moses. That law commanded love for one's neighbor, care for the poor, consideration for one's employee, discouragement of slavery. That was law founded, not on a feeling of scorn for other men but on a deep sense of social responsibility. The essence of that law is that there is no hierarchy of peoples, that all men have the same rights under a universal God. The very concept of the chosen people in the Bibie is that Israel was selected to preach to the world that there is no chosen people. This law teaches that life is not lived in a vacuum, but that it rests upon a moral foundation. Without this type of law, says the Passover story, there can be no true liberty. That is to say: You cannot be free if your neighbor is not free.

This great message cannot be repeated too often or too strongly. It goes to the very heart of the world's ills today, to the future of civilization, of human life itself on this distraught planet. Each succeeding day, without mounting incredible accounts of man's fantastic progress in his ability to destroy himself, gives this message literally vital import. Are the peoples of the world ready to declare that all men shall be free? Is the threat of aggression, of subversion, of domination, to be abolished, so that the power of the atom may be used to enrich human life rather than blot it out? Man must destroy war, or war will destroy man. Which alternative will men choose? Will they continue to careen heedlessly and crazily down the reckless road to global annihilation, or will they heed that same law, which proclaims in Deuteronomy: "I have set before thee life and death, the blessing and the course; therefore choose life, that thou mayest live, thou and thy seed"?

Man's choice will be determined by his reaction to the challenge and the promise of the Passover message of freedom, for freedom is life, and enslavement is death—intellectually, spiritually, and physically. As Americans, our tradition points in one direction—the direction inscribed on our Liberty Bell in words again taken from that law: "Proclaim liberty throughout the land unto all the inhabitants thereof." America's first task is to establish liberty completely at home. But after that her task is to persuade the peoples of the world to establish liberty everywhere else. That way lies peace and achievement—the true humanity that approaches divinity. God grant that we accept the challenge, and fulfill the promise.

Everybody Talks About Texas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 28, 1954

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, among the outstanding newspapermen from over the Nation who attended the recent meeting in Washington of the American Society of Newspaper Editors was Mr. Mason Walsh, an editorial executive of the Daily Times-Herald, of Dallas, Tex.

Mr. Walsh, as befits a good Texas newspaperman, kept his ears open for talk about Texas while he was in Washington. On his return to Dallas, he wrote a front-page column for the Times-Herald which entertainingly and effectively makes the point that the eyes of the Nation are on Texas.

Because of its significance to persons not so fortunate as to live in Texas, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Walsh's article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Get out of Texas.

Get out, that is, if you're interested in finding where most of the Texas talk comes from.

A couple of times a year, newspapermen's gatherings take me to other sections of the United States. Just back from such a trip, I'm more convinced than ever that the biggest Texas boosters come not from this State, but from the other 47, and the District of Columbia. They just can't help talking Texas.

Driving along in Washington, D. C., last week with several non-Texas newspapermen, we passed the Washington Monument. "There's the second highest monument in the United States," a fellow from Cleveland remarked. "Where's the highest one?" asked a Missourian. "In Texas, of course, near Houston," the Clevelander said. The other non-Texan, a Pennsylvania newspaperman, turned to me. "That's the way with you people in Texas," he said accusingly. "Always bragging." And I hadn't said a word.

Then there was the Oklahoma editor, who, with his wife, sat across the table from me at a dinner given by Bascom Timmons, chief of the Times-Herald Washington bureau. Learning through the introductions that the couple were from Oklahoma, I commented: "Nice that we're sitting together. After all, we're neighbors." The lady smiled. "I guess so," she said. "I come to Dallas often to shop in your wonderful stores. I like Texas all right. But," she said impishly, "why do you Texans always brag so much?" And I hadn't said a word about Texas.

"How far is it from El Paso to Texarkana?" asked a New Yorker at a get-together in Manhattan. Before I could answer a West Virginian in the group provided the correct answer. "What's so remarkable about that?" some other non-Texan said. "Nothing," said a second New Yorker dourly. "Bigness isn't important, after all." "That," came back the first New Yorker gleefully, "is what I always say about little old New York." I hadn't said a word.

An Arizona couple I met in New York told me proudly "We're both from Texas." "It's not that we aren't fond of Arizona," the wife added, "but after all, I came from Waxahachie." Then there was the New York newspaperman named after a Texas patriot, although he'd never set foot himself in the State. And a Chicagoan at one gathering volunteered statistics on Texas, shouting me down when I protested that some of the figures sounded too high. "Texas is the biggest, best State in the Union," he told me firmly. "Were you ever there?" I asked. "No," he admitted, "but I love it anyhow."

"Ooooh," commented somebody at the edge of the group, "how you Texans do brag."

Something needs to be done about it. It's gotten to where everybody talks about Texas except Texans.

Apparently, we don't need to.

Trends in Public Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 28, 1954

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I have hitherto, on April 19, placed in the Appendix of the RECORD part I of a distinguished address delivered by Mr. Claude

Bowers before the Woman's National Democratic Club on April 5, 1954. I ask unanimous consent to complete the record by having printed in the Appendix part II of his address.

There being no objection, part II of the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY HON. CLAUDE BOWERS BEFORE WOMAN'S NATIONAL DEMOCRATIC CLUB, APRIL 5, 1954—PART II

VIII

And now, after a century and a half, the old Hamiltonians are back again, flying the Federalist flag of special priviliges for the few, and trying, through terrorism, to intimidate liberals and Democrats into silence—the Fascist technique.

Unable to face the people on their record, they fall back on the old Federalist strategy in the days of Hamilton, and adopt the Fascist method in a silly attempt to smear 20 glorious years of Democratic administration as years of treason.

They are afraid, specifically, to attack the measures of these administrations; they are afraid to base their campaign on achievements of their own—there are so few in the interest of the people.

And so, taking their cue from Mein Kampf that victories may be won by the propagation of lies if persistently repeated, they propose to create an atmosphere of fear and hysteria in which the mind and judgment cease to function.

Remember, it was hysteria and big business that raised Hitler to power; it was hysteria and big business that held him there until he was ready to fare forth in an attempt to impose a Fascist tyranny on mankind. That is the reason that some of us are less concerned over creeping socialism than over galloping fascism.

For never since 1800 have democratic processes been the object of open sneers and attacks as they are today. We find men denying with scorn that we are a democracy. A republic, yes; a democracy, no. Not a democracy with the will of the people. Why the American boys now sleeping on the battlefields of Europe and Asia were told by us that they were fighting for democracy and against fascism and communism, and I do not like to think that these boys went to their death with a lie upon our lips.

Recently I was shocked when a distinguished person with a wide audience wrote that the "democracies since the French Revolution have put liberty above God," and this astounding antidemocratic statement was given wide circulation in newspapers with a pro-Fascist slant. It is time for us to face the fact that behind the hysteria that has been worked up by demagogs, is a deliberate plan to rob the people of their civil rights and discredit our democratic system.

I have heard it said that out of the mouth of babes we often learn what their elders are saying. Not long ago a young Republican leader in Washington announced his discovery that the people are not fit to rule; that democracy is a mockery; that government should be turned over to the aristocracy of wealth. The young man was a bit mournful because of the passing of the caste system, but he had some hope here, because naval officers now wear swords. I can imagine that the young man was hastily summoned to Republican headquarters and given a fatherly talk on the political facts of life. "Of course my boy" said the senior officer, "what you said is what our idol, Hamilton thought and said, and what we secretly believe now. But in politics, my lad, we must be discreet." In addressing the common herd, it is better to quote Lincoln than Hamilton, although Lincoln was a flaming Red when he put out that piffle about "government of the people by the people and for the people."

Because of demagogs playing a petty party game we have seen things in America in the last year or so that are the negation of the American way of life. We are living in a day when men are guilty by association; when decent men can be ruined by suspicions set afloat by malice; when men accused of crime are presumed to be guilty until they prove their innocence; when charges are directed against citizens by informers concealed in impenetrable darkness and refused the right to face their accusers.

One day I visited the old palace in Lima where men and women were tried, condemned and damned by the Inquisition. I have stood in the room where the victim was accused and interrogated. Opening from this room was another room, and through a small hole in the connecting door the unknown, unseen accuser made his accusation. We have been approaching the methods of the Inquisition.

Recently in a small city in Connecticut an organization ordered its members to spy on their friends and neighbors and report their flimsy suspicions to the FBI. Whether this group acted through hysteria or as fascists I do not know. But when asked to explain their purpose, they said that they were going to drive out of the community—not Communists, not subversives—but liberals and radicals. What a perfect fascistic thought. And how uncomfortable Jefferson and Lincoln would have been in that neighborhood.

And now we have wiretapping, that heavenly recourse of all the tyrants of the world. I hope we are not approaching a police state. * * * Of course today no Communist would talk over the telephone but it will be possible to check up on your political opinions. Why the time may come when it will be indiscreet to date a lady for lunch over the telephone because of the danger of being dragged into the court of the gossips as a correspondent.

And now to top it all we have that delectable organ of sweetness and light misnamed the Facts Forum, financed by an oil magnate from Texas with millions to spend on propaganda, to tell the people the way they should go. When asked the purpose of this mysterious benevolence, the spokesman smugly replied: "to tell the people what to think." So in the new order we are to have absolute conformity which is neither desirable or possible in a democracy. But what a perfect fascistic thought.

* * * * *

Now all this, evoked by demagogs in the hope of electing a Republican Congress, is whittling away the American way of life. And so it has come to pass that men are increasingly afraid to think out loud; when free Americans avoid a controversial subject through fear; when to test the effect of the hue and cry, the Bill of Rights was copied in the form of a petition to Congress for its adoption, and when submitted to 20 Americans for their signature 17 were afraid to sign.

* * * * *

I wonder if we realize how our prestige as a leader of the forces of democracy is fading beyond our border because of the cheap demagogy rampant in our land today. Recently I attended a private dinner where one of the guests was a lady from India who seemed shy. When asked if she did not find startling differences between her country and ours, she replied in a low, soft voice: "Oh, there are differences, of course. I find that we have greater freedom of speech in my country." An American woman expressed her astonishment. "I mean," said the lady from India, "that in my country we say what we think without fear, and I find so many, so many Americans who are afraid to think out loud."

IX

Now communism and fascism follow a common course in undermining and destroying democracies. First comes the swaggering, irresponsible demagogue with his bag of tricks. He begins by destroying confidence in the people's chosen leaders and in democratic processes—as is being done here; in throwing suspicion on the courts—as was recently attempted here when the FBI was forced to pry into his past to determine whether one of the greatest of Americans, Chief Justice Warren, was fit to sit upon the bench; and when they cannot count on the disloyalty of the Army—and they cannot here—they do not hesitate to create suspicion in the Armed Forces.

In these days of international crisis, when the issue is the preservation or destruction of a free world and so much depends on the Foreign Service, a vicious campaign of derogation and abuse has been waged to destroy faith in the men who man that service and to hold them up to ridicule. They have succeeded by persistent efforts, by irresponsible charges and innuendos in demoralizing that fine body of efficient and patriotic Americans in the foreign field until many are afraid to report what they see or think lest some demagogues interpret their observations as proof of a Communist connection. A man can be tried for murder but once if acquitted; but an able career diplomat has been investigated and vindicated eight times and a ninth inquiry is now planned. Because of things like these Foreign Service officers have come to feel that they cannot count on a fair deal from a public poisoned on demagogic slanders, and the morale of the Foreign Service has reached the lowest level it has ever known before. For 20 years I have had intimate contact with these career men in the Foreign Service, and a more patriotic, intelligent, and self-effacing body of men I have never known, and never expect to know.

This done, the demagogs proposed to destroy faith in the loyalty and integrity of the Army—an Army that wrote glorious chapters in the history of valor and victory in two major wars. * * *

X

Now anyone who attempts to divide or destroy the morale of the American people in the face of a dangerous foe is a collaborationist of the Communists.

The foolish boast that should a world war come we want and need no allies against the combined industrial and manpower of Russia and China has shocked and shaken our allies' confidence in our intelligence.

Noting the fear and hysteria stirred up by our demagogues with the support of a great political party, our allies are beginning to wonder if a Nation divided against itself, with no confidence in itself, is safe to lead the free nations of the world.

It is humiliating to a real American to find conservative papers in England and France seriously asking if we are abandoning democracy for totalitarianism.

Yes, our international prestige, so bright 2 years ago, has dimmed. This, in fairness is less due to the administration than to conspicuous leaders in the Republican camp, who are not friends of the administration, but have publicly been anointed as spokesmen of the administration, by the Republican National Committee.

And since the favorite orator of the Republican National Committee has traversed the continent at the expense of that committee to talk about treason, we come to the question—who are the collaborationist of the Communists? Or put it this way: what does Moscow want?

It wants to divide the American people into bitter factions, incapable of coordination—and these American demagogues are doing the work of Moscow.

It wants our country demoralized and weakened by fear amounting to hysteria—and here again these demagogues are doing the work of Moscow.

It wants the world faith in our free institutions destroyed by making a mockery of the first principles of a free society—and our demagogs are eager to oblige.

It wants the morale of our Foreign Service weakened in the gravest hour we have ever known, and doing the work of Moscow, our demagogues have reduced the morale of the State Department to the lowest level it has ever known.

It wants the morale of our fighting forces lowered on the verge of a possible war—and our demagogues have attacked it with a viciousness unknown before in all our history.

Moscow's supreme purpose to separate us from our allies—and these demagogues are doing their best to realize that plan of the Kremlin.

Moscow wants to make an open mockery of our freedoms and civil rights—and here the demagogs are rendering their greatest service to their soulmates behind the Iron Curtain.

The time is overdue for telling the American people that antidemocratic demagogy, even to elect a Republican Congress is doing immeasurable harm to American institutions, and is serving the strategy of communism by trampling on the freedoms, and by seeking to split our people into snarling factions in the face of a deadly foe.

• • • • •

XI

Now the purpose of the smear campaign charging the millions who in five elections raised Roosevelt and Truman to the Presidency are Communists and traitors is crystal clear—it is to divert attention from the fact—

That a new reign of special privilege has begun.

That the extravagant Republican campaign promises to the farmers have been dishonored.

That the property of the Nation has been turned over to speculators in oil and power.

That between four and five million workmen, representing from eight to ten million with women and children, are out of jobs; that the Secretary of the Treasury does not think it serious; and that the administration is loath to take steps to meet the danger.

That the administration's interpretation of its pledge to lower taxes is to give all the benefit to 8 percent of the people drawing dividends on stock in the great corporations; that it is Senator George and the Democrats who are fighting for a saving for the average man; and that it was Senator Douglas, a Democrat, who forced the lowering of excise taxes on the things the average man is able to buy.

If all this is brought home to the people the Congress that convenes in January next will find in the chair he has distinguished for 20 years that Texas Democrat of whom his party is proud, Sam Rayburn.

But even more important than taxes is this:

Shall the instrumentalities of government be used for the benefit of a few or for the equal benefit of all?

Shall the old-fashioned freedoms that assured our happiness be preserved?

Shall the American way of life of which Jefferson is the symbol be continued or give way to totalitarian methods?

Shall the reign of unbridled demagogy, to serve a petty party purpose, be ended by the upsurgence of American decency and fair play?

If our past foretells the future, the party of Jefferson will go forward in defense of our imperiled freedoms, and neither the enemies' boasted barricade of moneybags, nor his fusillade of slander can deny the victory to the party that found the Nation in a total economic collapse and left it the most prosperous in history; that forced humanitarian legislation on the statutes and lifted the haunting fear of an old age of poverty and misery from the hearts of millions; that invited the farmer and the worker from the kitchen to the family dining room; that ended the pillaging of national resources, raised the income of the people by billions of dollars, and directed the defense of liberty and democracy on the battlefields of Europe and Asia.

My Duty To Home and Country

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. McCULLOCH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 28, 1954

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, the Department of Ohio, American Legion, has been sponsoring an essay contest among high-school students for a number of years.

The subject assigned is always one of great public interest and in most, if not in all, instances has to do with good citizenship.

The subject this year was My Duty To Home and Country and is particularly appropriate in view of the fact that some of our citizens appear to insist on their rights and privileges but fail to assume their duties and responsibilities.

Ronnie Studebaker, Milton-Union High School junior, of Miami County, Ohio, essay contest winner which earned him a trip to Washington, clearly points up the necessity of recognizing and fulfilling one's duty to home and country.

I hope that countless Americans will read and live by it. The prize winning essay is as follows:

My Duty to Home and Country

Ever since our forefathers landed on these shores and began to carve a nation out of this vast wilderness, the home has been recognized as one of the most important foundation stones of America. A nation can be no better or greater than its homes, and we as individuals, make up the homes. Therefore, just as I am partly responsible for the type of home I live in, I am also partly responsible for the kind of nation I live in.

Also, just as my home offers me certain privileges and advantages, so my country offers me certain liberties, protection, and blessings. For these, I am ungrateful if I do not feel my obligation to both home and country. I am thankful for all that I enjoy, which may be shown in several ways.

First, I want to show an intelligent interest in what goes on in my community, my home, and my Nation. I need to give deep thought and study about the ways in which I can help solve the problems we face. When I reach the voting age, I should perform my duty at the polls to help elect the right men to office. But even before I become of voting age it will help me to be more useful citizen, if I learn the history and background of my country, and to study to understand what makes her the greatest Nation on earth. I must take advantage of my opportunities to travel, to read newspapers and magazines, and listen to news commentators, and the men who are at the head of our Government, as well as to observe and be interested in my neighbors and friends who make up "we, the people."

I must try to decide what are my beliefs about the good of my home and country, and I must have the courage to be able to stand for them. I must have enough respect to consider that the good of my fellowmen is more important than my own personal good.

I must be tolerant. Because it is my privilege to think and say how I feel about things in my home, or community, or country, I must not forget that it is the other fellow's privilege also.

It is my duty to be honest and upright. My country cannot be proud of me if I abuse my privileges of "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness," by being a "delinquent" or disobeying cur laws by acting in such a way that would disgrace the title, "American citizens."

Above all, I must be reverent in my duty to God, who gave us this land, and also gave us His son, who died that we might live. In performing my duties to God, I will be performing best, my duties to my country, which is truly "the land of the free and the home of the brave."

Tariffs on Woolen Imports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 28, 1954

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I wish to include herein a letter I have received from the Honorable John B. Hynes, mayor of the city of Boston, Mass., concerning tariffs on woolen imports. The subject of tariffs is very important to our section of the country.

The letter follows:

City of Boston,
Office of the Mayor,
City Hall, April 26, 1954.

Hon. Thomas J. Lane,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

My Dear Congressman: As you well know, the woolen industry is one of the basic industries of Boston and New England. In fact, from time immemorial, Boston has been the woolen center of the world. Undoubtedly, you also know that during a period of about 5 years over 100 woolen mills have closed-out in New England. This is due to a variety of causes with which you are acquainted as well as I.

Another danger is now besetting the woolen industry, that is, the imports of woolen and worsted materials which are rising rapidly. Obviously, it is most difficult for our woolen industry to meet the competitions of woolen mills which can operate at a very low cost. For instance, the average hourly wage of workers in the United States textile industry is $1.78 per hour; in Great Britain it is 47 cents; in France 46 cents; in Italy 47 cents, and about 10 cents in Japan. Any bill which will further reduce the tariff on these imports will endanger the very life of the textile industry in our country. As a matter of fact, it would appear logical that the tariff be increased rather than decreased.

It is also obvious, I believe, that any lower tariff, if it does not cause a closing of mills, will inevitably result in less employment and smaller payrolls. This will have an adverse effect upon the whole New England community.

The wool-textile industry, as you know, has been going through a series of difficulties, especially, in our part of the country.

Many thousands of workers have been laid off and other thousands are working only part time. The industry is struggling against the competition of newer and less expensive types of materials which are being substituted for woolen goods. In view of this situation, it would appear that the woolen industry, if it is to be preserved as a great, basic industry in our part of the country, should be given some protection and some help. I hope you will use your good influence in this respect. Certainly, increasing imports of foreign-made woolen goods, the product of cheap labor according to our standards, will sooner or later ring the death knell of our woolen industry in New England.

I hope you will give this matter your personal attention.

Respectfully,

JOHN B. HYNES,
Mayor of Boston.

Indochina—Stop, Look, Listen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAY J. MADDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 28, 1954

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, V. M. Simmons, editor and publisher of the Fort Wayne Journal-Gazette, sets out his thoughts regarding the Indochina crisis. His opinion on this international problem is well worth the consideration of the Members of Congress:

INDOCHINA—STOP, LOOK, LISTEN

The American people are deeply concerned over what action their Government may take toward the military situation in Indochina.

They do not want it to be stampeded into another war in Asia.

The American people want every step of the policy toward Indochina to be carefully considered.

They expect the President, the State Department, and the military to plan with wisdom and to proceed with reasonable caution.

The people expect the Congress to help keep the feet of the executive department on the ground.

Until there is major agreement among the various groups, no final commitments should be made.

Last week it was revealed at a meeting of congressional leaders that all three of the Joint Chiefs of Staff were opposed to immediate American military intervention even on a limited scale.

This was brought out after the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, Admiral Radford, had expressed himself in favor of sending a limited amount of air and naval power to help the French in Indochina.

About the same time, Secretary of State Dulles was asking that Congress give the President authority to do what he thought was necessary to prevent Indochina from falling into the hands of the Reds. Yet Dulles had no agreement with the British and French as to what they would do. Certain Members of Congress told him they thought he was getting the cart before the horse, and he is now abroad seeing what kind of commitments he can get from the French and British.

On the whole, the mental atmosphere in which the Government is making its decisions is not reassuring. There seems to be too much snap judgment, too much "playing it by air."

We have no desire to add to the already heavy burden of Secretary Dulles. But if he rushes into the Indochina affair without due consideration of all of the consequences, his burden will automatically become much heavier than it is now, and the cause of the United States may not be well served.

Late this month the rains will begin in Indochina. Then all major military operations must be held up until August.

We have no reason to believe that the French and native troops cannot hold out until the rainy season.

The rainy season will give the anti-Communist nations more time to consider how they will attempt to save Indochina and southeast Asia from falling into the hands of the Reds.

This thing is too important to be handled without serious consideration by the American people and their duly elected representatives.

Adventure Unlimited

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER F. MACK, JR.
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 28, 1954

Mr. MACK of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, 6 years ago the Civil Air Patrol inaugurated an international exchange program of air cadets. Today this idea has expanded to such an extent that it includes exchange programs with 15 foreign countries. It has made a great contribution toward the development of international understanding and good will, consistent with our Government's policy of making friends across the seas. This program has been extremely successful and will be expanded to reach even more remote areas in future years. It is worthy of note that this activity is wholly supported by private organizations and neither the Federal Government nor the United States Air Force budget has been touched for direct international cadet exchange operating expenses.

Maj. Gen. Lucas Beau, the national commander of CAP, and the other leaders in this movement are to be commended for promoting such a program which tightens the bonds of mutual interest of the youth of the world.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include an article by Col. Barnee Breeskin, who was the senior escort of the group visiting Italy as part of this program:

ADVENTURE UNLIMITED

(By Barnee Breeskin, colonel, CAP)

The adventure of a lifetime unfolds this month for some 140 teen-age Americans and a like number of a young men representing 20 friendly foreign nations.

For 2 weeks members of the United States delegation—all honor cadets of the Civil Air Patrol, civilian auxiliary of the Air Force—tour Canada, Latin America, and Europe in groups of 5 to 25. Meanwhile the youngsters from abroad see Washington, our Nation's Capital; spend 10 days as the guests of CAP members in various States and top off their excursion Americana with a whirlwind tour of New York City.

The occasion for this activity is the international cadet exchange of the Civil Air Patrol now in its seventh year. It began as a small but unique experiment with the exchange of 25 CAP cadets with 25 members of the Air Cadet League of Canada. This year it includes Belgium, Brazil, Denmark, France, Greece, Italy, Mexico, the Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, Great Britain, Cuba, Chile, Venezuela, and Peru, in addition to our northern neighbor.

Does this exchange of airminded young men work? I'll say it does and I can tell you firsthand because last year I had the privilege of being a senior escort officer with the group of United States CAP cadets visiting Italy.

It is wonderful to see the changes wrought in these boys in just 3 weeks. Their understanding of the problems that face other nations increased along with their understanding and acceptance of the manifold customs, traditions, and national points of view represented by each of the countries participating.

My adventure with the exchange was one of the greatest experiences of my life. It showed me again that kids are kids all over the world. They intermingled with the young Italians and even though there was a language barrier they seemed to make themselves understood to each other. Their differences in racial banckground and international politics faded into obscurity before the common bonds forged by youth and their joint interest in aviation.

The exuberant personalities and good cheer of the Yankees just overwhelmed their European hosts and somehow I felt that these same kids could teach a few of us grownups a little about how to get along with our neighbors all over the world.

Especially at Rhein-Main Air Base in Germany these youngsters proved that the airplane, the world's foremost engine of destruction, could also be an instrument of goodwill and international fellowship. Rhein-Main is the crossroads of the exchange in Europe. The American cadets arrived and were joined by the European delegation before fanning out to the host nations and the United States.

Here they were at Rhein-Main. They hailed from different countries. We spoke different languages. However, they had a common bond—the airplane. Every youngster whether he was Dane, Spaniard, Briton, Greek, or American could literally take an airplane apart and put it back together again.

In a few hours all of these youngsters were as close as peas in a pod having a bang-up, roaring time as kids will. It was a great sight to see because I realized that this group of young men, the cream of the crop from each of their respective homelands, could very well be the men who would be making international decisions tomorrow. The bonds of friendship and good will forged in this exchange might become the factors governing our international relations at some time in the future. Multiply this by the hundreds of young men similarly indoctrinated during past exchanges and the value of this youth program became quite evident.

Gen. Carl A. "Tooey" Spaatz, USAF, retired, former Chief of Staff of the United States Air Force and present Chairman of the National Executive Board of the Civil Air Patrol, explains the importance of the exchange this way:

"Throughout the world today one links the airplane with war and the destruction of mankind. There is, however, a silver lining to the cloud which casts its shadow over the world. Aviation can and should be an even greater force for peace and brotherhood than it is for war.

"The International Cadet Exchange is a prime example of how the airplane can become an instrument for community living among the nations of the world. During its 6 years much progress has been made toward the dream of world understanding. This annual exchange of aviation's youth from the free nations has made no small contribution to the realization of this dream.

"It is with great pride that the United States Civil Air Patrol takes is place among the nations working for world peace through this international brotherhood of air-minded youth."

From my personal experience with this program I can only say that General Spaatz is absolutely right all along the line. This exchange of young men who have in common their love of flying can be the foundation for world peace and the end to international conflict.

If we, the adults of today's crazy world, are too pig-headed to realize that brotherhood can hurdle all national barriers, we can through this exchange and others of a similar nature make sure that our sons and daughters know the real meaning of peace on earth and good will to all men.

Shall the Vote Be Extended to 18-Year-Olds?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 28, 1954

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, when President Eisenhower recommended the extension of the vote to 18-year-olds through a constitutional amendment it became incumbent upon all of us to reexamine this proposal, since it now has the tremendous prestige of the President of the United States behind it.

In the belief that a correct decision on the proposal lies in part with the young people themselves, I sponsored an essay contest on the subject among the high-school seniors of my district. A committee of distinguished citizens then reviewed the essays that were submitted, with a view to selecting a winner. As it turned out, they selected 2 winners, 1 who favors the proposal and 1 who opposes it. Rodney Moag, a student at the New York State School for the Blind at Batavia, won the affirmative side of the argument, and Miss Constance Powell, a student at Pavilion Central School, Pavilion, N. Y., made the best case against the proposal, in the opinion of the judges. I might say that, when the final count was taken, the students stood about 2 to 1 in favor of the President's proposal.

The judges included Miss Luella Hoyer, a district superintendent of schools in Orleans County, N. Y.; the Reverend Harold Burlingame, a former New York State chaplain of the American Legion; and Dr. Glenn Wiltsey, chairman of the department of political science of the University of Rochester. From among several hundred essays, they came to final agreement on the entries of Miss Powell and Mr. Moag, although they were unanimous in praising the thoughtful qualities of all the essays submitted.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to include in the RECORD at this point the two winning essays by Miss Powell and Mr. Moag:

SHALL THE 18-YEAR-OLD BE ALLOWED TO VOTE?

(By Rodney Moag)

At the inception of the 18-year-old draft 12 years ago, Senator Vandenberg expressed the belief that these youths should also be vested with suffrage. This has evoked two points of view, negative and affirmative. Both arguments contain worthwhile points, but I feel that a careful analysis will show the affirmative heavily outweighs the negative.

A youth is said to be naive, radical, and emotional; but, more than this, he is practical, energetic, and unflinching. Fresh from history and economics classes, the foundation on which to build a wise decision will be firm and vivid. After 3 years one forgets half of what he has learned.

A youth may be radical, but a radical is necessary to achieve a medium—how many Communists would we find if Senator MCCARTHY wasn't going all out for investigation? The other criticisms are all qualities of emotional immaturity, almost as prevalent among supposed grownups as teen agers. A youth wants to take a part, to do his share; and the earlier we launch him on his political career, the sooner he will be fit to take his part. His maturity will come years earlier. This will provide the Nation with more experienced, well-trained leaders.

On my 18th birthday I feel that I should be allowed to vote. There is One above who, if but asked, will lend manifold the wisdom necessary to make the right decision.

TO VOTE OR NOT TO VOTE

(By Constance Powell)

Arguing for the minority, I have reasoned that 18-year-olds are not sufficiently qualified to vote. The pros and cons of this argument are equally good; yet personal observation of the average ability and maturity of this age group forces me to side with the minority.

Not all 18-year-olds would take time to seriously consider the issue and/or candidate. Party preferences would replace reason and logic. Many high-school educators prove this point, I think. The inability to think the problem out might result in the individual voting only for legislation beneficial to him and detrimental to society.

I see no urgent need for more eligible voters. My reason to back this is the large percentage of men and women over 21 who have never been to the polls. There is a far greater need for a method or scheme to incite their interest in voting rather than just going and pulling the levers across the top row.

The questions and suggested changes which have been issues for some time would seem to have a more influential effect on elections. An example of this is the controversy concerning the electoral college versus popular vote.

Finally there is the problem of maturity. Lack of personal experience plus their past dependence on others handicaps their personal responsibility. Also, the fact that they are old enough to fight does not prove maturity. Physical strength does not mean mental ability; if it did we would have giants for leaders. Boys and girls of 18 are more easily swayed or convinced by everyday contacts.

This should not imply that all 18-year-olds would be in the same state of mind, but I know that next year, at 18, because of lack of knowledge on my part, I will not be prepared to go to the polls with an objective point of view to vote intelligently.

One Hundredth Anniversary of Washington Street Baptist Church, Lynn, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 28, 1954

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I wish to include the following address I delivered at the 100th anniversary of the Washington Street Baptist Church, Lynn, Mass., at the centennial banquet held on Wednesday, April 21, 1954:

Greetings, a century of service to God.

In this, our new land.

A light, shining through the darkness, showing man the true road to eternity.

An occasion for the only real and lasting happiness in all of human experience.

The parishioners and friends of the Washington Street Baptist Church and of the Reverend Robert Emery Baggs who is the spiritual leader of your congregation, rejoice in the Christian fellowship that has contributed so much to the lives of individuals, the community, and the Nation.

Now, as never before, the church is the compass that guides us past all the hidden shoals and the storms that beset each one of us on this earthly voyage, finally bringing us to safe harbor where the soul finds enduring peace.

As we look out upon the world of today, we see men and nations desperately searching for security.

Everyone is looking for the magic formula to free them from fear.

Formulas like the guaranteed annual wage, sickness, and accident insurance, pensions, money in the bank, military plans, treaties, the United Nations.

All well and good, but still falling short of the true goal.

Home—home to church and to God—where man finds the right way to live is the one and only solution.

From the early Pilgrim Fathers and their prayerful custom of thanksgiving to a President of the United States who opens his inaugural address with an appeal to the Creator of all life we turn to religion in times of anxiety, recognizing our human limitations.

Here in the unselfish understanding of the Christian family, nourished by divine truths, you acquire the courage, the love, and the wisdom to live as God intended that we should.

A church is not merely a building pointing a steeple toward heaven.

It is not just a location for a brief ceremonial crowded into the busy calendar of each week.

No, the church is much more important than that.

It is the central fact of all living, where we come together in divine worship and, inspired by Him, are strengthened to overcome our own failings and the temptations of the world.

From dust to dust all else will come and go except faith in the Father above.

This is the real, the lasting, security that you find in the spiritual home of the Washington Street Baptist Church.

The older parishioners among you have seen many changes take place during the years. Minister has succeeded minister. Old friends have passed away. Familiar landmarks have faded, vanished, and new buildings have risen in their stead. Sometimes the new ways of the youngsters seem disconcerting. The world is full of tumult and shouting.

The other day I heard a man complain, saying: "Everything is so uncertain. If I only knew what to think. If I could only be sure."

He can, if he returns to church.

The older folks know.

They are sure.

At peace with God, serene in their faith, knowing that this is the light and the way.

I hope you will forgive me if I sound like a minister without portfolio. It is not my intention to intrude on a calling that is in the very capable hands of your good shepherd, the Reverend Robert Emery Baggs.

But I do want to say that your church, although old in years and humbly though rightfully proud of its service to the people of Lynn, is looking forward to the future, always young in heart and spirit.

That is what we celebrate tonight.

In the very center of downtown Lynn your church observes its 100th anniversary. All races and creeds join with you on this festive occasion to wish for your church an eternity of service in behalf of the immortal spirit in man.

And to extend to your beloved pastor, our fervent admiration and genuine friendship.

Who Are the Selfish Interests That Are Paying the Bill for the Flood of Propaganda Urging Construction of the St. Lawrence Seaway?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 28, 1954

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, in order that Congress can keep abreast of the forces of righteousness I should like for the RECORD to show that, according to its lobby report, the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Association, the pro-seaway lobby, received $85,568.46 in contributions for the first quarter of this year. In this same period it spent $84,533.66.

You will recall, Mr. Speaker, that several weeks ago full-page advertisements in several papers addressed to Members of Congress, urged us to come to the support of national defense by voting for the seaway. The advertisements were signed by the National Committee for the St. Lawrence Seaway Project and carried a group of prominent names.

The whole argument of these advertisements was that we rally to uphold the American flag. The lobby report of the proseaway forces reveals that the ads were paid for by this organization. Of the $85,568.46 collected by this organization, $27,592.25 was given by the six companies which would benefit from the iron ore which is expected to come in from Labrador. They are Republic Steel, which gave $10,393.75; Wheeling Steel, $3,326; Youngstown Sheet & Tube, $2,157.50; National Steel, $4,315; Armco, $2,000; M. A. Hanna Co., $5,400.

Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as Congress at some future time may want to take due recognition of the intense patriotism of the forces back of the seaway, I am listing the rest of the contributors of $500 or more to the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Association for a period of only 3 months.

Bohn Aluminum, Detroit, $500; Ex-Cell-O Corp., Detroit, $500; city of Detroit, $2,000; Burroughs, Detroit, $1,000; Henry J. Muller, Detroit, $500; Cutler-Manger, Duluth, Minn., $500; State of Wisconsin, $10,753.69; city of Milwaukee, $6,454.61; county of Milwaukee, $4,625.77.

May I observe, Mr. Speaker, that the proponents of the seaway call the opponents "selfish interests."

An Immigrant Thanks America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT W. CRETELLA

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 28, 1954

Mr. CRETELLA. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a letter from Miss Loretta Mackey, supervisor of Americanization, adult education department, department of education, in the city of New Haven. Also included is a very fine theme written by Joseph Esposito on the importance of the Americanization school and of the wide benefits that he has enjoyed from its teachings. Joseph Esposito's well-written composition on the symbolism of the Americanization school and the light of progress well typifies the excellent job which is being done by adult educators in my district.

The work and accomplishments of Miss Mackey and her colleagues in the city of New Haven are widely known, appreciated, and commended in their adult-education classe. Inestimable assistance has been rendered by Miss Mackey not only in the teaching of Americanization to recent arrivals from foreign countries, but she has been very instrumental in resolving many various immigration problems of her students' families, relatives, and friends. Her welcome hand is truly an expression of pure Americanism and exemplary of the fine spirit shown to those who have chosen to make America their homeland.

The matters referred to follow:

ADULT EDUCATION DEPARTMENT,
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION,
New Haven, Conn., April 21, 1954.

Hon. ALBERT CRETELLA,
Hew Haven Conn.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CRETELLA: Knowing of your sincere interest in the foreign-born adults attending our Americanization classes, I thought you would be interested in the enclosed composition written by Joseph Esposito.

Joseph came to the United States from Brusciano, Province of Naples, Italy, October 1952. He is 27 years of age. When he arrived in the United States he could not speak one word of English. He first attended Mrs. Mary McGrath's class in the Woolsey Evening School. October 10, 1953, he moved to 61 Wooster Street. He then went to Mrs. Grace Kelley's class in Columbus School, which he is still attending.

We are all very proud of the way Joseph is mastering the English language.

Sincerely,

LORETTA MACKEY,
Supervisor of Americanization.

MY SCHOOL

(By Joseph Esposito)

The Americanization school is the light in the progress of humanity. By it, each person gets what he needs, for his life and for his future.

The scholastic education he receives prepares him for his life in work and his place in society.

The school is like a lighthouse; as the lighthouse guides the sailor and helps him to avoid dashing against the reefs, so the school gives light to the minds of the people in guiding them to a better future.

The school prevents blindness of the mind which causes confusion and leads people in the wrong direction and possibly to their ruin.

As a great symbol for knowledge, I should like to put a big light over every school to brighten the darkness of the night.

As the light breaks the darkness, so the school breaks the ignorance of the people and gives light to their minds in guiding them through difficult ways.

We foreign-born people need the schools to give light to our minds about this great country, and the glorious sources that rule the life of the United States. I feel sorry for the foreign-born people who don't take advantage of these great opportunities which the United States offers us.

They do not realize the noble purpose of the Americanization school.

The first night I attended school I did not speak English so I could not understand the teacher. But after a while I was able to understand a little English and enjoyed going to school. Soon I was able to understand my teacher because of her great patience in teaching me. She did not speak too fast and her words were very clear. When there was a new word or anything we did not understand she found a way to clear our minds.

Now I understand English much better. I understand the people with whom I work and the many people I meet. I am able to write English and read the newspaper. All these things I am able to do because of the efficient work of my teacher.

The teacher in the Americanization school must have a special ability for success in teaching the foreign people.

My teacher is sincere and understanding of our needs. She is a good teacher in this difficult task of teaching people who come from so many different countries.

I shall always be grateful to her for her help in preparing me to become a good and useful citizen of the United States.

My Duty to Home and Country

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFF CLEVENGER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 28, 1954

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following essay by Miss Gwen Scranton, of route No. 2, Hicksville, winner, American Legion of Ohio contest, 1954:

MY DUTY TO HOME AND COUNTRY

(By Gwen Scranton, 10th grade)

The success of a home or country is determined by whether or not the persons concerned put forth an honest effort for the good of its cause. If I would do justice to either I must not shirk on doing my duty to both.

The home is probably thought to be a place where parents and children live together as one big happy family. But it isn't so simple as that. Everyone has to perform certain duties to make homelife run smoothly.

First of all is the respect to our families. We should show respect and obedience to our parents. Refrain from referring to them as the "old man" or the "old lady." It only shows disrespect on our part. Be kind and polite and help them in any way possible. Be considerate of our brothers and sisters in doing our share of work to be done in the home. If we are going to a ball game or the like we should do daily chores or household task before departing rather than leaving it for our kid brother or sister to do because he or she isn't going anywhere.

The safety of our homes is important also. Many falls that proved fatal were caused by something not being in its proper place. The next time you see junior's skates on the stairs put them in a safe place where someone won't be stumbling over them. Another hindrance to home safety is the fire hazard. Be extra careful when using matches and keep them well out of the reach of curious children.

My duties to my country are essential in promoting its welfare. If I, along with others like me, do not carry out my duties it will result in the weakening of our democracy. We as high school students, can help keep our country strong.

By practicing American patriotism we will not allow the youth of America to become communistically indoctrinated. In time of war we will enter some branch of service to defend our country against her enemies. On the home front we are aiding in the expansion of the Ground Observer Corps and other civil defense organizations to be ready in the event of an attack by any unfriendly nation.

Another duty that we should prepare to meet is our right to vote. By exercising our voting privilege we will aid in electing the persons that will represent us in national affairs and our nation in world affairs. We must use wise judgment in choosing the people who are to hold these all-important offices in our Government. They are the leaders of our country.

Last but not least is our duty to be law-abiding citizens. People break many laws every day. Probably the most frequently broken are the traffic laws. They are made for our own benefit and safety, but the lawmakers can't do the whole job. We have the responsibility of making their work worthwhile by abiding by their laws.

Like traffic laws the laws protecting our country can take effect only when we as American citizens live by them and help to enforce them.

Let's do our duties to our homes and country and make them better for the present and future generations.

Murphy Army Hospital

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 28, 1954

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an address by Kenneth T. Lyons, national commander of the Federal Employees Veterans Association, regarding retention of the Murphy Army Hospital, Waltham, Mass., before the Massachusetts congressional delegation on April 28, 1954, in Washington, D. C.:

We wish to thank the Massachusetts congressional delegation for inviting the Federal Employees Veterans Association to appear here today concerning the closing of the Murphy Army Hospital in Waltham, Mass. We know that the Members of Congress from Massachusetts are well aware of the great interest that has been displayed by both the civilian and military in regard to the proposed order from the Defense Department to close this hospital. The FEVA has prepared a lèngthy report pointing out specifically and in great detail why this hospital should remain open.

The first and foremost reason for the retention of the Murphy Army Hospital is the fact that this is the only Army hospital in the entire First Army area. This includes Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, and parts of New York and New Jersey.

Secondly, the action taken by the Defense Department to effectuate the closing of this Army hospital is, to quote a much-overworked and trite expression, "false economy." This will be shown by various graphs which we have with us today. We cannot see any economy in the slashing of fringe benefits to our armed services and their dependents.

Third, the modern structure and facilities of this hospital are equal to that of any other hospital in the United States. As a result of these up-to-date facilities the excellent care given the patients can be testified to by the abundance of letters that we have received concerning the treatment given them there.

Fourth, the location of the Murphy Army Hospital should also be taken into consideration by the Defense Department. Consider the proximity of this hospital to some of the world's finest clinics and hospitals staffed by outstanding physicians.

Fifth, the situation in Indochina and the present world tension cannot justify a second mistake by our Defense Department. The cost of closing and reopening the Murphy Army Hospital for 2 months prior to the Korean conflict amounted to approximately one-quarter million dollars.

Sixth, Massachusetts has an induction rate 3½ times that of Arkansas; thus in comparison of servicemen and their dependents the First Army area has a far greater need for an Army hospital than the Fourth Army area.

HISTORY AND MAKEUP OF HOSPITAL

The Murphy Army Hospital was built in 1944 at a cost of $5 million. It was named for Frederick C. Murphy, a World War II hero who was awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor posthumously.

It is located in the northeastern section of Waltham, Mass., about 12 miles west of Boston. Its 44 individual red brick structures are Georgian in design and are connected by enclosed corridors. All the buildings are one story with the exception of the officers and nurses quarters and the administration building. The structure of the buildings is in accordance with the latest military regulations affording maximum protection for patients in the event of air attack or bombing. It is also equipped with an up-to-date fire department which has all the modern fire-fighting devices at its command.

It is situated close to the foremost medical schools and hospitals. Consequently, the Murphy Army Hospital has access to a group of consultants who are considered the most eminent men in their particular fields of medical and surgical endeavor. Among these famous doctors are such names as Smithwick, Dameshek, Meigs, Allen, Badger, Zonderman, Cannon, and Aufranc, to mention but a few. They represent the finest hospitals such as Massachusetts General, Boston City Hospital, Massachusetts Memorial, Children's Medical Center, Lahey Clinic, and New England Medical Center which includes the renowned Pratt Diagnostic Hospital. The Harvard and Tufts Medical Schools as well as the School of Medicine at Boston University are nearby also.

On September 15, 1951, the Murphy Army Hospital was accepted for membership by the Massachusetts Hospital Association, thus becoming the first Army institution to be so accepted. This association is composed of 151 major hospitals in the State, and affords the benefit of pooled ideas formulated by all members for improving the medical care of patients and rising administration standards.

To insure high standards of morale the hospital has a modern theater, a PX, library, reconditioning salon, and gymnasium, as well as exceptional grounds as compared with that of any hospital in the New England area. Thus recreation, which is so very vital for the recovery of patients, is also provided.

Transportation facilities for travel to and from Murphy are excellent. Regular bus service is provided to the door of the hospital, and it is easily accessible by automobile from all sections of New England. The Air Force base at Hanscom Field is only a few miles removed, thereby making air transportation of patients very feasible. The new bomber base at Limestone, Maine, when completed, will be one very important reason for the continuance of Murphy Army Hospital as a going installation.

PROFESSIONAL SERVICES RENDERED

The Murphy Army Hospital has a bed capacity of 515. It was originally a station hospital and later changed to a regional hospital, and finally to a general hospital following the closing of Cushing Hospital as an Army institution. Army personnel and dependents have recently been refused treatment at Murphy because of the freeze order that was put into effect there. Women who were given prenatal attention have been refused treatment and have been requested to seek medical care at Chelsea Naval Hospital in Chelsea, Mass. This medical facility has refused the majority of these cases due to the fact that they are now operating at full capacity. Some of the women and children have been referred to the Red Cross for whatever help they might be able to afford them. They have also been referred to Fort Devens Station Hospital, which is located over 40 miles from Boston and is of wooden construction. At this station hospital there is no nursery attached to the obstetrical ward, so that it is necessary for the mother and child to remain together.

The following is a breakdown of the services rendered during the period from January 1, 1953, through April 9, 1954:

Admissions: Admitted 5,313 patients, 2,258 military and 3,055 civilians; delivered 913 babies; admitted direct from overseas, 537.

Dispositions: Discharged 5,412 patients from the hospital, 2,347 military and 3,065 civilians; returned to duty 69 percent of all military patients.

Occupancy:

Average daily patient census	437
Average number of beds occupied	320
Occupied by military patients	264
Occupied by civilian patients	56
Average number of bassinets occupied	17

1. Outpatient service, 59,705 visits.
2. Dental service, 16,999 sittings.
3. X-ray service, 14,442 patients examined.
4. Laboratory service, 143,908 procedures performed.
5. Occupational therapy section, 12,891 patient visits.
6. Physical therapy section, 15,436 patient visits.
7. Physical reconditioning section, 15,758 patient visits.
8. Pharmacy section, 40,358 prescriptions filled.

9. Psychological tests administered to 581 patients.
10. Anesthetics administered, 1,453.
11. Operations performed, 2,061.

SUMMARY

I would now like to cite three cases which have been called to my attention as typical of those being refused treatment at Murphy Army Hospital. They were also refused treatment at Chelsea Naval Hospital and were forced to seek aid from private institutions, even though the Government guaranteed their husbands medical attention for services rendered to our country.

Mrs. Melvin Goldstein, of Roxbury, whose husband is now in Korea, was refused her monthly checkup in April, although her baby is expected in May. She has no car and is therefore unable to travel to Fort Devens. Chelsea Naval Hospital has no room for her.

Mrs. Barbara Withycombe, of Cambridge, whose husband is stationed in California. She has a child 2½ and is expecting another child in May. She must now seek aid at a private hospital which she can ill afford.

Mrs. Alfred Mercier, also of Cambridge, has a husband stationed in New Mexico. Her son is in need of an operation in 1 year and the family cannot afford a private hospital.

Time does not permit me to tell you of the vast amount of mail I have received from servicemen who are now in the hospital convalescing from either serious wounds received during the Korean conflict or through accidents while in the line of normal military duty. Many of these patients are paralyzed, victims of amputation, suffering from mental or nervous disorders, and it certainly is not necessary to enumerate on the other types of care offered as treatment for so many other illnesses. The thought of closing what to them is considered home is a severe blow to the morale of both them and their families. It is also a shock to the civilians who know of the many cases of a similar nature that have already been transferred from the hospital.

Each and every item which has been presented here today is of the utmost importance to the members of the armed services and their families and dependents, as well as to the general public. We as an organization are making this plea to the Massachusetts congressional delegation as a plea to prevent this inhuman method of saving a few taxable dollars. In effect, that is what the Defense Department is doing by their order to close the Murphy Army Hospital, and this in turn is making the blood of every serviceman and veteran in New England boil. The President of the United States himself has guaranteed the care of our military personnel and their dependents as one of his key points in the administration's program.

We urge the Massachusetts congressional delegation to make their plea direct to the President, if needed, in order to keep this desperately needed hospital open. The citizenry of Massachusetts and all the New England States are 100 percent in back of our Congressmen and Senators when they fight for an issue of this nature. The American taxpayer will never hesitate to fight for anything which is being done to protect his welfare or the welfare of those who have or are fighting to protect him.

OBSERVATIONS

Although the patient census and number of occupied beds has been moving steadily downward, the hospital has continued to admit a growing number of patients.

Admissions for the past 3 months have been somewhat higher than during the same period last year for both military and civilian patients.

Due to the extreme drop over the last year in admissions of battle casualties who are hospitalized for extended periods and the increase in civilian and newborn admissions, we find that the average patient currently tends to stay for a shorter period than the average patient admitted last year at this time. Average days hospitalized for dispositions will not, however, necessarily be reduced month by month, as many long-term patients are included in current disposition periods.

Admission of newborn has also shown an increase over the same period last year.

St. Lawrence Seaway Will Cost $5 Billion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 28, 1954

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, our colleague, Representative John Taber, of New York, made a very interesting statement in Auburn, N. Y., on April 15 regarding the overall cost of the St. Lawrence seaway.

I am inserting in the Record a newspaper account of Mr. Taber's statement from the April 16 issue of the Syracuse (N. Y.) Post-Standard as I feel it should have the attention of every Member of Congress:

TABER RIDICULES SEAWAY—PUTS COST AT $5 BILLION—DOUBTS HOUSE TO APPROVE

Auburn, April 15.—Representative John Taber tonight labeled plans for the St. Lawrence seaway ridiculous, said the project would cost the United States at least $5 billion and added that he didn't think it would be approved by the House of Representatives at this session.

The chairman of the House Appropriations Committee said in an interview that his estimade of $5 billion was what he considered a conservative figure.

He said it was based on estimated costs of dredging canals, channels, and harbors along the proposed inland waterway to accommodate large oceangoing vessels.

Present seaway legislation, now bottled up in the House Rules Committee, proposes the creation of a St. Lawrence development commission, authorized to issue a maximum of $100 million in revenue bonds to construct the American part of the waterway in the International Rapids sector of the St. Lawrence River.

Representative Taber said the $100 million wouldn't begin to pay for the project, which has been the center of debate in Congress—on and off—for at least 25 years.

TOO SHALLOW DRAFT

Representative Taber contended that any vessel drawing less than 35 feet of water cannot operate successfully as an oceangoing craft.

The proposed 27-foot seaway depth, he held, only would be suitable for ships with a 25-foot draft.

The seaway, to become a full-fledged waterway capable of accommodating oceangoing vessels, would have to be at least 37 feet deep, he said. And so would every channel, canal, and harbor along the 1,500-mile length of the waterway from the Atlantic Ocean to the Midwest.

Representative Taber said that in New York State harbors at Cape Vincent, Oswego, Sodus Bay, Rochester, and Buffalo all would have to be deepened.

The Buffalo project alone, he estimated, would cost $100 million. He said the Buffalo Harbor, for the most part, was about 22 feet deep, with only a small stretch 25 feet deep.

OTHER HARBORS

Other harbors he mentioned as having only a depth of 22 feet included Erie, Pa., Ashtabula, Toledo, and Cleveland, Ohio, and Detroit.

Duluth, he noted, was an exception with a natural depth sufficient to handle the big vessels.

Representative Taber also said it would be necessary to rebuild the Welland Canal in Canada.

Asked how this would affect United States financing, he replied:

"We'd have to pay our share."

Representative Taber said he doubted that the seaway legislation, already approved by the Senate, would get out of the Rules Committee this session. Proponents recently set up a plan to short circuit the committee, but decided against the move.

Canada plans to build the seaway alone, and has indicated recently that she will do just that whether the United States decides to climb aboard or not.

How To Keep More of the Money You Earn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY M. JACKSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 28, 1954

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an address by Mrs. Helen Valentine, editor of Charm magazine, entitled "How To Keep More of the Money You Earn," delivered before the Washington Fashion Group on April 28, 1954.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

HOW TO KEEP MORE OF THE MONEY YOU EARN

(Address by Mrs. Helen Valentine before the Washington Fashion Group, April 28, 1954)

I'm quite sure we all agree that we're mighty fortunate to be living in these exciting times. Some of the excitement is good, some of it frightening—but at least we know we're alive.

One unfrightening and pleasant aspect of our current world concerns women, and what has happened and is happening to us.

Surely, all of us have recognized the unprecedented changes in our living patterns in the last 10 or 12 years.

Economically, these changes have taken the form of higher income and a host of new products to spend them on. Culturally, they spell better education for more people; a great new interest in the arts, with an attendant rise in the general level of taste; increased opportunities for, and interest in, travel and leisure-time activities.

On the social level, there is a significant revival of interest in the family unit, there is an increase in the number of children per family, and a wonderful development of better housing. Isn't it amazing that 55 percent of the Nation's families own their own homes?

Yes, we are living in a thrilling time, and each of us in this room is doubly fortunate to be an integral part of it all. For, in a sense, we women and the jobs we hold represent the greatest change of all. Never before have women in such vast numbers worked at such a variety of occupations or had such an influence on the business life of the country.

Isn't it staggering to realize that 1 out of every 3 adult women in this country works and that these women total 19 million? But even more impressive is the fact that the great majority of us are wives—and many millions of us are mothers—doing a full-time job of housekeeping as well as working outside our homes 8 hours a day. Nor are we all youngsters by any means. The average age of workingwomen is rising—a point dramatically illustrated by the fact that more than 6 million women over 45 and more than 6 million over 40 are today holding jobs. The median age of employed women is 37.5.

This new world of workingwomen cannot be shrugged off as a temporary situation. Not long ago the national manpower council of Columbia University's School of Business announced plans for a study of these women, who now comprise almost one-third of the Nation's manpower, because "the common concept of women as an emergency labor reserve must be modified."

Today you have merely to tune in your radio, watch television, pick up any newspaper or magazine for evidence that everyone is aware of the importance of the workingwoman audience. You find child care advice for the mother who must leave her youngster while she goes to work; you find timesaving ideas for the woman who is fitting her job into her life; you find recipes for the after-5 cook; you find advice on how to get along in your job—all these are no longer exclusively the domain of the magazine for women who work.

But despite all this, the attitude toward women who work, the conditions under which they work—in fact, the very laws of our country have not kept pace. True, most of these laws were written at a time when women made up only a small fraction of the labor force rather than a third of it. Perhaps that's why, in so many cases, they really discriminate against us. But let's talk about these laws a bit later. First, let's look more closely at ourselves.

Are we fully aware of our own economic and political importance? We should remember that the $32 billion paycheck we earn collectively is a major factor in this country's economy. Many economists attribute the peak American standard of living directly to the purchasing power of women in the labor force, and specifically to the millions of working wives who contribute a second paycheck to their homes. This contribution, of course, goes beyond our homes, and provides many an industry with the means to profit.

Politically, women have won increased recognition, both for their potential power as voters and for their performance in Government and party jobs. I know that you, of all people, must be keenly aware of the roles of women in our political parties, of the high office they have attained in all branches of the Federal Government, and of the women serving in the governments of every city and State.

But the status of women in industry has also been changing dramatically. You yourserves, in this audience, are clear evidence of the change that has taken place, for the variety and importance of the jobs you hold prove that women are not only accepted, but welcomed, in one highly competitive world.

Take a good look at women in industry today. Look at the companies in every field—from transportation to finance, from steel to pharmaceuticals—which have named women to important executive posts. Try to count the successful doctors and lawyers, engineers, and scientists who are women.

There is no longer a limit on the fields women may enter, and the barriers to our advancement are rapidly disappearing. Hardly a week goes by without my seeing in the New York Times announcements of executive appointments the names of one or more women who have become company officers or directors.

For every example publicized in newspapers and business publications, I can cite more that have not been reported—that I have learned of in meeting with women and women's groups throughout the country. Last year I traveled 14,000 miles, and everywhere I visited, from the Northwest to the deep South. I found women holding unprecedented jobs in unprecedented occupations.

In Philadelphia, for example, where there is a concentration of heavy industry, the majority of companies had women in key executive posts—vice president of a steel mill, president of a fishing tackle firm, secretary of the city's major taxi company.

In Los Angeles, 1 out of every 6 women who work is classified as a professional or executive. I was particularly impressed with the above-average number of women who are successfully practicing law—and with the many distinguished women who are judges in the city's courts.

In New Orleans, the percentage of women managers, owners, and investors in business firms is higher than the national average. This in a city where, not so very long ago, women did not even go into the street unchaperoned.

Certainly, everyone in the country is aware of—and impressed by—the great numbers of women workers right here in Washington. Many of you, I am sure, know that the figure is a quarter of a million. But did you realize that 39,800 are professionals and executives—women like Mrs. Priest, Oveta Culp Hobby, Dr. Martha Eliot, of the Children's Bureau, Ruth B. Shipley, head of the State Department's Passport Division, Katherine G. Howard, Deputy Civil Defense Administrator, Dr. Hazel K. Stiebling of the Department of Agriculture, and others who hold enormously responsible posts in this nerve center of the world where history is constantly being made. We must conclude from this that women have a big hand in shaping policies that affect the entire world.

This certainly, should be a definitive answer to that final, desperate argument of those who challenge the right of women to work—and they are frequently the very people who vehemently oppose the tax changes we are seeking. I'm speaking of those people who can always be counted on to maintain that this country would be better off if women stayed at home.

This charge—if it deserves any reply at all—is best met by citing an indisputable fact. If 19 million women are working, it's for many good reasons. And, whatever those reasons, the results are good for the country.

In the majority of cases, women are working because they have to; a fact verified by the Department of Labor. A recent Women's Bureau bulletin pointed out that the proportion of wives who work is only 13 percent in families where the husband's income is $10,000 or more, but it rises to 29 percent where the hubsand's income is between $2,000 and $3,000.

Economics aside, did anyone ever stop to think just what would happen if every woman left the labor force tomorrow?

There would be 13 empty seats in Congress—226 vacant spots in State legislatures; there would be 1,000 policymaking jobs in our National Government unfilled; 500 fewer high-ranking diplomats representing the United States abroad. (Women's Bureau figures.) And what would happen to all the Government departments and the armed services?

Our schools would find themselves crippled with the majority of teachers gone—ditto hospitals without nurses. And, of course, the men who argue against women working would never dream of giving up their own secretaries.

We'd really have a service problem in our stores, with 1,500,000 saleswomen gone. (It's hard enough to be waited on today.)

Our third largest industry—fashion—would be in desperate straits if we—and all the other women designers, buyers, copywriters—left the ranks.

What would happen to social service agencies?

What would become of a place like the Woman's Medical College in Philadelphia? It would really have to close because practically all the physicians on its staff, as well as the instructors in the college and the nursing school, are women.

Our factories would be in a fine fix. Many of them would have to close down. But then, that wouldn't matter too much, because with all the purchasing power of our paychecks gone, there wouldn't be nearly the market for the goods these factories produce. And wouldn't our present high standard of living shoot right straight down?

Just think of the effect on the economy if all of the money women earn were suddeny taken out of circulation. Take our own Fashion Group as one small example. Let's just assume that the average salary of the 2,500 members of the group is $5,000 (I think that's a fair figure since our membership includes the top women in the industry). This means a collective annual paycheck of $12½ million—and do we spend it. Just take that out of the economy and we're not even a single drop in the bucket.

This debate on whether women should work always deteriorates into that old cliche—the battle of the sexes. Isn't it more positive and more constructive to accept the fact that we women are working, and turn our efforts toward means of making women happier and more productive workers?

It seems to me that you—as members of the Washington Fashion Group—are particularly privileged. You can exert a special influence because you are here in Washington. Most of must content ourselves with letters to our Congressmen, but you have the rare advantage of knowing personally, seeing often, working with the men (and the women) who make our laws. You write for the newspapers our Congressmen and their wives read every day, prepare the radio and television programs they listen to. This gives your voice extra strength. And that privileged position also gives you a very special responsibility to interpret the needs of all workingwomen.

I hope you will remind our lawmakers constantly that we must provide tax relief for working mothers.

We all know that certain business expenses are deductible from taxable income, such as operating a car, or entertaining. So is the salary of an employee—a secretary, a cleaning woman, an assistant—anyone who frees us to do more productive work. And yet, this vital and unavoidable expense which every working mother must meet if she is to hold a job at all, is not deductible. The care that she, as a responsible mother, provides for her children while she is away is obviously considered a luxury by our lawmakers.

Even now the Senate is considering the new income-tax bill which gives a nod to working mothers, but the concession which this bill represents does not begin to scratch the surface of the real problem.

Most of you, I am sure, are familiar with the provisions of this legislation, which will probably be enacted into law. As it now stands, it affords a tiny degree of relief to a minute fraction of this country's millions of working mothers. I refer to the section which says that widows with jobs may deduct up to $600 a year for care provided for their dependents—if those dependents are under the age of 10. I ask you how much care that $600 can provide—$11.54 a week? Can you hire anyone to care for your child or your neighbor's child for the unrealistic sum? And what about care for children over 10? They need supervision, too. And where does the law leave married women, most of whom work because they have to. Why shouldn't they be given some genuine tax relief? I'm quite certain that your answer to this question would be exactly the same as my own.

Take a look for a moment at the taxes we're paying on so-called luxuries—even if the amount has been cut—the handbag that is every bit as essential to us as a man's pockets (and there are no taxes on them), the cosmetics without which we couldn't face our jobs.

(And I'm wondering how many of us realize that we working women were a factor in the recent reduction of the Federal excise tax on cosmetics. One of the important arguments used by the Toilet Goods Association in congressional hearings on this subject was that workingwomen need their lipsticks to hold down their jobs just as surely as men need razors to keep up their personal appearance. We're all pleased, I'm sure, to see that tax cut in half—and the handbag tax, too.)

One of our important pieces of social legislation—which also involves a tax—has many inequities that should be of concern to workingwomen. Under the present system of computing social-security benefits the working wife rarely receives any higher benefit payment when she reaches 65 than she would receive as a dependent wife, unless she has worked continuously both before and after marriage. Yet she may have been paying into the social-security trust fund during most of her working years since 1937. And the new social-security proposals take no cognizance of this fact.

I hope you will call the attention of our legislators to the need for low-cost day care centers. These centers would give working mothers a happier alternative than paying high fees to a private nursery or, on the other hand, accepting the stigma of charity which is associated with the few community centers that now exist.

What about labor laws that would make provision for the fact that women do have babies, and allow them to take necessary maternity leaves without running the risk of losing their jobs.

And what's happening with equal-pay legislation? In far too many instances, it is not only legal but customary to pay a woman substantially less for doing exactly the same work as a man. Only 13 States now have equal-pay laws on their statute books, and even these States enforce their laws loosely. There is no national legislation dealing with this inequity.

Surely there is no reason to be shy about asking for the things that are so important to our happiness and our progress today. The thing that holds us back, doubtless, is the fear of being called feminists. Nonsense. What's wrong with recognizing our power as women who work and using it to get ourselves—not special privileges—but merely consideration as human beings.

Some of these much needed changes may take time to achieve. After all, it took us 72 years to get the vote. But let's speed up the process now—and surely you're the gals who can do it.

One-Hundred-Million-Dollar Aluminum Plant in Texas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 28, 1954

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, on Saturday, April 24, a significant step forward was taken in the industrial development of Texas. On that day the $100-million plant at Rockdale, Tex., of the Aluminum Company of America was formally dedicated. This plant is the first in history to use electric power generated by burning lignite as fuel for firing steam turbogenerators. Texas has a tremendous supply of lignite, which usually lies near the surface of the earth, and can be cheaply mined.

The use of lignite in the operation of electric powerplants built at the source of fuel marks an important industrial milestone in Texas. The process being used at the Rockdale aluminum works was developed by V. F. Parry, of the United States Bureau of Mines.

Mr. Sam Kinch, staff writer for the Fort Worth Star-Telegram, has written for his newspaper an article on the dedication of the Rockdale plant, and I consider the article worthy of the widest possible circulation. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ROCKDALE, April 24.—Alcoa's new $100 million Rockdale works formally were dedicated Saturday as an example of the system that has made America free.

Before a crowd of employees that also included leaders of government and industry, Governor Shivers welcomed the company as an "industrial citizen" of central Texas.

He said that with war clouds gathering over the world, Texans can take pride in the plant as a reward for the American way of doing business, and the American way of life.

Shivers said Texas must maintain a tax, government, and citizen climate that will make industry feel welcome because industrial payrolls will mean more jobs, better schools, and better government.

Another speaker on the dedicatory program, W. W. Lynch, president of Texas Power & Light Co., called Shivers the State's No. 1 salesman of industrial opportunity. Lynch said the Alcoa plant experiment in production of power from lignite can be the beginning of a program that can be useful and beneficial in many lines.

F. L. Magee, vice president and production manager of Aluminum Companies of America, said the Rockdale plant will have an output of 90,000 tons a year and will push Texas into second place among the States in production of aluminum.

Magee said the Rockdale operation is another first for the company. The company's first Texas plant at Comfort was the first to produce power by using natural gas and an internal-combustion engine.

John D. Harper, Rockdale works manager, was master of ceremonies for the opening. He said the public will be welcomed Sunday on inspection trips similar to those given employees and their families Saturday.

Among the public officials on hand Saturday were Congressmen Bob Poage, of Waco, and Clark Thompson, of Galveston; Lt. Gov. Ben Ramsey; State Senators Jarrard Secrest, of Temple, and Johnnie B. Rogers, of Austin; State Representative Herman Yezak, of Bremond; Judge W. A. Morrison, of the court of criminal appeals; and V. F. Parry, of the United States Bureau of Mines, who developed the lignite process being used at Rockdale.

Most of the dignitaries were guests at a dinner in Austin Friday night when industrial leaders from over the State met with Alcoa officials from over the Nation. Thomas D. Jolly, senior vice president of Alcoa, spoke briefly.

What the American Flag Means to Me

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 28, 1954

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, it gives me great pleasure to bring to the attention of my colleagues in the Senate a splendid essay written by one of our young Minnesota citizens on Americanism and on the American flag. Miss Lynn McGann, of 4733 Vincent Avenue South, Minneapolis, Minn., was awarded third prize in a national radio contest sponsored by the American Federation of Labor on the subject What the American Flag Means to Me. It is an excellent essay and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the essay was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT THE AMERICAN FLAG MEANS TO ME

(By Lynn McGann)

In the year of 1776 at Concord, Mass., a people oppressed by the iron hand of a selfish monarch and bound with the chains of tyranny, fired "the shot heard 'round the world." In the fire of the rebel guns and in the fire of the patriots' hearts was brought forth a banner dedicated to freedom—a symbol of light and law.

We have come to accept this standard as our own and wherever seen throughout the world it is considered America's own, but in a larger sense we can lay claim to this banner only as long as we maintain the freedoms for which it stands. To me the American flag is the symbol of a free nation consecrated to the task of preserving its freedoms. It is more than a shred of cloth, a stripe of red, a stripe of white. It symbolizes those precious rights that were so dearly won at Yorktown, St. Mihiel, and Iwo Jima. Each of its colors tells a story. The red—a reminder of the heroes' blood that has stained many a bayonet; the white—to recall the pure and honest hearts that guarded our heritage at home; and the blue—for the azure robe of night, from which a star-swept universe looks down upon us in judgment. How easy to forget that these same distant planets have watched the Roman eagle humbled, the swastika twisted and charred, and now they turn to us to observe how another nation may proscribe its fate. This is why I believe that if we should relinquish or surrender our freedoms our regal standard would become a mockery of the very things which it has long represented. A flag can be no better than its people. As long as we remain a free nation, dedicated to liberty, our flag can proudly be hallowed. Our colors mean freedom—the right to speak what you please, to believe what you hold true, to lead your life without state controls; the right to aspire to whatever goals you are willing to work for. This is what the American flag means to me.

If we wish to see the same proud flag of liberty flying over our Nation in years to come, we must be prepared to make the sacrifices, great or small, that will preserve these freedoms. If we shirk those responsibilities or abandon that heritage, we are not worthy of our flag or of the name "American."

Editorial Tribute to Senator Capehart

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 28, 1954

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an editorial entitled "Senator Capehart: Homer Believes in Salesmanship," which appeared in the Marion (Ind.) Chronicle on Friday, April 9, 1954.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

SENATOR CAPEHART: HOMER BELIEVES IN SALESMANSHIP

While Senator Homer E. Capehart, of Indiana, may not have the glamor of some of his fellow Senators, he has established a reputation for hard work and for his willingness to be of service to everyone. If the person seeking assistance or advice happens to be from Indiana it will not injure his standing, but the fact he is a Hoosier will be secondary. As a result, the Indiana Senator's stature has risen in the Senate and among the citizens of his home State, where rank means little and where almost everyone refers to the Senator as Homer. He has followed a steady pace since he was first elected 10 years ago, but not long ago he was ordered by his physician to slow down. The genial Homer agreed to follow the physician's advice, but he came out to Indiana a few days ago to speak to the Hoosier Legionnaires and to fill an engagement he was forced to cancel because of illness.

He discussed many things of interest to the ex-servicemen and he closed his remarks with a bit of advice that all well might heed. The Senator declared too much emphasis is being placed on the negative approach to communism. He asserted we should spend more time in selling capitalism rather than devoting our efforts to attacking communism. Homer was a successful manufacturer and salesman before he launched his political career and he was, no doubt, calling on some of his experiences as a private citizen to point to the advantages of selling your own product. Not any successful manufacturer, that we can recall, won his success by attacking his competitor's products. The Hoosier Senator is correct in asserting that the right approach, and only successful approach, is to sell your own product.

You do not have to look very far to see the benefits of capitalism. Look out the windows at the antennas in your own neighborhood to determine the number of television sets. The television set is one of the latest American gadgets but a recent survey shows almost one-half of the Marion homes have one. Maybe not all of the sets are paid for but that is another one of the advantages of capitalism, under which you can buy a television set, automobile, or even a home with a small down payment.

We hope Homer will keep up his campaign. A former Hoosier won almost lasting fame by his remark that all the country needed was a good 5-cent cigar. We think it now needs a little of the Hoosier philosophy as expressed by Homer and not so much bombast from Washington. But give Homer the time, and the energy, and we know he will do an outstanding job of putting his idea across.

Employment Figures and Industrial Earnings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CARLSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 28, 1954

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, there has been so much discussion about the extent of unemployment in the motorcar industry, the accumulation of new cars on dealers' floors which are unsold, and the generally reduced operations of the motorcar industry, that I wish to call the attention of the Senate to a recent statement comparing the first quarter of 1953 with the first quarter of 1954.

Mr. Curtice, president of the General Motors Corp., stated that sales of General Motors cars in the first quarter of this year topped the first quarter of last year, and total dollar sales of the corporation, including commercial and defense products, were only a shade under last year's first quarter.

There are some interesting facts contained in articles which I have in regard to unemployment, the production of new cars, and sales in the auto industry. Average employment was 574,000 for the first quarter of 1954. This is 30,000 higher than the first quarter of 1953, and an alltime high record of employment for this period.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record articles from the New York Times and the Journal of Commerce.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the New York Times]

STANDARD BRANDS INCREASES PROFIT

Standard Brands, Inc., and its United States and Canadian subsidiaries had a consolidated net income of $3,260,364 in the first quarter of 1954. This compared with $2,777,500 earned in the initial 3 months last year, Joel S. Mitchell, president, noted in his report yesterday.

BIG GAIN FOR ELECTROLUX

The Electrolux Corp., makers of vacuum cleaners, reported yesterday that earnings in the first quarter this year rose 43 percent above a year ago to $598,593.

The company announced that last month it sold more vacuum cleaners than in any month of its 30-year history, except for 1 month during the wartime scarcity period.

[From the Journal of Commerce]

GM CURTICE SAYS DEALER VOLUME TOPS YEAR AGO—EMPLOYMENT, PRODUCTION REACH RECORD LEVEL

Chicago.—Sales of General Motors Corp. cars in the first quarter of this year topped the first quarter of last year and total dollar sales of the corporation, including commercial and defense products, were only a "shade" under last year's first quarter results, Harlow H. Curtice, president, told a news conference here today.

Employment and passenger car production of General Motors were at the highest first quarter level ever, he declared.

Mr. Curtice was very optimistic about prospects for the auto industry and for business in general. "I believe that business generally will improve still further as the year progresses," he asserted. "No depression is in my vision," the GM chief said.

Average employment was 574,000—30,000 higher than for the first quarter of 1953 and an all-time record for the period.

Our payrolls for the first quarter reached a total of $656 million, including $23 million in overtime premiums.

"Currently," he added, "retail deliveries of passenger cars are running ahead of last year."

Needed: A Fair Shake

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 8, 1954

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following editorial from the Brookville (Pa.) American, of April 22, 1954:

NEEDED: A FAIR SHAKE

Washington, D. C.—Policy on the marketing of electric power at Federal dams has undergone important changes since last August when Secretary of Interior Douglas McKay wiped the slate clean and announced the principles on which his Department intended to operate. For the most part administration decisions and statements have made significant progress in implementing the theme that "the primary responsibility for supplying power needs of an area rests with the people locally."

But there is still a great area where congressional action is necessary if all the inequities of past Federal power policy are to be cleared away. Perhaps the most important need is that of restoring the principle of tax equality. At present the Tennessee Valley Authority and other Government power systems can boast of cheap rates because they pay little or no taxes. If, for instance, TVA's operations were made comparable with those of investor-owned utilities, according to C. J. Green, an engineer-accountant who was with the Federal Power Commission for 20 years, its rates for electric service would have to be just about doubled.

This means, of course, that the Nation's taxpayers are subsidizing the use of electricity in the Tennessee Valley—that consumers of electricity in areas where private companies operate are paying not only the cost of the service they enjoy and a substantial burden of taxes, but also an important share of similar costs that should be borne by consumers of governmentally generated electricity.

Opposition to Hawaiian Statehood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 28, 1954

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record a splendid article entitled "Statehood for Hawaii Has Byrd's Opposition," written by Frank R. Kent, and published in the Washington Evening Star of April 25, 1954.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Statehood for Hawaii Has Byrd's Opposition—Senator Sees Proposal Harmful to Nation's Best Interests

(By Frank R. Kent)

"Draftsmen of national political party platforms too frequently overlook the majorities in their campaign appeals to the minorities." This trenchant—and truthful—sentence is contained in a statement recently made by Senator Harry F. Byrd, of Virginia. It applies to both parties and all platforms. It points a finger at one of the worst forms of humbuggery under our system of government.

Senator Byrd used that sentence in connection with the bill to admit Hawaii to statehood. To this he is strongly opposed. Not only did both the Republican and Democratic Conventions pledge themselves to pass this bill but they have similarly pledged themselves several times before. Actually, since 1900, when Hawaii became a Territory, it has petitioned Congress 16 times for statehood; and, since 1920, bills for that purpose have been introduced 37 times. Many hearings have been held and much debate endured. But Congress has never even come close to passing any of these bills. The prospect of the present Hawaiian bill, supported as it is by President Eisenhower and passed by the House, is dim, indeed. When the Senate insisted on adding Alaska to the House bill it more or less sounded its death knell.

Regardless of that, the case against Hawaii is so devastating and convincing that it is difficult to see how it can be seriously debated. Hawaii, as Senator Byrd says, is an archipelago of islands, islets, and atolls which are neither contiguous to themselves nor to the United States—nor to anything else. The latest census—1951—showed a population of 186,000 Japanese, 30,000 Chinese, 62,000 Filipinos, 10,000 Puerto Ricans, 7,000 Koreans, 79,000 part Hawaiians, 13,000 Hawaiians, 77,000 Caucasians, and about 2,000 in other races, creeds, and colors. The area simply has none of the characteristics of an American State. Internally, it is dispersed and heterogeneous. Externally, says Senator Byrd, "it is vulnerable—contiguous to nothing. Its destiny is that of an outpost. Whatever you may call it, it can never be anything else."

As to its competence to govern itself with the responsibility of a State, the record shows that the "big five" labor unions control its economy and that there is abundant evidence of intensive Communist infiltration of island politics. "This is not," says Senator Byrd, "a question to be determined by the votes of Chinese, Japanese, or Puerto Rican minorities in this country. Nor is it a question to be determined for or by the people of Hawaii. It is a matter to be determined by ourselves only and in our own best interests. The fact that Congress for the moment is closely divided makes stuffing its membership with heterogeneous people from remote islands dangerous and unfair to the Nation and to the people of our States."

"If Hawaii is privileged to two Members of the Senate, each person in Hawaii will have a voice in the Senate 30 times as great as each citizen of New York. If Hawaii is privileged to send Members to the House, it will be at the expense of Representatives from the States. Who knows what States must reduce their representation in Congress to let in the Hawaiian, Japanese, Chinese, Puerto Ricans, Koreans, or whoever, they may send here? Just as these distortions will result in reduced representation of our own people in their own Congress, they will follow directly in the electoral college, where the President is elected."

Besides, Senator Byrd points out, if they affect the presidential election and the Senate they also would affect the American judiciary and all the principal officers, including Ambassadors, who are appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate. His opposition to the statehood for Alaska, Mr. Byrd says, is essentially on economic grounds and its inability to support a state government. Senator Byrd also makes the flat statement that there is among the people of the United States no demand whatever for the admission of Hawaii to statehood.

"The chief agitation comes from the official Hawaiian lobby in the United States, known as the Hawaiian Statehood Commission, which in 4 years spent nearly half a million dollars in service, supplies, publicity, entertainment, and other instruments of propaganda." It does seem that Senator Byrd has said enough to make any Member who is not considering the interests of a minority above that of the majority hesitate quite a while before voting Hawaii in.

Congressional Investigations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEO W. O'BRIEN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 28, 1954

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, numerous proposals have been advanced at this and past sessions of Congress for establishment of a code of "fair play" in connection with the conduct of congressional investigations.

In many such instances, the implication has been that the goal of such proposals was a particular individual or individuals. This has aroused opposition which had little to do with the merit or demerit of the proposed rule changes.

With that thought in mind I have introduced in the House a bill which does not involve personalities in any degree. Its contents are not even my own idea. The language is taken in its virtual entirety from a law recently enacted in my own State of New York, where it applies to procedures in connection with legislative investigations.

Mr. Speaker, New York State is the most populous State in the Union. It has approximately one-tenth of the population of the United States. Those people, through their elected representatives in the State legislature, have set up a code of fair play in connection with the conduct of legislative investigations. The vote on the bill was unanimous, both Republicans and Democrats supporting the measure. It was signed by a Republican Governor, who twice has been his party's candidate for President.

Neither the legislature nor the Governor of my State is soft toward communism. They have established standards, however, which they believe will enable them to make full and complete investigations into that or any other subject without trampling upon the rights of individuals.

I am presenting to this Congress, for study and consideration, a bill which suggests only that what is good enough for my State, with its 16 million people, may be the solution for which men of good will in and out of Government have been striving.

An Undivided Ireland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM T. GRANAHAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 28, 1954

Mr. GRANAHAN. Mr. Speaker, Easter week in Ireland is observed with reverent joy and solemnity, for not only is it a great religious festival, but it also marks the rebirth of Irish nationalism. The Easter Rising of 1916 and the heroic sacrifices of the founders of the Republic of Ireland will ever be the symbol of the undying love of Irishmen for the freedom of their native land. The children of the Gael, no matter where they may be, are ever interested in the fortunes of the Emerald Isle that gave birth to their forefathers. I have received from my friends of the Pennsylvania chapter of the American League for an Undivided Ireland the copy of a letter which the chapter addressed to the Prime Minister of Great Britain, the Right Honorable Sir Winston Churchill. The contents of this letter are worthy of the attention of those who love liberty and justice for all peoples. It epitomizes the remaining grievance that causes Ireland to remain aloof from any alliances that may entail recognition of Great Britain's right to occupy any of Ireland's territory. Having in mind House Resolution 19, introduced by Congressman John Fogarty, dealing with the effects of this problem of the partition of Ireland, I, under unanimous consent, insert the copy of this letter in the Congressional Record so that all may have an opportunity to read and study it.

The letter follows:

American League for
an Undivided Ireland,
Pennsylvania Chapter,
Philadelphia Pa., March 17, 1954.

The Right Honorable
Sir Winston Churchill, K. G.,
Prime Minister of Great Britain,
London, England.

Dear Mr. Prime Minister: Today is St. Patrick's Day, the national festal day of Ireland. Throughout the world, wherever the children of the Gael or their progeny may be, processions will be held, banners carried and groups assembled to honor Ireland's patron saint and in gratitude for the great gift of faith that he brought to Ireland—a faith that the Irish have kept through the centuries—and today constitutes in the Irish nation a great bulwark against the evil of communism.

There is only one corner in this wide world where St. Patrick's Day observances are banned and where attempts are made to curb demonstrations of love and veneration for Ireland's great apostle—and that corner is in northeastern Ireland, behind the line of partition created by the British Parliament in their Government of Ireland Act adopted in 1920, and for which no Irishman, Nationalist or Tory, voted. In fact, you recall, sir, that in 1918 the people of all Ireland voted 80 percent for an independent republic and Britain's reaction was to dispatch her Black and Tan Army to rob, pillage and terrorize the Irish people for 2 years.

You may also recall that after your Government had set up the puppet state called Northern Ireland, a boundary commission was promised and proportional representation set up for the protection of the minority. When it became apparent that these measures would boomerang and expose the absurdity of a six-county government, the commission was abandoned and the proportional representation repealed. There followed enactment of special powers acts, that in effect created a police state. The Tories restorted to gerrymandering of election districts, restrictions of the franchise, and every trick of political chicanery and skulduggery, to check the voting strength of the Nationalists. Then followed the Ireland Act of 1950, also adopted by the British Parliament, which perpetuates the present system of misgovernment and the foul mutilation of an ancient nation.

In the last general election in Northern Ireland, Mr. Liam Kelly presented himself as a candidate from Mid-Tyrone, pledging himself to remain away from the Northern Parliament as a mark of protest against the partition of his country and promising to use every channel to bring about the reunification of Ireland. His campaign was successful. But following his election he was seized and imprisoned, and based on his campaign speeches, charged with seditious utterances. This action was not aimed at Mr. Kelly personally. It was a flagrant attempt at intimidation of his constituents with the intent of forcing them to abandon their Nationalist aspirations. What a travesty, sir, on the principles of freedom of speech and freedom from fear and oppression, enunciated by you in the Atlantic Charter that became our credo in the great crusade known as World War II.

On this St. Patrick's Day, sir, may we remind you of your own statement, made in 1912, and we quote:

"Whatever Ulster's right may be, she cannot stand in the way of the whole of Ireland. Half a province cannot impose a permanent veto on the nation. Half a province cannot obstruct forever the reconciliation between the British and Irish democracies and deny all satisfaction to the united wishes of the British Empire."

We are told, sir, that your great desire today is for world peace. May we suggest that your efforts commence at your own door by ending the centuries-old occupation of Ireland, by the repeal by your government of the Ireland Acts of 1920 and 1950 and by withdrawing all aid, moral, financial, and military, from the puppet government of Northern Ireland. Let the Irish people resolve their difficulties among themselves. Restore to the Irish nation their sacred shrines that hold the mortal remains of St. Patrick, St. Brigid, and St. Columcille. Repudiate partition and remove any excuse for the U. S. S. R. following that pattern in the partition of Germany, Austria, and Korea.

Very truly yours,

JOHN J. REILLY,
National Vice President.
PATRICK J. MCNELIS,
President, Pennsylvania Chapter.

The Japanese Attack on Pearl Harbor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 28, 1954

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "To Preserve the Future," published in the Indianapolis Star of Sunday, April 11, 1954.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TO PRESERVE THE FUTURE

To preserve our future, we must learn from the past. All too often we say "The past is dead—forget it—let bygones be bygones." But if we do not study and learn the lessons of history, we shall continue to make the same mistakes we made in the past. War, aggression, and the appeasement that make both inevitable will continue to plague the world, H-bomb or no H-bomb.

Recently Americans have begun to hear the truth about how the United States was plunged into World War II at Pearl Harbor. The so-called revisionist historians, Sanborn and Tansill, have presented part of the record in Design for War and Back Door to War which showed how President Roosevelt deliberately maneuvered the United States into war by provoking Japan and inviting attack by weakening the fleet and failing to inform our military commanders at Hawaii. Now Adm. Robert A. Theobald has filled in the record in The Final Secret of Pearl Harbor, published April 28 by Devin-Adair and partially serialized in the April 2 issue of U. S. News & World Report. Admiral Theobald presents the factual documentation to prove beyond doubt that President Roosevelt and Secretary of War Stimson deliberately maneuvered the United States into war with the perhaps unwilling aid of Admiral Stark and Gen. George Marshall.

Why else did President Roosevelt prevent our military commanders from knowing that a surprise attack the afternoon of December 7, 1941, was certain? It was known in Washington. It was known by the commander in chief of the Asiatic fleet in the Phillipines and by General MacArthur. It was not known by either Admiral Kimmel or General Short in Hawaii because the available information was deliberately withheld from them. Why?

"There was never any military reason for preserving to the Japanese the opportunity of a surprise attack through the denial of information to the Hawaiian commanders," writes Admiral Theobald. "Free to act, it is an absolute certainty that both Admiral Stark and General Marshall would have done everything in their power to prevent such an attack. And yet, on the morning of December 7, Washington refused to send one short message to Hawaii in time to cushion the effects of the Japanese attack.

"This is the most revealing fact of the entire Pearl Harbor story. There was only one conceivable reason for it. Nothing must be done to prejudice the chances of the attack, even at the last moment. Japan was about to bring war to the United States, and President Roosevelt did not intend that any American action should cause them to change their plans at the last minute."

HOW WE WERE PUSHED IN

Roosevelt believed the United States must go to war against Hitler on the side of Soviet Russia and Britain. His friend and biographer Robert Sherwood made this plain in Roosevelt and Hopkins. But, despite continued provocations, Hitler refused to make any overt move that could give Roosevelt reason to demand a declaration of war. We gave destroyers to Britain, sent lend-lease to the Soviet Union, escorted ships with naval vessels and the President made many beligerent statements. But Germany wouldn't bite.

Japan, however, was a member of the Axis pact. If America went to war against Japan, we would automatically be at war with Germany and Italy. Thus Roosevelt's strategy was to provoke Japan to attack us. As the diplomatic and military records cited by Theobald show, this is what he did. He ended our commercial treaty with Japan, stopped all shipments of fuel, scrap metal, and tools to Japan, ended the subsidies on wheat to the Far East, stepped up financial and military aid to China, stopped exports from the Philippines to Japan and finally ended all trade with Japan. Meanwhile, as Ambassador to Japan Grew revealed in his book, the Turbulent Years, the Japanese desperately trying to reach some sort of agreement with us. Premier Konoye offered to withdraw from Indochina and China in return for trade resumption. He even suggested a break with the Axis powers might be possible. He warned that if the United States refused to negotiate with him to seek agreement and peace in Asia, his government would probably fall to the military clique and war would be most likely. Roosevelt refused to answer Konoye's plea. He refused to arrange a meeting. Then on November 26 he sent a message to Japan demanding complete surrender to every American demand—an impossible demand that was clearly an ultimatum. By that final act Theobald says, "President Roosevelt * * * deliberately brought war to the United States."

The American people knew nothing of all this. They were neither informed nor consulted. They had elected Roosevelt on his promise not to "send your sons to any foreign wars." They neither wanted war nor believed that it was in America's best interests to go to war. So they had to be forced into war by staging the Japanese attack first by pressure on Japan, then by weakening the Pacific Fleet, then by refusing to warn our Hawaiian commanders of the imminent danger.

It worked, and because Roosevelt, with the help of his military stooges Stark and Marshall, kept our Hawaiian command in the dark about the known Japanese intentions, Pearl Harbor was left virtually defenseless. In a few hours 4,575 American fighting men in the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps had died or were wounded grievously. We lost the bulk of our active fleet and 177 vitally needed planes. Of course, after Pearl Harbor, we lost hundreds of thousands of other lives in Europe and in Asia.

It is noteworthy that once the war in the Pacific started, President Roosevelt directed the major effort not against the Japanese who had attacked us, but against Hitler's Germany in Europe on the other side of the world.

DID F. D. R. KNOW BEST?

We won the war Roosevelt started. And then at Yalta and Teheran he lost it for us to

Communist Soviet Russia. All this, too, is on the record if Americans will just take the trouble to read it. They had better do so, for their futures and the liberty and lives of their sons may depend upon it.

The decision to make war is the most frightful decision a nation can make. There are times when it must be done to preserve essential liberty, to protect national independence. But certainly a free people in a democratic republic should have the right to make that decision, to know that decision is being made, to support it because they believe in it. They should not be tricked into war against their will in order to satisfy the egoistic assurance of one man who believes he knows everything.

We suggest that Americans read the record in the Final Secret of Pearl Harbor. To preserve our futures we should study the past so that we can be both forewarned and forearmed against another Pearl Harbor.

Help Needed for People of Texas Drought Area

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 28, 1954

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, important sections of Texas continue to suffer from the effects of one of the most devastating droughts our State has ever known.

The needs of the people in these areas were set forth in a resolution presented on Tuesday of this week by County Judge James McMorries, of Stanton, Tex., on behalf of 38 west Texas counties, to members of the Texas congressional delegation and representatives of the Department of Agriculture, the Farmers' Home Administration, and the Small Business Administration.

The serious nature of the picture presented in the text of the resolution ought to be a matter of widespread concern. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution presented by Judge McMorries be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"Whereas one of the worst droughts ever experienced by persons now living now prevails in a great many west Texas counties, and many of such counties have been designated already as being eligible for drought relief, consisting of certain concessions in the way of reduced freight rates on feed and aid in buying feed for livestock; and

"Whereas said drought continues unabated, and the problem for the farmers and ranchers now goes beyond the matter of temporary aid in providing for livestock and reaches to a question of whether the farmers and ranchers are to be able to remain on their homes and exist without aid from some source; and

"Whereas the essential thing necessary for their further operation is a more elastic and liberalized system of credit on the part of FHA to meet the following needs:

"(a) Loans to small businesses in such amounts as will enable the small-business men, who have extended needed credit to the farmers and ranchers of this distressed area, to restock their shelves with merchandise, and for carrying on the operation of their store.

"(b) Loans in such amounts as will enable those in real distress to pay their necessary living expenses, and for carrying on the operation of their farms and ranches.

"(c) Additional loans which will enable the farmers to deep break their land so as to put clay or hardpan on top of their land so that the topsoil will not blow away, or, if lands are not suitable for deep breaking, loans in such amounts as will enable the farmers to take whatever steps that are necessary to prevent soil erosion. This will cost approximately $10 per acre.

"(d) The active cooperation of the Soil Conservation Agency to advise and assist in retaining what top soil remains, and has not already blown away, and in preparing their lands so that when rain does come they may be able to raise crops.

"(e) An arrangement by which the FHA loans could be made payable over a period of 10 years, and payable on or before the date due, in order that these people might live and pay other debts to local creditors along with payments to FHA.

"(f) Invoke Public Law 875 of the Federal Congress that the farmers and ranchers in the distressed area might work and keep from having to go further in debt.

"Whereas it is the desire and purpose of the County Commissioners Court to call the attention of our Senators and Representatives in Congress and our Governor, to the dire need of these citizens, who have now reached the point where it is a matter of bare existence and a matter of receiving a helping hand, or abandoning their homes, and that section of the State becoming a barren desert; and

"Whereas the Governor of Texas has the authority to invoke Public Law 875 of the Federal Congress of the United States, which if invoked would make available to the drought-stricken counties of this State, moneys for public works, which would give employment to the needy and deserving in said drought-stricken area, and said Public Law 875 should be invoked: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the county commissioners court, convened in regular session, at Texas, this the 12th day of April 1954,* That the needs of these people and the direful condition of this part of Texas be called to the attention of our Senators and Representatives, and our Governor that they be urged to take such steps as are possible to obtain relief in the respects above entitled, to the end that these people will not be forced to abandon their land and their homes in order to exist and to the further end that they who have been useful law-abiding citizens may remain self-sustaining and not become wanderers and dependent on other people or other communities, and that the land in these counties may not become a barren waste with all fertile soil blown away; be it further

"*Resolved,* That a copy of this resolution be by the county clerk forwarded to our Senators and Representatives in Congress, and our Governor for their information, and guidance, and with the request of this commissioners court that they endeavor to in every way possible, obtain assistance for these people in this hour of dire need."

The above resolution being read, it was moved and seconded that the same be adopted.

Therefore, the question being called for, the following members of the court voted aye: Oscar Hudspeth, Frank Rochelle, C. L. Dowding, S. B. Ballard; and the following voted no: none.

V. L. MORRIS,
County Judge.

Attest:

SYBIL Z. HENSLEY,
County Clerk.

Equality in Pension Opportunity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 1954

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to state that under our Federal tax laws there are approximately 10 million American taxpayers who are denied any opportunity to provide security for their old age. This group of neglected citizens is composed of our American farmers, doctors, lawyers, engineers, other professional persons, and small-business men, such as garage owners, storekeepers, as well as salesmen and saleswomen. Our tax laws permit other groups to establish approved pension programs which give them preferential tax treatment while creating their retirement security.

For example, section 165 of the Internal Revenue Code allows a corporation to establish a pension program, and the corporate payments into the fund are deductible at the time of such payments, while the employees are not taxed on the benefits derived from the fund until such time as they are actually received. A similar opportunity is not available to the farmers, and the other persons that I have previously enumerated.

My bill, H. R. 10, would partially eliminate this discrimination by allowing farmers, professional people, and small-business men to establish private pension plans to provide for the security of themselves and their families.

The U. S. News & World Report for April 23 contained an informed article on this legislation. This article succinctly explains the principles involved, points out the safeguards against abuses, and describes the merits in the proposal.

In my opinion favorable action by Congress on this legislation is long overdue to give this neglected segment of our citizenry equal treatment under the Federal tax laws. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert the article from the U. S. News & World Report in the Appendix of the RECORD:

Something new in old-age pension plans is being pushed for doctors, farmers, small-business men, other self-employed.

Idea is to allow these people to put aside some earnings each year—tax-free—in special retirement funds or annuities.

Move, offered to give self-employed people the same benefits many employees now enjoy, has strong support.

A new retirement plan, to be paid for with tax-free income, is being advocated in Congress for self-employed people—11 million or so professional men, farmers, small-business men, others.

The plan, to be offered on top of social security benefits, has the support—formally, at least—of both political parties or their leaders. And the dozens of professional, farm and business organizations that demand the plan are getting the sympathetic attention of an election-minded Congress.

If the effort succeeds, self-employed individuals will be allowed to set aside limited portions of income to provide old-age pensions. Income invested in this way will not be taxed.

One-man pension funds are being asked as a move to put self-employed workers on a par with ordinary employees.

More and more millions of employees in business and industry, it is pointed out, are getting company programs that provide old-age retirement pay in addition to benefits from social security. Payments made to retirement funds by companies are charged off as a cost by the companies, but are not counted as income by employees. Essentially, they're tax-free employee income diverted to retirement programs.

Officers and directors of corporations, as employees, now share in these private pension plans. So do doctors, lawyers, other professionals working as employees of companies that have such plans.

Professional workers in business for themselves, it's argued, are at a severe tax disadvantage because they have no such retirement systems. That goes, too, for farmers, real estate dealers, other small-business men. They can use part of their income to buy annuities. But they get no tax exemption—or exclusion—for that income. They're taxed on the income at a time when their incomes are highest, and in the highest tax brackets, rather than in retirement when their incomes normally will be smaller.

Result, according to the arguments, is that the self-employed person finds it difficult to make any real provision for his old age.

The administration, as part of its answer, is offering social-security coverage to the millions of self-employed professional people still not covered. That idea, in the view of many professional groups, is good. But social-security benefits are too small to give a high-income person a standard of living anywhere near the one he has in active years.

Besides, it is pointed out, more and more employees get tax freedom for deferred income paid to retirement funds—in addition to social-security coverage.

The professionals want the same treatment. The Eisenhower administration, while approving in principle, is opposing immediate action on the bills now in Congress.

Voluntary pension plan for the self-employed, if approved, will be subject to specific regulations.

Only the self-employed and employees not eligible for company plans—or for Government-employee plans—will be able to get these income exclusions.

Strict limits, too, will be put on amounts to be given freedom from taxes. In general, the individual will be allowed to set aside, tax-free, as much as 10 percent of his annual earned income, with a maximum set-aside of $7,500 a year and $150,000 in a lifetime.

Older persons—those 55 or more when the bill is approved—will get to put aside additional amounts, as past service credits, in order to build pension funds in their fewer remaining years of work.

Individuals who feel they can't afford to set aside their full 10 percent in a particular year, moreover, will get a special carry-over. They can carry over unused allowances for periods of 5 years, but they won't be able to exclude more than $7,500 in any year.

Investment of this tax-free income will be subject to a detailed set of rules designed to make it impossible for the individual to get his hands on the money until the right time comes. Individuals will have two options:

They can put their special savings into "restricted retirement funds," to be sponsored by professional, business, farm, or other groups, and managed by bank trustees. Or they can buy a tailor-made "restricted annuity contract" from an insurance company.

In either case, the rules will not permit these special savings to be recovered unless the individual becomes permanently and totally disabled, or he dies, or until he reaches 65. At 65 he can draw his retirement money in a lump sum, or in periodic payments. Installment payments will be taxed as regular income, and lump sums in most cases as capital gains.

Size of benefits, of course, will depend on amounts saved, on the number of years those amounts draw interest, and on the ways in which they are invested.

The doctor whose case is illustrated in the box on page 120 offers an example of only one of the ways in which the plan could be used. His pension of $365 a month for life, starting at age 65 after $2,000 yearly investments for 20 years, is relatively large. Most self-employed persons, with smaller incomes, would not be entitled to invest so much.

The doctor in the example, moreover, is buying a relatively large pension by taking his benefits entirely in the form of annuity, without any life insurance protection. He might invest his $2,000 a year in a contract that includes a refund privilege. His monthly annuity check then will be $260, instead of $3.65. But, when he dies, his family will get an amount equal to the premiums he has paid, minus any sums he has gotten back.

Top benefits from the plan, according to its sponsors, will come to something like $1,000 a month. But that's for the rare individual who can afford to put aside the lifetime maximum of $150,000. Most individuals, it is said, will manage to buy retirement pay ranging from $75 to $200 or $300 a month.

That, combined with top social-security benefits planned at $162.80 for a couple at age 65, can mean a fairly adequate standard of living in retirement.

It can, at least, if Congress adopts the plan now put forward.

Support for the idea has been growing for some time. Bills now in Congress, providing for the program, are given a strong chance of approval—if not this year, then next. Backers of the plan already claim friends in high places.

Mr. Eisenhower, during his campaign, had this to say:

"In 1942 the Government made an important supplement to the Social Security Act by legislation which offered tax advantages to corporations and their employees in the establishment of pension funds. * * * When this legislation was being considered self-employed individuals were evidently forgotten. * * * I think something ought to be done to help these people to help themselves by allowing a reasonable tax deduction for money put aside by them for their own savings. * * * If I am elected I will favor legislation along these lines."

That, it's made clear, is just what bills now before Congress will do.

The proposal also was endorsed in principle by the Democratic Party platform in the 1952 campaign, according to the chairman of the platform committee, Representative JOHN W. MCCORMACK, of Massachusetts.

Supporters of the plan are hoping for early action, despite the reluctance of the Administration to move right now. The official position was expressed by Presidential Assistant Sherman Adams and by Secretary of the Treasury George M. Humphrey.

Mr. Adams, reminded that Mr. Eisenhower had approved the idea, replied, "The President's endorsement of the principle of privately sponsored pension plans was, of course, not intended to refer to any particular bill pending before the Congress."

Mr. Humphrey cited a number of "issues" involved, including the possible loss of "considerable" revenue, and explained that "the retirement-income problem is one of the subjects on which we have not yet completed our study."

Even so spokesmen for the self-employed express hope that they soon will get tax favors designed to encourage savings for their old age.

For a Continental Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 28, 1954

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Atlantic Monthly:

FOR A CONTINENTAL DEFENSE

(By James R. Killian, Jr., and A. G. Hill)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—No institution in the country has made a greater contribution to our national defense than Massachusetts Institute of Technology, of which James R. Killian, Jr., is president. Collaborating with him in the writing of this forthright article is A. G. Hill, professor of physics at MIT and director of the Lincoln Laboratory, which is operated by MIT for the three branches of the military service and which is devoted to technical aspects of air defense.)

I

Now that we know that the Soviets have achieved a thermonuclear explosion, the defense of our homes, our cities, and our lives is given a new and awful urgency. Long carried on behind closed doors, the debate on the issues posed by our present vulnerability to atomic attack should now come into the open, for our Government must have—and knows it must have—the help of informed public opinion in dealing with the problem.

The President and our military leaders are the only ones who can adequately brief the American people on the true nature of the threat we face and the means to meet it. Because of the part which research and technology have played and are playing in our defense, however, the special knowledge and outlook of the scientist and engineer have relevance in the current discussion of defense against atomic attack. Without assuming any military expertness, we seek to examine our defense policy from this special point of view. How vulnerable are we, and what are the issues involved in forming national policy to deal with the threat?

Within the limits prescribed by national security, our vulnerability can be described this way. One hundred atomic bombs dropped on selected targets in North America could kill or injure not just hundreds or thousands but millions of people. A grim calculation by informed experts can forecast the number of millions of casualties. This calculation leads to the conclusion that America might not survive this kind of attack even though we were able in the meantime to destroy our enemy.

If there should be a surprise air attack on the United States next week, next month, or even within a year, our defending forces would be able to intercept and destroy only a small percentage of the invading planes. This is not adequate to prevent the delivery of 100 bombs. This is not adequate to insure the continuity of our Government or the maintenance of vital industrial activity. This may not be adequate to insure the continuity of the United States.

Competent authorities, both military and scientific, agree that these macabre hazards are real; they are not bogeymen summoned out of a fertile imagination to induce Congress to vote more funds. They are brutally real, deadly reasonable calculations of the threat we face.

It is unlikely that the Soviets are yet able or ready to launch this kind of fatal attack on the United States. It is almost certain that within a few years, at most, they will be able to launch such an attack—unless our defenses are enormously improved. Competent opinion holds that even at the present time, the Soviets may have the capability of delivering a crippling atomic attack on the United States.

The American people must know and understand the possibilities. It is sometimes said that the facts will produce panic. Even if this were true, it would be better that we be frightened than that we remain serenely ignorant and vulnerable. The facts may frighten a few people, but they will produce determined action by most. The American people need facts in order to reach resolute conclusions. In the debate so far, the facts have not been adequately available because of understandable security restrictions. Not only have the facts been inadequate; they sometimes have been inaccurate and misleading—misleading because they were bootlegged facts and assembled piecemeal by people who have no direct access to authoritative sources.

In advocating a stronger defense of our continent against atomic attack, we are mindful that this is but one part of a comprehensive military responsibility. We visualize that this total responsibility consists of five major tasks, which we list without attempting to suggest relative priority:

1. Control of the high seas.
2. Defense of the North American Continent.
3. Capability to mount a devastating counterattack on an enemy's bases and homeland.
4. Our share of the defense of Western Europe.
5. Control of sudden outbreaks such as the Korean attack.

We cannot neglect any one of these major tasks and still have a coherent military plan and policy in the world we live in today. We cannot concentrate either on offense or on defense and have a sound plan and a capability designed for the threat we face. These are truisms, yet we find ourselves at the present time wide open to the delivery of atomic bombs by air.

There are three principal reasons why we are in this predicament: (1) We have traditionally tended to favor offense in our military planning; (2) we have underestimated the time required for the Soviets to achieve a strong atomic capability; and (3) we have assumed that a reasonable air defense of the North American continent was beyond our technical and economic means. These attitudes and assumptions, now challenged by the Soviets' achievement of the H-bomb, have led us so far to give low priority to the continental defense of North America.

With determination and skill, our Air Force has created its Strategic Air Command, or "SAC," as a great offensive striking force ready at any moment to launch an atomic counterattack on an enemy. Our Navy is also readying its air arm as an atomic striking force. Our capability in atomic weapons, coupled with our possession of these powerful air-offensive forces, is an essential part of our military defense, our diplomatic strength, and our leadership. It is unquestionably a mighty deterrent to a would-be attacker—assuming that potential attacker to be a rational power, not a mad or desperate or capricious dictator. We cannot forget, however, that three times since 1914 we have been involved in a war started by a dictator who thought he saw the chance for victory in a surprise assault.

In view of the prime importance of this offensive strength and in the fact of the evangelical zeal which SAC commands, it has proved difficult outside as well as inside the Military Establishment to introduce the concept of continental defense as a normal and natural partner of offense. There has been a fear, for example, that adequate air defense would undermine air offense. One of the immediate problems is to dissipate this deep-seated fear that attention to air defense on any substantial scale must inevitably weaken SAC and other offensive forces by diverting from them both attention and funds. We must achieve a stronger defense without weakening or subordinating our offensive power. We know of no informed, thoughtful advocate of a strong air defense who is not convinced of the importance of SAC and of an overall offensive power so great that it will provide a strong deterrent to the Soviets. We must continue to have creative thinking and planning for offensive power.

One of the chief concerns of those who advocate a stronger air defense is that SAC be protected to do its job. It must be defended if it is to be effective, and there is great apprehension that it is now vulnerable to severe damage by an air attack on its bases.

We need versatile military forces, competent both for offense and for defense. This poses grave problems of allotting materiel, money, men, and attention. The balancing of the branches of our military services may require enlarging present budgets; if achieved within present budgets it most certainly would require some drastic reallocations of funds within the Government as a whole. In seeking a balanced military force, we must also squarely face the effects of additional expenditures on our economy; we recognize the hazard of spending ourselves into bankruptcy.

There are other current misapprehensions and false issues in regard to air defense. The unfortunate impression has been created that the Air Force has little interest in air defense; that it is narrowmindedly committed exclusively to the offensive concept embodied in SAC. As we shall later show, this seems to be a misreading of the Air Force position. Both within and without the Air Force, there are those who disagree vehemently about the degree of emphasis which should be given to offense and defense, but those who are really informed will not share in any charge that the Air Force has no real interest in the creation of a defensive system against air attack.

The statement has been given currency that a few scientists, naive in the ways of military operations, have promised complete security from an air attack. This is rubbish. No informed and competent scientists who have considered the problem have concluded that a perfect defense is possible or probable. They hold the view that our present low defense capabilities can be improved manyfold. We have the technical resources to accomplish this if they are mobilized and put to use. It is this improvement that scientists advocate, not the building of a perfect system with all the astronomical numbers that this implies. The estimated percentage of invading planes which can be shot down once we have some of the improvements now under development is secret information. It is not 100 percent, or even 95 percent, but it is a great gain over our existing powers of attrition. Let no one be under the misapprehension that a perfect air defense is technically or economically feasible. Let it be equally clear that we are not helpless in greatly improving our defense.

Although present laboratory developments and military plans promise substantial gains in the future, these gains are not enough. We need still further to step up research and development to ensure further gains after those now under development have been applied. Able teams are at work, but they all could be strengthened by the addition of more of our first-rate scientists and engineers. We also need imaginative studies to seek new concepts for distant interception and for augmenting the offensive capabilities of SAC. The improvements which we might thus achieve could spell the difference between America saved and America lost.

II

The furtherance of air defense has been made more difficult by the creation of another false issue—the alleged ineradicable conflict between the scientific mind and the military mind. The impression has been given that it has been the scientists and engineers who have advocated air defense over the strenuous objections of the generals. The argument has been frequently heard that the scientists have a guilt complex for having developed the atomic bomb and that this guilt complex leads them to denounce and to deny offensive concepts and to take refuge in the Maginot Line complex of an idealized defensive system.

There may be some scientists who are motivated in this manner, but their number and their influence are insignificant. There are many considerations which have led scientists who are knowledgeable in military matters to advocate a greater emphasis on air defense than we have so far accepted or achieved. One of these considerations has been the knowledge that there were important technical developments which make an improved air defense more feasible.

There are other and quite subtle considerations which have led scientists to believe in a strong air defense. Perhaps the most compelling has been their understanding of the catastrophic implications of atomic bombs in the hands of a dictator, of atomic bombs made steadily more powerful and destructive, of atomic bombs so powerful that several of them would be equivalent in tons to all the bombs dropped by the Allies on Germany in World War II. This understanding leads the scientists to think in terms of forthcoming or potential innovations in warfare, to be preoccupied with the warfare of the future. This understanding has led the scientists to the conviction that we must miss no bets in planning for the defense of our country, that we need all the offensive and defensive strength that we can muster. It has given them the conviction that a really determined scientific effort may produce, as it did in World War II, wholly unexpected additions to our weapons and our concepts.

This point of view, however, is not unique to the scientists. In the face of charges that the Air Force has been indifferent to air defense, the fact should be made clear that it was the Air Force 3 years ago that induced a group of scientists to tackle the problem of air defense, a responsibility they were reluctant to undertake until urged by Secretary Finletter to do so. It was General Vandenberg himself who wrote the letter which set in motion a substantial research undertaking by civilian scientists in the field of air defense.

It is creating a dangerously false issue to charge either the military mind or the scientific mind with having a warped or distorted point of view. This charge has been made too often and too indiscriminately, and the effects have been damaging to the officer personnel of the services. There is now extensive agreement and cross-fertilization between scientists and military personnel of the Army, Air Force, and Navy in regard to air offense and defense.

To aggravate or to promote differences between our military personnel and other professional groups in the Nation is a vicious game, and those who play it in the hope of weakening the opposition to their position or concept may be opening a dangerous fissure in our national security. The same hazard exists in efforts to set one group of scientists against another, or to discredit those who advocate unconventional views on means to security.

In World War II, the Germans gave a convincing demonstration of failure properly to utilize the resources of science and of a cultivated incompatibility between military planners and scientists. We should diligently seek to prevent such a catastrophe in the United States.

Another aspect of the air defense problem which has been subject to much loose discussion is the cost of improving our air defense. Public discussion of an early-warning net has hit upon the figure of $20 billion or more as the cost of such a system. This estimate has been credited to a group of scientists who participated in a summer study project and whose report suggested that such an early-warning system might now be technically feasible. This group estimated no such figure. It did conclude that an early-warning line could be built at a cost which is high but which was very much less than $20 billion. As a result of this summer study, pilot-plant studies are now under way which should yield a conclusive estimate of the total cost of such an early-warning system. The $20 billion figure bears no recognizable relationship to any informed estimate which has yet been made, and it has misled many people in their appraisal of air defense possibilities.

The problem of cost of an early warning system is inseparable, however, from the broader question of the cost of an effective overall air defense system. We have already invested billions of dollars in providing our existing air defense with its interceptor planes, its antiaircraft guns and guided missiles, and its radar screens. Can we realize any effective defense from this investment? We have the public statements of our Air Force leaders as to our present severely limited capacity to down invading planes. It would seem, therefore, that we are faced with making an already huge investment of men, materiel, and systems really workable. If we can give our present system better eyes to detect low-flying aircraft which the existing radar doesn't see; if we can give our interceptors and our antiaircraft—as well as our civilian defense—time to get set to fight an invading force; if we can improve the capacity and speed of our communication and control systems so that our generals can properly, amply, and quickly exert the functions of command—if we can do these things by further technical development, then we shall have a sound basis of appraising the proposed expenditures. We cannot isolate air defense from the whole military system to protect the continent of North America, which, of course, embraces land and sea power.

Our real problem and decision are not concerned with any one separate concept, such as early warning, but the whole system of air defense and what will make it effective as a system. Actually there is evidence that effective early warning could reduce expenses and uncertainties in other parts of the system and thus partly offset its own cost. Only the concept of an effective overall air defense system is meaningful when we consider capital and operating costs, and we should not be misled by charges that an adequate early-warning system would cost $20 billion or some other figure that could only impoverish other arms of our military services.

The brutal conclusion is inescapable, however, that an adequate program for continental defense will be costly to the Nation and will require sacrifices. Nevertheless we are not convinced that the costs need be a backbreaking burden to the country. We are convinced that this cost may be small compared with the risks—the loss of whole cities. We hasten to add that we advocate no particular budgetary allotment or solution. We seek only to point out the budgetary implications of current technical developments.

III

Let us now turn to a more specific examination of the technological aspects of air defense.

Electronic technical improvements essential to air defense are being systematically pursued by a variety of groups, and particularly and concentratedly by the Lincoln Laboratory at Cambridge and Lexington, Mass. This laboratory is operating under an Air Force contract, but it is a tripartite organization working for and with all three military services, with each service sharing in the cost and in the management, and the Air Force providing the bulk of the funds. This laboratory is not limited in its program to early warning or any other component. It carries on its activities from both the components and systems points of view. Out of this project, and from others in industry—as, for example, in the Bell Telephone Laboratories—are coming certain promising developments. These cannot be guaranteed to come through as originally conceived; the only certain answer implicit in research is that certain answers may emerge, but not necessarily the ones envisaged.

Technically, the problem of defense, apart from the destruction of the enemy's bases, requires putting the defensive weapons (interceptors, antiaircraft guns, or guided missiles) in position to destroy the invading planes and giving these weapons a high probability of effectiveness.

In these days of high-speed aircraft and guided missiles, the time for defensive combat to take place is very small, and there is seldom opportunity for a second shot if the first shot misses. It is, therefore, important to receive and analyze the information about the striking force extremely rapidly, and to deliver to the defensive forces in very short time the necessary instructions to put this force on target. In order to accomplish this, technological developments for rapid data processing of information are absolutely necessary and are being pushed toward the solution of the air defense problem. Having successfully brought the defensive weapon close to the enemy bomber, the kill potential of the interceptor weapon must be great enough to ensure a high probability of the bomber's destruction.

Since the time of engagement is very short, since there is seldom an opportunity for a second pass at a target, and since the results of leakage through the air defense net are devastating, it is necessary to spread out the defenses in a series of zones or lines. A series of defensive weapons prevents any one of the weapons from becoming overloaded by a very heavy raid.

First, we need reliable early warning which can assuredly tell us that an actual attack is on its way or that a very serious and powerful feint is being made—the system giving this information without turning in false alarms. Such early warning not only serves to alert the defense but allows the civilian population and other military forces such as SAC to take proper defensive action. The warning should come hours and not minutes before the attack. Second, we need the ability to harass and destroy the attacking forces at long ranges from their targets. Third, we need an area defense in the regions of large population and industrial concentrations. Finally, we need short-range weapons such as antiaircraft guns and short-range guided missiles near the targets of greatest importance. Such a system, where each zone of defense can reduce and upset the striking forces and where the effect of a disastrous saturating raid is greatly reduced, can provide a measure of defense which is economically and technically feasible.

The solution of such a systems problem requires the very close cooperation of both military and technical persons. Technical developments are not useful to the military until they have been carefully adapted to military needs. Similarly, military concepts of defense must be guided by and based in part upon new technical developments.

One more word on the technology of continental defense. Atomic attack may not be confined to air or to delivery by manned aircraft. Defense against other methods of bomb delivery must not be neglected. Technology already promises to give us a better defense against submarine delivery, provided current developments are aggressively carried through to operational use. Delivery by intercontinental missiles is a future threat, but we must not be complacent about its being far in the future. The possibility of clandestine importation of atomic bombs must not be underestimated. We believe, however, that the aspect of defense which warrants special attention immediately is defense against delivery by manned aircraft.

IV

We come now to some of the broader considerations which bear upon an adequate air defense. In the atomic arms race in which we are engaged, we have sought to make sure that this Nation stays ahead, that we produce more and bigger bombs and better ways of delivering them. While we can derive satisfaction from our capacity to stay ahead, we cannot at the same time assume that this will provide us with security. As the former Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, Gordon Dean, and others have repeatedly pointed out, some point will be reached in the atomic arms race when relative atomic strength will be substantially less meaningful than it is now. This is true because the enemy will have enough—enough to cripple us if bombs can be delivered. Since the country with the lesser supply will have enough, simply adding to our atomic strength will not, under those conditions, insure our security.

As we approach this condition, defense becomes increasingly important along with our capacity to deter. The knowledge that we have a good defense can add to our power to deter, combined with SAC and other arms. As the atomic race plunges on, air defense—the defense against the enemy's delivery of his atom bombs—becomes inescapably more important.

The argument is heard that the advocates of a stronger air defense are isolationists, and that they seek to have America hide behind some mysterious electronic wall where she will maintain herself in lonely splendor and without entangling responsibilities. The reverse is actually true. Those who have a deep philosophical conviction that a stronger air defense is essential, reason from a different premise. They see the leadership of the United States strengthened by the world knowledge that we are prepared to repel as well as to invade. In the event of war, there is scant hope for our friends if we destroy our enemy and find ourselves destroyed.

An adequate defense can also add something to our bargaining powers at the international table. It provides another weapon for the arsenal of the free world. Moreover, if we can solve some of the problems, especially the technical problems, related to air defense, we can make a further important contribution to the success of NATO—to the defense of Europe. Our European allies look with dismay and horror at the prospect of an atomic war fought, not alone with the Soviets, but in Europe itself. If we and they are to prevent this, we will need more economical and more advanced methods of keeping the Russians out of Europe, and air defense improvements can help. A better air defense for North America can mean a better defense of Europe. Where does the defense of our allies or the confidence in us which brings us allies—where does this kind of defense differ from offense?

Our present and ultimate aim must of course be the prevention of war. A better defense will help in achieving this goal. Moreover, we might be more willing to enter into some agreement on the control of atomic weapons if we felt we had some reasonable means to detect treachery that might conceivably occur despite solemn covenants. If the Communists knew they would have great difficulty in breaking through our defense and in achieving a surprise, and that they would in turn be crippled by our retaliatory blow, they might be more amenable to some understanding.

These are factors which remove from air defense the tag of isolationism and which give it significance in the matrix of international relations. For these reasons it bears an important, if subtle, relationship to the sum total of our defensive efforts—the achievement of genuine peace.

As we in the United States examine the issues inherent in the air defense debate, we need above all to have more facts. We need more quantitative information about the threat we face. We need to have placed before us the qualitative considerations which affect our policymaking. When the recent Kelly report on continental defense was summarized in part in a news release, certain of its grim conclusions about the present threat to America were made less grim. The time has come for boldness and plain speaking. The American public is not well served by withholding facts that are vital to the decision making of a democracy and to its self-preservation.

In resolving the issues posed by Russia's possession of the H-bomb, our Government will need the calm and courageous support of all Americans. The problem is immense in all phases, in its military, budgetary, technological, and political aspects. It cannot be adequately handled by the Department of Defense alone, or by the administration alone, or by Congress alone. It requires the mobilization of the best wisdom and highest competence available in the Nation.

Anniversary of Declaration of War With Spain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 14, 1954

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, this month of April, 56 years ago, war with Spain was declared. It is proper, and should be a strengthening contribution to the patriotic spirit of present crucial times, that in this Congress we should pause in our consideration of the many problems now facing us to take note of the anniversary of the start of the United States on the road of world destiny.

I am extending my remarks to include an address by Major A. F. W. Siebel, past judge advocate general of the United Spanish War Veterans. Major Siebel, a veteran of the war with Spain, also served in World War I with the 132d United States Infantry. The address was delivered in Evanston, Ill., in 1936. It is so replete with information concerning the conflict of more than half a century ago that I recommend it to the reading of my colleagues in this anniversary April and to permanent place in their reference files. The article follows:

CONDENSED RÉSUMÉ OF THE SPANISH-AMERICAN WAR, 1898–1902

The USWV or United Spanish War Veterans, was born of men with a background of warfare that was unique in the history of nations. It arose from the ruins of wrecked humanity in an army that suffered more from the derelictions of our own Government than from the firearms of the enemies. Men untrained, unequipped, and uncared for were sent against a trained foe who had not the courage to fight American men who by their dauntless energy swept everything before them. A war humanity saw coming slowly but surely by reason of the tyranny of an absolute monarchy over helpless subjects in a neighboring island.

For centuries preceding our war with Spain, that tyrannical monarchy had misgoverned her colonial possession so severely that her subjects there weer a pitiful, starved, helpless lot, and those in Cuba were dependent upon the charity of our people. Around Habana alone, Clara Barton and her several agents fed 300,000 starving people. Several times the Cuban people made unsuccessful attempts to throw off the Spanish yoke but failed, and their punishment was most severe. One Spanish General Martinez Campos, in answer to an order to enforce the demands of his government, reported in 1878 as follows: "There are but two alternatives—one is to grant these people their just rights and the other is extermination, and I refuse to be the instrument of the latter." He was relieved and the inhuman punishment continued.

A state of rebellion existed in Cuba for some time prior to 1896 and President William McKinley said in his message of 1897, with reference to Cuba:

"The existing conditions cannot but fill this Government and the American people with the gravest apprehension. There is no desire on the part of our people to profit by the misfortune of Spain. We have only the desire to see the Cubans prosperous and contented, enjoying that measure of self-control which is the inalienable right of man, protected in their right to reap the benefits of the exhaustless treasures of their country."

* * * * *

We have mostly forgotten the conditions of Cuba, for misery is soon forgotten. The intervention of the United States was preceded by personal investigations of men of the highest integrity. The great Senator Thurston, of Nebraska, accepted an invitation of a New York newspaper to go to Cuba, investigate and report. The Senator went, taking along his wife, who died there before their return. Upon his return he spoke in the Senate, in part, as follows:

"I am here by the command of silent lips to speak once and for all upon the Cuban situation. * * * God forbid that the bitterness of a personal loss should induce me to color in the slightest degree that statement that I feel it my duty to make. * * *

"Under the inhuman policy of General Weyler, not less than 400,000 self-supporting, simple, peaceable, defenseless country people were driven from their homes in the agricultural portions of the Spanish provinces to the cities and imprisoned upon the barren waste outside the residence portions of these cities and within the lines of intrenchments established a little way beyond. Their humble homes were burned, their fields laid waste, their implements of husbandry destroyed, their livestock and food supplies for the most part confiscated. * * * They were thus placed in hopeless imprisonment without food or shelter. * * * They were left there with nothing to depend upon except the scanty charity of the inhabitants of the cities and with slow starvation their inevitable fate. * * * Upwards of 210,000 of these people have already perished. * * * Such a spectacle exceeds the scenes of the Inferno as painted by Dante. There has been no amelioration of the situation except through the charity of the people of the United States. * * * Spain cannot put an end to the existing condition. * * *

"* * * I never saw, and, please God, I may never again see, so deplorable a sight as the reconcentradoz in the suburbs of Matanzas. I can never forget in my dying day the hopeless anguish in their despairing eyes. Huddled about their little bark huts, they raised no voice of appeal to us for alms as we went amongst them. * * * The reconcentradoz—men, women, and children—starved, silent, famishing with hunger. * * * In Mantanzas * * * there were 3,600 deaths in 3 months. In 1 day * * * 15 persons died in the public square in front of the executive mansion. * * * I shall refer to these horrible things no further. They are there. God pity me; I have seen them—they will remain in my mind forever."

That is the description of the conditions we faced as given by a great man.

BATTLESHIP "MAINE"

Our consular representative pointed out the advantages to flow from the visit of national ships to the Cuban waters, in accustoming the people to the presence of our flag in the fulfillment of the mission of protection to American interests, even though no immediate need therefor might exist.

Accordingly, on the 24th day of January 1898, with the consent and approval of the Spanish Minister, the United States battleship *Maine* was sent to Habana Harbor, arriving there on January 25, and anchored at buoy No. 4, in 6 fathoms of water. A valiant crew she had. * * * there on that fateful night, February 15, 1898, they dreamed of the firesides back home where America tenderly nurtured her future guardians. The god of dreams reigned supreme on board until Spanish treachery rent the ship asunder and sent 266 human souls to eternity. Fate decreed that sacrifice to the god of war that He, through His wrath, might restore 12 million souls to their natural state of freedom and human existence.

On April 9, 1898, Congress adopted a resolution that the people of the Island of Cuba are and of right ought to be free * * *. Spain deemed this a declaration of war and treated it as such. President McKinley called for volunteers and the American youth sprang from hill and vale * * *.

The motives that actuated our people in embarking upon a war for humanity were expressed in the proclamation of Gen. Nelson A. Miles to the people of Puerto Rico in language more eloquent than I could compose as follows:

HEADQUARTERS OF THE ARMY
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Ponce, Puerto Rico, July 28, 1898.

To the Inhabitants of Puerto Rico:

In the prosecution of the war against the kingdom of Spain by the people of the United States, in the cause of liberty, justice, and humanity, its military forces have come to occupy the island of Puerto Rico. They come bearing the banner of freedom, inspired by a noble purpose to seek the enemies of our country and yours, and to destroy and capture all who are in armed resistance. They bring you the fostering arm of a nation of free people, whose greatest power is in its justice and humanity to all those living within its fold. Hence the first effect of this occupation will be the immediate release from your former political relations, and it is hoped a cheerful acceptance of the Government of the United States.

The chief object of the American military forces will be to overthrow the armed authority of Spain and to give to the people of your beautiful island the largest measure of liberty consistent with this military occupation. We have not come to make war upon the people of a country that for centuries has been oppressed, but on the contrary to bring protection, not only to yourselves but to your property, to promote your prosperity and bestow upon you the immunities and blessings of the liberal institutions of our Government. It is not our purpose to interfere with any existing laws and customs that are wholesome and beneficial to your people, so long as they conform to the rules of military administration of law and justice.

This is not a war of devastation, but one to give to all within the control of its military and naval forces, the advantages and blessings of enlightened civilization.

NELSON A. MILES,
Major General, Commanding the United States Army.

MANY MIGHTY MEN

Mighty men came forth into the scenes of activities that have not received the credit due them. Beside that great soldier Gen. Nelson A. Miles, we find these dashing cavalry leaders, Gen. James A. Wilson, Gen. Jos. Wheeler, Gen. H. W. Lawton, Gen. Leonard Wood, General Chaffee, Gen. Arthur MacArthur, Gen. Elwell S. Otis, Gen. Fred Funston, Gen. Charles King, Gen. Lloyd Wheaton, Gen. John R. Brooke, Gen. Fitzhugh Lee, General Shafter, and others. And there were men of the sea with dauntless courage and ability, whose names shine with splendor from the dome of our national history. Adm. George Dewey, Adm. Winfield Schley, Admiral Sampson, Adm. Richard Hobson, Capt. R. Evans, Captain Sigbee, Captain Philip, and many others. The leadership of those men inspired us on in the performance of our duties and the dash and vigor of Dewey's men at Manila characterized every engagement, whether on land or on sea.

Our Navy emerged from an unknown quantity to a powerful fighting unit. Never was a fleet of battleships crowned with such complete victory as ours at Manila and Santiago Harbor. They fought their battles as gentlemen of the sea and after the victors took the victims, Admiral Cervera reported to his government as follows (referring to our Navy): "They were chivalrous and courteous; they clothed the naked, giving them everything they needed; they suppressed their shouts of joy in order not to increase the suffering of the defeated, and all vied in making our captivity as easy as possible."

After the naval battle at Santiago, Admiral Schley's report to Sampson says:

"I have never in my life served with a braver, better, or worthier crew than that of the *Brooklyn*. During the combat, lasting from 9:35 a. m., until 1:15 p. m., much of the time under fire, they never flagged for a moment, and were apparently undisturbed by the storm of projectiles passing ahead, astern, and over the ship. The result of the engagement was the destruction of the Spanish squadron and the capture of the admirals and some thirteen to fifteen hundred prisoners, with the loss of 600 men estimated by Admiral Cervera.

"The casualties on board the *Brooklyn* were: Chief Yeoman G. H. Ellis, killed; Fireman J. Burns, severely wounded. The marks and scars show that the ship was struck about 25 times, and she bears in all 41 scars as the result of her participation in the great victory of your force on July 3, 1898. The speed-cone halyards were shot away, and nearly all the signal halyards. The ensign at the main was so shattered, that in hauling it down at the close of the action it fell in pieces."

Admiral Cervera also said after the conflict:

"There could be no doubt as to the outcome, but I should never have believed that our ships would be destroyed so rapidly."

After, the destruction of his fleet, Cervera jumped into the water followed by his son and two seamen. He was picked up and placed aboard the U. S. S. *Gloucester*. This vessel had several hundred insurgents on board, several of them wounded. The rebels said to him if he would go with them they would assist him. He refused saying, "We have surrendered to the Americans." The proud old Spanish man of the sea maintained the traditions of his fighting sphere.

HERE IS THE RECORD

But, they say that the war with Spain was a picnic and that no particular hardships were endured. Were they? Let's read the record.

It started with the blowing of 266 human beings into eternity. * * * Then President McKinley called for volunteers and 300,000 American youths sprang to arms * * *.

Our men had no training and no equipment with which to protect themselves. In some instances they were drilled with sticks and in others antiquated single-shot black-powder Springfield rifles, in the subsequent use of which they exposed their location as an admirable target for the enemy. The Spaniards did take advantage of this with death-dealing instruments of warfare that were up to date, and, if their degree of patriotism to fight for their country with first-class equipment had been one-half as ardent as ours was with antiquated equipment, your Republic might have sustained some severe losses.

DEWEY AT MANILA

To read the report of the Battle of Manila by Admiral Dewey sounds like a fairy tale. * * *

As early as January 27, the chief of the Bureau of Navigation ordered Commodore Dewey, then at Yokohama, Japan, to retain until further orders the crew of the squadron whose terms of enlistment had expired and on the day of the blowing up of the *Maine* the Assistant Secretary of the Navy sent him the following telegram dispatch:

"Order the squadron, except the *Monacacy*, to Hong Kong. Keep full of coal. In the event of a declaration of war with Spain, your duty will be to see that the Spanish squadron does not leave the Asiatic coast, and then offensive operations in Philippine Islands. Keep *Olympic* until further orders."

Dewey lost no time and reports:

"MANILA, May 1.—The squadron arrived at Manila at daybreak this morning. Immediately engaged enemy and destroyed. *Reina Cristina, Castilla, Don Antonio de Ulloa, Don Juan, de Anstra, Isla de Luzon, Isla de Cuba, General Lezo, Marquez del Duero, El Correo, Velasco,* 10 capital ships and a transport. I shall destroy Cavite arsenal dispensatory. The squadron is uninjured. Few men slightly wounded. I request the department will send immediately from San Francisco fast steamer with ammunition."

On May 4 Dewey took possession of Cavite and destroyed its fortification and cut the cables to the mainland. He reports further:

"I was unable to obtain complete accounts of the enemy's killed and wounded, but their loss was very heavy. The *Reina Cristina* alone had 150 killed, including the captain, and 90 wounded. The damage done to the squadron under my command was inconsiderable. There were none killed, and only seven men in the squadron very slightly wounded. Several of the vessels were struck and even penetrated, but the damage was of the slightest, and the squadron was in as good condition as before the battle."

On the 3d and 4th of May Dewey took possession of the island arsenals, effected safe landing, was in complete control, and the Spanish squadron was no more. A busy 4 days for our comrades.

ON SEA AND LAND

When Schley engaged the Spanish fleet in a running fight until he plugged them 1 by 1 until scores of first-class battleships were either sunk or captured. * * *

The trip of the battleship *Oregon* from the Pacific around the horn of South America to Cuba to engage in battle was no frolic.

The charge at El Caney and San Juan Hill, and trench life around the swamps of Santiago was no picnic.

The force marches through the hills of Puerto Rico in uniforms fit only for the icy northland, and the complete victory in all engagements, was no game of pleasantries.

Seven hundred and seventy-eight engagements were successfully fought under the torrid heat of the Philippine sun and that required real men.

Listen to the tale of Company C of the 9th United States Infantry: After assisting in quelling the Boxer Uprising, it remained for duty in China for a year, later guarding Aguinaldo as a prisoner of war, and then sent into the mountains to subdue the savages who were burning towns and murdering civilians. They passed through a trackless jungle, cleft by immense mountain gorges, fording deep and rapid streams, through dense forests of the mountains where enemy spring traps and pitfalls with sharp-pointed stakes at the bottom, cunningly covered with earth and leaves, awaited the unwary as instruments of torture and death. They arrived at Balangiga, with 78 men, and were there brutally slaughtered by treacherous natives, leaving only 25 men alive.

And there were sacrifices in many places as tragic as all of these.

ABSENCE OF FOOD

The most inexcusable crime was the absence of food, medical supplies, and sanitary measures for the preservation of health. Embalmed beef that permanently impaired the health, fever for which no medical aid was available, and a medical corps that was a sham and a disgrace.

Sanitation and care of men was unknown or unheeded. After we captured Santiago, the whole army of invasion would have been wiped out in 2 more weeks by fever if the War Department had not finally yielded to the almost insubordinate demands of the officers that the force be taken away while any of the soldiers were still able to walk. We recall distinctly the death transports which brought back the fever-stricken troops. A little more resistance at Washington that the men remain uselessly in the malarial districts, and none of them would have returned.

HERE ARE THE FIGURES

Significant figures of the Spanish War are these:

Killed in action, and died of wounds	1,704
Died of disease	8,933
Total deaths	10,637

You will, therefore, see that approximately five times as many men were taken by disease than were killed in action, with no figures at hand to indicate how many died of disease after they returned home.

This is an indictment of men assigned to guard the health of our troops, men who long ago were convicted at the bar of public opinion, and whose punishment was fixed at eternal shame.

The Spanish War, taking Regulars as volunteers, which they were, was 100 percent volunteers. The Civil War had 62 percent volunteers and the World War 36 percent. It lasted from April 9, 1898, to July 2, 1902, with an average length of service per man of 14 months. The men engaged in our various wars were:

The Revolution	309,791
War of 1812	576,622
Mexican War	112,230
Civil War	2,778,304
Spanish War and Philippine Insurrection	459,474
World War	5,019,874

Americans in foreign service:
Civil War: Navy only.
Spanish-American War: 61 percent.

World War: 46 percent.

Ours was an army composed entirely of volunteers, the most patriotic and worst treated army ever assembled by the American Republic. No American troops were ever so completely deprived of what the Government could well afford to provide for them, but disgracefully permitted to drift into the coffers of private grafters who enriched themselves at our expense.

The achievements of our Army, notwithstanding the embarrassments of its limited equipment and transportation and the scandal of its corrupt food supply, were successful to a marked and unprecedented degree. * * * Not a single reverse of disaster occurred. Not a single soldier, gun, color, nor an inch of ground was captured by the enemy. Twelve million people were liberated from despotism and our victorious Nation became a world power. The war cost us $1,200,000,000, and we received in return property worth $8 billion. No war was ever so profitable to us in dollars, but none was ever conducted so inefficiently in the care of men's health. * * * The celerity and completeness of our work was the marvel of the nations of the world.

The youth of the South fought beside the youth of the North, and for the first time we destroyed every vestige of sectionalism and healed the wounds of the Civil War. The past was forgotten and by reason of that war we became a united people. No East, no West, no North, no South; one great, grand country, magnificent in motives; invincible in power.

How Your Town Can Avoid a Recession

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 1954

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article from the current issue of Collier's.

William L. Batt, Jr., the author of this article, served as special assistant to the United States Secretary of Labor from 1949 to 1953. He had charge of Operation Bootstrap, assisting several communities to combat local recessions along lines he recommends on these pages. Mr. Batt is now serving as executive secretary of Toledo, Ohio, Industrial Development Council.

HOW YOUR TOWN CAN AVOID A RECESSION

(By William L. Batt, Jr., with Ronald Schiller)

What is the economic outlook for your community? How secure is your job, your your business, your future? Is a local recession likely? With the United States in the midst of an economic readjustment, these questions confront the people of nearly every city and town in the country today. Barring a major national recession, the answers in your community may depend largely on you and our neighbors.

The fact is that local recessions—except for the few caused by flood, drought, or other natural catastrophes—are all manmade. And the mistakes that men have made men can correct.

Many once-blighted cities and towns across the Nation already have lifted themselves out of the economic mire. In each case the key to success has been decisive, forward-looking, cooperative action by the citizens themselves, not Federal or State aid.

Their inspiring stories—some of them are told later in this article—point the way out for scores of other communities in the throes of a local slump or threatened with one. There's no need for the people of any city or town to sit idly by in the belief that they're powerless in the hands of vast forces over which they have no control.

The need for urgent action in cities already classed as critical areas by the Department of Labor is apparent. But how about other communities—your community? What are the danger signs that warn a slump may be near?

On this page you will find a list of storm warnings. Probably the most sensitive and reliable barometer of all, however, is unemployment. It has a greater effect on a community than all other economic pressures put together because it represents the point at which individuals begin to suffer. Moreover, its effects are cumulative. For every 10 people laid off by a factory, eventually up to 10 more may lose their jobs in stores, laundries and other service industries. When one business closes its doors, another may fail—and so on. Soon you have a local recession.

For this reason, the Federal Government keeps its finger continually on the pulse of the Nation's unemployment. Every other month in the 200 largest labor market areas in the Nation and in smaller towns where unemployment is serious, local offices of the United States Employment Service and its State affiliates send their employment statistics to Washington. After analyzing the figures, the Labor Department classifies the communities into four groups.

Cities in group I are areas of labor shortage, where there are more jobs than there are workers to fill them. Group II are areas of balanced labor supply or full employment. Group III are areas of moderate labor surplus, where there are not quite enough jobs for workers seeking employment. Group IV are areas of substantial labor surplus, the so-called critical areas.

All the labor market areas that have been listed as critical areas at one time or another in the boom years since 1949 are shown on the map on these pages. There are more than 100. Some suffered only temporary recessions due to fluctuations within industries or materials shortages. Others—like the textile towns of New England and the coal centers of Pennsylvania, West Virginia, Kentucky, and Illinois—are chronically depressed areas where unemployment has been serious for years.

But whether the recessions were temporary or chronic, most of these distressed communities had one feature in common. They were one industry towns—places where more than one-third of the working force was employed by a single industry. The economic well-being of the community was completely tied to that one industry. When the industry prospered, the town prospered. When the industry faltered, the community found itself in a crisis because there were not enough other local industries to take up the employment slack.

A year ago, for example, the "Quad Cities" of Davenport, Iowa, and Moline, East Moline, and Rock Island, Ill.—devoted chiefly to the making of farm machinery—were among the most prosperous in America. But with last year's drought and the sudden decline of farm income purchases of farm equipment dropped sharply. Since then hundreds of jobless men have walked the streets of the Quad Cities.

Every one-industry city and town in the United States that values its economic security should prepare a vigorous community program designed to broaden and diversify its economic base. Such a program is the only sure way that prosperous towns can protect themselves against a future recession, that depressed communities can help themselves back to economic health.

The value of self-help programs is clearly shown by the success of the numerous one-industry communities which already have fought or are fighting their way back to economic security. We shall tell the stories of four—Herrin, Ill., which fell on hard times when the natural resource on which its economy depended began to run out; Altoona, Pa., whose main industry declined because of technological advances; Lowell, Mass., stranded when its main industry migrated South; and San Jose, Calif., alternately blessed with plenty and plagued by scarcity because it depended on a seasonal industry. One of these four cities may be solving the same problems that confront your own community.

If medals for courage are ever awarded to entire communities, one certainly should go to Herrin, in southern Illinois. A few years ago the economic situation of this city of nearly 10,000 looked hopeless. Herrin lies in the center of a population area of 200,000 people, all of whom had once lived prosperously on the work provided by 25 of the Nation's richest coal mines. But during the late twenties the mines began to run out of coal. One by one, they closed down until only six were left—working part time. Financial distress spread like a blight. At one time more than half the working population was on relief.

During World War II, the Government built a huge shell-loading plant on Crab Orchard Lake near Herrin, employing 6,000 people. It helped considerably. But it was a temporary relief; the plant was certain to close at the war's end. A feeling of impending disaster lay over the community.

In 1944 O. W. (Bill) Lyerla, head of the chamber of commerce, postmaster, and owner of the local radio station, called a meeting of Herrin's business, labor, and civic leaders. He put the situation to them bluntly.

"We can do one of two things after the war," he said. "We can watch Herrin become a ghost town, abandon our homes and businesses and move out—or we can start now, while things are still pretty good, to bring some new industries in and keep this town alive. Take your choice. But if you decide to do nothing, I'm moving out now. I've got more money than most of you and I can afford to retire."

The alarmed Herrinites decided to act. Under Lyerla's driving leadership, they formed the Herrin Community Council to work out an industrial program for the city. At the same time, they induced other communities to join them in setting up Southern Illinois, Inc., to develop a program for the region as a whole and make plans for bringing private industries into the Crab Orchard munitions plant when it was abandoned by the Government.

The problems these organizations faced seemed insuperable. First, the region had a plentiful supply of willing workers but nearly all were coal miners with no other skills. Second, Herrin's record of labor strife was shockingly bad. One strike in 1922 had resulted in the notorious "Herrin massacre," during which 26 men had been killed. Finally, there was no money available to finance the program. The local bank could not undertake it, and when a delegation of businessmen went to St. Louis to see what could be done, the bankers there turned them down flat. "An unproved industrial area," was the polite answer most bankers gave them. But, as one banker confessed later, their private opinion was: "Invest my bank's money in 'bloody Herrin'? I'd have to be crazy."

The men of Herrin accepted the challenge. With the cooperation of the Southern Illinois University in nearby Carbondale, they set out to train workers in new industrial skills. Some 1,500 ex-miners and their wives attended classes in a dozen communities. They learned to operate everything from office equipment to heavy lathes. Then, as each new industry moved into the area trained workers would be ready to take their places at the machines.

Next, labor leaders got together and agreed among themselves to end unwarranted strikes. Disagreements with employers and interunion squabbles would be settled around the conference table rather than on the streets. Since then Herrin's record of work stoppages has been far below the national average. The leader of one local who violated the agreement by calling a wildcat strike was ousted from office by his union superiors.

ALL BUSINESS STOPPED ON DESTINY DAY

The problem of money was settled on Herrin's "destiny day"—September 25, 1944. By proclamation of the mayor, every business, school, office, and gas station in the city was closed—even funerals were postponed. The citizens flocked to Marlow's Theater, the city's biggest, to hear Lyerla outline the program that might save Herrin—and how much it would cost. He told 2,000 men, women, and children jammed inside the auditorium and an overflow crowd gathered around loudspeakers outside that $100,000 would be needed for advertising, promotion, and the purchase of plant sites for industries that might move to Herrin. The fund would be administered by 5 businessmen and 10 labor leaders.

Next day teams canvassed the city for the destiny fund, ringing every doorbell. Widows with no income other than State relief contributed 50 cents; laborers earning $20 a week put in $5. The owners of the biggest retail stores were asked for $5,000 each.

"It was a tough decision for some of us to make," recalls Clyde Brewster, the local Ford dealer who took over the reins of the chamber of commerce after Lyerla's health later gave way. "The little money we'd made during the war we were putting aside as a stake to help us get started elsewhere when the collapse came. But when Lyerla asked for it you couldn't refuse. He was Moses leading us to the promised land."

With the money raised, the Herrin program went into high gear. Soon the first big industry was landed—a large washing-machine factory built in 1946 by the Norge division of the Borg-Warner Corp., of Chicago, on two square blocks of land donated by the community council. The factory now employs 600 people.

About the same time Smoler Bros., Inc., a Chicago dress-manufacturing concern, took over a $200,000 factory built with money lent by the citizens of Herrin. The loan was to have been paid back over 15 years, but the company was so successful that it paid off the notes in 6. The plant employs 300 women.

In 1950 the International Staple & Machine Co., Inc., a Pennsylvania manufacturer of industrial staples, moved into another plant built with $160,000 loaned by the people of Herrin. It employs 125 men. Eighteen more new industries—making sectional homes, electric equipment, plastic products, stencil machines, fertilizers, coffins, and a variety of other products—moved into the abandoned Crab Orchard munitions plant.

Altogether these new industries pump $12,000,000 a year in wages into the region's economic bloodstream.

The industries did not come to Herrin without persuasion. Herrin's business leaders traveled to New York and Philadelphia at their own expense to follow up every lead, and in 1952 they landed their biggest prize of all—after it almost got away.

Allen Industries, Inc., a Detroit manufacturer of automobile upholstery and floor mats, was looking for a new plant. Herrin men had visited the company repeatedly to plead their case, but made scant progress. One morning they learned that the company had just about decided against Herrin in favor of a southern city; in fact, the directors were already on a train headed south. Refusing to accept defeat, a task force of Herrin businessmen, headed by Clyde Brewster, piled into a car, sped north and boarded the train. They spent 3 hours in the directors' compartment, presenting facts and figures until the Allen people promised not to make a final decision until they visited Herrin to look over a factory site. The directors came, liked what they saw, and agreed to build in Herrin—provided $1,200,000 was made available to erect the factory.

It was at this point that the project almost foundered again. The most that the people of Herrin could raise toward the Allen factory was $400,000; they had already given $500,000 for earlier projects. Labor unions and fraternal organizations like the Elks and Eagles had drained their treasuries. Individuals had nearly exhausted their savings.

But at the crucial moment a letter arrived at the chamber of commerce from the Prudential Insurance Co., one of the largest in the world. The Prudential offered to make up the remaining sum—and promptly came through with an $800,000 loan.

"It was a welcome surprise," Brewster says. "It meant more than that our financial worries were largely over. It was a graduation diploma that told us we had proved ourselves as an industrial area."

The Allen factory was built at a total cost of $1,350,000. It now employs more than 500 workers and eventually may employ 2,000.

Despite the progress made, unemployment has not ended in Herrin. But the industrial-expansion program is only half completed. The community council hopes to bring two more new industries to the neighborhood before the end of the year and looks confidently toward the day when chronic unemployment will end for good.

HOW ALTOONA FACED ITS CRISIS

In Altoona, Pa., the problem was different. Altoona, a heavily industrialized city of 77,000, was the site of the largest steam-locomotive building and repair shops in the world, employing 15,000 people. So long as steam powered America's railroads, Altoona seemed safe. But after World War II diesel engines began to replace steam in the East, and employment in the shops took a dizzy slide downward.

Refusing to panic, Altoona's business and community leaders met the crisis head on. The chamber of commerce formed a nonprofit corporation, known as Altoona Enterprices, Inc., to develop a program for expanding and diversifying the city's industries. The corporation hired a large Philadelphia engineering firm and teams of graduate economics and engineering students from nearby Pennsylvania State University to survey the city's economic assets and liabilities—its labor skills, power, gas and water supply, transportation, and industrial sites. "By the time they were finished there wasn't a question we couldn't answer about our industrial potentialities," says Chamber of Commerce Secretary Stanley Ruth. "Those reports became our bible."

Simultaneously Altoona Enterprises launched a campaign to raise $1 million for promotion, advertising, purchase of industrial sites, and loans for new industries interested in coming to Altoona. Every business establishment in town—2,000 in all—was assessed sums ranging from $60 for barber shops and shoemakers to $5,000 for the largest enterprises, to be paid over 5 years. The money was solicited as insurance. "You buy insurance to protect yourself against fire and theft," they were told. "Well, this is an insurance policy to protect your business against recession." The Altoona industrial payroll insurance plan, as it is called, is administered by an elected committee of 100.

The program began to pay off almost immediately. First new industry attracted was a branch of the National Radiator Co., of Johnstown, Pa. It was followed by a ball-bearing plant, a shoe factory, an automobile-parts plant, a chair plant, and several others. Together they provide jobs for 1,200 people, with an annual payroll of nearly $5 million. Some of these companies were attracted by newspaper advertising, others by mailed brochures. And, as in Herrin, every businessman was a volunteer scout. The chair factory is in Altoona only because an out-of-town salesman happened to remark to a local furniture dealer that his company was thinking of expanding.

"The most important discovery we made is that when industries decide to open up new plants they want to move fast. It costs them money to wait," says Mike Devorris, an official of the local electric company. "When they asked complicated technical questions, we didn't have to stall them off while we made an investigation. We already had the answers. They didn't have to waste time negotiating for a loan. We had the money waiting for them."

Sometimes even these attractions weren't enough. Sylvania Electric Products, Inc., an electronic tube firm which already had one factory in Altoona, received an urgent Government order and wanted to open a second plant. But no building was available.

The solution provided an excellent example of the group cooperation and the individual self-sacrifice that mark most community recession-fighting programs. Raymond R. (Babe) Long, the owner of the local interurban bus company, had just built a new garage. He agreed to move out, even though it meant that he had to park his busses in an open field until he could build another garage. Today his former garage is a factory employing 400 people.

Altoona is not yet out of the woods, but its citizens can see daylight ahead. New industries are taking up the slack as the railroad shops continue to lay off help, and the pattern for future economic security has been set.

WHEN LOWELL'S TEXTILES MIGRATED

Lowell, Mass., also discovered the importance of being prepared to receive new industries. This city, with a population of more than 100,000, was once the country's leading cotton textile manufacturing center. But in the 1920's the textile mills began to migrate to the South, where labor was cheaper. Economic decay set in. Lowell became one of the worst-blighted areas in the United States. It was left with a versatile, well-trained labor force, plenty of power and water, heavy unemployment, and miles of venerable multistoried red-brick mill buildings, some dating back to before the Civil War. Like most other New England textile towns, Lowell tried spasmodically to bring new industrial tenants into the old buildings, but the effort was not very successful.

In 1951 the Massachusetts State Legislature passed a bill empowering the Lowell city government to set up a municipally supported, 11-member industrial council to work out a comprehensive plan to improve the city's economy. As executive director, the council hired a top legal and industrial expert, Earl F. Cook, who immediately began preaching the heretical doctrine that old buildings were the curse of New England.

"A building is a machine like any other used in production," he said. "New England has few important raw materials, and because of its geographic position it cannot compete with other parts of the country in transportation costs. We must concentrate, therefore, on light industries producing goods low in weight and high in value—like plastics, light metals and especially electronics. Then, by adding skilled labor, we can convert a dollar's worth of material into, say, a magnetron tube worth $500. Such industries cannot operate efficiently in old cotton mills. Their assembly lines need modern, one-story plants and ideal working conditions and spacious parking areas. We must build new factories or die."

"Build or die" became Lowell's motto. An organization called the New Industrial Plants Foundation (NIP for short) was established and financed by 25 businessmen, each of whom invested $5,000. NIP acquired from the city at nominal cost at 110-acre tract at the intersection of two arterial highways and bisected by a railroad. Christened Lowell Industrial Park, it is large enough to accommodate nine big one-story plants and has ample parking facilities and wide landscaped lawns.

Then, with no tenant in sight and no assurance that it would ever be occupied, the new foundation began erecting a 42,000-square-foot ultramodern plant suitable for a variety of light industries. Before the building was completed, it was bought and fully paid for by Columbia Broadcasting System, Inc., for its Hytron Radio & Electronic Co. The plant, which makes transistors, eventually will employ 1,000 people. The investors got their money back plus interest, and began construction of a second building. Although it is only half finished, negotiations are nearing completion for its sale to a manufacturer in the light metals field. "We plan to have a new factory under construction at all times," says Cook.

Lowell is about a quarter through its recovery program. Much remains to be done, but the citizens are confident they have found the key to a prosperous, stable future.

The headache that beset San Jose, Calif., was seasonal unemployment. The city lies in the center of the beautiful Santa Clara Valley, where more prunes are grown than in any other region on earth. "We lived in a prune economy," recalls Kenneth Conn, executive editor of the San Jose Mercury and the News. "During the summer months when the fruit was harvested, every man, woman, and child able to work was employed in the local packing plants. In the winter, there wasn't a job to be had. And when the price of prunes dropped a cent tears flowed down the streets."

After World War II, San Jose businessmen decided something had to be done to create more jobs. Veterans were returning. People were moving into the State in unprecedented numbers. The area's population was increasing at a rate of 15,000 a year.

The chamber of commerce established an industrial department with an annual budget of $60,000 to advertise the industrial advantages of the valley. It was good advertising, and many prospects were attracted, but inexperienced San Jose wasn't ready for them.

"It was ridiculous," recalls Pete Pasetta, a local builder. "We'd drive the president of some big company to a likely looking site. When he asked the price of it, we didn't know. When he inquired about sewers, we said we'd talk to city hall. When he wanted to know about sidings, we told him we'd take it up with the railroad. He'd get disgusted and go someplace else where they knew the score."

BROCCOLI FARM PUT TO GOOD USE

Finally Pete decided to take matters in his own hands. He bought a nearby 120-acre broccoli farm, persuaded the city to extend water pipes and sewage lines to it, and ran railroad tracks through the broccoli at his own expense. It was a completely prepared industrial site. The first prospect Pete led out to the farm bought a section of it immediately. In a few months, every acre had been sold, so Pete bought two other farms totaling 300 acres.

Today almost 50 industries stand on the three farms. They employ 3,000 people, pump $15 million in payrolls into Santa Clara Valley's economy every year, and pay $400,000 in annual taxes compared with $1,000 formerly paid by the farmers on the identical land. On a nearby tract, the Ford Motor Co. last year started construction of a $100 million plant that will employ 4,000 to 5,500 people when completed.

The valley's economic problems have largely been solved, and San Jose no longer is listed by the Labor Department as a critical area.

The experiences of these four cities are not unique. Many other once-depressed communities in the United States have done as well or better, but space does not permit a description of their achievements. Any city in America, either threatened by or in the throes of a serious unemployment problem, can help itself as these cities have. The economic future of every community lies in the hands of its citizens.

WATCH FOR THESE DANGER SIGNALS IN YOUR COMMUNITY

If the answer to any 2 of these 8 questions is "yes," your community may be headed toward an economic recession. For what to do about it, see page 50.

1. Are layoffs and unemployment insurance claims increasing? Are hours of work being cut down?

2. Does unemployment total 5 percent or more of the labor force? Is it increasing?

3. Do most of your high-school and college graduates have to leave town to find work?

4. Are older people, women and minority groups finding home-town jobs almost impossible to locate?

5. Are retail sales dropping, store failures increasing?

6. Is yours a one-industry town? If so, is it a static or declining industry? Is the employment highly seasonal in character?

7. Is your town highly dependent on defense production? Would it be in trouble if there was a large cut in our national defense budget?

8. Are local manufacturers placing new plants outside your town? Are your plants becoming high-cost, marginal units, vulnerable to shutdown when business slackens?

HOW TO FIGHT A LOCAL RECESSION

1. Organize business, labor, and civic leaders of your community into a single working organization dedicated to fighting unemployment through economic development and diversification. Mobilize the community behind the organization.

2. Find effective, hard-driving leaders who know how to work with others. If no suitable local volunteers are available, hire an effective industrial-development expert from the outside.

3. Make a complete survey of the community to determine the reasons for unemployment and what new industries are best suited for your needs. Analyze the liabilities and take steps to correct them. Prepare precise information about the local labor force, transportation, utilities, industrial sites, educational and recreational facilities, and even the chemical content of your soil and water. Your local college or university may help, or a private firm of experts can be hired.

4. Make sure your community presents an attractive appearance. Towns have lost big industries when plant managers told their employers: "I'd resign before bringing my family to live in a place with such shabby streets and dilapidated schools."

5. Solicit contributions from local businesses, organizations, and individuals for promotion and for capital to build new factories where private builders and banks cannot or will not finance them.

6. Begin a professionally directed promotion and publicity campaign. Advertise in newspapers and magazines, mail out literature, interview industrial leaders. Follow up any lead on a new plant until you get a definite decision on its location.

7. Develop a spirit of enterprise, even if it means building a new factory before there is a tenant for it. With vast new industries like electronics, plastics, and atomic energy mushrooming and the population of the country growing by the millions every year, industrial expansion is inevitable.

8. Stabilize labor-management relations. Most manufacturers investigate the industrial relations of a community before they consent even to visit it. But even communities with a bad labor history have discovered that by obtaining the cooperation of local unions they can build a fine reputation for industrial peace.

9. Don't overlook the possibilities of expanding industries already in your community. There may be diamonds lying around your own backyard.

10. Find our what help is available from the State and Federal Governments. Several States have set up bureaus to aid communities seeking new industries. They cooperate in research, publish brochures and, especially in New England, even provide financial assistance through privately financed, publicly authorized development credit corporations. The Federal Government has an avowed policy (Defense Manpower Policy No. 4, in operation since March 1952) of placing contracts in areas of heaviest unemployment where possible. It also has given special tax-amortization privileges to defense plants which locate in these areas of chronic unemployment.

THEY ARE HELPING THEMSELVES

Many communities now or formerly classed by the Labor Department as critical unemployment areas have begun industrial-development programs along the lines suggested in Mr. Batt's article. Among those whose programs have proved outstanding are the following:

Altoona, Pa.; Cheboygan, Mich.; Danielson, Conn.; Fall River, Mass.; Grand Rapids, Mich.; Hazelton, Pa.; Herrin, Ill.; Iron Mountain, Mich.; Joplin, Mo.; Lawrence, Mass.; Lowell, Mass.; Manchester, N. H.; Muskegon, Mich.; Nashua, N. H.; New Bedford, Mass.; Pottsville, Pa.; San Diego, Calif.; San Jose, Calif.; Scranton, Pa.; Taunton, Mass.; Terre Haute, Ind.; Toledo, Ohio; Uniontown, Pa.; Utica, N. Y.; Wilkes-Barre, Pa.; Worcester, Mass.

A number of other cities and towns whose unemployment problem is not acute also have launched development programs. They include: Calvert City, Ky.; Dallas, Tex.; Evansville, Ill.; Fresno, Calif.; Louisville, Ky.; Morenci, Mich.; Oklahoma City, Okla.; Portland, Maine; South Bend, Ind.; Springfield, Ohio; Stockton, Calif.; York, Pa.

The Chemical Industry and the Tariff

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 28, 1954

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I herewith include an article entitled "The Chemical Industry and the Tariff," which appeared in the February 1954 issue of Monsanto magazine, published by Monsanto Chemical Co., St. Louis, Mo.:

THE CHEMICAL INDUSTRY AND THE TARIFF

To most Americans, foreign trade is a mystery. Such terms as balance of payments, rates of exchange, imports and exports, grate strangely on their ears. Those are things talked about in college classrooms.

But let the word "tariffs" slip into the conversation, and the American has an immediate, conditioned response, as if a thorn were in his conscience. Nine times out of ten, he's against them. "They protect big business." "They subsidize inefficient industry." And they keep him from having all sorts of inexpensive, exotic things from other parts of the world, or so he thinks.

His conscience is troubled by a belief that United States tariffs are among the highest in the world and, as such, are hindering the world's recovery.

That he feels this way should come as no surprise; it's what he has been told for more than 20 years. That his attitude does not square with the facts has gone largely unnoticed.

In the next few weeks Congress may decide what United States tariff policy will be for some time to come. That policy will have a bearing on the well-being not only of world trade, but of American industry, agriculture, and labor as well. For these reasons, there is need for a calm look at the facts, cold and statistical though they may be.

It is true; the United States has been a high tariff country. In the early 1930's our tariffs were among the highest in the world; we applied them to almost everything other countries sought to sell us. Our tariff rates averaged 50 percent of the value of all goods imported.

But in the 1930's and the two decades following, our policy was completely reversed. The United States steadily reduced its tariffs. We made it easier for the rest of the world to sell us its goods until, today, 60 percent of all our imports come in duty free. And of the 40 percent on which tariffs are collected, the rate averages only 12 percent of value. The average rate on all imports is only 5 percent.

As a result, our imports have been increasing. Last year the United States imported $11 billion worth of goods from abroad, more than four times as much as the 1936–40 average.

These are hardly the statistics one would expect of a nation that is supposed to have erected high tariff walls to protect its "selfish interests." Popular notions to the contrary, the United States is more nearly a free-trade nation than any other leading country in the world today. The fact of the United States high tariff policy in the 1930's has become the myth of the 1950's.

Even the 17-man Commission on Foreign Economic Policy, appointed by President Eisenhower, and whose membership included many free-trade advocates, has admitted grudgingly: "It seems clear by any test that can be devised that the United States is no longer among the higher tariff countries of the world."

The fact is that the United States is today the easiest market for the rest of the world's goods. Here foreign businessmen can sell with a minimum of redtape, without haggling with Government officials over prices, licenses, and foreign exchange. Here they are paid directly by the buyer and can take home their dollars, readily convertible into any other currency in the world, with no questions asked by Washington.

Not so when they trade with other countries. An Englishman who wants to import something from the United States or any other country must first secure a license from his Government. Licenses are not easy to come by and are limited to the imports considered essential by the British Government. Similarly, when he wants to sell something abroad, the Englishman must go to his Government for an export license.

British imports and exports are completely dominated by Government. The importer or exporter may be told which countries he may deal with, the amounts he may buy or sell, and, in many instances, the price he will be expected to get.

These barriers to British trade have a counterpart in almost every country in the world. Before manufactured goods made in Italy can be purchased by people in Argentina, for example, they must pass over both hurdles—first the export hurdle imposed by Italy and then the import hurdle imposed by Argentina.

What this means as a practical matter was described recently by a British manufacturer selling high-fidelity radio and TV equipment throughout the world.[1] After experiencing success in selling the United States market, he was asked by some of his colleagues in British industry, "What about import duties?"

"I replied that as British wages were lower than American, it didn't seem to matter. In my case, the rate was 13¾ percent, whereas the British preferential rate into Canada was 15 percent and then a manufacturer's tax was applied not only to the cost of the article but to the import duty as well. From experience of what it costs to ship my speakers to the United States, and after allowing for import duties, the price was fixed at $57.50. Equivalent prices in other countries varied according to the import duties and local taxes applied to the product. Typical figures were: Great Britain, $58.50; Canada, $62.50; South Africa, $67.20; Switzerland, $69; Australia and New Zealand, well over $70; when it was possible to get an import license, which wasn't often."

A study published recently by the Guaranty Trust Co. of New York[2] shows that practically every country licenses imports, exports, or both; that nearly every country has restrictions on how imports shall be paid for; that many countries impose quotas on the amounts of a product they will import from specified countries, or on the total amount of goods they will buy from a country.

The United States is an anachronism in world trade. While it seeks to lead the world back to 19th century doctrines of free trade, every other country is pushing on toward 20th century collectivism and control and channelizing of trade. All that we've done to encourage greater freedom of trade—by giving economic aid and reducing our own tariffs—has gone largely unheeded. While we've sought to lead the rest of the world toward freer trade by our example, other nations have pursued a course among themselves of you scratch my back and I'll scratch yours.

Nations no longer buy and sell for cash. Instead, they swap their goods with one another. And when countries swap instead of buy and sell, tariffs high or low are meaningless.

For the most part, swap agreements have been kept quiet—no country wants to tell its neighbors how good or bad a deal it got. At least 100 such agreements exist in Europe today, exclusive of Great Britain, which has swap deals with a group of nations that reads like a roster of the U. N.

Swap agreements work like this:

Says Holland to Denmark: "We have 5,000 tons of copra and tulip bulbs that you would like. You have 10,000 head of cattle we would like. Let's swap."

And so His Excellency the Minister of Finance and His Majesty's Secretary for Economic Affairs get together and work out terms. Only goods—no money—change hands. Next week the Dutch and the Danes may be working out a different kind of deal with other countries.

How come? Why don't they trade with money, as in the past? The answer is that most of the world's moneys—except the United States dollar and the Swiss franc—have ceased to have a definite meaning. Nobody knows what they are worth; in some cases they're all but worthless.

An exporter paid in French francs may find he has lost half the value of the goods he sold when he tries to use those francs to pay for what he buys in Britain.

So, most countries have laid aside the currency facade. They get right down to the business of barter and swap by deciding how many lamb chops are worth a bushel of wheat.[3]

In the United States we take many things for granted. We know that our money is acceptable anywhere in the world in payment for things we buy. We do not have to go to the nearest Federal Reserve bank for a license that permits us to convert our money into that of a country from which we import. No such freedom exists elsewhere in the world.

Is it any wonder, then, that United States foreign economic policy, 1945–53, is called "a $40-billion disappointment"?[4]

We've poured that amount of money into the rest of the world in 9 years to get it back on its feet, to stabilize its moneys and make them freely convertible, and to make other countries better able to ward off communism. We granted tariff concessions all during the 1930's and 1940's with a view toward freeing trade and bettering the world economically.

Before the war we did this by means of reciprocal trade agreements. Unfortunately, the term is misleading—there was very little that was reciprocal about them. All these agreements included "most-favored nations" clauses, which meant that tariff reductions granted to one nation automatically applied to all others.

Since World War II we granted the rest of the world substantial tariff reductions at conferences in Geneva in 1947, at Annecy in 1949, and again at Torquay in 1951.

It might be useful to look at the Torquay Conference for a moment. Some 30 nations met at that city in England 3 years ago and for 8 months discussed tariff reduction. In the end, the United States, which already had relatively low tariffs, agreed to cut its rates from 25 to 50 percent on a tenth of all the goods on which it charged import duties. In return, the United States got tariff cuts from other countries on less than a twentieth of all United States exports—most of them trivial items.

As if to compound the paradox, 16 countries meeting at the conference announced tariff increases. France, for example, raised tariffs on 38 types of goods.

To understand what happens at a trade conference like this, one must know something of the people and the attitudes involved. The United States is always represented by the Department of State. None of its personnel is particularly knowledgeable or interested in the products on which they seek and grant concessions; they're in the business of making friends. No American businessman is permitted at the conference and even if one does stray past, no State Department representative would be caught speaking to him.

Not even the Department of Commerce or the Federal Trade Commission, both of which are infinitely closer to the technical details of United States industry, attend these conferences.

Not so with the other countries. They are represented by topflight businessmen, with a reserve of first-hand knowledge of the industries for which they grant and receive concessions.

---

[1] How I Sell to America, by H. A. Hartley, Harper's magazine, p. 67, February 1954.

[2] Annual Summary of Foreign Exchange Restrictions, published by Guaranty Trust Co. of New York, January 1954.

[3] The Wall Street Journal, November 22, 1947.

[4] Currency Convertibility—Now, by Michael A. Heilperin. Fortune, pp. 106–107, September 1953.

All too often American negotiators have been prone to grant such concessions as a 10 percent reduction of our tariffs on cotton denims in exchange for a 5-percent reduction of another country's tariffs on Cadillacs. Moneywise, the two may add up to the same amount, but in terms of their effect they are very different. A small percentage cut in the duty on a Cadillac is virtually meaningless (especially when given by a country that won't issue import licenses), but a 10-percent cut in the duty on cotton denim makes a whale of a difference.

The latest proposal with respect to our trade is in keeping with the practices of the past 20 years. It would have us continue by our example a policy of trying to lead the world toward free trade.

President Eisenhower's Commission on Foreign Economic Policy has recommended a further lowering of United States tariffs by 5 percent in each of the next 3 years.

The Commission is concerned over a $5 billion gap in United States trade-aid—that our exports and aid, taken together, exceed our imports by the stated amount. The Commission should have studied the matter more closely, for when military aid is taken out of the picture, the gap is reversed. In 1953, United States commercial imports of goods and services exceeded United States exports of goods and services, including economic aid items, by a significant amount. Figures available at this writing show that in the first 9 months of 1953, imports came to $12,631 million while exports of goods and services, including economic aid items (but excluding military aid), came to $12,586 million. All indications are that this new, reversed gap will continue to widen against the United States.

Military aid to the rest of the world is a matter of public policy and as such is paid for by taxes. Evidently the Commission wants to further reduce tariffs to encourage imports and thus pay for at least a part of our military aid. This would, in effect, neatly transfer the burden of public policy from the public to a few businesses and individuals. It would be asking a minority to pay for what the majority wants done.

Certainly the burden of paying for our military aid to other countries should not be put upon industries and their employees which already are feeling the pressure of too much foreign competition.

Nor should it be represented to the American people that a further reduction in tariff rates will solve the world's shortage of dollars. At best, if all recommendations of the Commission on Foreign Economic Policy were adopted, the dollar gap might be reduced by a billion dollars.[5] Even if we were to wipe out all present tariffs, imports would not increase to a point where they would eliminate the present gap. The solution to the dollar shortage problem simply does not lie in reduced tariffs.[6]

The Commission's report shows a surprising lack of hard, factual data—either by report or allusion. Has it, too, worked backward from doctrine, slicing facts to support opinion, rather than working forward from facts to find opinion?

This is something Congress might well delve into at some length when it takes up the Commission's recommendations.

The Commission's proposals are all the more startling because they do not recommend that other countries be required to lower their tariffs as the price of further tariff concessions from us. In other words, the United States should reduce its tariffs as at Torquay and get nothing in return. Not only is this poor bargaining that loses us the respect of the rest of the world, but it leaves the United States with that much less to bargain with in claiming better trade concessions at some future date.

But why tariffs at all? What of it, if the rest of the world erects tariff barriers to trade? Why not let other nations regulate, control, and contrive as they will?

Do we have to have tariffs merely because other countries do? Why not let down the bars (they're all but down anyway) and invite in foreign competition? The United States is the most productive country in the world—its leadership is acknowledged in this sphere. If others can produce more cheaply than we, then let them sell to us.

This argument, heard so often, is invalid on two counts—and the chemical industry is a good illustration of both.

One is the matter of national defense.

The other is a question of whether or not we should allow United States jobs and investments to be wiped out by cheaper labor and capital from abroad.

It is a simple, incontrovertible truth that no war can be fought without a healthy chemical industry. Not only do chemicals enter into almost every facet of a wartime economy (or a peacetime economy, for that matter), but the industry as a whole has shown itself to be the one best answer to the cutting off of supplies from foreign lands.

This is neither theory nor doctrine; it is the lesson of two world wars.

In World War I, German dyestuffs and other chemicals were cut off from the United States. It was only because the American organic chemicals industry was able to fill the breach that we had necessary dyestuffs and pharmaceuticals.[7]

In World War II, it was the chemical industry that produced the styrene and butadine from which synthetic rubber was made. The organic chemicals industry helped increase the production of wonder drugs that made such outstanding contributions to reducing infection from wounds and saved thousands of lives.

During World War II, American TNT and picric acid plants were built and manned by the United States chemical industry. The United States Army Chemical Corps alone during the war purchased a billion pounds of 300 different chemicals, exclusive of those in the heavy tonnage or explosives field.

---

[5] Seymour E. Harris, professor of economics, Harvard University, in a letter published in the New York Times, January 31, 1954.

[6] By and large, discussion of the dollar gap is pretty academic. As we've already seen, the gap has been reversed with rising foreign industrial productivity. With more of its internal shortages met, the rest of the world is turning more of its production to export. At the same time, it is producing more of the types of goods wanted by other nations, including the United States. In the first 9 months of 1953, the United States purchased $12,631 million in goods and services from abroad. In the same 9 months, we exported (exclusive of military items, but including goods purchased with ECA funds) $12,586 million.

This gave us an excess of imports. Add to this direct investments, private remittances and other capital flowing out of the United States and amounting to $1,048 million, exclusive of ECA and other foreign aid payments, and one sees that the United States once again is a debtor country—with present tariffs. Further evidence of this can be seen in the flow of gold out of the United States in the past year. Today, foreign holdings of gold are at an alltime high—$22 billion plus. Foreign gold and dollar balances increased by $1.2 billion in the first 6 months of last year, despite the fact that foreign nations paid off $600 million in debt during this same period.

In the first 6 months of 1953, Britain had a surplus of dollar receipts from transactions with the United States, exclusive of economic aid, of $400 million. The entire sterling area had a favorable trade balance with the United States, exclusive of economic aid. During the same period, South America also had a favorable trade balance with the United States.

The only principal nations in the Western Hemisphere which had unfavorable trade balances with the United States were Canada, Mexico, and Venezuela. This was caused by capital investment by United States industry. American companies are establishing branch factories in Mexico; heavy investments are being made in Venezuela to mine iron ore; large sums are going into Canadian oil and iron ore.

[7] After World War I, these new chemical enterprises literally had to fight for their lives against the old, established German chemical cartel. It was at this time that America's then most distinguished economist, Prof. F. W. Taussig of Harvard University, vigorously opposed the tariff protection the industry required. Taussig was a classical economist in the 19th century tradition; he had been chairman of Woodrow Wilson's Tariff Commission. His argument:

"Regarded from the strictly economic point of view the chemical industry does not seem to be adapted to American ways. In our technical parlance, it lacks a comparative advantage. Its processes are painfully detailed and elaborate, in which highly trained and highly paid labor is applied slowly and carefully to a variety of products. Each one of these products is turned out in small amounts; a possible exception is synthetic indigo, of which there is something like mass production. In the main it is adapted to the German industrial ways and traditions: exact applied science; patient experimenting; a technical staff and its trained technical assistants, to be had at comparatively low salaries and wages; large-scale operations but not mass production. Some bad things have been said of the tricks of the German dyestuffs producers and merchants, and of the unscrupulousness of their competition. Apparently much of this was true, but hardly more true than of the same industry elsewhere; the business seems to lend itself to the worst features of the competitive system. The United States had not failed before the war to develop some chemical industries without high protection, but these were of a different type from the higher grades of coal-tar products. Here as in other directions the successful American industries are those turning out great quantities of a single product by large-scale methods. My impression is that not lack of aptitude for chemical industries as such, not great scarcity of trained chemists or lack of ability on their part, but the character of the dyestuffs part of the industry mainly explains the prewar situation. As a matter of the international division of labor, the people of the United States probably would do well to turn to other things in which they work to better advantage, and get their dyestuffs from Germany. And—to go on with the purely economic aspects of the case—the war stoppage of supply raises the old question whether it is worthwhile to restrict the advantages of the international division of labor because of a possibility of its sudden disruption."

In spite of Taussig, a Republican Congress protected the industry. That which Taussig thought "adapted to the German industrial ways and traditions" has been proved to be adaptable to American as well. It has been proved that "exact applied science and patient experimenting" can be just as American as German.

Magnesium and rocket propellants were chemical products, as were the specialized plastics essential to the electronics industry. So were antifouling paints that made it possible for ships to stay a year at sea without drydocking. Organic chemicals, too, made possible degaussing cables, plywood and self-sealing gasoline tanks for our fighters.

Organic chemicals made their contribution to this country's food production, too. DDT helped control infestations of the European corn borer and other insect pests that reduced the output of farm acreage and livestock. 2,4–D helped control weeds, which threatened to compete with field crops when farmers were left short-handed by the war.

And when the time came to translate atomic theory into the A-bomb, duPont, Union Carbide, Eastman Kodak's Chemical Division and Monsanto were called in to do the job.

The list is all but endless. Whatever you pick up in a quartermaster depot—paper, rubber, medicines, metal, or fabric—it has been processed by the use of chemicals.

This is not the sort of production we can lose to other countries. It is too essential to our defense in a world taut with international tensions. Yet, we can lose it if tariffs are to be lowered further.

Already, postwar tariff conferences, at which the Department of State gave so much to gain so very little, have cut tariffs on most synthetic organic chemicals by 50 percent. Some of the products suffered two 50 percent cuts, bringing the prevailing tariff on them down to 25 percent of what it was 20 years ago.

Depreciation of the dollar has compounded the injury to many organic chemicals on which two kinds of duties are applied—ad valorem, according to the value of the product, and specific rates at so much per pound. When present specific rates were set up, in 1930, the dollar was worth twice what it is today and so a 1930 specific rate of 3½ cents per pound would have to be raised to 7 cents to be as effective in 1954 as it was in 1930.

Is it any wonder that the organic chemicals industry has lost part of the American market and, as regards some products, has lost all profit?

If these tariffs were cut further, as they would be under the blanket proposals of the Commission on Foreign Economic Policy, much organic chemicals manufacture in this country would be lost to the east bank of the Rhine, within easy reach of the Russians.

This we cannot afford for whatever reason. All the more so if the reason be a notion that the rest of the world should adopt a doctrine of trade that it doesn't even want.

The second reason why tariffs are needed to protect our production of organic chemicals is readily apparent in the difference between wage rates in the United States and other countries.

In all cases, United States minimum wages are higher than prevailing wages in the chemical industry in other countries. A production worker in Germany today earns less than 50 cents an hour while his American counterpart makes $2, when vacations, pensions, and social security are added to his basic wage. German research scientists receive about a third as much as those in the United States. Hence, German research costs less and German industry therefore requires less gross profit.

German chemical plants cost less than American. While a bricklayer in St. Louis is restricted to the laying of 350 bricks a day, those working in Frankfurt, Germany, will lay 1,400 in a day. And so it goes. German plants and equipment are cheaper, German depreciation charges are correspondingly less. And, therefore, German organic chemicals sell for less.

In France, Italy, and Britain, the picture is much the same.

It is commonly believed that labor costs are relatively unimportant in the chemical industry. This is not necessarily true. It is not unusual to make less than 100,000 pounds of an organic chemical product in a year. For such products automatic controls and many labor-saving devices cannot be justified. They are made in batch operations, requiring the same amount of labor and technical supervision in the United States as in any other country.

Monsanto Chemical Co.'s sales last year were $341 million, but this total was divided among about 400 products which were sold in some 20,000 formulations. While some products were sold in tank cars in large quantities for as little as $20 a ton, many others were sold in small amounts, by the pound or gram. The manufacturers' price of cortisone, for example, is $6.08 a gram, $2,770 a pound.

With chemical production in most other countries at an alltime high, foreign chemical exports to the United States are on the increase. One direct result to date is the closing of facilities for the production of one Monsanto product. A large investment now stands idle because a foreign-produced chemical is coming in at a price below Monsanto's cost of manufacture. The price structure of other chemicals also is being threatened.

There is no need to further reduce tariffs at this time. Rather there is need to test what will happen when present-day tariffs, put into effect when the world's economy was unbalanced and disrupted by war, are tested under conditions of a world surplus-type economy such as we are now entering. In other words, it would be wise to see what will happen under the new world conditions before adjusting present tariff schedules.

There is a maximum amount of each chemical product that can be consumed in this country in a year. For the most part, the American chemical industry can deliver every pound of every product that can be used. If foreign production is added to this, especially at lower prices, then there will be unemployment in the American chemical industry. With such unemployment will come a lessening in the contributions which the United States chemical industry can make to both the peacetime economy and national defense. In a time of national peril this could prove to be our Achilles' heel.

The Chemical Industry, National Security, and the Tariff

(Statement by Monsanto Chemical Co.)

The people of an industrialized America know that many companies which produce peacetime goods make the munitions when war comes. They remember that the automobile industry stops making cars and makes tanks, trucks and guns; that instead of luxury transports, the aviation companies make bombers and fighters. They know, too, that it takes time to tool up and reconvert from peacetime to wartime production.

Few realize, however, that when war comes, the chemical industry needs no tooling-up time, no reconversion. Commercial and industrial explosives become military explosives. The styrene monomer which in peace makes household items and toys, in war becomes synthetic rubber. Polyester resins combined with glass fibers, which in peacetime provide decorative, structural building panels, have as many as 80 uses in the F–86 jet plane. The sulfa medicines which were peacetime wonder drugs were the miracle that saved thousands of soldiers' lives in World War II and Korea. At least 1,586 synthetic organic chemicals were used by our Armed Forces in World War II and the Korean conflict; 103 of those used in the latter war had not been used in World War II. The modern foot soldier uses a veritable host of chemicals and plastics in his clothing, equipment and munitions. The atomic submarines now building contain almost 600 chemical and plastics applications. In World War II, when the time came for the Army to translate the atomic bomb from theory to reality, the Government called on four chemical companies to do the job. Countless other illustrations would merely belabor the point. The fact is that every single chemical has two roles to play—one for peace and one for war. You do not reconvert the chemical industry when war comes—you merely shift chemicals from one end use to another.

It once was said "an army travels on its stomach." It now could be said that "an army travels on its chemicals" for even the combat rations of today are made possible only because of chemicals.

The United States first became aware of its dependence on synthetic organic chemicals when World War I cut off supplies from Europe. When that war was won, the Nation found that its infant industry had built itself to the point that there were 201 companies with 13,292 employees who, in 1921, produced 144 million pounds of organic chemicals. The year World War II started for America, its organic chemical industry consisted of 335 companies with more than 50,000 employees whose 1941 production was 6,800,000,000 pounds. Theree years later at World War II's peak, the synthetic organic chemical industry produced 15 billion pounds of chemicals—all of which were regarded as required for military or essential civilian production. Even though the Korean war called for only limited mobilization, 564 companies and 153,609 employees produced 27,500,000,000 pounds of organic chemicals, and 41 percent of this was chemicals for which mobilization authorities programed plant expansion to meet mobilization needs.

In any future war or occasion for full mobilization, the Nation's military and essential civilian needs for organic chemicals and its dependence on the industry's reservoir of technically trained manpower (who provide the research brain power from which the industry's spectacular advances have come) may well exceed the capacity to which the indusrty will have been carried by its steady and rapid rate of growth.

A strong domestic economy is as vital to national security as is military defense. It has been said that a modern economy—war or peace—is only as strong as its ability to supply oil, rubber, and steel. The vital nature of the chemical industry can be seen, then, when one realizes that without chemicals we would not have today's oil, rubber, or steel. Every gallon of oil requires chemicals to make it perform the way we want it to. Natural rubber needs chemicals for long life and low cost. The rubber tire of yesterday had a life of 2,500 miles; today it goes 25,000 and tomorrow it will be good for 100,000 miles—thanks to chemicals. And when supplies of natural rubber fail us, it's chemicals that make synthetic rubber possible. Even steel requires chemicals for its processing. The automobile, which uses oil, rubber, and steel, also contains over 250 chemicals, to say nothing of those in its gasoline and motor oil.

Just as the chemical industry is vital to the war machine, so too the vitality and growth of a strong peacetime economy depends on it. In fact, the synthetic-chemical industry is the keystone of all industrial production, wartime or peacetime. Every single industry in America buys from the chemical industry. In the fields of food, clothing, shelter, transportation, communications, and health, there is not a single important product that doesn't touch chemistry some place in its making.

Despite its growth and its successes, the American synthetic-chemical industry is vulnerable to foreign competition. The industry as we know it now in this country is only 35 years old. Abroad, its age is over 100 years. While American chemical makers are ingenious, so too, are foreign producers. The basic raw materials—coal, water, air, mineral, and agricultural products and petroleum—are all available in Europe. The techniques of manufacture (most of which is nonproduction line, "batch" processing) are much the same whether the production is in America or Europe.

The economics of manufacture are quite different, however. Contrasted with an hourly wage of $2.03 in the American plants are the 28 to 38 cents per hour paid to German chemical workers. Research costs, which take 3 to 6 cents of each sales dollar in the American chemical industry, go largely to the salaries of researchers. In Germany, after graduation, a man with a doctor of philosophy degree in chemistry earns but 560 marks (about $133) a month. We offer graduates with doctor of philosophy degrees a minimum of $525 a month. Thus, for the same dollar, German competitors can obtain 4 times the talent we can. And research is the lifeblood of the chemical industry where constant change is the historical pattern. Forty percent of our current sales are of products we didn't make 10 years ago.

Building costs are at least twice as high in America as they are in Europe; depreciation is double here, too. Therefore, the American chemical industry must earn twice as much gross profit as the Germans in order to earn the same return on investment.

In brief, all elements of cost are higher in America than in Europe because of the higher standard of living here.

In some fields, our productivity is greater, but it can't offset the lower labor rates abroad. A recent comparison with specific continental European manufacturers based on 3 large-volume chemicals showed that Monsanto had a ton-per-man-hour advantage of 5 to 1, 4 to 1, and 2.7 to 1, but because of lower wages, the European manufacturers' labor cost per volume of product was lower than ours by 33 percent, 40 percent, and 47 percent, respectively. Imagine how much still lower would be the labor cost per unit of production in the skilled and industrious German chemical industry.

There is an interrelationship in chemical manufacturing that is probably unmatched in any other industry. The manufacture of one chemical inevitably causes others to be produced as byproducts. The low price of industrial organic chemicals thus depends on the efficient use of all their byproducts. Pressure downward on the price of one byproduct can completely unbalance the price structure of all the others in the same chain. To cease making one product in the chain would mean an upward adjustment on the prices of all the others.

Today one-third of Germany's prewar chemical production capacity is in Russian hands. The other two-thirds—in West Germany—now produces 178 percent of its prewar output, according to the 1952 Annual Industries Report from the United States High Commission for Germany, which also says that German exports in general for the first 5 months of 1953 were up 26 percent compared with the same period in 1952 and exports to the United States alone were 50 percent greater than the 1952 rate. Much of this was made possible, too, with United States taxpayer dollars, since the same report indicates that from 1945 to January 31, 1952, the German chemical industry received over $50 million in United States economic and military aid with which to install modern plants and equipment in the place of the war-destroyed installations.

The growing European chemical industries are well organized in marketing their products through cartels. In West Germany, four companies (all of which were part of the I. G. Farbenindustrie) control almost the entire organic chemicals production. In France, 2 companies have 95 percent of it; in the United Kingdom, 2 organizations control 85 percent, and in Italy, 2 companies have 80 percent of the business. Yet, in the United States, the three largest chemical companies have only approximately 15 percent of the organic chemicals business. Methods used by foreign cartels in the sales of all chemicals include the establishment of exclusive marketing areas, sales below cost to eliminate competition, sharing of losses among all members and recouping such losses by restoring maximum prices after competition has been wiped out. Obviously such techniques are in accord neither with our business traditions nor with the antitrust laws.

Reciprocal trade agreements which brought about the present lower tariffs on chemicals were entered into at times when foreign production of chemicals was at a low rate during the last war and postwar periods. These tariffs, therefore, have not yet been tested in a period of normalcy. Nor has their effect been tested in a world-surplus economy. Until the effects of present chemical tariff rates, and the resulting real pressure on domestic prices from the mere offering of foreign chemicals, can be gaged in relation to current production and consumption levels in this country, there should be no further reductions. Already there is evidence of decreased American production of some chemicals. If continued, it can only result in unemployment.

Because the chemical industry in general and Monsanto Chemical Co. in particular are allied so closely to other industries and to United States security, Monsanto, therefore, supports maintenance of adequate chemical tariffs.

Federal Housing Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENDERSON L. LANHAM

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 28, 1954

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed unfortunate that irregularities and fraudulent practices have been discovered in connection with the administration of the Federal Housing Administration especially under section 608 of the act and title I.

While these abuses have, no doubt, existed and have continued to exist up to the present time, nonetheless, some of the offices of the FHA have been conducted in a manner to bring credit rather than disgrace to that organization. While I do not as yet know what will be discovered in connection with abuses under the so-called 608 program, in the office of the FHA in Atlanta, I do know that as far as abuses under title I are concerned, the Atlanta office, under the direction of Mr. John F. Thigpen, has cooperated fully with the Atlanta Better Business Bureau in eliminating irregularities in the home modernization and repair field. And I have confidence that the 608 program was administered without collusion or wrongdoing.

In this connection, I am inserting with my own remarks a letter which I have received from Mr. Thigpen, together with an article which appeared in the Periscope, the official organ of the Better Business Bureau, Inc., of Atlanta for March 1954. This shows the efforts that were made by the Better Business Bureau to bring to account and eliminate the unethical and crooked builders in the home modernization field:

FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION,
Atlanta, Ga., April 26, 1954.

Hon. HENDERSON LANHAM,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. LANHAM: In accordance with our telephone conversation of today, enclosed is copy of the March issue of the Periscope, a publication of the Better Business Bureau, Inc., of Atlanta. Your attention is invited to an article appearing on the front page entitled "BBB–FHA Cooperative Program Brings Results."

About a year ago we saw some evidence of abuse in the title I program, principally by unethical salesmen. We immediately solicited the cooperation of the banks, who as you know, make the title I loans, and the Better Business Bureau of Atlanta. A series of meetings were held and positive action was taken to eliminate these unethical practices, particularly by so-called floater type salesmen. Our records indicate that 26 salesmen and dealers in Georgia have become the subject of precautionary measures (restricted list) resulting from investigations made by this office. Six dealer cases are now pending.

We wish to point out that in the title I home improvement program in Georgia, in which many millions of dollars have been insured by FHA, the great majority of dealers and salesmen have conducted their business on a high ethical plane and this group should not be judged by the proportionately few who have engaged in objectionable practices.

Cordially yours,

JOHN F. THIGPEN,
Director.

BBB–FHA COOPERATIVE PROGRAM BRINGS RESULTS

Readers of the Periscope will recall that the Atlanta Bureau has given considerable publicity to the model home scheme, which was practiced by many unethical roofing, siding, and home remodeling contractors.

Their method of operation was to sell roofing and siding on the pretense that their particular product was new on the market, and that the manufacturer had authorized them to select homes to be used for advertising exhibits. The applicator informed the homeowner that he would receive commissions from jobs sold after the prospect had seen the model home. These commissions were to offset the cost of the material and labor used on his home.

A large majority of such jobs were financed under title I FHA loans. Cases which came to the Bureau's attention involving the model home scheme indicated that the customer did not receive something for nothing. In many such instances where the model home scheme was used, the homeowner was not financially able to keep up his regular monthly payments to the lending institution.

The consumer was not the only victim of the malpractices of unethical home remodeling contractors. The legitimate and ethical concerns in the repair business felt the adverse reaction and ill-will toward their industry as a result of the model home promotion.

Last summer, the Atlantic Bureau met with representatives of the title I FHA lending institutions and officials of the FHA to discuss ways and means to curb the unethical operations. An agreement was reached, and a positive program was initiated which has brought decisive results and practically eliminated the model home scheme in Atlanta.

The local Bureau has received commendation on the effectiveness of this program, and the following letter was received from the office of the FHA Director in Atlanta:

"DEAR MR. STEPHANS: Mr. Arthur J. Frentz, Assistant Commissioner in charge of title I operations in Washington, D. C., has asked me to extend to you his congratulations and best wishes for your splendid cooperation in our joint campaign in Georgia to clean-up the model-house racket.

"I would also like to take this opportunity to again express to you my sincere appreciation for the valuable and effective cooperation we have received from you in our efforts to eliminate the irresponsible dealers and the floater type salesmen representing these dealers. The accomplishments have been beyond our expectations, and our joint efforts have resulted in a number of such dealers and salesmen being placed on the precautionary-measures list and this has had a sobering effect on other dealers.

"I believe we have set a good example of what can be accomplished when your Bureau and our agency work in close cooperation.

"Enclosed is a copy of Mr. Frentz' letter.

"Very truly yours,

"JOHN P. THIGPEN,
"*Director*."

Samuel Dickstein

SPEECH
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 27, 1954

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, it is with sorrow that I learn of the demise of my life-long friend, Samuel Dickstein. We were both elected to the House of Representatives in 1922 to the 68th Congress. Not many of us are left of the group who came in in the 68th Congress. Only three remain: the distinguished Representative from Missouri, the Honorable CLARENCE CANNON, the distinguished Representative from New York, the Honorable JOHN TABER, and myself.

I distinctly remember the days when Sam Dickstein joined me in the early sessions of the 68th Congress. He was in his middle thirties, in the prime of life, enthusiastic, and raring to go. He soon became a member of the Committee on Immigration and finally achieved the chairmanship of that committee. He supported many liberal immigration bills and was ever the champion of the newly arrived. He knew that much of the strength of our Nation was drawn from our immigrants. He knew that we had achieved the highest standard of living that civilization has ever known, and knew that this was because we had siphoned off the best of the brain and brawn of peoples everywhere. That thought was the lodestar he followed, and as a result many fine pieces of legislation bear the honored name of Dickstein.

Samuel Dickstein had been a vigorous prosecutor of the State of New York, a distinguished Congressman, and finally an eminent jurist. He had 1 more year to serve on the supreme court bench of the State of New York, before retirement. It is not given to many the opportunity to serve with such strength of character, honesty of purpose and integrity of action, as was the lot of Sam Dickstein.

Those of us who mourn him in death, loved him in life. As I pen these words, it seems as though in the early morning I see him in the distance, walking over the hill. He fondly waves goodby, and then is lost to vision. He has vanished into the great eternity.

It seems a bit sad that nature has struck him down and taken him unto her in the fullness of his powers. In his latter years he worked on many important cases. The opinions he wrote were replete with prudence, wisdom, and commonsense. His is a great loss to the judiciary, just as his departure from the legislative halls was a great loss to Congress.

His name will ever be revered in his home State of New York, and his name will be enshrined in our hearts here. Our condolences go forth to his lovely wife and dear ones.

He is gone but not forgotten. He lives in the hearts of his fellows, and that is not to die.

H. R. 7200

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD BOLLING
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 27, 1954

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I feel impelled to call attention to a serious blow to the public assistance part of our social-security system as proposed in the Eisenhower administration's bill, H. R. 7200.

Our social-security system established under the administration of President Roosevelt, nurtured through a series of Democratic Congresses and advanced further under President Truman, constitutes an invaluable asset to American society. Yet the Eisenhower administration, in seeking to experiment with this system, appears ready to disorganize, reduce, and confuse the public assistance half of social security.

While I possess neither the resources nor the expert knowledge in the field of social security to undertake an exhaustive study, a careful analysis of H. R. 7200 reveals clearly its inherent dangers and raises a series of serious questions impugning the entire validity of its approach.

Ostensibly a reform of public assistance to help the poorer States of this Nation, ostensibly a bill to advance a progressive, dynamic program, H. R. 7200 appears to fall woefully short of both objectives. Worse still, in a number of cases it apparently accomplishes the opposite of what it purports to do.

In general, the following conclusions may be drawn from a study of the Eisenhower administration's proposed public assistance program: First, it endangers seriously the security of old people and dependent children in States which are least able to provide for their needs; Second, it undermines the ability of some of the poorer States to provide public assistance to the aged and dependent children and it requires of these States an even greater fiscal outlay for such programs to retain them at their present levels.

A brief description and analysis of the provisions of H. R. 7200 reveals their intent and how they would operate. H. R. 7200 purports to extend the current Federal matchine formula for public assistance to April 1, 1955, at which time the following formula would become operative:

First. A variable matching formula based on each State's per capita income.

Second. This formula includes a factor reducing each State's Federal share by 1 percentage point for each 5 percent of the State's old-age population—those 65 years of age and over—receiving old-age and survivors benefits.

Third. A bridge to insure that no State, purely as a result of this formula, loses more than 12 percent of Federal funds it receives for any program in the fiscal year 1954. To safeguard against sudden loss of funds from the Federal Government, this formula would be in effect during the first 2¼ years of operation of the new law, assuming the State spent as much from State and local funds as it did during the base period.

Fourth. States would receive Federal financial grants on the basis of an average maximum payment to its recipients. At present the matchable amount has to be computed on each individual case.

Let us now analyze these provisions, employing figures supplied by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; data, incidentally, which the Department seemed quite reluctant to make available.

A fundamental theory incorporated in the bill is that of variable grants. The objective of such a formula is to equalize payments among the States by making it possible for States with limited financial resources to increase their assistance payments. To quote from the Department's release explaining this bill:

> Under the variable matching formula, the Federal Government would give more aid, proportionately, to States where State and local resources are limited (PA No. 1).

The principle of variable grants is valid and meritorious, but this Republican bill is a defective instrument for carrying it out; the bill is inconsistent and contradictory and would work great hardship upon needy people and many States.

An examination of the operation of this formula as embodied in H. R. 7200, using the Department's data, reveals that, first, some States with greater financial resources would be more favorably affected than certain States whose financial resources are limited; second, a total of 12 of the 29 States with per capita incomes below the national per capita average income—and that is the base index used for determining Federal contributions—will suffer a reduction in Federal contributions for old-age assistance; third, all but 1 of the States above the national per capita income will also suffer a decrease in Federal contributions for OAA; fourth, a total of

12 of the 29 States with lower per capita incomes than the national average will lose Federal contributions for aid to dependent children. In addition, 1 State, Arkansas, ranking 47th or next to the poorest State in the United States in per capita income, receives no increase whatsoever in Federal funds for aid for dependent children; fifth, at the same time, 11 of the 19 States with per capita incomes greater than the national average will receive additional Federal contributions for aid to dependent children.

States losing in Federal contributions to old-age assistance although below the national average per capita income are: Alabama, Colorado, Florida, Missouri, Maine, North Carolina, South Carolina, South Dakota, Vermont, Texas, West Virginia, and Virginia. Those losing Federal contributions for aid to dependent children whose incomes are below the national average per capita income are: Arizona, Alabama, Florida, Louisiana, Missouri, New Mexico, North Carolina, South Carolina, Texas, Tennessee, Vermont, and Virginia. Arkansas receives no increase, although it is second from the bottom of States below the national per capita income.

States with superior per capita incomes which lose are: for old-age assistance—California, Connecticut, Delaware, Indiana, Illinois, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Montana, Nevada, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Washington, Wyoming, and also the District of Columbia. Wisconsin, a State with a superior per capita income, gains. Those States losing in aid to dependent children are: California, Connecticut, Delaware, Indiana, Maryland, New York, Ohio, and Washington. Nevada gains nothing, while 10 States, plus the District of Columbia, would receive increased Federal contributions.

A total of 30 States plus the District of Columbia would lose Federal contributions for OAA; 20 States lose for aid for dependent children.

H. R. 7200 proposes a cushion period which ends in 1957. But, as has been pointed out to me by the Honorable Phil M. Donnelly, Governor of Missouri, at the time the provision expires the reduction in Federal funds will be even more drastic in Missouri and other States than during the first year's operation of this bill. Missouri, while ranking ninth in the United States in the number of people 65 years of age and older, is third in the country in old-age assistance recipients. According to the latest statistics, Missouri ranks sixth in the Nation in the amount expended per inhabitant for old-age assistance in 1952–53. Nevertheless, it is a strange anomaly that if this bill went into effect, on the basis of figures supplied by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Missouri would suffer a 10.5-percent drop in Federal contributions for all its public-assistance programs. It would lose over $6 million for old-age assistance and over $1 million in aid for dependent children. After the bridge provision expires, Missouri could be expected to lose even more; the same would apply to a number of the States. States that will lose Federal contributions for these programs will either be forced to increase taxes in order to continue old-age assistance or aid for dependent children at their present levels or to reduce all assistance grants to needy old people and children in order to stay within available funds.

Still another feature of this bill places a difficult burden upon the States. Under H. R. 7200 the new matching formula would go into effect on April 1, 1955. Yet the fiscal year of most States starts in July, which means that there is little or no coordination between the two. Of course, if the purpose is to save Federal funds in the 3-month period between April and July, this is accomplished by this formula, but, of course, at the expense of burdening the States. It should also be noted that most State legislatures meet in January; they will have to act very quickly—to be prepared for the changeover by April 1. State legislatures are simply not given sufficient time; they cannot adjust that quickly.

One asset, and almost the only one in the bill, is its employment of an average rather than individual maximums in determining the Federal share of public-assistance payments. This simplifies administration, reduces redtape and administrative expense.

Nevertheless, one virtue, a minor one at that, in H. R. 7200, fails to qualify a bill as responsible legislation when it is otherwise totally inadequate. This bill is unfair and discriminatory in that it penalizes many poorer States instead of assisting them. Its effect, in many cases, would be the exact opposite of its announced purpose. Rather than a progressive advance, it constitutes a backward step in social security. Yes, it saves some money for the Federal Government, but at the expense of the meager benefits received by many of our needy aged citizens and at the expense of our State governments. Is this the way to accomplish that purpose?

Congress cannot afford to pass legislation in a vacuum. Many States suffer from economic recession; tax revenues tend to decline in such cases and old people in the labor force generally suffer first in a period of economic trouble. This bill would reduce the small incomes of many of our citizens, aged men and women who spend their entire assistance benefits for consumer goods. They save virtually nothing from assistance payments—all goes into food, rent, clothing, medical care, and so forth—direct and immediate consumer spending. Moreover, States with the least resources as well as those with the greatest resources lose Federal contributions. The poorer States can least afford such a loss. Obviously, the timing of this bill is very poor and the implementation of its general philosophy is highly inadequate.

Is this what the Eisenhower Republican administration proposes to take food out of the mouths of our needy aged and our dependent children? Why are we not working rather to distribute more surplus food to them instead of less. We have the surplus food. Is it the Republican purpose to place difficulties in the path of State efforts to deal with public assistance? I am sure that Congress, at least, has no such purpose in mind. Nor should we adopt legislation that is so contradictory or discriminatory as to violate the basic theory upon which the legislation is allegedly premised. Certainly we can expect a better performance from the Republican leadership. Or can we? Once again the Republicans have taken an operating program, public assistance, and a good democratic proposal, variable grants, and have Republicanized it into a niggardly, inadequate, reactionary program, detrimental to the welfare of our people.

Far from criticizing negatively, I should like to call the attention of my colleagues to possible alternatives which should be considered. First of all, instead of considering legislation like H. R. 7200, we could adopt legislation immediately authorizing a food allotment plan for the aged and for dependent children. Secondly, we would continue the present matching formula undisturbed. This means extending beyond this year the McFarland amendment to the Social Security Act; Senators Humphrey, Hill, and Sparkman have already introduced such legislation. If our purpose is to dovetail old-age assistance into our expanding old-age and survivors insurance program, the present system and formula seem to be working well. For example, since the 1950 social-security amendments, which greatly liberalized benefits and expanded coverage, were adopted, the number of old-age assistance beneficiaries has been declining gradually but steadily; from July 1950 to July 1951—a decline of 55,000; from July 1951 to July 1953—a decline of 80,000; from July 1952 to July 1953—a decline of approximately 60,000. Consequently, if we retain the existing formula, the old-age assistance load will gradually shift to old-age and survivors insurance. And in this process, the States will not be handicapped or driven to reducing average benefits. The transition will prove easy for them; they will find sufficient time to adjust to the change; and the aged people, themselves, will not suffer.

If we wish to increase the speed of transfer from old-age assistance to old-age and survivors insurance, it will be necessary to adopt a really liberal old-age and survivors insurance act. The Eisenhower proposals in H. R. 7199, which contemplate an increase in minimum old-age and survivors insurance primary benefits of $5 a month, will not serve this purpose. On the other hand, a bill for comprehensive expansion and liberalization of social security such as H. R. 6035, which I have introduced, and which is identical with similar bills introduced by other Democrats, constitutes a step in the right direction.

Nevertheless, whatever action we take in the House, let us beware of H. R. 7200. Let us remember that those unfortunates, the needy aged, the dependent children, the blind and the disabled, are human beings as deserving in consideration and justice as the rest of us. Let us assist rather than burden the States in their endeavors to help such people. Let us guard and strengthen our social-security system.

Federal Aid for Long Island Waterways

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STUYVESANT WAINWRIGHT
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 30, 1954

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I believe that it should be called to the attention of Members of Congress that Long Island has apparently become the stepchild of our Nation. We receive no consideration in regard to three great problems: Shore erosion, soil conservation, and dredging of the inlets to the natural waterways.

The Corps of Engineers has agreed to maintain the Fire Island Inlet for the coming year, due, mainly, to the fact that the great storm of last November did 95 percent of the work.

I would, further, like to call to the attention of the Congress a release of the Moriches Inlet Stabilization Committee, headed by an able retired Coast Guard captain, Eugene T. Osborne:

> We are holding this meeting to express our gratitude for the interest, both in the past and present, as manifested by the State, county, and town officials in the stabilization of Moriches Inlet. In inspecting the inlet, we were happy to have had the opportunity to show you the visible results of your efforts, which have meant so much to the thousands of people who live in and about the Moriches Bay area. We recognize that, despite the splendid beginning that has been made on the inlet, it is as yet far from completion, and we desire to find some method by which Federal funds can be obtained to assist in the completion of the project.
>
> The following should be of interest to all concerned, and is furnished without written or implied criticism in reference to the policy making such appropriations possible. On the contrary, we have deep respect for those foreign countries and individual States in our own country whose officials recognize the tremendous importance of their waterways and who work for their improvement. The figures given are believed to be substantially correct, as they have been gathered from newspapers, magazines, and other informative publications.
>
> (A) Seven hundred million dollars has been allotted by our Federal Government toward the improvement of the Rhone River, and $300 million more is under commitment by our Government toward the same project.
>
> (B) Three hundred million dollars has likewise been allotted toward the Rhine River, and more is expected to follow.
>
> (C) Several hundred million dollars has already been allotted to the Netherlands by our Government toward the restoration of their dikes which were so badly damaged by the great storm of several years ago. (This is real antierosion beach work.)
>
> (D) We have heard, too, that large amounts have been allotted to other European countries, to be used in the improvement of their waterways, harbors, and beach erosion work.
>
> (E) In the United States, many millions of dollars have been expended by our Federal Government in the improvement of much needed levee and inland river basin work. Each year additional sums are allotted for the same purpose.
>
> (F) We understand that in New Jersey work is now under way, under the supervision of the United States engineers, on jetty repair work at Barnegat Inlet. This was made necessary by the damage sustained at that inlet during the gale of November 1953. The quick action taken by the engineers in this case is commended. We also note that our engineers have recommended a $24 million beach widening project for the New Jersey coast, which, like Long Island, has suffered so badly by reason of erosion over the past years. Many other States, such as Florida and California, have, during recent years, received large Federal grants to be used for the improvement of their waterways and beaches.
>
> Consider now, if you will, what has happened, or more appropriately what has not happened, to the effort made by our local citizens to obtain Federal help in the stabilization of Moriches and Shinnecock Inlets. On May 8, 1946, a hearing was held by the United States engineers in the Westhampton Beach High School auditorium, for the purpose of inquiring into the facts and circumstances surrounding the need for such aid. The joint case of both inlets was ably presented, and much evidence supporting their need was furnished. To date, some 8 years later, no findings or report has been made, and we have been advised that funds are not available to complete the report. Naturally, we are keenly disappointed when the work elsewhere is contrasted with what has happened in our case.
>
> In considering the need of Federal appropriations for Long Island waterways, it is well to remember that New York State probably contributes more money to the Federal Treasury than any other State of the Union, and since the Atlantic coast line of Long Island is almost identical in length to that of New Jersey and constitutes New York's only seacoast, the seriousness of the situation and the great need for Federal help can be readily understood.
>
> The need of united action on the part of local and statewide interests, including those in authority, is quite apparent. We intend to work for that support and sincerely appeal to those present to assist in this movement.
>
> MORICHES INLET STABILIZATION COMMITTEE.

My Duty to Home and Country

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 28, 1954

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including 2 essays on the subject My Duty to Home and Country, 1 written by Miss Dorothy Fullager, of Mansfield, Ohio, and 1 written by Mr. Lee Kennedy, of Newark, Ohio. These two young people of my district are the winners of an essay contest given by the American Legion and the ladies auxiliary of Ohio. There were approximately 75,000 essays written. I want to congratulate the Legion and the auxiliary for putting this program into effect, and I am indeed very proud of Dorothy Fullager and Lee Kennedy. I recommend the reading of these essays to all of my colleagues.

MY DUTY TO HOME AND COUNTRY

(By Dorothy Fullager, Mansfield, Ohio)

What is my duty to home and country? It is hard to explain such duties. Perhaps we shouldn't try—yet. As we tour a great building in a great city maybe we'll learn the answer to this question.

The world is like a great city. Each building represents a country. Some are new and shiny; others, old and in shambles; some are small but lasting; others, brilliant and powerful skyscrapers. We are going to visit one of the greatest edifices—the United States of America.

First let's look at the foundation. If the building blocks could speak they would say:

"We are the homes of America. A weak home is a weak spot in our Nation. We are made not of stone, cement, and mortar, but people, their love and duties to us."

"But what are our duties to our home?" we ask. The blocks reply:

"A home is more than a house. In a home you learn to love, to share, and to give. There you learn the meaning of joy, sorrow, hope, and understanding. Home is where you learn to live. It is your duty to help make it a better; no, the best, place to live. This means more than helping with the dishes or the dusting. Those are the material things. Homes are made of those intangible qualities known only to the heart. Your homes are what you make them: 'As ye give, so shall ye receive.'"

Hearing this we realize that it is our duty to give of our all and as we do we know we are making our homes the best places to live.

Now let's examine the other parts that make this building the strongest in the city. The beams and rafters tell us, "We are the duties of good citizenship; your duties to your country. Sit down and let us explain ourselves."

Voting speaks first, "You must choose the government under which you live. Neglecting to vote is neglecting one of the privileges bought by the blood of your forefathers."

Obedience says, "You should never disobey the law. The Bill of Rights assures you of equal rights and protection as well as freedom. But you shall be free only as long as you respect the rights of others."

Support takes his turn, "Another duty you must perform is supporting your Government. If each of you does this it cannot fail. But remember this doesn't mean always agreeing with it."

Now service speaks, "You can serve your country in innumerable ways, large and small but the one way you are so conscious of today is defending your homeland. It is the epitome of service when a person gives his life for his country."

Greatly impressed we move to the windows. Through these windows people from other houses view our way of life. They are never closed for through them we are always giving to those in need.

The door to success is never locked; it is always open to all. The steps to opportunity lead to this door. Beyond them lie unlimited chances to make good.

The master of this house is a kindly old gentleman affectionately called Uncle Sam by some one hundred and fifty million members of the household.

Yes; it is a great house, the greatest in the city. As our tour ends we know that if we perform the duties just outlined, this building will continue to be the best and will never fall.

MY DUTY TO HOME AND COUNTRY

(By Lee Kennedy, Newark, Ohio)

The interpretation of a person's duties to his home and country varies with the individual. To me, a boy of 14, I think my first duty is to my home. One of the most important duties is one which is very well expressed by one of the Ten Commandments, "Thou shall honor thy father and mother." In fact if every citizen lived by the Ten Commandments he would be performing most of his duties to his home and country. It is my duty to help my family through troubled times and to share in the solving of the various problems which we encounter from time to time. In this way I can help to provide harmony and happiness in the home.

One duty which I think we sometimes forget but which is very important is our behavior in public, for how we act in public is a reflection oh how our parents have reared us.

It is also my responsibility to set a good example for my younger brother and sister.

I do not think boys my age have given enough thought to their duty to their country. I know I had not, but after thinking about it I have reached these conclusions: I believe one of the most important duties is to get a good education for if we have a well educated population, we are going to have a strong country.

Next I expect to spend quite some time in the army, and I might even make a career of it. This is one duty all boys of average or better physical and mental health can fulfill.

After this in my life will be the duty of voting which is surely an important one. In order to be a wise voter I must have a good knowledge of this country's laws provided for in the Constitution. I must also try to get as much information on each candidate as I can, and not let party politics influence my thinking in choosing the man best suited for the job. After electing these men it is my duty to obey the laws they make, and to use my privileges of freedom of speech and press as provided for by the laws of the land to continuously try to improve our Government, working always for a Government which will be truly representative of the people and dedicated to the good of the people.

Eventually it will be my duty to see that my own children receive a good education and give them the proper training they need to become good citizens. In this way we will be insuring a good future for our country.

The most important duty, one that I have saved for last but which usually comes first in a person's life, is religion. Every person should attend the church of his choice, for the faith of the American people in their Lord has helped immensely in making this country the greatest of them all.

Punchinello's Secret

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 28, 1954

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, a year ago our Ambassador Clare Boothe Luce arrived in Italy and I feel she deserves an anniversary token of esteem for a job well done.

When I visited in Italy last summer our Ambassador was just starting to become the target of the Communist propaganda organ. The breeders of hate carried on a merciless, unrelenting attack maligning everything our great Ambassador was doing for the benefit of that great nation. She was accused by the Commies of possessing the evil eye and placing a curse on everything she came near. Where, in reality, she was just ferreting out the evil doings of the Communist cells operating in Italy.

We, in the Congress of the United States, commend the hard work, diligence, and courage of our Ambassador. Regardless of how disagreeable the Communist hordes make it for Mrs. Luce she will prevail because the great Italian people realize that their American Ambassador holds close to her heart their welfare and the future welfare of their children.

The Italian people, being an enterprising and highly cultured race and, above all, believing in the freedom of man, I am positive will always rally to the righteous cause as proclaimed by our Ambassador.

Mr. Speaker, our former colleague, Clare Boothe Luce, is doing a dedicated job and deserves the great support her colleagues of this great deliberative body give her in an unrelenting fight to combat communism in Italy.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, let me say that the Italian-Americans in the great State of Connecticut prescribe wholeheartedly to the great work and accomplishments of their Ambassador Clare Boothe Luce.

I have further received a great response from Members of the House and Senate commending Mrs. Luce on the great work she is doing as the United States Ambassador in Italy.

As a portion of my remarks I include an article by Indro Montanelli, one of Italy's most distinguished and important democratic journalists. His article is in the form of a letter addressed to Benedetti the publisher of Europeo. Mr. Montanelli's article not only defends our Ambassador, but casts a very revealing light on the political situation in Italy.

Punchinello's Secret—Montanelli Discovers Italy Is an American Protectorate

Dear Benedetti [publisher of Europeo]: I read in L'Europeo Mrs. Luce's confidential speech to a dozen American journalists in Washington's Mayflower Hotel last January 5, along with Adelfi's [editor of Europeo] reply.

I don't know how you managed to get a copy of the text of the speech, but at any rate you are to be congratulated on having succeeded in getting it. But the American journalist who was allowed to share the secret with a few other colleagues and later broke it, is less deserving of congratulations. Mrs. Luce's speech was entirely secret in tone, and it is quite easy to see that it was meant to be only a guide for her listeners. The fact that news of the speech leaked out in its entirety will give further proof to those numerous readers who think that you can never trust a journalist. All of us journalists have, at some time or other, been given some secret to share with a minister or a diplomat, not intended for publication. Those who failed to keep the secret were disqualified for failure to comply with our business ethics.

But let's get to the speech itself.

Adelfi is to be admired for his objections [to the speech], which aren't merely drawn at random but are, instead, serious, documented and subtle. Too subtle in fact for my taste and the public's taste. Everything or almost everything he says is true. Pella did have De Gasperi's approval in forming his cabinet; it isn't yet definitely certain that an investigation of the 1,300,000 disputed votes would show that the center parties really won the election and that the electoral law had really passed; the Communist Party's reported 63 billion lire annual budget is probably an exaggeration; the difference between CD's and Social-Communists is 4.7, not 3 points, and, moreover, the president is not obliged by articles 92 and 94 of the constitution to recur to the majority party, in the event that it's the Social-Communist Party, to form the cabinet.

But this is merely unimportant faultfinding in Mrs. Luce's otherwise exactly drawn picture. I could, by using my friend Adelfi's own technique (do bear with me if it smacks somewhat of the curia and is captious), make the following objections:

1. No official statement whatever will ever convince us that De Gasperi and the CD's were well-disposed toward Pella. We Italians are just talking among ourselves here, Benedetti, so we don't have to grab each other by our coat lapels. De Gasperi called Pella's government a friendly one (he should at least have considered it a brotherly one); but, like a good friend, he put banana peels under Pella's feet at the first chance he had. I don't claim he did a bad thing; he may even have done a good thing. But there is certainly no doubt that he did do it.

2. The story about the 1,300,000 invalid votes is true, and you know it as well as I whom am most certain about it. How do we know it? My dear man, I am not that American journalist; neither are you; and neither is Adelfi. Since we can't cite our sources, we prefer to keep silent. But that is exactly what Mrs. Luce says—all Italian politicians agree that the electoral law had passed, but they all agree that if such a statement were attributed to them they would deny it. I know it will take years before the official reply is published. The fact that the Communists are working so diligently to slow it up is yet another proof of the truth of the Ambassador's statement. But the fact that the ballots were not approved does not prove that they were not counted.

3. Do the Communists have 25 billion lire, as Scelba claims, or 30 billion, as Taviani, defense minister, says? In either case, they still have more than 10 times more than all other parties put together.

4. Articles 92 and 94 of the constitution, and Carbone and the lawyers can say what they will, but constitutional procedure, which Einaudi so scrupulously follows, obliges the President to appoint as Prime Minister the head of the majority party. Can you just see Einaudi refusing Togliatti a priori, if Togliatti had even a relative majority? That would supposedly mark the preface to a coup d'tat. Performed with what? With boy scouts?

In my opinion, it isn't the details of Mrs. Luce's speech which should be noted and compared with reality; it is, rather, the overall picture of the speech. And every reader feels that her overall picture corresponds to reality. Just so you won't misunderstand me, I might state here that in 1948 I voted for De Gasperi, and again in 1953. And although I'll curse like an infidel when I do it, I'll probably vote for him again next time, giving no heed to my monarchist friends whose right I challenge to betray the King (with a capital letter, please) by forming a party in his name, a party which in practice does nothing but turn out to be a thorn in the side, like the beefsteak party. So you see, I'm not an anti-De Gasperi man on principle—quite the contrary. And yet I think exactly what Mrs. Luce thinks of him, namely, the votes given him in 1948 were administered very well in many ways, but certainly not in opposing communism. The 1953 election results prove that. What did the Ambassador tell the journalist whose discretion she wrongly trusted? This:

1. The church tried excommunication as a weapon in dealing with Catholic anticlerical Italians. But it boomeranged.

2. Although the DC's are in power, the government has taken no serious measure against the Communists. It allows them to print their papers on its own presses; it

never attacks them on its own radio; it grants their dailies all the paper they want; it houses their organs in its own buildings, and favors, or at least tolerates the trade with the East that fills the Communist Party coffers.

3. The dollars we give the Italians don't stop them from taking the road to communism. Instead, they help the Italians get there more easily, for they make the rich richer instead of helping the poor.

4. The social reforms have not brought about the effect we had hoped. The south, so conservative until now, has slipped to the left now that it's been divided into pieces and there exists the bank for the south.

5. Eight of the sixteen million Communists in Western Europe are in Italy, and Moscow is now aiming its greatest effort at them, since it is well aware that Italy is a vulnerable point.

6. In 2 or 3 years, Italy could disappear behind the Iron Curtain.

Now, my dear Benedetti, this argument is quite sound. And despite all those ingenious lucubrations that you and Adelfi think up, thanks to your statistics which are so easily adapted to all confused situations, there are millions upon millions of Italians (all those with any sense) who think exactly the same as the Ambassador does. Adelfi's claim that the Social-Communists would require 25 years to reach power legitimately is proved wrong by a very fundamental error. It supposes that there is a united front or bloc to face it. But you know very well that that is not so. The other day I was traveling on the same train with the CD deputy Mario Melloni, your friend but no longer mine. At one point he told me: "If my party opens up to the right, I'll go over to the Communists." How many Mellonis are there in the CD party? I mean how many Italians are there who are confirmed Democrats and who vote such, but who would go over to the other side, if forced to choose, as choose we soon must? It is they who form the line of demarcation in Italy. Don't worry only about the Social-Communists who aren't worried at all about an absolute majority. Worry about that broad fringe of bourgeoisie and democracy who are ready to join in with the Social-Democrats in having their day in a fine popular front government. All the Communists needed in Czechoslovakia was 18 percent to come to power, with Benes' and Masaryk's consent. I don't know how many Masaryks and Beneses there are hidden among us. All I know is that none of them would die of a broken heart or hurl themselves out the window if it were to come about.

You printed the following atop the last paragraph of Adelfi's article: "There is a danger, but it is not at hand." Ye Gods. What do you need to recognize the fact that it is at hand? Do you need to be put behind bars in some cell at S. Vittore?

I think that Mrs. Luce proved that she grasps our country's situation perfectly by saying what she did. I dare to add that she is perhaps the first American diplomat who has shown a grasp of it, even if she did take a 35 percent for a 37 percent [of the vote] and allowed Unita's higher circulation than it really has. It's debatable whether she had the right to tell all this to American journalists, and whether she acted well in doing so. I think she had the duty, not the right to do it, and as an Italian intent on defending my hide and my freedom, I am grateful to her for having said what she did in the last part, namely, Italian democracy must be defended at all costs, as its loss would be more grave than the loss of China. Sincerely, Benedetti, I would have been pleased to express the same gratitude to you and Adelfi, even for only the criticism of the Ambassador's speech which you thought opportune to write. But as I won't, you find yourselves, albeit unwillingly, responsible along with those Socialcommunists who, on this very day, March 20, questioned the government on the fitness of having Mrs. Luce removed from her position as Ambassador on the basis that she is (to them of course) no longer a persona grata in Italy. Which makes, or should make her, most desirable (persona gratissima) for us.

My dear Benedetti, you, Adelfi, myself and millions of others have the right to present all the notes we want to America and her representatives. But the only reason we have this right is because America is there to guarantee us such rights. You, Adelfi, myself and millions of others, can—must—declare our objections to the gross mistakes often made by American diplomacy, the superficiality of some of its commonplaces. But we must never forget that without America we might at best be able to print our objections on a "Squillo del Galeotto" ("The Galley-Slave Trumpet") mimeographed behind the walls of some national prison. For the truth is that we are 43 million galley slaves temporarily free on American bail.

Note that you and your paper have little to do with this since your opinion on this point has always been clear. But I wish you had made it clear again on this occasion. Mrs. Luce has not one, but a thousand reasons to be annoyed by a ruling class and a people who pass half their time in sucking up money from her country, and the other half in spitting on it. Our theaters are full of people who can still afford 3,000 lire for a seat thanks only to America, and yet are enraptured only by the bitter remarks hurled against America by actors who can accumulate millions only because of America. We give vent to our dignity in this attitude of freedmen. But the only dignity beggers should have is gratitude. You'll say that, being scrupulously impartial, we treat Russia in exactly the same way. But is it impartiality to treat those who line our pockets with dollars exactly the same as we treat those who make threats on our lives; those who guarantee us our life and liberty exactly as those who attack them; those who have taken away our last orangepeel exactly as those who have filled us with calories and vitamins?

Here I can hear my ears ringing with the prophetic cry: "You've sold out to the Americans." And in a certain sense that is true, since as an Italian I owe my life and liberty to the Americans. But those who accuse me are in the same condition as I am. Which of us is more honorable, I who admit it and keep the unspoken agreement, or they who feign ignorance of it, but betray it every minute?

My dear Benedetti; in publishing Mrs. Luce's speech, you dealt one of your customary excellent journalistic blows. Since you weren't taken into her confidence, you betrayed no one, and while I don't accept Adelfi's objections, they are put forth most civilly. The only thing missing is a postscript from you, saying in so many words: "Italian newspapers will be able to continue to wage polemics with one of the secret speeches made by the Ambassador of the protecting state only so long as that protecting state is America." That is implicit, say you? No, nothing is ever implicit with Italians. You have to remind them of everything. And as far as I am concerned, I have decided never to miss the chance of doing so. And that is why I have written to you. Neither you, nor I, can go on wiling away our time in variety shows, little scandals and big trials. The Italian journalist still limiting himself to such would not only be a poor Italian, but a poor journalist as well, since he would give proof that he is not aware of the fact that "there is a danger, and it is at hand."

Cordially yours,

INDRO MONTANELLI.

My Duty To Home and Country

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WAYNE L. HAYS

OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 1, 1954

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the very fine essay by James Valuska, of Mingo Junction, Ohio, entitled "My Duty To Home and Country." This essay was one of the American Legion contest essays which won one of the first prizes in the State of Ohio. My congratulations on this outstanding essay have been extended to Mr. Valuska personally, and I commend the essay to all the readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The essay follows:

MY DUTY TO HOME AND COUNTRY

As a senior about to graduate from high school, I realize that I have responsibilities toward my home and my country which I must fulfill. We, the youth of America, are tomorrow's foundation. Shall we be strong enough to continue building this wonderful Nation and democracy? Will our elements be composed of the freedom to know, the right to learn, and the joy to uphold this land of ours; or will we let the forces of evil and stupidity weaken us, permitting our future world to crumble? No. We must strive toward the greatest good and concentrate on the means at hand, which assets we have available today and know we must use them to the fullest advantage. There are many of us who have a tendency to be self-satisfied. Many accept the achievements of past civilizations without question and regard them purely as outright gifts. In the same attitude many take no personal responsibility toward improving society or uplifting humanity, but feel justified in being solely an average citizen.

I believe that our most important duty toward our home and our country is to become a good citizen. The first and greatest step in becoming a good citizen is developing one's self into the best individual possible. The best individual keeps his character above reproach and his integrity is such that it cannot be questioned. He maintains honor and moral standards to the highest degree and has a stanch faith in God and His divine guidance. He also must have the best education it is in his power to acquire. It is our responsibility to acquire all these traits which constitute being a good citizen.

Another important duty which will fall on the shoulders of a good many of us is leadership. Naturally we are not all born leaders, but many who should be, do not recognize this duty—or recognizing it, see fit to shirk it. Shall we be the leaders or the followers—if we are the leaders, where shall we lead? If we are the followers, whom shall we follow? This is an extremely decisive time in our lives and it is our duty to correctly formulate our ideals for the future of tomorrow.

One may ask why his duty toward his home is important. Without a doubt the family is our basic social group. It is the matrix in which the most significant habits and attitudes are laid down in the individual. Here he gets his first training in the moral codes of his society. Here he obtains most of the fundamental values which are woven into his life organization. The home is the foundation of society, hence it's welfare is vital to the welfare of the church, the school, the community, and the Nation. In the words of John Howard Payne, "Be it ever so humble, there's no place like home." We should do all that is within our power to strengthen our homes and to keep them strong.

Let us say this much to ourselves, not only with our lips, but in our hearts. Let us say this: I myself am a part of democracy—I myself must accept the duties and responsibilities. Democracy is not merely a privilege to be enjoyed; it is a trust to keep and maintain. I am an American. I intend to remain an American. I will do my best to wipe from my heart hate, rancor, and political prejudice. I will sustain my Government. And through good days or bad I will try to serve my country.

The Ukrainian Association of Washington, D. C., Supports House Concurrent Resolution 58

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 12, 1954

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including a letter from Mr. Omelan Antonovych, chairman of the Ukrainian Association, of Washington, D. C. This organization supports my House Concurrent Resolution 58.

The letter follows:

THE UKRAINIAN ASSOCIATION OF
WASHINGTON, D. C.,
Arlington, Va., April 5, 1954.

The Honorable LAWRENCE H. SMITH,
United States House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SMITH: In behalf of the Ukrainian Association, of Washington, D. C., I wish to take this opportunity to express our great appreciation for your efforts in connection with House Concurrent Resolution 58, favoring extension of diplomatic relations with the Republics of Ukraine and Byelorussia. We are of the opinion that the passage of this resolution would play an extremely important role in the psychological warfare efforts of the Western world directed against Soviet communism.

I also wish to express at this time some thoughts which, in our belief, might be helpful in your further efforts toward the adoption of Resolution 58. For your consideration we present the following salient points:

1. The Soviet rulers have always attempted and are still attempting to prove that the Western world (including the United States) has only colonial designs upon Ukraine and Byelorussia. In support of this thesis they constantly reiterate that Western powers come to Ukraine only to take over the land and enslave the people, e. g.—

The German occupation of 1918.

The hostile attitude of the allies toward the newly formed Ukrainian Government 1918-19 (incidentally this attitude on the part of the allies was instrumental in pushing the reawakening masses right into the arms of bolshevism).

The occupation of Ukraine by Germany during the Second World War.

Soviet propaganda continually reminds the Ukrainian and Byelorussian people, who have experienced German occupation on two occasions, that the threat of such an occupation still exists. This time, however, the threat emanates directly from the United States or some other power specifically delegated to do that job on behalf of the United States. The Soviets are able to instill fear in certain segments of the population by these threats of imminent disaster inasmuch as the people, being completely isolated from the West, are unable to make fine distinctions between the nations of the West, all of whom are dubbed by the Kremlin masters as "capitalistic imperialists."

In order to overcome such fears and suspicions on the part of the people of Ukraine and Byelorussia, more than mere words is now required. The establishment of diplomatic relations with these two nations will provide the best means of proving to their peoples that the United States has no hostile designs but, on the contrary, is willing to accept them as worthy of the recognition of the leading power of the democratic world.

2. Soviet propaganda contrasts conditions in the enslaved capitalist world with those within their own union which they claim to be composed of separate and sovereign nations all of which have equal rights (including the right of secession under art. 17 of the constitution of the U. S. S. R.). Soviet propaganda claims that under their system there are no backward peoples or nations. They are especially diligent in emphasizing the importance of Ukraine and Byelorussia as nations which have made most significant progress under Soviet conditions (the fervent repetition of this theme is probably dictated by the continued leanings of the peoples of these two nations toward the west and democracy). This motive was an integral part of Beria's speech at the 19th Party Congress in October 1952 wherein he expressed the political and economic importance of Ukraine. The course then initated has not been changed by the Kremlin and continues to the present day to wit:

(a) L. H. Melnikov was removed from the position of secretary of the Communist Party of Ukraine (a position of virtual dictator of Ukraine) in June 1953 for his policy of russification.

(b) The celebration of the 300th anniversary of the Pereyaslav Treaty has as its objective proving the people of Ukraine that the only unbampered path for their full development lies in Union with Russia. In this connection the Ukrainians are now, in 1954, being offered a coequal place with the Russians in sharing the might and power of the Soviet Union.

(c) The recent Kremlin move of ceding the Crimea to the Ukrainian S. S. R. is undoubtedly intended to prove the good faith of the Soviet masters toward Ukraine.

Such powerful moves and arguments, advanced by the Kremlin in order to keep Ukraine satisfied and thus separated from the West, require immediate and powerful counteraction on the part of the West and the United States in particular. No more powerful argument could be forthcoming than acceptance of Ukraine and Byelorussia into the comity of nations. By such an act the West would discontinue its treatment of them as second-rate vassals of Russia. Full recognition with an exchange of envoys is the only answer to this acute problem.

3. Any possible allegation that the exchange of envoys between the United States and Ukraine and Byelorussia could be interpreted as a desire to interfere in the internal affairs of the U. S. S. R. is not only absurd, but clearly contrary to accepted rules of international law. Leaving aside the purely incidental fact that it is Russia's system which is based on interference in the affairs of other nations through the Comintern, Cominform, and by other devious methods, it is a fact that the United States has already granted Ukraine and Byelorussia de jure recognition by voting affirmatively for their admission to membership in the United Nations in 1945.

Again, in conclusion, we would like to express our appreciation for your efforts in behalf of the Ukrainian nation which we believe can, if given the opportunity, play a much more important role in the anti-Communist struggle.

Sincerely yours,
OMELAN ANTONOVYCH,
Chairman, Ukrainian Association of
Washington, D. C.

The Bryson Bill, H. R. 1227

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 28, 1954

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a petition concerning the Bryson bill, H. R. 1227. The petition follows:

We, the undersigned, believing that the cause of total abstinence can be served by the reduction of advertising of alcoholic beverages over radio and television, urge that our congressional Representatives insist on getting a hearing and voting for the Bryson bill, H. R. 1227, which would prohibit the transportation in interstate commerce of alcoholic beverages advertising in newspapers, periodicals, and its broadcasting over radio and TV. Also to present the petitions to the House and to have a note made of them in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

Mrs. Elnora R. DeBardelehen, Mrs. H. K. Wiggins, Mrs. H. P. Waits, Mrs. B. L. Waldrup, Mrs. C. D. Moore, Mrs. J. T. Higgins, Mrs. A. P. Nelson, Mrs. John B. Vaughn, Mrs. A. S. Hargis, Mrs. Kate Boyles, Mrs. J. R. Gill, Mrs. J. E. Dillard, Mrs. B. L. Hayes, Mrs. G. D. Shubert, Mrs. O. C. Comer, Mrs. W. H. Henderson, Mrs. C. L. Duke, Mrs. W. J. Culver, Mrs. Frank E. Stubbs, Mrs. P. L. Buoh, Mrs. J. J. Wells, Mrs. J. S. Gates, Mrs. Claude E. Amberson, Mrs. J. C. Weinberg, Mrs. Roy Higgins, Mrs. John C. Weathers, Mrs. E. W. Jackson, Mrs. Myrtle Mitchell, Mrs. Wilbur G. McCrary, Mrs. W. W. Gannaway, Mrs. Kenneth Huddleston, Mrs. Walter D. Rogers, Mrs. Bernard D. O'Hare, Mrs. James C. Chism, Mrs. Maggie Rush Letson, Mrs. V. Day, Mrs. A. C. Coyle, Mrs. J. E. Gray, Mrs. Allen M. Simmons, Mrs. P. Z. Cooper, Mrs. P. A. Peacock, Mrs. W. C. Brannon, Mrs. T. S. Bryars, Mrs. Cathern Green, Mrs. R. B. Bryant, Mrs. B. L. Hagley, Mrs. R. L. Dunn, Mrs. C. T. Collier, Mrs. A. B. Lovett, Mrs. C. R. Crim, Mrs. B. F. Letson, Mrs. F. O. Dempsey, Mrs. C. E. Hargrove, Mrs. Susie Thompson, Mrs. A. P. Lehman, Mrs. W. D. McGill, Mrs. Iris R. Connor, Mrs. E. T. Etheredge, Mrs. J. C. Cash, Mrs. H. S. Chaffin, Mrs. H. W. Cannon, Mrs. W. E. Withers, Mrs Roy E. Smith, Mrs. T. H. Fallin, Mrs. F. H. Coupland, Mrs. John K. Black, Mrs. C. N. Fuller, Mrs. Herman E. Weston, H. K. Wiggins, H. P. Waits, Mrs. H. H. McGee, Mrs. M. D. Latham, Jack B. Vaughn, Mrs. J. R. Davidson, Mrs. S. M. Dunn, Mrs. Roy C. King, Mrs. S. H. Hancken, Mrs. J. R. Jones, Mrs. P. E. Feltham, Mrs. Roy Smith, Jr., Mr. Roy Smith, Jr., Mrs. Lula D. Johnson, Mrs. J. V. Cartwright, Mrs. J. C. High, Mrs. T. C. Latham, Mrs. J. A. Batson, Mrs. Jo Ann Campbell, Mrs. Ernest E. Campbell, Mrs. J. W. Reynolds, Catherine Dillard, John E. Dillard, Jr., Ovetta Neal, Mrs. Wilbur Schou, all of Birmingham, Ala.

An Anniversary Editorial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. OREN HARRIS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 28, 1954

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, freedom is the foundation of our democracy. It is the guiding start of the principle of independence. The principle of the independence of the individual conscience of man is beyond the grants of liberty by State or political entity.

It has truly been said that our American democracy was conceived in the Mayflower Pact, born of the Declaration of Independence, and developed in the Constitution of the United States and the Bill of Rights.

Religious liberty is the cornerstone of this great democracy. Spiritual freedom nourishes and sustains our common heritage. The churches of America provide the source of our strength, the living faith in our democracy that sustains the principles of liberty and freedom.

An example of this heritage exemplifying the faith in America was in the celebration recently of the golden anniversary of the Beech Street Baptist Church in Texarkana, Ark. Fifty years in the life of this church, some of which were arduous, rugged, and trying but eventful in the life of the community, have given faith and hope to so many and provided comfort, strength, and guidance for the community.

On the occasion of this important event, Mr. J. Q. Mahaffey, editor of the Texarkana Gazette, wrote a timely editorial which I wish to include in the RECORD, as follows:

An Anniversary Editorial

(By J. Q. Mahaffey, editor, Texarkana Gazette)

Today is one of the great days in the life of Texarkana's bustling Beech Street Baptist Church. It is 50 years old and the golden anniversary services today will be a fitting conclusion to a week of special services, featuring some of the biggest names in the Southern Baptist Convention.

The zeal with which the church has gone about the celebration of its 50th birthday is characteristic of the enthusiasm with which it tackles everything. The Reverend James G. Harris, a dedicated bundle of energy, exemplifies the spirit of a congregation which during the past few years has accomplished the impossible in financing, building, and expansion, not to mention the greater victories in the realm of the spirit.

It would be untrue to say that the 50 years have been a succession of sweet dreams. Beech Street has had its ups and downs. It has been tempered by troubles, a condition which almost every institution or individual must achieve before it can do its greatest works. The discouragements, the setbacks of Beech Street always seemed to give the church room for a running start on the comeback that carried it much farther up the hill.

Perhaps the most significant thing that can be said about this particular church on its 50th anniversary is the unchallenged fact that it constitutes a generous part of the conscience of Texarkana. That, it seems to me, has always been one of the tests which determines the effectiveness of a church in a community—how well does it serve as the conscience of that community.

It may be said to the credit of Beech Street Church that it is not ashamed of the gospel, nor is it afraid.

Whether you realize it or not, such institutions contribute greatly to your safety, your freedom, and your peace of mind for fear is a byproduct of evil of which righteousness is an unrelenting foe.

The Patriots' Paradox

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 28, 1954

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to insert an editorial on Patriots' Day, entitled "The Patriots' Paradox," which appeared on April 16, 1954, in the Italian News. It is a thought-consuming article, and I believe should be brought to the attention of the Members of the House of Representatives.

The Patriots' Paradox

Give me your tired, your poor,
  Your huddled masses, yearning to breathe free,
The wretched refuse of your teeming shore.
  Send these, the homeless, tempest-tost to me,
I lift my lamp beside the golden door.

—*Emma Lazarus*
(Words on Statue of Liberty).

For us, Patriots' Day is an ironic celebration.

In Boston, Italo-American veterans' organizations take the leading role in the celebration, not because they are Italo-Americans but merely because the North End—where the American Revolution had its birth—is made up almost entirely of people of our descent.

So we'll parade, and we'll make speeches, we'll lean out our parlor windows and watch the Paul Revere ceremony, and we'll raise a flag at Copp's Hill and decorate heroes' graves. And we feel pretty good to be Americans.

Then a superpatriot comes along and kicks every man and woman of Italian descent smack in the teeth. And although most of us are hurt enough to come back fighting, too many of us will take it, hoping for the pat on the head.

The 100 percent pure "Yankees" kicked us plenty hard when they passed the McCarran Immigration Act. In effect, it says Italians are not as good as Anglo-Saxons. We'll let a few in—but keep the number to a minimum. And as if this isn't humiliation enough, many of our own people will back up the cockeyed racial theories of Senator MCCARRAN and his discriminating cohorts.

So that's what makes Patriots' Day ironic for us.

We're good enough to take the lead in observing the famous ride of Paul Revere, who, incidently, has been quite conclusively proven to have been of Italian descent himself. And we're good enough to honor the heroes of the Revolution.

But others of our nationality don't seem to be.

Resolutions of National Society, Daughters of American Colonists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES C. DAVIS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 28, 1954

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert herewith the following resolutions adopted by the National Society, Daughters of American Colonists, at its 33d general assembly held in Washington, D. C.:

Resolutions of National Society, Daughters of American Colonists

RESTRICTING TREATIES AND EXECUTIVE AGREEMENTS

Whereas domestic law by treaties and executive agreements is the most dangerous issue facing America today; and

Whereas, unlike the laws of other nations, the Constitution of the United States makes foreign treaties become the supreme law of this land, thus superseding the Constitution and all Federal and State laws; therefore be it

Resolved, That the 33d general assembly, National Society, Daughters of American Colonists, urge the passage of a constitutional amendment to provide that no treaty is valid which conflicts with the Constitution of the United States, that no treaty is to be effective until implemented by legislation, and that no such legislation shall be valid if contrary to or in excess of the powers delegated to the Congress by the Constitution; and be it further

Resolved, That until the adoption of such a constitutional amendment by the Senate and by three-fourths of the State legislatures, we most strongly oppose the adoption of any further treaties by the Senate and the adoption of any further agreements of any kind with a foreign power or group of foreign powers by the President, by any United States Government department or agency, or by diplomatic notes, unless such treaty or agreement contains reservations unmistakably providing that our own national and State laws shall prevail in case of conflict with the terms of any such treaty or agreement.

GENOCIDE CONVENTION

Whereas article II (b), genocide, is considered an international crime if one "causes serious bodily or mental harm to members of a group," per example, a citizen of the United States might be considered as causing mental harm if he were to make remarks which might be construed as detrimental by the Soviet Union, and be tried by the International Court of Justice, the effect would be to restrict freedom of speech and destroy right to trial by jury as designated by the Constitution of the United States; and

Whereas the United States delegate in the United Nations legal committee has cast the American vote in support of a six-nation resolution calling for speedy ratification by nations of the world of the United Nations Genocide Convention; and

Whereas the Genocide Convention is technically in force because it has been approved by a majority of the U. N. members; and

Whereas the vote in support of the ratification is an arrant betrayal of the administration's promises before the Senate Judiciary Committee last April 6: Be it

Resolved, That the 33d general assembly, National Society, Daughters of American Colonists, strongly oppose the ratification of the Genocide Convention or Treaty by the Senate of the United States.

OPPOSITION TO PROPOSED GENOCIDE TREATY AND NEW CODE OF OFFENSES

Whereas in 1948 the United States representative to the United Nations signed the Genocide Convention and the Senate Judiciary Committee held hearings, however the proposed treaty has not been submitted to the Senate for ratification; and

Whereas a so-called code of offenses against the peace and security of mankind is on the program of the international law commission for consideration at its meeting in May, under which code many provisions of the Genocide Convention are incorporated: Be it

Resolved, That the 33d general assembly, National Society, Daughters of American Colonists, oppose the intent of the so-called code of offenses against the peace and security of mankind, a code which might become a new international law without the opportunity of the American people to reject it.

OPPOSITION TO COVENANT ON HUMAN RIGHTS

Whereas the Declaration on Human Rights and the pending Covenant on Human Rights as proposed by the United Nations are two different documents; and

Whereas the Covenant on Human Rights when ratified by the United States Senate as a treaty will become binding upon the United States; and

Whereas the American people are not aware of the inherent dangers in this covenant which would supersede our Bill of Rights and our State laws: Be it

Resolved, That the 33d general assembly, National Society, Daughters of American Colonists, urge public education and active opposition to United States ratification of the International Covenant on Human Rights as contained in the report of the ninth session of the Commission on Human Rights (Geneva, April 7 to May 30, 1953).

NATO STATUS OF FORCES TREATY

Whereas the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, which is a multilateral alliance between the United States and 13 countries, was signed in Washington, D. C., on April 4, 1949; and

Whereas representatives of the 14 countries met and signed 3 treaties dealing with problems arising under the NATO alliance which our Senate ratified in 1953; and

Whereas the status of the forces agreement, which is the third treaty, includes a provision known as article VII, which gives to a NATO nation exclusive criminal jurisdiction within its borders over foreign NATO soldiers (including American soldiers) who commit crimes while off duty; and

Whereas in the Status of Forces NATO Treaty the constitutional rights of American soldiers serving on foreign soil is abrogated and as this treaty repudiates one of America's oldest and finest traditions: that the American flag and the protection of the Constitution of the United States follow our soldiers wherever they go: Be it

Resolved, That 33d general assembly, National Society, Daughters of American Colonists, recommend that said treaty be repealed or amended to give American soldiers their proper protection while serving in foreign countries.

CONDEMNING RED CHINA

Whereas Red China has violated every international law by her entrance into the Korean Civil War and has practiced the most inhuman atrocities upon civilians and war prisoners alike, has murdered hundreds of American soldiers, prisoners of war, and has forced false confessions of germ warfare from harassed and suffering soldiers; and

Whereas we have as yet no negotiated armistice nor any peace formula with Red China: Be it

Resolved, That the 33d general assembly, National Society, Daughters of American Colonists, protests the admittance of Red China to the council table and strenuously opposes the recognition of Communist or Red China by the United States and/or its admission to the United Nations; and be it further

Resolved, That our United States delegation be instructed to use the veto power if necessary to prevent and prohibit the seating of the Red Chinese delegation in the United Nations for any purpose whatsoever.

FOREIGN ECONOMIC THREATS

Whereas employment and business activity in parts of America are being adversely affected by open-door immigration policies and excessive importation of goods from low-wage and slave-labor countries: Be it

Resolved, That the 33d general assembly of the National Society, Daughters of American Colonists, advocate the protection of American payrolls, agriculture, and industry from unfair foreign competition and ask Congress and the President to deal realistically and with foresight in making sure that our national economy is not being undermined and permanently damaged by unwise immigration and tariff practices.

TRADE WITH COMMUNIST COUNTRIES

Whereas any trade with Red countries helps their economic welfare and thus assists in the perpetuation of their dictatorships and makes them more formidable in the worldwide struggle between freedom and tyranny: Be it

Resolved, That the 33d general assembly, National Society, Daughters of American Colonists, oppose any trade with Communist countries and also opposes giving economic and military assistance to nations which insist on trafficking with the enemy.

UNITED NATIONS CHARTER REVISION

Whereas, in 1955, under article 109 of the United Nations Charter, revision of the charter will be made automatically; and

Whereas since the United Nations Charter was adopted as a treaty, any amendments adopted would be part of that treaty; and

Whereas a Senate committee was appointed in September to study proposals for the revision of the United Nations Charter: Be it

Resolved, That the 33d general assembly, National Society, Daughters of American Colonists, urge its members to study carefully and consistently the reports of said Senate committee, and all proposals for the United Nations Charter revision, that we may be prepared to contact our Congressmen intelligently with urgent requests for support of our resulting stand on this matter.

RIGHT OF VETO IN U. N.

Whereas frequent abuse of its right of veto by Russia cannot change the fundamental fact that proper use just once of the veto by the United States as a permanent member of the Security Council of the United Nations might save ourselves and the world from catastrophe; and

Whereas events demonstrate that the United States may be out-voted in the Security Council as well as in the Assembly of the United Nations: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the 33d General Assembly, National Society, Daughters of American Colonists, urge the public, the Congress, and the President to resist all attempts to weaken by omission or evasion our right of veto in the Security Council of the United Nations.

CONQUEST BY IMMIGRATION

Whereas Public Law 414, known as the McCarran-Walter immigration and nationality law, is being attacked by so-called liberals, both in and out of Congress; and

Whereas any changes in the law would sabotage the best immigration and naturalization bill this country has ever had; and

Whereas substitute bills and amendments have been introduced which would open wide the floodgates to a practically unrestricted flow of aliens; Be it

Resolved, That the 33d General Assembly, National Society, Daughters of American Colonists, request all members to write immediately and without fail to their two Senators and Congressmen urging them to prevent the destruction of the McCarran-Walter Act by the passage of any new laws, provision, or amendment.

OATH OF UNESCO

Whereas UNESCO (United National Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization), a specialized agency of the United Nations, operating in the United States through UNESCO National Commission under the United States Department of State and supported largely by American tax money, has as its objective the establishment of world government; and

Whereas UNESCO employees take the following oath: "I solemnly undertake to exercise in all loyalty, discretion, and conscience the functions to me as a member of the staff of UNESCO, to discharge these functions and regulate my conduct with the interests of UNESCO only in view, and not to seek or accept instructions in regard to the performance of my duties from any government or other authority external to the organization"; and

Whereas the UNESCO oath should, in effect, be classified as un-American: Be it

Resolved, That the 33d general assembly, National Society, Daughters of American Colonists, urge its members to put forth a determined effort to inform the public of this oath which undermines allegiance to this country.

AMERICAN TEXTBOOKS

Whereas the boys and girls in our schools today will, in a few years, become the citizens and the leaders of our country, and

Whereas it is evident that some textbooks and some teaching distorts the lessons of our American history, decry our country's heroes, and in the series of UNESCO booklets, Toward World Understanding, both teachers and pupils alike are warned against the poison of patriotism; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the 33d general assembly, National Society, Daughters of American Colonists, put forth every effort to combat this terrible attack on the minds and hearts of our boys and girls and urge the use of textbooks that will teach love of country and our heritage of freedom.

JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

Whereas the recent investigations by a special committee of the United States Senate have revealed that this Nation is losing its battle against juvenile delinquency; and

Whereas this committee reports it is baffled in trying to get at the root of the problem, it does recommend further study and emphatically states that the time has come to declare all-out war on juvenile delinquency: Be it

Resolved, That the 33d general assembly, National Society, Daughters of American Colonists, commend the investigating committee on its findings, so helpful in awakening parents and responsible citizens to causes of juvenile delinquency; be it further

Resolved, That we urge the continued pursuance of the investigations until the root of the trouble is exposed and proper legislation can be made.

PROMOTERS OF LOYALTY

Whereas continuing revelations and conclusive evidence disclose widespread tolerance and advocacy of radical and Communist theories at all levels of American education and in the various media influencing mass thinking: Be it

Resolved, That the 33d general assembly, National Society, Daughters of American Colonists, commend patriotic educators, teachers, pastors, journalists, commentators, and all those who have refused to join the subversive propaganda conspiracy against America.

RIGHT TO WORK

Resolved, That the 33d general assembly, National Society, Daughters of American Colonists, go on record approving just and proper legislation protecting a man's right to work.

COMMENDATION OF INVESTIGATING COMMITTEE

Whereas the House Committee on Un-American Activities, the Subcommittee on Internal Security, and the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, have been conducting valuable hearings and compiling essential information on un-American activities; and

Whereas these committees through the years have been of the greatest constructive force in combatting alien ideologies and subversive activities in the United States: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the 33d general assembly, National Society, Daughters of American Colonists, commend the efforts of these investigating committees to reveal the increasing infiltration into our American way of life of undesirable persons and their questionable conduct.

COMMENDING FBI

Resolved, That the 33d general assembly, National Society, Daughters of American Colonists, express its unqualified faith in the Federal Bureau of Investigation and appreciation for its ceaseless and invaluable vigilance in detecting subversive individuals and organizations in the United States.

RESTORATION OF MINERAL RIGHTS TO FORT BERTHOLD INDIANS

Whereas the construction of Garrison Dam Reservoir project in the State of North Dakota, acquired 158,000 acres of tribal and individually owned lands on the Fort Berthold Indian Reservation under Public Law 437; and

Whereas no provision was made to reserve to the Indians their oil and mineral interests in such lands: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the 33d general assembly, National Society, Daughters of American Colonists, approve the enactment into law of Senate bill S. 2812 which provides for the return of oil and gas rights to the Indians of the Fort Berthold Reservation.

AMENDMENT TO THE FLAG LAW (PUBLIC LAW 829)

Whereas section 3 (k) of Public Law 829 requires clarification to lessen present confusion on proper interpretation: Be it

Resolved, That the 33d general assembly, National Society, Daughters of American Colonists, request the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States to make the following desired change as provided for in section 8 (Public Law 829):

"In section 3 (k) strike out the entire subsection (k) and insert in lieu thereof,

"'When used on a speaker's platform, the flag if displayed flat should be displayed above and behind the speaker. When displayed from a staff, whether on platform, in chancel, or on the floor on the same level with the audience, or in the open on platform or ground level, the flag should occupy the position of honor at the speaker's right as he faces the congregation or audience. Any other flag so displayed should be placed at the speaker's left as he faces the congregation or audience.'"

THE FLAG OF THE UNITED STATES

Whereas the flag of the United States of America is a symbol drawing men's hearts together in gratitude for its protection and freedom; and

Whereas there is a growing need for the display of our flag, not only on public buildings and schools, but on every home in the country; and

Whereas such display of the flag by our citizens would constitute a public reaffirmation of their love for and faith in our country: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the 33d general assembly, National Society, Daughters of American Colonists, urge all citizens to own and display the flag of the United States at their homes, particularly on those days for special display of the flag as specified by section 2 (d) of the flag code.

Alcoholic Beverage Advertising

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 28, 1954

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, there is a large group of sincere persons in Illinois who are concerned about the effects of alcoholic beverage advertising, especially on the minds of children and young folks. Just as heavy advertising campaigns have induced a greater number of persons to take up smoking, it is feared that alcoholic beverage advertising will create a greater incidence of drinking.

I believe these citizens have a right to make their case before the Congress of the United States. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent to have their petition printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, along with the names of those who have signed the petition.

There being no objection, the petition and signatures were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To Our Senators and Representatives in Congress:

We, the undersigned, respectfully petition you to protect us in our rights as parents and as purchasers by passing legislation to prohibit alcoholic-beverage advertising over the radio and television and in our magazines and newspapers. Our television sets are being rendered worse than useless to us by alcoholic-beverage advertising, and our children are being led to believe that alcohol is harmless and to glorify crime by means of such advertising:

Judith Ann Dagley, Karen Sue Crawford, Loretta Fern Frymire, Venda Loe Frymire, Ronald Lee Boggs, Ronnie Gaines, Darrell Boggs, Ralph Stinson, Maunie, Ill.; Nigel F. Johnson, Carmi, Ill.; Mrs. Ernest York, Emma, Ill.; William Shoppell, Carmi, Ill.; Jennie Ozment, Verna, Newcomb, Emma Ill.; John M. Campbell, Dena Frease, Elizabeth N. Brown, Carmi, Ill.; Hattie Burress, Emma, Ill.; Guy L. Johnson, Mary Margaret York, Mrs. Walter L. Clark, Carmi, Ill.; Mrs. Minnie L. Seal, Emma, Ill.; Mrs. John Campbell, Mrs. Vernal Newcomb, Mr. Vernal Newcomb, Carmi, Ill.

Rev. Doyle K. Boggs, Mrs. Doyle Boggs, Wilber Edwards, Mrs. Wilber Edwards, R. H. Kilmer, Cecil Kilmer, Mrs. W. E. Lairmer, J. W. Scamahorn, Evelyn Schamahorn, Bessie Mundy, Raymond Roser, Charles Roser, Mrs. Raymond Roser, Janet Schamahorn, Gary Boggs, Darrell Boggs, Maunie, Ill.; Nora Spence, Enos Spence, Wm. Orr, Norris City, Ill.; Mrs. Frank Warren, Frank Warren, Broughton, Ill.; Donna Allison, Carmi, Ill.; Clarence Newcomb, Emma, Ill.

Maude Gunter, Iris Richardson, Minnie Gaines, Pearl Garrett, Esther Shroyer, Lucile Phillips, Mary G. Scolson, Jessie Lee Hayter, E. F. Garrett, J. B. Poppins, Harvey Cook, Hal Phillips, George Hayter, Lulu Moore, Margaret Garrett, Bill Delap, Jessie Garrett, Broughton, Ill.; George D. Pemberton, Eldorado, Ill.; Charles T. Melton, Broughton, Ill.; Malinda A. Pemberton, Eldorado, Ill.; Grace Irvin, Grace Poppins, Freda Coontz, Grace Cook, Wilma Barker, Broughton, Ill.; Mary Lee Pemberton, Eldorado, Ill.

Martha C. Anderson, Joe Anderson, Harry Ward, Mamie Ward, Phillip Kent Miller, Riley Mangis, Everett L. Anderson, Jess M. Leslie, Lela Mangis, Nannie McClure, Guy McClure, Mrs. J. M. Leslie, Nora Hemphill, E. M. Hughes, Loley Veldin, John W. Mangis, McLeansboro, Ill.; Amolee McIntyre, Louisville, Ky.; Sallie E. Black, McLeansboro, Ill.; Jack McIntyre, Louisville, Ky.

Edith F. Allen, Ella Moore, Della Williams, Mary Halton, Nellie Hensley, Daisy Roth, Verna Mead, Ida Decker, Amy Ross, Nellie Carlton, Alma Cremeens, Nellie Gullic, Ruby Hatton, Ruby Barnett, Idilene Harrawood, Louise Weeks, Roxie Huggins, A. B. Clodfelder, Margaret Edwards, Betty Edwards, Elsie Montgomery, Laurel S. Huggins, Norma Cook, Lucille Meeks, Robert R. Johnson, Chalmers E. Allen, McLeansboro, Ill.; Daye Harawood, Enfield, Ill.; Frank L. Smith, R. C. Hatton, Joe H. Cremeens, C. F. Downers, O. F. Gowdy, Ollie Irwin, Ouna Stewart, H. W. Hamilton, Lillian Hamilton, McLeansboro, Ill.; Mrs. Marian Schroeder, Hecker, Ill.; Mrs. Edith Smith, McLeansboro, Ill.

Walter Sanders, Alfred Vente, Fred Duncan, Charles P. Meade, Eanos Aud, Mary Aud, John Metcalf, Innis Young, Marie McGarvan, Donald Allen, B. C. Miller, J. J. Biggerstaff, Grace Campbell, Nannie Miller, Mae Biggerstaff, Ruby Duncan, Billie Duncan, Carlton Brockett, Dorothy Brockett, Alice Allen, Harry Thompson, Freda Thompson, McLeansboro, Ill.

Rev. Stanley Joplin, Finnis E. Biggerstaff, W. E. Carson, Mrs. Pearl Carson, Mrs. Geneva Bean, Mrs. Orrie Reed, Orrie Reed, Mr. and Mrs. Frank Farquay, Mrs. Wm. Gunter, Wm. Gunter, Mrs. Dave Casper, Mrs. W. M. Shaffer, W. M. Shaffer, Mrs. Shirley Nalley, Mrs. Frona Joplin, Mrs. Thelma Johnson, Mr. J. L. Johnson, Mrs. Anna Roe, Mrs. Sarah Bond, Mrs. Velma Waggoner, Charles W. Waggoner, Mrs. Edith Smith, Mr. and Mrs. James F. Grimes, McLeansboro, Ill.

J. D. De Wees, Mable T. De Wees, Lula Minor, E. L. Minor, Fred Friend, Eliza Friend, Norris City, Ill.; Rev. James G. Johnson, Doris E. Johnson, Eldorado, Ill.; Mrs. Jessie Albert, Mrs. Carrie Johnson, Mr. Clyde Johnson, Mrs. Effie O. Allen, Payne Allen, Geo. M. Albert, Mr. Tommy Howard, Mrs. Emily Dean Howard, Gertrude Cusic, Nena Cusic, Norris City, Ill.; Rev. Edward Minor, Arta Mae Minor, Alma Eaton, Maud Riley, Shawneetown, Ill.

Whereas we, the undersigned members of the Methodist Men's Club, of the Broughton circuit, object to the advertisement of alcoholic beverages over the radio and television because it violates the rights of freemen to decide what may come into our homes and because we think these beverages are an evil and are undermining the morals of our people and are causing delinquency among our youth: Be it therefore

Resolved, That we petition our Congressmen to prevent such advertising by suitable legislation.

Mr. G. J. Erwin, Broughton, Ill.; W. J. Faulkner, McLeansboro, Ill.; Claude Moore, Broughton, Ill.; Ralph Acord, Walter C. Wilson, Edward L. Shibinski, H. V. Council, Clarence Ernst, John T. Erkmann, McLeansboro, Ill.; Rev. Roy Hudson, Broughton, Ill.; Carl H. Glenn, McLeansboro, Ill.; Edward Tucker, Dale, Ill.; Paul Friel, Ellis Hill, C. E.

Bowers, W. C. Ledford P. H. Witters, McLeansboro, Ill.; Floyd E. Whitmer, Dale, Ill.; Earl Delap, Broughton, Ill.; R. C. Hatton, McLeansboro, Ill.; George D. Jenkins, Harrisburg, Ill.; Albert Whitmer, E. F. Garrett, Broughton, Ill.; Floyd Prince, Robert R. Johnson, McLeansboro, Ill.

Address of Gov. Herman E. Talmadge, of Georgia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. DAVIS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 28, 1954

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, Gov. Herman E. Talmadge, of Georgia, at the invitation of President J. P. Dennis, was invited to speak to the forum luncheon of the Traffic Club of New York on Wednesday, April 14, 1954.

Governor Talmadge delivered an address to the Traffic Club which deserves the attention and consideration of thoughtful persons in every section of our land.

Unanimous consent has been granted me to insert this address in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and pursuant to that unanimous consent, I insert Governor Talmadge's address herewith:

President Dennis, members of the Traffic Club of New York, and my friends, to you of the Empire State I bring the warm greetings of the 3½ million citizens of Georgia—the empire State of the South.

I am not here as an apologist, like some of my predecessors on the rostrums of the North and East.

Neither have I come as a critic.

I rather am here as an ambassador of a great State and a sturdy people.

All of us in the South, of which Georgia is the keystone and an important part, have come a long way in the last 20 years. The transition has been one from what was once considered the Nation's No. 1 economic problem to what is today considered the country's foremost opportunity.

Through toil and sweat today and planning and training for tomorrow, we, of Georgia, are pulling ourselves up by our own bootstraps. We have refused to leave our future to chance. Neither are we content to leave our reputation to erstwhile southern purveyors of literary filth who would rather make a dollar than tell the whole truth.

We are deriving our strength through renewed faith in ourselves, our labors, our heritage, our destiny and our God.

The Georgia of today has come a long way from the ruinous devastation left by the War Between the States.

Our people are united as never before and are working tirelessly at the task of promoting job opportunities and a better living for all. As a result, Georgia and her sister States of the South are advancing at a faster rate than those in any other region.

We are diversifying our agriculture and balancing it with sound industry. Our doors are open wide to capital and labor so long as they come to join in full partnership in our development. We are extending a cordial welcome to this new southward march.

Georgia has corrected the mistakes of a one-crop economy based on cotton. We have dropped to sixth among the States in cotton production, although it is still our chief money crop. However, we have made our chief gains and are leading the Nation in our harvests of peanuts, watermelons, pecans, and pimientos and our output of broiler chickens. We are second only to California in the growing of peaches and have increased our income from beef cattle 466 percent in the past 12 years.

Our State ranks third in size among the leading textile manufacturing States of the Nation and produces 75 percent of the country's tire fabric. Its plants, in addition, are manufacturing cottonseed oil and meal, steel, machinery, automobiles, chemicals, fertilizers, clay products, cement, furniture, leather goods, candy, wearing apparel, processed meats and food and refined sugar.

The value of our manufactured products is approximately $4 billion annually.

Georgia led the entire South in industrial development last year with 270 new or expanded plants each representing an initial investment of more than $50,000. These factories are affording new employment to 15,000 persons are adding $50 million a year in payrolls to the State's economy. A typical example of this excellent new industry is the Rayonier Corp.'s $25 million plant at Jesup which will manufacture synthetic fibers from wood cellulose made from south Georgia pine trees.

These plants, for the most part, are locating in the smaller cities and towns, many of which previously had no industry. There they are being welcomed as new citizens and a valuable addition to the economy. They furnished for the first time ample opportunities to women workers in the towns and help round out the income of farm families. This new purchasing power means added markets for all kinds of manufactured products.

The word has spread and more and more firms are coming to Georgia. There is scarcely a major company which does not have a branch plant, warehouse, or sales office in the State. The big companies have discovered that it is profitable business to process their goods in Georgia rather than shipping them in as they are ordered.

These strides have meant corresponding increases in bank deposits and clearings and in the take-home pay and purchasing power of our citizens. They have been translated into new homes, a higher standard of living, and the enjoyment of some of the better things of life.

There is no more accurate barometer of a State's progress than the accomplishments of its State government.

The old description used by some people when referring to Georgia of a Model T Ford mired in the mud near a one-room schoolhouse overlooking eroded cotton fields does not apply today.

I am proud that I can report to you that during my term of office the State of Georgia has spent almost three-quarters of a billion dollars on permanent and lasting improvements.

The Georgia Legislature is appropriating 53 percent of our total annual revenue for educational purposes, a percentage unmatched by any other State in the Union. During my administration we have supplied more money for education than all preceding administrations combined since the public school system was founded in 1871.

We have added over 1,000 new school buses and thousands of new teachers. But our greatest achievement in the field of public education has been the consummation of a $200 million construction program which is affording equal facilities for white and Negro children.

Similar long strides have been made in higher education with $25 million in new projects for our State colleges and universities.

We are creating a $15 million medical center at the University of Georgia Medical School to bring care to our indigent sick and more and better doctors to serve our people in both urban and rural areas.

Georgia has outstripped all other States in building 141 hospitals and health centers to serve every area and placing these important facilities within convenient distance of all our citizens.

The establishment of these improved and expanded educational and health facilities has rendered all of our communities far more serviceable and attractive in the quest for new business and industry.

Our road system, once shot through with politics and disintegrated from neglect, has been reformed into one of the best in the country. We are building new highways and maintaining existing roads at a rate unprecedented in State history.

A statewide forestry program has been activated and Georgia has risen from 46th to 1st among the States in the number of acres of timber protected. Eighteen new farmers' markets have been constructed and 14 others expanded. The State farm market in Atlanta is the world's largest and the entire market system last year reported an increase in total revenue from 1953 sales despite declining commodity prices.

For the first time we have achieved real prison reform. We have segregated the various types of offenders in our prison system and have given each inmate a productive job to do. Not only have we made the system more self-supporting but we also are rehabilitating the men. To combat false propaganda which has been circulated about our prisons we have made a film that is shown to judges all over the country who have before them extradition cases. No longer can out-of-State jurists conscientiously refuse to return fugitives to Georgia. We now boast of one of the best and most effective corrections' systems in the entire Nation.

Recognizing the fundamental fact that the security and prosperity of the future is tied up in the youth of today, we in Georgia are placing emphasis on programs designed to prepare our young people for responsible citizenship.

The world's largest 4–H Club center is being completed in central Georgia at a cost of $5 million, half of which has been borne by the State. Then, too, Camp Safety Patrol, the only camp of its kind in the world has been established near Cordele to train our young people in the rudiments of safety.

Under a grant from the Kellogg Foundation, of Battle Creek, Mich., the Nation's second adult-education center has been established with State matching funds at the University of Georgia as a place where men and women long since out of school can come for short courses and conferences.

Welfare benefits for the aged, dependent children, blind, and disabled have been trebled.

We have put into effect modern and efficient methods in the operation of our eleemosynary institutions and have transformed them from objects of shame into sources of pride. Humane and enlightened care have been substituted for bare custody at our hospitals for the mentally ill and tubercular and also at our schools for the blind and deaf.

All this and more we have accomplished without incurring any bonded indebtedness. When my administration ends in January the State's books will be balanced and a surplus will be left in the treasury. We have met our needs through streamlining our tax structure and adoption of a unique method of authority-type financing.

Shortly after I took office, the Georgia legislature enacted a coordinated sales-income tax as the basis for our State revenue structure. At the time it repealed scores of so-called nuisance levies and removed the State from the property-tax field, leaving that source of income to the counties and cities. Two years ago it adopted a constitutional amendment allocating for the first time all road-use taxes to the State highway department for road building and maintenance.

The school building authority is erecting our new public schools; the university system authority, our new college and university buildings; the bridge building authority, the bridges on our new highways; the hospital authority, the new Eugene Talmadge Memorial Hospital; and so on. A turnpike authority has been created to cooperate in the construction of the Chicago-to-Miami superhighway.

These authorities are private entities, separate and apart from the State. They are providng now long-needed capital improvements of a lasting nature to serve present and future generations of Georgians. This is being accomplished through the sale of revenue bonds and certificates which will be amortized out of regularly established capital outlay funds appropriated to State agencies.

These authorities are carrying out their programs at an extremely low administrative cost. And the rate of interest on their bonds and certificates is as favorable as that paid by the Federal Government on the national debt.

Relations between the races in Georgia, and throughout the South, at the present time are the best they have ever been in over half a century. We are getting along well and we Georgians believe that unmolested and without outside dictation and interference, we can work out our problems to the best interests of all concerned. Our major concern now, as it has been in the past, lies squarely in the realm of advancing the education, health, and welfare of all the people.

Many factors can be cited as responsible for the tremendous growth Georgia is experiencing. Among these are the abundant supply of productive and loyal labor; favorable tax rates; friendly State and local governments; ample water, electricity, and natural gas at favorable rates; economies in construction and living costs resulting from the mild climate and superior facilities for rail, air, highway, and water transportation.

I believe you will agree with me that of these advantages, the latter category is perhaps the most significant.

Georgia enjoys a unique position in relation to the South. It is described alternately as the gateway to the South and the keystone State of the South. Regardless of the simile you use, one cannot escape the conclusion that it is the center around which the business of the South gravitates.

Since the first lots were staked off for the city of Atlanta in 1836 and the city originally was christened Terminus—a most appropriate name—it has been the transportation and communications hub of the Southland.

Its role is illustrated by the fact that 90 passenger trains arrive and depart from it daily. Then, too, just one of the rail lines serving Atlanta handles 4,600 cars a day. The airport there is the sixth busiest in the Nation.

All major railroads coming into Georgia have built new yards in Atlanta. They also have converted 100 percent to the latest diesel equipment and are acquiring rapidly modern passenger cars.

The impressive total of 37 railroads with over 6,000 miles of mainline superimpose a network which covers Georgia from its mountains to its seacoast. Freight handled by these roads in 1952 totaled over 50 million tons.

Our State is perhaps more closely allied than any other to transportation since it built and still owns the Western and Atlantic Railroad which runs from Atlanta to Chattanooga. It is now under long-term lease to the N. C. & St. L. for a substantial annual rental.

One of the outstanding advancements in freight handling in our country was placed into operation 4 years ago by the Atlanta Freight Bureau, a nonprofit organization, which evolved the consolidated shipping plan. This is a pooling arrangement whereby individuals and firms buying in less than carload lots utilize the same freight cars and thus transport their goods with substantial savings on freight costs.

This has worked wonders not only in effecting economy but also in better service and more efficient car loading and handling. For instance, a machine shipped in New York on Thursday evening was delivered to the Atlanta buyer Saturday morning. This is astounding service for such bulky freight.

As I already have told you, Georgia is completing and unprecedented highway-building program. Broad, modern concrete and asphalt spans traverse the State and funnel motor transportation into all areas of the Nation. We are served by 519 motor carrier organizations operating interstate and 418 operating intrastate.

It was from the port of Savannah that the first steamship to cross the Atlantic sailed in 1819. The State enjoyed considerable prestige as an ocean terminal during its early history prior to the War Between the States, but its docks fell into disrepair and ocean commerce was neglected in the years which followed. We are now making a comeback.

One of my first acts as governor was the purchase of the Savannah Quartermaster Depot from the Government for $808,100—a transaction termed by the newspapers of my State as "the bargain of the century." This we have converted under the State Ports Authority into a self-supporting State port now valued at $20 million. Berth-for-berth it is the best equipped ocean terminal in the South and is the Nation's only State port standing on its own feet without a subsidy.

Of course, our operation is modest compared to the volume of goods and number of vessels handled by the Nation's larger ports like your own New York. Where you measure your imports and exports in millions of tons we still are dealing in thousands of pounds. But what is important is that Georgia firms needing water transport can now dispatch their goods through a port in their home State at great savings. They no longer have to ship their goods to New York, Charleston, Mobile, New Orleans, Jacksonville, and Norfolk. This has eliminated the payment of freight rate differentials which previously put Georgia business and agriculture at a disadvantage in competition with industries in other States.

And this is a two-way street because manufacturers and merchants, who formerly had to ship their goods into Georgia through distant ports, now can have them delivered directly to Georgia.

The Georgia port offers many advantages to shippers. It is constructed and equipped to facilitate loading and unloading in minimum time. The wharf charges are lower than those charged in many States and are comparable to those charged in others. Our personnel is satisfied and willing to work and we have had no delays—and anticipate none. Neither is any time lost because of bad weather.

We think, and I believe you will agree, that these are factors which add up to considerable savings to shipper and receiver alike.

The port operation is another example of the benefits Georgia is deriving from authority-type financing. The Georgia Ports Authority was created to operate the Savannah facility and in the 4 years it has functioned it has financed the construction of modern wharves, transit sheds and handling equipment while at the same time earning its purchase price three times over.

It goes without saying that Georgia owes a great debt to the world of transport for promoting the development which has freed it from the chains of economic servitude. And to you, the representatives of the companies and lines responsible, I wish to say, "Thank you," on behalf of all Georgians.

We are now engaged in the greatest struggle of our history. It is a clash of ideas and fundamental philosophies. The test is whether this Nation and its republican form of government, guaranteeing freedom for all its people, shall survive, or whether the entire world shall fall victim to the godless dictatorship epitomized by the one word, "communism."

Already 800 million of the world's people, occupying one-fourth of the land area of the earth, have fallen under the yoke of Red oppression.

The apostles of satanism who sit distrustingly in the Kremlin have no soul, no conscience and no God. They have one ruthless and uncompromising aim—the domination and enslavement of the whole world, including your fireside and mine.

It is folly for any of our leaders to be or act so naive as to suggest that we can sit around the conference table or do business in any other way with these butchers.

The Communists work night and day to destroy our institutions and are infiltrating key posts in government and other sensitive lines of occupation. Their strategy is to divide us and force us to defeat ourselves through bankruptcy, internal dissension and piecemeal commitment of our Armed Forces and resources to the farflung corners of the world.

No man who believes in freedom will be safe if our country falls victim to this menace. If we allow this to happen, we are not worthy of our heritage and will deserve the fate meted out ot us. We will have repudiated the sacrifices of our forefathers and will have denied our God.

There are certain positive steps which we can take to assure our future as a free and prosperous people:

We must launch a bipartisan crusade to destroy communism wherever it seeks to infiltrate into our Government and Nation. We must proceed without character assassination, headline-hunting, petty bickering or circumvention of basic liberties.

We must unite in strength and understanding with the resolve to assert ourselves in the international struggle with whatever force be necessary to preserve our country and our way of life.

We must return to the old American way of placing first things first.

We must define and limit Federal areas of taxation and give immediate tax relief to the individual taxpayer and business alike.

We must eliminate Federal bureaucracy and return government to the local level.

We must reaffirm the authority of the individual States to manage their own internal affairs without outside interference.

We must adopt a sound, realistic Federal budget predicated first upon filling our own peoples' needs and strengthening the fiber of our country.

We must give ourselves to a nationwide resurgence of faith in Almighty God; a faith which is the only source of lasting strength and power and a faith without which no country can be builded or can long endure.

The Role of Government in Nuclear Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN PHILLIPS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 28, 1954

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable W. Sterling Cole, Representative from the 39th District of New York and chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy of the Congress, delivered the 7th and last address in the William Pyle Philips lecture series on nuclear science on Wednesday evening, April 14, 1954, at Haverford College, Haverford, Pa. The previous speakers were top-flight scientists in various nuclear fields, including two Nobel prize winners. Representative Cole spoke on The Role of Government in Nuclear Development, dealing with the legal and political problems involved in atomic energy. Under unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, I extend my remarks in the Record and include this timely and informative statement:

It is an honor to have been invited to address you in this lecture series. Following the distinguished gentlemen of such great scientific learning who have addressed you earlier in the series has presented me with a standard I cannot hope to meet. Therefore, you must be patient with me if I avoid most of the technical side of the atom and talk in terms of the legal and political problems with which I feel more at home.

The role of the Federal Government in atomic energy is both complex and vital. As you know, President Eisenhower recently asked the Congress to revise the present Atomic Energy Act—which continued substantially unchanged since 1946. The President recommended revisions primarily relating to exchange of military and other atomic information with our friends abroad, and to opening atomic energy to private industry here at home. While considering these revisions, we should reexamine not only the machinery but also the philosophy of the original Atomic Energy Act. That is quite an undertaking. I will try to touch on at least some of it tonight, but I cannot hope to cover the entire area.

The Federal role in atomic energy can be separated into at least three categories: Production, development, and regulation.

By production, I mean not only the production of weapons and weapon materials themselves, but also the design and construction of the plants which produce weapons and weapon materials.

Development includes the conception and design of military weapons, basic research and applied engineering in nuclear research, and medical and biological research.

Regulation must, of course, include the problems of coordination of Government and industry activities and of the activities of the various agencies and departments of the Government.

During World War II, Federal atomic activities involved a huge and dramatic production effort. The wartime project was a gigantic gamble which paid off at Hiroshima and Nagasaki. After World War II, we all had visions of a peacetime atomic industry in a peaceful world. In this atmosphere of hope and peace the Atomic Energy Act of 1946 was written; the Baruch plan for international control of the military side of atomic energy was advanced; and men talked eagerly of atomic powered cars and planes which they expected lay only just beyond their reach. It was in this atmosphere that we created a civilian commission for atomic energy dedicated to peaceful development, which would be only temporarily delayed by concentration on military applications. The Atomic Energy Commission has stood as a monument to our determination to make atomic energy serve not only the military ends—which it does so dramatically—but the thousand peacetime purposes—which it does with equal effectiveness.

But production—atomic or any other kind—is not a normal function of our Federal Government. Here in the United States we have for the most part avoided injecting the Government directly into what we regard as business. Yet the production plants in which our atomic and thermonuclear weapons have been developed and manufactured are all today owned by the Federal Government. Because we needed additional weapon production capacity desperately—urgently—we have designed and built the new plants simultaneously on cost-plus-fixed-fee contracts with the taxpayers paying the whole bill. Those who did the work performed well. We now have about $7 billion of public funds invested in capital plant and equipment. Those plants are operated for the Government by industrial firms on contract. They are closely supervised by the Atomic Energy Commission. All of their expenses are fully reimbursed.

There are some who think that the American system of free enterprise is a luxury; something which we cannot afford in times of national stress. I disagree with them. I believe that competitive free enterprise has within it the seeds of our strength. I cannot help but wonder whether we might not have a stronger atomic-production system today if we could draw on the strength of competitive free enterprise. It is the responsibility of the Federal Government to assure the common defense and security. The most vital way in which to do so today is by maximizing the contribution which atomic and thermonuclear weapons can make to our military structure. This contribution should be made in such a way as to complement, not detract from the economic organization of our society. Production itself should be a Government role only in the event that there is some overriding reason which prevents private production.

The Federal Government today is the sole producer of atomic and thermonuclear materials. Is there some special reason why this force does not lend itself to our regular way of doing business? The answer to this complex question is vital to an understanding of what needs to be done in the months and years ahead.

The first billion or so of capital investment in atomic energy was made in secrecy as a military expedient. The processes involved gambles far beyond the risks normally taken by private enterprise. That meets the test; provides the wartime explanation. The postwar period of construction is different, at least in part. The huge plants which produce uranium 235 at Oak Ridge, Paducah, and Portsmouth are in fact peculiarly and solely useful as fissionable materials producers. But plutonium production facilities need not be of such singleness of purpose. They can be harnessed to produce electricity and to do other commercially profitable jobs.

Two facts seem to have dictated that new plutonium plants be undertaken only with public funds.

First, the Atomic Energy Act prohibited private investment. This prohibition seems to have been regarded as absolute and permanent by the Atomic Energy Commission.

Secondly, no private group came forward at any time and sought an opportunity to invest its own money in atomic production. There were too many other demands for profitable capital investment—television, electronics, light metals, and chemicals.

Yet the new plutonium production plants were not truly unique. Military requirements have in actual fact been expanding so rapidly and so consistently as to remove almost every marketing risk for the products of these plants. But it was done. There are no private plutonium production plants today.

The result of having all existing atomic production plants wholly owned by the Federal Government is that the foundation has been laid for a self-perpetuating Federal venture in production. It is not hard to imagine the political clamor which would arise if the Atomic Energy Commission were to shut down the plutonium production plants at Hanford. Tens of thousands of families have put down their roots in this one-company town. Even if all future military requirements for atomic-weapon materials were to be canceled tomorrow, the Federal Government would have a major resettlement problem on its hands. In all probability these plants would have to keep operating for a transitional period.

But in spite of the rapid development of our atomic and thermonuclear weapon program, I believe that there is very little possibility of our military requirements being satisfied for years to come. Therefore, it is imperative that the Federal Government adopt a definite program to get out of the production business during the years of continued weapon production which remain.

There are specific steps which can and should be taken.

Federal ownership of the towns of Oak Ridge and Hanford should be terminated as quickly as possible, and self-government instituted in the place of Federal paternalism. A bill to accomplish this is being introduced in the House of Representatives today. Action on the bill will be taken in this session

Diversified industries, small and large, should be encouraged to come into these cities so that the people will not have to depend exclusively on Federal employment for their livelihood. These people need a broader economic base, if their communities are to have a reasonable degree of economic stability in years to come.

Finally, as Government-owned production plants wear out or become obsolete and as new plants are needed, strong consideration should be given to making such plants privately owned and not dependent on atomic weapon material production for their entire revenue. Certainly an atomic reactor designed to produce electricity, or to preserve food at the same time as it produces material for weapons, is a better and more stable element in our production economy than a plant geared solely to atomic and thermonuclear weapon production.

The role of the Federal Government in developing atomic energy includes several areas. The clearest is the development of devices solely useful for military purposes. This includes weapons and nonweapon applications not of any extensive civilian use. The Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of Defense are jointly responsible for weapon development. The military works out the nonatomic parts of essentially atomic or thermonuclear weapons. The Commission handles the nuclear end of things. There is some risk inherent in this division of responsibility and therefore, to be effective, very close coordination is required. There is the possibility that both agencies might concentrate on immediate problems and consequently overlook the more difficult, far-reaching applications. To date, the Commission has kept ahead of the military in ideas for atomic weapons. Hundreds of scientists and engineers in Commission laboratories have become self-trained experts in futuristic military concepts, and very good ones at that. But it is not their profession; so if they overlook something, it really will not be their fault.

Military men need the stimulation of the radical ideas of the nuclear scientists and engineers. We need military requirements beyond our present capabilities, not nuclear ideas which take months for the military to grasp. We need nuclear weapons sized to meet all military situations, not just bigger and bigger and bigger H-bombs. We need nuclear weapons adapted to localized as well as global wars.

The Military Liaison Committee established by the Atomic Energy Act is now a one-way street channeling atomic data to the Defense Department, but allowing only a trickle of military data to reach the working people in the Commission laboratories. The Military Liaison Committee can and should channel much more information in both directions. The so-called task force system in which military men and scientists and industrialists work in a team should be extended.

Weapon development will undoubtedly require the continued best efforts of the existing nuclear weapon laboratories. In fact more such centers may be necessary. Weapon laboratories are but a small part of those owned and operated by the Commission. There also are the large development centers devoted to basic and applied nuclear research.

Without question it is a responsibility of the Federal Government to insure a vigorous and active nuclear scientific community. In the first place, almost every phase of our society—in peace and in war—profits from such activities. We cannot afford to leave their vigor and direction entirely to chance. In the second place, the cost of such activities has increased enormously. While great scientists can still make discoveries working alone with only a slide rule in their solitude, the majority of men who can make contributions need the electronic calculating machines, the particle accelerators, the reactors and all the other costly tools for nuclear research. There must be centers in which promising young people can work. There are not enough facilities in universities and research foundations. There must be Government-sponsored research laboratories as well. And there must be training programs and support for independent studies so essential to getting competent young people started on nuclear research paths.

It should not be necessary to defend basic research. Science has taught us that we profit in unforeseen ways from examining, thinking about, and understanding the basic phenomena of the world around us. But in the applied areas of scientific research, the lines of responsibility are less obvious. Here the role of the Federal Government is confused and badly in need of clarification.

We recognize that it is a good thing to find out how to use atomic energy to make electricity. But is it equally a good thing for the Federal Government to build the entire first generation of such plants? We must inquire what industry itself can fairly be expected to undertake. For example, if a pilot plant proves that an idea works, then perhaps industry should build the first full-scale plant. But if there is still some vital information missing, the remaining risk may be too large for industry to assume.

It is also recognized that the use of radiation for cancer therapy is important. But should the Federal Government finance all of the cancer therapy centers and operate them directly? Or should Federal grants be made to private medical centers? Or is this an area where industry should make a direct contribution to the Nation's health?

In each case, whatever the solution, the problem still remains as to who should carry out the development, construction and operation, as opposed to the scientific research. On the one hand, the scientist believes he knows his baby best. On the other hand, engineers are loath to concede that anything a scientist does is more than an idea which still must be perfected by engineering. For my part, and this is only one man's opinion, I believe the scientist is employed most profitably in scientific research, and the engineer in engineering development. It seems to me to be a waste of talent for them to invade each other's fields.

Now, if I am right, it follows that our national nuclear laboratories, in addition to doing basic research, should be encouraged to do applied development. But only up to the point needed to confirm their theories. The Experimental Breeder Reactor at Idaho is a good example of this. It took a $2 million experiment at a remote testing station in Idaho to prove the scientific theory that a nuclear reactor can be made to produce more fissionable material than it consumes. But who should take it from there? The scientist or the engineer?

From that point forward, I believe the laboratory should act in an advisory role to an industrial engineering organization. If the project is within the risk-taking ability of industry, then industry should foot the bill. The laboratory should be reimbursed for its work by the private group. If a partnership of Government and industry is needed, so be it. If the risk is too large for industry at all, and the end sought is clearly in the national interest, then the Federal Government should employ a private contractor to do the job on as reasonable a type of contract as can be arranged.

To summarize, it seems to me that the Federal Government has a responsibility to develop nuclear weapons, to encourage and train nuclear scientists, to conduct and support basic nuclear research, and in some cases to finance applied nuclear engineering development when the end is in the national interest and the risks involved make it difficult to obtain private financing.

The third and most complicated Federal role in atomic energy is that of regulation. By regulation I mean not only the regulation of industrial activity in the sense used for the Federal Communication Commission and the Federal Power Commission, but also the job of coordinating the atomic activities within the various parts of both Government and our society as a whole.

The Atomic Energy Act of 1946 was written in anticipation of the growth of an atomic industry. But that industry has grown far less rapidly than was expected in 1946. The hopes and expectations which were reflected in the language of the act at that time now seem to be fully justified. We were only optimistic too soon. Now, we have every reason to believe that there can be a sizable atomic industry both here and abroad within the next decade. Therefore, it is necessary to think very carefully about what the relationship should be between the Federal regulatory bodies and the industry which is just being born.

First, I think it is clear that we have the task of encouraging an industry, not harnessing one already in existence. Secondly, there is the very large responsibility for protecting the public health and safety. This new industry deals with substances potentially more dangerous than any heretofore entrusted to the hands of industry. I am referring, of course, not to the military aspects of fissionable materials, but to the industrial radiation hazard.

Whatever regulations are established concerning health, safety, and security must rest on a firm foundation. If the Government retains title to fissionable material, and if this retention of title does not in itself make it impossible for industry to possess and use fissionable material, there will be no question about the soundness of the bases of Federal regulation.

The revision of the Atomic Energy Act, which we are now considering, puts forward Federal ownership of fissionable material as the keystone of regulation. But Government ownership of all fissionable materials means that there must be assurances that those interested in investing their money in atomic energy will be able to obtain and use those materials. A system of licensing based on standards and procedures should be set forth clearly in writing. There must be channels through which individuals who believe they are being arbitrarily penalized may make appeals for relief. It is reasonable to assume that if Federal regulations do clearly set forth what it is that the industry must do, the industry would then have at least part of the assurances it needs to operate.

The other part relates to the rights of private individuals to profit from their own ideas. Patents have been a matter of Government regulation for centuries. Patents are intended not to prevent exploitation of ideas, but to encourage exploitation for the public benefit. Our problem in atomic energy is to provide that same traditional encouragement, but not to permit private profit from publicly financed knowledge. Private individuals have no need for patents on atomic and thermonuclear weapons. But in all other areas men should receive their rightful reward for things which they have created with their own time and money. Their reward should be determined by events and history—not by compensation boards.

For over 50 years monopoly has been frowned upon in the United States. One fear has been expressed many times in discussions about industrial development of atomic energy. Because of the large investments necessary, a few companies, solely as a result of their size, might profit most from the public investment. And the little fellows might be left at the starting gate. I do not believe that we should deny atomic patents on this ground. Large corporations do have an advantage as a result of their size. Patents are the natural and historic device by which small companies and individuals can hope to compete with bigness and existing know-how. I personally believe that patents are less significant to big companies than to small ones, and, therefore, I hope that the Congress, in the days ahead, will give serious consideration to the restoration of our normal patent system in nonweapon atomic energy fields.

Even though our pattern of regulation and licensing with relation to the private atomic energy industry is worked out successfully, there will still remain the task of coordinating Government efforts relating to atomic energy. It is unthinkable that representatives of the State Department should deal with a foreign nation, large or small, and not be aware of atomic implications. We receive many of our raw materials from overseas. Many of our allies look to us to assist them in raising their standards of living. All free nations look to our atomic and thermonuclear stockpile of weapons as the assurance of the defense and freedom of the West.

The Atomic Energy Act of 1946 was amended 3 years ago to permit some exchange of vital information with our allies. The language which was put into the act at that time was highly restrictive. It excluded all information about weapons and required many checks and balances. Today, that language is inadequate. Our military partners need more information, not necessarily about the design of atomic weapons, but about both their use and their effects. They do not need to know the size of our stockpile; but they do need to know what they can expect in the way of atomic support in the event that our stockpile is used in their defense. The revisions in the Atomic Energy Act now being considered would enable the Government to give them this knowledge. It would not allow them to have information they don't need—as design data, stockpile information, and the like.

But atomic information should not be able to flow out through a thousand channels. It is too closely linked up with our foreign policy and with our very survival. In each and every instance, our top policymakers must know precisely what we are trying to accomplish by the transmittal of specific atomic data to our allies. They must know what could be accomplished and what damage could be done if the specific limitations in each exchange were expanded or contracted. The President and the National Security Council provide a central clearinghouse to do this job. The bill now being worked on would take all these considerations into account. In addition, I have recently proposed that the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission be made a permanent member of the National Security Council. His knowledge should be available in all those areas where other policymakers are in need of this information.

There are many other equally important, though perhaps less dramatic areas of Federal activity in which an awareness of the potentials of atomic energy are vital. To name but a few, there are cancer research, Government financing of the training of scientists and engineers, regulatory activities in the fields of power, communication, conservation, and flood control, and in interstate commerce.

An example of the problems of administrative structure set forth in law which need attention is that of relationships between contractors to different agencies. Provisions now being studied would permit contractors doing atomic energy work for the Defense Department to have direct access to information in the possession of contractors doing atomic energy work for the Atomic Energy Commission. Today they must have two clearances even though they are dealing with exactly the same information.

Now, such changes as this are not so much a matter of the philosophy of Federal regulation and coordination as they are improvements in the mechanics for carrying out Federal responsibilities. I would not wish to imply that all of these difficult administrative situations should have been foreseen. They are the sort of thing which one discovers with the passage of time. We have been slow to correct some of these situations because they were interwoven with some of the other philosophical problems which I have already discussed.

There is one last area of Federal responsibility of which I wish to speak. It is not one on which the Congress can legislate with any assurance of effectiveness. Atomic energy is such a complex subject, and only so vaguely understood by most of our people, that the Federal Government, it seems to me, has a very real responsibility to provide the Nation with leadership in all atomic energy matters. The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy has felt this very strongly throughout its 8 years of existence. There is a body of public opinion on atomic matters, but it is not as well thought out on this subject as it is on most others. The big headlines and the dramatic facts seem to act like a curtain which prevents the average laymen from going further into the matter even though a large mass of unclassified information is there for the asking. This Federal responsibility to lead and to educate is not one which is centralized on one place. It must be shared equally by the Congress, all of the executive agencies and departments, and certainly by the President himself.

Secrecy and security are necessary things today, but they must be used in the broadest context for the common defense and security, and not in the narrowest. We must not conceal things from ourselves, lest we reap an unwanted harvest out of our ignorance. There are too many good things which are ours for the taking for any of us to limit our thinking about atomic energy to H-bomb headlines and circles of devastation drawn on maps of our cities. There are better crops, healthier lives, new industries, and rising standards of living to be had. We should seek them. It is a real Federal obligation to see to it that all our people know what these things are and do not lose sight of golden hopes through cynicism, ignorance, and fear.

Calumet-Sag Channel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED E. BUSBEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 28, 1954

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to insert the following resolution which was adopted by the city council of the city of Blue Island, Ill., on April 12, 1954, urging the Congress of the United States to enact legislation in the 83d Congress that would modify the language regarding bridge policy, as expressed in House Document No. 677, so that Federal responsibility for bridge construction may include highway bridges, as well as railroad bridges, over the Calumet-Sag Channel:

Whereas the city council of the city of Blue Island, Ill., has repeatedly expressed itself in favor of the improvement of the Calumet-Sag navigation project as provided in House Document No. 677, 79th Congress, 2d session; and

Whereas the success of the proposed development of Lake Calumet as an industrial and commercial barge-ship-rail-truck harbor to be undertaken by the Chicago Regional Port District Board in the near future, to a great extent depends upon the improvement of the Calumet-Sag Canal; and

Whereas under the conditions of House Document No. 677 the Federal Government will assume the cost of improvement and rebuilding of the several railroad bridges over the channel, but specifically excludes Federal responsibility for the rebuilding of the several highway bridges over the channel; and

Whereas the Truman-Hobbs bill was amended in July 1952 by an amendment which provides that the Federal Government may, in the interests of navigation, assume the cost of modification or rebuilding of highway bridges as well as railroad bridges over navigable waterways: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this city council urges upon the Congress of the United States to enact such legislation in the present 83d Congress as would modify the language regarding the bridge policy as expressed in House Document No. 677 aforementioned so that the Federal responsibility for bridge construction may include highway bridges as well as railroad bridges; and be it further

Resolved, That the city clerk be and is hereby directed to forward copies of this resolution to Members of Congress representing the States of Illinois and Indiana.

Passed this 12th day of April 1954.

JOHN C. JOHNS,
City Clerk.

Approved by me this 13th day of April 1954.

JOHN M. HART, *Mayor.*

Protect the Nation, Save the Coal Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 28, 1954

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Speaker, I find it difficult to square the roseate statements on the economic outlook with the grim unemployment in my district in the soft-coal belt of West Virginia.

Thousands of mineworkers are out of jobs in that area. These unemployed Americans and their families are subsisting on the dole; for the most part, they are dependent upon surplus foods. The outlook is bleak; not only are these people presently without jobs, but the prospects for future employment are also dim.

These Americans are looking to our Government for help, and rightly so, Mr. Speaker. They are shocked and dismayed when they hear that the United States Government, through the Export-Import Bank, is making a loan of $100 million to the European Coal and Steel Community, while little or nothing is being done to assist the American coal industry. They know it is well that free peoples in Europe be helped, but they are at a loss to understand why our Government extends the helping hand abroad while it turns a deaf ear to the coal industry in this country.

It has been stated in this House many times that the coal industry in the United States is in trouble. The Federal Bureau of Mines has estimated soft-coal production during the first quarter of 1954 at 90 million tons, or 16 percent below the 107 million tons in the first quarter of 1953, which was not a banner year. The situation in anthracite is equally alarming.

Mr. Speaker, coal was the keystone in the production drive for victory in two world wars. When our Government fails to look to the well-being and prosperity of the coal industry, then we are inviting trouble; nay, courting disaster. Coal shouldered big burdens in the recent wars and it will be called upon for a similar role in the event of new hostilities. The successful conduct of a war depends upon our ability to meet quickly and fully the requirements for fuel and energy. This cannot be done if the coal industry in this country is not kept in a strong, flourishing condition.

We are playing a dangerous game at the expense of coal, Mr. Speaker, in the voluminous imports of residual fuel oil. These imports are displacing millions of tons of coal, causing mine units to be shut down, throwing thousands of miners out of work, and creating ghost towns in the United States. Not only are we undermining our own national economy by this vicious practice, but we are also exposing our flanks, so to speak, for we are becoming more and more dependent upon foreign oil, and, if war comes, enemy submarines will cut off this source of supply quickly. This is not an unfounded cry of alarm; it is a clear reading of contemporary history.

The time is long overdue for constructive aid to the coal industry. Such action is in the national interest. This is not a sectional plea, but looks to the security of the country and to the production ramparts so essential to survival in the event of an enemy attack.

Today, I should like to stress particularly the aggravation of the situation existing in the coal fields that would be caused by the consummation of the proposed St. Lawrence seaway. This project would greatly facilitate the dumping of residual fuel oil into the United States, a development which could well be the final blow to the Nation's coal industry. It will be ironic, indeed, if the only action taken by the United States Government bearing upon the coal industry of this country is an action which would inflict further serious injury. This Government of ours should be exercising its full powers toward protecting the coal industry against the cutthroat competition of residual fuel oil.

Think of it, Mr. Speaker, in the overall picture. More than 30 million tons of coal production are being displaced annually by this imported residual fuel; and, instead of getting busy to put a halt to this menacing, unfair competition, the administration is furiously bent on participating in a costly seaway project that will literally cause a deluge of this foreign product.

When are we going to stop opening Pandora's box and start planning and acting for the welfare of the Nation's coal industry?

Neighborly Torrington, Conn.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 28, 1954

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, I recommend the appended article from the May issue of the Eagle Magazine to the membership of this great body in order to substantiate the importance of Torrington, Conn., and her role as a great American community.

Torrington's community spirit is displayed by the many active civic organizations she possesses and the devotion Torrington people have as God-fearing and loving people.

The article follows:

NEIGHBORLY TORRINGTON—YOUTH PROGRAM TYPIFIES CITY'S PROGRESSIVE SPIRIT

(By John J. Callahan)

Nestling in an emerald setting amid the Litchfield hills, famed for their beauty, is the city of Torrington, one of Conecticut's most important manufacturing communities. Forty years ago the population of Torrington was under 3,000; today it is nearly 28,000.

Torrington is steeped in tradition as the birthplace of John Brown, the abolitionist; the home of the Brass Industry of America; birthplace of the Reverend Samuel Mills, noted as the father of foreign missions; and home of the first condensed milk plant in the world, established by Gail Borden. All are highlights in its history. However, Torrington does not live in the glory of yesterday. It is a progressive and modern city.

There are 25 manufacturing plants employing approximately 9,000 people. The products are diversified and nationally known. The prosperity of Torrington's industry has been translated into real terms of prosperity for the city itself in an unusually high percentage of home ownership, car ownership, and other standards of good living.

Torrington takes great pride in the excellence of its youth movement, under the direction of Carl Bozenski, special activities director of the park and recreation department and father of the city's famous Christmas Village.

Elbow your way into Torrington's Fussenich Park on October 31 and you'll have the time of your life at just about the most exciting Haloween party you ever heard about. There is something new every minute in a breathlessly paced program featuring goblins, ghosts, witches, gypsies, hoboes, clowns, bands, special entertainers, community singing, contests, games, a parade, a radio party, and, to top it all off, a teen-age dance.

Of the 6,000 persons at the park last Halloween, about one-third were adults, many of whom were in costume. Take a look at the clowns, for example. You'll see them working in pairs all over the place, wearing the traditional circus makeup and going through ridiculous routines to the obvious delight of the kids. Know who they are? They are staid businessmen of the community, and include Paul Cassin, owner of a chain of hardware stores; Frank Ellis, sporting-goods dealer; Fred Short, head of a sign service; James Miller, professional photographer; Alfred Eyre and Richard Kilbourne, of Torrington's radio station.

Halloween may belong to the kids in many communities but in Torrington it belongs to the whole community. This increasingly popular annual celebration explains in part why vandalism is the least of this city's worries.

Among the clowns in Fussenich Park on Halloween will be one in traditional costume but with no paint on his face. That will be Carl Bozenski, in charge of special activities for the park and recreation commission. The community's special-activities program has brought Carl international recognition.

Carl has his own ideas on vandalism and juvenile delinquency, but he feels these are police terms and have no place in the recreation worker's lexicon. He will tell you that most vandalism can be traced to idle hands and minds.

"I don't want to be put in the position of telling other towns how to meet their young people problems," says Bozenski, "but I think there's a tendency in some communities to assume that because one communitywide party fails to check vandalism, the job is hopeless. To get anywhere with young people, you have to work with them around the clock month after month and year after year. You have to have a program and stay with it. Any community that is not willing to set up a live, full-time recreation department and give it adequate, even enthusiastic backing, is not seriously interested in checking vandalism."

Bonzenski has been honored by the Fraternal Order of Eagles' merit award for his outstanding work with the youth of Torrington.

This Connecticut city comes about as close to the true spirit of the holy day of Christmas as any place we know. Here the municipal authorities have a Christmas Village where children may have an intimate chat with Santa Claus, where they can see elfin workmen shaping toys, where they can see the reindeer waiting for the big night.

And, not forgetting the religious significance of the season, Torrington provides outside the Christmas village building, a large stable where life-size characters retell the story of the manger.

One of the most outstanding organizations in the city of Torrington is the Fraternal Order of Eagles, Aerie 974, instituted on February 3, 1905, with 98 charter members. The aerie has kept pace with the growth and development of the city until today it is the largest aerie numerically in the State, with a membership of 1,950 and a beautiful aerie home second to none in New England. Since its simple beginning 49 years ago, the aerie has paid $152,870 in benefits to members, proving that it is truly a benefit organization and a power for good in the community. Its degree team is famed throughout New England.

The aerie home, built in 1938, is situated 1 short block on Main Street from City Hall and 2 blocks from the center of the city. The building is a lasting testimonial to the officers and members of yesterday who planned and built it.

The aerie's membership rolls contain the names of men who have distinguished themselves in city and State politics, including the present mayor and former lieutenant governor of Connecticut, William Carroll; former mayor and head of the Connecticut Draft Board, Brig. Gen. Ernest Novey; and former mayor, William Patton. Three of its members have become State aerie presidents—John J. O'Connor, Cornelius J. Hayes, and the present State president, John Reichenberg. All three have proved themselves great fraternalists.

Visitors to Torrington Aerie Home will find a warm welcome from Secretary-Manager Maurice (Dick) Dillon, who is on duty every day and evening.

Lakes, ponds, and streams in the vicinity of Torrington have been restocked under the direction of the State fish and game commission, and offer attractive opportunities to devotees of rod and reel.

Torrington, among the hills of Litchfield County, is a wonderful blending of town and country, hill and valley, lake and stream, meadow and woodland. Nowhere will you find a friendlier city, a more warm-hearted people, or better opportunities for business or pleasure than you will find in this beautiful city among the Berkshire Hills—Torrington, Conn.

Kaw River Basin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD S. MILLER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 28, 1954

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under the rule granting the privilege of extending remarks in the Appendix of the Record, I include the following letters from citizens living in the first district of Kansas. It will be seen that these people are greatly interested in the problems arising out of the fact that the Kaw River Basin is peculiarly subject to damage both from deficiency and excess of rainfall.

These letters are typical of many that I receive daily on the subject and show a willingness of the people most vitally concerned to cooperate in any reasonable program to conserve moisture when deficient and prevent floods when excessive. Letters such as these, from good citizens who have at heart not only their own interests, but the welfare of the community, certainly make one proud to be their representative and at the same time make one realize his limitations and responsibility. As a Member of Congress, I am most happy to hear from wide-awake, thoughtful constituents, and this goes for those who disagree with me as well as those who share my own views.

The letters follow:

GARRISON, KANS., *April 26, 1954.*

Representative HOWARD S. MILLER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I would have liked so much to have gone to Hiawatha while you were home and visited with you regarding the many disturbing problems facing our Nation, but due a lot to time spent in behalf of the campaign for proper water management, I am dreadfully behind with farm work.

You have my thoughts and prayers as you deal with these many problems. I definitely feel that our position of leadership in international affairs will be successful in direct proportion to the success we make of witnessing our Christianity and democracy in conducting the affairs of our own Nation.

I feel that we should make every effort to reach through to the common people behind the Iron Curtain, and to show them that we know that they do not follow the thinking of their Communist rulers. I also feel that we should insist that our allies make greater efforts to give hope and confidence in democracy to colonial peoples. The people of Asia and Africa must be made to see that democracy offers more future for them than communism.

In regard to the probable hearing on House Document 642, I feel that the most important need is for someone to point out to the committee that the City Commission of Topeka does not represent the thinking of the majority of the citizens of Topeka. If you read the Vox Pop page of the State Journal, you will have noted how many anti-Tuttle Creek letters written by Topekans appear there. More, I really believe, than letters by prodam Topekans. Naturally the committee will be inclined to think that the city commission speaks the will of the city, but from all the contacts I have there I feel confident that it does not. Although I do not have the direct contacts with other Kaw Valley cities, what I have said for Topeka undoubtedly holds true for them.

The committee also needs to be made to realize that the people fighting 642 are for local protective measures that are not tied in with big dams.

If it were not for the incessant propaganda of the Army Engineers, I believe that the efforts made toward unity in asking for local protection on its own would have been successful.

I surely was glad to read of your introducing the bill relative to loans for watershed work. I feel that such a law would be a great help; and hope that if it doesn't go through this session you will be able to get it pushed through next session.

Sincerely and best wishes,

PAUL JAMESON.

MANHATTAN, KANS., *April 24, 1954.*

Hon. HOWARD S. MILLER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MILLER: The League of Women Voters in Manhattan, Kans., have been studying budgetary procedures in Congress.

One point I am especially interested in is giving the President an opportunity to veto any part of a bill or the item veto.

I would also like to express my opposition to House Document 642. Local protection works which we need so badly should not be tied in with controversial dams as this will only delay the protection we need.

Back of House Document 642 is the same group of industrialists who have been trying for years to get large storage reservoirs for industrial purposes.

Very truly yours,

MRS. RAY H. POLLOM.

MERIDEN, KANS., *April 26, 1954.*

Congressman HOWARD S. MILLER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We are writing you regarding House bill 6788 and House Document No. 642.

I am in favor of House bill 6788 and would like to have you support it. Because I think we would have a better country and better farms. Also conserve on the water deficit. It is my belief that if we had House bill 6788 passed we would have more water. Not just along the rivers and streams but everywhere, also, it would save soil erosion.

As for House Document No. 642, I am not in favor of this bill at all. Putting the large dams in is taking all of our best farms and letting our upland country wash away. My son and I each have a good farm in Delaware River Valley that is just as good as the Kansas River Valley land, that will be taken if the Perry Dam is put in and we think as much of our homes and land as anyone else. It is wrong to take people's homes away from them. Every time a large dam is put in, the State is ruined that much.

I understand that when the soil conservation is put in that the farmer pays 50 percent of it. When a big dam is built why not have a benefited district below and let them pay 50 percent of the cost also as they claim they are benefited and that their land is doubled in valuation.

I am asking you to vote against the House Document No. 642, but to vote for House bill 6788.

Sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. BENJAMIN B. SELF.

Calumet-Sag Channel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED E. BUSBEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 28, 1954

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following resolution which was adopted by the city council of the city of Chicago on April 7, 1954, petitioning the Congress of the United States to enact legislation in the present 83d Congress that would permit rebuilding of highway bridges, as well as railroad bridges, over the Calumet-Sag Channel at Federal expense:

"Whereas the Chicago City Council has repeatedly expressed itself in favor of the improvement of the Calumet-Sag navigation project as provided in House Document No. 677, 79th Congress, 2d session; and

"Whereas the success of the proposed development of Lake Calumet as an industrial and commercial barge-ship-rail-truck harbor to be undertaken by the Chicago Regional Port District Board in the near future, to a great extent depends upon the improvement of the Calumet-Sag Channel; and

"Whereas under the conditions of House Document No. 677 the Federal Government will assume the cost of the improvement and rebuilding of the several railroad bridges over the channel, but specifically excludes Federal responsibility for the rebuilding of the several highway bridges over the channel; and

"Whereas, the Truman-Hobbs bill was amended in July 1952 by an amendment which provides that the Federal Government may, in the interest of navigation, assume the cost of modification or rebuilding of highway bridges as well as railroad bridges over navigable waterways: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved,* That the City Council of the City of Chicago respectfully petitions the Congress of the United States to enact such legislation in the present 83d Congress as would modify the language regarding the bridge policy as expressed in House Document 677 aforementioned, so that the Federal responsibility for bridge construction may include highway bridges as well as railroad bridges; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That the city clerk be and he is hereby directed to forward copies of this resolution to the Members of Congress representing the States of Illinois and Indiana."

STATE OF ILLINOIS,
County of Cook, ss:

I, Ludwig D. Schreiber, city clerk of the city of Chicago, do hereby certify that the above and foregoing is a true and correct copy of that certain resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Chicago at a regular meeting held Wednesday, the 7th day of April A. D. 1954.

Witness my hand and the corporate seal of the said city of Chicago this 23d day of April A. D. 1954.

LUDWIG D. SCHREIBER,
City Clerk.

DISTRIBUTION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

To the Vice President and each Senator 100 copies; to the Secretary and Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, each, 25 copies; to the Secretary, for official use, not to exceed 35 copies; to the Sergeant at Arms, for use on the floor of the Senate, not to exceed 50 copies; to each Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress, 68 copies; to the Clerk, Sergeant at Arms, and Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives, each, 25 copies; to the Clerk, for official use, not to exceed 50 copies; and to the Doorkeeper, for use on the floor of the House of Representatives, not to exceed 75 copies; to the Vice President and each Senator, Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress there shall also be furnished (and shall not be transferable), 3 copies of the daily RECORD, of which 1 shall be delivered at his residence, 1 at his office, and 1 at the Capitol.

PRINTING DOCUMENTS AND REPORTS

Documents and reports of committees with the evidence and papers submitted therewith, or any part thereof ordered printed by Congress, may be reprinted by the Public Printer on order of any Member of Congress or Delegate, on prepayment of the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 162, p. 1940).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

IN

I
hol
wri
Air
issu
cat
I a
ma
Re

T
wa
as

F
stro
ply
"pi
def
I
son
cha
rea
T
ter
wha
is r
ma
erro
is t
rest

T
enc
all
mit
last
of
circ
In
selv
sta
find
be
cloc
cou
the
"
the
of
Few
erro
pilo
abs
tor
see
tion
nur
crea
of
sta

A
of
tha

Appendix

Pilot Error

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAT McCARRAN

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 29, 1954

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I hold in my hand an article on pilot error, written by Mr. Ed Modes, editor of the Airline Pilot, and printed in the March issue of the Airline Pilot, official publication of the Airline Pilots' Association. I ask unanimous consent that this article may be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Pilot Error and Those Unanswered Questions

(By Ed Modes)

Pilots the world over are developing visibly strong concern that a tendency toward applying too-broad connotations to the term "pilot error" may ultimately prove purpose-defeating.

It is not a shallow attitude, born of personal resentment as some may undoubtedly charge, but is based on sound and justifiable reasons.

To prevent misunderstanding or misinterpretation, it is necessary to clarify exactly what this attitude is and what it is not. It is not one of attempting to skirt reality by maintaining there is no such thing as "pilot error." It is one of concern that the term is too loosely used, often abused, and lacks restrictive definition.

A NOTICEABLE TENDENCY

There has been a noticeable recent tendency toward lumping under "pilot error" all those accidents in which the pilot committed only the final act, perhaps, the only last-ditch recourse open to him, in a string of circumstances, whether or not they were circumstances of his own making. Perhaps, in their own minds, the investigators themselves are aware that extenuating circumstances existed. Unfortunately, however, findings of "pilot error" have a tendency to be taken with finality and at face value, closing the books on an accident and discouraging further probings. Therein lies the great danger of such tendencies.

"Pilot error" statistics would seem to bear these facts out. Even a cursory examination of them reveals two significant facts: (1) Few, if any of them, state or so define "pilot error" as to categorically declare that the pilot truly, and solely erred in a manner to absolutely preclude involvement of other factors; (2) "pilot error" accident findings have seemed to increase in fairly accurate proportion to the rate at which the complexity, number, and variety of aircraft, have increased and thus increasing the possibility of opening the way to "chain of circumstances" accidents.

A QUESTION, NOT AN ANSWER

ALPA has long contended that a finding of "pilot" error poses a question more often than it answers one. The question, What other shortcoming along the line caused the pilot to err, if he did?

"If an accident is attributed to pilot error," ALPA's President Sayen recently pointed out, "the question to any sensible researcher is what caused the error. The pilots readily admit that there is occasionally an accident caused by pilot error. However, if we were to stop our research at that point, little would be accomplished in increasing air safety."

While the interests of air safety dictate candid acknowledgment of true pilot error, when and if it exists and can be conclusively and exclusively defined as such, probably the attitude of most of this country's airline pilots can be summed up in Sayen's statement before the Flight Safety Foundation's Bermuda Safety Conference.

THE REASON IS IMPORTANT

"We hold that no pilot ever erred deliberately or in the interest of self-destruction. ALPA is interested in the reason behind the error and feels that any accident written off as "pilot error" has not been adequately investigated. For example, did the error originate in design error, fatigue limits, cockpit booby traps, inadequate training program, etc.?"

The opinion of pilots of other countries on the subject of "pilot error" makes revealing and interesting reading.

One of the finest articles we've seen recently appeared in Indian Skyways. The highest compliment we can pay it is that we wish we had written it. We didn't. But we have obtained permission to reprint it. This country is halfway around the world from India, but take the Indian Skyways article, change a few telltale words here and there, and see if you can tell to which country it refers—India or the United States? It covers the "pilot error" subject pretty well, indicates its global nature. The article follows:

"PILOT ERROR

"Wrapped up in those two small words all too frequently heard in aviation is a mass of public error, official error, plus that most common of all errors, the human desire to take the easiest way out of any situation.

"Quite apart from the grave injustice done to the profession of air piloting by those who fling the answer 'pilot error' as the solution to almost every air accident that occurs to an airplane, these careless thinkers are doing serious damage to the progress of aviation and are in fact, consolidating the position so that more and still more air accidents will occur. They make no effort to discover the basic causes or the fundamental weak spots that lead up to the final action carried out by the pilot, which in many cases, is probably a last desperate effort to escape from a situation which is none of his own making. Knowing no other answer the investigators fling the two small words 'pilot error,' as the most expansive blanket they know, that will cover up their own ignorance and any possible errors of others that might have had something to do with the accident, when if disclosed, would result in a lot of dirty linen being washed in public.

"INTENTIONS VS. PRACTICALITY

"It is not suggested that those who investigate air accidents do not start out with the firm intention of finding out the true cause so that action may be taken to eliminate the danger and make flying safer. But like many good intentions, practical circumstances make implementation impossible. In the case of air accidents the lack of practical and certain knowledge on the part of the investigators is frequently the cause of reaching no clearly explained verdict. Rather than leave the investigation unanswered the investigators take refuge in the two little words 'pilot error.'

"Almost without exception, in all cases of serious air accidents the pilot is not available to give evidence, neither are there any alive who took part in the accident, at least at its point of occurrence. There may be important participants who were a long way from the scene of the crash. Designers, thousands of miles away may be the starting point, or careless workmen who have left their job improperly done, a thoughtless aerodrome hand who has allowed dirt or water to get into the fuel system, an ignorant or inefficient aerodrome officer or meteorological official, the clerk in the traffic office, who has slipped up with figures and has overloaded, or the operations manager who has taken too great a risk in search of profits; any or all of these may have played a part, perhaps a major part, in putting the pilot in charge of the aircraft in the spot from which he was unable to escape.

"A HUMAN INCLINATION

"Yet, the investigation discloses none of these dim but vital facts, or if they are discerned by the investigators, those directly concerned are naturally going to bring every conceivable argument to prove that they had carried out their part with perfection and they could not possibly have been wrong. Few would have the courage to go into a witness box and admit to an error that had resulted in an air accident that had caused the death of 40 or even 2 people. Besides, to be fair, would such an individual be quite sure that his error was in fact the real reason why the pilot crashed? The element of doubt in all matters connected with air accidents is so considerable it is almost impossible, or seems to be, to decide with any certainty why an air accident actually occurred, so we human beings fall back on the one unanswerable answer 'pilot error.'

"Taking basic causes of air accidents, investigators normally confine themselves to the aircraft, the aero-engines, the instruments and flying aids, weather and flight conditions, the circumstances of the flight itself and the immediate handling by the aircrew concerned. Is this enough? If in point of fact, the answer is to be 'pilot error' the investigation should go right back to the first day the unfortunate pilot makes his first flight, from which it is presumed sprung his desire to take up flying and become a pilot. Since then what has he been doing? Has he been trained for the duties of a pilot up to the standard of flying considered necessary for the flight which ended in disaster?

"SOME PERTINENT QUESTIONS

"This brings up the question, Are the standards of piloting for such flights high enough or are they inadequate? In fact, one is drawn to the conclusion that there are so many possible outside causes of an air accident that it is difficult to accept the conclusion that 'pilot error' is the correct answer. One would rather think that it is the least likely, and more logical, yet in the majority of air accident investigations the answer comes out 'pilot error.' In other words the investigators not knowing for certain what the answer is, give a conclusion that is unanswerable.

"There is no desire to pin the blame anywhere other than in the correct place, and this must be the main objective of any air accident investigation. It is, but the fact remains, investigators the world over seem to reach dead ends, their investigations are far from conclusive. There are too many 'ifs'—much too much has to be assumed or even guessed at. The verdict 'pilot error' closes the book, that ends it; people prefer to leave such answers alone; who would refute it? Possibly a near relative, but then the loss has caused such grief would not the near relative prefer to retire into the background secure in his or her knowledge or belief, that it was not 'pilot error.' Why probe into a painful wound?

"SLAMMING DOOR ON SAFETY

"No pilot takes a decision or performs an act knowing that it is likely to lead to an air accident. In difficult conditions of flight the captain has to decide he can only do so within the scope of his personal knowledge and experience. If circumstances outside his control have landed him in a position which is beyond his experience, knowledge, or ability, it is those circumstances which are the direct and primary cause of the resultant accident and those who produced them also contributed to the accident. Not the action of Captain X. Yet, it is almost certain that the answer will be set down in history, pilot error. Never mind the injustice. This kind of escape from factual explanation is laying the foundation for another and another air accident of exactly the same kind. Even worse, it is closing the door to the discovery of safe flying.

"These are matters for the closest investigation and although the air pilots' associations all over the world do investigate these things, it seems all their efforts to date have not been able to eliminate that answer, pilot error—as it should be eliminated from the majority of verdicts or at least such verdicts should be qualified with the reasons why Captain Z made such an error."

COULD TWO MAKE SAME MISTAKE?

The same sentiments are echoed by the Australian airline pilots. An article in their publication, the Australian Airline Pilot, says:

"No amount of training and preparation has, to date, entirely eliminated pilot error from flying, although happily a great deal has been achieved in that direction. It is almost invariably an individual thing peculiar to one pilot and one set of circumstances. Thus, when an error of judgment is found to be the cause of an accident to a civil airline as was recently the case in the Belfast tragedy, one wonders what were the thoughts and actions of the second pilot. We submit that it is most unlikely that he would have made the same error at the same time had he been in control of the aircraft.

"With these thoughts in mind we are led to suppose that the copilot concerned in an unavoidable accident must normally be otherwise engaged. If this were not so, and he, too, was looking out, he would certainly voice his opinions to the pilot. A captain's complete command presumably does not preclude action on the part of his first officer in an instance of extreme emergency.

"If we are correct in our thinking, accidents resulting from simple misjudgments should, in the presence of two experienced pilots, with dual controls, be completely avoidable. If the copilot is normally busy with other duties during takeoff or approach and landing, then perhaps on night or bad-weather flights he ought to be relieved of them in order that a second mind might be concentrated upon the job at hand."

CONCLUSIONS

In conclusion, it bears restating that the prime function of air accident investigations is unearthing the true causes and reasons behind the accidents. That function cannot be fulfilled by blanket dead-end pilot-error reports.

Opinion is expanding—some of it significantly enough outside the pilot ranks—that accident investigation efficiency would be stepped up if there were sharper differentiation between actual pilot-error and chain-of-circumstances cases. Then the way would be paved, in most instances, to more clearly answer the single most important question of accident investigation: What was the real and actual source originating the forces that ended in the accident? Pilot error, itself, cannot answer that question. It goes beyond that. How far beyond is what we should be concentrating on ascertaining.

A WRITER LOOKS AT PILOT ERROR

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The following item, which provides an excellent example of the insidious way in which a tag of pilot error can creep into an accident, is reprinted from the August 4, 1953 aviation column of Bob Sibley in the Boston Traveler.)

The Civil Aeronautics Board finally has gotten around to make a finding which says, in effect, that the pilot wasn't to blame for a Northeast Airlines crash landing at LaGuardia on February 6, 1953.

The cause, the CAB now agrees, is about what the Boston Traveler said it was way back in February—the right propeller blades started to reverse, malfunctioning.

This swung the airplane around to the right and dumped it in just before a normal landing would have been made.

The CAB still doesn't know what caused the blades to head for the reverse pitch position. But the report notes that wiring for this type of propeller has been changed to isolate the circuit from other wires.

There was one fortunate circumstance in connection with this crackup: The injuries were minor.

There were two unfortunate angles, however:

1. That there was an accident.
2. That the CAB couldn't have come up with this mechanical malfunction explanation a long time ago. Meanwhile, a mistaken impression had been spread around that the pilot had made an unskillful landing.

Manifesto to the Bulgarian People in Honor of the 75th Anniversary of the Tirnovo Constitution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. GLENN BEALL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 29, 1954

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, yesterday I had the distinct honor of being presented by the Union of Bulgarian Jurists with a copy of their manifesto to the Bulgarian people in honor of the 75th anniversary of the Tirnovo Constitution.

As we know, Bulgaria has been subjected to Communist domination; but, as is true among all freedom-loving people, the Communist rule is resented, and is tolerated only because for the moment the people are powerless to overthrow it. The spirit of freedom remains alive in the hearts of these people, and their compatriots who are outside the Iron Curtain do what they can to offer hope and encouragement.

The Union of Bulgarian Jurists yesterday presented to the Library of Congress a first edition copy of the Tirnovo Constitution, and recorded a message for broadcast over Radio Free Europe to the people in Bulgaria.

These jurists honored me by presenting me with a copy of their manifesto to the Bulgarian people. Among those participating in the presentation were: Mr. Ivan Stancioff, of Frederick County, Md.; Mr. Nikolai Balabanov, secretary of the Union of Bulgarian Jurists, and former Bulglarian diplomat; Stefan Gruev, a leader in the Union of Free Bulgarians in Paris; Dimiter Matzankeff, former member of the Bulgarian Parliament, and Miliu Miless, former member of the Bulgarian diplomatic corps, last stationed in Switzerland.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the very inspiring message to the people of Bulgaria, which will be broadcast over Radio Free Europe, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, in connection with these remarks.

There being no objection, the message was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MANIFESTO TO THE BULGARIAN PEOPLE

UNION OF THE BULGARIAN JURISTS,
New York, N. Y.

DEAR COMPATRIOTS: Today, 75 years ago, on April 23, 1879, representatives of the Bulgarian people, convened as a constituent assembly in Veliko-Tirnovo, laid the foundations of the new Bulgarian state by adopting and putting into effect its organic law—the constitution.

In the stormy history of our people, filled with struggles, victories, and defeats, the creation of the Tirnovo Constitution is the most precious achievement and one of which every Bulgarian is proud. No victory on the battlefield, no diplomatic success, can be compared with this historic event. Through this act the Bulgarian people took their place in the family of the civilized world, giving expression to their progressive spirit, their love of freedom and democracy, and their thirst for independence.

Now, commemorating the 75th anniversary of the Tirnovo Constitution, the sons and grandsons of its creators, have the sacred duty to pay tribute to the memory of these farsighted patriots and national heroes.

Dear Bulgarians: Today you suffer from the misrule and cruelties of a tyrannical regime, imposed from outside, supported by foreign arms and the sham Dimitrov Constitution inflicted by force on our unfortunate fatherland, This regime is a pitiful copy of the notorious Stalin Constitution, under which disguise the present imposters in Bulgaria dispose with impunity of the lives, labor, and property of the citizens, even after they have robbed them of the most elementary freedoms which every human being has the right to enjoy.

Contrary to this so-called constitution, the Tirnovo Constitution is a distinctly Bulgarian creation, a result of the national Bulgarian spirit. Its makers framed the Tirnovo Constitution in the ancient Bulgarian capital, on the indestructible foundation of four basic constitutional principles: Freedom, equality before the law, self-government, and the inviolability of person.

By these four principles, the Tirnovo constitution reflects the freedom-loving spirit of the Bulgarian, his aspiration for independence, and his yearning to be master of his work and property and to enjoy his family.

Through these principles, the Tirnovo constitution secures for the people the right to elect their representatives in the National Assembly and their local self-governing bodies. That is why every time the Tirnovo constitution has been violated the Bulgarian people have risen to defend its sanctity.

Those who have desecrated the Tirnovo constitution, and who have stealthily bypassed it, know very well that today it still lives.

The Tirnovo constitution continues to live, because it has never been lawfully revoked. No fundamental law may be amended, supplemented, or abolished unless changed in accordance with the pertinent provisions of the constitution itself. Today it still continues to live in the eternal, unquenchable yearning of the Bulgarian people for the rights and freedom secured by the Tirnovo constitution.

Celebrating the birth of the first and only lawfully existing Bulgarian Constitution to date, we, members of the Union of Bulgariat Jurists, have no thought of deciding in advance the question of amendments to the Tirnovo constitution that may be required after the liberation of Bulgaria. We realise that this is beyond the limits of our competence. Only the Bulgarian people have the right—and it is an inalienable right—to decide this question, according to the provisions of the constitution—and that only after they have been given back freedom to express their will. Until then, however, the Tirnovo constitution remains Bulgaria's Magna Carta, and we consider it our imperative duty to defend it as jurists and Bulgarian citizens against any encroachments. We pledge to continue to fight in order to secure the right of the Bulgarian people, guaranteed by the constitution, freely to express themselves as to the future development of this constitution.

Today every Bulgarian citizen is obliged reverently to recall the Tirnovo constitution and with a feeling of national pride and gratitude to relive those times, when, in Veliko-Tirnovo, a handful of Bulgarian patriots and fighters, who fought for freedom and human rights, guaranteed to every man on Bulgarian soil (without discrimination as to origin, nationality, religion, social status, or political concepts) the right to live, work, and pursue his happiness in a free and independent Bulgaria.

April 28, 1954.

Letter of Protest From Veteran Alleging Mistreatment in Connection With Hospitalization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 29, 1954

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record a most moving and eloquent letter addressed to the American Medical Association by a war veteran who has been subjected to what was obviously a most embarrassing, humiliating, and thoroughly unfair and obnoxious inquisition simply because he went to a VA hospital, at the suggestion of his family doctor, to have his life saved after 2 heart-rending years of expensive, personally paid, but fruitless attempts to find a cure elsewhere.

This letter, which appears in the April 1954 issue of the Montana Legionnaire, was sent me by Mr. W. H. Tilley, of Billings, Mont.

I thank him for it. I sincerely hope it will be read, not only by every Member of the Congress but by everyone interested in the rights and welfare of veterans.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Vet Thanks AMA for Causing Unjustified Investigation of Personal Financial Status

(Editor's Note.—We feel that no comment is needed on the following letter, save to say that it was written to the American Medical Association by a veteran who is being investigated to see if he could have paid for hospitalization he received from the Veterans' Administration.)

January 19, 1954.

American Medical Association,
Chicago, Ill.
(Attention: Secretary-manager.)

Gentlemen: I like to give credit where credit is due. Accordingly, please accept my thanks, in the spirit intended, for your part in causing me to be singled out for investigation by an agency of the Federal Government under sponsorship of a congressional committee. I am informed by the investigator that the fires under this committee are kindled by your association.

Be it distinctly understood that references to "you" in this letter are directed to the association, through its managing officials, and not to any one person, particularly not to those in your profession with whom I have dealt since December 1950.

I am investigated by processes and methods, the details of which must bring someone in your association much satisfaction.

A representative of the Office of Investigation, of the General Accounting Office, under the Comptroller General of the United States, has visited me at my place of employment. Because of this latter fact, he had to introduce himself to the head of the organization, present appropriate credentials, and secure permission to interview and question me, at Government expense and on Government time, and secure permission to audit my records of earnings, leave, and make such other checks which he desired. I was also told to be careful to tell only the truth, because my income-tax returns would also be checked. My home was also visited, and scrutinized carefully—presumably for evidence of extravagance or obvious wealth. Have you ever had this happen to you? It's such a nice comfortable feeling.

FINANCIAL DATA

I have been required to give detailed statements regarding my earnings during the past several years, to date; tell of all other income from other sources; tell the value of my home on today's market; the make, model and value of my car on today's market; whether or not I own an electric refrigerator, washing machine, television, clothes dryer, etc.; what is the value of my furniture on today's market and how much taxes I pay on it; what are my other assets, if any, and what they are worth on today's market; where my checking account it, how much I had in it on certain dates; have I a savings account, can I confirm whether or not I did, and if the answer is yes, how much was in it; what investments have I in stocks, bonds and others, if any; given written authorization to visit my bank and review my accounts over the years; how much I owed on my home on various dates, and what are my monthly payments; what other notes do I owe, and what are my payments; what other bills did and do I owe; and on and on and on into the depths of my life, my soul, and my income tax filings.

Be it further distinctly understood, this no reflection on the investigator. As such, he, or some other investigator, would apparently have had to obtain all of this intimate detail for the sponsoring committee, I am informed, to serve your purposes.

I am already under embarrassment before my friends and associates because it is alleged (and frankly, I do believe it) that certain Federal employees in Washington have avoided Federal income taxes—this has received wide notice around the Nation. Assuredly, the Bureau of Internal Revenue has countless easily enforced legal means of collecting overdue taxes. Apparently no other group of citizens of the Nation is involved, all being simon pure, because none other is mentioned in this article. So, as a Federal employee, I am first under a general stigma. Now, before my friends and associates I am under a specific stigma, because I am under special investigation.

VA SAVED LIFE

Perhaps you ask why all of this? The answer is simple. I am a veteran of World War II, and have had my life saved in a veterans hospital, after several outside medical authorities had failed to accomplish a simple diagnosis over a period of nearly 2 years of trying, and had given up. One of these learned gentlemen called the veterans hospital, in fact, and made arrangements for me to be admitted. Apparently, instead of going to the veterans hospital, I should have waited another 60 days and died, as assuredly I would have.

All of this started, gentlemen, because my friends and neighbors selected me to represent them in the Armed Forces, while they got their deferments, and went to work on farms and in defense industries. I had no objection of going. At least, unlike those obtaining deferments, I shall never need to wonder who went in my place and whether or not he lost his life.

Here, gentlemen, is a most interesting phase of this whole business. It never occurred to anyone to investigate my financial status, to see if I could afford to serve in the Armed Forces. No one asked if I had a home, how much I owed on it, what my payments were, did I have a checking account, its balance, a savings account, its balance, or a deep freeze, or what I owed and how I planned to pay my obligations. No one interviewed my employer, checked my pay records, examined my income-tax filings, visited my bank and looked over my accounts, asked for confirmation of balances, checked the payments on my property, inquired as to the sales value of my home, my furniture, my car, my bicycle, or my kiddie car.

UNCLAIMED EXEMPTION

No, not one of these checks was made. I did have a home, a new home in fact, and a small quantity of furniture, a new car, a new job, new mortgage, new bills, and all the usual encumberances, including a new daughter. The latter, be it distinctly understood, was not a draft exemption; she was the normal result of a happy planned marriage and I took pleasure in refusing the draft board, in writing, to claim her a cause for exemption or deferment.

My wife's health at that time (as now) prevented her from putting the baby in a day nursery and going to work in order to maintain the home. So, as a matter of necessity, the home was sold on forced sale, the furniture and the car likewise, the job was given up, and my family went to live with relatives.

Are you interested in all of this? Are you interested in what all of this cost me then, and whether or not I could afford it? Are you interested in what it cost all the millions of others? Your interest in my hospitalization indicates no.

Are you interested in the fact that while in the service I spent several week in the Fitzsimons Army Hospital (under the care of doctors of wonderful ability) with paralyzed face, fractured rib, and pneumonia, resulting from mistakes or indifferences of some of your profession with questionable ability?

PRIVATE CONSULTATIONS

Skipping a multitude of intervening incidents, important to me, immaterial to you, are you interested in the fact that I took examinations and tests for approximately 2 years before going into the veterans hospital, all given by reputable practicing members of your profession, thereby giving them first chance at my business and that not one of them could diagnose my trouble. One even went so far as to tell my wife that my only trouble was that I was neurotic and she was an overanxious wife. Her answer to this was, "perhaps, but it's the first time it ever made him sick".

Are you interested in what all of this cost me, and the fact that I paid cash on the barrelhead for everything, and never once questioned whether or not the ailment was service connected?

Are you interested in the fact that I went to the veterans hospital in desperation, that arrangements to enter were made by our then family physician, and that I went there as a last act because I learned they rated as good or better than Mayo's or Johns Hopkins, and that I would have gone to either of these only by again selling or mortgaging to the hilt everything I owned?

Are you interested in the fact that at the veterans hospital I was given immediate and competent examinations, and (this you may accept or reject, at your pleasure, it's a fact) the admission doctor diagnosed my trouble correctly in less than 5 minutes? Are you interested in the fact that I was confined immediately to bed, and that I was told I must live in it for 4 to 6 weeks before a badly needed operation could be performed?

RESPIRATORY FAILURE

Are you interested in the fact that it took 64 days of application of the most competent medical skill before I was ready for operation? Are you interested in the fact that even then, though the operation was performed by men of the highest caliber, I suffered respiratory failure (dead to the common people), but was saved by the skill of those in whose hand I had trusted my life, and required a second operation?

Are you interested in the fact that had your profession outside the veterans hospital diagnosed my condition properly when I first went to them, I would never have set foot inside the veterans hospital in the first place, and so placed myself in line for your charming investigation processes?

Are you interested in the fact that all of the doctors I have consulted with in this matter, state that they do not know the cause of what was wrong, and therefore could not say with authority that it was or was not caused by incidents occasioned by military service?

No, I must presume you are not interested in these facts. Is your interest in the fact that many men who served in the Armed Forces at terrific financial loss (with countless thousands losing either their lives or their future health and parts of their bodies) many spend time in a veterans' hospital at a loss of a few hundred dollars in fees to some private physician or hospital?

Have you one single man in your entire profession who can state, with absolute knowledge and authority, in every case, whether or not an ailment is service connected or is caused specifically by something else? You know there is not. Please, gentlemen, exactly what is your interest?

LOSS OF FEES?

Can it be that you are indignant at the loss of these few fees? Has this seriously hurt the pocketbooks of some of your membership? Sincerely I hope it has not. Could you afford to stand an inquisition such as I am now subjected to, to prove you have sustained a loss, the same as this inquisition is attempting to prove whether or not I am able to make up a loss to the medical profession—a loss which is yet unproved. Gentlemen, I cheated the undertaker—definitely not you. All doctors of my acquaintance now have as much or more business than they can reasonably handle, and nonveteran hospitals are crowded to the rafters, without seeking to blackjack the relatively few veterans who may, by manipulated statistics, be proven able to pay, but who have, in fact, paid all they could to those in private practice (as I have) before they resorted to the veterans' hospital. I wonder how many doctors, as individuals and without any pressure from organized lobbies, would approve the action now being taken against other veterans who have used the veterans' hospitals?

The answer may be that you are against socialized medicine, and its claimed evils. While its claimed evils are not yet proven, I, too, am bitterly against it probably more so than you are.

OTHER POSSIBLE TARGETS

If your interest is in economy in Federal expenditures, then why do you select this particular target? Why did you not pick on such juicy plums as foreign aid, subsidies to business, parities to farmers, or even educational aid to returning veterans? Under the latter, countless thousands of students (more than will ever do a doctor or a hospital out of a fee by going to veterans' hospital) received years of free schooling (including tuition, books, subsistence, and so on). Why not investigate schools and colleges, some of which sprang up overnight, some of which taught horseback riding, some of which taught such things as determining the sex of a chicken while yet in the egg, to see if they cannot be accused of nibbling at the public teat? Why not investigate all of the business houses (large and small) throughout the United States, which forced returning veterans to accept jobs only on an on-the-job-training basis, so that they could get Uncle to pay part of their salaries—and find out how many of these veterans were already more than well qualified for the jobs for which private business collected great subsidies. These are among the great swindles of all time, gentlemen—aren't you interested in them also?

Why do you not have those in the medical profession today, who received all or part of their schooling and subsequent training under the GI bill of rights and other free sources (paid by Uncle), investigated to see if they really needed this training, and whether they could have afforded to attend a private medical college? They, gentlemen, are no different from me, and don't you think they should be exposed? At least one of those doctors to whom I went for many examinations before going to the veterans' hospital was one who received such training.

UNFAIR INVESTIGATION

I submit to anyone that the investigation to which I am being subjected is narrow, biased, unfair, and completely prejudiced. I have nothing to hide, and have cooperated completely with an investigator in his soul-searching analysis of me, my family, and our private lives. I have gone so far as to suggest processes whereby he could check my financial status, processes of which even he was not aware.

This investigation is being performed, I understand, as an act apparently designed to prove something for the direct financial benefit of the AMA, and at what cost to the AMA? Is the AMA paying the bill for any of this investigation? You apparently complain of veterans improperly being in veterans' hospitals who should be in other hospitals. This complaint is made apparently to the Congress of the United States. There apparently is not sufficient proof of your complaint, or the Comptroller General's men would not now be out gathering proof for your benefit. Apparently you have great power and influence with the Congress to cause the Comptroller General to do this, and the Comptroller General is investigating to confirm the accuracy of this complaint (or is it a charge) at the expense of the taxpayers. Most assuredly, gentlemen, this cost is terrific. Couldn't you afford to pay it yourselves?

Frankly, I am quite shocked at the action you have in force, gentlemen. For individuals who have made such truly wonderful progress in medicine and its related fields, you are quite a disappointment.

Please ponder in all seriousness the several questions I have asked in this letter, and consider carefully if someone in the AMA isn't swallowing a camel and straining at a gnat. Then, please tell me whether or not, if I return to the veterans' hospital for further checkup, and treatment if need be, you will send out another investigator to interview my friends.

With my very best wishes for your intellectual awakening.

America Is Great Because Amercia Is Good

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 29, 1954

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the grand commandery of Knights Templar of Texas recently conducted a contest among high-school students of my State for the best eassay on the subject What Makes America Great?

The Honorable J. Lee Zumwalt, of Dallas, has announced that the winner of the $1,000 prize offered in this contest is Miss Cora Jo Bruce, high-school student of Plainview, Tex.

In her essay, Cora Jo has caught so well the essence of the greatness of America that her observations deserve to be widely circulated among the people. I ask unanimous consent that this prize-winning essay be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the essay was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A part of the greatness of America can be found in the factories and farms that have made the American economy the strongest in the world and have given her a standard of living unequaled by that of any other nation. The hum of machinery sounds through the day, and the glow from thousands of furnaces lights the night in order to supply the demand for goods.

Within America's boundaries there are wide prairies with fields of grain, pastures dotted with well-fed cattle, irrigated valleys, and orchards standing on terraced hillsides. Where tractors turn up rich, fertile soil or dams loose their water on arid deserts, huge crops spring up. At harvest time bales of cotton stand on loading platforms, granaries are filled to capacity, and everywhere farmers ship their produce to city markets. But, many nations have large industries and bountiful harvests, so it is not this alone that makes America great.

America offers her citizens the benefits of a free education. The public school system teaches each generation the importance of good government, thus enabling them to take their place in the responsible positions of society. They are made to understand the value of a human being and the strength of high ideals. But, all great civilizations have had some form of educational facilities; therefore, this alone does not make America great.

America is an amalgamation of people from all regions of the globe. The adventurous people who forged a nation from a wilderness, the courageous people who sometimes died for freedom, yet counted it worth the cost of their lives, the working people who never gave up until they reached their goal, laid the foundation for this democracy. America is a land of many races and creeds, but only one nationality—Americans. Here then, is a glimpse of the true greatness of America, for the people are the Government. Moreover, this Government is as strong as the people make it and as corrupt as they let it become. What plan of kings or tyrants would have made this Nation what it is or given to any people the opportunities which our Federal Government has given us? In what other country could a man follow the dictates of his conscience or his religious beliefs without fear of persecution?

The two most important things in the future destiny of this country are a book and a piece of paper. Two buildings stand before all others as symbols of reverence, dignity, and strength; and two songs come first to the hearts and voices of a musical people. The Bible and the Constitution—a church and the Capitol building—a hymn and an anthem, these are symbolic, but how else can you describe a nation if not with signs and pictures? How can you tell of the faith and trust of a people in a God they cannot see but know exists, without using symbols?

You may work in America's factories, sail her rivers, till her farms, attend her schools, and live among her citizens; yet, not until you observe these people in the church of your choice, proclaiming their beliefs, will you understand the greatness of America. When you see this, you will know that America is great because America is good; and if America ever ceases to be good, America will cease to be great.

The 1953–54 Recession: The Paradox of Efficiency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 29, 1954

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, during these days when we are groping for answers to the problems of unemployment and a sensible long-range farm policy, I invite the attention of my colleagues to a challenging paper prepared by a most thoughtful man, E. G. Shinner, chairman of the Shinner Foundation, Chicago, Ill. Mr. Shinner is a remarkable citizen who is doing much good. He established and is chairman of the Shinner Foundation. He enabled his 190 employees of the E. G. Shinner Co., of Chicago, to become the owners of his lucrative business through an employees' dividend system.

Mr. Shinner's ideas deserve much consideration.

I ask unanimous consent that his statement be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

THE 1953–54 RECESSION: THE PARADOX OF EFFICIENCY

(By E. G. Shinner, chairman, the Shinner Foundation)

There are several schools of thought on the subject of why we have business recessions, how they can be avoided, reduced in severity, or corrected, once they have gained material headway. The theory which perhaps has the greatest number of advocates or adherents, especially among people of the opinionmaking and policymaking group, can be broadly described in three short paragraphs:

1. That all which is needed to assure national prosperity is a greater productive capacity, a constantly increased productivity per man-hour, greater efficiency, and lower prices over the counter; this, it is held, will create a bigger pie and that all will be able to share in it;

2. That the basic remedial measures for the control or correction of recessions or depressions on the part of Federal or local governments are to step up spending for public improvements from time to time as the economy shows evidence of slackening, and to reduce such spending as the economy regains its vigor and full momentum; the reluctant acceptance of the old-age security insurance (OASI), unemployment insurance, and the very recent recognition of the value of low-interest rates as a stimulating factor;

3. That the Nation is capable of consuming in peacetime, all of the goods and products which can be produced with full employment.

To question the wisdom or the truth of these theories is regarded by the adherents of this philosophy as the equivalent of losing faith in the American private enterprise system. Unfortunately, this dogma pervades large segments of the opinion and policymaking groups of the Nation. It is taught in virtually every college in the country and bears the full indorsement of such important organizations as the NAM, the CED, and the CEA. To say that this theory is thoroughly entrenched—dug in—is but to state the facts.

Millions of citizens—businessmen, farmers, laborers, whitecollar workers, professional men, etc., are keenly aware of the fact that this whole theory simply flies in the face of the facts and that to blindly pursue it is simply to promote depressions. Unhappily, they are unorganized and, hence, are powerless to combat the continuous flow of propaganda—a propaganda which stems from looking backward, and a blind fetish for charting our future progress in strict accordance with the average upward trend over the past 50 or 100 years—attributing this progress to efficiency—and efficiency alone, forgetting entirely that the going had often been rough and in several instances, even desperate.

Notwithstanding the formidable opposition to any exceptions to this theory, I am convinced that there is overwhelming evidence to the effect that the major part of this economic philosophy is both unrealistic and fallacious. It is freely admitted that this philosophy of greater and greater efficiency has served us well for many years but it has become gradually outmoded as we have passed from an economy of scarcity to an economy of abundance.

The current business recession is, in my judgment, simply the natural fruition of the aforementioned unrealistic economic philosophy; that we are producing many products with but a fraction of the effort required a generation ago, should neither be overlooked nor can it be denied.

Production, without physical effort, violates or at least interferes with the time-honored, time-tested, and time-proven theory that man shall live by the sweat of his brow. Under our cherished private enterprise system, wages and salaries are based upon human effort or services rendered—none other. Consumption, in turn, is geared to payrolls; both are presently contracting. What we are experiencing now is "the paradox of efficiency."

Just recently, I visited the McArthur Dairy at Hollywood, Fla., where I learned that 1 man milks 400 cows per day. This is a typical illustration of what is happening throughout the Nation. The result, so far as the dairy industry is concerned, is too well known to bother with statistics, except to mention that there is now 1¼ billion pounds of surplus dairy products in the hands of the Government.

A similar condition prevails in virtually all phases of agriculture. The economists who have been, and for that matter still are, highly vocal and persistent in their espousal of the theory of constantly increased production at greater and ever greater efficiency have suddenly become strangely silent on how to deal with the troublesome problem of surpluses—their own brainchild. What to do about the depressing surpluses which they have been so instrumental in creating is left for others to solve.

The citing of a few more instances of the same principle as applied to industry will further emphasize the thesis or point which I wish to make.

The automobile industry operating at approximately three-fourths its capacity (200,000 workers idle in the State of Michigan alone) is producing at the rate of 6 million cars per year, or approximately 25 percent more than the most realistic estimates of what can be sold in 1954.

It has been learned from thoroughly reliable sources that the shoe industry operating at full capacity on a 4-hour day and a 5-day week can produce more shoes than have ever been sold in any 1 year in our history. Steel mills, farm machinery, textiles, furniture, household appliances, coal mining, etc., all find themselves in a quite similar position.

In the face of these conditions, the governmental approach appears to be utterly inconsistent. In the case of agriculture, the Government limits production by law and it is proposed that a substantial proportion of existing surpluses be sterilized, in other words, just sweep the problem under the rug.

On the other hand, a law is now pending permitting more rapid depreciation on new equipment on the theory that it will encourage the installation of automatic machinery and thereby speed up production and in general, expand the economy. As to where or how the product of this new automatic machinery is to be sold is just another $64 question. In other words, the ivory-tower economists (the CEA and their adherents) are apparently but concerned with a solution; this phase of the problem is supposed to resolve itself.

Much has been said and much lip service has been paid to the subject of small and independent business and its value to the Nation, with all of which I am in full accord. However, as long as we cling to the theory that what we need is an ever and ever greater productivity per man-hour, more efficiency, with constantly lower prices to the consumer—to create a bigger and cheaper pie so that all may share in it, we are in reality paying lipservice to small business and fighting it at the same time. Once we get a general recognition of the fallacy of this theory, we shall then be in a position to really contribute something to the welfare of independent business—the real mortar that holds the economic bricks together.

For the past 6 years roughly 25 percent of gross national product has been absorbed by war, military preparedness at home and among our allies, gifts through the Marshall plan, the point 4 program, and money grants to balance the dollar gap (most of which was used to purchase the products of American industry), the net result of which has been to create a highly artificial prosperity. At present the administration's economic approach seems to be that by the elimination of a large part of this extraordinary expense (the very thing which has created the unprecedented market for our products) that civilian consumption will take up all the slack. The current unemployment figures give mute evidence to the fact that this reasoning is both fallacious and unrealistic. The economy is, in fact, contracting in almost direct proportion to the reduction of these extraordinary governmental outlays.

What is needed is a reappraisal of the whole economic picture. We must face up to the incontrovertible fact that without some extraordinary means of absorbing the product of our industry, other than normal peacetime consumption, we shall steadily and surely revert to the status of 20 years ago. We shall, in reality, be compounding a felony by adding to "the paradox of plenty" experienced in the thirties, a new and added "paradox of efficiency." To raise these questions, I realize, is to invite the query—so what?

In my judgment, the first step is for the economists, Government officials, and opinion makers of the Nation to recognize the fact that overproduction is a problem and that sheer efficiency can be self-defeating. Once this is accepted as a fact—a premise—the solution is at least far less elusive. My first concern would be the welfare of independent business.

I would start the program by revising the agricultural price support programs. We have lost in the last generation roughly a million small farmers. The casualty list has been greater than in any other field, to my knowledge.

We should limit the amount of farm price supports extended to an individual farmer to an amount of production that will give him and his family a decent basic income. The total gross income of American farmers in the record year of 1951 was $37 billion. That was around $7,000 per farm. Our price-support laws should assure parity price for products enough to make up such an income, but no more. There should be no support at all on excess production.

If some men want to make a business out of farming, instead of a way of life, then let them do it at their own risk in the markets. Let them earn only what their efficiently produced surpluses will bring in a free market. They should not be permitted to squeeze family farmers off the land, nor subsidized for creating surpluses as has been done in the past.

This limitation on price supports would have the effect of putting the small farmers back in business, and of slowing up those who think that efficiency is a cure-all in agriculture.

In the face of increasing concentration of land and income in farming, Dr. Arthur F. Burns, chairman of the CEA, offers as a solution for the low income farmers, that they consolidate farms and, as an alternative, seek part-time work in industry where there are already millions unemployed.

Dr. Burns offers this approach in a thoroughly matter-of-fact manner. The unsophisticated reader might easily be led to believe that Dr. Burns' pronouncement could and should be accepted as a sound economic policy. Fortunately, it is easily exploded when the facts are brought into proper focus.

I would remind Dr. Burns that the loss of a million small farmers in the last generation has been accomplished only in small part by consolidations in the cause of greater efficiency. Rather, it has been the result of foreclosures, sheriff sales, and farmers in sheer desperation, just walking off and leaving a proposition that failed to provide a livelihood—a tragic situation.

The Burns' approach to this problem is the application of a cold price economy—a treatment that is at best, only partially applicable. Should he see fit to apply the same theory to all phases of agriculture, his own figures could lead him to but one conclusion, namely, that 5 million farmers represent sheer economic waste; 2 million, yes, even 1 million could perhaps do the job as well, or better. All of this brings to mind the wisdom of Goethe's picturesque and philosophical statement: "Gray are all theories, and green alone life's golden tree."

Like the vineyards of France, the woodcarving and watchmaking of the Swiss, the beautiful handicraft of the Italians—farming in America is and must ever be largely a way of life. It does not, nor will it ever, lend itself to a strictly cost-plus analysis and operation. There are perhaps upwards of 100,000 farms in the Nation which are operated by businessmen as a sideline—an avocation; that virtually all of them are operated in the red, would seem to be conclusive evidence of the fact that pure price economics does not provide the ultimate solution of our agricultural problems.

The economics of agricultural production, distribution, and consumption are exactly parallel with the economics of urban industry.

The agricultural problem may thus become the experimental laboratory to prove once and for all, whether or not we can afford to pursue an economic philosophy of ever and ever greater efficiency with fewer and fewer farmers, manufacturers, distibutors, etc., and still maintain and advance the standard of living for the average citizen.

My studied conclusion is that should our Government persist in blindly following the economic theory described in the opening paragraphs of this article, that our private enterprise system is doomed—the time is shorter than we think.

APRIL 26, 1954.

Appreciation for Benefits Under GI Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 29, 1954

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter to the President and Members of the Senate from a constituent, a wounded veteran of World War II, Joseph A. Jordan, Jr., of Norfolk, Va., expressing his appreciation for the privilege of completing his college education under the GI bill.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NORFOLK, VA., *April 12, 1954.*

PRESIDENT AND MEMBERS OF THE SENATE,
Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT AND MEMBERS OF THE SENATE: I wish to express to my fellow Americans, through you their senior lawmakers, my profound thanks for having been given the opportunity of studying under the GI bill (Public Law 16).

Though paralyzed as a result of my military service in World War II, I have been able, because of the veterans' education program, to complete my college education, earn my law degree and qualify to practice before the bar of the great State of Virginia.

Be assured, that I shall work hard to justify this kindness which has been shown towards me.

Very truly yours,

JOSEPH A. JORDAN, Jr.

Proposed Intervention by United States in Indochina

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 29, 1954

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter from Henry Wales, the Paris reporter of the Chicago Daily Tribune, which was published by that newspaper on April 28, 1954. This is a bare-knuckle discussion of the proposed intervention in Indochina by the United States, and should be read by every American.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A LETTER FROM PARIS REPORTER TO AMERICANS

GENEVA, SWITZERLAND, April 27.—The reported decision of the Eisenhower administration to plunge the United States into war over the regime in Indochina leaves the French people flabbergasted.

The French have considered all Americans as braggarts and boasters for the way they throw their money around since long before World War I.

They confirmed their opinion after the first war when America canceled the huge French debt, and during and after the second war when it financed every nation in sight and then, the war over, poured in more billions as Marshall-plan aid and now military aid.

But now, in 1954, when the administration apparently proceeds by devious measures to prepare the American people for a decision to send American youths to the jungles and rice fields, and run the risk of another world conflagration, the French are simply stunned.

WARN CIVILIZATION MAY BE DESTROYED BY BOMBS

One day they read fearsome statements by the President, Secretary of State, and big brass in the Pentagon that another world war with atom and H-bombs will pulverize the earth and stamp out civilization if not mankind.

The very next day they read statements, that of Vice President NIXON is one, that America is prepared to send an army to Indochina and carry on the war indefinitely if the French decide to quit and pull out.

American intervention in Indochina can well mean Chinese intervention and Chinese intervention can mean Russian intervention. By this chain it means world war III.

The French have been fighting this war of independence on the part of the Viet Minh for going on 8 years.

FRENCH PEOPLE READY TO ABANDON COLONY

For more than six of those years, the United States showed no interest in it, except perhaps to condemn it as a colonial war.

When Mr. Truman involved the United States in the Korean adventure, Korea was called the gateway to southeast Asia and the entire Eastern Hemisphere.

Now, after the years of the costly Korean business, with a truce finally achieved, Washington finds the Indochina situation is the one which has direct concern for the United States; that it imperils America apparently far more than the horror bombs, and that the Nation must draft youths for the Army, the Air Force, and the Navy to continue to fight it.

France, whose affair it is, has been trying for years to end the Indochina war by compromise and negotiation. The overwhelming majority of the French people want to withdraw and abandon the colony which was always in the red, from an administration point of view. It has been profitable only to the Bank of Indochina, the Michelin Rubber Co., a few other big interests, and to the horde of money changers, opium smugglers, and gunrunners who infest the area.

The majority in the French Parliament favors ending the war and giving up the colony, but many deputies are afraid of casting votes for negotiation with Ho Chi Minh, Viet Minh leader, for fear of being called traitors to the French soldiers being killed there every day.

It is appalling to think that while France will not send draftees to protect and maintain French property (the colony), that Mr. Eisenhower, Dulles, and the Pentagon are willing to force American youths into uniforms and send them to be slaughtered in jungle ambush.

Since World War II ended France offered Indochina "independence within overseas France" as the prewar empire is now called. The "independence" was subject to control over Indochina's foreign affairs, preventing treaties or commercial agreements with other nations. In other words, the wealth and business of Indochina would still be a monopoly for French concerns and French colonists.

Control over Indochina's finance was another plum which France intends to preserve; direction over public spending, insuring that the Associated States (as Laos, Cambodia, and Vietnam are called) pay interest on the debt to France; and linking the French currency to the piaster, monetary unit of Indochina.

UNITED STATES PAID LOSSES ON PIASTER SPECULATION

The gigantic speculation in piasters went on for years, with illegal operators converting their piasters into francs at twice their real value and making millions. In the long run, the United States paid for most of this thievery. The Bank of France in Paris redeemed piasters at double their value. The loss was made good by the French Government, which in turn dipped into Marshall plan and military-aid funds to reimburse itself.

Eisenhower, Dulles, and company call Indochina, "the key to southeast Asia." They say that if Ho Chi Minh, leader of the Viet Minh forces fighting for real independence, is not exterminated that the Communists will expand their success to Siam, Burma, Malaya, Indonesia, the Philippines, maybe Australia and New Zealand, probably India and Pakistan, then westward into Iran, and stop heaven knows where.

It reminds me of President Roosevelt's awesome announcement in World War II that the Germans in North Africa had completed the Transsaharan Railroad to Dakar and were about to send an invading force across the South Atlantic to Natal and Brazil, and thus menace the United States. The fact that the Nazis would be as far from America in Brazil as from their conquered bases in France and the problem of transporting this German army of invasion from Brazil to the United States were conveniently overlooked.

Maps show the monstrosity of pretending that Russia and Red China can send huge armies to Indochina and thence fan out to seize all of southeast Asia.

REDS HAVE LITTLE TO SPARE IN MUNITIONS

In the first place, Red China has no appreciable amount of supplies and munitions to offer. China was never a manufacturing, industrial state. What little material it makes now is sorely needed for construction and consolidation of the Communist regime at home.

In the second place, unless Russia has become a more industrialized country than even the United States, and with far greater production, it has no large amounts of weapons, munitions, and other supplies to give away. According to the statements by General Gruenther at SHAPE—supreme headquarters, allied powers in Europe—the Russians are expanding their army, navy, air force, and industry generally to meet the rearmament effort of the United States. If they have anything to give away, it goes to their satellites, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, etc.

Where are the roads, highways, and railroads to transport the men, equipment, and supplies from Russia, via China, to Indochina, Siam, Burma, Malaya, and the rest of southeast Asia?

There exists the trans-Siberian railroad from Moscow to Vladivostok on the Pacific. A branch line goes south from Manchuli to Harbin, Mukden, and eventually to Peiping.

From Peiping to Indochina there is no railroad, no highway, or other route for autos and trucks. There is a French rail line in Indochina parallel to the coast, so close in fact that it could be cut by gunfire from warships at many points.

RUSS SUBMARINE FLEET LARGELY IMAGINATIVE

But where are the transports and communications to back up an army strong eonugh to achieve the conquest of southeast Asia?

Russia has no navy, never did have one. The reports that 400 modern submarines are ready for sea duty are idiotic. Germany at the height of submarine operations in both world wars never had half as many.

Russia has no huge fleet of long-range bomber planes, either. And operations in Korea and now in Indochina show conclusively that battles in such terrain cannot be won from the air.

Britain does not want to expand the Indochina war into a major conflict, not even to protect the Crown colony of Hong Kong.

So it comes down to just this:

The President, the Secretary of State, the Pentagon all warn that employment of modern weapons, A-bombs, H-bombs, maybe nitrogen bombs, and all the rest may well wipe out civilization and might possibly exterminate mankind.

But the President, the Secretary of State, and the Pentagon favor mixing into the Indochina war "to protect southeast Asia," even though it entails a third world war with all its calamities and catastrophes.

Can it be that there is no one in the Cabinet, no group in the House, no one in the Senate, and no other great newspaper except the Chicago Tribune to oppose such madness."

HENRY WALES.

Veterans' Administration Medical Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 29, 1954

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article from the Montana Legionnaire, of April 1954, which deals with the excellent veterans medical program, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

This article certainly deserves the thoughtful consideration of Members of the Congress and all those who, with a paucity of information and a maximum of malice, have wilfully directed thoroughly unjustified attacks on that program.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VA TELLS ITS SIDE OF DIGEST CONTROVERSY

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The following article was written by J. Norman Lodge, director of information for the Veterans' Administration, at the request of the American Legion National Rehabilitation Commission.)

The Veterans' Administration has not prepared a point-by-point rebuttal to the Reader's Digest article, nor is one planned. I want to make it clear, however, that the lack of such a rebuttal in no way implies VA agreement with specific statements or general conclusions set forth in the article.

I believe it would be improper for the VA to offer such a rebuttal for two reasons:

(1) The article is not primarily directed at the VA, and does not attack this agency.

(2) The intent of the article obviously is to bring about a change in law to preclude hospitalization of non-service-connected cases, and this is a matter involving the legislature rather than the executive branch of the Government.

However, your letter expresses an understandable concern about the article, and requests additional information in regard to the VA hospital program. Without entering into a controversy concerning the merits of existing legislation, I feel I can give—and that you are entitled to know—the following facts about our hospital program.

PROVIDED BY LAW

(1) Contrary to allegations that the American people have never sanctioned Government hospital care for non-service-connected ailments, this veterans' benefit has its roots in law dating back 31 years. In an act of March 4, 1923, Congress authorized hospital care for veterans of the Spanish-American War, the Philippine Insurrection, and the Boxer Rebellion, who were suffering from specifically described non-service-connected disabilities.

The World War Veterans Act of June 7, 1924, authorized hospitalization for non-service-connected disabilities for veterans of any war, military occupation, or military expedition since 1897 when existing Government facilities permitted, and when the veteran was unable to defray the cost of such care himself. Later Public Law 2, March 30, 1933, eliminated veterans of military occupations and military expeditions, making eligible only veterans of a war. Still later laws with similar provisions are Public Law 312, August 23, 1935, and Public Law 28, May 11, 1951, the latter bracketing in Korean veterans.

(2) The VA currently operates 168 hospitals with a constructed bed capacity of 124,715 beds. The article reports a conservative estimate that this number of beds will have to be augmented by at least 200,000 more beds, which would make a total of nearly 325,000 beds.

ONE HUNDRED TWENTY-EIGHT THOUSAND THREE HUNDRED AND FORTY-TWO BEDS PLANNED

When the VA's post-World War II construction program is completed the VA will have a total of 174 hospitals with 128,342 beds. It is important to bear in mind: (a) The eventual total of beds is only 3,619 more than the VA now has, and (b) the VA has no plans, and has made no request for construction authority beyond the 128,342-bed planned total.

Actually the postwar construction program has been reduced, rather than expanded. In January 1949, 16,000 beds were deleted from the planned program, resulting in the cancellation of 24 proposed new hospitals, and the reduction in size of 14 other hospitals. Too, VA officials repeatedly have made clear the fact that it would be difficult, if not impossible, to provide the medical staff for more beds than are contemplated in the present program.

(3) Statements that the VA is or will be providing free medical care for all veterans just are not realistic.

First of all, there never has been authority under the law to provide care for all veterans. Under the law, hospital care is to be given first to service-connected cases if a bed is available, and if the veteran states under oath he cannot defray the cost of hospitalization.

LONG-TERM PATIENT

VA hospitals can provide care for no more than one-half of 1 percent of the veteran population (20,531,000 as of January 31, 1954) at any given time. In the course of 1 year, VA hospitals could accommodate no more than 2½ percent of the veteran population. Despite additional beds, the VA is admitting somewhat fewer patients because of the increasing long-term or chronic nature of the patient load. It is probable that on any given day there are as many, if not more, veterans receiving care in private, State and other non-VA hospitals as are being treated in VA hospitals.

Before World War II, on June 30, 1940, the VA was operating 86 hospitals with 59,637 beds. At that time the veteran population was 4,286,000. Since then the veteran population has increased 379 percent, but the number of hospitals and beds in the completed program—174 hospitals with 128,342 constructed beds—will have increased only 102 percent and 115 percent, respectively.

As explained above, the top priority for admission to VA hospitals is accorded service-connected cases. The number of veterans drawing compensation from the Government for service-connected disabilities has increased from 385,880 on June 30, 1940, to 2,040,000 as of January 31, 1954. This is an increase of 429 percent in the service-disabled group from which stems the potential service-connected hospital load.

TWO PERCENT OF DOCTORS

(4) It has been said that the VA medical program drains off a disproportionate share of the Nation's supply of physicians. The VA employs in its hospital and clinic operations 4,300 physicians on a full-time basis, which reserves their services exclusively for the VA. This number of physicians represents approximately 2 percent of the 210,404 active physicians in the Nation as of January 1954. It should be remembered, too, that the residency training program, conducted in 78 VA hospitals in affiliation with 72 outstanding medical schools, contributes greatly to the training of additional physicians.

The 14,564 full-time professional nurses represent about 4 percent of the Nation's 366,000 professional nurse total. In this field too, the VA contributes heavily to the training of additional nurses.

(5) I believe it is important to understand the nature of VA's patient load.

Of the total patients receiving hospital care 37.4 percent are being treated for service-connected disabilities, and another 9.8 percent are veterans with service-connected disabilities who are being treated for other disabilities. The total of these two service-connected groups amounts to 47.2 percent of the entire hospital load.

Of the remaining patients, 32.3 percent suffer from nonservice-connected chronic disabilities. Of these 32.3 percent chronic cases, about 60 percent are veterans receiving VA pensions. To qualify for VA pension, a veteran of World War I, World War II, or Korea must be found to be permanently and totally disabled, and must have an annual income of less than $1,400 if without dependents, or $2,700 if he has one or more dependents.

NONCHRONIC PATIENTS

Another 6.2 percent of the total patients receive VA pensions, but are nonchronic in the sense that they so far have been in the hospital less than 90 days, and an additional 3.5 percent of the nonchronic nonservice-connected patients have claims pending for VA compensation or pension.

Less than 10 percent of the total load are nonchronic, nonservice-connected patients who have filed no claim for compensation or pension, but all have stated under oath their inability to pay for hospitalization. The remaining 1 percent of the patient load included members of the armed services, nonveterans taken in as emergencies, etc.

Another way to look at the VA hospital load is by category of illness. Approximately 46 percent of all VA beds are devoted to care of the mentally ill. More than 13 percent are used to treat tuberculosis; about 36 percent are general medical and surgical beds, and nearly 5 percent of the beds are devoted to paraplegic, neurological, and physical medicine and rehabilitation patients.

Indicative of the long-term nature of the VA patient load is the fact that 66.1 percent of all patients have been hospitalized more than 90 days, and 51.7 percent of the patients have been hospitalized more than 1 year. More than one-third of all patients, and two-thirds of the psychotic patients, have been on the hospital rolls for more than 5 years.

Testimony before a congressional committee less than a year ago disclosed a nationwide shortage of 366,000 mental, 262,000 chronic, 219,000 general, and 31,000 tuberculosis beds. I believe knowledge of this fact makes it easier to evaluate the contribution of the VA program to the hospital needs of the Nation.

Dr. George Baehr Testifies Regarding the Importance of H. R. 7700 in Connection With the Construction of Health Facilities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 29, 1954

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, Dr. George Baehr, president and medical director of the Health Insurance Plan of Greater New York, gave some very significant and important testimony before the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee at its meeting this morning on H. R. 7700 in connection with Government guaranteed mortgages to facilitate construction of health facilities:

Statement Submitted to House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on April 29, 1954, by George Baehr, M. D., President and Medical Director, Health Insurance Plan of Greater New York

I should like to be recorded in support of H. R. 7700. The bill is designed to encourage the extension of voluntary medical insurance plans which will provide complete and adequate personal health services for insured people.

H. R. 7700 is one of the most important health measures introduced into this or any recent Congress. It recognizes that an increasing proportion of our population is living to an age when cancer, heart, and arterial diseases, and other forms of chronic illness are increasingly common; that the costs of adequate medical care for prolonged as well as for acute illness are today beyond the financial means of most families of low and moderate income unless met by prepayment; and, above all, it recognizes that voluntary prepayment plans should also be concerned with the prevention of sickness and the early detection and treatment of disease. Disease prevention and early disease detection are essential features of voluntary health insurance if prepayment for medical care is to be employed as a public health measure to prevent or at least retard the onset of prolonged disabilities which represent an increasing social and economic loss for the Nation.

COMPREHENSIVE PERSONAL HEALTH SERVICE PLANS

Preventive services and facilities for the early detection and cure of disease as well as prolonged medical care for chronic illness are included among the benefits of prepayment plans which provide comprehensive personal health services through prepaid group practice of medicine.

The provision of personal-health services of such comprehensive scope is possible only when the services are rendered by family doctors supported by teams of specialists qualified in the basic specialties of medicine and surgery, pathology, roentgenology, and physical therapy. In return for the per-capita annual income derived from the insurance premiums, the medical group or groups provide medical, surgical, X-ray, and diagnostic-laboratory services in homes, in doctors' offices, in the medical centers of the group, and in hospitals. Under the Health Insurance Plan of Greater New York, complete maternity care and even visiting nurse services in the homes and private ambulance transportation to the hospital are also provided without any additional cost.

Another advantage of prepaid group practice of medicine is that the quality of medical care may be safeguarded by the adoption of adequate professional standards by a medical-control board. The quality of medical care is also promoted by the free availability within the group of specialist consultations and by the unrestricted use of modern X-ray and diagnostic laboratory facilities for early disease detection. These facilities and services and their prompt availability without any financial barriers determine in large measure the quality and adequacy of personal-health services under this system of organized medical-group practice.

MEDICAL-EXPENSE INDEMNITY PLANS

Medical-expense indemnity plans, on the other hand, are not primarily concerned with the quality and adequacy of medical care. In this type of voluntary insurance, comprehensive health services cannot be provided because solo practitioners of medicine must be paid a fee for each service by the insurance carrier. Under this system, the total volume of doctors' bills for comprehensive services is unpredictable. Insurance carriers are therefore compelled to restrict cash indemnities to a limited number of reasonably predictable medical services, chiefly to services rendered to the subscriber in a hospital. This kind of insurance provides a cushion against some of the costs of certain catastrophic illnesses after they have occurred. However, it has been the experience of the Health Insurance Plan that 90 percent of all personal-health services are rendered to insured persons by family doctors, specialists, X-ray, laboratory, and other ancillary services outside of a hospital. These numerous professional services, so important to the preservation of health, are either excluded or only inadequately covered in most of the medical-expense indemnity contracts sold by commercial insurance and Blue Shield companies.

H. R. 8356, the reinsurance bill, may possibly encourage some medical expense indemnity companies to cover a few of the existing gaps in benefit coverage. For this reason I testified in its support before this committee a few weeks ago. But H. R. 8356 will, in my opinion, be of no value to comprehensive service plans like HIP which have very few gaps in benefit coverage. Nor should we delude ourselves with the hope that the reinsurance bill will ever enable commercial insurance companies and Blue Shield plans to provide comprehensive benefit coverage for personal health services outside of a hospital without large deductible and coinsurance features. Medical expense indemnity companies cannot take cash risks of unpredictable magnitude, nor will the Federal reinsurance fund be able to cover unpredictable risks of this magnitude and uncontrollability.

THE NEED FOR GUARANTEED MORTGAGE LOANS

Of the two bills, H. R. 8356 and H. R. 7700, the latter is more realistic. It will aid in the establishment and growth of other comprehensive service programs like HIP by guaranteeing loans from private lending institutions to local prepayment plans and to their affiliated medical groups for the acquisition of needed facilities and equipment. These loans can be repaid in future years out of earned premium income of the prepayment plan or out of the income of the prepaid medical group to which the loan is made. The permanente health plan could not have gotten under way without bank loans for which Mr. Henry Kaiser pledged his credit. The Health Insurance Plan of Greater New York could not have been established in 1947, in spite of the many employees of the city and of private industry waiting for enrollment, if it had not been able to secure the required working capital. Loans of $855,000 were advanced by several philanthropic foundations to HIP because of the plan's original demonstrated value. These loans are being rapidly repaid out of premium income.

Also, HIP has thus far been unable to make loans in any significant amounts to assist its affiliated medical groups in securing the required physical facilities and equipment of group centers. Most of the groups when they began, in 1947 and later years, had little if any financial resources of their own. Their participating physicians were at first obliged to see patients in scattered private offices of the individual doctors until the groups had accumulated a building and equipment fund of sufficient size. Meanwhile, many of these stalwart pioneers took no salary from their medical groups or, at best, received most inadequate remuneration for their professional services. It usually required several years of personal privation for the physicians of a medical group to accumulate half of the needed capital for a center, upon the strength of which they could then secure the remaining half as a mortgage loan from a private lending institution.

The financial sacrifies made by these physicians during the formative years of prepaid group practice and the medical group centers which they finally built are an enduring tribute to their valor and fortitude. It is more than we have any right to expect physicians to endure in creating so valuable a health service.

After 7 difficult years, 27 of HIP's medical groups are now housed in well-equipped medical group centers and the remainder will occupy their centers during the next year if they can secure the required financial aid. The physicians in groups which have acquired a medical center and have reached an average enrollment of insured families receive adequate remuneration and are able to amortize the mortgage loans on their central facility. Most of the physicians in the medical groups are partners, they contribute to a pension plan for retirement at age 65, and they own the physical facilities of their group center collectively.

As I stated to this committee at a previous hearing on March 24, 1954, "Together, H. R. 8356 and H. R. 7700 constitute a balanced health program for the Nation, a health service 'package,' which is not costly and which may be exceedingly effective in extending modern medical care under several forms of voluntary insurance. The people of this country can then ultimately decide in the light of actual experience which method of prepaid medical care they prefer, medical expense indemnity or group practice medical service plans. If only H. R. 8356 is enacted, they will have no choice in most parts of the country." I therefore urge the enactment of H. R. 7700.

One last observation concerning H. R. 7700. If Federal guaranty of mortgage loans is made available to encourage the establishment of prepaid group practice, it should also in all fairness be available to medical groups which engage in practice on a fee-for-service basis. American medicine and the American people could profit from a better organization of medical practice, whether it be on a fee-for-service basis or under a prepayment plan. I favor prepaid group practice because it enables families of low and moderate income to purchase comprehensive medical care of good quality at lower cost. But I would strongly recommend that H. R. 7700 be amended to encourage the establishment of both kinds of group practice because of their advantages to the American people.

Dr. Richard M. Carey, Medical Director of the Upper Manhattan Medical Group, Testifies Regarding the Need for Mortgage Loan Insurance as Provided in H. R. 7700

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 29, 1954

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Richard M. Carey, medical director of the Upper Manhattan Medical Group, gave some very significant and important testimony before the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee at its meeting this morning, and stated as follows:

H. R. 7700 recognizes the need to encourage the extension of voluntary medical-insurance plans, and to encourage physicians to associate themselves in medical groups. The Upper Manhattan Medical Group is a medical facility as defined in section 702 (g), H. R. 7700. As the medical director of this group I wish to be recorded in support of H. R. 7700, because it will aid in the establishment of similar facilities, improve the health of the people, and bring the cost of medical care within their means.

My support of this bill is in no way related to any benefit that might be derived by our group from its provisions. The purpose of this statement is to relate to the committee the difficulties we had to overcome in establishing our group, and to point out how this bill would solve these problems for others.

The highly specialized fields of medicine require coordination for efficient rendering of services to individuals. The formation of medical group (teams) supplies the organization demanded by the high degree of specialization in modern medicine. This fact has been apparent for many years, yet relatively few physicians have taken this logical step. I am convinced that the reason for this is to be found in the attitude of lending institutions toward medical facilities. Speciality buildings of the type necessary for group practice are considered poor mortgage risks, and this in spite of the accumulating evidence throughout the country to the contrary. Most banks and insurance companies are not interested in this type of loan. They feel that buildings of this type can serve only a single purpose and would be a total loss in the event they had to be taken over in default of the loan. Construction costs are higher than in more conventional buildings. The few institutions that have made such mortgage loans have provided only a small percentage of the cost.

As long ago as 1938, several of the physicians in our group attempted unsuccessfully to organize a medical group. The failure was due largely to their inability to obtain loans to finance the initial capital investment. The Upper Manhattan Medical Group was organized in 1948, for the purpose of becoming affiliated with the Health Insurance Plan of Greater New York. The group now occupies a modern group center, built and equipped at a cost of $450,000. A total of 10 banks and 2 insurance companies refused mortgage loans on the building. Our difficulty in obtaining financial assistance delayed by at least 2 years the erection of our center. We were finally able to obtain from a bank a mortgage loan amounting to only 24 percent of the cost of the building. Even this small loan required personal security of each physician. For a full year all of our earnings from the health insurance plan, and for an additional 3½ years 50 percent of our earnings from the plan, were placed in the building fund. This financial burden seemed at times too great to bear, but it indicates the kind of sacrifice physicians must make in order to organize a medical group and provide a proper diagnostic and treatment center. While we were able to accomplish our objective, I don't think many physicians would or should be expected to make such a sacrifice. The provisions of this bill would remove this financial barrier, and make it possible for physicians to borrow the necessary funds to establish themselves in a modern group center.

The geographic area served by the Upper Manhattan Medical Group is populated largely by families with low incomes. Most of these families in the past had a family physician in name only, whom they called on in emergencies or visited sporadically for minor illnesses. Most of their medical care was received through terribly overcrowded municipal facilities. Our group now serves some 11,000 of these individuals on a prepayment basis, through the health insurance plan of greater New York. Our 27 general physicians and specialists take care of all of their medical needs. Seventy-five percent of the required services are rendered in the group center or the offices of general physicians, 12 percent in the home, and 13 percent in hospitals. Ambulance service to the hospital is provided when needed and the services of a visiting nurse in the home are available. Specialist care not included in the 12 basic specialties provided by our partners, is provided by a panel of super specialists at no additional cost to the subscriber.

A continuing health education program is carried on through the medium of a regularly issued bulletin and a series of lectures. Periodic health examination for the early detection of disease is encouraged. I have practiced in this area for almost 20 years, and I speak with conviction when I say that both the quality and quantity of medical care provided by our group to 11,000 individuals is far superior to that which they have received in the past.

The payment of medical bills, when aided by prepaid health insurance, comes within the means of even low-income families. The amount of the premium can be budgeted, and paid in small monthly installments. Premium contributions by employers or union welfare funds further ease the payments. Medical expense handled in this manner for services provided by a medical group makes an ideal combination. The advantages of group practice are provided at relatively low cost in a manner permitting emphasis on early detection of disease and preventive medicine.

The provisions of this bill, if enacted into law, will encourage physicians to associate themselves in medical groups and will make available the necessary capital for proper diagnostic and treatment centers. Since medical groups afford a method of providing a higher quality of medical care, and since prepayment medical service insurance provides a means for bringing the cost of medical care within the means of low-income families, the combination of the two provides an ideal method of improving the health of the people at a cost they can afford. I, therefore, strongly urge favorable consideration of H. R. 7700.

Dr. Robert E. Rothenberg, FACS, Chairman, Medical Group Council of the Health Insurance Plan of Greater New York, Testifies Regarding the Need for Mortgage-Loan Insurance as Provided in H. R. 7700

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 29, 1954

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Robert E. Rothenberg, FACS, chairman, medical group council of the Health Insurance Plan of Greater New York, gave some very significant and important testimony before the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee at its meeting this morning, and stated as follows:

STATEMENT SUBMITTED TO HOUSE COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE AT WASHINGTON, D. C., BY ROBERT E. ROTHENBERG, M. D., FACS, CHAIRMAN, MEDICAL GROUP COUNCIL OF THE HEALTH INSURANCE PLAN (HIP) OF GREATER NEW YORK AND MEDICAL DIRECTOR OF THE CENTRAL MEDICAL GROUP OF BROOKLYN

The passage of the Wolverton bill, H. R. 7700, would make a fine contribution toward a solution to the people's health needs and should be supported actively by everyone interested in expanding medical care. It is obvious that there is great need to promote and extend voluntary prepayment health-service plans and to encourage physicians to form medical groups. Modern medical trends demand the pooling of knowledge and point the necessity for the pooling of equipment and facilities. There is just too much to know today for any one doctor, no matter how brilliant or highly trained he may be, to be able to handle alone all the illnesses of one patient. Similarly, there are so many costly instruments of diagnosis and treatment (such as X-ray machines, electrocardiograph machines, basal-metabolism apparatus, laboratory equipment, etc.) that the average doctor would be unable to purchase them should he desire to establish a truly, complete medical facility of his own. If he did, the costs of medical care to his patients would rise even higher than they are now. Under existing circumstances, the costs of diagnostic tests and the charges which hospitals are forced to make have placed private medical care beyond the reach of the majority of our people.

The old system of a fee for each service, or "c. o. d. medicine," must therefore give way to a more sensible pattern of payment of medical bills. As a direct consequence of the high cost of medical care, we are witnessing the rapid development of prepayment health service plans which permit the patient to budget in advance for his medical expenses and which give comprehensive care without the limitations brought about by a fee for each service.

In the concluding chapter of a book published in 1949, entitled "Group Medicine and Health Insurance in Action," I stated:

"Medical achievements during this century have been nothing short of miraculous, but the gains have been almost entirely along scientific lines. There is justifiable pride in the realization today that people get to places via stratoliner and streptomycin instead of stagecoach and squill. Unfortunately, the profession has been rather slow to recognize that it is just as difficult for the average man to afford the stratoliner and streptomycin of this era as it was for his grandfather to afford the stagecoach and squill of former days. By the same token, it is wonderful to contemplate that sepsis and shock, when treated early and properly, no longer present such great dangers to life. However, it is less pleasant to admit that too many of our people are unable to get to a place where they can receive proper treatment and that too many of them would be unable to pay for it even if they did get there.

"It is medicine's responsibility not only to discover new preventions and cures but to keep pace with economic advances. The problems of distribution and cost of medical care are as much the doctor's business as the proper dosage of digitalis or the correct procedure for cure of gallbladder disease. No American should be so isolated that he cannot obtain the services of a competent physician, and no service should be so expensive that it is beyond his ability to pay. Although experience in this field has been of relatively short duration, it can be stated with certainty that the solution to many of the country's medical problems can be found in group practice on an insurance basis. Group medical practice embodies the modernization of old techniques and permits the tired, overworked solo physician to share with highly trained colleagues the burden of his struggle against disease. Since no doctor can possibly achieve proficiency in all branches of medicine, the cooperation and specialization which exist in group medical practice offer much more efficient care. It is an obvious fact that the consultation technique often leads to the cure of otherwise obscure ailments. However, the improvement of practice methods by the formation of medical groups is a little help if the patient is unable to meet the costs of these services. For this reason, the organization of prepayment-health insurance in combination with group practice has been a natural outcome. Even at this early date, several million of our people are receiving aid in payment of their medical bills from health-insurance plans or companies. It is now the duty of physician and public alike to see to it that the benefits of this type of insurance are extended, by one means or another, to all our people who need and want it."

It is my conviction, and the conviction of the 1,000 HIP physicians whom I represent as chairman of their Medical Group Council, that group practice units throughout the country should be encouraged to develop and should be given financial aid to establish their physical facilities. This aid should come from private sources and the groups should be owned and controlled by the doctors themselves. At this time, there are some 650 to 700 medical groups in the United States. By enabling physicians to borrow funds from lending institutions, the Wolverton bill (H. R. 7700) would stimulate the formation of additional groups in urban and rural communities throughout the country. Lack of sufficient medical groups with adequate diagnostic, treatment, and hospital facilities has been the main deterrant to greater expension of comprehensive, voluntary, prepaid health service plans. The people want the benefits of these plans and are literally begging existing organizations such as HIP and the Kaiser Foundation to expand their activities and build new facilities.

The Central Medical Group of Brooklyn, of which I am the medical director and chief of surgery, is one of the 30 HIP medical groups. This one group alone serves 32,000 New Yorkers and has 39 family physicians and specialists on its staff. It has its own medical center, a 24,000 square foot building, fully air conditioned and fireproofed, costing over $900,000 to build and equip. It is not the purpose of this presentation to urge the committee to act in favor of H. R. 7700 so that this group or any of the other HIP groups may benefit from its provisions. Rather, it is our purpose to tell you a few of the problems and difficulties we in the central medical group encountered when we attempted to obtain financing for the construction of our group center. The kind of discouragement we faced over and over again in our search for a mortgage commitment has been experienced by many other groups in the process of formation and has been responsible, in large measure, for their failure to actually come into being. The enactment of H. R. 7700 into law would mitigate most of these difficulties.

From 1947 to 1952, the central medical group put aside approximately 25 percent of its doctors' earnings, before taxes, to finance a group medical center. This amounted to $493,500 but comprised only half of the moneys necessary for the construction and equipment of a facility adequate to care for its patients. The group therefore went to banks and insurance companies for the purpose of obtaining a mortgage loan. At least 15 savings banks and insurance companies turned down our requests for a mortgage. Nine mortgage brokers were approached to lend their aid. All of them requested bonuses ranging from 1½ to 3 percent of the face amount of the mortgage. They too failed to obtain a commitment. Many banks asked for personal net worth statements from each of the physicians in the group and even though these were invariably judged to be satisfactory, it did not convince them to issue a mortgage. (From this somewhat unusual request for net worth statements, one might predict the added difficulties that would beset a group of young beginners or veteran physicians who had not yet been in practice and who, therefore, could present no satisfactory net worth statements.)

Upon analysis of the causes of our failure to obtain help, we discovered the following:

1. A group medical center or diagnostic and treatment center is a specialty building and, therefore, an unattractive mortgage risk in the eyes of savings banks and insurance companies.

2. A group medical center is an unfamiliar type of building and differs considerably from the standard professional building.

3. The concept of voluntary prepaid, comprehensive health insurance was difficult for banks and insurance companies to grasp. Some looked upon us as bold plungers into an uncharted field and felt that their loans would be insecure in our hands.

4. The cost per square foot of constructing a group medical center is almost double that of an ordinary office building. There is much more plumbing needed for treatment rooms; special wiring, special outlets and heavy electrical conduits are required to service X-ray and other specialized equipment; an elaborate intercommunication system is essential, and an exceptional number of partitions are required for the many treatment rooms, consulting rooms, and nurses' stations. As a result, banks and insurance companies were discouraged from participating in such a venture or in advancing sufficient funds to do the job properly.

5. The geographic location of a group medical center may be medically desirable and necessary but, mortgagewise, may be considered a highly undesirable neighborhood. Some of the poorest urban localities and some of the least developed rural area may be most suitable for the placement of a diagnostic and treatment center and yet would seem to a bank or insurance company, an undesirable location in which to invest mortgage money.

The inability to obtain financial aid delayed construction for 1 year until finally, the group was fortunate in discovering a forward-looking insurance company who agreed to issue a 20 year mortgage in the amount of $250,000 at a 4¾ percent interest rate. This mortgage amounted to approximately 30 percent of the cost of construction whereas the group would have liked to have obtained a mortgage covering 50 to 60 percent of the total construction costs. Had the group been successful in obtaining a mortgage for 50 to 60 percent of the costs of its center, there would have been capital available to apply toward the construction of its own hospital. While such a project is still the aim of the group's doctors, they have been forced, because of lack of funds and available mortgage possibilities, to abandon plans for the construction of this much-needed facility.

The enactment of H. R. 7700 would lend dignity and stability to voluntary, prepayment health service plans and would aid in the establishment of more medical group practice units. It is my opinion that fifteen to twenty additional medical groups would have come into HIP if the young doctors interested in such an association had been able to finance proper diagnostic and treatment centers! These young physicians, many of them just recently released from the armed services, are willing to risk the little capital they possess but their funds must be supplemented by mortgage monies. Also, it must be remembered that a large share of the money which the doctors do have available, must go into furniture and equipment. Such items cannot, of course, be financed through long term loans.

The ultimate effect of H. R. 7700 would be to encourage private enterprise to play a larger part in providing a wider distribution of medical care at a cost more nearly within reach of the public.

Dr. Karl Pickard, FACP, Medical Administrator of the Central Medical Group of Brooklyn, Testifies Regarding the Need for Mortgage Loan Insurance as Provided in H. R. 7700

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 29, 1954

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Karl Pickard, FACP, medical administor of the Central Medical Group of Brooklyn, gave some very significant and important testimony before the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee at its meeting this morning, and stated as follows:

STATEMENT SUBMITTED TO THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE (RE H. R. 7700) BY KARL PICKARD, M. D., FACP, MEDICAL ADMINISTRATOR, CENTRAL MEDICAL GROUP OF BROOKLYN

As a physician who has been practicing as internist and medical administrator of a group associated with the Health Insurance Plan of Greater New York since its inception, I urge support of the Wolverton bill, H. R. 7700. This committee is already well aware of the operation and purpose of prepaid medical-care programs throughout the country. In previous testimony before the committee, many general statements have been made concerning cost of medical care, preventive medical aspects of prepaid programs, the philosophy of group practice and its advantages to patient and doctor, as well as the problems encountered by physicians who are seeking to establish themselves in this form of medical endeavor. The passage of the Wolverton bill, H. R. 7700, would do much to help these doctors establish proper facilities so that more people could benefit from additional comprehensive prepaid medical-care programs.

The purpose of my testimony is to present answers to questions often raised regarding the usefulness of a voluntary prepaid medical-care plan such as HIP:

Does the patient get comprehensive medical care?

Does the single yearly premium pay for operations when necessary?

Are the mothers delivered of their babies without additional cost?

Do the doctors take care of the entire family in the home as well as in the office?

Does the patient get X-ray and laboratory work when he needs it?

Can the patient call on the doctor any time of the day or night?

Does the patient get physical therapy, electrocardiograms, and basal metabolism tests when necessary?

These questions and many others related to comprehensive medical service can be answered affirmatively. However, factual data has been collected in the Central Medical Group of Brooklyn, especially during the past 3 years, which supports that answer. The data concerns itself only with numbers—number of services rendered by each physician in the group and by the nursing and technical help employed by the group. These numbers can easily be interpreted in terms of value and quality of service. I have prepared a chart for the years 1951, 1952, and 1953 which is attached to this report. May I discuss those facts and figures accumulated for the year 1953 at a time when the Central Medical Group of Brooklyn had approximately 32,000 patients on its roster. During that year over 200,000 services were given by the 39 doctors on the staff of the group and 8,409 services by the nurses and technicians associated with these doctors making a grand total of over 208,000 services. If we were to project this figure for all the patients enrolled in HIP we would readily see that over 3 million services were given. Each patient of the Central Medical Group received an average of 6.4 services during the year 1953. Of course, some patients had no occasion to call upon the doctor even though they were urged to do so for routine preventive examinations. Others used the physician's service only once during the year while still others, with serious medical complaints, had occasion to receive 30 or 40 services. As the chart shows, approximately 73 percent of these services were rendered in the doctor's office, 11 percent at the home of the patient and in our medical group, 16 percent in the hospital. Approximately 54 percent of the services was given by specialists other than pediatricians; approximately 14 percent was by the pediatricians, while the remainder, or 35 percent, was given by the general physicians. The fact that so much of the service was given by specialists is an indication of the high quality of service offered the patient in a group practice prepaid program.

A great deal has been said of abuses which would result from the prepayment of medical care when provided comprehensively without deterrent extra charges. The low figure of 11 percent for home calls would certainly indicate such statement to be fallacious. The fact that a percentage of patients did not appear for routine physical examinations, even though they were urged to do so through health bulletins and health education lectures, also shows that patients have little tendency to abuse medical care just because they do not have to pay for each service. It is of importance to the preventive health aspects of the program that our medical group gave almost 15,000 health examinations during 1953.

Here are other pertinent figures. During 1953, 450 new babies were delivered by the obstetricians of the group. There were 402 major surgical operations and 4,164 minor surgical operations done by all surgeons in the group. Because of the close association of the medical and surgical departments within the group, all these patients received complete medical preoperative and postoperative care by the department of internal medicine.

Approximately 21,000 services were given in the X-ray department and in the laboratory. This is about 10 percent of all service given. It is a rather impressive figure and shows that no corners were cut either in diagnosis or in treatment. In order to give these technical benefits to our patients as well as the extra services already mentioned, which include electrocardiograms, basal metabolisms, physiotherapy, etc. (see chart), the group had to obtain the newest in equipment and to hire well qualified nursing and technical personnel.

An attempt was made to estimate the cost to the patients for all services received in 1952. To each service whether it was an office visit, a home call, a delivery, an operation, an electrocardigram, or a heat treatment, we have allocated the amount of money that the patient would have had to pay in the New York area had he not belonged to the health insurance plan. The total cost would have been $1,836,525. The 32,000 patients enrolled with the Central Medical Group had a premium cost of $870,000, half of which was paid by the employer. Thus the patient received his medical care under this program for less than 25 percent of what it might have cost him. We must also remember that over 50 percent of these patients, earning less than $4,000 yearly as a total family income, probably could not have paid for any medical care and would have had to resort to care in free clinics or go without medical care.

In brief, then, the overall answer to the questions, I cited to you is this:

Prepaid medical care as practiced by the medical groups affiliated with the health-insurance plan does provide the patient, for the yearly premium, fully comprehensive modern medical services, including home calls by physicians and treatment in physicians' offices and in hospitals, including delivery of babies, including surgical operations, including services of laboratory technicians, X-rays, electrocardiograms, and the like—and including the services of qualified specialists as well as general physicians. The patient and his family are really insured against the total cost of all illness.

The Central Medical Group of Brooklyn started as the first group under contract with HIP in March 1947. At that time it had 17 physicians and only 69 patients. Its group center had a total of 4,500 square feet of space in which to treat patients. Since then it has grown very rapidly so that at present it has approximately 32,000 patients and 39 specialists and general physicians. In March 1953 it opened a new medical center with 24,000 square feet of space. This project cost the doctors of the group $900,000 for the land, building, and equipment. For this purpose they had put aside a percentage of their income each year. They were able in this manner to accumulate about 50 percent of the moneys needed; the rest had to be obtained through bank and insurance-company loans. The group requires a hospital in conjunction with its medical center. This it intends to obtain in the future. Such a hospital, of course, will cost more money than a small group of young doctors can accumulate by themselves. The aid proposed by H. R. 7700 would make it possible not only for the doctors of the Central Medical Group to go ahead with the completion of their project, but for other physicians throughout the country interested in group practice and in prepaid health insurance to establish the facilities needed to give good medical care.

H. R. 7700 can do much to allow the people of this country to meet the cost of medical care in the American way. I, therefore, urge its passage.

Utilization data, Central Medical Group of Brooklyn, for 1951, 1952, 1953

	1951	Rate	1952	Rate	1953	Rate
Mean enrollment and rate [1]	26,323	5.9	29,072	6.2	31,705	6.4
	Services	Percent	Services	Percent	Services	Percent
Total physician services and percentage.	156,302	100.0	180,380	100.0	202,759	100.0
Office services and percentage	109,828	70.2	126,214	69.9	147,437	72.7
Home services and percentage	18,928	12.1	22,316	12.3	22,299	10.9
Hospital services and percentage	27,546	17.7	31,850	17.8	33,023	16.4
General physician services	51,593	33.0	56,688	31.4	64,219	31.7
Pediatrician services	23,988	15.3	30,970	17.2	29,745	14.6
Other specialist services	80,721	51.7	92,722	51.4	108,795	53.7
Preventive services [2]	11,215	----------	13,914	----------	14,566	----------
Deliveries	341	----------	397	----------	450	----------
Major surgical cases	366	----------	418	----------	402	----------
Minor surgical cases	3,907	----------	4,093	----------	4,164	----------
X-ray services and percentage	5,633	3.6	7,359	4.1	8,798	4.3
Pathologist services and percentage	6,846	4.4	7,300	4.0	11,338	5.6
Total ancillary services	8,595	----------	8,304	----------	8,409	----------
Basal metabolism	714	----------	728	----------	843	----------
Electrocardiogram	1,057	----------	1,049	----------	1,548	----------
Physiotherapy	3,464	----------	3,702	----------	2,952	----------
Visiting nurse services	1,307	----------	940	----------	930	----------
Injections (by nurse injectionist)	1,948	----------	1,784	----------	2,015	----------
Ambulance services	105	----------	101	----------	121	----------

[1] Rate equals number of physician services per enrolled patient per year.

[2] Routine yearly health surveys.

Dairy Shockers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. THYE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 29, 1954

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article written by Alfred Stedman, and published in the St. Paul Pioneer Press of April 25, 1954.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DAIRY SHOCKERS

(By Alfred D. Stedman)

Enough to shock all concerned, including producers, consumers, Department of Agriculture, and Congress, are the Government's figures on the aftermath of the April 1 cut of 15 percent in dairy price supports.

Those figures forecast that, with average weather, the cut will be followed by 2.8 billion pounds more milk production in 1954 than in 1953. They estimate that total consumption of dairy products in all forms should rise in the equivalent of at least 2 billion pounds or more of milk.

Those figures are startling enough of themselves, without reading in false meanings. They don't disprove that Secretary Benson acted properly in lowering the 90 percent of parity support level.

But assuming average weather, the figures do point to a severe 1954 dairy situation, especially for the Midwest. They indicate the Government may have to buy about as much in supporting the lower-price level as it bought in backing the higher one. That means adding to the Government's holdings which on April 1 totaled 364 million pounds of butter, 483 million pounds of cheese and 599 million pounds of milk powder. What's the trouble? Why isn't increased use at the lower prices solving the problem?

In seeking answers, the first real shocker is a discovery about consumption of fluid milk, the most vital of foods, especially for the Nation's mothers and children. Sales of fluid milk lead all other uses, amounting to 42 percent of the total. The problem of surplus butter, powder or cheese doesn't arise until after consumers buy whatever amount they want to pay for as fluid milk for drinking.

And under artificially high prices, especially in eastern and southern cities, consumption of fluid milk has fallen seriously since the war. In the Greater New York City market, total fluid milk use was actually less this March than last. Yet a recovery to the former per capita level in the United States generally would about lick the dairy surplus.

A second shocker is a discovery that the dairy price cut isn't applying equally as between the Midwest and the high-priced eastern and southern markets. The Government states that in some markets outside the Midwest, the price support cut will mean no change in fluid milk prices at all.

The final shocker is a discovery of increasing use of Federal power to uphold those high eastern and southern prices, while excluding the Midwest's cheaper grade A milk and letting Midwest prices fall.

The Department of Agriculture supports farm prices of fluid milk in 49 city areas. In seven in East and South, it separates the fluid milk price support level from Midwest manufacturing prices, setting it apart and higher. In others as well, it levies under different guises what amount to tariffs that tax away from dealers any advantage to be gained from buying the Midwest's cheaper grade A milk. It recognizes local sanitary barriers against our product. It commonly prices our concentrated milk at the local fluid price level, as even the Twin Cities now are being asked to do. Applied in East and South, this knocks out the savings of two-thirds on freight costs from the Midwest, applies the tariff and kills concentrate's chance to sell. To cap the climax, the Midwest's grade A milk is barred from Washington.

So there's the story. In the high-priced areas, milk consumption lags. Thus they have more left over to pour into manufactured dairy products. Their butter and cheese are free to compete with ours. But Midwest milk is barred from competing with them. Why not set those markets free? Why not let consumers there have milk prices to encourage consumption? That should brighten the now dark dairy outlook.

A Monstrous Lawsuit Is Forestalled in Central Valley Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR ENGLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 29, 1954

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege in October 1951 to serve as chairman of a special six-member Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation which held hearings in Sacramento, Calif., on the Central Valley project. The purpose of the hearings was to consider Federal-State relationships in the management of the Central Valley project and to obtain factual information on the project water supplies, the water requirements of the lands to be served by the project, and the water rights necessary to operate it. The subcommittee made a critical analysis of several problems relating to project management and made some very definite findings and specific recommendations.

One of the matters which was covered at the hearings and on which findings and recommendations were made concerned the adjudication of Sacramento Valley water rights. The subcommittee found that the State of California and Bureau of Reclamation officials were making plans for an adjudication of Sacramento Valley water rights in the Federal court. It appeared to us on the subcommittee that such a procedure would result in a monstrous lawsuit, a "legal Frankenstein" which would destroy all hope for State control of Central Valley water rights. The cost of such a lawsuit would be enormous. It would embroil the Central Valley project in litigation for decades, and would probably delay further water development in the Central Valley of California. The subcommittee felt very strongly that all other means of settlement should be completely exhausted before resorting to such a lawsuit over the waters of the Sacramento River. We recommended that the State engineer of California should proceed as far as possible to settle the problem by administrative action, having in mind that a settlement should be attempted through negotiations looking toward the achievement of a practical operating agreement.

I am pleased to report to my colleagues that, as a result of the hearings and the recommendations of the special subcommittee, an attempt is being made to negotiate a settlement of the complex water-rights problem without recourse to litigation. A trial distribution of water program is now underway. Water users owning some 350,000 acres and diverting 94 percent of the water being taken from the Sacramento River above the delta are participating in the program. They have agreed to keep certain records and furnish information relative to the water they are diverting during this irrigation season. At the end of the year, after the information is all in, a report will be prepared by the State engineer on the actual utilization of water for irrigation during the summer and this report will form the basis for another trial distribution next year. The cooperation that has been given to this program is very encouraging and the achievement of a practical operating agreement is one step nearer. Messrs. ASPINALL, YORTY, D'EWART, POULSON, and BOW, who served with me on the special subcommittee, deserve a lot of credit for heading off this huge lawsuit, and keeping the Central Valley project on an even keel.

Phony Agreement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 26, 1954

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Boston Herald of April 20, 1954:

PHONY AGREEMENT

The Joint Chiefs of Staff gave unanimous approval to the New Look.

General Ridgway, Army Chief of Staff, expressed dissatisfaction with the New Look before Congress.

Admiral Carney, Navy Chief of Staff, expressed concern in a speech at Newport, R. I.

Is there a conflict? Of course. Then why did the Joint Chiefs of Staff unanimously agree? Because the Commander in Chief said last year that he would not tolerate any minority opinions in the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Result? Formal endorsement of the administration program by the Joint Chiefs of Staff. What does that mean? That the Joint Chiefs of Staff are following orders but that they individually do not necessarily believe in the program. Danger? That the country will not have the honest, professional opinion of its expert military leaders on which to build a strategy which will effectively defend the free world.

My Duty to Home and Country

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 29, 1954

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an inspiring essay by Palmer Cook, of Minerva, Ohio, in my congressional district.

Young Mr. Cook's essay titled "My Duty to Home and Country," gained him the honor of becoming one of the winners in the 1954 American Legion essay contest. His essay suggests a philosophy for American living which every American citizen could well follow.

The essay follows:

MY DUTY TO HOME AND COUNTRY

(By Palmer Cook, of Minerva, Ohio)

My first duty to home is to remember the fifth commandment in which it says, "Honor thy father and thy mother." It is a privilege to respect my parents and to confide in them for they are my best friends. I must be truthful, sincere and honest in character, action, and speech. This will earn the trust of my parents and the confidence of others.

It is my obligation to try to live in harmony with other members of my family and show them the same courtesy as I show my friends. I must shoulder a fair share of the work that must be done around the house.

Family loyalty is a duty that cannot be forgotten though some people never even think of this. Every family has some rules or regulations and it is up to me to obey the rules of my family even when they seem to be too strict. Parents have rules because they have the welfare of their children at heart.

It is important to remember the Golden Rule because if we do unto others as we would have them do unto us, all our duties would become easier.

There is a close relationship between duty to home and duty to country, for if I am a worthy member of my family circle, I will be a better citizen; and if I am a good citizen, my family will be proud of me.

I must give to my country my allegiance which means my service and my loyalty. It is my responsibility to be well-informed about our Government and its history. It is a duty and privilege to vote, and I intend to exercise this right when I am old enough.

It is my duty to respect the flag and learn the rules concerning its display and care.

Another duty to my country is to learn to get along with my neighbors, for if everyone learned to do this, the world would be a happier, more peaceful place in which to live.

It is most important to be a good citizen and obey the laws of my country because I enjoy the rights, privileges and protection of our Government as outlined in our Constitution. After reading about life in other lands, I appreciate more than ever the freedom and equality here which is found in no other country in the world.

I am proud to be an American.

The Attitude of Connecticut Farmers on National Farm Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 29, 1954

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, I enclose for use in the RECORD a letter from Ken Geyer, manager, Connecticut Milk Producers' Association, and public policy newsletter No. 2, containing the high lights of the agricultural policy conference held at the University of Connecticut on March 30.

There can be gleaned from a reading of the material the wise attitude of Connecticut farmers in seeking a national farm policy which will benefit every stratum of our society.

I commend these fine citizens for their straightforward thinking on this very important matter.

The letters follow:

CONNECTICUT MILK
PRODUCERS' ASSOCIATION,
Hartford, Conn., April 27, 1954.

Hon. JAMES T. PATTERSON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Once each year the College of Agriculture of the University of Connecticut sponsors an agricultural policy conference. This is an all day and evening meeting at the college, attended by farmers and farm leaders to discuss agricultural policy, both at the State and the National level.

This year the conference was held on March 30 and confined itself almost exclusively to the discussion of the national agricultural program. The group, of course, is not an action agency, as it is made up of members of the various commodity groups in the State, as well as members of such general farm organizations as the Farm Bureau and the Grange. As a result, no resolutions are ever passed at the meeting.

This year Professors Halcrow and Drew were asked to prepare a summary of the highlights and thinking of the meeting. A copy of this summary is enclosed.

I have read it over carefully, and I believe it reflects better than anything I have seen the attitude of Connecticut farmers toward the national farm problem.

Yours very truly,

KEN GEYER, *Manager.*

PUBLIC POLICY NEWSLETTER NO. 2, APRIL 1954

At the close of the Agricultural Policy Conference on March 30 it was agreed that a short summary of some of the highlights should be prepared. These conferences are for the purpose of discussing the economic implications of ideas which may be the basis for future farm programs.

CONNECTICUT FARMERS ATTENDING THE CONFERENCE LIKE FREE ENTERPRISE

Most farmers attending the conference agreed that they would like to see a gradual reduction and elimination of price supports and subsidies in agriculture and other parts of our economy.

DROP IN DAIRY SUPPORTS TOO DRASTIC

It was thought by some, however, that the recent drop from 90 to 75 percent of parity on dairy products was too drastic. This shary drop intensified the cost-price squeeze for dairy farmers who are buying some feeds based on 90-percent supports.

FLEXIBLE SUPPORTS

For the present, farmers favored flexible supports. The general opinion was that a flexible support level included the necessary machinery for gradually reducing or eliminating subsidies, but did have some insurance value. For example, national farm income dropped by 7½ percent in 1953. The price-support program probably arrested this decline in farm prices and prevented them from going still lower.

STORAGE AND PRICE-SUPPORT DILEMMA

The current dilemma in the price-support program is pointed up by the fact that total holdings and outstanding loans of the CCC have more than doubled in the past year. Wheat, cotton, and corn account for more than three-quarters of the total value. Largest percentage increases have occurred in dairy products—butter, cheese, and dry milk. The February 28 holdings of the 3 dairy products accounted for about 6 percent of the CCC inventory.

Although dairy products account for only a small portion of the CCC program, they have been rapidly building up surplus stocks during the past year. It is primarily because of this that the support level on dairy products was recently lowered.

The CCC totals are as follows:

	Feb. 28, 1954		Feb. 28, 1953, millions of dollars
	Millions of dollars	Percent	
Wheat	2,195	77.4	1,143
Cotton	1,510		311
Corn	1,224		763
Butter	207	6.5	43
Cheese	117		5
Dry milk	87		14
Tobacco	284	16.1	271
Cottonseed oil	185		83
Other	562		359
Total	6,371	--------	2,992

In order to avoid accumulation of greater surpluses it was necessary to proclaim acreage allotments and marketing quotas on cotton and wheat for 1954 and allotments on corn planted in the Corn Belt.

DIFFICULTY OF CONTROLLING OUTPUT

The acreage seeded to feed grains in 1954 will be 8 percent greater than the acreage seeded in 1953, according to the annual USDA spring survey of farmer's intentions to plant. Wheat acreage will be cut by 5 million. Corn will be about the same as last year. Major acreage increases are: Oats 3.2 million, barley 4.5 million, sorghum 4 million, and soybeans 2 million. This illustrates the difficulty of attempting to control agricultural output by allotments on a few crops. As controls are put on wheat and corn, acreages of the other feed grains rise sharply. Controlling acreage does not necessarily control total production.

On March 17 Secretary Benson, while speaking at the annual meeting of the National Farmers Union at Denver, Colo., made the following significant statement, "If I do not succeed in making any other point here, I want to impress upon you just as firmly as I can that the farm program of today is heading toward collapse." The reason for this statement seems apparent from the above figures.

ROLE OF GOVERNMENT

The general feeling at the conference was that the role of the Federal Government should be to stabilize and expand our economy and not to act as a major buyer in the market place.

The mere buying, by the Government, of surplus items at artificially high prices does stabilize farm incomes, but it also encourages additional production of items already in surplus. Past history (and the figures cited above) show that attempts to restrict this additional farm production through acreage allotments, marketing quotas, and so forth, are generally unsuccessful. The basic problem seems to be one of finding a method of stabilizing farm income without building up huge surplus stocks of certain commodities.

DIRECT PAYMENTS

Many people thing that a direct cash payment program would help solve this problem. Generally, commodities would be sold on the free market at whatever price they would bring. The Government might also maintain a modest storage program for the purpose of stabilizing supplies. Cash payments would be made to those farmers who are in need of help because of temporary market gluts. These payments would be based on the difference between the price received on the market and the support level (say a certain percent of parity).

LONG-RANGE ADJUSTMENTS

To improve farm income over a period of time it is necessary to have an increase in demand for farm commodities, or a movement of labor out of agriculture, or both. It is one of the functions of government to encourage expansion in industry and increasing employment, thus creating opportunity and mobility. A shift of labor out of farming into industry would possibly result in larger, more efficient family farms. At present, one-fifth of the farmers in the United States produce three-fourths of the total value of farm products marketed. Many of the remaining four-fifths of the farms must therefore be quite inefficient.

People remaining on the more efficient farms could be expected to realize higher net incomes. Those moving from inefficient farms into an expanding industry could also improve their income position. The general economy would therefore benefit from these labor shifts. High level price supports in general do not induce these necessary shifts of people out of agriculture into industry. They are more apt to make it possible for inefficient farms to continue to operate.

CURRENT THOUGHT ON THE NATIONAL FARM PROGRAM

Congress is not likely to make drastic changes in the present support program this year. The Joint Committee on the President's Economic Report recently stated:

"Whatever the merits of flexible supports and modern parity may or may not be, as a long-run program, it is questionable whether their contribution at this time will act to sustain farm income in the months immediately ahead when the threat to our econoic stability is generally recognized."

Congressional leaders are becoming more concerned over growing unemployment and lagging industrial output. The general feeling apperently is that a lowering of agricultural price supports at this time would have adverse effects on the national economy.

HAROLD G. HALCROW,
WILLIAM H. DREW,
Extension Economists.

Statement by Hon. John F. Shelley, of California, to House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service on Salary Increase for Classified Government Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 29, 1954

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by me to House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service on salary increase for classified Government employees:

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, when I appeared before you on March 1, 1954, to give my views on the need for salary increases for Government employees, my discussion was largely limited to the case for Post Office workers, although I did devote some attention to the problems of classified employees in general. Since the committee has now decided to report legislation affecting both groups at the same time, and since the administration's proposals for the classified employees are now more thoroughly understood, I would like to add to my previous testimony and amplify on my belief that all Federal employees should have a substantial salary increase without delay.

The shortcomings of the Civil Service Commission recommendations are now apparent, as far as meeting the needs of employees in the lower classifications is concerned. The arbitrary method that was used in arriving at their recommendation is also apparent. Instead of sitting down and giving real consideration to what amount of increase was needed in each of the different pay classifications to provide a fair and decent raise, adequate to compensate for higher living costs, it is obvious that the administration people who wrote the plan began by asking themselves "What is the absolute minimum overall increase we can recommend which will appear to give some satisfaction to Government employees but won't damage our claims that we are achieving economy in Government?" They settled on 2.5 percent of the total classified payroll and from that point proceeded to work up a scheme for apportioning the 2.5 percent among the various pay groups and to camouflage the inadequacy of the plan by disguising it as a new classification system. The end result, as might be expected, does practically nothing to give the lower paid employees of the Government additional money to buy their bread and butter, to clothe their families, and to pay the rent. I say "pay the rent" because at the present price of real estate, the good Lord knows that not very many of them can put up the downpayment to buy a decent home.

If there is any justification for setting an arbitrary ceiling on the total amount the administration feels it can afford to recommend for salary increases—and I refuse to admit that any ceiling below an amount sufficient to provide an adequate salary scale for all Government employees can be justified—there is certainly no justification for euchering employees in the lower classifications out of their fair share of such an increase. I do not quarrel with the fact that employees in the upper classifications should have a substantial increase, and I agree firmly with the proposition that there should be adequate differentials in the pay of supervisory employees and those who work under them. However, I cannot agree that these adjustments should be made at the expense of those for whom the need is immediate and urgent.

My personal belief is that really substantial increases, such as those provided in H. R. 4556, the Withrow bill, should be voted at once. That is the type of action I am fighting for in this Congress. Following that step the committee, working with the departments and with the recognized employee groups, should give mature study to the question of reclassifying positions and adjusting differentials. To attempt to do that now on the basis of unilateral recommendations by the Civil Service Commission will further reduce the present low morale of the rank and file Government worker. You can't feed a hungry dog by throwing him a rubber bone. Neither can you satisfy the justifiable demands of underpaid Government workers by tossing them a fancy package which, when stripped to the essentials, does nothing for them or their families.

I have received any number of letters from Government employees in San Francisco in both supervisory and rank and file positions. They are unanimous in citing the lag between pay increases for blue-collar workers and private industrial employees and the granting of similar raises to white-collar employees of the Federal Government. They are also unanimous in their demand for a full adjustment in all pay grades to compensate for cost-of-living increases. That time lag is the fault of Congress and it is also our responsibility to remedy the situation without delay.

I therefore again urge the committee to act favorably on legislation to bring Government employees' salaries up to a level which reflect a realistic understanding of how hard they have been hit. In normal collective bargaining in industry such wage adjustments could be made retroactive to help employees pay off some of the debts saddled on them because their raises were overdue. Since we cannot do that for Government workers because of our system, then let us by all means make the increase we do provide big enough so that when they get their first larger paycheck they won't be ashamed to take it home to their wives and families.

We Want the Truth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 29, 1954

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Boston Herald of April 21, 1954:

WE WANT THE TRUTH

Secretary of Defense Wilson delivered himself of the opinion, printed in the Tuesday morning papers, that we are "vulnerable but not highly vulnerable" to atomic attack. He wrapped the whole thing up by saying, "We are relatively secure."

We nominate these as the most meaningless phrases of the year.

How much less critical is vulnerable than highly vulnerable when one bomb carried by one plane can "take out" a city the size of New York? How safe is it to be vulnerable?

What are we relatively secure to? We are more secure than we were in 1947; we are undoubtedly more secure than besieged Dien Bien Phu, but are we secure enough when faced by a Russia which bragged only the other day she had an H-bomb? Of course not. We can hardly believe that Mr. Wilson really thinks we are.

It would appear that the American people are purposely being fed a lot of doubletalk by the Secretary of Defense.

In the afternoon papers of the same day, Mrs. Katherine Howard, of Boston, Deputy Civil Defense Director, said an atomic attack on the United States might produce more casualties than all our forces have suffered in all our wars.

She said that no American city is out of A-bomb range and that there is no sure way to stop all the planes in an enemy raid on the United States. "From one-half to two-thirds of them would get through to their targets—perhaps three-quarters of them, if the assault came tomorrow," she said. "We can be hit as a nation and hit hard, despite our military defenses," she continued.

Is this "relatively secure," Mr. Wilson?

The American people, whose lives are involved, are confused. They are beginning to lack confidence that our leaders know the facts and are capable of facing the facts that they do know.

The rumors and irresponsible statements ranging from Mr. Wilson's Pollyannalike optimism to our columnists of doom who wallow in despair—"the age of the praying mantis"—breed distrust, doubt, fear, confusion, apathy, or panic.

We believe that the American people deserve the facts. If the administration does not believe any of the many studies which have been made of air defense dangers and needs, then let them hurry up and get another one completed.

The American people should know how much an effective air defense would cost. What would it mean? How effective would it be? What are our alternatives?

We believe that the American people are big enough and courageous enough to survive and thrive in a hell-bomb age. But they cannot act until they know what is needed; they cannot build until they know what has to be built; they cannot make sacrifices until they know what needs to be sacrificed.

The American people believe in Gene Fowler's 11th commandment, "Thou shall not quit." But first they have to know the harsh, unvarnished truth. Somebody has got to tell them without sugar-coating and without hysterics.

Once the American people know the facts, we have full faith they will be equal to the stern realities of the atomic age.

My Duty to Home and Country

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1954

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, it gives me great pleasure to bring to the attention of my colleagues two splendid essays one written by June Kiger, a 10th-grade student and the other by Margaret Fox, a student in the 11th grade of the high school at Lancaster, Ohio, which is in my congressional district. These two young ladies were winners in an essay contest among high-school students which is sponsored each year by the Department of Ohio, American Legion.

The subject this year was My Duty to Home and Country and has to do with good citizenship, and it is very fitting and proper that we should all encourage and direct the thinking of our young people along this line. These are excellent essays and I am inserting them in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that all may have an opportunity to read them:

MY DUTY TO HOME AND COUNTRY

(By June Kiger, Lancaster, Ohio)

"Duty to home and country" is a phrase which has been repeated many times, but what is its true interpretation to me? As a youth of today with my many school, religious, and leisure time organizations, I have said these words when joining some of these worthwhile clubs, but unless serious thinking is given to the words they will become a meaningless phrase to me. This duty to home and country when put into operation, however, can become a real force for national unity, world peace and understanding.

There is a nationwide need for more citizens who know more about governing themselves, and who are strong enough and resourceful enough to do the things they know should be done. I, as an American, should be aware of the importance of accepting training for the responsibilities as well as the privileges of living in this country. Learning cooperation with others will help me to prepare to take my place in the home, in essential production, and in community affairs.

Learning to accept the duties of citizenship begins in the home with family life. Schools add knowledge and give me practice in democratic citizenship, but nothing becomes a real part of us until we have practiced it over a period of time and found that it works. A happy home is one in which we share abilities, problems, and experiences, and seek a democratic solution to the problems. No matter what the size or circumstances of our home, it is the duty of us to live there to try to improve it and its occupants. The Golden Rule would be a good yardstick for home and family behavior. Behavior outside the home is a direct reflection on the home, so the awareness of the real duties to home should be with me all the time, wherever I might be.

Just as others judge my home by me, so, too, do people judge our communities by our homes. Our States in turn are a collection of communities as our Nation is a collection of States. Just as a home needs a spirit of cooperation so does a community because it must contain people who will work together for the common good. We young people ned to plan and learn together, to accept racial and religious differences, and to become aware of what really is of importance in America.

I feel it is my duty to both myself and my country to know the historical background upon which America is founded, to understand government, and to realize that it is my responsibility to further the things I believe to be right and to change the things which I think could be better. We need to realize that in a democracy it is possible for every man and woman to have a voice in the government both by power of petition and by the power of voting. It is my duty as a person who will assume the responsibilities of citizenship to learn the fundamental principles of good government. It is also my duty to know what is happening in other parts of the world and the effect they might have on America and to realize the contribution America is making toward world peace and understanding.

The practice of conservation is an important part of my duty to home and country. I should not waste our resources, our money, or our time, and should respect the property rights of others.

Therefore, if I do the things I feel are right, make a useful contribution to my home and my community, then duty to country would fall into the pattern I have chosen, for, after all, our homes are our country. By doing my best to maintain high ideals, I feel I will make a small, but significant step toward a happier home, a more unified America, and toward peace and good will among the nations of the world.

Duties to My Home and Country

(By Margaret Fox, Lancaster, Ohio)

My duties to my home are love, respect, and obedience. I should try to help at home in any way I can. If I love, respect, and have obedience at home, I will love and respect my country and do everything I can for my country.

Whether I call it a privilege or a duty, whether I judge its benefits by the car in my garage or by freedom to worship at the church of my choice, by the food on my table or by my freedom to speak out in public without fear, I owe a great deal to my country for all the privileges that have been achieved by generations to safeguard the freedom which was dearly won for me.

The right to vote in secret and to have my vote count is not only a right, but a duty. Through agents chosen by me and others like me, all laws are made. No man, regardless of his station in life, wields more power than I in the voting booth. I shouldn't consider my duty done merely by voting in national elections every 4 years. There are also congressional elections, and local elections of various kinds. Remind the people in the shops and in the office about the State law which permits time off to vote. Go to work on your friends and neighbors. Get them to vote.

I not only have the duty to choose, but to determine candidates and issues. I should try to attend all meetings where matters of interest to me are discussed. Even though my ideas are not adopted, I will do good by making them heard, and others will respect me for it.

When I receive a notice of jury duty, my first reaction may be, "Brother, how can I get out of this?" It interferes with my work or leisure. If I try to dodge the responsibility of jury duty, I dig little spadefuls away from the foundation of one of my country's broadest freedoms. When our busiest, most responsible and most intelligent citizens avoid jury duty, they are setting a very bad example. Jury duty gives me a new insight into the reasons for the many happenings of the courtroom which cannot fail to send me home as a better citizen.

To obey laws is an important duty to my country. Laws are rules people make so I can live with other people without fighting. The simplest law of all, perhaps, is the traffic light. When it is green, it is supposed to protect me from the other fellow. When it is red, it is supposed to protect the other person from me. I am not so big that I am above the law nor is anyone else.

It is human nature to squirm when the Government strikes at my pocketbook through taxation. But it is also human nature to demand the conveniences, improvements and protection that I want for my family, my community, and my country. Taxes are the means provided for chipping in to obtain the things which I need and I can not pay for by myself. Every hour of the day and night, my safety, my health, my security are protected by public servants paid for by my taxes. Taxation with representation is a big improvement over the system of the dictators.

I also have a duty to bear arms. The most fervent hope in my heart is that the difference between nations may be settled without war. However, if I am called to bear arms during war, it is my duty to do so.

The most important duty of all, I think, is to love God, to worship God, and to thank God for my wonderful home and country.

Alarming Forced Unanimous Decisions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 29, 1954

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following editorial from the Boston Herald, Boston, Mass., Friday, August 14, 1953, which is most interesting and worthy of study:

Dangerous Defense Decision

It is now known that President Eisenhower announced a military policy at the secret meeting of defense leaders at Quantico, Va., which may have a serious and unfortunate effect on our military progress. It could cripple our new Joint Chiefs of Staff before they begin.

The President told the generals, admirals, and civilian Secretaries that he will not tolerate minority opinions by any member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. He said that he expected all decisions to be unanimous.

Superficially the policy sounds as if it were establishing a desirable unification of thought among the services. But it is the same policy which was enforced by the past Secretary of Defense—and it failed. In a series of editorials called The Right to Disagree, which we published last December, we attempted to show the dangers of such arbitrary unanimity.

The main dangers are:

1. Vital defense decisions may be evaded if they cannot be agreed upon. If no minority opinion is allowed, then no unanimous opinion is given. In other words nothing is done.

2. Decisions are made by compromise. These compromises are not based on fact, but horse trades. Our important defense policies are established on a "if you'll scratch my back, I'll scratch yours" basis.

3. The military leaders pass the buck to nonprofessional agencies. For example, the Joint Chiefs of Staff avoid all fiscal considerations and pass a skyscraper budget which has to be cut down to size by nonmilitary men who are not privy to secret information and who do not have the background to make strategic decisions.

4. Services which do not have a legitimate access to the men who are formulating defense policy, who are not given their day in court, tend to end run to Congress and the press. This is a bitter, personal, undignified procedure. It creates an atmosphere which makes a calm, judicial analysis of defense problems practically impossible.

5. The President, the National Security Council, and Congress hear only the pronouncements of those views which are approved unanimously by the Joint Chiefs of Staff. This is almost a guaranty of intellectual sterility. It makes it impossible for the Nation's leaders to make decisions based on consideration of both sides of any defense question. They only hear one side.

During a barbecue at the Quantico meeting the top military commanders were given aprons with the defense team and varsity printed in big letters across the front.

It will take more than that to weld the three services into a defense team. And one essential condition is that each service be treated with respect. Free professional discussion of all defense problems should be encouraged, not denied.

Facts of War in Indochina

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 29, 1954

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record the pertinent portions of an article entitled "Our Disgrace in Indochina," written by William Worthy, Jr., and published in a pamphlet of the American Friends Service Committee, of recent date.

There being no objection, the portions of the article were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Facts of War

What, in brief, are the facts of the 7-year-old war in Indochina? In the March 1948 issue of the Crisis George Padmore detailed the events leading up to the outbreak of the fighting. Perhaps I should summarize the war's long course and its disastrousness to date for die-hard western policies by going back to an evening last spring in Saigon when I was being briefed by the French censor on that day's fighting between the "loyal" Vietnam forces and the "rebel," Communist-led Viet Minh guerrillas. As he skipped with his pointer over the map of Indochina—the three Associated States of Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos (the latter having just been invaded)—I began to have an unexpected feeling of profound ignorance. For years I have read the Times and other major United States publications with religious regularity and thoroughness. Yet no dispatches had ever given me the slightest hint that such vast sections of territory were under Viet Minh control. As of now 90 percent of Vietnam—the most populous and advanced of the three states—is held by the guerrillas whose colorful leader is always referred to in western publications as "Moscow-trained Ho Chi Minh."

The reader will note the quotation marks around the "loyal" Vietnam forces and around "Moscow trained." No less a Tory paper than the London Daily Telegraph has said that "the pro-French Vietnam Army is uncertain in loyalty." And throughout Asia, from India to Japan, I found the universal conviction that Ho Chi Minh, despite his Moscow training, is and always was a nationalist first and foremost. While Indochina was being ruled by Vichy French collaborators during the Japanese occupations, Ho was the leader of the anti-Japanese maquis and dealt with the anti-Nazi maquis of France. The people of Vietnam still call Ho's Viet Minh Party "le maquis" and "la résistance." From New Delhi last July 6 Nehru thundered that the conflict in Indochina is a "war for national liberation."

Let me also use an analogy in discussing Ho's attachment to Moscow. Barring those persons who by temperament are stooges and collaborators, Tito has shown that there is a limit on the degree of foreign influence that can be exerted on anyone of any nationality—especially on anyone charged with the responsibility of governing a proud people. In 1946 a Quaker relief worker in China asked Mao Tse-tung, Chinese Communist leader, how he had liked to see the Russians, after V-J Day, dismantle, crate, and ship to the Soviet Union everything in Manchuria that was worth taking. Mao would say only three eloquent words: "I am Chinese." Similarly, I met in Japan many American-educated Japanese, hitherto (according to their fellow countrymen) more American than Japanese in their outlook, who are turning against the United States of America because our policies for Japan are now felt by them to be flagrantly against the best interests of their native land.

IMPERIALISM STRONG

At the Potsdam Conference of July 1945 it was decided that British troops and the Chinese forces of Chiang Kai-shek should accept the surrender of Japanese forces in Indochina. The British, landing on September 19, were stationed south of the 16th parallel, and the Chinese to the north of it. Even with a Labor Government in London British imperialism did not change: It believed in "soldiarity forever" among its brother imperialisms in France and Holland. The British refused to recognize the Vietnam Republic, helped rearm French forces and helped them to reestablish their sovereignty in Saigon and most other cities

According to authorities on Asia, the anti-Communist Kuomintang Chinese first favored Ho's government. The Vietminh had held a congress near the Chinese border and elected Ho president of a provisional government, "which established itself at Hanoi and looked confidently for Allied recognition." The Chinese helped the Vietminh to hold general elections—the first in the country's history. From the elections came a national assembly. But before Ho could consolidate his government the Chinese made a deal with the French, and Chinese troops were withdrawn from Indochina. The French then made ready to return above the 16th parallel. On March 6, 1946, Ho signed an agreement with France in which France recognized the democratic Republic of Vietnam as a "free state with its own government, parliament, army, and finances, forming part of the Indochinese Federation and the French Union." Ho agreed to allow 25,000 French troops to be stationed in Vietnam provided they would be withdrawn gradually by 1952.

But soon disagreements arose over interpretations of the territory covered by the Vietnam Republic. In November 1946 the French bombarded Haiphong. The Vietnam Army retaliated. By early 1947 a full-scale war was on. In May 1948 the French dug deep into the barrel of former collaborators with the Japanese and picked out Bao Dai to head a rival government. In June 1949 he assumed the title of Chief of State under the fiction of "associated statehood" which, say the scholars, "differed only in name from the familiar colonial regime."

PLAYBOY CHIEF

Most of the fighting has taken place within the state of Vietnam (the invasion of Laos last spring was short-lived), but nevertheless the French have been greatly embarrassed during the past year by ever more insistent demands from both Laos and Cambodia for full independence. (After VJ-Day the French strong-armed their way back into those two states also.) Today, 149 miles northeast of Saigon, at Dalat, sits Boa Dai (when he is not on the Riviera). Even by regal standards of living his royal presence seems on the costly side. Said Newsweek on April 13, 1953:

"It isn't generally realized but supporting Bao Dai, the playboy chief of state of Vietnam, has been costing French (and American) taxpayers close to $9 million yearly. It's now generally acknowledged in Saigon that he'll have to be deposed sooner or later."

But whether sooner or whether later he, like many other political figures in that bled and corrupt land, will never starve. According to an official report of the Indochinese Exchange Control, Bao Dai and his Empress transferred 176 million francs (half a million dollars) to Europe as early as 1949, and bought themselves a sumptuous villa in Cannes and an estate in the Belgian Congo.

The highest estimate of support that anyone claims Bao Dai enjoys among the Vietnamese people is 20 percent (New York Times, November 8, 1953). And even that small percentage seems to be withering away. A dispatch on October 20, 1953, in the Christian Science Monitor declared:

Both the French and Bao Dai himself must feel that they are standing on shifting sand. The question now is just how long either, or both, can manage to keep on their feet and parry the blows of Indochina's growing non-Communist nationalism.

Behind all this lies the sorry economic, educational, and social record which the French have chalked up in this colony of theirs. In precolonial days in Indochina there had been total literacy. During French rule it dropped to 20 percent. (By contrast, illiteracy has been declared a punishable offense in places where Vietminh rule has been stabilized and, according to the New Statesman and Nation, a great land redistribution program, benefiting the peasants, has been put into effect in those areas.) Today the characteristic poverty always found in colonies has been aggravated by an inflation so astronomical that the cost of living in Saigon is probably the highest of any city in the world. Everyone has to live as much as possible on the black market. Even the paychecks of the personnel at the American Embassy, MSA, and other United States agencies are openly cashed at the blackmarket rate of exchange. Trade unions, still extremely weak, did not enjoy legal status until July 1952, when, under the pressure of American officials worried about Communist infiltration and exploitation of misery, a new labor code became law in Vietnam.

WIDESPREAD CORRUPTION

This code, however, does not cover agricultural and plantation labor, the overwhelming bulk of the working force. (The 20 biggest rubber plantations, mainly French-owned, each employ over 35,000 workers.) During an interview in Saigon an MSA official complained that the recently enacted Agrarian Reform Act—low-interest loans to permit farmers to buy their lands and to emerge from generations of usury—has not been implemented because, he said, "the big landowners are the Government." The tax-collection machinery is both inadequate and corrupt: the saying goes that many merchants seldom pay taxes, only bribes. On really important matters the degree of authority exercised by Bao Dai's puppet regime and by the Kings of Laos and Cambodia was brought to light on May 10, 1953, when the French authorities (crude colonizers, lacking the British finesse) merely "notified" the three governments several hours before Paris devalued the Indochinese piastre.

The political prisons are filled with persons who take too strenuous exception to French rule. Last May excerpts leaked out from a secret report of a four-deputy commission from the French National Assembly accusing the French bureaucracy in Indochina of establishing a virtual dictatorship. From Paris on May 24 a United Press dispatch quoted the report as saying that "an inefficient, unwieldly bureaucracy, shot through with rivalries and self-interest, is daily alienating the loyal Vietnam population and lessening the chances of victory over the Communists. * * * Such a regime cannot endure."

As is always the case under an imperialistic dispensation, some French business interests are profiteering, while France as a whole is being ruined by the war. Indeed, even Adlai Stevenson—I say "even" because he fully supports this colonial war—said during his Asian trip that "certain French businessmen are making such exorbitant profits that they would rather see the war drag on." Who can be so willfully blind as not to foresee in Indochina a possible repetition of Chiang Kai-shek's grand finale on the mainland of China—except that I doubt that Bao Dai could get enough last-ditch followers to fill a rump island.

And what precisely are we backing and who precisely are we fighting in Indochina—yes, we Americans with our newly upped billion-dollar "ante" for two-thirds of the current year's fighting budget, we with our napalm and our bombers, we with our military advisers and the "keep fighting" orders from our Nixons and diplomats? According to a sentence that slipped into a sweetness-and-light editorial in the New York Times of December 8, 1953, Jawaharial Nehru told Richard Nixon face to face in New Delhi that the United States of America is supporting colonialism in Indochina and Africa. So much for our allies. And our enemies? An Associated Press dispatch in the Tokyo Evening News of December 20, 1952, quoted a high-ranking French officer as giving out the "generally agreed" estimate that only 20 percent of the Vietminh guerrillas are absolute Communists. The rest are "taught next to nothing about the theory of Marxism or Stalinism." They are Nationalists who simply want the French and Americans to go home. Like everyone else in Asia they feel that they can handle the Communists "once the national question is settled."

Salk Polio Vaccine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS E. MORGAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 29, 1954

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago I inserted in the Appendix of the Record two editorials with regard to the safety of the so-called Salk polio vaccine and made reference to a broadcast by ABC commentator Walter Winchell on April 11, 1954, in which he stated that the vaccine contained "live" not "dead" virus. I received a letter from Mr. Winchell's secretary, together with a statement which he later made on the subject. I believe that the controversy over this vaccine has been straightened out, and a committee of the Nation's top polio experts have given their go-ahead signal for the start of a nationwide test of the new polio vaccine on children. However, in all fairness to Mr. Winchell, I wish to include his letter and statement in the Record. They follow:

New York Mirror,
New York, N. Y., April 17, 1954.

Dear Congressman Morgan: Mr. Winchell has asked me to send you the following:

"Dear Congressman: I just learned you inserted in Congressional Record several editorials critical of my position in polio vaccine controversy. I am enclosing herewith my side of it trusting you will want to be fair and include it in CONGRESSIONAL RECORD also.

"Good wishes,

"WALTER WINCHELL."

Sincerely,

ROSE BIGMAN,
Mr. Winchell's Secretary.

[From the Walter Winchell broadcast of April 11, 1954]

Mr. and Mrs. American Family, my statements last week about Dr. Salk's new polio vaccine started a very great controversy. Is it safe or isn't it? The National Polio Foundation says it is safe; the United States Public Health Service says it is safe; the discoverer, Dr. Salk, says it is so safe he gave it to his own children. The United States Government Health Department admitted, however, that earlier tests gave them, quotes, "some difficulties" end quotes, confirming in part, I think, what I reported last week. That the test contained 7 batches out of 10 with live—not dead—virus. Dr. Van Riefer, of the National Polio Foundation, admits 4 contained live virus. I was also confirmed when I said that the Michigan State Medical Society had disapproved until they received answers to questions they had raised. The Government people state that none of the Salk vaccine for use is unsafe, but there appears to be some dissenters. A wire news service last Sunday night after my broadcast quoted a virus expert, a very great one, named Dr. Sabian, of Cincinnati. Dr. Sabian reportedly stated that he felt the mass polio tests should be delayed until possible unknown effects were known. The Associated Press quoted a Dr. Roger L. J. Kennedy of Mayo Clinic and the Academy of Pediatrics. This doctor said he was not speaking for them, but for himself. Dr. Kennedy reportedly told the Associated Press science editor on April 7, that he would not allow the use of the new Salk vaccine on his children—that he felt caution should be used, in view, he said, of statements made by people who have voiced objections. Now, he couldn't have meant me. I do not object to it. I'm a newspaper reporter trying to present both sides to you. My source for all of this, including last week's warning, was Paul De Kruif—De Kruif—of Holland, Mich. He is also a consultant to the Chicago Board of Health. He is also a roving editor for Reader's Digest magazine.

Pennhurst and William A. Phillips, Synonyms for Modern Mental Care

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PAUL B. DAGUE

OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 29, 1954

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, I am indebted to our esteemed colleague, the Honorable LOUIS B. HELLER, for calling to my attention an editorial appearing in a recent issue of the Orange (Calif.) Daily News which pays well-deserved tribute to William A. Phillips, the superintendent of Pennhurst State School, a State institution for mentally defective children, located at Spring City, Pa., in my home county.

As the editorial points out, Pennhurst at the time Mr. Phillips assumed the superintendency was in "bad shape," with a record among the lowest of that type of institution. Under his competent and inspired direction, the school has now become a model of its kind, and, as Mr. Heller has pointed out to me, has reached that pinnacle of perfection which invites editorial commendation from as far away as California.

The course of mental illness is a tragedy that has increasingly commanded the attention of great humanitarians; and under the impetus given Pennsylvania's mental-care program during the term of Gov. James H. Duff, the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania has been setting the pace in the field for other progressive States to follow. The fact remains, however, that fine buildings and pleasant surroundings alone are not enough, and it is only when dedicated administrators like William A. Phillips come on the scene that we find institutional care transformed into the modern miracle we so proudly acclaim at Pennhurst.

The editorial to which I have referred is included in these remarks in full as a further tribute to this inspired and unselfish public servant:

"UNTO THE LEAST OF THESE"

You might make a mental note of the name William A. Phillips. If you haven't already heard it, you will, more and more. Phillips is superintendent of the Pennhurst State School in Pennsylvania, which is attended by 3,525 students, ranging in age from 6 months to 80 years. But to Superintendent Phillips they are all children and treated as such, for they are all mental cases.

At last count, something less than 300 are capable of absorbing formal education and attend school sessions daily. Hundreds more of course, learn gardening, carpentry, housekeeping, weaving, printing, mattress making, shoe repairing, and other crafts as occupational therapy, and in hopes that some, at least, may be returned to the outer world. And as you might expect, the 1,400-acre institution includes a fine, modern farm with all sorts of livestock.

But what makes Pennhurst remarkable is the fact that Phillips has banished fear, has outlawed locked doors and the two former "jail" wards. He has put a stop to the abuse and mistreatment of patients, and proved that sympathy and understanding are more effective than strong-arm methods in maintaining discipline. When Phillips took over the fear-haunted, rumor-ridden institution in 1948, there were 46 escapees at large. Today there are 2. And there are no delinquents.

The Phillips viewpoint, philosophy and experience are sadly needed in "schools" for mental defectives all over the country, and news of his phenomenal success in this desperately difficult field of human relations is spreading. His aid will be sought and his talents projected far beyond the wholesome acres of Pennhurst.

Judge Robert Palmer Anderson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS J. DODD

OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 29, 1954

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, the United States District Court for the District of Connecticut is soon to have a new judge, Robert Palmer Anderson, of Noank, Conn.

Judge Anderson's appointment by President Eisenhower and the confirmation of his appointment by the United States Senate means that the Federal court in Connecticut will continue, as it has in the past, to be known for the outstanding ability and sterling character of its judges.

Judge Robert Anderson has earned an enviable reputation in Connecticut as State's attorney for New London County and as a judge of our superior court. Judge Anderson is young enough to be vigorous and enthusiastic and experienced enough to be moderate, careful, and scholarly. By temperament, by training, and by intellectual achievement, he is well qualified to become one of the outstanding judges in our Federal system.

I am sure that, in paying this tribute to Judge Anderson and to his appointment by President Eisenhower, I am joined by my fellow citizens of the State of Connecticut.

My Duty to Home and Country

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN

OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 29, 1954

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following essay entitled "My Duty to Home and Country," by Jack Reichert, of Mason, Warren County, Ohio, which won the recent Ohio American Legion essay contest:

MY DUTY TO HOME AND COUNTRY

(By Jack Reichert, Mason, Ohio)

"Do what conscience says is right,
Do what reason says is best,
Do with all your mind and might,
Do your duty and be blessed."

As Americans we are inclined to think too much of our rights and very little of our duties. We should never forget that for every right we enjoy, there is a corresponding duty. A right has been called a reward for a duty fulfilled. After we have done our duty then we may claim our rights! If we are careless or selfish in respect to our duties, we may be sure that they will not have as many blessings for us as they would if we were more watchful and faithful.

Our first duty is to obey the laws of our country. Without obedience to law, there can be no such thing as a good government. Laws are the results of the experiences of the generations which have gone before. Just as obedience is necessary to your country, so it should be also in your homes. Children can serve their country by doing their duty in their homes. They can repay the love and sacrifice of their parents by loving and doing unselfish deeds. We should never forget that the law of the home is the law of love, service, and sacrifice. Sometimes we think of our parents as people who are always making demands and seeing that they are carried out. The assigning of tasks and their successful completion is the beginning of the formation of habits that are reflected in the better citizenship. Therefore, a good home requires cooperation, self-sacrifice, and the occasional giving up of some individual rights, just as America expects us to make some sacrifices for the good of the Nation.

We should be eager to do something worthwhile to gain the spirit of our Nation's greatness. For instance, we see around us great opportunities—a country teeming with possibilities and rich in resources. We are surrounded by opportunities for success, so it is our duty now, as youths, to select a vocation. An aim in life requires not only continuous thought and study, but it also requires our special fitness and a search of the requirements of the vocation. Since this prepares a way for the future, you will find yourself fitting into society by earning an honest living for yourself and those dependent upon you. People who accomplish the most are those who work with a definite purpose. During youth, then is the time to select an aim in life and leave no stone unturned to the pathway to success. The highest position in America is open to the person who has the vision to achieve it. This should be the goal of every American.

There are insiduous forces continually opposing and threatening our rights, privileges, and liberty. Our next duty then, is to take up arms and fight for America, prepare to give our life if necessary. Many men and women have died in order that we may keep our rights, privileges, and liberty.

Next, we find that in a few years we will be expecting and exercising the privileges of our birthright—being allowed to vote. There is not enough money in existence to buy the vote of true Americans. The privilege of the ballot is a priceless heritage not to be traded away for favor, friendship, or gain. In order to prepare ourselves to vote in an intelligent manner when we become of age, we must read and discuss all phases of our Government's history both past and present. Discussions teach us to have repect for the opinions of others and it leads to truth.

The form of government under which we live is not the work of any one man or group of men. It is the outgrowth of long experience. Therefore, let us as youths recognize this and keep our Nation the greatest land of all by working hard, obeying, and making many sacrifices so the Almighty will preserve and keep America forever and ever.

My Duty to Home and Country

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACKSON E. BETTS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 29, 1954

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, on April 28 the Ohio delegation in Congress entertained the winners of an essay contest sponsored by the American Legion of Ohio on the subject of My Duty to Home and Country. Following is an essay written by one of the winners, Juanita Brinkley, a student at New Bloomington School located in Marion County in the Eighth Ohio District.

I might add that the interest of these young persons in witnessing the actual operation of the Federal Government here in Washington was an inspiration to me. Some day they will be conducting the affairs of state in our places, and it is trips such as this which will prepare them in any walk of life for better citizenship. For that reason I am also grateful to the American Legion for having sponsored this contest and trip.

The essay follows:

MY DUTY TO HOME AND COUNTRY

(By Juanita Brinkley, Marion, Ohio)

"Patriotism calls for the faithful performance of all the duties of citizenship in small matters as well as on tented fields"—Bryan.

I, an American student-citizen, am preparing to serve my home and country with the example of living citizenship as my guide. My duty is to prepare myself in a manner that will prove that we can win the hearts of our fellow countrymen by the use of courage, cooperation, justice and kindness.

As an example at home, it is my duty to impart knowledge and wisdom to my family in a manner that will teach them to love, honor and cherish their home. Let me control my tongue, temper, thoughts and actions that concord may become the theme of our homelife. I pray that I may have the strength to bring into our home the peace, happiness, and beauty of God's outdoor and indoor world.

As an example at school, it is my duty to my country to respect the rights of others, advance the principles of good government, and promote opportunities for all—regardless of race, color, creed, or rank. Let me learn to help others that we may progress economically, socially, and politically. I will study diligently that I may learn to find joy in my life tasks and in common daily duties. In my relations with other students, I will practice honesty, purity, unselfishness, love, and responsibility.

As an example in my community, it is my duty to help my country to feed the hungry and to clothe the needy. Let me use good will toward all of my neighbors and therefore be responsible for friendly relationships between individual and nation. Dependence, social control, and planning are the keynotes of happy communities. I will study about community language, tastes, and opinions in order that I may help my community. Ambition, good work, fair play, and love of community life will produce a solid foundation for living in our land of unlimited opportunity.

As an example of good citizenship, it is my duty to have faith in the justice of our courts, to protect our freedoms, to give my life for the support of democratic government, and to foster tolerance, security, and peace. Let me place aid to my country above personal gain. If we are strong in heart and movements of mind and action, our country will be a living example of true democracy. It is my duty to cherish my ancestral heritages and gain the spirit of true living which they practiced during the early years of the founding of our Nation.

As an example at church, it is my duty to attend faithfully, sponsor acts of kindness and charity when needed, develop firm spiritual foundations so necessary to the successful operation of our Government and respect traditions. Faith, hope, and fair competition encourage development, achievements, and success. We need to establish faith, freedom, fraternity in ourselves, God, and all mankind.

America, I pledge my life to you and to my family. I will live by deed, not time. I will live so that my life makes yesterday an hour of happiness and tomorrow a dream of hope and peace. I will fight for the ideals and sacred things of my country. I will revere and obey the laws of my country.

"Four things a man must learn to do
If he would make his record true:
To think without confusion clearly;
To love his fellowman sincerely;
To act from honest motives purely;
To trust in God and Heaven securely."

Government by Denunciation—The Way of the Damned

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 15, 1954

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith an article by Leland Stowe, from the current issue of the Reporter:

GOVERNMENT BY DENUNCIATION—THE WAY OF THE DAMNED

(By Leland Stowe)

How can Red regimes pervert literally legions of men, women, and children into informers—paid or unpaid? Why do they serve the police-state dictatorship and their unscrupulous rulers without regard for justice, their country's welfare, or their own personal integrity? Here is the inside and authoritative story of how Red Bulgaria's secret police (the Darjhavna Sigurnost, or DS) recruits great numbers of civilian informers.

Although the reliability of the source of this information is unquestionable, his name cannot be used. What he reports here is confirmed by solid and voluminous documentation obtained in Europe from escapees and from many other satellite sources. We may call this very well-informed witness Mr. B—.

"Bulgaria's DS recruits informers by mehods both direct and indirect. The direct method is simple, savage, police torture. The selected candidate is arrested on trumped-up charges, beaten until he confesses, given a death sentence—and then offered his life if he will henceforth expiate his 'crime' by spying on 'the enemies of the people.' If he 'breaks' and agrees, he must sign a sworn statement which makes him a tool of the secret police for life. Then he may have to spend only a few years in jail or a forced labor camp—acting as a stool pigeon against fellow prisoners. After that he graduates to 'free spy.' Or he may be sent at once to a town where he is unknown and start work as an informer.

"Another direct method is used for former old-regime state officials, army officers, and such. These potential candidates are first studied closely by DS recruiters—to determine which are weak characters, or mentally depressed after illness, or are vulnerable because of affairs with women or because they accepted graft while in office. All such persons can rarely refuse an invitation to cooperate with the secret police. Once enlisted, any person is caught for good.

"FOR LOVE OR MONEY

"But the indirect recruiting techniques are still more vicious and diabolical," reports B——. "Here are the most favored methods which Communist secret police employ everywhere:

"They exploit each individual's personal and intimate relations in every available manner. A man is desperate because his wife will not grant him a divorce. So a plainclothes DS agent assures him it can be arranged—provided he renders a few services to the DS. Maybe the police only want to know what people talk about in his shop or office—at first. He gets his divorce—and he's in the net.

"Young lovers with parental objections to their marriage are easy game. A prying DS agent uses such a situation very skillfully. 'Well,' he says, 'what are you worrying about? Isn't her father an anti-Communist? (Or a former bourgeois, or a kulak?) Do us a few small favors and the old man will go where he can't bother you for a long time.'

"Before long the girl's father disappears into a concentration camp. Scores of innocent fathers have paid for their daughters' unapproved love fancies in this fashion. The young husbands embark on a new career—as paid secret denouncers of associates and neighbors. Again these newly recruited informers never get out of the trap."

A second indirect method concerns people with financial difficulties—in debt or out of work, or with serious illness in the family. "In such cases," B—— continues, "the DS plays the role of benefactor. Whatever the personal difficulties may be, the secret police recruiter fixes things up—for those same small services, which grow bigger and bigger in due time. Because almost any human being has some vice or weakness—some vulnerability—the police never lack candidates. A ladies' man is offered a very pretty girl; a heavy drinker gets all the liquor he can consume; a gambler obtains the means to satisfy his mania night after night; an ambitious fellow gets a chance to become a somebody.

M. D.—MASTER OF DENUNCIATION

"Students are a third category, and they are especially to be pitied. Of course the best students want to go to college to benefit from specialized training. But in Bulgaria today there is probably not a single student who has not rendered some kind of services to the secret police. Why? Because that's the only way they can now gain admission to higher studies.

"Under Bulgaria's Communist regime almost 85 percent of the students receive state scholarships—but these are granted only upon orders issued by the DS. It's impossible for an honest young man with no political interests to attend a Bulgarian university. In order to do so a student must sell his soul, in one degree or another, to the secret police. During 1952 the few who refused to do so were promptly expelled. All who remain are charged with reporting sub rosa on faculty and fellow students, and equally about the families with which they are lodged.

"Many students promised to cooperate in order to get into college, and then reneged. The Communists did not like to attract public attention by more expulsions. So they devised a new law whereby all candidates for upper educational institutions must be recommended by (party controlled) professional or workers' organizations. Candidates must thereafter first spend an undetermined trial period in these organizations—and finally pass examinations before admission to universities. This enables party and DS representatives to screen out all student candidates who are noncooperative.

JUNIOR MVD MEN

"But the Reds' most monstrous and criminal system pertains to their recruitment of children, even the extremely young, as informers. Without knowing it, children in satellite countries to the number of several million have become innocent denouncers of their own parents.

"Today most elementary-school teachers in Bulgaria collaborate with the party and secret police, and this is certainly true of a large proportion of teachers in the other Communist satellites. Replacement of old regime teachers—persons of conscience and democratic principle—by Reds or fellow travelers has everywhere made much progress after all these years. Even those survivors who are secretly antagonistic dare not betray themselves.

"Because teachers take their orders from party officials or veiled police agents, Communist mobilization of children is remarkably simple. The regime launches a campaign for peace signatures aid for Korea, or other propaganda purposes. In each case what do the parents think and do about this sacredly patriotic campaign? This is where the teachers, acting on strict orders, assign what is called homework to their eager young pupils.

"What 'homework' actually means is that the children are told to ask their parents' opinions about the current party campaign or activity—and then report these conversations, usually in writing, while in school. What child of 9 or 10, or even considerably older, can resist the teacher's praise for a well-written report? The teachers, of course, sift out all reports that indicate hostility to the Communists or any other dubious parental attitudes—and pass them on, by whatever intermediary, to a secret police agent. This wholesale hoodwinking of unsuspecting boys and girls into unwitting betrayal of their fathers and mothers is the most dastardly of all Communist informer-recruiting methods."

Behind the scenes in the satellite countries Russian MVD officers actually control and, in practical effect, boss most of the secret police chiefs and top executives. These Russian specialists are veterans of the Yagoda NKVD and Beria MVD reigns. They avoid public appearances; many masquerade under native-sounding aliases. But these same Russian MVD men or their predecessors introduced and entrenched Moscow's scientific informer-recruitment methods throughout the puppet states. In this respect Mr. B—— makes an interesting observation:

"Several of Sofia's most prominent Communists have involuntarily confessed that Bulgaria's secret police are actually directed by Moscow. On various occasions they have publicly stated that 'Thanks to the fraternal help given by Soviet specialists to the DS in Bulgaria, the ulcer that was destroying the ranks of Bulgarian Communists has been eliminated.'

"Another fact also demonstrates that Moscow's MVD is the real boss of Bulgaria's secret police. Often a Bulgarian worker is refused employment in a Bulgarian enterprise owing to some past anti-Communist activity, alleged or actual. But this same worker, blackballed by the DS, may be hired by some Soviet-run enterprise such as Sovromsproekt, Gorbuso, or Soboldtroj.

"When it comes to labor, the Russian managers of these Soviet enterprises pay no attention whatever to decisions taken by the Bulgarian secret police. If the DS wishes to arrest a Bulgarian employed in a Soviet enterprise, it must first obtain the Soviet management's consent—which is seldom granted."

THE SMOTHERING FOG

What does the introduction of a mass-informer system, in which millions are seduced or driven into daily practice of secret and anonymous denunciations, actually do to a nation and its entire people? The answer lies in the smothering fog of fear and suspicion which today paralyzes 90 million Red-ruled people in eastern Europe.

PERENNIAL SEEDS

When civilian informers are recruited en masse and the anonymous-accusation system is established as a permanent aspect of national existence, the informers are not kept at work merely on topical secret reports and routine betrayals. The satellite Communists have already put many of them to work on the long-term future. Members and civilian agents of the Reds' MVD prototypes are being geared to carry on—in disguise and under false political clothing—if the Red regimes should be overthrown. Mr. B—— reports this strategy as follows:

"In Bulgaria methods are already being applied to insure that the DS will continue to function in the event that the Communists are ejected. This is why secret police agents frequently request their collaborating informers to supply lists of all their acquaintances or fellow informers suspected of being anti-Communist. These are 'liquidation lists'—prepared against a possible eventual change in government. The Reds' second purpose is to get documentary evidence now against their own informers and other collaborators, so that they can still be coerced into serving Moscow and the MVD—even after liberation."

Communist-shackled satellite Europe constitutes an ominous, tragic, and alarming demonstration of what the introduction of mass-informer methods does—and must inevitably do—to any people and to any political system in any country. When secret denunciation becomes a part of government, no citizen can be secure.

Everyone becomes frozen with fear and maddened by despair—which is the exact condition of the third of the world's people under Communist domination today. The way of the informer, whether totalitarian-infected or not, is the way of police-state servitude and of lifelong damnation.

A Bill To Outlaw the Communist Party in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. DODD

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 29, 1954

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to outlaw the Communist Party in the United States.

The bill which I have introduced is identical with the bill introduced by Senator MIKE MANSFIELD in the United States Senate on March 25, 1954.

For a long time I have been trying to draw up a piece of legislation which would provide for the outlawing of the Communist Party, and in this effort I have examined all of the proposals which have been made over a period of several years.

It is my judgment that Senator MANSFIELD's bill is the best proposal that has been made, and as I introduce the measure in this House I am desirous of giving full credit to Senator MANSFIELD for the authorship of this measure.

The bill is as follows:

A bill to outlaw the Communist Party and similar organizations

Be it enacted, etc., That whoever knowingly and willfully becomes or remains a member of the Communist Party, or of any other organization having for one of its purposes or aims the establishment, control, conduct, seizure, or overthrow of the Government of the United States, or the government of any State or political subdivision thereof, by the use of force or violence, shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned not more than 10 years, or both. For the purposes of this section, the term "Communist Party" means the political organization now known as the Communist Party of the United States of America, whether or not any change is hereafter made in such name.

SEC. 2. This act shall take effect on the first day of the third calendar month following the month in which it is enacted.

Farm Facts Versus Fallacies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. KARL C. KING

OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 29, 1954

Mr. KING of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, unanimous consent has been granted me to insert in the Appendix of the Record the following editorial from the Christian Science Monitor of April 27, 1954:

Farm Facts Versus Fallacies

Politicians who would never dream of advocating socialism in any other field but seek to have Government manage American agriculture are running into some awkward facts. As we see it, they are offering economic fallacies to farmers which will not stand factual examination.

There is, for instance, the claim that flexible price supports will not help reduce surpluses. The argument is that if the price is allowed to drop farmers will increase production. This does happen on occasion, but the history of American agriculture shows that in general lower prices are reflected in reduced production. In 1952 hog prices fell to 75 percent of parity. Growers reduced the size of the pig crop, and prices went up. Because of low potato prices last year growers plan to cut acreage this year by 11 percent.

In fact, when during the war the United States wished to insure plentiful food supplies it adopted high (not low) price supports. Indeed, until that time there had been no price supports above an average of 62 percent of parity. Incidentally, every other wartime control has been dropped, and the gradual lowering of support prices now advocated by President Eisenhower and Secretary Benson was supported by both parties in 1948.

Another fallacy often fed to farmers is the belief that prices can be maintained indefinitely by law. Although the United States Government now holds a year's wheat crop in storage, it has not been able to keep prices at the 90 percent of parity called for by the current law. During 1953 wheat prices averaged only 82 percent of parity. The rate for corn in March was 80 percent. There are also figures which show that over longer periods crops without price supports did better than those leaning on a Federal crutch.

The impression has been widely sown that unless rigid price supports are continued American agriculture will go to pot. But many proved friends of the farmer and careful students of his problems in both parties—such as Senators Aiken and Anderson—are convinced that flexible supports will better serve his long-range welfare.

In this connection it is worth remembering that the six basic crops on which there are price supports account for only one-fourth of the American farmers' cash income. It must be remembered also that high selling prices for some farmers mean high buying prices for other farmers—such as those who feed grain or hay they can't raise.

Another fallacy—this one used to scare politicians—is that the Eisenhower-Benson farm program will throw the election to the Democrats. Actually, most of the close congressional districts are not in the farm areas. One estimate is that there are only 20 in farm regions. The bulk of the close ones are in urban and industrial areas, where lower price supports appeal to consumers. Even in the agricultural sections there are many stanch farmers who do not want Government to guarantee them a living—and manage their farms.

Some authorities believe a lasting cure for the yearning for socialized farming requires a severe lesson. They think that if rigid price supports were continued—without reducing surpluses by setasides for relief and foreign aid—the whole project would soon go smash. We trust the fallacies will be recognized without such a drastic experience.

Broyhill Constituents Have Their Say

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 29, 1954

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, for several years now much hot air has been blowing across the State of Virginia, emanating from Richmond, Va., and aimed at the residents of northern Virginia. The words carried by this ill wind which blew no good were generated by malicious intent with no other purpose than to stir up bitterness between northern and southern Virginia.

The fine people of my district have been variously labeled by certain of the State's representatives in Richmond as "hot heads, crackpots, and foreigners recently imported into the State." I do not choose to involve myself in a fruitless debate of these nonsensical charges by these fabricators of malevolent mischief.

Rather I would quote from a recent editorial concerning the results of the questionnaire I sent my constituents, which appeared in that highly respected newspaper of Virginia's Capital City, the Richmond Times-Despatch. This paper has the largest circulation of any in the State. After reviewing the highlights of the poll tabulation, the Despatch states:

> Taken overall, the results of Representative Broyhill's poll indicate some sound thinking on the part of the northern Virginians. We would like to believe that their views are shared by the majority of Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this statement by this fine newspaper has effectively dispelled any remaining whiffs of unpleasant, uncalled-for, un-Virginian hot air.

The editorial in its entirety follows:

Broyhill Constituents Have Their Say

Republican Representative Joel T. Broyhill, of Virginia's 10th District, recently queried 112,000 of his constituents in northern Virginia concerning a wide range of foreign and domestic problems. He got back answers to the 77 questions from just under 12,000 persons, an excellent response.

This type of polling does not necessarily give a true picture of the opinions of the people as a whole. But enough persons responded in the Broyhill poll to make the results interesting and, to some extent, significant.

He found that 67 percent of those who answered approve in general the administration's handling of international relations, with 22 percent disapproving, and 11 percent having no opinion.

There was overwhelming support (63 to 28) for continuing foreign financial aid, though there also was a strong belief expressed (60 to 31) that such aid should be reduced. The voting was close (48 to 42) in favor of reducing military aid to other nations.

There was an even split (39 to 39) on the question whether there should be more aggressive prosecution of the war in Indochina, but it was 55 to 27 against the United States assuming more of the burden of that war. And Secretary Dulles' massive-retaliation warning got a thumping 74-to-15 backing.

On domestic issues, Mr. Broyhill's constituents wisely voted 67 to 28 against any further tax reductions until the budget is balanced. They gave 72-to-17 general approval of the Taft-Hartley Act, but indicated perhaps not much familiarity with the 14 amendments recommended by President Eisenhower, since 41 percent express no opinion as to whether those amendments should be enacted. The others voted 37 to 22 in favor of the amendments.

On other domestic matters, Senator McCarthy's investigations were disapproved 49 to 43, universal military training was endorsed 67 to 23, rate increases to eliminate the postal deficit were given a 62-to-30 backing, and the proposal that 18-year-olds be permitted to vote was frowned on 51 to 43.

And there was overwhelming opposition (82 to 9) to the present rigid farm price-support program, and endorsement (76 to 13) of President Eisenhower's proposal for flexible supports with a gradual reduction.

Since many Federal employees reside in the 10th District, it is especially interesting to note the 68-to-16 expression of approval of the 191,000 reduction in the number of Federal employees during the past year, and also the 51-to-37 vote against amending the Hatch Act to permit more political activity on the part of Government workers.

Taken overall, the results of Representative Broyhill's poll indicate some sound thinking on the part of the northern Virginians. We would like to believe that their views are shared by the majority of Americans.

Iowa's Literacy Highest in the Nation as Disclosed in Military Examinations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES I. DOLLIVER

OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 29, 1954

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following statement from the Iowa Development Bulletin:

Iowa's Literacy Highest in the Nation as Disclosed in Military Examinations

Iowa's illiteracy rate of 3.9 percent, as disclosed in Armed Forces general classification tests, last year, ranked as lowest in the Nation, the Iowa Development Commission reports.

In a recent report from the United States Department of Defense, records show that illiteracy in other States is causing a vast waste of the Nation's military manpower.

An average of 1 in every 7 men flunked the examinations, which weigh a man's mental and educational qualifications. Those who cannot pass the test are rejected by the armed services, since it is concluded that such persons, rated by the United States Office of Education as "functionally illiterate," haven't the ability to absorb military training within a reasonable time limit.

Dr. Samuel M. Brownell, United States Commissioner of Education, has cited this situation as a matter of national concern, because high rejection rates place extra draft burdens on other States.

While the national average for functional illiteracy is 11 percent, as compared to Iowa's 3.9 percent, a total of 33 States rank below the national average.

* * * * *

Iowa's superior educational system and social environment provide its people with outstanding opportunities for secure and successful careers in Iowa, the most literate State in the Union.

The intelligence records made by Iowans in the armed services reflect the educational excellence of the State's public instruction, colleges, and universities.

Time Not on Our Side in Arms Race

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE S. LONG

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 29, 1954

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial by John Harriman from the Boston Globe of Thursday, October 1, 1953:

Time Not on Our Side in Arms Race

(By John Harriman)

The announcement that military spending will be cut again next year will raise grave questions in many people's minds.

How does the power we could marshal today compare with that of the Soviet Union?

Are we growing stronger or weaker, compared to Russia?

Does our present and planned strength assure us of national security?

THREE POSSIBLE WAYS TO ATTAIN OUR AIMS

In considering these questions, it should be held in mind that the purpose of military strength is the attainment of national objectives in foreign policy.

These objectives can be obtained by three, and only three, means:

1. By winning a war.
2. By creating such a preponderance of military strength that the Nation can enforce its will without going to war.
3. By negotiation around a bargaining table.

For the United States today the first two of these three means are certainly out.

Today we are not stronger than the Soviet Union.

On the ground we are, of course, hopelessly outnumbered by Russia's 175 divisions, plus some 50 European satellite divisions, plus the rapidly modernizing armies of Communist China.

In the air, we have warplane production of about 12,000 a year * * * compared to 22,000 (best estimate) for the Soviet Union, including 5,400 MIG jet fighters.

On paper we are far stronger on the sea. But no one really knows. Russia's submarine fleet is said to exceed the combined underwater fleet of the rest of the world, and Jane's Fighting Ships recently warned of 4, possibly 5, new Soviet superbattleships capable of launching guided missiles.

Even qualitatively we may not be far ahead, according to a story carried in yesterday's Wall Street Journal, which warned of recent strides by Russia.

WHEN ONE HAS A .45 AND OTHER A .38

But what of negotiation, the third means by which a nation can gain its objectives? We are not building enough strength to win a war * * * nor to impose our will without having to go to war. But are we creating enough power to insure us a favorable negotiated deal at some future conference table?

Power is, of course, relative. In 1948 we could have sat down to negotiate with Russia with confidence of being able to work out a pretty favorable settlement * * * for while Russia had huge land armies to back up its demands, we carried the only atomic bomb in the world in our pocket.

Today Russia, too, has the bomb, and while our bomb may be bigger and better, Russia's is big enough. There is not much advantage in holding a .45 pistol in your hand if the other fellow holds a .38. Both weapons are sufficiently lethal.

Thus time has not been on our side in the past. Nor is it likely to be in the future, when instead of .45 and .38 pistols the Russians and ourselves carry weapons of even larger caliber.

So many factors are involved in national defense and military power that one must beware of facile and superficial conclusions. Certainly this writer does not feel qualified to even suggest a verdict. Nevertheless the American people are entitled to be uneasy today * * * when most discussion of military spending seems to be giving primary consideration as to whether or not taxes can be reduced without wrecking our hopes for a balanced budget.

Weakness at Geneva

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE L. HAYS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 29, 1954

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a very fine article by Walter Lippmann entitled "Weakness at Geneva," from the April 29 issue of the Washington Post and Times-Herald:

Today and Tomorrow

(By Walter Lippmann)

WEAKNESS AT GENEVA

The western position at Geneva has been weakened during the past week, and the immediate and critical business is to repair the damage. What new development has there been which has affected for the worse our calculations?

There has been no unforeseen and unexpected military development. It was known a week ago that General deCastries and his heroic garrison at Dien Bien Phu are fighting against fearful odds. It was known then that in the Red River Delta the big perimeter, which the French Union forces hold, is infiltrated to a dangerous degree. It had been known, too, for many weeks, ever since the visit of M. Pleven and General Ely to Indochina, that the allegiance of the Vietnamese Army cannot be counted upon surely if it is severely tested in a hard battle.

Our effort at Geneva has been designed to prevent this bad, but not entirely lost, military position from turning into a diplomatic and political collapse. Mr. Dulles was working under hopelessly difficult political conditions here in Washington and at a time when American opinion had not yet begun to be informed about the true position in Indochina.

Mr. Dulles' policy was to organize a united front which was to mean, in effect, that though the battle at Dien Bien Phu was lost, this would not mean that the war was lost. The bringing up of this reserve strength was to show that Ho Chi Minh cannot obtain a complete victory and the uncontested mastery of Indochina. Proving this would strengthen the negotiating power of the western nations at Geneva.

What has happened, then, in the past week to impair this fundamentally sound calculation? The appeal made by the French Government for immediate intervention in the battle of Dien Bien Phu. This subjected American policy, and British as well, to an impossible test. The policy was designed to save, not Dien Bien Phu, but the non-Communist position in Southeast Asia. The French appeal, which may have had some encouragement from American sources, has put London and Washington in the painful and dangerous position of refusing to come to the aid of a hard-pressed ally, and of having made, therefore, a gigantic bluff which has been called.

There is no denying that almost every high official from President Eisenhower down has been talking too big, has allowed more to be inferred than was intended, and that there has been an element of bluff in their statements. Therefore, we must not be surprised that the desperate politicians in Paris were misled into believing that we were on the point of entering the war. I do not know whether the French Government had been told fully and clearly what our real position was, whether they had been reminded that under the Constitution we could not intervene suddenly, and that we were not as a matter of fact in a military posture to intervene immediately in what might become a wide and prolonged war.

Be that as it may, a policy, designed to discount the consequences of Dien Bien Phu has been made to look like a mere bluff because it cannot save Dien Bien Phu. This is very damaging to the western position in the negotiations at Geneva. For at bottom Britain and America are not bluffing about the decision not to surrender southeast Asia to the Communist orbit. The damage done by the appeal and by our own loose talk is that it may cause the Communist powers and the uncommitted Asian countries to equate the nonintervention at Dien Bien Phu with nonresistance in southeast Asia.

This bad stumble at the threshold of the conference might cause the Communist powers to raise the price and to propose impossible terms for an armistice. To repair the damage it will be necessary for the Western powers to agree on the terms of an armistice which they could accept; which in the opinion of responsible but uncommitted Asian opinion, the Chinese and the Vietminh ought to accept.

The crucial diplomatic business at Geneva is to work out 1 or 2 negotiable formulas of this sort. We do not know now whether the other side wants to negotiate, as it did in Korea, an acceptable compromise as the basis for an armistice. What we do know is that European, uncommitted Asian, and almost certainly American public opinion as well, will insist that an earnest, sincere, and searching attempt be made to negotiate such an armistice.

Unfortunately it is almost impossible, owing to the political situation in Washington, for Secretary Dulles to participate in this effort. Congress has deprived him of the means to negotiate. He can make no concessions to the Vietminh or to Red China; at the same time he is allowed to talk of military intervention in the war only if first he can show that there is a coalition of powers all prepared to intervene, too, and prepared to share with us the military effort and the casualties.

The American position at Geneva is an impossible one as long as the leading Republican Senators have no terms of peace except unconditional surrender of the enemy, and no terms for entering the war except as a collective action in which nobody is now willing to engage.

By the conditions which the Senate has imposed, Secretary Dulles cannot collaborate with London and Paris, with New Delhi and Karachi, in the negotiation of that "modus vivendi" which the President told the chamber of commerce we are seeking. The Secretary of State is well-advised, therefore, to consider leaving the conference, and of having the United States withdraw for the time being to the sidelines. For he cannot put this country in the ignoble position of trying to prevent the termination of a war in which it is unwilling to participate, except on conditions which everyone knows cannot be met.

Then, having recognized that for the time being we are not able to play the part of a leading power, we can devote ourselves unreservedly to the question of whether Secretary Stevens was smiling when he was photographed with Private Schine.

Congress To Get 137-Wing Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 29, 1954

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include a news story written by Elie Abel appearing in the New York Times of January 6, 1954, showing the Democratic position last year on a stronger Air Force was correct, and the Republican position wrong:

CONGRESS TO GET 137-WING PROJECT—EISENHOWER APPROVES PLAN FOR AIR FORCE EQUAL IN POWER TO TRUMAN'S 143 UNITS

(By Elie Abel)

WASHINGTON, January 5.—An Air Force that will equal in atomic striking power the 143-wing program discarded last year has been blueprinted and approved by President Eisenhower.

That goal has, however, been scheduled for 2 years later than the Truman administration had planned. Instead of June 1955, the Truman deadline for the 143-wing Air Force, President Eisenhower has set June 1957 as the target date.

In assigning the Air Force dollar priority over the Army and Navy, the President and his National Security Council approved an actual goal of 137 wings for the end of the fiscal year 1957.

Although this is six wings fewer than President Truman had recommended, staff officers say that in essential offensive components the Air Force will be about as strong.

The projected increase in air power is a cardinal provision of the new long-pull defense program, calling for substantial cuts in ground and sea strength, which will be presented to the Congress later this month.

TWO PROGRAMS COMPARED

The projected strength of the Air Force, when it reaches the 1957 goal, is compared in the following table with the Truman administration's 1955 plan for 143 wings:

	143 Wings	*137 Wings*
Strategic Air Command	57	54
Air Defense	29	34
Tactical Units	40	38
Troop Carriers	17	11

A combat wing, varying in size with its mission and the type of plane with which it is equipped, may contain from 30 to 75 aircraft.

Discussing the new program, Air Force staff officers said that the loss of three strategic bomber wings would be offset by the fact that the 2-year delay would permit equipping the new wings with more modern aircraft. Recent improvements in nuclear weapons also would make up for the numerical reduction, they contended.

PRESIDENT INVITES LEADERS

The President, who has received advance indications that this program may run into strong congressional opposition, has invited four Republican members of the House and Senate Appropriations Committees to discuss the New Look defense program with him before the budget message goes to Congress.

Senators STYLES BRIDGES of New Hampshire and HOMER FERGUSON of Michigan will join Representatives JOHN TABER of New York and RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH of Massachusetts in the White House budget conference.

They are to meet later this week or early next week with the President and Joseph M. Dodge, director of the Budget Bureau; Charles E. Wilson, Secretary of Defense; Roger M. Kyes, Deputy Defense Secretary, and Adm. Arthur W. Radford, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

The New Look, in the case of the Air Force, also provides for five additional air defense wings. Officers in the past have been scornful of any policy that emphasized purely defense operations by the increasing ability of the Soviet Union to strike an atomic blow at the United States.

Soviet bombers, these officers said, were being steadily improved in speed and range. Now that the Russians had a thermonuclear (hydrogen) weapon, the Air Force recognized that the threat of retaliatory strategic blows by United States bombers might not be sufficient to deter a devastating attack on this country's industrial centers, they added.

Air defense has been too long neglected in the United States, they conceded, on the now exploded theory that the Soviet Union had an insufficient stockpile of atomic weapons and lacked the planes to deliver them.

The reduction of two tactical air wings, in the Air Force view, is justified by the proposed cut in ground forces. Tactical units are used in support of ground operations.

In the matter of troop carriers, however, Air Force officers admit that the six-wing reduction may be a serious handicap. The Army is scheduled to drop about 400,000 men in the next year and a half, and the forces that remain must have extreme mobility, they said.

Credit Where Credit Is Due

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALT HORAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 29, 1954

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, under the privilege granted me to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am pleased to include an editorial from the Portland (Oreg.) Oregonian that does fair and sound credit to our esteemed colleague from Oregon, the Honorable HOMER D. ANGELL. It is good to see such appreciation of an able and hard-working Member.

The editorial follows:

GOP RACE FOR CONGRESS

A tight race for the Republican nomination to Congress from the Third (Multnomah) District has aroused lively interest. Representative HOMER D. ANGELL, lawyer and experienced member of the State legislature, broke through the Democratic tide of 1938 to defeat Representative Nan Wood Honeyman, New Deal favorite. Since then he has staved off every GOP primary and Democratic general election challenge to become the senior in age and service of Oregon's congressional delegation.

Representative ANGELL's leading challenger this year is Tom Lawson McCall, veteran of World War II, ex-newspaperman and radio man, and former administrative assistant to Gov. Douglas McKay. He is as well qualified for congressional duties as anyone could ask, and is conducting a vigorous campaign while Mr. ANGELL is restricted to Washington duties.

The third Republican contestant is A. W. Lafferty, who served in Congress from 1911 to 1915. His single campaign plank is the O. & C. grant lands, which very few understand despite his arduous efforts. In the 1952 primary, Mr. ANGELL was given 55,598 votes, Mr. Lafferty 17,773 votes, and an unknown, John F. Reichlein, 12,442. It may be assumed that most of the votes for Lafferty and Reichlein were anti-Angell votes. But in the general election, in this Democratic county, Mr. ANGELL defeated Democrat Alfred H. Corbett, 125,504 to 107,099.

Mr. ANGELL usually has ben endorsed by organized labor and draws good Democratic support in general elections. He has been popular with the old-age pension groups. But he has a solid popularity among Republicans who sometimes do not agree with his votes on measures favored by Democrats. He sticks closely to his job in Washington, hits hard for the interests of his district, and holds important committee assignments.

Mr. McCall is in the position of a young man with wide community, State, and regional interests, well-educated and politically skilled, attempting to retire a veteran of 16 years of congressional service and with a record of conscientious application to his duties. Since Mr. ANGELL is sound and active, age need not be the primary consideration of voters.

Both men are progressive in their thinking and approach to National and State issues—industries, employment, natural resources development with power at the top of the list, etc. The nomination will depend on whether the Republicans of Multnomah County are satisfied with Mr. ANGELL's service, or whether they believe it is time for a change. This newspaper believes either man would be a credit to his district, and either should win in the fall election.

Why Help Build Up Russia?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 14, 1954

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I recently read in the Florida Times-Union, Jacksonville, Fla., an article by Tracy Danese, 17-year-old son of my good friend Emanuel Danese, president of the Jacksonville Board of Realtors. Tracy was president of his class at Kenney High School and he plans to continue his studies in college, preparing for a career in Congress. I wish him success and am glad to pay him tribute not only for serious thoughts of dedication to public life but also for the care which must have gone into the preparation of the thoughtful and important article, which I include herewith:

WHY HELP BUILD UP RUSSIA?

It has been made known that the United States is preparing to relax controls on trade with Iron Curtain countries. Foreign Operations Administration Chief Harold Stassen has told Congress that, along with Britain and France, we will begin shipping certain items to the Soviets which were formerly on the strategic goods list. The purpose of this, he said, is to try and turn Red production toward peaceful consumer goods and divert it from mobilization products.

Also, France and Britain have long argued for a more relaxed trade program with Iron Curtain nations. This has been a point of controversy between the United States and these two countries for some time, and now it seems that we must humor them so as to keep in good standing with them. Of course, this has not been directly said, but with our attempts to organize a Pacific defense pact which is largely dependent upon the cooperation of France and Britain, it seems reasonable to believe that these trade concessions will cause our two allies, who so far have been reluctant to commit themselves to any definite Pacific defense plans, to see the favorable side of such a defense program as we have proposed.

If we could depend on Red production turning from weapons, then indeed this would be such a radical change that there would be very little need for future defense pacts at all. In fact, if such a change did take place, the large majority of the world's troubles would be ended. The two major arguments, however, for a relaxed trade program seem to contradict each other and there are also certain factors against such a program which completely outweigh any arguments for it.

First, let us consider one of the basic theories of communism. It is that eventually all forms of government other than communistic will be abolished by force or otherwise and a communistic type of government substituted in their places. This brings us to the conclusion that democracy and communism cannot peacefully exist side by side in this world.

Therefore, why should we help the Red regime to thrive when it is devoted to destroying our own system of living? One of our biggest assets in the present cold war is the discontent of the people behind the Iron Curtain. We saw this in the East Berlin revolts last June 17. The citizens of those nations under control of Russia are fed up with the standards of living provided by their puppet governments. Should we help their governments pacify them and get on their good side? One of our strongest hopes for a free world is a revolution within the Iron Curtain and contented people do not revolt. If we enhance Soviet production of consumer goods, we are sending the fruits of our democracy, unlabeled, behind the Iron Curtain. When the people finally receive these goods they will bear the Communist label. The people will be told that "Big Brother" has provided for them. Then the people will love "Big Brother" and be willing to listen to him when he says that democracy and the Western World are their enemies and must be destroyed. Certainly, we do not expect the Reds to tell the people that the luxuries, which they would have as a result of these trade agreements, are theirs through the generosity of the Western nations.

Also, what guaranty do we have that Soviet industry would be turned from implements of destruction to the production of consumption goods? It is prudent to assume that they could manufacture more weapons and at the same time turn out consumer products with the items we intend to send them. This, they have not been able to accomplish and it has been one of the Kremlin's biggest drawbacks. The Red regime must concentrate its existing manufacturing output on arms to maintain the force with which it keeps its citizens in hand and also with which it keeps itself in existence. These citizens are an unhappy lot at present. They see their national industries producing large quantities of munitions but none of the commodities which their commissars keep telling them will be theirs. The Kremlin realizes the discontent of its people as a result of its perpetual mobilization and also it realizes that it is in a precarious position so long as these people remain discontented because even its brute force will not always be able to keep them in hand. The Red government would welcome the chance to put itself in a favorable light with its citizenry by producing consumer goods for them and at the same time keep on turning out weapons to maintain its giant military strength, for any institution which is as essentially evil as communism must maintain brute power to insure its continued existence. These trade concessions will give the Soviets that chance.

Another thought on the subject, and a "nasty" one it is, is that some big United States businesses are going to make large profits from this move. Of course we know that that had no influence on these agreements one way or the other. Or, do we? There is going to be money made somewhere, just as there was before Pearl Harbor. Let us hope that we learned our lesson the first time because the next lesson is going to hurt more than the first one.

Despite what is said to the contrary, the fact still remains that we will be helping a government which is resolved to abolish ours. Is that a logical move?

Secretary of Interior McKay's Assurance of Sympathy to Governors of Coal-Producing States Not Supported by Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 29, 1954

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, Secretary of Interior Douglas McKay told a group of governors of the coal-producing States that there is no easy solution to the problems of the coal business.

He went on to say that the way to meet the situation was to have an intensive research program, which, he told the governors, was being undertaken in his Department.

No one who has any knowledge of the coal business can deny the difficulty in solving its problems nor can anyone deny the need for an intensive research program.

We can, and do, quarrel with the assertion of Mr. McKay that his administration is fostering such a program.

Despite his pious assertion of sympathy, the Secretary, who seems to be the first-string quarterback when the administration shifts into its give-away formation, has this record in the field of coal research:

First. Under his administration the synthetic liquid fuels pilot plant at Louisiana, Mo., has been closed and all research stopped.

Second. Under his administration the synthetic liquid fuels pilot plant at Rifle, Colo., has been closed.

Third. Mr. McKay's budget request for the current year for the synthetic liquid fuels program was drastically cut.

Fourth. In fact, Mr. McKay's pruning knife made perhaps its deepest cuts in the whole Bureau of Mines program, and then officials of his Department made only weak attempts to justify the work of this all-important agency, wherein coal research is carried out.

Perhaps there is more than coincidence in the fact that the synthetic liquid fuels program has been cut back and the fact that coalminers, by and large, supported Governor Stevenson in 1952 while the oil barons were heavy contributors to the Republican campaign fund.

New Trends in American Immigration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAT McCARRAN

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 29, 1954

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the appendix of the RECORD an address by Edward S. Maney, Director of the Visa Office of the Department of State, before the 24th annual conference of the National Council on Naturalization and Citizenship at the Hotel Astor in New York, on Friday, April 2, 1954.

The address is entitled "New Trends in American Immigration."

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The National Council on Naturalization and Citizenship I understand is primarily concerned with the problems of the immigrant who wishes to integrate into the American community and to become a citizen of the United States. From this point of view the members of the council will be interested in certain changes which the Immigration and Nationality Act has brought about in the immigration field and which will be reflected in the composition of the group that makes up our new immigrants.

The Immigration and Nationality Act which was enacted on June 27, 1952, has now been in operation for more than 15 months. Almost unnoticed by the general public, this act has brought about a number of changes which have proven beneficial to those who wish to come to the United States and have in many ways facilitated the administration of the law.

Before I discuss with you some of these changes let me remind you that the basic concepts of the Immigration and Nationality Act are not different from those which have been the basis of American immigration policy ever since there has been a limitation on the number of immigrants to the United States. I am discussing these basic concepts not only because they have remained unchanged but also because they relate to American immigration policy, which is the responsibility of the Congress of the United States. I will discuss with you changes the new law has brought about and which have become most obvious to us in the Visa Office of the Department of State during these last 15 months.

One of the most troublesome problems consular officers in the field and we in the Department of State had to deal with before the new law became effective was that of an American citizen who had married a woman of Asian ancestry and discovered only too late that under our laws then in existence he had only the choice between his country and his wife since our laws, with few exceptions, then did not permit the immigration of persons of Asian stock.

One of the most important changes the new law has brought about is the elimination of race as a bar to immigration. Alien wives and husbands of American citizens and alien children of American citizens are now eligible for immigration and entitled to nonquota status irrespective of their race. While it is true that the quotas accorded to Asian peoples are minimum quotas it must be borne in mind that the volume of immigration from a given area is composed of both quota and nonquota immigrants and the latter group of course may exceed without limit the numerical limitations placed on quota immigrants. This is best illustrated by the fact that during the last fiscal year 1,043 Chinese and 2,489 Japanese came to the United States as immigrants, although Japan has a quota of only 185 and only 105 quota numbers are available to Chinese persons. In evaluating these data it must be recalled that racial bars to immigration were not lowered until the second half of the 1953 fiscal year.

Another important change which the new law has brought about is a general relaxation of the method by which the quota chargeability of an alien is determined. The basic rule remains unchanged that the quota of an alien is determined by his place of birth. While formerly only an alien wife chargeable to an oversubscribed quota could be charged to the more favorable quota of her accompanying husband, under the new law a husband as well as a wife may be charged to the more favorable quota of the accompanying spouse. For example, the Greek husband of an English woman may be charged to the quota of Great Britain.

Similarly, a child may now be charged to his own quota, the quota of his accompanying father or mother, whichever of the three is most favorable. In the past a child mandatorily had to be charged to the quota of the accompanying father. This relaxation of the law, which may seem unimportant, I assure you has brought relief to many an immigrant family by giving them an opportunity to come to the United States together rather than choosing between separation or waiting together abroad.

Another change relating to the quota chargeability has brought relief for many hardship cases for which there was no satisfactory solution under the old law. In a considerable number of cases prospective immigrants born in countries with small and oversubscribed quotas had to be given the discouraging information that they had to anticipate an indefinite waiting period under the quota of their country of birth, although they had no tie to the country of their birth.

The typical example is that of an alien born in India while his British parents were stationed there as missionaries, or that of a Swiss person born in Egypt whose father was stationed there as a consular officer of his country. The law now permits that an alien who was born in a country in which neither of his parents was born and in which neither of his parents had a residence at the time of such alien's birth may be charged to the quota of either parent. In other words, to use our examples, the alien born in India may be charged to the British quota to which his parents would have been chargeable, and the alien who was born as son of the Swiss consul in Egypt may be charged to the quota of Switzerland.

Fuller use of existing quotas is made possible under the new law by permitting that any portion of a given quota not used during the first 10 months of a quota year may be used without numerical limitation during May and June, that is, the last 2 months of the quota year. The restriction on the use of quotas to 10 percent of each quota per month, which now is applicable only during the first 10 months applied to every month of the quota year under the old law. Thus, quota numbers were lost if a demand for immigration visas in excess of 20 percent developed in May and June of a year under a quota which had not been utilized up to 80 percent during the first 10 months of the same quota year.

The prohibition against the immigration of manual labor, the so-called contract labor provision of the old law, by and large restricted immigration to the United States to relatives and close friends of American citizens and of permanent resident aliens. Aliens with good skills and many of them needed in this country but lacking family or friendship ties as a rule could not come to this country as they were unable to secure an acceptable affidavit of support as evidence that they were not likely to become public charges. Thus real "new-seed immigration" had become unknown in this country except for those immigrants who benefited under the Displaced Persons Act of 1948.

This situation has been drastically changed by two provisions of the new law. On one hand the outdated and inflexible contract-labor law was eliminated. Now an alien is permitted to make arrangements for his employment before he comes to the United States and may submit evidence about his employment to show that he is not likely to become a public charge. Only if the Secretary of Labor certifies that there exists an oversupply of a given skill in a given locality of the United States will the immigration of aliens be barred who possess such skill and who are coming to this locality. No such finding has so far been made by the Secretary of Labor.

The other provision of the new law which is helping the "new-seed immigrant" as well as American industry, business, and cultural interests is the one giving a first claim to one-half of the quota of each country to aliens whose services are needed urgently in the United States because of their high education, technical training, specialized experience, or exceptional ability and to their spouses and children.

The provision permitting immigrants to have employment before coming to the United States eventually will make itself felt also in the distribution of immigrants throughout the United States. As long as immigrants had to rely for their immigration on affidavits of support from relatives and friends in this country the traditional trend of the immigrant movement continued to be to urban areas where there was already considerable immigrant settlement. Now it is to be expected that the settlement of new immigrants in the United States will not only be influenced by their tendency to go where they have friends or relatives but that it will be guided by job opportunities throughout the country.

Some misunderstanding seems to exist in the mind of the general public as to the effect the new law has had on the security provisions applicable to immigrants. The opinion seems to be widespread that the new law is more exacting in that respect. Actually the reverse is true.

For all practicable purposes the new law has reenacted the security provisions which had been part of the immigration laws since the passage in 1950 of the Internal Security Act. One significant change, however, has taken place. In the past, and ever since 1940, not only present but also former members of proscribed organizations were excluded from admission into the United States as immigrants. For example, an alien who in his youth some 20 or 30 years ago was a member of the Communist Party was still ineligible to receive a visa regardless of the fact that long since he had given up his early political associations and had since become an outspoken fighter against communism.

The new law contains an escape clause for former voluntary members of proscribed organizations, a fact which has been given little if any publicity. The defector clause contained in the new law permits the issuance of a visa to a former voluntary member of a proscribed organization if the alien since the termination of his membership and for at least 5 years before the date of his visa application has been actively opposed to the principles and ideology of the proscribed organization of which he was a member.

This provision of law has made it possible to admit to the United States as immigrants a number of aliens whose record of the past years has justified that the United States show forgiveness for past political association and has thus enabled us at least indirectly to encourage future defections.

After this trial period of 15 months we in the Visa Office can say that the new law as far as it affects the visa function of the Department of State constitutes a considerable improvement over the earlier laws. I hope my brief presentation has shown you that the new law tends to keep families united in migration, makes the use of quotas more flexible and facilitates the admission of "new-seed immigrants." It gives due recognition to the need in the United States for certain skills, professional knowledge, and ability. It also opens the door to those who in the past were permanently barred for reasons of race or as a result of former and long past political affiliations.

I know that some of you are critical of the basic philosophy of our immigration laws particularly its national origins quota system which actually goes back to the Immigration Act of 1924. In all fairness to the new law this criticism I think should be divorced from a recognition of the fact that the new law has brought many important improvements over the old law, particularly in relation to its treatment of immigrants.

In their administration, laws can be interpreted literally and restrictively. On the other hand, they can be given a reasonable and humane interpretation. I want you to know that ever since the Immigration and Nationality Act has become effective we in the Visa Office have made every effort, without doing violence to the plain intent of the law, to interpret it reasonably and humanely. In our frequent discussions with the congressional committees on questions relating to the interpretation and administration of the law we have found that it is also their desire to see the law administered in a commonsense manner.

I should like to use this opportunity to express my deep appreciation of the fine cooperation we in the Department of State have enjoyed in our close work with the Immigration and Naturalization Service. Ever since the new law was enacted we have been meeting regularly with representatives of the Service and in close cooperation have worked out the various problems which naturally would arise in the implementation of a new statute. I am glad to say that we have been able to work out each and every problem which has come to our attention during these first 15 months.

Although I am not speaking here for the Immigration and Naturalization Service I am certain I can say both for that Service and for the Department of State that we have done everything and will continue to do everything possible to interpret and administer the immigration laws consistent with the intent of Congress and in the best interest of the United States.

Polish Constitution Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STUYVESANT WAINWRIGHT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1954

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege several weeks ago to address the American Order of General Pulaski, one of our fine Polish-American organizations. This distinguished group of men includes some of our outstanding military heroes of recent wars.

To commemorate Polish Constitution Day, May 3, I would like to call to the attention of the membership of the House two fine messages sent to the counsel and general secretary of this order. While the President of the United States and the Secretary of State were addressing themselves to the meeting I have referred to, their messages are pertinent to the constitution day of this great nation put under subjugation by the Communist enemy.

The messages follow:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, April 1, 1954.

Mr. JOSEPH P. PLONSKI,
Counsel and General Secretary,
American Order of General Pulaski,
Mineola, N. Y.

DEAR MR. PLONSKI: Please extend my greetings to all members of the American Order of General Pulaska attending the investiture dinner on April 4.

Americans have good cause for enduring devotion to the memory of General Pulaski. His courageous efforts on behalf of liberty and his personal contribution to this Nation's freedom earned him a place of honor in our history and in our hearts. It is most appropriate, I believe, that Americans of Polish origin should dedicate themselves to perpetuating the name of a great patriot and champion of human freedom.

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, March 29, 1954.

Mr. JOSEPH P. PLONSKI,
Counsel and General Secretary,
American Order of General Pulaski,
Mineola, N. Y.

DEAR MR. PLONSKI: I am happy to respond to your letter of March 16, 1954, with a message on the occasion of installing the officers and directors of the American Order of General Pulaski. Please extend my sincere congratulations to them as leaders of this organization.

America is indeed indebted to Casimir Pulaski and the other Polish patriots who out of devotion to liberty contributed so much in our behalf by their brave efforts. Pulaski died while helping Americans in their fight to be free and his place of honor as a hero in our history will not grow dim with time.

Today Poland is again ruled by foreign oppressors and many of her best citizens are scattered throughout the world. We know how tragic this situation is, yet the stubborn refusal of the Polish people to surrender faith in eventual freedom inspires all of us in our continuing efforts to create conditions which will permit freedom to prevail everywhere. That faith is a constant reminder, as is the life of General Pulaski, that love of liberty is one of the closest bonds between the people of America and the people of Poland.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN FOSTER DULLES.

Where Will Farmers Get Phosphate?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE L. HAYS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 29, 1954

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting this article from the March issue of the Ohio Farm Bureau News entitled "Where Will Farmers Get Phosphate?"

This article gives some insight into the attitude of the President's Cabinet which seems to be more concerned with taking care of big business than in protecting the people of this country and assuring them future supplies of things vital to their well-being. If Secretary McKay keeps on, there will shortly be nothing left in the country to give away.

The article follows:

WHERE WILL FARMERS GET PHOSPHATE?

It may be rather difficult for some Midwest farmers to get concerned over what happens in a place so remote from them as is the Snake River in Idaho, yet they have a very real stake there. What develops there in the next few years may well answer the question of whether farmers in this area will be guaranteed a continued source of low-cost phosphates in the future.

That's why official delegates at our last State annual meeting adopted a resolution concerning the proposed Hells Canyon Dam project in Idaho.

In order to fully appreciate this resolution, an Ohio farmer must be filled in on some pertinent background information.

PRESENT SOURCES

In 1940, a United States Geological Survey showed that total phosphate reserves in the United States amounted to 15,300,000,000 tons. Of this amount, 5,060,000,000 are located in Florida. Far lesser amounts are located in Tennessee, Kentucky, South Carolina, and Arkansas. The bulk of our reserves—nearly 8 billion tons—are located in the Western States, adjacent to Hells Canyon.

At present, nearly all the phosphates used in Ohio fertilizer come from Florida which, incidentally, are all owned and controlled by private companies. Florida deposits are being mined too rapidly.

Realizing this, several cooperatives in the Midwest got together a few years ago and organized Central Farmers Fertilizer Co., which purchased a large chunk of the western phosphate reserves. Your Farm Bureau Cooperative is a member of Central Farmers, as are Farm Bureau cooperatives of eight other Midwest States. Ohio Farmers Grain Supply Co. is also a member.

In order to fully develop the area, Central Farmers needs an available source of large quantities of low-cost power. With this power available, it is conservatively estimated that savings to farmers in phosphate fertilizer would run more than $3 million per year. Even this big figure is but a fraction of the total savings to American agriculture.

Concentrated fertilizer would provide savings in manufacture, bagging, and freight costs of at least $14.50 per ton, with savings up to $34 per ton for longer hauls. On the basis of 1950 consumption, farmers would save more than $20 million annually by using more concentrated fertilizer, which the Hells Canyon area would make possible.

At the moment that power is not available. And here is where the controversy over Hells Canyon rages. Should the project be undertaken by private power or public power?

FARM BUREAU POLICY

Your Farm Bureau's policy of long standing in controversies of this nature is clear-cut. We say: "Where private-utility companies are ready and willing to do the job, they should be allowed to do so. If not, it becomes necessary for the people to act for themselves. There are now serious doubts as to whether private-utility companies are willing to undertake a project that would accomplish the two most important objectives: (1) Low-cost power to people and other patrons in the area; and (2) continuing source of domestic phosphates.

Private utilities would construct a series of small dams, a project which from all indications, would fall far short of future needs. At the same time, this course would rule out, for all time, the possibility of constructing a larger dam at Hells Canyon.

On the other hand, the Hells Canyon Dam would accomplish all these objectives and would, in addition, make possible the controlling of Columbia basin floods, provide navigation in a mineral-rich area now inaccessible, and help finance new irrigation projects. But what's of equal importance, Hells Canyon dam would be a self-liquidating project.

CHANGE IN ATTITUDE

For many years, construction of Hells Canyon Dam was taken as a foregone conclusion. But in recent months, the attitude of the Federal Power Commission has been revised drastically in favor of plans offered by a private company. In addition, Secretary of Interior Douglas McKay has expressed himself in favor of this new school of thought.

In present form, private utility's plans for the area are definitely unsatisfactory. Thus, as our annual meeting delegates concluded in their resolutions:

"We urge the Federal Power Commission and the Congress of the United States to support the proposed Hells Canyon Dam project and to oppose the alternate proposal for construction of smaller dams."

Organization for Flight Safety

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAT McCARRAN

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 29, 1954

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, the president of the Airline Pilots Association, Mr. Clarence N. Sayen, delivered an address before the Flight Safety Foundation at the Bermuda air safety seminar which I believe will be of material interest to my colleagues; and I therefore ask unanimous consent that this address, which I now send forward, may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The airline pilot is the primary consumer or user of the products, gadgets, procedures, or innovations that are designed to improve air safety in commercial air transportation. This explains one reason why he is concerned with safety and maintains an independent organization dedicated to the improvement of air safety. There are several other basic reasons.

One, the airline pilot has a primary responsibility for safety to his passengers, and the general public which cannot be delegated to anyone * * * neither his employer, the Federal aviation agencies, nor any other person or agency. The airline pilot cannot, in good conscience, and in face of this responsibility, accept a product, gadget, procedure, or innovation if he has any doubt as to its safety.

Two, the airline pilot has a natural interest in the development and growth of air transportation. Air transportation is his business. His own welfare depends on its prosperity. Since, for initial employment, an airline pilot is old at 30, his professional career is determined with his initial employer when he reaches 30. Unlike even the president of the company, he cannot readily transfer his knowledge and skill to another company; therefore, his "record" as a professional airline pilot is his stock in trade. He is not likely to look lightly at gadgets, innovations, or revised procedures that might fail him at a critical moment. He cannot in his primary responsibility to the public or to his professional career afford "experimentation" on the job.

Third, the professional airline pilot is interested in his own self preservation and economic gain. One of the greatest safety assets of commercial air transportation is the fact that most airline pilots are conservative family men.

CONTINUOUS MONITORING

Some airline pilot utilizes practically every commercial aviation facility in the world (outside of Russia) every day. In addition, practically every type of commercial aircraft, aircraft component, radio, commercial airport, etc., is utilized daily by a professional pilot. There is available, therefore, through this means, a continuous monitoring of all aviation facilities. By the means of routine pilot reporting and special incident reports, the aviation industry has available its greatest source of information to determine that safety problems exist. We conceive one of the primary safety functions of the airline pilot to be the discovery and reporting of air safety problems. Anything that interrupts or interferes with the free flow of this information in itself constitutes a hazard. The ALPA then must perform several important functions to most efficiently render this service. One, a stimulus must be provided for continual alertness in the apprehension and reporting of hazards or incidents. The role of the critic must be maintained and must be attractive. Two, channels must be kept open and an independent spokesman provided through which reports may be properly channeled and effectively made known. Third, a medium must be provided for following up on reports to see that action is taken. The conscientious individual who never sees results from his work becomes frustrated and the work stops. He may cease to bother people with his complaints and the level of safety will drop accordingly. Complacency has never sponsored progress.

INCIDENT REPORTING

It is not easy to keep the channels open for incident reporting. Both officials of Government agencies and airline officials have taken actions at times which almost completely shut off incident reporting on some airlines, and drastically reduced it throughout the industry. They, therefore, created a hazard of greater magnitude than that which they were at the moment trying to eliminate. Several examples will demonstrate this point.

A day or two after the Bolivian P-38 rammed the Eastern Airlines DC-4 at Washington National Airport in 1949, an EAL Constellation took off from Washington National and began its climb-out in accordance with its air traffic clearance. The crew made a turn to the right and shortly after rolling out of the turn and while still climbing an Army aircraft flying with the hood up, simulating an instrument approach, and in a steep rate of descent, flashed by the airline craft. The pilot of the airliner executed a quick maneuver to avoid the Army aircraft whose crew apparently never saw the airline airplane. The captain of the airliner reported the incident to the tower pointing out the hazard and steps were taken to curtail military-training flights in this congested area. The crew of the airliner heard nothing further regarding the incident for approximately 6 months when the captain and copilot received greetings from the enforcement division of the CAA informing them that the Administrator was seeking to have their pilots' licenses revoked. It seems that someone had computed that the airline aircraft may have been on a collision course under a rule-book interpretation of the Civil Air Regulations. The crew spent many months in expensive litigation trying to clear their pilots' records and to maintain their means of pursuing their profession. Incident reporting on the airline deteriorated.

Some few months ago an airline crew was ferrying an empty DC-6. The copilot had been having trouble with his landings and had a tendency to make high approaches. The captain, as is often expected of him, in addition to his other flying duties, was trying to train the copilot. The copilot, making the landing with the empty airplane repeated his error of a rather high approach. The pilot considered going around for another landing to give the copilot an additional opportunity; however, difficulty was experienced in reversing the propellers in landing and in bringing one of the propellers back to positive pitch. The go-around was therefore abandoned, the aircraft brought to a stop on the runway, taxied to the ramp, and the propeller difficulty reported to maintenance. It should be noted that this incident occurred after the tragic National DC-6 accident at Newark where a propeller was found in reverse pitch and which accident increased the anxiety among flight crews over propeller difficulties. Upon maintenance reporting the propeller difficulty, the pilot was immediately removed from flight duty. Several days later he was discharged. He had been with the company for more than 10 years and was regarded as a competent pilot.

The reaction among the airline's pilots was so violent that all copilot training, including takeoffs and landings by copilots was suspended immediately by official action of the pilot group through their representatives, and serious consideration was given to suspending all incident reporting including logbook notations, etc. Had this occurred, the airline would have been paralyzed in a matter of days for lack of information concerning the state of aircraft and facilities. The pilot, many months later, is still involved in an expensive procedure trying to clear his professional record and be reinstated to his position. How far safety has been set back on this airline and progress curbed is incalculable. The ironic part of both of these incidents is that had the Eastern Airlines' pilot not reported the near collision he would never have been involved in extended litigation to retain his pilot's license, and the pilot reporting the reversing would still be employed had he but remained silent. They can only comfort themselves with the thought that one may have prevented further deaths from collision and the other a load of passengers from being killed by a reverse propeller in flight or a defective reversing on a wet or slippery runway.

SPECIAL PROJECTS

Although we conceive the primary responsibility of the pilot to be the discovery and reporting of air-safety problems, ALPA recognizes the necessity for the pilot or operational viewpoint being applied in the solution of problems. Therefore, in addition to the organizational processing of problems at the local, national, and international level which will be described later, ALPA attacks specific problems on a special project basis. This is accomplished by designating individual pilots with specialized training or experience along a particular line as spokesman and specialists for the association on a specific subject. Committees are set up to work with the spokesman. The committee and spokesmen have available to them the channels and facilities of ALPA from which to gather information or determine pilot opinion. By this means, pilot specialists sitting with industry committees trying to find solutions to air safety problems are in a position to responsibly represent the operational or pilot viewpoint. They are also in a position to determine the consumer acceptance of the results.

ALPA currently has 18 special projects in progress embracing such subjects as airport lighting, fire prevention, cockpit standardization and others.

CONTRACT WRITING

Safety considerations must permeate one other aspect of ALPA's activity—that of establishing the rates of compensation, rules, and working conditions for pilots. Since ALPA is by law the collective-bargaining agent for practically all of the airline pilots in the United States, ALPA with the air carriers largely determines the rules and working conditions of pilots. Extreme care and caution must be exercised that safety is a primary consideration in this activity. For this reason, among others, active line pilots participate and make the final decisions in all ALPA collective-bargaining sessions.

ACCIDENT INVESTIGATION

ALPA participates in the investigation of all major air-carrier accidents. Standard investigation and reporting procedures have been worked out and are furnished to pilot representatives. Reports of each investigation are made to the president of the association. Such reports are analyzed by ALPA staff members and pilot representatives for clues that may prevent future accidents. Recently the practice of reporting the probable cause of the accident has been instituted. In this regard, it should be noted that ALPA readily admits that there are pilot-error accidents. However, it holds that no pilot ever erred deliberately or in the interest of self-destruction. ALPA is interested in the reason behind the error and feels that any accident written off as pilot error has not been adequately investigated. For example, did the error originate in design error, fatigue limits, cockpit boobytraps, inadequate training program, etc. ALPA feels that this viewpoint must be strongly represented at all accident investigations if the operational aspect is to be thoroughly explored and the maximum learned from each accident.

ALPA ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE

The basic unit of the ALPA organization is the local council. At each domicile where a minimum number of the pilots of a particular airline is based, a local council is organized. Each council has a local council air safety committee which is charged with the processing of local air safety problems.

This may include contacts with the local airline, Government, civic, or airport officials. Surveys conducted by ALPA are processed through this committee. There are currently 115 air safety committees throughout the United States, Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, Great Britain, Germany, Egypt, Peru, Brazil, and Japan.

Central air safety committees

The pilots of one airline may have 10, 12, or more councils. Representatives from each council comprise the airline central air safety committee. Problems common to more than one council or concerning the entire airline are processed through this committee. There are currently 41 airline central air safety committees.

Regional air safety committees

Representatives from the council air safety committees in a particular region comprise the regional air safety committee. For example, representatives from 15 air safety committees make up the New York area regional air safety committee. This committee processes problems which are peculiar to a particular geographical area. Example: The noise problem in the New York area.

National air safety organization

The national organization of ALPA maintains an engineering and air safety department through which problems from the 115 council air safety committees, 41 airlines, or regional committees may be processed. The national organization usually serves as the spokesman on national problems or designates a pilot specialist or pilot committee to speak for ALPA. A "draft release" procedure is employed to secure a representative opinion on a subject. Special committees are required to submit their findings for comment to all council committees. The industry representative who feels that he has gaged pilot opinion by the process of speaking to several pilots at random is naive * * * however, we still occasionally hear the statement "but I spoke with several pilots and they told me this is what the pilots want." If representative pilot opinion is desired, go through channels to the pilot representatives.

The 12th Convention of ALPA provided for an annual air safety forum. This will be an annual convention of safety representatives from each airline who will devote their meetings entirely to air safety problems.

International Federation of Air Line Pilots Associations is a federation of pilots organizations from 20 different countries with international offices in London. The processing of safety problems of an international nature and representation at ICAO is effected for the member organizations through IFALPA. An annual meeting is held of representatives of the 20 member organizations. Special study groups are established to deal with individual problems. Study groups are maintained in each geographical area of the world to monitor facilities and represent pilot viewpoint on problems peculiar to the area and concerning which pilots flying continuously in the area will be best informed.

SAFETY VERSUS ECONOMICS

ALPA represents pilots in their economic problems as well as their safety problems. We are familiar with the constant complaint of the safety specialist that the airline operator and Government agencies too often get their economic and air-safety thinking mixed and that safety suffers as a result. It is proper to inquire, therefore, whether ALPA opinions on safety matters are not sometimes dictated by economic considerations. This question may be answered in two ways. First, ALPA is a strong enough organization to process its economic problems without recourse to the utilization of safety as an argument. Safety decisions may be made without the consideration of utilizing such decisions toward achieving an economic goal. Secondly, however, we must be realistic enough to remain cognizant that unresolved economic problems influence safety and must, therefore, be considered. Unresolved problems influence morale. The airline industry is susceptible to "wars of nerves." Low morale adversely affects safety. We are cognizant of (1) the importance of exercising extreme caution in flight operations during periods of economic crisis or low morale, and (2) the advisability of seeking as expeditiously as possible solutions to problems which arise. If there must be a dispute over an issue, it is better to have it quickly and reach a decision.

CONSUMER ACCEPTANCE

Even a designer of clothespins would not put his commodity on the market without attempting to measure the consumer acceptance and then when the commodity comes on the market, the consumer has the prerogative of accepting or rejecting it. Yet, on occasion in the aviation business, we still have new gadgets, standards, and procedures placed into operation without pilot representatives ever having been consulted or informed. In a recent instance, the gross weight of an aircraft was altered without consultation with or information to the pilot representatives. This despite the fact that gross weight increases alter the performance pattern of the aircraft.

It is my belief that the user viewpoint should be represented throughout the conception, design, testing, and adaptation of aircraft, their components or operational procedures, if the maximum of safety value and acceptance is to be achieved. The existence of an effective and responsible association of pilots, having facilities for the dissemination of information and an organizational structure capable of making available responsible spokesmen through whom Government agencies and industry representatives may work, is of positive value to accomplish this goal. Through one agency Government and industry may sample the user viewpoint. Opinions, viewpoints, and decisions which are reliable may be secured.

One further point should be made clear on the ALPA viewpoint and organization for safety. We do not believe that a bilateral approach by the Government and pilots, or management and pilots, to safety problems deprives the Government official of his authority or the management official of his managerial prerogative. It is simply a more effective way of improving air safety—a responsibility the pilot cannot avoid or delegate nor the Government or industry avoid or delegate.

India and World Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 29, 1954

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, India is greatly misunderstood in the United States. United States is greatly misunderstood in India. Statements like that of Ambassador Mehta from India can help heal the breech between our two nations. Mr. Mehta's remarks follow:

I am grateful to you for the honor done to me in inviting me to address this distinguished gathering. I welcome this opportunity to talk, among friends, about India's approach to international problems and her efforts in the common task of achievement of world peace.

India is not an English-speaking country, although to many of us, English is a familiar and valued medium which has contributed and will, I am sure, continue to contribute much to the national life of our country. Language is not merely what we speak and hear and write; it is something which is integrated with our mental processes. We think and even breathe a language. English is to us a foreign language and yet through its medium we have imbibed many a lesson of freedom and democracy. Years ago, Wordsworth wrote:

> "We must be free or die, who speak the tongue
> That Shakespeare spake;
> The faith and morals hold
> Which Milton held."

But apart from the inspiration derived by the political movement, in literature and philosophy, in art and science, the English language has profoundly influenced Indian thought and modes of expression. More. It has been one of the unifying forces in a vast country. In our Parliament and Legislative Assemblies, in law courts and universities, in industrial firms and scientific laboratories, English is still the principal medium of communication. We are determined to have our own national language but this does not mean any aversion to the study of English for technical purposes as well as for communication with the rest of the world. We do not believe in any narrow creed which sacrifices cultural values and builds barriers between minds. We do not wish to shut out light from any land. Indeed, so far as the United States is concerned, this medium of English language is an additional facility which makes for closer bonds between our two countries. For, I am assured on good authority that what is spoken in this country, strange as it may sound to us at times, is basically English. I feel, therefore, that I can count on a special measure of understanding and goodwill in speaking before an organization whose larger purposes embrace the promotion of an attitude of free discussion and mutual tolerance among the English-using peoples of the world.

But there is a deeper reason for this sense of ease of expression which I am permitting myself on this occasion. It is a reason which is germane to the subject of my remarks today. It is no less than the fact that what I claim to be a unique peaceful culmination of a difficult relationship in international affairs—and let us face it, the relationship between an imperial power and its subjects cannot but be a difficult one—took place as a result of the cooperation of one of the main groups of English-speaking people and the people of India. In a world which is seriously troubled by the awesome signs and rumblings of conflict, consider, for a moment, the substantial contribution in capital that India and Britain jointly have made to the abiding assets of peace as a result of the deliberately chosen method by which India regained her freedom and Britain transferred power. Today, how much worse would have been the prospects for world peace if in 1919 the Indian people and their leaders had hearkened to the voice of the realists, the practical men, the emotional enthusiasts, the passionate revolutionaries, and others who glorified the martial tradition, and had plunged the country into a mass movement of armed and violent resistance against the British? It might be that, in time, that way too, India would have achieved independence, but with what a terrible legacy of hatred and bitterness and with what sinister shadows lengthening over the Continent of Asia.

It is fundamental to an understanding of India's attitude in world affairs that we should remember that India's national leadership deliberately chose the method of peace in her struggle for independence; that by doing so, she has not only built up amicable relationship with the United Kingdom, but has also acquired a perspective for the peaceful handling of disputes between nations. Our national movement has been described as nonviolent. And constitutionalism is but nonviolence translated into political terms. From this it follows, and indeed, it would be a betrayal of her rich experience if she were to do otherwise, that India brings to bear on various issues in international relations that concern her, or in which she is asked to participate, an intrinsically peaceful approach.

The first peaceful dividend of this approach has been India's considered decision, even though she has chosen a republican form of government, to be a member of the Commonwealth of Nations. As you know, the Commonwealth is not a juridical entity, it is not a superstate; it is an organization wherein a pool of experience and wisdom is shared by a group of countries. Not that these countries do and will always agree with one another or vote together; indeed, on rare occasions they register a lack of unanimity in the United Nations. That is to be expected in the free association of independent sovereign countries, none of which is prepared to be a mere camp follower or satellite. And this surely, in democratic countries and in their relationships, is what one would expect. There is no attempt in the Commonwealth to proclaim and impose overall leadership whether on the basis of priority in the organization itself—as could be claimed by the United Kingdom; or because of wealth—a claim which would justifiably be made by that wonderfully active country Canada; or on the basis of size, which is surely something that could be claimed by the great Dominion from down under, Australia; or because of the weight of population, as in the case of India herself. The resulting mutual respect and equality among its members is what makes the Commonwealth so important an international experiment. And India is glad to be a party to this organization wherein, when differences arise, they are accepted with tolerance and mutual respect. There is in this Commonwealth no castigation of countries for not having declared themselves to be on one side or the other. Nor because of divergence in outlook and policies on specific problems is there a tendency to treat such differences as signs of heterodoxy. Nor, again, do such differences raise doubts about our fundamental unity of purpose. We are not continuously asked to proclaim ourselves on the side of the angels. Perhaps, because the British with their severely practical approach, recognize that we are all men in a world of men. And we, with an oriental simplicity, prefer the devil we know to the devil we don't.

The foreign policy of India, as of some other countries in that area such as Burma and Indonesia, is described as one of neutralism. Political terminology is not always precise nor, indeed, static. During the war, for example, the term "non-belligerency" was used as distinct from neutrality and there were also forms of neutrality such as benevolent neutrality. If neutrality in the present conditions implies a lack of responsibility concerning world affairs or a desire to escape international obligations by not taking sides or a policy of isolation, then surely this term is inapplicable to the attitude and policy of India and other countries in that area. But if such a term means a rejection of commitment to either side now engaged in the cold war and a desire not to get involved in the conflicts between great powers, there is an element of truth in this description. India's foreign policy, however, is rather one of maintenance of a certain measure of freedom in her outlook and independence in her decisions. Even in a cold war, the Indian position has not been one of cold neutrality; for, her leaders and representatives have not hesitated to commit themselves to a position which they considered to be right. India's attitude has not even been one of a supine desire for noninvolvement since India has involved herself whenever she saw an opportunity to do so constructively. In the counsels of the world she has tried to exercise discrimination in judging international issues without preconceived notions or idealogical obsessions. Moral judgment depends upon free determination made on merits as one sees them, not dictated by extraneous considerations or pressure. It is no doubt possible to disagree on the merits of such issues but I do maintain that we have been endeavoring to adopt an attitude towards international affairs which we believe consistent not only with our interests but with values such as we see them. It is, in other words, a positive attitude embodying constructive approach for reducing world tensions and developing a firmer basis of cooperation among nations.

Have there been any good reasons for the application of this epithet of neutralism to Indian attitude and policy? Is it not abundantly clear that India has shown a positive, almost a bold, concern for peace in the world? Is such a policy neutralist or supine or confused? Had India, though not a combatant participant in the Korean war, been neutralist, would she not have sat back and perhaps displayed some of the plague on both your houses mentally? But did she not, on the contrary, devise a scheme for a truce in Korea which eventually became the basis of a cease-fire and the prisoner repatriation arrangement? I would remind you that this effort of Indian was described by Mr. Henry Cabot Lodge, the chief of the United States delegation to the United Nations, as a splendid and sincere effort for peace. Speaking the other day to the Pilgrims in London, Sir Gladwyn Jebb, who led the U. K. delegation to the United Nations, stressed the Indian initiative on the issue of Korean prisoners-of-war and pointed out that without this Indian proposal, hostilities in Korea would have gone on longer than they did. And did not India also send her uniformed paratroop medical corps to this theater of war, and did not its services win encomiums? And did she not provide the full contingent of armed forces required for the repatriation arrangements? Did not the conduct of the Indian Custodian Forces receive worldwide appreciation? Are these the actions of a country which lets the issues of peace and war, or any of the major issues facing our world, simply pass her by?

And then, again, is it neutralist to have called for a cease-fire and armistice in Indochina which obviously, if not today, then tomorrow, must be the first step in the ending of hostilities and in the beginning of a happier day for that war-ravaged country?

Again, in the Western Powers Disarmament Resolution adopted by the United Nations on November 18, 1953, it was India that suggested a clause calling on the main atomic powers to meet informally for the purpose of reaching agreement. It was this one clause in the resolution to which President Eisenhower referred in his speech to the U. N. General Assembly on December 8, 1953, when he stated that the United States Government was willing at once to go ahead with the suggested private talks.

I need hardly elaborate this point further because I am sure you will understand that India's attitude is anything but that of isolation or aloofness or indifference to moral issues. India's attitude and actions in world affairs have shown, I venture to suggest, a concern for peace and a constructive approach toward achieving it which cannot be described by stereotyped clichés about neutralism and fellow-traveling. We stand on the record of the past 7 years' work in the United Nations and its specialized agencies and in the chanceries of the capitals of the world. And I submit without hesitation that it is a record which establishes our desire and our determination, within the limits of our powers to contribute toward an easing of tensions and promoting some measure of understand and harmony between countries which for good or ill have to live together despite their different ideologies and varied systems. As has been well said, "we must face life as it is and understand that diversity is its most essential feature * * * fear of difference is dread of life itself." It is an illustion that there are only two systems in the world—capitalistic and communistic; there are numerous systems, political and economic, which are all different and all changing. My country, for example, believes in evolving a mixed economy combining initiative and enterprise with social justice and economic equality. Why not? After all, we do not want a dull, drab uniformity all over the world, standardization of cultures, mechanization of the mind. There is joy in diversity, beauty in variety. We can and shall remain different and yet work together and participate in common tasks, cooperate in various world organizations and agencies.

We may look at India's attitude towards world peace in another and equally valid manner. It is by examining briefly her domestic policies and measures. It is a truism that a country's policy at home is bound to affect its foreign policy and its international relations similar affect internal affairs. So, in the assessment of any country, it is prudent to see whether a government practices within its borders what it preaches outside. In the case of India, this is of vital concern because any considerable breakdown of internal peace in the country might well have widespread and serious repercussions. India holds as much as a sixth of a human race, and the destinies of her people are closely intertwined with those of the world community.

The Government of India, then, has a direct responsibility for maintaining peace in one-sixth of the world and our friends might well ask how that task is being performed.

Let us glance briefly at the internal picture of India. As you know, we have a working democracy which not only sent 107 million voters to the polls in the general elections of 1952 to elect about 4,000 legislators in the states and in the federal center, but underlying this we have the rudiments and rural communities in most of our 564,000 villages which we are seeking to develop so as to bring democracy to the doorstep of the humblest citizen of the country. I mention this because I think it might well be of interest to our friends here on the other side of the globe to know that while democratic traditions and practices have their roots in India, we are endeavoring to build up institutions and ways of life to strengthen these democratic forces.

The rule of law has been from the earliest times a major force in the Indian concept of society. It has been mentioned in a recent book on the impact of the new states of southeast Asia on the development of international law by Mr. Philip W. Thayer, that, "At the back of the ancient system of Hindu law, whether regarded on a national or international basis, was an ethical concept known as Dharma." This was a concept which was just as binding upon states in their relations with each other as it was on individuals, and it meant, in the final analysis, that one must do the right thing simply because it was the right thing. Sanction lay in the source of the concept, as being in the nature of a divine command which could not be ignored. This concept of Dharma, deeply rooted in the very foundations of the Hindu law, exerted a profound influence on all its branches. In the transplanting and absorption of some phases of the law in Burma and in Indonesia, Dharma, with its emphasis on ethical values, was bound to play an important part. No wonder then that our present constitution provides adequate safeguards which any citizen of a democratic state could possibly expect, guaranteeing to him his rights, complete equality before the law, regardless of race, creed, sex, or occupation, and a firmly established judicial system to which the individual can have recourse if need be. Our laws do not permit subversive activities, violence, and sabotage to go unchecked. Any citizen who, for whatever reasons, indulges in these antisocial activities, takes the consequences of his actions, but we do not outlaw any form of belief or thought provided it does not lead to overt actions leading to hatred and violence.

Though our rights are fortified by the Constitution and the law, we feel that our best safeguard for peace and welfare are the vigilance and awareness of our democratically elected Government in seeing to it that the citizens of the country are provided with the basic opportunities of education, employment, and other opportunities to stimulate the exercise of their own initiative. In these fields we frankly start with great handicaps. We admit that we are way behind where we wish to be, but these hard realities do not deter us. On the contrary, we have tried to measure and husband our resources in men, materials, and money and to deploy them to the best advantage of the community and the individual. We are now entering upon the fourth year of a development plan which has already been able to overcome in a substantial manner the deficient supply of the main food grains used by our people, and much of the shortage in cotton, jute, and other raw materials for our industries. We are expanding our production of steel, we have added considerably to our production of fertilizers, and we are bringing about 17 million acres of land under additional irrigation facilities. We will soon have basic school facilities for 60 percent of our population and we are making, in addition, rapid headway through adult literacy campaigns to complete the basic education of our vast population. Most State governments have abolished outmoded systems of land tenure and have given security to the peasant, and therefore enhanced his interest in better methods of cultivation and generally in better living conditions. In rural India, a remarkable manifestation of the human spirit at its best has been promoted by a voluntary effort, headed by Acharya Vinoba Bhave, one of Mahatma Gandhi's leading disciples, to redistribute agricultural land so as to convert about 10 million landless agricultural laborers into peasant owners with a personal stake in the development of the country. In the last 2 years or so, about 3 million acres of land have voluntarily been surrendered by landlords to Bhave; and this land, together with agricultural implements and some other forms of assistance to establish homesteads, is being made over to landless agricultural laborers. Indeed, this movement indicates that new forces are at work in India which have to find channels, other than the legislatures and governmental institutions, through which to function.

Without exaggeration or immodesty, India can be described as a resurgent land in which age-old problems are being dealt with democratically and with modern knowledge and techniques by the cooperative effort of the Government and individual citizens. We are endeavoring to strengthen these constructive forces and constantly we refresh ourselves by drawing on our great cultural heritage from Buddha to Gandhi.

May I add that it is our constant endeavor to arrive at peaceful solutions by mutual agreement with our neighboring countries with which we propose to live in amity and friendship. We realize only too well that discontent and chaos in countries nearby would adversely affect our own interests and hamper our progress. We have, like the United States and Canada, an unguarded frontier between India and Burma with whom our relations are cordial. Recently, we have had an agreement on problems of immigration with Ceylon, which is an evidence of mutual good will and will be an instrument of good neighborly relations in future. It is true that India's relations with Pakistan have not been as satisfactory as they should be and, I have no doubt, will be. It is nothing surprising if the creation of two states by partition of the country should have resulted in several complex problems; many of these difficulties are being overcome by adjustment and compromise. Those who are impatient about the solution of some of the outstanding questions should remember the insuperable difficulties in resolving similar issues in Western Europe and the American Continent. Our Prime Minister has repeatedly stressed that there cannot be a prosperous India without a prosperous Pakistan on its borders and that, with their common roots and similarity in conditions and problems, they should be able to solve their mutual problems and establish harmonious relations. India, which insists on the principle of equality between nations and races, whether weak or strong, and on the need for international cooperation cannot but look upon all her neighbors as equals with her in the common enterprise for social welfare and world peace.

One word in conclusion. In this atomic age, civilization has no future unless we can devise some rational means of settling differences and overcoming conflicts between nations. Perhaps the physical powers of men have outstripped their moral sense and we must either achieve peace or perish. We cannot, and should not, build upon a psychology of fear and distrust. We must deliberately learn to think in terms of the individual welfare of common man and woman everywhere. This was eloquently emphasized by President Eisenhower in his memorable speech last April. He said:

"Every gun that is made, every warship launched, every rocket fired signifies—in the final sense—a theft from those who hunger and are not fed, those who are cold and are not clothed. * * * This is not a way of life at all, in any true sense. Under the cloud of threatening war, it is humanity hanging from a cross of iron."

The United Nations and methods of diplomacy provide the necessary machinery for settlement of disputes and attainment of collective security. We have to defend moral ideas and combat oppressive social systems not by war but by other weapons, such as education, public opinion, political institutions, and economic development. The ultimate problem of an international society is the achieving of harmony between different systems and the balancing of claims and conflicts between countries. Toward this task we all have to dedicate ourselves, since there is no middleway now between international cooperation for peace and destruction of civilized life.

St. Paul, Ark., High School

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES W. TRIMBLE

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 28, 1954

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, we have been honored this week by a visit to Washington of the graduating class of the St. Paul, Ark., High School. This is a consolidated school in the south part of Madison County in the district which I am honored to represent.

These young people deserve great credit not only for the fine school work which they have done but because they earned the money themselves to make this trip. They sold fence posts, did baby sitting, mowed lawns, had school plays, and did any other honorable work available in the community to raise money.

They are accompanied by the school superintendent, Carey Bussell, and by the English instructor, Mrs. Annabel Hawkins. The young folks in the groups are:

Georgia Ann Combs, Dixie Brannon, Wilma Williams, Lola Vire, Verda Cooper, Peggy Baker, Dorothy Gabbard, Norma Sue Ogden, Shirley Stewart, Loreta Masterson, Joanne Milligan, J. D. Hawkins, Billy Joe Anderson, Mandred Vol Parker, Jr., Lee Mounce, Landon Hawkins, Bill Miller, Carl Baker, Shirley Ogden, Bill Kidd, and Don Davis.

I am also happy to tell the House that Georgia Ann Combs, a member of this high-school graduating class, won top honors in a statewide essay contest with her essay entitled "The Physically Handicapped: Competent, Dependable Workers." I wish to pay tribute to her for the honor she has brought not only to her school and her county but to all of us. I insert her essay as a part of my remarks.

Pauline Wiliams, also a member of the class, who was unable because of illness to make the trip to Washington, won fourth prize in the contest. We are proud of her and wish she could have been here, too.

These fine young people relieve my fears for the future safety of the country as they and their fellow students from all parts of the United States come at this time to visit the Nation's Capital.

The essay, above-mentioned, follows:

THE PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED: COMPETENT, DEPENDABLE WORKERS

(By Georgia Ann Combs, of St. Paul High School)

I would like to prove that the physical handicapped can become competent, dependable workers. To do this I would like to bring in the facts and plead my case to the employers as a lawyer would plead his case to a jury. I choose circumstance to be the final judge.

Glancing over any audience one will see in any segment of mankind, from radiant youth to withering age, evidence of man's frailities—the four "B's": bunions, bifocals, bulges, and baldness. These are only mild outward imperfections, but we will have to admit that even these are handicaps. Thus applying the term handicaps to these mild imperfections, we are again forced to admit that out of the 142 million people in the United States, 142 million are handicapped.

A handicap is an asset. A handicap is a spring-board to success. Everywhere about us we see those whose success is obviously due to their handicaps. This is not the exception; this is the rule. No one succeeds without a handicap; no one succeeds in spite of a handicap; but, everyone succeeds because of a handicap. This is true because a handicap gives us an inferiority complex. In the attempt to rid ourselves of this sense of inferiority, we put forth tremendous effort and so achieve heights we would never otherwise have attained.

Let us take a look into the past at some of the great men and women whose success was because of their handicaps. There has been only one Helen Keller. This child, deprived of the two greatest pathways to the mind, became a woman brilliant in intellect, lofty in character. Without sight or hearing, she is a genius. What order genius she would have been with them one can only guess.

Dr. Burno Furst is probably the foremost mental athlete of this century. He has stored away in his brain cells hundreds of poems, scores of novels and plays besides the fact that he can repeat verbatim the entire German Civil Code, some 2,385 paragraphs of legal verbiage filling five thick volumes. Has Dr. Furst always been such a genius? No; he was the class dunce and even had to write his best girl's telephone number on a slip of paper. He realized his trouble early as being a lack of memory and began to train his mnemonic musculature. Can there be any doubt that the reason Dr. Furst has such a phenomenal memory today is because he started life with such a bad one?

The Marquis of Villalobar lived and overcame a handicap so rare as to be almost single. He was a nobleman, he was rich, he was brilliant, he was handsome—but he was a monster. Nevertheless he didn't do badly with a life that was a disaster from the womb. He became his country's ambassador to Belgium, stumping along on clumsy contraptions, which raised him to normal height. These are only a few out of many who have proven that physical handicaps are assets.

If we must accept the fact that no man is without spot or wrinkle and that these very handicaps are his road to success, then why does pity fill our eyes when we see the crippled, twisted body? It is only human nature for us to feel this pity for those we consider less fortunate than ourselves, but are they less fortunate? Some, who have struggled from the very bottom to the greatest of heights, know a happiness that a normally handicapped person could never experience. These, whose bodies take on all shapes and forms of disfigurement but whose minds know the blessings and joy that comes with success, need not the pity of an able-bodied man who does not know the real meaning of true happiness. Furthermore, they do not want this pity and rightfully resent it. From the depths of their thoughful minds they find room to pity the one who unthinkingly pities them. Thus to conclude the whole matter in business terms: Pity not the man with crippled legs who leans, but the man with the sound legs who leans.

Those, whose handicaps exceed the normal maladjustments in bodily disfigurement, without exception, resent being placed in a class, being socially ostracized, as much as they resent being pitied. This is especially true when they come to the employer's desk and receive not only words of rejection but the brand of being an unfit. Thus they return to their state of being a dependent because of an unwise employer. If the employer had considered their abilities as well as their disabilities, 9 times out of 10 they could have become desirable workers, independent men and women, and taxpaying citizens. It is only a matter of fitting the man without legs to a job that does not require the use of legs, fitting the man who cannot hear to a job that does not require hearing, or fitting the man that can't work around noise to a job in a quiet area, etc. When this is done the individual with the greatest handicap for other jobs will do the job he can do, better than the normal worker would. This is because of the fact that he feels inferior that he puts forth this extra effort, as I have explained before.

Although it is more blessed to give than to receive, it is not easy on the part of the recipient to be always on the receiving end. Often the giver does not realize that there is something humbling, something which relegates the recipient slightly to a lower level, when he is placed in a situation where he must always accept and never reciprocate.

Summing it up, a physically handicapped person does not want and does not need pity; does not want and does not need something for nothing; but, he does want and need a fair chance to find his place in life and accomplish his all-important purpose for existence. If the physical handicapped are given this opportunity of contributing to the world instead of taking from the world I say they will prove more than capable of doing their share. The employer who does his part in accepting the physical maladjusted will be more than repaid also.

Restoration of Military Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 29, 1954

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, the military appropriations bill for 1955 has made some significant forward strides towards restoration of military benefits that have been progressively whittled away over the past 10 years. There is still room for improvement in this field; if we are to build an alert and ready military force for protection of our country. The following statement by a spokesman of the Eisenhower administration indicates additional steps that must be taken by Congress this session. Under unanimous consent I insert the remarks of John B. Hannah, Assistant Secretary of Defense, as they appeared in the Army-Navy-Air Force Register of April 24, 1954:

> At the present time, a man leaving the service becomes eligible for certain material benefits which are not available to him if he remains in uniform. In effect, we offer a bonus to leave the service to the very officers and men we are most anxious to retain. The value of these benefits to an individual can be as much as $5,000. It is easy to see that the $40 to $360 reenlistment bonus does not look very large in comparison. Then we must spend money to train and equip his replacement $3,200 in the case of a basically trained soldier. Thus it may cost at least $8,000 to replace a rifleman leaving the service, much more to replace a highly trained specialist, infinitely more to replace a jet pilot.
>
> Of even greater consequence is the adverse effect on operational proficiency caused by a continuously heavy personnel turnover. For example, it takes more than 2⅓ 2-year inductees to equal 1 4-year enlistee, because of the training overlap. To maintain a trained Army of 1 million men would require 55,000 new inductees per month, assuming that only 2-year men are used by the Army; however, only 24,000 new 4-year enlistees per month would be needed. It is plain to be seen that there is a great loss of manpower here, as well as a loss of time and effectiveness within the units in which the turnover is going on throughout the 4-year period, and a great additional money cost.
>
> We have concluded a thorough study of the problem of making military careers more attractive and so reducing this turnover, and on the basis of the findings—the so-called Womble report—we have embarked on an extensive program to improve the attractiveness of military service as a life career.
>
> Let me give you some examples of the things which operate to discourage men from remaining in the military service.
>
> #### HOUSING
>
> One of the most important is the housing situation, both at military installations and in surrounding communities. One principal reason why men do not stay in the service is the unhappiness of their wives at being unable to find decent housing for the family and adequate schooling for the children. Self-respecting men want their families with them, and they hesitate to remain in the service when they see that it may be impossible to find acceptable housing or provide adequate educations for their children. We make it possible for the ex-service man to borrow money to buy a home if he leaves the service, but do not extend the same help if he stays in the service. The country can well be ashamed of some of the housing occupied by married men and some of the barracks in which single men are quartered.
>
> There will be submitted to Congress specific proposals for improving the housing and educational facilities for military personnel and their families, and it is my sincere hope that action will be initiated to remove this great liability to military service.
>
> So long as such a large percentage of our men must be deployed overseas we cannot avoid family separations, but we can do much to improve the housing when the families are together and to assist the dependents when they are separated.
>
> #### MEDICAL CARE OF DEPENDENTS
>
> A second area in which the services find themselves severely handicapped in their efforts to build up their core of experienced enlisted men and officers too is that of medical care for dependents. It has been established plainly that worry about the health of dependents and the availability of adequate care for them in times of sickness or accident has an adverse effect upon morale, particularly that of men separated from their families while on duty overseas. Again, the services want the kind of men who have a sense of responsibility for their dependents, and are finding it hard to keep them under current conditions. At present, medical care is provided for dependents only if health facilities not required for men in uniform are available. It is the hope of the Department of Defense that in this area, too, the Congress will approve an equitable program of relief. The need for this help cannot be overemphasized.
>
> #### COMMISSARY STORES
>
> As you gentlemen know, the operation of commissaries and post exchanges has been the subject of considerable discussion and controversy. People in the military services feel that these operations should be considered as partial compensation for some of the benefits they forego by remaining in uniform rather than returning to civilian

life. I suppose the question will always be debated, and commissaries and post exchanges will continue to be the targets of criticism.

We have closed 6 and we have 38 under continuing study. The rest of them have been given certificates to permit them to continue to operate as required by the last appropriations act.

But as long as the military services cannot pay competitive salaries and wages, and the commissaries can sell groceries to military people at a subetantial saving, the Department of Defense must continue in favor of operating them.

RETIREMENT

May I call your attention to still another matter in which military personnel feel that they are entitled to more protection. They believe that the conditions of retirement under which they enter the service should not be changed to their disadvantage while they are on active duty. Without such assurance they have no real security for the future and find little incentive to make military service their life careers.

American Friends of the Alliance Israelite Universelle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 29, 1954

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I have the pleasure of offering a speech of the distinguished Ambassador from France, Mr. Bonnet, before the American Friends of the Alliance Israelite Universelle at the Waldorf Astoria in New York:

Ladies and gentlemen, friends and members of the Alliance Israelite Universelle, I thank you sincerely for the honor you have bestowed upon France in tendering this dinner to me as the representative of my country in the United States.

As you know, one of the manifold duties of an ambassador is to attend a number of official lunches and dinners. However, to this dinner tonight I come not in the line of duty, but with all my heart and goodwill; because the Alliance Israelite Universelle is a French organization that has accomplished so much good for so many people, it is very close to my heart.

The alliance has an illustrious background. Among its founders and ardent supporters were such great Frenchmen of the Jewish faith as Adolph Cremieux, Charles Netter, and Sylvain Levy. These men devoted all their efforts and energies to the noble work of emancipation and education of the Jews in North Africa, and Near and Middle East, and the Balkans.

It was almost a century ago that a group of French Jews organized themselves for the sole purpose of giving effective help and to improve the welfare of needy Jews in different areas.

I was deeply impressed when I learned the Hebrew slogan of the Alliance Israelite—"Kol Israel arevim ze ba-ze." I am told that this is a quotation from the Talmud, meaning "All Israelites are responsible, each for the other." While I do not pretend to be a commentator on the Talmud, may I be audacious enough to interpret this Talmudic phrase to mean that it is the obligation of Jews to come to the aid of their fellow-Jews in all circumstances, wherever they may be.

The Jewish sages had good reason, indeed, to give such counsel. Some of the blackest pages of history tell the stories of the sufferings of Jews and of the shameful persecution they endured. Even in our civilized 20th century, supposed to be the century of tolerance and progress, 6 million Jews were annihilated by a savage nationalist and anti-Semite called Hitler. When tolerance is ignored, freedom and democracy are in deadly danger.

With the exception of the dark years when France was under the heel of the Nazis, I am proud to say that my country has always been a bright light in the path of suffering Jews, and a haven of refuge for them.

Another expression of your Jewish sages says "Israelites are merciful, the sons of the merciful." It is this phrase, I am sure, that my compatriots who created the Alliance Israelite Universelle had in mind. From 1860 to this very day, the alliance has never ceased to care for its brethren in those countries where it considered its work most necessary.

Believing that education is a fundamental need for every child and for the future of the world, the alliance undertook the establishment of schools and vocational institutions in the countries of the Middle East and north Africa where the Jewish masses had no opportunities for religious and secular education. As part of the latter, not only were they concerned that the children learn what you Americans call the three R's—reading, writing, and (a)rithmetic—but they also gave them the means to learn trades and skills so they could establish themselves as self-supporting and stalwart members of their communities.

Ladies and gentlemen, I am here tonight, like all of you, as a friend of the Alliance Israelite. I have not come as a propagandist for my country. However, I am sure that you will permit me to voice great pride in the fact that ever since this Alliance Israelite was organized back in 1860, the Government of France has deemed it an unqualified obligation to give utmost support and aid to this great French-Jewish organization.

Whether in Morocco, Tunisia, Algiers, Istanbul or Jerusalem, the French Government has never hesitated to cooperate to the fullest extent with the trustees of the alliance for the benefit of the Jewish youth in those places.

I dare say that probably many of you have not had the opportunity to visit French North Africa. You have read and heard much about French colonialism, French imperialism and French exploitation in that part of the world. May I say to you that, while the French people did derive benefit as a result of the occupation of North Africa, it was for the mutual benefit of both.

We gave those countries educational systems, we taught them hygiene, we improved their social welfare, we created order out of chaos by organizing civil government administrations, we set up judicial systems; we are helping them to develop their natural resources and to establish a healthy economy. The French administration in North Africa has, beyond all doubt, greatly improved the lot of the people there. Moreover, we consider those people as our equals, and we are gradually proceeding toward self-government for these countries which we want to be associated with France, along federal lines, in an everlasting community of nations equal in rights and duties.

My country has always been deeply concerned, also, with the protection of the rights of all ethnic groups, wherever we have interests. Let me assure you that as long as there is a France, she will not only cooperate wholeheartedly in the work of great humanitarian causes like the Alliance Israelite, but she will exert every effort to protect the rights, the property, the very lives of all peoples within her territories, regardless of race, color or creed.

Tens of thousands of Jewish boys and girls received their education and vocational training through the alliance with the full cooperation and subsidy of the French Government; scores of thousands of Jewish children are still receiving fine educations and outstanding vocational training thanks to the Alliance Israelite and the French Government.

The generosity of American Jewry toward the institutions of their coreligionists in the United States is world famous. May I here put in my word of commendation for the generosity of my countrymen who, in spite of their reverses and untold suffering during 5 years of Nazi tyranny, continued to help their brethren in north Africa and in the countries of the Middle East.

I cannot think of a nobler deed, a greater act of brotherhood than to help the Alliance to support and maintain its worthy institutions in the 13 countries where they exist. It is my deep conviction that the Alliance Israelite is one of the greatest causes deserving of support and assistance.

The problems and needs of the Alliance for cooperation from fellow Jews abroad are symptomatic of the broader problems and needs of all free nations and peoples everywhere in the world today.

The war in Indochina is, undoubtedly, the most pressing issue now facing the free world. It is the leading front-page news. This war spells danger for the whole of southeast Asia. Needless to say, as the Ambassador of France to the United States, it is my principal concern these days.

For nearly 8 years the French have been fighting a war against Communist aggression in Indochina. This war is still raging. Its intensity is on the increase. It is not, it is not a war of French colonialism or imperialism, as the Communists describe it. It is, rather, a war against Communist imperialism and totalitarianism, a war for freedom and against subjugation, to preserve human dignity and the rights of the individual. It is a war to save southeast Asia from the clutches of the Communist aggressor, to preserve the freedom of hundreds of millions of our fellowmen, and to prevent the natural resources of that area from falling into the hands of the Communists.

In this war for freedom and liberty, tens of thousands of Frenchmen have laid down their lives. This war has bled the French treasury and impoverished the nation. We are deeply grateful to the United States for all the help it has given us. Without it we could not have carried on. But the burdens and the suffering have been ours. You all know that, as I am speaking here tonight, the heroism of the army of the French Union at Dien Bien Phu continues to draw the admiration of the entire free world.

I would like to make clear here a fact concerning French policy in the war in Indochina which, I fear, has escaped even many of the most astute observers of international affairs. The objection of France to active intervention by other powers in the Indochinese war has not been because of my country's colonial interests there, as some have charged. It was the aim of the French Government to keep this conflict localized in order to prevent the outbreak of a worldwide conflagration.

In addition, we have pledged and given full independence to the three Associated States. We are building, with the material help of the United States, their national armies, which will soon comprise more than 300,000 men, the best guarantee of full independence one can dream of.

We hope that through costly efforts, very costly in French and Indochinese lives and resources, to obtain an honorable peace for our associates in Indochina and for ourselves, and thus save southeast Asia for the free world. It is to be highly deplored that, after it had been decided to hold a conference at Geneva on April 26 for the purpose of solving the far eastern conflicts, the Communist camp, renewing the mistakes they often committed in the past, notably in Korea, launched new and fierce attacks against us, against the heroic defenders of Dien Bien Phu, thus casting a serious doubt on their readiness to put an end to the dangerous wars still raging in Asia.

Danger to the free world still lurks all about us. How wise were the founders of the alliance when they adopted the slogan "All Israelites are responsible, each for the other." How wonderful it would be for the entire free world to adapt this slogan to say, "All free men are responsible, each for the other."

Freedom must be saved. Freedom must survive. Freedom must reign.

I thank you.

Ignorant but Happy?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL D. PERKINS

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 29, 1954

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Louisville Courier-Journal of April 25, 1954:

IGNORANT BUT HAPPY?—IF MODERN METHODS OF EDUCATION ARE SO WONDERFUL, WHY THE RISING TIDE OF CRITICISM OF THEIR RESULTS?

(By Mary Bingham)

Believing that parents would be interested in reading an account of what goes on in some typical Louisville elementary-school classes, the Courier-Journal ran a series of straight-reporting articles recently, written by one of the best reporters on the staff, Marion Porter.

These stories revealed a satisfying and engaging picture of children eagerly learning in an atmosphere of affection and understanding.

The classes covered were being conducted in the techniques and spirit of "modern" educational method: the children were embarked on an educational exploration or adventure in which the teachers served as guides and counselors. Consideration was being given to their "felt needs"; they were given great freedom of physical movement in the classroom; they were being encouraged to express their views, and they were learning the multiplication tables without drudgery through playing games.

They seemed happy and at ease.

It would seem that no normal parent could be anything but satisfied with the experience his child was getting in the happy, friendly classrooms Miss Porter visited.

Why the criticism?

Yet, if conditions everywhere (and Louisville schools must be presumed to be a part of the national pattern) are as wholesome and satisfactory as our series would indicate, what is the explanation for the rising tide of criticism of the schools—criticism so insistent that the National Education Association, the professional organization of public-school teachers and administrators, has felt it necessary to compile a pamphlet of the educators' efforts to answer their critics: "A List of Articles and Books Concerned With The Recent Wave of Attacks on Public Education"? (Washington, D. C. National Commission for The Defense of Democracy Through Education, NEA.)

This flood of criticism comes from parents, personnel managers, industrialists, college presidents, college deans of admission, and may be found in countless books, newspaper articles, and magazines, both popular and egg-head.

In general, this criticism makes two charges:

First, that the schools are neglecting those liberal studies which, in Socrates' phrase, prepare for "that self-examined life which alone is worthy of freemen"—English, history, mathematics, and languages.

Second, that although the professed aim of the modern school, to fit youngsters into a full-functionary economy" ("A Look at Our schools," by Dr. Paul R. Mort and William S. Vincent), has required that liberal subjects be sacrificed to vocational and "life adjustment" courses (such as family relationships, health, sex education, and safe driving), nevertheless the graduates of the schools are not properly fitted for employment because they are inadequately grounded in fundamentals. They lack mastery of tool subjects, reading, writing, and arithmetic.

To quote only a few of the most responsible voices:

"It has been found that a great many pupils in secondary schools have reading abilities of the fifth, or even the fourth, grade level." (What the High Schools Ought to Teach, American Council on Education.)

"The war revealed the serious deficiencies which had accumulated—deficiencies in English, mathematics, science, history * * * foreign languages." During the war, the armed services' search for officer candidates "with an oral mastery of foreign languages threw a flood of light on the inadequacy of the instruction given in high schools and colleges." (The Impact of The War Upon American Education, by I. L. Kandel, professor emeritus, teachers college, Columbia University.)

In 1941, Adm. Chester W. Nimitz gave the following facts and figures:

"In an examination for entrance to the Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps, given to 4,200 freshmen at 27 of the leading universities, 68 percent of the candidates were unable to pass the arithmetic reasoning test; 62 percent failed the whole test, which included also arithmetical combinations, vocabulary, and spatial relations. The majority of failures were not merely borderline, but were far below passing grade."

Evidence leading to the conclusion that no very successful reform has attended the Navy's revelations as to the inadequacy of mathematical skills in high-school graduates may be found in a plaintive advertisement which the General Electric Co. ran in the Atlantic Monthy for September 1953:

"For some reason or other, our youngsters have been shying away from math in junior high school and in high school. The United States Office of Education reports that only 20 percent of high-school students are taking mathematics.

"But research is the pioneer land of America's future, and mathematics is the road map of research. If something isn't done soon, our country may find itself feeling its way blindly through a supersonic, atomic miracle age, mathematically unarmed for either war or peace."

James B. Conant, former president of Harvard and High Commissioner of Germany, a stanch defender of the public schools, comments:

"Perhaps the single greatest cause of complaint concerning our schools and colleges is on the score of the inability of the graduates to express themselves adequately, either in speech or in writing. A second is our dismal failure to awaken in more than a fraction of even our college students a continuing interest in good literature and scholarly works dealing with history, philosophy, and science." (Education in a Divided World, p. 133.)

Mr. Conant's concern is understandable:

"Comic magazines which run about fourth grade in reading difficulty, constitute one-fourth of the total magazine reading of high-school seniors." (Know Your Reader, by George R. Klare and Byron Buck, p. 21, Hermitage.)

Mr. Conant believes "this failure of our education at what is admittedly a crucial point" must be regarded as "only a passing phase." His complacency is not shared by President Dodds of Princeton, or President Griswold of Yale. As reported in Time magazine (May 18, 1953), the former stated:

"Unfortunately, when we come to view America's vast system of tax-supported secondary education, we are bound, I fear, to admit that, with all it has to its credit, it is not fulfilling its duty to the mind. * * * Its greatest weakness has come from playing down academic scholarship * * * in favor of universality at a level of intellectual aptitudes adjusted to a common denominator. * * * The privately sustained school * * * is sadly needed to help keep alive and nurture the spirit of liberal learning. * * * It is its fidelity to the tough subjects such as foreign languages, English, mathematics * * * and history that renders the independent school so necessary today."

In a recent report to the alumni of Yale University, President Griswold warned that the country is threatened by "an educational collapse and cultural setback from which neither Yale nor any other university could escape"; that "if the schools cannot or do not send them (the colleges) properly qualified material, the whole fabric of higher education becomes a bridge built upon rotten pilings."

"Let spelling go"

Dr. Edgar A. Waugh of Michigan State Normal College, Ypsilanti, is quoted in the New York Times (August 21, 1953) as saying: "If either personality development or spelling has to go, let it be spelling."

Dr. Waugh evidently shares the low view of spelling competence of Dr. Paul Mort of Teachers College, Columbia, who calls learning to spell correctly one of the "little dish-washing jobs of education." ("A Look at Our Schools," p. 46.)

Yet spokesmen for business and industry view with alarm these little unwashed dishes.

A recent story in the Courier-Journal began "As I rode down, the street in my veichil, I met a continous stream of trafic." This was presented as an example of punctuation and spelling errors made by Louisville high-school graduates seeking employment here.

Commented Herman Wright, chairman of the education committtee of the Louisville branch, National Office Managers Association:

"Ninety percent of the girls who apply for stenographic jobs with my firm misspell the word "vehicle." A great many of them misspell continuous and traffic. Every now and then, they put in a comma, just to show they know there is such a thing."

2. SURVEYS SHOW LACK OF KNOWLEDGE

A serious cause for much criticism of the modern school and its products may be found in the results of two surveys made by the New York Times several years ago.

These surveys tested the knowledge of a fair cross section of college freshmen in American history and in geography.

"Striking ignorance of even the most elementary aspects of United States history" was revealed. Twenty-five percent of those tested could not identify Abraham Lincoln; 78 percent could not cite two contributions made by Lincoln to the country; many thought he was famous because he "emaciated" the slaves. Eighty-one percent could not cite two contributions made by Theodore Roosevelt; nearly 50 percent of the students listed Andrew Jackson as Stonewall Jackson; less than half could name two of the many specific powers granted to Congress by the Constitution; only 6 percent could name the Original Thirteen Colonies. Yet, at the time the test was given, American history was required to be taught in the schools of 38 States, and was established by practice in all others.

Thoughtful parents and editorial columns all over the country expressed even more concern at the results of the New York Times geography test.

At a time when the United States is faced with problems of world leadership, when decisions of war or peace may have to be decided by citizens on the basis of issues in countries on the other side of the world, young people showed stark ignorance, not only of the geography of far-off places, but of their own country. Only 5 percent could name the States on the Atlantic seaboard. Only 2 percent had any idea of the population of our nearest neighbor, Canada, "several thousand" of the 4,752 who took the test placing it at 100 million. Only seven students could name the countries neighboring Yugoslavia.

The deficiencies revealed in the geography tests are all the more surprising because the present-day method of teaching geography, combined with history as social science, is so often cited by educators as one of the most successful innovations of modern pedagogy: Dr. Paul Mort writes:

"A subject like geography in the 1900 school is gleaned from a single book, a few paragraphs at a time. But geography is about life. Why should it be taught in this deadly fashion? Numerous books, motion pictures, the building of model cities and farms, the making of contour maps, dramatization of phases of the life of foreign children, the preparation of illustrated booklets all contribute to the liveliness of geography as it is taught in the modern school." (P. 33, A Look at Our Schools.)

3. PHILOSOPHY, CURRICULUM RAPPED

Vigorous as is the criticism from some quarters of the teaching of the 3 R's in today's public schools, it seems mild compared to what is said by certain critics about modern educational philosophy and the curriculum.

This is no place to attempt a résumé of the dissent from the philosophy, the roots of which go back to Rousseau, to John Dewey, to William Kilpatrick and his disciples. But the reservations shared by many people about the view of man and the order of good which underlie it, about its pragmatic, experimental, and relativistic approach to values have been stated time and again by such men as Robert Hutchins, former chancellor of the University of Chicago; Bernard Iddings Bell, distinguished author and churchman; Mortimer Smith; Mark Van Doren; Albert Jay Nock; Jacques Barzun, and others, whose intellectual qualifications require that their questions be taken seriously.

Shortcomings discussed

Shortcomings of teacher-training institutions, and their products, have been recently dealt with by Albert Lynd in his article in the Atlantic Monthly, Quackery in the Public Schools, and enlarged on in his book of the same title; in Our Children Are Cheated, by Benjamin Fine, and in magazine articles such as a recent one in Life magazine, Who Teaches Teachers? by John William Sperry.

The burden of the complaint is that teachers-college courses in method (How To Teach), which take up about half the students' time in college, do not really educate them. They are too often ignorant of the subject which they are supposed to impart to their pupils.

These critics view with alarm the fact that 50 percent of all students in teachers' colleges come from the lower half of their high-school class (Dean Peik, of the University of Minnesota's College of Education, as quoted by Benjamin Fine, p. 196, Our Children Are Cheated). The results of the selective-service qualification-test program do not allay that alarm:

"With an all-quantitative test * * * education (majors) clearly remain in bottom position, separated from the * * * intermediate category by a substantial margin. * * * No matter how one looks at the major-fields data, the performance of the education group is conspicuously poor. Among students in each year of study, the percent of those in the educational category who pass the test is less than half that for the engineering category. * * * The only conclusion that can be drawn from the exceptionally poor performance of the (education) group as a whole is that a large number of low-ability students are preparing to enter the teaching field." (Education Testing Service Report, 1951–52.)

The controversy about the curriculum in the public schools is a part of the three R's debate.

Schools lack time

The argument of the people who feel that fundamentals are being neglected centers upon the fact that the curriculum has been expanded to cover so many subjects that the schools no longer have time enough to devote to their primary tasks.

The most bizarre example of the attempt to make the curriculum responsive to the felt needs of the pupils, and to cater to their interests, may be found in a current series of articles in Collier's magazine, Our Schools—Afraid To Teach? by Howard Whitman. At the Denver East High School, the author found high-school boys in aprons making fudge (for academic credits) in a class called "Boys' Foods."

Mr. Whitman's example may be extreme. But the variety and all-inclusiveness of the modern high-school curriculum may be noted in a report of the Connecticut State Department of Education entitled "The Redirection, Reorganization, and Retooling of Secondary Education."

A partial list of the things the high school is expected to teach (in addition to traditional studies) follows: Socioeconomic problems, home care of the sick, driver education, safe living, industrial hygiene, community health, care of children, home decorating, consumer education, boy and girl problems, personal grooming, hospitality, understanding of reproduction, occupational training, and housing.

Critics of the expanded curriculum called it "watering down" or adding "frills" to the basic subjects (English, history, science, mathematics, and languages) which the schools must teach because children are unlikely to learn them elsewhere; defenders of the enlarged curriculum are likely to refer to it as "an enriched program."

With the growth of the "enriched" (or "watered-down") curriculum has come a reform (or a "collapse," depending upon the point of view of the speaker) of the marking system.

"A public-school system which promotes all children at the end of each academic year regardless of whether their work is good, bad, or indifferent * * * develops in the pupils a basic irresponsibility. Why bother to learn anything when there is neither reward for doing it nor punishment for not doing it? * * * I have talked with scores of teachers, hardworking, conscientious public servants that they are, who admit that the whole pattern of automatic promotion, plus a breakdown of discipline, has developed in the student a basic irresponsibility the like of which previous generations did not know. 'Getting something for nothing' is accepted by millions of schoolchildren today as a truism." (In Defense of the Critics of American Public Education, by Hugh Russell Fraser, education editor, Pathfinder News magazine; School and Society, Oct. 27, 1951.)

Robert Hutchins asserts that education in these terms is not education at all: "It is large-scale housing venture."

And, again: "The collapse of liberal education in the United States has taken us into the doctrines of immediate needs and adjustment to environment, and has ended in the concept of the educational system as a gigantic play-pen in which the young are to amuse themselves until we are ready to have them do something serious." (The Conflict in Education, p. 93.)

The expansion of the curriculum to include fudgemaking has grown out of the belief of modern educators that the schools must be responsible for the development and growth of the "whole child." It has also been greatly influenced by the fact that the high school today, unlike the 1900 high school, must accommodate everybody, the bookish and the unbookish.

A different job

Protective and necessary laws require that young people stay in school until they are 16 or 18 (actually, almost 50 percent of them drop out before graduation), and the range in interest and ability of the students is very different from that of high-school pupils of 50 years ago.

At that time, the high schools were almost exclusively preparatory schools for the colleges and graduate professional schools. The schools must now provide education for all American youth, and the job is a different one. Hence, there has arisen the conception of schooling as a social process, and its enlarged responsibility has thus been stated by Dr. Wilbur A. Yauch, former elementary school principal, now on the staff of Ohio University:

"Parents cannot always supply the best environment for growth. * * * So they look to the schools to do this for them. Here, children should live in a lush environment that will bring out the best in everyone. All the omissions and deficiencies of the home environment should be corrected, if possible." (How Good Is Your School? by Wilbur A. Yauch; Harper & Bros.)

Perhaps the most penetrating comment on the dangers to education of biting off more than you can chew was made by Alfred North Whitehead: "The whole problem of education is controlled by lack of time. If Methuselah were not educated, it was his own fault or that of his teachers."

4. INDEPENDENT SCHOOLS INCREASE

Even such a cursory glance as this at some of the current criticisms of the public schools would seem to show that, valid or not, strong reservations about their goals, methods, and the educational competence of their graduates exist in the minds of many people.

The extent and seriousness of those reservations may be measured by the very marked increase (regretfully noted by James Conant in his latest book, Education and Liberty) during the last 25 years of independent schools.

In general, the teachers in these schools have not had training in teachers' colleges; the curriculum, teaching methods, and grading are closer to the classical school than to the modern one.

They are also expensive.

Only the sharpest spur of dissatisfaction with the public schools at hand could, one assumes, persuade so many parents to add to their substantial school taxes costly bills for tuition of their children in independent schools.

The dissatisfaction exists, and criticism grows.

Nor can the very great majority of the critics be dismissed as enemies of the public schools. Indeed, the very violence of their dissent suggests an almost proprietary concern. For very few Americans would deny that the great instrument of the public schools, whether in its 1900 or its modern form, has brought closer to realization the ideal we cherish of a cohesive, open, and democratic society. They deplore all the more, therefore, its threatened metamorphosis into a playpen.

Travelers Aid Sees Ghost of the 1930's

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 29, 1954

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, Ralph Collins is the executive director of the Travelers Aid Society in Chicago. In the Chicago Sun-Times of April 29, 1954, he is quoted as saying that the older workers in his organization have already begun to see the "ghosts of the 1930's."

Mr. Collins is in a much better spot to note the signs of a gathering storm than most of us. He is where the effects of tightening economic conditions are first felt—displaced workers wandering hopelessly in search of jobs. The Sun-Times states, on Mr. Collins' authority, that workers, thrown out of employment elsewhere, are coming to Chicago by train, bus, and jalopies. As no employment is available to them in Chicago, the Travelers Aid is taxed beyond its means to care for the situation.

It is to be hoped that the administration will not hold back the inauguaration of a public work program until it is too late.

I am extending my remarks to include the Sun-Times article, as follows:

Seek Jobs Here—Chicago Being Invaded by New Stlye Tourist

(By Madelon Golden)

The city is getting new-style tourists by the hundreds.

They are young men and even whole families looking for work in the promised city of industrialism.

"But about 75 percent must be sent right back home," says Ralph Collins, executive director of the Travelers Aid Society, 22 West Madison.

TWENTY-FIVE PERCENT INCREASE

His organization has reported a 25-percent increase in persons asking for assistance at Chicago's train depots, Midway Airport, and bus stations in the first 3 months of 1954.

"Most of them are young men between 20 and 30 who lost jobs in other parts of the country and believed that work is plentiful in Chicago," he said.

From January through March of 1954 the TAS recorded 1,402 cases of individuals or families seeking help, contrasted with 763 such cases in the same period last year. Most of the increase is from the West and Southwest.

NO RESTRICTIONS YET

"At the current rate, the society's budget will be out of kilter," Collins said. "The increasing began about November 15, and TAS needed $3,000 extra over estimates to meet its expenditures by the end of 1953," he explained.

"So far we have not restricted or limited intake," Collins said.

"However, older workers of the society have already begun to see the ghosts of the 1930's," Collins said. During the depression demand for help was so great that the society couldn't handle it. TAS officials assisted in setting up a State transient bureau then to handle the overflow.

FOOD AND LODGING

Immediate care—food and lodging—is arranged by the society for stranded persons.

"But even such stalwarts as the Pacific Garden Mission and the Cathedral Shelter have had to limit emergency care to 1 day as a rule now, due to overwhelming demands," Collins said.

"The 25 percent for whom the society is able to help find jobs usually are unskilled workers," he added.

Among the society's locations, the bus station is drawing the greatest activity. "Bus travel is the cheapest," he pointed out.

Many people also come in jalopies. Families often prefer this means. Police refer these cases to TAS.

Outlaw Wiretapping Save by Court Order and Then Only in Cases Involving National Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 29, 1954

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following statement by me before the Special Subcommittee on Wire Tapping Legislation of the Senate Judiciary Committee, on Wednesday, April 28, 1954, at 10 a. m.:

Interception of wired or wireless communication should be outlawed except in those cases where it is specifically permissible, such as in espionage, sabotage, subversion, and matters pertaining to our national security and defense, and in cases where it is permitted by State law. In those permissible cases, no tapping should be permitted unless, as in the case of a search warrant, a court order ex parte shall have been obtained.

It is time to call a halt to this wretched practice, so obnoxious to all our citizens. Wiretapping is a media for extortion, blackmail, and corruption used by cheats, procurers, prostitutes, gamblers, racketeers, bootleggers, bookmakers, and kidnapers. The roster is revolting, and it permeates our whole society. Such malefactors should be denied the right to tap wires and anyone who installs the apparatus should be punished.

Wiretapping is also used by the FBI, the CIA, the Army, Air, and Navy Intelligence Services, the city police, State troopers, private detectives, business executives, political parties, and labor unions. All these entities should be prohibited from intercepting calls or messages except in cases involving national defense and security and in cases permitted by State law. Conversations of Members of Congress have been intercepted and recorded. * * * Not even the office of the President is immune. The late Senator Tobey used a tape recorder to take down a conversation deemed private by former President Truman.

The FBI does considerable wiretapping, and I quote from the Reporter magazine: "The FBI, which probably does more wiretapping than any other Federal agency, is at constant pains to depreciate its use of the technique. J. Edgar Hoover's recent public statement on the subject of tapping was made before a House Appropriations subcommittee early in 1950, when the FBI Director said his agents were tapping less than 170 telephones at the moment. Assuming 5 conversations over the average phone each day, 170 telephones would carry more than 300,000 tapped conversations a year. Such a figure is merely a guess, but it compares favorably with the concurrent testimony of Mrs. Sophie Saliba, head of the record file room of the New York office of the FBI. Mrs. Saliba disclosed that more than 3,500 discs of FBI-tapped conversations had been destroyed in 1949. Since a disc can easily hold 5 telephone conversations, probably these discs held at least 17,500 conversations—all obviously the work of the New York office alone.

We supposed that we had proscribed the indiscriminate use of wire taps by section 605 of the Communications Act, but legalistic juggling of words balked our efforts and limited our meaning. The tap apparently incurs no penalty. Only the evidence obtained by a wire tap cannot be deemed legally admissible in evidence. It is the "fruit of a poisonous tree."

Let us now not lose the opportunity to outlaw wiretapping once and for all, except in those cases where it is necessary for our national security. Any wire tapping bill creates a conflict. On the one side we have the ideals of freedom and individual privacy. On the other we have the need to use the most modern techniques to ferret out and prosecute crime, to get after saboteurs, espionage agents, and to protect our national security. The conflict must be resolved. Let us resolve it then with the least injury to our liberties. The requirement of a court order is a proper safeguard. A court order would prevent abuse of the power. I quote from a statement made by the Association of the Bar of the City of New York:

"The importance of a prior court order for any wiretap is much the same as in the case of a search warrant. The requirement of a search warrant is made 'so that an objective mind might weigh the need. * * * The right of privacy was deemed too precious to entrust to the discretion of those whose job is the detection of crime and the arrest of criminals. Power is a heady thing.'" (*McDonald* v. *U. S.* (335 U. S. 451, 455).)

District Attorney Miles F. McDonald testified favorably as to his experience under the New York statute requiring a prior court order for any wiretap: "I think prosecutors, myself included, can be overzealous. * * * The judge is a safeguard." He also testified that he had never had any bad experience so far as leakages in the court are concerned. (Hearings, pp. 80, 82.)

It is not asking too much to give up a bit of our freedom to enable (after a court order has been obtained) the FBI, the CIA, and the Intelligence Services of our Army, Navy, and Air Force, to track down spies, saboteurs, and the disloyal, who would deprive us of all our liberties.

I would oppose any bill that would leave the power to tap in the discretion of the Attorney General, or any designee of his. This is too great a power to lodge in any one individual. Power begets power, and the use of power for power's sake is tempting. Such inordinate power could be used even for political purposes and thus abused. We must remember that we legislate for the future. No one can foretell who our future Attorneys General will be. There is nothing personal in this argument. The Court is the proper determining agent. We are a Government of law, not a Government of men. To my mind, wiretapping involves the presence of an unexpected, silent, furtive, and unwelcome guest at your telephone. It is like the invasion of your proverbial castle. You may not enter anybody's home, even if you suspect a crime has been committed there or is about to be committed, without a search warrant. Is there any difference when you enter the hearth and home by way of a telephone wire? Why should we not in commonsense require a court order in those circumstances just as we do in a case of a search and seizure? Also the agency which does the eavesdropping ought not to be in sole control. The Attorney General should not, because he cannot adequately do so, police himself. No time would be lost in getting the court order and there would be no danger of leaks. In my State of New York, where a court order is required before a wire tap is permitted, experience has shown that the wrongdoer is never apprised beforehand of the intended tapping. Incidentally, Communists no longer communicate by telegraph or telephone. They have received orders not to do so, and they would be fools indeed to use such a form of the transfer of ideas and instructions and propaganda.

I hope the argument made in the House for a wiretap bill with absolute power residing in the Attorney General, will not be made in the Senate. It was most unfortunate that the bill was called an Antitraitor bill. This is a slick slogan which has an appeal to sensation not sanity, to passion not patience, to fear and not frankness. It implies that anyone opposing the bill for the best of reasons, might be branded as one who renders aid and comfort to traitors, which, of course, is absurd.

One might inquire as to why I, or someone else, did not seek to amend the bill that passed the House, by inserting a clause which would have outlawed wiretapping save in the cases I have indicated above. We have rigid rules of jurisdiction in the House, and we were actually considering only a rule-of-evidence bill; a bill involving procedure in the Federal courts. We were not considering an amendment to section 605 of the Federal Communications Act, which involves wiretapping. If such an amendment had been offered, it would have been subject to a point of order, and the Speaker would have been compelled to sustain the point of order.

At this point I should like to go back a bit into the history of wiretapping. In 1934 the Federal Communications Commission was established as an independent agency. Included in the enabling act, as section 605, was a provision intended to outlaw wiretapping once and for all. It read, in part:

"No person not being authorized by the sender shall intercept any communication and divulge or publish the * * * contents * * * to any person * * * and no person having received such intercepted communication * * * shall * * * use the same or any information therein contained for his own benefit or for the benefit of another."

Violations were made subject to a $10,000 fine, 2 years in prison, or both.

Three years later the Supreme Court reviewed section 605 of the Communications Act.

Several defendants in Nardone against United States appealed their convictions of liquor smuggling on the ground that the evidence used against them was the result of taps by Federal agents.

The Court ruled that section 605 applied to all persons—persons as Federal agents and all others. But the Court also ruled that the evidence was inadmissible since the agents violated the law in obtaining such evidence.

But the Federal agents who violated section 605 by tapping were never prosecuted. No one has ever been prosecuted for illegal tapping—except in one case, that of a lawyer named Gruber. The Department of Justice has never gotten after its men for wiretapping. Attorney General Jackson said in 1940:

"I do not feel that the Department of Justice can, in good conscience, prosecute persons for a practice engaged in by the Department itself, and regarded as legal by the Department."

In March 1941, Attorney General Jackson made this new construction of section 605 public:

"There is no Federal statute that prohibits or punishes wiretapping alone."

Jackson said: "Any person, with no risk of penalty, may tap telephone wires and eavesdrop on his competitor, employer, workman, or others, and act upon what he hears or make any use of it that does not involve divulging or publication."

In 1939 Nardone was reconvicted not on direct-wire evidence but from evidence obtained in turn from wiretap leads. The court held the evidence was "fruit of the poisonous tree" and was thus inadmissible. Nardone was again freed.

In conclusion I repeat: Thow clear safeguards around the power to tap; insist upon the court order.

Boston Naval Shipyard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 29, 1954

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I would like to bring to the attention of the other Members of the House of Representatives, a resolution, adopted on February 18, 1954, by the Massachusetts Mayors' Association, concerning industrial type activities performed at the Boston Naval Shipyard. I am in complete agreement with the sentiments expressed in this resolution, and I shall appreciate all assistance which I may receive from my colleagues in the furtherance of my efforts in behalf of the Boston Naval Shipyard:

Whereas the thousand of men and women employed in the Boston Naval Shipyard as our fellow citizens contribute to the economic well-being of our respective cities and towns in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts;

Whereas the employment level of the Boston Naval Shipyard is being reduced incommensurate with capacity employment levels attained during World War II when its high record of accomplishment was established and the present level of employment places the shipyard in fifth position among naval shipyards against second position attained during World War II;

Whereas industrial activities in the Boston Naval Shipyard such as ropemaking, chainmaking, and submarine repair work which by operation have demonstrated considerable annual savings and which are presently threatened or have been discontinued and the work diverted to activities outside the Commonwealth of Massachusetts;

Whereas such action is contrary to the spirit of promoting effective economy in Government operations, will lower the standards of proficiency of performance of Government employees and is contrary to the best interests of the citizens of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts: Be it

Resolved, That efforts be intensified to maintain established shipyard operations economically justifiable; to assign to the Boston Naval Shipyard work in amount such that the shipyard is restored to the No. 2 position in employment level of the naval shipyards; to allay further layoffs at the Boston Naval Shipyard.

By unanimous vote.

PHILIP J. CROWLEY,
President.

EVERETT, MASS., *February 10, 1954.*

Ireland Seeks Only Unification

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 29, 1954

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, recently a group of American editors made a tour of Europe and reported concerning the conditions which they observed in various countries. Their observations regarding Ireland are noteworthy in that they point out the overwhelming interest and concern of the Irish people over the present division of their country as a result of the imposition of the unwanted border across northeastern Ireland by the British Government.

Many Members of Congress have frequently wondered whether the Irish people were themselves greatly concerned over this situation, and I feel that this article by Lee Attelson, which appeared in the New York Journal-American, gives an affirmative answer to this query. Until this border has been eliminated Ireland cannot properly take her place among the nations of Europe, joining in their councils and cooperating in the general program of western European defense. We, as Members of Congress, can indicate our recognition of this desire for unification on the part of the Irish, as well as profess our continued support of the principle that each nation has the sole right to determine the nature of the government under which it prefers to exist, by signing the Fogarty discharge petition now on the Speaker's desk. In this way we express the sentiment of the American people as well as of the Congress that the Irish people have the exclusive right of determining whether their country should be divided or not.

The article to which I referred, reads as follows:

IRELAND SEEKS ONLY UNIFICATION

(By Lee Attelson)

DUBLIN, April 26.—An astonishing air of alooftness hovers over Ireland. It is a sort of mental isolation which is not readily understood.

In eight other countries recently visited by a group of American editors touring Europe, Russia, the need for common defense and related problems are constantly in the foreground.

In Ireland one hears only of internal affairs—unification of Ireland, education in the Irish language, problems of emigration and agriculture are the topics on everyone's mind and tongue.

And, just as the civil war is still being "fought" in our Southern States today, so the Easter rising of 1916 is current magazine material in Ireland.

So we asked the Taoiseach (pronounced Theeshuck) or chief of State, American-born Eamon de Valera, if he thought, in the awful event of another war, Ireland would remain neutral again and if she could maintain her neutrality.

"Yes," the Prime Minister replied, and added:

"You understand of course that we cannot join NATO or an EDC or anything of that nature. Such groups are composed of nations that have their independence and wish to retain it. We are seeking our independence. Our aim is to seek what we have not got.

"Also, the various pacts involved, inherently and explicitly provide that signatories shall respect the territorial integrity of the others.

"For us to join such a group would mean in effect that we were supporting and protecting Britain's right to hold Ireland's six northeastern counties, which would be altogether contrary to the will of the Irish people. Our idea is to get Britain, who in effect occupies the six counties, to restore them to Ireland."

De Valera, who looks extremely well and hale despite his 71 years and strenuous existence (only his eyesight bothers him), pointed out that this unification matter must always be Ireland's greatest preoccupation until it is resolved.

"If," he asked, "Ireland got her unification, would she ever be likely to join the British Commonwealth as a full partner?"

The Prime Minister looked up from his plain desk—a desk without ornaments and at the moment without a scrap of paper on it—and smiled serenely.

"There is," he replied, "no disposition ever again to become a part of the British Empire."

It is interesting to note, by the way, that this leader for independence has in his visitors' waiting room three prominently displayed articles: The American Declaration of Independence, the Constitution of the United States, and a statue of Abraham Lincoln.

Case No. 1

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 29, 1954

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, here is a typical case of extreme hardship caused by the numerous unfair provisions of the McCarran-Walter Act. This case and scores like it demand drastic changes in the act:

Error of pennies in 1922 leads to deporting move.

Herewith find the New York Times report of the tragic happenings under our present immigration laws:

DETROIT, April 11.—Samuel Jones, a 72-year-old Detroit pensioner, faced deportation to his native England today because he forgot to pay for a newspaper more than 30 years ago.

Mr. Jones came to this country in 1922. The newspaper incident occurred shortly after his arrival in Detroit.

He said that while running for a streetcar he grabbed a newspaper and failed to drop any pennies in the coin box. Arrested, he was convicted of simple larceny and fined $15.

Later, Mr. Jones made a 2-week visit to Canada. Under immigration regulations, any alien who leaves the country is considered a new entrant when he returns. In applying for reentry Mr. Jones neglected to tell immigration officials about his conviction. The concealment of the conviction was a violation of immigration laws and Mr. Jones now faces possible deportation.

Mr. Speaker, certainly a case of this sort should be adjusted administratively by a responsible official. The law must be amended to that end.

Address of the Honorable James P. McGranery at the Third Annual Dinner of the Law School Alumni of Duquesne University

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 29, 1954

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following address of the Honorable James P. McGranery at the third annual dinner of the law school alumni of Duquesne University, April 20, 1954:

ADDRESS OF THE HONORABLE JAMES P. MCGRANERY, RECENTLY THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES, FORMERLY JUDGE OF THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA, AT THE THIRD ANNUAL DINNER OF THE LAW SCHOOL ALUMNI, OF DUQUESNE UNIVERSITY, HONORING THE SUPERIOR COURT OF PENNSYLVANIA IN THE WEBSTER HALL HOTEL, PITTSBURGH, PA., APRIL 20, 1954

Mr. Chairman, the Very Reverend Father Vernon F. Gallagher, and the reverend fathers of the congregation of the Holy Ghost, may it please the court, honored guests, members of the law faculty and alumni of Duquesne University, fellow members of the bar of Pennsylvania; I am grateful for the distinguished honor of addressing you upon the occasion of your third annual dinner meeting which takes place three score and sixteen years after the founding of the Pittsburgh College of the Holy Ghost, destined to become, a score and three years later, Duquesne University.

Your law school, at once child and twin of the university, thereupon inaugurated its wisely implemented aim of imparting varied and solid knowledge of law and of preparing its graduates to be representatives of justice, defenders of the weak and unfortunate, and models of the highest American citizenship.

From its beginning Duquesne has recognized that moral training is an essential element of true education, and has fostered in her sons "habits of virtue and moral integrity to form men of deep thought, of solid principles, of virtuous habits, and of sound character." Her alumini have gone forth through the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania—and into other States and other countries to participate in and to interpret international, national and local affairs as leaders of the bench and of the bar.

The members of our bar who have had the good fortune to receive their early legal education in Duquesne's law school, have been privileged: They have been inspired by the example and precept of Duquesne's faculty to walk in the footsteps of the truly great lawyer. In the tradition so eloquently expressed by President Judge Rice, of the superior court, at Lycoming County's welcome to the court within a year of its creation: "* * * any estimate of the truly great lawyer," declared that distinguished jurist, "which omits reference to his integrity would be unworthy. By this I do not mean the mere observance of those common rules of fair dealing which keeps a man from positive dishonor, but those qualities of heart and conscience which make him duly sensible of the responsibility and dignity of his office, either of attorney or judge, and which keep him free in his mental, as well as moral action from every corrupting and every dishonoring influence and motive."

Judge Rice's words reach us down through the years that the superior court has won and held the respect and veneration of the bar and of all citizens of Pennsylvania. Created originally in 1895, to relieve the supreme court by transferring a substantial portion of appellate work, the superior court set up a high ideal and keen sense of responsibility as a standard for discharge of the duties devolving upon it.

Judge Rice's thinking was shared by his brothers, Associate Judges Beaver, Reeder, Orlady, Wickham, Willard, and McCarthy; and by their successors whose names now are enshrined in the hall of fame of Pennsylvania's judiciary. Whether we recall Judges Porter, Beeber, Mitchell, Morrison, or Head; Judges Keller, Trexler, Williams, or Linn—we are reminded of lawyers who, as members of the judiciary, were "uplifted by the consciousness that they were dealing with subjects which involved human rights."

These early judges, like the present eminent and worthy judges of the superior court, in tribute to whom we have assembled this evening, are truly representative of the greatest in Pennsylvania's noted bar. Perhaps one reason that they are thus joined in close fellowship is their shared concept of the legal profession, which has been well described by the words of one colleague:

"Every profession, as a profession, is entitled to be judged by the highest ideals of its best men, and mere love of glory or the acquisition of wealth are not the highest ideals of the best and greatest lawyers. To the ideal lawyer, forms and precedents are not the end of legal learning, nor the mere instruments for winning legal victories, as tricks in a game, but are the means whereby the law is safeguarded and justice is administered in an orderly manner."

The present membership of the superior court, under the leadership of its illustrious president judge, the Honorable Chester H. Rhodes, has merited the esteem of the bar and the public because their legal learning, their unfailing courtesy to contending advocates, their thorough, certain and expeditious performance of judicial duties, their impartial interpretation of legal principles and the conscientious application of those principles to the causes of litigants—with proper protection of the freedoms and rights of every individual—have vindicated Pennsylvania's tradition of a qualified and independent judiciary.

So sincere and earnest has been the conviction that the qualified judge must be completely independent, that we find in the speech of the late E. Hunn Hanson at a political convention in 1896, while placing in nomination Judges Beitler and McMichael after a few months' service following gubernatorial appointments, and Judge Gordon, after judicial service to which he had been first appointed and later elected, this assurance of "* * * the unwritten but binding declaration, that every judge who behaves himself well and administers his high office honestly and impartially shall be retained in the public service. This is a highly beneficent rule, in the observance of which rests the security and safety of our people. In its enforcement, neither party nor faction are known, merit and worth are recognized, and the judicial office is preserved pure and free from partisanship and political obligation. In the Republic, it is true that confidence has at times been shaken in both the legislative and executive branches of our Government, but not in the judicial. The latter, established in the confidence of the community, stands as a bulwark of safety between it and anarchy."

Later, in December of that same year of 1896, the Hon. J. I. Clark Hare, retiring after uninterrupted service since December 1851 in the Court of Common Pleas of Philadelphia County, thus counseled the bar:

"If I ventured a suggestion, it would be that the bar should sedulously maintain the custom of Philadelphia, that judges shall not be dropped at the end of term, in furtherance of practical or party politics. Appointments to office are in fact made by the nominating convention of the party which for the time being has the upper hand, or rather by leaders who control their followers, but the power of ratification still remains to the people, and they are responsible for confirming an unworthy choice. The bar are citizens as well as lawyers. Citizenship in a Republic implies sovereignty, and a sovereign who allows his powers to lapse may lose his crown."

This principle of an upright independent, nonpartisan judiciary has at times been challenged by "a party, which for the time being has the upper hand," as in my own native city of Philadelphia last fall. I am proud and happy, however, that brothers of the bar and other fellow citizens of Philadelphia responded with courage and indignation to this attempt of power-hungry politicians to raid the court and reminded the group of little men who were willing to sacrifice principle to expediency—that the incumbents of the judicial office are never puppets of a party—but instead—the trusted magistrates of the entire community.

Indeed, the sacred functions and the grave respondsibilities of a judge constitute him the conservator of the political institutions of the republic and the bulwark of constitutional liberty.

A judge must be impartial as between opposing counsel in his court; yet he must never be impartial between truth and error, honesty and deceit, integrity and deception. He should be calm and detached as to matters in controversy while the issues are being argued; he cannot remain aloof, however, where counsel become forgetful of their obligations as officers of the court.

Every judge could well model himself after Judge Allison, who, according to the late Reverend Hampton L. Carson, Esquire, "never interposed in the clash of arms between counsel at the bar, however hot the fray, as long as the weapons used were those of the soldier. He put forth his hand with indignation if he saw but the gleam of the dagger of the assassin."

Ours is an ancient and honorable profession and it must be kept so by members of the bar whether serving in the judiciary or as officers of the court. Pennsylvania's legal tradition was borne in earlier times across the sea; and we are heirs at law and in spirit of Lord Bacon, whose familiar essay reads, in part:

"The place of justice is an hallowed place, and therefore not only the bench, but the foot-place and precincts and purprise thereof, ought to be preserved without scandal or corruption. For certainly grapes (as the Scripture saith) will not be gatherers of thorns or thistles, neither can justice yield her fruit with sweetness amongst the briars and brambles of catching and polling clerks and ministers."

The attendance of the courts, said he, are subject to certain bad instruments, amongst which he mentioned: "First, certain persons that are sowers of suits, which make the court swell and the country pine. The second sort is of those that engage courts in quarrels of jurisdiction, and are not truly amici curiae, but parasiti curiae, in puffing a court up beyond its bounds for their own scraps and advantage. The third sort is of those that may be accounted the left hand of courts—persons that are full of nimble and sinister tricks and shifts, whereby they pervert the plain and direct courses of courts and bring justice into oblique lines and labyrinths. And the fourth is the poller and exacter of fees, which justifies the common resemblance of the courts of justice to the bush, whereunto, while the sheep flies for defense in weather, he is sure to lose part of his fleece."

Hence, in the early days of the Province of Pennsylvania lawyers were not held in highest esteem, because distrust of them had been borne here from Mother England. So it was that in the latter years of the 17th century Gabriel Thomas wrote:

"Of doctors and of lawyers, I say nothing; because the Province of Pennsylvania is both peaceable and healthy, having no occasion for the pestiferous drugs of the one, or of the wiles and arts of the other; because they both have license, hangmanlike, to murder and make mischief."

Nevertheless, the intervening centuries have enabled the great lawyers of our Commonwealth to contribute to legal thinking in the Republic.

John Dickinson, of Pennsylvania, authored some of the greatest state papers in revolutionary and colonial history: The Declaration of Rights, The Address to the Crown, and The 13 Articles of Confederation. James Wilson's service on the floor of the Federal convention was of continuing historic importance. Horace Binney was victor over Daniel Webster in the Girard Will case. Jeremiah S. Black defended the liberty of the citizen from the encroachments of the military in the Milligan case. So I could go on and recite names of noted Pennsylvania jurists: George Sharswood, Thomas McKean, Tilghman, founder of the system of equity jurisprudence; or names of Pennsylvania's eminent counsel: Joshua Humphreys, Rawle, Dallas, Lewis, Ingersoll, and others.

The fact that ours is a government of laws not of men is largely due to the Nation's bar who have waged an unending struggle to preserve our constitutional rights in the face of attempted oppression by wealth or privilege or attempted tyranny by pressure groups or political despots.

Today, as in the time of Clarendon, "the law is the standard and guardian of our liberty; it circumscribes and defends it; but to imagine liberty without law is to imagine every man with a sword in his hand to destroy him who is weaker than himself."

Benjamin Franklin, the immortal, adopted Pennsylvanian, upon being asked, after the close of the convention: "What kind of government have you provided?" responded with the terse challenge:

"A republic if you can keep it."

This challenge reaches us today and mingles with the airwaves over which we hear repeatedly from citizens—who should be better informed—persistent references to our Government as as democracy.

That our Republic has safeguarded the survival of democratic principles is not a paradox—but a truism.

We have a democratic way of life because we have a republican form of government.

That is why Daniel Webster declared: "We have been taught to regard a representative of the people as a sentinel on the watchtower of liberty."

The separation of powers has been the constant guaranty of liberty under law. As Hamilton wrote in the Federalist:

"The executive not only dispenses honors, but holds the sword of the community. The legislature not only commands the purse, but prescribes the rules by which the duties and rights of every citizen are to be regulated. The judiciary, on the contrary, has no influence over either the sword or the purse. * * * It may truly be said to have neither force nor will but merely judgment."

Similarly, the advocate who pleads before the court is effective insofar as he performs his duty to his client, per fas and never per nefas, and is ever mindful of his duty as an officer of the court, never forgetful of the eternal and unchanging interests of truth and justice.

A lawyer worthy of the bar's tradition of honor and fair dealing—lives by a code of conduct that has become his second nature. Cardozo has said that membership in the bar is a privilege burdened with conditions. The lawyer is thus considered in his relationship to the client and to the court—He has, in his professional status, an even more far-reaching relationship, namely, his function to the community, local, national, and international. As Professor Matthews, of Ohio University, says:

"Leadership is an integral function of membership in the legal profession."

Lawyers today dominate the legislative and executive branches of the Nation, the State, and municipalities; thereby, no doubt, prompting Henry L. Stimson to declare that "without a bar trained in the traditions of courage and loyalty our constitutional theories of individual liberty would cease to be a living reality."

And if our constitutional theories are today under attack, the legal profession owes a duty to the Nation to unite in defense against the enemy whose ruthless goal is the overthrow of our form of government by force and violence, by wile and confusion, by infiltration and attack.

There is no peace in this modern world—which is more slave than free. And the last citadels of liberty may be our political institutions with the heritage of 12 centuries of devotion to the cause of love of truth, love of justice.

Unquestionably the lawyer who recites the eternal verities of the Declaration of Independence, while denying the existence of the Creator who is the source of all human rights—the lawyer who argues for the enforcement of the Constitution while holding membership in a surversive organization pledged to replace the American form of government with atheistic dictatorship—is engaged in mockery of the court he is sworn to serve as officer.

Such a member of the bar is an anomaly at least, unless one would classify him in harsher terms.

If such men have infiltrated even in small number the legal profession, the time has come for the bar to examine itself.

Homer D. Crotty states that "in the law schools, the overwhelming emphasis is on instruction in legal principles and in legal reasoning. The teaching of ethical and professional standards is emphasized in but a minority of the schools."

And again: "There seems to be a great reluctance in many schools to inquire into the loyalty of applicants for admission as to whether or not such applicants are or ever have been members of the Communist Party."

Certainly it is at least a contradiction to enroll a student who is to become an officer of the court which he is dedicated to destroy.

If, as Wigmore maintained, the legal profession is a guild of public officers, the preceptees must have a basic record of courageous and loyal citizenship upon which to build a structure of devoted service.

It is not enough for bar associations to set forth canons of ethics and deliver speeches on the responsibility of the bar to the public unless the membership—and particularly those who accept positions of leadership—set an exemple of willingness to sacrifice for public service of the Nation. The officer who advises young lawyers to sacrifice personal selfish interest to the duty of patriotic service; and then, when called to serve, pleads commitments to the bar association, is not advancing the cause of the bar in our country.

While the duty of public service is rewarding in satisfaction of a duty fulfilled, it is never accompanied, and should not be—by material or financial gain.

Moreover, in today's confused atmosphere of news-slanted reporting by a press which lacks chronology as well as accuracy, the holder of public office—no matter how conscientious—is subjected to headlined, gratuitous accusations by the reckless, the political demogags, the subversive conspirators—some of whom have infiltrated our bar. It cannot be denied that continued acceptance at the bar of any of these "false witnesses" is an indictment of the bar itself.

Note well: Such character assassins should not be identified, however, with the courageous public official or representative who, in the discharge of his sworn duty, exposes to the public view the wrongdoer or the traitor.

A good citizen, like a worthy lawyer, knows that, in the phrase of St. Thomas, the tranquil living together in order is the essence of peace.

If living together in order and living together in tranquillity are the two primary elements of social life, it is the duty of the bar to "awaken again the consciousness of a juridical order resting on the supreme dominion of God and safeguarded from all human whims; a consciousness of an order which stretches forth its arm, in protection or punishment, over the unforgettable rights of man and protects them against the attacks of every human power."

Well might the bar of our day adopt as exemplar that valiant scholar, G. K. Chesterton, of whom Walter De La Mare wrote:

"Knight of the Holy Ghost, he goes his way.
Wisdom his motley, truth his loving jest;
The mills of Satan keep his lance in play,
Pity and innocence his heart at rest."

Economic Aid to India Is Imperative

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 29, 1954

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, rumblings of discontent if not extreme hostility can be heard from some Members of the House and Senate to the proposed plan of the administration to give India $85 million in economic assistance and $19 million in technical aid for the coming fiscal year. Senators Knowland and Dirksen, and Representatives Judd and Smith voice their opposition in terms of their resentment to Prime Minister Nehru's so-called dynamic neutrality and his differences with United States policy on Red China, the H-bomb, and the collective security program.

Yet Nehru, on balance, is one of our best friends in Asia, and India is desperately in need of the proffered help for her industrial development. Nehru maintains a policy of persistent and vigorous opposition to communism in his country. He has jailed 10,000 Communists since India became an independent state. He vigilantly weeds Communists out of the civil service and his Congress Party is a constant thorn in the side of the Communists.

Senator Knowland has been quoted as saying that Nehru does not speak for Asia. But we know that Nehru carries India on his back like Sinbad carried the Old Man of the Sea. Certainly, he speaks for India, and when he speaks, all Asia and all southeast Asia listens to him. Nehru is a man not only to be reckoned with, but to be encouraged. Depreciate him too much and India, like China, will be lost to us. And we cannot afford to lose India especially with Indochina teetering on the Communist brink.

How short-sighted and inept can these "China Firsters" get? They insist on labeling all our aid as anti-Communist, and they insist on paeons of praise and gratitude from all governments receiving our aid. These nations do not want to be looked upon as pawns in the East-West conflict. Proud nations like India resent this attitude which robs the giver of his grace and the recipient of his pride.

The point 4 aid now being contemplated for India, is worth many millions of dollars of military aid. India is a democracy. The "right to dissent" is inherent in democracy, and India has the right to criticize us just as we have the right to criticize her. If we cut off economic aid to India because of her dynamic neutrality in the cold war—just as we in our early history were neutral in European conflicts and via our Monroe Doctrine—India might well fall on "t'other side."

They Saved One

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PATRICK J. HILLINGS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 28, 1954

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, on leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an editorial from the San Diego Union of April 22, 1954. This editorial on the Petrov case in Australia points up the fact that we must continue to work for the development of a policy of liberation for the enslaved people behind the Iron Curtain. This case is evidence that the Russians are having real trouble in holding down the desires of the people behind the Iron Curtain to be free.

The editorial follows:

They Saved One

Australia's commendable action in saving Mrs. Evokiya Petrov, wife of a Red diplomat who deserted to the Soviets, warms the heart of freemen around the world.

To the Communists, Mrs. Petrov was important only as a means of gaining revenge against her husband. It is doubtful if she has diplomatic information of value. But her rescue upholds the principle of the sanctity of the individual.

Beyond matters of principle, the true value of this dramatic rescue lies in the example which has been given other Communists who may be considering defection. The handling of the Petrov affair and the previous United States skill in safeguarding Yuri Rastovorov, who escaped from the Reds in Tokyo, should encourage other key Communists who are wavering.

Representative Hillings, Republican, of California, has gone so far as to wire the President urging that he declare it a matter of public policy that the United States will provide asylum for any Communist government official who is being detained against his will.

Mr. Hillings earlier introduced a bill in Congress setting forth specific methods for encouraging more Red leaders to defect.

Dealing with Red officials is distasteful in any sense of the word. But it is to our advantage to encourage as many of the Communists as possible to desert the enemy and reveal their knowledge of Soviet affairs to the free world.

My Duty to Home and Country

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. HESS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 29, 1954

Mr. HESS. Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of pride that I insert in the Congressional Record an essay by James Grace, of Cleves, Ohio, entitled "My Duty to Home and Country."

This essay was one of the prize-winning compositions in the contest conducted by the American Legion, Department of Ohio, and reads as follows:

My Duty to Home and Country

(By James Grace)

Hi, there! I'm little Joe, the average American boy. My big brother is GI Joe. Say, fellow, isn't it great to be an American—to have the privileges of an American home and the thrill of being a part of the greatest Nation on the face of the earth. May I tell you just how I feel? I believe it is my duty to protect, preserve, and uphold the rights and traditions founded in my home and country.

However, before I can intelligently understand what my job is, I must first know the full meaning of the word "duty." Daniel Webster states that duty is "the conduct due to parents and superiors; respect." He also implies that "duty" carries with it a moral obligation to do and not to do certain things. I should like to reflect upon those things I should do for my home and country.

The foundations of the individual life—mental, moral, and physical—are laid in the home. My attitudes toward my home must be based on helpfulness and cooperation with others. By living and working with others in the home, one acquires the virtues, habits, and skills needed for the highest success in life. This in turn helps to build a better and stronger America for coming generations. I must contribute to that cause now before it is too late. Duty to my home should be mingled with pride. It isn't something I have to do, but something that I should want to do. I should keep my home a happy place in which to live.

My country is made up of my home alongside of all my American brothers' homes. These homes make up our Republic. My duty to my country is to be loyal and true to to the ways of our great Republic. I am proud to be a member of the greatest democracy on earth. A democracy which stands for the freedoms of religion, speech, press, and assembly. The duty of every American is to be willing to serve faithfully and defend fervently the principles upon which our country is founded. Our fathers, and their fathers, and those before them, fought untold centures and labored through long trials and hardships that we might enjoy the rights of freedom, justice, and equality. It is my privilege to see that they remain on the face of the earth.

No man can do the job of preserving the American home and way of life alone. It takes all of us pulling together. Cooperation begins in the home and spreads into the community, the Nation, and throughout the world. We should strive for the highest type of citizenship and all that it implies. If every citizen would stop to think for a moment of what it means to be endowed with the greatest gift of community existence—that of having a part in the government of humanity—he would find it easy to perform his duty. I like to recall the words of Abraham Lincoln, "Let us all remember that all American citizens are brothers of a common community." To these words, I like to add those of Theodore Roosevelt, "We have room in this country for but one loyalty—loyalty to the United States." This is the way we all should feel. America is not belligerent; she seeks peace with liberty, equality, and justice for all.

It is the duty and should be the hope, prayer, and will of each American to live, fight, and, if need be, die for my home, your home—our country.

Who Took the Beating?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PATRICK J. HILLINGS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 28, 1954

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, the San Diego Union on April 24, 1954, praised the splendid work of a House Un-American Activities subcommittee under the chairmanship of the gentleman from California [Mr. JACKSON] which held hearings recently in San Diego. The fine and fair manner in which Mr. JACKSON conducted the hearings and the constructive work accomplished in San Diego are living proof of the great value and importance of congressional investigations. Mr. JACKSON and his colleagues should be commended for their splendid efforts in exposing the Communist conspiracy. The article which appeared in the San Diego Union follows:

> WHO TOOK THE BEATING?
>
> The hearings conducted by a subcommittee of the House Un-American Activities Committee have done much to dispel the erroneous impression that the investigations here would be other than a dignified attempt to unravel the story of Communist conspiracy.
>
> If there was any browbeating involved it was on the part of the defiant witnesses, not the committee conducting the hearing.
>
> Representative JACKSON, Republican of California, and Representative DOYLE, Democrat of California, are to be commended for their ability to keep the investigations on a constructive level despite the obvious attempts by some witnesses to make the hearings a hoax.
>
> The committee added much to San Diego's knowledge of the workings of the Red conspiracy. This is one of the advantages of taking the hearings to local communities.
>
> Representative JACKSON recently commented that the nine men selected by Congress for the Un-American Activities Committee take more of a day-to-day beating than any other Members of the House.
>
> He added "only when entering the field of communism is there a public effort to stop investigations." What he says unfortunately is true. It is time we made more effort to support this committee.
>
> While it is apparent that the Communists in the past made a major attempt to gain a stronghold in San Diego, testimony would indicate that their program failed. The Reds retain cells in San Diego, but they have fought a losing battle. Such setbacks, however, give no cause for apathy in the constant effort to guard the many military secrets in this county.

Celler Protests United States Arms Agreement With Iraq

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 29, 1954

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, it is now revealed that the United States has executed an agreement for arms aid to Iraq and has indicated the existence of a similar agreement with Saudi Arabia. Strangely enough, the news of this agreement broke in Bagdad, and Washington was then forced to confirm it. Why was Washington reluctant to reveal the pact here? Did it wish to keep it under wraps? The Department of State well knew that the contemplation of sending arms to Iraq and Saudi Arabia was met with great protest from many Members of the House and Senate as well as by others.

Iraq says the aid is unconditional. The State Department indirectly indicates that the arms are for self-defense and will not be delivered if they are to be used against Israel. It is pertinent to ask what guaranties were demanded from Iraq that the arms be not so used. It is equally as pertinent to ask what will the United States do if Israel is attacked. We have no answer to those questions. Has the State Department an answer?

It is supposed that these arms will be used by Iraq against possible Soviet aggression. The Arab States do not acknowledge any threat of Soviet aggression. Witness the recent action of Vishinsky in the Security Council, who exercised two vetoes recently in favor of the Arab states.

The one hostility openly acknowledged by the Arab States, is their hostility against Israel. Iraq, the recipient of arms, has refused to enter into any armistice agreement with Israel. Iraq has banded together with other Arab nations into the Arab League. We know by its own word that the Arab League is bent on Israel's destruction. Nuri Said, speaking before the Iraqi Parliament said:

> The Arab League Security Pact is designed to protect us against only one danger—the Zionist danger.

On March 3 of this year, the Embassy of Iraq in Washington issued a lengthy statement urging Arab unity against Israel. King Saud of Saudi Arabia stated in January of last year:

> Israel to the Arab world is like a cancer to the human body, and the only remedy is to uproot it just like a cancer.

The tensions in the Middle East between the Arab States and Israel are grave. Certainly, this agreement of arms to Iraq can hardly serve the interests of peace in that area.

I renew my protest against the shipment of arms to Iraq. I demand to know the exact term of this arms agreement executed by the United States and Iraq.

My Duty to Home and Country

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIVER P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 29, 1954

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, the winners of the American Legion of Ohio essay contest were in the Capitol last week and it was my pleasure to meet with them. One of these winners was Miss Victoria Bapst, of Lakewood and the 23d District. Inasmuch as her Congressman was not in the city, it was my pleasure to act as her host and to congratulate her upon her very fine essay on the subject "My Duty to Home and Country" which I ask be printed below for the information of my colleagues.

The American Legion is greatly to be congratulated for its sponsorship of this contest, a part of its great program of developing Americanism and patriotism in this land.

The essay follows:

MY DUTY TO HOME AND COUNTRY

(By Victoria Bapst, Lakewood, Ohio)

"My home and my country"—those are beautiful words, for America is my country, and my country is my home. It is a gift, a precious heritage, and yet this home of mine is all too often taken for granted. The gift implies a duty and indeed there are duties to my home and country.

The first is to know my country. That is, to know everything about it; the history of it, the story of how it was discovered, settled, made independent; how it rose in farming, in manufacturing, in improved transportation, and in numberless ways of progress. We must know how it grew from a few colonies to a mighty nation, spreading from one ocean to the other, and how it struggles even today in a world of strife to keep peace. I must know of its present activities and of its hopes and plans for a good future. Yes, I must know my country as it was yesterday and as it is today.

Next, I must love my country. Knowing what it has done, can do, and will do, I cannot help but love it and the people who make it what it is. I must love it with the love of a man who has a precious gift—a gift so precious that he dreads to lose it. I must love it with the spirit that rises above all to say, "God, this is my home. Love it as I do and watch over its people." If I can know and understand that this, my home, is the realization of the dreams of men who lived long ago and loved it even then, enough to fight and die for it, then surely I too, will love my country as I should.

Thirdly, I must serve my country. Of course, it is said that those who serve greatest, serve as the Armed Forces who protect our land, and if necessary, die for it. But there are many ways to serve, and they all lead to one thing, being a good citizen. The average good citizen pays taxes, accepts jury duty, obeys laws, and does much more, but still the average ctizen can usually improve. There are civil-service units, blood donations, relief funds. There are food and clothing drives for the unfortunate victims of famine and war. Even the motorist who stops for a stop sign when no one is looking and the pedestrian who waits for the light to change when no cars are coming, the people who take time to help the old, blind, or very young to cross a street; even these are helping to serve their country, each in his own way, for each one has his own job. It may not be as important or a noticeable one, but it is a small part of a great plan to keep a strong nation strong by serving her to the best of our ability.

The final duty you may have guessed. As you have seen the duties we owe to our country are like to those we owe to God, Himself; that is, to know, to love, and to serve. And so our final duty, even as we pray to God, is to pray for our country. We must thank God for what He has given us. We are so fortunate. We must ask Him, humbly, to forgive the evils within our land and to see only the good—the love that comes from it. We must beg Him to care for our land, to watch over its people and to protect them always.

These are our duties: to know, love, serve, and pray for our country, for our country is America—and America is our home.

Exposition and Parade of Progress on Rehabilitation and Employment of the Physically Handicapped

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 29, 1954

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the House to the Exposition and Parade of Progress on Rehabilitation and Employment of the Physically Handicapped to be held in the departmental auditorium on Constitution Avenue, April 28–30. A special invitation has been extended by the President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped to all Members of Congress and their families to attend the exposition which will feature advances made during the past 25 years in methods of rehabilitating physically handicapped individuals and in methods of placing them in jobs suited to their abilities.

I understand that the exhibits will include a number of actual handicapped workers demonstrating their abilities to perform many different kinds of work. The exposition will be open from 12 noon to 5 p. m. and from 7 to 10 p. m. each of the 3 days.

The special room set aside for the developments in artificial limbs, will, I know, interest many Members since much of this research was made possible by grants from congressional appropriations.

The exposition has nationwide interest because, as I understand it, exhibitors from more than 20 State are providing displays covering the gamut of activities performed by the handicapped. I wish to personally urge that as many of you as possible attend.

Go-It-Alone Policy Is Wrong

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 15, 1954

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include in the RECORD a letter from a constituent on the important issue of United States involvement in the war in Indochina.

The letter expresses a viewpoint which I believe many of us can agree with. Because I have been deeply impressed with the message which came from Mrs. Elfriede M. Hasse, I have asked for the unanimous consent of the House to make it an official part of the RECORD.

The letter follows:

SHILLINGTON, *April 28, 1954.*

Hon. GEORGE M. RHODES,
Representative, State of Pennsylvania,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: A few days ago I read in our newspaper a very interesting editorial which suggested that the reader should write his own opinion about Indochina to his Representative in Congress. To me that seems an excellent idea and after careful consideration I would like to present my feelings over this problem to you.

First of all, I am very much opposed to the idea that the United States should even consider to go it alone if necessary. If something must be done then it should only come to pass as an absolutely united action and by that I mean a more effective one than happened in the Korean war.

If Indochina is as important, as the leading men of our country make us believe, and I don't doubt it, then it certainly must be just as important to England and the rest of the free world. I cannot see why we should be ready to again become involved in a war if the other nations keep themselves out of it. Either the problem is as burning as it is presented and then it certainly should not be too difficult for other nations to join the United States or, in my humble opinion, we should also keep out of the conflict.

Another reason why I am not eager to see our Nation sacrifice her sons in that jungle war is the problem of France itself. I cannot help but feel that France and its incompetent policy is highly to blame for the whole situation in Indochina. Had she given complete freedom to the people of Indochina, as it was promised, I hardly believe that a fanatic idea such as communism would have found its way so easily into the hearts of the people. The colonialism of France is by no means a very noble chapter in the history of the world. I fail to see why through France's shortsightedness and greed our Nation should become involved in a conflict which emission nobody can quite survey. As far as I could observe, the United States received little help from her ally, France; as a matter of fact, until now it seemed to me that the Government of France went out of its way to always act contrary to that which the United States wanted her to do. I do not think that our allies should be our slaves and puppets, but I certainly expect them to side with us on vital issues.

The last, and in my estimation most important, reason for this letter is my fear of a world war. Korea was already a very dangerous moment, but by the grace of God we managed to limit the hostilities to that country. Will we be so successful a second time? And if we are not, what then? The horrors of modern warfare are so tremendous that nobody can begin to survey it in its entirety. Indochina may be very important indeed, but to our country and its cities, our people and their welfare, mankind with its culture and civilization, which is not created only by us but by generations of noble minds before us, seem to me more, much more important. There never may be a world war. Because if it does come, it means the end of everything for which we now are ready to fight. There must be a way of peace. Because certainly even the irresponsible, fanatical men in the Kremlin cannot close their eyes to the fact of absolute destruction of their country and people if they don't follow a mighty nation on the path of peace.

The United States of America is this Nation, sir, chosen by divine providence for this sacred mission. It is the Nation which by its very foundation and development is, or should be, ready today to stand up to the terrific pressure of materialism, oppression, and the forces of destruction and show the world that the will for peace, the power of a moral force is stronger than the most powerful weapons and more victorious than the shadows of evil which holds our poor world so merciless in its grip.

If this can be done, then truly do we stand at the dawn of a new and glorious age.

I most sincerely hope that your decision may be both right and wise.

God be with you.

MRS. ELFRIEDE M. HASSE.

Shipbuilding Industry May Be Most Vulnerable Area of Our Preparedness Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 29, 1954

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, the House today is acting upon the Defense Department appropriation bill. It is a good measure and the Appropriation Committee is deserving of a great deal of credit for the fine work that it has done in providing necessary funds for the various military departments.

However, I feel impelled to say that if Congress does nothing further this year to implement our preparedness program than to approve this bill it will not have done enough. That may appear to be a strong statement. I only wish I could make it stronger for I believe it sincerely. In my remarks during the debate on the bill I mentioned some of the reasons for making that statement. It is supported by the statement made to the House Merchant Marine Committee yesterday by Rear Adm. W. D. Leggett, Jr., United States Navy, Chief of the Navy's Bureau of Ships, in which he said that our shipbuilding industry may be the most vulnerable area of our preparedness program. He was not talking about Navy shipyards. He was talking about our commercial shipyards. Their plight is deplorable from a defense point of view. Congress must do something about them soon.

I trust that Members of the House will read Admiral Leggett's statement which I include herewith:

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, it is a privilege to appear before you this morning to give you my views on H. R. 8637, a bill to amend title XI of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936.

There is an urgent requirement today for new-ship construction, not only to modernize our merchant marine but, of equal importance, to provide critically needed assistance to our private shipbuilding industry. Both are essential to our national security.

Most of the ships in our active merchant fleet are approaching obsolescence. Nine-tenths of the dry cargo ships in the national defense reserve fleet have a design speed of only 11 knots or less. These consist chiefly of about 1,400 Liberty ships built under wartime conditions and obsolete when their keels were laid.

The Reserve Fleet is also deficient in large oceangoing tankers and troopships of adequate speed.

Last summer, the Department of Defense, during the course of a congressional hearing, went on record as to an immediate deficiency of 214 merchant-type vessels, consisting of 165 cargo ships, 6 large passenger ships and 43 large tankers.

Correction of these deficiencies would not only strengthen the national defense, but would also revive the distressed private shipbuilding industry. This industry cannot be maintained by naval shipbuilding programs alone. It must also have the support of a healthy merchant marine.

As Coordinator of Shipbuilding, Conversion and Repair for the Department of Defense, I have certain responsibilities for mobilization planning, for procurement of ships for defense purposes, and for coordinating repairs and conversions within the United States. I have a primary and continuing interest, therefore, in the maintenance of an adequate defense nucleus of operating shipyards which can be expanded, if necessary, to meet the sudden demands of a full-scale emergency.

The situation today in our private shipyards is so critical that I have grave concern whether the industry can meet mobilization production schedules.

You will recall that at the outset of both world wars, we had a year or two to recruit and train shipyard personnel, expand our facilities and start building up our merchant marine. Even with this notice, our output of new ships barely managed to catch up with the serious losses we were encountering. In fact, most of our ship construction became available near the end or even after the termination of hostilities.

Our present situation is often compared to 1939. I believe this to be somewhat misleading. The situation now confronting us with regard to the shipbuilding industry is more like 1941 than 1939, in the sense that we cannot count on a prolonged period for mobilizing needed skills and facilities.

It is apparent that the industry is not prepared today to meet initial wartime requirements. Our private yards now have about 118,000 employees, less than one-third of the total in December 1941. They have only about 29 large oceangoing merchant ships under construction, a small fraction of the work underway in 1941. All of these 29, except 3, are scheduled for completion this year.

In order to improve the economic health of the industry, the Navy, for the past several years, has been awarding most of its shipbuilding to private industry. During fiscal 1954, all new naval construction is going to private yards. Up to the present, we have been reasonably successful in helping to maintain, through normal competition, a fairly broad base of operating yards widely dispersed throughout our coastal areas.

With regard to repair work, the Navy, last year, began awarding the overhauls of most active fleet auxiliaries, together with selected combatant ships, to private yards. Previously, these yards had been regularly receiving repairs to service craft, overhauls of reserve fleet ships and similar work. During the past 2½ years, the Navy has awarded repair and overhaul work having a dollar value of approximately $271 million to private yards.

I regret to say, however, that this additional Navy work has not stabilized private yard employment which, in the last several months, has declined by another 3,000. A further drastic reduction is expected later on this year, as the privately-owned and Mariner construction now on the ways is completed.

This will result in an increase in the proportion of employees engaged in Navy work to total private-yard employment. Unless new work is forthcoming, the Navy will thus find itself in the uneneviable position of being the industry's principal support.

I am particularly concerned with the fact that highly skilled design and production personnel are rapidly being dispersed among other industries which can provide more stable employment. We may not have time, in the event of another emergency, to either recruit or train new workers.

The Merchant Marine Act of 1936 was enacted to foster the development and to encourage the maintenance of a merchant fleet capable of serving our needs in peace or in war. It was intended to provide adequate incentives for a continuing merchant-ship program. This objective is not, at present, being attained.

Based upon our analysis of workload needs of the industry, it would appear that the shipbuilding potential of our country must be supported by some interim emergency program. It is not my responsibility to recommend what such a program should be. To provide a minimum sustaining workload for the industry, however, it should consist of at least 20 ships annually and start at the earliest possible time. It would not, in any sense, be a permanent solution to our problem. It would, however, keep a number of yards from closing in the next year.

The only permanent solution is, of course, to provide greater incentives to commercial operators to place orders for new merchant ships on a continuing basis. There are a number of legislative proposals now before the Congress which may help to acomplish this purpose.

I am authorized to say that the Department of Defense supports H. R. 8637 in principle. The Department is in accord with the purpose of the bill which is to stimulate new ship construction. More modern and improved types of ships may be brought into being and the industry may be greatly benefited. These are worthwhile objectives. While certain revisions may be desirable, the Department considers that specific comment on detailed provisions of the bill is primarily within the jurisdiction of other Government agencies. I am informed that the Bureau of the Budget has not yet formulated its position on the bill.

In closing, I would like to repeat that the Navy is gravely concerned with the plight of the shipbuilding industry which promises to become the most vulnerable area in our preparedness program.

Conditions have seriously deteriorated since 1952 when shipbuilding was in effect declared a distressed industry. Many firms are today faced with the prospect of closing up, unless new work is forthcoming. The Navy will continue to do what it can to ease the situation. However, it is certain that the Navy's annual construction programs cannot alone support a mobilization base of operating shipyards capable of the expansion necessary to build a wartime merchant marine.

I wish to thank you, Mr. Chairman, and members of the committee for inviting me to testify on this important subject.

Letter Carriers Are Best Salesmen of America for American Ideals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 5, 1954

Mr. HAGEN of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, the American letter carrier, city, village, and rural, is probably one of the most familiar sights to more Americans than any other individual alive. He is truly the ambassador to every Main Street, avenue, and highway in the land as he makes his daily rounds. There is no one who has ever failed to receive a visit from him. His daily presence on our streets is a constant reminder of the stability and the indestructibility of this land of ours.

Because the letter carrier is such a familiar sight, and because he makes his appointed rounds with such smooth efficiency and uninterrupted continuity, too often he is taken too much for granted and little effort is made to recognize his true worth.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include the following tribute to Uncle Sam's Main Street ambassadors from the March 1954 issue of the magazine Glass Horizons, published by the Glass Bottle Blowers' Association of the United States and Canada, of which Lee W. Minton is the editor:

UNCLE SAM'S MAIN STREET AMBASSADORS

In Washington last month a group of serious gentlemen carrying bulging briefcases climbed the steps of the House Office Building to keep a date with members of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. What the committee members heard that day and on succeeding days gave them a severe case of burning of the ears.

The men carrying the heavy briefcases were spokesmen for the National Association of Letter Carriers—largest of the Government employee unions—and other postal organizations. They had several thousand unkind words for the "piddling" pay increase for postal workers offered in a bill before the committee. With charts and reams of statistics, the NALC spokesmen built a solid case in favor of granting letter carriers and other postal employees a more substantial pay boost.

That is the kind of fighting the NALC has been doing in behalf of letter carriers since it was organized in 1889 in Milwaukee. As Government employees, the letter carriers do not have the strike weapon and must depend on the persuasive arguments of the NALC before Congress to win pay increases and improved conditions.

The NALC, however, has not always enjoyed the right to petition Congress. Theodore Roosevelt, while President, issued an order forbidding a postal employee to even speak to a Member of Congress about postal wages. All in all, the NALC fought for more than 20 years for the right to place letter carriers' grievances before Congress. Finally, the Lloyd-LaFollette antigag law was passed giving Government workers the right to petition "either individually or collectively for improvements in the conditions of their labor, including hours of labor and compensation." The same act forbade Government workers from joining an organization which might call for a strike against the United States.

The NALC, along with other Government workers' unions, has exercised its right to address Congress wisely and with good results. It has campaigned without letup for improvements in the letter carriers' working conditions.

Right now the NALC is deeply concerned with the problem of winning letter carriers a pay raise. Starting pay for carriers, NALC spokesmen point out, is $1.615 an hour—almost 18 cents an hour less than the average earnings of factory workers. Even after years of service, they told the House committee, letter carriers still lag far behind comparable municipal workers in salary schedule.

The NALC tackled the current pay battle with plenty of experience. Its first big fight was elimination of the spoils system, which was virtually abolished in the postal service in 1893, when President Harrison placed every free delivery post office under civil service.

Next big fight was to reduce hours of work. Before the turn of the century post-office employees worked 7 days a week, 52 weeks a year. Often their workday exceeded 12 hours. Starting pay of a postal employee about that time was $800 a year.

Every victory for the NALC has come hard. Undoubtedly many of them would not have come at all except for the fierce loyalty which members gave the organization. Today, membership exceeds 100,000, spread over 4,250 cities in the United States, Puerto Rico, and the Hawaiian Islands. There actually are more members of the letter carriers' organization than there are actual regular carriers on the payrolls. This is because retired carriers maintain their membership and "substitute" carriers, also eligible, are anxious to join the NALC.

For protection of members, the NALC maintains a Mutual Benefit Association, which has paid out more than $9 million in death benefits, and a sick and accident insurance program which affords insurance against loss of earnings during illness. A recently established hospitalization plan has been hailed as one of the best ever offered Government workers.

Since 1917, the NALC has been an American Federation of Labor affiliate. NALC President William C. Doherty is a vice president and executive council member of the AFL and the federation's chief spokesman on Government employee affairs. Vice president of the NALC is Jerome J. Keating, an enthusiastic and effective spokesman on legislative affairs, who also edits the highly respected journal of the NALC, the Postal Record. Peter J. Cahill, the secretary-treasurer, is responsible for administration of the sound fiscal policies of the association, which only recently completed construction of a handsome new headquarters building in view of the Capitol.

No Troop Involvement in Indochina

SPEECH

OF

HON. TIMOTHY P. SHEEHAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 29, 1954

Mr. SHEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, in the summer of 1950, when I first campaigned for the House of Representatives from the 11th Illinois District on the northwest side of Chicago, I found the majority of the people I contacted to be violently opposed to the Korean police action. As a result, I was highly critical of President Truman and the then encumbent Democrat Congressman for their part in the Korean fiasco. My stand on the Korean question, I feel, was very much instrumental in enabling me to win election to the 82d Congress by a substantial majority.

In my reelection campaign in 1952, the voters in my district were convinced that with the election of a Republican President and a Republican Congressman from the 11th District, they would see definite action with regard to ending the Korean mess. When President Eisenhower ended the Korean war, the people reacted most favorably.

By reviewing the recent pronouncements of President Eisenhower, Vice President Nixon, and Secretary of State Dulles, a real possibility exists that we will become embroiled in the southeast Asian war before the end of this year. From recent statements of Mr. Churchill of England, Mr. St. Laurient of Canada, and others, we alone seem to be heading into this war, in spite of President Eisenhower's thought that the free nations will present a concert of readiness to react in whatever way is necessary.

To my way of thinking, this will mean, as in Korea, the United States will suffer over 90 percent of the casualties and pay more than 90 percent of the costs.

From mail received from my constituents, and from direct conversations while home over the Easter recess, I have not heard a single word in favor of using our boys to fight in Indochina.

Experience proves that if we attempt to fight a limited war as we did in Korea, we cannot win. Experience proves once a war is started, no one can control its course. Experience proves that three wars in the present generation—World War I, World War II, and Korea—have not eased world tension or brought peace. Experience proves that Soviet communism thrives on wars, as evidenced by the fact that communism today governs or controls 800 million people as against 180 million during World War I, not to mention the vast increase in control of land and resources. Experience proves that military victories alone do not solve world problems.

It is my belief that the American people are not ready for world leadership, because it entails conquest, occupation, and governing the conquered people. It would forever entail a forced contribution to military service from every American home, huge foreign aid outlays, and overburdening taxation, all of which would bring on socialism or government control of our lives.

From a purely practical standpoint, getting involved in Indochina would, as a famous American general remarked about Korea, be a war against the wrong enemy, at the wrong time, and in the wrong place.

If President Eisenhower and the Republican leadership commit our troops into southeast Asia, I am of the opinion the people will show their disgust by returning a Democrat-controlled Congress in November, and a Democrat president in 1956.

Knowing that the will of the majority of my constituents is firmly against committing our boys in another Korean type of war, and knowing from recent experience that military victories do not bring peace, if Congress is given to vote on this issue—which President Eisenhower says will happen—I will vote against sending our troops to Indochina and southeast Asia.

Address by David Himmelfarb to Massachusetts Mayors Association, Sheraton-Plaza Hotel, February 10, 1954

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 29, 1954

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address by David Himmelfarb, master ropemaker, at the Boston naval shipyard before the Massachusetts Mayors Association at the Sheraton-Plaza Hotel on February 10, 1954.

The Boston naval shipyard lies within the heart of the congressional district which I represent here in the National Legislature. As a result, my interest in maintaining this naval shipyard at peak efficiency both for our national security and in the best interests of the New England economy is perhaps greater than that of any other member of the New England delegation. It is my belief that my colleagues here in the House should be well-informed, and I submit this address by Mr. Himmelfarb to their attention:

> The thousands of men and women of the Boston naval shipyard for whom I am a spokesman have asked me to convey a message of sincere appreciation to your association for the opportunity you have extended to us to tell you the Boston naval shipyard story. These men and women living in the communities of which you gentlemen are the chief executives are comforted in the knowledge that as their fellow citizens you necessarily are concerned with their problems and can be of considerable assistance toward their solution.
>
> Considering the short time your business meeting will allow me, I do not plan to go into a sales talk to impress you with the importance of the Boston naval shipyard. The 12,000 employees, living in virtually every city and town within a 50-mile radius of Boston, are the testimonies of importance.

Facts relating to the shipyard and its tie-in with your communities are cited in the brochure which I have for you. As a shipyard activity, the Boston naval shipyard surpasses all others in New England. In the State of Massachusetts alone, the commercial shipbuilding and repair industry involves spending approximately $60 million in wages and materials annually. Over and above that the Boston payroll and operating costs amount to approximately 1½ times this figure and if the value of the material is added, represents a sum well in excess of $100 million annually. If we consider the moneys spent by naval personnel, which are necessarily affected by curtailment of the working force of the shipyard, you will readily recognize that our problem of coping with the layoffs at the Boston naval shipyard must be considered your problem too.

In the press last week considerable space was devoted to the demands of our congressional leaders from Massachusetts, to place defense contracts in distressed areas in Massachusetts. The cities of Lowell, Lawrence, New Bedford, and Attleboro were cited particularly. The failure to secure the contract for construction of the carrier at Quincy will, it was stated, result in a substantial layoff at the Fore River plant. With the program, in effect, of cutting the number of Federal employees and services in your cities, you need no stretching of the imagination to visualize the further impact that layoffs connected with Government work will have on your communities. The matter I lay before you today is to be aware of the fact that layoffs in Government plants are adding to your community problems and being aware of the fact, give us, the men and women of the Boston naval shipyard, your active support for a better break.

I state the matter in this way because, as we have seen in the past, layoffs and curtailment on the basis of alleged overall economy are not giving our people a fair break. Let me illustrate what I mean: There is no doubt but what the concentration of shipbuilding skills and traditions of New England cannot be equaled anywhere. Proximity to Europe, of course, was and continues to be a basic advantage. A naval ship crippled in the North Atlantic can get to Boston easier than to New York or Philadelphia and hence can be salvaged and returned to duty that much faster. Our heavily industrialized areas supply an invaluable reservoir of skills which can be duplicated nowhere. In World War II this reservoir of skills was able to build up a peak force of 50,126 employees. At that time, Boston naval shipyard was the second highest of the 10 naval shipyards in the country. The accomplishments at the Boston naval shipyard have become a matter of record of which we can justifiably be proud. Yet, since World War II, the Boston shipyard has dropped from second place to fifth place. Whereas in 1945, the Boston shipyard employed 13 percent of the total naval shipyard employment, today the total is 10 percent. Whereas other shipyards, compared to their peak World War II levels for present employment levels were cut only by as low as 50 percent, the Boston shipyard suffered the greatest percentage reduction at 74 percent. With further layoffs scheduled, this would put Boston even in a worse position.

The employees of the shipyard find this trend hard to understand. We know that our workmanship is of the highest quality. Our costs bear comparison with any others. The need for getting the work done is here. The fleet must be serviced. Considering all these factors we feel that we are not unreasonable in expecting better treatment. A small, but pertinent case in point, concerns the ropewalk in the Boston naval shipyard. This is an establishment which, since 1834, has provided the Navy's cordage needs while serving as a research and development center for the Navy's cordage problems. The savings to the Government by operation of the ropewalk runs into thousands of dollars annually. Yet, despite this fine record of achievement and demonstrated savings, the press recently reported a recommendation of a congressional subcommittee to close down this activity. If this recommendation is carried through, I can inform you from my own personal knowledge that fine caliber men, after devotion of years to work in such a speciality, will be tossed into the labor market, broken in spirit and not readily employable. Similarly, the forge shop in the Boston naval shipyard is a pioneer in the specialized art of developing and making the strongest anchor chain in the world. Yet, despite the demonstrated savings in cost, anchor chain is being procured outside of Massachusetts. With respect to submarine work, a highly specialized type of ship repair work, comparison of jobs between naval shipyards, shows that the Boston naval shipyard effected consistently higher quality work at lower cost, yet the Boston naval shipyard lost out in further assignment of this work. The net result of a higher cost to the Navy with resulting layoffs at the Boston shipyard, will be a loss of skills which, in terms of industrial know-how, may be devastating. In these cases I cite, I stress that savings are demonstrated and are a matter of record. Yet, curtailment and layoffs are in order. Where then does economy become a basis for layoffs?

In answer to this, let me quote an editorial of the Boston Post of February 4: "The consolation contract for destroyers given to Fore River, despite a lower bid from the Bath, Maine, yards is added proof that here was a great deal of lobbying and juggling in connection with awarding the contract. Fore River was outlobbied and outjuggled." This, indeed, expresses that, with respect to distribution of work in shipyards, Massachusetts economy is again being forced to play second fiddle.

The message I would like to leave with you is that what happens to the employment of the Boston naval shipyard is in greater or lesser degree vital to your communities. Toward the objective of allaying the spread of unemployment in Massachusetts communities, the men and women of the Boston naval shipyard look for your assistance.

What do we want you to do? Help our efforts to make our congressional and administration leaders aware of the necessity for avoiding layoffs and curtailments in our shipyard.

Help us get a fair share of the work.

How can you do it? We bow to your experience in the matter.

Flood Protection for Duarte

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PATRICK J. HILLINGS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 28, 1954

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, as the Representative in Congress from the Duarte area, I have been working over the past months, in cooperation with local officials, to assure Duarte of adequate flood protection. This is a continuing problem which requires constant vigilance on the part of all concerned. I am happy to report at this time that definite progress is being made.

The Federal Government is pushing ahead with its work to complete the Whittier Narrows Dam. Waters from the mountains and foothills above Duarte will flow into its giant reservoir. Already work is in progress, or plans are being formulated for the various tributary channels which will funnel the waters into Whittier Narrows. On December 17, 1953, I wrote to the Secretary of the Army, who is responsible for flood control matters, and urged that sufficient funds for this purpose be requested in the President's budget. This request was later fulfilled. In early 1954, I appeared before the House Committee on Appropriations to support my request for adequate funds. Subsequently the House passed the appropriation bill providing the money to hasten the completion of the Whittier Narrows Dam.

The disastrous forest fires of this winter aggravated Duarte's flood problem. The fires stripped the mountainsides of protective vegetation which under ordinary conditions would hold the soil in place. When the rains came, mud, debris, and water poured in Duarte which caused damage to homes. Because of the emergency situation created by the fire, President Eisenhower, at my request, issued an executive order declaring that a major disaster situation existed and he directed that all Federal agencies cooperate to the fullest extent.

In March of this year, while the Committee on Appropriations was considering the budget for the Forest Service, I again asked the Congress to take cognizance of the need for reforestation and other necessary improvements in Angeles National Forest which lies north of Duarte. The committee sent one of its members, Congressman OAKLEY HUNTER, of Fresno, to make a survey of conditions in Angeles National Forest. The House has already passed the appropriation bill for the Forest Service, and it is now pending in the other body—Senate.

Mr. Speaker, I should not sit down without paying tribute to the fine public service rendered by the Duarte Dispatch and its editor and publisher, Mr. L. C. Fulbright. This newspaper has been of great assistance to me in keeping in close touch with the community. It has been not only a mirror of public opinion, but it has helped me in reporting to my constituents from Washington.

At this point, I wish to place in the RECORD an article from the Duarte Dispatch of April 15, 1954, which describes the status of local flood-control projects planned by the county of Los Angeles in Duarte.

The article follows:

SOLUTION OF DUARTE FOOD PROBLEMS SEEN—COUNTY ANNOUNCES PLAN TO CONSTRUCT $2,500,000 FLOOD CONTROL SYSTEM

What is undoubtedly the best news for Duarte citizens (especially those in the northern section) to be released in a long while is the announcement regarding flood control emanating from Supervisor Legg's office this week.

Relief from the mudflows which caused extensive damage to many Duarte homes during the winter storms this year was promised this week as County Supervisor Herbert C. Legg disclosed plans of the Los Angeles County Flood Control District to construct a system of debris basins and channels in the Bradbury-Bliss, Maddock Canyon area.

The $2,500,000 system was outlined in detail by H. E. Hedger, chief engineer of the district, in a report this week to Legg.

Construction priority has been assigned to the Bradbury-Bliss, Maddock Canyon project because of the recent fire in the watershed area of these canyons. Present plans call for construction of debris basins and a portion of the proposed permanent channels in the two canyons this year.

Flood-control engineers estimate that the basins should be completed in time for the 1954–55 rainy season, Legg said. He emphasized that completion of the basins would remove much of the danger of mud and debris from Duarte homes and property, but that waterflows would still be experienced in the principal water-carrying streets until the entire system of permanent chanels is completed.

Construction schedules for 1954 call for completion of a debris basin in Bradbury-Bliss Canyon with a permanent channel from the basin to the intersection of Lemon Avenue and Winston Street, and a second basin in Maddock Canyon with a short length of permanent channel ending in a temporary channel which follows the present stream bed to the head of Vineyard Avenue.

Future construction entails building a third debris basin in Spinks Canyon and completion of the system of permanent channels to remove waterflow from the streets. This future system of channels will connect with Bradbury Canyon Channel at Lemon and Winston, run diagonally east to a point about 500 feet north of the Foothill Boulevard-Royal Oaks Drive intersection, where it will connect with the proposed Spinks Canyon Channel.

From this point the channel continues on a diagonal line to the north roadway of Royal Oaks, runs parallel to Royal Oaks to Mount Olive Drive, then turns south in Mount Olive to the Santa Fe Dam Reservoir below the Atchison, Topeka, & Santa Fe railway tracks. The permanent channel from the Maddock Canyon runs diagonally west to join with the Bradbury-Spinks trunk channel at Mount Olive and Royal Oaks.

Legg cautioned that residents on Vineyard Avenue will not experience complete relief from flood conditions until the permanent channel for the Maddock Canyon Basin is completed. He pointed out that by constructing the debris basin this year, the main threat to life and property from heavy rocks and debris would be removed, but that Vineyard residents still face prospects of waterflow and some mud during periods of heavy rain.

My Opposition To Sending American Troops to Indochina

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 29, 1954

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to make clear my opposition to sending United States Armed Forces to Indochina.

The issue in Indochina is not whether the advance of communism should be stopped, but, rather, how best to stop it. Even if we concede that the Soviet Union and Communist China have captured control of the Viet Minh movement, the driving force of that movement remains the same as it was 8 years ago. That force is nationalism. The mainspring of that nationalism has nothing whatever to do with the politico-social theories of Marx, Lenin, Stalin, or Mao Tse-tung. That driving force has its basis in the desire of the peoples to be free from western domination. France could have granted independence at the time the Philippines, Indonesia, Burma, India, Ceylon, and Pakistan were made independent. The fact that she has not granted complete and unequivocal independence to date only serves as fuel to the burning fires of nationalism.

Eight years of civil war have demonstrated that those fires cannot be quenched by military means alone. Just as French Union forces have been increased, the Viet Minh forces have grown. As the United States has increased provisions of materiel to the French Union forces, Czechoslovakia, the Soviet Union, and China have increased the flow of arms to the Viet Minh. After 8 years of fighting, it may realistically be said that the territory under French control remains the same as at the outstart.

In the psychological and the political war—the war to win the loyalty of the people, the war which takes precedence over military conflict—the French are on the defensive and no military measures can be successful until the people are granted the freedom to which they have so long aspired.

When military measures have failed in the limited area in which this war has been fought during the past 8 years, it is not likely that success will be found by increasing the intensity of operations on both sides. More American planes, compensated by more Soviet planes, cannot basically alter the will for freedom in the Indochinese people. An extension of this war, locking Communist China and the United States in a death struggle, will not serve to gain the freedom of the Indochinese people.

Whether the United States were to send troops into Indochina on her own, or under the cloak of a 10-nation southeast Asian defense arrangement, does not alter the material fact that military measures are secondary to the winning of this war.

Whatever constructive rule the United States may assume in resolving this conflict, the intended results will not be served by sending United States troops to Indochina, and I, personally am definitely opposed to such action. All of the shooting in the past 8 years has proven that all the people of Indochina want is their independence. Had this independence been granted long ago, this war could have been avoided.

Murphy Army Hospital

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 29, 1954

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following statement given by Past Commander Anthony D. Tieso of the Disabled American War Veterans, Department of Massachusetts, before a meeting held on April 28 in the House Veterans' Committee, concerning the proposed closing of the Murphy Army Hospital at Waltham, Mass.:

Statement by Anthony D. Tieso, of Mattapan, Past State Commander, Disabled American Veterans, Department of Massachusetts, Before the Bay State Congressional Group, Concerning the Proposed Closing of Murphy Army Hospital

Ladies and gentlemen of Congress, this morning I am representing the Disabled American Veterans, Department of Massachusetts, upon the authority of State Commander George J. Lynch. Unfortunately, Commander Lynch, due to illness in his family, cannot be present. If you will bear with an old sailor, I wish to give you a message.

The proposed closing of the Murphy Army Hospital is needless. The Federal Government wishes to deprive dependents of servicemen of Massachusetts of medical care and hospitalization on the grounds of economy. This, may I assure, is false economy and will bring untold hardships and great expense to mothers, sons, and daughters of many a Bay State soldier.

For example, the nearest Army hospital to Boston is at Fort Devens, a distance of over 45 miles from the capital of Massachusetts.

An expectant mother, receiving pre-natal treatment, is forced to travel long distances for medical examinations and will not receive any reimbursement for her expenses. This will occur if Murphy Hospital is closed, though the Federal Government, by law, is supposed to give full medical care to the dependents of our soldiers.

They are not receiving anything free from the Federal Government. When a man enlists in the Army of the United States, he automatically receives the benefits of a serviceman.

When the United States takes away these benefits, it affects the morale of every man in the uniform of this country. Secretary of the Air Force, Harold E. Talbott, while speaking in Massachusetts last Monday, disclosed that enlistments are dropping at an alarming rate. This, according to Secretary Talbott, was due to lowering of morale because benefits are being stripped from the servicemen.

Massachusetts sent over 500,000 men and women into World War II. During the Korean conflict, over 100,000 Bay Staters served their country. Today many of them still wear the uniform of this country. They have distinguished themselves on the field of battle.

Now the Federal Government rewards them by attempting to close the Murphy Army Hospital in Waltham, an institution that is needed by the soldiers from Massachusetts.

Thousands of mothers, sons, and daughters, miles away from their loved ones in uniform, are to be the victims of economy. Economy will not keep this country strong against aggression. Only our fighting men, possessed with courage, strength, and a high morale, can keep this country strong.

But the Federal Government can cause untold damage to our Armed Forces. A soldier from Massachusetts will suffer immeasurable harm if the Murphy Army Hospital is closed.

The Disabled American Veterans requested President Eisenhower, the Members of the House and the Senate, to convert Framingham VA Hospital into a Federal Soldiers' Home. This request was denied by the Federal Government.

Today, the Disabled American Veterans of Massachusetts strongly protests the closing of Murphy Army Hospital in Waltham and urges you to do everything in your power to help the mothers, sons, and daughters of every soldier from Massachusetts.

Thank you for listening to an old sailor.

Power Partnership Must Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 29, 1954

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following editorial from the Oregon Journal of April 23, 1954:

Power Partnership Must Work

Time is running out, powerwise, in the Pacific Northwest.

This was made unmistakably clear by the report of the engineering committee of the Pacific Northwest governors' power-policy board at Victoria, B. C., Wednesday.

This report, drawn together by 25 leading engineers representing all major Federal, regional, State, and municipal systems and private companies for the guidance of Northwest governors, paints this realistic picture:

The region, including Northwest States and British Columbia, has approximately 7 million kilowatts of installed capacity today.

It will need at least 13 million kilowatts by 1963–64 at present rates of growth that have held up since 1920.

That means that 6 million additional kilowatts of installed capacity will have to be in production at the end of the decade.

And it has only 4 million kilowatts of additional capacity in sight; that is, under construction or definitely projected.

If that means anything—and this is the most accurate coordinated estimate yet made by authoritative sources—it means that the region will be short at least 2 million kilowatts of power by 1963–64.

The simple arithmetic of this situation emphasizes the extreme urgency of promoting more starts by whatever agencies are in position to make them.

It spells out in cold figures the need for putting a real power partnership on the track and making it run—from the senior partner, Uncle Sam, down to the smallest project by the smallest company, city, or PUD.

The governors of the Northwest States know all this.

The 11 power systems that make up the Northwest power pool know it.

One of the results of this knowledge is a group of five power-partnership proposals involving various combinations of public and private power systems in the region.

Another result is a flood of applications for power permits, public and private.

But none of these partnership proposals has been carried through. None is ready. The attitude of the administration and the Congress is undetermined.

And almost every individual project, from the city of Tacoma's Cowlitz program to British Columbia's Mica Creek project, to PGE's Deschutes program, to the city of Seattle's Boundary project, to Idaho Power's low-dam program on the Snake, or the Corps of Engineers' Libby project either has determined local opposition or runs into the highly technical international questions concerning upstream-downstream benefits and payments.

What can be done, therefore, to get these projects unstuck?

What can be done to arouse the Congress?

What can be done to overcome local, and sometimes shortsighted, opposition?

The governors' committee is working manfully at the problem. It is attempting to evolve a list of projects on which all can agree and behind which united support can be alined. It seeks agreement on one or two big dams that can be started and will take up the slack until partnership deals can be wrapped up. It hopes to have such a program ready for the next meeting at Spokane June 23–24. Some observers felt that it should have been ready last Wednesday—at least a start.

It's no small matter, developing 6 million kilowatts of power in 10 years. Thirty or forty dams and several billion dollars are involved. Some very complicated legal and engineering problems are also involved. Not to mention financial problems.

But we believe that these difficulties can be overcome. We believe a workable and working power partnership can be developed. These things can be done because they must be done. Merely understanding the magnitude of the task and agreeing on a starting point helps. It helps a lot.

Wiretapping Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK B. BROOKS
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 29, 1954

Mr. BROOKS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, at no time during his long and distinguished career has the leadership of the Honorable Sam Rayburn been more clearly evidence than in his splendid speech before this body on the wiretapping legislation. Appealing for sound, nonpartisan judgment, Mr. Rayburn urged the adoption of the substitute offered by the gentleman from Louisiana, Hon. Edwin Willis, placing the matter in the hands of the traditional law-enforcement agency of this country, the Federal courts. Throughout this entire proceeding it was noted by the membership-at-large that our able colleague, Mr. Willis, continued forthrightly refusing to be led astray.

The statemanship of these two outstanding Americans and Democrats was lauded by Paul Cook, editorial writer for many years on the Beaumont Enterprise, Beaumont, Tex., in a judiciously phrased editorial which appeared in this exceptional Texas newspaper on April 10, 1954. I commend it to my colleagues as a tribute to the astute judgment of that scholarly editorialist, Mr. Cook, and as a fitting tribute to the esteemed Honorable Sam Rayburn, beloved throughout the width and breadth of this country as "Mr. Democrat" and the Honorable Edwin Willis, the finest flower of the Acadian traditions of democracy and freedom.

The editorial follows:

Wiretapping Evidence

Two of the best arguments that could be offered for protecting American citizens from abuse of police authority through wiretapping came from Representatives Willis, of Louisiana, and former Speaker of the House Sam Rayburn.

The Louisiana Representative, whose bill requiring Federal court approval before the Attorney General can order wires tapped was adopted by the House when passing the bill to legalize use of wiretapping evidence in Federal courts, said he saw "no difference in principle between the requirements for a search warrant before a man's home can be entered and a requirement for a warrant before his home can be entered via wiretapping."

Sam Rayburn called the attention of the House to the fact that "Attorneys General come and go," but "faith in the perpetuity of Government rests in the courts of this country."

Both Mr. Willis and Mr. Rayburn defended a basic principle of the American Government, whose primary purpose in all matters of domestic concern is to safeguard the rights and liberties of the individual citizen.

The two schools of thought on wiretapping evidence stand at opposite extremes: Mr. Justice Holmes denounced it; other persons think it sometimes becomes necessary to fight the devil with fire. So the move was made to present in court evidence obtained by wiretapping as the only effective way to deal with spies, traitors, saboteurs, and other enemies of the United States.

The analogy between a search warrant and the requirement of the Willis amendment is a good one. No public official of this country, no matter how high his office, should have authority to invade a man's home without a search warrant, which no such official now has under the law.

Wiretapping is an invasion of a citizen's privacy. He may be a criminal, a subversive or a decent and loyal American citizen. The utmost care must be exercised, therefore, in seeing that the innocent citizen's rights are protected, even though a few crooks and scoundrels slip through the meshes of the law.

Obtaining court permission to tap a wire ought not to interfere seriously with any investigative work or procurement of evidence the Attorney General may think necessary. Even if it did interfere, it is better to err on the side of liberty than to subject American citizens, good or bad, to police authority that could be easily abused.

As Mr. Rayburn remarked, Attorneys General are subject to the same human frailties other persons have. While a like observation might apply to Federal judges, the American people trust their Federal judges to be fair, and know they are above politics.

Messages to the Washington Street Baptist Church, Lynn, Mass., for Scrutiny 100 Years Hence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 29, 1954

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article from the Daily Evening Item, Lynn, Mass., of Friday, April 23, 1954, with respect to the hundreds of messages to the citizens of Greater Lynn, Mass., of 2,054, being packed in the ingenious time capsule saluting the centennial of the Washington Street Baptist Church. The time capsule was designed and presented the parish by the General Electric Co. The capsule was buried in the base of concrete at fitting ceremonies on the church lawn on Sunday, April 25, 1954, and it is warranted by General Electric engineers to last more than a century.

The article follows:

World Leaders See Religion as Mankind's Hope for Surviving Atomic Destruction in 100 Years—Messages Sent for Centennial

(By Paul A. Haley)

A dynamic 20th century civilization which has achieved great scientific strides and improved beyond the comprehension of preceding generations the material wants of mankind has yet to fathom the depths of its greatest problem—understanding the hearts of mankind.

This is the composite opinion of the Nation's industrialists, theologians, editors, political leaders, educators, and plain citizens, who, in an avalanche of responses, have sent messages to the Washington Street Baptist Church for scrutiny 100 years hence.

The answers received by the pastor, Rev. Robert Emery Baggs, to the hundred of letters he sent out to leaders of modern thought both here and abroad, have been amazing.

They include such national and world leaders as Archbishop Richard J. Cushing of Boston, through an editorial in the Pilot, diocesan newspaper; President Eisenhower, Gov. Christian A. Herter, ex-President Herbert Hoover, Secretary of State John Foster Dulles, the editors of Time, Life and Fortune, President Harold Case of Boston University, the Right Rev. Monsignor William E. Drapeau of St. Jean-Baptiste Church, Rev. Harold W. Buker, D. D., pastor of the "mother" First Baptist Church; and among scores of others including Mayor Arthur J. Frawley, leading Jewish rabbis, and pastors of local churches.

All of them will be buried in a scientifically-fabricated copper time capsule to be placed into a bed of poured concrete and buried on the lawn of the downtown Lynn church Sunday at 3 p. m. at impressive exercises concluding the centennial program of the parish.

The intent of the members of Washington Street Baptist Church is that it will not be opened until the members of the church in the year 2054 celebrate the second century of the church in the service of Christ in Greater Lynn.

Speaker at the exercises will be Rev. Issac Higginbotham, D. D., executive secretary of the Massachusetts Baptist Convention and head of the 300,000 Baptists in the Bay State. Brief remarks will also be made by Mayor Arthur J. Frawley, the Rev. David B. Howe of the United Baptist Church of Saco, Maine, and son of the late beloved Rev. Chester H. Howe, for 20 years pastor of the local church; the present pastor, Rev. Robert Emery Baggs, and others.

Last week's issue of Life magazine devoted a full-page editorial, The Christian Hope, to the request of Mr. Baggs that its publisher, Henry R. Luce, submit a message to the people of 2054.

"Religion," says the editorial, "will not save civilization except by saving the soul of the individual."

The Luce publication, Time, features theologian Henry Pitney Van Dusen for its cover portrait, and, to comply with the request of the Lynn pastor, devotes its cover story to the trend of modern theology exemplified by his career as head of Union Theological Seminary. Both magazines were sent by Mr. Luce to be included in the time capsule as his contribution for the people of 2054.

Time and Life are only two of many national and international publications to evidence interest in the time capsule to be buried on the lawn of the Lynn Church.

The editors of the Christian Century have devoted a full page in its current issue to discussing the probable course of religion and mankind's spiritual advancement in the next century.

At the request of Archbishop Richard J. Cushing, of Boston, last Saturday's issue of the Pilot, the diocesan newspaper, contained an editorial by Rt. Rev. Monsignor Francis J. Lally, a native of Swampscott, forecasting the hope of the Roman Catholic Church for the next century. Both Archbishop Cushing and Monsignor Lally joined in letters to Mr. Baggs extending their warmest congratulations to the Washington Street Baptist Church on its centennial."

The entire issue of the Pilot, containing the editorial, will be included in the time capsule as will Saturday's issue of the Christian Science Monitor, an international daily, which also devoted an editorial to the subject, including reference to the fact that the founder of the Christian Science faith, Mary Baker Eddy, had her inspiration while living in Lynn.

In his editorial, Erwin D. Canham, famous editor of the Monitor, says:

"Here is a clear call to recognize that the ultimate source of tyranny is not to be looked for in the Kremlin but deep in the human mind itself, and that thinking, not bombs, must root it out. This is our contribution to the time capsule of the Washington Street Baptist Church and our faith is strong that in 2054 humanity will have measureably progressed toward recognizing the incalculable potencies of spiritual thinking to heal the world's desperate ills."

In his expression of the attitude of Archbishop Cushing and the Roman Catholic millions of the greater Boston area, Monsignor Lally, in his editorial in the Pilot, says in part:

"For the church, of course, a hundred years is merely as a day and we can be sure that the same realities that occupy our attention today will be, in the flavor of later times, giving hope and inspiration in the century ahead.

"Even while the scenery changes and in one direction or another men seem to advance, the spiritual values on which our constant destiny depends remain ever constant. A resolute faith in the truth of Revelation, a firm hope in the promises of Christ, and a life expanding in the love of God and man—these must stand as the key to success in every generation and in whatever country."

The editorial board of the Encyclopedia Brittanica, in an analysis of the events of the world in both 1854 and thus far in 1954, submit this summation from the Sanskrit in A. D. 500, as epitomizing their hope for mankind a century hence:

"Learning is a name superior to beauty; learning is better than hidden treasure. Learning is a companion on a journey to a strange country; learning is strength inexhaustible. A man in this world without learning is as a beast of the field."

An entire inside spread of two pages in the current issue of the Crusader, national Baptist news-magazine, features the Lynn time capsule, together with a picture of the church, its young pastor, and the General Electric Co. designers, Albert Hansen, Jr., and Carl L. Pike.

To its 2 million readers from coast to coast, the Baptist magazine offers this thought for the members of the Washington Street Baptist Church in 2054:

"We cannot pretend to know what mundane, or interplanetary news will be flashed on the telescreens of March 29, 2054. But the eternal news, then as now, will not be what man is doing, but what God did for man on the first Easter. Let us keep Easter perpetually in our hearts, in 2054 as we did in 1954—with our daily lives proclaiming, "Christ Is Risen."

From President Eisenhower, who also sent a letter congratulating the Lynn church on its present centennial, came an autographed message to the people of 2054 expressing the thought that the "America of your century will be as virile a force in a greater world as it is in our generation, and that you will be living in a generation when war, hatred of one another, and man's inhumanity to man, will have been replaced by the great traditions of the Christian faith."

And from the desk of busy Gov. Christian A. Herter comes the following, constituting a part, only, of his message to the Massachusetts citizens of 100 years hence:

"Today we retain precious freedom in America. If this is all that remains of our Nation when this message is reread 100 years from now, it is a sound inheritance. But we also hope and pray that posterity will find the same kind of prosperity, natural resources, expanding economy, opportunities, good health, and brotherly understanding that Americans now enjoy.

"Underlying all this is our common faith in God, the basic foundation stone which made America great and will continue to perpetuate our Nation's strength, I hope, for many centuries ahead. Let our future hold fast to the traditions and the spiritual devotion of the past and let us always work to improve our present."

From former President Herbert Hoover came the following message, in part, from his home in the Waldorf Astoria Towers in New York City:

"The land frontier of America has been conquered. But the frontiers of science and better understanding of human welfare are barely opening.

"This new land, with its high promise, cannot and will not be conquered except by men and women inspired by concepts of free spirit and free mind.

"And it is those moral and spiritual qualities which arise alone in freemen which will fulfill the meaning of the word 'American.' And with their fulfillment will come centuries of further greatness for our beloved Nation."

From the Christian Friends of the Anti-Defamation League in Chicago came a letter of warm congratulations and thanks that this organization founded by Rabbi Irving S. Rosenbaum to accentuate better relations with all faiths should be asked to contribute material to the time capsule. The Christian Friends Bulletin, the league's magazine, devotes considerable space to the centennial program of the Lynn church in its current issue, which will be buried in the time capsule.

From Chairman Leonard Hall, of the Republican National Committee, came a warm message for the Republican Party in the year 2054. Mr. Hall, who was requested to submit the material because this is also the 100th anniversary of the GOP, being founded at Ripon, Wis., inclosed a copy of his eloquent address at the 100th anniversary program at the Wisconsin town on March 20, together with his autographed photograph.

Another American institution celebrating its centennial this year—the Yonkers Savings Bank, of Yonkers, N. Y., has expressed the following sentiment:

"As emissaries of all mankind, it is our fervent hope that the Washington Street Baptist Church, now entering its second century will continue to grow in spirit and in truth and in the knowledge that those who come within its portals will add to the cumulative goodness of the next century."

A much-appreciated letter of felicitations has been received from Rabbi Roland B. Gittelsohn, of Temple Israel, Boston, expressing regret that due to the Passover season, he was unable to compose a message for the year 2054, and extending the congratulations of the people of his great Boston Temple. "I rejoice with you," the Rabbi says, "and hope that the future of the Washington Street Baptist Church will be one of illustrious accomplishment and spiritual and material success for you and your people."

Mayor Arthur J. Frawley, explaining that he laid aside all other commitments to be present at the centennial banquet of the church on Wednesday and plans to attend the time-capsule ceremonies, has gone to considerable time to pen a message to the people of Lynn of 2054.

We are living in a period of inflation during which time we have seen the cost of living increase tremendously in the matter of a few years. This condition has continued for several years, but I observe a recession from that high pinnacle of spending. This recession, in part, was undoubtedly caused in our community by a curtailment of spending by the Federal Government for war materials and implements. It is the hope, however, of the elected officials of our Federal Government that this recession is but a temporary thing.

The city of Lynn has just completed the construction of three new school buildings—the Ingalls, the Edward A. Sisson, and the Julia A. Callahan Schools. We have also completed additions to the Sewall-Anderson on Pine Hill and the Pickering Junior High School in Wyoma. We are in the process of completing an addition to the Capt. William G. Shoemaker School at Regina Road. Despite this new construction, we still find ourselves with crowded conditions in our classrooms and face the problem of additional schoolhouse construction when our city finances permit it.

We have extended our water-supply system toward the Lynnfield line, and have plans for the construction of a new standpipe and pumping station in that area. We have extended our sewer system throughout the Ward 1 and Ward 7 areas and are presently engaged in the expansion of one of our main water-supply ponds.

I observe a feeling of unrest and fear in the minds of many people because of the recently developed hydrogen bomb. We have been told that the exploding of one of these bombs in a city comparable to Lynn would completely destroy every living thing within the city and demolish every structure within its boundaries. This, very naturally, creates a fear in the minds of our people. I believe it has caused many people to turn more frequently to Almighty God to pray for protection and help in these trying days.

I believe the people throughout the country are becoming more conscious of their dependency upon God and becoming more pronounced in their reliance on God's help.

We hope that we will surmount all these fears and continue to build our country to a stronger and more God-fearing Nation and give it to our descendants 100 years hence in a more sound and more religious state than we now observe it.

One of Lynn's leading Catholic clergymen, the beloved Rev. Myles J. McSwiney, pastor of St. Joseph's Church, has submitted a message which the parishoners of the Washington Street Baptist Church in the year 2054, upon opening the buried time capsule, will deliver to the then pastor of St. Joseph's Church to be read to its parishoners of a century hence.

Father McSwiney concludes his letter to the pastor of the Washington Street Baptist Church by expressing his "congratulations on the 100th anniversary of your church, and my personal good wishes."

Rt. Rev. Msgr. William E. Drapeau, pastor of St. Jean-Baptiste Church, in a searching message to the parishoners of St. Jean-Baptiste Church in the year of Our Lord 2054, said, in part:

"There has been great progress in science in our day, and we benefit greatly from these things that were given us by God for our use. Still this progress has also brought such instruments of force that mankind has today the means to destroy whole nations. Did man learn to control these powers? You are the judges, and I may only hope that he did learn.

"We have today, also, a battle of ideologies, many of which tend to take away from man his faith in God, and some of these even deny the existence of God. How many became the victims of these false doctrines? You alone may count them.

"We are working today to bring mankind to the realization that we are all the children of God and that we were made by Him and for Him. What is true today and shall also be true in your day is the great and solemn truth: 'I am the Lord thy God; thu shalt not have strange Gods before Me.' "

From the third assistant secretary to Sir Winston Churchill, Prime Minister of Great Britain, came to the church a courteous letter stating that while the statesman had read with great interest the invitation to submit a contribution, that he was unable to comply because of his preoccupation with the current status of world events and his duties in the House of Commons. He did however, the secretary said, send his sincere personal congratulations to the Washington Street Baptist Church on its centennial.

A message of hope and inspiration, despite the worldwide repercussions of the recently exploded H-bomb in the Pacific, is contained in the contribution of the Rev. Benjamin P. Browne, executive director of the Board of Education and Publication of the American Baptist Convention, with headquarters in Philadelphia.

"Over our world of 1954," he says, "hangs the sinister shadow of the H-bomb. The diameter of its destrcution has been set at 30 miles * * * and in this moment there are threats of new wars in the Orient. Many pessimists predict the annihilation of the human race, and some scientists say that we have only a limited time left on this planet.

"Despite these gloomy predictions and these fearful threats of destruction, I here record the confidence of believers in God that nothing that has occurred in our generation has changed our faith in a sovereign God. Recent events have only deepened our faith that God is the supreme ruler, who will overrule the madness of man by His eternal wisdom and power.

"We salute you, church members of 2054 and you Christian leaders who are carrying on in God's tomorrow. The God who has been our help in ages past will be your help in ages still to come. Because of our faith in Christ, we greet the unseen with a cheer, for we hold to the faith that overcomes the world."

From Very Rev. Archmandrite Christopher Argyridies, pastor of St. George Greek Church of Lynn, came a beautiful message to his parish a century hence, including the following expressive paragraphs:

"You must always remember that your ancestors migrated to this city of Lynn, Mass., 150 years ago. They were organized into a small community by the name "Greek Orthodox Community of St. George" and then they established a small church and a Greek school to perpetuate their religion and their language and their Greeek traditions in this country, the United States of America. But after 150 years they found out that their community buildings were not suitable for the new generation. Therefore they decided to build a magnificent community center with a modern new Church of St. George on this centrally located site bounded by three streets: South Common Street, Church Street and Blossom Street.

"They had struggled hard to obtain these buildings to continue their traditions for a religious and national point of view. The hopes and the prayers of these people centered around four great orthodox ways of Christianity: To preserve for them the Divine teachings and holy traditions of their Greek orthodox religion and in doing so to make them better citizens of this wonderful, freedom-loving country which is theirs.

"It is our prayer at this writing that in the year A. D. 2054, these objectives will have been realized and those members of the Greek community who now read and listen to these words will embody the ideals and principles which their ancestors of 100 years ago held aloft for them.

"Our future prayer is that the fine spirit of brotherhood which has existed between our churches down through the years will continue to exist, through the century to come, and forever."

Lauding the Washington Street Baptist Church as home of the second oldest Boy Scout troop in the area served by Bay Shore Council of Greater Lynn, Arthur A. Schuck, chief Boy Scout executive of the United States, has sent a message for the members of that organization 100 years hence.

Secretary of State John Foster Dulles, submitting a lengthy and meaty message for the people of 2054, says: "Any nation which bases its institutions on Christian principles cannot help but be a dynamic nation. Institutions born of faith will inevitably perish unless they are constantly nurtured by renewed faith."

Dr. Herbert Gezork, president of Andover Newton Theological School, which has given the Lynn church several of its pastors, including the present incumbent, the Reverend Robert Emery Baggs, says.

"At present it sometimes looks as if mankind would destroy itself by the power which the new Atomic Age has put into our hands. We can only pray that God will give to the statesmen of the world vision, patience, and wisdom so that we may be spared the catastrophe of further terrible world wars."

Speaker Joseph W. Martin, of the United States House of Representatives, submitting an eloquent three-page message to the American people of 2054, concludes his review of the great traditions of the Nation with the following two paragraphs:

"No other land has ever held life so completely embodying the aspirations of a free people as the America of 1954. True the American dream has never been defined in all of its majestic scope and grandeur and in all of its service to human felicity. Every race and every creed has contributed to its robust splendor. Every generation, every age, the people of every clime, have embraced its promise, and been nutured and strengthened by its hope.

"That its guiding light will continue to shine in full splendor and power in the year of our Lord 2054 has never been doubted by those who hold aloft, in 1954, the sacred torch of freedom under God."

Another American firm, the Daniel Hays Co., Inc., of Gloversville, N. Y., marking their 100th anniversary in business, has penned the following message to the president of the company a century hence, in part:

"It is our conviction that the chances of this letter coming to the attention of the president of the Daniel Hays Co., Inc., as the Nation's greatest glove manufacturers, a century hence, depends upon the Washington Street Baptist Church and all other churches, Protestant and Catholic, and the Jewish Synagogues of our great Nation continuing to so effectively teach the Christian-Hebrew traditions."

Rev. Forrest L. Knapp, executive secretary of the Massachusetts Council of Churches, enclosing a copy of its magazine, the Christian Outlook, containing a lengthy article on the Lynn Centennial, concludes his message with the following sentiment:

"It is not given to ourselves with our finiteness to see ourselves with the perspective of 2054. But we pray to the God and Father of our beloved Jesus Christ that, with the impelling power of His love, we shall strive to aid you of tomorrow to accomplish what should not be postponed until the day after tomorrow."

Walter Yust, chief editor of the Encyclopedia Brittanica, says, in part:

"The world will never be at peace until peoples humbly accept the fact that no one national ideal is the pattern for the entire world. Capitalism, socialism, communism, are actually impotent weapons in a world struggle for amity and peace. They may be important ideologies, but only because they with others, have helped to give the world its wars.

"Humility, and, I think, Christian humility—and it is known under many other names—is the salvation of the world."

The renowned Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick, pastor of the Riverside Church in New York, gives his message to the world of the next century, as follows:

"Out of a very tense and threatening generation we send our greetings to you who will be carrying on the great traditions of the Christian gospel a century from now. We have faced in our time two great world wars and now, with new and greater destructive weapons of hitherto unimaginable power, we are menaced by the possibility of a third.

"Nevertheless, Christian forces are not dismayed. We believe that the future belongs to Christ; though the dangers of our time are immense, the possibilities are magnificent. With faith and hope we greet you across the unseen years, trusting that in your day some of these possibilities may be realized."

The hope of Irving School, talented executive director of the Jewish Social Service Agency of Lynn, condensed from an unusually well prepared and thoughtful three-page message, is that in the year 2054, he will have no successor in bringing hope to the afflicted and hopeless because mankind will have solved the problems of old age, want, and human distress in all forms.

"Take no offense, my learned colleague of the next century," he says, "but my most ardent hope is that there is no call for your services. I would long for a world bereft of social problems, freed of financial, physical, emotional and spiritual woes. I long for a world in which there will be no field for social workers, generals, admirals or other professionals so sorely needed today to defend and sustain our civilization."

Edward J. Hanley, president of the Allegany Ludlum Steel Co., itself celebrating 100 years in business this year, concludes his message with the following thought:

"I am hopeful that the future will be brighter than the past; that men will have learned to evaluate success in terms of improving the well being of the human race in this world and the next, and will learn also to evaluate material things merely as a help to happiness and true contentment."

Boston University's President Harold C. Case says:

"From the vantage point of a university president, whose task it is to guide the process of higher education, and whose belief in the future is sure and sound, I am glad to salute my successors in 2054.

"I hope that the efforts we in the field of education have put forth may result in improved opportunities for useful living for peace, justice, and true world brotherhood.

"I charge you of 2054 to remember your obligation to maintain freedom, Christian ideals, and to build a better comunity."

Capt. Eddie V. Rickenbacker, World War I ace and president of Eastern Air Lines, sending a message addressed to the "Youth of 2054," concludes a 3-page exposition of its personal philosophy of living by stating:

"I believe in my country. I say humbly and sincerely, that there is nothing in the world—not even life itself—that I love more than I do this land of ours. No worldly goods can take the place of my country. And loving my country means loving my countrymen, regardless of race, creed, or color.

"I trust that my personal creed of 1954 has become a commonplace in your world of 2054 and that all of those who read this message will be earnestly living it daily."

Walter E. Lawrence, town manager of Saugus, submitting a copy of this year's 170-page Town Report, which has won praise of directors of the Schools of Government at Harvard University, Tufts College, Boston University, and from Gov. Christian A. Herter, expresses the hope that in 2054, "Saugus will become an even greater component of that happy North Shore community which is Greater Lynn."

Sheriff Earl E. Wells, depicting the causes which lead youth to go astray and come under the jurisdiction of the county courts and places of detention, says:

"It is my fervent hope and prayer that by your generation the American people will have solved these great social problems so that the sheriff of 20ε4 will not be faced with such heart-rendering juvenile and young adult shattered lives."

The hope that America of 2054 will have "acknowledged Christ and act according to His doctrine" is expressed by Howard Murray probation officer of the Lynn district court, where the pastor, Rev. Robert Emery Baggs, is the Protestant chaplain. Mr. Murray expresses the hope that by the next century the schools will have introduced mental hygiene as a part of their curriculum and that juvenile delinquency will have been solved by treatment of incipient cases by psychiatrists and psychologists.

David C. Adkins, managing director of the Lynn Chamber of Commerce, says, in part:

"To the inheritance we have received we have sought to add such new elements to the flowing current of human life as will illuminate man's soul with a vision of the kind of world he can achieve if his will is keen and his spirit is strong."

Because of its sentimental value, one of the most treasured contributions received by the church for its time capsule comes from the United States Naval Training Center at San Diego, Calif., where Comdr. Harris W. Howe is chief of naval chaplains.

Commander Howe is one of the two clerical sons of the late beloved Rev. Chester H. Howe, for 20 years pastor of the church, and has been a member of the Washington Street Baptist Church for many years. His brother, the Reverend David B. Howe, pastor of the United Baptist Church at Saco, Maine, will be a speaker—at Sunday's burial of the time capsule on the church lawn.

The widow of the late Lynn pastor, Mrs. Annie C. Howe, is now visiting her son in California. She makes her home at 49 Atlantic Terrace.

In his letter to be sealed in the time capsule, Commander Howe reveals that the ministerial tradition of the family started by his father and perpetuated by himself and brother will be carried into the third generation. The chaplain's two sons, Chester Harris Howe 2d and Josiah Sanford Howe, both of whom were baptized in the Washington Street Baptist Church and still retain their membership here, are both planning to follow their father and grandfather into the Christian ministry.

In his message, Commander Howe concludes as follows: "Looking ahead to 2054, I have every confidence and expectation. It's impossible to predict all that will happen, but one thing I know, what we live for and stand for in Jesus Christ will be victorious. If Christ be for us, who can be against us (and win?)."

Pastors of local churches contributing inspirational messages for posterity included the Reverend Harold W. Buker, D. D., pastor of the mother First Baptist Church; the Reverend Della Davis, pastor of the First Spiritualist Church of Lynn; the Reverend William H. Gavin, pastor of the First Presbyterian Church; the Reverend Claude H. Voorheis, pastor of the East Saugus Community Church; the Reverend Wilbur C. Biegler, pastor of the Cliftondale Methodist Church; the Reverend Ira J. Roberts, pastor of the Maple Street Methodist Church and president of the Greater Lynn Council of Churches; the Reverend Howard F. Smith, minister of the Lynn Unitarian Church; and scores of others.

We Are a Republic, Not Democracy, and Here the Difference Is Explained

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. SAMUEL K. McCONNELL, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 29, 1954

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Southern California Forum, Friday, March 26, 1954, which I think is most appropriate at this time:

WE ARE A REPUBLIC, NOT DEMOCRACY, AND HERE THE DIFFERENCE IS EXPLAINED

(By Hufford MacDougal)

Much confusion has been built around the term "democracy." Although the form of government in the United States is that of a republic, it is frequently called a democracy.

Yet the Socialist Party of Great Britain and the Communist Party in Russia each claim democracy as the proper description of their government.

It is important that we get a clear understanding of political and economic words and phrases, for we are in the midst of a conflict in which words play a vital role.

There are some sharp and vastly important differences between democracy and republic. Let's first examine democracy.

Democracy: The Greeks gave us the word, meaning the people rule. The basic element in political democracy is legal and political equality for all.

Democracy doesn't set up any certain form of Government except the town meeting form in which all citizens come together and make their laws on the basis of majority rule.

Minority is overruled and may be overrun or even destroyed in this form of government.

Actually, in its widest usage today the term "democracy" is almost altogether economic in its meaning.

The Russian Communists call themselves democrats and declare that democracy means public ownership of factories and farms—with every citizen allotted an equal share of the goods and services produced.

The British Socialists have what they themselves call democratic socialism, or socialism by vote of the majority, but they claim democracy means the welfare state idea, or equal shares for all.

Such economic aspects of democracy were not respected by the framers of the Declaration of Independence and the United States Constitution.

The purpose of these pioneers in human freedom was to set up a Government that would give mankind the fullest opportunity for liberty, spiritual growth, and the pursuit of happiness.

This was the great liberal philosophy which characterized the creation of the United States of America. Genuine political liberalism means political and economic freedom—that's all.

The respect of minorities, freedom of speech, limitations imposed upon the rule of majorities, careful dividing up of the powers of government into three branches—all these blessings of the American form of government have nothing whatever to do with democracy as such.

They are liberal tenets, and they may or may not be present in a democracy.

Thomas Jefferson, who wrote the Declaration, and who was one of the truly great political liberals of history, called himself a Republican Federalist in a letter addressed to George Washington on May 17, 1792.

In his first inaugural address President Jefferson carefully described himself as a Federalist and a Republican. Republican in this sense was not meant to be partisan, but to represent Jefferson's liberal governmental philosophy.

We find that philosophy interwoven in the framework of our Republic.

Republic: In the form in which we have it, a republic means representative government with political and legal equality for all.

It is founded on a Constitution, with divisions of authority vested in the legislative, judiciary, and executive branches, and with States and individual rights clearly defined.

The framers of the United States Constitution, in creating our Republic, were aware that the States were creating the Federal Government, not vice versa, and that the people were sovereign in those States.

No republic like it has ever existed. It has permitted the flourishing of a democratic way of life—but not a democracy; a way of life with man's God-given rights protected with equality of opportunity and of franchise extended to all, majority and minority alike.

It has given individuals the opportunity to dream, to produce, to create, to save and invest, and to worship God in their own way.

Nowhere else on earth have all these blessings in combination been given a people to any such degree.

But we must understand and protect the fundamentals of our Republic if we are to continue to enjoy its blessings.

The Grand Old Prophets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 29, 1954

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, it is always interesting to listen to prophecy. It is sometimes very helpful to appraise the value of phophecy, to recall the prophecies which have passed into the limbo of history. It is therefore, appropriate that I call to the attention of our colleagues the following very interesting excerpts as reprinted in the May 1954 issue of the Democratic Digest:

THE GRAND OLD PROPHETS

Grass in the streets, 1932: "The grass will grow in the streets of a hundred cities, a thousand towns; the weeds will overrun the fields of millions of farms." (Herbert Hoover, October 31, 1932.)

Will destroy—1933: "The Democratic administration's program for Federal Bank Deposit Insurance will destroy the entire banking system." (Gov. Alf. M. Landon, 1933.)

Day of recokoning, 1933: "The deficit now facing us for 1934 will reach $812 million. We cannot get on in that way. There will be a day of reckoning and it will not be long deferred if we continue this program." (Senator Simon D. Fess (Republican, Ohio) May 3, 1933.)

Ruining the country, 1934: "The vast and reckless pouring out of Government money cannot be kept up much longer without ruining the country." (Henry P. Fletcher (later chairman of the Republican National Committee), February 12, 1934.)

Wholesale liquidation, 1934: "There would be a wholesale liquidation of national securities if the national debt should exceed $32 billions." (It is now $265 billions.) (George V. McLaughlin, president, New York State Bankers' Association, April 7, 1934.)

Going over the precipice, 1934: "Even if we stop spending in time to avoid going over the precipice, the debts now being incurred for projects which will not increase our productive facilities, and the resulting burden of future taxes will unfavorably and substantially affect our future standard of living." (National Association of Manufacturers and Congress of America Industry Platform and Resolutions, December 5–6, 1934.)

Destruction, 1934: "It has become perfectly apparent that the purpose of the Roosevelt administration is not the healing of our economic ills but the destruction of our economic system." (Representative Bertrand H. Snell, Republican, of New York, minority leader of the House, June 15, 1934.)

Will wreck * * *, 1935: The Roosevelt program for social security "will wreck the Nation." (Congressman Robert P. Rich, Republican, of Pennsylvania, 1935.)

The last time, 1936: "It is thought by some that this year may mark the last time the country will vote for a President * * *." (C. Douglas Buck, GOP national committeeman, the Republican Challenge, p. 26, summer 1936.)

Universal bankruptcy, 1936: "If this is to continue the result is the tears and anguish of universal bankruptcy." (Herbert Hoover, address to GOP National Convention, June 19, 1936.)

Reap the whirlwind, 1936: "During the past 3 years those in control of our Government have sown to the wind. We and our children and our children's children for generations to come must reap the whirlwind. * * * The processes of recovery have begun despite the tinkering of the New Deal." (Jouett Shouse, president, American Liberty League, June 20, 1936.)

A cruel hoax, 1936: "This is the largest tax bill in history. And to call it 'social security' is a fraud on the workingman. * * *

"I am not exaggerating the folly of this legislation. The saving it forces on our workers is a cruel hoax. * * *" (Gov. Alf M. Landon, GOP presidential nominee, September 26, 1936.)

National bankruptcy, 1940: "We have seen with heavy hearts our own Nation, for 7 years, drifting toward one-man Government and national bankruptcy." (Representative JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., June 25, 1940.)

Brink of chaos, 1944: "Our representation in the vital areas abroad is on the brink of chaos. The answer is the same abroad as it is at home." (Thomas E. Dewey, St. Louis, Mo., October 16, 1944.)

Destroying economic life, 1944: "Regardless of the professed friendship of the New Deal for the workingman, the fact remains that under the New Deal American economic life is being destroyed." (Republican platform, 1944.)

Disaster and ruin, 1950: The Democratic Party program "can result only in disaster and ruin for our country." (Republican National Committee statement of principles and objectives, February 6, 1950.)

Mired in the mud, 1952: "The question is do you want to stand still mired in the mud of New Deal prosperity or do you want to march down the shining corridor of progress to prosperity, security and peace?" (General Eisenhower, October 2, 1952.)

Never again? "I have repeated this particular pledge over and over again in the United States. All of those associated with me and I are dedicated to this proposition: At the first sign of any approaching recession in this country, there would be instantly mobilized under the finest professional business, labor and other leaders that we have, every resource of private industry, of local government, of State government, and of Federal Government to see that never again shall depression come to us." (Candidate Eisenhower, Yonkers, N. Y., October 20, 1952.)

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Printing and binding for Congress, when recommended to be done by the Committee on Printing of either House, shall be so recommended in a report containing an approximate estimate of the cost thereof, together with a statement from the Public Printer of estimated approximate cost of work previously ordered by Congress within the fiscal year (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 145, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on Printing, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Frank Brodie is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

PRINTING DOCUMENTS AND REPORTS

Documents and reports of committees with the evidence and papers submitted therewith, or any part thereof ordered printed by Congress, may be reprinted by the Public Printer on order of any Member of Congress or Delegate, on prepayment of the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 162, p. 1940).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Ma

IN

I
urc
pri
pat
lin

T
Wi
Ro
the
Am
Sta

I
Mr
ma
hea
Ho
har
put
I ha

T
con
chu
The
gre
stre
Rig
org
and
revi
3 h
view
ly, t
to t
over
pro
van
bett
and
base
then
thos
ican
ing

Af
hand
ands
mate
than
Ame
spiri

At
lic g
field,
sic b
speal

Th
repre
were
Fred,

Appendix

May Day Celebration in Burlington, Wis.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 3, 1954

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on Saturday, May 1, it was my pleasure and privilege to be the guest speaker at a patriotic May Day celebration in Burlington, Wis.

The American Legion, Department of Wisconsin, through Comdr. Gordon W. Roseleip, had designated Burlington as the outstanding city for its pioneering Americanism program "May Day: United States Way."

Dr. Robert R. Spitzer, together with Mr. Roseleip and Mr. R. L. Sullivan, made up the committee which spearheaded this outstanding celebration. However, the whole community joined hands and literally "went to town" in putting on one of the finest ceremonials I have ever witnessed.

The day opened up with the whole community and its visitors attending church. All churches participated. Then, about 10:30 in the morning a great parade of the most beautiful floats, stressing the Constitution and Bill of Rights, bands, military, and veterans' organizations, civic groups Girl Scouts, and Boy Scouts, took place before the reviewing stand. It took approximately 3 hours for the parade to pass the reviewing stand. I might say, incidentally, that the day marked a fitting climax to the efforts of Dr. Spitzer who had over a period of time joined with other prominent citizens of the State in advancing the idea that Americans should better understand their Government and the principles upon which it was based, and that they should dedicate themselves anew to the preservation of those principles in order that the American system be preserved intact for coming generations.

After the parade, the churches joined hands in serving luncheons to the thousands who had gathered. It was estimated that to this community of less than 5,000 people, something like 30,000 Americans had come to witness this inspiring patriotic celebration.

At 3 o'clock in the afternoon, the public gathered at the high school athletic field, where the celebration included music by the Fifth Army band, singing, and speaking.

The Navy, Air Force, and Army were represented, and numerous dignitaries were present, including President E. B. Fred, of the University of Wisconsin.

I send forward a copy of my remarks, and ask that they be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Do We Appreciate America?

(Address by Hon. Alexander Wiley, of Wisconsin, chairman, Senate Foreign Relations Committee, at Burlington, Wis., patriotic celebration "May Day: The United States Way," May 1, 1954)

I am proud and thrilled to participate in this great patriotic celebration here in Burlington—the city which has previously been recognized by the American Legion for its outstanding Americanism.

This is an unforgettable day in the history of Burlington and in the history of Wisconsin.

Indeed, it is an unforgettable day in American patriotic observances.

You have recaptured May Day from the radicals, from the Communists and you have restored it in America.

The eyes of our country are on you now as you blaze a new trial in the fulfillment of the American heritage.

I know that I express the feelings of all of the folks who have come from Washington, from Madison, and from other areas in expressing heartfelt congratulations to you.

A great many folks known and unknown had planned long and well for this day; its success is a tribute to them and to you, the people of Burlington and this entire region.

ACCENTUATING THE POSITIVE

You today are demonstrating a true feature of the American way of life. You are emphasizing—not criticism, but affirmative action.

You are not just combatting the negative, you are accentuating the positive.

You, as salesmen, so to speak, are becoming filled with enthusiasm on the greatness of this product—America. Thereby, you and I, as salesmen, can better sell it—proclaim its virtues—to our countrymen, particularly to those whom we hold dear.

We can better point out its absolute superiority over any system which has ever been tried in this world—particularly that system of atheism, materialism, of despotism known as communism.

THE MEANING OF OLD GLORY

The American flag flies high today.

It does not fly high only upon the staff. It flies high in the hearts of every citizen here.

On this day, we feel as did the poet who wrote:

"There are many flags in many lands,
There are flags of every hue;
But there is no flag, however grand,
Like our own Red, White, and Blue."

And why is Old Glory unlike any other flag?

It is not simply because it is the flag of our homeland—yours and mine.

It is not just the flag that we were taught to love and to honor when we stood alongside our mothers and dads when we were young.

It is not just the flag to which we have pledged our undying allegiance a thousand times in a thousand settings.

It is not just the flag which embodies our future and our present and our past, as it does indeed.

Rather it is the flag which today is the hope of the entire free world. So long as it flies aloft, Western civilization is safe. If ever Old Glory goes down, western civilization, Judeo-Christian civilization, will have gone down with it. That must not happen. It will not happen.

MANKIND LOOKS TO AMERICA

Old Glory will continue to show all mankind that "government of the people, by the people, and for the people" can and will endure.

And it is because of great patriotic rededications like this that the Stars and Stripes will not falter.

Yes; this is a day when every heart swells with pride and on every lip there are the words:

"My country 'tis of thee,
Sweet land of liberty."

As chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, I have visited in many countries.

I have seen many people in many places. I say to you that there is no country in the world to which mankind looks as it looks to America.

Columbia is still the "gem of the ocean." America is still the "last best hope of earth."

It is not simply because in this atomic-hydrogen age, the military future of mankind depends upon our military strength.

It is not simply because America's long-range air fleet, America's mighty weapons, are the principal deterrent against the aggression of international communism.

THE AMERICAN IDEA

It is because the American idea is the most powerful single idea in the world today. What is that idea?

It is the idea that every man is precious and priceless and sacred as a child of God.

It is the idea of human dignity and human value.

It is the idea that every man is born free and equal, that every man has the right to grow and develop, to achieve and to acquire.

Not in 20 centuries of recorded history has there been a land like America or an idea like the American idea or blessings as varied and as priceless as America's blessings.

The whole world realizes those facts.

If we were to open our gates, literally millions of people would try to immigrate here.

In countless minds throughout the world, there is the thought, "If only we could be Americans; if only we could visit America; if only we could enjoy the freedoms that Americans enjoy."

Yes, the whole world stands in awe before America.

But do most of us appreciate our own country as much as we should?

Have many of us allowed the fire of devotion to burn low in our hearts? Unfortunately, to a considerable extent, some of us have.

Many of us have tended to take for granted this magnificent heritage into which we were born in this country, God's country.

OUR MATERIAL BLESSINGS

I am not now talking of the material blessings, great as they are.

I am not thinking of Americans owning their own homes and driving their own cars and enjoying holiday vacations and having television sets, refrigerators, washing machines, and a thousand and one other conveniences.

I am not talking even of the high standard of living we enjoy, the abundant food which we and our children eat—which looks like feasts to most of the world. I am not talking of America's physical greatness—our towns and cities and countryside—"the purple mountains' majesty above the fruited plain."

For these material blessings, we are truly grateful. But I am thinking far more of the intangible blessings.

SIX JEWELS OF GREAT PRICE

These are our greatest jewels of all.

Let me list these jewels of the American heritage so that we might better appreciate them and guard them.

I should like to set forth six of these jewels.

Two of them are great documents. Another is a song. Another is a piece of cloth, but the dearest piece of cloth to any American. And still others are the great landmark of today and of yesteryear and the great figures of today and yesteryear.

THE WONDROUS CONSTITUTION

1. First is the magnificent document which is the charter of our freedom.

It is the document which a British Prime Minister, William Gladstone, called "the most wondrous work ever struck off at a given time by the brain and purpose of man."

I refer, of course, to the Constitution—the guardian of our freedom of speech, freedom of the press, freedom of assembly, of our right to vote, of trial by jury, of freedom from unlawful seizure, of freedom of religion, freedom of opportunity.

This is the document which expressed the eternal truths which have been brought to mankind by the seers and sages of the universe. This is the document which climaxes man's ascent to freedom from slavery.

This is the document which has given to us, the oldest continuous government of any nation on earth.

Know this Constitution, if you would be worthy of it. Love it with all your heart and soul.

Protect it from those who would undermine it, or those who would, in zeal, distort it.

THE DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE

2. The second great blessing in the American heritage is one which preceded the Constitution.

It made the Constitution possible.

It is the document which has rung down through the ages as man's clearest assertion of his rights to sovereignty. This document was drafted by Thomas Jefferson between June 11 and June 28, 1776. It was the document for which the Liberty Bell rang on July Fourth of that year. It begins:

"When in the course of human events" * * * it continues:

"We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed."

OUR NATIONAL ANTHEM

3. To symbolize America, there are certain outward signs and sounds which are the hallmark of our freedom.

One such is that magnificent anthem written in 1814 by an American witnessing the British bombardment of Fort McHenry.

It begins:

"Oh, say can you see by the dawn's early light
What so proudly we hailed at the twilight's last gleaming?"

And it concludes:

"And the star-spangled banner in triumph shall wave
O'er the land of the free and the home of the brave."

OUR STARS AND STRIPES

4. And there is the American flag, itself, Old Glory, which brave men have given their lives to hold aloft.

Brave men have died at Bunker Hill and Heartbreak Hill that it might not fall, and brave men have died that it might be planted on top of enemy ramparts.

It came down on Corregidor, but only briefly, for it was later to rise there and on the enemy's Mt. Suribachi.

It fell back at Kasserine Pass, but only briefly. And it never went down in the Battle of the Bulge.

It has had its temporary setbacks, but it has always endured to victory.

The red, white, and blue embodies the saga of American heroism in every war.

But just as important, it embodies the saga of American industry and love and devotion and friendship and tolerance in time of peace.

OUR NATIONAL HOLIDAYS

4. And there are the great days of America, the days on which we pause to rededicate ourselves to freedom—Independence Day and Armistice Day, and Declaration Day, and Thanksgiving Day.

And there are other days like Pearl Harbor Day, December 7, when we remember the travails of our country.

And there are the holy days of Christmas, and Eastertime when we fill ourselves anew with the glory of God, which is the foundation of our way of life.

5. And there are the great scenes of America's triumphs and yes, her defeats.

Not just the great landmarks of her battles, not just Lexington and Concord and Sumter and Gettysburg, but thousands of places, known and unknown, here and abroad, where patriots sacrificed and died that we might live.

OUR LEADERS AND CITIZENS

And the sixth of our jewels is the greatest of all—our own people—our own leaders, and our own citizens.

We are great because our leaders were great, and because their followers were great.

We are free because of Washington and Jefferson and Lincoln. And we are free because there were people, known and unknown, who were willing to follow these great leaders—to give them their all.

We are free because, whether we are Republicans or Democrats, we have always joined ranks behind those patriots who have ably led our land—from the first of our Presidents to the great Chief Executive who occupies the White House today.

THE ENEMY TODAY

Now, my friends, against all of these jewels which I have enumerated are ranged today the poisoned stones of a totally different philosophy.

It is the philosophy which today controls and strangles one-third of the world's people spread over one-fourth of the world's surface.

It threatens the rest of the world today, including ourselves, as no conqueror has threatened us in our history.

It is the force which would substitute Karl Marx for George Washington; the Red flag for the red, white, and blue flag; the Internationale for the Stars and Stripes; Moscow for Washington; an international dungeon for Independence Hall.

Against this enemy, and against his agents, their dupes and accomplices we must commit our hearts and souls and resources.

We must do so in a calm, careful, conscientious, but dedicated manner.

We must do so in accordance with the traditional, constitutional processes of our land.

We must show our appreciation for the American way by combating the Communist way. We must demonstrate by our action, not just our words, that we are worthy of the American heritage.

We can do so by telling and selling the story of the American heritage, by selling it, wherever we are, in home, office, factory, school, union, veterans' post, chamber of commerce, or anywhere else.

We can do so by urging our elected representatives, and our appointed officials, to protect us against those who would destroy this Republic.

FOUR BILLS CONGRESS SHOULD PASS

Time does not permit me to spell out certain of the specific acts which we should perform, in order to protect America. Let me, however, just list at least four such actions briefly:

1. Congress should promptly enact legislation to cope with the problem of Communist-dominated trade unions, and of individual Communists particularly in strategic industries.

2. Congress should pass legislation to make admissible in Federal courts evidence gained through legal wiretapping in national security cases.

3. It should strengthen congressional powers of inquiry by passing a bill to give immunity to those witnesses who would otherwise plead silence on the ground that they might incriminate themselves under the fifth amendment.

4. It should extend capital punishment to those guilty of espionage in peacetime. Obviously, such espionage can be just as dangerous as espionage in wartime.

VIGILANCE AGAINST A PEARL HARBOR

Meanwhile, we must strengthen the offensive capabilities and the military defenses of this Nation.

We must be vigilant against a Pearl Harbor attack, an attack which, in this atomic age, could be utterly disastrous, and which could snuff out the life of this Nation.

We must make sure that adequate plans are made for civil defense in our country. This means dispersal of industries. It means plans for orderly evacuation of cities. It means preparation in every phase of American life for emergency procedures which could be set in motion instantly, in the event of enemy attack.

Every single segment of American society—law, medicine, banking, education, transportation, communications, manufacture, will be challenged as never before, in the event of enemy attack.

These are but a few ways by which we can demonstrate that we intend to keep intact the American heritage, and pass it on unimpaired, to those who will follow after us.

EVIL PREVAILS IF GOOD MEN DO NOTHING

There are those who may shrug off their responsibilities and contend that what happens elsewhere in the community, or elsewhere in the Nation, is no problem of theirs.

But the fact of the matter is, that, as stated by Edmund Burke, "All that is necessary for evil to prevail is that good men do nothing."

If you and I do nothing, the evil of un-Americanism will indeed prevail.

But it will not and it must not prevail.

CONCLUSION

By this great celebration today, you, my fellow citizens, prove that you intend to have evil fail and good prevail.

You intend to serve as true trustees for the human race—trustees of the great assets which mankind has developed and, of which, we, today, are the custodian.

It has been a great pleasure to be with you today.

I know that my colleagues and I will bring back with us to Washington a renewed sense of pride in our country and in our State.

We are the better for having been with you today. We are the stronger, the more dedicated.

And I know that this is true of you as well. Thank you, and good luck to you all.

The Miracle of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 3, 1954

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, on April 28, Brig. Gen. Paul L. Wakefield, of Austin, Tex., State Director of Selective Service, made an address before the graduating preflight class at Lackland Air Force Base, San Antonio.

General Wakefield—soldier, patriot, stateman, and friend of statesmen, a great Texan and a grand human being—entitled his address simply "The Miracle of America." It is one of the most inspring speeches ever to come to my attention. Its content deserves to be widely circulated. I ask unanimous consent that this address by General Wakefield be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MIRACLE OF AMERICA

How many members of the preflight graduating class know what a miracle is? How many of you have ever seen one?

I know some of you are going to say, "Yes, sir. Right here. Myself. I got through preflight. Now, if I get through flying school, it's going to be a real miracle."

I got to thinking the other day about miracles. It was just after your commandant, Col. Cecil E. Combs, asked me to come over from Austin to San Antonio and talk to you.

I began thinking about something that I consider a miracle, but I wondered if this thing I think is a miracle really is one, considering the definition of the word "miracle."

So I went to the big dictionary in my secretary's office and noted down on a scrap of paper the definition of a miracle. It read:

"An event or effect in the physical world beyond or out of the ordinary course of things. A feat or occurrence so unusual as to seem miraculous. A wonder or wonderful thing. A marvel."

Well, my miracle seemed to fit the definition, and, in my judgment, my miracle, is about the biggest miracle the world has ever seen. Deep in my heart, I really think it is.

Many years ago, when I was your age, the miracle was here, only it has grown to be a bigger one since that time. I didn't think much about the miracle then. I just took it for granted. And I feel that's the way a lot of people look at it today.

Maybe you've guessed what my miracle is. My country. My country and your country. Your miracle and my miracle.

Why is it a miracle? What makes me think it is a miracle? Give me your attention and I will try to tell you, although I know I will never succeed as I would like.

In 50 years, we Americans have more than doubled the output each worker produces an hour. Today, the average American worker can produce about 5 times as much an hour as he did 100 years ago. Results: more goods for more people at lower prices.

Since 1900, we Americans have increased our supply of machine power 4½ times. Result: Life is easier for everybody.

Since 1900, the number of jobs in America has increased from 27½ million to about 60 million. Result: Everybody is contributing to their country's strength.

America's net output of goods and services increased by 29 times between 1850 and 1944. Result: More of the good things of life for everybody.

In 1910, only 44 children out of every 100 of high-school age were in school. By 1948, it was 82 out of every 100. Result: More strength for the individual and more strength for our Nation. Mirabeau B. Lamar, one of the fathers of Texas education, said: "A cultivated mind is the guardian genius of democracy."

Since 1900, our annual national income (in dollars of the same purchasing power) has increased from about $50 billion to about $225 billion.

In the past 50 years, despite rising prices, the average worker's purchasing power has about doubled. In the past 100 years, we Americans have increased the real wages of American workers (wages in relation to prices) by 3½ times. In other words, a man today in America, taking into consideration how long he has to work for his pay, how much he gets, and how much he has to pay for what he buys, earns 3½ times as much he did a century ago. And he earns twice as much as his father did a half-century ago.

Since 1850, we Americans have reduced hours of work from about 70 hours a week to around 40.

Today, the average American consumes 2½ times more goods than in 1900. Forty years ago, for example, the American people got little in the way of citrus fruits. In the intervening years, consumption of this fruit has increased many, many times over. The average American has vastly improved his diet.

So much for the material things in American life. Not that I consider material things unimportant, for I should not have taken up so much time with them had I not considered them important. Man is composed of both the material and the spiritual, and so both are important to him.

Yes; our material advancement has been a miracle. We can hardly grasp how it has come about. In fact, many of us never stop to think of America as a miracle. We just take America for granted. As I said before, when I was your age, I more or less took this country for granted. As I look back over the years, I believe it is my experience in the service of my country that has done more than anything else to awaken me to the fact that I live every day in the midst of an extraordinary miracle.

It's good for every soldier, sailor, and airman to have some foreign duty. It was good for me. You can see America a lot better from an island in the Pacific wastes, or from the vantage point of a foreign capital. The contrasts you will see from traveling around the world will make you see the miracle. And, as you travel in foregin lands you will meet foreigners who believe in this miracle, although they've never seen it. All over the world there are people waiting, hoping, and praying that some day, somehow, they will be able to leave their native lands and come to America to live. Why do they want to come? It isn't the climate.

Am I implying that everything is perfect and rosy in America today? It's not my intention to do so. Our American way isn't perfect because human beings aren't perfect. We still have our ups and downs of politics, prices, jobs, and justice.

But the over-all truth is that the average American makes more, has more, and enjoys more than any other citizen under any other system anywhere else in the world. And—above all—he has freedom of choice throughout his life, and that is granted only under the American system.

The international Communists would have us trade in our happiness machine instead of having it washed and greased once in awhile. They would have us just junk it, instead of repair it. Do you throw away a piano because it won't produce the right notes? No. You tune it.

Before the international Communists, commanded by Russia and caressed by China, can have any influence with me, they'll have to offer me a bigger miracle than I now have. They'll have to run a lot better want-ad in the world press than they're running now.

Suppose you picked up a copy of the San Antonio Express or Light tomorrow morning and found an ad in the classified pages reading about like this:

"BIG OPPORTUNITY

"Worker earning $10 for 8 hours' work offered opportunity to earn same amount by working 81 hours."

Would you bother to answer that ad?

If you did, it would be to find out what the joke was. It's a joke, all right; but the funniest part of it all is that someone is offering you this opportunity. And that someone is the internationl Communists. They say the communistic system provides more for the average man, and he should, therefore, switch systems.

In Russia, leading exponent of communism, the average worker has to work 81 hours (more than two 40-hour weeks) to earn the same $10 worth of goods that the average American worker earns in one 8-hour day.

I'm not telling you young men all this because I think your loyalty needs building up. I have a great faith in the loyalty of the average American. I'm just trying to put before you as forcefully as I can the miracle we see and experience here in America every day we live.

Now, what has produced this miracle? Our people have produced it, of course. But what is the philosophy, the reasoning, the intellect that has brought it about? What is the conception of human affairs that has caused it to thrive? For only a few short years ago, as we reckon time in the long perspective, our country was a wilderness. Why has this great civilization evolved and grown in strength and moral stature?

We have our miracle, I am convinced, because, fundamentally, nearly everyone in America believes that each and every man, woman, and child is important. Americans do not think so much about the group as they do the individual. Americans take care of the individual, and, as they do, the group takes care of itself. Isn't it logical that if we see to it that every individual gets a square deal the well-being of the whole follows?

I can see this in nearly everything Americans do. I see it in our laws. I am responsible for the operation of the draft boards in Texas. The draft law requires that our young men be looked upon as individuals, that they not be considered in the mass, that they be given treatment according to the way their own individual cases fit the law and regulations. We do not herd them into uniform like cattle, the way a country like China does. We take a lot of trouble about the affairs of each and every man on the draft boards' lists.

This national attitude, which is so much a part of all decent Americans, is a heritage bequeathed to us by our forefathers, who risked their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor on the belief that all men are important. They held it to be a truth that all men are created equal. And, although all men may not develop equally, our democratic system, based on Christian principles, never loses sight of the conception that they lose importance thereby. They must continue to have equal opportunity by our ideals.

Thomas Jefferson didn't look upon these principles, contained in the Declaration of Independence, as being something new or revolutionary; he looked upon them as being practical. He referred to them as "commonsense." Well, I think the miraculous growth and development of our country has proved him as right as man could be. It's an ideal that has worked.

We owe all this as much to the American people as we do to the Founding Fathers of our country. There is as much, if not more, in the way of safeguarding individual rights in the first 10 amendments of the Constitution as in the Constitution itself. In fact, the first 10 amendments, commonly called the Bill of Rights, were submitted by the First Congress and adopted by the people because of a general belief that the original seven articles of the Constitution did not sufficiently protect the individual rights so sacred to the American character.

Now what is my purpose in talking to you young men about the miracle of America and what brought it about?

Your duty, before and after you become officers in the Air Force, is to defend America, her people, her institutions, and her principles. By tradition, you and I, if necessary, must sacrifice much—even the ultimate, our lives—in defense of all that is ours. Many have done so. They have died that the miracle might continue to live. I honor their sacrifice with respect and humility, just as I will honor your lives so long as you live them for your country.

I have spoken to you about the miracle we live in with the hope that you may see something you have not seen before, that you may perhaps have a more concrete realization of what you are defending. I would have you never take America for granted. I would have your country loom large in your minds as you go on to flight training. Yours is now and will continue to be a great responsibility. I would have you pause now and then in the stress of your daily duty and training and think of the great thing to which you are responsible.

You are indeed training for a great responsibility. Sometimes, at night, I awake to hear the deep, vibrant roar of the B-36 bombers as they fly over Austin. Perhaps one day these, or even greater, machines may be in your hands. When I think of the great load that can come to the officers and men of those crews, I just want to send a salute their way to convey my respect and admiration.

But everything is not responsibility to the man in uniform. All responsibility brings privilege. If a man has met, faced, and discharged his responsibility, he has earned the privilege of knowing that he was equal to the task, and that no man will wish to deny him the repose and the pleasure that are rightfully his. To America, a soldier, sailor, or airman is an individual, and important, no matter what his rank.

You, gentlemen, are going to provide your country with your services. In exchange, your country will provide you with the miracle.

Do as I Say, Not as I Do

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 31, 1954

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, the editorial which appears below was written by Harold G. Stagg and appeared in the Army Times. I commend its reading to every Member of Congress. Mr. Stagg prefaced his editorial by the following statement:

THE NAKED TRUTH

The editorial below is our initial attempt to show that our editorial policy already follows a formula outlined by President Eisenhower. We have tried to relate and balance the President's own formula to and with the facts as they exist.

No partisanship or political malice is implied or intended. Among honest people there can be no controversy over the naked truth. The naked truth is that McCarthyism has divided the American people; set Republican against Republican, Democrat against Democrat, Catholic against Catholic, veteran against veteran.

The purpose of the editorial is to direct attention to the need for the President to give more substance to his own words and to his own faith. We ask only that he set the example which he has asked newspapers to follow:

TO HIM WHO BEARS THE PRIMARY RESPONSIBILITY

"If to do were as easy as to know what were good to do, chapels had been churches and poor men's cottages princes palaces. It is a good divine that follows his own instructions: I can easier teach 20 what were good to be done, than be one of the 20 to follow mine own teaching." Merchant of Venice.

On April 22, in a New York speech before the American Newspaper Publishers Association, President Eisenhower appealed to American newspapers to do the impossible: assume full responsibility for bringing about both domestic and international unity.

"I know that to present the facts in perspective is a difficult task," the President said. "The haste of living creates reader impatience. It discourages complete explanation and places a premium upon cliches and slogans. We incline to persuade with an attractive label, or to damn with a contemptuous tag. But catch words are not information."

At another point in his talk, the President quite rightfully warned that "it is dangerous to us and to peace when we carelessly speak in generalities * * * for understanding we need the facts and the perspective within which they fit."

We agree with the President that a great need for factual information exists. And, certainly, we find no fault with the President's splendid objectives—domestic unity and international peace. Since the beginning of time other leaders have had the same goals. In the very first sentence of our April 17 editorial, we, too, said: "We're awfully tired of catch phrases that turn out to be meaningless." In the very last sentence of our April 24 editorial—which was in print 24 hours before the President spoke—we said: "We can do no more than pledge ourselves to continue to seek out and report the truth—according to our lights."

And so we continue.

The truth of the matter is that the President, individual members of his Cabinet, and the Republican National Committee, of which he is boss, have consistently inclined—as the President said—"to persuade with an attractive label, or to damn with a contemptuous tag." And they have encouraged disunity by speaking in generalities and refusing to give the press and the public the facts and the perspective within which they fit.

It was the President himself who persuaded the American people with an attractive label—the Great Crusade. It was members of the President's Cabinet who placed premiums upon cliches and slogans by describing our national defense plan as the New Look and our new foreign policy as one of instant retaliation.

And it is the Eisenhower administration which has refused to give the press "the facts and the perspective within which they fit" by including among the total number of security risks removed from Government service wholly innocent persons who transferred from one agency to another, died, or resigned in the normal course of events.

And it is the Republican National Committee which reportedly has accepted for nationwide use in the coming political campaign a movie captioned Twenty Years of Treason, and which features former President Truman, Attorney General Herbert Brownell, and FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover in the infamous Harry Dexter White case.

Usually, when the American press uses "an attractive label" to persuade, or a "contemptuous tag" to damn, the labels and tags are those coined and applied by others—including Presidents of the United States.

We do not charge that the President, his Cabinet, his administration, or the Republican Party are alone in persuading with attractive labels, damning with contemptuous tags, or speaking in generalities. Their opposites in the Democratic Party use the same techniques.

But we say the same to them as we often say to ourselves—practice what you preach.

And we believe—with the same deep faith that the President has in our democratic institutions, customs, and destiny—that his April 22 speech was written and delivered for the express purpose of making it no longer possible for him to avoid his own responsibility to take decisive steps to lessen our domestic disunity. By his own words, he has made it impossible for the President of the United States to continue to remain aloof from the problem which has become synonymous with domestic disunity: McCarthyism.

The President told his audience of newspaper publishers that he was not presuming to tell them how to run their businesses. But he most certainly set a pattern for himself and his administration.

It has ben proved beyond dispute that McCarthyism has divided the American people—including veterans—into two groups: those who believe in or for other reasons support Senator McCARTHY's alleged anti-Communist activities; and those who have used the sense God gave them to see McCARTHY and McCarthyism in the proper perspective.

If all we hear is true, President Eisenhower is among the second group. But to date, his public comments on Senator McCARTHY can best be described as generalities, which the President says are "dangerous to us and to peace." It would seem, then, that on the basis of the President's own analysis of the situation, the time has come for him to speak out, and to speak out bluntly.

The people have faith in the President. But faith—like genius—is something quite intangible. Genius, they say, is 2 percent inspiration and 98 percent perspiration. Faith, then, must be 2 percent belief and 98 percent self-consecration.

To have faith, we must believe, but we can sustain our beliefs only in those leaders and those things to which they, the Infinite Being, and we ourselves give substance. True faith flourishes only with the knowledge that if we couple our beliefs with practiced devotion to our institutions, our customs, and our destiny, the hoped for will happen.

It is difficult to sustain faith in a neighbor's often-declared love of animals, if you see him kick his dog, or whip his horse, or if he avoids chastising those of his children who are deliberately cruel to animals.

In order that the American people may retain their faith in our President—and in order for the President to give substance to those things in which he professes great faith—he has a primary duty to himself and to his office to give the American people "the facts and the perspective within which they fit" about McCarthyism.

Then, when the President has done that, he should stand foursquare before the American people and say, without equivocation, that he is for or against McCarthyism and all that for which it stands. We believe his April 20 speech laid the groundwork for such a statement—possibly after the current McCarthy-Army hearings blow up, as we fully expect them to do.

To do less than that is to render his words meaningless; to give substance—not to our faith in him—but to the feeling that in lecturing the newspaper publishers he was giving an elementary first grade lesson to a class of postgraduate students of Americana. Only this time the teacher would be saying:

"Do as I say—not as I do."

Department of Defense Appropriation Bill, 1955

SPEECH
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 29, 1954

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 8873) making appropriations for the Department of Defense and related independent agency for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes.

Mr. McCORMACK. I have a letter from Gen. William Henry Harrison, Jr., adjutant general of the Massachusetts National Guard. I have conferred with members of the committee. Representatives of the National Guard Association appeared before the subcommittee and asked for an increase over the budget. Would the gentleman make an explanation for the record, please?

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, the Army Subcommittee gave the Army-National Guard joint construction program for armories the full amount requested in the budget, namely, $9 million. That is an increase of $900,000 over the amount that appeared in fiscal 1954. The figure that they will have available for obligation in fiscal 1955 totals $18,598,000. That figure of $18,598,000 is made up of the $9 million which the committee proposed, plus $9,598,000 of previously appropriated funds which will not be obligated on June 30, 1954, and consequently will be available for obligation in fiscal 1955. At the end of fiscal 1955 out of the $18,598,000, the Army National Guard Bureau in the Pentagon does not anticipate that it will obligate $2 million of this fund. In other words, they will obligate only $16,598,000 out of the $18,598,000 that they expect to have available.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS. Is this money available for the 2 categories which the national association was interested in, 1 item of $15 million and the other $5 million?

Mr. FORD. No. The total amount, $15 million, is for 3 parts of the Reserve forces construction program. Nine million dollars is for the joint State and Federal Government armory construction program. It is the Federal portion. The States make their own contribution to go with the Federal funds. One million dollars is the nonarmory construction for the National Guard, which is fully Federal financed. Then there is $5 million of the $15 million which is for the Army Reserve armory construction program. We gave the full amount requested by the President for all three portions of the program.

Mr. HARRIS. Is it not true that the national association thought they should have $5 million for the non-Federal program?

Mr. FORD. They came before our committee—representatives from four States—and requested additional funds. They are not Federal officials, but they were State adjutants general, I believe, and they naturally and properly requested more money. Although I think we must treat their requests certainly with high respect, after all, they are speaking like any other interested party, asking more funds for a program in which they happen to be particularly interested. Inasmuch as we gave the full amount the budget requested, more than we gave them last year, and $2 million more than they expect to obligate in fiscal 1955, the committee could not see the justification for more money.

Mr. HARRIS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. McCORMACK. May I read the minds of the members of the subcommittee when I say they are very favorably disposed toward the National Guard?

Mr. FORD. I think that is very true. We gave them all the money requested for construction; every penny requested for the regular National Guard program, $218,502,000, which is about $8 million more than was given in fiscal 1954.

Mr. McCORMACK. And if, through regular processes, a supplemental budget comes up, the subcommittee would view it favorably?

Mr. FORD. We would.

Coudert Amendment Would Prevent Military Debacle in Indochina

SPEECH
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 29, 1954

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 8873) making appropriations for the Department of Defense and related independent agency for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH] is recognized for 4½ minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, it is not an easy task to come to the well of this House and oppose those who are leading the fight against this amendment. He should clearly understand the intent behind it; we ought to take the cat out of the bag.

We are talking about Indochina in this amendment, make no mistake about that. A vote for the amendment will be construed as a vote to prevent the commitment of combat troops there. We have just returned from our districts and you were asked, as I was: What about Indochina? Will we send our boys in there to fight again?

Also the question: "When is Congress going to assert its prerogatives with reference to war?" The people are waiting for an answer to that question. They will get it when the vote comes on the amendment before us.

Make no mistake about it, if it is voted down the word will go out that the Republicans are not opposed to sending troops into Indochina. Whether or not that is the fact that will be the implication. I say to you there will be many of us who will not return on this very issue. The Republican Party cannot survive a war in China. The Democrats did not survive the war in Korea, as we know. As I see it, the American people are fed up with this international globbaloney.

I hope you are going to get a chance to stand up and be counted on the record. The people want to know if they are really represented here or not.

We talk about the President. It is a lame excuse to say that the passage of this amendment will be a repudiation of him. This very day he has said that Congress will have the final say as to war in Indochina or any other place. So why all this concern about an offense to him. That is a specious argument.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. WHEELER. I want to ask the gentleman if he has heard within the past 4 years any criticism coming from his side of the aisle of the manner in which troops were sent to Korea?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I do not recall at this moment.

Mr. Chairman, this it not a challenge to the President's authority. It was only a short time ago that a high elected official was reported to have said: "If necessary, we may have to fight in Indochina."

Let us forget about all the technicalities, about the language and so forth, and realize that we are this afternoon taking a position on what we are going to do in Indochina. Any kind of argument contrary to that will not hold water so far as our constituents are concerned.

Just a short time ago Mr. Bedell Smith was asked a question about Indochina. He was asked this question:

> Can Indochina be saved, and how?

His reply:

> The position of the United States is that, if there is a united will among the free nations East and West, a will that is made clear to the Communists so there can be no

misunderstanding on their part, that this of itself would give pause for further adventures and aggression.

Now, what is the situation? The French are making a deal with the Communists in Indochina today and we talk about collective security. When the Geneva Conference is over, your Uncle Sam will be holding the bag, as he did at the end of World War II and Korea.

Mr. Chairman, I repeat that the issue raised by this so-called Coudert amendment is one that involves the critical situation in Indochina. It is foolhardy for us to say that we may be compelled to fight alone there if the French will not fight on and if other nations are not willing to act. Is it in our national interest to carry that burden alone?

I submit that if the rest of the free world will not join in meeting the issues presented by Indochina, then the United States cannot alone undertake to stop communism in that area.

No one will deny, Mr. Chairman, that Indochina is a symbol at this time. So it is important to us and to the rest of the free world, but the price of our involvement, even with the strongest of alliances, must be seriously weighed. Our involvement, as the President has already said, risks tragedy; yes, the tragedy of billions of dollars, millions of lives, and possible defeat.

While we must admit that we do have a stake in Indochina of great interest, we must constantly remember the necessity of preserving our own strength. It must not be dissipated in the swamps and jungles of Indochina.

Andrew J. Biemiller, Representing the American Federation of Labor, Testifies in Favor of H. R. 7700, To Provide Federal Government Guaranty of Mortgage Loans To Construct Medical Facilities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1954

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Andrew J. Biemiller, formerly a Member of Congress from the State of Wisconsin, representing the American Federation of Labor, appeared on Friday, April 30, before the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee in support of the provisions of H. R. 7700. In supporting the need of mortgage loan legislation such as that provided in H. R. 7700, he stated as follows:

STATEMENT IN SUPPORT OF H. R. 7700 PRESENTED BY ANDREW J. BIEMILLER, MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE OF THE AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR, BEFORE THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, my name of Andrew J. Biemiller, and I am a member of the national legislative committee of the American Federation of Labor. My office is located in the AFL Building, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. I am accompanied by my colleague, Mr. Nelson H. Cruikshank, director of social insurance activities of the American Federation of Labor.

We appreciate the opportunity to present to this commitee the views of the AFL with respect to the specific measure now before you—a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide mortgage loan insurance for hospitals and medical facilities used in connection with voluntary prepayment health loans, which was introduced by the distinguished chairman of this committee, Representative WOLVERTON (H. R. 7700).

We have had the privilege on three previous occasions to present our views to this committee in the course of the committee's extensive explorations of the health needs of the people of this country and the possible constructive steps that appropriately can be undertaken by the Federal Government toward meeting these needs and the assistance that might be given to local governmental agencies and voluntary groups.

On January 15 it was our privilege to appear before the committee in the course of its broad and general exploration of health problems. At that time we presented an analysis of these problems as viewed by an organization representative of some 10 million wage earners and their families. Members of the committee will recall that we introduced in the record at that time the position of the American Federation of Labor as expressed in resolutions most recently confirmed by the 72d convention of the AFL in September 1953. This official position was consistent with our historic position in support of a program of national health insurance. We also stressed that, while these resolutions expressed the major objective of the American Federation of Labor, our organization had also consistently held to the view that any constructive steps that could be taken that would meet part, if not all, of the need merited the support of organized labor. We emphasized the fact that the position of the AFL is not an all-or-nothing position.

Again, on February 5, we were privileged to appear before this committee in support of H. R. 7341, a bill designed to broaden the scope of the Hill-Burton Hospital Survey and Construction Act. We expressed our conviction that the assistance provided in this measure to the States and localities in improving their integrated hospital and health facility construction programs represented another constructive step in meeting an important part of the health needs of the Nation's citizens. You may recall, however, that at the conclusion of this testimony we made reference to two other measures—H. R. 6950, the Health Service Facilities Act, and H. R. 6951, the Mortgage Loan Insurance Act—and pointed out that the objectives of these measures merited the favorable consideration of this committee because, in our opinion, their enactment would add impetus to the development of such comprehensive programs of the kind which your committee had been analyzing and studying during the several weeks prior to the hearings you were then conducting on the extension of the Hill-Burton program.

Finally, on April 1, it was our privilege to present the views of our organization on the administration proposals for the reinsurance of voluntary health insurance programs as they were embodied in H. R. 8356, a measure also introduced by the distinguished chairman of this committee, Representative WOLVERTON. At that time, we reviewed what we felt to be the six areas of major need experienced by working people and their families, dependent upon wage income. We indicated also that these needs were generally characteristic of the vast majority of the population. Without at this time repeating the description of those needs, we should just like to recall that they were as follows:

1. Preventive care.
2. Access to facilities and personnel.
3. Comprehensive protection.
4. Full family coverage.
5. Budgeting for full prepayment.
6. Improvement in quality of medical care.

In addition, we outlined four needs that were more of a community nature, which were as follows:

1. Care for the chronically ill and the indigent aged.
2. Expansion of local public-health units.
3. Aid to medical education.
4. Expansion of hospitals, health centers, and other physical facilities.

We reported at that time that, upon review of the principles contained in this proposal, the social-security committee of the American Federation of Labor had taken a position that the basic principle of reinsurance was not to be disregarded in the development of a broad health program. Our major objection to the reinsurance proposals as presented at that time was not so much to the specific provisions of the bill, but to the context in which it was presented. We pointed out that, in our opinion, it could not properly be presented as a national health program. As we have followed the testimony presented by various groups in relation to this measure, we have come to the conclusion that there is general agreement with this position. We note that the administration representatives seem quite aware of the fact that it leaves many questions unanswered. In our opinion, these unmet problems are among the most important, as we indicated at that time. We note that the representatives of some nonprofit organizations, notably Blue Cross, felt that the reinsurance provisions might enable them to extend the limited protection which these plans offer to some groups presently outside the scope of their coverage. To whatever extent this is true, we feel that it is a worthy objective. We further noted, however, that representatives of comprehensive prepayment plans operating on a group practice principle reported that there would be little, if any, value to them in the reinsurance proposal.

In this connection, I should like to cite for the information of this committee a declaration of policy adopted at the St. Louis convention of the American Federation of Labor last September:

"In the absence of a comprehensive program of national health insurance, we are encouraged to note the continued growth of union health and welfare plans throughout the country. While many, if not most, of these programs have serious gaps and deficiencies, they help our members in some measure to meet the heavy costs attendant upon sickness and disability. We are particularly gratified to note a growing interest on the part of many unions in the establishment of truly comprehensive direct medical service plans, making use of the advantages of group medical practice in health centers and clinics, serving trade-union members and their families in the community. Such plans represent a long step forward in improving the quality and scope of health care available to working men and women and their dependents." (P. 641, official proceedings, 72d AFL convention.)

The committee will observe the emphasis in this declaration in support of direct medical service plans incorporating group medical practice and based on the prepayment principle. We submit this statement of principle adopted by the American Federation of Labor at this time because it appears to us to have a very direct bearing on the proposals contained in H. R. 7700. As we observed in previous statements presented to this committee, there is a rising tide of interest in the development of such voluntary comprehensive plans in a number of centers throughout the country. Your committee has had presented to it the description of the operation of some of these plans that are already underway. Mr. Hal Gibbons presented a very comprehensive description of the operation of the Labor Health Center in St. Louis. Mr. Fred Umhey described the very extensive program of the various centers that are now operating under provisions of collective bargaining agreements between employers and the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union. Dr. George Baehr, in a statement submitted to the Committee, described the operation of the Health Insurance Plan of Greater New York and, more recently, presented his views in respect to this particular measure growing out of his experience as medical director of that comprehensive plan. There is a relatively new plan in operation in the city of Philadelphia, where 22 unions affiliated with the American Federation of Labor have developed such a comprehensive prepayment plan. You are also acquainted with the plans operated by the Permanente Foundation on the west coast. A considerable number of our local unions, under terms of collective bargaining agreements, are participating in these plans, and the experience with them represents one of the most successful developments to date in meeting the needs of the local membership.

There are a number of other areas today where such plans are in the early formative stage. In the city of Milwaukee, for example, there is a recent announcement of a plan that is just getting started. Proposals are underway in Chicago, as well as in a number or other areas.

In all of these plans there has always been the problem of the considerable capital outlay that is necessary to get the plan started. On the west coast the participants in the Permanente plan were fortunate in having the financial backing of the Kaiser industries. In St. Louis, without detracting from the notable achievement of that plan, we observed that there was a particularly favorable collective-bargaining situation which enabled the employers and the labor union which developed the plan to meet the necessary outlay at the start of the program. In New York the original expenses of organization were met in part by grants from a number of foundations. There was also the important factor of the city government bringing into participation in the plan many thousands of municipal employees, which provided a certain guaranty of financial support. Even here, however, the plan was somewhat hampered in its early stages by the lack of capital for the construction of facilities which would have made it possible for the plan to meet more expeditiously its growing needs.

We are of the opinion that, if enacted, this bill would encourage private lending institutions to provide funds to voluntary associations, including cooperatives and labor unions, which undertake to offer hospitalization and medical care on a prepayment basis. The availability of such loans would certainly help stimulate further experimental developments of these voluntary plans set up by these organizations, as well as by community groups, groups of physicians, and others. We trust, however, that this committee will also give further consideration to the possibility of a supplementary source of funds to be provided by direct Government loans to these groups, as proposed in the earlier bill introduced by Senator HUMPHREY (S. 1052), and in H. R. 6950, introduced by Chairman WOLVERTON last January.

We are aware that this committee is still giving most careful consideration to the reinsurance proposals contained in H. R. 8356, as well as to the various other proposals which have been presented to you. It is our view that if the committee should see its way clear to report out the reinsurance proposal designed to underwrite the extension of even a limited type of voluntary health insurance by both commercial and nonprofit organizations and combine with that the proposals contained in the measure now before you which would enable and encourage voluntary consumer groups to develop comprehensive group practice prepayment service plans, the combination of the two measures would constitute a genuinely constructive approach to important elements of the total health problem. It is in line with this approach that we urge the adoption of H. R. 7700.

And now, Mr. Chairman, when Mr. Cruikshank and I appeared before your committee on April 1, we submitted several specific changes, mostly dealing with definitions, which we proposed be incorporated in this bill. At that time you asked us to suggest language which would implement the changes that we recommended. We are just completing the drafting of that specific language, and will very shortly have it in the hands of your technical staff.

Again, we wish to thank you, Mr. Chairman, for the opportunity you have afforded us to present the views of the American Federation of Labor with respect to these proposals.

Postal Pay and Reclassification Proposals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 3, 1954

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith the following statement I made before the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee on Friday, April 30, 1954:

Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, I appear before you to express support for an adequate pay increase for postal workers and other Federal employees. A pay bill which I introduced is identical with the Withrow bill and calls for an $800 increase and the elimination of the first 2 grades. I am for this legislation because I think it is meritorious and in the best interests of the postal service and our economy.

My second objective, and a very important one, is to oppose the legislation which embodies the proposals offered by Postmaster General Summerfield and the Fry report. Employees have much more to lose than gain by the Summerfield bill, even though it would give a $100 annual pay increase to the average postal worker. Their security would be undermined and their pay standards jeopardized as one-man rule, and spoils-system politics could replace the merit system.

In my humble opinion, the Summerfield approach is basically wrong. I say this because it reflects an economic philosophy held by special-interest groups which have opposed every intelligent social advance in the last generation. It is the thinking of those who accept the trickle-down philosophy on economic issues. On tax legislation this philosophy calls for a disproportionate burden on those least able to pay. On postal rates it would put an extra burden on those who already pay more than their proportionate share. It is not difficult to understand how those who accept this philosophy would offer as little as $10 a year increase to those in the greatest need, while in the high brackets they would suggest an increase of $100 a week.

I can't agree with that kind of thinking and I don't believe members of this committee can be sold on it, despite high-pressure salesmanship and the slick, deceptive advertising campaign. I know that some members of this committee resent some of the tactics which are being used to force this bill through the Congress.

At the outset of our hearings, the Postmaster General submitted the salary study and pay adjustment plan which had been prepared by George Fry & Associates, of Chicago, Ill. I have examined that study rather carefully and have reached the following conclusions:

The study apparently covered a period of approximately 2½ months from mid-November of 1953 to February of this year. According to exhibit No. 11, which is titled "Representative Locations and Installations Study" (p. 45 of the report), the study covered some 29 post offices out of a total of approximately 40,000. In 15 instances it appears that some consideration may have been given to the principal function of the postal service, which is the movement of mail. In all other instances, it appears that the study was limited to such things as supply sections, inspection division offices, traveling mechanicians, and things of that sort.

I believe that the Postmaster General, or one of his representatives, stated that the study was made by eight people. From the length of time involved, the number of offices visited, and the number of people who were engaged in the project, I have reached the conclusion that the study was, of necessity, something less than complete and authoritative. While I would not question the ability of the Fry organization to make an objective study of this nature, I do not believe that the report submitted can qualify as a complete or authoritative finding.

It seems to me, based on the testimony we have heard, that the study is merely a sort of window dressing prepared to support a preconceived objective. On page 24 of the report, under the caption "Legislative Approach," we find the following:

"It is recommended that every effort be made to have the principles rather than all the mechanics of the post-office pay structure incorporated in any new legislation, and that such legislation be broad in text and import. In this way, without any lessening of the overall responsibility by Congress for salary control, the Post Office Department and its field services could administer and control salaries effectively, fairly, and economically in changing times and changing conditions."

If that language means anything at all, it means that those who prepared the report are recommending that the Postmaster General be given the authority "to administer and control salaries effectively * * * in changing times and changing conditions."

Any request for authority to control salaries to meet changing times and conditions can only mean authority to reduce salaries when the economic condition permits. In plain English, the Fry report recommends that the Postmaster General be given authority (which now rests wtih Congress) to upgrade or downgrade positions, increase or decrease salaries, in accord with his own economic views. That, in my opinion, is cause for alarm, not only among postal employees, but among Members of Congress, because of confusion and discontent which would have a terrifying effect on employee morale and the postal service.

The report makes reference in several instances to an alleged lack of incentive in the present pay system. However, it seems to me that if the recommendations were adopted, there would be an even greater lack of incentive for superior work and accomplishment. At the present time, employees have only the hope of a limited number of promotions and the possibility of securing more desirable assignments as an incentive. Under the proposal, both of these would be greatly diminished if not entirely eliminated.

Referring to the Inequities of Present Promotion System (p. 4) the report states:

"The Postal Pay Act, by providing fixed service requirements for those eligible for promotion to supervisory positions (7 years as clerk or carrier in first- and second-class post offices, 7 years as clerk in the postal transportation service, except for the requirement of 9 years as clerk in class B railway and highway post office runs) has restricted the lateral entry of qualified personnel into supervisory positions in the postal field service.

"Although it is traditional in the postal service for supervisory positions to be filled by employees advancing up through the ranks, there should be no arbitrary barriers to prevent these positions being filled if necessary by qualified personnel who have gained the necessary experience outside of the postal service."

I wonder if there are any members of this committee who believe that the adoption of this proposal would lead to anything other than the filling of supervisory positions by political patronage? While it may well have been traditional to fill such positions by employees advancing through the ranks, that condition will no longer prevail once we allow such positions to be filled through the back door. I am sure that all postal employees will recognize that once the way is opened for those politically favored to enter the service at the top, all hope of reward for efficiency will disappear.

On pages 14 and 15 of the report, we find the "Recommended installation and operating policies." No. 4 provides that, "Each job specification should be assigned to a salary grade by the Bureau of Personnel under the Postmaster General."

However, No. 9 provides, "Authority to allocate individual jobs to grades for which specifications have been published should be delegated to the lowest practical level of field supervision (postmasters, district superintendents, terminal managers, and the like) subject to review and correction by the Bureau of Personnel."

The adoption of such policies will perhaps result in a certain flexibility of operation but it would equally provide for a pattern of flexible discrimination in each individual post office. Job descriptions or specifications would be subject to interpretation by each local postmaster and through him, by each supervisor. Under such circumstances, there will be a natural tendency to evaluate a given position solely for the purpose of showing a saving whether such saving results in an injustice to the employee or poorer servive to the public. I believe postal employees are justified in their objections to any such proposal.

In dealing with basic pay policies under the caption "Installation and Administration," on page 13 of the report, we find that "no individual should receive a reduction in pay as a result of this plan." Further, the report states that "employees who are now earning more than the approved maximum of their grade should not be reduced in pay. Where practical, they should be moved in the future to higher grade positions for which they are qualified and in which openings exist." I believe that when considering these recommendations we have to keep in mind the recommendation previously referred to that "Every effort be made to have the principles rather than all the mechanics of the post office pay structure incorporated in any new legislation, and that such legislation be broad in text and import."

I have always looked with a certain amount of skepticism on requests from administrators of Government departments and agencies for broad-sweeping powers. It smacks of totalitarianism and is in sharp conflict with the spirit of good labor-management relations. While we all have a high regard for anyone who occupies the position of Postmaster General, we know that no matter who happens to hold the position at a given time they are necessarily subject to those fallacies which beset the human race. None of us are perfect, and that goes for Postmasters General as well as for Members of Congress.

On page 4, under caption "Preferred Assignment System," the Fry report states, "Another outgrowth of the present pay plan is the so-called preferential assignments system whereby employees may be transferred, on the basis of seniority, to positions of lesser responsibility and difficulty and continue in the same pay range."

It seems to me that those who prepared the report might have elaborated somewhat on the precise positions to which they had reference. Most of the preferential assignments within post offices, or, at least, within post offices with which I am familiar, are those listed in the proposed grades 4 and 5 on pages 52, 53, 54, 55, and 56 of the report. Those preferred assignments involve employees assigned to postal savings, wholesale stamps, information windows, time clerks, and general window clerks, all to be found in the proposed grade 4; and claims clerks, station clerks, clerks performing multiple finance functions, all of which are to be found in the proposed grade 5. If these so-called preferential assignments are really positions of lesser responsibility and difficulty, then it seems to me that those who prepared the report have been guilty of some serious errors.

It is apparent that no effort was made to consult with those who could, if given the opportunity, present helpful information. I note from the report (p. 19) that, "the program was announced at a meeting of representatives of the employee organizations early in November, prior to the starting of the field study." However, from conversations with the employee representatives, I have not been able to find a single instance where any of the employee representatives were consulted in any manner while the study was in progress. I was told by several of the employee leaders that when the announcement was made in November they were also told that they would be consulted and that they would be given an opportunity to discuss the study, and they understood at least that such discussions would take place before the plan was approved. From all I have been able to learn, however, every effort was made to keep the results of the study a closely guarded secret until it was presented to this committee by the Postmaster General on February 16. I wonder if this secrecy was purposely designed to keep the employees and their representatives from knowing anything about the proposal until it was too late for them to do anything about it. I understand that some of the employee representatives were invited to discuss the plan with Assistant Postmasters General Lyons and Abrams on the afternoon of the day in which it was presented to the committee. All of us must recognize, however, that this action amounted to nothing more than window dressing, since the plan had already been presented to the committee and a press release covering the presentation had been given out by the Postmaster General.

I have never before heard of a study of this sort being made entirely without participation of employees or their representatives. Certainly it is not the practice of progressive private employers that President Eisenhower suggested in his statement approving the Summerfield plan. I can only conclude that this was done purposely and that it was intended to place postal employees and their organizations in a defenseless position. I, for one, am entirely unwilling to proceed on that basis. There must be a reason, first, for the secrecy in the preparation of the plan itself, and, secondly, for the introduction of legislation so long a time after the proposal was presented to this committee.

I am not at all impressed with comparisons made with private industry. Furthermore I believe government should set a pattern for private industry to follow—a pattern of sound, practical, and progressive labor-management relations.

We should give thought to what would have the most favorable effect on the service and on the economy. We should take a closer look at the mounting surpluses, not only of food, but of almost everything else. We should give some consideration to human needs, and what income is required for at least a minimum standard of living on a decency level.

I am afraid the human side was overlooked in this proposal. It looks barkwards rather than forward. The practice in private industry it attempts to follow is that which was outlawed in every case when working people won a voice in determining conditions under which they work and live.

In a White House statement, the President expressed support of the recommendation of the Postmaster General because "it combines the best practices of progressive private employers."

As one who has had experience in the field of labor-management relations, I say that this proposal is not the kind that progressive employers would offer. No progressive employer would attempt to change his employment policies and job classifications without taking into confidence the workers in his employ. No such confidence is evidenced in this proposal.

On page 5 of Mr. Summerfield's statement of February 16, he said, and I quote: "The management of the Post Office Department believes that a superior postal service can be built only on the dedicated efforts of employees who feel in their hearts that they are being treated fairly, that they are being paid fairly, and that extra effort and initiative on their part will be rewarded."

My contention is that the Summerfield bill would have the opposite effect from the expressed objective. It would create widespread dissension in the postal service. The adverse effect on morale would lower the quality of the service. At the present time reaction among postal employees does not indicate that this proposal is one that offers fair salaries or inspires good morale or initiative. The volume of protests from all over the Nation speaks for itself.

If this proposal follows the practice of progressive employers in private industry it should contain a provision for recognition of employee oganizations to require Federal departments and agencies to deal with them on all personnel matters, employee appeals and grievances.

Progressive employers recognize the rights of employees to be consulted before sweeping changes, such as proposed in the Summerfield bill, are made. Proper grievance machinery is particularly important when such a change is proposed, yet the Post Office Department has shown no desire to grant such rights to postal employees.

It would be unwise of this committee to adopt this plan without a more thorough study. The pressure on this committee to accept this program should not cause hasty action of approval. Over the past years, under the former administration, it was charged that the Executive was bringing undue pressure on the legislative branch of the Government. But I have never, since I have been a Member of Congress, seen such pressure tactics as have been used to put over this proposal.

Never since I became a member of this committee have so many letters and telegrams come to me from big corporate interests from all parts of the country on a postal-pay bill. I believe that such leters were sent to all Members of Congress. All of them asked that the Summerfield plan be adopted. There is litle doubt that this flood of endorsements from the big business interests was inspired by someone. Few, if any, of those who sent these messages really understand what it is all about. It is not at all surprising that they oppose an adequate pay increase for Federal employees. For the most part the telegrams came from sources which have consistently opposed every social advance that the people have won during the past generation.

Some telegrams implied that a pay raise for postal and Federal employees would set off a round of demands for pay increases by workers in private industry. Such a statement is pure nonsense. The recession trend and the millions of unemployed workers in industry throughout the Nation prove how deceptive such talk really is.

Radio commentators and news columnists, who reflect the extreme conservative point of view, have joined in pressing for the Summerfield measure. They have given the public a one-sided picture and a false impression of this proposal. In one case, a radio commentator said that the men and women who came to Washington in recent weeks to contact their Representatives on postal pay were CIO members, whose only interest was to set off a series of pay increases which would benefit workers in private industry.

When we hear charges about pressure and smokescreens, it is well to keep these things in mind.

I do not believe we should yield to pressure from any source. I do not think we should say "Yes" to every request that Federal employees make. But I sincerely believe they have a good case and deserve a much better deal than offered in the administration bill. My viewpoint, I can assure you, is not due to pressure of any sort, but because of practical experience in dealing with economic problems of this kind.

Mr. Summerfield told this committee that the average pay of clerks and carriers increased 94 percent since 1939 and the cost of living went up only 93.6 percent. What has not been considered is that the national income went up something like 300 percent in the same period.

The Postmaster General also pointed out that custodial laborers had a 127-percent pay increase in contrast with the 93.6-percent rise in living costs. But percentage figures, like charts, can be deceptive and very confusing. It is certainly true of laborers whose wages never did reach the point where they were on a level sufficient for a decent American standard of living.

I know of no one who asks that the same standard of living be guaranteed to every worker, but I do believe that before we start figuring how wide the margin should be between the highest and lowest pay of employees, we should be sure to consider a minimum standard based on the needs of an average family.

In spite of across-the-board increases, the present minimum pay does not permit much more than the bare necessities, and why shouldn't all people in the Federal service feel that their children should also have the right and opportunity for a college education? That possibility is limited for many children of Federal employees.

In private industry pay margins are wide. But I don't think we should follow that practice in the Government service. Ability and initiative should be recognized. Compensation should be paid according to skill and effort. There is no disagreement on that.

If we are realistic, we will agree, too, that private industry is not a state of perfection. There may be evils in the Federal service, but they can be found also in private industry. Those in control or at the top frequently set their own salaries—whatever the traffic will bear and sometimes more. The determination is not always on their worth or contribution to the industry.

Employers also differ widely on what practices are most sound. Some employers accept the right of workers to have an organization. Others bitterly oppose. What is right is frequently a matter of opinion of progressive and backward employers and there can be an honest difference of opinion among us as to what is sound and progressive.

The Postmaster General is doing a good selling job on his proposal. His TV and radio programs, newspaper releases, and bulletins are well done and well timed.

The public is getting but one side of the story. It sounds good if you don't get the whole story. But we on the committee have a chance to see what's inside the pretty looking package the Postmaster General is trying to sell, and I, for one, don't think it's what it's advertised to be.

From what I have seen and heard in the past 15 months, I can't help but wonder if all members of the new team believe that the postal service should be operated as a public enterprise. I recall a United States News article of about 2 years ago which listed the post office as one of the Federal operations that the United States Chamber of Commerce thought should be considered for sale to private owners.

The post-office service has been pictured in a false light for a long time. I suspect that there have always been some in high places that can't accept public enterprise as part of a free-enterprise system.

And now, before closing, Mr. Chairman, I want to add other and even more important reasons why I think we ought to scrap this Summerfield proposal.

There are many "gimmicks" in the bill which can be interpreted in such a way as to permit civil-service and employee organizations to be weakened or destroyed. They give the opportunity for a strong top man to force his will on all employees in the service. I am sure none on this committee wants to give one man the right to hire and fire in the postal service—to cut pay or raise salaries as he wishes. Fear among Federal employees does not promote good or efficient Government service. The postal workers, thanks to their splendid organizations, have not felt the lash of unscrupulous strong-arm policies as have many unfortunate Federal employees who lack organization strong enough to successfully block abuse and injustice.

I could accept Mr. Summerfield's proposal in better faith if I would not remember some of the incidents which I thought were less than fair and not in accord with sound democratic principles and policies.

I have not forgotten his statement made on January 21, 1954, before the National Industrial Conference Board in New York City when he said, and I quote:

"Meanwhile, the Government has had a soul-searching. Almost 2,200 people who were security risks are no longer using up your tax money. I am here to tell you that we are not hiring new ones. Somehow I do not feel too amicably inclined toward people who make treason a preoccupation."

Does anyone on this committee believe as it has been charged that 2,200 traitors were fired as the Postmaster General inferred? After all the evasion, sidestepping and ducking of Civil Service Commissioner Young on that question, I don't think any member of this committee will accept such a statement as anything but false and morally wrong. I am sure that no normal, intelligent and informed person believes it, and those who have been saying it know it is false and deceptive.

It has been said that those opposed to the administration bill are using smokescreens. It seems to me that the air is full of smoke and a good portion comes from the Post Office Department.

We all remember the poll on postal rate legislation that was launched by the Post Office Department and paid for with tax funds.

The loaded questions made it quite evident that the poll was not intended to measure public opinion but to influence it—and to influence Members of Congress.

I remember past criticism that the Truman administration used tax funds to popularize social security and public housing. I thought the criticism was farfetched. But what about the Post Office Department Information Service that everyday is pouring out a flood of propaganda bulletins? The last bulletin was numbered above 3,000. These bulletins proclaim the great virtues of the Department. They tell of great savings, improved postal services greater efficiency, higher employee morale, which we know is largely fictional and empty self-praise.

I have too much respect for the intelligence of the average citizen to think that he can be made to believe that black is white, even if it is repeated time and again. And I am even more sure that members of this committee cannot be influenced in that manner—and I feel confident that you will ditch this proposal until we can take a good and thorough second looks.

It is not members of this committee who are putting up smokescreens, as inferred on April 6, only several weeks ago, by Mr. Summerfield. He told this committee that it must be apparent to all that criticism of his reclassification proposal is nothing more than a smokescreen. On that same day, Mr. Summerfield used the name of Richard J. Gray, head of the Building and Construction trades department of the AFL, as a supporter of his proposal. I was surprised, as no other labor leader in America has endorsed the Summerfield bill. I had a chance to speak to Mr. Gray about it and he admitted that he didn't know much about it. I doubt if most of the other inspired letterwriters, commentators, and businessmen knew any more about it than Mr. Gray. I think it would be most interesting to have Mr. Gray appear before our committee on the matter.

I have introduced legislation for an across-the-board pay bill, but I would be quite willing to see a compromise which would call for a flat increase together with a percentage hike.

I hope we can get together on a bill promptly. I further hope that we will not meet some of the experiences as on the postal rate bill where even my good friend, Mr. Murray, objected that it was unfair to members of the committee and that the Department was going too far with some of its tactics to obtain their objective.

Henry J. Kaiser Testifies in Favor of H. R. 7700, a Bill To Establish Federal Insurance of Private Loans To Construct Necessary Self-Supporting Hospitals and Other Medical Facilities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1954

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, continuing its hearings on H. R. 7700, a bill to amend the Public Health Service to provide mortgage loan insurance for hospitals and medical facilities has heard a statement from Mr. Henry J. Kaiser, president of the Kaiser Foundation, who strongly advocated this bill. Mr. Kaiser emphasized the tremendous importance of the bill in helping to solve the health needs of this Nation, and stated that it would prove to be one of the most constructive steps that this Congress could take toward stimulating private initiative in the development of a sound health program.

Mr. Kaiser stated that this bill would accomplish the following: It would open the way for many millions of our people to obtain voluntary, comprehensive, prepayment health plan protection they can afford. It would enable thousands of doctors to obtain necessary facilities and provide their patients the highest form of teamwork medicine. It would stimulate investment of enormous sums of private capital in the building of entirely self-supporting medical centers, hospitals, diagnostic and treatment clinics, without subsidies, without Government control, and without lay interference in the practice of medicine.

Mr. Kaiser's statement to the committee, in part, is as follows:

Statement of Henry J. Kaiser on H. R. 7700 (Wolverton Medical Facilities Insurance Bill) Before the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, April 30, 1954, Washington, D. C.

I want to express my heartfelt conviction that the American people can be exceedingly grateful to your committee. You have worked tirelessly and earnestly endeavoring to find solutions to the health needs of our people.

You are grappling with the problems of health that directly affect American families and individual citizens in more intimate human terms than almost any question confronting the country.

You have not been dismayed by the defeatists—those whom your chairman has aptly called the advocates of do-nothing—who fail to recognize the needs of the people; nor have you succumbed to the temptation of insisting upon nothing less than a cure-all solution to the Nation's medical-care problems—a temptation that also leads to inaction. You have been seeking effective, step-by-step solutions to these problems rather than demanding immediate panaceas.

In this search your hearings have developed a wealth of significant information which, in your capable hands, will lead to substantial constructive action in stimulating the forces of free enterprise to bring more and better medical care to far greater numbers of our people at costs they can afford.

It has been a great privilege for us to come across the country to testify again at your committee's invitation because we desire to be of any and all possible assistance to your important work. We are particularly happy to be invited to express our views on H. R. 7700—the bill you are now considering.

ENDORSEMENT OF H. R. 7700

We wholeheartedly endorse H. R. 7700, the medical facilities insurance bill introduced by Chairman Wolverton.

Of course, this legislation has not been advanced as the answer to all the manifold health problems of the Nation, such as the shortages of medical and allied personnel, inadequate public-health programs in many parts of the country, or the problems involved in increasing the opportunities for more intensive research in the prevention and cure of the chronic diseases; also, H. R. 7700 undoubtedly will be improved upon as to its details through suggestions for revisions being received and reviewed by your committe.

Enactment of H. R. 7700, in my judgment, will prove to be one of the most constructive steps that this Congress could take toward stimulating private initiative answers to health needs of the American people.

H. R. 7700 can open the way for many millions of our people to obtain voluntary, comprehensive, prepayment health-plan protection that they can afford.

It will enable thousands of doctors throughout the country to obtain necessary modern facilities and to provide their patients the highest form of teamwork medicine.

H. R. 7700 can stimulate the investment of enormous sums of private capital in the building of entirely self-supporting medical centers, hospitals, diagnostic and treatment clinics, and other medical facilities, without subsidies, without Government control, and without lay interference in the practice of medicine.

THE NEEDS AND DEMANDS FOR COMPREHENSIVE HEALTH COVERAGE

Spokesmen for millions upon millions of our people have testified before your committee concerning the overwhelming need and desire of the people to cover a much larger portion of their doctor and hospital bills by the prepayment method.

Chairman Wolverton's H. R. 7700 is specifically designed to broaden and extend voluntary health coverage. The importance of this objective can be pointed up by the 1952 statement of the then president of the American Medical Association: "Voluntary prepayment plans are the medical profession's greatest bulwark against socialization of medicine."

The fact that literally an avalanche of people are turning to one or another form of health insurance has been well demonstrated by statistics presented to your committee on the phenomenal growth of membership in prepayment plans. The country is now approaching the 100 million mark in the number of people who have some prepaid protection against hospital costs.

Yet, Mrs. Hobby and her staff of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare have told you: "Despite the progress, it is evident that many of the needs are not being met. Major long-term illness can become a financial catastrophe for many American families. * * * In many cases the coverage now offered through voluntary insurance is extremely limited. * * * Only about 17 percent of the total amount of private expenditures for medical care was paid for by some form of insurance in 1952."

The most startling fact presented by Mrs. Hobby's staff is that only "about 3 percent of the population is covered for comprehensive medical care."

The groundswell of public demand throughout the land today is for comprehensive coverage that provides people both preventive medical attention and protection against the staggering costs of prolonged illnesses.

As yet the doctors, hospitals, and prepayment health plans of this country have barely scratched the surface of providing, on a prepayment basis, the full extent of the medical care which can be supplied through the voluntary, self-supporting health plans.

The vision of the gigantic opportunities for the free enterprise of the medical profession, hospitals, and health plans to meet the people's needs is seen by President Eisenhower, who said in his special January 18 message to Congress that voluntary health insurance plans "can reach many more people and provide better and broaded benefits. They should be encouraged and helped to do so."

H. R. 7700 would materially assist in accomplishing these objectives of better and broader benefits for more people.

To illustrate these points, where voluntary, group practice prepayment plans have been started—plans which provide comprehensive medical care services at reasonable cost—popular demand for such services has exceeded the capacity of existing facilities to meet the demand. For example, the Kaiser Foundation health plan in northern and southern California has had to close down its enrollment of new applicants for membership from time to time until additional facilities could be financed and built.

A great contribution of H. R. 7700 is that it will accelerate the creation, growth, and development of comprehensive health-service plans throughout the country by stimulating the provision of necessary hospital and related facilities.

THE VAST SHORTAGE OF MEDICAL FACILITIES THAT H. R. 7700 CAN HELP MEET THROUGH STIMULATION OF PRIVATE INVESTMENTS

In trying to be as helpful as possible to your committee's work for improving the Nation's health, my associates and I in the Kaiser Foundation health program have studied the challenging facts you have assembled concerning the enormous shortages of hospital beds and unfilled needs for new diagnostic and treatment centers, as well as allied facilities.

We personally went also to the offices of the Health, Education, and Welfare Department and its Division of Hospital Facilities of the Public Health Service and we have been deeply impressed by the reports they have presented to you. H. R. 7700 is aimed directly at helping fill part of the critical needs for facilities shown by these official facts and figures, and I refer specifically to the following:

The Nation is short 848,678 hospital beds of all categories, according to the surveys conducted by all the State hospital authorities.[1]

In general-hospital beds alone, the Nation as a whole is reported short by 31 percent, with substantial variations among different areas.

The expenditure of more than $100 million a year is declared required merely to replace general hospitals that have been classed as firetraps and as hazards to health and safety.

The construction of more than $180 million a year of general hospitals is reported needed just to keep up with the growth in population.

President Eisenhower[2] and Mrs. Hobby have told the Congress that conservatively the Nation needs more than a half million additional hospital beds.

The cost of needed additional hospital beds is placed even under these most conservative estimates at more than $8 billion.

As you have been confronted by the magnitude of the deficits in the country's health facilities and existing services, you no doubt have been deeply concerned over the problems at every turn. Now I see our health problems as opportunities. In fact, it has always been my philosophy that problems are opportunities in work clothes.

---

[1] Hearings before Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on H. R. 7341, February 4 and 5, 1954, table p. 61.

[2] President Eisenhower's health message to Congress, January 18, 1954.

I see no reason why the billions that must be raised for needed hospitals have to come solely from taxes and charitable contributions. The Wolverton bill, H. R. 7700, opens up some stirring opportunities for additional effective solutions to this problem.

There are the opportunities for private capital, under the stimulus of Federal insurance of loans, to be generated in steadily increasing millions to build medical facilities on a completely self-liquidating basis.

There are the opportunities opened up for medical centers and other facilities to be financed on a fully self-supporting basis.

There are the opportunities for doctors, who desire, but up to now have been unable to do so, to avail themselves of the advantages of the highest form of teamwork practice and, at the same time, to provide their patients more high quality medical care within the patients' means.

Against the Nation's current estimated need for construction of $8 billion worth of hospitals, it should be emphasized that H. R. 7700 is directly designed to encourage the flow of private financing into facilities that meet the tests of soundness and of ability to repay the insured loans. It would not, and should not, provide insurance of loans for facilities which must of necessity depend upon taxes or subsidies.

Up to now private financing for hospitals has been extremely limited by the understandable reluctance of banks and insurance companies to loan on them.

H. R. 7700 recognizes that there is an important, though almost untouched field for the sound extension of private capital for medical facilities which can stand on their own feet financially. To the extent that the Government insurance of loans stimulates private investment in medical facilities, it will take a burden off the taxpayers and part of the drain off hard-pressed charities and philanthropy. We believe that an increasing portion of needed medical facilities can be privately financed on a self-sustaining basis, under the stimulus of the Wolverton bill.

A major need for which H. R. 7700 proposes to stimulate investment of private moneys is for diagnostic and treatment facilities. Mrs. Hobby has testified: [1]

"A diagnostic and treatment center is a facility in which a number of medical specialists and technicians operate as a team. It is a well-recognized fact that the team approach results in earlier diagnosis and better treatment for the patient. The full extent of the need for diagnostic and treatment centers is unknown."

A significant and hopeful trend is taking place in the building of doctors' offices and outpatient clinics in connection with hospitals. The Commission on the Financing of Hospital Care has pointed out the importance of utilizing outpatient services as much as possible. Visits by ambulatory patients to doctors often make their admission to costly hospital care unnecessary. The practice of preventive medicine—early diagnosis and early detection of disease—can cut the public's health bills and at the same time assure the people much better health.

H. R. 7700 can make an invaluable contribution by helping make possible diagnostic and treatment centers, operated exclusively and independently by local doctors in every community. They would be good business for the doctors; they would readily pay for themselves, and most important of all, the patients would get a great dividend of better care, reasonable costs and healthier lives.

---

[1] Hearings before the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce February 4 and 5, 1954, p. 19.

Address of Maj. Gen. James A. Stuart at Special Services Honoring the District of Columbia's War Dead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1954

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Maj. Gen. James A. Stuart of the Marine Corps at the special services honoring the District of Columbia's war dead on Sunday, May 2, 1954:

PRICE OF FREEDOM

(Address by Maj. Gen. James A. Stuart, U. S. Marine Corps)

It is with a very deep sense of humility that I accepted the honor of offering here today a few words of tribute to those who have fought and died for our country and the principles for which it stands for.

It is the humility of one who knows how great the debt the living owe to those who died for their belief in liberty and for their hope of peace.

It is the humility of one who realizes how little mere words can serve to pay tribute to them.

As one who has spent the greater part of his life in the military service, I am gratified and inspired to take part in a memorial tribute of this scope and nature.

The sponsors of this commemorative observance, the District of Columbia War Memorial and May Day Corporation, and all participating organizations, may well be justly proud of their exemplary efforts in recalling to memory annually the sacrifices individuals of our Nation, have made in order that we might continue to enjoy the fruits of liberty and freedom.

It is entirely fitting that a day should be set aside upon which to extend our thoughts to our departed comrades, their families and friends.

Such thoughts bring home to us very clearly that freedom is not free.

It is not gratuitous, to be had without cost of obligation.

Though previous and of value beyond human ability to assess.

Its price is sometimes dreadfully high.

Many of us here today can remember back almost 36 years ago to the end of World War I.

The costly struggle was over.

The forces of democracy had prevailed.

The free world was still free but the price of that freedom was high.

Those who fought knew, and many wondered perhaps, as they grieved for fallen comrades, if a solution to liberty and freedom could not be found.

Less than 25 years later, however, many of these same men who had fought so valiantly in freedom's cause in World War I, were called again—this time along with their sons—to oppose the rapid encroachment of aggressor nations upon the liberties of the free world.

In that Second World War, the end of which we celebrated a scant 9 years ago, we gained a decisive military victory wherever we fought, and the assault upon freedom ceased again. But the flower of our young manhood paid, and paid highly.

Slightly less than 4 years ago we engaged in another fight—for right and freedom.

Once again our finest young men responded to the desperate needs of the hour, once again many paid the supreme price. That freedom and justice might still live.

It must now be unmistakably clear that military victories alone do not purchase freedom and peace for all time.

Freedom must be repeatedly fought for and protected between times with a continuous and militant vigilance.

It is to the men who paid the price in full in order that we might still continue to enjoy the fruits of liberty, so hardily won by the forbears of this Nation, that we pay honor and tribute today.

These were men, even as you and I, holding the same hopes and aspirations. The same love of life and the glories of the future, the same dreams and way of life, for them was never fulfillment.

So, to the more than a million outstanding and upstanding Americans who have died fighting for this great country of ours.

We owe a debt that cannot be paid in any coin.

We all, each and every one of us, have been placed under a very real and deep obligation.

Surely, something that is so precious, so very important—something for which so many fine Americans have given their lives to defend, must be valuable to those of us who remain.

Our obligation is to militantly continue its preservation, if for no other reason than to see to it that these men did not die in vain.

Those of us assembled here today and either the fortunate ones who were spared or the friends and stanch supporters of the principles which motivated them, because we were spared it is not too farfetched to presume our mission on earth has not been fulfilled.

That we have duties still to perform which are as important as the battlefield, missions of the past.

As I have pointed out, freedom is not free, neither is it something that can be purchased for cash and the account closed.

It is an installment-plan purchase, another payment always ready to fall due.

The continuing price is vigilance and militant strength, devotion, sacrifice.

It must be paid faithfully and on demand.

It is this solemn thought which prompts that which I now want to say. Today as a nation, our efforts are focused upon one predominant objective—the surrender of the liberties for which so many have fought and died.

Those liberties dearer to free men than their lives or any material thing which they possess.

On this May day it would be a mockery for us to laud the valor and devotion of our fighting men, and shun the burden of safeguarding that for which they fought.

Perhaps the finest legacy left us by these courageous men is the fact that each was fighting for that in which he believed.

They were not engaged in battles to preserve a dynasty, nor to win land in order to subjugate whole nations of peoples.

Theirs was the battle to preserve to all men the freedom of their souls.

I am convinced that those we honor today are impelled by the hope for more than the immediate victory to be attained by force of arms, as it has been one of the traditions, here in the Nation's Capital today, to build solidly, so that what is constructed can be enjoyed by many succeeding generations, so it was, that these men, as did their fathers before them, fight, that liberty might be preserved, and all the benefits of freedom and peace accrue to the land as their continuing memorial.

If the bright flame of their lives had that purpose, we are bound to maintain that purpose as our own.

Our presence here today would be but a sentimental gesture of little value if we do not resolve that we as individuals shall embrace our duties as citizens with the same unity of purpose and determination as did the men whom we gather to honor.

Today our desires must not be for tasks equal to our powers, but rather for powers equal to our tasks.

Our aim must ever be to preserve the true liberty of our citizens and at the same time assist others to acquire the same blessings.

We have learned from experience that the position of our country as the primary power between democracy and enslavement by dictatorship becomes more difficult and hazardous every day.

In this critical situation true constancy to our Government is a priceless virtue. That virtue must be cultivated by all of us.

It involves on our part a willingness to sacrifice for the common good.

It dedicates our first efforts to support of the Nation's integrity.

It consecrates us to the preservation of established American institutions and ideals.

It breathes tolerance and understanding into our relations with our fellow citizens.

It inspires reverence for those principles which are the source of the benign blessings bestowed upon us by the American way of life.

This virtue must be something a great deal more than an irradiating optimism that somehow everything will work out all right.

We must face present problems and the future with a realistic approach and a full consciousness that all of us must continue to devote our best efforts to the American ideal if it is to survive and prosper.

We cannot close our eyes to the fact that our survival is threatened as long as there are destructive ideologies with aggressive tendencies abroad in the world.

The problems we face for the future may be greater than any we have faced in the past.

The sacrifices we shall be called upon to make may be greater than any ever made before.

Whatever the problems, whatever the sacrifices asked, we must accept them only as challenges to our destiny.

We dare not fail, lest civilization suffer its worst retrogression in all recorded history.

And so today, as we rededicate ourselves to the cause for which so many Americans have died, I would like to pay homage to our fallen comrades by recalling to the minds of those present one of the more eloquent tributes to those who have died in battle: "Among them uncommon valor was a common thing."

And to express the hope that as they were welcomed to the halls of Valhalla they found there that peace which passeth all understanding.

Outlawing Communist Party

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARLAN HAGEN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1954

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include the following Calipatria Chamber of Commerce resolution in support of my bill to outlaw the Communist Party:

CALIPATRIA CHAMBER OF COMMERCE RESOLUTION

The Calipatria Chamber of Commerce believing in the urgent necessity for enactment of legislation by the Congress of the United States, outlawing the Communist Party of the United States and the members thereof supports the unanimous adoption by the California Legislature, at its last session, of Assembly Joint Resolution No. 5 urging and petitioning Congress of the United States to immediately enact such legislation; did at its regular meeting assembled in Calipatria, Calif., adopt the following resolution:

"Whereas the Communist Party of the United States is engaged in and committed to a world-wide conspiracy to overthrow and illegally dominate and supersede noncommunist governments, including the Government of the United States; and

"Whereas to accomplish its objectives, the Communist Party of the United States advocates the use of force, violence, and other illegal means; and

"Whereas the Communist Party of the United States permits its members no deviation from its policies and programs, with the result that each member thereof is a participant in its unlawful subversive conspiracy to overthrow the Government of the United States; and

"Whereas such nefarious activities should not be permitted to continue under sanction of law; and

"Whereas at present, there are several bills pending before the Congress of the United States, including H. R. 7405, H. R. 7846, and S. 2752, which would outlaw the Communist Party of the United States and the members thereof: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Calipatria Chamber of Commerce*, That the Congress of the United States be and it hereby is petitioned and urged to immediately enact legislation to outlaw the Communist Party of the United States and the members thereof; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the secretary of the chamber is hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, to the President of the Senate, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

This is to certify that the above is a true and correct copy of resolution adopted by the Calipatria Chamber of Commerce, in regular meeting assembled at Calipatria, Calif., on the 21st day of April 1954.

R. M. CHAPMAN,
Secretary-Treasurer.

Hero of Detrick Incident Is Back at His Job There

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DeWITT S. HYDE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1954

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an article which appeared in the Frederick Post on April 20, 1954, entitled "Hero of Detrick Incident Is Back at His Job There," by Betty Sullivan, as an example of the devoted loyalty of many of our Federal employees.

The article follows:

HERO OF DETRICK INCIDENT IS BACK AT HIS JOB THERE

(By Betty Sullivan)

Joseph R. Larsen, Jr., is back at work.

Monday was his first day on the job since June 1, 1953, and a very special occasion it is for him and for his colleagues in Dr. Dale Jenkins' laboratory at Camp Detrick.

To Larsen it marks graduation from a 9 months' course as tough and rugged as a man can take. To Detrick it means the return of an important researcher whose phenomenal bravery and determination safeguarded top-secret information.

What 26-year-old Joseph Larsen didn't know on Monday when he trundled himself into the lab was that 2 hours later Col. John J. Hayes, flanked by a sizable contingent of Detrick notables, would invade his office to present a Meritorious Civilian Service Award, one of the highest honors a grateful government bestows upon an individual whose patriotism is beyond the normal call of duty.

Detrick notables present at the ceremony included: Dr. LeRoy D. Fothergill, scientific adviser to Colonel Hayes; Dr. John L. Schwab, Director of Technical Operations; Dr. Dale Jenkins, Larsen's immediate superior; Dr. Carl Brewer, Chief of the Division; Lt. Col. Cecil D. Miller, deputy to Colonel Hayes.

The award stated: "Having distinguished himself by displaying outstanding courage and risk of personal safety, placing his responsibilities for safeguarding highly classified documents above his personal well-being. * * *"

It was no dramatic wartime act of heroism that distinguished Larsen, and started the chain events that have, he says, jet propelled the last 9 months. A commonplace automobile accident set things in motion.

AUTHORIZED COURIER

That was early on the morning of June 2, 1953. Larsen, a Chemical Corps civilian entomologist, was driving by jeep from the Chemical Center to Detrick. He had recently been transferred to the installation here and his family had not moved. He traveled daily from Edgewood—just another commuter, to all appearances,. Actually he was a very special courier authorized to transport top-secret Army documents.

That June morning Larsen was custodian of a packet of papers, later discreetly described by a Detrick spokesman as "very important to the welfare of the United States." As the jeep neared Unionville, the steering mechanism locked, the vehicle crashed and Larsen was thrown out. He lay dazed, desperately injured, but doggedly he clung to consciousness, his every instinct alert to guard the documents he still clutched.

Not until State Police Sgt. C. D. Mades arrived and assumed responsibility for safe delivery of the papers, did Larsen permit himself to be put on a stretcher and taken to the Frederick Memorial Hospital. There for 7 weeks he fought the first battles of a long campaign for health. Delicate spinal surgery was performed by Dr. E. P. Thomas. Every possible treatment was given. Then July 21 an Army ambulance plane came in and Larsen, accompanied by Dr. Thomas, flew to New York.

UNIQUE INSTITUTE

There he entered one of the country's unique establishments, the New York University Institute of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation, part of the huge Bellevue Medical Center, where Dr. Howard Rusk is carrying out his own original, often unorthodox but spectacularly successful ideas of getting paraplegics back to normal life and work. * * *

With pulleys and slings Larsen learned to move about in bed, then to swing himself out into a wheelchair, to a straight chair, and back again. He was fitted with braces, taught to walk with arm-bracing canes.

He learned to dress himself again, to care for and tend his body as a normal adult. Rusk people "strive for independence" and even the physicians who work with them often are astonished at the degree of proficiency acquired by paraplegics, quadraplegics, amputees, and the other handicapped in the institute.

Now Mr. and Mrs. Larsen are back at Detrick. They are in post quarters only a little distance from the entomology lab where he will work. Before long they'll build a home of their own, one especially designed for easy comfortable living of a paraplegic.

BACK HOME IN FREDERICK

Frederick has come to seem home to them, although they had no residence here before the accident. The whole community was touched last year by the Larsen brand of courage, and so much warm friendliness and hospitality was given Mr. and Mrs. Larsen they said they wanted to make this their home.

They both have "a very special orchid" for the Frederick Memorial Hospital. Like all healthy people, Larsen before the accident never spared a thought to what paralyzed people go through. Here he was in a fracture bed, turned frequently, massaged, and kept in such excellent condition that he arrived in New York ready for Dr. Rusk's strenuous rehabilitation. Others are not so fortunate. Larsen saw patients in New York so ravaged by bed sores they'd have to be treated a year or more before they could begin on the physical exercise of rehabilitation.

Last July, Larsen said "If there's one chance in a million I can walk again, I'll make it." He has. Today he's an independent man with a good job in his chosen field. His biggest worry now is keeping his weight to the 200 pounds that's his normal. "You learn to think about that when you walk on your hands," he says as he swings along on his special canes.

Henry J. Kaiser Presents Additional Data in Support of H. R. 7700, a Bill To Establish Federal Insurance of Private Loans To Construct Necessary Self-Supporting Hospitals and Other Medical Facilities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 29, 1954

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, in his testimony before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce in favor of H. R. 7700, Mr. Henry J. Kaiser presented a detailed statemeint as to the Government's role under H. R. 7700, a bill to guarantee loans for construction of medical facilities, and why he thinks this venture would be successful. He also stated that this bill is designed to provide facilities for the modern practice of medicine on a teamwork basis. His detailed statement with respect to these matters is as follows:

VIEWS OF HENRY J. KAISER ON H. R. 7700

INSURANCE OF PRIVATE LOANS ON A SOUND BASIS

The Government's role under H. R. 7700 would be the well-established and eminently successful role of insuring private loans by banks, insurance companies, and other private lending institutions for construction of financially sound medical and hospital facilities. This is a true American private enterprise way.

Various large lending institutions with which we have discussed this type of insured mortgage loan have indicated they would be willing to make such loans upon presentation of facts which clearly support the financial soundness of proposed medical facility projects.

The bill spells out that the only ones eligible for insured loans are those approved as responsible and able to repay the obligations for facilities.

Certainly the banks and insurance companies will exercise their high standards of prudent judgment and factfinding to ascertain to the maximum the responsibility of borrowers and their projects. It has been amply proved over the years that Government insurance or guaranties of loans does not result in lending institutions relaxing their credit standards. They have their own standing and reputation for soundness to safeguard.

Moreover, severe penalties are imposed upon a lending institution granting an unsound insured loan. Under this bill the lender in such cases would receive a low rate of interest and would have to wait 10 years to obtain full repayment of a defaulted balance.

You well know the remarkable record of the Nation's financial institutions in the tremendously successful insured loan programs of generating billions of dollars of private capital for homes for millions of American families; houses, businesses, and farms for veterans, and defense emergency factories built by private industries. H. R. 7700 would extend for medical facilities this same insurance principle that has worked so effectively in the programs of the Federal Housing Administration for home building; the Veterans' Administration for veterans' small businesses, homes, and farms; and the Federal Reserve Board's work with V-loans.

The expenditures for the mortgage-insurance program provided by Chairman Wolverton's bill would be paid out of the premiums collected for such insurance. It is pertinent to note that under FHA-type loans the Government never has had to pay out any public funds for losses incurred. As a matter of fact, the FHA has shown a 45-percent surplus of fees and premiums received above all expenses and losses. Here are the figures:

FHA from inception through June 30, 1953

Income: Fees, premiums, interest, dividends, etc	$768,372,312
Expenses:	
Operating, etc	308,342,199
Interest	24,478,801
Losses and charge-offs	25,402,373
Reserve for possible losses	56,299,727
Total expenses	414,523,100
Net income above expenses	353,849,212

A major purpose of Federal mortgage insurance is to provide a reasonable trial period to demonstrate to private lending institutions that certain publicly desirable facilities can and should be financed on a normal commercial basis. Thus FHA-type loans started a housing boom, and financial institutions have invested more than $23,600,000,000 through insured loans in the building of about 4 million dwelling units. Financial institutions likewise have invested $20,600,000,000, under Veterans' Administration-insured loans in 3,290,000 units of veterans' businesses, farms, and homes. The insurance provided the assurances and underlying stability which brought forth huge amounts of private capital.

Similarly, some additional experience with the financing of medical and hospital facilities organized to operate on a completely self-supporting basis is necessary to convince private lending institutions that they can be financed on a normal commercial basis. This is a desirable Government objective and is the function of H. R. 7700.

As an illustration, the banks would not initially finance the construction of hospitals by the Kaiser Foundation without a private Kaiser guaranty. Now, as the result of experience with a number of Kaiser Foundation hosiptals, they are lending on additional new hospitals without any guaranty.

Already there are approximately 630 groups of doctors successfully operating around the United States today, numbers of them already possessing clinics and anxious to build their own hospitals or other needed facilities. They would be well qualified as applicants for loans under H. R. 7700 to expand diagnostic and treatment centers and build new hospitals.

Certain outstanding leaders of the medical profession have testified that, in their firm opinion, hundreds of new groups of doctors would establish group practice, voluntary prepayment health service plans if long-term financing for necessary facilities were made available to them.

If the sole accomplishment of the Wolverton bill were to release hundreds of millions of dollars of private capital, not now obtainable, to help build needed medical facilities, that would be a lasting service to the people. Yet the purposes and potentialities are even greater.

MODERN MEDICINE FOR MILLIONS OF AMERICANS

H. R. 7700 is designed to provide facilities for the modern practice of medicine on a teamwork basis.

In facilities financed through insured loans, doctors representing general practice and the major specialties can practice the highest form of group teamwork medicine—in modern facilities with modern equipment—to the end that the full use of advanced medical skills is made available for the prevention and treatment of disease.

However, modern medicine practiced in modern facilities is still not an adequate answer to the vast majority of our fellow citizens who today anxiously ask: "What will happen if serious illness or a costly operation hits me or my family?"

Modern medicine practiced in modern facilities must be brought within the financial means of the people. For this reason, a fundamental element of H. R. 7700 is the combination of prepayment with the principles of group practice in integrated hospital and outpatient medical centers, where major emphasis is placed on preventive medicine.

Through prepayment, the well help pay for the sick and payment for medical services is budgeted in an orderly fashion.

Through group practice in integrated hospital and medical facilities, great economies are achieved in eliminating duplication of overhead expenses, duplication of equipment and auxiliary personnel, and in the elimination of unnecessary hospitalization where outpatient services are available and are medically indicated.

Preventive medical services serve not only to prevent disease, arrest it in its early stages, or bring it under effective control, but also serve to keep the costs of medical care down, since it is much more costly to provide services for the treatment of disease in its advanced stages; also, preventive medical services are the major weapons in our attack upon the chronic diseases.

These elements—prepayment, group practice, well-planned integrated hospital and medical facilities, and preventive medical care—which I described at some length in my earlier appearance before this committee on January 11, comprise the new economics of medical care. These elements are not untried nor untested.

In all parts of the country these principles have been tested during the past two decades and longer. Groups of physicians practice on a teamwork basis in the Mayo Clinic, the Crile Clinic, the Leahy Clinic, and in university hospitals, like Johns Hopkins, and in hundreds of medical-group clinics.

Prepayment is a well-established principle familiar to us all.

The advantages of well-planned integrated facilities are well known, not only in medicine but in all phases of industrial and commercial enterprise.

Emphasis upon disease prevention and the development of preventive medical services have been principal objectives of the leaders in the field of medicine and public health for many decades.

The fusing of these elements in group-practice health-service prepayment plans have been described to you by Dr. Russell V. Lee, Palo Alto Clinic; Dr. Clifford H. Loos, Ross-Loos Clinic; Dr. George Baehr, Health Insurance Plan of Greater New York; and, in addition to ourselves, by other witnesses who have come before this committee. The spread of these tried and tested elements by other groups throughout the country will be a basic development out of H. R. 7700. The insured loans will remove the major obstacle—that is, the lack of funds for long-term financing of the necessary hospital and related facilities—the obstacle standing in the way of rapid growth and development of the new economics of medical care.

H. R. 7700 rejects the idea that the best medical care has to be limited to the well-to-do; rejects the idea that modern advances in the technique of disease prevention and cure have become so expensive that only the few, not the many, can realize their benefits.

This, unfortunately, has been true where outmoded, inefficient organization of services and facilities has not kept pace with the great scientific advances in medicine. In fact, this is the fundamental paradox of medical care in the United States today—20th century medical knowledge, skills, and technique and ancient forms of organization of medical services. The new economics of medical care embodied within the Wolverton bill makes it eminently practical for the full and comprehensive benefits of 20th century medical knowledge, skill, and technique to be brought within the means of the people to pay for it.

Spokesmen for millions upon millions of Americans are demanding that the people be afforded the advantages of modern medical science with all its wonderful skills for preserving health, saving lives, and extending the life span. But outdated, disorganized, topsy-turvy forms of supplying medical services nullify and deny to too many people the advances of modern medical science.

Those people who live in areas where group practice prepayment plans are operating can enjoy the advantages of modern, comprehensive medical care services at costs within the means of the average person. Many millions of our citizens who do not now have access to group practice prepayment plan membership, would be given this opportunity through the enactment of H. R. 7700.

Much has been said and written about so-called free choice in discussions of the changing pattern of medical economics. It is significant to point out that in these discussions of free choice, little if any attention is given to the basic fact that many millions of our people are not afforded real freedom of choice.

The tardiness in bringing the organization of health services up to 20th-century standards is the basic threat to free choice in medical care today.

There is no real freedom of choice where millions of people are cut off from adequate medical care, because the inherent weaknesses of the fee-for-every-service system, with its costly, helter-skelter disorganization, result in prohibitive doctor and hospital bills.

There is no real freedom of choice where tens of thousands of physicians have to diagnose or treat their patients to a greater or lesser extent in accordance with the patients' ability to pay rather than solely on the basis of the medical needs of the patients.

There is no real freedom of choice when tens of millions of people in this country do not have the opportunity to choose, if they so desire, modern, group practice, prepaid, comprehensive medical care with its many great advantages.

There is no real freedom of choice when the overwhelming majority of physicians in this country lack the opportunity to practice on a teamwork basis in modern well-planned facilities, because of their inability to obtain long-term financing for such facilities.

H. R. 7700, if enacted, would constitute the greatest stimulas to real freedom of choice in medicine today. It would give millions of people throughout the country the freedom of choosing group practice prepaid comprehensive medical care, if they so desired. It would give all physicians the freedom of choosing group practice, if they so desire.

The health organizations which we represent wholeheartedly support the principle of freedom of choice. It is our fundamental belief that the people of this country must have this right to free choice. The millions of persons who desire to obtain their care on a prepaid basis from physicians practicing as a team in modern well-planned integrated facilities must have this right to obtain such care. I know of no more effective way of accomplishing the objective of promoting real freedom of choice in medical care than through the enactment of H. R. 7700.

In conclusion I deeply appreciate this opportunity to state our views on H. R. 7700. As you see, we give our unqualified endorsement to this bill—

Because it will assist in filling the critical need for additional hospital and medical facilities;

Because it will accomplish this purpose through the enlistment of the forces of private enterprise and private capital;

Because it will afford thousands of doctors of the country the opportunity to practice modern medicine on a teamwork basis; and

Because it will open up to many millions of our citizens the opportunity of obtaining comprehensive, modern medical care services at reasonable cost.

Roy D. Moore

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1954

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, my home city of Canton, Ohio, suffered a great loss on Saturday last through the death of one of its leading citizens, Mr. Roy D. Moore, president and publisher of the Canton Repository and Brush-Moore Newspapers, Inc.

In Roy Moore's death our community lost a great friend who had been a leader in Canton's progress for nearly a quarter of a century. The people of the State and the Nation can never fully know the great contribution he made to good government by his capable but unpretentious leadership.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Canton Repository of Sunday, May 2, 1954. This editorial is the final tribute of those who knew Roy Moore best—the people who worked for him and with him—the employees of the Repository.

The editorial follows:

ROY D. MOORE

All of Roy Moore's friends are trying to put into words the thoughts which fill their hearts.

We who have been his working associates want to do this, too.

We have a particularly strong reason.

Roy Moore's dynamic enthusiasm and his career in newspaper publishing and management had a powerful impact on us.

His unfaltering devotion to truth in the reporting of news was an inspiration to all of us who worked with him and looked to him for guidance.

Without him we would have had a less fruitful and satisfying experience with our lives than we have had because he lived and let us share his hopes and his accomplishments.

He was our favorite success story.

We respected him for the great distance he had traveled from his humble beginning as a telegrapher at the early age of 15.

We respected him for the organization he put together with the skillful help of his business associates, William H. Vodrey and the late Louis H. Brush.

We respected him as an enlightened employer who could be depended on to make equitable decisions in all matters affecting our interests.

We respected him for the respect he commanded in a strongly competitive business—and for the esteem in which he was held by men and women in other fields of endeavor.

Roy Moore's secret was obvious. It was his liking for people.

He liked people so naturally and charmingly that they, in turn, liked him and wanted to heilp him realize his dreams.

He was one of those men in whose presence other men felt better than they really were.

Those of us who worked closely with him during the years of his greatest activity always felt this way about him. We valued his esteem because he always let us know he valued ours.

Whether our jobs were in the mechanical departments—helping to prepare news copy—working with advertising—or in the counting room, he always knew who we were, what we were doing, and why it was important.

He made us feel when we had a chance meeting or a scheduled conference that it was his privilege to be with us—not our privilege to be with him.

He was unfailingly generous with his time and his sympathetic understanding.

It was his special pleasure to perform services or favors outside the ordinary fields of duty. Many of us had special cause to be grateful for his devotion to our well-being. Had he been privileged to live longer, there would have been many more who would have had special cause to be grateful.

Thinking back over this unusual and pleasant association with Roy Moore, we know that we shared a relationship and companionship far above the ordinary.

He was one of those gifted persons who had the common touch in a superlative degree.

He could have succeeded in whatever he tried because all his friends would have wanted to help him. They would not have wanted to see him fail.

We are glad he chose to succeed in our profession and that we had the opportunity to work with him.

It was our regret—and we know it was his, too—that in the last year he had been unable to join us more often in the everyday newspaper work he loved so dearly.

We want to add our voices to the chorus of his friends and associates speaking words of comfort to Mrs. Moore, his children, and his dearest companions.

It is the most heartfelt tribute we can pay to say there was no man of his day we would have chosen to be associated with in preference to Roy Moore.

When he died, a little bit of us died.

We shall honor his memory and cherish all our precious recollections of a long and happy association with a man who had no superior in the art of friendship.

Reducing the Postal Deficit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GORDON CANFIELD

OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 3, 1954

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the Post Office Department has not always been in the red, and if Postmaster General Arthur E. Summerfield's program is given the proper support, it will again be in the black. I present a statement issued by the Postmaster General in a release last Thursday, as follows:

Postmaster General Arthur E. Summerfield's success in reducing the huge postal deficit from $727 million in the fiscal year 1952 to an estimated $425 millions in the fiscal year 1954 and the Summerfield long-range program to place the Post Office Department on a pay-as-you-go basis by increasing its income and improving its efficiency are both receiving widespread attention and support.

Audacious and ambitious as these objectives are, they are not entirely new in a Department that has usually run in the red and has piled up a deficit of over $4 billion since World War II. The record set by Postmaster General Montgomery Blair proves that the Post Office Department can be operated on a self-sustaining basis.

On May 5, 1861, Montgomery Blair an able lawyer who had been Solicitor General of the United States, became Postmaster General and served in this capacity in the Cabinet of President Lincoln until September 23, 1864.

In the fiscal year 1860, before Blair became Postmaster General, the postal deficit exceeded $10 million, postal revenues being less than $9 million and expenses more than $19 milllion.

Five years later, in the fiscal year 1865 when Blair left the Post Office Department, it operated with an actual surplus of $917,249.

As far back as the fiscal year of 1852, there had been annual and growing postal deficits. The record, by 5-year intervals prior to Blair's administration, shows:

Year	Revenue	Expense	Deficit
1852	$5, 184, 526	$7, 108, 459	$1, 923, 022
1857	7, 353, 951	11, 508, 057	4, 153, 718
1862	8, 299, 820	11, 125, 364	2, 826, 144

The next 3 years, under Blair's direction, the Department's fiscal record shows a startling reverse, as follows:

Year	Revenue	Expense	Deficit or surplus
1863	$11, 163, 789	$11, 314, 206	−$142, 625
1864	12, 438, 253	12, 644, 786	−404, 814
1865	14, 556, 158	13, 694, 728	+917, 249

The deficit reduction was the result of (1) efficient and economic administration, (2) definite steps taken to reduce costs, and (3) increased income.

Post office embezzlements, common under previous administrations, were eliminated. Franking of postmasters' private mail was ended, rates were increased, compulsory prepayment of postage was enforced; publishers were no longer allowed to postpone postage payment on printed matter.

Postmaster General Blair was an innovator as well as an economizer. He made the first move toward establishing the Universal Postal Union; instituted the first regular railway post-office service; introduced city free delivery service; and planned and secured legislation setting up the money order system which became effective a few months after he left office. Further, Blair regularized the termination of postal service in the seceded States and organized an efficient Army post office system in the Union armies.

These highlights of postal history encourage the present postal management in their belief they can meet all the requirements of President Eisenhower's directive:

"The Postmaster General will institute a program directed at improving service while at the same time reducing costs and decreasing deficits."

Steps taken by the present management of the Post Office Department include later window hours and later collections; increased use of trucks, buses, and other modern forms of transportation; introduction of a plan to carry regular mail by air; relief for the Post Office Department from the cost of carrying mail for other Government departments; transfer of airline subsidies to the Civil Aeronautics Board; and many other changes in the interest of economy and better service.

Postmaster General Summerfield's program emphasizes the need for higher postage rates to reduce the large deficits resulting from inflation in the postwar period. The proposals now before the Congress would add $250 million to revenues. For the long range he is recommending that the Congress adopt the plan to make the Postal Establishment self-sustaining by requiring the postage rates be adjusted according to formula whenever significant cost changes occur.

The Spirit of Joy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 3, 1954

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include another splendid and original address, The Spirit of Joy, given by the Most Reverend Richard J. Cushing, D. D., archbishop of Boston, at a dinner to Archbishop Cushing on April 25, 1954, in Boston, Mass., the proceeds of the dinner being used and donated by His Excellency for charitable purposes.

The wolf at the door which the archbishop mentions in his address was the subject of an address he made last year at a similar dinner and which address appears in the May 18, 1953, issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The address follows:

Last year when you and I all met together I talked to you about the wolf at the door. I told you that he was my favorite beast, that he kept me on the go—particularly the wolf at somebody else's door—and that if I ever got to heaven, I'd have the wolf at the door to thank for it. Such show of virtue as I have managed to develop is due to the work I have had to do to keep the wolf away from the door.

Well, since that happy evening a year ago, I came within a glimpse of heaven. I didn't get in—so I came home. I might as well tell you, here and now, that in spite of any rumors to the contrary, I came home to stay, to stay as long as God lets me—and that, please God, will be a long time indeed.

While I was loitering around the gates of heaven I saw the birds of St. Francis flying about, high above the walls. There was also the eagle of St. John. I heard the dog of St. Roch barking to his heart's content and I thought I heard a growl or two from the lion of St. Mark. There was a pretty lake nearby—and in it I saw the fish of St. Anthony. But when I got home, there at the door was the wolf of Poor Richard.

To tell you the truth, I think he was glad to see me. However, he snarled a bit, all the same, by way of reminding me to get back to work—and so I am glad to see so many of you and I am grateful to you for bringing so many bones to this banquet so I can throw them at Poor Richard's mascot—the famous old wolf at the door.

While I was sick I decided a number of things. One was that, even at the longest, life is too short for tears. I decided that everything in life should be a joy to the convinced Christian—and that there is nothing more important to preach nowadays or to push everywhere than the idea of joy in the Lord, the joy God intended us to find in our work and in all things else.

So let me talk to you tonight on joy. The times require that we recapture it. Your presence here in numbers so great and with friendship so generous increases it in me. The work you make possible spreads it.

Joy is essential to life, a necessity of life; it is a source of life's power as well as its pleasure. Every man has need of joy; so, too, every man has a right to joy. It is indispensable to the health of soul and body; it is necessary to physical and spiritual industry; it is a condition of religious living.

Hence it is not a mere poetical phrase to say that joy acts upon human beings as sunshine upon plants. The quickening influence of joy and the paralyzing effect of sadness are readily observed. In children especially, we note that sorrow deadens, whereas happiness revives and enlivens them. With invalids happiness actually works miracles—a fact known and utilized by wise physicians.

At times our strength and energy seem to be actually redoubled by the coming of joy. A man's power to will and to do, even his desire to live, is reinforced by joy. He is made bold, he is kept undismayed. Many a lofty resolve and noble deed has been born of joy. Working ever with high purpose, zealous for the good, the true, the beautiful, joy keeps a man's lower inclinations under strict control and develops his best capacities. Under the magic of its influence, he grows gracious, kindly, ready to serve. Thus joy brings individuals closer together, promotes social harmony and ties the knot of friendship.

No one can live without joy, not even the Christian soul following the path of perfection. Indeed, a cheerful, happy, friendly spirit is more often encountered among believers and Christians than among unbelieving and irreligious men. Among the saints the proportion of joyous souls is particularly great. It is not the moderns in art and letters, but the religious writers and poets and artists, who have carefully cultivated and sincerely championed the cause of joy. In the history of modern literature we find a shocking number of famous names listed as foes of joy and prophets of pessimism, but none is religious.

On the other hand, it was an 18th century Capuchin who undertook to defend joy against the rigorism which was then trying, in the name of piety, to cast gloom not only over the religious life, but over all existence. His book on the Joy of the Soul still deserves to be read. He loudly proclaims the work of joy:

"Joy is useful to virtue, useful in the transaction of business, useful in society, useful for all good things. As long as your soul is in joy, your intellect will be more active and productive, your ideas will be clearer, your imagination more lively, your heart more at rest, your temper more gay and cheerful, your society more agreeable, even your health stronger; your piety will be sweeter, your virtue more generous. Joy is useful in the transaction of business. With the help of joy, the fatigue of our necessary labor is made easy; our difficulties vanish; melancholy was never a virtue, and never will be; it takes away from the value of our sacrifices, instead of adding thereto. The Apostle tells us that God loves a cheerful giver; and nothing does more honor to the 'yoke' of His service than the calm serenity on the brow of those who bear the whole weight of it, for His sake."

Frederick W. Faber, the great English preacher, waged war against the contemporary spirit of sourness and pessimism. Throughout his numerous spiritual writings there runs a pure stream of joy. So wholesome and so sensible is his teaching that we may well recall it here.

It is joy alone which can give liberty of spirit. Without it, "helps become hindrances, sacraments formalities, fervors scruples, and the order of rule and habit, instead of being a facility of expansion, grows into a chain of bondage and pusillanimity," as Father Faber tells us.

Joy is the sail of the boat; he who knows how to manage his sail can take advantage even of adverse winds and make them serve toward a swifter voyage. True pure joy is as good a tutor as sorrow and is equally necessary, if not more so. "There are souls, too, in the world which have the gift of finding joy everywhere, and of leaving it behind them when they go. Joy gushes from under their fingers like jets of light. There is something in their very presence, in their mere silent company, from which joy cannot be extricated and laid aside. Of a truth, he is the happiest, the greatest, and the most godlike of men, as well as the sole poet among men, who has added one true joy to the world's stock of happiness."

And so, Father Faber concludes, true religion, true Christianity, may be determined by this mark: it increases, rather than lessens, the joy of life.

By the same token, an age of defective religious faith is an age without joy. A civilization of technical and materialistic emphasis is bound to be short on spirit and therefore on joy. By reason of its multiplied forms of amusement, many of them mechanical rather than natural, it may be a civilization of too many pleasures and too little joy.

A great philosopher once described our civilization in just those words—too many pleasures, too little joy. Something of the same point was made concerning his own individual life by the unbeliever who wrote his own epitaph in these words:

"He had in life much happiness,
Yet happy he has never been."

Men without faith secure and possess many joys; still they are without joy.

Reflections like these persuade me that the time has come to start a crusade of joy. It would be the forerunner of a mighty return to faith and faith, in its turn, would stabilize and guarantee the permanence of our spirit of joy.

A great German bishop of the early part of the century decided that the times had become as melancholy as human nature could take. Art, philosophy, everything had developed the creeps. The heavy air of pessimism prevailed on every side. He fell to speculating on the cause of the universal gloominess in his neighbors and, he had to confess, in himself. He found it to lie in what he called the "joylessness of modern civilization"—and he traced this joylessness to lack of faith.

So he decided to wage a one-man battle against both—a battle that should be renewed in our times. He wrote a small pamphlet called A Little Book of Joy. He sent it around as an Easter greeting at just about this time of year in 1909.

Within a year Bishop Keppler's little book was bringing him mail from every corner of the world. The first year's printing was 54,000, though he had originally intended it for a small circle of close friends. The idea of the crusade of joy caught on; it appealed to all classes, creeds, and conditions of men. You would have thought he had discovered a new element or a new elixir of youth. So enthusiastic was the response to his crusade and so eagerly did people snatch up his little book on joy.

Of course, the secret of its power was the profound wisdom underneath the smiling surface of what he said. He didn't seek to tickle people into laughing; he taught them joy. He didn't use funny stories; he developed a whole theology of joy.

The great sources of his material were the Holy Scriptures and the lives of the saints. These abound in joy. Jewish prophecy and Christian faith, he pointed out, agree that God gives joy as the greatest and best of His blessings to those who serve Him lovingly and well.

Like a rich vein of silver, joy runs through the writings of the Old Testament and through the life that it describes. The Hebrew language—although its vocabulary is poor in comparison with the classical and modern tongues—has no less 12 verbs which mean "to rejoice," "to be happy." The good Israelite is saved from the danger of undervaluing or distorting the idea of joy and the human desire for it, by his knowledge that the deepest, purest fountain of joy is the throne of God, the Divine essence. As God Himself rejoices "in His works," "in Jerusalem" and over Zion "with gladness," so does the just man "rejoice in the Lord," and "delight in the Lord" and "rejoice before God."

All in all, the people of God under the Old Testament were a joyful people. "Sing joyfully to God, all the earth: serve ye the Lord with gladness. Come in before His presence with exceeding great joy," was a recommendation then in force. The exhortation: "Be glad in the Lord, and rejoice, ye just, and glory, all ye right of heart" is ever repeated. "And let the just feast, and rejoice before God; and be delighted with gladness." Even in a time of great sadness the prophet exhorted the people: "Be not sad; for the joy of the Lord is our strength."

The New Testament is, of course, the testament of joy in a higher degree than the Old. The New Testament is welcomed to earth by the Virgin Mother, in her little home, more holy and joyful than anything since the days of paradise. It is publicly announced by the angels on Christmas night as a "great joy that shall be to all the people." And Mary is rightfully hailed by believers as "cause of our joy."

The bearer and the center of New Testament joy is the Messiah, the God-Man. Jesus and joy—that, indeed, is a mystery of which it is hard to speak. Who will fathom or measure the nature and the depth of the God-Man's joy? It is a wonderful union of divine happiness—inseparable from His person, never lost even in His darkest hours—with all the joy possible to a pure, sinless, human heart. For He became like unto us in all things, even in joy, and needed it and made use of it, just as food and drink.

One of the apocryphal Gospels relates that the people of Nazareth gave the child Jesus the name of Gentleness. They had a saying, "Let us go to Gentleness, to become happy." This is perfectly credible; for in the sunshine of His nature everything must have been illumined with joy.

How happy and full of joy was our Savior's association with His disciples. It is significant that His first journey in their company was to a wedding, and that at a wedding He performed His first miracle. The Messiah is certainly no foe of happiness, but rather the one to whom men may venture to apply when the wine of joy gives out. Instead of the water of merely natural joy, which only pleases the palate, He bestows the wine of that higher joy which infuses new life into the whole being; and the Virgin Mother, too, graciously appears as mediatrix of joy.

Ever since joy has been the mark of His best followers. The halo, that mark of particular honor with which art adorns the heads of the saints, is a symbol of their heavenly glory; but it also reminds us of the halo of joyousness and kindliness encircling their features even during mortal life.

How can I speak of holy joy and of the joy of the holy, without naming my beloved Francis of Assisi, poor "Brother Ever-Glad," master of joy, and especially of joy in suffering. His joyfulness was a natural gift. Even before his conversion, when during the war against Perugia, he spent a year in prison, he astonished his companions with his constant cheerfulness and incessant singing. Throughout his life of poverty and external hardship he was always rich in joy. For him the strains of pain and joy commingled; indeed, the deepest pain to him was a source of highest joy.

Francis cried out, "We Friars Minor, what are we other than God's singers and players, who seek to draw hearts upward and to fill them with spiritual joy?" To play good people into heaven, to sing before everyone's door about the beauty and delight of serving the Lord—this Francis had tried personally in Assisi, and he assigned the same troubadour's ways to his brothers. "Holy contrition and holy humility and holy charity and holy joy make the sould good and happy," he said. There were many who in St. Francis of Assisi's time did not know this, and therefore God's singers, as his men were called, went out into the world to sing this into the hearts of men.

So has it always been with the saints. It is illustrated by the old tale of the scholarly ecclesiastic who, in pursuit of his own perfection, sought a spiritual guide and adviser. After much searching, he at last found what he was seeking in the person of a beggar covered with sores before the door of a church. He said to the beggar, "Good day, brother," and the answer came, "I have never had a bad one."

"Then may God send thee better days."

"My lot has always been the best."

"How can that be? You are covered with wounds and sores."

"That is true, but it is the goodness of God that has sent them to me. When the sun shines, I enjoy the sun. When it storms, I enjoy the storm, for God sends it."

"Who art thou?"

"I am a king."

"Where is thy kingdom?"

"My soul is my kingdom and no rebellions ever happen there."

"How camest thou to this supremacy?"

"I sought it in prayer and meditation for a long time until I found it."

"And how didst thou find it?"

"I found it as soon as I had rid myself of the external world. Within my soul I found God—and joy."

And there, my friends, we have it.

Our weakness is the lack of interior life. One truly interior soul suffices to give life and strength and inspiration to thousands.

Well, then, what shall we do?

If we would recapture joy, then the motto of progress must be: "Go back!" Not back to the old times when there were no machines, no factories, no railways, nor airplanes, nor television, nor newspapers; but back to religion, to the spirit of faith, to a joyful view of life, to abstinence and self-conquest, to honestly, loyalty, love—to all those higher things so scornfully regarded by modern men, vain of their culture, and insane on the subject of war. Men have paid for their blunders by being almost totally deprived of joy. Nothing but a return to a true estimate, a conscientious appreciation of these higher goods and forces can again quicken the dying pulse of life's joy.

You people have been wonderful to me. You have done for me the best that anyone could do: you have made possible the joy I like to give to others. And so, I owe you much. I owe you prayer. I owe you gratitude. I owe you the secret of my own unconquerable optimism. This is it: Seek joy where it can be found—in the narrow path of duty, on the highway of Christian charity, in the mountain air of faith, in the sunshine of love, in the healthy atmosphere of hard work. "Only do your work," says the wise man, "and joy will come of itself." Thus you will find joy. Thus I have found it; in the work that you make possible. God grant you joy—and bless you for the joy you give to me.

It Doesn't Help Taxpayers To Shortchange TVA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1954

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include herewith an editorial entitled "It Doesn't Help Taxpayers To Shortchange TVA," which appeared in the May 1, 1954, issue of the Courier-Journal of Louisville, Ky.

The editorial is as follows:

IT DOESN'T HELP TAXPAYERS TO SHORTCHANGE TVA

There is a measure of sham in the administration's newly announced plan to let private power companies take over from the Tennessee Valley Authority a large share of the job of supplying electrical power to the atomic energy plants in the Paducah area. The-plan, if put into operation will be a terrific windfall to the private power companies concerned. It will not benefit the Tennessee Valley Authority nor will it save the taxpayers any money, as claimed by administration spokesmen.

Because more than 50 percent of their estimated 1956 power production is scheduled to go to atomic-energy plants and other defense installations in the Tennessee and Ohio River Valleys, TVA officials have warned that the TVA area faces a shortage of power for domestic and industrial uses by mid-1956 unless additional power-generating facilities are made possible by congressional appropriation. Congress and the President, however, have refused to approve new funds for generation purposes. Instead, the administration now proposes to let private power companies furnish 600,000 additional kilowatts of power to AEC plants, and let TVA use the 600,000 kilowatts for domestic and industrial purposes. Thus, say administration spokesmen, TVA will need no additional generating facilities, and the taxpayer will be saved the cost of the plants had TVA been required to build them.

In a sense, this is true. If TVA can use the power from its Shawnee plant near Paducah to meet the growing demands of the Memphis area, it will not be immediately necessary for the agency to build its proposed Fulton plant west of Memphis. This does not mean, however, that the American taxpayer will be saved an amount equal to the cost of the Fulton plant. For what the Government will save by not building the TVA generating plant it will lose by paying higher power costs to the private power companies that will be allowed to furnish the 600,000 kilowatts now supplied by TVA.

At present, the Atomic Energy Commission pays TVA between 3.4 and 3.84 mills per kilowatt-hour. It is paying private companies between 4 and 4.2 mills per kilowatt-hour. This means that the AEC (and thus the American taxpayer who supports the agency) saves more than $20 million a year through low TVA rates, and will save far more when atomic-energy plants now under construction go into operation. It will lose these savings, of course, if the administration forces it to buy more expensive private power. And it is hard to see how the Government can save money by taking money from the Atomic Energy Commission to give to the Tennessee Valley Authority.

You Can Do Your Bit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER JOHNSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1954

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, since I introduced my bill, H. R. 8600, several weeks ago to increase the use of dairy products in the armed services, I have received a great many letters from people in my district in support of the bill.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert an editorial by Walter H. Brovald, editor of the Stanley (Wis.) Republican on the need for such legislation. I commend it to the attention of my colleagues because Mr. Brovald very ably points out the value of dairy products as food.

Incidentally, as Mr. Brovald points out, the Stanley Republican is a Republican newspaper. This is one bill that I believe deserves support irrespective of partisan politics.

Mr. Brovald's editorial is as follows:

YOU CAN DO YOUR BIT

Some 2 or 3 weeks ago, this newspaper urged the House Armed Services Committee to consider the merits of a bill introduced by Wisconsin's 10th District Representative, LESTER JOHNSON, calling for an increase in Armed Forces' dairy rations.

We have been consistently interested in legislation which has put more milk, butter, and cheese on the menus of Federal hospitals and other institutions, and very appreciative of the progress made in this direction.

GOVERNMENT USE IMPORTANT

We are convinced that however fine a program may be advanced for the disposition of Government dairy surpluses, and however intense the efforts to hold down future surplus, increased use of dairy products by the Federal Government itself is an important consideration.

It is important not only for reasons of national economy, but also from the standpoint of nutrition for the patients in Federal hospitals and sanitoriums, and, if Mr. JOHNSON's H. R. 8600 is passed, for our soldiers, sailors, and marines. Just recently we received new evidence on this point from the National Dairy Council.

DAIRY PRODUCTS BEST FOODS

Of all the food consumed, reports the council, dairy products give the following proportions of energy and nutrient content to American meals:

Nutrients:	*Percent*
Food energy	16.2
Protein	26.0
Fat	24.7
Carbohydrate	8.1
Calcium	76.2
Iron	3.6
Vitamin A value	18.5
Thiamine	11.4
Riboflavin	48.3
Niacin	4.2
Ascorbic acid	5.9

Dairy products are, indeed, nature's most perfect foods.

Why, then, should are Armed Forces be continued on a dairy product rationing system established many years ago? Especially why should this be so when dairy surpluses are the cause of so much concern in Washington?

BILLION POUNDS OF MILK MORE

Mr. JOHNSON's bill would increase the consumption of milk by at least 1.8 billion pounds. The use of cheese would be doubled and butter consumption increased substantially.

It would be at least a partial answer—and a wise one—to the dairy surplus problem.

If our readers agree with us, we urge them to write to members of the Armed Services Committee at once, asking that hearings begin on H. R. 8600. We ask them, too, to write friends and relatives in other States urging them to write.

We are a Republican newspaper; Mr. JOHNSON is a Democrat. We feel his proposal, however, to be of great enough merit to command the support of all of us who are interested in the dairy industry and its welfare. Every additional pound of milk, butter, and cheese for which we can find consumers, the better off will be our industry and our Nation.

WHO TO WRITE TO

There follows a list of some of those House Members on the Armed Services Committee. Readers are especially urged, regardless of the State in which they reside, to write the chairman of the committee, DEWEY SHORT, and the ranking Democratic committeeman and previous chairman, CARL VINSON. Wisconsinites should also write their committee representative, ALVIN E. O'KONSKI.

These three men and all others listed below may be addressed at the House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

Illinois: LESLIE ARENDS, MELVIN PRICE; Oregon, WALTER NORBLAD; California, LEROY JOHNSON, ROBERT WILSON, CLYDE DOYLE, GEORGE P. MILLER; and Michigan, PAUL SHAFER.

Soviet Anti-Semitism Is Postponed, Not Disowned—American Policy in the Middle East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 3, 1954

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD excerpts from a speech which I delivered in New York City on Thursday, April 15, entitled "Soviet Anti-Semitism Is Postponed, Not Disowned—American Policy in the Middle East."

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOVIET ANTI-SEMITISM IS POSTPONED, NOT DISOWNED—AMERICAN POLICY IN THE MIDDLE EAST

(Remarks of Hon. HERBERT H. LEHMAN, of New York, at dinner on behalf of United Jewish Appeal, New York, N. Y., April 15, 1954)

I am very pleased to be here in New York tonight addressing this audience.

* * * * *

We are concerned tonight with that vast number of Jews terrorized, oppressed and pinned down behind the Iron Curtain, over whom hangs the heavy sword of genocide. Only a few short months ago, the specter of pogram was raised again throughout the entire area of central and eastern Europe under Soviet rule. That specter roused fearful memories of the ancient terror which in generations past had ravaged the Jewish communities of that region.

Now under Communist rule, the same threat is posed again—the same frightful menace. Reports seeping out from behind the Iron Curtain disclose that anti-Semitism although somewhat quieted in very recent months, has not been disowned but merely postponed—subordinated to other purposes, for the moment.

Soviet imperialism has not discarded the cruel device of anti-Semitism; it has been merely transferred to a reserve status. We still need—perhaps more than ever—to be deeply concerned over the welfare and fate of the million and a half Jews imprisoned behind the Iron Curtain.

Many of them already endure the brutal hardships of the slave labor camps. Many—we do not know how many—have been liquidated. Thousands have been uprooted from their homes in Hungary, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, East Germany, and Bulgaria and carted off to the hardships of the Siberian wastes.

These thousands and hundreds of thousands require rescue. They need our constant and unremitting efforts for the lifting of the Iron Curtain to permit their escape to freedom in Israel and, to the extent possible, in the United States.

We must keep this danger—and this necessity—in mind. We must accept this situation as a long-range responsibility and, in concert with others in our country and in other lands who are willing to share in the concern for the lives of these hundreds of thousands of our fellow human beings, we must work out a solution.

We must bear in mind that any turn of the wheel of events which confronts the Soviet world with a new crisis, from without or from within, is likely to result in a new explosion of anti-Semitism. We must face the fact that anti-Semitism is an endemic disease in those areas, ready to burst into violent, epidemic proportions under the provocation of internal crisis.

In humanity's name we must persist in our resolve and our efforts to succor these helpless coreligionists of ours who are and continue to be in deadly danger.

Of course, we in the United States must be prepared to do our fair share not only to rescue these victims of oppression and terror but also to provide a haven and harbor for them. In this connection we must persist in our efforts to seek a revision in our own immigration laws, so that we can admit a reasonable number of these and other deserving individuals into our own land. The fight against the McCarran-Walter Act must go on.

The major asylum for these unfortunates and for other Jews throughout the world is, of course, Israel. And Israel is and continues to be a major object of our endeavors, as it is the major hope of Jews in danger and distress throughout the world.

The creation of the State of Israel, more than any other simple act of statesmanship in the past 2,000 years, has given heart to those who have known only despair and suffering—to the homeless, the unwanted, the rootless wanderers in hostile lands. In 6 short years 750,000 Jews have found in Israel a refuge and a homeland. There is 6 short years a new nation, with a dynamic economic life and a vibrant, democratic political life, has been constructed.

We here have a dual responsibility toward Israel. We have a responsibility as Jews for the welfare of our fellow Jews attempting to build new lives for themselves in their new land. And we have a responsibility as Americans to foster the growth and development of the democratic way of life in a feudal area of the world.

Above all, we have a high responsibility as American citizens to work for peace in the Middle East. I am convinced that the current tension between Israel and its Arab neighbors can be abated only if the United States and the United Nations insist on the prompt formalization and stabilization of the relations between Israel and her neighbors. It has always been the policy of the United States and the United Nations, in all cases involving disputes between neighboring nations, to get the principals to meet, to sit down with each other, and thus to seek a solution of their differences.

There can be no effective policy toward the Middle East which does not make it clear to the Arabs that they must not only recognize the fact that Israel exists but that it is their inescapable obligation to confer in good faith with Israel, in order to work out their mutual problems. Peace in the Middle East must be built on the solid foundation of agreement to seek peace and not to stir up and foment war.

Such an agreement can lead toward peace—a lasting peace based on integration of complementary resources, and on mutual cooperation for common purposes. We must insist on such a course, which would surely be in the best interest of our own Nation as well as of the people of the Middle East.

We must be impartial in insisting that both sides show an equal willingness to abide by their responsibilities as members of the United Nations and as members of the community of free nations. Both sides must be told, in no uncertain terms, that they may not play fast and loose with the peace and security of the Middle East by delaying longer a concerted effort to stabilize their political relationships.

We must be impartial in insisting that both sides refrain from provocative acts, whether on a small or large scale, whether by economic blockade in the Suez or by permitting banditry, armed clashes, or surreptitious raids, into the territory of the other.

The free world has an obligation to insist that the tremulous peace not be further endangered by blind prejudice or sullen intransigence, on either side.

Border raids can result in H-bomb explosions. Skirmishes can result in the slaughter of millions of innocent people.

To insist that there be a halt to these and a beginning of peace talks is not to interfere unduly into the internal affairs of small powers, but rather to protect the interests of all peoples. This would be true impartiality. A policy of pious aloofness from the realities of the present situation is not impartiality but sophistry.

Let us bear in mind that the Soviet Union is actively fishing in these troubled waters. The primary interest of Soviet imperialism, as evidenced by its attitude in the United Nations Security Council in recent weeks, is to encourage tension and unrest, and to reap the benefits of continuing or even increased unrest and violence in this vital area.

Any policy on the part of the United States which fails to direct itself against all these basic factors plays directly into the hands of the Kremlin.

Our country realizes that lasting peace and stability cannot be attained exclusively by political action but must be based also on healthy economic development. That is why American economic aid and technical assistance in the Middle East should be continued and be made available in even greater measure than in the past. In this way we will not only be in the position of opposing the folly of war and turmoil in the world but we will also be holding out the positive hope of human progress.

Five Steps We Might Take To Salvage Indochina

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 3, 1954

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial entitled "Five Steps We Might Take To Salvage Indochina," which appeared in the April 30, 1954, issue of the Courier-Journal of Louisville, Ky.

The editorial is as follows:

FIVE STEPS WE MIGHT TAKE TO SALVAGE INDOCHINA

America's current position on Indochina is essentially negative. That is our weakness at Geneva. We have virtually no prospect of working out an agreement with the Communists. At the same time, we have made no concrete proposals capable of uniting our own allies, Britain, and France, behind us.

We know of a good many things we do not want to do on the Indochina question. We don't want to let the Communists take over the country; we don't want to send American ground troops to prevent that result; we don't want to bargain with Red China to get out in return for American recognition. What is it that we do want to do?

We do not want the French to arrange a cease-fire with Ho Chi Minh's forces, for fear the terms would be too bad. The French, with maddening logic, point out that we ourselves negotiated a cease-fire in Korea that left half the country in the hands of not only Communist, but Communist invaders.

We want France to withdraw her troops from Indochina, but not without making some provision to fill the power vacuum that would result. Vice President NIXON, who studied the problem on the spot a few months ago, has said publicly that a simple French withdrawal would plunge Indochina into Communist control within a month. Many Americans have been saying easily, "Why don't the French get out and give these people something to fight for?" Now we are being forced to conclude that this would be no safe solution, for either the Indochinese people or for us.

We have made only one suggestion of a positive nature. It is for a South Asian defense alliance, something like a NATO of the Pacific. We have not yet hooked up this proposal with any specific formula for solving the immediate problem in Indochina.

It would help greatly if we could offer a positive program, something that might win the endorsement of France and Britain and the active support of the masses in Indochina. Here are some steps we might take:

1. Persuade the French to go all the way on guaranteeing independence to Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia. Back that pledge by the word of the United States and, if possible, other friendly nations.

France has gone almost that far already, but without winning widescale support in return for many concessions. Why? Because the Indochinese do not altogether trust French promises, and because Paris has insisted that the Indochinese states must remain within the French Union. They must be given the full option of staying in the union or getting out, if the pledge of freedom is to have its full psychological effect.

2. Work out an orderly plan for withdrawal of all French troops, beginning at the moment when fighting has stopped and some degree of order has been restored.

3. Propose a small but effective occupation force to take over when the French move out.

This force might include troops from the United States, Australia, Thailand, and the Philippines. It would remain only until free elections could be held. At that point, the people of the area could decide whether they wanted to be a part of the French Union, an entirely independent country, or a satellite of Communist China.

4. Give a firm pledge, with our allies, to protect the future freedom of the Indochinese states from foreign aggression.

If the people of the area should vote themselves Communist in a free election, there is nothing we could do either morally or physically to protect them from their folly. We could pledge military retaliation, however, against any outside power that sought to impose its will on the Indochinese people. This goes no further than the pledge we have already given to South Korea. It is essentially the same as the NATO pledge.

5. Provide a further increase of military aid, in everything short of troops, to try to keep France and Vietnam in the fight for a test period.

They might not be able to hold out, even with such help. It is known, however, that the greatest power of the Viet Minh forces is not the support of Red China, but the argument that only the Viet Minh are truly fighting for independence. It would be interesting to see how the Indochinese people would respond to a choice between a promise of full freedom backed by pledges from the western nations in addition to France, and a similar promise backed only by Red China, a neighbor they have always feared.

France is mortally sick of the war and may get out on terms we will not like. The thing we have never been able to test is the degree of resistance that would be shown by the people of Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia in the face of a full pledge of freedom that they could trust. Surely it is worthwhile to test that factor before either letting the whole area go down the Communist drain, or throwing in American troops to bolster a line that keeps sagging inwardly.

Before we commit ourselves to any really massive venture in southeast Asia, let's try what can be done with native morale fighting on our side. The rainy season should bring a lull to the Indochina fighting. That gives us almost certainly the last chance to make the test.

Revolutionary Machines for Newspaper Publishing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 29, 1954

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Quincy Patriot-Ledger, of Quincy, Mass.:

ANNOUNCEMENT

The Quincy Patriot-Ledger has been designated to carry out production research in the use of two revolutionary new machines for newspaper publishing.

First newspaper in the world to adapt these machines to newspaper work, the Quincy Patriot-Ledger will pioneer the use of processes that may prove to be the most significant development in printing production in 75 years.

First of the machines is the Photon, manufactured in Cambridge. This machine, which sets type by a photographic process and does away with the use of the traditional metal-type face, was developed by the Graphic Arts Research Foundation, Inc., of which Dr. Vannevar Bush, noted scientist and wartime head of the United States Government's Office of Scientific Research and Development, is a prime mover.

The second machine is the so-called Dow Etcher, which makes it possible to make a full-size newspaper page on a magnesium plate in 2½ minutes. The Dow Etcher has been developed by the Dow Chemical Co. in cooperation with the research division of the American Newspaper Publishers' Association.

The combination of the two devices in the production of a newspaper, it is believed, will completely change the traditional methods of type production.

The Dow Etcher is now in operation at the Quincy Patriot Ledger and the first of the Photon machines will be installed within a few weeks.

Both the American Newspaper Publishers Association and the Graphic Arts Research Foundation, Inc., designated the Quincy Patriot Ledger as the first newspaper in the world to use the machines and to carry out the necessary research work to adapt the devices to newspaper production.

The Photon machine, a development of a French typesetting invention, has aroused the interest of the printing world more than any other development in years. Already it has been used to set type for the book The Wonderful World of Insects but it has not been used as yet for newspaper work.

The Photon machine will photo-compose type. Traditional methods set the type by hand or mechanically by use of metal. In photo-composing, the type is set on film which is then made ready for etching. Among the advantages claimed for Photon are speed and ease of operation.

The Dow Etcher can be used for the regular production of newspaper cuts or pictures; or it can be used as a key adjunct to the Photon process. The Patriot Ledger has been using the etcher for its news pictures and a recent record-breaking production of a United Press facsimile picture was made possible by the machine. In exactly 27 minutes from the beginning of picture transmission in Washington, the magnesium cut was ready for use. Part of the record was due to the fact that the Dow Etcher cut engraving time from 20 minutes to only 2½ minutes.

The Patriot Ledger is not unmindful of the responsibility it assumes in pioneering these two processes. We believe, however, that we have become partners with researchers and scientists not just to improve all printing processes, but to bring ultimate benefit to the reading public of the world.

G. PRESCOTT LOW,
Publisher.

Efforts of Foreign Agricultural Service To Develop New Market Outlets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT D. HARRISON

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1954

Mr. HARRISON of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, as Assistant Secretary Davis pointed out in his talk Agriculture's Course in Foreign Trade, at the Michigan annual farmers week program, at East Lansing, Mich., last February 3, 1954:

> The truth is that we have not needed to push foreign sales for more than a decade and that today we are not properly equipped and tooled to do it. * * * Today they [trade] are attempting to redevelop their old outlets. But in order to do so they have to train new men, develop foreign connections, fill pipelines with goods and launch a selling program. * * * As this takes place we must emphasize promotion to push sales at a fair price rather than to expand sales by means of drastic price cutting.
>
> The problem of expanding exports of farm products has to be approached on a commodity-by-commodity and a country-by-country basis. There is no simple formula that can be followed since many factors influence trade in any particular commodity.
>
> The big fundamental need is for a revisal and further development of international trade through regular commercial transactions and procedures. This requires a freer system of trade and payments than we now have in the world; and for that we all must strive.

Last November, in recognition of this problem, Secretary Benson reorganized the Foreign Agricultural Service to implement the carrying out of a vigorous export trading program. The present Foreign Agricultural Service Organization Chart was not adopted and the funds to hire commodity specialists to make the desired concentrated effort on export programs was not approved until November 12, 1953. On that date the Department of Agriculture began recruitment for marketing specialists. This recruitment has proceeded slowly since the Department has refused to take any persons but those acceptable to the trade and recognized by private business as well as governmental standards as truly expert in their fields. The Foreign Agricultural Service as such, of course, has made no sales, but in accordance with traditional policy of channeling all possible trade through commercial sources has acted as a clearing house, point of contact, expediter, and general adviser.

There are, however, five principal types of market development activities to help private traders that will be carried out by this service. These are: First, Working with foreign governments and traders in matters relating to market preferences, trade restrictions, foreign exchange, and discrimination against American farm products; second, providing first-hand information to American agricultural exporters and importers on market situations and trade opportunities; third, bringing together American exporters and foreign importers under conditions favorable to trade; fourth, analyzing and interpreting commodity and trade information for dissemination of American agriculture; and fifth, providing a comprehensive appraisal of foreign production and competition.

It has been only 4 months since it was reorganized, yet the Foreign Agricultural Service has already made significant headway in facilitating the disposal of surplus commodities. By commodity they include:

A. Tobacco: Within the last few months the Foreign Agricultural Service has been able to recruit two tobacco specialists. They are currently negotiating with the trade to procure two more. One expert visited France, Spain, Finland, Sweden, Denmark, Germany, the Philippines, Korea, and Japan.

The results of these visits to date are an agreement by France to purchase in excess of 8 million pounds of tobacco. Negotiations started by the Spanish to take between 12 and 18 million pounds of dark tobacco. Korea began negotiations for the procurement of 11 million pounds of tobacco. Actual orders or negotiations have not been started by the other countries. However, the activities carried on in these countries are very significant. The visits to Finland, Sweden, Denmark, and Germany dealt with tariff and other legal problems detrimental to trade in tobacco between the United States and those countries. Steps are now being taken by the trade in those countries to get their government to correct these detriments to trade. This has progressed so well in Norway and Sweden that the trade is anticipating sales of tobacco to those two countries. In the Philippines and Japan similar discussions were held with the manufacturers of tobacco products as well as government officials to remove legal barriers.

B. Grain, feed, and seed: Of the 6 commodity specialists the Foreign Agricultural Service has been attempting to recruit, they have 4 now working.

The results of the activities of these commodity specialists follow:

First. Rice: In the face of the greatly increased supply of rice in the world market, United States rice exports for the crop year are equal to those of the previous season which was the highest on record. Specifically, Cuba is importing a million bags more than last year. Japan is importing 3.3 million bags more than last year. Before sales in the Far East could be consummated the pressure of 90,000 tons of surplus rice had to be removed from the market. One expert visited Burma and India and started negotiations which resulted in the consummation of a deal between those two countries for the sale of this rice, thus relieving the pressure on the world market and enabling United States exporters to maintain the alltime record for rice sales at favorable prices.

Second. Grain: They have been very active in working on the recently announced $20 million sale of wheat to the Spanish Government. Also they have aggressively participated in the negotiations with the Japanese Government under which they have recently announced intention to purchase 400,000 tons of wheat and 100,000 tons of barley. In the meantime they have continued negotiations with Mexico on the taking of additional corn; with Korea on the purchase of wheat and barley; and Brazil by attempting to arrange a barter for wheat. A memorandum of understanding has been drawn up with the Millers National Federation in which they are dividing the cost of sending representatives of Asia to promote the sale of grain and grain products in that part of the world.

C. Cotton: Of the 5 cotton commodity specialists the Foreign Agricultural Service hopes to recruit, 4 are now on the staff. Three of these specialists have visited in the past 6 months England, France, Germany, Italy, Spain, Japan, India, Hong Kong, Singapore, Indonesia, Burma, Pakistan, Egypt, British East Africa, Lebanon, Syria, and Sudan.

The activities of these specialists have directly contributed to the sale of some 250,000 bales of cotton under section 550 of the Mutual Security Act, and has resulted in the efforts by the textile manufacturers in France, India, Japan, and Italy to get their respective governments to make foreign exchange available to permit the maintenance of traditional exports of cotton to these countries. Specifically, one specialist assisted in the arrangement of an Export-Import Bank loan to Japan for the specific purchase of American cotton.

D. Fats and oils: Of the 4 commodity specialists the Foreign Agricultural Service is attempting to recruit for this division only 2 are now on the staff. The other two have been selected from the trade but have not yet reported for duty.

Only one commodity specialist has been sent abroad. He is currently in west Africa making a competition study of that export area for vegetable oils—peanuts, palm oil, and palm kernels—and on a special basis arrangements have been made for a specialist on lard to leave for Germany in the immediate future to assist in settling a dispute between United States lard exporters and German importers.

E. Fruits and vegetables: Representatives of the Fruit and Vegetable Divisions have traveled in all the countries of western and southern Europe and most of the principal citrus producing areas of North Africa and the Near East. In addition to facilitating the movement under section 32 of over 300,000 boxes of pears, and 2,000,000 boxes of oranges and grapefruit in the past 6 months, the Foreign Agricultural Service attributes the purchase of 25,000 tons of raisins to the efforts of these two specialists. They also had a leading part in creating the demand abroad which resulted in the sale under section 550 of the Mutual Security Act of $5,000,000 worth of prunes, $2,500,000 worth of canned apricots and peaches and $2,500,000 of fresh oranges and grapefruit, and canned grapefruit to Europe.

In my opinion, the Foreign Agricultural Service is to be complimented for the fine start they have made in helping the trade people in this country recapture lost markets and in finding new export outlets for surplus commodities.

Pakistan Wheat Program Concluded

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. CARL ANDERSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1954

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, last Tuesday the Foreign Operations Administration issued a press release announcing the termination of the United States wheat program to Pakistan. Director Stassen described it as a dramatic example of how swift action by the President and the United States Congress brought food to millions of people in a friendly nation faced with starvation.

Last October my Subcommittee on Appropriations for Agriculture stopped in Pakistan to see just how this program was working out and just how it was being handled. We observed the unloading of the wheat and then traveled along a 400-mile route inland where we witnessed its delivery. The great appreciation of the people who received it was very evident and was a great source of satisfaction to those of us who had worked to get the program through the Congress setting up this gravely needed relief to millions of suffering people. The program has resulted in economic stability in Pakistan and strengthened its confidence and morale. The need for the program arose because of several serious droughts in Pakistan in 1951 and 1952 and millions in that country were threatened with famine in 1953. About 26 million bushels of wheat went to Pakistan on a grant basis. At one time as many as 28 vessels were on the high seas carrying wheat to Pakistan. The 94th and last shipment is now en route and due to arrive about May 22. I understand, Mr. Speaker, that 30 percent of this wheat was distributed free to the most needy people. The balance reached the market through normal channels of distribution. Since the food grain was readily available to the consumers, the price declined sufficiently to produce a stabilizing effect on other basic foods.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate the people of Pakistan on their ability to handle a program of this type and character. I am proud and pleased that the United States Congress was an instrument to their aid in their time of need.

The press release follows:

WASHINGTON, April 27.—The Director of Foreign Operations, Harold E. Stassen, today welcomed the announcement from Pakistan that the special United States wheat program has achieved its purpose and may now be terminated.

He called the project "a dramatic example of how swift action by the President and the United States Congress brought food to millions of people in a friendly nation faced with starvation."

Making his comment following the announcement by Pakistan's Prime Minister Muhammad Ali in Karachi, that nearly 23 million bushels (610,976 tons) of United States wheat has successfully averted critical famine conditions that had beset his country, Stassen said:

"The Pakistan wheat program which has come to successful fruition stands as a worthy example of the high purposes of United States foreign policies. It has helped save from starvation millions of human beings. It has been gratefully received and efficiently administered and distributed. It has helped a friendly nation avert a national disaster by providing food which was in abundant supply in the United States. Through this program, we have contributed to economic stability in Pakistan and strengthened confidence and morale.

"The people of Pakistan are to be congratulated on the careful manner in which they carried out the handling and distribution of this wheat."

Crop failures caused by severe droughts in 1951 and 1952 confronted millions of Pakistan's population with the threat of famine in 1953. Pakistan asked for emergency aid from the United States and President Eisenhower acted quickly.

Congress sped through legislation at the President's request and on June 25 President Eisenhower signed the bill. The next day the first shipment of wheat left Baltimore for Karachi. It arived July 21.

The Pakistan Wheat Aid Act provided for shipment of 700,000 tons (about 26 million bushels) of wheat to Pakistan on a grant basis. An additional 300,000 tons could be made available under the legislation on a grant, loan, or purchase basis, depending on the situation. With today's announcement neither the balance of approximately 87,000 tons nor the 300,000-ton reserve will be needed.

At one time as many as 28 vessels were on the high seas carrying wheat to Pakistan. The 94th and last shipment, consisting of 2,470 tons, is now en route and is due to arrive in Chittagong about May 22.

The Pakistani Finance Minister has announced that some 30 percent of the wheat received was distributed free to the most needy. The balance reached the market through the normal channels of distribution. Because the food grain was readily available to the consumer the price declined sufficiently to produce a stabilizing effect on other basic foods.

The Pakistan Ambassador to the United States has said that several million of his people have been saved from starvation by the program.

From the sale of the wheat, the Pakistan Government expects to realize about $50 million in rupees which is earmarked to support projects agreed upon by the United States and Pakistan Governments as necessary to the development of the country, with emphasis on projects designed to provide against a recurrence of this last famine threat.

Wheat was shipped from the United States in bulk and was bagged in the hold of the ship upon its arrival in Karachi by Pakistani workmen who labored around the clock. The sacks of wheat were distributed via sealed railroad cars, trucks, and even by camel to the remote villages.

The bulk of the wheat has reached the Pakistani housewife in the form of grain. After grinding it into flour by hand, they pat the flour into thin cakes like a tortilla or thin pancake. This is called chappati—a word synonomous with bread.

About 67 percent of the wheat shipped was hard winter wheat, which is used in making chappati. The remainder was soft wheat. Of the ships that carried wheat to Pakistan, 56.9 percent were of United States registry. The shipments originated from the following areas of the United States: 33 percent from the Atlantic coast, 59 percent from the gulfports, and 8 percent from the Pacific Northwest.

Marion N. Hardesty, special assistant to the Director of Foreign Operations, was in charge of the wheat program from its inception.

Let Us Think of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 28, 1954

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an editorial appearing in the March 1 issue of the United Mine Workers Journal. The article emphasizes the lackadaisical attitude being shown by the present administration toward a very important problem affecting the Nation's economic and military security—the problem confronting the coal industry in the United States.

The editorial follows:

GOVERNMENT EXTENDS $100 MILLION FOR EUROPE'S ECONOMY BUT IGNORES UNITED STATES COAL PROBLEMS

Advance by the United States Government of $100 million in the form of a 25-year loan at 3⅞ percent interest to the European 6-nation Coal and Steel Community, otherwise known as the Schuman plan, was announced in Washington just as reports were sifting back from abroad of the renewed activity of cartels in direct conflict with the avowed aims of the European planners who got the loan. It also comes at a time when at least two of the nations linked together in the Schuman plan have stiff restrictions against coal imports from this country.

The new European loan, the first ever made to an agency representing a group of nations instead of a single state, was made also in the face of the fact that the United States coal industry in the victim of cutthroat competition from foreign oil imports of the subsidized oil industry which is dumping its surplus residual oil on the American fuel market in such vast quantities as to cause wide distress in many coal communities here. The Government maintains an attitude of indifference toward the problems of our own coal industry, while it extends a helping hand to Europe's cartelized coal and steel producers.

Big business in Europe has long cherished the cartel or monopoly idea of price-fixing and production limitation by business itself for the benefit of businessmen. Through trade agreements among business allies in various nations, the cartels divide up the market among themselves over a wide area of Europe.

In effect, they are an economic empire that is often more powerful than the respective governments of the various nations in which they operate. Only a decade ago this cartel system was worldwide in scope and had such American giants as Du Pont and General Electric among its partners in suppression of competition. Several United States Senate committees went deeply into this ramified field and exposed the cartels—but all that was yesterday.

Today, in Europe's coal and steel industries, the cartels are again in the saddle and are sabotaging the efforts of the Schuman plan to eliminate restraints on trade bewteen its six nation members. In disregard of the policy of the six nations—Western Germany, France, Italy, Belgium, Holland, and Luxembourg—three big cartels in Germany, Belgium, and France are already operating a private tariff and quota system and are preparing a written contract form to make their schemes more binding. This will permit low-cost producers to reap excessive profits as prices are fixed high enough to permit marginal producers to stay in business, and foreign trade is limited as the cartelists decree.

Time and again competent observers have pointed out that Europe's only hope for recovery lies in an integrated economy, eliminating restraints on trade within its own confines, and also by lifting production by adoption of more modern techniques. Our Government has financed countless trips of European labor and management people to the United States to learn our ways of production, yet the cartels are operating on the outmoded principles of scarcity and high profits. All sorts of special gimmicks are in effect also, such as forcing customers to take certain amounts of substandard coal along with orders for the best.

Against this monopolistic combine, the Schuman planners who have headquarters in Luxembourg, where they employ about 500 experts, interpreters, and chauffeurs, can only issue a flood of paper orders and bulletins, which the cartels file in the nearest wastebasket. One Schuman planner, in trying to explain why the agency has put price ceilings on coal at a high level, told the Wall Street Journal recently:

"If we freed prices now, the national cartel agencies would simply take over the job. As things stand now, the cartels simply see to it that the ceiling prices set by us are also minimum prices for the industry." In other words, the cartels take the plan's ceiling as a starting point and then fix prices at whatever they figure the traffic will bear.

Yet, the United States Government is pouring 100 million of good American dollars down this rat hole while at the same time it turns its back on the American coal industry, which asks not for $100 million or even $1 million but only for elementary protection against a waste product that is dumped on our markets by a handful of big oil firms.

It's all of a pattern with the gigantic giveaway program that has been underway since the war. And this loan, Government officials indicate, is but the first of a new series to insure normal growth of Europe's industries. Is the cartel system a part of this normal way in Europe?

Alert Members of Congress are asking questions more persistently each passing day as to the meaning of administration policy in connection with this latest loan and the whole field of foreign loans and trade. To

Members from the coal regions it is especially shocking that this vast sum should be handed to a European experimental agency with the aim of promoting foreign coal and steel development while problems of our own coal industry are ignored.

The thinking of Members of Congress is reflected in a recent statement by Representative ROBERT C. BYRD, Democrat, of West Virginia, who asked: "How can we be so zealous of the interest of the coal industry in Europe and so blind to the condition of the coal industry in the United States?"

Polish Constitution Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1954

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, in 1942 Stephen Vincent Benet wrote a prayer which President Franklin D. Roosevelt read before the Assembly of the United States on Flag Day. In his plea for world brotherhood, Poet Benet included these words:

> If our brothers are oppressed, then we are oppressed. If they hunger, we hunger. If their freedom is taken away, our freedom is not secure.

It would be appropriate, Mr. Speaker, that we ponder these plain but meaningful words today, for this is the day on which Poles throughout the world commemorate the 163d anniversary of Poland's May Constitution.

Both before and since that historic day—May 3, 1791—on which the Poles rejoiced in the adoption of a constitution, Poland has known cruel oppression. Few peoples have such a personal appreciation of the worth of freedom as have the Poles. Their history has given grim testimony to the unpleasant truth that liberty never is finally won, but must be defended again and again and, when seized by a new generation of tyrants, must be recaptured in costly conflict.

It is an irony of fate that, as we join with Poles and Americans of Polish descent in recalling the May Constitution, freedom once more languishes in bondage in Poland. A government which is a mockery of the principles of justice and human dignity for which Poles and all other disciples of liberty have fought through many generations holds itself forth as the government of the Poles. It is, of course, a Communist government, and this has caused us to fall into the unfortunate habit of referring to "Communist Poland."

If we reflect a moment, we realize that we do injustice to a great people in calling their homeland a Communist country. On this day, at least, we should reassure Poles everywhere that we know there is no such thing as "Communist Poland"—a Communist government, yes, but never a Communist nation where the people still cherish the ideals of democracy.

The tenacity with which Poles have maintained their tradition of free thought and individual liberty may be seen in the fact that this people continues to celebrate the anniversary of the adoption of a constitution which served less than 2 years before Poland again was partitioned by neighboring nations. The Poles were not to enjoy national independence again for more than a century. Many Americans of Polish ancestry fought in the Armies of the United States during World War I, and one of the fruits of their victory was a free and independent Poland.

In 1939, the Nazi tanks rolled eastward and the hearts of freemen everywhere went out to the valiant Poles, fighting for their homes against overwhelming odds. Battered Poland was reclaimed, but only to fall under Communist domination.

A lesser national spirit would have been ground into the bloody soil generations ago, but the Polish spirit is resilient. While we mourn the present state of Poland, therefore, we can permit ourselves to look ahead to that bright day on which freedom again will emerge from her dungeon in Poland, escorted by the liberty-conscious Poles. In that admirable country, how many secret thoughts are so projected today; how many vows to carry on the battle are being renewed by underground fighters.

"If our brothers are oppressed, then we are oppressed. * * *"

The atomic age has brought this truth most forcefully into our consciousness.

The oppressor does not rule us, but the oppressor still is abroad in the world, and Poland feels his boot. As we note the Poles' great anniversary, let us renew our prayers for the restoration of freedom to their homeland.

Taft's Enduring Mark

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN R. BUSH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1954

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the April 28, 1954, issue of the Williamsport Sun, Williamsport, Pa., which pays tribute to a great man:

TAFT'S ENDURING MARK

Looking back less than a year after the death of Senator Robert A. Taft, no one can say with any sort of finality where history will eventually place him. Yet it seems unlikely he will be found of lesser stature than such great lawmakers as Henry Clay, Daniel Webster, and John C. Calhoun.

What stirs fresh thoughts on Taft's role in history is the publication of a book called The Taft Story. It is written by William S. White, a Washington press correspondent. It is not a biography—perhaps political profile would be a more accurate description.

At least it seems to appraise carefully the Senator's significance for his times.

White says that significance is large.

Apparently, however, there are persons who disagree. One historian, for example, has said he feels the passage of time will diminish Taft's stature. He stressed the fact that, except for the Taft-Hartley Act, the Senator's name is attached to no important legislation.

This would seem a trivial and almost wholly irrelevant yardstick. Lawmakers are not baseball pitchers, to be judged by their won-and-lost record. Far more to the point is the power and influence a Senator may exert over the general course of legislation.

Gaged this way, Senator Taft was one of the most powerful men ever to establish himself on Capitol Hill. Even through many years of the long Republican twilight while Democrats were reigning at both ends of Pennsylvania Avenue, the Ohioan's was the strongest single voice heard in the legislative hall.

A small part of this power came to Taft because he was the bearer of a famous name. Much more came to him because he was the embodiment of great political forces, a symbol of order and stability to all who saw chaos in the trend of events.

Yet, fundamentally, he earned his position of power through tireless devotion to the substance and forms of lawmaking. As White suggests, he was virtually born to the Senate. He made himself a legislative authority. He gained a reputation for honesty and integrity. With these things came high respect. With respect came dependence of others upon him, and with dependence came power.

True enough, Taft's name adorned very little legislation. But his imprint was on practically everything important the Senate did in his last 10 years of life. And the knowledge that it would be was a fact always to be reckoned with, by the whole Congress and the White House itself.

Unless the measure of a man's influence and significance alters radically in the next few decades, Taft's big mark on his own time will not easily fade.

Why Admit Hawaii?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 3, 1954

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Why Admit Hawaii?" written by Frank R. Kent, and published in the Washington Star and other newspapers of his syndicate on Sunday, April 24, 1954.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHY ADMIT HAWAII?

WASHINGTON, April 24.—"Draftsmen of national political party platforms too frequently overlook the majorities in their campaign appeals to the minorities." This trenchant—and truthful—sentence is contained in a statement recently made by Senator HARRY F. BYRD, of Virginia. It applies to both parties and all platforms. It points a finger at one of the worst forms of humbuggery under our system of government.

Senator BYRD used that sentence in connection with the bill to admit Hawaii to statehood. To this he is strongly opposed. Not only did both the Republican and Democratic Conventions pledge themselves to pass this bill, but they have similarly pledged themselves several times before. Actually, since 1900 when Hawaii became a Territory, it has petitioned Congress 16 times for statehood, and since 1920 bills for that purpose have been introduced 37 times. Many hearings have been held and much debate endured. But Congress has never even come close to passing any of these bills. The prospect of the present Hawaiian bill, supported, as it is, by President Eisenhower and passed by the House, is dim indeed. When the Senate insisted on adding Alaska to the House bill it more or less sounded its death knell.

Regardless of that, the case against Hawaii is so devastating and convincing that it is difficult to see how it can be seriously debated. Hawaii is, as Senator BYRD says, an archipelago of islands, islets, and atolls which are neither contiguous to themselves nor to the United States—nor to anything else. The latest census (1951) showed a population of 186,000 Japanese, 30,000 Chinese, 62,000 Filipinos, 10,000 Puerto Ricans, 7,000 Korean, 79,000 part Hawaiians, 13,000 Hawaiians, 77,000 Caucasians and about 2,000 in other races, creeds, and colors. The area simply has none of the characteristics of an American State. Internally, it is dispersed and heterogeneous. Externally, says Senator BYRD, "it is vulnerable—contiguous to nothing. Its destiny is that of an outpost. Whatever you may call it, it can never be anything else."

As to its competence to govern itself with the responsibility of a State, the record shows that the Big Five labor unions control its economy and that there is abundant evidence of intensive Communist infiltration of island politics. "This is not," says Senator BYRD, "a question to be determined by the votes of Chinese, Japanese or Puerto Rican minorities in this country. Nor is it a question to be determined for or by the people of Hawaii. It is a matter to be determined by ourselves only and in our own best interests. The fact that Congress for the moment is closely divided makes stuffing its membership with heterogeneous people from remote islands dangerous and unfair to the Nation and to the people of our States."

"If Hawaii is privileged to 2 Members of the Senate, each person in Hawaii will have a voice in the Senate 30 times as great as each citizen of New York. If Hawaii is privileged to send Members to the House it will be at the expense of Representatives from the States. Who knows what States must reduce their representation in Congress to let in the Hawaiian, Japanese, Chinese, Puerto Ricans, Koreans, or whoever they may send here? Just as these distortions will result in reduced representation of our own people in their own Congress, they will follow directly in the electoral college where the President is elected."

Besides, Senator BYRD points out, if they affect the presidential election and the Senate they would also affect the American judiciary and all the principal officers, including Ambassadors, who are appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate. His opposition to the statehood for Alaska, Mr. BYRD says, is essentially on economic grounds and its inability to support a state government. Senator BYRD also makes the flat statement that there is among the people of the United States no demand whatever for the admission of Hawaii to statehood.

"The chief agitation comes from the official Hawaiian lobby in the United States, known as the Hawaiian Statehood Commission, which in 4 years spent nearly half a million dollars in service, supplies, publicity, entertainment, and other instruments of propaganda." It does seem that Senator BYRD has said enough to make any member who is not considering the interests of a minority above that of the majority, hesitate quite a while before voting Hawaii in.

Tidelands and Louisiana State Boundary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 29, 1954

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, it is hardly necessary to repeat that Judge Leander H. Perez, of Plaquemines Parish, La., is recognized as one of the outstanding authorities in the United States on the subject of the so-called tidelands. There is no doubt that his scholarly approach to the problem and his indefatigable efforts contributed in great measure to the final success of the fight for enactment of the proper legislation.

His fight has not stopped with the passage of the legislation and the recognition of the validity of the law by the United States Supreme Court. Judge Perez is now carrying on the fight for the establishment of the proper limits of the offshore lands in accordance with the legislation and the intent of the Congress.

Recently at a meeting of the Louisiana State Mineral Board, which has jurisdiction over the State's tidelands, Judge Perez outlined the position of the State of Louisiana in language understandable to anybody who will read it. He is so fundamentally correct in his approach to the subject and so sound in his presentation that I think it would benefit Members of this body to take time out and read this brief statement.

Judge Perez makes the position of Louisiana crystal clear and leaves no doubt in any fairminded person's mind as to the extent and limitations of the Louisiana tidelands.

Here are Judge Perez' remarks:

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the State mineral board, may I submit to you a brief statement on the all-important subject of tidelands and our State boundary? It is my purpose to deal only with the fundamentals involved in these matters.

On March 15, 1954, the United States Supreme Court handed down a ruling rejecting the claims of unconstitutionality filed by the States of Alabama and Rhode Island against the Tidelands Act, Public Law 31, chapter 65, approved by President Eisenhower on May 22, 1953. The Court held that act of Congress was final on the matter of State ownership of tidelands, within the boundaries recognized by the Tidelands Act. This, in effect, is the green light to go ahead with the orderly development of our State's natural resources within its historic seaward boundary.

In connection with our State boundary, I should like to call your attention, first, to the provision of the United States Constitution, section 3 of article IV, which provides that, "New States may be admitted by the Congress into this Union."

Under that authority, Congress has admitted 35 States into the Union by acts, all of which fixed the boundaries of each 1 of these States, whether inland or coastal States.

In order to know what any State's boundary is, we must look to the act of Congress which admitted that particular State into the Union.

By act of April 14, 1812, Congress admitted Louisiana as a State into the Union, and described its boundaries, including its gulfward boundary 3 leagues from coast. Nothing in this act refers either to 3 miles or to the shore with reference to the State's gulfward boundary.

In order to locate the State's boundary at 3 leagues from coast, it is necessary to determine where the coastline is. This is also provided for by act of Congress. On February 10, 1807, 2 Stat. 413, Congress passed an act authorizing the President to have surveyed, established, and marked the coastline of the United States within 20 leagues from shore. It is significant that in 1807 Congress directed that our coastlines be established as far out as 70 miles from shore.

By act of February 19, 1895 (28 Stat. 672, 33 U. S. C. 151), Congress authorized and directed the Secretary of the Treasury to designate and define by suitable bearings or ranges with lighthouses, light vessels, buoys or coast objects, the lines dividing the high seas from rivers, harbors, and inland waters.

By section 101 of Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1946 (11 F. R. 7875), Congress vested this authority in the Commandant of the Coast Guard.

The United States Supreme Court passed upon the character of waters lying inside of such a coastline designated and defined under authority of the 1895 act in the State of New York. In 1896, the Court held that pursuant to the authority of the act of Congress of February 19, 1895, the Secretary of the Treasury, on May 10, 1895, by Department Circular 95, had designated and defined the dividing line between the high seas and the rivers, harbors, and inland waters of New York, as follows:

"From Navesink (southerly) lighthouse, NE¾ E. easterly, to Scotland light vessel, thence NNE½ E. through Gedney Channel whistling buoy (proposed position) to Rockaway Point life-saving station."

The whole of Gedney's Channel is within this line.

The Court held that Gedney's Channel inside of that line is as much a part of the inland waters of the United States within the meaning of this act as the harbor within the entrance. See the Delaware (161 U. S. 459, p. 463).

In another case decided in 1909 another Federal court held, with regard to the act of February 16, 1895, that "This legislation, however, was for the purpose of defining the inland waters of the United States." (See *U. S.* v. *Newark Meadows Imp. Co.* (C. C. N. Y. 1909, 173 F. 426, at p. 428).)

Therefore, the purpose of the 1895 act of Congress should not be questioned; nor should the fact that when a coastline is officially established under authority of that act, the waters inside of that line are "inland waters," and the waters outside that line are the high seas; and that said line therefore marks the seacoast. That line is where the inland waters end and the sea begins.

That is what the act of Congress provides, and that is what the United States Supreme Court and a Federal circuit court of appeals held in two separate cases. So it should require no further "test case" on this score.

Here it should be pointed out that in the 1953 Tidelands Act of Congress, the same as in the 1895 act, "coastline" is defined as "the line marking the seaward limit of inland waters" which is in "direct contact with the open sea."

Furthermore, the Tidelands Act recognizes State ownership of its tidelands and resources in such lands and waters within the seaward boundaries of a State as extending from the coastline not more than 3 marine leagues into the Gulf of Mexico.

(Please take note: From coast, not from shore.)

Here it is most interesting and important to note that in the California case (1947) (67 S. Ct. at p. 1664), confirmed in the Louisiana and Texas cases (1950), the United States Supreme Court held that the States owned in trust for their people the lands under "inland" navigable waters, "such as rivers, harbors, and even tidelands," and that the Government did not deny this. So that even without the Tidelands Act of 1953, the State was not prevented by the United States Supreme Court decisions in 1947 and 1950 from developing its mineral and other resources within its "inland waters," inside of the coastline, as designated and defined under authority of the act of Congress.

I emphasize this, to point out the great difference between "shoreline" and "coastline," which some people confuse. The waters from the State's shoreline to its coastline are inland waters, the same as our rivers or inland lakes, and cover a broad belt of several miles which cannot be compromised or given away because the State owns the lands and resources in this broad area in trust for its people. That trust must not be violated under any pretense.

Under authority of the 1895 act of Congress, as amended, Louisiana's coastline has been officially designated and defined by bearings, lighthouses, buoys, and coast objects, as follows:

"From Ship Island Lighthouse to Chandeleur Lighthouse; thence in a curved line following the general trend of the seaward shorelines of the Chandeleur Islands to the southwesternmost extremity of Eroll Shoal; thence to Pass-a-Loutre lighted whistle buoy 4 to South Pass lighted whistle buoy 2; thence to Southwest Pass entrance midchannel lighted whistle buoy; thence to Ship Shoal Lighthouse; thence to Calcasieu Pass lighted whistle buoy 1; thence to Sabine Pass lighted whistle buoy 1."

The waters inshore of the lines described above are inland waters, and the waters outside of this coastline are the high seas (see sec. 82.1, pt. 82 of U. S. Coast Guard Pamphlet CG 169, Aug. 1, 1950).

The coastline having been definitely and officially established under authority of the act of Congress and Louisiana's boundary having been fixed by Congress in the act of its admission at 3 leagues from coast, it is relatively a simple matter to measure 3 leagues seaward from that coastline.

When these questions are presented solely by reference to the fundamentals, the historic facts and laws involved, the picture indeed appears very simple and understandable. There is no longer any need for confusion or doubt about Louisiana's boundary, nor of its ownership of the tidelands and natural resources within its historic boundary: 3 leagues from coast in the Gulf of Mexico.

I submit herewith a copy of USCG chart showing the coastline with the State of Louisiana's 3 leagues from coast seaward boundary shown by the solid line.

Question has been raised as to how this broad belt of water included in Louisiana's historic boundary might be considered under international law. This question is answered by the judgment rendered on December 18, 1951, by the International Court of Justice, in the Norwegian Fisheries case—*United Kingdom* v. *Norway*, December 18, 1951, General List; No. 5—when it held that the 50 to 75 miles off Norway's shores into the North Sea were the internal waters of Norway because of the existence of an historic title based upon royal decrees issued between 1812 and 1935. Louisiana's historic boundary extends 3 leagues from coast as fixed by act of Congress in April 1812, admitting Louisiana as a State into the Union. So, there can be no reasonable question urged against Louisiana's boundary from an historic standpoint under international law. An even more ancient historic claim to Louisiana's broad coastline could be based on an official French map made in 1705 showing the gulfward coastline of the Louisiana territorial waters under the de la Salle discovery in 1683.

Gentlemen, I respectfully submit that your work of granting mineral leases and making regulations for the development of our State's mineral resources offshore to the State's outer seaward boundary should proceed without hesitancy or uncertainty because of the location of either our State's coastline or seaward boundary. They are definitely established under authority of acts of Congress, with which we are required to agree and should agree. It cannot be expected within reason that they would be repudiated by the Federal Government which established them.

The Northeastern Penitentiary, Lewisburg, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD M. SIMPSON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 29, 1954

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include herein the following articles which appeared in Pennsylvania newspapers during the last month in relation to the Northeastern Penitentiary at Lewisburg, Pa.

[From the Milton Evening Standard and Union County Standard-Journal of February 25, 1954]

No One, Reds Included, Coddled at Lewisburg Prison, Newsman Finds—Inspects All Types of Accommodations; Star Inmates Treated Like Any of Others

What is your definition of coddling of prisoners? If it means anything less than locking up a man and throwing away the key, then every Federal prisoner is coddled. If it means punishment heaped upon punishment, then it still means that every Federal prisoner is coddled.

Recently, Representative Sutton, Democrat, Tennessee, demanded a sweeping investigation of the Federal prison system charging that Communists are being coddled. The Federal penitentiary at Lewisburg has some of these prisoners. The institution has been called a country club and it has been charged with having coddled just about every well-known person that wound up behind the wall.

A representative of the Standard-Journal paid a visit to the institution yesterday. He had a long talk with Warden George W. Humphrey and he visited many parts of the institution. He also made it a point to see every type of quarters used by inmates—from the single rooms to the segregation cells. He found no medieval torture chambers, no solitary confinement holes, despite testimony of prisoners at Federal court yesterday. He found quarters that were clean and neat, some that were freshly painted, and some that were being painted. He found none that were elaborate.

GOVERNING FACTOR

At Lewisburg the men live in two types of cells, open dormitories, cubicles, squad rooms, or single rooms. Their conduct and performance at their job and the ability to get along with others governs the type of quarters in which they will live. The prize is the single room.

The single private room is private in that there is no other bed in the room which is approximately 6 by 10 feet. A barred window provides a view of the prison yard but there are no bars on the door. The door is wood with a small glass window. In the room is a bed, footlocker, wash bowl, metal chair, and perhaps a table. One man had a shoe shine kit attached to the wall. A radio head set also is available and there is one light—high on the ceiling. Lights in all quarters are turned out at 10 p. m.

The doors to these rooms are not locked. Prisoners may visit from one cell to another but they cannot leave the corridor. The door there is locked. All the prisoners on one floor share a common shower room and toilets.

The squad room is the next best, in the mind of a prisoner. From 3 to 7 men share this type room. Chairs, beds, and footlockers are metal. Each squad room has its own showers and toilets.

Before a man can advance to either of these quarters he must have spent at least 6 months in an open dormitory or cubicle. The cubicle is simply partitions between beds with room for the footlocker and chair. The partition is about 4 feet high so that when a man stands erect he is in an open dormitory. When he sits or lies down he has some privacy.

The cells are different from private rooms in that the doors are bars and are locked. Inmates here cannot visit from one cell to another. They are confined to their particular cell. Exterior type cells differ from interior only in that they have no window in the cell. A space about 4 feet separates the windows from the locked cell door. Toilet facilities are in each cell.

The only other type quarters available is the segregation unit. The inmate living here has been guilty of a serious infraction of the rules or has become involved in serious trouble. He is allowed out of the room once a day for exercise and his meals are served to him. If he is guilty of the more serious breach of conduct he may also be on a restricted diet. He receives all the necessary calories, proteins, and the like but the food is prepared as a type of hash and is minus all the trimmings.

GOOD TIME

Through good conduct, outstanding work, and a sincere effort to show self-improvement, an inmate can earn "good time" at Lewisburg. The good time means that his release date can be advanced, but a man, through excellent conduct, cannot be released until he has served at least one-third of his sentence.

Naturally, inmates are concerned about losing even a day of good time but the most effective "weapon" in the hands of the administration is the withholding of certain privileges, the kind of privileges that to an outsider seem trivial. Such things as not allowing an inmate to play cards, see a movie once a week, take part in recreational activities, listen to the radio, or purchase cigarettes, candy, an apple, or orange at the inmate commissary are seriously felt by the men who live from day to day for this sort of diversion.

Withholding visiting or letter-writing privileges also is used. However, these privileges can be increased through the efforts of the inmate. Instead of having visitors 2 hours a day 2 days a month, he may earn as much as 4 visiting days a month.

* * * * *

Prisoners must work unless they are ill. In their leisure time they may take part in inmate activities, such as sports, music, educational classes, and the like. Many have taken advantage of the educational and vocational programs.

In touring the quarters, Warden Humphrey made it a point to pass by or through quarters of the more widely known inmates. Their quarters were no different from the others.

The office of the Bureau of Prisons in Washington, D. C., receives a complete file on each inmate once a year, and in many cases more often than that. The inmate's type of work and quarters are indicated. Any extra privileges awarded anyone soon would be known.

An inmate must live within the walls. His mail is censored, his visitors selected, and his life is regimented. That is coddling of prisoners at Lewisburg.

[From the Sunbury (Pa.) Daily Item of January 22, 1954]

The Lewisburg Story: Work, Play, Education, and Guidance Part of Pen Life

The thriving community at the Lewisburg Federal Penitentiary has a unique population in that the average age is about 26 years and most of its members leave town after a relatively short stay.

* * * * *

The similarity of individuals in a group ends somewhere. Inside a penal institution or outside there are no two humans alike in all respects, thus the hollowness of the popular notion that a convict is a convict and that is all.

It has taken the Federal prison system almost 50 years to disprove that mistaken concept and while the false connotation lingers in some minds, the system is convinced.

Perhaps the greatest stride toward proving the idea that persons convicted of a crime could be classified other than merely convicts and treated accordingly was taken 18 years ago when the classification system was initiated in Federal institutions.

The application of this process of understanding the offender as an individual, of meeting his own particular needs, and of preparing him for a successful return to the community is regarded one of the most significant steps in penal history.

Warden George W. Humphrey and his staff at Lewisburg depend heavily on their classification clinic and related processes and bend plenty of effort toward applying it as effectively as possible.

CLASSIFICATION BOARD ACTS

Following the 30-day quarantine period, a newcomer at the penitentiary is released into the general population, but not before he meets the classification board. This group, composed of the warden, two associate wardens, supervisor of custody and parole, supervisor of education, a representative of the medical department, a chaplain, an industrial consultant, and the man's individual parole officer, is equipped with an admission summary.

The summary is a mass of information gathered by the social service unit during the first month, covering almost the entire life of a prisoner, supplemented with reports from the medical officer, psychiatrist, educational officer, and any other staff representative who examined, tested, interviewed or observed the man.

The classification committee considers and votes principally on custody, transfer to another institution, living quarters, social service, medical treatment, psychiatric treatment, employment, education, recreation, and religious training. Only the classification clinic can make a change if and when it is needed.

Copies of the report are sent to the Bureau of Prisons in Washington, the probation officer in the field, and also may go to a public welfare or a family agency in the home community.

For all inmates, there is such a thing as reclassification, each case being reviewed at least once a year.

Feeling more confident and sure about where he fits into the community at Lewisburg, our 30-day wonder packs up and moves out of quarantine into general population quarters.

ROUTINE BEGINS

The next day, providing it isn't Sunday, the latest arrival on the mainline will arise at 6:45 a. m. when he hears the reveille steam whistle and will be ready for breakfast at 7:15. He will go to work at 8 o'clock and return at 11:40.

After the noon meal the work whistle is sounded at 12:40 p. m. The working day ends at 4:30 o'clock, and supper is at 5 o'clock.

At 5:40 the athletic and library details will get things ready for the evening's activities. Teachers report to their classrooms at 5:45. Inside recreation starts at 5:55 o'clock and school at 6.

* * * * *

Weekday evenings are spent in activities as normal as any community on the outside. The men can attend choir, orchestra, and hillbilly band rehearsals, take part in gym classes or go to a basketball game either as a player or spectator. The extensive 22,000-volume library, operated much like a public library, is open for liberal periods. Books for the library are selected from review services.

Saturdays, Sundays, and holidays are movie nights at Lewisburg. Prison attachés say the range in interest in types of films is about the same as on the outside. Gangster films and those heavily suggestive of sex are prohibited. Like the radio programs, the films are selected by an inmate committee with the assistance of an employee counselor.

VALUE PRIVILEGES

The most widely used and apparently the most effective form of discipline at Lewisburg is the loss of privilege. Segregation and forfeiture of good time are means applied in extreme cases. Segregation carries with it a strict diet with no extras. Warden Humphrey shares the theory of many modern penologists that a man is sent to prison as punishment, not for punishment.

Participation in religious services and activities is on a par if not better than on the outside. There are at the present time about 900 Protestants and Jews, and 400 Catholics. A few have no religious affiliations. The average attendance at Protestant services on Sunday is between 160 and 180 men. Catholics average about 130 at mass on Sunday. All attendance figures double or triple at Christmas and Easter, very much like on the outside.

A meticulously planned program of work and play, education, and guidance stemming from a sound classification unit administered by men who make it a career is the basis for an orderly and useful life at Lewisburg.

Half of Inmates Work on Farm or in Prison Industries at Lewisburg Penitentiary

More than half the inmate population at the Federal penitentiary at Lewisburg are engaged in industrial or farm work and almost half have enrolled in educational courses, said Warden George W. Humphrey as he explained the detailed system by which men are assigned to duties within the prison walls.

Men assigned to prison industries where clothing is made for the Army and Veterans' Administration or metal cabinets, chairs, trays, and similar items are produced for Government agencies earn from $20 to $40 per month, but to obtain one of these jobs an inmate first must meet certain qualifications designed to assign the man to his proper place.

If a man is best suited for farm work he may be assigned to the farm camp at Allenwood where beef cattle, hogs, and poultry are raised along with feed for livestock. Or, he may be assigned to the prison farm at Lewisburg, where a dairy herd is maintained and food is grown for the prison. Much of the food grown is processed for future use.

As was explained earlier, every inmate entering the Lewisburg Penitentiary is subjected to a searching examination in an effort to glean all possible information so that institution officials can best fit the man in his proper niche. A niche that will prove beneficial both to the man and to society.

Once the series of mental and physical examinations are out of the way a complete report is compiled. Each man's case is treated separately by a classification committee composed of the warden, two associate wardens, the superintendent of classification and parole, superintendent of education, a representative of the medical department, two chaplains, industrial counselor, the man's individual parole officer, and the classification secretary. To these men go the responsibility of deciding just what kind of work and training the inmate shall have, what type of custody is needed, where he is to live, what, if any, social service is necessary, his education and recreational requirements, or if he is in the wrong type of institution and should be transferred.

Each member of the committee votes separately, but once the committee makes a decision no one person may make a change without consent of the entire group. An inmate may question any one of the decisions, and the committee will restudy the problem, but generally when a decision is made the inmate is urged to cooperate for a time to determine what changes are to be made. Each man's case is restudied every 12 months.

Generally, if tests indicate certain aptitudes, a man is placed in that kind of a job and urged to enroll in educational courses available. If he is a trained worker an attempt is made to give him work so that his skills can be maintained or improved for use when he is released.

* * * * *

One of the most important decisions to be made by the classification committee is that of custody. The committee must decide how much supervision the inmate needs, whether he is best suited for dormitory or cell life, or whether he should be transferred to some other type institution.

Mark S. Richmond, associate warden points out that the idea behind the classification committee's decision is to place the man in a situation so that his time spent behind the wall will be put to good use. "We have a man a relatively short period of his life," he said, and explained, "we sometimes feel that we get the results of other people's failures."

* * * * *

One of the most important new developments in penal rehabilitation is the use of group therapy. This type treatment is relatively new and is highly specialized, but it is the practice of psychiatry with a group rather than an individual. Individuals are aided in this matter by weaving into a conversation problems of most inmates and discussing these problems without pointing directly to one individual. This sort of treatment generally is used in discussion groups on marriage and the family, employment. Negro culture (since one-third the prison population is Negro), mental hygiene and the like. An Alcoholics Anonymous can be found at the institution and members from nearby communities often visit the inmate organization to discuss the movement and keep the men informed of activities on the outside.

* * * * *

A great deal of emphasis is placed on educational advancement. Classes from first grade through college are conducted and almost half the inmate population is enrolled. * * *

All of these pieces fit together in one big jigsaw puzzle that is designed to return an inmate to society as a useful member. Some fail to respond, but the overall program has proven itself many times over.

[From the Union County Standard-Journal, Lewisburg, Pa., of February 4, 1954]

Caliber of Correction Officers High at Lewisburg Penitentiary

Operation of the Federal penitentiary at Lewisburg in many respects is like the operation of a small but specialized community, or, better still, like a mammoth repair shop—one that repairs human lives rather than machines.

A searching examination system is used at the institution in an effort to place a man in a situation where he will benefit from his surroundings. To do this takes carefully trained personnel. Hundreds of them.

All the employees of the prison northwest of Lewisburg are carefully trained and their training is endless. Employed there are men skilled in every profession and vocation, but the men closest to the inmates, the men who know the inmates best are the correctional officers.

A good correctional officer has been described as one who can detect and eliminate trouble before trouble develops. To accomplish that, a man must be a keen student of human nature.

INTENSIVE COURSE

It isn't possible to become a correctional officer simply by applying for a job. Instead, a civil-service examination must be taken and passed. Once the man is accepted, he undergoes an intensive 4 weeks' basic training course which includes a thorough indoctrination, physical training, and close supervision while on the job.

A year's probation is next on the list, and during this period there are lectures and classes covering all phases of the prison program.

An in-service training program is operated continuously. Each employee below a department head must have at least 4 hours of various types of training. The program covers the entire span of the prison service from simple shakedown (search for contraband) to concepts of the prison system.

Advanced training is provided for a select group. This group includes men with long service and experience. It includes such training as techniques and procedures of prison administration and operation and research into specific fields.

* * * * *

KEY FIGURE

Because the correctional officer is assigned to every work group, he soon becomes well acquainted with the inmates. He not only must maintain custody but must teach good work habits. He often is the first person to whom inmates appeal for help on some particular problem, and it is this man who can guide an inmate back to the proper track or send him stumbling on his wayward journey.

There is required shooting on the rifle range, learning judo for defensive purposes, studying mass and individual psychology, plus the routine handling of men to insure a smooth operation of the institution.

* * * * *

Like any other school, the training officer at Lewisburg constantly is on the alert for new training methods. A series of film strips have been made at Lewisburg for that purpose and special workshops are conducted at all Federal institutions.

The record for more than 20 years of the history proves that the caliber of correctional officers at Lewisburg is exceptionally high. Blair said there has never been a riot at Northeastern, but quickly added that the possibility always exists and no one ever will say that it can't happen here.

[From Grit, Williamsport, Pa., of January 24, 1954]

Prison at Lewisburg

The modern concept of a prison's functions is well illustrated at the Northeastern Federal Penitentiary at Lewisburg. To visiting newspapermen last week, Warden George W. Humphrey expressed his belief that a man's punishment is his loss of freedom and there should be no effort to make his prison lot hard.

At the Lewisburg institution there is no bread and water diet, no solitary confinement. Rather there is an honest effort to understand a prisoner's problems and help him to solve them. To this end, recreation, educational and cultural opportunities, and religious services are emphasized. A man who has violated the laws of society is given every chance to live a better life.

Warden Humphrey was most convincing in his discussion of this enlightened approach to the prisoner problem. The Lewisburg Penitentiary appears to have competent leadership. The occasional incidents which have occurred there in the past would seem to be minor by comparison with the overall job of supervision and rehabilitation which is being done.

St. Lawrence Seaway Is Called a Threat to Nation's Railroads

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 29, 1954

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the following letter taken from the columns of the March 27, 1954, issue of the Indianapolis (Ind.) News and over the signature of Mr. Frank L. Collins definitely describes the threat of the St. Lawrence seaway to the railroads of this Nation:

St. Lawrence Seaway Is Called a Threat to Nation's Railroads

To the Editor of the News:

I have read with interest certain comments made by Mr. E. W. Dobson, of Morgantown, in relation to the St. Lawrence seaway. Mr. Dobson has expressed some criticism of Mr. Eugene L. Behmer, who has taken the position of the railways in opposing the seaway project. I regret that I have not read the statements made by Mr. Behmer, but I would like to point out a few facts to his adversary from Morgantown.

Mr. Dobson questions as to what manner a regional project such as the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Waterway could jeopardize the financial structure of our railway industry. The answer is quite simple. The railways have a tremendous capital outlay in the form of tracks, stations, shops, etc., as well as a large labor force. The gross revenues from this huge industry are great, but the costs of operation are also great. Therefore, the margin of profit is relatively small. Any loss of revenue traffic to any source, e. g., the St. Lawrence seaway carriers, could easily wipe out this small margin of profit.

Yet the problem is greater and more long standing than in the specific instance of the seaway project, and if Mr. Dobson fears that there is something drastically wrong with railway finance, perhaps I can suggest the answer here.

The only thing that might be drastically wrong with the business foundation of the railways might arise from the fact that they operate wholly upon their own resources. The railways stand alone in the transportation industry as the only private enterprise carriers competing against three forms of socialized carriers, namely, the motortrucks, the airlines, and the inland waterways. And no private industry operating wholly upon its own resources can compete long against a socialized industry.

Now I quite agree that the Government should operate or financially assist in private operations wherever there is a social or economic need and transportation services are unprofitable. But in any situation where State assistance makes it possible for one form of transportation to compete against another, such assistance is not only wasteful but extremely unjust.

As to the part the St. Lawrence seaway would play in national defense, I must confess that I have never been able to learn how it would serve in any war effort. This waterway would require much military protection at a great effort and much expense for its 6 months of operation. I realize, just as Mr. Dobson has explained, that no large enterprise would be free from attack; however, 1 well-aimed bomb or 1 capable saboteur active at a strategic spot could paralyze traffic in this waterway.

The railways, on the other hand, which can carry all the consignments transported by this inland waterway, would be almost impossible to paralyze. Their networks of tracks crisscross and bypass all cities and towns so that if one or more points were knocked out, traffic easily could be rerouted. Therefore, the danger to defense transportation does not arise from military sources, but from financial. For if nothing is done to assist our railways, many of these strategic rail lines eventually will have to be abandoned.

Frank L. Collins.

A Decision on Bias

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 3, 1954

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record a very fine editorial entitled "A Decision on Bias," published in the New York Herald Tribune of April 29, 1954. The editorial deals with a recent court decision involving the operations of the New York State Commission Against Discrimination.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

A Decision on Bias

The court of appeals has upheld the power of the New York State Commission against discrimination, thus giving important new strength to the commission. The latter has been justly proud of its record in settling cases without resort to the courts. But in the case of the Holland Vocational Service it is clear that the commission had a difficult problem. The employment agency's questions were clearly designed to establish whether the applicant was a Jew. The commission objected not to a single question but to all that had been asked. To make sure that the agency did not continue its objectionable course, the commission ordered the submission of names and addresses of applicants and job orders for a year. Both the finding of discrimination and the order for production of records were upheld by the court.

From the very beginning the commission has found it difficult to curb discrimination when practiced by the private employment offices. So many legitimate reasons may be advanced for failure to refer an individual that it is only when the commission can study all agency records for a sufficient period of time that a pattern of discrimination could be traced. In backing up the commission on this important inspectional function the Court of Appeals has decided wisely.

Inadequacy of Price Formulas for Farm Programs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 3, 1954

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, the April issue of the magazine Country Gentleman contained a very interesting article entitled "A Price Formula Is Not Enough for a Farm Program," written by Albert J. Ebers of Nebraska. I wish to quote a sentence or two from the article, as follows:

> The first and most universal law observed by all farmers is that the greatest profit comes from the highest yield.

I quote further from the article:

> Farmers will restrict acreages of surplus crops if all farmers do so through Government programs, but restricted acres will be put in the next most profitable crop so that overall production will be reduced but little.

Mr. Ebers comes to the conclusion that an effectual farm program must expand the outlets for farm products by finding ways of controlling surpluses and by bringing about a better balance between production and marketing needs.

The article goes to the heart of the farm problem. Everyone concerned might well read and study the ideas expressed by the author who has lived with the farm problem during his entire life. It will be noted that Mr. Ebers urges using farm surpluses in connection with defense efforts at home and abroad, the diversion of tilled acres to soil and water conserving legumes and grasses, and for industrial purposes.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire article may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Can farm production be controlled by prices? This economic law of business is being proposed for agriculture and is accepted by many in nonfarm circles. If applied to agriculture it will not hold because the controlling factors are different. Farm production cannot be adjusted simply by lowering prices, and it will be a mistake to base a farm program on that assumption.

The first and most universal law observed by all farmers is that the greatest profit comes from the highest yield. Experience has taught us that this is so and it fits the natural inclination of the farmer to raise the largest crop and manage his livestock enterprise to get the best returns possible.

On family sized farms, 75 percent of the costs are now fixed. The farmer cannot reduce them by firing himself or letting a part of his land lie idle, for it is the last few acres and last few bushels of yield that may bring the margin of profit over costs. Moreover, as the prices of his products decline the farmer is harder pressed for efficiency, and the biggest factor in efficiency is high yield. So he will strive for the highest possible yield to maintain his standard of living and meet his fixed costs. Farmers did that in the 2 years of lowest farm income—1932 and 1933—when they planted the largest acreage on record in crops.

Those who say that lowering prices will reduce farm production either have not farmed for too long or do not believe history. It may even have an opposite effect. Take, for instance, the dairy farmer whose cows in 1953 netted $200 per cow in milk receipts over feed costs. Say that in 1954, because of lower milk prices, his herd will net only $125 a cow. With your income reduced three-eighths, would you reduce it further by selling off some of your cows? Hardly. More likely, if your feed production and milking setup would enable you to do it, you would try to make up for this reduction in income by increasing your herd.

A change in farm policy will not change the facts. The farmer knows that the lower his prices go the more he must try to come out even by striving for the most efficient production and the highest yield.

Therefore, flexible price supports will tend to flex only downward, as they will have no noticeable effect on total farm production.

Something besides a purely price formula is necessary in a farm program that will enable farming to come through this surplus period safely, and without endangering the whole economy through the loss of farm purchasing power.

In considering such a program certain facts, well realized by farmers, will have to be faced. One of the present theories is that farmers can be induced, either by acreage and marketing controls or lower prices, to shift out of a product that is in surplus production.

Farmers will restrict acreages of surplus crops if all farmers do so through Government programs, but restricted acres will be put in the next most profitable crop so that overall production will be reduced but little.

Ordinarily we have some choice between crops we raise, and can shift acreage from one crop to another if it is more profitable. But usually prices of farm crops in any region stay in a rather stable relationship with one another and, unless one is in short supply, it will not pay to make a shift. Also we have the choice of deciding whether it will be more profitable to sell our crops or, if we have livestock, to feed them. This, too, is not as much of a choice as it first seems, for if a farmer is equipped for dairying, he will keep dairy cows and must feed them. Here again efficiency counts more for profit than shifting to another livestock enterprise.

But now the opportunity to shift from one crop or one kind of livestock to another has become less open to us. Research and farming progress have produced higher-yielding crops and increased breeding and feeding efficiency to such an extent that our farm output potential is away above domestic needs.

An effectual farm program consequently must have these other objectives besides price supports:

1. Expanding outlets for farm products by finding ways of trading our surpluses to foreign countries or using them to promote our interests abroad, and by developing larger markets at home.

2. Bringing about a better balance between farm production and market needs by diverting sufficient acreage to soil-conserving and other nonsurplus uses until we can work our surpluses down to safe carryover proportions.

I think farmers generally want the most use possible made of our surplus production, both at home and abroad. This might be helped by a two-price system, particularly for wheat and cotton, whereby domestically used production would bring a parity price and the surpluses move into world trade at world-market prices. Many of us feel, too, that more effort should be directed toward finding new uses for farm products through research and also toward cutting down the growing price spread between farmers and consumers, so that our own people could afford more and higher-quality food products.

These measures will take time. Meanwhile, storing our surplus fertility in the land, for use when needed, would be a better investment than storing surplus production in elevators and warehouses. It would protect farm price levels now, and consumer needs in the future.

Those of us who farm use the products of industry in both our living and our work. We know from past history that when farm prices are low for any extended period, compared with things the farmer has to buy, the effects spread to all other lines of business and employment. Our economy is feeling a little of the influence of below-parity farm prices now. That is why a program that will maintain stable farm prices and income is as much to the interest of the public as it is to the farmer.

Can We Eat Up That Food Surplus?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GUY M. GILLETTE

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 3, 1954

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Can We Eat Up That Food Surplus?" published in Wallace' Farmer and Iowa Homestead for May 1, 1954.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CAN WE EAT UP THAT FOOD SURPLUS?

With more milk and butter coming on the market, with more beef in prospect, more chickens and more hogs next fall, every farmer asks: "Who is going to eat it up?"

One answer is to expand the home market for livestock products. But how?

Around 20 percent of the families of the United States will eat less milk, eggs, and meat than they really need. And 16 million persons are getting scanty Government help to keep them eating.

The Wallace-Homestead poll went to Iowa farm people with this question:

"Congress is considering a food stamp program which would turn food surpluses over to the unemployed and those now getting public assistance. Do you think this is a good idea or a poor idea?"

Republicans and Democrats joined in a vote of approval:

	Republican	Democrat	Total
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*
Good idea	76	75	76
Poor idea	19	19	19
Undecided	5	6	5

A young farmer in Green County commented: "I think the food stamp program O. K. Why not help some of our own people as well as shipping the surplus to foreign countries?"

Who should get food stamps? The following groups are getting some kind of public assistance: 2.6 million on old-age assistance under Federal-State programs; 1.9 million getting help for dependent children; 2.4 million on unemployment compensation; 4.7 million on old-age insurance under social security; and 1.1 million on direct relief.

Farmers, in talking about food stamps, seemed to give first place to help old people and children. Some had doubts about more aid to folks on direct relief and to the unemployed.

A young farmer in Black Hawk County reported: "I don't approve if this food is handed out so men won't hunt for work. I'm having a terrible time now trying to get help."

A farmer in Story County added: "If we turn the stuff over to the unemployed, they might never go to work."

Have farm views changed on food stamps? No. Earlier polls also showed a favorable response. In 1953, the Wallace-Homestead Poll asked:

"A dairy committee is recommending the following method of getting rid of Government supplies of butter and cheese. 'Issue stamps worth 50 cents on a pound of butter and 25 cents on a pound of cheese. Give stamps to folks now on relief rolls, to hospitals and to other institutions.' What do you think of the proposal?"

On this, the vote was:

	Republican	Democrat	Total
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*
Good idea	65	69	66
Bad idea	21	17	20
Undecided	14	14	14

Farmers are apparently more interested in food stamps now than last year. More farmers see a continued surplus of milk, butter, and cheese, with trouble ahead in low-grade beef and eggs.

Senator Aiken's food stamp bill is before Congress. Senators Aiken and Anderson also have an emergency bill to develop plans for getting surpluses at cut rates to low-income families.

Views on Construction of Echo Park and Split Mountain Dams

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR V. WATKINS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 3, 1954

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, in a recent publication entitled "the Natural History" magazine, there was printed an article under the sponsorship of the Nature Conservancy organization, wherein Dr. Richard H. Pough, its president, went on record as being opposed to the Echo Park and Split Mountain Dams at the confluence of the Green and Yampa Rivers in western Colorado and eastern Utah.

I have just received a letter from two members of that organization, who are on the teaching staff of a university in my State, complaining of the action taken by their organization.

Messrs. Hayward and Beck in their letter to Dr. Pough point up one of the problems being faced by other well-meaning organizations which without sufficient background take a stand in opposition to this project. These Utah professors state:

> We feel that it should be a general policy of the conservancy to utilize its members who live in and are well acquainted with local conditions in an advisory capacity before controversial policies are decided upon and published as the attitude of the organization as a whole.

This is just another example of many which have appeared recently wherein bona fide well-meaning organizations, which having been victimized by the misinformation circulated by pseudo conservationists, hastily and without due consideration adopt a resolution or other statement of position opposing this project without first obtaining the advice and opinion of its members who are personally acquainted with many of the pertinent factors necessary for an intelligent decision.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record the text of the letter written to Dr. Pough by C. Lynn Hayward and D. Elden Beck, members of Nature Conservancy and other ecological societies and associations.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Provo, Utah, *April 28, 1954.*

Dr. Richard H. Pough,
President, Nature Conservancy, Chairman, Department of Conservation and General Ecology, American Museum of Natural History, New York, N. Y.

Dear Dr. Pough: It has come to our notice that the Nature Conservancy, of which you are president and we are members, has gone on record as being opposed to the proposed Echo Park and Split Mountain Dams on the Green River in northeastern Utah and adjoining Colorado. We also note your article opposing these projects in a recent number of the Natural History magazine.

Both of us are deeply interested in the preservation of natural communities as well as objects of nature for scientific study and for the enjoyment of the people. One of us has been a member and supporter of the Nature Conservancy and its forerunner, the Ecologists Union, from the very beginning. One of us has also been a member of the American Museum of Natural History Association for several years and has respected and supported most of the policies of that organization. However, we feel that, having lived in this western area for many years and knowing first-hand many of the problems involved in the proposed projects, we cannot sustain the Nature Conservancy or the American Museum in their efforts to kill these vital projects. Furthermore, we feel that it should be a general policy of the conservancy to utilize its members who live in and are well acquainted with local conditions in an advisory capacity before controversial policies are decided upon and published as the attitude of the organization as a whole.

We stand for the proposed Echo Park project for the following reasons:

1. Utah and the other upper basin States in the Colorado River drainage are arid States and their very life and development depends upon the utilization of the water resources available to them from all sources. The principal remaining source of water in these States is the Colorado River and their future is dependent upon a full and complete utilization of the waters of this river system. These waters to be completely utilized must be controlled by storage.

As a result of the compact among the six Western States and the United States, Utah, Colorado, Wyoming, New Mexico, California, and Nevada, signed in 1922, Utah is entitled to 23 percent of the water allocated to the upper basin States under the compact. If Utah fails for any cause whatsoever to use this water to which it is entitled under the compact, and projects are in the meantime developed in the lower basin, Utah's rights will, in spite of the compact, be lost.

The Colorado River storage project, which includes the Echo Park Dam, is the key unit and provides the only means of obtaining and conserving in Utah the waters of the Colorado River that legally belong to it. The people who have not lived in the arid West cannot fully appreciate the value of water which must be developed and used to meet the needs of a rapidly growing population. The Colorado River storage project involves the regulation of the Colorado River which can only be done by storage. It involves the irrigation of land within the States of the Colorado River drainage basin as defined in the Colorado River Compact. It involves the generation of power and the provision for water for municipal and industrial purposes. There are large areas of arid lands which need water, the only source for which is the Colorado River. There are large deposits of raw materials which need water and power in order that they might be processed. The Colorado River under control and development provides storage for regulation which enables the upper basin to meet its commitments to the lower basin in terms of water, provides power for industrial development, and provides water for consumptive uses for agriculture, municipal and industrial purposes.

The project not only involves irrigation of a few acres of land near the dam site, but water is to be brought into the Great Basin area where the bulk of the population and industry of the State of Utah is at present located. At present these communities located along the Wasatch Front depend almost entirely upon the drainage from the Wasatch Mountains, which, in the form of small streams, is inadequate to meet the needs of our expanding industries and population. A series of several dry years would spell disaster to us even under present conditions. The only large streams that transverse our area are the Green and Colorado Rivers, and at present we cannot utilize these streams except to a very minor degree.

We believe that the conservation and use of our water and power resources is in the public interest and that no other use, to which an area could be put, would compare in importance to the full and complete utilization of these resources. This is doubly true in an arid region where the water is so important and where the development of power is so essential to the industrial and agricultural development of the area. The development of these resources represents true conservation and not pseudo conservation which would hold unused in perpetuity a resource of great magnitude.

When some of those who are opposed to the proposed projects speak of some selfish local group that is advocating these vital conservation measures, it is evident that those in opposition have no concept of the magnitude of these projects and their importance to a large and rapidly growing population that likes to live here and is as anxious as any other people to see our area grow and prosper. This has no point of comparison, in our opinion, with the preservation of some small area of primitive grassland or a growth of redwood trees from exploitation. This proposed water conservation is a public enterprise of such magnitude that every agency that professes conservation should surely support it rather than fight against it. We feel that this is an opportunity for influential organizations such as the Nature Conservancy to really support an outstanding proposal in conservation at its very best.

2. It is generally understood that the proposed reservoirs will not submerge the dinosaur remains for which the Dinosaur National Monument was originally established in 1915. Neither will it submerge much of the area of the monument as it was expanded in 1938. Furthermore, the areas that will be submerged are not of outstanding scenic value when compared with many other areas along the course of the Colorado River that will not be in any way disturbed by these projects. We have had the pleasure of covering much of the country along the course of the Green and Colorado Rivers in Utah, and have been impressed with the grandeur of the scenery in areas that will be far removed from the Echo Park Reservoir and other reservoirs in that area. There would still be left numerous rapids to run for those who like to run them, and many miles of wilderness for the pleasure of those who wish to become footsore and weary.

3. Surveys were begun for these dams in 1904 and have continued to the present. Thus, they were projected 11 years before the Dinosaur Monument was established. The water and power needs of the area involved were appreciated many years ago, but are only now becoming acute. When the boundaries of the monument were extended it was agreed by the National Park Service that the extension of these boundaries would not interfere with power and irrigation development. Such was the agreement in the proclamation extending the monument over the signature of President Franklin D. Roosevelt. The present Secretary of the Interior and two previous Secretaries, after thorough investigations, have sanctioned the construction of Echo Park Dam. The United States is both legally and morally bound to sustain its commitments made to the people of Utah and Colorado when the boundaries of Dinosaur Monument were expanded from its original status to the present size in 1938.

4. There have been objections to the projects on the grounds that we already have a surplus of agricultural products, and that the opening up of new land would only add to such surpluses. This seems to us to be an extremely nearsighted view to anyone who understands population trends in the United States, and particularly in the West, as well as the food needs of the world as a whole. Furthermore, the projects would furnish water not alone for irrigating farmlands, but also for the beautification of our communities and to a large degree for culinary purposes. Beyond this, the supply of cheap power for our growing industries, cities, and farms is most essential.

5. With respect to the use of alternate sites for the dams, we quote the following from a statement by C. B. Jacobson, engineer in charge of Colorado River Storage Project Investigations, Bureau of Reclamation, 1954:

"No single site on the upper Colorado River or its tributaries is capable of doing the job alone, in fact, the most efficient team consists of nine dams, reservoirs, and powerplants. Although the proclaimed enlargement of the monument clearly provided for development of water and power within the monument, the Department of the Interior, nevertheless, painstakingly examined suggested alternatives for the two important dams—Echo Park and Split Mountain—which lie within the monument. The final conclusion of the Department, whose agencies fostered the enlargement of the Dinosaur Monument in 1938, was that there were no substitutes for Echo Park and Split Mountain Dams that would not materially diminish the effectiveness of the 9-reservoir system. The plan submitted to the Congress of the United States thus included the Echo Park and Split Mountain Dams. On January 18, 1954, while appearing before the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, Under Secretary of the Interior Ralph A. Tudor, an eminent engineer who has made a personal study of the Echo Park and Split Mountain situation, was questioned about the economic importance of these two dams in the total plan. He replied, 'There are no adequate substitutes. * * * The removal of these two dams from the system would be like taking the pistons out of the upper basin engine.' The principles of the plan have the concurrence of the seven States of the upper and lower basins, the Department of the Army, the Department of Agriculture, and the Federal Power Commission."

In summary it might be said that we strongly favor the proposed Echo Park and Split Mountain projects on the grounds that they are sound conservation and that they are vitally needed for the future development of this western area. It is also clear that they are not setting a precedent for the exploitation of our national parks and monuments since it was definitely stipulated that the national monument in question would not interfere with water and power developments.

It is our hope as ardent conservationists that the Nature Conservancy, as well as other conservation agencies, will reverse its attitude and add its influence to the success of these vital projects.

Sincerely yours,

C. LYNN HAYWARD,
Member Nature Conservancy; Member Ecological Society of America.
D. ELDEN BECK,
Member American Museum of Natural History Association; Member Nature Conservancy.

International Understanding Through Cultural Exchange

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS CASE
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 3, 1954

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Mrs. Dorothy D. Houghton, former president of the General Federation of Women's Clubs, on the subject International Understanding Through Cultural Exchange.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTERNATIONAL UNDERSTANDING THROUGH CULTURAL EXCHANGE

(Speech delivered by Mr. Dorothy D. Houghton, April 12, 1954, at a luncheon given by the Washington Board of Trade, in honor of the Azuma Kabuki dancers and musicians from Tokyo, Japan)

It seems appropriate to me, today, to speak on a topic which, while being very much related to the occasion, constitutes an idea which may well be called a prerequisite for peace, namely: International Understanding Through Cultural Exchange.

I am certain that you will agree with me if I say that we can only have feelings about people and things we actually know. And that we can only understand and love that which we know well. True international understanding therefore can only come about when nations will have thoroughly known and understood each other. And peace will only be lasting when this has been achieved.

Since all peoples alike crave for harmony, peace, economic stability and progress, which wars make impossible, all nations are basically linked by a common desire which is prevented from bearing fruit only because of their ignorance of one another. And their not knowing, not understanding each other, makes for suspicion, and suspicion for fear. And fear brings about subjective attitudes, built on misconceptions which have devastating consequences. It is obvious, therefore, that this ignorance is the basis of international misunderstanding. To root it out, all nations on the five continents of this planet must endeavor to gain as much knowledge of one another as possible—and this is best brought about by cultural exchange in its very broadest meaning.

"Cultural exchange" is realized in innumerable ways. For instance, through international travel. (I should like to interject here that the idea of intensified international travel appears so imperative to the legislative branch of my Government that Congress has recently introduced a bill which calls for its promotion.)

"Cultural exchange" is achieved through technical cooperation.

It is realized through the exchange of clergymen, teachers, artists, scientists, and journalists, among Asian, American, European, and African countries. These individuals and groups who travel to distant lands carry with them the very seed of good will and the sword against ignorance.

It is with this awareness, and in this spirit, that I welcome the Azuma Kabuki dancers and musicians to America. I should also like to pay tribute to Japan for having been in the forefront of those free nations who have been actively cooperating in cultural interchange. None of us will ever forget the glorious exhibition of the Treasures of Japanese Art, which last year were shown at the National Gallery and other American museums.

Since July 2, 1951, Japan has been an active member of UNESCO. Through the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization an exhibit of American children drawings was recently sent to Tokyo. The exhibition was a great success, and a short while ago a group of 59 drawings by Japanese children was received here as a token of appreciation, and with them a medal, a certificate, and 2 books for Geraldine Payne, a 7-year-old little girl from Greensboro, N. C., whose drawing had received the first prize in Tokyo. Thus, the spirit of international understanding through cultural exchange grows roots in the hearts of little children who, we pray, will be the citizens of a peaceful tomorrow.

I think it is important to remember here the value of the international organizations which further a better understanding among nations.

First, of course, I should like to speak of UNESCO, which has been joined by more countries than even the United Nations. It counts 69 member nations. It is an interesting fact that Russia, and none of the Iron Curtain countries, are members of UNESCO, and that Soviet Russia with the largest program of cultural and other propaganda, and its interminable cultural conferences, refuses to cooperate on the international level, and in developing the freedom of the arts. Instead, she turns the arts into slaves of the state. In fear of freedom, lest the regime collapse, the Soviet ideology bars individualistic expression. Its concept is diametrically opposed to the idea of artistic freedom, which has been so beautifully formulated by Thornton Wilder. He says that "the artist is not insisting upon freedom for freedom's sake—as thoughtless adolescents do, as criminals do. Freedom presents itself to an artist not as a void but as a severe summons. Of all men, artists and men of religion have the clearest vision of what freedom is; and they live in fear lest they abuse it. No one commands their laborious hours, no one can help them. The only freedom the artist desires is a servitude to the truth. For his interior struggles we can do nothing." * * *

But coming back to UNESCO, nothing could better illustrate the purpose for which it was created than these words taken from its constitution. I quote:

"Since wars begin in the minds of men, it is in the minds of men that the defenses of peace must be constructed; ignorance of each other's ways and lives has been a common cause, throughout the history of mankind, of that suspicion and mistrust between the peoples of the world through which their differences have all too often broken into war; the wide diffusion of culture, and the education of humanity for justice and liberty and peace are indispensable to the dignity of man and constitute a sacred duty which all nations must fulfill in a spirit of mutual assistance and concern * * * peace must be—founded, if it is not to fail, upon the intellectual and moral solidarity of mankind."

To realize this purpose the organization will—

(a) collaborate in the work of advancing the mutual knowledge and understanding of peoples, through all means of mass communication and to that end recommend such international agreement as may be necessary to promote the free flow of ideas by word and image;

(b) give fresh impulse to popular education and to the spread of culture;

(c) and finally, maintain, increase, and diffuse knowledge.

UNESCO has truly become an indispensable tool for the promotion of international interchange of knowledge and the combating of illiteracy.

Let us also remember here such valuable organizations as the Cultural Commission of the League of Arab States; the Council of Europe which recently passed a convention on Human Rights; the International Bureau of Education in Geneva with its annual conferences of Ministries of Education from all over the world; the International Union for the Protection of Literary and Artistic Works which protects writers and composers within member states in matters pertaining to copyright; and last but not least, the Organization of American States, formerly the Panamercian Union.

Of course, there are many nongovernmental organizations, engaged in the furtherance of international good will along the lines mentioned. I shall not attempt to name them all, for they are too great in number. However, ANTA, the American National Theater and Academy on the national level, and the International Theater Institute on the international level, provide an excellent illustration of what nongovernmental groups can do in this realm. ANTA, for instance, is the United States, center of the International Theater Institute. It produces plays by distinguished foreign authors, a play that reflects the life and living of another country, or one concerned with those ideas and ideals of mutual helpfulness and good will. The theater has a tremendous role to play as a means toward understanding. It lifts the audience into participation and through participation to a sympathy that is more powerful in that it is experienced through the emotions as well as apprehended by the mind.

(a) Finally, I should like to speak of the United States Government efforts fostering International Understanding through Cultural Exchange.

It is only natural that I should first think of the tremendous contribution my own organization, the Foreign Operations Administration, is making: FOA cooperates with 56 nations in 1 or more aspects of the Mutual Security Program. Sixteen of those nations are in Europe; 14 in the Near East, South Asia, and Africa; 7 in the Far East; and 19 in Latin America. No program is undertaken except upon specific request of the participating government. No technical program has any military strings attached as the price of United States cooperation.

Technical cooperation is such an important factor in creating better understanding between America and other nations because it is a two-way street. Not only are we providing knowledge, new skills, techniques through a fisheries adviser for Liberia, a fartilizer expert for India, a tax consultant for Iran or a teacher-training specialist for Jordan, but through our contracts between United States and foreign colleges, professors, students, scientists, government officials, and labor experts from other countries come to the United States colleges and through their very presence stimulate United States research and interest in their native land. For instance, Mark Gordon, of the FOA Mission in Ethiopia, explained upon his recent visit here that through an Ethopian contract with the Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical University, Oklahoma has become the only State where everybody knows something about Ethiopia.

FOA finances part of the costs involved in these contracts. The fundamental difference between United States and foreign universities is the extension service American colleges give. In the United States, the university does not teach only a selected few, but it also extends vast services to the people. Here, university personnel go out into the field and work with farmers, advise industries, render services to the government. It offers evening and week-end classes and special courses during vacation periods. These concepts are passed on to foreign universities through the consummation of these contracts and they will slowly revolutionize the role of foreign universities in faraway lands, always assisted by American professors and United States university personnel who teach their techniques in demonstration services.

I know it will amuse you to hear how one FOA project affected the Iranian village of Sheraz. There, FOA assisted in the building of a new village water-supply system. A few months after its completion, the keeper of the village morgue went to see the village council with a seemingly grave complaint. He explained that he had hitherto been paid by the number of bodies he buried, but that he had now to insist upon an annual salary due to the severe drop in business.

The foreign trainees and productivity teams program is another important factor. We have a present 3,000 to 4,000 foreigners here who have come over under this program for additional training in specific technical fields, important to the economic development program of their native countries. Simultaneously, they learn to understand our political, social, and economic institutions, which is just as important as their technical training.

Work-study training programs, primarily for young workers from Europe, make possible their working in American factories for American wages. They spend time with American families, go to American amusements, take out American girls, and return to their home countries to tell about their experiences. They are also given special orientation courses which enable them to transpose that which they have learned into workable and applicable methods at home.

Before their departure, our American technicians are likewise oriented as to the history, culture, and customs of their prospective host country. However qualified these technicians may be, they could be worse than useless would they and their wives not understand the attitudes and the differences in tradition, motivation, and social organization, of the foreign country they are about to visit.

In collaboration with the Department of State, FOA is now developing technical training for Asians in Japan. The type of training they can secure in Japan is much more applicable to the situation to which the individual is going to return, than training obtained in the United States.

But don't let me forget the other United States programs in my great enthusiasm over the work of the Foreign Operations Administration.

(b) The Department of State with its International Educational Exchange Service promotes genuine understanding and mutual respect between the United States and all free peoples. This program seeks to bring about greater worldwide confidence in, and cooperation with, the United States. It furthers the realization among other peoples that the motives, objectives, and policies of the United States Government and its citizens are in harmony with, and will in fact advance, their own legitimate aspirations for peace, progress and freedom. In 1953, grants were awarded to more than 7,600 persons, involving exchanges, with 72 countries of the free world. These persons were key persons—leaders or potential leaders of affairs in their countries.

The positive results of this program are best illustrated through the statements made by foreigners upon conclusion of their visit here. A young German who landed on our shores with some very harsh criticisms of United States fraternities as a breeding ground for self-styled snobs commented after he had been here for a year:

"I do not think that I have been assimilated here, that I have been Americanized to any great extent, but I have found in Sigma Chi, a common meeting ground where I can be a close friend to Americans and still be a good German. That may not sound too extraordinary but imagine this concept really being applied on a large scale in international relations."

A Japanese legislator told of his understanding in this way:

"I realized from this trip that the essential difference and disagreement between Communist Russia and the United States is that the former represents a way of life by compulsion and the latter represents a way of life which is based on and derives its strength from voluntary processes. The American way is just and proper for human society."

Even the sports are not neglected in this program. A particularly effective tour was the visit to Japan of the New York Giants. The Japanese, who are avid baseball fans, came in great numbers to see the Giants in action against a Japanese team. Widely and favorably reported was the message of President Eisenhower which Baseball Commissioner Ford Frick brought with him.

(c) Turning to Latin America, I should like to remind you that our whole concept of using cultural relations as an instrument of foreign policy began with our Government's official programs of cultural exchange with Latin America in 1936. These programs have been and still are the concern of the Bureau of Inter-American Affairs in the Department of State. "Stable, satisfactory relations between the United States and the nations of Latin America are vital as we seek to build a cooperative peace characterized by freedom and rising levels of well-being," to use the words of Milton Eisenhower, pronounced upon his return from Latin America last November. And again, in March 1954, at the 10th Inter-American Conference at Caracas, several of the most important agenda items were concerned with cultural relations and the exchange of persons.

These programs then, of which I have spoken to you today, are the implementation of President Eisenhower's concept as expressed before the Fourth National Conference of the United States National Commission for UNESCO in September 1953. He said, "I cannot urge too strongly or too often the dedication of the energies, resources, and imaginations of peoples throughout the world to the waging of a total war upon the brute forces of ignorance and poverty."

Preserving America's Outdoor Heritage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 3, 1954

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I was very much interested to receive recently an exceedingly worthwhile reprint from the Nature Conservancy, an association for the conservation of natural areas. The reprint deals with the preservation of our outdoor heritage. It consists of an article published in the bulletin to the schools of the University of the State of New York in March 1953 by Mr. Paul B. Sears, chairman of the conservation program of Yale University.

My own State has long been deeply interested in conservation of our heritage, and I know that this article will be of interest to my colleagues. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the Record, preceded by the list of the distinguished board of governors of the Nature Conservancy.

There being no objection, the list and article were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Board of Governors

President: Richard H. Pough, American Museum of Natural History.

Vice President, S. Charles Kendeigh, University of Illinois.

Secretary: Herbert C. Hanson, Catholic University of America.

Treasurer: Joseph J. Hickey, University of Wisconsin.

Conrad Chapman, Boston, Mass.; Austin H. Clark, United States National Museum; Frank E. Egler, Norfolk, Conn.; F. Raymond Fosberg, Falls Church, Va.; Albert M. Fuller, Milwaukee Public Museum; C. M. Goethe, Sacramento, Calif.; G. B. Gunlogson, Racine, Wis.; William Hard, New Canaan, Conn.; Paul A. Herbert, Michigan State College; Jean M. Linsdale, Robles del Rio, Calif.; Herbert A. McCullough, Howard College; Karl A. Menninger, Topeka, Kans.; M. Graham Netting, Carnegie Museum; Curtis L. Newcombe, Lafayette, Calif.; E. Laurence Palmer, Cornell University; Robert L. Perkins, Jr., Tenafly, N. J.; J. E. Potzger, Butler University; James B. Ross, Atlanta, Ga.; Robert W. Schery, Kirkwood, Mo.; Paul B. Sears, Yale University; Julian A. Steyermark, Chicago Natural History Museum; William Vogt, Planned Parenthood Federation of America; Alvin G. Whitney, Delmar, N. Y.

What Worth Wilderness?

(By Paul B. Sears)

The State of Ohio, containing about 40,000 square miles, was once a magnificent hardwood forest. The forest types, thanks to the records of early surveyors, have been largely mapped. Yet it is almost impossible to form an adequate picture, from any surviving records, of the appearance of that forest. The State has its full share of memorials—statues, libraries, institutions; some useful, some not; some beautiful, many ugly. But somehow it never occurred to anyone to set aside a square mile, much less a township 6 miles square, of primeval vegetation for future generations to see and enjoy. Yet this could have been done for less than the cost of a single pile of stone of dubious artistic and cultural merit.

Farther west the boundless prairie, that living carpet of wonderful changing colors, is all but gone. Strenuous effort will be required to set aside proposed grassland national monuments. Unless this is done, the prairies will survive only on the pages of travelers' journals and in the descriptions of those who, like Willa Cather, knew and loved them.

We need not, said Darwin, marvel at extinction. But we have reached a point of civilization where we are no longer proud to be the agents of extermination. Once we are reminded that a species—key-deer, trumpeter swan, moccasin-flower or arbutus—is in danger, it is possible although never easy to rally help in preserving it. Often, as with the heath hen and passenger pigeon, help comes too late.

The business of preserving game species moves somewhat more briskly, being substantially financed by license fees and insistent sportsmen. But for a long time the conserver of species, whether sportsman or not, missed the point. It seemed enough to slow down or stop the actual killing of individuals. We ignored an ancient rule of warfare, put into effect by Rome against Carthage; if you wish to eliminate, destroy the center of activity, the home.

Now the home of any species is the community of which it is a part. True, by juggling diet we can now get certain wild animals to breed in a zoo, but that is a sorry expedient. As Ding Darling once pointed out, you can always tell a tame mallard from a wild one by its potbelly. If we are really serious about preserving any species we must preserve, in generous measure, its community of plant and animal life. Can we, in our own larger community of fierce competition for space, justify this?

Sentiment, of course, draws scorn from the practical minded. But I doubt if sentiment is as fragile a defense as we think. How cheaply would the toughest minded sell the loyalty and pride of those who serve with him in factory, field, or countinghouse? How great can a commonwealth become, how long can it endure, if it measures everything by price tag?

There exists, I suppose, such a thing as fundamental decency and gratitude and there are ways to acknowledge it. The Mormons have their monument to the gulls which saved them from the locusts. The Lord Chancellor sits upon a wool sack memento of the source of England's early economic power. Many of us have seen the block expressing gratitude to the boll weevil which first obliged the South to begin diversifying its crops—a curious but impressive tribute.

We are, and rightly, generous in our regard for the group of most unusual men who made possible our Nation and planned its greatness. But we ought to remember, too, that in large measure our power and leadership are based upon the lavishness of Nature, building undisturbed through millemiums. The ancients thought it not unworthy to worship the gods who have them grain—rice, wheat, maize. Is it unworthy in our enlightened day to commemorate, by generous preservation, the natural wealth which has been the lifeblood of our economy? I, for one, do not think so. To me it seems a matter of ethics and national self-respect.

An American commander in eastern Europe told me that he gave permission to the cold and hungry people of a city to help themselves to the trees in their ancient forest park. This they refused to do, and the hard-headed general was deeply moved by their decision. It will not do to write off sentiment.

There is also, in the need for generous natural areas, the question of important scientific knowledge. The undisturbed communtly of plants and animals is a beautifully organized dynamic system, employing energy from the sun for the use and reuse of water, air, and minerals in sustaining abundant life, while keeping its own organization going. Technically, this presents an exceedingly important phenomenon, the approximation of a steady state. Our knowledge of this phenomenon can do with considerable improvement, and again we need generous examples for its study. When men are beginning to talk rather seriously of raising some billions for the exploration of space, we ought not to neglect a more immediate, and definitely hopeful, source of knowledge. Knowledge for its own sake, like sentiment, is not lightly to be written off by a civilized nation.

It happens, however, that although the knowledge thus obtained is not likely to be patentable as a source of direct profit, its benefits diffused over the land-use pattern of our Nation should be vrry great. The studies of Dr. John E. Weaver, of the University of Nebraska, carried on through the years on a pitiful remnant of rented prairie, are of growing significance to the economy of the great grasslands of North America.

Just as the engineer in machine and industrial design must have at hand his theoretical apparatus of calculation, so the biologist and others who would design intelligent land-use, must have their norms or standards of measurement. And these norms, to a large degree, are to be found in the complex pattern of interrelationship represented by the undisturbed natural community. At present we have to rely largely on intuition—a wasteful and dangerous process, as is trial and error. It is a moral obligation to know if we can.

Why are species which have endured for millions of years—the oak, chestnut, elm, and beech—suddenly so vulnerable, now that we have disturbed their homes? Introduced parasites are not the entire answer. Why are the second-growth forests which now cover about two-thirds of New England so full of inferior stock that a generation or more must pass before they become reasonably productive? Is it because we have systematically harvested the best and biggest trees, leaving only scrub individuals of bad heredity to reproduce themselves? Four thousand years of corncobs are piled up in Bat Cave, N. Mex., and the ones on top are as scrubby as those at the bottom. Presumably the Indians ate all the big ears instead of saving them for seed. What happened in the cornfield can happen in a forest. We need to know.

Yet neither knowledge nor sentiment alone afford the most powerful justification of ample wilderness or natural areas set aside in perpetuity. Rather it is the mixture of practical, theoretical, and ethical symbolized by the question, "What kind of a nation do we want?" Do we wish to build a future completely and ruthlessly mechanized, standardized, and artificial? Do we really mean to crowd back nature to the utmost minimum, depending upon ingenious artifice at every turn for physical and spiritual sustenance, until we have to eat standing up and the healing which comes of solitude survives only in dreams?

The hour is late, but we still have a measure of freedom to choose.

How Texas Cities Work To Reduce Fire Hazards

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 3, 1954

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the magazine Business Week devotes two pages of its May 1 issue to text and pictures showing how the Texas city of Corsicana conducted an all-out town inspection to cut down fire hazards.

The town-inspection idea is not a new one. But, with recent rises in fire losses, the method has been called increasingly into use by American cities. According to Business Week, it is "probably going over bigger in Texas than anywhere else," thanks to the efforts of the Texas Insurance Fieldmen's Association.

The story of what was done in Corsicana, Tex., is an important one and might well be studied with profit in other cities all over the Nation. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the article from Business Week be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

For 3 years Corsicana's merchants and property owners have been shelling out some $75,000 a year in extra fire insurance premiums because the place got itself listed by insurance companies as a "hot town"—one with high fire losses. This year Corsicana, an old-time oil town of about 20,000 some 60 miles south of Dallas, decided to do something—and did it on April 14 and 15, with the help of the insurance men it called in.

When the 2-day affair was over, 859 red tags saying "fix me" were scattered throughout downtown Corsicana, wherever the fieldmen found poor wiring, faulty plugs, inadequate extinguishers, rubbish heaps, or other hazards. Schools got into the act with fire drills and lectures; the children took warning especially from a gawky clown named Stupid Carelessness who went around trying to gum up everbody's best efforts.

GENERAL

Corsicana's experience with rising fire losses may be an extreme case, but it's not too uncommon these days. For the United States as a whole, the figure of $903.4 million compiled by the National Board of Fire Underwriters for property that went up in smoke or was damaged by fire last year represented a jump of 15.1 percent over 1952. The human loss is startling, too: Some 11,000 persons died during last year in fires.

These figures give you an idea why more and more cities are going in for the town inspection treatment that Corsicana has just given itself. The idea is not exactly a new one: It originated way back before 1900, and some 2,500 towns and cities—mostly in the 5,000 to 25,000 class, but ranging up to cities as large as Minneapolis—have had it. But it's spreading with the rise in fire losses. And right now it's probably going over bigger in Texas than anywhere else.

WHAT IT IS

The idea in a town inspection is to cut down on fire hazards and fire losses, boost a city's fire rating, and thus reduce its fire insurance rates. It's done by having a group of insurance company fieldmen who know all the ropes come into a town and give it a stem-to-stern going over. City officials then take over for the follow-through.

Large cities don't usually go in for this treatment because they have more effective fire-prevention bureaus—and they are too big for any kind of a thorough inspection in the day or two the fieldman can allot for it.

TEXAS TO THE FORE

Most States content themselves with one fire insurance fieldmen's association, and only one or two towns can get the inspection treatment in a year. But Texas covers so much territory it has five such associations—and each of them makes two inspections a year. That's what is putting Texas out in front.

The Texas system of credits and debits on top of the basic fire insurance rates gives merchants and property owners a big incentive, too. These credits and debits are based on a town's fire loss record over a 5-year period. Say the base rate is $10 per $1,000. In a town that gets a 15 percent debit because of heavy losses, a property owner would pay $11.50 per $1,000; in a town with a 15 percent credit he would pay $8.50.

GAINS FOR ALL

It was the credit-debit proposition that got Corsicana merchants stirred up. Until 3 years ago the town had a credit rating; then sizable fire losses gave it a 15 percent debit—and the $75,000 a year in extra premium costs. Corsicana's fire chief also had his reasons for going along with the inspection idea. He figured he needed a new pumper, a new substation, and some additional personnel; and the ballyhoo of a town inspection might help sell the idea to taxpayers.

But what about the north Texas division of the Texas Insurance Fieldman's Association, which sent 54 of its fieldmen into Corsicana and footed the entire bill at a cost of some $3,500? There are 171 capital stock fire insurance companies in the division. It's true, of course, that the companies collect higher premiums in towns with high fire losses. But they don't make as much money in such towns; they'd rather have the property owners pay less, and have to shell out less themselves in claims.

BEFORE AND AFTER

The main event in Corsicana's inspection bee was a 2-day affair, but there was more to it than that. Beforehand, an advance group of fieldmen came in to line up support of city officials, merchants, civic clubs, radio and press. The actual business in hand got under way the night before the 2-day inspection, when teams of 2 fieldmen and a boy scout each were assigned to downtown business block inspection and to handing out slips to homeowners asking them to check the fire hazards in their homes.

After the show was over, and the fieldmen had left, town officials took over to follow up the red "fix me" tags that were tied onto the downtown fire hazards. It's in the follow-up that the results really show.

On the basis of other Texas experience, the fieldmen figure owners will voluntarily correct 40 percent to 85 percent of the hazards—and the town has enforcement powers if they don't.

Most Texas towns and cities have swung from the debit to the credit side of the rating sheet after inspections—though one town was handicapped by a lot of red tags on its own fire station. Ennis, for example, switched from a 5 percent debit last year to a 20 percent credit this year; and Witchita Falls got a similar credit the next year, saving its business community more than $100,000 in insurance bills.

Made in Kentucky

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 3, 1954

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an article written by the distinguished reporter, Joe Creason, of the Courier-Journal, entitled "Made in Kentucky," which appeared in the April 25, 1954, issue of the Courier-Journal of Louisville, Ky.

If Owensboro, Ky., has its way the trade-mark "'Made in Kentucky" will soon have national significance. Owensboro is one of the most civic minded small cities in the United States as is exemplified by the fact that they felt the need for a college in their midst, so over $1,000,000 was pledged by local citizens and businesses in Owensboro and Daviess County, and Kentucky Wesleyan College at Winchester, Ky., was picked up and moved to Owensboro.

It is a small city of fine churches and schools, and most important, of alert, intelligent citizens, as is proved by the fact that aside from a college Owensboro has many different kinds of industries and supports two newspapers, the Messenger and the Inquirer, and two radio stations, WVJS and WOMI.

At present, Owensboro has entered the arena of heavy industries with the establishment of the Green River Steel Co. and the manufacture of a superior grade of steel.

A civic minded business leader, Casper Gardner, is the mayor of this progressive city.

The article is as follows:

MADE IN KENTUCKY—GREEN RIVER STEEL MILL, NEWEST HEAVY INDUSTRY IN STATE, BASES BIG HOPES UPON ITS NEW PROCESS

(By Joe Creason)

And then there's the old proposition of the man who built a better mousetrap and suddenly found the world beating a path to his door.

That is the success-story formula the Green River Steel Co., Kentucky's newest heavy industry, hopes will be worked out in its case.

Not that Green River Steel, located at Owensboro, is in the mousetrap business. But the firm believes it has come up with a product which in its line is superior to anything now on the market. The product is sounder and cleaner steel, the kind necessary for highly stressed parts of automobiles, trucks, agricultural implements, and, especially, reciprocating airplane and jet engines.

The entire $12,500,000 Green River plant was built specifically to turn out high-quality steel from scrap in two of the most modern top-charged electric furnaces in the world. It uses the Dornin process, the newest wrinkle in the industry.

This Dornin process is what makes Green River Steel truly distinctive. It is the only company in the Nation producing steel by the process; Green River President Sidney D. Williams claims it is the greatest development in quality steelmaking in this country in the last 50 years.

The Dornin process is the invention of two George A. Dornins, senior and junior. It was tried for the first time in 1944 and tests continued on through 1947.

Two things—rather, two modifications of normal practice—make the Dornin process different and enables Green River to meet the increasing demand for sounder and cleaner steel. The modifications are something like this:

1. The molten metal is poured into big end-up molds, as at any other mill. However, the Dornin process uses molds with a 2 or 3 times greater taper than normal.

2. After the ingot is formed, it is punched, upset, and forged on complicated machines made especially for Green River. These operations more or less knead and refine the grain structure of the steel, producing better steel.

Or say those who should know.

The mill is located on a 100-acre site east of Owensboro. The front edge of the property borders U. S. 60, while the back edge reaches to the Ohio River, where dock facilities are being built.

The high roof of the shedlike plant is laced with cranes of assorted size, ranging from 15 to 75 tons in capacity. The 430 men who work in the mill must learn an intricate system of whistles and sirens, each with a different meaning.

Right now the only raw material used is scrap—13 freight carloads a day—old auto fenders, springs, farm equipment, machine-shop turnings, and the like. Some 60 tons of scrap is loaded by a huge magnet into the "charge bucket" and moved by overhead crane to the furnace.

The top of the furnace swings to one side. The three electrodes which produce the heat lift up and the scrap drops into the furnace. The top swings back into place and the electrodes are lowered into the mass.

When both furnaces are going full blast, more electricity is used than the domestic consumption of the city of Cincinnati.

A heat of around 3,000 degrees Fahrenheit is generated in the furnace. Three hours are required to melt the scrap. During that time, various tests are made to analyze the liquid metal.

When the steel is melted, the furnace is tilted forward and its content dropped into a steel, firebrick-lined ladle. Another crane moves this ladle to the ingot, mold rack.

At this stage the steel is liquid but not workable. It is cast into ingots to put the metal in a form that can be worked.

The liquid steel pours from the ladle into individual 4-ton tapered ingot molds. The steel remains in these molds for about an hour and a half, during which time it freezes—"freeze" meaning it take on solid from. It is still about 2,500 degrees.

Next the ingots are stripped from the molds and placed in 1 of 8 soaking pits where they are brought to a uniform temperature for forging.

Now the main part of the Dornin process is begun. Cranes take the ingots to an upsetting press. This press can exert a pressure of 5 million pounds and literally forces the unsound metal in the ingot to the outside where it can be cropped off. The pressure closes up the pores in the metal and shapes the tapered ingot into something resembling an inverted pear.

Since an ingot of such shape cannot be rolled, it is put into another press from which it emerges as 8 or 9 feet long and 16½ inches around. Two manipulators, each with 43,000 working parts and costing $90,000, hold the ingot under the press in this operation.

Some tears may have developed on the surface of the ingot in the forging. These are removed at another station by hot scarfing—that is, burning them out with the use of oxyacetylene torches.

The ingots, now forged, still are hot, but not hot enough for rolling. So they are returned to the soaking pits for reheating.

After that, the ingots are moved to the blooming mill. There they are rolled back and forth into finished sizes—rounds or squares, as the customer has ordered.

After that, the steel, now the shape ordered by the customer, passes by a saw where it is cut into proper lengths. Shipping is the final step.

The mill was built through a Federal loan of $8,500,000 and $4 million of private capital. Robert B. Hensley of Louisville is vice president and general counsel. Directors include Rogers Morton, Louisville; George Ballard and H. Grady Black of Nashville; Milton Underwood, Houston, and William C. Fischer, Buffalo. None of the officials make any bones about expecting rough going for a while. After all, they point out, this is a new firm in a very competitive business selling only high quality—and, consequently, higher priced—goods.

But they still believe all they need is to get their steel into the hands of users. Then, they say, quality will tell—just as in the case of the man and his better mousetrap.

Threats to Christianity and Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1954

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply impressed by a message I received today from Rev. Harry A. Klingeman, secretary of the social action committee of the Central Pennsylvania Conference of the United Brethren Church.

It deals with the threat of nuclear power to human life and the survival of our civilization. It also points to the threat of totalitarian tyranny at home as well as abroad—a threat to human liberty and to the Christian faith and the principles of American democracy.

Mr. Speaker, I can wholeheartedly agree with the statement and its objectives; and, under unanimous consent of the House, I make it part of the official RECORD.

The letter and statement follow herewith:

CENTRAL PENNSYLVANIA CONFERENCE
OF THE EVANGELICAL UNITED
BRETHREN CHURCH,
York, Pa., April 30, 1954.

To the Honorable GEORGE M. RHODES.

DEAR SIR: The Central Pennsylvania Conference of the Evangelical United Brethren Church, meeting in its 115th annual session in Trinity Church, York, Pa., and comprising 290 churches in Pennsylvania, Maryland, and Virginia with a membership of 42,730 people, unanimously adopted the enclosed statement of Christian convictions on current issues facing our Government, its representatives and the American people, and directed me to respectfully forward the same to you.

Very truly yours,
HARRY A. KLINGEMAN,
Secretary of the Social Action Committee of the Conference.

NUCLEAR POWER

Recent scientific developments in the field of nuclear research have resulted in the releasing of power that has admittedly added serious concern to the already alarming problem of international relations. One representative in government has stated that the recent experiment in the Pacific was "so far beyond what was predicted that you might say it was out of control." The President of the United States has indicated that the scientists were taken unawares by the magnitude and effects of the explosion.

In view of the unexpected results upon human life of these experiments to those far distant engaged in peaceful pursuits of providing food for various parts of the world, and in view of the impairment of their trade as well as the extent of injury from burns and contamination of food being secured for human consumption, and furthermore, in view of the devastation that will inevitably follow the use of such power in nuclear warfare—our Christian conscience demands that we lift our voice to discourage further development of this power for destructive purposes on the part of all nations. We recommend our Government in its leadership for international control. We strongly urge that further research and development in this field be directed to peaceful ends.

ALIEN AND DOMESTIC TOTALITARIAN THREATS

As Christian citizens we are concerned by current evidences of deterioration and decay of public morale and personal liberty. There is a growing spirit of fear and distrust among the citizens of the United States. This spirit would substitute conformity under pressure for liberty under law.

Our elected representatives are responsible for the protection of the American people from totalitarian threats both foreign and domestic. We loathe the communism which at home and abroad is an evil creed hostile to our Christian faith and to our Christian confidence in the principles of American democracy.

Communism is in direct violation of human freedom. We know also that some of the most active persons and groups, both national and local, engaged in investigating communistic activity are themselves guilty of acting on principles hostile to freedom. We believe their methods have tended to intimidate loyal members of the Government as well as members of the teaching profession and other individuals and groups.

We believe that many citizens in and out of Government have become afraid to stand up for free speech and personal liberty. Hesitant and passive response to this threat on the part of the American people and their elected representatives is evidence of the degradation of our common life. We urge each other and our fellow citizens to dedicate themselves anew to freedom and to speak out fearlessly against both alien and domestic totalitarian threats.

Problems of International Carriers Versus Foreign Competition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER F. MACK, JR.

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1954

Mr. MACK of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, this body recently heard floor debate on the matter of an amendment to the Civil Aeronautics Board's appropriations for 1955. During that debate, it was argued that the responsibility of the Congress is to guarantee that our great international airlines did not vanish from the airways in the face of relentless and highly subsidized foreign competition.

I am particularly interested in an article written by Mr. Leslie Gould and appearing in the New York Journal-American of April 27. It is enough that our international airlines should be faced with this same foreign competition without having to contend with stifling edicts from agencies within our own Government.

In the belief that Mr. Gould's article will be of interest to this entire body, I include herewith his article which appeared in the New York Journal-American on April 27:

Figure This One: Pan-Am, CAB, and the Antitrust Laws

(By Leslie Gould)

The ways of Government—no matter what the party label—are confusing—to put it mildly.

To wit, the case of Pan-American World Airways and its Latin and South American operations.

The Department of Justice has an antitrust case against Pan-Am and W. R. Grace & Co. for their 50–50 ownership of Panagra, which flies from the Canal Zone to the west coast of South America and to Buenos Aires. This is a monopoly, so say the little lawyers of antitrust.

On the other hand, the Civil Aeronautics Board wants to establish a single independent airline from Miami and Houston to the points now served by Panagra and Braniff Airways by combining the international operations of Braniff and Panagra.

Under the CAB proposal, the merged Panagra-Braniff line would serve chiefly the west coast of South America and Pan-Am, as it now does, the east coast. There would be less competition than there is now, for there would be just 2 lines instead of the present 3.

As part of the CAB's suggested deal, Pan-Am and W. R. Grace would relinquish their stock interest in Panagra.

DOESN'T MAKE MUCH SENSE

Jointly or severally—to borrow a phrase from the lawyers, God love them—neither matter seems to make much sense.

The CAB's action is understandable in that it made a mistake several years ago when it figured South American air traffic could support an additional carrier. That was when it allowed Braniff to compete with Panagra. As the Government subsidies being paid for service to that region show, it was never economically feasible and less so today with the foreign carriers moving into the region with service from American airports.

Braniff got its permit to fly to South America when the then CAB split 2 to 2, and Harry Truman cast his vote for that line.

ROUGH ON THE PIONEER

The CAB's proposal blandly covers that error, but it is rough on the pioneer. So is the antitrust suit.

The suit ignores three key points:

1. The fact Pan-Am and Grace were willing to take the risk in 1928 to establish an airline to South and Latin America.
2. That there is competition and tough competition from foreign-subsidized lines, all with access to United States airports.
3. That competition from another domestic line has proved uneconomic.

The CAB lives in an atmosphere reminiscent of that popular musical, Brigadoon. It will allow domestic lines to operate beyond the continental borders, but won't let the pioneer American international carrier to operate domestically beyond its embarkation port.

Hidden Subsidies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1954

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include a letter from the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, dated April 13, 1954. This is in reply to my letter of March 31 to the Director, raising certain questions in regard to his report of March 18 on the upper Colorado River storage project and participating projects, which appears in the Congressional Record for April 7, 1954, at page A2665. In that letter I asked the Director:

> In view of the foregoing, how can you, as Director of the Bureau of the Budget and one of the chief officers of the present administration responsible for a sound-money policy and program and for economy in Government, ignore the huge Federal subsidy that would be involved in the repayment plan proposed for the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, and fail to comment upon or point out the amount of such subsidy that would have to be borne by the Nation's taxpayers? And how can you justify your approval, indirectly at least, of the so-called Collbran formula for repayment of reclamation projects which, if authorized for the upper Colorado River Basin development, would constitute a drastic departure from existing reclamation law and would establish a new repayment policy for all future reclamation projects requiring a vast increase in Federal subsidy?

In his reply, the Director discusses at some length the proposal to increase the repayment period from 40 years as provided by existing reclamation law to 50 years. Of course, he knows that this proposed 10-year extension is a relatively minor element in the amount of the Federal subsidy that would be involved in the proposed repayment plan of this billion-dollar project. The important factor that would vastly increase the Federal subsidy involved is the proposed postponement for about 50 years of repayment on most of the irrigation costs. Actually, the proposal is a 50-year repayment plan in name only.

The Director states that the proposed repayment plan for the upper basin project differs from the Collbran formula. However, the differences are merely in detail. The essential element of the Collbran project repayment provisions is the postponement of repayment of a large portion of the irrigation investment for 50 years and more. In essence, the proposed repayment program for the upper Colorado River storage project and participating projects is the same as the Collbran formula, since thereunder a major portion of the irrigation repayment would be postponed for 40 to 50 years according to the Director's own statement.

The Director states in his letter:

> The Bureau of the Budget, in acting on the Colorado River project, was fully aware that under the proposed repayment plan the Federal Government would provide a considerable subsidy as a result of deferred interest-free repayments, and that this subsidy would be larger than under 40-year repayment. Our studies showed that the interest subsidy for the participating projects might equal about two-thirds of the construction costs allocated to irrigation. A large part of the subsidy represents postponement of the major portion of the irrigation repayment for as long as 40 to 50 years.

Why, then, did the Director in his report of March 18 omit any mention of a Federal subsidy which he now admits might amount to two-thirds the irrigation construction cost?

But let us examine just what the Director's statement of a two-thirds subsidy would mean.

According to the most recent cost estimates of the Bureau of Reclamation, the construction cost of the participating projects—excluding Eden project, previously authorized—allocated to irrigation, amounts to $200 million in round figures. These participating projects would irrigate 366,000 acres in the aggregate, about 65 percent of which would be furnished only a supplemental water supply from the project, which would average merely a small fraction of a full water requirement. Thus the equivalent acreage that could be furnished a full water supply from the projects would be about 200,000 acres.

Based on the total acreage, the irrigation construction cost would range from over $200 per acre to nearly $800 per acre, and would average $545 per acre.

The Federal subsidy assumed at two-thirds of the construction cost, according to the Director's statement would, therefore, average $365 per acre or about $50,000 for the average-size farm in the participating projects.

The Federal subsidy per acre would be about 2½ times the average value per acre of fully developed irrigated land in the area of the participating projects.

However, taking into account that about 65 percent of the lands to be served would be furnished only a supplemental water supply, the Federal subsidy would be about $600 per acre on a full-supply basis of 4 times the average value of developed irrigated land in the area.

But this two-thirds subsidy, which the Director now admits, would only be the initial or first cost of the subsidy. Huge as this subsidy would be, the interest subsidy that would accumulate during the so-called repayment period would many fold greater. It is conservatively estimated that the increase in national debt at the end of the repayment period occasioned by the necessary payment of interest by the Federal Government on the funds borrowed for construction, including proper allowance for interest during construction and development periods, would amount to about a billion dollars. This would be over $2,700 per acre on the entire area to be served in the participating projects, or about $370,000 for the average size farm.

It should also be clearly understood that the amount of this increase in national debt in accumulated interest charges could never be repaid from project revenues and would keep on increasing indefinitely unless or until paid off through general taxation.

The foregoing figures do not include the Shiprock project, New Mexico, which has also been proposed as a participating project at an estimated construction cost of about $200 million. If included in the program, it would add about a billion dollars more to the national debt in interest subsidy.

Thus, Mr. Speaker, is revealed the huge hidden subsidy that would have to be borne by the Federal Treasury and become a burden on the Nation's taxpayers if this proposed upper Colorado River development is authorized and built. I call it to the attention of the Congress because I believe that the facts as to the true cost and particularly the Federal subsidy involved in this proposed development should be fully revealed before action is taken by the Congress. I believe the Secretary of the Interior and the Director of the Budget Bureau have an obligation to disclose such salient facts and figures to the Congress. As yet, that has not been done.

The letter of the Director of the Budget Bureau is as follows:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE
OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D. C., April 13, 1954.

Hon. JOHN P. SAYLOR,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SAYLOR: This is in reply to your letter of March 31, 1954, raising various questions regarding my letter to the Secretary of the Interior on the Colorado River storage project and participating projects.

The questions which you raised relate mainly to the wisdom of, and the financial and economic basis for, the administration's recommendations to the Congress for the development of the upper Colorado River Basin. The Congress itself has the responsibility to determine whether the recommendations shall be enacted into legislation.

The following comments take up the issues you raise in the order followed in your letter.

INVASION OF THE DINOSAUR NATIONAL MONUMENT BY THE PROPOSED ECHO PARK RESERVOIR AND POWER PROJECT

As you have indicated, various enactments by the Congress, beginning with the act establishing Yellowstone Park in 1872, have included statements of policy to restrict use of national parks to certain purposes and to protect and conserve their scenery, historic objects, and wildlife for future generations. Except in the case of overriding considerations of national interest, this administration will strongly oppose proposals to encroach upon national park and monument areas.

The Congress in the Water and Power Act of 1935 has specifically prohibited the Federal Power Commission from issuing licenses for construction of water storage or power projects within national parks and monuments. The Congress, however, has made many exceptions to this general policy in acts authorizing specific national parks, such as the Grand Canyon and the Rocky Mountain National Park. And in other instances the Congress has changed the status of national monuments over the years. For example, on February 16, 1954, the House passed H. R. 6251, deauthorizing the Shoshone Cavern as a national monument.

The Dinosaur National Monument was established in 1915 to preserve an area in which a great concentration of dinosaur fossils was found. It originally consisted of 80 acres. These original monument lands will not be affected in any way by construction of the Echo Park Dam.

In 1938 the monument area was increased to over 200,000 acres by Presidential proclamation, and provision was made for the eventual construction of water storage and power projects in the enlarged area. The proclamation issued by the President specified that the area was to be administered by the National Park Service, but went on to state "except that this reservation shall not affect the operation of the Federal Water Power Act of June 10, 1920 (41 Stat. 1063), as amended, and the administration of the monument shall be subject to the Reclamation Withdrawal of October 17, 1904, for the Brown's Park Reservoir site in connection with the Green River project."

This history indicates, therefore, that there was no intention to reserve the enlarged national monument area exclusively for park purposes. The intent of the President in 1938 to permit use of this enlarged area for power projects also seems clear. In selecting the Echo Park site for recommendation to the Congress, these historical facts have been taken into account. The Echo Park site is downstream from the above mentioned reclamation withdrawal, and while the reservoir will affect a larger area including the Brown's Park site, it will not affect the original monument area.

With regard to your reference to Under Secretary Tudor's testimony, at the House committee hearings, on the figures as to evaporation losses, we have discussed this matter with the Department of the Interior. We have been advised that the Department has taken up the question of evaporation losses with the committee and that the correct figures were supplied to the committee. We have been further advised that Mr. Tudor's conclusions are still valid.

The Secretary of the Interior and the President have the duty of recommending legislation for the consideration of the Congress which they believe to be in the national interest. The Secretary of the Interior has statutory responsibility for both the reclamation and the national park programs. On the basis of a careful appraisal by Under Secretary Tudor, Secretary McKay has concluded that the advantages of building Echo Park Reservoir outweigh its disadvantages. After review of the Secretary's findings by the Executive Office, the administration is recommending that Congress authorize the Echo Park Reservoir. The final decision on Echo Park, however, rests with the Congress.

USE OF 50-YEAR PERIOD FOR REPAYMENT OF IRRIGATION INVESTMENT

You question the recommended increase in the period for repayment of irrigation investments to 50 years. Insofar as irrigation is concerned, existing reclamation law provides that projects which can repay the irrigation investment within 40 years, exclusive of a development period of not to exceed 10 years, may be administratively authorized by the Secretary of the Interior. Projects which do not meet this criterion must be authorized by the Congress. Thus legislation proposals for new reclamation projects are generally projects on which the irrigation investment cannot be repaid in 40 years.

In the case of the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, the Bureau of the Budget accepted the Department of the Interior's recommendations to permit a repayment period of 50 years. The Department has recommended a repayment period of 50 years or longer on all recent project proposals submitted to this office for clearance. Our approval of the Department's recommendation on the Colorado River project and on other projects recently approved takes into account the fact that it is becoming increasingly difficult to secure repayment of irrigation projects within a 40-year period.

The Congress also, in recognition of the difficulty of repayment in 40 years, has made a number of exceptions in recent years, lengthening the repayment period when projects have been authorized by specific legislation. Among these are the Lewiston Orchards project, 50 years; Preston Bench project, 74 years; Gila project, 60 years; Weber Basin project, 60 years; Paonia project, 68 years. During the past few years it has been the generally accepted practice of all agencies involved in water-resources development, when they propose projects involving direct repayment of Federal investment, to use a 50-year period. Such a period has also been recognized as an appropriate period for repayment of costs allocated to power and municipal water supply. In the light of all these circumstances the Bureau of the Budget believes that 50 years is a reasonable maximum period for irrigation repayments.

FEDERAL SUBSIDY IN THE INTEREST-FREE FEATURE OF IRRIGATION INVESTMENT AND MODIFIED COLLERAN FORMULA FOR REPAYMENT

The Collbran formula to which you refer is the method provided by the Congress in the authorization of the Collbran Reclamation project (act of July 3, 1952) for repayment of irrigation costs which exceed the repayment ability of the irrigation water users by power and municipal water revenues after investments in those purposes have been repaid with interest. This provision was enacted to exclude use of the interest component of the power reveneus, which had been proposed by the Department of the Interior to show repayment of irrigation costs.

Under the Collbran formula, irrigation repayment contracts were authorized to run for 50 years. Costs allocated to municipal water supply were to be repaid with interest within 50 years. Costs allocated to commercial power were required to be repaid with interest, but no repayment period was specified. The costs allocated to irrigation which were beyond the ability of irrigation water users to repay within 50 years were assigned for return by power and municipal water revenues after the costs of these purposes have been repaid. Under these provisions, the assistance in repayment of irrigation costs will not be available from municipal water supply revenues until after 50 years, and the timing of assistance from power revenues is indefinite, although the Department of the Interior now anticipates that such assistance would be available after the 50th year.

Under the repayment formula recommended for the Colorado River project, the costs allocated to power and municipal water supply would be repaid with interest within 50 years. The formula also requires full repayment of irrigation costs without interest within 50 years, exclusive of any development period. To assure the complete repayment of the irrigation investment within the prescribed period, the formula requires that, before initiation of construction of a participating project, a careful reassessment be made of the probable availability of power and water supply revenues in an amount sufficient to provide full repayment of the share of the irrigation investment not paid by irrigation water users. If sufficient revenues are not expected to be available, the project would have to be deferred.

The principal difference between the Collbran formula and the repayment formula recommended for the Colorado River project, therefore, is that the cost allocated to irrigation cannot be expected to be fully repaid for considerably more than 50 years in the case of the Collbran project, whereas the full irrigation cost is required to be repaid within 50 years, exclusive of any development period, in the case of the Colorado River project.

The Bureau of the Budget, in acting on the Colorado River project, was fully aware that under the proposed repayment plan the Federal Government would provide a considerable subsidy as a result of deferred interest-free repayments, and that this subsidy would be larger than under 40-year repayment. Our studies showed that the interest subsidy for the particpating projects might equal about two-thirds of the construction costs allocated to irrigation. A large part of the subsidy represents postponement of the major portion of the irrigation repayment for as long as 40 to 50 years.

In approving the Colorado River project, the administration recognized the general policy followed by the Federal Government since 1902 of subsidizing irrigation development in the West by interest-free financing. Based on a careful review of the proposed comprehensive plan for the development of the water resources of the upper Colorado River Basin, the administration believes that the national interest in promoting the economic development of this area warrants the interest-free subsidy for irrigation involved in this project. At the same time, the administration believes, and has recommended to the Congress, that no participating project be undertaken until full repayment of the irrigation investment within 50 years can be foreseen, and until there has been a finding of a favorable economic justification of the project based on a careful reexamination of the benefits and costs.

USE OF A SEPARATE REVOLVING FUND IN THE TREASURY TO FINANCE THE PROJECT AS COMPARED TO A BASIN ACCOUNT

In your letter you express the view that the proposed revolving fund is essentially the same as the so-called basin account, which you indicate has serious objections. The separate fund is proposed as the financial entity to account for all appropriations for construction and operation and for all expenditures and revenues on the upper Colorado projects. It permits the use of revenues from whatever source to repay the total reimbursable costs, and in this sense it can be characterized as a basin account. It should be noted, however, that by limiting the uses of the fund and by setting specific requirements for the return of the Federal investment to the general fund of the Treasury, including interest on the cost allocated to power and municipal water supply, a sound financial basis for the development of the upper basin is assured.

Your letter states that the use of a basin account in which surplus revenues would be accumulated and used with the idea of financing additional developments, would constitute advance authorization of future projects and would make possible their construction, regardless of economic merit, need, or financial soundness. In fact, however, the proposed legislation provides that all construction will be financed from appropriations made by the Congress to the fund. It also requires the return to the Treasury of the reimbursable costs, including interest on the power and municipal water investment, within 50 years of completion of the unit or feature for which such appropriations are made. Authorization of the projects by the Congress bears no direct relation to the balances in the fund, but depends on their conformance with the conditions outlined in the proposed ligislation. On the other hand, the fund is directly concerned with the amount and timing of the capital outlay for project works. Under the provisions of this fund, before initiating construction of any authorized part of the development, it will be necessary to determine that revenues, after deducting the required payments of reimbursable costs and interest on projects already undertaken, will be sufficient within the period specified to repay the project costs. Thus an orderly development of the basin, will proceed in accord with sound principles of financing and repayment.

The proposed language setting up the fund does not permit the use or appropriation of revenues for construction but requires the annual payment to the Treasury of all such revenues in excess of operating needs of the project. Under these provisions no cash surplus may accumulate in the fund. It should also be noted that there is formalized under the proposed fund, a business-type annual budget presentation. Such a presentation will provide complete information on the financial status of all phases of the basin program.

Your letter questions whether the proposed financial procedure will be recommended and applied to future reclamation developments. The fund was specifically designed to provide for financing of the Upper Colorado Basin development. While this type of financing could be adapted to other similar developments, each proposal would have to be appraised on its own merits.

ECONOMIC FEASIBILITY IN RELATION TO FINANCIAL FEASIBILITY OF RECLAMATION PROJECT

In reference to the economic justification of the proposed participating projects, you ask whether the Bureau of the Budget favors and approves the substitution of a benefit-cost-ratio basis for economic justification in place of a finding of financial feasibility as now prescribed by law. As indicated in the above comments on the repayment period and the proposed separate fund, the administration has no intention of departing from sound standards as to financial feasibility for the various projects in the upper Colorado River Basin. But, in addition to the requirement for financial feasibility, the administration also believes careful consideration should be given to the economic evaluation of the proposed projects.

Under reclamation law, the only requirement for feasibility of reclamation projects, aside from engineering feasibility, has been repayment of reimbursable costs within a prescribed period. This is referred to as "financial feasibility." However, in reviewing proposed projects, the Bureau of the Budget, following the usual practice of the agencies, also applies the test of economic evaluation or economic feasibility. Economic evaluation, as expressed in the benefit-cost ratio, is not a substitute for financial feasibility. Rather it is an additional criterion to be used in determining the justification for investing public funds in a water-resource project.

In the case of the upper Colorado River project, the administration has recommended conditional authorization of the participating projects, subject to a new finding of favorable economic justification by the Secretary of the Interior for each project, based on a cooperative study with the Department of Agriculture of the direct agricultural benefits and a reevaluation of the nondirect benefits. This requirement as to favorable economic justification, prior to initiation of construction, would be in addition to the requirement for repayment of the irrigation investment on each project within 50 years.

I hope the above comments on the questions you have raised will be of assistance to you in your consideration of the Colorado River storage project and participating projects.

Sincerely yours,

Joseph M. Dodge, *Director*.

Keeps His Eye on the Ball

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OREN HARRIS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1954

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, we are all aware of the fact that the leadership of the Congress, whether it is with the majority or minority party, has a most difficult and responsible position. Today, as always, our future depends on strong, fearless, and dependable leadership.

It is well recognized that Senator Lyndon B. Johnson, of Texas, a former Member of this House and now minority leader of the Senate, is providing the kind of leadership in the interest of this country as conditions and circumstances require. On April 12, 1954, the Texarkana Gazette, a daily newspaper at Texarkana, Ark.-Tex., carried a most interesting and timely editorial on the services of Senator Johnson, which, under unanimous consent, I include herewith in the Record:

KEEPS HIS EYE ON THE BALL

When Senator Lyndon B. Johnson became the minority leader in the Senate, he announced that as leader of the opposition he would favor or oppose the President's proposals as they were submitted, and would not be governed by opportunism or partisanship. We think he is to be congratulated on sticking to that resolve in spite of the bitterness that has been generated in the attacks of the parties upon one another.

Although he has not hesitated to oppose President Eisenhower's administration on matters on which he thought the administration was wrong, he has not been petty nor nagging in that opposition. He had stuck mighty close to a determination to place his country before his party and it is that type of reasoning that enables a politician to step up to the high level of statesmanship.

There is no doubt that Senator Johnson is one of the most powerful men in Washington but he has managed to keep his feet on the floor. A lesser personality might have let so much power go to his head.

Senator Johnson has conducted himself with the dignity that Texas expects of its Senators. If he continues the course he has been pursuing, there is no reason why he should not succeed himself for many terms in the United States Senate.

Address of Lt. Gen. Thomas S. Power, United States Air Force, at Cambridge, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1954

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following address of Lt. Gen. Thomas S. Power:

Congresswoman Rogers, Secretary Talbott, distinguished guests, ladies, and gentlemen, it is a particular pleasure for me to participate in this ceremony because it marks my first visit to this important member of the air research and development team.

During my first few days with the command, I have been tremendously impressed with the caliber of men that I have found in the Baltimore headquarters. It has been a stimulating experience to witness the deep respect they have for the importance of the mission of the command and their apparent awareness of the vital role it plays in the security of this country. I have been looking forward with pleasure to similar experiences when I visit the different centers.

I want you to know that during my 26 years of service, most of which has been in combat units, I have developed a deep respect for the contribution made by the scientist in the attainment of the qualitatively superior position now held by the United States Air Force. I know that the most courageous crews, no matter how superbly trained, cannot hope to compete successfully against an enemy possessing superior equipment and armament.

It is our job to see that American crews are never placed in this position. We must maintain qualitative superiority. This will require a team play between science, industry, and the Air Force to phase in the different components under the weapon systems concept at the right intervals. The time differential today between the conception of a new technique or gadget in the research laboratory and its delivery as a usable end item to the combat units is still too great.

We must speed up and emphasize the research of today, phase it into tomorrow's development, and then marshal these developments into weapon systems if we are to maintain the lead position in today's technological race.

The research work that you are doing here will undoubtedly affect tomorrow's Air Force more than today's, and as a result, this center's work is apt to be less understood and certainly less glamorous than those that have supersonic aircraft zooming about or guided missiles taking off in spectacular fashion. We must achieve a better understanding on the part of the public and ourselves of the nature and the importance of your work.

I know that you have been producing excellent results under very trying conditions, mainly due to inadequate facilities. It is, therefore, a pleasure to see you move into this fine, new laboratory, not only because it will enhance the quality of your work, but also because it is a mark of recognition for the importance of your endeavors. Keep up the good work.

Thank you.

St. Lawrence Seaway in the Nation's Best Interests

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1954

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a timely editorial entitled "And Now Let It Pass," taken from the April 30, 1954, issue of the Commercial Appeal of Memphis, Tenn.

This concise and cogent statement in behalf of American participation in the construction of the long-delayed St. Lawrence seaway is most pertinent as this important issue comes up before the House for debate and final vote this Wednesday and Thursday.

I call special attention to the most deserving reference made to my friend and colleague CLIFF DAVIS and to other members of the House Public Works Committee from the Midsouth, such as, JAMES TRIMBLE, of Arkansas, ROBERT E. JONES, of Alabama, FRANK E. SMITH, of Mississippi, and TOM STEED, of Oklahoma, all who have given invaluable support in helping make possible that the House may now, for the first time in this legislation's history, be given this only and final opportunity to determine whether or not the United States shall protect and maintain its interests in that international waterway by joining Canada in the construction and eventual ownership and management of the St. Lawrence seaway.

The editorial follows:

AND NOW LET IT PASS

A House Rules Committee majority has finally succeeded in getting the St. Lawrence seaway bill out to the floor, where it can be debated on merit. The bill had been needlessly bottled up by the rules group for weeks. Now that it is out, it should be passed with minimum of further delay.

It has bitter-end opposition which can be counted on to use every legislative trick to prevent House passage, and thus what should be done and what may happen are different things.

That the seaway bill broke through the Rules Committee bottleneck was due not only to the pressure of the administration's leadership, but to aid given by Democratic Members from the Midsouth. All members of the House Public Works Committee from this section had voted for the seaway when the bill was before that group for action.

When a decisive hearing was held by the Rules Committee, Representative CLLIFORD DAVIS appeared before it to vigorously urge approving action by that group. Representative DAVIS had long held the sound position that the seaway will prove beneficial to all the midcontinent area, including the lower Mississippi Valley.

We reiterate what has been said here before, that when the seaway bill comes to a point of final vote in the House it should contain no crippling amendments and that all House Members from the lower valley States should follow the example of Midsouth Public Works Committee members and give it their support. American participation in the seaway's construction is to the Nation's best interests, politically and economically. Its building has already been too long delayed.

Presentation and Dedication of Goethals Memorial, Canal Zone

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1954

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave given, I include as a part of these remarks the address delivered by Dr. Richard H. Whitehead at the dedication of the Goethals Memorial at Balboa, C. Z., on March 31, 1954. Col. George W. Goethals served from April 1, 1907, until March 31, 1914, as Chairman and Chief Engineer of the Isthmian Canal Commission, the seven-member organization charged with the duty of supervising the construction of the Panama Canal and related activities. Upon completion of the canal, Colonel Goethals became a major general through congressional action. His death occurred in 1928.

The memorial—a marble monument, with fountain accessories—was constructed with Federal funds under act of Congress. Dr. Whitehead, an eminent engineer with the Isthmian Canal Commission during the construction period, and in the Panama Canal organization thereafter, served as a member of the Goethals Memorial Commission, and, on its behalf, made formal presentation and dedication of the memorial. Thereupon, it was unveiled by Dr. Thomas R. Goethals, son of General Goethals.

It is interesting to note that in attendance at the ceremonial, and appearing on the program, was former Congressman Maurice H. Thatcher, of Kentucky, the only surviving member of the Isthmian Canal Commission—which went out of existence on March 31, 1914, upon completion of the canal—and who was also formerly Civil Governor of the Canal Zone.

An address was also delivered by Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, of Wisconsin. Brig. Gen. John S. Seybold, Governor of the Canal Zone, presided.

Dr. Whitehead's address follows:

ADDRESS OF DEDICATION OF THE GOETHALS MEMORIAL, BALBOA, C. Z., MARCH 31, 1954, BY DR. RICHARD H. WHITEHEAD, MEMBER OF GOETHALS MEMORIAL COMMISSION, FORMERLY TESTING ENGINEER, ISTHMIAN CANAL COMMISSION

Four and a half centuries have passed since Columbus, Spain's admiral of the ocean sea, skirted the coast of this very isthmus, seeking a strait to a southern ocean and since Balboa close by "first stared at the Pacific" a few years later "silent upon a peak in Darien." Columbus little imagined when he dropped anchor in Porto Bello that the southern sea he sought was only 40 miles distant. The first ships to sail the Pacific and cross this isthmus were hauled piecemeal by Balboa over the nearby mountains of Darien. Generations before the settlement of our New England colonies, Old Panama was a flourishing city, and the Camino Real and the Cruces Trail were busy highways across this isthmus. We canal builders secured our rock from Porto Bello and our sand from Nombre de Dios for the building of the great locks and dams at Gatun. Laden with sand and crushed stone our strings of barges left these ports whence in olden times the plate fleets had sailed laden with the treasures of the Incas. Through uncounted ages a barrier between Atlantic and Pacific, this historic Isthmus of Panama threw its challenge to future potential waterborne commerce and navigation. It remained for Gen. George W. Goethals to carry forward and complete the world wonder of the Panamal Canal and so "forge a planet's dream."

Ferdinand DeLesseps of France was the first to respond to this isthmian challenge. The outstanding success of the Suez Canal which he completed in 1869 naturally turned his thoughts to a Panama Canal. A survey in 1877, by Lieutenant Wyse of France, located the proposed canal between Colon and Panama City paralleling the North American-built Panama Railroad.

Little did our pioneer North Americans realize when they ran their lines here through fever-ridden swamps and jungles to build the Panama Railroad that they were laying out simultaneously the route of a future isthmian canal. Their route crossed the lowest pass to be found between the oceans in any part of the Americas, elevation 287 feet, and at one of the narrowest parts of the isthmus, an airline distance of only 30 miles. The Panama Railroad completed in 1855, was an essential tool for building this canal. DeLesseps organized the French Canal Co., purchased the railroad, and started excavation for a sea-level canal in 1881. Popular and honored in France, with him at the head, capital and support were assured, even though we stood aloof.

DeLesseps' experience at Suez proved a handicap. He, like ourselves later, underestimated the task ahead. The engineering problems met with at Suez were not at all comparable with those the future held in store at Panama. Panama required a huge cut to be blasted through mountains of unstable rock. At Suez it was largely a matter of dredging out mud and sand and depositing them nearby on the adjacent banks. DeLesseps, by circumstances of his own creation, became the promoter of an unsound venture and his company catastrophically failed in 1889. A new company was then formed out of the receivership of the old, which obligated itself with no anticipation of success to construction of a makeshift lock canal by 1904.

Many reasons have been cited for the failure of the French. At the time of their attempt there was no great General Gorgas to make the Isthmus a healthy place to work and live in and the consequent mortality among the French was appalling. A rightful share of the money the French invested in their company failed to reach the Isthmus.

The French, however, would have failed, even under favorable conditions because the building of the Canal required the man severance of nature-fused continental masses, and heavy power-driven equipment to do this economically was not available until the turn of the century. The task, even with this technically advanced equipment was of such tremendous size that it could only be successfully undertaken with a government such as ours of great resources, beyond the capacity of any privately financed company.

It is surprising that DeLesseps did so much with such antiquated equipment. The excavation by the French up to when we took over half a century ago amounted to over 78 million cubic yards, of which nearly 30 million was useful to us. The French reached a maximum of a little over one-half million cubic yards per month. Their effort here, in spite of yellow jack and malaria, would have built another Suez Canal.

The great German poet, Wolfgang Goethe, made the following prophecy long before the French attempt in 1827:

"It may be foreseen that this young state (U. S. A.) with its decided predilection to the west, will in 30 or 40 years have occupied and peopled the large tract of land beyond the Rocky Mountains. It may furthermore be seen that along the coast of the Pacific Ocean, where nature has already formed the most capacious and secure harbors, important commercial towns will gradually arise. In such a case it would not only be desirable but almost necessary that a more rapid communication should be maintained between the eastern and western shores of North America than has hitherto been possible with the tedious, disagreeable and expensive voyage around Cape Horn. I therefore repeat that it is absolutely indispensable for the United States to effect a passage from the Mexican Gulf to the Pacific Ocean and I am certain they will do it."

We finally did but the French paved the way and we profited by their misfortunes.

We could no longer hold aloof when Panama became a sister Republic on November 3, 1903. In her declaration of independence she stated:

"The people of the Isthmus have decided to recover their sovereignty and begin to form a part of the society of the free and independent nations in order to work out their own destiny to insure their future in a stable manner and to discharge such duties as they are called upon by the situation of their country and its immense richness."

Panama, now a sovereign republic, possessing the Isthmian challenge to water-borne commerce, had a duty to all nations and peoples of placing the canal venture in capable hands. As Goethe had prophesied, we were the logical nation to undertake the great task and the only one in the Americas with the required resources. After making a treaty with our new sister republic to establish the Canal Zone, we took over the task from the French just half a century ago. The Republics of the Americas and the world at large have all benefited, with Goethals and his men successfully meeting the Isthmian challenge.

An outstanding effort first had to be made by us to clean up the Isthmus and make it healthy to insure the success of the venture. That took time and patience. General Gorgas, as a result of the success of his great work here, has received the acclaim of all nations and is justly one of America's immortals in the hall of fame.

Meanwhile President Theodore Roosevelt had great difficulty in getting the task of construction started. A vital initial contribution to the building of this great waterway was made by the great North American civil engineer, John F. Stevens. He replaced the French equipment with modern equipment, removing their narrow-gage tracks and replacing them with gages larger than our standard gage up north, and he advocated that a lock canal be built.

Stevens succeeded in so organizing excavation in the cut, the most difficult task in building the canal, that it reached 1 million cubic yards a month. Trains carrying away the excavated material moved on unheard of schedules. He then resigned on April 1, 1907. At that time, while excavation was well underway, only 6 million cubic yards had been removed by the United States.

The building of the canal meanwhile had become a "must" of our North American people. President Theodore Roosevelt, determined to carry out their wishes on the resignation of Stevens, decided to turn the canal enterprise over to the officers of the Corps of Engineers. He had 2 reasons: 1, that an Army officer could not resign; and the other, that continuity would be secured. To the Corps of Engineers are entrusted the canals in the United States for construction, operation, and maintenance. With a civil administration and an Army officer in charge, the needed canal organization could be made up of both civilian and Army personnel. With this in mind, he selected an outstanding engineer officer with a genius for administration, our Col. George W. Goethals, to head up the task. The "Colonel," as we knew him on the Isthmus, became our great leader and the builder of the canal.

Here we canal diggers wrested with and harnessed the forces of nature on a hitherto unknown scale, in a jungle setting of an alien and inhospitable clime. Finally, a great international waterway was achieved that is in the last analysis a huge water-elevator powered by the Chagres working with clocklike precision—transporting from ocean to ocean an increasing procession of ships laden with the produce of all nations.

Under Goethals our faith moved mountains.

The task was finished on schedule in spite of unexpected difficulties such as the Culebra and Curacha slides. The present permanent operating organization as a result was put into effect just two generations ago with General Goethals as the first Governor of the Panama Canal, and the canal was opened to commercial traffic with the passage of the SS. *Ancon* on August 15, 1914.

While the canal was opened with the passage of the steamship *Ancon*, it was not fully dependable for daily transit of oceangoing vessels until July 1, 1917, when the great unexpected slides of Culebra were brought under control. The amount of unanticipated slide material removed at this time from the Culebra slides alone amounted to 39 million cubic yards. The total useful excavation by the French and the total excavation by the United States up to the time President Roosevelt placed Goethals in charge to take over the work amounted to only 36 million cubic yards. The building of the canal had thus only begun when Goethals received his assignment. The task ahead was still greatly underestimated. It proved a task that only a great nation with large resources and able administration could hope to complete. At this very moment the Culebra slides are still in motion. The great Curacha Slide, however, has finally become quiescent.

The actual excavation made up to the time the canal was ready for dependable service, including the 30 million cubic yards of useful excavation by the French, proved to be 325 million cubic yards. The amount to date, including added improvements to make the channel safer for navigation, is in excess of 550 million cubic yards. As much as 2 million cubic yards of material were removed in a single month from the narrow confines of the Cut alone.

Goethals, like his predecessor, Stevens, believed in a lock canal. The mighty Chagres he would treat, like DeLepinay and Stevens as a friend, instead of as an enemy whom DeLesseps would divert to the sea. The wisdom of this attitude was borne out by the events of November 27 to 28 in 1932 when the maximum inflow into Gatun Lake from the mighty Chagres was 350,000 cubic feet per second, far greater than Niagara, and its control was only possible by opening the lock culverts with full spillway discharge. Goethals, unlike DeLesseps, got off to a sound beginning, at least for the initial construction, of this great waterway by following the plans of De Lepinay and Stevens. Our Congress amid great opposition in what Goethals referred to as "the battle of the levels" approved the present lock canal.

Time fully has demonstrated that General Goethals accomplished his task here beyond reproach of carrying forward and completing the world wonder of this Panama Canal. His administrative genius was simple and direct. He began by taking the confusion out of the task and by simplifying the component parts so that he could pass along and delegate responsibility. He then coordinated each such delegation to insure the expeditious and harmonious carrying on of the work as a whole. He demanded not loyalty to himself, but loyalty to the job; but his own example of devotion allowed no distinction between the two.

He maintained personal contacts to assist others where needed; to censure where deserved; and to recognize merit and achievement whenever opportunity offered. Every member of the force took personal pride in his job. The great majority tried to outdo what was expected of them and new records of performance were set. All toiled with a morale and efficiency that deservedly has been the praise or envy of all nations.

Here in General Gothals' life and work at Panama, is a model indeed of inspirational leadership in the administration of large governmental enterprises.

To you who have been given the sacred trust of leadership, here is Goethals' own code given to the graduating Class of 1912, at the United States Military Academy, West Point:

"The most important duty that will devolve upon you is the control, direction, and command of men. To successfully accomplishment any task, it is necessary not only that you should give to it the best that is in you, but that you should obtain for it the best there is in those who are under your guidance. To do this, you must have confidence in the undertaking and confidence in your ability to accomplish it in order to inspire the same feeling in them. You must have not only accurate knowledge of their capabilities, but a just appreciation and a full recognition of their needs and rights as fellow men. In other words, be considerate, just, and fair with them in all dealings, treating them as fellow members of the great Brotherhood of Humanity. A discontented force is seldom loyal, and if its discontent is based upon a sense of unjust treatment, it is never efficient. Faith in the ability of a leader is of slight service unless it be united with faith in his justice. When these two are combined, then and then only is developed that irresistible and irrepressible spirit of enthusiasm, that personal interest and pride in the task, which inspires ever member of the force, be it military or civil, to give when need arises the last ounce of his strength and the last drop of his blood to the winning of a victory in the honor of which he will share."

Percy MacKaye, the American poet, caught the spirit of the canal as Pennell did likewise in drawings, when he sang:

"A man went down to Panama
Where many a man had died,
To slit the sliding mountains
And lift the eternal tide,
A man stood up in Panama
And the mountains stood aside.

"For a poet wrought in Panama
With a continent for his theme,
And he wrote with flood and fire
To forge a planet's dream,
And the derricks rang his dithyrambs
And his stanzas roared in steam.

"Where old Balboa bent his gaze
He leads the liners through,
And the Horn that tossed Magellan
Bellows a far halloo,
For where the navies never sailed
Steamed Goethals and his crew.

"So nevermore the tropic routes
Need poleward warp and veer,
But on through the Gates of Goethals
The steady keels shall steer,
Where the tribes of man are led toward peace
By the prophet-engineer."

I ask our fast-dwindling Canal Diggers "Gold" and "Silver" to remember the number on your brass check. It should help you over the summit of the Great Divide. To the younger generation may this memorial recall the following words of Goethals, inspire you and give you faith and courage in the future:

"It all amounts to this: whatever your hands find to do, that do with all the might this is in you. Face every task with a determination to conquer its difficulties and never to let them conquer you. No task is too small to be done well, for the man who is worthy, who is fit to perform the deeds of the world, even the greatest, sooner or later the opportunity to do them will come. He can abide his time, can rest—safe in himself as in a fate."

Truly "a poet wrought in Panama."

The Congress of the United States authorized the erection of this memorial to Gen. George W. Goethals in commemoration of his signally distinguished services in connection with the construction and operation of the Panama Canal. By authority vested in me by the Goethals Memorial Commission, under whose direction the wishes of Congress have been complied with, I hereby dedicate this memorial to all nations and all peoples.

Case No. 2

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 10, 1954

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, here is another case of undue hardship which highlights the need for drastic revision of the McCarran-Walter Act. This is one of many discussed in the recent book by J. Campbell Bruce, called the Golden Door, the Irony of Our Immigration Policy:

Prof. Lawrence Schwartz, one of the world's most noted abstract mathematicians, and a professor at the University of Nancy, France, was invited to deliver a paper at the International Mathematical Congress at Harvard University. He spent many weary months awaiting his visa, which was finally granted to him. However, he was permitted to appear officially at no other university in this country, either to hear any lectures or to give any. If he wished to travel about, he was permitted to do so, only if he gave written notification of each change of address to immigration authorities.

The noted professor delivered his paper at Harvard University. Then, disheartened by the extreme restrictions on his movements, returned immediately to France.

How unfortunate, indeed, to give so shallow a welcome to an esteemed man of learning.

The Puzzle of Indochina

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 3, 1954

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend by remarks in the RECORD, I include the following pertinent editorial entitled "The Puzzle of Indochina," by I. Monte Radlovic, editor of the Diplomat magazine, taken from their March 1954 issue:

THE PUZZLE OF INDOCHINA

"Is the French predicament in Indochina symptomatic of much graver ills in France itself?"

Searching, sometimes embarrassing questions are being asked these days as anger grows over France's inability to win a victory. In a few areas questions have been replaced by harsh—and growing harsher—statements, such as: "France has no self confidence left!"

What, then, is basically wrong? France owes it to herself and to the millions who admire "the flag of liberty" to quiet the rising indignation over Indochina.

Questions tumble upon questions in the Indochinese puzzle. What has happened to the once-vaunted "Navarre Plan" for quick victory? Why are American technicians needed now? What has become of the $800 million yearly the United States is spending for an Indochinese victory (about $400 million for direct arms aid in Indochina and the same to support the French budget in connection with the war)? Are estimates true that the Red Chinese aid to Viet Minh rebels is less than $75 million annually? Why is 'full independence' being withheld from the associated states?

That such disquieting questions should arise is no mystery. Rumors have been persistent for weeks, and sometimes for months, that the French Assembly would authorize a negotiated peace to hand Indochina over to the Communists * * * that outright military defeat could be expected * * * that an insufficient amount of the funds (United States) earmarked for Indochina are actually going to the battle zones.

So long ago as early June of last year, a United States House of Representatives Committee on Foreign Affairs made a pregnant, if not portentious, report on Indochina, along with its recommendations for funds. Briefly, this report declared that:

"France could lose the war. Local populations were not supporting their government because they do not have confidence in * * * the ultimate willingness of the French to accord independence for the area."

The report clearly indicated suspicions of where United States funds were going, when it stated "without minimizing the gallant struggle of the French, it is (our hope) that more aid will go directly to the forces of the three associated states rather than funneling all the aid through the French * * * that the training of the Vietnamese will be intensified so that all peoples of Indochina will be better able to advance toward the attainment of freedom and independence."

Thus, one may wonder about such implications as those raised in the United States Congress, and those growing among leaders elsewhere. Until there is a satisfactory explanation of the Indochinese puzzle, it can only be prudent to accept the advice of the foregoing committee, when it asserted:

"Until the peoples of the associated states are assured of receiving their ultimate independence, success in driving out the Communist invaders will be difficult, if not impossible, to achieve."

F. D. R. Foe Backs Him on New Pearl Harbor Charge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAM RAYBURN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 3, 1954

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Edward T. Folliard which appeared in the Washington Post and Times-Herald of Sunday, May 2, 1954:

FDR FOE BACKS HIM ON NEW PEARL HARBOR CHARGE

(By Edward T. Folliard)

PHILADELPHIA.—It is one of the ironies of history that, while the Japanese are now regarded as our friends and allies, Americans still quarrel over this issue: Who among themselves was to blame for the successful Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor?

There is a man here in Philadelphia who knows a lot about that greatest of American military disasters; who has had little to say about it since his retirement from official life, but who finally has moved into the arean as a champion of the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt.

He is Owen J. Roberts, a retired Associate Justice of the Supreme Court, a distinguished member of the Republican Party, and in 1941 chairman of a commission appointed by FDR to investigate and report on the facts of Pearl Harbor.

AN ADMIRAL'S BOOK

Justice Roberts says it is outrageous to suggest that President Roosevelt wanted Japan to make war on the United States and that he enticed the Japanese into making their attack on Pearl Harbor.

That is the theme of a new book by Rear Adm. Robert A. Theobald, United States Navy, retired, which has caused the latest flareup in the controversy. The book is entitled, "The Final Secret of Pearl Harbor," and was carried in advance of publication by the U. S. News & World Report.

Admiral Theobald contends that Mr. Roosevelt in 1941-42 muzzled Gen. George C. Marshall, Chief of Staff of the Army, and Adm. Harold R. Stark, Chief of Naval Operations; that he forced them to withhold vital intelligence from the American commanders at Pearl Harbor, and that "this wholesale denial of information to Hawaii * * * is incomprehensible unless we accept that President Roosevelt wanted the Japanese surprise attack on Pearl Harbor."

TEAPOT DOME PROSECUTOR

Justice Roberts, now a hearty 79, talked about the Theobald book as he sat in his law office here on Chestnut street, puffing on a pipe.

He recalled how President Roosevelt had surprised him right after the Pearl Harbor attack by asking him to head a five-man commission to investigate and report on the facts. His surprise was understandable.

Justice Roberts had been named to the Supreme Court in 1930 by President Herbert Hoover, and it was no secret that he opposed much of the New Deal. However, he had a reputation not only as a jurist but as a thorough and relentless factfinder, having first become a national figure in the celebrated Teapot Dome oil scandal.

Appointed as a special prosecutor by President Calvin Coolidge in 1924, Roberts (with Atlee Pomerene) convicted former Interior Secretary Albert F. Fall of accepting a $100,000 bribe in the oil case. This must have been a factor in President's Roosevelt's decision to tap Justice Roberts for the Pearl Harbor investigation.

"Certainly I was no partisan of Franklin D. Roosevelt," Justice Roberts told me, "but I think it little less than an outrage to attribute to him a political motive which would involve the possible sacrifice of many American soldiers and sailors.

"It is perfectly obvious that the last thing Roosevelt wanted was war with Japan at that time. He was afraid that he couldn't stave it off, but he was trying to do everything he could to stave it off.

"The reason for that was the state of unpreparedness at Pearl Harbor. Everybody knew that we needed a lot more out there than we had. The Army and Navy were straining to give it to them, but the demands from Europe were so great that they couldn't.

"The suggestion of Admiral Theobald seems to me outrageous. The diplomatic memoranda and correspondence show that the United States was doing everything to postpone hostilities. The orders to all commanders by both the Army and the Navy were that they should not permit any incident that could be construed by Japan as an aggression or a challenge."

BIPARTISAN COMMAND

Justice Roberts noted that one weakness in Admiral Theobald's thesis was the political background and the character of FDR's two chief Cabinet advisers in the military field—Secretary of War Henry L. Stimson and Secretary of the Navy Frank Knox. Both men were Republicans. Stimson had served earlier in the Cabinets of President William Howard Taft and President Hoover. Knox had been the Republican nominee for Vice President in 1936 on the GOP ticket headed by Alf M. Landon.

Justice Roberts said that the records of both Stimson and Knox indicated complete integrity of purpose.

"Certainly," he said, "neither of them would have gone along with what Admiral Theobald indicates was a dastardly plot to involve us in a war with Japan."

Justice Roberts met Admiral Theobald at Pearl Harbor when the Roberts Commission was there investigating the disaster. Theobald was then helping Rear Adm. Husband E. Kimmel, United States Navy, retired, who at the time of the attack was commander in chief of the Pacific Fleet.

Justice Roberts told me that he and the other members of the commission would have preferred to exonerate Admiral Kimmel and Lt. Gen. Walter C. Short, Army commander of the Hawaiian department. As it was, the commission reported to President Roosevelt on January 24, 1952, that both Kimmel and Short were guilty of a dereliction of duty.

Justice Roberts noted in the 1942 report, and also in his interview, that these commanders and their subordinates had a conviction that Japan had no intention of raiding Pearl Harbor.

"Consequently," said the report, "this form of attack was a complete surprise to all of the superior officers of Army and Navy stationed in the Hawaiian area. This conviction persisted notwithstanding messages containing warnings and orders, brought to the attention of both commanders over a period of weeks prior to the attack.

"As early as October 16, the commanders were warned of the possibility of an attack by Japan on the United States and were directed to take precautions and make preparatory dispositions in the light of this information. A significant warning message was communicated to both the local commanders on November 24. On November 27 each responsible commander was warned that hostilities were momentarily possible. The warnings indicated war, and war only."

The November 27 warning which the Navy Department sent to Admiral Kimmel (with instructions to show it to General Short) started off with these words:

"This dispatch is to be considered a war warning. Negotiations with Japan looking toward stabilization of conditions in the Pacific have ceased and an aggressive move by Japan is expected within the next few days."

Admiral Theobald says in his book that critics of Admiral Kimmel magnify the significance of this dispatch.

"Unaccompanied by alert and mobilization orders," Theobald writes, "the dispatches of November 27 were little more than 'general information' messages for the Hawaiian commands."

He says that there was no last-minute warning, although Washington had virtually conclusive evidence that the Japanese were about to move. He says that General Marshall and Admiral Stark, if free to act, would have done everything in their power to prevent the attack on Pearl Harbor, and yet on the morning of December 7 they refused to send one short message to Hawaii in time to cushion the blow.

"That is the most revealing fact of the entire Pearl Harbor story," Admiral Theobald says. "There is only one conceivable reason for it—nothing must be done to prejudice the chances of the attack, even at the last moment. Japan was about to bring war to the United States, and President Roosevelt did not intend that any American action should cause them to change their plans at the last minute.

Having loosed this literary blockbuster at FDR, Theobald says that his book is not intended as a criticism of the war President or of any of the other principal actors. He says that the Pearl Harbor attack brought a thoroughly aroused United States into the war and thereby assured defeat of the Axis Powers.

Had FDR tried to initiate America's entry, he says, he would have run into trouble in Congress, and the war effort would have been handicapped by divided sentiments among the people.

"If this is a fair appraisal of President Roosevelt's line of reasoning, as it seems to be," Admiral Theobald continues, "his decision to entice the Japanese to deliver a surprise attack upon the fleet in Pearl Harbor must be accepted as thoroughly sound from his standpoint, despite the losses which resulted."

To all of this, as has been said, Justice Roberts vigorously dissented.

Justice Roberts also took out after a new book by Adm. William H. Standley, United States Navy, retired, who was a member of the Roberts Commission. A chapter of the Standley book, Admiral Ambassador to Russia, recently was printed in U. S. News & World Report.

Admiral Standley, who is 81, says now that if the Roberts Commission had not been limited in its jurisdiction it would have arrived at much the same conclusions as those expressed by the minority (Republican) members of a joint congressional committee which made its report in 1946. This minority report blamed not only Admiral Kimmel and General Short, but President Roosevelt, Stimson, Knox, Marshall, Stark, and Gen. Leonard T. Gerow, who in 1941 was Assistant Chief of Staff of the War Plans Division.

Justice Roberts, commenting on the Standley book, recalled Standley's membership on the Presidential investigating commission and asked: "Why did he sign the report?"

Justice Roberts also called attention to a passage in Standley's book in which he deals with subsequent investigations of the Pearl Harbor attack. Says Standley:

"Some of the findings of these various investigations and boards were at variance with the findings of the Roberts Commission. * * * I am convinced that the facts reported in the Roberts Commission findings, bearing in mind the limitations imposed upon us, are more accurate, more authentic, and more thorough than any of the investigations made from 3 to 4 years later."

Trade Relations With Japan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK E. SMITH
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 29, 1954

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include the following copy of a letter which I have sent to Secretary of Defense Wilson:

APRIL 29, 1954.

The Honorable CHARLES E. WILSON,
Secretary of Defense,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I understand that protests have been made to you in regard to bids submitted by Japanese firms on equipment necessary for the Dalles Dam on the Columbia River. I would like to strongly urge that the Japanese bids be considered on the same basis with any other bids which have been received from responsible sources.

As a member of the House Public Works Committee, which recently authorized an increased appropriation to cover costs of construction for the Dalles Dam, I was very much impressed with the record of economy achieved by the Portland District of the Corps of Engineers. Through division of the work to encourage competition from contractors, and other steps to gain both economy and efficiency, the cost of the dam will be well below initial estimates, in spite of generally increased construction costs since the time of those estimates. From the standpoint of the Corps of Engineers, and from the best interest of American taxpayer, it would be very disappointing for this record to be spoiled by arbitrary action ignoring low bidders for equipment for the dam.

I believe it would be a great mistake for the Defense Department to participate in the development of a policy which would make normal trade relations with Japan more difficult. Japan is an anchor of American defense policy in Asia. The development of healthy trade relations with that country should be an essential part of our defense policy, in addition to being good common sense from an economic standpoint.

I understand that the question has been raised in regard to possible hardship if an American firm loses this bid. There is no comparison between the hardship involved for an individual firm and the millions of Americans who produce for export and who will feel the results if our trade relations with Japan continue to deteriorate.

Any prejudicial action against a bid pending before your Department will be directly contrary to the President's recommendations in regard to the "Buy-American" Act. I am confident that you will carry out the President's policy in this regard.

Cordially,

Frank E. Smith,
Member of Congress.

Academy Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 3, 1954

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the Record, I include an editorial which appeared in the Boston Traveler of April 29, 1954, entitled "Academy Action."

This editorial sets forth in an effective way the availability of Camp Edwards in the Cape Cod area of Massachusetts for selection as the site of the new United States Air Force Academy.

As the editorial well states:

> The Cape Cod base would be the near-perfect answer to the problems of getting the right location. Camp Edwards today is on a caretaker basis. It has barracks and buildings into which the cadets could move immediately. It is close to Otis Field, an excellent all-weather site for the over-ocean training. It is only 60 miles from Boston, with this city's unparalleled facilities for education and research. It adjoins a vast stretch of land owned by the Government, and available for expansion:

The editorial follows:

ACADEMY ACTION

Four weeks ago today, President Eisenhower signed the bill authorizing a $126 million United States Air Force Academy.

Here in Massachusets, at Camp Edwards on Cape Cod, we have the ideal site for that establishment.

Yet for 4 weeks we have waited in vain for the news that Air Secretary Talbott, or some other Air Force representative, would be coming this way to take a look at the Edwards setup.

Talbott has been to Texas, California, Michigan and elsewhere, looking over possible sites for the academy. General Lindbergh has been to Sioux City, Iowa, for the same purpose. Other Air Force agents have been checking up on recommended areas here and there around the nation.

But what's the matter with somebody's taking a trip to Edwards?

The Cape Cod base would be the near-perfect answer to the problems of getting the right location. Camp Edwards today is on a caretaker basis. It has barracks and buildings into which the cadets could move immediately. It is close to Otis Field, an excellent all-weather site for over-ocean training. It is only 60 miles from Boston, with this city's unaparalleled facilities for education and research. It adjoins a vast stretch of land owned by the Government, and available for expansion.

The Greater Boston Chamber of Commerce has been pounding on these facts all month. The chamber has been sending telegrams to Senators Saltonstall and Kennedy, urging them to invite Talbott to visit Massachusetts and inspect the Cape Cod site.

Still nobody comes this way.

Just recently, a brochure put together by the chamber and the Massachusetts Department of Commerce went out to the five-man commission that eventually will decide the site of the academy. That brochure pointed out the advantages of the Edwards area.

Still nobody visits us.

We feel this is a project that the entire New England congressional delegation should work on with all posible persuasive force.

It's time this area got up on its feet and did some yelling. We'll get no attention unless we make some noise.

Spending Federal Funds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILL E. NEAL

OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 3, 1954

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, pressure for authorization of Federal money comes from many sources and for many impractical projects.

To appropriate funds to initiate projects of questionable value while neglecting established facilities rapidly becoming obsolete, is, to say the least, uneconomic over the long pull.

The following editorial calls particular attention to the Federal Government's obligation to maintain existing navigable facilities on the Ohio River, where further neglect will not only deprive the area of the continued benefits of past appropriations but will build up added costs for repairs and replacements. The editorial is from the Huntington Advertiser, Huntington, W. Va.

OHIO RIVER TRAFFIC OUTGROWS FACILITIES

Huntington, being an important river shipping point from the earliest days of the city, stands to gain economically from any Ohio River improvement program that will accommodate the flow of traffic.

Huntington citizens, therefore, should be interested in a fresh look at the overall program which the Ohio Valley Improvement Association has been supporting for years.

Four years ago the report of the President's Water Resources Policy Commission announced:

"The greatest immediate need, insofar as waterborne commerce in the Ohio River Basin is concerned, is the replacement of existing locks and dams in the Ohio River which are inadequate to meet the demands of modern river transportation."

In the spirit of this policy laid down by the Commission the association is carrying on. In different ways, it is trying to impress upon the public the need for early completion of various projects which have long been considered, but exist to a large extent on the drawing boards.

One in which this section of the valley is especially interested is the high-level roller dam, proposed to be constructed at Greenup, Ky. When finished, the modern locks and dam at this point will replace 5 obsolete structures, including 1 near the mouth of the Big Sandy River. Present facilities cause serious traffic delays in one of the busiest stretches in the entire inland waterway system. The proposed dam will reduce locking time for modern craft and cargo by 80 percent, provide annual savings of $600,000 in operating and maintenance costs.

The Ohio Valley Improvement Association, launched more than 50 years ago with the backing of a number of prominent Huntington citizens, is distributing a brochure which contains pertinent information in compact form and should make clear to the public the urgency of the improvement program.

Here are a few points the OVIA makes in its appeal:

YESTERDAY

OVIA started, at the turn of the century, to work for canalization of the Ohio River.

Canalization of the Ohio was completed in 1929. These original improvements were authorized on the basis of estimated traffic of 13 million tons a year.

The original locks, still in use, were designed for tows less than 600 feet in length.

NOW

Ohio River tonnage is 64 million tons, almost 5 times as great as the 13 million tons anticipated in planning the present locks.

Tonnage on the Ohio River is twice the paid tonnage moved through the Panama Canal.

More inland tonnage is carried by the 981-mile Ohio than on 1,800 miles of the Mississippi River from Minneapolis to the gulf.

Modern tows—almost twice as long as the old locks on the Ohio—have to be split at every one of the Ohio River's 46 locks between Pittsburgh and Cairo.

Twenty-three locks on the Ohio River are from 35 to 50 years old.

Twenty-one locks are from 25 to 35 years old.

When completed, the overall Ohio River improvement program of the United States Army engineers will:

Replace obsolete locks and dams with a system of high locks and dams, and long pools.

Reduce total number of locks from 46 to 21.

Reduce river transportation costs up to 50 percent.

Provide 1,200-foot locks for handling modern tows with one locking.

Quadruple transportation capacity of the Ohio River.

Army Adds Honor to Many Laurels Earned by Carley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANK E. SMITH

OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 29, 1954

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include an article from the Memphis Commercial Appeal for April 25, 1954, concerning well-earned recognition by the Department of the Army which is to be given to a distinguished Midsouth newspaperman.

The article follows:

Army Adds Honor to Many Laurels Earned by Carley

(By George Sisler)

Twenty-nine years of exceptional and outstanding service to the United States Army have led to the awarding of the Departmept of Army's certificate of merit to Jack Carley, editorial writer for the Commercial Appeal.

Secretary of the Army Robert T. Stevens disclosed in Washington yesterday that the rarely issued commendation for a civilian will be presented early this summer in a ceremony at Vicksburg, Miss.

BACKED RIVER WORK

The award in effect expresses the appreciation of the Army, and especially its Corps of Engineers to one of the Old Reliable's most reliable writers for his more than a quarter century of untiring efforts in the furtherance of flood control and harbor and navigational improvements on the Mississippi River system. Other factors in Mr. Carley's long career earning him the certificate of merit were:

Assistance rendered during the 1927, 1937, and 1943 floods along the Mississippi River and its tributaries.

Service as a special consultant to the War Department at Washington in 1946.

Support of and service to the Army Ground Forces during World War II.

WAS AID TO PICK

"For splendid cooperation * * * in connection with the atomic bomb project" and the interest shown "in the maintenance of security prior to the use of the bomb." (Expressed in a commendatory letter dated August 25, 1945, soon after Hiroshima, by Lt. Gen. Leslie R. Groves, who commanded operations through which the first bomb was produced.)

For assistance as a special civilian aide to Lt. Gen. Lewis A. Pick at Omaha, Nebr., during the disastrous Missouri Basin flood of 1952.

"For work in behalf of a unified authority in the military establishment." (Expressed in a commendatory letter in 1947 from the late Judge Robert P. Patterson, Secretary of War.)

The original recommendation for the award to Mr. Carley was made by Big. Gen. John R. Hardin, president of the Mississippi River Commission, and Maj. Gen. Samuel D. Sturgis, Chief of Army Engineers.

In the Army Department file on which the Certificate of Merit is based are commendations covering various activities from 1925 to the present, from:

Gen. Brehon Somervell, retired, wartime commander of Army Service Forces and now president of Koppers, Inc.; General of the Army Douglas MacArthur, retired; Lt. Gen. Ben Lear, retired, former Army Ground Forces Commander and later deputy theater commander in Europe during World War II; the late Judge Patterson; Lt. Gen. LeRoy Lutes, retired, former Army Service Forces commander; Lt. Gen. Daniel Noce, Inspector General of the Army; Maj. Gen. Donald H. Connolly, retired, builder of the wartime Persian Gulf supply route and former Memphis District Engineer; Lt. Gen. Eugene Reybold, retired, former Chief of Engineers and one-time Memphis District Engineer; Maj. Gen. Max C. Tyler, retired, former president of the Mississippi River Commission; Lt. Gen. L. R. Fredendall, retired, former commander, Second Army; General Sturgis; General Hardin, and Col. Allen F. Clark, Jr., present Memphis District Engineer.

BEST FRIEND

Included in the file is a letter of appreciation signed by 51 civilian employees of the Memphis district on the occasion of the Corps of Engineers 175th anniversary on June 27, 1950. The letter sets forth that from a flood-control standpoint, "We think that history will record that you (Mr. Carley) have been the best friend the lower Mississippi Valley has ever had."

The certificate of merit, to be presented by top-ranking Army officials, is signed by Secretary Stevens.

Mr. Carley, a long-time personal friend of J. Edgar Hoover, director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, has been a visiting instructor at the FBI National Academy in Washington since 1942, and is the possessor of a very rare FBI citation awarded in 1940. He also holds another FBI certificate of grateful appreciation awarded upon the completion of 10 years of service as a visiting instructor at the FBI Academy.

TWO LEGION TROPHIES

The Commercial Appeal editorial writer also was awarded the American Legion's Stephen S. Chadwick trophy in 1939 for the best editorials on national defense, and was the recipient of the first award of the James S. Bodley American Legion trophy for contributions to Americanism, in 1947.

Mr. Carley joined the staff of the Commercial Appeal in the fall of 1923 and has served as city editor, managing editor, and editorial writer in turn. He is married to the former Louise Meldahl, daughter of the late Capt. Anthony Meldahl, famed Ohio River packet operator. He also is a 33d degree Scottish Rite Mason and a member of the Tennessee Consistory.

Mr. and Mrs. Carley live at 393 North Garland.

Statement Regarding H. R. 8963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JEFFREY P. HILLELSON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1954

Mr. HILLELSON. Mr. Speaker, I have just introduced H. R. 8963. This provides that the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service and the Administrator of Housing and Home Finance Agency will furnish or make available to the city of Grandview $500,000 on the cost of a sewage plant for Grandview. This bill would allow the $500,000 to be made available only after $325,000 is provided by the city of Grandview.

An application by the city of Grandview was made to the regional HHFA in 1952 under Public Law 139. The amount of $255,000 was approved by the Senate Banking and Currency Committee in a report in 1953. However, the application was too late to receive the allocation of funds from the Federal Government.

The 1952 sewage system was not an extensive system, and will not now meet the State or local requirements. The plan at that time included only main lines and very limited lateral facilities. A plan has now been devised to meet specifications of the State health department for a complete sewage system which would meet the requirements of a city of 5,000 population.

Following are estimates for this sewage system:

Lateral sewers	$361,000
Two pumping stations	42,400
Sewer mains	65,000
Outfall sewer	25,000
Sewage treatment plant	220,000
Contingencies, 5 percent	35,000
Cost of land and easements and rights-of-way	5,000
Engineering, including supervision	50,000
Legal and administrative cost	12,000
Interest during construction	6,000
Project contingencies	3,000
Total	825,000

The reasons the Federal Government has been asked to assist in this project are:

One. The Grandview Air Base is now in active operation. The Air Force has brought in over 2,500 personnel and the alleged strength of this base is to be around 4,000. Personnel at the base are making daily requests for housing units in Grandview which is estimated at approximately 800. Grandview cannot provide these housing units without added facilities.

Two. The United States Navy is operating war plants near this area which has resulted in affecting the normal position of the city of Grandview. In other words, at the present time over 312 students—which represents a very high proportion of the school population in Grandview—come from families belonging to the air base or working in the Federal defense plants in this area. The school children are mentioned to show the influx of personnel caused by Grandview being within a Federal defense impacted area.

It is only right and proper that the Federal Government take steps to assist Grandview in this project. I have previously stated that the Housing and Home Finance Agency recognized the need for such a project by acknowledging the fact that the Federal Government caused this situation. This is further proven by the fact that they have deferred action on this project purely because of the funds involved. Never have they doubted the need nor the priority for the Government to assist in this project. Also, I have not been able to determine why this particular project was refused funds in 1952 when other projects of similar nature were granted Federal money.

New, New, New Look

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1954

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the Record, I include a fine and courageous editorial entitled "New, New, New Look," which appeared in the Boston Post of April 29, 1954. This editorial is consistent with the position I have consistently taken in strongly urging a strong and powerful military force. The only thing that the Communists respect is what they fear, and that is a power stronger than they possess.

The editorial follows:

NEW, NEW, NEW LOOK

Anyone with a reasonable quota of brains, an unlimited purse, and the power to issue orders can call upon the American people and American industry to produce the sinews of war after a war comes. But something more than that is required to make ready for any eventuality in a world with such a precarious balance of hostile forces.

By this time, Congress should be fed up to the teeth with the New Look, the New, New Look, and the New, New, New Look—the latter hinted at by Secretary of Defense Wilson. How many looks must he take before making up his mind just exactly how much must be spent for armaments to provide the maximum security for the minimum cost? When the administration decided to save money on the national defenses it was rather clear that it was a wild gamble.

To say that another new look may have to be taken at the defense budget because of events in Europe and Asia is sheer deception. The events in Europe and Asia were certain to follow the cease fire sellout in Korea, as day follows night.

It is simply incredible that with a President highly trained in evaluating a military situation, that there should be such a chaotic situation. Threatened with another war, the Nation is having its defense budget cut almost $6 billion.

Clem D. Johnston

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD H. POFF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1954

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, we of the Sixth Congressional District of Virginia are extremely proud of one of our distinguished sons, Hon. Clem D. Johnston, who was recently honored, as the capstone to his illustrious career of service to his State and Nation, by his election to the presidency of the United States Chamber of Commerce.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I quote herewith the following editorial which appeared in the April 29, 1954, issue of the Roanoke Times, published in Roanoke, Va.:

HIGH HONOR FOR CLEM JOHNSTON

Roanokers do not need to be told that Clem D. Johnston is a man of many parts, vigorous and able in many varied fields and a natural leader in all of them. We may be pardoned, nonetheless, if we swell with pride that his qualities, so well known in his hometown, have been once again recognized on the national level with his election as president of the United States Chamber of Commerce.

His fellow townsmen, we suspect, will be inclined at the risk of seeming smugness to congratulate the United States Chamber rather than Mr. Johnston upon his selection. He has already served that powerful business organization for some 22 years in a variety of positions of leadership, and his record of dynamic service to the chamber must be known by now to a large portion of its 1,600,000 businessmen members.

It would be difficult to imagine that the United States Chamber could have done itself a better turn than it did in Washington yesterday in turning over the reins of the organization to the strong hands of Clem Johnston.

The roster of Mr. Johnston's activities in the last quarter century—he is only 57 years of age, though his accomplishments are sufficient to fill several lifetimes—are truly amazing. A highly successful businessman with a whole string of enterprises scattered throughout western Virginia and extending into nearby States, he has found time to serve his own neighbors in accepting the leadership in numerous vital civic programs.

He has repeatedly responded to the call of his Government for full-time service and as an unpaid consultant in the field of warehousing and supply. In two world wars he has made a record of valuable service, and he has branched out to assist in formulating and directing policy in such fields as civil defense, Federal-State relations, and highway programs.

The national recognition now accorded him in his election as president of the United States Chamber of Commerce means achievement of a pinnacle of success which only a handful of Americans in any generation can reach. But we suspect that even this may not prove to be the capstone of the remarkable career of this remarkable man.

India Protests Military Aid to Pakistan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 12, 1954

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I am including an editorial that appeared in the Hindu of Monday, March 8, 1954. The editorial in question presents its government's views on the military-aid program which is about to become effective between our own Government and Pakistan.

The editorial follows:

CONSEQUENCES OF MILITARY AID

India's views on the proposal of the United States to give military aid to Pakistan have been repeatedly voiced in public by our Prime Minister. But Mr. Nehru's statement in Parliament on March 1 is invested with special significance in that it has come after President Eisenhower's letter to the Prime Minister. It makes it clear that nothing that the President has conveyed by way of clarifications and assurances in his letter and the accompanying statement has enabled Mr. Nehru to change those views. In the circumstances, Mr. Nehru, in his reply to the President, could do no more than briefly indicate this position. Beyond reciprocating the President's sentiments of good will (on which India has never expressed any doubts) Mr. Nehru could not obviously enter into a controversy with the President through an exchange of letters. This does not, however, mean that it is all there is to it. His sober and grave appraisal of the consequences of the American move not only to India, but to Pakistan and the whole of Asia, is addressed as much to our countrymen as to the policymakers in America. It is in fact analogous to the statement which accompanied the letter of the President and merits the latter's careful study even at this late hour.

The first point made by Mr. Nehru relates to the immediate reactions to, and the possible long-range consequences of, the introduction of foreign military forces into the continent of Asia. It has been repeatedly urged that it would not make for peace but would strengthen age-old suspicions and apprehensions based on the past history of this continent. The immediate reaction, in some of the Asiatic countries, to the reports of American military assistance, have tended to confirm this view. If the intention is to promote peace and security the originators of this policy have already produced the opposite results. In fact, there is no need to go once again into a long argument about it. For, as Mr. Nehru has pointed out, "The fact is there, that there has been in India and in Pakistan a sense of upsetting of things, as it were, and a sense of insecurity. In other countries in Asia, western and other, the result has been in a sense, a situation becoming fluid and a certain apprehension as to what the consequences might be."

The second point made by the Prime Minister is of more immediate concern to India and Pakistan, in that it is likely to affect the whole course of their future relations. The promise of military aid to one of them by a western power, has served, if not to drive a wedge between them, at least to arrest the process of closing the rift which has unfortunately existed since their emergence as two independent countries. This is not what we had expected of a friendly country, especially after Mr. Nehru's repeated warnings in this regard ever since the possibility of military aid was mooted. It is not surprising that the Prime Minister feels strongly on this aspect of the matter, and has characterized the American move as amounting to "intervention" of a kind which has done and could do no good to either of the two neighbors. After 6 years and more of bitter experience India and Pakistan had come to realize that the best way of solving their mutual problems was by direct negotiations as became two countries on whom history and geography had cast the role of friendly neighbors rather than warring brothers. Mr. Nehru and Mr. Mohammad Ali were firmly persuaded that this was the right way and had made good progress, during their meetings, toward a solution of these problems, when this military aid business came along and spoiled the whole atmosphere. In the words of Mr. Nehru:

"Recently a new and more friendly atmosphere had been created between India and Pakistan and by direct consultation between the two Prime Ministers, progress was being made towards the solution of these problems. That progress has now been checked and fresh difficulties have arisen. The military aid being given by the United States to Pakistan is a form of intervention in these problems which is likely to have more far-reaching results than the previous types of intervention."

How much harm has been done to the chances of a friendly settlement of Indo-Pakistan differences can be judged by reference to the Kashmir dispute. If Mr. Nehru and Mr. Mohammad Ali had progressed so far as to agree on a tentative date for the induction of a plebiscite administrator it was on the assumption that an agreement on demilitarization (prior to a plebisciee) would follow. But what hope is there now of Pakistan agreeing to a reasonable level of demilitarization when she finds herself suddenly in possession of vast quantities of foreign armaments? The Pakistan Prime Minister's recent utterances on this subject show that there is indeed very little chance of this happening. By thus tilting the military balance between the parties to the Kashmir dispute the United States has thwarted the hopes of a peaceful solution. Worse still, it may well prove (the President's assurances notwithstanding) that she has actually provided the aggressor with the wherewithal to renew his aggression, which had been halted at the cease-fire line. From any point of view the military aid proposed by America at this juncture cannot but have disastrous consequences to the peace and security of Asia. Whether, even now, it is not possible to defer action on this policy is a matter which the President should consider deeply. But there is little chance of this happening. There is therefore every justification for the Prime Minister's warning that a grave situation has arisen. His confidence that the country will face it as a national issue on which there can be no difference of opinion is equally justified.

Indochina Will Turn to Reds if Freedom Is Denied

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1954

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, the first step in understanding and coping with the confused and critical situation in Indochina, it seems to me, is the realization that human resistance to colonialism did not end with the winning of our own Revolutionary War and the achievement of our independence from Great Britain.

There is growing evidence that the same stirrings of the legitimate spirit of nationalism and independence exist in other lands today, and the failure to date of the French to recognize and accede to that worthy desire in Indochina plays directly into the hands of the Communist enemies. Not only have the people of that unhappy land been taken in by Communist appeals to the nationalist spirit and by Communist promises of freedom, but the French have failed to provide the firm assurance of independence which alone can create the will to resist the Communists.

Thirty years ago Stalin declared that "the road to the victory of the revolution in the West lies through a revolutionary alliance with the colonies and dependent countries against imperialism." Insofar as America supports France in its efforts to maintain colonial status in Indochina, it falls into the strategic trap Stalin so frankly disclosed.

Recently a native of Vietnam, now a student of Kalamazoo College, in my district, gave an interview to the Kalamazoo Gazette, which underscores the heartbreaking situation of the Indochinese aspirants for freedom and independence. Because of the light it throws upon the current situation, I include this excellent newspaper report of this interview:

FEARS INDOCHINA, IF FREEDOM DENIED, MAY TURN TO REDS

(By Dan Ryan)

For a widely publicized war, the fighting in Indochina remains pretty much of a mystery to most Americans.

They know that the French are fighting native forces called "Viet Minh" and that the Vietminh are led by Communists headed by a man named Ho Chi Minh.

They also know, rather vaguely, that the French are assisted by a large number of native soldiers loyal to the French.

Beyond this, things get pretty confused.

One resident of Kalamazoo is not confused. She is tiny Mai Nguyen, (pronounced My Wen, meaning in English, White Spring Flower) a native of Indochina, now studying political science at Nazareth College. To her the Indochinese war is an intensely personal thing.

"To understand the Indochinese war, you must first understand something about Indochina," she says.

"Indochina is actually three countries, Laos, Vietnam, and Cambodia. These three little nations are bordered by China, Burma, Thailand, and the South China Sea.

"I am a native of Vietnam. That's where the fighting is going on. It's a long, slender country with three large cities, Hanoi in the north, Hue in the middle, and Saigon on the southern coast. Almost all else is jungle or rice farm land."

HOPE TO BE FREE

"The French have governed our land since the 1860s. I do not think we like that any more than you Americans liked the British here.

"I was living in Saigon in World War II. We knew little about the war. The Japanese moved in to overthrow the French in 1945 but treated us well. Later we were bombed by Allied planes fighting the Japanese.

"When the war ended our people hoped to be free of French domination. Some French statements offered some hope of a government of our own, but not real independence. Somehow the French in Vietnam and the French in Paris never seemed to think alike and our free government never actually arrived.

"During those years only one strong leader had a chance to appeal to public imagination. He is Ho Chi Minh, an old man who traveled widely and was trained by the Communists in Russia.

"In the beginning the people were deceived. They didn't know he was a Communist. Even the French recognized him as the chief of Vietnam. Now everyone knows he is a Communist, but it is too late. Besides the Vietnamese people have no one else to turn to. Our king, Bao Dai, is not respected. He is a French puppet. He does nothing for his people.

"To the average native of Indochina, Ho Chi Minh is fighting for freedom. If you wish to fight for Vietnamese freedom you join his forces. If you do not, you fight with the French.

"Those fighting on the side of Ho Chi Minh are not all Communists. Many choose to fight with the Communists because they hate the French more.

"When the rumored free government of Vietnam did not arrive, street fighting broke out in Saigon in 1946. The Vietminh, or nationalist forces, seized my father and put him in jail because he worked as an engineer under the French.

"Then they let him out and the French arrested him and put him back in jail as a nationalist. He managed to get out and our family fled north to Hanoi. From then on we moved constantly as refugees from village to village, until 1949.

"The large cities are all controlled by the French. A Vietnam boy who does not flee from the cities is drafted by the French army. He must then fight against his countrymen.

"If he flees the French, he is drafted by Ho Chi Minh. As a result the people grow despondent and listen to Red propaganda."

THINKS U. N. COULD HELP

"The Vietnamese soldier fighting with Ho Chi Minh feels he is fighting for freedom. The Vietnamese soldier fighting with the French holds no such firm conviction. That is why so many Vietnamese men join Ho Chi Minh.

"I believe that if the Vietnamese people could have the help of the United Nations in setting up a true nationalist government, free of French ties, the people of Vietnam would rally to it and fight communism, because Ho Chi Minh could no longer say he is fighting for independence.

"Many of us look with hope to one of our men, Ngo Dinh Diem, now in France, as a possible leader of a free government. There are also many young Vietnamese studying here and abroad who could be the core of an independent Vietnam. But no matter who leads us, we must first have freedom. If we do not get that from the French, I fear my country will follow China into communism.

"We appreciate the good will and generosity of the American aid, but that help is useless and misdirected when it does not lead to an independent Vietnam government. No amount of weapons will do so long as there are no soldiers with a purpose.

"If you could help us as you helped the Greek nationalists, we could form our own government and turn back the Communists. This will probably not be a popular thought here, but it is how we feel."

Immigration Code Injures Scientific Research in United States—Need for Reform

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 10, 1954

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am pleased to insert in the RECORD, the following letter I received from the American Academy of Arts and Sciences:

AMERICAN ACADEMY OF
ARTS AND SCIENCES,
Boston, Mass., April 23, 1954.

Hon. EMANUEL CELLER,
House Judiciary Committee,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CELLER: The Council of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences on recommendation of its committee on international relations voted unanimously at its April meeting to give strong support to the Gubser resolutions, House Joint Resolutions 307 and 308, especially the latter. The aim of both these resolutions is to encourage the visits of foreign experts in science and other fields of scholarship, by simplifying and accelerating the process of obtaining a temporary visa.

Both resolutions provide for a prompt decision on each application for a nonimmigrant visa if the applicant alien intends to take part in a scientific, technological, or cultural conference or meeting in the United States, or intends to occupy a teaching or research position, or intends to take part in an industrial, technological, scientific, or cultural transaction which is temporary in nature. They also provide for a review of the consul's decision in cases where a visa is denied to such an applicant alien. This review is to be promptly carried out by a board of learned scientists, scholars, and other distinguished citizens or by other special means provided by the Secretary of State and in special cases to issue nonimmigrant visas to aliens who might otherwise be excluded under our present law. We believe that a simplified procedure is called for in considering applications for such temporary visas, in contrast to the prolonged inquiry which may be necessary before an immigrant visa is issued to a prospective permanent or long-term visitor. Alien visitors who come to attend conferences in this country must usually receive decisions quite promptly; otherwise, the decision comes too late to permit them to attend the meeting which was the object of their visit.

There is much evidence that the scientific and cultural life of this country is suffering from the lack of adequate contacts with our foreign colleagues because of difficulties which so many of them experience when they wish to visit this country. The most obvious evidence of this is found in the increasing tendency to hold international scientific meetings outside the United States, because of the difficulty of holding them here. Information on this point is to be found in a brief report in Science, the official magazine of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, in the issue of March 19, 1954, page 3A. We may recapitulate some of the most salient evidence here. For instance, at the Ninth International Congress of Genetics in Bellagio, Italy, last summer, the following resolution was unanimously adopted:

"The congress asks the international committee not to recommend that the next congress be held in any country to which it may be expected that scientists would be refused permission to enter on grounds of birth or political associations, past or present."

Montreal, Canada, has been chosen for the 10th International Congress of Genetics.

In May 1953 the American Psychological Association announced that the International Congress of Psychology would hold its 1954 meeting in Montreal. We may quote further from the article in Science:

"The statement released by the APA went on to say that the American Psychological Association had hoped to invite * * * the International Congress of Psychology to meet in New York City. * * * Because of the delays and embarrassments which foreign scientists experience in attempting to obtain even temporary admission to this country, the association decided it could not issue the invitation."

The APA went so far as to have a statement read into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 98, page 5920 (1952), to the effect that, in deciding to hold the 1954 International Congress in Canada, the psychologists agreed not to have a meeting in the United States until the existing legislation is "modified in such a way that visiting scientists will not be put through an inconvenient and embarrassing procedure in order to gain permission to visit this country."

These instances, unfortunately, are typical of many others. For instance, the First International Congress of Biochemistry was held in Cambridge, England, in 1949; the second in Paris in 1952. There was a strong sentiment among many biochemists that the third congress, in 1955, should be held in the United States, but this sentiment was overruled and it was decided to hold the 1955 Congress in Brussels.

We should point out that all of these meetings deal entirely with open information; there is no need to consider making any classified information available to the foreign visitors who would be admitted under the Gubser resolutions.

The present unsatisfactory state of affairs is damaging to the United States in at least two ways. First, it arouses antagonism to this country, and sharp criticism of our political methods, among a great number of the intellectual leaders in the countries of Western Europe and in other countries which are generally to be regarded as our friends. This is a serious matter, with great political significance. These intellectual leaders have profound influence in their countries; their words are listened to with attention by their governments and by the people at large. If our policies antagonise them and make them suspicious, we are doing direct harm to American foreign policy as well as to international cultural relations. In the second place, by interfering so gravely with the visits of foreign scholars to this country, we are actually weakening the state of national defense. A strong and healthy development of science is an indispensable element of national strength in the world of today. By obstructing the free interchange of ideas between the leading scientists of foreign countries and of our own, we are obstructing our own scientific progress and actually endangering our national security.

We, therefore, strongly recommend the prompt passage of 1 of the 2 Gubser resolutions. Of the 2, we prefer House Joint Resolution 308 which includes all of the provisions found in House Joint Resolution 307 and also would permit the Secretary of State to grant nonimmigrant visas in special cases, when it would appear to be in the national interest to do so, despite some of the milder technical restrictions of the McCarran Act.

The Attorney General would, of course, retain the right to bar the admission of any alien if there were reason to believe that his admission might constitute a danger to this country.

We believe that the passage of House Joint Resolution 308 is a matter of vital importance in the interests of this country, and we urge you to bring it promptly before the Congress for favorable consideration.

Very truly yours,

JOHN T. EDSALL,
Chairman, Committee on International Relations.

Polish Constitution Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. F. D. ROOSEVELT, JR.

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 3, 1954

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, today is the anniversary of the adoption of one of the most important documents in the history of democracy—the Polish Constitution of 1791. This document, enacted just a few years after the work of our own Constitutional Convention was finished, guaranteed freedom of religion, provided for the election of a democratic legislature, restricted the rights of the king, granted full political rights to commoners and gave the peasants protection under the law.

The constitution of May 3, 1791, was adopted by Poland 19 years after the first partition of that country by Russia, Prussia, and Austria. It was a critical period in Poland's history as foreign aggressors attempted to assert tyrannical pressures on the Polish Government and threatened to occupy the entire country. But the Poles would not be intimidated. In 1791 they announced that all men are free and equal and in this way challenged the very basis of dictatorial power.

The tyrannical rulers of Russia, Prussia, and Austria ordered the second partition of Poland in 1793. Invading armies overran Poland, converging upon her from the east and the west but although they were to occupy Polish soil for a century and a quarter, they never controlled the Polish people. Throughout 127 years of occupation, a Polish underground remained active and Polish national life and culture went on developing. The courage and devotion to principle which produced the May constitution kept the Poles a strong and united people.

I am convinced that this same moral strength which made it possible for Poland to become a free nation in 1918, will bring about the eventual downfall of Soviet tyranny. As we pay tribute to the courage of the Polish people, let us at this same time learn a lesson from them. It is to remain as true to our ideals and recognize our obligations as fearlessly as did Poland's May constitution 163 years ago.

National Commerce and Transportation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. OREN HARRIS

OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 3, 1954

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, today the world is sizzling with trials, difficulties, and tribulations. This Nation is faced with one of its greatest challenges. There have been many trying eras in the history of our country which required the greatest care as decisions were made. We are today faced with momentous decisions.

In approaching these difficult problems, international commerce and transportation becomes a most decisive factor. Not only does it affect our relationship with other countries, but international trade and the means of transportation are vital to our own economy. Our future security and our success in the present world struggle for ideology that is our principle of freedom and independence as against the totalitarian, dictatorial and willful aggression of the Communist philosophy will depend to a great extent on our ability to promote international trade and maintain adequate transportation.

Last Friday, April 30, 1954, Col. J. Carroll Cone, assistant vice president, Pan American World Airways, was invited to address the annual banquet of the College of Business Administration of the University of Arkansas at Fayetteville. Colonel Cone is a native of Arkansas, a fighter pilot in World War I, served as a State official of Arkansas, and later Administrator of the Civil Aeronautics Administration. He has had extensive travel in official capacity for his Government and for his company. From this experience he gave to this group of students of our university a most interesting discussion on the subject of international commerce and transportation.

Due to the importance of this subject to the future of our country, I include this most interesting address with these remarks in the RECORD:

Your invitation to address the annual banquet of the students of the college of business administration of the University of Arkansas is a signal honor for me and one that is very much appreciated.

Arkansas is my native State. This university bestowed upon me the honorary degree of doctor of laws in 1946, and to be asked to address you at this Commerce Day banquet is no less an honor.

The topic you have asked me to speak on today is International Commerce and Transportation, a field with which I have been connected for 17 years, and I take pride in the fact that my company, Pan American World Airways, with its far-flung routes for both passengers and cargo circling the earth, has had an important part in expanding our foreign trade.

Pan American has not rested on its laurels. It is continually striving to extend further the principle of international air operations defined by Juan T. Trippe, founder and president of Pan American. Long ago Mr. Trippe asserted that the goal of Pan American was "not just to fly airplanes on schedule, across oceans, to six continents and around the world—the goal was to carry people, cargo, and letters in great numbers—mass transportation for the average man at fares he can afford to pay."

It should be emphasized that international travel is more than just tourists looking at strange sights, visiting the fabled places of the world, having a good time abroad. International travel and commerce is a builder of good will, and in these times there cannot be too much of that. Of the millions that go overseas from the United States, how many make friends in foreign lands? How many of them attain an understanding and sympathy for foreign men and women and their ways? How many of them return to their homes with new concepts of the problems that harry international relations, and a much better understanding of them?

There is no better way of understanding a foreign people—in essence, foreign nations—than to go abroad and see for yourself. There are a lot of implications in the prosaic words, "tourist rate." It means low cost transportation, and low cost transportation means that thousands who never before could afford to go abroad can now do so. It means that thousands more may make friends overseas, thousands more can bring home and there spread a greater and more informed concept of foreign ways and ideas.

Is there a better way of promoting international friendship?

It is a fact that my company, Pan American Airways, has done more in the field of helping the average man to travel overseas than has any other air carrier. Against the opposition of its competitors, Pan American instituted tourist rates on its New York-San Juan run in 1948, with the result that traffic tripled. The lowered rates have since been extended to all the 63 countries it serves, and this year it became possible to fly completely around the world on tourist rates.

And tomorrow you may go to any Pan American office, to any Pan American travel agency, and buy yourself a ticket to new horizons for 10 percent down, the rest to be paid later.

It is astonishing to think that it was only some 30 years ago that air transport made its first contribution to our commerce. Only mail was carried in those days, on a route from New Brunswick, N. J., to Chicago and the west coast. There were no radio beams, no other aid to navigation except a compass. Weather services that today guide a pilot in every quarter of the globe were unheard of then. The pilot carried the mail—a few letters that you could put in your hat—with an eye cocked aloft at the weather, and a prayer.

How different theses things are today was demonstrated to me in the 15,000-mile round trip I took recently to Sao Paulo, Brazil, to attend the annual meeting of the International Business Management Congress as a representative of our Governor Cherry and the State of Arkansas. Over the wide waters that separate the South American Continent from ours, over the vast stretches of jungle that would take weeks to travel overland, our plane winged its way with unbelievable speed—and in no part of that journey was that plane out of touch with land-based stations, in no part did we lack navigational guides to keep the course true.

It is a far cry from the first airmail routes, a far cry from Pan American's initial flights in 1927. The company's first service began that year with a winter operation in Alaska—the first time that the speediness of the plane on regular service supplanted the dog team. In those days a trip of a few hundred miles might take weeks, the traveler not even riding in the sled, but walking beside it and paying 10 cents a mile for the privilege.

In that year, too, Pan American began a pioneer international service, from Key West to Havana, Cuba, a flight of 90 miles over the choppy waters of the Gulf of Mexico. The flight was made in a Fokker F7, the first multiengined transport to fly under the American flag. It had three engines, but the handful of passengers it could carry would be lost today in the vastness of the Super-6 clippers and the DC-6B's that are the rule today.

For the previous 6 or 7 years foreign air lines, the great European-flag lines such as British Imperial Airways, Air France, the Dutch KLM and Germany's Lufthansa, had been expanding throughout the world. Their routes were already well established in continental Europe and were reaching out strongly for the Middle East and the great markets of the Orient. They were already serving Latin America. They had a long head start.

In 6 years, however, our American-flag air system was linked to every capital in Latin America. In 1934 Pan American built the bases on Midway, Wake, Guam and Manila, and a year later the China Clipper made the first trans-Pacific flight from San Francisco Bay, making the stops at Honolulu, Midway, Wake, Guam and Manila without incident and on schedule. Thus, an airplane owned by an American company, built in the United States by American workmen, flown by an American captain and crew, and operating under the American flag, became the first to fly the Pacific in scheduled commerce.

Four years later the American team of airplane and men conquered the Atlantic. Again, Americans were the first to conquer the Atlantic. Today, hundreds of passengers and tons of cargo are flown regularly across the Atlantic each week. It is now routine.

International air transport has come of age. London and Paris are but 12 hours from New York and Boston. India, Brazil, Argentina, and South Africa are 24 hours away. It takes but 36 hours to fly to Australia, Japan and Hong Kong, the Orient, or to any point outside the Iron Curtain. In 3 days you can fly around the world. International air transport has become an essential part of our foreign trade and our holiday travel—in fact, more people go abroad by air than by sea; more mail goes overseas by air than by sea.

The importance of this to the citizens of of Arkansas and of all the United States is this:

A great international airways system organized and available at a moment's notice links the United States and all countries of the free world outside of the Communist lands; the United States has a great fleet of long-range ocean transports with trained flight crews; it has experienced ground staffs stationed abroad at strategic airports in all six continents; it has a communications system worldwide in scope, and ready at a moment's notice for military assignment.

The value of such an instrument in peace has been proved, and its value as the first line of defense was signally demonstrated in World War II, both in the Atlantic and the Pacific, and in the Korean conflict. In all these engagements it was the peacetime transport, changed over to military needs within days, that ferried the badly needed men and materials to the war fronts faster than ever before. Coordinated, working together, the airlines accomplished a wartime task that only they could do, and one that proved invaluable in the conquest of aggressors.

Today and every day the airlines are a huge fleet, valued at many millions of dollars—but not adding a dollar to our military budget—that can respond at any time to the needs of the military.

As businessmen and taxpayers, it is important to us, too, that many millions of Americans will go abroad this year and spend their dollars for education, for pleasure, for personal purchases. In 1953 they spent $1,300,000,000. And in this year, when more than ever are expected to go abroad, the Government estimates the sum will grow to $1,500,000,000—a lot of American dollars abroad which can be used in turn for purchase of American goods if they are made attractive enough and priced right.

I have spoken, proudly, of the contributions of Pan American and the country's airlines in the development of international trade, and of the contributions of the airlines to international goodwill. I wish now, in no less proud vein, to speak of my fellow natives of Arkansas who have risen high in the fields on international banking and commerce.

There are too many to mention all of them at this time, but coming quickly to mind is Samuel Rayburn, once president of the Union Trust Co. of Little Rock, who went to New York about 20 years ago as president of Lord & Taylor, and who was later to become president of the Associated Dry Goods Corp., which owned Lord & Taylor, McCreery & Co., and many other business institutions in New York and Michigan. There is Arthur McCain, a native son of Arkansas, who, until recently, was president of the Chase National Bank; Charles McCain, formerly of Little Rock, who was president and is still member of the board of Dillon Read & Co., of New York; Van B. Sims, formerly comptroller of the State of Arkansas and now vice president of Lord & Taylor; Miss Dorothy Shaver, a native daughter of Arkansas, who is now president of Lord & Taylor. There are many more.

Arkansas is fortunate, too, in having the highest type of representation in both Houses of Congress. The outstanding reputations for ability, integrity, and patriotism of Senators JOHN MCCLELLAN and WILLIAM FULBRIGHT are a source of pride to all Arkansans everywhere; and the records and reputations of the Arkansas Members of the House of Representatives are nationally recognized. It gives me great pride to be able to number all of these great men among my personal friends—their value to Arkansas and to the Nation is practically unlimited.

FUTURE PROSPECTS FOR YOUNG AMERICANS IN WORLD COMMERCE AND TRANSPORTATION

I would like all of you young Americans who are soon to go out into the world of commerce and industry to know that during the 17 years I have been with Pan American World Airways I have traveled to over 40 countries and colonies and that, without exception, I have met Arkansas men and women living and working in each of those countries—all of them in activities connected directly or indirectly with American commerce.

From my own experience and observation, please be assured that practically all of the great American business concerns are constantly seeking new and larger markets, at home and abroad, and are constantly surveying the field for capable young men and women, with the proper educational background and who speak foreign languages, to represent American business in international commerce.

During the past 20 years, American manufacturers and producers have tripled and quadrupled their production capacity until now they are capable of producing, with the facilities at hand, more than double the requirements of the American public in practically every type of manufactured goods or agricultural produce needed and desired by the human race. This condition makes it urgently necessary for American producers to expand their sales departments and their marketing territories. This fact, alone, should present unlimited opportunities to you when you go out into the business world.

The possibilities are unlimited for aggressive young Americans with imagination and determination, and, strange as it may seem to you, there is hardly a spot on this globe that I have visited in which I did not find one or more Arkansans doing a noteworthy job for the American companies that they represented.

Among many other well known American concerns represented in practically every foreign country outside of the Iron Curtain, you will find all the great automobile manufacturers, harvester companies, manufacturers of electrical goods, sewing machines, drug manufacturers, manufacturers of household appliances of every description, great American construction companies, refrigerator companies, and hundreds of others. In other words, if you properly qualify yourselves, learn one or more foreign languages, and really try to make a place for yourselves in the sun of international commerce—you may rest assured that the sky is the limit.

By the way, it's gratifying to all Americans to know that you will find American flying equipment (civil and military) in the sky of practically every section of the world.

My career was begun in Arkansas, having been born and reared on a cotton farm in the southern part of the State. I had very few opportunities and a limited education, with no chance to specialize in any particular line of work; but after serving as a fighter pilot in France during World War I, I came home and was shortly thereafter appointed assistant secretary of State of the State of Arkansas, and we later elected twice a State auditor, during which time I also organized and commanded the 154th Squadron of the Arkansas National Guard, and during the same period, organized an aircraft manufacturing concern in Little Rock, in which we built and sold over 500 airplanes.

After the stock-market crash of 1929, and during the trying hard times that followed—particularly for us in the South—President Roosevelt was elected and, at the insistence of Senator Robinson and President Roosevelt, I left Arkansas to accept an appointment as Director of Civil Air Regulations in the old Bureau of Air Commerce.

Two years later I was sent to Europe by our Government (based in Paris and London) to study and report on the development of European aviation, during which time I had the official title of adviser to the United States on European aeronautics. It was while on this mission in Europe that the President of Pan American World Airways reached me in Paris by transatlantic telephone, and prevailed upon me to resign from Government service and join Pan American World Airways for the purpose of organizing and managing Pan American's operations across the Atlantic to Europe.

Six years ago my company sent me to Washington, where I am now based, to handle certain special missions in connection with our relations with various Government departments. It has been, at times, a very difficult but fascinating assignment, and a rewarding one as well—for it has given me an opportunity to make some contributions to public and governmental service.

It should be emphasized that similar, or better, opportunities will be available to those of you who develop the ability, the courage, and the determination to make your way in the world. You may rest assured that the great State of Arkansas and its splendid leaders in State and Federal Government, will always be ready to give the deserving a helping hand.

In conclusion, I thank my good friend, Senator FULBRIGHT, for suggesting my name to you, and thank you for your cordial invitation to be with you on this occasion. May God bless you all.

Tribute to Miss Vonna Lou Chambers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD H. VELDE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1954

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, every year the American Legion, Department of Illinois, holds an oratorical contest on the subject of the Constitution of the United States of America. This year more than 25,000 students competed in the statewide contest, and, in the final judging that took place at the Freeport High School, Freeport, Ill., on March 19, 1954, I am happy to report that one of my good promising constituents, Miss Vonna Lou Chambers, 201 West Glen Avenue, Peoria, Ill., placed second with her prepared oration and her extemporaneous speaking immediately following the oration.

Miss Chambers is the same young lady who placed first in the I Speak for Democracy contest sponsored last fall by the Peoria Junior Chamber of Commerce in cooperation with the Radio and Television Broadcasters and Manufacturers Association. Since this latest work of Miss Chambers entitled "The Constitution—Our Heritage" is so good as to have been rated second in the American Legion's statewide contest, I should like to have it inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for reading by all my colleagues.

It is most encouraging and refreshing to read these words of a high-school senior girl and what she thinks of our Constitution. Miss Chambers will receive a 2-year scholarship to the University of Illinois as a reward for her placing second in the contest, and I am sure that after reading her work you will all agree with me that this college scholarship couldn't be granted to a more deserving and capable young lady.

The address follows:

One hundred and seventy-seven years ago a new nation came into existence. That nation was the United States of America, your country and mine—and the foundation upon which it was built was an idea—an idea with two hundred or more definitions. Some call it freedom. Some call it private enterprise. Some call it individual initiative. In truth, it is simply the idea that every individual is somehow worthwhile, and this includes you and me and all the others. This Nation—this idea is our heritage, and like anything which is inherited it may be lost if it is not cherished and protected.

In order to protect our heritage we must understand it—understand how it came to be and why each of us has an equal right to it. If we were to single out anyone particular instrument of government of most importance to the preservation of our American heritage, it would be our Constitution. For in this document, as amended from time to time, are the effective guaranties of our freedom, and only to the extent that we understand the Constitution and cherish and defend it, will we succeed in preserving our freedom.

Come with me now as we reflect humbly but proudly on the real meaning of our Constitution and what lies behind it.

By 1779 with the aid of an ax, faith in God, and a belief in the common man, the people of the Thirteen Colonies had carved a home for freedom out of the wilderness. They struggled right, long years to win the right to be free and independent States. But with peace came new dangers. For as one historian put it, "They were like a barrel made out of thirteen stout staves, but without a single hoop to hold them together." They wanted to make certain that their hard-bought liberty would be preserved. So they gave its safe-keeping into the hands of the people who had bought it—and it was put into strong, capable hands.

In 1787 55 delegates assembled in the old State House in Philadelphia. Among them was James Madison, who because of his vast knowledge in the theory, structure, and form of government was later to become known as "Father of the Constitution." Also there was wise, benevolent old Ben Franklin, alert and keen when anything important was taking place. There was young, handsome Alexander Hamilton with his passion for justice—the clear thinker—the man with a plan. Then there was George Washington, stately and serene, whose very presence was like a benediction.

These were no ordinary men, but grants among men, well instructed in the school of pain, privation, and hopelessness. They knew the task that lay before them and they set to work with a will. They threw out the old, outmoded Articles of Confederation and began anew. They provided for a legislative body to make laws; a judicial body to interpret the laws; and an executive body to enforce the laws. Three distinct branches of government, all equal in power and all working together, yet so planned that no one branch could gain supremacy over the others. With wise foresight they made provision for their charter's amendment, thus making it flexible, so that it could grow and change as its aspiring people grew and changed.

But from the people, the farmers, the blacksmith, the fisherman—from the common people, came whispers of suspicion, murmurings of doubt swelling into a crescendo of protest. From Rhode Island and Virginia, from Massachusetts and the Carolinas came the demand of the people for a guarantee of rights—not implied, but plainly written, so that the whole world might see that just governments derive their power from the consent of the governed.

So, out of the nailed-up doors of meeting houses, out of the witch trials of old New England, out of the creakings of the rack, out of the seething emotions of the people who could no longer stomach injustice emerged a 10-part epic of human imperatives which we call the Bill of Rights.

Now the people could worship as they pleased. They could speak and write what they thought, assemble and discuss without fear. They were given the right to choose their work. If accused of a crime, they could demand a public trial by jury—in short, they assured to themselves and us their posterity, the right to what can be expressed in no better way than "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

But all this great heritage we have been inclined to accept as a matter of course. True, in time of war we have rallied magnificently to the protection of our freedoms against foreign foes, but we can lose our freedom, perhaps have lost some of it by inattention or a negative casual attitude toward our duties as citizens. There have always been those who would snatch this priceless gift from us. History shows plainly that only through the constant vigilance of the people have we been able to perpetuate our freedom. The Constitution does not guaranty us liberty, it grants us the privilege of liberty, but, in the words of Thomas Paine, "If we expect to reap the blessings of freedom we must undergo the fatigues of supporting it"—sometimes at the cost of the lives of our finest young men.

The people of previous generations underwent the fatigues of supporting liberty—on the snow at alley Forge; with Jackson at New Orleans; when brother battled brother in the Civil War; with Dewey at Manila; in the mud of Chateau Thierry; on the beaches of Anzio and Bataan; and in the mountains and ricefields of Korea.

In the past, we have grappled with aggressive foes, and we have won. But today, within the very borders of our country, there is a more cunning foe, a brutal alien philosophy which masquerades as a friend—and which spells doom for us if it is not checked. Poised like a hissing viper this "ism" would destroy our Constitution and take from us our precious liberties. Working slowly, it spreads its villainous propaganda, gradually striving to seize the smaller offices of Government, hoping eventually to control and dominate the whole Government.

Oh, yes; we know all about this for it is true—but the truth hurts. So we shrug our shoulders and adopt an indifferent attitude of—why worry, it can't happen here—after all, this is the land of the free. My friends, we must awaken from our lethargy before we find ourselves so hopelessly enmeshed in the coils of despotism that it is too late.

We must not stand idly by and watch our freedom stripped from us; our Constitution torn page by page and reduced to shreds; our Statue of Liberty pounded to dust.

Today, into the hands of the present generation, into our hands, has been passed the sacred trust of undergoing the fatigues of supporting liberty. It's up to us, for America is what we make it; its laws are our laws, its Government is our Government, its destiny is our destiny.

"But what can we do?" you ask. The answer is simply this: We can combat these termites of tyranny by arming ourselves with a burning fervor for the ideals of human liberty. Let us take our Constitution and read it, become acquainted with it, know it, and, finally, use it to our advantage by accepting our duties and obligations as citizens. These duties are to respect and defend the country which has accorded us the blessings of liberty—to vote, to help choose good leaders and representatives, and to support the leaders the people elect; to pay taxes, considering them as our dues to the greatest government on earth; to support law and order by respecting the rights and property of others; and to abide by the will of the majority, but to preserve the rights of the minority.

Let us, each and every one, accept these obligations as our bill of duties which parallels our Bill of Rights. By so doing we will be registering our inalienable right to defend our heritage of freedom granted to us in that great document, our Constitution.

The Objective and Purposes of the Communist Leadership Have Not Changed One Iota; the Objective Is To Communize the World, Nation by Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRAZIER REAMS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1954

Mr. REAMS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I place in the Appendix of the RECORD a very timely column written by Mr. Grove Patterson, editor in chief of the Toledo Blade. Mr. Patterson has twice been president of the American Society of Newspaper Editors, a world traveler, a great writer, and one of the most farsighted and understanding citizens of this Nation.

The article follows:

THE WAY OF THE WORLD

(By Grove Patterson)

The Archduke Otto, who would become the Emperor of the Austro-Hungarian Empire if the old order of pre-World War I were ever restored in Europe, astonished some of his hearers in his recent lecture in Toledo. At least he dealt out some facts with which I was not familiar and he added some opinions which stimulated thought. Perhaps I should have known it before, but I was amazed when he said Russia had so much oil that she was exporting it—some 3 million tons last year. He said about 5 million tons would be exported this year and next.

The reason for Russia's constant policy of aggression, the archduke said, is not because she is interested in the industrial wealth of Western Europe. She doesn't need it. The Soviet Union's own industry is developed to such a degree now that she can meet her own requirements.

The reason for Soviet policy goes much deeper than the acquirement of an industrial potential. Russia in her possession of the satellite countries, such as Poland, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, Rumania, Hungary, and so on, is ruthlessly carrying out the unchanging Communist objective so clearly laid down by Lenin at the beginning of the revolution in 1917. It has been nearly 40 years since the revolution, but the objective and purposes of the Communist leadership have not changed one iota. The objective is to communize the world, nation by nation.

So long as one country in all the world remains outside the Soviet orbit and unadapted to Communist policy, Lenin said, and Stalin repeated, communism will not be successful. It must be universal among all the children of men. Thus it is that Russia, while not at the moment making war on any nation, is making war in every nation not yet conquered. The objective of the Kremlin has not altered by a hair's breadth. Only by a firm foreign policy, a policy of threatened force, can the United States halt the westward movement of this great conspiracy.

Our administration, as is evident in the speeches of Secretary of State Dulles, believes that the policy of threatened force and "massive retaliation" is all that can be expected to stop Russian aggression. No treaties, however solemnly entered into, no negotiation, will be effective. A firm, unmistakable foreign policy, clearly stated, is the only language Russia will understand or heed. Any appeasement on our part means only a gradual giving way before Communist aggression.

It is time we ceased being the fearful victims of a cold war and time we instituted a cold war of our own. The invention of the hydrogen bomb is destined to make this policy stick.

Archduke Otto surprised many who heard him by disposing of the idea that communism is or ever was a workingman's, a labor movement. Lenin in all his writing about communism never referred to it as a labor movement. In America we confuse the word "proletariat" with the rank and file of labor. A proletarian is an uprooted, a confused, an unhappy person who doesn't know where to turn. He is a person mentally and morally upset. He grasps at the promises of Communist agitators as at a straw that will bear him up in his unhappiness.

The force of communism comes mainly from the middle classes and sometimes the so-called upper classes. The main ingredient in it, its most vicious element, is atheism. It is principally a movement against God and the faith in Christian principles. Only a renewed awareness of the spiritual value of the human being, and an understanding of his inheritance from Divine Providence, will furnish the strength that will successfully combat and eventually defeat communism, the police state, the slave state.

Governor Meyner's Leadership Praised

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. HART

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1954

Mr. HART. Mr. Speaker, the Newark Sunday News for Sunday, April 18, 1954, commented most favorably upon the fine brand of leadership being displayed by Gov. Robert B. Meyner, of New Jersey, in seeking a sound solution to what it terms "the State's most serious problem."

It is heartening to note that the result of the Governor's spotlighting the imperative need of providing a water supply adequate to the uses of the State for a half century to come is bipartisan support of measures looking to that end.

The editorial of the Newark Sunday News follows:

SOUND SOLUTION

Leadership exerted by Governor Meyner has produced bipartisan sponsorship of a program that promises to guarantee New Jersey a dependable water supply adequate for the needs of the next 50 years.

Bills providing for the construction of reservoirs in Round Valley, Hunterdon County, and in the State-owned Wharton tract in South Jersey have been introduced by Assemblymen Barnes, of Essex, and Junda, of Passaic, Republicans, and Assemblyman Thompson, of Mercer, the Democratic minority leader.

Included in the bills is a proposed $100 million bond issue to be submitted to the voters in November. Unlike most public projects, water reserves are growth assets which also pay handsome dividends. Deficits are incurred only during the construction period. There would be plenty of customers for the new supplies, which would be developed in stages as demand required.

The pending program seems like a sound solution of the State's most serious problem. Shortsighted sectional opposition in the past has helped put New Jersey, rapidly growing in population and industry, and plagued by drought, in a dangerous position. This opposition is being heard again. If it is permitted to block action this time, the consequences to the whole State could be disastrous.

Chicago Bar Association Opposes Wiretapping Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 29, 1954

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am extending my remarks to include the report of the Chicago Bar Association concerning H. R. 8649, which was passed by the House on April 8, 1954, and is now under consideration in the other body. The report follows:

REPORT OF THE CHICAGO BAR ASSOCIATION

I. PROPOSED LEGISLATION RESPECTING WIRETAPPING

The United States House of Representatives pased, on April 8, 1954, H. R. 8649, which proposes to permit the admission into evidence of material obtained through intercepting wire or radio communications by the Federal Bureau of Investigation or the inteligence services of the Army, Navy, or Air Force during the course of investigations in connection with certain named crimes affecting the national security. Such material could be introduced only in criminal proceedings involving those crimes and must have been obtained upon express written approval of the Attorney General. If acquired after the effective date of the act, it must have been obtained pursuant to an order issued by a Federal district or appellate court judge as well. The judge must be satisfied before granting the order that one of the named crimes has been or is about to be committed and that the material to be obtained would assist in the conduct of the investigation. The bill would also prohibit the divulgence of the information contained in the order or acquired pursuant to the provisions of the bill for purposes other than those mentioned.

In the Senate, Senator MCCARRAN, Democrat, of Nevada, introduced S. 3229. This bill would add section 245 to chapter 13 of title 18 of the United States Code (the civil-rights chapter of the title designated "Crimes and Criminal Procedure"), prohibiting all wiretapping except as authorized therein, and would add to section 605 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U. S. C. 605) a proviso corresponding to the exception. This exception would authorize agents of the Department of Justice to intercept wire communications when authorized in writing by both the Attorney General and a Federal district court. The agent of the Department of Justice would obtain from the court an ex parte order to extend for not more than 6 months, renewable for a like period, upon application "supported by the authorizing certificate of the Attorney General and such oral or other evidence as the judge may require to determine whether there is reasonable ground for belief that such interception will result in the procurement of evidence of the commission of" particular specified crimes relating to the national security. The Attorney General may authorize application for a wiretapping order whenever he has reason to believe that evidence of the commission of any crime punishable under certain named statutes "may be obtained through the interception of any wire communication."

The Attorney General has expressed a desire to have enacted a bill which would permit the use of all evidence obtained upon his express written approval during the course of an investigation into any of the mentioned crimes affecting national security without the requirement of a court order.

II. PRESENT LAW AND DECISIONS GOVERNING WIRETAPPING

(a) Under the pertinent decisions of the United States Supreme Court, wiretapping is constitutional, but the use of material so obtained is prohibited by statute. *Olmstead* v. *United States* (277 U. S. 438, 72 L. Ed. 944 (1927)) concerned a conviction for violation of the National Prohibition Act based on evidence obtained by transcribing tapped telephone conversations. Seven hundred and seventy-five typewritten pages of such conversations were in the record. In holding that neither the fourth (unreasonable search and seizure) nor the fifth (due process, compulsory self-incrimination) amendment was violated, Chief Justice Taft said:

"There is no room in the present case for applying the fifth amendment unless the fourth amendment was first violated. There was no evidence of compulsion to induce the defendants to talk over their many telephones. They were continually and voluntarily transacting business without knowledge of the interception. Our consideration must be confined to the fourth amendment."

He distinguished *Gouled* v. *United States* (255 U. S. 298), which held inadmsisible papers taken by an army private in the course of an apparently social call, and language of Mr. Justice Field in *Ex Parte Jackson* (96 U. S. 727) saying that the fourth amendment protected sealed letters and packages in the mail. The second distinction was made on the grounds (1) of the constitutional provision setting up the post office and (2) that the individual pays the Government to deliver mail unopened. The Court cited *Hester* v. *United States* (265 U. S. 57), admitting the testimony of Federal officers who had trespassed on the land of the defendant to watch him hand a bottle of whiskey to another from 100 yards distance. Mr. Justice Holmes, referring to wiretapping as "dirty business," dissented on the ground that as wiretapping was a crime under State law, the judicial branch of the Government should not encourage the prosecuting forces of the Government to break the law. He expressly declined to state his position on the constitutional questions presented. Mr. Justice Brandeis dissented on the same ground and on the ground that the fourth amendment covered all invasions of privacy, but was phrased in words covering only those invasions common at the time the Constitution was written. He also held that the use of evidence obtained by wiretapping was a violation of the fifth amendment. Justices Butler and Stone also dissented on constitutional grounds.

Nardone v. *United States* (302 U. S. 379, 82 L. Ed. 314 (1937)) concerned a conviction for smuggling liquor in which essential evidence was obtained by wiretapping. This was after the enactment of the Communications Act of 1934, and the Court, through Mr. Justice Roberts, held that section 605 of the Communications Act prohibited the use of such evidence. Justices Sutherland and McReynolds dissented.

The pertinent section of the Communications Act of 1934 prohibits unauthorized divulgence of wire or radio messages by the carrier and provides: "and no person not being authorized by the sender shall intercept any communication and divulge or publish the existence, contents, substance, purport, effect, or meaning of such intercepted communication to any person; and no person not being entitled thereto shall receive or assist in receiving any interstate or foreign communication by wire or radio and use the same or any information therein contained for his own benefit or for the benefit of another not entitled thereto; and no person having received such intercepted communication or having become acquainted with the contents, substance, purport, effect, or meaning of the same or any part thereof, knowing that such information was so obtained, shall divulge or publish the existence, contents, substance, purport, effect, or meaning of the same or any part thereof, or use the same or any information therein contained for his own benefit or for the benefit of another not entitled thereto:"

More recent cases have held that evidence which could not have been obtained had the Government not tapped the defendant's wires was inadmissible (*Nardone* v. *United States* (308 U. S. 338, 84 L. Ed. 307 (1939))); that intrastate communications came within the protection of the first Nardone case (*Weiss* v. *United States* (308 U. S. 321, 84 L. Ed. 298 (1939))); and that if a tap is used, defendant may examine records of material taken from a tap and cross-examine Government witnesses as to where and how they got their evidence (*United States* v. *Coplon* (185 F. (2d) 629 (C. A. 2d (1950), cert. den., 342 U. S. 920, 96 L. Ed. 690)). Evidence acquired by a detectaphone applied to the wall of the office adjacent to defendant's is admissible, even as to the defendant's end of telephone conversations, *Goldman* v. *United States* (316 U. S. 129, 86 L. Ed. 1322 (1942)); and it is up to the courts of the several States whether wiretap evidence is admissible in State court trials, *Schwarta* v. *Texas* (344 U. S. 199, 97 L. Ed. 231 (1952)).

(b) On the practical level, one of the prime safeguards against wiretapping is the trouble to which the Government must go to maintain a continuous watch. According to the testimony of Mr. Miles McDonald, district attorney of Kings County, N. Y., before the subcommittee of the House Committee on the Judiciary, this operation requires the full on-duty time of six men. Technological advances, however, may eventually reduce or eliminate the need for manpower.

III. RECOMMENDATIONS REGARDING PROPOSED LEGISLATION

It should be observed first of all that a large number of bills have been introduced in previous sessions of Congress to permit wiretapping by Federal law-enforcement officers, and the evidence thereby obtained to be introduced into court. None has become law. Under the present law, the various Attorneys General since the adoption of section 605 of the Communications Act have uniformly interpreted the words "intercept and divulge" to include in the prohibition of that section only the divulgence of intercepted material; so wiretapping is done, but evidence derived therefrom is not used in court.

It is the position of this committee that under standing United States Supreme Court decisions the Federal Constitution does not prohibit the use of wiretap evidence in court. It is further the position of the committee that the minimal rights guaranteed the individual by the Constitution may be implemented by act of the Congress, and that this is a suitable area for such implementation. As a matter of policy, this committee feels that wiretapping is an evil which generally ought to be prohibited by law. In general, Americans should have an enforcible right to speak freely over the telephone. Although the right to be secure from the introduction of wiretap evidence in court is directly valuable only to those whom the Government may prosecute, the right not to be spied on is valuable to all. No government, however benign, should invade the right to privacy which is one of the factors making American citizenship so valuable.

Chief among those circumstances which some allege might justify tapping wires is a threat to the national security. Since most of the evidence upon which the threat of internal subversion can be evaluated is not available, the committee is in no position to determine whether the present threat is great enough to justify departure from the normally sound policy of prohibiting wiretapping altogether.

The committee does wish to make clear, however, its belief that certain steps should be taken by the Congress in making this policy determination. Before deciding, Congress, through the appropriate committee or subcommittee, should have before it all possible evidence as to (1) the extent of the threat to be combated; (2) the material which could be introduced in criminal proceedings under any contemplated statute; and (3) the probable effectiveness of the contemplated measures. The committee feels that it is incumbent on anyone supporting the authorization of wiretapping to bear the burden of proof in all three of the above respects.

If, upon adequate showings, Congress should decide that a law is necessary to permit the use of wiretap evidence, this committee believes that at least certain safeguards should be included in any such law to minimize the infringement of our rights and to assure that wiretapping will be used only where necessary to the purpose for which authorized. This committee is opposed to both of the aforementioned bills in their present form, as neither includes the minimum safeguards deemed necessary.

The provision that such authority be granted only to Federal judges seems essential. The safeguard that unauthorized wiretapping be made a crime also seems necessary, though further clarification should be made with regard to the rights of State and local officials in this field under State legislation.[1] Perhaps a provision should be inserted granting an individual right of action for punitive damages against any person, whether in the course of a Government investigation or not, who illegally taps his telephone wire. A bill should include a provision clarifying its relationship to section 605 of the Communications Act, and perhaps amending the key words of that act to read "intercept or divulge."

Although under the present rules of discovery the accused probably would have ample opportunity to examine a complete transcript of all conversations intercepted along with the right to introduce any additional relevant parts thereof into evidence that might be deemed helpful to his defense, further examination should be given to the need for spelling out such precautions. Technical information with regard to the detection of forged recordings does not appear to have been available to the House committee considering the legislation. Such advice might be helpful in reducing the possibilities of such evidence being distorted and might accordingly increase the reliability and weight of such evidence in court. Some provision should be made for all original recordings to be kept under seal as soon as obtained and the tampering or altering of any such recordings should be made a felony. Under no circumstances should evidence obtained before the effective date of the act be admissible, as would be authorized by H. R. 8649.

In order that Congress be assured of an opportunity to reexamine the effectiveness of this legislation and also to correct possible abuses in the light of its operation, any such act should extend for a limited duration. Further, court orders authorizing wiretapping under such legislation should expire within a given length of time, as set out in S. 3229.

In view of the experience of New York officials with the importance of secrecy in the wiretapping procedure, it might be wise to incorporate a provision setting forth certain secrecy precautions. Applications to the court could be in the form of an affidavit by a designated official of the agency desiring to make such a tap and should set forth therein all facts necessitating such authorization. This application could be made in private to the judge in his chambers and could be kept under lock and key at least until the authorization had expired.

It has also been suggested, for the sake of efficiency and authenticity, that the wiretapping function be delegated only to the FBI. Other governmental agencies making investigations could then, as they apparently do now, work in conjunction with the FBI in the wiretap phase.

These bills appear to restrict the use of information derived from wiretapping to investigations and judicial proceedings brought by executive agencies, but it might be wise further to prohibit expressly any use of wiretapping or the evidence therefrom by other governmental bodies such as congressional committees.

Several points on the general subject of wiretapping should be discussed briefly in this report. First, it should be understood that the exclusion of wiretapping evidence from court proceedings is based only on the ground that as a matter of policy, courts should not consider evidence acquired by the Government in violation of the law. Since section 605 of the Communications Act prohibits the divulgence of such communications, the courts have excluded such evidence. England and Canada have no such doctrines. It seems clear that the basis for any exclusion of any such evidence has not been its untrustworthiness. With certain precautions such evidence might be the most reliable evidence that could be obtained and introduced in some types of proceeding.

Secondly a similarity can be shown to the search and seizure and self-incrimination prohibitions of our Constitution although their application to wiretapping was rejected in the 5 to 4 opinion of the United States Supreme Court in *Olmstead* v. *United States, supra*. For those who feel the analogy has merit it should then be pointed out that under proper judicial supervision as outlined herein wiretapping authorization would differ from the process of issuing a warrant for a search and seizure primarily in the aspect of the secrecy of wiretapping as against the element of knowledge that usually exists in such a search and seizure.

The supporters of legislation authorizing wiretapping have suggested that its enactment would effectively put everyone on notice that telephone communications were not necessarily private and therefore would be a warning against making incriminating statements in that type of communication. But notice that you are deprived of a right is a poor substitute for the right self. It might also be pointed out that if the supporters are correct in this view, the potential value of any wiretapping in future investigations will be correspondingly diminished.

It has been argued that we can depend on the Attorney General not to use wiretapping to excess without relying on the courts. In answer, it should be pointed out that if the practice were legal and the evidence obtained thereby admissible, it would be the Attorney General's duty to tap wires whenever he thought that to do so would be effective. He should not therefore, have to guard those whom he should prosecute against his legal attempts to procure evidence against them.

IV. CONCLUSION

The burden of proof in showing the Congress that there is a need for legislation authorizing wiretapping should be borne by those advocating it. Since such legislation would necessarily derogate from the individual's freedom and right of privacy, it should be considered only after a congressional determination that the advantage in safeguarding our national security outweighs the disadvantage to individual rights. If such legislation is then determined necessary, careful thought must be given to minimizing the accompanying impairment of individual privacy and freedom.

Those bills now under consideration by Congress are not acceptable. In their present forms, they fail to contain even the following minimum safeguards: (1) Supervision by a court upon written showings by the Government; (2) prohibition of unauthorized wiretapping together with clarification of the Federal-State relationship on the subject; (3) limitation of scope to specified crimes regarding national security; (4) provisions to assure security of the material obtained; (5) limitation of authorization to the FBI; (6) limitation of the duration of both the act itself and the periods of each judicial authorization; and (7) prohibition against the use of evidence obtained prior to the effective date of the act.

In consequence, this committee opposes the proposed legislation and respectfully recommends that the board of managers adopt this report as the report of the Chicago Bar Association and take whatever further action relative thereto it deems advisable.

Respectfully submitted.

THE COMMITTEE ON CIVIL RIGHTS.

Editors Urge Action; National Support of Statehood for Both Hawaii and Alaska Shown in Newspaper Comment From Every State in the Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON

DELEGATE FROM HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1954

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, editorial comment appearing in the daily press in all parts of the country since the start of the present session of Congress shows statehood for both Hawaii and Alaska is strongly supported by the overwhelming majority of the newspapers of the country. This is demonstrated by excerpts from a portion of editorials appearing this year as follows:

ALABAMA

Birmingham (Ala.) Post-Herald, January 27, 1954:

> Ever since the question of statehood for Alaska and Hawaii became matters of national interest, we have advocated that they both be admitted to the union at the same time.

Birmingham (Ala.) Post-Herald, January 30, 1954:

> What they all add up to is that the loyal Americans in Alaska and Hawaii deserve the full citizenship that only statehood can give them, and that it is high time it was granted.

---

[1] Presently many State and local officials are engaged in wiretapping under State authorization. New York is an example of such a State.

Selma (Ala.) Times-Journal, January 7, 1954:

Faith in the democratic process will go up a notch when there is an end to the obstructionism that has plagued this worthy legislation so long.

ARIZONA

Flagstaff (Ariz.) Sun, January 26, 1954:

Sordid maneuvering for personal and political advantage at the expense of the people of potential States—and the larger national interest—deserves the condemnation of all good citizens.

Nogales (Ariz.) Herald, March 23, 1954:

To any outsider measuring this whole performance as a test of the wisdom and fairness and generous spirit which are supposed to mark a free people, this statehood tangle must seem a shabby show.

Nogales (Ariz.) Herald, January 2, 1954:

Admission to full participation in the affairs of this Republic should not be a political football.

ARKANSAS

Texarkana (Ark.) News-Digest, March 25, 1954:

The second session of the 83d Congress has anything but distinguished itself thus far. Admission bills for the States No. 49 and No. 50 would brighten a dull record.

Eldorado (Ark.) News, January 27, 1954:

Nevertheless, sometimes a nation must be thankful for partial progress, however motivated. It looked this year as if Hawaii would gain statehood, and that was no small thing.

Searcy (Ark.) Citizen, February 3, 1954:

All of these things make it appear to us that Alaska is equally if not more necessary to the American State system than is Hawaii, and therefore we feel that the United States Senate should pass enabling acts for both Hawaii and Alaska this year.

Texarkana (Ark.) News-Digest, April 2, 1954:

It should be a pleasure for mainland citizens to welcome two new States into the Union, with constitutions approved by Congress and with a guaranty that a republican system of government will be preserved.

CALIFORNIA

Los Angeles (Calif.) Times, March 19, 1954:

Hawaii wants full State status and is entitled to it.

San Francisco (Calif.) Chronicle, March 30, 1954:

We are encouraged by Senator KNOWLAND'S prediction that the statehood bill will win nevertheless. Only by a vote to admit the Territories can the Senate escape the charge of playing politics with the rights to self-government of several hundred thousand people who are just as much Americans as any of us.

North Hollywood (Calif.) Valley Times, March 24, 1954:

The percentage of Hawaiian residents who are native-born citizens is larger than is the comparable ratio in New York State. And the score as regards unchallengeable loyalty is equally favorable for the Territory bidding for the 49th State position. That is why somebody has remarked that challenging Hawaii on racial, or composition-of-population, basis amounts to an expression of lack of confidence in the operation of our democratic order, lack of confidence in our system's ability to operate successfully when mixtures are involved, mixtures as regards races and political backgrounds of our populations.

San Francisco (Calif.) News, April 2, 1954:

We canont believe the President's misgivings about Alaska are strong enough to permit this injustice to be perpetrated in his name and in the name of the party he heads.

Perhaps, then, a word from the President would be enough to assure statehood for Hawaii and Alaska. We hope it will come.

COLORADO

Boulder (Colo.) Camera, January 20, 1954:

There is no better time than right now to get the statehood issue on the floor and passed—for both Alaska and Hawaii.

Pueblo (Colo.) Star-Journal, January 18, 1954:

We have supported the statehood for Hawaii in the past when the Democrats were in control of Congress and we are restating our position today.

Denver (Colo.) Rocky Mountain News, April 3, 1954:

Statehood for Hawaii and Alaska is involved in partisan politics to a degree that may defeat this historic legislation unless strong statesmanship is demonstrated in Washington.

CONNECTICUT

Waterbury, Conn., March 26, 1954:

Historically our Territories have grown into States. Residents of these two have long expected to achieve that status. It is their right.

Stamford (Conn.) Advocate, April 2, 1954:

Hawaii has been ready for statehood for a number of years. Economically the islands are more than capable of supporting all the trappings of a State government. The population though mixed has been stable and politically mature. President Eisenhower has urged statehood for Hawaii from the beginning of his political campaigning.

Norwich (Conn.) Bulletin, March 19, 1954:

Certainly admission to statehood isn't supposed to be determined by politics, regardless of the fact that it often may be, and right now it isn't the qualifications of either that are getting consideration.

DELAWARE

Wilmington (Del.) News, March 6, 1954:

Few politicians you can buttonhole will say that statehood for Hawaii and Alaska isn't a good and proper thing—no matter what the man may be thinking privately. We believe that the issues have been argued to the finish and we do not see any real case against granting statehood status.

Wilmington (Del.) Journal Every Evening, April 3, 1954:

We are glad to note, however, that Delaware's Senators FREAR and WILLIAMS both voted for the (statehood) measure.

FLORIDA

Tampa (Fla.) Tribune, March 13, 1954:

Admission of the two Territories will be a credit to both political parties. It is not only right and just as a matter of national policy, but in view of the sorry effects of colonialism in other parts of the world it also has world implications.

Daytona Beach Evening News, April 5, 1954:

Opposing statehood for both or either is harmful because the position of the United States would be greatly strengthened by giving both full status in our family of States.

Fort Lauderdale (Fla.) News and Sentinel, March 25, 1954:

To any outsider measuring this whole performance as a test of the wisdom and fairness and generous spirit which are supposed to mark a free people, this statehood tangle must seem a shabby show.

GEORGIA

Columbus (Ga.) Enquirer, January 29, 1954:

It appears that the time has arrived for Congress to give its full and complete approval to the proposal to add another star to the American flag as a symbol of Hawaiian statehood.

Albany (Ga.) Herald, January 21, 1954:

Both Alaska and Hawaii have long since made out valid cases. From the political, economic, and military viewpoint, these Territories are—and have been for a decade—fully qualified for both the benefits as well as the responsibilities of statehood.

Augusta (Ga.) Chronicle, February 6, 1954:

Partisan politics has no place in the question of statehood for a Territory. If Hawaii has the qualifications required and is prepared to assume the responsibilities of statehood, then admit the Territory as a bona fide State.

Macon (Ga.) News, January 21, 1954:

In our view, both Hawaii and Alaska deserve statehood status.

IDAHO

Boise (Idaho) Morning Statesman, April 3, 1954:

Admission of either of these Territories as a State will be a significant step. It will mark the extension of the Union, for the first time, beyond the contiguous continental land mass lying between the Mexican and Canadian borders.

Moscow (Idaho) Idahonian, March 20, 1954:

To any outsider measuring this whole performance as a test of the wisdom and fairness and generous spirit which are supposed to mark a free people, this statehood tangle must seem a shabby show.

Twin Falls (Idaho) News, January 31, 1954:

But even so, a nation sometimes must be thankful for partial progress, however motivated. It looked this year as if Hawaii would gain statehood, and that would be no small achievement.

ILLINOIS

Joliet (Ill.) Herald-News, March 30, 1954:

Delay is being given the proposal for Hawaiian statehood. The parliamentary tricks being used successfully by opponents of statehood to frustrate the residents of Hawaii are disillusioning and distasteful to most Americans.

Moline (Ill.) Dispatch, March 24, 1954:

It is unfortunate that the Communist bogeyman has been invoked to further becloud the issue of granting statehood to Hawaii and Alaska.

Macomb (Ill.) Times, January 21, 1954:

This session of Congress convening next week should approve Hawaiian statehood and Alaskan statehood in America's own enlightened self-interest.

Kewanee (Ill.) Star-Courier, March 24, 1954:

The citizens of both Territories have been given the runaround too many times.

INDIANA

Evansville (Ind.) Press, March 22, 1954:

But there are enough votes, from both parties, to pass both Hawaii and Alaska. Political realism as well as justice admits no other course than to concede this fact and get the matter settled.

Indianapolis (Ind.) Times, March 17, 1954:

They are not willing to sell their precious right to full citizenship for the price of a tax cut—and it would be an insult for Congress to ask them to do so.

Decatur (Ind.) Democrat, March 15, 1954:

Both sides in the statehood maneuver should move to admit the two Territories at the same time. We can change the stars in the flag by 2 just as easy as adding only 1.

IOWA

Decorah (Iowa) Public Opinion, January 18, 1954:

Granted that the ILWU is an unwholesome force; but that is hardly good reason for rejecting Hawaii for statehood.

Nevada (Iowa) Journal, March 18, 1954:

Some months ago, speaking of statehood for Alaska as well as Hawaii, we said, "Let's make it 50." Senate action in voting to combine statehood measures for the two Territories is, we can hope, an echo of this sentiment and a forecast of their induction into the Union.

Mason City (Iowa) Globe-Gazette, March 23, 1954:

The citizens of both Territories have been given the runaround too many times.

Sioux City (Iowa) Journal-Tribune, March 12, 1954:

So long as we are going to open up the country for expansion, we'd just as soon see Congress vote to take both Hawaii and Alaska in. Both have things we can use as a Nation and both have fine people, too. Seems to us the Nation can't lose by choosing both.

KANSAS

Lawrence (Kans.) University Kansas, March 15, 1954:

Surely if residents of these two Territories must now pay United States taxes they may as well get all the benefits of our Nation and gain a voice in United States affairs. After all, persons born in these two Territories automatically become United States citizens, but they cannot vote for Presidents, Congressmen, etc.

Fort Scott (Kans.) Tribune-Monitor, February 4, 1954:

This rather sordid maneuvering for personal advantage at the expense of the peoples of potential States—and the larger national interest—deserves the condemnation of DWORSHAK's fellow Republicans.

Liberal (Kans.) Southwest Times, March 16, 1954:

There is a historical precedent for pairing States. During the formative stage of the Republic the States were admitted by pairs to maintain a political balance between the slavery and antislavery factions in Congress.

KENTUCKY

Louisville (Ky.) Courier-Journal, March 14, 1954:

Both Hawaii and Alaska are qualified for statehood and deserve it as a matter of democratic right. Their admission to the Union in 1954 would be added and timely proof of American faith in democracy and in the principles of self-government.

Covington (Ky.) Enquirer, March 10, 1954:

After years of repeated investigations, mostly unnecessary, Congress again is debating the question of statehood for Hawaii. Unless petty politics interferes, Hawaii should make the grade at this session. It is ready for statehood in every respect.

Covington (Ky.) Post, March 6, 1954:

Friends of Hawaii have ample evidence to refute Mr. EASTLAND's Red bogey. ,

LOUISIANA

Monroe (La.) News-Digest, March 12, 1954:

There never has been any sound reason, across the past 3 or 4 years, that both Hawaii and Alaska should not have been admitted as new States in the Union.

Alexandria (La.) Town Talk, February 2, 1954:

Nevertheless, sometimes a nation must be thankful for partial progress, however motivated. It looked this year as if Hawaii would gain statehood, and that was no small thing.

Lake Charles (La.) American Press, March 20, 1954:

To any outsider measuring this whole performance as a test of the wisdom and fairness and generous spirit which are supposed to make a free people, this statehood tangle must seem a shabby show.

MAINE

Portland (Maine) Press-Herald, April 6, 1954:

Whether or not Alaska and Hawaii are voted statehood this year, the United States Senate, including MARGARET SMITH and FREDERICK PAYNE, of Maine, acquitted itself nobly by voting favorably, thus lending integrity to the Republican platform.

Portland (Maine) Express, February 16, 1954:

We suggest only that all these reports, if laid end to end, ought to pretty conclusively prove that the good Americans of the two Territories deserve to be granted the complete citizenship that would come with statehood.

Waterville (Maine) Sentinel, April 1, 1954:

To any outsider measuring this whole performance as a test of the wisdom and fairness and generous spirit which are supposed to mark a free people, this statehood tangle must seem a shabby show.

MARYLAND

Hagerstown (Md.) Herald, March 19, 1954:

To any outsider measuring this whole performance as a test of wisdom and fairness and generous spirit which are supposed to mark a free people, this statehood tangle must seem a shabby show.

Salisbury (Md.) Times, February 15, 1954:

Except for complications about buying new flags with 49 stars, there seems to be no good reason why these people shouldn't be brought into the Union. If Texans, Vermonters, Nevadans, and New Yorkers can remain in good standing, Hawaiians should have no trouble whatever.

Baltimore (Md.) Evening Sun, April 2, 1954:

Much will now depend upon the President and his leaders in the House. If they choose to accept Alaska along with Hawaii, the double admission may carry. But if they stand against it, the measure may die in conference.

Cumberland (Md.) Times, March 23, 1954:

During presidential election years there seems to be almost universal support for the idea of granting the two Territories statehood.

MASSACHUSETTS

Springfield (Mass.) Morning Union, April 2, 1954:

The right of Hawaii and Alaska to statehood has long since been demonstrated, and the continued failure of Congress to grant them that right does little credit to Congress.

Boston (Mass.) Herald, April 2, 1954:

The two-in-one statehood bill deserves to pass this year. We hope that the administration will give its blessing to it and provide the margin for certain victory.

Baston (Mass.) Traveler, April 3, 1954:

This would seem like a good time for the President to change his stand on Alaska and to encourage the House to pass the statehood bill as it was passed by the Senate.

MICHIGAN

Detroit (Mich.) News, April 1, 1954:

In welcoming these two great outposts to statehood, all others will feel increased vigor and greater confidence in the American future. It comes at a propitious hour.

Saginaw (Mich.) News, March 12, 1954:

Hawaii has been stalled repeatedly. No justifiable case for rejecting her petition has been made in the last decade.

Detroit (Mich.) Times, March 6, 1954:

It would be good for us all, for America as a whole, to have Hawaii and Alaska in the American union as States.

MINNESOTA

Faribault (Minn.) News, March 10, 1954:

Hawaii as a State can be a lighthouse of freedom and democracy in the Pacific.

Hopkins (Minn.) Review, March 25, 1954:

Neither Hawaii or Alaska deserves to be kept standing by with hats in hand any longer. Both should be given statehood before the session adjourns.

Duluth (Minn.) News Tribune, January 29, 1954:

It would confound quite a few cynics if the two new States were admitted by action of Congress at this session, fulfilling platform pledges and proving to the world that the United States can still make a decision of this kind, even though there is reason to suspect that neither party will be the sole and permanent beneficiary.

MISSISSIPPI

Greenwood (Miss.) Commonwealth, March 27, 1954:

Quincy had not objected to the earlier admission of Vermont, Kentucky, Tennessee, and Ohio, presumably because these touched the boundaries of the Original Thirteen or of land claimed by them. Louisiana marked a new departure, just as do Hawaii and Alaska. Nowadays all would call Quincy wrong. Perhaps some day we shall feel the same way about the opponents of today's applications for admission.

MISSOURI

Caruthersville (Mo.) Democrat-Argus, January 22, 1954:

Probably politics has entered into the matter of admission of States into the Union in our Nation's past history, but we daresay there has never been a more glaring example of it.

Jefferson City (Mo.) Capital News, January 26, 1954:

Either the people of Alaska and the people of Hawaii are entitled to right of legislating about their own affairs or they are not. On the whole, the reasons for granting them statehood appear stronger than those for withholding it.

Kansas City (Mo.) Times, April 3, 1954:

The only just course for the Rules Committee is to let the House membership decide the Hawaiian and Alaskan issues in a floor vote. There is plenty of time for a decision at this session if those who can give the green light will only lay politics aside and do their duty.

St. Louis (Mo.) Post-Dispatch, April 2, 1954:

Admission of Alaska and Hawaii to the Union would be an accomplishment of historic magnitude for the administration over which Mr. Eisenhower presides.

MONTANA

Lewistown (Mont.) News, February 1, 1954:

So let's forget the politics. Let's make 'em both States.

Great Falls (Mont.) Leader, March 13, 1954:

To have them in the Union of States would be good for America as a whole because it would make it stronger both economically and militarily. Our national prosperity would be greatly enhanced and our national security immeasurably improved.

Helena (Mont.) Independent-Record, March 19, 1954:

Actually there is good reason to vote on the two Territories in the Senate at the same time. Both deserve statehood.

NEBRASKA

Omaha (Nebr.) Public Ledger, January 8, 1954:

We do not think anyone objects to the admission of Hawaii * * * but Alaska should have statehood, too.

Lincoln (Nebr.) Evening Journal, February 2, 1954:

The arguments for its admission are as good as they have been all along, and the anticipated welcome to Hawaii will make it less feasible to debar the much closer northern Territory on political grounds.

Lincoln (Nebr.) Star, February 11, 1954:

Statehood, especially for Hawaii, would deal a hard blow to the world's cynical view by America's own rejection of it. It is a case where a deed would speak louder than a million words.

NEVADA

Reno (Nev.) State Journal, January 20, 1954:

It does not seem to make much difference whether Hawaii and Alaska are qualified to become States. The Senate Interior Committee yesterday voted to ask the Senate to approve statehood for both Territories, which is fair enough.

Elko (Nev.) Free Press, March 26, 1953:

The Hawaiian people are ready for statehood. They have requested it innumerable times. They should have it—this year. The Senate's task in the matter is thoroughly clear.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Portsmouth (N. H.) Herald, March 18, 1954:

To any outsider measuring this whole performance as a test of the wisdom and fairness and generous spirit which are supposed to mark a free people, this statehood tangle must seem a shabby show.

NEW JERSEY

Trenton (N. J.) Times, February 4, 1954:

The Senate obviously should pass the statehood measure when it comes up for consideration. And the same goes for Alaska, too.

Newark (N. J.) News, February 8, 1954:

It has for years been the expressed opinion of the News that both these Territories, outposts of the national defense, deserve statehood.

Paterson (N. J.) News, March 11, 1954:

But justice demands that Alaska receive equal and nondiscriminatory consideration with Hawaii. The issue should not be decided on the basis of political advantage.

Camden (N. J.) Courier-Post, April 3, 1954:

Alaska's case for statehood may not be as strong as Hawaii's, but it is still a strong one.

If it is a matter of statehood for both or for neither, we believe most Americans would favor statehood for both.

NEW MEXICO

Albuquerque (N. Mex.) Tribune, February 2, 1954:

What they all add up to is that the loyal Americans in Alaska and Hawaii deserve the full citizenship that only statehood can give them, and that it is high time it was granted.

Albuquerque (N. Mex.) Tribune, March 25, 1954:

Opponents of statehood for Hawaii and Alaska have spent many hours presenting their case in the Senate, but Senator LYNDON JOHNSON, Democrat, of Texas, revealed in one sentence the imposing fakery of the proposal that the two Territories be made "commonwealths" instead of States.

"Other than being deprived of the privilege of voting for President and Vice President and of electing two Senators and Representatives in the House, they would have all the other advantages of statehood," he observed.

Absolutely correct. Up to now, however, that privilege has been regarded by American citizens as a precious and essential one—and we think it will be for a long time to come.

Albuquerque (N. Mex.) Tribune, March 17, 1954:

Among Hawaiians and Alaskans there is no more thought of independence than there is among New Yorkers or Californians. They are as thoroughly American as any State in the Union. It is not a question of whether they shall become States; it is a question of when.

NEW YORK

New York Times, April 1, 1954:

Their admission as States is wholly in accordance with the historic development of our country from the thin fringe of colonies along the Atlantic coast to the continental dimensions it has long since achieved. The people of both Territories—and it is really people that we are talking about—are as much Americans as the people of Iowa or the people of California.

New York Herald Tribune, April 3, 1954:

Given an opportunity to vote, it is reasonable to assume that the House will follow the Senate and grant both Hawaii and Alaska the privileges and obligations of statehood.

Daily News, New York City, April 1, 1954:

After decades of discussion, the time to make the Star-Spangled Banner a 50-star flag seems eminently ripe.

Troy (N. Y.) Record, April 8, 1954:

Hawaii deserves the statehood we have long owed to her and many times promised. That privilege should be extended to her without delay, even at the price of having to take Alaska along with her.

NORTH CAROLINA

Gastonia (N. C.) Gazette, March 20, 1954:

To any outsider measuring this whole performance as a test of the wisdom and fairness and generous spirit which are supposed to mark a free people, this statehood tangle must seem a shabby show.

Greenville (N. C.) Reflector, March 10, 1954:

It is time the Congress considered the matter of statehood for Alaska and for Hawaii on the basis of qualifications rather than on the basis of Democratic or Republican Party affiliation.

Burlington (N. C.) Times-News, March 12, 1954:

As a part of the Union, not a Territory as now, there should come a closer, more cooperative association between the United States and Hawaii with the latter a State.

Wilmington (N. C.) Star, March 12, 1954:

But think of the advantages, especially from the national security viewpoint, of having these Territories in the Union. Both are defense outposts. That position would be strengthened by statehood in that their people would have a closer feeling for the United States. Many of the bureaucratic problems in dealing with them would be relieved or solved. They would gain a voice in national policy.

NORTH DAKOTA

Grand Forks (N. Dak.) Morning Herald, January 23, 1954:

It is rather difficult to understand the appearance of former Gov. Ingram M. Stainback, of Hawaii, before the committee to recommend that the islands be denied statehood at this time.

Minot (N. Dak.) Daily News, March 18, 1954:

If partisan politics are allowed to decide the status of the people who live in these Territories, they are being done a great injustice.

Bismarck (N. Dak.) Tribune, March 25, 1954:

If Alaska and Hawaii are indeed qualified for statehood and desire it, eventually both should receive it. The present mess seems a sorry mess in which fairness and sincerity are lost in an entanglement of extraneous political considerations.

OHIO

Cleveland (Ohio) Plain Dealer, April 6, 1954:

However, both Territories are destined for statehood eventually; it might as well be now.

Columbus (Ohio) Citizen, April 2, 1954:

Perhaps, then, a word from the President would be enough to assure statehood for Hawaii and Alaska. We hope it will come.

Springfield (Ohio) Sun, April 3, 1954:

As Senator CLINTON ANDERSON, of New Mexico, remarks: "All he's got to do is take his foot off Alaska and this bill will pass." It sounds like an easy way to make history, and we hope Mr. Eisenhower will try it.

Columbus (Ohio) State Journal, April 5, 1954:

With both Hawaii and Alaska clamoring for statehood, why should we not consolidate our position by making the Union a constellation of 50 States—or at least admitting Hawaii to make it 49?

OKLAHOMA

Oklahoma City (Okla.) Oklahoman, January 16, 1954:

In total population and in total wealth Hawaii is fully entitled to statehood privileges. And the strategic importance of the islands in case of war is offered as a reason for granting statehood in the Territory.

Broken Arrow (Okla.) Ledger, March 18, 1954:

Let's not disappoint our outland citizens again, on any pretext.

Oklahoma City (Okla.) Oklahoman, March 15, 1954:

And there's ample historical precedent for that. During much of the formative stage of the Republic the States were admitted by pairs to maintain a political balance between the slavery and antislavery factions in Congress.

Frederick (Okla.) Leader, March 19, 1954:

To any outsider measuring this whole performance as a test of the wisdom and fairness and generous spirit which are supposed to mark a free people, this statehood tangle must seem a shabby show.

OREGON

Baker (Oreg.) Democrat-Herald, March 20, 1954:

To any outsider measuring this whole performance as a test of the wisdom and fairness and generous spirit which are supposed to mark a free people, this statehood tangle must seem a shabby show.

La Grande (Oreg.) Observer, January 30, 1954:

Only one comment seems appropriate on the committee's action: It's about time.

Bend (Oreg.) Bulletin, March 26, 1954:

Some of the Members of the United States Senate who are bitterly fighting statehood for Hawaii are using some rather specious arguments to bolster their positions.

Portland (Oreg.) Oregon Journal, February 1, 1954:

We think the answer is yes in both cases. And a better Portland and a better Honolulu will be the consequence.

PENNSYLVANIA

Philadelphia (Pa.) Inquirer, April 3, 1954:

Certainly it is all out of order to use Alaska to block Hawaii, or vice versa. If Hawaii is entitled to statehood, and apparently she is, she should get it.

Easton (Pa.) Herald, March 19, 1954:

Some months ago, speaking of statehood for Alaska as well as Hawaii, we said, "Let's make it 50." Senate action in voting to combine statehood measures for the two Territories is, we can hope, an echo of this sentiment and a forecast of their induction into the Union.

Shamokin (Pa.) News-Dispatch, March 20, 1954:

To any outsider measuring this whole performance as a test of the wisdom and fairness and generous spirit which are supposed to mark a free people, this statehood tangle must seem a shabby show.

RHODE ISLAND

Westerly (R. I.) Sun, March 23, 1954:

To any outsider measuring the whole performance as a test of the wisdom and fairness and generous spirit which are supposed to mark a free people, this statehood tangle must seem a shabby show.

Westerly (R. I.) Sun, March 28, 1954:

It is unfortunate that the Communist bogeyman has been invoked to further becloud the issue of granting statehood to Hawaii and Alaska.

Providence (R. I.) Bulletin, January 26, 1954:

If both Territories are in roughly the same degree of readiness for statehood, Mr. Eisenhower ought to settle for the package deal as gracefully as possible.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Columbia (S. C.) Record, March 25, 1954:

If statehood is to be granted to either—and the Record believes both have earned it—it should be granted to both.

Sumter (S. C.) Item, March 23, 1954:

To any outsider measuring this whole performance as a test of the wisdom and fairness and generous spirit which are supposed to mark a free people, this statehod tangle must seem a shabby show.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Canton (S. Dak.) Sioux Valley News, March 18, 1954:

Midst all the political conniving, double-talk, and parliamentary maneuver in Congress regarding the question of statehood for Hawaii and Alaska, it was exceedingly refreshing to read Senator CASE's comment in his newsletter this week.

Here's what our candid, forthright Senator had to say, after a brief résumé of the uncertain status of statehood bills in the Senate: "Personally, I shall vote for statehood for both Alaska and Hawaii whether the final vote comes on them singly or together."

Millbank (S. Dak.) Herald-Advance, March 18, 1954:

Some months ago, speaking of statehood for Alaska as well as Hawaii, we said, "Let's make it 50."

Madison (S. Dak.) Leader, January 20, 1954:

We do not see why the major party cannot get together on the statehood measures, so that Alaska and Hawaii can both be admitted as sovereign States of the Union.

TENNESSEE

We cannot believe the President's misgivings about Alaska are strong enough to permit this injustice to be perpetrated in his name and in the name of the party he heads.

Knoxville (Tenn.) News-Sentinel, January 29, 1954:

Which comes first is a small matter—especially to people who have waited this long for justice.

Jackson (Tenn.) Sun, January 26, 1954:

Nevertheless, sometimes a nation must be thankful for partial progress, however motivated. It looked this year as if Hawaii would gain statehood, and that was no small thing.

Jackson (Tenn.) Sun, March 18, 1954:

To any outsider measuring this whole performance as a test of the wisdom and fairness and generous spirit which are supposed to mark free people, this statehood tangle must seem a shabby show.

TEXAS

Orange (Tex.) Leader, March 19, 1954:

Commonwealths are a device of empire and no American should want any part of them.

Houston (Tex.) Press, March 22, 1954:

Opponents of statehood for Hawaii and Alaska have spent many hours presenting their case in the Senate, but Senator LYNDON JOHNSON, Democrat, of Texas, revealed in one sentence the imposing fakery of the proposal that the two Territories be made commonwealths instead of States.

"Other than being deprived of the privilege of voting for President and Vice President and of electing two Senators and Representatives in the House, they would have all the other advantages of statehood," he observed.

Absolutely correct. Up to now, however, that privilege has been regarded by American citizens as a precious and essential one—and we think it will be for a long time to come.

Austin (Tex.) Statesman, March 18, 1954:

But aside from the politics of the situation, there is fairness in acting upon the claims of Alaska for recognition if Hawaii is to be admitted, for the one has as much argument in its favor as the other.

Fort Worth (Tex.) Press, March 18, 1954:

It is not a question of whether they shall become States; it is a question of when.

Waco (Tex.) Times-Herald, March 20, 1954:

But aside from the politics of the situation, there is fairness in acting upon the claims of Alaska for recognition if Hawaii is to be admitted, for the one has as much argument in its favor as the other.

UTAH

Provo (Utah) Herald, March 18, 1954:

To any outsider measuring this whole performance as a test of the wisdom and fairness and generous spirit which are supposed to mark a free people, this statehood tangle must seem a shabby show.

Salt Lake City (Utah) Tribune, January 24, 1954:

It remains to be seen whether the committee majority was prompted by the conviction that Alaska is also ready to become a State or is resorting to a familiar legislative trick.

Salt Lake City (Utah) Telegram, March 6, 1954:

Congress is in a position to soften the harm to the country's prestige abroad. Early admission of Hawaii as a State could do much to give the lie to charges of racial bigotry and imperialism upon which Communist propaganda feeds.

Hawaii's grounds for statehood are well known and go far beyond this matter of a propaganda tug-of-war of course. Hawaiian statehood is inevitable. Both parties have promised it. There is no apparent reason for continuing to put it off.

VERMONT

Rutland (Vt.) Herald, April 3, 1954:

Hawaii, with a population of almost 500,000 in 1950 (and probably more now) is economically on a par with many parts of the mainland. It would have more voters than Nevada, Wyoming, Delaware, or Vermont, and almost as many as New Hampshire. There is virtual unanimity on its readiness for statehood—even among those who want Alaska, too.

Island Pond (Vt.) March 19, 1954:

Some months ago, speaking of statehood for Alaska as well as for Hawaii, we said, "Let's make it 50."

VIRGINIA

Danville (Va.) Register, April 2, 1954:

If there is too much communism in Hawaii, as Senator ROBERTSON and others complained, then it is just as dangerous to us as if it existed in the State of Hawaii.

Arlington (Va) Sun, March 18, 1954:

Statehood should have nothing to do with party politics. The question that must be considered is not how the admission of Alaska or Hawaii will affect the makeup of the present Congress, but rather how well the people who live in these Territories will discharge the responsibilities that come with statehood.

Suffolk (Va.) News-Herald, March 18, 1954:

To any outsider measuring this whole performance as a test of the wisdom and fairness and generous spirit which are supposed to mark a free people, this statehood tangle must seem a shabby show.

WASHINGTON

Walla Walla (Wash.) Union-Bulletin, January 23, 1954:

The issues should be judged on their merits alone, and on that basis there can be little question but that both should be granted statehood at the earliest possible date.

Vancouver (Wash.) Columbian and Sun, January 6, 1954:

With the tide of empire ebbing elsewhere in the world, putting Hawaii and Alaska on a par with our present family of States would give Communists fewer stones to hurl at us and our "cruel imperialism."

Seattle (Wash.) Alaska Weekly, March 19, 1954:

So far as it goes, this editorial is a powerful argument for statehood. It is the kind of argument so ably advanced almost daily and in more detail in the Anchorage Times, Alaska's largest newspaper.

Tacoma (Wash.) News-Tribune, March 19, 1954:

It would be well if by that time the obstructionists Senators on both sides can be convinced that it should not be a case of either Hawaii or Alaska, but both—soon.

WEST VIRGINIA

Charleston (W. Va.) Gazette, March 13, 1954:

A survey shows that 81 percent of Americans favor admission of Alaska. An overwhelming majority of Alaskans want it. Statehood would strengthen national security for the United States and greatly increase Alaska's population and the development of her agriculture and industry.

Huntington (W. Va.) News-Digest, April 2, 1954:

It should be a pleasure for mainland citizens to welcome two new States into the Union, with constitutions approved by Congress and with a guaranty that a republican system of government will be preserved.

Charleston (W. Va.) Labor's Daily, April 3, 1954:

Hawaii and Alaska can exist economically as States. Each has a population justifying admission as a State. The Commonwealth status created for Puerto Rico does not meet the realistic needs of their people.

Huntington (W. Va.) News-Digest, March 30, 1954:

Actually there is good reason to vote on the two Territories in the Senate at the same time. Both deserve statehood.

Sutton (W. Va.) March 25, 1954:

It is unfortunate that the Communist bogeyman has been invoked to further becloud the issue of granting statehood to Hawaii and Alaska.

WISCONSIN

Milwaukee (Wis.) Journal, February 3, 1954:

Hawaii's case for statehood is strong. Alaska's case is less strong, but many a State has been accepted with fewer qualifications. The peoples of both Territories deserve equal citizenship with the rest of us. They have earned it.

Janesville (Wis.) Gazette, February 5, 1954:

Because of their distance from continental United States, the two Territories are in the forefront in national defense planning. There are few areas in the world of greater strategic importance to this Nation under present world conditions than the two Territories which are candidates for statehood.

Waukesha (Wis.) Freeman, March 20, 1954:

The importance of granting the people of these two Territories full participation in the affairs of the Nation transcends all minor considerations. If it means that to lump the 2 questions into 1 will bring about statehood for Alaska and Hawaii sooner, we're all for it.

Wausau (Wis.) Record-Herald, March 17, 1954:

The question of statehood for both Hawaii and Alaska should be decided separately and on the basis of merit alone. It's a question in which partisan politics should play no part.

WYOMING

Sheridan (Wyo.) Press, March 17, 1954:

The question of statehood should be bigger and more important than straight party politics.

Rock Springs (Wyo.) Miner, March 21, 1954:

To any outsider measuring this whole performance as a test of the wisdom and fairness and generous spirit which are supposed to mark a free people, this statehood tangle must seem a shabby show.

Casper (Wyo.) Tribune-Herald, March 25, 1954:

Neither Hawaii nor Alaska do, or would be granted freedom if they asked it. They consider themselves a part of the United States. They seek equality within the Union as they are willing to assume their share of responsibility.

Let Us Keep Faith With the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 28, 1954

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am pleased and honored to place in the RECORD an address delivered by the able and distinguished junior Senator from Missouri, the Honorable STUART SYMINGTON, at the annual Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner in the State of Michigan, held on May 1, 1954, at the Masonic Temple in Detroit.

Senator SYMINGTON's review of the record of the present administration states clearly the problems facing the American people in the forthcoming congressional elections. I believe his remarks merit the attention of this House.

LET US KEEP FAITH WITH THE PEOPLE

Mr. Chairman, Governor Williams, and fellow Democrats, I am very glad to be with you this evening. Thank you for asking me.

It is always a pleasure visiting with old friends—and I am especially glad to see your former Senator, Blair Moody.

The same holds true for your Governor, the Honorable Mennen Williams.

We of the Democratic Party are proud of the fact that Governor Williams is the first Democratic Governor ever to serve three terms in the great State of Michigan.

After he is again elected next November, he will be the first Governor of either party ever to serve four terms.

The record of Governor Williams is a record of practical interest in and for all the people, a record also characteristic of those two great working Democrats we gather here to commemorate this evening—Thomas Jefferson and Andrew Jackson.

In their different ways, these two men hammered out the basic difference between the Democratic Party and its opposition.

Some in this country still affirm that the leader of Jefferson's opposition, the founder of Republican doctrine, Alexander Hamilton, was right in believing that if the tubs of the economic royalists were filled at the top, some wealth was bound to trickle over to the people below.

But that was never the belief of either Jefferson or Jackson. They were convinced that if all our people prospered, the economic leaders were bound to prosper also.

Jefferson possibly never heard of the term "mass purchasing power," but over 150 years ago he was working to establish the philosophy of such purchasing power as a foundation stone for our party.

Today the importance of mass purchasing power, the good life for all the people, is an integral part of the plans and policies of the Democratic Party.

I well remember another visit to this great city some 21 years ago. Conditions were far different then than they are today.

I came by train to Detroit from Chicago, and then was stranded.

I had no money and could not cash a check.

The banks were closed. There were long lines of citizens waiting for food.

Those were the days Eddie Cantor well-described, when he said, "Hotel clerks now ask registrants, 'Do you want your room for sleeping or jumping?' "

That visit was during the final days, until last year, of a Republican administration.

Now the Republican Party is back in power—and already we see growing signs that its leaders desire to return to the same old philosophies.

Unemployment grows. Production declines. Businesses fail.

The American people do not want any recurrence of those unfortunate conditions. That is why, next November, they intend to once more place the Congress in the hands of the Democratic Party.

But, my friends, I am not one who thinks the days of the Republican Party are numbered. Along with most Americans, I believe in the two-party system.

Actually, all Democrats should be grateful to our Republican friends for the many opportunities they have given us to serve, especially for those additional opportunities they will be offering us after next November.

As we know, the Republican Party prides itself on being the party of business efficiency. It has cut out all paper work except what is absolutely necessary to conduct our Government.

To that end I have here a special pamphlet recently issued by the Department of Agriculture. Its title is, "Ways to Cook Rabbit."

In my State, the mountaineers would appreciate even more a pamphlet on how to catch rabbits, because under this administration they are getting steadily more scarce.

In fact in the Congress they are becoming more like Republicans. Instead of multiplying, they now divide.

In an effort to prevent the Republican Party disappearing entirely from the scene, some of us have suggested a four-point program, as follows:

Point 1: Every man appointed to high office in this administration should give his word of honor to the President that he will stay on the job at least 6 weeks.

Point 2: The Congress should be kept in a constant uproar. In that way some Republicans might get so confused they would vote for the Eisenhower program.

Point 3: We suggest the Republican Party strike a new two-faced coin at the Treasury commemorating its present farm program. This coin would symbolize that program, which has been well described as one which holds an umbrella over the farmer's head when the sun shines, then takes the umbrella away when its starts to rain.

Point 4: Last year the Republicans cut the Air Force $5 billion. They asserted this was done to obtain a better Air Force.

Some Democrats suggested, Why not cut it $10 billion and have a much better Air Force.

Our suggestion now is, so as to obtain a supreme Air Force, the Republicans should appropriate nothing at all.

Yes, we believe the Republican Party has a great future, provided the voters forget the past.

With more seriousness now, however, may I bring up matters pertaining to these four points.

In order to efficiently handle high office in the Federal Government, one should have experience, plus a high sense of duty. Able public servants are made, not born—and as a former businessman I know there are basic and broad differences between the running of a business and the running of a Government department.

Therefore, as domestic problems continue, and international tension grows, it is a sad commentary on our times to see so many people leaving the Government so they can return to the more pleasant pastime of making money; and this just as they may be getting a real grasp of their job.

As but one illustration of the confusion in the present administration, let's look at Indochina.

We send plane mechanics there at the same time we announce no more peripheral wars—rather a policy of massive retaliation.

Then we send more planes, and fly foreign troops in, and announce we may have to send our own youth to fight in the jungles of Asia.

At this time I do not criticize these policies. But I do say the American people have the right to have them clear.

We are also advised in one of the President's many Commission studies, that a lowering of tariffs will solve many of our economic problems.

In the face of growing unemployment along with shrinking agricultural incomes, however, should not equal emphasis be placed on our economic problems at home?

I believe any tariff changes should be done on a product-by-product basis, with full weight given in each instance to our own prosperity and security.

Every believer in private enterprise wants competition on the basis of relative efficiency, whether between domestic producers, or against foreign producers.

But we want fair competition—not competition controlled by foreign cartels and monopolies, or subsidized by foreign governments.

In any consideration given for further lowering tariffs, we must bargain to obtain what is also right for American farmers, workers, businessmen, and consumers.

Now as to the farm picture.

Without minimizing problems in our industrial areas, it is a fact the three great depressions of this century were farm bred and farm led.

Last January, the President sent a message to the Congress. In that message, he stated, "an unending effort has proceeded in the past 12 months to provide the American farmer his full share of the income produced by a stable, prosperous country."

But note the effects of this unending effort.

The farm parity ratio fell 8 points from the 1952 average, and it has fallen 2 more points since that message.

The personal income of farm owners was $2.4 billion less in 1953 than in 1952.

Nevertheless, the administration's farm program proposes even further cuts in farm income; and the 1955 Republican budget actually asks for a 37-percent reduction in expenditures for flood control and related projects compared with the last Democratic budget.

In placing cold figures beside warm facts, the administration attempts to explain its reversal of campaign promises by asserting this country can no longer afford a fair price support program for the farmer.

During the past 20 years, however, the losses on price support for our six basic crops were less than 1 cent per year per person.

And during the fiscal 1953 alone, our foreign-aid expenditures were 87 times as much as the total cost of the entire price-support program.

The total loss in all farm commodities since the inception of the price-support program over 20 years ago, is less than the money the American taxpayer contributed last year to Indochina alone.

I do not question the need of some foreign aid. But I do question those who are shortsighted and miserly when it comes to recognition of the problems of our own neighbors at home.

People often think of Michigan as a great industrial State.

It is. But it is also a great farm State.

Michigan is in the first 10 in the production of corn, wheat, oats, rye, hay, and dairy products. It is third in sugar beets. It is among the first four States in apples, peaches, pears, and grapes.

Our negotiators with other foreign countries should work for the elimination of foreign trade restrictions against American goods, along with the absorption of part of our agricultural surpluses.

We will gain more, not only in strength at home, but also in good will and respect from others, if we emphasize that our international trade relationships must be on the basis of a two-way street.

So the farmers also have a growing interest in what might well be characterized as this trend backward.

Have you noticed recent statements of this administration? First they deny there is any recession. Later on, often in the same speech, they explain how they plan to get out of the one we are in.

Now let us talk about national defense, a subject I have been closely connected with for the past 13 years.

In this field, the paradox of the administration's position is complete.

Over 5 years ago the greatest prophet of our times, Winston Churchill, made the following statement:

"What will happen when the Communists get the atomic bomb themselves and have accumulated a large store? You can judge yourselves what will happen then by what is happening now. If these things are done in the green wood, what will be done in the dry? If they can continue month after month disturbing and tormenting the world, trusting to our Christian and altruistic inhibitions against using this strange new power against them, what will they do when they themselves have large quantities of atomic bombs? No one in his senses can believe that we have a limitless period of time before us."

Now the Soviets not only have the atomic bomb, but also the hydrogen bomb—and what is equally important, the long range bombers and submarines necessary to deliver it.

The period of total danger is therefore with us.

A hydrogen-bomb attack would kill millions of people. It should be of some interest to all here tonight to know that many military experts believe Detroit is the prime strategic target.

Now let's see what the administration is doing about it.

Last year the administration cut the Air Force budget over $5 billion, from $16.7 billion to $11.4 billion.

This year their supersalesmen went to work—in the press, on radio, and above all, on television.

They ballyhooed the idea that this year great emphasis would be on airpower.

How many citizens know that despite that ballyhoo, today the Republican administration is recommending fewer planes and fewer trained people for the Air Force than it did last year; and this after the previous $5 billion cut?

This country today is relatively weaker—"relatively" is the important word—against the military might of Soviet Russia than it has ever been against any possible enemy in the history of our country.

What is the answer to this Republican administration to that fact?

The answer is clear. The administration now recommends further reduction in American airpower, despite the fact that only last year they cut that airpower over $5 billion.

Is not this action a stimulant to the plans of those atheistic Communists, who have often announced their intention to destroy our country and our way of life?

Never forget that as these budget firsters boast about the fact they are increasing our airpower, they are actually boasting about the spending of money which had already been appropriated in previous Democratic administrations.

As they take credit for Democratic appropriations of the past, they further heavily cut airpower appropriations for the future.

In my opinion this policy is not right. Nor is it frank. It may result in the loss of our country.

This Republican policy is the practical recognition of Korea, of Indochina, of Egypt, of Iran, of East Germany; and of our knowledge that the Communists now have the hydrogen bomb.

In our policies we should keep faith with the American people.

The program of the Republican Party differs from what they announced 2 years ago; but the program of the Democratic Party has been maintained, steadfast. Let me prove that to you.

Two years ago I presented to the people of my own State of Missouri, a program, a creed, of and for my party.

May I read it to you. I do so without the change of a single word.

We Democrats, we Americans, are not only characters in the living book of democracy. We are also its authors. And so it falls upon us to decide whether chapters that are to come will tell a story of retreat, or of continued advance.

We Democrats believe in an America where factory workers are not discarded after they reach their prime—where there is no endless chain of poverty from generation to generation—where impoverished farmers, and farm workers, do not become homeless wanderers—where monopoly does not make youth a beggar for a job.

We Democrats believe in an America whose rivers and valleys and lakes and hills—the wealth of our soil and our waters—are protected and developed as the rightful heritage of all the people, resulting in a sound and prosperous economy.

We Democrats believe in an America that provides educational opportunity for all its people.

We Democrats believe in an America where trade and industry bring the necessities and conveniences of living within the means of an ever-growing number; where enterprise and work bring proper rewards; where no businessman can be stifled by the harsh hand of monopoly; where the legitimate profits of legitimate business are the fair rewards of every businessman.

We Democrats believe in an America with peace in the ranks of labor—where working people can take their proper place at the council table; an America where the dignity and security of the working man and woman are fortified by the safeguards of a fair law.

We Democrats believe in an America where those who have reached the evening of life can live out their years in peace; where pensions and insurance for the aged shall be forthcoming as a matter of right to those who, through a long life of labor, have served their families and their Nation well.

We Democrats believe in an America devoted to freedom and unified by tolerance and religious faith—a people consecrated to peace, but confident in their strength, because body and spirit are secure and unafraid.

We Democrats believe in an America which has the courage to lead in a troubled world. We believe that in world affairs we must have strong policies, policies which shape events, rather than having events shape our policies.

We cannot, we will not accept any doctrine that we are in the grip of forces we cannot control.

With God's help, a dynamic America which follows this creed will never succumb to the evil night of Communist aggression.

Faith of the people in their Government is but faith in themselves—and that faith is the best guaranty of security, as well as the best guaranty of national and individual freedom.

The Democratic Party is the party of all America. It is not the tool of any one section, any one class, any one group. Its doors are open to all who believe in a country whose future is unlimited.

We Democrats seek to spread—not quarantine—prosperity.

Our goal is peace in the world—not strife at home.

Our aim is the preservation of our liberties.

The American people will judge our success by our performance. And when they examine the record—a record which we proudly offer for their inspection—they can come to only one conclusion.

They will march with the Democratic Party to victory—victory in November and victory for the years to come.

That is what America means to you. That is what it means to me.

Let us have more of the truth, so we will know how to steer the course.

Then let us move forward, under God, in our search for that better life which can only be realized by people who will do whatever is necessary to remain free.

Polish Constitution Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD W. HOFFMAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1954

Mr. HOFFMAN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the year 1954 marks the 165th anniversary of the adoption of the Constitution of the United States. That initial phrase, "We, the people of the United States of America," formally attested to the fact that the power to govern is found in the people, and that there is no moral or natural right to govern without the consent of the governed. From the inception of its history as a nation, this country formally recognized that the rights of the people did not derive from the Government, but from the fact that each individual is a freeborn son of God.

Two years later, on May 3, 1791, these same fundamental principles were recognized by the Government of Poland, with the adoption of the Polish Constitution.

Through the goodness of God and the natural protection of two vast oceans, the United States of America had a long period of relative peace, during which the ideals of liberty, responsibility, and the rights of man had an opportunity to mature and to grow strong. The freedom-loving people of Poland, however, shortly after the adoption of their constitution, fell under the domination of their powerful neighbors. From that day until this, with the exception of the brief period between two World Wars, the principles of liberty and the right of man have been for the Polish people not an actuality, but a beacon light which has been dimmed, but not obscured, by repression and tyranny.

It is to the everlasting glory of the people of Poland that, deprived of existence as a nation, they have remained for the free world a symbol of the spirit of democracy. That the liberty of God's children will some day again be theirs, is as sure as is the eventual triumph of the principles of freedom and goodness over the tyranny and evil which are abroad in the world today. In the hope that this day of triumph will soon come for our friends in Poland, let us today pledge our renewed efforts and fervent prayers.

Ireland: Strange Aloofness From World Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDGAR A. JONAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1954

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, in view of the mounting heat of the so-called cold war between the Iron Curtain nations and the nations of the free world, and in view of the situation existing with respect to the efforts of Western diplomats to resolve the problems presented by the hot war in Indochina and the stalemate in Korea, one frequently hears a question posed concerning the Irish position on the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, the European Defense Community, and the possibility of Irish participation in the event of a general war.

This question is only natural, because of the traditional ability of all Irishmen to hold up their end in any fight, whether large or small, and because of the unsettled state of affairs with regard to the partition of Ireland. The latter problem, obviously, is important as affecting the solidarity of the peoples hitherto encompassed by the British Empire, should a third worldwide war break out.

Because I think it worth while, Mr. Speaker, for all Members of Congress to be informed on the subject of Ireland's current foreign policy, under unanimous consent I include in the RECORD an interview with Mr. Eamon De Valera, Prime Minister of Eire, published April 26 in the Chicago American:

IRELAND: STRANGE ALOOFNESS FROM WORLD CRISIS

(By Lee Ettelson)

DUBLIN, April 26.—An astonishing air of aloofness hovers over Ireland. It is a sort of mental isolation which is not readily understood.

In eight other countries recently visited, common interests in the face of Russia, the need for common defense, and the problems related to such problems are constantly in the foreground. Here one hears only of internal affairs—unification of Ireland, education in the Irish language, problems of emigration and agriculture are the topics on everyone's mind and tongue.

1916 UPRISING RECALLED

And, as often in our Southern States today where the Civil War is still being "fought," here the Easter rising of 1916 is current magazine material.

So we asked the Taoiseach (pronounced theeshuck), American-born Mr. Eamon De

Valera if he thought in the awful event of another war Ireland would remain neutral again and if she could maintain her neutrality.

"Yes," he replied, and added:

"You understand, of course, that we cannot join NATO or an EDC or anything of that nature.

"Such groups are composed of nations that have their independence and wish to retain in.

"We are seeking our independence.

"Our aim is to seek what we have not got.

"Also, the various pacts involved, inherently and explicitly provide that signatories shall respect the territorial integrity of the others. For us to join such a group would mean in effect that we were supporting and protecting Britain's right to hold Ireland's six northeastern counties, which would be altogether contrary to the will of the Irish people.

"Our idea is to get Britain, who in effect occupies the six counties, to restore them to Ireland."

UNIFICATION TOP PROBLEM

Mr. De Valera, who looks extremely well and hale despite his 71 years and strenuous existence (only his eyesight bothers him), pointed out that this unification matter must always be Ireland's greatest preoccupation until it is resolved.

"Unification is still the main political aim of the Irish people and of all political parties."

He was asked:

"If Ireland got her unification would she ever be likely to join the British Commonwealth as a full partner?"

The prime minister looked up from his plain desk—a desk without ornaments and at the moment without a scrap of paper on it—and smiled serenely. He replied:

"There is no disposition ever again to become a part of the British Empire."

It is interesting to note, by the way, that this leader for independence has in his visitors' waiting room three prominently displayed articles:

The American Declaration of Independence, the Constitution of the United States, and a statue of Abraham Lincoln.

AUSTERE OFFICE

His own office is almost austere. Aside from a few plain chairs and the old square desk, one sees only the three necessary gadgets: a phone, a dictating machine, and an intercom box.

The prime minister speaks in a slow, rambling but deeply thoughtful manner. Coming back to the unification problem, he said:

"How it can be reached is not so clear as our aim. We try to bring the facts of partition to fair-minded people—people who believe in democracy, in the principles Woodrow Wilson laid down, some of the principles of the Atlantic Charter.

"We feel that when they know the facts they will agree this island of ours is a unity both geographically and nationally, and that to divide it in the interests of political expediency (as was done at the time of partition in 1920) was a crime.

"The Irish people are no more satisfied than would be the British or the French people if their countries were cut up against the will of the majority.

"It is in the interests of all concerned, Britain included, that partition should be ended.

"As to the immediate future, I see nothing I can now point to except to continue to try and impress fair-minded people."

EMIGRATION ISSUE

While unification is a constant matter of discussion both here and in Belfast, where Mr. De Valera's views are not unanimously held at the very least, Ireland has more immediate cares.

Ireland's educational system, incidentally, needs a little explanation for the average American. There are no state schools as such. They are denominational, the local parish priest, Protestant rector, or Jewish rabbi being the manager.

The teachers are trained by the state and paid by the state, but their hiring and firing is solely at the discretion of the managers of the schools.

IRISH COMPULSORY

The state lays down the program and recommends textbooks, but a wide choice is left to the individual managers and teachers. The teaching of Irish is compulsory for half an hour each day. The state also bears the major share of other school expenses, but with the Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish communities responsible for a part.

This system applies to the primary grades. Secondary schools and colleges are in private hands, also entirely denominational.

Securing a secondary education, therefore, requires private resources so that what we call high-school education is not yet freely available, much less mandatory. Nearly half the children between 14 and 16 do, however, continue their formal education either part-time or whole time in secondary or vocational schools.

But the use of Irish in the schools is a must and all parties are in agreement as to its necessity.

OFFICIAL VIEW

This is confusing to non-Irish, as the old Gaelic tongue has not been generally used for about a century in the eastern counties, although in a few of the western counties it is still widely spoken.

Let the Prime Minister speak his official view:

"The Irish language is our principal national characteristic. It is one of the marks that distinguishes us as a separate nation. The movement to revive it has popular approval but it is difficult to get people who are accustomed to one language to turn to speaking another.

"It is a new language to a large number of people. There would have been no difficulty when I was young in making the change because Irish was spoken by the majority of the older people, for example, it was so in my neighborhood in Limerick. We will catch up in another generation."

ENGLISH IN DAIL

"We would like to have Irish become the everyday language, the language spoken in the home and on the street. This would not mean English would not be our second language. It is one of the great languages of the modern world and would be to us a second language, as for example the case of the Danes or the Swedes. Many people know two or more languages in this way for instance in Switzerland where people speak French and Italian or Italian and German, etc."

Questioned as to the use of Irish in the Dail, Mr. De Valera said:

"Not everyone even in the Dail speaks Irish so that most of the proceedings are in English, but the number of Irish speaking members and particularly the number who understand it is growing. It is just a matter of time and perseverance."

The Taoiseach was asked to comment on the recent hydrogen bomb disclosures. He expressed the hope of all mankind when he said:

"The effect of this bomb may be to outlaw war. It is less likely, at least, that those who have it will become involved in war."

Mr. De Valera declined to discuss Paffaire McCarthy. He said:

"I never interfere with the politics of other countries.

"I hope to see America again, however. I was invited to review the St. Patrick's Day parade in New York this year but I could not get away. I hope to another year."

POLITICAL BRIDGE

One reason for not getting away is the coming Dail elections next month. The Fianna Fail (the De Valera party) has managed to get a near majority in the Dail (pronounced Daw-l) in several elections.

The Prime Minister is hopeful to repeat that again this year and that "sense and reason will prevail."

This remark is prompted by the fact that in a prior election, when the Fianna Fail did not get a clear majority but was still the biggest party by far, the parties both right and left made a coalition of "interparty" government. This, as one commentator put it, was building a bridge of the right and left, over Mr. De Valera's head.

This situation was about what would have happened if Henry Wallace's left-wing Progressives had combined with the GOP to oust the Democrats.

One thing is certain: Whatever party wins, Irish scenery, quiet, and charm will still draw the tourists.

Soil Conservation and Watershed Programs

SPEECH

OF

HON. THOMAS G. ABERNETHY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 11, 1954

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 6788) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with States and local agencies in the planning and carrying out of works of improvement for soil conservation, and for other purposes.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY].

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, I have no doubt but that our friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania who just preceded me, is very earnest about the views he has expressed. However, I think it should be pointed out and emphasis should be laid upon the fact that, as I am informed, they are not actually his views but are those of the Army engineers. He stated that they were contained in a message from the Department of Defense, but of course they actually came from the War Department engineers, who we are told oppose this legislation.

In the opening of his remarks the gentleman from Pennsylvania also stated that he had searched in vain through the report for recommendations from various departments of the Government. He is correct in saying there is nothing in the report from the various agencies to which he referred. However, in all deference to the heads of these agencies, they are simply the subordinates and actually the employees of the Chief Executive of the United States. The President certainly does not have to call upon and secure from his subordinates a favorable report before he asks for legislation. Nor must the Congress have such in order to pass it. Why should these agency heads be heard to complain, if they have any complaint? The President himself sought this legislation. I do not always agree with the President, but in this instance I certainly do. Furthermore I do not feel that the views of the agencies mentioned by my friend are of material consequence. Whatever they are, there is no good reason why they should be included in the report.

Reference was also made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania to the fact that there was nothing in the record or report from Mr. Dodge of the Bureau of the Budget. I think that is what he said. I do not want to misquote him. May I call attention to the fact that there is a statement in the report from Mr. Rowland Hughes, the Acting Director of the Budget Bureau. This was sent down to us on August 31, 1953, exactly 31 days following the message of the President of the United States requesting this legislation. Both communications are found on pages 8, 9, 10, and 11 of the report. In the very last paragraph of the letter from Mr. Hughes I find these words:

> In our judgment the purposes of H. R. 6788 would be consistent with the view of the President that "we should move ahead in the construction of works of improvement and the installation of land-treatment measures as rapidly as possible consistent with a sound overall fiscal program."

The Acting Director of the Budget, Mr. Hughes, says that the bill now before us is in keeping with what the Chief Executive has requested.

This bill does not create any new agency. It simply expands a type of work which has been carried in a very limited fashion and under other authority for a very long time.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ABERNETHY. I yield.

Mr. HORAN. The Department of Agriculture has the responsibility for most of our major watersheds. This is a watershed improvement and protection and water detention bill. With the forest fires right now in Colorado, in the Colorado watershed we need these upstream detention basins.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I thank the gentleman. The facts are that this bill permits the Soil Conservation Service of the Department of Agriculture in the administration of these programs to just put more of them into operation and to expand this most beneficial and highly desirable work to all sections and regions of the United States which are in dire need of it.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ABERNETHY. I yield.

Mr. HOEVEN. Is it not true that the jurisdiction so far as this bill is concerned is completely within the Department of Agriculture, and that the Bureau of Reclamation or the Department of the Army engineers have absolutely nothing to do with it?

Mr. ABERNETHY. Of course, the gentleman is correct. If I had to wait on the Bureau of Reclamation, and it renders a good service in its field of operation, or if I had to wait on the Army engineers, and they render a good service, too, for the type of program which this bill authorizes, then my people would never live to see the day when we would get what we need in the way of water control and water conservation. In their own spheres of operation they render good service and do a good job but we also need the type of service this bill would make available, something which the Army engineers and other agencies do not now provide.

(Mr. ABERNETHY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Calumet-Sag: A National Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 26, 1954

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am calling attention to an editorial in the May 1954 issue of the Marine News on the formation of the Cal-Sag Waterways Development Committee, and the vital importance to the Nation of the Calumet-Sag link in the Nation's lakes-to-gulf water transportation system.

On February 17, 1954, when the preliminary steps were being taken in the formation of the Cal-Sag Waterways Development Committee, I said in my remarks in the House under a special order:

> Mr. Speaker, today there is being held in the city of New Orleans a meeting of dynamic leaders of the Mississippi Valley who vision the opening of new worlds of wealth and opportunity in the development of a great system of inland waterways.
>
> In the immediate start in digging the Calumet-Sag project these men of large interests and long industrial training see first, the surest means of meeting the economic pains of readjustment; second, multiplying the industries and the employment of inland America while adding to the business volume of the seaports; and third, in the event of war furnishing easily protected facilities for the transportation of men and material.

From this historic gathering in New Orleans eventually came the Cal-Sag Waterways Development Committee, in which men of large stature and of tremendous driving power are uniting their efforts to accomplish the prompt building of the long-needed link to a system of inland waterways so imperative to the prosperity in peace and security in war of our country. The editorial in the Marine News, one of the world's leading waterways publications, stresses that Calumet-Sag is not a local issue but a national issue.

With the national interest at stake, and support coming from both parties and all sections of the country, there should be no further delay in appropriating funds for the Calumet-Sag development long since authorized by Congress after exhaustive study and consideration.

The Nation and the times demand Calumet-Sag. Further delay will be inexcusable. The Marine News editorial pinpoints the issue.

Service Attractiveness Progresses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 29, 1954

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, the first concrete steps to restore vital military benefits have been taken this year by the House Military Appropriations Committee, which has eliminated some of the more objectionable riders that had previously dampened the spirits of career personnel. The tide has been turned in this session of Congress, and many of us are looking for additional action on the part of Congress that will show our fighting men and women that we know and appreciate the problems of career military service.

An informative article on this problem appeared recently in the March-April issue of the Retired Officer. I extend it in the Appendix of the RECORD:

> SERVICE ATTRACTIVENESS PROGRESS
>
> More than a year has passed since the deterioration in service attractiveness became so acute that the Joint Chiefs of Staff, absorbed as they are with vital defense planning, reported the danger to the Secretary of Defense. The President expressed concern about this April 30, 1953, when he informed the Congress that he had directed the Secretary to study the problem. Thereafter, beginning with the Womble committee, the matter has been under study.
>
> At this writing (late March) no specific recommendations have been made, but it appears they will be forthcoming soon. We are confident that this time something tangible will be done.
>
> It has been reported that Defense Secretary Wilson has made a detailed report to the President covering what must be done to raise attractiveness of the military services. It appears that the White House will support this action, including consideration of a necessary pay increase, other compensating benefits, and increased medical care for dependents. An improved career plan for warrant officers is now under active consideration in Congress.
>
> Assistant Secretary of Defense Hannah recently informed the House Appropriations Committee that the most important service needs include (1) improvement in housing, (2) medical care for dependents, (3) protection of commissaries and post exchanges, (4) protection of retirement rights, and (5) adequate promotion opportunities.
>
> Representative DEWEY SHORT, Republican, Missouri, chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, recently stated, "We are playing with dynamite by constantly whittling away" benefits from those charged with the security of the Nation. He told members of the committee that they must act to assure service personnel "that we will keep faith with them to the best of our ability."
>
> Speaking of the many young men who are leaving the service because of uncertainty for the future, Mr. SHORT said that "if we continue to play havoc with young officers who want to be a part of the hard corps,"

the country will be hard pressed to find top quality military leaders.

Secretary Wilson has informed the President that he has asked the Hook Commission to review its 1949 military pay proposals in the light of current conditions. Since the original recommendations of the Commission, conservative as they were, were reduced by the Congress in enacting the Career Compensation Act of 1949, and since the cost of living has risen 13 percentage points since 1949 while military pay has been increased much less than half that much (see opposite page), there appears little doubt that the Commission will recommend an increase.

These are all hopeful signs. We realize that patience is a virtue, but that it can be tried almost to the breaking point. In our various optimistic observations that something will be done, we realized that these things take time. They must not, however, take too much time.

We are confident that if concrete proposals for needed legislation are submitted to Congress, Congress will act affirmatively and swiftly to improve service conditions. That Congress is aware of the necessity for action is clear from the enactment of the Federal Employees Retirement Benefits Act, improving legislative employees' benefits; and its consideration of increased pay for classified, postal, congressional and judicial pay. But time marches on and this session of Congress will soon come to an end. Action is needed and it is needed now.

The St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. D. ROOSEVELT, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1954

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, within a matter of a few days, the House will consider S. 2150, a bill to authorize United States participation in the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway.

A great deal of misinformation has been circulated by the opponents of the seaway, including material calculated to create the impression that the people of the city of New York are opposed to this project. The people of the city of New York, Mr. Speaker, have always considered of paramount importance the welfare of the country, the strengthening of its effort for national defense, and all other measures calculated to promote economic progress.

Six months ago the mayor of New York was overwhelmingly elected to that office by the people of our city. By virtue of this, Mayor Wagner is well qualified to represent the views of the people of the city of New York. Therefore, under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to include the following telegram which I have recently received from Mayor Wagner, and which I understand was addressed also to other members of the New York delegation:

Hon. Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr.,
House of Representatives.

Dear Mr. Congressman: I am taking the liberty of calling your attention to the Wiley bill, passed by the Senate and now pending in the House, authorizing American participation in the St. Lawrence seaway development. As you know, I have long favored this project and it has been a keystone of the Democratic Party program, both State and National, for many years, as an important step in the continuing development of America.

There has been considerable opposition to the seaway—some of it selfish, much of it representing an honest difference of opinion. However, the seaway is going to be built by our great neighbor, Canada, whether we participate or not, so the merits of the seaway need no longer be debated. It is about to become a fact. America, the State of New York, and the city of New York will be in a better position to protect their respective interests if America is a partner in the seaway project, not just a spectator. I strongly urge your affirmative vote on this tremendous national improvement.

Robert F. Wagner,
Mayor of the City of New York.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized book dealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by book dealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the Congressional Record, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

PRINTING DOCUMENTS AND REPORTS

Documents and reports of committees with the evidence and papers submitted therewith, or any part thereof ordered printed by Congress, may be reprinted by the Public Printer on order of any Member of Congress or Delegate, on prepayment of the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 162, p. 1940).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the Record.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Printing and binding for Congress, when recommended to be done by the Committee on Printing of either House, shall be so recommended in a report containing an approximate estimate of the cost thereof, together with a statement from the Public Printer of estimated approximate cost of work previously ordered by Congress within the fiscal year (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 145, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on Printing, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

DISTRIBUTION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

To the Vice President and each Senator 100 copies; to the Secretary and Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, each, 25 copies; to the Secretary, for official use, not to exceed 35 copies; to the Sergeant at Arms, for use on the floor of the Senate, not to exceed 50 copies; to each Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress, 68 copies; to the Clerk, Sergeant at Arms, and Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives, each, 25 copies; to the Clerk, for official use, not to exceed 50 copies; and to the Doorkeeper, for use on the floor of the House of Representatives, not to exceed 75 copies; to the Vice President and each Senator, Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress there shall also be furnished (and shall not be transferable), 3 copies of the daily Record, of which 1 shall be delivered at his residence, 1 at his office, and 1 at the Capitol.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. The money derived from such sales shall be paid into the Treasury and accounted for in his annual report to Congress, and no sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the Congressional Record is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Frank Brodie is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the Record at $1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

E

HON

IN THE

Mr.
I ask u
in the
statem
tion of
Sunday
ballroo
There
ment w
RECORD
"Whe
there is
words of
Adam M
cation t
fight for
sal fight
ideals of
cause th
of this s
ly came
forces o
Polish p
and how
coveted
and opp
Polanc
its early
democra
accepted
equality
the tyra
absoluti
ideas ca
products
This wa
May 179
kind's st
cial equ
a beacon
of letter
loving m
last year
complete
The reac
the cons
and Pol
sidious
despotis
The y
fighting
as well
and a ha
with glo
1918 Pol
tional in
universa
self-dete
Its shor
hopes of
it. But
by a new
ence. T
struck P
first chal
Nazi tyra
up mank
sacrifice

Appendix

Poland's Constitution Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL

OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 4, 1954

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unaimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a brief statement which I made in commemoration of Poland's Constitution Day, on Sunday, May 2, 1954, in the imperial ballroom, Hotel Bradford, Boston, Mass.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"Wherever there is a struggle for freedom there is also a struggle for Poland." These words of the great Polish patriot and writer Adam Mickiewicz have had twofold application throughout Polish history. Poland's fight for liberty has been part of the universal fight for the achievement of the highest ideals of freedom and independence, and because the Poles bore more than their share of this struggle, that heroic country naturally came to be fought over by the powerful forces of reaction. How many times have Polish patriots died in this cause of liberty, and how many times has Poland been the coveted prize between the forces of justice and oppression.

Poland's democratic heritage goes back to its early tradition of social and political democracy. It was a tradition that readily accepted the radical ideas of liberty and equality that began to rouse Europe against the tyrany and oppression of its age of absolutism. Out of the ferment of these ideas came a great document—one of the products of that universal revolutionary age. This was the Constitution of the third of May 1791. It was Poland's offer to mankind's struggle for political freedom and social equality. For generations it serves as a beacon to future Polish leaders and men of letters and as an inspiration to freedom-loving men throughout the world. But the last years of the 18th century witnessed the complete dismemberment of the Polish state. The reactionary forces in Europe referred to the constitution as a "dangerous novelty," and Poland's neighbors saw in her an insidious threat to their own unpopular despotism.

The years of bondage saw Polish patriots fighting in behalf of freedom in other lands as well as in their homeland. The century and a half following the partition were filled with glorious deeds on behalf of liberty. In 1918 Poland's long fought for goal of national independence was achieved. Out of a universal strife for freedom and national self-determination a new Polish state arose. Its short history confirmed the fondest hopes of the men who had helped to found it. But in 1939 the world was torn again by a new struggle for freedom and independence. The holocaust that swept Europe struck Poland first and Poland offered the first challenge to the overwhelming might of Nazi tyranny. Once again Poland had taken up mankind's contest and once again she sacrificed herself in its behalf. Yet, the war which was fought to restore liberty to all nations of the world did not see that goal achieved. Today, Poland is once again the victim of a grinding tryranny whose oppressed people will not acquiesce in despotism, but who continue the tradition that was built by the generations of Polish fighters for freedom, equality and justice.

Today the greatest struggle for freedom of all time is being waged. Poland is a focal part of that struggle. The ruthless methods of oppression of the Kremlin have failed to establish the Communist regime on firm ground. There is continued unrest, sabotage of the industrial program, resistance to collectivization, and opposition to the regime. But these people cannot carry on the fight alone. We have offered asylum to countless Poles on these shores; aware of the true nature of the government we have in several instances closed Polish consulates, and suspended Warsaw government publications in this country. To keep alive the truth and the hope of the Polish people, our Congress established Russia's guilt for the Katyn massacres and is at present investigating the Communist enslavement of the Polish people. Only on Thursday last (April 29) the Senate of the United States passed a resolution, of which I want to read you one paragraph:

"The Senate condemns the refusal of the Soviet Government and of its puppet governments to allow free and fair elections in Poland, Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, Albania, Czechoslovakia, and the Soviet Zone of Germany."

The goals of today's struggle for freedom will not have been achieved so long as liberty and independence are not once again reassured to Poland. And I know that the people of Poland will now as in the past keep faith until that day.

Through her past Poland has become a symbol of all the imperishable universal ideals of freedom and democracy. In observing Polish Constitution Day today with the many people of Polish descent in my own State of Massachusetts, with countless exiles throughout the world, and with the millions suffering in their tortured homeland, we are once again rededicating that symbol and our faith in it.

Poland's Constitution Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES H. DUFF

OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 4, 1954

Mr. DUFF. Mr. President, I have received from John H. Shenkel, chairman of the Americanism committee of the American Legion, a communication with reference to Poland and the anniversary of Poland's constitution. I ask unanimous consent that the communication be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the communication was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The people of Pittsburgh and Allegheny County join with the Polish people in their observance of the 163d anniversary of the Polish constitution of May 3, 1791. On this sad anniversary, sympathy is evoked because Poland today is in forced slavery behind the Iron Curtain and ruled by the leaders of Red fascism and atheistic communism. As early as 1935 Poland could have made a deal with Hitler, to her own advantage, but true to her loyalty to high principles, refused to make such a deal. Hitler, Stalin, Von Ribbentrop, and Molotov became partners in crime and signed the agreement of August 23, 1939, which was the go sign for the brutal attack on Poland, September 1, 1939, and the stab in the back by Soviet Russia on September 17, 1939. A freedom-loving Poland, traditional friend of the United States, was sacrificed.

Molotov made the Soviet attitude plain when he declared at a session of the Soviet Parliament on October 31, 1939: "Two swift blows at Poland, one from the German Army, the other from the Red army, and Poland was no more." While the world was asleep to the menace of atheistic communism, Poland, alone, fought Soviet Russia in 1920. They need us today; we may need their help tomorrow.

Poland with over a thousand glorious years of culture and civilization on the 3d of May 1791 passed the constitution inspired by the ideals of the American Declaration of Independence and the French Declaration of the Rights of Men. It was the first written democratic constitution in Europe, establishing the rights of the common man. Poland, before its partition, was the country of the world with the greatest degree of constitutional, civic, religious, and intellectual liberty and won worldwide recognition as the haven for the oppressed.

In 1430, 200 years before the English Habeas Corpus Act, Poland guaranteed liberty of the person by the act of neminem captivabmus niso jure victim," the memorable law of the inviolability of the individual. This Habeas Corups Act was never violated by Poland. In 1506 Poland added a new article to the fundamental statute: "nihil novi constitui debeat per nos, sine communi consenu conciliarorum et nontiorum terrestium." This statute strengthened and developed the principle that all power must come from the people, and that the people must obey the laws made by themselves through their representatives.

President Washington accepted the news of the Polish constitution with warm praise: "I always wished well to Poland and that, with all my heart." All during the American Revolutionary War and after, the expressions of George Washington show clearly his noble and sympathetic attitude toward Poland. He was one of her best friends. Friendship for Poland grew into an American tradition, just as friendship for America became traditional in Poland. During Poland's reverses, the sympathies of America were always on her side, on the side of "that brave and generous people, who for centuries have been battling against the plunderers of Europe and the tramplers upon the common rights of man."

This zeal to battle for liberty and the rights of the common man brought Kosciusko, Pulaski, and other Poles to America. Their presence in the revolutionary ranks is the strongest proof of the Polish sympathies in the beginnings of this Nation and in every crisis and danger since. Thousands of Polish people and Americans of Polish descent have made the supreme sacrifice in the cause of freedom in all wars in our history and including Korea. Since those days, the world has changed many times. Poland is now in slavery, her freedom temporarily taken from her, but the friendship between America and Poland will never die. The sentiments of old are still alive, sanctified by the blood of the brave Polish people.

The first foreign patriot to heed the call of the "shot that was heard around the world," and the first to come to the aid of the American colonies in their struggle for freedom, was Thaddeus Kosciusko, later to be made a general by the American Congress. Today, his name is familiar to and revered by the whole civilized world.

This young military engineer threw himself into the contest on the side of the colonies with dashing ardor and professional skill and ability. His conduct and work received the highest praise. General Washington said "To his care and sedulous appreciation the American people are indebted for the defense of West Point." His engineering skill contributed to the efficient fortification of West Point where his handiwork, even more than all else, serves as a constant inspiration to our military students. General Kosciusko was the author of the "Manoeuvres of Horse Artillery for the United States Army" and can justly and fairly be called the father of the American artillery. Thaddeus Kosciusko entrusted to his old friend and great admirer, Thomas Jefferson, then the Secretary of State, his will which is, really, the finest monument he himself erected to his own memory in America. In his will, written 65 years before Abraham Lincoln issued the Emancipation Proclamation, the Polish patriot pleaded for the emancipation of American slaves and gave the whole of his modest fortune to be employed in the freeing of them, in giving them an education and in having them instructed so that they might become good citizens, happy and useful men and women. In spirit and purpose he was a pioneer in both the efforts to emancipate the slaves and in the effort to train them for worthy citizenship.

The love and admiration for Kosciusko has not died in America. Many volumes could be filled with tributes paid to General Kosciuszko by eminent Americans and men of other countries. It will suffice to close this with the tribute of George Washington himself: "No one has a higher respect and veneration for your character than I have."

General Casmir Pulaski was another celebrated Polish commander who distinguished himself during the American Revolution. He came with only the desire to fight for the liberty of the New World. He was famous throughout Europe for his bravery and conduct in defense of liberty and was thought to be the most expert and best horseman in America. Congress rewarded his bravery by commissioning him, at the instance of General Washington, the first commander of the American Cavalry with the rank of general. He organized the famous mounted Pulaski Legion and fought under General Washington on many battlefields and was with him at Valley Forge. Pulaski paid out of his own funds, the cost of the equipment and sustenance of his beloved Legion, over $50,000, without any expectation of a refund. General Pulaski rendered great and invaluable services to this country.

By his dauntless courage, fortitude, and devotion he saved the whole army of General Washington from total destruction and horrible disaster. He supplied the cavalry with its first set of service regulations and history justly conferred on Pulaski the title of the "father of American cavalry."

General Pulaski in a cavalry charge, while trying to break an attack on a column of French troops in Washington's Army, received a mortal wound and died 2 days later, October 11, 1779, on board the ship *Wasp*. His companions "consigned his corpse to a watery grave."

> "Columbia! He died for thee—
> Cheerfully, and for liberty!
> Honored forevermore—
> On this Atlantic shore."

During all the 123 years of partition, Poles fought on the battlefront of liberty all over the world for the freedom of other people. Poles fought for the cause of human freedom under their war cry "for our freedom and for yours." When Polish patriots put "your" liberty on a par with "ours," it was no mere gesture, but a forceful expression of their conviction that the only guaranty of freedom for any nation is the freedom of all nations.

President Thomas Jefferson called the partition of Poland "a crime," President Woodrow Wilson, "one of the great crimes of history."

The Polish people have contributed much to the world in time of peace and war, and we of the American Legion are forever grateful to that world famous composer and pianist, patriot, and statesman, the beloved Ignace Jan Paderewski, who while on a world tour in the United States, shortly after the American Legion was formed, turned over to its child welfare fund thousands of dollars, the entire proceeds of his concert tour in this country, paying all expenses out of his own funds.

In a letter to Dr. John G. Bowman, chancellor of the University of Pittsburgh, written in Houston, Tex., on April 22, 1939, Ignace Jan Paderewski said:

"I believe in God Almighty, and I believe too in the final triumph of what is of God in our immortal souls. With His help and under the spiritual guidance of those who still have faith in Him and who follow His commandments, out of the present turmoil will emerge a new and better world, a new and better mankind."

Truth, crushed to earth, shall rise again.

Poland, crushed to earth, shall rise again.

We should avoid the term "Communist Poland" as being unfair and untrue.

Let us remove any confusion and stigma, especially for historical purposes, about Poland being in any way willingly associated with communism. It should be made clear that the native people of Poland are being presently dominated, subjugated, and persecuted by Communist tyranny, against their will, and no confusion on that score should be permitted to exist, and may I suggest during this sad and tragic period of world conditions that when we refer to Poland we use the clear expression "Poland dominated by communism."

JOHN H. SHENKEL,
Chairman, Americanism Committee,
American Legion.

Texas Students See Need for Soil Conservation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 4, 1954

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, every year one of the outstanding newspapers in the State of Texas, the Fort Worth Press, sponsors a Save the Soil and Save Texas award program. This program points up the soil conservation district as the key to permanent soil conservation work on every acre of Texas farmland.

As an important part of the Save the Soil and Save Texas program, the Fort Worth Press sponsors an essay contest on soil conservation among Texas school pupils. This year, some 50,000 students wrote essays on the subject.

Brief exercepts from some of these essays were published in the Fort Worth Press of April 30. These excerpts, brief as they are, provide encouraging evidence that the young people of Texas are well aware of, and greatly concerned by, the need for continuing soil conservation work.

I ask unanimous consent that the article from the Fort Worth Press be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

For directness and a fresh point of view you can't beat the teen-agers—when they really let themselves go at the essay business.

Probably 50,000 Texas school pupils wrote their ideas and impressions concerning soil conservation in the 1954 conservation awards essay contest.

Their entries contained many a sentence worth repeating.

Try these—just a few excerpts chosen at random from the thousands of essays offered:

Mary Rabel, of route 2, Columbus, wrote: "Try once like I did and look around you. You may be surprised, too, as I am."

STARTS CAMPAIGN

And Lois Hood, of Tulsa, gave notice: "Our work has begun. I have started a campaign to save the soil."

William Young, of Rhoads High, Daingerfield, admitted: "I do not know much about soil conservation. The many people that I asked did not know much either. One big thing that I feel I can do would be to help other people learn more about it."

Then there was the kicker supplied by young David Griggs, of Alvarado: "Ranching will keep right on going in Texas, but if you think it is fun in a drought, you are entitled to a mouthful of dust."

But here are other sparklers from the stacks of high and junior high school paperwork. They will provide a chuckle now and then, but perhaps they'll cause you, too, to think.

DISTRICT'S BEST

Norene Curtis, Junction: "One of the best ways to spread conservation is through soil-conservation districts."

Barbara Polsky, Marfa: "I can begin by gaining a working knowledge of my own soil-conservation district. * * * The job of soil conservation is mine also."

Dennis Bruhl, Farmersville High: "I can do my best to improve the land we own—for it may become an example for others."

Earl Malone, Carthage High: "Soil conservation has something to do with everyone. This includes me and you. I'll do my part in soil conservation; you do yours."

Peggy Sparks, box 53, Pattonville: "I had never realized until now that when I saw a gully or ditch running through a field that it was more than just a long hole in the ground. It never occurred to me that a portion of the soil had been washed away."

DO HER PART

Janice Countryman, Mount Vernon High: "I cannot do much about this problem that is facing us; but I can do my part."

Hood Barnwell, route 4, Pittsburgh: "'What I Can Do About Soil Conservation' is a subject that should have been thought about long before it was."

Bill Johnson, Mount Pleasant High: "If we will all join as a great army against this problem, we will give it a fit."

Violet Brott, Iowa Park High: "Remember only you and I can save the precious soil that nature has given us."

Marsha Lehew, 1100 South Pecan, Arlington: "Soil conservation should start in one's own backyard."

Linda Copper route 1, Alvarado: "By encouraging my father and possibly others to do more soil-conservation work, I can help conserve the soil for not only myself but also for my children and grandchildren."

Pat Hendrix, Joshua High: "We can let our State and national legislators know how we feel and how interested we are in soil and what is done with it."

Sylvia Williams, Del Rio: "By informing myself—now and later, I shall be preparing myself for the role that I will play later in life, that of a qualified voter."

Patricia Moore, Plano High: "The place to start is in the school."

Henry Bull, Alla School seventh grader, Celina: "The first thing I can do is to understand fully the necessity of soil conservation."

Don Marshall Tillerson, Alla School, Celina: "The best way I can help with soil conservation is by learning as much as I can."

Anita Schmutz, Van Horn: "The school students may not realize it, but every theme they turn in is one more voice—to make America more soil conservation conscious."

Jean Preston, star route 1, Lamesa High: "Goodness. I must get busy. There's work to be done."

Marshall Cockrell, Tulia High: "What I can do about soil conservation is be interested in it."

Sue Derby, Canadian High senior: "The other day I began thinking about it and the thought occurred to me—the soil is just as important to my life as it is to anyone in the country."

Shirley Trice, Sparenberg: "I should strive to help keep what we have and to build up what has been destroyed."

Joyce Lisbeck, route 2, Jourdanton: "It always gives Dad a thrill to know we are interested in his work and this might help him get started in soil conservation practices."

Kenneth Mahalite, Eagle Lake High: "The reason I like soil conservation is that it doubles your money."

Ronnie McLane, Runge: "It is my duty to protect the rights of my children and grandchildren."

John Ellisor, Pettus: "If every town or city would do its part in soil conservation, a part of the soil-saving troubles would be over."

Use of A-Bombs in War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 4, 1954

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an editorial entitled "United States Should Not Act Alone in War, But A-Bombs Pose Problems," which appeared in the Eugene Register-Guard, published in Eugene, Oreg., on March 28, 1954.

I discussed this editorial in a speech in Boston recently, because I believe it is one of the best analyses of the subject matter I have read in recent months.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

UNITED STATES SHOULD NOT ACT ALONE IN WAR, BUT A-BOMBS POSE PROBLEMS

When Secretary of State John Foster Dulles recently stated that any aggression on the part of the Communist powers would be met with "swift and massive retaliation at places of our own choosing," he inadvertently provoked controversies as to the implications of that statement, in terms of presidential relations with Congress here at home and relations with our allies abroad. President Eisenhower has made haste to state that he would not think of embarking on war without obtaining the necessary action by Congress as provided by the Constitution; likewise, he has endeavored to make it plain that no action in the direction of war will be taken without consulting our allies.

Nevertheless, the Dulles statement has caused considerable concern and it has been given interpretations which Mr. Dulles himself did not intend. He was trying to define an attitude rather than a specific policy.

It is probably a good thing that the statement was made and the questions raised, because now is the time to look realistically at some of the problems which are presented by nuclear weapons, and at the effects which they may have upon the character of wars. It is almost certain that if another great war comes, it will come without warning, like the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor. There will be no time for the traditional severance of relations, followed by formal declarations of war. That obviously raises these problems:

Retaliatory measures must be taken instantly; they cannot wait for formal authorizations.

The President of the United States, as Commander in Chief, must assume responsibility immediately, especially if the aggression is against this country or any of its Territories.

In the nature of things, retaliatory action must precede congressional authorization or meetings with our allies by many hours. The character of modern warfare is such that even a few hours of delay in mobilizing and retaliating could be fatal.

Some people are saying that under the pressure of the times, the war-making powers have actually been transferred from Congress to the President. They are also saying that through our commitments with our allies, we are bound by their actions and that any one of them could drag us into war. We do not agree with these theories although in some measure they are true.

In our opinion, a declaration of war has always been the final and formal recognition of a condition or state of war, rather than a thing initiated by legislative action. Conditions have not changed except in the elements of speed and timing. We think historical analysis bears this out:

When Fort Sumter was fired upon in 1861, President Lincoln had to take certain military steps without waiting for congressional action.

The war with Spain in 1898 offers a more doubtful case because of the mysteries surrounding the sinking of the *Maine*. In that case, the declaration of war on Spain might be called an initiated policy and some even call it an aggressive action on our part.

In 1916–17, a virtual state of war had existed between us and Germany for many months preceding the final attacks on our shipping which caused President Wilson to ask Congress for a declaration.

In 1941, we were involved in lend-lease and many other activities on the side of the Allies, prior to the attack on Pearl Harbor, which made formal declaration necessary. But in that case, the retaliatory measures preceded declaration immediately.

An examination of British comment reveals that our Allies are not really so disturbed by the Dulles declaration as might be supposed. The Manchester Guardian says:

"American strategy is a matter of life and death to every one of us. The criticism that the policy of massive air retaliation in case of an attack was taken unilaterally by the United States is off the mark. So is the criticism that the decision will turn every local war into a potential world war, and that the United States is now leaving the provision of ground troops to other people.

"The decision to rely primarily on air power was not unilateral or even new, though Mr. Dulles' way of stating it was. As far back as 1946 the idea was implicit in Sir Winston Churchill's speech at Fulton, Mo., and he has developed it many times since."

The Observer says:

"The succession of statements, in part contradictory, by authorized spokesmen of the United States administration, still leave the situation confused. But it is now clear that what Mr. Dulles called 'swift and massive retaliation at places of our own choosing' is not to be brought into play except in cases of direct military aggression against the United States or one of its treaty allies."

And the London Times remarks tolerantly:

"Even the kindliest and best intentioned of giants causes a certain amount of nervousness among its friends, and that is hard on a giant. Through the years the United States has heard of its allies' anxieties that it might declare war too soon or not soon enough; that it was too far removed from Communist armies to take Communist threats seriously, or that it is now taking it so seriously in its own land that freedom and tolerance are at stake. The United States may well get impatient with all this."

Constant consultations prior to military emergency—between our President and Congress and between our Government and our Allies—are the only possible way to avoid the misunderstandings and the divisions which might be fatal after a blow has been struck. Once an attack has been made, there must be no hesitation in retaliatory measures.

Mr. Nixon—A Reappraisal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH F. HOLT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1954

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call to the attention of my colleagues an editorial from the Oxnard Press Courier, dated Tuesday, April 20, 1954. It is an editorial well worth reading. My congressional district is next door to the city of Oxnard and the county of Ventura, and my interest is sincere in the growth of the community of Oxnard and the service the Oxnard Press Courier has given that community.

The editorial follows:

MR. NIXON—A REAPPRAISAL

One year ago President Eisenhower delivered to the American Society of Newspaper Editors the most important address he has yet given as Chief Executive. It was the address in which he enunciated the policy for peace of this country; it is still the guide to our policy, the address and policy upon which the free nations base their hopes.

This year, at the meeting of the same assemblage of editors, the principal address was given by Vice President Nixon. The

President was not in Washington. The Vice President spoke in his place, at a luncheon gathering.

Now the Vice President did not as such speak for publication. He does not hold press conferences. Because of his position, he rarely speaks on national or international affairs for quotation; that is done by the President, by the Secretary of State. Mr. Nixon's talk to the editors could not, therefore, be quoted, and it was not quoted.

Yet it was a most remarkable address. It did not have the importance for the Nation and for the world that the President's speech a year ago held. But it may very well prove to be the most important address of Mr. Nixon's career.

This could be so because he made it before the most critical audience in the United States. His talk was a closely reasoned summation of the international scene, with especial references to his recent world tour, and with particular emphasis upon Korea, and the lessons learned there, and upon Indochina, and the crisis developing there. Mr. Nixon's address was a brilliant performance, and afterwards he answered, with the utmost frankness, pointed questions from the editors. When he had finished, and his audience moved away, there were many who said that, frankly, their opinions of the calibre of the Vice President had been changed; that they had come to respect him much more highly than ever before; and there were some who said that this man may be the next candidate for President of the Republican Party.

With those friendly and laudatory opinions of Mr. Nixon the editor of this newspaper is happy to join. We do so the more gladly, because this newspaper had been extremely critical of Mr. Nixon after the revelation, during the 1952 campaign, of the private fund that had been made available to him, as a Senator. We have not changed our view that his acceptance of that fund was wrong. We have not changed our view that his campaign explanation of that fund was a clever piece of demagogery. But we no longer hold the view, after learning a great deal about Mr. Nixon in Washington, that he is not one to be trusted with high responsibilities.

Clearly he has grown greatly in stature, as the Vice President. Clearly he has come to occupy not only a high office, but a place of great responsibility in this administration. Clearly he has discharged with great skill the tasks given him by the President. And clearly he could become a very formidable candidate for the presidency, if he continues to grow as he has grown.

We are glad to give this 1954 estimate of Mr. Nixon, and make it a generous one, because we had been so frankly critical of him 2 years ago.

Armenian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES R. HOWELL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1954

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, the following are excerpts from my remarks given at Rochelle Park, N. J., on the occasion of the 58th anniversary of the Armenian Revolutionary Federation, May 1954:

Today, we are celebrating the 58th anniversary of the New York Armenian Revolutionary Federation. At first hearing, there is one word in that name, which in these times of trouble and confusion, causes a sort of pricking of the ear.

It is the word "revolutionary." But this, as all words, cannot have a meaning devoid of context—in this case: historical and political context.

For one thing, it is a word not unfamiliar to the American scene and the American character. For we, too, had our own glorious revolution and we have been truly revolutionary ever since in the fields of social endeavor, economics and political acumen.

For the Armenians their revolution started during the latter half of the past century. It was a revolution very similar to our own both in its ideals and in its sacrifice and struggle.

It was a revolution for freedom, for justice, for peace.

And its greatest champion became the organization known as the Dashnag Party or the ARF.

The efforts of this organization were crowned at the end of the First World War in the establishment of the free and independent Republic of Armenia.

The republic was established on May 28, 1918, which is, by the same token, Armenian Independence Day, just as July 4 is our day of independence.

The Armenian Republic was established on the principles of democracy with an elected legislature that in turn elected the executive, or administration.

In these popular and democratic elections, the Armenian people time and again gave their vote of confidence to the Dashnag Party.

And due to the efforts of this organization the Armenian Republic was recognized, first by the Supreme Allied Council on January 19, 1920, and a little later, on April 23, by the United States Government.

The Ambassador of the Armenian Republic, Dr. Armen Garo, was himself a Dashnag.

On the internal sphere of progress, the Dashnag Party was instrumental in bringing about the establishment of 1,500 schools in the new Republic of Armenia and the founding of the University of Erivan of which the first dean, Nicol Agbalian was also a Dashnag.

But the Soviet aggressor to the north could not view with indifference the growth of freedom and democracy, even though in a small state, to its south.

And aggression caused Armenia to be one of the first victims of Soviet expansionism.

Since the downfall of the republic, 33 years ago, the Dashnag Party has persevered, often under the most dire conditions, in its struggle against tyranny, against the godless practice and theory of communism and for the freedom, liberation, and independence of its homeland—Armenia.

There were times—we will all remember—when it was not so popular to be anti-Soviet. There were times, before then, when very few were aware of the tremendous Communist menace.

It is in those times that the Dashnag Party maintained its unflinching crusade against the tyranny of sovietism to be joined later by many many allies who slowly came to the realization of the danger.

Today the Dashnag Party is not alone. Today the struggle is not an isolated one for freedom of Armenia, or of Poland, or of Czechoslovakia, or of China.

We have finally realized that humanity is one and if its freedom is violated at one point—be it ever so remote or ever so minute—then it is in essence violated throughout and everywhere.

Therefore those who like the Dashnag Party bear the proud tradition of having carried the crusade alone and sometimes in almost impossible conditions, can take great and true solace in the fact today that the world—the free world is with them.

And when we say the free world we should mean thereby the freedom-loving world, including in this the millions of victims behind the Iron Curtain, who are our best and natural allies.

The Dashnag Party may proudly hold up its head today on its 64th anniversary. It has traveled a long, long way. It has never been easy. The Dashnag Party has seen persecution, tyranny, and bondage of its homeland, has witnessed its resurrection, then its triumph and establishment as a free member of the family of nations, has then lost this, carrying the struggle from the dispersion for 33 years.

But the dawn of victory is assured. For mankind must ultimately find the path or perish. And find its path it will which will lead to peace, freedom, and justice to all.

And as we march along that path we shall always be proud to have our small, yet valiant ally: the Dashnag Party and the Armenian people.

Gen. Milan R. Stefanik

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1954

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call the attention of the House to the fact that today is the 35th anniversary of the tragic death of Gen. Milan R. Stefanik, one of the great heroes of Slovakia.

General Stefanik was the first Minister of War in the early Czechoslovak state and helped to form and organize the independent Czechoslovak Army in World War I. Along with Benes and Masaryk, he was one of the outstanding leaders in the Czechoslovak movement for independence.

Stefanik came to the United States in June 1917 to gain Czech and Slovak recruits in this country for the Czechoslovak Legion which was then being formed in France. His success in these efforts was not marked but he did a tremendous amount of good in securing the cooperation of the Czechs and Slovaks in the Czechoslovak movement. The American Slovaks agreed to cooperate in this movement on the basis of a program of the Slovak League of America. This was Stefanik's greatest success in the United States.

Milan Stefanik, a true Slovak patriot, was killed in an airplane crash on May 4, 1919. This day is celebrated everywhere by Slovaks as Stefanik Day in honor of their beloved war hero. His death is especially tragic in view of the fact that he was so able to achieve Czechoslovak cooperation, while never losing sight of the true interests of his own Slovakia. I am proud to join all Slovaks in commemorating this anniversary.

Let us hope that the example of General Stefanik will inspire all of the Slovak people, both in this country and abroad, to continue the fight for liberation of their homeland. I am confident that, when this liberation is finally achieved, the Slovak people will then be given the opportunity freely to choose the type of government under which they wish to live in accordance with the policy of self-determination which this country advocates for all peoples throughout the world.

Compilation of Results on Questionnaire for 1954

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT C. BYRD
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 28, 1954

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Speaker, earlier this year I circulated a questionnaire throughout the Sixth West Virginia District. The questionnaire went into the hands of people from every walk of life, and it was sent to householders of both political parties.

My purpose in mailing this questionnaire to my constituents was threefold. Firstly, I desired to ascertain the sentiments of my people with respect to certain very important subjects likely to be considered by the Congress. Secondly, I hoped to stimulate a greater interest among my people concerning some of the paramount issues which face us as a Nation. Thirdly, it was my wish to assure the people of the sixth district that they, too, have a voice in the finest Government in the world, and that I, as their Representative, welcome their advice upon any and all legislative matters.

My threefold objective has been gained, and the response to this questionnaire has been gratifying. I believe that I now have a better working knowledge of the kind of representation which my constituents expect me to render, and I include herewith a tabulation of the results of this questionnaire in order that the Members of Congress may have the benefit of the thinking of my fellow West Virginians as we consider the great questions which confront us.

The tabulation follows:

Compilation of results on questionnaires for 1954

Question	Yes	Percent of total	No	Percent of total	No vote	Percent of total
Do you favor:						
Government price supports on basic farm products?	4,758	49.3	4,092	42.4	804	8.3
An increase in the national-debt limit above the present $275-billion limit?	2,008	20.8	6,882	71.3	764	7.9
Revising the McCarran-Walter Act so as to permit more immigrants to enter the United States than are now authorized?	3,526	36.5	5,686	58.9	442	4.6
The United States joining with Canada in the development of the St. Lawrence seaway?	7,034	72.9	1,882	19.5	738	7.6
A constitutional amendment making treaties of no force and effect if they deny or abridge any right enumerated in the United States Constitution?	5,738	59.4	2,560	26.5	1,356	14.1
Lowering the voting age to 18 years?[1]	4,487	54.3	3,545	42.9	231	2.8
Continued military aid to foreign nations?	5,667	58.7	3,427	35.5	560	5.8
Continued economic aid to foreign nations?	5,252	54.4	3,784	39.2	618	6.4
A more intensive probe of Communist activities in the United States?	8,064	83.5	1,106	11.5	484	5.0
The suggestion that America pool its atomic secrets with those of other nations?[1]	1,641	21.9	5,342	71.3	509	6.8
The integration of German military units into the defense system of western Europe?	7,804	80.8	1,032	10.7	818	8.5
Admitting Red China to the United Nations?	732	7.6	8,498	88.0	424	4.4
Permitting Communist literature in our overseas libraries?	1,260	13.1	7,938	82.2	456	4.7
A ban on the mailing of all obscene literature?[1]	6,028	84.1	789	11.0	351	4.9
Any form of increased taxation to secure a balanced national budget?	2,925	30.3	6,333	65.6	396	4.1
An increase in postal rates?	4,026	41.7	5,281	54.7	347	3.6
Continued appropriations for Government housing projects?	6,256	64.8	2,983	30.9	415	4.3
The rearming of Japan as a deterrent to future Communist aggression in the Far East?	7,086	73.4	1,892	19.6	676	7.0
Appropriating more money for building our own air, sea, and land defense arms?	8,631	89.4	473	4.9	550	5.7
Continued aid to Communist Dictator Tito of Yugoslavia?	1,960	20.3	6,941	71.9	753	7.8
Witnesses who are being questioned with regard to un-American activities frequently withhold testimony by taking refuge in the provisions of the Fifth amendment. Do you favor finding ways to prevent this?[1]	8,418	87.2	858	8.9	378	3.9
Should the Taft-Hartley law be amended?[3]	5,934	[2]61.5	2,632	27.3	872	9.0

---

[1] This question was not included on all questionnaires.

[2] 216, or 2.2 percent, suggested outright repeal.

[3] Those who favored amendment were divided as to purpose. Some favored amending so as to favor management; others, to favor labor.

The Facts About Mr. Nixon's Speech

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PATRICK J. HILLINGS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 4, 1954

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, the majority of newspapers across the country which commented editorially on the recent statements of Vice President Nixon in regard to the situation in Indochina have supported his frank and courageous views.

The Vice President did not advocate sending American troops into Indochina, and he pointed out that every effort must be made to strengthen the position of the French and other anti-Communist forces in that country. He did warn the Communist aggressors that our Nation is not going to tolerate further Communist aggression, and he pointed out that we must be willing to make this point clear to the Reds in no uncertain terms. That, of course, is the official policy for the present administration.

Mr. Roscoe Drummond analyzed the Vice President's remarks in the following article which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune on April 22, 1954:

THE FACTS ABOUT MR. NIXON'S SPEECH

(By Roscoe Drummond)

WASHINGTON.—As the result of his off-the-cuff, only temporarily anonymous speech before the American Society of Newspaper Editors in Washington, Vice President Nixon is being rather widely criticized for what he didn't do. It is important, therefore, to tie down the facts as firmly as possible. Though there is already evident considerable support for the views which he expounded Mr. Nixon is being principally criticized on the grounds:

That the question about the possibility of sending American ground troops into Indochina was "planted" in order to give the Vice President an opportunity to advance his thoughts "spontaneously."

That Mr. Nixon was carrying out a well designed plan to launch a trial balloon in behalf of the Eisenhower administration to see how much resistance there would be to the ultimate use of United States ground troops in Southeast Asia.

That the Vice President was warning the country that all-out war in Asia was imminent.

Quite a number of editors went away from this meeting holding these views and some have subsequently expressed them in interviews. They are understandable, but I am now convinced that these judgments are not borne out by the facts. I have carefully and, I think, successfully checked the circumstances of Mr. Nixon's speech, and it can be put down as fact that:

1. The question about United States troops in Indochina was not known to the Vice President at any point before it was asked and that he had no intention of discussing this aspect of the subject.

2. Mr. Nixon was not carrying out any calculated plan to prepare public opinion to accept the use of American troops and was not sending up a trial balloon to see how it would go. There was no discussion of the speech with President Eisenhower before it was delivered.

3. The Vice President does not anticipate an expansion of the Indochinese war nor does he expect that the United States will become involved further that it now is involved.

Mr. Nixon delivered a balanced, informed, penetrating speech to the editors on the problems of Indochina and all southeast Asia, on the magnitude of America's stake in keeping southeast Asia from falling to the Communist domination and on the urgency of avoiding a deceptive settlement, which would in effect be a sellout to the Communists, at Geneva.

He then took questions from the floor. They were varied and pointed. He was responsive and forthright in reply. One editor wanted to know what the Vice President thought about the use of American ground forces if the French were unable to hold Indochina.

Mr. Nixon had to make an instant decision whether to no-comment the question, whether to avoid its substance by hedging, or whether to be direct and candid. He chose the latter—and more credit to him.

Though his answer was completely candid, it was careful and precise. Mr. Nixon began by pointing out that the question was hypothetical; should American troops be used, if the French were unable to hold. He stated that he did not accept the questioner's premise that the French would not hold out.

Within these terms—that the question was hypothetical and that he did not accept the premise of the question—he gave an honest and hypothetical answer.

The answer was: If it is necessary to use American ground forces to avert the loss of southeast Asia to Communist control, Mr. Nixon said he personally believed American ground forces should be employed.

This was not a prearranged question and this was not a prearranged answer. It was a weighty answer because it came from the Vice President. It was also weighty because, while it did not reflect an administration decision, it did reflect Mr. Nixon's awareness of all the information which comes before the National Security Council. I doubt if Mr. Eisenhower is at all upset.

But let us not forget that the President has pledged that there will be no involvement of American ground troops in Indochina without the issue being presented to Congress for a joint executive-legislative decision.

The War in Indochina

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT H. BOSCH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 4, 1954

Mr. BOSH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include two editorials from the New York Journal-American which should be of great interest to all of us. They follow:

AN EDITORIAL

Many Americans are wondering why it is that the war in Indochina, which is of so little concern to the British and our other free world allies, must be of so much concern to us.

Prime Minister Churchill flatly refused to go along with the proposal by Secretary of State Dulles that an ultimatum be served on the Communists to get out of Indochina or else.

Mr. Churchill gave further point to the matter by assuring Parliament no British commitment whatever had been given to send troops to Indochina in any circumstances.

In contrast, the American people are being conditioned to believe that the Indochinese war is so important to us that if other free nations do not support us in turning back Communist aggression we must do it alone.

The British must be just as much endangered by what is happening in Indochina, and by what impends, as we are, but they are being remarkably calm about it.

Maybe the spokesmen for the American Government who would have us go into the Indochina war alone if necessary are right, but a lot of Americans would like to have them prove the point first.

It would be a great tragedy if our interventionists succeeded in getting us into the conflict, alone or otherwise, and then turned out to be wrong—an experience with which Americans have had past and very grim acquaintance.

NOT AGAIN

Gen. Mark Clark makes the point in his new book, From the Danube to the Yalu, that the United Nations could have won the Korean war at the time of Chinese intervention, as General MacArthur wanted to do but was prevented from doing by his political superiors.

Moreover, he says unequivocally that it should have been done MacArthur's way, because that would have saved us the terrible expenditure of life and wealth we subsequently made in Korea,, and would have saved us the first military defeat in our history—the latter being the whole responsibility of our politicians and not of our military leaders.

But that is not the real point General Clark makes.

What he wants most to accomplish, if any word of his can do it, is to make sure America will not repeat its tragic mistake.

"Never, never again should we be mousetrapped into fighting another defensive ground war on that peninsula," is the lesson he draws from our bitter experience in Korea.

For the broader future, he has this urgent admonition:

"Never should we commit numerically inferior American troops—the first team at that—against numerically superior forces of the enemy's second team unless we are prepared to win."

The vital significance of General Clark's book is that it puts a vivid background behind the curent war in Indochina, where we are on the brink of repeating the Korea mistake.

When we went into Korea, we were without dependable allies.

If we go into Indochina, even our allies are warning us we will have to go alone. The same problem of numerically superior enemies we had in Korea will confront us in Indochina.

Finally, while we once had a chance to win in Korea, it is doubtful if the opportunity to win will ever exist in Indochina.

General Clark is just as right now as General MacArthur was in 1950 when the hordes of Red China were allowed to come storming across the Yalu with the inviolable sanctuary of Manchuria at their backs.

Our great waste of American lives and resources was the price of the mistake we made in Korea.

What the price of the same mistake in the future will be we can only guess.

Freedom for Poland Rally

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES R. HOWELL
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 4, 1954

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, May 2, I had the privilege of addressing the Freedom for Poland Rally for Greater New York, celebrating the 163d anniversary of the Polish Constitution. At the conclusion of this fine, well-attended meeting, the following forthright resolution was adopted which I commend to the attention of my colleagues:

We, the free Poles and Americans of Polish descent, assembled on May 2, 1954, at Manhattan Center, New York City, to commemorate the 163d anniversary of the Polish Constitution of May 3, 1791, one of the world's great documents of progress in the field of human rights, make the following declaration:

Aware of the tradition of our forefathers and of the spirit of the history of the Republic of Poland, we pay homage to the great ideals of freedom and democracy embodied in the thousand years of the existence of the Polish nation.

Remembering the great sacrifices made by the Polish nation during the Second World War, we reaffirm before the free world and especially before the United Nations our stand of nonrecognition of the decision taken at Yalta regarding Poland and imposed upon that country, and declare that the Communist system introduced in Poland as a result of the Yalta agreement is foreign to the Polish tradition, spirit and the thousand years old ties with the Western civilization.

We renew our demand that the aim of the American policy should be the liberation of nations enslaved by Soviet Russia and restoration to them of the natural, God-given right to live in freedom and enjoy the blessings of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness which is their rightful heritage.

In connection with the Geneva Conference we repeat our warning against the danger of appeasing Soviet Russia at the expense of smaller, weaker nations. It is our considered opinion that we cannot gain anything by futile negotiations with the Communist rulers. The Communist tyranny must be wiped out from the face of the earth before we too will become its victims. Any compromise with the Kremlin, even as a temporary expediency, constitutes the first step toward the defeat of the United States and of the free world and consequently toward the victory of the bloody Communist aggressors in Korea and Indochina. It is the glorious duty and destiny of the United States to fight the enemies of freedom and not to give into them even in the smallest degree.

We welcome the political unity of the free Poles around the Polish Government in exile and salute its author, Gen. Kazimierz Sosnkowski.

We urge all Poles in the United States and all Americans of Polish descent to solidly support the Polish National Fund which provides independent material means to carry on the struggle of Polish legal authorities in exile for the liberation of Poland from the Soviet oppression.

Long live the United States—the unconquerable fortress of freedom and democracy.

Long live the free and democratic Poland.

Seaway Nearing Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK E. SMITH
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 29, 1954

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, there is growing evidence that the sectional attitude toward the St. Lawrence seaway project is breaking down and a more enlightened approach based on overall national interest is taking its place.

This point of view is well represented by editorials appearing in the Christian Science Monitor and the Philadelphia Bulletin:

[From the Philadelphia Bulletin]

SEAWAY NEARING VOTE

Proposals for United States participation in the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway under discussion for nearly 30 years and now to be brought to a vote in the House has met with vigorous opposition from many quarters. The seaway has been favored by every President since Woodrow Wilson's time, but it has been stymied by sectional opposition from areas whose commercial interests would be adversely affected.

The action of Canada in determining to proceed with the project alone if the United

States decides not to cooperate has, however, pulled the rug from under one foot of opponents zealous to preserve the existing transportation setup. These opponents are now confronted with a condition not a theory. Any adverse effect on local commercial interests that could be expected from a joint seaway enterprise is likely to be expected from the same kind of enterprise under Canadian ownership.

In view of the changed circumstances the railroads and other interests concerned fall back on considerations of costs. They say that the initial expenditure proposed would be but a drop in the bucket of the ultimate cost. They discount the contention that the seaway will be self-supporting and will not really be a drain on this country's resources. On the validity of the present proposal from an investment point of view the outcome in the House will probably depend.

This matter needs to be considered from the standpoint of national—not sectional—interests. It does not deserve favorable action because the Midwest root for it nor condemnation because other areas are vigorously antagonistic. The country will best be served by a decision as to whether the economic welfare of the United States as a whole will be promoted by letting Canada go it alone or by a policy of cooperation.

[From the Christian Science Monitor]

For a Great Purpose

What have compelled every President since Woodrow Wilson to urge American participation in the St. Lawrence seaway are broad considerations of their country's economic welfare and its national defense. These are the same considerations which have moved other Presidents to back the building of transcontinental railroads and the digging of the Panama Canal, and we trust it has been these considerations which persuaded the Senate 3 months ago to pass its bill authorizing joining with Canada in the project and the House Public Works Committee to approve its bill and send it to the floor.

Now the chief hazard this historic step faces is the possibility of amendments which might seem to favor the seaway, but actually so hamper American participation as to nullify it. One, said to hold this danger, looms in prospect—the Brownson substitute bill. This bill, we understand, would not reduce the cost of the project substantially, if at all. It would simply place obstacles in the way of financing it sufficiently serious to cause indefinite delay.

It seems evident now that, at last, the American people overwhelmingly want to have a part in the building and controlling a great waterway from Lake Superior to the sea. Their will should not be frustrated by harassing legislation.

Resolution Adopted by National Association of Pro America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT H. BOSCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1954

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following resolutions adopted by the National Association of Pro America dealing with problems of the utmost interest to the people of our country:

Resolution by National Association of Pro America Adopted March 10, 1954

UNITED STATES ECONOMY

Whereas Pro America has advocated a fiscal policy which included a balanced budget, a minimum of Federal Government with subsequent reduction of expenditures and a lower ceiling on national debt: Therefore be it

Resolved, That Pro America oppose the raising of the national debt beyond the present approximate $267 billion, with yearly interest of approximately $6½ billion.

CIVIL SERVICE

Whereas civil service was designed to protect capable and valuable routine Federal employees in certain proper categories from the evils of the spoils system; and

Whereas there is a continuation of discredited and entrenched bureaucracy in our Federal Government: Therefore be it

Resolved, That Pro America urge the Congress to amend the civil-service laws to remove policymaking positions from civil-service status.

HEALTH INSURANCE

Whereas the principle of subsidy has, down the years, been opposed by Pro America; and

Whereas the principle of health reinsurance is in essence a form of subsidy or will lead to the same: Therefore be it

Resolved, That Pro America express its disapproval of the reinsurance health plan as presented by the executive department of our government.

POLITICAL CHANGE OF PERSONNEL

Whereas the platform of the Republican Party and campaign speeches pledged to the people of the United States that if elected the new administration would with dispatch change the moral and political climate in Government by replacing entrenched bureaucrats with persons of integrity committed to the campaign pledges; and

Whereas these pledges were largely responsible for the President's election; and

Whereas these pledges have not yet been fulfilled: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the National Association of Pro America urges that all policymaking personnel of the Truman administration be promptly replaced.

REVISION UNITED NATIONS CHARTER

Whereas Frederick T. Rope, acting director of the Office of Public Affairs of the United Nations, has advised under date of November 27, 1953, that Senator Alexander Wiley is chairman of a special committee in the Senate on U. N. affairs; and

Whereas this committee was appointed to evaluate and consider various proposals on the subject of the revision of the United Nations Charter; and

Whereas the Parliamentary Group for World Government under date line January 28, 1953, have submitted A and B plans for revision of the United Nations Charter; and

Whereas formal consideration of revision of the U.N. Charter will come up in 1955: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That Pro America work for the preservation of our present form of government in sponsoring an educational program on the United Nations Charter and to submit to Senator Wiley's committee proposals for revision of the U. N. Charter which will protect our form of government.

BRICKER AMENDMENT PRINCIPLES

Whereas an amendment to the Constitution to limit treatymaking power and executive agreements was defeated by one vote in the Congress; and

Whereas Pro America stands for such an amendment: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That in case there is no action in the immediate future on the part of Congress to pass any legislation for the principles of the Bricker amendment, in order to obtain the will of the American people, Pro America shall sponsor a campaign to request the legislatures of the 48 States to make application for an amendment to the Constitution incorporating the principles of the Bricker amendment; and be it further

Resolved, That Pro America shall endeavor to obtain the cooperation of similar organizations in presenting to each State legislature an identical application which, when passed by the requisite number of States, would necessitate calling a constitutional convention for that purpose.

TRIAL BY JURY OF COUNTRYMEN

Whereas the Constitution of the United States protects the right of every citizen to be tried by jury of his countrymen; and

Whereas there is increasingly grave concern over the provision of the NATO Status of Forces Treaty which allows American Armed Forces drafted into the service of their country to be tried in the courts of NATO countries when assigned to duty there: Therefore be it

Resolved, That Pro America lend every effort to alert the American people to the dangers present in this treaty which affect American members of the Armed Forces, their dependents, civilian employees, and their dependents who are employed by the armed services when off duty and serving in foreign lands.

MILITARY AND FOREIGN POLICIES

Whereas the drafting of our boys and forcing them to fight on foreign soil is a great threat to our liberty and one of the greatest causes for unhappiness of our people; and

Whereas we believe that the President of the United States has no right to commit land forces on the continents of Europe or Asia without the advice and consent of the Congress and without war being declared by Congress: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the National Association of Pro America petition the Congress of the United States to reexamine at once our military and foreign policies and to seek speedy and proper measures to protect another disaster like Korea.

DISMISSAL OF OFFICIALS

Whereas the summary dismissal of Dean Clarence Manion from an important post in government for which he was uniquely qualified has caused a large segment of influential voters to lose confidence in the political judgment of the administration; and

Whereas because of this summary dismissal, men of equal stature may be reluctant hereafter to accept appointment under this administration: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the National Association of Pro America expresses regret and disapproval of this unfortunate incident; and be it further

Resolved, That a careful evaluation be made of Dean Manion's dismissal by the administration in order that a similar incident shall not occur.

At Stake in Indochina

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PATRICK J. HILLINGS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1954

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an editorial from the New York

Times of April 19, 1954, which discusses Vice President Nixon's comments in regard to the situation in Indochina. The editorial follows:

At Stake in Indochina

Vice President Nixon's answer to a hypothetical question in respect to Indochina has evoked wide comment and the expression of an apprehension that is not hypothetical. As the State Department promptly and correctly pointed out, the Vice President was asked what would be the policy of this Government on the use of ground troops in Indochina in the event of a French withdrawal from the country. The Department and the Vice President were right in pointing out that this was regarded as a highly unlikely contingency.

What the Vice President's frank and spontaneous answer to this question has done, however, is once more to focus American attention on the gravity of the situation in Indochina and the importance of its defense to the cause of the free world. If the presumed loss of Indochina to the Communists could be the basis for advocating a direct and costly American intervention, there must be cogent reasons why its defense is of the utmost concern to us. That concern, moreover, must be not merely with the price that we might have to pay in goods and lives for the defense, but the cost that we and the rest of the free world would have to pay in the event of defeat or retirement from the field.

At stake in Indochina there is, first of all, the potential liberty of the Associated States, of the people of Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos. Their independence and sovereignty has already been recognized by the French, but the precise relationship of Vietnam to the French Union is still in negotiation. In any event, they have the chance to be free if they are defended. If they are conquered by the Communists they can expect only to enter into a new colonialism, as vassals of the Soviet Union, which would be far worse than that from which they have emerged. The Vietnamese and the French who are gallantly standing at Dien Bien Phu are defending human liberty, not fighting for an abandoned "colonialism."

At stake, also, is the ultimate fate of much of southeast Asia. If Indochina falls to the Communists, Thailand can be put under an intolerable pressure, especially if its large Chinese population can be brought under the control of Peiping. Similarly, Malaya will be made perilously vulnerable, and Malaya also has a very large Chinese population. The Communists would be on the borders of Burma and in a much stronger position from which to assist the Communist attempt to take control of the new Burman republic. In addition, the fillip of a Communist victory in Indochina might easily provide the impetus for a quick Communist coup in Indonesia, where the Communists are already in a "united front" Government and where the Government's authority is far from secure.

What is at stake in these countries is human liberties, first of all. But the Communists have not ignored the fact that this is the rice bowl of the world. The river deltas in Indochina, Thailand, and Burma supply most of the world's available rice for export. The planned conquest of Indochina is a plan to put into Communist hands the most powerful of all weapons, that of starvation. In addition, southeast Asia supplies most of the world's natural rubber, most of its tin, most of its coconut oil, kapok, cinchona, rattans, resins, and abacá. This target is not a little group of palm-dotted atolls. It is one of the richest raw-material areas in the world.

More than a generation ago Lenin set down the dictum that the conquest of the world for communism lay, first, in the conquest of Asia. We have seen the battle plans that emerged from that dictum. We have seen the fall of mainland China, the assault on Korea, the appropriation and absorption of border States. We have seen subversion in Japan, terrorism in Malaya and the Philippines, revolt in Burma and Indonesia. We are seeing frontal attack at Dien Bien Phu.

These things must lie back of our concern with Indochina. It is not just a question of what force we may be obliged to use and the if and when of that use. It is a question of survival in a free world, for us as well as for the Indochinese. This is the reason that the Vice President and our administration take the case seriously and the reason why we must do likewise.

The Rising Star of Richard Nixon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFTON (CLIFF) YOUNG

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1954

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, recent events which have occurred in the Orient and in particular in Indochina have emphasized the need for able leadership in this country.

An editorial appearing recently in the Richmond Times-Dispatch under date of April 20, 1954, contains pertinent observations upon one of our most able national leaders. He has demonstrated on numerous occasions his ability to give the people of this country sound advice on issues of gravest national importance. It is gratifying to see the increasing editorial recognition of his exceptional ability.

The editorial follows:

The Rising Star of Richard Nixon

While Vice President Nixon's advocacy last week of sending United States troops to Indochina, under certain hypothetical circumstances, caused a sensation around the world, those who heard him make this speech to the American Society of Newspaper Editors' convention in Washington were enormously impressed by the manner in which he handled himself on that occasion.

Many newspapers, including the Times-Dispatch, disagree with his personal stand in favor of sending troops to Indochina, if the French should pull out their forces (something he regards as unlikely), but opinion was virtually unanimous at the Washington meeting as to Nixon's great ability.

"I have grossly underestimated that man," said the chief editorial writer of a southern newspaper which has seldom agreed with Eisenhower or Nixon on anything.

"I'd vote for him for President in 1956," said one who voted for Adlai Stevenson in 1952. "Neither do I feel any longer that the country would be sunk if something happened to President Eisenhower and Nixon took over."

These comments were rather typical, after the Vice President concluded an hour-long address, from notes, and an off-the-cuff question period which continued for some 35 minutes more.

His formal remarks dealt with the broad problem of Asia, and he said nothing in the course of those remarks about sending troops to Indochina. It was in the question period that this issue was raised, and as with all the other "hot potato" problems that came up, he dealt with it promptly and forthrightly.

The poise, the clarity, the force, and the fluency with which the Vice President discussed the Asiatic problem in his address, and the equally able manner in which he discussed everything from United States troops in Indochina to the Oppenheimer case, left most of the audience almost gasping. A great many of the editors had formed their impressions of Nixon from his soap-opera performance on television and radio when he came under fire during the presidential campaign of 1952, and they were not prepared for the truly professional job he did last week.

This, it should be emphasized, has nothing to do with whether they agreed or disagreed with his position on specific issues. Nor is it in any way related to the fact that he tried to make an off-the-record speech to several hundred newspaper editors, their wives and guests—an obvious absurdity and impossibility. Presumably both he and the White House realized that the gist of his remarks could not be kept quiet. Apparently the administration wished to use the occasion as a sounding board.

Certainly the impression Nixon gave of sheer ability, of a quick and cogent capacity for lucid expression, and of a broad grasp of many complex questions was tremendous. It seems reasonable to declare that whereas prior to April 16 he had been regarded as a good deal of a lightweight by many of the Nation's editors, they came away from his address with a much fuller realization of why President Eisenhower sent him last year on a trip to the Far East, and why Nixon occupies a more vital role in Washington than any Vice President in the country's history.

Christian Citizenship Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. HILL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1954

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, the International Society of Christian Endeavor conducted a nationwide Christian citizenship crusade and has just concluded the third annual Christian citizenship award contest. It was for girls and boys in North America between the ages of 15 and 19, and its purpose was to alert young people as to their responsibilities in a representative form of government.

The contest included all of the United States and Canada, and the winner will receive a $250 cash award and an all-expense trip to the World's Christian Endeavor convention in Washington, D. C., July 24–28, 1954.

The contest ended April 30, 1954, and the winner was a young lady from Berthoud, Colo., in the Second District. I am very proud indeed that it was 16-year-old Jana Woodrum, a member of the First Presbyterian Church of Berthoud, a junior in the Berthoud High School where she edits the school paper, is accompanist for the boys' chorus, and is also assistant church organist.

I insert for the Record the very excellent and fine letter Miss Woodrum wrote which won first prize—I Speak for Christian Citizenship.

I Speak for Christian Citizenship

My Congressman,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Sir: I am writing you, Mr. Congressman, in support of Christian citizenship. I am convinced of the prominence Christianity needs to play in our lives. Our great country, founded on Christian principles, will continue to be great as long as her citizens are trying to be Christians. I know you, the people's representative, are keenly aware of this. And so I want to assure you that I am back of you when you speak for Christian citizenship.

The influence each of us wields over others can be a dynamic force for Christianity. If you try, at the sessions of Congress and other governmental functions, and if I try, in family relationships and at school, to be Christian citizens, we will be advancing toward our ultimate goal—a world at peace.

Mr. Congressman, in order that you may speak for Christian citizenship, you must ask for supreme guidance. In a Government as complicated as ours, where every decision is of far-reaching or even world consequence, you must wonder continually which way is the right way. Too often if humans rely on their own limited vision they blunder into mistakes and errors. In the running of a nation, these blunders can be tragic.

George Washington, standing alone in the snow on the hillside at Valley Forge, gazing with mingled feelings on his men, encamped below him without decent food, clothing, or shelter, must have felt more than the chill of the winter weather. Then he knelt and asked for guidance, and the vision came to him of stars and stripes waving over a great and free land, and he arose, and won a war, and became the father of a Christian Republic.

Abraham Lincoln, seeing the Union split asunder, must have wondered if ever it would be welded back together, stronger and better. Then, confident of divine guidance, he forgot his fears, forgot himself, and, thinking only of one nation and of all men created equal, he became immortal, became the Emancipator.

The founder of our Nation and the preserver of our Nation both depended on someone greater than themselves to guide them aright, and built and guarded this America. Today when it is no longer a question of just America, but rather of the whole world, dare these United States deviate from seeking that guidance which has made them a symbol of hope and liberty to all mankind?

The answer lies in your hands, Mr. Congressman, in your actions, in your convictions, in the way you run this Government. Speak for your Christian beliefs as you sail the ship of state by asking the Great Captain for His guidance.

You can speak for Christian citizenship by being courageous. It is comparatively easy to be brave on a battlefield where everyone admires and expects fearlessness. It is harder to be brave when an indifferent or frightened world closes its ears to the good and the right. It must take a lot of courage to be brave on the congressional floor. It is then that a man is tested, that his depth is measured. It is then that a distinction is made between those who drift and those who row. It is then that you must stand firm, stand firm in the face of hostility and indifference, stand firm in the right, stand firm with courage.

If there are those among your associates in the Government who have fallen into the habit of believing the easy way is the best way, you have an opportunity and a duty as a Christian citizen to arouse in them that courage which made it possible for our forefathers to defy tradition and ridicule and create an entirely new way of life. By standing firm, by being decisive in your actions, by keeping trust with the people who elected you, by being courageous, Mr. Congressman, you will be speaking for Christian citizenship.

But such a man as you would not have been elected to your high office unless we the people had been speaking in our turn for Christian citizenship. This is a democracy, a government by the people, where I, too, must speak—speak for Christian citizenship by seeking divine guidance. My behavior every day with my family at home and with my friends at school, shows what I stand for and where my guidance comes from. I, too, have decisions to make, which, though not of national significance, affect the lives I touch. It takes many deeds of love to repair the damage done by an act of hate or selfishness. And in the same way that one kindness often blossoms into many more, so a cross remark may spread like an evil fungus.

It has been said that as the homes go, so goes the Nation. Because I am part of a home, I am a factor in the way this Nation goes. There are four in our family, Mr. Congressman: my parents, my little brother, and myself. If I am kind, happy, helpful, considerate, and loving toward them, I will be helping to make a Christian atmosphere in our home. And if, when daddy goes off to drive his trucks, and mother cleans the house or does the dishes, and Tommy and I start to school—if we carry with us a Christian atmosphere, it will help to guide us all day long, and we will be speaking for Christian citizenship.

I must take responsibilities at school where citizens are being trained. I must ask for that guidance which will keep me on the straight and narrow path—perhaps the hard way, but certainly the right way. And though I am only a teen-ager, I must acquire well the habit of looking to a higher source; then when I become a voter and in part responsible for the fate of the freedoms, I will be able to discern the way to speak for a Christian world and a peaceful world.

I, too, can speak for Christian citizenship by being courageous. I must be brave enough to stand up for my ideals and for justice and for the right. It will not be easy to be a Christian citizen, but I must have courage to be just that. I must have strength of character that I may be absolutely honest—never cheating, that I may openly oppose anything which will harm my best, such as intoxicating drinks, that I may combat indifference, intolerance, and racial prejudice.

What dauntless faith and fearlessness the colonists must have had to pit their small strength against the queen of the seas. It is for both you and me, Mr. Congressman, in this 20th century to look to their example and take courage to go forth today and crusade for Christian citizenship.

Sincerely yours,

Jana Woodrum.

Winning Essay in Texas Soil Conservation Contest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 4, 1954

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the interest of Texas youth in soil conservation is well exemplified by the winning essay in the Save the Soil and Save Texas awards program sponsored by the Fort Worth Press.

This essay was written by Bobby Burnett, 17-year-old Lamesa (Tex.) High School senior, and a member of the Lamesa high chapter of the Future Farmers of America. He is going to be a farmer. He will be a good one.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of Bobby Burnett's winning essay be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the essay was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

What can I do about soil conservation? Shall I postpone what I can do until tomorrow, or shall I do something that will save our soil today? Today I must do something or tomorrow—there wil be no tomorrow. Today's soil is tomorrow's bread, and my duty is to save a nation—a world—from hunger. Can I tell every farmer in this great country to run terraces, to plant cover crops, and to use some type of crop rotation? No, I cannot.

Because I am planning to become a farmer, my efforts toward improving the soil must be tireless. I must protect my land at all times. To encourage other farmers to practice conservation I must perform the following measures: terracing, contour cultivation, strip cropping, cover cropping, and deep-breaking. To the rancher, I must emphasize the importance of pasture improvement and range management. Should I move to an area where there is timber, my work in soil conservation would go on, for good woodland management means more lumber, pulpwood, and fuel in the future. All the things that I can do toward soil improvement cannot be done on the farm or on the ranch. My cooperation with my soil conservation district will not only aid me directly but my interest will encourage indifferent farmers to seek help and advice from the district. Having studied soil management in the FFA, I have acquired a knowledge of the soil that will help me in future years.

What can be my greatest contribution to soil conservation? I can turn from my greed and selfishness of planting one money crop year after year and give the soil the rest and food it needs. I, you, we—everybody can dedicate his land to God, whence it came, and our lives to the preservation of His good earth.

In Tribute to Poland, the First Ally

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES G. OAKMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 3, 1954

Mr. OAKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I consider it an honor to participate in the celebration of the anniversary of Polish independence and to pay tribute to a heroic people. Today all people of Polish extraction greet this eventful date with a song on their lips, the Third of May Mazurka, and I am sure that even though the Iron Curtain alters the tones and distorts the words, the echo repeats from all sides:

> Poland is not dead yet,
> While we are alive.

On May 3, 1791, Poland guaranteed freedom to all her citizens by adopting a constitution, and became the first nation in Europe to have a written democratic document proclaiming the principles of human liberty.

On September 1, 1939, Poland was the first nation to take up arms to resist Nazi aggression—the first who had the courage to say no to Hitler. Poland in her international policy was faithful at all times, not only to the letter but also to the spirit of her treaties, and did not allow herself to be led astray by the Nazi proposal to take part in an attack on Soviet Russia, and refused to cooperate in any anti-Soviet plot, abiding by her neutrality and striving for peace. Yes; Poland was first to fight, and for this honor paid dearly with the blood of her soldiers, not only in Poland during the September campaign but on all Allied fronts—in Norway, France, in the Battle of Britain, Africa, Italy, Belgium, Normandy, Holland, Germany—on the seas, and in the skies over Europe.

Poland was the first ally. While Poland was the "mother of the United Nations," she was excluded from the Conference of the United Nations, convened on April 25, 1945, at San Francisco. Yet the thought that was to guide the work of the San Francisco Conference was expressed by a Polish King in 1750—Stanislaw Leszczynski, one of the early protagonists of international cooperation, who wrote a memorandum on strengthening the general peace. The thought underlying his plan was that the community of nations should go to the assistance of any country attacked. Likewise, in 1833, Poland's greatest poet, Adam Mickiewicz, proclaimed in his works the ideal of the common brotherhood of man—a genuine international organization.

The Polish people have always been brave to the point of folly and they have always been believers in freedom. Time and again they have been found defending the rights of men and women to live their own lines in their own way. The Polish people fought against a German invader trying to steal other peoples' lands as far back as the year 963. In 1241 they saved Europe from the invading Tartar hordes. In 1685 it was Sobieski and the gallant Poles who protected and saved Christianity from the ravages of the Mohammedan sword and stopped the infidel hordes from overrunning Europe and destroying the Christian people. The liberty-loving Poles came to the aid of our American Colonies in the Revolutionary War. Wherever liberty and justice are at stake, the sons of Poland never fail to rally. Thousands of Polish boys from my State fought courageously on the battlefields of Korea.

Poland has always been devoted to the cause of humanity. Her contributions to human liberty and free institutions are glorious. She is a symbol of freedom and of peace.

In observing this anniversary of a great event in the history of Poland, let us recognize that the fate of this old, brave, great nation still disturbs the world and America. At Yalta, Teheran, and Potsdam we played a role not entirely compatible with our ideals. Let us all hope and pray that Poland, the first nation in Europe to adopt a democratic form of government, will be permitted to work out her own destiny under a government of her own, chosen by her own people.

New Look Reexamined

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1954

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, the final and most meaningful test of a military strategy, or weapons system, is the crucial test of actual combat in the field. Yet in an era of cold war, of psychological warfare, or total diplomacy, the test of strategy and weapons is much less certain or decisive.

For many months now this Nation has been operating under what was proclaimed as the New Look in military-foreign policy and strategy.

Recent events in southeast Asia plus the experience of our military experts in current North Carolina maneuvers—Exercise Flash Burn—offer us the basis for a reexamination of the New Look in light of actual experience. The speaker's podium is often far removed from the actuality in the field. Perhaps this was the case when the New Look was first proclaimed.

Significant questions arising out of recent experience have been raised by Hanson W. Baldwin, in New York Times of May 2, 1954. I include his article in the RECORD:

NEW LOOK REEXAMINED IN LIGHT OF INDOCHINA—QUESTION IS HOW MUCH TO DEPEND ON NEW WEAPONS, HOW MUCH ON OLD

(By Hanson W. Baldwin)

FORT BRAGG, N. C., May 1.—In Washington and in the pine forests and on the sand hills of North Carolina the Nation's New Look military policies were under debate and test this week.

In Washington the House of Representatives approved—though not without misgivings—a military budget for the next fiscal year of about $28.7 billion, some $5.6 billion less than the current budget. Here, in the Fort Bragg area, the Army, holding its largest postwar maneuvers in conjunction with the Air Force, is utilizing new weapons and experimenting with both new and old techniques. The ground forces, most heavily hit by budget cuts, are faced with a reduction in the next fiscal year from 20 to 17 divisions and a further tentatively planned reduction in future years to 14 or 15 divisions. And Army, Navy, and Air Force are also in the most difficult and uncertain tactical and organizational transition from solid past to uncertain future since the United States first became a Nation.

In Washington, stirred by the Indochina crisis and the political dangers of Geneva, Secretary of Defense Charles E. Wilson frankly admitted that the next few months might force a new look at the New Look. The Secretary's phrase—a soul-searching review of our present politico-military policies—bore a striking resemblance to the agonizing reappraisal which Secretary of State Dulles said we faced if the European Defense Community Treaty is not ratified.

BASIS FOR THE NEW LOOK

The global outlook in Washington, which of course affects our military policies, is plainly influenced by the current crises in Europe and Asia. The original New Look policies were intended to prepare the Nation for the long pull instead of a particularized date of crisis; to give first priority to a capability for massive retaliation (by atomic and hydrogen weapons) as a deterrent to war and as a defense against atomic attack; to emphasize seapower and airpower, mobility and flexibility; to decrease somewhat fixed United States land commitments overseas and to increase the readiness of the Army strategic reserve in this country; to improve United States air and continental defense, and, particularly, to cut military costs.

The reductions in Army strength that were a part of these policies were predicated upon assumptions that, gradually, many—if not all—of our United States troops could be withdrawn from Korea; that Japan would rearm; that United States Army commitments overseas would be slightly decreased—not increased—and that the European Defense Community Treaty would be passed and Germany would be rearmed.

What Washington faced last week was the agonizing possibility that some of these assumptions might be invalid.

WITHDRAWAL OF TROOPS

Two Army divisions have been withdrawn from Korea, and in the next fiscal year several others may be withdrawn as the 21-division South Korean Army is better trained and equipped. But Geneva offers no prospect of any final Korean settlement; the Communists in North Korea still number well over 1 million men and the withdrawal of all United States forces is not in sight. Japan has started the long, hard road back as a military power, but it will be some years before she is capable of providing a reasonable degree of self-defense. Our forces there can, perhaps, be reduced—but not eliminated—for a long time to come.

The potentially dangerous political situation at Geneva might deliver the coup de grace to the long dormant European Defense Community Treaty. And firm security for Western Europe is unlikely without German men under arms. There is no prospect of any major withdrawal of United States manpower from Europe in the near future. But the issue is most clearly exemplified by Indochina.

The deteriorating position of the French defenders of Dien Bien Phu and of the Red River Delta emphasized, ironically, the role of United States Army ground forces in our security policies. United States naval and air aid to the Dien Bien Phu defenders was ruled out in Washington some time ago, for military as much as political reasons.

DOUBTS ON UNITED STATES HELP

The contracted perimeter of the Dien Bien Phu's strong points, the lack of adequate ground-air communications, the onset of the monsoon and other reasons convinced our Washington military authorities that, so far as Dien Bien Phu was concerned, United States naval and air aid at this late date could not be effective.

But this week, the French military attaché—one of a group of foreign observers at these maneuvers—watched with mixed feelings as some 9,000 American airborne soldiers parachuted from fleets of transport aircraft. Here was the very type of troops that could aid Dien Bien Phu. But the 82d Airborne Division, participating in exercise Flash Burn, is 1 of only 2 airborne divisions the United States Army has. Both are in this country; both have prior strategic commitments.

One or two airborne divisions might save Dien Bien Phu—if they could be flown there in time, which is now very unlikely. But probably 5 to 10 divisions or more would be needed if Indochina were to be saved. Even this number might not be conclusive, and certainly would not be if the Chinese Communists intervened in large numbers.

Neither the United States nor its allies has any such number of divisions available today unless (a) other areas are dangerously weakened, and/or (b) additional units are mobilized or activated and additional funds are provided for the Army.

COST OF INTERVENTION

Large-scale ground intervention in Indochina would probably require the United States to increase its Army to at least 25 to 30 divisions—instead of decreasing it to 17—and to add $5 to $10 billion to its military budget instead of subtracting $5 billion from it.

This is one dilemma. It is essentially a strategic, politico-military and psychological problem. Faced with an Indochina type of war, are we willing to fight another Korean-type conflict with the necessary costs in money, men, and blood? Or are we willing to utilize only air and naval aid (and a limited number of ground specialists) at the risk that such aid would not be effective? Or would we spread the war to retaliate against China at a time and place of our choosing?

Are we willing, in other words, to fight a limited conventional war in an area most advantageous to the enemy—the jungles of Indochina—or would we fight a war to win in an area of our choosing, utilizing perhaps, new as well as conventinal arms? This is one problem which only Washington can decide. But there is another. Gradually and perceptibly it may be decided by maneuvers such as this one in the sand hills of North Carolina.

WEAPONS OF THE FUTURE

The Army, the Navy, and the Air Force are all integrating atomic weapons and missiles into their tactics and organizational structure to an increasing degree. But the new missiles are not fully perfected; the push-button age has just started. In short, the Army and the other services are groping into an unknown future.

But even so, there is already a noticeable tendency on the part of the Army and the other services, particularly the Air Force, to depend upon atomic and hydrogen arms as an answer to all military situations. Indochina with its jungles and mountains and roadless terrain, its enemy naturally trained to dispersion, digging, camouflage, and cover, suggests strongly that such weapons as the "Corporal" guided missile, or the 85-ton 280-millimeter cannon or the atomic bomb would have very limited, if any, application there. But if the present trend continues, the Army and the Air Force in particular, may become so dependent upon these new weapons that they cannot fight effectively without them.

This is the second dilemma—how much to tailor our practical concepts and training manuals to the new arms, how much to depend on the old. Here again Indochina suggests caution and not extremism; we must be ready for the new but we must retain the best of the old.

The St. Lawrence Iceway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 7, 1954

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the St. Lawrence seaway, if it ever becomes a reality, will lie idle for 5 out of every 12 months because of ice. Therefore, it should really be called the St. Lawrence iceway, according to the following editorial taken from the March 23, 1954, issue of the Beaumont (Tex.) Enterprise:

THE ST. LAWRENCE ICEWAY

Calling the St. Lawrence seaway the St. Lawrence iceway does not please advocates of this project who make much of its alleged benefits but have nothing to say about two facts which could outweigh all its potential value to the United States.

Several months of every year the St. Lawrence is choked with ice. The ship channel proposed, being only 27 feet deep, would be too shallow for all but light-draft oceangoing vessels.

A photograph of the International Rapids section of the St. Lawrence, taken last January, shows an arctic expanse of ice, where navigation would be impossible for any kind of vessel but an icebreaker. Hard work by icebreakers precedes the annual rebirth of Montreal as a seaport.

Another objection to the seaway never mentioned by its proponents is that one bomb dropped by an enemy plane (from Russia, maybe) would put the seaway out of business.

All the northern part of the United States is now admittedly open to air raids over the top of the world. If invaders got through the air defense of Canada and the United States there would be nothing to prevent them from destroying installations in the International Rapids section of the seaway as they headed for large cities and industrial centers of the United States: Indeed, the St. Lawrence seaway might be the first target struck if and when world war III begins.

The St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 4, 1954

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include two editorials relative to the St. Lawrence seaway. The first editorial entitled "Seaway Vote Nears," appeared in the May 1 edition of the Washington Daily News; and the second editorial appeared in this morning's edition of the New York Herald Tribune:

[From the Washington Daily News of May 1, 1954]

SEAWAY VOTE NEARS

The bill for American participation with Canada in the building of the St. Lawrence seaway was passed by the Senate weeks ago. Now it is scheduled for a House vote next week.

Some have misgivings about the economic soundness of the seaway. But the seaway will be built whether the United States helps or not.

The issue, then, is whether our Government should have a voice in the administration of an important waterway on its northern border.

There is only one sensible answer to that—yes.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of May 4, 1954]

THE SEAWAY IN THE HOUSE

In his state of the Union message President Eisenhower listed the St. Lawrence seaway project as something to be acted on "promptly." First recommended by President Coolidge in 1923, it has been supported by successive Presidents but put off by the Congress under pressure from regional interests. Now at last it has been passed by the Senate; it has been voted on favorably by the House Public Works Committee. Tomorrow it comes up for debate, with the prespect of a decisive vote by Thursday.

The bill will create a seaway development corporation, an agency of the United States, authorized to incur up to $105 million in obligations direct to the Treasury. The United States share of the tolls on the 1,200-mile seaway running between the Great Lakes and the North Atlantic is expected to make the project self-liquidating.

To the well-founded arguments for the seaway a new urgency has been added by Canada's willingness and readiness to go ahead on its own if the United States is not prepared to share in the undertaking. By every test of national interest, national security, and national dignity this is something from which we cannot want to be excluded. It is to be hoped that the House will follow the lead of the Senate in approving it by a large majority.

A preliminary hurdle has been raised in the form of the so-called Brownson amendment, which would disrupt the present schemes for financing the work and perhaps delay it so long as to make cooperation with Canada impossible. This and other crippling amendments must be voted down. Passage of the bill as it now stands will be a solid accomplishment for which this Congress will be remembered.

Rhode Island Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AIME J. FORAND
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 4, 1954

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, today is Independence Day for the great and glorious State of Rhode Island. One hundred and seventy-eight years ago, on May 4, 1776, the State of Rhode Island declared with impunity her independence from Great Britain. It repealed an act entitled "An act for the more effectual securing to his Majesty the allegiance of his subjects in this His Colony and Dominion of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations." This was Rhode Island's formal severance of the proverbial "umbilical cord" of social, political, and economic ties from her mother country. This was the "shot heard around the world." This was the day that the State of Rhode Island led the colonies in taking similar action, which was taken 60 days later on July 4, 1776.

Among her many notable firsts, Rhode Island's great initiative for freedom was in its founding. It was in Rhode Island that Roger Williams, one of the preeminent benefactors of mankind, instituted his practice of religious tolerance, enabling the populace to pursue their choice of worship.

The second great initiative in the cause of freedom was the procuring of the first charter making Rhode Island an independent colony of Great Britain. This was accomplished fearlessly while the trained guns of the British Navy breathed heavily down the necks of the subscribers to the charter.

The initiative by Rhode Island in opposing the taxation acts was exemplified in the agitation over the Sugar and Stamp Acts which brought on the hostilities that culminated in the Revolution. In this Rhode Island was conspicuously aggressive.

The initiative in the war did not find Rhode Island wanting. The battle of Lexington was fought April 19, 1775; the next day 1,000 men were on the march from Providence to Boston, but they were stopped by dispatchers from Lexington.

The first gun fired upon the ocean at any part of His Majesty's Navy in the American Revolution was discharged from a sloop under command of Capt. Abraham Whipple on June 15, 1775, 2 days before the battle of Bunker Hill. This was the beginning of a glorious era in the naval enterprise of Rhode Island. The affair led to the correspondence between Captain Whipple and Captain Wallace, of the British frigate, which contained the following repartee:

> You, Abraham Whipple, on the 10th of June 1772, burned His Majesty's vessel the *Gaspee*, and I will hang you at the yardarm.
>
> JAMES WALLACE.

This was answered as follows:

> To Sir JAMES WALLACE.
>
> SIR: Always catch a man before you hang him.
>
> ABRAHAM WHIPPLE.

This bravery and humor is typical of Rhode Island. Our State's firmness lies in her record. Rhode Island still remains the land of "firsts." The circumstances have changed the times, but the character and determination still lies dormant only to be kindled by any sort of tyranny over the mind of man.

Though small in size, Rhode Island has led the Nation in its biggest controversies. The accomplishments of our great State can be summed up in the inimitable words of Winston Churchill when, in addressing the Royal Air Force, he said:

> Never before have so few contributed so much to so many.

The St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES G. OAKMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1954

Mr. OAKMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that sectionalism is still noticeable in the attitude of certain newspapers concerning the St. Lawrence seaway legislation. The Philadelphia Inquirer has adopted a very narrow attitude promoting appropriations for the Delaware River by opposing United States participation in the St. Lawrence seaway. This has created a reaction in other parts of the country which is very unfortunate. As evidence of this, I submit for the RECORD editorials from St. Paul Pioneer Press, Cleveland Plain Dealer, Cincinnati Enquirer, and the Detroit Free Press:

[From the St. Paul Pioneer Press of April 10, 1954]

SELFISH OPPOSITION

The Philadelphia Inquirer supplies an example of the kind of selfishness that goes into the opposition to the St. Lawrence waterway. The Inquirer is demanding that Congress appropriate $8,400,000 out of the national pork barrel now, and then 4 millions a year forever, to give Philadelphia a 40-foot channel to the sea. At the same time it is fighting with all its might against American participation in the Canadian project for a self-supporting channel from the Great Lakes into the Atlantic.

The people of the Lake States do not oppose the improvement of Philadelphia's existing outlet to the sea, even if it is a Treasury handout while the St. Lawrence seaway would be self-liquidating. But they can reasonably demand that the St. Lawrence be deepened to 27 feet, before the Delaware River is deepened to 40. The Lake States have waited 30 years and more for direct access to the sea and it is certainly their turn to get some kind of a St. Lawrence waterway before others are handed de luxe improvements for those they had all these years.

The Inquirer makes much out of the fact that the St. Lawrence would be frozen over for 4 months out of the year, and seems to think it would not be of much use, for example, as a highway for Laborador iron ore, for that reason. So are the Great Lakes frozen over for 4 months of the year, but in the remaining 8 months, some 200 million tons of traffic is transported on the lakes. In those 8 months of navigation, more tons of traffic go through the Soo canal than through the Panama and Suez canal together in 12 months.

The steel industries of the Lake States would handle the Labrador ore in just the same fashion as they have the ore from the head of the lakes since iron was first mined here in Minnesota. They stockpile enough in spring, summer, and fall to carry the mills through the winter.

Only 2 out of Pennsylvania's delegation of 30 in the House are on record for American participation in the St. Lawrence seaway that would serve half of the North American Continent. But doubtless all or nearly all of them favor the handing out of millions to improve Philadelphia's "personal" seaway.

As the battle for the St. Lawrence project goes into its final stage, the slogan should be: "No second helpings for anyone until the Lake States get theirs first."

[From the Cleveland (Ohio) Plain Dealer of April 11, 1954]

SEAWAY SILLINESS

The Philadelphia Inquirer of late has stuck its masthead out the window and began gobbling up all the old chestnuts against the St. Lawrence seaway. Of course that may not be too difficult in Philly, because one of the main thoroughfares is Chestnut Street.

What irks us is the lack of reason in the Inquirer's arguments.

Ice clinks the Inquirer. The seaway will be frozen up and useless 5 months of the year, the paper argues.

Even if this were true, which it isn't, what difference does it make? Apparently the Inquirer editorial writer is so provincial that he never has heard of the Soo Canal or certainly of how transportation works on the Great Lakes.

Despite seasonal interruptions because of winter freezing, the Soo in 8 months handles more tonnage than both the Panama and Suez Canals combined do over the full year. The idea of stockpiling seems to have eluded the Inquirer.

Less than 4 percent of American flagships now afloat will be able to use the seaway's 27-foot channel, goes another of the Inquirer's arguments. By way of quashing that nonsense, Maj. Gen. S. D. Sturgis, Jr., chief of the Army engineers, told the Lake Carriers Association here last week that 75 percent of the ships using New York Harbor could go through the proposed waterway. Naturally no one here expects to see the Queen Mary docked at the East Ninth Street pier.

The Inquirer questions that the seaway would be essential for national defense. Should we take the paper's word against that of the President, members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and all those charged with safeguarding this Nation? Somehow we feel it is wiser to go on their recommendations.

New Deal boondoggle—that's what the Inquirer calls the seaway. Presidents Woodrow Wilson, Warren G. Harding, Herbert Hoover might be fascinated with this description. They backed the project years before the New Deal and/or boondoggle era. By the same token, the Plain Dealer must be New Dealerish, for we were the first major newspaper to sponsor the project.

But the Inquirer says the seaway (a self-liquidating proposal through tolls) should be blocked. Instead the United States taxpayer would be better off shelling out some $36 million to dredge the Delaware River Channel to a 40-foot depth. A small section of the population would thus benefit at the expense of all. If that isn't boondoggling, what is?

The irritating part of it is that some people who have votes on the seaway actually swallow such guff. Twenty-eight of Pennsylvania's 30 Congressmen are supposedly committed in opposition.

Such stubbornness, fortunately, can no longer prove much. Congressional double shuffling on the seaway issue can be expected to evaporate shortly after the Easter recess ends late this month.

[From the Cincinnati Enquirer of April 22, 1954]

LET'S HAVE THE SEAWAY

By now, just about every valid argument against American participation in the development of the St. Lawrence seaway has been advanced and disposed of. Meanwhile, the reasons for going ahead with the project steadily have become more persuasive.

After all, it has been advocated by every successive administration and debated exhaustively for more than 20 years. Whatever boondoggling aspects it may have had in early years, the pending proposal embodies nothing rash, nothing socialistic, nothing unfair or prejudicial to any section of the Nation. The measure approved early this year by the Senate calls only for American development of that section of the seaway which traverses the International Rapids, leaving the other sections to be handled by Canada, and it is not complicated by any provision for the generation of hydroelectric power.

The measure does not contemplate a vast public subsidy, for it would set up the seaway development on a self-liquidating basis, with the bonds to be bought by the Treasury and retired from tolls on shipping.

Paradoxically, all opposition to the seaway development has not yet disappeared, by any means. However, most of the remaining opposition easily identifies itself from the standpoint of self-interest.

The Philadelphia Inquirer, for example, almost waxes apoplectic at the mention of the seaway, yet in the next breath demands Federal subsidization—or rather plain outright payment for—a 40-foot-deep, 800-foot-wide Delaware River channel from Philadelphia to the Atlantic, and complains bitterly that only $2,150,000 a year is earmarked for maintenance of the channel.

We can, and cheerfully do, concede the economic justification for making Philadelphia an ocean port. But isn't it incongruous for Philadelphians to storm and rage at the thought of opening up the landlocked Midwest through a self-liquidating project?

Certainly we have no proprietary interest in the St. Lawrence seaway, and in certain respects it presents a competitive disadvantage to this river-and-rail city, but we believe a project so clearly worthwhile to all the

North Central States is therefore useful to the Nation as a whole, and certainly is not to be opposed for the sake of anyone's own back-yard interests.

In an effort to prove that the seaway is a "boondoggle," the Philadelphia Inquirer ran a picture on its editorial page showing the International Rapids section of the St. Lawrence frozen over in January, using this to ridicule the idea that the seaway would be valuable to national defense, or would provide an efficient and inexpensive route for bringing labrador ore to Middle Western steel mills.

The opposition is hard up indeed when it resorts to such boobytrap arguments as this. Ore shipments along the present Great Lakes route from the Mesabi range are carried on in the spring, summer and fall. Ice-locking of the canals in winter is accepted and taken into account in production planning—and the same would be true in the case of the St. Lawrence seaway route.

If the Atlantic port cities ridicule the freight-carrying potentialities of the seaway, how can they argue, simultaneously, that it would ruin them?

Virtually all of the remaining arguments against the St. Lawrence seaway (except that ice-locked boogy) could just as plausibly have been used to prevent the digging of the Panama Canal. If we wait much longer to proceed with this national improvement, the historians of the future are likely to assume we had rocks in our heads.

[From the Detroit Free Press of May 1, 1954]

VICTORY IN SIGHT: SEAWAY BILL NEARS PASSAGE

The St. Lawrence seaway development has moved closer to realization than at any time since it was first seriously proposed, well over a generation ago.

After hopes for favorable congressional action had ebbed and waned during the past few months, the House Rules Committee on Thursday gave the measure its approval and sent it to the floor of the House.

It now is scheduled to come up for final vote next week. By next Friday the seaway bill may have become law.

The history of this project, of such tremendous importance to the economy of the American hinterland, has been one of selfish obstructionism by vested and local interests which have been unable to visualize the overall benefits because of myopia produced by concern for sectional or private advantage.

This attitude has caused delay to such a degree that only the most unwavering determination in the face of constant disappointment and defeat has enabled the St. Lawrence route to the sea to be revived each time its opponents believed it was safely buried.

The more recent history of the project has been more encouraging.

In January 1954, for the first time, the Senate passed the seaway bill.

After the House received it, with prospects still bright, the House Public Works Committee quickly gave it strong approval. Then it went to the Rules Committee, where opponents were entrenched.

There it languished, and once more hope for ultimate favorable action began to fade. Then Thursday's release of the measure by the Rules Committee, making a full House vote possible, raised new prospects that the long battle may be nearly over.

However, it is not over.

Backers of the seaway bill still have a great deal of missionary work to do; wavering votes must be fastened down, and converts must be made.

None of that will be easy, but scenting victory, we can be assured that champions of the measure, in and out of Congress, will exert themselves as never before.

One of the things which provides a favorable augury for the seaway is the fact that it rates high on President Eisenhower's legislative program.

That program has not been advanced as the President and his party leaders would prefer. In fact, the ability of the administration to produce a substantial part of its legislative program in this session may have a strong bearing on the outcome of the November elections.

Lukewarm Republicans, aware of this, may now, perhaps, be counted upon to back the seaway bill for the purpose of being able to cite accomplishment when they seek reelection this fall.

Failure to vote favorably on the seaway may cause many of their constituents to ask the embarrassing question of why they failed to support the President's program.

That realization on the part of the Representatives may account for the reason the bill finally come out of the Rules Committee, when time was running short.

It offers the best hope that by next week roadblock amendments will have been successfully hurdled and the seaway will have become law.

Governor Meyner and VFW Commander in Chief Richards Speak at Americanization Day Exercises

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. HART

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1954

Mr. HART. Mr. Speaker, in 1931, on the last Sunday of April, Capt. Clinton E. Fisk Post, No. 132, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, of Jersey City, initiated its celebration of Americanization Day. Interest in the celebration was relatively small.

Each succeeding year the same post has continued to observe the last Sunday of April as Americanization Day, and has had the gratification of seeing the celebration grow into the second largest demonstration of its kind in the United States.

As usual, a large committee of willing and earnest workers, this year under the direction of A. Pat Menendez, past commander, Clinton E. Fisk Post, as general chairman labored long and diligently in preparation of the great event.

More than 20,000 military and civilian units participated in this year's parade, witnessed under bright skies by many thousands of Jersey City citizens. The marchers, led by 45 bands, represented veterans' organizations, military, civic, and social groups from 6 States of the Union.

Grand marshal of the parade was Sergeant William F. Borer, a Korean war prisoner for 34 months, who was accompanied by 4 other ex-prisoners of the Korean Communists, recently returned to their homes, namely, Stanley Bartholomew, John Midolo, Robert A. Brown, and Arie VanRyn. Designated as aides to the grand marshal were Capt. Francis X. Burke, Lt. Stephen R. Gregg, Sgt. John W. Meagher, and Nicholas Oresko, all of Hudson County, all holders of the Congressional Medal of Honor. A fifth aide was Commander James P. Clark. After its long march along Hudson Boulevard, the parade swung into Pershing Field, past the stand where it was reviewed by high officials of all the most prominent veterans' organizations and their ladies auxiliaries and by State, county, and city officials too numerous to mention individually.

Prior to the arrival of the parade at Pershing Field, thousands gathered and listened intently and with enthusiastic interest to a number of addresses, most of which, though brief, were inspirational in nature.

Invocation and benediction were by Rev. Abram Pepling, pastor, Second Reformed Church, and a prayer was offered by Rabbi A. L. Gottesman, both of Jersey City. Mayor Bernard J. Berry delivered a welcoming address. Others who spoke were Maj. Gen. C. S. Ryan, commanding general, Fort Dix, N. J.; Raymond Clyons, of Hoboken, commander, Department of New Jersey, American Legion; Alexander Gow, of Paterson, commander, Department of New Jersey, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States; William Wark, of New Jersey, Supreme Commander, Military Order of Cooties, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States; Rev. Stephen Paul Kenny, C. P., pastor, St. Michael's Monastery Church, Union City, Marjorie Concepion, president, Department of New Jersey, Ladies Auxiliary, Veterans, of Foreign Wars, of United States, and myself, whose privilege it has been to speak at all 23 of these annual exercises.

The two principal figures on the reviewing stand were Hon. Robert B. Meyner, the personable and energetic Governor of New Jersey, and Wayne E. Richards, national commander in chief of Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States. Both were accorded ovations by their large audience before and at the conclusion of their remarks. The Governor spoke without notes. He termed the parade and accompanying exercises "one of our effective answers to communism," and exhorted his hearers "to make all of the 365 days in the year days in which we display our faith in the American system."

Commander in Chief Richards spoke in sharp, incisive tones and with a deep sense of conviction that held the attention of the throng as he delivered the following address:

PRESERVATION OF AMERICAN FREEDOM REQUIRES ETERNAL VIGILANCE

(Address by Wayne E. Richards, commander in chief, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States Annual Americanization Day Program, Jersey City, N. J., April 25, 1954)

It is a real privilege for me to attend this mammoth celebration—this traditional Americanization Day in New Jersey—as sponsored by the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States. I welcome this visit with the senior leaders and distinguished citizens of your great State. Long have I been aware of the uncommon interest of New Jersey in the veterans' welfare. This great gathering today is ample proof of your deep and abiding interest in all that the veteran fought for—our America.

As an American citizen, I am proud to stand up and be counted on this memorable occasion. And as commander in chief of the one million and a quarter members of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, I bring their thanks and their profound appreciation for all that the committee—and the supporting organizations—have done to make this one of the largest and most impressive patriotic celebrations of its kind in the United States. As you know, the Americanization Day here marks the beginning of Loyalty Week which is sponsored by the VFW throughout the United States and in Panama, Hawaii, and Alaska.

We are here to pay tribute to a great American ideal—the American Republic. We are reminded that the Founding Fathers created and bequeathed us the first government in the history of the world to be dedicated to the personal, political, and religious welfare of mankind. There is hardly any limit to the blessings of life that are possible with the full realization of this great political ideal. The closer we shape our lives to all the obligations of American citizenship, the happier we will be as individuals—and the greater our strength as a Nation.

The extent to which we realize this great American dream—the ideal of self-government—depends entirely upon ourselves. However, I ask you, how well have we been doing? I believe you will agree that the subversive forces of socialism and communism have been eating into the fabric of our national life. You know there are conditions existing in our Republic that cause thinking men and women deep concern.

Our meeting today is a challence to Communist philosophy and teachings. We must regain the Spirit of '76—for who can deny that the democratic principles and ideals of self-government of our forefathers are the real glories of America? They served as beacon lights for the dark and stormy night of our early existence as a Republic. May we never forget that eternal vigilance is the price of our freedom—and never in all our history has it been more true than today.

An inspiring patriotic conclave such as this one renews our faith in American ideals and institutions. It emphasizes the value of our priceless heritage. It brings home to every good patriot that in order to maintain and preserve the precious jewels of our heritage, it is necessary for every true American to go so far as to pledge his life, his fortune, and his sacred honor. In short, we are here to rededicate ourselves to Americanism.

And what is Americanism? It is not what is known generally as a system of government. In reality, it embodies government. And this kind of government it embodies is that characterized as the capitalistic form. Americanism is what may be termed a way of life, a theory of human society, a doctrine of human relations that is characteristic of America. It includes a system of government—and certain nongovernmental principles and ideals—that have led to contentment and happiness in everyday living.

What are these principles and ideals? They are many. But among them are freedom, equality, justice, and humanity; genuine service to mankind—including alleviation of human suffering; tolerance in religious and social matters; freedom of the press and of speech; freedom in political life and the right of individual conviction. And, thank the Lord, it includes that sublime principle of self-government—the equality of man before the bar of justice.

Our great problem as of this moment is to preserve these precious things for our children—and we hope, for the children's children. This could be done without too great effort were it not for the international gangster tactics of the Communist Party. The great things we have in this glorious America are those which communism has vowed to destroy. A small group of lustful, cruel, avaricious men of tremendous cunning—with ambition ever whetted by power and the hope of more power, and whose promotions have usually been gained over the bodies of murdered friends—have entered into a diabolical conspiracy to conquer the world.

Among the many approaches and ways planned to take take us over, we should not forget that Communist leaders have openly asserted that communism plans to attain part of its goal through the intermediary of socialism. Remember that communism is only the violent brother of socialism—and furthermore, that both socialism and communism have always had as their objectives the destruction of our present form of government. Is not socialism a wolf stalking in the skin of a lamb? Beware of any brand of creeping socialism. And ever keep in mind that Communist—and socialistic—propaganda has, from the very beginning—yes; from Karl Marx himself—been aimed at the destruction of the capitalistic system.

As plain American citizens, what can we do to preserve our freedoms?

First, we should do all possible to help our youth chart its course. That is so important.

Second, we should exert every effort to help awaken the American people—and most certainly our friends and relatives—to those subversive forces and influences that could undermine our national life and which, if not checked, will have disastrous results.

Third, we should help ourselves and other people to regain spirituality. By this, I mean help infuse anew into ourselves and our people the ideals and principles that are the glory of our Nation.

Fourth, we should reexamine America's history and institutions with a view to strengthening our confidence and faith in the rightness of the democratic cause as practiced here; and in our high destiny as the world's greatest republic, and the leader of the free world.

How may we help our youth, our Nation's most priceless asset, chart its course? First, as parents and friends, find what youth is being taught in the schools. Look over the textbooks. Examine the laws, and where courses in State and American history are required by statute, make sure that the statutes are enforced.

If provisions for the teaching of sound history are not existent, then take steps to see that they are written into the laws, and that the law is forthwith enforced. When and wherever it is found that alien ideologies are taught in the schools with a view to subversion, then it is time to get rid of the teachers. This is equally true of textbooks that covertly teach subversion, or those that advocate the so-called blessings of totalitarian systems and ridicule our own. Constructive criticism of our Government—yes. Advocacy of its overthrow by force—no.

The issue is clear. We should ask ourselves, what is best for our schools? What is best for the 30 million young citizens who are attending them? And who, so soon, will be governing this great country of ours. That philosophy should ever govern us. You and your neighbors, as citizens of the community in which you live, will decide what the young people study, or, I assure you, alien-directed hands will take over.

I beg of you all to keep active at the community level. Do not let the world government UNESCO type of claptrap take over. Steer clear of those reformers who would make over our Government. Do your best to chart the course of our precious youth.

To continue your work as an effective citizen, be active in various opinion-molding organizations such as the PTA, church groups, veteran, and other national organizations. But remember that the Commies infiltrate and work night and day in all segments of American organizations. However, these Red workers, or fellow travelers, can be countered by loyal American citizens.

It is up to all of us to be tireless workers for Americanism. That is the only way by which we can win. Fill those empty chairs at meetings of your unions, veterans' organizations, lodges, and civic groups. Often Communists slip into those empty chairs under the guise of being good, honest citizens. It was recently written, "The empty chair at meetings is America's greatest enemy—and communism's most important aid."

Let's get in and sell America. Let's talk about some of the great things she has done.

Frankly, my friends, we who enjoy the highest standard of living in the world seldom give serious thought as to how this came about. Rarely do we stop to contemplate that it was by the application of great ideals and fundamental principles—such as private enterprise, right to personal property, and competitive business in a climate of freedom.

Let us preach that America gave the common man his greatest hope, and through a system of self-government brought mankind's finest dream to realization in the New World.

The things that brought about this richer, fuller, happier life must be kept before our people in these days of trial. We must learn to think of ourselves not as Europeans, Asiatics, or Africans—or as Protestants, Jews, or Catholics—first, but rather as Americans, regardless of racial extraction or creed—and what is good for America—the land we owe so much. Emphasize the system which gave you and me a break in life. Those things cannot be taken for granted.

Those great principles of our Government—combined with their general application—is unparalleled inspirational reading. What greater historic drama was ever enacted than the creation of the American Nation? It has been said that the signing of the Declaration of Independence was the greatest act of faith of all time. And as for the Constitution of the United States, that imperishable creation of our forefathers has been called by a British statesman the most wonderful work ever struck off at a given time by the brain and purpose of man.

In the conquest of the wilderness, in the making of a civilization, we find history second to none. Study your American history. Read the Government publications on our generous aid to the free world. Learn all possible about our constitutional government. All of these things will help show you why our Nation, under God, became what it is today.

I assure you, the Veterans of Foreign Wars—with its 10,000 posts in this country and abroad—is dedicated to spreading the word of the benefits of our form of government. We consider that our paramount duty.

And finally, as we leave this great inspirational gathering to go about our several tasks, may we take increased pride in our privilege of being a part of this blessed Nation—a pride based upon a devotion to country, a firm resolve to do our part to insure that this Government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall remain strong and ready to meet whatever danger may lie ahead.

The Communist Menace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 4, 1954

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, last Saturday, May 1, a distinguished Member of the United States Senate paid his first visit to New Hampshire. The Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCarran] addressed a statewide conference of the Catholic War Veterans in the city of Manchester, and gave a message of inspiration to all Americans. The Senator from Nevada, whom I value as a friend, and for whose ability and courage I have great respect, made a searching and militant analysis of the Communist menace. I commend his statement to the attention of every thinking person in this Nation. It is with pleasure that I ask unanimous consent to have the Senator's address printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

This is the first speech I have ever made in New Hampshire. I have been through your State, and I have flown over it, but I have never lighted long enough before to unburden myself of any oral expressions. That has been my bad fortune. I do not feel, however, that I am a total stranger here. For one thing, you have given me a wonderful welcome. For another, I know that wherever I find a chapter of your organization, I find friends. Besides, one of my closest friends in the Senate is the senior Senator from New Hampshire, the President pro tempore of the Senate of the United States, the chairman of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, the Honorable Styles Bridges.

Senator Bridges is a man whose sincerity, ability, and unfailing sense of fairness have endeared him to his colleagues on both sides of the aisle. He is one of the most hardworking Senators in Washington; besides. That combination of ability and hard work accounts for Senator Bridges' very substantial achievements during his 17 years in Washington.

Seventeen years ago it wasn't popular to be an anti-Communist. But Senator Bridges never has wavered in his opposition to the world Communist conspiracy. In many fights for anti-Communist causes—some of them lost causes, I am sorry to say, in those days—Senator Bridges has stood with me, sometimes shoulder to shoulder, sometimes more nearly back to back, the numbers on our side were so small.

I have always found your senior Senator a man who puts principle above profit and the welfare of his country above political advantage. Styles Bridges is a good American.

Before I pass from the subject of New Hampshire friends of mine, I want to say a word about the man who invited me to come here and address you, who met me at the train, and who has made all possible arrangements for my comfort; a young man whom I met in Washington quite some years ago, and whose aggressive and enthusiastic approach marked him even then as one who would go far. He is a war veteran, like yourselves, a man who really knows his way around in Washington, and who is also a good American—Wes Powell.

Mr. Chairman, I want to talk to you for a little while about liberty and independence. We call the Fourth of July Independence Day because it is the anniversary of the Declaration of Independence.

We call this America of ours the Land of Liberty because here, as nowhere else on earth, individual liberty has been preserved and protected.

Did you ever stop to think of the relationship between independence and liberty?

In the minds of the Founding Fathers of this Republic liberty was the important thing. They fought for independence because it seemed to them the only way to preserve liberty. To paraphrase the words of Patrick Henry, they did not find life so dear or peace so sweet as to be purchased at the price of chains and slavery.

Because of their vision, their fortitude, and their devotion to the ideals of human freedom, we have independence today, and we have liberty. But do you think the Declaration of Independence alone guarantees that we shall always have independence? Or that the Constitution of the United States, with its Bill of Rights, guarantees that we shall always have the liberties we hold so dear? If you do—if you take it for granted that the liberty we prize can never be lost to us—then you are thinking dangerously.

More than 100 years ago, Daniel Webster said: "God grants liberty only to those who love it, and are always willing to guard and defend it."

That was true then, and it is true now.

The Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States are living documents because generations of Americans have made them live by being willing to fight for the American way of life, and to die for it if necessary. It is the responsibility of this generation to pass on this heritage to the next generation, unimpaired in vigor and validity.

America is not free because she is great; America is great because she is free; because here, as in no other nation under heaven, we have learned to release and to us the energy of free men working under a system of free enterprise and self-government.

In the world today there are many threats to our independence, and to the freedoms which we enjoy, and to both our independence and our freedoms. The greatest of all these threats is world communism.

The orbit of Communist control, which included one-seventh of the world's population in 1917, has seeped and spread until it now embraces more than one-third of the world's population. That increase has been reflected in the Western Hemisphere. The intensification of communism, and underground Communist activity, in the United States, has increased proportionately.

Maybe you have heard arguments about how many Communists there are in the United States.

Mr. J. Edgar Hoover has told us that according to his information, there are about 25,000 trained, steeled, disciplined and regimented underground members of the Communist Party in the United States today. They constitute a grave threat to this country. The Communist Party in the United States is stripped down to its muscle. And if you think 25,000 dedicated and disciplined Communists are too small a group to worry about, remember that is many times the number in the little band of Communists which took over Russia.

The Communist Party leaders themselves have boasted that for every party member there are 10 others who follow the party line or serve the party's cause. That means there is a potential fifth column of more than a quarter of a million persons in the United States.

Many Americans have been lulled into a sense of complacency by the claim that there are comparatively few members of the Communist Party in the United States. If these were just people trying to peddle some new ideas, there would be no need to fear them. But the Communist Party of the United States of America is an operational branch of a worldwide underground movement inspired from abroad and having as one of its major objectives the destruction of our form of government. This situation cannot and must not be dismissed lightly.

Don't ever be fooled by the old lie that the Communist Party is just another political organization. J. Edgar Hoover exploded that one long ago.

Let me quote you his exact words. He said:

"The Communist Party is not a bona fide political party. It is a highly organized, militant, and disciplined conspiratorial group following the whims and dictates of international communism. * * * The Communist Party of the United States constitutes a fifth column if there ever was one."

Much more recently, in an address just last week before the National Congress of the DAR, the director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation stressed one of the most dangerous attributes of the Communist fifth column when he said:

"To me, one of the most unbelievable and unexplainable phenomena in the fight on communism is the manner in which otherwise respectable, seemingly intelligent, persons, perhaps unknowingly, aid the Communst cause more effectively than the Communists themselves. The pseudo-liberal can be more destructive than the known Communist because of the esteem which his cloak of respectability invites."

In the work of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee we have seen the stark truth of that statement demonstrated time and again. The most pitiful thing about this siuation is the fact that many of these pseudo-liberals believe they have arrived at their position and derived their opinions as a result of their own thinking.

They do not realize that they have been misled and misinformed; that they have been conditioned by Communist propaganda to accept certain false promises; that their thinking processes have been twisted by semantic manipulation; in short, that in a very real sense they have been brain washed. I feel sorry for these people, who are helping to tear down the bulwark of their own liberties; but I cannot help them. Their salvation lies in the love of God, and in their own hearts. Not by pressure from outside, but by self-examination and meditation, leading to complete recognition of the essential ungodliness of communism, can one of these find release from the web of wrong assumptions, perverted conception, and bare-faced lies which his own mind has helped to spin about him.

Meanwhile, these deluded ones continue very much in evidence while real hard-core Communists become harder and harder to uncover.

The Communist Party in the United States is going farther and farther underground all the time.

It has been working constantly toward the perfection of a highly developed underground apparatus, and decentralization of Communist Party operations. This decentralization has already tripled the number of Communist Party clubs, and meetings of larger groups have been done away with almost entirely.

The Communist Party has issued no membership cards since 1948. Maintenance of party membership records has been discontinued. Communist Party members talk with each other in guarded phrases with double meanings. They use codes in correspondence. The party has substituted a courier system for other means of communication. Party records have been destroyed, or removed to what are considered secure hiding places. Secret printing facilities, and supplies, have been hidden for future underground operations. Transfers of party members from one district to another are now controlled through the use of an elaborate identification system.

All this means that the Communist Party today has virtually conmpleted its preparation for operating entirely underground. It has selected the secret leaders for its underground appartus. It has established and is operating a far-reaching and vigorous loyalty program of its own. Even the executive committee of the party, itself, has been investigated and reinvestigated to make certain that its members are loyal Communists.

One of the major objectives of the Communist Party today is to infiltrate and if possible take over as many basic industries and special-interest groups as possible. The party is endeavoring particularly to exploit the youth of the country, veterans, civil rights, those of foreign nationality—the so-called foreign-language groups—the press, radio, television, the motion-picture industry, and educational, political, and labor groups, as well as various women's organizations.

When they have succeeded in infiltrating a particular organization, the Communists attempt to use that organization as a transmission belt. That is the Communist approach to the problem of reaching the masses of the people; by having Communists work among the masses in the various organizations.

J. Edgar Hoover has cited the National Lawyers Guild as an example of a Communist transmission belt; on organization which, though it may have many members who are neither Communists nor fellow travelers, nevertheless, as an organization, is used for the furtherance of Communist purposes, and for the dissemination of Communist propaganda.

The Communists have for a long time been concentrating on trade unions as a means of accomplishing their ends. It is a Communist objective to seek to put themselves in a position to sabotage essential industry in sensitive defense areas in the event of a national emergency. Communist efforts toward infiltration have been intensified in basic industries, vital to our security, such as steel, heavy machinery, mining, communications, transportation, the electrical industry, and the maritime industry.

The Communists have developed one of the smoothest and most effective propaganda machines that modern civilization has ever known. They capitalize upon ill-founded charges designed to enlist honest, progressive liberals to support left-wing causes. They look for little grievances which can be blown up into movements. For example, they go into areas where civil rights problems arise, and try to aggravate the situation as much as possible, to create confusion and controversy.

The Communists also operate an efficient and widespread espionage network.

You may be interested to know what some of the primary objectives of Communist espionage agents have been in recent years. I think this is extremely interesting, and perhaps significant. These objectives have included: information on atomic research; the identities of atomic scientists in the United States; radar; jet propulsion; topographical maps of United States coastal areas, including airports and military landing fields; data on biological warfare; our industrial and military resources; and biographical data concerning leading personalities in the United States.

Why do you suppose Communist Russia wants information of that nature? Do you think she wants it to assist in preparing to sit down at the peace table and help us plan for a free world, or do you think Communist Russia wants that information to aid her plans for world conquest and world domination, plans to which the United States is an obstacle, plans which require that the obstacle which is the United States be removed either by military defeat or political domination?

I think I can tell you why Russia wants that information. She wants the information about our scientific advances in the realm of atomic energy and military weapons so that she can keep abreast of our developments in those fields, and if possible get ahead of us in such developments. She wants maps of strategic areas in the United States, because those maps would be useful in the event of war. She wants information about our industrial and military resources, because such information would be similarly useful. She wants to know about our atomic scientists so she can mark the men who are most dangerous to her; men whom she must liquidate, or coerce, or subvert. She wants biographical data concerning leading personalities in the United States so she may determine from their records who are the opponents of communism and what may be done with them; whether they have relatives within the sphere of Communist domination, through whom pressure can be brought to bear upon them; how they can be discredited, or derided, or ridiculed, or politically defeated.

This is not a fairytale I am telling you. This is not a bedtime story. These are cold, hard facts. The sooner the people of America come to know them and face them, the greater chance we shall have for the survival of our liberties, our freedoms, our form of government, our American way of life.

There has been no more ruthless creed than communism, no greater danger to the peace of the world, no greater threat to human liberty and human dignity, since the beginning of recorded history.

This Nation which we all love is engaged today in a relentless struggle with the forces of world communism—an adversary to whom every concession is an admission of weakness, every gesture of appeasement an invitation to further aggression.

It is a struggle which we must win if our children and our children's children are to be free to speak, and write, and work, and worship as they please. It is a struggle which we have a chance to win. We even have a chance to win it without having a shooting war, if we are sufficiently vigilant, sufficiently tough-minded, sufficiently willing to sacrifice, sufficiently willing to pay whatever price may be necessary for the preservation of our independence and our liberty and our freedoms. But if we are not willing to work and to sacrifice for these things we hold dear—yes, and to fight for them, if need be, even to the death—then assuredly we shall have no hope of preserving them.

Two hundred years ago Benjamin Franklin said: "They that give up essential liberty to obtain a little temporary safety deserve neither liberty nor safety."

God grant that we may so conduct ourselves both as individuals and as a Nation in the trying times that lie ahead that we may—in the language of the Constitution—"secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity."

Experience of Jamestown, N. Y., With Municipal-Owned Utilities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 4, 1954

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter to the editor of the Jamestown (N. Y.) Sun, published on Saturday, March 13, 1954, relating to the Niagara power problem.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the EDITOR, JAMESTOWN SUN:

In view of the propaganda against municipal-owned utilities, a brief statement regarding Jamestown's experience may not be out of place.

Private control of industries is proper, but it would be unthinkable for a city to have a multiplicity of water and electric plants.

In the matter of public-utility service, I believe the community should provide such service because public-utility service must, by its very nature, be under a monopolistic control in the area it serves, whether publicly or privately owned. There is consequently no place for free competitive enterprise in such undertakings. The conservative New York Times said at the time the David Lilienthal appointment was made that "the TVA undertaking has done more to promote free enterprise in that section of the South than any other agency."

It was in 1889, I believe, that the writer introduced a resolution which was adopted at an open-forum meeting held in the old Hall block at the corner of Main and Third Streets, urging the city council to submit to a referendum vote a proposition to establish a municipal electric-light plant to light the streets of the city. The resolution was pigeonholed by the city council, but the agitation for a plant was continued by the writer and other newspaper citizen writers, with the result that in 1891 the city built a plant to supply about 130 electric street lights and issued $30,000 of bonds for this purpose.

In 1893 an additional $32,000 bond issue was voted to expand the plant for the purpose of supplying electric lights to homes and business places. This was the first municipal electric plant in America to embark upon such an undertaking. But since the demand for electric service increased beyond the capacity of the plant, there was a growing sentiment for further expansion of the plant. The city council was then in control of the plant and succeeded in delaying such expansion for a period of about 10 years. However, in 1908 a new administration was elected, pledged to bring about an enlargement of municipal utilities sufficient to meet the needs of the community without any tax levies for such purpose and to select nonpartisan administrators having wide experience in industrial management, and also engineers who were not only skilled but sympathetic with municipal requirements as to expansion and the common good. It was these administrators who laid the foundation for the success that has made possible the results since achieved.

Here is a brief summary of the status of the Jamestown plant to date. Purchase value of plant and equipment $12 million which is far less than prevailing prices. Adding the estimated earning capacity and franchise value on the low basis of $13 million, we have a total of $25 million. The franchise value may be 2 or 3 times higher than I have estimated. All of these values however have been achieved without a single dollar of tax levies.

The receipts from consumers during 1953 were $2,300,000. Bonds against the plant are less than $2 million. Deducting from receipts operating expenses of $2 million including tax contributions of $220,000, depreciation $393,000 and part payment on bonds, there still remains a surplus gain of nearly a quarter of a million dollars. During these 40 years the Jamestown consumers have paid $33 million for electric service but if they had paid the rate charged in nearly all the other cities in the United States of America, they would have paid $58 million instead of $33 million. They would have paid $25 million more than they did pay. Hence the Jamestown consumers have conservatively saved $25 million which, added to purchase, earning, and franchise value of the plant, makes a total gain of $50 million to the city.

In this connection it should be stated that the City Electric Department has also voluntarily contributed $2,700,000 in lieu of tax payments and $1 million in dividends. There is no indebtedness against the plant which has to be paid from taxes.

The recent increase of 18 percent in the electric rate was necessary by reason of the excessive cost for the expansion project. But notwithstanding this increase in rates, the Jamestown plant is still among the 3 or 4 plants having the lowest rate in America. In New York State east of Jamestown and Niagara Falls, the rate is 40 percent higher than in this city.

In Jamestown consumers can operate a refrigerator 4 hours for 1 cent, a washing machine 3 hours for 1 cent, a radio 3 hours for 1 cent and toast 15 slices of bread for 1 cent. These remarkable results were obtained in the face of 20 years of competition by a Niagara power syndicate.

SAMUEL A. CARLSON,
Mayor Emeritus of Jamestown, N. Y.

LAKEWOOD, N. Y.

Social and Economic Relationship of United States and Puerto Rico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 4, 1954

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I addressed the House in support of House Resolution 512, creating a Select Committee To Conduct a Survey and Study of the Social and Economic Relationship of the United States and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. These remarks appear on page 5585 of the RECORD of May 3, 1954.

During the course of my remarks I told the House that the Appropriations Committee had advised me that the approximate total annual income from Federal sources paid to Puerto Rico is $88,496,220. Members of the House have asked me for a breakdown of the figures. I am pleased to submit herewith tables which reflect these Federal contributions:

TABLE I.—*Direct grants to Puerto Rico, fiscal year 1952*

Department of Agriculture:	
Agricultural experiment stations—regular grants	$253,656
Cooperative agricultural extension work—regular grants	620,348
National school-lunch program—regular grants	2,885,387
National forests—shared revenues	2,654
Research and Marketing Act of 1946—cooperative projects in marketing	40,707
State and private forestry cooperation, etc	350
Removal of surplus agricultural commodities—value of commodities distributed	326,858
Commodity Credit Corporation—value of commodities donated	506,000
Department of Commerce:	
Civil Aeronautics Administration: Federal airport program—regular grants	$591,757
Bureau of Public Roads—highway construction — regular grants	1,618,993
Department of the Interior:	
Federal aid, wildlife restoration—regular grants	9,270
Department of Labor:	
Unemployment compensation and employment service administration — regular grants	381,585
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare:	
American Printing House for the Blind—regular grants	1,363
Vocation rehabilitation—regular grants	240,268
Colleges for agriculture and mechanic arts — regular grants	50,000
Vocational education—regular grants	478,540
Survey and school construction—emergency grants	19,701
Venereal disease control—regular grants	288,814
Tuberculosis control—regular grants	195,123
General health assistance—regular grants	331,634
Mental health activities—regular grants	52,447
Cancer control — regular grants	53,918
Heart disease control—regular grants	35,412
Water pollution control—regular grants	17,800
Hospital construction, survey and planning — regular grants	1,737,928
Old-age assistance — regular grants	1,721,304
Aid to permanent and totally disabled—regular grants	367,384
Aid to dependent children—regular grants	1,393,852
Aid to the blind — regular grants	43,384
Maternal and child health services—regular grants	372,083
Services for crippled children—regular grants	315,329
Child welfare services—regular grants	228,028
Other:	
Public Housing Administration, Federal annual contributions—regular grants	289,282
Payments to States under Federal Power Act—shared revenues	13
Veterans' Administration, supervision of on-the-job training—regular grants	7,997
Total, direct grants	15,478,167

Source: Annual report of the Secretary of the Treasury.

TABLE II.—*Federal-aid payments to individuals, etc., in Puerto Rico other than direct grants and loans, 1952*

Agricultural conservation program	$980,435
Sugar Act program	17,127,255
National Guard—Army	1,351,914
National Guard—Air Force	399,090
National Cancer Institute research grants	11,286
National Institutes of Health general research grants	18,165
National Heart Institute research grants	14,148
National Neurological Diseases and Blindness Institute research grants	$11,124
National Microbiology Institute research grants	3,000
National Cancer Institute teaching grants	25,000
Automobiles for disabled veterans	1,600
Veterans' Administration readjustment benefits and vocational rehabilitation	12,513,227
Total payments to individuals, etc	32,456,244

Source: Annual Report of the Secretary of the Treasury.

TABLE III.—*Paid civilian employees, Puerto Rico, June 30, 1953*

Department or agency	Puerto Ricans	Other	Total
Treasury	326	34	360
Defense	4,902	361	5,263
Justice	27	67	94
Post Office	816	0	816
Interior	209	5	214
Agriculture	517	45	562
Commerce	53	79	132
Health, Education, and Welfare	99	21	120
Housing and Home finance Agency	75	17	92
Selective Service	163	0	163
Veterans' Administration	612	36	648
All other	50	27	77
Grand total	7,849	692	8,541

Source: Civil Service Commission.

Garrett County, Md.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER

OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 4, 1954

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, there appeared in the Baltimore Sunday American of Sunday, May 2, 1954, an editorial entitled "Garrett County," which reflects credit on one of the great counties of our great State of Maryland. I, therefore, ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GARRETT COUNTY

Garrett County, in the Allegheny mountains west of Cumberland, is noted for its hospitality. That its reputation along that line is well merited was illustrated last week when a survey by local civilian defense officials showed that virtually every household in Oakland, the county seat, would accept refugees from areas bombed in wartime.

Those refugees might be from Baltimore, or from Pittsburgh, or from any other bombed-out area. The people of Oakland will accept them into their homes, no matter from where they come.

Dispatches from Oakland state upward of 1,000 victims of bombing attacks could be sheltered in the homes of Oakland.

The humane attitude of the people of Oakland is greatly to their credit. Their willingness to accept bombed-out persons is in strong contrast to that of another community (not in Maryland) which indicated recently that it wanted no part of homeless, frightened, penniless "displaced persons" fleeing from big-city bombing.

In Oakland the survey disclosed that most households have extra beds to care for refugees.

Oakland's civilian defense chief, the Rev. John J. Atwell, should be proud of his people. For Maryland is proud of Oakland.

Address by Gen. Douglas MacArthur at Manchester, N. H.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 4, 1954

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, on Thursday, last, at a statewide banquet in New Hampshire, sponsored by This Is New Hampshire, headed by the distinguished Governor, Hugh Gregg, my old and distinguished friend, that outstanding soldier and great American, who has served this country so brilliantly, in peace and in war, General of the Army Douglas MacArthur, was present as our honored guest. While there, he delivered an address which I believe to be of real interest.

Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Speech by General Douglas MacArthur

Governor Gregg and, with great pride, may I not now say fellow citizens of New Hampshire, it is indeed a great distinction to address you as an honorary citizen of this historic and beautiful State. It has contributed so much to American freedom, and culture, and progress. No one can ride over its network of modern highways without becoming enthusiastic about its picturesque scenery, its points of historic interest—its wooded hills, its blue lakes, its rustling streams, its deep glens, its tumbling waterfalls, make it beautiful indeed. From the granite highlands of its North with the Great Stone Face, to the low lands of the seacoast harbor of Portsmouth in its South, through its maze of lakes and its measureless stretches of pine and spruce, its mixed stands of birch, maple, oak, and elm, with the constant hint of the wild flowers of the field, the golden rod and purple asters of the roadside and the alpine growths of the high mountain slopes, there is etched an unforgettable picture. And always beating upon memory is the vital mark you and your forbears have placed upon the history of our nation. From the earliest settlement upon these shores down through all the grim crises which accompanied and followed the birth of our beloved Republic, New Hampshire has played its noble role.

Just south of Portsmouth stands the granite monument to the memory of those first settlers of 1623. Capt. John Mason, from Hampshire County, England, with his colony at the mouth of the Piscataqua River, to trade in fish, furs, and lumber can perhaps be called the father of the State. Portsmouth, Dover, Exeter, and Hampton were followed by Nashua, Manchester, and Concord. Its village commons were the muster fields of the Minutemen of the Revolution. New Castle treasures its old fort, the scene of the war's first act of open rebellion. It took the lead of all the Colonies in adopting a State constitution. Down through the ages its great names are legion. Franklin Pierce, President of the United States; Horace Greeley that first and greatest of publishers; Mary Baker Eddy with her Christian philosophy; Thaxter, Proctor, French, MacDowell and an endless list. But to me, first and foremost of all stands the great name of Daniel Webster. He was the hero of my childhood's imagination as my grandfather, a law associate of Rufus Choate, would regale me with stories of those two worthy adversaries of the bar. And always, it seemed that Webster with his outstanding oratory came out best in my grandfather's eyes, despite his personal attachment to Choate. And as I grew older and my own studies of American history began to leave their impressions upon my mind, I realized that although Daniel Webster's life had not embraced those periods of mortal struggle—the first to achieve and the second to preserve the integrity of our Republic—during the interval between the two, he had contributed immeasurably toward the strengthening of our constitutional liberties and the preservation indivisible of our Federal Union. Thus, I have always felt, as an American citizen of New England ancestry, a peculiar obligation to pay my respects to the memory of this great man on the consecrated soil upon which he trod. I was glad, indeed, therefore, to receive the invitation of Governor Gregg to be with you here this evening. And I am doubly glad to meet here, on his native soil, my old and distinguished friend, Senator Styles Bridges. He represents both State and Nation brilliantly.

Possibly it is unnecessary for me to point out to you, that the struggle to preserve undefiled the edifice of national strength and unity which Daniel Webster and his contemporaries did so much to fabricate, still requires in these troublesome times the utmost of our devotion. In Webster's own words: "When the mariner has been tossed for many days in thick weather and on an unknown sea, he naturally avails himself of the first pause in the storm, the earliest glance of the sun, to take his latitude and ascertain how far the elements have driven him from his true course." For there have been, are now, and probably will continue to be, those abroad in the land, blind equally to the lessons history has taught and the facts of contemporary life, who, skeptical of our form of civilization and government, seek to change their underlying fundamentals. Just as did your forebears, we must ourselves, and instruct our children and children's children to guard with increasing vigilance against adventurers in our midst who travel along with those whose evil purpose it is, covertly and cunningly, to subvert and tear down the structure of our free institutions. They hope by these means to ultimately destroy our sovereign independence and curb the constitutional rights and liberties we now enjoy as freemen.

More than anything else, or at any time in our modern history, the Nation needs leaders in the mold of New Hampshire's Daniel Webster. Leaders who, with fearlessness and logic and unchallengeable integrity, will take an invincible stand against any compromise with those immutable principles upon which has always rested our strength as a free people. To such end we must constantly study and analyze, and restudy and reanalyze, our heritage of wisdom from the past, in order that as our birthright we may project its basic principles unerringly into the future. Progress and improvement and imaginative wisdom, yes. But we must reject any leadership which takes upon itself the arrogance arbitrarily to dismiss the lessons of the past as not applicable to the needs of the future. For just as those cardinal truisms of Daniel Webster's time came down from the ages, so will they live on through the ages yet to come. Just as individual life is but a fleeting second in the vast universe of time, so civilization will go on and on into eternity; and the sound ideas which were heeded by our forefathers then, we must ourselves heed now and bequeath unsullied unto civilization a thousand years hence. For the only thing in this world that can go on forever is a sound idea. The only thing in this world you can't stop is a sound idea.

I recall Daniel Webster's words, uttered just 2 short years before his death, as he solemnly spoke of the life and works of those New Englanders who had preceded him: "Thanks to almighty God," he reverently said, "who from that distressed, early condition of our fathers, has raised us to a height of prosperity and happiness, which they neither enjoyed, nor could have anticipated. We have learned much of them; they could have foreseen little of us. Would to God, my friends, would to God, that when we carry our affections and our recollections back to that period, we could arm ourselves with something of the stern virtues which supported them in that hour of peril, and exposure, and suffering. Would to God that we possessed that unconquerable resolution, stronger than bars of brass or iron, which nerved their hearts; that patience, "sovereign o'er transmuted ill," and, above all that faith, that religious faith, which with eyes fast fixed upon heaven, tramples all things earthly beneath her triumphant feet."

May we, in our day, maintain something of those stern virtues with which Webster and his contemporaries were endowed, just as he looked back upon his own forebears to maintain something of those which supported them. May we supplant some of our wastefulness with their frugality, our timidity with their courage, our dependence with their self-reliance, our weakness under Government with their strength over Government. For only thus, may we preserve, unto ourselves and our posterity, that heritage which offers us the vision, and wisdom and strength to safely guide our beloved Nation through the rocks and shoals which lie ahead. Let us perpetuate unto all time and all eyes these grand New Hampshire virtues.

Again, Governor Gregg, my thanks and appreciation for having made me a citizen of this great State.

Power From the Bonneville Power Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 4, 1954

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the Record an editorial entitled "Regional Doubts Not Ended by Interior's Power Reply," published in the Oregonian of April 16, 1954.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Regional Doubts Not Ended by Interior's Power Reply

The Interior Department's reply to the Washington State Power Commission's application for a prior reservation to buy all the seasonal firm and interruptible, or dump, power from the Bonneville Power Administration is reassuring in one part and disturbing in others. Under Secretary Ralph Tudor's letter to Washington State Power Commission raises more questions than it answers.

Colonel Tudor did not question the qualification of the Washington commission as a public-power preference customer under terms of the Bonneville Act, though it would be a wholesaling rather than a utility retailing agency. A precedent for the Washington commission's buying power from Federal generators, transmitting it over Federal lines and selling it to utility customers has been set in Arizona.

Colonel Tudor rejected Washington's request for advance earmarking of all nonfirm Federal energy, now being supplied to other customers and to become available as new generators are put in service, for preference purchase by WSPC. But he said that if Washington builds steam-generating plants, as contemplated, the Bonneville Administration will consider specific requests for interruptible power purchases to be "firmed up" with steam.

This, of course, would add firm power to the Northwest supply. Such an arrangement would benefit the entire region. But there would be no advantage to anyone except the Washington commission if that body became merely a "middleman," without adding steam generation. Nor has it a proper claim on present and future Federal power until it can qualify by building steam plants and adding something of its own. However, WSPC is entitled to a BPA estimate of how much dump power will be available in the system, in order to plan its steam generation.

It is in the latter portion of Colonel Tudor's letter that new issues are raised. He said he thinks there is merit in the idea of the Washington commission becoming Bonneville's exclusive or major customer for resale of power to be consumed within the State of Washington. WSPC thus would acquire earnings which it could use as a revenue base for dam or steam-plant construction. It would take over the customers now served directly by Bonneville. Presumably, one of the results would be higher power rates for Washington consumers, since a middleman's profit would come out of the transactions.

More troublesome still is Colonel Tudor's assumption that the Washington commission would be permitted, if not encouraged, to acquire Federal transmission lines within the State of Washington under a lease-purchase agreement if it became BPA's primary customer there.

This strikes at the heart of the regional concept under which the power resources of the Columbia Basin have been developed by the Federal Government in the past two decades. It could mean the end of the integrated regional system, should political frictions develop in a States rights quarrel. It could seriously affect the claims of States other than Washington to power produced under Federal investment. It would certainly make it more difficult for the Northwest to join in a regional public corporation for generation and transmission of power.

In an address to the Municipal Forum in New York City March 4, Under Secretary Tudor said the Federal Government is not putting "for sale" signs on its dams and transmission lines. But he added:

"The one exception to this rule, if it be an exception, is that if some responsible public body, such as a State, comes in with a concrete proposal to purchase some of our facilities, such a proposal will be approached by us with an open mind."

He mentioned possible sale of the Federal Central Valley project to the State of California and of feeder transmission lines in Arizona to the Arizona Power Commission. In each instance, however, the water used, the dams and generation and the transmission lines lie wholly within those States. They are not parts of a regionwide, several-States system as are the Columbia dams and transmission lines in the State of Washington. No other State is dependent upon the integrated operation of the California and Arizona projects.

There is absolutely no justification for the sale of Federal dams and transmission lines of the Northwest regional system to any single State. The only proper purchaser would be a regional agency representing all the States through which the Columbia and its main tributaries flow and representing, as well, the National Government which is obligated to protect the defense and economic interests of the whole Nation.

The Washington State Power Commission's demand for the lion's share of Northwest power benefits, the threat to maintenance of a regionwide, integrated transmission system, and the Interior Department's thinking in the matter, leave this newspaper with grave misgivings. No time should be lost in establishing a regional corporation to deal with these problems on a cooperative basis.

Work of Texas Soil Conservation District Wins National Recognition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 4, 1954

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the Texas State championship for soil conservation work, in the Save the Soil and Save Texas awards program sponsored by the Fort Worth Press, has been awarded to the Dalworth Soil Conservation District.

The work that went into the winning of this distinction was explained in a recent article in the Forth Worth Press. Because of the worthy example the Dalworth District has set to other soil conservation districts throughout the Nation, I consider this article deserving of the widest possible circulation.

Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the Forth Worth Press article be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Nobody can deny it. This was Dalworth's year.

The Dalworth Soil Conservation District, a strong contender in past years, forged ahead of tight competition to stake its claim to the State championship among the 168 such districts now serving Texas farmers and ranchers.

Long ,a leading contender, in past years the Dalworth district has made a race of it for other regional and State champions in the Fort Worth Press conservation awards program.

To win, the Dalworth district topped as classy a field as ever entered the lists.

The Dalworth board has an impressive story. The supervisors—they are Chairman W. T. Crouch, W. C. Terry, W. O. Jorgensen, A. T. Vandiver, and F. L. Vollintine—this year set out to tell the story in a way that could not be denied.

THREE THOUSAND FOUR HUNDRED AND SIXTEEN AT WORK

The 14-year-old district—it was voted in during 1940—now has 3,416 cooperators who work 595,355 acres of land."

The district includes all of Dallas and Tarrant Counties with portions of Johnson and Ellis. Farm sizes vary from 1 acre to 12,000 acres.

One job the district tackled last year has brought it national attention. It set out to acquaint the public with the work and responsibilities of soil conservation districts. The board members spent hours talking over the ways of getting it done. They called in representatives of agencies, business organizations, feed and equipment dealers and others. They went at their self-imposed assignment in a lot of ways. Their success in it helped them to the contest victory.

A CHAMP DISTRICT

In conservation on the land—the goal of all conservation undertakings—the Dalworth record would be hard to top. In nearly all the items of reckoning, the district scored the total possible number of points or came close.

Here's the kind of progress for the year in conservation practices that helped the district to victory: cover cropping, 43,634 acres; rotation grazing, 50,887 acres; pasture seeding, 5,939 acres; terracing, 172 miles; pond construction, 254; waterway development, 145; brush eradication, 1,245 acres; and rotation hay and pasture, 17,926 acres.

That was only a part of the story. The board's calendar has been filled constantly with an almost unending series of field days, tours, displays and meetings.

MONTHLY BULLETIN

The district publishes a monthly newsletter. It goes to 5,100 persons—to cooperators, all soil conservation district supervisors in the State, to officers of the National Supervisors' Association, to county agents, vocational agriculture instructors, newspapers, and many others.

There are over 2,000 Dalworth soil-conservation-district signs on gates and fences. They are helping to tell the district's story 24 hours a day.

Dalworth leads the State in the number of subscriptions to Soil and Water magazine. This obviously is due largely to the efforts of the board in the magazine's behalf. Mr. Jorgensen is a vice president of the Texas Association of Soil Conservation District Supervisors. He spends much of his time on work in connection with the magazine.

OWN ESSAY CONTEST

To the Fort Worth Press conservation essay contest, the Dalworth district board has added its own competition. The board has offered its own list of prizes to winners.

In the last 3 years the board has awarded certificates of merit to cooperators for outstanding work in completing farm and ranch plans.

Interest in flood prevention has claimed the attention of the Dalworth board in recent months.

The board members took part in two television programs during the year, telling their story to the growing public audience. About 40 cooperators joined them in the programs.

PRINTS MESSAGES

The district's claim to championship includes a wide assortment of printed matter designed to call attention of farmers to the conservation opportunity and of the public to the opportunity to help. Here's a sample: An envelope-size folder entitled "Suggestions to Service and Civic Clubs (and Their Members as to How They Can Assist, Through Their Dalworth Soil Conservation District To Conserve Soil and Water, Improve Soil Fertility and Reduce Siltation Into Lakes and Streams and Municipal Water Supplies)."

And then there's 22 Ways Feed, Seed, or Fertilizer Manufacturers or Dealers Can Assist Their Dalworth Soil Conservation District.

WENT OUT FRONT

Toss onto this heap the other publications, all the newspaper articles and photos for which the district board was largely responsible, all the cards and mailing pieces and—

Well, you understand how this soil conservation district, which only last year was runnerup to the Kaufman-Van Zandt district in the central Texas region, stormed out in front to become the State champion soil conservation district of 1954. You can't beat that kind of trying.

The Indochina War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 4, 1954

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am greatly disturbed about the diplomacy, or lack of diplomacy, of the United States Secretary of State at Geneva, and, in view of what I consider to be his fiasco, I should like to have printed in the Record a very interesting article entitled "Plain Talk Needed on Indochina War," written by Herbert Elliston and published in the April 18, 1954, edition of the Washington Post.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PLAIN TALK NEEDED ON INDOCHINA WAR

(By Herbert Elliston)

Secretary Dulles came back from his mission to Europe with a heap of words which failed to touch the central problem of the war in Indochina—viz, the independence problem. But that was to be expected. From the beginning the half truth has reigned supreme on Indochina.

Senator John F. Kennedy has come in for well-merited praise for compiling a bill of particulars against this administration and the last for misleading the people on Indochina. His examples could have been multiplied manifold. There has been an incessant doping of the public about underlying facts as well as current realities in Indochina.

In this connection the Truman administration is seconded in every respect by the Eisenhower administration. Mistakes, on the way to correction by the winding up of hostilities in Korea, are now in process of being compounded. The Democratic administration "sold" our intervention in Indochina, in Mr. Truman's public welcome of Gen. de Lattre de Tassigny, on the grounds that Indochina was "another Korea." It was nothing of the sort. Then the Indochinese conflict has been touted consistently and sans qualification as a war against communism. Another misrepresentation.

In liberty's name, as Mr. Truman once put it, we have poured in our aid, material and moral, so as to determine what President Eisenhower now miscalls the "transcendent" issue in southeast Asia. Lincoln found no more difficult word to define than liberty, but as applied to our talk about Indochina, there is no difficulty in showing that it has been grossly misused.

The prevarications on Indochina which have been most odious have to do with the status of Indochina. The official line is that the Associated States of Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos are free and independent. On the contrary, they are still bound hand and foot to the French. The proof is that, simultaneously with the arrival in Paris of Secretary Dulles, Chief of State Bao Dai personally showed up there and made another plea for his country's liberty. In Washington we entertain Ambassadors from the three Associated States just for the purpose of throwing dust in the American people's eyes.

The plan fact of the matter is that the war in Indochina is still a colonial war. All Asia knows it. And all Asia in consequence condemns the United States as the receiver in bankruptcy of an imperialist order that the French can no longer support.

It is this aspect of the war in Indochina that makes the Communist problem in southeast Asia touch-and-go. Not only have we thrown away good will in Asia, we have actually helped the French to make Communists. We simply can't win with them and their leading strings. Moreover, we have made the Ho Chi Minh or Viet Minh Communists more and more dependent upon the Chinese Communists. All this explains why at this late hour nerves are so raw in Washington.

To appreciate the foolishness of the proceedings one has only to hear a Vietnamese officer we are training in America talk admiringly about Ho Chi Minh. It makes you think we are operating in Cuckooland. If we are to stop the march of Chinese Communist imperialism, we must face and acknowledge the facts, and quit supporting puppets before we lose our arms to the Communists as we did in China. We need free men handling our weapons in this crucial struggle, and so I say: a fig for Ho Chi Minh's communism—the thing to worry about is that he has a monopoly on Indochina nationalism.

But there is no evidence of the recognition of this truth as yet. Soon after the Kennedy speech, Mr. Stassen spoke on Indochina in an appearance before a congressional committee. In an otherwise admirable presentation on East-West trade, he said that the Viet Minh arms are made in China, Russia, and Czechoslovakia. This is the kind of half-truth that this administration inherited from the last.

Mr. Stassen left out of account a big source of Viet Minh supplies, namely, the United States via Chiang Kai-shek. On September 16, 1951 General de Lattre de Tassigny made this statement when he was in Washington: "Most of the equipment we are up against comes from China, and it is American equipment, such as your equipment of the (captured) divisions of Chiang Kai-shek." De Lattre's honesty shook the Capital.

Equity for the Aged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1954

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a series of letters from correspondents with respect to the inequity of the so-called wage ceiling in the social-security program. In my judgment, we should either get rid of it entirely, so that those obliged to work after 65 would have the same unfettered right to their income as those with incomes from investments; or—a minimum concession—we should permit those who work after age 65 to qualify for a modest increase in benefits by virtue of their added contributions to the social-security trust fund between ages 65 and 70. There is neither rhyme nor reason to the present arrangement, as those on the receiving end of the program are highly articulate in testifying.

A sample of my recent mail on this subject follows:

Niagara Falls, N. Y., *March 31, 1954.*

Hon. Harold C. Ostertag,
Representative, 39th District,
Washington, D. C.

Honorable Sir: During the course of life it is hard to estimate how long one will be permitted to live on this earth.

This morning I read an article in the Buffalo Courier-Express on Social-Security Critics' Idea To Be Sought. In reply I would like to state: I have paid my social security for the required periods (according to the law) and am collecting my monthly payments. Having retired from my official position in industrial medicine I am still able to work. The difficulty is that I cannot, at my age, get a position that will pay enough to live on without giving up my and my wife's social security.

We feel that since I have paid in my social security as prescribed by law that I should be able to collect my payments regardless of what I can earn.

We do not expect Uncle Sam to be a Santa Claus or an insurance company. If we over 65 years of age could work and earn up to our ability it would make old age a happy time.

Yours sincerely,
McCarter Brown, M. D.

Great Bend, Pa., *April 6, 1954.*

Representative Ostertag,
Washington, D. C.

Honorable Sir: I am not classed among those that are "old and rich." I need to work for a living. Therefore I would greatly appreciate having the age limit dropped to 70 instead of 75 whereby one could earn all that he can. I am now 71.

Sincerely yours,
Charles H. Guernsey.

Geneva, N. Y., *April 5, 1954.*

Hon. Harold C. Ostertag,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

My Dear Mr. Ostertag: I am taking this opportunity to write you relative to the inequities of the present social-security system. I am, of course, referring to those people who are 65 years of age and over who are now barred from receiving their social-security benefits because of the fact that they earn wages in excess of $75 a month.

It is very unfair and quite unjust that a person 65 years or over, who has the ability to hold down a position which pays over $75 a month, should be barred from receiving social-security benefits after they have had payroll deductions taken from their pay envelopes ever since 1937. In other words, they have been paying for social security but can't get it. They are discriminated against because they earn over $75 a month, but they were not discriminated against when it came to payroll deductions ever since 1937.

It looks to me as though this particular group of 65-year-olds have been taken for succors, as their social security payments through the years are of no benefit to them at the age of 65 under the present law, but their payments each week through the years do enable the Government to help pay the 65-year-olds who earn less than $75 a month.

As a person reaches the age of 65 years they are inclined to need more medical care, as well as medicine, as the time goes on which they did not need when they were younger.

Consequently they need more money to pay for the extra medical expenses which are naturally incurred as they commence to go through the aging process.

I believe that wage earners, like myself, have been under the impression for nearly 18 years that they had ironclad rights to Government old-age benefits. Under the present social-security system in a great many cases it does reward the old and rich and it penalizes the old and poor. Under the present system 6 out of 10 persons who are 65 years of age and over are ineligible. Is that fair? Is that just?

I am hoping, Mr. OSTERTAG, that your effort along this line will prove successful in seeing that justice is secured for this particular group of 65-year-olds, so that they can also reap the benefit of the money they have invested through the years, the same as those who earn a smaller salary.

When you pay for social security through the years, you should have the benefit of it at the age of 65 years regardless of your salary. Am I not right? To me that seems the American way of doing.

Very truly yours,

ADA SANDHOLT.

Out of Red China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 4, 1954

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, listed below is an article entitled "Out of Red China," which appears in the April 16, 1954, issue of the Princeton Alumni Weekly. It is by the Reverend John D. Hayes, graduate of the class of 1910, of Princeton University. I trust the story will be of interest to the House:

OUT OF RED CHINA—A CHRISTIAN MISSIONARY DESCRIBES HIS OWN EXPERIENCE OF COMMUNIST IMPRISONMENT AND "BRAIN WASHING"

(By John D. Hayes)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Mr. Hayes was one of the first Americans to undergo "brain washing" by the Communists and live to tell of it. A former Rhodes scholar who captained his college crew at Oxford, Mr. Hayes did settlement and YMCA work in Europe until the close of World War I, when he went to China with the Presbyterian mission in Peiping. Here in the land of his birth, Mr. Hayes served as executive secretary of the mission, taught languages, and conducted flood and famine relief. During the period 1943–45 he was interned by the Japanese and 5 years later the Communists threw him into prison. They broke his mind and made him confess crimes he had never committed. Following are excerpts from an address delivered at Wooster College, from which Mr. Hayes transferred to Princeton.)

My wife and I had been working in the city of Kweiyang, in the far interior of southwest China, where we were assisting the Chinese church, at their invitation, in their national mission project. At least that was what I thought we were doing. The Communist court was later to point out to me, that, in picking the town at which the major roads from Canton, on the seacoast, Nanking, on the Yangtze, Chungking, the wartime capital, and Kunming, the end of the Burma Road, all met. I had picked the best place for espionage work in southwest China.

Mrs. Hayes had found the rigorous climate here too much for her, and had to go to the British colony of Hong Kong, where she found the chance to assist the same Chinese church in a liaison capacity.

I went down to visit her in November 1949. While there the plane, on which I was to return, was grounded by technicians refusing to service it. This gave us an opportunity to consider afresh the question as to whether or not I should try to go back to a place which was obviously going to be under Communist control. We felt that the spirit of Christ could penetrate all barriers, search out what was the hidden source of conflict, and reveal that love which alone can change enemies into friends. It was our aim to explore all possible avenues for interpreting the mind of a people, just coming to taste new freedoms, to us who take complete personal freedom as an obvious right. Although the American Government had withheld recognition from the new regime, there was still the opportunity through Christian missions of continuing to maintain personal contact, and thus to assure the people of China that the church, and certainly the great majority of Americans, still felt an attachment for friends of 100 years standing. I thought I had the answers. As I look back now I see that all God desired was full commitment. He then took over His training for a difficult job.

(After flying to Chunking, Mr. Hayes caught the last postal bus over the Burma Road to Kweiyang. He was stranded 50 miles short of this goal, so ill for a time that he could not stand. Here he witnessed the arrival of the Communists.)

On the morning of liberation the red sedan chair carried by four bearers—the official chair of welcome—started off from the Peace Preservation Headquarters across the street, headed for the south. I knew that I should have ample time to go across the street, and see how the Church of England Mission had come through the night. We had a real Thanksgiving service. It is in times like these that one realizes what the word Thanksgiving means. I knew, however, that I had to get back and be behind closed doors as soon as possible. I opened the barred gate leading onto the street, and found myself facing a milling crowd going north—north instead of south—that was strange. I was decidedly nonplussed. I knew that I should be out of sight at a moment like this. But it was just as if someone was standing beside me and saying, "It's all very well to trust me behind closed doors, I want you to trust me out in the open, and in moments like this." Do you know, my whole manner changed. Something had happened to me then.

A man looked up from the middle of the crowd, and seeing me standing there as nonchalantly as I could manage, called out to me with a slight taunt in this voice, "Come along, American friend. Come along and welcome the liberators to town." Well, it was the last thing I thought of doing. But out we went to the end of town, and I never have seen such a welcome. If I hadn't been in that crowd I would never have believed it. People streamed in from the hillsides, filled the little lanes, and poured out into the main street. Shopkeepers, for once, left their wares in charge of their womenfolk, and went off to see what was doing. It was a terrific crowd, and I saw the Communists come into town.

ENTER: THE LIBERATORS

The first division came in, believe it or not, with their hands swinging free, their rifles on their backs, marching in a free and easy style, singing the liberators' song. It was almost as if they were saying, "We know you are welcoming us. We never expected any trouble from you." It was a remarkable bit of bravado—faith. If you will, for they did not trust that town one bit. The Nationalist army had just withdrawn. The official red chair, in quick response of welcome to a feint from the south, was still wandering over the mountains to the south in search of the commandant, while he was marching his troops in on the north. Yet, that was the way they walked into town—a remarkable expression of bravery and devotion to their cause, for which they might have been wiped out with ease. These were the ones, college trained, who would shortly disperse into the shops and the countryside, and explain to everyone the principles and ideals of the new regime. Behind them came the next division. That was armed quite differently, taking no chances. They had guns held across their chests—good American Tommyguns at that—with their fingers on the trigger, and their eyes alert. Then came the rest of the regiment in regular marching order, their guns over their shoulders. I had seen what I was later to recognize as symbolic of the entry of communism into any new area. First,, the friendly open gesture of good-will, then the terrific spasm of cruelty, followed by the rigid discipline of the new order.

HOME AND TEACHING

A few days later, postal service was resumed with Kweiyang, and I was fortunate enough to reserve a place in the first bus that dared to come from Kweiyang to the other side of the river. Some fellow travellers and I made our way by foot and pony cart to the bank of that treacherous stream and gave thanks when the little craft, that had upset the day before, losing passengers and owner, saw us safely across. The bus that met us—standing room only—pulled in late that night. I found that the social landscape had changed. Rickshaw pullers were now members of the ruling class, and I carried my bags a mile and more to my garden gate. To my great surprise I saw the lights go on in my little bungalow, and my Miao lad welcomed me to an undisturbed home. I was in—back at last where I was known, just in time for the midweek prayer-meeting at the Church down the street—another Thanksgiving. But I wasn't in yet. I was to go in far deeper than I have ever been before—into the lives of the people.

I was soon offered a position on the faculty of the National Teachers College as professor of English, which I accepted with alacrity, and also a few months later a similar position in Kueichow University, with its rather more wealthy students, some miles out of town. This gave me the rare opportunity of meeting both college and high-school students, which the Communists always use to spark their movement, and the chance to understand the new regime in a way that I could never have done otherwise. For it brought me in close touch with students and professors; while they were going through the difficult days of "thought reconstruction," the so-called brain washing, usually termed "thinking through." These, however, were the halcyon days. Land was being apportioned to all, landlord and peasant alike—provided, of course, that the landlord had not seriously offended any of his tenants. There were always found a few who had done so, and in their conviction and execution, the peasants felt a new sense of power. Still general amnesty was offered to all, on the condition of full and frank confession of all their crimes against the people. Factory workers were happy in their new organizations, and in the quick settlement they were obtaining for all outstanding grievances. Workers and farmers alike were delighted and dazed to know that the new government was their government pledged to carry out their will.

Then came the cruel days. All my time was now spent on the two college campuses, through fortunately I still kept my home for weekend breaks. I came to know the mental torture through which many of the students and some of the faculty were now going. They saw their fathers or friends ruthlessly thrown into jail, and were forced to witness the actions of the people's court against them. Often they were required to march in the processions that followed the criminals to the execution grounds, witness the final act, then plead with the court for the release of the body. On going back to their colleges they faced social ostracism, unless they had progressed enough in political thought to denounce their loved ones.

These students, now left destitute, would sometimes come to you for a little assistance, but later much more for sheer sympathy—the sympathy that comes from sharing the life's load of another.

These young folk would come to me, particularly in my home on a weekend, and tell me their story. With the time at my disposal I shall try to sketch one. A leading man of honor in the community, the head of the Nationalist Party in the province, had come back to town from the hills where he had gone to marshal the last remnants of resistance against the incoming tide. He had been given a safe conduct back to town by one whom he had regarded as a brother, having brought him up as a member of the family, and, a couple of months previous, had actually gone guarantor for him when he was about to be shot for being a Communist. His erstwhile friend was now vice governor of the province.

It was only a couple of months later that the sirens blew, and we were all kept to our houses, while the guards went 'round, thither and yon, and picked up men and threw them into jail—and this Nationalist leader was among them. A year later this "friend," whose life he had saved, signed his death warrant. When he was brought out before the People's Court, and faced with a long list of crimes, he was asked to reply, and confess. He limped as the guard prodded him forward with his bayonet. His hands were shackled behind with chains over his shoulders pulling them up tight, and his legs were in irons. He is the only man I know of on either side of the water who, facing such a court has dared to say, "Some charges are true, and some are false."

The court was nonplussed. Like another court of old it abruptly changed its charge, "You must acknowledge that you have shot Communists." His quiet reply was, "Only in the discharge of my official duties." The court was again embarrassed. It turned to the crowd, and asked the all too familiar question, "What shall be done with this man?" The crowd, thoroughly seeded with Communists, yelled, "Kill." The court then turned to its prisoner, "What have you to say?" I wonder whether they expected him to plead for mercy. His reply was widely quoted, "I shall regard any sentence by this court to be a generous act." That a man, whose public and private life were above reproach should thus be sentenced to death, was the grossest miscarriage of justice. The city was stunned by it.

MY TIME HAD COME

When some Communist students came exulting into my little bungalow at the very time that this man and his 12 colleagues were being shot on the neighboring mountainside, I knew my time to challenge the new regime had come. I told them, "No truly civilized country ever shoots a man for his political affiliations." When this statement hit the headlines, 2 days later, interestingly enough it was not challenged directly. The countercharge was, "What right has this American to talk, when his country is pillaging Korea? Is that an act of a civilized country?"

I was started now—but how far could I go in changing the mind of a new regime that while bettering the economic life of the masses, was bearing down so heavily on their spirit? My next opportunity came some 10 days later. A province-wide drive for greater production was being based solely on the "Hate America, Assist Korea" slogan. I pointed out to a couple, whom I knew to have the ear of the local provincial government, and had earlier been active in Christian church work, that it was most unwise to base such an important and vital program for the new regime on a purely "Hate America" basis. It would be far wiser to have at least a second string to one's bow, "Good Life for Kueichow" or "The Best Life for Everybody."

"General MacArthur," I said, "was about to bomb Manchuria. They knew that Russia was not prepared at this time to enter the war, and Mao could have no other alternative than to come to terms with the United Nations forces. General MacArthur's first demand would be for a complete reversal of the 'hate America' position. Then where would be all this new provincewide effort?" How was I to know that that very afternoon the Voice of America was carrying the broadcast that President Truman had recalled General MacArthur, on the very grounds of the proposed bombing of Manchuria? This coincidence was, for the college staff, too close to be accidental. I was expelled from the college, and placed under house arrest.

(Six months under house arrest ended with his being thrown in jail.)

I should like to go into the jail story, but time prevents. I much touch on one detail of it—the so-called brainwashing technique. They are capable of cracking your mind—it's perfectly simple, friends. The mind, that is, to a great extent the creation of science, can, as we are all beginning to find out now, be cracked by science. You can be made to see hallucinations to suit the ends of the manipulators of one's mind. Just as in dreams one sees details brought together in a picture, and so realistic, that they still stay in mind when one is fully awake, so one can be made to see these dreams in daytime just as if one were recalling instances of things that had happened, and had been for a time lost to memory.

After a fortnight's gruelling interrogation it is a terrific thing when one "sees" an American friend seated opposite you in your study and asking you what to do about his transmitting radio. I could remember the shock of hearing this information, concealing it too, so that he might not be unduly startled. I knew, perhaps better than he, the close surveillance under which we foreigners were living. So I advised him to dispose of it in the best way I knew how. When this "memory" came flashing into my mind after these 2 weeks of daily grilling in court, I found myself faced with the greatest moral problem I had ever met. What would you do? Until then I had been telling the truth. I had opposed the regime and was willing to face the consequences.

FORTY DAYS AND FORTY NIGHTS

Under a Communist court you are held responsible not only for what you do and say, but for what others may do and say because of what you have done and said. In my hallucination, I had advised my friend as to how he might dispose of his radio—and he had acted on my advice. I realized that under the new laws under which we perforce were living, I was accordingly responsible for what he had done with it, and his friends as well. I did not know what they had done, beyond a stack of telegrams which the court charged had been sent over this radio. It was for me, however, to take over the full responsibility. That paper was hard to write. It took 3 days to write 1 page. The relief of mind which followed the handing in of the paper through the bars of the door to the guard, I could understand. But where came the new sense of joy and strength with which to meet the court on the following day? This too must have puzzled the court.

Then it dawned on my numb mind that in following quite blindly the steps of the Master I was finding the wisdom and strength for which I had been praying. A new understanding came over me of what it meant to be truly in fellowship with man, in the sense in which Christ has come into our lives, and very truly carries our burdens. God has made us in His likeness, and Christ, as the Communist would see it, has come into the fellowship of man and takes full responsibility for such a daring act of creation. As the gruelling still continued for the rest of the 40 days of the first court, I little realized that my mind had given way, but I was more and more conscious of a wisdom and strength that was more than that displayed by the court. My mind had cracked, but my spirit, under God, was remaining true—loyal to God, to one's friends, and to the truth—what it thought to be the truth.

HERESY IN COURT

The court wanted me to write on the work of the foreign missions of the American church. They are firmly convinced that mission work is but the sheep's clothing that covers a conscious or unconscious agent of the American Government. According to Communist law, you are held responsible for all the acts of any organization of which you are a member. Here was my last and best opportunity to influence the court.

I gave this paper on the Aims and Work of Foreign Missions some 3 months' thought. During the last couple of weeks of that time I had the opportunity of referring to the Scriptures. I had been refused my repeated request for these in either Chinese or English. But in the last few weeks in prison all four of us Protestant missionaries had been put in one cell, and they had been permitted to bring their Bibles. Each paragraph began with a statement of some aspect of Christian faith expressed in Communist terms, and ended with a confession of where I had fallen short of it. I have never written any thesis with greater care, for I felt that this was my one great opportunity to have spread on the records of the court a statement of Christian faith that would at least reach the inner few that determine Communist policy. I noted for the first time that St. Paul had met his Roman authorities in jail—and had won them. Would that I might have done the same.

But I endeavored to put before them Christian ideals that in principle and practice went far beyond their claims of human brotherhood and the dignity of man that they profess. It takes about 3 weeks to process a paper, and 3 weeks after this paper had been submitted we all four, the last Protestant missionaries in that area, were sentenced to expulsion, and were sent out under guard. So, marvelous to say, when one went the furthest in to challenge and to win the new regime, one found the door opened, and all of us on the way out.

On reaching Canton we were thrown in jail once more while the local authorities made sure that they had got the story correct, and that this widely heralded spy ring of southwest China was actually on its way out. Then a short trip to the border, and the guards escort you to the little bridge that spans the river separating Communist China from the British territory of Kowloon, Hong Kong. Never had I sensed so deeply the feeling for a flag as a symbol of liberty, in thought as well as in life, as that day when the afternoon sun lit up the British flag flying overhead. May the day soon come when the flags of every nation will carry in their folds the same spirit of freedom.

American-Asiatic Relationships

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 4, 1954

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a constituent of mine in Salem, Oreg., wrote me a letter referring to a column written by the editor of the Oregon Statesman, published in the March 28, 1954, issue of that paper, dealing with some of the problems involved in American-Asiatic relationships, and I ask that the article be published in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IT SEEMS TO ME

(By Charles A. Sprague)

Last Sunday I heard a sermon in a New Jersey church in the course of which the preacher used this illustration:

An artist sought to depict the story of Dr. Faust, who sold his soul to the Devil in exchange for knowledge and power. He painted Faust and the devil playing at chess. The devil had made a move and called checkmate to indicate he had completely boxed in his opponent. The expression on Faust's face was a mingled one of frustration and despair. He had gambled—and lost. The picture was hung and viewed by the public. One of those who saw it was a chess expert. He studied it for a long time and then exclaimed, "No; a king and a knight have another move."

Two days ago I commented on the apparent checkmate which appears to spell our doom under a shower of atomic bombs: We will not take the aggressive now before Russia has a stockpile of H-bombs; yet we cannot depend on an agreement with Russia whose very philosophy is alien to respect for agreements with the capitalist world. No defense system promises more than 70-percent protection against invading bombers. So we remain sitting ducks awaiting the H-day when an enemy deems the time is right to strike and gain mastery of the world. Small wonder then if the devil in the shape of Mars leers at the world scene in grim satisfaction, and calls "checkmate."

I am no expert either at chess or world politics, but I refuse to accept any such verdict. So long as we point to things we cannot do we accentuate the negative—and nothing is done. Our diligence should be directed toward seeking out the possible moves still open for king or knight on the chessboard of international politics.

The first requirement is a change of attitude among our own policymakers. They must develop a certain degree of flexibility, a readiness to bargain—sacrificing a few pawns if need be to secure positions of greater value. In the coming Geneva Conference if we go determined to make no concessions at all we may make no concessions—and also make no gains. In particular our national policy should not be determined for us by such extremists as Syngman Rhee and Chiang Kai-shek. Our statesman should chart our own course, in the light of our national interest and concern for the free world.

Right here I want to emphasize the importance of the part which the people themselves must play. Instead of clinging to attitudes of no cooperation with the Soviet world and branding every negotiation as a form of appeasement or defeat, they must give their representatives room for maneuver. The whipped-up denunciation of Yalta and Potsdam has greatly exaggerated any of their errors, and it serves now to chill any thought of accommodation with the Communist world—witness how Arthur Dean was put on the pillory when he said we should be prepared to deal realistically with Red China. If American opinion ties the hands of its diplomats they can make no moves and so are automatically checkmated.

There comes a time when statesmen must act affirmatively even if they appear to go contrary to the pressures or demands of the moment. They must take the long view and make their moves for the long-term profit. So it is now with our statesmen: they must rise to high levels of intelligence and courtage even though it means the wolf pack will nip their heels.

One of the major requirements in a flexible policy is patience. Even though no immediate escape from the dilemma of horror is apparent, time may open one up. The hates and furies which breed wars have a way of softening with the lapse of time if they are restrained in the interval. Nor is it necessary to await a millenium. The searching of the mind directed toward finding a solution to the world dilemma, which refuses to yield to bafflement or defeat, surely will meet with success. It may come slowly, by stages; but come it must.

Transfer of Extension Work in the Bureau of Indian Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WESLEY A. D'EWART

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1954

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, I have had prepared and have introduced in the House today a bill providing for the transfer of extension work in the Bureau of Indian Affairs to the Department of Agriculture and the States.

The bill provides for the transfer of funds and authority from the Indian Bureau to the States through the Department of Agriculture to expand their present extension program to include extension assistance to Indians. The Federal funds previously available to the Indian Bureau for carrying on this work will now be made available to the States.

Indians are citizens of the States in which they live and should in their own interest be obtaining the technical assistance they need in agriculture and home economics through the same channels as all other citizens. This transfer of activities will not mean less service to the Indians, but will really mean more service, as it will make available to them the assistance of the technicians of the Montana State Extension Service and Experiment Station. It will also bring the Indians and non-Indians into closer working relationships with each other and make for a better understanding of community problems of mutual interest to both. To continue a special extension service in the Indian Bureau for Indians only tends to keep them segregated and encourages them to look to the Federal Government for all services, instead of the agencies through which other citizens receive their services.

I have had a number of complaints that the extension experts of the Indian Service are giving advice and indeed instructions requiring practices almost diametrically opposed from those of the State extension people.

If there are such conflicts, I feel that they should be resolved, and I believe this bill will accomplish that purpose.

The State college with its technically trained research and extension staffs, who are studying constantly the agricultural and economical problems of the State, is in a better position to render extension assistance to the Indian citizens of the State than an independent group of extension workers under the supervision of the Indian Bureau in Washington.

It is the belief that this transfer will prove effective in educating Indians to their responsibility as citizens, and also in helping non-Indians to recognize Indians as citizens through their more frequent contacts with them.

The Indian population of Montana, according to the 1950 United States census, is 16,606, which is being served by 13 extension employees of the Bureau of Indian Affairs and 4 extension agents employed under a State contract with the Montana State Extension Service.

The combining of these two extension services in Montana, with all of their funds and resources, will provide a strong single State extension service for all people of Montana.

I feel confident that the same situation prevails in other States where large Indian groups are located.

What of the Future?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. B. CARROLL REECE

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1954

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, Mr. George E. Stringfellow delivered a very penetrating address at the annual dinner of the Chamber of Commerce of Knoxville, Tenn., on April 6, 1954.

Mr. Stringfellow is one of our great men—an outstanding industrialist who devotes much of his time to helping his fellow men.

Presently he is senior vice president of Thomas A. Edison, Inc., having worked in close association over the years with Thomas A. Edison, and has successfully carried forward the great work which Mr. Edison had started.

It is inspiring when a man with Mr. Stringfellow's multiplied interests and responsibilities devotes so much of his time to civic affairs.

Since the address which he delivered at Knoxville holds such a wide interest, I insert it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that it might be more widely available:

Because it is a good thing for all of us to try to look ahead and see where we are going, I shall ask you to join with me tonight in the amusing and interesting game of prophesying. Many of you will have answered your rich rewards before my long-term prophesies can be checked and others of you will have forgotten them.

Whether you agree with my predictions or not, I hope I shall stimulate some of you to weigh and appraise each of my prophesies, and by that very act become prophets yourselves.

I am going to start right here with your energetic and beautiful city of Knoxville, and see what my crystal ball shows for a half century hence. From 1920 to 1940 the city's population increased 2 percent per year; from 1940 to 1950 it increased 1.2 percent per year; and during the last 3 years, including 1953, it increased at the rate of only ⅔ of 1 percent per year. But look at metropolitan Knoxville. Its rate of increase through the last 3 years has been 2 percent per year, or 3 times the rate of increase of the corporated city. On that basis, I predict that in 2004 the population of what is now Knoxville will then be 1 million. (I am sorry I cannot give you the exact figure.)

Like most of the cities in the United States, Knoxville is experiencing the effect of decentralization which means that factories, stores, office buildings, and dwellings will spread out into what are now the suburbs.

All American cities will be very different looking places in 2004. There will be more parks and parking spaces in the center of the city, where the public and cultural buildings will be. I predict that the change will be felt even in a certain town in Vermont, to which a native returned for the first time in 35 years. The First Congregational Church hadn't changed. The village green hadn't changed. The postmaster hadn't changed a bit in 35 years. . The prodigal son asked the postmaster "What's the population of the town today?" "935." "That's funny. It was exactly 935 when I left 35 years ago. How do you account for that?" "Well," said the postmaster, "the town is so healthy nobody ever dies, and when a child is born, someone leaves town."

I am very sure that before the year 2004, the corporate limits of the city of Knoxville will have been extended to include all of the territory which is now considered metropolitan Knoxville. As we get wiser, and political power is transferred more and more from the professionals to the voters and taxpayers, we shall reap the economies and other obvious advantages of having one great municipality, and that great city of Knoxville of 1 million souls will be beautiful, uncongested, prosperous, and the source of great civic pride.

As to the prosperity of the individual citizens, I note that the family income here has more than doubled within the last 6 years. My forecast is that it will again be quadrupled before 2004, with a net average family income of at least $20,000, and I am talking in terms of buying power of the present dollar. I base this earning on the great increasing productivity of the entire United States, as I shall presently explain.

The fact that the Greater Knoxville will be more spread out and that one citizen will have to travel more feet or more miles in order to do business with his fellow Knoxvillians, does not by any means imply that it will take them more time to get together. They will be further apart in distance, but closer to each other in terms of minutes and seconds. With less congestion traffic will move faster. With one-story buildings, less time will be consumed in moving vertically in elevators and in waiting for elevators. Moving sidewalks will be commonplace.

The helicopter, which even today has firmly established itself in our own cities as a carrier of mail and as a carrier of passengers between two or three airports in the same city, will be in common use by all inhabitants. Engineers are already predicting and have blueprints for air passenger carriers which will rise and land vertically, and also will have great horizontal speed and carrying capacity. Your own imagination can fill in the details of what that will do not only to transit inside of Knoxville, but what it will do to transit between Knoxville and Chicago and London.

My prediction that real family income and purchasing power, already the greatest in history, will be further quadrupled in 50 years has, I believe, a solid basis, namely the enormous increase in productive capacity which is made possible by the scientific, industrial, and agricultural techniques already at hand, of whose development we have only scratched the surface.

To keep the thing going we must learn, and of course are learning, how to keep distribution of purchasing power in line with rapidly increased productive capacity. Since the real income of the average Knoxville family has doubled in 6 years, it is clear that our distribution of purchasing power is keeping pace with our increasing capacity to produce.

Just when we hear with alarm of a shortage of vital materials, such as tin, copper, and natural rubber latex, we are reassured by the genius of our industrial researchers in discovering new uses for metals hitherto considered impurities or laboratory curiosities, such as cadmium and titanium, and new ways to extract and make use of metals, like aluminum and magnesium, of which our earth's crust furnishes an almost unlimited supply, and in producing, if necessary, synthetic rubber and quinine.

Just when we see a limit on oil deposits we are told of unbelievable new deposits in nearby Canada. And, by the way, my forecast includes a prediction that we shall grow closer and closer to Canada and Mexico, economically and politically, with fewer and fewer barriers of any kind between us.

You know as well as I do what we have ahead of us with respect to the use of atomic energy. It seems obvious that at first the new power, because of its early stage expensiveness of equipment and material, and the necessity of massive shields against the dangerous rays, will not compete with steam and electricity developed from coal or waterpower. No doubt, the first round of nylon cost many times as much as silk, but the developers of nylon had good reason to expect that it would become competitive with silk, and so it is true that the energy from the splitting of the atom will become competitive with energy from coal and waterpower. For example, the first electric-light bulb manufactured by Thomas Alva Edison cost about $5, which he sold for around $1. But as production increased economies were effected and the product soon dominated its market.

What about food? Are our cows going to produce more milk and our bulls more steers, and our acres more wheat and corn? Is our agricultural productivity going to increase with our increase in population? We'll still have to eat, even in a world of helicoptors and atomic energy.

Here again my crystal ball is an optimistic orb. We have learned a lot of late. Between 1934 and 1947 our crop yield per acre increased 33 percent in wheat, 40 percent in corn, and 30 percent in oats. We are continually improving the breed of our cows and steers, adapting them to new pastures which could not have supported their predecessors.

We are learning the vital need for preserving the green sponge of trees and grass on our mountains, and how it can be done, so as to make our valleys more productive, and less accursed by floods, and dust bowls, and distressed areas. You know all about that right here in Tennessee. We are learning how necessary it is that our Nation's God-given resources shall not be sacrificed to commercial greed or purely local selfishness or narrowness.

This has been a rosy vision of the material things in our future. I am confident it is no more rosy than sound appraisal will justify.

But what about some of the other things? What about the greater and greater percentage of aged men and women that we shall have with us, as we conquer disease after disease that in the past has been eliminating people in youth and middle age. Will they be comfortably supported? How will they occupy their long years after retirement?

Here again I am optimistic. Our national income will be more than enough to go around comfortably, and they will therefore not be neglected. I think we'll adapt our educational system so as to make use of the part-time services of elderly people who with their life experience can supplement the work of career teachers in the public schools. We see a step in that direction where so-called "sitters" are helping the youngsters with their homework.

By 2004 our two political parties will have become organizations of voters, with honestly different views from each other. Both parties will represent integrity, decency, and economy in government, and be opposed to the institution known as political patronage. Neither party, at the national, or State, or county level will be organized primarily for the purpose of furnishing administrative or judicial jobs, or patronage power to professional organizers. The jobholders will, before long, have to surrender party control to the voters, and confine their efforts to doing the necessary administrative work for which the voters are paying their salaries.

While man's control over his passions and selfishness will, I am afraid, probably not keep pace with his increased control over his physical environment, I am confident that there will be some discernible improvement, as there already has been in the past. In fact, there has got to be an improvement, if we are to survice in this day of the atomic bomb and the Communist.

It's like the new clerk in the drug store who explained why he sold a bottle of milk of magnesia to a customer complaining of a bad cough. He said, "He won't dare cough."

Well, we won't dare go much further with the miracles of modern science unless at the same time we achieve rapid development in the social and moral field.

I am sure we shall do so, and that many of you will be here in "Greater Knoxville" in 2004 to confirm everything I have said this evening.

WHAT OF THE IMMEDIATE FUTURE?

In a free economy like ours where men have the right to engage in excessives, the business curve is seldom flat for any appreciable period of time. In our free economy the trend has been upward for many years, and I predict it will continue in that direction as long as we preserve our way of life and men have freedom of choice.

We sometimes get disturbed about the fluctuations in business. We are in one of those fluctuating business periods right now. Indications are strong that we are again on our way up.

There is little doubt that more houses will be built this year than last.

A rise in retail sales is another bright prospect. J. C. Penney, the fabulous dry goods merchant, is looking toward a promising future and expects to open 30 new stores this year. He anticipates that his company will do as well and perhaps even better than in 1953.

Surplus inventories are shrinking, and that's good. We know that the consumption of steel right now is 15 percent above the production of that important commodity. As a result of the fast readjustment of inventories unemployment climbed to about 3,700,000 in February, but it is generally felt that as a result of the seasonable pickup in business, there will be fewer persons unemployed in April than in March. In other words, the trend will be reversed.

We know that our people earned, and in the aggregate, spent about as much last month as in the same month in 1953, which was an all-time record.

Taxes will be reduced this year, close to $8 billion. This will increase buying power and at the same time reduce prices.

The Prudential Insurance Co. recently loaned $250 million to the Chrysler Corp. for 100 years. The management of both these corporations certainly has faith in the short- and long-term future of America, as we all should.

I think the future is bright for those industries and businesses whose management does an efficient job of manufacturing and an intelligent job of distribution.

I have faith in America. We have made more progress in 160 years than other nations have made in 6,000 years.

We have accomplished this because we possess a form and philosophy of government which provides the maximum liberty for its citizens.

Ours is an economic system which provides investors, producers, and consumers with freedom of choice and freedom of opportunity.

Ours is a system in which the productive facilities of the Nation are owned by the people instead of by Government.

Ours is a system that recognizes the dignity of the individual, encourages high moral and ethical standards, and gives its citizens an incentive to do their best and rewards them according to their production.

Our rewards in the past have been gratifying and I am sure they will be in the future.

A Red Is a Red, No Matter Where You Find Him

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1954

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, from the April 24, 1954, edition of the News-Palladium published by Stanley R. Banyon, in Benton Harbor, Mich., comes the following editorial:

CONGRESSMAN HOFFMAN ON SENATOR McCARTHY

We thought Congressman Clare Hoffman made a crackin' good point the other night in his local broadcast when he touched on the raging controversy over Senator McCarthy, the hell-for-leather nemesis of the Commies, in and out of Government places in Washington.

Hoffman's point was that if the Reds are so bad and so dangerous to world peace and our own national security that Vice President Nixon last week was hinting we might have to send American boys to the battle lines against them in Indochina, why is it so wrong for McCarthy to be running them down here at home.

A Red's a Red, whether he's trying to steal an H-bomb secret in Washington or in the plant where they're made or he's engaged in shooting down American boys in Korea or Indochina.

Mr. Hoffman says Senator McCarthy may get a little rough and tough in his Red hunt, but it's a job that can't be done by pulling the punches. Moreover, if by some ill chance of fortune we go to war with the Reds in Southeast Asia, it won't be any hit-and-apologize farce as marked the Korean fiasco.

No doctor ever stopped a cancer with talcum powder.

The above, from the pen of Stanley Banyon, in my judgment, seems to accurately reflect the views of the people of southwestern Michigan. People may not approve of all of the Red hunter's methods, but they want no truck with communism here at home, especially when this is the only country which is conscripting its youth to fight communism abroad.

Rifleman May Play Greatest Role Ever

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. B. W. (PAT) KEARNEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1954

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I wish to include the following article which appeared in the Washington Post and Times-Herald for April 5, 1954:

RIFLEMAN MAY PLAY GREATEST ROLE EVER

(By John G. Norris)

Last week's top-level statements and debate one the hydrogen bomb served to completely overshadow some conferences here concerning an older weapon of war. The National Rifle Association held its 83d annual sessions along with those of the official National Board for the Promotion of Rifle Practice. What little public interest there was centered on an exhibition of muzzle-loading guns, old Colt revolvers and other collectors' items. Such antiquarianism, however, was only a social sideline to the real purpose of the meetings in which top Pentagon chiefs took part.

The presence of Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway, Army Chief of Staff, and Gen. Lemuel C. Shepherd, Jr., Commandant of the Marine Corps, did not reflect merely a personal interest in a key weapon of past wars. Rather it was a deep conviction that the rifleman and his weapon will play an even more important role in the Atomic Age than in the past. This is the way many top military men reason:

The advent of atomic weapons has brought new tactics of land warfare calling for much greater dispersion of forces. This in turn places more reliance on the individual infantryman and his ability to handle his weapon.

The terrific destructive power of the new weapons is a tremendous check on their use. This has seemed to encourage more small wars like Korea and Indochina and guerrilla fighting as in Greece, Malaya, and the Philippines. Skill with small arms is an important factor in such combat.

A parallel development to the new super weapons has been in the airborne field. Big, new troop-carrying helicopters can make war more three-dimensional than paratroopers. This may put Army Corps headquarters, communications centers, bridges, and depots in the front lines and put a premium on the shooting ability of radiomen, cooks, drivers, and clerks.

In case cities are smashed by H-bomb or A-bomb attacks, organized minutemen must be ready to combat saboteurs, looters, and a possible fifth column. Few of today's citizenry have the skill with a rifle that their forefathers had.

This makes the man and his individual weapon a basic defense, argues Maj. Gen. Merritt A. Edson, retired Marine Corps Medal of Honor winner who is executive director of the NRA. Wars may be decided by the side whose men can use their rifles best.

General Ridgway stresses the key role of the infantryman in holding Western Europe in case of world war III and in finally winning any war. The man with a rifle has had to fight his way to settle past conflicts, and will again despite all pushbutton war developments, he firmly believes.

General Shepherd declares that even if mass atomic exchanges come in a new war, they will not settle it. There will come a time after such exchanges when someone will surely conclude that the only way to end the destruction will be to seize the source of the enemy's atomic strength, he states. There is where the infantryman comes back on the scene.

Chairman Dewey Short, Republican, of Missouri, of the House Armed Services Committee, agrees on the future key role of the infantryman. He points out how some simplest of weapons often are the most successful counterpart for complicated new ones. The Navy is countering new Russian developments in mines by building wooden minesweepers, and the Air Force is experimenting with nonmetalic, low flying bombers to evade radar defense.

Short supports the military men who are asking for an expansion of funds for stepping up rifle practice in the United States. The NRA and National Board—a joint Pentagon agency—are cooperating in the program. Government funds no longer are spent in promoting the NRA's Camp Perry matches for the experts. Instead, the great effort has been to interest boys in marksmanship and give them a place to shoot at home. The emphasis now is turning to providing means for thousands of ex-servicemen to keep up their military developed skill with a rifle. At present the Government is putting up the magnificent sum of $100,000 to administer the program and lends surplus rifles to local shooting clubs. The latter pay for the ammunition and support the ranges. This program provides for training 3,500 senior and 4,000 junior shooters. The NRA is urging that the program be expanded to train 6,000 reservists and 15,000 teenagers as a start toward "universal marksmanship training." One hundred thousand dollars is less than half the cost of one bombsight or some spare parts on a destroyer engine. It's awfully cheap defense insurance and should be increased.

Polish Constitution Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS B. HELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 29, 1954

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, exactly 163 years ago a great document in the annals of human freedom was born which has since become a landmark in the development of constitutional government. I refer to the Polish Constitution which was adopted on that memorable date in Poland's history, May 3, 1791, a date which takes on new meaning and significance in our own day.

The desire for human freedom and dignity, for human rights and social justice, for democracy and religion toleration, is perhaps stronger today than it has ever been in the history of mankind. And yet the great paradox of history is the fact that the Polish people, the same nation which has brought forth this notable document more than a century and a half ago as a charter of liberty, cannot celebrate its anniversary in a free Poland today.

The homeland of the Polish people is sealed off behind the Iron Curtain where freedom is not tolerated, where human rights are trampled upon, where social justice and religious toleration are unknown, and where democracy has been perverted in its meaning and purpose. Americans of Polish descent, however, have not forgotten their kinsmen in Poland and are giving them the fullest moral and spiritual support in their hours of anguish. They are hoping and praying that this nightmare of Communist tyranny and oppression, their enslavement and degradation, will soon end and Poland will once again rise as a free nation.

On this occasion of Polish Constitution Day, I am happy to join with all friends of a free Poland and with freedom-loving people everywhere in praying that the delivery of all the nations suffering under the yoke of the Communist oppressors will not long be delayed. As we pay our tribute to the bravery of the Polish people, let their struggles of the past and of the present serve as a beacon of light to us in the days ahead.

It Can Be Done—Editorial From Boston Traveler: A Tribute to Hon. John W. McCormack and His Special Investigating Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 1954

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to call the attention of the House to an editorial from the Boston Traveler under date of April 21, 1954. It is an extremely timely bit of newspaper advice and deserves the thoughtful consideration of our congressional investigating committees.

We in this House can well be proud of the manner in which the very difficult problem of dealing with subversives, their organizations, and their activities was handled some 20 years ago. Under the very able chairmanship of the Honorable JOHN W. McCORMACK, the present distinguished minority whip, the special House Investigations Committee did its job in true legislative fashion. It ferreted out the evil, made specific recommendations, and saw to it that these recommendations received the approval of the Congress.

The editorial follows:

WITHOUT THE FANFARE

Looking backward in time, we've been wondering how this battle against internal communism would have made out if it had been conducted on more workmanlike lines.

We think progress would have been better, and a lot of headaches might have been avoided.

Specifically, we're thinking now of the time 20 years ago when Congressman JOHN W. McCORMACK was chairman of a special House investigations committee. His particular committee was handed the job of probing Nazi, Fascist, and Communist propaganda activities. It did its job so well that its recommendations for the Smith law, the Foreign Agents Registration Act and other good legislative moves were adopted and have been serving the Nation ever since.

That committee did its work without fireworks, without dramatics, without corny oratory, without insults, and without splitting the country into angry and bitter factions.

How was it done? Easy.

At the committee's first meeting, the members voted unanimously to stick to three rules.

First, all witnesses were to be heard first in executive session for screening purposes.

Second, evidence offered in public hearings had to pass the admissibility of courtroom evidence. Hearsay evidence was barred in order to protect the reputation of innocent persons.

Third, committee members agreed not to make speeches in connection with any investigation until after that specific investigation had been closed and the findings were complete. The committee members thought of themselves somewhat as judges, and recognized that speechmaking would be the equivalent of prejudging the evidence.

The McCormack committee had a tough job on its hands. The Nation was under heavy bombardment from Nazi, Fascist, and Communist propaganda sources. Sometimes even families were split in their opinions. The scenery was spotted with the likes of Browder, Pelley, Viereck, and would-be storm trooper outfits.

Yet the committee went to work, quizzed its witnesses, gathered its information, and submitted its findings in a workmanlike way that won commendation.

A lot of good was accomplished, without any hoopla or theatrical bellowings. Thus, it can be done.

U. S. S. "Hartford"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT W. CRETELLA

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1954

Mr. CRETELLA. Mr. Speaker, under leave, I insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement issued by John D. Lodge, Governor of the State of Connecticut, and a former Member of the House, in connection with the contemplated reconditioning of the U. S. S. *Hartford* and the transfer of that famous ship to be permanently berthed.

The statement follows:

As you are aware, on March 5, Representative JAMES P. S. DEVEREUX, from Maryland, introduced H. R. 8247, which authorizes the Secretary of the Navy to dispose of several historic warships, specifically the U. S. S. *Constellation*, the U. S. S. *Hartford*, the U. S. S. *Olympia*, and the U. S. S. *Oregon*.

With respect to the U. S. S. *Hartford*, this legislation, if acted upon favorably by Congress, will permit the Secretary of the Navy "to make minimum repairs * * * so as to enable that vessel to be safely transported, by towing or otherwise, from its present berth to the harbor of Mobile, Ala."

During my tour of duty last summer as a Naval Reserve officer, I had the opportunity to visit this famous old ship, and upon my return, I communicated immediately with the Navy Department to determine whether it would be feasible to have the U. S. S. *Hartford* reconditioned sufficiently to be moved to Mystic. I was informed at the time that the cost to recondition her and bring her to Mystic would amount to about $1,025,000 and that the entire expense would have to be borne by Connecticut since purportedly there were no funds available to the Navy Department for that purpose. We did not feel, at the time, that the State could undertake such an expenditure.

Since that time considerable interest has been shown by many of our citizens who are eager to see the U. S. S. *Hartford* permanently berthed in her home State. The most recent expression of interest came from the well-known commentator on military affairs, Maj. George Fielding Eliot, a resident of Litchfield, who suggests a citizens' campaign to raise some of the necessary funds.

Within the last month, this office has been in touch with the Navy Department discussing the possibility of moving the U. S. S. *Hartford* to Mystic more economically by use of an ARD floating drydock.

In view of H. R. 8247, which would authorize the moving of this ship at Federal expense, it would appear to me that if she is to be moved by Federal action, every effort should be made to have her brought to Mystic as is desired by many of our citizens.

Department of Defense Appropriation Bill, 1955

SPEECH

OF

HON. HARLAN HAGEN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 29, 1954

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 8873) making appropriations for the Department of Defense and related independent agency for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes.

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word merely to ask a question which relates to a minor matter. It is in two parts and relates to a provision on page 39, section 717, dealing with commissary operation, if someone on the committee is familiar with it.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I may say to the gentleman that that is the same provision we carried in the bill for the current year.

Mr. HAGEN of California. This language for reimbursement is identical with the previous provision; is that correct?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. It is identical language.

Mr. HAGEN of California. And the language establishing criteria for operation in the United States; it would be the same as it was last year; is that correct?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. That is correct.

Hampton Roads: The Great American Seaport

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PORTER HARDY, JR.

OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 4, 1954

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, on last Thursday night I had the privilege of attending the annual meeting of the Hampton Roads Maritime Association. The meeting was addressed by one of our distinguished former colleagues, the Honorable J. Lindsay Almond, who is now so ably serving Virginia as attorney general.

Speaking at Norfolk, the largest city in my district, Mr. Almond pointed out many significant advantages of Hampton Roads—one of the world's great seaports. I am sure that much of the information supplied by Mr. Almond will be of interest to my colleagues and particularly to those intimately concerned with matters of world trade or maritime affairs. I am glad, therefore, to include below this address of Virginia's distinguished attorney general, Hon. J. Lindsay Almond:

PARTNERSHIP OF POWER AND PROGRESS

It is with a deep sense of humility that I respond to the honor of the invitation to address this 34th annual banquet of the Hampton Roads Maritime Association. Humility, invoked out of respect for your splendid accomplishments and in contemplation of the staggering opportunities which lie ahead for greater service and development.

My background is neither nautical nor maritime. I was reared on a farm in Orange County but went to the mountainous area of southwest Virginia to launch my professional career. As a country boy, absorbed in the rigors of farm life, the Atlantic Ocean, to me, was just as far away and inaccessible as the Pacific.

Generally speaking, an individual is circumscribed, in a measure, by environmental conditions. It is, however, a happy and fruitful concomitant of human nature that the perspective of vision broadens and deepens in scope with the advancing steps on the highway of life. Progressively, through the years, there has been a growing realization on my part, approaching the proportions of an obsession, that Virginia has not thrown the full weight of her innate genius, her power and influence in the constructive development of her vast natural potentialities with which the Divine Creator has so richly endowed her.

Paradoxically enough, it has seemed difficult for our people to embrace and envision the whole scheme of our natural advantages, opportunities, and assets. We have diluted the tensile strength of our economic fabric, not only through a spirit of apathetic dormancy, but through the process of patchwork on the quilt of economic growth and progress. Instead of community independence, so prevalent, an attribute not to be condemned, we need to develop more community interdependence. Political and economic provincialism is a shackle stifling to growth, progress, and constructive development.

Of course, all of us take great and intense pride in the contribution which the ports of Greater Hampton Roads make to the vast area of Virginia immediately contiguous thereto; the great business and industrial enterprises which have grown up around and are so vitally dependent upon them, as well as the rapid growth and cultural influence of this great metropolis of people.

Sometimes we find ourselves in a domain so vast that we are unable to see the beauty and awesome majesty of the forest because of the trees. Through our own failure to correctly appraise and evaluate that which surrounds us, we are rendered impotent to transmit their virtues of service and opportunity to the world.

The almost fabulous message of the port facilities and services available here now, with the potentiality of their future development and resulting beneficial impact upon the whole economy of Virginia, should be impressed indelibly upon the mind and conscience of every forward looking Virginian dedicated—even though by his own enlightened self-interest—to the future growth and development of the overall economy of this Commonwealth.

Through the cooperative and cohesive utilization of the vision, skill, genius, initiative, enterprise, and brawn of business, industry, labor, promotional civic agencies and government, State and local, in a mutual partnership of power, potential, push, and perserverance indissolubly wedded to a dynamic spirit of progress, the ports of greater Hampton Roads can and will, in the not distant future, become the pride of all Virginia; an asset of incalculable worth to the Nation, envied by all competitors and superior to any port facility anywhere in the world—a towering monument of economic strength, stability, and stamina in time of peace, and an arsenal of democracy and a bastion of defense in time of war.

Today in the embryonic stage, in the light of its future potential, Hampton Roads has nearly 300 wharves, piers, and docks. It has 150,000 acres of warehouses and transit sheds. Its facilities compare favorably with modern techniques and its terminals are conveniently accessible on one side by adequate depth of water, and from the other by a belt line railroad system. No other port in the world possesses finer or more efficient, time saving, cost reducing coal transshipment facilities for the loading of vessels than are those at its three coal terminals. The increase of its grain exportation requires that the 750,000 bushel elevator at Sewells Point be more than doubled at an expenditure in excess of a million dollars. Because of its large importations of petroleum products, Hampton Roads furnishes the attraction and impetus for the location and development of expansive refinery interests, thus bringing in and sustaining new industry representing millions in investment and redounding, not only to the wholesome growth and benefit of the community, but enhancing the economic stability of the entire State. Constantly plying the waters of the ocean with cargoes headed for these ports are tankers from the oil fields of Texas, Mexico, the West Indies, the Persian Gulf, and the coastal ports of eastern and western United States. With nine major railroads, with convenient and ready access to waterfront terminals, commodities are handled between car and vessel with expedition, at low cost and a minimum of risk to cargo safety. Shippers reap material benefits through favorable rates and the low cost and efficiency of handling their shipments.

Here we have the finest commercial shipbuilding and ship repair facilities in the world. The Nation's largest private shipyard is located at Newport News, and one of the greatest naval installations in the world. Two hundred and seventy-three steamship lines converge on Hampton Roads forming a connecting link between the Virginia ports and practically every major port throughout the world. Its avenues of service fan out to the Pacific Coast ports, the highly productive and consuming areas east of the Mississippi, west to Chicago, north to Detroit, and south to Atlanta and Birmingham. It is an indispensible conduit for the rich coal fields of Virginia, West Virginia, and Kentucky. It reduces the burden of shipping costs by serving as an outlet for the cotton mill sections of the Carolinas and Georgia, the timber producing areas of Virginia, West Virginia, and the Carolinas, as well as the important agricultural and manufacturing areas of the Middle West. Whether the commodities be imports or exports, these ports by reason of fortuitous location and natural advantages, aided by a marvelous transportation system and modern facilities, are uniquely equipped to meet efficiently and economically the port requirements of a vast territory throughout America and the world.

Ice free the year round and a child of geographic fortune, its commendably wholesome and peaceful labor climate and atmosphere far transcends that which at times, attended by terrific losses to both management and labor, has throttled and strangled business and commerce in other ports of this country.

While we have witnessed phenominal growth in the past 15 years, yet, we cannot afford to rest on our oars for competition is keen. Relatively few Virginians realize that in 1952 Hampton Roads cleared 58 percent of the total export tonnage shipped from the principal Atlantic coast ports, representing a value of $517 million and 250 percent greater than the New York tonnage, and representing an increase of 650 percent over 1940 shipments. The combined export and import cargo in 1952 increased 420 percent over 1940. The 1952 imports of 3 million net tons reflect an increase approximating 180,000 tons over 1951 and a value in excess of $135 million. This tonnage represented a 216 percent increase over 1940 and a dollar value increase of 300 percent. These statistics, phenomenal and almost prodiguous, I cite from the 1954 annual report of your association. They are so impressive as to challenge the imagination but signally portentious of future growth and expansion.

Clustered in and around and in augmentation of this great resource of State-wide import and impact are a multiplicity of thriving markets, and golden and challenging opportunities for increasing industrial expansion.

Virginia must awaken and embrace the full efficacy of the ancient proverb: "Where there is no vision, the people perish." Our already heavily tax-burdened people are becoming more and more tax conscious and tax resistant. The only alternative to the increase of direct taxes is to be found in the expansion and full utilization of our vast resources. Virginia has no greater resource than the potentialities of this great port and harbor facility. The responsibility for its development is not circumscribed by the Hampton Roads area. It is a matter of statewide import and concern, with potential benefits to every and all of the area of Virginia from the mountains to the sea. It is an asset of incalculable worth to every political subdivision—remote and near. With our great arteries of inland transportation, rail and highway, it is accessible and serviceable to mine, farm, factory, and forest. Industrial expansion is essential to the broadening of the tax base, spreading the load and the creation of new sources of revenue to meet the growing cost of governmental services to the people. Every stable industry locating in Virginia is not only a stimulant to the economy of its immediate location, but augments the strength of the economic fabric of the whole State. If my community loses an industry which your community gains, your gain is not my loss. Both and all derive direct benefits. This area has already demonstrated, with the surface hardly scratched, that it is a dynamic magnet for the attraction of new and powerful industrial enterprise to Virginia, with resultant dividends therefrom pulsating through the arteries and strengthening the vitality of the entire economic structure.

None is so blind as he who will not see. He who looks down the panoramic vista of the immediate future and fails to see here the greatest port facilities in the whole world with ocean cargoes coming from and destined to the uttermost ports of the globe, all contributing to the sum total of Virginia's growth and progress, should recall and profit from the prophetic admonition of that old proverb: "Where there is no vision, the people perish."

Therefore, State and community, business, industry, labor, and all segments of the political, social, and economic order, working shoulder to shoulder with a common purpose for the commonweal, should strive to achieve this salutary objective through the application of this advice from Kipling:

"It ain't the guns nor armament,
Nor funds that they can pay,
But close cooperation that makes them win the day.
It ain't the individual,
Nor the Army as a whole,
But the everlasting teamwork of every bloomin' soul."

Resolution Adopted by Governors' Permanent Fuel Conference Requesting Restriction of Importation of Residual Oil

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 29, 1954

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, a critical situation has been developing in the coal industry due to several different causes. One of the most serious causes arises from the unrestricted importations of residual fuel oil from foreign sources.

The subject had careful and serious consideration at the recent Governors' Permanent Fuel Conference held in Washington, D. C., on April 28, 1954.

At this conference a resolution was adopted that calls for remedial action by Congress. The call is urgent—the answer should not be delayed.

The resolution to which I refer is made a part of my remarks. It is as follows:

Whereas great damage has been inflicted on the coal industry through closing of existing mines and permanent loss of valuable coal already developed, on employment, and on the Nation's economy because of unrestricted importations of residual fuel oil from foreign sources; and

Whereas the maintenance of a strong domestic coal industry is essential to the Nation's defense, security, and welfare; and

Whereas the public interest requires a curtailment of foreign residual fuel oil imports through appropriate congressional action: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Governors' Permanent Fuel Conference, composed of the chief executives of the major coal producing States, in meeting assembled on April 28, 1954, at Washington, D. C., urges the members of the congressional delegations from the several affected States to use their best offices in obtaining immediate legislative action whereby the continually increasing flood of imported residual oil may be restricted.

Israel and the Arabs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 8, 1954

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I think the interview between Eliezer Livneh, a member of the Israeli Parliament and the editor of the important Israeli journal Beterem, given to Rabbi David Neiman of the Community Temple of Brooklyn is most apropos.

It appeared in the April 1954 issue of American Judaism.

The interview follows:

Question. How did the Arab refugee problem originate?

Answer. When the Arabs waged war on us in 1948, the leaders of the Arabs, including those in Palestine, told all Arabs to leave Palestine or the Jews would kill them. They were assured that they would be able to return within a few weeks with the victorious Arab armies and share in the spoils of war. So certain were the Arabs that they would destroy Israel. When the war ended, only an armistice was established and it would have been folly for Israel to readmit enemies onto its soil. Of course, the Arabs who resisted the advice of their leaders and remained in Israel have continued to live in their homes and on their land. Much of the resentment of the refugees is directed toward their own leaders who misled them.

Question. Has the Government of Israel done anything about the Arab refugees?

Answer. The Government of Israel first suggested the plan to reunite families. Israel offered to reunite any Arab families separated by the war. They were offered a choice: The Israeli branch could join the others in Arab territory or the Arab branch could rejoin the others in Israel. Many Arabs have taken advantage of this offer; the majority have chosen to live in the Jewish state.

Question. What have the Arab States done about the Arab refugees?

Answer. It is a sad commentary on the morals of the Arab leaders that they not only have done nothing to relieve the plight of the refugees but, on the contrary, have done everything possible to heighten the problem. It is well to recall that the former Grand Mufti of Jerusalem (who collaborated with Hitler during the war) urged the Arab States to keep the refugees in the camps and not allow them to rebuild their lives in any Arab country, so that the refugee problem might remain as a political weapon in the hands of Israel's foes. The suffering of these thousands of homeless people is thus being used by their brothers for political ends.

On January 17, 1954, the magazine section of the New York Times carried two articles on this question, one pro-Israel and one pro-Arab. In the latter this was said: "The reasons the * * * villagers cannot resettle elsewhere are economic and psychological. * * * The psychological factors include the refugees' deeply rooted belief, encouraged by Arab politicians in Jordan and elsewhere, that they would lose the right to compensation or to return to their former lands if they gave up their status as refugees by accepting resettlement outside Palestine." That is what the Arab leaders tell the refugees in the face of Israel's explicit offer to compensate the Arabs for their abandoned property if they will settle in Arab countries.

When Arab refugees cross the border of Israel illegally and cause damage, it is said that they are only after food for their children from land rightfully theirs. But the same pro-Arab writer, quoted above, also stated: "At that time (the outbreak of the war) Palestinian Arabs were assured by their leaders that they would soon be able to return to their homes. Now, operating under this convenient cover, professional thieves raid Israel settlements and further accentuate the tensions along the frontier."

Question. What is the Israeli attitude toward Kibya?

Answer. It is widely condemned. Also condemned is the constant harassment of Israel by Arab invaders. Also condemned is the one-sided Security Council resolution which spanked us harder than any nation has ever been spanked and said virtually nothing about the exasperation to which we have been, and continue to be, subjected.

Question. What is the Israeli claim to Jerusalem?

Answer. Jerusalem is more Jewish than Washington is American, London English, and even Paris is French. It is part and parcel of the Jewish state, especially new Jerusalem, which we built with our own hands and resources out of nothing. Besides, when the Arabs attacked us and assaulted Jerusalem in defiance of the United Nations and the sancta of three faiths, we were the only ones in the wide world who fought for it.

Question. Are there any conditions attached to the Israel offer to talk peace with the Arabs?

Answer. No. None whatsoever. Israel has repeatedly offered to sit down and negotiate, but the Arabs repeatedly ignore us. We have been accused of defying the U. N. But note the silence of Arabophiles about Jordan's failure to answer the U. N. summons (or Egypt's stubbornness at Suez).

Question. What is the present situation on Israel's borders?

Answer. Tense. And when we talk of borders in Israel, it may seem to Americans, living in an immense country, that only soldiers who guard outposts are involved. But in Israel more than half of the population lives within 20 miles of a border. Hence, the majority of our people are potentially involved in the frontier crises.

College Years—An Adventure of the Mind

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1954

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the other night, Wednesday, April 28, 1954, at the Hotel Roosevelt in New York City, it was my very good fortune to hear Mr. Robert Alan Kelly, third-year law student of Harvard Law School, address well over 600 alumni and friends of St. Peter's College, of Jersey City, N. J., at a diamond jubilee dinner commemorating the 75th anniversary of that distinguished institution.

Mr. Kelly, of 253 Jewett Avenue, Jersey City, a graduate of St. Peter's College, class of 1951, thoroughly delighted his listeners with an address sparkling in wit, brilliance, and the spirit of youth. I liked particularly these of his words:

> We celebrate tonight the 75th anniversary of our physical college. But an adventure of the mind—for that's what a college really is—cannot be hemmed in by the mere chronology of years.

And again these of his words:

> Yes; our college of the mind—that universal republic of learning for all freemen—is in reality the original, undiluted culture of western Christendom itself.

I trust that my colleagues in the House will find enjoyment equal to mine in the address of Mr. Kelly, cited below under unanimous consent, with his kind permission:

ST. PETER'S IN THE POSTWAR ERA

(By Robert Alan Kelly)

I must confess, at the very outset, that I approach this discussion of St. Peter's in the Postwar Era with a great deal of uneasiness. Not many of us here have been participants in its golden past, as Judge Sullivan has, nor, may I say, could we recall it with an artistry so sure as his. None of us, of course, is able to peer into the mysteries of the future to learn what is yet to come for our alma mater. But when it comes to the recent past, just as when the topic is Leo Durocher, installment buying, the common cold, or women—why, then, everyone is an expert. Please excuse me then if most of what I have to say is tentative. In a way, talking about the St. Peter's we all know at a dinner such as this does resemble testifying before a congressional committee—since those on the other side of the table have most of the facts already. The eminent lawyers in the audience will doubtless remind me that, in accepting the invitation to speak, I have waived my right to plead the fifth amendment. As usual, this was a perfectly disastrous thing for anyone at Harvard to do. But since this is a St. Peter's gathering, if your reaction is too hostile, perhaps I can get a measure of protection by invoking the fifth amendment.

Now, if there is one word that can be said to characterize our college in the years following the Second World War, I believe that word is "expansion." The expansion I speak of was noticeable in every aspect of college life, but, in all probability, its most obvious manifestation was in the size of the student body. Instead of a prewar enrollment which rarely exceeded 500, our postwar complement usually hovered around 2,000 students. Those two household phrases of our college years—GI bill and Public Law 16—undoubtedly began this influx, but I daresay that they are not responsible for its continuance. For, despite the veterans' recessional—even after the ex-captains and the ex-privates depart—1,500 or more still seemed to be our normal student population. Higher education, it seems, has at last become as well received as baseball—but it took a world war to do it.

The immediate result of the onrush, at least in 1946, was seven freshman sections, classroom congestion and what I fear was a crushing schedule for the faculty. But inevitably, as graduation follows on the senior finals, more students mean more professors, and many new names began appearing on the course charts. Names like Mihalik, Yanitelli, Flynn, McGill, Fahy, McCauley, Walsh, and McLaughlin. Even the courses began to burgeon. Mr. Crotty inaugurated a study of statistics; Mr. Murphy brought his practical background in labor and commercial arbitration to the business school; Mr. Loftus carried political philosophy, and the socratic method into the arts curriculum and in the dank recesses of Gannon Hall, before which all AB's, BSII's and business school men cringe in terror, Dr. Jackson and Mr. McNally invented new tortures for the long-suffering BSI's. Even fringe benefits came our way. Mr. Mainig revamped the guidance program and Mr. Grant continued Mr. Nevin's work in the placement office. In such profusion did all this appear that there may well have been some danger of the student adopting the attitude of the proper Bostonian, who once remarked: "Let me have the luxuries of life and I will soon learn to do without the necessities."

The Jesuit faculty kept up with the increase of lay professors and I think each of us in the postwar years had our share of the distinctive glory of a Jesuit college—the teaching of an individual S. J. Perhaps the only regret any of us has on this score was that before we really got to know an individual S. J. well—off he went to Canisius or Woodstock or the Marshall Islands—off about his Father's business. Indeed, the tenure of its Jesuits seems to be the only thing which is unstable in a Jesuit college. This, of course, is better than an instability of purpose or basic convictions which often characterizes other faculties but it still tends to break down the connection which an alumnus has with his alma mater. Perhaps, if enough of our alumni in enough of our schools shout, "Please, stop it," even the provincial will share our concern. But these additions to our faculty, however much they were a cause for joy, could hardly overcome the sorrow of our losses. The one great tragedy of our postwar St. Peter's was the passing of the big three from our classrooms and from our midst. But their presence so filled St. Peter's that no student from our years will ever consider them wholly gone. We even summarized our admiration for them in a rhyme:

"Here's to dear old St. Peter's,
  Built upon mortgaged sod;
Where Chetwood speaks only to Rankin—
  And Johnson speaks only to God."

Now the rhyme is all too true; and this trinity of learning speaks only to another trinity.

But, who of us can forget Father Chetwood as he facetiously remarked, when he finally found someone willing to venture an answer: "Ah, a human hand." Who could fail to remember Father Rankin as he agonized in the mental labors of every ethics student—the frantic gestures as he helped pull down the blue clay of error and, then, the joyous war whoop as they both uncovered the diamond of a living thought. Who would not accord a special place in his memories for Father Johnson—that giant of a man from an age of deeper scholarship and livelier enthusiasm than our own. If he walked our corridors in Genoa velvet, with a book fresh from Aldus under his doublet, in the company of Thomas Moore, he could not have been more a man of the Renaissance. He was a startling man, too. On my very first day at St. Peter's, we all arose automatically for the opening prayer when he tottered into old room 7. Then, this kindly looking old priest—who seemed to be put together of cobwebs and ashes so that he would crumble at the touch—wheeled around, fixed upon us a glance, which, if it were Cicero's he would have reserved it only for Catiline, and rasped: "Sit down. We are studying Latin. Do you think this is a prayer meeting."

There is only one other, of a thousand and one tales about him that I want to recount now—and only because it seems to recapture, for me, something of his elusive character. We were somewhere in the Odes of Horace and a hapless pre-med was translating. It was plain that the pre-med had been up rather late the previous evening, contemplating what Father Johnson always referred to delicately as "other things." The word "virgo" occurred several times in the passage under consideration and each time, the pre-med rendered it inadvertently, as "virgin." We all waited for the storm. It came in a strident voice: "Why don't you try 'maiden'?" The pre-med halted Job-like to await again the voice from the whirlwind. The voice was gentle now—with a touch of wry wit as it said: "This is poetry, John. Why be so biological?"

But our theme was the postwar St. Peter's and the expansion which characterized it. Not only was this burgeoning in human beings; it encompassed physical things as well. Indeed, from 1946 to 1951, hardly a term passed without some renovation or addition to the college plant. First of all, the old Young Mansion was converted into a residence for the Jesuit faculty; not too long after the end of the war, Memorial Hall arose behind the gym. It was then disconnected from the main buildings but we knew it was ours since it bore a suspicious family resemblance to the arts building—though I suspect it had a bar sinister in its coat-of-arms. The gym itself went through several alterations—new grandstands and a color scheme which seemed to change as frequently as our opponents on the court below. But the principal addition was, of course, McDermot Hall, which provided badly-needed classrooms and office space—not to mention, that imposing panneled meeting room.

As a matter of fact, there was one rather symbolic thing about McDermott. In its erection, the old brownstone fountain near Glenwood Avenue was torn down. On this had been inscribed the names of the knight commanders of the Most Noble Order of the Peacock, our primeval student government. This was symbolic, I say, because a few months before, the entire MNOP setup had been torn down in a species of bloodless coup d'etat. Jacobins, in both the student body and the faculty—who believed in an elective council—were everywhere in protest demonstrations. All that was needed to complete this picture of revolution was the sound of tumbrils carrying aristocrats to a guillotine somewhere on the Plase de la Collins Gym. But, as in Ruritania, student politics at St. Peter's still wore a rose—and the man chosen by the newly liberated electorate to head the student council was the former head of the MNOP. There is no analogy to this except perhaps a hypothetical situation, in which, after the October Revolution, Czar Nicholas II emerged as secretary-general of the Bolshevik Party.

Other new activities were as common as flunks in a calculus exam: Pavan, the literary quarterly—which has already provided a drama critic for Commonweal; a revamped "Paww Wow"; the Society for the Advancement of Management at the business school and two intercollegiate groups—the National Student Association and the National Federation of Catholic College Students. The alumni association sprang to life at the end of the war and has now attained a level of efficiency and support of which this evening's dinner is but one small token. In the sports field, not only were there new teams formed in the postwar years—in golf, swimming, and fencing—but our first love, the basketball team ascended to dizzy heights. But then, I suppose, that is no more than what should befall those who fly with the Gray Eagle. Those were the great days when we humbled Seton Hall and Fordham; the years of achievement for Shiel and Tommy Smith; even the zany when we played with Manhattan to perhaps the only basketball tie in captivity. Indeed, a sports writer recently suggested that our reputation as a "spoiler" actually hindered schedule making with better publicized teams.

Perhaps the most startling change was the addition of an ROTC unit to our campus activities. In a way, though, it came too late. Father Ward was not around to witness this final triumph of militarism. The addition of ROTC was at least prudent, however. Jersey City has always respected that ancient piece of wisdom—"If you can't beat 'em, join 'em." And the United States Army, even in its peacetime battles, seems to have the habit of victory.

There is one other change—the most important one—which I have not mentioned. It is too pervasive ever to discuss in a 15-minute talk. I refer to the amalgamation of Hudson College. This particular expansion was almost carniverous in character. One fine day, the board of trustees swallowed Hudson and regurgitated the School of Business and the School of Arts and Sciences. Together now, they are partners in a rather loose alliance—each performing its unique function in friendly rivalry—though I sometimes suspect that students in this alliance tend to look upon it in much the same way that France and Germany regard the forthcoming European Army Treaty.

And so, we come from the postwar past to the present—and we stand upon the threshold of our future. We celebrate tonight the 75th anniversary of our physical college. But an adventure of the mind—for that's what a college really is—cannot be hemmed in by the mere chronology of years. Tonight, we actually celebrate the ideas and the ideals which perhaps, we first encountered in our college years and which, we hope, despite our wavering and our missteps, are still at least the ultimate reference of our post-graduate lives. This rich tradition of the mind is older by far than 75 years. Its lineage can be traced through Ferdinand Farmer, the Jesuit who preached and taught in New Jersey long before the American Revolution; it is kindred to the Spanish friars who first brought higher learning to this hemisphere; it is descended from the great Jesuit universities of 16th century Spain, France, and Austria; it was sired by the medieval schoolmen and reaches, through them, to their inspirations in classic Greece, Rome, and Palestine. Yes, our college of the mind—that universal republic of learning for all freemen—is in reality, the original, undiluted culture of western Christendom, itself. In that heritage, we have our assurance of the future. And our physical college shares in that assurance also, for it is but an instrument of that great tradition. The very symbols of our college proclaim it. Our peacock heralds a resurrection with unending life, and our motto—"In Perpetuum"—forever—is both a challenge and a promise. The challenge to us—to our loyalty to its precepts and our courage in their fulfillment; the promise to those who come after us—a promise of further service to them, and to the city and State which have benefited from our colleges' contributions during three generations. Thus constituted and thus resolved, the St. Peter's of the future can do nothing but outstrip its postwar past, in richness and in distinction.

THE DIAMOND JUBILEE DINNER COMMEMORATING THE 75TH ANNIVERSARY OF ST. PETER'S COLLEGE BY THE ALUMNI ASSOCIATION, WEDNESDAY, APRIL 28, 1954, HOTEL ROOSEVELT, NEW YORK CITY

THE PRESIDENTS OF ST. PETER

The Reverend George B. Kenny, S. J., 1878–80.

The Reverend John McQuaid, S. J., 1880–88.

The Reverend Peter Cassidy, S. J., 1888–91.

The Reverend John Harpes, S. J., 1891–1900.

The Reverend Joseph Swinge, S. J., 1900–02.

The Reverend John W. Fox, S. J., 1902–06.

The Reverend Edward J. Magrath, S. J., 1906–11.

The Reverend Joseph A. Mulry, S. J., 1911–15.

The Reverend James F. McDermott, S. J., 1915–21.

The Reverend Joseph J. O'Reilly, S. J., 1925–31.

The Reverend Joseph S. Dinneen, S. J., 1931–37.

The Reverend Dennis J. Comey, S. J., 1937–43.

The Reverend Vincent J. Hart, S. J., 1943–49.

The Reverend James J. Shanahan, S. J., 1949– .

THE DIAMOND JUBILEE CLUB

Charter donor members: Hon. Mark A. Sullivan, Sr., 1897; Hon. Joseph F. S. Fitzpatrick, 1898; Hon. Daniel T. O'Regan, 1905; Dr. Vincent P. Butler, 1914; Dr. John N. Connell, 1915; Hon. Paul T. Cullum, 1915; Dr. James E. Reynolds, 1915; Hon. Thomas J. Stanton, 1915; Rt. Rev. Msgr. Martin W. Stanton, 1919; John J. Boylan, 1934; Frank A. Magyer, 1943; Walter N. Sheil, 1950; Thomas F. X. Smith, 1951.

PROGRAM

Toastmaster: The Honorable James P. Murray, Jr., 1939, State senator, New Jersey.

Invocation: Rt. Rev. Msgr. Martin W. Stanton, 1919, pastor, St. Aedan's Church.

Greetings: The Honorable Joseph F. S. Fitzpatrick, 1898.

St. Peter's yesterday: The Honorable Mark A. Sullivan, Sr., 1897.

St. Peter's rebuilding: The Reverend Joseph S. Dinneen, S. J., director of missions, Maryland province.

St. Peter's postwar years: Robert Alan Kelly, 1951.

St. Peter's today: The Reverend James J. Shanahan, S. J., president, St. Peter's College.

Greetings from the State: The Honorable Robert B. Meyner, Governor, State of New Jersey.

Speaker: The Honorable Thomas F. Meaney, 1908, judge, United States district court.

Benediction: Rt. Rev. Msgr. Joseph F. Dolan, 1897, pastor, St. Vincent's Church.

Reserve Judgment in the Army-McCarthy Case Until All Evidence Is In

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 29, 1954

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, I have just returned from a hurried trip to Michigan, and while there I found that there is an understandable temptation to pass an exasperated and adverse snap judgment on the current proceedings in the McCarthy-Army controversy.

In my opinion, however, it will be most unfortunate if thoughtful Americans yield to this temptation. I believe it is of the utmost importance that the judgment of public opinion be held in abeyance as far as possible until all of the evidence is in.

It is significant, and ironical, that the pressures for a snap judgment, and one hostile to Senator McCARTHY, are strongest from the professional McCarthy-haters.

This is the same crowd that has ceaselessly clamored for the adoption of regular courtroom procedures in congressional investigations, particularly the right of cross-examination of witnesses. Now that there is cross-examination with a vengeance from all sides, and a clear determination to bring all of the facts at issue to light, this same element is deploring the dragged out proceedings and objecting to the so-called public washing of dirty linen.

Already evidence is developing in the hearings that the commanding general at Fort Monmouth had commended the McCarthy committee investigation of subversives and security risks at that highly sensitive military installation, and that he was under heavy pressure from within the Department of the Army to remove the suspensions of certain security risks. This is a highly relevant disclosure and has a most important bearing on the fundamental issue of who it is in the Federal Government who wants to relax or eliminate the hunt for traitors and potential traitors in the military.

In urging that thoughtful Americans reserve judgment on the entire matter I should like to remind them of 4 or 5 facts which have been temporarily obscured by the present proceedings:

First. An Army major was promoted and honorably discharged after he had repeatedly invoked the protection of the fifth amendment.

Second. An Army general did refuse to give information as to who was responsible for this promotion and honorable discharge, acting under orders of top Department of Army officials.

Third. The Secretary of the Army did agree to provide this information, but as a result of enormous pressures from within the military and from the left-wing press, who charged him with surrendering to McCARTHY, began a diversionary attack upon McCARTHY.

Fourth. The counsel for the Army gave added impetus to this diversionary tactic by releasing charges of demands for special favors for Private Schine.

Fifth. It has already been conceded, in the current hearings, that the Secretary of the Army desired to substitute self-investigation of subversives by the Army for congressional investigations, in spite of the statement of the Fort Monmouth commander that more had been accomplished in 2 weeks by the Senate investigating committee than had been accomplished in 2 years by the Army itself.

I do not ask, or expect, a verdict in favor of McCARTHY in advance of a full exploration of the facts. But I strongly believe that the foregoing considerations, and the eagerness of the anti-McCarthy crowd to discredit him by discrediting the current proceedings, is a fair warning against an adverse snap judgment.

Of course, it is unfortunate that the controversy developed and that it reached its present stage. But it would be infinitely more unfortunate if there were any turning back in the Senate committee's expressed determination to get all of the facts, or if there were a superficial judgment rendered by a careless or impatient public before the evidence is all in.

Why Am I a Republican?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT W. CRETELLA
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 4, 1954

Mr. CRETELLA. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit a speech made by John M. Lupton, of Connecticut, to the Norwalk Woman's Republican Club and the Westport Young Republican Club on April 20.

I find this speech so invigorating, so honest and concise that I consider it a privilege to offer it to my colleagues for reading. I congratulate my good friend John Lupton on the splendid presentation and on the forthrightness of the statements contained in his speech.

The speech follows:

Why Am I a Republican?

Because I care. Because it makes a difference what happens to my country. Because it is the only political condition which seems to me to make sense in a day and age characterized politically by nonsense. Simply put, I am a Republican because I honor in my heart and mind the best of our Nation's past; because I am confident in our Nation's present; and because I have faith in our Nation's future.

More than that, however, I am a Republican because I know that mere respect for the past, confidence in the present, and faith for the future in themselves are—and can only be—respectable platitudes. Alone, they mean little, accomplish nothing, and lead nowhere. To spend our days looking dreamily at the past, to become merely nostalgic dreamers for the good old days—to do this and nothing more is to make of ourselves ineffectual men and women too old in spirit to do the work that must be done. On the other hand, to remain merely confident that no matter how dark the clouds today a few brief hours of night in which to sleep and dream will chase them all away—to do this and nothing more is to become but an ostrich taking cheer in the happy blindness that what we can't see won't hurt us, particularly if we just pretend that it wasn't there to see in the first place. And finally to go through life with nothing but faith, to tell ourselves that things are pretty bad, or, even, that they are pretty terrible but that like a class B moving picture, "everything will come out all right in the end" because everything always has—to do this and nothing more is to put ourselves, our Nation, and our future in the hands of others willing—nay, determined—to shape that future to suit themselves.

And that is why I am a Republican.

Since we may take it for granted that we all have a very vital stake in our country and its development from this point onward; and since we should also be able to take it for granted that each and everyone of us has a very real obligation to play his greatest possible role in that development, we must obviously seek the best means of exercising that obligation. For the individual to contribute effectively to the preservation and advancement of a Christian republic may well be the greatest right and the greatest necessity facing us as freemen in this life.

Generally speaking, I believe man acting as an individual can do little that is effective in shaping either the present or the future of a political institution. Only when men work in concert through the instrument of a recognized political party can they bring their fullest weight to bear. Even the man who limits his political action to a vote in any—or every—election does more than the man who does not vote. He makes a choice between this man or that; this platform or the other.

But the voter who belongs to and works for no party; the effete dabbler who makes a show of his so-called independence, does little more, indeed, than make a choice. He casts one vote. Because he is blindly unaffiliated, because he is proud of his nonpartisan character (as if our heritage, our liberty, our very destinies were things about which we must not be partisan), he has in any one election only three alternatives.

He can vote for either one of the major parties, in which case he in effect says, I care nothing for your principles, I care nothing about your ideals or theories, I ask only that you put on a better show than your opponent, ply me with more sugarcoated words, paint me a prettier picture and I will vote for you in this entertaining national popularity contest; I will select a president as I in effect select the songs on the Hit Parade.

Alternative No. 2. He may ignore the two major parties—in one of which the victory almost always lies—and vote (he always calls it a protest vote) for a splinter party. He accomplishes nothing. His vote indeed is lost; his voice is lost. All too often we do not even know—nor does he—just what it is he is protesting against.

Obviously, the third course for the nonparty voter is on election day to go fishing. About this course nothing need be said. A privilege won in hardship, defended time and again in bloody tragedy, is lost by default.

Mere voting in this election or that then is not enough. Our political parties will be effective only to the degree that they have the dedicated service of dedicated Americans.

What parties? In this time and place a realistic approach requires that we consider only two. For America must not become a one-party nation; that way lies the death of freedom. Nor must America become a 3-, 4-, or 44-party Nation; that way lies chaos, paralyzing inaction, the forfeiture of individual responsiblity at home and national responsibility in foreign affairs.

We have come now to the crux of our problem. Since there are two major parties our adherence to the principles of either one must be based on reasoning which—like a double-edged knife—cuts in either direction.

I am a Republican because I am in favor of certain basic propositions. I am a Republican, too, because I am opposed to other propositions.

In a 10-minute talk, obviously we can concern ourselves only with the essentials, with the hard core of the problem, rather than with the surface details which in a political argument provide the documentation. I am, for instance, more concerned tonight about the proposition that in its dealings with other nations our Nation must be governed by the simple fundamentals of honesty and realistic national self-interest than I am in establishing that agreements such as those made by a Democrat at Yalta violate such fundamental principles.

What, then, am I against? What do I find in the Democratic Party which leads me to the conclusion that being a Republican is the only logical choice for a man to make?

I find 20 years of abused stewardship, 20 years in which the trust placed by the voters in Democratic leaders was violated, partially, perhaps by men who were knowingly and intentionally evil; but more importantly by people who, regardless of their intentions, misruled because they ignored in their thinking the very things which had made the country of their Government strong and great; because they set themselves above the country, above its traditions and its laws, above its people.

Such leaders—confident perhaps that they knew what was best—gambled for 20 years with our national heritage. They made of the Democratic Party not a party of the people, but a party dedicated to the manipulation of the people. They laughed at the heart and foundation of our republican form of government; States rights they subordinated to the interests of a superstate; the Supreme Court they referred to as nine old men and they tried to make it more than nine at that; the people they reduced to data on a filing card, statistics, blocs, groups, the forgotten man, the one-third of a nation, the princes of privilege, the economic royalists, the adherents of a slave-labor law. They ignored, they changed; and what they couldn't ignore or could not change, they either castigated with bitter invective or ridiculed with cutting sarcasm from the typewriters of professional wordsmiths. And always they acted in the name of "progressiveness"; always they were something they called liberals. And because they saw themselves as bigger than history, they changed fact to suit their needs; a man who disagreed with one President became publicly a liar, another a copperhead; men who mentioned facts distasteful to another President were dealers in red herrings. Government became a game—a giant giveaway program; and, as with any carnival shell game, the prizes were always big enough and elusively just close enough to keep the suckers on the hook.

Such a party I must reject because as a man I must be against certain things. These things. What things do I believe in? What things lead me to be a Republican?

I believe in the people. All of the people. Not just the little people, or the forgotten people; not the laborer; not the farmer; not the consumer; not the capitalist; not the Negro nor the Jew nor the Old Yankee; not the statistical nonentity of the bureaucrat. I believe in the people. All of the people.

And because I believe in the people I believe in the republican form of government in which all ultimate power is vested in the people, who in turn give to designated officials a limited power to act for them. And I believe, too, that the faith of the people is not to be abused; and the trust of the people is not lightly to be considered; and the heritage of the people is not to be traded, nor, like the property of a bankrupt businessman, sold to the highest bidder.

The wisdom of the people. Politicians frequently forget that it exists. Unscrupulous manipulators in the human market try to pretend that there is no such thing. Statistically minded government sociologists try to reduce it to a mathematical formula. But it does exist; there is such a thing; it can't forever be treated as a mere computation.

The politician who seeks always to give the most palatable answer to every problem; the manipulator who speaks of having this bloc or that in his back pocket; the statistically minded official who arrives at a decision on the basis of what he assumes to be the relative popularity of alternatives—these people ignore the wisdom of the people.

I believe that wisdom cannot for long be ignored. I believe the people know. I believe the people want honesty, integrity, realistic sincerity. I believe the people want to be treated forthrightly, and I believe the people can take the bad along with the good. To treat the people in any other way is stupid. More, it represents a cynical regard for the basis of our whole structure of representative government. It is worship of the consequences rather than of the causes of our freedoms.

I believe, too, in a constitutional government. I believe that such a government has made America strong because it has provided succeeding generations with unmistakable guideposts, and has at the same time established an orderly system of detours when detours become necessary. I believe that our Constitution is not something to be ridiculed nor ignored. It is not something to be changed by legislative default or executive usurpation or judicial fiat.

I believe in all honesty in our capitalistic system. I believe in it because I have seen the greatness of the country which it has helped to produce; because I know that time and time again its strength has been called on to save the free world.

And, finally, I believe that there is a power greater in world history than that of any man or of all the people themselves. I believe that no government, no nation, no people can long survive in disregard of that power.

These beliefs I hold. They rest on principles which seem to me to be self-evident. Their implications for me, at least, are clear. As an American I want to hold my head high at home and abroad. I want to live in a country ruled ultimately by people who are self-reliant, whose integrity and character have not been vitiated by the blandishments of even the most benignly paternal government, whose futures and the power to shape them remain still primarily in their own hands, who live in harmony at home, who deal honestly abroad, who seek no special favors and make no shoddy leads, and who, most importantly, look unashamedly for guidance to God.

Such an America is in the traditions of its founding. Such an America can face any task before it. Such an America is worthy of the best that we can dream for, work for, and love. Such an America we can achieve. That is why I call myself—and proudly so—a Republican.

Career Legislation Lags

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 29, 1954

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Army-Navy-Air Force Register of April 24, 1954:

CAREER LEGISLATION LAGS

While Department of Defense officials, both civilian and military, are in agreement that legislation designed to improve living conditions of career officers and enlisted men of the Armed Forces is of first importance, Congress has moved at such a slow pace that some of the major proposals may not reach the floor for a vote. Present plans of congressional leaders call for adjournment by mid-July.

According to testimony of Defense Department heads when appearing recently before the House Appropriations Committee in connection with next year's budget, there is serious concern over the fact that a relatively small percentage of enlisted men have expressed a desire to adopt the military service as a career. The loss of trained men at the expiration of their enlistments has always proved costly. The basic training of an Army infantryman costs around $3,200. To train a man in a military specialty after the basic course has been completed, requires a much more expensive period. For example, the cost of training a jet pilot runs up to $70,000. How to retain these trained individuals as career men is a moot question.

During the course of the hearings on the 1955 defense appropriations, Navy Secretary Anderson listed the following items as those most frequently discussed by naval personnel:

Dependents' medical care; reduction in allowance for movement of household goods; commissary stores; ships service and PX stores; low pay relative to cost of living; subsistence allowance below cost of food; sea and foreign duty pay; threats of reducing incentive and hazardous duty pay and survivor benefits.

When Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower and Personnel Hannah was being interrogated regarding enlistments and reenlistments by the House subcommittee, a press report was introduced which listed eight principal gripes among men in uniform—low pay compared with jobs of the same level in civil life; separation from families when assigned to foreign duty; unrealistic retirement pay and difficulty in getting it; lack of good housing for dependents; inadequate medical care for dependents; slow promotion; loss of many fringe benefits and dilution of military authority, a complaint advanced by officers.

Secretary Hannah informed the committee that his Department is trying to take care of many of those things which were pointed out by the Womble report of 1953. Specifically, he asserted that the matter of housing for men with families and single personnel is something which will be included in the program sent to Congress. His Department wants to start a better housing program designed to cover a relatively long period of time. Secretary Hannah said the Department would like to have the Congress give consideration to the possibility of extending the same kind of encouragement to the man in service who will reenlist that is now given the veteran insofar as the acquisition of a home is concerned. In connection with the matter of a pay increase, he told the Appropriations Committee in February that the Department's feeling was that if consideration is going to be given to an increase in compensation for civilian employees of the Government, then military personnel should also be given consideration.

The Register has repeately, editorially and otherwise, called for appropriate legislation which will raise service pay to a proper level and increase allowances of members of the Armed Forces in such a way that resignations of officers will be infrequent and enlisted personnel will have less reason for not making the military service a career. Unless Congress acts, the present tremendous turn-over in men will continue and may become a prohibitive cost in the years ahead.

Outlawing the Communist Party

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARLAN HAGEN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 3, 1954

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Speaker, in spite of the fact that the Attorney General of the United States has opposed legislation introduced by myself and others to outlaw the Communist Party, there appears to be no unanimity of opinion in the executive branch of the Government on this subject. The U. S. News & World Report issue of May 7, 1954, carries the report that the Vice President is inclining to the view that it would be wise to outlaw the Communist Party on the theory that it has been dealt with most effectively in countries where it has been outlawed. I agree with these views of the Vice President, if they are his views. Mr. Brownell has not been entirely consistent in opposing this legislation and at the same time advocating a law to strip Communists of their citizenship. I say put them in jail.

Further reasons for my opinion are detailed in my testimony before the House Judiciary Committee in support of my bill to outlaw the Communist Party, H. R. 8326, which I submit to this body herewith:

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN HARLAN HAGEN BEFORE HOUSE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE IN RE H. R. 8326, A BILL TO OUTLAW THE COMMUNIST PARTY, APRIL 8, 1954

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, my resolution declares that our courts have found that there exists a revolutionary Communist conspiracy committed to the overthrow of Federal and local divisions of government by force and violence through its parent party and its affiliated, subsidiary, and frontal organizations and the members thereof. These organizations are declared to be illegal and devoid of the rights, privileges, and immunities belonging to legal organizations in the United States. The resolution further provides that whosoever is a member of or participates in the revolutionary activities of these organizations knowing the said object or purpose are guilty of a Federal crime punishable by a maximum of 10 years in jail or a fine of $10,000, or both.

In effect, I have declared the illegality of the organizations referred to and have made membership or participation in the activities of such organizations a penal offense if such membership or participation was entered upon with knowledge of the revolutionary purpose of the particular organization, including Communist fronts. If its provisions become law, violations thereof would be prosecuted in our courts according to the practices and methods of American jurisprudence, including requirements of reasonable cause for filing an indictment or information.

This legislation and similar legislation should be most carefully considered in order that its justification be established and that workable definitions should be established for defining a penal offense. These considerations apply to any penal legislation, but are particularly vital here because we are dealing with an extension of the concept of criminality to activity which often does not wear the raiment of overt acts of violence or subversion and is often understandably confused with ordinary political or philosophical inquiry or action.

I have no intention in offering this legislation to foreclose the right to minority opinion about proper answers to our political, social, and economic problems. I agree with Justice Robert H. Jackson, of the Supreme Court, when he said, "If there is any fixed star in our constitutional constellation it is that no official, high or petty, can prescribe what shall be orthodox in politics, nationalism, religion, or other matters of opinion, or force citizens to confess by word or act their faith therein." I am certain that we can afford to tolerate any opinions which are advanced, however erroneously, as a proper method of securing the interest of the people of the United States provided that it is true that the proponent is not seeking thereby to promote the interests of a foreign sovereign and is a person who offers his mind and body to the service of the United States in peace or war without qualification and in the belief that this country may be imperfect but it is still the best country in the world.

A Communist does not have this true faith and loyalty to the United States. He is not a mere critic of our institutions or a reformer thereof. He rejects the worth of all our institutions. He is subject to an iron mental discipline emanating from a foreign sovereign which is our declared enemy. He believes that any lie, any dissemblance, any action whatsoever is justifiable if it carries out the latest directive from the Kremlin and promotes the ultimate triumph of a revolutionary proletariat in this and other countries. He is a complete moral bastard and more effectively works against causes which he public endorses because of their appeal to reformers than he does against the capitalist whom he traditionally caricaturizes and attacks.

In other words it is naive to assume that communism is some kind of a native radicalism. Rather it is an un-American conspiracy directed by foreign masters and it should be treated as such.

My offer of this legislation is not designed to feed the beast of demagoguery which has been loosed in this country and has fattened on the fears of an implacable foreign enemy in an atomic age. In fact its enactment will do much to clear the atmosphere of suspicion by which the Communists and their right-wing counterparts divide and conquer by substituting American methods of prosecution for asserted offenses against the Government for present legal and undefined acts of association or advocacy, sometimes provable only by the rankest hearsay and often lacking in that element of knowledge which is the basis of punishment or other adverse judgment in the American tradition.

My offer of this legislation does not stem from any belief that we are in danger of losing our collective American mind to internal subversion. In a democratic forum of ideas our American traditions of free enterprise, humanitarianism and religion can defeat Communist ideas any day of the week. The danger to America arising from internal communism comes from its ability to pervert otherwise good causes and its ability to attract party followers into the channels of sabotage and espionage to the point that we must regard every true Communist as a potential spy or saboteur. For these reasons we must bar the door to the solicitor and hucksters of this foul movement and my resolution will accomplish that closure.

Per se Communist publications will have to cease their perverted and inflammatory journalistic explorations. Liberals as well as conservatives, if these expressions mean anything in these troubled times, should welcome the disappearance of these sinkholes of untruth. Communist demagogues will no longer be able to defeat good causes for which they have a secret revulsion by their advocacy in the interests of expediency and the demagogues of the extreme right will no longer be able to sell their merchandise on the sole premise that they are taking a position different from the position of the extreme left. Parenthetically I would note that my resolution applies to any organization, Communist or non-Communist, which seeks the overthrow of the Government by illegal methods. Reasonable people, therefore, who seek American answers to our problems of preservation or change, will be less likely to be forced into a nutcracker between the extreme right and left which forced the disappearance of democracy in Germany and produced Adolph Hitler. Like the snows of tomorrow the fanatics of the totalitarian left and right will fade away or be left talking to and influencing each other with no access to the bulk of our citizens.

We will have a weapon to terminate the activities of Communists and other violent radicals in setting up false fronts or penetrating existing legitimate organizations.

I submit that this legislation is necessary to a propert treatment of security and radicalism dedicated to mass violence in this country today. I trust that you in your good judgment will approve its passage.

Ninety Billion Dollars for Nothing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 29, 1954

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, I have consistently opposed the giveaway programs by which the leadership of this Nation has sought to buy the friendship of other nations since World War II. Recent developments in the realm of international affairs have, I believe, fully vindicated the wisdom of that opposition.

An excellent statement of the folly of this program, and of the isolated plight in which this Nation finds itself today, is contained in an article by Mr. Constantine Brown in today's Washington Evening Star. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include Mr. Brown's analysis of this situation:

Our International Difficulties—Nearly $90 Billion We Have Spent in Less Than 10 Years Has Paid Off in Allies Who Fail Us at Critical Times

Even the wishful thinkers who firmly believed that by spending tens of billions to buy friendships we could weather the international storm caused by the Communists realize today that this country finds itself in unprecedented international difficulties.

Our security in the Pacific is seriously threatened. We appealed to our British and French allies in vain to seal off that area against the Reds. We were rebuffed.

By following the 19th century adage that Britain knows no friendships, no enmities but only interests, Prime Minister Churchill neatly pulled the rug from under our feet and breached the free nations' common front to resist Red imperialism.

Political men in Washington were astounded to read the British Premier's speech of last Friday. In addressing the Primrose League, a Conservative Party organization, he suggested the establishment of links with the U. S. S. R. which would convince the Muscovites that the British wish peace, happiness and prosperity to the U. S. S. R.

Mr. Churchill added the astounding sentence that Britain wanted the U. S. S. R. to play a proud and splendid role in guiding humanity. It was the same Churchill who a few years ago invented the expression the "Iron Curtain" to describe the Kremlin's unbelievable ruthlessness. Words are never meaningless when expressed by British Prime Ministers even when there are strong indications of deterioration caused by age.

Within less than 24 hours Mr. Churchill's friendly expression was translated into deeds. The British Government announced the removal of controls from exports of tin, rubber, electrical appliances, and machine tools, and other strategic materials, to countries behind the Iron Curtain—except Communist China. The reservation toward the Peiping Government is only temporary. According to reports from London, the British Government is awaiting only the so-called settlement of the Korean and Indochina issues at Geneva before China is allowed to enjoy freedom of imports from Britain instead of the present bootleg trade.

That our foreign policy has received the most serious setback in generations—probably the worst since we started playing in the international big league—is acknowledged by Republicans and Democrats. It is equally accepted as a fact by Secretary of State Dulles himself, who is not to be blamed for what has happened. His major mistake was to yield to the French and British pressure at Berlin and agree to the Geneva Conference.

But insofar as the overall responsibility for our greatest discomfiture in history is concerned, the fault lies with the past administrations, which chose a reckless spending of money and goods as the best means to establish America's position in the world. There is no doubt that the Republican administration has followed that pattern, because, as congressional leaders explain, there was no other possibility. The minds of the American people had been primed for such a policy and none other.

However, the American taxpayers who have been forking over a sizable amount of their income to help the establishment of the free world's basic policy of collective security were never warned that the time might come when our allies might run out on us. Any suggestion to that effect would have been denounced by the present and past administrations as rank isolationism, which in the present-day dictionary is tantamount to being treasonable. Yet it happened. The collective security balloon burst in our face at the most critical moment in our history.

Secretary Dulles, realizing the serious turn the situation has taken in southeast Asia, proposed a collective security treaty for the South Pacific along the lines of the NATO. When the answer from London and Paris was not what he had the right to expect, he rushed over to convince our allies of the necessity for such a common front. He discovered that the situation was far more serious than he had anticipated when he met with a positive refusal from our allies.

So did the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Adm. Arthur Radford, who followed Mr. Dulles in the French and British capitals. Admiral Radford spoke about the military urgency of such an agreement. He was told very politely that this was our business and our business alone. Yet, the British and the French Governments know that in view of the turn of things in Asia the security of America depends far more on what is happening across the Pacific than across the Atlantic.

Our European friends found us ready and willing to do anything they wanted to secure their safety when the Red shadow was cast over Europe. But they decided that it would be in keeping with their interests to leave us in the cold at one of the most crucial crises in our history.

Anglo-French neutralism and political mercantilism which had been discounted so heavily in the past by our diplomatic and MSA officials had finally permeated deeply into the governments of our major allies. They are now telling us in effect: "Sorry, we appreciate your predicament but you have to work out your problems by yourselves."

This is the concrete result of the nearly $90 billion which the American taxpayers have spent on allies in less than 10 years.

Brownson Proposal Is Without Precedent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN R. DAVIS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1954

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the proposal of my able colleague the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BROWNSON], to finance United States participation in the St. Lawrence seaway by revenue bond issues is most unusual and without precedent in United States Government corporations. In no instance has the Federal Government ever proposed to finance a Government policy, particularly one designated as necessary for national security, with revenue bonds over which private bankers will have a veto power.

In all cases that we have studied the Federal Government has either put large amounts of equity capital into Government corporations, plus either Government guaranteed bonds or bonds backed by substantial assets. This is borne out by a study of Government corporations which I submit for the Appendix of the RECORD for the benefit of my colleagues since this matter will be debated on the floor tomorrow:

MEMORANDUM ON GOVERNMENT CORPORATIONS CREATED BY ACT OF CONGRESS

1. Not one of the Government corporations created by Congress and functioning today has been made solely dependent upon the issuance of nonguaranteed bonds to the public for the financing of its activities. Furthermore, so far as has been determined, not one Government corporation created by Congress in the 20th century history of such legislation has ever been made solely dependent on such bond or note issues for the funds needed to finance its activities.

2. At the present time the issuance of bonds or notes to the public without Government guaranty of principal and interest is being used only by certain banking corporations in the farm credit and housing credit fields: The Federal land banks, the Federal intermediate credit banks, the central bank for cooperatives, and the Federal home-loan banks.

3. The Federal land banks were created with a capital stock of $125 million paid in by the United States, plus capital stock purchased by all borrowers from such banks. There were also very substantial Government contributions to paid-in surplus (amounting to $141 million as of June 30, 1943). The bonds which have been issued to the public without Government guaranty are the joint and several obligations of all 12 land banks and are not revenue bonds but are unqualified commitments secured by farm first mortgages. The mortgage loans made by the banks are always at a higher interest rate than that paid by the banks on the preceding issue of bonds, the spread enabling the banks to operate. This is a straight, long-term mortgage banking operation, the bonds being marketed when funds are needed by the banks to meet the demands for first mortgage loans. Eight hundred and seventy-five million dollars of bonds were outstanding on October 31, 1953, of which at least $675 million were in the hands of commercial and other banks and insurance companies.

4. The Federal intermediate credit banks were created with a capital stock of $60 million paid in by the United States, plus a $40-million revolving fund available for further capital-stock subscriptions and paid-in surplus (the latter amounting to $5,600,000 on September 30, 1953). These banks are engaged in discounting agricultural and livestock paper for production credit associations, banks for cooperatives, commercial banks, and other institutions, and making loans to such institutions upon the pledge of collateral. These banks have sold in the open market, without Government guaranty, collateral trust debentures, which are the joint and several obligations of all 12 banks, and which are secured by cash, Government bonds, Federal farm-mortgage bonds, or the agricultural and livestock paper discounted by the banks, or secured paper representing loans made by the banks to other financing institutions. The debentures are thus not revenue commitments, but are unqualified commitments secured by collateral. This again is a straight banking operation in the farm-credit field, the debentures being issued monthly according to the banks' needs. There were $775 million of debentures outstanding on September 30, 1953. The banks had $793,500,000 of loans receivable, $32,400,000 of cash, and $62 million in Government securities.

5. The Central Bank for Cooperatives has capital furnished by the United States and also by all borrowers from this corporation (1 central bank, 12 district banks). The total capital stock on September 30, 1953, was $197 million ,of which $170,500,000 had been paid in by the United States and $18,400,000 by borrowers. The debentures insured by the Central Bank must be secured by collateral at least equal to the amount of outstanding debentures, the collateral to consist of cash, direct obligations of the United States, or notes, etc., discounted or representing loans made. Here again the debentures are not revenue commitments, but are unqualified commitments secured by banking collateral. Here again there is a straight banking operation involving loans by the Central Bank to cooperatives of national or broad regional scope and to its district banks, plus the discounting of paper. On September 30, 1953, the debentures in the hands of private buyers amounted to $119 million, and there were $12 million in the hands of other Government corporations. The group of banks had assets of $333 million in loans receivable, $23,500,000 in cash, and $43,400,000 in Government securities.

6. The Federal home-loan banks perform the same function in general for their members (building and loan, savings and loan, and homestead associations; savings and cooperative banks; insurance companies) as the Federal Reserve System performs for commercial banks and the Federal land banks for farm financing. These Federal home-loan banks originally had a capital of $124,741,000 paid in by the United States and additional capital subscribed by all member institutions. As of September 30, 1953, the United States capital contribution had been repaid, and there was a capital stock of $360 million, all privately owned. These banks have issued to the public, without Government guaranty, consolidated debentures which are the joint and several obligations of all the banks. The law under which they have been issued provides that no such debentures shall be issued if any of the assets are subject to any pledge or lien; and provides further that the debentures are not to be issued in excess of the amount of the obligations of member institutions held at that time and secured by home mortgages or obligations of, or guaranteed by, the United States. There were $349 million of such debentures outstanding on September 30, 1953, in the hands of commercial banks, insurance companies, etc. At that time the banks had $797 million in loans receivable, $397 million in Government securities and $30,000 in cash. It also appears that the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to purchase the obligations of these banks, at his discretion, up to $1 billion outstanding at any one time, but no use has had to be made of this authority. Here again we find a straight banking operation, to provide a reservoir of long- and short-term credit in the home financing field.

7. The foregoing corporations which have raised money by selling nonguaranteed bonds or debentures in the open market have all been engaged in banking operations; none of the financing so accomplished was for a construction program; in all cases the corporations had substantial capital and/or paid-in surplus contributions from the United States and also, in 3 out of the 4 cases, from their borrowers or member institutions (and in the fourth case a substantial revolving fund for additional capital contributions, if needed); and in all cases the securities issued and sold in the open market were unqualified commitments secured by banking-type collateral, not revenue bonds dependent solely on the earnings of the corporation.

8. Inland Waterways Corporation was created by Federal legislation to operate the Government-owned waterways system. There was capital stock of $15 million contributed by the United States, plus $12,300,000 of paid-in surplus. The Corporation could issue nonguaranteed notes up to 25 percent of the value of its assets but has apparently never done so. None were outstanding either on June 30, 1943 or on September 30, 1953.

9. Panama Canal Company (formerly the Panama Railroad Company) was originally created in 1849 as a privately owned corporation under New York law. Since 1905 it has been wholly owned by the United States Government through the purchase of the capital stock of the corporation. In 1948 it was reincorporated under a Federal charter, with no capital stock. It has, however, had $268 million of paid-in surplus from the Government. The former Panama Canal Agency (now named the Canal Zone Government) operated and maintained the canal until July 1, 1951, when the Panama Canal Company took over. Its operations were financed by appropriations, since tolls, taxes, etc., went into the United States Treasury as miscellaneous receipts. There has never been any public borrowing by these organizations, but there has been some borrowing from the Treasury by the Panama Railroad Company and its successor, Panama Canal Company ($5,900,000 on September 30, 1953). Of course, the canal itself was built by the sale of United States Government bonds.

10. In the case of the Tennessee Valley Authority, there has been no capital stock but the United States has contributed a paid-in surplus of $45 million and there have been expended appropriations of over $1,500,000,000. Any bonds to be issued by TVA were to be issued on the credit of or guaranteed by the United States or sold to the Treasury. There were $29 million in the hands of the Treasury on September 30, 1953, and none elsewhere.

11. Other currently functioning corporations created by Federal legislation are:

(a) Commodity Credit Corporation—capital of $100 million paid in by United States and maintained by successive appropriations—Corporation, with approval of Secretary of Treasury, can issue bonds, notes, etc., but any sold in the open market would be guaranteed by the United States—on September 30, 1953, there were nearly $4 billion of the Corporation's obligations in the hands of the Treasury and none elsewhere.

(b) Export-Import Bank of Washington—capital of $1 billion contributed by United States—borrowing was originally from RFC, now from the Treasury—$1,430,000,000 of obligations in the hands of the Treasury on September 30, 1953.

(c) Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation—capital stock subscribed by United States—the Corporation may borrow, with approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, on bonds guaranteed by the United States—$400,000 of obligations in private hands on September 30, 1953.

(d) Federal National Mortgage Association—capital and paid-in surplus of $21 million contributed by the United States—borrowing was originally from RFC, but now is accomplished through HHFA, which borrows from the Treasury—nearly $2,500,000,000 of such obligations outstanding on September 30, 1953.

(e) Federal Crop Insurance Corporation—capital of $27 million paid in by the United States—also over $77 million of expended appropriations—no borrowings.

(f) Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation—capital of $289 million—$150 million from the United States plus $139 million from the 12 Federal Reserve banks (all such investment having been repaid by 1948)—authorized to borrow from the Treasury, but has not done so.

(g) Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation—capital of $100 million originally, $77 million as of September 30, 1953, all owned by the United States—borrowing, if any, is from the Treasury.

(h) Federal Prison Industries, Inc.—capital supplied by appropriations—no borrowing.

(i) Public Housing Administration—capital stock and paid-in surplus provided by the United States, $188 million as of September 30, 1953—contributions to the States, etc., provided for by appropriations and allocations from other United States agencies (amounting to $190 million as of September 30, 1953)—authorized at one time to issue bonds, etc., guaranteed by the United States but now borrows from the Treasury ($619 million as of September 30, 1953).

(j) Institute of Inter-American Affairs—no capital stock but paid-in surplus of $12,500,000 from the United States—also other funds from appropriations either direct or by allocation from other Government agencies (amounting to $116 million as of September 30, 1953)—no borrowing power under the Federal charter of 1947.

(k) Production Credit Corporations (12)—capital of $120 million supplied by the United States—no borrowing authority.

(l) Reconstruction Finance Corporation—original capital stock of $500 million subscribed by the United States—borrowings from the Treasury.

(m) Virgin Island Corporation—paid-in surplus and expended appropriations of $6,300,000 on September 30, 1953—operates on appropriations by Congress made to a revolving fund—no obligations issued to the public.

Resolution of the Newark (N. Y.) Chamber of Commerce Concerning Public Law 199

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1954

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, upon request and under leave to extend my remarks, I include a copy of a resolution adopted by the Newark (N. Y.) Chamber of Commerce on April 13, 1954:

Resolution of the Board of Directors of the Newark Chamber of Commerce Concerning Public Law 199

Whereas parcel post was a major public service, established by Congress in 1912, so that all Americans, city dwellers, farmers, throughout the Nation could have equal delivery service for the things they needed. Parcel post has contributed greatly to the development of the United States through the years; that tens of thousands of businesses employing millions of people are founded on parcel-post operation. Most people in the United States use parcel post; and

Whereas parcel post produced $484 million revenue for the Post Office Department in 1952—over 28 percent of the Department's total income. Parcel post was a tremendous money maker; $122 million was the profit parcel post brought to the Post Office Department in 1952; and

Whereas for many years until 1952 packages up to a maximum of 70 pounds could be mailed from any of the 41,000 post offices in the United States for delivery by any other post office; and

Whereas where once you could mail 70 pounds, you now mail only 20 pounds beyond the second parcel-post zone. Only 40 pounds may be mailed in the first 2 zones; combined length and girth limits have been cut from 100 inches to 72 inches; and

Whereas the mailer loses time, material, labor, and repacking his shipments. Mailing charges increase. More and more customers are driven from the use of parcel post; and

Whereas the post office lost $73 million in 1952 as a direct result of restrictions on parcel-post weight and size. In 1953 revenue loss probably will be greater. The loss to postal service is more serious because it represents the most profitable traffic, the gain from which was used by the post office to offset the losses in providing parcel-post service to remote or less populous areas of the country: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Newark Chamber of Commerce favors the Broyhill bill, H. R. 2685, that would repeal Public Law 199, and has been filed in the House. This bill, if enacted, will restore the full 70-pound, 100-inch limitations on parcel post:

1. And that the members, officers, and directors of this chamber use their best efforts to have this bill enacted immediately.

2. That a copy of this resolution be sent to the proper committees in Congress and to the Senators from the State of New York.

Adopted April 13, 1954.

Newark Chamber of Commerce,
John D. Meyers, *Secretary-Treasurer.*

DISTRIBUTION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

To the Vice President and each Senator 100 copies; to the Secretary and Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, each, 25 copies; to the Secretary, for official use, not to exceed 35 copies; to the Sergeant at Arms, for use on the floor of the Senate, not to exceed 50 copies; to each Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress, 68 copies; to the Clerk, Sergeant at Arms, and Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives, each, 25 copies; to the Clerk, for official use, not to exceed 50 copies; and to the Doorkeeper, for use on the floor of the House of Representatives, not to exceed 75 copies; to the Vice President and each Senator, Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress there shall also be furnished (and shall not be transferable), 3 copies of the daily Record, of which 1 shall be delivered at his residence, 1 at his office, and 1 at the Capitol.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Printing and binding for Congress, when recommended to be done by the Committee on Printing of either House, shall be so recommended in a report containing an approximate estimate of the cost thereof, together with a statement from the Public Printer of estimated approximate cost of work previously ordered by Congress within the fiscal year (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 145, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on Printing, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized book dealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by book dealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the Congressional Record, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

PRINTING DOCUMENTS AND REPORTS

Documents and reports of committees with the evidence and papers submitted therewith, or any part thereof ordered printed by Congress, may be reprinted by the Public Printer on order of any Member of Congress or Delegate, on prepayment of the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 162, p. 1940).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the Congressional Record is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Frank Brodie is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the Record at $1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

E

HON.

IN THE

Mr. E
dent, o
helps t
problen
of mer
sirable,
insertec
an edi
Problen
Evening

The c
convinc
this vit
omy.

One
tion of
effect th

It is a
prise, th
potentia
Force.
in the r
tition th
shrivel t
tries ra
cheaply

There
was ord
as follo

The tr
tional p
marine
under a
is priva
trade-ro
selves i
America
other co
a most
the vita
tial, aft
We can
normal c
we could
nothing
and equ
we do.

By th
astic sup
to earn
to the re
line mu
of opera
to leave
ting in
the prol
as a spe
as Mary
fornia.
ing the

In a g
activity
are offse
producti
matters

Appendix

The Shipping Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 5, 1954

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, on the thesis that anything that helps to promote understanding of the problems facing the Nation in the field of merchant marine is eminently desirable, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Shipping Problem," published in the Baltimore Evening Sun of May 4.

The editorial present in succinct and convincing fashion the importance of this vital segment of the national economy.

One statement that merits the attention of every thoughtful citizen is to the effect that—

> It is a most special form of private enterprise, the vital fourth arm of our military potential, after the Army, Navy, and Air Force. We can no more afford to let it die in the normal course of peacetime competition than we could afford to let our Army shrivel to nothing just because other countries raise and equip their infantry more cheaply than we do.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SHIPPING PROBLEM

The trouble with trying to formulate national policy on this country's merchant marine is that the problem defies solution under any of the easy rules of thumb. It is private enterprise, to be sure. Regular trade-route freighters and tramps find themselves in direct competition with both American ships and shipping from dozens of other countries all over the world. But it is a most special form of private enterprise, the vital fourth arm of our military potential, after the Army, Navy, and Air Force. We can no more afford to let it die in the normal course of peacetime competition than we could afford to let our Army shrivel to nothing just because other countries raise and equip their infantry more cheaply than we do.

By the same token, we can give enthusiastic support to the efforts of other nations to earn dollars by carrying American goods to the rest of the world. But somewhere the line must be drawn if the far lower costs of operation by friendly competitors are not to leave the bulk of the merchant fleet rotting in the ports. Legislators can look at the problem of shipbuilding and shipping as a special concern of such coastal States as Maryland, Virginia, New York, and California. But they do so at the peril of ignoring the national stake in these activities.

In a great many other areas of economic activity the higher American labor costs are offset by a more efficient system of mass production and distribution. In shipping matters the offset is far less. And the whole tangled business of the war-boom, peacetime-bust cycle only aggravates the difficulty of stabilizing the merchant marine somewhere in between a pure free-enterprise undertaking and a vital national-defense activity.

To say as much is to belabor the obvious contradictions. But it is from just such contradictions that the administration has had to start in working out the detailed program that the Under Secretary of Commerce presented to the Senate Water Transportation Subcommittee yesterday. The program involves some extensive Government subsidization, which the first Republican administration in 20 years must have accepted with some reluctance. But it also calls for vigorous attempts to reduce the present high labor costs and to increase efficiency. There will be a chance for discussion of the program in more detail later. For the moment it is enough to underline once again what is so frequently overlooked—the fact that the merchant marine presents a unique problem, calling for some compromise between the extremes of economic and political philosophy.

Individual Rights and Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 5, 1954

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address on Individual Rights and Security, by Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS, of Illinois, at the St. Louis University Law Day, April 24, 1954.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS AND SECURITY

(Address of Hon. PAUL H. DOUGLAS, of Illinois, at St. Louis University Law Day, April 24, 1954)

I

I welcome this chance to speak to you in an atmosphere that is as yet free of the violence of politics in an election year. For if past campaigns are any guide to the one that lies straight ahead, you and I both know what to expect. Charges will be made that were best left unsaid. Friendships will be strained that should have remained firm. Men will claim sole credit for good acts they opposed, and will blame others for what they themselves did. And most differences of opinion, however honorable, will be portrayed on one side as a plot to betray the Nation, and on the other as selfless patriotism.

Because of all this, I want to use this brief moment of calm to consider one leading question. How can we preserve an America that will be secure and yet free, an America that will be orderly and yet open to change, an America that will be united and yet rich in the diversity of its parts—an America that will skillfully and justly balance its forces between the life needs of the community and the life needs of the private person?

The work of shaping this kind of an America has never been an easy job. Yet throughout the past, the general form of what we have done has been reasonably plain. In time of war all of us have shelved our private plans and have placed ourselves under the national discipline whose aim has been the security, order and unity of the community. With the coming of peace, we have relaxed the strong hand of government. We have aimed at social and political arrangements that would enlarge the freedom of the individual; that would broaden the avenue for our personal talents, and that would permit a diversity of outlook.

But what complicates our life today—and what causes so much spiritual strife in our hearts—is that the historical conditions known to the past, are not known to us now. We are at war, and yet not quite at war. We are at peace, and yet not quite at peace. And under the present condition of half wars, undeclared wars and cold wars—all without a visible terminal point—we are denied the old moral certainties based on a clear-cut state of war or peace. We are torn, rather, by demands that the individual be sacrificed to the overriding security needs of the community, and the rival demands that freedom and justice for the individual come first and that all else must serve them.

II

In great measure, the acuteness of the problem before us is due to the impact of communism on our times. And since what we do in our search for both security and freedom is directly related to our view of communism, let us first deal with that aspect of the question.

Jacques Maritain, the distinguished Catholic philosopher, has described communism as the ultimate heresy, not because it attacks Biblical doctrine, but because it seeks to displace it completely as a way of life. And so it does, by planting dragon seeds in soil the Judaic-Christian tilled for a different purpose. For it was this tradition, sanctified by our religious and secular martyrs, which raised before the eyes of humanity the aim of lasting peace, of social justice, of mercy, of fraternity between men, and of an end to all forms of slavery and oppression. It was this tradition, too, which taught all of us that we were created, not self-made; and being created, that we owed a disciplined obedience to our Creator.

All this, the Communists have turned against us. The yearning for peace has become their weapon to attack as warmongers those who arm themselves to preserve the peace against Communist aggression. The yearning for social justice has become their moral sanction to destroy the existing social frame, and to establish their harsh authority on the debris. The yearning for mercy has become their devilish doctrine of forgiveness by which any Communist can lie, betray, deceive, and kill, and yet be absolved in the name of the revolution. The yearning for fraternity has become their demand that men surrender their will and their soul to the herd instincts of the mass. The concept of discipline before a Creator, has become their foul adoration of those who control the weapons of force in a state—the firing squad, the concentration camp, the forced confession, the judicial murder.

Nothing has escaped their corruption. There was a time, for example, when Americans felt free to join together in private groups, to remove an injustice or to promote a worthy cause. But we hesitate to do that now, after having seen how the Communists have perverted the aims of those same groups. There was a time, also, when an American, as his thoughts dictated, did not hesitate to state his views in a petition addressed to public officials. But even this ancient right has fallen under the cloud of suspicion, because the Communists have used it to divide instead of unify opinion, to distort instead of clarify it. Even our language has felt the hand of Communist-corruption. We used to be able to talk in the American sense about people's movements and about progressive causes. But we are now inclined to shelve these terms. For we have seen how they have been used by the Communists to mask the true nature of the slavery that is planned for those who are seduced by them.

Nor is this all. In their tactics, the Communists always demand the tolerance of society when they are in a minority. But once in power, they use the apparatus of the state, not to resolve social conflicts but to crush dissent. Once in power, they never tolerate in others what they formerly demanded for themselves.

III

How can we deal with this cunning foe, without destroying the process of democracy in the course of trying to defend democracy?

I think that our line of approach should begin by isolating two separate factors. The first is the threat of subversion, sabotage or possible sabotage. The second is the holding of unpopular opinions.

Taking these factors in order, it should be clear by now that the Communist Party has been stripped down to a hard core of disciplined men and women whose loyalties are with Russia, rather than with us and who, in the main, can only be regarded as actual or potential enemies of the United States. The process of identifying and bringing them to light has now been pressed vigorously for 6 or 7 years, and the top leaders have been jailed after lengthy trials in which it was demonstrated that they plotted to overthrow our Government.

The figure of the hard core of Communists that remains at large has been recently estimated by President Eisenhower to be in the neighborhood of 25,000. And I have every reason to believe that President Eisenhower knew what he was talking about. I have equal reason to believe that the FBI can at any moment put its finger squarely on any Communist Party member or spy; and moreover, that if it should be called on to do this, the FBI will adhere to its reeply ingrained respect for our civil liberties, and to its earnest desire to protect the innocent as well as the guilty. But in any case, I feel that it is unsafe to have Communists in public employment or in sensitive private positions. Nor would I knowingly hire them for any position where they might sway immature youth or poison the wells of information. The process of exposure—orderly exposure—must therefore be continued.

Moreover, I have long believed that in the event of war, or a grave national emergency precedent to a war, the Government should have the power to intern Communists so that they would be unable to do damage to our society, or be violently assaulted in turn by an enraged population. In the course of their internment, I would have them treated humanely, but would nevertheless keep them out of the stream of social life until the danger was either over or largely past. This is what the British Government did to suspected Nazi and Fascist sympathizers in the opening days of World War II. And a measure authorizing that same course of action in the case of the American Communists was sponsored by a group of liberal Senators to which I am proud to belong; and, through our effort, was actually incorporated in the McCarran Act of 1950. The proposal we sponsored is now part of our organic law, not as a substitute for the McCararn Act, but as a supplement to it.

IV

But if this course of action is warranted in an emergency handling of Communists, we must take equal care at all times to preserve the traditional right of Americans to hold unpopular opinions. Here we come to the heart of the difficulty raised by the conduct of some congressional investigations. Let me say in this general connection that the broad right of the Congress to investigate is a necessary adjunct of its right to legislate. If the Congress were denied the authority to investigate, it could conceivably be reduced to a forum which did little more than approve resounding resolutions. But when it exercises that authority with discrimination and care, it serves three useful purposes. It informs itself upon subjects that might require legislation. It informs the Nation about similar subjects. And it acts as a check on the work of the Executive.

The majority of congressional investigative committees—and the committees work in a broad range of fields other than the ferreting out of subversives—are conducted with a scrupulous respect for the three purposes I have just mentioned. But it is the exceptional committee, the committee that uses the investigative process to invade the preserve of the Executive, the committee that conducts legislative trials for acts that are not criminal, the committee that would punish men for holding unpopular opinions—it is this kind of a committee that has brought the whole investigative process under a cloud.

The issue presents itself most sharply in connection with the legislative trials of individuals who are connected with actual or alleged "Communist front" organizations. All of us have seen how some self-appointed groups have labeled every organization that works for humane ends, such as a peaceful world or the elimination of social injustice, to be subversive. I recall not so long ago, that this charge was made in Indiana against the Quakers, and even against the reading of the story of Robin Hood to children. That charge, happily, was drowned out by a national chorus of derisive laughter. But in other cases incalculable harm has been done by such loose branding. The result is not only to smear large numbers of innocent people, but to discourage men and women from joining any organization no matter how innocent or worthy it may be. Since social progress in the country is largely effected by voluntary organizations, the acceptance of this practice will tend to create an intellectually and morally stagnant society, which will be afraid of ideas and of any change whatsoever. This, as I shall later point out, would not only prevent us from improving but would actually be a poor defense against the forces of communism.

The Attorney General, with the aid presumably of the FBI has, however, listed a large number of organizations as being subversive. The first such list was published in 1947 by the Truman administration, and since then later additions have been made. Such judgments, of course, are not infallible. But if we assume for the sake of argument that they are in the main correct, does it follow that those who are or who have been members of these so-called front organizations, are themselves subversives? If, for example, a group of citizens join together to urge a slum clearance project, does this good cause therefore become bad because some bad men also espouse it or join with good men to further the project? Should good men refuse to support good causes because there are some bad persons who, to give themselves a color of respectability, are also supporting them?

Consider what would happen if it is urged that they should refuse. In that event, all good causes would be lost and all that bad men would need to defeat them is to give them nominal support. Yet this would be the least of the dangers. If good men are driven into retirement and refuse to take the lead in advocating good causes through fear of the Communist kiss of death, then the way will be open for the Communists to masquerade as the only force in the land that is abreast of the needs of the time. Would this be in the public interest? Would this be the way to strengthen democracy? The answer, in my mind, at least, is an emphatic "No."

There are further points which are involved. Are men to be disgraced for joining organizations 10 years before they were declared subversive by the Attorney General? To do so, is to say that ex post facto laws and judgments are justified. And the Supreme Court has pointed out that "an ex post facto law is one which renders an act punishable which was not punishable when it was committed." If we overrule the Supreme Court in this matter, if we disgrace men for associations which were not unlawful at the time they were made, then we deny ourselves the moral authority to damn the Communist courts and how they arrive at their version of justice. For the common characteristic of the Communist courts is their willfulness, and not their legality, and their talent for sending men to the firing squad, and the gallows, on the basis of ex post facto rules and judgments—rules and judgments that change with each shift in the Communist Party line.

In considering this general question, it should be further realized that during the great depression and the struggle against Hitler's totalitarianism, it was difficult to identify Communists. They did not wear identification tags or tattoos which enabled them to be spotted. Moreover, the organizations in question were generally headed by men of national standing—Republicans and Democrats alike—who were strongly opposed to communism and whose personal motives were beyond reproach. Unfortunately, however, most of them were also busy men who had no time to give to a constant and vigilant watch over what was happening. In the sequel, the Communists infiltrated these organizations under the guise of being liberals, worked hard at the routine jobs, and by their aptitude for drudgery, gradually and quietly took over the active command. Furthermore, the organizations in question were generally run from central offices in New York and it was hard for men in other sections of the country to follow their internal workings.

What brought Communist policy into the open was, of course, the Stalin-Hitler pact of 1939 and the subsequent attack of the Communists against the democracies. Where Communist control of these organizations was dominant, they began to change their tune. Instead of attacking Hitler, they now attacked England, France, and the United States. Instead of advocating active intervention to check fascism, they now reversed themselves and advocated isolation.

If I may intrude a very personal note here, it was at this time that I held my first public office, namely, alderman from Chicago's fifth ward. As positions go, this was not one in which a man can change the course of the world. Yet the Communists marked me for destruction because I denounced them for treachery. In the previous years, I thought I had felt the worst of the Communist attacks—attacks, which like those from the extreme right, are directed with greatest force against any man who stands, as I've tried to do, at the liberal center. Yet in this aldermanic experience, which coincided with the period of the Hitler-Stalin pact, the local Communists outdid themselves in their venomous attempts to portray me as a tool of Wall Street, a merchant of death, a hireling of the international bankers, and so on and so on.

I intrude this personal note, because what happened in the fifth ward of Chicago at this time, happened everywhere across the Nation. Every liberal who believed in stopping aggression in its tracks, was brought under the muzzle of Communist guns and was blasted as a warmonger, and as one who was lustful for blood money. Meanwhile, in countless national organizations, honest liberals who saw with consternation that the groups which they had trusted were turned by the Communists from their original purpose, resigned and dropped out in enormous numbers. They commonly did so in 1939 and 1940, or from 7 to 8 years before the organizations were declared subversive by the Attorney General. Are these men to be pilloried because they found out what was happening years before the Department of Justice acted? Are they to be pilloried because they were the first to come to grips with the Communists once they saw the truth about Communist tactics and aims? Are these men who were never Communists to be driven from the public scene because of the buckshot sprays of avowed Communists who took an extra 10 years to recant?

What is important in these matters is to judge the whole nature of a man's life, and not isolated acts. Has he on the whole been devoted to the public good and has he been willing to sacrifice for it? Or has he followed every twisting and turning of the Communist Party line? If so, he can probably be written down as either a party member or a confirmed fellow traveler. If he has advocated democratic principles through thick and thin, and has opposed the Communist position when they were attacking democracy, then he is one of the true democrats.

V

Insofar as congressional committees are called upon to deal with the question of loyalty or disloyalty in individual cases, the committees must be provided with standards of conduct to guide them in their work. Moreover, the members of the committees must do more than pay lip service to these standards. They must faithfully adhere to them in the course of their actual work. I realize, of course, that there is an inherent difficulty in having a Congress enact a uniform set of procedures that would apply to any committee which undertakes an investigation. For, as I've already said, these investigations cover a wide range of subject matters. And what would be a safeguard against the abuse of congressional privilege in an investigation into subversion might impede the swift, effective, and fair investigation into subjects such as juvenile delinquency, taxation, or waterpower development. There is, therefore, a case to be made for some measure of flexibility by which the several committees can adopt their own rules, suited to the object they have in view. But in the case of committees that can subpena an individual and force him to testify against his will, there is this advantage in having the Congress as a whole enact the rules of procedure:

When the Congress as a whole does that, the individual who feels that his rights before a committee have been violated can appeal to the courts for relief. But he has no such ready recourse when the committees themselves make their own rules.

VI

In all that I have said thus far I have sought to emphasize that thought should be left free, and that subversive acts alone be punished. There are those among us, of course, who go further than that and who believe that views which they strongly oppose should be repressed and those who give voice to them punished. Such dogmatic absolutism is, of course, seldom stated or explicitly avowed. But it is nevertheless secretly held by many and has strong emotional support. This is precisely what the Communists would do if they were ever to obtain power. And so would many members of the extreme right wing in political and economic matters do this if they had the power.

What all this leads to was vividly stated by Thomas Jefferson in his Notes on the State of Virginia, written in 1781:

"It is error alone which needs the support of government. Truth can stand by itself. Subject opinion to coercion; whom will you make your inquisitors? Fallible men: men governed by bad passions, by private as well as public reasons. And why subject it to coercion? To produce uniformity. But is uniformity of opinion desirable? No more than of face and stature. Introduce the bed of Procrustes then, and as there is danger that the large men may beat the small, make us all of a size, by lopping the former and stretching the latter. * * * What has been the effect of coercion? To make one half of the world fools, and the other half hypocrites. To support roguery and error all over the earth."

Along with Thomas Jefferson, all of us who adhere to the modern doctrine of political democracy know that it rests upon the assumption of peaceful exchange and free discussion. The experience of centuries has taught us that this permits the greatest progress to be made with the least dissension and with a minimum of civil strife. We know that we are playing with dynamite when we allow any group to punish a minority for holding views which conflict with theirs. Men smarting from injuries so inflicted will try to overthrow the government, and if successful in gaining the seats of power, they will then practice on their former oppressors that which was practiced upon them. By not according civil liberties to the minority, the majority of the moment takes the grave risk that it will set in motion forces which will in turn ultimately undo them, in a bloody and weary cycle of violence, hatred, and oppression that feeds on itself until eventually every man stands alone as the enemy of his neighbor.

Here in America, we have raised the Constitution as a force that is superior to any transient majorities or minorities. The heart within the heart of our constitutional theory is that the majority will not persecute the minority, and the minority will not advocate revolution. Nor is this the whole of the bargain. As the minority gives up the idea of revolution, it receives in return the right to propagate its opinions as long as it does this peacefully. As the majority on the other hand is entrusted with the rule of the government, it is committed to keep open the avenue for dissent so that new majorities might conceivably be formed to displace the ruling one by peaceful means.

It is to the everlasting honor of the American people that despite strong temptations to behave otherwise, they have faithfully adhered to this constitutional doctrine for 165 years. However exaggerated our language may become during election times, the overriding fact remains that our great political parties have held in common the great ends of a democratic society. They have agreed that when any party forms a government, it shall govern by consent instead of coercion. They have agreed at regular intervals to surrender the direction of the Government to a rival party when that is the desire of the electorate. They have agreed that when this exchange takes place, it shall be made in a peaceful way. And they have agreed that at such times, the changes in existing relations and proportions in the whole community shall be of a moderate instead of a drastic sort.

With this proof before us that we can be united and orderly and yet tolerate dissent, would it not be foolhardy for us to abandon all that has made us strong in the past? Would it not be foolhardy for us to seek our security in a world of Communist menace by imitating the Communists? By terrorizing Americans to a point where they would be afraid to speak to their neighbors or even to their children on matters that worry them? By demanding that every American adhere to a fixed ideology? By punishing those who might have different ideas on how the national interest can best be served? Would there be any point to our sacrifices in blood and treasure to stop aggressive communism in its tracks, if, in the end, we became the twin of the very force we opposed? Those who would crush the right of dissent as that right is now expressed within the existing borders of the Constitution, would, of course, deny that they mean to give the Communists a cheap victory over us. They would deny that they would be undoing from within what the Communists have been unable to do by attacking us from without. But the results of their action, despite their denials, would lead in that direction.

VII

I am convinced that the great majority of Americans want our political life to go forward on a principle that has its counterpart in the farming operations of this region. Some years ago here in the American midlands, it used to be thought that the good farmer was the one who could plow a straight furrow, whether over a plain or up and over a hill. Yet it turned out that when the rains fell, the straight furrows became a trough for water that cut deeper and broader until the water washed away all the topsoil. The midland farmer learned that the man who respected what lay beneath his feet, who treated each plot of earth differently, who plowed in lines that matched those of the earth, built in passing a series of dykes for rainwater that refreshed but did not devour the earth. In this same image, and following this same method, I am convinced that the great majority of Americans do not want to be coerced into following razor-sharp ideological lines that run up hills and down the other side and onto the plains. We know from the experiences of Europe that if we suppress unpopular opinions that do not square with the straight lines we draw, then as surely as it is true in the natural world we shall erode our rich political life and shall choke on the dust of tyranny.

Tyranny, I acknowledge, is a large and loaded word. Perhaps I am unduly extravagant in using it. But tyranny is best averted by attention to its early symptoms. For as the Times of London declared more than a century ago:

"The greatest tyranny has the smallest beginnings. From precedents overlooked, from remonstrances despised, from grievances treated with ridicule, from powerless men oppressed with impunity, and overbearing men tolerated with complacence, springs the tyrannical usage which generations of wise and good men may hereafter perceive and lament and resist in vain. At present, common minds no more see a crushing tyranny in a trivial unfairness or a ludicrous indignity, than the eye uninformed by reason can discern the oak in the acorn, or the utter desolation of winter in the first autumnal fall. Hence the necessity of denouncing with unwearied and even troublesome perseverance a single act of oppression. Let it alone and it stands on record. The country has allowed it and when it is at last provoked to a late indignation, it finds itself gagged with the record of its own ill compulsion."

So spoke the London Times in 1848.

Yet it is not sufficient that we merely denounce tyranny. It is far more important that we work together with patience and forebearance to eliminate the wrongs which the Communists seize upon as a means of portraying themselves as the sole protector of the rights of minorities. For example, I believe it is both just and prudent to help open the doors of economic opportunity to all Americans regardless of religion or race. Unfortunately, as matters now stand, there is no legal guarantee of this. The Bill of Rights merely protects the individual against the abuse of power by the National Government, and in certain matters, by the State governments. But it does not protect him again the actions of other powerful individuals who deprive him of certain essential freedoms and rights. Nor is it difficult to understand why this protection is missing. At the time the amendments were enacted, most Americans were self-sufficient farmers who could stand on their own feet and could do without protection from powerful neighbors. Now, however, we live in a corporate economy wherein the average worker owns little more than his labor. If he is denied access to machines because of his religion or race, he is denied the means of life.

It seems to me, therefore, that in order to promote greater equality of opportunity and true national unity, there is need in this field for legislation that will be intelligently and sympathetically administered. It is better that this be done by States wherever possible, than by the Federal Government, since the States are closer to the problem and can take action more effectively. Moreover, great care should be taken to work out cooperative relationships between the Federal Government and the States, and where there are satisfactory State laws under effective administration, to let them have primary jurisdiction. But national legislation can fill in the gaps and guarantee at least minimum standards.

As a related matter, we need to address our best thoughts to the question of how we can achieve the widest dispersion of economic power among our people as a condition that guarantees the widest dispersion of political power. For experience again has taught us that when the forces of production are concentrated in a relatively few hands, either they reach out to bid for a monopoly over political power; or, in the other extreme, the people at large insist that the Government should take over the direct management of the highly concentrated economic plant. In my own view, I vigorously reject either form of monopoly, whether it runs from economics to politics, or from politics to economics.

I firmly believe that we in America have the genius to achieve our own salvation, against all threats of communism from within or without, and against that emotional tyranny of the majority which the French scholar DeTocqueville warned against over 125 years ago.

When Lord Acton said, "Power corrupts and absolute power tends to corrupt absolutely," he was not speaking in riddles. He was stating an obvious fact.

I believe in the diffusion of political power on the widest possible base.

I believe in and hope that we shall ever maintain the widest possible diffusion of power over the shaping of public opinion through the press, radio, television, and other mass communications.

I believe in the diffusion of economic power through prevention of monopoly and the encouragement of competition in order to prevent great agglomerations of economic strength which inevitably reach out into other fields to assert controls. There is an interplay of economic and political force, and our job is to maintain a balance in both. All government at best is an effort to achieve the ideal within the limitations of the politically practicable. If at times the results of our efforts seem far short of what is desirable, we have no writ to fly to extremes of wild experimentation. That is the course of ultimate ruin.

I believe also that we must maintain a wide diffusion of economic prosperity for the individual man, through tax and other national policies. The sharpest weapon against communism is a home, a good job, a family, and a bank account. Given these conditions, the individual man resists with all his power the blandishments of extremism whether from right or left.

In closing, I offer the thought of one of our greatest men, the late Chief Justice Charles Evans Hughes, spoken at the 150th anniversary of the first meeting of our Congress of the United States:

"Forms of government, however well contrived, cannot assure their own permanence. If we owe to the wisdom and restraint of the fathers a system of government which thus far has stood the test, we all recognize that it is only by wisdom and restraint in our own day that we can make that system last. * * *

"With respect to the influences which shape public opinion, we live in a new world. Never have these influences operated more directly, or with such variety of facile instruments, or with such overwhelming force. We have mass production in opinion as well as in goods.

"The grasp of tradition and of sectional prejudgment is loosened. Postulates of the past must show cause. Our institutions will not be preserved by veneration of what is old, if that is simply expressed in the formal ritual of a shrine. The American people are eager and responsive. They listen attentively to a vast multitude of appeals and, with this receptivity, it is only upon their sound judgment that we can base our hope for a wise conservatism with continued progress and appropriate adaptation to new needs."

Let us therefore take Justice Hughes' words to our hearts. Let us maintain a receptivity of ideas, encourage the inquiring mind without fearing it. Let us maintain that broad diffusion of intelligence and individual prosperity. In that course is our salvation.

Tin Supply and the Texas City Smelter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 5, 1954

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, on April 26 I submitted Senate Concurrent Resolution 79, calling upon the Congress, among other things, to express its conviction that the American tin smelter should be continued in operation at least until June 30, 1955.

In the April 29 issue of the San Antonio Express, there appeared a brief editorial in support of my resolution.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

TIN SUPPLY AND THE TEXAS CITY SMELTER

Tin is a strategic metal. For either the national defense or for keeping peacetime wheels turning, tin is just about the most essential metal there is. Steel or copper or even uranium could be better spared.

The explanation is that tin supplies the spark which kicks off every automobile, motortruck, airplane, or diesel engine. Moreover, tin provides the contact point for every light bulb, radio, radar, or TV tube in use today.

In view of those facts, two situations which have developed—when considered side by side—do not make sense:

(1) As an economy measure, the Eisenhower administration has directed that the tin smelter at Texas City be shut down on June 30. That is the only tin-refining plant in the New World. It is the only plant anywhere which is adapted to processing Bolivian ore.

(2) The Communist military advance in Indochina jeopardizes the mines of Thailand, Indonesia, and Malaya, that produce 65 percent of the world's tin. Before World War II the United States obtained practically all its tin from that quarter.

After Japan had overrun those countries early in 1942, the United States was compelled to salvage tin cans and toothpaste tubes for its tin—a scant and uncertain supply source.

Do the American people want that to happen again? Should the Government go ahead with its plans for closing the Texas City smelter, it would invite a repetition of that hazardous situation.

For that reason, a resolution which Senator Lyndon B. Johnson has introduced—calling for operating the Texas City plant at least until June 30, 1955—is a vitally important defense measure. It should be speedily adopted and effectuated.

Color Television

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 5, 1954

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record a letter and an editorial with respect to color television which I have sent to the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission.

The editorial appeared in the April 30 issue of the TV Guide, and proposes that color-television manufacturers insert UHF and VHF tuners in their sets, so that television viewers can enjoy a broader field of reception. I hope my colleagues will have an opportunity to examine the editorial. I believe this proposal will be of general interest.

There being no objection, the letter and editorial were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

APRIL 20, 1954.

Mr. Rosel H. Hyde,
Chairman, Federal Communications Commission,
New Post Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Chairman: I have had an inquiry concerning an editorial in the April 30 issue of TV Guide regarding color television. I am enclosing a copy of this editorial which is entitled "As We See It," which appears on page 3.

It has been called to my attention that this editorial has developed some pertinent suggestions with respect to color television. I am further informed that the suggestions made are worth consideration by your Commission at this time, inasmuch as there are now few, if any, color-television sets in general use in the country. I do not know what the technical problems would be with respect to the insertion of UHF and VHF tuners in every set. It would appear to be a reasonable recommendation and one that would be of benefit to the viewing public.

I would appreciate very much having your comments on the subject.

Sincerely yours,

Styles Bridges.

As We See It

Now, as we enter the new era of color TV, is the time to establish ultra-high-frequency television as a major factor in the medium. It can be done, simply and easily, by installing at the factory a combination VHF-UHF tuner in every color set produced.

There is room in the frequency spectrum for only about 300 VHF stations, while the spectrum can accommodate about 1,700 UHF stations. The public would be served best by the greatest number of stations. More outlets in each area would mean a wider choice of shows for viewers.

As things stand now, it is difficult for a UHF station to make its way in a region served by a couple of VHF stations. In order to receive new UHF stations, the viewer must install a converter in his set, and that entails expense. So far, UHF outlets have been successful chiefly in areas that have no VHF competition.

The Federal Communications Commission has done almost everything in its power to push UHF. It has yet, however, to urge that manufacturers install tuners capable of receiving both VHF and UHF telecasts in all color sets.

A check of major manufacturers shows that only one specifies VHF-UHF tuners for all its color sets. The others either have made no decision yet or are installing them only as ordered by customers.

This is a golden opportunity, perhaps the only opportunity that ever will arise, to put over UHF television. It is evident that color sets gradually will replace monotone receivers over the next few years. If, during the replacement period, provision can also be made for reception of UHF stations, viewers will benefit twofold.

Address by Rear Adm. Donald J. Ramsey Before the Mirror Manufacturers' Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 5, 1954

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Congressional Record an address by Rear Adm. Donald J. Ramsey, United States Navy, retired, delivered in Washington, on April 23, before the Mirror Manufacturers' Association.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

I have been asked to discuss with you the outlook for silver. The picture at this time is confused and the outlook is obscure. The silver bloc is prowling around again. There is a bill in Congress which, if enacted into law, would call for a price for silver estimated to be around $6.50 per ounce, as compared with the present 85¼ cents per ounce.

The silver-producing interests exploit every opportunity for obtaining a higher price for silver. They never cease to attempt to persuade the Treasury to purchase more silver, despite the fact that the Treasury now has nearly 2 billion ounces of silver which by law must be valued at approximately $2½ billion, when today at the open-market price it is worth only $1½ billion.

Nearly all economists, bankers, and those who know the silver picture recommend that the Treasury stop buying silver.

In 1950 the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System officially stated that repeal of the silver-purchase laws would be in the public interest.

In 1950 a congressional subcommittee of which Senators Douglas and Flanders were members, recommended that the Government cease buying silver for monetary purposes. They concluded that even as a subsidy the silver-purchase program was defective because it granted aid to producers who needed no aid. Today there are producers of silver who receive a subsidy of 5¼ cents an ounce, while their earnings indicate no need for any subsidy. For instance, 1 company turned in over 3 million ounces of silver to the Treasury in 1953—about 10 percent of the United States production.

The earnings of this company increased from about $86 million in 1952 to over $88 million in 1953. Does this company need a subsidy? The silver produced by this company is solely a byproduct. If it received nothing for the silver this company would still be in pretty good shape. It is well to remember that about 75 percent of all silver produced in this country is a byproduct in the production of copper, lead, and zinc.

In 1950 the Treasury Department officially took the position that it would not object to the enactment of legislation repealing the silver purchase laws. It is not conceivable that the present Treasury officials would change this position in the light of the Republican Party platform for 1952, which called for sound monetary policies. The present silver policies are unsound from every point of view. It is sometimes claimed that the silver purchase laws are only a little unsound—that the subsidy is trivial. If someone took one penny out of your pocket every day you might not miss it, but this is a very dangerous philosophy.

In view of the nearly 2 billion ounces of silver the Treasury has been forced to accumulate, it is not conceivable that more silver would be purchased for any purpose.

There are those who still talk glibly about doing something for silver. The producing interests still talk about doing something for silver in order to help produce copper, lead, and zinc. This is no solution for the difficulties which have been encountered by some of the base metal producers. The present silver subsidy is a windfall to some producers. It is a subsidy paid at the expense of our monetary system. If the silver producers are entitled to aid, it should be on the same basis as every other commodity.

I reminded you last year of the so-called free silver in the Treasury which is available to industry at 91 cents per ounce. This free silver supply is rapidly being depleted as it is used to manufacture subsidiary coins, viz, half dollars, quarters, and dimes. This free silver has been a buffer against the onslaughts of those who would force up the price of silver.

The outlook for silver is obscure until the silver purchase laws are repealed, and even then the silver producers will think of some other way in which to do something for silver—they always have. Every individual in this country must be alert to prevent this from happening. It is the man in the street who pays for it.

S. 2555, a bill to repeal the silver purchase laws, sponsored by Senator Bush, together with Senators Douglas, Green, Kennedy, Pastore, Purtell, and Saltonstall, is now before a subcommittee of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee. This bill must be enacted into law at the earliest possible time. These laws are unsound from a monetary point of view, provide a subsidy regardless of need, and prevent a free market for silver.

The Crisis in Indochina

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 5, 1954

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an editorial entitled "A Matter of Timing," published in the Standard-Times of New Bedford, Mass., on April 9, 1954. The editorial deals with the crisis in Indochina.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

A Matter of Timing

Discussion of the crisis in Indochina, sparked in large measure by Senator Kennedy's analysis on the Senate floor Tuesday, discloses concurrence among his colleagues that action must be taken to prevent the Communists from gaining control of that area. There is divergence of opinion, however, on what steps are necessary to prevent a Communist victory and how far the United States should go to assure eventual defeat of the Red forces.

President Eisenhower discussed the subject at length during his Wednesday news conference and stated the administration is determined to keep Indochina out of Communist hands.

Senator Kennedy, who visited Indochina in 1951, when a Member of the House of Representatives, emphasized in his Senate speech the issue of independence for the three Indochina states. He was critical of the unfulfilled promises made by the French that independence will be granted. "The stringent limitations upon the status of the associated states as sovereign states remain," Kennedy said, "and the fact that military victory has not yet been achieved is largely the result of these limitations."

The Senator's expressed desire that the United States not become a partner to "maintenance of political relationships founded upon ancient colonialism" reflects the views of many Americans. But it raises the question whether the United States would be wise to insist France give the Indochina states independence now, as Mr. Kennedy suggests, or whether actual independence should be deferred to some future "target date," as has been suggested by Senator Dirksen, of Illinois.

Mr. Dirksen conceded that if any effective native force is to be developed to fight communism in Indochina "you've got to give them something for which to fight." He said the logical action now would be assurance from the French that independence will be granted at some specific date, which could be 4 or 5 years hence. To insist that French administrators "walk out tomorrow" would cause deterioration in the situation overnight, he said.

During World War II, comparable, though not parallel, situations existed in India and the Dutch East Indies. In each case independence was promised during the war but was not consummated until after victory was achieved. India obtained independence from Britain in 1947, when the Republics of India and Pakistan were formed. The East Indies received independence from the Netherlands in 1949, when the Republic of Indonesia was born.

The independence problem in Indochina is made complex by the existence of three separate states in that area, Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos, each governed by a native ruler under the supervision of a French commissioner. Last July the French Government agreed that ultimate independence should be given to Indochina but cited the necessity of accomplishing this by separate negotiations with each of the three states.

France has made no secret about its desire to withdraw from Indochina, where the war now is in its 8th year. The French are searching for a face-saving plan which will permit them to shed the war burden under conditions other than defeat. They hope a compromise can be worked out at the conference on Asiatic problems scheduled for Geneva April 26.

The United States recognizes France as a valuable ally. To lose her support at this critical stage of the battle against communism would be a serious setback.

Insistence that she grant immediate independence to the three states of Indochina might end any possibility of the united action that both President Eisenhower and Secretary of State Dulles propose.

The Bricker Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. BRICKER

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 5, 1954

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD 2 editorials, 1 entitled "Prime Example," from the Cincinnati Times-Star of April 16, 1954; and the other entitled "Treaties Come First," from the Omaha Morning World-Herald of March 25, 1954. Both the editorials pertain to Senate Joint Resolution 1.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Cincinnati Times-Star of April 16, 1954]

PRIME EXAMPLE

Other news has pushed the Bricker amendment into the background.

Mr. Truman's statement, however, in amplifying his view, contrary to that of the administration and Mr. Attlee, that the secret Roosevelt-Churchill agreement in 1943 supplying Britain with a veto over United States' use of the A-bomb is no longer in effect, brings the defeated amendment back into sharp focus.

Mr. Truman, contending that there was no secret about the agreement, actually, says "There was no secret about it to the people who were entitled to know about it."

In other words, what the people don't know about these "pencilled-note" deals in the Roosevelt-Churchill style won't hurt 'em.

We think it has hurt them in the past and that it can in the future. It is up to the people through their elected representatives in Congress to make agreements as far-reaching and important to the country as the veto power over the use of our major military weapon.

It certainly isn't up to the Chief Executive. For that the best proof is that the present Chief Executive and his predecessor hold opposite views on this same veto power.

Here is a prime example of the danger Mr. BRICKER sees in secret executive agreements with foreign powers.

[From the Omaha Morning World-Herald of March 25, 1954]

TREATIES COME FIRST

Now it's official.

President Eisenhower can't order "massive retaliation" from British air bases without consulting the British Government. Sir Winston Churchill said so, thus confirming what the London papers had been saying for several days past.

Half of Europe might lie in ruins after a sneak attack but not one United States bomber in Britain could take to the air until the Prime Minister and his Cabinet gave permission. Nor does this restriction apply to Britain only. The American President, it is averred, would be obliged to consult the governments of all of the countries in which United States bombers are based before ordering "massive retaliation."

However, while the President must consult with America's allies before hurling United States planes into battle, he apparently is not accountable in the same way to the people of the United States or to their Congress. The Constitution says plainly enough that only Congress can declare war but under the NATO and Rio pacts, according to Secretary Dulles, the constitutional provision may be set aside if any ally is attacked. Thus the sacred covenant between the Government and the American people can be ignored—but not the promise to foreign governments as embodied in a treaty.

This state of affairs raises a considerable question as to the worth of foreign bases which cannot be used the moment they are needed. If "massive retaliation" is to be subject to foreign veto, or must wait on debate in a foreign parliament, it isn't much of a defense.

It also raises once more the question as to the relationship of treaties to the Constitution of the United States.

When Senator BRICKER fought for an amendment which plainly stated the supremacy of the Constitution over treaties, the White House insisted that no amendment was needed because the Constitution is always supreme.

In this instance, however, the Secretary of State says the Constitution may be overridden by the terms of a treaty—although the same treaty is not binding in the same way on the other nations which signed it.

The meaning for Americans is clear enough: Treaties come first in the United States. They are not only above the Constitution, but apparently above common sense.

Communists in Asia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 5, 1954

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Only the Free Can Hold," published in the St. Louis (Mo.) Post-Dispatch of April 8, 1954. The editorial deals with the subject of Communists in Asia.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ONLY THE FREE CAN HOLD

When President Eisenhower says the free world simply cannot afford further losses to the Communists in Asia, he is stating an important aspect, but only one aspect, of the complicated problem of Indochina.

As the President told his press conference Wednesday, no problem is receiving more attention from the administration than this one. If it is being approached from all sides, those who are dealing with it surely recognize that if the free world is to hold Indochina, then, first of all, Indochina must be free.

Is there any way that Indochina can be genuinely free without being independent from France? The President says he is not sure that the people of the Associated States want independence. But surely there is a strong presumption that they would not reject a status which the Indians, the Burmese, the Filipinos, and the Indonesians have won.

In 8 long years of fighting, the French have never been able to evoke in Vietnam broad popular support for the war—despite successively larger gestures toward granting partial independence. Can there be any real doubt that broad popular support is unlikely to be given unless and until the objective of the war becomes independence for Vietnam rather than the retention of a colonial rule which has been shaken off elsewhere in Asia?

These considerations lend support to the argument of Senator KENNEDY, of Massachusetts, that the United States would be backing the losing side if it intervened militarily without a prior French commitment for independence. And it is possible, of course, that such a commitment might remove the necessity for intervention—might even pave the way for an armistice and a settlement.

Secretary Dulles is wisely consulting other powers concerned in Indochina, and it is well to recognize that the effectiveness of American policy may in large measure depend upon how completely it represents a collective policy. Our leadership in Korea was strongest, with the peoples of Asia, when we were carrying out United Nations directives, and weakest when we acted unilaterally. In Indochina far less than in Korea can the United States go it alone.

A willingness to take counsel from other members of the coalition we seek to lead, a determination to work for true freedom in Indochina—these are two of the most essential ingredients of a wise decision.

Polish Fight for Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. UPTON

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 5, 1954

Mr. UPTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Polish Fight for Freedom," published in the Union Leader of May 3, 1954. The Union Leader is a newspaper published in my State. The editorial expresses the hope, shared by all of us, that the Polish people may ultimately achieve their freedom.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POLISH FIGHT FOR FREEDOM

People of New Hampshire will join heartily in spirit in the celebration of the 163d anniversary of the May 3, 1791, Constitution of Poland by the St. Stanislaus Post, 1407, of the Catholic War Veterans of Nashua, and similar organizations throughout the United States.

This celebration which commemorates one of the most dramatic moments in history is rendered doubly significant by the plight of the Polish nation today as an unwilling victim of the Kremlin.

The 1791 constitution converted Poland into a hereditary limited monarchy with ministerial responsibility and biennial parliaments. Class distinctions were done away with. The towns got full administrative and judicial autonomy, as well as a measure of parliamentary representation. The peasants were placed under the protection of the law, and absolute religious toleration was established.

It is fitting that this phenomenal guarantee of freedom to the Polish people at such an early date should stir the patriotism of Poles today, even though it lasted for only a short time. The 1791 constitution was overthrown by Russia, which declared it revolutionary, and in 1793 Poland suffered her second partition.

But this document was not forgotten. The constitution adopted in 1921, when Poland emerged from her third century-old partition, was based on the 1791 document. But once more the period of Polish independence was to be destroyed in a few years at Yalta. The agreement was a monument of hypocricy. While the signatories solemnly professed devotion to the principles of the Atlantic Charter, they violated its self-determination clauses, first by assignment to the Soviet Union of almost half of the territory of prewar Poland, and second by the allotment to Poland of an indefinite amount of ethnically German territory.

Every principle of international morality was violated when vital decisions about Poland's future were taken without participation of anyone qualified to speak for Poland. The outrage was completed when the promise of free and unfettered election in Poland proved later to be a fraud and a farce. A Communist-dominated government was imposed on Poland, which for all practical purposes became part of the Soviet Union.

It may be taken for granted that the Polish people will not accept this bondage forever. That has been proven by their record across the centuries. A day of deliverance will come. Their liberty will be restored. And every American who loves freedom and cherishes democracy will support this fight and pray earnestly for the day when the century-old dream of Polish freedom will be fully realized.

Vocational Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURR P. HARRISON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1954

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix, I include a short analysis prepared by Dr. Dowell J. Howard, superintendent of public instruction of the Commonwealth of Virginia, which I believe will be of interest to Members of the House in the consideration of appropriations for Federal aid to vocational education, pursuant to the Smith-Hughes and George-Barden Acts.

The analysis follows:

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

The position I have taken is that if the administration is to declare an overall policy in regard to grants-in-aid to States that that is one thing but if they are to attempt to reduce expenditures for an important educational function and increase other grant-in-aid programs, then I think they are wrong. Certainly, in my opinion, they are wrong so long as they have a committee studying this problem and the committee has not yet reported.

Based on budget recommendations for 1954–55, of six major federally aided State programs, it seems to be the intent of the present administration to cut vocational education and increase everything else. It is rather obvious that it is the intent of the administration to gradually eliminate Federal funds for vocational education. You are, of course, familiar with the recommendations of the President. I am, however, listing below certain facts:

	Appropriated for fiscal 1954	Recommended for fiscal 1955	Percent increase (+) or decrease (−)
I. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE			
1. Vocational education	[1] $25,958,383	[1] $24,785,122	−4.7
2. Office of Education (salaries, etc.)	2,900,000	3,100,000	+6.9
3. Vocational rehabilitation	23,000,000	[2] 27,975,000	+21.6
4. Land-grant colleges	[3] 2,501,500	[3] 2,501,500	0
II. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR			
1. Bureau of Apprenticeship	3,230,000	3,215,000	−.5
III. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE			
1. Extension Service	[4] 32,257,370	[4] 30,675,000	+23

[1] These figures include both the Smith-Hughes and George-Barden appropriations. (The Smith-Hughes is a permanent appropriation—$7,138,331.) The proposed cut of $1,173,261 is in George-Barden funds and based on this fund alone is a 6.4 percent cut.

[2] This includes a recommended appropriation of $19,075,000 and a supplementary appropriation of $8,800,000 recommended in the proposed legislation.

[3] This does not include a permanent authorization of $2,550,000.

[4] These figures include total appropriations for 1953–54 and total recommendations for 1954–55.

You will observe that, compared with the appropriations for 1953–54, vocational education will be cut 4.7 percent, whereas other programs receive up to 23 percent increases. I am not complaining about increases for other worthy programs, but I am insisting that if the Congress begins to cut something it appears that they begin to cut the thing which is vital to the public-school system. I am conscious of the fact that a 4.7-percent decrease is small, but it is the principle and policy about which I am concerned.

This proposed legislation provides an increase in appropriations for Federal-aid programs administered by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare ranging from 0.7 to 115 percent. The breakdown shows that Virginia will receive a net increase of 31 percent in funds for federally aided programs administered by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The breakdown shows, but does not call attention to, the fact that the Federal appropriations for vocational education for Virginia at the same time will be decreased by $34,487.

In my opinion, there is little to indicate a determination on the part of the administration to reduce Federal expenditures. An across-the-board cut would be more indicative of such determination.

Inasmuch as sizable increases are proposed in many other federally aided State programs, there is, in my opinion, much justification for an increase in Federal funds for vocational education. I believe that a number of Congressmen concur in this feeling. As a matter of fact, the Federal Government spent three times as much money on foreign education programs in fiscal 1953 for 15,410 persons as was expended for vocational education in the United States for 3,039,347 American citizens who helped pay the bill. I am submitting below a brief tabulation which will give you the picture:

	1951	1952	1953
Federal funds spent for foreign aid education programs	$28,007,000	$49,807,417	$78,930,032
Number of people served in foreign aid education programs	13,069	16,278	15,410
Federal funds appropriated for vocational education (includes Smith-Hughes and George-Barden funds)	27,262,882	26,408,383	25,958,383
Number enrolled in federally aided vocational programs	3,363,420	3,165,998	3,039,347

I have attempted to face this problem realistically and the 26 years I spent specifically in the field of vocational education and my present position points up the importance of an adequate program of vocational education. I am more and more convinced that it is one of the soundest programs in which the Federal Government participates. I cannot live with my conscience if I sit idly by and see it reduced as long as the Federal Government has no overall policy and continues to segregate vocational education as a major item of their reduction.

The Dilemma in Indochina

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT GORE

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 5, 1954

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Dilemma in Indochina," published in the Berkshire Eagle, of Pittsfield, Mass., of April 8, 1954.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE DILEMMA IN INDOCHINA

The bitter dilemma the United States is facing in Indochina was admirably described by JOHN F. KENNEDY, junior Senator from Massachusetts, in a speech in the Senate, Tuesday, April 6. His speech evoked a discussion which still further emphasized the difficulties of the struggle now going on and the risks that American policy is taking.

The dilemma is simply this: If we continue to maintain the war, we must not only take over most of the cost of the war, but we put ourselves in the position of fighting to perpetuate French domination, an oppressive and rapacious colonialism, disliked by 95 percent of the native peoples. If, on the other hand, we allow the French, who are tired of the whole affair, to get out and withdraw all military forces from that country, we are handing over the entire nation to the Communists, and making Indochina practically a puppet of the Red Chinese Government.

Mr. Kennedy, restrained by reluctance to offend French feelings, confined himself to facts but did not give a pertinent summary. That summary would have been that the French are notoriously bad colonizers, and have been at their worst in Indochina. After being in that country nearly 90 years they have done nothing toward training the native people to govern themselves. The French dominate the entire country politically, culturally, and economically; they compounded decades of bad rule by going back on their word in 1947, and thus precipitating the current war. They have almost no support among the native population and are still unwilling to take any steps to gain it. Other Asiatics look on the struggle as another example of the people of Asia trying to throw off the yoke of European domination. The fact that Ho Chi Minh is a Communist seems to them a minor matter; what is important is that he is a native resisting foreign domination. The United States is, in effect, underwriting French misrule and French blunders which brought on the war; if France had honored its postwar agreement the war never would have started.

But if the United States refuses to help and lets France get out, as it seems to want to, the effects would be incalculable. Indochina is important not only because of its assets—it is one of the few food-exporting countries in Asia, but because of its strategic position. If it comes under Communist domination, the Communists are established on the flank of Burma, and are put in position to take over all southeast Asia when it becomes convenient.

Senator Kennedy believes that while either of these alternatives involves catastrophe, there is a third choice. If the people of Indochina are given guarantees they will accept that they will have complete independence within a specified time, he believes the people will rise and help defend their land from the Communists. But without their help, the struggle is hopeless, and the United States now is running the risk of taking on single-handed the whole conduct of a war against the Indochinese rebels and the hordes of Red Chinese under conditions infinitely worse than those that prevailed in Korea. It is some consolation to know that even some of the most devoted adherents of Chiang and Rhee realize the facts, and will balk at such a war.

Austin College, of Sherman, Tex., Looks to the Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 5, 1954

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the church college has exerted a tremendously important influence on American education throughout our history as a nation. Many of our national leaders have come out of these institutions. The typical church college steadfastly upholds the traditions of the past while planning wisely to meet the needs of the future.

Such a college is Austin College, of Sherman, Tex., founded in another historic Texas city more than a century ago. Austin College recently inaugurated a new president, and outlined a $5-million 10-year program of development.

The Dallas Morning News, in its issue of Sunday, May 2, 1954, published a story by one of its staff members on the plans of Austin College. Those far-reaching plans show a faith in the future that is truly American in the best sense of that great word.

I ask unanimous consent that the article from the Dallas News be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Sherman, Tex.—Venerable Austin College looked to the future Saturday as it inaugurated a new president and outlined a $5 million, 10-year program of development.

The new president is Dr. John D. Moseley, a 38-year-old native of Greenville, who received the gold seal of his office from W. C. Windsor, of Tyler, chairman of the Austin College trustees.

"The history of Austin College reveals why it has surmounted obstacles—the faith and courage of those connected with it, Dr. Moseley said.

"We must reaffirm our faith in the role of the church college.

"The church college was one of the first American institutions and Presbyterians led the way in that field."

Austin College was founded in 1849 at Huntsville and claims to be the oldest college in Texas operating continuously under the same charter.

Dr. Moseley outlined the college's 10-year development plan at an afternoon session following his inauguration. The plan had previously been previewed to trustees and some alumni by Toddie Lee Wynne of Dallas, chairman of the planning group.

The program would stabilize college facilities for an enrollment of 700 full-time students or a total enrollment of full and part-time students not to exceed 1,000.

Three million dollars of the proposed fund outlay would be used for new buildings and two millions for endowment.

Proposed building plans call for four new dormitories, costing $365,000 each; a religious chapel, $300,000; remodeling and improvement of Sherman Hall, $75,000; a fine arts and classroom building, $625,000; field house, auditorium and swimming pool, $275,000; landscaping, $50,000; remodeling of Thompson Hall and changes in the Administration Building, $75,000; central heating, relocation of shops and central warehouse, $150,000.

The development program will be submitted to the Presbyterian Synod of Texas at its meeting in Austin on May 7.

Principal address at the inauguration ceremonies was given by Dr. Arthur Flemming, president of Ohio Wesleyan University who is on leave from that school to act as Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization in Washington.

Dr. Flemming said the most important objective of such a college as Austin College is "to send out young men and women who are ready to make sacrifices for freedom."

"Many college graduates sit back in their easy chairs and deplore conditions in their communities but do nothing about them," he said, urging a more active role by college graduates in civic, political, and religious affairs.

The inauguration was witnessed by a large crowd on the north court of the campus under threatening skies. The rain held off, however, until after the ceremony.

About 100 Dallas residents at tended the event, coming here in chartered buses. Roy Klein, of Dallas, moderator of the Synod of Texas, gave the invocation, and Dr. William M. Elliott, Jr., of Dallas introduced Dr. Flemming.

Revision of Internal Revenue Code

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 5, 1954

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a statement of the position of the Boston Tax Forum with reference to H. R. 8300, adopted April 14, 1954. The statement deals with the proposed revision of the Internal Revenue Code.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Boston Tax Forum is a professional group composed of 25 lawyers and accountants interested and working in matters of Federal taxation. The membership comprises tax practitioners in many of the leading Boston law and accounting firms and professors lecturing on taxation at the Harvard Law School. A list of the members and the firms accompanies this statement.

At a special meeting of the forum held on April 12, H. R. 8300 was discussed. The desirability of revision of the Internal Revenue Code was recognized and the many important and beneficial improvements contained in H. R. 8300 were appreciated. The nature of many of the numerous changes and new concepts has raised serious doubt whether in certain areas the bill as now written on balance is not less beneficial than existing law. To have a tax law which will serve the public with justice and equity and which can be administered with stability and certainty means not just a few major changes but a revision of a great many of the provisions of the pending bill.

The statements made to the Senate Finance Committee thus far appear to have been sympathetically received, and statements made by staff representatives indicate that extensive revision, and in certain areas very extensive revision, is being undertaken in H. R. 8300.

As it now appears that the revision will be very extensive, the tax forum respectfully suggests that before the revised bill is reported out by the Senate Finance Committee a further opportunity be given to taxpayers' representatives to confer further with staff representatives on the revised draft or revised particular sections thereof in order that no opportunity be overlooked to see whether revisions introduce new problems or are capable of further improvement.

When the great length and number of changes in the pending bill are borne in mind, some departure from ordinary legislative procedure in the case of less comprehensive measures seems called for and justified.

The forum realizes that the new code is scheduled to be enacted this session but the forum believes a little time (say 10 days) in which to take a second look would not prevent accomplishment of the objective.

might save much time in conference and on the floors of Congress and, above all, would be likely to lead to a better code—the objective of all concerned.

Upon motion duly made and seconded, the following resolution was unanimously adopted:

"*Resolved*, That a committee of the tax forum composed of its chairman, Kenneth W. Bergen; Edward C. Thayer, and Herman Stuetzer, Jr., is appointed to present to congressional and Treasury officials and, if it appears practicable and desirable, to the Senate Finance Committee the serious concern of the Boston Tax Forum with regard to certain provisions of H. R. 8300, the pending tax revision bill, and also to present its suggestion that further opportunity be given to study the revisions before the bill assumes final form."

We respectfully request that this expression of views be ordered printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

KENNETH W. BERGEN,
EDWARD C. THAYER,
HERMAN STUETZER, Jr.

APRIL 14, 1954.

MEMBERS OF THE BOSTON TAX FORUM

Joseph H. B. Edwards, Bingham, Dana & Gould.

John Dane, Jr., Kingsbury Browne, Choate, Hall & Stewart.

Earle W. Carr, Gaston, Snow, Rice & Boyd.

Allan H. W. Higgins, Charles D. Post, Goodwin, Procter & Hoar.

Samuel S. Dennis, Hale & Dorr.

Erwin N. Griswold, John M. Maguire, Ernest J. Brown, Stanley S. Surrey, Harvard Law School.

Alex J. Macfarland, Carl J. Marold, Herrick, Smith, Donald, Farley & Ketchum.

Herman Stuetzer, Jr., Lybrand, Ross Bros. & Montgomery.

Earle Johnson, William Shelmerdine, Nutter, McClennen & Fish.

Douglas I. Mann, Patterson, Teele & Dennis.

S. Ralph Jacobs, Peat, Marwick, Mitchell & Co.

Richard F. Barrett, Powers & Hall.

Richard Riley, Price, Waterhouse & Co.

Edward C. Thayer, Rackemann, Sawyer & Brewster.

Wilson C. Piper, Harry Mansfield, Ropes, Gray, Best, Coolidge & Rugg.

Kenneth W. Bergen, Walter G. Silcox, Warner, Stackpole, Stetson & Bradlee.

Unemployment Figures Compiled by New Jersey Division of Employment Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH J. ADDONIZIO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1954

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, current Government statistics on unemployment do not bear out the administration's contention that there is no cause for concern about the economic slump. In my State of New Jersey, the figures compiled by the New Jersey Division of Employment Security, show there were more than 101,000 claimants unemployed the week ended April 17. This is the highest ever recorded in my State with the exception of the post-V-J Day layoffs in 1945.

The following report gives an up-to-date picture of the situation in each New Jersey county for the week ending April 17 as compared with the prior week, the same week in a prior month and the same week last year. This is the first of the regular reports now being compiled by the division, and has been furnished me by Mr. Harry Kranz, legislative director of the New Jersey State Council of the Congress of Industrial Organizations:

Unemployment insurance claimants, by counties, of New Jersey (estimated distribution)

Counties	Week ending Apr. 17	Prior week	Comparable week	
			Last month	Last year
Atlantic	3,157	3,345	3,511	2,958
Bergen	9,320	9,393	8,304	6,098
Burlington	1,977	1,932	1,997	912
Camden	4,872	4,691	4,662	2,864
Cape May	732	702	738	614
Cumberland	3,798	3,468	2,989	3,077
Essex	20,442	20,692	20,112	10,368
Gloucester	1,527	1,496	1,394	1,025
Hudson	14,240	14,090	13,289	9,253
Hunterdon	612	643	643	161
Mercer	5,289	5,497	5,254	1,585
Middlesex	6,847	6,217	5,241	3,646
Monmouth	4,104	4,159	3,775	2,925
Morris	1,976	1,970	1,834	1,124
Ocean	664	651	694	534
Passaic	11,127	11,191	9,203	6,996
Salem	673	641	694	410
Somerset	1,478	1,465	1,430	677
Sussex	408	390	400	206
Union	7,052	7,324	6,986	3,436
Warren	756	759	696	209
State total	101,051	100,716	93,846	59,078

Counts of claimants or the registered unemployed, are made on the assumption that any person certifying to unemployment any time during the week may be considered to be unemployed during the whole of that calendar week. The count includes therefore any certification, whether for new, continued, or reasserted unemployment. Data of workers insured under the Railroad Retirement Board are excluded, and the data are adjusted to exclude nonresidents of New Jersey and those partially employed. Unemployment of claimants who failed to file claims because disqualified or ineligible is necessarily excluded. This count, while based on receipts of claims documents, necessarily contains an estimate of the persons actually unemployed but not scheduled to appear until the following week under the biweekly reporting program.

R. & S.

APRIL 23, 1954.

Texas Town Closes Up To Go Fishing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 5, 1954

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, we may at times have difficulty in recognizing the fact here in this Chamber, but the truth is that spring has come.

This has now been made official by a town in my State of Texas. The town is Seymour, in western Texas. On last Monday, Seymour went out of business for a full day and the people who lived there spent the day fishing—not necessarily catching fish, but fishing.

The people of Seymour have been doing that on a spring day every year for more than a quarter of a century. I think their example might well be commended to all Americans everywhere.

In order that the pattern followed in the Texas town of Seymour may become more widely known, I ask unanimous consent that an Associated Press story telling of Seymour fish day be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEYMOUR, TEX., May 1.—A posh on the world's troubles.

Seymour is gonna close up shop Monday, and every danged one of its 3,779 citizens is ordered by the mayor to go fishing.

They'll go, too.

For 28 years when those first symptoms of spring fever got to crawling over a body, they've been locking up downtown for 1 whole day and taking off with a pole.

Nobody seems to know how or why it got started. It just did.

Seymour is on the northwest Texas plains where Lake Kemp is a 444,000-acre blue haven in a land of mesquite, ranches, and wheatfields.

That's where Seymour is going Monday—right up to Seymour Gate on Lake Kemp, where the mayor told them to go.

Mayor W. R. Whitley's proclamation reads:

"Know all men by these presents: Whereas since time immemorial man, woman, boy, and girl have pursued the ancient and time-honored custom of trying to induce a wily and stubborn fish to bite a hook—"

And whereas, the mayor said, he proclaimed May 3 as Fish Day.

"And I do further hereby proclaim that on said date each and every citizen shall lay aside his daily pursuits and gird and arm himself with a fishing pole, line, hook, and bait, and make his way by the most expeditious means of transportation to the said shores of Lake Kemp and there test his skill, strength, wit, and patience against the said wily fish in the time-honored fashion and manner."

The chamber of commerce got out some handbills around town saying if you don't like to fish, "You will find the environment perfect for eating, sleeping, playing bridge, canasta, and other games, as well as plain and fancy gossiping."

They'll select a Seymour Fish Day Queen from 12 beauties from the local high school.

And a posh on care for 1 whole day.

O for a Faith That Will Bring World Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 5, 1954

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a poem entitled "O for a Faith That Will Bring World Peace."

In this poem Fred Burdick, editor of the Capitol Gist, whom I have known for more than 12 years, has presented the pathos, truths, and facts about war, and outlined the precepts of practical Christianity which can, and I believe will, bring lasting world peace.

Ever since the establishment of the Capitol Gist in February 1942, I have been a subscriber and have read probably every issue, and followed with interest and profit the steady flow of the Gist of Constructive Ideas for Making a Better America and World, the motto of the Capitol Gist.

During these 12 years I have never read in the Gist a word of personal criticism, innuendo, rumor or slander, which is indeed a laudable record for the publication. Everything has been constructive.

The first accomplishment of the Capitol Gist having a direct bearing on world peace was a special edition on ending the war with Japan, featuring interviews with more than 25 Congressmen giving their reasons why there should be clarification of "unconditional surrender" for Japan, proving that Congress was virtually unanimous for such clarification as a major step toward ending World War II. I am told that Senator Tom Connally, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee at that time, said that this special edition of the Capitol Gist "may have been a factor in bringing an end to the most destructive war in history."

There being no objection, the poem was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

O for a Faith That Will Bring World Peace

(By Fred Burdick)

O the tears of mothers whose boys will ne'er return with their fine enthusiasms and gay smiles,
O the groans and moans of the wounded and the dying on the blood-stained fields of battle,
O the anguish of the war widows and the crying of war orphans who cannot know why,
O the false slogans designed to make war seem noble and good instead of hellish and bad,
O the hate and resentment brought by war propaganda made of half-truths, rumors and lies,
O the anger and fear caused by war-thoughts that can poison blood-streams and make well persons ill,
O the cruel hopes that wars can solve problems instead of making untold new and worse ones,
O the aftermath of war with its disillusionments, misery, want, woe, and unrest,
O for remembering that in wars the Four Horsemen have been the only final victors,
O for heeding scientists' warnings that modern war can bring civilization's end,
O for knowing the madness of war that maims, burns and kills even mothers with babes in arms,
O for common sense of the common people who perceive the greed and hate that sparks wars' fires,
O for statesmen to see the need for more foresight, understanding, tolerance, and patience,
O for quick recognition of the Fatherhood of God and the Brotherhood of man,
O for wisdom to heed the teachings of the lowly Nazarene who went about doing good,
O for seeing that just practicing the Golden Rule can make wars to cease and bring world peace—
"All things whatsoever ye would that men should do unto you do ye even so to them";
O for a faith in this: "Men shall beat their swords into plowshares and their spears into pruninghooks";
O for the day when men can stop making guns, tanks, and bombs and instead build homes, schools, and parks,
O for the dawn seen by the Prince of Peace when there shall be, "On Earth Peace, Goodwill Toward Men."

Statement by Hon. Ezra Taft Benson, Secretary of Agriculture, Before House Committee on Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL B. DAGUE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1954

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I have availed myself of the privilege of placing in the Appendix of the Record the fine statement delivered today by Secretary Benson before the House Committee on Agriculture. I have long been on record as favoring the policies advocated by the Secretary and, I believe, that this statement is a factual evaluation of the agricultural situation as it presently exists. If there is an answer to overproduction stimulated by rigid supports and previous failure to impose acreage limitations, the Secretary cannot be charged with not trying to search for a solution. I commend his fine statement to your careful consideration:

Statement by Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson Before the House Committee on Agriculture

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I appreciate the opportunity of appearing again before this important committee to discuss matters vital to the agricultural industry and, in fact, to all of our people. My only interest is the interest of the farmer and the welfare of this country.

Since I last met with you 2 months ago, the great debate on our farm program of the future has been going forward here in Congress and throughout the Nation. In your continuing search for all of the available facts bearing upon this situation, you have held most extensive hearings.

This free and full discussion of the many phases of our agricultural problem is in the best tradition of our form of government. I am convinced that the Nation is looking forward to the enactment of an improved farm program as an outgrowth of these complete hearings.

As we approach the time when this committee and its counterpart in the Senate will report legislative recommendations to the Congress, it might be well to take stock of our present position. At the same time, within the limitations which always surround such an effort, we might also consider the outlook for American agriculture under certain of the major proposals which have been put forward here.

We are nearing the end of a crop year which has seen an unprecedented buildup of food and fiber under Government price-support operations. As we move toward another harvest, we face the probability of further accumulations of some commodities which are already overflowing our warehouses.

The cost-price squeeze which has reduced net realized farm income in 5 of the last 6 years remains a continuing problem. Prices paid by farmers for goods and services are now only a few index points below the all-time high reached 2 years ago, while prices received for agricultural products have fluctuated at a level sharply below the peaks attained during the Korean war.

Farm exports have held during the first 8 months of this fiscal year at the levels of a year earlier, but they are down sharply—particularly in wheat—from 1951–52. With food production steadily mounting in the nations which were the heaviest importers following World War II, we face serious obstacles in the all-out effort which this Government has undertaken to help expand our foreign outlets.

Although moisture conditions this spring are favorable throughout most of the Nation, we still have a serious drought problem in parts of at least 6 States.

While prices of such major sources of farm income as hogs and soybeans today are far above parity, many agricultural commodities are bringing less than the Government support price in the open market. With a large part of our 25 million diverted acres being planted to other crops, we may face further price dislocations for some nonbasic commodities.

In the light of this situation, we have a clear obligation to evolve programs which will deal realistically with these problems. We must set our course in a new direction—toward better balanced production, more freedom of action for individual farmers, broader research and education, greater efficiency, and improved marketing methods.

I sincerely believe that the recommendations submitted to this Congress by President Eisenhower and embodied in the committee print now before you charts the course we should take at this time.

We have arrived at a point in our operation of Commodity Credit Corporation were it is becoming clearly apparent that a more realistic price-support program is in order. At the end of this fiscal year, June 30, our loans and inventories are expected to total about $6.3 billion, as compared with slightly less than $3.5 billion 1 year earlier. The increase in CCC holdings, $2.8 billion, represents about 9 percent of our total 1953 income from farm marketings.

Because of production controls on wheat, cotton, and corn, our takeover of these commodities should be smaller next year. However, there is doubt as to whether we can achieve overall substantial production cutbacks with acreage restrictions and marketing controls. Their purpose can be defeated if farmers employ their best land, fertilize more heavily, improve tillage practices, extend irrigation, and step up the fight against insects and plant diseases. Such actions are undertaken in economic self-interest and are understandable enough. But they simply do not reduce production.

Despite efforts to control production on acres diverted from the basic crops, this land will add its output to the total. In all probability we shall have to expand our loan operations for barley, grain sorghums, flaxseed, soybeans, oats, and rye which will be harvested on the acres diverted from wheat, corn, and cotton.

Dairy products and four basic commodities—wheat, cotton, corn, and tobacco—account for more than nine-tenths of our current price support operations. Wheat alone represents more than one-third of the $6.5 billion currently tied up in inventories, loans, and purchase agreements. The basic commodities, which represent more than 90 percent of our investment, bring in only 23 percent of our farm income.

Even though we should not harvest a single bushel of wheat in the United States this year, the July 1 carryover of 875 million bushels shown on the adjacent chart would be sufficient to meet our domestic need and all of our foreseeable exports. Actually, the April 1 crop report indicated a probable yield of around 900 million bushels for 1954, under normal conditions.

The cotton carryover at the beginning of the new crop year on August 1 is estimated at 9.6 million bales, most of which will be under Government price support. This is enough cotton to meet our domestic needs for a full year. We will have it on hand at a time when the new crop is beginning to move to market.

Our carryover of corn as we go into the new crop year October 1 is expected to reach 900 million bushels—a record high. This is enough to meet our livestock feeding requirements for about 4 months, however, and it does not of itself represent a dangerously large surplus. The price-depressing effect of such a supply, nevertheless, forces huge quantities of corn into the Government loan. This can create substantial financial losses. Right now CCC is selling large quantities of off-grade corn from the 1948 and 1949 crops at prices well below the acquisition cost.

Current Government holdings of dairy products—more than 1.3 billion pounds—and of cottonseed oil—nearly 1 billion pounds—are considerably greater than we need to insure an adequate supply for consumers. The perishability of the dairy products makes it imperative that they be moved within a relatively short period to avoid spoilage.

Now it certainly can be argued most convincingly that we do need adequate reserves of food and fiber for our own well-being and even for our national security. I have always maintained that we do. At the same time, we must distinguish between the blessings of ample stockpiles and the burden of unmanageable surpluses.

Food is a weapon in time of war and it can be employed most effectively in implementing our foreign policy during a period of peace such as we all pray for in the years ahead. I believe it is generally agreed, however, that our current supplies of farm commodities far exceed those of any potential enemy and that if war should come it would not be lost by this Nation for want of food and fiber.

What we propose to do with these surpluses is more important at the moment than how we acquired them. Nevertheless, it should be made very clear that the Government itself is partly responsible for the present situation. During World War II and the years immediately following and again during the Korean war, farmers were asked to produce every possible pound of food and fiber. They were exhorted by the Government and further encouraged by prices which were well above support levels. They responded magnificently with the greatest burst of production in all history. American farmers provided food for the hungry, aided reconstruction abroad, and helped keep important areas within the orbit of the free world.

When both demand and prices began slipping from the peaks reached in February of 1951, the Government continued to call for all-out production. By 1952 it was apparent that our stocks of some commodities were at a point where further accumulations would make it exceedingly difficult to hold prices at support levels. Production controls for wheat and cotton were clearly indicated, but no official action was taken. Some of our current problems stem from that unwise decision.

While farmers have been suffering these economic reverses, they have continued to make available to the Nation's consumers an abundant quantity of nutritious food. The same food which cost 23 percent of consumer income in 1935–39 was available in 1953 for 18 percent, as the chart here shows. Actually the American people spent slightly more than one-fourth of their disposable incomes for food last year because they also bought more and better products than in the prewar period.

Now I should like to emphasize that while the farmer's share of the food dollar has declined from 52 percent in 1946 to 45 percent, the entire drop occurred before January of 1953. When this administration took office, the farmer was receiving 45 percent of the food dollar. He still is. Throughout the last 15 months his share has averaged 45 percent. During the 1935–39 period, the average was only 40 percent of the index then used.

A major factor contributing to the farm problem has been the serious slump in farm exports during the last 2 years. As the related chart reveals, the value of farm exports declined by 30 percent during the year ending June 30, 1953.

During the 8-month period—July through February of this year—exports of agricultural commodities have held at almost exactly the same rate as a year earlier. Such exports in February were valued at $236 million, up 15 percent over January and 9 percent above February 1953.

As you know, we have been making an all-out effort to expand our foreign trade outlets.

Right now we have trade missions in Europe, South America, and Asia seeking new markets for our farm products. These missions are made up of 35 leading authorities on agricultural production and marketing. They include men from our national farm organizations and the heads of exporting associations. Some of them are from farm producer and agricultural trade groups. In total, these trade missions represent a cross-section of our agricultural interests in world commerce.

It was President Eisenhower, you will recall, who first proposed these trade missions in his farm recommendations to the Congress early this year. He called for a series of missions "to explore the immediate possibilities of expanding international trade in food and fiber."

A great deal of preparatory work was organized and carried out within the Department. A thorough briefing was held here in Washington, and the members departed on their respective missions early in April. They will return late in May to make their reports.

The objective of the missions is not to negotiate contracts or arrange sales of any kind. It is simply to carry out the President's proposal for exploring the possibilities of expanding exports of United States agricultural products, developing international trade, and building good will and understanding. Among the problems to be studied are the improvement of marketing and trade practices, the removal of road blocks to United States exports, currency situations affecting trade in agricultural products, and ways of increasing consumer preferences through improved quality, packaging, and handling of United States agricultural products.

Before leaving the United States, members conferred with officials of various departments of the executive branch. They also met with Members of Congress and with the President at a special White House interview. The President gave the missions a strong endorsement. And along with everyone else, he is looking forward to the reports which the members will make upon their return.

Meanwhile, we are employing a number of programs designed to supplement normal commercial trade in moving agricultural commodities into greater use abroad. Among the most important are these:

Section 550 (Mutual Security Act of 1953, Public Law 118): We expect to ship approximately $230 million worth of surplus agricultural commodities under this program during the current fiscal year. Transactions already approved total about $200 million.

Barter (sec. 4 (h), CCC Charter Act, amended, Public Law 85, 81st Cong.): During the current fiscal year we have negotiated trades totaling some $36 million, principally grain, which is more than 3 times the amount moved in the preceding full fiscal year. These transactions were handled through private trade channels at prevailing market prices.

Offshore procurement (sec. 5 (f), CCC Charter Act, Public Law 806, 80th Cong.): Under this program we have recently negotiated the sale of $20 million worth of wheat to the Spanish Government, in exchange for foreign currency. This sale was developed cooperatively with a number of other Government agencies.

Section 32, exports (act of August 24, 1935 (7 U. S. C. 612c)): In an effort to regain traditional foreign markets for certain fruits, export-payment programs have been placed in effect under this act. Normal trade channels are employed. Commodities include fresh pears, fresh and processed oranges and grapefruit, apricots, and raisins.

Section 416 (Agricultural Act of 1949): We are currently moving, mostly into foreign outlets, substantial stocks of dairy products under this act, which authorizes us to dispose of foods in danger of spoilage by donating them for use of needy persons. In less than a year we have donated nearly 180 million pounds of dairy products to 17 United States private welfare organizations for overseas relief in 36 foreign countries.

Famine relief: Under Public Law 77 we shipped more than 600,000 tons of wheat to Pakistan to avert famine there. In addition, under Public Law 216, we are moving about 84,000 tons of wheat to alleviate serious food shortages in Bolivia, Jordan, and Libya.

Other special foreign-relief programs (sec. 513 (b) of the Mutual Security Act): Under the East German food program approximately 5.6 million packages of food valued at $13.7 million were distributed to hungry people in East Berlin and East Germany. Some 4.5 million food packages valued at $12 million were distributed under the Christmas food program to needy people in 20 friendly countries of Europe, Latin America, and the Near East.

Despite our efforts, total wheat exports for the current crop year will be the smallest since the end of World War II. Indications are that a number of importing nations will not exercise their option of taking the full quotas allotted to them under the International Wheat Agreement.

Cotton, our other major farm export crop, is beginning to move at a better rate. During February of this year we shipped 401,000 bales abroad, almost double the figure for the preceding February. This rate was maintained during March. Cotton exports in April picked up even further. Stocks in other countries have been reduced and world prices are now near the United States level.

Certainly the whole problem of exports has been attacked with new vigor and there are some encouraging signs that our policies are paying off in certain areas. What is urgently needed here, however, is not a few one-shot deals but a persistent and continuing search for new, permanent, foreign markets. We are moving toward such a goal.

There are at least some members of this committee who believe that a two-price plan for wheat and possibly cotton would enable us to maintain a larger share of the world market for these crops. The Wheat Advisory Committee recommended such a plan. As you know, there was serious consideration of this approach within the National Agricultural Advisory Commission which studied the overall farm problem last year.

The conclusion was that the advantages might be more than offset by international trade repercussions, by protests of American consumers, and by opposition from producers of feed grain. There might also be sizable administrative problems. If these difficulties can be overcome, this plan should be reconsidered. Until such time as this appears possible, however, I believe the interests of our wheat producers can be best protected through flexible-price supports, incorporating the set-aside provisions, as now outlined in the committee print.

Whatever the program this Congress agrees upon, it should be based over the long pull on abundant production rather than scarcity. Ours is a growing and expanding economy. Our economy of the future will not be static. It will be one of abundance—well-balanced abundance—not scarcity. We need a dynamic agriculture to keep pace with our national development.

The accompanying chart is of interest in this connection. It shows that our total cropland has increased very little between 1910, when we were a nation of 92.5 million people, and today, when our population is near the 162-million mark. Census projections indicate that there will be more than 200 million Americans by 1975 and we shall have to feed them from approximately the same number of acres in cultivation now.

Because of the record-breaking surpluses of a few commodities which have been built up during recent years, we are going to need some production controls, even under the program recommended by the President. With the set-aside provisions, the increased outlets, and the better balance which flexible price supports will provide both at home and abroad, we can work toward full production more rapidly under this program than we can with an extension of the present one.

It is my firm belief that a further extension of rigid price supports at this time will jeopardize our entire farm program. We would face the prospect of heavy financial losses, and continued burdensome surpluses of some commodities.

The mounting total of CCC loans and inventories—limited though it is to a few commodities—could soon reach a point under continued rigid price supports where the entire structure would come crashing down of its own weight. Because there is so much in our present programs which is basically sound and deserves preservation, I sincerely hope this will not happen. Yet I cannot overlook the fact that if we do not heed the storm warnings now on the horizon, many of the positive gains in agricultural legislation may be swept away.

I am convinced that the program recommended by President Eisenhower will point our efforts in the direction we must take. It was not conceived as a quick cure for agriculture's ills. There is no such medicine. But it does offer real promise of starting the patient on the road to recovery.

It will work toward giving farmers more direct control over their own operations than would be possible with rigid supports. It will encourage better balanced production, through its flexible features. It will permit us to attack the surplus disposal problem with greater vigor. And, finally, it will insure a prosperous, stable agriculture over the long-term pull.

For the immediate future, the administration's proposal, with its set aside feature, calls for the highest level of supports on basic commodities ever provided in permanent farm legislation.

The charts inserted here indicate the level of price support which would be expected with anticipated yields, exports, and domestic utilization. As can be seen, tobacco and rice would be supported at 90 percent of parity during the 1955 and 1956 crop years. Corn would be supported at about 85 percent of parity for the 1955 crop and at about 87 percent the following year; peanuts at near 83 percent during both years.

For both wheat and cotton, the level of support would vary with the size of the set-asides. A 400-million bushel wheat set-aside would call for minimum supports at about 79 percent in 1955 and near 82 percent the following year. A set-aside of 500 million bushels would raise the level to about 84 percent the first year and near 87 percent in 1956. With a 3-million bale set-aside, the 1955 cotton crop would be supported at approximately 82 percent of parity, and the 1956 crop at 89 percent. A 4-million rule set-aside would mean a level of about 86 percent the first year and possibly 90 percent in 1956.

Attached to this statement as exhibit A is a tabulation which shows in detail how the five basic commodities would be affected by the House committee print provisions. Figures on tobacco are not included as the support level would remain at 90 percent under marketing quotas.

The high level of supports provided under the measure before you has given rise to this question: "Since the program recommended by the President would indicate supports at or near 90 percent of parity over the years, what objection can there be to making these supports mandatory at 90 percent?"

The answer, briefly, is this: The Agricultural Act of 1949 and other relevant legislation were written with a view toward maintaining supplies of basic commodities at levels which would call for price supports at or near 90 percent of parity. We have proposed no important changes in this, beyond suggesting increases in the normal carryover of wheat and cotton. If the administration's proposals are adopted, and if supplies are kept in line as the basic law contemplates, prices would be supported at or near 90 percent of parity under the loan program.

There are several unpredictable factors, however, which might create supplies in excess of the quantities contemplated.

The minimum acreage provisions for certain crops might be raised.

Acreage allotments and marketing quotas might not be invoked.

Yields might be exceptionally high.

Export markets might suddenly be diminished.

Domestic outlets might be curtailed.

If supplies piled up as a consequence of such circumstances, it is important that there be an opportunity for lowering the support price, to encourage consumption, to reduce the incentive for high production, and to encourage desirable shifts in the pattern of production. This is the reason why flexibility is desirable, even though it is contemplated that the support price would normally hold within the upper limits of the 75 to 90 percent range.

It seems to me that flexible supports serve to call constantly to farmers' attention the fact that supplies must be held in line with demand in order for price supports to remain at or near 90 percent of parity.

Now as you know, the act of 1949 will become effective next January 1, if new legislation is not enacted. Even without the revisions which are embodied in the bill before you, this is essentially a sound law. We could move forward with a workable farm program which I believe would be in the long-term interests of agriculture. Under the discretionary authority vested in the Secretary, if conditions specified in the law were found applicable, it would be possible to cushion the year-to-year variations in the level of price support in line with the President's recommendations for gradual changes.

In my own opinion, the act of 1949, as it stands today, is far better adapted to our current needs than an extension of basic crop price supports at 90 percent of parity.

The administration's recommendations also call for modernized parity for all commodities. Existing provisions, which in effect require the use of old parity for wheat, corn, cotton, and peanuts, should be allowed to expire, as now provided, on January 1, 1956. Preferential treatment gives these four commodities substantial advantages over other commodities, as follows:

Wheat: old parity is 33 cents per bushel above modernized parity.

Corn: old parity is 19 cents per bushel above modernized parity.

Cotton: old parity is 1.3 cents per pound above modernized parity.

Peanuts: old parity is 2.4 cents per pound above modernized parity.

Whatever program we operate under after 1954, the problem of diverted acres will almost certainly be with us for some time. Based on farmers' intentions to plant, barley acreage this year will be up 49 percent, grain sorghums up 28 percent, sugar beets up 19 percent, and flaxseed up 18 percent. Smaller increases are indicated for a variety of other products. Aside from the crops under acreage restrictions, only potatoes show a significant decrease in indicated acreage.

To meet this problem next year, we have requested an advance authorization of $250 million for the 1955 agricultural conservation program. This would represent an increase of $55 million over the preceding year, with the augmented funds to be made available concurrently with the announcement by the Department of a program limiting the use of diverted acreage.

Under the ACP program it is also possible to share the costs of soil conserving practices on acreage suitable for continuous cultivation and to help farmers make permanent land use adjustments on soil which is not well adapted to cultivated crops. Large-scale production of cash crops from diverted acres could compound our price-support problems in other commodities. We believe the use of ACP funds to help prevent this deserves a high priority.

Another problem which we may continue to face is the importation of competitive farm commodities, drawn to our shores by the magnet of price supports. As you know, this administration in recent months has acted to limit shipments of oats and rye into the United States.

In this connection, my attention was recently directed to an editorial appearing in the Toronto, Canada, Financial Post of April 17, 1954. It was captioned "Fine While It Lasted."

This editorial, commenting upon the United States imposed rye quota said, in part:

"The United States has a surplus of rye. The American price has been boosted away above world levels as a result of fantastically high Government support prices. While United States grown rye was going into storage, Canada, by cutting her support price a cent or two, has been supplying much of the regular market. Normally, Canada exports about 3 million bushels of rye annually to the United States. In the last 7 months alone, we have exported over 12 million.

"We did the same thing with potatoes a few years ago, and with a number of other farm products since. In reality Canadian producers were getting almost the full benefit of these official American support prices without contributing one cent as taxpayers to the huge subsidies charged to the United States Treasury. It was a fine thing while it lasted but it was a crazy sort of marketing just the same."

Were it not for the import quotas on such major products as wheat and cotton, our markets would have been flooded with these crops. But these quotas do not prevent other exporting nations from capturing the world markets out of which we have priced ourselves through high supports.

Whenever we move to restrict the importation of foreign farm commodities, we are charged with erecting barriers against world trade. Nevertheless, in the interest of our farmers, the protection of their price-support programs is essential. It was our own

Government policy, in the form of price supports, which made many of these importations economically feasible in the first place. Quotas should serve to restrict, insofar as practicable, those imports which are attracted to the United States by our price-support programs. The differential between United States and world prices for some commodities will continue to attract foreign farm products and will also prevent us from recapturing some lost markets abroad.

There is another important aspect of the Government's role in commerce both here and in world markets. When the Government is the largest owner of several important agricultural commodities—as it is today—our management and disposal of these products inevitably become entwined with both our national and our foreign policies.

A private grain firm which owned 10 million bushels of wheat might negotiate a sale or barter arrangement with a foreign importer on any terms which would be mutually agreeable. Let Government undertake such a transaction, however, and it may become an international incident which could involve charges of dumping, price cutting, and disruption of world trade.

While prior to this month it was costing us approximately half a million dollars each day just to store our Government holdings of food and fiber, that figure has risen to more than $700,000 per day with the takeover of 1953-crop wheat and small grains on May 1. This represents an annual storage bill of more than one-quarter of a billion dollars and it is likely to grow, rather than decrease, in the months ahead. Since I started to read this statement, not many minutes ago, American taxpayers have been charged with more than $15,000 for storage of CCC-owned commodities.

I believe this represents an extremely dangerous trend toward more government in business. If government is to be the largest owner of some major farm commodities, how long will it be before we are also the largest wholesalers and perhaps eventually the principal retailers?

I should like now to discuss the problems we face in administering price supports for dairy products. I shall discuss butter, though the situation is somewhat similar for cheese and for nonfat dry milk.

The Government now owns about 360 million pounds of butter, about one-third of a year's consumption, acquired while endeavoring to support the price. This butter is still in good condition, but the time is approaching when it must be moved in larger quantities. We are concerned about this heavy supply; we are even more concerned about the fact that our stocks are still growing.

We have adjusted the level of price support to 75 percent of parity. Preliminary reports which have come to us during this past month indicate that consumption has increased about 10 percent above last year. As the promotion program of the industry gets underway, we may realize a greater increase.

However, milk production will increase as a consequence of a number of factors. There is the momentum of the past; trends in a biological business like dairying cannot be reversed quickly. The abundant beef production of 1953 was a reflection of the favorable conditions of previous years; abundant milk production in 1954 may be largely explained in the same manner. The rate at which dairy cattle were culled was low during 1953 because of low beef prices. The supply of grain and forage has been abundant. Winter weather has been mild and better breeding yields its continuing effect.

An intensive campaign to cull dairy herds, and all out sales promotion will undoubtedly be of help. The dairy industry is expanding its programs of education and merchandising. This week, for example, four milk-dispensing machines are being installed in the Department of Agriculture. Strawberry-flavored milk and other new merchandising ideas are being developed. By vigorous promotion of the sale of whole milk the supply problems of butterfat and manufactured milk can be lessened.

Nevertheless, there is the strong possibility that we might, in the absence of any disposal program, have on hand, a year from now, approximately twice our current supply of butter. Even with relief and school-lunch distribution such as we have in prospect for this coming year, our stocks would still be expected to grow. As I said before, we are concerned about the 360 million pounds which we now own; we are even more concerned about the next 360 million pounds which we might acquire.

Our desire to launch a butter-disposal program is intense, and on several occasions during past months we have been hopeful about early announcement of such a program. But in each case, as we sought to launch this program, we were restrained by the complexities which we encountered, and by the fact that grave burdens would be placed on our market structure.

One of the first methods proposed was to give, or sell for 1 cent, a pound of Government butter with each pound of commercial butter purchased by the consumer. One version of this plan has been called the coupon method. The administrative awkwardness of this plan, and the time required to get it in motion, caused us to put it aside.

Another plan, the so-called average-price plan, would involve sale of Government butter to distributors at a very low price. Averaging the cost of butter from current production and butter from CCC, the trade could lower the selling price on print butter to consumer outlets. Using this plan and under what we consider optimistic assumptions, we would still increase CCC inventories about 75 million pounds during this marketing year. This omits from consideration such butter as could be moved through relief and school outlets, which are substantial. The volume of butter handled by CCC would increase sharply with this plan and it would cost us in excess of $100 million merely to retard the rate at which we would build up stocks. This is in addition to the capital loss involved in the sale of CCC butter. Finally, there are almost insurmountable problems in treating the trade equitably under this plan. Windfall profits would occur for some firms, and undue hardship for others.

There is another proposal, for which we do not now have authority. This is a plant-payment plan. Under this plan, the market price could be permitted to decline to a level at which CCC acquisition would be halted. We could dispose of present stocks over time through relief, school lunch, and foreign sales, but stocks would need to be rotated to maintain quality. CCC would make payments to manufacturing plants, equal to the difference between the prevailing market price and the price which would reflect the intended level of support to farmers. This plan was used during the war and was demonstrated to be administratively feasible. The cost would be comparable with the other plans if comparable disposal programs were undertaken and if the plans work as assumed. This route, like the others, has its particular hazards.

Under any of these disposal plans we would, in effect, not only give butter away but in addition we would be paying in the neighborhood of 50 to 75 cents a pound to get rid of it.

Efforts to halt the accumulation of dairy products, and to dispose of these stocks, will in all probability involve costs, over the next 12 months, of half a billion dollars or more. Decisions of far reaching importance are required. I therefore earnestly request this committee for counsel. We have sought to develop a satisfactory disposal plan within the framework of present law. There is grave doubt that this can be done. I ask you therefore to consider whether the law should be changed to permit other operations, as well as loans and purchases, in the support of dairy products.

In conclusion, I should like to touch upon the serious drought problem which we face in several States this year. I have already mentioned that while moisture conditions are generally favorable over most of the major producing areas, the situation remains critical in parts of six States. This region includes southwestern Kansas, southeastern Colorado, eastern New Mexico, extreme western Oklahoma, southwestern Nebraska, and parts of west Texas.

Here the heaviest damage has occurred on acreage which is largely unsuited for cultivation. Much of this land is sandy or of loose texture. Although it is productive in years of abundant rainfall, it is subject to serious wind erosion during protracted dry spells. Weather records show that year in and year out there be more dry years than wet ones in this area.

High wheat and cotton prices, stimulated by the demands of World War II encouraged the plowing up of much new land. High price supports, with the suspension of acreage allotments, have tended to keep many of these acres under cultivation during the last few years.

Altogether, we estimate that in the southern Great Plains more than 11 million acres of cropland and about 5 million acres of range land have been damaged by wind erosion this year. Winter wheat has either been blown out or smothered with drifting sand and silt. Sand dunes have formed on some cotton land. Ranges have been buried under wind-borne dust. Cattle have suffered from lack of feed and water.

To combat these immediate problems, we have undertaken an emergency drought aid program to assist farmers and ranchers. This includes:

1. Farmers Home Administration loans.
2. The sale of government-owned feed concentrates at below market prices.
3. Use of ACP funds for wind erosion control.
4. Recommendation for the use of $15 million in Federal disaster relief funds to encourage chiseling, listing, and cover crops on land subject to blowing.

While we are proud of the fact that we moved quickly to meet this crisis, the measures are largely temporary ones. For the most part, they do not go to the heart of the problem. Any permanent solution must include the retirement to grass of millions of acres unsuited to cultivation. It must include substantial changes in patterns of farm management. Altogether, we estimate that about 8 million acres should be returned to grass.

Man learns slowly in his struggles with nature. This is the fourth major drought period which has struck the southern Great Plains area since it was first settled in the 1880's. The prolonged droughts of 1890–95 and 1931–38 forced radical, though temporary, changes in land use.

The winds which stripped the topsoil from the plains also drove thousands of disillusioned and bankrupt farmers from the land. But when rains returned so did setttlers—many of them newcomers with new hopes and some of them just "suitcase" farmers who saw an opportunity to turn a fast dollar along with the sod.

Many of them took a quick profit and left the problems of erosion and land rehabilitation to their neighbors and the State and Federal Governments. The people who remained are suffering the same heartaches and hardships which forced so many of the earlier settlers from this land.

The story of three Dust Bowl counties—Baca and Kiowa in Colorado and Stanton in Kansas—is more or less typical of what has happened in this area. Attached to this statement as exhibit B is a tabulation which shows the recent history of these counties with respect to wheat acreage.

Both Baca and Stanton Counties went through a big plowup during the early 1930's. Came the drought and much of this acreage was either abandoned or returned to grass. There was no such early plowup in Kiowa County, however. That came later.

The outbreak of World War II and the return of substantial rainfall to these counties came almost coincidentally. From 1939 to 1947, Baca County's seeded wheat acreage jumped from 63,000 to 360,000. The average cash return from the wheat crop skyrocketed from $1.92 to $48.17 per acre between those same years.

During this same period Stanton County went from 120,000 to 210,000 seeded acres. Returns per acre went from $1.86 to $57.98.

Kiowa County, which had resisted the plowup through the early thirties, showed the most amazing increases of all in wheat acreage. From 1939 to 1944, wheat acreage went from 5,000 to 8,000. But by 1947 there were 105,000 acres and by 1952 there were 365,000 acres planted to this 1 crop. The cash return per acre also increased enormously, as in the two other counties.

From a purely speculative standpoint, this plowup represented one of the great bonanzas of all time for some people. During any one of several years in the 1940's the cash return per acre amounted to far more than the value of the land.

In fairness, it must be said that the plowup was induced by high market prices and the exhortation of Government for more wheat production. Wheat produced on these acres saved untold lives abroad and helped the cause of freedom in Western Europe. While these gains largely offset the difficulties which now face us, we must nevertheless face up to the problems as they are.

It seems to me that we have a clear obligation to our descendants, if not to ourselves, to preserve through wise use the soil which is one of our greatest God-given resources. High support prices, continued beyond the time when increased production is needed, serve to retard adjustments to wise land use. I question that we can longer afford to provide incentives in the way of high price supports for the production of crops in excess of needs on land unsuited for continued cultivation.

The time has come when we must give more consideration to long-range planning. We have been dealing too much with symptoms and too little with causes. I am convinced that a program which is pointed toward tomorrow's needs will mean a more stable and prosperous agriculture. I believe the farm-program recommendations of President Eisenhower offer the best hope of achieving such a goal.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to thank you and the members of this committee for this opportunity. With the assistance of the members of my staff who are present, I shall be glad to answer as best I can any questions which you may have.

EXHIBIT A

Wheat: Estimated normal supply, total supply, quota level, allotment objective, and price-support level, assuming certain legislative revisions (House committee print of Mar. 9, 1954) including set-aside as shown

[Quantities are in million bushels] [1] [2]

Normal supply (assumed the same for all years):

1. Domestic consumption and exports	900
2. Carryover allowance (20 percent of 1)	180
3. Normal supply (1+2)	1,080
4. Marketing quota point (110 percent of 3)	1,188

Normal supply (assumed the same for all years)—Continued

5. Acreage allotment objective (item 3)	1,080
6. Supply for minimum support at—	
90-percent parity (1.02×3)	1,102
75-percent parity (1.3×3)	1,404

	Marketing year				
	1954-55	Set-aside of 400 million bushels		Set-aside of 500 million bushels	
		1955-56	1956-57	1955-56	1956-57
Total supply:					
7. Allotment (million acres)	62.0	55.0	55.0	55.0	55.0
8. Total carryover July 1	875	899	827	899	827
9. Assumed set-aside	0	400	400	500	500
10. Carryover for price-support purposes	875	499	427	399	327
11. Production [3]	901	825	825	825	825
12. Imports	3	3	3	3	3
13. Total supply for price-support purposes	1,779	1,327	1,255	1,227	1,155
14. Total supply for marketing quota and allotment purposes	1,779	1,727	1,755	1,727	1,655
15. Disappearance	880	900		900	
Minimum support level:					
16. Supply percentage (13÷3)		122.9	116.2	113.6	106.9
17. Minimum support level (percent of parity)	[4] 90	79	82	84	87
18. Effective parity price, basis Mar. 15, 1954 (dollars per bushel)	2.49	2.49	[5] 2.37	2.49	[5] 2.37
19. Minimum support price (dollars per bushel)	2.24	1.97	1.94	2.09	2.06
20. Marketing quota following year? (Compare items 4 and 14.)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

[1] Major revisions: Carryover allowance of 20 percent (now 15) of domestic disappearance and exports in computing normal supply. A marketing quota would be proclaimed when the total supply exceeded the normal supply by more than 10 percent. The allotment objective is normal supply. Set-aside from 400 to 500 million bushels. Quantity set-aside to be excluded from carryover computation for price-support purposes. Transitional parity provision effective Jan. 1, 1956.

[2] Assumes normal yields and compliance with quotas.

[3] 1954 crop based on "Prospective Plantings for 1954" and Apr. 1, 1954, Crop Report. 1955 and 1956 crops assume production on 55,000,000 planted acres at an average yield of 15 bushels per planted acre.

[4] 90-percent support required by law.

[5] Transitional parity.

Cotton upland: Estimated normal supply, total supply, quota level, allotment objective, and price-support level, assuming certain legislative revisions (House committee print, Mar. 9, 1954) including set-aside as shown

[Quantities are in million bales] [1] [2]

Normal supply (assumed the same for all years):	
1. Domestic consumption and exports	12.0
2. Carryover allowance (20 percent of item 1)	2.4
3. Normal supply (also allotment objective) (1+2)	14.4
4. Marketing quota point (110 percent of 3)	15.8
Normal supply—*Continued*	
5. Supply for minimum support at—	
90-percent parity (1.02×3)	14.7
75-percent parity (1.3×3)	18.7

	Marketing year				
	1954-55	Set-aside of 3 million bales		Set-aside of 4 million bales	
		1955-56	1956-57	1955-56	1956-57
Total supply:					
6. Allotment (million acres) [3]	21.4	18.2	17.3	18.2	17.3
7. Total carryover on Aug. 1	[4] 9.6	9.2	7.8	9.2	7.8
8. Assumed set-aside	0	3.0	3.0	4.0	4.0
9. Carryover for price-support purposes	9.6	6.2	4.8	5.2	3.8
10. Production [2]	11.5	10.5	10.0	10.5	10.0
11. Imports	.1	.1	.1	.1	.1
12. Total supply for price-support purposes	21.2	16.8	14.9	15.8	13.9
13. Total supply for marketing quota and allotment purposes	21.2	19.8	17.9	19.8	17.9
14. Disappearance	12.0	12.0	----------	12.0	----------
Minimum support level:					
15. Supply percentage (12÷3)	----------	116.7	103.5	109.7	[5] 96.5
16. Minimum support level (percent of parity)	[5] 90	82	89	86	90
17. Effective parity price, basis Mar. 15, 1954 (cents per pound)	34.97	34.97	[6] 33.65	34.97	[6] 33.65
18. Minimum support price (16×17) (cents per pound)	31.47	28.68	29.95	30.07	30.28
19. Marketing quota following year? (Compare items 3 and 13.)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

[1] Major revisions: Carryover allowance of 20 percent (now 30) of domestic disappearance and exports in computing normal supply. A marketing quota would be proclaimed when the total supply exceeded the normal supply by more than 10 percent. The supply percent support price scale would start at "not more than 102 percent" (now 108) for minimum support at 90 percent of parity, with support to vary 1 point for every 2 points variation in total supply. Set aside from 3 million to 4 million bales, such quantity to be excluded from carryover computation for price support purposes. Revises the minimum national marketing quota (see [3]). Modernized parity to become effective Jan. 1, 1956.

[2] Assumes normal yields and compliance with quotas.

[3] Revision: The larger of the equivalent of 10 million bales, or 85 percent of the previous year's acreage allotment (or 80 percent of July 1 acreage if no allotment in effect) but not less than that acreage required to assure a normal supply.

[4] Published figure. Recent information indicates carryover may be slightly higher.

[5] 90 percent support required by law. If supply percent table were in effect, support would be 75 percent.

[6] Modified parity.

Corn: Estimated normal supply, total supply, quota level, allotment objective, and price support level, assuming certain legislative revisions (House committee print of Mar. 9, 1954) [1]

[Quantities are in million bushels]

Normal supply (assumed the same for all years):	
1. Domestic consumption and exports	3,200
2. Carryover allowance (15 percent of 1)	480
3. Normal supply (1+2)	3,680
Normal supply—*Continued*	
4. Acreage allotment objective (same as 3)	3,680
5. Supply for minimum support at—	
90 percent parity (1.01×3)	3,717
75 percent parity (1.15×3)	4,232

	Marketing year		
	1954-55	1955-56	1956-57
Total supply:			
6. Allotment in commercial area (million acres) [2]	47.0	50.2	53.2
7. Assumed acreage in commercial area (million acres)	[3] 54.0	[4] 55.0	[4] 56.0
8. Assumed acreage in noncommercial area (million acres)	[5] 25.7	25.7	25.7
9. Assumed normal yield, commercial area (bushels per acre) [6]	44.3	44.3	44.3
10. Assumed yield, noncommercial area (bushels per acre) [7]	24.5	24.5	24.5
11. Carryover Oct. 1	900	823	691
12. Production commercial area (7×9)	2,392	[4] 2,437	[4] 2,481
13. Production noncommercial area (8×10)	630	630	630
14. Imports	1	1	1
15. Total supply (11+12+13+14)	3,923	[8] 3,891	[8] 3,803
16. Disappearance	3,100	3,200	----------
Minimum support level:			
17. Supply percentage (15÷3)	[9] 106.6	105.7	103.3
18. Minimum support level (percent of parity)	90	85	87
19. Effective parity price basis Mar. 15, 1954 (dollars per bushel)	1.81	1.81	[10] 1.72
20. Minimum support price (18×19) (dollars per bushel)	1.63	1.54	1.50

[1] Major revisions: Carryover allowance of 15 percent (now 10) of domestic consumption and exports in computing normal supply. No authority for marketing quotas. Support price to vary 1 percentage point for each 1 percentage point (now 2 percentage points) variation in supply. Transitional parity provision effective Jan. 1, 1956.

[2] Based upon acreage required, at normal yield per planted acre (1949-53 average), which would result in a normal supply, considering carryover, imports, and production in noncommercial area.

[3] Prospective Plantings for 1954, dated Mar. 19, 1954, indicates the acreage might be as much as 55.3 million acres. Adjustment to 54 million acres is made because farmers did not have their individual acreage allotments at the time their intention reports were made.

[4] Assumes overplanting by 1 million acres more than the previous year's acreage estimate; production is at normal yield.

[5] Based on calculations made from Prospective Plantings for 1954.

[6] United States 5-year average for commercial area, 1949-53, per planted acre.

[7] United States 5-year average for noncommercial area, 1949-53 adjusted, per planted acre.

[8] Each 100-million-bushel change in supply would affect minimum support level by about 3 percent of parity.

[9] Not applicable since 90-percent support required by law.

[10] Transitional parity.

Rice, rough: Estimated normal supply, total supply, quota level, allotment objective, and price support level, under present legislative provisions and provisions of S. 3052 and House committee print of Mar. 9, 1954 [1]

[Quantities are in thousand hundredweight]

Normal supply (assumed the same for all years):	
1. Domestic consumption and exports	[2] 51,250
2. Carryover allowance (10 percent of 1)	5,125
3. Normal supply (1+2)	56,375
4. Marketing quota point (110 percent of item 3)	62,012
Normal supply—*Continued*	
5. Acreage allotment objective (same as item 3)	56,375
6. Supply for minimum support at—	
90 percent parity (1.02×3)	57,502
75 percent parity (1.3×3)	73,288

	Marketing year		
	1954–55	1955–56	1956–57
Total supply:			
7. Allotment (thousand acres) [3]	2,312	2,132	2,173
8. Assumed acreage (thousand acres)	[4] 2,370	2,150	2,190
9. Assumed yield (pounds per acre) [5]	2,326	2,326	2,326
10. Carryover, Aug. 1	2,600	6,776	5,835
11. Production (8 x 9)	55,126	50,009	50,939
12. Imports	300	300	300
13. Total supply (10+11+12)	58,026	57,085	57,074
14. Disappearance	51,250	51,250	
Minimum support level:			
15. Supply percentage (13÷3)	[6] 102.9	101.3	101.2
16. Minimum support level (percent of parity)	90	90	90
17. Effective (modernized) parity price, basis Mar. 15, 1954 (dollars per hundredweight)	5.49	5.49	5.49
18. Minimum support price (16×17) (dollars per hundredweight)	4.94	4.94	4.94
19. Marketing quota for following year? (Compare items 13 and 14.)	No	No	No

[1] In accordance with the President's farm message, revisions would permit "mandatory price supports at 90 percent of parity * * * to expire after the 1954 crop." Assumes normal yields and compliance with allotments.

[2] 1953–54 estimated domestic consumption 25,900,000 hundredweight, and 1954–55 estimated exports of 25,350,000 hundredweight.

[3] Based upon acreage required, at normal yield per planted acre (1949–53 average, which would result in a normal supply considering carryover. Assumes that allotments would be in effect in 1955–56 and 1956–57.

[4] From Prospective Plantings for 1954, dated Mar. 19, 1954, adjusted upward by 10,000 acres to cover minor producing States.

[5] United States 5-year average, 1949–53, per planted acres; assumed the same each year.

[6] Not applicable since 90 percent support required by law; however, if supply-percent table were in effect (Agricultural Act of 1949) support still would have been at 90 percent, based upon estimates then available.

Peanuts: Estimated normal supply, total supply, quota and allotment level, and minimum price support level assuming legislative revisions proposed in House committee print of Mar. 9, 1954 [1] [2]

[Quantities are in thousand tons]

Normal supply (assumed the same for all years):	
1. Domestic consumption and exports	647
2. Carryover allowance (15 percent of item 1)	97
3. Normal supply (1+2)	744
4. Marketing quota point (quota applicable each year).	
Normal supply—*Continued*	
5. Quota in absence of minimum (also allotment objective) [3]	647
6. Supply for minimum support at—	
90 percent of parity (1.02×3)	759
75 percent of parity (1.3×3)	967

	Marketing year		
	1954–55	1955–56	1956–57
Total supply:			
7. Allotment (1,000 acres) [4]	1,610	1,610	1,610
8. Assumed acreage picked and threshed (1,000 acres) [5]	1,513	1,513	1,513
9. Assumed yield, picked and threshed (pounds/acre) [6]	927	927	927
10. Production (8×9÷2,000)	701	701	701
11. Carryover Aug. 1 [7]	148	148	148
12. Imports	1	1	1
13. Total supply (10+11+12)	850	850	850
14. Disappearance [7]	702	702	
Minimum support level:			
15. Supply percentage (13÷3)		114.2	114.2
16. Minimum support level (percent of parity)	[8] 90	[7] 83	[7] 83
17. Effective parity price Mar. 15, 1954 (cents per pound)	13.5	13.5	[9] 12.8
18. Minimum support price (cents per pound)	12.2	11.2	10.6
19. Marketing quota following year? [10]	Yes	Yes	Yes

[1] Major revisions: The supply percent support price scale would start at "not more than 102 percent" (now 108) for minimum support at 90 percent of parity, with support to vary 1 percentage point for every 2 points variation in total supply. Transitional parity provision effective Jan. 1, 1956.

[2] Assumes normal yields and compliance with quotas.

[3] Computed under section 358 of AAA of 1938, as amended. Assumed the same as item 1.

[4] Minimum acreage allotment.

[5] About 94 percent of allotment, based on previous years' experience.

[6] 1949–53 adjusted average yield.

[7] Assumes that Commodity Credit Corporation diverts sufficient quantities to domestic crushing or export to reduce carryover to 148,000 tons each year. It should be noted that peanuts which are surplus to edible requirements are largely diverted for crushing, usually at substantial loss to CCC. Were larger carryovers feasible, any such surpluses would lower minimum support levels from those indicated. For example, if there were no diversion by CCC the minimum support levels could drop as low as 80 and 76 percent of parity, respectively, for 1955 and 1956.

[8] 90 percent support required by law.

[9] Transitional parity.

[10] Quota in effect each year, by law.

EXHIBIT B.—*Trends in wheat acreage, yield, and value per acre, Baca and Kiowa Counties, Colo., and Stanton County, Kans., 1929–53*

Year	Baca County, Colo.				Kiowa County, Colo.				Stanton County, Kans.			
	Wheat seeded	Yield on seeded acreage	State average price	Value per acre	Wheat seeded	Yield on seeded acreage	State average price	Value per acre	Wheat seeded	Yield on seeded acreage	Average price [1]	Value per acre
	Thousand acres	*Bushels*	*Dollars*	*Dollars*	*Thousand acres*	*Bushels*	*Dollars*	*Dollars*	*Thousand acres*	*Bushels*	*Dollars*	*Dollars*
1929	120	9.2	0.97	8.92	8	7.5	0.97	7.28	112	13.4	0.97	13.00
1930	204	6.8	.61	4.15	6	7.3	.61	4.45	195	9.8	.61	5.98
1931	246	14.5	.33	4.78	17	11.4	.33	3.76	247	18.8	.33	6.20
1932	355	4.2	.37	1.55	16	1.7	.37	.63	250	10.1	.37	3.74
1933	228	.6	.65	.39	10	.5	.65	.32	248	1.3	.65	.84
1934	236	.3	.84	.25	21	.6	.84	.50	243	2.4	.84	2.02
1935	110	.05	.90	.04	6	.7	.90	.63	230	.1	.90	.09
1936	100	.02	1.00	.02	11	.8	1.00	.80	220	.8	1.00	.80
1937	113	.1	.91	.09	4	.1	.91	.09	192	.1	.91	.09
1938	25	1.3	.49	.64	5	6.6	.49	3.23	104	2.0	.49	.98
1939	63	3.0	.64	1.92	5	2.2	.64	1.41	120	2.9	.64	1.86
1940	73	4.0	.62	2.48	4	3.9	.62	2.42	109	5.8	.62	3.60
1941	89	8.0	.89	7.12	5	4.3	.89	3.83	144	7.0	.89	6.23
1942	80	19.1	1.04	19.86	6	15.0	1.04	15.60	136	20.5	1.04	21.32
1943	90	11.1	1.29	14.32	9	17.6	1.29	22.70	134	17.5	1.29	22.58
1944	144	15.3	1.35	20.66	8	10.3	1.35	13.90	145	11.2	1.35	15.12
1945	141	14.3	1.41	20.16	21	8.8	1.41	12.41	161	31.0	1.41	43.71
1946	257	9.0	1.85	16.65	56	19.1	1.85	35.34	142	12.2	1.85	22.57
1947	360	21.6	2.23	48.17	105	20.0	2.23	44.60	210	26.0	2.23	57.98
1948	304	18.7	1.90	35.53	221	16.7	1.90	31.73	166	21.2	1.90	40.28
1949	350	17.1	1.87	31.98	268	8.8	1.87	16.46	198	14.7	1.87	27.49
1950	177	1.3	2.00	2.60	319	3.0	2.00	6.00	168	8.5	2.00	17.00
1951	236	2.7	2.11	5.70	331	5.0	2.11	10.55	181	15.1	2.11	31.86
1952 [2]	213	2.1	2.05	4.30	365	9.0	2.05	18.45	202	18.6	2.05	38.13
1953 [2]	--------	(3)	2.00	(3)	--------	(3)	2.00	(3)	193	7.1	2.00	14.20

[1] Average price for Colorado is used for comparative purposes.
[2] Preliminary.
[3] Not available.

The McCarthy Investigation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 5, 1954

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Who Are the Conspirators?" written by Bruce Braswell, and published in the Berryville (Ark.) Star-Progress of April 22, 1954. I think the article is extremely well written and is a reasonable treatment of a difficult subject. I recommend it to the attention of my colleagues.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHO ARE THE CONSPIRATORS?

(By Bruce Braswell)

A remark one hears all too often these days is "JOE's doing a good job, though I don't agree with his methods." Many Americans support the antidemocratic methods of Senator JOSEPH MCCARTHY in hopes that he will save democracy from communism. How has it come that we seem to have lost faith in the ability of a democratic society to preserve itself by democratic means?

We have many tragic examples of good causes that men have tried to defend by methods contradictory to those causes. Once all means are allowed, the end disintegrates.

Think of the years 1932–33. We in this country were struggling with unemployment and industrial stagnation. So were other countries. We eventually solved our problems by democratic means. Not so with some other countries.

In Germany there were many who said "Adolf is doing a good job, though I don't agree with his methods." Hitler found the great source of his strength not in the depression or the unjust clauses of the Treaty of Versailles, but rather in the fear of communism among the German people. Hitler and Goebbels and the rest took this fear, magnified it a hundredfold and posed as saviours of the German people from communism. When their fear campaign showed signs of wearing out, they burned down the legislative buildings and blamed it on the Communists. This justified all of their actions thereafter in imprisoning Communists, Socialists, liberals, and anyone who dared oppose the "saviours" of Germany.

What is Senator MCCARTHY doing if he is not aping Hitler? MCCARTHY, in the same spirit of opportunism as Hitler, has seized on a very natural apprehension of the American people and has magnified it beyond all reasonable proportions. MCCARTHY seems to have decided if there isn't a real Communist conspiracy, it is necessary for him to create the appearance of one in order for him to have the honor of crushing it.

There are, of course, Soviet agents at work in this country, just as we presume there are American agents in the Soviet Union. This is no new situation. Spies have a long, if not honorable, history in all governments. There were English spies in France, and French spies in Germany and so on before the First World War or the Napoleonic Wars. Then, as now, they were trying to steal military secrets and produce unrest among the people. The proper body to handle enemy agents is the FBI, the counterespionage service, and the courts. Once our agents have caught these individuals, they should be tried and convicted in our normal courts, which are quite competent to handle them. How many spies has MCCARTHY caught? None.

What about the Communists and fellow travelers? Here's where MCCARTHY claims to be doing his job of exposing them. Should it be a crime to be a Communist? Even to raise this question shows that we have regressed to the days of the Inquisition when men were tried and burned for merely their belief. Once upon a time it was considered a right of an American to hold any belief he so desired, though if he put a belief into action that harmed other people then he would be liable for the ordinary punishments. As an absurb example, you have every right to believe that all people who eat beans should be executed. Nobody will prosecute you for that. However, if you start to carry out that or any other belief that is contrary to the best interest of society, you will be punished. By this reasoning it must not be a crime to be a Communist. Though it may very well be one to act as a Communist believes.

If we will send a man to prison for 20 years on being proved in a court of belonging to the Communist Party, as one of our neighboring States seems prepared to do, what will keep us some day from sending a man to prison for belonging to the Democratic Party if it should be so decided? Haven't we already heard the charge of traitor applied to the Democratic Party? Once antidemocratic methods are admitted, even with good intentions, democratic values are destroyed.

The real conspirators in America today are the opportunists like MCCARTHY who abuse the real concern of Americans in order to promote their own selfish interests. Thus far we have sat by and let MCCARTHY turn his subcommittee into an extraordinary court which needs no grand jury to decide whether a case has been made out against the accused but simply subpenaes him. A court that forces a man to prove himself innocent and assumes him guilty until he does so. A court that limits the right of cross-examining witness to the prosecuting counsel and not the defense counsel. A court that allows as evidence any groundless suspicion, lie, or rumor that may be cast against the accused. A court that does not state its sentence, nor allows a man to clear him name, but sends him away to find that he has lost his job and good name just because he has been up before the investigating committee.

Our regular courts are the courts to handle these as other cases. If there is evidence that a man has violated the law, then present it to the grand jury and let it decide whether there is enough evidence for a trial. If there is, then try him in a democratic courtroom.

There is no need for MCCARTHY or his fellow conspirators. He is supposedly a legislator. Let him stick to legislation, and leave the rest to our capable law-enforcement officers and courts.

Newspaper Interests in Television Stations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE

OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 5, 1954

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, the increasing concentration of control over the mediums of communication and information in the Nation gives me very serious concern. Any threat of monopoly in communications is a far more serious matter than mere economic monopoly in other fields, important as the latter is. No other function in our society is so essential to the preservation of our institutions as free and untrammelled communication of information and opinion. This is a matter which now is before the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly Legislation of the Senate Judiciary Committee. In this connection I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a tabulation from the April 1954 issue of the publication Television Age, showing newspaper interests in television stations. Newspapers or their owners have interests in almost one-third of all television stations on the air. The survey by Television Age shows that newspaper interests own a majority or minority share in 112 outlets and in 29 companies with certificates pending.

There being no objection, the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Newspaper interests in television stations

Station	Owner	Affiliation
KRBC-TV, Abilene, Tex	Eva May Hanks (64 percent)	Abilene Reporter News and 4 other Texas dailies.
WAKR-TV, Akron	Akron Beacon-Journal (45 percent)	Knight newspapers. Certificates pending for WIND-TV Chicago. Applicant for Miami, Fla. (channel 7) with Cox.
WAIM-TV, Anderson, S. C	Anderson Independent and Mail	
KFDA-TV, Amarillo	C. C. Woodson (25 percent)	5 Texas and Oklahoma dailies.
KGNC-TV, Amarillo	Amarillo Globe-Time and News	Interlocking ownership with Lubbock Avalanche and Journal, holder of certificate pending KFYO-TV Lubbock.
WICA-TV, Ashtabula	D. C. and Olive Rowley	Ashtabula Star-Beacon and 3 other Ohio dailies.
WSB-TV, Atlanta	Atlanta Constitution and Journal	James M. Cox newspapers. Applicant for Miami, Fla. (channel 7) with Knight. See WHIO-TV, Dayton.
KBAK-TV, Bakersfield	San Francisco Chronicle (49 percent)	See KSBW-TV, Salinas; KRON-TV, San Francisco.
WBAL-TV, Baltimore	Baltimore News-Post	Hearst newspapers. Applicant for Forest Hills, Pa. (channel 4), Whitefish Bay, Wis. (channel 6).
WMAR-TV, Baltimore	Baltimore Sun	
WBKZ-TV, Battle Creek	John L. Booth and family	Booth newspapers: 8 Michigan dailies. Certificates pending WSBM-TV, Saginaw.
WLEV-TV, Bethlehem	J. F. and J. H. Steinman	Lancaster New Era and Intelligencer Journal. See WDEL-TV, Wilmington; WGAL-TV, Lancaster.
WABT, Birmingham	Birmingham News	
WBEN-TV, Buffalo	Buffalo News	
KCRI-TV, Cedar Rapids	Cedar Rapids Gazette (30 percent)	
WCIA, Champaign, Ill	Helen Stevick (10 percent), Marajen Dyess (10 percent).	Champaign News-Gazette.
KFBC-TV, Cheyenne	Cheyenne Newspapers, Inc. (38.8 percent)	Wyoming State Tribune and Eagle.
WGN-TV, Chicago	Chicago Tribune	Interlocking ownership with New York News (WPIX).
WKRC-TV, Cincinnati	Cincinnati Times-Star (50 percent)	See WTVN, Columbus.
WCPO-TV, Cincinnati	Cincinnati Post	Scripps-Howard; applicant for Knoxville (channel 10), Spokane (channel 2). See WMCT, Memphis.
WEWS, Cleveland	Cleveland Press	Scripps-Howard. See above.
WRBL-TV, Columbus, Ga	Columbus Enquirer (51 percent)	
WBNS-TV, Columbus, Ohio	Columbus Dispatch	
WTVN, Columbus, Ohio	Cincinnati Times-Star Co	See WKRC-TV, Cincinnati.
KRLD-TV, Dallas	Dallas Times-Herald	
WFAA-TV, Dallas	Dallas News	
WDAN-TV, Danville, Ill	Danville Commercial-News	The Gannett newspapers. See WECT-TV, Elmira; WHEC-TV, Rochester. Certificates pending for WGTH-TV, Hartford.
WHIO-TV, Dayton	Dayton News and Journal-Herald	James M. Cox newspapers. See WSB-TV, Atlanta.
KGTV, Des Moines	Evening Telegram Co. (30 percent)	Morgan Murphy newspapers: Superior (Wis.) Telegram. See WEAU-TV, Eau Claire, KVOL-TV, Lafayette.
WWJ-TV, Detroit	Detroit News	
WGLV, Easton	Easton Express	
WEAU-TV, Eau Claire	Eau Claire Press Co. (24½ percent), Morgan Murphy (14½ percent).	Eau Claire Leader and Telegram; Morgan Murphy newspapers: Superior Telegram, Lafayette (La.), Advertiser, and others. See KGTV, Des Moines; KVOL-TV, Lafayette. Applicant for Madison, Wis. (channel 3).
WECT-TV, Elmira	Corning Leader (51 percent), Elmira Advertiser, and Star-Gazette (49 percent).	The Gannett newspapers. See WDAN-TV, Danville; WHEC-TV, Rochester; WGTH-TV, Hartford.
KROD-TV, El Paso	El Paso Times	
WICU, Erie	Edward Lamb	Erie Dispatch. Certificates pending for WMAC-TV, Massillon. Applicant for Orlando, Fla. (channel 9), Toledo (channel 11).
WDAY-TV, Fargo	Fargo Forum (34 percent)	
WFTL-TV, Fort Lauderdale	Fort Lauderdale News (78.57 percent)	
KFSA-TV, Fort Smith, Ark	Donald W. and Edith R. Reynolds	Southwestern Publishing Co.: Fort Smith Southwest American and Times Record, also papers in Nevada, Oklahoma and Arkansas. Applicant for Henderson, Nev. (chapter 2).
WBAP-TV, Fort Worth	Fort Worth Star-Telegram	Carter Publications.
KMJ-TV, Fresno	McClatchy newspapers	Fresno Bee, Sacramento Bee and Modesto Bee. Applicant for Sacramento (chapter 10).
WFMY-TV, Greensboro, N. C	Greensboro News and Record	
WNCT, Greenville, N. C	Josh Horne (10 percent), Herbert Brauff (10 percent).	Rocky Mountain Telegram, Wilson Times.
WFBC-TV, Greenville, S. C	Greenville News and Piedmont (39 percent)	
KHQA-TV, Hannibal, Mo. (Quincy, Ill.)	Hannibal Courier-Post (13.98 percent)	Lee newspapers: Wisconsin, Iowa, Nebraska, Illinios. Certificates pending for KGLO-TV, Mason City, Iowa. Applicant for Madison, Wis. (chapter 3).
WHP-TV, Harrisburg, Pa	Telegraph Press (96.25 percent)	
WTPA, Harrisburg, Pa	Donald Newhouse	Harrisburg Patriot and News. See KOIN-TV, Portland; WSYR-TV, Syracuse.
KGMB-TV, Honolulu	Honolulu Star Bulletin (24.25 percent)	
KONA, Honolulu	Honolulu Advertiser (50 percent)	
KPRC-TV, Houston	Houston Post	
WSAZ-TV, Huntington, W. Va	Huntington Publishing Co. (89 percent)	Huntington Herald Dispatch and Advertiser.
KTVH-TV, Hutchinson-Wichita	J. P. and S. F. Harris (2.17 percent each)	Hutchinson News Herald and 4 other papers in Kansas and Iowa.
WJTV, Jackson, Miss	Jackson Clarion Ledger and News	
WJHP-TV, Jacksonville	John H. Perry Associates	Jacksonville Journal and other papers.
WMBR-TV, Jacksonville	Washington Post	See WTOP-TV, Washington.
WJAC-TV, Johnstown	Johnstown Tribune-Democrat	
WDAF-TV, Kansas City	Kansas City Star	
WGAL-TV, Lancaster	J. F. and J. H. Steinman	See WDEL-TV, Wilmington; WLEV-TV, Bethlehem.
KLAS-TV, Las Vegas	Herman Greenspun (5 percent)	Las Vegas Sun.
WLBW-TV, Lebanon	Lebanon News (36 percent)	
KCOP, Los Angeles	Copley Press	8 California and 4 Illinois papers.
KTTV, Los Angeles	Los Angeles Times	
WHAS-TV, Louisville	Louisville Courier-Journal	
WETV, Macon	Macon Telegraph and News	16 percent of radio station which part owns WETV.
KBES-TV, Medford, Oreg	Amos E. Voorhies (50 percent)	Grants Pass Courier.
WMCT, Memphis	Memphis Commercial Appeal	Scripps-Howard. See WCPO-TV, Cincinnati, WEWS, Cleveland.
WCOC-TV, Meridian	D. W. and Mrs. R. S. Gavin	Meridian Record and Clarke County Tribune, Quitman, Miss. Applicant for Jackson (channel 47).

Newspaper interests in television stations—Continued

Station	Owner	Affiliation
WTOK-TV, Meridian	James H. Skewes (11 percent)	Meridian Star.
WTMJ-TV, Milwaukee	Milwaukee Journal	
WCCO-TV, Minneapolis-St. Paul	Mid-Continent Radio-Television, Inc. (53 percent), owned by St. Paul Dispatch and Pioneer Press (50 percent) and Minnesota Tribune Co. (50 percent).	Ridder Publications: St. Paul Dispatch and 12 other papers in California, Washington, Minnesota, North and South Dakota and New York. See WDSM-TV, Superior.
WPIX, New York	New York News	See WGN-TV, Chicago.
WTAR-TV, Norfolk	Norfolk Virginian-Pilot	
WKY-TV, Oklahoma City	Oklahoma Publishing Co	Oklahoma City Oklahoman and Times.
WCAU-TV, Philadelphia	Philadelphia Bulletin	
WFIL-TV, Philadelphia	Philadelphia Inquirer	
KOAM-TV, Pittsburg, Kans	Joplin Globe Publishing Co., (option to buy 30 percent).	Joplin Globe & News-Herald.
WKJF-TV, Pittsburgh, Pa	Agnes J. Reeves Greer	Morgantown (W. Va.) Dominion News.
KOIN-TV, Portland, Oreg	Mitzi and S. I. Newhouse, Jr. (50 percent)	Portland Oregonian. See WTPA, Harrisburg; WSYR-TV, Syracuse.
WGEM-TV, Quincy, Ill	Quincy Herald-Whig (70.3 percent)	
WNAO-TV, Raleigh	Raleigh News and Observer (12.5 percent)	
WEEU-TV, Reading	Reading Eagle and Times (90 percent)	
KZTV, Reno	Southwestern Publishing Co. (50 percent), Donald W. Reynolds (50 percent).	Reynolds owns 75 percent of Southwestern. See KFSA-TV, Fort Smith.
WHEC-TV, Rochester	The Gannett Newspapers (85.72 percent)	Rochester Times-Union, and Democrat and Chronicle, and chain of New York papers. See WECT-TV, Elmira; WDAN-TV, Danville; WGTH-TV, Hartford.
WHBF-TV, Rock Island	Rock Island Argus (17.165 percent)	
KFEQ-TV, St. Joseph	St. Joseph News Press and Gazette (43 percent)	
KSD-TV, St. Louis	St. Louis Post-Dispatch	
KSTM-TV, St. Louis	East St. Louis (Ill.) Journal (10 percent)	
KSBW-TV, Salinas	San Francisco Chronicle (25 percent)	See KBAK-TV, Bakersfield; KRON-TV, San Francisco.
KFSD-TV, San Diego	Elliott L. Cushman	San Diego Shopping News.
KRON-TV, San Francisco	San Francisco Chronicle	See KSBW-TV, Salinas; KBAK-TV, Bakersfield.
WKAQ-TV, San Juan	El Mundo	
KVTV, Sioux City	Register & Tribune Co., Des Moines	Des Moines Register and Tribune, Minneapolis Star and Tribune, Look Magazine. Applicant for Des Moines (channel 8), Minneapolis-St. Paul (channel 9).
WSBT-TV, South Bend	South Bend Tribune	
KHQ-TV, Spokane	Spokane Chronicle	
KYTV, Springfield, Mo	Springfield Newspapers, Inc. (50 percent)	Springfield News, and Leader and Press; president Tams Bixby, Jr., and son own 70 percent of Muskogee (Okla.) Phoenix and Times-Democrat, applicant for Muskogee (channel 8).
WHYN-TV, Springfield-Holyoke	Holyoke Transcript (50 percent)	
KTVU, Stockton	Browen Industries (75 percent)	3 California dailies.
WDSM-TV, Superior	Northwest Publications, Inc. (51 percent)	Ridder Publications (69.4 percent). See WCCO-TV, Minneapolis.
WSYR-TV, Syracuse	S. I. Newhouse and family (99 percent)	Syracuse Post-Standard and Herald-Journal and 7 other papers in New York, New Jersey, and Oregon. See WTPA, Harrisburg; KOIN-TV, Portland.
KTNT-TV, Tacoma	Tacoma News-Tribune	
KCEN-TV, Temple, Tex	Temple Telegram	
KCMC-TV, Texarkana	Camden (Ark.) News	Associated with C. E. Palmer newspapers: Texarkana Gazette and News. Certificates pending for Hot Springs (channel 9).
WIBW-TV, Topeka	Capper Publications	Topeka Capital and others.
WMAL-TV, Washington	Washington Star	
WTOP-TV, Washington	Washington Post (55 percent)	See WMBR-TV, Jacksonville.
WTRF-TV, Wheeling	News Publishing Co. (34 percent), Albert V. Dix (22.6 percent), Gordon C. Dix (7.3 percent).	H. C. Ogden newspapers: Wheeling Intelligencer and News-Register, other West Virginia papers. Certificates pending for WBLK-TV, Clarksburg Dixes publish 6 Ohio dailies.
KEDD, Wichita	Wichita Beacon (5 percent)	
WILK-TV, Wilkes-Barre	Wyoming Valley Broadcasting Co	Stockholders own interest in DuBois (Pa.) Courier-Express and Butler (Pa.) Eagle.
WDEL-TV, Wilmington	J. F. and J. H. Steinman	See WLEV-TV, Bethlehem, WGAL-TV, Lancaster.
WSJS-TV, Winston Salem	Piedmont Publishing Co. (66.6 percent)	Winston-Salem Journal and Twin City Sentinel.
WFMJ-TV, Youngstown	Youngstown Vindicator (43.88 percent)	
WKBN-TV, Youngstown	Cleveland Plain Dealer (40.63 percent)	Certificates pending for WHK-TV, Cleveland.
WHIZ-TV, Zanesville	Zanesville Publishing Co. (60 percent)	Zanesville Times Recorder and Signal.
CERTIFICATES PENDING		
WALB-TV, Albany, Ga	Albany Herald	
WBRZ, Baton Rouge	D. L. and C. P. Manship, Jr., (45 percent)	Baton Rouge Advocate and State Times.
WBOS-TV, Boston	Basil Brewer (58.918 percent)	New Bedford Standard-Times. See WTEV, New Bedford.
WWNY-TV, Carthage, N. Y	Watertown Times	
WIND-TV, Chicago	Chicago News (27.7 percent)	Knight newspapers. See WAKR-TV, Akron.
WHFC-TV, Chicago	Richard W. and Rose M. Hoffman	4 suburban newspapers.
WBLK-TV, Clarksburg	News Publishing Co., Wheeling	H. C. Ogden newspapers. See WTRF-TV, Wheeling.
WHK-TV, Cleveland	Cleveland Plain Dealer	See WKBN-TV, Youngstown.
WCBI-TV, Columbus, Miss	Columbus Commercial Dispatch	
WJPB-TV, Fairmont, W. Va.[1]	J. Patrick Beacom	Mannington (W. Va.) Times.
KFBB-TV, Great Falls [1]	Fairmont Corp. (23.8 percent)	6 Montana dailies.
WGTH-TV, Hartford	Hartford Times (option for 45 percent)	The Gannett newspapers. See WHEC-TV, Rochester, WECT-TV, Elmira, WDAN-TV, Danville.
KTVR, Hot Springs	Southern Newspapers, Inc	C. E. Palmer newspapers (20.5 percent). See KCMC-TV, Texarkana. Alden P. Mooney (31.5 percent), Hot Springs Sentinel Record and New Era. News Times Publishing Co. (3 percent), El Dorado News and Times.
WDXI-TV, Jackson, Tenn	Aaron B. Robinson (57.33 percent)	Corinthian.
KVOL-TV, Lafayette, La	Lafayette Advertiser (50 percent)	Morgan Murphy Newspapers. See WEAU-TV, Eau Claire; KGTV, Des Moines
KFYO-TV, Lubbock	Globe-News Publishing Co	See KGNC-TV, Amarillo.
KGLO-TV, Mason City, Iowa	Mason City Globe-Gazette	Minority stockholder Lee Loomis has interest in KHQA-TV, Hannibal, Mo.
WMAC-TV, Massillon	Edward Lamb	See WICU, Erie.
WTEV, New Bedford	Basil Brewer	New Bedford Standard-Times. See WBOS-TV, Boston.
WDHN New Brunswick	Home News Publishing Co. (76 percent)	New Brunswick Home News, Metuchen Reporter, Linden Observer.
WIBG-TV, Philadelphia	Philadelphia News (10 percent)	
WBEC-TV, Pittsfield	Pittsfield Berkshire Eagle	
KISJ, Pocatello, Idaho	Western Publishing Co	Holds stock in Oregon, Utah, and Montana newspapers.
WGAN-TV, Portland, Maine	Guy P. Gannett newspapers	4 Maine dailies.
WSBM-TV, Saginaw	John L. Booth (84.3 percent)	See WBKZ-TV, Battle Creek.
KUTV, Salt Lake City	Salt Lake City Tribune (50 percent)	
KVAN-TV, Vancouver, Wash	Sheldon F. Sackett (75 percent)	Coos Bay (Oreg.) Times. Applicant for Oakland (channel 2).
WRAK-TV, Williamsport, Pa	Williamsport Gazette and Bulletin (67 percent)	

---

[1] Scheduled to go on the air by Apr. 1.

Nixon's Reply to Loaded Question Was Only Honest One Possible

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES RAPER JONAS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1954

Mr. JONAS of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Charlotte Observer, Charlotte, N. C., of April 22, 1954:

Nixon's Reply to Loaded Question Was Only Honest One Possible

Vice President Nixon's answer to a question about sending American troops to Indochina if the French withdraw should be interpreted in view of the background discussion that led up to the question. When this background is thoroughly understood, it seems to us that Mr. Nixon gave his questioner the only possible answer. His alternative was to refuse to answer.

The Vice President had just delivered an extremely able explanation of the situation in Southeast Asia, based on his own observations there and his talks with both heads of state and ordinary people. He displayed an extraordinary grasp of the situation and made a lucid exposition of how the fall of Indochina would pose an immediate threat to the whole free world and might force the United States to abandon its whole strategic position in the west Pacific.

Mr. Nixon then submitted himself to questions from his audience, the American Society of Newspaper Editors, with the clear understanding that both the speech and his answers to the questions would be off the record.

One editor then asked him—as nearly as we can remember the words—this: "If the French should withdraw entirely from Indochina, would the United States send American troops to hold it?"

As anyone can see, that was a loaded question. Franklin D. Roosevelt would have called it an "iffy" question and would have ducked it by refusing to give an "iffy" answer. But Nixon did not duck it. Before he replied he made it clear that it was a hypothetical question, and that any answer would have to be hypothetical. He said he did not believe the French would withdraw from Indochina, and that, therefore, the decision on sending American troops probably would never have to be made.

But, he continued, if the French withdrew, if there is no other way to keep Indochina out of Communist hands, the stakes of the free world are so great that as a last resort we would have no other choice but to hold it with American troops.

When all the "ifs" are considered, the Vice President's answer was not so sensational as it has been made to appear. He would probably not have answered the question if the society had not agreed in advance that all he said at the luncheon was to be off the record. As he left the hall, however, he was surrounded by the working reporters, who pleaded to be allowed to quote his answer. Finally he said they might quote it only if they attributed it to an "administration spokesman" and not to him personally.

Of course, it had to come out. The answer was too important to be kept anonymous. We believe it well that it did come out, because we have in Indochina a situation that has got to be faced. Mr. Nixon has good reasons to believe that the French will not withdraw; but if they do, nobody else can hold Indochina but the United States.

The uneasiness caused by his answer, we believe, is due to the fear of the American people of being drawn into another Korea-like war, in which fainthearted allies will hold us back and keep us from winning. This newspaper is as much opposed as anybody to that kind of bogged-down war. If we have to go in, let it be emphatically understood that we are going to win regardless of kibitzers and that we intend to leave the associated states of Indochina free and independent nations.

A war on any other basis in Indochina would be unthinkable.

The Romance of Remembering

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. HART

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1954

Mr. HART. Mr. Speaker, there has just come to my attention a brief but beautiful and reverent address delivered by my friend George E. Stringfellow, imperial oriental guide, A. A. O. N. M. S., before the Paterson Valley Ancient Accepted Scottish Rite of Freemasonary, Northern Masonic Jurisdiction of the United States, at Paterson, N. J., on April 15, 1954.

George E. Stringfellow is an eminent citizen of our country. As vice president of Thomas A. Edison, Inc., he is one of its outstanding businessmen. He was long associated with Mr. Edison before the latter's death and has since maintained his connection in a directive capacity with the great organization which bears his honored name.

Large as his achievements loom in the industrial life of America, Mr. Stringfellow is known most favorably because of his deep and Christian-like interest in practical, measured relief assistance to the sick, the poor, and underprivileged. He is known far and wide in New Jersey for his philanthropic endeavors and accomplishments. He is one of the founders of the New Jersey division of the American Cancer Society, of which he was president for the first 3 years of its existence. He is still an active and productive worker for the society, being a member of its board of directors, its executive committee, and chairman of its finance committee. He is also a member of the board of directors of the parent corporation, the American Cancer Society, and vice chairman of its executive committee.

As though the time and attention devoted to these loving labors were not enough to absorb the energies of this fine American, he has equal enthusiasm in his generous nature for another splendid charitable interest, the Shriners' hospitals for crippled children. I am not a member of the Shrine. But everyone conversant with the currents of American life is acquainted in some measure with the untold relief and happy results these institutions of skillful care have brought to the pain-racked and broken bodies of so many of our children. In North America and Hawaii, the Shriners maintain 17 such Temples of Mercy, in which during the last quarter century more than 300,000 crippled children have been treated, nearly all of them helped and very many of them cured. No one could be more zealous in behalf of these hospitals than Mr. Stringfellow.

The speech I include herewith is illustrative of Mr. Stringfellow's nobility of character and of his adherence to the divine principle of love of neighbor which he exemplifies in his life:

The Romance of Remembering

I am highly honored to be invited to speak to you tonight, when we commemorate that other memorable Thursday when Christ and His Disciples were gathered at the Last Supper.

"This do in remembrance of me," said Christ as He offered the bread and the wine to those who were gathered around him. Through 2,000 years of Christian history we remember the sacrifice that is symbolized by that simple ceremony.

We are here to remember God and to pay tribute to our brethren who have departed from our midst. With ceremony and mysticism we have emphasized their importance and idealized the meaning of this occasion.

Memory by nature is romantic. Unpleasant and sorrowful experiences have a way of being softened by the passage of time while the happy occurrences are enhanced and stand out clearly in our thoughts. Time seems to give a glamor to past events, whether they are within our own experience or in ancient history.

We remember Egypt for its wealth and its kings. The pyramids are a symbol of a once fabulous civilization.

We remember ancient Greece as devoted to wisdom and beauty. The temples and the statues are left to remind us that it too was once a great civilization.

We remember Rome for its leaders and its lawmakers who contributed much to the art of government. But its glory too is gone. There remains only the ruins to give clue to its once far-reaching influence.

Those are the things we remember—the romance and the beauty.

Those civilizations had potentialities for greatness and indestructibility. They attained great world influence. But they reached only a certain peak in their glory and then crumbled because of despotism, slavery, greed and corruption.

Our civilization, and I speak now of our country, has potentialities for lasting greatness as evidenced by its rapid development into a powerful leader among the nations of the world. Remembering the fate of past civilizations, we might ask ourselves, will our Nation also collapse after reaching a level beyond which it cannot rise? Will it, in the romantic imaginings of future generations, be only a memory of machines, speed and production?

I believe that our Nation, because it was built on a spiritual foundation, will endure and will fulfill its responsibility of leadership.

We must ever remember that ours is a Christian country, founded on Christian traditions. We must remember that the men and women who came to our shores in search of religious and economic freedom were bound together by a spiritual thread that no hardship could sever. That thread has been the warp on which the whole pattern of our Nation was built.

It was that faith in God which gave our forefathers, many of whom were Masons, the courage to fight for independence and to win in spite of overwhelming odds.

From that faith came the almost divine wisdom that gave us our Constitution which for 160 years has assured us the right of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

That faith was the light which guided the actions of our leaders during the dark days of the Civil War.

Today we face the threat of communism. It is an ideology which denies God, enslaves man, creates hate, and brings about devastation in the human soul.

The Communists recognize the power of the belief in God and assert that it must be exterminated before communism can be safe.

By their own admission we have in our possession a spiritual weapon which can be used against their materialistic onslaught.

As Christians and as Masons we believe in the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man. This is a phrase we hear often, particularly in the rituals of our order. Its simplest interpretation can be made in the words of Christ when He said, during the Last Supper, "A new comandment I give unto you, that ye love one another."

This is what gives significance to Maundy Thursday. This is why we are here tonight—to remember and to heed with renewed spirit the commandment to love one another.

If we should practice that admonition, it might well be the solution to the ills and problems of the modern world. That may sound visionary, but it isn't wholly impossible. Not if we follow Christ's teachings and His example.

His love inspired love in those around Him. There was little reason for a strict orthodox Jew like James to associate with a despised collector like Matthew. Yet, when they became friends of Jesus, they inevitably became friends of one another.

A rough fisherman like Peter had little in common with a refined scholar like Nathaniel, but they were drawn together by their mutual friendship with Jesus. And so it was that the love one showed for another touched someone else and like the ripples on the water, reached unseen shores as a result of one point of contact.

"To love one another" is the motivating spirit of our brotherhood. Our example could very well be the pebble that could start the ripple of friendship spreading from among ourselves to our neighbors, our business associates, our Government officials, and touch foreign shores through the leaders of other nations.

If the spirit of brotherhood were to be accepted and practiced in the affairs of individuals and of nations, the unrest which now disturbs the world would disappear.

It would create tolerance and promote better understanding. It would protect the weak from the strong. It would eliminate selfishness and greed.

We would have, as a result, peace and good will in our individual lives and peace and good will in national and international affairs. The world would be a better place in which to live.

Let us remember that God embraces the universe and love is the substance out of which the world and man were created. Let us remember that "God is love."

Tangible Tax Relief

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1954

Mr. **BOLAND**. Mr. Speaker, the Springfield (Mass.) Daily News carried an editorial in its issue of May 3, 1954, that clearly underscores a justification for increasing the personal income-tax exemption from $600 to $800.

A few weeks ago this House passed what the Republican leadership referred to as a tax revision bill. In the debate that ensued, the Democratic members of the Committee on Ways and Means emphatically developed the unassailable fact that the bill was in reality a tax reduction bill—a tax reduction bill for those best able to pay. For included in the measure was a reduction in taxes on unearned income. The great majority of Democrats plus a few Republicans unsuccessfully tried to amend the bill to grant tax relief to the great bulk of the taxpayers by raising the exemption from $600 to $700. The attempt failed by a few votes. The measure is now being considered by the Senate Committee on Finance. Mr. Speaker, I intend to bring the editorial of the Daily News to the attention of that committee, and for that purpose, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the editorial that states the position of Prof. Alvin Harvey Hansen, of Harvard University, widely known and able political economist.

The editorial follows:

Tangible Tax Relief

The sure way to lighten the burden on the American taxpayer is to increase the personal income-tax exemption. We have learned that it does little good to reduce the excise taxes because many motion picture industrialists and manufacturers have raised their prices to pocket what the Government used to take. The customer pays just as much as he ever did.

The average taxpayer can apply the old novelty song to an excise-tax reduction: "A wonderful chance for somebody, but for somebody else, not me."

Does he pay less for a movie ticket now that the Government has slashed the taxes? Does he see the billion-dollar reduction reflected in previously taxed items?

However, it would be different with an increase in income-tax exemption. The motion picture and other industries could not skim off the savings. Every taxpayer would benefit.

The proposal to increase the exemption from $600 to $800 is advocated by Senator Walter F. George, Democrat of Georgia, and others, and has the endorsement of Harvard Prof. Alvin Harvey Hansen, widely known and honored political economist.

Professor Hansen says, "If $500 was a reasonable personal exemption in 1944, when we needed a very broad income-tax base to finance the war, then the present day equivalent in real terms, namely $800, must be regarded as fair and reasonable." He said that the proposed $200 increase is justifiable because of the rise in living costs during the last decade.

The billion-dollar excise-tax cut helped manufacturers and the cinema interests, but an increase in the income-tax exemption would give real relief to the taxpayer.

League of Women Voters Survey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. D. ROOSEVELT, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 1954

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, the League of Women Voters of the City of New York recently undertook a poll of public opinion with respect to problems of international cooperation and foreign trade. League members interviewed 2,100 people in the 5 boroughs of New York on the basis of a scientific sample prepared by the Elmer Roper Institute of Public Opinion. Columbia University and the Massachusetts Institute of Technology undertook to analyze the replies. The survey shows that 56 percent of New York City residents believe that the United States cannot defend itself without help from its allies. It also shows that 73 percent of the people of the city of New York feel that the United States and the rest of the free world would enjoy increased prosperity and an expanded standard of living if they were permitted to increase the level of international trade.

Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following press release and statistical tables recently issued by the League of Women Voters of the City of New York.

Fifty-six Percent of New Yorkers Believe United States Could Not Defend Itself Without Allies

"The majority of New Yorkers favor international cooperation—both military and in trade," announced the League of Women Voters of the City of New York today, quoting from the results of a poll just concluded by the league in this city. Highlights of the poll show that 56 percent of this city's residents believe that, if it came to war, the United States could not defend itself without military help from its allies. The poll also revealed that 73 percent of New York City residents feel that greater prosperity would result for all, if the United States and other countries of the free world increased their trade with each other.

Based on a scientific sample devised by the Elmo Roper Institute of Public Affairs, the study covered 2,100 people throughout the 5 boroughs. Columbia University and the Massachusetts Institute of Technology were responsible for the questionnaire and for the analysis of the answers to the poll. The aim of the survey was to determine how a cross section of New Yorkers feel about international cooperation, particularly with respect to world trade.

This was a pilot study, and it is believed that it will stimulate similar polls by other League of Women Voters organizations in the different cities of the country.

The local survey revealed that support for military and trade cooperation with our allies was voiced by the majority of New Yorkers in both sexes, all age groups, and all educational and income levels.

A significant fact revealed by the survey concerned the United Nations. Only 7 percent of the respondents indicated that the United States should drop out of the United Nations.

"The fact that 73 percent—almost three-fourths of New York's citizens are aware of the mutual benefits deriving from world trade is particularly encouraging," said Mrs. Ralph B. Morris, president of the League of Women Voters of the City of New York. "We believe that one of the most effective approaches to peace is through a greater exchange of goods among the nations of the free world. This finding from our survey is also encouraging because it indicates that most New Yorkers support the President's position on world trade. This position was defined by the President in his message of March 30, when he said:

"'If we fail in our trade policy, we may fail in all. Our domestic employment, our standard of living, our security and the solidarity of the free world—all are involved.'"

With the Reciprocal Trade Agreement Act expiring on June 12, 1954, the two Senators from New York State and all the Congressmen from this city have indicated that they are very anxious to know the thinking of their constituents on the subject of international cooperation and world trade. The survey of League of Women Voters is thus of great importance to the lawmakers who represent New York City in the Nation's Capital.

On tariffs, 44 percent of the city's inhabitants feel that an important argument for a low tariff on goods coming into this country is that it will make other countries financially stronger so that they will not need our help. Thirty-one percent were for decreasing our tariffs, 19 percent for retaining them at present levels, 16 percent for increasing them.

The poll was conducted by volunteer workers, members of the League of Women Voters with some help from other women's groups. It was the first poll of its kind to be undertaken by any volunteer women's group.

The findings of this study are expected to be incorporated in a book on world trade to be published by the Center for International Studies of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Attitudes toward the United Nations

[Percent]

	Sex		Age				Education		
	Men	Women	21 to 30	31 to 40	41 to 50	Over 50	Grammar school or some high school	High school graduate, business school or some college	College graduate, postgraduate
United States has been doing less than its share	11	10	10	9	14	8	8	10	19
United States has been cooperating to about the right extent	27	32	30	31	30	29	28	29	38
United States has been doing more than its share	48	36	45	41	38	40	39	45	40
United States should drop out of the U. N	9	5	4	5	7	9	8	6	3
Don't know	5	17	9	13	12	14	17	10	
No answer			1						1
Total	100 (885)	100 (1, 208)	100 (447)	100 (632)	100 (469)	100 (550)	100 (1, 013)	100 (791)	100 (259)

Attitudes toward military alliances

[Percent]

	Sex		Age				Income				Education		
	Men	Women	21 to 30	31 to 40	41 to 50	Over 50	Under $3,000	$3,000 to $4,999	$5,000 to $6,999	$7,000 or over	Grammar school or some high school	High school graduate, business school, or some college	College graduate, post-graduate
If it came to war:													
We could not defend ourselves without military allies	60	53	63	55	54	53	53	54	59	62	52	57	70
We could defend ourselves without military allies	32	33	30	34	35	32	32	35	33	30	35	34	21
Don't know	7	13	7	11	10	13	14	10	7	8	13	8	8
No answer	1	1			1	2	1	1	1			1	1
Total	100 (885)	100 (1, 208)	100 (447)	100 (632)	100 (469)	100 (550)	100 (537)	100 (708)	100 (424)	100 (266)	100 (1, 013)	100 (791)	100 (259)

Attitudes toward recipients of United States economic assistance

[Percent]

	Sex		Age				Income				Education		
	Men	Women	21 to 30	31 to 40	41 to 50	Over 50	Under $3,000	$3,000 to $4,999	$5,000 to $6,999	$7,000 or over	Grammar school or some high school	High school graduate, business school, or some college	College graduate, post-graduate
Recipients of economic assistance:													
Are carrying their share of the load	25	23	27	25	22	21	19	22	25	33	19	24	41
Are letting the United States do the job	47	45	40	44	48	50	48	49	43	38	52	45	27
Some are, some are not	20	18	24	18	18	18	15	18	26	22	16	22	25
Don't know	7	13	9	11	10	10	17	10	4	5	13	8	5
No answer	1	1		1	2	1	1	1	2	1		1	2
Total	100 (885)	100 (1, 208)	100 (447)	100 (632)	100 (469)	100 (550)	100 (537)	100 (708)	100 (424)	100 (266)	100 (1, 013)	100 (791)	100 (259)

Attitudes toward more trade between United States and countries of free world

[Percent]

	Sex		Age				Income				Education		
	Men	Women	21 to 30	31 to 40	41 to 50	Over 50	Under $3,000	$3,000 to $4,999	$5,000 to $6,999	$7,000 or over	Grammar school or some high school	High school graduate, business school, or some college	College graduate, post graduate
If we trade more with other countries:													
Both the United States and other countries would become more prosperous	75	71	84	71	73	66	63	75	75	84	65	79	86
Only the other countries would benefit	13	9	7	11	11	13	10	11	13	9	13	10	5
Only the United States would benefit	3	2	2	2	3	3	5	2	1	-------	4	1	1
It would not make any difference	3	3	2	3	3	4	5	3	3	2	4	2	2
Don't know	5	14	5	12	10	13	16	8	7	5	14	7	6
No answer	1	1	-------	1	-------	1	1	1	1	-------	-------	1	-------
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

Recommendations on United States tariff policy

[Percent]

	Sex		Age				Income				Education		
	Men	Women	21 to 30	31 to 40	41 to 50	Over 50	Under $3,000	$3,000 to $4,999	$5,000 to $6,999	$7,000 or over	Grammar school or some high school	High school graduate, business school, or some college	College graduate, post-graduate
Increase our tariffs	21	11	12	14	16	21	15	17	16	14	17	16	9
Decrease our tariffs	35	29	32	31	34	30	30	28	31	45	28	30	9
Keep them about the same	20	18	21	20	15	19	20	20	18	15	19	22	16
Increase some, decrease others	8	5	9	5	6	5	6	5	7	8	5	7	8
Don't know; not classifiable	16	37	27	31	29	25	30	30	28	18	31	27	18
No answer	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------
Total	100 (885)	100 (1,208)	100 (447)	100 (632)	100 (460)	100 (550)	100 (537)	100 (768)	100 (424)	100 (266)	100 (1,013)	100 (791)	100 (250)

Internationalism (attitude toward U. N.) and attitudes on tariffs

[Percent]

	Attitude toward United States participation in U. N.			
	United States has been doing less than its share in the U. N.	United States has been cooperating to the right extent in the U. N.	United States has been doing more than its share in the U. N.	United States should drop out of the U. N.
Tariff response:				
Increase tariffs	15	12	19	24
Decrease tariffs	46	31	31	29
Keep about the same	15	20	22	15
Increase some, decrease others	8	6	6	7
Don't know	-------	-------	-------	-------
Not classifiable	16	31	22	25
No answer	-------	-------	-------	-------
Total	100 (214)	100 (631)	100 (855)	100 (135)

NOTE.—A preliminary inspection suggests that there is fair consistency on responses to questions on internationalist-isolationist attitudes. For the sake of simplicity, attitude toward the U. N. is used in this cross-tabulation as a rough index of internationalist-isolationist feeling.

Attitude toward increase or decrease on tariffs

[Percent]

	Both United States and other countries would prosper	Only other countries would benefit
Do you think we should increase tariffs	14	31
Decrease our tariffs	35	20
Keep them about the same	19	21
Increase some and decrease others	7	5
Don't know	25	23
Total	100	100

ATTITUDES TOWARD FOREIGN TRADE

Do you think we should increase those tariffs or duties on goods we buy from other countries, decrease them or keep them about the same?

1. Concerned with the threat to the domestic economy: to avert unemployment, depression, dumping by foreign countries, etc. (15 percent.)

2. Autarchic considerations: Need to maintain production potential as insurance against wartime shortages caused by interruption of imports; need to preserve our natural resources. (Less than 1 percent.)

3. Benefit to United States of tariff revenues. (E. g., "We need money so badly that the tariff would help." "Will help us financially to increase our budget—give us some financial income.") (1 percent.)

4. Isolationist, xenophobic, suspicious, resentful, retaliatory, etc. (E. g., "Because they've taken enough from us in past. Let them pay. They hate the United States." "Other nations should leave us alone, we're doing fine." "We must help ourselves first." "Everything we send over there, they tax us double." "Since they're giving us a dirty deal we should raise tariffs.") (3 percent.)

5. Considerations bound up with the idea of "comparative advantage." The country that can produce each commodity cheapest should be the country that should produce that commodity for the rest of the world. (E. g., "If things can be produced cheaper in other countries, we should buy them." "Foreign competition would force domestic producers to produce economically or not sell." "Products can be made more cheaply in certain countries than in others.) (1 percent.)

6. Support of the aims of United States foreign policy. (E. g., "It would keep other countries from becoming a prey to communism." "If we reduce tariffs * * * other countries can meet their responsibilities in the United Nations and in defending themselves." "If we do not share, others will constantly plan ways to take it away from us.") (3 percent.)

7. Benefits to business in the United States; exports only possible reciprocally with imports, e. g.: "More trade would increase our business." "There would be more business. We would buy more and they would buy more." "Every country needs trade. If tariffs are too high, the United States will be in a hole." (Five percent.)

8. Advantages for consumers in the United States, lower prices, e. g.: "Being that my husband is a workingman, that's what I imagine. We would be able to buy more." "If tariffs were increased, goods from other countries couldn't be sold here in the United States." (Eleven percent.)

9. Advantages for "international trade"; "mutual advantages"; "trade, not aid" (abstract, sophisticated arguments, with no illustration of meaning, no explanation or clarification. Possibility that these arguments are not fully digested by the respondent), e. g.: "We have to encourage world trade." "High tariffs are a barrier to free world trade." "Lower prices means more trade." (Thirteen percent.)

O. Homely morality; direct, outgoing sympathy for other nations, e. g.: "To help other countries." "The common citizen of all countries benefits—lightens his burdens." "If increased, other countries have it hard." "They are paying enough now." (Six percent.)

X. Reasons based on conservatism, traditionalism, complacency (associated with the keep-them-about-the-same response), e. g.: "People O. K. as of now. No use upsetting things." "They (in Washington) know what they're doing." "See no reasons for change." "It is O. K. as it is." (Two percent.)

Y. Other (list). (Four percent.)

Reject. Not applicable. (Forty-three percent.)

SUMMARY

1. Increase our tariffs. (Sixteen percent.)
2. Decrease our tariffs. (Thirty-one percent.)
3. Keep them about the same. (Nineteen percent.)
4. Increase some; decrease others. (Six percent.)
5. Others. (Twenty-eight percent.)

Iowa and Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. SMITH

OF MISSISSIPPI

Monday, April 5, 1954

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include the following article from Nation's Business:

THIS IS FOREIGN TRADE AT WORK

The wife of a Coe College professor in Cedar Rapids, Iowa, tosses a pound of sugar into her shopping basket and thus insures employment for a mechanic at the Iowa Manufacturing Co. in another part of town.

The mechanic never saw a sugarcane, his interest in foreign trade is negligible, and certainly he doesn't know a chunky little man named Julio Acosta who lives near Cardenas, Cuba.

Yet, when the checker rings up the sugar sale on the cash register, the mechanic, the professor's wife, Julio, Cardenas, and Cedar Rapids have been engaged in a piece of international commerce that affects the welfare and prosperity of everyone of them.

That is foreign trade.

Cardenas is a thriving seaport on the northern coast of Cuba, about 75 miles east of Havana, proud of its year-round balmy climate, of its Spanish Colonial-style Palacio Municipal, of its surrounding wealth of sugarcane.

Cedar Rapids is a thriving trading center—deep in the heart of the corn country—proud of its extremes of climate, of its battleshiplike municipal center erected on an island, of its rich outlying topsoil.

Cardenas, population 45,000, has a few tanneries, and there's some activity in the raising of henequin, a fiber. Basically, though, Cardenas is a one-crop, one-industry town. The welfare of Cardenas is tied to the cultivation, processing, and sale of sugar.

In contrast, Cedar Rapids, population 75,000, is a city of diversified interests. Corn, oats, wheat and barley, cattle and hogs, all play a part in the area's economic health. An equally important role is played by its wide variety of manufacturing plants.

Yet, as sharply as the two cities differ, the relative prosperity of each is linked to the same chain of exports and imports—between their two countries, and the countries of the world. Both the one-crop city and the city of diversified products must have foreign trade to bolster and maintain their respective high standards of living.

Cardenas—and Cuba—sell cane sugar to Cedar Rapids—and the United States. In return, Cardenas—and Cuba—buy hams, lard, cereals, tractors, rock crushers, radio transmitters, farm spraying equipment, and other products from Cedar Rapids, along with items from just about every other section of the United States.

Volumes of statistics show how much sugar the people of Cedar Rapids and the rest of the United States bought from Cardenas and Cuba; and how many Cedar Rapids and American products the people of Cardenas and Cuba bought in return. Statistics are forbidding, but not Julio Acosta whom I visited on his family-size cane plantation.

Julio was standing on the hood of his American-made truck, waving his arms proudly at the tall, shimmering ranks of cane which rose higher than the truck's cab, when he reduced the statistics to one apt sentence.

"Si, senor," he said. "If I get a good price for this cane, I will be able to buy another truck this year. If not, I will have to wait."

The colono (cane farmer) was acutely aware that his ability to get a good price for his sugar hinged on the sale to the United States, by far Cuba's biggest customer. If he got a good price, someone would sell a new American truck. Thus Julio's own prosperity is intertwined with that of the auto industry workers who build trucks in Detroit and other American cities. (In 1952, Julio's compatriots bought 24,300 American-made autos, trucks, and buses.)

The Acosta farmhouse is too far off the main highway to be served by central electric power, but the Acostas—father and two grown sons—were well enough off, as a result of their cane sales in recent years, to have bought, and installed, an American-made set of batteries, and an American-made generator, which produce enough electricity to provide lighting and to run an American-made radio. The farmhouse also contained an American-made kerosene refrigerator and sewing machine. Virtually every piece of farm equipment and machinery bore the phrase: Made in U. S. A.

Juan Perez Escanez is the unpaid secretary of the union at one of the sugar mills in Cardenas. Like other workers in the seasonal sugar industry, he supplements his income by working on the docks when the mill is temporarily shut down.

"The workers in Cardenas, whether they work in the mills, in the distilleries, or on the docks, understand that sugar is their livelihood, and exports their source of prosperity," the impassive but bright-eyed Juan told me.

The flourishing sugar-export years of World War II and later have given Juan an annual income of about $1,500. This permits him a comparatively high standard of living, he says. He drives a 1-year-old American auto. He lives in a new house (costing $2,500) in the Playa Larga, from which—like other modest homes in this workers' section of Cardenas—sprouts the antenna of an American-made TV set. The Perez family—father, mother, two children—also have a radio, electric iron, and refrigerator, all of American manufacture.

"My wife wants to buy a washing machine, but I told her she will have to wait a while because last year was not so good," Juan explained. "It all depends on sugar."

According to the local Camara de Comercio (chamber of commerce), some 1,000 householders there already enjoy the benefits of American-made washing machines.

The Camara de Comercio also estimates that 1,500 automobiles, 6,000 radios, 1,000 TV sets, 3,000 refrigerators, and 500 freezers—virtually all produced and assembled in American plants—are in use, bought with sugar-export dollars.

Any visitor to Cardenas can see, as I did, that the picturesque seaport is an excellent market for American producers. The stores of Cardenas are packed with American goods of all kinds and makes. So are the stores and shops of all of Cuba. In 1952, Juan's fellow Cubans bough 44,000 refrigerators and home freezers, 43,500 TV sets, 79,000 radio sets, 39,000 stoves and ranges, 33,000 electric fans, 6,000 washing machines, 3,700 sewing machines, 7,500 typewriters.

The mayor of Cardenas, Senor Bathuel Posada Delgado, is a round-faced man who has not use for ties. While being interviewed through an interpreter, he maintained and unceasing round of conversations with constituents who filed into his office or stopped him in the wide corridors of the city hall.

"Those citizens who interrupt," explained His Honor, "ask for money to buy medicines, for advances on their wages, for postponement of their taxes. Sugar and henequin export receipts fell off. People have been thrown out of work.

"We all understand the meaning of imports and exports, for sure. Look," he said, pointing to the dingy cracked ceilings of the high-walled city hall, built in 1862. "We had to put off painting the ceiling of our beautiful building. Export dollars dropped, so tax receipts dwindled."

Wages and income of just about everybody, the farmer, cane cutter, mill worker, refinery worker, are based on a sliding scale with the price of sugar, the mayor pointed out, "even my own salary."

Cedar Rapids, which is 800 miles from New Orleans, its nearest port, lies in the heart of what was once the Nation's isolationist belt. Recently, however, Cedar Rapids families have begun to realize that exports have helped to give them their high effective buying power, after taxes, of $5,334 annually.

More and more farmers in the Cedar Rapids area, and in Iowa, today recognize that their own prosperity is wrapped up to an important degree in the exports of their farm products, according to Rex Conn, farm editor of the Cedar Rapids Gazette and former county agent who still spends most of his time in contact with the farmers.

"The volume of farm exports varies from yier to year," Mr. Conn explained. "In any case farm exports are important in holding down the temporary oversupply of unsold agricultural yields, and in returning to the farmers decent prices and fair profits."

Corn, cornmeal, popcorn, oat flour, cereals, stock and poultry feeds, meat products, lard are among the agricultural products exported from Cedar Rapids.

The breadwinners of Cedar Rapids, especially those who work in the many plants which over the past 20 years have increasingly developed foreign outlets, are even more conscious of the importance of exports to their standard of living.

"Just ask any of the men on the assembly line," commented John Evans, AFL central labor union secretary. "They won't even have to talk to you about what exports mean to them. All they'll do is point to the machine on the line—a rock crusher, or a power crane, or something like that—and show you the ticket that says the machine is slated for Cuba, Venezuela, Belgian Congo, or Siam."

The businessmen of Cedar Rapids have taken positive steps to encourage overseas trade. In 1947 Cedar Rapids business leaders set up a foreign trade bureau in their local chamber of commerce—a bureau unique in the State. Since then the bureau has helped individual firms with their export problems, and has undertaken an educational campaign in the city and surrounding area.

As of today, a partial list of manufactured items exported from Cedar Rapids to Cardenas and other parts of the world includes navigation equipment, limestone spreaders, sensitized photographic paper, power cranes and draglines, television boosters, fertilizers, piston grinders, tractors, meat tenderizers, pharmaceuticals, precast concrete joints, grain milling machinery, asphalt plants, trampolins and other gymnastic equipment, pressure embalmers, passenger elevators, radio transmitters and receivers, machine chassis parts for trailers, seeders, creamery processing machinery, belt conveyers, sparkplug insulator and scores of other items.

"In 1 recent month," noted Bob Cadwell, the quietly energetic executive vice president of the chamber, "I signed certificates of origin for local products being shipped to 58 countries." From memory he recalled vitamins to Iceland, dresser sets to Lebanon, radio sets to India, complete rice mills to Siam, and road builders to Cuba.

Iow Manufacturing Co., maker of heavy earthmoving equipment, is a home-grown industry which has long sought foreign business for its surplus production. Recently the firm has set up two export sales subsidiaries in an effort to go beyond surplus production sales.

"For instance, we sold $500,000 worth of equipment to Cuba last year," explained Frank D'Aquilla, export manager. "We feel we can sell more, much more, if we only go after it hard."

A number of Cedar Rapids firms have their own export departments. Some 15 of them sell overseas through Gordon Fennel, who operates an export division for these companies. Tall, lanky Mr. Fennell had a different angle on the value of exports to a business and its community.

"Exports," he said, "have no seasons. Summer is the slack season for oatmeal in the United States, but at the same time, it's winter in one half the world." Two big companies, Quaker and National, prepare oatmeal in Cedar Rapids for export the world over.

Cedar Rapids' industrial plants produce $200 million worth of goods a year. About $25 million worth is shipped abroad according to the local foreign trade bureau.

"Our studies indicate that 1 of every 10 persons working in Cedar Rapids gets his livelihood, directly or indirectly, from exports," commented youthful Bob White, of Collins Radio, who is chairman of the foreign trade bureau. "That adds up to 4,100 persons. It is obvious that any abrupt halt to exports, wiping out the work and incomes of the 4,100 would have a sharply injurious, if not disastrous, effect on the rest of the community."

The story of Cardenas and Cedar Rapids is, to a greater or lesser degree, the story of virtually every sector of Cuba and the United States.

The Cubans sell us around half of their sugar crop. In addition they sell us some tobacco, fibers, and—through our tourists—scenery and services.

We sell Cuba just about everything that's grown, processed, or manufactured in this country.

General Electric, for example, has estimated that its varied exports to Cuba provide jobs for 1,500 American employees. It would be impossible to track down the specific 1,500 employees. Nonetheless, the importance of the GE sales should be clear to the 1,500 employees of the GE plant at Fitchburg, Mass., where they make small turbines and superchargers; and to the 1,400 employees of the GE plant in Detroit, where they make cemented tungsten and chrome carbides, used for cutting tools, dies, and special valves.

The importance of the GE sales in Cuba should also be clear to the firm's 500 employees at Allentown, Pa., where they make toasters, grills, and coffeemakers; 500 at Bucyrus, Ohio, making fluorescent lamps; 600 at Clyde, N. Y., germanium products, many of which are used in TV sets; 1,000 at De Kalb, Ill., washing machine motors; 1,100 at Tiffin, Ohio, hermetic motors for refrigeration units; 500 at Fort Edward, N. Y., specialty and ballast capacitors for fluorescent lights, planes, radar.

What's true of GE holds for Westinghouse and dozens of other American makers of metal and electrical products, sold in large numbers to Cuba.

The interdependence of the prosperity of Cuba's colonos and American farmers can be demonstrated in several ways. For instance, Cuba's sale of sugar to the United States provides Cubans with the money to buy one-sixth of the American rice crop—a boon to 7 counties in Mississippi, 15 counties in California, 24 counties in Texas, 27 parishes in Louisiana, 31 counties in Arkansas.

One-fourth of America's lard exports goes to Cuba—to the benefit of the farmers in the corn-hog-producing States of Iowa, Illinois, Indiana, Ohio, Missouri, and Minnesota. American exports of cotton goods to Cuba are a definite help to this industry in New England and the South.

In 1952 Cuba cultivated 1,326,000 acres to provide sugar for Americans. In the same year, American farmers had to utilize 1,478,000 acres to produce the pork and lard, rice, wheat and flour, beans and peas, cotton, dairy products, barley and malt, eggs, fruits, oats and oatmeal, corn and corn products, and truck crops exported to Cuba. American farm products sent to Cuba required more cropland than was under cultivation in any 1 of the 6 New England States.

A little more than every fourth spoonful of sugar consumed in the United States—where the per capita consumption is 100 pounds a year—comes from the Cuban cane fields. A little more than every fourth dollar of Cuban per capita income, one of the highest in Latin America, is spent on goods from the United States of America.

In 1952 Americans bought $438 million in Cuban products, chiefly sugar. In the same year, Cubans bought $516 million worth of American goods. Little Cuba, with only 6 million population, proved to be our sixth most important foreign customer, providing jobs for more than 86,000 workers in the United States.

Just as the two cities, Cedar Rapids and Cardenas, are only a small, but important, part of the United States-Cuba story, so the United States-Cuba story is only a small, but important, part of the overall United States-world trade volume.

In 1952 Uncle Sam exported $15,200,000,000 worth of products, providing jobs, according to the Department of Commerce, for 3,126,000 Americans. In 1952 Uncle Sam imported $10,700,000,000 worth, and these imports provided 1,250,000 more jobs in the United States of America.

Together, our exports and imports in a single year created 4,376,000 jobs in this country.

This is an impressive figure, and it strikes home when you stop to think in terms of Cedar Rapids again. Cedar Rapids employs 41,000 workers of all kinds. It takes the annual output of all the workers in 106 cities the size of Cedar Rapids to handle America's foreign trade. The export-import figures strike home—every American home.

Address by Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway in Boston, Mass., on the Occasion of the 100th Anniversary of the English High School Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1954

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include an address made on May 3, 1954, by Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway, Chief of Staff, United States Army, in Boston, Mass., on the occasion of the 100th anniversary of the English High School Association.

The views of General Ridgway made on any occasion are very significant, and the views he expressed on this occasion are of great significance. I particularly call attention to the statement he made in relation to communism that—

> It is a threat which might take the form of unheralded, swift, and large-scale military aggression in widely separated areas of the globe—one in which suprise, if achieved, could result in devastating losses.

The address follows:

In 1853 a group of English High School graduates, joined together by ties of common loyalty and devotion to their alma mater, founded the English High School Association.

They would, I am sure, be gratified to witness the array of distinguished members and guests, leaders in the arts and sciences, and a true cross section of all that is finest in the life of the community who have assembled here this evening to commemorate the 100th anniversary of that occasion. Such a gathering demonstrates that the feelings of loyalty and affection for their school which animated the first members of the association have continued unabated through the years—a tribute to the consistent excellence of the school, the soundness of its teachings, and to the sterling qualities of the youth of Boston who have pursued their studies there.

It has been said that an institution is the lengthened shadow of one man. In his 2-year tenure as the first headmaster of English High, Mr. George Barrell Emerson impressed upon the school the stamp of his character and set a pattern for the high standards of scholarship, of integrity, and of diligence that have distinguished the faculty and pupils of the school to this day. English High, since its founding in 1821, has been honored to have as its headmasters and teachers men inspired by devotion to the highest standards of their profession and motivated by the desire to educate and train their pupils to be worthy and effective citizens.

It is in this tradition of selfless service and dedication that Dr. Walter F. Downey has directed the affairs of the school for over three decades, enhancing its prestige, endearing himself as a benefactor and counselor of the boys entrusted to his care, and advancing the reputation of the school as a beneficial influence in the city of Boston.

It is a great pleasure to me also to see present here tonight two of the splendid teachers who made my stay at English High one of the most inspiring experiences of my life—Mr. Alvah T. Southworth and Mr. John A. Marsh.

An anniversary is a time for looking back upon the path we have traversed, the obstacles surmounted, the goals achieved. It is a time when, with the benefit of the perspective that time alone can give, we can extract from the tangled skein of history the threads that shine through all as the true and the worthwhile. To me, the values that emerge as those that we, as individuals and as a Nation, are determined to protect and preserve above all else are the spiritual values.

In the 100 years that have passed since 1853, the growth of English High has been paralleled by the growth of the Nation. While the school has increased its total enrollment from 170 students in 1853 to over 1350 today, the United States has grown from a population of 25 million to become a mighty giant of over 160 million. It has grown in wealth and prestige and is, in this year of 1954, a dynamic and prosperous Nation.

By all the logic of history, we should also be a secure and peaceful Nation. We have no designs upon the territory or rights of any other nation in the world. We desire, above all else, to live in peace with our neighbors in the world community. Yet, the greatest problem we have today is the problem of national security and how best to achieve it. And a large proportion of the energies of our citizens and Government leaders is devoted to the vital task of insuring the safety of our Nation against aggression.

Highlighting the urgency of national defense and its importance to us all is the fact that in the past hundred years of scientific and technical progress and of the constantly expanding horizons in every field of knowledge, the development of military weapons has been one of the most astounding of all. When we consider that in 1853 dynamite was unknown and that today we measure the explosive power of the hydrogen bomb in millions of tons of TNT, it is understandable that the prospect of the next 100 years is not to encourage unbounded optimism.

Our Nation, however, has not survived and prospered by reason of the fears and timidity of its citizens but, rather, because they possessed unlimited faith and confidence in themselves and a dedication to the spiritual values of life. And it is these spiritual values that to me are the essential threads that are woven through all our history. They are the real cause of our past achievements and our surest reliance for future achievements.

As our Nation has expanded in strength and influence, our responsibilities have correspondingly increased. The growth of militant communism, which had its inception just over 100 years ago, with the publication of the Communist Manifesto, has resulted in a new peril to our continued existence.

I believe that we should neither minimize nor magnify the dangers inherent in the present world situation nor underestimate our courage to confront them. With the faith our fathers and mothers had, we too shall face up to all the dangers which threaten us. We too shall find that in the sturdy qualities of our forebears, and in their ability to respond to every challenge with unparalleled faith and vigor, we possess a limitless reservoir of strength.

Modern war on a general scale is a threat under which our generation lives. If it came, it would place greater demands upon all of us, military and civilian alike, than our people have so far had to endure. This threat to our national security which exists today is not local in scope. It is brutal, savage, ruthless. It has no scruples, no inhibitions, no restraint, only the fear of effective retaliation and defeat. It recognizes no standards of decency of God or man. It is a threat which menaces us here in America scarcely less than it menaces the peoples of Korea, of Japan, of Southeast Asia, and of Western Europe. It is a threat which might take the form of unheralded, swift, and large-scale military aggression in widely separated areas of the globe—one in which surprise, if achieved, could result in devastating losses.

Recognizing the existence of this threat and its global nature, recognizing the compelling necessity of being ready to meet it militarily, if it takes the form of military assault, our Nation is participating vigorously in the vital task of the defense of the free world. We, as a people, are striving to prevent war. This is our unchanging goal. But we have learned through experience that that goal is best achieved through strength, so long as there exists in the world a great military power ruled by a clique which advocates and practices military aggression.

This threat is not solely military, however. It exists in the political, the economic, and the spiritual field. Communism seeks by every unscrupulous means to divide our allies by preying upon their difficulties and subverting their institutions. It seeks to destroy the economy of the free world, to deny to the peace-loving people of the world their normal aspirations for a healthy, stable economy which can provide the prosperity which modern technology and scientific advances make possible. And it strives to destroy belief in God and in divine guidance, without which there can be neither meaning nor purpose to human life.

The situation which exists today—a situation in which we are maintaining active military forces of a size without precedent in our history, except in time of actual war—places a heavy obligation upon the young people of our country. It is an obligation which entails many sacrifices—interruption or delay of civilian careers, postponement of personal plans, military service in strange lands, sometimes under hazardous conditions. But there is a compensation. That compensation is the knowledge that through their service to the Nation our young people are helping to safeguard the rights and liberties without which there could be no free choices, no personal plans—for all would be subservient to totalitarian authority.

I believe the spirit of dedication, the sense of duty, burn as strongly in the hearts of the youth of today as ever they did in the hearts of the youth of 1861, of 1917, of 1941, and of 1950. The graduates of English High offer eloquent testimony of the truth of this statement. They have compiled an impressive record of service to our Nation, in peace and in war, that testifies to the deep sense of honor and duty that their school has taught.

They have served with distinction in religion, education, and public service, in science and industry and commerce, and in all the peaceful pursuits of life. Graduates like Father Christopher Griffin, the Reverend Roger Williams, and Rabbi David B. Albert demonstrate by their sacred calling the importance of the spiritual element in our way of life. Chief Justice John P. Higgins and Judge Paul G. Kirk, to mention but two among many, have added to the reputation of our school by their devotion to the principle of freedom under law which is one of the cardinal elements of our democratic society.

In times of crisis graduates have responded magnificently to every challenge and have contributed in generous measure to the preservation of our Nation's freedom. In World War II and in Korea the latest generation of English high graduates has displayed the courage, patriotism and steadfastness of character that distinguished their predecessors in World War I and previous wars. The 5,500 men who served in World War II and the 271 who laid down their lives in that conflict offer ample proof, if any were needed. The present classes face challenges that equal, and may yet surpass in their demands, any that have gone before. I feel confident that they, too, will be worthy of their school of their State and of their country.

In preparing the youth of today to be the citizen of tomorrow the intrinsic worth of an English high school education lies as much in its emphasis upon the intangible or spiritual values as it does upon the diffusion of knowledge in the academic subjects. By precept and example, the virtues of clean living, rectitude, and manliness in all the affairs of life are emphasized. With them are inculcated an awareness of the spiritual and moral concepts which are the basis for our civilization, founded as it is on a belief in God and in the inherent dignity of man. These qualities, admirable at all times, are needed especially to sustain the individual in times of crisis.

The advent of new and terrible weapons of destruction has not invalidated the essential nature of war nor the importance of the individual. No matter how awesome the nature of the weapon, weapons are still the servant of man and not his master. As long as we remain a united people, with a dedication to freedom and a determination to protect that freedom at all costs, I believe that we can surmount every difficulty and achieve our objective of peace and security. I believe that this can and will be achieved through increased dedication to the things of the spirit.

If then in a backward glance over the past hundred years we should try to extract what is preeminently precious, I believe that we would agree that what has made our Nation great and what we must preserve and protect above all else are the spiritual values. I believe the integrity, the courage, the industry, and the virility of our people, their inextinguishable faith in God and their unquenchable love of freedom under God, are what we want to protect. With them our physical and material wealth are given meaning and purpose. With them we can advance into the next hundred years with faith and confidence.

Never in our history—nor, I think, in the history of any other nation on earth—has this truth been more meaningful than today. Decisions, fateful decisions, await the taking by our Government. Some of them include an element of great urgency. Others, while no less important, imperatively demand that they be reached only as a result of prolonged and patient analysis of the most honest, searching, and objective character.

Within the Army—and, indeed, all the armed services—there is an abiding confidence in the rightness of the great human values we are defending and in our ability to forge the strongest possible defense with the men and weapons at our command. New weapons, far from invalidating the effectiveness of our Army, have added new strength and extended its capabilities. The Army is forging ahead in an era of atomic and hydrogen weapons, with the determination to master their techniques and limitations, to overcome all obstacles, and to secure victory if called on to fight. The Army has confidence in its weapons and in its leaders. Its members must likewise have the fullest confidence that they are supported wholeheartedly by the people of this Nation, from whom they draw their strength and to whom, under God, they owe their devotion.

Today, more than ever before, we need this wholehearted support of all our people to provide an effective military defense. Warfare has vastly increased in complexity. The scientist and the technician, the scholar and the clergyman, labor and management—all have taken their places beside the soldier as defenders of our homeland. Only because we all—civilian and soldier alike—have had the steadfastness of spirit, the firmness of determination, to meet the challenges to those value which we cherish, have those values survived. Only if we retain that spirit and that determination can those values continue to survive. Indeed, it should be clearly stated that only peoples who will unflinchingly protect their spiritual values deserve to retain them.

If our schools can impress upon their students the importance of these intangibles, then they are fulfilling their basic role in building a stronger and better America. English high has met this high standard in the past. I am confident that it will continue to do so in the future, and that the ideals which have inspired our school and Nation throughout the past hundred years will continue to sustain them through the years to come.

We know we shall not be an aggressor. We can have no assurance that others may not attack us and the things for which we stand. There are forces extant which would destroy us, if they could, and there is a timelessness in their evil scheming we must never ignore.

But from the boundless reservoirs of America's faith, we can, please God, preserve an honorable peace, or failing that through the wanton aggression of others, we can, with that same faith, build and maintain the strength to defeat all enemies who may assail us. It demands great wisdom, integrity, courage, determination, and patience. It demands faith in our youth, our country, and in God.

I believe our people have them all, and in abundantly adequate measure.

Air Secretary Urges Pay Boost To Save Money

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 5, 1954

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, near the top of the list in proposed recommendations for improving military career attractiveness is a pay raise for service men and women. Numerous studies have pointed to the indisputable fact that military pay has fallen far behind its comparable rating with other fields of endeavor.

This session of Congress must give immediate attention to the pay scale of military personnel. It is truly false economy to spend thousands of dollars to train a fighting man only to have him quit the services because of the ever-increasing gap between his pay and that of his counterpart in industry or the professions.

The military does not expect Congress to offer pay equal to that of outside employment. It does expect, and rightly so, that consideration be given the increased cost of living. Pay adjustments must be made to make career service more attractive and to enable us to keep our fighting machine from progressive deterioration through lack of reenlistments of trained personnel.

A cost-of-living pay raise bill such as I have introduced would go far toward restoring military morale, and would help to bolster reenlistments at this critical period, just prior to reenlistment of fighting men brought into the service by the start of the Korean conflict 4 years ago. The dollars we invest in a pay raise will go far toward replacing the dollars we would need for training hundreds of thousands of skilled technicians to replace those who otherwise will not stay in the service. We could never replace the lost skills and technical training of those who did not reenlist.

Under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD an article on the problem, as featured in the April 24, 1954, issue of the Army, Navy, and Air Force Journal:

AIR SECRETARY URGES PAY BOOST TO SAVE MONEY

Air Force Secretary Harold E. Talbott this week told Defense Secretary Charles E. Wilson that the Government could save $100 million annually by a 10-percent boost in the Air Force reenlistment rate and called for a pay raise to help achieve this objective.

In a semiannual report covering the period which ended December 31, Secretary Talbott stated:

"Higher rates of reenlistment of airmen and extension of tours of duty of officers will require special reenlistment bonuses, adjustments upward in pay, better housing, and restoration of fringe benefits, such as commissaries, post exchanges, and medical care of dependents, where such have been eliminated."

Secretary Wilson observed that "some means must be found to reduce the high rate of personnel turnover, which is increasing costs, lowering morale, and, above all, depriving the Armed Forces of the experience essential to maximum efficiency."

Mr. Wilson said that "firm long-range policies covering the conditions under which military personnel will serve should help to attract more capable personnel and lead to longer periods of service, thus paying off in greater effective military strength as well as in lower cost."

The Defense Secretary said proposals will be made to Congress to make military service more attractive as a career, but he did not spell out details.

Mr. Talbott reported that a survey conducted among 175,000 airmen eligible for discharge in the next year showed that only 24 percent indicated they would reenlist, with 27 percent undecided. The remainder said they did not want to reenlist.

He said that in addition to saving the Government money, a rise in reenlistments "would provide an overall improvement in the efficiency of the Air Force. The solution to this problem lies in making Air Force service more attractive."

Army Secretary Robert T. Stevens stated in his section of the semiannual summary that "it is of the utmost importance that everything possible be done to maintain a career military service, clothed in dignity and honor, which will be attractive to the highest type of young American and which will hold the high quality personnel we now have."

"I consider it urgent," said Secretary Stevens, "that immediate steps be taken to insure the continued development of the finest type of military leadership."

The comments by the service secretaries in the semiannual reports were made public less than a week after similar reports on service morale were made to the American Society of Newspaper Editors meeting in Washington, D. C.

At these sessions, the Nation's top editors learned details of the problem confronting the Armed Forces in attracting and retaining outstanding personnel and the steps which are being taken to improve the situation.

A highlight of these presentations was the observation by Assistant Defense Secretary John A. Hannah that study is being given to the possibility of a pay raise for men and women in uniform, particularly if new pay legislation is adopted for the Government's civilian employees.

Winning Essay in Employ the Physically Handicapped Contest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 5, 1954

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, it has been my pleasure in the past to bring to the attention of the Congress the splendid nationwide essay contest on Employing the Physically Handicapped.

At this time, I am happy to do so once again. I send to the desk the text of the winning essay in the Wisconsin competition, as written by an able young lady of Kenosha, Wis.—Miss Bonnie Jean Getschman.

I ask unanimous consent that the essay be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, and that it be preceded by a list of the outstanding citizens in Wisconsin who serve on the governor's committee on employment of the physically handicapped, a list of the distinguished citizens who participated in judging this particular essay contest, and a list of the winners from among Wisconsin's 1,600 junior and senior high school students who participated.

There being no objection, the lists and the essay were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GOVERNOR'S COMMITTEE ON EMPLOYMENT OF THE PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED

Walter J. Kohler, Jr., governor.

Ben E. Kuechle, chairman.

Robert W. Hansen, vice chairman.

A. L. Beier, secretary.

John P. Adler, Allied and Independent Theatre Owners, Marshfield.

Sid Bliss, Wisconsin Network, Inc., Janesville.

Ellsworth S. Coe, president, Wisconsin Press Association, Whitewater.

Thomas J. Doran, State Medical Society, Madison.

John L. Doyne, deputy treasurer, county of Milwaukee, Milwaukee.

Robert A. Ewens, executive vice president, Wisconsin Manufacturers Association, Milwaukee.

William Faulkes, Madison.

K. W. Haagensen, director, public relations, Allis-Chalmers Manufacturing Co., Milwaukee.

George Haberman, president, Wisconsin State Federation of Labor, Milwaukee.

Seward H. Jacobi, Wisconsin State Chamber of Commerce, Madison.

John Kubiak, chief, Vocational Rehabilitation Division, Madison.

David Lippert, Madison Bureau of the Milwaukee Sentinel, Madison.

W. F. McCormick, general manager, Record-Herald Co., Wausau.

Harry A. Nelson, chief, Rehabilitation Division, Veterans' Administration, Milwaukee.

Ralph O'Connor, general manager, Radio Station WISC, Madison.

John Oster, Jr., president, John Oster Manufacturing Co., Milwaukee.

William H. Siemering, Veterans Employment Representative for Wisconsin, Madison.

Charles M. Schultz, president, Wisconsin State Industrial Union Council, Milwaukee.

Milo K. Swanton, executive secretary, Wisconsin Council of Agriculture Cooperatives, Madison.

Arthur F. Trebilcock, president, Borden's Kennedy-Mansfield division, Madison.

INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE

R. J. Pearson, Veterans Employment Service, chairman.

Hobart Bondi, Veterans' Administration.

Joseph Brown, Vocational Rehabilitation Division.

Eugene Cooper, Wisconsin Association for the Disabled.

Max Hays, Wisconsin State Employment Service.

Frank Powell, State Department of Public Instruction.

Kenneth Woodring, Rock County service officer, Janesville.

National and State Employ the Physically Handicapped Essay Contest

Sponsored by the President's Committee on National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week and the Governor's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped.

ESSAY CONTEST COMMITTEE

State: George A. Haberman, chairman, State Federation of Labor; Ralph O'Connor, radio station WISC; David J. Lippert, the Milwaukee Sentinel; Arthur F. Trebilcock, Borden's Kennedy-Mansfield division.

CASH PRIZE DONORS

State: Wisconsin Association for the Disabled, Wisconsin Manufacturers' Association, Wisconsin State Chamber of Commerce, Wisconsin State Federation of Labor, Wisconsin State Industrial Union Council.

National: Disabled American Veterans.

STATE JUDGES

Scott M. Cutlip, professor of journalism, University of Wisconsin; Sister Mary Nona, O. P., president, Edgewood College; John R. Wrage, personnel manager, Gisholt Machine Co.

SCREENING COMMITTEE

Ellsworth L. Peckham, chairman, Wisconsin State Employment Service; Mary F. Beyer, rehabilitation division, State board of vocational and adult education; Gordon Boardman, department of public instruction; Eugene Cooper, Wisconsin Association for the Disabled; Mason C. Dobson, executive office; Philip Dykstra, Wisconsin State Board of Health; Robert C. Graewin, public welfare department; Mary Husting, rehabilitation division, State board of vocational and adult education; Thomas J. Lucas, public welfare department; Kay Middleton, Wisconsin Free Library Commission; Ralph J. Pearson, veterans employment service; Edward J. Pfeifer, rehabilitation division, State board of vocational and adult education; Ross Rowen, Wisconsin Education Association; Gerhardt A. Schueler, department of veterans affairs.

Award and Cash Prize Winners, 1954

FIRST, $150 IN SAVINGS BONDS

Bonnie Jean Getschman, Kenosha. Mary D. Bradford High School, D. T. John, principal; Miss Charlotte A. Moody, English instructor.

SECOND, $100 IN SAVINGS BONDS

Lenore Kreitz, Wausau. Wausau Senior High School, E. H. Boettcher, principal; Miss Kathleen Bertolone, English instructor.

THIRD, $75 IN SAVINGS BONDS

Corrine F. Horn, Owen. Owen High School, W. K. Doonan, principal; Mrs. Margaret Armstrong, English instructor.

FOURTH, $50 SAVINGS BOND

Marjorie Toal, McFarland. Madison East High School, F. S. Randle, principal; B. I. Carter, English instructor.

HONORABLE MENTION, $25 SAVINGS BONDS

John Hughes, Beloit. Beloit Catholic High School, Sister Mary Remigia, principal; Sister Mary Elise, English instructor.

Jane Orth, Milwaukee. Shorewood High School, J. D. Logsdon, principal; Miss Bertha White, English instructor.

Nancy Lee Paul, Appleton. Appleton Senior High School, Herbert H. Helble, principal; Miss Adela Klumb, English instructor.

Annette Wiley, Beloit. Beloit Memorial High School, Royal B. Everill, principal; Miss Dorothy Dunn, English instructor.

Keith Youngberg, Eau Claire. Eau Claire Senior High School, David Barnes, principal; Miss Pearle Landfair, English instructor.

Barbara Helen Zwick, Milwaukee. Rufus King High School, Ralph Chamberlin, principal; Eugene Hackett, English instructor.

PREVIOUS WINNERS

In 1949: Patricia A. Theisen, Cassville High School; Phyllis Indermuehle, West Bend High School; Dorothy Ottow, Madison West High School; Shirley J. Smith, Waukesha Senior High School.

In 1950: Betsy Barland, Eau Claire Senior High School; Barbara Murray, Wauwatosa Senior High School; Byron Barrington, Manawa Little Wolf High School; James Smith, Chippewa Falls McDonnel High School.

In 1951: Lois Erdmann, Waukesha Senior High School; Wayne J. Barta, Milwaukee St. Francis Minor Seminary; Florence Goetz, Marathon High School; Jean Conlin, Milwaukee Messmer High School.

In 1952: Sally Anne Wolff, Fond Du Lac St. Mary's Springs Academy; Mary Louise Liskovec, La Crosse Acquinas High School; Donn Dahlke, Westfield Union Free High School; Edgar H. Koch, Two Rivers.

In 1953: Carole Mahnert, Milwaukee Rufus King High School; Charles Earl Morris, Sharon High School; Arlys Jean Udelhoven, Lancaster High School; Marlene Margaret Klebe, Elkhorn High School; Clarence F. Fugina, Jr., Arcadia High School; Dorothy Rabin, Milwaukee Washington High School; Lois Ann Schneiberg, Milwaukee Messmer High School; George Wm. Shepherd, Milwaukee Pious XI High School; Lionel Skamser, Eau Claire Senior High School; Mary Ann Ward, Elkhorn High School.

The Physically Handicapped: Competent, Dependable Workers

(By Bonnie Jean Getschman)

"Katherine, that rehab man has been putting the pressure on again. I wish he'd leave me alone. He just can't seem to realize that we're running a business, not a charity."

These words, spoken by my father at the supper table a few weeks ago startled me out of my reverie. My mother murmured a sympathetic answer and gave me a look which said more plainly than words: "Please don't start an argument." She knew that the employment of the handicapped had been my pet project in social problems class the previous year.

Despite my mother's plea, my convictions did not allow me to pass over lightly my father's chance remarks. It surprised me to hear these words coming from my father, who is the personnel manager of a large factory, and whom I had always considered an extremely fair man. My flow of words simply would not be stopped.

"Why, Dad!" I exclaimed, "do you mean you've actually refused to cooperate in the job placement of the physically handicapped?"

"Refused to cooperate? Why, do you realize what would happen if I started hiring these handicapped workers? Absenteeism would shoot up. The accident rate would rise. It would be just plain foolish to take such a step."

"We studied this in class last year, and I found in all the records I studied, the handicapped had better absentee rates and had fewer accidents. Their loyalty, pride in work, cooperation, and punctuality compare very favorably to those of normal workers. They are usually very grateful for their jobs; and, as a result, they put forth more effort to please their employers."

"Maybe that's what you learned in school, honey, but I know a man who was nearly ruined by hiring handicapped workers. His son lost a leg in the war. He met many other handicapped veterans in the hospital. When he came home, his dad gave him a job in the small factory he owned. The son persuaded his father to provide jobs for some of his friends. These men proved very lazy and incompetent, but he was ashamed to fire them. In the end, he had to fire them in spite of the embarrassment, or go out of business."

"In the first place, this man obviously did not hire men who had been properly rehabilitated. He knew nothing whatsoever about their backgrounds. When you hire a handicapped person through an established agency you can be sure that he has not only been thoroughly trained for his job, but has also proven himself well adjusted mentally and emotionally. However, if, after you have given him a fair trial, you feel that he is not filling the job properly, the sponsoring agency will assume responsibility for finding him a job which would be more satisfactory."

"Even if you are right, I have my business to look after. I can't afford to pay extra workman's compensation and buy a lot of special machinery."

"Nearly all of the physically handicapped who are placed in the proper jobs can do these jobs without any special machinery. In fact, we learned in school that disabled personnel can successfully perform 80 percent of the tasks of which the able-bodied person is capable. And as for insurance, no higher rate of workman's compensation insurance is charged because of the employment of the physically handicapped."

"How can that be? Surely they must have more accidents."

"In many cases, the disabled have fewer accidents. Having a physical handicap serves to make them more careful. If they are placed in the proper job, their handicap will not put them in any more danger of an accident than a normal person."

"Well, I certainly haven't any soft jobs for these fellows."

"They don't want any soft jobs, Dad. All they want is a good job with decent pay and a chance to support themselves and their families. They aren't looking for handouts and don't like being supported by the Government. There are very few handicapped who do not have at least one job they can do as well as a normal person. Being physically handicapped does not necessarily mean being job handicapped. A vet who has lost a leg may do very superior skilled work with his hands. Only the qualifications which are necessary for the job should be considered."

"All this may or may not be true, but I'd still rather not take any chances. I'd much prefer to let somebody else take care of the physically handicapped and keep on hiring normal men who are sure to do the job."

"I think I can give you a few more good reasons why hiring the handicapped would be a real advantage for you. It might actually lower your taxes."

"Lower my taxes. Why, that's impossible."

"Not at all. While the disabled veteran is unemployed, he is a tax burden on the Government. You are helping to pay for his support. If you give him a job, you'll be saving yourself tax money. National security is also strengthened by the employment of the handicapped. While they may not be capable of serving their country in the Armed Forces, they can fill jobs which leave able-bodied men free to fight."

"Well, I have to admit, you have a few good points there, Barbara."

This was my father's only reply, but for the rest of the meal, he was quiet and thoughtful. During that same week, he finally agreed to take on one handicapped worker, just to see how it worked out. He told my mother that Bill Leonard (he's a veteran with one arm amputated), while he isn't doing anything spectacular, is a good, steady worker. He seems to be very good natured, and he is certainly giving his department a lift. Dad also confided that he just might consider hiring more handicapped workers if there are any more job openings.

I am very proud of having converted my father to my point of view, but I am not smug about it. While several good Americans are doing their share and more in the job placement of the handicapped, many are refusing to do their part or ignoring the issue completely. I shall never be satisfied until I have successfully appealed to every employer in America. This is the reason I am appealing to you, employers.

Hire the physically handicapped, competent, dependable workers.

Bill To Amend Section 2 (a) (3) of Title I of the Public Utility Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 5, 1954

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced into the House a bill to amend section 2 (a) (3) of title I of the Public Utility Act of 1935. The bill has three basic objectives. These are: First, the expeditious development by private companies of atomic energy for peacetime and defense purposes; second, the development of essential electric-power resources by private capital under the President's partnership program rather than at the taxpayers' expense; and third, the recognition of the primary responsibility of States to regulate companies affected with a public interest.

Projected atomic-energy power projects involve such a large expenditure of funds that it has been found impossible for one electric-utility company to finance such a project alone. Such development as has so far taken place has been through the pooling of resources of a number of electric-utility operating companies. This program has been slowed down, however, through the duplicate regulation exercised over participating companies by State and Federal Commissions. One company, for example, wishing to participate in a project of this kind is subject to the jurisdiction of five State commissions, the Federal Power Commission and, under the law as now written, the Securities and Exchange Commission.

My bill would eliminate a part of this duplicate regulation by making it possible for the Securities and Exchange Commission, by order, to declare a generating company, created to pool the resources of several companies for the development of atomic-power projects and other such large power projects, not to be an electric-utility company within the meaning of title I of the Public Utility Act of 1935. The Commission could issue an order, however, only upon an application and upon a showing by the generating company that enumerated safeguards are present. These tests are ones which will make certain that participating companies will not become holding companies in the conventional sense and that the public interest is fully protected.

If atomic energy is to be speedily developed for peaceful purposes by utility companies, and if the President's power-partnership program is to be made effective, I believe it essential that this bill be speedily enacted into law.

Nixon Comment Has Its Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 29, 1954

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following editorial from the San Diego (Calif.) Union of April 20, 1954:

SOBERING POSSIBILITY: NIXON COMMENT HAS ITS BENEFITS

Vice President Nixon's comments on Indochina have had a sobering effect upon the American people. They underscore the importance of the battle being waged in southeast Asia.

It is to be hoped that we will never be called upon to make a decision on sending troops to Indochina under the circumstances proposed in the hypothetical question answered by Mr. Nixon in an off-the-record discussion with editors.

The Vice President opined that it might be necessary to fight the Communists with American troops—if the French withdrew. The latter qualification is the important one here.

If the French were to quit Indochina, it would be necessary to reappraise all our policies including those on the European Continent. French withdrawal would mean that there had been a change in parliamentary lineup in that country—and this in turn might indicate that in this hypothetical case France had adopted a neutralist attitude on the Continent.

While the Vice President's comment on troops for Indochina was not part of his prepared address, we do not believe it to be an off-the-cuff comment. He has given considerable thought and study to Indochina, and there is a strong possibility that he regards Indochina as a last-ditch area where communism must be stopped lest it grow to a point where it will overrun the free world.

President Eisenhower recently compared the situation to that of a row of dominoes. If one falls, they all tumble. The premise is that if Indochina goes Red, all of southeast Asia will—and thus Japan and the Philippines, too, will become victims of the Communist blight.

While we would want to reserve judgment on sending American troops into battle anywhere, we can see beneficial effects from Mr. Nixon's comment on this subject.

The Vice President has let it be known to Red China that the United States may not be bluffing in its warning against further aggression. And the Reds must approach Geneva knowing that the United States will figure in any French decision on Indochina. This strengthens our position.

President Eisenhower has said that American troops would not be sent into battle without congressional consent. If it ever becomes necessary to make such a request, it is better that the entire problem will have been considered in advance. Mr. Nixon's comments affords that opportunity.

Americanism Versus All Other Isms

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. MARTIN DIES

OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 5, 1954

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following by Louisa Eldridge, of Houston, Tex.:

AMERICANISM VERSUS ALL OTHER ISMS

With the kiss of the sun for a pardon and the song of a bird for mirth, you are closer to God in your garden than any place else on earth. Perhaps as I enjoy this simple pleasure of my own small backyard, pondering the devious subterfuges leading to the destruction of the American way of life the thought strikes me forcefully; How is it possible among this tranquility? Then, quickly, the next thought follows: How is it possible to explain Americanism and just exactly what does the American way of life mean to me as an American citizen?

Before the questions scarcely have been posed, I am stymied. American citizenship indubitably means untold opportunities too numerous to recount. It means more joy and ease of living than any place on this earth. It means public schools and colleges for all. It means the beauty of New England snows to the blue waters of the Gulf of Mexico. It means fields of waving grain, acres of white cotton, towering industries, unspeakable beauty of valleys and mountains from the Atlantic to the Pacific. It means loyalty, love, and harmony of family and friends.

Even all of this is not sufficient. Have you as a citizen of this great Republic ever tried to explain Americanism—what American citizenship means to you, what the American way of life means to you, what the Constitution of the United States of America means to you, the Declaration of Independence, the Bil of Rights, with all the prerogatives and privileges of a free and independent individual? As one who unswervingly believes in the capitalistic system of America, with its free enterprise as the last and only hope of freedom for the world, I maintain it is not only wise but necessary to our survival for every American to take stock.

The attack upon America is of a virulence and of a mendacity. Specious and nonlogical propaganda so commonly known as brainwashing seems to be the order of the day. Why is this not recognized for what it is, namely, the apotheosis of evil? Why do Americans who know the truth continue to take the less hazardous and more comfortable middle-of-the-road attitude? Why have so many Americans become muddled and confused about the basic precepts of right and the privileges and responsibilities of our American heritage, together with the fundamental principles upon which our country was established?

Human nature as such has not changed. Right is still right. Wrong continues to be wrong. Honor and integrity are still necessary for the formation of a solid foundation for an individual or a country to build a decent and happy life. The Ten Commandments, after 2,000 years, are the unchanged laws of God. After almost two centuries the Constitution of the United States of America is undeniably the most perfect human document ever written. "If one believes in right principles, and in God, whose divine intelligence provides the natural law to all mankind as a way of life, it is then impossible to compromise with Marxism, which is based on materialism, and thus rejects God."

With this incontrovertible evidence why has it become in the eyes of many a sign of weakness to love one's country; to revere God and to respect the individual rights of man? Why has nationalism become, according to many, a poison for the mind? The unsavory program of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), the monster brain child of the United Nations, propagandizes our teachers and our children with this: "As long as the child breathes the poisoned air of nationalism (patriotism), education in world-mindness can produce only rather precarious results. As we have pointed out, it is frequently the family that infects the child with extreme nationalism."

Does not that quote from the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization virtually terrify you as an American? Nationalism is patriotism. It is loyalty and devotion to your country and its established principles. But according to UNESCO, these ideals must be eradicated at all costs. According to the program of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization love of country is a dangerous hazard to our children. This fallacious and incredible doctrine of UNESCO has been subtly promulgated for the past 20 to 30 years in our American colleges. It has produced our Alger Hisses, our Rosenbergs, our fifth-amendment Americans. If one doubts this, let him read the countless volumes of testimony given before the investigating committees: Committee on the Judiciary, Senator WILLIAM E. JENNER, chairman; the House Committee on Un-American Activities, HAROLD H. VELDE, chairman; and the Senate's Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, Senator JOE MCCARTHY, chairman. The transcripts of testimony pertaining to communism in education consume approximately 1,000 pages.

At this moment I take a dim view of the survival of our American way of life. With reluctance I face the immutable and factual evidence leading to this conclusion. Since the year 1800 socialism, which is the forerunner of communism, has been treading its way.

Our republican form of government has been under constant attack. On November 16, 1933, Franklin Delano Roosevelt opened the floodgates by recognizing the godless U. S. S. R.—the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. The Roosevelt-Truman administrations invited, even aided and abetted, the destruction of our American Republic. This is not acrimony or heresy but irrefutable truth. This does not mean to imply that to the end I shall not fight for the survival of my country. "Breathes there a man with soul so dead, who never to himself hath said—'This is my own, my native land.'" With Patrick Henry I shall stand and acclaim: "I know not what course others may take, but as for me give me liberty or give me death."

Americanism and the American way of life mean: "I am an American—a free American. Free to speak without fear. Free to worship God in my own way. Free to stand for what I think right. Free to oppose what I believe wrong. Free to choose those who govern my country. Free to uphold this heritage for myself and all mankind." One great American patriot has expressed my belief in Americanism more powerfully than my capabilities permit. Thus I quote George Sokolsky: "I believe that America is an ideal, a hope. It is freedom for all mankind. It is liberty for the individual man. It is human aspiration that makes the erect man stand in the dignity of his own person. This ideal is unchanged in the 177 years since Thomas Jefferson penned the glorious Preamble to the Declaration of Independence."

To this ideal American patriots from Lexington to St. Mihiel; from Corregidor to Iwo Jima to the shameful and bloody hills of Korea have pledged their sacred honor, lives, and fortunes. For generations Americans from all walks of life have contributed their talents to this ideal. The least that I can do as a privileged American is to spend my efforts in teaching the youth of this land to believe in and cherish these United States of America "as a government of the people, by the people, for the people, whose just powers are derived from the consent of the governed; a constitutional representative government; a republic; a sovereign nation of many sovereign states; a perfect union one and inseparable, established upon those principles of freedom, equality, justice, and humanity." I further believe it is my duty to my country to teach the youth of this land "to love it, to respect its flag, to obey its laws, to uphold its Constitution, and to defend it against all enemies" both within and without.

All these things and many more I poignantly believe to be an integral part of America, Americanism, and the American way of life.

My American heritage challenges me as an individual to use every resource within my power to save my country from the quicksands of nefarious and traitorous ideologies sown for the aggrandizement of evil.

Leonard E. Kopitzke

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1954

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I was profoundly grieved last week to learn of the untimely passing of Leonard E. Kopitzke, cheesemaker of Marion, Wis., with whom many of my colleagues here in the House of Representatives had become acquainted on his various visits here in our Nation's Capital in the interests of the dairymen.

Mr. Kopitzke was widely known as an outstanding dairyman and was perhaps best known as the president of the Wisconsin Cheesemakers Association, a position which he held since 1940. He was a member of the Wisconsin Cheesemakers Association board of directors for 24 years, served on an advisory committee to the Office of Price Administration and the United States Department of Agriculture during World War II, was a director of Cheesemakers Mutual Insurance Co. since 1934, a director of the Northeastern Wisconsin Cheese and Buttermakers Association since 1932, and was a director of the American Dairy Association of Wisconsin since 1949. He operated the Star cheese factory in Marion, Wis., and I am sure that many of my colleagues will recall having partaken of his splendid cheese which has been so widely distributed here on Capitol Hill.

The dairymen of the State of Wisconsin and of the Nation have lost an outstanding leader. I am sure that the membership of the House joins me in this expression of sympathy to the family of the late Leonard E. Kopitzke.

Editorial Comment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JEFFREY P. HILLELSON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1954

Mr. HILLELSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the May 1, 1954, edition of the Independence Examiner, Independence, Mo.:

BLOW TO GAS USERS

By changing the method of evaluating natural gas reserves for the Panhandle Eastern Pipe Line Co., the Federal Power Commission opened the floodgates of exploitation upon millions of consumers.

This will be a lush windfall for all pipeline companies that will expect and receive the same treatment by the Federal Power Commission under its recent ruling. That will affect consumers of the Independence area in terms of higher rates than they ever paid before. The local distributing company buys from the Cities Service Pipe Line Co. at the city gate for resale to local consumers. The rate charged by the pipeline company is reflected directly by the local distributing company in rates to local consumers. When the rate hike upon the distributing company comes, the Missouri Public Service Commission will have no other alternative than to give the company relief. The local consumers will pay.

Rates that consumers pay utilities are fixed by the Federal Power Commission and the Missouri Public Service Commission high enough to yield the pipelines and local utilities a profit on their investments in operating facilities, including reserves.

By the new ruling, the Federal Power Commission permits the Panhandle Eastern Co. to value its reserves at the price that it would pay for them today at present inflated figures as compared to the costs of acquirement perhaps some years ago.

City Counselor John F. Thice who always represents the city in rate hearings before the regulatory bodies, recently said that such valuations do not represent the actual legitimate costs but imaginary costs. For instance, "When a company drills a hole in the ground at a cost of $1,000, for example, and strikes gas, the value of the gas found would be estimated and charged into the rate, and not the actual cost of drilling the hole. How is anyone able to know the amount and value of the gas in the ground before it is taken out? The value of the gas thus found could be set at any figure."

Representative OAKMAN, Michigan Republican, and Senator FERGUSON, also of Michigan have introduced legislation to bar the Federal Power Commission from departing from its previous rate making policies.

Representative OAKMAN describes this as replacement of fact with fancy and points out that the present $3 million valuation of the Panhandle's reserves will be increased many times. The Senate Commerce Committee has set a hearing on the Ferguson-Oakman bill for May 6. Those who prepared the bill have estimated that the new rate policy will cost American consumers at least $50 million a year more than they are now paying for natural gas.

The only member of the Federal Power Commission who stood for the consumers and against the company in this matter was Claude L. Draper, who has served on the Commission since it was created in 1930. Jerome Kuykendall and S. L. Digby, the two Eisenhower appointees, and Lee Smith and Dale Doty, the 2 Truman appointees, voted for the company's interests.

It follows that if consumers cannot be protected legislatively that relief should be sought judicially by taking the matter to a test before the Supreme Court, as was done on situations that led to inflation of prices about 10 years ago.

Time for Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1954

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Army-Navy-Air Force Journal of May 1, 1954:

TIME FOR ACTION

The story of the progressive deterioration of the attractiveness of the armed services from a career standpoint has now been effectively told to the country and sympathetically received. There is today a nationwide awareness of the unnecessary expense and loss in efficiency brought about by the former shortsighted policy of "socking the services."

From a rather cold and unresponsive beginning, the civilian leadership of the Department of Defense warmed up to the problem and has done an efficient job of convincing Congress and the people that grave damage has been done by taking away rights, benefits, and prestige from the military services.

The daily press and national magazines have taken up the cudgel to tell their readers what is being done to their Armed Forces. Latest example appears in the May issue of Fortune: "General LeMay's Management Problem." Analyzing SAC from a strictly business viewpoint (in which Fortune is a recognized expert), the article lays great stress on the damaging influence of the failure of personnel to continue in the service. SAC's "most critical management problem," says Fortune, "is its low reenlistment rate which produces a 20 percent annual turnover." This is not due to the danger of the job, states the article, but "it is in part due to the inherent instability of the airman's life in SAC—his frequent shifts from place to place—and in part to the services' inability to compete in pay and benefits with private industry. SAC trains airmen to technical proficiency in radio, radar, air-traffic control, photography, motor mechanics, communications, and the like, only to find private industry bidding more for their services in money and living conditions than SAC offers. SAC is, in effect, running a technical training college for the benefit of United States industry."

Congress, whose zealousness to save money at the expense of service personnel and their families was the major cause of the present dilemma, has almost completely changed its mood. The legislative committees and their chairmen, Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL and Representative DEWEY SHORT, have continued fully aware of the gravity of the situation and have pointedly asked the Department of Defense to give them a program to work on.

Even the House Appropriations Committee, which in the past has originated and pushed through most of the antiservice legislation, is now awake to what is going on and is likewise looking to the Department for a solution. In its report this week on the military appropriations bill, the Appropriations Committee deplored the low rate of reenlistments. It admitted that the Department has been vigorous in seeking to increase reenlistments, but was struck by the fact that training is becoming increasingly expensive. It modified some of its oppressive riders and took the almost unprecedented step of urging the legislative committees having jurisdiction of the armed services to consider the matters covered in their quickie-riders so that they can be dropped from the 1956 bill. But, most significantly, the committee hoped that the Department will soon be in position to present to the Congress its recommendations for legislative or other action which would tend to strengthen this phase of our national security.

In spite of its outstanding job in exposing the situation and in spite of its announced program, the Department of Defense is considerably behind a reasonable schedule in submitting corrective legislation to Congress. The first major recommendation went to Congress this week—the bill to insure a more equalized and dependable system of medical care for the families of service personnel. It is an important measure and most vital to the morale of the Services. Yet one cannot help recalling that the problem it aims to solve is an old one and that the report of the Moulton Commission, upon which the recommendations are based, was rendered last June—10 months ago.

There yet remains the recommendations on many more problems to submit to Congress. Some solution must be found to the vexing matter of family housing. The privileges of commissaries and post exchanges must be protected from further legislative curtailment. There must be reasonable allowance for the transportation of household goods. Disability benefits must be adequate and also death benefits and provision for survivors. Likewise retirement privileges should be made secure and not subject to abridgment. Also important is the matter of undue delay in the benefits given veterans. Under present conditions, it is more profitable to leave the Services than it is to remain in and be denied veterans' rights.

The current delay in submitting legislation cannot be entirely placed upon the Department of Defense. It is highly probable that the Bureau of the Budget is holding up on many of their projects. Whatever the cause, the delay should be ended. The time has come to cease talking about the need for better career incentives and do something about them.

Freedom of the Press

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURR P. HARRISON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1954

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix, I include an article by Harry F. Byrd, Jr., editor of the Winchester Evening Star, daily newspaper published at Winchester, Va. This editorial, which was printed on October 1, 1953, received national recognition recently when the Freedoms Foundation awarded this Virginia editor its George Washington Honor Medal.

The editorial follows:

FREEDOM OF EXPRESSION: A PRICELESS HERITAGE BOUGHT WITH BLOOD AND TEARS

When the author of the Declaration of Independence wrote that "if the choice were left to me whether to have a free press or a free government, I would choose a free press," he was not thinking of a freedom conferred for their own benefit upon owners of newspapers.

Thomas Jefferson and his co-revolutionaries had lived under a government controlled press. They realized what the Virginia Constitution cited: "Freedom of the press is the great bulwark of all liberty; if it be restrained, all liberty fails."

It is difficult for a newspaperman to discuss the significance of a free press without conveying the impression that he has a selfish motive—that he favors a free press merely because he is a part of the press.

So in preparing this, I tried to put myself in the frame of mind of too many Americans—what difference does freedom of the press make to me? I am not a newspaper publisher, or editor, or writer. It's of little concern to me whether the American press is free or controlled.

This is a somewhat plausible attitude—certainly to us of this complacent generation. For more than 160 years the American people have enjoyed a free press; we have not lived under a government-controlled press or a church controlled press.

So in preparing this I said to myself, "Maybe my motive is selfish, maybe if I were not a newspaperman I would not worry about the freedom of press as guaranteed by our Constitution."

Then I reread the Constitution and some of the debates of the Constitutional Convention of 1787. I then realized anew that those who insisted that the very first articles of our Constitution guarantee to every American freedom of speech, freedom of religion, and freedom of the press were not newspaper publishers or editors. (They were merchants, lawyers, frontiersmen, farmers, soldiers.)

I realized anew, too, that freedom of speech and freedom of religion and freedom of the press are synonymous. They mean, one and all, collectively and individually—simply freedom of expression for the individual, within the bounds of common decency.

And after all was not this the reason—the real reason—our forefathers gave of their blood and of their lives? It was for that one magic word—liberty: Liberty to worship God in any manner we see fit, and liberty to express our views on any subject, whether orally or in writing.

This is the most priceless heritage a people can possess.

No; the framers of the Constitution of these United States did not spill their blood merely that editors and publishers might be free to print and comment on the news without restraint; they did it to assure liberty of action and liberty of expression to the individual citizen.

They realized that individual freedom could not survive if the Government, the church, or any other group had any control, however remote, over the channels of expression. Therefore the channels of expression must be free.

The signers of the Declaration of Independence and the framers of our Constitution realized the importance, nay the necessity, of a free press for the very reason that we today do not. They had lived under a government-controlled press.

They were not interested in a free press for the newspaper's sake; they were interested in a free press as the only effective way to protect their own individual liberties.

All history tells us that the one sure way to regiment a nation is first to regiment its mind. Dictators have had diverse personalities, have handled differently the emotions of their peoples, have varied their propaganda approach. But throughout history, all from necessity took the same basic step: Each subjugated the press as logic told them they must do in order to promote and maintain their dictatorships. It was true of Hitler; it was true of Stalin; it was true of Mussolini; it was true of the royal rulers of France and of Great Britain; it is true today in Argentina, in Czechoslovakia, in Poland.

Read the words of Nikolai Lenin, founder of Communist Russia, in a speech in Moscow, 1920:

"Why should freedom of speech and freedom of the press be allowed? Why should a government which is doing what it believes to be right allow itself to be criticized? Ideas are more fatal things than guns. Why should any man be allowed to buy a printing press and disseminate pernicious opinions calculated to embarrass the government?"

Dr. Gainza Paz, publisher of the famous Argentinan newspaper, La Prensa, recently seized by the Argentina Government, uses these words to explain why a dictator fears an uncontrolled press:

"News from free countries comes to oppressed people and teaches the benefits of liberty. News from an oppressed and terrified country teaches a bitter lesson to other countries which still have all or part of their freedom. News makes them reflect. Every dictator knows these elemental principles very well. Therefore, every dictator hastens to raise barriers against the circulation of news within his country, impede the entrance of news into it and forbid the dispatch of news from it. News must be kept down."

But, you may say, what guarantee does the public have that the press will not abuse its freedom? The only truthful reply is that there are no absolute guarantees. There are corrupt and disreputable newspapers just as there are shyster lawyers, quack doctors, dishonest merchants and grafting public officials.

But the overwhelming majority of newspapers, like the overwhelming majority of lawyers and doctors and merchants and public officials are honest, conscientious, and patriotic. Were it otherwise, America long ago would have ceased to be the great Nation it is today.

No, the American press is not perfect. It makes mistakes—and plenty. We agree thoroughly with Benjamin Franklin that "abuses of expression ought to be suppressed, but," continued Franklin, "to whom dare we commit the care of doing it."

That is the crux of the whole situation—"to whom dare we commit the care" of determining what the people may or may not read.

American newspapers are free from restraint before publication but they are held responsible after publication. They must face the courts if libelous statements are printed. This is a citizen's recourse against an unscrupulous publisher.

Another safeguard against a newspaper abusing its rights is the severe competition to which all newspapers are subjected. There are approximately 1,900 daily newspapers in the United States with a daily circulation of more than 50 million; and there are 10,000 weekly newspapers.

Practically all of these are under different ownership, all have different editors and newswriters. You here in this community have access to—delivered here daily—at least a dozen different newspapers.

The only control over the channels of expression a free nation can allow is control by the people themselves in refusing to patronize unworthy publications.

So when we in free America consider the subject of a free press, let us consider it carefully; let us consider the alternative; let us look at those countries in which the press is not free; let us, too, look back to 1776 and to our priceless heritage of liberty given to us by the blood of those who regarded freedom of religion, freedom of speech and freedom of the press as the foundation of our democracy.

Let us remember that freedom of religion, freedom of speech, and freedom of the press are synonymous—that we can't have one without the others.

And let us remember that the dark night can fall here just as it did last year in Argentina. An American President only 18 months ago proclaimed his inherent right to seize newspapers and radio stations, if, in his opinion, it would serve the best interests of the country, a theory the Supreme Court overruled.

But the Supreme Court changes just as do Presidents, and so long as human nature, essentially power-grasping, continues as it is, the threat to the liberties of the individual citizen always is a possibility. Eternal vigilance on the part of the public is essential. And that is why once a year National Newspaper Week, October 1 to 8, seeks to focus attention on freedom of expression, a priceless heritage bought with blood and tears.

Economy at GPO

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES RAPER JONAS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1954

Mr. JONAS of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from a recent issue of Modern Lithography, one of the outstanding journals in the graphic arts field, which shows how economy can be attained in a Government operation if the will to do so is there:

Best news during the past 30 days was the announcement by the Government Printing Office that it is reducing by 5 percent its charges for printing. Other Government departments and agencies, who are the "customers" of the GPO, thus will share in the economy results of the efficient printing operations.

In a letter from Raymond Blattenberger, Public Printer, to the heads of Government departments, he stated that the reduction, the first in 20 years, was the result of changes made in GPO management during the last 8 months. "Shortly after I took office," the Public Printer said, "the Congress approved a business-type budget for the Government Printing Office, which is set up in almost the same manner as the budget for any large private printing plant. I believe that this change has resulted in real savings, and the mere shift in emphasis from the regular type Government appropriation to a business type structure is in itself causing everyone concerned at the Government Printing Office to adjust his thinking from the regular Government terms to the thinking of people engaged in a business activity."

He reported that he had instituted a series of internal budgets for the administrative and service divisions, with a resulting reduction in overhead expenditures of over $882,000 a year. Further shifts in operations resulted in savings of $23,000 a month while Congress was not in session, and of $11,000 per month since that body has convened. The GPO has initiated action to return to the Treasury Department $5,000,000 of the GPO's cash working capital, which it was felt could be utilized to better advantage elsewhere in the Government.

The Public Printer's hope is "that this is not the end, but only the beginning." "I am looking forward to the day," Mr. Blattenberger concluded, "when every Government agency will have its printing done at the Government Printing Office, not because it is required to do so by law, but because the Government Printing Office renders the type of service the agency wants when the agency wants it."

This type of thinking and action on the part of the Public Printer certainly deserves the acclaim and support of the graphic arts industry.

A Bill With Fringe on Top

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1954

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the San Diego Union of May 2, 1954:

A BILL WITH FRINGE ON TOP

Fringe benefits are not rightly named. Their only fringe-like quality is that during the past 10 years they have been trimmed away a great deal.

They are not fringe—if we take that to mean on the border—but quite centrally located among the earning which servicemen consider as theirs, according to the contract.

It was gratifying to learn of last week's approval by the House Appropriation Committee of a defense appropriation bill which restores some major benefits. The bill has the approval of the Armed Services Committee. Adoption by the House seems most probable, according to Representative WILSON who has been highly effective in this program.

When a man decides to make the service his career, he knows that he has no chance to earn a fortune. He knows that he will have to pick up his family and move when orders arrive. He knows that he will live a life of activity and danger.

He knows this but he expects something in return. He expects that the Government will provide medical care for himself and his dependents. He expects to be paid enough when moving to break even on the pesky transaction. If the situation warrants one, he expects to be able to purchase food from a commissary. He expects to be able to retire after serving the period of service stipulated in his contract.

These are as much a part of the serviceman's compensation as the money paid him by the disbursing officer. He earns them. He expects them. But he has not been getting them.

These are the rights which are specifically restored in the bill approved by the two committees of the House. Their restoration will plug a hole through which service morale has been leaking for a long time, service morale upon which rests our national security.

Seaway: Sectional Disadvantage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 5, 1954

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following editorial from the Lawrence Tribune, Lawrence, Mass., April 20, 1954:

SERVING THE NATIONAL INTEREST

It strikes us that the supreme audacity is to be urged to be selfless to serve somebody else's selfish interests. We are on the mailing list of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Association. Monday we received two tearful appeals from the association asking us to oppose the proposal of Congressman CHARLES BROWNSON, Republican, of Indiana, that the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation sell its revenue bonds to the public instead of to the United States Treasury, without Government guaranty.

In one of the letters, JESSE P. WOLCOTT, Republican, of Michigan, complains that "every available fact compels the conclusion that the Brownson amendment would scuttle the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation. Every traditional opponent of the seaway is welcoming it with open arms. They know that that method of financing (with revenue bonds sold to the public—editor), without precedent in all the cases of Government corporations, will not produce the construction funds without very substantial delay, if at all." In the other letter, Dr. N. R. Danielian, president of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Association, described the Brownson amendment as an "underwater torpedo to sink the administration program, fused by the irreconcilable opponents of the seaway," and declared that "it must be stopped before it does its damage."

We are not so sure, and our doubt is reinforced by something else that Dr. Danielian said. We quote from a speech he made before the Council of Civic Clubs in Minneapolis, Minn., Monday noon, as follows:

"The problem here in Minnesota has not been one of price competition with iron ore from other sources. Your problem is what would happen to the location of industry if there is a cost-price squeeze. Without the St. Lawrence seaway, the growth of heavy industry would have to take place in areas in the East and South with access to seaborne raw materials. Your interest in the St. Lawrence seaway, therefore, deals with the question of location of industry, whether growth will take place in the Middle West or some other part of the country. If the low-cost, high-grade, open-pit ore diminishes in supply, industry may have to move out of the Great Lakes area. Holding down the cost of production of industry in comparison with other parts of the country must be a serious concern to all of us interested in the Middle West. I am firmly convinced that without the seaway the Middle West faces the same kind of industrial migration as New England."

We gather from the above that the rest of the country is supposed to take the broad view of the St. Lawrence seaway, while the Middle West counts up the private benefits which will result. As Dr. Danielian explains it, money spent upon the seaway would be an outright subsidy of middle western industrial ambitions. There is a serious question as to whether the seaway will serve the national interest, but there can be no doubt that it will mean sectional advantage on the one hand, and sectional disadvantage on the other hand.

If Southeast Asia Falls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER HOLTZMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 5, 1954

Mr. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, in these hectic and dangerous times, with global war a possibility, it is most important that we give our undivided attention to the Indochina problem.

In my opinion, the need for a forceful and definitive policy concerning Indochina by far transcends any other issue.

In line with this I offer to the Members of the House two articles appearing in the New York Herald Tribune of Wednesday, May 5, 1954, and most respectfully urge the membership to read them carefully.

Much can be learned from the reading of these two articles, one which discusses overall policy, and the other which goes into the problem of British-American relations concerning the French Indochina war.

The articles follow:

IF SOUTHEAST ASIA FALLS

(By Roscoe Drummond)

WASHINGTON.—The frank truth is that we are at the point of losing Indochina to Communist control. No course of action which can retain it is now visible or in prospect. If the worst is to be averted, militarily and diplomatically, it will be miraculous. One dangerous aspect is that the Government never expounded to the American people—to see if they would accept it—a program of action capable of successfully defending Indochina.

At the same time administration spokesmen have, during the last 16 months, discussed Indochina so often so optimistically that the country is unprepared to see it slip behind the Iron Curtain.

Politically, militarily, and diplomatically we have been losing most of the time, and either our intelligence has been unusually bad or Government officials, who have been close to the facts, have not been candid—or both.

Let us look briefly at some of the frustrations—some of our own making and some imposed by others.

One condition of success which President Eisenhower always stressed was that a people to be successfully supported must be willing and eager to defend itself. But the Indochinese have never fully had their hearts in fighting the Communist insurrectionists because, while France has promised and repromised independence, it has never given its fulfillment a fixed date. While the President and the Vice President and other administration leaders have said the loss of Indochina and southeast Asia would be a national calamity, congressional leaders have constantly said, "yes, but," which meant that they thought that involvement through possible use of ground troops would be a worse calamity. Ground troops might not have been necessary, but could we effectively begin to avert a calamity by serving advance notice that we wouldn't fight? Now, in the end, we haven't even taken many of the lesser steps. This was our own frustration.

In Paris Secretary Dulles disclosed that the administration would come to the defense of Dienbienphu with carrier-based air power if Britain and Australia would agree. Britain said no, and this was an allied frustration.

And now comes Geneva. The fall of Dienbienphu seems imminent, capable of being timed by the Communists as a bargaining card at the conference table. France, weary and burdened with the war for 7 years, fighting to defend a land it is promising to give up, its own government harassed and uncertain, seems ready to accept a "negotiated peace" which many believe will in the end deliver Indochina to the Communists.

Conceivably the chain reaction may not be as certain and as total as we now anticipate. The fall of Dien Bien Phu may not bring the fall of Indochina or its negotiated capitulation. The fall of Indochina may not lead, domino-like, to the fall of the other free nations of southeast Asia. But this is a grim prospect.

The outlook cannot give us anything but the gravest anxiety and it presents the administration with the greatest political embarrassment if not the gravest political consequences.

In many ways the right-wing of the Republican Party has put the Eisenhower administration in an uncomfortable box not of its own making.

During the 1952 campaign and earlier, Senator McCarthy, Senator Jenner, Senator Taft and others contended:

That the Truman administration through inaction or inadequate action permitted China to fall prey to the Communists.

That it was our shortcomings, not Chiang Kai-shek's shortcomings, which gave the Communists their chance.

That it was within the power of the United States to avert Communist conquest of China and that we failed to do it.

Now, what is to be said and what will those who were persuaded by the McCarthy-Jenner-Taft thesis say, if the United States, through inaction or inadequate action, permits all southeast Asia to fall prey to the Communists? Will not the Republican right-wing argument of 1952 that put all the blame on Truman and Acheson for the fall of China, be equally valid when applied to putting the blame on Eisenhower and Dulles for the fall of Indochina and the rest of southeast Asia?

Some Republican leaders did not accept the McCarthy-Jenner-Taft line of argument against the Truman administration but they did not often speak out.

If Indochina falls, the Eisenhower administration will face a political dilemma of large proportions—and this will be the least of the grave consequences.

PLAYING INTO REDS' HANDS?—SPLIT OVER INDOCHINA UPSETS BRITISH

(By Joseph Newman)

LONDON, May 4.—There is increasing concern in London that Anglo-American differences over Indochina are playing into the hands of the Communists and injuring chances of a negotiated settlement at Geneva.

Anxiety in both official and political quarters was expressed in this opening passage of an editorial today in the Times of London:

"It would be disastrous if misunderstandings over Indochina were to develop and increase between Great Britain and public opinion in the United States. The Communists would quickly exploit them. Not only would the last hope of peaceful settlement be gone; if allied differences grew there would be no hope left of saving Indochina by military means were military means still found to be necessary."

CALLED CRUCIAL POINT

This touches a point which is considered to be of crucial importance. It suggests that differences, if permitted to continue, would paralyze Anglo-American capacity to intervene to prevent Indochina from falling to the Communists following a possible breakdown of the Geneva talks.

British officials, politicians, and newspapers, including the Times, hold the United States rather than Britain largely responsible for the situation.

They do so on the grounds that the United States lacks a clear-cut policy on Indochina, swings from one extreme to another, and fails to make a realistic appraisal of the various alternatives involved.

In the absence of a clear-cut policy, it is being said that the United States proved unable to assume leadership in the Indochina issue and that Prime Minister Churchill took the initiative in establishing the policy of not intervening pending outcome of the Geneva talks.

CONFUSION IS BLAMED

The confusion in American policy is attributed to differences of opinion in Congress and to General Eisenhower's refusal to act without congressional sanction. This raises before the British Government the disturbing prospect of an American Government paralyzed by a Congress which is unable to decide what to do.

The British Government already has been confronted with the problem arising from the apparent contradiction between the executive and the legislative branches of the American Government.

When Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles, just before the opening of the Geneva Conference, asked Britain to join the United States in an air offensive to save the fortress of Dien Bien Phu, in northwest Indochina, he did so without being able to commit Congress to such action.

The British Government in effect was being asked to enter the Indochina war without being certain that the American Government would be permitted by Congress to do so.

Britain rejected the idea of Anglo-American air intervention to save Dien Bien Phu.

DIFFERENCE IN POWERS

Sir Winston, supported by a Conservative majority in the House of Commons, has the power to commit Britain to war in Indochina. President Eisenhower apparently does not hold such power in the United States at the present time.

British officials feel offended by American criticism as coming with ill grace from a country which has not yet been able to decide its own position.

The British maintain that their policy was better than no policy at all—which is what they feel America's position amounts to.

The British decision not to intervene at the present time was based on two broad assumptions:

1. The French military position in Indochina is not as bad as American and French officials have pictured it, though the fall of Dien Bien Phu would be a severe blow.

2. The Geneva conference offers a chance to negotiate a settlement which would obviate Anglo-American intervention.

NOT OPTIMISTIC

However, the British are not optimistic about the chances of negotiating a settlement, and the position taken by the Churchill government leaves open the possibility of intervention in the event the Geneva talks fail.

What disturbs responsible people in Britain is the thought that the United States may swing from the extreme of immediate intervention (an extreme which Congress may not have sanctioned) to the extreme of not intervening at all at some future date when the fate of Indochina may be at stake.

It is hoped in London that Washington will take some middle course and will join Britain in leaving open the possibility of joint intervention, if that should be necessary to hold Indochina after the Geneva conference.

This requires a new agreement on a policy to fill the vacuum left by the present situation. The sooner such an agreement is reached the better it is felt the western powers will be able to deal with the Communists at Geneva and after Geneva.

Hon. Lindsay C. Warren

SPEECH
OF
HON. WOODROW W. JONES
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 3, 1954

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in paying tribute to the fine and noble public career of the Honorable Lindsay C. Warren. I also express my deep regrets that he is leaving public service. On April 30 he retired to private life after a long and brilliant career of service to his county, State, and Nation. After serving his county and State in many capacities, he was honored by his people by election to Congress in 1924, and served from March 4, 1925, until his resignation on October 31, 1940. Upon his resignation from the Congress he took over the duties of Comptroller General of the United States. Altogether he has been on the Washington scene for 30 years.

It was not my privilege to serve with him in the House of Representatives, but history reveals that he rendered outstanding service to his country while a Member of this body. Those who did serve with him tell me that he was not only an able and conscientious Congressman, but that he was also an outstanding leader in the House.

As Comptroller General of the United States, Mr. Warren has built an enviable record. Under his leadership, the General Accounting Office has risen to new heights of importance and respect as a Government agency. In riding herd on Federal spending, he was instrumental in saving the American taxpayer millions upon millions of dollars. His reputation for honesty, economy, and efficiency in government became known far and wide and his record of accomplishments as Comptroller General stands as a monument to a distinguished and brilliant career of Government service.

Lindsay Warren is a statesman and is a great American. He will be sorely missed on the Washington scene. As he retires and returns to eastern North Carolina, I wish for him peace, good health, and a most pleasant retirement.

Postal Transportation Service Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER HOLTZMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 5, 1954

Mr. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I would like to include herein a communication which has been sent to the Members of Congress from the Greater New York area from the National Postal Transport Association.

This points up a serious situation which has arisen in the Postal Transportation Service, one which rightfully deserves the serious consideration and attention of the Congress:

APRIL 13, 1954.

To Members of Congress From the Greater New York Area:

We wish to bring to your attention a situation which will work serious hardship on postal transportation clerks employed in the New York area. We refer specifically to the transfer of Connecticut, Rhode Island, and Massachusetts distribution from Pennsylvania terminal, New York, to the newly established New Haven terminal. As a result of this transfer, employment for over 150 clerks will be lost in the New York area. While the Department has stated that all regular clerks are expected to be absorbed they have given no consideration to the serious unemployment for substitutes that will most certainly result. Nor has consideration been given to the plight of regular employees whose seniority and promotional opportunities will have been taken away. Regular clerks face the prospect of long years of nightwork and Saturday and Sunday work and many clerks with over 20 years of service and advanced in age will be forced to perform the arduous duties of parcel-post distribution.

We feel that it is unfair for classified employees in the PTS to suffer loss of employment while non-civil-service employees are utilized in the New York post office on a year-round basis. Mail that is being worked by these non-civil-service employees can certainly be worked in the PTS terminals in the New York area by classified career substitutes who are required to pass periodic examinations on their fitness. Certainly a career employee has more interest in the job and can give more devoted service than a temporary employee . The postal service can ill afford to allow the services of highly skilled and trained PTS employees to go unused at a time when efforts are being made to work the mails in the most economic and efficient manner possible.

With the inception of the flying experiment, mails that have been worked in the PTS have been diverted to the post office. Among these distributions are New York State first-class mail. The clerks in the PTS are especially trained and qualified to work this mail which requires detailed knowledge of State schemes and it is our contention that they should remain in the PTS.

We, therefore, urge you to intercede with the Post Office Department to obtain a replacement of distribution for the PTS in the New York area so as to insure full employment for classified PTS substitutes and alleviate serious hardship for the regular clerks.

Respectfully yours,

Benjamin Goodman,
Vice President, Second Division, National Postal Transport Association.

St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 5, 1954

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, unemployment and its grim reality is never a pleasant subject to discuss, and I do so only out of a sense of duty and a regard for the national welfare. I have never believed in an ostrichlike approach to the problems of our time. I deplore the attempt to make political capital out of the misfortune of the jobless, just as I reject any hush-hushing of the subject. The St. Lawrence seaway project will condemn our American economic pattern and add to the volume of unemployment the Nation is confronted with. I say this advisedly and with regret, for no one wants to stand in this Chamber and be a purveyor of gloom.

From my knowledge of the business and industrial complex of my district, I know the small businesses, the coal industry, the railroad business, and workers will be affected if this seaway measure is passed. Through one source alone—that of the increased importation of cheap, residual fuel oil, the coal and railroad industries will be hit a crippling blow, and all the collateral businesses and industries will be damaged. It should be ever uppermost in our minds that this cheap byproduct of the wastes of the foreign oil industry is essentially the result of low-salaried labor competition. What compounds the injury is that much of this residual fuel oil has been made possible in its production by the use of American dollars in the form of foreign aid.

It is an arresting and challenging thought that when the matter of restoring the economies of friendly foreign countries was under discussion following World War II, coal industry officials and labor leaders came up with a plan whereby American coal would be furnished to our allies instead of dollars. In this way, American ships by the hundreds and American seamen by the thousands would have been employed in the implementation of the plan and work would have been furnished for thousands of American miners and railroaders. It is a regrettable fact the plan was rejected by our policymakers and thus all the advantages went to foreign business. We are witnessing the unhealthy results of that decision now. Beyond this we are confronted with the proposal to increase and multiply that grievous economic wrong by facilitating the flow of this foreign fuel product through the construction of the St. Lawrence Waterway, financed through public funds. Its construction would be a direct and serious threat to the security and well-being of the bituminous coal industry. We should be concerned, here and now, with rectifying the damage caused this vital industry instead of giving consideration to step up its import volume through a federally financed project.

We hear much ill-founded talk about the national defense aspects of this so-called seaway, Mr. Speaker. Many of my colleagues have dealt effectively with this aspect and have laid bare its defense claims. I want to insist, however, that when you neglect the industries of the United States, when you weaken them and make it impossible for industry to achieve a degree of prosperity that will allow for modernization, then you are greatly injuring the national defense.

Let us examine the primary economics of the situation. To keep the coal industry in a proper state of fitness, strong and flourishing, its markets need to be protected against unfair, cheap foreign competition. This will not materialize if we increase the advantages of that competition by facilitating its inflow through construction of this St. Lawrence seaway.

Without question, America has the best transportation system in the world. Let us keep it this way and add to its superiority. We know from expert testimony how this waterway would damage the railroad industry. We have abundant testimony of the injury it would do our merchant fleet. We know that the dumping of cheaply manufactured goods from abroad into the American market would cripple small manufacturers and business conditions in this country, and swell the numbers of jobless.

Mr. Speaker, I hope good sense will prevail and that this body will defeat the St. Lawrence seaway project. As a part of my remarks, I include an editorial from the Philadelphia Inquirer of Saturday, May 1, 1954:

ONE "EASY PAYMENT" ON A $2 BILLION BOONDOGGLE

Soon there's going to be "bargain day" on the St. Lawrence.

It is due next week, when the House of Representatives is to vote on the St. Lawrence seaway.

House Members will be told what a big bargain is offered. For only $105 million we will buy equal rights in a vast seaway. For a mere $105 million we'll bolster national defense, promote commerce, foster peace, and acquire other miracles as fast as the seaway publicity boys can think 'em up.

True, the seaway will be frozen up—a regular glacier—5 months of the year. But no doubt the seaway lobby will come up with a scheme to cut the ice into cubes, sell it, and tell us that'll make the project self-liquidating.

Trouble is, Congress will not be told that this $105 million in the seaway bill is a gimmick to sell a $2 billion project with one easy downpayment.

The point of the $105 million bargain is to get Uncle Sam to sign on the dotted line. Once he has signed, he'll be like the chap who finds he's signed up to buy a property he doesn't need and can't afford—because there was no downpayment. From that moment on costs pile up. So with the seaway.

It would soon be obvious that the 27-foot channel in the present bill is almost worthless, since so few ships could use it. To dig the channel to 35 feet would up the price to $2 billion for the United States share alone.

Next would come the cost of deepening all the Great Lakes ports and harbors. That would run into big money.

Nor would that be all. Where does anyone think all the votes came from to put the seaway bill through the Senate?

It was after $3 million was reported for a study of the New Deal Passamaquoddy boondoggle that Maine's votes switched to support of the seaway. Western votes were not so cheap. Only after a start was promised on a $597 million upper Colorado reclamation project did votes from that section fall into line. Time alone will tell what may have been promised to other Senators.

But the taxpayer will pay for those votes and that logrolling. So, in simple honesty, those costs must be added to the seaway—and when they are the $105 million will look like petty cash.

Finally, there will be the cost—beyond calculation—of the harm to commerce, employment, wages, and general prosperity which this artificial project will mean to the natural harbors and ports of America.

Bargain day on the St. Lawrence? How naive can you get?

Bracketing of Hawaii and Alaska for Statehood Admission Sets No Precedent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. E. L. BARTLETT

DELEGATE FROM ALASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 5, 1954

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, the Globe-Gazette, of Mason City, Iowa, has concisely pointed out in an editorial published on March 30 that the proposal to bring Hawaii and Alaska into the Union together to make 50 States united would not set a precedent. Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to have that editorial reproduced here:

The current proposal to admit Hawaii and Alaska to statehood at the same time isn't anything new in American history. In the past they've come in singly, in pairs, and even in clusters.

The first State added after the original 13 was Vermont, in 1791, followed by Kentucky a year later, Tennessee in 1796, Ohio in 1803, and Louisiana in 1812.

Maine and Missouri posed the most vexing problem due to the mounting North-South rivalry. Maine was antislave; Missouri was considered proslave. The result was the famed Missouri Compromise of 1820.

The greatest group entry occurred in 1889 and involved the Dakotas, Montana, and Washington. New Mexico and Arizona were bracketed for statehood in 1912.

So Congress would have to find some other excuse for violating the unequivocal pledge of both parties.

The Program for Full Employment, Production, and Confidence as Submitted by United Steelworkers of America to the President

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 5, 1954

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following statement of the executive board of the United Steelworkers of America regarding the concern of the steelworkers about the Nation's present economic situation, which we all agree is far from good:

We have met in a special meeting of the international executive board of the United Steelworkers of America to voice the concern of the steelworkers about the Nation's present economic situation.

The state of the economy is not good.

Industrial production has been slowly moving downward for months. At the end of February it was 9 percent below a year ago. The downward trend has continued in March.

Retail sales in February were 5 percent off from last year. March has brought a further reduction in sales.

Automobile production is down over last year and, at the same time, auto dealers report inventories to be substantially greater than a year ago.

Approximately 4 million workers are totally unemployed. In addition, it is apparent from the decline in the average work week that at least another 2 or 3 million others are working only part time because of slack work.

In our own industry—steel, which is basic to our economy—production in the last week of March fell to 68 percent of capacity, with no substantial pickup in sight.

Almost one-third of the Nation's steel capacity lies idle, a loss of about 40 million ingot tons of steel per year; 189,334 members of our union in basic steel and metal fabricating have been laid off and are unemployed; another 257,026 members are working a short workweek.

The loss of purchasing power in our industry due to unemployment and a reduced workweek, approximates one-half billion dollars a year.

As steelworkers we have no interest or desire to make political capital out of this situation. The situation is rapidly becoming critical for us and for the economy.

We are completely confident that with management and labor working together, and cooperating in turn with their Government, the downward economic trend can be checked and our economy restored once again to a state of dynamic expansion.

As steelworkers we deem it our responsibility and obligation to put forward a program to keep this Nation strong and prosperous.

Our great production system can and must be restored to full operation to meet the daily needs of our growing population; it must, in fact, move constantly forward to higher levels of production and efficiency as it has so successfully in the past.

Today, unfortunately, the gap between what America must produce to maintain maximum production and employment, and what we are actually producing, is growing larger.

Last spring at the peak, we were turning out goods and services at an annual rate of $371 billion; today, we are producing at a rate of about $359 billion. Responsible economists predict that our national output for the entire year of 1954 will range between $350 to $355 billion, although we actually will need a production level of $380 to $385 billion to keep our growing labor force fully employed.

Here, then, is the task that confronts us: We must find customers for an additional $25 to $35 billion worth of goods and services which now are not being produced and sold because buyers are not available.

Surely, it is within the power of the American people to close this gap. Instead of vainly waiting to see if the situation gets worse—and then face the probability of trying to tackle the problem after it has become much more difficult to cope with—constructive private and public policies must be undertaken now to reverse the tide.

First, let us consider several policies which governments—Federal, State, and local—must pursue in order to make their full contribution to the goal:

1. Benefit payments to the unemployed and to pensioners under the Social Security Act should be increased immediately by at least $3 billion.

As a simple act of humanity—quite apart from its stimulating economic effect—the rates and duration of benefits for the unemployed, and the amount paid to pensioners under the Old Age and Survivors Insurance system must be immediately increased.

Today, the average unemployed worker covered by the State compensation laws received about $24–$25 a week, about one-third of his former earnings in contrast to the two-thirds which were anticipated when these laws were enacted.

Pensioners receiving benefits under the Social Security Act receive a piteously low average payment of about $50 a month, hardly enough to keep body and soul together.

This great and rich Nation certainly can and must improve the lot of its two most needy groups, the unemployed and the aged. All of the increased benefits would flow into the spending stream and create new consumer demand. To aid the unemployed and the aged alone, benefit schedules must be increased by at least $3 billion a year immediately.

2. By raising the personal Federal income tax exemption to $800, more than $4 billion can be added to consumer demand.

No single policy of government will more quickly stimulate consumer buying than wise and timely tax action. To counteract the downward trend, the present $600 personal exemption (which is actually far lower in real value than the $500 exemption of World War II) should be raised to $800 immediately.

Every family now subjected to the Federal tax will enjoy a benefit; more important, the tax savings of millions of moderate income families will be spent for daily family needs, thus, adding substantially to consumer purchases. A tax policy that achieves this end will do much more to reverse the recessionary trend than special tax privileges for corporations and a minority of stockholding families whose benefits, at this time, would be largely unspent.

3. Public-works programs should be immediately expanded by at least $5 billion to help catch up with the backlog and keep abreast of new demand.

Because of the impact of the last depression and then the prior claims of war and defense requirements, vitally important public construction still lags far behind the need of our expanding population.

According to the 1954 Economic Report of the President, our State and local governments alone must spend almost $20 billion every year for the next 10 years just to meet the need for streets and highways, schools and hospitals, and local water, sewer, and industrial waste facilities. Additional sums must be spent for courthouses, airport, recreation facilities, and other types of projects. Thus, total State and local public work expenditures should exceed $200 billion over the next 10 years if the needs of the population are to be met.

On the Federal level, vitally important projects, some of them already authorized by Congress but postponed because of prior war and defense requirements, are needed to provide harbor improvement, flood-control and power facilities, land reclamation, national park and forest improvements, and the construction of Federal buildings. There should be no further delay in authorization for United States participation in the vitally needed St. Lawrence seaway.

The establishment and maintenance of a merchant marine and of a ship-building industry consistent with our national defense needs is required. Responsible authorities of the Maritime Administration and the Navy Department estimated last year that the deficiency in our merchant fleet numbered more than 200 ships, including 165 cargo ships and 43 tankers. In addition to the need for reducing these deficiencies there should be provided a realistic means for replacement of existing tonnage now approaching obsolescence. In order to make certain that privately owned shipbuilding and repair yards can expand to meet the needs of the United States in the event of an emergency, financial assistance by the Federal Government should be given to support an adequate merchant fleet. Experienced shipbuilders to construct and repair shops are an important requirement of our national defense. Domestic building of a greater proportion of our merchant shipping requirements will involve additional employment by the shipbuilding industry perhaps to the extent needed to maintain a work force potentially capable of expansion to meet emergency requirements.

In 1953 the total outlay for all public works—Federal, State, and local—amounted to slightly more than $11 billion. Certainly, this amount can and should be raised by at least $5 billion during the next 12 months. Not only would more employment be stimulated, both in the mines and mills that provide materials and on the construction projects themselves, but the wealth of the Nation as a whole would be greatly and permanently increased.

We do not advocate or believe in made work. We are suggesting substantial and vitally needed public improvements.

Our proposal is a modest one, indeed. According to the President's report, our public works could be stepped up by one-half or more within a year. Now is the time to begin.

4. Prompt Federal action can increase our national home-construction and slum-clearance effort by $5 billion.

Responsible public groups report, after years of exhaustive study, that a national housing goal of 2 million new units a year is now required if American families are to achieve adequate shelter.

The Administrator of the Federal Housing and Home Finance Agency, Mr. Cole, has stated that only about 1 million new housing units will be built this year, 10 percent below last year's level and 40 percent under the output of 1950.

Surely, at the very least, we can achieve the million and a half new housing starts a year proposed by the late Senator Taft's postwar Committee on Housing and Urban Redevelopment. This can be done, in the first instance, by public policies which support the construction of well-built and reasonably priced homes for the great American middle income market by allowing low initial payments and long-term mortgages at low interest rates geared to ability to pay. For our lowest income families, however, who cannot undertake to buy new homes for themselves, public housing must be expanded to the 200,000 yearly level authorized by the Housing Act of 1949 if we really mean to obtain decent shelter for all Americans.

Even if we achieve only the construction of one and a half million new homes in the next 12 months—actually a completely inadequate goal—the additional $5 billion expended will nonetheless provide a great stimulus to employment and production throughout the Nation.

All of these proposals, involving social welfare benefits, taxes, public works and home construction, are practical, workable measures geared to reversing the current business downturn by reducing the existing gap in demand. There is no waste or boondoggling in them. Simple humanity toward needy men, women, and children dictates the improvement in unemployment compensation and pension benefits that we recommend. An equitable sharing of tax savings—with the largest aggregate going to the millions of families who need tax relief most and will spend whatever savings they receive—motivate our tax proposal. The urgent need for long delayed public works and more home building, and the stimulus to the economy which would flow from an expanding construction program prompts our recommendation for action in this area.

Certainly, it cannot be argued that these proposals involve a raid upon the public treasury. Major improvements in our social welfare system can be covered by existing trust funds and reserves. In the case of taxes, our proposal would simply apply tax reductions in a manner that would most effectively strengthen the economy at this time. The cost of many new public works projects like turnpikes, toll bridges, and airports would be self-liquidating. Others, sooner or later, must be built at public expense; with manpower and resources now available, this is the time to expand our effort. As for our proposal to increase substantially our national housing output, the public cost would be low compared to the benefits obtained. The additional hundreds of thousands of families who would be assisted to purchase their own homes would ultimately pay the full cost; in the case of public housing, a substantial part of the outlay would be covered later by rental income.

Enlightened policies by management in collective bargaining with labor can also contribute to the restoration of maximum production and employment in the United States.

With the approach of collective bargaining in the steel industry, we believe that forward looking steps are more necessary now than ever to insure an improvement in the income and benefit position of its workers. Only by keeping the purchasing power of wage and salary earners in step with the constantly rising productivity of our American industrial system can prosperity be assured for both management and men.

We must particularly recognize the importance of this fact at a time when consumers' purchases are already lagging behind the Nation's capacity to produce. Whether we are considering the need of the lowest paid segment of our population—for whom a substantial increase in the statutory minimum wage is now long overdue—or the responsibility of the great steel industry to its own employees, the necessity to constantly attain a higher real wage level is basic to the preservation of the private enterprise system in the United States.

There can be no doubt that the combined effect of a forward looking wage and benefits policy pursued by management in collective bargaining with labor and enlightened action by Government in the field of social welfare, taxes, public works, housing, and farm policy can bring this recession to a quick end. Both the direct increase in expenditures by consumers, Government, and business and the indirect stimulus which these programs and policies can bring about will eliminate the present gap in total demand and restore our economy to health and prosperity.

The United Steelworkers of America neither views the present, nor the future, with hysteria. Our faith in this Nation and its capacity to meet its problems is unlimited but in the short-run, between last summer and today, millions of workers and their families in steel and other industries have been suddenly faced with distress and we cannot stand idly by. The great resources and enterprise of America must be utilized to meet this problem now.

We are not urging any irresponsible action; we are simply proposing to the leaders of our industry and of our Government a reasoned and practical program which will restore full employment, production, and confidence to all of the people and enterprises of the United States.

Retirement for Reservists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS B. HELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 29, 1954

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill in Congress to liberalize the requirements of the Army and Air Force Vitalization and Retirement Equalization Act of 1948 for retirement of reservists who served on active duty during World War I and World War II. This act is known as Public Law 810 and was passed by the 80th Congress.

At the present time, a reservist who was a member of a Reserve component prior to August 15, 1945—that is, prior to V-J Day—may be granted retirement pay under Public Law 810 if he meets the following qualifications: (a) He must have at least 20 years of satisfactory Federal service; (b) he must have served during World War I or World War II; (c) he must attain the age of 60.

Recently, in discussions with a friend of mine, I learned that there is a small group of reservists who have completed more than 30 years of creditable service with our Armed Forces during both World Wars, and some even in the Korean war, but their contribution is being overlooked or ignored under the existing retirement law. Although my friend is not planning to retire soon, his record of service is typical of the men in this small group who have accumulated similar experience.

He entered the Army during World War I, served on the European battlefields, and subsequently remained in the Reserves. He also served in World War II and in the Korean war, accumulating a total of more than three decades of Reserve and active duty service for his country. He is still in the Reserves to this day.

Mr. Speaker, only a small number of men remain in this category who could still benefit from the retirement privileges provided in my bill. Some of them no longer retain their health or ability to pursue their occupations. Even at this late date we should be liberal in our recognition of the great services they performed, and not the least of these is the fact that they stayed in the various Reserve components between the two wars and helped to maintain our Reserve units up to strength. Most of these men are now in the middle fifties or close to 60, and some among them with not too much of this world's goods to their name.

It is my opinion that these men are entitled to receive special recognition for their contribution to the security of our country. They have responded far and above the call of duty. I believe that in recognition of their record of patriotic service they should be granted the privilege of retiring at the age of 55 instead of 60. Consequently, I drafted a bill which seeks to set up a new class of persons entitled to be retired under Public Law 810.

My bill provides that, in order to be entitled to retirement pay as a member of the new class, an individual must meet the following qualifications: (a) he must have at least 30 years of satisfactory Federal service; (b) he must have served during both World Wars I and II; (c) he must have attained the age of 55.

Mr. Speaker, I am strongly of the opinion that Congress should take into consideration the service rendered by these men over such a long time and during two great wars, and that we should recognize their contribution and their sacrifices by liberalizing the retirement law in their behalf. They have given a great deal of their life and time to our Armed Forces. Now they are so few in number, and even fewer are the years left to them in which they could benefit by this recognition. I urge you to give serious and prompt consideration to my proposal. In so doing, we shall at the same time boost the morale of all those serving in our Reserve components and those making a career for themselves in our Armed Forces.

The text of my bill is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the portion of subsection (a) of section 302 of the Army and Air Force Vitalization and Retirement Equalization Act of 1948 (10 U. S. C., sec. 1036a) which precedes the colon preceding the first proviso thereof is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(a) Any person—

"(1) who, upon attaining or having attained the age of 60 years, has performed satisfactory Federal service as defined in this section in the status of a commissioned officer, warrant officer, flight officer, or enlisted person in the Army of the United States or the Air Force of the United States, including the respective Reserve components thereof, and also including the federally recognized National Guard prior to 1933, the United States Navy, including the Reserve components thereof, the United States Marine Corps, including the Reserve components thereof, and has completed an aggregate of 20 or more years of such satisfactory service in any or all of the aforesaid services, or

"(2) who, upon ataining or having attained the age of 55 years, has performed satisfactory Federal service in any status referred to in paragraph (1) in any of the components of the Armed Forces referred to in paragraph (1), and has completed an aggregate of 30 or more years of such satisfactory service in any or all of the aforesaid services, part of which service was performed as active Federal service during any part of both of the two periods referred to in the last proviso of this subsection,

shall, upon application therefor, be granted retired pay."

Traffic and Highway Modernization Necessary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

of

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 28, 1954

Mr. HAGEN of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, there is a great need for such a long-range nationwide program and it certainly should include provisions for improving the traffic situation in and around our Nation's Capital. Travelers who come here have noted the need for better roads into and out of the city, including more bridge capacity across the Potomac River and the desirability of a freeway in the southwest section of the city similar to the one in Georgetown. As a member of the District of Columbia Committee, I am naturally interested in the planning and programing of highway improvements in the Washington metropolitan area as well as throughout the country as a whole.

Everyone interested in the subject will find something to think about in the following address of Arthur O. Dietz, president, C. I. T. Financial Corp., before the Economic Club of Detroit, Monday, April 12, 1954, on the subject of Traffic and Highway Modernization:

Traffic and highway modernization is one of the most serious peacetime problems we, as a nation, have ever faced. The traffic and highway problem must be solved and it must be attacked now for we are rapidly falling almost hopelessly behind. We need a vigorous program, supported by strong leadership. And the leadership must be furnished by American business because the traffic modernization program is of vital interest and concern to American business.

It involves the steel industry which sends 18 percent of its product to the automobile industry. It involves the glass industry which sends 75 percent of its product to the automobile industry; the rubber industry which furnishes 85 percent of its product to the auto industry. It involves the upholstery and leather industry which sends 68 percent of its product to the auto industry.

It also involves 1 out of every 6 businesses, 1 out of every 7 employees and $40 billion in retail sales, including over 40 billion gallons of gasoline. And many others far too numerous to mention here.

All of us know the frustration of traffic congestion. But not many realize how desperate our highway problem really is.

We have built, incredible as it may seem, more miles of automobiles since 1945 than we have miles of highways. If we were to place every new car produced since 1945 bumper to bumper, and laid alongside of them every mile of highway we have built since then, the cars would stretch further than the roads.

And what is even worse is the way these roads are being used. American motorists do 86 percent of their traveling on only 23 percent of the Nation's 3 million miles of highways. In other words, 86 percent of the travel is limited to 700,000 miles of highways.

Now just what is being done to solve this problem? Last year, the United States spent about $5,200,000,000 for roads. But of this total, only $3 billion went for new roads and improvements on existing roads. The remainder was spent on maintenance. Because the cost of road construction has more than doubled since 1941, we are actually spending only the equivalent of $1,500,000,000 prewar dollars for new roads—or less than we spent in 1938.

The American Association of State Highway Officials estimates that our highway deficiency amounts to $50 billion. There is no quick and easy solution to this problem. Even if we should decide to allocate $50 billion to highway construction and try to do the job in 1 or 2 years, it would be impossible. We would be limited by equipment, skilled manpower and materials. How much can we spend a year? My company has financed a very substantial part of the highway construction equipment in use. We know something of that industry. We know the time and skill needed for planning and engineering. We know the weather problems. Maybe—just maybe—we could build up in a few years to an average annual expenditure of $7 billion or $8 billion on new roads, to which must be added $3 billion for current maintenance. So, starting with a $50 billion highway deficit, we need to spend $10 billion or $11 billion a year on highways—and that is over at least a 10-year program, starting at a figure below the peak expenditure and building up to it. The maximum addition from one year to the next could hardly exceed $1 billion and the program would need to be most carefully laid out in advance to support such a buildup.

What will we buy for such an outlay? In my opinion, continued national prosperity and a better life for everyone.

What would an improved and up-to-date traffic program mean to us? Virtually, every major industry would benefit but let's take just one example: auto sales.

Last year, there were approximately 48 million families in this country. Of this total, about 16,800,000—or 35 percent did not own an automobile.

These families, study shows, are concentrated in two groups: the very low income groups and groups in urban areas.

Families living in urban areas constitute a vast majority of the carless group. In cities with populations over 500,000, 45 percent of the families do not own cars. And you all know why a great many of these people do not own cars: because they aren't worth owning. Those families who might want a car for weekend trips, find that congestion on the parkways and highways is almost as bad as in the cities. Most of these families want cars and they can afford cars, but they simply will not buy them until traffic congestion is relieved.

In the great suburban and rural market too, better roads mean greater consumer purchasing in the form of automobile use and all the concurrent contribution to a high-level economy which the use of the automobile brings with it.

But with good roads and easy, uncongested driving, the automobile can successfully compete with the backyard weenie roast or the appeal of the baseball game on television. American families still love the joys of the open road. They will pile the kids in the car and go places if the road is good and the road is open. They will still put mileage on cars, use up gas and tires and support the great roadside service industry if we make it easy for them to reach the national parks, the lakes or the beaches. But if we continue to permit our roads to deteriorate and become congested and dangerous, then that love-of-home competition is going to hurt us considerably.

I am glad to note that some motorcar companies are now stressing the two-car family market. That appeals directly to the home market, for the suburban family is a family that needs two cars, one for shopping and school, perhaps, and the other for dad to use to get to the plant or office from the relatively inconvenient outlying location to which they have moved. Pop would rather drive to work and he would get home faster to work in the garden or play a round of golf—but if driving conditions to the plant or into town are intolerable, he will continue to use public transportation, poor and expensive though it is, and we will be failing to capitalize on another important opportunity presented to us by the home market. Better roads are just one way to do this.

In the past, the suburbs have tended to cluster along railroad lines and existing roads. But we now come to the point where we must begin to consider suburbanization of the suburbs, as well as the suburbanization of cities, by the establishment of better intermediary roads which penetrate the utilized areas. The cost of developing new communities would actually be less than the cost of building in areas already congested.

Just think for a moment what the development of these communities means:

A substantial increase in the use of electric power and natural gas.

Increased demand for refrigerators, kitchen ranges, furniture, washing machines, heating units, and other appliances.

New sales for many of the so-called luxury appliances—such as air conditioners, garbage disposals, deep freezers, mix-masters, incinerators, and other items.

A new need for schools, hospitals, shopping centers, libraries and public works—as well as for homes.

New opportunities for services, such as doctors, lawyers, dentists, and others.

Finally, there is the whole question of more economical and rapid transportation of goods by highway—a subject of paramount business importance but one I must pass over today.

The highway problem will not wait for a solution. Even if we started today, a solution is at least a decade off. We are losing ground every day. What can we do about it?

We are articulate, influential leaders in local, State, and Federal affairs. We must make known the need—we must each individually speak and work to get the program started. Many companies represented here are doing this. Many of Detroit's leaders in this audience are carrying the banner in this cause. All I can tell you is that the rest of us are not doing enough, for the program is not moving fast enough. We must do more.

The financing for this type of road expenditure, of course, will have to come primarily from Federal and State sources. I don't favor excessive Government spending or Government intervention in private business. But I think we should all distinguish between those Government expenditures which expand the area of operation for private business and those which compete with private business. Government expenditures for traffic modernization do expand the area for private business and are critically necessary. I am entirely in favor of this type of Government spending, as I am sure you are. A promising step in this direction, although obviously inadequate in view of what I have said is the approval by the United States Senate of a bill calling for $1 billion a year designed to encourage local expenditures for roads.

United States Charges China Spurs Drug Habit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON CANFIELD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1954

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include several articles appearing in today's issue of the New York Times on what Communist China is doing to promote illicit narcotics traffic, particularly in the United States.

The articles follow:

UNITED STATES CHARGES CHINA SPURS DRUG HABIT—TELLS U. N. GROUP REDS SPREAD NARCOTICS IN WEST—DENIAL MADE BY RUSSIAN AND POLE

UNITED NATIONS, N. Y., May 4.—The United States accused the Foreign Ministry of Communist China today of directing a campaign to spread drug addiction in the Western World.

The charge was made by Harry J. Anslinger, Federal Narcotics Commissioner. He declared that Peiping Government officials had assumed overall control of the illicit narcotics traffic, both to reap profits and also to demoralize the people of the free world.

Mr. Anslinger made the accusation in furnishing up-to-date evidence on the illegal drug trade to the United Nations Commission on Narcotic Drugs. Included in his report was a full account of the April 5 seizure by Federal agents of a smuggling ring in San Francisco, supplied with heroin from the Chinese mainland.

The Commissioner's remarks on Red China brought an almost instant protest from the Soviet and Polish members of the Commission, both complaining that the United States was slandering an absent government and also dragging in political issues.

Prof. Valentina V. Vassilyeva, the Soviet member, also contended that the documents the Commission was working on said only that illegal trafficking was suspected and nothing was proved. This brought the comment from Mr. Anslinger that the heroin stocks seized in San Francisco didn't float here.

Mr. Anslinger reminded the members that he had warned for several years that the illegal drug trade on the Chinese mainland was growing. But the new element, he declared, is that the Foreign Ministry now has taken over the direction of drug exports and distribution through the National Trading Co., which has its headquarters in Peiping.

In the last year, he said, 800 tons of opium, heroin, and morphine, valued at $60 million, was shipped out. This was 20 percent short of the goal on which the Government officials had planned, he said.

This spreading of narcotic addiction for profit and political motive is not the work of one man in the Communist regime, Mr. Anslinger charged. "It is the policy of the entire Communist regime in mainland China." It is part of a continuing 20-year plan, he continued, to spread addiction among free peoples.

The extension of the same pattern to areas falling under Peiping's control, he added, has mushroomed the narcotic menace from Communist China into a multiheaded dragon.

Mr. Anslinger also made these other charges:

In Japan, fanatical Communist traffickers have resorted to the extreme measures of cutting off the ears of small-time sellers who reveal the identity of the supplying in Communist China.

South Korea has become the target of tremendous quantities of heroin or opium smuggled from North Korea, where intensive cultivation of the opium poppy is being pushed around Pyongyong.

Communist agents from North Korea posing as refugees have been arrested in South Korea with heroin to be used for political activity and mental purposes.

There has been a threefold increase in some land areas devoted to opium cultivation in Communist China and the establishment of new heroin factories.

In his account of the smashing of the San Francisco narcotic ring Mr. Anslinger told the Commission that eight prominent Chinese had been arrested and that Judah Isaac Ezra, a Hong Kong supplier or morphine, had been indicted. Federal agents seized 6 pounds of heroin—sufficient to supply 1 million addict doses.

The drugs, he reported, were carried into this country by merchant seamen, or sometimes smuggled in ornately carved camphorwood chests with special compartments.

MULTIHEADED DRAGON SEEN

TOKYO, May 4.—The United States Army disclosed today that more than 600 American servicemen were confined to the Tokyo stockade on narcotics charges last year.

The information was released in a speech made before a meeting of psychiatrists of the Far East Command, but it did not include data about five other military stockades in Japan that also handle narcotics cases.

"The biggest thing we learned in the survey," a doctor said, "was that G. I.'s introduce their own buddies to it (narcotics)."

The survey showed that heroin was used by the majority of addicts.

OPIUM TRACED TO SOURCE

OTTAWA, May 4.—Canadian researchers have now found a way to trace the origin of opium "beyond a reasonable doubt," the Department of Health announced today.

By studying the opium ash they can discover where the drug came from.

Bishop Sheil's Address Commended

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 29, 1954

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I herewith include a letter from General President Dave Beck, of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen, and Helpers of America, which appeared in the International Teamster, the official magazine of the Brotherhood. The article entitled "Bishop Sheil's Address Commended" follows:

BISHOP SHEIL'S ADDRESS COMMENDED

I am printing in this issue in the space reserved for the general president's letter, excerpts from an important address delivered last month by the Most Reverend Bernard J. Sheil, auxiliary bishop of the Roman Catholic diocese, of Chicago, before a labor education conference. Bishop Sheil's work and position in modern life is well known to the labor movement, and his words bear serious consideration. I subscribe to his sentiments 100 percent. Following the excerpts from Bishop Sheil's masterly address, I have made some observations of my own regarding the subject of communism.

Space does not permit a complete reprinting of the bishop's excellent address, but the following excerpts will indicate the scope and general philosophy enunciated in his Chicago message:

"The problem is no longer one of alerting the people to the danger of communism. We are all aware of that danger. The problem we are facing is what do we do about it. The unsolved problem, in other words, is what constitutes effective anticommunism. More than that, what kind of anticommunism is moral? What kind of anticommunism is proper in a freedom-loving country like ours? The three go together, in my mind. If anticommunism is immoral, it is not effective. You cannot effectively fight immorality with more immorality. If anticommunism flouts the principles of democracy and freedom, it is not in the long run effective. You cannot effectively fight tyranny with tyranny. And if anticommunism is not effective, it is so much sound and fury, signifying nothing.

"It is not enough to say that someone is anti-Communist to win my support. It has been said that patriotism is a scoundrel's last refuge. In this day and age anticommunism is sometimes the scoundrel's last defense. As I remember, one of the noisiest anti-Communists of recent history was a man named Adolph Hitler. He was not wrong because he was anti-Communist. He was wrong because he was immorally anti-Communist; he countered Communist tyranny with a tryranny of his own. And inevitably, Herr Hitler was a dismal failure as an anti-Communist. Half of his own Germany now lives under communism and half of Europe lives in Communist slavery. Would this be true, I wonder, if Hitler had been morally anti-Communist. If Hitler had fought Communist tyranny with democratic freedom, the world we live in—I am persuaded—would be quite different today. And I venture to say there would be less, not more, communism in it than there is.

"No Hitler has risen in America, and I must say that I think it is nonsense when foreign reporters and journalists decribe us as living in a kind of Hitlerian reign of terror. We are still free—and we will remain free—let's have no doubt about that. But, it seems to me that now, while we are free, is the time to cry out against the phony anticommunism that mocks our way of life, flouts our traditions and democratic procedures and our sense of fair play, feeds on the meat of suspicion and grows great on the dissension among Americans which it cynically creates and keeps alive by a mad pursuit of headlines.

"How much more of this are we going to tolerate before we remember that we are proud Americans, with values of our own? If we throw those values away—and I am referring to our traditions of innocent until proved guilty, I am referring to our concern for means as well as ends, I am referring to our trust in our basic institutions—then we will be left with our anticommunism, but very little else.

"An America where the accused is guilty until he is proved innocent, where means don't matter but only ends, an America which has lost faith in the integrity of the Government, the Army, the schools, the churches, the labor unions, press, and most of all, an America whose citizens have lost faith in each other—such an America would not need to bother about being anti-Communist; it would have nothing to lose. Such an America would have nothing to recommend it to freedom-loving men—nothing at all, not even the shining image of its victorious junior Senator from Wisconsin.

"Anticommunism is a serious business. It is not a game to be played so publicity-mad politicos can build fame for themselves. If someone were to tell me that the masters of the Kremlin inspired this burlesque to distract us from our real dangers and keep us from taking effective anti-Communist measures, I'd have half a mind to believe him.

"I can't imagine what would please the Kremlin more than to turn America into a frantic, hysteria-ridden place, full of suspicion of an American for an American. If the Kremlin masters wanted to weaken us—and they do—I suppose that they would be delighted to see Americans lose confidence in the integrity of their political leaders, lose confidence in the stability of their Army, suspect clergymen and teachers. I imagine they would delight in seeing us lose faith in our constitutional privileges, in seeing us ape their courtroom procedures and hound innocent little Government clerks who are blown up to important spies and saboteurs as long as it is good for a front-page story. Congressional committees have done good work, and will do more. But when they are cynically used to trap headlines rather than spies, they mock themselves—and they mock us, too.

"Aside from the actual undermining of democracy that such procedures entail and the harm done to the individuals involved—and tell me, is there anyone who will deny that General Marshall, to name only one, was truly injured? Or is it to be accounted as nothing that an honorable soldier is berated as a traitor to his duty and his country? Aside from such evils as this there is the fundamental problem that these shenanigans distract us from our real problems, including the problem of communism. They distract us from pursuing a truly effective program of anticommunism. Are we any safer, for instance, because General Marshall was branded as a traitor? No, we aren't. But we are a little less honorable. We have taken what a devoted public servant gave us and offered him abuse and calumny as our gratitude in his years of retirement. Are we any safer because the line between a liberal or a nonconformist and a Communist or subversive is hopelessly blurred? I doubt it. Are we any safer because nonconformity has been practically identified with treason? I think not. Do we have anything less to fear because people have been bullied by the chairman of an investigating committee and his counsel? I doubt it. Is America a safer place for ourselves and our children because the morale of our State Department has been blitzkrieged? Or because our fine officer corps has been insulted? Or because political controversy has sunk to a new low of name-calling? Again, I would say no. Are we anymore to be feared by the Communists because of all the hundreds of headlines the Senator from Wisconsin has piled up? I don't believe so. Just what has been accomplished?

"In my book if a man is truly anti-Communist, he is concerned with meeting the challenge of communism on every level. He is interested first of all, in seeing to it that conditions here and abroad are such that they don't provide a fertile breeding ground for communism. He is interested in such matters as seeing to it that people get enough to eat, have decent homes, are able to raise their children with dignity. His scope is broad. He is interested in measures to share the wealth of "have" nations with the have-nots. He is interested in breaking down the barriers which separate people—national barriers, class barriers, religious barriers. He is interested in making a better place of his own little corner of the world and of doing all he can to see that others are not in want. I judge an anti-Communist—the real thing, not the cops-and-robbers version—by how well he does these things. If he happens to be a legislator, I look at his record. I see how he voted on measures to make freedom a reality and not merely an aspiration in the lives of his own fellow citizens and of the poor of the world. By this standard, a number of famous anti-Communists, I'm sorry to say, simply don't measure up.

"Communism is a military problem. I judge an anti-Communist according to his record of supporting military measures taken to hold back the Communist forces. I judge him according to how much he helped the Army do its work and not according to how much harm he did to Army morale, how many generals he has insulted.

"On the question of internal subversion, I judge an anti-Communist according to how well he does the very difficult job of seeking out subversives, clearly identifying them and removing them from critical positions. I take it that a genuine anti-Communist is one who despises the court methods of the Communists. I take it he hates the Communist idea that one is guilty until proved innocent. I take it that the genuine anti-Communist is one who, above all, believes in the democratic procedures and is willing to stand by them, even in the face of great temptations to lose one's temper and to lose one's faith in the methods of freemen. I judge an anti-Communist by how well he fulfills all these responsibilities in a difficult, delicate job.

"In a word, on this score I judge an anti-Communist according to how well he succeeds in doing what he is supposed to be doing, not according to how many headlines he makes. I judge him according to how well he clarifies the difference between treason and nonconformity, not according to how well he blurs the distinction. I judge him according to how many innocent people he had helped prove innocent and how many guilty people he has proved guilty. I do not admire him as an anti-Communist According to how many guilty and innocent both leave his courtroom without his having made clear and convincing just what their status is but only fogging the issues and reputation of innocent and guilty alike."

"But although the church takes no position, and will not, on such a matter of public controversy, the church does take a position on lies, calumny, the absence of charity and calculated deceit. These thing are wrong, even if they are mistakenly thought of as means to a good end. They are morally evil and to call them good or to act as if they were permissible under certain circumstances is itself a monstrous perversion of morality. They are not justified by any cause, least of all by the cause of anti-communism, which should unite rather than divide all of us in these difficult times."

There is little that I could or would add to the fine words of Bishop Sheil. His remarks constitute a great reaffirmation of faith in our fundamental American ideals. I would like to recall to the members some words of my own in connection with the fight against those who would destroy our form of government through subversion. As the members know, I have for many years been fighting communism and totalitarianism from one end of the country to another in speeches and in our union in aboveboard fashion. I feel that fair fighting is the American way and that is the way of the teamsters.

It is hardly necessary to recall to the members the many speeches and writings I have prepared through the years on this question. I would like to recap briefly the remarks I made before our last general convention in Los Angeles, Calif., on this subject—those words set the policy and keynote of our attitude toward the subject of communism. After being elected general president I said in my brief remarks of acceptance:

"It is hardly necessary to mention communism as a challenge to the teamsters since we are considered among the most patriotic and loyal organizations in America. But we can remain a loyal and patriotic force only through constant vigilance. We are not going to let communism burrow or bore within our organization. We will keep a continuous lookout for the slightest sign of infiltration—infiltration from the extreme left or the extreme right. It seems that Communists never sleep—they work day and night. We likewise must never fall asleep on the job of keeping Communists out * * * we cannot afford to be smug or indifferent. Eternal vigilance in keeping our unions safe is and must always be the watchword."

I have said this and have made similar statements numerous times in warnings against communism and racketeering. I want to emphasize and reemphasize the important task of responsibility as decent, fair-minded citizens—fair to ourselves, our fellow unionists and our fellow citizens. Fairness and honesty have been and will always be the basic policy of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters.

Let me also add for the consideration of those in Congress that in America our judicial system does not provide for our playing under two rule books, one rule to apply to Members of Congress and another directed against union representatives or members. There is a list of examples on this score we could refer to, such as Representative ERNEST K. BRAMBLETT, J. Parnell Thomas, and others. We have found no insistence that these men were removed from office, without trial procedure in our courts, thus affording examination, or even after conviction in our courts, as we are now finding an insistence in cases in which union people are concerned.

I want to also repeat again to our members that the International Brotherhood of Teamsters is for 100 percent unity in the labor movement, inclusive of the CIO, A. F. of L., United Mine Workers and all other loyal trade unionists. We are for settlement of jurisdictional disputes in accordance with the laws of the American Federation of Labor. We do not support changing the rule book after decisions have been rendered. This permits violations of previously decided cases and freezing these violations against compliance. It would open up, through arbitration or any other procedure, the possible reversal of decisions already decided and submitted through the constitutional procedure that both parties were pledged to accept.

My record on racketeering is identical with that of communism—there is no room in the teamsters' union for racketeering or crooks just as there is no room for Communists. I will insist on fair play and a fair hearing in every case of complaint, but once the facts are known beyond dispute I will take appropriate action.

In recent weeks I have devoted some attention to the economic situation. I have written about it in the International Teamster and have made addresses about it before many teamster groups, most recently in Chicago, Ill., at the trade division meetings, reports of which will appear in next month's Journal. I do not want to take the time and space to go into the economic situation at this time, but I would like to remind our members that the economic issue is still paramount in importance to trade unions everywhere.

March was supposed to be a great decision time. Unfortunately the figures on unemployment increased rather than decreased and the automobile business got worse. Job surplus areas increased on the labor map and in general some serious unemployment developed in many places. I do not want to be pessimistic and am certainly no self-appointed prophet of doom or spokesman of gloom. I do believe in being realistic. I have said repeatedly that the administration should use weapons it has at hand to fight the economic recession—I have been saying this for weeks and weeks. There are some signs that this advice is about to be followed—or would be followed if some of the timid politicians were not afraid that there might be political repercussions. Let me say here and now, if the political leaders do not take action, there will be more than political repercussions. These timid politicians will be swept aside by a cyclone of wrath from the American people—wrath vented against those in power for being too scared to act and to use the weapons now in their hands.

Fraternally,

DAVE BECK,
General President.

United States Must Find Way To Care for the Aged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 5, 1954

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, as the sponsor of a bill to amend the Social Security Act so as to repeal the $75 monthly work clause which works a real hardship on so many of our older folks able to make a real contribution to our economy through useful employment, I find much sense in the article by the distinguished Senator from Maine, MARGARET CHASE SMITH, appearing in this day's issue of the Newark (N. J.) Star-Ledger. Senator SMITH has long been a champion of a more realistic approach to proper old-age benefits under social security, and I commend her article to my colleagues of the House as we prepare to consider amendments to the basic act.

The article follows:

UNITED STATES MUST FIND WAY TO CARE FOR THE AGED

(By United States Senator MARGARET CHASE SMITH)

WASHINGTON.—Because I have long been an advocate of the Federal social security and old-age assistance programs, some people have accused me of being socialistic. By that standard the same charge could have been made against the late Senator Robert A. Taft—and the same charge could be leveled at President Eisenhower.

Let them call me what they will. I can't bring myself to a cold and heartless attitude toward the older people of our country just because some extremists call me names.

The need for social security is incontestably established, since we are not all endowed with the tools and ability to achieve security through individual effort. Circumstances, or "breaks" if you wish to use that term, have granted some of us greater ability to achieve happiness and capture security.

Others of us are not so lucky. Our mental or physical capabilities have been limited from birth, or have not been developed because of lack of means of development, or have been impaired by misfortune. Depression, war, and inflation in unbroken succession have shaken the faith in the belief that man is the master of his own destiny. These conditions have proved beyond a doubt that our Government must cope with the problems of social security and old-age assistance.

Existing social and economic conditions force upon us the need of solving this problem. Less than 1 out of every 5 receives any old-age assistance, and since the average payment is around $51 a month—with half of them receiving from $51 down to $27.89—this is not even bare subsistance in the face of today's cost of living.

Some will say that these payments are only a supplement. But the question to be asked in answer to this is: "A supplement to what?" The catch is in the fact that the recipients of old-age assistance grants are not allowed to earn any amount to supplement the amount paid to them without it being deducted from their monthly allowance. Even old-age and survivors insurance, with its earning clause, prevents many a citizen from earning necessary additional income.

The current legislation on this matter befor Congress is probably the most important domestic problem now confronting our people. For it will affect all our people.

Prayer Is a Weapon, Too

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEO W. O'BRIEN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 5, 1954

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, the city of Burlington, Wis., deserves the high tribute paid to it by the Nation and its leaders for the manner in which it conducted its patriotic May Day celebration last Saturday.

Without in any way detracting from this fine, patriotic endeavor, I think we should take note, also, of a celebration which took place on that same date in the city of Albany, N. Y.

More than 85,000 persons took part in a moving demonstration of the great and growing American belief that prayer is the mightiest weapon in our cold war arsenal and that without it sheer material power will not suffice.

On May 1 last, while booted Russian soldiers marched through the streets of Moscow under a canopy of destructive planes, 50,000 persons walked through the streets of my city, while 35,000 others lined the streets.

None of those marchers carried a gun. Not a single war machine rumbled through the streets or shattered the silence of the skies.

Why did those thousands march and what was their rendezvous? They marched because they wanted to give visible proof of their calm belief that prayer can succeed where guns fail and that faith is more potent than the clever phrases of diplomacy.

Their rendezvous was the spacious park which stretches in front of the Capitol of New York State. They went there to pray and to listen to the words of religious leaders. Not a single threat came from a single throat. There were neither clenched fists nor vindictive shouts. The multitude prayed for peace and then went home, their final prayer being for the peoples who live under the iron rule of those who would destroy us.

I am proud of what happened in my home city last Saturday and I am sure that the words of prayer which assaulted the skies over Albany on May 1 are echoed in millions of hearts across our great land.

I should like to pay special tribute to a group of young ladies who had this moving demonstration in charge. They are students at the College of St. Rose in Albany. Seven years ago they started this annual demonstration as a campus affair. A few hundred students took part. Seven years later, 85,000 citizens participated. The young ladies of St. Rose are to be complimented upon their religious fervor and their high patriotism.

After 60,000 Years' Growth a Billion-Dollar Corn Crop

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES I. DOLLIVER
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 5, 1954

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Iowa Development Bulletin of April 15, 1954:

AFTER 60,000 YEARS' GROWTH A BILLION-DOLLAR CORN CROP

When Iowa became the first State in the Nation to produce a billion-dollar corn crop, in 1952, this record yield climaxed what is now considered approximately 60,000 years of corn development, the Iowa Development Commission reports.

The recent discovery, by Yale University and Oberlin College scientists, of corn pollen in drill cores 200 feet beneath Mexico City has radically revised previously accepted concepts of corn's antiquity.

Plant scientists had heretofore generally agreed that the age of corn—from a wild grass to its present state of development—was about 20,000 years. The new evidence, however, indicates that corn, as a distinct entity in nature, had its origin as long as 50,000 years ago, according to a Harvard University botanist, or, more likely, some 60,000 years ago, the Corn Industries Research Foundation has disclosed.

In addition, it is now contended that corn is not a descendant of the tropical grass, teosinte, as long supposed. However, botanists maintain that teosinte is corn's closest relative and that the grass can be immensely valuable in the development of new hybrid-corn strains.

Crossbreeding with teosinte, they have demonstrated, causes corn to mutate and increase in variability, thus facilitating human selection of hybrids resistant to drought, disease, and insects.

The long-held theory that corn is a native of the Americas, rather than of Asia, has been strengthened by these recent studies; with the Mexico City discovery definitely establishing the Western Hemisphere as the birthplace of corn.

While corn may have had its origin beneath Mexico City, the ancient crop has found a billion-dollar garden spot in Iowa, land of the gold that grows.

Red China Using Dope To Defeat Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1954

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, the Capitol at Washington is the mecca for hundreds of thousands of Americans who travel from all parts of our Nation to Washington each year to see this great edifice which has become the symbol of our representative and democratic form of government.

High atop the dome of our Capitol stands the figure of a woman clad in flowing draperies with her right hand resting upon the hilt of a sheathed sword. This figure is officially known as the Statue of Freedom, and it is especially appropriate as it is symbolic of the devotion to individual freedom which is traditional to all Americans and is the very foundation of our form of government.

Communism is the antithesis of every principle of Americanism which we cherish, and we must be constantly aware of this fact in our efforts to defeat the Communist purpose.

Communism is an active vicious force loose in the world today. It recognizes no territorial boundaries. It denies all religion, all spiritual values, and, therefore, it has no soul, no moral sense, no decency. It considers the individual only a cog in the Communist machine, a part useful only so long as it does the bidding of its Red masters. Human life, as such, has no importance in communism. It is always expendable in the furtherance of cause.

The goal of international communism is not limited expansion of the Soviet Union, not even continued growth of the Communist growth. It is world conquest to place all peoples under the heel of the masters in the Kremlin. Communism knows no compromise. Communism may retreat, but only to await another day when aggression may be more successful.

The ways of communism are devious, stealthy, unscrupulous. The Communist agent acting on orders from the Kremlin is a man without honor, a man who stands ready to commit any crime, any atrocity, at the bidding of his Red masters.

The warfare against communism is not a struggle far removed from the individual American. It is not a war of great nation against nation on the battlefield, a warfare that can be met, force with force. It is a warfare carried on by individual agents moving under Red direction in our own Nation as well as in other free countries where Red infiltration is in progress. It is a propaganda warfare of individual Red agent against individual American to pollute the mind, a warfare where only constant ever alert vigilance by every loyal American in our land can bring ultimate and final victory.

The Communist agent in America is not only after the vital war secrets guarded by the Government. This type of espionage is known to all of us, and the heroic work of congressional committees has brought the spotlight of fearless investigation upon the traitors in Government, and the foreign agents who seek to undermine our national security.

But the Communist agent does not stop here. His job is to undermine the very foundation of our Nation. He is out to spread distrust and dissatisfaction among our people. He is out to foment trouble in every section of our land. He is out to warp the minds of our youth. And his job includes the spreading of vice and crime to demoralize our citizenry.

The Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Central Intelligence Agency, all the intelligence agencies of our armed services, the law-enforcement divisions of every State, county, city, and town, are constantly investigating any suspected Communists and are on guard against the spreading scourge of communism.

But this is not enough. The battle against communism and Communist ideology is being waged within the borders of the United States. It can be won only by a constant, vigorous fight by each American for the democratic ideals of liberty, for the protection of individual freedom of thought and action, and thus against the lies, deceit, and false lures of communism which would destroy all individual liberty everywhere.

The Communist bullet on a battlefield can take the life of an American soldier, but Communist propaganda and infiltration in America is aimed at the destruction of an American's immortal soul.

Even with all we have learned about the Communist foe, Americans are not yet aware of the full danger, the limitless bounds of Communist iniquity, the lengths to which the Red menace will go to rot away the foundation of our Nation and destroy the moral fiber of the American people.

As an example, a recent editorial in the Saturday Evening Post, based on the statement of Commissioner Harry J. Anslinger, of the Federal Bureau of Narcotics, brought to the attention of the Nation the efforts made by the Reds in China to make dope addicts of our boys in Asia. It reports the Red campaign in dope warfare as follows:

RED CHINA EXPORTS OPIUM TO MAKE DOPE ADDICTS OF OUR BOYS IN ASIA

> There is one form of Red warfare against the civilized world which the armistice agreement did not suspend or even mention. That is dope warfare.
>
> This form of campaigning, designed to make United Nations soldiers into drug addicts, did not begin with the outbreak of hostilities in Korea. The use of opium derivatives, as an adjunct to aggression and conquest, has been familiar to the Far East for at least 25 years. Before and during the Japanese war on China, hordes of Korean gangsters, in the earlier years enjoying extraterritorial rights as Japanese subjects, and later acting as agents of the Japanese Army, smuggled great quantities of heroin into China. The smuggling of the deadly heroin into China had one major purpose—the demoralization of a people marked for conquest. The dope traffic was designed to bring in revenue.
>
> Ever since the latter part of 1949, when the Communists obtained control of south China, the Burmese and Siamese Governments have been complaining that tons of opium were moving into and through their countries by jungle trails from southwest China. In recent years the Chinese press in Hong Kong has been reporting monotonously and laconically the arrests of dope peddlers and seizures of opium, morphine, and heroin smuggled into the crown colony from Red China.
>
> Meanwhile, the Japanese and Korean police, plus the United States military authorities, have been increasingly busy for 6 years, keeping tabs on opium derivatives smuggled into Japan first, and then into South Korea—from North Korea and northern China directly, and from south China by way of Hong Kong. As long ago as July 10, 1952, Commissioner Harry J. Anslinger, of the Federal Bureau of Narcotics, submitted to the United Nations Commission on Narcotic Drugs a report which the United States Government had received from the Supreme Commander of the Allied Powers in Japan a few months earlier. It dealt with the smuggling of narcotics from North Korea and Communist China into Japan.
>
> According to this report, the first Japanese police seizures of smuggled dope in quantity had been made late in 1947. The stuff was heroin, and the arrests made immediately involved high Communist Party functionaries on Japan's southern island of Kyushu and a party organization in Rashin, North Korea. Then the poison began coming in from all directions. In 1951, 2,208 traffickers in dope were caught in Japan, and of these 377 were Chinese and 269 were North Koreans, all Communists. Mr. Anslinger told the U. N. Narcotics Commission that, in view of the evidence, it is not slanderous to state that Communist China is at the present time the biggest source of the illicit traffic in narcotic drugs in the world.
>
> That was in 1952. In April of 1953 a much longer and more detailed report was submitted to the U. N. Narcotics Commission, packed with the names of Red Chinese official patrons of the dope trade and of their agents abroad. The commission has shown that the dope was coming down the west coast of Korea in small boats from the Communist Koreans in the north to the Communist guerrillas in southwest Korea. Its ultimate destination was, of course, the U. N. armed forces.
>
> In the Japanese press it is commonly assumed that the smuggling of heroin and other drugs into their country serves a double purpose. It yields funds for the purchase of strategic materials by Communist underground agents, and for the support of the Japanese Communist Party. The second and incidental purpose is the demoralization of the American and other occupation forces in Japan.
>
> Meanwhile addiction is growing in this country, notably among teen-agers, as every newspaper reader is aware; and the commodity involved is usually heroin, the deadliest of opium derivatives and one that has no place in American medical practice and is not, therefore, diverted from the legal manufacture and distribution of narcotics. It comes from abroad. The Federal Narcotics Bureau says that Red China is the major source of supply.
>
> A fuller knowledge of Red China's dope traffic as an instrument of policy ought to help doubting Americans get a clearer understanding of Bolshevik ethics.

Mr. Speaker, the word "dope" is a word that holds a special loathing. It is a synonym for the lowest level of vice, corruption, and crime. And the United

States has been shocked in recent years at the unbelievable increase in the dope traffic and aghast at the record of teenage addicts which has been brought to light.

The traffic in narcotics aimed by Communists at our young soldiers abroad is evidence enough of the deadly seriousness of the Red intent.

In his statement on the dope traffic, Commissioner Anslinger also declared that in Red China "the traffic in narcotics is closely related to other organs of the Communist government."

And in April of this year, just a few weeks ago, Commissioner Anslinger announced the seizure in San Francisco of millions of dollars worth of heroin and stated "the source of the heroin was Communist China."

If, as the foregoing indicates, heroin, the drug most widely circulated among our teen-agers, is also coming into America under Communist supervision from Red China, if this is also a part of the Communist campaign to undermine the morale of America and bring ultimate destruction to our Nation, then how can any American anywhere remain complacent to the Communist threat. How can any American fail to realize that there can be no compromise with communism in its self-styled crusade for world conquest.

Tax Cut Bonanza

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1954

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include a sound and effective editorial entitled "Tax Cut Bonanzas," appearing in the April issue of the Labor Leader of New York City. The editorial follows:

TAX CUT BONANZAS

In what the New York Times called a notable victory the Republican Party, by passing the recent tax program, decided that college football games should be encouraged more than family life.

At the present time every workingman is allowed to claim on his income tax that each dependent, that is, wife, children, etc., costs him $600 a year to support. Now let's forget partisan politics and talk commonsense. No one lives on $600 today in the United States. Yet our tax program says that if you make $600 and are single you can afford to pay taxes. It claims that a man who makes $38 a week and has wife and one child to support can pay taxes on his income. That's absurd.

FOUR PEOPLE ON $52

This program as it now stands will tell an American worker who earns $52 a week and has a wife and two children that he is so well off that he should pay income taxes. That's a lie.

So what happens? This year Congress has a chance to change that. A Democratic Congressman introduced a bill to raise the exemptions for dependents to $700. Even this is not too good but it is closer to realism than $600. By a vote of 204 to 210 the House of Representatives told the American people that children only cost $500 a year.

Sometimes reality presents itself so clearly to the intellect that a man has to be either a fool or a rogue to deny it. We think the reality that one cannot live on $600 a year today in America is that strong.

We don't know what the average family income is for a Congressman but we would suggest that any man who voted against the tax-exemption increase for dependents try to just eat on $600 a year. Never mind clothing, housing, and medical care. Never mind any relaxation. Just try to eat on $600.

We realize that the Federal Government has many financial responsibilities and it must get money from someplace to meet these needs. But the point is Congress did cut taxes. But where?

WHO GOT THE TAX DECREASE?

Congress cut taxes on dividends from stock. Congress gave corporations and other businesses faster tax writeoffs. Congress slashed excise taxes and luxury taxes. Congress did not give any relief to the man who works for a living. There was no cut in income taxes for earned income from wages.

Taxes on furs, jewelry, luggage, and toilet preparations were slashed by 50 percent.

Taxes on sporting goods, mechanical pencils, pens and lighters were cut 33 percent.

Light bulbs, tubes, cameras, lenses and films are now taxed 50 percent less. And now you can go to college basketball, football, baseball or checker matches without paying tax.

And of course, "Ma Bell" who helped so gallantly in the recent crusade was rewarded with a decrease in tax on telephone calls.

But when it came time to give a tax break to the workers what did Congress do? They said: "A $600 income tax deduction is enough for any child of any American worker."

WHO DID IT?

The ACTU is not a political organization but facts are facts. The President backed this program. He instructed the Republican leaders in Congress to back his program and to refuse tax relief to the American worker. He went on TV and asked for it. The results are what the Republicans demanded. On the vote to raise tax exemptions for children from $600 to $700 the count was: "Yes," 193 Democrats, 10 Republicans, 1 Independent; "No," 201 Republicans, 9 Democrats.

We think that Democratic Floor Leader JOHN W. McCORMACK of Massachusetts summed up the feeling of quite a few Americans when he said: "The Republican tax bill is indefensible in that portion which gives great benefit to corporations and constitutes a bonanza to stockholders, the larger ones in particular. It is unjust and in my opinion morally wrong to make a person with earned income pay considerably more taxes than persons with unearned income from dividends."

Retention of Veterans' Services Contact Office at Boston, Mass., Imperative

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 26, 1954

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following resolution adopted by the Massachusetts House of Representatives:

RESOLUTION URGING FAVORABLE ACTION BY CONGRESS ON H. R. 3685 SO THAT THE VETERANS' SERVICES CONTACT OFFICE MAY RETAIN ITS PRESENT QUARTERS AT 1 BEACON STREET, BOSTON

Whereas the veterans' services contact office of the Commonwealth of Massachussetts has rendered invaluable assistance to thousands of Massachusetts veterans, disabled veterans, and their families by acting as their attorney before the various agencies of the Veterans' Administration located here in this State; and

Whereas the members of the veterans' services contact office have by their great humanitarian accomplishments become one of the most effective and important agencies of this Commonwealth; and

Whereas the veterans' services contact office along with many other organizations recognized by the Veterans' Administration and located at 1 Beacon Street has secured benefits amounting to millions of dollars and in thousands of cases won for deserving disabled veterans the full benefits that should be given them under the law; and

Whereas there is a recent directive ordering said agency to vacate their present quarters in the Veterans' Administration Building at 1 Beacon Street, Boston, Mass.; and

Whereas H. R. 3685 presently being considered by the United States Senate Finance Committee would permit the veterans' services contact office to remain in their present quarters and assure similar agencies in 29 other States the same benefits: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Massachusetts House of Representatives urges Senator SALTONSTALL and Senator KENNEDY and the entire Massachusetts congressional delegation to push for favorable action on H. R. 3685; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be transmitted forthwith by the secretary of State to each Member of Congress for this Commonwealth.

House of Representatives, April 28, 1954, adopted.

LAWRENCE R. GROVE,
Clerk.

A true copy. Attest:

EDWARD J. CRONIN,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

Which Road for the U. S. A.?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT H. BOSCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1954

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Speaker, we are all greatly concerned with regard to the course that the United States will follow in its endeavor to keep Indochina out of the list of countries that have fallen into the hands of the Communists. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the New York Daily News which should give us all food for thought:

WHICH ROAD FOR THE U. S. A.?

As reported exclusively by Ruth Montgomery in yesterday's News, Senate Majority Leader WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND, Republican, of California, is all set to lead a Senate fight for the dispatch of United States troops to Indochina if President Eisenhower so wishes.

As reported yesterday by the United Press, Speaker of the House JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Republican, of Massachusetts, says we won't have to send troops to Indochina or anywhere else in Asia.

These statements were made after both **Knowland** and **Martin** had conferred with the President.

While the national leadership is thus apparently of two minds, our British and French allies are running out on us at Geneva. France wants to end the Indochina war at almost any price. Britain flatly refuses to consider Secretary of State John Foster Dulles' proposal for a Far East anti-Communist alliance till the Geneva Conference is over.

As far as we can see, the Nation is now very near a point where it can choose 1 of only 2 roads into the future. Here are a couple of road maps. On each is pictured the worst things we can imagine happening.

TAKE THIS ROAD?

Congress O. K.'s United States troops for Indochina. They start moving.

Britain and France urge halfhearted fight, for fear of angering Red China and Red Russia. Eisenhower, remembering Korea, rejects this advice.

Red China enormously steps up its help to Indochina Reds. Kremlin greatly increases war-material shipments to China.

United States war effort swiftly mounts. So do casualties; so do taxes. Shortages develop, followed by controls and rationing.

United States blockades China ports.

United States bases in Mediterranean, Atlantic, and east Pacific areas gradually thinned of air and sea power complements, to concentrate more and more strength on Indochina war.

Russia, still untouched directly by this war, masses troops and airpower in East Europe; also, long-range bombers and atom and hydrogen bombs in Siberia.

Red China now in the war in every way except by official declaration of war.

More and more United States troops withdrawn from West Europe for Indochina service.

United States eventually bogs down, like France before it, in hopeless war on vast land mass of the continent of Asia.

United States finally bled white, and self-laid open to H-bomb assault from Russia—West Europe equally open to land-and-air attack by Russia.

OR THIS ROAD?

Congress refuses troops for Indochina.

France pulls out of that war; makes Munich deal, with British approval.

Communist conquest of all southeast Asia (by military power or fifth column or both) moves forward rapidly.

United States makes "agonizing reappraisal," by skeletonizing its forces in West Europe, greatly strengthening all air and sea bases that can contribute directly to defense of United States, doing what it can to line up and beef up, as reasonably dependable allies, Japan, Nationalist China (Formosa), the Philippines, South Korea, Spain, Turkey.

Communist conquest of southeast Asia completed. Prime Minister Nehru surrenders India to Reds, who liquidate him a few hours later, along with his entire governmental top echelon.

Now facing each other as the only remaining first-class powers in the world: The United States and Soviet Russia.

But United States not bled white; United States strength not spread thin all over non-Red world.

United States has become Fortress America, ready and able to defend itself primarily, and capable of extending valuable defense aid to real allies that know communism for what it is and have the courage to fight it to the last ditch.

Which of these two roads is the more likely to lead to world war III and the possible suicide of the human race?

Which is the more likely to come out at a balance of armed power in the world, so that nobody will have the suicidal will to start a major war or risk one?

If there is a third road open, the Nation should be told.

In any event, we think the American people, whose sons do the fighting and dying in all our wars, are entitled to a frank statement from Messrs. Eisenhower and Dulles as to what road they think our country ought to take.

The Good Authority Myth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARLAN HAGEN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 5, 1954

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Speaker, I submit for your attention and the attention of the other Members of this legislative body, an article printed in the Bakersfield Californian, a California newspaper, on April 12, 1954. The opinions expressed in this article are those of Bernice Harrell Chipman, a fine lady who is a frequent contributor to the expressions of journalistic opinion contained on its editorial page.

I can add nothing to the comments contained in this forthright expression of opinion on the subject of anonymous informers and unnamed pundits:

WHAT DO YOU THINK?—THE GOOD AUTHORITY MYTH

(By Bernice Harrell Chipman)

I find myself more and more curious and more confused about that deus ex machina so often referred to by press and radio, that mysterious creature looming so largely in the background of events, "the informed source who may not be named." This nameless authority, in fact, would seem to be in light of the respect accorded it, somewhat in the Old Testament tradition of the terrible Jehovah, whose awful name could not be spoken without dread sacrilege.

Who is this nameless source? Is he a god above the battle, seeing all, knowing all, or is he a hot protagonist of the subject under consideration? How do you picture him, this nameless, faceless man of mystery, this informed source, as his weighty words come to you second or third hand? Is he a general in gold braid and medals or a foreign minister in homburg, with recessive chin and tie, or a diplomat complete with silk hat and briefcase, a Congressman exhorting through his cigar? Or is he sitting like a spider in his web of ticker tape with gleaming economic eye while fortunes rise and fall?

And who has informed him, this anonymous font of wisdom? What, I wonder, are his authorities? Does he, too, have informed sources who, to him, are nameless, and does this hierarchy in turn have its nameless informants, and so on and on into the outmost vacant regions of soundless space? And why is this mysterious source under such secret wraps and why does he break down and divulge all this hush hush to your commentator or news analyst? These are questions I can't help asking as I hear this pompous cliché employed to bolster some theory or opinion.

The strange thing about these informed sources is that they so frequently turn out to be misinformed sources. We never hear the news pundits say, however, "I have these words from a misinformed source who may not be named." But often he might say just that, since by their words you have to know them, and both informed and misinformed are as often wrong as right in relation to what proves to be the facts—or the results. Either way they are too often our sources of information, be they right or wrong, and how are we to know and to judge what we hear from such nebulous nonsense? Well—face to face we should know them, not personally, of course—but with names. For myself, I give no credence or belief. I pay no heed or mind to any nameless authority.

All God's children got names. Let them use them, say I, and if anyone wants to influence my alleged mind, he will have to have a moniker and use it for no "informed source" hiding behind a cloud of anonymity is going to form my opinion or shape my conduct.

And the same holds in other fields save those of political affairs and world conditions. The lowest form of communication is the anonymous letter. The poorest type of book review or art criticism is the unsigned article, capable of doing untold damage yet carrying no responsibility or authority. In such categories fall, too, the unnamed sources and the secret witnesses employed by certain investigating bodies, all like small boys making faces behind a fence.

What's in a name? Everything, when it comes to the identification of information. Men of substance and standing have earned the names that carry weight. We may not always agree, but we know who is talking—and usually why. But as for "informed sources who may not be named"—I don't believe a word they say.

Russian Navy No. 2 in World, Ranking Next to That of United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 5, 1954

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the **Record**, I include the following article from the Washington Sunday Star of May 2, 1954:

RUSSIAN NAVY NO. 2 IN WORLD, RANKING NEXT TO THAT OF UNITED STATES—SHIPYARDS WORKING AROUND CLOCK RAISE FLEET FROM SEVENTH POSITION OF DECADE AGO

(By William H. Gregory and Donald D. Jones)

To numerical supremacy in the air and on the land, Russia appears to be seeking to add preeminence on the seas.

Ten years ago Russia was a poor seventh in naval strength. Today it is second. Only the United States fleet is larger, but in tonnage alone, not in number of ready combat ships.

Soviet shipyards—working around the clock—are building nothing but fighting ships, surface vessels as well as submarines. Their merchant shipping—100 percent of it—is being built in non-Communist countries, principally Finland, the Netherlands, Denmark, Italy, and Sweden.

There is nothing modest in the scale of the Russian buildup in fighting ships. In submarines, for example, the U. S. S. R. is outbuilding the United States 12 to 1.

BUILDING FAST CRUISERS

In high speed modern cruisers—and this is not so generally known—they are building more each year than all the North Atlantic Treaty Organization countries together. More than 50 destroyers have been added to the Soviet navy in the last few years.

Not that this buildup means the Russians are ready to challenge the United States and Britain on the high seas—they are not.

But of growing Soviet naval strength, Adm. Robert B. Carney, United States Chief of Naval Operations, in an exclusive statement, has this to say:

"The determined efforts of the Soviet Union to build a navy that will threaten allied control of the world's lifelines gives all of us cause for sober thought.

"The rapid construction by the Soviet Union of lethal seagoing weapons systems, including longe-range submarine, naval aircraft and fast, heavily armed cruisers, as well as their noteworthy acquisition of merchant vessels, all point to a determined Soviet effort for a long-sought maritime preeminence."

NEW FACTOR IN EDUCATION

"As many Americans have realized, the existence of Soviet shore-based weapons systems—guided missiles, coastal artillery, short- and long-range aircraft—have always been a threat to our own ability to project United States military might overseas. Thus, whether the Soviet Union did or did not have a navy, there was created the need for a far-ranging United States Navy with sufficient military power to control distant coastal waters and to support and sustain our allies and sister services.

"But the rise of the Soviet navy has added a new factor to the equation—one which must be carefully inculcated into our overall security planning."

Another view, to complete the perspective, from Adm. Arthur W. Radford, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, made in 1952 in Indochina:

"The entire combined Communist navies would not be capable of undertaking any large-scale operations in the face of the opposition they would meet."

Admiral Radford, known to advocate a naval blockade against Red China and Indochina if a show of force against the Communists in southeast Asia is necessary, apparently still holds to his 1952 position.

At firsthand, Admiral Radford's and Admiral Carney's views appear to be contradictory. This is not the case, as can be seen from an analysis of Russian strength.

This comparison of United States, British, and Russian fleets in compiled from figures from recognized naval strength authorities such as Jane's Fighting Ships, from the British Admiralty and from figures just released for this series by the Navy Department:

	U. S. S. R.	United States	Great Britain
Carriers	0	17-29	5-7
Battleships	3	4	1-5
Cruisers	24	19	11-24
Destroyers	125	246-340	62-95
Submarines	350	100	35-53

In addition, Russia has 1,000 patrol vessels, 25 minelayers, 525 minesweepers, 200 large amphibious vessels and 200 fleet auxillaries, including aircraft tenders.

SOVIET ARRAY IMPRESSIVE

"The Russian array of naval strength is impressive," the United States Navy says, "but cannot yet challenge the West at sea."

Russia's deficiency in aircraft carriers is obvious. It has none. Persistent rumors from behind the Iron Curtain, however, tell of one afloat or being built.

In line with a policy of never underestimating the enemy—a policy born of the debacle at Pearl Harbor—the Navy points out some Communist advantages.

Soviet navies are ready to go; they have no ships in mothballs. Also, the Russians are able to maintain large numbers of patrol and mine craft (mine-laying, incidentally, is a revered Russian specialty learned in Czarist days) on the active list. This is unlike the western practice of building such smaller craft after war breaks out.

Merchant shipping apparently is growing. About 75,000 tons are on the ways in western countries. Their new or second-hand ships sought abroad are principally dry cargo vessels of from 2,500 to 5,000 gross tons.

SHORTAGE OF TANKERS

Louis S. Rothschild, Maritime Administrator, says there is an acute shortage of tankers under Russian registry, and recently there have been efforts to purchase such ships in the West. Both Britain and France have been approached.

"Current indications are that the greatest part of Russian efforts to obtain new or second-hand merchant-type tonnage from Western countries is concentrated primarily in dry cargo vessels of from 2,500 to 5,000 gross tons," Mr. Rothschild said. "The fact that many Russian seaports have only moderate depths of water makes it advisable for them to limit the size of merchant-type tonnage for maximum operational flexibility.

In the merchant ship category, the U. S. S. R. still retains the following vessels made available to it under lend-lease in wartime:

"Liberty, 38; prewar dry cargo, 44; prewar tankers, 1; warbuilt tugs, 2; and prewar tugs, 1—a total of 86.

"Efforts by the United States Government to obtain return of these vessels are continuing."

SHIPS STURDY AND FAST

There's an old wives' tale that Russian ships are poor in quality, like much of their consumer goods is often said to be. United States Navy officials have this to say:

"The Russians build sturdy ships. Their newest ships are every bit as good as their opposite numbers in western navies—fast, heavily gunned, and sound, the Russian ships often incorporate foreign ideas and developments, although only the best features are borrowed. The final result is a first class—but completely Russian—ship.

"The Soviet naval architect has fewer headaches than his western counterparts, for all he must fit into the narrow confines of his warship hull are the fighting features. Air-conditioning, iceboxes for fresh foods, moving pictures, and ice cream are not part of the Russian sailor's life.

"It remains to be seen whether their current plans for expansion contemplate a direct challenge to western naval supremacy by construction of big ships such as aircraft carriers and battleships."

Memorandum on Brownson Amendment to St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD R. FORD, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1954

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, we have heard a great deal about a proposal by the Congressman from Indiana [Mr. BROWNSON] to finance United States participation in the St. Lawrence seaway by the issuance of revenue bonds without Government guaranty. This is an unusual and unique proposal and quite unworkable as far as the seaway is concerned.

Since debate on this issue is somewhat limited, I think it will be helpful to have the pertinent facts in the RECORD. I therefore wish to have printed in the RECORD a memorandum on the reasons why the Brownson proposal would, in effect, defeat the administration's program for the most worthwhile project:

MEMORANDUM ON BROWNSON AMENDMENT TO ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY BILL (S. 2150)

1. The proposal now known as the Brownson amendment to the St. Lawrence seaway bill is that the United States portion of the seaway be financed by the sale to the public of the revenue bonds of the Government corporation to be created by the bill, without Government guaranty of either the principal of or interest on the bonds.

2. All of the traditional bitter-end opponents of the seaway, and now of United States participation in the seaway that Canada intends to build anyway, have leaped to the support of this revenue bond proposal because they know that it will without question scuttle United States participation in the project.

3. There is no congressional precedent whatever to support this proposal. In every other case in which Congress has created a corporation to be financed by the issuance of its stock or bonds or both, Congress has recognized that the Government either must subscribe to enough capital stock and paid-in surplus to enable the corporation to get its revenue-producing operations well established or Congress must authorize the issuance of the necessary amount of bonds to be sold to the Treasury or to be guaranteed as to principal and interest by the Government—or a combination of such assured financing methods.

4. As among the foregoing financing methods, the Treasury Department and the Bureau of the Budget have a strong preference for the method of financing now provided by S. 2150—the sale of the corporation's bonds to the Treasury. In fact, the bill as originally introduced in both Houses of Congress was amended in the Senate to meet the views of the Treasury and the Bureau of the Budget on this subject. Furthermore, in response to a request by the chairman of the House Public Works Committee, the Treasury at least (and perhaps also the Bureau of the Budget) is understood to have stated that it is in favor of the sale of bonds to the Treasury as against the Brownson finacing method.

5. Those supporting the Brownson amendment refer to the turnpike and bridge authorities created by various States in recent years and to the successful sale to the public of the nonguaranteed bonds of those authorities. Those situations, however, differ basically and radically from the St. Lawrence seaway project.

(a) The interest on the bonds of such State authorities is exempt from all Federal income taxes. Without that exemption the interest rate on such revenue bonds, instead of ranging from 3¼ to 4 percent as it does, would doubtless have had to range from 5¾ percent or 6 percent on up. The results in the case of this seaway project would be: First, an increase of $4,500,000 to $5,500,000 in interest charges during the construction period, thus increasing the cost of the project by that amount; and, second, an increase of from $2 million to $3 million per year in interest charges in the operating years prior to any substantial retirement of bonds. Those increases would, of course, have to be reflected in higher rates of tolls to be levied on the seaway traffic. Those higher tolls would, of course, increase the price to our people of commodities brought through the seaway for domestic consumption and would also minimize the advantage of the seaway to our producers who would like to sell their farm or factory products in the world market.

(b) To grant a Federal income-tax exemption to the bonds of this Government Corporation would, however, be to reverse the established Government policy in such matters. This policy is stated in section 742 (a), of title 31, United States Code, which provides that interest upon obligations issued on or after March 28, 1942, by the United States or any agency or instrumentality thereof shall not have any exemption, as such, under the Internal Revenue Code.

(c) Furthermore, in the turnpike and bridge bond cases it has been found necessary, and possible, for the States to give certain firm assurances to the investing public which Congress could not, as a matter of law or of national policy, give in this case.

(i) The greater part of this seaway will, in any event, be in Canadian territory and be operated under the jurisdiction of the St. Lawrence Seaway Authority of Canada; and no assurance could be given by Congress or our Government corporation to private investors that Canada would never take any action, either in respect of tolls or otherwise, that would prejudice the payment of our corporation's bond interest and principal when due. Without such assurance, however, the revenue bonds could not be sold.

(ii) Furthermore, Congress could not, either as a matter of law or of national policy, give potential private investors assurance in the seaway bill that the United States will do nothing while the bonds are outstanding that would prejudice the payment of the bond interest and principal when due. Any such assurance would be an attempt by Congress to contract away its power to legislate in the future in respect of this great artery of interstate and foreign commerce and an attempt to remove the legislative discretion of future Congresses in this field. Also, even if it could do so, Congress certainly would not, as a matter of national policy, so tie its own hands. An economic depression of the future might call for action by Congress or our seaway corporation, in respect of tolls or otherwise, to help revive trade and commerce. Again, the security of this country might, at some time, require the imposition of such strict controls over the passage of ships through the seaway as to affect substantially the volume of seaway traffic and the revenue derived therefrom. Again, because the seaway will be a great instrument of defense in time of need, the Government must remain free to use it as such an instrument in time of emergency, regardless of the effect upon the bonds.

(iii) In the turnpike and bridge bond cases further protection is given by complicated and precise provisions relating to the tolls to be charged; and, in addition, there is a covenant not to reduce the tolls that are initially put into effect, except when certain carefully defined protective requirements can be met. In those cases the sole and exclusive consideration in the fixing of tolls is the servicing and retirement of the bonds. Here, however, we have a great international project in the operation of which the economic interests of all of our people, not of just a relatively few bondholders, will have to be taken into account. And we must operate our portion of the project in cooperation with Canada. The proper balancing of the various considerations entering into the fixing of tolls in this case cannot possibly be determined at the time of the bond financing, which would be 5 to 6 years in advance of the opening of seaway operations; and yet, without such a determination on a firm contractual basis, one of the essential elements of public financing through revenue bonds is missing. Also, in recognition of the obvious public interest in the seaway operations and of the different public groups—consumers, producers, shippers, carriers, etc.—who will have an economic interest in such operations, the bill contemplates that the tolls originally established may be changed from time to time after due notice and public hearing. Obviously in these circumstances Congress should not approve any present covenant with private investors not to reduce tolls except under certain specified, limited conditions which would be calculated to assure their bonds full protection. Yet without such a covenant, another of the essential elements of this proposed form of public financing is missing.

(d) This form of public financing would, moreover, present problems in addition to those of the Federal income-tax exemption and the firm legislative assurances required by private investors in such cases. There would be, for example, the matter of assuring that the bonds would be negotiable instruments and would be legal investments for public bodies, banks, and fiduciaries. There would be the question of the ability of the trustee for the bondholders, in event of default on the bonds, to secure the court appointment of a receiver to operate the United States Corporation and its Government-owned properties for the benefit of the bondholders. And these would doubtless not exhaust the problems that would arise.

6. Even if it were possible, which it is not, to put the financing of this seaway project on a par with the turnpike and bridge projects by making extensive revisions of the seaway bill to provide in some fashion for the matters discussed above, that would not be good enough. The experience in those cases shows that we might expect a period of from 15 to 30 months to pass before the bonds could be offered to the public. In the New Jersey Turnpike case it was only 14 months, but that was a speedy exception. In the case of the Ohio Turnpike it was 33 months, and in Indiana, with plenty of outside experience to go on, it was 34 months—2 years and 10 months. Of course, Canada would not wait for any such period of time to pass. It would proceed to construct an all-Canadian seaway. And the national policy adopted by Congress, i. e., to obtain United States participation in the national-security interest of the United States, would collapse; and this Government and the Congress would be a laughingstock wherever the seaway is known.

Good Business Ahead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. BATES

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 16, 1954

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, it was my pleasure to hear Richard L. Bowditch speak before the New England congressional dinner meeting on Tuesday, April 27, at the Mayflower Hotel, and his message on the business outlook was one of the most stimulating and encouraging I have heard in a long time. Mr. Bowditch is associated with C. H. Sprague Son, of Boston, and retired this year as president of the United States Chamber of Commerce after a very successful term. He is a vigorous leader and one who looks up and forward.

With the consent of my colleagues, I wish to extend my remarks and insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following remarks by Mr. Bowditch:

You may be interested to know that wherever I have stopped, I have been asked if we are going to have a depression.

My answer—and without exception—has been "No." I do not foresee a depression.

That does not mean I own a crystal ball or have any gift of second sight. My answer is based on the findings of our economists at the National Chamber of Commerce—and on the expressed views of key businessmen in all quarters of the country. Our economists have weighed the chances on their charts and graphs, and the businessmen I have consulted have weighed the chances on the sensitive scales of their own pocketbooks. They are optimistic—and so am I.

But I am concerned about the frequency of the question. I have had it fired at me in some of the most prosperous communities in the country—where there isn't a cloud in the sky or any reason to anticipate a squall. This wouldn't make sense unless you figured that somebody is trying to foment a depression-psychology. I am convinced that somebody is. It's not you businessmen. It is not my fellow businessmen in Boston.

You don't want a depression. We don't want a depression. The business institution has never wanted a depression. There is no profit in banked fires—and there are few customers among the unemployed.

But the blunt truth is that quite a few people in this country do want a depression—and they are doing everything they can to bring one about. They are conducting a form of economic germ warfare by spreading the virus of fear and hysteria. Up to now, I have refrained from paying them my compliments. But it seems to me that this would be a good time to take off the kid gloves—and come out swinging. The time to be polite is over. Now is the time to be blunt. Let me put it this way:

The people who want a depression are the same people who would like to see our free-market system come to a deadend—and then be taken over by a planned economy. They are attempting to cash in on the common knowledge that you can't change over from an arsenal economy without some aches and pains.

For the most part, these people have long histories of identification with so-called big government movements and antibusiness crusades. There is no occasion for me to name any of them. I do not propose to give them any personal free advertising. Each one has built his own Trojan horse of emergency, but when you read them in the press or hear them on the air, they are all on the same riding path.

What they are after is personal power, and if the country has to hang over the gorge of disaster for them to get it, that's all right with them.

I do not believe they can get anywhere with their basic ambitions, but they can make trouble.

Through fear and hysteria, they can prolong the perfectly normal economic dip we are now experiencing. The fever they are spreading could get beyond control. It behooves us to be alive to this situation—with discernment and courage.

The fallacy of the depression argument is apparent to any candid mind. There was nothing unexpected about the current readjustment. We ought to explode the exaggerations with a mine of facts.

The business community is discounting the lamentations of the professional Jeremiahs and the wishful prophets. Expenditures for plant and equipment already authorized or in the works for 1954 are not far from the 1953 levels. These expenditures are the proof of faith in an expanding future.

Defense spending has been cut, but it's still high. It will continue at a high level until the cold war is defrosted—and no one can guess when that will happen.

Commercial construction during 1954 will be among the brightest spots of a generally good construction picture. It is due for another boost of at least 10 percent above last year's boom volume. Expenditures for office buildings, loft buildings, and warehouses can be expected to be about 15 percent greater than in 1953. Outlays for stores, restaurants, and garages are forecast to be at least 5 percent more. If you add in hotels, motels, and commercial recreational buildings the 1954 total will reach $2.4 billion—compared with about $2.2 billion in 1953.

Let me stress this fact:

We have never had a depression, a recession, or a long stretch of hard times with business stimulants of this character. This is not 1929. These times are not the 1930's.

The Jeremiahs of disaster are forecasting a depression on the basis of conditions that prevailed more than 20 years ago. There is no similarity. In the 1930's, our banks were hungry for money. Today, they are loaded with cash. In the 1930's we had more than half a hundred different weak and motley banking systems. Our banking structure was a house of cards. Today savings accounts are safe. Our banks are sound.

It is highly improbable, if not impossible, that the stock-market crash of Black Friday in October 1929, could ever be repeated. In those days, we were mesmerized by the lure of wild speculation. Today, there is no huge bubble to burst in our face.

In 1930, the farmer had been in trouble for almost 9 years. He was in debt, and on top of that came the drought. As of today, farm prices have declined somewhat because the farmer has lost much of his foreign market, but the farmer has a dozen good years behind him. The farm debt of the 1930's was an albatross around the neck of the whole economy. There is no comparison with the present.

In the 1930's, again, there were astronomical holdings of American securities by foreign investors, most of whom elected to unload them in this country in a wild flurry of panic. That could not happen now. Foreign banks demanded that our banks pay their debt to them in gold, and most countries defaulted in their debts to American banks. There is no comparison in this connection either. We will not be caught in that nutcracker again.

I am not such a Pollyanna that I fail to appreciate the jolts and jars of a readjustment period, but I cannot go along with the theory that this country will ever duplicate the depression of the 1930's. No two wars are ever fought on the same basis.

The strategy and tactics of World War I and World War II were as far apart as the strategy and tactics of 1812 and the Spanish-American War. And no two economic cycles are ever quite alike.

What we need at this moment is more courage, more confidence, and more optimism and more salesmanship. Sure, we have a buyer's market in many lines, particularly in durable goods. What is so wrong with that? A free market cannot always be a sellers' market.

Sometimes I think we all need a refresher course in salesmanship.

Perhaps we have been order takers so long we have lost our knack for selling.

If that is true, we might as well throw in the towel right now, but I don't believe it is true. We didn't build the American economy on the basis of order taking. It was built by salesmansip, plus service.

Service is one of our favorite words, but I sometimes think we underrate it. We often use it to mean courtesy and promptness on deliveries and other desirable virtues. It is also a synonym for ingenuity.

The self-starter is an example of service and salesmanship at one and the same time. We used to have to crank our cars by hand. Then the self-starter came along, and the owner hankered to rid himself of his old car as soon as he could. It was still in good running order, but it didn't have that self-starter, and that was what he wanted.

When we say that our people are loaded down with durable goods today, let's remember that self-starter. Our salesmen have a job of selling new models with new trimmings to old customers whose present models are still in running order. In this postwar era, you have to have what the people want—at the right price. They have the means to buy and they will buy if we can sell the goods.

Isn't that about the picture? Look at the television industry. Color TV is a rich man's toy at the moment, and even the rich have trouble getting a set. But no one can tell me that the price won't be down to the average man's pocketbook in another few years.

Television owners aren't going to hang on to their black-and-white sets when the neighbors get their pictures in color. Not if I know my fellow Americans—and not if I know what our salesmen can do if they wear out more shoe leather and fewer trouser seats.

The Jeremiahs of disaster tell us that nothing can save the Nation from depression except vastly increased Federal spending. I disagree. That does not mean I am necessarily opposed to public works to take up the slacks in employment that cannot otherwise be filled. The time for public works is during economic dips. Our highways, for example, could stand a substantial amount of facelifting.

It is the concept that Federal spending, in itself, can make prosperity in time of peace that is all wrong. We tried that in the 1930's, and while the present-day prophets of doom don't like to be reminded of it, Federal Government action did not cure the depression. There were still about 9 million unemployed in 1940 after 7 years of Government tinkering with the national economy and interference with business. Had the Federal spending in the 1930's not been accompanied by stringent restrictions on the normal operation of business, things might have been different. But there is no point in talking about that. I will let the Jeremiahs recite their ancient history while we try to think ahead.

The future expansion of the American economy is inevitable—if we can preserve the free market system. But we cannot hope to preserve it unless it is understood as well as we understand our free social institutions. They are opposite sides of the same coin.

We live in the greatest Nation on earth—we must not sell it short.

Charles Evans Hughes once said: "This country need fear no foreign foe—we the people are the power, the peril, and the hope."

Are We Outsmarting Ourselves?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1954

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, with the growth of our centers of population throughout our Nation, and the increased number of automobiles on our highways and streets, especially in California, the traffic situation continues to be a major problem which we are all anxious to solve satisfactorily.

The answer, of course, lies for the most part in extensive intelligent highway construction, and the program already initiated in California for freeways and improved highways is one of the most advanced in the United States.

However, the cost of such construction is a drain upon the resources of every State, and much could be done at the Federal level to assist in the solution of the Nation's highway problem if the Federal Government would return to the States all of the gasoline taxes it collects. This would provide funds for highway construction in every State in the Union.

The need for legislative action for this purpose is stressed in the following article by De Witt Emery, president of the National Small-Business Men's Association:

ARE WE OUTSMARTING OURSELVES?

Are we outsmarting ourselves? Has the atom bomb, for example, solved more problems than it created?

Another example—insects. Someone not too many years ago came up with DDT, and there was much rejoicing over our having insects licked. All we had to do was spray with DDT and they died, died like flies. But did they? The weaklings died, but the largest and strongest didn't, and their offspring are now bigger and stronger, heartier than ever. Sure, a new, stronger insecticide will kill the weaker of the present superbreed, but will it exterminate them, or will another turn of the cycle give us a new crop of still bigger and still stronger insects?

Then there are the wonder drugs. Surely they are a great blessing to mankind. Certainly they have been to me personally. I've taken at least a ton of them during the past 2 years. I probably wouldn't be here today if these drugs had not been available. But just the other day I heard a group of doctors discussing the wonder drugs, and they were very much concerned that they are being relied on too much; they are being too widely prescribed for minor ills, so that when the real killer strikes the wonder drug will have lost its effectiveness so far as that individual is concerned. Are we outsmarting ourselves?

Another great blessing to all of us is the automobile, but, even so, there are times when one wonders if it has solved more problems than it created; if it wouldn't, after all, be better to go back to the horse and buggy. These thoughts are most apt to occur on a hot Sunday afternoon in August when one is trying to get back to his home in any of our larger or medium-sized cities. Recently it took me 33 minutes to drive 6 blocks in the Loop in Chicago. Old dobbin in his day could have traveled the same distance in 5 minutes or less.

In the beginning, only a very few could afford to own an automobile, and they couldn't use their cars very much because they were forever breaking down, and when they did run, there wasn't such a thing as a good road for them to use in going anyplace. Gradually this changed over the years; and ever-increasing number of people were able to buy automobiles, and as cars became more numerous the taxpayers—the motorist has always paid more than his share of taxes—put up an ever-increasing amount of money to build highways, and later super highways. Even so, particularly since the end of World War II, highway construction has fallen way behind the production of automobiles, until today the condition of the highways throughout this country is a national disgrace. Here and there, in any section of the country, one finds a really good stretch of highway, but more often than not it is preceded by a rough, narrow road which should have been widened and rebuilt years ago, and is followed by more of the same old road.

I've heard it said that there ought to be a law to prevent Detroit from breeding cars like flies. Maybe so, but if we ever got such a law there wouldn't then be any traffic problems. In the first place, no one would be going anywhere; and in the second place, no one except the commissars would have enough to buy a car.

I heard Will Rogers say one time that he could solve the traffic problem overnight. His solution was to pass a law providing "that no one who didn't have any business going where they were going couldn't go there."

There is a very simple solution to the highway problem. It is for the Federal Government to return to the States all of the gasoline taxes it collects. If this were done, it would provide funds for a really gigantic highway construction program in every State in the Union. An important byproduct would be the creation of literally millions of jobs.

Maybe, if those of us who drive automobiles every day went to work on it, we could persuade Congress to take action "right quick." What has been done so far at both the State and Federal level is grossly inadequate. I know about highways. I have just returned from a 4,700-mile drive through 10 States.

Oklahoma Salutes an Outstanding Son

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1954

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, all Oklahomans were pleased to hear of the award of the Pulitzer prize for international reporting to an outstanding native son, Jim G. Lucas, of the Scripps-Howard newspapers.

As a combat correspondent with the United States Marines, Jim Lucas performed heroic service during World War II.

As a reporter with American forces in Korea, Jim Lucas brought the Korean war into the homes of America, and once again won the respect and affection of the GI's and the admiration of all newspapermen.

Now Jim is in Indochina, writing the frontline story of that war, and doing his Nation a service by his competent reporting of daily events.

It is a pleasure to join in paying tribute to this brave Oklahoma newspaperman, and to have the opportunity to place in the RECORD the following editorial from the Washington Daily News:

> TOP HONORS TO LUCAS
>
> The Pulitzer prize for international reporting has been awarded to Jim G. Lucas, of the News and other Scripps-Howard newspapers, in deserved recognition of his human interest stories last year from the Korean war front.
>
> It couldn't have gone to a better reporter. In professional news-writing circles the Pulitzer prize for reporting is conceded tops, and that, in our opinion, is just where Jim Lucas belongs, just as another great war reporter, Ernie Pyle, belonged.
>
> The exultation we feel will be shared not only by the readers of the News but by that great legion of frontline GI's whose miseries and joys, heroism, and humdrum have been so chronicled by Jim Lucas.
>
> Human interest stories necessarily require humans as subject matter and that is where Jim excels. The wars he writes about are not intricacies of maneuver and strategy—they are the wars the rifle-carrying dogface fights and experiences. Or the mud-slogging marine, the freckled kid in a B–29 gun turret, or the ammunition passer on a battleship. Jim knows them all, thousands of them, and in the words of a Seventh Division citation last year in Korea: "His reporting, mellowed by common understanding of the sacrifices endured by men in the line, together with unwavering journalistic integrity, has resulted in the most outstanding portrayal of the American soldier in Korea."
>
> It was characteristic of Jim that when the fine news of his winning the Pulitzer prize was announced he was in Indochina reporting still another war. It was the same last year when he won the Omar Bradley Medal of the Veterans of Foreign Wars.
>
> We are proud of Jim Lucas not only because he is a great reporter who generates extraordinary reader interest but because he is an ardent devotee of facts.
>
> We feel sure he deeply appreciates the honor that has come to him and wishes he were in this country to accept it; but, given the choice, we think Jim would prefer to stick it out in Indochina. There's a war and that's where Jim wants to be.

Slogans Don't Make a Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 29, 1954

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, some folk define "public relations" as the art of making what is not seem to be. Personally, I do not hold with this cynical concept. In fact, I believe any public relations program based upon such a philosophy is, in the long run, a poor program; one that is doomed to eventual failure.

This appears to be the philosophy of the hucksters in the present administration. Every campaign seems to be based upon an effort to make what is not seem to be.

We were first exposed to this technique in the matter of the mission of the Seventh Fleet at Formosa. During the 1952 campaign we were subjected to a brain washing, intending to make it appear that Chiang Kai-shek was straining at the leash on Formosa, held back by the Seventh Fleet from invading China, throwing the Communists out and solving all problems in Asia.

Well, the Seventh Fleet was told it should continue to protect Formosa, but should let the powerful legions of Chiang cross to the mainland at will. It turned out, however, that what was not just was not, regardless of how hard the hucksters attempted to make it seem to be. Chiang continued to make a few piddling raids, which he had been doing all along anyhow. But the brain washing then went to another, double mission.

Slowly we were built up to the need for a New Look at our military situation. Finally, after about 6 months of brain washing, we were given two new slogans. A New Look in the military, and a foreign-military policy of "instant, massive retaliation," which required great airpower, which the New Look, according to the hucksters, was supposed to supply.

I have called attention repeatedly to the fallacy of the so-called New Look military policy. When we examined the military budget we found, first, the Air Force was getting only a part of the program that had been cutback a year before; and, second, the New Look, with its supposed emphasis on airpower to carry out "instant, massive retaliation," was nothing more nor less than a means of hiding a simple, meat-ax budget cut. Moreover, no less a person than Admiral Radford, the new Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, said it was not a New Look at all, merely a continuing evaluation of the situation.

So it turned out that the brain washing was just one more attempt to make what is not seem to be.

While this was going on, we were subject to still another brain washing. We began to hear a great deal about initiative in the cold war. Finally, in January, we were told by the President that we had gained the initiative. Most of us hoped this was true.

Now, it appears to have been just another public-relations gimmick to make what is not seem to be, or else I have an erroneous understanding of the meaning of initiative.

Last Friday, Mr. Speaker, R. H. Shackford, a foreign correspondent for Scripps-Howard newspapers, in a dispatch from Geneva, reported that the Communists "now have the West on the run diplomatically as well as militarily in Asia." He further reported a "tougher tactical line" on the part of the Communists.

Is this the "initiative"?

On the same day, Crosby S. Noyes, in a special dispatch from Geneva to the Washington Star, said, and I quote:

> Already there is evidence that the initiative at this Conference is very much in the hands of the Communists.

End of quotation.

Sunday morning, we read the following headline in one Washington newspaper: "United States Defeat Looms at Geneva." Then there was a subhead which read, "France, Britain Fail To Back American Bluff on Asia Policy."

The other Washington newspaper had the following headline on its main Geneva story: "Dulles' Failure on Geneva Aim Laid to Impossible Conditions."

The subhead in this paper read, "Secretary Returning Home After Week Viewed as Disastrous Diplomatically."

So far as I am concerned none of this adds up to the "initiative," although I admit the possibility that my understanding of the term might differ from that of the hucksters. But it is not a very complicated word.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to include the Noyes and Shackford dispatches as a part of my remarks.

This moment that public relations is the art of making what is not seem to be might be acceptable in a program designed to sell mouth wash. It should not be carried out in the Government of the United States at any time, and particularly in times as perilous as now.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I beseech the hucksters to forget the lessons learned while peddling their soap and detergents. I urge them to operate on the basis of frank statements of the problems faced, and frank statements of the alternate solutions.

We can only legislate with the support of the people, who must be informed.

The above-mentioned dispatches follow:

Ike Spiked the Parley—Thus Far Reds Are on Top at Geneva

(By R. H. Shackford)

Geneva, April 30.—The Communists—Russian, Chinese, North Korean, and Indochinese—are the only happy people at the Geneva Conference today.

President Eisenhower's seeming press conference suggestions that a deal with the Communists in southeast Asia is all that is possible now hit the western delegates here between wind and water. There wasn't much spunk before Ike spoke, and his comments fixed it.

The question here is:

Can even a deal on the partition of Indochina be made?

Will the Communists, who now have the West on the run diplomatically as well as militarily in Asia, be satisfied with a half loaf when by pressing on they see chances of a whole loaf?

The answer to both questions here seems as of now to be "No."

REDS ON OFFENSIVE

Neither Soviet Foreign Minister V. M. Molotov nor Red China's Premier-Foreign Minister Chou Enlai show any sign of being lenient. On the contrary, every sign at this conference is that the post-Stalin period of sweetness and light is ending and a tougher tactical line is in the works.

From an American plont of view this Geneva Conference—only in its fifth day—must be labeled a colossal failure.

The formal conference itself has been a farce. Each day the delegates of 19 nations ride to the Palais Des Nations in their limousines and a couple of them deliver set speeches. They are supposed to cover Korea but the Communists talk about everything under the sun.

INDOCHINA NEXT

Now it looks as though the Indochinese phase of the conference may get under way late this coming week or the next one. By then Dien Bien Phu may well have fallen, since many here believe the Communists can take it any hour they wish and currently are toying with it like a cat with a mouse.

Amidst the confusion, one thing stands out—that the West's tough talk of a few weeks ago, especially by the Americans with respect to Indochina, has turned out to be just talk. The Communists called that bluff.

For weeks the French have been criticized for an appeasement approach to Indochina.

Earlier this week it was the British who were being beaten over the heads—especially by Americans—for blocking "united action."

Today it is the Americans who are being accused of having talked too boldly in recent weeks without the will to carry it through.

The truth is that all 3 nations are in a mess together and all 3 must bear in varying degrees responsibility for the diplomatic victory now in prospect for the Communists in southeast Asia.

Eisenhower Statement Causes American Confusion in Geneva—Report He Favored Indochina Partition Later Denied, Seen as Damaging Position

(By Crosby S. Noyes)

Geneva, April 30.—Reports trickling into Geneva from President Eisenhower's news conference yesterday have caused the greatest consternation and confusion in the American delegation here.

To emphasize the isolation of this conference, top delegates still are professing ignorance of what the President actually said.

The reports themselves are confusing. The first stories carried a strong implication that General Eisenhower had implied a settlement in Indochina on the basis of partition of the country between the Communists and French Union forces by suggesting an arrangement similar to that in Germany and Berlin. Later reports indicated the President had specifically denied he was talking about partition.

Although they are unsure where they stand, the American spokesmen are insisting that partition in Indochina is still out of the question so far as the United States is concerned. It is felt strongly among observers here that such a suggestion would amount to an open admission of bankruptcy of the allies position in Southwest Asia.

REDS HAVE INITIATIVE

Already there is evidence that the initiative at this conference is very much in the hands of the Communists.

In the present phase it is clear that the Communists are not even considering the possibility of a political settlement in Korea. They are playing the issue strictly for its propaganda value, and—in the opinion of people who should know—they are doing a shrewd job of it.

Secretary of State Dulles, who planned to expose the Red Chinese before the bar of public opinion, is finding the going much tougher than he could have expected. His case on Korea may be grounded solidly on history and law and it undoubtedly makes a strong appeal to Europeans here. On the other hand, the Communist case is aimed squarely and accurately at Asians and is grounded no less surely on nationalism and "anti-foreign" sentiment in the countries involved. It is childish to believe that this battle of words can sway fixed opinions on countries immediately involved or arrive at any solution of the Korean problem, but things said here can have a profound effect on such fence-sitting countries as India and it is in this direction that Chou En-lai and Russian Foreign Minister Moltov are making their pitch.

RED CONCESSIONS DOUBTED

So far as Indochina is concerned, there is the gravest doubt that the Communists will give an inch. From their point of view a settlement based on division of the country would be an unnecessary concession at a point where they hold both the military and political advantage. If an armistice in Indochina is arranged here under present circumstances, it would only seem possible on the basis of a general cease-fire and a subsequent political assimilation of the country by the Communists.

The effect of any such "solution" in Indochina is not hard to predict. It isn't only a question of losing Southeast Asia to communism. Throughout the world the fact would be interpreted as evidence of political impotence of the United States to act when its vital interests were threatened. Already, there is a bitterness in Western Europe over what appears to be an attempt to pin the responsibility for failure of France and Britain.

For better or worse, American prestige throughout the world is at stake in Indochina and the Communists are standing by to rake in the chips.

Polish Constitution Day, May 3, 1954

SPEECH

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1954

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, Poland is watching and waiting May 3, 1954—163d anniversary of Polish Constitution Day.

What does it mean when Poland is garrisoned by Russian Armies and governed by Communist puppets?

How can a piece of paper outlive a tyranny that has all the material power in its hands—May 3, 1955—1956—1957?

Is there any hope for the miracle of independence? I believe that there is. The faith and the patience of the Polish people inspires me with this confidence.

The struggle against communism will be long and grim. We will suffer defeats in the process. We will be discouraged by the weakness of Allies. We will wonder how some intelligent people can be fooled repeatedly by Communist propaganda. Sometimes we will think that the American people will never wake up to the responsibilities of our world leadership for freedom in time. And as we see our own politicians trim their sails—fearful of taking a resolute stand because of possible political repercussions next November—there will seem to be no realistic basis for any hope.

I deliberately point up some of the liabilities we face—and only some—because we have got to know what we are up against before we face what must be done.

There are no sure and packaged answers for the problems inherent in the Communist menace.

Except the faith to outlast communism.

The faith to think and act effectively; to give us steady and unyielding determination.

The Polish people have it.

We must acquire it.

We are on record against the Communist seizure of Poland.

From this moral base, how are we to move forward with practical measures that will help the Polish people to throw off the yoke of Communist enslavement and reestablish their independence?

There is no immediate chance. But, day by day and year by year, perhaps, we must gradually mobilize and put into action every weapon that will bring pressure to bear against the cracks in the Iron Curtain.

That curtain is not evidence of Communist strength. It is a sign that they fear contact between their own peoples and those of the free world. This is the weakness in their armor that we must find and open wide by every means possible.

The Polish people are watching and waiting.

And the Soviets are worried, wondering what they are waiting for.

We can tell them now.

It will be the May 3, when the Polish Constitution will once again be the law of that courageous country, and the stony silence of captivity will be replaced by the joy of freedom.

The history of Poland demonstrates that its people have those resolute qualities to survive any tryanny.

Their history is similar to our own.

Brothers in spirit, we shall help one another to defeat communism, and to liberate the world.

The steadfastness of our faith in God and in freedom is a power that communism can never match.

The Polish people are watching and waiting for the day when they will have the opportunity—with our help—to send communism reeling back into the slime that spawned this monster.

That day will come, and the observance of Polish Constitution Day strengthens us in this mutual purpose.

A Film on the Story of Money

SPEECH
OF
HON. ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 5, 1954

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, some say that money is energy. On the shelf or in a vault it would not dig a trench or build a house. In use, in flow, like blood, it energizes man and thus, its value might be measured in units of energy. Others hold that, as a convenient medium of exchange, its value can continue to be established on the ebb and flow of production or consumption of goods or the use of services.

In any league, the story of money and its management appears to be rather a complex thing. Once, too, was the writing of a letter or the reading of one.

Under unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, I should like to take the liberty of assembling at this point in the Record various remarks it was my privilege to make in the 1955 subcommittee hearings on Treasury and Post Office appropriations. It is hoped that the observations might, in some measure, help create a story on money as easy for the greatest possible number of our citizens to understand as it is for them to read and write:

The Story of Money

Mr. Sieminski. Mr. Parsons, may I ask a few questions? If you do not care to answer them, the Department can fill them in for me later.

Mr. Parsons. I will be glad to answer them, if I can.

Mr. Sieminski. To your knowledge, do you know if there is a film in existence anywhere in this country on the story of money?

We know production. We know distribution. We know manufacturing. We know almost everything there is to know, from Boy Scouts, cops and robbers, cowboys and Indians and the purple sage, right on up to the greatest industrial plant the world has ever seen, America, but can you tell me where there is a film that the people in my district can see, the schoolchildren, the college students, the Rotarians, and others, on the story of money?

Mr. Parsons. I do not believe there is such a comprehensive film; certainly none that we have in the Treasury Department. We have various materials in the Secret Service on the problem of money, which I am sure you are familiar with, such as the "Know Your Money" materials, and we also have in the Savings Bond Division some films that have been prepared and donated to the Division to aid in the stimulation of the sale of savings bonds. None of those, however, point specifically to the broad subject that you are getting at; at least, I do not believe they do. I would be very happy, if you would care, to have assembled two or three of these to see if they would be of any help to you, though I am sure they would not meet what you have in mind.

Mr. Sieminski. We know that one thing Communists hold back from people is a knowledge of money, what makes it flow, what holds it in check, its distribution, and how it has affected people in their historical development. They hold back the facts and blame financiers. We know as kids in school that man and civilizations sprang from the Nile, fanned out along rivers and valleys wherever there was irrigation. We know down in Mexico, for instance, that the Mayan civilization flourished from 500 to 1500. There we see pyramids and chapels and temples and works of man. We find coins, but surely there must be a thread somewhere from the start of man right on through that could piece together a story on money that could be told dramatically. We hear it is a medium of exchange. We know Government officials handle it, spend it, collect it, and how governments are run on it, and homes and families build dreams by it; but I wonder if we could find out a little more on who sits on the supreme court of finance, who pulls the strings, to what tunes? Must man sweat for it? Fight and die for it? Must the flow of money be geared only to the pressing energies of man? And not in the arid, barren regions of the earth to create more energy and wealth with less wear and tear on the body?

I think we have reached a place where we can no longer, as I said yesterday, afford to make capitalists and financiers whipping boys in depressions and wars. One way, I think, that the whip can be held back is to give our people here and now and all over the world a greater appreciation of the part money plays, so that it will not, like financiers of the past, be thought of as something wicked or heretical. It takes money to live.

I thought in my lectures, previously referred to, in the Army that if I had been able to show soldiers something about money and not just something about price tags on clothes handed them, show them something on money as big in scope and coverage as we did on strategy in World War II with a film series called Why We Fight, we could not only get their fullest cooperation while in uniform, but also, later in private life, hold them steadfast to the things that help keep America humming, foreign and domestic enemies notwithstanding. The Story of Money, by Norman Angell (1929), might serve as an approach on the topic.

Money To Match Energy

Mr. Sieminski. I read a statement by the Indian Ambassador recently, no doubt thrown out as a challenge to people in government all over. He said in effect, if I remember it, 15 of the poorest countries of the world, representing over 50 percent of the world's population, earn less than 9 percent of the world's total income. Certainly that is a mark for any public servant to shoot at. If I were in private industry today as a sales-promotion manager and I were told that my performance was 9 percent of a maximum, I would have quite a target to shoot at.

I just wonder if we should wait for men of industry and good will alone to lift the level of income among the poor, and all, or is there something that people like you in public service and we in public service can do to focus the fact that what we are interested in really is that the flow of money, like the flow of blood, be harnessed fast to our energy from birth to death.

Is it not a reasonable thing to say that we are working to match human energy with the availability of cash, or must cash availability depend upon accountants behind corporate desks?

Secretary Humphrey. You spoiled it all with the last few words. I do not know what they mean.

Mr. Sieminski. I mean that money must match energy, keep pace with it through life.

Secretary Humphrey. I do not know what that corporate thing means. I agree with you a hundred percent that it is our job here, it is Government's job to try to promote in every way the opportunity for the American people to advance themselves. I think it is our job to do it, to remove every obstruction we can and provide every assistance we can. I think that is what has made America great. I think the thing that has made America is the fact that we have 160 million people all trying to help themselves, and just nothing can stop them. We have put in all kinds of barricades in their way and they have still progressed. If we take some of those barricades away, particularly extremely high taxation, it will give them a chance to progress much more rapidly in the next few years than they have in the past. I think it is a great opportunity, and I think that is the job that all of us should work at. We are working at it right today, by trying to get these expenditures down, trying to bring government down in its levels of participation, trying to get smaller government, trying to get more money in the hands of the people for them to handle as they want to rather than bringing it in here and trying to handle it the way we want to handle it.

We are not smart enough, and no group of people is smart enough to equal the abilities of 160 million people who look after themselves, if we will just let them do it.

Mr. Sieminski. I am honored with your very fine statement, your interest, and your desire to help me think this thing through. I shall make further observations during these hearings and during debate on problems that trouble me which I do not fully understand. I am new in this game. I guarantee you, though, that I come forward with one thing, and that is, that if the energies locked in the heart of every individual in America, and in the hearts of everyone on the face of the globe, were tapped as we have tapped knowledge concerning the circulation of the human body, and if we could harness that energy for good during a man's lifetime on this globe, the Creator, I am certain, will give us all a helping hand when we get upstairs.

He says to us now, I am sure, "that if only you people could get together, couple your energy with what I give you to work with down below, show me you can do it with one another, I will reveal the next mystery," which is probably what we are all hoping for.

Secretary Humphrey. God bless you. I am for you.

The Idea Is To Keep All Three People in the Game

Mr. Sieminski. Mr. Chairman, before complimenting the Postmaster General on his lively and easily understood report and before expressing the hope that his Department receives the fullest amount needed for Mr. Summerfield to make every adjustment necessary to effect the reported savings required to set his Department in balance, I would like to clarify various formulas as they apply, economic formulas, through the eyes of three figurative people—first, the private citizen on his doorstep; second, the businessman, at his desk; and, third, agencies of

Government. Presumably, each operates under a different formula, varied by its motivating force: the citizen, to have enough cash to pay his bills, including taxes; the businessman, enough profit with which to promote business; Government agencies, enough resilience to satisfy both. Cash in hand and within reach is fundamental. The idea is to keep all three people in the game.

I trust, Mr. Speaker, that the above will help put the story of money on the road and into the homes of all concerned.

Case No. 3

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1954

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, here is still another case of extreme hardship caused by the rigidity of the provisions of the McCarran-Walter Act, discussed by J. Bruce Campbell in his book, The Golden Door. The difficulties encountered here highlight the absurdity of the suffering endured by the honorable wife of an American citizen.

Mrs. Nelson was born in Alexandria, Egypt, holds 2 graduate degrees from the University of Paris and 3 degrees from the University of Berlin; taught at the University of Berlin from 1927 to 1938, and achieved fame in Germany as a radio lecturer. She was first married to Rolf Redwitz, an anti-Nazi, who was impressed into the German Army and killed in combat against the Russians in 1945. Mrs. Nelson was herself dismissed from the University of Berlin in 1938 for her refusal to join the Nazi Party, and 2 years later was sentenced to hard labor in a German munitions factory with her 10-year-old son, Kurt. After 3 years she suffered a physical breakdown. She is listed as Blue Booklet member No. 221 of "the persecuted people and prisoners of the Nazi system," and an honorary member of the Comite Sanitaire Suisse, a similar organization in Switzerland.

Mrs. Nelson was an interpreter, after the war, for the Director of the Office of Economics, United States Military Government in Germany for a year, and then worked in Italy on International Refugee Organization problems before she established her own language school. In 1952 she and her son, Kurt, then 18, traveled to Mexico on the Sidarma Line vessel *Andrea Gritti*. In Tijuana, Mexico, she married Forrest Nelson, an American citizen, whom she had previously met in Europe.

Forrest Nelson asked for nonquota status for his bride, as the wife of an American citizen. This seemed agreeable to the United States Immigration Service. However, the vice consul in Tijuana objected because Mrs. Nelson had arrived in "territory contiguous to the United States on a nonsignatory line." A nonsignatory steamship or air line is one that has not entered into an agreement with the Attorney General to permit inspection of passengers. This is so even though it penalizes passengers who may otherwise qualify to enter the United States legally. As a result of this eccentric circumstance, she would have to wait in Mexico for 2 years before she could become eligible to enter the United States.

Since Mrs. Nelson's Mexican visa was good only for 6 months, the vice consul suggested that at the expiration of her visa she go to Cuba, which was not considered contiguous territory. She was assured her papers were all in order and that a visa would be issued shortly. She flew to Habana and her file followed, but certain records were found to be missing from her file. Also, disaster following upon disaster, the United States Immigration Service sent word that the Nelsons were not actually married. Apparently a clerk had failed to record the marriage, and Nelson flew to Habana, where he and his wife were married once again.

Now the Immigration Service was satisfied, but the American consul in Habana was not, and he ordered a new investigation. This meant getting duplicates of papers obtainable only in Europe, which Mr. Nelson did obtain at considerable outlay of time and money. But by this time Mrs. Nelson's Cuban visa had expired, and she was granted an extension of time. When this extension ran out the consul in Habana had all the necessary documents required by law. He advised her then that the required investigation was completed, but he wanted to check a little further, and at last her visa would be forthcoming.

Unfortunately, however, the Cuban authorities refused to grant her a further stay, so she flew back to Tijuana. It may be that she will have to fly back to Cuba again in 6 months' time, while the consul in Habana is making his further check.

Mr. Nelson was able with no difficulty to bring his stepson, Kurt, into the United States on a student visa, and the boy is studying at a California college. Mrs. Nelson's brother lives in Los Angeles and has been an American citizen for more than 20 years. But Mrs. Nelson for almost 2 years has been traveling back and forth between Tijuana and Habana, waiting to be admitted to the United States.

It is little wonder that Forrest Nelson, an American citizen who can trace his family back to the Pilgrims on the *Mayflower*, finds himself in the miserable predicament of not knowing whether to give up his wife or give up his country.

Pledge to the Flag

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS E. DORN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1954

Mr. DORN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I should like to speak in support of my resolution, House Joint Resolution 502, or any of the many resolutions which have been introduced by my colleagues, designed to insert the words "under God" in the pledge of allegiance to our flag.

I believe it particularly significant that these words be added to this pledge. The great seal of the United States carries on the reverse side the pyramid which "signifies strength and duration"; the eye over it and the motto "Annuit Coeptis," "He [God] has favored our undertakings," allude to the many signal interpositions of providence in favor of the American cause. Many of our coins carry the words "In God we trust."

Throughout the history of our Nation we have by words and deeds expressed the faith of our fathers in God. He is the God, undivided by creed, to whom we look, in the final analysis, for the well-being of our Nation. Therefore, when we make our pledge to the flag I believe it fitting that we recognize by words what our faith has always been.

The St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES G. OAKMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1954

Mr. OAKMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newspaper editorials:

[From the New Bedford (Mass.) Standard-Times of May 3, 1954]

KILLING BY AMENDMENT

In the face of mounting support for the pending bill that provides for United States participation in the St. Lawrence seaway project, opponents are resorting to amendments which would scuttle its objectives.

The measure, which may be called up for consideration in the United States House of Representatives tomorrow, appears likely to stand or fall on the results of voting on the amendments, rather than on an objective judgment of its own merits.

Three crippling amendments have been proposed by those who do not wish the bill to pass:

1. Removal of the bill's authorization permitting a St. Lawrence development corporation to issue up to $105 million in revenue bonds, which would be sold to the United States Treasury. This would force the corporation to go into the private money market for its funds; it would eliminate the financing feature of the bill as voted by the Senate and the House Public Works Committee.

2. Elimination of authority to sell bonds, forcing the corporation to ask for annual appropriations from Congress.

3. Inclusion of a requirement which would make it mandatory for the United States to conclude agreements with Canada on tolls and related matters before any construction is complete.

The first two of these amendments already have been turned down by the House Public Works Committee and the Senate, respectively, but are expected to be raised again during House consideration. The third faces its first test in voting in the House.

For the first time during the 30 years this bill has been in controversy, New England business interests have given it their public support. A survey by the New England Council and the New England Association of Commercial Executives reports that business leaders in the six-State area favor United States participation in the seaway by more than a 2-to-1 margin.

The legislation involves a program of foremost economic and military importance, from which New England, as well as other areas of the Nation, will derive benefit. It is to be hoped the amendments will not succeed in their purpose of crippling the project and that the bill will be approved by the House as it was by the Senate, and will become law.

[From the Washington (D. C.) Evening Star of May 4, 1954]

SHOWDOWN ON ST. LAWRENCE

What is very likely to be the final legislative showdown on the St. Lawrence seaway project is due in the House this week. It will come on a bill which authorizes the United States to join with Canada in the building and control of certain portions of the deep-sea waterway. The measure, which already has passed the Senate, would create a Seaway Development Corporation with authority to issue and to sell to the United States Treasury $105 million in bonds to cover the financing of the American part of the project. The bonds would be retired from revenues received by the corporation from toll charges.

Every administration from that of Republican President Coolidge to that of Democratic President Truman indorsed some variation of the St. Lawrence development plan. As Army Chief of Staff, General Eisenhower supported the project. As President, he has reaffirmed this position and has cited the support of the National Security Council and of his Cabinet.

In recent years the powermaking and the waterway parts of the project have been split apart. The Canadian Government has authorized the Province of Ontario to go ahead with a great hydroelectric power development downstream from Ogdensburg, N. Y., and the New York State Power Authority has received approval from the Federal Power Commission for its participation. The FPC ruling has been appealed, however, by opponents of the project and the power program is delayed accordingly.

Meanwhile, the legislation on the waterway aspect alone, bearing administration blessing, was passed by the Senate in January as several previous opponents switched to support of the plan. The House Public Works and Rules Committees finally have cleared the measure to the House floor with only slight revision but with a battle forecast over a proposed change in financing which proponents claim would "torpedo" the administration's objective.

It is no secret that Canada has become increasingly impatient with American delays on the overall St. Lawrence program and is fully prepared to go it alone. A Canadian corporation has been set up to build and operate the seaway, and if the 83d Congress does not complete action on the matter there probably will be no next chance. The weight of evidence, particularly on the grounds of importance to the national security, favors United States' participation. The House should act accordingly and approve the legislation as already passed by the Senate.

[From the Winston-Salem (N. C.) Journal and Sentinel of May 2, 1954]

INTERNATIONAL DRIVEWAY

Legislation to permit United States participation in the St. Lawrence seaway project is scheduled to reach the floor of the House of Representatives on Wednesday. Should the House approve the legislation, our participation in the project would be assured—after some 30 years of effort—because the Senate has already approved the bill and President Eisenhower is publicly on record as strongly favoring it.

During the many years the seaway projects has been discussed, the pros and cons of it have been thoroughly examined. Canada's decision last year to go ahead with the project, with or without United States participation, makes all the arguments academic. The time has passed when one's attitude could be determined by how the seaway would affect one area economically at the expense of another. Even the national defense argument has lost some of its force. The sole question which the Members of the House must answer is whether the seaway will be built with American participation or without it. Canada will go ahead whatever we decide.

Perhaps an analogy will help explain why we should participate. Suppose the garage at your home is at the back of your lot and you had a choice of building your own driveway on your own property, or using your neighbor's driveway, cutting back onto your own property near the garage. If the neighbor is a good friend (as Canada is to the United States) you might consider using his driveway. But supposing your good friend and neighbor sells his property to a stranger, or perhaps to an enemy. What happens then? You may have to build your own driveway or stop using your garage. But there is no possibility of the United States being able to build its own. So it is conceivable that we could be refused the use of the existing one, and thus be denied access by water to one of our most important and vital areas. The way to avoid this extreme eventuality is, of course, to share the ownership so that whatever happens we have a voice in its operation.

The chance of the United States and Canada becoming enemies, you may say, is as remote as the moon. There's no denying that, but today strange things happen, and they happen with a suddenness that is amazing. We fought a no-holds-barred war with Germany, Japan, and Italy less than a decade ago, yet we now have firm alliances with them. Our war-forged partnership with Russia has turned to bitter enmity. China, with whom we had the closest bonds of friendship not much more than 5 years ago, has met us on the battlefields of Korea, and our armies still face one another in an uneasy truce that is not going to be turned into a peace treaty tomorrow. Admitting the tightness of the bonds that link the United States and Canada, and admitting that serious dissension between us is all but impossible, common sense tells us to participate in the St. Lawrence seaway project. If we are ever forced out of it, at least we won't have lost it by default in 1954.

The 30-year battle in Congress for United States approval is not over yet. Opponents have readied some amendments that would nullify our participation, even while theoretically approving it. Chances for its passage, however, are as good as they ever were, if not better. The House should approve the project and retire from the wars a question that has caused far too much debate and dissension for too many years.

Is Spain as Fortunate as Canada?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1954

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, today's press carries reports of precautionary measures now being taken in Madrid and other parts of Spain to avoid hostile demonstrations on the occasion of Queen Elizabeth's impending visit to Gibraltar. It is reported there are factions in Spain which oppose British control of the rock; and, unless checked, they would only further aggravate international tension at this time.

A question one might well ask is: Can a benefit be spelled out for Spain in British control of Gibraltar the same as one can spell out a benefit to Canada in American control of Alaska? Or in having American interests in Newfoundland? In this respect is not Spain as fortunate as Canada?

Canada knows that if Alaska is attacked the might of America will come to its defense, and, incidentally that of Canada. The same would apply to an attack upon Newfoundland.

An assault on Spain from Africa would bring the might of Britain to the defense of Spain, via the defense of Gibraltar. The people of Spain might well have wished for such help when Islam, on the march from 632 to 1050, swept from China through Spain into France, where Charles Martel, grandfather of Charlemagne, stopped it in its tracks in the Battle of Tours.

Did not Stalin say that the road to Paris was through China, and, by implication, through Africa and across Spain, thus, outflanking EDC, Maginot Europe, and NATO? The Moslems made that sweep once. It can be tried again. Rommel swept eastward across Africa via that route; did he not?

One wonders whether the powers that be in Spain should not be congratuated for the precautionary measures they are taking on this occasion. It is good to see the factions in Spain warned, to stop racing their engines long enough to stop, look, and listen, eastward. The spirit of Rommel or Ghengis Khan, in a red cap, may be coming their way.

Postal Workers Record Position on Wage Proposal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. BONIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1954

Mr. BONIN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to include in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article which appeared in the Pittston Gazette on April 7, 1954. This recently was sent to me by Mr. Nicholas J. Arcola, the president of Branch 162 of the National Association of Letter Carriers in Pittston, Pa.

The article is as follows:

POSTAL WORKERS RECORD POSITION ON WAGE PROPOSAL

Postal workers, including clerks, letter carriers, and mail handlers of Pittston Post Office are aghast at the wage and incentive proposal of the Postmaster General which was broadcast over the radio April 2, 1954. They feel the proposal was extremely important, not for what it said, but for what it did not say.

It is, however, quite obvious that this plan would place in the hands of the Postmaster General a power much greater than that granted to the head of any other Government department. It is worthy of note that he will have absolute authority over the biggest business in the world, the Post Office Department of the United States, with 500,000 employees. For the first time in the history of the Post Office, the Postmaster General has seen fit to use the Post Office Department Postal Bulletin, the radio, and the press to propagandize salary legislation for postal workers when the vast majority of postal workers are unalterably opposed to such legislation.

Postal workers are, generally speaking, dedicated to the service of the United States. Never has there been any question of loyalty and never any employee convicted of Communist leanings. The postal worker is unique in the position of being excepted from the application of most labor laws, union recognition, and he has waived the right to strike. He must depend solely on the action of Congress for relief and it is now he feels some relief should be forthcoming in the form of increased earnings at least to the equivalent level of "take home" pay in 1939.

The Post Office performs an indispensable service at less than cost. The application of the profit and loss principle of private business is misleading.

Mr. Summerfield's proposal is based upon a report of Fry & Associates, Inc., of Chicago, Ill. This hastily thrown together report contains many inequities, half-truths, and untruths. Postal workers feel that veteran members of the postal service should sit together with postal officials and legislators and thresh out some workable plan that would be just and fair to all.

The Postmaster General states his plan would create more incentive. Surely no incentive is needed in the Pittson post office where approximately 50 percent of all eligible clerks and carriers took the recent examination for promotion to supervisory positions.

Mr. Summerfield states, "Our plan does not reduce the salary of any employee now on our payroll," but section 404 provides:

"Sec. 404. Nothing in this act shall be deemed to reduce the per annum or hourly rate of basic compensation of any employee on the rolls on the effective date of this act to an amount less than his rate of basic salary immediately prior to such date, so long as such employee is assigned to perform and does perform work of the same level of difficulty, responsibility, and qualifications requirements as the work which he was performing immediately prior to such date."

Note that under these sections the Postmaster General would be authorized to reallocate any position from a higher grade to a lower grade. This very carefully worded section actually provides a method whereby the salaries of present employees could be reduced merely by reassigning them to other duties.

Section 301 of the bill provides:

"Sec. 301. The Postmaster General shall place each position in its appropriate grade in conformance with standards established by him under section 302. Whenever the facts warrant, the Postmaster General may change any position which he has placed in a grade under this section from such grade to another grade."

"Sec. 302. (b) The Postmaster General is authorized to revise, supplement or abolish existing standards or prepare new standards from time to time."

Certainly, this should prove interesting to say the least—one pay grade today and another tomorrow. Surely loyal and conscientious workers are worthy of better treatment than this.

Mr. Summerfield states, "our plan gives immediate increase in pay to 400,000 of our 500,000 employees." Section 503 (b) of the bill provides: "Each employee who, immediately prior to the effective date of this act, was in the maximum salary grade for his position, shall start his waiting period of 52 weeks for his first within-grade step increase under this act on such effective date." Effective date of the bill is 6 months after date of enactment. This means that clerks in grade 9 (after 9 years of service), would receive no immediate increase but would have to wait at least 18 months before becoming eligible for the next grade. Mr. Summerfield neglected to state that 20 percent of the clerks would receive an increase of only $10 per year. Also he neglected to state that some pastmasters would receive increases of from $1,000 to $5,000 per year.

Section 601 (a) provides that all new appointments shall be made at the entrance rate of the appropriate grade. However, section 601 (b) provides that: "In the discretion of the Postmaster General, any individual who has been employed in a civilian capacity in any branch of the Government may be appointed to that step in the appropriate grade of the Postal Field Service Schedule which is less than one full step above the highest rate of basic compensation which he received from the United States." This would provide authority for the appointment of persons outside the posal service to supervisory positions. What a Roman holiday for any political-minded postmaster. Long-working postal workers could be shoved aside and appointments made to supervisory positions of nonpostal workers who never went through the mill of night work, long hours, undesirable tours, etc. Is that democracy? Is that what happens to our 20-year fight for seniority rights

Mr. Summerfield also states, "our plan widens the difference in pay by skills and degrees of responsibility." What happens to the veteran employee of 20 or 30 years of service who because of failing health cannot perform the more responsible work? Must he step down to a lower pay level and have a junior employee enjoy the higher pay?

Many more inequities exist in the proposal of the Postmaster General but space will not permit listing them here and now.

Mr. E. C. Hallbeck, legislative representative of National Federation of Post Office Clerks, appeared before the Post Office and Civil Service Committee recently and brought out a comparison between weekly earnings of postal workers and production workers. Percentage of average salary increase above the 1939 level:

Postal workers	93.8
Automobile workers	181.6
Bituminous coal	228.5
Footwear	148.8
Railroads	148.3
Retail trade	135.9
Wholesale trade	143.3

HENRY J. FREDERICK,
President, Local 610.
BERNARD C. GAWLAS,
Secretary, Local 610.
NICHOLAS J. ARCOLA,
President, Branch 162.
PATRICK J. FINNERTY,
Secretary, Branch 162.

Polish Constitution Day

SPEECH
OF
HON. HUGH J. ADDONIZIO
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 3, 1954

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, throughout their recorded history the Poles as a nation have had their ups and downs. In medieval times when they first established their kingdom this was accomplished by heroism and daring deeds. They successfully subdued strong local leaders and founded the kingdom about the year 966. This kingdom continued for more than 600 years. Then late in the 16th century Poland was united with Lithuania, and its territory was considerably enlarged by the annexation of certain territories of ancient Russia. Thus, early in modern times Poland was a major power in Europe.

As long as Russia was weak and Germany remained disunited, Polish monarchs successfully held their own against all comers, and in fact played a major role in the defense of Europe against Asiatic invaders. Late in the 18th century, however, Poland's envious and avaricious neighbors—Austria, Prussia and Russia—joined forces for the purpose of partitioning Poland. In their dark plots they were successful partly because Poland was internally weak, and this weakness was caused by the prevalent disunity and dissension among the Poles themselves. A large number of them were thoroughly dissatisfied with the governmental machinery of the kingdom, and they wanted to overhaul that machinery. Finally the task of drafting a constitution was begun by the Great Parliament in 1788, and a new constitution was completed early in 1791. On May 3 the Parliament voted for the adoption of this constitution. It is this day, the 163d anniversary of the Polish Constitution of 1791, that is being celebrated today.

As an historic document, that constitution is a veritable landmark not only in Polish history but in the political and constitutional history of entire eastern Europe. For the first time constitutional monarchy with limited powers and a responsible cabinet form of government was adopted in that part of Europe. By that constitution ancient class distinctions and privileges were wiped out, and the arm of the central government was strengthened. This was done by extending the protection of the law to the peasantry and thereby enlisting their support. Most significant, however, for those days and for that part of Europe, was the fact that this constitution guaranteed absolute religious freedom. In this and in many other ways the Polish Constitution of 1791 was in the vanguard of democracy's advance into central and eastern Europe. Although the Polish state was shortly thereafter devoured by her predatory neighbors, this constitution remained a beacon to the Poles in their never ceasing efforts for freedom and independence—efforts which were crowned with success in 1918. And today, though Poland has again been under the oppressor's heel since 1939, the ideal and principles of that constitution continue to inspire Polish patriots in their struggle against the worst tyranny of all.

Today in commemorating the 163d anniversary of the adoption of that constitution we pay our respects to the memory of its creators—men of vision and of courage. In celebrating that historic anniversary we strengthen the bonds of sympathy and understanding between ourselves and the Polish people who have been sealed off from the free world by their heartless oppressors. We ardently hope that soon all Poles will again be able to celebrate this anniversary in their free and peaceful homeland.

DAV Commander Watts Urges VA to Reject Further FHA Inspection

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARLAN HAGEN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1954

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Speaker, I submit for your attention a most informative article published in the Disabled American Veterans semimonthly newspaper, issue of April 27, 1954. This article shed some interesting light on the current housing scandals as they relate to veterans:

DAV Commander Watts Urges VA to Reject Further FHA Inspections—Await Clearance of Current Situation

Washington, D. C.—The Disabled American Veterans has urged Veterans' Administration to reject as unacceptable any further Federal Housing Administration inspections of GI housing in light of the current FHA scandal investigations.

DAV National Commander Howard W. Watts, in a letter to Administrator of Veterans' Affairs Harvey Higley, noted that, aside from the irregularities charged against FHA by the administration and two congressional committees, VA itself has had difficulties with FHA inspections in several areas of the country—including Colorado and parts of California and Nevada.

In view of the irregularities and difficulties, Commander Watts called on the VA Director to discontinue to use FHA inspections on mortgages guaranteed by the VA.

Commander Watts also urgently requested the VA Administrator to resist any efforts to bring about a transfer of any functions in the loan-guaranty program to the FHA.

Such a transfer has been recommended to the White House by the President's Advisory Committee on Housing. The DAV earlier registered vigorous protest against such a proposed move in a letter to President Eisenhower, which the White House promised to take under consideration before taking any action.

TRANSFER OF FUNCTIONS UNLIKELY

The sensational Government's announcement of the scandals uncovered in FHA made it unlikely that any VA functions will be transferred to FHA for some time—if at all.

The immediate problem is the fact that VA around the country accepts FHA inspections in 20 to 25 percent of GI homes whose mortgages are guaranteed by VA under the GI bill of rights. VA home-loan guaranties to veterans purchasing dwellings are being given out at the rate of 40,000 to 45,000 a month.

The commander's letter to VA Administrator Higley declares:

"Press releases concerning certain irregularities in the operation of the Federal Housing Administration have recently come to my attention. These press releases indicate that the Federal Housing Administration's appraisals or cost analyses are faulty to a serious degree. If statements in the public press are true, it would seem exceedingly unwise to transfer the FHA functions vital to the veteran home purchaser."

CONGRESS DID NOTHING ABOUT TEAGUE FINDINGS

Charges of faulty inspections by FHA on homes built during and after World War II have been raised by the Teague select committee and the Rains subcommittee following their independent investigations in 1952. Congress did nothing about the charges.

However, it now oppears that the Administration and Congress are both anxious to clean up the FHA mess.

The two angles currently under investigation deal with emergency apartment house construction, during and immediately after the war, and the still existing program of home improvements.

Federal Housing Administration, created in 1934, is a construction loan insurance agency. It makes no direct loans; but it guarantees to back up a percentage of the loans put up by lending institutions for construction and sales of homes, and for improvements and repairs to homes.

In 1942 Congress passed an especially liberal law—for the builders—known as section 608. Under this statute, FHA agreed to insure 90 percent of the lender's loan to a builder putting up apartment houses. The program produced some 7,000 apartment developments between 1942 and 1950, containing some 465,000 dwelling units. FHA's insurance ran to $3,500,000,000 on this program.

TAKE QUICKIE CASH

As it turned out, the program proved to be a bonanza for the smart builders. The 90-percent FHA insurance was based on FHA's estimate of the cost of the project. But the actual cost, it now is clear, was in many cases considerably less than FHA's estimate, and FHA's loan insurance figure. The builders reaped in windfall profits, estimated as high as $500 million, by taking as quickie cash the difference between the actual cost of the projects and the amount of mortgage insured by FHA.

For example, a builder brought into FHA plans for an apartment house project. FHA estimated it would cost $1 million to build, so FHA committed itself to insuring a construction loan for $900,000. On the basis of the commitment, the builders got a $900,000 loan from the banks. Then the builder went ahead with the project, and constructed the apartment house development for an actual cost of $700,000. This left the builders with $200,000 in windfall profits, plus the buildings with its rentals, without having had to put up any of their own money.

Thousands of veterans got clipped on this seemingly legal deal—although the FBI is probing for collusion with FHA officials on some of the juicier windfalls—because the rentals of these projects were based on overall costs, including the cost of the mortgages and the windfalls. Thus, even today, thousands of veterans living in the projects are paying higher rents—as much as 25 percent more than normal, according to one committee study on Capitol Hill, with no chance of redress.

SUEDE-SHOE BOYS MAKE HAY

The other facet of FHA under heavy fire is its so-called title I program under which the FHA automatically agrees to insure loans by lending institutions to homeowners who want repairs and improvements of any kind—including, it has been disclosed, swimming pools, burglar alarms, fire alarms, and barbecue pits—some 500 items in all.

As a result of the loose administration of this program, racketeers knowns as "dynamiters" or "suede-shoe boys" have been invading various areas of the country, high pressuring homeowners into buying fancy improvements to their houses, overcharging them, and then giving them a poor job—with homeowners stuck for the bill, and no recourse. FHA has held in the past pretty much that these shenanigans—involving racket backs, according to one congressional leader—were not its concern. In view of the fact that more than 2 million FHA loans have been made under this program, there were some mighty fine pickings available for the "dynamiters." Again, veterans were hurt. Findings on Capitol Hill leave no doubt that many of the victims of the racketeers were veterans living in GI housing.

GI'S EVENTUALLY LOSE

Before the investigations are over, FHA's biggest program of all, involving some 2,800,000 homes bought under FHA insurance—many of them by veterans—will be carefully scrutinized by Congress. The Teague and Rains investigations of 2 years ago unearthed hundreds of cases in which ex-GI's were gypped through overappraisals and shoddy inspection.

One Hundredth Anniversary of Erath County, Tex.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OMAR BURLESON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1954

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, in October of this year the citizens of Stephenville, Erath County, Tex., plan to celebrate their county's and city's 100th anniversary.

In the New England States and the States in the vicinity of Washington, D. C., and along the Atlantic seaboard, 100 years is not a long period in the history of a town or a community. In the Southwest, and particularly in the western part of Texas, a century of community life holds unforgettable and cherished history.

Stephenville, Tex., located in my congressional district, is historic as compared to areas farther west, and it is significant that they celebrate this occasion. It is a community which has had a tremendous influence over a wide section of the country. Many of its people are of pioneering stock and retain admirable characteristics which are reflected in a highly progressive community activity.

The following, written by Mr. Homer Stephen, is taken from the Comanche Chief, a newspaper in the neighboring town of Comanche, Tex., and is descriptive in a brief way of this fine town and some of the people whose influence continues to live among the present day population:

Erath County Planning for 1954 Centennial

(By Homer Stephen)

(Dedicated to Ewell Jones, Dick Spradley, and Clinton Cox and every person who gives their aid to the centennial planning committee for the 1954 celebration. Compiled by the Erath County Central Texas Historical Society. Chartered under the laws of the State of Texas.)

Stephenville was founded in 1854 according to official and authentic records in Austin, Tex., and Washington, D. C.

Stephenville was named after John M. Stephen, he and his brother, William F.

Stephen, established a store here in 1854. It was the only business that shows on the original tax roll rendered for taxes in 1856, the year the county was created.

According to records in Washington, Stephenville was first spelled Stephensville, with an "s" at the last. In 1872 William F. Stephen suggested to the officials in Washington that they leave the "s" off of Stephen for these people had never used an "s" at the last part of their name.

James Stephen, the father of William F. and John M. Stephen, was an extensive landowner west of the Brazos, before Erath County was organized in 1856 according to a land abstract, on April 7, 1848. James Stephen bought at public auction in Washington County, Tex., the Sien Bylthe Survey in the Milan District of Texas, now Erath County, 4,409 acres of land for $150. This survey is about 20 miles southwest of the present city of Stephenville. Some of the land is still in the Stephen family.

Rollcall of a hundred early residents of Stephenville: Anderson, Akey, Carter, Compton, Collier, Creswell, Chapman, Cage, Crow, Cowan, Carlton, Chamberlin, Clark, Alsup, Davis, Doyle, Bennett, Williamson, Fagan, Mulloy, Oxford, Mefferd, Graves, Arendell, Chandler.

Evans, McNeil, Watts, Slaughter, Garrett, Hurley, Turley, Hickey, Frey, Neblett, Harris, King, McCleskey, Blakeney, Wilson, Gaston, Roberts, Robinson, Marrs, Higginbotham, Buck, Jones, McMillian.

Henson, Cragwall, Franks, Livingston, Pearcy, Hancock, Barham, Wright, Stephen, Strong, Stephens, Savage, Wood, Dawson, Nugent, Dupree, Dupy, Fidler, Maloney, Johnson, Motherall, Howard, Miller, Keith, Howell, Martin, Moser, Nichol, Young, Clay, Belcher, Pack, Overby, Palmer, Pannel, Perry, Berry, Mothershed, Moore, McMahan.

Baldwin, McAllister, Mobley, Brandon, Ellis, Holt, Counts, Lawson, Lydie, Hicks, Cole, Fields, Fenner, Ferguson, Emmett, Winters, Hollingsworth, Woolverton, Yarbrough, Smith, Stone, Stafford, Shelton, Sansing, Keyser, Poteet, Watson, Young, Klegg, Kelly, Richards, Moss, Phelps, Rasberry, Goren, Wyley, Shelton, Holcomb, Gilbreath, Teddlie, Clements, Hawkins, Straus, Lyle, Schnable, McD. Reil, Snow.

The first election held in Stephenville was in 1856. The first tax roll was made in 1856. A complete and authentic record of both are in the possession of the Erath County Central Texas Historical Society, also the names of the first public official, etc.

Stephenville is located in the heart of central Texas and is in the midst of a diversified farming area. The State and National system of hard-surfaced highways connect Stephenville with all sections of Texas. It has a growing season of 238 days and an annual rainfall of 30.8 inches. The average temperature is 64.8°. The climate is conducive to good health, and it has an elevation of 1,264 feet. The town is well supplied with pure water, a modern sewer system, modern hotels, a splendid hospital, banks, excellent churches of many denominations, etc.

The public-school system is one of the best and most progressive in the State. It is supplied with excellent buildings and a very capable teaching staff.

Stephenville is the home of Tarleton State College, founded in 1899 by the late John Tarleton, who made the college possible by leaving a large estate to be used in the establishment of the college. In 1917 the people of Stephenville donated the entire school plant to the State of Texas, to be used as a junior college as a branch of the Agricultural and Mechanical College of Texas. It is one of the excellent junior colleges of the Nation.

Stephenville has a cheese plant, peanut shelling plant, various manufacturing plants, many fraternal and civic organizations, chamber of commerce, and historical societies.

The Stephenville Chamber of Commerce with the cooperation of many other groups is sponsoring a celebration for the fall of 1954 to honor the known and unknown pioneers, who bequeathed a great heritage to generations unborn, and to the fine citizens who have moved here in recent years, who are doing such a fine and noble work in carrying on Christianity and civilization. And so may their children's children carry on and improve the great heritage until the marble that marks the pioneers' graves crumbles into dust and a greater civilization arises where the will of God prevails, is my prayer.

A Law That Will Not Allow Freemen To Earn What They Are Capable of Producing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1954

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD today a letter from a correspondent in Philadelphia with respect to the oppressive wage ceiling in the Social Security Act. Under legislation soon to be brought before this House, the wage ceiling, now fixed at $900, will be lifted by the munificent sum of $100, so that a beneficiary may earn $1,000 a year without loss of benefits. Wage-earning beneficiaries will also be put on an equal basis with the self-employed, in that penalties for exceeding the wage ceiling, in the form of loss of benefits, will be enforced on an annual, rather than a monthly basis.

This, in my judgment, however, is only gilding the inequity. I believe the wage ceiling should be removed from the act. If it cannot be removed by this Congress, then surely the very least we can do is to allow those who are obliged to continue at work over age 65 to qualify thereby for extra benefits, and remove the wage ceiling entirely at age 70.

Mr. Speaker, the injustice of the present system is well illustrated in the following letter:

CHESTNUT HILL, PHILADELPHIA, PA.,
January 26, 1953.

HON. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: It being my understanding that you are a member of a committee in the House, which is sponsoring a bill to try and correct the present social-security law, desire to express to you my views on this situation; many winter winds and summer suns have passed over my head, as I am nearing 70 years of age and am drawing down social security from our Government to the amount of $60.60 per month and while I have no quarrel with the amount, I do object most strongly to a law that will allow me to earn but $75 per month, without the loss of my social-security benefits. Therefore, if I earn $76 per month, I am penalized $60.60 and have worked a month for a compensation of $15.40, thereby giving no one an incentive to work.

Being in excellent health and thoroughly capable of earning a great deal more than $75 per month, I do not feel that my social-security benefits, for which I and my previous employers have paid for and I am lawfully entitled to, should be taken away from me, even though I am able to earn $1,000 per month or more.

I have had many conversations with the recipients of social-security benefits and they all protest most vehemently against a law that will not allow freemen to earn what they are capable of producing.

There are many other phases of the present law that could be improved no doubt, but the only one I am interested in, is the one that I have mentioned above. Therefore, I am writing to you to express my appreciation of your efforts in behalf of the many able-bodied men of mature experience and knowledge, who are willing to work and are securing social security, but who are held in bondage by a law which has all the earmarks of an act of a dictator.

I am,
Respectfully yours,
I. C. BANKS.

Farming as a Career

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JEFFREY P. HILLELSON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 12, 1954

Mr. HILLELSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wednesday, April 28, 1954, edition of Missouri Farm Bureau News, Jefferson City, Mo.:

FARMING AS A CAREER

"Farmers, it seems to me, are literally the most important people in the Nation. Our very life depends upon them, for they—a mere 15 percent of the population—produce the food that keeps all the rest of us alive." This statement is made by R. I. Throckmorton, former dean of agriculture of Kansas State College, who presents a strong case for farm careers for young persons in an advertisement of a leading life insurance company which recently appeared in national magazines.

Many parents are concerned with the questions of just how much encouragement they should give their children to be farmers. Thousands of farm boys and girls in Missouri are finding their own answers through 4–H and vocational agriculture projects. Under the wise guidance of 4–H leaders and vocational agriculture instructors and the understanding and cooperation of parents farm youths are finding that they like farming and by the time they complete high school many of them have a substantial investment in livestock and equipment.

It's too bad that unsettled world conditions maintain a condition that Government and military leaders interpret as requiring military training for all young men. Just at the time when boys are ready to settle down with the girls of their choice to an occupation of farming they must go into military service. And the girls—many of them—go to the cities to work.

It has been stated that "you can take a boy away from the farm, but you can never take the 'farm' out of the boy that has spent his boyhood there." So it is good to find more and more interest being taken in the occupation of farming.

Dean Throckmorton concluded his statement with the thought that children who like the soil, like to grow things, like the outdoors and enjoy people and like to do things for others should be encouraged by their parents to become farmers. In this way the children have a chance at "a life that calls upon man for intelligence, sweat, and compassion and rewards him with security, satisfaction, and spiritual peace."

May we all take renewed faith in our occupation of tilling the soil.

Calumet-Sag Channel Is a National Monument

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED E. BUSBEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 28, 1954

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to insert in the Congressional Record an editorial which appears in the May 1954 issue of Marine News. I am happy to have this opportunity to bring the editorial to the attention of the Members of Congress, because it stresses the fact that the Calumet-Sag Channel is a vital link in the Nation's waterways system. Calumet-Sag can in no way be considered a local project; its early construction is of prime importance to all sections of our country and to every segment of our population. The editorial follows:

THEIR PROBLEMS GO WITH THEM

The formation of the Cal-Sag Waterways Development Committee, announced on April 5, constitutes a major forward step in the fight to develop and improve this vital link in the Nation's Great Lakes-to-Gulf Waterway System. It is a guaranty of continuing effort, one that last year stripped from Cal-Sag the false label of "local interest," forcing recognition of the Cal-Sag in its true light—as a national issue.

Nor was this achievement a minor one, for it constituted a necessary step toward eventual success for the project.

In view of this, it is heartening to note that the Chicago committee, which last year was formed to sponsor this educational program for the development of the Cal-Sag project, has affiliated itself with the new organization, the Cal-Sag Waterways Development Committee; for by so doing it has assured continuity of effort.

Speaking of this effort, Congressman Fred E. Busbey, author of the bill seeking an appropriation of $5 million to get the Cal-Sag under construction, commented recently that nothing to equal its effectiveness had previously come under his observation.

In view of this and similar statements by those in a position to judge, the decision of the newly organized committee to continue and expand this dynamic campaign calls for congratulation.

In this regard, the unanimously elected chairman of the reconstituted committee, Henry E. Seyfarth, recently stated that "the committee has committed itself to raise the necessary budget to finance the educational program developed last year, and which is still in effect."

To achieve this continuity of effort, Mr. Seyfarth added, "the new organization has retained the services of the group of men who were the creators of the dynamic and constructive program which has made of the Cal-Sag project a major issue before Congress."

That Cal-Sag is a project of which Congress is fully aware there can be little doubt; and, in this regard, Marine News takes justifiable pride in its efforts of the past to aid and assist through the medium of its pages in forcing recognition of Cal-Sag's true status as being vital to the Nation as a whole.

Recognizing this national importance of Cal-Sag—and of so many other waterways projects falsely tagged with the label "local interest"—the Marine News in the past has given its unqualified support to those attempting to achieve improvements.

And Marine News shall continue in the future to give this support to the efforts of the newly constituted Cal-Sag Waterways Development Committee.

It will, as always, support to the hilt every constructive effort to improve the Nation's Waterways, and to convince the Congress and the public that—as in the case of Cal-Sag—no waterway problem is purely "local."

How could it be? The waterways belong to the Nation—and their problems go with them.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided,* That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized book dealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by book dealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

DISTRIBUTION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

To the Vice President and each Senator 100 copies; to the Secretary and Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, each, 25 copies; to the Secretary, for official use, not to exceed 35 copies; to the Sergeant at Arms, for use on the floor of the Senate, not to exceed 50 copies; to each Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress, 68 copies; to the Clerk, Sergeant at Arms, and Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives, each, 25 copies; to the Clerk, for official use, not to exceed 50 copies; and to the Doorkeeper, for use on the floor of the House of Representatives, not to exceed 75 copies; to the Vice President and each Senator, Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress there shall also be furnished (and shall not be transferable), 3 copies of the daily Record, of which 1 shall be delivered at his residence, 1 at his office, and 1 at the Capitol.

PRICE OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

The Public Printer is authorized to furnish to subscribers the daily Record at $1.50 per month, payable in advance.

Remit by money order payable to Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Printing and binding for Congress, when recommended to be done by the Committee on Printing of either House, shall be so recommended in a report containing an approximate estimate of the cost thereof, together with a statement from the Public Printer of estimated approximate cost of work previously ordered by Congress within the fiscal year (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 145, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on Printing, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the Congressional Record, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

PRINTING DOCUMENTS AND REPORTS

Documents and reports of committees with the evidence and papers submitted therewith, or any part thereof ordered printed by Congress, may be reprinted by the Public Printer on order of any Member of Congress or Delegate, on prepayment of the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 162, p. 1940).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the Congressional Record is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Frank Brodie is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the Record at $1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the Record.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. The money derived from such sales shall be paid into the Treasury and accounted for in his annual report to Congress, and no sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

E

IN THE

Mr.
publish
Minnea
titled
Free N
Mr. Bi
Minnea
dent o
ticle in
deal of
tion.
be high
the art
I there
it be
RECORD
There
was ord
as follo

INDOO

Three
Britain,
der thro
spite pe
Allies o
Europea

Today
and Fra
what to
issues at

The w
it has b
The free
to go th
their su
largely d
tion.

What
diate occ
tion. B
a consid
over oth
oping fo

If the
had been
on what
they wo
what to
on what
Europea
military
with Rus
strains o

It is q
also is h
suspiciou
Minh, th
and milit
so much
Chinese

Appendix

The Indochina Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. THYE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 6, 1954

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, there was published in the May 2 issue of the Minneapolis Star-Tribune an article entitled "Indochina Crisis Tests Unity of Free Nations," written by Carroll Binder. Mr. Binder is an editorial writer for the Minneapolis Star-Tribune. He is a student of international affairs. The article indicates that he has given a great deal of thought and study to the question. For that reason I think it would be highly beneficial to all of us to have the article made a part of the RECORD. I therefore ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INDOCHINA CRISIS TESTS UNITY OF FREE NATIONS

(By Carroll Binder)

Three months ago, the United States, Great Britain, and France stood shoulder to shoulder throughout the Berlin Conference despite persistent Russian efforts to divide the Allies on German rearmament and other European questions.

Today the United States, Great Britain, and France have widely divergent views on what to do about Indochina and other major issues at the Geneva Conference.

The western alliance is more strained than it has been at any time since its inception. The free nations show disturbing tendencies to go their separate ways at a time when their survival in freedom and security is largely dependent upon continued cooperation.

What to do about Indochina is the immediate occasion of this threatened disintegration. But the disunity over Indochina is to a considerable degree a result of divisions over other matters which have been developing for a number of years.

If the United States and its principal allies had been able to reach a meeting of minds on what to do about Communist China, they would have less difficulty agreeing on what to do about Indochina. Differences on what to do about rearming Germany, a European army, thermonuclear weapons, military aid to Pakistan, and negotiations with Russia have contributed to the present strains on the coalition of the free nations.

It is quite likely that the Soviet coalition also is having its troubles. China may be suspicious of Russia's intentions. Ho Chi Minh, the Viet Minh leader whose political and military gains are causing the free world so much anxiety, probably is suspicious of Chinese intentions. As a realist, Ho recognizes that aid such as China is giving Viet Minh calls for political concessions.

But at the moment, Russia is standing shoulder to shoulder with Red China and together they have achieved for Red China the status of a fifth great power at Geneva despite United States refusal to recognize such a status. Viet Minh pressure at Dien Bien Phu and Sino-Russian pressure at Geneva seem to be creating a situation in which the Communist-led Viet Minh regime will have to be treated with despite American, French, Vietnamese, and other objections.

To the disinterested observer, the Communists appear to be united, the free nations appear to be disuniting. There are divisions within the United States, France, and other countries over what to do about Indochina and about allies which could present serious problems for the respective governments.

The British appear to have found a basis of temporary unity in the Churchill government's decision not to intervene militarily in Indochina or join in the formation of an alliance looking to such intervention until the possibilities of negotiating an Indochinese settlement at Geneva have been explored.

The British also appear to be insulating the British commonwealth against disintegrating tendencies by deferring action on Secretary Dulles' proposed Southeast Asian Treaty Organization until India, Pakistan, Ceylon, Burma, and Indonesia have canvassed the possibilities of cooperation at a meeting at Ceylon.

This does not mean that the United States and Great Britain have severed the ties which have enabled them to withstand the terrible stresses of the last 14 years. They still make common cause on most great issues. It is to be hoped they will make common cause if a major crisis develops over Indochina or some other Asiatic issue on which at present they hold differing views.

It would take far more space than is available here to set forth the divergent American, British, French, and other views on what can and should be done to prevent the Communists from Gaining control of Indochina.

Basically, the Eisenhower administration believes that Indochina must be kept out of Communist control in order to prevent the great resources, strategic positions and populations of all of southeast Asia from falling under Communist control. Such Communist gains, the administration believes would create a situation in which Japan and other areas would be lost to our side and give the Soviet world a highly dangerous preponderance of strength.

The administration has not made clear how it proposes to keep Indochina out of Communist control. It hopes granting of full independence from French control would inspire the people of Indochina to overthrow the Communist-led Viet Minh regime and create a government capable of resisting Chinese Communist pressure.

The administration seems to assume that France can be induced to continue fighting the Viet Minh despite termination of French authority. Some members of the administration favor use of American air and naval forces to help the French and Vietnamese vanquish the Viet Minh. This faction would like to have the British, Australians, New Zealanders, Filipinos, Thailanders and as many others as possible join the United States in such military intervention but is understood to be prepared to have the United States act single-handedly if no major allies can be persuaded to act with us.

Other members of the administration and apparently a strong majority in Congress oppose use of American forces in Indochina except as part of an effort participated in by a considerable number of allies.

No major allies are willing to join the United States and France in such military intervention until efforts to negotiate an end to hostilities have proved unsuccessful.

This position is based on the belief that the Viet Minh is a genuine nationalistic movement which cannot be destroyed by military intervention and the fear that such intervention would create hostility against the intervening nations throughout Asia without effectively deterring communism.

Those who take this view do not believe that a sufficiently strong regime can be constructed in the near future in non-Viet Minh Indochina to stand unsupported by the Western Powers. Western support would give the regime a colonial hue antipathetic to other Asian nations, difficult even for the Philippines to countenance.

Those who take this position want to explore the possibilities of deterring the advance of communism by other means than those favored by important members of the Eisenhower administration. Some of our allies and the neutral countries of Asia want to see what can be achieved by negotiations with both Red China and the Viet Minh.

Secretary Dulles is forbidden by dominant elements in Congress and his own commitments to treat with Red China or Ho Chih Minh. He cannot promise either France or the Vietnamese American military aid except in cooperation with other countries which, as explained above, means that he cannot at present either negotiate with or fight against the Viet Minh and their Red Chinese allies.

This state of affairs is being compared to 1936 when the great powers remained passive while Hitler reoccupied the Rhineland and began the march to World War II; to Munich when World War II became inevitable and to the time in 1940 when the United States and other countries refused to help the French resist Japanese conquest of Indochina and paved the way for Pearl Harbor and the Japanese seizure of much of Asia.

There are unmistakable similarities. There are also important differences between those situations. The course being followed may prove to have been as catastrophic as the courses mentioned above. But in choosing a course today it cannot safely be assumed that military intervention would prevent Indochina from going under Communist control.

Indochina conceivably could be sovietized despite the sacrifice of many American lives. It conceivably could remain at least partially non-Communist despite nonintervention. There are no absolutes in that complex and critical situation.

In the face of such uncertainties it would be tragic if the free nations split and thus risked the loss of their own security and freedom without saving Indochina's.

The Nation's Health

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 6, 1954

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, on April 7 I appeared before the United States-Mexico Border Public Health Association, meeting in Albuquerque, and delivered an address on the subject of the Nation's health. I ask unanimous consent that my address may be printed in the Appendix.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A LEGISLATOR VIEWS THE NATION'S HEALTH

(Address by Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ, of New Mexico, before the United States-Mexico Border Public Health Association, meeting at the Hilton Hotel in Albuquerque, April 7, 1954)

I certainly will not attempt to discuss medicine and public health with this group on equal terms. You who have honored me by inviting me to speak here must have done so in part because you knew I would not intrude my layman's views into those specific fields in which you have such a high degree of professional competence.

Yet I would not have you think that we talk altogether different languages. I was born at Los Chavez in Valencia County; my wife's maiden name was Imelda Espinosa, and Albuquerque has been my home most of my life. I am proud of my long association with the border States. And—since one of my greatest concerns in the Senate is and has been the health of the American people—I am particularly pleased to have this opportunity to address the United States-Mexico Border Public Health Association and the host for this 12th annual meeting, the New Mexico Public Health Association.

Some of you are perhaps aware that I have been in the Senate since 1935. During most of those 18 years, I have, among other duties, served on the Senate Appropriations Committee. Thus I have had a splendid opportunity to observe the Federal dollar in action, and to participate in the democratic processes by which the Federal dollar is apportioned and spent.

A member of the Senate Appropriations Committee is made particularly aware of his grave responsibility to the citizens of this Nation and to his constituents, who by their ballots asked him to serve them in Washington. The decision on appropriations isn't just a matter of dollars; spending them according to a formula would be a matter for an accountant. It isn't even a matter of selection and rejection on the basis of program comparison; that would be a matter for simple administrative decision.

The thing that makes wise decisions difficult on this committee sounds simple enough, but is really very complex. For example, one must consider, in connection with each major appropriation for each Federal agency, what the money really buys and how essential the purchase is to America's national and international well-being.

To reach acceptable answers, and to translate those answers into appropriations, often demands the wisdom of Solomon, the patience of Job, the strength of Hercules, the courage of Sergeant York, and the skill of Houdini.

I said earlier that I would not attempt to discuss health in your terms. I will not go back on that. But you will be interested to know that I did get a pretty fair background in health activities in recent years when I served as chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee dealing directly with labor and health matters. This experience has been one of the high points in my legislative career. I like to think and sincerely believe that my interest and my effort are reflected in health progress of many kinds throughout the Nation. It is a relief in these times, when there are so many problems on which men of intelligence and good will differ to find some truths that one can believe in without reservation and that lead straight as an arrow to a course of action.

I realize that a healthy population is one of the keys to our tremendous capacity to produce as a nation. I realize that disease of the mind or of the body—both the nagging sickness that any family has, and the heart-breaking tragedy of sudden death or prolonged illness—can fall on any of us at any time. And I have learned some of the things I can do personally about health and disease, what constitutes a sound national policy, and what the Congress should do about it as an agent of the people.

My classroom during this instructional period was the Senate hearing room itself. My teachers were the private citizens, practicing physicians, public-health workers, and Government officials who came before the subcommittee.

I was impressed by the fact that tremendous forward strides have been made during the last 50 years in medical and public-health practice. The life span has increased more than 20 years; many of the acute infectious diseases have been virtually eliminated; the nutritional status of the people has been improved; control measures such as sanitation, quarantine, and air and water pollution have been established. People are living longer than ever before; and they are in better health while they are living. Some experts say the health of America is better than that in any other country in the world.

It is a strange paradox, however, that our very success in medicine and public health has created new problems which seem even larger than the old ones.

Because more people are living longer, there have been significant increases in the diseases that attack older people. Furthermore, we have made virtually no progress in controlling the diseases of middle and old age. A man of 50 today has almost the same life expectation as had a man of 50 in 1900. The chronic diseases have come to the fore—heart disease, cancer, mental illness, arthritis, diabetes, and so on. The conquest of these diseases demands a new kind of research, a new dimension in medical care, and the development of new socio-economic patterns to meet the crisis of long-term illness.

A word on the human and economic burden of disease today. The cost in taxes alone of hospitalizing the mentally ill is more than $1,100 million a year. Roughly half of this is Federal and half is State money—and the taxpayers must be prepared to increase this by $100 million each year until some way is found to bring mental illness under control.

Another statistic: heart disease and cancer alone cause 500,000 premature deaths (between the ages of 25 and 64) in this country each year.

You in the public health field can interpret these data better than I. It is apparent even to a layman, however, that we must develop new ways to diagnose the chronic diseases in their early stages, must mobilize research to find the underlying causes, must improve the accessibility and availability of well-trained personnel and well-equipped hospitals, and must increase public awareness of the importance of using the health services that are available.

The Public Health Service has two basic programs and one special program relating to the border between the United States and Mexico.

The first basic program is foreign quarantine work, under which preventive measures are applied to keep five so-called quarantinable diseases (smallpox, yellow fever, plague, cholera, and louse-borne typhus) from crossing the international border. Smallpox is a special concern. A vaccination is required for all returning United States citizens who have been abroad and for all noncitizens entering the country. In addition, those who pass the border continually (perhaps several times a day or week) are checked periodically. It will give you some idea of the size of this quarantine program if I give a few figures: In the 12-month period ending last July, there were a million and a half people who entered the United States from the interior of Mexico, and 35½ million "local crossers," for a total of more than 37 million people to be checked for quarantinable diseases. There were more than 225,000 vaccinations given without charge to people arriving at the border. I should point out parenthetically that it is rare indeed for these examinations to reveal conditions requiring medical detention, and that this record can only be interpreted as a tribute to the effectiveness of the public health and medical professions on both sides of the border.

The second basic, continuing program under foreign quarantine is the medical examination of aliens, carried out by the same inspectors and medical officers who make the quarantine examinations. During the same 12-month period, more than 81,000 aliens were given medical examinations as required by law. Of that number, 69 were not permitted entry because they had mandatory excludable diseases—for the most part mental diseases, tuberculosis, and dangerous contagious diseases. An additional 1253 were referred to the Immigration Service for final determination; they did not have normal physical well-being and could have been excluded from the country on medical grounds, but these factors had to be weighed against the individual's ability to earn a living before a decision could be reached.

The one special program relating to the border is the examination of agricultural labor recruits, both at migratory centers in Mexico and at reception centers at the border for those workers who pass the preliminary screening. At the migratory centers Mexican physicians and nurses, with the assistance of Public Health Service medical officers, conduct medical examination and vaccination programs. At the reception centers, United States doctors and nurses give the labor recruits a final medical screening, including X-rays, VD inspection, possibly a blood test, and sometimes disinfestation by DDT dust or spray. In addition, these officers make recommendations regarding emergency medical care needed by laborers upon entry, with expenses borne by the Labor Department. Roughly 200,000 workers were examined in 1953 at migratory centers in Mexico and 300,000 at reception centers on the border; of these, nearly 4,000 were denied admission on medical grounds and nearly 8,000 more were referred to Immigration for final decision.

Part or all of this summary information on quarantine activities may be old hat to you whose primary work is in the field of public health. But I was surprised, impressed, and tremendously pleased when I received the data from the Public Health Service in Washington. I was suprised at the size and scope of the program, impressed by the apparent efficiency with which it is carried out, and pleased at the heart-warming demonstration of cooperation between friendly nations in the resolution of a common problem.

Will you forgive me for a moment if I talk about health in New Mexico? And maybe a little bit about New Mexico itself? I think you will find the profile I draw of this border State relevant to the business of this association.

I hope that Dr. Clark and anyone else representing New Mexico's fine department of public health will be particularly tolerant during this part of my talk. I often find it useful to list a whole series of facts when there is a large problem that concerns me. Sometimes just setting them down, as honestly as I know how, helps me see a way to take a step in the direction of resolving the problem. Dr. Clark and his people know, as I know, that the health picture in our State does not compare favorably with most other States, or with the Nation as a whole. There are many reasons for this. The situation just kind of grew up with the State, and nobody is at fault—unless we do nothing about the situation, instead of trying to make it better.

First, a few basic facts:

1. We are the fourth largest State in the Union, with a population of roughly 700,000, representing about 5½ persons per square mile.

2. Our per capita income is relatively low, and we are considered not to have achieved the economic status of most of our sister States.

3. Our rate of population increase is the second largest in the Nation (1950 was up 30 percent over 1940), with the greatest growth in urban populations.

4. Despite this trend toward urbanization, medical and public health services must continue to be geared to the rural areas, which contain roughly 50 percent of the total population.

5. We have a very high infant mortality rate.

6. Overall death rates for the State in 1950, compared with the Nation, show an unusual pattern. Death from such conditions as heart disease and cancer is far below the national average, while death from communicable and so-called childhood diseases is way up.

7. Climate and geography bring to New Mexico tourists and health seekers (with heart disease and tuberculosis, for example) who place an added burden on all medical and public health services (and may in part be responsible for part of our apparent shortcoming in the health statistics sheets).

8. The native population is accustomed to inadequate health standards, can make only limited use of ordinary health education materials, and is so scattered that there is neither time nor incentive for community programs.

9. New Mexico has no training facilities and so cannot accept responsibility for producing its own professional personnel.

10. Because many counties have a per capita income of less than $500 per year, they cannot attract competent medical personnel or support hospital and clinical facilities.

11. Inadequate income is also related to unsanitary living conditions and to faulty diet, both of which contribute heavily to New Mexico's high incidence of certain diseases.

12. The current level of State and local taxation for public health purposes does not permit adequate support to the public health staff.

13. With virtually no endowment of hospitals, it is difficult for hospitals to balance their budgets and still provide the necessary charity services.

14. The number of patients per physician is abnormally high, and the physicians are largely concentrated in Albuquerque and Santa Fe.

15. Hospital facilities for the mentally ill are inadequate, and for the chronically ill, almost nonexistent.

16. There are insufficient beds for patients with tuberculosis.

17. Because of distance and other factors, sick people are frequently not taken to the hospital or physician until it is too late for them to receive the full benefit of medical care.

These are just some of the factors that are at work in New Mexico's health scene. In most ways, we seem to be pretty far behind, and the picture looks pretty dismal.

But this is not the whole picture, by any means. A strong reason for being hopeful is that we have a forceful, hard-working, dedicated nucleus of public health workers in the State. The public health movement has made remarkable progress, against tremendous odds, since its beginning in 1919. I will not take up your time with details of what has been done. The facts are published elsewhere. But I want Dr. Clark and his staff to know, and medical and public health staffs throughout New Mexico to know, that their work richly deserves all of the praise and cooperation that our State can give, and more support than the State has given.

Since this is my home State, and since I know my home State, I can speak only for New Mexico. But I know that if my colleagues from the other border States were here they would endorse my conviction that broad recognition is your just reward, together with greater assistance in your struggle to achieve the things you need in order to do your work even better.

You will note that I have not made specific reference to our friends from south of the border and what their presence here implies. Neither have I referred to the objectives of this United States-Mexico Border Public Health Association and the ways in which the organization seeks to accomplish its purposes. This omission is no accident. I have heard about your association generally, but in my view, it would be strange and inappropriate for me to describe and interpret your work to you. I am counting on having you do that for me, since it is a subject with which you are totally familiar and in which I am vitally interested.

I cannot and would not wish to close, however, without conveying my respects and good wishes to you who are from Mexico. With each passing year, in little ways and in large ways, the bonds between our countries are strengthened. We value highly the privilege of having Mexico as our friend and neighbor. And I personally am very grateful to all of you for this opportunity to be with you at dinner, to talk with you, and to see in action this association which has contributed so much to border health.

Growth of Texas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 6, 1954

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the Texas Research League, a fact-finding organization, recently predicted that Texas will have more than 12 million inhabitants by the year 1975, only 21 years from now.

Texas is growing faster than the Nation as a whole, a challenge not only to those of us who live in the State but to national business and industry. The growth of Texas is in line with the opportunities afforded in Texas.

The Austin American, published in the capital city of Texas, editorializes that the Texas growth graph is the key to new opportunity. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

According to an old saw, Texas' future is still before it. A remarkable future it promises to be.

For a scientific survey promises that Texas will gain more than half as many more people than it now has during the next 2 decades. A population projection by the Texas Research League came up with the forecast of a Texas with more than 12 million inhabitants in 1975.

This has a profound significance for the State, both as a government and a people. It will mean for instance that the typical Texas city will be one and one-half times as large as at present, and that rural population likewise will increase. It will mean State governmental expenditures must continue to rise above the $600 million annual present rate; that there must be many more State and local hospitals; thousands of additional schools; and that the volume of business and property values will grow vastly.

Texas is growing faster than the Nation as a whole, the specialized study showed. The estimate was that about 300,000 persons will come to Texas from elsewhere in 1955 to make their homes permanently in the State; and that the rate of immigration will steadily rise until it exceeds half a million new Texans during the year 1975.

Austin, in its own population estimates announced this week, shows it is growing not only at the Texas rate but even faster than Texas as a whole.

Austin gained more than 70 percent in population between 1930 and 1940; and on top of that huge increase gained more than 50 percent from the 1940 figures when the 1950 census report was made. It has progressed from an official 132,000 in the census count to an estimate exceeding 170,000 in 4 years this month. The census report is as of April 1, 1950.

Research League officials said their computation was on the conservative side, and the actual figures of growth may be considerably higher. Specifically, the estimates were reached by statistical techniques that could not take into account the theoretical effect of changes, such as establishing a comprehensive antidrought and soil- and water-conservation program for the State. If such a program is effected, league officials said it would be plausible to expect a very great increase in the immigrant population.

The forecasts, not optimistic or promotional guesses but computations based on proven statistical methods, pose for Texas great problems of planning, of getting ready, and of achievement, both in Government and in the private economy.

There is a challenge for an adequate base for the expanded economy. There is a challenge to the industry of the Nation to recognize the present and future Texas consumer market. There is a need to plan that there be jobs and diversified employment and business opportunity for the growing number of Texans and those who want to become Texans.

Cities must plan for more schools and hospitals, more streets and utility services. Their business and industry leaders must plan for more and more varied types of enterprise, a broader economic base, to absorb the growth in numbers and sustain a sound and prosperous economy. The promise of growth is a favorable, not a negative, factor, but its fulfillment is a challenge for the State and its cities to get ready for both its obligations and its opportunities.

The Nation's Maritime Policies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 6, 1954

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, in connection with the important report of the study of the Nation's maritime policies just made by Under Secretary of Commerce Murray, it is gratifying to note the reactions of such a well-informed American as Walter E. Maloney, president of the American Merchant Marine Institute.

Mr. Maloney has issued a clear-cut statement commenting on the review and because of his exceptional knowledge of all phases of this problem, as well as because he is a spokesman for the largest segment of the merchant marine industry, his observations are well worth the attention of the Congress of the United States and of the public generally.

I therefore ask unanimous consent that the statement of Mr. Maloney be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The comprehensive review of maritime subsidy policy just presented by Under Secretary Robert B. Murray, Jr., is a challenging document which deserves the attention of thoughtful Americans. Most certainly the statistical and factual data it contains bears out the warnings previously expressed by merchant-marine spokesmen to the effect that forthright action is necessary if our flag is not to disappear from the high seas.

Secretary Murray and all who had part in the preparation of the report are to be commended for the thoroughgoing studies they pursued in assembling and coordinating the data on which their conclusions and recommendations are based. They have approached their assignment realistically and we can be assured that their findings will be used as the basis of legislative and executive action henceforth.

Unanswerable arguments as to the dependence on the American merchant marine for national defense are to be found in Secretary Murray's review and in the subsequent explanatory statement of Senator JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER, who has manifested such an intelligent awareness of dangers to the security of our country and who has acted in order to avert the threatened disasters.

These official spokesmen make abundantly clear that—

(a) Security interests of our Nation are inseparably linked with the successful operation of our merchant marine;

(b) Experience in world conflicts prove that the United States must depend on its own merchant fleet in grave emergency;

(c) Adequate provisions must be made immediately through a replacement program if our merchant fleet is to be saved from deterioration and construction of new ships must be undertaken at once and continuingly in order to provide an adequate fleet for our country's needs in the approaching 10 years;

(d) The taxpayers of the United States have received 100 cents in value for every dollar appropriated in the past under the existing subsidy program.

(e) Essentially different conditons between American and foreign shipbuilding and ship operation make it imperative that special measures, such as subsidies, be maintained to enable our citizens to finance American-flag ships which will be available for governmental use when emergency demands;

(f) Prevailing maritime policies are basically sound but must be implemented by financial outlays of only an infinitesimal fraction of total defense expenditures to insure their continuing success.

It is gratifying to note that the Under Secretary of Commerce for Transportation and the Maritime Administration endorse our legislative proposals to meet current needs. The review contains approval of the pending Butler bill on mortgage insurance and expresses unqualified acceptance of the parity concept, which signifies concurrence with our recommendations for financial allocations to implement that policy.

Also, the report advances irrefutable proof of the justification for cargo preference provisions, such as are included in pending proposals of Senator BUTLER and Congressman THOR TOLLEFSON. This support for permanent legislation to utilize the American merchant marine to the utmost is both timely and farsighted. Likewise, the implied repudiation of ill-conceived suggestions of certain members of the Randall Commission should put to rest for all time any possibility of serious consideration of these Randall Commission recommendations.

All in all, the Murray report is an affirmation of the program of the American merchant marine. The forward-looking survey is indicative of a zeal to safeguard the security of American interests. It also reflects an understanding of present-day needs and of ways to meet them. If the Congress legislates in the light of the facts presented in this review, and if the executive branch of our government takes appropriate action to implement these measures, a distinct advance will be made for the benefit of our Nation.

Texas General Practitioner of the Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 6, 1954

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, members of the medical profession wisely and properly hold the general practitioner in the highest esteem. So do all of us.

Dr. A. L. Thomas, of the town of Ennis, in Ellis County, Tex., recently was named "General Practitioner of the Year" by members of the house of delegates of the Texas Medical Association. Dr. Thomas was chosen for this high honor because, in the words of Dr. Mayo Tenery, of Waxahachie, Tex., "he probably typifies the real family physician, a friend and confidant."

I ask unanimous consent that an Associated Press article briefly outlining Dr. Thomas' unselfish career of service be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SAN ANTONIO, May 2.—A doctor who first started practice in 1903 and at 78 shows no indication that he intends to slow down was named general practitioner of the year by the house of delegates of the Texas Medical Association meeting here Sunday.

He is Dr. A. L. Thomas, Ennis.

In nominating him for the honor, Dr. Mayo Tenery, Waxahachie, declared: "At the age of 78, and after 50 years of practice, he is still as active as ever. He is doing obstetrics, general practice, and surgery."

The thing most often said of him, Tenery continued, "is that he will go any time of the day or night to the rich or the poor, whether they pay or not.

"His reputation for charity is above and beyond the call of his profession. * * * He probably typifies the real family physician, a friend and confidant. * * * He has a love of the people which has enabled him to treat mental and spiritual ills as well as physical."

Dr. Thomas was in church at Ennis when he was telephoned to be notified of the award.

He was born in Auburn, Ga., in 1875, and came to Texas in 1886. He graduated from Polytechnic College, Fort Worth, and taught school in a one-room classroom at Bardwell for a year in 1898.

Dr. Thomas then attended the University of Louisville, received his degree of doctor of medicine there, and began general practice at Cryer Creek in 1903. He interned at Texas State Hospital, Terrell, in 1904, and moved to Ennis in 1905.

In Ennis Dr. Thomas studied under Dr. R. A. McCall, who taught him that medicine is a combination of arts, sciences, and the humanities.

He was the first man in Ellis County to do microscopic work, and all the doctors in the county brought specimens for him to diagnose. Dr. Thomas also was the only anesthetist in the county for some time, and is believed to be the first man there to own and operate an X-ray machine.

His first surgery was done in the home on a portable table that he hauled in his buggy. A quilt and sheet were used to make it soft. During his 50-year career he has delivered 3,000 babies.

Dr. Thomas has done post-graduate work in New York, Chicago, and New Orleans.

In addition to his practice, Dr. Thomas has been prominent in civic affairs in his hometown. For 20 years he has served as chairman of the board of Ennis public schools. A past president of the Kiwanis, he was named citizen of the year in 1951, the first person to to receive that honor. He has also served as Ennis health officer, and as chairman of the first library board.

Statement by Hon. Joseph Lipski Before Congressional Committee on Communist Aggression, May 4, 1954

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. BONIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 5, 1954

Mr. BONIN. Mr. Speaker, on Monday and Tuesday of this week, the Select Baltic Committee of this House, of which I am a member, held public hearings in the city of Chicago on the illegal seizure of the former proud and independent nation of Poland. I am proud to report that we heard the testimony of some splendid witnesses who experienced life behind the Iron Curtain. Among these witnesses appeared Mr. Charles Rozmarek, president of the Polish National Alliance, who testified to the betrayal of

E

Poland and its eventual subjugation by the ruthless dictators of Russia.

Another highly respected witness was Mr. Joseph Lipski, the rightful Polish Ambassador of the Polish Government in Exile. Parts of his forceful and chronological statement is submitted for the thoughtful consideration of each and every freedom-loving American:

The resolution agreed to by the United States House of Representatives on March 4, 1954, to extend the activities of the Baltic Committee will tighten the links of friendship and confidence between the oppressed and the free.

The fact that brutal and cunning methods of physical and moral torture applied by the Communist oppressors are revealed in all grim details by this committee and given wide publicity, should be a reassuring proof that the free world is increasingly aware of the gravity of events behind the Iron Curtain.

The truth about conditions of life in the captive countries will be at the same time a warning against dangers of Communist approach and infiltration.

In testifying here today I would like to express, on behalf of the Polish Government in Exile, sincere appreciation to the Chairman of the Baltic Committee of the United States House of Representatives, the Honorable CHARLES J. KERSTEN, and to the other members of this committee for their initiative and noble efforts to promote freedom for the subjugated nations.

It is most gratifying that the resolution of March 4 has met with encouragement and full approval of the United States administration as shown in the memorandum of the Department of State of February 8, last, for which we are greatly indebted to the Secretary of State the Honorable John Foster Dulles and his department.

Present conditions in Poland will have to be investigated against the wider background of historical events. Ample documentary evidence—as yet unpublished—can be produced at the request of the committee from the archives of the Polish Exiled Government in London. In my testimony I would like to make some brief remarks on Polish-Soviet relations with special reference to international commitments violated by the U. S. S. R.

The reborn Polish State was faced with a perilous situation on its eastern confines. The Bolshevik 1917 Revolution, headed by Lenin, had overthrown Kerensky, and seized control of the Government of Russia. Communism was on the march, proclaiming world revolution.

When after Germany's defeat in November 1918, her armies began to withdraw from Eastern Europe, Soviet military units expanded westward on the track of these retreating forces. A Soviet-Polish war ensued reaching its climax in the summer of 1920.

In launching his July offensive against Warsaw the Russian C. i. C. General Tukchachevsky issued an order to his troops in which he said: "* * * the destinies of the world revolution will be settled in the West. Our way toward worldwide conflagration passes over the corpse of Poland."

The victorious Battle of Warsaw checked the Bolshevik onslaught. Thus for two decades communism was prevented from penetrating into the heart of Europe.

The Conference of Ambassadors in Paris recognized by its decision of March 15, 1923, the eastern boundaries of Poland as fixed in the Treaty of Riga. The United States Government in a note presented to the Polish Government on April 5, 1923, took cognizance of the above decision with regard to Polish frontiers, as being in harmony with the assertions of territorial sovereignty of Poland.

In those years Poland concluded with the U. S. S. R. a number of technical and commercial agreements, as well as several important conventions of a political character, destined to strengthen peace in Central and Eastern Europe.

Following agreements supplementing the stipulations of the peace treaty of Riga should be quoted:

1. The protocol of February 9, 1929, for the immediate entry into force of the Treaty of Paris of August 27, 1928 (Kellogg Pact), regarding renunciation of war as an instrument of national policy. This protocol was signed in Moscow on Russia's suggestion, as this country was not among the original signatories of the Treaty of Paris. The common protocol was signed also by Estonia, Latvia, and Rumania. Later on the Soviet Government declared their access to the original Kellogg Pact and was therefore bound by two separate pledges to renounce war.

2. Pact of nonaggression between Poland and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics signed at Moscow on July 25, 1932. The validity of this agreement was extended on May 5, 1934, for 10 years, i. e., until December 31, 1945.

This bilateral pact refers to the Treaty of Paris stipulating in article 1 that the contracting parties "undertake to refrain from taking any aggressive action against, or invading the territory of the other party, either alone or in conjunction with other powers." Alinea 2 of this article regards as contrary to the above-mentioned pledge "any act of violence affecting the integrity and inviolability of the territory, or the political independence of the other contracting party," even if such acts are committed without declaration of war and avoid all possible manifestations. Article 2 excludes any direct or indirect aid or assistance to the aggressor state during the whole period of conflict. Article 3 stipulates that neither country should be a party to any agreement openly hostile to the other state from the point of view of aggression.

3. Convention for the definition of aggression, signed in London on July 3, 1933, between the U. S. S. R. and seven of her neighbors including Poland.

The meaning of the term "aggressor" was laid down in article II of the convention and very detailed stipulations enumerated various cases such as internal conditions of a state (political, economic, and social, which could not justify an act of aggression).

4. Exchange of notes on September 10, 1934, between the Polish Chargé d'Affaires in Moscow and the Director of the Peoples' Commissariat for Foreign Affairs in which the pact of nonaggression of 1932 and the convention for the definition of aggression were reaffirmed in connection with the joining with the League of Nations by the U. S. S. R.

5. Polish-Soviet declaration of November 26, 1938, confirming that the relations between the two states would continue to be based to the fullest extent on all the existing agreements, including the Polish-Soviet pact of nonaggression.

Official Soviet policy with regard to Poland was laid down in these international documents. In practice, however, Poland was not spared from subversive activities of the Cominform.

As a characteristic feature of deceitful methods it is worthwhile to note that the Polish Communist Party was dissolved—strange as it may seem—at the instigation of the Comintern in 1938.

Polish refusal to join anti-Comintern pact directed against the U. S. S. R. Negative attitude toward forming of blocs. Relations with Moscow and Berlin based on nonaggression pacts.

With the seizing of power by Hitler in 1933—Poland's position particularly difficult as she found herself surrounded from the west and east by two totalitarian powers. Both made efforts to induce Poland to join an alliance directed against the other.

Offers were made to Warsaw on different occasions and under various circumstances. But Polish foreign policy remained strictly within the terms of nonaggression pacts she had concluded with Soviet Russia and Germany.

In the spring of 1939 Soviet diplomacy carefully disguised any change of attitude toward Poland notwithstanding the fact that Hitler's demands presented to the Polish Government after the occupation of Prague, the seizure of Memel, and the military protectorate extended over Slovakia had brought about a marked tension between the two countries. During his visit in Poland in the middle of May 1939—the Vice Commissar for Foreign Affairs, Wl. Potemkin, assured the Polish Foreign Minister that—in case of a German-Polish conflict—the U. S. S. R. would maintain a friendly attitude visa-vis Poland. He stressed that he was making this declaration on special instructions from Moscow. Similar assurances were repeated by the Soviet Ambassador in Warsaw, Nicolai Sharonov, until the first days of the war. Rumors of alleged conversations between Russia and Germany were flatly denied by Soviet diplomats abroad, amongst others by Mr. G. Astakhov, Counselor and Chargé d'Affaires of the Soviet Embassy in Berlin, whose active role in the secret parleys was, later on, disclosed (I met him occasionally in my capacity of Polish Ambassador in Berlin).

In view of Hitler's menacing attitude, France and Great Britain undertook negotiations with the Soviet Government for a pact of mutual assistance destined to stem his aggressive designs. These conversations dragged on for months during the summer without definite results. New demands were continuously brought forward, including territorial claims in eastern Europe. Parallel with these conversations most secret approaches were made by Soviet Russia in Berlin. Already Stalin's speech at the 18th Party Congress in March 1939 was the first indication of his change of attitude toward Hitler. A month later, when the tension flared up, the Soviet Ambassador in Berlin made his first official overture on April 17, followed by other approaches. The outcome of those confidential negotiations was the nonaggression pact of August 23, 1939, signed in Moscow by Ribbentrop and Molotov. A confidential annexe, revealed only after the war at Nuremberg, drew a line of spheres of interest between Germany and Soviet Russia through the Baltic countries, Poland, and Rumania. The Western Powers were doublecrossed, Poland partitioned along the rivers Narow, Vistula, and San, but Soviet aggressive aims, carefully concealed for long years within the walls of the Kremlin, were fulfilled. For her neutral and benevolent attitude in Hitler's conflict with Poland and the Western Powers, Russia had been paid off by a large share of spoils in central and eastern Europe. She expected now to sit on the fence and watch the deadly struggle between the capitalist powers, awaiting the moment of their exhaustion to appear in her dominating role in Europe.

On September 17, 1939, while the Polish forces were engaged in a desperate fight against overwhelming Nazi onslaught, the Polish Ambassador in Moscow, Mr. Grzybowski, was called at 3 a. m. to the Soviet Foreign Office, and handed a note, signed by Mr. Molotov, announcing that Soviet troops had been ordered to cross the Polish border. This dramatic interview of the Polish envoy with Mr. Potemkin can best be described by Mr. Grzybowski himself when he appears before the committee.

So close were the relations between Hitler and Stalin at this juncture that even the wording of the note, which had to give a motive for the entry of Soviet troops on Polish soil, was beforehand discussed at

E

length between Molotov and the German Ambassador, Count Schulenberg.

In a subsequent treaty signed in Moscow, on Septmeber 28, 1939, by Ribbentrop and Molotov, certain territorial adjustments were made to the secret protocol of August 23, 1939. Lithuania was thus joined to the Soviet sphere of interests, whereas parts of the Warsaw district and the district of Lublin passed under German occupation.

The conspiracy Soviet Russia entered with Nazi Germany in dividing secretly Poland and other countries into zones of mutual interests—as well as the invasion of Poland, on September 17, 1939, were flagrant breaches of all the bilateral and multilateral agreements enumerated above. It was also an unequivocal violation of the Charter of the League of Nations, to which Soviet Russia had adhered in 1934.

It thus became evident that the series of pacts Soviet Russia had concluded with her western neighbors were merely tools of camouflage serving a much advertised Communist propaganda of peaceful coexistence.

In his speech delivered to the Supreme Council of the U. S. S. R., on October 31, 1939, Foreign Commissar and Premier Molotov declared: "* * * One swift blow to Poland, first by the German Army and then by the Red Army and nothing was left of this ugly offspring of Versailles."

The Polish territory seized by Soviet Russia, as a result of the Ribbentrop-Molotov agreement, covered 77,620 square miles, with a population of 13,190,000 people. Supported by their pact with Hitler and, owing to the war between the Western Powers and Germany, the Soviets felt free to impose on the conquered populations their rule of terror and oppression with brutal display of force. All measures were taken in complete disregard of the rules of international law and ethics and carried out with striking rapidity.

The characteristic features of Soviet methods in Poland were: Liquidation of local administration of political parties and all non-Communist organizations, Polish, Ukranian, and Jewish alike. Annexations of those territories into Soviet republics under the cover of fake elections to national assemblies. Imposing on Polish citizens of Soviet citizenship without right of option and recruitment to the Red army. Looting of public and private property, confiscations and economic exploitation. Mass deportations to Russia exceeding over 1½ million people. The majority of the deported were arrested, sent to places of forcible detention, to labor camps or prisons.

The Polish Government in Exile, which, after the occupation of Poland, resided first in France and then, since June 1940, in Great Britain, lodged with the allied and neutral governments protests against all these violations of international law. The diplomatic notes are recorded and can be supplied to the committee.

During the whole time of Nazi-Soviet cooperation Gestapo and GPU worked hand in hand, suppressing every patriotic move among the population. Nevertheless already at that time the Polish underground assisted the allied war effort in disturbing transports of raw materials, sent from Russia through Poland to Germany destined to support her war potential.

On June 22, 1941, Hitler attacked Russia.

By that time Poles had learned, from tragic experience, what Communist rule meant to the enslaved nations, whereas western democracies did not yet realise the whole bitter truth. This should be kept in mind to understand the exceptionally difficult position of the Polish Government in London, when Soviet Russia joined the Western forces as an ally in a war against Germany.

Gen. W. Sikorski, Prime Minister of the exiled government and commander in chief of the Polish forces, fighting under Supreme Allied Command in the West, made a daring contribution to the Allied cause in concluding, on July 30, 1941, the Polish-Soviet agreement.

By this agreement the U. S. S. R. recognized that the Soviet-German treaties of 1939 relative to territorial changes in Poland—have lost their validity. The resumption of diplomatic relations was stipulated. Both Governments undertook to render one another aid and support in the war against Hitlerite Germany. It was agreed that a Polish Army would be formed on the territory of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and General Anders released from the Zubianka prison was appointed by General Sikorski, commander of that army.

An additional protocol provided that—on the resumption of diplomatic relations—the Soviet Government would liberate all Polish citizens who were deprived of their freedom, either as prisoners of war or on other grounds.

On the occasion of the signature of this document the British Secretary of State, Mr. Anthony Eden, handed General Sikorski a note assuring him that His Majesty's Government do not recognize any territorial changes which have been effected in Poland since August 1939.

The summer of 1942 was marked by a series of hostile moves on behalf of the Soviet authorities. The great blow against the Polish relief organization was struck at the moment when, thanks to the charitable institutions in the United States of America and Great Britain, as well as to the aid granted through the lease and lend, substantial shipments of relief began to arrive to Russian ports and were properly distributed with the assistance of the delegates of the Polish Embassy.

Thus the vast Polish relief organization formed in accordance with the agreement of December 23, 1941, was disrupted by the NKWD scores of Polish relief workers imprisoned, thousands of Polish citizens of Jewish faith and of Ukrainian and Byelorussian origin were rearrested for refusal to accept Soviet passports. Others were forcibly conscripted in the Red army. (Extensive Polish diplomatic correspondence covers those events.)

It was significant that these drastic steps were taken soon after Molotov had concluded the 20-year Anglo-Soviet alliance.

At both wartime conferences in Teheran and Yalta vital Polish interests were discussed and decisions taken (viz, severance from Poland of her eastern boundaries) without prior consultation with the Polish Government, the only authorized spokesman of the Polish nation.

The Yalta agreement sanctioned the imposition on Poland of a government focused on the Communist-sponsored Lublin group.

This led to the withdrawal of recognition, on July 5, 1945, to the Polish constitutional government by the United States, Great Britain, and France.

Whatever perfidious interpretations or applications of the Yalta agreement were practiced by the Soviet Government which acted mala fide from the very beginning, the fundamental error of this document consists in the fact that it violates the sovereign rights of, and the treaty obligations toward, an allied country whose independence thus was sacrificed.

Therefore this act will never be recognized by the Polish nation.

The Polish nation today under the most brutal Communist yoke is not losing faith in her destiny, convinced that the ideals of justice and freedom, so dear to the American Nation, will finally triumph over the forces of evil.

Utah's Future Depends on Water in the News

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DOUGLAS R. STRINGFELLOW

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1954

Mr. STRINGFELLOW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article entitled "Utah's Future Depends on Water in the News," by George D. Clyde, director, Utah Water and Power Board, printed in Intermountain Industry, April 1954:

Saturday, March 20, was a redletter day for the upper basin States. On that day, President Eisenhower gave blanket approval to the upper Colorado River storage project, and made that vital project a part of the administration's program. This action came approximately 52 years after the National Reclamation Act was passed and it marks the second stage in the development of the intermountain States and the control of the last remaining large water resource available to the States of Utah, Colorado, Wyoming, and New Mexico.

The upper Colorado River storage project is unique because it involves a comprehensive, well-planned development of an entire river basin, no part of which can be developed by itself. It must be developed in its entirety and recognition by the President of the United States of this basin-wide program marks a new achievement in reclamation and the development and control of the natural resources of this Nation.

The comprehensive development of the upper Colorado River Basin contemplates the construction of an interlocking system of dams to be constructed on the tributaries and the main stem of the Colorado River to assure full and complete regulated flow which is necessary to provide water for the lower basin States under the Colorado River Compact and to provide power-generating facilities to produce revenue which help pay for the costs of the participating projects.

This interlocking system of dams consists of 9 dams, the largest 2 of which are Glen Canyon Dam, near the Arizona-Utah border, and Echo Park Dam, located in Colorado near the Utah line and within the boundaries of Dinosaur National Monument. Echo Park Dam is the key dam in this entire system, and without it the system of interlocking storage dams cannot function effectively. Any other combination of dams which does not include Echo Park is more costly in water, more costly in power, and less effective in regulation.

The attack on the Colorado River project has been centered on Echo Park Dam simply because it is the key structure and, without it, there will be no upper Colorado River storage project. If there is no upper Colorado River storage project, the upper basin States cannot utilize consumptively the portion of the water of the Colorado River which was allocated to them under the Colorado River compact, and that water which they cannot use will run downhill and be used consumptively by the lower basin after it has been used to make power at the string of power plants now constructed and proposed to be constructed throughout the lower basin.

These opponents of the Colorado River storage project disregard completely the fact that 90 percent of all the water in the Colorado River originates in the upper basin and they disregard completely the commitment of the United States which was made when

E

Dinosaur National Monument was expanded, to the effect that the local people would be permitted to develop and utilize the water and power and grazing resources within the confines of the expanded Dinosaur National Monument.

Now that the administration has given its blessing to this project, the Budget Bureau, the Department of Interior, and Congress are working on legislation to put it into effect. There now seems to be little opposition to the principle involved. The attack is still on in connection with Echo Park, but there is no objection to the construction of Glen Canyon Dam. There are those who would favor the construction of Glen Canyon Dam and no other storage.

These people, principally, again are from the lower basin—knowing full well if that is done, the power goes to the lower basin, the water goes to the lower basin, and with the building of an economy based upon these resources, it will be extremely difficult to get public or congressional approval for the construction of works later in the upper reaches of the stream, which works would use consumptively the waters upon which depended the economies developed in the lower basin. This project is so huge, it involves so many billions of dollars over the period of years of the life of these projects, that the stake is being bitterly fought for.

Although the President gave his blessing to the construction of Echo Park and Glen Canyon Dams, he only gave conditional support for the participating projects, requesting that before unconditional authorization be granted to these participating projects, that they be completely reevaluated and that a joint report by Interior and Agriculture be submitted relative to the agricultural feasibility of these participating projects. In my opinion, this is another effort to delay and ultimately defeat this project. The United States Bureau of Reclamation has been making investigations in the upper basin for 30 years. They have explored and reexplored every potential reservoir site and participating project. It is true that they have not been able to go into the detail necessary for a planned report. This will come after the authorization and before construction is started. It seems to me that nothing will be gained by reevaluation; they have no new evidence to present and, if another 30 years goes by before they can get authorization for these participating projects, their time will have run out. The waters will have been put to use in the lower basin and there will be absolutely no chance for consumptive use developments in the upper basin.

I have no objection to the joint report of Interior and Agriculture on the agricultural feasibility. However, I think authorization for these projects should be given at once and then Interior and Agriculture be instructed to proceed with a detailed investigation of agricultural potential. By doing this, we would lose no time. I am convinced that the water and land resources are there and by joining them through the construction of this basinwide project, this Nation and this State will gain in total wealth, and our economy will be stabilized.

It is expected that the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs will come out with its report very soon. It is hoped that the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs will call this bill up for hearing so that action might be taken in the present Congress.

It takes a long time to prepare the planned reports which are necessary before contracts can be let for construction. The employment situation in this country today indicates that there should be processed projects which will employ large numbers of people before the numbers of unemployed reach uncontrollable proportions. The reclamation program endorsed by the President of the United States on March 20 points the way to large-scale employment—not only at the construction sites, but all the way up through the manufacturing and service areas of employment. Therefore, it is hoped that Congress at this session will approve the authorization of the Colorado River storage project and its participating projects and will provide funds for immediate preparation of planned reports leading to ultimate appropriations for, and construction of, the Colorado River storage project and its participating projects.

Can We Internationalize the Atom?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. STERLING COLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1954

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Mrs. Lin Root entitled "Can We Internationalize the Atom?" which appeared in the magazine This Week under date of February 21, 1954:

More than 2 months have passed since President Eisenhower proposed before the United Nations General Assembly that the nations in the atomic arms race contribute to a U. N.-supervised bank of fissionable material—an international pool of nuclear energy and talent to strip atomic energy of its military casing and adapt it to the arts of peace.

Although in that time the plan has been acclaimed in the western nations and treated with apparently sincere interest in the Soviet world, one basic question has been raised repeatedly: Assuming the nations concerned are willing, can such an international operation work? Is it practical?

The answer is yes. Just such a joint operation has been working—and working well—for almost 3 years. The Joint Establishment Experimental Pile (JEEP) in Kjeller, Norway, is owned and operated in equal partnership by Norway and the Netherlands.

Although still, comparatively speaking, in its adolescence, JEEP has made $7,000 worth of commercial deliveries of radioactive isotopes, is producing radioactive iodine for a pharmaceutical company, is at work on a 5,000-kilowatt atomic generator and is conducting extensive research in the production of atomic energy for industrial power.

GO-IT-TOGETHER POLICY

JEEP came about in a simple, neighborly way. Early in 1951, Norway was just completing construction of a heavy-water reactor—an atomic furnace which operates on natural uranium in heavy water. Norway was a producer of heavy water—which is H_2O with a heavier H—but not uranium.

The Netherlands, it turned out, had several tons of uranium oxide, bought before the war by a professor who though it might come in handy later and cached under Nazi noses during the war. Both countries planned industrial expansion and an increased demand for power. Both were maritime countries, aware that atomic ship propulsion was the coming thing. But neither could proceed alone. So they did the natural thing—they pooled resources and set up shop at Kjeller.

A committee of 3 Norwegians and 3 Dutch scientists was set up to govern the project, which was to be managed by a director, either Norwegian or Dutch. Dutch and Norwegian scientists were to work under the same rules, and the whole project was to be run as an open scientific institution.

VISITING PHYSICISTS

And that is how it has worked. Not only are security safeguards dispensed with, but the Kjeller Institute is open to the public and well-visited. I have been there many times. In addition, any qualified scientist can come and work at Kjeller. The staff has included physicists from Italy, Yugoslavia, Sweeden, and the United States, and visitors from almost every other nation in the non-Soviet world.

Not the least of JEEP's values has been its stimulus to atomic research in other small countries. Many of the visiting scientists are working on plans to build reactors in their homelands—and the Kjeller pile is an ideal model. It is perhaps the cheapest of its size and achievements ever built. Its total cost was about $2,300,000—a million in cash and $1,300,000 worth of heavy water contributed by Norsk Hydro. It is a price within reach of almost any country.

SOCCER MONEY

As a result, Sweden has almost completed an industrial reactor and others are planned or in progress in Switzerland, Belgium, France, Great Britain, Italy, the Netherlands, Canada, Mexico, Brazil, Australia, and India. Norsk Hydro, incidentally, is filling these countries' order for heavy water.

JEEP has solved the problem of private or public ownership with a compromise, a public and private ownership plan. Norsk Hydro owns a sizable chunk. Other industrialists, notably ship owners, have bought shares in the expectation of industrial usage of atomic power. Part of the public money comes from the Norwegian State Soccer Betting Pool, which controls public wagering.

In the Netherlands, the setup is similar. The Dutch Reactor Commission has signed contracts with industrial firms and private industry has supplied sizable funds for future rights. New laboratories and research groups have also been established to cooperate with the joint project.

ISOTOPE MARKET

Meanwhile, JEEP is starting to take care of its own financing by selling isotopes, and has more orders than it can fill. But this is a sideline. The scientists are primarily interested in (1) studying the possibilities of various reactor designs and (2) production of industrial power. Already JEEP heats its own building by utilizing the heat produced in the reactor.

It seems likely that President Eisenhower had knowledge of the Kjeller pool when he made his proposal in the U. N. Dr. Gunnar Randers, the Norwegian scientist who first conceived the Kjeller project and is now its director, had conversations with Adm. Lewis Strauss, head of the United States Atomic Energy Commission, this past fall. And the informal international conference on atomic reactors, sponsored by JEEP and held at Kjeller last August, was liberally attended by American representatives, scientists, AEC observers, members of the United States Office of Naval Research in London and the United States scientific attaché in Stockholm.

I was at this conference and found it a striking display of the stimulation that multi-nation, open methods can produce. The conference was entirely on heavy-water reactors for industry; armaments did not enter the picture.

EXCHANGE PLAN

More than 100 scientists of 19 nations, from India to Brazil, attended. Every one was a member of the atomic energy group of his own country. But many had never even seen a reactor. Their excitement ran high. Instead of working in lonely insecurity, informed only by declassified documents from the United States and Britain, they knew

E

what others were thinking and planning in their field.

For example: Over coffee after a session in which there had been a Swiss report on their atomic progress, a Norwegian physicist turned to me and said, "You see, there is Switzerland going through the identical heat exchange determinations that we have just finished. If we had known, we could have put the money into measurements in a different range—or they could have. Together we could have covered more than twice the ground in half the time."

All around me the same idea was taking form in many languages. The conference culminated in a proposal by Dr. Randers for the establishment of an International Nuclear Energy Society, open to scientists of all nations, for the promotion of peaceful uses of atomic energy through the exchange of knowledge.

SCIENTIFIC FERVOR

There was none of the detachment of scientists here. Applause broke out before Dr. Randers had finished.

Dr. Stevan Dedijer, head of Yugoslavia's Institute for Research on the Structure of Matter, was on his feet immediately.

"I support wholeheartedly this proposal," he said. "The country I represent can only invest a few dollars a year. We cannot afford to make mistakes."

Another delegate jumped up: "Yes, we would spend less money together than the sum of what each would spend separately and we would move faster. We should pool our ideas. Say one country has graphite, another has uranium, another the possibility of making enriched uranium. Each could carry out experiments that we decide on centrally—and we'd all benefit."

The vote was unanimous. The Society is still in the process of formation, but before the delegates disbanded, three countries agreed to set out immediately on a joint attack on a group of experiments. They were Norway, The Netherlands, and Switzerland.

THREE-NATION ATTACK

Here is how the joint attack has started to work: Dr. Arne Lundby, nuclear physicist in charge of the reactor development department at Kjeller, was working at the reactor shield recently when an airmail special-delivery letter arrived from Dr. Werner Zünti, of the Physikalisches Institut in Zurich, Switzerland. Handing over his work to an assistant, Dr. Lundby ran across the snow-packed road to his office in the project's physics building.

There he fished out some notes—from a half-open drawer, not a triple-locked safe—pushed a space clear on his desk and made fast calculations. Then, taking letter and papers, he consulted with Director Randers and then went upstairs to the office of Dutch Physicist Dr. Jacob A. Goedkoop. The two conferred for half an hour about the possibilities of a changed design for reactor fuel elements. An answer was drafted and Lundby went downstairs to send it off to Dr. Zünti by the first plane to Zurich.

Without formality, without the rigors of security, a three-nation exchange of information had taken place.

PIONEER MODEL

JEEP is a small-scale, but working model, a practical demonstration of the President's proposals. Although few outside the scientific world are aware of its existence, it is inconceivable that any progress toward an international atomic pool will be made which will not include, if not be based upon, the pioneer work of Norway and the Netherlands; and it is apparent that, if their example is followed, peacetime atomic progress will certainly, as the Norwegian scientist said at the conference, "cover more than twice the ground in half the time."

Or, in the words of President Eisenhower at the U. N.: "The United States knows that peaceful power from atomic energy is no dream of the future. That capability, already approved, is here—now—today.

"Who can doubt, if the entire body of the world's scientists and engineers had adequate amounts of fissionable material with which to test their ideas, that this capability would rapidly be transformed into universal, efficient, and economic usage?"

Congressman Frank J. Becker Gets Free Cigarettes for Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY J. LATHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1954

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, it is a real pleasure for me to bring to the notice of the membership of the House, a development that will prove of great interest and also service to our veterans and all of those who are doing their bit to help our former servicemen who happen to be hospitalized in State institutions.

Appended hereto is a regulation under date of April 19, 1954, put out by the Veterans' Administration, which thoroughly explains how veterans' organizations and others may make distribution of tax-free cigarettes and other tobacco products to veterans in State institutions. It seems to me that this regulation should be included in the RECORD because it is something that I know will interest all of our veterans' organizations and others, all over the country, and service organizations generally who have been trying to help our hospitalized veterans.

It is also meet and proper, I think, to mention that the promulgation of this regulation is due, in large part, to the painstaking and persevering efforts of our colleague from New York, FRANK J. BECKER. He has done a tremendous job in working with the Treasury and the Veterans' Administration in finally getting this policy adopted.

Prior to this regulation, a veteran who happened to be in a State hospital could not be given tax-free cigarettes. He was lying in a State hospital bed, and, therefore, could not get his free smokes. This was because up to the present time it had been the policy that distribution of cigarettes, tax free, could only be accomplished in Federal hospitals. Obviously, this was discrimination of the rankest sort and it very sharply hindered and diminished the very human work that many veterans' organizations were doing in the distribution of cigarettes to hospitalized veterans in State institutions. Simply as an example, let me cite the Kings Park Hospital in my own State of New York. Here we have a facility run by the State which has nearly 2,000 veteran patients in it. This is a mental hospital and I need not dwell on what this means. Up until this new regulation, veteran service organizations could not provide these mentally ill veterans with tax-free cigarettes. They had to pay the regular tax, whereas in a Federal hospital, the cigarettes were tax free.

Our colleague, Mr. BECKER, finally was able to change this. Failing legislative opportunity for action, he had numerous conferences with the Treasury Department, Internal Revenue people, and the Veterans' Administration, and I think it should be stated here that all of these groups acted and cooperated most handsomely with the result that today we have eliminated the discrimination between a veteran in a State hospital and a veteran in a Federal hospital so far as tax-free cigarettes are concerned.

Appended hereto—and it gives me great pleasure to include it—are a letter from Arthur Connell, the national commander of the American Legion, two letters from Dr. Charles Buckman, director of the Kings Park State Hospital, Kings Park, N. Y., telling Mr. BECKER just what it means to have this new policy of tax-free cigarettes for our veterans in State institutions, and also a letter from the chairman of the National Public Relations Commission of the American Legion.

I know that all of our veterans' organizations will be tremendously interested in having this regulation included as a part of the record because my colleague, Mr. BECKER, has mentioned to me the complete and, indeed, the perfect cooperation he has received from them in his efforts to get this regulation issued.

The letters and statements referred to are as follows:

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., April 19, 1954.

To: Managers all VA hospitals, domiciliaries, and centers with hospital activities.

Subject: Tax-free tobacco products.

1. The purpose of this letter is to prescribe the policy and procedure for the purchase and gratuitous distribution of tax-free tobacco, snuff, cigars, cigarettes, and cigarette papers and tubes (hereinafter referred to as tobacco products) to present and former members of the Armed Forces of the United States, who are patients in hospitals and institutions (hereinafter referred to as institutions), owned or controlled by the government of the several States, Territories, and the District of Columbia.

2. Policy: (a) The officer-in-charge of each such institution will act as a representative of the Veterans' Administration in the purchase, storage, and distribution of the tobacco products. The unauthorized or illegal use of these products may result in withdrawal of the privilege by the Veterans' Administration. This arrangement will be effective only in those institutions where the officer-in-charge agrees to abide by the regulations prescribed by the Veterans' Administration to accomplish the purpose and in the exercise of proper controls.

(b) Funds donated for the purchase of tobacco products must be submitted directly to the institution. The Veterans' Administration will not accept nor handle donations of funds for the institutions. Donations may be made by voluntary service organizations, or others, desiring to do so, in the same manner as permitted in the current Veterans' Administration program for the tax-free tobacco products.

(c) The tobacco products must be distributed on a gratuitous and equitable basis to all eligible recipients. Under no circumstances will such items be offered for resale.

(d) The matter of payment, or nonpayment of any applicable State taxes on tobacco products lies entirely between the concerned State and the institution.

3. Procedure: (a) Institutions desiring to purchase tax-free tobacco products, and having funds on hand, will prepare and submit the following documents to the Veterans' Administration hospital designated as the approving authority under the program.

(b) A completely executed purchase order (on the institutions' regular purchase order form) in favor of the manufacturer of the desired tobacco products.

(c) Treasury Department Form 7996, completely executed and all copies signed by the officer-in-charge of the institution and forwarded to the designated Veterans' Administration approving authority (usually the nearest Veterans' Administration hospital) for approval. The following statement should be typed by the institution on form 7996 above the signature of the officer-in-charge "For free distribution to present and former members of the Armed Forces of the United States who are hospitalized in this institution." The VA hospital manager (or his designee) will approve by signing in the space provided all copies except 1 and distributed as follows: 1 copy will be retained for station files; the original and 2 copies, along with the institutions' purchase order will be mailed to the manufacturer; 1 copy bearing initials of approving officer will be returned to the institution for retention.

(d) Immediately following receipt of the tobacco products, the institution shall execute TD form 7998. The receiving officer shall sign all copies in the space provided, and the officer-in-charge shall sign all copies as approving officer. Distribution shall be made as follows:

(1) Transmit two copies to the manufacturer who made the shipment.

(2) Transmit one copy to the VA hospital for matching with form 7996.

(3) Retain one copy for the institutions' files.

(e) The file of TD form 7996 and TD form 7998 will be retained for a period of 2 years, and be available to the Veterans' Administration and the Internal Revenue Service for inspection purposes.

4. It is requested that full cooperation be given to the various institutions in making this program effective at the earliest possible date. Forms TD-7996 and 7998 will be requisitioned from the forms depots in the usual manner and furnished to the institutions upon request.

FRANK B. BREWER, M. D.,
ACMD–Operations.

KINGS PARK STATE HOSPITAL,
Kings Park, N. Y., March 12, 1954.

Re More Smokes for Veterans
Hon. FRANK J. BECKER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKER: It was with great pleasure that I received your notice about "More Smokes for Veterans," and that under the new regulations hospitalized veterans in State institutions may now be given tax-free cigarettes. This has come about through your very able efforts, and in behalf of the patients and everyone concerned I want to thank you very much for all you have done for us. I have notified the various people here concerned so that we may look forward to this added comfort for our veteran patients.

With deep appreciation and many thanks, I remain,

Sincerely yours,
CHARLES BUCKMAN, M. D.,
Senior Director.

KINGS PARK STATE HOSPITAL,
Kings Park, N. Y., April 27, 1954.

The Honorable FRANK J. BECKER,
House of Representatives,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. BECKER: We were very pleased to receive your letter as well as copy of the pertinent Veterans' Administration regulations for the distribution of tax-free tobacco products in State hospitals. This, as you know, particularly applies to us because of the nearly 2,000 veteran patients in this institution. I have made the information available to our people and we trust that this will be put into action very soon.

Everyone at this hospital, and myself particularly, are greatly indebted to you for your splendid work in our behalf, and you can rest assured that your actions will go a long way toward the comfort, welfare, and rehabilitation of our mentally sick veterans. Again my many thanks, and with deep appreciation for all of your efforts, I remain,

Sincerely yours,
CHARLES BUCKMAN, M. D.,
Senior Director.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *March 12, 1954.*

The Honorable FRANK J. BECKER,
Member of United States Congress, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR FRANK: As chairman of the National Public Relations Commission, as a Legionnaire from your own county, and as a friend, I am most proud of the success of your efforts in connection with tax-free cigarettes sent as gifts from veterans' organizations to our hospitalized comrades confined in private and public hospitals, other than Federal institutions in the United States.

You reflect great credit not only upon yourself and your constituency but certainly upon the American Legion, with which you have been so long and so prominently identified.

Very sincere congratulations and kindest personal regards,

THOMAS E. PARADINE.

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
Washington, D. C., March 10, 1954.

The Honorable FRANK J. BECKER,
Member of United States Congress, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR FRANK: Through your untiring efforts it will soon be possible to purchase tax-free cigarettes to be used as gifts from veterans' organizations to war veterans confined in other than Federal hospitals in the United States.

It is particularly gratifying to know that one of our most active Legionnaire Congressmen, a member of the National Public Relations Commission, has been the instrument through which this very worthwhile project has been brought to a successful conclusion. You are to be commended on your stick-to-it-iveness and patience during the long period of time it required to convince those in authority that our Government could well afford to waive taxes on cigarettes that were to be distributed to men who have served their country and who are now patients in many hospitals throughout the land.

We in the national organization of the American Legion are very proud of you and extend our heartfelt thanks and congratulations to you on this great accomplishment. Certainly the Department of New York can be very proud of their Legionnaire Congressman, the Honorable FRANK J. BECKER.

Cordially yours,
ARTHUR J. CONNELL,
National Commander.

The St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 6, 1954

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter received from Walter P. Reuther, president, and Thomas H. Burke, chief of congressional liaison, Congress of Industrial Organizations:

CONGRESS OF INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONS,
Washington, D. C., May 4, 1954.

DEAR CONGRESMAN: Early this Thursday afternoon (May 6) the House of Representatives will, after over 20 years of struggle, record what is virtually certain to be its final decision on the St. Lawrence seaway (S. 2150). We hope that S. 2150 will pass by a large majority and that the Brownson amendment will be rejected decisively.

The Brownson amendment, in our view, is a palpable device to wreck the St. Lawrence project. It would appear that this joker is offered on the assumption that the bill itself will certainly pass on Thursday. The Brownson amendment provides the bonds of the Authority be sold "to the public" without Government guaranty. The bonds of all important public-works projects, such as TVA, Bonneville, and others have been Government guaranteed. As a matter of fact, no single one of our vital public undertakings of the past generation has been financed otherwise.

The St. Lawrence seaway has been recommended as a measure of national security. Presidents of both parties have been for the project. It is now absolutely clear that Canada will build the seaway on its own and operate the waterway as a Canadian project if the Congress this week refuses to participate in an undertaking so vital to the interests of both countries.

We urge and recommend that you oppose the Brownson amendment and vote for S. 2150, authorizing the United States to participate in the construction and operation of the St. Lawrence seaway.

Sincerely yours,
WALTER P. REUTHER,
President.

CONGRESS OF INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONS,
Washington, D. C., May 4, 1954.

Hon. GEORGE A. DONDERO,
Chairman, House Committee on Public Works, House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DONDERO: We realize that as chairman of the House Committee on Public Works you will be in the position of floor manager for the St. Lawrence seaway bill. We believe that a statement as to our position on this important and very vital legislation may be of assistance to you in your work in behalf of this bill. In line with this, we are enclosing herewith a copy of a letter which we have recently sent out. This letter sets forth our position in favor of the St. Lawrence Waterway project.

We would also like to cite a wire sent by our President Walter Reuther to the Great Lakes St. Lawrence Association, reiterating our continued support of this project. The following is the text of this telegram:

"Be assured that the UAW-CIO and the National CIO will do everything possible to help in getting favorable action by the House

Committee on the St. Lawrence Waterway project. You can count on our continuing cooperation until this long delayed vital project has become a reality."

Wishing you every success in your endeavors for the passage of this legislation, I remain

Sincerely yours,

THOMAS H. BURKE,
Chief of Congressional Liaison.

Ukrainian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY W. WIER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1954

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter from Victor Filipowitsch, head of the Minneapolis Branch, Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, Inc., Minneapolis, Minn., with resolution adopted on the occasion of Ukrainian Independence Day.

The letter and resolution follows:

UKRAINIAN CONGRESS
COMMITTEE OF AMERICA, INC.,
Minneapolis, Minn., April 24, 1954.

Hon. ROY W. WIER,
United States House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: It is our greatest opportunity and pleasure to send our sincerest regards to you, as to one of the most and best leading people of America. This is because of the occasion of the Ukrainian Independence Day, recently celebrated by the millions of Ukrainians all over the world, as much and especially in the United States of America.

Attaching the proclamation of this day, celebrated in Minneapolis, we hope to find in you our friend and supporter of ideals of many millions of Ukrainians bitterly struggling for their freedom for centuries.

Our trust in you,

Respectfully,

VICTOR FILIPOWITSCH,
Head of the U. C. C. A., Minneapolis Branch.

ALEXANDER LUTY-LUTENKO,
Master of the Ceremony.

RESOLUTIONS UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED BY ALL PRESENT AT THE ANNUAL UKRAINIAN DAY, JANUARY 24, 1954, AT MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.

We, the Ukrainians, gathered together on this day to celebrate the 36th anniversary of the union of all the lands occupied by the Ukrainian people into one independent state, proclaim the following:

1. The Ukranian Parliament—the Ukrainian Central Council, expressing the will of the Ukrainian people, on January 22, 1918, in the capital city of Kiev proclaimed the independence of the Ukrainian National Republic.

2. On January 22, 1919, the Government of Ukraine, expressing the will of its population, proclaimed the union of all parts of Ukraine into one independent and sovereign state.

3. In the Russo-Ukrainian War which the Communist Moscow started against the young Ukrainian Republic, Muscovites occupied the country and enslaved Ukrainia by forcing upon them the Muscovite Communist dictatorship.

4. The Ukrainian people never acquiesced to this occupation and constantly conducted and still are waging the fight of liberation of Ukraine from communism and the Muscovite imperialism. This fight is being waged on all lands of Ukraine in different forms: as a passive resistance and as an armed conflict which is being conducted by the Ukrainian Insurgent Army (UPA).

5. The Muscovite Communist Government, knowing that the Ukrainian nation never will abandon its fight for independence, is forced to falsify the history of the Ukrainian people, in order to discredit the strife of the Ukrainians for independence.

6. By the order of the Communist Party of the U. S. S. R. a huge celebration of the 300th anniversary of the treaty of Pereyaslav is being organized. Following the ratification of this treaty, Moscow, using subterfuge, deceit, and force, gradually changed the military alliance between Hetman Bohdan Khmelnitsky, the head of the Ukrainian State, and the Muscovite Tsar Alexy into a military occupation, thus brutally destroying the sovereignty of Ukraine. In the same way now, Moscow, under the Communist leadership, is destroying the independence of Poland, Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia in Europe, and of some countries in Asia. At present the Muscovite Communists are trying to convince the world that the Ukrainian people, on their free will 300 years ago united forever with the great Russian people and thus "had chosen the only right way in their fight with the intruders."

7. By this huge and noisy celebration of the 300th anniversary of the treaty of Pereyaslav, the Muscovite Communist government is trying to show to the world the inseparability of Ukrainians from Russia. Toward this end the Muscovites falsify the history of the Ukrainian people.

8. By this falsification of the historical facts Moscow is trying to inflict a spiritual and political harm to the Ukranian people, harm which can be compared to that done during the famine of 1933.

9. These actions of the Russian Communists are finding support among the Russian-American anti-Communist groups. These groups, defending the imperialist interests of the Russian Empire, are trying to coerce the American principles of freedom and independence. Contrary to the principles of the American democracy they are opposing the independence of Ukraine and of other oppressed nations.

10. We firmly believe that the principles of freedom and independence have the same meaning for all nations. For the Ukrainians these ideals can be safeguarded only by the Ukrainian National Republic whose independence was proclaimed by the Ukrainian Parliament, the Ukrainian Central Council, on January 22, 1918.

Polish Constitution Day

SPEECH

OF

HON. VERA BUCHANAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1954

Mrs. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, today, the 3d of May, we commemorate the 163d anniversary of the adoption of the Polish Constitution of 1791.

To all Americans of Polish descent and to the millions of Poles everywhere the 3d of May is a symbol of liberty and democracy. On that memorable day in 1791, King Stanislaus exhorted the deputies of the Polish Diet to accept the new constitution as the last means of saving their country and himself set the example by swearing to defend it. Under this constitution all invidious class distinctions were abolished, the franchise was extended to the towns, serfdom was mitigated preparatorily to its entire abolition, absolute religious toleration was established, and every citizen declared equal before the law.

The rights and liberties proclaimed in the constitution of 1791 make it easy to understand why the 3d of May is to the people of Poland what our Fourth of July is to us.

Although designed to establish liberty and order under law together with the stability to discourage the familiar aggressions of Poland's strong and avaricious neighbors, these hopes were destined to an early disappointment and the Polish nation was allowed only a brief period in which to enjoy the blessings of its Democratic rule. The second partition came in 1793 followed by the third partition in 1795 and Poland as an independent state disappeared from the map.

The bitter disappointment, the more bitter because of the golden promise of those earlier days, still saddens the hearts of the freedom-loving people of Poland as they watch and experience the dictates of a puppet government under the domination of the Kremlin.

A nation with such a proud heritage will never die. Americans of Polish ancestry are joined today by their fellow citizens in solemn tribute to the brave people of Poland and in the profound hope that the day is not far distant when that ancient country will again take her rightful place among the democratic nations of the world.

Retreat From Moscow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENDERSON L. LANHAM

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1954

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, with leave to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I am including herewith an editorial which appeared in the Boston Post for April 20, entitled "Retreat From Moscow." Without agreeing with all of the verbiage of this editorial, especially its flippant reference to Secretary Dulles, it is nonetheless on the whole in line with a speech I made on the floor of the House on May 3 which appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date on page 5560.

It is significant that the Boston Post was a strong supporter of President Eisenhower during his campaign for the Presidency.

The editorial follows:

RETREAT FROM MOSCOW

The almost incredible sophistry of the administration's thoughts and declarations about the Nation's relationship with the rest of the world will be thoroughly exposed a week hence at Geneva.

Last February President Eisenhower said flatly that it would be a tragedy for the

E

United States to become involved in Indochina. After that, the principle of massive retaliation at points and times of our own choosing was enunciated. The emphasis was to be on airpower and the H-bomb and the new weapons, not on ground troops.

John Foster Dulles, the diplomatic pretzel bender, unveiled one of his creations which added up to a flat threat that if the Chinese Reds actually intervened in the Indochinese fight, the United States would do something drastic to oppose them.

The Chinese Reds called the bluff. They have Chinese Red forces engaged in combat in Indochina. Dulles hustled to London and Paris to engage in more sophism, and came back with an agreement throttled out of the French and British that they would take part in the examination of a possibility of a collective defense. In other words—they do not plan to do anything, but there's no harm in talking about it.

Finally, Vice President NIXON sent up a trial balloon to see how the American people would react to the possibility that American ground troops will be sent into Indochina. What ground troops, and what happened to massive retaliation?

These are the men who talked so movingly about ending the blood bath in Korea and stopping the slaughter of our boys in Korea. These are the men who sold South Korea down the river. These are the men who only 3 months ago were talking about what a tragedy it would be for the United States if we became involved in war in Indochina. And these are the men who are seeking to convince the American people that they will win a conference at Geneva that is lost before it even begins. And they know it is lost, but they have their excuses ready for the gullible American public.

These are the men who by every means of expression at their command invite the Soviet Union to get in the first lick with an H-bomb. These are the men who, in the past 18 months, have made all the vital decisions, not one of which has any foundation in reality.

The reality is that our will to fight, our chances of victory and our alliances have steadily eroded. The Soviet Union has risked nothing, ventured nothing, and has gained victory after victory. Communism becomes stronger, spreads outward, and the free world becomes weaker and racked by dissension. We are engaged in a retreat from Moscow.

When and where will the line be drawn? When and where will there be an ultimatum? When and where will the United States pass from the defensive to the offensive?

Arabs Reject Peace But Avoid War, Too

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 6, 1954

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article by Robert C. Doty in the New York Times of May 2, 1954:

Arabs Reject Peace But Avoid War, Too—United States Arms for Iraq Believed To Mean Attack on Israel Is Not Expected

(By Robert C. Doty)

CAIRO, May 1.—Tension between Israel and her Arab neighbors, arising from a wave of frontier incidents, continues high, but there are many sound indications that the Arabs are as unlikely to launch a new attack as they are to conclude a real peace.

From the Arab standpoint war would present grave dangers of diplomatic and military disaster. Peace, on the other hand, would entail the lifting of the economic blockade of Israel and the sacrifice of almost the only, and certainly the best, defense against a threat of economic dominance by Israel.

This view, shared by many Middle East observers, has been reinforced by the announcement last Sunday that the United States had agreed to give, and Iraq to accept, arms aid.

Iraq is still nominally at war with Israel, but, lacking a common border with the Jewish state, has escaped involvement in the current epidemic of violent incidents across the armistice lines. Considering the United States record for unswerving support of Israel, it is inconceivable that Washington would arm any nation likely to participate in an attack on the state that owes its existence to donations of public and private funds from the United States.

Further, although aid was called unconditional in the Baghdad announcement, the Mutual Security Act under which it was granted provides that States receiving United States arms must undertake to use them only for defense. Thus, in effect, Iraq has signed itself out of participation in any "second round" attack on Israel.

SIGNIFICANT OMISSION

Significantly, Arab critics of the Iraqi tendency to move closer to the west have made virtually every complaint except that Iraq has renounced the right to join aggressive action against Israel. If such action were regarded as a serious possibility it would be reasonable to expect a clamorous outcry against a step that committed Iraq to a passive role.

This does not mean that the Arabs of Egypt, Jordan, Syria, Lebanon, Saudi Arabia, and Iraq are more peace-loving than they were when the war began or that if it were feasible they would not seize the opportunity to eliminate Israel as a state.

It is not to say either that a miscalculation, accident, or uncontrolled local reaction to an incident such as the Israeli attacks on the Jordanian villages of Kibya and Nahhalin, or the slaying of 11 Israelis in the Scorpion Pass bus ambush by unknown asassins identified with Jordan by the Israelis could not snowball into a resumption of hostilities.

What does seem reasonably certain, however, is that, as the Arab leaders realize, war—particularly an aggressive war—would cost the Arabs their remaining assets in a rivalry with Israel. Responsible heads of the Arab governments therefore can be expected to make every effort to prevent emotion from overruling self-interest.

COST OF A WAR

The reasons that resumption of hostilities is not appealing to the Arab governments are these:

(1) Militarily speaking, a war is uncertain and uninviting. Although the Arab armies outnumber the Israeli forces and are improved in quality, at least in Egypt, since their indifferent performance in 1948, the Israelis are still believed to have the edge in training, equipment, and tactical skill. The Arab collective security pact still exists principally on paper, rather than in an effective coordination of military forces, Israel would fight on interior lines of communications, while the Arab armies have to make long desert circuits to come to one another's support.

(2) The Arabs could attack Israel only at a sacrifice of their present legal position, which they consider to be unassailable. This is based on support for the United Nations decisions on the partition of Palestine and on Arab refugees. At present, they argue that it is Israel that is defying the will of the General Assembly, as expressed in resolutions on the boundaries, calling also for either reparation or compensation for the 850,000 former Arab residents of Israeli territory who were driven out during and since the Palestine war. The refugees are now supported by the United Nations in camps located in the Arab States.

(3) Aggression by the Arabs presumably would cause the United States, Britain, and France to take action to support their guaranty of a status quo in the Middle East and end whatever small hopes the Arabs still entertain of enlisting Western sympathy for their position vis-a-vis Israel and of obtaining military and economic aid from the West.

(4) Few if any of the governments of the Arab States feel themselves securely enough in power to risk the unpredictable domestic consequences of a foreign war. Egypt's military junta is busy purging the press and political enemies at home after winning a hairbreadth victory over forces seeking the return of civilian government. In foreign relations, its efforts to oust Britain from the Suez Canal zone takes long precedence over the Israeli dispute. Syria, too, is convalescing from a political upheaval. Iraq is busy with projects for unification of the Levant States and closer ties with Turkey and Pakistan.

KEEPING IT ALIVE

From the Arab standpoint, the reasons for rejecting the idea of real peace negotiations and continuing instead to maintain pressure on Israel under the truce agreements are no less compelling than the strictures against war.

These considerations are both political and economic in nature, and basically defensive in character. The official position is that the Arab States will negotiate a peace settlement only after Israel has agreed to implement the United Nations decisions on partition, and refugee compensation and repatriation. Actually, even if Tel Aviv were to consent to a revision of the frontiers and give satisfaction on the refugee issue—neither action is likely—it is doubtful whether the Arabs would consent to make peace even then.

A peace settlement would involve acknowledgment of an Arab defeat in the military campaign of 1948. It would mean, of course, recognition of Israel, acquiescence in permanent establishment of what the Arabs consider to to be an alien state in the midst of the Arab world, one that sits astride land communications between the eastern and western parts of the Arab bloc. Such concessions would humiliate any Arab state politically, a consequence that none is currently willing to risk.

Even more important, however, a peace settlement would force the Arabs to give up their one effective defense against Israel's great potential economic power—the Arab League boycott.

By a refusal to permit trade with Israel to be carried on through their territories, and by blacklisting the companies that carry on such trade by sea or air, the Arabs have seriously impeded the economic development of Israel. Surrounded by Arab-controlled Middle Eastern oil, Israel is forced to import hers from Caribbean sources.

As long as she is denied local outlets for agricultural and industrial production, Israel apparently is doomed to a perpetual unfavorable trade balance made up only by heavy subsidy from the United States Government and the World Zionist Organization.

ECONOMIC ISSUE

Some Arab officials frankly admit that they are afraid that Israel, freed of these limitations, would soon establish economic dominance over the entire Middle East. These men offer no apology for refusing to accept the challenge to engage in what they consider to be unequal competition in the free market.

F

The Arab States, they point out, are only just emerging from a long period of foreign colonial domination that condemned them to serve as raw material suppliers and consumers of foreign manufactured goods.

With a population richer in scientific, technical and management skills, with a demonstrated ability to attract development capital from both the United States Government and private sources that is denied the Arabs, Israel could quickly offer competition in price, quality and quantity of production that would cause the infant Arab industries to sicken and die, the Arabs believe. Only the boycott prevents this from occurring, the Arabs assert.

For all of these reasons, the prospects for reopening peace negotiations are far from bright.

The Arab League is not a very effective instrument of Arab policy but it had enough strength to hold Jordan out of separate talks with Israel on revision of the armistice agreement. The Arabs have threatened to resist, to the point of a walkout, United Nations' Security Council action to link Jordan's complaint on the Nahhalin attack with a general discussion of the whole Arab-Israeli issue. Such a broader discussion, the Arabs fear, would again give Israel the opportunity to draw upon the propaganda advantage to be gained from appearing as the advocate of peace while the Arabs were again forced to defend what they consider to be their essential interests by defending the status quo, which is neither peace nor war.

Atomic Vengeance Is Not Enough

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. STERLING COLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1954

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me before the 135th anniversary banquet of Colgate University at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, New York, Thursday, April 29, 1954, at 9:30 p. m.:

Mr. Chairman, President Case, and men of Colgate, to be identified in any fashion with an institution of learning such as Colgate University, which has endured for nearly a century and a half, is in itself a great distinction; to have attended and graduated from such an institution is a coveted privilege; to have served as trustee of that university for a number of years is a rich experience; to have been invited by the alumni of such a school to address a gathering such as this commemorating the anniversary of the founding of that university by 13 consecrated, devout, determined, and enlightened men 135 years ago, is a high honor; and to be able to accept that invitation and discuss matters of great importance to our national security and welfare is a welcomed opportunity.

On behalf of all the alumni at this gathering tonight, may I express a word of greeting to Colgate men everywhere. We wish you could be with us here tonight, and we hope that the spirit that is Colgate may transport you across the intervening miles to our midst in the Starlight Room of the Waldorf.

Colgate graduates have never shirked the responsibilities of educated men in a free society. When our society has been exposed to peril, Colgate men have been found in the front ranks of those guarding its liberties and its freedoms.

It is about those freedoms that I wish to speak with you tonight—about the preservation of our national liberties in the age of atomic and hydrogen energy.

Two months ago our Government began a historic series of hydrogen-weapons tests at our Pacific proving grounds. None of us—and I include here the scientists whose brilliant attainments made these tests possible—will rejoice in the technical achievements of this latest series of nuclear tests. None of us can find comfort or satisfaction in the fact that man's ingenuity has now reached the point where a single hydrogen bomb, carried by a single plane, can eliminate the heart of the greatest city on earth. Yet that is the stark reality of the hydrogen era.

Three years ago, when our Government undertook the active development of thermonuclear weapons, all of us associated with our national atomic enterprise fervently hoped it would prove beyond the capacity of science to harness hydrogen energy for military purposes. We hoped that by proving thermonuclear weapons could not be built we might prove at the same time that the arsenals of the enemies of the free world could never be augmented by these dreadful armaments. But these hopes were quickly proven to be illusory. Today hydrogen weapons are an appalling reality—on both sides of the Iron Curtain. Although none of us can find comfort or satisfaction in the realization, it is, nevertheless, the fact that man's ingenuity has now reached the point where a single plane—a single plane—on a single mission can carry more destructive cargo than the total carried by all of the planes on all of the missions by all of the Allied and all the Axis nations in all the years of World War II.

Today some have suggested that our Government unilaterally renounce additional tests of hydrogen weapons. To those offering such counsel I would say this: The aim of the United States Government is not to build bigger and ever more destructive weapons without end. Our nuclear tests have been confined to devising weapons for which there exists a demonstrated military requirement. We are conducting these tests because it would invite disaster—not only for this Nation but for all like-minded nations as well—to renounce the development of an armament which the enemies of our kind of world are themselves developing with all possible speed and priority.

We are not manufacturing hydrogen bombs because we believe they point the way toward bargain-basement defense budgets. We are not constructing these weapons because we think they can relieve us of the necessity of learning to live and work with our allies. We are not building hydrogen bombs because we see in them a cure-all for the root causes of world insecurity.

We are developing hydrogen energy for military purposes because we have no alternative—because despots embracing an alien and evil philosophy aimed at total world dominion have left us no other course. On the day the rulers of the Soviet Union demonstrate, by deed rather than word, that they are willing to join with other nations in regulating the output of nuclear weapons and all other instruments of war as well, we will gladly and eagerly end our efforts to harness the atom for military uses. More than that, we will not be found wanting or ungenerous in our desire to divert the skills, the moneys, and the resources now allocated to military applications of nuclear energy to great programs for the betterment of mankind everywhere in the world.

When World War II ended, we were the sole possessors of atomic weapons. Our atomic monopoly, coupled with the superiority of our strategic Air Force, appeared to most Americans as our best and surest means of avoiding wholesale aggression by the Soviet Union. Many of us imagined that a decade might pass before the Soviets achieved their first atomic bomb, and still another decade before they could manufacture these weapons in significant numbers. Accordingly, our entire defensive posture was built around our ability to answer all-out Communist aggression with an atomic counterblow. Our efforts to develop a continental defense against the inevitable day when atomic war could proceed in opposite directions were accordingly but halfhearted. In pre-Korea defense budgets, the demands of maintaining air-atomic supremacy and a bare minimum of conventional land and sea forces left but little leeway for building defenses against an atomic threat which then appeared many years, or even decades, in the future.

But that future is here today. Far from requiring decades to amass a significant stockpile of nuclear weapons, the men of the Kremlin possess such a stockpile at this very moment. To be sure, our own atomic striking power has been growing in the meantime at an ever-increasing rate. Despite the end of our atomic monopoly, the quantitative lead we possess over the Soviets in nuclear weapons, a lead which we must increase, and the ability to deliver them against the Soviet industrial and military heartland, remain our supreme deterrent against all-out war.

Strategies built primarily around the concept of passive defense have always proved self-defeating, and they would prove self-defeating now. In the last analysis, a nation must rely for its military security upon its ability to carry a war to the foe. Yet national strategy must keep pace with changes in the balance of world military power. A policy which made preeminent sense when the Soviets possessed no atomic stockpile must now be adjusted and broadened to take account of the Soviet Union's presently existing, and rapidly growing, ability to engage in two-way atomic war.

The grim statistics are these: Today, the Soviet dictators are capable of manufacturing nuclear weapons of such destructive power that a single bomb could destroy the heart of New York or Chicago or Washington. Today, the Soviet Union has planes capable of delivering such weapons—even if on one-way missions—against the majority of our critical target areas. Whether the Soviets could now mount an attack of such intensity and scope that our ability to retaliate would be eliminated may be open to debate. But 3 or 4 years from now, the Soviets will be able to launch a saturation attack against our Nation—an attack so massive that our ability ultimately to prevail may be open to grave question.

Were an attack to occur this week, or this year, we would have no effective way of repelling it. At best—and this is very optimistic—we might intercept as many as 1 out of every 4 Soviet bombers. It is entirely possible, however, that the ratio of interception would be much less—and I assure you that in saying this I am not revealing any secrets to the Soviet Union. The rulers of Russia are probably more aware of our present inability to defend ourselves adequately against an atomic attack than are the American people themselves—much more aware of it.

I join with all of you in fervently hoping that the Soviet overlords will reckon with our devastating retaliatory power, and thereby conclude that a nuclear sneak attack against the cities of America would result in the ultimate ruin of those who perpetrated it. In the past, however, the Russian rulers have miscalculated our will to resist and our determination and ability to strike back against aggression—witness the invasion of Korea. We shall therefore be rash to presume that the Soviets may not miscalculate it once more and seek to test our resolve in the crucible of intercontinental atomic battle. I point out also that our ability and resolve to launch an atomic counterblow remains our supreme deterrent to all-out aggression by the Soviets. But we may pray that this resolve will never be tested.

E

Destroying Russian cities will not bring back to life American cities which have been gutted and ravaged by a nuclear Pearl Harbor. Leveling Russian industries will give us little consolation if American industries are leveled first.

Atomic vengeance is not enough.

Seen in proper perspective, the threat of atomic and hydrogen instant and massive retaliation is only one-half of the military effort needed to provide our homeland with security against nuclear attack. The other half consists of a dual program for continental defense and for civil defense, both of such scope and efficiency that an enemy will understand, without putting us to the test of battle, that a nuclear Pearl Harbor can never bring us to our knees.

Each day that an additional bomb enters the Soviet stockpile, on each occasion that yet another plane is assigned to the Soviet long-range air force, our need for an effective continental defense becomes more urgent. All will agree that is beyond our capacity to create a continental defense which would guarantee 100 percent of success in repelling hostile aerial formations. It is within our capacity, however, to inflict such losses on raiding formations that an enemy will in all probability be dissuaded from casting the die for intercontinental atomic war or be kept from dealing us a mortal blow even if he does.

Until a few years ago, a continental defense system promising such degrees of success appeared to be out of the question. At the very height of their efficiency, the planes of the Royal Air Force and the guns of the antiaircraft command destroyed less than 10 percent of the bombing planes the Nazis hurled against the United Kingdom. In an era when the destructive force of blockbusting aerial bombs was measured in hundreds of pounds of TNT, such a level of attrition sufficed to make a sustained bombing campaign unprofitable. But today, a single plane—a single plane, I repeat—on a single mission, can carry more destructive cargo than the total carried by the combined air forces of all the Allies and all the Axis nations through all the 6 years of World War II. When a single hydrogen bomb delivered on target can spell the death of our largest American city, no real security can be found in a continental-defense system intercepting only 1 bomber in 10. Yet, with the radar, the interceptor craft, and the antiaircraft of World War II, a greater measure of success was impossible.

But beginning in 1950, American scientists—many of them the same men who had brought the atomic bomb to fruition—made a series of discoveries which promise to revolutionize the science of military defense as much as nuclear bombs have revolutionized offensive warfare. These have been called "technological break-throughs," but I prefer to call them "technological payoffs." Working undramatically but tirelessly and with brilliant efficiency in laboratories of both basic and applied research throughout our Nation, our scientists, technicians, and engineers have devised radical new weapons and electronic devices which offer the promise of hitherto unattainable degrees of success in detecting, intercepting, and destroying any bombers which might be directed at the industries and cities of this Nation.

With certain of these revolutionary developments you are no doubt familiar. Ground-to-air missiles have catapulted our ability to destroy enemy aircraft. The new generation of high performance jet interceptors, armed with rockets, will bring unprecedented efficiency to the operations of our Air Defense Command. Advances in the detection of aircraft, many of them still highly classified, are likewise here or in the offing.

Science, which has brought to our Nation the deterrent influence of our atomic and hydrogen stockpile, can now be our greatest helper in finding the mechanisms with which to defend ourselves from these selfsame weapons of mass destruction.

We must guard against one danger, however. We must not fall into the error of integrating these new weapons—some of which are already in production, and others still in the design stage—of integrating them into a defensive system more suited for the defensive and offensive weapons of yesterday than for the armaments of today or tomorrow.

Traditionally, defense against bombing formations has been regarded as passive defense—as point defense. That is to say, the air defenses of World War II relied upon surrounding critical target areas with a close-in perimeter of antiaircraft guns and nearby air bases, on which were stationed short-range interceptor aircraft. Against the comparatively low-speed bombers of World War II, with their payloads of conventional explosives, such a passive defense system offered a tolerable degree of protection. But not so today. Now, if we were to wait until enemy planes crossed our borders or approached our seacoasts before activating defensive tactics, we could secure no significant degree of protection whatsoever. A Russian TU-4 bomber—the plane which now constitutes the backbone of the Red air force—would be over this very building in less than 20 minutes after we detected it within 100 miles of New York Harbor. As the piston-driven planes of the Red air force are retired in favor of high-performance jet bombers, the futility of a military plan which relied exclusively upon local or point defense becomes all the more obvious.

If we are to defend ourselves against the planes of today and tomorrow, rather than the planes of yesterday, our first requirement is for advance warning of an impending attack. Today, we would have no more than a few minutes prior notice of approaching bomber formations. My own belief is that we unquestionably need at least 6 hours of advance warning. So long as we are denied such prior notice of an attack, we cannot evacuate our target cities. Neither can we alert and commit to action more than a small fraction of our interceptor aircraft. No less ominous, the planes of our Strategic Air Command might be destroyed on the ground before they could launch a retaliatory blow against an aggressor.

The scientists most knowledgeable concerning this problem are unanimous in believing that we need, and can have, an advance warning system which would detect enemy aircraft long before they reach our borders. The geographic position of our country superbly lends itself to securing such an alert. On the west, our Nation is bounded by the vast stretches of the Pacific Ocean. On the east, 3,000 miles of Atlantic Ocean, and our Western European allies separate us from our Communist adversaries. On the north, 2,000 miles of arctic waste stand between the Soviet Union and the populated areas of Canada. From whichever direction an attacking force might come, west, north, or east, it must traverse vast stretches of water or uninhabited land bemore reaching its destination, the cities of North America.

Space, sheer space, can be, if it is wisely used, an ally of untold worth in creating an effective continental defense system. Almost 4 years have passed since our scientists first proposed putting space to work by establishing an early warning line across the north of Canada, and extending it seaward to the east and the west by means of patrol aircraft and picket ships. More than 2 years have passed since the formidable technical problems involved in making a distant warning system both effective and economical were surmounted. And yet, 4 years after the need for such an early warning line was pointed out, and 2 years after our scientists developed the equipment which would make such a line possible, it is still not in existence. Negotiations with the Canadian Government on the subject of where, how, and by whom the first of such early warning lines would be built and operated have been in progress for nearly 2 years.

Scarcely a week goes by but that we are not reassured through optimistic press releases that these negotiations are proceeding harmoniously, satisfactorily, and with the sense of urgency which the situation requires. We cannot detect enemy planes with press releases or comforting reassurances.

Literally dozens of excellent studies and reports have been made on the problem of continental defense. All of them agree that adequate advance warning of an enemy nuclear attack is the prerequisite of all other measures designed to improve our continental defenses, and that such a warning is possible. If we are subjected to atomic attack before such a system is in actual operation, there will be little satisfaction in the fact that the conclusions of our innumerable studies on continental defense were brilliantly correct. With all the earnestness at my command, I urge that we immediately cease studying the early warning problem and immediately begin the actual construction of an advance warning line.

Today, large sums of money are already being expended on continental defense. Still larger sums will be required in the future to keep our defenses ahead of step-ups in Soviet offensive power. The real need of the moment, however, is not for dollars but for decisions. The need is to translate into reality, as quickly as possible, preparations which are technologically possible and already funded by the Congress.

I have been assured by leading authorities that we can measurably accelerate the presently planned date on which an early warning line will be in operation with a very modest additional outlay of money. I have been assured in addition that significant improvements in the overall effectiveness of our continental defenses during the next 3 years can be made—again without large outlays of dollars, if we put an end to further discussion and instead make positive decisions to get about this job with all possible speed.

One of the main problems now confronting us in this respect is the diffusion of responsibility for continental defense within our Military Establishment. There is no clear-cut line of command along which decisions are channeled from the top civilian planners within the Defense Establishment to the Army, the Air Force, and the Navy units engaged in continental defense. Simply getting to know the facts about continental defense requires traversing one of the most complicated bureaucratic mazes ever to exist in the Pentagon. It is now still more difficult to assign clear and definite responsibility for errors of omission or commission in this field.

In order to correct this situation, which to me is highly unsatisfactory, I plan to introduce legislation which would create a new position within the Defense Establishment—an Assistant Secretary for Continental Defense. To me it is completely ironical that in our whole vast Department of Defense there is no one, officer or civilian, whose responsibility is the defense of our homeland. Such an Assistant Secretary, who would sit in the highest councils of our military planners, would be charged with overall responsibility for coordinating our continental defense effort. Subject of course to the authority of the Secretary of Defense, he would be responsible for drawing together the diverse continental defense activities of the three services into a coherent, integrated program aimed at bringing an effective defensive structure into being as quickly as possible. I earnestly believe that this single administrative step—centralizing responsibility for continental defense within the office of a new Assistant Secretary—will by itself significantly advance the day on which we will have more than token defenses against enemy attack—more than a press release blockade.

The same logic which calls for centralization of the continental defense effort of our own Government argues even more compellingly for unification of the continental defense programs of Canada and the United States. Canada lies athwart the most direct air routes between the Soviet Union and our country's industrial heartland. Without the complete cooperation of our friends to the north, we simply cannot build a realistic continental defense system. In turn, the Canadians are no less dependent upon our assistance.

We Americans sometimes tend to forget, and I fear the Canadians do likewise, that Toronto and Ottawa and Montreal and Vancouver are today as exposed to atomic attack as our own cities, and that Canada's industries and centers of population would constitute prime targets in the event of an enemy assault. The contributions of Canada—in terms of military manpower, armaments, and critical raw materials—loom ever larger in the defense of the free world, and in the event of all-out war, no aggressor could ignore opportunities for eliminating Canada's war potential. Moreover, if America and Canada deprive themselves of the advantages of defense-in-depth—and if we Americans are forced to build a continental defense system exclusively within our own borders, aerial formations unable to penetrate our Nation would forcibly be diverted to target areas in our friendly neighbor to the north. The phrase "continental defense" was not coined accidentally. It is not simply the United States—it is all of North America which is today threatened and which must be protected.

Our two nations must develop an organization to provide a common response to a common threat. Such a common response, I believe, should not be limited to cooperation in the field of early warning of enemy attack. It should be extended to those measures required not only to detect, but to intercept and repel, approaching aerial formations long before they reach the cities of Canada or the United States. If we require enemy planes to penetrate successive barriers of defensive weapons before they reach a target, we shall dramatically alter for the better our ability to turn back—and thereby prevent—an assault against either of our two nations.

The political, tactical, and logistic problems involved in creating a system of interception-in-depth are formidable—but they are far from insurmountable. On technical grounds, it is entirely possible to maintain and operate a complex of interceptor installations in the Arctic. It is entirely possible to extend such a system over the Atlantic and Pacific, through the use of hunter-killer forces modeled on the tactics our Navy has adopted in combating the submarine menace.

I cite but one example of the defensive gains which would accrue from a system of active interception in depth. It is now practical to manufacture small-scale atomic weapons specifically designed for the interception of enemy aircraft. The destructive power of such weapons is such that a single atomic warhead would be far more effective than literally thousands of conventional antiaircraft shells in repelling hostile planes. Yet who would welcome the prospect of using such weapons—for all their efficiency—near the centers of population of our two nations? The prospect, however, is completely different if missiles and rockets with atomic warheads could be employed far out to sea or far above the Arctic wastes, remotely distant from any urban targets.

Yet surely we cannot begin to exploit all the possibilities for a realistic and effective continental defense through independent action of Canada and the United States, or through token coordination of our joint defensive efforts. I, therefore, propose that our Government, as speedily as possible, enter into a mutual continental defense pact with Canada, under the authority of the United Nations, comparable in purpose, scope, and organization with the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. I would envisage as emerging from such a treaty a North American continental defense organization. Army, Navy, and Air Force units from our two nations would be assigned to such a command in a manner akin to the land, sea, and air forces now stationed in Western Europe and reporting to SHAPE headquarters in Paris. Such a North American continental defense organization would be headed by a supreme commander whose responsibility and authority in the field of continental defense would parallel those now exercised by General Gruenther in his position as Supreme Commander of the Allied Powers in Europe.

Would not such a unified North American defense organization be radical and unprecedented? Yes; but no more radical or unprecedented than the threat we now face from the Soviet Union. I submit that all other considerations notwithstanding, it would be suicidal for Canada and the United States not to recognize the new dimensions to sovereignty brought by the threat of atomic and hydrogen warfare.

Continental defense, like any other military problem, involves combining human and material resources into an organizational structure of maximum efficiency. To build a continental defense commensurate with our peril, we, therefore, need three things: More and better weapons and detection devices for discovering, tracking, intercepting, and destroying enemy aircraft. We need unity of organization within our own continental defense effort—which can be brought about by establishing the position of assistant secretary for continental defense. We need unity of organization with our Canadian friends—which can be brought about through a mutual defense pact by establishing a North American defense command.

Far from representing a modern-day version of isolationism, continental defense and isolationism are contradictory terms. Both in terms of the threat which has made it necessary and the measures which will make it effective, continental defense underscores the shrinking nature of our globe and the imperative necessity of working together with our allies toward the goal of a better future.

What the future holds for us no man can say with certainty. Heretofore all prolonged armaments races in history have ended in war, and we shall be relying more on our hopes than on reason or precedent if we decide that the verdict of history will now be amended to take account of nuclear weapons. Yet we must admit these weapons have no parallel in earlier historic epochs—never before has man had within his grasp the capacity to destroy entire civilizations. Sir Winston Churchill, whose prophecies have been so many times correct, has voiced the hope that, in one of the great ironies of history, nuclear weapons, precisely because of the universal destruction which would follow in the wake of their widespread use, may usher in an era of altogether unexpected peace.

Even were this to come to pass, however, no person could cherish the prospect of a peace whose prolongation depended upon a balance of atomic power. Moreover, we shall flaunt all the lessons of recorded history if ever we come to believe that the steel of armaments, even nuclear armaments, can be a permanent substitute for spiritual armament. In all probability military deterring power can do no more than keep open the future for a real peace. It can do no more than buy us time—precious and wasting time—which must be used to build a world in which peace rests not upon the threat of terrible reprisal but upon the respect of man for his fellow man and the prospect for an enlightened justice between all men.

Those of us who are alumni of Colgate University can well thank our famed alma mater on this anniversary of her birth for having taught us those spiritual armaments which have always been man's final sword in times of trouble. Never despairing as we face the future, let us—as alumni of Colgate, as Americans, and as men of good will—now bend our efforts to build the better world of the future—a word which we shall inevitably build if hewn by the cutlass of our spirit, championed by the sword of our hope, and defended by the buckler of our faith.

Rotobroilers: A New Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1954

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, in this amazing country of ours an industry can develop from insignificance to overwhelming import in the space of a very few years. The development of a new industry can have double meaning—it can result in creating jobs where there were none, and if the right kind of a product is involved, it can add to the comfort and improved living conditions of millions of people.

Such an industry, indeed, is that of manufacturing and selling rotobroilers, those amazing portable cookers which every day are finding their way into homes across this great country of ours.

Looking back just a few years would find no mention of rotobroilers in any cookbook. It was not until after World War II that American ingenuity and progress began to make strides in developing this product.

As the capabilities of rotobroilers were developed sales increased. Let us look for a moment at the sales figures of the industry during the past few years: In 1951, $9 million in sales were registered; in 1952 this figure was upped to $13 million; and in 1953 the total sales of rotobroilers was $72 million.

The increase in the number of employees which has come along with these increased sales has, of course, been reflective of the number of sales.

The growth of this industry is, indeed, remarkable considering the short span of years. One manufacturer, the Roto-Broil Corp. of America, recently purchased its second huge plant in the short space of a year and already operates its own stainless steel plating plant and plastic molding division, employing hundreds of people.

For the housewife this new appliance has been a tremendous boon. Consider the fact that she now has a cooking device that will barbecue, roast, toast, boil, broil, grill, fry, and yes, even bake, for her in a compact, portable, table height unit that does not get excessively hot.

Let other nations make their claims for their inventiveness and aggressive-

E

ness. American ingenuity has continued and will continue to make this land a happier and more prosperous place for all to live.

In Justice to the Aged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1954

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, a bill to expand and improve our social security program will soon be before this House. It is a good bill and I expect to support it. However, it still leaves a great many injustices in our program, and it is my intention, therefore, to offer several amendments to it.

One group who are victimized today by legislative oversight are widows of workers who died without becoming fully insured. They are victimized because their spouses died at the wrong time. And the law has never been modified to correct this injustice.

Widows of men who contributed to the social-security fund for as long as 25 quarters before 1951 are today ineligible for survivors benefits under the program, although the widow of a man who died after 1951 after contributing for as little as 18 months or 6 quarters, may receive a benefit up to $63.75 a month as his survivor. How can we justify such discrimination? What is the rationale of such a program?

Mr. Speaker, I have received innumerable letters from women caught in this legal boobytrap.

They are elderly ladies, well beyond the age of employability, and either eligible now, or soon to become eligible for social-security benefits, if the law were fairly written. As it is, they must either eke out a living as best they may, or turn to the bitter bread of charity, with its humiliating investigations and means tests.

Mr. Speaker, it is long past time to correct this injustice. I shall, therefore, offer an amendment to the administration bill which will enable survivors of covered workers to qualify for minimum benefits if such workers contributed to the social-security fund for the minimum period possible under the law, which, under the 1950 amendments was six quarters.

Under leave to extend my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter from a correspondent in Batavia, N. Y., which well illustrates the injustice of the present system:

BATAVIA, N. Y., *April 14, 1954.*

DEAR MR. OSTERTAG: My husband died March 5, 1949, at which time it was required that an applicant for benefits under social security must have had deductions from his pay for 24 quarters. My husband had deductions for only 21 quarters, because prior to that period he was self-employed.

The law passed in 1950 granted benefits to those with only six quarters of deductions, who were living, but forgot survivors of those who passed on. Surely, there is no fairness nor justice in giving benefits to those who contributed for 6 quarters and refusing benefits to those who had contributed for 21 quarters. Sixty-three months of deductions, 45 more than the requirement today, but unfortunately my husband did not live until today. I believe that the term "discrimination" could be correctly used for such laws.

I am leaving my case with you, believing that you will do the best that anyone can do. All good wishes,

Cordially,

(Name withheld.)

I might add, Mr. Speaker, that when I first took up this matter with the Social Security Administration in 1951, it was pointed out that Congress had declined to make the 1950 amendments retroactive, as they affected survivors, because to do otherwise would be "administratively difficult." I can only say that if we are enacting laws here for the convenience of the administrators rather than to secure justice for the people, we have certainly lost sight of the very foundations upon which this Government rests.

The St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1954

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following telegram from David J. McDonald, president, United Steelworkers of America:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *March 4, 1954.*

Representative GEORGE A. DONDERO,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

S. 2150, the bill to authorize participation by the United States with Canada in construction of the St. Lawrence seaway, will soon come before the House of Representatives for consideration and action.

This bill has the support of the United Steelworkers of America for the following reasons:

It is in the interest of the national security; witness its unanimous endorsement by President Eisenhower, the Cabinet, the National Security Council, and the Joint Chiefs of Staff, on this basis.

Its construction is inevitable, Canada's determination to build it alone, in Canadian territory, has determined that; the recent decision of the United States Court of Appeals on the Federal Power Commission license to the power authority of the State of New York has cleared the way for the all-Canadian seaway.

United States industry and agriculture will eventually repay to Canada her investment in the seaway through navigation tolls charged by Canada on traffic originating in, or destined for, the United States; due to the imbalance of population between the two countries, viz, 160 million United States as against 15 million Canada, 85 percent to 90 percent of the potential traffic will be either shipped to, or shipped from, the United States.

This project is unique in that it will produce revenues in the form of navigation tolls that will make it self-sustaining and self-liquidating and will in no way be a burden on the United States taxpayer.

On the basis of the foregoing the United Steelworkers of America urge you to support S. 2150 when it comes before you for consideration on the basis of the national security and welfare.

DAVID J. MCDONALD,
President, United Steelworkers of America.

The Constitution on Trial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ERRETT P. SCRIVNER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1954

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, one of the outstanding oratorical contests each year is that sponsored by the American Legion.

This year's national contest winner was a fine young Kansan, Jack E. McNees, a 15-year-old sophomore at Shawnee-Mission High School, Johnson County, Kans., one of the youngest ever to win the national contest.

Kansas is proud of Jack, his achievements, his coach, Maurice Swanson, and the zeal, energy, and talent that brought him through to final victory and a scholarship which will mean so much to him and his future.

Jack is a credit to the community, State, and Nation, and to his justifiably proud parents, Mr. and Mrs. J. William McNees.

Jack's oration, delivered at Los Angeles April 7, 1954, was on the subject the Constitution on Trial, and is worthy of appearing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

After reading this oration, which follows, you, along with the listeners, can give your answer:

Ladies and gentlemen of the jury, we, the people, who in America are the ultimate arbiters, are met here today in the high court of public assemblage, with God as our judge and history as our witness, to pass judgment on the foundation stone of a republic—the Constitution of the United States.

The charges brought against it are neither new nor unknown to any of you, but, in clarification of the issues at stake, let the indictment be read once again:

"The Constitution is old and outmoded. It was written nearly two centuries ago, before the advent of the machine age, political parties, industrial and international competition, as well as a host of other modern realities which today make it strait-laced, moralizing, impractical, and anachronistic.

"The Constitution yields too much power to the masses. It allows the people to rule unchecked by the rich, the well-born, the pureblooded, and the rest of their natural superiors.

"The Constitution guarantees the most petty unit of modern society—the individual—copious personal rights which, because they are held hallowed and inviolate, gravely impede the necessary evolution of our country toward the benefits of centralized and socialistic government.

"Finally, the Constitution is based on the deistic superstitions of the 18th century and therefore its words have become meaningless; its principles, obsolete."

These accusations against our Constitution are heard by us nearly everyday.

It is time, therefore, that the concepts of America were brought to justice; that the truth were known once and for all about this Constitution of the United States; that the indictment as well as our very Nation itself should either stand or fall.

I speak in defense of America.

Long ago, on some primordial landscape, men first came together and decided that like the wolves, they would form a pack, and that like the wolves, one individual—one—would rule them all.

The civilizations of the next 10,000 years witnessed a procession of sages, saints, and martyrs who strove to lead humanity forth from out of its self-imposed bondage, but these few lone prophets were all too easily crushed and the sultans, czars, and caesars thought they had little to fear.

Then in 1776 the thrones of monarchs and dictators all the world over began to quake and tremble as the voice of an enraged people in 13 oppressed British colonies arose in a mighty affirmation of the freedoms they were ready to die to secure; in an overwhelming denunciation of all the autocracies that had tyrannized mankind since civilization began; in an earthshaking, revolutionary, and heart lifting Declaration of Independence.

"We hold these truths to be self evident," they said, "that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness * * *."

"That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed. That whenever any form of government becomes destructive to these ends, it is the right of the people to alter or abolish it."

The Americans had said it at last. The news was out and, within a generation, the world was in ferment. First, Louis XVI was dragged to the guillotine, then Maximilian to the firing squad, and so the flames of freedom spread, as they are still spreading even today, from nation to nation, from century to century, deposing tyrants and freeing the downtrodden, sweeping across the face of the earth.

With the surrender of Cornwallis, however, the 13 now United States had settled themselves to the most difficult, critical, and complex task of all—the Revolution was over and anarchy was no longer enough: now they must make a government.

This was the all-important turning point, the crisis of our history. Men had thought they'd won freedom before, but because they had failed to make it secure in a tangible bill of rights, all was soon lost to a skillful demogog or dictator.

The men that met in that first American Congress then, looked back over the centuries to the very beginning, even as we have done today, and to all that had come to pass since then. They looked back upon the triumphs, trials, and tragedies of the human spirit in every age and era, in every land and time.

And then, they began to write.

They looked back and saw the British Parliament dissolved by the edict of Cromwell; House of Burgesses disrupted by underlings of the Crown; the early Christians forced into the sewers and catacombs of Rome because forbidden to meet elsewhere, and the men of the Constitution wrote the people shall forever have the right to peaceful, public assemblage.

They looked back and saw the battlefield at Runnymede, King John forced to sign the Magna Carta, habeas corpus at last guaranteed to all freedmen; they saw Copernicus and Galileo, old men in their dying years, dragged before the tribunals of the inquisition and forced to renounce the work of a lifetime; they saw Joan of Arc tried, tormented, and condemned by a court of her arch enemies; and the men of the Constitution wrote the people shall forever have the right to a fair and speedy trial by jury.

They looked back and saw the works of Rousseau, Spinoza, and Voltaire banned because they'd ventured to publish their convictions; saw the press of John Peter Zenger hacked apart because he had dared to print the truth about British injustice; and the men of the Constitution wrote the people shall forever enjoy freedom of the press.

They looked back and saw Socrates forced to drink the cup of poisoned hemlock because he had discoursed on democracy; saw Martin Luther flinging his defiance to a corrupted clergy by refusing to recant a word of his reforms; saw Savanarola burned alive because he'd dared to show wanton Florence its own lustful shame; and the men of the Constitution wrote the people shall forever possess freedom of speech.

Lastly, they looked back and saw the Huguenots of France slain by the hundreds in the St. Bartholomew's Day Massacre; saw the ancient Mayflower braving the fury of an Atlantic storm so that the Pilgrims might worship as they pleased; saw Roger Williams driven into the New England wilderness because he'd protested Salem's witch burnings; finally, they looked back and saw a Jew bolted to the cross atop Golgotha because he had dared introduce a God of love into the world; and the men of the Constitution declared that above all else, the people shall forever hold freedom of religion.

This is our Constitution: as it stands today, as it has stood since 1791—the culmination of 10,000 years' history, a hundred centuries' fight for freedom.

And yet, part of the indictment against the Constitution seemingly still stands:

For to many, it is true, its principles have apparently become outdated; its words have become meaningless; its ideals, obsolete.

But, ladies and gentlemen of the jury, it is not the Constitution—no, it is not the Constitution, indeed, that should be on trial here today for this offense—for it is rather we, the people, who have failed—failed so miserably in our duty to mankind.

Witness the facts: that less than half of us who are qualified usually even bother to vote; that over a fourth of the people cannot even name their own Senator or Congressman; that the front page must take third place behind the scoreboard and the comic strip in America's reading habits; that the great gulfs of segregation and discrimination must still loom between races of men created in the same divine image; that free men, or many of them, will resort to almost any indolent alibi or artifice to avoid jury duty. Yes, this is the indictment against us—that we, the people, the citizens of America have thus so desecrated the high altar of freedom with our own cheap apathy.

But there is yet a hope; our survival no longer depends on the sacrifices of the past, the patronage of our allies, or the contingencies of fortune.

The future, ladies and gentlemen of the jury, rests with you.

Bequeathed to us by unnumbered generations is indeed a noble heritage, one planted in the rich soil of truth, guarded by seven generations' wars, tended by the dignity of time, watered with the blood of patriots, and lighted by the hand of God. It is a heritage that was lived for in the lives of earth's greatest men; it is a heritage that was died for at Waterloo, Rome, and Calvary in no less a degree than it was at Normandy, Guam, and Heartbreak Ridge. It is a heritage that has been entrusted to the American people.

How, then, will history find us—guilty or not guilty?

Guilty? Guilty of apathy, ignorance, and despair? Guilty of not serving, not knowing, not caring? Guilty of a heritage lost? Guilty of a nation's death? Guilty of liberty's demise? Guilty of murder—murder by stagnation, by oblivion, by neglect?

Or are we instead about to rally before it is too late? About to recognize our moral obligation to the consecrated dead for the past, to ourselves for the present and to posterity for all time?

Yes; are we about to arise and again be worthy of time's mighty heritage? To reaffirm its worth, to heighten its glory, deepen its faith, exalt its aim, and to fulfill its vision by realizing the great truth that every freedom engenders its responsibility, that every right begets its duty?

Which is it to be? Shame or glory? Guilty or not guilty? Immortality or extinction? Which is it to be?

The verdict, ladies and gentlemen of the jury, is in your hands—your hands alone—and the world awaits your decision. America rests its case.

JACK MCNEES.

Playing With Political Fire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1954

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to include an editorial from the Newark Star-Ledger, of Newark, N. J., of May 4, 1954, entitled "Playing With Political Fire":

The statement by Stephen A. Mitchell, Democratic National Chairman, that the Republicans sent State Secretary Dulles "to his own funeral" at Geneva, is not only unfair and inaccurate, but a case of playing with political fire of a most dangerous kind.

It would seem that to the "all's fair in love and war" cliché has now been added the phrase "and politics." For were it not that the Nation was approaching an election, there is little chance that this Democratic spokesman would have indulged in the kind of political fire poking that resulted in his making the statement.

Mitchell has charged that (1) Vice President NIXON did a "very great disservice" with his remarks on Indochina; and (2) the administration sent Dulles to Geneva with "a popgun and shot the ground from under him."

NIXON'S speech, of course, was decidedly to the point. He emphasized—as President Eisenhower and Secretary Dulles have pointed out time and again—the necessity of preparing the American people for any emergency that may arise as a result of our determination not to permit this massive area in Asia to fall into Communist hands.

The lesson of permitting the Communists to move into a vacuum created by weak Asiatic nations being left to their own fate, should have been learned in Korea. If you are to believe Mitchell's words, this lesson has not been learned.

As for Dulles' mission to Geneva, it must now be perfectly clear that far from shooting the ground from under him, President Eisenhower has proved beyond all shadow of a doubt that our foreign policy has consistently followed the principle of (1) no diplomatic recognition of Red China; (2) maintaining and increasing our defenses against possible Communist aggression; and (3) participation with Britain and France and the NATO countries in establishing a line of defense in Europe and Asia against further attempts by the Reds to expand their area of domination.

All this we have done while giving the Kremlin every opportunity to show by actions, rather than words, that its attempts at easing the cold war tensions are being made in good faith.

Mitchell knows he was playing politics when he made his statement; so do the Republicans. The question is, however, how the rest of the world—on both sides of the Iron Curtain—took his words.

James E. Stuart, Executive Director of Cincinnati Blue Cross Plan, Endorses H. R. 8356, Health Reinsurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 6, 1954

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, James E. Stuart, executive director of the Cincinnati Blue Cross Plan, gave some very significant and important testimony before the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee at its meeting this morning, in support of H. R. 8356, the health reinsurance bill, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, H. R. 8356, providing reinsurance for voluntary prepayment plans, if enacted into law should, and I believe, will go far toward eliminating existing gaps in coverage for hospital and medical care.

It should be particularly helpful to those plans that provide service benefits instead of cash indemnities toward the cost of personal health services rendered.

To cover the larger employed groups has not been difficult for either the nonprofit service plans or the commercial insurance companies. The cost of acquisition has been small and the level of services provided or benefits paid has been relatively high. For such groups the problem of personal health care during the period of employment is being solved through the voluntary prepayment method of an increasingly satisfactory manner, and fully adequate coverage may be realized without aid of Federal assistance of any kind.

The real problem is and will continue to be the development of a satisfactory method of reaching individuals who are not associated with others through employment in a group of sufficient size to be readily reached by voluntary prepayment. Here voluntary prepayment fails simply because of the cost of acquisition, the fear of bad financial experience because of the degree of selection against the carrier.

In my opinion, the nonprofit Blue Cross Plan can use the proposed reinsurance program effectively to reach such unassociated individuals and the very small employed groups by creating a special grouping of all unenrolled persons living within a city, a county, village or township. Through periodic, intensive enrollment campaigns in which the press, radio, and television as well as civic associations, luncheon clubs and community organizations will be utilized to let everyone know of the opportunity to join during a limited period of time. This community-wide type of enrollment, already tested in many areas on a somewhat limited basis, would be a logical plan or program for reinsurance and would go far toward fulfilling the purposes of the act.

In most areas, such unassociated individuals are now reached only through individual underwriting in which the expense factor is far too great, the benefits far too limited and continuation of protection at the carrier's option. Communitywide enrollment offered for a limited time each year provides an opportunity for such persons to join at little expense to themselves or the carrier and solves a real problem in providing adequate voluntary prepayment to all the people who want it.

Diseases now generally excluded in contracts individually underwritten can be covered and protection without age limits and with waiver of preexisting conditions can be offered. Waiting periods can be eliminated, except for the usual 9 months for maternity benefits.

Most of the experimentation that has been done in this area of community enrollment has been done by Blue Cross. The plan which I represent has done considerable pioneer work and has proved conclusively so far as we are concerned, that it is actuarially possible to provide adequate protection at reasonable rates to people who enroll through the community group method.

In 1942, we started enrolling towns and villages as community groups with the local bank or building and loan association accepting payment of subscription fees. Regular group benefits were provided. By 1949, we had 61 villages, towns, and cities enrolled on this basis, the largest being the city of Middletown, with a population of some 33,000 persons. Today, 82 communities are so enrolled.

In 1949, we decided to have an annual, areawide open enrollment period in the 15 counties in which the Blue Cross plan operates. During a designated 2-week period, which was widely publicized with considerable free time and space given by the press, radio, and television in addition to paid advertising; and with maximum support from community leaders including the mayors of cities and towns, representatives of the various religious faiths and heads of community organizations, membership was offered to all the unenrolled people in our area regardless of place of employment, age, or any other condition.

In each of the following years, we have conducted such an areawide open membership campaign, usually during the first 2 weeks of September. Each year, the number of members enrolled as a direct result of this campaign has increased, beginning with some 25,000 in 1949 to more than 70,000 in 1953. During the past 2 years when more than half of the total population of the area was already Blue Cross members, as much as 10 percent of the unenrolled population made application for membership, at a total acquisition cost of little more than $1 per contract or about 40 cents per member enrolled. This cost is almost insignificant when compared with the usual cost of enrolling individuals without group affiliation.

We have found such unlimited areawide enrollment programs to be practical actuarially as well as promotionally. The actuarial key to such enrollment is that a new group of members must be added each year to prevent the deterioration of risk that takes place in any static group. For example, in 1952, hospital bills of all members who enrolled during all four prior open membership periods amounted to 79.1 percent of subscription fee income. However, with those who enrolled during the September 1952 campaign excluded, the hospital utilization amounted to 99.44 percent of income.

Perhaps surprisingly for some is the age distribution of members enrolling during our areawide open membership periods. The following is an analysis of such subscribers by age for the last three campaigns:

Age distribution of applicant or contract holder

	1951	1952	1953
81 and over	2.2	2.5	2.6
71-80	10.7	10.5	10.8
61-70	16.8	17.3	16.6
51-60	17.1	16.5	15.6
41-50	16.1	16.4	15.6
31-40	15.9	16.7	16.5
Under 30	21.2	20.1	22.3

Few plans have put on such campaigns and only one, so far as I know, has opened up membership to all people in the community regardless of age or place of employment.

Legislation such as H. R. 8356 would encourage many Blue Cross plans, and possibly all, to make community-wide enrollment available with regular benefits at reasonable rates. From the viewpoint of the Blue Cross plan which I represent, reinsurance might well be used for even further extension of the community enrollment idea.

For example, the preexisting condition clause now used only in the area-wide open enrollment campaign, and waived after 1 year of membership, might be eliminated altogether. The number of days of coverage might be extended from the present 70 provided in this contract, and Blue Shield surgical and medical protection might be offered at the same time.

In addition to community enrollment of cities, villages, townships, and the area-wide enrollment described above, if the proposed legislation is enacted some Blue Cross plans will present for reinsurance a program of major medical expense to provide coverage in catastrophic types of illness requiring long-term care. Such major medical expense coverage is now being offered to some extent by the insurance industry but so far as I know, the reinsurance of such a program, which might be offered by the nonprofit plans, is not now available. In order for Blue Cross and Blue Shield to protect and maintain their present basic coverage on a service basis, it will probably be necessary for these plans to offer coverage for extended illness. The insurance company which offers the major medical expense coverage may well demand and secure the basic coverage also.

It is also possible that all Blue Cross plans acting through the Blue Cross Association, Inc. (a nonprofit organization incorporated under the laws of Illinois), will present a plan of loss ratio reinsurance for the total Blue Cross movement in the United States and thus through reinsurance provide a guarantee fund to protect the solvency of any Blue Cross plan providing service benefits to its members.

The adaptability of the provisions of H. R. 8356 to provide assistance in the aforementioned areas as well as in other situations makes it a major step in the direction of eliminating existing gaps in personal health protection through the voluntary prepayment plans.

The General Tax Revision Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 6, 1954

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, in the general tax-revision bill we recently passed in the House of Representatives, we filled the longfelt need when we wrote into that legislation a provision that all taxable annuities or pensions received by annuitants or pensioners up to and including the first $1,200 would be exempt from any taxes. This legislation will give relief to retired schoolteachers, municipal employees and annuitants and pensioners in other categories. It was a splendid step and will be greatly appreciated by those in the teaching profession and others who will benefit by such legislation.

It embodies the main provisions of the Mason bill, H. R. 5180, which were merged in the general tax-revision bill by the Ways and Means Committee and passed by the House. The Mason bill would have gone a step farther and made certain provisions for those who found it necessary to retire before reaching 65 years of age.

This general tax-revision bill was passed and sent to the Senate and now is being given consideration by the Senate Finance Committee of that body. I hope that body will give particular consideration to liberalizing this particular provision referred to, which would provide for retirements, under certain conditions, at less than 65 years of age.

Schedule of Meetings in the Seven Counties of My District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 6, 1954

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, since I have been in Congress I have always attempted to keep in close contact with the people of the 17th Ohio District, whom I represent.

While a Congressman is expected to have a broad grasp of national and international matters, and to give information on many troublesome subjects, I deem it most advisable to keep in touch with the people of our district so that I might have their views and endeavor to be of service to them in their personal problems.

Having been assured by the leadership that the Congress will not be in session, I will again, this year, follow the procedure of holding meetings in the courthouses of the seven counties in my district.

I have established the following schedule:

Monday and Tuesday, August 23 and 24, Ashland, Ashland County.

Wednesday and Thursday, August 25 and 26, Mansfield, Richland County.

Friday and Saturday, August 27 and 28, Mount Vernon, Knox County.

Monday and Tuesday, August 30 and 31, Delaware, Delaware County.

Wednesday and Thursday, September 1 and 2, Newark, Licking County.

Friday and Saturday, September 3 and 4, Millersburg, Holmes County.

Tuesday and Wednesday, September 7 and 8, Coshocton, Coshocton County.

Weekdays 9 a. m. to 5 p. m. Saturday conferences will last only until noon, when the courthouse closes.

It is surprising how much can be accomplished when a citizen and his Congressman can sit down and talk over national and personal problems.

No appointments are necessary for these conferences and I urge any or all of my constituents to meet with me on the date most convenient to them.

With the knowledge thus obtained, I know I will be better able to truly represent them in the Congress of the United States.

Let Us Use Our Abundance To Help Needy Americans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 5, 1954

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement to be made by me before the Committee on Agriculture, House of Representatives, May 7, 1954:

Mr. Chairman, we have heard a great deal indeed during the past few years concerning agricultural surpluses. In many instances these agricultural supplies are referred to as "burdensome surpluses" and as "agriculture's leading problem." To be sure, supplies which are allowed to accumulate out of proportion to desirable carryover stocks and which are in danger of deteriorating to the extent of becoming unfit for human consumption adversely affect farm prices and present serious difficulties to those who are charged with the responsibility of administering the numerous programs through which surpluses must be distributed.

According to recent estimates, about 70 percent of the world's population is underfed, and with the cost of living at an all-time high, many millions of our own citizens, living on fixed incomes such as social-security payments, pensions or other forms of compensation, simply cannot afford to enjoy an adequate diet. If unemployment increases, a growing number of low-income families may lack proper nutrition.

Millions of our citizens who have retired after long years of service to their country and who have planned for their advanced years, either through private annuities or through the social-security program, have for some time been finding it increasingly difficult to buy the foods required for an adequate diet because of their fixed incomes and a constantly increasing cost of living. While the cost of living has continued to increase, there has been little or no adjustment in social security or other pension or compensation benefits to offset these rising costs.

In view of these conditions it appears ironic that we in the United States speak of burdensome surpluses. We are indeed a fortunate Nation to be blessed with abundant resources and the capacity to produce an abundance of food and industrial products to provide a high standard of living for our own people and for export to other nations. Certainly this productive capacity should not be viewed as a serious problem, rather it should be looked upon as a great blessing. It can be considered a problem only if we do not find ways to bring the two sides of the market, supply and demand, together, and means to make it possible for our citizens to purchase and consume the products of agriculture as well as nonagricultural products.

This high standard of living in the United States is a model for the world of what free people can achieve—an accomplishment which no form of communism or totalitarianism can match. That standard of living cannot be maintained and improved under a program of scarcity. A plentiful food supply is an indispensable element to a fuller material life for all of our people. If the time ever comes that we are faced with shortages of the various foods and fibers then we would be justified in speaking of problems, far more serious than those of surpluses.

As we look at our carryover stock of agricultural commodities and those held in price-support inventories, there is a tendency to take a short-time view of the situation and think of the accumulation of stocks as something that will continue. However, if we should be so unfortunate as to experience a serious drought or a major crop failure in any one year we would have no surpluses, but instead we would be faced with the problem of inadequate supplies.

There is one other important factor that often escapes mention in all of these discussions concerning excessive food supplies, and that is the fact that our population is increasing at the rate of about 2½ million people each year who need to be fed. Looking ahead, say to 1960, we are likely to have a population close to 175 million people. If the people in this country in 1960 consume food and other farm products at the same rate as in this past year, our domestic consumption of farm products would then be about 9 percent higher than this past year. On this basis, by 1960 we would probably need about 2 billion more pounds of meat each year, nearly 500 million dozen more eggs, an additional billion pounds of milk solids, and approximately 8 million tons more feed grains than we produced in 1952, as well as greatly increased quantities of fruits and vegetables.

It is my belief that H. R. 9048, "A bill to provide supplementary benefits for recipients of public assistance under Social Security Act programs through the issuance to such recipients of certificates to be used in the acquisition of surplus agricultural food products" is a step in the right direction in using our abundant food supplies to assist needy citizens of the United States.

This bill provides that each individual receiving assistance or benefits for any month under a program of old-age assistance, aid to dependent children, aid to the blind, or aid to the permanently and totally disabled provided for in the Social Security Act, as amended, shall be entitled to receive, as a supplementary benefit for such month, $10 in face amount of surplus food certificates to be applied by these individuals toward the retail purchase price of surplus agricultural food products. The agricultural products to be available for purchase with these certificates will be those announced each month by the Secretary of Agriculture and will include those commodities the supply of which exceeds domestic demand to such an extent as to depress the market price below the parity price.

The provisions of this bill have several merits. First, it makes it possible for needy people in this country to consume an additional $10 worth of food per month and at the same time prevents an equivalent quantity from going into storage. The program carried out under this bill will assist in reducing stocks of those commodities which are now in storage and will help prevent future accumulation of excessive food supplies.

There have been numerous proposals to give our surplus food to other friendly countries to relieve suffering and strengthen the cause of democracy throughout the world. While this is a most worthy cause and one that should not be overlooked, we can still make it possible for our own people to enjoy the advantages of our abundant production.

In view of the merits of H. R. 9048, I sincerely hope the bill will receive early consideration and passage by the Congress.

There are several bills before the Congress which have for their purpose the stimulation of consumption and use of our abundant foods and fibers. Mr. HARRISON of Nebraska has introduced an interesting proposal to accept foreign currencies for our agricultural products. I feel we should be willing to take new approaches and to experiment with proposals tending to encourage use of our productive capacity instead of curtailment of it. I hope the committee will feel inclined to go along with and try as many ways as possible to base our solution of our so-called surplus problem on increased use and consumption both at home and abroad.

Italian-American Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1954

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Clinton Item, of recent date:

ITALIAN-AMERICAN VETERANS

Before the Italian-American Veterans in Leominster last night, Congressman PHILIP J. PHILBIN, who was honored with a plaque by the club for his service, roundly denounced what he termed the hysterical approach to current world problems based on spreading undue fear among the American people regarding the A- and H-bombs.

"Fortunately the Nation is thoroughly aware of the threat of world communism and its diabolical methods," he said. "The people are not only aroused but determined to check the spread of this evil and Godless movement. But we must never permit ourselves to fall a prey to the current propaganda of the enemies of democracy who are working to spread unreasoning hysteria throughout the country and the world about the possible use of atomic and hydrogen weapons in warfare."

"There is no prospect in my opinion that any nation presently could seriously contemplate the use of such weapons," he continued. "If in a moment of madness, zealots should decide upon such a course, the power of this Nation to retaliate would be swift and truly terrible. I do not look for such attacks, however, and I do not look for war."

"Rather than generating public furore, it must be the province of American statesmanship to exercise calm, balanced judgment, and to seek the outlawing of these and other terrible weapons by all nations and the speedy conversion of all these dangerous substances to constructive peacetime uses."

"It is peace we should seek with all our hearts and it must be a just peace," he declared. "It cannot be based upon appeasement of those who are aiming to destroy our system of government, nor can it be secured by intemperate talk and the brandishing of atomic weapons."

PHILBIN praised the club for its stanch Americanism and loyalty and work for good causes. "There is no group in the Nation," he said, "more loyal and devoted than yours, and you may be proud of both your great heritage and your many contributions to America. Keep them up."

Open Letter About Indochina

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1954

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I incorporate in the Appendix of the RECORD an open letter written to me by R. R. Brinkeroff, owner and publisher of the Utica Herald, of Utica, Ohio. Mr. Brinkerhoff, known to thousands of people as "Brink," has asked some very important questions. I think his article merits the serious consideration of this Congress. I also incorporate in the RECORD, Mr. Speaker, my reply. They follow:

[From the Utica (Ohio) Herald of April 29, 1954]

AN OPEN LETTER TO OUR CONGRESSMAN ABOUT INDOCHINA—EDITOR WANTS TO KNOW WHY SEND AMERICAN BOYS TO DIE IN BLOODY JUNGLE

Hon. J. HARRY MCGREGOR,
Representative, 17th Ohio,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR HARRY: All this war talk by the President, the Vice President, some of your fellow Congressmen and the high brass of the Army has me worried.

Are these men, otherwise of sound mind, seriously considering sending American boys to fight and die in those bloodstained Indochinese jungles in a war that they care nothing about?

Why should American boys died to protect people who will not fight for their own country and for a country where it is impossible to tell friend from foe?

Surely these supposedly smart men know that the war with Russia, when and if it comes, will not be decided in the jungles of Asia but in Europe and probably in the skies over Europe.

Are Russian soldiers being sent to Indochina? Of course not. The Commies are too smart for that. They get the Chinese to do their fighting for them just as they did in Korea.

Why then should we be dumber than the Russians? Why don't we use Chinese troops if we must fight the Commies over there? Formosa is running over with Chinese troops who have been training, training, training for years with American help and with American tax dollars, some of them mine and yours and the folks in your district.

What have these Free Chinese been training for? To fight the Red Chinese? Then here's their chance.

I am absolutely opposed to this business of sending American boys all over the world to fight wars for nations that show little interest in the matter themselves.

Furthermore, I can't understand why we are so afraid of hurting the delicate sensibilities of these nations in which we have poured and are still pouring billions of the taxpayers' dollars. It's an old saw but still true that "He who pays the piper has the right to call the tune."

I know that you and Mrs. McGregor were mighty glad to get your son back home safe and sound from the Korean mess. Do you want to send him and other boys into a still worse mess?

You've always been a pretty sound-thinking man for my money, HARRY, and I hope that good old Ohio horse sense still is working.

Keep our boys out of China.

With kindest personal regards,
Sincerely yours,
R. R. BRINKERHOFF.

MAY 5, 1954.

Mr. R. R. BRINKERHOFF,
Editor and Publisher, Utica Herald,
Utica, Ohio.

DEAR BRINK: Yesterday I voted in Ohio, and this morning I find on my desk in Washington your open letter relative to sending American boys to fight on foreign soil and your recommendation that Chinese troops on Formosa be sent against the Communist troops in Indochina, which evidently appeared in your newspaper on April 29.

I apologize for the delay, as you certainly were entitled to a prompt reply, but, as stated above, I was back in Ohio voting.

Brink, I have always contended that our Armed Forces should not be sent to a foreign country without an act of Congress. You raise the question of Indochina. I firmly believe that if anyone interferes in that conflict it should be the United Nations. By this, I mean all members of the United Nations who are opposed to dictatorship. I am definitely opposed to the United States carrying the flag of freedom and allowing the rest of the countries of the world to sit idly by. You mentioned the Nationalist Chinese be allowed to fight in Indochina. We must remember, Brink, that the Nationalist Chinese were driven off the mainland because of the actions of the previous administration, and especially the military leaders. I certainly am in acord that the Nationalist Chinese should participate, but I also am most emphatic that some of our other so-called Allies should realize that they are a part, and should be an active part, in protecting the freedoms of the world. In other words, Brink, it is time for us to say "No" to the countries of the world who sit idly by while we send American boys and girls to fight in foreign countries.

Your comments relative to our son, Laird, are greatly appreciated. The McGregors know what it means to have a son wounded on foreign soil. We join with you and Mrs. Brinkerhoff in being willing to do anything humanly possible to stop communism, and we also join with you in saying let all the freedom-loving countries participate and not just the United States.

With kind regards.
J. HARRY MCGREGOR,
Member of Congress.

Seaway Before the House

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1954

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post and Times-Herald of May 6, 1954:

Seaway Before the House

The House vote on the St. Lawrence seaway bill scheduled for today will be one of the most important tallies of the present session of Congress. As sponsors of the bill emphasized yesterday, this is in a very literal sense the last chance the House will have to pass upon this issue. If it should fail to support the administration and the Senate, which have already endorsed the St. Lawrence project, Canada will promptly begin construction of an all-Canadian seaway. Failure of the United States to participate in so vital a project would be a grave misfortune which future generations of Americans would never cease to regret.

Both the United States and Canada need the seaway. They need the power it will generate, the great advantage that it will give to shipping by means of a deep channel linking the Atlantic Ocean to the Great Lakes, and the added security it will afford. Indeed, the argument has already been resolved in favor of the seaway. The only issue the House has to decide is whether the United States should claim the advantage of being an equal partner. We hope that the decision will be forthright and that American participation will not be clouded by any sabotage schemes such as the Brownson amendment. The national interest, in our opinion, demands an overwhelming affirmative vote for the seaway.

The Constitution Is Your Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. GWINN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 2, 1954

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following article by Clarence Manion which appeared recently in Spotlight:

The Constitution Is Your Business

(By Clarence Manion)

We are a country of highly organized special interests. Everybody is concerned with his special interest and indeed has to be in this highly organized and thoroughly competitive age. But what alarms me is that seldom, if ever, do I find any organization that is brought together in the general interest. And it is precisely the general interest of the United States that is in need of help and attention. If I should ask you to tell me what phase or branch of industry you represent, we would call the roll of all the enterprises, manufacturing, merchandising, exploration, advertising, transportation. That's your business, isn't it? That the great mistake we all make. Your business is only incidentally the business of merchandising and manufacturing and selling and transporting.

The Constitution is your business. It's the only business you have. If it weren't for the Constitution, there wouldn't be any business in this country that is private in nature. And if you permit the foundation of all business enterprise to be innervated or subverted, then you won't be in business any longer. You will be at the beck and the call of totalitarian direction.

Let me give you two recent historical events, both of which ought to be well known to you. A few months ago, the government of Guatemala seized 230,000 acres of land belonging to the United Fruit Co. What did the United Fruit Co. do about it? Nothing. There isn't anything that anybody can do about the seizure of their property in Guatemala. There isn't any constitution in Guatemala worthy of the name. It's full of escape hatches through which the dictator can crawl at his convenience. And Guatemala is not behind the Iron Curtain yet. Guatemala is just behind our backs.

About the same time, the then President of the United States seized the steel properties of the country and what did the owners of the steel mills do about it? They went to the courts and asserted their constitutional rights. The courts and, ultimately, the Supreme Court decided that the President had exceeded his powers and they ordered the President to return the properties to their owners, which the President did. All of us took that news calmly. Here and there, there was a toast to the good old Constitution. Beyond that, there wasn't a ripple of interest or of recollection.

But I want to remind you and urge you to remember the disparity between the Guatemalan seizure and the seizure in the United States of America. What took place in Guatemala is what is taking place all over the world. Not merely behind the Iron Curtain, but in front of it. What took place in the steel case takes place only in the United States of America.

This is the only place on earth where an individual can force his government to respect his rights, and that's the very definition of liberty; and that is why I say the Constitution is your business. It is the license under which you continue to operate as a private property owner and as a private enterpriser. And I direct your attention to the Constitution and to the jeopardy in which it finds itself.

The United States of America, which is the hope and envy of mankind, is merely the incarnation of four basic political convictions, and when those convictions disappear, disintegrate, or are subverted, the United States will collapse. The hope of the world will disappear.

What are those four facts? After all, it isn't difficult to recall when the United States was a vacant lot and there wasn't any United States; and onto that vacant space some architects came with a plan for reconstruction—the only time in the world when a political organization was planned in advance. It didn't evolve; it was made, deliberately, according to a prescription which was advertised to the world. And that expression, that plan, that blueprint is known as the American Declaration of Independence.

Did you ever hear of it? Well, try to find a copy some place. It's difficult. There you find the four facts of American life expressed with the first breath of the new life of this Republic.

No. 1: "We hold this truth to be self-evident," they said, "that all men are created * * *." There is a God, in other words. God exists according to this blueprint, not as a matter of faith, but as a matter of fact; the fact of God's existence is postulated and built into cornerstone No. 1 of the Republic. And remember that "We hold this truth to be self-evident * * *."

No. 2. "That all men are created equal." And here is the most bedeviling phrase in anybody's language today—human equality. How equal can people be? What are the limitations and potentialities of human equality? The Russians are selling a brand of human equality around the world; and millions of people are buying it. They want to be equal. What is the natural law of equality? What is the fact of equality?

It says here, "All men are created equal." All men, in other words, are equal in God's sight. That's the precise expression, "in God's sight"; and for that reason, they are equal before the law of the land, because if I know anything about the law of the land it is merely a projection of God's law—equality before God—equality before the law and beyond that inequality in every conceivable way. Did you ever hear anybody advertising the limitations of human equality? Do you think you're all equal, one to another? Do you think it is possible to make you equal?

I ask you to take a look at that fingerprint of yours. J. Edgar Hoover says there is only one like it on earth. You are the only man or woman who now lives or who has ever lived who had that distinctively individual trade mark. Contemplate it. Think of an allwise providence that breathes in into you a mark of differentiation from everybody else on earth. And do you think that's the end of your individuality? No, that's only the beginning. Everything about you is different. God made men and women, each of whom is different from every other one; and in that difference lies the secret of civilization.

Thank God for those differences. Some want to be farmers, some want to be fabricators, some want to be politicians, professors; out of that great difference in ambition and in energy and in aptitude and in intellect, we are fed and clothed. Did you ever realize that? There's only one thing missing in that great heterogeneous mass of differences necessary to spark a great civilization like ours—that's freedom. These intellects, these energies, these ambitions, this enterprise need to be free in order to achieve; and that brings us to:

No. 3: "We hold this truth to be self-evident," they said, "that all men are endowed (not by the Constitution or the Bill of Rights, but) by their Creator with certain unalienable rights and amongst these are life and liberty." It so says, "life and liberty" joined together, inseparable, unalienable, as gifts of God. Liberty is as important to human nature as life is. Without liberty, man disintegrates—so that's the third great fact of life—the divine origin of rights and obligations because obligations are just the reverse side of the coin of right. And now, finally, for the fourth fact of life.

How to preserve this human freedom—that's the $64 question. How to keep men free? Now, they had not to observe but to invent * * * to make something—fact No. 4: "We hold this truth to be self-evident," they said, "that to secure these rights, to protect these gifts of God, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed." Man makes government to protect the gift God gave to man.

We begin to get perspective. Government is last, not first. God is first; government is last; and now the opposition to communism begins to be rationalized. It's the fact of God's existence that puts government in its place—that puts natural limitations upon government which man has a moral obligation to enforce—that keeps government a servant, lest it develop into a master.

Every totalitarianism that ever existed was materialistic and godless because, where there is no God, government is god. That's why communism is godless; that's why every tyranny from Herod to Hitler was godless. It's the fact of God that subordinates government. You businessmen better advertise the fact of God, not to save your souls—I'm not worried about them; I'm worried about saving your civilization. The fact of God is first in the order of importance.

Now about government—how to keep it confined; how to keep it in its place. There are many unfortunate notions about government today. Government is, according to these specifications, a tool, a device, manufactured to do a special job, like a lathe or a drill press; it's a dangerous tool; and then, for the first time, in any age of history, they tied their government down; they limited it; they controlled it; they made it serve rather than master them; and that's the rationale of your history—this inseparable logical linking between the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States.

There are three things that you must sell: You must sell the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution of the United States, and, yes, the Ten Commandments of God. Because when all this was done, somebody asked James Madison why this Government won't work. "Nobody has ever done this to government before. It won't function. You can't treat government like this; it has no power." And Madison answered classically. He said: "We have staked the whole future of American civilization not upon the power of government, far from it, but upon the capacity of mankind for self-government."

Better advertise that. Tell them what William Penn said 100 years before the Declaration of Independence was written. "Those people who will not be governed by God will be ruled by tyrants." The Founding Fathers knew it. Our generation should know it. Those people who will not, in other words, govern themselves according to the laws of their Creator will be ruled by a despotism. It was so in every age of history. It will be so with us.

Self-government, self-restraint, moral consciousness, that's the price of your constitutional system, and so the Ten Commandments have come back into currency. Sell those three things: God's commandments, the blueprint for freedom, the Declaration of Independence, and the constitutional confinement of government in the interests of freedom because there isn't any definition of freedom that isn't contained in the phrase "limited government."

Forty years ago, Woodrow Wilson said something that ought to be on a few billboards. Woodrow Wilson said, "The history of liberty is the history of the limitation of governmental power." He said, "When we resist the concentration of governmental power, we resist the processes of death, because," he added, and this is important, "a concentration of governmental power is what always precedes the death of human liberty."

Today, 40 years later, the Communists have taken Wilson's phrase and paraphrased it into a command. The Communists say, "A concentration of governmental power is what must precede the death of human freedom." And so they first concentrate power and then they seize it, as they seized it in Czechoslovakia and in Hungary and in Bulgaria and Rumania and Latvia and Lithuania—in 15 separate nations containing 600 million people, since the end of World War II.

First, they consolidated control over the police; then they consolidated control over the ballot boxes; and then the people, in terror of the police, voted themselves behind the Iron Curtain. There wasn't any marching Russian army. There were no dropped bombs. Czechoslovakia voted almost unanimously to go behind the Iron Curtain; so did 600 million people in that greatest conquest of all time.

You think they won't try it on us? Their first objective is to concentrate power and when the Communist conspirator comes to this country he looks first for the centralized control of the police. And where does he find that? He goes to Washington. He has Dexter White or Alger Hiss or somebody ready to take over the job. But he can't find the centralized control over the police because with the remarkable prevision of their generation, the Founding Fathers decentralized the control of the police. It is not in Washington. Police are controlled in the States of the Union, and the cities and the hamlets of the United States, by constitutional provision. There isn't any consolidation over the power of the police. Police control is a State control, not because of anything you did or I did but because of something the Founding Fathers wisely did before the word Communist was current.

And then they look for the ballot boxes; and where do they find those? In Washington, controlled by the Minister of Voting? They find the ballot boxes dispersed through 48 independent constitutional jurisdictions called States. Voting qualification is a State right; 48 different places, 48 different rules.

And, last of all is the land. The land which they want to confiscate is the first act of the Communist government. Where is the central control of the land? How can they get their hands on that? They look for it in Washington and they don't find it there. They find land controlled by the wise prevision of the Founding Fathers—not in Washington but—in 48 separate, individual constitutional jurisdictions called State land, and property is locally controlled under State law. Keep it that way. States' rights is your best defense against communism. Defend States' right. Learn about them. Understand them.

Of course, the Pentagon has its part to play; so do the other expensive measures that we use to defend ourselves against marching Russian armies and dropping Russian bombs. But I remember what the Communist told me in Notre Dame, who had lately escaped from the Daily Worker, a decade ago. "The Constitution," he said, "is the greatest frustration of the Communist conspirators in the United States of America." And how few of us know it. They know it. The Constitution of this country is your greatest protection.

* * * * *

I know how human we are, how reluctant to take upon ourselves the burden of saving our fellow man, but it isn't George's job. Don't expect George to do it. He won't do it. He hasn't done it. I've talked to him. He isn't interested at all. You must do it, each and every one of you. If you're troubled with apathetic sickness, I'll tell you how to get rid of it.

I had a client the other day, believe it or not; and what is more extraordinary, a paying client. We had been working with him for weeks to try to insulate him against the post-mortem impacts of the Federal tax collector. You know what I mean? Don't know how much good we did but we went through all of the usual motions. We had created a big trust agreement. He'd rewritten his will and the will of his wife. We made gifts, inter vivos of course. They were all inter vivos; none of them were causa mortis, lawyers take notice. We had had deeds of land, oh yes, life-insurance policies reassigned, bank accounts readjusted, a big stack of documents on the desk.

My client had reached the signing stage and he was signing away with a big smile on his face. At that point, I interrupted hilm. I said, "John, you seem to be getting a kick out of this." I wasn't getting any kick out of it. I was fed up with it, tired, and disgusted.

John laid down his pen and looked at me, still smiling. He said, "Pat, I certainly do get a kick out of this. You know, I'm an old man. I'm ready to admit it to you. I've been pretty successful. I've accumulated quite a bit of property, more than I ever thought I would be able to count. Unfortunately, I lost my wife a few years ago. I have some lovely children and grandchildren. I'd like to have them have some of this property. I knew that unless I sat down and did something like this, it would all go to the four winds and the rest of it would go to the Government." He said, "I think we've done the best we could. I'm very happy. I'm going to sleep tonight." He started to sign again.

At that, I interrupted him a second time. I said, "John, now that you've taken care of their property, what are you going to do about their liberty?" John didn't even stop this time. He just laughed out loud, shrugged his shoulders. "Liberty," he said, "I don't know anything about liberty. I'm just a merchant. I'll just have to leave liberty to the politiicans and the professors."

Then I told him something that I'm going to tell you. "Tear up the trust agreement. Tear up the will. Throw away the life-insurance policies. Forget the bank account. Forget the common stock. Forget everything. Because unless you leave your children liberty, you leave them nothing at all.

"Ask the Jews in Germany. Ask the well-propertied Jews in Germany what good their property and their wealth did them when they were faced up against the concentrated, unlimited power in the hands of Adolf Hitler. Ask the ghosts of 10 million Kulaks murdered by Joe Stalin. Ask those ghosts, 'Say, fellows, you had lots of property. What good did it do you when you were faced up against the concentrated, unlimited power called communism?' "

Wherever you ask the question and of whomsoever you ask it, the answer comes back, always the same. In time of unlimited, concentrated government, your property is going to buy your children just one thing—a ticket to the concentration camp: a one-way ticket to the point of no return. So will you please think about that the next time you pay that life-insurance premium, the next time you put a codicil on that will, the next time you stash away a few dollars for the new grandchild?

Think about it, please, particularly when you look at those children and those grandchildren. Gather them around you and take a look at them, as I have looked at mine. Then ask yourself one question: "How much power, how much unlimited, concentrated power, is my Government going to have when these youngsters are as old as I am?"

Ask yourself that question, my friends. That will do it. I guarantee that it will do it. Then and there you'll make a resolution that your legacy, not of property but of liberty, to these, your children, is going to compare favorably to the big fortune of freedom that the Founding Fathers left to you.

Israel's Sixth Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS B. HELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1954

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, this weekend the State of Israel is celebrating the sixth anniversary of its independence. The citizens of that country and the many friends of Israel in the United States and throughout the world will rejoice on this occasion, although their joy is tempered by the fact that Israel still has not been successful in establishing peaceful relations with its neighbors.

In fact, at this very moment, tension between Israel and the Arab States is reaching new heights because of the constant friction and border incidents. Open hostilities may break out unless the United States and the United Nations succeed in convincing the Arab countries that peace is imperative in the Near East and that they will be endangering the security of the whole area if they persist in their warlike acts and provocations.

Unfortunately, our own country has recently embarked upon a policy of so-called "impartiality" as between Jews and Arabs, which only serves the cunning purposes of the Arab States. The most recent phase of this policy of impartiality is to enter into agreements with individual Arab States whereby American arms and military supplies are made available to them, ostensibly against possible Soviet aggression in the Near East. Such an agreement was announced last week with Iraq, and a similar agreement is reported to be in the final stages of negotiation with Saudi Arabia.

It is of interest to recall that Iraq's military forces were among the first to invade Israel when the latter declared its independence just 6 years ago. Now, we are informed that the military aid being made available to Iraq by the United States is being done so unconditionally. Under such circumstances, it is proper to ask: What will prevent Iraq from using these arms from America against Israel?

When I question the wisdom of our diplomacy in the Near East at this time, I do so because I am convinced that its present policy is fraught with great danger for the peace, the security and the stability of the Middle East. We are coddling the Arabs at the expense of Israel, our only true ally and friend in that area.

On this occasion of Israel's anniversary, we should reconsider our relationship with that country and seek to reaffirm our bonds of friendship and cooperation with it. Its people are staunch believers in the principles of freedom and human dignity, as are the American people. We must therefore continue to help Israel preserve its freedom and independence, to make her economically self-sustaining, and militarily secure.

In this spirit, let us renew our cordial relationship between the United States and Israel, and let us extend to the Government and people of Israel our congratulations and sincerest wishes for genuine peace for them and for all mankind. May the coming year see Israel at peace with its neighbors and with the world, and may it continue to grow and develop as a free and independent nation.

We Should Pursue the FHA Investigation With All Speed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1954

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend and revise my remarks, I am concerned about the apparent failure to push the investigations into the Federal Housing Administration frauds and irregularities. The investigations which started off with so many charges and so many promises now seem to be bogged down. We hear little from the investigators and see less in the papers. Congress cannot afford to let this scandal go dry on the vine.

The American people want a full and complete investigation of FHA frauds and wrongdoing. If there is nothing wrong, we should complete the investigation fully and exonerate the Federal housing agency and its officials of wrongdoing. On the other hand, if fraud, corruption, and dishonesty are found in FHA transactions, these matters should be given to the public with all possible speed, and regardless of who is involved, proper penalties for fraud, corruption, and dishonesty should be applied.

Of course, only a full investigation can disclose what has been done. From what I have read and heard, and what I believe, it is my judgment that the Government has been fleeced by wrongful use of its credit, tens of millions of dollars. This has been done, I am informed, by falsifying of records, by getting wrongful appraisements, by watering charges made against construction, and causing the issuance of Government guaranty in instances not justified and in other instances beyond the limit of the guaranty which is justified under the statute. These are all technical matters. They may involve officials of Government, lending agencies, contractors, and business people. The chips should fall where they may; wherever the blight of corruption and dishonesty casts its sinister shadow, there investigators should be found. The American people want and expect punishment of those who have betrayed their trust as Government officials, and they want punishment meted out to private interests who, in violation of our laws, have gotten rich in times of emergency when the Government was trying to help its people on housing programs.

Regardless of how the violations have occurred, and regardless of whom they touch, the investigation should proceed and proceed quickly.

Senator BYRD started with an investigation but I have recently heard little further from his investigating committee. Senator CAPEHART has announced an investigation and the Housing Administration has announced an investigation.

The more of these investigations where dishonesty and corruption is involved, the better we like it.

W. H. J. Hipple III, of Atlantic City, N. J., Testifies in Favor of H. R. 8356

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1954

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, the testimony of W. H. J. Hipple III, of Atlantic City, N. J., before the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee at its hearing this morning, is highly important with regard to the favorable attitude expressed in support of the provisions of H. R. 8356. Mr. Hipple's statement is as follows:

My name is William Hipple. I am from Atlantic City, N. J. I am occupied there as an estate analyst and in that capacity I represent several life-insurance companies and a number of health and accident organizations. The ensuing statements do not carry the imprimatur of any organized authority. They are derived from experience and examination.

The mass of testimony in reference to reinsurance is impressive in its acclaim of the progress made in the health insurance field. The testimony would seem to characterize this progress as a general increase of persons covered in conformance with the needs and purposes of the insured, and the promise for even greater strides with the advent of major medical insurance. The accompanying statistics would appear to support this contention.

Should we accept the foregoing graphic representations of the numerous authorities that have appeared before this committee, and fail to classify them, our fears for the inadequacies of the health insurance industry would be unnecessary. We are obliged, however, to recognise to what extent this progress is quantitative rather than qualiative in nature.

Health insurance plans fall into two general groups. The plans which are subject to cancellation or renewed at the option of the company, and the noncancellable plans guaranteed to renew for a specified duration of time up to age 65. There are policy differences within the group and company policy varies with respect to performance in their use of restrictive provisions. Since the policyholder has recourse only to policy guarantees (and their interpretation by the courts), company practice remains an important but an unpredictable factor. The prospective risk has two willing sources of information on this point; the agent not always motivated by a sense of responsibility to the prospect, or the latest most bizarre advertisement to which he has been exposed. I hesitate to comment on either for fear of seeming to present untoward bias.

The term "actuarial principles" has been referred to in the course of testimony, ostensibly, as a pragmatic basis for computing morbidity. It has become natural to identify this expression with the experience principle subscribed to by the life-insurance industry, and attempt to resolve the problems of the health-insurance industry with that reference in mind. Unfortunately no such ultimate has been established in the underwriting of health-insurance risks, nor is it likely that a valid experience table will be obtained if current practices of some of the larger commercial carriers are perpetuated.

The statement of the National Association of Insurance Commissioners adopts the term "actuarial science." It is my feeling after reading their resolution that they have been entirely sincere in allocating the term to this subject of health insurance. If it is a science there must be variable laws at work, if there are laws at work it should be possible to derive a uniform experience table. Unfortunately no such formula is in evidence. What actuarial principle can be deduced from a policy issued to a standard risk and later canceled or amended to exclude a disease or class of related diseases. They are not referring to a principle or an actuarial science. This practice begets an artifact constructed from indefinite and patchwork precedent. The enlightened advancement of the underwriting process in the life-insurance industry has not been imitated by the health-insurance companies because the acceptance of restrictive provisions has nullified the incentive to broaden and extend underwriting procedures. To increase premium income many life-insurance companies have exposed their experience to new and untried areas. The leaders in this experiment have been stock, and combination stock and participating companies. It is my impression that the results have been gratifying to the company and the policyholder. To come up to date with this subject, just before I left my office I received a memorandum from one of the leading life companies offering insurance to selected risks with a history of coronary thrombosis or angina pectoris as recently as a year ago at the substandard rates of course. This is not philanthropic research: it is a sound and enterprising decision to accumulate experience in an untested group.

What purpose can this reflection on an allied industry serve? It should provide us with evidence that a responsible industry with substantially similar benefits, if it hopes to expand will select undetermined and neglected regions to develop, and that the many will follow the few in their profitable adventure. It is important to understand a business that has produced one of man's most valuable documents, and I think it is possible to employ many of its principles in the health-insurance field.

The companies issuing noncancellable, guaranteed renewable policies and voluntary prepayment plans, such as Blue Cross, are distinguished by the reliable manner they have promoted the growth of the health-insurance industry. Their contribution to the advancement of private enterprise is significant.

Emphatic attention should be accorded the cancellable or "the not guaranteed renewable" policy, not only to the provisions of the contract but to their interpretation and enforcement. It should be within the province of section 201 of H. R. 8356 to determine the number of claims currently under dispute, the incidence of lapse, and the number of policies amended or canceled, by the applying company. This suggestion could conceivably evoke some spirited opposition, but it is necessary if the reinsurance program is to be more than an extemporaneous organization.

I am disturbed by the apparent evasion of issues in the resolution of the insurance commissioners. It could be inferred from their document that they recognize no great disparity of underwriting in the health and accident field or if they do that it is not germane to the subject of these hearings. On page 1 of their testimony they state "the bill contains provisions which involve subsidization and tend to point toward the complete socialization of health services." No special clairvoyance is required to see that the threat comes not from this bill, but from the inadequacies that produced it.

Some of the testimony would criticize the reinsurance process outlined in H. R. 8356 as uncharacteristic; that it would simply be a needless addition to the existing available reinsurance sources. I am hopeful its peculiar nature will be effective in creating a higher level of underwriting and subsequently this proposed reinsurance program will be unnecessary. We might properly refer to the bill as an act of initiative and momentum. Beyond that descripition I feel it has no proper place in our private enterprise system.

One additional matter I have been reluctant to mention because it is rightfully a subject for the purview of the various State commissioners: It is the agent's part in the sales process of health insurance. Only the most energetic restraint deters me from expanding this issue. The agent is an enigma—to the company, to the prospect, and to the statistics. He verbally defines policy provisions with impunity, and who is to measure the mischief he does to the unsuspecting prospect. It would seem wise to include the agents statements in the policy as an appendage to and part of the policy contract. Such an arrangement would preclude many of the disputes arising from misleading sales talks.

The material I have presented to this committee must necessarily be limited in range. The complexities of actuarial science are simply not within my frame of reference. I wish to be regarded only as an interested observer and offer these statements as worthwhile only insofar as they derive merit from logic.

Finally I should like to add that we should militantly oppose the transgression of our historical ideals. I am opposed to socialized medicine in all its forms and any legislation that would promote or induce it. My livelihood is provided for by insurance premiums and I am determined that this satisfactory arrangement will continue unhampered by regulation of the Federal Government. I see in this proposal no desire to test the durability of the medical profession or the insurance industry, but rather an instrument to avoid future encroachment by less prudent authority.

I look forward to this committee's favorable action on Mr. WOLVERTON's bill, H. R. 8356.

Protection for the American Press

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS B. HELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1954

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, just a year ago, on May 5, 1953, I introduced a bill, H. R. 5003, which provides that newspapermen shall not be required to reveal the sources of their information in Federal courts, before Federal grand juries, or before congressional committees, except under certain circumstances involving the security of our country or where there is concealment of a crime.

My bill aroused considerable interest throughout the country and received wide support in the Nation's press. It was reported in the news columns, discussed in editorials, and commented upon by columnists. Only a few days ago the Washington Post and Times-Herald made reference to my bill in an editorial on press responsibility, in its issue of May 1, 1954.

At the time I introduced my bill a year ago, I made certain comments and observations about the privilege of a free press. I wish to quote a few brief passages from my remarks as they appeared in the RECORD at that time:

> The rights and liberties enjoyed by the American people will remain safe as long as we have a free press in this country. When there is an abridgment of that time-honored right, then the safety of our whole national structure is threatened for our free press has always been one of the great champions for liberty and democracy. * * *
>
> One of the major keys which make possible for our newspapers to present to their readers the true facts is the privilege of newspapermen to refuse to reveal the sources of their information. Very few people realize, however, that under the present Federal laws and jurisdiction no newspaperman can either claim this privilege or be guaranteed protection for refusing to divulge the sources of his information. * * *
>
> Through passage of my bill, Congress can prove its faith and trust in the American press, it can reiterate its belief in freedom of the press, and it can voice its confidence in newspapermen and in their code of ethics. Newspapermen are not asking for protection based on mere relevance or pertinence of material. They want a specific safeguard which will give them the necessary protection of the law. They want official recognition of a traditional privilege which will strengthen the freedom of the press in this country.

Mr. Speaker, exactly a year has gone by since then and nothing has been done. The House Judiciary Committee, to whom my bill was referred for action, has taken no action on the measure and has not even submitted it to a subcommittee for study. Meanwhile, the newspaperman's privilege or right to protect his sources remains unprotected and it is bound to hurt seriously the freedom of the press in this country and the methods of newsgathering as we know them today.

That this issue is very much alive now and will undoubtedly continue to grow in importance is clear from events of these last few days. I am sure my colleagues have not failed to notice that in the current Army-McCarthy hearings, the Senator from Wisconsin has claimed the right not to divulge his sources of information and his claim was sustained by the chairman. In handing down the ruling, Senator KARL E. MUNDT stated as follows at the hearings on May 5, 1954:

> The Chair is prepared to rule. He unhesitatingly and unequivocally rules that in his opinion, and this is sustained by an unbroken precedent so far as he knows before Senate investigating committees, law-enforcement officers, investigators, any of those engaged in the investigative field who come in contact with confidential information are not required to disclose the source of their information. The same rule has been followed by the FBI and, in my opinion, very appropriately so.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that the "unbroken precedent" referred to by Senator MUNDT is even older and dates back much further in our history where it concerns the right and privilege of newspapermen not to disclose their sources of information, than it does in the case of "those engaged in the investigative field" or the FBI. The newspapermen's privilege goes back to the days of John Peter Zenger, one of the earliest pioneers in the struggle for freedom of the press in America, whose fight for freedom of expression in 1735 helped to establish the fact that the affairs of government should remain public. Since then there have been a number of instances where newspapermen chose to go to jail rather than reveal their sources of information, and in this way they upheld the unbroken precedent.

I desire to raise this question: Why should the right not to disclose sources of information be recognized for those engaged in investigations and for the FBI, but not for newspapermen? Why should our press—and this applies also to the periodical press, newsgathering agencies, radio and television—be denied this privilege to which it lays claim and precedence extending over 2 centuries or more? If we cherish our freedom of the press, then we should give the American press the protection it needs.

Mr. Speaker, the editorial in the Washington Post and Times-Herald referred to above was as follows:

> PRESS RESPONSIBILITY
>
> Canadian courts recently handed down a ruling which, if allowed to stand, will hobble Canadian newspapers in their obligation to report the news. Blair Fraser, Ottawa editor of MacLean's magazine, was ordered by a provincial court to reveal the sources of his information for an article on politics in British Columbia. Mr. Fraser refused to do so and appealed the order. But his appeal was rejected by the Appeal Court and by the Supreme Court of Canada.
>
> There have been similar cases in the United States. Some newsmen have gone to jail rather than reveal their sources of information. Two Newburgh, N. Y., reporters spent 5 days in jail in 1948 for refusing to tell a grand jury their confidential sources of information. In 1934, 2 Kentucky reporters spent several days in jail when a Danville police judge charged them with contempt for refusing to disclose where they had obtained certain information. Twelve States now accord reporters the same protection of law as given to lawyers, doctors, or clergymen with respect to confidential information. It has been argued that the right is implicit in the first amendment and that it is now a part of the common law. But the reporter's right to protect his sources is not yet recognized in some jurisdictions.
>
> To remedy this defect, Representative LOUIS B. HELLER, of New York, is sponsoring a bill to accord reporters the legal right to refuse to disclose sources of information except in special circumstances involving national security or concealment of a crime. "Newspapermen are not asking for protection based on mere relevance or pertinence of material," Mr. HELLER properly said when he introduced his bill last year. "They want official recognition of a traditional privilege which will strengthen the freedom of the press in this country." This right must be protected or newspapers will be unable to obtain information or even tips from persons who do not want their identity known.

The St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1954

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, as one who lives far from the territory to be served by the proposed St. Lawrence waterway, I believe that I can view the project more dispassionately than most. I must say I become more mystified at the attitude and behavior of the proponents of the St. Lawrence waterway with each new development in connection with that project. For instance, some year and a half ago when the Canadians renounced the old Executive Agreement of 1941, providing for construction jointly by the United States and Canada but with the United States footing practically the whole bill, and announced their willingness and even their desire to build the waterway alone without any cost to the American taxpayer, I looked for great rejoicing on the part of the proponents. Here at last was the perfect answer to what, in the final analysis, had always caused the Congress to reject or lay aside consideration of the St. Lawrence Waterway year after year, namely the tremendous expense to the United States. No approval by Congress would be required and no part of the cost would be borne by the United States, yet the same project would be built and by reason of guarantees in existing treaties American vessels and commerce would have the right to use it on terms of complete equality with Canadian vessels and commerce.

But not at all, instead of rejoicing the proponents talked and acted as though this would be a near calamity and have used this as the newest, and perhaps the weirdest, of all the many different arguments that have been advanced through the years as to why it was urgently necessary that the United States join with Canada in building the waterway.

Many Members of Congress have decried the failure of European countries to expend enough effort and money on their own behalf along with their constant requests for more money and aid from the United States. Then along comes a country that can stand on its own two feet and has the pride and courage to want to do so—that country wants to build in its own country with its own money a project with the unusual characteristic of being available and useful to us on the same terms as to the citizens of that country—and instead of saying "congratulations, more power to you" many Members of Congress are conjuring up silly reasons why this would be hurtful to our national interests. Personally, I think the continuing fight is merely a reflection of a state of mind possessed by many that nobody is capable of doing anything without United States help or else it is because certain individuals feel their pride and prestige is at stake. As I said at the beginning, I am mystified at the attitude and behavior of the proponents of the waterway, particularly those dedicated to the balancing of the budget, the reduction of taxes, or the elimination of unnecessary spending.

Then, Mr. Speaker, along comes another proposal to save the taxpayer from having to bear the cost of the proposed St. Lawrence Waterway and this time the reaction from the proponents is violent and almost hysterical. This second proposal to spare the taxpayers the cost of building the works in the St. Lawrence River called for by S. 2150 is a proposal known as the Brownson amendment.

I need not spend any time describing this amendment, as that has already been done. It is sufficient to say that the Brownson amendment would put the financing of the United States share of the St. Lawrence Waterway on a genuine revenue-bond basis under which the bonds of the Seaway Corporation would have to be sold directly to the public without any guaranty of principal or interest by the Federal Government or any agency thereof. This would put the financing of the proposed waterway on the same basis as toll bridges and toll roads in California. Under our California Toll Bridge Authority Act it is provided, by section 30235, that—

> Bonds issued pursuant to this chapter shall not constitute or be a debt, liability, or obligation of the State.

It further provides that—

> The payment of both principal and interest of all bonds shall be secured only by the tolls or other revenues collected from the particular toll bridge or other highway crossing for which the bonds were issued, other revenues and interest thereon, and sinking funds created therefrom received by the Authority.

I hear proponents maintaining that it is not feasible to build projects through the issuance of bonds that do not constitute a lien on any particular property but are dependent solely upon the revenue from the project. This clearly is not so where the investors are convinced that the project has been carefully planned and thought out and will produce adequate revenues. On this basis, hundreds of millions of dollars of bonds have been quickly and easily sold to the investing public by the California Toll Bridge Authority. If the investing public has faith in the cost estimates of the Army engineers and the revenue estimates of the Department of Commerce, there should not be the slightest difficulty in marketing revenue bonds of the St. Lawrence Seaway Corporation for the purpose of building the works called for by S. 2150. According to the estimates of the Department of Commerce, the revenues from the project are expected to be 2½ times the annual cost of the project, including not only the cost of operation and maintenance, but interest and amortization on the investment. No one ever contended that the provision of our California statutes requiring the financing of the construction of toll bridges by revenue bonds was a means of killing such projects, but rather it is looked upon as a means of insuring that only sound projects will be constructed. The opponents of the St. Lawrence Waterway maintain that the costs will greatly exceed the estimates of the Army engineers and that the revenues from the project will be far less than the amount estimated by the Department of Commerce, and that as a consequence, the waterway could never be self-liquidating and will be an economically unsound project.

There is a very easy way to determine which side in this controversy is correct and that is to leave it up to the private investor to determine whether he will buy revenue bonds for the purpose of raising money to construct the project. If the project is considered sound by the investors, there will be no delay whatsoever in raising the amount of money required. On the other hand, if they do not believe the project is economically sound, not only will there be delay, but in all probability the bonds will never be sold and the project will never be built by the United States, and that is exactly as it should be.

When you consider that the endorsement of this project by the Cabinet and by the President himself was on the assumption that the project would be self-liquidating and economically sound, it seems to me entirely reasonable and consistent to put this one fact to the best

E

known practical test, and I know of no better practical test than the judgment of private investors.

In addition to the unsound argument about delay resulting from the use of revenue bonds, the proponents have said that the use of revenue bonds is impractical as a means of constructing an international project. Again the proponents are on very weak ground because the works to be constructed pursuant to S. 2150 are to be entirely on the United States side and the project has an international aspect only by reason of the fact that Canada plans to build works of a comparable nature in the section of the river that lies wholly in Canada. The only truly international part of the project is in the construction of the dams and the powerplant. These structures constitute single physical entities running across the international boundary and requiring international cooperation, and yet the portion of the work to be done by the New York Power Authority, an agency of the State of New York, is to be done with money raised through the issuance of revenue bonds by the New York Power Authority. These bonds will not be backed by the faith and credit of the State of New York.

In short, it is entirely clear to me that the objections raised by the proponents to the use of the revenue-bond method is nothing more than a showing of complete lack of faith in the soundness of the project they advocate having built with funds of the Federal Government. Actually, Mr. Speaker, it is the attitude of the proponents toward the Brownson amendment that has weighed more heavily with me in reaching the determination that the St. Lawrence Waterway project would be economically unsound than any other single bit of evidence.

Indochina

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1954

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I wish to insert the following editorial which appeared in the Vicksburg (Miss.) Evening Post on Monday, April 19, 1954:

INDOCHINA

Today the world's hottest trouble spot is Indochina. It looms rather foreboding in view of some semiofficial pronouncements that we may be called upon to either reinforce or to replace the French in that area of defense against the spread of communism. Vice President Nixon stirred up a hornet's nest when he made the statement that in the unlikely event the French withdrew from Indochina American troops might be sent in. This was followed by a statement from the State Department that it is "highly unlikely" United States troops will have to replace French forces in Indochina, but this statement was tempered by a support for Mr. Nixon's stand that southeast Asia must be saved from Communist aggression.

After Korea, it will be quite difficult to sell the American people a bill of goods on Indochina, particularly if that area is to be defended in a manner similar to Korea. We believe fully that we must stop Communist aggression. We recognize quite well the significance of the spread of Communist influence and control over Asia, but we must ask in all justice why it should be the sole responsibility of the United States. The French have a stake in Indochina and the British have a great stake in the Far East. Our stake is our own security, the security of our western frontier. There is work for all; there has been work for all; but it did not work out too well in Korea, where we carried the load. Should we begin activity in Indochina, we can conceivably foresee another Korea, with America holding the bag, paying the freight, losing our manpower, fighting almost alone the battle which belongs as well to so many other of the free nations.

We do not believe the administration will commit any troops to Indochina without presenting the matter to Congress, and we do not believe Congress will sanction such a move. Yet we cannot overlook the fact there is a very definite threat to our security if the Reds are victorious in that far eastern country. Our greatest job, and one not yet accomplished, is the unifying of the free nations into consolidated action against the Reds in any area of aggression—action which will be carried on jointly with allies carrying their fair share of the load. We cannot, we must not, assume full responsibility in every trouble spot in the world.

Critical Materials and Dependency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1954

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the Record, I include a very impressive editorial entitled "Another Side" from the columns of the well-known Boston Record. It admirably sets forth the need for developing American resources in the field of critical materials.

Largely as a result of policies affirmatively pursued by this Government in recent years, this Nation is becoming increasingly dependent upon foreign nations for a wide range of critical materials. The subject is a large one and I cannot deal with it at this time. But it is also a very serious and grave one for the American people, and I believe the contents of this editorial and its subject matter should receive the careful, continued attention of every Member of this House, high-ranking officials of the armed services, and the administration.

To what extent is this Nation now dependent upon foreign-produced materials critical to our economy, especially during international stress and war?

To what extent is widening Communist control in Asia, the Near East, and Africa threatening to cut off essential materials critical to the defense of this Nation?

To what extent is the Soviet able to deprive us of these materials?

These are gravest questions. I will continue to warn the House about them.

The editorial follows:

ANOTHER SIDE

The American Government recently advanced a large sum of money for the development of lead mines in Africa, with the agreement that repayment was to be made in that metal.

Lead is an important metal to the economy of America, and in wartime it is indispensable, so this seems at first blush to be a good deal.

But there is another side to it.

There are tremendous deposits of lead in the United States, and if the mining industries were encouraged and supported by our Government to the same extent that the African enterprises are being encouraged and supported all of our peacetime and wartime needs would be amply supplied.

In addition, many thousands of Americans would be usefully and profitably employed.

But as it is, many of our American lead mines are idle, and much of our potential source of lead is undeveloped, and a great employment field is barred to American workers.

There is no disputing the fact that lead can be produced in Africa at a lower cost than in America.

The average pay of an African lead miner is less than $12 per month, plus keep, whereas the American mineworker gets an average pay of $360 a month—if and when he works at all.

One way to correct that adverse competitive situation would be to cut the American wage standards to the African level, which nobody wants to do.

But why is it any better to turn our markets over to foreign competitors, and close our mines and deny our people jobs?

What good is it to have a high wage level, but no jobs?

It is not only in the field of strategic metals, such as lead, that we have this situation.

In all fields of American production, in which cheaply produced foreign goods are permitted to have an advantage in American markets, the ultimate price of the imported article must include the unemployment it creates in America. This is especially true of New England textiles.

Those who give away American wealth so lavishly and reject American resources so carelessly are quick to impugn the motives of those who want our country to achieve self-sufficiency and to be self-supporting first, and to be the good Samaritan and the almoner to the rest of the world only after American self-interest is properly served.

But what is wrong with putting American welfare, prosperity, and security first in the considerations of our own people and Government?

Water Highway Into a Utah Wonderland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. DAWSON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1954

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, an important byproduct of the Colorado River storage project which has been recommended for authorization by President Eisenhower will be the amount of scenery that will be opened up to the view of the Nation.

Not only will the construction of Echo Park Dam make it possible for the aver-

F

age tourist to enjoy Dinosaur National Monument, but the construction of the other large dam at Glen Canyon, Ariz., will open to boat travel some of the most colorful scenery in the United States.

For the information of the House, I am inserting in the Record the following editorial that appeared recently in the Salt Lake Tribune giving Members a preview of the type of scenery that construction of Glen Canyon Dam will make available:

Water Highway Into a Utah Wonderland

Rainbow Bridge has been acclaimed as "perhaps the greatest single natural wonder in America." It is located in extreme southern Utah a few miles south of the Colorado River. It was discovered in 1909 and preserved as a national monument by presidential action in 1910.

Despite its fame, its long history, and its great beauty, few people have ever seen it—the reason being that it is located in one of the most inaccessible regions of America, the last part of the United States indeed where geographical discoveries are still being made.

There are only three ways to see Rainbow Bridge. One is to fly over it—which is easy enough, although somewhat hazardous because emergency landing places are nonexistent. But it is not too satisfactory because it is difficult to appreciate the magnificence of this 309-foot high, 278-foot wide arch from the air. A second way is by water—coming down the Colorado by boat to Aztec Canyon, then hiking over a rugged trail some 6 miles to the bridge. That is a trip which takes days and is only attempted by the more adventurous. The third approach is by land over some 40 miles of poor dirt road, then packing in over a rough 14-mile trail. That's a hard trip which also takes days and is also attempted only by the adventurous.

Because of the rugged terrain in this whole country bordering the Colorado, it is unlikely the area will ever become readily accessible to ordinary sightseers except for one possibility—the construction of the proposed Glen Canyon Dam and reservoir as part of the upper Colorado storage project.

This reservoir, when filled, would turn the Colorado River into a 186-mile water highway, stretching from a few miles above Lees Ferry in Arizona almost to the confluence of the Green and Colorado Rivers in Utah. It would permit the sightseer to travel by boat right up to Rainbow Bridge. But it would do far more than open this heretofore inaccessible natural wonder to the average American tourist. It would open up a whole fantastic land—one of the most amazing regions in the world of weird formations of all kinds, carved over millions of years by wind and rain and river out of the solid rock.

It has to be seen to be believed. But few people have ever seen it. Only a few years ago a natural arch larger than Rainbow Bridge was discovered in a tributary of the Escalante River, and new bridges and arches are still being seen by air and ground explorers in various parts of this region.

The Glen Canyon Reservoir would not only fill the canyon at the dam to a depth of some 580 feet, with 200 feet of water at Hite, but it would put water into many miles of the San Juan, White, and Escalante Canyons, their tributaries, and innumerable other gorges leading into the Colorado. It would create miles of water roads leading into fascinating areas few human beings have ever seen.

Some intrepid souls who want to keep this vast region a private preserve for the most rugged river rats and hikers will protest opening up this wonderland to the multitude. But if, in the utilization of our natural resources, we follow the "greatest good to the greatest number" philosophy, then we must advocate making the scenic splendors of America accessible to the many.

This Glen Canyon Reservoir would do for the amazing region along the Colorado in southeastern Utah, just as Echo Park Reservoir would make accessible the beautiful Green and Yampa Canyon areas in northwestern Colorado. Many thousands instead of a few hundred each year could then see the magnificent scenery and the natural wonders hidden deep in the canyons of the Colorado and its tributaries, and reserved now for the eyes of a handful of the most hardy or the most wealthy.

My Record in Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS B. HELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 29, 1954

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, in March of this year I had the privilege of completing 5 years of service in the House of Representatives to which I was elected in a special election in 1949. In 1952 there was a reapportionment of the congressional districts in Brooklyn, with the result that my district was changed in certain respects: some sections were detached from the district, while others were added to it, notably Greenpoint, parts of Williamsburgh, the Bushwick area, and so forth.

It has been my practice every year to render a report to my constituents setting forth my work in Congress, my record of achievements, and my views on major legislation. Because of the geographic changes in my district, I deem it my duty and responsibility to summarize my past record and the work which I have performed in the United States Congress as the Representative of the newly formed Eighth Congressional District.

PAST LEGISLATIVE RECORD

In covering a period of 5 years it is obviously impossible to list the full record of my activity during this period. I shall therefore limit this review to major legislation and how I voted on these issues.

I. In the 81st Congress, covering the years 1949 and 1950, my record was as follows:

Taft-Hartley Labor Act: I strenuously opposed this act as being antilabor and urged that it be repealed. In one of my first addresses in Congress I pointed out how this law is undermining collective bargaining, provoking unnecessary strife, and stripping workers of their basic rights. I have since then continuously fought against this act and have advocated that it be repealed entirely, or at least be liberalized by eliminating certain sections which are harmful to the interests of labor.

Displaced Persons Act: The problem of immigration has always been a matter of deep interest to me. My maiden speech in Congress shortly after taking my oath of office was in favor of amending the Displaced Persons Act to admit an additional 100,000 refugees. It was my opinion that the United States should exert moral leadership in the solution of the displaced persons problem.

Civil rights: I have always been in favor of safeguarding the rights of minority groups and the elimination of discrimination. I voted against the poll tax; I have urged the adoption of legislation to establish fair employment practices without regard to race, color, religion, or national origin; I called for an early end to racialism and segregation in our Armed Forces, as well as other guaranties of civil rights.

Social security: I supported the expansion of the social-security program and the extension of its benefits to wider segments of our population.

Public health: I favored passage of a national health insurance and public health bill to secure for the people of this country a reduction in sickness and premature death. It is my conviction that our prosperity, our well-being and the welfare of the communities in which we live depend in large measure upon maintaining the highest level of health.

Postal and Federal employees: The plight of the underpaid postal workers and Federal employees is well known to me. One of my first acts in Congress was to introduce a bill to correct this inequity by raising the salaries of these people to enable them to cope with the high cost of living. I have supported their cause all along during my 5 years in office.

Brooklyn Navy Yard: This famous Government shipyard, located in my congressional district, once employed over 20,000 people. Employment there has fallen off to about 18,000. I have kept in touch with the Navy Department to see that it assigns sufficient work to the yard, and that a high level of employment is maintained at all times. In 1950, when 760 workers at the Brooklyn Navy Yard were on the verge of being laid off, I appealed to President Truman and to the Secretary of Defense and was successful in saving the jobs for these people. On another occasion disabled war veterans were dismissed from their jobs at the yard. I made a personal investigation, took up the matter with the admiral in charge and succeeded in regaining employment for them at the yard. These are only a few of the many problems, in addition to an endless stream of individual cases involving navy-yard workers who appeal to me directly for help.

International affairs: World affairs have always been of primary interest to me. The security of our Nation, world peace, Communist aggression, aid to our allies—these and other matters are of vital importance to every American. I have strongly supported our foreign-aid program, including military and economic assistance to the free nations. Back in 1950 I warned against recognition of Communist China and the expansion of Communist domination in southeast Asia. I voted for President Truman's point-4 program to make available American technical aid to underdeveloped areas of the world to improve the standard of living in those areas. I voiced strong protests against

E

the suppression of human freedom in countries behind the Iron Curtain and against religious persecution of Catholics, Protestants, and Jews in those countries.

II. In the 82d Congress covering the years 1951 and 1952, this was my record on major issues:

Price control: The danger of inflation and runaway prices was a serious threat to our economy during this period. I favored economic controls as a protection to the consumer against rising prices, black markets, and the high cost of living. I called for an effective price-control law to give the wage earner and the low-income groups the fullest protection in obtaining food and other essentials. I introduced a bill to roll back prices to the level existing before the Korean war, but Congress adopted a weak measure which failed to halt rising prices.

Rent control and housing: I consistently supported continuation of rent control, construction of low-cost housing, elimination of firetraps and slum clearance in order to maintain a high standard of living and proper health standards. In 1951 I introduced a bill to extend rent control for another 2 years and to make the law more effective, and also a bill to repeal the limitations on construction of low-rent housing and authorizing the construction of 75,000 dwelling units annually. In 1952 efforts were made to kill the housing program, but, after a bitter struggle, we succeeded in gaining approval for 35,000 units.

Civil rights: I continued to fight for civil rights, particularly the abolition of discrimination in employment, in housing, and education. I voted for the FEPC bill. I supported the Price amendment to the universal military bill to eliminate segregation in the Armed Forces. I introduced a bill in 1952 to establish severe penalties for those committing acts of violence against racial or religious groups or their institutions. I urged a strengthened civil-rights section in the Justice Department, statehood for Hawaii and Alaska, and home rule for the District of Columbia.

Labor and social security: I continued to oppose the Taft-Hartley law and to urge its repeal. I supported a higher minimum wage. I advocated maximum payments in unemployment insurance and a broadening of the system so that more workers would be entitled to unemployment benefits. I voted for the bill, H. R. 7800, to increase the monthly social-security payments by 12½ percent, and I urged that outside income for retired workers be increased from $50 to $100 per month. I also voted for an increase in pension of railroad workers, widows, war veterans, and others.

Veterans' affairs: I supported pensions for veterans or their dependents, benefits for disabled veterans, to widows and surviving children of veterans, aid in finding employment for jobless veterans, and so forth. In 1951 I introduced a bill to extend to veterans of the Korean war the same benefits granted to World War II veterans. I introduced a bill, passed by Congress in April 1952, to compensate United States war prisoners captured by the Japanese and the Germans during World War II. When the Veterans' Administration sought to remove its regional office from Brooklyn, which serves 400,000 veterans in our borough, I introduce a bill to stop this move and also intervened with President Truman and thus succeded in saving the jobs of 2,000 VA employees.

Immigration: In 1952 the discriminatory McCarran-Walter immigration bill came up. I vigorously opposed it, voted against it, and when President Truman vetoed the measure I voted to uphold the President's veto but Congress overrode him and it became law. I stated then, and repeated it on numerous occasions since, that passing the McCarran-Walter Act was a grievous mistake and that I would exert every power to amend or revise the act. I supported a bill to admit 300,000 refugees from Europe. I also introduced a bill to admit 50,000 immigrants from Italy outside of quota restrictions.

Aid to Israel: Since 1951 I have continually supported American economic aid to Israel to enable her to absorb the hundreds of thousands of refugees entering that country. I urged the State Department to use it good offices to obtain peace between the Arab States and Israel, and more recently I protested against sending arms to the Arab countries.

Miscellaneous: There were many other issues on which I expressed by views frankly and fully. I urged tax exemptions for the low-income groups and placing the burden of taxation more on big business. I called for economy in Government expenditures, but not at the expense of fundamental needs of our population, such as endangering social security, housing, education, health, and so forth. I introduced a bill to investigate illegal sales of narcotics and a bill to create a United States Medical Academy.

MY RECORD IN THE PRESENT CONGRESS

The 83d Congress was elected for the 2 years 1953 and 1954. Since we are now in the midst of our legislative work for the current year, this phase of my report covers only the 1953 session and the first 4 months of 1954 until the end of April.

The giveaway Congress: The present Congress, which is under Republican control, will go down in our history as the "giveaway Congress" because of the giveaway of our country's national wealth and resources to big business and to the privileged few. The administration's giveaway program includes the offshore oil and other national resources under our coastal waters, public power, mineral deposits, housing, public lands and forests, synthetic-rubber plants, and so forth. I was among those in Congress who advocated that the income from offshore oil be used for educational purposes. I introduced a resolution to set up a congressional Committee on Natural Resources to maintain a careful watch over our Nation's natural wealth. It is clear by now that the Republican-controlled 83d Congress will enact a minimum program of legislation and has thus far failed to amend the Taft-Hartley labor law, to revise the McCarran-Walter immigration law, to grant statehood to Hawaii and Alaska, to expand social security, and to take any action on civil rights. But it did eliminate price control and rent control, it curtailed public housing, and gave away the offshore oil.

International affairs: Problems of world peace, security, and defense of our country remain the dominant factor in our thinking and hopes for the future. I have been disturbed that the Eisenhower administration has reduced our defense budget. In the light of events, I feel this is not the time for such reductions, because the security of the Nation is endangered. I voted in favor of the resolution to keep Communist China out of the United Nations because of her inhumane treatment of American prisoners of war in Korea. To aid the free world, I voted to continue the foreign-aid program, renewal of the Reciprocal Trade Agreement Act to encourage international trade, to send surplus wheat to the famine-stricken people of Pakistan and other countries.

Economic conditions: The high cost of living still continues under the Eisenhower administration. Prices of food, housing, medical care, and other essentials pushed the cost of living to a record high during the past year, which resulted from the removal of all economic controls. Last year I introduced a bill to provide standby controls in the event of a continued rise in prices, but the Republicans would not even consider it. Earlier this year unemployment began to grow at an alarming pace. I have spoken on the floor of the House at least three times recently on the subject, urging Congress to take action. On February 4 I discussed the unemployment situation in my congressional district. A month later, on March 4, I reported that unemployment was reaching serious stages with nearly 4 million unemployed in the country, and I suggested a program to deal with this problem. On March 31 I cited unemployment figures and introduced a resolution to establish a congressional committee to investigate the unemployment situation in the country.

Housing: In 1935 the housing program was cut to shreds by the Republicans when only 20,000 units were authorized for construction. Similarly, rent control was completely abolished and rents were increased in many areas. This year, President Eisenhower submitted a program calling for the construction of 35,000 housing units, but his own party sought to kill the program and in fact defeated it in the House. Fortunately the Senate restored the appropriation. I voted for the program of 35,000 units, but I emphasized it was inadequate.

Labor and social security: I am convinced that under a Republican-controlled Congress the Taft-Hartley labor law will never be repealed, and that if it is in any way amended it will be for the worse, not for the better. I introduced 2 important bills in 1953 dealing with the extension of social security and old-age pensions. My social-security bill calls for broadening coverage to include 10 million people who are not now entitled to these benefits, to increase the minimum monthly payments from $25 to $40, to use a better wage base so that the benefits can be higher, to increase the allowance for outside monthly earnings from $75 to $100, and to lower the age limit from 65 to 60 years. My pension bill provides for a monthly pension of $40 to all persons over 65, which is to be paid in addition to social-security benefits.

Immigration: Congress has taken no steps to revise the discriminatory McCarran-Walter law. Its only action concerning immigration was to pass the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, which I wholeheartedly supported, to admit 214,000 refugees over a 3-year period. This measure, however, has thus far turned out to be a huge hoax. At last reports, only 6 refugees have been admitted in the 9 months since its enactment due to the numerous restrictions. I introduced 2 major immigration bills: One called for the admission of 100,000 Italian immigrants; the other was an omnibus immigration bill, prepared in conjunction with 32 of my colleagues in Congress under the leadership of Senator HERBERT H. LEHMAN, to recodify our immigration and naturalization laws and replace the McCarran-Walter Act.

Taxes: I have always favored larger tax exemptions for the low-income groups. The tax revision now under consideration in Congress, however, proposes to revise our tax laws in such a way as to benefit big business, not the wage earner. For this reason, I have fought and voted for the amendment to raise the income-tax exemption from $600 to $700, but voiced the view that it should be raised to $800 this year and to $1,000 next year as the only way to help the low-income people. I also supported repeal of the excise taxes on theater admissions, liquor, furs, cosmetics, and other goods. I voted for extension of the excess-profits tax on the big corporations. I introduced two tax relief measures: one to grant tax deduction to working mothers who must provide care for their children; the other, a deduction up to $1,000 for the education of a dependent child whom the taxpayer is maintaining at school or college.

Civil rights: I regret to report that absolutely nothing has been done by the Republican-controlled 83d Congress in the way of civil rights legislation to date. No FEPC, antilynching, antipoll tax or other civil rights measures came before either House of Congress. I introduced two such bills in 1953: One, for the abolition of the poll tax as a prerequisite for voting in a primary or regular election; the other, for protection against vandalism committed on account of racial or religious prejudices. This year I introduced a resolution which suggests a set of rules of procedure governing investigations by congressional committees. There is great dissatisfaction in our country with the investigative methods used by certain committees and there has been a good deal of abuse of the civil rights and liberties of American citizens which threatens our way of life.

Miscellaneous: When the Secretary of Agriculture recently requested Congress to cut the school-lunch program by $15 million thereby causing much hardship to many communities benefiting from this program, I urged that the appropriation be restored and I addressed the House pleading that the full program be continued as in the past.

I presented my views to the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee in support of an adequate increase in salaries for postal workers and Federal employees.

I introduced a bill to reduce from 4½ percent to 4 percent the maximum interest rate on home loans to war veterans. I also joined in the effort to restore cuts in the appropriation for the veterans' hospitalization program.

When 2,300 workers at the Brooklyn Navy Yard were threatened with the loss of their jobs in the spring and summer of 1953, I called a conference of the Democratic Congressman from Brooklyn who designated me as chairman to negotiate with the responsible officials to help these people. We were successful in saving their jobs for 1953, and to some extent also during the current year.

CONCLUSION

I receive numerous calls and requests from my constituents for help in personal maters, such as immigration cases, veterans' problems, housing needs, pensions and social security, military allotments, requests for Government publications, and other services. I have tried my utmost to be helpful in such instances.

This is the record of my work and my achievements in Congress and my views on major issues, as I enter my 6th year of service in Congress in behalf of the people of my district. It is a brief accounting of my stewardship of office which I am proud to present to my constituents, together with my assurances that I shall continue to serve their best interests in the future.

Address of James R. French at Tomb of Unknown Soldier

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN DOWDY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1954

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, on last Sunday, May 2, the Independent Order of Odd Fellows made its annual pilgrimage to the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier. As a part of the program at which wreaths were placed upon the tomb, Sovereign Grand Master James R. French addressed the assembled brothers in the amphitheater at Arlington Cemetery. I feel that the address and its subject matter merit a place in the RECORD, and under unanimous consent, I include it herewith:

A little over one and one-third centuries ago some of our forefathers set up on this continent an organization dedicated to the task of promoting the principle of universal brotherhood, a principle that can only be practiced where all men are free and equal, and where they are so jealous of that freedom and equality that they are willing and ready to lay down their lives to preserve it inviolate to the end of time.

Today the whole world is in the throes of a great struggle between two great forces to ascertain whether or not men shall remain free or whether they should return to the dark ages of slavery. Whether an organization such as ours shall continue to be free to work for the welfare of mankind, or if its ideas, teachings, and practices shall be ground under the heel of intolerance. Whether men shall have the right to own and control their own homes, businesses, schools, churches, and lodge halls, or if they shall be herded from the barracks of concentration camps to the state directed of slaves; while their children are taught a series of lies under the direction of one who never saw them and has no love for them; and whose only interest is training them for future slavery; and whether people shall enjoy such things as churches and lodges as a pleasure and privilege of today, or whether they shall be a legend of a long-dead past, soon buried in the pain of abuse, suffering, want, and privation.

Through all the years of its existence the members of the Independent Order of Odd Fellows have held firmly to its teachings of freedom and equality; of loyalty to our Government; of adherence to the high standard of good citizenship which does not allow us to accept the gratuities of a land of plenty, then bite the hand which fed us. With equal firmness have we taught and practiced the directives of the first and second commandments.

Therefore, are we gathered here at this last resting place of one who, for aught we know, may have been a sincere and true Odd Fellow, for did he not show evidence of such when he gave his all for freedom and sacrificed his very identity for the brotherhood of man? Yes, we pay homage to his memory and here renew our pledge of brotherhood to him; that so long as the three links shall decorate our lodge halls and be worn upon our persons, we shall not forget the sacrifice he made but with the guidance of the Father above we shall move onward in our work of love and brotherhood to the end that men may some day live together in peace; so that the sons and daughters who live after him shall not pay an eternal debt by sacrificing, as he did, their all that others might live.

Address by the Most Reverend Bernard J. Sheil, D. D.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM J. GREEN, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1954

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by the Most Reverend Bernard J. Sheil, D. D., auxiliary bishop of Chicago, founder and international director-general Catholic Youth Organization, at the UAW-CIO International Educational Conference, Civic Opera House, Chicago, Ill., April 9, 1954:

I would like to talk about a subject we hear a lot of these days, anticommunism. Note that I said anticommunism. I think it is necessary that we give a little thought to just what form anticommunism should take at this point in America's history. That all decent Americans are against communism, I should think, would go without saying. That we are opposed to communism, both as individuals and as a Nation, and why, hardly needs an explanation. I know that I could stand here and tell you what you already know. I could tell you that communism is morally evil because it is militantly, viciously, one might even say diabolically set against God and man. I could tell you that communism deprives men and women of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. I could detail the bloody history of communism as it operates in every land where it has taken hold. I could repeat the story of Communist treason in the United States. I could outline the well known attempts of the Communists to infiltrate into our great national institutions. In a word, I could match the oratory so familiar to all of us. Or, I could try to. But what purpose would be served in going over all that we know to be so bitterly true? The problem is no longer one of alerting people to the danger of communism. We are all aware of that danger. The problem we are facing is what do we do about it. The unsolved problem, in other words, is what constitutes effective anticommunism. More than that, what kind of anticommunism is moral? What kind of anticommunism is proper in a freedom-loving country like ours? The three go together, in my mind. If anticommunism is immoral, it is not effective. You cannot effectively fight immorality with more immorality. If anticommunism flouts the principles of democracy and freedom, it is not in the long run effective. You cannot effectively fight tyranny with tyranny. And if anticommunism is not effective, it is so much sound and fury, signifying nothing.

It is not enough to say that someone is anti-Communist to win my support. It has been said that patriotism is the scoundrel's last refuge. In this day and age anticommunism is sometimes the scoundrel's first defense. As I remember, one of the noisiest anti-Communists of recent history was a man named Adolf Hitler. He was not wrong because he was anti-Communist. He was wrong because he was immorally anti-Communist; he countered Communist tyranny with a tyranny of his own. And inevitably, Herr Hitler was a dismal failure as an anti-Communist. Half of his own Germany now lives under communism and half of Europe lives in Communist slavery. Would this be true, I wonder, if Hitler had been morally anti-Communist? If Hitler had fought Communist tyranny with democratic freedom, the world we live in—I am persuaded—would be quite different today. And I venture to say there would be less, not more communism in it than there is.

No Hitler has risen in America, and I must say that I think it is nonsense when foreign reporters and journalists describe us as living in a kind of Hitlerian reign of terror. We are still free, and we will remain free—let's have no doubt about that. But, it seems to me that now, while we are free, is the time to cry out against the phony anticommunism that mocks our way of life, flouts our traditions and democratic procedures and our sense of fair play, feeds on the meat of suspicion and grow great on the dissension among Americans which it cynically creates and keeps alive by a mad pursuit of headlines.

How much more of this are we going to tolerate before we remember that we are proud Americans, with values of our own? If we throw those values away—and I am referring to our traditions of innocent-until-proved-guilty, I am referring to our concern for means as well as ends, I am referring to our trust in our basic institutions—then we will be left with our anticommunism, but very little else. An America where the accused is guilty until he is proved innocent, where means don't matter but only ends, an America which has lost faith in the integrity of the Government, the Army, the schools, the churches, the labor unions, press, and most of all an America whose citizens have lost faith in each other—such an America would not need to bother about being anti-Communist; it would have nothing to lose. Such an America would have nothing to recommend it to freedom-loving men—nothing at all, not even the shining image of its victorious junior Senator from Wisconsin.

In my view, we have been victims in the last few years of a kind of shell game. We have been treated like country rubes to be taken in by a city slicker from Appleton. "Now you see it, now you don't"—the Government is full of Communists; we are all in mortal danger. We hear there are 205—now we hear 81—now the voice says 57 card-carrying Communists in the State Department. We hear that General Marshall is a traitor, a leader of a black conspiracy that dwarfs every other conspiracy in history. This charge is never proved, and now, a few years later, in a recent book has been gently explained away as an exaggeration by the carnival man's intellectual shills. Who cares about the good name of the venerable general who has given a lifetime of service to his country? The game must go on. The Army is soft on communism; another heroic general is told that he is not fit to wear the uniform. Hubbub, commotion, everybody suspecting everybody else. Our colleges are called hotbeds of subversion. A headline? Then a Communist is found decoding secret messages (only she doesn't decode messages and she isn't a Communist). Excitement galore there is, but precious few results as Communists, supposed Communists, phantom traitors, and innocent people are alike pursued from headline to headline, from edition to edition. What kind of a spectacle are we becoming anyway? What has happened to our sense of balance, our sanity—our sense of humor, you might say? If we Americans could stand off in space and look at this foolishness—the mad, merry search for the spotlight that has been going on for the past 2 or 3 years in the name of anticommunism, I think our native sense of humor, our ability to laugh at ourselves, to recognize that we had been taken in would save us, if nothing else.

Anticommunism is a serious business. It is not a game to be played so publicity-mad politicos can build fame for themselves. If someone were to tell me that the masters of the Kremlin inspired this burlesque to distract us from our real dangers and keep us from taking effective anti-Communist measures, I'd have half a mind to believe him. I can't imagine what would please the Kremlin more than to turn America into a frantic, hysteria-ridden place, full of suspicion of an American for an American. If the Kremlin masters wanted to weaken us—and they do—I suppose that they would be delighted to see Americans lose confidence in the integrity of their political leaders, lose confidence in the stability of their Army, suspect clergymen and teachers. I imagine they would delight in seeing us lose faith in our constitutional privileges, in seeing us ape their courtroom procedures, and hound innocent little Government clerks who are blown up to be important spies and saboteurs as long as it is good for a front-page story. Congressional committees have done good work, are doing good work, and will do more. But when they are cynically used to trap headlines rather than spies, they mock themselves—and they mock us, too.

Aside from the actual undermining of democracy that such procedures entail and the harm done to the individual involved—and tell me, is there anyone who will deny that General Marshall, to name only one, was truly injured? Or is to be accounted as nothing that an honorable soldier is berated as a traitor to his duty and his country? Aside from such evils as this, there is the fundamental problem that these shenanigans distract us from our real problems, including the problem of communism. They distract us from pursuing a truly effective program of anticommunism. Are we any safer, for instance, because General Marshall was branded as a traitor? No, we aren't. But we are a little less honorable. We have taken what a devoted public servant gave us and offered him abuse and calumny as our gratitude in his years of retirement. Are we any safer because the line between a liberal or a nonconformist and a Communist or subversive is hopelessly blurred? I doubt it. Are we any safer because nonconformity has been practically identified with treason? I think not. Do we have anything less to fear because people have been bullied by the chairman of an investigating committee and his counsel? I doubt it. Is America a safer place for ourselves and our children because the morale of our State Department has been blitzkrieged? Or because our fine officer corps has been insulted? Or because political controversy has sunk to a new low of name-calling? Again, I would say no. Are we any more to be feared by the Communists because of all the hundreds of headlines the Senator from Wisconsin has piled up. I don't believe so. Just what has been accomplished? I wonder. The larger-type charges almost always peter out to a back-page item after they have served their purpose: to gain a headline. But by then, our Man on Horseback is charging off in another direction—tomorrow is another day, another edition, there is need for another headline:

This kind of ridiculous goings-on is seriously described as anticommunism. If you will pardon a very lowbrow comment, I say "Phooey." America today is faced with a world challenge—military, political, social, religious, the protection of its own institutions from subversion within and aggression from without. It's about time we start taking that challenge seriously and drop the cops-and-robbers game that has been going on.

In my book if a man is truly anti-Communist, he is concerned with meeting the challenge of communism on every level. He is interested first of all, in seeing to it that conditions here and abroad are such that they don't provide a fertile breeding ground for communism. He is interested in such matters as seeing to it that people get enough to eat, have decent homes, are able to raise their children in dignity. His scope is broad. He is interested in measures to share the wealth of "have" nations with the have-nots. He is interested in breaking dwon the barriers that separate people—national barriers, religious barriers, class barriers. He is interested in making a better place of his own little corner of the world and of doing all he can to see that others are not in want. I judge an anti-Communist—the real thing, not the cops-and-robbers version—by how well he does these things. If he happens to be a legislator, I look at his record. I see how he voted on measures, to make freedom a reality and not merely an aspiration in the lives of his own fellow citizens and of the poor of the world. By this standard, a number of famous anti-Communists, I'm sorry to say, simply don't measure up.

Communism is a military problem. I judge an anti-Communist according to his record of supporting military measures taken to hold back the Communist forces. I judge him according to how much he helped the Army do its work and not according to how much harm he did to Army morale—how many generals he has insulted.

On the question of internal subversion, I judge an anti-Communist according to how well he does the very difficult job of seeking out subversives, clearly identifying them and removing them from critical positions. I take it that a genuine anti-Communist is one who despises the court methods of the Communists. I take it he hates the Communist idea that one is guilty until proved innocent. I take it that the genuine anti-Communist is one who above all believes in the democratic procedures and is willing to stand by them, even in the face of great temptations to lose one's temper and to lose one's faith in the methods of freemen. I judge an anti-Communist by how well he fulfills all these responsibilities in a difficult, delicate job. In a word, on this score I judge an anti-Commuist according to how well he succeeds in doing what he is supposed to be doing—not according to how many headlines he makes. I judge him according to how well he clarifies the difference between treason and nonconformity—not according to how well he blurs the distinction. I judge him according to how many innocent people he has helped prove innocent and how many guilty people he has proved guilty. I do not admire him as an anti-Communist according to how many guilty and innocent both leave his courtroom without his having made clear and convincing just what their status is but only fogging the issues and the reputation of innocent and guilty alike.

As you can see, I take a pretty dim view of some noisy anti-Communists—one in particular, the junior Senator from Wisconsin. I do not take a dim view of them because they are anti-Communists, but because they are such pitifully ineffective anti-Communists. I hate to see anticommunism identified with this kind of playing for the grandstand.

Now I want to make clear that what I have said is my personal opinion. I am not speaking for the Catholic Church but only for myself, a citizen. Other Catholics may take a more kindly view of the public career of the junior Senator from Wisconsin and of the effect he is having on the Nation. That certainly is their privilege, as it is my privilege to speak as I have. Other Catholics may agree or disagree with the judgment I have reached. On political matters such as these, a Catholic's statement—even a bishop's—bears no more authority than whatever he can bring to it as a citizen and public figure. I know that there are many in my church who do not agree with me on this. So be it. Time will tell which of us is right.

But although the church takes no position, and will not, on such a matter of public controversy, the church does take a position on lies, calumny, the absence of charity and calculated deceit. These things are wrong—even if they are mistakenly thought of as means to a good end. They are morally evil and to call them good or to act as if they were permissible under certain circumstances is itself a monstrous perversion of morality. They are not justified by any cause—least of all by the cause of anticommunism, which should unite rather than divide all of us in these difficult times.

Need of Stockpiling Manganese

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1954

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, for a long, long time now Congressman Burr P. Harrison, of Virginia, and myself have been calling to the attention of officials in the departments of the Federal Government the vital need of stockpiling manganese, which is so essential to the defense effort, and to the fact that Virginia has manganese in large quantities, both high grade and low grade. But apparently, for some unknown reason, the officials who have the authority to act to see that manganese is properly stockpiled and that the programs are put into effect which will secure the manganese in Virginia have failed to heed our advice. Finally, the General Service Administration made an independent survey of Virginia and the Appalachian area, which survey showed absolutely that large quantities of manganese are available in Virginia, and that the program to secure low-grade manganese in Virginia should be set up and that a receiving depot should also be established. The General Services Administration recommended this. The report is now before the Office of Defense Mobilization, but nothing has been done.

It has been my privilege in recent years to work closely with Mr. J. Carson Adkerson, of Woodstock, Va., president of the American Manganese Producers Association, who is an able leader in the field. Mr. Adkerson is not only the president of this association but is personally associated with manganese development and exploration. He has been a tireless campaigner for equality in governmental consideration of manganese deposits. He has been actively engaged in these pursuits since prior to World War I, with the goal in mind of having established a manganese ore depot in the Old Dominion.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the Record, I submit for your attention a most informative article prepared by Mr. Adkerson dealing with the subject in which he and many of us are vitally interested. This article which has appeared in the press sets forth in substantial detail the factors involved in this undertaking.

Washington, D. C.—The Soviets, aided and abetted by persons within our own Government agencies, are again using cheap manganese as a strategic and political weapon to undermine the security of the United States, J. Carson Adkerson, president of American Manganese Producers Association, stated to the press today.

For years the Communists have followed a hide-and-seek policy with manganese—now you see it, now you don't. They are out to stop further development of manganese resources in the United States. The administration leaders are swallowing it hook, line, and sinker.

This same strategy in manganese has been used by the Soviets over the years.

Every time developments of our own manganese deposits are started and substantial investments are made in the industry, the bait of cheap manganese is dangled before our eyes and announcements follow, like an echo, from our own Government agencies to the effect that the manganese situation has eased, and then the rug is pulled from under domestic producers. It happened following World War I. It happened again in 1927 and in 1930. It happened again in 1945 following World War II. In 1951 when we needed manganese most, the Soviets cut us off entirely. Now with domestic developments just getting underway we fall for it again.

In spite of continued warnings and costly experiences of the past, the same disastrous moves in the way of cutbacks and curtailments in our own developments are now underway in the Government agencies.

More than 90 percent of the 2,300,000 tons of manganese ore consumed in the United States in 1953 was imported. Only 160,000 tons or less than 10 percent was produced from domestic sources. Our stockpiles are secret, but limited and definitely inadequate. Russia's recognized 300 and more submarines could choke off our far-flung sea lanes overnight.

Without manganese we would have no steel. There is no known substitute for manganese in the manufacture of steel. If our supplies of manganese were cut off our steel mills would close.

A widely heralded nationwide program intended to stimulate domestic production of manganese is now being carried forward under the General Services Administration. This is destined to produce only about 6 percent of our consumptive needs and this for a 5-year period only.

The small stockpile allocation for milling grade ores at Wenden, Ariz., is being completed in less than half the time expected. There is no assurance to producers that purchases will be continued after the present tonnage allocation is used up.

Producers shipping high grade ore are willing and ready to install more equipment and expand production but no assurances are forthcoming that the market will be continued after the time limit expires in 1958.

There is no stockpile for milling grade ores east of the Mississippi River and those established west of the Mississippi serve only very limited areas. Producers are pleading for a market for their ores and crying "discrimination."

It is understood that the GSA months ago definitely recommended to the directive agency, Office of Defense Mobilization, that a stockpile for milling grade ores be established in the Virginia area. Under the new nationwide program, Virginia today is shipping more high-grade manganese ore than any other one State but producers have no market for milling grade ores. A stockpile of 6 million units in Virginia, the same as at Wenden, Ariz., would mean only 1 percent of our total 1953 consumption of manganese ore and this for a 5-year period only. This is a tragic example of delay and indecision within the ODM. After a war starts the tone would be different but then it would be too late.

Instead of delays and cutbacks, the domestic manganese program should be expanded and extended until at least one-third of our consumptive needs is being supplied from domestic sources. Anything less than this, together with a 10-million-ton stockpile of manganese ore to serve in an emergency, is an invitation to disaster.

It is time for the American public to take a look-see into the manganese situation and the proposals being made to kill further domestic developments and accept paper contracts for so-called cheap manganese from known hostile foreign sources.

Tariffs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1954

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am enclosing a letter written by some very good friends of mine in Utica, Ohio, in which

E

they enclose a letter from the Utica Businessmen's Club.

Mr. Speaker, this group in my opinion represents a cross section of real Americans. They have submitted to me their views without pressure, and I am of the definite opinion that their letter and their recommendations should be carefully read by the entire membership of this Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I am also enclosing my reply to these letters.

The letters follow:

The Utica Herald,
Utica, Ohio, April 29, 1954.

Hon. J. Harry McGregor,
Seventeenth Ohio Congressional District,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Harry: The attached letter about tariffs and customs duties was obviously not written by the undersigned, but all three of us subscribe 100 percent to what it says. In fact, it was written at our request by an expert in such matters, our fellow citizen, Cary R. Wagner.

Mr. Wagner, from his long experience as an officer and consultant in many fields of the organic chemical and petroleum products business, is exceptionally well-qualified to write such a letter.

At the meeting of our dinner club on April 20, Mr. Wagner gave us a talk on tariffs and it was voted unanimously by the 40 men of the Utica community present to send you a letter backing up his ideas on this subject.

We have always had the greatest confidence, Harry, in your good sense and in your devotion to the best interests of this district and of the country as a whole, and we feel that this matter vitally concerns all of us.

In a country so tremendously interconnected in matters of trade and production, no one industry can be put out of business and no one group can lose their livelihood without it affecting a great many more.

We hope you will see your way clear to oppose further tariff cuts in this field and to oppose further juggling with customs duties in an effort to cut tariffs indirectly.

With kindest personal regards from all three of us, members of the committee appointed by our club president, W. J. Wilson, Jr., we are

Most cordially yours,
R. R. Brinkerhoff.
S. Dwight Jewett.
Graham Kirkpatrick.

We would also appreciate it very much if you would pass this letter and our sentiments on to Senator John W. Bricker and Senator Thomas Burke.

Utica Businessmen's Club,
Utica, Ohio.

Hon. J. Harry McGregor,
United States House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Congressman McGregor: This letter is being sent to you pursuant to a resolution adopted at the regular meeting of the Utica Businessmen's Club held on Tuesday, April 20, 1954.

The Utica Businessmen's Club strongly opposes any program of tariff reduction unless it is accompanied by dependable safeguards to protect industrial productive capacity which is essential to our own national defense and unless those safeguards at the same time will guarantee that no injury will be caused to our own domestic economic activity.

We are impressed with the fact that with our present tariff level our imports last year reached a record-breaking $11 billion. We also are aware that for the past year and a half the United States has been running a deficit instead of a surplus on its current account of international payments. We note further that there is at the present time a $10 billion backlog of undelivered but programed military aid for our foreign allies. With total contracts outstanding at the beginning of this year in the amount of $1.9 billion, and with an additional authority for the expenditure of about $8 billion for offshore procurement, it is hard for us to see how any program of tariff reduction is called for as part of an effort to further strengthen our allies.

We are generally familiar with the President's message on foreign trade and the Randall Commission report and are aware that neither one of them addressed attention to the problem of protecting our defense productive capacity from injury under a program of tariff reduction. We are also aware that these reports, like many others which preceded it, stress the importance to our allies of maintaining a strong domestic economy in the United States. We think it would be a mistake to place all of our eggs in one basket so far as maintaining this domestic economic strength, as the President and the Randall Commission seem to do. They stressed that our economic activity will be aided by increased exports, and say these can only come through increased imports. We think this overlooks the fact that at our present level of tariff rates in this country a very high level of exports and imports indeed has been maintained. With the $10 billion programmed but as yet unexpended for mutual defense assistance in foreign countries, it would seem that an adequate reservoir of dollars has been provided above those which are currently being earned at record-breaking import levels.

We understand that Congressman Kean of New Jersey, has introduced a bill which would put into operation the President's program of reducing tariffs 5 percent a year, plus 50 percent over 1945 rates on items not coming in in large quantities, plus a scaling down to 50 percent of any items carrying rates now above that level. We understand that his bill contains no provisions for strengthening the peril point and escape clause which are intended to safeguard domestic industry from injury.

We think it apparent from the number of applications for escape clause relief which have been filed (nearly 60) and the pitifully few cases in which the relief has been granted (3) that something is wrong with our escape clause procedure. We think they should be amended to make it absolutely clear that no tariff reduction will be permitted which might threaten serious injury to essential defense productive capacity or to any producer, segment of industry, or industry which contributes to the strength of our domestic economy.

We respectfully urge you to do what you can to further the objectives stated in this letter. We believe they are the only safe and sane approach to a foreign-trade program. Surely no one could seriously argue against standby controls to protect our own national defense production capacity or to maintain the kind of economic activity which has made America the economic and military arsenal for the entire free world.

For much the same reason we oppose H. R. 6584 now pending in the Senate which would change customs valuation and currency conversion procedures. By eliminating the higher foreign value base, the bill would cut duties and protection available to domestic industries. The new definitions it contains for value bases will also result in lower duties and a loss of protection for domestic industries. The bill would tie currency conversion to par values for foreign currencies which are established abroad. All of these changes will make it easier for foreigners to exert some control over the determination of United States duties. The sweeping reductions which would result from this bill, moreover, are not even subject to the limited safeguards now provided by the peril point and escape clause procedures.

We think the Federal Government in Washington ought to be enough concerned about the trouble which our domestic economy is already experiencing, and with insuring that at all costs we have to the greatest extent possible defense production capacity to protect our security here at home, to shrug off the temptation to do something dramatic by tariff cuts to bolster the attitude of our foreign friends. We are doing enough for them now through tariff cuts already made (our duties averaged only 5.6 percent last year), and through military grants and credits. We can do a lot more for them by protecting our own strength than through a course of phychological tariff boondoggling.

Respectfully yours,
The Committee,
By R. R. Brinkerhoff.

May 5, 1954.

Mr. R. R. Brinkerhoff,
Mr. S. Dwight Jewett,
Mr. Graham Kirkpatrick,
Utica, Ohio.

Dear Friends: I am today in receipt of your letter of April 29 enclosing the statement of the Utica Businessmen's Club in opposition to the lowering of tariffs.

Many thanks for sending the letter and statement to me and may I add that I think your points are well stated. With your permission, I am inserting it in the Congressional Record of this date. I am one who believes that we should not lower the living standards of the American people. This philosophy cannot be followed by allowing products made by low-wage-rate labor in other countries to be brought into this country at a cheaper selling price than the products can be produced here. I believe in reciprocal trade but it should be a 2-way road, not a 1-way. I voted for the peril-point clause and I will vote to strengthen it because in my opinion, the American people must be protected. I am of the firm conviction that successful foreign trade can be had by selling to foreign countries those products which are surplus for us and their shortage and conversely by buying those products which are their surplus and our need. In my opinion, it is ridiculous for our Government to bring products in that we already have a surplus of which forces our people to become unemployed, which is certainly a serious threat to our economy. To be perfectly honest, "I like America," and I am going to continue to do everything I can do to see that our people are employed and that our financial and economic positions are on a sound basis.

Many thanks for your letter and I hope my position meets with your approval.

With kind regards,
J. Harry McGregor,
Member of Congress.

The Netherlands Carillon for the American People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GERALD R. FORD, JR.

OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 6, 1954

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, May 5, my colleague, Representative Paul Shafer, of the Third Congressional District, and I had the privilege and honor of attending the ceremonies where the people of the Netherlands presented to the people of the United States the beautiful Bells for America.

Dr. Kortenhorst on this occasion represented his people and his government, while our own beloved Speaker of the House of Representatives acted for all of the 160 million Americans. It is a high honor for me to incorporate as a part of my own remarks the comments made at this presentation by Dr. Kortenhorst and Speaker Martin:

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Assistant Secretary of the Interior, ladies and gentlemen, Friday, the 4th of April 1952, Her Majesty Queen Juliana of the Netherlands presented, on behalf of the people of the Netherlands to the people of America, a token gift of 32 bells at Meridian Hill Park, awaiting the permanent gift of a 49-bell carillon, to be known as Bells for America, which were cast in the 3 bell foundries of Holland.

The long and delicate process of the casting of this perfectly tuned ensemble of 49 bells is now finished. The bells are decorated with emblems, designed by Mrs. E. van der Grinten-Lücker, Louis Meijs, and Gerard van Remme, painters and sculptors; a Dutch poet Ben van Eysselsteijn wrote the verses which they bear.

I have come from The Hague to Washington as the privileged interpreter of the thankful Netherlands population for the generous help given by their American friends during the dark years of the war and its aftermath.

Gratitude is the memory of the heart and it is well known that this memory lives longer than what cool brains are able to produce.

The voices of this carillon wish to speak first of all of the relations of those who during the struggle of nations, gave their lives or their health for our liberation.

Our national soil is drenched with the blood of thousands of young soldiers to whom the people of the Netherlands owe their reborn independence after many years of oppression.

We will never forget them and we will remember them with deep emotion.

Mothers and fathers of war victims, every ring of these bells means a token of our gratitude to your sons and of our sympathy with you.

This gratitude is not asked for by you, but we feel it as a priceless treasure and as a permanent homage toward those who gave their lives for our liberty and for the liberty of our children and grandchildren.

How I wish I could show you the flower-covered graves of your dear ones, tended by our boys and girls who consider this a gesture of piety as if they were tending their own brothers and sisters.

This carillon, one of about 300 in the whole world, bears an exceptional character. Each of these 49 bells is representative of a particular group of the Dutch community or of that part of Netherlands territory which has donated it.

The biggest represents the Antillean islands at this side of the ocean, shining in the sun.

Eleven bear the names and the emblems of the Dutch Provinces. I will quote, as an example, the words written on the bell of the Province of North Holland, where our capital of Amsterdam is located:

"You brought deliverance after the fearful dark of hunger, pain, and shame; my bell tolls the gratitude of free Holland."

Then follow bells of the mining industry, commerce; industry; the mercantile marine; finance (if you own money, it obeys and follows you; if money owns you, obey it and it will swallow you); aviation; the navy; the Army; the Air Force; the civil servants; the women's organization; the Dutch village of Roosteren (although it lay in the front line the evacuated population returned to their homes without loss of life. A votive chapel was erected there as a sign of thanksgiving to God); transport; the middle class; trade; communications; the fishermen; the farmers; horticulture; arts; sciences; education; commercial arts; sport; the students. And the last 12 bells are dedicated to youth. The smallest bears the emblem of the stork and is dedicated to Princess Marijke, youngest daughter of Queen Juliana.

It bears these lines:

"I am the smallest, the purest."

The total carillon represents the Dutch population as a whole. Every bell has its individual tune, but chiming together they create a perfect harmony, a hymn in homage to our Lord, Who ordered love and peace among all who are of good will.

Carillons have an old tradition in the Netherlands, and the greatest bell-founders of the world, Francois and Pierre Hemony, were Dutchmen. They worked in the 17th century. During the following centuries this noble craft was neglected, but at the present time it has come into its own again.

Three Dutch bell foundries collaborated in its casting—van Bergen, Heiligerlee; B. Eijsbouts, Asten and Petit and Fritsen, Aarle-Rixtel, well-known names in America.

I invite you to consider with me the significance of the ringing of bells throughout the world. The air is filled with bell ringing in joy and sorrow, at birth, at weddings, and at death, at the outbreak of war, and the coming of peace.

Different are the voices of bells on different occasions and for various moods. And variously also do the bronze throats ring out in different seasons. Quite differently again under a clouded or in a clear sky, in snow or rain.

And that is the reason why such a special carillon is chosen as a token of our friendship and gratitude to the American people. These chimes are like living beings, with a soul, a heart, and a tongue; they are able to weep or to shout with joy; they are like true friends, always accompanying you and always present by day or by night.

The 5th of May, this very day of the presentation of the carillon is hailed in my country as liberation day. Nine years ago flying fortresses under allied command dropped food and medicine near the cities and villages where 3½ million people suffered from hunger, weakness, and illness.

War was over, thanks to God and to our American, Canadian, British, and other allied friends.

So no better day could have been chosen for the presentation of this marvelous musical instrument.

For the first time this Dutch carillon will send its sonorous voice out into the American air, admonishing the citizens of both our peoples to understand the watchword, engraved on yet another of the bells:

"Voice of town and country, sound through me;
Help from shores across the sea fought for peace and liberty.
For a world without shame, free of fear and free of chains
We battle."

And now, Mr. Speaker, please accept for the people of the United States this gift from the Netherlands.

Remarks of Speaker Joseph W. Martin, Jr., in Accepting Custody of the Netherlands Carillon for the American People

Dr. Kortenhorst, Mr. Ambassador, ladies and gentlemen, it is my privilege to take custody of this carillon from the Netherlands people. I accept it in the name of the people of the United States, and it is in their name that I request Dr. Kortenhorst to take back to his people our heartfelt thanks.

We in America have had ample opportunity to observe the skill with which the artisans of the Netherlands have drawn on their vast cultural background to produce artistic masterpieces admired throughout the world. One of the arts in which the leadership of the Netherlands has long been recognized is that of bell casting. The Hemony brothers in the 17th century established a tradition of excellence in this field which has not been challenged since. I think that it is particularly appropriate that the Netherlands people should have chosen to express their appreciation to us in the form of an art treasure which could only be produced by the combined artistry and industry for which the donors of this carillon are so justly famous.

I think that it is also significant that this carillon comes to us as a gift from all the Netherlands people, from all walks of life and from all parts of the realm. When the bells are permanently housed in their tower across the Potomac from the Lincoln Memorial, they will ring out a constant reminder to the American people that their past sacrifices are appreciated and that their aspirations for the free future of mankind are shared by their Netherlands brothers.

When we consider the motives which prompted the Netherlands people to make us the gift of this carillon, we understand more readily why one of these bells is dedicated to peace. While I would not want in any way to detract from the harmony of the bells, which is the secret of the perfection of this carillon, I do hope that it will be the sound of this bell of peace which will ring the loudest.

It is not enough for me to speak of peace and for this bell to ring it out. We must all unite in our efforts to insure peace and thus avoid the ravages that occur when we are forced from the path of peace. The Netherlands people are acutely conscious of the necessity to unit in the defense of our peaceful ways. They have also joined with their neighbors in the common exploitation of their economic resources.

By virtue of having been the first nation to deposit their instrument of ratification of the treaty establishing the European Defense Community, they are in the forefront of the nations pressing for a stronger foundation for the common defense of western civilization. As we listen to the harmony of these bells, let us not forget the harmony of purpose and striving which links our two great peoples.

Objections Voiced to St. Lawrence Seaway by Chambers of Commerce, Maritime Organizations, and Port Officials

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1954

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I have received many communications from chambers of commerce, maritime organizations, port authorities, and invidual citizens expressing opposition to the St. Lawrence seaway as provided for in the bill passed by the Senate and before the House for consideration on May 5 and 6, 1954.

I have given careful consideration to the communications I have received and to the arguments that have been made for and against the legislation. I am convinced I would be justified in voting against the bill as presently before the House.

I include as part of my remarks the following:

New Jersey State
Chamber of Commerce,
Newark, N. J., February 2, 1954.

Re St. Lawrence seaway
Hon. Charles A. Wolverton,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Congressman: Present indications are that the Wiley Et. Lawrence seaway bill, S. 2150, may soon be brought to the House floor for debate and final vote. The bill provides for United States cooperation with Canada in building a shallow seaway channel limited to the International Rapids section of the St. Lawrence River.

While this bill authorizes a bond issue of only $105 million to finance the United States' participation in this 100-mile program, it is quite evident that this is only an initial step that would certainly result in tremendous pressure for completion of the full length deeper water channel. Preliminary estimates of the cost to the United States of the full project vary from 500 million to 1 or 2 billion dollars.

The channel is proposed in the interest of national security and while the project would, theoretically, liquidate itself in 50 years, legitimate questions have been raised as to the possibility of liquidation of the initial cost plus the multitude of related expenses. This might mean payment out of Federal tax money derived from all of the 48 States although one study, previously submitted to Congress, stated that no benefits would accrue to 29 States with some question as to the effects in several of the others.

In many of our States the result would be dislocation of industries and reduction in employment in transportation, mining, and maritime operations.

The preliminary cost estimates of the channel itself and of related projects may be increased tremendously and result in a heavy drain on the United States Treasury with the major benefits, especially from the presently proposed limited project, going to Canada and its industries.

We restate our position as recorded each time this seaway situation has been brought up. We contend that the seaway is not required from the standpoint of navigation, is not in the general national interest or in the interest of the State of New Jersey. There is understandable disagreement by authorities over the value of the channel as a defense project. If the United States did not cooperate in the building, but did let Canada do the work as it wants to do, our defense rights would be fully protected through present international treaties which state there can be no discrimination against American ships.

We urge that your vote may be registered in the interest of definite opposition to this type of legislation.

Sincerely yours,
Irving T. Gumb,
Executive Vice President.

New Jersey Industrial
Traffic League,
Newark, N. J., May 3, 1954.

Hon. Charles A. Wolverton,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Wolverton: This organization is composed of traffic representatives for 148 leading mercantile, commercial and industrial firms throughout New Jersey.

As men who have devoted their business careers to the practical aspects of traffic management, we are convinced that the St. Lawrence seaway cannot be economically justified and that considerable further subsidies would be required to sustain the proposed project. From our review of the testimony in the Senate hearings, we are neither convinced of the military necessity for the seaway nor that it can be defended.

I have been instructed, by unanimous vote, to inform you of the League's opposition to this legislation. In our opinion, the seaway would divert further traffic from New Jersey's ports, while taxpayers of this State would be required to support the competitive, noneconomical project.

Very truly yours,
L. Clinton Hoch,
Chairman, Legislative Committee.

Camden, N. J., *March 31, 1954.*

Congressman Charles A. Wolverton,
House of Representatives:

Urge that you work and vote against St. Lawrence seaway legislation as economically unsound and detrimental to vast business and labor interests, particularly insofar as the Delaware Valley area is concerned.

John H. Reiners,
President, Camden County Chamber of Commerce.

Philadelphia, Pa.,
May 3, 1954.

Hon. Charles A. Wolverton,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

Sincerely urge that you actively work against and vote in opposition to the St. Lawrence measure Wednesday as detrimental this community and not in best interest of the Nation.

Walter P. Miller, Jr.,
President, Chamber of Commerce of Philadelphia.

Philadelphia, Pa.,
May 3, 1954.

Hon. Charles A. Wolverton,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

The Philadelphia Maritime Exchange, whose membership is composed of those engaged in the maritime industry or affiliated therewith in the Philadelphia Port area, respecfully request your support against the enactment of S. 2150, the St. Lawrence seaway bill, which we understand will be voted upon by the House during the current week. The insufficiency of this navigation project is exemplified in the fact that approximately 92 percent of the vessels of American registry would be unable to use the seaway because of the limitations of the 27-foot channel. This limited channel would be outmoded, no doubt, before the start of construction. We urge you not to consider this pending legislation favorably. Passage would be adverse not only to the interest of this three-State area but also to the United States. In the event the House should insist on the passage of this measure, the exchange requests that it be amended in accordance with Congressman Brownson's proposal which provides that the project be financed through the sale of bonds to the public without Government guaranty, instead of the United States Treasury putting up the money.

H. G. Schad, *President.*

Philadelphia, Pa.,
March 30, 1954.

Hon. Charles A. Wolverton,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

The Chamber of Commerce of Greater Philadelphia is greatly alarmed at the serious economic threat of the St. Lawrence seaway to the entire east coast. Every city and community along the eastern seaboard stands to lose sums which may total billions of dollars if the seaway become a reality. This unwarranted and destructive project poses a threat to every man, woman, and child in the East. If it is approved, thousands of workers in our ports as well as in the interior may eventually lose their jobs. The long-range impact will come too close to every family. We urge you to unite in a hugh antiseaway blec with other east-coast Congressmen to beat back this insidious danger to the well-being of the whole region.

Walter P. Miller, Jr.,
President, Chamber of Commerce of Greater Philadelphia.

Philadelphia, Pa., *May 3, 1954.*

Hon. Charles A. Wolverton,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We understand that S. 2150, the St. Lawrence seaway bill, will be voted upon by the House of Representatives during the current week. The Philadelphia Marine Trade Association, whose membership is made up of steamship operators, steamship agents, stevedoring companies, tugboat and barge companies, marine terminal operators, warehouses, and companies rendering other services to the marine industry in the Philadelphia port area, respectfully requests your support against the enactment of this bill. The limitations of this project are exemplified by the fact that the channel depth of 27 feet will prohibit in excess of 90 percent of vessels of American registry from transiting this waterway. We urge that you oppose this legislation, which would be adverse to the best interests of the United States and also the Philadelphia port district. Should the House, however, be insistent on the passage of this legislation, this association urges you to insist that the bill be amended to provide that the project be financed through the sale of bonds to the public without Government guaranties in accordance with the proposed amendment by Congressman Brownson.

William G. Munro,
President.

SEAWAY A QUICKSAND FOR TAXPAYERS

The bill to saddle the American taxpayer with the St. Lawrence seaway has been reported favorably by the House Public Works Committee. With members flip-flopping like so many trained seals to approve this year what was rejected last year, the measure now goes to the Rules Committee.

It is our earnest hope that the bill goes no further. Never has a measure been so fraudulently sold to the American people.

"The seaway is not going to cost the United States taxpayers a cent." So proclaims Representative J. Harry McGregor, of Ohio. The bonds, he says, will be paid off by seaway tolls. It was an amendment providing that seaway revenues be earmarked for bond payments which got the measure through the House Committee, headed by seaway champion Representative George A. Dondero, of Michigan.

Such fancy financing by fiat deserves examination. Let's take a close look at what the seaway will cost United States taxpayers.

First, the bill authorizes financing up to $150 million. Sounds cheap. But does anyone honestly believe this is more than a small down payment?

Three years ago, when prices were lower, United States Army engineers estimated the American share of the seaway cost at $598,536,000—nearly 4 times the total financing in the present seaway bill.

Yet even the Army engineers' estimate is admittedly low. The history of Government construction projects shows that they always cost far more than the estimates. For example, the Welland Canal was estimated at $40 million and cost $120 million. The Bonneville Dam was estimated to cost $42 million and actually cost $80 million. We could name many more such examples.

So the actual cost of building the seaway under present plans is likely to be much nearer a billion dollars than $150 million—and that for only a 27-foot channel.

Not a single major ship now under construction could use that channel, according to our information. Less than 4 percent of United States-flag ships now afloat could use so shallow a waterway.

So, it is easy to see the game that is afoot. Once committed to build the seaway, once construction is well underway—these facts will suddenly come to light. Then we will be told that we simply must deepen the seaway to 35 feet—and then the taxpayer will find the cost zooming toward the $2 billion mark.

Bear in mind further that the seaway would be frozen up 5 months of every year—with no tolls collected in all that period. Surely only an optimist wearing rose-colored glasses and a transcendent imagination could talk about such a project not costing the taxpayers a cent.

Last, but by no means least, is the hidden cost which would be, perhaps, the greatest of all. That is the cost of the harm done to present ports of the eastern seaboard and Gulf of Mexico. That damage would not alone be measured in loss of business by shipping and railroads. The general prosperity of all those regions would be affected.

Yet another cost would be distortion of the economic life of those areas. During the 5 months the seaway was frozen up, present ports would be expected to handle the commerce which the ice-bound seaway could not handle. Since that business might well be insufficient to offset losses over the other 7 months, the United States might be compelled to subsidize the ports, railroads, and other facilities, because they, far more than the seaway, are vital to national defense. There would be still more costs piled upon the United States taxpayer.

That's why we say that the $150 million in this bill is a phony downpayment which is aimed to sell Congress and the country a costly boondoggle. Such come-on tactics played a large part in pushing our national debt to nearly $275 billion.

The time to stop is now. We urge the House of Representatives to defeat this seaway bill.

Case No. 4

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 5, 1954

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, here is a case of an escapee from Communist tyranny who suffered undue hardship because of the restrictive provisions of the McCarran-Walter Act. J. Campbell Bruce discusses it in this book, the Golden Door, and it impressed me not only because of the distress it details, but also because it became necessary for Congress itself to step in and offer relief in a situation which should not have required such an extreme measure.

Gustavs Ildimars Freibergs managed to escape from Latvia in the midst of the fire of Communist troops. He was able finally to enter the United States in 1947 on a visitor's visa. When, however, he tried to apply for permanent residence because of his great desire to become an American citizen, it was found that this could not be granted him on the ground that Latvia's quota was way oversubscribed, and a quota number was not available.

He asked to have his temporary visa extended twice, and during that time he was drafted into the Army. So much a part of this country did he become that he married an American girl even before his induction. Freibergs served in Korea for 6 months and was then rotated back to this country. Shortly after his return the immigration authorities ordered him deported to Latvia—while he was in Korea his temporary visa had expired. When his story came to the attention of the Los Angeles Times interest in his case was aroused. A private bill was introduced for his relief in the Congress, and his deportation was halted.

We have since passed a law which would have helped Freibergs in view of his service in the Armed Forces. But still we are faced with the vivid fact that the Latvian quota is minute. This boy who fled from Communist fire had to seek congressional help because of that rigid limitation. It still remains part of the McCarran-Walter Act. We have permitted those boys who served in Korea to remain, but we refuse to reexamine the quota provisions of the act—inequitable, unfair, and restrictive as it is.

Vicksburg (Miss.) Post-Herald Wins Pulitzer Prize for Local Reporting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS

OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 6, 1954

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, on December 5, 1953, one of the most destructive tornadoes in the history of my State struck the city of Vicksburg. In a matter of minutes, it took the lives of 38 people, rendered some 1,200 homeless, and inflicted property damage amounting to more than $30 million. It was the greatest tragedy to befall this historic community since it suffered the seige of Vicksburg in the War Between the States.

Working under extremely adverse conditions, handicapped by power failure and injuries to reporters and staff members, the Vicksburg Post-Herald went to press a few hours later to report details of the disaster to the world.

Reports of the tornado which appeared the next morning were so outstanding and of such significance that they earned for their paper the Pulitizer prize for local reporting.

Mr. Speaker, Mississippians are justifiably proud of this distinguished recognition accorded one of its newspapers. Hon. Louis P. Cashman, editor and publisher of the Post-Herald, and the members of the paper's staff are to be congratulated for this notable achievement in the field of journalism.

As a Mississippian, I am proud to call this to the attention of the House; and, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am inserting a copy of an Associated Press news item giving an account of this award. The item appeared in the Vicksburg Evening Post on May 4, 1954:

POST-HERALD GETS HIGHEST AWARD FOR TORNADO COVERAGE—PULITZER AWARD CITES REPORTING ON DECEMBER DISASTER

NEW YORK.—The Vicksburg (Miss.) Post-Herald winner of a Pulitzer prize for local reporting, was awarded the coveted honor for getting out its regular edition in the wake of a crippling tornado.

The paper was credited with covering in accurate detail and scope the disaster which killed 38 people. It struck two blocks from the newspaper office on December 5, 1953, and hampered coverage by damaging power and communications lines.

City editor Charles Faulk said cooperation by every department of the paper was the key to the prize-winning coverage.

It was an all-around job, he said, accomplished under great difficulty. Every staff member helped out and every department came through, he added, despite terrific problems.

The Post-Herald's efforts were hailed by local leaders as being responsible for building a spirit of unity needed to cope with the damage and in helping to avert any signs of public panic or disorder.

Gov. Hugh White, of Mississippi, praised the paper for a distinguished example of local reporting and publishing in the face of a catastrophe that would more than justify the omission of several editions.

The newspaper staff—editorial, clerical, and mechanical—all pulled together to get out the post-tornado editions even though the disaster brought personal tragedy to many of them. Members of the families of some were victims of the storm, while others had close friends among the injured and dead.

With makeshift and ingenious arrangements the paper was published. Despite its handicaps and problems, the newspaper managed to deliver full details and latest developments of the tragedy to the Associated Press.

Faulk paid tribute to AP staffers Douglas Starr of the Jackson bureau, and James Saggus of New Orleans, describing them as members of the team.

"Starr was over here within an hour after the tornado struck," Faulk said, "and pitched right in helping in every way possible. The same thing goes for Saggus and all other AP men who kept the story moving."

The St. Lawrence Seaway—Result of Poll of New England Business Leaders

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 6, 1954

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I submit for insertion in the RECORD a survey which I believe reflects the true sentiment of business leaders in New England on the St. Lawrence seaway. It comes as the result of a poll of the members of the New England Council and the New England Association of Commercial Executives and was ex-

E

pressed in a questionnaire titled "Views of New England Business Leaders on Major Congressional Issues" and dated as recently as April 27, 1954. It shows that 63 percent of New England's business leaders favor United States participation in the construction of the seaway, as compared with 29 percent against, with 8 percent not voting, or a majority of 2 to 1 in favor of participation.

THE VOICE OF NEW ENGLAND'S BUSINESS LEADERS IS HEARD ON THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY; THEY ARE FOR UNITED STATES PARTICIPATION 2 TO 1

Results of survey of members the New England Council and the New England Association of Commercial Executives entitled "Views of New England Business Leaders on Major Congressional Issues," April 27, 1954:

Total number voting	776
Distribution of vote:	
Vermont	30
New Hampshire	66
Rhode Island	48
Connecticut	92
Maine	64
Massachusetts	392
Miscellaneous	84
Total	776

Question No. 11: Do you favor United States participation in the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway?

Results: Yes, 481 (63 percent); no, 228 (29 percent); no vote, 67 (8 percent); total, 776 (100 percent).

National Park Concessions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1954

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I insert at this point in the RECORD four resolutions which were adopted by the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee of the House on May 4, 1954, in compliance with the act of July 31, 1953—Public Law 172, 83d Congress, 67 statute, page 261.

The act of July 31, 1953, provides that the Secretary of the Interior shall report in detail all proposed awards of concession leases and contracts, including renewals thereof, 60 days before such awards are made, to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives for transmission to the appropriate committees.

Meeting in open session on May 4, 1954, the committee was apprised of no reason to disapprove the Secretary's recommendations on the four proposed concession awards covered by the following resolutions:

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND
INSULAR AFFAIRS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

Whereas the act of July 31, 1953 (Public Law 172, 83d Cong., 67 stat. 261), provides that the Secretary of the Interior shall report in detail all proposed awards of concession leases and contracts, including renewals thereof, 60 days before such awards are made, to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives for transmission to the appropriate committees; and

Whereas the Speaker has referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs a letter dated March 9, 1954 containing the recommendations of the Secretary of the Interior with regard to a proposed award of a concession permit to Fred Harvey which will, when approved by the regional director, region 3, National Park Service, renew for the period January 1, 1954, through December 31, 1954, concession permit No. I–29np–43, under which the company is authorized to operate the Painted Desert Inn, Petrified Forest National Monument, Arizona; and

Whereas the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has, in session with a quorum present, this day found no reason to disapprove the recommendations of the Secretary of the Interior in this matter: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives give notice in writing to the Secretary of the Interior that it has no objection to his recommendations in this matter.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR
AFFAIRS.
A. L. MILLER, *Chairman*.

Adopted this 4th day of May 1954.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR,
AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

Whereas the act of July 31, 1953 (Public Law 172, 83d Cong., 67 Stat. 261), provides that the Secretary of the Interior shall report in detail all proposed awards of concession leases and contracts, including renewals thereof, 60 days before such awards are made, to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives for transmission to the appropriate committees; and

Whereas the Speaker has referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs a letter dated March 16, 1954 containing the recommendations of the Secretary of the Interior with regard to a proposed award of a concession permit to Drs. Alfred M. Lueck and John A. Pearson which will, when executed by the Regional Director, region two, National Park Service, extend for 1 year authorization to operate the hospital and furnish medical and dental care in Yellowstone National Park, Wyo., for a period of 1 year from January 1, 1954; and

Whereas the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has, in session with a quorum present, this day found no reason to disapprove the recommendations of the Secretary of the Interior in this matter: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives give notice in writing to the Secretary of the Interior that it has no objection to his recommendations in this matter.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND
INSULAR AFFAIRS,
A. L. MILLER, *Chairman*.

Adopted this 4th day of May 1954.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR
AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

Whereas the act of July 31, 1953 (Public Law 172, 83d Cong., 67 Stat. 261), provides that the Secretary of the Interior shall report in detail all proposed awards of concession leases and contracts, including renewals thereof, 60 days before such awards are made, to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives for transmission to the appropriate committees; and

Whereas the Speaker has referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs a letter dated March 16, 1954, containing the recommendations of the Secretary of the Interior with regard to a proposed award of a concession permit to Catherine W. Verkamp, Margaret Mary Verkamp, John George Verkamp, Mary Janet Trisler, and Catherine Martin, which will, when executed by the Director of the National Park Service, extend for 1 year from January 1, 1954, authorization to the aforesaid persons, doing business as Verkamp's, to provide accommodations, facilities, and services, for the public on the South Rim of Grand Canyon National Park, Arizona; and

Whereas the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has, in session with a quorum present, this day found no reason to disapprove the recommendations of the Secretary of the Interior in this matter: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives give notice in writing to the Secretary of the Interior that it has no objection to his recommendations in this matter.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND
INSULAR AFFAIRS.
A. L. MILLER, *Chairman*.

Adopted this 4th day of May 1954.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR
AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

Whereas the act of July 31, 1953 (Public Law 172, 83d Cong., 67 Stat. 261), provides that the Secretary of the Interior shall report in detail all proposed awards of concession leases and contracts, including renewals thereof, 60 days before such awards are made, to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives for transmission to the appropriate committees; and

Whereas the Speaker has referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs a letter dated March 19, 1954, containing the recommendations of the Secretary of the Interior with regard to a proposed award of a concession permit to Robert Eslinger and Maxine Lambert which will, when approved by the regional director, region 1, National Park Service, authorize the sale of firewood at campgrounds in Great Smoky Mountains National Park, Tenn., for the period April 15, 1954, to October 31, 1954; and

Whereas the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has, in session with a quorum present, this day found no reason to disapprove the recommendations of the Secretary of the Interior in this matter: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives give notice in writing to the Secretary of the Interior that it has no objection to his recommendations in this matter.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR
AND INSULAR AFFAIRS.
A. L. MILLER, *Chairman*.

Adopted this 4th day of May 1954.

Every Day Should Be Mother's Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1954

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following poem by Mr. Demus C. Kizer entitled "Every Day Should Be Mother's Day":

E

Every Day Should Be Mother's Day

(Dedicated to my mother)

(By Demus C. Kizer)

Just once a year, a day in May,
Is set aside as Mother's Day;
But every day should be her day,
With love and honor, we should pay.

Her generosity and virtues, we should extol;
A God-fearing mother, whose heart is pure gold.
When we need courage, hope, and cheer;
Her very presence is our strength to endure.

Bless you, mother, God bless your loving heart.
We depend on your prayers when life seems dark.
Your love and trust, allay our fears,
Down life's rough roads, these many years.

If we were in trouble, with the world in disdain,
You'd shoulder our burdens and never complain.
We're blessed with sisters, a father, and brothers,
But God only gives us, one loving mother.

Bless you mother, God bless your soul.
The great things you've done, alone consoles
The hearts of all, no one could do more.
I'm sure, these things, God will not ignore.

To mother, we owe a debt we can never repay;
So, accept our gratitude, we humbly pray,
That we may be worthy of a wonderful mother,
For God, in His heavens, knows we dearly love her.

May her hopes and dreams be realized, and life be sweet,
From morning's early sun, 'til its daily retreat.
May the sea breezes blow, moon and stars shine bright,
On a wonderful soul, we cherish with all our might.

Rural Electrification

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1954

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a statement made by Mr. Ernest Sjogren, of Funk, Nebr., which he made at the executive committee meeting of the Rural Electric Association on January 26, 1954, and supplemented on February 25, 1954.

Mr. Sjogren has long been interested in the promotion of good, sound rural-electric service in Nebraska and the Nation. He has been recognized many times for his efforts and loyal service.

A careful reading of his remarks indicate that he is somewhat disgusted with the New Deal radio commentators, newspaper columnists, and others who would undermine this administration at every opportunity with complete disregard of the damage they are doing to our country.

Mr. Sjogren implies that in some instances, where no criticism would be justified, many statements have been misrepresented or manufactured with great invasions upon the truth in order to discredit the fine work the REA has done in the past, is doing now, and what I hope it will continue to do in the future. Not only have these men misled the REA cooperatives, but they have also done them a great disservice.

I might remind my colleagues that in December 1953 and January 1954 my Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs held extensive hearings on the subject of public power. Testimony indicated that the new power criteria would not be damaging to REA's, as told by some.

The testimony brought out the fact that many REA groups and other preference customers of Federal power did not realize that former administrations, and in comparatively recent times, had made long-term contracts with private groups for Federal power at costs far less than that of production.

The statement, which I sincerely hope my colleagues will carefully read, follows:

DISCUSSION BY ERNEST SJOGREN AT THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING OF THE RURAL ELECTRIC ASSOCIATION, JANUARY 26, 1954, SUPPLEMENTED FEBRUARY 25, 1954

Mr. Chairman, first of all I wish to inform you that my own Southern Nebraska Rural Public Power District has just recently been notified by the REA Administrator and some of the Congressmen that our application for a loan has been approved in the amount of $735,000. I also wish to state that the time consumed by the REA in processing this application was probably less than the time consumed in the processing of any one of our several former applications totaling well over $4 million. I wish to commend the REA for this prompt service. This certainly does not indicate any slowdown, nor any loss in efficiency in the service of the Department in Washington.

Another matter I wish to mention is the Robert S. Allen column that we run in our State publication. This column was discussed at a meeting of State managers and editors at the Miami meeting. It was stated that this column carries many statements that have no base for accuracy whatever and that its nature may be libelous. It was also stated that all but two State associations had discontinued this column from their publication. However, for certain reasons it was decided to subscribe for this column for only 1 more year. If our publications are to accomplish their purposes they cannot be permitted to carry any statements that may be biased or questioned as to accuracy.

I am not going to give a detailed nor a general report on the Miami meeting. Some of you who were there may do that. However, there are a few matters that I wish to discuss very briefly. These matters are relative to the situation we now find ourselves in the existing controversial Federal power policy and the REA.

My approach is going to be very negative and I am going to point to some holes in our ferocious attacks on the Federal administration. What I am about to say is my own opinion, formulated by reading the record and observing from the sideline, merely as a grassroot farmer and not as a member of any organization.

Many of us grassroots who have been connected with the rural electrification movement since the inception of REA have always had a clear and justified understanding and knowledge, that to be successful in our endeavor to electrify rural America we must first of all maintain everything pertaining to rural electrification above the level of partisan politics. To refrain from the mention of politics has even been considered a virtue. As of today this situation seems to have been completely reversed.

Several meetings have been held for the called purpose of discussing the effects of the present Federal power criteria on our rural electric projects. While some good was derived from these meetings, many people who attended were at loss in deciding whether the prior purpose of calling these meetings was for discussing the concerned criteria or for the promotion of certain personal aspirations.

I attended the two Missouri Basin meetings at Omaha and the Electric Consumers Conference at Denver. These meetings were all held in a definitely sensed atmosphere hazed by the influence of administration condemnation. I also attended the NRECA meeting at Miami. I can now state that everything expected to happen at Miami did happen—and more too. The lid was definitely razed from the smouldering political keg.

We attended these meetings and listened to magnificent orations delivered by "have been's" or "would be's." We were feasted with part facts and distorted facts to the extent that many of us have become glutted with utter confusion. Antagonistic statements of part facts, quotes, misquotes, and inconsistencies seem to have become the proper procedure of expression.

Some there are who would like to place our whole program into chaos by injecting it into the most confused skulduggery that has ever been witnessed. The damage already done by this procedure cannot now be calculated. If continued it can result only in the scuttling of the whole REA and the Federal power program.

If our purposes and objectives are to be attained and survive I believe that we must first of all remove the REA shroud (which has become soiled by contemptible charges against the Federal administration), from the environments of personal aspirations and rabble rousing. Having done this, we grassroots may in a clean atmosphere come to sound conclusions by analyzing facts as presented and as found in the records.

I have the profoundest regard for the Constitution of our United States. I have the greatest respect and faith in its administration elected by its own people. It is absurd to even think that anyone can believe in administrative liquidation of people's welfare.

I am sure that there is no problem pertaining to our program too paramount to be amicably solved to the best interests of the people if solutions are sought in an environment free from personalities and administration prejudice.

I have here the voting records on rural electrification and related Federal wholesale power of Members serving in the United States Senate and the House of Representatives. This record, as you know, was compiled for members of the NRECA. I might say that at the board of directors meeting at Miami most of the members expressed great desire to have this record compiled to date. Some even urged that it be completed before the coming elections.

I do not question the correctness of the record as far as recording of votes is concerned. But with the absence of analysis and comments on the bill voted on, and on other bills involved, one may very easily judge a voter as being against our cause, whereas if all the facts involved were known he might really be our best friend. And furthermore, we certainly cannot fairly judge a Congressman's qualification and desirability by his vote on merely one of the many important issues that faces him.

I have studied this voting record in the light of the many charges that have been made against the Federal administration at recent meetings that I have attended. I think that it is only fair to let this voting record, that we have compiled for our own

E

use, answer some of these charges. By so doing, we might find some correct answers to our bewilderment and confusion. Some of these charges briefly discussed are as follows:

I. Higher power cost: At the Omaha meeting we were led to believe that the present administration would exercise its privilege in setting the period for amortization of investments on power facilities at 50 years instead of 78 years as has been in the past, thus causing higher electric rates.

From the Voting Record (House) we read:

Item (25): "Vote on clear-cut amendment to H. R. 2873 to reduce 78-year period for paying off investment in power facilities to 50 years, thus causing higher electric rates from most Bureau of Reclamation dams." January 22, 1948: Yeas 220, nays 134, not voting 76.

II. Charges are made that administration policy has eliminated a bulk of transmission lines that are necessary to serve preferred customers, particularly in the Bureau of Reclamation area.

From Voting Record (House), quote as follows:

Item (36): "Vote on amendment to H. R. 3790 (Department of the Interior appropriations, 1952) to reduce by $10,100,000 funds for construction by the Bureau of Reclamation to serve rural electric systems and others (amendment did not deal with power facilities alone)." May 2, 1951: Yeas 237, nays 160, not voting 36.

Item (37) (House): "Vote on amendment to H. R. 3790 (Department of the Interior appropriations, 1952) providing that no Bureau of Reclamation construction funds 'shall be used to initiate the construction of transmission facilities within those areas covered by power wheeling service contracts which include provision for service to Federal establishments and preferred customer'." May 2, 1951: Yeas 226, nays 163, not voting 42.

Also—

Item (17) (Senate): "Vote on amendment to H. R. 3790 (Department of the Interior appropriations, 1952) to authorize the use of Bureau of Reclamation construction funds to 'include and provide for the construction of transmission lines in the Bureau of Reclamation's regions 6 and 7 including western Minnesota,' to serve rural electric cooperatives in Minnesota and Iowa." July 12, 1951: Yeas 15, nays 55, not voting 26.

III. Charges are made against the administration for bringing to a halt which will eventually wreck the rural projects in the Southeastern Power Administration area as well as in the Southwestern Power Administration area. I am not familiar with the problems in this area but there seems to be controversies regarding lack of funds for desired transmission facilities.

From Voting Record (House), quote as follows:

Item (32): "Vote on amendment to H. R. 3790 (Department of the Interior Appropriations, 1952) to eliminate all funds ($3,400,000) for construction by the Southeastern Power Administration to serve rural electric systems and others." May 2, 1951: Yeas 248, nays 149, not voting 36.

Item (33) (House): "Vote on amendment to H. R. 3790 (Department of the Interior Appropriations, 1952) to reduce by $550,000 funds for construction by the Southwestern Power Administration to serve rural electric systems and others." May 2, 1951: Yeas 222, nays 173, not voting.

Item (34) (House): "Vote on amendment to H. R. 3790 (Department of the Interior Appropriations 1952) to eliminate SPA's Western Missouri Project to serve rural systems and others." May 2, 1951: Yeas 247, nays 152, not voting 34.

Item (15) (Senate): "Vote on germaneness of Senate Appropriation Committee amendment to H. R. 3790 (Department of the Interior Appropriations 1952) restricting use of SPA and SEPA continuing funds to serve rural electric cooperatives." July 10, 1951: Yeas 42, nays 30, not voting 24.

Item (16) (Senate): "Vote on Senate Appropriations Committee Amendment to H. R. 3790 (Department of the Interior Appropriation, 1952) restricting use of SPA and SEPA continuing funds to serve rural electric cooperatives." July 10, 1951: Yeas 39, nays 29, not voting 28.

Reports similar to those quoted above may also be found in the Voting Record in answer to charges made against the administration in other areas such as the TVA and Bonneville. It is interesting to note the overwhelming majority of votes by which these issues were set up in a pattern that is described in the Voting Record as being unfavorable to our cause. It is likewise interesting to note these patterns were all set up by a Congress under the regime of a former administration.

IV. The administration's power policy has been relentlessly condemned for abrogating the preference right by the removal of the recapture clause from 11 long-term contracts.

The hearings recently held in Washington before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, House of Representatives (briefly referred to as Congressman Miller's hearing) revealed many important facts that become very startling when focused on our critical condemnation of the present Federal power policy.

In studying the report on this hearing we discover that all preference customers have not, as we have been led to believe, been protected by a recapture clause.

On page 9 of this report are citations from the different acts passed by Congress from the Reclamation Act of 1906 to the Flood Control Act of 1945. These acts all deal with water, hydrogeneration, or sale of hydroelectric power. These citations are policies passed by Congress for the disposal of power generated in the particular area for which the act was passed. All these acts have clearly defined provisions to give certain preference to certain groups. The Bonneville Act of 1937 is the only act cited in this report that provides for a cancellation clause in its contracts to privately owned companies in its own service area. On page 8 of this report is the power policy adopted by the Secretary of the Interior January 1946. This policy very definitely states that preference in the sale of power shall be given public agencies and cooperatives. Section 1 (f) of this policy definitely states that contracts with privately owned companies shall be limited in time and shall contain provisions for cancellation in favor of preference customers.

It is very significant to note that even under this policy, with its preference and cancellation provisions, that preference rights were also (in our own terms), abrogated by the execution of long-term contracts to private companies without the cancellation feature. Several of these long-term contracts, one for a period of 50 years, were executed under this policy. List of these contracts may be found in the report on Miller's Hearings, page 27.

V. The administration has been charged by some people for stopping all hydro developments and progress of Federal power.

On pages 6 and 7 of report on Miller's hearings we have the Interior Department's statement dated August 18, 1953, quoted as follows:

(a) "Of the total Bureau of Reclamation construction program of $174 million for the present fiscal year, $63,400,000 will be spent on hydroelectric power developments and distribution facilities or on multipurpose dams which will have power production as a major function."

(b) "Scheduled for this year is start of installation of 104,500-kilowatt generator at Hoover Dam."

(c) "A $7,682,991 contract has just been let for the Monticello Dam in California."

(d) "One million dollars appropriated to initiate work at Central Valley in California."

(e) "Recommendation to Congress for authorization of the Frying Pan-Arkansas project in Colorado, 104,000-kilowatt project."

(f) "Approval of report for installation of 50,000-kilowatt powerplant at San Luis Valley in Colorado."

(g) "Three million dollar appropriation to Bureau of Reclamation for planning of further water resource projects involving hydroelectric features."

According to testimonies these starts seem to be the first since the beginning of Korean war.

VI. We criticize the administration for not consulting us regarding the power problems in our area.

From NRECA Executive Committee meeting held in Washington on November 5–6, 1953, following quote:

Item (11): "T. Foley Treadway, Jr., partner, Southern Engineering Co., Atlanta, reported on a meeting that had been held the day before by generation and transmission groups of the Missouri Basin with Assistant Secretary of the Interior Fred G. Aandahl. Problems covering this area and the Southwest were discussed. He informed us that Mr. Aandahl has asked for a committee of five to be appointed from this area to discuss the disposition of power with his Department."

Almost 4 months have now passed since this request was made. I have not yet seen a report from such a committee, nor have I seen any report stating that such a committee has ever been appointed.

The records clearly indicate that all our problems and difficulties did not arise from procedures or actions taken as recently as yesterday or a few monts ago. Most of them may be traced back several years. Therefore, it is only logical that most of these mentioned accusations, and several others, aimed at the administration should be aimed directly at precedents set up in congressional patterns in previous years.

In a program such as ours it is reasonable to assume that we shall continue to experience problems and controversies. We have always had to deal with them in the past. We can all remember our problems connected with the brown-out days following World War II, due to power shortage. We also may revive our memory merely 3 or 4 years ago when in a dozen or more drafts and redrafts we were squabbling with the Bureau of Reclamation for a satisfactory power contract.

We have always been concerned about funds. By resolution or by other means, requests have been made to every Congress for huge appropriations to expand our program. I do not believe that any Congress ever appropriated the full amount we requested. But the appropriations have always been more than ample to provide for our timely desired progress and growth.

The rural power program is no longer in its infancy. As it grows into maturity it must necessarily become more and more independent and must assume more and bigger responsibilities.

In assuming some of these responsibilities, which are or must be definitely defined in the light of our laws, the rurals now find it necessary to explore the status relative to their preference in the Federal power supply.

Although the several congressional acts carry the preference provision, the interpretation of the preference is evidently such that even the best attorneys in the past as well as today cannot agree as to its real implementation.

Based on its interpretation of these acts the administration has adopted a power policy in which the rules are spelled out in the power criteria. I believe that everybody will agree that any undertaking that has as many implications and ramifications, in its

E

dealings with different areas under various conditions, as the Federal power program must of necessity have as a guide the criteria. Whether or not we rurals have in the past been floating through very thin air, without having the criteria, is not questioned. The facts are that we have the rules and they have become a very controversial issue.

Many people have become greatly alarmed at the possible damaging effects. The administration has given repeated assurance that nothing is involved in the criteria that will hurt the rurals. Other people have expressed themselves as having no fear—and again some have become indignant and resorted to legal procedure and have declared carrying the fight to the very portals of the United States Supreme Court. I am not denouncing the legal procedure but in making the declaration I believe that it would be well to remember the repeated warnings of our great former Administrator, Mr. Wickard, "Too many times we win by only one vote on the Hill." Though the courts may be won and the Hill lost, what are the gains?

I do not believe that we can ever expect to accomplish our purposes and objectives by using published bold-typed smear propaganda against our administration while we are with the one hand signing a contract for 100,000 kilowatts of low-priced Federal power.

Nor do I believe that we are maintaining a clear atmosphere, in which many of our problems must be examined and solved, by publishing propaganda denouncing our Congressmen as voting against the people by their votes on controversial issues on the perimeter of our Nation.

I do not believe that we in Nebraska are wise to the extent that we are eligible to judge what the people want or what is best for them in the New York area or in any other area where these controversies are from all indications equally divided.

I often become somewhat disturbed when we of our own State often discuss Federal power in other areas; we often become too concerned about the national precedent in the hydropower industry. This concern resolves itself into the thinking that the Federal Government alone has or should have the right to develop our streams into hydropower. In other words ,that is to say that the Federal Government alone should have the right to develop the natural resources of our Nation. This would necessarily include hydropower, petroleum, forestry, mining, and, finally, the land and the soil.

This thinking is certainly contrary to the doctrine of free enterprise, the freedom to choose and the freedom of initiative, all of which constitute the large alley through which all progress and advancements have passed to make ours the greatest nation on earth with its people enjoying the highest standard of living in the world. It would be very absurd to even believe that our people want to retard their progress by the shackling of these freedoms.

St. Peter's College Diamond Jubilee Dinner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. HART

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1954

Mr. HART. Mr. Speaker, 75 years ago there was established in Jersey City under the auspices of the Jesuit order a great institution of learning, St. Peter's College. It is my pride and privilege to be numbered among its alumni.

Throughout all the years of its existence during whch its student body has grown enormously in numbers but maintained of necessity the high qualities of heart and mind demanded of it by the college superiors it has sent forth countless men—men eminent in the clergy, in the professions, in arts and sciences, in public life, in the business world—who have enriched the culture and advanced immeasurably the welfare of our country, and in a very special manner, that of northern New Jersey.

On Wednesday evening, April 28 last, a great banquet under auspices of the college alumni, was conducted in the main ballroom of the Roosevelt Hotel, New York City, commemorating the 75th anniversary of the founding of St. Peter's. The great hall was filled to overflowing by the alumni, their ladies, and friends of the college. Several former presidents of the institution were present, one of whom, Rev. Joseph F. Dineen, S. J., delivered a stirring, moving address. Rev. James J. Shanahan, S. J., now president, outlined the future prospects of the college; former Judge Mark A. Sullivan, one of its earlier graduates, reminisced about his experiences and impressions as a student and Mr. Robert Alan Kelly, eloquent young alumnus, spoke of more recent days within its walls. Mr. Joseph F. S. Fitzpatrick, chairman of the committee, who arranged the fine event, spoke briefly in welcoming the guests, and State Senator James F. Murray, Jr., presided as toastmaster with his customary skill and aplomb. Among the distinguished guests accepting invitations to the banquet was Hon. Robert B. Meyner, Governor of New Jersey.

Many distinguished scholars are listed on the rolls of those who have been graduated from old St. Peter's. Among those widely noted for brilliance and learning is Hon. Thomas F. Meaney, of the class of 1908, now judge of the United States District Court for the District of New Jersey, and for many years before his accession to the Federal bench, a jurist presiding over the courts of that State. To him was accorded the honor of delivering the principal speech of the evening. The topic which he selected for his discourse was Education, and I am pleased to append hereto the main portion of his meaty address:

> The topic of my discourse for this evening is education, a formidably comprehensive one which perforce I shall constrict to a limited if somewhat general consideration. Of course, no matter from what angle this question be viewed, one fact remains unalterable and that is that the first influence on the individual, the earliest instruction is in the home, in the family which should be the bulwark of both church and state. Here the first and lifelong impressions are made on the sensitive mind of the child, a situation the importance of which cannot be overestimated. When a man and woman are joined in holy wedlock in the sacrament of matrimony, they assume mutual duties in this lifetime relationship. When by their act and the will of God, children are born of the union, new and sacred responsibilities are added. Upon the parents rests the obligation by precept and example to initiate the pattern which will outline the course of their development, and later to indicate the further means to be pursued in their general training. I might here dilate on the part which the family plays in the question of education, and the dire results of the failure of parents to meet the task which is theirs. I might point out the evils of broken homes and of the collapse of standards of integrity and decency. But that is not the phase of the overall problem of which I wish to speak. I am concerned at the moment with that part of it which of necessity is outside the family and has to do with the civil education as well as the moral and religious, in the schools, with preparation for the assumption and carrying out of man's destiny. I need not tell you that the main objective of attendance at our alma mater was for something other than the development of biceps and muscular agility and prowess on the athletic field; and for something other than the forming of useful social contacts. It was concerned with the proper development of mind and heart. There is no need for me to remind you that the theory of Jesuit education does not aim solely at the production of men equipped with the means of meeting the conflicts of the world in the acquisition of the material rewards of success. There is a better and higher end in view, and one for which the Jesuit teaching equipment is of the first order. Education there means the strengthening of the will and the intellect by supernatural truth, using all of the means of grace which may so abundantly be drawn upon. St. Peter's and institutions like it, stand steadfast in the midst of the whirlwind of changes which modern tendencies demand, particularly in the field of higher education.
>
> For generations the accent in secular educational processes has been placed on technical and scientific aspects. The preexisting culture, based on a recognition of the importance of revealed religion and the part it must play in any well ordered scheme of instruction, was largely cast aside as unsuited to the assumption that man's concern must be only with that which affected his material well-being and his economic needs. Man was presumed to live for his life on earth alone, and only that was really important which contributed to the satisfaction of his earthy aspirations.
>
> With the growth and spread of rationalism, the type and quality of educational endeavor tended more and more to the utilitarian. Its purpose was no longer to develop the well-rounded man, equipped to meet the problems of this world and at the same time to fulfill the purpose for which he was created. As scientific research disclosed more and more of the effects of the laws of nature, and those discoveries were applied to invention and development of even greater marvels, so the minds of modernistic educators turned more and more to that form of training which would best enable them to delve further into the field of science, of science in capital letters. Of course not all men could avail themselves of this training, and not all who could were able to achieve success. But the general trend of education, determined by the world's measure of what constituted success, had scientific accomplishment as its goal, and defined the form in which educational processes should be molded. Naturally they were molded more and more along secularistic lines. There was, of course, a limited preservation of the humanities for the spirit will not be completely denied, but in general utility was the end all and be all.
>
> The unfortunate corollary of this condition of affairs is that a vitally important element of true education has been sacrificed in most systems of instruction. The spiritual side of the training of men has been neglected, has even been rejected as superfluous, if not as hostile, to intellectual development. The rapid progress of discovery and the enormous increase in the store of human knowledge begat in men an exaggerated sense of their importance and an

L

obsessive pride of intellect. Many innovators in the field of human knowledge became blind to the fact that faith and reason, religion and science are not opposed to each other. They fail to see that faith has never tried to deny the freedom of scientific investigation, though it does proclaim its right to establish proper limits thereof. After all scientific exploration into the unknown and the resultant revelations mean only that men have discovered more about the operation of the miraculous design of the Almighty in the creation of the physical world. With that faith never quarrels. The trouble arises out of the failure of earthbound scientists to acknowledge the divine ordainment of the principles, and their physical effects, on which they have chanced.

What this calamitous distortion of the function of education has done is only too apparent in the world today. Unmindful of the fact that it must concern itself, as Pope Pius XI has said, "with the aggregate of human life, physical and spiritual, intellectual and moral, individual, domestic, and social," the scope of education in modern secular control has been limited in a major degree to fostering the practical features of secular learning to the exclusion of those appreciations which created men must have. Let me say again that true Christian education has no quarrel with true science. On the contrary it encourages the quest for knoweldge and the application of its results to the benefit and enrichment of mankind. Its insistment, however, must be that in the processes of training there be no sacrifice of spirituality, morality, and religion on the specious pretext that they constitute a restriction on freedom of thought and research. Divine revelation, divine teaching, never circumscribe the legitimate activities of the questing human. Rather do they channel them to the wellsprings of truth.

I have made reference to the state of the world today. It needs no Jeremiah to bemoan the agony into which the souls of men have been cast in this society of untrammeled, undisciplined human beings. When the attempt was made to dethrone God and deify reason, unaided by faith, the first destructive steps were taken toward the holocausts which have brought so much suffering to humanity. Twice in the century in which we live, we have seen the inevitable consequences of the failure of what we might term the New Look in education and the resultant breakdown of private and public morality. As the individual has fallen away from the concepts of God's truth, so many nations have abandoned their bases of justice and divine law. They have abandoned every fundamental principle in their mad struggle for positions of dominance from which to control their own and other peoples. Power without responsibility has become their god. Two world wars have eventuated, the second a horrible intensification of the first and a foreshadowing of what a third all inclusive conflict will mean. God forbid that it ever come with its threat of the destruction of such civilization as we know.

As men have gone further from the light of the world, so has their discontent and unhappiness increased. Devotion to material success has not resulted in happiness. Yes, we have the electric light, radio, television, the automobile, and a thousand and one other wonders that have become commonplace as a result of modern scientific advancement, but peace has not entered men's hearts.

The discoveries that were to mean so much, the fruits of the new education which were to mean release for men from drudgery, poverty, and indignity have failed in their magic. Justice and universal recognition of human rights are further away than ever. Selfishness, greed, acquisitiveness have increased, and the homely virtues which were the cherished aim of our supposedly less favored forebears have been lost in the mad rush for the glittering rewards of temporal triumphs.

Yes; we have seen colossal stupendous achievements. But for this astounding obverse there is a bleaky terrifying reverse. We know that all is not well with men, nor with their fabulous progress. Let us examine in what state we are. The motorcar has its counterpart in the Army tank, the commercial airplane has its counterpart in the flying fortress and the Sabre jet, and so on. For every instrument for man's comfort there is a corresponding one for his destruction. And now the greatest force which man has discovered, which might contribute so much to the arts of peace, has thus far been developed only as a weapon of war, frightening in its potentiality for destruction, offering what has been called "a prefabricated hell in the superb civilization of fear." Again we see another savagely unfortunate result of the perversion of education, where justice, truth, human dignity have been thrust aside for other and pagan concepts.

The great divisive philosophies with the accompanying progressive de-Christianization of education in so much of the world have brought about a dispensation where the nations of the world are alined in a struggle the outcome of which no man can foresee. In particular, Communist-controlled peoples, denied knowledge of the word, perverted by incessant propaganda, and oppressed by their godless masters, are in enforced opposition to the till now free countries. In that part of the world not under Communist control there still subsists a measure of perception of real truth, a stubborn residue of the teachings of men of God. We know that there are such things as inalienable rights of the individual, we abhor slavish obedience to the State as a supreme master. We know that God does exist and that His law is above all. And it is only because of these recognitions that we may be saved, only if we hold fast to these truths that we can surely meet the threat of pagan power ideology. Because, in spite of everything, there has persisted a leaven of spirituality in us, we will be able to survive the assaults of the force of evil.

Unfortunately, in that battle for God, we may be compelled to use the horrible weapons of destruction which man's inhumanity has forged. For while we renew our dedication to His work, and strive to walk in the paths of righteousness, we must ever be ready to combat the powers of darkness, ready to endure suffering and endless sacrifice if need be. For now, prayer and good works may be our part, but the day may unfortunately come when all of the tragedies of war may fall upon us, when none of us may shirk his burden, however dreadful.

And when, with God's help, we or our children or our children's children bring peace out of this world's chaos, it will be only when the lesson has been learned that Christ came to this world to furnish a practicable way of life in accordance with His teachings and example, and to enable men to save their souls.

You may think I have strayed from the subject of my discourse but what I have done is simply to highpoint the results of the failure of education in its proper function of training men to think and act in accordance with right reason illumined by the supernatural light of the example and teaching of the Savior of the world. This impeachment can in nowise be directed at the methods and courses followed at the educational institutions guided and directed by our church. It is an indictment of the aims, ends and accomplishments, of the failures, of the pedagogical processes which take no account of the estate to which man is called by virtue of the fact that he is a child of God. It may be too late to hope for a reversal of form, but certainly it remains our duty to do what is in our power to bring the world back to sanity through proper education.

We of St. Peter's know that our alma mater has remained an unchanging guide in the way of truth, and we must ever be proud of that knowledge. It is for us to remain faithful to what we learned there and to give significant allegiance to that for which it stands, not peripherally, but deeply; then we can do our part fully and completely, to the limit of our powers, to make this world a better place in which to live, and in which men may conform their lives to the pattern of salvation as outlined by the laws of God and His holy church. Can our faith in Christ and His church overmatch the fanatical devotion of the followers of the antichrist? Are we willing to dedicate ourselves as wholly and completely to what we believe and know to be the truth, and sacrifice ourselves as readily for it, as do they in their unhallowed cause? This is our challenge. We dare not refuse to accept it.

A Proposal To Create a Department of Civil Defense in the Department of Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. R. WALTER RIEHLMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1954

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, the recent discussions on the floor of the House concerning the Defense Department appropriation bill have brought out some startling facts about our plans for military defense of the United States in the atomic-hydrogen age. I fully concur with the administration's efforts and its policies in building a strong retaliatory force. Our best hopes for preservation of the free world lie in international negotiation from a position of strength. Although it is now a matter of hindsight, it is generally agreed that much of our current troubles might have been averted had we not disarmed as rapidly as we did following World War II.

However, the recent public releases on the destructiveness of the hydrogen bomb have shocked the people of this Nation into giving more thought to our civil defense. In fact, one of the main reasons for releasing to the public the hydrogen bomb information was to bolster the efforts of the Federal Civil Defense Administration and to increase its effectiveness.

The Federal Civil Defense Administration, as presently constituted, is primarily an information coordinating headquarters which must depend upon the voluntary efforts of each State in the Union to develop the kind of individual civil defense operations which each State can afford. The limit of each State's plan is dependent upon the amount of State money available for this activity. Even where the people of the individual States are made conscious of the great necessity for their State's civil defense program, and even where adequate State funds could be made avail-

F

able for civil defense, the process of translating this concern into governmental action in a democratic society is bound to be a slow one. Can we as a nation afford, at this period of technological development, the luxury of such a system? I do not believe that we can. Although I have opposed in the past, and shall continue to oppose in the future, the shifting of many legitimate State functions to the Federal Government, it would seem obvious today that civil defense, as well as military defense, is a proper responsibility of the National Government.

This is not a radical idea by any means. It long ago became apparent that State militias were an outmoded form of military organization for the United States. State militias had to be disbanded in favor of a more integrated approach through the National Guard program, operated from the Department of Defense. Independent State civil defense organizations are, today, as outmoded as independent State military organizations.

When it was announced last summer that the Soviet Union had conducted a test explosion of the hydrogen bomb, it became increasingly clear to me that the civil defense program of the United States was becoming outmoded. The potentialities of this Soviet weapon were further pointed up by the recent release of information concerning the United States hydrogen bomb detonated in March of 1953, and also by the various reports on the most recent hydrogen bomb explosion. Many of us are convinced that our entire civil defense program is obsolete.

One fact which has become apparent is that civil defense is no longer a program which we can afford to relegate to a subordinate position in our governmental structure. The task of civil defense cannot be entirely separated from the main effort of our national-defense program. This means that the Federal Government must assume a greater share of any responsibilities now borne jointly with the several States. The present division of civil defense functions between the Federal Government and the States is wholly unrealistic in view of the destructive characteristics of the hydrogen bomb. The civilian sanctuaries of a few years ago have become the military targets of today. We must be just as concerned about the defense of the civilian populations of our great industrial and commercial centers today as we have been about the defense of our military bases and installations in the past.

It is not only necessary that there be a greater concentration of authority at the Federal level, but it is also necessary for the Federal Government to shoulder the principal financial burden. Every American citizen is entitled to a minimum and equal share of effort for his defense should a war be brought into our backyards. The problem, therefore, is a national one. The responsibility of our National Government to the people can be carried out only by an intelligent program developed and operated from a central point.

The present civil-defense program, established pursuant to the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950—approved January 12, 1951—is a loose confederation of individual State programs. While much progress has been made, both at the State level and by the Federal Civil Defense Administration—particularly with regard to negotiation of interstate mutual-aid compacts—the basic system itself has proved to be wholly inadequate.

It is not a secret that the civil-defense program has been a stepchild agency in the executive branch of the Government. The Congress has repeatedly made drastic cuts in the appropriation requests of that agency from its inception. Whether the cuts were made as a result of lack of confidence on the part of the Congress in the program being proposed, or whether these cuts were a necessary economy measure is almost beside the point. As an economy measure, the argument may hold up if the priority for that program were to be based on the conditions existing in 1941, in 1949, or even in 1951. In that period our military position, as it was affected by the development of atomic weapons and hydrogen weapons, was an entirely different one from that with which we are faced today.

The people of the United States have never refused to face up to a problem involving our national safety merely because of the monetary costs involved. We can no longer depend upon the dual system of charging the Department of Defense with the responsibility of a military defense of our people from enemy action on the one hand, and charging the Federal Civil Defense Administration, through a loose confederation of State civil-defense agencies, with the problem of taking care of our citizens in the event of military attack upon our homeland.

While I realize that this approach is radically different from any civil-defense program previously adopted in the United States, the time has come to face the facts that military and civil defense cannot be separated. We must develop an entirely new concept of civil defense.

Voluntary participation in civil defense is, like voluntary armies, largely a phenomenon of the past. We are being faced with the realities of total war. Civil defense now requires an effective corps of trained personnel. In terms of importance, it is no longer possible to distinguish this type of service from purely military service.

There is no real answer to the inadequacies of our present civil-defense program. Indeed, it is no longer a question of whether our civil-defense officials have succeeded or failed in their assigned tasks, or whether this person or that party was responsible for the success or failure. It is, rather, a matter of lifting our conception of civil defense out of the framework of pre-atomic-hydrogen days. It is a matter of carefully examining the realities of defense requirements in a completely new and modern setting. It is a matter of considering, in the light of new realities, the problem of constructing a rational program for civil defense.

While the experience accumulated by the Federal Civil Defense Administration will, naturally, be of great importance in developing a new civil-defense program, a study of the problem itself should be much broader; it should be dealt with on a level encompassing our entire national-defense program. Civil defense must be considered as a part of our military planning by the Joint Chiefs of Staff and by the National Security Council. It cannot merely be coordinated with the military plans being developed at that level. When civil defense is developed along lines of mere coordination or cooperation with these basic military policy planning groups, civil defense becomes a kind of second-class agency, regardless of the sincerity of both the military and the civil-defense leadership.

Because of these considerations, I am introducing a concurrent resolution, expressing the sense of Congress that the President, in accordance with the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended, should provide such a positive program.

The program outlined in this resolution provides for the abolition of the Federal Civil Defense Administration and for the creation of a Department of Civil Defense. This newly created Department would be established within the Department of Defense, and would be headed by a Secretary with a status equivalent to that of the Secretaries of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force. The Secretary of Civil Defense would be assisted by a civilian Chief of Staff who would become a member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

The new Department of Civil Defense would be similar to the military departments in many respects. Its functions would be carried out under the direction, authority, and control of the Secretary of Defense, and its recommendations for further legislation would be submitted through the Secretary of Defense, who is a member of the National Security Council.

An incidental advantage which would accrue as the result of incorporating the civil defense program within the Department of Defense is the possibility for more intensive utilization of surplus military property. Large quantities of surplus military property are now being offered for sale to the public. Under the military surplus property program, as presently constituted, the Federal Civil Defense Administration has no priority in claiming excess military property, much of which would be usable in the civil defense program. State and municipal civil defense organizations, at present, are not even eligible to participate in the Federal donable surplus property program. Inclusion of the new Department of Civil Defense within the Department of Defense would make available to civil defense activities much of the surplus military property now being sold, and a considerable portion of such property could be transferred from the military departments without reimbursement.

As to manpower requirements, it is suggested that the President's reorganization plan request legislation to permit an allotment of personnel to be made through the machinery of the existing United States Selective Service System. Such a system would be a most fortunate program for utilizing the services of those who cannot meet their obligations in the national military service for reasons of conscientious objection, physical disqualifications, or for any other reason. It is not intended to imply that the manpower requirements for this department shall be supplied solely from the pool of those who are rejected for or exempt from military service. Such a limitation would be unfair to the many patriotic citizens who, for reasons entirely beyond their control, have not been fortunate enough to serve our country in the past. It is my belief, furthermore, that this civil defense program, within the Defense Establishment, might be studied to determine the possibilities for including it in the plans for the universal military training program.

This new department would be charged with the primary responsibility for preparing a comprehensive program for civil defense geared to the hydrogen bomb age. It would be able to exert leadership in the development and operation of a positive and effective national civil defense system.

One argument is frequently advanced against giving undue prominence to defensive measures such as civil defense and the Air Defense Command. It is argued that our best defense is a strong offensive power, and that programs emphasizing defense rather than offense are isolationist in character, seeking to hide America behind some mysterious wall of impenetrable defense without entangling international responsibilities. As part of this same line of reasoning, it is argued that the men, money, and materials necessary for such defensive measures would result in a dangerous drain upon our offensive capabilities.

These viewpoints deserve full and serious consideration, of course, but I cannot agree that they preclude much more ambitious defensive measures than we have yet undertaken. The problem cannot be phrased in terms of alternative choices. The simple fact is that we must achieve a stronger defense without weakening or subordinating our offensive power. Adequate defensive measures coupled with powerful offensive capabilities do not add up to either isolationism or bankruptcy. The leadership of the United States would be strengthened by the world knowledge that we are prepared to repel as well as to invade. In the event of war, there would be scant hope for the survival of the free world if we were able to destroy the enemy, but incapable of preventing the annihilation of our own cities and people.

Our homes, our cities, our families, our skilled industrial workers, are just as much a part of the total national defense potential as our uniformed military forces. It would be disastrous to continue to ignore this simple truth.

The St. Lawrence Ship Channel: Railroad Opinion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1954

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statements of views by leading railroads:

THE ST. LAWRENCE SHIP CHANNEL: RAILROAD OPINION

How do the great railways of the West and the Northwest view the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence ship channel proposal? Will the opening of the Great Lakes to the commerce of the world react favorably or unfavorably on the earning power of the railroads? Will the national benefits to be derived justify the undertaking?

These are questions friends and opponents of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence ship channel wish answered.

The railroads themselves have stated their positions time and again.

The Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Tidewater Association presents for the reader's consideration, and without comment of its own, their authorized views.

CHARLES P. CRAIG,
Executive Director.

THE RAILROADS WITH EASTERN TERMINI ON THE LAKES FAVOR THE GREAT LAKES-ST. LAWRENCE SHIP CHANNEL

Conceivably some of the reasons may be stated as follows:

The low cost of deepwater navigation extends the radius of distribution and develops railroad traffic to and from the ports.

Extending marine commerce to Great Lakes ports is not basically competitive to the railroads, but creates traffic to and from the ports they serve.

Increased car efficiency through quicker turnaround and resultant greater earnings per car.

Recovery to these roads of a just proportion of the total revenue on interchange traffic.

Increased traffic in the territory they serve.

(a) Stimulation in production due to the lowered cost of reaching markets.

(b) Greater purchasing power due to (a) and widening the economic margin of production.

THE NORTHERN PACIFIC VIEW

Howard Elliott, chairman, Northern Pacific Railway Co., speaking before the Harvard Club of New York City, said:

"This is a great project, national in its scope and influence. It is a plan for a ship canal, to be eventually 30 feet deep, between the lower St. Lawrence and Lake Ontario, in which the United States and Canada will have an equal interest. Incident to the building of the ship canal there is a proposed development of 1,464,000 horsepower, twice as much as is developed at Niagara. The estimated cost is $253 million of which $150 million is for power and $103 million for the waterway. Some say that the estimated cost is too low, but the project will be beneficial to New England and to all the country tributary to the Great Lakes. It will relieve congestion on the railroads reaching the upper Atlantic ports when population and industry are twice what they are today. The project will help coastwise trade, export and import trade between the Middle Western States and foreign countries and give great opportunity to our merchant marine fleet. The President in his recent message, thought this project deserved the immediate attention of Congress."[1]

CHICAGO, MILWAUKEE & ST. PAUL APPROVES

President H. E. Byram writes:

"There is no doubt, to the extent that vessels moving through the canal would carry grain and grain products from the Middle West, that there would be an advantage to the railroads serving lake ports in the release of their cars at such ports rather than on the Atlantic coast."

President Byram, in a recent address at Duluth, upon the occasion of a visit with the various executives of his road, announced their decision to exercise the option held by the Milwaukee Railroad to purchase from the Northern Pacific Railroad a half interest in its terminals at Duluth and its lines between the head of the lakes and St. Paul and Minneapolis. A major factor in reaching the conclusion to exercise the option was the belief that lake ports would soon be made seaports and the Milwaukee desired an outlet to the sea on Lake Superior as well as on Lake Michigan.

"We are heartily in sympathy with the development of the waterway. We are not afraid of it as competition. We are confident that the waterway will come and that is why we want a foot on the doorstep of Duluth. It was a considerable influence in bringing us to our conclusion.

"It is useless to fight such an improvement for our country. On the contrary, we expect to share in the great business that will come with the opening of the Great Lakes to the sea. We are desirous of sharing in the traffic that must come through this port and for that reason have decided to cast our lot with you and share in the prosperity that will be yours."

ILLINOIS CENTRAL RAILROAD

C. H. Markham, president of the Illinois Central, holds the view that—

"You make a striking point * * * when you point out how the congestion of lake traffic has thrown a considerable burden upon the railroads. When you say that railway equipment is uneconomically employed in the long swing from the interior to the seaboard, I assume you have reference to the national situation—uneconomically by reason of the great need for the facilities of transportation. I agree with you on that score, of course. It certainly is uneconomical when a load for which the railroads are not prepared, for which they are not, and should not be expected to prepare—is thrown upon them in a time of transportation shortage.

"I want to compliment you and your organization upon the high type of the campaign which you are making for the Great

---

[1] "The time has come to resume in a moderate way the opening of our intracoastal waterways, the control of flood waters * * *, the development of the great power and navigation project of the St. Lawrence River. * * * These projects cannot all be undertaken at once, but should have the immediate consideration of the Congress and be adopted as fast as plans can be matured and the necessary funds become available.

"This is not incompatible with economy, for their nature does not require so much a public expenditure as a capital investment which will be reproductive, as evidenced by the marked increase in revenue from the Panama Canal. Upon these projects depend much future industrial and agricultural progress. They represent * * * the addition of a great amount of cheap power and cheap freight by use of navigation, chief of which is the bringing of oceangoing ships to the Great Lakes."—Calvin Coolidge, President, message to Congress, December 1923.

Lakes-Tidewater project. There is no reason why a railway man should not agree with the spirit of a campaign which bases its plea upon the merit of the project campaigned for. You are seeking to promote a project solely upon its merits, or at least what you see to be its merits, and you have not brought false issues into the campaign you are making."

CHICAGO & ALTON VIEWPOINTS

William G. Bierd, receiver for the Chicago & Alton Railroad, says:

"Therefore as I view it (the St. Lawrence project), I come to this thought; the plan is sound. When developed it will be self-supporting and as an individual question it will be an operating economy as a great means of transportation. It is only a question of carrying this out; and if carried out would it be a real necessity? I am sure it would; and all of the interests of the country will profit by it. So, my conclusion is that much more study must be given to the subject, knowing as I do that this is a feasible and economical thing to do. * * * It must become a national question, as of course it has that large scope. Then the proper men of science and the proper representatives of the Government must work out a proper means, a proper contract if you please, a proper treaty if need be, by which this vast plan can be carried out and paid for, that it may bring the benefits to those who need them and not be harmful to the rest. * * * in other words, when all of the American and Canadian people, under proper terms and conditions can profit by it."

AS THE CHICAGO & NORTH WESTERN RAILWAY CO. SEES IT

Fred W. Sargent, president of the Chicago & North Western Railway Co., views the transportation situation, as follows:

"The people of the Middle West are unfairly discriminated against as the result of the Panama Canal. The Middle West is paying directly for the canal, not only because of its competition with the railroads but also because the canal is not paying its own way, if return on capital investment and loss of taxes are given consideration, as they should be.

"The Panama Canal does not serve the Middle West but affords uncontrolled, unrestricted and unrestrained competition thorugh means of public subsidy for the purpose of taking industries out of the Middle West and planting them on either coast.

"The country as a whole in the end will not prosper by this discrimination against the Middle West. There may be a temporary advantage. In the end, however, any such sectional preferential treatment will not succeed. The Middle West right now is entitled to have tolls through the Panama Canal placed on such a basis as to make the canal self-supporting not only as to operating costs but with reference to a fair return on capital investment plus an allowance for taxes equal to the average taxes on equal capital invested paid by the railroads.

"The people of the Middle West are also entitled to have boat lines operating through the canal subject to the jurisdiction of the Interstate Commerce Commission, just as the railroads are, and required to file and publish tariffs so that the transcontinental railroads may know what all rates, including tramp-steamer rates, are through the canal. At the present time boat lines know the rates of the railroads and can underbid them at will. The railroads have no way of knowing what any fixed form of competitive water rates are or will be.

The Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Waterway will help the Middle West. Anything that will help promote the prosperity of the inland empire lying between the Allegheniese and the Rockies will help the railroads and will be of inestimable value to the entire country."

GREAT NORTHERN RAILWAY CO. ATTITUDE

Ralph Budd, president of the Great Northern Railway, Co., says:

"The benefits accruing to the Middle and Northwestern sections of the United States as a result of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence tidewater project, cannot help being apparent to anyone who has given the subject consideration. * * * The interests of the Great Northern Railway which are so intimately associated with those of its territory would necessarily be furthered. * * * The success with which lake-and-rail movement of ore and coal is carried on serves as a splendid illustration of what could be done in a larger way with the tidewater project carried out so that exporting could be carried on freely from this great middle and northwestern territory directly from the termini of the rail lines which serve the territory. It would mean much for an improved car supply in times such as those recently experienced in that, cars, instead of being lost to the western lines and in that way to the shippers of the Northwest, would be unloaded at lake ports and returned immediately to the territory for other loads."

Charles Donnelly, president of the Northern Pacific, says:

"Our railroad serves a territory which produces many things which must find a market in the Eastern States and foreign countries. This is particularly true of wheat, our principal agricultural product. We have favored the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Waterway project because it promises to reduce the cost of transporting these products from our eastern termini to these markets and because the railroads would participate in the general benefits to come from any such addition to the prices paid to producers in our territory."

MINNEAPOLIS, ST. PAUL & SAULT STE. MARIE OPINION

Edward Pennington, the president of the Soo Lines, submitted before the International Joint Commission the following statement:

"The Northwest, especially the States of Wisconsin, Minnesota, North and South Dakota, Montana, Wyoming, and Nebraska, are vitally interested in the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Waterway project. The development of the agricultural and mining interests in these States in excess of domestic requirements is dependent upon the export demand, and to successfully meet this condition, must be able to compete in transportation with other large producing territories. The States named contain more unoccupied acreage and better opportunities for a larger population to enjoy the surety and independence of a successful home life than any other part of the United States. To produce and dispose profitably of their produce, the route to the ocean and to the ships to reach foreign markets must be shortened—this project seems to offer the solution.

"The Pacific Coast and Southern States have the Panama Canal, which has revolutionized their routes and is enabling them to develop their territory with a certainty of transportation. With the completion of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence project the great Middle West, now from 1,000 to 1,500 miles from either ocean, will have the ocean transportation brought to their borders. The rail carriers serving this large territory, in almost every case, have their own rails to the Great Lakes, and their part of the transportation can be performed with much greater certainty and with much less equipment than is necessary now. The experience and delays in connection with the movement of the limited crops from this territory during the last few years demonstrates, it seems to me beyond any argument, the advantage of having this short haul to a water transportation available.

"The forty-odd years that I have been connected with the Northern Pacific System I have seen the grain shipments grow from a few cars to 129 million bushels per year, and this from a territory only a small part of the available acreage of which is under cultivation, and a more intense and intelligent cultivation of which would double the production and population.

"There is little territory within my knowledge that attempts the export of its products for a distance from the ocean that the Middle West of North America does, and while our transportation rates on the agricultural products have been low compared with land transportation anywhere else, it has still been a handicap to the producers and to the development of the country. The population of the world and the demands for food and necessities of life are increasing. If the United States is to contribute to this demand its producers must be placed in a position to meet the situation. Water transportation has always been, and will always be, the cheapest and most reliable transportation of the world at all times, and this Great Lakes-St. Lawrence water project seems to be one that should be encouraged in every way possible.

"I have not given the project any thought whatever from an engineering viewpoint, but as for the benefits to be derived if the project is put through, I think it would be a great thing for the Northwest and Canada to shorten the rail haul. It would have the same beneficial effect on the Northwest as the Panama Canal has had on the Pacific coast cities and coast States. The Northwest receives very little benefit from the Panama Canal, compared with what they would receive if the inland ocean route were put through.

"Looking to the future of this great Northwest, which is not over half developed, the transportation lines that we have at the present time cannot handle the products of this country. Our surplus that goes overseas cannot be handled by the eastern ports on the transportation lines east of Chicago without having to pass over the Allegheny Mountains, except that which goes via the lakes in bulk. If the producers of these Northwestern States could ship without reshipping, it would gain a great deal of revenue for the producers. Take Montana, the two Dakotas, Minnesota, and Wisconsin, which are great producers of foodstuffs, grain, and meats, and the surplus of which must go abroad, and if this project is put through it would seem to me it would inure to the benefit of a great many people."

CHICAGO GREAT WESTERN POSITION

S. M. Felton, chairman, Chicago Great Western Railroad, says:

"As far as the Chicago and Great Western is concerned, I am quite ready to endorse your project."

And again Mr. Felton adds:

"As I said in the meeting, I am heartily in accord with the project but I do not believe it is wise to attempt to carry it out on a 25-foot channel. We must go to 30 feet or not at all because by the time the canal is completed a 25-foot channel will be out of date. In fact, it is getting there very fast now and we will need the best possible facilities to make the program a success."

CHICAGO, BURLINGTON & QUINCY RAILROAD

To conclude this array of testimony from leading railroads and railroad men, within the United States, the reader is asked to read what Mr. Hale Holden, president of the Burlington says with reference to the proposal for the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence ship channel:

"I view the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence tidewater project as a matter of the highest interest and importance to the development of the middle and northwestern territory, comparable only to the Panama Canal in its widespread and beneficial results.

"To make the project successful, the engineering plans must be and I understand are commensurate with the object in view; with plans adequate for present and future expansion, direct deep water access to the Aalantic Ocean must necessarily operate as a great spur to the growth of the territory, furnishing as well an important and needed ally to the existing rail transportation facilities. Past experience with rail and lake movement offers a guide and encouragement to this greater development toward rail, lake and tidewater movement and not the least important result will be the increased protection in times of heavy demand to the equipment of the large grain-carrying roads in western territory. This will save many car days and insure better continuity of car supply to the farmers and producers of bulk and manufactured products in this growing territory."

And again on July 8, 1923, he wrote to Mr. Craig:

"I believe the western roads view the development of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence project with keen interest, anticipating that there are no engineering or operating reasons why the plan is not entirely feasible. With a sustained vessel movement there would undoubtedly be more effective use of western equipment by a quicker return of cars to western territory."

A CANADIAN VIEWPOINT

To those who look at the matter of St. Lawrence ship channel improvement from the continental rather than the strictly national point of view, the manner in which the proposal is regarded by a leading Canadian rail official will be of interest.

Sir Henry Thornton, president of the Canadian National Railways, in an address delivered at Cornwall, Ontario, said:

"Much has been said of the development of the St. Lawrence as a deepdraft waterway. I hope that the day will eventually come; and we do not regard the development of any such great national waterway as a competitor, rather we look upon it as something which will build up traffic, assist in the industrial development of the Dominion, and in the last analysis we will find that we shall have gained very much more than some people may imagine we will have lost.

"In the interior of the United States and Canada there lie the great inland oceans, the Great Lakes, and they are connected with the ocean by the noble St. Lawrence River. To my mind it is inconceivable that a barrier shall exist or be permitted to exist between the area of this great inland sea and the ocean. I believe that it is inevitable that the Great Lakes and the ocean must be connected by a waterway of sufficient draft to accommodate large oceangoing vessels. When that day comes it will be to the advantage of the people of Canada and likewise those of the nation, and such cities as Cornwall which lie upon the route of that waterway will find that they, too, will share in the general prosperity.

"Then, in addition to the waterway which nature has placed at your door, nature has also placed at your threshold, a very large natural waterpower, a waterpower, which I understand, will develop a million and a half horsepower, of which half will be the property of Canada. Naturally a supply of cheap power at your very gates and the other natural advantages which surround the city of Cornwall, and when I say city, I only anticipate somewhat the future, with all these advantages I venture to predict that the day will come when this will be a great and thriving city, and rightly so."

CONCLUSION

The Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Tidewater Association presents the foregoing without comment. The high character and wide range of the testimony speaks for itself.

Whether the deep continental areas of the United States are to go ahead or whether they must shrink back to 1900 depends upon finding a less expensive way of getting to market. This can be accomplished in but one way: by placing the interior of the continent on a maritime base.

Construct the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway.

St. Lawrence Seaway and What It Means to Milwaukee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES J. KERSTEN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1954

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the St. Lawrence seaway has finally become a reality. This represents one of the most important accomplishments of the present Republican administration. The seaway will mean more jobs and more business for the people of Milwaukee.

The bill which has now passed both the Senate and the House creates the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, which will cooperate with Canada in building and maintaining a 27-foot-deep channel to the Atlantic Ocean. Estimated total cost to the United States: Only $105 million.

The St. Lawrence seaway has been dreamed of for more than a century. In 1895 Canada and the United States set up a Deep Waterway Commission to study the seaway problem. This body reported on it favorably as did many other commissions which have been created since.

Finally in 1932 a seaway treaty was negotiated by Canada and the United States. The treaty was defeated in the Senate in 1934.

In 1941 another agreement was made with Canada but World War II deferred any action on it.

In 1946 the Senate Foreign Relations Committee presented another bill to the Senate but no action was taken on it.

In 1947 another bill to construct the seaway was defeated in the Senate.

In 1952 the Senate again took up the matter of the seaway and again it defeated the measure.

Now finally, in 1954, with a Republican administration and a Republican Senate and a Republican House, the seaway bill has been enacted.

We in Milwaukee are probably only partially aware of the great boon a deep channel to the ocean will be to us. On products we buy from abroad, it will mean lower prices for us as consumers. On products which we sell, it will improve the competitive position of Milwaukee industry with respect to other industries throughout the United States and the world.

The increased traffic through our port will mean more business and more jobs for Milwaukee.

Milwaukee, as the closest transfer point between Europe and South America and the agricultural Midwest, could become the most important port on the Great Lakes.

Furthermore, thanks to the keen foresight of the municipal port director, Mr. H. C. Brockel, and our other Milwaukee city officials, the Milwaukee port is well equipped to handle the expected increase in traffic which will result from the construction of the seaway.

Milwaukee has long prepared itself for the advent of the St. Lawrence seaway and now has adequate pier and shore frontage right on Lake Michigan with adequate access by both the Chicago & North Western and the Milwaukee Road, and by trucks. Milwaukee could become the port for Chicago traffic.

We all know that Chicago has developed practically all its entire waterfront into a parkway and will have a difficult time reconverting in order to handle oceangoing vessels.

Even today, many goods destined for Chicago are unloaded here in Milwaukee because Milwaukee has the equipment to unload various types of vessels. For instance, Milwaukee has a gantry crane with a 70-ton capacity which is capable of unloading and loading the heaviest cargoes.

It is thus possible that Milwaukee could become the port to handle the goods coming and going from all of Wisconsin, Illinois, Iowa, Missouri, and the entire breadbasket of the plains States. This could develop many new businesses and jobs for our Milwaukee people in handling this great increase in traffic.

Thus, the St. Lawrence seaway may be the most important economic factor in the development of Milwaukee and Wisconsin since the first barrel of beer was rolled out of the aging caverns on the bluffs overlooking the Milwaukee River.

Reasons for Opposing the Pending St. Lawrence Seaway Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1954

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, the arguments made for and against the bill now pending before the House for the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway have been numerous and varied. I have recognized the necessity of giving more than usual care and consideration in determining the relative merits of these differing viewpoints.

After giving full consideration to the matter, I am convinced that the development of the St. Lawrence seaway, as provided for in the bill now before us, would not be advisable at this time for the following reasons:

First. Its development would adversely affect the welfare of each of the North Atlantic ports and other existing seaports of the Nation through the diversion of traffic from them, thus nullifying the usefulness of facilities and equipment in which billions of dollars have been invested to provide for the efficient and economical handling of waterborne commerce. Two wars have shown the vital need for strong seaports. To weaken these ports by the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway with all its inadequacies and limitations would not promote the national defense.

Many of the North Atlantic port facilities are maintained by municipal and State agencies at a cost of many millions annually. They are not large revenue producers. In these ports there are also huge private investments in piers, terminals and other harbor facilities, which likewise provide only a small return on the investment represented. Any diversion of traffic from these facilities is quickly reflected in operating results. Even the loss of a small percentage of the traffic now moving through these ports would spell the difference between profitable and nonprofitable operation.

These ports, which handled the tremendous volume of traffic in support of our Armed Forces and of our allies during the war should be kept in healthy and efficient operating condition. This can be done only by maintaining an adequate and steady movement of commerce.

Second. The utilization of port facilities and the employment of labor would be subject to fluctuating seasonal demands for the proposed seaway would be usable only 7 months of the year. For 5 months it would be choked by ice. Yet these seaport facilities must be maintained in maximum operating capacity to meet the peak requirements of the 5-month winter season, despite the inevitable losses incurred in the remaining 7 months. In this regard we would direct attention to the fact that in the New York area alone, an area of some 14 million people, it has been estimated that 1 out of every 10 people earn their livelihood from the movement of waterborne commerce. Similar conditions prevail at all North Atlantic ports and therefore any action which would affect this vast working segment of our Nation can only result in a severe economic impact upon the Nation as a whole.

Third. The same problem faces the railroads. The amount of traffic claimed by proponents that would be diverted to the waterway would seriously affect the interests of existing railroad transportation without compensating benefits to shippers or other interests. These existing land transportation facilities would have to be maintained at a high operating level to meet peak requirements during the 5-month winter season when the waterway is closed to navigation, although they would be confronted with a new source of competition during the 7-month open season of navigation. It is evident that efficient ports can remain efficient only so long as a strong rail transportation machine backs them up.

Fourth. Less than 4 percent of existing American-flag vessels, and none of the American ships now being built could, fully loaded, transit the proposed 27-foot seaway channel. Only foreign-flag shipping would benefit and do so at the expense of the American merchant marine. The experience of World War II emphasizes the importance of a strong American merchant marine and therefore any action which would jeopardize this position is neither in the best interests of the Nation nor those engaged in foreign commerce.

Fifth. The project is labeled as being in the interest of national security. However, it probably could not be militarily defended if constructed. As is well known, canals and locks are most vulnerable objects of air attack and the destruction of a single segment could put the entire seaway out of commission. Such an event could be disastrous to our national defense, particularly if a number of vessels, so vital in the event of war, were bottled up in the Great Lakes.

Sixth. There can be no basis for the contention of the proponents that this project would be self-liquidating because they have no idea, in the first place, of just what part it is they plan to make self-liquidating. The amendment adopted by the House Public Works Committee does not make it self-liquidating. It only provides that the revenues from the project would be earmarked for the retirement of the project's indebtedness. An amendment offered in the Public Works Committee by Congressman Brownson, of Indiana, which was turned down by a voice vote, but which is to be presented on the floor, would take care of the self-liquidating controversy in that the bonds would have to be sold on the market without Government guaranty. As the bill now stands the bonds would be sold to the Treasury, and therefore would be Government bonds.

Seventh. The present bill, which contemplates an expenditure of over $100 million is but a limited part of the total project as envisioned by the proponents and is merely an effort on their part to get "the foot inside the door." The inadequacies and limitations surrounding the proposed 27-foot seaway channel are shown in paragraph designated fourth above and need not be repeated here. It suffices to observe that the seaway as proposed is virtually obsolete before construction and that it is reasonable to expect that authorization for a deeper channel will be sought should the 27-foot channel be authorized. In addition, many more Federal millions would be necessary in order to make the harbors of the Great Lakes ports and the connecting channels suitable for oceangoing ships. The Army engineers in 1950 estimated the cost of the complete waterway to this country as about $600 million. This first $100 million would be but the opening wedge for a subsidy which would grow and grow so that the initial sum would shrink into relative insignificance.

J. Edgar Hoover Defends the Exposure of the Communist Threat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES J. KERSTEN
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 6, 1954

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, gave an excellent address recently to the DAR in which he pointed out that any person or organization which dared to raise its voice against the threat of communism became the target of vile and vicious attacks. Said Mr. Hoover:

> It is an established fact that whenever one has dared to expose the Communist threat he has invited upon himself the adroit and skilled talents of experts of character assassinations.

Mr. Hoover also stated:

> To me, one of the most unbelievable and unexplainable phenomena in the fight on communism is the manner in which otherwise respectable, seemingly intelligent persons, perhaps unknowingly, aid the Communist cause more effectively than the Communists themselves. The pseudoliberal can be more destructive than the known Communist because of the esteem which his cloak of respectability invites.

Mr. Hoover also pointed out in his speech that large numbers within the Community Party were not necessary in order to promote its cause. In fact, Mr. Hoover said, the Communist leaders are aware that 1 or 2 dedicated Communists in the proper places can better serve the Communist cause than masses of members. For outside the hard core party membership there are thousands of fellow travelers and sympathizers who will aid and promote the work of the Communist Party.

I include herewith the following speech of Mr. Hoover which was given before the Continental Congress of the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution, April 22, 1954, Washington, D. C.:

> It is a high honor to receive this award of the 63d Continental Congress of the Daughters of the American Revolution. I consider this award a tribute to the loyal and self-sacrificing efforts of my associates in the Federal Bureau of Investigation. It is really their achievements which you are recognizing this morning and in accepting this award I do it on their behalf.
>
> Just as the work of the Federal Bureau of Investigation reflects the tempo of the times, so its accomplishments give testimony to the helpful assistance we have received from Americans in every walk of life. In the past 30 years, during which I have been privileged to head the FBI, it has had a singleness of purpose—to protect the people of these United States to the fullest extent of our authority and to insure to them the rights and liberties which are guaranteed by our Constitution. It has vigorously resisted every attempt to inject it into partisanship of any form. The FBI will continue to maintain a nonpartisan status so long as I have any voice in its destiny.
>
> I am continuingly impressed with the patriotic devotion to America of our national leaders in the executive, the legislative, and the judicial branches of our Government. The Congress, year in and year out, Republicans and Democrats alike, has closed ranks and thrust aside partisan considerations in providing for the needs of the FBI. Without the loyal, patriotic support of Congress, our work would be completely handicapped.
>
> As real national security ultimately must rest on the dedicated efforts of all people to preserve our American way of life, we naturally must look to our fellow patriotic Americans for major assistance in fulfilling our responsibilities. With a force of only 1 special agent to every 26,000 inhabitants in the United States, we could not possibly carry out our duties without the fullest of coopera-

E

tion from all law-abiding people and patriotic organizations.

With all honesty, we need to examine our hearts to determine the depth of our loyalty; then, with every ounce of strength we have, we must do our part to fight Red fascism—this evil enemy within our gates.

Over the years, the Daughters of the American Revolution on National, State, and local levels, has been alert to this menace and outstanding in its cooperation with the FBI. You as individual members have time and again rendered assistance of the highest order to the FBI. This is another reason why I am so happy to meet with you today. More and more, the women of the country have been capably filling their rightful roles in our national life. In protecting the home, women are also protecting the security of our Nation. The Daughters of the American Revolution, long before the general public recognized the true nature of communism, was out in the forefront calling attention to this growing menace.

In taking a stand for the preservation of the American way of life, your organization became the target of vile and vicious attacks. So have all other patriotic organizations and, for that matter, every other person who has dared to raise his voice against the threat of communism. It is an established fact that whenever one has dared to expose the Communist threat he has invited upon himself the adroit and skilled talents of experts of character assassination. The Federal Bureau of Investigation has stood year after year as taunts, insults, and destructive criticism have been thrown its way.

To me, one of the most unbelievable and unexplainable phenomena in the fight on communism is the manner in which otherwise respectable, seemingly intelligent persons, perhaps unknowingly, aid the Communist cause more effectively than the Communists themselves. The pseudoliberal can be more destructive than the known Communist because of the esteem which his cloak of respectability invites.

Thinking people now know that a fifth-column assault was launched on this Nation years ago. International communism has unmistakably revealed itself as a sinister force. One-fourth of the earth's surface and one-third of the world's population have now come under the godless tyranny of Communist dictatorship.

Red fascism has come to have an evil, ugly meaning in the world today. We have come to associate it with greed, cruelty, lust for power; it means war and death for innocent peoples; it threatens our security and all the heritage we, as Americans, hold dear.

Literally thousands of homes and careers have been disrupted by the worldwide assault of international communism. There is not a home in the land which has not been adversely affected by this menace. Think, for example, what could be done for the general welfare of America and, in fact, the world if the sums of money which have been appropriated to defend ourselves from the Communist menace could be used for peaceful purposes.

As President Eisenhower recently observed, while the membership of the Communist Party in the United States is small in numbers, they are dangerous. The American Communists and the Soviet Communists follow the same pattern. They are motivated by the same ideology and they are dedicated to the same base objectives. The American Communist Party is an integral unit of the international Communist conspiracy to overthrow the Government of the United States by force and violence.

Over the years I have observed that the Communist leaders themselves have not stressed the need for large numbers of members as they hold to the principle that Communist Parties, when favorable situations arrive, have the power of swift and solid growth. Communist classes hear the words of William Z. Foster, head of the American Communist Party, iterated and reiterated that the Communist Party's strength runs far beyond all formal measurements. Leaders of the Communist Party frequently point out that often 1 or 2 dedicated Communists in the proper places can better serve the Communist cause than masses. This too can now be clearly seen.

Outside of the hard-core party membership which today numbers some 25,000, the Communists are supported by their legions of fellow travelers, sympathizers, apologists, and otherwise seemingly innocent persons who have been duped into doing the party's work.

The FBI has been in the front lines of the fight against the Communist menace for many years. Its effectiveness can be measured by the intensity with which the Communists, their sympathizers, and respectably cloaked apologists have advanced their attacks on the FBI. There have been times when they might have succeeded in their efforts to destroy our effectiveness were it not for the manner in which Members of Congress, the media of public opinion, patriotic organizations, and the citizens on the street raised their voices in protest against distortion, misrepresentation, and smear. All true Americans have our deepest gratitude. As I have already observed, the measure of our success is in direct ratio to the fullness of the cooperation we receive.

The matter of maintaining internal security is complicated, difficult, and calls for caution and the utmost of perseverance. Experience has demonstrated that the real subversives are identified only through painstaking professional work with information gleaned from innumerable sources. That is why Presidents Roosevelt, Truman, and Eisenhower each in turn have called upon all patriotic organizations and persons to promptly communicate to the nearest office of the FBI any information they may possess on espionage, sabotage, or subversive activities.

Information furnished confidentially to the FBI will be protected, as the FBI zealously guards the identity of its sources of information and the confidential character of its files. The sole objective of the FBI investigative efforts is to ascertain the truth or falsity of complaints, information, or suspicions communicated to it. We always have been sensitive to our sacred duty to protect the innocent. And the facts, when secured, do this just as they establish the guilt of the wrongdoer.

The Communists, above all else, fear the truth. They fear the traditions of liberty and justice bequeathed us by our freedom-seeking forefathers. That is why they seek to rewrite the past. The fine and loyal members of your great organization are to be congratulated for urging the study of American history. There can be no surer way to appreciate American democracy than to understand its origins and growth. We should understand also the things our forefathers were willing to fight for and the ideals in which they believed.

In the days and years which lie ahead, the strength of America must rest in the desire and the willingness of our people to remain true to the ideals of 1776, for when a national ideal dies, a nation perishes. To trust the Nation's security to the tangible strength of weapons and fortifications only is not the complete answer. Americans must feel proud of their Nation and have faith in their Government and its servants. They must be willing to sacrifice for the common good. They must be anxious to keep this Nation a land of the free. The heart of America is true, unafraid, unselfish, and has deep understanding.

You, and thousands of others like you, are an inspiration to all Americans to work in the cause of liberty. In this hour, when an alien ideology would destroy our institutions, no cause could be more sacred. Freedom must be jealously guarded. Unless it is nourished, protected, and exercised, it will be lost. It is the very essence of our lives.

I have the deepest faith in the future of America. Communists are driven by fanaticism, selfish ambition, and an urgency to dominate and destroy all that is good. They endeavor to subvert the minds, the bodies, and the souls of men. But in the end they are destined to fail because they are blind slaves of a human tyranny—not servants of God. They are puppets of a dictator, not free men and women.

Should the spirit of free men die, our Nation would no longer survive. To keep that spirit alive is the task of every true American. This means that truth must prevail in every walk of life and there must be a dedication to fight, if need be, to maintain that truth. The truth is that the American way of life is the hope of the world; we can have no more sacred trust than to preserve that way—of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

We are fighting together for God and country. In the end we shall win. So keep up your courage. Keep up your fight for God and country. Millions of good Americans support you.

Peace in the Middle East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1954

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, the Baltimore Zionist Council is composed of the Baltimore district of the Zionist Organization of America, Hadassah, Mazrachi, and the labor Zionist groups, representing a total paid enrollment in Baltimore of 12,000 members. This group held a public meeting on May 3 and adopted a resolution which contains ideas which should be utilized in formulating the United States policy in the Middle East. The council also recommends that our Government use its influence and prestige for the purpose of establishing a just and permanent peace in the Middle East. The resolution reads as follows:

RESOLUTION PASSED BY BALTIMORE ZIONIST COUNCIL AT A PUBLIC MEETING, BETH JACOB AUDITORIUM, PARK HEIGHTS AND MANHATTAN AVENUES, MAY 3, 1954.

The decision of the United States Government to give military aid to the Government of Iraq will not contribute to the peace of the Middle East, nor will it strengthen the defenses of the free world. To arm Iraq at a time when Arab-Israel tension has been mounting, and without its firm commitment to make peace with Israel, is to fortify and embolden Arab intransigence and risk a renewal of open hostilities. Iraq has been the most vindictive and belligerent member of the Arab league in the continued war against Israel; it has refused even to enter into an armistice agreement with Israel. This decision of the United States Government to ship arms to Iraq cannot serve the cause of peace, since arms for one Arab State means arms for all, and the use of arms cannot be controlled once an aggressor has them.

E

All of the Arab States have refused to take any serious steps that might contribute to peace and stability in the Middle East. Jordan, for example, which has the longest common frontier with Israel, refuses to confer with her neighbor, although U. N. Secretary-General Hammarskjold has attempted to convoke such a conference to deal with border problems. Egypt has resisted U. N. attempts to open the Suez Canal to Israeli traffic, although guaranties for the free use of the canal are written into international law. Indeed, Egypt has also blockaded the Gulf of Aqaba, an interference with seaborne commerce that is only tolerable in international law when a state of war exists. Syria's threats and obstructions have hindered for months the hydroelectric development of the Jordan River; Syrian batteries have been raking Israel fishing fleets on the Sea of Galilea.

The situation has continuously deteriorated. The United Nations Armistice Agreements which governed the relations between Israel and the Arab States for the past 5 years have virtually broken down because the Arabs, emboldened by the pursuit of their favor, are persuaded that they can intensify their warfare with impunity. And the United Nations itself has now become unable to meet Arab defiance. Its attempts to enforce the armistice agreements are being frustrated by the ominous vetoes of the Kremlin which is now brazenly courting the Arab League with characteristic disregard for United Nations purpose and principle.

Israel has always been prepared to make the attainment of peace in its region a primary theme of its national policy, and has brought all of its resources of thought and effort toward that end. Israel has felt, and still insists, that national freedom and full sovereign rights are the inheritance of all peoples in the Middle East and not the monopoly of one. Each nation, large or small, has the right to its own area in which its life and spirit should develop under its own controls in perfect freedom. The State of Israel has repeatedly stated that it is willing to make its contribution in the closest and most direct unity with the efforts of the Arab Governments.

We respectfully suggest that the policy of the United States Government in the Middle East should be based on the establishment of a permanent and just peace in that area. For that peace—no arms are needed. The Arab States should be made to understand that a fundamental concept of an armistice agreement is that the parties to this agreement should be actively seeking a transition to a permanent peace. This obligation to proceed from armistice to a permanent peace is not optional. It is mandatory and obligatory upon the parties to the armistice. A refusal to meet under the armistic agreement for the purpose of establishing a permanent peace is in itself a violation of the armistice agreement and a continuation of hostilities.

The Arab nations have continuously and publicly avowed their refusal to meet with Israel for the purpose of peace. We call upon the United States Government to direct its prestige and influence toward bringing the Arab States to a peace table with Israel. It should be made clear to the Arab League that it will not tolerate blockades, boycotts, threats, and aggression. The United States should rescind its decision to ship arms to Iraq, an avowed aggressor nation, with a publicly announced policy of the destruction of Israel. The way to win the friendship of the Arab people for America, and for the cause of freedom, is to give them economic and technical assistance to raise the standards of living of all people in the Middle East.

Therefore, we, the Baltimore Zionist Council, composed of the Baltimore Zionist District of the Zionist Organization of America; Hadassah, the Women's Zionist organization; the Mizrachi Organization of America; and the Labor Zionist Organization of America; and representing more than 12,000 members in the city of Baltimore, do respectfully request that the elected delegates of Maryland in the House of Representatives and Senate of the United States bring these facts to the attention of the State Department, the Mutual Security Administration, and other responsible agencies, to use their good efforts to re-examine their policy in the Middle East, to withhold all arms aid to the Arab nations, to grant basic technical and health aid to the nations of the Middle East, and that these agencies be made aware of the efforts of Israel to bring about a just peace in the Middle East.

BALTIMORE ZIONIST COUNCIL,
BORIS M. KATZ, *Chairman.*
MRS. SIGMUND FEINBLATT,
Vice President.
WILLIAM BRAITERMAN,
Secretary.
LOUIS CORDISH, *Treasurer.*

Last Chance on the Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK

OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 6, 1954

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, before this afternoon is over the House will be called upon to make a final decision on the St. Lawrence seaway. This represents the last chance that this Nation has to join with Canada in the construction, ownership, and control of this project, since if this country defaults now Canada will certainly build it alone. Under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a very timely editorial entitled "Last Hurdle," which appeared in this morning's edition of the New York Times:

LAST HURDLE

In his state of the Union message last January President Eisenhower told the Congress that both the United States and Canada "now need the St. Lawrence seaway for security as well as for economic reasons." He explicitly urged prompt approval of our participation in its construction.

That very month the Senate acted on the President's recommendation in a smashing vote of 51 to 33, with as many Democrats as Republicans (plus 1 Independent) taking the majority position. Today, for the first time in the two decades that the project has been under legislative consideration, the House will vote on this great work of international collaboration. If the House should reject the seaway, Canada will go ahead and build it anyway.

But if the House gives its approval, as we earnestly hope it will, the United States will join with its friendly neighbor to the north in an undertaking that should prove to be a major contribution to further economic development of the Great Lakes region and to the entire Nation. More than one Member of Congress has already changed from opposition to support of the bill on the basis that the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and of course the President, as well, have been placing great stress on the necessity of the seaway as a measure for the national defense. It would make possible the water-borne transportation of ores from Labrador, for example, to the steel mills of the Great Lakes area.

The House Public Works Committee approved the bill early in February. The last hurdle but one has long since been crossed. The question is now up to the House itself; and, so far as the United States is concerned, it is now or never.

Statistics Tell Story of Israel's Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GORDON CANFIELD

OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 5, 1954

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, Israel became a state in May 1948, and next Sunday will celebrate 6 years of independence. The growth and progress of this bastion of democracy in the Middle East present a remarkable story of achievement. As one who has had trees planted in my name within the confines of this young Republic by my thoughtful constituents, and well-wishers, I want to see them flourish, and I join my friends in a salute to Israel's courageous pioneers on this anniversary.

Although Israel is a new state, its traditions are as ancient as any in the world, and it should be pointed out that no other country of proportionate territory has accepted so many immigrants in so short a time as Israel during the last 6 years. The figure now stands well above the million mark. This help for the victims of tyranny and persecution resulted in a monumental housing task, which is being met with modern construction.

Under the caption "Statistics Tell Story of Israel's Progress," the New York Herald Tribune last Sunday presented some statistics on Israel which are described as most challenging and even startling. They are as follows:

Population: More than 1,500,000. Up by 125 percent.

Industry: 6,000 workshops and factories in 1948; more than 20,000 today. Work force increased from 72,000 to 120,000. Electric power consumed: 70,888,000 kilowatt-hours then, 193 million kilowatt-hours now. Production up from $450 million to $850 million. Industrial equipment up 60 percent in 6 years. Much of this has been achieved by State of Israel bond issue purchases abroad.

Agriculture: Area under cultivation rose from 412,500 acres to 1 million acres. Area under irrigation up from 72,000 acres to 138,000 acres. Farmworkers now total 75,000 compared with 29,000 in 1948. Agriculture production: Then $112,500,000, and now $222 million. The number of tractors in use rose from 680 to 3,850, while combines are up from 260 to 810.

Water: An important item of life in the arid Middle East, Mekoroth Water Works Co., Ltd., the largest in its field, supplied 175 million cubic meters last year compared with 21 million in 1948. New irrigation, hydroelectric, and pipeline projects are under way, within a few years they will increase water supplies to 935 million cubic meters annually.

Steel: Huge quantities of pipe required for these projects is being supplied by domestic sources. Two steel-pipe plants are now in operation, and a new pipe mill is nearing completion.

Food: Self-sufficiency has been reached in vegetable supplies, and is expected soon in dairy products, eggs, fruit, fish, and edible oils. Cattle and sheep raising is being expanded, and increased wheat growing is projected.

Science: Technicians have developed seeds and soil conditioners to produce many crops never before grown in the area. These include sisal, bananas, coffee, flax, peanuts, cotton, tobacco, and sugar beets.

Minerals: This year, production at home is expected to save $4,500,000 in hard currency. Production has been stepped up in the Elath copper mines and the iron mines of Galilee and the Negeb. Potash, extracted from the Dead Sea, is finding foreign markets. The mineral program calls for creation of basic industries to exploit other natural resources.

Transportation: Israel has become an international communications center. Aviation and port facilities have been expanded; roads have been repaired and built, and the internal-railway system has been vastly improved.

Merchant marine: Six years ago, Jewish-owned tonnage totaled 14,000. Today, Israel owns 33 ships of 139,000 registered tons, including 4 passenger steamers, 5 modern fruit carriers, and 23 freighters.

Trade: Israel's trade deficit dropped about $70 million in 1953 compared with 1951, the first year of the State of Israel bond issues. The deficit now is $227 million. The capital investment from bonds, plus rising exports, is expected to reduce it constantly.

The Taft-Hartley Repeal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1954

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the following resolution was passed by the executive board of the Indiana State Federation of Labor. The resolution sets out what is on the mind of the well-informed person who knows the true facts regarding the Taft-Hartley law.

President Eisenhower in his campaign of 1952 promised the American Federation of Labor convention that he would fight to remove the injustices in the Taft-Hartley Act. Up to this time no effort has been made by the leader of this administration to carry out these promises made to union labor in the fall of 1952.

The resolution follows:

Whereas the Taft-Hartley law has utterly failed as a Labor Management Relations Act in bringing about its heralded peace in industry but has instead been the direct cause of much greater and more bitter industrial unrest and has also succeeded by its illegal restrictions on the peaceful organizing activities of labor organizations in preventing hundreds of thousands of underpaid wage earners from exercising their constitutional rights of becoming members of a bona fide labor union of their respective choice; and

Whereas the said Taft-Hartley law, by repealing the Norris-LaGuardia Act and removing that great legal protection that union men and women had in the event of a labor dispute with an employer, has set up procedure which has and will continue to be of inestimable value to sweatshop employers of the Nation by assisting hard-boiled management in forcing intolerable conditions upon defenseless employees; and

Whereas the said Taft-Hartley law has successfully thwarted the efforts of many American Federation of Labor unions in their efforts, many times to establish more equitable working conditions and wages in the nonunion shops and factories, by reason that the law protects the antagonistic employers in their efforts to resist labor unions: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we, the representatives of the American Federation of Labor unions in Indiana, in body assembled, do hereby denounce and condemn the said Taft-Hartley law as being an unholy and immoral and degrading piece of antiilabor legislation, and we also declare it to be at variance with the constitutional rights of American citizens in their liberty of forming voluntary organizations, therefore that it should be repealed outright; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution, under our signatures and seal, be sent to the American Federation of Labor, to all State councils, and to all Congressmen and Senators.

Submitted this 24th day of April by the executive board of the Indiana State Federation of Labor.

Carl Mullen, President; Stanley Elliott, First Vice President; Roy Creasey, Second Vice President; John E. O'Donnell, Third Vice President; John Soucie, Fourth Vice President; Marie Bailey, Fifth Vice President; Otto Suhr, Sixth Vice President; O. B. Chambers, Seventh Vice President; Hobert Autterson, Secretary-Treasurer.

Ten Words

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. GWINN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1954

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following portion of a speech by Clarence Manion which was printed in a recent issue of the magazine We the People:

TEN WORDS

I rode to Chicago on an airplane a short time ago with a very influential man from New York. I gave him this business all the way from La Guardia Field to the Midway Airport. He sat silently, stoically listening and nodding. Finally he began to take notes. I felt encouraged, and gave him more; but when he left the airplane he gave me his notes. He said: "Manion, watch your blood pressure, my friend." He said: "You can't do anything about this despotic trend. The fate of our civilization is in the cards. Here," he said, "is the 10-word cycle of civilization. It has happened to everybody; it will happen to us." The 10 words burned themselves into my recollection.

Do you know them? Ten short words—none of them very sweet.

Civilization begins in "bondage." Bondage is word No. 1.

And out of bondage comes "faith in God," word No. 2.

And with faith in God comes "courage," and it comes from no other place. Courage is word No. 3.

And with courage, men acquire their "liberty," No. 4.

And after liberty comes "abundance," word No. 5.

And then, after abundance, "selfishness."

And after selfishness "complacency."

And then after complacency, "apathy."

And after apathy "dependency," the "gimme" stage.

And after that, back to bondage again: Bondage to bondage in 10 fateful steps.

Where are we on this vicious circle of civilization? Would you hazard a guess? We have passed the point where faith gave us liberty and procured abundance. Are we in the stage of selfishness, or complacency, or apathy, or perhaps even dependency? God save the mark.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Printing and binding for Congress, when recommended to be done by the Committee on Printing of either House, shall be so recommended in a report containing an approximate estimate of the cost thereof, together with a statement from the Public Printer of estimated approximate cost of work previously ordered by Congress within the fiscal year (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 145, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on Printing, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized book dealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by book dealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

PRICE OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

The Public Printer is authorized to furnish to subscribers the daily RECORD at $1.50 per month, payable in advance.

Remit by money order payable to Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 5, 1954

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "Freedom," delivered at the University of New Hampshire by Louis C. Wyman, the distinguished and able attorney general of the State of New Hampshire. I think this address will be of interest to all Americans.

I am informed by the Public Printer that the printing of the address in the Appendix will require 2½ pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, at a cost of $212.50.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FREEDOM

(Address by Louis C. Wyman, attorney general of New Hampshire, University of New Hampshire, March 24, 1954)

We in America take our freedom far too much for granted. The word "freedom" is easily talked about and loosely used. Those who have never had to earn it, to whom it has been passed down by national inheritance cannot appreciate it in the same manner as our millions of veterans who have fought for it, or those loved ones of others who fought and did not come back. They know what freedom means and in spite of all the loose talk from soapbox, rostrum, and pulpit, they have not given their all in vain for we still have real freedom in this country.

Many individuals from all walks of life who proclaim their love of freedom the loudest, support policies and programs which if allowed to become effective in this country would most certainly erode, if not destroy, this professed love. Public ownership of the means of production through socialism or fascism or communism can only be a prelude to statism. The struggle between those who believe in an all-powerful central government and those like our forefathers who believe in an all-powerful individual people, is the great sociopolitical problem of the 20th century.

I am not so far removed from college but that I can remember very clearly that these problems are not unique to this particular year nor are they understood only by older people. You are now at the prime of your intellectual capacities. Perhaps you lack practical experience but certainly you have the greatest resources with which to learn from the writings of others and from the teachings of your professors, the facts from which to make up your own choice as to the direction you yourselves may wish to go in life and the road you wish your country to follow. This is truly freedom in the most literal sense.

In more than half the world there are no such freedoms as our Bill of Rights gives to each of us in America. This is incredible to some Americans, but true. In our country you may choose your own religion; you may go to the church of your choice; you may choose your own line of work; you may speak freely and fully wherever and whenever you see fit (but of course you may not cry "fire" in a crowded theater unless there is a fire); you may write for publication in school papers, national papers, national magazines, or if the resources are available to you, for your own printer. You have the right and privilege to live in your own way, within the limitations of law, insofar as your conduct may affect the rights of others—with the right that your home shall indeed be your own castle. Neither the President of the United States nor the FBI may enter your home without a warrant and a warrant is not lightly issued in America. You have the right to vote for the individuals and policies of your own choice. You may not be imprisoned without just cause and if some overzealous prosecutor locks you up, habeas corpus is ready for your immediate release. You cannot be visited in the night and taken away without just cause; without the charges against you being immediately made known to you, and you have the right to counsel at all times and the right to reasonable bail for your release from custody.

I thought it might be of particular interest to you to discuss something of that particular aspect of freedom that affects you in the immediate present. I refer to the phrase "academic freedom," which has been widely discussed of late in connection with National and State investigations into subversion. "Academic freedom" is no magic phrase. It merely means, as I understand it, the right in academic vein to search for truth. It is a search which you are now engaged in. It is important. It is vital. It must never be compromised, either by those who seek to enforce conformity or those who seek not to teach but rather to advocate.

Only through knowledge can you who study here understand the nature and meaning of the various forms of government around the world. Only through responsible presentation—as distinct from advocacy—of various political orthodoxies, from the extreme left to the extreme right can you have these facts. I have repeatedly emphasized my belief that this is so, and my conviction that in teaching the political facts of life it is essential that you know of the nature and purpose and propaganda of each form of government. Actually, not only as students but as citizens, it is your duty to learn such facts. On the other hand, it is also the duty and responsibility of your teachers to give you the facts but not to slant them in such a way as to throw your perspective out of focus. A teacher who is a Communist cannot avoid slanting by definition.

These halls of learning are protected from the cold, cruel world. You don't suppose, for example, that your educational institutions are on a self-supporting basis? Who do you think is paying the bills for that difference between the cost of operating your institution and the sum of your collective tuition charges? Whether in a State institution, where the taxpayers help, or in a private institution, where endowments and gifts from private sources furnish the funds—all of our educational institutions owe their very life to the so-called capitalist system of free enterprise. These resources came from hard work on someone's part. Someone who sought to accumulate some wealth to make his life easier for his old age, to raise his standard of living, and someone who had sufficient vision to know that those of the following generation must and should be forearmed with knowledge to make their struggle that much easier.

In our State investigation, in the course of questioning an individual who also happened to be a professor at one of our educational institutions, the question came up as to whether or not that professor would endeavor to dissuade a young man or woman who had been given the facts without advocacy, should he or she choose the path of communism before leaving the campus. That professor answered that he would not attempt to dissuade that student in this choice any more than if he chose capitalism. Think of this. Mark it well, for our very survival as a free nation depends in the last analysis upon your ability to understand exactly what that answer involves. Not that teachers should be propagandists for democracy, but surely they do not violate any tenet of principle or conscience in seeking to dissuade a youth who is following a course irreconcilably opposed to all democracy stands for. To help you in some small measure with this understanding, let me speak for the few minutes that remain of the greatest threat to our country in this century.

There can be no doubt that this greatest threat lies from without—from Russian communism—from a powerful foreign nation that does not believe in God; that claims that all events in the universe can be explained from a materialistic concept (dialectical materialism); that has no code of ethics whatever except to further the one end of the eventual revolution of the proletariat; that seeks to subvert and conquer every other free nation in the world by infiltration or open and notorious aggression. That is the danger. It may seem unreal to you because you cannot for the life of you understand how any responsible person in this great free State or this free Nation could work for a foreign power, yet I tell you here and now that the record on this in America is dismal and fearsome. Not so much in terms of numbers but of a range from misguided intellectuals to downright traitors. This range has many reasons for its existence, running from the payroll of the Communist Party to cloistered theorists who in blind search for peace would disarm America and wait for this other nation to apply the Golden Rule around the world. What has been this Golden Rule of Russia? (In 1917-18; Russia rose in revolution; in 1919 our Secretary of State Lansing wired President Wilson that the Bolshevist's purposes were as stated in their call for their first Congress, as follows:

"The present is a period of destruction and crushing of the capitalist system of the whole world. The aim of the proletariat must now be immediately to conquer power. To conquer power means to destroy the governmental apparatus of the bourgeoisie and to organize a new proletarian governmental apparatus. This new apparatus must express the dictatorship of the proletariat."

In 1920, Secretary of State Colby wrote an open letter to the Italian Ambassador referring to the Russian revolutionaries:

"These facts, which none dispute, have convinced the Government of the United

States, against its will, that the existing regime in Russia is based upon the negation of every principle of honor and good faith, and every usage and convention, underlying the whole structure of international law; the negation, in short, of every principle upon which it is possible to base harmonious and trustful relations, whether of nations or of individuals. The responsible leaders of the regime * * * have frequently and openly boasted that they are willing to sign agreements and undertakings with foreign powers while not having the slightest intention of observing such undertakings or carrying out such agreements * * * [they have declared] * * * that the very existence of Bolshevism in Russia, the maintenance of their own rule, depends, and must continue to depend, upon the occurrence of revolutions in all other civilized nations, including the United States, which will overthrow and destroy their governments and set up Bolshevik rule in their stead. They have made it quite plain that they intend to use every means, including, of course, diplomatic agencies, to promote such revolutionary movements in other countries."

In 1924, Secretary of State Charles Evans Hughes reported to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on the Communist International:

"From the above it will be seen that the question of whether Communist programs contemplate the use of force and violence has been passed upon by every class of tribunal which could pass upon it, namely, Federal and State courts, administrative tribunals and legislative committees of both Federal and State Governments, and in every class the result has been in support of the position that force and violence are inseparable from Communist programs. In addition, the Secretaries of State of the United States under different administrations, have issued formal expressions on the subject of Soviet Russia and all of them are in line with the foregoing decisions."

Since then, the history of the relationships between Communist Russia and the rest of the world, including this country, with the exception of a brief period of an alliance of expediency against Fascist Hitler is a consistent record of Communist insults, barbarities, espionage, and unveiled hatred of the capitalist system. From pictorial records of the Red domination in Spain in the late 1930's to the shocking photographs of American men shot in the back with hands tied behind them in the recent Korean struggle, the course of human events ever since the recognition of the Russian Government by this country in 1933 can only lead to the conviction that the disciplined Communist fanatically seeks world domination, which must include the thorough destruction of the strongest power blocking his path—the United States of America.

Since 1949 or thereabouts a great deal of the Communist Party in America has gone underground. This has been because some States have outlawed it; other States have required registration, and the Federal Government has made it a felony to advocate forcible overthrow or destruction of the Nation or of any State. Perhaps we have less than 25,000 active, indoctrinated, disciplined Communists in America today. Perhaps there are more. I do not know. But these hard-core Communists are aided by others who are called fellow travellers, who work for front groups, some misguided, and some by design. You have only to look at history to see the danger of this plan for world conquest. Although conditions in Russia in 1917 were obviously greatly different from those in America in 1954, there were then but 80,000 Bolsheviks that overthrew that nation of 145 million people. Now, only 37 years later, Communists control one-half the population of the world, of which only a small percentage belongs to the Communist Party. With ruthless dictatorial force it controls 11 nations with a total of 800 million people. There are reported to be in addition perhaps 5 million more Communists in 80 other nations of the world, including many of the western bloc. These Communists are dedicated to subversion, to penetration of organs of government ranging from commissions and departments to labor unions and even parts of the movie industry. Since the last World War, the Communists have taken over Eastern Germany, a part of Austria, Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Hungary, Rumania, China, a part of Mongolia, and North Korea. The latest open and notorious aggression is taking place right now in Indochina. In none of these countries did communism take over by vote. No nation has ever adopted communism by free choice at the polls. It is indeed a sober prospect, not necessarily one to terrify us, but one which surely demands that we must learn the nature of the movement, its purposes and objectives, and the best way in which to meet its challenge.

This does not mean that you can't talk about communism here; that you cannot discuss it; that you cannot have its nature and purposes explained to you right here on campus. It means simply that every responsible agency of government in this country, no matter from what party source, has consistently found as a fact that the Communist Party is not a political party entitled to a place on the ballot but that it is an arm of a foreign power bent upon the subversion and destruction of our way of life. There is no thought control in the analysis of these facts, nor is there any attempt on the part of any responsible investigating agency to enjoin conformity upon you short of your committing the crime of advocating the overthrow or destruction of your State or Nation, or knowingly belonging to an organization that has such a purpose. That ought to be a crime, don't you think? And if you see fit, knowing the fact of what communism is, of what its purposes are, to join the Communist Party, then I suggest to you in all candor that you go elsewhere to live, for if knowing these facts you help to seek to overthrow this state other than through alteration of government by lawful processes of constitutional amendment, I am quite sure that most of your fellow students and most of your brother citizens will neither understand nor want you here.

Perhaps this has still been too general for you. Maybe it seems to you as though you are still far removed from any danger from communism; that I am an alarmist; that most of those who write of the dangers of communism do so for publicity purposes and are not much more than sensationalists. Let me be still more specific then.

You want to be able to live your own lives when you are finished here, don't you? You want the least possible interference from Government with your personal lives. We all do. If you must face military service you want it over with quickly so you can build your own future. Surely the last thing you want is war. It is the last thing any of us in his right mind wants in this time of atom and hydrogen superbombs.

Then reflect well on the fact that man's inventive genius has evolved means of destruction that are completely out of step with man's capacity to get along with his fellow men. We are technologically years ahead of our social progress. World society is not ready for hydrogen bombs that in one split second can wipe out not just Manchester, not just Keene, not just Portsmouth—but the entire State of New Hampsire south of the White Mountains and all of Boston, Lawrence, Haverhill, and Portland, Maine. Put the results of the last test, as we have learned of it so far, on a map of this area and draw your own conclusions. It is horrible. It defies even the Superman tales in terms of destructive capacity. But even then it is not so horrible as what is happening behind the Iron Curtain to the minds of your generation and that to follow you.

Soon there will be very few younger people in Russia and the satellite nations who know anything but suspicion and hatred for America. From the most tender ages, our information is that children of the Communist nations are being brought up to hate you—to hate our way of life with a bitter, sullen, defiant hatred spawned of ignorance and rested on fear. They are being told we are germ warmongers. That we stop at nothing; that we torture innocent men and women; that we aim to destroy them and their parents and their homes. They are being told, in short, that if they do not first destroy us, we will destroy them.

Well, Hitler's youth legions gave some idea of the culminative effect of this type of mind poison over a much briefer span of years than the Communists have had available. Do you believe as this generation over there comes of age—comes into power—that peaceful coexistence is going to be possible? Isn't it pretty clear what their conception of the Golden Rule is going to be? It must be substantially like the most basic law of the wild—kill or be killed. This is the great danger, it seems to me. Time is running out for us in our relations with and hopes for youth behind the Iron Curtain.

Hatred, fear, and prejudice. Communism seeks to fan these dormant coals even here in our Granite State. Let me give you an illustration: The National Attorney General, as you know, officially designates certain groups and organizations in this country as being subversive, Communist, totalitarian, or Fascist. This has been done for a good many years. These listings are made public and people know of them generally across the land. They are now made only after notice to the organizations involved, and an opportunity to come in and show cause in opposition if desired. There are more than 200 such organizations on the present listings.

A witness in the State's investigation into subversive activities and persons (and, incidentally, a well-educated person) testified that he was not presently nor had he ever been in the past a member of the Communist Party. He protested quite vehemently the State's attempt to thought control him by asking him questions about his activities in the past. He read a lengthy prepared statement in which, after berating the objectives of such investigations, calling them evil and dangerous, he stated that he would decline to answer questions concerning ideas, beliefs, and associations which could not possibly be pertinent to the matters being investigated. Well, it soon appeared from questioning that this witness had been active in not 1, not 2, not 3, but more than half a dozen organizations officially cited first by the House Committee on Un-American Activities as subversive or Communist, and then later by the National Attorney General (then of the Democratic Party) as subversive or Communist, and his activities in many instances took place long after such citations and designations had been made widely public.

Then this same witness offered as an exhibit to his testimony a January 1954 issue of a publication of which he was coeditor. Upon examination there appeared upon a page of this magazine—the same page—the following direct quotations:

"But while we are explaining this, let us not forget that the root of the trouble is capitalism, not McCarthyism. We will never be out of the wood, nor will the world at large, as long as the United States has its present crazy economic system. No doubt that means we have a long way to go. But at any rate let's not lose sight of where we're going.

* * * * *

"Revolution, which was once a word spoken with pride by every American who had the right to claim it, has become a word spoken with timidity and doubt and even loathing. And freedom which, in the old days was something you used, has now become something you save—something you put away and protect like your other possessions—like a deed or a bond in a bank. The true test of freedom is in its use. It has no other test." (Archibald MacLeish, Atlantic Monthly, August 1949.)

I asked this witness whether this juxtaposition of these two items intended to indicate an advocacy that revolution is the answer to the change in the "crazy economic system" and he answered: "No. That was just a little filler. We find a little space needs filling up." Then I looked further through this magazine which this witness presently coedits and I found such titles as "Politics and the Proletariat, 1953"; "Who Doesn't Believe in Class Struggle?"; "In Order To Answer the Question Whether There Are Classes in America in the Marxian Sense and Class Warfare and a Class Struggle, One Must Take Account of a Social Fact Which Is So Obvious That, Like Poe's Famous Letter, It Escapes Attention"; "The Marxian Theory of the Irrepressible Conflict"; "It Is Necessary To Do Something and There Is No More Important Task Than That of Spreading the Truth About What Is Happening."

My friends, what can possibly be the purpose and objective of printing such matter in America today? What does it appear to mean to you? Who seeks recognition of an alleged inevitable class struggle? Who seeks the end of the capitalist system? What is the plain purport of these words?

It has often and verily been said that "The pen is mightier than the sword." I will not try to answer here this evening the "whys" of such writings—why this witness did these things; wrote these things. I don't know whether I could even if I tried. But I do know and I say here tonight to you that there can be no reasonable question of the right of this State to question individuals such as this witness. Each of us—and you yourselves—must always so conduct our lives so as to be able at any time to fearlessly face the witness stand under oath to answer questions concerning loyalty to our State and Nation. You cannot expect that if you associate with Communists; sponsor and attend and write for organizations officially designated as subversive or Communist, print publications replete with double meanings on issues of loyalty, that you may not some day have the constitutional light of day cast upon such activities. This is no invasion of any right of personal privacy. It is clearly not only the duty but the responsibility of the State to its other free citizenry to cast the light upon such activities.

You see—it is all not merely a matter of belonging to a political organization and having it repressed. It is a question—and a basic one—of whether a given individual in a showdown between Soviet Russia and America, would take orders from Russia. That is the great unanswered question no matter whether an individual is presently a member of the Communist Party or was for any protracted period in the past. Where does his loyalty lie should war break out? Do you know? I don't.

If a person was a member of the Communist Party for 6 months 23 years ago, that is one thing. If he was a member for 6 years, that is another. If he was a member of 16 years, that is still another. At some point along the way it can be found that no reasonably well-informed American citizen, much less a well-educated American citizen, could have helped but know that activity furthering the purposes of world communism, and more particularly the Communist Party in America, was contrary to his allegiance to the United States Government, and contrary to the best interests, safety, and security of this country and State. This is not hysteria. This is not witch hunting. This is not thought control. This is seeking facts. It is not for the inquisitor to pass judgment either upon the ultimate question nor upon the individual witness, much less castigate him on the witness stand. His record is there to speak for itself, on the facts

For example, have you considered what it means when a witness in a fact-finding investigation into the question of subversion declines to answer a relevant question on the grounds that his answer if given might tend to incriminate him? The crime involved is that of subversion. If he claims his privilege in good faith, it is only logical to assume that at least the witness believes that if he were to answer the question truthfully he would thereby furnish evidence which would constitute a link in a chain tending to convict him of a crime. This is a perfectly proper constitutional privilege with a tremendous historical background. But it is a privilege personal to the witness and one which cannot be validly exercised by the witness to shield other persons. The fact that refusal to answer proper questions in the field of subversion tends to injure the reputation of a witness is completely beside the point. The dilemma in which a witness finds himself is one fundamentally of his own creating. Too many witnesses have used the privilege as a basis for an exercise in personal, conscientious objection against turning informer. This is close to an abuse of the privilege provided the period involved relates to a time outlawed by the statute of limitations, or provided the witness knows very well that he himself has never been knowingly active in the Communist Party or any other subversive organization. It is decidedly unfortunate when some distinguished legal figures confuse the true nature and meaning of the privilege against self-incrimination with invasion into rights of privacy. Certainly there can be no right of privacy against legitimate inquiry into alleged subversive conduct, whether by a legislative investigating body or by proper law-enforcement agencies. There have been some abuses but this fact should not obscure the basic principle of this privilege against self-incrimination. You really owe it to yourselves to keep your thinking straight on this point in the midst of all the confusion that surrounds it in the minds of some people.

I have long hoped that in some way, some day, those oppressed peoples of Russia, of the satellites, of North Korea, will rise up and cast off their shackles of bondage. I desperately hope that their tragic system of enforced hatred, controlled living, propagandized knowledge, and state press, will collapse some day of its own falsities within. Maybe it will. But in the meantime, it is apparently strong and ever growing stronger. So must we be also. In truth this is your responsibility.

So, for a last word of advice to you—don't waste your years here. Your time is precious. Budget it carefully. All the money in the world will not buy 1 minute of it over again. You will only be here once. Make the most of it. Look ahead now, and know what you're going to try to do with your life. If you want to be a lawyer, a doctor, a nurse, a farmer, a writer, an engineer, it makes little difference. There is work and promise for all. But direct your thinking and your activity toward a known goal. Don't just drift here. Give your college, your State, and your Nation your best pull on the oars. This is not for yourself alone. It is for God and loved ones as well. What you put in your head now nobody can take away from you. If you do each day's work thoroughly you will make more progress than you now believe possible. If you do these things, and ask yourself each night before you go to sleep "What have I done to help today?" we in America will stay on top of the ladder—for the good of the world, and ourselves. If you don't do these things—if you loaf while the youth of Russia work—we, the "Great Americans" are going to be knocked off the ladder.

It is up to you. I know you will accept the challenge, for you are America's life insurance.

Foreign Policy Aspects of the Eisenhower Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, May 7, 1954

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, last evening it was my pleasure to address the Whig-Cliosophic Society, in Princeton, N. J., on the subject of the foreign policy aspects of the Eisenhower administration. I ask unanimous consent that the text of my address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FOREIGN POLICY ASPECTS OF THE EISENHOWER ADMINISTRATION

It is a triple pleasure for me to be here tonight.

First, I consider it a real honor to have the privilege of being with this group, the oldest college political and debating society in the world. We meet here in the best traditions of the democratic process to examine, freely and candidly, some of the most crucial issues of our times.

Second, it is a special, added pleasure to be in the home territory of my esteemed colleague, the senior Senator from New Jersey, H. ALEXANDER SMITH, and his wife.

I have a particular warm spot in my heart for Princeton because of ALEX SMITH. He sits at my right hand in the Foreign Relations Committee, and I gratefully acknowledge the enormous debt I owe him for his wise and good-humored counsel. He is chairman of our Subcommittee on Far Eastern Affairs, and he has done a splendid job in this highly critical area.

Senator SMITH is as proud of Princeton, as I know Princeton is proud of him. From long association with him, I have had this fact impressed upon me—I am now in what he invariably refers to as "the intellectual hub of the universe." I must also pay a compliment to your junior Senator, BOB HENDRICKSON, and his wife Olga. They are fine folks.

Finally, it is a pleasure for me to be here because the foreign policy of the United States—about which I shall speak to you tonight—is more than ever before the great shield of our Republic.

PARTISANSHIP STOPS AT WATER'S EDGE

In all candor, may I say at the outset that foreign policy is not genuinely a subject for partisan debate, and I do not approach it in a partisan spirit.

The Eisenhower administration frankly recognizes the many good elements in the foreign policy it inherited from the previous administration. What it has sought to do is to build on these good elements and strengthen the weak elements.

I submit that in this endeavor it has been largely successful, albeit not at all times and not in respect to all places. But that qualifying description arises from the very nature of the extremely difficult world situation in which we now find ourselves.

With respect to my fundamental premise of nonpartisanship at the water's edge, I remind you that much of our foreign policy rests on bases that were built by the cooperative effort of both political parties during the past 10 years.

Can any student of foreign relations forget, for example, that such great forward steps as the Greek-Turkish aid program, the European recovery program, and the Vandenberg resolution which paved the way for the Atlantic Pact, had their roots deep in the Republican 80th Congress?

The Eisenhower foreign policy can be quite simply described as a policy of bold collective security.

Its basic principles have long had the widespread support of Americans in both political parties. This public support has been demonstrated in many ways—in elections, in testimony of representative organizations before congressional committees, and in a long series of bipartisan votes in Congress. This is worth remembering when the policy is criticized. "The public," said Mark Twain, "is the only critic whose opinion is worth anything at all."

Such opinion is particularly welcome on our foreign policy. Why? Because an effective, successful foreign policy has become indispensable, not only to the survival of America, but to the survival of the free world and of western civilization.

SURVIVAL: OUR BASIC STANDARD

And it is on this basic point of our own survival that I should like to present the case in commendation of the foreign policy deeds of the Eisenhower administration since January 1953.

The fact of the matter is that the President of the United States has been spending a tremendous proportion of his time on foreign affairs and rightly so. He has been basing his crucial decisions in international affairs, as has his able Secretary of State on this one paramount standard: "How may we act so as to be adequate for our own national survival."

How may we act so that this country will not go down, as Rome went down, and as other civilizations of the past went down before a barbarian conqueror? How may we act so as to prevent an atomic Armageddon?

Consider for one moment what world war III could mean, if it came.

Bear in mind the fact that there would be no victor of world war III—a war of the H-bomb and the A-bomb and bacteriological weapons.

One side might end up slightly less devastated than the other side. Our people might have suffered a lesser degree of extermination than the other people.

But that is not a bright prospect, and Mr. Malenkov knows it as well as anyone else.

Is it any wonder, therefore, that our own President—who has known the terrible meaning of war at first hand—is determined to do everything within his power and within the power of this country to prevent East-West tensions from exploding into war?

As a consequence our President and Secretary of State Dulles have planned and executed a foreign policy which, I submit, has proven more vigorous, more imaginative, more dynamic, more daring, than that of the previous administration.

It has proven so, both in strengthening ourselves and our allies, and in probing and exploiting the weak spots of the Soviet bloc.

Now, I can almost hear many folks in my audience saying, "Is it not a fact that in spite of this more vigorous, more imaginative, more dynamic, more daring policy, we are still in the midst of the greatest difficulties? Is it not a fact that we are running into difficulties not only with the Soviet bloc, but in trying to restore the unity of the free world?"

Yes, we are experiencing difficulties—extremely serious ones. But our real achievement is that these difficulties, however serious, are far less than they might have been, had we not even attempted the many actions which we have taken on the world scene. A superhuman effort has been and is being made to reduce our difficulties. Certainly the almost continuous worldwide travel of our Secretary of State evidences that fact.

PROBLEMS LONG IN MAKING

But in May of 1954, we are confronted in Indochina, in Geneva, and elsewhere, with critical situations which have long been in the making. Our problems have not arisen overnight. They will not and cannot be solved overnight. The new administration is not a vendor of miracles. It has accomplished much. It knows that a great deal more needs still be done.

We are all admittedly concerned over the trends of the present Geneva conference, particularly as regards Indochina.

PREMATURE VIEWS OF GENEVA

Frankly, developments have been occurring so fast within the past few days that, for this and other reasons, I am not going to attempt to try to spell out a definitive evaluation of Geneva. I don't think that anybody can.

I don't think that when you and I are watching a mile-long race, that we can attempt to judge results after the first quarter-mile. Someone may appear to be ahead after that first quarter, but most of the race is still to be run.

I cannot agree with those who have given quick, off-the-cuff evaluations of Geneva as a so-called allied defeat, a disaster, or other morbid views.

What did these people expect—the millennium?

What did they expect after France's 8 indecisive years of the bleeding conflict in Indochina? Indeed, what did they expect once China—one-fifth of the human race—was swallowed up by communism? Did they think southeast Asia would be easily immune to the Red onslaught?

I should like to make a second observation on Geneva. It is that there is a tendency, when things don't go as well as we might like, to start casting recriminations.

Now, it is a fact that certain of our allies have not done all that we might have wanted them to do and when we wanted them to do it. The French could and should have granted independence to the three associated States of Indochina much sooner.

The French could and should have trained native troops and leadership to a far greater and faster degree than they have.

The British might have and should have taken action to implement Secretary of State Dulles' sound suggestion for united action in southeast Asia.

And one could add other points on which our allies could have acted more speedily, more boldly, and imaginatively.

But you can be quite sure that our allies feel in many respects that we, too, could have acted in ways different from the ways we did act.

And as regards France, let me say that in her hour of travail, I trust that we will display the sympathetic understanding, the continued deep friendship characteristic of two great allies who have twice in a generation shed their blood together.

I trust that we will not forget that the heroism of the defenders of Dien Bien Phu will stand for all time as an inspiration to freemen.

The challenge to us, therefore, is not to hurl accusations against our allies back and forth in a transatlantic verbal boxing bout, but to figure out how we can regain our united strength and aim our collective blows at our adversaries.

The hard fact of the matter is that we and our Allies have allowed our unity to falter. But that is no proof that we cannot repair our unity, instead of allowing the Soviets to continue their divide-and-conquer technique so successfully.

CAN'T HAVE CAKE AND EAT IT TOO

A third note which I should like to make in this connection is this: there is a price tag on most things in this world, including on foreign policy. You cannot get things of value at no cost whatsoever. The cost of liberty and security often runs high.

If some Americans are not willing to take any risks whatsoever as regards Indochina, even as regards the sending of technicians; if they are unwilling to make further sacrifices in American money and material; then they should not expect the impossible.

If on the other hand, they agree that Indochina is the key to southeast Asia, and if they agree that southeast Asia is a crucial element on the world scale, then they must make up their minds as to how much of a price they are actually willing to pay to maintain Indochina free.

If these Americans don't want to pay any price at all, then they should frankly so state and not delude Americans or others, particularly the French.

What I object to are those critics who say, "Yes, Indochina is crucial. But we refuse to run any risks over it. We refuse to make any sacrifices over it."

I say: You cannot have your cake and eat it too in this world. You cannot maintain freedom unless you are willing to pay the price.

SHOULD WE PAY A PRICE IN BLOOD?

Now, what is the long-run price for maintaining Indochina? Would it be worth the price if that price included American manpower—precious American blood—American ground troops?

That is the terribly significant question which has concerned the highest military and diplomatic leaders of the United States Government. It has been considered repeatedly by the National Security Council. I am not going to try to usurp the prerogatives of the executive branch in attempting a definitive answer.

I do not pose as a military expert. I am not going to offer armchair strategy on the military possibilities open to us at this 11th hour.

But I only want to make this point: that we should not permit people to argue on both sides of the same question.

If they want to criticize the Eisenhower administration for permitting serious reverses—as if the situation were completed under our control, which it is not—and then for permitting arrangements to be started for a negotiated peace in Indochina, that is one thing.

But if they want to criticize the administration, both (a) for those reverses and (b) for even daring to raise the question of how we may attempt, with our allies, to halt the reverses, then I say such criticism is exceedingly arbitrary and unfair.

I point out very definitely that we are but one party to our worldwide system of collective security.

We do not and will not attempt to dictate. That is the way of the Soviets, not our way.

PREMISES OF OUR FOREIGN POLICY

Now, I want to turn to the broad and continuing basis of United States foreign policy.

The most significant single fact of world politics is the fact of aggressive Soviet power and its threat to our freedom and security.

Any American foreign policy which does not seek to meet the threat and reduce it to more manageable proportions is worse than useless; it is suicidal.

The Eisenhower foreign policy is based on the premises that this threat can best be met through increasing the total strength not only of the United States but also of like-minded nations; that allies are not only useful but also necessary; that as the threat assumes political and economic as well as military forms, it must be met in political and economic as well as military ways; that in meeting the threat we need not limit ourselves to the specific form the threat takes; that although we must pace our efforts on the assumption that the threat will be of long duration, we can hasten its end by applying constant political pressure; and that, in the meantime, we are always ready to enter into good faith negotiations for the solution of outstanding problems and the reduction of world tensions generally.

KEY ROLE OF U. N.

I want to emphasize that the United Nations plays a very large role in the Eisenhower foreign policy.

This administration wholeheartedly supports the United Nations. American policy continues to be based on support of the United Nations. We have sought, and continue to seek, ways and means of strengthening the United Nations.

I am sick and tired of hearing narrow-minded critics parrot the nonsensical slogan, "Get the United States out of the U. N. and the U. N. out of the United States." It is hard to imagine a more ill-conceived policy.

Those who would destroy the U. N. fail to understand a very simple truth; if we were to disband the U. N. today, so essential is it to the cause of world peace that tomorrow we would have to start building a similar organization to take its place.

REVIEW OF POLICY

When John Foster Dulles appeared before the Foreign Relations Committee in connection with his nomination to be Secretary of State, I asked him what he hoped to accomplish in the next year.

"I think," he said, "that the first task is to review and reappraise the present policies.

"Those policies have in them many good elements, but on the other hand, the situation has changed and deteriorated in many parts of the world.

"There is always a great danger that, without intending to do so, we may fall into a rut or a process that already exists. The tendency is, there is a momentum that carries you along the line of present action, and it is very difficult to get the opportunity to really make a fresh review. The easy thing is to carry on. * * *

"I hope before the end of the year we will be able to come up with either fresh policies or with a fresh conviction that the existing policies are the best that we can find. I hope that in most cases, we can find better policies."

This statement remains a good description of the Eisenhower administration's approach to foreign policy. It is a realistic approach, an approach in which our policies are kept under constant review and scrutiny to make sure that they are the best that can be devised and that we do not, as Mr. Dulles described it, "fall into a rut or a process that already exists."

Mr. Dulles made this statement on January 15, 1953.

THE CAPACITY FOR RETALIATION

One year later—on January 12, 1954—the Secretary spoke to the Council on Foreign Relations in New York and outlined the evolution of the Eisenhower administration's foreign policy.

That speech pretty well sums up in a general way the results of the fresh appraisal which was Mr. Dulles' goal for his first year in office.

These results, which have been called the New Look, have been the subject of considerable misunderstanding. What the New Look really boils down to is that we will react to Communist aggression—in Mr. Dulles' words—"by means and at places of our choosing." We will not necessarily abide by the Communist choice of means and places.

In other words we will not let the Communists set the ground rules.

Basically, I am convinced that the idea of developing the capacity for instant retaliation is sound.

This does not mean that we are committed to instant and massive retaliation every time there is an aggression. Nevertheless, the only way we can deter aggression is to let the aggressors know in advance that their aggression may cost them more than they will gain. Indeed, the mere existence of the capacity for instant and massive retaliation is the best possible guaranty that it will never have to be used.

This policy does not, as has been charged, restrict us to a choice between starting world war three and ignoring local aggressions. On the contrary, it gives us wider choices and greater freedom of choice than we had before.

With this in background, I want to turn again to specific geographic areas of the East-West conflict.

THE ARMISTICE IN KOREA

We have already briefly scanned the Indochinese problem.

We must not, of course, lose sight of the fact that the initial item on the agenda of the Geneva Conference was not to be Indochina, but rather, Korea—scene of the epic defense by the United Nations against the forces of Communist aggression and scene of our armistice agreement. The Communists have already repeatedly violated the agreement, thus flaws have developed as we knew they would in the armistice.

As a result, there are those who have attempted to belittle the Korean armistice completely. They contend that the armistice solved nothing. They are wrong. It solved the problem of people getting killed.

It is a fact that the Chinese Communists were probably able thereby to divert some of their strength to Indochina. But the fact of the matter is that we, in turn, were able to utilize the armistice better to gird our strength for our own worldwide commitments. The armistice permitted us to begin the policy of disengagement, for we had obviously been forced to commit too large a proportion of American ground troops to one small and exceedingly remote area.

The armistice permitted us to remove the Korean problem from the battlefield to the conference room. The armistice has proven, in effect, to be one of the significant accomplishments of the last 16 months.

Accompanying the armistice, we have negotiated and ratified a mutual security treaty with Korea. We have concluded a military assistance agreement with Japan, and the Japanese will be making an increasing contribution to their own defense.

I have long advocated an overall Pacific Pact to strengthen the forces of freedom in that part of the world. It is now closer to realization than ever before, notwithstanding the unfortunate delay in carrying out Secretary Dulles' united-action plea.

FREE WORLD ADVANCES IN MIDDLE EAST

Turning now to the Middle East, we observe that Iran has been saved from communism. Under the leadership of its young Shah, that historic country is now on the road to better days. The Iranian-British oil dispute, which once vexed the whole area, has yielded to cooler heads and better judgment.

Equally significant in the Middle East has been the bringing of Pakistan into active participation in the free world defense system. The Pakistani and the Turks have arranged an alliance which we hope will be broadened to include other countries of the Middle East. Negotiations for a military assistance agreement between the United States and Pakistan are actively proceeding. Pakistan is a truly remarkable country, poor in material wealth but rich in devotion to freedom and capable of making a very significant contribution to our common cause. We welcome her as an ally.

The developing defense arrangements in the Middle East offer a good illustration of the results of the fresh appraisal which has been made of our past policies. One of our objectives in that area had long been a Middle East Defense Organization which would tie the Arab States in with Turkey and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. Such an arrangement would strengthen the area generally and greatly facilitate the defense of one of the weakest and most crucial areas of the free world.

It soon became apparent, however, that the attainment of that objective was highly improbable and that we could not realistically base our policy on it.

We turned our attention, therefore, to something that was more nearly attainable—a defensive alliance along the northern tier of middle eastern states, anchored in Turkey at one end, in Pakistan at the other, and including Iraq and possibly Iran. We have not given up our ultimate goal of an areawide alliance in the Middle East, but meanwhile we are making encouraging progress toward a more limited and more realistic objective.

SOME PROGRESS IN WESTERN EUROPE

In Europe, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization has been strengthened.

The NATO buildup has been put on a long-term basis, at a level that can be sustained. This makes the burden more easily bearable, both for ourselves and our allies. It has made it possible to reduce our economic aid to the vanishing point, and this has had beneficial effects not only on our own budget but also on our relations with our allies. NATO is a significant deterrent to Communist aggression in Europe, and it is now acquiring strength which will last.

We have long recognized that NATO could not be fully effective, however, without a contribution from Germany. The device which has worked out for securing that contribution was the European Defense Community. The EDC Treaty was signed in May 1952, but 8 months later when the Eisenhower administration took office, not a single member had ratified it. This was made one of the top priorities of American policy, and EDC has now been ratified by 4 of the 6 signatory states.

FRANCE AND EDC

We are all aware of the interrelation between Indochina and the problem of French ratification of EDC. The fact that France has not ratified the treaty is of deep concern to us, to thinking French men and women, and to men of good will everywhere. But no man, viewing the facts, should underestimate the difficulties and complexities of France's internal parliamentary problem in relation to EDC. Secretary of State Dulles has done everything possible to present the facts frankly to the French Government. I am sure that no one could charge Mr. Dulles with lack of forthrightness on this or, for that matter, on other pressing issues.

A further accomplishment of the Eisenhower foreign policy in Europe has been to bring Spain into our defense system. As the result of an agreement signed last year, we now have at our disposal Spanish sites for bases of very great strategic importance.

The past 16 months have likewise brought about a closer association of Yugoslavia, and its considerable military establishment, with Greece and Turkey. This gives added strength against aggression in southeast Europe.

OUR LATIN AMERICAN RELATIONS

Finally, in Latin America, the Eisenhower administration has taken steps to rectify the neglect by our policymakers of our nearest friends which had prevailed for so long.

The trip by the President's distinguished brother, Dr. Milton Eisenhower, did a great deal to improve our relations in Latin America generally and to convince the people there that we genuinely want their friendship.

The most dramatic change in Latin American attitudes toward the United States is exemplified by Argentina. There is now not only a very much friendlier atmosphere toward the United States in Buenos Aires, but there has been a curtailment of the anti-United States propaganda activities of Argentine Embassies in other American Republics. We trust that this improvement in relations will continue and will be enhanced.

We further strengthened hemispheric solidarity at the 10th Inter-American Conference in Caracas in March.

By the impressive vote of 17 to 1, that conference recognized that "the domination or control of the political institutions of any American State by the international Communist movement, extending to this hemisphere the political system of an extracontinental power, would constitute a threat to the sovereignty and political independence of the American States, endangering the peace of America * * *."

That is a great step forward. It recognizes, for the first time in this formal way, that communism is itself foreign intervention in the affairs of the Americas. And it comes none too soon to meet the Communist menace in this hemisphere, particularly in Central America and the Caribbean, notably the Communist beachhead in Guatemala, which already is beginning to radiate its evil influence to neighboring countries and elsewhere in Latin America.

UNSOLVED PROBLEMS

By this brief region-by-region summary, I do not of course intend even to imply a completely or uniformly encouraging outlook.

There will always, of course, be unsolved problems. I have dealt at some length with one of these problems—the one in Indochina—but I have not even mentioned others, on any one of which a whole evening could be spent—such as for example, the Arab-Israeli conflict in the Middle East, the Egyptian-British dispute over Suez, the problem of India's position, the problems of German unification, of an Austrian peace treaty, and many others.

On balance, however, by any objective standard of measurement, we have made substantial progress in the last 16 months. You cannot expect this progress to take spectacular form like a before-and-after picture advertising the results of dieting. A part of our foreign policy progress does not yet appear in tangible results. It consists of taking steps to make some of our outstanding problems more susceptible to solution.

I do want to point out however that many of these problems arise from an insufficient understanding on the part of the people involved of the nature of the Soviet threat and from a misunderstanding of American policies and American motives.

PROPAGANDA OF AND ABOUT US

Because of our association with our NATO allies, some of whom happen to be the principal colonial powers of Europe, the United States is unfortunately and unjustifiably tainted with colonialism throughout most of the non-European, non-Communist part of the world—in the Middle East, in Africa, in Asia, and even to some extent in Latin America.

It is a scandal that this was ever allowed to happen. No other country on the face of the globe has such an unblemished record against colonialism as the United States, and no other country has such a black record as the Soviet Union. In Secretary Dulles' restrained phrase, our policy in that regard had become "unnecessarily ambiguous." That is being corrected.

As a further step in promoting better worldwide understanding of the United States and the things it stands for, we have strengthened our overseas information programs. These programs are designed to disseminate the truth about Americans and American policies. The more we can spread the simple, unvarnished truth, the more trouble the Communists have in peddling their lies.

THE SOVIET CAPTIVE COUNTRIES

There is one very important part of the world which I have not talked about tonight, and that is the Soviet Union itself and its captive countries. Some extremely interesting things have been happening in that area recently.

The increasing number of desertions of Communist espionage agents and saboteurs is a matter of great significance.

For years, of course, there have been a great number of refugees flowing out of the Soviet bloc, and that too, is significant as an indication of the opposition of the people generally to Communist totalitarianism. But of late the desire for freedom has begun to penetrate even into the Soviet secret police, which we can presume to be composed of hard core, specially selected and trained agents. We can rejoice that the Soviet loyalty and security program is not working very well.

There is other evidence of tension and unrest behind the Iron Curtain. The most spectacular exemple was, of course, the June 17 riots in East Berlin and throughout the Soviet Zone of Germany. But those riots are only indicative.

The Senate Foreign Relations Committee is publishing a series of studies, prepared by the Library of Congress, on tensions within the Soviet Union and the Soviet captive countries. These carefully documented studies show that every social and economic group has special grievances against the Communist imperialists. They show further that the Communists are having great difficulties in imposing their system and that in many cases their efforts to date have resulted in complete failure.

It might be easy to draw many inferences from these facts and to conclude, wishfully, that the Soviet Empire is on the verge of collapse. It would be highly unrealistic to base our policy on such a misleading and mistaken premise. But we can legitimately take comfort in the fact that the Communists have their troubles, too. They have more troubles, in fact, than we do.

Many of these troubles, of course, are the inevitable result of the internal contradictions which afflict all totalitarian states. But I think it is fair to attribute some of them to our own policies of strength and determination. The stronger the free nations, the brighter the flames of liberty and independence will burn in the breasts of oppressed peoples everywhere.

As I have pointed out one of the key points of the Eisenhower policy is to put as much political pressure as possible on the Soviet bloc. The more trouble the bloc has for itself, the less opportunity it has to start trouble for others.

UNITED STATES FLEXIBILITY

This strategy also gives us more flexibility, more maneuverability, more initiative. Let me give you a few examples of how this works.

We tell the Soviets that we will react to aggression, but we do not tell them how. We worry them, keep them guessing.

We deneutralized Formosa. The Communists no longer have assurance that our Seventh Fleet will prevent Nationalist Chinese actions against the mainland.

We are disengaging ourselves from Korea. This means that less of our strength is tied down in one spot; more of it is available as a strategic, mobile reserve. It means that we have more strength, not less.

We challenge the Communists to live up to their professed desire for world peace. We demand deeds to prove the good faith of their glittering words. When the deeds are not forthcoming, some of the glitter wears off the words.

We go further. We put forward constructive suggestions of our own—such as the President's proposal for the peaceful development of atomic energy. Negotiations based on this proposal are now going forward. We hope for positive results. If the Soviets mean what they say, we will have positive results. If not, then the whole world will know where the blame lies.

PRESERVE NONPARTISANSHIP

Viewing the situation as a whole, I believe that the facts which I have presented justify my contention that our foreign policy during the last year and a quarter has indeed been more vigorous, more imaginative, more dynamic, more daring, in searching out weak spots in the Soviet bloc and in bringing pressure to bear on those weak spots.

I do not for one moment attempt to gloss over the obvious difficulties we have encountered. I do not believe that the Republican administration and its supporters in the Congress could or would make any claims to perfection or infallibility or in before-and-after miracles.

Now, as to the charges against our administration, I point out to you that we are approaching an important byelection. Inevitably there is a tendency in some quarters to magnify alleged shortcomings of the incumbent or the previous administration. I believe, however, that at least insofar as foreign policy is concerned, both Republicans and Democrats should exercise restraint, judgment, and fairness.

This is no time for partisanship to divide us on foreign policy. It is bad enough that we have experienced the degree of division which we have encountered in certain respects with our allies. Let not this division occur in our own land as well and thereby aggravate our problems with friend and foe alike.

We welcome honest differences at home and abroad. We know that reasonable men have a right to differ and will inevitably differ at times. But the stakes are too high for the survival of this Nation—I repeat, the survival of this Nation—and of western civilization as a whole, for us to allow partisan bickering, partisan crowing, or partisan accusations, to impair American foreign policy.

There are those who have attempted completely and unreservedly to denounce bipartisan or nonpartisan foreign policy. I confess I cannot appreciate their twisted logic.

Don't they realize that the enemies of our country want nothing more than to divide us? Don't they realize that there is nothing incompatible between bipartisan foreign policy and our constitutional system? In this system the incumbent administration has basic support from the loyal opposition with whom it consults at all stages and yet both the majority and the minority reserve to themselves the right to have certain differences.

CLOSE POLITICAL BALANCE OF POWER

There must be and will continue to be bipartisanship in foreign policy, particularly under the present delicate political balance of power.

Take the situation in Washington today. With the Senate divided 48 to 47 in favor of the Democrats, and with a two-thirds vote necessary for the ratification of all treaties, how could President Eisenhower possibly conduct our foreign policy without a substantial number of votes from the other side of the aisle?

Those who insist that bipartisanship is outmoded, badly need a lesson in elementary arithmetic.

I repeat: We welcome honest criticism. Such criticism is a part of the American tradition, and out of it there frequently come some constructive ideas and suggestions. The absence of such criticism is one of the great weaknesses of the Soviet Union, and the opportunity for it here is one of our great strengths.

CRITICS SHOULD SUGGEST ALTERNATIVE

Those who criticize, however, have the responsibility of offering a better alternative.

The practical conditions which we face in the world rarely give us a choice between black and white. We are usually confronted with varying shades of gray, and frequently pretty dark shades at that. We have too often been in a situation where there were no good alternatives, where we have had to choose the least undesirable one.

It is easy enough to lambaste the President or the Secretary of State in retrospect. It is easier to call a football game on Monday morning than it is on Saturday afternoon. But objections which are offered on Saturday afternoon are entitled to a great deal more respect than those which do not come until Monday morning.

I would be more impressed with the criticism which I hear of our foreign policy if the critics displayed more foresight and less hindsight. There has been too little of the former and a great deal too much of the latter from the Hoosier critics.

In the language of the old frontier saying, "Any jackass can kick down a barn but it takes a carpenter to build one."

Together with our allies, we are, by and large, moving ahead in our building a structure of world peace. Our progress is not perfect nor is it uninterrupted by setbacks. But I challenge our critics either to come up with a better set of blueprints or to pitch in and help execute those that we have.

CONCLUSION

I conclude these comments with this final point: In the last 16 months, we have strengthened foreign policy—the shield of our Republic. We have strengthened it toward the end of our own survival and of the survival of all that we hold dear.

We have done so on the sound premise that our strength would improve the chances of peace.

There is no man in the Eisenhower administration who lightly considers war, whether it be a so-called minor war, or a global Armageddon which might start from such a war.

If partisan critics want not just to criticize but to misrepresent the position of the administration, then they must reckon with the consequences of the division which they may cause.

The world situation is in a fluid state—more so than perhaps ever before. An event in one part of the world dynamically alters events elsewhere. Our prospects in any one area can change for the better—or for the worse—by some sudden action or series of actions. A so-called defeat can be turned into victory and, yes, the reverse is true as well.

All of these facts make it necessary that we all maintain our sense of perspective. These facts make it necessary that critics think before they speak, and that they offer constructive alternatives when they criticize.

We of America have made progress in our foreign relations. We must make more progress. But we will require the greatest possible unity, patience, and understanding toward that end.

Diversification of the Economy of North Carolina

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALTON A. LENNON

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 7, 1954

Mr. LENNON. Mr. President, North Carolina has one of the most diversified economies of any of our States. As evidence of the great progress we are making, I wish to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a newspaper article which recently appeared in a great many North Carolina newspapers.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WESTERN ELECTRIC EXPANDS TO EMPLOY 10,000 PEOPLE NOW

(By Wade Lucas)

WINSTON-SALEM.—Veterans of World War II were still returning to their homes and being hailed as heroes in many instances back in 1946 when the first of the units of what is officially known as the North Carolina works of Western Electric Co. was established in North Carolina.

Today, Western Electric, whose parent company is the internationally known American Telephone & Telegraph Co., has expanded its operations not only here in Winston-Salem but also in Burlington and Greensboro.

More than 10,000 persons, some 35 percent of whom are women, are working the standard, 40-hour week in the North Carolina works of Western Electric. It is about these people, most of whom are native-born Tarheels, that this story is being written to point up that workers in this company find little difficulty adapting themselves to skills required in the manufacture of electronics, electrical equipment, and associated products.

Because of the nature of the electronics work being done here, in Greensboro, and in Burlington in Western Electric's North Carolina works, integral units in the company coast to coast operations, not too much can be said. But in the Pentagon in Washington and in headquarters of United States Armed Forces throughout the world the officials know much more about the company's operation in North Carolina than can be told here.

WHAT IT MAKES

But, and here the company's booklet, Welcome to Western Electric, is quoted, is a little insight into the concern's operations within its guarded plants located in North Carolina. Headed "What We Make," here it is:

"Today the United States is for electronic and communications spending many billions of dollars for equipment for defense. The Western Electric Co. produces an important part of that equipment for every branch of the armed services—Army Ordnance and Signal Corps, Navy, and Air Force.

"The products manufactured by the North Carolina works are principally electronic equipment for defense such as search, tracking, and fire control radar, and transceivers.

"Work is also being done at the North Carolina works in an electronic control system for the Army Ordnance's electrically controlled antiaircraft missiles which travel at supersonic speeds. In addition to defense projects the works' personnel recently teamed up with organizations at other Western Electric locations to manufacture the equipment for the Bell System's transcontinental microwave radio-relay system used in transmitting TV."

Kansas-born Fred Henderson, North Carolina works manager, is inordinately proud of the work being done by the more than 10,000 workers in the plants here, in Burlington, and in Greensboro. So is Frederick R. Kappel, president of Western Electric, who recently visited the State and inspected his company's plants in the three cities.

SAFETY RECORD

For these workers, practically all of whom are Tarheels, are among other things setting safety records that not only earn for them awards from the United States Department of Labor and the North Carolina Department of Labor, but also warm praise from North Carolina's Governor, William B. Umstead, and Director Ben E. Douglas, of the North Carolina Department of Conservation and Development.

Employees of the North Carolina works of this big company during 1953 earned the enviable record of only 0.92 injuries per million man-hours worked. It is the lowest such mark ever attained by a manufacturing location of the Western Electric Co. working as many as 18½ million hours in a fiscal year.

Burlington employees have qualified for the North Carolina and United States Department of Labor joint award for outstanding safety achievements for the seventh consecutive year, Winston-Salem for the fourth consecutive year, and Greensboro for the second consecutive year.

In addition, Winston-Salem and Burlington received the National Safety Council's award of honor in 1953 for having worked in excess of 4 million man-hours without a lost-time injury. Greensboro also qualified for this award in 1953 and has worked more than 4,500,000 man-hours without a lost-time accident "to which record." The Amplifier, company employee publication proudly points out, "the Greensboro employees are still adding hours." Winston-Salem has applied for its second award of honor for having worked 5,290,147 man-hours from June 30, 1953, to January 11, 1954, inclusive, without a lost-time accident.

Asked to comment on this safety record, Works Manager Henderson, no man to go out of his way to seek publicity by any manner of means, said to the company workers: "The State and national awards for safety achievement for which our North Carolina works' employees have qualified reflect your splendid cooperation in maintaining standards of safety on the job which have resulted in an accident frequency rate far below the rate for our industry. I am truly proud of this outstanding safety record, and I know you are, too.

"Safety on the job is not enough, however, I want to urge you as strongly as possible to use the same caution off the job * * * at home and on the highways * * * which has earned you national recognition for safety achievement on the job. It's a small price to pay for the continued health and happiness of your loved ones."

PRAISE FROM GOVERNOR

And to Western Electric Co.'s approximate 5,600 employees in Winston-Salem, 3,200 in Burlington, 1,400 in Greensboro, and North Carolina works' field engineers scattered throughout the world with the United States Armed Forces, Governor Umstead has this to say:

"North Carolina is proud of the work you are doing and the safety records you are setting. You are shining examples of what can be achieved by practicing safety on the job. As Governor of North Carolina, I congratulate you."

The Governor, who has made further industrial development of North Carolina a principal goal of his administration, also spoke as the active chairman of the State board of conservation and development, policymaking body for the State department of conservation and development.

Conservation and Development Director Douglas, who is spearheading the State's campaign for more industrial payrolls, joined Governor Umstead in congratulating the Western Electric Co.'s Tar Heel workers for their safety achievements.

GOOD WORKERS

"These people, as Mr. Fred Henderson has said, are good workers, easy to train in the complex manufacture of electronics and electrical equipment, have excellent records for job productivity, and are showing us that safety can really be practiced on the job. To them my heartiest congratulations."

Readers of the State's newspapers may remember what Western Electric's Fred Henderson said in the department of conservation and development sponsored industrial development forum at Burlington last year.

EASY TO TRAIN

"We knew when we came to North Carolina there would be much training involved and we were concerned about how rapidly the people here would adjust to our work," Henderson said. "We were agreeably surprised, however, to find the training requirement to be less than half what we expected, showing how adaptable the people are."

In a talk to Winston-Salem Rotarians recently, Mr. Henderson was quoted as saying that the stability and willingness of North Carolina's young people to learn gives the State an important asset for attracting new industry.

And pointing up the quality and productivity of the workers his company employs in North Carolina, this Kansas-born industrialist, who is becoming quite a booster for North Carolina and its people, said it is quite a tribute to his company's Tar Heel employees that they can build the concern's "Nike" guided missile, which happens to be a complicated electronic weapon with more than 1,500,000 parts.

That Western Electric has faith in North Carolina and the State's determination to build for that "better tomorrow" that Governor Umstead envisioned in his inaugural address in Raleigh in January 1953, is further demonstrated by the company's construction of a new manufacturing building here.

It is expected this building will be completed sometime this year. Including auxiliary service buildings and an office building which was started during 1953, the new construction, approximating $8,000,000 in cost, will provide about 625,000 square feet of space in which to centralize work now being performed at several leased locations in Winston-Salem.

Poland's Constitutional Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, May 7, 1954

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement which I have prepared relative to Poland's Constitutional Independence Day.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is a distinct privilege for me to join my colleagues today in celebrating the Constitutional Independence Day of Poland. It is appropriate that today, May 3d, that we in the Congress take note of this day because just within the last few days the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations reported a resolution favoring the immediate holding of free and fair elections in Poland. As a member of that committee, I enthusiastically joined in voting for it.

The people of Poland are today enslaved by international communism. We in the United States must never forget that one of our goals as a free nation in the free world must be the eventual emancipation of Poland and its people from Communist totalitarianism. The spirit of Poland remains free. I am confident that Poland itself will again soon be free.

Secretary Benson's Attitude

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BARRY M. GOLDWATER

OF ARIZONA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, May 7, 1954

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Secretary Benson's Attitude," published in the Syracuse (N. Y.) Post-Standard of recent date.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SECRETARY BENSON'S ATTITUDE

Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Benson told newsmen in Washington yesterday that he won't resign if Congress rejects his flexible price-support program. That's good news.

Secretary Benson, during his months in the Cabinet, has shown that he is honest, has the courage of his convictions, and is constructive in his efforts, too, for good, sound government. We need that kind of man in Washington.

Members of Congress up for reelection are threatening to throw out his carefully considered and planned farm program designed to check overproduction now costing American taxpayers in the billions every year. They want to keep parity payments at a rigid and artificial 90 percent, despite the heavy waste, fearing that the Benson program will antagonize farmers.

Every valid argument is in favor of the Benson program. The one it would replace is a wartime measure designed to stimulate production when every ounce of food could be used. With other countries up to normal in food production and this country's export demand heavily reduced, the old system is out-of-date and a heavy burden upon American families because of taxes they must pay for surplus foods that can't be used.

Surpluses, as every New York State dairy farmer has learned through years of bitter experience, are the bane of agriculture and the fact that the Government subsidizes them does not change the fact.

The change has to be made. The country can't continue to throw away billions every year on an unsound and outworn program. It is up to Congress to recognize and act on the fact.

The Challenges of Civil Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, May 7, 1954

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I was pleased to receive in this morning's mail a letter from Mr. Edward J. Konkol, executive secretary of the Wisconsin Good Roads Association, conveying certain resolutions which had been adopted by the fourth annual convention of that association in Milwaukee on April 27.

One of the resolutions deals with the vital interrelationship between good roads and civil defense. It is clear that if, for example, we are to make adequate preparation for the evacuation of our cities because of imminent enemy attack we must have a far better system of highway exits from our major cities, in order that vast numbers of lives may be saved within the minutes and hours of the time which may be available.

I was glad to note recently that Federal Civil Defense Director Val Peterson emphasized the significance of planning our future highway program toward that end.

In my own State the mayor of our largest city, the Honorable Frank Zeidler, has long emphasized the theme of the importance of the highway system in relation to civil defense.

At Mayor Zeidler's request, Dr. George Parkinson, Deputy Director for Civil Defense, prepared an evacuation plan for the city of Milwaukee, and plans for its implementation are now being made.

It is my earnest hope that the planning of the integration of an improved and expanded Federal highway program with civil-defense needs will proceed apace, rather than lag for lack of imagination or lack of necessary funds.

I send to the desk the text of the resolution adopted by the Wisconsin Good Roads Association on this issue.

On the overall implications of civil defense, I append to it excerpts from Mayor Zeidler's annual address to the Common Council of Milwaukee on April 20.

I ask unanimous consent that both of these items be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution and the excerpts from the address were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION SUPPORTING GOOD ROADS FOR CIVIL DEFENSE

Whereas the citizens of Wisconsin and the Nation have been greatly concerned in recent months with the development of military weapons including the atomic and hydrogen bombs; and

Whereas various programs have been designed to accelerate the public interest in the matter of civilian defense in order to develop an orderly evacuation procedure in the event of an atomic attack; and

Whereas it has been pointed out by civilian defense authorities and officials that the matter of movement of the masses of people in time of emergency or time of attack is of paramount importance to the salvation of the citizens and to this end it is desirable to have good roads capable and available for this purpose; and in this new atomic age with the development of nuclear weapons; and

Whereas it will be necessary to disperse our heavy basic industries and good highways are essential to the citizenry for ready access to such dispersed industries: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Wisconsin Good Roads Association do endorse the program of the Wisconsin civilian defense officials and extend their cooperation in this worthy cause to bring about greater public interest in better roads for civil defense; and be it further

Resolved, That the highway program in Wisconsin be accelerated with the view of developing better and safer roads in order to fit into the civil defense program in the movement of civilian and military personnel in the time of great catastrophe; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Honorable Walter J. Kohler, Governor of Wisconsin and the Honorable Ralph J. Olson, adjutant general of the State of Wisconsin.

Dated at Milwaukee, Wis., this 27th day of April 1954.

WISCONSIN GOOD ROADS ASSOCIATION.

Attest:

EDWARD J. KONKOL,
Executive Secretary.
OLAF JOHNSON,
President.

ANNUAL MESSAGE OF MAYOR FRANK P. ZEIDLER, APRIL 20, 1954

APRIL 20, 1954.

To the Honorable the Common Council.

GENTLEMEN: In preparing this annual message on the state of our city it became evident to me that most of our problems and needs, our plans and hopes for the future were tied to a tremendous goal—evolution for the dual purposes of security and beautification.

All our thinking and action ought now to be directed toward this goal.

CITIES IN THE ATOMIC AGE

Our future progress is largely dependent upon how best a city can live and grow in the age of nuclear weapons. Milwaukee's evolution is being forced by the revolution of science.

We must learn how to provide for the long-range reduction of the vulnerability of our cities. We must reduce the density of our population, and make industry less vulnerable. At the same time we must preserve the income sources of the city so that it can exist. We also must provide for the safety of our people by arranging for their rapid dispersal should attack come.

These concepts must be in the background of every municipal decision we make henceforward.

Of course, we hope that the nations of the world will, by international agreement, soon relieve us of the threat which hangs over every center of population. Unfortunately the sole answer is not entirely in the hands of the United States.

It so happens that out of the pressure of the tomic age forces have developed which can help produce a beautiful and modern city. We must harness these forces for rebuilding and renewing our city, for conserving neighborhoods, for improving the flow of traffic, for increased planning and zoning. Properly directed over two decades, these forces can make for more mental and physical comfort in our metropolitan life.

In our city's evolution, we must eradicate our old, dirty, and wornout exteriors. The ugliness, decay, dirt, and pollution, which have for so long characterized large parts of our American cities, are undesirable and unnecessary. The natural instincts of our people cry for wholesome surroundings. It is up to us now to plan for our objective: That Milwaukee shall be a model city for cleanliness, beauty, security, and opportunity.

As we progress in this evolution, we will be—at the same time—making adjustments for the stern and awesome realities engendered by the resolution in nuclear weapons.

At the present time, the metropolitan centers of our Nation continue to expand in a manner which provides a hazard for everyone. Between 1940 and 1952, more than 6 million people were added to the resident population of central cities of 168 metropolitan areas. Realistic thinking, begun immediately after 1946, would have set up, through local, State, and Federal Governments, plans for the future location of people and industry. Thus we could have minimized the dangers that are now inherent in our American metropolitan cities. A system of regional zoning, and a modern manner of collecting and allocating taxes, would have allowed cities to adjust themselves to the realities of the age.

We, in the cities, cannot ignore the changes which must take place because of the recent dramatic advance in the power of nuclear weapons. Individuals, and industries alike, will begin to make decisions to get away from the targets. These moves will be encouraged by the Federal Government in a hundred ways through the policies of the National Security Council and the Office of Defense Mobilization.

The impact of these new policies is being studied. The Milwaukee Civil Defense Administration and the Milwaukee County Civil Defense Commission have jointly authorized a study of our city's future evolution as dictated by the need for dispersal. But while we begin to alter our course of civil development, we must also concentrate on immediate pressing problems.

Procedure at the Hearing of the Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, May 7, 1954

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very interesting and timely editorial entitled "Above the Law?" which appeared this morning in the New York Herald Tribune.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ABOVE THE LAW?

To "The Case of the Cropped Picture" must now be added "The Case of the Purloined Letter"—or, what is worse, "The Case of the Letter That Was Never Written." It is really dismal that the Senate hearings should have to spend hours going into matters of this kind, and even more dismal that in two current instances such shabby tricks should have been perpetrated by Senator MCCARTHY and his staff.

"Now I would like to, Mr. Secretary, give you a letter." So said the Senator on Tuesday, opening up a new line of attack upon the Secretary of the Army. And what did the letter turn out to be? It turned out to be a digest of information which should not have got outside the restricted channels approved by the FBI, in the form of a carbon copy of which no original apparently exists. Mr. Hoover did not sign it, and, in fact, never wrote the letter. In short, this document was basically different, in form and substance, from what Senator MCCARTHY had represented it as being; and the way he had got it, as well as the way he produced it at the hearings, raised the gravest questions as to the propriety of the Senator's conduct.

What is even more shocking than the fraud is the theory by which Senator MCCARTHY justified the incident. He had received the letter, he said, from an Army intelligence officer; day and night he was receiving reports, and no one (as he told Mr. Welch) "will ever get me to violate the confidence of loyal people in this Government who are giving me information." The unknown Army officer is certainly guilty of a serious offense in transmitting this FBI report to unauthorized persons. Others are guilty in varying degrees of insubordination, disobedience of official orders, disloyalty to their chiefs. Yet Senator MCCARTHY encourages all these, connives with them, protects them. He puts himself at the head of secret spy apparatus, claiming to be above the law—and above all principles of orderly administration and executive responsibility. Such means, any means, are justified, he implies, because he is seeking to root out communism and others (presumably) are not.

It is one thing to protect the kind of informants upon which the FBI relies. It is entirely a different thing (as Mr. Jenkins has so far failed to realize) to protect an informant who brings secret information from the FBI or from some other part of the Federal establishment. The refusal to reveal the name of such a one is proof that Senator MCCARTHY considers himself the center of an absolute power, with the executive department reduced to subservience before him.

The facts which reveal the nature of Senator MCCARTHY's arrogance and usurpation are, fortunately, the same ones that will prove his undoing. The public is now seeing clearly what is at stake in the hearings: the issue of orderly constitutional government as opposed to a one-man reign of terror. It is seeing also the methods by which Senator MCCARTHY works. The cropped picture may not have seemed of vital importance in itself, but tied in with them the altered FBI report, and seen as one in a long series of tricks and deceitful maneuvers, it takes on a weighty significance. Communism cannot be rooted out this way. Equally important, free institutions cannot in this way be preserved.

Texas Newspaper Suggests Mass Citation to Youths Serving as Medical Pioneers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, May 7, 1954

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, an outstanding east Texas newspaper, the Lufkin Daily News, recently published a very brief editorial titled "Our Brave Youngsters."

Because the three sentences composing the editorial express a feeling widely shared by our people, I wish, without further comment, to ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Our Brave Youngsters

When they get around to passing out awards again in the medical field, we hope the authorities can find it in their hearts to give a group—or perhaps we should say a mass—citation to the thousands of youngsters now submitting to the Salk antipolio vaccine tests.

With varying degrees of bravery, these kids are serving as medical pioneers in a project that could wipe out one of our worst remaining scourges. To some of them the hypodermic needle must look as big as an atomic cannon.

The St. Lawrence Seaway

SPEECH

OF

HON. FRANK E. SMITH

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1954

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (S. 2150) providing for creation of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation to construct part of the St. Lawrence seaway in United States territory in the interest of national security; authorizing the Corporation to consummate certain arrangements with the St. Lawrence Seaway Authority of Canada relative to construction and operation of the seaway; empowering the Corporation to finance the United States share of the seaway cost on a self-liquidating basis; to establish cooperation with Canada in the control and operation of the St. Lawrence seaway; to authorize negotiations with Canada of an agreement on tolls; and for other purposes.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Smith].

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I first became acquainted with this project in 1951 at the hearings before our committee, when both the national and the international aspects of the matter were presented in great detail; how the proposed seaway will effect our national economy; how it will affect our national defense; our relations with our neighbor to the north, Canada; and in a broader sense, our relations with the rest of the world.

Many grave statements have been made about the bad effect from an economic sense upon other sections of the country if this project is completed. They are the same type of statements that were made in years past, when it was first suggested that we build the Panama Canal; that we build a transcontinental railroad or a transcontinental highway; when we developed water commerce on the Mississippi and Ohio Rivers; when it was proposed that we develop the harbors of our great seaboard cities. This American economy is not a pie which we can divide in such a way that if one man's share gets larger the other man will naturally have to get some more. This economy of ours has to continue to expand and develop. If all sections of our country are to continue to get a larger share, if all of us are to continue to enjoy a better standard of living, if the American way is to provide a better life for all of us, we must do everything we can to develop all of the economic potential of our country, without regard to sectionalism, without any regard to whether this will help somebody a little more than it will help me.

The St. Lawrence seaway project will, of course, be of great benefit to the States which border upon the Great Lakes, but it will be of greater benefit to this Nation of ours as a whole.

I hope that the House of Representatives tomorrow, when it takes final action on this measure, will give its overwhelming and enthusiastic endorsement, which will show to the country and the rest of the world that we are attempting to act on this project without any spirit of sectionalism, and that that spirit will carry over into the future so that other projects of this same type will be met with the same attitude.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Dien Bien Phu

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1954

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, the tragic fall of Dien Bien Phu in accordance with the Communists predetermined timetable will come as a sobering shock to those who have been lulled into complacency by the administration's verbal gyrations between oft-repeated soothing slogans—to justify defense cuts—and sporadic tough talk which fooled our own people but patiently failed to bluff or deter the Communists.

Only power can deter the Communists. Only existent, evident, unchallengeable power can give us the peace we all fervently desire. There will be no peace through weakness.

The significance of Dien Bien Phu is far greater than it need have been except for administration statements. If nothing could be done or would be done to save it, obviously it was a psychological, strategic, and political blunder to magnify it to huge proportions and thereby increase the damage its fall has done to the cause of the free world.

Korea and Indochina are two ends of one battle line. After our strength was frozen and immobilized in Korea, it was obivious Communist strength would shift to Indochina. Although not a military strategist, I stated this fact months ago, and predicted that Indochina might well be another case of "too little and too late."

Now the cruel blow has fallen. The sterile vacillating and confused policies of this badly divided administration have brought us to the brink of diplomatic and military disaster. It is time for the administration to call off its family quarreling, its disgraceful circuses, and begin to give this Nation responsible leadership accompanied by frank explanations of policy to the American people.

In my speech to the House on February 26, I warned that "Talking tough and carrying a small stick" would not fool the Communists. This was several months ago. The dangerous drift with lack of a clear policy was very clear to me even then. The administration still appears to lack a policy. A policy of political expediency cannot prevent catastrophies from piling up one after another. It is time some firm guidance was given to our floundering ship of state.

United States Cannot Win a War in Indochina

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1954

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including a timely editorial that appeared in the Washington Star of May 5. This editorial points out very clearly that there are many questions to consider before jumping into a war in Indochina today. I am including the editorial at this point in the Record:

Troops for Asia

The early editions of yesterday's Star reported Senator Knowland as having told the New York Daily News that he would give his fullest support if the President asked Congress to approve sending United States troops to Indochina. He added, seemingly as a kind of afterthought, that he had no hint General Eisenhower was planning to ask for such approval.

In the same editions it was revealed that Speaker Martin does not believe it will be necessary to send American troops to Asia. the people of Asia, he thinks, have the manpower; all they need is material and moral support from the free-world nations. By midafternoon the picture seemed to be changing. After conferring at the White House, Senator Flanders emerged to quote the President as saying that the United States will undertake no military operations in Indochina unless it has the support of the people of that region.

It is difficult to understand why men in positions of some responsibility persist in making statements of this kind. There does not appear to be any design or overall motivation behind them. Even if the contrary were true, however, the possibility of American involvement in the war in Indichina is much too serious a matter to be dealt with in this kind of off-the-cuff, hit-and-run comment.

The war in Indochina is not being lost because of any lack of manpower or equipment. In both respects, the forces led by the French have marked superiority. The war is being lost primarily because the Vietnamese for a number of reasons lack the will to fight for their own independence. They dislike the French and they dislike the native government supported by the French. There is considerable reason to believe that most of the Vietnamese, if they would not actually perfer to see a Communist victory in Indochino, are at least substantially indifferent to that prospect.

If we were to plunge into this jungle war, for what would we be fighting? Would we be striving to maintain the French position? If so, our effort would be doomed to failure. Would it be our purpose to end the war and permit the Vietnamese to choose their own leader? If so, they might well choose the Communist, Ho Chi Minh. And what would we do about that?

Finally, have those who talk so glibly about moving into Indochina faced up to the implications? They seem to think that southeast Asia can be saved if only we will fight a neat little war in Indochina and then get out. But suppose it doesn't work that way; suppose these troops-for-Indochina advocates find themselves looking world war III squarely in the face. If they are not willing to have this country go through with it—alone—they had better pipe down.

The Pearl Harbor Charge: Honor Walks the Plank

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 4, 1954

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, the concept of honor has always been fundamental in the code of behavior of our professional military corps.

Therefore it comes as something of a shock when a retired admiral allows honor to walk the plank in order to promote the sale of a book.

The suggestion that President Franklin D. Roosevelt deliberately planned and provoked the attack by the Japanese on Pearl Harbor has been made in a recently published book.

Such a suggestion has been properly branded as outrageous by Owen J. Roberts, a retired associate justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, and chairman of an investigating committee appointed in 1941 to get the facts on the Pearl Harbor attack.

Mr. Roberts, a long-time arch foe of President Roosevelt, with his investigating committee went thoroughly into the question of what happened at Pearl Harbor. He said recently:

> Certainly I was no partisan of Franklin D. Roosevelt, but I think it little less than an outrage to attribute to him a political motive which would involve the possible sacrifice of many American soldiers and sailors.

Certainly it is something of a new low, Mr. Speaker, when a man retired from the honorable profession as an officer in the United States Navy, in order to sell copies of a book, makes such a charge unsupported by evidence.

And certainly Owen J. Roberts is a man of integrity best qualified to assess the validity of such a charge. He did so in an interview with Edward T. Folliard, of the Washington Post and Times-Herald, published on May 2, 1954, which was inserted in the Congressional Record of May 3 by the distinguished former Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Honorable Sam Rayburn, of Texas. It may be found on page A3193 of the Record of that date and I urge every Member of the House, who has not already done so, to read Mr. Folliard's article.

Salute to Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 6, 1954

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege at this time to offer a tribute to the bravest of young democracies. On May 8, 1954, the State of Israel reaches its sixth anniversary. We join with it in proudly acclaiming a series of achievements unparalleled in history.

Israel is a small country—in fact, it is among the smallest countries on the face of the earth, comprising somewhat less than 8,000 square miles. It is of great cultural, spiritual, and moral value as the cradle of modern civilization and the place of origin of three major religions, all based on the belief in one God.

Upon the completion of its sixth year of independence, the people of Israel have every reason to be proud of their achievements. During these fateful years Israel has engaged in building solid economic foundations, a sound economy which will enable its citizens to achieve a high standard of living, and to absorb the many newcomers who have returned to their ancestral homeland in such huge numbers from the far corners of the globe.

Side by side with agricultural and industrial development, Israel successfully established a truly democratic government in the Western sense, including the most essential democratic institutions, such as, a parliament—freely elected by secret ballot, a well-functioning judicial system, a free press, freedom of religious worship, compulsory education, and many other institutions characteristic of democratic nations. There are many more achievements in the development of education and culture, scientific research, progress in social welfare, and the tremendous effort to improve public health.

Today Israel has thriving new villages, cities, industries, farms and mines, and every citizen of Israel can look upon these achievements with pride, just as they look forward to even greater accomplishments.

We are proud that the United States was destined to play such a significant part in the creation of the Jewish state and we will never cease to thank President Harry S. Truman for being the first head of a state to extend formal recogntion to it. This country and its people have aided it in many ways in the formative years of its early existence and with a continuance of this aid will come the goal of economic independence.

I am happy to extend my heartfelt greetings, and I know my colleagues join me on this occasion in extending their felicitations, too, to the Government and the people of Israel. Together with them, and all peace-loving nations the world over, working together we are assured that Israel will continue to be a bulwark of democracy in the Middle East.

With the aid of the United Nations, the hatreds of enmity must be dissipated and peace between Israel and its neighbors must be established, not only in treaties, but in reality.

Of What Should a Man Be Proud if He Is Not Proud of His Friends

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 28, 1954

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, with justifiable pride, I place in the Record an article from the Christian Science Monitor, under date of May 6, from the pen of Godfrey Sperling, Jr., staff correspondent. It is dated at Lansing, Mich., and speaks of the personal magnetism of Gov. G. Mennen Williams making a bid for his fourth term as Governor of the State of Michigan.

This man of outstanding character, ability, stamina, and devotion is my friend and constituent as a resident of the 14th Congressional District of Michigan. He is a person deserving of special interest, not only by the people of Michigan, but of the United States. Honest and sincere, he is a tireless worker for the rights of those who often have few to champion their cause.

Mr. Sperling's article from the Christian Science Monitor follows:

Williams Public-Relations Skill Matches Vote-Pulling Charm in Michigan

(By Godfrey Sperling, Jr.)

Lansing, Mich.—There is a special Williams meaning behind the headlines telling of the Democratic Governor's decision to make the race for an unprecedented fourth term in the Michigan State Capital.

To appreciate the public-relations skill of the still boyish Gov. G. Mennen Williams, it must be explained that only one paper in the State, the Marshall Evening Chronicle, is a consistent Williams rooter.

The normally cold press, therefore, hardly pricked up its ears when the hint was dropped that the Governor was about to make his fourth-term decision—that, in fact, he was going to think about it during the Easter holiday and decide whether to run for reelection or make a bid for a Senate seat.

WINS PRESS RECOGNITION

Although naturally, there was some newspaper interest evident in the Williams decision, the chances of big headline coverage seemed dim.

The Governor, who wears polka-dot ties and signs everything in green ink, found nothing in this problem which could faze a man who only recently had steered along unemployment compensation and fair employment practices committee bills despite a reluctant Republican-controlled legislature.

When he then returned from his short vacation, it was announced he had bought a

15-minute spot on television to make his decision pronouncement. The newspapers were first offended, then outwardly distressed that TV was to be given this "beat." Forgotten was the previous lack of enthusiasm.

The Governor persisted with his TV plans, however, as press rancor grew into protests. Then, at noon of the day of the evening telecast a terse announcement of the Governor's decision was delivered to the capital correspondents. And their grateful editors splashed the news in big headlines throughout the State.

What is the appeal of this onetime member of the Young Republicans who doesn't mind at all if he is called "Soapy," a nickname which alludes to his Mennen family ties? (Not the polka-dot ones.)

ATTRACTIVE PERSONALITY

A witness in a small town was interviewed after the Governor had scored an impressive, though narrow, victory in the face of the strong Eisenhower crosscurrent.

She admitted she did not know anything about the Governor, what his policies were, what he believed in. "Then why did you vote for Governor Williams?" she was asked.

"Mister," she said, "I've seen him."

Those thousands who have heard the Governor call square dances will also say, in effect, "We've seen him."

The personable, attractive Mr. Williams slouches chummily in his chair as 7 newspapermen also slouch about his office during a news conference, of which he holds 2 each working day. He is just back from Ann Arbor, so he elects to start the conference with this mock announcement:

"I've really nothing to report but, as usual, I was a huge success—" he pauses while one reporter remarks that he hasn't known the Governor was away and another reporter says he is equally unenlightened. "—for I was talking about Michigan," the Governor completes his sentence.

This delayed punch grew out of impish intention this time, but those who have heard him on the radio say that the unfinished sentence is a mark of the inept Williams presentation. A nasal, gravel voice also mars the radio effect, as both Governor and aides readily admit.

But on television, sincerity and pleasant persuasiveness carry the Williams meaning through with complete clarity; and faulty diction and other flaws are swallowed up by that same charm which reaches out from the platform and across the conference table.

As a result, the Governor is using TV as the major medium in his drive for reelection. Television provides a particularly effective campaign weapon in Michigan for outside the Detroit area, a large part of the State has a captive audience, with only one station reaching listeners.

As the news conference comes to an end, an older reporter moves up to the Governor's desk and with a banter which appears accustomed says:

"In Washington you criticize Eisenhower and then you come back here and talk about how you and Eisenhower agree. I don't understand you my boy."

The "boy" grins and answers:

"I've explained that to you before. On some issues I am in agreement with the President. On others I am not."

This conversation grew out of the Governor's bill-pushing technique during the last legislature. He backed a bill for higher employment compensation, legislation which was opposed firmly by the Republicans who were in control of both Houses.

The Governor then embarrassed the Republicans by pointing out to them that President Eisenhower had called for the States to pass almost an identical unemployment-compensation provision. The Williams-Eisenhower coalition thus won over enough Republicans to put over a compromise of this bill.

On FEPC a similar device was used, but a watered-down bill finally was buried in committee. The Governor expects passage in the next session.

The Governor now, for the first time since coming into office, is able to talk about a balanced budget for the coming year. This development, however, comes despite—and not because of—his failure to get a corporation income tax enacted. A business receipts tax (which he refused to sign but permitted to become law) has helped the sales tax in filling the State coffers.

What are the Governor's ambitions, besides his desire to win in the fall? How about the Presidency?

"What with all the imponderables, a man would be foolish to plan to run for President," he says. "But, on the other hand, any person who would say he did not want to be President is not telling the truth."

Or, again as the Governor's press secretary, Paul Weber, expresses it: "The Governor has his lightnin' rods up. Just in case lightning should strike in his direction."

Reenlistment Drop Is Costing Billions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1954

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following editorial from the Atlanta Constitution of Wednesday, April 28, 1954:

REENLISTMENT DROP IS COSTING BILLIONS

Secretary of the Air Force Talbott told a Boston audience Monday that an alarming decline in Air Force reenlistments is endangering the air arm's ability to do its job. Although its situation is more complicated perhaps than that of the Army and Navy, the condition is by no means peculiar to the Air Force.

In the 6 months from July to December 1953, reenlistments in all 3 services hit their lowest mark in years. A total of 185,000 trained Air Force men are up for discharge this year. More than half of them will not reenlist.

Traditionally distrustful of the military, the American people themselves are largely to blame. The Armed Forces have been tolerated as an evil to be minimized except in periods of war. Our frequent changes of pace make it practically impossible to plan any sort of life as a career military man.

We refuse to give up the old fallacy that in an emergency "a million men will spring to arms overnight." That has always been foolish but is especially foolish now. Today's Armed Forces are made up of specialists—skilled men who must be carefully and expensively trained.

That we are doing. However, the training is becoming more and more a school to provide technicians for private industry. It is estimated that the cost to the Air Force alone in training replacements is about $2 billion a year.

While this may be beneficial to private industry, it is no way to build an effective Air Force nor to hold down the Federal budget. No one hazards a guess as to just how much the total cost is to the country.

What are the reasons?

Pay is a factor, but our Armed Forces are the highest paid in the world.

One of the principal causes has been the whittling away of the fringe benefits—PX privileges, medical services for dependents, promotion and retirement regulations, tax exemptions, travel pay, and many others. These incentives that kept many in the service have been eliminated because of civilian pressures and the cry of economy.

The military man doesn't consider these fringe benefits as frills. He considers them small guaranties for the uncertain security of his life. He, too, wants to feel that he and his family will be provided for and have a decent place to live. He, too, hates to be kicked around.

Pay of personnel is a small item in the total cost of the Armed Forces. However, this draining off of trained personnel adds up to anything except economy. All the jet aircraft the country can build are useless without crews to fly them.

While considering the much heralded New Look in our military power, Congress and defense leaders should take a new look, too, at the reasons why men and women will not remain in the Armed Forces. It would be much cheaper in the long run to make military careers attractive than to perpetuate policies that repel and discourage.

Congress right now is trying to undo some of the damage, considering among other things a 10-percent pay raise. Pay raises, however, will not compensate for the lack of permanency and security that a military career offers today. We need a long-range program upon which those who'd like to stay in the services can place reasonable dependence.

May Day-United States Way at Burlington, Wis., on May 1, 1954

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1954

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, all Members of this House of Representatives are proud of our respective congressional districts. At this time I am particularly proud of the citizens of Burlington, Wis., which is in my county and district.

An idea was born there, Mr. Speaker, which ultimately came to full bloom and realization on last Saturday, May 1. It was that here in the United States May Day should have a real meaning for the American people. For the subversive elements within the country it means a time to exploit the Communist system of government whereby the individual is at the mercy of the government.

At Burlington, Wis., May Day-United States Way was a great demonstration of the American way of life where government is the servant and not the master of the individual. Here each person enjoys the blessings of liberty and freedom; in Russia people are the victims of tyranny and oppression.

The feature of this celebration was a 2½-hour parade of floats, marching units and bands. It was a great spectacle. This historic event will never be forgotten in the State of Wisconsin.

To the members of the American Legion of the Ross-Wilcox Post, to the Department of Wisconsin, to the business organizations, the labor unions, the churches and many other groups, I say "Congratulations to all of you for an outstanding job of Americanism. We left Burlington better citizens for having been there."

IN T

M
ask
in t
of a
chap
tion
title
It
thes
of P
of t
lanc
Bida
the
did
T
was
as f

(Re
ig
A
en
It
you
day
Run
I
nece
here
Sta
not
resu
Con
T
tory
day
not
the
ann
mar
men
the
cele
I
men
stab
C
zoll
Buc
elec
ma
una
Pro
his
the
Ru
Bu
how
Tu
I
ing
her
her
the
join
ally

Appendix

Toward Freedom in Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER FERGUSON

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 10, 1954

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of an address I gave before the Michigan chapter of the Rumanian-American National Committee, in Detroit, May 9, entitled "Toward Freedom in Europe."

It was a great pleasure for me to join these several hundred loyal Americans of Rumanian descent in the celebration of the great historic occasions of the land of their forefathers. Mr. Michael Bida, of Royal Oak, is the president of the chapter and he arranged this splendid observance.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TOWARD FREEDOM IN EUROPE

(Remarks of Hon. HOMER FERGUSON, of Michigan, before Michigan chapter, Rumanian-American National Committee, Independence Day dinner, May 9, 1954)

It is a pleasure for me to be here and join you in celebrating this great national holiday of Rumania—the Independence Day of Rumania which falls on May 10.

I believe it is not only appropriate, but necessary, that we celebrate this anniversary here in Detroit and throughout the United States, because this glorious occasion cannot be celebrated in Rumania today as a result of the terror and oppression of the Communist dictators.

Three of the greatest events in the history of Rumania are celebrated on this holiday, but I want to make it clear that I am not here and you are not here to celebrate the phony Russian celebration of the May 9 anniversary of the Russian victory over Germany. The Communists have tried to erase memories of a free Rumania by substituting the May 9 anniversary for the occasions we celebrate.

I would like to briefly outline the developments which lead to a free, progressive, and stable Rumania.

On May 10, 1866, Charles, Prince of Hohenzollern, took oath to the constitution in Bucharest and was formally installed as the elected sovereign of the principality of Rumania. He had been elected by the almost unanimous vote of the assemblies of the Provinces of Wallachia and Moldavia. With his accension to the throne, the union of the two provinces into the principality of Rumania was now formally recognized by the Europeans powers and Turkey. Rumania, however, still remained under the bond of Turkey.

Eleven years later, on May 10, 1877, during the Russo-Turkish War, Rumania broke her outdated bonds with Turkey, declared her independence, and entered the war on the side of Russia. The Rumanian Army joined with the Russian forces as an equal ally in the campaign of the Danube where its gallantry and steadiness contributed materially to the defeat of Turkey.

The third great event took place on May 10, 1881, when Rumania was elevted to a kingdom and Charles was crowned, by the will of the people, the first King of Rumania. These developments resulted in the establishment of a Rumanian Government which was stable and led to the development of one of the more prosperous and progressive countries in eastern Europe.

These events, then, bring us together today in honor of the bravery, courage, and love of freedom which has always been exhibited by the Rumanian people. The people of the United States have always had a close and friendly interest in the welfare and national aspirations of the Rumanian people, and so it is proper that we in the United States and in the free world should observe this anniversary and honor the splendid history of Rumanian freedom.

We cannot mention these matters without expressing our concern over the present plight of Rumania and the other nations imprisoned behind the Iron Curtain, and I would like to discuss the policies and actions of the Government of the United States with respect to these captive peoples.

Despite the fact that before 1941, Rumania and Russia were never at war, the Russians have been considered an enemy nation by the Rumanians since the beginning of the 18th century when the Muscovites reached the Dniester River in their westward expansion * * * and that river, of course, was the eastern boundary of Moldavia.

The principalities of Rumania were situated on the road to Constantinople and became the inevitable stamping ground of Russian armies bent on capturing that city. On 12 occasions, the Russian troops crossed the country, and the Rumanians liked them no better than the Turks did.

Russian annexation of the eastern part of Moldavia, which they call Bessarabia, in 1812 and 1878 leaves no room for doubt about the imperialistic tendencies of Russia, even in the pre-Communist days.

These older disputes with Russia, coupled with the brutal treatment accorded Rumania now by the Communist overlords, leaves no doubt about the feeling of present-day Rumanians. No one in Rumania considers the Communist rulers as anything but agents of Moscow who could not possibly hope to keep their power over the country without the backing of the Red army.

Popular discontent with the Communist rule in Rumania had reached serious proportions in the last couple of years, as proved by the events. As late as a year ago, the Communists were not thinking of concessions but of redoubled efforts, but the events in Berlin last June changed their thinking and they now have slackened the reins considerably. The Communists have even admitted serious failures.

The Communists claim that the unrest in Rumania and other captive nations exists only because it is artificially stimulated from without.

That has some truth only in the sense that faith is a contagious thing, which penetrates even curtains of iron. The people of Rumania and other eastern European nations are essentially religious people. They are patriotic people. They have a spiritual faith that is enduring and great traditions that will never be forgotten.

The American people hold to the belief that governments must derive their just powers from the consent of the governed and we believe that our liberty gives hope to the world now and for all future time.

No peace and no government can endure if it denies and repudiates the idea that government should rest on free consent or which denies to others the opportunity to express their beliefs and their consent.

The United States Government believes in that concept and no United States Government should oppose it anywhere.

But our creed does not call for exporting revolution or inciting others to violence. We believe that revolution and violent change often destroys what it would gain.

Rejoice, we can in the problems that confront the masters of the Kremlin because of their own oppressive policies but in fairness to their cause and ours, we cannot urge or incite those oppressed people to revolt or violent action at this time. Such a course of action at this time would do far more harm than good and would deliver a serious setback to the cause we all serve, peace and freedom based on justice.

Thus we see that action now to stimulate revolution in the captive areas of the world would not serve the cause of freedom and could have extremely serious and unfortunate results.

What then, are we doing to restore peace and freedom to the world, and to captive countries such as Rumania.

First, it is obvious that the United States must maintain its own freedom and power if it is to assist others to regain theirs. Much of our effort has been devoted to the task of building the strength and power of the United States to protect our own liberty and to protect the freedom of the rest of the world.

The Soviet Communists are planning for what they call an entire historical era, and we must do the same. They seek, through many types of maneuvers, gradually to divide and weaken the free nations so they will come to practical bankruptcy.

In the face of this known strategy, measures cannot be judged adequate just because they avert some immediate danger. We must plan for the long pull. The Eisenhower administration recognized this situation and has taken many steps to develop our strength for the long-time need.

We have modified our military policy in line with these considerations and in recognition of the changed conditions of modern warfare and are now planning and building military forces adequate for our defense at a cost this Nation can stand for the long period of time required.

We have vigorously pushed the efforts, in cooperation with our allies, to strengthen NATO and to gear its actions for the long time requirement. We have worked for the establishment of the European army, EDC, with firmness and vision in order to build and maintain the defense of the free world.

We need allies and collective security. Our purpose is to make these relations more effective, less costly and this is being done by placing more reliance on deterrent power without eliminating dependence on local defensive power. We want for ourselves and the other free nations, a maximum deterrent at the bearable cost.

We have succeeded in great measure in this respect. Now the Department of Defense and the Joint Chiefs of Staff can shape our

Military Establishment to fit what is our policy, instead of having to try to be ready to meet the enemy's many choices. As a result, it is now possible to get, and share, more basic security at less cost.

One of the great deterrents to a Communist armed attack on the free world is the freedom-loving spirit in the souls of the people behind the Iron Curtain. The Communists know that the Rumanians and other peoples who are temporarily enslaved will not fight for the Communists in their attempt to enslave the rest of the world.

We have succeeded in extending our network of collective security alliances to the southwest Pacific and are now engaged in building a defensive alliance for the security of southeast Asia.

Despite any actions at the Geneva Conference, we are pushing ahead with this Asian defense alliance and we are making progress.

These then are the ways we have improved our strength for the long-time defense of freedom. We have not found any magic formula that insures against all forms of Communist successes. It is normal that there may be some setbacks to the cause of freedom at some times and at some places, but we have insured that such setbacks will be only local and only temporary.

The second prong of our efforts to restore freedom to the world deals with our inherent and positive opposition to the present situation.

At the present time the situation behind the Iron Curtain involves the captivity of hundreds of millions of persons of distinctive nationality, race, religion, and culture. The hardest task of the Soviet rulers is to beat this disunity into Communist conformity. If they can succeed, then the menace of communism will be immeasurably increased.

It is of the utmost importance to our Government that we should make it clear to the captive people that we do not accept their captivity as a permanent fact of history. If they become hopeless, we would have lost the chance to forge a hostile power that can swing great weight in the downfall of communism.

Secretary Dulles and President Eisenhower have made it clear on innumerable occasions that the United States looks for the restoration of freeedom to the captive lands. Mr. Dulles expressed that thought in his message to you here today, and our Government uses every possible means to drive that idea home to the people behind the Iron Curtain.

One of my purposes here today is to assure you and the freedom-loving people in Rumania that Rumania has not been forgotten and her desire for freedom has not been overlooked by the United States and never will be.

We can be sure that there is going on, in the captive nations and even within Russia, a silent test of strength between the powerful rulers and multitudes of human beings. Each individual no doubt seems by himself to be helpless in this struggle. But their aspirations in the aggregate make up a mighty force, and we must keep that force alive and hopeful.

We have a great ally behind the Iron Curtain. The present satellite governments in Eastern Europe are only puppets of Moscow but the people in those countries are our allies.

There is also a third, and highly important, phase of our foreign policy. It deals with our efforts to expose to the clear view of the world the goals of the Soviet Union and in return, to meet those goals with a firmness of purpose and clearness of thought.

A prime example of this new phase of our policy took place during the recent Berlin Conference. The Communists came to that Conference with an outward attitude of good feeling and cooperation. The Communist position was not at first openly revealed. It was masked behind ambiguous words and phrases.

But as the Conference unfolded, Mr. Molotov was forced to respond to the vigor of Secretary Dulles and the true Soviet purpose became apparent to the world. The Communist designs and treachery became clearly understandable to the entire world.

This policy of exposing their real aims and calling attention to the evil the Communists represent has had its results.

One good example concerns the great personal bravery and patriotism ond Mr. and Mrs. Valeriu C. Georgescu. You will recall that the two sons of this couple were retained in Rumania when the parents returned to this country, and that a Communist diplomat tried to get Mr. Georgescu to serve as a Communist spy in order to safeguard his children. With great personal courage he refused and related his story to the Government. The Communist diplomat was immediately expelled from the country.

President Eisenhower and our State Department applied the strongest kind of diplomatic pressure and suceeded in securing the release of the two boys, who have now rejoined their parents after 7 years of being held hostage.

The story of the Georgescu's, to me, illustrates two things. First, the bravery and love of freedom of the people of Rumania, and second, the results which can be achieved by firmness of policy and forthrightness of action.

This, then, is the broad outline of the ways we are building for the return of freedom and liberty to every area of the world.

American foreign policy should be and is designed to promote American welfare. But we know that our own welfare would not really be promoted by cynical conduct which defies moral principles. In a world in which no nation can live alone, to treat our friends unjustly is to destroy ourselves.

Our policy is designed to strengthen ourselves and our friends in the free world and to give hope and courage to our friends behind the Iron Curtain. We do this through our labors, through our objectives, our actions, and our constant prayers.

Celebration in Honor of Capt. William A. Maguire, United States Navy, Retired

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS H. KUCHEL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 10, 1954

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record a short statement concerning the celebration to be held in my home community of Anaheim in commemoration of Capt. (Ch. C.) William A. Maguire, United States Navy, retired, on May 16.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Statement by Senator Kuchel

A celebration honoring the memory of Capt. William A. Maguire, USN, padre-hero of Pearl Harbor, is to be held on the grounds of St. Catherine's Military School Anaheim, Calif. Following his retirement after 30 years in the Navy, Father Maquire's last assignment before his death last year was chaplain to the cadet corps at St. Catherine's.

Capt. (Ch. C.) William A. Maguire, USN, retired, served as chaplain at the school from the time of his retirement from active duty until his death in London while on vacation last September, and the Dominican Sisters of Mission San Jose, in charge of the school, plan to perpetuate his memory by erecting a new chapel in his honor. The plan has received the approval of Cardinal McIntyre.

Father Maguire wrote two books—Rig for Church and The Captain Wears a Cross—about the Navy and Navy men. Adm. Adolphus Andrews wrote as a foreword in the latter book: "This is a book about the men of our Navy by a man who must know as many of them, and know them as well, as anyone who ever wore the Navy's blue. Chaplain Maguire has, as much as any man I have ever known, a talent which is rare—the talent of knowing other men, not superficially or carelessly or through a veil of personal preconception, but as they are. To the varied, exacting tasks of his profession, he brings deep sympathy for other men and wide tolerance of their human foibles." Admiral Andrews closed his remarks with, "For the men of whom Chaplain Maguire writes are typical of our Navy. So is the officer who writes of them."

Father Maguire was born December 31, 1890, in Hornellsville, N. Y. He was ordained July 4, 1915, in Louvain and first reported for duty with the Navy in 1917.

While on duty aboard the *Christabel* in the Quiberon Bay on April 17, 1918, he was cited for bravery and was later awarded the Navy Cross by official orders in 1920.

Father Maguire was fleet chaplain, stationed at Pearl Harbor at the outbreak of World War II. The catchy wartime tune Praise the Lord and Pass the Ammunition was "credited" to him; however, he officially denied any part of it.

To have known him as a priest, a man of the Navy, and a friend of all, I can only add "God rest his soul."

Do We Have a Foreign Policy?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 10, 1954

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on April 22 the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. Magnuson] delivered an address to the Federated Women's Clubs of Virginia, assembled in convention at Richmond.

At their suggestion, the major emphasis of his speech is on foreign policy. My colleague made some very pertinent observations.

I ask unanimous consent to place the address in the Appendix of the Record, so the Members of this body may have the benefit of the Senator's remarks.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Speech Delivered by the Honorable Warren G. Magnuson, of the State of Washington, at the State Convention of the Virginia Federation of Women's Clubs, at Hotel Jefferson in Richmond, Va., on April 22, 1954

It is good to be here in Richmond—in the Old Dominion State. We are meeting on historic ground. Virginia has been the mother of great Americans—the Father of our Country, the author of the Declaration of Independence, are names that head the list. Since the early days of the Republic you have contributed generously to the leadership of our Nation—men whose ideas and ideals are embedded in our Constitution, are taught in our schools, are cherished by our people, and have dictated the course of our Nation for 175 years—in both foreign and domestic policy.

There come to mind ideals and concepts embedded in these phrases:

"Give me liberty, or give me death."

"All men are created free and equal."

Each is entitled to "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

These are fundamental concepts which guide our Nation. These are concepts which have led us to declare to the world that we sought nothing for ourselves after World War II—that we seek nothing now except the right of people to be free.

We have declared war—not against people, but against tyrants and dictators—whether they be of the Fascist or Communist variety. We believe that enslavement of a Czechoslovakian or a Russian endangers our own security—our own right to enjoy freedom and pursue those endeavors which, as a people, contribute to our peace and happiness.

It is a particular pleasure to be here in Virginia addressing your convention. The Federated Women's Clubs throughout America are performing a significant service to their membership and their communities.

I clearly recall the searching inquiries I received from your clubs in my State in the fall of 1947. General Marshall had made his now famous speech at Harvard University, which served as the trial balloon for the Marshall plan. During that summer and fall my correspondence with your clubs reached gigantic proportions—most of your members were convinced that United States aid was indispensable to the rehabilitation of Western Europe. Club women, more than any other single group, sensed the spirit of the plan and registered their willingness to make sacrifices it would require.

In his Harvard speech General Marshall sketched the outlines of the plan that was to bear his name. The people of the Nation responded with suggestions and criticisms. Details were hammered out in hardheaded discussions with the administration, between the administration and congressional leaders.

By the time the plan was presented to Congress it bore the indelible imprint of Marshall, Connally, and Vandenburg. After committee hearings and weeks of floor debate, Congress passed legislation authorizing foreign economic aid and, in successive years, Congress has provided appropriations to implement the plan.

No one can tell with certainty what would have happened to Western Europe had we not taken this historic step. We do know that the plan was successful—that communism was contained—that Western Europe was set on her feet, that the countries involved had been given the strength to resist aggression, both from within and without. The peoples of these countries were given the hope of a better future and, hence, the incentive to resist. They were given something to fight for.

The point I make is that this plan, which cost the taxpayers of this country billions of dollars, was formulated by the administration—was revised by the Congress—and was accepted by the country, because it was clear as to purpose and definite as to procedure. All of us knew what the plan was, what it would entail and we solidified our ranks behind it.

So it was also with the Truman doctrine. Communist guerrillas were making a bid for the conquest of Greece—Turkey was threatened, action by the United States was required—that action took the form of the Greek-Turkey loans; programs for economic and military assistance.

Here, too, the administration, with Vandenberg and Connally participating, decided on a policy and formulated a plan, clear in its purpose and definite in its procedure. The Congress and the country measured up to the responsibilities involved. The plan went forward and aggression by Communist forces was stopped in its tracks.

Again, I make the point, our policy was definite. We formulated a plan. We discussed it thoroughly on a bipartisan basis. Our country accepted it and our efforts were successful.

By this time the men in the Kremlin had turned their greedy eyes on Asia. They were seeking three main objectives—

They wanted the manpower in China—they wanted the industrial capacity and know-how of Japan—they wanted the rice bowl, the food, of southeast Asia.

Because of the chaos in China, our economic and military aid to the Nationalist Government did not stem the tide. The Communist conspiracy was successful. Today the manpower of China is at the beck and call of the Kremlin.

The first thrust at Japan came in June 1950. The North Koreans, stimulated and supplied by the Chinese and Russian Communists, crossed the 38th parallel. The United States and the United Nations reacted. We carried the brunt of the fight, but in so doing we demonstrated to the Kremlin our determination to live by the ideas and ideals of our own traditions—demonstrated our determination to live by the concept of the United Nations and the charter which brought it into being.

There is an uneasy truce in Korea but, temporarily at least, the thrust toward Japan has been halted; Communist aggression in that part of the globe has been stopped.

Now we are facing a new crisis. Communist dictators have shifted their pressure from their second objective, Japan, to their third objective, namely, seizure of the rice bowl of southeastern Asia.

The Secretary of State is in Geneva. For the first time, Red China, the aggressor, will be sitting in the council chamber.

Our prayers and our hopes are with Mr. Dulles. I do not want to add to his burdens; I do not want to complicate an already unbelievably complicated problem for the President of the United States and his administration. I hold the conviction, however, that the elected representatives of the people in the Congress of the United States have a duty to speak out. The welfare and security of the Nation supersede all other considerations.

The people of this country have a right to know what is planned, what our policy is, what is in store for them. The decisions made by the administration—the decisions made at Geneva—will set the course this Nation will follow. That course may lead to peace. It may lead to war.

On Wednesday the papers announced that the Secretary of State had held a conference with a bipartisan delegation of the Congress. He briefed them on the situation we confront.

It is significant that following this briefing a member of my party felt compelled to state: "This is the nearest the administration has come to a bipartisan approach to the problem."

There will be no one from Congress at the Geneva meeting. In the era of true bipartisanship, Senators Vandenberg and Connally were sitting at the right hand of the Secretary of State.

Even more important they were in constant consultation with the Secretary and the President in the weeks preceding the day of final decision.

Insofar as I can judge the administration is confronting this new crisis in Indochina alone. Neither the Congress nor the people know what the policy is, or whether there is a policy. Neither the Congress nor the people know what the plan is—or whether there is a plan. The Congress and the people are confused—because the administration appears to be confused.

We have been told by TV, by radio and in the newspapers that we have a "bold new policy"—a "bold new program."

We no longer have merely policies and programs in Washington, D. C. They are always "bold new programs" or "bold new policies"—or "dynamic policies and programs"—or we have "seized the initiative" in a "bold new way."

These phrases are beginning to scream from overwork.

But let us look for a minute at the sources of confusion. While the Communists were diverting men, materiel and military leadership from Korea to Indochina—when they were rattling their sabers in southeast Asia—we announced that we were cutting our military expenditures by $5 billion for the coming fiscal year. Then we, the people, were told that this was a part of the new military look.

And then the Secretary of State, in what was billed as the "most important foreign policy speech since the new administration took office" told us we would rely on "instant and massive retaliation" to deter aggression—that in the future we would strike the enemy at "times and places of our own choosing."

And then the Vice President of the United States went on a nationwide broadcast to announce that henceforth we would not permit ourselves to be "nibbled to death in small conventional wars."

And later the President of the United States said, "This country would never be taken into a war without a declaration from Congress." And still later that we would not send American troops to Indochina.

And then the same President said that we could not afford to lose Indochina to the Communists—that we would have to accept great risks now, to avoid greater risks in the future.

And then last week the Vice President got back into the act and said we might have to send troops to Indochina.

It is small wonder that we are confused. If the free world cannot afford to lose Indochina, it follows that the free world must save Indochina from Communist domination. If we must save Indochina at all costs, we may have to send American boys to Indochina.

If, however, we are merely trying to run a bluff on the Kremlin—we had better take another look at our "hole card." They don't bluff easily. We had better say what we mean and mean what we say—and, unless we know what we are saying, we had better keep still until we have thought the problem through.

I once read a definition of a leader, which said, "A leader is a man who has followers."

The way to get followers in the Congress of the United States and in the country—the way to get followers in a democracy—is through discussion with those people who are expected to follow.

In the past most basic decisions in our world policy have been followed by committee hearings, congressional speeches, editorial comment, and public discussion. A rollcall of these great debates is a rollcall of the historic steps by which America has assumed her world responsibility.

I have already mentioned the Marshall plan, the Truman doctrine, and to these could be added the North Atlantic Treaty, troops to Europe, and the question of expanding the war in Korea. No such discussion has taken place in the present instance.

The Secretary of State announced that henceforth we would rely on "massive and instant retaliation"—at times and places of our own choosing. Does this mean that we are ready to precipitate a third world war? What risks are involved? Do we mean that to stop aggression in Indochina we will drop an atomic or hydrogen bomb on Chinese or Russian cities? Such action on our part would almost certainly signal the start of world war III. Possibly that is the course to follow but, unless we are prepared to do what we say, there is no point in saying it.

The threat of massive retaliation will deter war only if the Communist aggressors are convinced that we mean to go through with it.

I said earlier that we responded to the new pressures on Indochina by an announcement that we were cutting our military budget by $5 billion. The cut is to be made in conventional forces.

To date the conflict in Indochina has been guerrilla warfare. Most military experts agree that atomic and hydrogen bombs are useless against such tactics. Conventional forces are required.

The new "military look" and policy of "massive retaliation" reduce our alternatives in a situation like Indochina to two courses of action—first, atomic retaliation with the risk of precipating world war III, or second, limited responses to local aggression, but with insufficient conventional forces.

In my judgment, the time has arrived for sober, objective, and calculated thinking. If the free world cannot afford to lose Indochina, let's formulate a plan to save it.

The administration must take the initiative, but the Congress and the people must be brought into the discussion.

If there is a plan, it should not be kept secret.

If there is not a plan, it is long overdue—and any plan that is formulated must be based upon the historic concepts which I mentioned at the beginning of this talk—concepts embedded in our Constitution and our tradition—concepts to which the people of the historic Old Dominion have contributed so much, and which we all must fight equally hard to return.

War Is on the Horizon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1954

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, May 5, the press gives Senate Majority Leader WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND as authority for the statement that we must now draw the line against Red aggression in Indochina, and without Britain, if she will not join, form a Pacific alliance to hold that line. The Senator is further quoted as saying that he will lead a Senate fight to send United States troops to Indochina if the President finds it is "in the vital interest" of the United States to do so.

If we are to stay out of a fourth world war, the people—you—must act.

The save-the-world foreign policy of President Wilson, who won office on the slogan that he "kept us out of war," put us into that war 5 months after he was reelected.

Franklin D. Roosevelt, on October 23, 1940, at Philadelphia, said:

> We will not participate in foreign wars and we will not send our Army, Naval, or Air Forces to fight in foreign lands outside of the Americas except in cases of attack.

On October 30 of the same year, speaking at Boston, he added:

> I have said this before, and I shall say it again and again and again: Your boys are not going to be sent into any foreign wars.

Secretly, through the use of our ships and men, he was aiding Great Britain, flighting Germany, and soon we were openly in World War II.

While President Truman was proclaiming his desire for peace, at the request of the United Nations and apparently because of secret executive agreements, which the Bricker amendment would have prevented, he put us into the war in Korea.

Three wars fought to help other nations—because we were fooled into thinking that our national existence depended upon the winning of those wars. More than a million American casualties. Thousands of young Americans still prisoners of war in the hands of butual enemies.

Billions upon billions of dollars given to reform the world, purchase the friendship of other nations.

Now, with a showdown in Indochina, the nations to whom we have given so much desert us.

India has told us to quit sending our planes transporting French soldiers over her territory to Indochina.

Germany and the other nations of that continent do not want our Armed Forces in Europe.

With Canada, Britain, Australia, and every other nation with military power refusing to draft its men to fight beyond the borders of its own country, we are still conscripting our young men—and, if some internationalists had their way, our young women—to fight thousands of miles from home, on the theory that we must do so in order to preserve our national existence.

With Britain and France trading with Red Russia and Red China, Britain refusing to fight by our side in Indochina, we can, in my opinion, find no quicker, more effective way of enslaving our people, destroying our own freedom, our own prosperity, imperiling the future of our country, than permitting ourselves to be sucked into this war in Indochina.

The people of this country—you—can now prevent that catastrophe by protesting vigorously and unceasingly to those who, through the press or otherwise, they learn favor the present foreign policy—which means war.

If we sit silent now, fail to protest the policy which is involving us in world war IV, we cannot consistently protest when our men—the sons, the fathers, the husbands—are shipped abroad. Nor will we have anyone except ourselves to blame when, year later, many are shipped back in flag-draped caskets, thousands lie in unmarked graves, other thousands remain until relieved by death as prisoners of war in the hands of a cruel, conscienceless enemy.

I am doing everything I can think of to keep us out of this war. If you oppose war, why not write the President, your Senators?

New Front in Southeast Asia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 10, 1954

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "New Front in Southeast Asia?" which appeared in the Saturday, May 8, 1954, edition of the Christian Science Monitor.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW FRONT IN SOUTHEAST ASIA?

Washington is now putting official stress on a collective-security system for Southeast Asia. It is also reported to be ready to link this with a "protected compromise" on Indochina, with the hoped-for security pact guaranteeing any "bearable" armistice that may be negotiated at Geneva.

There will be those who say that if the United States had sent in air support to Dien Bien Phu all thought of compromise would have been made unnecessary. We think not. Gallant as the heroic French-Vietnamese stand at that fortress was, tragic as is its fall, the Indochina problem is far greater than Dien Bien Phu, and its solution is more than military.

The great mistakes of recent American policy in Asia has come from an overemphasis on military factors.

Until a month or two ago Washington believed that, with sufficient American arms aid, the Navarre plan for defeating the Vietminh in Indochina could succeed. Numerous observers of the situation, including this newspaper, felt that such a hope was chimerical—unless the French should accompany their military action with a grant of genuine independence to the Indochinese States.

When the visit of General Ely to Washington at the end of March brought a sharp, belated recognition that the Navarre plan was not succeeding and that France was ready to seek peace at almost any price, the reaction was to seek to stiffen and strengthen French resistance by statements implying American willingness to enter the war if necessary.

But American entry into the war would be useless, in the long run, unless it had the support of (1) the Indochinese people and (2) other Asian nations. The only way to gain both these ends would be by a grant of independence to the Indochinese states—or at least a definite commitment to grant it at a certain date—and the setting up of a broadest based, popular government in Vietnam.

Those who would embroil the United States in the Indochinese war without first achieving these ends might well take account of one basic fact; there is going to be no purely military solution of the problem in that area. The real battle is for the loyalty of the Indochinese people, and that is not going to be won by a puppet French regime, even with the backing of American troops.

A useful suggestion by Colin D. Edwards was recently made in the letter columns of this paper; that coincident with the grant of independence the United States, Britain, and France together "offer to purchase the major portion of the foreign investments in Vietnam and present it to the Vietnamese people." This would be but a small expenditure in comparison with the billions in arms aid the United States has been pouring into Vietnam, but it would convince the Vietnamese they had the substance rather than the form of independence, and it would reassure France that the United States did not wish merely to substitute its own economic imperialism for retiring French colonialism.

Here is the sort of united action that would really pave the way for Vietnamese victory. For mere intervention in the war by a basically western coalition would be fundamentally ineffective, even in the unlikely event that such a coalition could be formed before the possibility of a compromise solution to the war had been thoroughly examined.

This brings us back to Geneva. A little united action there seems more possible now. But it will be successful only if the western powers all realize that Vietnamese indepedence is an indispensable element in any attempted solution.

Record of Hawaii's People as American Citizens Praised by Native Son of South

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON

DELEGATE FROM HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 10, 1954

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, under the unanimous consent of my colleagues, I insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter addressed to the board of directors of the Southern States Industrial Council, by George H. Lehleitner, of New Orleans, and a copy of an analysis made and entitled "Good Citizenship: Hawaiian Style." The letter and statement follow:

GEO. H. LEHLEITNER & CO., INC.,
New Orleans, April 15, 1954.

To the Board of Directors, Southern States Industrial Council.

GENTLEMEN: My attention has been drawn to the letter your very able general counsel, Tyre Taylor, sent the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, in which he stated that at your meeting of May 21–22, 1953, you gentlemen had gone on record in opposition to statehood for Hawaii and Alaska, primarily because these areas are not physically contiguous to existing States. This disapproval by your distinguished body is disappointing to a fellow southerner with strong convictions that Hawaii and Alaska are qualified for statehood.

It is true, of course, that neither is contiguous with existing States. But that this would prevent their functioning as compatible members of our Union would not seem to follow, in the light of precedent.

For you will recall that when California was admitted, in 1850, the nearest State was 1,500 miles away, with intervening mountain barriers, trackless desert, and plains populated with hostile Indians. In fact, in 1850, the easiest, safest—and sometimes the quickest—mode of transport between California and Washington was by ship, around the Horn—a sea voyage of 15,000 miles, which generally took in excess of 3 months.

I am quite sure you did not intend to create the impression that contiguity with existing American States should be the prime factor in determining an area's eligibility for statehood. For were such a standard established we would then be required to assume that because of its contiguity with the United States, the Mexican Republic, if interested, would, per se, be an eligible candidate.

Rather am I persuaded that you will share my conviction that the overriding consideration should continue to be the factor which has carried the most weight in the past when Congress has appraised the readiness of other Territories for statehood. That factor has been the compatibility of an area's citizenry: Their preparedness to assume the responsibilities and privileges of full membership in our American Union. In short, would it not appear to you that the most indispensible question to ask about the peoples of the areas under consideration is this: Are they good American citizens?

If they are not, mere physical nearness will not make them such. But if they are, the fact that it takes residents of Juneau and Honolulu 20 hours to fly to Washington will not prevent their being useful, homogenous Americans.

Probably no two of us would completely concur on all the elements of a good citizen. However, I am sure all Americans will agree upon these essential ingredients: A good citizen should be unswervingly loyal to his country, interested in its welfare, and in that of his neighbors—both local and national.

Certainly, he must be law abiding. And, because the extent of his education will, in a large measure, regulate the extent of his ability to discharge those responsibilities—as well as determine, generally, his economic accomplishments—a good citizen is burdened with the necessity of seeing that he, his children, and his neighbors, all receive the best possible educations.

Because your membership is concentrated in the Southern States, I felt you would welcome an opportunity to compare their performances against those of Hawaii in the indices covered by the attached survey.

I trust you will believe that this long letter—and the many weeks which went into the researching of its accompanying data—has but one motivation: a desire to have my fellow southerners share my deep conviction that the people of Alaska and Hawaii are, in all respects, ready for statehood; and that their addition will strengthen and enrich our beloved Nation.

Yours very sincerely,

GEO. H. LEHLEITNER.

P. S.: I regret that I do not, at the moment, have full statistical information on Alaska available for incorporation into these tables. That which I do have, however, indicates that Alaska's comparative showing would be good. Indeed, there is no reason why this should not be the case for, after all, are not the vast majority of Alaskans simply Californians, Ohioans, Texans, etc., who, following the examples of their American pioneer ancestors, pushed on to settle and make their fortunes in America's last remaining frontier area?

G. H. L.

GOOD CITIZENSHIP: HAWAIIAN STYLE

That a majority of Hawaii's citizens are of oriental or Polynesian ancestry is true; that the quality of their citizenship is, as a consequence, inferior, does not follow. Only recently we were witness to the melancholy spectacle of 21 young mainland Americans—natural-born citizens all—deserting to the enemy, and our national crime statistics give mute testimony that the possession of full American citizenship, by mere accident of birth, will not, in itself, guarantee us good citizens.

In any appraisal of Hawaii's good citizenship it is essential that recognizable benchmarks be established against which her people's performances may be measured. Because most of us have never been to Hawaii, whereas we do enjoy a familiarity with our own States and our Nation, I propose to use our own accomplishments as yardsticks. In so doing I am mindful that comparisons are, invariably, odious. These, then, are submitted in all humility in the hope that they will serve to show my fellow southerners that Hawaii, by every reasonable standard, is indeed a fit partner for our Union of States.

Because education is the true bedrock upon which good citizenship must be built, it seems proper that the first tables deal with this subject:

TABLE I.—*Public elementary and secondary education*

	Pupils enrolled		Ratio	Average number days school in session	Average number days attended per pupil enrolled
	Elementary	Secondary			
United States of America	19,404,693	5,706,734	1 to 3.4	177.9	157.9
Alabama	555,892	124,174	1 to 4.5	176.3	154.2
Arkansas	328,804	78,280	1 to 4.2	173.9	151.7
Florida	353,241	96,595	1 to 3.6	180.0	166.2
Georgia	571,329	146,708	1 to 3.8	178.0	153.7
Louisiana	399,634	83,729	1 to 4.7	179.0	155.8
Mississippi	446,683	80,757	1 to 5.5	172.5	136.5
North Carolina	703,608	181,035	1 to 3.8	179.9	162.2
South Carolina	415,146	79,039	1 to 5.2	177.4	148.5
Tennessee	539,445	120,340	1 to 4.4	176.7	156.2
Texas	1,078,453	275,714	1 to 3.9	174.6	149.1
Virginia	497,563	100,304	1 to 4.9	180.0	161.6
Hawaii	65,074	24,746	1 to 2.6	171.7	163.3

TABLE I–A.—*Teachers with less than 4 years of college preparation* [1]

	Total	Percent	Average annual salaries classroom teachers		Annual expenditure per pupil enrolled
			1950	[1] 1953	
United States	266,879	25.9	$3,010	$3,605	$208.83
Alabama	7,106	24.1	2,111	2,610	117.09
Arkansas	5,134	35.8	1,801	2,035	111.71
Florida	1,285	5.2	2,958	3,600	181.27
Georgia	5,718	19.9	1,963	2,720	123.37
Louisiana	2,630	12.5	2,983	3,225	214.08
Mississippi	6,338	38.3	1,416	1,741	79.69
North Carolina	3,828	11.4	2,688	3,175	140.82
South Carolina	4,157	23.2	1,801	2,765	122.39
Tennessee	10,077	39.9	2,302	2,620	132.17
Texas	3,306	5.6	3,122	3,326	208.88
Virginia	7,661	30.3	2,328	2,925	145.56
Hawaii	840	19.9	3,508	4,178	214.82

[1] NEA estimate for 1953; all other data is for 1950.

Sources: U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education. National Education Association, Research Division. Territory of Hawaii, Department of Public Instruction.

TABLE II.—*Urban crime rates*

[Offenses known per 100,000 inhabitants]

	Murder and manslaughter	Robbery	Aggravated assault
United States of America	5.05	59.6	81.5
Alabama	13.07	33.1	143.3
Arkansas	10.36	46.3	95.7
Florida	9.97	52.7	102.8
Georgia	20.67	45.0	231.4
Louisiana	10.60	44.8	85.7
Mississippi	13.05	18.9	86.2
North Carolina	11.19	29.3	384.4
South Carolina	7.59	22.6	135.3
Tennessee	13.64	45.4	64.4
Texas	11.92	45.4	100.0
Virginia	8.95	64.0	238.8
Hawaii	3.68	13.9	15.3

Source: FBI, Uniform Crime Reports, 1952, vol. XXIII, No. 2.

TABLE III.—*Deaths from motor vehicle accidents*

[Rate per 100,000 population]

United States of America	21.
Alabama	28.5
Arkansas	19.1
Florida	31.8
Georgia	26.9
Louisiana	21.8
Mississippi	24.1
North Carolina	28.3
South Carolina	29.6
Tennessee	24.3
Texas	32.4
Virginia	27.9
Hawaii	13.4

Source: U. S. Public Health Service; 1950 annual report, Vital Statistics of the United States.

TABLE IV.—*Survey of vital statistics*

	Percent of live births occurring in hospitals	Infant deaths per 1,000 live births	Deaths from tuberculosis per 100,000 population	Death rate (all causes) per 1,000 population
United States of America	88.0	29.2	26.3	9.6
Alabama	59.8	36.8	30.8	8.8
Arkansas	64.6	26.5	35.3	8.1
Florida	78.6	32.1	25.6	9.6
Georgia	69.5	33.5	28.1	8.8
Louisiana	83.4	34.6	29.8	8.8
Mississippi	45.9	36.7	29.1	9.5
North Carolina	70.4	34.5	24.6	7.7
South Carolina	57.1	38.6	25.1	8.5
Tennessee	74.2	36.4	38.0	8.9
Texas	80.0	37.4	31.8	8.2
Virginia	73.5	34.6	29.6	9.0
Hawaii	97.1	23.8	15.0	5.9

Source: U. S. Public Health Service; 1950 annual report, "Vital Statistics of the United States."

Tables I and II are eloquently self-descriptive. Even so, they cannot convey the complete story of Hawaii's progressiveness in education. Most mainlanders are astounded when they learn that her compulsory attendance law dates back to 1844; it predates those of every State in the Union, except Massachusetts. Hawaii's record, in table III, is all the more phenomenal by reason of its density of population, combined with its extremely high ratio of automobile ownership.

The prime significance of table IV, it seems to me, lies in its ability to give us an insight into Hawaii's standards of public health. For sociologists and Public Health authorities, alike, recognize the direct relationship between a community's health standards and its statistics on infant mortality and deaths from tuberculosis.

Throughout the world those causes of death march hand-in-hand with malnutrition, substandard housing, poor sanitation, insufficient public knowledge, and, perhaps most important of all, from a lack of adequate medical facilities.

Again, these statistics, impressive as they are, cannot tell the full story of Hawaii's progressiveness in public health, nor give one the feel of the deep social consciousness of Hawaii's people; only a studious visit could do that. Then one would encounter such accomplishments as this: The islands are completely rabies-free; this scourge was inoculated and quarantined out of existence years ago.

Too, while the visitor to Hawaii is much impressed with its fine facilities for the control and treatment of mankind's afflictions, it is her application of the Golden Rule which leaves the most indelible impression. The sole qualification for admission to Hawaii's healing institutions is that one be sick; the country of his antecedents and the color of one's skin neither helps nor hinders. It is, perhaps, of interest to note here that in the 55 years Hawaii has been under the American flag, the islands have been completely free of major racial disturbances. Somehow, even we southern visitors leave the Islands with the impression that our Lord would be pleased with what He would find in Hawaii.

How do Hawaiians discharge their obligations as citizens at the polls? How intense is their interest in representative government? And how well qualified is the citizenry to use its ballot with discrimination?

I know I need not labor the point that the answers to these and related questions are tremendously important when weighing the matter of Hawaii's readiness for statehood. For the ballot, intelligently used by the preponderant part of a community's citizenry, is free man's sword and shield against tyranny. Used unwisely—or by too few—it remains a sword, but too often becomes one turned against its possessors.

TABLE V.—*Exercise of franchise*

	Median school years completed, persons 21 years of age [1]	Citizens of voting age [2]	Votes cast, 1952 Presidential election	Percent of citizens of voting age balloting
United States	12.1	94,974,460	61,551,978	64.8
Alabama	10.1	1,734,473	426,120	24.5
Arkansas	10.3	1,109,935	404,800	36.4
Florida	11.8	1,790,517	989,280	55.2
Georgia	10.0	2,003,171	651,303	32.5
Louisiana	10.4	1,577,244	651,952	41.3
Mississippi	9.5	1,204,791	285,532	23.7
North Carolina	10.5	2,304,909	1,210,910	52.5
South Carolina	9.6	1,148,289	341,121	29.7
Tennessee	10.2	1,964,702	892,553	45.4
Texas	11.7	4,491,044	2,076,846	46.2
Virginia	10.9	2,013,357	619,689	30.7
Hawaii	12.2	189,616	[3] 130,345	68.7

[1] Source: Bureau of the Census; 1950 United States Census.

[2] Source: New York World-Telegram: 1953 World Almanac.

[3] Source: U. S. Senate; Statehood for Hawaii, hearings, 83d Cong.

In evaluating the foregoing, it should be borne in mind that the national vote was by far the heaviest ever recorded due to unusually keen interest in the presidential campaign. In the case of Hawaii, however, no such magnetic attraction existed—for Hawaiians cannot vote for presidential electors; instead, the Hawaiian vote is that which was cast for her voteless Delegate to Congress. Viewed in this light, the intensity of interest in representative government displayed by Hawaii's citizens is most remarkable. An average of 87 percent of her registered voters regularly vote.

TABLE VI.—*Internal revenue statistics*

	Residents 21 years of age and older, 1950 [1]	Percent of total	Individual income tax collections, 1952	Percent of total	Per capita [2] tax paid
United States	96,732,290	100.00	$33,738,370,000	100.00	$349
Alabama	1,740,815	1.80	247,157,000	.73	142
Arkansas	1,106,225	1.14	106,052,000	.31	96
Florida	1,809,895	1.87	397,386,000	1.18	220
Georgia	1,998,255	2.07	367,268,000	1.09	184
Louisiana	1,575,440	1.63	285,796,000	.85	181
Mississippi	1,204,885	1.25	100,207,000	.30	83
North Carolina	2,300,140	2.38	383,049,000	1.13	162
South Carolina	1,148,030	1.19	154,041,000	.46	134
Tennessee	1,966,625	2.03	315,606,000	.94	160
Texas	4,714,870	4.87	1,319,309,000	3.91	279
Virginia	2,015,255	2.08	423,080,000	1.25	210
Hawaii	254,626	.26	88,992,000	.26	350

[1] Source: Bureau of the Census; 1950 United States Census.

[2] Source: U. S. Treasury Department; Comparative Internal Revenue Collections, 1952.

The population figures used in the two preceding tables are those of adult residents for what, I believe you will agree, are excellent reasons: Only adult residents may vote, and they pay virtually all individual taxes.

The fact that Hawaiians must pay the same Federal taxes as do residents of the 48 States is, I believe, too well known to justify detailed amplification here. What is not generally understood, however, is that our Hawaiian citizens pay a larger per capita tax to the Federal Treasury than do the residents of 28 States. Ironically, Hawaii's pro rata contribution toward the cost of maintaining the Union materially exceeds that of those States whose representatives are making such a determined effort to keep our island citizens in a colonial status.

Taxpaying Hawaiians pay Uncle Sam over $4 to every dollar paid by Mississippians. The interests of Mississippians are protected by 8 votes in Congress; Hawaii has 1 voteless Delegate. Yet, Mississippi is spearheading the effort to deny our Hawaiian citizens their just entitlement as American freemen.

There is a yet more poignant comparison which needs no tables. It is the relative sacrifices these two American communities placed on freedom's altar in the Korean war. Mississippi, with a population more than four times as large as that of Hawaii, suffered 438 killed and missing; Hawaii lost 434 of her sons.

I hasten to add that this disparity doesn't apply only to Mississippi. For Hawaii, with three-tenths of 1 percent of the Nation's population, suffered 1.3 percent of America's battle deaths in Korea; in proportion to population, her casualties were the heaviest in the Nation. The explanation lies largely in the fact that at the outbreak of the war United States troops were needed urgently. Hawaii—and Hawaiian troops—were geographically closer to Korea.

No Hawaiian has complained of that disproportionate sacrifice; it was made proudly in our common battle against communism. What all Hawaiians bitterly resent, however, in the face of this latest evidence of their patriotism, are the cruel slanders some mainland Americans are guilty of when they call Hawaii "a hotbed of communism," and level unsupported charges of disloyalty.

It seems to me no thinking person will require any further evidence of the solid loyalty of our Hawaiian citizenry than this: More than 22,000 of Hawaii's young men—selected at random from all walks of life and representative of all racial groups—wore America's uniforms with honor in the Korean war. Not one case of desertion to the Communist enemy occurred.

In the light of the foregoing, you can appreciate why Hawaiians are both angered and embittered over Senator EASTLAND's recent charge that "the admission of Hawaii to statehood would place on the floor of the Senate two Senators who, if not Communists, would be subject to influence from Moscow." (U. S. Senate, March 4, 1954.)

Anyone versed in the fundamental principles of communism and its history knows that this cancerous growth develops most readily in the minds of those who live in areas plagued with widespread poverty, ignorance, oppression, and despair. Certainly none of these conditions prevail in Hawaii, where fieldhands on cane and pineapple plantations earn $10.16 per day. This wage makes them the highest paid agricultural workers in the world, and they know it.

Is it reasonable to assume that such people as these would embrace communism? If so, may God help America. For what hope could there then be that other sections of the United States, less developed culturally and economically than is Hawaii, could long survive the Red menace?

The truth is that neither the ILWU, Hawaii's biggest labor union, nor its management antithesis, the Big Five, controls Hawaii. Instead, Hawaii is dominated by the only group which should be in control: its people. And out of an intimate knowledge of them, which dates back to my World War II service and extends through three postwar visits to the islands, may I assure you, my fellow southerners, that no more patriotic, heroic, progressive, and capable Americans reside anywhere? The full citizenship of statehood is a reward they have richly earned in an apprenticeship of 56 long years.

Just as each of our present States, when admitted, added its own measure of strength and greatness to the whole, so, too, will Hawaii. It is my earnest hope that these pages have enabled you, in part, to see why this should be so.

GEORGE H. LEHLEITNER.

The West Virginia Turnpike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 10, 1954

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, the people of the United States are now very much interested in turnpikes or self-liquidating highways. Mr. Marben Graham, State editor for the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette, has prepared a table with reference to turnpikes, and has made special reference to the new highway in West Virginia, which probably will be opened this year.

I ask unanimous consent that his article may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WEST VIRGINIA TURNPIKE NEAR OPENING

(By Marben Graham)

CHARLESTON, W. VA., May 5.—They're working night and day now to open West Virginia's 87-mile turnpike south from here to Princeton, 14 miles from the Virginia State line, by early fall.

It has been termed the most hazardous stretch of highway east of the Rockies by the engineering firm in charge. The cost of $1,500,000 a mile for two lanes is the most expensive of any of the more than 840 miles of toll roads already built and more than 1,000 miles now being built in 17 States.

Boosters hail the project as the most important link in a series of arteries to make a continuous, dreamed-of Great Lakes-to-Florida route as well as forerunner of a chain of intrastate roads to boost State agriculture and industry.

Skeptics, and they almost equal the optimists, dub the project "West Virginia's folly." Traffic to and from the mountain-rimmed, sparsely populated territory around Princeton (population 7,500) will not average the necessary 6,000 cars a day for years, many predict. Some say the upkeep and interest on the $133 million worth of bonds likely will not be met.

"We are going to prove the turnpike is a paying proposition in a hurry," predicts former Gov. Okey L. Patterson, newly named director of the turnpike commission.

EXUDES CONFIDENCE

The former governor exudes confidence. He points to the bulging profits which have been accumulating on many other turnpikes, such as Pennsylvania's and New Jersey's. Virtually every toll road is operating in the black, he says. These include:

State	Miles	Cost
Pennsylvania	327	$240,750,000
New Jersey	118	385,000,000
Oklahoma (Turner Turnpike)	88	38,000,000
Connecticut (Merritt and Wilbur Cross)	67	38,000,000
Maine	44	20,000,000
Westchester, N. Y	25	25,000,000
Buccaneer Trail, near Jacksonville, Fla	17	4,000,000
Overseas to Key West, Fla	122	8,500,000
New Hampshire	15	7,500,000
Denver-Boulder, Colo	17	15,000,000

Turnpikes and extensions to present ones now under construction include:

State	Miles	Cost
New York Throughway	427	$500,000,000
New Jersey Garden State Parkway	165	285,000,000
Ohio	241	326,000,000
Pennsylvania Delaware River extension	33	65,000,000
Pennsylvania northeastern extension	110	200,000,000
New Hampshire-Massachusetts to Connecticut	40	26,000,000
New York Southern State Parkway	13	40,000,000
New Jersey Hudson County extension	8	40,000,000

The Indiana Turnpike Authority is mapping a 126-mile, $280 million roadway to link up with the Pennsylvania-Ohio artery and is discussing a $500 million north-south link to end at New Albany, near Louisville. This latter would be a part of a projected $1.5 billion Chicago-to-Miami road through Kentucky, Tennessee, and Georgia.

Florida is working on plans to extend the Key West Turnpike north of Miami to Fort Pearce, a project whose estimated cost has risen from an original $55 million to $87 million. Pennsylvania is studying a 100-mile loop connecting the Pittsburgh area with Erie.

Connecticut has authorized a $400 million pike, Greenwich to Rhode Island.

Virginia's legislature is committed tentatively to a 75-mile turnpike extending south from the West Virginia roadway. This would cost $90 million or more and entail at least one very costly tunnel. North Carolina is working on a 125-mile link that would cost around $200 million.

Even the most optimistic turnpikers here say, however, it will be 5 years before it would be necessary to extend the present West Virginia road to the Virginia border. It may be even longer before loops stretching over 450 miles and costing $750 million are started to the north. Right now a route to near Morgantown, linking with another extension of the Pennsylvania Pike, appears to have priority over one to the northern panhandle and Wheeling and Weirton.

"It will take generations instead of years to complete the State's chain," says Tom Cummins, Daily Mail reporter, who wrote an exhaustive series on the project.

Effect of Farm Losses on National Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 10, 1954

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, it is fundamental that our entire national economy is very directly and very strongly affected by the economic condition of agriculture. If farmers get into trouble, everybody else is going to be in trouble before long.

Farm losses are national losses. That fact is pointed out strikingly in an article which Dr. E. V. Walton, head of the department of agricultural education, Texas Agricultural and Mechanical College, recently wrote for the Dallas Times-Herald. I ask unanimous consent that Dr. Walton's article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COLLEGE STATION, May 1.—Farm losses take a toll of $14,900,000,000 a year from the Nation's income according to a summary prepared by agriculture research scientists.

The summary prepared by the scientists show that farm losses on crops alone equal the potential production on 120 million acres of cropland. The 1942–51 potential production figure of $41 billion a year is pared $13,400,000,000 by actual losses plus an additional soil and flood loss of $1,500,000,000.

Crops are hardest hit by weather, insect damage, harvesting wastes, and losses in storage and marketing. Research scientists say that the combined losses affecting crops equals the annual production on 120 million acres of the Nation's 358 million acres.

Range and pasture incomes are hardest hit by livestock diseases, plant diseases, fire, insects, and weeds. Losses equal the potential production on 154 million acres of range and pasture or an annual slash of 17 percent of the potential on 1,020,000,000 acres. Livestock diseases and deaths add another $815 million to the loss.

Forest loss is estimated at 47 percent of the potential on 228 million acres.

Soil losses, according to the most careful calculation of the scientists add up to 500,000 acres lost to cultivation each year. Flood losses up the total loss to $1,500,000,000. Scientists cannot accurately compute losses due to lower yields and higher costs of production on remaining land.

Scientists estimate that disease loss could be cut 75 percent in cotton and 23 percent in wheat by measures now proven and economically feasible. The proper use of insecticides, researchers say, could save 30 percent of losses in livestock and milk production.

More research is needed to salvage a large percent of the $15 billion annual loss affecting the Nation's economy.

The Church-Wiley Fireworks Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 10, 1954

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have commented on numerous occasions on the urgent necessity for passage of the Church-Wiley fireworks control bill, H. R. 116, as amended, which will be taken up this week for action, according to the decision of the majority policy committee.

I have spoken on the bill because I feel it is my responsibility, as chairman of the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee which considered the bill, to see to it that the bill does not die on the vine, so to speak—that it does not get overlooked because of other more pressing congressional legislation.

In some respects, it may seem strange that the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee should spend so much time on a bill which appears to be relatively minor, and is not directly related to his primary field of interest. The fact of the matter is, however, that I was entrusted with the responsibility of considering this legislation in committee, and I feel that it is incumbent upon me to continue to press for action on it.

SABOTAGE AMENDMENTS WILL BE COMBATED

I do not have any doubt that, when the bill comes up for final debate, some opponents may try to throw in all sorts of amendments against it.

Let me say that if there are any amendments which can feasibly be enacted to strengthen the bill, clarify it, perfect it, they will be considered very carefully. However, I serve notice that anybody who expects to sabotage the bill by some amendment which may utterly vitiate its purpose, will have a fight on his hands.

EVERY GROUP SUPPORTS IT

I cannot state too strongly that there is not a single organization in the United States which does not support the bill.

The only exception consists of those fireworks groups which have a direct economic stake in the bill, which have naturally opposed it.

If the fireworks industry were at all interested in protecting the health of our people, particularly that of our youngsters, it had ample opportunity in the last 20 years to come forward with some constructive proposals.

Its tendency to try to offer some so-called substitute at the 11th hour is, to say the least, somewhat suspect.

I send now to the desk a few of the many expressions which I have received from a great many civic organizations and newspapers in the United States supporting the Church-Wiley bill. I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN MUNICIPAL ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D. C., April 14, 1954.

The Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: In behalf of the American Municipal Association's 12,000 member municipalities in 44 States, please accept our thanks for your efforts on the Senate Judiciary Committee to bring about a favorable report on H. R. 116—the bill controlling the interstate shipment of fireworks.

This is a splendid example of Federal-State-local cooperation at its best. We should like to take this opportunity of thanking you for your interest and appreciation of the problem.

Yours sincerely,
RANDY HASKELL HAMILTON,
Director of the Washington Office.

THE WISCONSIN OPTOMETRIC
ASSOCIATION, INC.,
Madison, Wis., April 26, 1954.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: Your tireless efforts in behalf of H. R. 116 (fireworks control) are greatly appreciated by the officers and members of the Wisconsin Optometric Association.

It is unfortunate that this measure, designed solely to preserve and protect man's most precious gift—his eyesight, met with objection when it came up on the call of the consent calendar April 19.

However, we and many others of your constituents back home are greatly reassured by the fact that you have personally served notice that you are going to "request the policy committee to bring the bill up for floor action at an early date and to demand a roll call in order to let the mothers and fathers know who among their Senators is willing that the youth of our land run the risk of blindness for the profit of fireworks manufacturers who bootleg their output in interstate commerce."[1]

Please rest assured, Senator WILEY, that our association is keeping a watchful eye on this matter and we are behind you and your colleagues who advocate passage of H. R. 116 100 percent. If there is anything that we can do to help, please let us know. In the meantime we will appreciate receiving a report of any significant developments.

Respectfully yours,
WISCONSIN OPTOMETRIC ASSOCIATION,
CHARLES O. VAU DELL,
Executive Director.

WISCONSIN CONGRESS OF
PARENTS AND TEACHERS,
May 3, 1954.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: On April 29, 1954, 1,500 delegates representing 110,000 members of the Wisconsin Congress of Parents and Teachers assembled in Milwaukee in State convention passed the following resolution:

"Whereas the State of Wisconsin has passed an antifireworks law; and

"Whereas fireworks are being shipped in from other States: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the Wisconsin Congress of Parents and Teachers support, without reservation, passage of bill S. 2245, to prohibit the transportation of fireworks into any State in which sale or use of such fireworks is prohibited."

It was the consensus of delegates that Federal fireworks-control legislation is necessary to supplement law in States which now prohibit sale or use of such fireworks.

Respectfully yours,
MARIAN OLWELL,
Mrs. Glenn F. Olwell,
Legislative Chairman.
MADISON, WIS.

CHICAGO, ILL., *April 29, 1954.*

The Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building:

The officers and board of trustees of the National Society for Crippled Children and Adults, 11 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, has given me the authority to tell you that the society stands strongly behind your efforts to secure the enactment of H. R. 116. Our society has had years of experience in working with those who are handicapped by accidents due to unwise use of fireworks. We sincerely believe that the States which have passed protective laws should have this added protection from the Federal Government.

LAWRENCE J. LINCK,
Executive Director.

[From the Aberdeen (S. Dak.) American-News of April 18, 1954]

PROHIBIT FIREWORKS

If South Dakota lawmakers are really interested in reducing the death and injury toll from accidents they should consider legislation which would prohibit the sale and shooting off of fireworks.

Thirty-two States now have a model fireworks code which takes fireworks out of the hands of children and provides for public displays in safe areas.

It has been estimated that the number of persons killed by fireworks since 1900 exceeds the number of American soldiers killed in the War for Independence. And 20 times as many have been seriously injured by fireworks as were wounded in that war. Nearly 1,200 children annually are killed, blinded, or permanently disfigured and disabled by fireworks.

Most parents detest fireworks and usually buy them for their children reluctantly and heave a sigh of relief when the last cracker is finally exploded. But each year many little tots suffer the consequences of fireworks despite the extreme care used in exploding the lethal nuisances.

South Dakotans currently are vitally concerned about the increasing death toll on highways and it is certain that the legislators will spend considerable time in discussing ways and means of curbing this senseless death. At the same time these lawmakers should look into the matter of fireworks and consider passage of a law prohibiting their sale in South Dakota. A majority of the citizens would approve such legislation.

The Federal Congress is now considering a bill which proposes to prohibit the interstate shipment of fireworks in violation of State laws. This law would be applicable in South Dakota only if the State legislators approved a bill forbidding the sale of fireworks in South Dakota.

It is evident that Federal legislation prohibiting the transportation of fireworks would be wise and sensible. And South Dakota parents who are of this conviction should not hesitate to write to their Congressmen requesting enactment of this Federal law.

---

[1] Washington News, May 1954 Journal of the American Optometric Association.

When the Federal Congress achieves the worthy objective of prohibiting the transportation of fireworks and the South Dakota Legislature heeds the urging of parents to stop the sale and shooting off of fireworks in the State, then some South Dakota little boy or girl will be saved from death, blindness, or permanent disfigurement.

[From the Chicago Sun-Times of March 20, 1954]

A Mother's Complaint About Fireworks

A mother of six children sent us an advertisement one of her boys received in the mail. It offered all kinds of fireworks for sale, to be shipped by express. One selection included "3,000 pieces of the finest supercharged flashlight crackers available." Youngsters with the price can get aerial bombs, cannon salutes, skyrockets, and other dangerous explosives.

The mailing piece included a special red-inked notice:

"Rush order now. There is pending in Washington a bill which will place an impossible and unfair burden on the shipper of fireworks. We hope such a bill will not be enacted into law, as we will then be forced to cease all shipments of fireworks. * * * We therefore recommend that you get your fireworks now, as the future is very uncertain."

The bill referred to is one sponsored by Representative Church, Republican, of Illinois; and it would forbid the transportation of fireworks into a State where their retail sale is forbidden. Illinois last year passed such a law. It is now illegal to sell any fireworks except caps for small cap pistols. Even sparklers are banned (they develop heat of 2,400° F.). The sale of fireworks for supervised public display is not forbidden.

The merchants of mayhem can get around the Illinois law by shipping fireworks to children from another State. The Church bill would forbid this. Mrs. Church has impressive evidence of the need for stopping the bootlegging of fireworks to children. One is the story of a Chicago boy who lost both his hands last July 4. A package of fireworks he ordered by mail exploded. Mothers want the shipment of such dangerous stuff stopped.

By their votes the parents of America will know whose side Congress is on—the side of people like the mother of six children mentioned above, or the companies merchandising stuff that blinds, maims, and kills our youngsters.

What Do the Vietnamese Think About the War?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 10, 1954

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, Larry Allen, a correspondent for the Associated Press, has been in the Indochinese region for more than 3 years. He is the only American correspondent who has consistently been on the job in that area of the world.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an article written by him entitled "What Do the Vietnamese Think About the war?"

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

What Do the Vietnamese Think About War?

(By Larry Allen)

Hanoi.—There's been a bitter, costly war on in Indochina for nearly 8 years, but here in this war capital for French Union forces—and elsewhere—the average Vietnamese doesn't seem to care much about it.

In this war refugee-swollen city of more than 500,000 (triple the population at the end of World War II) the people seem to be unconcerned whether the Vietminh or the French are winning or can win.

Even the daily war communique, from time to time, fails to appear in Vietnamese newspapers, for the only French-language newspaper in Hanoi, the Journal L'Entente.

Seldom is any Vietnamese heard discussing the war.

MONEY AND GIRLS

His interest, instead, runs to the question of whether the French Government will further cut the exchange rate of 10 French francs to one Indochinese piastre, or the latest importations for added attractions at the city's many taxi dancehalls and so-called night clubs.

The high cost of living, however, even takes precedence over all of this. But the war? Well, it just goes on.

And, that's the attitude that the Vietnamese people, as a whole, seem to have in the cities of Saigon, Haiphong, and elsewhere in Vietnam.

About the only people who really appear conscious of the fact that there's a war on is the young Vietnamese who has just been drafted out of a lucrative business and placed in the army for 2 years' required military training.

THEIR QUESTIONS

But it's clear, too, that he doesn't like it, and he appears to be singularly uninformed about what he's fighting for.

Rather than war, the educated Vietnamese much prefers to talk about such questions as: "When are the French going to give us complete independence?" Or "When is Chief of State Bao Dai going to call general elections so Vietnam can have a legislative assembly?"

Part of this apathetic attitude undoubtedly is due to the fact that a majority of Vietnamese people still have a deepseated sympathy for the Vietminh leader, Ho Chi Minh.

For he rang a bell the Vietnamese have never stopped hearing when, in starting his revolt against the French in Hanoi on December 19, 1946, he declared that he would "drive out the French colonialists and bring true independence to the Vietnamese people."

Even though many Vietnamese now realize that Ho Chi Minh's nationalistic spirit long since has been tinged a deep red with the advice and military aid he is getting from Red China, they still like him because he is a Vietnamese.

LITTLE DONE

The other part probably is due to the fact that the Vietnamese Government has done little to instill in the hearts of the people a war consciousness and to elicit wholehearted support for the Vietnamese Army.

The Vietnamese who are in the army, or who have to go into it, finally realize that there is a war on, but the rank and file of the Vietnamese manifest an interest in the conflict that seems to be down to an irreducible minimum.

One thing all Vietnamese appear to be agreed upon—they want to see the French get out of the country.

And the French have made it clear they want to get out of this costly, nondecisive struggle, but they can't do it until the Vietnamese army is capable of defending the country.

That day still appears to be far distant, even though the Vietnamese Government says there'll be 330,000 men under arms by the end of this year.

For the army still is green and needs much more war experience. Its development has not been helped by many desertions and the apparent lack of concern by the people themselves whether there is a national army or not.

PEOPLE'S APATHY

Apathy of the Vietnamese people often has been strongly criticized by high French army leaders.

One general once said: "If we had 100 percent cooperation of the Vietnamese people, the war could be won in less than a year. We have about 10 percent."

Here, in Hanoi, there are French, Senegalese, Moroccan, Foreign Legionnaire and Vietnamese troops moving about the city constantly. At nighttime, there frequently is heard the dull roar of distant artillery or mortar fire. And that's just about the most war flavor there is in the Hanoi atmosphere.

In all of Hanoi, for instance, there isn't a single patriotic poster calling for enlistments in the Vietnamese army or making appeals to the public for support of the war effort.

In the crowded cinemas of Hanoi, occasionally some of them briefly flash a slide on the screen before the movie starts, showing a Vietnamese officer standing beside a tank.

And, occasionally there are published appeals for donations to blood banks or to save old newspapers and magazines for soldiers in the field.

NO INDICATION

But, other than this, there's virtually nothing to indicate to a stranger that here one of the world's longest and most bitter wars started, and is still going on.

In speeches, proclamations and decrees, members of the Vietnamese Government, from time to time, try to drive home to the Vietnamese people that communism would control every phase of their lives if Ho Chi Minh won the war.

But these make only a casual, if any impression, upon the average Vietnamese—whether he be in Hanoi, Haiphong, Saigon, or in any town or village.

President Eisenhower's recent declaration to the effect that some people in Indochina showed a lack of enthusiasm for the war drew high praise from many French Army commanders.

They commented, "He hit the nail on the head."

The couldn't care less attitude of the Vietnamese in the cities and towns even is more strongly reflected among the 7 million to 8 million people who live in the 5,406 villages of the rich, ricegrowing Red River Delta.

NOT INTERESTED?

They make it clear to almost any visitor that they're not interested in the fight between Ho Chi Minh and the French and their pro-French Vietnamese allies.

It seems to make little, if any difference, to the villagers, whether they live under Ho Chi Minh's Red flag or the yellow-red-striped flag of a democratic Vietnam. They haven't been sold on the idea that Ho Chi Minh is a Communist, but they do know he is a Vietnamese.

But the villager would like to see the war ended, so there'd be no more raids upon his rice hoards by Viet Minh troops in the delta.

As one ricegrower expressed it, "All we want is to live in peace, to have a place to sleep, and enough rice to eat."

TVA's Influence on the Nation's Electric Rates—Statistics Show Lower Rates for All Consumers of America Since TVA With Increased Earnings for Private Utilities

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 10, 1954

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, there was a favorite expression of the late Al Smith which became a part of our language many years ago—and is still a part of our language. And that expression is "Let's look at the record."

That is what I want us to do. Look at the record of what TVA has meant to users of electric power throughout our Nation—not only users of public power, but the users of private power as well.

I shall ask consent to have some facts and figures on power rates inserted in the Record, but before doing so, I wish to make two observations here, observations based upon facts, upon the record.

First, I want to say that in 1932, the year before TVA was created, residential electric rates in Tennessee and the area surrounding Tennessee were among the highest in the Nation. The lowest were in the State of Washington, largely because of the influence of the municipal electric systems in Tacoma, Seattle, and the great Northwest. There was no well-defined regional pattern. In 1952—20 years later—residential electric rates were lowest in the TVA area in the East and the Bonneville area in the West. The rates in other areas grow progressively higher as the distance from the TVA and Bonneville increases. The TVA and Bonneville projects have served as yardsticks to bring electric poweer rates down in areas adjacent to these regions.

Next, Mr. Speaker, I want to emphasize that the low rates charged by the privately owned utilities adjacent to the TVA area, whether they are low by TVA example or by TVA competition, have not retarded the growth in the private power companies' common-stock earnings. From 1937, the earliest year for which Federal Power Commission data are available, to 1952, the record shows that earnings available to the common-stock holders of the larger privately owned power companies in the United States a little more than doubled and similar earnings of the companies adjacent to TVA increased fivefold.

That is the record. Public Power competition has served to bring down the rates of private power companies and at the same time profits and earnings of the private companies have also greatly increased.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I desire to have included with my remarks in the Appendix of the Record a bulletin issued by the TVA Director of Information, entitled "TVA's Influence on Electric Rates." It is regrettable that it is impossible to include certain charts which were used to illustrate the figures cited in the bulletin, but the information in the bulletin contains the impressive figures used in the charts. I commend its reading to the Members of the Congress and the public generally.

The written content of the bulletin follows:

TVA's Influence on Electric Rates

Millions of electricity users in other parts of the country are enjoying lower power rates, in addition to other national benefits, because of the great Federal multiple-purpose projects such as those on the Columbia River and in the Tennessee Valley. Figures show the influence of dynamic rate policies spreading outward to other areas like ripples in a pool. They provide further evidence that the benefits of Federal multiple-purpose projects are not confined to the immediate regions in which they operate.

Some of the national benefits of TVA need only to be mentioned to be recognized. TVA has added 630 miles of modern navigation channel to the Nation's inland waterways system. A billion ton-miles of freight a year are moving on the Tennessee River with annual savings of $12 million to shippers. Over this great waterway the Midwest, for example, ships wheat and automobiles, and the Gulf States oil and gasoline.

TVA dams control floods in the Tennessee Valley; but they provide even greater annual flood benefits along the lower Ohio and Mississippi. The new lakes with year-around fishing are enjoyed by millions of people from all over the United States. TVA's chemical engineering research and development have assisted private industry's development of phosphate reserves in the West. TVA fertilizers have helped State extension services to demonstrate better farm management and fertilizer practices on operating farms and have increased the demand for concentrated fertilizers from private manufacturers.

DYNAMIC RATE POLICY

One of the outstanding accomplishments of TVA has been the successful demonstration of the value of a dynamic policy of electric ratemaking, as written into the TVA Act by its framers with the expectation that the example would provide inspiration for lowering electric rates elsewhere. TVA is instructed that its power be sold so as to "permit domestic and rural use at the lowest possible rates and in such manner as to encourage increased domestic and rural use of electricity." The act also requires that TVA's power operations be "self-supporting and self-liquidating." The combination of these two requirements became the basis for a new concept of ratemaking in which it was anticipated that if rates were deliberately set low, they would so encourage the use of electricity that increased sales volume would provide sufficient revenues to cover the costs.

This rate policy has paid. TVA's wholesale revenues are covering all costs of operation including maintenance and straight-line depreciation and, in addition, are providing a return on the power investment averaging about 4 percent per year. The municipalities and cooperatives which distribute TVA power have even higher earnings. During the past year their returns averaged about 7 percent.

There are other direct benefits from this rate policy. By June of 1955 about half of TVA's output will go to atomic energy and other Federal defense establishments at low rates which save the taxpayers many millions of dollars annually on defense costs. TVA's policy of encouraging greater power use through low rates and abundant power supply has provided a large market for appliances manufactured in other sections of the country.

But perhaps most important of all has been the influence of these high-use, low-rate policies on electric rates elsewhere in the Nation.

RETAIL RESIDENTIAL RATES

The pattern of higher electric rates with distance from the TVA region is revealed by figures showing average costs for residential use in 1932, before the advent of TVA and in 1952. Monthly electric bills for 100 kilowatt-hours' use at the residental rate were examined for cities with 50,000 or more population in 1930 in successive zones 200 miles wide radiating from the TVA service area. Because of the few cities of over 50,000 population in the Western States, it was not practical to extend the zones into these areas; instead, the bill for individual cities were shown. For the States of Washington and California, it was again possible to use averages.

In 1932 Tennessee had the highest average bill of all areas with $5.26 for 100 kilowatt-hours of residential use. There was not much variation and no apparent pattern in the averages for the surrounding zones. For the eastern part of the country all were around $5. The Far West was lower, with the State of Washington, where Seattle and Tacoma have long operated municipally-owned systems, having the lowest average in the country—$3.18.

But by January 1952, a definite pattern had developed. Washington State (now in the Bonneville area) continued to have the lowest average bill for 100 kilowatt-hours, the figure being $2.39. Next came the TVA area with an average bill of $2.50. Going outward from the TVA area the average bills ranged progressively upward to $4.12.

The reductions in average bills for 100 kilowatt-hours, between October 1932 and January 1952, were: for the Tennessee Valley region, $2.76; for the next zone, $1.73; for the second zone beyond, $1.12; for the third zone, $1.24; for the most remote zone, $0.78.

POWER RATES TO RURAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVES

Other figures show the average price per kilowatt hour paid for wholesale power by REA borrowers in 1952 in successive zones 200 miles wide radiating from the Bonneville service area and from the TVA service area. The marked trend of increasing prices with distance from the Tennessee Valley area and from the Bonneville area stands out strongly.

Starting with 4.9 mills per kilowatt-hour in the TVA region and going northward, the average price rises progressively to 15.5 mills for the northernmost zone. Going southward, the average is also successively higher as one goes farther from the Tennessee Valley, starting with 4.9 mills per killowatt-hour and increasing to 7.8 mills per killowatt-hour. Starting with Bonneville, the rate is 3.5 mills per kilowatt-hour. Here the increase from zone to zone is not as marked as in the East but it is still quite apparent. The successive figures are 5.8, 6.0, 8.4, and 9.7 mills per kilowatt-hour.

Because TVA and Bonneville are principally hydropower areas, fuel costs were examined to see if this could account for the great difference in wholesale power costs between zones. It was found that the extreme variation in average fuel costs between zones can account for about 3 mills per killowatt-hour, as compared with an extreme variation in average selling price between zones of about 10 mills. Moreover, even after subtracting the average fuel cost for each zone from the average total price for the zone, the pronounced trend of rising prices with increasing distance from the Bonneville or TVA area still remained, clear and convincing.

POWER COMPANY EARNINGS

The foregoing shows that the private power companies nearest the Tennessee Valley have made the greatest reductions in retail rates and also sell power to REA cooperatives at the lowest wholesale rates. Have these companies been hurt because they reduced their rates and sold more power?

From 1937–39, when the Federal Power Commission first published financial data, until 1952, annual common stock earnings of the Nation's privately owned utilities approximately doubled, while their total outstanding common stock increased around 40 percent. Over the same period, for the nine companies adjoining TVA, common stock earnings multiplied five times and their outstanding common stock increased about 50 percent. These are the earnings remaining after payment of operating expenses, interest on bonds, and preferred dividends.

From the record it hardly appears that the companies adjoining TVA have suffered from TVA's influence on electric rates.

Case No. 5

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1954

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, here is a case discussed by J. Campbell Bruce in The Golden Door, of a man who was able to regain his permanent residence in this country after a period of residence here of 23 years, only because he managed to return just before the McCarran-Walter Act came into effect. The McCarran-Walter Act might have penalized him forever for a crime he committed when he was a youngster, and for which he had paid the penalty, even after years of proof of his good behavior as a resident of this country.

Gilberto Benitez-Villalba is a man in his fifties. He lives in Los Angeles where he works as a grocer. He is married to an American citizen, has 5 citizen children, 1 of whom is a disabled veteran of World War II.

He came to this country from Mexico with his parents in 1912. Nine years later, at the age of 20, he was convicted of burglary in Texas and served 14 months in prison, with time off for good behavior. Benitez was then deported to Mexico, and in 1926, with the Attorney General's permission, he was permitted to return to this country. Benitez lived an exemplary life from that time on, and always regretted the crime of his youth.

In 1949, he applied for naturalization and was told, when his record was checked, that he was not entitled to it. Not only that, but he was served with a warrant of arrest because it was deemed that his original reentry in 1926 was unlawful, and in the investigator's opinion should not have been granted to him.

Benitez applied for the privilege of voluntary departure under the seventh proviso, which would entitle him to return on another visa regardless of the legality of his 1926 entry, because he had had a good record for at least 7 years. This matter was debated for 2 years, and Immigration denied voluntary departure and ordered him deported. This would have meant that he could never return to the United States. His family, all American citizens, would have had to become exiles in order to be with him, including his disabled veteran son.

Two months before the McCarran-Walter Act came into effect, Benitez' appeal of the above verdict came through, and he was granted voluntary departure. Benitez departed and a time limit of 90 days was placed on his return, or he would be permanently barred. He returned in time and was reunited with his family. The vagueness of the definition of what constitutes good moral character might, under the McCarran-Walter Act, have concluded that Benitez' 1-time conviction, even though it had happened 32 years before, preclude voluntary departure, and he would then have been barred from this country forever.

The Fall of Dien Bien Phu

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 10, 1954

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an article entitled "After Dien Bien Phu What?" by Hanson W. Baldwin, noted analyst for the New York Times.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

After Dien Bien Phu What?—Reactions to Loss May Make or Break France and Anti-Red Bloc in Far East

(By Hanson W. Baldwin)

The fall of Dien Bien Phu marks the end of an era.

The ultimate military, political, and psychological reactions may either make or break the anti-Communist front in the Far East and France as a great power.

Dien Bien Phu and its consequences can be a positive asset or a negative liability in the continuing struggle for the world, in which it represented only a battle. A lost battle has tipped the scales of history in the past; Dien Bien Phu may prove, in future accountings, to be the balance point of contemporary history.

No such sweeping results may be apparent immediately. In the cold statistics of combat, Dien Bien Phu was a small battle. The French probably committed a total of about 15,000 to 16,000 troops to the ground effort. Fully 3,000 to 5,000 of these were captured, killed, or wounded prior to the final assault. Virtually all available and operational French aircraft in Indochina had been committed intermittently after the final Communist attempts to seize the fortress started in mid-March. The estimate of French aircraft lost and severly damaged was 50 to 70 in this period.

THREE COMMUNIST DIVISIONS

The Viet Minh forces that finally overran Dien Bien Phu after a long siege originally totaled 25,000 to 50,000 men—the greater part of three Communist divisions. These were backed by the bulk of an artillery division and supported by thousands of coolies and porters and hundreds of Soviet-made Molotov trucks, driven in part by Chinese, that shuttled supplies from the Chinese frontier.

These forces lost heavily in their five main human-wave assaults against the French positions; it is probable that the French defenders destroyed the better part of 2 Communist divisions during the last 2 months. The enemy, however, rounded up guerrilla units and reinforcements and at the end probably outnumbered the French by between 4 and 6 to 1. No accurate estimate of total Communist casualties is available, but dead and wounded probably totaled 20,000 to 40,000.

The military balance sheet of Dien Bien Phu is not, therefore, crippling to the French, insofar as statistics go. There are more than 500,000 French, French Union and Indochinese troops opposed to the Communists in Indochina, so the loss of more than 15,000 men is not a fatal blow, militarily or mathematically. Dien Bien Phu itself was merely a trail and crossroads in the jungle, a French outpost of resistance near the friendly Thai country.

BROADER EFFECTS ASSAYED

But Dien Bien Phu had become a phychological symbol and a political factor as well as a military intangible.

In a military sense it is the largest single French Union loss in the 7½-year Indochina war. The defeat comes when the French Union forces already are hard pressed in the vital Red River Delta area and when the battle to keep open the important Hanoi-Haiphong road has reached a crescendo.

The basic military questions in Indochina, then, are: Will there be a military chain reaction in the Red River Delta area? Will the estimated total of 8,500 Communist underground guerrillas in Hanoi itself rise against the French? Will the enemy, hurt badly by his Dien Bien Phu casualties, be strong enough to follow up his victor with heavy blows at Hanoi, Haiphong, and elsewhere? Will there be widespread defections from Vietnamese military units?

These questions are significant, largely because of the psychological importance of Dien Bien Phu, an importance the French themselves created. They established Dien Bien Phu as something of a military chip on the shoulder, openly inviting Communist frontal assault. And, for the first time in the war, the Communists accepted the dare—and then overran a heavily fortified French position.

VALUABLE TROOPS LOST

They overran, too, some of the best troops France had in Indochina. The blow to the prestige of France and to that of her backer, the United States and, indeed, the blow to the role of the white man in the Orient, is apparent.

Dien Bien Phu's psychological significance extended beyond southeast Asia. The martial pride of France had been greatly stirred by the long and gallant fight conducted by Big. Gen. Christian de Castries and his men against great odds. What now, in France? Will the reaction be one of despair and defeat or will the stout fight and the lost battle serve as a psychological Thermopylae to stiffen the French spirit to determined resolution?

The battle'e effects on the weak Bao Dai regime in Vietnam are perhaps less important than its political effects in France. It probably means a political crisis just as the Indochina phase of the Geneva Conference opens. If the present Government falls, the French will be conducting highly important negotiations in a position of compounded weakness.

If Christian de Castries is enshrined with France's military immortals, if the French regard Dien Bien Phu as a Verdun, with its memories of fortitude and resolution, instead of a Sedan, with its recollections of defeat and shame, then France may rise again from defeat to attain her potential greatness.

Rules of Procedure for Congressional Committees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN WELKER

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 10, 1954

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an article entitled "Just What Process Is Due?" written by C. P. Ives, and published in the Baltimore (Md.) Sun of May 10, 1954.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Just What Process Is Due?

(C. P. Ives)

For several years now important segments of the intelligentsia have been denouncing chairmen of congressional investigating committees for their abuse of witnesses. They have been demanding courtlike privileges for the witnesses.

Now within a few days precisely the same people have suddenly started denouncing chairmen of investigating committees for being too polite to witnesses. And they have abruptly begun to denounce witnesses for their abuse of wider witness privileges.

Or rather, they have been denouncing one committee chairman and one committee witness. They denounce Chairman Mundt, of the Army-McCarthy hearings, because he treats Senator McCarthy the way they have long insisted the Chair should treat witnesses. And they denounce Senator McCarthy because, enjoying in these hearings the novel, courtlike cross-examination privileges they have long demanded for witnesses, he is using them to the full.

It begins, indeed, to appear that what important segments of the intelligentsia would prefer—at least in this particular investigation—is a code of committee practice more like this:

"The chairman sends you a letter 'inviting' you to appear before his committee on a certain date. Then he starts issuing a barrage of statements telling the world what a dangerous and nefarious character you are.

"When you no longer have a friend left in the world, the hearing begins, and the chairman starts out by reading a statement in which he finds you guilty and pronounces sentence upon you. Then he announces that the committee will proceed to a full and impartial investigation of the facts.

"[This] seems to be a great waste of everybody's time, because when the evidence has been fully presented, the chairman ignores it completely, writes a report setting forth all his preconceived notions, and quotes at length from his opening statement to prove he was right all the time."

But, you say, it is unfair to attribute to the intelligentsia types a desire for this kind of a hearing in re McCarthy? Well, maybe it is, but don't overlook the source of the quotation just above.

It comes from a speech by the United States Steel Corp.'s Mr. Benjamin F. Fairless, who was talking out of personal experience. The intelligentsia types who protested the kind of hearing Mr. Fairless describes when Mr. Fairless was being investigated make up perhaps what is the shortest list in the entire history of the Anglo-American jurisprudence.

Not, of course, that the intelligentsia types should be too much criticized for not galloping to the aid of Mr. Fairless and his kind. Actually, with some discount for genial overstatement, and with a residual admission of the very real need of some reform, the kind of hearing Mr. Fairless describes is pretty much in line with American precedent.

That is to say, over a century and a half of our somewhat tumultuous public life, we have worked up a tradition of rough-and-ready practices in the congressional hearings.

We have firmly refused to confuse committees with courts. We have realized that the courts must on occasion overprotect the individual as against the community because courts inflict fines, imprisonment, and death. We have realized that the committees must occasionally lean toward community rights as against the individual because committees do not fine, imprison, or execute, but merely develop facts for legislative action.

We have kept cannily away from the notion that in any literal sense we should lug the court kind of due process into investigations. We have kept firmly in mind that the looser committee methods in themselves constitute due process of law in the historic meaning of the term.

For the historic meaning of due process is simply that procedure must follow the customary law of the land. The 17th century jurists who shaped our legal institutions used the terms "due process of law" and "law of the land" quite interchangeably. Loose committee procedure and tight court procedure are equally customary—equally law of the land—in America.

The contemporary thing is, though, that important segments of the intelligentsia don't seem really to want equal committee treatment of all sorts of witnesses. When Mr. Fairless is roughed up before the committees their silence is all but absolute. But let one of themselves be roughed up and they demand a chairman who acts like a judge and cross-examination rights for witnesses.

The trouble is—as important segments of the intelligentsia see quite accurately in the Army-McCarthy hearings—that cross-examination or other courtlike privileges for witnesses in congressional investigations clog inquiry, obscure the facts, murk up the allocation of responsibility.

What important segments of the intelligentsia don't seem to see is that you can't have one committee rule for intelligentsia types and another for Fairlesses—and McCarthys. That wouldn't be due process of law.

Air Traffic in the Washington Area

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. GLENN BEALL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 10, 1954

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, air traffic in the Washington area has been a problem for a number of years, and there has been much discussion, many proposals, but unfortunately there has been no action.

Everyone agrees that Washington National Airport has reached the traffic saturation point, and everyone agrees that something must be done. In the Washington Post and Times-Herald of May 7, John G. Norris relates the history of this problem, and in concluding asks a very pertinent question.

National has been happily free of accidents for many months, despite the chock-a-block condition—

Mr. Norris wrote—

Is it going to take a major disaster there to force some solution of the admittedly bad situation?

Among the alternatives proposed to Washington's air-traffic problem has been that the excellent facilities at Friendship International Airport be used. That airport is still available and can relieve the overburdened National Airport without additional expense.

The time has come when a decision must be made, and let us hope that the decision will not be forced by some tragic air disaster.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record the article to which I have referred, entitled "Second Airport Site," written by John G. Norris, and published in the Washington Post and Times-Herald of May 7, 1954.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Second Airport Site

(By John G. Norris)

THE PLANES GO ROUND AND ROUND

A year now has passed since the economy-minded new Eisenhower administration abandoned the already-underway Burke, Va., airport in favor of joint military-civilian use of Andrews Air Force Base. To date no forward step has been taken toward setting up a second Washington airport there, and the once-approved Andrews project appears to be dead.

Commerce chiefs, who have been periodically reporting that "negotiations are under way," won't concede this. But all concerned admitted to the Washington Post and Times-Herald yesterday that Commerce and Air Force officials decided several months ago they could not agree on an acceptable plan for joint use of Andrews. Since then there have been attempts by higher authority to work out a solution, but none since some time in March. And meanwhile, the bad congestion at Washington National grows steadily worse, with increasing delays of service and danger to the city and airline passengers.

A chronology of the Government's march up and down the hill on Andrews is revealing.

In late March 1953, Commerce Secretary Sinclair Weeks, who has jurisdiction over civil aviation matters, eliminated $1,660,000 budgeted by the Truman administration for the purchase of additional land at Burke. The latter project had been authorized in 1950 at a cost of $14 million and more than $800,000 had been spent on land acquisition. Shortly after Weeks' action, President Eisenhower ordered the Pentagon and Commerce to submit recommendations on substitution of Andrews for Burke.

On May 26, 1953, Weeks announced that he and Air Force Secretary Harold E. Talbott had agreed in principle on the joint use of the nearby Maryland base, and that discussions on final details fo the Weeks-Talbott plan would begin immediately. As the Air Force had stanchly opposed prior proposals of this kind, it was clear that the new Republican team had overruled the generals.

On May 28, representatives of the 9 scheduled airlines unanimously endorsed the Government's plan for joint utilization of Andrews.

In June, Governor McKeldon, of Maryland, and the Maryland delegation in Congress attacked the new plan. They had been fighting the Burke Airport, in an effort to force Washington to use the big new Baltimore airport at Friendship, which has been a financial flop and employed to only partial capacity.

On November 13, Undersecretary of Commerce for Transportation Robert B. Murray, Jr., said that negotiations on final details for use of Andrews should be completed within 60 days.

Sometime after the first of the year, however, Commerce and Air Force negotiators decided they could not agree on an acceptable plan. Gist of the trouble, it is said, was twofold: (1) Experts of Commerce's Civil Aeronautics Administration felt the areas at Andrews offered them for a terminal, hangars, ramps, etc., were unsatisfactory, and the Air Force said the CAA-picked site would interfere with military operations; (2) the Air Force viewed the whole matter as a temporary solution of Washington's problem because of the proximity of the Andrews and National flight patterns and Commerce could not see spending millions at Andrews for a stopgap.

Some Andrews civilian use partisans charge that Air Force officers never intended to give up part of the field and won over their civilian chiefs by insisting on unacceptable conditions. They contend that the original purpose of Andrews—the air defense of Washington—now is only a secondary function there, and it is largely used administratively and for proficiency flying of Pentagon pilots.

Many Air Force officers see the move, on the other hand, as merely a foot in the door under which the CAA would eventually take over all of Andrews. They say also that the airlines—despite their acceptance of the plan a year ago—actually oppose it because no one of them wants to move operations from National to more remote Andrews.

Airline officials conceded that Andrews has its disadvantages, but say they are willing to accept anything to relieve the present congestion.

When Commerce and the Air Force reached an impasse last winter, they referred the matter back to Budget Director Joseph Dodge. Dodge tried his hand at a settlement unsuccessfully, and then returned to business. His successor, Rowland Hughes, hasn't gotten into the question, a spokesman said. There the matter rests on dead center.

Meanwhile National Airport is at the traffic saturation point. There were 16,569 plane arrivals and departures last March, compared with 15,612 in March 1953. A total of 235,843 passengers landed or took off in March 1954, 24,911 more than the same month in 1953. CAA records list National as the third busiest airport in the country, behind Chicago and LaGuardia at New York. In actuality, Washington is the worst off, for Chicago is getting its second airport—use of O'Hare Air Force Base. And New York has a second facility at Idlewild, by no means near capacity, and can use Newark if necessary. National has been happily free of accidents for many months, despite the chock-a-block condition. Is it going to take a major disaster there to force some solution of the admittedly bad situation?

Fertilizer Cost

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 10, 1954

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Fertilizer Cost National Issue in Hells Canyon Case," appearing in the April 1954 issue of the Pacific Northwest Cooperator. The article discusses the value to the farmers in the Middle West and the West of a high dam at Hells Canyon from the standpoint of the production of cheap fertilizer.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FERTILIZER COST NATIONAL ISSUE IN HELLS CANYON CASE

(By Barrow Lyons)

WASHINGTON, D. C.—The tremendous national significance of the Hells Canyon case loomed decisively in final testimony last month before the Federal Power Commission declared a recess (until early May) to permit proponents of the high dam to prepare an affirmative case.

Testimony clearly showed that Idaho Power Co.'s license desire is a minor consideration in relation to a really great issue, which is: Shall the United States develop its vast resources of western phosphate rock for the benefit of farm economy throughout the Nation?

It became apparent that granting a license to Idaho Power Co. would doom the vast Idaho resources of phosphate rock to remain only a minor source of fertilizer for many years to come. With little hope of reduced cost of fertilizer, farmers will have a tougher uphill battle to preserve fertility of soils in which every food consumer in America shares an interest.

RECALL CO-OP WITNESSES

Recognition of the important part farm co-ops have in this fight to protect the interests of producers and consumers was seen in the recall of two previous witnesses—Charles Baker, of Walla Walla, Wash., general manager of Pacific Supply Cooperative (on behalf of Northwest co-ops); and Glen Bunting, Chicago, manager of Central Farmers Fertilizer Co. (on behalf of Midwest co-ops).

From the farmers' standpoint, some of the most telling testimony yet entered in the case came just before the 2-month recess from Roscoe E. Bell, of Portland, Oreg., whose researches into phosphate resources and fertilizer production have won international recognition.

Bell emphasized that only about one-fourth of western phosphate rock can be processed into fertilizer by the acid process.

Electric processing must be provided unless the Nation wishes to waste three-fourths of the millions of tons of this vital resource.

Add 1-mill per kilowatt to the cost of electric power used in an electric fertilizer furnace and you add $13 per ton to the cost of production, he pointed out.

(Note: Industrial power rates now quoted in eastern Idaho are approximately 7 mills. High dam rates are estimated at 3 mills. A 4-mill differential means, according to Bell's studies, a difference in production cost of $52 [illegible] ton.)

It requires 13,000 kilowatt-hours of energy to produce 1 ton of phosphorus, Bell stated.

In addition to the rapid jump in cost of production as the cost of power mounts, Bell pointed out how heavily freight rates hit the farmer when he buys acid-produced phosphate.

Transportation cost of ordinary superphosphate from Montpelier, Idaho, to Mason City, Iowa, is $66 a ton of plant food; triple super drops to $25 a ton; and $18 a ton for Calcium metaphosphate, and $15 a ton for elemental phosphorus. (These last two require electric processing.)

Idaho Power Co. attorneys bitterly fought to prevent Bell's testimony from admission to the record.

FPC Examiner Costello wavered in his decision and agreeed to admit it temporarily, referring final decision to the full Commission itself.

In the United States Senate, the long-range impact of the case on the economic development of the entire Northwest and the Nation was emphasized by Senator WAYNE MORSE, of Oregon. He urged that Congress press Senate bill 2590, sponsored by 17 Senators, which, he said, "proposes that a check be made to prevent the FPC from giving away the people's interest in maximum development of the economic resources of the area."

He pointed out that "Secretary McKay, in a Capitol Cloakroom broadcast, had admitted that the private company plan would not provide maximum development" * * *. Also that "FPC Chairman Jerome Kuykendell is known to be an opponent of the project upon which he must pass judgment." He concluded: "When a commission is so rigged with partisans, it is important that Congress exercise a check upon adjudications of the Commission."

Warfare: Communist Style

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAT McCARRAN

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 10, 1954

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, the counsel of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, Mr. Julius N. Cahn, has written an article entitled "Warfare: Communist Style," which appears in the May issue of National Republic magazine. The article is so well written, and is such a forceful contribution to anti-Communist literature, that I believe it should have the widest possible distribution; and as an aid to such distribution, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A war of the worlds is raging. It has been raging since November 7, 1917, when there occurred the most disastrous single even of the 20th century. The event was the Communist counterrevolution which overthrew the Kerensky regime which, in March, had succeeded Czarist rule in Russia.

From the day of the counterrevolution, unremitting war has raged between the Communist world and the non-Communist world. Actually, the war had been declared a century before when the Communist Manifesto of 1848 signalized the formal opening of the Communist onslaught. However, when communism established its foothold in Russia in 1917, it attained a military base from which to intensify its hostilities. Unfortunately, the world did not clearly perceive the basic facts of the onsluaght:

(1) It did not recognize the grim implications of the ultimatum hurled by Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels in 1848.

(2) It did not understand how the chain of conspiracy throughout the remainder of the 19th century and in the forepart of the 20th century was leading to Communist seizure of a powerful base somewhere in Europe.

(3) Once that base had, unfortunately, fallen to communism, the world did not recognize that Russia was irrevocably committed to continuing and spearheading the voilent destruction of the rest of the world.

It is small wonder, therefore, that this war has gone so badly for our side. We have scarcely and only belatedly recognized that we were even engaged in such a war. The other side—world communism—knew it very well, however. That is why, in 37 years, it has so successfully expanded its tyranny over one-third of the world's peoples, spread over one-fourth of the world's land surface. This is faster conquest over a larger area than has been achieved at any time by any other force in history.

When Communist guns roared on Heartbreak Hill and Porkchop Ridge and 140,000 brave American boys fell in defense of Korea, including over 30,000 dead, we knew at last that this was war. But the actions which had led to Korea and which have followed after the so-called truce—were also war—a new type of war.

To the Communist, war is continuous; it never ends. If violent fighting stops, nonviolent fighting starts. Indeed, it continues because Communist war moves effortless in continuous graduations. Communism is perpetually on the attack against its enemies—at one stage, with words inside a parliament, at another stage, outside, with an assassin's bullet or a general strike, or with printed words in magazines and newspapers, or with resolutions by front organizations, or with bloody civil war.

I have seen the Communist assault in over 20 countries and even more cities—in East Berlin, in Guatemala, in Georgetown, British Guiana, in Algiers, in Vienna. Wherever I have gone, I have seen the pattern of the new type of military attack.

Communist warfare is new-style warfare with many old-style elements. It is a combined operation based upon total assault on a society.

The concept of total war was brought to its original zenith by the Germans during World War II. But communism has given new meaning to total war. It is a meaning of perpetual war, universal war. It is a war of integrated operations, based upon simultaneous assault on the front and on the rear.

Communist rear warfare is aimed at the utter disintegration of society, disintegration of the will to resist, disintegration of every institution within society, government, the Armed Forces, labor, education, religion, agriculture, science.

Communist warfare is based on the idea that you can destroy a country as easily or more so, from within as from without. You can destroy it by infiltrating its currency until it is more useful as wallpaper than as a medium of exchange. You can destroy it by industrial paralysis—by numerous strikes—which bring on enormous economic losses and bitter hatreds between classes. You can destroy it, if necessary, by resort to arms, by guerrilla warfare—a bleeding warfare of attrition until a country's lifeblood is drained in hemorrhages of human life and treasure.

Many of communism's foes still fail to realize that this total—political, military, social, psychological, economic warfare—is part and parcel of the new Communist military science. An expert observer, Col. William Kintner, in his excellent book The Front Is Everywhere, says this:

"The failure of the military to understand the nonmilitary aspects of Communists has been matched in non-Communist countries by an equal failure of political and civil leaders to understand the military aim of communism."

Not only is Communist warfare an integrated military-political-economic-psychological unit, but the very essense of many of its military concepts, as such, is new. Communist battle strategy and tactics have been been dynamically evolved. Communism has tested its weapons, its techniques, on every available battleground—in Spain, in China, in Greece, in Indochina—constantly experimenting, revising, improving, perfecting.

For the non-Communist world to fail to perceive these facts is to risk suicide. The price of blindness in today's world is blood. The price of ignorance of this menace is infamy.

Many of communism's foes have in particular been hypnotized by stereotyped military thinking in which war is fought according to a rulebook with such rules as govern humane warfare, decent treatment of prisoners, observance of cease-fires and armistices.

To the coldblooded, ruthless, fanatic Communists, these concepts mean absolutely nothing. Even when the attack is not waged with open violence, communism is no mere academic brain exercise, no mere economic theory, no mere substitute religion, no mere political system of ideas. Communism is a no-holds-barred, everlasting military assault. Every Communist Party is an organ of combat against non-Communist society.

Now, let us prove the military character of communism. Let us prove it by communism's aims, communism's thinking, communism's military components.

(1) First and foremost, the aim of classical war is the violent destruction of the enemy forces. The aim of communism is the violent destruction of the enemy society—of which its armed forces are but one component.

In February 1848 in the Communist Manifesto, Marx and Engels stated:

"The Communists disdain to conceal their views and aims. They openly declare that their ends can be attained only by forcible overthrow of all existing conditions. Let the ruling classes tremble at the Communist revolution."

The Communist Party of America, in its first constitution and program, stated:

"The object of the class struggle which inevitably develops into civil war is the conquest of political power."

"Violence," says Karl Marx, "is the midwife of every old society when it is pregnant with a new one."

The Communists in all their thinking have presumed an eventual military conflict between the Communist and non-Communist powers.

These are the words of Lenin: "* * * (T)he existence of the Soviet Republic side by side with imperialist states for a long time is unthinkable. One or the other must triumph in the end. And before that end supervenes, a series of frightful collisions between the Soviet Republic and the bourgeois states will be inevitable."

(2) The thinking of the leadership of communism is basically military thinking. The writings of Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Stalin are saturated with military concepts. Both Marx and Engels were military scholars. Engels himself was a keen soldier—interested throughout his lifetime in military science. Both were students of revolution, of armed uprising. Both grasped the concept that war and civil war are not short in duration. In their correspondence, Marx and Engels are quoted:

"We say to the workers, you have to go through 15, 20, 50 years of civil wars and national wars, not merely to change your conditions, but to change yourself and become qualified for political power."

Both Lenin and Stalin took active part in crucial military struggles—Lenin, in the masterminding of the Petrograd rebellion of November 1917, and in the Russian civil war which followed, and Stalin, particularly in World War II. Then, time after time in his discussions with Roosevelt and Churchill on war strategy, the crafty Stalin displayed that he was interested on more than a token basis in trying to live up to the grandiose titles of "generalissimo" and "marshal."

But from its inception, there has been nothing amateurish about Communist war and/or revolution. Lenin in particular set forth classic rules for insurrections. Among those rules are:

"Firstly, never play with insurrection unless you are fully prepared to face the consequences of your play. * * * Secondly, the insurrectionary career, once entered upon, acts with the greatest determination and on the offensive. The defensive is the death of every armed uprising. * * * Surprise your antagonists while their forces are scattering. * * * In the words of Danton, the greatest master of revolutionary policy yet known, 'Audacity, audacity, and more audacity.' "

Much of Communist military science has been written by Mao Tse-tung, a skilled military theoretician. It is expressed in his books On a Prolonged War, The Chinese Revolution and the Communist Party of China, and Strategic Problems of China's Revolutionary Wars. A study of these words and of the Chinese Red deeds is almost as requisite today as is a study of Russian Army tactics, because Chinese guerrilla strategy is being made a military gospel for Communists throughout the world. Mao's ideas may be summed up:

(A) You can fight and win a war with a minimum of material. You can fight a war with the enemy's own captured arms.

(B) You must frustrate your enemy. You must do what he least desires. You must fight under conditions which you choose, when you choose, and where you choose. You must fight him where his logistical problems are greatest.

(C) You can defeat superior forces. As they advance, you retreat. You exhaust them, fatigue them in an endless futile chase. As they move upon you, you "evaporate" your forces. Your troops scatter, disappear, disguise themselves. Meanwhile, you harrass them, blow up their rail lines, ambush them.

In its long march, Mao's Chinese Red army retreated 6,000 miles in 2 years, but still it held itself together as a fighting force. Eventually, with Soviet arms and equipment, it rebounded. Meanwhile, communism's allies and dupes abroad caused us to abandon Mao's enemy—our proven friend—gallant General Chiang Kai-shek and his Nationalist army—which had fought so long and bled so severely in the fight both against Japan and against the Reds.

Mao had envisioned and executed three stages:

(A) Defensive, mobile warfare—in which the superior enemy is on the offensive against you, and in which you retreat, gradually grinding him down, inflicting losses upon him, until the front becomes stabilized.

(B) Stalemate warfare, position warfare, in which you increase your strength while the sitting enemy's morale deteriorates and defeatism grows.

(C) Aggressive, mobile warfare in which you take the counter-offensive, then destroy the enemy.

These are lessons which are being applied today so successfully by the Reds in Indochina. They are lessons which may one day be used in the Amazon jungles of Brazil or wherever Communist bosses feel military conditions are ripe.

(3) Let us turn now to a listing of the various aspects of an army which are present in the international Communist conspiracy.

(A) Communism is based upon military organization with centralized authority and a chain of command.

At the bottom, the Communist "cell" is akin to the military squad. At the top, in any country the representative of the Communist International, like Gerhardt Eisler was in the United States, is the "front commander." He reports to the theatre commander, who reports to the Kremlin. He is in charge of the total resources available on that front.

The resources include not only the Communist Party, but Communist-fronts and Communist fractions within non-Communist organizations.

(B) Communism has military components. It has its infantry, particularly its shock troops—its "activists" or "militants." It has services of supply, finance, communications, transportation, the equivalent of an Adjutant General's Office and Provost Marshal General's Office, ordnance (e. g. gun running, gun manufacture, gun thefts).

It specializes in its intelligence and counter-intelligence action (the latter through its so-called "control commissions"). Communist espionage, in particular, is one of the most crucial of its military specialties.

These components exist both above ground and underground, because Lenin taught that in every nation there must be a legal and an illegal Communist Party.

(C) Communism imposes absolute discipline—it tolerates no insubordination.

(D) It insists on comprehensive training, indoctrinating its raw recruits into hardened revolutionaries.

The Communist equivalents of the National War College, of Fort Benning, Randolph Field, and Leavenworth, are the Lenin Institute, the University of the Peoples of the East, the Jefferson School of Social Sciences, and other Communist schools throughout the world.

These schools teach inside, and wherever possible, outside the Soviet Union, military and pari-military operations—everything from street fighting to blowing up railroad trains, to operation of secret radio sets, code systems, courier systems, strike strategy, etc.

(E) Communism utilizes classic military tactics like concentration of forces, tactics of maneuver, deception, etc., together with all sorts of modern variations.

The basic unit of the military force is, of course, the individual Communist. He is a new breed of fanatic warrior. Nicolai Lenin said:

"We must train men and women who will devote to the revolution not merely their spare evenings, but the whole of their lives."

The Third World Congress said:

"The Communist organizer must look upon every member of the party and every revolutionary worker as a prospective soldier in the revolutionary arm. For this reason he must allot him a place in the party which will fit him in his future role."

The Communist soldier goes where he is ordered. If he is ordered to change jobs, he changes jobs; ordered to move from city to city, he moves, as directed.

The top Communist agents are moved as well, from country to country. Leading American Communists, like Earl Browder and Eugene Dennis, were battle hardened in Communist espionage in Shanghai, for example. The Communist leader, Chou-En-lai, operated not only in the Chinese Communist Party, but in the French Communist Party.

This then is the nature of the military enemy. Can he be defeated? Absolutely.

Must he be defeated? Imperatively, yes, if we and the world are to be saved from endless slavery.

Can he be defeated without world war III? Yes; because no rational-thinking individual wants or would precipitate a global holocaust.

How then can we win this new-type warfare? We can win it by total defense and total attack (short, however, of actual war).

I refer to total defense of our American institutions and total (nonviolent) attack—psychological, economic, political—against Soviet Russia. After all, Communist society is infinitely more susceptible to disintegration from within than is our own. In contrast to our happy, harmonious, prosperous, free society, Russia is a seething caldron of hatred, bitterness, fear, suspicion, squalor, and misery. Russia's captive empire despises its ruthless, godless oppressors, and is eager to cooperate in every possible way with the west.

As for ourselves, the total attack upon our Nation can only be met by a total defense of that Nation. Every institution which the Communists seek to destroy, it is up to us to strengthen—religion, education, government, the armed forces, labor, industry, agriculture.

Our means throughout our defense and offense are four—superior firepower, superior brain power, superior will power, superior soul power.

By fire power I refer to America's building up of invincible armed forces. By brain power I mean using God-given intelligence to thwart the Communists at every turn. By will power I mean an utter determination to defeat—not simply contain—this enemy by every feasible peaceful means available to us, by tightening anti-Communist laws here at home, for example; by not only combating Communist propaganda abroad but taking the offensive in our own information program. By soul power I mean utilizing of our spiritual might.

We must never become so preoccupied with material means that we forget that our great strength is a spiritual strength, because our cause is a spiritual cause which we are waging against the principalities of evil.

Senator Wagner: Government for the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1954

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, May 4, 1954, marked the first anniversary of the death of a great American and a distinguished United States Senator from the State of New York, Robert F. Wagner.

I am pleased to direct the attention of our colleagues to the following article written by Leon H. Keyserling, who was legislative assistant to Senator Wagner from early 1933 through 1937, and closely associated with him until his retirement in June of 1949. It appeared in the May 18, 1953, issue of the New Republic, and follows:

Robert F. Wagner, who died on May 4, was born in Germany in 1877. Brought to New York at the age of 8, he lived with his penniless parents in the basement where they labored, battled his way through the years to a law diploma, rose rapidly to high elective and judicial offices in the State, and served 23 successive years as a United States Senator. During a vital period, he introduced and guided to enactment a more varied and significant group of laws than any other Senator in our history.

To review briefly his 40 years of public service is impossible. During his 6 most active years, he sponsored the Social Security Act, home owners loan legislation, Public Works Administration, United States Employment Service, National Labor Relations Act, Railroad Retirement Act, Civilian Conservation Corps, United States Housing Act (slum clearance and low-rent housing), National Industrial Recovery Act, national housing legislation (FHA), various unemployment relief laws, and a host of other measures.

Proponent of so much legislation associated with the heyday of the New Deal, Wagner was far more than the legislative agent of a preordained program. When he introduced the National Industrial Recovery Act in early 1933, its great public-works features were a synthesis of public works and relief bills which he had been agitating since 1930. The effort to deal comprehensively with prices and wages, production and industrial relations, was attuned to his long search for a balanced program of recovery and reform rather than a panacea such as the bill for a 30-hour week to share unemployment instead of combating it. Despite shortcomings, the NRA laid foundations for improved economic conditions which still endure.

Years before introducing the social security bill in 1935, Senator Wagner sponsored the first resolution ever presented in the Congress to study unemployment insurance; between 1930 and 1933 he presented bills to measure unemployment, alleviate its hardships, spread its costs, and counter it affirmatively with industrial stabilization measures. In two of his later efforts—the National Labor Relations and the United States Housing Acts—he encountered not only powerful expected opposition, but also the more heartbreaking experience of apathy or dissent running to the highest levels of the executive structure.

Senator Wagner hated to indict individuals or groups; he saw many sufferers but few malefactors. He never tried to win a temporary—and in a democracy, dangerous—majority by pitting one interest against another. Seeking to improve society rather than to punish or reform individuals, he aimed his appeal at the reason of all fair-minded men by programs geared to the ultimate welfare of all.

While radical in his determination to get to the heart of matters, in certain fundamentals Wagner was a fundamentalist. He instinctively disliked the Court-packing plan, not because he thought judges holier than other men, but because he thought the basic framework of our free institutions more sacrosanct than any man. Rarely has a man in public life rejected so vigorously all weapons except the truth as he saw it. But when armed with a just cause, he ignored the political risks and personal burdens of fighting for reforms before they became popular.

Love of the ancient safeguards which a free society must hold fast to even while rushing to solve new problems; unwillingness to use distortion for political advantage; courage to forsake one's own political superiors on a vital party issue where one believes them to be mistaken; determination to fight for one's beliefs before they are accepted; a burning passion to help the underdog without wronging the more fortunate; lonely withdrawal from the material and social advantages open to a successful man, in order to concentrate upon his life's work—these were rare qualities, not in an idealist satisfied just to be right without being effectual, but in a practical man driven by an insatiable desire to get results.

Even now, there are millions of families living in decent homes which would not have been built but for his efforts. There are tens of millions of workers who enjoy an industrial democracy which but for him would not be so full. There are thousands of businesses and farms and banks alive and thriving because of his numerous measures designed to afford them direct aid and stimuli. There is a throbbing $360 billion economy which, but for the many measures bearing his imprint, would not be so strong or stable or just.

How different countless American lives would be today if some quota in 1885 had prevented this boy of 8 from coming to these shores. And how important for our future it is that later Members of the greatest deliberative body in the world measure up to the standards which Robert F. Wagner set.

No Unity of Free Nations at Geneva Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 3, 1954

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am including as part of my remarks an article by Mr. Marquis Childs which appeared in the Washington Post and Times-Herald of April 30. It is an excellent statement of a situation that presently exists at the Geneva Conference and it would appear that the United States is in a rather unfortunate situation.

The article follows:

UNITED STATES STYMIED AT GENEVA CONFERENCE

(By Marquis Childs)

GENEVA.—Beneath the troubled surface of this Asian conference the differences that divide the western allies are becoming more and more evident. The division is, above all, over what to do about the threat of the loss of Indochina.

That dwarfs every other consideration. Britain and the United States have taken almost diametrically opposite stands. In a closed session of the Big Three, British Foreign Secretary Eden said that he favored a cease-fire in the Indochina conflict.

United States Secretary of State John Foster Dulles opposes a cease-fire in the conviction that any compromise solution following the end of the shooting will lead inevitably to Communist domination. Consequently, Dulles here in Geneva and Admiral Radford in London and Washington are continuing the effort to put together an emergency defense structure that will sustain France even after the fall of Dien Bien Phu.

But with Britain holding back, it becomes almost impossible for the Eisenhower administration to go to Congress to ask for approval of an emergency pact that would give sanction to the use of American armed strength—at least Air and Navy—for the hard-pressed French.

With British approval of a cease-fire and without direct American support at once, French Foreign Minister Bidault would seem to be compelled to negotiate an end of the fighting with the Communist representatives of China and Russia here.

Although Bidault has been meeting for talks with Molotov, the French insist that no cease-fire offer has yet been made and that if and when one is made it would have to be carefully considered by the Laniel government in Paris. The growing belief is that the French will want international controls and that they will be backed in this by the British.

Controls enforced by the United Nations for a cease-fire line might be the only way by which outwardly at least the differences of the Western allies could be reconciled. But, at best, in the American view it would be a face-saving device with the likelihood that Communist infiltration would circumvent any controls.

The divisions among the Western powers come down to a fundamentally different view of the Communist threat. As the British and the other Commonwealth powers—Australia and Canada—see it, the United States is proposing to use arms in Indochina to put down an internal revolution which is not in actual fact Communist imperialism.

In a private talk with this reporter one of the Commonwealth delegates put it as follows: "How can anyone possibly think that a wave of planes over Indochina could stop the infiltration which is everywhere? A hundred waves of planes could not reverse the feelings of those who believe they are throwing off the colonial yoke."

But the logic of Dulles' position remains in the American view unassailable. Any compromise will give southeast Asia to the Communists, and, therefore, military resistance must be continued if a way can possibly be found short of America going in alone, which is ruled out by all policymakers here.

Because the perspective of the European allies is so different, Dulles is becoming a somewhat lonely figure at this conference. He goes right on insisting that there can be no letdown in Indochina. For this view he has little support. It is also the official American view that the loss of Dien Bien Phu will not mean the loss of the war. American military intelligence rates the Communist threat in the delta area as not so serious as the French appraisal.

This optimism must be taken with a larger dose of skepticism since official American reporting on the Indochinese war has always been overly optimistic. Nor does it take into account the shaky political situation in France where the loss of Dien Bien Phu seems certain to bring savage political reprisals.

Already between Paris and Saigon angry recriminatory telegrams are being exchanged. Supreme Commander General Henri Navarre is blaming the timing of the Geneva Conference for the plight of the fort and its nearly exhausted defenders. Paris is passing the blame back to Navarre.

The Communist Chinese by demanding impossible terms for a cease-fire may still unite the West. But that is counting on almost too much luck.

Time To Stop Dragging Feet in Cal-Sag Appropriation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 6, 1954

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the passage of the St. Lawrence seaway bill makes imperative the passage by this Congress of an appropriation bill for the Calumet-Sag Waterway. I have spoken many times on the urgency of this matter. Now that the St. Lawrence project is assured surely the 83d Congress will not continue to drag its feet on the rest of the program to give our country a system of inland waterways from the Atlantic to the Gulf of Mexico. Let it not be said of us that we went half way and then stopped.

I am extending my remarks to include the last paragraph of a letter from Henry C. Woods, chairman of the board of Sahara Coal Co., of Chicago:

> If this bill (St. Lawrence seaway) is passed I think that you should give those people in the midcontinent and especially those in Chicago, the right also to ship by river through the port of New Orleans from Chicago. This involves your voting for an appropriation called the Cal-Sag project.

Mr. Speaker, there can be no excuse for further delay in providing the money for an immediate start on the work of construction.

President of National Association of Registered Nursing Homes Testifies Before the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee in Support of H. R. 7700, a Bill Providing Mortgage Guaranty of Loans for Construction of Health Facilities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 7, 1954

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, Zuzie Siegal, president of the National Association of Registered Nursing Homes, made a very important statement before the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee outlining the needs of the nursing home operators for some method of financing loans for the construction of additional facilities. Her testimony is as follows:

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, my name is Zuzie Siegal and I am the president of the National Association of Registered Nursing Homes. Our association consists of memberships in 33 States. The members are operators of nursing homes throughout the Nation and they are the type of people who provide a perfect cross-section of thinking and ability in the care of chronically ill, convalescent, and infirm patients. They represent, in total, many hundreds of years of practical experience, which as we must all admit, is something that this field particularly requires.

The National Association of Registered Nursing Homes is the oldest organization of its kind in the United States. It is a nonprofit association composed of nursing and convalescent-home owners and operators pledged to the improvement of standards and ethics. The officers, all of whom own or operate one or more institutions, serve the association without compensation of any kind. Many of the members of this association have 30 or 40 years' experience and are well qualified both by education and service to speak on the problems of caring for the aged, convalescent, infirm, and chronic patient.

In my opinion, and I am certain I express the views of all the members of the association, no group truly interested in the care of the sick could possibly oppose any bill which is intended to enhance the program of medical care. It mut be obvious, therefore, that we favor H. R. 7700 in its intent. However, we respectfully submit that in developing the intent of this legislation we must not overlook those who are going to carry out this intent. In my opinion there are several serious omissions in this bill and there are a number of thoughts not fully expressed. It is to these omissions and thoughts that we should like to direct your attention.

However, before discussing our suggestions, may we submit to you a few statistics, which our study of the testimony on H. R. 7341 shows to have been neglected. During the hearings on H. R. 7341, it has been testified that there are 20,000 nursing homes in the United States. Assuming for this discussion the figure of 20,000 nursing homes, it is important to note the following: The average capital investment per nursing home is conservatively set at $60,000. The total estimated investment, therefore, is $1.2 billion. The average nursing home has a bed capacity of 25, providing therefore, an approximate total of 500,000 beds. For the care of its guests, under present standards, each nursing home employs, roughly speaking, 1 person for every 3 patients, or in round numbers a total of 170,000 persons. The average weekly salary of such employees is about $50, or about $8.5 million weekly. The sum total of these figures cannot help but impress you with the fact that we who address you on H. R. 7700 today represent a large financial stake in the American economy.

We suggest that the most serious omission in H. R. 7700 is the failure to mention the proprietary nursing home. This is of serious concern to us because it very definitely excludes this large group of pioneers in the field of nursing home care from benefits which are provided for those who have followed. It is a generally recognized fact in the field of medical care that the private agencies have always led and that the so-called nonprofit governmental agencies have usually followed.

May we point out to you at this time that the terminology used in H. R. 7700, as well as in previous bills, with regard to voluntary agencies, requires a little clarification. Voluntary agencies may and do care for the sick. In this group of sick are included those who are able to pay their own way totally, those who pay their way partially, and those who require total assistance from public and private agencies. In return for the designation of voluntary these agencies are given many benefits, among them tax exemptions, the right to go to the community for soliciting of funds, and, of course, a sizable sum of money from tax funds. Wherein, we ask, does this voluntary group differ from the ignored proprietary group—ignored in spite of the fact that they carry out and prove the basic fundamental tenet in this country; namely, "free enterprise and private initiative?" This principle is expanded on page 2, line 10, of the bill and I quote "solutions to the people's health needs can and should be attained through free enterprise and private initiative." Let us at no time lose sight of this all-important fundamental of our political and economic life.

Just as do the voluntary institutions, we, the proprietary nursing homes in this country, admit people who are able to pay their way, people who can only partially pay their way, and people for whom private and governmental agencies have assumed responsibility. The unhappy difference is that we have no tax exemptions, no right of fund solicitation, and no recourse to tax funds in charitable institution budgets. Ours, therefore, is a very, very difficult role. We are a recognized member of the medical care team in the total overall medical care program, locally, statewide, and nationally, yet for some reason, which we choose to believe is purely oversight, no mention is made in this bill, H. R. 7700, of the proprietary nursing home.

We hope that you will bear with us if we recall to this committee's mind testimony on H. R. 7341. In the testimony to which we refer the question was asked by one of the committee whether the nursing homes fear competition or whether they fear the higher standards which would be set by the allocation of money to voluntary institutions only. We wish to call to your attention the fact that nursing-home operation is a profession and not a business. We wish further to call to your attention that it is not competition we object to, but unfair competition. Our position on the medical-care team has a parallel. This parallel is that we, in a sense, are much like the physician who practices his profession without fear that any other physician's standards are any higher, but who objects strenuously to unethical competition on the part of his fellow physicians. We ask no special favors, but neither do we expect that assistance generously given to others will be dispensed so as to miss our capable and experienced hands.

When, therefore, H. R. 7700 provides for mortgage insurance on loans which may be made by private banks for the purpose of improving the medical care in any community, who can say that any recognized member of the medical-care team should not benefit from such legislation? The nursing homes, because of their pioneering status, have had to take a tremendous amount of criticism. They have taken it, and they have steadily progressed. As you probably know, there was a time when public agencies came to our then infant association for advice and guidance in the preparation of standards for nursing homes. Have all of us forgotten the horrors of the old almshouse? Even the very earliest of proprietary nursing homes represented an unquestioned improvement over the poorhouse. We merely ask now that through the inclusion of proprietary nursing homes in the benefits provided in H. R. 7700 you make it possible for us to improve further the facilities which we originated and initiated in this country. That, we sincerely believe, is not asking too much.

In its declaration of policy this bill states, "It is the conviction of the Congress that there is a serious need throughout the country for a greater number of hospitals and related medical relief and services than now exist or are being planned under existing programs." Whether we find ourselves in total or partial agreement on this point we do want to point out that such need may well be local in nature and that it is a fact that some parts of the country are quite well provided for through existing proprietary nursing home facilities. No one will deny that in some areas there are insufficient beds, and other areas there are vacancies. Be it distinctly understood, however, that it can be readily proven that in those areas where the shortage does not exist that the explanation can be found in the fact that the proprietary nursing homes have provided the facilities.

Our cooperation we now offer in an extended form. Just as we have cooperated with governmental, hospital, and welfare agencies, and various social private agencies, so now are we prepared to cooperate with any medical group plan which may choose to make use of our facilities. The public stands in constantly increasing need of nursing care. If this need is to be met, it is obvious that proprietary nursing homes, the organization best suited to provide this care, should most certainly be included in the planning.

There is one more item which was not at all brought out in previous testimony on H. R. 7341, which bears directly on our contention that the proprietary nursing home has a legitimate, esteemed place in the medical care team in this country. Psychologists, social workers, and people in general who are interested in the humane aspects of patient care (and on this point we are certain we will have the backing of Secretary Oveta Culp Hobby) will agreed that the primary concern in any medical-care program is the patient. Having agreed on that can anyone with proper conscience maintain that institutional atmosphere is preferable to the type of home-like, friendly, loving care atmosphere which is provided in the proprietary type of nursing homes. Many of these patients come from institutions where they have spent months and years. They come into surroundings which are maintained to provide them once again with a feeling of home and friends and not wards and crisp, impersonal uniforms. Proprietary nursing homes offer many advantages over institutionalized, large, cold buildings. Nursing homes are located near the patient's relatives and friends. The patients are given new family within the home and above all, they are given an opportunity to retain the small vestige of pride and self respect which is left to them in their remaining years.

Is there really a need for the creation of new institutions when the simple expedient of a mortgage-insurance plan can make it possible for those who have the best know-how to do the job expeditiously, efficiently, and economically?

One final point that we want to make in addition to what we have already said. We wish to quote from the testimony of the hearing before your committee on H. R. 7341, held on February 4 and 5, 1954, where, on page 108 your Honorable Chairman CHARLES A. WOLVERTON stated:

"Certainly, there is no intention to preclude your organization and the homes that it represents from having the help that is contemplated under H. R. 7700, and if it has not been drawn specifically enough to make it certain that you would have that, I would, as the introducer of that bill, have no objection to amending it in that particular, although at this moment I do not think it will need that amendment. I wish to assure you that the intention is to assist in the operations such as you are representing here this morning.

Mr. Clerk, will you give several copies of H. R. 7700 to Mr. Muse and, too, the statement in connection with it that I issued, so that he may be assured of what I am saying."

We feel certain that the chairman, Mr. WOLVERTON, meant what he said and it is on that score that we request that this patent omission in the bill as it is presently written be corrected. We therefore ask your honorable body to make the necessary insertions, changes, and clarifications so as to include the proprietary nursing homes in the provisions of H. R. 7700. We note that such insertions, changes, and clarifications would be in order in the following sections:

(a) Declaration of Policy and Purposes, section 701.

(b) Definitions, section 702.

(c) Eligibility for Medical Facility Service, section 706.

(d) And in any other portions of the bill necessary to effectuate the changes requested.

We are most grateful for the courtesy you have extended and for the opportunity you have given us to express our thoughts on this particular legislation. We are encouraged by the knowledge that legislation regarding this very important segment of the medical field is being given such thorough and intelligent consideration.

"Alternatives in Indochina: United States Intervention for a Regulated Peace," According to a French Writer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1954

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I have just received a letter from a personal friend and a well-known French writer who sets forth the position of the French citizen in no mistakable terms on the subject of the present situation in Indochina. I will not use his name but if Members of this body are interested in knowing who he is, I will be glad to furnish his name.

Mr. Speaker, I am including at this point an excerpt from his letter under date of April 28, 1954:

> May I take this opportunity of telling you how deeply the Dien Bien Phu tragedy has moved the French Nation. It was obvious to all, as soon as the Viets unmasked their artillery, obtained through China and presumed to be of Czech make, that our men could not withstand the pressure placed upon them. We were all suspended to the radio, hanging on for news of them, amazed, especially those of us who have some experience of war, that they were able to hold out so long. I think you should know of the spirit in which the troops hastily rounded up in France went to something which was obviously quite hopeless and must end in their death or capture.
>
> It may well seem surprising to you that so important a troop was placed in a position where it could not be unblocked by relief columns. I was during the whole war associated with Navarre, and especially in the years of occupation worked with him and learned something of his mind. It is my impression that he was faced with the problem of keeping as much territory as possible as a basis for future operations, by allied forces, and he had not the manpower for defense. I am inclined to think that the Dien Bien Phu garrison was posted so outlandishly to draw off the enemy forces and gain time toward the coming of the rainy season. I may of course be wrong. I do know that his obsession was the lack of adequate forces to conduct the campaign as he thought should be done.
>
> Now what? It is proven that we cannot muster in that distant place enough forces to come to a victorious conclusion or even to hold off permanently and wear out the forces of the opponent. Consequently the time has come when either our allies must intervene with their forces, or we must negotiate. This is the unanimous feeling of the French public. I speak without any personal knowledge of the situation in Indochina, but with ample knowledge of the currents of feeling here. There are those who would prefer allied intervention to negotiation, there are those who would prefer negotiation and fear the consequences of allied intervention. But I know of no one who believes we can continue to go it alone as we have done since the end of 1946.
>
> Indeed if the French Government were to commit itself to pursue the war without any military help from its allies, only material help, there would ensue an erosion of the political regime.
>
> I appreciate that a difficult choice lies before you. It does not seem to me unnatural that it should come to you, as in fact France has no special interests in Indochina. Our economic interests are far too unimportant to weigh in the balance, we have divested ourselves of our political rights in favor of the Associated States. We sustain this war for only two reasons, which are not special to us. In order to defend a common strategic interest of the West, which is only faintly perceived here, and in order to protect the Christian and other elements of the population against the brutalities of Communist rule: this is far more vividly here than the former motive.
>
> However strong the second motive, it is insufficient to inspire ceaseless sacrifice of our best men, unshared by our allies. It may well be that Indochina is not an adequate occasion to send our American troops, but French public opinion feels that it is then not an adequate occasion to expend our troops. The time has come when our allies must either come in with their men or approve our withdrawal and help us to make it honorable.
>
> I do not know what solution is possible if negotiation is resorted to. The Indian-British solution seems to be partition at the 16th parallel. I do not know whether this would be acceptable to the opponent. It is rife with difficulties on our side, not on account of the French but on account of our Vietnam partners who are indignant at the thoughts, and one understands them. However, the solution adopted, I think regrettably, in Korea, creates a precedent. If this solution were accepted by the others and forced upon our Vietnam partners, there is no doubt that our cooperation with them would become very difficult.
>
> Some decision must intervene in a matter of weeks: either allied intervention or negotiation. French public opinion will not, I feel convinced, support the continuation of the present policy.
>
> Thank you for bearing with me.
>
> Very sincerely yours,
>
> —— ——

Canada Reaction to Seaway Mixed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 10, 1954

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks and include a newspaper article, I append a news dispatch with an Ottawa dateline published in the New York Times on May 8, 1954, which completely bears out my contention that Canada wants to build the St. Lawrence seaway without interference from the United States. Why we do not let them do it and thereby save $105 million is beyond my comprehension.

Whether we participate in this project or not, Canada will control it as she does now, and it makes no difference what we do, because whatever tolls that may be charged must be agreeable to us under the treaty agreements between our two countries. It would be most embarrassing if Canada refuses to consider the charging of tolls at all.

I hope my colleagues will read this factual article by Tania Long, the experienced correspondent of the New York Times:

> CANADA REACTION TO SEAWAY MIXED—GOVERNMENT COOL—SEES ACTION AS UNILATERAL—MANY CITIES WELCOME UNITED STATES DECISION
>
> (By Tania Long)
>
> OTTAWA, May 7.—Official Ottawa did not share today in the rejoicing of many Canadian cities and inland harbors over the final approval by Congress of its St. Lawrence seaway bill.
>
> While municipal authorities happily predicted a new era of industrial expansion and prosperity as a result of the long-awaited project, the Government's attitude remained cool.
>
> The view was that if the United States wanted to participate with Canada in a joint construction program it should put forward some proposal to that effect. No such proposal having been made, Canada was officially, at least, going ahead with plans to build the seaway on its own.
>
> Canada's position was clearly stated by Prime Minister Louis St. Laurent last night when he told the House of Commons that he was ready to discuss with the United States any suggestion it might have for the construction of the seaway provided it did not incur additional delays.
>
> The passage of the United States bill is not regarded here as an offer to participate with Canada in the billion-dollar project, which will open the Great Lakes to deep-sea shipping.
>
> Rather, it is considered as a unilateral action on the part of the United States to build within United States territory a canal and locks along 46 miles of the International Rapids section of the river.
>
> ### CANADA IS UNCOMMITTED
>
> Canada, it is noted with some emphasis here, is in no way committed to a joint participation with the United States in the seaway. Twenty years ago and even as late as 7 years ago when tentative agreements were drawn up by the two nations for a joint program, only to fail to win congressional approval, Canada was eager to share in the project.
>
> It is suggested now that were it not for the protracted negotiations necessary before a truly international project could be worked out, on a 50-50 basis, Canada would have preferred such a solution to the one that might evolve as a result of United States action.
>
> This is, that the United States will build a part of the project on its own, and that Canada will do the major work of enlarging and deepening the channels from Montreal to Lake Erie on her own.
>
> Rather than this, Canada would greatly prefer to build an all-Canadian seaway. Since 1951, Canada has made no secret of the fact she hoped the United States would only come into the power phase of the whole program and stay out of the seaway.
>
> Complete control by Canada would have many advantages. In the first place Canada would benefit more financially than if she shared tolls and other revenue.
>
> Second, it is unofficially estimated that an all-Canadian seaway would be cheaper to construct. This is advanced as one argument that Canada might use to urge the United States to alter its present plans.
>
> As matter stand, Canadian thought on the question may be summed up with the words, "too little and too late."
>
> ### POLITICAL FOOTBALL EXPECTED
>
> Canadians say that the cost of the United States project comes to only one-third of what Canada will have to spend in completing the work and there is regret that the American offer to participate has come at a time when Canada was quite ready to build the seaway alone.
>
> As expressed in a lead editorial in the Ottawa Citizen, the "historic event would have been hailed with more enthusiasm in this country had it happened a few years earlier."
>
> As it is, the editorial says "Canada's own plans for an independent enterprise are so far advanced that this tardy measure is more an embarrassment than a source of satisfaction."
>
> The Toronto Telegram takes a similar line but adds, "The prospect that the seaway when built may remain a football of American politics and subject to malicious investigation by dimwit Congressmen cools off any Canadian enthusiasm at this late date for praising the House of Representatives for voting for the seaway."
>
> In the meantime, until the United States makes the next move, whether in a proposal for joint participation in the seaway or in some other form, the Canadian Government intends to stand pat on its last official communication to the United States.
>
> This was a memorandum from the Department of External Affairs to the United States Ambassador here dated January 9, 1953.
>
> It stated that having noted President Truman's observation that there was still an opportunity for the United States to join in building the St. Lawrence seaway, the Canadian Government was prepared to discuss any proposal made by the United States providing it would cause no serious delay to the completion of the whole seaway.

It is obvious therefore that if the United States wants to participate it will have to open negotiations immediately for some form of joint operation of the seaway. A large number of important details—such as for instance, the equitable levying of tolls—remains to be ironed out by the two countries.

Mixed Feelings in Montreal

Montreal, May 7.—This port, Canada's largest, had mixed feelings today over the ultimate effects of the St. Lawrence seaway project.

It welcomed congressional approval of the project with reservation since it shares with New York grave misgivings over its future once the seaway is completed. This was apparent in much of the comment offered on the legislation.

The chamber of commerce said cautiously that "nobody can be sure at this stage what the effects of the seaway will be on Montreal. But a locality cannot stand in the way of the development of the whole country."

J. P. Boyle, president of the Shipping Federation of Canada, the representative body of the country's private shipping interests, said there would be no immediate concern since the seaway would not be a reality at least until 1960.

"There is some fear that the port will be bypassed as a great shipping center. But, although there is strong sectional opposition to it, we can't impede progress. The seaway will benefit all Canada," he said.

The strongest fear is that Montreal will become a whistle stop on the run into the lakes. Critics believe most foreign ships on the St. Lawrence will be designed for passage to the lakes so that the major share of inward and outward freight won't even touch this port.

Several prominent authorities have done their best to debunk these theories.

HARBOR REMODELING PLANNED

A committee of Federal engineers appointed 3 years ago reported emphatically that Montreal's title of "world's largest inland port" would not become a hollow boast after completion of the seaway.

It has already been shown that Montreal's value as a defense, supply, and production post would be incalculable in another war if the seaway becomes a reality. A vast remodeling of the harbor already is planned, allowing berthing space for more ships.

Navigation will be made easier through elimination of the powerful St. Mary's current, which washes along the harbor now. Industrial sites created by reclamation of river areas will bring industry closer to shipment points.

Frederick D. McCaffrey, traffic manager of the Central Commerce & Navigation Co., said recently the seaway would bring a boom rather than a decline to Montreal.

He noted that the seaway would limit the size of ships. Apart from that, vessels using the channel probably would have to lighten here and stop off on the way out. Then too Montreal has standing facilities that it would take any lake port years to rival.

Nonetheless, the predominant feeling among shipping officials is "wait and see."

The Bryson Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 10, 1954

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, I should like at this time to insert in the Record, by request, the following three letters in favor of the Bryson bill which place liquor advertising under certain prohibitions:

Central Methodist Church,
Arlington, Va., May 4, 1954.

Hon. Joseph Broyhill,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Congressman Broyhill: I am enclosing a petition signed by citizens in your district. Will you do us the favor of presenting this petition to the House and have a note made of it in the Congressional Record?

Anything that you can do in addition to your individual support to get the Bryson bill, H. R. 1227, enacted into law will be greatly appreciated.

Very respectfully,

J. L. Kibler.

To Our Congressman:

We, the undersigned citizens of Virginia, in view of the appalling toll of murder on our highways called to our attention by the President, and of the recent frightening disclosures of the Senate hearing on juvenile delinquency, urgently beg you to remove unfair inducement to drivers to drink and the dangerous influence of sales talk for alcoholic beverages being channeled into our very homes over the air to the eyes and ears of our children by voting for and passing the Bryson bill, H. R. 1227.

J. L. Kibler, W. B. Welkinson, Edith B. Frank, Frances Manston, Mrs. Cecil Eggleston, Mr. and Mrs. Charles Bonneville, Marie Lindsay, Freda Kibler, Gladys Batman, B. G. Kibler, E. B. Miller, C. W. Bragg, Mrs. C. W. Bragg, Frank B. Williams, Arlington, Va.; Veta V. Donock, Falls Church, Va.; Carl N. Lindsey, Mrs. E. F. Ligon, Mrs. L. H. Randall, Mae M. Mills, Mrs. Clara Williams, Warren A. Hitt, James E. Grim, Mr. C. R. Brooks, C. S. Smith, Mr. and Mrs. Bob Lear, Mr. and Mrs. J. E. Cooper, Mrs. C. I. Lusby, Arlington, Va.

C. I. Lusby, Mr. and Mrs. Roy Sprinkles, Mr. K. L. Johnson, Veeve L. Eldred, Mrs. C. H. Georgie, Mr. and Mrs. William E. Clayborne, Mrs. Clarence Fleming, Mrs. Nettie Barr, Mrs. Clara Hollingsworth, Mrs. Charles Boegett, Lois D. Davenport, Virginia L. Brooks, Ernest L. Brooks, Fairfax, Va.; M. S. Maddox, Mr. and Mrs. Billy D. Crawley, Beulah T. Roland, Henry Maddox, Nell Leybarn, Mrs. Elliot, Mrs. H. Maddox, Mrs. Priscilla Packwood, Blythe McKenney, Wilma W. Schmidt, Joseph E. Cooper, Ellen B. Bowler, Dennis Kinkaid, Mrs. E. S. Hollady, Virginia R. Harpham, Myrtle N. Kibler, Miriam W. Guy, Arlington, Va.

To Our Representatives in Congress:

We the undersigned, citizens of the United States of America, desiring to claim the right to be free in our homes, implied in articles III and IV of the Bill of Rights, earnestly beg you to grant us a hearing on and to pass legislation prohibiting the broadcasting over radio and TV of advertisements of alcoholic beverages, and also to prohibit the transportation in interstate commerce of magazines and newspapers carrying such advertising. We request that the following names be inserted in the Congressional Record:

Mrs. A. E. McCurdy, Mattie O. Harris, Cora L. Worlsey, Julia W. Remhard, Lonia Wilson, Anna L. Payne, Lillian W. Payne, Ruth Burke, Lucy Gibson, Addie S. Horner, Eleanor M. Wilson, Jessie T. Lasswell, Lula M. Huskey, Mildred Fairfax, Vesta K. McCurdy, Arville E. McCurdy, Moss H. Pennington, Effie J. Hill, Louise A. Vliet, A. M. Vliet, L. A. Vliet, Mary G. Vliet, Robert O. Pennington, Julia F. Fox, D. Eugene Brown, Arlington, Va.

Lancill Hildebrand, Pearl Jones, H. P. Myers, Jessie E. McCubbin, Arlington, Va.; Ada D. Everett, Washington, D. C.; E. June Rooks, Josephine H. Farmer, Euzela Grantham, Grace E. Hamilton, Lottie L. Shepherd, Edith Upperco, Alvena Cooper, Carroll Upperco, Mary Douglas, M. A. Dewey Walker, Oda Laswell, Jeanette Wilson, Lucy Y. Robinson, Bessie Y. Copeland, Allie D. Bawler, Glenn T. Bebber, H. L. Bowler, Arlington, Va.; Ruth M. Ford, Bowie, Md.; Beatrice Y. Hailstorks, Washington, D. C.; Mildred M. Riley, Arlington, Va.

Hon. Joel T. Broyhill,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Broyhill: Will you please promptly present this petition to the House and have it noted in the Congressional Record?

As Christian citizens we hereby petition you to request the chairman of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee for a public hearing on Bryson bill (H. R. 1227) in the near future, to facilitate its getting to the House for vote, and then to vote for it. We do not like liquor advertising.

Thank you for the fine things you have already done for us.

Respectfully.

Ona W. Haverkamp, Marion E. Beard, Helen Buskey, Helen T. Hayes, Martha James, Mrs. Anna Newcomer, Cora A. Fields, Ida E. Beard, Emmie Griggs, Ethel F. Hodgson, Evelyn F. Dow, Arlington, Va.; May E. Reamy, Fairfax, Va.; Lillie J. Fetter, Maria H. Crahill, Mrs. Clare B. Deming, Mrs. Edith F. Johnson, Mrs. A. F. Augster, F. W. Haverkamp, Arlington, Va.

W. P. Beard, Walter F. Shaw, Arlington, Va.; Clyde W. Humphrey, Alexandria, Va.; Henry Richert, R. E. Noucher, E. J. Johnson, Oliver Whitvellwitz, Jesse J. Bell, H. P. Paden, F. N. Dean, Rachel L. Bell, Ruth C. Paden, B. C. Harrison, M. E. Waltz, A. F. Augster, Sr., Mrs. A. F. Augster, Sr., Mami H. Wurts, Le Roy F. Deming, Cris Howard, Arlington, Va.

Modern European Democracy Began in Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 10, 1954

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include a splendid and informative article, Modern European Democracy Began in Poland, written by Rev. Ferdinand E. Slejzer, of the Holy Trinity Church, Lowell, Mass., appearing in the issue of May 8, 1954, of the Pilot, Boston, Mass.:

Modern European Democracy Began in Poland

(By Rev. Ferdinand E. Slejzer)

"Veni, vidi, vici" (I came, I saw, I conquered) was the message received by the friends of Caesar as he successfully routed Pharnaces Ponticus at the first assault.

"Venimus, vidimus, Deus vicit" (We came, we saw, God conquered) was the message sent to the Vatican by John Sobieski, King of Poland, when he defeated the Turks at Vienna and thus saved Christian Europe from the flood of Islam.

Each message pronounced the character of a great man.

One was written in the boisterous tone of a Roman; the other with the pious simplicity of a Pole. One was based on egotism; the other on the love of God. Caesar fought and conquered for the sake of laurels and glory; Sobieski for the love of God and religious freedom.

In this, Sobieski personifies the freedom-loving Pole who despises agression but fights religiously for the moral rights of humanity. He symbolises the Poles' traditional unrelenting struggle against every tyranny—for the heart of a Pole beats with respect for justice.

Poland always strived to live in accord with her neighbors as the love of God taught her the principles of peace. She was reluctant to form huge armies lest they create a martial spirit within, and an unfounded suspicion without, the nation.

This belief was so strong that her neighbors—Russia, Austria, and Prussia—took advantage of the unpreparedness, and in 1773, joined their forces and helped themselves to a portion of Poland's territory under the guise of bringing order to a chaotic state.

GREAT DIET

This treacherous absorption awoke the spirit of every Pole. In some 15 years, there was achieved, by successive stages, a change in the mental life of the nation. The symptoms of the awakening of sound political ideas became more and more numerous. The light of learning spread. National consciousness, the consciousness of independence from foreign guaranties, was intensified. The Great Diet was convoked in 1788.

"Foreign observers had followed the activities of this congress with skepticism and ironical indifference. The Poles were regarded as noisy, troublesome, and childish people—outlandish in their ideals, fickle in temper, and incapable of great and decisive deeds. The problem was whether they should live under the tutelage of Russia or Prussia, provided they did not lose their political existence altogether. So thought the world.

"But after the 3d of May 1791, the world began to take the Poles more seriously. It was now the general belief that the nation would, after all, effect its regeneration if only it were allowed to work out its destinies undisturbed. The great question now was whether the neighboring states would permit a revival which would in many ways alter the balance of power and cut short many cherished ambitions." (R. H. Lord, the Second Partition of Poland.)

At first, Prussia and Austria responded in an unexpectedly favorable manner. But, as history bears out, in 1793, "the foremost ruler in Christendom, served by a well-trained army, flushed with military, naval, and diplomatic triumphs, and restrained by no great state or statesman, deliberately elected to assassinate the progressive Republic. Her accomplice, Prussia, was now a purblind power whose treachery made its greed yet more repulsive."

When Catherine of Russia boasted that the partition had gone off as smoothly as butter the Poles might claim that within the framework of a smaller state they had proved that they could educate and legislate with the best.

But what was this much-lauded constitution of the 3d of May?

Posterity joins the best contemporary opinion in deeming the constitution of the 3d of May one of the greatest achievements in Polish history.

That incandescent moment when King Stanislaus and his parliament, having sworn to the constitution in the Cathedral of St. John, joined in the solemn Te Deum to the thunder of the castle guns has never lost its inspiration. It had been proved that ordered liberty, evolved in England and analyzed in France, could be adapted by another nation to its special needs. The age was an age of monarchy, and the Poles had long been proud of their republic. Yet, while the French uprooted monarchy, the Poles made it respectable.

KUDOS FROM ABROAD

Edmund Burke compared the French and Polish revolutions greatly to the advantage of the latter and passed a noble eulogy upon the new document. Best wishes and congratulatory messages came from the Vatican. Plaudits arrived from America and from Sweden. Holland issued a commemorative medal to observe the constitution's birth. Newspapers and magazines throughout the world offered printed laurels to this parchment of historical human attainment.

Poland, by the first of the 11 articles, remained Roman Catholic, but tolerant, save of apostasy from the national faith. The nobles retained their privileges; townsmen remained eligible for ennoblement; agreements between peasants and their lords came within the purview of the law. The legislature of two chambers was to include assessors from towns. Apart from sudden emergencies, it would meet every 2 years, as well as 4 times every century to revise the constitution.

"The 'liberum veto' and 'confederation' vanished. The king might propose laws but these must be laid before the Diet. He received a suspensive veto from one Diet to the next. He shared executive power with a council of 6 guardians of the laws, comprising the primate as head of the educational commission, and the heads of 5 departments. The throne remained elective but in families. The king, having sworn to the constitution, became sacrosanct and irresponsible. He received the rights of pardon, of command in war, and of nominanting bishops and civil and military officials, but the guardians of the laws were always at hand to frustrate autocracy. Such was the constitution in whose honor a new church, that of divine providence was to be built in Warsaw." (The ,Cambridge History of Poland.)

"Desiring to make use of the present juncture in Europe, and of that moment of impending catastrophe which has restored us to ourselves, free from the shameful commands of foreign violence, valuing dearer than life, than personal happiness, the political existence, the external independence and internal freedom of the nation," the Diet passed the Government bill of the third of May, 1791.

Regarding this constitution as a threat to their divine right of rule, the absolute rulers of Prussia, Austria, and Russia hastened to stifle Poland's democracy. The partitions of 1793 and 1795 followed.

And after 123 years of national extinction, Poland was reborn as a sovereign state in 1918 only to be plunged into serfdom once again in 1939.

Attempts even today are being made with ruthless cruelty to break the heart and the spirit of a gallant people who refuse to submit to tyranny. But some people cannot be vanquished. The flower of their youth may be cut down in battle. Their cities may be reduced to rubble. But their spirit will survive the tyrant, and will emerge strong and victorious when he has been overthrown.

Such a people are the Poles.

Rural Electrification Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 29, 1954

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, if there is one thing I enjoy more than a good laugh it is a real belly laugh.

I appreciate the sense of humor which some of our department heads display from time to time. The country at large has a wrong impression of the lack of humor and the inability to joke so often attributed to bureaucrats.

Ancher Nelsen, rural electrification administrator, displayed a terrific sense of humor with tongue in cheek praise for his agency recently in my native New Orleans.

Mr. Nelsen was in New Orleans to tell the people down there what a great job the REA was doing. He was wonderfully pleased with himself and the manner in which the REA was operating under his direction. He was so pleased he even had this to say to the folks down there who took his statement at face value and undoubtedly believed what he was saying, because they had no way to know what a jocular fellow he was and how be enjoyed his little joke.

Mr. Nelsen said this:

> In the 10 months since I took office REA has approved more loans in terms of number and amounts than were approved in the corresponding period the year before.
>
> This means that we are aggressively meeting the needs of the borrowers.

Now that is really a giggle.

On the same day that the good and well-satisfied Mr. Nelsen was making that pretty speech, his own agency, after having under consideration for some 4 years, 10 months of which belonging to Mr. Nelsen's stewardship, was finally waking up to learn what its policy was.

Unbelievable?

Not if you have ever had any dealings with the REA.

Having in the major part an urban district, I have not previously been thrown in contact with the REA on a practical basis, although I have always been suspicious of its expressed intent and the manner in which it actually operated. This experience has, indeed, been enlightening.

It all started back in 1950, when a group of individuals headed by Mr. John E. Potthurst, a leading civic and businessman in New Orleans, accepted the expressed intentions of the REA at its face value. He had not as yet learned the true facts about this agency. He really believed that the REA wanted to supply electricity to rural areas where electricity could not otherwise be supplied. Silly boy.

First it was one thing and then it was another. It was always going to be consummated shortly—that "shortly" soon became an apparent eternity.

First one set of question would be asked. When they would be answered then another set of questions would be forthcoming. But the patience of Mr. Potthurst and his associates was something to admire. Job had nothing on them.

Through the years the stumbling, the fumbling, and the bumbling continued and still no electricity for the people of lower Plaquemines Parish.

Ah, but a new day was to dawn. A new administration came into power. The redoubtable Mr. Ancher Nelsen was made the Administrator. I breathed a sign of relief and satisfaction. I was willing to forget the years and months which had gone before, because now here was action in its finest form and did not Mr. Nelsen boast about his expeditious way of handling things. I did not know he was such a jokester at that time.

Well, after 10 months hagling during which time I was promised repeatedly that everything would be all right and finally saw the application of the folks interested sent to the so-called legal department of the REA for a perfunctory examination. I was assured and reassured, and so was Mr. Pottharst, that the signing of the paper was almost a mere formality and perfunctionary piece of business.

What a brute for punishment I was. I actually believed them though I dread to think that my naivete should leak out.

Tired by more delay I asked for a "yes" or "no" answer by a certain day and I got it.

The answer was "No."

Anyway it was the first time that something definite had been said after 4 years, but imagine my surprise when I was informed that it was suddenly discovered that it was against the policy of the REA to make such loans for rural electrification. It took Mr. Nelsen 10 months to find out what the policy of the REA was and he came up with the scintillating observation that the REA was only for farmers and to hell with everybody else. That one really threw me. I did not recall having read anywhere in the law that REA was only for farmers so I asked to be shown the law. You will enjoy reading the reply.

I am including my letter and the reply so you can wonder how foolish can some people get.

Anyway, it now appears that the policy of the REA has been finally established.

It is all right to lend money to five unqualified individuals, but it is not all right to lend money to an established small public utilities which only wants to do business as an operator under what has been called free enterprise.

The REA, under its existing policy, would much prefer to subsidize a group where there is no chance of getting the taxpayers' money back than to assist a small concern to help the people of a specific area.

It matters little to the REA that this small utility company has spent much money on the false promises of the REA. It means little to the REA that actual work orders were issued. After all they were only scraps of paper.

Anyway, here is the chronological story of this fantastic transaction as furnished to me by Mr. Pottharst. Read it and you will understand why Mr. Nelsen's remarks at New Orleans gave me such a belly laugh.

At the end I am also including the letter from Mr. Fred H. Strong; my letter to him asking what does he mean "only farmers can get aid"; and then his reply to me. They are all good for a laugh, but unfortunately there is tragedy in this laugh because as usual the taxpayer and the little fellow gets it in the neck and the bureaucrat sits back and gets his laugh at the Congress. But why should he not laugh because Congress will not do anything at all about it.

The moral of this experience is that bureaucrats and bureaucracy have not changed a bit even if the name of the party has changed from Democrat to Republican.

Here is the story for the record—but remember the people still do not have the electricity and the chances they will not get electricity as long as the REA takes years to make decisions and months to determine policy and interpret the law to its own satisfaction:

LOUISIANA 27—PLAQUEMINES

Mr. Kenneth C. Barranger wrote Mr. E. E. Karns, REA, August 15, 1949, reorganizing limited profit corporation of electric cooperative for line to run from Venice, across the river, 8 miles down east bank to Pilottown, then 18 miles from there to Burrwood.

Letter application to REA, October 22, 1949, $488,000 for purchasing and installing dual fuel (natural gas) powerplant.

Application for generating plant allocation with REA by Peoples Utilities, November 2, 1949: Louisiana—27 plaquemines.

Capacity of plant, 5,000 kilowatts.

Estimated cost of generating plant including substation at plant, $970,000.

Mr. Pottharst wrote Mr. Karns January 25, 1950, submitting application for loan of $520,189; $194,815 of this for extension of distribution system to areas not now served, and $325,374 for installation of new equipment.

Congressman HÉBERT wired Mr. Pottharst February 3, 1950: "Karns assures will expedite to fullest. * * * Involves powerplant heavy rural construction. Necessary studies must be made before final action taken. Will take few weeks to complete."

Mr. Karns wired Mr. Pottharst February 7, 1950: "Application under study. Unable to predict time limit for final decision."

Mr. Pottharst wrote Congressman HÉBERT June 14, 1950: "All legal technicalities are dispensed with. * * * The last time we talked with them they said what with people going on vacations and other very simple projects to lend money to, they had put ours off (because it was a tough one) until they had plenty of time."

Congressman HÉBERT wrote Mr. Pottharst July 3, 1950, that he was that day advised by Mr. K. T. Hutchinson, Assistant Secretary, Department of Agriculture, that application for loan funds submitted by Peoples Utilities, Inc., presents some rather complex problems because funds have been requested to finance the purchase and installation of a generating unit in company's existing generating plant, as well as funds to finance rural distribution facilities, and that he hopes a decision on application can be reached within next 60 to 90 days.

Mr. Barranger wrote a memo to Mr. Pottharst September 7, 1950, to the effect that Mr. Karns had advised him over the phone that morning that he had reopened the file and was writing Mr. Tom Hardeman, his field man, to come to New Orleans on Monday or Tuesday of coming week to confer with Mr. Waldermar Nelson (Peoples Utilities' engineering firm). Mr. Karns told him that classification of consumers and load estimates should be gone over again, that according to present estimates, the loan on the existing lines is increasing too rapidly. Mr. Karns mentioned that the estimated cost of construction of the line from Venice to Burrwood and Port Eads had jumped from $180,000 to $300,000.

Information in great detail given to Mr. Tom Hardeman on September 15, 1950, in line with foregoing.

Congressman HÉBERT wrote Secretary Brannan, Department of Agriculture, October 5, 1950, that the matter was hanging fire for over a year, that he had phoned Mr. Karns that date and was informed by him "it would be disposed of at some future date."

Senator RUSSELL LONG wrote Administrator Wickard, REA, Washington, on October 12, 1950, that 1 year had elapsed since he had a conference with some of their officials, and requesting prompt action.

Mr. Karns wired Mr. Pottharst October 19, 1950: "Relative letter regarding joint use of facilities regret final recommendations cannot be made until application for a loan has been approved."

Congressman HÉBERT sent Mr. Pottharst on October 20, 1950, a copy of a letter from Mr. Hutchinson, Acting Secretary, Agriculture Department, dated October 18, 1950, advising that "the only simple answer that could have been given up to now would have been disapproval of the application for loan funds for this project." Mr. Hutchinson further stated:

"The first request for REA assistance in meeting the electric needs of the people in the area around Pilottown and Burrwood came in the form of a letter dated August 15, 1949, requesting information regarding forming cooperative. Application for loan to cooperative was submitted October 25, 1949. Within a month REA completed preliminary studies and four proposals emerged. Two discarded immediately as unfeasible because of limited number of potential customers to be served and because of the unusually high costs of wholesale power, construction, and operation which could be anticipated. Third possibility was purchase of the facilities of Peoples Utilities by a cooperative to serve entire area; this was dropped because cost of acquisition, $700,000, was found to be too high to allow for reasonable rates and repayment of the loan.

"Sole remaining possibility seemed to be loan to Peoples Utilities to serve all those in the area wanting electricity, and Mr. J. E. Pottharst, for the company, was so informed. On January 25, 1950, an application was submitted for loan in amount $520,189. By middle of June all requested data was submitted, and REA members began preparation of a detailed loan recommendation for Administrator's consideration. Questions of feasibility and loan security were narrowed down to two rather fundamental items:

"1. Peoples Utilities, because already mortgaged, apparently not in position to give REA adequate security for loan.

"2. Company, even before reducing rates as indicated would be done to bring rates in line with others in area, was operating at loss averaging about $1,000 per month.

"Until these two points could be cleared up, no loan could be approved.

"REA undertook to develop solutions to these problems. Some thought was given to possibility of setting up a subsidiary corporation which would then be in position to offer first mortgage as security for Government loan, but no realistic basis could be found for separating facilities for such subsidiary.

"During August REA learned company had under consideration substantial refinancing on its own initiative, which might strengthen company position for further consideration of Government loan, however, this would change financial structure of company and render useless much of survey completed last spring. As soon as applicant has completed refinancing REA will be in position to take additional steps towards a decision on feasibility of loan."

Congressman HÉBERT wrote Mr. Pottharst November 29, 1950, that he was that day advised by Mr. Claude Wickard, Administrator, REA, that representative of Power Division of his Administration would be sent to New Orleans on December 4, 1950, to meet with fieldmen of Finance and Loan Divisions to discuss application.

Mr. Karns wired Mr. Pottharst November 29, 1950, that meeting would be held at Monteleone Hotel, then proceed to area to be served, and asking if Mr. Pottharst, attorney and engineer could meet with them on December 4, 1950, with available details to assist with study. Mr. Pottharst wired Mr. Karns interested parties would be on hand December 4, 1950.

Mr. E. F. Renshaw, regional head, Applications and Loans Division, REA, wrote Mr. Barranger May 21, 1951, "unable to say when our study will be completed but assure you we will give it every possible consideration."

Mr. Wickard, Administrator, REA, wrote Congressman Hébert June 8, 1951, that revised application submitted by Plaquemines Electric Cooperative, Inc., in February 1951, is for 68 miles of line to serve 236 customers near mouth of Mississippi River, that considerable work has been gone into, and problems encountered very difficult; that under the plan as now proposed the cooperative contemplates purchasing wholesale power from Peoples Utilities, Inc., and that REA had recently written Peoples Utilities, Inc., for proposal and if they agree to supply a satisfactory wholesale rate to the cooperative, REA will be in position to resume their studies of the loan application.

Mr. Barranger sent June 11, 1951, to Mr. Thomas B. Dunphy, Head, Power Procurement Division, REA, copy of contract submitted to Plaquemines Electric Cooperative, Inc., by Peoples Utilities, Inc.

Receipt of Mr. Barranger's letter June 11, 1951, to Mr. Dunphy, acknowledged by Mr. E. F. Renshaw, Section Head, Applications and Loans Division, REA on July 23, 1951, advising they were proceeding to analyze the feasibility of the application based on rate contained in proposal.

Mr. William C. Wise, Acting Administrator, REA, wrote Senator Long on September 18, 1951, that according to the terms of the contract submitted by Peoples Utilities to Plaquemines Electric Cooperative, the average cost of power would be approximately ⅓ cent per kilowatt-hour, which is far in excess of what REA-financed borrowers in Louisiana are paying for purchased power, and that it was believed that they would be in a position to make a decision within the near future.

On September 24, 1951, Mr. William C. Wise, Acting Administrator, authorized allotment on Form ADM-125A, United States Department of Agriculture, REA, controlled material allotment serial No. 8–6934, system designation, Louisiana 27 Plaquemines, of 64,800 pounds of copper wire for third quarter of 1952.

On October 2, 1951, Mr. Thomas B. Dunphy wrote Mr. Barranger that while previous discussions with Peoples Utilities indicated average cost of purchased power would approximate 1.25 cent per kilowatt-hour the average cost of power under the proposed rate schedule before adjustment by the "All Commodities Index" would be 1.91 cent per kilowatt-hour for 300 hours use of maximum allowable demand, which is still above the level of feasibility for the proposed loan. Mr. Dunphy suggested that negotiations with Peoples Utilities, Inc. be reopened for the purpose of agreeing upon a contract approximately the "Standard Contract Form" attached to his letter of October 2, 1951 and providing average power cost approaching 1.25 cent level mentioned in earlier discussions, and that the possibility of supply from the system of Louisiana Power & Light Co. should be more thoroughly investigated from the viewpoint of competitive cost and adequacy of service as compared with Peoples Utilities, Inc.

On November 16, 1951, Mr. William H. Callaway, Section Head, Applications and Loan Division, REA, wrote Mr. Barranger that field appraisal would be made early part of December of the entire area to be served eventually by Plaquemines Electric Cooperative prior to REA giving final consideration to their application for loan.

Mr. Thomas Dunphy wrote Mr. Barranger December 21, 1951, giving schedules under which cooperatives in Louisiana were purchasing electric service from Louisiana Power & Light Co., Gulf States Utilities Co., and Central Louisiana Electric Co., Inc.

Mr. William C. Wise, Deputy Administrator wrote Congressman Hébert on January 28, 1952, that REA were considering the application for a loan from the Plaquemines Electric Cooperative, Inc.

Mr. Pottharst wrote Mr. Barranger April 22, 1952, offering to reduce rates of Peoples Utilities to Cooperative, which data Mr. Barranger sent on to Mr. Calloway and Mr. Dunphy on April 23, 1952.

On May 2, 1952, Mr. R. E. Payne, Section Engineer, Engineering Division, REA, Washington, advised Peoples Utilities that due to the necessity for providing assistance to the telephone program it had been decided to give certain field engineers specialized training in telephone engineering to more actively participate, and that Mr. Sprout, field engineer, would be absent from his headquarters from May 8, 1952, to June 13, 1952, and requesting that all routine matters requiring his attention be deferred until his return.

On October 2, 1952, Mr. Herbert Wales wrote Mr. Pottharst (acting for Mr. John W. Scott, Director, Southwest Area Office, REA, requesting conference with Mr. Pottharst and their field representatives, Glazier and Cox during October or November. This letter for some reason not received until November 4, 1952, after Mr. Glazier had visited Mr. Pottharst, on which date Mr. Pottharst advised Mr. Wales that Mr. Glazier had called on him. Mr. Scott acknowledged this letter of November 24, 1952, stating they hoped to be able to advise Peoples Utilities about the middle of December 1952 regarding their analysis of Peoples Utilities proposal.

Mr. Pottharst wrote Mr. Scott on January 6, 1953, that Peoples Utilities were expecting to hear from REA daily. Mr. Richard Richter replied for Mr. Scott that their field representative, Mr. Cox, would arrange to visit at an early date.

Congressman Hébert advised Mr. Pottharst January 19, 1953, that he had talked with Mr. Scott's office and was informed they had been in contact with Mr. Pottharst and had a field representative scheduled to talk with him the following week.

Mr. Cox confirmed on February 4, 1953, to Mr. Pottharst the matters discussed with him on his recent visit.

Mr. Pottharst wrote Mr. Scott on February 6, 1953, outlining the basis that Mr. Cox stated REA would be willing to consider application for loan funds.

On February 18, 1953, Mr. Scott wrote Mr. Pottharst REA were continuing their studies on the basis of his letter of February 6, 1953, borrowing funds up to 80 percent of cost of facilities and Peoples Utilities contributing 20 percent, and stated that they hoped to advise Mr. Pottharst in approximately 2 to 3 weeks regarding his proposal.

Mr. Pottharst wrote Mr. Scott February 25, 1953, requesting that the matter be given preferred attention.

Mr. Scott wrote Mr. Pottharst March 17, 1953, that conferences had been held with Power Division, who were then completing a preliminary study to determine size of unit required to provide firm power for farm and nonfarm establishments to be served. Advised future designation of application would be "Louisiana PUI."

Mr. Scott requested further data from Mr. Pottharst on April 20, 1953, which was given to him in detail April 27, 1953.

After conference with Mr. Scott on May 11, 1953, Mr. Pottharst forwarded to Mr. Scott information requested, which Mr. Richter acknowledged on May 15, 1953, stating they were transmitting to Power Division. Now designated as "Louisiana 28 PREC."

Mr. Pottharst wrote Congressman Hébert May 25, 1953, requesting he contact Mr. Scott for approval.

Congressman Hébert wired Mr. Pottharst May 29, 1953: "Agriculture Department reports in touch with you all day yesterday. Should have definite information today."

Another wire from Congressman Hébert to Mr. Pottharst, May 29, 1953: "Scott advises talked with you today. Doing everything possible to assist. States he plans to call you again June 8 re matter."

Mr. Scott wrote Mr. Pottharst May 29, 1953, requesting further information, which was furnished him on June 8, 1953.

On June 16, 1953, after phone conversation with Mr. Scott, Mr. Pottharst wrote him in great detail re data requested. Acknowledged on June 19, 1953.

Congressman Hébert wrote Mr. Pottharst and July 3, 1953 advising that he had been that day advised by the Administrator, REA, that a preliminary study of the application had been completed and letter had been written to Mr. Pottharst outlining in detail REA's conclusions.

On September 3, 1953, Mr. J. K. O'Shaughnessey for Mr. Ancher Nelsen, Administrator, REA, wrote Congressman Hébert acknowledging the Congressman's letter of August 25, 1953, inquiring as to the status of the application for loan, stating that there were a number of legal problems to be resolved before they could complete their final analysis and that they expected this would require at least 2 or 3 weeks to work out the details.

On September 10, 1953, Mr. Pottharst wrote Mr. Scott that he had just returned from a month's vacation and found that nothing had transpired on the project since their last conversation.

Mr. Barranger, as representative of Plaquemines Rural Electric Corp., wrote Mr. Scott on September 10, 1953, requesting that he phone him and discuss the progress of the application. This was acknowledged by Mr. R. E. Cole, director, southwest area, to Mr. Barranger on September 18, 1953, stating that as soon as the matter has reached the stage where action on his part would be required, he would be advised without delay.

Mr. Cole wrote Mr. Pottharst September 22, 1953, inquiring if new subsidiary corporation had been organized. Acknowledged by Mr. Pottharst October 1, 1953.

Congressman Hébert wrote Mr. Pottharst October 16, 1953, advising that he had talked with Mr. Cole and was informed REA office was then preparing their recommendations on application for loan, but it would be 2 to 4 weeks before final review could be made.

Mr. Fred H. Strong for Administrator, REA, wired Congressman Hébert November 16, 1953: "Reurtel R. E. Cole loan recommendation prepared by area office October 21. Application now receiving administrative review. Will inform Mr. Pottharst results as soon as possible."

Mr. R. E. Cole wired Mr. Pottharst November 19, 1953: "Please airmail copy of mortgage as executed by Peoples Utilities to National Bank of Commerce." Airmailed to him that day.

As requested in telephone conversation between Mr. Cole and Mr. Pottharst, Mr. Pottharst sent Mr. Cole on November 24 1953, copy of audit report of Peoples Utilities for fiscal year ending August 31, 1953.

Mr. Pottharst wired Mr. Cole December 14, 1953, if Peoples Utilities were granted loan to include line to Venice and tidewater oilfield south of Venice, $75,000, it would be agreeable for loan to be with Peoples Utilities on 80-percent basis.

Wire received from Mr. R. E. Cole by Mr. Pottharst December 12, 1953: "Re tel we will telephone you to discuss possible revisions of loan basis as soon as Office of Solicitor completes its review of indenture and related matters."

In phone conversation with Mr. Pottharst, Mr. Cole stated on December 22, 1953, that administrative department would make a definite proposal by wire that afternoon or the following morning, and if it was acceptable REA would proceed on that basis.

Wire proposal sent to Mr. Pottharst by Mr. Ancher Nelsen on December 23, 1953.

Mr. Pottharst wired Mr. Nelsen at length on December 30, 1953.

Mr. Pottharst wired Mr. Cole on January 8, 1954, there would be no refinancing involved.

This brings us up to Mr. Robert T. Beall's letter of January 13, 1954 (for Mr. Nelsen, Administrator), and Mr. Pottharst's reply of January 18, 1954.

WORK ORDERS

Excerpt from letter by Mr. J. H. Rixse, Jr., REA, to Peoples Utilities, Inc., April 18, 1950:

"We understand that you desire to construct several short extensions by your own crews prior to the making of a loan and that you desire to reimburse your funds by loan funds if and when a loan is made. As you are aware, however, we cannot authorize construction in anticipation of a loan. Such work when accomplished is considered as member extensions and is reported to REA and recorded in the borrower's records by means of construction and retirement work orders. The procedure and documents required are thoroughly explained in the manual of work order procedure, a copy of which is enclosed."

Mr. Waldemar Nelson (of Bedell & Nelson, engineers) wrote Mr. E. E. Karns, REA, re work orders Nos. 101, 102, 103, and 104.

Mr. Nelson advised Mr. Pottharst April 28, 1950, they had received from Washington office of REA following work orders approved by the Application and Loans Division and Engineering Division:

	Amount	Total cost [1]
Work order No. 101—Empire Menhaden Co., extension REA No. D80257, item FP-8-A1	$2,604.58	$2,541.28
Work order No. 102—Quinn Fisheries Co., REA No. D80258, item FP-8-A2	3,841.80	4,176.36
Work order No. 103—Lake Hermitage unit, REA No. D80259	9,349.95	10,215.52
Work order No. 104—Main line extension along highway to feed Lake Hermitage unit extension, item LH-1-A	5,454.81	7,157.26

[1] (Mr. Dubourg, our auditor, advised total cost material and labor.)

Mr. Nelson wrote Mr. H. H. Sprout, Pineville, La., REA representative, May 12, 1950, re Louisiana 27—Plaquemines, regarding having work order No. 104 for Lake Hermitage line approved by applications and loans division and engineering division, and that Peoples Utilities proposed to do the construction with their line crew, and asking that he come down and look this over.

"Mr. Sprout coming down on May 24 to review work," Mr. Nelson advised over phone, May 16, 1950.

Mr. Nelson wrote Pottharst on June 6, 1950, that Mr. Sprout inspected construction already completed on Lake Hermitage extension and passed on Mr. Sprout's recommendations. Mr. Sprout discussed accounting for expenditures, advising in addition to records of labor and material, a record should be kept of the truck mileage.

United States
Department of Agriculture,
Rural Electrification Administration,
Washington, D. C. March 31, 1954.

Mr. J. E. Pottharst, Sr.,
President, Peoples Utilities Co., Inc., New Orleans, La.

Dear Mr. Pottharst: This is in reference to your application for an REA loan to finance 85 percent of the cost of a generating unit and building at Buras, a three-phase line to Venice, and approximately 50 miles of line south of Venice—construction which, together with associated items, would require a loan of approximately $570,000.

After careful review of your application, we regret to advise you that we cannot approve the desired loan.

Under the Rural Electrification Act, the Administrator, in making any loan, must make certain specific findings in respect of feasibility and security. Without reflection upon your company or its future prospects, we have concluded that, with due regard to all relevant consideration—including: (1) The relationship of the proffered REA security to your existing indebtedness (as affecting both generating facilities and distribution system); (2) the practical security problems relating to power supply in the event the Government should be obliged to exercise its remedies under the proposed mortgage; and (3) the problem of continuity of management—we would be unable, under existing standards, to make such certification in the present case.

Moreover, as you know, it was the primary intent of the Congress in enacting the Rural Electrification Act, to provide for the extension of electric service to farmers and related consumers in rural areas. Though the proposed loan would enable you to serve some rural residence, it appears: (1) That approximately 90 percent of the anticipated revenue would be derived from commercial and industrial consumers and approximately 55 percent of the total revenues would be derived from two large industrial loads.

April 2, 1954.

Mr. Fred H. Strong,
Deputy Administrator, Rural Electrification Administration, Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Strong: Thank you very much for your letter of March 31, and enclosed copy of letter which you addressed to Mr. Pottharst in connection with the belated realization that it was contrary to the policy of REA to make loans under such circumstances. The strange thing to me is that it took you 3 months to ascertain the policy of REA in connection with making these loans. Of course; this 3-month period is what you admit; the remaining 2 years and 9 months during which this application has been before the REA is something which you disown but still rests at the door of the Administration itself.

In this connection I would like for you to quote to me specifically and in detail the justification for the statement in your letter which reads: "Moreover, as you know, it was the primary intent of the Congress in enacting the Rural Electrification Act, to provide for the extension of electric service to farmers and related consumers in rural areas."

I would like to know the exact language in the law or the authorization which causes you to make such a statement. My appreciation of the supposed benefit of the law was the extension of electricity to rural areas which otherwise could not be supplied with this power. To be further specific, because my experience in dealing with your agency indicates I must be specific, I want to know where in the law is the term "electric service to farmers and related consumers in rural areas" used.

I will appreciate your cooperation in this matter and hope I may get an answer before next Christmas as I have my Christmas gifts arranged for and won't like to include this one as a gift.

Sincerely yours,
F. Edward Hébert.

United States
Department of Agriculture,
Rural Electrification Administration,
Washington, D. C., April 6, 1954.

Hon. F. Edward Hébert,
House of Representatives.

Dear Mr. Hébert: This is responsive to your letter of April 2 concerning the application of Peoples Utilities Co. for an REA loan.

As stated in my letter of March 31, 1954, to Mr. Pottharst, the REA decision that the pending loan application could not be approved was based upon full study of the application, with due regard to all relevant considerations, including: (1) the relationship of the proferred security to the applicant's existing indebtedness (as affecting both generating facilities and distribution facilities); (2) the practical security problems relating to power supply in the event the Government should be obliged to exercise its remedies under the proposed mortgage; and (3) the problem of continuity of management.

Specifically, however, you inquire concerning my further observation, in such letter, as follows:

"Moreover, as you know, it was the primary intent of the Congress in enacting the Rural Electrification Act, to provide for the extension of electric service to farmers and related consumers in rural areas."

The language of the act (found in sec. 4 thereof) is:

"The Administrator is authorized and empowered * * * to make loans for rural electrification * * * for the purpose of financing the construction and operation of generating plants, electric transmission and distribution lines or systems for the furnishing of electric energy to persons in rural areas who are not receiving central station service."

It was not our intent to draw any distinction, for the purpose of this section, as between a farm on the one hand and an establishment such as a rural residence, a rural store, a rural school or church, etc., on the other. To do so would, we agree, obviously be unsound. Rather, we were pointing out that this entire group of consumers was, as shown by rather clear legislative history in the hearings and debates on the original Rural Electrification Act of 1936, the intended beneficiaries of the act—the persons for whose benefit the act was passed. Suppose, however, as an extreme case, that REA received an application for a loan to a new enterprise in a sizable amount the sole purpose of which was to extend electric service to a single customer—a huge new industrial plant which was technically a "person" in a "rural" area. It would seem doubtful, to say the least, whether such an application would qualify for a loan even under the strictly legal test, and I think you would share such doubt.

Between this extreme case and the normal case of a loan to serve farmers and related rural consumers (such as rural residences, etc.) there are, of course, many conceivable gradations in degree. Though the point was not necessary to our decision in his case, we, in our letter to Mr. Pottharst, were pointing out that elements of this problem were involved in his application since it appeared that approximately 90 percent of the anticipated revenue would be derived from commercial and industrial consumers and approximately 55 percent of the total revenues would be derived from two relatively large industrial loads.

Sincerely yours,
Fred H. Strong,
Deputy Administrator.

Mr. Speaker, can you imagine such a reply to a specific question? Even if the excuse was valid, imagine waiting 10 months to come up with such an answer.

You say it could not happen.

But it did happen, and here in Washington.

Perhaps REA, instead of standing for Rural Electrification Administration, should be changed to mean "resist every attempt" to get results.

West Covina's New Post Office

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PATRICK J. HILLINGS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 10, 1954

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, West Covina, one of the fastest growing cities in the 25th Congressional District and the State of California, is now on the postal map.

During a recent visit to my district, I had the pleasure of presenting a flag to the new post office on the eve of its opening. As the Congressman from that area, this occasion was particularly gratifying to me since it marked the culmination of a long fight on the part of many people.

Some time ago, I received a resolution from the City Council of West Covina urging that a post office be established there. You see, Mr. Speaker, despite the rapid growth of the city, it was faced with the anomalous situation of being served by three different post offices—Covina, Puente, and Baldwin Park. A letter addressed to West Covina under those circumstances usually was returned to the sender undelivered more often than not.

Petitions were received also from a large number of interested citizens in the area. Following my conferences with the Postmaster General, a survey was made by postal inspectors, and a decision was made to open the new post office. It is now possible to mail a letter to West Covina with every assurance that it will be delivered. The new post office is located at 1134 East Garvey Avenue.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I wish to place in the RECORD the following article which appeared in the May 6, 1954, issue of the West Covina Tribune:

WEST COVINA POST OFFICE IN FULL SWING

West Covina has won its 5-year battle for a post office.

The campaign was fought across the battlefields of bureaucracy, through entanglements of redtape and over mountains of confusion and indecision. But the battling West Covinans finally won out.

Ten years ago West Covina wasn't thinking much about having a post office because there wasn't even a thousand residents to worry about it. However, in the meantime, the city has grown to the point where it has a population of more than 18,000 and postal service has become of paramount importance.

In mid-1953, the situation had crystallized to the point where it was predicted that West Covina would have a post office by Christmas of that year. It didn't work out that way, due to the aforementioned redtape and confusion, but 4 months later, in April 1954, the dream came true.

On April 21, Congressman PAT HILLINGS flew in with an American flag that had once flown over the Capitol at Washington, D. C., for presentation to the West Covina post office branch. The following Monday the office was opened at 1134–1136 East Garvey Avenue in the West Covina Center.

The office is a branch of the Covina post office and therefore is under the direction of Covina Postmaster Clay McCarn. However, the operation of the branch is the responsibility of Superintendent E. F. Merrick. Clerk in charge is E. W. Todd. Merrick began his postal career in the Covina office 9 years ago. Todd has been with the Covina office 3 years, transferring there from the Encinitas office.

Working in the branch are 5 clerks, including Merrick and Todd, and 15 carriers.

West Covina branch office will be included in the next supplement to the Postal Guide, according to McCarn, and will soon have its own postmark.

Mr. Speaker, I also wish to include an editorial from the same edition. I wish to acknowledge the fine support in furtherance of this project that I have received from this newspaper and its managing editor, Eddie Faunce.

The editorial follows:

IT'S REALLY HOME

For the first time in its 31 years of existence, residents of West Covina can really call it home.

For the first time since it was incorporated in 1923, residents can now look their questioners in the eye and say: "West Covina is my mailing address."

Gone is the confusion of living in West Covina but having one's official mailing address listed as Covina, Baldwin Park, or Puente * * * anything but West Covina.

Today we have a branch post office, eliminating the confusion.

Today we have full-scale postal services in our own city. No longer do we have to travel to Covina.

But, most important. When we apply for a driver's license we won't have to listen to: "Oh, yes; you live in West Covina, but your real address is Covina, Baldwin Park, or Puente."

Today we are a city.

It's been a long fight. And many persons share in the victory.

First there are the people themselves. They have signed petitions, written themselves, and made phone calls.

On the receiving end of those letters, petitions, and phone calls were city and postal officials who, in turn, forwarded them to Congressman PAT HILLINGS. Working in Washington directly with postal officials, he was able to present our problem.

So while the end credit may rest with Representative HILLINGS, it has been the people of West Covina, speaking through their officials, who have triumphed.

Then there's Postmaster Clay McCarn, who has cut redtape, cut a corner or two and kept Washington informed of the wishes of the people.

Many of the petitions went to the city council. There they were phrased into resolutions and mailed to just about anyone who could help, including Vice President RICHARD NIXON.

All of this helped.

But there is more to be done.

We need our own postmark. Postmaster McCarn assures us that it is on its way. We should be in the Postal Guide. McCarn assures us that this, too, is one its way.

Christ a Threat?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 6, 1954

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, because of the defection of Judas, and because of prior association with that arch-conspirator, I trust that it will never follow that our Lord Jesus Christ was ever a threat to Christianity.

As a five-star general, still on active duty, still drawing the pay and receiving the emoluments bestowed upon him by a grateful and victorious Nation, I trust that Gen. George C. Marshall will yet live to witness the charges leveled against him nullified in the RECORD of the Congress of the United States.

Perhaps a conscience-stricken people will yet signal its Commander in Chief to summon a joint session of the Congress to enable it to do just that.

The Superpatriot—A Menace to American Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY W. WIER
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 10, 1954

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend and revise my remarks in the Appendix, I include an article from the Minneapolis Star of Wednesday, May 5, 1954, by Dr. Charles W. Mayo, famed Rochester, Minn., surgeon, entitled "The Superpatriot—A Menace to American Freedom."

The article is as follows:

THE SUPERPATRIOT—A MENACE TO AMERICAN FREEDOM

(By Dr. Charles W. Mayo)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Following is a speech by Dr. Charles W. Mayo, famed Rochester surgeon, at the annual Minnesota congressional dinner at Washington, D. C., April 27. The dinner was sponsored by the chamber of commerce of Minneapolis, Duluth, Faribault, Redwood Falls, Rochester, St. Cloud, Crookston, the Minnesota Employers Association, and the Minnesota Chamber of Commerce.)

In the postwar period, the warning that we run the risk of investigating ourselves to death has been sounded many times by many persons, yet today the problem confronts us as powerfully as ever.

Each era in our history has presented its peculiar problems that required special solution. We have seen our freedoms threatened before, and eventually have acted wisely in the presence of danger. Our power to act is strengthened by the knowledge of our freedom.

It is not unusual, nor unprecedented, for a nation to be threatened as the United States is today, on two sides, both from within and from without.

Among the perils from within are those which might cause us to lose our freedoms in an overzealous approach to danger in the United States from Communists in government and in our educational system. Of course, we do know that Soviet-style communism undoubtedly is the greatest danger that we or any other free nation face from without.

The agencies of the Federal Government have demonstrated that they are able to cope with the Communist menace from within. Their abilities to do so are being strengthened.

The free world, seeking collective security through the United Nations, presents the most formidable bulwark against aggression in the history of mankind.

What of the superpatriots who threaten our freedom? The answer to this problem rests, I think, with the American people who, when they are in possession of the facts, have the greatest power of any people—the power to act as individuals.

My work is in the field of science. I am shocked and alarmed when other scientists are, in effect, put on trial by groups who do not have the power to try them. And the scientists are not the only ones who have their loyalty questioned. The arms of the investigators have the strength to reach into each American home and expose each skeleton in each closet.

The scientist who, in 1942, looked on Russia as an ally and entertained a Russian in his home apparently might just as well forget about working for the Government, no matter what his views are today.

If he did present himself to the probers, he would need the patience and tolerance of a superhuman. And let him answer the charges. Let him finally win clearance. Is it all over? One of America's most brilliant physicists found out recently that it is not.

Of great help to the superpatriot is a technique that is becoming increasingly popular in America—the second guess. In 1945 we were a victorious Nation. In a seeming flash we found ourselves confronted with a menace greater than the Fascist hordes. Frustrated and bewildered, many of our citizens, however well-meaning, set out to attempt to fix the blame.

Second guessing is a great game. It brings to those who practice it an Olympian feeling of never being wrong. That is because the making of vital decisions is not their concern.

Second guessing, to the extent that it is practiced today, is a frightening thing. It means that a man who honestly and with no malice in his heart made a wrong decision must bear the scar for life, and too often his family are cosufferers.

The drumbeat of the second guesser is growing louder in our Nation. In the minds of many Red hunters, the hasty, irrational decision of a college student suddenly becomes of vital importance to the security of the Nation when the student reaches full maturity.

However, let us put aside the personal feelings of the men who are put to the inquisitor's test. Purely selfishly, let us consider what freedom means in scientific research, what it means to the success of all endeavors.

Scientific pre-eminence and freedom of thought and inquiry are inseparable. Nowhere has this been more graphically demonstrated than in the United States. If we need reinforcement of this fact, we have only to consider what happened to the art of medicine during Nazi rule in Germany.

On the brighter side of this attack by the superpatriots on basic freedom is a growing awareness in the minds of many Americans that we have this problem. Before we can find a cure for this strange twist in our Nation's history, we must look for the cause. Most Americans hold the charitable view that persons who make mistakes in good faith are entitled to a second chance; that persons are not judged guilty without a fair trial; that there is a difference between disloyalty and apparent disloyalty.

It is not too far-fetched to say that a form of calm hysteria holds many Americans in its grip. This hysteria manifests itself in many ways. Fear and frustration are very much in the picture. Uncertainty and a feeling of helplessness go hand-in-hand with frustration. These assuredly are uncertain times. The threat of global suicide is ever present.

Because of supersecret measures necessary to preserve our security, we must place faith in our leaders, but it must not be a blind faith. It is possible that the American people have never been more bewildered, and at the root of bewilderment is fear that breeds on lack of knowledge.

We, as Americans, must now of all times realize that we must be tolerant of the necessity to temper our ideas of what we can and cannot do. It is possible that we may and do become bewildered by the intricacy of the problems that face our Nation and its leaders.

Basic to our way of life is the concept that our people have a right to know. The corollary is that armed with the facts we can reach proper decisions.

There is real danger in underestimating the intelligence of our citizenry and in tempting the imagination of people with just part of a story.

There is danger in Government officials deciding what people are entitled to know about their affairs.

There are evidences that our present administration is mindful of this shortcoming. I believe there is further need for a thorough reevaluation of the Government's public information program in the fields of atomic research and defense. We also need to know more about the Reds-in-Government issue—not from the lips of congressional investigators who keep an eye on their constituents, but from the agencies that should be getting the first crack at infiltrating Communists.

Besides steps to give the American people more information, consideration should be given to a program of reeducation in the meaning of freedom. Thomas Jefferson once suggested, let us put forth a good idea—freedom—to replace a bad one—unfair attacks on our citizens in a scatter-gun attempt to root out Communists in Government. Jefferson added, "Punishment is no solution for bad ideas."

A full appreciation of the meaning of freedom would include an understanding that our way of life is not without its risks.

United States defense officials often complain that we give the Soviet Union considerable useful military data by printing this material in magazines and newspapers available to all Americans.

Members of Congress are given secret military information that in the Soviet Union would be available to only a select few within the Kremlin. These are but a few of the examples of the risks of being a people at liberty.

We would have it no other way.

Foremost in gaining a full appreciation of freedom is the knowledge that right is on our side; that if we do not sacrifice our freedoms and thus destroy ourselves from within, our message to the peoples of the world who sway between communism and liberty will become stronger.

The rash of Red-hunting going on in the United States today and its repercussions are having serious effects abroad, particularly in the rest of the free world.

By its very nature a totalitarian state stultifies the minds of its citizens. Time is with us, because if we support and reaffirm our basic beliefs, our strength will grow. The totalitarian-controlled masses can be pushed only to a certain point before lack of freedom of thought and inquiry will take its toll in decay or counterrevolution for freedom.

This is a lesson of history we should not forget in these days when we wish for time so desperately.

Freedom is made up of many intangibles. It has a rare flavor that can easily be lost. Freedom's cornerstone is the right to an opinion; the right to disagree.

Too often we tend to forget that from disagreements have sprung many of our most noteworthy achievements in science, the arts, and in political life. We Americans thrive on the unaccepted, the untried, the new, the unorthodox. We are a curious people, and therein lies a great potential strength.

World public opinion, weighted on the side of freedom, is a weapon to be reckoned with.

Mr. Dulles Asked for It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 10, 1954

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a discussion of the Indochina problem as it relates to Geneva from the Washington Post and Times-Herald of Friday, May 7.

The West, and particularly the United States, is extremely embarrassed over the presence of the Vietminh representatives at this conference. So far their presence, together with the problem of Indochina has pushed the question of Korean peace into the background, which in January and early February was the principal purpose of having the conference.

I should like to invite the attention of my colleagues to the conclusion, voiced in the editorial:

> But in this case [Indochina's invitation to the conference] the United States was really asking for some sort of mischief on the part of the Soviet bloc when it consented to the inclusion of Indochina on the agenda of the Geneva Conference.

The editorial follows:

And Now Indochina

Whether there will be any Geneva discussion on a settlement of the Indochina problem is said to depend upon a satisfactory answer to a nice question in protocol. Did Communist China join in the official invitation to the Viet Minh representative to attend?

The onlooker, not knowing how the invitation was extended in the first place, will be somewhat mystified by the to-do over the subject which is reported from Geneva. In such matters there is generally a convenor, and since we do not recognize either the Peking or the Viet Minh regime, and since the British do not recognize the Viet Minh regime, the invitation went out, presumably, from Moscow. But, if there is any fuss about the form of the invitation, is Moscow likely to produce the document or a facsimile thereof? Hardly likely.

Questions of prestige in international relations, of course, should not be underrated, especially in dealings with Asia. But in this case the United States was really asking for some sort of mischief on the part of the Soviet bloc when it consented to the inclusion of Indochina on the agenda of the Geneva Conference. Better, much better, now to ignore any suspicion of irregularity lest this country be made to look foolish, and to concentrate on the chairmanship. The solution of this particular problem consistent, with all-around fairness is to alternate between Mr. Molotov and Mr. Eden.

Britain at this parley is reverting to her historic role of honest broker. For days past, while Mr. Dulles' military ardor has been cooling down, Mr. Eden has been seeking what the President calls a modus vivendi in the event a cease fire can be arranged. That could be a partition, despite the President's vague ban, or it could be a coalition government—though both of these solutions would be to the advantage of the Viet Minh and the Soviet bloc since native opinion is predominantly pro-Viet Minh.

However, little can be done at this late stage to frustrate a solution based on compromising the rival claims of the parties concerned. In the nature of things a conference, as this newspaper said yesterday, is a place to discuss compromises, not to dictate term. Secretary Dulles should not have sponsored a conference if he had no compromise or diplomatic policy in mind. Moreover, even if his mind (or the GOP's) was obsessed with a military solution, it was not wise to wait and form a combination in the teeth of a crisis—or, as the saying goes, during a crash landing.

The time to develop a coalition for the purpose of saving the existing French Vietnamese position in Indochina was long ago. Instead we were content with wordy and meaningless communiques every time we agreed with the French to finance the defense operation. The communiques meant different things to the two parties and, as it turns out, precisely nothing to history.

The Farm Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 10, 1954

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, pursuant to unanimous consent granted me by the Senate today, I present a broadcast by Glenn J. Talbott to be printed in the RECORD.

The broadcast is as follows:

BROADCAST BY GLENN J. TALBOTT
FEBRUARY 4, 1954

This Nation of ours is essentially a classless society. By that I mean that there are no hard and fast rules that separate and divide us into a lower class, an upper class, or a middle class by virtue of birth, social position, or inherited title. That's the way it is, and that's the way it should continue to be.

But we are divided up into various kinds of occupational classifications. Some of us work in factories, in various businesses, as doctors and lawyers, and about 5 million of use are in the business of growing enough food to feed a Nation of 161 million persons. We're farmers.

Plain commonsense tells us that if one economic segment of our society is to prosper, then the other segments must prosper too. The economic wheels of this Nation won't keep turning for long if one of those wheels—agriculture for instance—is flattened by an economic depression.

But as just about everyone knows, the economic air is going out of the agricultural wheel. It's sinking, and whether it's sinking into a depression, a recession, or just down to a sunny plateau is merely playing with words. What we all know is that farmers are in real economic trouble and unless something is done about it—and done quickly—then the rest of the Nation is heading for the same trouble.

It is essential that the rest of the country understand this. That workers, businessmen, and professional people fully realize that they cannot long prosper if the farmers of this Nation are allowed to slide into a depression. They should also understand that farmers depend on farm price supports as their bargaining power for a fair price. This is similar to organized labor's ability to bargain for decent wages, and the American businessman's dependency on tariffs, fair trade laws, and other artificial devices which enables him to set prices for the goods and services he sells.

Now that's not difficult to understand, but it's often clouded with fancy phrases, highly colored words, and confused thinking. Sometimes this confusion arises through ignorance but more often it is created purposefully in an attempt to distort the real issues and divide the citizens of this Nation over how their economy works.

One of the main purposes of our Government is to provide for the common welfare, and that means making a major attempt to bring about a mutual understanding of the problems that confront us. It does not mean making a major attempt to create discord between farmers and consumers.

But apparently this administration has launched a campaign to sow seeds of discord. It is attempting to turn consumer against farmer in order to frighten Congress into passing an impractical, unworkable system of farm price supports.

Last month the Secretary of Agriculture, Ezra Taft Benson, appeared before the Senate Agriculture Committee and launched the most unbelievable attack on farmers this country has ever seen.

Here's what Mr. Benson told this great committee of the United States Senate: "At what point will the 140 million Americans who do not live on farms rise up—as they did in the potato fiasco of a few years ago—and demand not revision but outright elimination of all direct aid to agriculture?"

Well, I think I can answer Mr. Benson's question. These 140 million Americans will rise up and demand elimination of all direct aid to agriculture just as soon as they are convinced by exactly the kind of propaganda that Mr. Benson tried to sell the Senate committee, that a prosperous agriculture is a curse rather than a blessing to America.

It is apparent that Mr. Benson, the administration's farm spokesman, is attempting to blackjack city Congressmen into buying the sliding-scale system of price supports. It is a definite campaign, the outlines of which are already determined.

A large majority of farmers are opposed to the sliding-scale system of farm price supports. They know it is impractical and unworkable. Impractical, that is, if agriculture is to be prosperous.

The administration apparently knows that it cannot sell its unworkable farm plan to farmers, so it is attempting to sell it to city Congressmen by threatening to incite a political revolt among city consumers against farmers.

This is a cold-blooded political maneuver which threatens to destroy all chances for the adoption of a sound, effective system of farm price supports. But at least one of the largest organized groups is not buying Mr. Benson's campaign and it is not afraid to tell Congress its position.

Just after Mr. Benson made his speech, which attempted to set consumers at the throats of farmers, Walter Reuther, president of the CIO, wrote to the chairmen of both the House and Senate Agriculture Committees. I would like to read a few excerpts from Mr. Reuther's speech. He wrote, and I quote: "We denounce Secretary of Agriculture Benson's attempt to incite city workers against farmers and farmers against city workers by falsely stating that city workers are opposed to price supports for farm products."

"We do not believe the 140 million Americans who do not live on farms are now or are likely to become opposed to 'all direct aid to agriculture'."

Mr. Reuther goes on to say: "They are aware, as specifically pointed out in the Eisenhower administration's budget sent to Congress January 20, that the direct Federal money aids to business exceed direct aids to agriculture including net costs of price supports. The business aids do not include billions in additional subsidy given business apart from direct appropriation."

Mr. Reuther said his organization was fully aware of these two important points: "First, farm productivity must be maintained at a level to insure at all times (a) a supply of food sufficient to meet the needs of an expanding population at home and (b) whatever obligations this Nation may assume abroad; and second, agricultural prices must be stablized at levels that will afford farmers a fair share of the Nation's income."

And Mr. Reuther went on to tell the Congressmen that "we shall not be split away from and put in opposition to the working farm families in America. We suggest that instead of trying to set American citizens at each other's throats, as Secretary Benson is attempting to do, the Eisenhower administration quickly address itself to this simple proposition:

"That food is grown to be eaten and fibers are grown to be worn and used; that those who produce the foods and fibres should not be penalized for abundant production, but must be assured adequate incomes," and, "that consumption should be increased by bringing about, through investigation, exposture and, if necessary, antitrust prosecutions, reductions in exorbitant markups of food prices from the time they leave the farm gate to the time they arrive at the retail counter."

And finally, Mr. Reuther suggested that "so-called surplus foods and fibers should be moved into consumption and use within this country and abroad by methods that will strengthen, not weaken, our own and our allies' economies."

Now that was not the leader of a farm organization speaking. It was the president of one of the Nation's largest organized labor groups, the CIO.

Farmers of this Nation should be extremely grateful to Mr. Reuther for his strong support of their farm programs and his keen insight into the problems of this Nation.

In reality, Mr. Reuther, a leader of organized labor, never should have been required to defend farmers against their Secretary of Agriculture.

This Nation has come to a sad situation when farmers can no longer expect the Secretary of Agriculture to present the true side of their story to Congress and must depend on a leader of organized labor to correct the Secretary of Agriculture's testimony. To date, only organized labor—and the Farmers Union—has objected to the Secretary of Agriculture's transparent attempt to incite political warfare between consumers and farmers.

Last week in Washington, D. C., the executive committee of the National Farmers Union, of which I am chairman, issued a statement sharply critical of the administration's attempt to divide and split the citizens of this country into warring factions.

The executive committee's statement said that Mr. Benson's statement can "only serve to distort the entire question of an agricultural price policy and to create calculated dissension between farmers and consumers. In making the statement, Mr. Benson did an enormous disservice to American agriculture."

The executive committee praised Walter Reuther for what it described as his "statesmanlike action." It charged that: "In their attempt to blackjack Congress into accepting a highly impractical and unpopular farm program which offers only the bleak prospect of scarcity in a nation which in a few short years will be needing and demanding more and more food and fiber, the opponents of adequate farm-price supports have deliberately confused an issue which demands clarity and understanding."

I have no doubt that farmers may expect more of this same kind of distortion from the administration in months to come as the battle over what kind of farm program we are to have gets hotter. Since it can't gain the support of farmers themselves for its program, the administration is turning to consumers who live in the towns and cities. It is desperately trying to convince them that the sliding scale will mean a cheaper and more plentiful supply of food when in reality it would mean exactly the opposite. It is trying to dissuade city Congressmen, through fear and intimidation, to drop their long-time support of farm programs. And in doing this, the administration is risking the Nation's abundant food supply in order to win approval of a farm program farmers don't want and which can well wreck our agricultural economy.

This is a blunt charge, but it is one that the administration will have a hard time wriggling out of. Farmers should be fully aware of what kind of propaganda they will be forced to meet in the months to come. They should know what charges will be made and how to answer them.

You may be assured that the Farmers Union has no intention of sitting idly by while high administration officials attempt to wreck all chances of a sound farm-price-support program.

Each time they attempt to divide and conquer by pitting consumer against farmer, we intend to answer them with the true facts. Each time they falsely describe the alleged merits of the sliding scale, we will counter with the real need for abundant food production.

This is not just one person's battle. Nor is it a battle to be fought and won by farmers alone. It is a fight upon the outcome of which we shall all share. We must convince our city cousins that our economy is so interwoven if one of us crashes, then we all crash together.

It is apparent that we cannot, as in past years, depend upon the Secretary of Agriculture to do this for us. It's going to be our job and the sooner we get started the better off we'll be. It is time now to start writing letters to your Congressmen and Senators stating your views on these vital matters. I expect to be with you again next Thursday morning.

The Farm Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 10, 1954

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, pursuant to unanimous consent granted me by the Senate today, I present a broadcast by Glenn J. Talbott to be printed in the RECORD.

The broadcast is as follows:

BROADCAST BY GLENN J. TALBOTT FEBRUARY 11, 1954

Good morning. Once again I am speaking to you, by transcription, from Washington, D. C., where I am working with Jim Patton and your Washington staff trying to mobilize congressional support for a realistic farm price support program—realistic not only in terms of what we think is the absolute minimum to keep agriculture on a sound economic basis and thus insure much needed support for a badly sagging national economy, but realistic in terms of actual congressional probabilities.

As every farmer now knows, the President and his Secretary of Agriculture, Ezra Benson, have recommended a sliding scale price support program to this Congress. In addition to this, they are urging the use of a lower price parity formula. The weight and prestige of the White House are behind these recommendations. Furthermore, the President through Mr. Benson has launched a national campaign to arouse consumers against the present farm-price-support law or any extension of it.

As I reported last week, 140 million consumers are being given a completely distorted picture of our farm programs. Deliberately misleading figures on the cost of the price-support program have been used and it appears will continue to be used in spite of the fact that Senator YOUNG has insisted that Secretary Benson clarify the record. Gross exaggeration of the farm surplus problem by administration spokesmen is another attempt to arouse consumer and public resentment against our farm programs. Last week, top officials of the American Farm Bureau started a series of nationwide State, county, and township meetings to sell farmers on the administration's sliding scale price-support program.

These are some of the things we have to reckon with in Washington. They become blunt political facts when you deal with Congressmen and Senators.

There is, however, plenty of evidence that not all the consumers nor all the Congressmen and Senators are swallowing the administration story hook line and sinker.

We think the Farmers Union has been doing a pretty good job in getting out the true facts. Our Dairy Conference in Madison, Wis., last month accomplished a great deal in focusing public attention on a sick farm industry. It did much to inform the public, businessmen, and the Congress about the real problems and what the obvious solutions are. We are doing a great deal of research in all phases of the farm and consumer problem and we think we are making considerable progress in our campaign of truth and commonsense. As I told you last week, the Farmers Union is receiving powerful support from organized labor in getting our story out to the working consumer—which, incidentally, represents 120 million of the some 140 million consumers Mr. Benson is trying to arouse against farmers.

And we believe, in time, that many businessmen who are, of necessity, realists themselves will come to understand that you can't let the farmer slide down the economic rathole without provoking disastrous repercussions to their own welfare.

This is another reason why many Congressmen and Senators are reluctant to accept the Eisenhower recommendations at face value. This is another reason why more and more Congressmen and Senators are carefully, even eagerly, considering the commonsense proposals of the Farmers Union.

For the few remaining minutes this morning I'd like to direct my remarks particularly to North Dakota's businessmen, because the economic problems we are now facing in North Dakota are common to all of us. We think it is high time that farmers and businessmen begin to realize how closely their economic interests are interwoven. This is probably more true of North Dakota than almost any other State in the Union.

It's time for business to realize that parity for farmers is as important to the businessman as it is to farmers themselves. Farm parity should be considered for exactly what it is—a cold-blooded economic objective that means dollars in the farmers' pocket and profits on the businessman's operation. It's that simple. It isn't anything else. Parity is not a political slogan, it is not a partisan political term, it is not a subsidy, and it is not an ideological concept dreamed up by the New Deal, the Fair Deal, the Farmers Union, or the CIO. Parity is a concept that has been in use since the days of Herbert Hoover. Parity means for famers a fair share of the national income, and because agriculture is a basic raw materials industry producing 70 percent of the raw materials that feed our economy, the price of agricultural raw materials is the principal factor in the size of our national income.

I believe many businessmen are rapidly becoming aware of this. Parity income or lack of parity—which is now the case—can be readily translated by the machinery dealer, the druggist, the grocer, the auto dealer in terms of mounting inventories, reduced volume of sales, increasing totals of accounts, and notes receivable.

The majority of the businessmen in North Dakota must surely realize what has been going on the last few years. In 1948 farm income in North Dakota was in excess of $750 million. Since that high point, it has been steadily dropping until in 1953—5 years later—cash farm income in North Dakota was less than $400 million. This has been due to a number of factors. Appreciable drops in production due to weather account for part of the declining farm income in North Dakota. But the major cause was the decline in farm prices. And this decline came even with the present farm price-support program which pegs wheat at 90 percent of parity and other grains variously from 75 to 90 percent of parity.

Now let's break down these figures. In 1948 your farm customer had, on the average, $12,500 to spend with the businessmen. Five years later, 1953, that had been cut almost in half—to something like $6,700.

Most businessmen don't have to be told that something has happened in these last 5 years. All you have to do is check your books. You are selling less combines, less tractors, less washing machines, less lumber, less of everything. You have more stock on your shelves and more in the warehouse than you've ever had before. Your credit problem is increasing and you are finding it harder and harder to keep collections current. You are finding yourself going to the bank more often to borrow money to carry your inventories. You are paying less in income taxes, not because of lower rates, but because your profits are down. Many of you operated in the red this past year.

And remember, this is during a time when wheat has been pegged at 90 percent of parity and wheat is one of the major crops in North Dakota.

And now, the administration wants to slide wheat downward to 75 percent of parity. Add this to the 20- to 30-percent cut in wheat acreage—add this to another 20 percent across-the-board cut in wheat prices if the new parity formula goes into effect—and you'll see farm income in North Dakota go down another $100 million in a single year—even if production remains the same.

But even ignoring the changes in the price support program which this administration wants to impose upon agriculture, the Federal Reserve Board estimates that cash farm income in North Dakota will drop another 10 percent this year even if we are successful in extending the present law. That's why the Farmers Union is fighting—for you, as well as ourselves—for a full parity price support program to cover all farm commodities.

History has proved time and time again that farming is the most vulnerable segment of our economy. Particularly is this true in North Dakota and the other upper Great Plains States. Farmers get into economic trouble first and drag the rest of the economy down with them if farm incomes are not stabilized at high levels. Depressions are led by low farm prices and are fed by low farm prices. A drop in farm income of nearly 50 percent in 5 years can hardly be termed a "healthy readjustment" as every farmer has long realized and many businessmen are now finding out.

It is a proven economic and historical fact that when the national economy fails to expand by as much as 10 percent in any year as measured by the dollar value of gross national product, that same year the prices received by farmers start dropping and pull down farm family income and purchasing power. This is the record:

In the 43 years since 1910, there have been 16 years when the national economy failed to expand by as much as 10 percent. In 12 of these years, farm prices and farm income dropped.

In 20 of these past 43 years the national economy expanded by more than 10 percent. In 18 of these years, farm prices and income rose.

Just as if to prove the rule, there were 4 years in which the national economy expanded by exactly 10 percent. In 1 of these years there was no change in farm prices, in another year farm prices dropped 3 percent, and in the remaining 2, farm prices rose 2 percent in 1 year and 3 percent the other.

This is the national average. In a predominantly agricultural State like North Dakota, the drops and rises are more drastic and more immediately felt by businessmen.

In 1950, according to the Bureau of Census figures, there were nearly 8,500 North Dakota farmers with gross incomes in the ten- to twenty-four-thousand-dollar class. There were over 20,000 farmers in the five- to nine-thousand-dollar class and over 20,000 farmers in the $2,500 to $5,000 class.

Latest BAE figures show that as many as 50 percent of the farmers have dropped from the 2 highest classes and that now nearly 36,000 farmers are grossing less than $6,700 average for all North Dakota farmers. We told you a few minutes ago that the average per-farm-gross income dropped from $12,500 to $6,700 from 1948 to 1953, which is alarming enough in itself, but the real facts of great significance to businessmen are that more than half of North Dakota farm families grossed substantially less than that average figure.

Do we need parity then? I would say the facts speak for themselves. I would say businessmen in North Dakota have as much stake in farm parity as farmers themselves.

If these, then, are the plain economic facts—common to both farmers and businessmen—then why not translate them into realistic political facts, too? It is nothing short of ridiculous for farmers to fight businessmen and businessmen to fight farmers in the economic and political arenas.

It has been encouraging to note during the past year that greater understanding of mutual problems is developing. Scores of small towns chambers of commerce have passed resolutions and have bought full-page newspaper ads boosting the cause of full parity for farmers. This must continue.

Businessmen can help themselves; they can help their farm customers by writing letters to their Congressmen and Senators, urging action in this session of Congress that will give farmers full parity price supports on all commodities. Write today as individual businessmen; write as you meet in your civic organizations. Your Congressmen and your Senators, Milton Young and Bill Langer, need and want this kind of honest expression from you.

And to our own Farmers Union members, I cannot urge too strongly the importance of keeping those letters and wires pouring into Washington here. They are desperately needed to counteract the campaign of Mr. Benson to arouse the consumer against us. There is far too much at stake to let blind party politics distort our judgment. Party lines in Congress are being cut sharply by this farm issue. Republicans and Democrats alike are working side by side to save the farm economy from disaster—not just because of farmers alone, but because they clearly see that a broken farm economy will mean a general national depression. If Republicans and Democrats in Congress can do that—then farmers and businessmen in North Dakota, whose very economic lives are involved, ought to be able to take action together too.

I'll be back again next week with another interpretation of Washington developments as they affect all of us in North Dakota.

The Farm Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 10, 1954

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, pursuant to unanimous consent granted me by the Senate today, I present a broadcast by Glenn J. Talbott to be printed in the Record.

The broadcast is as follows:

BROADCAST BY GLENN J. TALBOTT, FEBRUARY 18, 1954

I am speaking to you again this morning from our Nation's Capitol where the sixth caravan of Farmers Union members from North and South Dakota, Minnesota, Colorado and Montana are winding up a full week of visiting with their Congressmen and Senators and with top officials in the Departments of Agriculture and Interior. Tomorrow they will start their long bus ride back home but they will be markedly different people from those who arrived here last Sunday afternoon.

They will go home with a new appreciation of the legislative problems that are involved and which must be solved before any kind of a farm program is realized in this session of Congress. They will go home with a new and realistic appraisal of the kind of Congressmen and Senators whom, in part at least, they had a responsibility in sending to Washington as their representatives. They will go home with a new sense of responsibility of the role they must now play as citizens in a democracy. And they will return home determined that they should and must do a better job in making our democracy work.

In one brief week in talking to their Congressmen and Senators they have learned how 1 bad Congressman or 1 bad Senator can make the difference between success or failure in this 83d session of Congress—the fight over farm programs and farm price supports will be that close. On the other hand, they also realize how one good Congressman or Senator, with courage and ability, can ofttimes overcome the damage effected by a number of weak and incapable representatives.

And one of the most lasting impressions they have of Washington is the important role politics plays in every facet of our Nation's Capital. Nothing is done here—nothing is accomplished—without its political implications. Politics is the lifeblood of Washington.

And that is as it should be, I suppose. And since it is a blunt fact it is well that more and more people come to realize it. Politics—yes, party politics, is a vital and integral part of our representative form of government. It is probably the best and most democratic way of selecting our officials, whether on a local, State, or National level. No better way has ever been conceived. If it has produced at times some inefficient and bungling administrations—if it has produced some incapable and dishonest Congressmen and Senators it is not the fault of the political party system—it is the fault of the people—their indifference, their lack of interest, their shirking of individual responsibilities as citizens.

The answer to better government—the answer to a better Congress—the answer to the kind of legislation and administration to realize the kind of public interest programs so necessary to farmers and all people is only to be found in widespread political participation. It is that simple.

No farmer, for instance, could conceive of hiring a couple of itinerant farm workers, whom he had never seen, and letting them use his expensive machinery and burn expensive gas and oil to put in his crop without direction, without supervision, without the farmer himself working right along with the hired men. Nor would the farmer even consider paying out good money for seed to put in that ground unless he knew where the seed came from and that it was good seed.

But the facts are that many farmers will let a handful of people run their government. He will allow a couple of strangers to make all the political decisions for him. And then he wonders on election day why there aren't better candidates on the ballots. And later he is still wondering why the guy he elected as governor or as Congressman isn't doing a better job.

That's what happens far too often.

And today, politics, legislation, and government in all its phases is as important to the farmer as the kind of seed he puts in the ground. Of what value is it to the modern farmer of today to use efficient machinery, to know soils, to know seed, and to be a hardworking, efficient farmer and to be able to raise good crops, if the price he gets ultimately forces him into bankruptcy?

This year, 1954, is another important election year. What are you planning to do about it? Personally, I think the farmers of North Dakota have a selfish reason, if not a moral obligation, to do a lot about it. I should think they would consider individual participation in party politics as a cold-blooded necessity to protect their farming interest and the interest and welfare of their families. And the time to start is now.

It is not so important which political party or faction you choose as your personal preference for individual political participation. All that democracy ever asks of its citizens, in the field of politics, is that they use their innate intelligence and commonsense. The important thing is to become an active political party member. Take part—an active part—in your precinct meetings. Select delegates to the county meetings with care and good judgment. Be willing, if you are chosen, to serve as a delegate. State your opinions in precinct and county meetings. It is out of this sort of widespread participation that good party platforms are adopted and good candidates are chosen.

If, for instance, the political faction of your choice is the Non-Partisan League, then next week it is your responsibility to attend the precinct meeting in your township, and it is your responsibility to attend as a bona fide paid-up member. Make certain your dues are paid if you desire to be selected as a delegate to the county convention and perhaps later as a delegate to the State convention. In both your precinct meetings next week and the county conventions on March 11, plan to discuss all issues that are pertinent to both State and National problems and see that these issues are spelled out in your platforms. Select delegates whom you are confident will support those issues and work for the endorsement of candidates who will campaign on those issues and who will, if elected, honestly and to the best of their ability, represent you.

If you prefer to work within the Republican organizing committee or within the Democratic Party, the procedure is the same. Make your choice and perform your duties conscientiously and in a democratic manner.

If all this is done—if everyone so participates in party politics this spring—then on primary election day, June 29, you can go to the polls in good faith knowing that a good slate of candidates are on all ballots. Your choice, then, is not between the bad or the worst, but between the good and the better. That is the way to good government.

I cannot urge too strongly the necessity of every citizen discharging their political responsibilities with honest, conscientious political party participation.

And before I conclude this weekly report to you, may I urge once again that you write your Congressmen and Senators today asking their unwavering support of adequate price-support legislation in this session of Congress. We need full parity price supports on all major farm commodities and we must have adequate appropriations for all farm programs and agricultural agencies which are vital to farm family agriculture. The battle in Congress on these issues will be close. Our friends here in Washington need your encouragement and our opponents need convincing.

Until next week, then, goodby from Washington.

The Farm Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 10, 1954

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, pursuant to unanimous consent granted me by the Senate today, I present a broadcast by Glenn J. Talbott to be printed in the RECORD.

The broadcast is as follows:

BROADCAST BY GLENN J. TALBOTT, FEBRUARY 25, 1954

This is my fourth radio report to you from Washington. Next week I expect to be in St. Paul to attend the biennial meeting of the Farmers Union Central Exchange. After the exchange meeting, I shall have 3 or 4 days at our State office in Jamestown before leaving for preconvention board meetings in Denver. Our National Farmers Union Convention is to be held this year in Denver, March 15 through the 19th. Postconvention board meetings will probably be concluded March 21 or 22. It now appears that I shall have to come directly back to Washington at that time to stay probably until the middle of April.

Congressman HOPE, chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, now expects to start formal committee hearings on March 10. Administration spokesmen from the Department of Agriculture will present their arguments for the sliding-scale theory of price supports—led off by Secretary Ezra Taft Benson and followed by various departmental spokesmen. It is expected that the administration will take 10 days to 2 weeks to make its case. There will then be opportunity for various farm commodity groups, trade groups, and processors associations to be heard, after which the committee will hear the general farm organizations.

After hearing testimony from all organizations that desire to be heard, the committee will then draft its recommendations to the Congress.

A somewhat different operation is evidently being followed by the Senate Agriculture Committee under the chairmanship of Senator AIKEN, of Vermont. No date has yet been set for general hearings on the farm program price-support problem, although some piecemeal hearings have been held on various sections of the administration's proposals. A hearing was announced last Wednesday to be held on Thursday on the administration's proposal to support the price of wool at 90 percent of parity through the use of compensatory payments. We supported the proposal. As you know we in the Farmers' Union have believed for many years that the use of compensatory or price adjustment or production payments, as they are variously called, would be a sound operational device to support the prices of many commodities, particularly the so-called perishables.

Wool, of course, is not a perishable commodity, and it will undoubtedly be interesting to learn how the administration justifies the proposed wool program against the background of their own statements for more than a year that the theory of such payments was not only unsound but, much worse than that, such theories were a part of this whole business of "creeping socialism" about which they are so very concerned. How production payments, as a vehicle for price supports, can be creeping socialism when applied to dairy or poultry products, fruits, vegetables, beef cattle, hogs, sheep and lambs, and not be creeping socialism when applied to the wool that grows on the sheep and lambs will be, for all of us, I'm sure, a good lesson in economics, or politics, or perhaps in just plain semantics. At any rate, it should be interesting and informative.

I should like now to take a few moments to tell you how this administration is seeking to build economic pressures designed to create political support for its program of lower price supports for farmers.

I reported to you early this month the program spearheaded by Mr. Benson to invite city consumer resentment against farmers and their price-support program which have always heretofore received quite widespread support from city congressmen. Mr. Benson gave a completely distorted picture through the press to the city people of this country—first, in regard to the cost of the farm program, and, second, both by what he said and by what he left unsaid, he gave to consumers through the press a completely inaccurate picture of either farmer or farm-program responsibility for the high retail cost of food to the consumer. He gave the impression that farm programs (and this was given a press interpretation) that farm price supports had cost the taxpayers nearly $17 billion in the past 25 years. In later hearings Members of the Senate Agriculture Committee required him to put into the record the actual cost (by commodities) of the price-support programs. Since the beginning these figures show less than a billion and a quarter dollars, or about $60 million a year. A far cry from $17 billion, but press distribution of the real figures has been practically zero as compared to the first nationwide blast of publicity. He gave the impression that farmers through farm price-support programs were responsible for the constant or rising cost of food at retail. He did not say that transportation, processing, wholesale, and, in many instances, retail charges and margins have constantly increased, whereas the farmer's share of the consumer's food dollar has steadily declined during recent years to a low now of 45 cents.

We can be truly thankful for the understanding and statesmanlike attitude of organized labor, with whom we have sought constantly for "areas of agreement" on broad public policy questions for many years. Their support now is vitally important to us.

An equally strong and calculated effort is being made to incite civil war in agriculture by setting commodity group against commodity group. First, as I have said, consumers against farmers, then cotton against dairy, dairy against feed grains, cattle against corn, feed grains against corn, corn against feed grains.

Here is the way it is being done. Price supports for 1954 are as follows: The 6 basic commodities are required by law to be supported through 1954 at 90 percent of parity. These are wheat, corn, cotton, rice, tobacco, and peanuts. Levels of support for other commodities are left to the administrative discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture. There are certain limits to this discretion on certain commodities. The Secretary has set support prices on certain other commodities as follows, for 1954: Flax, 70 percent of parity; soybeans, 80 percent; oats, barley, and grain sorghum, 85 percent; and rye, 85 percent. On Monday of last week he announced supports for dairy products at 75 percent of parity, effective April 1, as compared to 90 percent at present.

In processed form flax is linseed oil and linseed meal, soybeans in processed form is soybean oil and soybean meal, and cotton produces cottonseed. Cottonseed in processed form is cottonseed oil and cottonseed meal. Linseed meal, cottonseed meal, and soybean meal are high-protein feeds, competitive with each other and either competitive with or supplemental to oats, barley, grain sorghums, rye, and corn. Oats, barley, and corn have some nonfeed commercial uses but they are principally feed. Rye is about 50 percent food and 50 percent feed.

The experts in animal nutrition at our Federal experiment stations and at our State land-grant college experiment stations have worked for years to develop the actual pound-for-pound comparative feed value of all of these supplemental and competitive feeds. This ratio or relationship in terms of price is called the feed value equivalent. Largely since World War II, support prices on these competitive and supplemental feeds have been based on the feed value equivalent with 90 percent supports on corn. This was true of these support prices in 1953 as announced in the fall of 1952. They were as follows: All related to corn supports at 90 percent of corn parity, barley 85 percent of effective parity, oats 85 percent of effective parity, grain sorghums 85 percent of effective parity, flax 80 percent of parity, soybeans 90 percent of parity, and rye 85 percent of parity and, of course, cotton at 90 percent of parity. In the spring of 1953 Secretary Benson reduced price support on cottonseed from 90 percent to 75 percent of parity. Support prices announced for 1954 thus far are as follows: Barley, oats, and grain sorghums, 85 percent of effective parity, same percentage as 1952 but these 3 feed crops have been on transitional parity which means the slide between the old parity and the new at the rate of 5 percent each year. Therefore, barley, oats, and grain sorghums are supported at the same percentage of a lower parity price: Rye at 85 percent, same as 1953; flax, 70 percent of parity, down 10 percent; soybeans, 80 percent, down 10 percent.

In terms of pricing: Oat supports are down 5 cents per bushel, barley is down 9 cents per bushel, flax is down 65 cents per bushel, soybeans are down 28 cents per bushel, grain sorghums down 15 cent per hundredweight, and rye, no change.

Obviously the feed value equivalent in terms of price relationships among these competitive and supplemental feeds and between all of them and corn supports at 90 percent of parity has been completely destroyed.

Normally when linseed meal is cheaper than soybean or cottonseed meal or cake, demand would shift there, i. e., to linseed meal, bringing an upturn in the flax price.

This does not happen because of our substantially open door to flax imports (principally from Argentina). Normally, when oats, barley, grain sorghums or rye are priced too low in relation to corn, either corn comes down or the others come up to the "feed value equivalent price." Fortunately corn doesn't come down because of mandatory 90 percent supports, but unfortunately oats, barley, and rye don't come up by reason of our substantially "open door" for imports of those crops, principally in recent years from Canada. Parenthetically our total imports of these competative feeds, including feed wheat, in calendar year 1953 was 151 million bushels.

The end result of this very involved pricing situation is that the lower priced feed grains, competitive with corn, will move in greater volume into the areas of normal corn consumption which in turn will leave constantly greater supplies of corn in the Commodity Credit Corporation's inventory. This will provide additional argument for those who wish to reduce support prices on corn as well as other commodities.

Finally on Monday of last week, Mr. Benson announced that price supports on dairy products would be reduced from 90 percent to 75 percent of parity effective on April 1. He expects to get political support from consumers on this move. He evidently expects then that economic pressure will force dairy farmers to support his desire for cheaper oats, barley and the high protein supplements as well as grain sorghums and rye. If this can be accomplished, the economic pressures which I have heretofore outlined will make it politically impossible to hold corn supports at 90 percent of parity. Without corn, we cannot hold wheat and when we lose wheat and corn it will be equally impossible to hold cotton and the other basic commodities.

Briefly then, this is the way in which the administration has set up the economic factors which they hope will force political support for their sliding scale program of price supports. A temporary surplus of butter and the reduction of dairy supports is quite evidently the trigger which is expected to detonate, one at a time, the time bombs that have been planted throughout agriculture with complete destruction of our entire price support program as the end objective.

I see my time this morning is running short, but in my few remaining moments, I should like to analyze some of the basic facts about the alleged butter, cheese and dried milk surplus.

In 1953, we produced about 120 billion pounds of milk, about 5 percent more than in 1952. Based upon present levels of consumption, we have at end of 1953 about 7 to 8 percent of 1953 production in CCC inventory.

We have a large area of underconsumption of dairy products in the income brackets below $3,500 of annual income. When I say underconsumption, I mean consumption below the minimums prescribed by our nutrition experts for a diet necessary to build and maintain sound healthy bodies.

If this area of underconsumption can be reached, we have a minimum need for an annual production of between 150 and 160 billion pounds of milk. Therefore, instead of overproduction, we have sound minimum need for expansion of between 20 to 25 percent over 1953.

Reducing dairy price supports from 90 to 75 percent obviously will not result in opening the market where we have real underconsumption. It will only result in requiring the dairy farmer to further subsidize present consumption in the income areas where subsidy is unnecessary, and will not result in increased consumption.

If you would like a copy of this broadcast for further study and future reference, please write to our State Office here in Jamestown—copies are available.

Next Thursday morning I shall be with you again by transcription. At that time, I shall present further analysis of this problem together with what we believe is a sound workable solution—that is in the sound interest of consumers and producers of all of these related commodities.

I hope also that by that time I can report to you how the farm program price support legislative situation is shaping up. Until next Thursday then, same time, same station. Thank you for listening.

The Farm Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 10, 1954

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, pursuant to unanimous consent granted me by the Senate today, I present a broadcast by Glenn J. Talbott to be printed in the RECORD.

The broadcast is as follows:

BROADCAST BY GLENN J. TALBOT, MARCH 4, 1954

Good morning, you are listening to this broadcast on Thursday morning, March 4, but I am writing it in my room at the St. Paul Hotel on Sunday afternoon, February 28. As I look out my window it is a clear sunshiny day, comfortably warm with the feel and smell of spring in the air. Lawrence and Nellie Erickson and Bill Martin, with whom I visited earlier this afternoon, tell me that there are reports of wheat already seeded out in Bowman County. Well, it's still pretty early for seeding in North Dakota. We could still have some winter weather. Reports are of dust storms of serious proportions in the Texas-New Mexico, western Oklahoma, eastern Colorado, and southern Wyoming area. The area of moisture deficiency seems to be moving northward through the high plains country. Missouri is going into the third year of serious moisture shortage.

Despite the greatest possible effort by the staff at our experiment stations, no variety of either wheat or durum resistant to the new race 15 B rust has thus far been developed. Against this background of probable low wheat yield in an increasing area of moisture deficiency, which has already produced dust storms altogether too reminiscent of the black blizzards of the early thirties and the possibility, at least, that if the balance of the wheat area has adequate moisture we may well lose much of it to 15 B rust, the administration continues its efforts to reduce support prices. Its spokesmen continue to emphasize the need to reduce production and they continue constantly to place heavy emphasis on what they call costly, unneeded, and unmanageable surpluses of farm commodities. When we place these problems against the perspective of the highly explosive international situation, the enlarging drought area, and the thus far uncontrollable plant disease—15 B rust—there is some considerable likelihood that these so-called burdensome surpluses of food and fiber may, as has happened several times in the recent past, turn out to be among our greatest blessings.

There are several million families in our country whose incomes are inadequate to provide them with the amount of protective foods a sound minimum diet would prescribe. Farmers can, and they have, produced the food that is needed, but farmers by themselves cannot supply this food at prices these low-income families can pay. Farmers' costs are very high and rigid; therefore, the price for raw farm products must be comparably high and comparably rigid or farmers will quickly lose their ability to produce at all. There are 161 million people in our country and that number increases annually about 2,600,000. I pray we may never see the day, because of unwise production restrictions or because of a deliberately planned unwise ratio of price assurance to the high rigid costs which farmers have to meet, that we will face actual and serious food deficits. All of the countries of Asia and most of the countries of Europe have had as their principal problem for many years, and some of them for many generations, too little food to maintain the health of their people.

There is no such thing as having exactly enough food. Remember always that the other side of the food surplus coin is an actual shortage of food.

Last week I reported to you that we produced in 1953 about 120 billion pounds of milk and that this was an increase over 1952 milk production of about 5 percent. The Administration used this 5-percent increase as one of its principal arguments that 90 percent of parity price supports were too high and therefore induced uneconomic increased output by dairy farmers. The further argument used in support of the decision to reduce these supports from 90 percent to 75 percent of parity was that this would eliminate the incentive for unneeded expansion of milk production, while at the same time reduced prices at the consumer level would induce great expansion in consumption thereby eliminating the problem of the so-called unmanageable surpluses of butter, cheese, and dried milk.

Here are the facts: The increase in milk production did not come in any substantial amount from the area of principal dairy production. There is no evidence that the increase was induced by the so-called high dairy support prices. The increases came in substantially total amount from the States which are marginal to the principal dairy States. To illustrate—the Dakotas and Montana greatly increased dairy production. North Dakota, for example, increased milk production 14 percent in 1953 over 1952. There is practically no evidence that this increase came because dairy supports were too high. There is, on the other hand, a great body of evidence that the grain and livestock farmers of the Great Plains area, who normally milk 3 or 4 cows to supply the family needs for butter, cream, and milk, are now milking 10 to 15 and 20 cows. They are not doing this because dairy price supports are to high, but, on the contrary, it is because price supports on rye, barley, oats, and flax are too low and because a 20- to 25-percent cut in wheat acreage is actually a cut in income. All of this plus the possibility of lower supports on wheat, corn, and cotton, plus the further possibility that these crops may go on the new lower parity price formlua if this Congress does not act to extend present legislation—all of the evidence is that the increased milk production in 1953 results from grain and livestock farmers' needs for supplemental income because price supports for their normal production are either nonexistent or too low in relation to their extremely high rigid costs. There is no evidence in our history that will support the theory that reducing dairy supports to 75 percent of parity will stop or slow down this trend. On the contrary, there is great historical evidence that the present trend will continue to accelerate.

Let us now examine the administration's theory that reducing dairy price supports from 90 to 75 percent will result in substantial increases in consumption.

First, as the 90 percent price support program was administered by Mr. Benson in 1953, farmers actually received about 82 percent of parity. If the 75 percent program is administered the same way in 1954, dairy farmers can expect to receive about 67 percent of parity.

The national average price received by farmers for manufacturing milk in 1953 was about $3.60 per hundredweight. We can expect it to average about $2.90 per hundredweight, in 1954. Butterfat prices to farmers can be expected to reduce 10 cents per pound as a minimum and more probably 12 cents per pound. Dairy farmers in the New York milk shed are receiving 9 cents per quart for grade A whole milk, while New York consumers are paying 27 cents per quart. A 15 percent reduction in price supports to farmers means in the New York milk shed 7 to 7½ cents per quart instead of 9 cents. All margins between farmers and consumers are fixed on a unit, not a percentage basis, therefore, the maximum reduction to the consumer would be from 27 to 25 cents per quart. Butter prices at retail could be reduced a maximum of 8 cents per pound. There is no evidence in history to support the theory that these reductions in farm prices will be fully reflected by the trade to the consumers.

Let us, however, give everyone the benefit of the doubt and against the background of the known rigidity of the administered prices and margins between farmers and consumers, let us assume that the cut in farm support price from 90 to 75 percent will be fully reflected to consumers. That would mean a reduction of 8 cents per pound on butter, 14 cents per pound on dried milk and 2 cents per quart on whole milk. All of the consumption statistics in the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Labor and the Department of Health, Welfare and Education, which have been assembled over a long period of years, seem definitely to indicate that among the approximately 75 percent of our population who have annual family income of $3,500 and up, the consumption of the protective foods, principal among which are dairy products, is at or above the minimum standards of dietary adequacy and that consumption of milk, butter and cheese in these income areas does not measurably fluctuate with increases or decreases in price. Therefore, there is no evidence that consumption in these income levels will increase in any measurable amount even if the trade fully reflects at the consumer level the maximum possible reductions in price which I mentioned a moment ago.

These same agencies of Government have voluminous consumption statistics which show that in the next annual family income bracket below $3,500, the consumption of the protective foods (again principally dairy products) drops sharply below the minimums prescribed by our nutrition experts for a sound diet, and the further down the income scale you go, the consumption of the protective foods, including dairy products, continues sharply to decline clear down to the vanishing point. The consumption statistics also show that if all of those in the lower than $3,500 annual income brackets (and this includes old age assistance, those drawing unemployment compensation and social security payments and other groups, in addition to parttime workers)—if all of these people consumed only enough butter, cheese and milk to bring their diets up to the bare minimums of dietary adequacy—we should have immediate need for between 150 and 160 billion pounds of annual milk production, an increase of 20 to 25 percent over the 120 billion pounds produced in 1953, with a consumption of 113 billion pounds in round figures, leaving a so-called surplus of about 7 percent of the total 1953 production.

It is clearly obvious that the maximum possible price reductions at the consumer level, based on 75 percent price supports to farmers will not bring about increased consumption in the only income areas where we have underconsumption.

It is equally obvious that dairy farmers will rather quickly go bankrupt at prices to them, reflective of 75 percent of parity.

The record shows that farmers cannot produce with high rigid costs, and sell at prices low enough to make butter, milk, and cheese available in the income areas where serious underconsumption and malnutrition really exist and, finally, it must be completely clear that we do not have overproduction of dairy products, but that in reality we have underconsumption (by reason of consumer income deficiency) below the minimum standards for dietary adequacy in an amount that equals 20 to 25 percent of our total 1953 milk production.

The argument that we have overproduced and that the sliding scale of price supports to farmers can and will resolve the problem has no statistical or historical evidence to support it, and it is a 100 percent political phony.

We must accept as sound public policy the establishment of a domestic food allotment program, the purpose and objective of which must be to make available the health protective foods in this entire area of underconsumption which relates to inadequate income.

These protective foods must be made available in sufficient amounts to meet, at all income levels, sound minimum dietary standards.

When this is done we shall need expansion of the entire dairy industry by about 20 to 25 percent over 1953 production. An expanding dairy herd will provide sound need for use of diverted wheat and cotton acres in production of more oats, barley, and grain sorghums. An expanding dairy herd will also need expansion of the high protein feed supplements—linseed meal, soybean meal, and cottonseed meal. On this foundation, we can extend the mandatory minimum price supports at not less than 90 percent of parity on the basic commodities, on dairy products and mandatory feed value equivalent price supports on the competitive and supplemental feeds.

I reported to you last week the deliberate distortion of the feed value equivalent pricing on the high protein feed supplements and on the other feeds competitive to corn. I told you how dairy products had deliberately been made a prime political target at this time and how the pegs had been set to make corn the public enemy No. 1 next year. I stated last week that dairy was the trigger designed to set off one at a time, the economic time bombs throughout agriculture during the current year, carefully designed to create economic pressures which in turn are expected to build political support for the administration's objective, and that is complete destruction of our farm price-support program.

I have analyzed this whole situation with a sound cross section of the congressional leaders of the South, with a cross section of the Midwest Republican leadership, and I have talked with a few of the leaders among the city Congressmen. President, Jim Patton has spent the last 10 days with a wide cross section of the city congressional leadership and in analyzing the entire situation with the leaders of organized labor.

It was, of course, a great help to our side when on Thursday of last week, the joint Congressional Committee on the Economic Report—by a vote of 14 to 2—repudiated the administration proposal for a lower parity price formula and the sliding scale of price supports. Our fight is not won—it may not be won. We may win in Congress only to meet a Presidential veto—but the foundation is laid and we are in much better shape than we were even 2 weeks ago.

In summary, we should in this Congress get a domestic allotment program to distribute protective foods up to dietary minimums—extend mandatory 90-percent price supports on the basics and on dairy products and mandatory feed value equivalent price supports on the supplemental and competitive feeds. This is the way it looks in Washington as of now.

Thank you for listening.

The Farm Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 10, 1954

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, pursuant to unanimous consent granted me by the Senate today, I present a broadcast by Glenn J. Talbott to be printed in the RECORD.

The broadcast is as follows:

BROADCAST OF GLENN J. TALBOTT,
MARCH 11, 1954

Electric power was a luxury in the United States just a generation ago. It cost 5 to 10 cents per kilowatt-hour in homes. Only 15 percent of rural homes had it at all as late as 1935. The power industry had been under attack for years for its policy of keeping electricity scarce and costly. But the attacks alone were of no avail.

The bottleneck of scarce and costly power in the Nation had to be broken by the establishment of Federal electric power yardstick programs, based on the development of power resources which belonged to all of the people.

Senator George Norris' Tennessee Valley Authority Act initiated such a program. It was followed by the Rural Electrification Act and then by the Ickes power policy. Under that policy the former Secretary of the Interior started aggressively using electricity from Bureau of Reclamation and Army engineer projects to provide low-cost electricity to public and cooperative preference customers throughout the West, including our own State.

Most of today's population has lived through the era of American electrification. Most of us know how the Tennessee Valley Authority made electricity abundant and low cost in its area, causing a great industrial and economic expansion there. We know how the great Bonneville Power Administration did the same thing for the Pacific Northwest, and how Bureau of Reclamation power provided the basis for the establishment of rural electrification cooperatives west of the Mississippi.

Inconceivable as it may be to many people, the national administration is today liquidating the Federal power program. By liquidating I do not mean slowing it up for economy reasons, or stopping it where we are. I mean liquidating in its real meaning—disposing of, doing away with.

We hear denials. We hear reassurances that our rural electric cooperatives are not going to be hurt. We hear officials, suddenly subjected to pressure and made aware of the political consequences of their actions, contradicting each other and even their own prior statements—as Fred Aandahl has done in the case of his Fargo statement about raising Federal power rates.

But when one digs into the detail of what is actually being done in Washington—when one digs behind the curtain of self-serving statements—it is completely clear that methodical liquidation of all our Federal power program is not only under way but well advanced.

A step-by-step program to get the Federal Government, and I now quote exact words, "out of the business of generating and distributing power as soon as possible," was outlined in a nationwide broadcast from Cleveland, Ohio, last April 11, 1953, by former President Herbert Hoover. Mr. Hoover was speaking at the diamond jubilee of Case Institute of Technology. His address was regarded as so important that it was carried all over the Nation by the radio chains. Many of you heard it.

Since its enunciation, the Hoover plan has been followed almost exactly by the administration and Congress. And Mr. Hoover, who himself once blocked the great Tennessee Valley development by vetoing the second Norris Muscle Shoals bill, has been put at the head of a Federal Commission with lawyers, engineers, accountants and all the other technicians required to work out the details for the give-away of all Federal power facilities.

Mr. Hoover outlined three major steps in his program for liquidation of the Federal power programs as soon as possible. I want to quote his own words:

"1. The Congress shall cease to make appropriations for steam and hydroelectric plants solely for power.

"2. The Congress shall follow the precedent of the Colorado project (Boulder Dam) and make no appropriations for new multiple-purpose projects unless the electric power is first leased."

Those two steps, of course, were intended to end all expansion of Federal generating and distribution facilities. The Congress last year did precisely what Hoover recommended. It refused to authorize the start of any new Federal power facilities whatever. No new dams or significant transmission facilities were given funds to start.

Then came Mr. Hoover's third step, designed to prepare the give-away of existing Federal facilities. It read:

"3. The Congress should, jointly with the President, set up a temporary commission on the reorganization of this whole Federal venture (in electric power) with resources to employ technical assistance."

The Commission and its assistants were then given an A-B-C-D assignment by the former President:

A. Reallocate the costs of existing projects charged to power generation.

B. Set up a new system of bookkeeping and revise power rates at the Federal projects. (This was the step Assistant Interior Secretary Fred Aandahl was talking about at Fargo when he warned that Federal power rates were going to go up).

C. The New Commission would formulate standard plans and procedures for leasing or otherwise turning our present Federal electric facilities to private enterprise.

D. It would formulate standard plans and procedures whereby non-Federal agencies could, in the future, install, own, or lease the electrical part of new multiple-purpose dams so there would never again be any Federal power facility.

What happened after Mr. Hoover made that speech detailing how to wreck Federal power programs? Was he repudiated? Was he permitted to retire to the relative obscurity of a private citizen to buttonhole people and preach his doctrine as a private citizen?

No indeed. After Mr. Hoover outlined the blueprint, President Eisenhower reached out and brought him back to Washington as the head of the very liquidation commission which Hoover had advocated.

Today Herbert Hoover is the chairman of a joint congressional and Presidential commission which has a task force of technicians—all enemies of public power—working on the A-B-C-D steps to turn existing power facilities over to non-Federal agencies. Mr. Hoover's deputy at the head of that task force is Ben Morreel, formerly the head of a great steel corporation and an avowed enemy of the Tennessee Valley Authority and public power.

It would be childishly naive to believe that the President did not know of Mr. Hoover's plans for liquidation of the Federal power programs. They were enunciated in advance of his appointment. They were broadcast to the whole Nation. They were published in pamphlet form. Obviously the former President was appointed to preside over the liquidation of the Federal power projects now going on.

Another foe of public power appointed to a vital post in relation to power policy by the President, Dean Clarence Manion, who says TVA should be sold and opposes Federal power programs, has declared publicly that the President knew his views on power matters at the time he was appointed Chairman of the Commission on Federal-State Relationships.

When all the facts are put together, there cannot be the least shred of doubt that a careful plan is being methodically followed in Washington to liquidate TVA, to liquidate Bonneville, to liquidate the Federal power programs in the Southeastern and Southwestern areas of this Nation, and to liquidate the Federal power program in the Missouri Basin.

Sometimes the tempo of the liquidation program changes. Sometimes there are minor retreats. The give-aways in both the Columbia Basin and the Missouri Basin—the plan to contract away our power for 20 years to private utilities—were both altered a bit when the administration was confronted by indignant citizens.

But the main goal of liquidation has not been changed.

I intend to go into the detail of how the program of supplying Bureau of Reclamation power to our REA and municipal systems is being destroyed in another broadcast.

Today I want to discuss briefly what the liquidation of the Federal power programs will mean on a broad, national scale.

Three years ago a national commission was set up to inventory and determine if we have the resources and materials necessary to maintain a strong Nation, able to defend itself in any emergency. It was known as the Materials Policy Commission and was headed by William S. Paley of the Columbia Broadcasting System, a businessman. It reported in June 1952.

The Commission found that one of our most critical problems is to provide abundance of low-cost electric power. We must have a 260 percent expansion from 1950 to 1975. And the Commission pointed out that it must be low-cost or our great electroprocess industries cannot survive. They use tremendous quantities of power and would be uneconomic if power costs rise. These industries include aluminum and the other light metals. They include phosphate for both chemical and fertilizer uses.

In the near future, other metals will be involved, according to the Paley Commission, because, as we run out of high grade ores, it will take large quantities of electric power to beneficiate low grade ores, concentrating them sufficiently to be useable. In the case of iron ore in the Lake Superior region, for instance, it now takes only 3 kilowatt hours of electricity per ton to handle the high grade ores. But we are running out of high grade and it will take 75 to 90 kilowatt-hours per ton to prepare the lower grade ores for use.

Phosphate is a present day example of shortage resulting from high power costs. It affects every farmer in this State. We could have an abundance of low-cost phosphate fertilizer if the farmers union could get electric power in northeastern Utah or southeastern Idaho at the rates charged by the Bonneville Power Administration. We have a phosphate reserve and could get others easily. But the Idaho and Utah power companies serve the area. They want 6 mills and more per kilowatt hour for electricity. That makes it impossible to process the phosphate rock economically. The TVA phosphate plants have 2-mill power. So phosphate fertilizer is today both relatively scarce and unnecessarily expensive in the West because a Government power yardstick has not yet reached into this critical area to break the power bottleneck.

I have given only examples of specific critical situations which can occur if our Federal power program is liquidated. Shortages will plague us. Prices will rise. Employment will fall. The economic expansion, which is so vital to full employment and good farm markets, can be ended by this one unwise and reactionary policy.

In both the Tennessee Valley and the Columbia Basin, the census shows that a new job was created for every 11 kilowatts of new low-cost electric energy made available. TVA installed 3.5 million kilowatts of generating capacity between 1935 and 1949. The census showed a rise of 325,000 jobs and 50 percent in real per capita income in the valley in the same period. Statistics from the Bonneville area show the same sort of expansion.

But now all this is being ended and the yardsticks are being reversed.

The tidelands oil giveaway sinks into insignificance as the electric-power giveaway proceeds. In the tidelands case the Congress and administration gave away a few billions of dollars of royalties which should have come into the Federal Treasury. They gave away some oil that belonged to all of us.

But in the electricpower giveaway, America's whole future is involved.

Beyond the economic aspects of the power giveaway is another which concerns many people very deeply—people who believe in true democracy.

The Black Lobby investigation in 1935 showed the Nation how the private-power interests influence politics; how they use ratepayers' funds to buy advertising space, radio time, and secretly employ public figures to wash our brains with their propaganda.

Today, the power interests have four major national agencies, backed by millions of dollars, brainwashing the people and influencing the Congress. They are the Electric Companies Public Information Program (sometimes affectionately called PIP), the Electric Companies Advertising Program, the National Electric Light Association, which maintains the most expensive lobby in Washington, D. C., and the Edison Electric Institute.

The companies infilter local civic clubs, some of the farm organizations, groups like the reclamation associations—every citizens' movement that they can influence. They send their employees by hundreds—at ratepayers' expense—out on door-to-door campaigns to influence elections.

The Paley Commission tells us that our electric-power industry must be expanded 260 percent by 1975 to meet our power needs. If this is all to be a private-monopoly industry, as Hoover proposes, then this already gigantic $25 billion industry will become an $80 billion industry. It will be handling at least $20 billion annually of funds. It will have virtually unlimited money to brainwash the voters of this Nation, to manipulate elections, and control our political life.

The private power companies, already a malignant and evil influence on American political life, will then amount to a fourth branch of Government. We have legislative, administrative, and judicial branches. Realism requires us to admit that if the power companies grow to the size envisaged in the Paley report and made possible by the Eisenhower-Hoover power policy, we will have created a political force in America equal, if not superior, to the branches of the Government itself.

All of us are properly concerned about the prospects of higher electric bills and shortages of power growing out of the new power policy.

But our concern should run far deeper than that.

The electric power policy fight is a major fight in the struggle between corporatism and democracy in America, between hard times and economic growth, between scarcity and abundance.

The power giveaway has progressed further than most realize.

In the Southeastern States transmission facilities to carry power from public dams with 600,000-kilowatt capacity have been stopped, so no one but private companies can get the power.

In the Tennessee alley needed plants have been blocked.

In the Southwest our Nation has dishonorably repudiated valid contracts with five REA generating and transmission cooperatives, putting the REA's at the mercy of private companies.

In the Columbia Basin the bulk of all power to become available for many years has been contracted to private utilities for 20 years and the choicest dam sites are being licensed away.

In our Missouri Basin the administration has repudiated responsibility for REA power supply and will soon start contracting power to private companies.

Mr. Ashton B. Collins, the man who owns the copyright on the private utility trademark, Reddy Kilowatt, said in an address to the Edison Electric Institute, composed of private utility moguls:

"I submit we cannot take 20 years to undo what 20 years did to us. We had better try to do it in 4 years."

If you spend a little time in Washington, as I have done, it soon becomes clear that Mr. Hoover's power giveaway plan is being executed on Mr. Collins' timetable.

The Farm Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 10, 1954

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, pursuant to unanimous consent granted me by the Senate today, I present a broadcast by Glenn J. Talbott to be printed in the RECORD.

The broadcast is as follows:

BROADCAST BY GLENN J. TALBOTT, MARCH 18, 1954

On a recent broadcast I described the plan being followed by the Eisenhower administration to liquidate the Federal power projects, and to reverse the Federal power policies that have been developed in this country since the time of President Theodore Roosevelt. The blueprint of this plan was spelled out in detail by former President Herbert Hoover about a year ago. The deeds—not the words, but the actual deeds—of the Eisenhower administration so far are following Mr. Hoover's plan step by step. Herbert Hoover has never made any bones about his opposition to public power. He himself described his plan as one which would get the Federal Government, in his own words now, "out of the business of generating and distributing power as soon as possible."

I want to review quickly the plan laid down by former President Hoover. Point 1, and I quote directly from Mr. Hoover's speech, was:

"The Congress shall cease to make appropriations for steam and hydroelectric plants solely for power."

Last year the President and Congress followed step 1 of Mr. Hoover's plan precisely. Again this year President Eisenhower is following Mr. Hoover's plan. Not a single new Federal power project has been proposed by the Eisenhower administration. There are no new dams, and no backbone transmission line projects. Those are the deeds. The words go even beyond that. The administration has announced that it will give to the private utility companies all the remaining hydroelectric sites that remain if they want them, and that the Government will build no more fuel-burning steam-generating plants in competition with the private utilities.

The second point in Mr. Hoover's plan for liquidating public power was, and again I quote directly from former President Hoover:

"The Congress shall follow the precedent of the Colorado project and make no appropriation for new multiple-purpose projects unless the electric power is first leased."

The Colorado project to which Mr. Hoover refers is Boulder Dam. The power produced at that dam is sold at the dam site, instead of being transmitted across country to where the REA co-ops and local public power systems can buy it. The precedent Mr. Hoover recommends would make it practically impossible for REA co-ops and municipalities to get the advantage of low-cost power from any Federal projects that are built. It would mostly go to the big private utilities which alone can afford to build the expensive transmission lines over to the dam sites.

A number of Congressmen have reported they were told by Budget Director Dodge that the Eisenhower administration will not build any more dams until arrangements have been made in advance to do just what Mr. Hoover recommends, that is, arrangements to sell the power or lease the right to install the powerplant equipment at the publicly owned dams to private utility companies.

Mr. Hoover's third point was, and again I quote directly from his speech of last April:

"The Congress should, jointly with the President, set up a temporary commission on the reorganization of this whole Federal venture with resources to employ technical assistance."

Just after this speech, President Eisenhower appointed the man who made the speech—former President Hoover—to head up the commission which Hoover proposed. That is the Hoover plan—a plan admittedly for the purpose of liquidating the public-power program. The Hoover plan will make electricity scarce, and it will make electricity expensive. These policies will wreck the farmers' REA cooperatives, and either force them into bankruptcy, into forced sales to the private-utility companies, or make them completely helpless to do the job for which the farmers set them up.

The direct result of the Hoover plan being followed by the Eisenhower administration will be to restore monopoly control over all sources of power to the private-utility companies. It will guarantee that the power companies can have all of the best remaining power dams. It guarantees that the private utilities will control all fuel-burning steam-electric plants. It guarantees that the private utilities will control all future transmission systems and at the same time that the Federal Government is backing away from effective competition with the private utilities, the funds available for REA loans are being cut drastically so that REA co-ops will be absolutely unable to take over the Federal projects which the Government is abandoning.

Another direct result is that this plan will stretch the yardstick wherever public-power projects are allowed to remain at all. The yardstick I am talking about is the effect of low-cost public-power projects in measuring what electricity ought to cost. That is the only kind of competition that is possible in the electric-utility industry. We can't have competing lines running down the same street or down the same road. The only competition we can ever hope to have is the indirect competition of public projects acting as a yardstick to show the public how cheaply power can be produced and sold.

The yardstick is being stretched by the Eisenhower administration in exactly the ways recommended by point 3 of Herbert Hoover's plan. The rates charged by Government power projects are being increased. The rate increases are already being put into effect in many parts of the country. In addition to that, President Eisenhower has assigned study commissions to the job of working out new bookkeeping methods and cost allocations. It is an open secret that these commissions are right now in the process of working out higher-rate schedules to be charged for public power.

Fred Aandahl, who is now the Assistant Secretary of Interior for Power, let this particular cat out of the bag some months ago in a speech at Fargo when he said that rates to be charged by Federal projects are going to be increased. Mr. Aandahl, incidentally, has been doing such a vigorous job of pulling the private power company chestnuts out of the fire that REA co-op delegates gave him the nickname "Freddy Kilowattt" at their recent national convention.

How is all of this going to affect our REA cooperatives?

In the first place, we know that whoever controls the supply of any resource holds the whip in his hand as far as control over the industry is concerned. The Hoover plan being followed by the Eisenhower administration will give the private power companies almost absolute control over all supplies of wholesale electricity. With that whip in their hand, the REA cooperatives will be completely helpless in the long run in their efforts to keep electricity for farmers cheap and abundant.

With less and less chance to get loans from REA because REA appropriations are being cut far below the needs of the co-ops, the REA co-ops will be forced to knuckle under to the private power companies and sign long-term contracts. These long-term contracts with the utilities will sign away the freedom of the REA co-ops. It is important to keep in mind also that rates can move in only one direction under a long-term power-purchase contract. The cooperatives cannot move the rates down unless the utilities consent. But the rates can be changed in the other direction. If the power companies can persuade regulatory agencies that their costs have increased and that they deserve a raise in rates, no contract could protect the co-ops from being forced to pay that increase.

When the Hoover plan is carried out, the REA co-ops will be forced into a dependent second-class utility status. At that point 1 of 2 things is likely to happen:

One possibility is that the private power companies will put on the screws with all their might in an effort to kill the co-ops complete and take them over. This has been done in this country in several instances where co-ops were forced into the position of dependence on private utilities which will result from the Hoover power policy. REA co-ops are squeezed between two jaws on the monopoly pincers. One jaw is high rates for wholesale power, bad wholesale power service, and inadequate supplies of wholesale power which make it impossible for the co-ops to give good service to their customers.

The other jaw of the monopoly pincers is competition on the retail level from the very utility company which has monopoly control over the wholesale supply upon which the co-op depends. Obviously, if your retail competitor can control the price you are forced to pay at wholesale, it is an easy matter to assure your financial ruin. This is exactly what happened recently out in Idaho and Oregon, when the Idaho Power Co. forced one of its wholesale customers to the wall and compelled it to sell out to the power company. Anyone who thinks that other power companies would be any more charitable toward the REA co-ops if they were ever able to achieve a similar monopoly control over them is much more optimistic than I am.

I think it is important to try to foresee just how the squeeze play to kill off REA co-ops will operate if the power companies decide to follow that course when the Hoover plan gives them the power to carry it out. I think the first move will be made among the farmers themselves. Utility company representatives will work on the directors and managers of the co-ops in an effort to get them to back the sell-out maneuver. That has happened already in some areas, and it might happen here. If the original directors and managers stand fast against the power company sell-out drive, it is entirely conceivable that a power-company-inspired campaign will be put on to replace those directors with new ones who will do the power company's bidding. That has been done in some areas also, and also might happen here. There have been cases where proutility elements in a cooperative have scoured the countryside to pick up proxy votes in order to pack an annual meeting and elect a proutility slate of directors. Almost the same thing might be done with mail ballots, if the proutility element were to go down the road in an organized campaign for a proutility slate. It would be a very wise precaution for the REA co-ops, it seems to me, to take a look at their voting regulations to see whether they might be taken advantage of for this kind of a campaign.

The other side of this same coin is already being carried out by some of the proutility officials in the present administration. That is, the strongest defenders of the interests of the REA co-ops are being discredited among their own people. Fallacious stories are spread about them, their activities and policies are misrepresented, managers are given subtle warnings that they had better be good and go along if they hope to have successful relations with those in power. The purpose of this is to blackball the farmer-directors and the managers who are most able and willing to stand up firmly for the cooperative's rights.

I am not saying that we are certain to see an outright drive to get the co-ops to sell out. I am simply saying that it has happened in some parts of the country and wherever it has happened, this is the pattern that has been followed by proutility interests. But whether the co-ops are actually sold out of the utilities or not is really unimportant. If the REA co-ops have their teeth pulled, by being deprived of their ability to compete with the power companies, by being robbed of their supply of wholesale power at the lowest possible cost and in fully adequate quantity, if all of those things which are the inevitable consequence of following the Hoover plan happen, then the REA co-ops will be destroyed just as surely as if they were taken over outright. We have learned that lesson in every cooperative field we have gotten into. When we first set up oil co-ops, we soon found that it was not enough to operate on a retail basis alone. The oil interests simply shifted their margins a little and started taking their exorbitant profits out of the wholesale margin. That is exactly what the private power companies will do if they are able to get monopoly control over the sources of wholesale electricity. The REA cooperatives cannot perform their real purpose unless they have the freedom, and the ability, to press continually for the lowest possible rates and for an ever-expanding supply of electricity. There is absolutely no reason for electricity to become more expensive. There is no reason that the cost of electricity on the farm should not be brought down and down and down, making it possible and profitable for farmers to use more and more and more. There is no reason why we should give up our goal, even here in North Dakota, of 1-cent per kilowatt electricity for every farmer.

But that goal of abundant and cheap electricity will never be realized unless the people, represented by their locally owned REA co-ops and their locally owned municipal utility systems and their publicly controlled Federal power projects, are able to remain in control of their own destiny.

The Farm Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 10, 1954

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, pursuant to unanimous consent granted to me by the Senate today, I present a broadcast by Glenn J. Talbott to be printed in the RECORD.

The broadcast is as follows:

BROADCAST BY GLENN J. TALBOTT, MARCH 25, 1954

I am speaking to you this morning from Denver, Colo., where more than 1,200 Farmers Union members from every section of the country have just completed the most successful convention in the 52-year history of the National Farmers Union.

Not only was the convention a fitting climax to a great year of membership expansion, new attainments, and accomplishments in public acceptance of our program, but the convention served as a rallying point which will solidify these gains and will enable the National Farmers Union to go forward with greater strength and effectiveness in serving the farm families of this Nation.

Proof of this was apparent in the high level of enthusiasm and feeling of unity that existed through the entire week, not only between individual delegates and between the various States, but between the union itself and our affiliated cooperatives and business institutions. E. A. Syftestad, of the Farmers Union Central Exchange; M. W. Thatcher, of the Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association; and C. E. Huff, of the Farmers Union Insurances, made powerful contributions to the deliberations of the convention, and their pledge of cooperation to the total Farmers Union plans for the future effected a singleness of purpose that has never before been known in the annals of any major farm organization, and which, to my thinking, symbolizes a new era of influence—a new era of maturity and a new era of national acceptance that lends new strength to the National Farmers Union as the most effective voice for American farm families. I am not alone in holding to this impression. I believe every delegate left the National Farmers Union Convention this week keenly aware of the great potential that lies ahead for our great union. They were thrilled by it; they are proud of the Farmers Union as never before, even as I am; even as our great national president, Jim Patton, to whom so much credit is due, is also proud and humbly aware of the great and added responsibilities that inevitably are his as the leader of America's most effective farm organization.

From the moment the gavel sounded to open the convention on Monday morning until it adjourned last Friday afternoon, every delegate had a sense of destiny that had to be fulfilled. Every speaker, from the greatest of all Secretaries of Agriculture, Charlie Brannan, to Leon Keyserling, the able international economist, to the Honorable Norris Dodd, who received the Farmers Union award for outstanding service to agriculture, equally sensed the quiet determination of the delegates to fulfill their responsibilities as the representative voice of farm-family agriculture.

Therefore, it was only natural that the most significant event of the convention was the formulation and adoption of a great program of policy and action that not only maintains the historic high principles and aims of our union, but because farmers are always practical people, it spells out specifically how they expect to accomplish those objectives within the framework of political, economic, and social realities.

Here are some of the principles and aims spelled out by the delegates:

"We believe in the essential dignity of the human individual.

"We believe in the truth and rightness of democracy over any type of totalitarianism, whether communistic or fascistic.

"We believe in the essential and God-given freedoms that are necessary to the dignity of man and vital to the preservation and strengthening of democracy.

"We believe in the right of each person, without discrimination, to an equality of opportunity.

"We believe that the family is the primary and basic unit of human society and should be preserved, strengthened and enriched.

"We believe in abundance, the rapid development of the full potential of our total productive capacity, and the availability of that abundance to all people.

"We believe that the land and the natural resources of our country should be used and tended for the greatest good of the greatest number of people in this and future generations.

"We believe that farm families on the family farms are a vital balancing force in the social and political structure that is vital to democracy and to the securing of world peace and understanding.

"We believe that full parity for farm families in its broadest sense is not only right and fair but that it is essential to the maintenance of a balanced, healthy economy.

"We believe that cooperatives and cooperative techniques are essential to a better agriculture.

"We believe in the right of farm people to establish their own organization under their own control and to use that organization in attaining the goals of security, party and peace."

There you are. That is what the farmers union believes. That is what I believe and I am proud of it. That is a belief that every Christian person must come to understand and share if the preservation of our democracy, essential human dignity, our basic freedoms and the sustained fight for world peace is to have any meaning at all. How do we accomplish these objectives?

Being practical people and firmly believing that democracy was conceived and exists to serve its own people, we in the farmers union have spelled out a wholly democratic procedure of action.

First of all, we maintain that the farm problem is a national problem—of interest and of vital concern to everyone in these United States. That the production of food and fiber by less than 3.5 million commercial farmers to serve basic needs of more than

160 million people, is fundamental to the well-being of the entire Nation, to its defense, and to its relationship to the rest of the world.

Therefore, in our highly legislated economy, the national interest requires a strong and permanent farm program designed to maintain a financially healthy agriculture that will secure to farm families parity income, parity of credit, parity of security and of opportunity and parity of available living standards.

To realize this we urge and encourage our members—and all farm families—to participate intelligently in the political and legislative phase of our democracy. We encourage cooperation and understanding with labor and all other consumer groups who by necessity are day by day aware of the need for abundant food and fiber. In our increasing maturity we are recognizing these blunt political realities as being right and proper in a democracy. To be unwilling to work politically and legislatively with those other peoples whose welfare and common interest are identical with ours is to deny the very basis of democratic procedure.

To maintain and increase the total wealth and strength to our Nation, not only immediately but in the future, we believe abundant production of food and fiber made possible by a permanent full parity price-support program for farm families and by subsidiary programs of long-term, low-cost credit, adequate commodity storage to maintain necessary food reserves for national defense and security, increasing development of public power, rural telephone, health insurance, proper and prudent use of all our natural resources, including the land itself, are among the necessities required by our national self-interest.

We know that the farm problem is not overproduction, it is not surpluses, it is not too much price supports. The real problem is underconsumption, the real problem is too little food available to the people in low-income brackets, the real problem is the inadequate and too limited price-support program that falls far short of providing parity income to farm families. These are the real problems and the delegates to the National Farmers Union Convention last week recognized these problems as our national administration does not, cannot, or will not recognize them.

Federal Government statistics make it only too evident that a deliberate reduction of farm prices and farm income will surely lead to economic disaster—that a reduction of food and fiber through a continuous program of acreage allotments and marketing controls will bring inevitable hardship and hunger to a nation that alone of all nations of the world is capable of producing all it needs. It is only too evident that if the problem of underconsumption were solved, we would have not a surplus food problem but one of too little of many health protective foods.

I am proud of the program that was adopted. It is a good program. It is humane in its concept and practical and realistic in its suggested methods.

As our program is brought to the knowledge of farm families and the consumers of this Nation, it is being accepted., And because it is constructive and legislatively workable, it will, in time, be accepted by our lawmakers in Washington. In a democracy that is the real test of any program. Does it serve people? Is it workable and is it wholly in the public interest? The Farmers Union program meets fully all of these tests.

Right after I complete this tape-recorded broadcast from Denver, your national president, Jim Patton, and myself are leaving for Washington, to resume the legislative work that we have been doing for the past 2 months. Hearings before the House Agriculture Committee are under way and we will, strengthened by the inspiration of this convention and by this great program of policy and action, make our appearance before that committee. We are assured of a courteous and thoughtful reception. We are additionally assured of serious consideration of the program we have just adopted because many Congressmen and Senators know, by past experience, that ours is the true voice of farm family agriculture in America—that our program is sound, workable, and legislatively practical.

I want to extend my congratulations to all the Farmers Union members of North Dakota for the wise selection of delegates which you sent to this National Farmers Union Convention. They represented you well and honestly. They did a magnificent job. Their deliberations were careful and thoughtful. The deliberations in which they took a prominent part resulted in a program of which all of us can be very proud.

Public Laws 312 to 322, Inclusive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1954

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am extending my remarks to include my reports to my constituents in the Second District of Illinois covering Public Laws 312 to 322, inclusive. The reports follow:

SEVENTEENTH REPORT ON LEGISLATION OF THE 83D CONGRESS

DEAR FRIEND: Continuing where we left off:

PUBLIC LAW 312

S. 2714, increases borrowing power of Commodity Credit Corporation

The Commodity Credit Corporation is the financial organization through which are carried out loans and purchases providing price supports for farmers. The agricultural bloc regards it as the most important of all the agencies of the United States Government in maintaining the economic health of the Nation. It has operated as a protection of agricultural stability.

Nevertheless, it has been costing us a great amount of money. At present the storage item alone amounts to $14 million a month. As a member of the committee (Banking and Currency) with jurisdiction over CCC legislation, I have maintained that instead of storing excessive amounts of perishable products such as butter the benefit in part should go to urban centers like Chicago in helping out in our relief problem and in more adequately caring for our aged. Old-age assistance allowances could be helped out tremendously by distribution of good butter, otherwise either going to ruin or running up staggering storage bills.

The merit of CCC and the policies underlying its administration, however, were not involved in the consideration of Public Law 312. This law increases the borrowing power of CCC from $6,750,000,000 to $8,500,000,000, an increase of $1¾ billion. It does nothing else. It does not authorize additional spending. Its sole purpose is to provide the money for contracts previously authorized and agreements already entered into. To that extent it is an honest measure.

Public Law 295 (see my report No. 12) was a dishonest approach. It sought to avoid the lifting of the debt ceiling by ordering the United States Treasury to cancel CCC's I O U for some $741 million, thus keeping CCC within the legal debt limitation by a subterfuge. On this the Honorable True D. Morse, Under Secretary of Agriculture, took issue with me, my questions and his replies covering 5 pages (96–101) in the House public hearings.

Fortunately, Public Law 312, as finally passed, was amended (by the Senate, the House agreeing) to prohibit such subterfuge in the future. The exact wording is: "Such capital impairment shall be restored with appropriate funds as provided herein rather than through the cancellation of notes."

To me it was as clear as crystal that giving CCC close to a billion dollars to spend (in excess of the authorized ceiling) merely by ordering the Treasury to cancel the notes of CCC could not measure up with recognized standards of honest dealing.

PUBLIC LAW 313

H. R. 5509, Medical Corps colonels in the Regular Army

This is intended to aid in making service in the Medical Corps of the Regular Army more attractive to career officers. In 1947 the Pharmacy Corps (where officers became full colonels in 26 years) was abolished and officers therein transferred to the Medical Corps. The act of 1947 limited the number of medical colonels (that included those from the old Pharmacy Corps) to 2 percent of the authorized officer strength of the corps, whereas in other male corps the number of colonels could be as many as 8 percent. Public Law 313 wisely removes that limitation and places the Medical Corps on the same footing as the other corps.

Since 1947 the trend has been to relieve Army doctors from administrative duties that they may devote themselves to professional work. With the prevailing scarcity of doctors the 2-percent restriction proved a handicap in procuring and retaining officers with the requisite qualifications. There just was not enough future in prospect. Private practice was more alluring.

The House passed the bill by consent.

PUBLIC LAW 314

H. R. 4558, policing the air

Radio transmission amateurs (and others) should take notice. Hereafter there will be rigid prosecution of violations of section 501 of the Communications Act prohibiting operation of a radio transmitter without an FCC license.

Policing the ether is the important responsibility of the Federal Communications Commission. But the Commission could not do the job well because existing law was too stringent. It subjected the violator (usually an overenthusiastic air fan) to a possible 2-year term in prison. Result: Federal prosecutors and grand juries shied away. Since 1940 there have been only a dozen or so prosecutions.

On the recommendation of the Commission Public Law 314 reduces a violation of section 501 from a felony to a misdemeanor for a first offense. For those who persist (after a fine for a first dereliction) prison will be ahead.

PUBLIC LAW 315

S. 489, Bradley Field, Conn.

During World War II the United States acquired a 58-acre tract adjacent to Bradley Field, Windsor Locks, Conn., for a post engineer area for the Army Air Force. Since 1947 it has been rented to Connecticut for its National Guard. As Connecticut is willing to maintain the area for defense purposes, and to surrender it back to the Federal Government in the event of an emergency, Public Law 315 authorizes its conveyance to the State. United States prudently reserves all mineral rights. There was no objection in the House to this routine legislation.

PUBLIC LAW 316

S. 2348, redcedar shingles

You may never have known it—I did not until this measure was explained in the House—but since 1937 redcedar shingles have been in the driver's seat as far as the census was concerned. Each and every month the Director of Census had the busy job under existing law of compiling fulsome statistics on the production, shipment, and importation of redcedar shingles. Reason was we had a trade agreement with Canada which provided for a tariff when our imports exceeded a certain figure which required a mixture of statistics and mathematics to fix. It cost our Government a lot of money to keep the statistics monthly current.

The old agreement with Canada having been superseded, and the tariff on recedar shingles eliminated, Public Law 316 follows up by doing away with the monthly census. Hereafter redcedar shingles will get the same census treatment as other products: (a) annual total production reports, (b) inclusion in quinquennial census of manufacturers.

PUBLIC LAW 317

S. 1827, waiver on Seattle real estate

If you have had experience with a Chicago Title & Trust Co. title opinion you will understand the why of Public Law 317.

Owners of property in Seattle adjoining the Lake Washington Ship Canal (United States Government facility) asked the Washington Title Insurance Co. for a guaranteed title policy. The title company demanded a waiver by the United States of any interest in the property. Federal attorneys agreed that the United States had no valid claim of any nature. It was necessary, however, to pass another law (Public Law 317) before anyone could give a waiver binding the United States.

The measure met with no objection in the House.

Cordially and sincerely,

BARRATT O'HARA,
Member of Congress.

EIGHTEENTH REPORT ON LEGISLATION OF THE 83D CONGRESS

DEAR FRIEND: Continuing where we left off:

PUBLIC LAW 318

Senate Joint Resolution 34, admission to West Point and Annapolis of subjects of Thailand and Belgium

Under Public Law 318 two subjects of the Kingdom of Thailand (Siam) will be admitted to the Military Academy at West Point, and two subjects of the Kingdom of Belgium to the Naval Academy at Annapolis. They will not be entitled to commissions in the United States Armed Forces on graduation.

I found interesting the historical background furnishing the precedents for Public Law 318. Two cadets from Chile were admitted to West Point in 1816, two from Colombia in 1823. Since 1884 to the present acts of Congress have admitted cadets from Nicaragua, Guatemala, China, Siam (now Thailand), Costa Rica, El Salvador, Cuba, Colombia, Ecuador, and Panama. In addition since 1908 the Secretary of War has been empowered to appoint Filipino cadets, since 1946 to appoint persons from the American Republics and since 1948 to appoint Canadians.

Although the first foreign national admitted to the Naval Academy was a Frenchman (1861) most of those admitted later were subjects of the Japanese Empire. The number of cadets from Japan was large. In 1906 Congress authorized the admission of a student from Cuba, in 1922 one from Venezuela, and in 1923 one from Cuba and one from Holland.

As Public Law 318 was recommended by the Department of State and the Department of Defense it passed the House by voice and I heard no dissenting vote. In the Senate there was reference to the timeliness of the action as regards Thailand because of the difficulties that kingdom is having in fighting communism.

PUBLIC LAW 319

S. 2111, our Star-Spangled Banner

In casting your vote for Public Law 319 I experienced the same patriotic thrill that you will on the reading. The flag of our country—and the story of the writing of the Star-Spangled Banner—are part of our national pride and heritage.

Public Law 319 permits Old Glory to fly 24 hours a day over Flag House Square in Baltimore. There in fact will be two banners always in the air at this historic national shrine—the present flag of our country and a replica of the flag in use during the War of 1812.

Under existing law (enacted in 1942) it is the rule that the flag usually may be displayed only from sunrise to sunset. The exception is made for Flag House Square because this is the birthplace of the flag that inspired Francis Scott Key to write the Star-Spangled Banner.

Standing in this square at Albermarle and Pratt Streets in Baltimore is the home of Rebecca Young, who had made flags for Washington's army, and of her daughter, Mary Pickersgill, and her granddaughter, Caroline Pickersgill, during the War of 1812. Here it was that Mary and Caroline Pickersgill made the great battle flag that flew over Fort McHenry during the 3-day attack on Baltimore in September of 1814 and which Francis Scott Key immortalized.

The House Judiciary Committee recommended the measure as in keeping with the respect and dignity due the flag. It said that granting the 24 hour flying privilege would promote a better and more diffused knowledge of the history of our flag. I agreed with the committee.

PUBLIC LAW 320

H. R. 4558, amends Communications Act

This is a minor amendment to the Communications Act of 1934. It extends from 15 to 30 days the time in which the Federal Communications Commission must act on protests against the grant of any radio authorization. The Commission's calendar is crowded and questions raised are complex. No one objected to giving it a little more time.

PUBLIC LAW 321

H. R. 4557, mobile radio stations

Persons planning the operation of (a) mobile radio stations, and (b) common carriers, safety and special radio services take note. Public Law 321 exempts those in (a) from the requirement of a construction permit as a prerequisite to an application for a license to operate a radio station and for those in (b) authorizes the Federal Communications Commission to waive the requirement.

The reason that radio stations engaged in broadcasting (unaffected by Public Law 321) must obtain permit before beginning construction is to keep the FCC free from pressure when later an application is made for the license to operate. Otherwise the pressure argument could be expected from an applicant for a radio station license that his large expenditure for construction would go out the drain if he were not permitted to operate. So he properly is required to take the matter up with the Commission at the very start. Mobile stations, however, do not call for such plant installations and equipment.

As Public Law 321 will eliminate much unnecessary paper work, and thus save money for the taxpayers, it had the hearty blessing of your representative.

PUBLIC LAW 322

S. 79, Mammoth Cave National Park

This I found interesting. The original cost (1937) to the Government of Mammoth Cave National Park in Kentucky was $300,000. The remainder of $3,200,000 had been raised through contributions. The sum was insufficent to purchase all of the property, so Onyx Cave and Crystal Cave were left in private hands. Together they comprise some 440 acres.

Since then Mammoth Cave has proved a large tourist attraction. The Government takes in (admission, guide, elevator fees) much in excess of administration expenses. But the two privately owned caves have been a source of confusion to the public and embarrassment to the park officials who have no jurisdiction over them. Moreover, they divert revenues otherwise coming to the Government.

Public Law 322 authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to cooperate with the State of Kentucky for their acquisition. It is estimated that their cost will be around $600,000. The plan is for Kentucky to raise the money by a bond issue, buy the two caves and then turn over title to the United States. Kentucky will be reimbursed in installments from the profits of the Mammoth Cave National Park, which then will comprise the entire scenic area.

Cordially and sincerely,

BARRATT O'HARA,
Member of Congress.

Italian-American Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 10, 1954

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, contemplating all the gloomy conjectures relative to the outcome of the international conference being held in Geneva, and the fearsome prospects of a collapse of resistance to the Reds in Indochina, I recalled a letter which appeared in the letters to the editor column of the Providence (R. I.) Journal on April 12, 1954.

There is nothing which will dispel gloomy thoughts as effectively as a ray of hope which comes from a positive expression of confidence from a person who knows whereof he speaks.

The letter I have reference to was written to the editor of the Providence Journal by a prominent Rhode Island citizen of Italian origin. It discusses, most succinctly I must say, relations between the United States and Italy.

This letter is important for what it says relative to these relations. It is of even greater importance for the confidence it expresses that we shall not fail in our efforts to promote peace throughout the world.

Under unanimous consent, I place this letter of my good friend Mr. Luigi Scala, of Providence, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I sincerely recommend its reading to all my colleagues in the House:

ITALIAN-AMERICAN RELATIONS

Italy was prominent on the editorial page of your issue of March 30, having been the subject of an editorial and of two letters in "In the Day's Mail." For your continuous sympathetic understanding of Italy, may I as an American of Italian origin, compliment and thank you.

There should be no disagreement with you on your position as to the contemplated visit of Vice President Nixon to Italy; it is to be discouraged.

Unless Mr. Nixon can go to Italy to tell the Italians that we shall unfailingly implement with deeds our declaration of March 1948, to revert the Free Territory of Trieste to Italy, or at least the much reduced subsequent one of last October of transferring military and civil power in Zone A of that territory to Italy; that we shall correct the inequities of the McCarran immigration law, insofar, at least, as to abating the offensive racial implications which are inherent in the very much restricted Italian quota; and to make the Watkins Immigration Relief Act a go, it is certainly better for Mr. Nixon to remain this side of the waters.

This does not mean that the Italians do not like Americans, or are ungrateful for the benefactions received, as stated by the writer of one of the letters you published. For individual assistance received over there, there is not a sender in America who has not been showered with thanks and blessings.

The help given by this country as a Government is to be viewed from a different angle, for help of this sort has a distinct international connotation. Italy has not been helped by the United States strictly by a motive of philanthropy or in a sheer gesture of friendship. This help, generous as it has been, fits within our larger pattern of holding back eastern communism; it is part and parcel of our foreign policy.

Moreover, there can be no denying that the national assistance which Italy has received from us has been acknowledged on innumerable occasions, unreservedly and solemnly, by Italian statesmen and officials, many of whom have even come to America to express the deep appreciation of their country.

As for the press in Italy, the Socialist-Communist newspapers are, of course, derogatory of United States policies and Government; but this is to be expected of the Communists. In the democratic press in Italy, which is by far the majority, one may read criticism on a political level of American policies with respect to Italy. But this criticism is not without reason and perhaps is not even debatable.

On the other hand, Italy joined NATO without bargaining, is supporting the European Defense Community, and on other international issues affecting our foreign interests is standing loyally on the side of America.

On the issue of communism in Italy, may I add to the good letter which you published that the leaders, the militant intellectuals of that party, are relatively few, perhaps proportionately not many more than we have, known and unknown, in the United States; but the climate over there unfortunately is fertile for demagogic promises, while this is fortunately not so in the United States.

In other words, poverty is a bad counselor. Leaving out any conscious or unconscious bias, it may be stated that were it not for the spiritual power and traditions of the Catholic religion, which are rooted in Italy and in the other western countries of Europe, even if one notices thistles on the surface, all of them would have been overrun by communism. The Catholic religion has proved to be the most powerful deterrent to communism, and communism looks on it as its greatest adversary.

And, in spite of all contrarieties, there is no other country in the world where the rank and file of the people hold more affection for the United States than in Italy.

L. Scala.

Providence.

The United Nations: 9 Years of Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES R. HOWELL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 10, 1954

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, 9 years ago representatives of 51 nations, united against aggression in a war then near its close, met at San Francisco. It was their purpose to lay the foundations of an international organization dedicated to the preservation of peace among nations and to a cooperative attack on problems of an economic, social, cultural, and humanitarian character—problems from which no country, in all humility, can claim exemption.

Two months later the Charter of the United Nations was signed. This Charter is not a constitution for a world government, but a treaty ratified by sovereign states. Under it, they voluntarily assumed solemn obligations as members of an international organization to work together in building the foundations of peace through greater well-being for all peoples, and in developing a system of collective security against aggression. It should always be remembered that the United Nations is not an entity apart from the nations which form it; their collective efforts for security, which find a permanent focus in the deliberations of United Nations bodies, only reflect the strength of the will to peace existing in the individual governments and peoples of the 60 member states.

Disillusionment has become the fashion in some quarters about the ability of the United Nations to resolve international conflicts—particularly East-West tensions—and to resist aggression swiftly and effectively. Yet in four regional wars, in the Balkans, Palestine, Kashmir, and Indonesia, action by the United Nations brought about a cease-fire. The determined stand taken in 1946 by the United Nations Security Council, strongly backed by the United States and Great Britain, played a major role in the cessation of direct Soviet interference in the internal affairs of Iran and in the withdrawal of Soviet troops. And in the supreme test—that of meeting Communist aggression in Korea backed by the Soviet Union itself—the United Nations, encouraged by the prompt action of the United States, met the challenge.

Human institutions in a free world have a surprising resilience and capacity for adaptation. Faced with paralysis in the Security Council because of Soviet obstructionist tactics, the United Nations turned to the General Assembly to cope with the continuing Communist aggression in Korea. In the Assembly's uniting for peace resolution of November 1950, and subsequent actions, that body showed itself to be an effective forum in which the spotlight of world opinion can be focused on acts of aggression and their perpetrators. Students of the constitutional development of the United Nations believe that there is nothing in history to match the speed and effectiveness with which the United Nations developed in this time of trial.

Achievement less spectacular but of the greatest significance for the long-run development of a peaceful and prosperous world is that of the United Nations and its 10 specialized agencies in combating the economic and social problems which beset the world, particularly in the underdeveloped countries. Our former deputy representative to the United Nations, Mr. Ernest A. Gross, once said that if he had learned anything at the United Nations it was that collective security meant not only collective action against an aggressor but against hunger, disease, and ignorance.

In this struggle against hunger, disease, and ignorance, the one United Nations activity which has perhaps most caught the world's imagination is the expanded technical assistance program—the United Nations own point 4 program for sharing technical skill and know-how. Secretary General Dag Hammarskjold has called this program "one of the great pilot ventures" of the United Nations. In the words of Mr. Hammarskjold, this venture is "a striking confirmation of general faith in the contribution that can be made by the United Nations to the building of a world of justice and peaceful progress, to lifting the lives of all men to a level worthy of man."

Cooperation in the technical assistance prorgam is thus symbolic of the unity of purpose with which the members of the United Nations must push on toward their goal. The United Nations is daily proving its value as an instrument of mankind for the eventual building of a world of peace and well-being. If we here in the United States hold fast to our faith in the United Nations, the momentum which our faith cannot help but give to this worldwide movement will bring nearer the reality of a peaceful and prosperous world.

The time is approaching for the chance for members of the United Nations to reexamine and review the structure of that organization. I urge that the United States strongly support the proposed conference for the revision of the United Nations Charter. Such a conference offers an opportunity to strengthen the U. N. and therefore increase the chances for world peace and a higher order of international morality.

Kremlin Jitters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PATRICK J. HILLINGS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 10, 1954

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, I have consistently urged that greater efforts might be made to give encouragement to the people behind the Iron Curtain that we have not forgotten them even though they live in Communist slavery. I intend to continue my efforts in this regard with the hope that the day will come when many of the countries seized by the Reds can once again be free.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include a newspaper article and editorials which discuss this subject.

The following editorial appeared in the Los Angeles Examiner April 26, 1954:

Kremlin Jitters

The Soviet diplomatic break with Australia over the Petrov affair has caused very little, if any, consternation in the land down under but it is an open indication of a violent attack of the shakes that has seized the Kremlin.

Troubling the minds of the Kremlin mob and causing, we hope, sleepless nights is the question: How many more of our diplomat-spies, how many more of our secret agents, are going to flee to the other side and spill their information?

In fact, official sources in Australia regard this fear as the real reason for the diplomatic break. They believe the Kremlin wants to get its entire diplomatic staff out of there fast to prevent further defections.

Vladimir Petrov was third secretary of the Soviet Embassy, but actually he was the big wheel of the Soviet secret police in Australia. He sought and obtained asylum April 13, bringing with him a mass of documents pinpointing the Russian spy setup there. Subsequently his wife was rescued dramatically from an attempt to take her to Moscow by two Soviet thugs.

Before Petrov there was Yuri Rastvorov, chief Soviet spy agent in Japan, who surrendered himself to the United States intelligence agency in January.

And after Petrov came Capt. Nikolai Khokhlov, a high secret agent who had been assigned to West Germany on a murder mission with a fantastic weapon—a cigaret case that silently shot cyanide bullets. He gave himself up to United States authorities a few days ago.

As concerns the rupture in diplomatic relations, dispatches say Australia is reacting with relief rather than alarm. These relations have been mostly empty formality for years anyway, and Britain can take care of whatever interests Canberra still has with Moscow.

As we said a few days ago, we admire the way Australia acted in the case of Petrov and his wife. Now we admire Australia more for the realistic composure in facing this latest development. It all adds up to this truism: If you're going to take a stand against communism, you've got to be tough and firm.

And that applies both to individuals and nations.

The following editorial appeared in the Washington Evening Star, May 4, 1954:

Outrageous and Uncivilized

The Kremlin must be more than a little upset by the fact that within recent months—in places like Japan, Australia, and West Germany—it has been losing a number of its secret agents. For these agents, in defecting to the side of freedom, have been revealing things that can hardly fail to cause the Malenkov regime embarrassment abroad and a measure of worry at home.

Certainly, as far as the outside world is concerned, the revelations made by the defectors have exposed enough dirty work in the field of espionage and terrorism to justify what has been said about it by Walter Dowling, Acting United States High Commissioner for Germany. As Mr. Dowling has put it—in a formal protest to his Russian counterpart in Berlin—the whole business points to "a deliberately outrageous and uncivilized course of conduct on the part of the Government of the Soviet Union." More than that, as for the Kremlin's internal affairs, the desertions of the undercover agents indicate that the U. S. S. R.'s secret police organization—largely the creature of the late Lavrenti Beria, who had strong support among the personnel—may well be riddled with low morale, fear, bitterness, and incipient disloyalty as a result of Beria's sudden downfall and execution not long after Stalin's death.

Of course, since only a relatively few of these agents have fled to the West up to now, it would be wishful to read too much into the situation. Still, enough of them have defected to throw a new and luridly instructive light on the grim nature of the Soviet system and on how that system operates on both sides of the Iron Curtain. Clearly, despite Moscow's occasional dovelike noises, the free world has as much reason as ever to build up and maintain the strongest possible defenses against this continuing and undiminished menace.

The following article appeared in the Alhambra Post Advocate April 21, 1954:

Hillings Bill Gets Boost by Soviet Grab

(By Frank Kuest)

Washington.—The dramatic rescue of a Soviet diplomat's wife from her Communist captors attempting to spirit her from Australia for certain doom in Russia, today gave impetus to legislation sponsored by Representative Pat Hillings, Republican, of California, to provide sanctuary in the United States for all Communist officials willing to trade Red secrets for freedom.

(Hillings was a guest speaker before the Alhambra Chamber of Commerce this morning.)

The Hillings bill is before a House Judiciary Subcommittee headed by Representative Louis E. Graham, Republican, of Pennsylvania, who has indicated that early hearings will be held.

The proposed measure would simply encourage officials in Communist-dominated countries to renounce communism by trading secret Soviet information for freedom and temporary asylum in this country until Red rule collapses in Russia and the satellite states in Eastern Europe and Asia.

PEACE THREAT

"The Soviet Union and the international Communist conspiracy are the greatest threats to world peace," Hillings has stated. "We can advance the cause of world peace if we encourage the internal disintegration of the Red empire."

The California Congressman said this can be accomplished by providing sanctuary for the hundreds of uneasy Communist officials in Red states who would desert the cause of Marxism and Russian imperialism in a bid for freedom.

The legislation advanced by Hillings would not necessarily give citizenship to Communists who defect but would guarantee them asylum until such time that their home countries are rid of the Red plague.

What spurred a new look at the Hillings legislation was the event that has occurred in Australia, where a key Soviet diplomat, Vladimir Petrov, took advantage of an offer to trade Red secrets in his possession for sanctuary.

It has been reported out of Canberra that Petrov may be one of the most important officials to switch allegiance to the West since the code clerk, Igor Gousenko, deserted communism in Canada in 1945 and handed over secrets that uncovered a Soviet atom spy network.

Moreover, it was reported that Petrov was able to turn over information to Australian authorities identifying 30 or more Australians who were listed as cooperators or contacts in spy work in the antipodes.

KIDNAP ATTEMPT

Armed Russian agents attemped to kidnay Mrs. Petrov and remove her from Australia and remove her to Russia until they were intercepted by Australian police at Darwin, the last stop before the plane departed Australia, and the Red agents were disarmed and Mrs. Petrov freed.

The Hillings bill would precisely perform the same function as the event in Australia by allowing admission to the United States of Communist government officials who renounce their allegiance to communism, flee from a Communist country and enable them to supply information to the United States which is valuable and useful to the security of this country and the free world.

Rumania's Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT C. BYRD
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 4, 1954

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Speaker, the League of Free Rumanians has just brought to my attention, on the occasion of their national independence day, May 10, the sufferings and slavery of their country under the Soviet yoke.

It feel it proper to pay homage to the enslaved Rumanian nation, to her spirit of resistance and her unshakable faith in the ideals we share. It is appalling that, after a war in which so many young Americans gave their lives, slavery and totalitarian rule, instead of receding, have enlarged their dominion even to the inclusion of nations formerly free. We are now faced with a Communist empire controlling 800 millions of people. There is no longer any doubt today, especialy after the recent developments in Asia, that our own future and security are fatally jeopardized by the formidable threat of this immense, expanding tyranny. Consequently, I consider it none too soon to freshly reexamine the problem of the subjugated nations. At this moment of crisis for the United States, it is certain that these peoples, crushed under the oppressive heel of the Russian Communists, will be our natural and active allies. There are no other nations in the world whose fate is more inexorably bound to our own. They will rise again in freedom, or fall deeper in their mire of misery, according to our victory or defeat in the world struggle for liberty.

Among these peoples the Rumanians have brought an eminent contribution throughout their history to the defense of Europe and Christianity. One of their great princes, in the 15th century, Stephen the Great, was called Athleta Christi by Pope Sixtus IV. Rumania, situated as it is on the eastern borders of Europe, bore the brunt of all the barbaric invasions from the East. The Rumanians emerged, after a long period of trials and vicissitudes caused by the invaders, fighting by force of arms for their independence, which was eventually reestablished by the Congress of Berlin in 1878. The existence of a free Rumania as an element of European stability had already been recognized after the war against Russia by the Treaty of Paris in 1856.

We now realize that, by destroying the independence of countries like Rumania, at the end of World War II, the European equilibrium was ipso facto abolished. We now see clearly how right were the American advocates of self-determination and independence in Europe at the conclusion of World War I. Unfortunately, those sound principles have been infringed, the consequence being that, in order to maintain the balance destroyed through the condoned swallowing up by the Soviet Union of 100 million people, we are compelled to keep troops in Europe.

Concerning the case of Rumania, it is perhaps interesting to note some reactions from the Rumanians themselves. I herewith insert the following letter addressed to the Secretary of State by the League of Free Rumanians on March 6, 1954:

MR. SECRETARY: Nine years ago, on the 6th of March 1944, Rumania was victim of the well-known, brutal, and overt Soviet seizure. Thus, immediately after the Yalta Declaration, a Communist puppet government was installed through the Kremlin's Diktat, while the whole of the Rumanian army was fighting on the allied front, being considered at that time as its fourth combat force.

At the Moscow Conference in December 1945, the United States and the United Kingdom, aware of this Soviet-Communist seizure, tried to help restore freedom in Rumania by asking that free and unfettered elections be held. But the elections of November 19, 1946, held under Russian occupation and controlled by its Communist stooge government, proved to be a flagrant denial of democracy. In its official statement of November 26, 1946, the Department of State fully exposed the fraud perpetrated under duress and terror. The satellite and nonrepresentative character of the government imposed in Rumania was, thus, again identified and denounced.

For yet undisclosed reasons, the United States signed in February of 1947 a peace treaty with this same government implicitely confirming its recognition. The only significant provisions of this treaty under the circumstances, namely article III, regarding the securing of human rights in Rumania, were never carried out by the Moscow-sponsored government. This fact was officially denounced by the United States on the occasion of the repeated rejection of the demand for admission presented by the Bucharest Communist government before the United Nations. (The Department of State has published two volumes—No. 4376 and No. 4376A, released respectively November 1951 and February 1952, presenting abundant evidence which demonstrates the violation of the peace guarantees of human rights in Rumania.)

It is also common knowledge that other provisions of this treaty, viz., article II, regarding the limitation of Rumanian armed forces, have not been respected. Consequently, there is no doubt whatsoever that the de jure position of the present Rumanian government is that of a forcibly imposed, totalitarian government, illegitimate, nonrepresentative, and a violator of international law. A recognition of such a government cannot have any foundation in principle.

The ordeal of the Rumanian people under the ruthless foreign occupation of Soviet communism, their economic exploitation, and their deprivation of elemental human rights and liberties are now a matter of record. On the other hand, through Soviet political and military pressure, Rumania has been transformed against the will of its people into a satellite base for the aggressive schemes of Moscow.

In view of these facts, the further maintenance of the recognition of the Bucharest government appears to be clearly detrimental to the prestige and political interests of the United States. The thesis advocated in certain circles, that the presence of an American legation means encouragement for the enslaved, is, in our view as Rumanians, utterly specious. On the contrary, such a presence with all its correlated humiliations and flagrant impotence performs a single major role—it shows the Rumanian people that the United States considers the Moscow-imposed Communist government as rightful and legitimate. This obvious inference brings increased discouragement and a feeling of total abandonment which are conducive to complete conformity and exhaustion of the moral forces of resistance.

It is for these reasons, sir, that we take the liberty to respectfully ask you to give your consideration to the urgent problem of the withdrawal of recognition. The League of Free Romanians is expressing the earnest hope of thousands of Romanian exiles that such a moral and political reparation, represented by the withdrawing of recognition and condemnation of the unlawful, criminal, Soviet-quisling government in Bucharest, would be forthcoming for a suffering and oppressed people, who are deeply and sincerely devoted to the United States and to its noble humane and political ideals.

Yours respectfully,

MIHAIL FARCASANU,
President.

Mr. Speaker, the people of eastern Europe are undoubtedly awaiting with anguish that we reaffirm the Wilsonian principles of national freedom and self-determination. It is only natural that they need something substantial from us in order to sustain their hopes and their will to resist. It is not reasonable to expect that the great reservoir of faith in the United States could be maintained without our responding to its aspirations.

Our propaganda, in order to be effective with regard to the subjugated peoples, must be the expression of a policy which would take into consideration their legitimate desires. The moral and political vacuum which is felt behind our weak propaganda toward the countries within the Soviet orbit cannot inspire and strengthen the vast potential of forces against Soviet domination. We have to give some positive encouragement to these enslaved peoples if we are interested in keeping alive the spark of resistance and revolt, which in the hour of decision could ignite the powder keg within the bastions of our enemy. It is my belief that now is the moment to formulate and take measures for the implementation of a constructive American policy in regard to the subjugated nations of Eastern Europe.

The Townsend Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY

OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 5, 1954

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD a letter from Mr. Jno. C. Cuneo, California State organizer of the Townsend plan for national insurance:

THE TOWNSEND PLAN FOR
NATIONAL INSURANCE,
Cleveland, Ohio, May 6, 1954.

Hon. SAMUEL YORTY,
Member of Congress,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. YORTY: The Ways and Means Committee is in the process of trying to develop a proposed bill for presentation to Congress, whereby the social-security laws will be improved and broadened. Since this is a vital matter that affects all Americans very directly, every Member of the House of Representatives and of the Senate should give specific consideration to whatever bills are presented.

The record clearly shows that when the social-security laws were adopted, it was hoped that by this time we would have a well developed, sound social-security system in the United States. However, the results achieved are far from the goals sought. The inadequacy of the grants paid; the tremendous "needs' basis" red-tape involved and the confusing and unsatisfactory results achieved through having a different program in each State, must be apparent to everyone.

On April 10, 1954, Dr. Francis E. Townsend, and other representatives of our organization, appeared before the Ways and Means Committee and urged the adoption of bills, H. R. 2446 and 2447, as amendments to the Social Security Act. These bills, if adopted by Congress, would correct many of the deficiencies of the Social Security Act and do it very easily. In addition, there would be many other muchly desired objectives achieved. With this type of social-security program, coverage would be extended to all Americans. It would be on a pay-as-we-go basis and the amounts paid to the blind, orphans, disabled, and to the aged would be geared to the fluctuations in price levels. Thus, we would eliminate the necessity of making constant changes in the law to adjust the amount of the grants paid to the recipients.

While bills, H. R. 2446 and 2447, would accomplish all of the above broad changes, they would, in addition, do much more to help all Americans in matters such as our problems with farm surpluses, unemployment, and of maintaining our economy on an even keel so as to continue our high level of profitable business. Thusly, we would prevent our boom and bust periods and assure a volume of tax revenues to keep our national economy in sound condition.

H. R. 2446 and 2447 were introduced by the Honorable HOMER D. ANGELL and by the Honorable ROBERT T. SECREST. At the present time, 174 Members of the Congress have signed discharge petition No. 2 to bring these bills to the floor of the Congress for full study, debate and vote, as provided by our American tradition.

If the Congress really wants to solve such problems as farm surpluses, unemployment, maintain prosperity, without war, and if it wants a sound, simple and equitable social-security system for all Americans, it will proceed at once to adopt H. R. 2446–47.

I sincerely believe the serious conditions we face and the fact that 174 Members of the Congress ask that these bills be brought to the floor of the Congress justifies the Ways and Means Committee to send these bills out for a debate and vote without further delay.

We earnestly urge that you and your colleagues make every effort to secure favorable action by the Ways and Means Committee.

Thank you for signing discharge petition No. 2 and for all of your past efforts to assist the aged and unemployable citizens.

Sincerely,

Jno. C. Cuneo,
State Organizer.

Resolutions Adopted at Wisconsin Young Republican Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM K. VAN PELT

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 10, 1954

Mr. VAN PELT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I wish to include the text of the resolutions adopted at the State convention of Wisconsin Federation of Young Republicans held at Oshkosh, Wis., May 2, 1954. The resolutions follow:

Resolution presented by Bill Mulligan, passed:

"The Wisconsin Federation of Young Republicans hereby goes on record affirming its stand that the threat of international communism is the most important issue facing the American people today. It deplores the attempts of the Communists, their left-wing followers, and of many well-meaning, but misguided individuals to substitute the issue of personalities. The Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, under the chairmanship of Senator Joseph R. McCarthy, has accomplished much during the past year. It has brought to the public's attention serious weaknesses in the security programs of the Armed Forces, the Government Printing Office, and private defense contractors, and in our overseas information centers. The Eisenhower administration has cooperated with the investigating committees of Congress in their efforts to correct security weaknesses in contrast to the shabby performances of the Truman administration: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the Wisconsin Federation of Young Republicans therefore goes on record commending the constructive accomplishments of Senator Joseph R. McCarthy and his Senate Permanent Investigating Subcommittee and the Eisenhower administration in weeding out atheistic communism."

Following this resoluution, Ray Fredrickson moved the following, passed:

"I move that this convention, if possible, should submit to the Senators of the United States, to the Congressmen of the party, to the national officers of the party, to the national officers of the Young Republicans showing our full support on behalf of the YR's of the State of Wisconsin on behalf of Republican Senator of Wisconsin, Joseph R. McCarthy."

Anita Becker introduced this resolution, which passed:

"*Be it resolved*, That the 1954 Young Republican convention go on record as commending the American Legion of Burlington, Wis., for their commemoration of May Day in the United States way and that a copy of this resolution be sent to that organization."

Lou Ceci moved this resolution, which was adopted:

"*Be it resolved*, That it is the sense of the Young Republican convention assembled here at Oshkosh that the 1955 convention of the Young Republicans be held in Milwaukee the first weekend in May."

Presented by Bill Mulligan and adopted:

"Whereas, 18-year-olds have taken such an active part in their Government;

"Whereas 18-year-olds presently have more maturity than their 21-year-old counterparts 175 years ago due to the advances in education and communications;

"Whereas 18-year-olds have been granted other legal rights;

"Whereas 18-year-olds are less susceptible to apathy;

"Whereas 18-year-olds have exhibited great enthusiasm in voting in Georgia: Be it

"*Resolved*, That the Wisconsin Federation of Young Republicans, in convention assembled, endorse the 18-year-old vote in the State of Wisconsin and urge that all senators and assemblymen back this proposal in their 1955 legislature; be it further

"*Resolved*, That a copy of the resolution be sent to the Governor, the legislature, and the press."

Presented by Jack Steinhilber and adopted:

"The United States Constitution now reads that in order to become the supreme law of the land, laws must be pursuant to the Constitution, whereas treaties need only be made 'under the authority of' the Constitution. This wording has been interpreted by the Supreme Court to mean that any treaty negotiated by the President and passed by two-thirds of the Senate are per se Constitutional. Treaties and other agreements have been used to legislate in domestic affairs, an effect not contemplated by our Founding Fathers.

"Therefore, this convention believes that a constitutional amendment embodying the major objective behind the Bricker amendment, is necessary to preserve our system of separation of powers. This amendment should state that all treaties and executive or other agreements shall be the supreme law of the land only if they are pursuant to the Constitution. We feel that such an amendment would make it clear that a treaty as well as an act of Congress is subject to the limitations of power set forth in the Constitution."

Neal Harris presented the following resolution and unanimously adopted:

"*Resolved*, That the YGOP convention assembled recommend to their executive committee that a YGOP labor council be set up for this federation similar and parallel to the present farm council to study and advise this organization as to the labor situation."

Gene Petrie moved the following resolution and adopted unanimously:

"*Resolved*, That we, the Young Republicans of the State of Wisconsin take this occasion to heartily commend President Dwight D. Eisenhower for the extraordinary leadership he has given to our party and to our country in the short space of 15 months he has been in office. We wish him well in the further performance of his difficult duties."

Leo Martin presented this resolution and it passed unanimously:

"Whereas the 1954 Oshkosh convention is a tremendous success;

"Whereas Republican public-office holders who addressed the convention were a true inspiration;

"Whereas the Winnebago County YGOP's have, by their diligence, created an occasion which will be long remembered: Be it hereby

"*Resolved*, That the 1954 Wisconsin Federation of Young Republicans in convention assembled congratulate the convention committee, and the local arrangements committee, and all individuals involved in making this a successful convention."

Ray Lecy presented the following resolution and it passed:

"I move that this convention go on record as highly commending the work of Mr. Mark Catlin as our convention chairman."

Resurrection for Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES R. HOWELL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 10, 1954

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, the Easter edition of the Polish-American Journal contained an editorial by the publisher, Mr. Leopold Dende, that I believe is most inspiring.

On Easter Sunday, we observe with joy the great miracle of resurrection, the event that symbolizes for us the ultimate triumph of good over evil. Mr. Dende draws the parallel of Easter with the suffering and oppression that Poland is now passing through. He believes that the message of Easter for the people of Poland is that their nation will eventually rise in triumph from the oppressive hand of communism that now covers the land.

I am also including the names of the pastors whose names appeared below this editorial:

Our Easter Message

In observing the Resurrection of Christ from the dead we should give thought to the following:

When Jesus Christ was crucified, the forces of evil were certain that they had gained an upper hand in this world of ours. But it wasn't so. The victory of evil was short-lived. Christ came back in the glory of Resurrection, giving visible testimony that God is more powerful than evil.

Today, the forces of evil, personified by godless Communist tyrants, are crucifying almost half of humankind, including the land of our forefathers—Poland—and are confident of their power to score a global victory.

There is no denying that the forces of evil, spearheaded by Communists, are powerful on both sides of the Iron Curtain.

There is no denying that we are facing a terrific struggle with communism and other forces of evil.

In this titanic struggle, the Roman Catholic Church is the greatest spiritual force in the world against communism and all other evils of humankind.

And remembering resurrection, we, the Catholics, are certain that eventually the good will conquer the evil.

On this Easter holiday and holy days let us join our enslaved brethren in Poland in prayers for the resurrection of Poland, let us offer up supplications to the Throne of Mercy that Poland may again enjoy the blessings of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, which is the rightful heritage, and let us resolve to do everything in our power to hasten the victory of good over evil and to bring about the Kingdom of Heaven on this earth of ours.

Rev. Stanislaus A. Milos, St. Anthony's Church, Port Reading, N. J.

Rev. Martin A. Piasecki, Our Lady of Czestochowa Church, Jersey City, N. J.

Rev. Albert Arthur Rojek, president, Second World War Polish Chaplains Association in the United States.

Rev. Henry A. Sarnowski, director, Don Bosco High School, Ramsey, N. J.

Rev. Joseph A. Smolen, Our Lady of Czestochowa Church, Jersey City, N. J.

Rev. Bronislaus A. Socha, St. Valentine's Church, Bloomfield, N. J.

Rec. Walter Urbanik, Sacred Heart Church, South Amboy, N. J.

Rev. Peter Wieczorek, Sacred Heart Church, Manville, N. J.

Rev. John P. Witkiewicz, St. Joseph's Church, Hackensack, N. J.

Rev. Fabian Zator, O. F. M. Conv., St. Casimir's Church, Riverside, N. J.

Rev. Alexander L. Zdanewicz, St. Joseph's Church, New Brunswick, N. J.

Rev. Ceslaus M. Jasionowski, S. T. D., St. Mary of Czestochowa Church, Bound Brook, N. J.

Rev. Clement Kacprzynski, O. F. M. Conv., St. Stanislaus Church, Trenton, N. J.

Rev. John A. Karolewski, St. Anne's Church, Jersey City, N. J.

Rev. Francis A. Kasprowicz, Holy Cross Church, Trenton, N. J.

Rev. M. A. Konopka, Holy Family Church, Carteret, N. J.

Rev. Francis P. Kowalczyk, Holy Rosary Church, Passaic, N. J.

Rev. Edward S. Kozlowski, St. Therese of the Child Jesus Church, Linden, N. J.

Rev. Anthony T. Kurzynowski, St. Joseph's Church, Passaic, N. J.

Rev. Metislaus C. Lankau, Sacred Heart Church, Irvington, N. J.

Rev. Zenon Lesniowski, St. Stephen's Church, Perth Amboy, N. J.

Rev. Ladislaus J. Madura, Our Lady of Czestochowa Church, South Plainfield, N. J.

Rev. Francis S. Majewski, Sacred Heart Church, Hudson Heights, N. J.

Rt. Rev. Msgr. Vitus J. Masnicki, Protonotary Apostolic St. Adalbert's Church, Elizabeth, N. J.

Rt. Rev. Msgr. Paul Knappek, St. Casimir's Church, Newark, N. J.

Rt. Rev. Msgr. Martin J. Lipinski, St. Hedwig's Church, Trenton, N. J.

Rt. Rev. Msgr. Anthony A. Traika, Mt. Carmel Church, Bayonne, N. J.

Rt. Rev. Msgr. John F. Wetula, St. Stanislaus Kostka Church, Garfield, N. J.

Rt. Rev. Msgr. James Wrzeciono, St. Stephen's Church, Paterson, N. J.

Rev. John P. Adamowski, St. Joseph's Church, East Millstone, N. J.

Rev. Adolf Banach, O. F. M. Conv., St. John Kanty Church, Clifton, N. J.

Rev. Stephen A. Buszka, All Saints Church, Burlington, N. J.

Rev. Alexander W. Fronczak, President, Polish Clergymen Society, Lodge 24, PCU of American, Most Sacred Heart of Jesus Church, Wallington, N. J.

Rev. Theodore J. Gajewski, St. Stanislaus Kostka Church, Plainfield, N. J.

Rev. Leo P. Hak, St. Anthony's Church, Jersey City, N. J.

Drew Pearson Slightly Off the Beam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEROY JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 10, 1954

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herein an article which appeared under the name of Drew Pearson in the San Francisco Chronicle on May 3, 1954. The article concerned a project in my congressional district, the 11th District of California, known as the Tri-Dam project. The Tri-Dam project is a water conservation project, which is being undertaken by the joint efforts and financial obligation of the Oakdale Irrigation District and the South San Joaquin Irrigation District. Upon reading Mr. Pearson's article, the secretary of the Oakdale District, at the direction of the directors of both districts, wrote an article responding to Mr. Pearson's article.

I include herewith, first, the article by Drew Pearson; and, second, letter written by C. W. Quinley, secretary of Oakdale Irrigation District, to Mr. Pearson:

MERRY-GO-ROUND

(By Drew Pearson)

With just as little fanfare as possible, Secretary of the Interior McKay has given the green light to a reversal of the 50-year-old Teddy Roosevelt Reclamation Act.

In a letter dated April 6 to Congressman MILLER of Nebraska, McKay has O. K.'d the same principle for reclamation and waterpower as has been applied to the graft-ridden FHA. Western Senators who have examined the McKay plan say it amounts to the biggest giveaway since New Deal days and is a complete reversal of Eisenhower policy. They plan a battle to block the policy in Congress.

But its chief provisions will be completely ignored. These provisions, considered all important in the building up of the West, but bitterly fought by the power companies and big landowners, are:

1. Preference to public bodies such as municipalities and REA co-ops, rather than private utilities, in the sale of power.

2. A 160-acre limit on the amount of land any one owner can have under water from a Federal reclamation project. Big landowners have been trying to knock this limitation out for years.

To get around these two important reclamation policies, Secretary McKay has O. K.'d a plan to give power on the Stanislaus River in California to a group of private irrigation developers plus Pacific Gas & Electric. In addition, the Federal Government will hand this group $10,370,000 in grants and loans under a special bill introduced by Congressman LEROY JOHNSON with Senators KNOWLAND and KUCHEL, Republicans.

On top of this, Congressman MILLER of Nebraska has introduced a bill making this applicable to all of the 17 Western States. The Reclamation Act would be completely bypassed and ignored.

Background of this important byplay is that about a year ago, the Oakdale and South San Joaquin Irrigation Districts signed a contract with Pacific Gas & Electric to set up 3 powerplants on the Stanislaus River, and using this contract as security, they negotiated a loan of $4,700,000. The excess water, they planned, would be used for irrigation.

Just at this time, however, Secretary Humphrey's hard-money policy upset the applecart.

Whereupon the California promoters called on Under Secretary of the Interior Ralph Tudor for help, and Tudor finally came through with a plan not only to give the Stanislaus River to the private groups, but also hand them $10,370,000 in loans and grants.

OAKDALE, CALIF., *May 6, 1954.*

Re Tri-Dam project

Mr. DREW PEARSON,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The directors of the Oakdale Irrigation District and South San Joaquin Irrigation District have read your column respecting the Tri-Dam project, appearing in the San Francisco Chronicle on May 3, 1954. Knowing and approving of your efforts to keep the public correctly and accurately advised, we know that you will wish to consider the following facts:

THE AGENCIES INVOLVED

Your column indicates the Tri-Dam project is being developed by "private irrigation developers plus the Pacific Gas & Electric." They are referred to as "California promoters." The fact is that the two districts involved are public agencies of the State of California acting only for governmental purposes, organized in and functioning as going concerns since 1909. They own no property in the proprietary sense. (*Anderson-Cottonwood Irrigation District* v. *Klukkert* (13 Cal. 2d 191), and numerous cases therein cited. Also sec. 20057 Water Code.) They make no profit and under the constitution of the State of California the legislature retains complete or plenary control over them. In this semiarid State, bringing water to the land is as much a governmental function as providing roads and police protection. The legislature has set up State agencies in the form of irrigation districts to perform that function.

Thus, there are no private promoters or individuals involved. To the contrary, the entire population of the 2 districts, over 30,000 people, are the direct beneficiaries of the project and the entire population of the State of California, the indirect beneficiaries. These districts have the right to divert 1,816.6 second-feet from the Stanislaus River. A portion of these rights dates back to 1853. All of the districts' water rights were formerly adjudicated pursuant to California law in the Superior Court of San Joaquin County by judgment entered November 14, 1929. This project grants no additional right to divert water from the river to these districts.

HISTORY OF THE PROJECT

The project has been in the development stage since 1938. The two districts have spent over $1,250,000 of their own taxpayers' money on engineering, preliminary investigations, diamond drilling, access roads, surveying, design work, etc. It has been investigated and approved by the State engineer, and the State of California has granted the necessary water right permits to make the project possible. It has been investigated and approved by the Bureau of Reclamation, and licenses have been granted for the project by the Federal Power Commission. All this was done during the Democratic administration of President Truman.

THE 160-ACRE LIMITATION

The districts, organized in 1909, contain 143,457 gross acres. Of this acreage 121,000 acres are now under irrigation. Much of the balance is in roads, towns, etc., and unirrigable. Disregarding holdings of less than 1 acre, the average size farm is 27 acres. The districts are almost completely developed to irrigated farms. All lands in the districts already have a water supply, though inadequate. There is no opportunity for land speculation. Under existing reclamation law and policy the 160-acre limitation would be meaningless and without effect in these districts.

PREFERENCE CUSTOMERS UNAVAILABLE

This is an irrigation project. All the water developed will be used for irrigation in the districts. The incidental use of the water for power generation is only a means of making the project economically feasible.

The power features will be built and owned by the districts, the State agencies involved. When the construction costs are paid, they will be in a position to do what they please with the power, including setting up their own distribution systems. The districts investigated the possibility of selling the power initially to the city of Los Angeles, the Bureau of Reclamation, and other public agencies, but economics would not permit of this being done.

Thus, if this development is to be added to the sum total of the wealth of the State and Nation, it must be done by sale of power to the private utility until construction costs are paid. That is the plan.

THE FINANCING

Your column states that "Using this contract as security, they negotiated a loan of $4,700,000." No such loan has been made, negotiated, or even considered.

The financing plan is for the districts to sell bonds to private purchasers and themselves finance between $43 million and $47 million of the construction costs, depending on interest rates (not $4,700,000), and will borrow from and pay back to the United States any additional amount required to complete construction. In any event, such additional amount will probably not exceed $4 million; but to provide against possible unforseen contingencies, the $10,370,000 amount is made available, if needed. It is this reserve that makes the sale of private bonds possible.

SUMMARY

What this plan amounts to is the State of California, through its districts, endeavoring to provide the public reclamation development heretofore usually provided through the Bureau of Reclamation at great cost to the United States. The districts can do this at less cost and with the same public benefits. We feel you will agree this is a worthy objective.

In this letter we have not been able to go into any great detail, but would be glad to sit down at any time with you or your representatives and provide complete facts and figures that have been developed at a cost of $1,250,000 which has been paid by the taxpayers in these districts.

Very truly yours,
Oakdale Irrigation District.
Edwin Koster, *President*.
South San Joaquin Irrigation District.
John Vrieling, *President*.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that everyone who is interested in water conservation will read this extension of remarks, and especially Mr. Pearson's article and the answer of the Secretary, which shows how completely wrong in every particular Mr. Pearson was.

Hidden Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. DAWSON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 10, 1954

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I am greatly indebted to my good friend and colleague, the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Saylor], for having extended his remarks in the Congressional Record of May 3, under the heading "Hidden Subsidies." I am particularly indebted to my friend for his having reproduced, so that all the world might see it, a letter addressed to him on April 13 by the Honorable Joseph M. Dodge, Director of the Bureau of the Budget. The principal reason for my gratitude to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania lies in the fact that he has thus given wide circulation to a letter from one of the highest officials in the executive branch of the Government, setting forth with clarity and logic the administration's full support for the policy of the reclamation program—for the policy of developing the West. I may add, Mr. Speaker, that Director Dodge's letter of April 13 is, in a very real sense, epoch making, for the Bureau of the Budget has been notoriously conservative in its attitude toward the authorization of Federal reclamation projects. I venture to express the hope that the policy so ably explained by Budget Director Dodge in his letter of April 13, and the recent blessing accorded by this administration to the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, meaningful as they are for the immediate present, will be of greater and greater significance in the years to come for the 17 Western States.

My good friend, the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Saylor] is noted for taking, let us say, a highly reluctant attitude toward the development of the 17 Western States. My good friend and all his Pennsylvania colleagues ought, in their own interests, to demonstrate greater concern for the development of the West, particularly, through the Federal reclamation program.

It is not the hidden subsidies of the Federal reclamation program with which my friend should be concerned. It is the hidden benefits of that program of which he should take note. Indeed, this House, as well as the other body, and the people of the country as a whole ought to take note of these immense hidden benefits of the Federal reclamation program. As a result of 50 years of effort, some 7 million acres of good farmland are under irrigation in the West; 125,000 family farms are receiving water for irrigation in the West; 125,00 suburban homes in the West are receiving irrigation water.

As a result of some 47 harvests since the Federal reclamation program was put under way in 1902, almost $9 billion worth of agricultural products have been derived. This is the result of the investment of less than $2 billion in the last 50 years. During the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, some 25 hydroelectric powerplants, constructed under the Federal reclamation program, produced gross revenues of more than $48 million. And, what of the more than $500 million paid back by the water and power users in the West on Federal reclamation projects during the past 50 years? What of the almost $3 billion in Federal tax revenues alone coming into the Nation's coffers from reclamation project areas? What of the fact that retail sales in the 17 Western States, where this Federal reclamation program touches the people directly, have averaged more than $150 per capita higher than in the other 31 States?

My friend should concern himself with the direct financial effect on the railroads in Pennsylvania, on Pennsylvania's manufacturers, and on Pennsylvania's merchants of the Federal reclamation program. If my distinguished colleague will take time to look into the situation, he will find, for instance, that, in 1 year alone, the Federal reclamation program was responsible for the movement out of the State of Pennsylvania of more than 98,000 railroad cars, carrying more than 27 million tons consigned to the Western States. The figures on motortruck loadings are even more stupendous.

The thing that has been too long hidden from the general public, and, apparently, from my good friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, is the benefit to the country at large from the Nation's investment in the Federal reclamation program. The President and his aides evidently recognize these benefits. The Congress has recognized these benefits. I hope that the Congress will continue to give evidence of its recognition of these benefits through the authorization of the Colorado River storage project and participating projects .

When my friend speaks of "hidden subsidies" connected with the Federal reclamation program in the West, he must do so with tongue in cheek. I say that, because his 22d Congressional District in the great State of Pennsylvania has benefited from Federal Government aid in the construction of public works for many years. He is active in seeking the authorization of additional works. His constituents do not have to pay, as our western water users have to pay for the cost of these works. Indeed, the taxpayers of my State of Utah, and the States of Colorado, New Mexico, and Wyoming have helped to pay the cost of these works.

Already built in Mr. Saylor's district are: the Mahoning Creek Reservoir, at a cost to the taxpayers of the United States of more than $6½ million; the Crooked River Resevoir, at a cost of more than $4½ million; and the Johnstown project, at a cost of almost $9 million. Now building in his district is the Conemaugh project, at an estimated cost close to $50 million. His constituents do not have to repay the costs of these works, with or without interest. It seems unreasonable on his part to complain against the established policy—a policy established under Theodore Roosevelt—whereby the western water users are not required to pay interest on the country's investment in their irrigation works.

Wisconsin Young Republicans Meet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM K. VAN PELT

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 10, 1954

Mr. VAN PELT. Mr. Speaker, the Wisconsin Federation of Young Republicans held an outstanding convention at Oshkosh, Wis., May 2, 1954. The event was attended by over 1,000 delegates. Senator Barry Goldwater, of Arizona, was the principal speaker and he delivered a most inspiring address. Other speakers included Senators Alexander Wiley and Joseph R. McCarthy, of Wisconsin. I was privileged to present the keynote address.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I wish to include the platform adopted by the convention. The platform follows:

1954 Platform of the Wisconsin Federation of Young Republicans

PREAMBLE

Our goal: At home, a Nation of opportunity; abroad, a peaceful world.

Our promise: At home, economic prosperity with a faith in moral values; abroad, a community of free nations living at peace, exchanging ideas, raising the standard of living throughout the world.

TAXATION

1. As we promised, we have: (a) cut income taxes to the extent of 10 percent; (b) lowered excise taxes; (c) ended the excess-profits tax.

2. Tax laws are being revised and streamlined.

3. We commend the administration for reducing waste and extravagance as inherited from the previous administration, making some tax cuts possible. We believe, however, that the budget can still be balanced by further scrutiny of, and cuts in, appropriations by the Congress.

NATIONAL ECONOMY

1. We urge the present administration to halt the encroachment of socialism and socialistic programs upon our traditional free-enterprise system. We believe in the right of individual States to govern their own affairs. We commend the administration for the return to private ownership many businesses which are now being more efficiently handled by the individual citizen. We urge the continuation of the free-enterprise program in order to avoid further socialism. We commend our Republican administration for abolishing the unnecessary controls on rent, wages, and prices. This, too, is an aid to antisocialization and return to free enterprise in America.

2. Although we do favor extension of social security, we are opposed to Federal compulsory health insurance and any further planned economy.

3. As we promised, we have restored the independent status of the Federal Reserve Board in the Nation's fiscal policies. It is no longer a tool of the Treasury to further inflate the dollar, but rather its energies are directed at the stabilizing and safeguarding the financial structure of the Nation.

4. We commend the Republican Party for reorganizing in numerous departments to eliminate approximately 200,000 needless jobs, which is in direct contrast to the Government under the New Deal bureaucracy.

FARM PROGRAM

We believe the farmers are entitled to the equivalent of 100 percent of parity for their products in the market without subsidies and Government purchases which price these products out of the market. Until the above can be realized, we most strongly endorse Secretary Ezra Taft Benson's flexible price-support program.

We advocate—

1. The reduction of price supports to 75 percent of parity on all feeds and supplies that the farmer buys and that are now supported at 90 percent of parity.

2. A concerted effort on the part of the Government to dispose of the vast surpluses of agricultural products we have acquired under the 90 percent parity program; by gift, if necessary, for disaster relief.

3. A greater efficiency in the production, marketing, and distributing of agricultural products.

4. A further effort on the part of the dairy industry to promote the consumption of dairy products.

5. A complete review of all Government financial supports for other industries and segments of our economy.

LABOR

1. We favor continuation of the Taft-Hartley law because it has upheld the right of both employees and employers.

2. We are presently concerned with the labor situation involving job employment and job security. We recognize that much of this present unemployment is due to the end of the Korean war. We favor the administration's program of returning to private interest, business which ought to be run by the people, and encourageing free enterprise to seek new ways and means of placing our system back on a sound economic basis. We are facing a period of adjustments, which, if we continue to support administration proposals, will result in employment reaching a new peacetime high.

CIVIL RIGHTS

We commend the Eisenhower administration for—

1. Ending segregation in the District of Columbia, the armed services, and in the Federal Government agencies.

2. The action of its Justice Department in filing a brief against segregation in education in cases now before the Supreme Court.

3. Its appointments of qualified personnel to public office regardless of race, creed, color, or national origin. We recommend more State legislation in the field of civil rights to eliminate segregation, poll taxes, and other devices used to deprive people of their constitutional rights. We believe this can best be done by promotion of a real two-party system in the South.

SECURITY

1. We commend the administration in its policy of reestablishing the fact that Government employment is a privilege, not a right.

We believe the FBI and the Justice Department have done an excellent job in the investigation and the prosecution of cases involving treason and espionage.

Further, we believe that congressional investigating committees have performed a vital function in bringing to light subversive activities, and we urge their continued efforts in ths field.

2. We recommend that the Congress, from its experience in the committee hearings into loyalty questions, further enact laws that will enable the Justice Department to prosecute disloyal persons.

FOREIGN POLICY

1. We commend Secretary of Defense Charles E. Wilson, and Robert M. Kyes for their realistic planning under the guidance of President Eisenhower concerning the Nations' defense structure. This planning in defense has reduced duplication of jobs, and restored efficiency and teamwork in the Defense Department. We contend such long-range planning is aimed at a strong America, without the crushing burden of astronomical appropriations. It emphasizes the points where America's capabilities are greatest.

The strategic air command is probably the greatest deterrent to war, and we urge it continued emphasis as a major part of the defense structure.

2. We urge the administration to adopt a graduated program of foreign aids in accordance with the deeds and needs of individual nations. However, we are in favor of an extended reciprocal trade program rather than continued foreign aid.

3. We commend President Eisenhower for stating that he will seek congressional advice and approval before committing United States troops abroad.

4. We commend the President and Secretary Dulles on our firm dealing with communism aggressively, by giving moral support to all nations and peoples desiring to maintain or secure independence.

5. We urge the United States delegates to the United Nations to cooperate in order to bring about a complete revision of the Charter of the United Nations to specifically and unequivocally state its major purpose will be to bring about eventual supervision of armaments throughout the world, and to settle international disputes.

Leo Martin,
Chairman.
Neal Harris II,
First District.
Roger Murphy,
Second District.
Roger Novy,
Third District.
Mary Anne Suctholz,
Fourth District.
Phil Gross,
Fifth District.
Jack Steinhilber,
Sixth District.
Gerald Richardson,
Seventh District.
Jack Pelisek,
Eigthth District.
James Leader,
Ninth District.

Remarks of the Honorable Sam Rayburn, of Texas, Minority Leader, at the Jefferson-Jackson Day Dinner, May 6, 1954

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 10, 1954

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to insert in the Record the remarks of my good friend and wise counselor of many years, the able, distinguished, and beloved minority leader of the House of Representatives, the Honorable Sam Rayburn, of Texas, delivered at the annual Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner at the Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C., Thursday, May 6, 1954.

Sam Rayburn's experience in the art of government in the Congress of the United States covers a span of 40 years and he has served his Nation wisely and well throughout that time. His remarks deserve the attention of the membership of the House and the people of the Nation:

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Truman, Mrs. Truman, and my fellow Democrats; first, I want to express my appreciation to everyone who has had anything to do in bringing about this grand affair, and especially to Chairman John Kenney. At this time, I also want to pay tribute to Chairman Steven Mitchell for the wonderful work he is doing here and elsewhere.

I am here tonight because without prefixes and without suffixes and without apology, I am a Democrat. I was proud to be a Democrat under the leadership of that great scholar-statesman Woodrow Wilson. I have been proud to be a Democrat under the leadership of those two bold and fearless statesmen, Franklin D. Roosevelt and Harry S. Truman.

We have had a change. We have had nearly 17 months of Republican rule. Anybody here want another change? The Republicans have demonstrated that they cannot function. They cannot get the job done. They do not have the machinery or the know-how.

American voters are looking to us again because they know we know how to get the job done and get it done right.

We have been waiting for the Eisenhower administration to act—to get off dead center.

We have been wondering when they are going to spread their wings, get off the ground and let us know where they are going and how. This failure to tell us has caused a lot of people who wanted a change 2 years ago to start asking for a change now.

In 1952 the Republicans said they were going to clean up the mess in Washington. You heard a lot of talk about a mess then, and you are hearing a great deal more now. It is obvious to all of us that the Republicans have created messes of their own. They stepped into them without Democratic assistance.

I rarely discuss Senator McCarthy. He is not our problem, he is the problem of the Republican Party. I will say this, however, if this were a Democratic administration; if this were a Democratic Senator, if this were a Democratic Secretary of the Army, and a Democratic Department of Defense, all the Republicans and a majority of the newspapers would be saying: "This is the biggest mess that Washington has ever witnessed."

During the presidential campaign and for weeks afterward, the Republicans ate up the Yalta and Potsdam agreements blood raw every morning before breakfast. But after they came into power, somebody in the State Department must have read these agreements, and somebody was intelligent enough to understand them. At least we do not hear anymore Republican talk of Yalta and Potsdam.

During the campaign the Republican orators went over the country criticising the Truman-Acheson foreign policy, indicating they were going to make great changes. Practically the only change they have made in the Truman-Acheson policy is to administer it in a sorry fashion. Frankly, under their administration of our foreign policy, one thing definitely has taken place, and that is the tragic truth, we have fewer friends in the world today than we had January 20, 1953.

I have nothing to say in criticism of President Eisenhower personally. We are not going to follow the example set by the Republicans during the administrations of Roosevelt and Truman by hating the President just because he is a member of another party. We are just not built that way.

President Eisenhower was born in my district. He was a good baby, but he moved off to Kansas, and after he was 60 years of age he decided he was a Republican. I wonder, after his troubles and the lack of action on the part of the Republicans with whom he is associated, if he does not regret today that fateful decision.

I have listened to all his messages on health, social security, housing, and others, and my comment would be that if these messages had been advocated by a Democratic President, the cry would go up: "Too New Dealish"; "Too Fair Dealish"; "socialistic."

I will say this, that if this were a Democratic President and a Democratic Congress, we would do something about carrying out his recommendations and his program.

Here it is the last half of the 2d session of the 83d Congress and only one major bill—the excise tax bill—has been enacted. In the 1st session of the 83d Congres, except to renew laws that we had passed, only two positive pieces of legislation were passed by that session. One was to give the tidelands to the States, and the other was to admit 214,000 displaced persons. That is a record that I think not even the most partisan Republican can be proud of.

They were going to balance the budget, but it is my deliberate opinion on the 30th of June, if it is an honest budget, it will be out of balance from five to eight billion dollars.

They were going to cut taxes. The House has passed a bill, but it has not been acted upon by the Senate. But to show you their theory of taxation—they still have the old Hamiltonian theory of "trickle down." The Hamiltonian theory was, and the Republican theory now is—the way to make the country prosperous is to make the rich very rich in the belief that some of it will trickle down to those with low incomes.

The Jeffersonian theory was, and the Democratic theory now is—the way to make the country prosperous is to make the people who labor with their hands—the farmers, the workers—reasonably prosperous so that he may have a buying power, and that buying power will be such that every element of our economy will be in a state of reasonable prosperity.

We resisted this kind of taxation. We wanted to help the little man, the lower income man. We tried to raise the exemption from $600 to $700. This was defeated by an overwhelming majority of the Republicans. A provision in that bill is that a man who works with his hands, with his brawn, and with his brain, who has a wife and two children, has an income of $4,000 a year, pays $240 a year in inccome tax. But the man who has an income of $4,000 from dividends, pays only $110 in taxes.

The Republicans went out a few weeks ago and glorified Abraham Lincoln as the founder of the present Republican Party. Abraham Lincoln was a great, a good, and a wise statesman. He was a great liberal. If he were living today and the Republican Party were a tree, in my opinion, he would refuse to stand under it.

The Republicans made a great many promises in their platform in their speeches in 1952. For some strange reason, the Republicans are avoiding any reference to these now embarrassing campaign slogans. But I don't think the enlightened American electorate will let them get away with it this time.

Most Americans can recollect fairly well when they are disillusioned.

The American farmer has suffered through this administration's policies and proposals affecting prices on his products. He won't forget it.

The American housewife knows that prices she must pay now are higher than those she paid 2 years ago. She remembers well.

The American workman knows he is not as well off under the Eisenhower administration. He feels it in his breadbasket.

The American businessman, especially the small-business man, knows that business is not as good as it used to be under dynamic Democratic days. Their books remind them.

I don't think the Republican administration has earned the gratitude of the families of the more than 4 million who have lost their jobs since President Eisenhower took office.

Each idle workman has his individual depression.

Now, the Republicans have much to say about Democrats being prophets of gloom and doom; that we are trying to talk this Nation into a depression.

I'm a livestock man myself. I can speak for a segment of that industry.

Two years ago, I sold my Texas calves for $150 a head. Last year I sold my calves for less than $50 a head.

I did not talk myself into a depression. But I'm in a depression.

My hope for my country is that the Eisenhower administration will not follow the tragic footsteps of the Hoover administration. Hoover and Secretary of the Treasury Mellon thought they could talk the Nation out of a depression by issuing statements calculated to be reassuring. They did not blind the people to the facts. They merely deluded themselves, and we all know what happened.

The President and his new business chieftains are doing as Hoover and Mellon did—issuing statements. They should recall what Lincoln said about fooling people. Folks, it just can't be done.

Until lately we've heard talk and have seen newspaper polls on the popularity of President Eisenhower as against the comparatively low opinion the people hold for his Republican administration.

I have always been under the impression that the President was responsible for the men he selected in his administration to carry out the policies he believes in, or at least, advocated.

I am confident that calm-thinking Americans will hold the Chief of State finally responsible for the success or failure of the conduct of our Government.

Many reliable sources over the country report that the full bloom of Eisenhower's 1952 popularity is fading, and fading fast; that the stem is wilting and the roots are curling.

Within all reason and all logic, the chief of a political party in power must ride up or down with the fortunes of his party.

Right now the track of the Republican Party is downward.

There are many reasons for this. For one, the crowd around President Eisenhower just can't take hold.

The reason they can't take hold is because they are uncertain, unsure, and unknowing.

For instance, the Republicans came rushing into Washington with a hard-money policy. I said then that all they succeeded in doing was to make money harder for the average American to get.

It did not take long for the GOP to abandon that hard-money policy and high interest rates.

I could cite other shifts and even offer the suspiciou that the so-called dynamic progressive legislative program submitted to Congress produced an aroma of phoniness. But suffice it to say—to say with the utmost sincerity and regret—the Republican Party lacks unity and strong leadership.

A crusade, if there is one, must have courageous, inspiring, and fearless leadership.

It must have unity in the ranks to succeed.

What has happened to the Eisenhower crusade?

When I look over the status of the President's legislative program now, I'm reminded of the old song, Where Art Thou?

Here it is almost summertime—the 83d Congress is in the 5th month of its 2d session—and the President's tax revision, farm, foreign trade, statehood, Taft-Hartley, housing, immigration, social security, and health proposals are bogged down in controversy and open revolt.

I suppose the Republicans will go to the country this autumn and plead with the people to return a GOP Congress to enact the President's program in the last 2 years of his administration.

What assurances can they give the people that they will do any better in the final 2 years of this administration than they did in the first 2 years, when the President enjoyed the peak of his popularity? If the Republicans don't like his program now, by what twist of fate will they like it later?

By their past performance, we judge them.

By performance we judge all men elected to public responsibility.

There is one thing about the 20 years of Democratic control in Washington that will remain uppermost in the minds of the people.

We performed.

We did a constructive job.

The Republicans have not dared to repeal any permanent legislation we enacted.

And now the further away we get from the Truman administration, the bigger it looks in the history of our Nation.

The Democratic Party always has given the country courageous and constructive leadership. It will do it again and again.

By 1952, the people had grown so fat and prosperous that they wanted a change—and many of them got it with a vengeance—a vengeance that has been felt by the farmer, the laborer, the livestock man, the little-business man, and the housewife.

The people are anxious for a change now, and they will so record it, come November.

When I look our beloved country over, and the whole world in which we live, I know that we live in an hour of terrible danger.

We are justified in asking, "What of the night," or "Whither goest thou?" The United States of America has been challenged to lead the world. Unless we, with a bold and fearless leadership, accept this challenge and lead this unhappy world, it will not be a decent place in which to live and rear our children.

I want a government here that will be an example, not only to the people who know and enjoy liberty, but one that will reach into those dark recesses around the earth where people do not know liberty—who have never tasted its fruits.

I trust that we can so lead and so act that the humble man may know that he has a fair chance in a more just world, beknighted people may unbend their weary backs, and raise their tired eyes with the trust that they may look into the shining face of hope. That under God, liberty, and freedom may not perish from the earth, and that the hope of the lowly Galilean who walked these shores 20 centuries ago may come true, and that we may have peace and good will.

He's Cooking With Gas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MYRON V. GEORGE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 10, 1954

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I wish to insert the following editorial from the Arkansas City, (Kans.) Traveler.

This editorial was written in support of my opposition to the proposed increase asked by Cities Service in their wholesale price for gas. This increase would adversely affect all consumers supplied by their major pipelines. If the Federal Power Commission grants this proposal in its entirety, it will no doubt mean that other major gas-line companies will be able to qualify for similar increases, hence will adversely affect every gas consumer in the United States. The editorial from the Arkansas City Traveler is as follows:

He's Cooking With Gas

Gas consumers of this congressional district have a representative in Washington who is trying to save them some money. Myron George, Third District Congressman, has gone to bat for the people who use natural gas. He is trying to save them money.

Few people in this area do not have a gas appliance. They heat water and buildings with gas. They cook with the fuel. They refrigerate with gas. Industries use huge quantities.

Serving a wide territory in Congressman George's district is Gas Service Co., and this company buys its gas from Cities Service Co. Cities Service has applied for an increase in gas rates and the Federal Power Commission has the request under consideration.

A protest to this increase has been put on record by Congressman George. He says that approval of the application would cost his constituents a million dollars a year. He sets out reasons why he does not believe the rate boost should be allowed, saying he doesn't believe Cities Service and other firms seeking the increases need any at all.

The Congressman estimated that an increase would cost Arkansas City consumers $82,000 a year while Sedan consumers would pay an additional $25,900. Most communities in his district served by the company were listed and the estimated increase set out.

The Congressman believes that the company which sells gas for resale can get along all right with the present rate. Most consumers agree. It's good to have a Congressman in Washington who will represent the people in all things of importance. His interest in serving the district extends outside the national legislative halls. The people might write him and lend their support to his efforts. Urge him to stay in there and fight. Give him 15 "rahs" and spell out G-e-o-r-g-e. Then shout for him to help "Hold that line."

The Seaway at Last

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 10, 1954

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I call your attention to a very pointed and timely editorial appearing in the Washington Post and Times-Herald of May 8, entitled "The Seaway at Last."

It is almost belaboring the obvious to sing the praises of the seaway; last Thursday's vote in the House of Representatives is the most convincing evidence that the seaway, after many tribulations and setbacks, has sold itself. It is hoped that the construction of this great waterway will usher in a new era of prosperity for all the people of this entire Nation. So you see, "time's a-wasting." We cannot get rolling on it soon enough.

The editorial from the Washington Post and Times-Herald follows:

The Seaway at Last

Now that the St. Lawrence seaway has been overwhelmingly approved by both the House and Senate it is difficult to see how Congress could have reached any other conclusion. This great waterway stretching 2,450 miles into the heart of the North American Continent will be an economic boon to both the United States and Canada. It will strengthen the defense of both countries, and the power dams to be constructed in connection with it by the Province of Ontario and the State of New York will supply both countries with needed electric current. The project has had the support of every President since World War I, and, despite the vehement special-interest lobbying against it, we surmise that it has almost as much popular endorsement here as in Canada.

Some of the reaction in Canada to the vote by the House appears to be anticlimactic. This is not surprising, for the Canadians have long been disgusted by the dragging of feet on this side of the border in regard to the project. There is no doubt whatever that Canada was ready to go forward alone, and doubtless many had come to believe that that would be the best course in any event. The Canadian Government, however, has clung to its policy of preference for an international undertaking. That policy was reiterated less than 2 months ago by the Secretary for External Affairs, Lester B. Pearson, when he appeared before the National Press Club in Washington.

In the long run the wisdom of this policy is likely to be more apparent than it is today. Constructed jointly, the seaway can and doubtless will become an additional bond between the two nations. If Canada had found it necessary to build the seaway alone, it would still have been of enormous importance to the security and economic welfare of the United States. Under existing agreements, Canada could not have discriminated against American shipping between the Atlantic and the Great Lakes, but all-Canadian control and management of a waterway so vital to American interests could easily have become a source of friction.

The authorization of the New York State Authority to carry out the American share of the power project is still under challenge in the Supreme Court, but this does not appear to be a major obstacle. Indications are that construction of the power dams may begin before the summer is over. This is an auspicious outlook. We cannot avoid the conclusion, however, that the Canadians are more to be congratulated for their patience than Congress for its belated action in climbing aboard the bandwagon.

Thirty-Year FBI Director Still Going Strong

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PATRICK J. HILLINGS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 10, 1954

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleagues in paying tribute to the great record of public service rendered by Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, as Director of the FBI. Today is Mr. Hoover's 30th anniversary as FBI Director. He has obtained the respect and admiration of Americans everywhere and he has set a pattern for outstanding and devoted service to our country. I wish Mr. Hoover many, many more years of continued success and good health.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to include as part of my remarks, an Associated Press story by Mr. Don Whitehead, which appeared in newspapers throughout the country on May 9, 1954:

THIRTY-YEAR FBI DIRECTOR STILL GOING STRONG

(By Don Whitehead)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Serving through five administrations, J. Edgar Hoover has raised the Federal Bureau of Investigation from a hack-ridden Government bureau to the Nation's top law-enforcement agency. It hasn't been easy and criticism has been plentiful. Here's a vivid closeup of Hoover on the eve of his 30th anniversary as FBI Director.)

Thirty years ago—on May 10, 1924—United States Attorney General Harlan Fiske Stone summoned a dark-haired young lawyer into his office, peered at him over his glasses, and said gruffly:

"Young man, I want you to be acting Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation."

Thus began the remarkable partnership between J. Edgar Hoover and the FBI, a partnership that has endured through and into the administrations of 5 Presidents and 11 Attorneys General. A partnership that has brought recognition and fame, brickbats and attacks—but no sign of interruption.

The graying FBI chief looked back over those 30 years the other day as he sat still for a rare and surprisingly long interview in his office in the Department of Justice Building on Pennsylvania Avenue between 9th and 10th Streets Northwest.

It's a quiet, comfortable office. Except for an intercommunications box, there is nothing to indicate that from this point J. Edgar Hoover controls and directs a huge law-enforcement agency touching the safety, the freedoms, and the security of a Nation.

POLITICS RULED OUT

Hoover recalled the 1924 Stone interview and grinned.

"Mr. Stone was scowling when I came in. He always scowled. He was a rugged, gruff, but fair man. The scowl was a mannerism, and not something in his personality. I told him I would take the job only on two conditions.

"He said: 'What are they?'

"I said the Bureau had to be divorced from politics, with appointments made solely on merit. Second, promotions would be made on proved ability, the FBI would not be a catch-all for political hacks, and would be responsible only to the Attorney General.

"Mr. Stone scowled again and said: 'I wouldn't give it to you under any other conditions. That's all. Good day.'"

Then Hoover added: "I never thought in those days the Bureau would be the size it is today—or that I would be sitting in this chair as Director. At the time, I considered the job as temporary.

INTO THIRD GENERATION

"The other day I gave one of our agents his 20-year key, something that always gives me a thrill. He said: 'Mr. Hoover, I'll start my next 20 years with the FBI if you'll start your next 30.' And that made me realize I have been around here a long time. Now I'm beginning to see the sons and grandsons of FBI men apply for jobs with the FBI. That gievs me a lot of satisfaction."

Hoover's 59 years rest lightly on him. His dark hair has grayed at the temples. He's heavier than the 29-year-old he was when he took the job. But he still talks rapidly, and he's quick in his movements. His eyes are black. He is 5 feet 11 inches tall and weighs 180 pounds. His broken nose—smashed by a baseball as a youngster—gives his face a look of bulldog tenacity.

In the course of the talk, I asked Hoover a question that has cropped up intermittently from the day the FBI was first formed in 1908.

"Is there a danger of the FBI becoming a gestapo? What is to prevent the FBI from using police-state methods?"

Hoover's reply was quick and emphatic:

"No; there is no danger of the FBI becoming a gestapo—not if we have men of character in the organization and an alert public opinion.

"We must continue to have men of good moral character such as we have today. We may make some mistakes in our choices, but if we get the right type of men they will refuse to stoop to gestapo-type methods."

EXTERNAL SAFEGUARDS

"Public opinion is a great force, too. The inquiring attitude of the American press is a magnificent factor in keeping an organization honorable and clean. We couldn't get the approval of the press with unethical and improper methods.

"Then, too, there are the checks and restraints under which we operate, and properly so. The FBI is not an independent entity. It's under the Attorney General, and he is the first check against us. We must go before the Bureau of the Budget and justify the funds to carry on our work.

"Then there is the greatest check of all—Congress. I must give reasons for the funds I request, and report on our stewardship. We must have the support of Congress to exist, and the FBI could not become a gestapo so long as there is a searching attitude by Congress.

"Finally, there are the courts with their check against our procedures. The courts soon would expose the use of improper searches and seizures—and so would public opinion.

"I must explain every item in our budget and how the money is used. I want to account for every cent, because an unexplained fund can lead to abuses.

"As it stands, we don't have to apologize for being in the FBI. There has never been a scandal involving the FBI in the past 30 years. We are fair and we are hard. But that's the way it should be."

I asked about reports and insinuations that FBI files are opened to some congressional investigators—and that the FBI "tips off" Members of Congress to subversives on whom its own agents can't get evidence for a court case.

Hoover replied: "I can say unqualifiedly that is an absolute lie.

"I'm pretty sensitive to the matter of our files. There's nothing more important than the sanctity and integrity of our files. I've consistently resisted every attempt to make the raw files available. Data from FBI files have leaked out through other agencies. People like to throw the name of the FBI around. They wave a report and say 'This is from the FBI'—but the report was not furnished by the FBI.

"Some former FBI agents are on congressional committee staffs. People think a former agent has an open pipeline to the FBI, but it isn't true. If anything, we'd lean over backward in order to give no reason for such a suspicion. We can't be responsible for former agents. Many fine men have left the organization. But we can't speak for all of them.

"If people ever get the idea that our files are a sieve—then there will be a loss of confidence in us by the people, and the country's security will be in peril."

Hoover created a flurry when he appeared as a witness last November to testify in the case of the late Harry Dexter White, after Attorney General Herbert Brownell charged former President Harry Truman promoted White despite FBI reports of espionage activities.

Some Democrats said privately they regarded Hoover's testimony as political—and pro-Republican. There was some questioning of Hoover's motives.

"I always have resisted appearances before any congressional committee, except those dealing with appropriations," Hoover explained. "The only exceptions I have made have been on orders from the Attorney General or on the insistence of the committees.

"I testified in the White case solely to clarify the role I had played in the situation. I never could have been a party to any agreement with White. The President has a Cabinet to advise him, and it's not my place to do it. My relations with Mr. Truman, while friendly, were not such that I ran in and out of his office."

Then Hoover added: "During the Republican administrations, I have been accused of being a Democrat—and during Democratic administrations, I've been accused of being a Republican. As a matter of fact, being a resident of Washington, I've never voted and I have no politics.

"At least, I've never been accused of being a Communist."

His sense of what is right and what is wrong leaves few gray areas in his own standards of conduct. There is a strong religious streak in Hoover's character and to him God, home, and country are sacred things which must be protected from evil forces.

"I find my own rules of conduct laid down in the sixth chapter, eighth verse of Micah," he said. "This says, * * * 'And what doth the Lord require of thee, but to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God?'"

And this philosophy encompasses also a stern code for the wrongdoer. Hoover said: "We must pay the penalty for the wrongs we do."

The clergy almost won young Hoover to its ranks before the FBI claimed him, partly because of the religious atmosphere of his home and the influence of a young Presbyterian minister.

Hoover was born January 1, 1895, only a few blocks from the United States Capitol, the youngest of four children. His father worked with the Coast and Geodetic Survey. His mother was a grandniece of a one-time Swiss consul general to the United States. The family was a tightly knit group, and home life left its mark on Hoover.

"I strictly believe the molding of character begins at home," the FBI chief said. "There's the best place to reverse the trend in juvenile delinquency.

"In my own home, I never remember having a meal that wasn't opened by someone saying grace. I always had to go to Sunday school. I was given a little Testament for attendance on 52 consecutive Sundays—and it was one of my treasures. I still have it.

"In those days, we always read from the Bible so that our home environment developed a deep religious belief and faith.

"And my father was a strong influence, too. I used to look forward to Saturday afternoons. That's when I'd go to my father's office and wait for him to get through work—then we'd come home together. He was close to me as a pal."

In Central High School, young Hoover was known as "Speed"—not because he was particularly fleet of foot, but because he was always wanted to get things done in a hurry.

The pull of law won out over the ministry. Hoover was graduated from George Washington University in 1916 with a bachelor-of-laws degree and he won his master-of-laws degree a year later. He was an honor student.

Young Hoover figured the Department of Justice was the place where he could get the greatest amount of experience in the shortest possible time. He took a job as clerk—and 7 years later was on this way to becoming one of the best known names in the United States.

Before Hoover took over, the FBI was an inept, politics-ridden agency tainted by past Government scandals. There was no requirement—as there is today—that FBI agents must be lawyers or accountants with a background of good moral character. They got their jobs by political pull. They had no authority to carry weapons (that authority was not given until 1934). There was no fingerprint file, no crime-detection laboratory, no training program—and no prestige.

As FBI Chief, Hoover tossed out the political hangers-on, the incompetents, and some with criminal backgrounds.

"I started weeding out the hacks," he chuckled, "and it so happened that the great bulk were Republicans because there happened to be a Republican administration in office. This brought down on my head the outraged cries of politicians and appeals over my head to the Attorney General.

Hoover and his FBI zoomed to national prominence in the gun-blazing gangster era of the early '30s, and with the solution of the Lindbergh kidnap case. He made the FBI a center for scientific crime investigation and brought a prestige to law enforcement that never had been attained before in this country.

Hoover lives quietly in a modest home in northwest Washington. His mother and father are dead, and a housekeeper looks after the home. His companions are two silver-blue Cairn terriers, Butch and G-Boy.

When the day's work is done, Hoover usually dines at Harvey's Restaurant. He's partial to steaks, Florida stone crabs, green turtle soup, popovers, charcoal crisped hamburgers, and angel food cake.

A bachelor, Hoover's name never has been linked romatically with any of the women he is seen with occasionally at night clubs and social events. A close friend says:

"John never married because he just didn't have the time for anything but the FBI—and not having the time, he never found the right girl. He's often on the move night and day, and he works all hours. He never thought it was fair to ask a girl to share this kind of life."

A good many years ago, Hoover told a girl reporter: "I'm not criticizing the so-called glamor girls. They are attractive in their way, but they don't appear to me to be real or sincere, and they don't measure up to my ideas of what a girl should be.

"I have always held girls and women on a pedestal. They are something men should live up to, to honor and to worship. If men would remember this and keep them there married life would be better. I have had that idea about women all my life."

Representative George Protests Plan To Hike Gas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MYRON V. GEORGE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 10, 1954

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I wish to have inserted the following news story carried by the Coffeyville (Kans.) Journal of May 4, 1954:

REPRESENTATIVE GEORGE PROTESTS PLAN TO HIKE GAS

Representative Myron George has protested a proposed gas rate increase he says would cost third district residents nearly a million dollars a year.

In a letter to the Federal Power Commission Chairman Jerome K. Kuykendall, the Altamont Republican said the increase would cost Coffeyville an estimated $211,600 additional each year—the largest single lump in the district.

The proposed gas rate increase by Cities Service Gas Co. would cause increases as much as $12 million annually in Kansas, Oklahoma, Missouri, Texas, and Nebraska, also served by the company, George added.

The Associated Press story said the Commission recently allowed Panhandle Eastern Pipeline Co., a rate increase based, in part, on the present market value of the firm's gas reserves. Previously gas reserves were listed at original investment for ratemaking purposes.

George, saying he was writing at the behest of protesting "mayors, governing bodies and city officials" in his district, told Kuykendall he didn't believe Cities Service and other firms seeking rate boosts needed any at all.

"From the information I have been able to gather studying the stock market reports * * *" he said, "it would seem to be that adequate earnings have been produced for these companies under the old rates."

In his letter, George said the application asked to have rates fixed with the commission's "new formula" and he penned a particular protest to that.

Other increases in this immediate vicinity, as outlined by George, would be: Cherryvale, $13,900; Arkansas City, $82,000; Columbus, $17,000; Galena, $5,000; Parsons, $105,900; Pittsburg, $125,300; Independence, $161,500; Fredonia, $50,900; Caney, $41,100; Girard, $11,500; and Sedan, $25,900.

George told a AP reporter the proposed increases might be as much as $3,254,000 a year in Kansas City, Mo., $1,313,000 in Kansas City, Kans., $989,000 in Wichita, and $482,000 in Topeka.

Emotion Blocks Our Trade Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 10, 1954

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include herewith an editorial entitled "Emotion Blocks Our Trade Policy," which appeared in the May 7, 1954, issue of the Courier-Journal of Louisville, Ky.

The editorial is as follows:

EMOTION BLOCKS OUR TRADE POLICY

Nothing is simple in today's world, not even the old rule of doing what comes naturally. This country, for instance, has millions of pounds of butter oozing out of warehouses where the Government put it after buying to keep the industry alive. What would seem easier as a way out of this embarrassing burden than to sell it where there's a customer willing to pay?

But try and do it. Washington dickers to sell 40 million pounds of surplus butter to Great Britain. People over there are hungry for butter, particularly for butter that is a bargain, say, at 47 cents a pound.

Mere mention of this figure starts trouble. The American housewife is paying up to 70 cents, and that little only since recent price cuts. She will want to know why our Government should sell abroad for less. You can just hear her screaming. However, her outcry will be nothing to that you are likely to hear from the people of Denmark, who have been supplying the bulk of Great Britain's butter or ages—and counting on butter as their chief export product.

The housewife's cries may be discounted. They come largely from impulse. After all, the American woman is reasonable. She will see, once the facts are laid on the line, that trade, even at discount below home prices, is as cheap and effective an arrangement for understanding between nations as may be found. Denmark's cries, however, are something else again.

We mention Demark and butter by way of illustrating the complications of life in the world today. The great element in these complications is the existence of Soviet Russia and that country's meaning to us. The Soviets, too, are butter hungry, to a greater extent than the British. Denmark and the Netherlands sell butter out of their surplus to the Soviets and make no bones about it. On our part, the very thought of doing so raises political and personal goose pimples. It is easier to rationalize competition with a good friend like Demark for a large hunk of their British market than to overcome the moral and mental shudders that come from mention of sales behind the Iron Curtain, of any kind and at any price.

There are inconsistencies in this policy and attitude. Surpluses are surpluses (and cost us dearly). Trade is trade. It has more purpose than bringing in dollars. If we are to compete in Denmark's historical market, which is fair enough, we should not stick at taking our surpluses to other markets, where competition is less keen. It should be pointed out that the Eisenhower administration has not completely closed the door to any part of the world as a market.

Hon. Clyde Doyle, Representative in Congress, 23d District, California, Reports To His People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 10, 1954

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, each of the four terms I have been elected to serve a great people in Los Angeles County, in my native State of California, I have made written report, directly back to these people, of my work as their Representative in this great legislative body. I have done so, because I believe it is absolutely necessary for my neighbors back home at the "grassroots" of American citizenship to know what their own Representative is doing. As you well know, Mr. Speaker, very many other Members of this House, on both sides of the political aisle, regularly make similar reports. The last two by me were on April 6, 1950, and on April 28, 1952. Since these annual reports, made when I represented the 18th Congressional District, district lines and numbers were changed. In the June 1952 primary, under the "cross-filing" law in California, I was accorded the honor and recognition of my 6 previous years, and won both the Democratic and Republican nominations in the newly created 23d District, the largest portion of which was in the former 18th district.

I again repeat what I stated in our Congressional Record on April 28, 1952, to-wit:

The strength of our democracy and the American way of life depend upon the extent to which the American people know the facts about, as Abraham Lincoln said, "a government of the people, by the people, and for the people."

Mr. Speaker, I thank you and all my other distinguished colleagues for granting unanimous consent to place this report in the official Congressional Record of this 83d Congress. As in other years, so again, I shall send this direct through the mail to many hundreds of folks so they may know, first hand, what the actual record is.

No tax money will be spent to print the copies of this "report" which I send back home to my people in the great 23d District:

Washington, D. C., *May 6, 1954.*

To all my neighbors of the 23d Congressional District:

I have the honor of submitting my first official report to you as residents of the newly created 23d Congressional District. I continue to recognize the responsibility you placed upon my shoulders when you elected me to be your first Representative from the new 23d District, in June 1952, when you further favored me by giving me sufficient of the ballots of both registered Democrats and Republicans. This fact, together with my natural and already established habit of first being an American Congressman ahead of being merely a partisan, gave me a richer realization of high honor and duty. It also redounded to the benefit of the 23d District on frequent occasions.

I know you realize that in this report, I cannot possibly enumerate every one, or even nearly all, of the official duties and acts which I have had the pleasure and duty of representing you in since the beginning of this my 8th year at the Nation's Capital. But, within the limit of time and space allotted me, I want to share with you as many of my official acts as possible. I want you to learn first hand. Furthermore, I believe you are entitled to have me report direct to you at your home. If I have not voted and acted as your elected Representative in Congress as you would have me, I cordially and sincerely invite you to let me promptly and fully hear from you as to how and why you think I was mistaken. How can I know what you think about the performance of my heavy duties and responsibilities, on your behalf, if you do not tell me? So, neighbor, I seek your considered opinion—at all times.

My 23d District office, located in the Post Office Building, Huntington Park, has regularly been open and expertly staffed 6 days a week from 9 a. m. until 5 p. m. Literally hundreds of personal and telephone calls have been promptly served by my two able secretaries. I also have another paid secretary who lives in and serves the residents of the Watts-Willowbrook area of the 23d District. There is maintained close, prompt coordination between my district and my Washington, D. C., office, where I necessarily am, almost all of the time. You will find prompt, courteous, able help from my district staff, who will contact me at Washington, if necessary.

My office at 1030 New House Office Building, Washington, D. C., has been staffed at all times with at least two experienced secretaries who have been with me for about 4 years already. This office has also been open 6 days a week. Four mail deliveries a day bring heavy first-class letters and many important documents, reports, periodicals, telegrams, etc. I still continue to try to personally read every first-class letter addressed to me, and to personally dictate or supervise the answers. Some days I cannot possibly do so, either because my work on the floor of the House itself, or my attendance upon my two major committees, or my official absence from Washington, D. C., on committee work—these are some of the reasons I cannot personally find time or opportunity to do as much as I would like each day. The 23d District is recognized as one of the busiest and most important in the Nation. Some districts in the Nation do not need more office help, but the great metropolitan districts of Los Angeles County, San Francisco, Chicago, Boston, New York, etc., do. But all districts are now allowed the same office budget.

At the opening of the 83d session, I made arrangements, with the consent of the Postmaster General, to have my secretary present at the various post-office buildings in my 23d District on specified hours, which were given publicity. This was in a new and different effort to take my office services to the people. However, so very little use was made of this innovation that it was discontinued in a few months.

Many letters and telegrams come to me at Washington asking me to be present at some lovely dinner, civic group meeting, veterans' convention, public celebration, or political meeting. In this connection, may I again assure you I would like nothing better than to come home for these cordial, important events. But, of course, my 8 years of seniority in Congress means more and more responsibility upon me as your Congressman. More committee meetings and duties at the Nation's Capital, and more official committee assignments away from Washington in other States; or, even in other nations.

You see, the Armed Services Committee, of which I am an established member because of my several years of seniority, is charged with hearing or actually seeing the evidence, wherever possible, before we authorize any appropriation for military expenditures. In keeping with this heavy responsibility as a member of important subcommittees, I have officially inspected and surveyed certain matters in the following foreign nations: Alaska, England, France, Austria, Germany, Italy, Africa, Spain, Portugal, Denmark, Norway, the Azores, Japan, Hong Kong, the Philippines, Okinawa, Kwajalein, Guam, Johnson Island, Hawaiian Islands, Pearl Harbor, Aleutian Islands, and Point Barrow. I have witnessed certain atomic bomb explosions and had the benefit of interviewing and meeting many of the highest staff officials of the United States and other nations regarding world conditions. Before President Eisenhower was a candidate for high office, I was one of a very few sent to Paris to confer with him and his staff. I am a member of the Armed Services Subcommittee No. 1, of which Hon. Paul Shafer, Republican, of Michigan, is the chairman. The majority party numerically always has the committee chairmanships and the most members on every committee. I was a member of the special subcommittee assigned to make a study of the synthetic rubber plants of our Nation. There are 35 members of the Armed Services Committee. The chairman of the committee has personally thanked me for my faithful committee work and attendance. On January 6, 1954, Hon. Paul Shafer, Republican, my distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Subcommittee No. 1, wrote me a very gracious letter welcoming me back from Christmas vacation recess in which he also said:

"What is most impressive to me is that your interrogation of witnesses is intelligent and understanding and you do not take the time of the committee with unessential questions or observations."

As a member of the House Un-American Activities Committee, I have attended its sessions faithfully. Also, I have fully discharged my heavy duties as a member of subcommittees of the full committee, sitting at San Francisco, New York, Los Angeles, San Diego, Washington, etc. Also, I naturally feel I have functioned patriotically, constructively and ably for the reason, among others, that the committee unanimously chose me as chairman of the Subcommittee on Rules. Not all the rules from my committee were adopted by the full committee of nine members. But, most of them were. Furthermore, it is said this Rules of Procedure, printed July 15, 1953, is the first time in congressional history when such a comprehensive set of rules for the protection of the witness; guidance of legal counsel for the witness; and, for the policy and procedure of the congressional committee itself, was printed and freely distributed to all interested. Furthermore, the committee chairman, on the floor of the House of Representatives, spoke in appreciation of my services on the committee and for my "effort to keep it nonpartisan."

The speech of Chairman Velde, Republican, of the House Un-American Activities Committee, on the floor of the House of Representatives on February 25, 1954, as reported in the Congressional Record at page 2175, is itself clear evidence that my efforts as a member of that committee to have it function on as high a level as possible have been recognized by Congress.

Mr. Velde said: "I wish to say to the gentleman from California [Mr. Doyle] as well as to the other members of the committee that I appreciate wholeheartedly the support the gentleman from California [Mr. Doyle] has given his chairman; that I am sure each one of us realizes the importance of his effort to keep this very important committee nonpartisan; and I am sure each member of the committee has done his utmost to fulfill that obligation."

As to the public bills I have filed in this 83d Congress, they are 16 in number. They are as follows:

House Joint Resolution 29, January 3, 1953: To authorize the President of the United States to appoint a committee to designate the most appropriate day for National Children's Day.

House Joint Resolution 30, January 3, 1953: Proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to grant to citizens of the United States who have attained the age of 18 the right to vote.

House Joint Resolution 124, January 13, 1953: Granting the consent of Congress to joinder of the United States in suits in the United States Supreme Court for adjudication of claims to waters of the Colorado River system available for use in the lower Colorado River Basin.

House Joint Resolution 125, January 13, 1953: Proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States with respect to the term of office and qualifications of Members of the House of Representatives, increasing term to 4 years.

House Resolution 69, January 13, 1953: Creating a Commission on the Problems of Aging and Elderly People.

H. R. 1534, January 13, 1953: To amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, to insure proper review of disability status of persons discharged from the armed services and to provide for a copy of disability record and to provide for presumption of service-connected injury or disease.

H. R. 1535, January 13, 1953: To provide a 1-year extension of the existing 5-year limitation on the period of time for presenting Indian claims to the Indian Claims Commission.

H. R. 1536, January 13, 1953: To amend Veterans Regulation No. 9 (a), as amended, so as to increase the limit of amounts payable thereunder in connection with the funeral and burial of deceased veterans.

H. R. 1537, January 13, 1953: To amend the Social Security Act to provide for payment under the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system of child's insurance benefits to children who have attained the age of 18 but are incapable of self-support because of physical or mental disability, and for other purposes.

H. R. 1538, January 13, 1953: To restore the right of certain veterans to apply for insurance.

H. R. 1539, January 13, 1953: To provide that the tax on admissions shall not apply to admissions to a moving-picture theater.

H. R. 1540, January 13, 1953: To amend the Social Security Act to permit individuals entitled to old-age or survivors insurance benefits to earn $125 a month without deductions being made from their benefits.

H. R. 1541, January 13, 1953: To provide reduced postage on airmail parcel post sent to members of the Armed Forces of the United States in certain areas.

H. R. 1542, January 13, 1953: To provide free postage for members of the Armed Forces of the United States serving in the United States or elsewhere.

H. R. 1543, January 13, 1953: To provide hospital and medical treatment for certain disabled veterans residing abroad for service-connected disability.

H. R. 3473, February 24, 1953: To establish the Federal Agency for Handicapped, to define its duties and for other purposes.

All of these have been referred to committees or subcommittees. Before the committee will proceed with a hearing on any public bill, the executive or administrative agency or department has first to file its approval or disapproval with the congressional committee concerned. Many times Members of Congress file a public bill, well knowing in advance that such bill will not get out of committee or be approved by the department. But all major legislation is a matter of education; necessity and compromise. Also bills by minority Members of Congress never take precedence over similar bills by majority party Members. My public bills were filed by me aware of these factors. But, each of them stated a principle I felt should have some worthy consideration in any study of related legislation.

During this 83d Congress I have filed 22 private bills. Such bills are generally for the benefit of persons claiming relief from Uncle Sam on account of refunds due, naturalization, and immigration relief, compensation claims, alleged damage, etc. These private bills are for the benefit of residents of the 23d District. All such bills also have to have reports thereon from the Federal agency concerned before they can begin being processed in committee.

The daily Congressional Record has been placed by me in the 23d District public libraries, college and high-school libraries so as to be available to the largest number of citizens. I have frequently mailed to the public officials throughout the 23d District whatever valuable Government printed matter I could obtain, including valuable printed information to the school faculties for assistance to them in instruction about matters at the Nation's Capital. Some of these publications I have been pleased to be able to obtain, even at my own personal expense. And, many students have also received from me pertinent data and cordial assistance from my offices.

I know of no request for assistance, founded on merit, which has not had attention with dispatch and my best efforts. However, it has been well said, "There are some things that even a Congressman cannot accomplish."

I am also sure that the record speaks clearly of my active and cordial and able assistance, at all times, with the very able public-school officials of the several school districts, who have called upon me for assistance from the Nation's Capital, in important matters there pending. For instance, in April, the Compton Union High School district was given a tentative entitlement of $19,762.23 for 1954, with $14,821 immediate payment. The Bellflower City School district was at the same time given a tentative entitlement of $52,426.20 for 1954 with $39,319 for immediate payment, and the Enterprise School district, Compton, was allowed tentative entitlement of $6,736.70, with immediate payment of $5,052. I now desire to compliment all these school officials and representatives. They have been prompt and thorough. I frequently receive compliments from the Federal level for them. This session I have already been pleased to cooperate with the schools of Paramount, Downey, Bellflower, Compton, and Lynwood, for which I have received their appreciative expressions.

Again in this 83d Congress I did as I have done in the 79th, 81st, and 82d Congresses, personally testified before the Post Office and Civil Service Committee of the House in favor of a decent and necessary raise in salary for the postal clerks, carriers, and employees.

As to the lads I have nominated to compete for entrance to West Point and Annapolis Academies during all my 8 years, I am proud to report that only one has failed in scholarship. And this was in only one subject. I wish to respectfully suggest that if there are boys who wish to take the civil-service examinations for thest two existing academies; to wit, West Point or Annapolis, because they have decided to make it their career, I would be proud to arrange so such lads can get a chance to compete. Also, I am invited to name 10 boys from the great 23d District to take competitive examinations for the newly authorized Air Academy. I invite inquiry by interested lads in the 23d District. I always require approval of parents for boys to take the necessary examinations. I cordially invite prompt inquiry. Any boy qualified physically, and of the required age, without regard to creed, color, or politics, is entitited to be considered on his own merits. I have never, nor will I, nominate a lad on account of any political consideration or gain to myself.

Because I know folks at home, in all congressional districts, should know what the attendance record of their own Congressman is, I quote the Los Angeles Times for April 11, 1954, as follows:

"Perfect records: The tally of Los Angeles Congressmen with perfect voting records in the 14 House rollcalls this year, includes 4 Republicans: Patrick J. Hillings, Arcadia; Joseph J. Holt, Van Nuys; Gordon McDonough, Los Angeles; G. P. Lipscomb, Los Angeles, and 1 Democrat, Clyde Doyle, South Gate."

My appreciation is hereby given to the newspapers and press of the 23d district for using so much of my newsletter from time to time.

We have not had opportunity to vote on subjects of aid to veterans and veterans' dependents, aid to aged and elder citizens, extension and expansion of social security, benefits for veterans under educational and health programs, etc. But, I have always supported these in principle. I expect to do so again.

As there have been comparatively few rollcall votes as of this date; and, as it is to be hoped there will be several very important votes shortly, it has been stated that a vote schedule or tally sheet of all the California Congressmen will soon be issued. This will give all the rollcall votes of all California Representatives during this 83d Congress. Therefore, it will be interesting for you to know how we all voted on the same measures. I am informed this will soon be generally publicized throughout all the California Congressional Districts. I respectfully urge you to observe my vote in this vote tally and request you to let me know wherein you think I made any mistake and why you think so. I have never claimed to be able to so vote in Congress as to please everybody. But, I have always voted according to the equities and justices as I saw them, when the final text of the legislation was written and presented on the House floor. To this I have always added the factor of my own conscience. I have never voted to please any pressure group, nor any bloc, nor stood in any personal relationship to materially profit or lose on the outcome of any legislation upon which I have voted as your Representative.

Being frequently asked as to when Congress will adjourn for the summer, I can only say that the House now appears to me to be well ahead, several weeks at least, of the Senate. July 31 is the reorganization bill deadline—but, it is not always observed. It is now likely that the House will probably have to wait until the Senate catches up.

However, as June 8 is the date for the California primary election, in every congressional district, it is here expected that every California Congressman, in both parties, who desires to do so, shall leave the Halls of Congress and go to his congressional district and campaign for his own reelection. Here at Washington the long-established and frequent phrase, heard on both sides of the political aisle, is as follows: "If you can't be elected, you can't be a Congressman."

Therefore our committee colleagues and all Members of the Congress naturally expect we California Members to be absent from committee and the House floor long enough ahead of June 8 to meet our reelection campaign needs, whatever they may be.

In fact, some of the California men are already home in their respective campaigns. As the election dates of each State come up, the Members from that State are excused from Congress to go home. Congress expects them to go home in plenty of time and as often as necessary to adequately meet election campaign needs. Two years comes around very rapidly for Congressmen.

There are other matters I would like to visit with you about, but I hope to meet very many of you personally. Mrs. Doyle joins me in this hope. She has now worked side by side with me all these years but has never asked for, nor received, one cent of Federal pay for her services.

Let me name in general outline the geographical outline of the great 23d District, which I have the honor to represent, and in which you and I have the privilege of residing, as including the cities and towns and vicinities commonly known as: Bell, Bell Gardens, Bellflower, Clearwater, Downey, Florence, Graham, Firestone, Watts, Willowbrook, Huntington Park, Maywood, Paramount, Walnut Park, Compton, Lynwood, South Gate, Lugo, Hollydale, Home Gardens, Hondo, and Vernon.

In closing this report to you, my neighbors of the great 23d District, I renew my hope that my wife and I may have the pleasure of meeting and knowing as many of you as possible. Mrs. Doyle will remain at our residence in South Gate until we we return to Washington for the 84th Congress (I hope).

I will return to the 23d District from Washington before June 8, the same as the other California Congressmen do, expecting to return to Washington right after June 8, as it is evident Congress will not adjourn for several weeks after that.

So, asking you to let me know what you think, and why; and inviting you to let me know whenever and wherever you think I can be helpful to any person or problem, I have the honor to be,

Your Congressman,

Clyde Doyle.

The Horatio Alger Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS E. GRAHAM
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 10, 1954

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an article from the News-Tribune of Beaver Falls, Pa., which tells of an honor that has been bestowed upon one of my constituents, Michael Baker, Jr.:

[From the Beaver Falls News-Tribune of May 1, 1954]

County Man To Receive Horatio Alger Award

Michael Baker, Jr., who built one of the Nation's largest consulting engineering firms from scratch in less than 10 years, will receive a 1954 Horatio Alger Award in New York on May 6.

Kenneth J. Beebe, president of the Horatio Alger awards committee of the American Schools and Colleges Association of 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York City, anounced today that the youthful head of Michael Baker, Jr., Inc., Rochester, was one of 10 recipients of the award.

Winners were chosen by balloting among 3,000 educational leaders in all parts of the country. Awards are given annually to men who have risen from humble beginnings to make outstanding records of achievement and service in the best American tradition.

Baker will receive his award, a bronze plaque, in the Rainbow Room of the RCA Building in Rockefeller Center in New York City. The eighth annual presentation will be made by Dr. Norman Vincent Peale, the National Awards Committee chairman. A buffet luncheon will follow.

Other 1954 winners are Donald R. Brann, president of the Easi-Bild Pattern Corp., Pleasantville, N. Y.; John Allan Bush, chairman of the board of Brown Shoe Co., St. Louis, Mo.; Clifford F. Hood, president of United States Steel Corp.; Fred A. Lawson, president of E. L. Patch Co., Stoneham, Mass., drug manufacturers; William P. Lear, chairman of the board of Lear, Inc., aircraft and electronic equipment manufacturers; Daniel A. Poling, editor of the Christian Herald, New York; Andrew B. Shea, president of Pan American Grace Airways; Harold V. Smith, president of Home Insurance Co., New York; and Joseph Sunnen, president of Sunnen Products Co., St. Louis, Mo., automotive tools and supplies.

The Horatio Alger Award Committee is a non-profit organization, dedicated to fostering the American way of life, which enables people with poor beginnings to rise to great heights through their own ability and industry in the tradition of the fictional Horatio Alger. An important function of the organization is a scholarship fund which it maintains to provide student aid and assistance to worthy students.

Baker, now 42, was born in Beaver, the youngest in a family of eight children. His father, the late Michael Baker, was Beaver County surveyor and engineer for more than 50 years and young Michael grew up in an engineering atmosphere. He was graduated from the Pennsylvania State College (now University) with a degree in civil engineering in 1936 after a hard struggle to finance his own education. After graduation he served as borough engineer of State College, but decided to go into the contracting business. An ill-fated venture in strip coal mining proved disastrously unprofitable and Baker found himself forced to make a brand-new start in 1940.

FOUNDED IN 1940

In April of that year he founded his present business in a hotel room and spent the next 3 months in a search for his first job. From a $25 lot-surveying project and a $40 drafting order, Baker rose quickly to sizable jobs and by the end of the first year his firm had grown to an 8-man outfit which grossed $15,000.

During the following years, his business increased steadily and hit its present stride in World War II. Government agencies, which had shied away because of his youth, gave him job after job because they liked the speed and professional polish with which he did large jobs and small. His organization continued to grow and soon he had about 1,000 employees in the field and hunched over drafting boards. Plans for air bases, Navy cantonments, and military defense installations literally flowed from Baker drafting boards across the face of the free nations.

After the war he began a diversification program and did postwar community planning, consulting-engineering work on many factories, highways, irrigation projects, airports, schools, and aerial mapping. He landed a big contract for engineering and construction work in Saudi Arabia and now is engaged in a joint venture with Harza Engineering Co., of Chicago, in another large projects in the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan. This work involves planning, designing, and supervising construction of hydroelectric dams and some 160 miles of irrigation canals in Yarmouk and Jordan River Valleys.

Other current jobs are aerial mapping of 500,000 square miles of the Western United States; highway planning and design in Maryland, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Indiana, and Ohio; underground storage facilities for the United States Air Force; schools, industrial plants, churches, and municipal buildings. A subsidiary company, Michael Baker, Jr., Air Maps, Inc., does aerial photography and mapping.

Baker, his wife, the former Myrtle E. Pitzer, of Jamestown, Pa., and their two sons, Michael Baker, Jr., III, 16, and Carl, 12, live in Brighton Township.

Early in 1954 Baker was honored by the College of Steubenville, Ohio, with an honorary degree of Doctor of Science for his outstanding accomplishments. He is a registered engineer in 40 States and Territories.

River Bill Reaches Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 10, 1954

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following editorial from the New Orleans Item of May 4, 1954:

River Bill Reaches Congress

The Old River bill is now before Congress.

Representative Boggs has introduced it in the House of Representatives.

It next must be heard by the House Public Works Committee, and Louisiana and the whole Mississippi Valley are hoping it gets quick approval there.

It must. The danger at Old River is real. If nothing is done about it, the Mississippi River is going to change its course as surely as next month is going to be June.

And until Congress acts nothing can be done to stop it.

The Old River bill (authorizing control works to stop the steadily increasing diversion of the main Mississippi stream down Old River and the Atchafalaya) is based on expert study and approved by the Mississippi River Commission and the Army engineers.

It is true that most authorities estimate that the river will not have actually shunted its main stream into the new course for another 12 to 15 years.

However, the engineers say that it will take from 8 to 10 years to build the control works, as well as a year's preliminary work on plans and designs.

This leaves a very narrow margin of time for safety and makes it vital that this Congress act to get this project rolling.

The bill calls for authorization of $47 million for construction of everything needed at Old River except a navigation lock and provides that construction on the proposed lock may begin as soon as the plans for it are approved by the Chief of Engineers.

With such an authorization, the engineers could get on with the job of completing detailed plans, drawings, test borings, site surveys, etc.

They would then be ready when the actual appropriation is asked next year, and could start building by midsummer 1955.

And this, in view of the short time left before the river may have irrevocably shifted course, is none too soon.

Not only New Orleans but the whole Mississippi Valley would face ruinous losses in trade if the Mississippi went astray. We would become strictly a salt-water port, and river shipping would be disrupted all up and down the valley.

Congress has much on its mind and many proposals before it. Some very worthwhile projects may have to wait.

But the Old River bill can't wait—because the river won't.

From Galilee to Elath, From Clee to Heaven

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 10, 1954

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include herewith an editorial entitled "From Galilee to Elath, From Clee to Heaven," which appeared in the May 7, 1954, issue of the Courier-Journal of Louisville, Ky.

The editorial is as follows:

From Galilee to Elath, From Clee to Heaven

Yesterday Israel celebrated its sixth anniversary of independence.

These had been hard years. They had seen war. They had seen immigration of staggering proportion. To the 650,000 Jews who were in Israel in May 1948 had been added 718,000 by the end of last year. But the nation's first enacted fundamental law was the Law of Return, giving every jew the right to settle in Israel without restriction.

These had been good years too. Austerity and vigor have pushed both agriculture and industry. In the last 6 years the number of children attending elementary school (free and compulsory) has trebled.

Israel's problems are far from solved. But fervid hope dwells there, and on the eve of the sixth Independence Day, the Associated Press reported, "bonfires were lit on more than 100 hills in a chain from the mountains of Galilee down to the Negev Desert and the Red Sea port of Elath." It recalled another such bonfire chain in another country celebrating another event—the 50th anniversary of Queen Victoria's Coronation. As A. E. Housman described it:

"From Clee to heaven the beacon burns,
The Shires have seen it plain,
From north and south the sign returns
And beacons burn again."

A Plan for Poverty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY W. WIER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 10, 1954

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include an editorial from the Grand Rapids Herald-Review of May 6, 1954, by L. A. Rossman, publisher, entitled "A Plan for Poverty." The editorial follows:

A PLAN FOR POVERTY

So many of the friends of agriculture regret and resent the cut in dairy prices imposed by Secretary Benson with the evident support of the administration at Washington. The fact that there is a surplus of butter and dried milk, the first real surplus in the life of the dairy industry, is not too disturbing for it is known that there are so many who should drink more milk and a few more quarts of milk a year for the people of the Nation would create a shortage. There is resentment because, at best, dairying is a form of farming which hardly pays wages to those who milk cows and the reduction takes away any margin of profit, actual or theoretical, that the dairy farmer has had. There is indignation that of all forms of agriculture in which there have been surpluses and problems that the one most sensitive to considerate treatment should be first chosen for discipline and deflation.

There are very few who defend the dairy price cut. There are many people who drink milk with regularity but who seldom see a cow. There are a few hidebound politicians who would rather serve the party than help their neighbors. There are some so-called economists who reason off the beam as do most of that group. To defend the indefensible, these people contend that dairying is inefficient. How action that will take the profit from the good dairymen and make the situation of the marginal producer worse will help agriculture is beyond understanding.

The argument that dairying is inefficient is a miserable slander and anyone familiar with agriculture who makes it ought to be condemned to the most menial job in the barn for the rest of his life. There are many who remember dairying as it was. There was the pan of milk in the cooler or kitchen. Such milk could not be sold today. There was dairy butter, much of it poor. The cream separator, the pasteurizer, and the milking machine are all symbols of great progress. There was once a time when cows spread tuberculosis and undulent fever. That is no longer true. A generation ago any cow that gave milk was a good cow. Today the scales determine the merits of cows. Pure bred sires replaced the ragged bull. Artificial insemination makes the good sire go further. There are cow-testing associations everywhere in the dairy country.

Those who look about will see great, modern creameries and dairy plants. Any citizen of Minnesota who saw the birth and progress of Land O' Lakes and contends that the great dairy industry has not made progress is both blind and dumb. Of course, butterfat is in competition with vegetable and animal fats and it always has been. Since 1930 the population of the United States has increased by 23 percent. The production of butter has declined and the use of cheese, evaporated milk, and ice cream has more than doubled. There has hardly been a meeting of a farm group in a dairy community, or a talk by a county agent, in the last quarter century at which the problems of the dairyman were not discussed intelligently and constructively.

Again, anyone who travels about the countryside, and this is especially true in a newer land, can see dairying as it is. He will see splendid herds that began with a single scraggly cow. He will recall good dairymen who were once inexperienced boys. The marvel is that so many have done so well in the most exacting type of agriculture. To say that the inefficient do not exist would be to close the eyes to reality. There are many of them. The question is what to do about them.

Under the pressure of education and help some of the inefficient may be made better. But there are many to whom the dairy farm is a haven because it will produce milk, meat, and home for a family. Thank heaven for these people. Without them and their inefficient production there would not be enough milk to feed the children of America. Should these people be driven off from the land? Should they be told to go to the cities and live in the tenements where they may have little milk? Should they be told to go and raise corn when there is too much of it now? Not all people can be efficient. They cannot be made efficient by Congress, by law, and hard times. That so many who may be regarded as inefficient are engaged in such a useful thing as milking cows should be a source of thankfulness rather than unsympathetic criticism and scorn. There are inefficient men in factories. No one suggests that all wages be reduced. There are inefficient men in business. No one can argue that the hope of any profit in business should be abandoned. The inefficient suffer enough from their own limitations. They need a kindly hand on the shoulder, not a kick from behind.

If the parity price plan for agriculture is wrong, it should be abandoned. If it is right, the farmer should have full parity without tinkering by politicians some of whom seek the big-city vote at the expense of those on the land. Even with the parity theory there will be times of surplus. They are much better than the suffering and high costs of shortage. It takes years and years to increase the productivity of a dairy herd and years and years to increase the ability of the dairymen. A few careless months can discourage the efforts of a half century to diversify the income of agriculture in the dairy States.

We Began With Failure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SID SIMPSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 10, 1954

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Quincy Herald-Whig of May 5, 1954:

WE BEGAN WITH FAILURE

On Thursday of this week, will occur the 347th anniversary of the first permanent settlement by Europeans in what eventually became the United States. A group of approximately 100 men sailed into Hampton Roads on May 6, 1607. Just a week later they selected a town site on a James River sandspit, a most unlikely spot from which to launch a great nation.

Americans have good reason to believe they are a people of destiny. Only the especial protection of providence could have been responsible for the survival of the Jamestown colony.

Although Englishmen had toyed with the idea of settlements in the New World since Henry VII, they had been unable to put their plans into execution. Raleigh's attempts died at Roanoke. During Elizabeth's reign, the English activities on this side of the water were confined mostly to raids upon the Spanish shipping.

The Virginia company was formed as a commercial venture. The fact that men without families were sent out in the first expedition indicates there was little thought of permanence. Bacon declared it a "shameful and unblessed thing" to settle a colony with "the scum of the people." Of the 100, only 9 had trades. There were a blacksmith, a bricklayer, a mason, a tailor, a barber, and four carpenters. There were 12 so-called laborers, who seldom had worked. Fifty-five were "gentlemen"—mostly men escaping justice or ne'er-do-well sons of good families.

These men were wholly unfitted to make their own way even in a settled community. In a strange and savage land they were almost helpless. Most of them died. Some were killed by Indians. More of the same stripe were sent out by the Virginia company.

Here almost three and one-half centuries ago, these from the backwash of society tried communal existence—and failed. Their experience should afford a lesson for those peoples contemplating the merits of Russian-style communism.

The communism practiced by the Jamestown colony was nearer true communism than is the Russian variety. Each man was expected to do his share of the work, place his produce in a common warehouse from which he could draw his needs.

"To escape from the anarchy which resulted from a system that sank the interest of the individual in that of the community, it had been needful to arm De la Warr (governor sent out from London) with the sharp sword of martial law," wrote Edward Eggleston, historian. The early governors, De la Warr (Delaware) and Dale, were despots, but communism required desperate measures without which the colony would have perished.

Thus our very beginnings established the fallacy of the communal system with its resulting loss of initiative. It operated in Virginia only on an emergency basis only by use of the most stringent totalitarian rules. The governors condemned to death those who refused to do their bidding.

Only after the common stock plan had been abandoned did Virginia prosper. From the sordid beginning, the world's greatest Nation has grown. We remember today the mistakes of that long ago period. Our Nation has grown great because the pioneers dared to experiment and to discard things useless or inferior.

To Prohibit Picketing of the White House

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DWIGHT L. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 10, 1954

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on March 29, 1954, I introduced in the House, H. R. 8603 to prohibit picketing within 1,000 feet of the grounds of the White House. It will be remembered that within the past 2 years the White House has been picketed on 2 occasions, and there was no reason or justification in either instance for picketing the White House or the White House grounds.

I believe that in these troublesome, critical, and perilous days that picketing of the White House is a possible source wherein the safety of the President is put in jeopardy, and I think that every precaution and means of safety should be thrown around the Chief Executive of our Nation at all times and that picketing should not be tolerated.

As a part of my remarks I incorporate an editorial from the Fort Lauderdale Daily News of May 4, 1954. This editorial was written by Jack Gore, the editor thereof, who has won outstanding recognition for his splendid editorials in furthering the American way of life.

The editorial is as follows:

Representative Rogers' Bill

A few weeks ago a good many Americans were somewhat shocked to see on their television screens, and later in the newsreels, the spectacle of the White House being picketed by a group of striking longshoremen from New York who didn't like the manner in which the Federal Government had intervened in the New York dock strike.

Among those who were shocked by this spectacle was Fort Lauderdale Congressman Dwight L. Rogers, who promptly introduced a bill in Congress to forbid such practices and who is hoping that the legislators will get their minds off the McCarthy-Army hearings long enough to give his bill a favorable vote.

UNLAWFUL TO PICKET NEAR HOME OF THE PRESIDENT

Like most of the legislation Representative Rogers introduces, this present bill is simply worded and to the point. It merely says that it shall be unlawful for any person to participate in picketing within 1,000 feet of the grounds of the White House, and any person who violates this act shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned not more than 60 days, or both.

To those who might think there is no precedent for such an antipicketing statute there is already legislation on the books which protects certain other places in the District of Columbia, including the Supreme Court, the United States Capitol grounds and property used or occupied by foreign governments or their representatives, from picketing, and Representative Rogers reasons that the White House should now be included in this list.

Certainly anybody who remembers the disgusting tactics used by the Rosenberg sympathizers, when they tried to get those convicted spies saved from the electric chair by parading around the White House with big signs appealing to President Eisenhower, will agree with Representative Rogers that this antipicketing law meets a need. As the Washington Post has already said in commenting on Representative Rogers' bill: "Groups that picket the White House are often fanatics, crackpots, or malcontents deliberately trying to create trouble. Most of them appear to be more interested in creating propaganda or attracting publicity than in righting the grievances about which they complain. If they were sincerely interested in reforms, they would doubtless choose more effective methods."

We endorse those statements 100 percent. Like Representative Rogers, we think there should be a law against picketing the White House and we hope that Congress passes such a law before any other crackpot groups try to emulate the performances of the Rosenberg sympathizers and the striking New York longshoremen.

Dynamic Policy Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 10, 1954

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include herewith an editorial entitled "Dynamic Policy Needed," which appeared in the May 6, 1954, issue of the Franklin Favorite, of Franklin, Ky.

Faced as we are today with a psychological and propaganda threat of the spread of communism, plus economic and military threats, it is imperative that we maintain effective military forces equipped with the most modern weapons. The strength of our Air Force must continue to increase until we have a powerful and effective Air Force. Our combat wings must be adequate and properly equipped. It is essential that we continue to have airpower second to none.

We must have a continental defense system adequate for the security of the United States. Our defense against atomic attacks must have the means of early warning, and our interceptors, antiaircraft, and civilian defense must be strong and alert. Notwithstanding the tremendous amount of money—estimated at 68 cents of each budget dollar—required for major national security consisting of military, mutual military programs, atomic energy, and stockpiling, we must remain strong on land, sea, and in the air if we are to survive as a nation and a free people. In order to preserve our Republic we must remain militarily strong—freedom and strength are synonymous. As we go along we must not overlook the fact that to keep the United States militarily strong we must also remain economically sound. As pointed out by the Franklin Favorite, of Franklin, Ky., it is wise to make plans and to formulate policies with long-range goals in view, and at the same time maintain a dynamic policy which can change with events and circumstances.

I include at this point in the Record the editorial:

Dynamic Policy Needed

Secretary of Defense Wilson said recently that events of the next few months may force the United States to take another look at its defense policies. He said that our military programs and the amount of money required to carry them out are always subject to change.

There is reported to be concern that the cuts in the defense budget made recently could be invalidated if a change in our present policy is made. The cuts were made partially on the assumption that the Army could be reduced somewhat in numerical strength. If the idea of a European army should fail to materialise, or if we should be forced to take some new action in Indochina, all this could be changed.

It is good to know that Secretary Wilson is aware of the need for a dynamic policy which must change with events and circumstances. It is wise to make plans and to formulate policies with long-range goals in view. It would be unwise, however, to set any policy so rigid that quick change would be impossible.

Events of these troubled days happen quickly and often without warning. What is an adequate and a sensible defense policy one day may be obsolete the next.

It is reassuring to know that our policies are under constant examination so that they can be able to cope with whatever should come. The Indochina situation is much closer home than one likes to think.

Hon. Sam Rayburn, Distinguished Lawmaker, Made Honorary Member of International Legal Fraternity of Phi Delta Phi

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 10, 1954

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday evening last in the city of Washington, D. C., Hon. Sam Rayburn, our beloved colleague and former Speaker of the House of Representatives, was initiated into the International Legal Fraternity of Phi Delta Phi. The ceremony in which Speaker Rayburn, statesman and distinguished lawmaker, was made a member of this great international fraternity of distinguished lawyers was most impressive. In making Mr. Rayburn an honorary member, the fraternity has added distinction to the roster roles of its membership. As we know, former Speaker Rayburn has contributed immeasurably to the growth and development of the law of the land, if not a practitioner of his profession in the courts, certainly in the role of legislator both as a member of the General Assembly of the State of Texas and as a distinguished legislator for many years in the Halls of Congress.

Mr. Rayburn's role has been that of advocate for the passage of progressive legislation for the people of this Nation as a Member, chairman of his committee, majority leader for his party, and Speaker of the House of Representatives longer than any other Speaker in the history of this Nation.

Along with Mr. Rayburn, a fellow Texas attorney, D. L. McCormack, and Judge W. K. Miller of the district court were also made honorary members of the Phi Delta Phi Fraternity together with some 37 senior law students of George Washington University and Georgetown University in a joint ceremonial.

Mr. Rayburn delivered on the occasion of the banquet, following the initiation, a brilliant and inspiring message addressed principally to the young lawyers, his fellow initiates. Unfortunately, a manuscript copy of this address is not available for reproduction in the Record. In the main, the address was that of an elder statesman designed to inspire the young lawyers of the Nation together with an optimistic faith in the future destiny for our country.

Phi Delta Phi has saluted Mr. RAYBURN and in turn Mr. RAYBURN has brought added honors to the membership of this distinguished legal fraternity.

Industrialist Henry J. Kaiser Making Heavy Investment in Hawaii in Anticipation of Extensive Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON

DELEGATE FROM HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 10, 1954

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, the acquisition by Henry J. Kaiser, industrialist and builder, of a large tract of strategically situated land in the city of Honolulu and plans for its development on a multimillion-dollar basis is significant evidence of the increasing interest of mainland capital in Hawaii and the great future that is in prospect for the Territory of Hawaii.

Under unanimous consent, therefore, I insert an announcement of Mr. Kaiser's plans issued by the Kaiser Services, Kaiser Building, Oakland, Calif., on April 23, in the Appendix of the RECORD:

HONOLULU, T. H., April 23.—Evidencing his deep personal interest in Hawaii and its future, Henry J. Kaiser, the industrialist and builder, today announced the purchase of the 339,000-square-foot John Ena property adjoining the Ala Wai Yacht Basin for a multi-million-dollar Honolulu development.

Bringing to Hawaii the experience of an organization engaged in the development of complete modern cities, Mr. Kaiser and his associate, Fritz B. Burns, famed builder and city developer of Los Angeles, will team up to plan large-scale projects to stimulate the vacation-land and business potentialities of Honolulu and the Islands.

The combined Kaiser-Burns city development organization, which is immediately starting planning for the Hawaiian developments, recently has invested in and constructed an entirely new city known as Panorama City in southern California, whose main street covers a mile of business frontage, the most modern shopping facilities, major department stores, banks, parking for 5,000 automobiles and many other projects which are in the process of being built.

The purchase price of the Ena property in the northern part of Waikiki Beach and contemplated improvements will run into several million dollars. A master plan of developing the area will be formuated before specific projects can be announced.

Mr. Kaiser, who has been a close observer of the development of many of the world's outstanding vacation lands, stated emphatically that Hawaii is long overdue in keeping pace with the almost unbelievable strides being made in air transportation. Hawaii, he said, is already closer to the mainland both in hours and in transportation dollars than Florida or California were during the height of their respective periods of greatest attraction to vacationers and their ensuing eras of almost unlimited prosperity.

"Everyone I know on the mainland," said Mr. Kaiser, "is eager to visit Hawaii. The mainland as a whole regards Hawaii as its most enticing vacationland. The desire is there, but Hawaii must take the initiative. There is so much to be done and so little time in which to do it.

"Hawaii must prepare immediately to accommodate people in all walks of life for both short and long vacations. Yes, and for permanent residents, too, who will reverse their present mode of life, and instead of visiting the islands occasionally will live on the islands and visit the mainland occasionally.

"In this day and age," continued Mr. Kaiser, "vacations are no longer a luxury confined to the privileged few. Vacationers want to get away into a new and different atmosphere, but they do not wish to use up all of their free time in travel.

"The bottleneck is not desire. Everyone, and I mean everyone, wants to come to Hawaii. Nor will transportation be the bottleneck, but rather the living accommodations on the islands—accommodations which are within the reach of everyone from the vacationing secretary and schoolteacher to the retired couple, the junior executive, and the workingmen and women. Yes, and you can include their entire families.

"Despite its great appeal and the friendly spirit with which Hawaii is regarded, the average American has felt unequal to the financial burden of an Hawaiian vacation. There is a psychological barrier because of his concern as to the adequacy of his pocketbook. I am sure that the real spirit of 'Aloha' is not confined to the well-to-do."

Fritz B. Burns, long-time associate of Mr. Kaiser in large-scale community building projects, will be Mr. Kaiser's partner in the acquisition, financing, and development of the Honolulu properties.

Mr. Burns was one of the outstanding pioneers in the crusade for lower cost homes, having built thousands of homes during the thirties which were within the reach of almost anyone's pocketbook. The results of this early crusade are manifest today in the huge volume of housing being built on the mainland. Mr. Burns is president emeritus of the National Association of Home Builders, an organization which has constantly aimed to improve the technique of home building and to provide better homes at lesser costs.

In 1945, as the war was coming to its close, Mr. Burns built the famous Postwar House on Wilshire Boulevard, in Los Angeles, which, during its exhibit period, was displayed to more than 1 million visitors. In this house many of the postwar products in building materials and appliances were perfected and submitted for the first time to the test of public acceptance, giving manufacturers the necessary assurance for immediate reconversion into postwar activities, thereby eliminating any lapse in our national economy.

Recently Mr. Burns' time and attention has been absorbed in his capacity as chairman of the Build American Better Council. As Mr. Burns says, "Our objectives actually are to rebuild America, not by any blockbusting tactics, but by upgrading and improving every house, every building—and best of all, every neighborhood."

This current crusade, already activated in more than 100 cities and towns, aims to bring every dwelling unit in the Nation up to adequate standards of living within the next few years, and the complete elimination of slums.

"If we have no slums, then certainly we can have no slum dwellers," says Mr. Burns. "A house or a neighborhood need not necessarily be new. Most of us live in older homes, but every home must be weatherproof, healthful, safe, and sanitary, and its surroundings free from rubbish, trash, and vermin. We believe there is no place like home, be it ever so humble, but humbleness need not embrace or imply substandard living conditions.

"Many areas in Honolulu are long overdue for development and rehabilitation," continued Mr. Burns. "Our objective will be to do just that without losing, but rather enhancing the true atmosphere of the islands. Our plans are only in a formative stage. Details will be announced later."

Mr. Kaiser joins in the Burns philosophy, and declares that many parts of Honolulu are due for tremendous rebirth and rejuvenation in order to keep pace and keep synchronized with the advancements already being made in transportation between the islands, and the mainland, and the even greater ones to come.

"Hawaii's ability to attract people should not be limited by its capacity to accommodate them. More construction and more visitors are the major keys to continued prosperity," Mr. Kaiser declared.

John L. Lewis' Statement to the Governors' Fuel Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 10, 1954

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, one of the highlights of the recent governors' fuel conference held in Washington, D. C., for the purpose of discussing the plight of the coal industry was the following interesting and informative address by Mr. John L. Lewis, president of the United Mine Workers of America:

Governor Fine, thank you for your most complimentary introduction to this distinguished audience. Distinguished governors of the several States, including a special salute to the Governor of my own State—Illinois; representatives of the coal industry: The statistical story and the accompanying economic factors of consideration have been very ably presented to you by Messrs. Pickett and Earnest representing the two segments of the industry.

The coal industry is not here today with any of its representatives asking that the taxpayers of America be assessed to maintain free enterprise in the coal industry. The coal industry has demonstrated repetitiously in our public history its ability to function and produce under conditions consistent with American standards without subsidy from the Government, without assessing the taxpayers but in accordance with the rules of free enterprise and American competition and reward for genius and incentive. It has demonstrated beyond peradventure and cavil that the American workman, American management, American investors have produced here an industry that excels in efficiency and performance, in standards of living, in safety, in the quality of its products, that of any other civilized country in the world.

But I have no desire to burden you with statistics. I might just say in passing that the official average daily production per man employed in the bituminous coal industry of this country is in excess of 7 tons. Since last August, because of the demise of many operations in the industry, and the concentration of sales and production in a fewer modern units, the production per man per day of bituminous boal in the United States is more than 8 tons per man employed. Contrast that if you will with the record of any other country older in their development of coal and in their exploitation of its portents, England, the Continent, the Far East and elsewhere. In those places they have a production that on the basis of the same method of computation as our own is less than 1 ton per man-day. There are no new values inherent in our economy by which we can raise our standards of living unless and except as we increase productivity.

Through decades past the United Mine Workers of America have encouraged increased productivity in the mining industry on the part of the men employed, increased mechanization by management and investors, increased efficiency of physical plants and units. And in that way the industry has been able to absorb without burden upon the consumer of coal, without interfering with the expanding and growing economy of the Nation, the cost incident to the higher standard of living, the shortening of workdays, the increased taxes, the medical and pension assistance given to the men who work in the industry, all are comprehended in that price of our coal. Permit me to say that the price of coal now—the realization price of coal throughout the country—is less now than it was in 1948.

Twice this industry; to wit, in World War I and World War II, has proven its capacity to increase its production equal to all the requirements of the domestic government and equal to the requirements of our allies who were unable—though possessing coal in volume—to produce enough for their own requirements; all without Government assistance, all without taxpayers' money. This is a splendid chapter in the history of America's free economy and an exemplification of free enterprise that it would do well for some of our statesmen and some of our business leaders to read again.

Yesterday, our Government gave $100 million to the European coal and steel authority. We don't ask the Government to give $100 million to the American coal industry—although conceivably, the American coal industry may be more important to Americans than the European coal and steel authority.

It's a moral certainty that that money will never be paid back. Of course, they'll pay the interest on it—3⅞ percent—for a few years out of the principal just the same as Ponzi did in Boston. But Ponzi went to jail or somewhere else. We're building up in Europe with American taxpayers' money a device that economically is designed further to cripple the American economy and throw Americans out of work. The coal and steel authority is a cumbersome international arrangement whose chief function so far on the part of the respective international governments is to see that no country participating has any more of the soft jobs attached to it than the other country. It has got so that one has no social distinction in these countries unless he has a position on the great super coal and steel authority.

In the meantime the private cartels in Europe are undermining the coal and steel authority to such a degree that its future is extremely perilous. And in the meantime, those countries are embargoing American coal and declining to admit American coal into some of those areas even on a competitive basis in order that the coal and steel authority might have a monopoly on what business exists. And we give them $100 million to carry out that enterprise.

All right, the American coal industry is not asking $100 million. We're asking that there be a national fuels policy that is designed to protect the public interest and permit the investment in the coal industry to have a chance during peacetime to remain alive long enough to exist in wartime.

I've just so much to say on this that I have trouble in the brief time that I am going to speak to select points and factors which you can absorb without a great understanding of this industry.

We need a national fuels policy. For a number of years the United Mine Workers of America has advocated that before committees in Congress and elsewhere in public forums in the country. We must determine what are the lines of demarcation for the uses of the liquid and the solid fuels of this country and to what degree the public interest and the safety of the Republic is being protected by the policies we are following and to take necessary steps to prevent the billions of dollars of capital invested in the industry, which we will need tomorrow, from being impaired, stricken down and lost, together with the physical plants of the industry as against the ravages of a subsidized fuel, domestically speaking, and a foreign fuel that is coming in to please the diplomatic policies of the State Department and certain oil companies. The oil industry is subsidized by the Government in the arbitrary and outrageous depletion charge that is allowed tax free by the Government. That gives them more money to hire lobbyists and buy advertising and propagandists to deride the coal industry, where the investment is made and is fixed and where there is no such margin and advantage. Certainly, any national fuel policy would dictate that the first call on the oil industry with all its variations and refinements should be for the Navy and the merchant marine and the Army and the Air Force.

Secondly, that policy should provide for the lubricants and volatiles essential to keeping our machinery running in our country and to supply our chemical industry. And after that in the area of making heat or generating power, the policy should be one that would not impair the billions of dollars of fixed investment in the coal industry nor strike down this great producing machine that has been wrought in our country. If we wish to expand, at any time, our productive capacity of coal under modern conditions, it's a fair estimate that there will have to be invested by private investors $10 for each annual ton of production. That's a lot of money. In the anthracite industry, roughly speaking, it would take about twice that much because of the extra problems, different conditions, variation in the geological arrangements of God and nature. It is more than a suicidal policy from the standpoint of national interest to permit this industry to drift into chaos and confusion, discouragement of its investors, and the dispersal of its trained force of coal producers. I might say in passing that it is generally recognized that only miners can produce coal and in all the times in the past when there has been an occasion to want to augment the labor force in the mining industry of this country in a time of stress I've never come across one man who had another job who wanted to go to work in the mining industry. He was content to let someone else do it. He might be possessed of all kinds of ideas as to just what conditions that man should work under and just how much the operation should pay him and just how many hours he should work, but he doesn't want to do the work himself. He only has those ideas for somebody else.

You'll all recall from your memory the submarine menace on our eastern seaboard and in the Caribbean Sea that threatened us vitally during the last war until happily we were able to provide an answer to it. The tankers from our gulf ports were being torpedoed day after day. There was no oil available from foreign countries. Gasoline was rationed as were other oils. The Big and Little Inch pipelines were inaugurated to deliver oil from the sources of production to the refineries of the East.

Well, let us consider. Tomorrow, according to the public press, or the day after, according to some of our statesmen and diplomats, or next week, or next month a world conflagration may break out. We are told that the Russian Government has available a tremendous force of the most modern submarines that German and Russian scientists have been able to conceive and produce in the years since World War II. Admittedly, they will be able to base a large group of those submarines off our coasts, East and West, the West coast as well as the East. And what happens? What happens when they sink our tankers from Venezuela en route to our refineries? What happens when they sink modern tankers of great capacity coming from the ports of the Gulf to the eastern refineries? And what happens to the economy on the West coast when the oil from California can't go up the coast in barges, and tankers, and fuel the Northwest? What happens to that economy? The economy of the Northwest and the West coast will be stricken, demoralized, in confusion and helpless, unable to redeem itself or extricate itself from that situation because there is no oil. Very well, you might say we will muddle along until we find some alternative method to escape from this situation as we did before. But suppose, in the meantime, the Russian high command becomes a little impatient. You know what they could do and would do? All they would have to do would be to pinpoint and destroy 10 refining areas in the United States, 10 refining centers, and the American economy would be stagnated, confusion would reign. They don't need to stop long enough to destroy our cities or destroy our steel mills, or destroy our chemical plants one by one. All the Russian planes have to do is to pinpoint and destroy 10 oil refining centers in the United States. And all Russia would then promptly do would be to call on us to surrender. Because then coal couldn't come to the rescue of the economy. Then the conversion couldn't be made in time to meet the emergency. Then new mines could not be developed with speed and dispatch. Then there wouldn't be enough coal miners to man those mines. So I ask you what your country would do under those circumstances? I take it that the Russians, if that day ever comes, God forbid, will do those things that just come naturally. So what are we going to do about it? They would in all likelihood accompany their demand for surrender of this Republic by the suggestion that we furnish them 50,000 hostages to insure tranquillity while they thrust their cast iron oriental philosophy down our throats as a Nation. So isn't it time to do something about it? Isn't it time to ascribe this thing to the paid lobbyists of the oil industry of this country, no matter how politically powerful they may be, nor how many of our statesmen in times gone by have lent a ready ear and a willing ear to their importunities and their whisperings?

Why destroy or impair beyond redemption an industry upon which the economy of this country has been built, upon which our people and our fathers before us have erected the greatest instrumentality for the comfort and well-being of man that has ever occurred in all history? I mean our Republic. I mean our form of government. I mean our flag. I mean our standards of living. I mean the progress we have made in the realm of culture and education and longer life. Culture doesn't exist in a debased economy. Culture and education and scientific progress come as a result of a well regulated, well organized, well conducted, and managed economy.

Providence was good to America in locating this country where it is, geographically in the temperate zone, with natural resources beyond compare as related to any other country. Americans have grown great in exploiting what? In exploiting those God-given values that the Creator placed here. Coal is our most-valued natural resource. Our Nation has been on a coal economy. Coal will continue to be the basic consideration in the generation of energy in the United States upon which our coal economy is predicated. Why impair it, why throw it away? Should we follow the example of England? The 45 million people in England are literally standing on billions of tons of fine quality coal. God gave it to them. They have no other resources. They have no timber. They have no oil. They have no chemicals. They have coal. And yet they haven't had the aptitude to mine enough of that coal from under their feet to sustain the economy of the British Empire either in peace or in war. They produce 1 ton a day. They pay a wage scale that is five times inferior to the wage structure in the United States. Their product has three times the destination cost of American coal when it gets to the consumers. That's the history of the British coal industry. They didn't believe in mechanization. They didn't believe in increasing productivity. The men who owned the British mining industry for decades past, prior to nationalization of their mines, took the money from their shares and spent their time on the Riviera or traveling about the world in comfort, telling lesser mortals how they should run their economies and their politics and their international relations. They woke up one day and found that their coal industry could neither keep the population warm in the wintertime nor enable their manufacturing industries to absorb the cost of their coal and still compete in world markets.

And nationalization has not improved it because they still have the same problems. And the decline of the power and the eminence of the British Empire, which they have gloried in for centuries past, is visible to all who read and watch. And a further decline is just as inevitable as the setting sun. What do you want to do about it, you men of responsibility in this country? Shall we permit this impairment of our economy? Shall we rely upon the assumption that power from the atom is going to turn all the wheels of our industries? That time isn't coming in your time and mine. Not if we retain private enterprise in this country, investment for profit, call it what you may, capitalism. That time isn't coming. Why, the scientists haven't yet evolved a method for disposing of the residue of ash from the atomic process. They don't know what to do with it. They can't do anything with it. So far they have been able to keep that ash in lead or steel containers at a tremendous cost, but they don't know whatever to do with it. And certainly we couldn't build enough lead or steel containers to hold the ash from an atomized economy—not yet. We can't dump it in the waters of our lakes or rivers or the sea. We can't permit it to infect the land areas. So those who dream of the millenium coming in economics immediately still have a long time to dream. In the meantime we must live. We must maintain our strength, nationally and as a people. We have to maintain our internal strength to be able to give away so much money, as we are doing.

I mustn't talk too long. These things are obvious. I might just say in a nutshell that the statement of the United Mine Workers to this conference asked you to note these facts: (1) Coal is our only unlimited source of energy available within the continental limits of the United States; (2) that our petroleum supply is limited and we are already dependent upon foreign imports of oil to meet the needs of the Armed Forces. And note it down and carry it away with you that on the second day of hostilities there will be no foreign oil coming to our refineries from anyplace. And there will be a restricted amount of American oil coming to our refineries because our transport from the gulf to the Atlantic seaboard will be cut off, too. Point 3 states that the Communist aggressors have the largest submarine fleet in history, capable of shutting off these oil imports virtually at a moment's notice. Point 4—atomic energy, our great new source of armed might, is not now and will not be for an unpredictable period of time, capable of supplying both the weapons of defense, the power to operate the domestic and, if necessary, war-production economies. Point 5—that the present danger makes it mandatory that the American coal industry be kept strong and efficient in order to meet the fuel and energy needs of our Nation and our allies. Six, that these problems are, most assuredly, life-and-death matters to the Republic. Life and death.

May I not at this time express my very great personal commendation to Governor Fine and the governors of these great States our our Nation who have considered that this question was one that justified their attention enough to cause them to leave their home States and come to Washington to lend their time and their judgment and their counsel in determining what should be done. I think that it will be a very potent influence in awakening the public and the Members of Congress and the heads of our administrative Government to the necessity of paying attention to some of these bread-and-butter questions that run to the well-being of every citizen. Too much cannot be said for the wise judgment that inaugurated this conference, and I think the American people will be appreciative of the fact that this conference has been called, that the distinguished leaders of these coal-mining States and the Secretary of the Interior are here to counsel, each with the other, about what may be done. To me there is nothing more important that is now pending as affecting the domestic welfare of Americans than this question. I know that if Dien Bien Phu is a test of the free world, as said by our President, we won't be able to do anything about it unless we keep our own household here in order. Our population must be sustained, our strength must be kept up. There are many people in the country who believe that this is merely an economic question that can be left alone so that nature can take its course and the contending operators and miners, who once in a while cavil with each other, should be left to fight it out and that the public will win either way it goes. But the considerations are greater than that. And only by bringing these matters to the attention of the people can we get a proper focus of public attention and public expression on this question.

There are some voices in the coal industry who are saying: "Oh, we need a wage reduction." Just as if that would settle anything about the economy of this industry. In one typical district, in northern West Virginia, where the daily production per man is 12 tons a day, a wage reduction of $3 a day to each miner would make a saving of 25 cents a ton—25 cents a ton. And that 25 cents a ton reduction would not be the solution to the economic problems affecting the industry. As a matter of fact the railroads and the equipment suppliers probably would raise their prices right away on the grounds that a wage reduction had taken place and they would take the 25 cents and leave the operators just where they are now. But, there isn't going to be any negotiated wage decrease in the mining industry, bituminous or anthracite. That's a confidential matter. I wouldn't want it to get out. But on that rock I place my Ebenezer. So we might as well talk about ways and means so that the operators can continue to pay the American standards in the form of wages and conditions and talk about ways and means to give the investors and the managers of the industry a fair play in participating in the energy markets of this Republic. And that's all there is to it. Governor Fine, I'm going to take this opportunity to quit. I am deeply grateful to you, sir, for the time and energy that you have given to inducing your associates to come here. My compliments.

Social Security Benefits Should Be Increased

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT C. BYRD
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 3, 1954

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Speaker, a recent survey of the living conditions of people in this country who are receiving social security benefits brought to light at least one individual who found that his benefit was adequate for his needs. This 68-year-old man lived alone in a 1-room shack, which he owned, in a rural area in the South. The shack had no utilities and very little furniture. The old gentleman, who had been laid off by his employer in 1950 at the age of 66, found it possible to get along on his social security benefit because he could supplement his income by the fish he caught, the game he killed, and the food he raised.

I cite this instance because it seems to me to highlight the kind of living conditions which are implied as security in a social security system which today pays an average benefit of only about $50 per month. How many of us, I wonder, have really faced up to the problem which confronts so many of those of our fellow citizens who are trying to stretch that pitifully small amount to meet living expenses for 1 full month? If one has a fishing pole and a gun, and if he owns a small, shabby shack in a rural area, I suppose it can be done. But all of us must recognize that most people receiving social security benefits are not living—and cannot live—in such cirumstances. Nor would we want them to.

Can we believe that an average benefit of $50 per month, under today's circumstances, stands for even a minimum of security for the aged people of this country? It is clear to me that we cannot.

How are our senior citizens managing to live on the benefits they are receiving, I ask myself many times. The survey of people receiving social security benefits, to which I referred, has some of the answers in terms of individual circumstances. As you read through these case-by-case stories, two points stand out. One is the cruel incidence of medical expense which arises with the increasing infirmities of age; the other is the story of gradually dwindling savings.

One example is the case of an aged widow with savings of $1,000 at the time she received her first benefit payment of $39.90 per month. This amount took care of her maintenance expenses because she lives with a single daughter in rented quarters in a middle-sized city in the East. But during the year she was hospitalized for 2 months, and then confined to bed at home for 18 weeks. As a result, $600 of her life savings were used to pay the housekeeper needed for one prolonged illness—leaving savings of only $400. The next illness may wipe them out altogether.

Consider the case of another widow, aged 77, living alone in rented quarters in a large city in the East, with a monthly benefit of $25 and cash assets of $214. Occasionally she is able to find work as a babysitter to supplement her tiny income. She obtained a used winter coat from her son's wife. But her savings were used up last year when she was confined to bed at home for 3 weeks with a leg injury, and her only remaining resource is a social security benefit of $25 per month.

Or take the 69-year-old man and his 57-year-old wife living by themselves in rented quarters in a middle-sized city in the South. The total benefit received is $25 monthly, because the wife at age 57 is not eligible for a wife's benefit. The couple use gas for heating and cooking, and kerosene lamps for lighting. They obtain their clothing from secondhand clothing stores or from discarded trash cans in the alleys. A small garden plot and five chickens help to supply food.

Now Mr. Speaker, I cite these real-life stories because they suggest the kind of hardship which is imposed by the existing benefit structure. And, may I remind you that their circumstances are not unique. According to this survey's findings, 1 in 8 men, 1 in 6 women, and 1 in 4 aged widows had only their social security benefits for money income during the survey year. Two-thirds of the men, seven-tenths of the women, and four-fifths of the aged widows were unable to supplement their incomes by odd jobs because they were physically unable to perform those jobs. Almost two-thirds of the beneficiaries had less than $75 per person per year in independent money retirement income other than benefits. Finally—and I want to emphasize this point, because I believe we too often think that social security beneflits are almost invariably supplemented by benefits from private plans—only 17 percent of all beneficiary groups had employer or union pensions in addition to their social security benefits, and, of this group, only 2 percent of the aged widows had such pensions.

Summarizing the data assembled in this survey, Margaret L. Stecker wrote:

> Few beneficiaries had enough to meet emergencies or to provide for prolonged and expensive medical care. Some were in debt; but, by and large, it was difficult for low-income beneficiaries to obtain credit; some just tightened their belts and got along.

These, then, are the people with whom I am concerned when I talk about improving our social security system in terms of paying more adquate benefits. Now, it is true that the so-called administration bill, as revised for this session of Congress, makes provision for an increase in the amount of benefits ranging from $5 to $7 per month. But it takes three different sections of the bill to make this small increase. One, as you know, arises from the proposal to raise creditable earnings from the present base of $3,600 to $4,200; another, from the four-year "drop-out" clause which would disregard the 4 years in which earnings were lowest or nonexistent in computing the benefit; and the third revises the benefit formula upward slightly.

All of these provisions are desirable in themselves, but they simply do not go far enough to accomplish the purpose of providing an adequate benefit. In increasing the amount of the average benefit from $50 to $55 or $57 per month will, of course, furnish some relief to our aged citizens and to widowed mothers and their children; but, it still is not a "security" income. In terms of wage replacement, and, for all practical purposes, in terms of purchasing power, it is, indeed, lower proportionately than were the original benefits established in 1935 and 1939.

It is not enough to say, then, that there is no need for a substantial increase in benefits at this time since benefits were increased in 1950 and again in 1952. This is a short-range point of view which overlooks the fact that no change was made in the benefit formula between 1939 and 1950—with the result that the average benefit prior to the 1950 amendments was only about $26 per month. The fact is that the increases provided in 1950 and 1952 hardly translated 1939 benefit levels into present-day price and wage levels.

This brings us to a major point which should underlie all of our decisions in this matter. The purpose of our social security system, as I understand it, is to keep benefit levels current with rising wage levels, so that benefits will represent a meaningful replacement of the money income lost by the worker upon his retirement, or by his family in the event of his death. All of us are aware that the long-term trend of wages in this country has been consistently upward. But I wonder if we are also aware of just how radically the rapid rises in wages in the last decade have distorted the structure of our social security system.

One figure will suggest this distortion. When the 1939 amendments set $3,000 per year as the maximum amount creditable toward benefits, all of the earnings of 97 percent of all workers were covered. Thus the benefits to which they were entitled were much more closely related to the amount of their wages on retirement than is the case under present law or under the administration's proposals. I am told that in order to reestablish the same proportion which existed in 1939, we would have to increase the amount of covered earnings to about $6,000 instead of the $4,200 contained in the administration bill. Certtinly this is a matter which calls for our considered attention.

This Congress cannot, in my opinion, either disregard the inadequacy of existing benefits or settle for a token increase in their amount. Each of us must bear in mind the fact that the median income for persons aged 65 and over in 1952 was just $881 per year—or $73.41 per month—while for the population aged 14 and over it was almost 3 times as much, or $2,315 per year. We must take account of the fact that the cost of living has increased by about 50 percent in the 6-year period from 1947 up through 1952. We must remember that these are just a few of the hard facts which suggest and economic problems which most of the aged people in our country are facing today. We must be concerned, as well, to translate these facts in terms of family needs and family contributions. Clearly the benefit structure of our existing social security system should be substantially revised, so that it will provide genuine security for the men and women who, during their working life, have contributed a portion of their wages each month to that end.

The Physically Handicapped: Competent, Dependable Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 3, 1954

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I have the very great privilege of including a prize winning essay in a contest sponsored by the Governor's committee of the State of Wisconsin for the Employment of the Physically Handicapped. First prize in this contest went to a constituent of mine, Miss Bonnie Jean Getschman, who attends the Mary D. Bradford High School in Kenosha, Wis.

I am proud that Bonnie Jean Getschman is one of my young constituents and I feel that her remarkable essay should have a permanent place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of our great country.

THE PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED: COMPETENT, DEPENDABLE WORKERS

"Katherine, that rehab man has been putting the pressure on again. I wish he'd leave me alone. He just can't seem to realize that we're running a business, not a charity."

These words, spoken by my father at the supper table a few weeks ago startled me out of my reverie. My mother murmured a sympathetic answer and gave me a look which said more plainly than words: "Please don't start an argument." She knew that the employment of the handicapped had been my pet project in social-problems class the previous year.

Despite my mother's plea, my convictions did not allow me to pass over lightly my father's chance remark. It surprised me to hear these words coming from my father, who is the personnel manager of a large factory, and whom I had always considered an extremely fair man. My flow of words simply would not be stopped.

"Why, Dad," I exclaimed, "do you mean you"ve actually refused to cooperate in the job placement of the physically handicapped?"

"Refused to cooperate? Why, do you realise what would happen if I started hiring these handicapped workers? Absenteeism would shoot up. The accident rate would rise. It would be just plain foolish to take such a step."

"We studied this in class last year, and I found in all the records I studied, the handicapped had better absentee rates and had fewer accidents. Their loyalty, pride in work, cooperation, and punctuality compare very favorably to those of normal workers. They are usually very grateful for their jobs; and, as a result, they put forth more effort to please their employers."

"Maybe that's what you learned in school, Honey, but I know a man who was nearly ruined by hiring handicapped workers. His son lost a leg in the war. He met many other handicapped veterans in the hospital. When he came home, his dad gave him a job in the small factory he owned. The son persuaded his father to provide jobs for some of his friends. These men proved very lazy and incompetent, but he was ashamed to fire them. In the end, he had to fire them in spite of the embarrassment, or go out of business."

"In the first place, this man obviously did not hire men who had been properly rehabilitated. He knew nothing whatsoever about their backgrounds. When you hire a handicapped person through an established agency, you can be sure that he has not only been thoroughly trained for his job, but has also proven himself well adjusted mentally and emotionally. However, if, after you have given him a fair trial, you feel that he is not filling the job properly, the sponsoring agency will assume responsibility for finding him a job which would be more satisfactory."

"Even if you are right, I have my business to look after. I can't afford to pay extra workman's compensation and buy a lot of special machinery."

"Nearly all of the physically handicapped who are placed in the proper jobs can do these jobs without any special machinery. In fact, we learned in school that disabled personnel can successfully perform 80 percent of the tasks of which the able-bodied person is capable. And as for insurance, no higher rate of workman's compensation insurance is charged because of the employment of the physically handicapped."

"How can that be? Surely they must have more accidents."

"In many cases, the disabled have fewer accidents. Having a physical handicap serves to make them more careful. If they are placed in the proper job, their handicap will not put them in any more danger of an accident than a normal person."

"Well, I certainly haven't any soft jobs for these fellows."

"They don't want any soft jobs. All they want is a good job with decent pay and a chance to support themselves and their families. They aren't looking for handouts and don't like being supported by the Government. There are very few handicapped who do not have at least one job they can do as well as a normal person. Being physically handicapped does not necessarily mean being job handicapped. A vet who has lost a leg may do very superior skilled work with his hands. Only the qualifications which are necessary for the job should be considered."

"All this may or may not be true, but I'd still rather not take any chances. I'd much prefer to let somebody else take care of the physically handicapped and keep on hiring normal men who are sure to do the job."

"I think I can give you a few more good reasons why hiring the handicapped would be a real advantage to you. It might actually lower your taxes."

"Lower my taxes. Why, that's impossible."

"Not at all. While the disabled veteran is unemployed he is a tax burden on the Government. You are helping to pay for his support. If you give him a job you'll be saving yourself tax money. National security is also strengthened by the employment of the handicapped. While they may not be capable of serving their country in the Armed Forces, they can fill jobs which leave able-bodied men free to fight."

"Well, I have to admit, you have a few good points there, Barbara."

This was my father's only reply, but for the rest of the meal he was quiet and thoughtful. During that same week, he finally agreed to take on one handicapped worker, just to see how it worked out. He told my mother that Bill Leonard (he's a veteran with one arm amputated), while he isn't doing anything spectacular, is a good, steady worker. He seems to be very good natured, and he is certainly giving his department a lift. Dad also confided that he just might consider hiring more handicapped workers if there are any more job openings.

I am very proud of having converted my father to my point of view, but I am not smug about it. While several good Americans are doing their share and more in the job placement of the handicapped, many are refusing to do their part or ignoring the issue completely. I shall never be satisfied until I have successfully appealed to every employer in America. This is the reason I am appealing to you, employers.

Hire the physically handicapped: competent, dependable workers.

Wiretaps Can Be Faked

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 10, 1954

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, many of us had grave misgivings when the House passed a bill, falsely labeled by the administration hucksters and slogan makers as an "antitraitor" bill, which would permit the use of evidence gathered by wiretapping in Federal courts when the crime of treason was involved.

The amendment to the bill which insisted that wiretap evidence could be used only by court order instead of by a directive from the Attorney General made it somewhat more palatable.

Certain recent events, however, have driven home the contention that so-called documentary evidence may be altered and tampered with. The misgivings on this score are discussed in an editorial from the East St. Louis Journal, published in my hometown, on May 4, which I include as a part of my remarks.

Inasmuch as the House may consider this bill if the Senate makes any changes, I suggest that my colleagues read this editorial and give careful consideration to the extremely well-taken points:

WIRETAPS CAN BE FAKED

Under the somewhat stilted title of "antitraitor" bill, a measure to legalize wiretapping in the United States is being debated by Congress.

The bill is aimed at saboteurs, spies, and subversives both past and present. Under the provisions of the measure evidence obtained by wiretapping before the proposed law would be admissible in trials yet to be held.

No good American wants to aid traitors as the title of the bill implies, but there are dangers in the wiretap bill and which make the measure repulsive to those same good Americans.

One of these dangers is the possibility of altering or faking. The Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, told the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee this week that doctoring or editing of a tape recording, to leave out words or rearranging them, is "impossible to detect unless it was done awkwardly."

He also said that wiretap evidence is only as dependable as the person who handles it.

There was a time when most persons believed that photographs were unalterable evidence that judges, juries, and the public could accept as positive proof. The use of composite pictures—two photos put together to appear to be only one—and cropped pictures has caused many persons to pause and to be skeptical about any photograph introduced as evidence.

The courts also are well acquainted with use of handwriting forgeries. It is also possible that there can be forgery by typewriter.

It is entirely possible then, as Senator PAT MCCARRAN, of Nevada, has said, that a witness hearing an altered wiretap tape, or presumably an unaltered one, might say:

"Yes, that is my voice, but that is not what I said."

In addition to the fact that recordings can be changed, there is the possibility that telephone conversations will be misconstrued, or innocent chatter interpreted as evil.

Wiretap evidence has been called "proof that is beyond a reasonable doubt." Is it?

Future Municipal Growth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. B. CARROLL REECE
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 10, 1954

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the following is an interesting editorial from the Lake Land News, Dover, N. J., April 12, 1954, in reference to a very splendid address by Mr. George E. Stringfellow, which I recently had printed in the RECORD:

FUTURE MUNICIPAL GROWTH

It is always intriguing to conjecture on the growth of a community, trying to vision what changes will occur far into the future. Everybody knows now that the tendency nowadays is for municipalities to spread out, with people moving a greater distance out than in the past, trying to get farther away from the industrial and commercial interests. But what is the trend among commercial interests that have such an important influence on a community's future? What will happen to the older sections where big factories were constructed years ago and are now growing old?

An interesting prediction presented by George E. Stringfellow, of West Orange, well-known New Jersey industrialist, in a talk before the Knoxville (Tenn.) Chamber of Commerce last week, inspires a picture like this: Big cities of the future will have big parks, public buildings, and cultural interests in the heart of the city where the outmoded industrial buildings of the past were located. Around that center will be a circle of industrial buildings, all set in their own landscaped grounds as has become customary in Morris County in recent years. The circular belt surrounding them will have commercial interests and shopping centers at intervals, not so compact but integrated with garden apartments and other home developments. Then beyond that, stretching to the horizon, will be the single-family homes, all with plentiful yard space, and close by to schools that mother all community activities, clubs, and other recreational facilities.

Of course, municipalities do not actually grow according to pattern and a lot of things, such as topography, can alter the course of growth, but it's a nice picture anyway.

Address by His Excellency Feridun C. Erkin, Ambassador of the Turkish Republic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 6, 1954

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, His Excellency Feridun C. Erkin, Ambassador of the Turkish Republic to the United States, is one of the greatest representatives that the Republic of Turkey has ever sent anywhere. He splendidly represents a great and proud people. Turkey today is the most outstanding bulwark the free world has against the encroachment of an atheistic ideology outside the United States itself. I commend to this House his splendid address delivered in Washington, D. C., October 27, 1953 at a dinner given by the American Friends of the Middle East to celebrate the 500th anniversary of the conquest of Istanbul by the Turks:

I wish to express, first of all, my appreciation to the Middle East Institute and most particularly to its able president, Mr. Keiser, and Professor Fischer, for having conceived the idea of this gathering and brilliantly carrying out their plans. A few months ago the 500th anniversary of the transfer of Istanbul to Turkish hands was being celebrated with simple, symbolic ceremonies, endeavoring, in an atmosphere of humility and determination, to derive from its history, new lessons intended for the future.

I am fully aware that to penetrate into the depths of the 500 years of history since the conquest would require very thorough and substantial studies. In fact, such an ambitious subject would fill a lifetime. I shall, therefore, limit myself to some general observations and deductions regarding this historic event.

The Turks embraced Istanbul as their own; they fell in love with it; Turkish poets immortalized the city in lyric poems; and the entire Turkish nation endured countless hardships and fought many wars for the sake of preserving it. One can say that since 1453, the history of Istanbul has become synonymous with the history of Turkey, and actually has become the very history of the Turkish people.

When talking about the conquest of Istanbul, I think it would be of value to dwell for a moment upon the personality of Mehmet the Conqueror; Sultan Mehmet II is one of the historical figures about whom the pens of historians have flowed and many anecdotes have been narrated, both in Turkey and abroad. Unfortunately, the great majority of books written in western countries are works distorted by prejudices and full of fabricated tales of hatred and vengeance. However, among these writers one can discern a few who, although maintaining their religious prejudices, have been able to retain the integrity and objectivity consistent with the scientific character of historical studies and, in that manner, to find the truth. Such a writer is the French historian Guillet. In his book entitled "History of the Reign of Mehmet II," published in 1690 and dedicated to Louis XIV, Guillet, after somewhat apologizing for the mention of the name of the Turkish Conqueror, writes that he has chosen the subject to serve as a lesson with a view to saving Christianity in the future from catastrophes similar to the conquest of Constantinople. He then poses this question to the enemies of the conqueror: "Why are you afraid to confess the fame and glory which cover that great man? Was it not we Christians who bestowed upon him the titles of 'Great Turk' and 'Grandseigneur'?" Guillet describes the conquerer not as the enemy of Christianity, but, on the contrary, as a tolerant and secular leader. He expresses surprise and deep admiration toward him for the sagacity that he has shown in approaching the great institution of religion from the political angle, and in using both the Bible and Koran for this same purpose. He praises his great statesmanship in creating charitable organizations for the poor, irrespective of their religion and nationality.

The eminent modern historian Gonzague de Reynold, in his book entitled "Hellenism and the Genius of Europe," published in 1944, devoted long pages to the policy of Mehmet II toward the Greeks. He points out that the Sultan possessed too great a political sense to reduce to ruins the great city that he desired to make his future capital. The Sultan immediately set out to settle the situation of the Greeks. He left to the orthodox clergies the duty of administering their church. Not only did he help elect Gennadios at patriarch and install him with all traditional splendor, but he also granted him extensive favors and privileges. He confirmed to the patriarch and his successors all their ancient prerogatives upon their bishopric. The patriarch possessed full liberty to convoke synods, to take and to impose decisions in the realm of faith, and to discipline his flock. The author thus concludes that the organization of the patriarchy has been the salvation of the Greeks, the mainstay thanks to which they have been able to preserve their national structure.

As a result of the calamities and catastrophes which continually befell this great capital well before the conquest, the city had become depopulated. Mehmet II hastened to proclaim, within the second day of the capture, that the citizens who fled the metropolis or who were in hiding should feel free to return and to resume their everyday existence without fear of persecution. In this manner, where two and a half centuries before, the Crusaders had perpetrated acts of vandalism, the Turks brought peace, tranquillity, and justice. The Latins had taken the city and destroyed it; Mehmet conquered to beautify it. The Latins behaved like conquerors; Mehmet's actions were those of a great sovereign. At a time when the religious wars were devastating the west, a Turkish monarch brought to a city which had been Christian the solace of law, justice, and tolerance.

Mehmet II had decided to create a young and vigorous state upon the ruins of the Byzantine Empire. Upon this state would fall, in the course of subsequent centuries, the historic task of repulsing the invasions coming from the east and of maintaining the unitary and original character of the Mediterranean civilization, secure from any and all domination alien to this region.

Mehmet II embarked on this task by promising himself to raise the banner of the Byzantine Empire. He took particular care to maintain the hereditary institutions of the defunct regime, and to perpetuate the work of the Byzantine Emperors. The Church of St. Sophia was not demolished as it would have been under other conquerors. It was, for reasons of state, converted into a mosque; its mosaics, gleaming with beauty and refinement, were not destroyed, but simply covered with whitewash in a manner which would permit easy restoration. One day when he visited the forum, Mehmet was dazzled by the splendor of this magnificent historic place, and gave his entourage an order which was at the same time an expression of a policy: "Our duty is to perpetuate the work of the Byzantine." This promise has been fulfilled.

But the west in no ways considered the positive character of this conquest and its civilizing features. It saw in it nothing but sacrilege and intrusion and let itself be carried away by a profound consternation. The efforts undertaken to organize a new crusade failed due to the absence of a leader imbued with sufficient personality and driving force to unite different countries around this goal. One whole century elapsed before Europe could achieve the unity sufficient to inflict upon the Turks in 1571 the defeat of Lepante, which, in fact, was the prologue to the destruction of the Ottoman Empire in 1918.

May 29, 1453, the date of the capture of Constantinople by the Turks, has been chosen by the historians as marking the end of the Middle Ages and the commencement of the modern age. This is not an arbitrary demarcation motivated merely by historical convenience and expediency. The Byzantine Empire, weakened by internal political and religious struggles, characteristic of the Middle Ages, was nothing but a tottering political entity exposed to the repeated threats of invasion by the Asiatic peoples. The conquest of Istanbul epitomized the end of the Middle Ages and all that it represented, including anarchy, religious quarrels, and political dissension, and its replacement by a new era characterized by tolerance, order, and stability, discipline and security. Therefore, five centuries later, in 1953, the meditative and thinking mind cannot help but weigh the value, the historic fairness and equity of the opinion which contends even today that the present expansion of communism puts the Christian civilization in the presence of a menace similar to that which confronted it during the invasion of Europe by what they call the "Asiatic hordes" of Mehmet II.

From the political point of view, the settlement of the Turks in Constantinople actually resulted in containing and repulsing the invasion of Europe by Asiatic armies and stopping the onslaught of the Slavs on the continent. The iron walls of the Turkish citadel set against the Russian invasions have preserved the peoples of Europe who would otherwise be swept away by the continuous assaults coming from the north and east. The subjugation of the Balkan countries by the Turks, when studied in the light of historic facts, reveals itself not only as a movement of liberation of the peasantry from the anarchy and tyranny of local feudal principalities and the establishment of the unifying and protecting rule of a central state characterized by law, peace, and security for all subjects, irrespective of their race, creed, and religion, but also as an enterprise which spared these countries from a more real and permanent menace of Slavic or German invasions. To cite only one example from many, it is interesting to note that the creation by Suleiman the Magnificent of a Christian state in Hungary, vassal of the Ottoman Empire, clearly revealed a political conception completely opposite to the spirit of invasion. Thanks to this action, not only was Jean Zapolya able to preserve his faith, but at the same time bishops and monks continued to play their religious, social, and political roles in this border state of the Ottoman Empire. It is needless to say that German or Slavic domination of the Balkans would immediately set in motion in those countries a process of total assimilation destroying every national edifice and local characteristic.

The temporary Turkish domination, by allowing the subjugated peoples to retain their local autonomy, free development of their culture, the use of their national language, and complete freedom of worship, permitted those countries to organize movements of liberty and independence. It is in this manner that the Balkan countries were able to develop as independent states, until the day when Slavic expansion, allied to the Communist imperialism, succeeded, thanks to the force of its ideological pursuits and its military power, in taking over these countries. The historical process further proves clearly that Russian expansionist spirit is not confined to the Communist Kremlin alone. By following without respite the growth of their empire, the leaders of the Kremlin reveal themselves as true heirs of the Czars. Already under Catherine, Russia, after having colonized Siberia, was pushing its advance guards to the very doors of Mongolia, crossing the Bering Straits, and gaining a firm foothold in Alaska. Catherine the Great, at the same time embracing the spirit of the Crusades, was entertaining the much coveted dream of snatching Constantinople from the Turks and again planting the cross on the dom of St. Sophia on behalf of a religion in which she did not believe, and an ideal of the Third Rome which unremittingly obsessed her. It was in this manner that Latvia, Lithuania, and the Ukraine, in short the entire route from the Baltic to the Black Sea, ceased to belong to Europe and became Russia. Heroic Poland was liquidated after a series of partitions, and this dismemberment was nothing but the forerunner of a project of conquest much more ambitious, enveloping the whole continent of Europe.

Even before Catherine, with the reign of Peter the Great, Europe, which hitherto had been wont to fear the Turks, was beginning for the first time, to fear the Russians.

However, in spite of all his efforts, Peter the Great failed to gain a firm foothold on the Black Sea. Here, too, success would favor Catherine. She allied herself with Joseph II, German Emperor, in order to bring about the dismemberment of the Ottoman Empire. This project was foiled thanks to the prompt and vigorous reaction of Turkey. But unfortunately, two successive wars imposed upon Turkey subsequent to this conspiracy, gave Russia the opportunity not only to gain a foothold in Crimea, on the shores of the Black Sea, but also to sow the seeds of future ethnical, political, and religious quarrels in the direction of Constantinople and the Mediterranean. This event marked the birth of the struggle for the straits. The fight for the capture of Istanbul and the straits, followed through by the Russians in 13 wars imposed upon Turkey, still goes on, through the plans of world expansion.

While blocking on the one hand the route to the South as well as the Mediterranean to the Slavic invasions, the Turks succeeded, on the other hand, in halting the German expansion. The most characteristic trait of this Turkish policy took place during the reign of Suleiman the Magnificent. The desperate appeal made to the Turkish Sultan by Francois I, imprisoned by Charles V at Pavia, resulted in the conclusion of an alliance between the two monarchs, and in the liberation of the French King. The Turkish Sultan had already ceased to be considered as the Chief of Asiatic hordes temporarily camped on the European soil until such time when the Crusaders would again push them back to Asia. He reached the stature of a great sovereign, successor of the Basileus, holding the reins of an empire that has emerged as the real continuation of the Byzantine Empire. Busbeq "the Fleming," Austro-Hungarian envoy, professed a sincere and frank admiration for this new Oriental empire. The Sultan, surnamed the "Magnificent" by the occidentals, becomes an essential element of European stability.

Like all the ephemeral things of this world, it is the fate of empires to be born, to become great and to shine with a splendor which slowly grows dim as they decline and finally disappear.

Starting with the 19th century, under the pressure of nationalistic movements, the Ottoman Empire began to lose, one after the other, its European provinces.

The increasing weakness of Turkey prompted Russia to pursue with more insistence the realization of her ambition to take possession of the Straits. She became more and more determined to exploit all incidents, even to create pretexts to ask from Turkey new territorial sacrifices and fresh concessions. The Balkans had become the center of trouble and intrigue, propitious to the realization of Russian designs. The Balkan Wars, actually were to become the predude to the catastrophes of the First and Second World Wars.

The pacifying and stabilizing role played by the Ottoman Empire for more than four centuries became clearly evident when its downfall, brought about in great part by foreign intrigues, carried with it the collapse of European balance of power as well as a series of further troubles which culminated in two world wars.

The events which have followed since 1918 would suffice to prove that the vacuum created by the disappearance of the Ottoman Empire cannot be easily filled. Old Turkish provinces (the Balkan States), felt the need to form a grouping with a state such as Turkey having a long past and possessing traditions propitious to the creation of an alliance based upon equality and the preservation of common interests. From this anxiety for existence was born the Balkan Entente, the genial work of Ataturk. The same idea has begun to take form again recently with the signing of the Treaty of Friendship and Cooperation between Turkey, Greece, and Yugoslavia. In this way the same need for security, the same concern over the preservation of national existence, the same desire to unify efforts for solidarity and fraternal cooperation aimed at peace and well being, all these considerations push again today the Balkan countries together around the same factor of stability, personified by Turkey.

The need for regrouping is also dawning in some friendly quarters of the Middle East. If the projected arrangements for the defense of the Middle East ever materialize, this would assure the continuation in this region, around the Turkish nucleus, of the peace and security block already created in the Balkans. Future developments will tell us in what degree this second trend is destined to take shape and consistence. In any event, the very fact that the regrouping has already taken place in the Balkans, and that it has become a living trend in the Middle East constitutes the most eloquent tribute paid to the Ottoman Empire for its earlier pattern of peace and stabilization.

The celebration of the anniversary of the conquest has raised fears and apprehensions in many foreign circles lest it may constitute a ground for friction between Turks and Greeks. It is true that until 30 years ago Turk and Greek were the worst enemies to be found in the whole world. But thanks to the vision and foresight of their leaders, these two nations showed the wisdom of liquidating all the causes of conflict and friction which had divided them for centuries, in order to inaugurate an era of trusting and cordial friendship. Ataturk's stroke of genius and prompt decision to transform St. Sophia, originally a Greek church and then a Turkish mosque, into a museum of joint civilization, carries in it the symbolic expression of the reconciliation that embraces the entirety and the future of Turkish-Greek relations. Heirs of old civilizations and cultural values and traditions, both nations are now startling the whole world with their fine demonstration of spiritual courage in the presence of the grave danger which threatens the freedom.

St. Sophia is no longer the religious emblem of a cult that places Turks and Greeks in opposition to one another in a sterile rivalry, but an institution of fine arts which the friendship and cooperation of the two peoples will bequeath to posterity as the product of their common civilization. The two Governments have agreed to proclaim the day marking the conquest of Constantinople as an occasion for joint celebration by the Turkish and Greek universities. The two countries consider the conquest as a constructive historic event of cooperation in their mutual relations. The Turkish Government in particular has scrupulously endeavored to give to this celebration a character and scope completely devoid of bellicose and provocative meaning.

Thus a country which inaugurated a new era by introducing into the Middle Ages the spirit of political and religious tolerance, a country wherein once settled in security thousands of Christians and Jews who had fled their own country deprived of justice, an empire that at one time took upon itself the equilibrium of Christian powers, a nation who allied highest military virtues with best traditions of chivalry and won renown for loyalty to the given word as well as clemency and generosity toward the enemy, a nation who, after halting for centuries the czarist drive for expansion opposes now a Communist thrust at the Mediterranean: this country, this nation celebrated a few months ago the 500th anniversary of their embracement of Istanbul. Commenting upon the event, the Greek orthodox patriarch, Athenagoras, repeated in Istanbul a highly significant philosophical deduction which he had confided to me here in Washington while he was still holding the position of orthodox archbishop in America. "The conquest of Constantinople by the Turks is a sign of a special will of God for the defense of the Orient and of civilization. The centuries that have elapsed since the conquest have served to prepare the Turks for the role they were destined to play and they are, in fact, continuing to play."

The opinion of this prelate is perfectly well founded. The great event which took place on May 29, 1453, was to leave its indelible print on the destiny of the future, and to have a decisive influence upon the history of contemporary international relations. The conquest of Constantinople had plunged Europe into the fear of an Asiatic invasion. Five hundred years later Constantinople, which became Istanbul, continues to be, in the hands of the Turks, a strong and most reliable bastion of the Mediterranean and Europe against the Asiatic forces, as well as a resolute and stanch advance post against the expansion of communism. Now, the Mediterranean is the cradle, the center, and the future of civilization. The history of the Mediterranean is the history of the world. The security of the Mediterranean is the security of the world. Referring only to contemporary events, all the great international perturbations that have taken place in the 20th century, were born from great struggles undertaken with the purpose of monopolizing supremacy in the Mediterranean. In the event that an expanding Asiatic power should establish itself in the Mediterranean, it unquestionably would be the end of Europe and of all civilization.

Turkey, up to now, has been able to check all Asiatic expansion designed to eradicate the subtle unity and the kinship of the Mediterranean. We have been fortunate to see the great American democracy, during these past years, join Turkey and other peace-loving powers in the Mediterranean to defend liberty and civilization. But let us be on our guard; the eternal question of the Straits is once more beginning to be reviewed as a forerunner to a vigorous drive directed at puting an end to the stable and balanced regime of Montreux which governs them, in order to force Turkey and the other contracting parties of the Montreux Convention to accept a precarious setup designed to serve the exclusive interests of the Communist expansion. The Western World, the United States, as of the moment, have to meditate and weigh the importance and the exceptional gravity of the move in that direction which, initiated a few years ago, is most likely to be resumed in the very near future.

They must be prepared to oppose any and all attempts to overrun the Mediterranean which are clearly designed to put an end to its unity, security, and stability. In this colossal struggle in which east opposes west, Turkey resolutely alines herself with the west. She has joined NATO, and she is a member of the Council of Europe. Turkish soldiers, imbued with the hereditary heroism of their race, have been able to achieve epic exploits in Korea. Completely ignored by the Americans for centuries, Turks appear, in 1953, among the ranks of the most loyal allies of the United States. Thanks to the continuous development of personal contacts and relations, the Turks are daily becoming better known in this country. Historians have established that the conquest of Istanbul by the Turks, was indirectly responsible for the discovery of America. At this time we are witnessing a good turn of history and America now is discovering Turkey. But it would not suffice, in my opinion, to limit the very existence, the extent, and the significance of our relations to the political necessities and contingencies born from an evaluation of the present danger. As far as we Turks are concerned, we are determined to give them a permanent character of fruitful, fraternal, and far-reaching cooperation dedicated to the common good of our two peoples. It is on the youth of America, on the youth of Turkey, that we must confer the task of perpetuating and further developing our friendship. We must teach young people to know each other, to like each other, and to respect each other. Now I submit that no nation in the world has been so misunderstood and so misjudged through evil propaganda and distorted information as the Turkish people. The innocent and most astonishing questions with which I have been personally confronted during the course of my 5 years' stay in this country, even by persons of high culture, and more especially, the attempt of these persons to justify their fantastic questions and affirmations by so-called facts of history commonly taught in schools, have always made me feel that a movement to revise the American textbooks which discuss the history of the Turkish people would be extremely useful. The causes for the downfall of the Ottoman Empire which followed its greatness and glory, as well as the determining factors of certain salient events of its history, may have unintentionally reflected the insinuating data propagated by certain international sources which were presumably much more concerned with serving a specific political goal than the cause of historic truth.

The history of the Turkish people has often been written by foreigners who shared in common the determination to depict this people as the hereditary enemy of occidental civilization and a constant menace to Christianity. No one has attempted to draw a picture of Turkish history by looking at it from the Turkish point of view. It is this approach in historic literature and even in textbooks of history in Europe and also in America which has given rise to ill conceived and erroneous ideas of the Turks. Today's historian, however, has no longer the excuse of immediate and confusing contemporaneousness which often complicates matters and obscures the truth. He has at his disposal innumerable documents designed to enlighten his understanding. Above all, he has sufficient perspective to measure the discrepancy between events and their telling, so as to conform to perceivable and intelligible reality with objectivity. It is the duty of education to teach students to free themselves from prejudice and from the ready-made knowledge which a deliberate propaganda attempts to inculcate in them. For only an intelligent, dispassionate consideration of historic events can orient science accurately and objectively and shed an equitable light on the understanding of the history of nations.

I presented the above remarks pertaining to the future of our relations in the course of my speech on October 29, 1952, at the annual banquet of the American-Turkish Society in New York, and expressed the hope that the center of Turkish studies of Columbia University, in conjunction with the American-Turkish Society, would devote a portion of their enlightened efforts to the worthy task of inspiring a work of such fundamental importance. I have no indication that such an effort has as yet been undertaken.

I am laying before you these same remarks at this magnificent gathering arranged under the auspices of the Middle East Institute. I hope that my appeal will receive generous and active response. In fact, I sincerely wish to believe that this will be so, because your institute, by graciously arranging this commemoration, with the main theme being to call the attention of the Western World to the real, historic significance of the capture of Istanbul, and, consequently, to the contribution of the Ottoman Turks to modern civilization, has already initiated a constructive, scientific, and objective move in the right direction. I am convinced that it is only under such circumstances of mutual understanding that we can settle our relations on broad and permanent foundations, and raised our present ties to the level of a splendid heritage dedicated to posterity.

The Oppressive Wage Ceiling in the Social Security Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 10, 1954

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, I am confident that most of the Members of this Congress do not realize what a hardship is worked upon the elderly people of this country by the oppressive wage ceiling in the Social Security Act, which is presently fixed at $75 a month or $900 a year. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD a letter from a correspondent from Englewood, N. J., dealing with this matter. This letter follows:

ENGLEWOOD, N. J., *April 2, 1954.*

Representative OSTERTAG,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: Why should old people who draw social-security pensions be prohibited from taking jobs that pay a living wage? Surely they cannot exist on their pensions, even when augmented by the ceiling wage. According to statistics, the average oldster lives to the age of 66.8 years, so they don't have much time to work anyway, most frequently. These days you read in the papers about the politicians raising their salaries and pensions. Upon drawing their pensions, are they prohibited from taking lush jobs?

I hope Congress will give the old folks thoughtful and careful consideration.

Respectfully yours,
(Name withheld.)

Polish Constitution Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD R. FORD, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 10, 1954

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, May 3 is an eventful day in the history of human freedom. On this day in 1791 the Polish Constitution was adopted by the people of Poland. In the annals of human progress it was a great step forward in the evolution of the democratic processes. Listen to the words contained in the preamble of this immortal document:

> Persuaded that our common fate depends entirely upon the establishing and rendering perfect a national constitution; convinced by a long train of experience of many defects in our government, and willing to profit by the present circumstances of Europe, and by the favorable moment which has restored us to ourselves; free from the disgraceful shackles of foreign influence; prizing more than life, and every personal consideration, the political existence, external independence, and internal liberty of the nation, whose care is entrusted to us; desirous, moreover, to deserve the blessing and gratitude not only of our contemporaries but also of future generations; for the sake of the public good, for securing our liberty and maintaining our kingdom and our possessions; in order to exert our natural rights with zeal and firmness, we do solemnly establish the present constitution, which we declare wholly inviolable in every part, till such period as shall be prescribed by law, when the nation, if it should think fit and deem necessary, may alter by its express will such articles therein as shall be found inadequate. And this present constitution shall be the standard of all laws and statutes for the future diets.

Subsequent events have torn asunder this great nation dedicated under the terms of this great charter. Poland is still under the yoke of cruel and ruthless Russian domination. Her people, however, forcefully demonstrate to the world that the shackles of freedom are bursting at the seams. The two young Polish fliers who escaped from Poland are the best evidence in support of this statement. From the case of Frank Jarecki I know personally that the cauldron of freedom is boiling over and will soon overflow its sides. When the time is ripe we must and will be ready to offer our helping hand. This is the policy of liberation announced by President Eisenhower when he assumed office. We will not fail our trust. We this day rededicate ourselves to this mission of freedom and liberty for a heroic nation and its sturdy and stalwart people.

Today the world over people of Polish descent rejoice and send their spiritual greetings to the gallant men, women, and children in Poland. As our forefathers fought and died for freedom, so, too, has fate required this of the Polish people. From this suffering will come, as sure as we have night and day, a greater freedom-loving Poland.

Let us all join in offering our prayers and best wishes to the people of this great nation.

H. R. 7870, a Bill To Authorize a Food-Stamp Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 10, 1954

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement I made before the House Committee on Agriculture concerning my bill, H. R. 7870, for the disposal of a portion of the surplus foods now in Government storage to people receiving welfare, under a food-stamp plan:

TESTIMONY BY CONGRESSWOMAN LEONOR K. SULLIVAN, DEMOCRAT OF MISSOURI, BEFORE THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE ON H. R. 7870, HER BILL TO AUTHORIZE A FOOD STAMP PLAN

I very much appreciate the opportunity to discuss with the members of this committee my bill to get some of our surplus food into the stomachs of hungry people.

H. R. 7870 would authorize the Secretary ow Agriculture to distribute a small portion—up to one billion dollars worth a year—of our surplus, Government-owned stocks of food to needy families in the United States under a food stamp plan.

The members of this committee are, I am sure, thoroughly familiar with the successful food stamp plan in operation during the early years of the Roosevelt administrations. The purpose of that plan was twofold: To help the poor—and how many of them we had then. A large proportion of our population was in want; and second, to provide markets for farmers in desperate financial straits. The food stamp operation, then, of necessity, had to be a huge undertaking for it had to meet a huge dual responsibility in a time of economic disaster.

Of course, our situation today in no way resembles that of the depression days of the middle thirties. There is no depression in the United States. But I think it would be tragic to shut our eyes to the fact that we do have an economic recession, that we do have nearly 4 million unemployed, that we do have other millions on relief and in distress. Simultaneously, we have these mountains of surplus food accumulating in warehouses and storage bins.

My bill does not represent a solution for surpluses accumulating under the price-support program and other programs of aid to agriculture. That is a problem which I know the members of this committee are wrestling with—a terribly complex problem. While my bill is no solution for it and does not pretend to be a solution for it, it does attempt to put part of this food to human use—to get some of it—a small portion of it—to children going without milk and eggs and meat, to families who get up from their tables almost as hungry as when they sat down to eat.

Do we have such families in the United States? Unfortunately, yes, we do. The number is growing. Their plight in the midst of this abundance of food is a tragedy. It is a disgrace. It is a mockery of the resourcefulness of the United States.

I hesitate to say it, but I must be blunt and speak my mind honestly: We have here in the United States hunger. While we may tend to shut our eyes to that fact, I can assure you the Communist conspiracy has not done so. It galls me, as I know it does every member of this committee and every Member of Congress and for that matter every American, that the plight of a small percentage of our people furnishes grist for Communist propaganda throughout the world—half truths intended to convince the minds of men in Europe and Asia that hunger in the United States is proof that the American system does not work and cannot work for the good of all the people.

It does work and it can work and, in the vast majority of cases, it is working. But let's be honest with ourselves: We do have actual need and want and destitution among some Americans. And we have it when our warehouses bulge at the seams with so-called surplus food. I say so-called because obviously much of this food is needed for proper nourishment of American children and for people who because of handicaps or other reasons, including failure to find jobs and ineligibility for unemployment compensation or public assistance, have insufficient income to enable them to eat regularly and adequately.

THE SULLIVAN BILL

I hate to think of any American—or anyone else for that matter—not receiving an adequate diet in these days when our agricultural progress and resourcefulness have provided us the means for assuring abundance for all. I should like to say: Take this surplus and give it away to anyone who is hungry, anywhere.

But, of course, we have to put some limit on our generosity, and pay heed to the possible and the practical. If we sit by doing nothing because we don't yet have the perfect answer to every problem, why of course we would never do anything.

In this bill, I have tried to seek a practical approach. H. R. 7870 does not say we should give away free food to anyone who happens to come by and ask for some. It attempts to channel a portion of this food to those most in need—those whose circumstances are most desperate. Let's at least start with them, and then, if we find we can do more than that, why certainly let's go on from there. Therefore, I have suggested in H. R. 7870 that we establish a food-stamp plan aimed primarily at persons and families on relief—on public assistance—or in need of such assistance but ineligible because of legal technicalities.

This is not to say that people on social security or on unemployment compensation or participating in other programs of that nature not directly reflecting destitution could not well be included in a food-stamp plan. I think that determination would depend upon information which the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Department of Labor might be called upon to provide to this committee on the extent of need in these categories and on the extent of the surplus food which could be distributed among them on a practical basis.

But there is no doubt—none whatsoever—of the need of those on relief. Their relief grants are admittedly inadequate to keep any American family in the barest minimum of decency and dignity. Everyone acknowledges that. There is no dispute about it. A millionaire is eligible for unemployment compensation or for social security, but no thousandaire is eligible for relief. Relief clients are destitute Americans with no resources, no income, no funds. They are paupers. And they are hungry.

There is a second category in this tragic situation. They are the unemployed who have no unemployment compensation for one reason or another or who have used up their unemployment-compensation benefits. Whether they have a dollar to their name or not, they are also ineligible for public assistance in many jurisdictions, including Missouri, by reason of the fact that they are employable. Where do they go? Where can they go? They can go to the private charities.

The private charities in the United States—certainly in our cities—are in desperate straits. Here in the city of Washington, both the private charities and the public relief agencies are turning people away—people in need, people who are hungry—people without jobs and without income—because funds are not available to help them. This is not an isolated Washington phenomenon. This is happening in many of our cities and in our States. I have a report dated several months ago from the research bureau of the Social Planning Council of St. Louis—including an analysis of recent trends in relief experience of community-chest agencies. In keeping with the rising trend in unemployment earlier this year—unemployment 73 percent greater than a year ago—it showed a situation of crisis.

In December 1953 the Salvation Army family welfare department assisted 42 percent more cases than a year ago and spent 236 percent more money for direct relief. The St. Vincent De Paul Society assisted 45 percent more cases, but had only 7 percent more money to cover this increased load.

"These two chest agencies represent the ones most acutely affected by the sensitivities of the labor market," the analysis declares, "because of policies directed toward attempting to meet, to some extent, all the demands upon their resources. Data for other chest agencies also show excessive demands for relief in recent months."

Now these were cases in large part resulting from unemployment, from the termination of unemployment compensation or from the waiting period to get unemployment compensation. Many more large families than usual were applying, and the bulk were in the unskilled labor group. In this situation the private Community Chest agencies had to turn people away because they did not have the funds to help them.

The report states, "Experience to date indicates that the family agencies which have the largest relief budgets, Family and Children's Service, St. Vincent De Paul Society, Salvation Army, all have been taxed up to and beyond the limit of their relief budgets" in November and December 1953, and January 1954—the period covered in this analysis.

It is in view of the fact that many of our States limit relief to people who are unemployable that I have included in my bill families which need relief but cannot obtain it because of State or local law.

A key provision of H. R. 7870, and one which I especially urge be included in any legislation which the committee recommends in this area, is that surplus-food allotments made under a food-stamp plan clearly be in addition to and not in place of any public-assistance grants otherwise being extended to recipients.

I would hate to see any public agency use a food-stamp plan as a device or as an excuse for cutting down on already inadequate relief grants. If that were to happen, the whole purpose of this bill would be destroyed. The relief burden on our cities and States is a heavy one, and there might be a disposition in some jurisdictions to reduce benefits as a means of saving local tax funds if the Federal Government were to step in and provide some free food. But the people on relief would be no better off at all.

H. R. 7870 is intended to help them—not to shift a portion of the burden from local or State to Federal shoulders, with no improvement whatsoever in the relative well-being of these unfortunate citizens.

THE MACHINERY OF FOOD-STAMP DISTRIBUTION

I would like to call to the attention of the committee the fact that H. R. 7870 does not attempt to cross every "t" and dot every "i" in the operation of a food-stamp plan. I have deliberately allowed for broad discretion on the part of the Secretary of Agriculture in determining the kind and variety and amounts of food to be distributed under a food-stamp plan. On the other hand, I have assigned to him the responsibility to have the food packaged in a form in which it can be distributed and to provide the distribution machinery.

It may be that he might want to use existing stores for the distribution of this food, as was done under the old food-stamp plan. If not—if he finds central distribution points in the various cities to be preferable—then he can use that method. In a program of this magnitude, I do not believe in tying his hands and requiring that he distribute so much butter and so much milk or other surplus to each person each week or each month. I think that has to be an administrative determination.

At the same time, however, it is incumbent upon the Congress to give to the Secretary, in addition to authority, the funds he needs to distribute this food efficiently and effectively.

In this connection, I think I should acknowledge the fact that I know—and I am sure the committee knows—that we now have some machinery for the distribution of surplus foods to needy families. It is a program requiring State initiative. Its operation varies widely from State to State, and many States, I understand, have never bothered to set up the necessary machinery.

At the time I introduced H. R. 7870 only a very few States among the 48 were participating. Others have since come into the program as their unemployment problems increased. But as I understand it, it is a somewhat haphazard sort of thing, and I don't think it is doing the kind of job which should be done and must be done. My bill is intended to repeal the present program and substitute for it a clearcut, nationwide type of operation in which any city or county welfare agency could participate, whether its State officials cooperated or not. You might have extreme distress in one city or county in a State which was generally experiencing booming prosperity. Under those circumstances, although the State might be slow to act, the locality could act promptly.

Certification of eligibles among those on public assistance would, of course, be a simple matter. Everyone on the public assistance rolls would be eligible and would be certified. The problem would lie in the certification of eligibles not on public assistance. But I think this could be worked out readily by the city or county welfare agencies themselves with the advice and the help of the private charities.

SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT

Because of the importance of this matter and because of its complexity, I have recognized ever since drafting my bill that it can undoubtedly be improved and that it may have provisions in it of a technical nature which would hinder rather than aid the purpose of this bill. That is always possible.

Consequently, I sent copies of my bill to many experts in the social work field in St. Louis—professionals in both the public and private agencies—and to our State director of welfare. Their comments are most helpful. Most of them—I should say virtually all of the letters I have received in reply—endorse the idea of a surplus food distribution program for needy families. I shall include some of those letters for the record, because I think they can be helpful to the committee.

Several raised the question of financing of the necessary certification machinery—the procedure for establishing those eligible for food stamps and surplus foods. They point out that the States and municipalities in many cases have no funds for this purpose. I urge the committee to take that fact into account in its consideration of this bill and recommend your best judgment as to the financing requirements. Perhaps a cooperative financial arrangement could be worked out.

Others who wrote to me suggested that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare be given joint authority with the Department of Agriculture for the operation of the program. I would have no objection to that; it might be a very useful arrangement. Nevertheless, we must realize that the main burden in this whole program would rest on the Department of Agriculture, and under those circumstances I think the Secretary of Agriculture should have all of the authority necessary in his own hands to make the program operate efficiently and effectively. I am sure he would welcome aid and advice from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

It has been pointed out to me that the wording on one section of my bill could be construed to have the effect of eliminating various programs now in operation for the distribution of surplus food through the school lunch program or for foreign aid or for assistance to hospitals and so on. That is not my intent.

I asked the Legal Section of the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress to study my bill from that standpoint, and I would like to submit the recommended changes in language they have given me to make sure that my bill does not harm any of the successful programs now under way for use of surplus foods, but merely substitutes a better procedure for the distribution of this food to the one category I have in mind here, that is, to people who are destitute.

I urge your favorable consideration of this legislation; your approval of a food stamp plan would bring not only new hope, but new strength and new health to millions of American families whose desperate situation cries out for humane assistance. Thank you very much.

THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS,
LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE SERVICE,
AMERICAN LAW DIVISION,
Washington, D. C., April 26, 1954.

To: Hon. Mrs. John B. Sullivan.

Subject: Comments on H. R. 7870, especially section 6 thereof.

Section 6 of H. R. 7870 would not affect the school-lunch program authorized in title 42, United States Code, sections 1751–1760. The section, however, might be interpreted as terminating the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture under section 416 of the Agricultural Act of 1949 (7 U. S. C. 1431) to dispose of surplus food commodities in furtherance of a school-lunch program and as preventing his continued use of funds made available under section 32 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1935 (7 U. S. C. 612 (c)) to implement such a program.

Section 6 would prevent the Secretary from continuing to exercise his authority under section 416 of the Agricultural Act of 1949 (7 U. S. C. 1431) to distribute food commodities acquired through price-support operations to the Bureau of Indian Affairs and Federal public welfare organizations for the assistance of needy Indians and to private welfare organizations for the assistance of needy persons within and without the United States. It would also prevent the continuance of the expenditure of the funds provided under section 32 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1935 (7 U. S. C. 612 (c)) for agricultural commodities to donate to persons in low-income groups.

In view of the fact that the bill as presently drafted could interfere with existing programs, we suggest the following amendments, which we believe would clarify the intent of the legislation.

On page 2, line 12, strike the semicolon at the end of section 2 (1) and insert the following: ", and organizations given priorities under section 416 of the Agriculture Act of 1949."

On page 2, line 22, insert after the word "thereof" the following: "and organizations given priorities under section 416 of the Agriculture Act of 1949."

On page 3, beginning on line 3, amend section 3 to read as follows:

"SEC. 3. The Secretary shall issue, to each eligible department, agency, or organization requesting the distribution of surplus food under section 2 (1), food stamps for each kind of surplus food to be distributed, in amounts based on the total amount of surplus food to be distributed and on the total number of needy persons in the various States and political subdivisions eligible to receive such food. Such stamps shall be reissued by each such department, agency, or organization to needy persons receiving welfare assistance, or in need of welfare assistance but ineligible because of State or local law, and shall be redeemable by such needy persons at local distribution points to be determined by the Secretary under section 2 (3)."

On page 3, beginning on line 25, amend section 6 to read as follows:

"SEC. 6. The distribution of surplus food to needy persons in the United States under this act shall be in lieu of, and not in addition to, the distribution to such needy persons under section 32 of the act entitled 'An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act, and for other purposes, approved August 24, 1935 (7 U. S. C., sec. 612c), as amended, and section 416 of the Agricultural Act of 1949.' Distribution of surplus food under this act shall be subject to the same system of priorities as is presently provided for in such sections."

On page 4, beginning on line 9, amend section 7 to read as follows:

"SEC. 7. For the purposes of this act, a needy person is anyone receiving welfare assistance (financial or otherwise) from an eligible department, agency, or organization, or who is, in the opinion of such department, agency or organization in need of welfare assistance but is ineligible to receive it because of State or local law."

As you requested, your statement and the letter from St. Louis are returned herein.

AMERICAN LAW DIVISION.

ST. LOUIS CHAPTER, AMERICAN
ASSOCIATION OF SOCIAL WORKERS,
St. Louis, Mo., April 23, 1954.

The Honorable Mrs. John B. Sullivan,
House of Representatives,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MRS. SULLIVAN: I received the copy of H. R. 7870 that you recently sent me and concerning which you asked my comments.

I have discussed this matter with Mr. Rudolph T. Danstedt, executive director of the Social Planning Council of St. Louis, and learned that on March 11, 1954, he sent you his reactions to the bill. Since I agree with the observations contained in his letter I will not trouble you with a repetition of them here.

In short, I feel that the objectives behind the bill are sound but care must be taken that the proper administrative structure, together with adequate funds, be made available so that such a plan could be properly administered.

Sincerely yours,

HERMAN L. KAPLOW,
Chairman.

The Christian Woman's
Benevolent Association
of the Christian Church,
St Louis, Mo., April 8, 1954.

Mrs. John B. Sullivan,
Member of Congress, Third District, Missouri, Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mrs. Sullivan: We are in receipt of your letter concerning bill H. R. 7870 which you introduced in the House of Representatives.

I read the bill and approve of it and would urge its passage. I see no reason for the Government storing food when it should and could be made available to people who are actually in need of more food and because of the lack of food do not have the proper diet. Neither do I see any point in sending this food to foreign countries when there is need for it at home.

It would seem that the food stamp plan would be one of the best ways of distributing this surplus food to the needy public.

As a charitable institution, we have received some of the commodities which have been distributed through the Community Chest and we have appreciated them very much and hope we will continue to get these commodities whenever they are made available to the public.

These gifts of food have been a big help and saving to us in our work of feeding the homeless and needy old people and children we care for in our institutions.

Sincerely,
The Christian Woman's Benevolent Association,
Selina A. Hulan, *President.*

Forest Park Children's Center,
St. Louis, Mo., March 31, 1954.

Hon. Mrs. John B. Sullivan,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mrs. Sullivan: I am writing in answer to your request that I comment about the proposed bill providing for the distribution of certain surplus food commodities to needy persons. As director of a private social agency, I do feel that it would not be within the confines of my duties to answer your request in a personal vein, for it does have at least the possibility of certain political implications. I have, however, discussed this in our recent board meeting, and I can comment that our entire board, along with myself, believe that the bill you prepared is positive, constructive, and desirable. We all endorse this bill, not necessarily in detail, but certainly in principle.

Sincerely,
Richard M. Smith,
Director.

George Washington Carver House,
St. Louis, Mo., March 18, 1954.

Hon. Leonor A. Sullivan,
House of Representatives,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mrs. Sullivan: In reference to bill introduced to the House of Representatives and referred to the Committee on Agriculture, I can only make one comment and that is I think it's wonderful.

This bill will take care of the nutritional diet of so many needy people, as you have already stated in your bill, that are ineligible to receive aid because of State or local laws.

With people like you in there pitching for them the elevation of the health standards will rapidly rise.

Yours faithfully,
Ralph T. Young.

The Salvation Army,
St. Louis, Mo., March 15, 1954.

The Honorable Mrs. John B. Sullivan,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

My Dear Mrs. Sullivan: Thank you for forwarding copy of H. R. 7870 which you have introduced in the House of Representatives.

We would like to go on record as favoring the enactment of this legislation, as there is very definitely a great need in the State of Missouri at the present time for additional assistance.

We would hope that it might be possible to include an amendment which would make it possible for other agencies to refer families for this assistance, even though they are not eligible for public assistance. Generally speaking, those ineligible for public assistance are coming to private agencies. We are not suggesting that the private agencies handle the distribution—but rather a definite plan be worked out so referrals could be made.

Surplus food might make all the difference between a family eating a proper diet or living at a substandard level.

Be assured of our deep appreciation for your interest in our less fortunate citizenry and we wish you every success in having the bill passed.

Yours sincerely,
Lt. Col. A. E. Ramsdale,
Divisional Commander.

St. Louis Bureau for Men,
St. Louis, Mo., March 24, 1954.

Mrs. John B. Sullivan,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

My Dear Mrs. Sullivan: I am in favor of House bill 7870 relative to the use of stamps for the distribution of surplus commodities providing these stamps can be used in the usual retail outlets of the community, and also providing the United States Government pays for the total administrative cost of such a program.

Very truly yours,
Isaac Gurman,
Executive Secretary.

Jewish Community
Centers Association,
St. Louis, Mo., March 23, 1954.

Hon. Mrs. John B. Sullivan,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mrs. Sullivan: I received the copy of House bill 7870 which you sent me. I very strongly agree with you that it is necessary to provide for distribution of surplus food commodities to needy persons in the United States by use of a food-stamp plan.

I feel that this bill is of particular importance today what with layoffs in industry and a state of recession. It, frankly, grieves me to think of people suffering from malnutrition when there are such tremendous quantities of surplus food in warehouses and other storage facilities.

I personally feel that people have a definite right to decent housing, employment, and, needless to say, adequate diets. If for any reason the above mentioned are not available, then I feel this Government has a responsibility.

If the different States would be administering this food-stamp plan, then perhaps some thought should be given to the actual cost of administration and whether some form of Federal assistance and administration be necessary.

I, personally, am quite proud that a Representative from the State of Missouri introduced this very necessary legislation. I would like to state, incidentally, that I am expressing my own point of view and the above comments do not necessarily represent the thinking of the board of directors.

Sincerely yours,
William Kahn,
Director.

Goodwill Industries,
St. Louis, Mo., April 1, 1954.

Mrs. Leonor Sullivan,
Congresswoman of Third District of Missouri, United States Congress,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mrs. Sullivan: Because of some very pressing matters here in connection with our organization, I've gotten a bit behind in my correspondence. Please excuse my delay in answering your communication requesting my comments on House of Representatives bill 7870 in regard to surplus foods and their distribution. The handling of the surplus commodities, as they are handled at the present time, is meeting a great need.

The school-lunch program I feel is terrifically worthwhile, and surplus commodities that are furnished organizations such as ours for noon lunches, for handicapped people, and so forth, means a tremendous good is being done for the people in our agencies and also it helps our agencies tremendously.

In reading over bill H. R. 7870, on page 4, lines 1 through 8, it is not clear to me whether this bill is to take the place of the present system of distribution of surplus commodities, or is to be in addition to this present system.

I would not want to see anything done to disturb the present system as it is established and functioning well and meeting a tremendous need in a very systematic and worthwhile way. However, I realize this is only touching a very small portion of the surplus commodities, and if the program, as outlined in this bill, would be in addition to that program, it sounds to me as though it would be very good.

I would suggest that besides public agencies, the private agencies meeting certain standards would be given the privilege of distributing these stamps also. This would necessitate close cooperation to avoid duplication. Thanks for writing to me, and if I can be of any additional help, feel free to call on me.

R. C. Adair,
Executive Director.

St. Louis Chapter,
1954 Red Cross Fund,
St. Louis, Mo., March 22, 1954.

Mrs. John B. Sullivan,
Member of Congress, Third District, Missouri, Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

Dear Mrs. Sullivan: We are pleased to answer your letter regarding the need for a distribution of surplus foods to families in actual need.

You are quite aware of the fact that 55 percent of his budgetary need is supplied to a person who has been determined by a medical advisory team in our welfare office to be so disabled that he cannot be gainfully employed and so support himself. Obviously if this incapacitated man or woman has to pay any of his other living expenses which is presumed when his budget is drawn up by the relief agency, he cannot have more than 55 percent of the amount of money which he needs for food and may have very considerably less. The improvement of his physical condition cannot progress favorably under these conditions. Your plan for distribution of surplus commodities would decidedly assist such ill and handicapped persons on the relief rolls.

There is another group of persons who are handicapped and who are unable to be included in most relief rolls because of the administrative determination that they are employable for light or sedentary work for which many are not at all qualified. Anyone who is unemployed but employable is not entitled to any relief. More people in these two categories are turning to social agencies in this period of readjustment, which is taking place, and which brought increasing numbers of relief requests to social agencies in this area beginning last October. In addition there are increasing numbers of unemployed who are drawing unemployment compensation which cuts down the amounts which they have to spend for health-preserving foods.

In the cases within the public agency involving mothers of young children (to the age of 16) who are eligible to aid to dependent children, support for the mother is not included in the relief given except to the extent of 55 percent of the total budget of the family. This very important group of future citizens would also profit physically from additional food which might be made available to them. This would also be true of the large number of veterans and their families and the wives and children of deceased veterans who have to live on the pensions and compensation which are provided to them by the Federal Government.

The value of surplus items would probably be rapidly noticed in the beneficial effects to ill persons whose physical condition would improve more rapidly and enable them to return to employment and self-support at an earlier date than is now possible. In a relatively short time it would probably be possible to demonstrate that less money had to be spent in medical care on children, the aged and infirmed, and other unemployables who suffer various physical breakdowns due in part to poor nutrition. And, in the long view, the contribution of good nutrition should have its effect on the growing young population which will be our future citizens.

If you have not already done so, I suggest that you write to the social planning council requesting information about a study of recent relief requests which has been undertaken and which is going forward at the present time among all of our family agencies in St. Louis.

Surplus commodities cannot provide the whole answer to the problem but anything which provides additional nutritious food to the people whom we have described above, is a move in the right direction.

Sincerely,

William R. Ebbinghaus,
Director, Home Service.

Social Planning Council of
St. Louis and St. Louis County,
St. Louis, Mo., March 18, 1954.

The Honorable Mrs. John B. Sullivan,
House of Representatives,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mrs. Sullivan: Your letter to us asking a reaction to your proposed H. R. 7870 providing for the distribution of surplus food commodities by use of a food-stamp plan was discussed by the executive committee of this division.

In our opinion it would be extremely desirable to make surplus foods available to needy people in the United States.

We believe that such foods should be distributed through public welfare agencies. We realize, however, that certain problems of distribution would arise. Certain needy persons are not, of course, receiving public assistance because of the restrictions of categorical assistance. For instance, in the State of Missouri employable persons are not eligible for public assistance regardless of the extent of their need.

Also our public assistance offices are understaffed and are carrying very large caseloads. It might be questionable whether they would be in a position to certify persons not on their roles, and handle distribution. This would have to be decided by these agencies, however.

We should also be sorry to see any regression with regard to the present practice of providing cash relief. Considerable progress has been made in this State in getting away from a commodity basis for relief. It would be important to make a clear distinction between the regular policy of cash relief and the distribution of surplus foods as a special circumstance.

We appreciate your consulting with us on this proposed bill.

Yours sincerely,

(Mrs.) Frances Goodall,
Executive Secretary, Family, Old Age, and Children's Division.

Social Planning Council of
St. Louis and St. Louis County,
St. Louis, Mo., March 11, 1954.

Hon. Mrs. John B. Sullivan,
House of Representatives,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mrs. Sullivan: I have examined with considerable interest H. R. 7870 which has been introduced by you which proposes to establish a food stamp plan.

It is my opinion that a food stamp plan would be very useful and helpful to many thousands of individuals in the St. Louis area now receiving public assistance whose grants in many instances are inadequate, as well as to a number of unemployed people who are not eligible for public assistance because they are classified as employables. Several well informed individuals with whom I have discussed your proposal are definitely enthusiastic about it and have indicated their wish to support it.

For your information, I am enclosing a copy of a recent study we have made of the unemployment and relief situation we have here in St. Louis and St. Louis County which indicates that there are quite a few persons in need of relief but unable to get it because they are employables.

It would seem to me for such a food-stamp plan to be effective, however, some of the following conditions would need to be met by the Secretary of Agriculture:

1. That the stamps be redeemable in retail food outlets, perhaps where individuals customarily shop. This was the nature of the food-stamp plan in the prewar years.

2. If the above plan is not possible and distribution depots of some sort have to be established, then Federal funds should be available for financing the cost of maintaining and operating such depots.

3. The probability is very good that our State division of welfare would be the certifying public-welfare agency in Missouri. The division does not have the personnel to certify individuals not on public assistance and some emergency provision for funds to obtain such personnel would need to be provided by the Federal Government.

Four or five years ago, if I recall correctly, an opportunity was presented in the State and in St. Louis for the distribution to individuals of certain surplus foods. We were not able to avail ourselves of that opportunity because there were no funds for financing the cost of distribution and financing the personnel needed for certifying as to need. Unfortunately, this might be the situation again if the Secretary of Agriculture is not given funds for handling distribution and certification.

Sincerely yours,

Rudolph T. Danstedt,
Executive Director.

Social Service Exchange, Department of Social Planning Council
of St. Louis and St. Louis County,
St. Louis, Mo., March 12, 1954.

The Honorable Mrs. John B. Sullivan,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mrs. Sullivan: I am very glad to have an opportunity to comment on your bill, H. R. 7870, to provide for the distribution of surplus food supplies to needy families through use of a food-stamp plan. I know that many people to whom I have talked recently share your concern about inadequately nourished families and individuals in our midst, and the concurrent accumulation of surplus foodstuffs which might be used in provide them with a diet more conducive to maintenance of health, and to the rehabilitation of individuals now dependent on the community. I have been in the welfare field long enough to recall the benefits provided under the previous plan, which aided not only the recipients of the surplus foods, but also the producers on the farms and the retail merchants who distributed the supplies.

As a first priority, I would think such food should be channeled to recipients of public assistance through our State division of welfare. With the blind, aged, and permanently disabled persons receiving maximum grants of $55 per month, adequate nourishment is impossible for recipients with no outside income. We see these aged and disabled persons constantly faced with the need to make degrading adjustments to this inadequate income. Small wonder that so many of our aged are helpless and lethargic, and that disabled persons are not rehabilitated, but remain dependent on the community the rest of their lives. Recipients of aid to dependent children, which provides a maximum of $60 for a mother with one child, are possibly even worse off and the results even more poignant, since the deprivation of children fosters many later problems for the community and the Nation. The families who must depend on the State-financed general relief program have for years received relief in an amount sufficient to provide only 55 percent of a minimum standard budget. Since this group is composed of people only temporarily or partially disabled, they would appear to have a good potential for rehabilitation and adequate diet is certainly an important factor in such a program.

Since the State division of welfare has no direct-assistance program for families of employable persons who are without jobs, many of these families are now turning for help to the privately financed charities, such as family service agencies of the Community Chest, Red Cross, etc. To illustrate, in December of 1953, the St. Louis city public welfare office had 1,163 cases receiving general relief and the Chest agencies had 1,100 such cases. These families, as well as many who cannot be aided by private charities because of limitations of staff and funds, could certainly be helped by the program you propose.

I am quite sure that the State department of welfare would have to have Federal funds provided to finance the job of certification and distribution. I doubt whether the department could even handle certification of families on their own rolls without additional personnel for which they now have no funds. The previous plan, which provided for distribution through food retailers, placed the surplus commodities in easy reach of aged or disabled persons. If this plan is not feasible at this time, some provision would need to be made for deliveries at home for persons unable to go to a distribution center and carry home packages. This again would have to be financed with Federal funds in all likelihood.

I earnestly hope that this bill will be enacted, and that the problem of financing certification and distribution can be worked out through use of Federal funds.

Very truly yours,

MRS. ELIZABETH HENDRICKS,
Executive Secretary.

STATE DEPARTMENT OF
PUBLIC HEALTH AND WELFARE,
St. Louis, Mo., March 18, 1954.

Hon. LEONOR SULLIVAN,
Member of Congress, Third District, Missouri, Congress of the United States, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MRS. SULLIVAN: Your recent letter and a copy of H. R. 7870, together with excerpts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, containing your remarks on this resolution have been received and read with a great deal of interest. I am taking the liberty of referring this to our St. Louis city welfare commission, which is bipartisan and is composed of four prominent city residents. Mr. Henry F. Chadeayne, of the General American Life Insurance Co. is chairman, and the other members are Mr. Julian Cohn, of the Weil Clothing Co.; Miss Edna Emme, president of the Godofroy Manufacturing Co.; and Mr. Chester E. Stovall, director of industrial relations of the St. Louis Urban League. It is believed that their evaluations of this bill would be of more value to you than my own. In addition, a copy of your letter together with a copy of my reply will be forwarded to Mr. Proctor N. Carter, director of the division of welfare, for his information and evaluation. The responsibility of determining whether or not the division of welfare can act as a certifying agent for these food stamps rests with the State director.

Public assistance programs, which are administered by the Missouri Division of Welfare, do not always provide sufficient grants for the complete maintenance of recipients. There are numerous cases who because of statutory limitations on the amount of assistance granted are unable to meet their needs on the grants they receive. In one of the programs, that of general relief, it has not been possible to give adequate grants due to insufficient amount of money available for this program. For many years Missouri has not provided assistance to employable persons or in households in which there is an employable member. During these periods of high employment most people are able to secure jobs and there was little need for assistance. With the retrenchment in the defense program and a general lowering of the employment level there are people who are unable to get jobs and are in need. Under our current regulations it is not possible to provide these persons with assistance grants. From the above, therefore, it would appear that there are three broad generalized groups who would be aided under the provisions of H. R. 7870.

As you may recall the division of welfare did act as a certifying agency when surplus commodities were distributed prior to World War II. Those commodities which were provided by the Department of Agriculture were distributed through the use of WPA labor. In 1940 a food stamp plan was inaugurated whereby these foods were distributed through merchants. I was inducted in the service shortly after this plan started so do not have personal knowledge of it; however, it is my understanding that it worked quite well and was very satisfactory both to the recipients and merchants as well as the administering agency. If such distribution could be made under H. R. 7870, this would seem to better serve the needs of the clients who could redeem the stamps in stores within their areas and not be forced to make long journeys to some warehouse in another section of the city. It would probably be pleasing to the merchants for it would bring people into their stores and give them a part in the distribution, thus they would not be looking upon it as competition. Lastly, it would solve the problem of rental of warehouses, packaging, storage, and distribution for in a city like St. Louis this could be a very costly operation.

I am very grateful to you for this opportunity of reading H. R. 7870, and I am sure you will be hearing from the members of our Commission after they have had an opportunity to review the material.

Very truly yours,

ROBERT D. RIPPETO,
Director, St. Louis City Welfare Office

Buford Dam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PHIL M. LANDRUM

OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 10, 1954

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Speaker, down in the mountains of northeast Georgia, in the Ninth District of Georgia which I am privileged to represent, there is being constructed by the Corps of Engineers a mammoth multipurpose dam on the Chattahoochee River. The dam structure has come to be commonly referred to as Buford Dam, Buford being the name of the town nearest which the structure is located, but the impoundment will create a large and magnificent lake in the picturesque mountain country of this southern region. The lake will be formed chiefly from the waters of the Chattahoochee River and throughout this Nation the Chattahoochee River has gained fame among school children, lovers of literature and even soil and water conservation experts by reason of the Song of the Chattahoochee written many years ago by Georgia's immortal poet laureate, Sidney Lanier.

Individual efforts leading to the construction of this dam have been numerous. Scores of distinguished citizens from Fulton County, Ga., led by their mayor, the Honorable William B. Hartsfield, have worked closely with the Honorable JAMES C. DAVIS, who represents the Fifth District of Georgia here in the Congress. Congressman DAVIS has worked untiringly and unselfishly for the construction and completion of this project. My predecessor in the Congress, the Honorable John S. Wood, of Canton, Ga., contributed immeasurably to this project. Many distinguished citizens from Gwinnett County and Hall County and Forsyth County and Dawson County, and Stephens County and Habersham and White Counties where the great river has its beginning, have contributed valuable time and effort toward this development. Georgia's junior Senator, the Honorable RICHARD B. RUSSELL, has worked untiringly, and, sometimes in the face of obstacles which would break the efforts of the ordinary man, to bring this project to complete realization. All of these deserve our praise for their efforts in behalf of this work. Through their foresight we, in that section of Georgia, are going to benefit tremendously. The lake could be appropriately named for anyone of this vast number of distinguished citizens and officials.

However, years ago the renowned Sidney Lanier in his beautiful Song of the Chattahoochee told the real story of why 1 day man would find it necessary to harness these waters in order to preserve the great natural resources of the region. The poem has been memorized by schoolchildren all over Georgia, and, in many parts of our Nation. Few in Georgia are without knowledge of the moving poem written by Sidney Lanier about this river. Therefore, many hundreds of citizens and scores of civic clubs and organizations in my district have decided that the lake should be named for this immortal poet, and in response to their entreaties I have introduced H. R. 9045 seeking to have this lake named "Lake Lanier." I wish that I had the time to tell you what each of these organizations and individuals have said with reference to their reasons for naming this lake in honor of our great poet. This cannot be done, but in the Gainesville News, a Georgia weekly published in the thriving metropolis of Gainesville, Ga., by the Honorable Charles Hardy, he has summed up all of these reasons in an editorial carried in his paper several weeks ago. That editorial entitled, "Down Through the Valleys of Hall" is inserted herewith so that all of you may understand the real feelings of our people and their reasons for wanting this lake carry the honored name of Sidney Lanier:

DOWN THROUGH THE VALLEYS OF HALL

Not that we have anything to do with naming the new reservoir lake that will be formed by Buford Dam, or that our opinion will amount to much, but the News is definitely for naming the new body of water Lake Lanier, after Georgia Poet Laureate Sidney Lanier.

We base our belief and our like for Lake Lanier on the beautiful Song of the Chattahoochee, written by Lanier, and which all school children have memorized ever since it was written. It is a beautiful poem that ripples along as the waters of the Chattahoochee ripple along "out of the hills of Habersham, down through the valleys of Hall." Those who have traveled the Chattahoochee from its source above Robertstown back to the top of the gap, and along Spoil Cane Creek along the Unicoi Gap Road, and those who have waded it at Helen and fished it east of Mossy Creek Campground, camped on its banks, and followed it over the rapids and through the still waters, marvel at the way Lanier captured the rhythm of the river as it "hurries amain to reach the plain, run the rapid and leap the fall."

Sidney Lanier captured something in his Song of the Chattahoochee. He put it down in words on paper for all generations to enjoy. No more fitting tribute to one of Georgia's immortal spirits and one of Georgia's mighty rivers could be paid than to name the reservoir "Lake Lanier."

The Buford Dam will restrain the wild waters of the Chattahoochee, and will accomplish that which the rushes, waterweeds, laurel, ferns, and the fondling grass could not. The dam will cause the waters to abide, abide here in the valleys of Hall. Naming the lake for Sidney Lanier will also cause his name to forever abide, abide here in the Hills of Habersham and here in the valleys of Hall. It would be a most fitting tribute.

House Concurrent Resolution 58

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OTTO KRUEGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 10, 1954

Mr. KRUEGER. Mr. Speaker, North Dakota has a group of substantial, hard working, industrious people whose racial origins are in the Ukraine and Byelorussia. They have adopted our ways and are staunch supporters of our liberty, and appreciate our freedoms. In the adoption of House Concurrent Resolution 58, they see an opportunity to advance the cause of the freedom to those still under Soviet control in these two Republics. On their behalf, I would like to insert the following letter in the Record:

Ukrainian Congress
Committee of America, Inc.,
Bismarck., N. Dak., May 7, 1954.

The Honorable Otto Krueger,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Congressman Krueger: It is our understanding that House Concurrent Resolution 58, advocating the establishment of diplomatic relations between the Soviet Republics of Ukraine and Byelorussia and the United States, is soon to be brought before the House Foreign Affairs Committee for final consideration.

This resolution won the unanimous approval of the subcommittee assigned to study the proposal under the chairmanship of the Honorable Mrs. Frances P. Bolton.

There are many benefits to be derived by America from such an exchange of diplomats. Assuming that the Soviet Union would accept the offer, we would have an access, formerly denied us, to the capitals of the two most important and largest non-Russian Republics in the Soviet Union. Ukraine with a population of 43,572,000 and Byelorussia with a population of 10,525,000 are two of the most sensitive and unstable areas within the Soviet orbit.

Such a move would also provide new hope and faith for the Ukraine and Byelorussian people that their miserable plight under the Soviets and the aspirations toward independence from Moscow are fully appreciated by the United States to which they look for aid in their struggle. Both of these non-Russian nations have established their independence 35 years ago with the collapse of the czarist empire, before being crushed by Communist imperialism. Each nation has its own language, religion, culture, literature, history, and glorious tradition of fighting for liberty and freedom. Ukraine, as the Kingdom of Kiev, was well-known since the second half of the eighth century.

A Soviet refusal of this diplomatic proposal would expose once again not only the well-known fact that the Ukrainians and Byelorussians in the Soviet Union are not free to govern themselves as they choose, but would also undermine Moscow's fraudulent claims of a desire for friendly, peaceful relations with the West.

We respectfully urge you, to favorably support this resolution, for it is of vital importance to American security and victory in America's dealings with the Communist threat. We will appreciate your inserting this statement into the Congressional Record as a matter of public record.

Very sincerely yours,
Dr. Anthony Zukowsky,
President, UCCA State Branch of North Dakota.

Veterans of Foreign Wars Loyalty Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. DAVIS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1954

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, on May 1, which was Veterans of Foreign Wars Loyalty Day, it was my privilege to have a United States flag flown from the Capitol for the future use of the VFW in Georgia. As the flag was flying from our Nation's Capitol, Veterans of Foreign Wars in Georgia and throughout our country were observing Loyalty Day.

In the rush of everyday life many of us tend to forget the great privilege of being an American. A brief reminder now and then makes us appreciate the fact that we live in a free country. The VFW Loyalty Day program was inaugurated as an annual event to help supply this reminder, to counterattack the Communists May Day celebrations, and to help minimize the effects of Communist propaganda.

In Georgia the program was directed by State Commander Joe T. Wood, of Gainesville, and State Loyalty Day Chairman Charles A. Moran. In discussing the fine program they state:

> Loyalty Day is a nonpartisan, nonsectarian, and cooperative effort to exhibit national unity and rededication to our democratic ideals.
>
> It is gratifying that each year more and more of our fellow citizens are demonstrating their interest and concern and are eager to help spread the movement so that eventually all will participate in some way. As the world situation continues to become more serious and the security of our country and the safety of our fellow citizens imperiled, our thoughts turn more to the Almighty to whom we must intercede for victory in this global life-and-death struggle with the Red hordes.

The VFW asked all denominations in the State "to build up sermons and messages around the theme of loyalty—loyalty to God—being mindful of the fact that the very foundation and framework of our Government is based on belief in God, and that it is to Him that we must look for aid."

Organizations and schools were urged to use the pledge to the flag that was adopted at the last State encampment: It is:

> I pledge allegiance, under God, to the flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one Nation, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

I consider it an honor to serve as an honorary vice chairman of the Georgia Loyalty Day Committee. The foundation of the program is the same as that of our great country, a fundamental belief in God.

This country, while recognizing the dignity of the individual, has developed into the richest and most powerful Nation in the world. For example, the United States has only 6 percent of the world's land and only 5 percent of the world's population, but we produce in this country well over 40 percent of the world's total output of goods. We are the world's largest exporter and importer and we have created about two-thirds of the world's savings.

It is well for all patriotic Americans to observe loyalty day by rededicating themselves to the principles of our tried and proven American way of life. In fact, we might all follow the suggestion of the Georgia VFW—"Loyalty day—every day."

Salute to the Commemoration of the Polish Constitution of May 3, 1791

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. PILLION

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 10, 1954

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege at this time to place in the Record a resolution which was unanimously adopted at a mass meeting commemorating the 163d anniversary of the adoption of the Polish Constitution of May 3d, 1791, held at the Polish Home in Lackawanna, N. Y., on Sunday, May 2, 1954:

> Whereas the Polish Constitution of May 3, 1791, was the most liberal and democratic document of its day proclaiming respect for the human rights and the lofty aspirations for freedom of the individual;
>
> Whereas within the past decade since the end of World War II, Communist Russia, as a result of fearful and shameful appeasement of western democracies, has seized a sector of Poland and subjugated Poland and other free nations under the yoke of communistic imprisonment;
>
> Whereas this unfortunate example of Polish imprisonment by Communist Russia should fully awaken our Government to fuller defenses against threatening evils on the part of Russia: Now, therefore, be it
>
> *Resolved,* That we, as Americans wholeheartedly dedicated to the four freedoms, feel dutybound in the name of justice and equality to pledge loyalty and allegiance to our great and beloved United States of America to be always on guard against communism; be it further
>
> *Resolved,* That we, as American citizens of Polish descent, hereby repeat our pledge of loyalty and allegiance to our great and beloved United States of America; be it further
>
> *Resolved,* That we appeal that our great Republic of the United States of America, which guarantees freedom and liberty to all, do everything in its power to restore those blessings of liberty to millions of enslaved Poles who are now suffering political, religious, and economic persecution in their land; be it further
>
> *Resolved,* That the now functioning pro-Communist government of Poland, illegally imposed upon the once free people of Poland, be brought to an accounting before the world's tribunals of justice for the excesses and persecutions of the countless thousands of Polish citizens. We demand that the perpetrators of the persecutions of the thousand-year-old established state religion, the Roman Catholic faith, together with its spiritual leaders, namely, His Eminence Stephen Cardinal Wyszynski, primate of Poland, be denounced and punished according to the immensity of their crimes; and be it further
>
> *Resolved,* That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States,

Dwight D. Eisenhower; to the Vice President, Richard M. Nixon, President of the Senate; to the Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles; to the United States Senators Irving M. Ives and Herbert H. Lehman; to Congressmen John R. Pillion and Edmund P. Radwan.

William M. Stypowany,
Chairman,
Joseph F. Kij, M. D.,
Walter J. Lohr,
John F. Aszkler,
Julia Molenda,
Lottie Harzynski,
Stephen Guz,
Resolution Committee.

Lackawanna, N. Y., *May 2, 1954.*"

Gov. Dennis J. Roberts Applauds Democratic Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AIME J. FORAND
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 10, 1954

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, on last Thursday evening more than 1,500 enthusiastic Democrats attended a Jefferson-Jackson dinner in the Mayflower Hotel here in Washington.

The dinner was the culmination of a 2-day conference of party leaders at which an inventory was taken of the state of the Union and an appraisal made of the contribution of both major political parties to the general welfare and security of our country, as well as of our position in world affairs.

Gov. Dennis J. Roberts, of my home State of Rhode Island, was one of the leaders who spoke at the dinner. His address was a true appraisal of the record of the two political parties in the 83d Congress which I feel should be made available for all to read.

Therefore under leave already granted me, I include as part of my remarks Governor Roberts' address. It follows:

The dinner is a well-deserved tribute to the record of the Democratic Party in Congress.

I count myself particularly fortunate this evening to be able to join in this tribute. On behalf of the Democrats from outside Washington, I congratulate with all my heart the record of the Democrats in the Senate under the skillful and able guidance of Lyndon Johnson, and those in the House under that wise statesman, Sam Rayburn. It is fitting that the Governor of the smallest State in the Union should be given this opportunity to salute the Democrats in the Congress and these two gentlemen from a somewhat larger State.

I would also like to take this opportunity to compliment Chairman Steve Mitchell and his staff for their hard work and for the excellent way in which they are bringing inspiration and leadership to our party throughout the length and breadth of this great country. They are, of course, getting some powerful assists from sources which, I assume, are somewhat beyond their control.

What Congress does, or fails to do, affects vitally our own country and the whole free world. In examining the record of Congress, what do we find? On the Democratic side, responsibility and restraint. We find a unified, responsible Democratic Party working in the best interest of the whole country; a Democratic Party that restrains itself from blind partisanship, that is not afraid to support the present administration when it acts in the interest of the people, and a Democratic Party that offers constructive proposals when the administration is wrong or is without a sound program.

Take two diverse but significant examples. Democrats have backed the President in his low-cost housing program against the embittered opposition of many in his own Republican Party. In foreign affairs, the responsible leadership of the Democratic Party has backed the President against the mistakes and misjudgments of his own party. It is almost conceded that on the large, crucial issues, Republican eyes have turned to Democratic votes in Congress.

The present administration has borrowed or continued basic democratic programs. They have, of course, accepted only minimum goals; but in accepting basic democratic legislation, they have admitted the validity of the great social program of our party, which when out of office they so fiercely condemned. Our party has not been guided by the selfish partisanship of the Republican Party, but has continued to support progressive programs whenever they have been consistent with basic democratic plans.

Perhaps one of the greatest signs of the restraint of our party's leaders in Congress has been displayed in their lack of personal vindictiveness. Whenever Democrats have disagreed with a portion of the administration's program, they have attacked the substance of that particular program and have not sought to engage in a virulent attack on the individual presenting the program.

Now, let us go on the Republican side. What do we find? Massive indecision and a house divided. Their record in the past 15 months has been one of much studying—investigation—but of very little tangible positive results.

A truce has been effected in Korea, but we seem on the brink of a far worse situation in Indochina. There is nervousness and anxiety in our own country. The President recently felt obliged to take cognizance of that fact in a broadcast. On the economic front there has been in many quarters more than anxiety—there has been real hardship and dislocation.

I come from a highly industrialized State—a State whose principle asset is the skill and the know-how of its people. We are a productive people ready, willing, and able to turn our great energies to fruitful economic pursuits. What is true of Rhode Island is equally true of many other sections of our country, and yet we find ourselves, through no fault of our own, engulfed in large-scale unemployment. I do not suggest that the Nation is in the throes of a national disaster. I have faith that we shall work ourselves out of our present unemployment, but it must be said that the present large-scale unemployment confronting us is awesome. Under present circumstances we have a right to expect that the administration will take affirmative steps which will quickly reverse the downward trend. It has been said by Republican apologists that Democratic Congressmen who have warned against what is happening are prophets of gloom.

The fact is that the Democratic Party in Congress has demonstrated its willingness to face up to present economic conditions and to support a program for a prosperous and vigorous economy. Just as the Democratic Party has forgone political advantage at the water's edge, so too have we forgone political advantage on matters affecting the well-being of our economy. Epithets have been hurled by those who would divert attention from the basic fact—the urgent need for a dynamic program which comprehends an expanding and prosperous economy.

In this hour, when the world is sorely divided; when the free world is faced with the unending menace of red aggression and when our country carries the heaviest burden in the fight to sustain the free world, the obligation of an opposition party is heavy and all embracing. The manner in which you have discharged your obligation is the measure of your achievement. You have been a loyal, strong, effective and cooperative opposition party and we Democrats throughout the country are proud of you.

The Republicans in Congress seem still to be acting by reflex action. For 20 years their first instinct was to oppose, and they seem unable to drop that habit. They seem so used to being a minority party that it would seem a pity that we did not return them to that happy state as soon as possible.

Not only do the Democrats throughout the country appreciate the work of the Democrats in Congress, but I venture to say that your work has not gone unnoticed by even those who strayed from the Democratic fold in the last election. We are approaching an election year in which the record of this Congress will play an important part. Your role in it may well be decisive. Again let me salute you in behalf of all Democrats for the manner in which you kept aloft the Democratic banner and made it a rallying point for Democrats throughout the country who face the coming elections with confidence and enthusiasm.

Resolution of Roosevelt Home Owners' Club

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS S. GORDON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 10, 1954

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following resolution I received from the Roosevelt Home Owners' Club, of Chicago, Ill., commenting on the high cost of food in this city. It appears to me to be quite timely.

Resolution of Roosevelt Home Owners Club at a Regular Meeting Held on April 8, 1954, at Chicago, Ill.

Whereas the Roosevelt Home Owners Club membership is made up of about 400 owners of small homes, the majority of them residing in and owning property in the city of Chicago, county of Cook, and State of Illinois;

Whereas at a regular meeting held in the city of Chicago, county of Cook, and State of Illinois, on April 8, 1954, among other matters taken up was the matter of the high cost of food in the city of Chicago, while the farmers in the countryside outside said city were receiving much lower prices for their produce than they were receiving formerly, notwithstanding the increase for their produce as sold to the consumer in the city of Chicago;

Whereas be it further—

Resolved, That this matter be called to the attention of the Honorable Thomas S. Gordon, Congressman in our district: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the matter of the disparity in prices as received by the farmer for his produce and that paid by the consumer in the city of Chicago for the same produce be called to the attention of the said Hon. Thomas S. Gordon, Congressman in our district.

Roosevelt Home Owners Club,
By Walter Krajewski, *President.*

Freedom for Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED E. BUSBEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 10, 1954

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, May 3, 1954, the Select Committee To Investigate the Incorporation of the Baltic States Into the U. S. S. R., commonly referred to as the Baltic Committee, of which I am a member, held hearings in Chicago on the means and techniques used by Soviet Russia in taking over Poland as a satellite nation, in violation of the Yalta agreement.

One of the witnesses who appeared before the committee was Mr. Charles Rozmarek, president of the Polish National Alliance and president of the Polish American Congress. It has been my honor and privilege to know Mr. Rozmarek personally for many years, and I am familiar with the tireless and devoted work he has done in behalf of the people of Poland.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Mr. Rozmarek's statement:

STATEMENT OF CHARLES ROZMAREK, PRESIDENT OF THE POLISH NATIONAL ALLIANCE AND PRESIDENT OF THE POLISH AMERICAN CONGRESS BEFORE THE SELECT COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE INCORPORATION OF THE BALTIC STATES INTO THE U. S. S. R., MAY 3, 1954

I was immensely pleased when I learned of the formation of this congressional committee. I was even more gratified when I learned recently that it had extended the scope of its investigations. I am sure that my feelings are shared, not only by 6 million Americans of Polish descent, but also by millions of other Americans who recognize the Communist danger and who are deeply concerned with the basic American concept of freedom and justice for all men.

I welcome this committee to Chicago. More Americans of Polish descent live here than in any other city in the United States. I am sure that all of them welcome you here and appreciate your worthy and judicious efforts. My position as president of two of the largest Polish organizations, the Polish National Alliance and the Polish American Congress, qualifies me, I think, to speak in the name of all Americans of Polish descent.

We appreciate, too, your thoughtful kindness in choosing today, which is Poland's national holiday, as the date of your first hearing, and we feel honored that you planned to take testimony from free Poles on this day.

We Americans feel that the Polish case is very important because Poland is the largest country in central-eastern Europe. During our generation we have witnessed two world wars which had commenced in Europe and in which Americans had to die. Poland is the key to peace in central Europe. It is, therefore, indispensable that she be free and independent. Without a free Poland there can be po peace in Europe. Moreover, a strong and independent democratic Poland is the first line of defense for the Western democracies as well as America against totalitarian aggression.

We, Americans of Polish descent, understood the Soviet intention and the Soviet policy long ago. I don't have to quote our innumerable books, pamphlets, articles and speeches in which we sounded our warnings. Beginning as early as 1939 I raised a voice of warning to such leaders as Roosevelt, Truman, Hull, Stetinius, Byrnes and Acheson against Soviet treachery. Unfortunately, for a long time our warnings were ignored.

Alarmed at the turn of events, we Americans of Polish descent, organized the Polish American Congress at a great convocation held in Buffalo, N. Y., May 28, 29, 30 in 1944.

In my keynote address to the 3,000 delegates assembled at this historic conclave, I stated that one of our objectives was "to express our unequivocal support of the American foreign policy based upon the Atlantic Charter and the Four Freedoms. The impartial application of the principles enunciated in the Atlantic Charter will assure a just and lasting peace to all the United Nations, among whom is our first and ever faithful ally—Poland."

At that time I also said: "There have been disquieting indications of late that certain Americans, instead of leading all the Allied Nations toward a democratic future, are ready to push Poland, the Baltic countries, and other democratic nations into the sphere of a dictatorial power.

"Those Americans seem to forget that pushing millions of people into the Russian orbit means forcing them to live under an antidemocratic government with its abhorrent collectivism and with its one-party system run by a secret police force more efficient than the dreaded Gestapo. It means for these innocent people an endless suffering instead of a free, democratic life of their own choice. It means placing them behind prison bars.

"Unless we stand firmly by the sacred principles embodied in the Atlantic Charter, a third world war, worse than the present one, will be inevitable within our own generation.

"The people of America are sending war supplies to the Soviet Union with one specific purpose—and that is—to be used exclusively for the defeat of our common enemy—Germany. We are not supplying the Soviets with American airplanes, tanks, and ammunition so as to enable her to dismember Poland, the charter member of the United Nations. Nor are we sending Russia lend-lease equipment to enable her to obliterate the peaceful republics of Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, or any other country whose only sin is a preference for democratic government to an atheistic dictatorship."

On October 11, 1944, President Roosevelt received a delegation of the Polish American Congress at the White House.

As spokesman for this group, I expressed fears that the principles of the Atlantic Charter which the United States had pledged to uphold were being abandoned to placate a rapacious ally, and I presented a strong plea of justice for martyred Poland.

In conclusion I stated: "In view of the attitude of Soviet Russia to the Polish Government, we ask for your assurance, Mr. President, that you will insist that neither an alien nor a puppet system of government shall be imposed upon Poland nor that any part of her population will ever be disposed of or transferred against the really freely expressed will of the Polish people."

The President, in reply, expressed sympathy for our cause and stated that "Poland must be reconstituted as a great nation." He also stated that "It is very important that the new Poland be one of the bulwarks of the structure upon which we hope to build a permanent peace." The President promised to take the necessary steps to insure Poland's independence.

A photograph of this delegation together with the names of all present I am presenting to this congressional committee. You will note in the background of this picture a large map of prewar Poland. It is significant that there was no Curzon line on this map which we interpreted as indicating President Roosevelt's approval of a strong, free Poland within her rightful prewar boundaries. We did not know at the time that at Teheran an agreement had been made to surrender almost one-half of Poland with 15 million people to Russia.

On October 28, 1944, a week before the national elections, President Roosevelt invited me for another conference in his private train in the Illinois Central Station at Chicago.

Following this conference, I issued the following statement: "During the visit of the Polish American Congress delegation to the White House on October 11, and during my conversation with the President on October 28 in Chicago, he assured me that he will carry out the pledges of the Democratic Party with regard to our foreign policy and that he will see to it that Poland is treated justly at the peace conferences."

The President had definitely assured me that he would uphold the principles of the Atlantic Charter and the four freedoms. He told me that he distrusted Stalin, as he had been fooled by him on several occasions.

The President also expressed strong fear that Stalin might again team up with Hitler as he did at the beginning of the war. "Let us win the war with Germany first," he said. After Hitler's defeat, he indicated that he would know how to take care of Stalin.

I wish to state that at this conference in Chicago I was shocked by the President's physical appearance. I told my close friends at the time that I believed that he had only a short time to live.

About 3 months later we witnessed the spectacle of a sick President of the United States taking a dangerous and tedious long trip all the way to Russia for the Yalta Conference, where he was outwitted and outmaneuvered by the Soviets.

It is to be noted that among those in President Roosevelt's advisory group at Yalta was the convicted perjurer, Alger Hiss.

The most charitable interpretation I can give to President Roosevelt's role at Yalta was that he was a very sick man and perhaps did not know that he was signing a death warrant for the free people of Europe and Asia.

It is tragic, but nonetheless true, that American and British diplomacy, seemingly fascinated by the Soviet giant and distracted by a policy termed "war expediency," did not properly or efficiently protect the interests of Poland. This, mind you, in spite of the clear obligations which both the United States and Great Britain undertook with regard to their faithful ally.

Let's look at the record. Great Britain obligated herself by guaranties, which she gave to Poland on March 31, 1939; the British-Polish Mutual Assistance Pact of August 25, 1939; and by further assurances given during the Battle of Britain where, incidentally, 25 percent of all casualties were Polish fliers. By her commitments, Great Britain gave her solemn pledge to help Poland preserve her independence. Great Britain committed herself not to conclude any agreement with a third power concerning Poland, and especially no agreement that might prove injurious to Poland, without first consulting the legal Polish Government. In spite of all these assurances, agreements and commitments, we now know from the memoirs written by Her Majesty's Prime Minister, Winston Churchill, that Great Britain conducted secret negotiations with the Soviet Union to the detriment of Poland's territorial and political integrity a long time before the war ended. We now know that Great Britain concluded an agreement with the U. S. S. R., first in secret at Teheran, and then openly at Yalta—an agreement that deprived Poland of 49 percent of her prewar territories. And it was the same British Government that had promised to work for, not against, her trusted and loyal Polish ally, who forced on the people of Poland the so-called coalition government—a government led and controlled for the most part by the Kremlin's agents.

It is with sadness and regret that we Americans must admit that the American war leadership abandoned the principles of the Atlantic Charter—principles that millions of American soldiers were giving their lives to uphold.

The Atlantic Charter, signed by 47 countries, including the United States and our ally, Poland, guaranteed that every nation would have a right to elect its own government. It was in violation of the Atlantic Charter that American leaders gave in to Soviet blackmail and that America became a party to the farcical Council of Ambassadors. This council was set up at the Yalta meeting. Its job was to impose a government on the Polish nation. Acting against the Atlantic Charter, American leadership urged the free Poles to join the Kremlin-controlled coalition Government of Poland. Failing again to observe the principles of the Atlantic Charter, American political leadership, without the consent of the legal Polish Government, decided in agreement with the Soviet Union and Great Britain, to give to Russia half of Poland. It didn't seem to occur to anyone to ask the 15 million people of eastern Poland if they wanted to become part of the Soviet Union. While the territorial changes in the enemy countries were to be decided at future peace conferences, the surrender of half of the territory of the faithful ally—the country that was first to fight, the country that gave everything in the common struggle against totalitarianism—was to take place before any peace conference. If that were not bad enough, the question would be decided by third powers and the legal Polish Government would have no hand in the decision. And this is exactly what happened.

The Yalta agreement does not bind the United States. It was never submitted for ratification to the Senate of the United States as prescribed by the Constitution. Because it has no legal value, we, as free Americans, will never cease to call for its absolute rejection. The Yalta agreement does not bind and never has bound the Polish nation or the legal Polish government, still operating under the most difficult circumstances in London, because the legal goverment was never a party to the agreement.

Because of the perfidious Soviet methods and unfortunately because of the weakness and lack of vision on the part of the western democratic leadership, the Soviet Union has extended its control over 600 million people in the last 10 years. This means the Soviet Union now controls at least 800 million people, one-third of the human race.

Your committee is now investigating the methods and injustices that enabled the Soviet Union to achieve this unprecedented imperial power. It is extremely important that the American public knows of your work and understands its significance. America has become the decisive power in the free world.

More and more Americans are becoming aware of the Communist danger. May I say now at this hearing that you, Congressman KERSTEN, known and respected as you are by millions of Americans for your uncompromising support of the policy of liberation—you and the other distinguished gentlemen of your committee, are the best proof of the blessed change, of the new awareness, that has taken place in this great Nation. That is why, speaking in the name of 6 million Americans of Polish descent, I welcome you to the great city of Chicago, I pledge our support, and I say we are proud that we have such Congressmen and such a chairman of this vital committee.

You, gentlemen, are preparing the case today for an international criminal trial, which sooner or later will send the world's most vicious criminals to the gallows. I submit, there are sufficient provisions under the present rules of the United Nations Charter to indict the Soviet Union for all her inhumanities in violation of the general principles of law recognized by civilized nations. The success of any such action now rests on the diligence with which you, gentlemen, pursue this unprecedented investigation.

God bless your efforts.

Oil Workers Union Protests Job Curtailment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM STEED

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 10, 1954

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, much has been said recently concerning the Nation's employment situation. I am including in my remarks today a letter addressed by the Inter-Union Council, Oil Workers International Union, to the stockholders of the Tide Water Associated Oil Co., which touches upon two very important developments.

This protest points out that the company has carried on a drastic curtailment of jobs within its plants without the normal reason of curtailed production or operations, and also the effect that imports of foreign oil by this company is having on its employment of American labor.

Company policy can account for some of this curtailment. But the impact made upon jobs by foreign oil imports is very significant. Considered in the light of the whole oil industry, the impact made on jobs by such imports in one company becomes a matter of grave concern. Permitted to go on unrestricted, this trend can and will become a threat to the future stability of the domestic production of oil and could, in time of great emergency, make our national defense a great deal more precarious.

This is not an isolated company problem. It is something that should be considered along with many other danger signs in connection with the overall industry security as regards foreign oil imports.

The employees' letter follows:

GENTLEMEN: We, the undersigned representatives of your employees, wish to bring to your attention a situation seriously affecting the lives of people who have given many years of their lives to the building and developing of the Tide Water Associated Oil Co.

Until recent months the number of employees in our bargaining units exceeded 5,000; within recent months your management has effected a drastic curtailment so that now over 1,000 of your employees have been laid off, and additional employees have been retired without having their positions filled by new employees. For example, until recent months your Bayonne, N. J. refinery employed approximately 1,900 people, and now it employs about 1,225 people in our bargaining units. Of this number, 120 were retired, and the balance laid off. This is a reduction of 675 people in this one refinery alone. In our Mid-Continent area we represented approximately 270 people. We now represent 170, and this is a curtailment of 100 people. In your west coast division we represented approximately 2,830 people, and now we represent around 2,500. This is a curtailment of around 330 people.

Now if this situation was brought about by financial reverse of your company, we could understand it; or if it was brought about by a lessening of your production in the oil fields, we could understand it, but let us restate to you the actual case.

For the year 1953 your sales have increased approximately $56 million over 1952; your profits before taxes increased $4 million, and your net profits increased almost $5 million. Your surplus for the year increased $6 million, and the net worth of your company went up $22 million.

During this tremendously profitable year of 1953 you reduced the number of your employees by 809, which was a 7.1-percent decrease in employment, but your net profit on your investment went up 1.4 percent; your net profit on sales went up 0.5 percent, but most important, your net profit per man-hour of production increased from $1.32 in 1952, to $1.69 in 1953—an increase of 37 cents per man-hour.

Now during this same year when your profit per man-hour had gone up 37 cents, and when you had decreased the number of your employees by 809, your runs to the stills, or daily through-put, had increased by 20 percent.

Also during this period of curtailment of manpower in your operations in the United States, your employees discovered through articles in the newspapers, that your company has budgeted tremendous amounts of money to bring back on stream the plants and facilities of the Mitsubishi Oil Co., Ltd., a Japanese corporation, of which the Tide Water Associated Oil Co. owns 50 percent of the stock. This is the corporation that fed the Japanese navies and armies with petroleum products during the Second World War. Your employees wonder if products of this corporation are to be used to compete with products developed and produced in the United States. The notoriously low wages of foreign oil companies seriously disturb employees in the United States, especially when we see expansion in foreign operations and curtailments going on at home.

The thing which disturbs us is the importation of foreign crude oil into this country while at the same time employees of the American companies are being laid off. Last year we imported 236.6 million barrels of crude oil into this country, a gain of 27 million, or approximately 13 percent over 1952—and this in a period when American companies were curtailing their employees in the United States.

We also understand that the Tide Water Associated Oil Co. has a 5-year agreement to purchase crude oil produced by Pacific Western in the neutral zone of Saudi Arabia Kuwait, and from May to December of 1953 imported an average of 13,000 barrels a day into your Avon refinery in California.

Now the position of the trade union movement has never been that it has the right to tell management how to operate its business, but we do feel we have a right and a moral obligation to call to the attention of the company, and especially the stockholders thereof, these matters which directly affect the lives of their employees and their tenure of employment with a company. Your employees have given many years of their lives in helping you to build the Tide Water Associated Oil Co. into a very large and successful corporation. Their years of faithful service has been made possible by having the Tidewater Associated Oil Co. operate as a successful corporation, but your company, as well as our unions, recognize that no corporation can be successful without having well-satisfied and cooperative workers, because your workers in the past have been cooperative and have worked harmoniously with your management in bringing about an efficient-running organization. The proof is that you have realized an ever-improving position in your profits.

We ask that you as a company, desist from this drastic curtailment program; that you accept your responsibility as a mighty corporation, and help to bring about full and stable employment, not only within the United States, but especially within each of the communities where your main plants and facilities are located. Certainly you recognize that a responsibility is yours in doing your corporation's share in maintaining a stabilized economy in this country.

We ask that you not only stop this curtailment program, but that you also restaff your plants so that no employee is required to work under conditions which might not be considered completely safe. By the curtailment of your maintenance crews, it is the feeling of the balance of your employees, that you have brought about conditions wherein adequate maintenance is not being performed, and that equipment is therefore not safe to operate.

The undersigned representatives of the employees in your operations throughout the United States and acting by their direction, recommend to you your serious consideration of correcting the inequities which the actions of your management has brought about.

The members of our organizations are disturbed by the complete lack of security which all of them feel as a result of such curtailment. This drastic curtailment seriously endangers the safety and well-being of the employees. Continued action of this nature will destroy any spirit of cooperation which exists between the employees and your company.

The urgency and seriousness of the situation demands immediate and appropriate relief for the people affected. By complying with the requests urged herein, the company can exact for itself a more harmonious relationship in its vital labor relations.

Respectfully submitted.

Joseph Ellingson, United Petroleum Workers, New York, New Jersey; Charles Gaffney, Avon Refinery, Oil Workers International Union, CIO; Lloyd Zimmerman, Westside Pipeline, Oil Workers International Union, CIO; Charles Florence, Oklahoma and Kansas Division, Oil Workers International Union, CIO; Adam Sadowski, Bayonne Refinery, Employees Association of Bayonne, Inc.; Henry Prairie, Ventura Production Department, Oil Workers International Union, CIO; Charles F. Armin, Coordinator, Tide Water Inter-Union Council; Louis Guido, United Petroleum Workers, New York, New Jersey; James McKune, Bayonne Refinery, Employees Association of Bayonne, Inc.; Armand Monlux, Avon Refinery, Oil Workers International Union, CIO; Richard Jones, Avon Refinery, Oil Workers International Union, CIO; Jack Griebel, Los Angeles Basin, Oil Workers International Union, CIO; James A. Morgan, International Representative, Oil Workers International Union, CIO.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the Record.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

Code of Laws of the United States

Title 44, Section 181. Congressional Record; arrangement, style, contents, and indexes.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the Congressional Record, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the Congressional Record semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

Title 44, Section 182b. Same; illustrations, maps, diagrams.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the Record without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the Congressional Record the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily Record as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided,* That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the Record with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the official reporters of the Congressional Record, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the Record shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the Record issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the Record for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the Record of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the Record shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the Record style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the Record.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the Congressional Record any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix, but this rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the Congressional Record.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the Congressional Record Appendix the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed.

10. *Official reporters.*—The official reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the Congressional Record by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this restriction shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. The Public Printer or the official reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the Congressional Record which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Illustrations.*—Pursuant to section 182b, title 44, United States Code (as shown above), requests for authority to insert an illustration in the Record should be submitted to the Joint Committee on Printing through the chairman of the Committee on Printing of the respective House in which the speech desired to be illustrated may be delivered. Illustrations shall not exceed in size a page of the Record and shall be linecuts only. Copy for illustrations must be furnished to the Public Printer not later than 12:30 o'clock p. m. of the day preceding publication.

13. *Corrections.*—The permanent Record is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

Reco

IN TH

Mr.
urday
the p
Distri
orable
of the
Spe
tary a
Mille
trict,
Shore
Mille
way h
servic
his co
In h
person
Eisenh
sonally
every
Duri
the R
record
stand
Mr.
sent th
Appen
Ther
was or
as foll
Address
Massa
Repre
the R
for C
Md.,
It is a
and me
one of t
I alway
within
of Mary
I am
this sp
historic
tion of
It is g
is repres
T. Mill
a man o
out for
has been
over the
ber of th
importa
your vot
apprecia
ington,
office by
I woul
is alway
for his
to affirm
responsi

Appendix

Record of the Eisenhower Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. GLENN BEALL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 11, 1954

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, last Saturday evening the State of Maryland and the people of the First Congressional District were honored to have the Honorable Joseph W. Martin, Jr., Speaker of the House, deliver an address.

Speaker Martin paid very complimentary and deserving tribute to Edward T. Miller, who represents the First District, and the people of the Eastern Shore are extremely proud of Ted Miller, and are fully aware of the able way he has represented them and of the service he has been to the Congress and his country.

In his address Speaker Martin gave a personal report on the progress of the Eisenhower administration, and I personally believe that it is a record of which every Republican can be proud.

During the congressional campaign the Republican Party will run on its record, and I think that record will stand the scrutiny of the electorate.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Address by Hon. Joseph W. Martin, Jr., of Massachusetts, Speaker of the House of Representatives, at a Dinner Meeting of the Republican State Central Committee for Cecil County, at the Armory, Elkton, Md., May 8, 1954

It is a great pleasure for me to be in Elkton and meet with the fine folks of Cecil County, one of the Nation's oldest political divisions. I always have a very good time when I am within the borders of the great Free State of Maryland.

I am especially pleased to be present at this splendid Republican gathering in an historic community in a really historic section of our country.

It is gratifying to come to a section which is represented in Congress so ably by Edward T. Miller. You people are fortunte to have a man of the caliber of Ted Miller watching out for your interests in Washington. He has been a great aid to me in working to put over the Republican program. He is a member of the Appropriations Committee, a most important congressional assignment. With your votes, you will be able to express your appreciation of his years of service in Washington, and I know you will coninue him in office by a big majority.

I would like to emphasize that Ted Miller is always zealous in advancing what is good for his district. In this connection, I want to affirm that he led the fight and is chiefly responsible for the White House approving an appropriation of $96 million for the improvement of the Chesapeake & Delaware Canal.

You people of Maryland are deeply interested in what is being done for our country and for our people by the Republican Congress and the Eisenhower administration. I propose tonight to make a personal report on just what accomplishments have been made by your new team in Washington.

Sixteen short but eventful months ago, the Eisenhower administration and the 83d Republican Congress took office in Washington. You heard much talk about the "mess" in Washington during the last campaign. But at that time we were unable to comprehend the extent of the "mess." The Republicans inherited a Government riddled with scandals and the stains of corruption blemishing the halls and corridors of Government agencies.

The Republicans inherited waste and inefficiency simply beyond belief. The Republicans inherited fumbling and bungling doctrines of socialistic planners that were shaking the financial foundations of our Government. In short, there was a gigantic house-cleaning job to be done right off the bat.

Well, I want to emphasize right now that there has been a clean-up in Washington. When President Eisenhower made his appointments, he put a premium on honesty and integrity. The happy hunting days of the "fixer" and the "percentage" boys are done. Anyone transacting business in Washington today knows that a new atmosphere prevails. Once again all of us, Republicans or Democrats, can rightfully take pride in the high standards existing in your new Federal Government.

That is an accomplishment that I know you will want to emphasize in the campaign days ahead.

To achieve progress, there must be a well-defined goal. The Republicans have that goal and a program for its achievement.

President Eisenhower, in outlining his program, said that its prime objective is "the building of a stronger America." "A stronger America," the President said, is "a nation whose every citizen has reason for bold hope; where effort is rewarded and prosperity is shared; where freedom expands and peace is secure."

The President detailed his program in a series of messages to Congress. I want to say right now that never before in my years of service in Washington have we had a President who has done so much to cooperate and work in harmony with the Congress. The President does not believe in the assumption of dictatorial powers by the Chief Executive. He is a champion of the principle of coequality among the three branches of the government, the legislative, the executive and the judicial.

The President's recommendations were received with a real spirit of harmony and cooperation by the Republican Congress. Thus a "new team" came into being in Washington—a Congress and a President working hand in hand toward the betterment of America.

I am going to tell you good Republicans just what actually and positively has been accomplished by the "new team" in Washington. I know that you are interested and will want to pass these facts on to your fellow workers and to your neighbors.

A key pledge of President Eisenhower and the Republican Congress was to eliminate the wasteful spending and cut out the fat. Harry Truman had prepared and submitted a budget to the new administration and the new Congress which he said could not be cut a thin dime. The "new team" went to work together on the Truman budget and reduced it by $14 billion. Just think of it—$14 billion of waste and unnecessary expenditure cut out of a single budget. Your Republican Government did this without sacrificing a single essential Government service. In plain fact, we are giving the people far better service and they are getting more for their tax dollar.

The cut of $14 billion from the Truman budget made it possible for a reduction of 10 percent in Federal income taxes beginning January 1, 1954. This was the first break in the long, long trend of ever-increasing taxes.

But your "new team" in Washington was not satisfied with just this 10 percent reduction.

We went to work to fulfill the campaign pledges of lower taxes and tax revision. Consequently, I can tell you tonight that we have provided a tax saving to every American earner, every American family.

The bulk of the savings has gone to the individual, not to business enterprise, as you would be led to believe by the wailing exponents of tax, tax, spend, and tax.

Facts speak for themselves. As of today, Republican administration policies and Republican congressional action have resulted in a total of $7,400,000,000 in tax savings. More than two-thirds of this tremendous amount of savings goes directly into the pockets of the wage-earner and family and other individuals. This is based on the tax reductions which have already gone into effect, plus those proposed in the House-passed tax revision bill.

In addition, that portion which directly benefits business provides the means for additional plant expansion, the investment that creates new jobs, and a more free and independent economy. Our prosperity depends upon jobs for every American who wants to work. A tax policy which provides more jobs is in the best interests of everyone in America.

The reduction of individual income taxes on January 1 saved the taxpayers $3 billion. Next, the excess-profits-tax burden on business was eliminated, which saved $2 billion.

Then on April 1, the Republican Congress reduced excise taxes as much as 50 percent in a great many items of daily need. This provided an additional $1 billion for our taxpayers to spend for the things they need and want. The Republicans cut the excise tax on a great many items of everyday use. The tax on local telephone service was cut from 15 to 10 percent, the tax on long distance calls was cut from 25 to 10 percent. The transportation tax was cut from 15 to 10 percent. The tax on powder, lipstick, and other toilet goods was cut from 20 to 10 percent. The tax on handbags and wallets was also cut from 20 to 10 percent, as was the tax on electric light bulbs.

Next, the Republican House Ways and Means Committee completed the most comprehensive overhauling of our tax laws that has been done in the past 50 years. On the floor of the House, the Republican Party supported this tax-saving measure wholeheartedly. But for that support, it would not have passed. The House bill will provide another $1,400 million in tax savings during its first full year of operation.

This Republican tax savings bill benefits every segment of our population from the young to the old. The bill increases to $1,200 the income tax exemption for retired school teachers, firemen, policemen, and others living on set incomes as a result of their long and faithful service.

The bill also provides for a $600 exemption for each child regardless of that child's income, a provision that enables a tax-paying parent to encourage his children to work during summer vacations without losing them as income tax deductions.

The bill increases the amount everyone can deduct from tax payments for medical expenses and also allows a working parent to deduct $600 for expenses incurred in caring for children under 10 years of age.

These are more Republican achievements you can talk about.

The $7,400 million tax saving brought about by cooperation between the Eisenhower administration and the Republican Congress is the biggest in the history of our Nation.

We all know what inflation has done to the dollar and to the everyday life of the American people. Your Republican administration pledged itself to do everything possible to bring a halt to inflation. This has been done. For the first time since 1940, the steady decline in the value of the dollar has been stopped.

During 1954, the purchasing power of the dollar has actually gone up. A halt has been brought to the spiral of constantly climbing prices. This is evident almost every time you now go to the store to make a purchase.

Just how did the Republicans stop inflation? One of the first acts of your new Republican team back in February and March of 1953 was to throw price and wage controls out the window. This ended a 12-year period of regimentation which had handcuffed and stifled our economy.

Through the removal of these artificial restraints, production was stimulated, and the increased supply of goods and services which resulted had a great deal to do with pushing prices downward. It was simply the old story of supply and demand doing an effective job in a free market.

Our economy drive also had much to do in bringing a halt to inflation. In the past administration a great part of the pressure which kept sending living costs upward came from the Federal Government's wasteful spending and the policy of constant borrowing. This means of operation simply pumped more and more paper money and credit into the bloodstream of the Nation's economy, consequently forcing prices ever upward.

The real victim of inflation was the person of limited means, wage earners, farmers, retired persons, and the like. Naturally, these are the people who have the least amount of leeway in their budgets to take care of constantly rising prices.

By halting ruinous inflation, President Eisenhower and the Republican Congress have rendered a great service to all of the people, but most particularly to those in the lower-income brackets and those of limited means.

Let's take a look now at the economic picture. It is a fact that 1953 was the most prosperous year in United States history. That is a matter of unassailable record.

The next fact is that this year of 1954 seems likely to be the second best year in history. Of course, we'd like to have this year set another record, but we also think having the second best year is a pretty fine accomplishment.

And there is this difference: We are no longer at war. We are making the transition from 14 years of war, preparation for war, and the aftermath of war to what we hope will be permanent peace.

The transition will not be easy. It entails the best that is in all of us, and it entails sacrifice by some. But war also entails sacrifice—very great sacrifice—for millions of human beings. We can all be thankful now that this kind of sacrifice is not being demanded today.

Let us also keep a sense of perspective. There are pluses as well as minuses in the present situation. And, despite the efforts of some of our opponents to talk the country into recession, the pluses still far outnumber the minuses.

Unemployment declined by 260,000 during the month of April, reversing a trend which began last October. Employment increased by nearly half a million during the month, as measured during the week ending April 10. The agencies which watch these developments reported "there was evidence that unemployment continued to decline as the month progressed." There are today approximately 60½ million people gainfully employed in our country. This effectively answers the partisan politicians who are chanting the country is headed for the bowwows.

While it is still too early to be absolutely certain that the economic adjustment has run its course, we do know that the steps already taken by the Congress and the Eisenhower administration are paying off in strong signs of improvement. These steps include the tax cuts and a number of other monetary actions.

The Federal Reserve Board has made possible easier borrowing by business and consumers by making sure that banks have a plentiful supply of credit for those who wish to borrow. The Treasury is managing the national debt at the lowest interest rates in many years, and this helps keep interest rates down for borrowers. The Treasury is doing its financing so as not to compete with other borrowers.

One very noticeable effect of these positive steps is the record construction boom, which is generating high activity throughout the economy and creating many thousands of jobs.

I believe that we should look at all the facts in our economic picture, put them in their true perspective, and then apply the weight of logic and reason. If this is done, I am confident the Nation will be able to size up its current problems as they truly exist, and we will be able to bring them to solution.

I told you about the ending of the scandals and the restoration of confidence and faith in your Federal Government. In this connection, there has been a rebuilding of Government ethics of another nature. President Eisenhower in his campaign promised a cleanout of disloyal persons from the Federal payroll. He was not long in office when at his direction the Government adopted a strict new security program that was designed to clean out the Reds, the leftwingers, fellow travelers, and other security risks.

President Eisenhower's program was based on the principle that working for the Government is not a right, but is a high privilege, and that anybody whose background or record did not meet the new security tests did not belong in the Government.

The latest report on the operations of this new security program revealed that 2,429 Government employees have been separated from their jobs.

Your new Republican team is completing a job of reorganizing the Federal Government which was started by the Republican 80th Congress back in 1947. One of the first acts of the 83d Congress was to amend the Reorganization Act, extending the authority of the President to streamline Government agencies up to April 1, 1955. A bit later, another bill was enacted which recreated the Hoover Commission originally established by the 80th Congress, giving the new group broader powers and jurisdiction to bring about efficiency in Government.

Under the new laws Congress has passed 10 plans for reorganizing and streamlining the Federal Government. Task forces of the new Hoover Commission are hard at work on new reorganization proposals, the enactment of which will mean a saving in tax dollars to the American people.

Another commission is making a study to untangle relations among Federal, State, and local governments in order to come up with ways to save money and at the same time give better service.

The Republican Congress acted quickly and vigorously in matters affecting the health of the Nation. As one of its first acts in 1953, Congress created a new executive Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, with Cabinet rank. Three other important health measures have been enacted by the House. One provides Federal aid to State and local governments for construction of hospitals and health centers. The second, enacted in March 1954, extends and expands for 3 years the survey and construction of hospital facilities throughout the country. The third, enacted just last week, gives the States more authority and leeway in the use of Federal grants-in-aid for public health services, including the fight on cancer, tuberculosis, heart disease, and mental health. This bill will simplify an outmoded patchwork of Federal grants and will streamline Federal aid to improve health in States and communities where it is most needed.

House committee hearings have laid the groundwork for improving and expanding social security.

The finest highway improvement bill in a decade has been enacted into law.

Agricultural committees in both Houses are working on an improved-farm program in the best interests of all the people—farmers and city folk alike.

You realize, of course, that the daily grind of the efficient mill in Washington doesn't produce every 24 hours results which are screamed by headlines. But they are results, and they all are a pattern of the program for progress and achievement.

We have made notable achievements in two other fields—national defense and foreign policy. These new policies in the most important sphere of national defense and vital foreign policy operations have been called the New Look. I want to say that's the kind of New Look that best fits our interests.

President Eisenhower appointed an entire new set of military leaders, including the Joints Chiefs of Staff. They have given intensive study to our military position and have come up with a revised, up-to-the-minute strategy.

This strategy is based on two realities. The first of these is that the Kremlin's master plan is to dominate the world, including the United States. The second reality is on the favorable side: It is that nuclear weapons and airpower give us astonishing powers to deter aggression. Our main defense today is the Kremlin's knowledge that if it should be foolish enough to launch war upon us, we will retaliate in massive proportions. At the same time, we are building our own continental defenses to make doubly certain of your safety.

With our strategy based on the twin facts of atomic weapons and far-ranging airpower, we have been able to bring defense costs down to a level which can be supported for whatever period is necessary. This means, in simple language, that we will be able to protect ourselves from Communist aggression as long as that menace lasts; and we will not be risking bankruptcy and prostration in the process.

Under this strategy, we are building the Air Force to a record strength, and we are also strengthening the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps all down the line with more modern weapons and more advanced techniques.

We are building for the long pull—for long-term safety. We will keep America strong, safe and secure as long as the slightest danger exists.

Secretary Dulles is valiantly struggling to rescue the United States and the world from the disastrous policy of appeasement, a policy which permitted the Soviets to gain domination of Asian countries one by one.

We are struggling to arouse Asians to the necessity of banding together to resist the steady march of communism. With Pakistan, Thailand, Burma, Cambodia, Laos, South Korea, the Philippines, Japan, and Formosa united in a common cause and openly supported by the United States, Great Britain, France, Australia, and New Zealand, this fight can be won and probably without firing a single shot.

Such a combination would not require American foot soldiers. There are sufficient Asiastics to provide the manpower if properly equipped and trained. And an Asiatic army fighting for Asiatic freedom would eliminate the tag of American imperialism.

This organization can and would win freedom for every country. People fighting for freedom cannot be defeated. It's a fine ideal for which Secretary Dulles struggles, and he is entitled to the support of all people who wish to stop Communist aggression and keep ablaze the light of freedom in Asia.

I have reported to you briefly just what your new Government has been able to do for all of the people of our great country in the period of 16 months.

I sincerely believe that they are accomplishments of which all of us can be proud.

But there is still much to be done. We must have a Republican Congress in 1955 and 1956 which will support our great Republican President and complete the job he has set out to do.

The American people have today in Washington an administration and a Congress solemnly dedicated to fulfill all of their pledges and promises.

The Republican administration and the Republican Congress are committed to economy in government, to the lessening of burdonsome taxes, to crack down on the Communists, to oust those who are disloyal, to the building of a mighty military defense to keep our Nation strong, to the continuation of new foreign policy which restores us to our rightful place in the world, and to a peace based on prosperity for all.

One final word to you who believe in President Eisenhower and his purpose to build a prosperous America and a peaceful world. The Eisenhower program will not be given a fair chance for success unless there is a Republican majority in both the House and the Senate. Democratic control of either branch would unquestionably scuttled and baffle the carrying out of his worthy objectives.

The only effective way to support President Eisenhower is to give him a Republican Congress.

Is Post Office a Public Service or Public Utility?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 28, 1954

Mr. HAGEN of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, on March 18, 1954, I issued a separate minority report protesting the enactment of H. R. 6052, a postal rate increase bill, at this time, and in view of more recent developments, I take this occasion to emphasize my opposition to such enactment in this term of Congress.

I feel that we should refresh our memories somewhat in this deliberation and in this connection, I wish to point out that on September 7, 1951, during the debate on the floor of the Senate concerning the last postal rate increase measure there was a great deal of uncertainty as to the validity of the figures presented by the Post Office Department. I quote the Honorable Senator FRANK CARLSON, from page 11254 of that RECORD, as follows:

> There is a great deal of doubt in the minds of many of us as to the methods used. We should like very much to spend a great deal of time in studying the cost ascertainment methods, to see whether the Post Office Department is using a system which is fair to the various types of mail and in the distribution of the mail.

Although the postal rate increase bill was passed in 1951, the outgrowth of these deliberations, having to do with uncertainty as to the Post Office Department presentation, was the introduction and passage of Senate Resolution 49 calling for a thorough study of the Post Office Department and its methods. This measure was passed by the Senate in the first session of the 83d Congress. The work under this resolution has been completed, and I am pleased to report that the Senate has authorized the issuance of the report of the Advisory Council to the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee, which was established by Senate Resolution 49. As a member of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, I have had an opportunity to review, as anyone has, this report and believe it to be a very thorough and complete report on the Post Office Department.

If there was reluctance to pass the last postal rate increase bill because of the uncertainty of the facts presented by the Post Office Department, it seems to me unwise to pass another rate increase at this time. The Carlson committee report provides a basis for a long-range solution to the many problems dealing with postal rates, and I feel that full study and attention should be given this document before further consideration is given to H. R. 6052, the pending postal rate increase bill.

On March 31 the Postmaster General issued a companion report entitled, "Financial Policy for the Post Office Department." It is interesting to note that both the Advisory Council and the Post Office Department ask the Congress to establish a definite postal policy as a basis for resolving the many problems pertaining to the postal rate controversy. In this connection I call the attention of the Congress to a statement from the Postmaster General's report, contained on page 108 of that document:

> (D) A permanent expression of postal policy is overdue: Clearly, a reconsideration of the basic charter of the Post Office is overdue. Congressional action is necessary to define its service objectives, to establish a rate-making philosophy, to give more freedom to management, and generally to provide all reasonable means of achieving an efficient and lwo-cost postal system. Continuing uncertainty, contention, political expediency, and partial measures (or no measures at all) add up to legislative ineffectiveness. The present Congress can make history if it finds and adopts a permanent and sensible course of action for the future.

It may take some time for the Members of Congress to acquaint themselves with both the Advisory Council and the Post Office Department's reports. These should be fully and carefully studied before any further action is taken on postal rates because now we have a basis for a permanent solution to this perennial controversy. I, for one, am satisfied that the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee's report is an outstanding job. I feel that Senator CARLSON and his committee should be heartened by the extent to which there are protests to the findings of the Advisory Council.

The Postmaster General's proposed policy statement asked that the Congress consider the Post Office a "public utility" but this seems to straddle the issue of whether the Post Office Department is a business or a service. The Advisory Council to the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee calls for a policy in which the Post Office Department will be termed a "service."

The report of the Post Office Department sets forth certain statements to the effect that the incremental cost principle is invalid for postal purposes. The Postmaster General's report, on page 133, states:

> Nowhere in the early history of the Post Office is there any implication by the Congress that any class of mail should be entitled to be a burden on any other class of mail, or that other classes of mail should be considered as merely incidental items to first-class in the function of the postal service.

However, elsewhere in the Post Office Department's report this objection seems to be fully dissipated. In discussing the fixing of rates by formula pricing, on page 115, the Post Office report makes the following statement:

> 6. First-class mail and airmail, being premium services, should, between them, absorb as an addition to allocated cost an amount equal to the sum of: (1) the loss on foreign mails and special services (except such portion as is computed to relate to other classes of mails); (2) the discount from cost on second-class mail; and (3) the discount from cost on third-class mail.

Elsewhere in his report, on page 159, the Postmaster General, in referring to an item of $53 million for loss on registry, insurance, collect-on-delivery, and other special services, makes the following statement:

> The Post Office feels that the rates being charged may be at the maximum that the traffic can bear, although further studies are being made. It also believes that, since these are auxiliary services, any losses on them should be supported by revenues from other classes of mail with the greatest percentage of responsibility going to first-class.

In light of the foregoing, I suggest that the Post Office Department is in error, and I further maintain that they are also in error in insisting that the present rate bill should be passed immediately.

This seems to be contrary to the intent of Congress as set forth back in 1951 and as realized in the work of the Advisory Council to the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee. The Postmaster General presented a bill to Congress before the Senate study was completed. One can only conclude that it was based on patchwork and guesswork. We should not hastily pass a bill before the real facts are known. Let us not subject the American people and important segments of our business structure to increased expenses in this critical time in our economy until we have the facts. Let us defer action on H. R. 6052, the postal-rate-increase bill.

Fiftieth Year Jubilee of the Juvenile Division of the Pennsylvania Slovak Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. BONIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1954

Mr. BONIN. Mr. Speaker, on May 2 I had the privilege of attending the 50th year jubilee of the juvenile division of the Pennsylvania Slovak Union held in the Hotel Sterling in Wilkes-Barre, Pa. The supreme officers and directors of this union are listed as are the program of the jubilee and a brief history of the juvenile division:

SUPREME OFFICERS AND DIRECTORS OF THE PENNSYLVANIA SLOVAK UNION

Rt. Rev. Msgr. George A. Bendik, R. C. spiritual adviser; Rev. John Koval, G. C. spiritual adviser; Hon. John Kmetz, honorary president; Stephen J. Tkach, president; John Slivovsky, first vice president; Martin Desht, second vice president; Martin Podskoch, Sr., secretary; Joseph Simkovich, treasurer.

Michael Bonchonsky, president of trustees; Stephen J. Kavulich, secretary of trustees; John Istvan, Thomas Onzik, Mat Rusnak, Andrew Dzurek, trustees.

Joseph J. Puhy, editor of official organ, Bratstvo; Paul R. Selecky, Esq., legal adviser; Dr. John J. Bendik, medical adviser.

PROGRAM

America—Hej Slováci.................Assembly
Invocation...Rt. Rev. Msgr. George A. Bendick
Spiritual adviser
Introduction of toastmaster.................
Hon. John Paulus, general chairman
Toastmaster..............Martin Podskoch, Jr.
President, Rev. Matthew Jankola district
Welcome.....................Stephen J. Tkach
Supreme president, Pennsylvania Slovak Union
Greetings.......................Francis Parrish
Junior Branch No. 3, Hazelton, Pa.
Greetings.......................Bernice Zavada
Junior Branch No. 105, Exeter Boro, Pa.
Slovak address..Rt. Rev. Msgr. John S. Sobota
Honorary spiritual adviser
Vocal selections..............Michael Malenda
Remarks......Congressman EDWARD J. BONIN
Remarks..............Rev. Leo J. Flood, C.S.C.
President, King's College, Wilkes-Barre, Pa.
Remarks.......................Hon. John Mikula
Introduction of Under Secretary of the Army.....................Hon. John T. Kmetz
Address........................Hon. John Slezak
Under Secretary of the Army, Washington, D. C.
Address........................Hon. John S. Fine
Governor of Pennsylvania
Benediction....................Rev. John Koval
Greek rite spiritual adviser
Song leader......................John Skorvira
Accompanist...................Miss Vera Mirmak
Accompanist to Mr. Malenda..............
Prof. Charles Button

FIFTY YEARS: 1904–54

The birth of the juvenile division of the Pennsylvania Slovak Roman and Greek Catholic Union occurred at the annual meeting held on June 23, 1904 in Nanticoke, Pa. The following supreme officers were present: Rev. John Halyko, spiritual adviser; Andrew Lupco, president; Andrew Bushik, vice president; Edmund Lembik, financial secretary; John Kraynak, recording secretary; Stephen Lukac, treasurer; Edmund Uffalussy, manager of the printery; John Jurc, Stephen Pisony, and Stephen Wagner, trustees, where by a unanimous vote of all officers present, a plan was submitted and adopted to establish a juvenile division of the Pennsylvania Slovak Roman and Greek Catholic Union, and that Catholic children from age 6 to 16 be eligible for membership.

This action of the supreme officers was subsequently ratified at the 11th convention of the parent organization held in Hazelton, Pa., on June 19–24, 1905, at which time the new juvenile division already consisted of 28 branches with a membership of 1,128.

"Indispensable" Echo Park Dam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. DAWSON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1954

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, the Christian Science Monitor, one of the Nation's most reputable newspapers, is doing a magnificent job in presenting the issues surrounding the construction of Echo Park Dam in Dinosaur National Monument. This controversial dam is a key unit in the development of the water resources of Colorado, Utah, New Mexico, and Wyoming. This development—the upper Colorado River storage project—has received the active support of President Dwight D. Eisenhower and Secretary of Interior Douglas McKay.

The position of the advocates of Echo Park Dam is clearly stated by Roscoe Fleming in an article in the Monday, May 10, 1954, issue of the Christian Science Monitor. The article follows:

"INDISPENSABLE" ECHO PARK DAM

(By Roscoe Fleming)

DENVER.—The position of advocates of the proposed Echo Park Dam is simply this: It is an indispensable key structure in developing irrigation, power, and industry throughout the whole upper Colorado River Basin, a development long promised to the people of this vast area.

Further, it will hardly touch the beauties of Dinosaur National Monument, and will render those beauties much more accessible to the people of the country, who own them.

Why does the whole billion-dollar upper Colorado storage project—now before Congress and controversial largely because of the controversy over Echo Park—mean so much? Because 40 years ago half the flow of the river, every drop precious in an arid region, was promised to the lower-basin States. The other half was promised to those of the upper basin where the water originates. California, as one of the lower-basin States, has received its share to overflowing; the upper-basin States—Colorado, Wyoming, New Mexico, and Utah—must have the storage project if they are ever to get their share.

IMPORTANCE OF ECHO SITE

Their getting their share depends to a large extent on whether they can ever have any more population, industry, and prosperity than they have now—whether, in short, they are to be participants in the further development of America or sit on the sidelines.

Why does Echo Park mean so much? Because all irrigation-power projects must meet criteria of need and feasibility, plus the thrifty standards of the Eisenhower administration.

With Echo Park Dam in place, the whole upper-basin storage project indisputably would meet these standards. Without it, the whole project might well fall.

It is perhaps significant that no qualified engineer has ever approved any suggested alternative site to Echo Park, its proponents say. The crucial criterion is that of evaporation.

Water is precious in the West, and a lot is wasted through return to the air by evaporation before it can do the work for which it was stored.

For example, some 800,000 to a million acre-feet yearly evaporate from the surface of Lake Mead, or enough for the domestic needs of a city the size of New York.

Undersecretary Tudor, a capable engineer hoping to find a solution that would satisfy everyone, recently spent a month studying and traveling practically every inch of the Echo Park area and all suggested alternative sites.

He came to the reluctant conclusion that the waste involved in any other site was too great to consider. The inevitable power loss of about 200,000 kilowatts at any other site is relatively dispensable, he said, but the water loss through evaporation is not.

EVAPORATION SAVING ESTIMATED

Echo Park, due to its narrow canyons with high steep sides, would conserve from 100,000 to 200,000 acre-feet of water yearly against evaporation, which would be lost at any other site. The smaller amount represents the domestic water supply of a city the size of Denver, the larger one would supply a city the size of St. Louis. Mr. Tudor argued that this is too much to lose.

Echo Park would store about 6.5 million acre-feet of water, and this storage is vital if the upper-basin States are to hold back enough water to supply lower-basin needs in dry years, and still be able to carry on their own development.

On the recreational side, its proponents point to Lake Meade behind Hoover Dam, and Roosevelt Lake behind the Grand Coulee, and ask, how did these lakes alter the dry canyons they filled, save for the better? These are now two of the great recreational areas of the Nation, where there was nothing but dry wilderness before.

They also ask how the foes of Echo Park propose to develop Dinosaur National Monument, which has only a thousand visitors a year, when the whole national park system is so starved for money that conservationist Bernard DeVoto recently suggested that some of the parks be closed down to save the rest.

But the case for the Echo Park Dam rests on the thesis that it is indispensable in regional development, would do no harm to the recreational possibilities of the area, and in fact, would enhance them.

Provide Social-Security Benefits for the Totally and Permanently Disabled

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 4, 1954

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that this Congress can and should improve our social-security system by increasing its benefits and its coverage, and that other suggested improvements should be made. But, to my mind, one of the very striking deficiencies in the administration bill covering these points is the fact that it fails to provide benefits for totally disabled workers. In so doing, it completely ignores one of the major deficiencies of our social-security system.

First of all, let us be sure that we understand very clearly the kind of family situation which calls for this type of protection. Consider the case of a 35-year-old worker who, as a result of an automobile accident, has been completely disabled. If he had been killed, present law would give benefits to his wife and children until the children reach the age of 18. But because he managed to survive, through the miracles of modern science, his family is entitled to no benefits at all until he reaches the age of 65. Do we honestly intend to allow this kind of discrimination in a system which purports to give the American people a form of social security?

Or take the case of a 55-year-old carpenter who is forced to lay down his tools following a heart attack. He, too, must wait until his 65th birthday—10 long years—before he is entitled to any social-security benefit, and, furthermore, the amount of his benefit at age 65 will be reduced for each year he is not working. Sometimes the right to that benefit is lost altogether because the disabled wage earner cannot work for a period long enough to qualify him for benefits.

The administration's proposal would improve the present law in this respect, at least, by its provision to freeze benefit status at the point of disability. But it fails to provide any disability benefit. How much, I wonder, will it comfort a family victimized by such a tragedy to know that they will receive a benefit 30 years, 20 years, or even 10 years from the time when they most need it? Total disability is a triple threat to family income. First of all—and unlike retirement—it is unpredictable and may strike at any age without warning. Secondly, the wages upon which the family was living and planning for the future stop almost immediately. And finally, at the time when those wages stop, a large medical bill is probably added to the family budget.

I have been concerned first with the human factors involved because it is my considered opinion that we sometimes lose sight of them in the discussions of social-security benefits for the totally disabled. We have been too prone to meet prejudice with prejudice and argument with argument in verbal jousts which are not without eloquence on both sides, but which lose sight of the basic purpose of any sound social-security system; namely, protection against wage loss caused by commonly shared hazards.

Let us bear in mind, then, that the instances of family tragedy which I have cited are not isolated cases in our country. Statistics tell us that over 2 percent of the civilian population between the ages of 14 and 65 are away from their jobs on a given day because they have been disabled for 7 months or more. Since only 1 such disablement in 20 is work-connected—and thus covered by workmen's compensation—the other 19 people cannot qualify for disability benefits under social security.

Recent studies show that almost 73 percent—or 1,486,000—of the persons with long-term disability had been in the employed labor force immediately before becoming disabled. Of this group 1,093,000 were men, and 393,000 were women. In the age group 55 to 65, almost 98 percent were working when disability struck. And may I suggest that this last figure points up one of the features which makes a benefit program covering total disability an appropriate extension of our old-age and survivors insurance system. For, in essence, it views total and permanent disability as a form of premature but enforced retirement. In this respect it faces up to a fact which all of us recognize—namely that an arbitrary retirement age, such as age 65, disregards the human factor that some of us are forced to retire before that time for physical reasons, while other more fortunate men and women can continue to work well beyond any given age. In effect, therefore, a system providing benefits for those persons forced by ill health to retire prematurely, will reach down to furnish retirement benefits on an individual basis to meet individual need.

But, someone will say, establishing such a program will open up the opportunity for thousands of false claims; it will encourage malingering; and it will destroy individual initiative. First of all, let me remind you that these very familiar charges have been brought against practically every forward-looking piece of social legislation which has been proposed. If we had really believed, in this country, that most of the people most of the time are both lazy and dishonest, we would never have founded our public schools, our farm programs, or our social-security system. It is always possible, of course, to cite a few individual cases which buttress this philosophy of suspicion. As for myself, I am thoroughly convinced that the great majority of Americans are honest, decent, hard-working people who are chiefly concerned with getting and holding a good job so that they can properly support their family. From a strictly hard-headed point of view, does it make sense that any American father would choose to retire from the labor force at existing wages for benefits which average today around $50 per month?

Again, someone else will say that total disability insurance is a good program on paper, but that it opens up the insoluble problem of determining what constitutes disability in a public program. I have heard this argument advanced repeatedly, and I have heard it answered to my own satisfaction. For it simply does not make sense to me that it is possible to determine the extent of disability for our veteran's programs, for our railroad retirement system, for workment's compensation, for the civil-service retirement system, and for our vocational rehabilitation programs, but not for persons covered by social security.

On this point may I remind you of one further fact. The development of our State vocational rehabilitation programs in the past decade is, to my mind, one of the best arguments for providing benefits for the totally and permanently disabled. First of all, the magnificient advances in methods of rehabilitation which were developed during and after World War II, have made it possible for many people, who would heretofore have been considered hopelessly disabled, to return to now hope and new jobs. In terms of a program for total disability benefits, this means that younger workers, in particular, need not remain permanently on the benefit rolls. They will be entitled to such benefits during the retraining program provided by the rehabilitation services, but can gradually be returned to self-sufficiency.

Secondly, rehabilitation tests serve as a double check on the extent of disability. For if, after all the resources of our agencies of rehabilitation have been used, the decision is that the individual cannot by any means become able to work, then, certainly, we can be reasonably sure that he is entitled to benefits as a totally and permanently disabled worker.

Let us bear in mind that the disabled people who would benefit from such a program are a fair cross section of our population who have become the victims of an unpredictable fate. The Office of Vocational Rehabilitation, in analyzing the situation of some 66,000 persons rehabilitated during the year ending June 30, 1951, found that, of the group, 56 percent were disabled by disease, 30 percent by accidents, and 14 percent by congenital conditions. The greatest single group—30 percent of the total—had lost the use of arms, legs, or back. In practically every instance, according to this report, the financial situation of the families "varied between precarious and disastrous." One in eight was on relief, and 1 in 12 was living on insurance payments, most of which were temporary. Can this Congress in conscience hold that these people are not entitled to disability benefits?

Some people would have us believe that the alternative of public relief through a means-test program is the appropriate way to provide for the family needs arising from the disability. I am convinced that it is not. Most people who have been self-respecting and independent wage earners all their lives wait until the last possible moment before submitting to such a means test, and, when they finally must ask for help, they do it as an admission of defeat and surrender. For such people, rehabilitation becomes a psychological task as well as a physical or vocational task. A disability-insurance program would save valuable time and preserve self-respect by meeting the difficult problem at its most critical moment—in the early stages following the occurrence of the disability.

Finally, the argument has been advanced that such a program would be difficult to administer, that it would create a new program and a new bureaucracy in our Government. Now here are the facts. According to most estimates, the number of professional persons who would be added to the old-age and survivors insurance staff to administer the plan would be from 60 to 75. All of these would be physicians, and their work would be primarily to determine medical policy and to consult on medical problems. All medical findings would be in the hands of physicians in private practice—as they are for other public programs. With regard to administrative features, the system would gear directly into the old-age and survivors insurance system. Employers would have no new tax forms to prepare and no new records to keep, since the existing central record system and the regional offices maintained for old-age and survivors insurance could service the new program.

I urge upon the Members of this Congress that our present concern for improving the social-security system must not overlook its improvement in this vital respect. I remind you that the House passed a bill providing such benefits in connection with the 1950 social-security amendments, only to have it deleted by the Senate and in conference. I remind you that the social-security plan adopted in 1935 established social-insurance systems covering wage loss caused by old age or unemployment. Our State workmen's compensation systems furnish protection against occupational disability. The one essential area we have done nothing about is the risk which every worker faces of being totally disabled. Not until we have provided the benefits of social insurance covering this exigency will we have achieved a truly protective system of social security in the United States.

Mother's Day, 1954

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1954

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to deliver the principal address at the 30th annual Mother's Day ceremonies of the American War Mothers Sunday, May 9, 1954, at the amphitheater, Arlington National Cemetery.

The address follows:

Madam Chairman, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, it is a great honor to be invited to participate in the 30th annual Mother's Day ceremonies sponsored by the American War Mothers.

I know of no other organization in existence today that more adequately reflects the true spirit of American motherhood than does the American War Mothers.

Your distinguished organization symbolizes the patriotic service rendered by the mothers of America in freely offering their own flesh and blood in defense of American ideals.

Today America salutes the American War Mothers as it pays homage to the mothers of this Nation.

It is proper that one day out of each year be set aside as a reminder of the love and reverence we owe our mothers, and which in truth we should express every day of our lives.

Mother's Day is a simple festival of gratitude within the family, an acknowledgment of a debt that can never be discharged.

The members of the family, wherever they may be, still within the home or out in the world for themselves, unite in appreciation of mother and the sacrifices that make home possible.

On this day a "thank you" is said which was forgotten on other days, and whatever may be the language of her children mother understands.

Some little gift, a letter, a card of greeting, a visit, a bouquet of flowers, these are the varied currencies of appreciation.

Their value surpasses the material.

For it is human value, without money and without price.

Mother's Day is a precious day.

But it is entirely possible that as we approach the thoughts of this day we may be too much given to sentiment to meet the actual facts with the clear judgment that they demand.

It is possible we may let sentiment take the place of duty.

Does the wearing of a flower and the use of pious-sounding platitudes fully express our devotion?

If we are among the number who are so highly favored as to have good mothers, and that number is very much in the majority, we can do no greater honor than to "follow in our mother's footsteps."

We are too inclined to give lip service only.

The real and lasting service extends far past the second Sunday in May.

It is not made up of words alone.

On Mother's Day what seems to be trivial has an importance beyond itself.

Life is lived amidst a sea of trouble, worries, misunderstandings, disappointments, and under this friction, day by day, the bond of love that should bind brothers and sisters sometimes wears thin.

The most satisfying of all pleasures to mother is absence of jealousy and ill-feeling among her children who are dear to her heart and who on Mother's Day can unite in paying her the tribute of love and devotion that she so richly deserves.

The children of a real mother are not just incidents in her life.

They are her life.

Her interest in them does not vary with her moods.

They create her moods.

The unfolding of their natural tendencies, day by day, is the textbook from which she studies.

Therein she finds the derivatives around which she builds—to form their character.

She keeps her heart young.

She is their friend and their confidante.

She is one of them, but a superior one, with the knowledge of her years and the spirit of her children.

These are the mothers we need.

The economies of home and nation are closely allied.

The Government of our country depends upon the men who guide it.

The character in these men has its beginning in the home.

The character of the home is made and enlarged or limited by the woman who is the mother of that home.

It can be truly said that the character of our Nation is founded on the American home.

A leading historian of our day says that no great nation has ever been completely destroyed by an outside attacking force.

The nations and the peoples that have been destroyed were the victims of self-destruction.

One of the major factors in this process of death from within has been the weakening and decay of family life.

Frankly the future of our Nation depends more upon what happens in our homes than we have heretofore realized.

The experience of our social agencies and schools all point to a basic fact.

Not only are good homes important to the life of the people and the very existence of a nation, but the most potent factors and influences in the growth and development of wholesome personality lie in the life of the family.

Schools, community agencies, the church, a good neighborhood, all help; but the basic institution in giving a sound and wholesome start in life is a good home.

Evelyn M. Duvall, of the National Conference on Family Relations, reminds us in one of her books of the stress and strain under which homes have been struggling in recent years.

She says: "Family life in the last several generations has changed more drastically and radically than ever before in the history of man."

Not all of the drastic changes have been wholly destructive.

The truth is that family life has been undergoing terrific shifts and changes.

This has complicated the task of achieving happy and wholesome family life.

It is encouraging, however, to know that mothers and fathers in our Nation are increasingly aware of the constant challenge and are striving to make home life happier more satisfying and more Christian.

We must take more time for family living, more time for having fun together, more time for sharing with others, more time for opening our minds to new ideas, and more time to constantly recall our Christian heritage.

Then, too, we must always take time for Mother's Day.

Mother is still the one who takes the lead in seeing that the home's operation is smooth.

There are many tributes that are tendered mothers for their loyalty, their sweetness, their unselfishness, their tenacity for work, their forbearance, their understanding, and many other of their noble qualities, for all these are woven into the tapestry of a good home.

Yes. Mother is always the "chief cook" and "bottle washer."

But her influence on the children and her part in training them correctly calls for education and intricate psychology which often cannot be found in books.

The welfare of the family also requires her to know something of sanitation and health.

Running of the household to meet the budget requires some knowledge of economy and the handling of money.

To help her children iron out their problems she must know something of the functions of schools, churches, and all groups with which they will come in contact.

To make sure that the best laws are enacted for her children's future she has to know something about politics, government, and international affairs.

As a matter of fact mother is expected to be a walking encyclopedia.

As we recognize in this annual tribute the sterling qualities of a good mother, let us pause and realize that we are living in a turbulent and divided world.

At this moment the diplomats of the world hold the fate of our civilization in the palms of their hands in this atomic-hydrogen-weapon age.

Despite the efforts made to formulate a just and lasting peace, the goal has not been reached because the hearts of mankind are not yet attuned to the spirit of universal love which is essential if the family of nations expect to dwell in harmony with each other.

History is replete with the experiences of nation after nation who sought power and glory through conquest and subjugation.

It is written on the memories of mankind that the nation that forgot God and refused to recognize the human dignity of every creature created by Him traveled the road to ruin and oblivion.

Yet how short is the memory of man?

Regardless of lessons from history of the utter destruction of ancient empires, our minds were refreshed during the present 20th century by the fate that befell modern dictators who have trod the same path to destruction that their counterparts traversed in the dim and distant past.

We erroneously thought we had learned a costly lesson from World War I, but our entry into World War II was a grim reminder that the Armistice of 1918 settled nothing, but was truly, as Webster defines the word, merely "a cessation of hostilities."

We are at this moment within the shadows of the tomb of the Unknown Soldier, a hero of World War I, who real identity is known only to God.

What a mockery it is to realize that since his heroic death thousands of American boys just as eager and patriotic have been sacrificed on the altar of freedom in a second global war and in the Korean conflict.

At the moment Communist aggression in southeast Asia confronts a worried world eager to prevent a third world conflict.

Meanwhile the quest for peace and understanding among all nations continues to elude our grasp, because those who fashion world affairs have lost their sense of moral values and insist on decisions that benefit them alone.

This moral degeneracy has been nurtured because a godless philosophy has supplanted the Christian idea of love and brotherhood.

There is not a mother worthy of the name, regardless of her racial origin, who has not counseled her children as to the difference between right and wrong.

This sound advice has been given in various tongues since time immemorial, but interpreted the same the world over as the eternal characteristic of every mother, the intense desire to see her child develop courage, resourcefulness, and virtue.

These lessons she has taught her child from infancy whether she may have been lacking in formal education or the possessor of a college degree.

In short, it is the basis of mother love and devotion an dintended as lessons in character building.

Unfortunately those obstructionists to world peace, for the greater part, come from homes where, in early childhood, they were taught the truths of Christianity.

Yes, at their mothers' knees they learned the first prayers of babyhood and were given additional training in the love and fear of God during their boyhood years.

Then as they reached man's estate they faltered and embraced the false philosophies that were man-made concepts and devoid of Christian principles.

They were the same philosophies of government that ancient empires adhered to and which led them down the road to national ruin.

Paganistic in their basic principles, the prime objective is to relegate God to the background and to ridicule and defy Him.

Is there any wonder with such an international background of moral depravity that we grope for a peace that we cannot reach because of the baseness of men's hearts.

These men literally hold the destiny and the welfare of millions of God's creatures in the very palms of their hands.

Yet while we pass judgment on the rest of humanity it is well to remember that we Americans have also departed from the path of right living.

In doing so we have spurned the teachings that in early life were intended to serve us as a shield against the temptations that we were warned to expect.

We pride ourselves on being the strongest Nation on the face of the globe, but are we certain that an inventory of our national strength does not disclose that it is of a material nature and lacking in spiritual values?

It is true that recent reports indicate that there has been a marked increase in the number of people returning to church.

This is indicative of the fact that the basic convictions of the American people are rooted in firm ground, but our tendency to become indifferent is an attribute that could easily lead us into serious difficulty.

We practice the virtue of Christian charity to such a degree that we have poured billions of dollars into projects and programs designed to rehabilitate the war-torn countries.

These programs, while commendable, are often undertaken while the needs of our own citizens are ignored, especially those who have reached the twilight of life and find the day's burden more than they can bear.

It is to the credit of Hon. J. Edgar Hoover, and to many outstanding leaders in the field of education, that we are being aroused from our spirit of indifference and brought to realize that juvenile delinquency is a problem.

Yes; a problem that, unless it is solved in a practical manner, it will increase in its intensity as a national menace that must be curbed.

On this Mother's Day let us face the challenge that confronts us as a Nation by rededicating our own lives to the ideals that our mothers held so sacred and for which they gave their full measure of devotion.

Let us show our appreciation, our honor, and respect for the memory of the motherhood of America by caring for the living.

May the blessed memories of our God-fearing, self-sacrificing, and sainted mothers always be an inspiration and a guiding star in our lives until that day when by the grace and mercy of God we shall meet our mothers in that blessed land from whence no traveler shall ever return and where life is eternal.

A Good Move

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1954

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, it was announced yesterday that President Eisenhower planned to nominate William F. Tompkins, of Maplewood, N. J., as an Assistant Attorney General, to direct a newly established Division of Internal Security in the Department of Justice. We in New Jersey are proud that Mr. Tompkins, who has served with distinction as New Jersey's United States attorney, should receive this distinction.

The new Division of Internal Security, which Mr. Tompkins will head, presumably will handle all cases dealing with espionage, treason, sabotage, and the loyalty of Federal employees. As the formal announcement said, the result will be to "centralize and fix responsibility" within the Justice Department for the handling of subversive activities. While prosecuting such cases, Attorney General Herbert Brownell pointed out, special efforts will be made to safeguard the constitutional freedoms of all those involved.

It is obvious that Mr. Tompkins is taking on a tough assignment, and we all wish him success.

I would like to include two editorials, one entitled "Security With Justice," from the New York Times of May 11, and the other, "New Weapon Against Subversion," from the New York Herald Tribune of the same date:

[From the New York Times of May 11, 1954]

SECURITY WITH JUSTICE

The new Division of Internal Security in the Justice Department has been established to emphasize and to expedite the Government's continuing program against subversives. Prosecutions in this field have up to now been undertaken by a special section of the Criminal Division, which reportedly has not been able to keep up with the workload.

Investigations of subversion in all its forms will be made, as they have heretofore been made, by the FBI. But now the Justice Department will presumably be in a position to move more quickly into the courts than it has in the past. It will have considerably more personnel devoted to this phase of its actvities, they will comprise a separate unit of the Department and they will be headed by an officer with the prestige and authority of an Assistant Attorney General.

The Government has certainly not been idle in this area. Just last month the Attorney General spoke of the success the Justice Department had already achieved in meeting the problem of subversion. He noted that since 1948 over 100 Communist leaders have been indicted, 67 have been convicted, and 14 were then on trial. Yesteday there were sent to the Congress two new bills in pursuance of the administration's legal attack on Communist infiltration into industries or organizations that might affect the national security.

In commenting on the steps the administration has been taking against Communist subversion, both the President and the Attorney General have placed great stress on the necessity of preserving "the traditional American conceptions of due process of law." The operation of the Government's own loyalty-security program has not been entirely above criticism on these grounds. The Attorney General was well advised to point out that the new Division of Internal Security, which will handle Federal security-risk cases among others, "will be charged with the particular duty of safeguarding constitutional freedoms of all persons involved in any of its prosecutions."

[From the New York Herald Tribune of May 11, 1954]

NEW WEAPON AGAINST SUBVERSION

The formation of a new Internal Security Division in the Department of Justice should increase the Government's efficiency in combatting subversion by the prosecution of lawbreakers. It will set off cases involving espionage and the like from the regular work of the Criminal Division and, as the White House announcement put it, "centralize and fix responsibility" within the Department for a vitally important and specialized kind of legal activity. The head of the new Division, Mr. William F. Tompkins, has earned a reputation for vigor and thoroughness as United States attorney.

Setting up this agency goes far to round out the administration program for meeting the danger of Communist infiltration within the United States. The security regulations established by President Eisenhower in executive departments are directed against existing or potential risks in Government service. The Federal Bureau of Investigation has been encouraged to continue its general surveillance of all danger spots. Now the Justice Department has been streamlined for more efficient prosecution of actual violators of the laws concerning subversive activities. At every point to which its authority extends, the administration has shown an acute awareness of the Communist peril and a determination to meet it effectively by fair and legal means.

Citizens' Pensions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1954

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting into the Record an interesting study of Miss Emily Cuyler Hammond on the subject of what has been termed citizens' pensions, a possible alternative to our present social-security system. The actuarial cost study upon which this proposal is based was prepared by Mr. John S. Thompson.

The matter follows:

This is to present a plan of social-security reform, tentatively entitled "Citizens' Pensions," based on a proposal made by Senator Hugh Butler of Nebraska, in 1950.

Predicated upon the full, equitable liquidation of the present OASI-OAA system, the purpose of citizens' pensions would be to provide for the essential needs of individuals age 65 and over who are unable to provide adequately for themselves, without impairing the incentives to work or to save of those who can.

It would be pay as you go, financed out of general revenue or by the levy of an income surtax. It would be full coverage in the sense that every American citizen, rich or poor, who had not been a public charge most of his life, would be eligible for pension after age 65, provided his income fell beneath a given maximum. And it would be self-administered in the sense that the income tax is self-administered today.

Every American, man or woman, at age 64, upon application would be given the proper forms and, in the event that pension were assumed to be warranted, asked to return to the Bureau of Internal Revenue:

A. A statement of status: Name, address, etc., and number of years, if any, on public assistance (excluding aid to dependent children, aid to the blind, and other disability programs).

B. A declaration of gifts made in contemplation of pension: Any gift in excess of $3,000 made in any of the 5 years immediately preceding reaching the age of 65. (The average total allowance for gifts made in contemplation of pension—$15,000.)

C. A declaration of capital assets: Real property (location and assessed value); interests in unincorporated businesses or partnerships; stocks; bonds; savings in cash and/or deposits; fiduciaries and trusts. (The average total capital assets allowance for pension purposes: $15,000—without lien.)

D. A special declaration of estimated income for pension purposes: Adjusted gross income (found on p. 1, item 4 of United States Individual Income Tax Return Form 1040); income earned abroad; pensions (in addition to those reportable for income-tax purposes and other than veterans' pensions awarded for service-connected disability), i. e., railroad retirement, etc.; annuities (in excess of amount computed as annual value of capital assets allowance plus interest); gifts (in excess of $300 in 1 year, but excluding property in kind for personal use); inheritances (in excess of $300 cash and/or real estate which would raise the capital assets allowances above the regional limit, but excluding property in kind for personal use).

The husband and wife cases—each would be assumed to have half their combined property and income. For example, if a man and wife both over 65 had a house and farm worth $22,000 and an income of $3,000, each would be assumed to have $11,000 in capital assets, and $1,500 in income and would receive citizens' pensions accordingly. If a man over 65 and his wife under 65 had a house and farm worth $22,000 and income of $3,000, each would be assumed to have half; he would receive a pension, but, being under 65, she would not. If a man over 65 and his wife under 65 had a house and farm worth $22,000, he had an income from farming of $1,000 and she had an income from a trust estate of $4,000, each would be assumed to have $2,500 which would make it unnecessary for him to have a citizen's pension.

A table similar to that now used with the simplified income tax forms would advise the applicant the amount of his pension. If his income for pension purposes were under $600, he would receive a citizen's pension of—for example—$600 or $50 a month. If his income were over $600, his citizen's pension would be diminished by $1 a month for every $25 more of annual income, tapering off altogether at $1,825.

Revised declarations of estimated income for pension purposes could be made quarterly, so that the sudden loss of a job would entail no hardship.

Dependents and survivors now covered by OASI would be eligible for citizens' pensions under the citizens' pensions eligibility requirements. Younger persons would not be provided for under the new program as at present envisioned, while children eligible for ADC would be cared for under that program.

If in 1953 citizens' pensions had been in effect long enough so that OASI-OAA already had been entirely liquidated and no longer influenced the new system, out of an aged population of 13.1 million, 10,542,000, or 80.5 percent, would have received citizens' pensions in some denomination, while 2,558,000, or 19.5 percent, with incomes for pension purposes of $1,850 and over would have received no citizens' pension. The cost would have amounted to $4.9, or 2.2 percent, of adjusted gross income or a somewhat higher percentage as a surtax after income taxes.

The following cost study has been prepared by the distinguished actuary, Mr. John S. Thompson, who was a member of the staff of the Mutual Life Insurance Co., New York, 1905–26, and an officer of the Mutual Benefit Life Insurance Co., of Newark, N. J., first as mathematician and finally as president, 1946–53; now retired; he was president of the Actuarial Society of America, 1932–34; and has been for many years and is a fellow of the leading actuarial societies of the United States and Great Britain:

"CITIZENS' PENSIONS

"Cost study

"In estimating costs, whether long range or short range, of any new old-age benefit plan—or even of changes in an existing plan—a wide margin of variation from probable results must be expected in consequence of events and conditions which cannot be predicted. This is amply demonstrated by the history of social security. Not only did the early 1935 estimates of costs of old-age benefits differ from those actually observed, due to inexperience with work and retirement patterns, but the 1939 estimates were made enormously difficult by the amendments introducing dependents and survivors as beneficiaries—to mention only a few of the influences which affected the most skillful predictions. The 1950 and 1952 amendments further confounded the cost estimates. In spite of the guidance given by 10 or more years of experience, the short-range projections were considerably wide of the mark, and, with the propensity of Congress to change the law every few years, the accuracy or inaccuracy of the long-range projections may never be known.

"The same may be said with varying degrees of emphasis of the cost estimates pertaining to the various bills for amendments of the present OASI system.

"Such a new plan as now proposed, which would pay benefits on a sliding scale to persons over 65, working or retired, whose capital assets and annual incomes are below a given level, while simpler than the present system, would of course also be subject to demographic and economic trends, and its cost estimates would be influenced by any unpredictable changes.

"Even for the year 1953, all factors affecting the cost of citizens' pensions are not obtainable with exactitude since the plan was not in operation during 1953 and we do not know, for instance, how many eligible persons might simply have failed to apply for benefits.

"However, there is certain basic information from which, with reasonable assumptions, useful conclusions may be drawn. For example:

"A. Bureau of the Census, Department of Commerce: The population over 65 in 1950, approximately 12,270,000.

"B. Bureau of Internal Revenue, Department of the Treasury: The total number of exemptions for age (over 65) and/or blindness in 1950 (the latest year for which such returns are available), namely, 4,914,351. This number classified according to taxable and nontaxable returns, according to returns for single persons, separate returns of husbands and wives and joint returns of husbands and wives, and broken down into adjusted gross income groupings of under $600 and thence by $150 and $250 jumps to incomes of $5,000 or more.

"C. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: The total number of blind (including all ages and whether or not receiving Federal aid), namely, 260,000.

"D. The Federal Reserve Board: Data from the Survey of Consumer Finance as to percentage of persons 65 and over owning their own homes, differentiated as to annual incomes and as to urban or rural residence. Also the percentage of persons 65 and over having net worth, differentiated as to amount.

"After adjusting for cases of blindness, it was estimated that the number of aged persons represented by income returns to the Bureau of Internal Revenue was, in 1950, approximately 4,654,000, and thus that the number of aged persons not filing returns was approximately 7,616,000. Since adjusted gross income under the proposed plan would be only one measure of income for pension purposes, allowance was made for railroad retirement payments, partially tax-exempt pensions and annuities from life-insurance companies, various kinds of capital assets in excess of permissible maximums, inheritances and gifts in excess of permissible maximums, income earned abroad, etc. Then both groups of aged, those represented by tax returns and those not so represented were redistributed into income groupings for pension purposes—under $600, $600–$749, $750–$999, etc.—and carried forward to 1953, 1955, 1960, 1980, and 2000 as set forth in table I.

"The principles and methods followed in these projections were substantially the same as those utilized by the actuaries of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in Actuarial Study No. 36, published by the Department in June 1953. In regard to the levels of net worth and of income which would have particular bearing on such a program as citizens' pensions, weight has been given the rising incidence of home ownership and of savings after age 65. Considerable weight also has been given to the fact that the maturity of old-age pensions from other sources—railroad retirement, etc., and, notably, from personal and corporate pension plans carried by life-insurance companies and other corporations—will operate gradually to increase the average level of retirement incomes so that, ultimately, the proportions of persons receiving the smaller incomes may be considerably less, and of those receiving the larger retirement incomes considerably greater, than at present. For example, considering group annuities alone, while there are today only 180,000 now being actually paid (Life Insurance Fact Book, 1953, p. 29), there are 2,527,000 employees covered who are below the retirement age but of whom a large proportion will be drawing pensions in later years. In addition, it is anticipated that, in line with a moderate current trend, the employment of persons at ages immediately above age 65 may tend to increase and thus lighten the burden of old-age benefits.

"Table II shows citizens' pensions costs in contrast to the present OASI-OAA system and several modifications.

"It will be noted that, whereas citizens' pensions would have cost $4.9 billion for 1953 as against only $3.9 billion for the present OASI-OAA system (table II, cols. 1 and 2). Citizens' pensions would have been paid to 10,542,000 men and women over 65 all of whom would have had incomes for pension purposes below $1,850 (table I). At the same time, OASI and OAA benefits went to only 7,937,000 persons including OASI primary beneficiaries, dependents, and survivors, and at least some OASI primary beneficiaries as well as survivors are known to have incomes considerably in excess of $1,850.

"It will be further noted that in 1953 citizens' pensions would have cost considerably less than OASI with universal employment coverage and with the present aged blanketed in at a minimum $30 monthly benefit—either with or without the work clause.

"However, on the cost side, the underlying important difference between citizens' pensions and OASI-OAA, or any of the proposed amendments thereto, is that citizens' pensions would be flexible. If economic conditions were bad, citizens' pensions aggregate costs would automatically go up to protect those in need. If economic conditions continued to improve, citizens' pensions costs might conceivably be diminished. OASI, on the other hand, as now constituted, must continue to grow whether the individuals concerned, or the economy as a whole, benefit by it or not. Table II illustrates the point: under similar high employment and level-wage assumptions in the year 2000, the present OASI-OAA system with universal employment coverage and with the present work clause would cost $18.1 billion, as against $7.6 billion for citizens' pensions—a saving of some $10.5 billion."

TABLE I.—*Citizens' pension beneficiaries according to income group, pension amount, number of beneficiaries, and percentage of total aged population*

[Number of persons in thousands]

Citizens pensions income group	Average monthly pension	1953		1955		1960		1980		2000	
		Number of aged persons	Percent of total aged	Number of aged persons	Percent of total aged	Number of aged persons	Percent of total aged	Number of aged persons	Percent of total aged	Number of aged persons	Percent of total aged
Under $600	$50	3,249	24.8	3,447	24.8	3,555	23.7	4,365	19.4	4,077	15.1
$600 to $749	46	2,122	16.2	2,252	16.2	2,355	15.7	3,038	13.5	3,051	11.3
$750 to $999	38	2,201	16.8	2,335	16.8	2,475	16.5	3,420	15.2	3,753	13.9
$1,000 to $1,249	29	1,451	11.1	1,543	11.1	1,665	11.1	2,475	11.0	2,943	10.9
$1,250 to $1,499	20	838	6.4	890	6.4	975	6.5	1,575	7.0	1,998	7.4
$1,500 to $1,749	11	511	3.9	542	3.9	600	4.0	1,035	4.6	1,431	5.3
$1,750 to $1,850	3	170	1.3	181	1.3	210	1.4	383	1.7	540	2.0
Total beneficiaries $1,850 and under		10,542	80.5	11,190	80.5	11,835	78.9	16,291	72.4	17,793	65.9
Nonbeneficiaries $1,850 and over		2,558	19.5	2,710	19.5	3,165	21.1	6,209	27.6	9,207	34.1
Total aged population [1]		13,100	100.0	13,900	100.0	15,000	100.0	22,500	100.0	27,000	100.0

[1] Mean of high cost and low cost population figures from Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Social Security Administration, Actuarial Study No. 36, June 1953, p. 24

TABLE II.[1]—*Citizens' pension cost estimates as compared with the present OASI–OAA system and several modifications—Intermediate cost estimates*

[All amounts in millions of dollars]

Calendar year	Citizens pensions [2]	Present OASI-OAA system [3]		Present OASI-OAA system universal employment coverage [3]		Universal employment coverage paying present aged $30 a month	
		Present work clause	No work clause	Present work clause	No work clause	Present work clause [4]	No work clause
1953	$4,900	$3,905	$5,305				
1955	5,200	4,910	6,218	$4,910	$6,208	$5,836	$7,144
1960	5,500	6,479	7,921	7,050	8,885	7,801	9,636
1980	7,200	12,004	13,912	14,065	16,830	13,991	16,756
2000	7,600	15,718	17,710	18,140	21,054	17,694	20,608

[1] All figures pertaining to the OASI-OAA type system supplied by Robert J. Myers chief actuary, Social Security Administration, U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

[2] Covering persons over 65 with incomes for pension purposes under $1,850—assuming younger persons in need to be taken care of under States programs.

[3] Covering OASI primary beneficiaries, dependents, survivors, etc., and Federal share of OAA but excluding States share of OAA.

[4] Excluding wives 65 and over of men 65 and over who are working from the $30 blanketing-in payment.

How to determine your citizens' pension

If your annual income for pension purposes is—	Your monthly citizens pension is—	Your annual citizens pension is—
$0 to $600	$50	$600
$601 to $625	49	588
$626 to $650	48	576
$651 to $675	47	564
$676 to $700	46	552
$701 to $725	45	540
$726 to $750	44	528
$751 to $775	43	516
$776 to $800	42	504
$801 to $825	41	492
$826 to $850	40	480
$851 to $875	39	468
$876 to $900	38	456
$901 to $925	37	444
$926 to $950	36	432
$951 to $975	35	420
$976 to $1,000	34	408
$1,001 to $1,025	33	396
$1,026 to $1,050	32	384
$1,051 to $1,075	31	372
$1,076 to $1,100	30	360
$1,101 to $1,125	29	348
$1,126 to $1,150	28	336
$1,151 to $1,175	27	324
$1,176 to $1,200	26	312
$1,201 to $1,225	25	300
$1,226 to $1,250	24	288
$1,251 to $1,275	23	276
$1,276 to $1,300	22	264
$1,301 to $1,325	21	252
$1,326 to $1,350	20	240
$1,351 to $1,375	19	228
$1,376 to $1,400	18	216
$1,401 to $1,425	17	204
$1,426 to $1,450	16	192
$1,451 to $1,475	15	180
$1,476 to $1,500	14	168
$1,501 to $1,525	13	156
$1,526 to $1,550	12	144
$1,551 to $1,575	11	132
$1,576 to $1,600	10	120
$1,601 to $1,625	9	108
$1,626 to $1,650	8	96
$1,651 to $1,675	7	84
$1,676 to $1,700	6	72
$1,701 to $1,725	5	60
$1,726 to $1,750	4	48
$1,751 to $1,775	3	36
$1,776 to $1,800	2	24
$1,801 to $1,850	1	12
$1,851 to	0	0

First Things First

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1954

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD today some excerpts from a letter from a beneficiary of our social security system. The letter speaks for itself; it needs no comment from me, except this: In the next few weeks, this House will have two major pieces of legislation before it. One will be the fiscal 1955 slice of the foreign aid program, the program through which we have sluiced so many tens of billions of American dollars to help people in foreign lands. The other will be the social security program, through which we have tried to provide a modicum of help and comfort for the aged and for young widows and orphans in our own country. I hope we will take a long, hard look at both programs this year, and put first things first—by which I mean putting the interests of our own people above those in other lands, and helping those of our own people who need help the most. My correspondent's letter illustrates what I mean far better than could any words of mine:

APRIL 28, 1954.

Re social security

To Mr. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG.

DEAR SIR: I can assure you we are sincerely appreciative of what we are getting. But having worked very hard to get our own 3-room home and lived very frugal in order to support ourselves and not ask any help from the welfare, we find the people on the welfare can and do live much better than we can. My husband has had three operations. He will be 75 years old in May and has to go to a doctor every 3 or 4 weeks and sometimes much more than that, and he is now unable to work. He gets $25 a month. I am 67 years old and work at the canning factory in season, which is about 10 weeks, 2 weeks on strawberries and about 8 weeks on beans; but have to return my social-security check when I earn more than $75 a month. I get $31.60 a month, having worked and earned more under social security than my husband, as I have done scrubbing and cleaning and anything I could get; also worked at an old ladies home since about 1941 to support us. So we certainly would appreciate a raise if it is at all possible, as doctoring and medicines cost so much. I don't feel able to work much more as my nerves are giving out. But believe me I am very thankful that I have had the health and strength to work; also thankful to be living in America where if one is willing, one can find work to do; also very thankful for social security. But if we could get more, we could live a little better, and at least have a change from hamburg nearly every day.

Yours truly,

[Name withheld.]

P. S.—Thanking you very much for what you are trying to do for the aged.

Small Towns of Texas Seek Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 11, 1954

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the industrial development of my State of Texas during the last decade has astounded the Nation. I would like to point out that this development has not been an accident. It was planned.

Texas has undergone tremendous industrial expansion because Texas offers great opportunities for industry and because Texas goes out after new industries.

That is true of small towns as well as cities. As an example, I cite the case of Grandview, in Johnson County, Tex. A recent news story in the Dallas Times Herald tells how this small town, with a population of less than 1,000, has initiated a soundly based effort to acquire industries for which it is suited.

I ask unanimous consent that this news story about Grandview, which sets an example for small towns everywhere, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GRANDVIEW FORMS INDUSTRY FUND

GRANDVIEW, May 8.—Business leaders of Grandview have subscribed $50,000 for the Grandview Industrial Foundation, Inc., a new industry-seeking organization.

Grandview, 50 miles southwest of Dallas, with a population of 886, is said to be the smallest town in Texas to raise this amount of money for industrial development use.

The corporation's capital stock of $50,000, plus its borrowing ability, will be made available to firms desiring to establish new industries or relocate present established businesses in Grandview, Floyd H. Wilson, president of the nonprofit organization, said.

The type of aid available will be the acquisition of sites and the construction of buildings thereon for rental or purchase rights under long-term contracts.

Wilson emphasized some 700 persons are available for work within a 10-mile radius of Grandview.

Coal Aid for Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1954

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the May 6, 1954, issue of the Altoona (Pa.) Tribune tells the story of how our Government recently advanced $100 million to the European Coal and Steel Community while the United States coal industry faces disaster.

It is interesting to note that the editorial mentions that 2 of the 6 members of the European Coal and Steel Community have acted to restrict coal imports from America.

The editorial follows:

COAL AID FOR EUROPE

Here in our Blair County and central Pennsylvania region we know that the coal industry needs some kind of revitalization. A conference was held last week in Washington in an effort to arrive at some ideas for a solution of the problem. At least one group, the United Mine Workers, called for Government aid.

Interior Secretary McKay said coal is our most vital fuel supply.

Yet, strangely, nobody seems to have any ideas on the subject, even though—and mark this—the United States Government recently advanced $100 million as a 25-year loan at 3⅞ percent interest to the European Coal and Steel Community, the 6-nation combine known as the Schuman plan.

It is worth observing, however, that while our own coal industry faces trouble, and we lend this large amount abroad, at least 2 of the 6 members of the Schuman combine have acted to restrict coal imports from America.

And, at the same time, this country admits large imports of surplus residual oil, which are dumped onto our own fuel markets, already struggling with our domestic problem.

And, perhaps to compound the felony, reports from abroad tell us that, despite the efforts of the idealistic Schuman plan to place marketing of coal and steel on a fair, businesslike basis, old Europe refuses to give up its cartels.

In Europe, a monopoly is a cartel. Continental big-business men retain the unshakable idea that the only way to do a profitable business on a large scale is to operate on the principle of scarcity and high prices.

European cartels have operated on this principle for a good many years, centuries, even. They have made it a common policy in the past to create scarcities, when none existed, thus boosting the price of their products.

The Wall Street Journal the other day quoted a representative of the Schuman plan, at the Luxembourg headquarters, as saying:

"If we freed prices now, the national cartel agencies would simply take over the job. As it is the cartels simply see to it that the ceiling prices set by us are also minimum prices for the industry.

In other words, European big business gives little attention to the legal controlling agency, and sets its own prices, at whatever it figures the traffic will bear.

Thus, the principle of free and extensive trade is violated. And that is the principle involved in the Schuman plan.

On the face of it, our money would appear to be going largely to maintenance of the same old cartels in Europe, pouring profits into the pockets of the continental big shots.

While here at home our coal industry languishes, and other industries, notably our own railroad establishment in Altoona and the central Pennsylvania area, feels the lack of coal traffic.

Government often operates in strange ways. Our relations with Europe unhappily, seem to be predicated on the basis of our willingness to play sucker constantly along some line.

Forever Geneva

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT H. BOSCH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 11, 1954

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Speaker, everyone is speaking of Geneva and the results at Geneva, I therefore, under leave to extend my remarks, include an editorial from the New York Daily Mirror entitled "Forever Geneva," which I believe will be of interest to my colleagues and all thinking Americans:

FOREVER GENEVA

Korea apparently has been sidetracked at Geneva, although that was the principle purpose for the conference. The South Koreans have little hope that anything will happen at Geneva so far as their country is concerned.

The concentration is now on Indochina, which is the immediate seat of war. The Chinese, who are in command of the Indochina situation, as they were in the Korean, are moving toward Hanoi, which they expect to take almost immediately. This means that the war progresses for the conquest of Annam.

Lying off the coast of China and dominating the east coast of Indochina is the island of Hainan, now held by Red China. Hainan has been developed into a military and naval base. Out of it ply Russian snorkel submarines, apparently in large numbers. The island also has airfields. It has been reported that supplies are shipped from Hainan in submarines and landed on the Indochina coast.

Once the point of Hanoi falls into the hands of the Communists, supplies from Hainan will be able to move freely to the Red armies. Already about three Red Chinese divisions (some reports call them mixed brigades) are operating inside Indochina. The Chinese cities of Kweilin and Kunming are being used as bases for this war.

But what are they doing about all this at Geneva? Nothing, of course. Speeches are being delivered; conferences are being held. But here is an aggressor nation, Red China, that has, first, marched into Korea, and now into Indochina and made war there.

Under Secretary Walter Bedell Smith said in his speech:

"We are here to establish a united, free, democratic, independent Korea. We are here to assist, if we can, in the establishment of a durable, secure peace for the Associated States of Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia. We are here to uphold the authority of the United Nations to resist aggression. We are here to prevent the spread of communism in southeast Asia. We are here to bring closer together the free nations of the world."

One is almost reduced to the vulgar expression, "So what?"

The fact is that the Red armies keep rolling along, conquering new territory all the time. What will undoubtedly fall to the Soviet universal state will be 22 million additional people and one of the principal ricegrowing areas of the world. What we are told is that a will to negotiate in good faith might do something to solve this problem of Soviet aggression.

Actually, we have been negotiating in good faith with the Soviet universal state since 1943, when Roosevelt, Churchill, and Stalin met at Teheran, where our disasters commenced. We have never ceased to negotiate in good faith and we have never won a negotiation. Each conference means a new defeat despite our good faith. So what is the use of talking about good faith when those who sit on the other side of the table never have good faith. They use every conference as a basis for a new war, a new series of activities against the United States.

How long are we to keep on taking it? Our delegates were sent to Geneva to negotiate a political settlement concerning Korea. It was agreed at the Berlin Conference that that should be the first order of business at Geneva. It has not been the first order of business. It is now postponed indefinitely. Therefore, the Geneva Conference has been diverted from its primary purpose and as it looks now, we might even get euchered into a general, all-subject conference, the design of which would be to gain recognition for Red China and to get that brutal, murderous country into the United Nations.

Much is being made of the fact that the enormous Chinese delegation at Geneva is moving into the open, entertaining lavishly, and that Chou En-lai is being projected as a terrific personality. It is even being suggested that Molotov is taking a back seat at Geneva so the Chou can look fiercer and more significant.

The Soviet universal state acts as a unit of Geneva or anywhere else. Its design is the entrapment of the United States and our ultimate destruction. Maybe if we attended fewer conferences, we might be better off.

Syngman Rhee Keeps on Warning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT HALE
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 11, 1954

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following newspaper article by May Craig:

SYNGMAN RHEE KEEPS ON WARNING

(By May Craig)

WASHINGTON, May 3.—Wise, brave old President Syngman Rhee is crying in the wilderness again, as a prophet who has never wavered in reading aright the Communist threat. He says that we should have met it head on in Korea; he warns that appeasement now will get us nowhere, and that he, for one, will never appease.

He is one who has stuck to the original and right attitude toward the Communist aggressor. He said it again last week. Withdrawal of Communist troops from North Korea and free elections for the whole country. That is what he has been saying all along. He protested the partition of his country, which has now made North Korea a Red province, armed and entrenched, most of the North Koreans killed off, Chinese settled in. He knows that a partitioned Korea means a Communist Korea soon.

He said the only salvation for his country and the rest of the free world was to fight bravely and completely in Korea. We would not do it; our allies would not do it. General MacArthur wanted to do it. General Van Fleet wanted to do it. The allies held us back; the State Department held us back. They said it would spread the war. Maybe it would have. But the war has now spread to Indochina, and if we fight there, are we not spread, as we feared in Korea?

Vice President Nixon, in the now-famous speech to the editors, said that we should send American troops to save Indochina from the Reds, if necessary. He was asked if it would not have been better to have fought to win in Korea, if we must now fight in Indochina, and he replied that, hindsight being better, perhaps we should have fought it out in Korea.

We went into Korea with brave talk about a free and independent Korea but we watered that down. We accepted a truce-talk offer when we had the Chinese staggering and they needed time. We gave them time. We are now in Korea talking settlement of Korea—all this time and we do not have a settlement in Korea. Rhee fears, with good reason, that he will be sold down the river.

He threatens to fight all alone if he must. He cannot do that, because he has no resources except what we give him. He sees across the water Chiang Kai-shek, the Nationalist Chinese leader, whom we recognize as head of the Chinese people, but do not treat as such. We have admitted Red China to the Geneve Conference, but not the Nationalists.

We tried to make Chiang take the Reds into his government, which he knew meant betrayal and the end of him, and he refused. We stopped aid to him and he fell. He is entrenched on Formosa with an army which we train and supply, but will not help him to use. At the time of the truce, he said that the truce would free Chinese troops for Indochina. We did not listen to him, and now that is what has happened.

Eisenhower said, "Let Asians fight Asians," but we have not allowed Korean or Nationalist Chinese to fight in Indochina. Are we now to send drafted American men there to fight? France does not send drafted men out of the country—only volunteers. The Americans have their drafted men all over the world.

Rhee says he does not believe that Reds will ever withdraw from Korea; they must be driven out by force. He wants to do that; if America supplies the means. He does not believe they will withdraw from Indochina or Germany or anywhere else. "Communism has never yielded a square inch of soil anywhere except as a result of armed force and there is not the slightest hint that there will, is, or ever will be, any change in that policy."

"The Soviet is bent on world conquest and will never willingly sacrifice its hold on such a strategically useful territory as Korea. * * * We will fight on alone. Every Korean prefers the choice of death to that of continued division. Unification of Korea could have been achieved long ago if some of our friends had not arrived at the erroneous conclusion that communism can be dealt with in a gentlemanly way."

He is represented in the Geneva meeting but says he will withdraw if no progress is made in 90 days—that is what he has said since the beginning. And he warns against fake withdrawal of Red troops to fool the U. N. troops into withdrawal. He daily views the Red breach of the Korean truce agreement in North Korea. It was agreed that neither side would increase its strength while the political settlement was being debated. The Reds have greatly increased their strength and refused to allow the neutral inspection teams to fulfill their duty. Rhee knew that the Reds would never allow inspection.

The United States is at the crossroads. We have chosen the road of a united free world against communism. We have poured out men and money and goods, to strengthen the Allies. Now that the time has come to marshal that strength against the Reds, the Allies weaken and talk. That is their right. But should we continue to pour out our strength to allies who do not choose to remain allies in any real fight against the enemy?

We say we cannot afford, for instance, to spend the money on complete radar protection for this country, because we are spending so much money on our first line of defense in other countries, in rings of bases. But if this is not a line of defense for us—what then? Is this the moment for what Secretary of State Dulles calls an agonizing reappraisal of our plan and design and pattern for the defense of the United States? These bases are not ours in time of war. The countries in which they are located will decide whether we can use them or not—we could not use them if the people of a country were hostile. Should we be building a defense of continental United States, a fortress America, as old Herbert Hoover said, long ago?

This is a time for us to make these decisions—before we decide that we alone will try to save the world from communism—before we send American men to Indochina. And after Indochina—where next? Burma and Thailand and Malaya and Indonesia and Japan? Can we do it, and should we do it?

Pledge of Alligiance: "Under God"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. FALLON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1954

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and resolution:

D-DAY, 10TH ANNIVERSARY,
Baltimore, Md., May 5, 1954.

Re Pledge of allegiance: "Under God."
Hon. GEORGE H. FALLON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Attached hereto please find a copy of a resolution I introduced at the national convention of the 29th Division Association at Philadelphia in August of 1952. It was passed without a dissenting vote, and later adopted by many other organizations.

While I am heartily in favor of the sudden hullabaloo nearly 2 years later, I want the credit to be given to me and to the 29th Division Association. Please use your best efforts to that end. Thank you.

With kind regards and all good wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,
JOSEPH J. PHILBIN.

BALTIMORE, *August 21, 1952.*

"Whereas the late Francis Bellamy in 1892 wrote a splendid pledge of allegiance to the flag of the United States, which today is widely used; and

"Whereas when Francis Bellamy wrote this stirring pledge, the pall of atheism had not yet spread its hateful shadow over the world, and almost everyone acknowledged the dominion of Almighty God; and

"Whereas now that the militant atheistic Red menace is abroad in our land, it behooves us to remind the free people of these United States that they are utterly at the mercy of God: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the 29th Division Association, Inc., in national convention assembled in the city of Philadelphia, Pa., this 31st day of August 1952, urge that the name of Almighty God be incorporated in Mr. Bellamy's pledge of allegiance, to the end that the pledge read as follows:

" 'Under God, I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.' "

JOSEPH J. PHILBIN,
Post Department Commander,
Department of Maryland.

Passed without a single dissenting vote, and later adopted by the DAR, the Flag House Association, the VFW, the DAV, sections of the American Legion (notably the Nurses' Post of the Department of Maryland), incorporated in the pledge at the "I Am An American Day" in 1952 in Patterson Park, the CWV, War of 1812 groups, etc., etc.

Publicized by William E. Pyne, of the Baltimore Evening Sun, and widely spread by the AP throughout the northwestern quarter of our country, including Virginia.

United Mine Workers Urge Action To Halt Mounting Unemployment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 11, 1954

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by the United Mine Workers of America calling upon the Eisenhower administration to implement the Employment Act in order to halt mounting unemployment.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UMWA CALLS FOR IMMEDIATE ACTION TO HALT UNEMPLOYMENT

WASHINGTON, D. C., May 8, 1954.—The international executive board of the United Mine Workers of America today called upon President Eisenhower, the Members of Congress, Cabinet officers, and the directors of the various departments of Government for immediate implementation of the Employment Act of 1946 through a broad program of tax relief, improved unemployment compensation, public works, credit and currency readjustments and the removal "from the backs of American labor and industry (of) the crushingly unfair competition of foreign-made goods and fuels."

By unanimous action, the 25-member board, speaking for more than a half million coal miners in 28 States as well as members of district 50 and the United Construction Workers declared that the Employment Act's declared policy of "maximum employment, production, and purchasing power" must "be made effective" so that "the might, power, and ability of this Nation to defend itself against its enemies, both foreign and domestic (may) be adequately and promptly secured."

In addition to the above-mentioned persons, copies of the resolution are being sent to all local unions of the UMWA, to the Governors of the coal-producing States as represented at the recent Governors' Fuel Conference held in Washington, and to the press and radio.

The full text of the UMWA resolution follows:

"Whereas the Congress of the United States on February 20, 1946, officially promulgated the basic policy of the Federal Government as to employment and related economic problems by the enactment of Senate bill 380, known as and called the Employment Act of 1946; and said law so enacted and the policies therein set out and proclaimed have continued to be and now are the governing law on the subject, and should be recognized as such by the national administration and its officials now in control of the affairs of this Nation; and

"Whereas in said act the Congress specifically declared it to be the 'continuing policy and responsibility of the Federal Government' to maintain 'maximum employment, production, and purchasing power'; and

"Whereas among other things, said act also specifically made it the duty and function of the Council of Economic Advisors to the President of the United States to develop economic policies 'to avoid economic fluctuations or to diminish the effect thereof and to maintain employment, production and purchasing power,' and the President of the United States, in light thereof and in conformity with the national policy proclaimed by the Congress, is specifically charged by the statute with the duty of causing such policies to be evolved and placed into effect at such times and in such manner as to implement, effectuate, and support such national policy; and

"Whereas it is common knowledge and now well known to all citizens of the United States that even as this Nation stands at the crossroads in world affairs and at a time when our national strength should be at its maximum, that unemployment is rapidly rising, that production is currently shrinking, and that purchasing power is in direct ratio dwindling—all as epitomized in the fact, recently but reluctantly admitted by the national administration and its spokesmen, that the number of men and women of the United States thrown out of work due to deteriorating economic conditions, climbed from 1.2 million in October 1953 to 3.7 million in March 1954, and that the total number of those who now cry out for employment far exceeds the 4 million mark and that even this number is rapidly on the march to even higher levels; and

"Whereas the American people as a whole, and particularly its laboring population, are entitled to immediate enforcement and implementation of the national policy of 1946 (still the binding and guiding law of the land) and to a cessation of the ruinous and devastating flood of virtually tax-free foreign goods and fuels into American markets, as illustrated in the movement into American coal markets of Canadian and Mexican natural gas and Venezuelan and Arabian oil, and the multitude of other products from foreign lands—all encroaching on the ability of the American workmen to obtain employment, maintain production, and increase purchasing power; and

"Whereas this creeping paralysis of economic destruction now gradually engulfing this country cannot be stemmed by rolling readjustment, weather predictions, or by a program of "too little and too late," and the legal, financial, administrative, and legislative means to stem this oncoming deluge is at hand and available to the national administration and its officials: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the international executive board, United Mine Workers of America, in formal meeting assembled,* That it, in the name of and on behalf of all its members, now calls upon the President of the United States, the Secretaries and responsible heads of the manifold departments of Government, and upon the Congress, to face up to the realities of the situation confronting the American people, to implement without delay the declared policies of the Employment Act of 1946, to set in motion programs of tax relief, increase and extension of unemployment compensation, public works, credit and currency readjustments, and remove from the backs of American labor and industry the crushingly unfair competition of foreign-made goods and fuels, to the end that the national policy of maximum employment, production, and purchasing power be made effective, and the might, power, and ability of this Nation to defend itself as against its enemies, both foreign and domestic, be adequately and promptly secured."

Upper Colorado River Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DOUGLAS R. STRINGFELLOW

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1954

Mr. STRINGFELLOW. Mr. Speaker, in recent weeks opponents of the Echo Park Dam and other phases of the administration-sponsored upper Colorado River project have been disseminating a great deal of false and malicious propaganda. It is amazing how many armchair experts have come forward to expound on the ease with which it is possible to take "a leisurely boat ride down the Yampa and Green Rivers through the Dinosaur National Monument." It is always easy to imagine oneself a great adventurer when watching a TV account or viewing a film of some far-distant place, but it is a "horse of another color" to actually be a participant.

Genteel members of the Garden and Sierra Clubs can speak glowingly and with bravado of the beauty and grandeur of the canyons of Utah. We admit our scenery is superb and hard to excel. However, when these self-styled experts start talking about conservation of water or ability to run the treacherous rapids of the upper Colorado or its tributaries, they are far afield from their limited fields of knowledge. I have long since ceased to be either amazed or amused by the countless number of these "remote experts on arid Utah water problems and scenic wonders" who are living in such distant and fertile places as Pennsylvania and California.

It disturbs me no end when I see respected and able Members of Congress fall prey to the guile and craftiness of these word-picture painters who by every means possible try to thwart and obstruct the wheels of progress. These opponents of Echo Park Dam carry on their crusade under the guise of "conservation and preservation of our national parks," but, intentionally or in ignorance, they are laboring in an ignominious cause bent upon preventing the maximum utilization of resources which would bring increased benefits and wealth to all the people of our Nation.

To illustrate how completely these pseudo river rats can mislead an average American family seeking a suitable place for a tranquil vacation, I would like to call your attention to a copy of a letter I received from Mr. and Mrs. Richard Schall, of Wrightwood, Calif., the original of which was addressed to the editor of Sunset magazine. This letter very ably illustrates the power of the press to misinform if it allows its pages to be filled with half-truths or fabrications of rock worshipers' and flower sniffers whose only knowledge of Utah's geography has been acquired through a subscription to a glossy periodical. The letter follows:

May 7, 1954.

Sunset Magazine,
Menlo Park, Calif.

Gentlemen: After reading the articles in the March 1954 issue of the Sunset and National Geographic, we felt perfectly safe in arranging for a boat ride down the Yampa and Green Rivers through the Dinosaur National Monument.

We went into the river at Lily Park on May 3, 1954, and there assembled our folding kayak. Had the boat been large enough we would have no doubt also taken our young son with us. We are now extremely thankful that we did not do so.

After 5 hours on the Yampa River our boat was swamped in the rapids. Luckily we were able to reach shore where we camped and dried out our equipment. On the second day and near Hardings Hole on the Yampa River, we struck a rock, tearing a 4-foot hole in the bottom of our boat. Fortunately we had a can of glue with us and with patches cut from our air mattress were able to patch and repair the boat. Had we been able to quit the river we would certainly have done so. However, we could find no way out nor did we have any idea where we were. On the third day we were in the river for 10 hours before we reached a ranch, which we were informed was Island Park. During this entire day the boat was leaking badly and we were barely able to keep it afloat. We had many narrow escapes from other rocks and how we kept from tipping over we still do not know. Two ribs of the kayak were broken and our boat was almost a complete wreck.

We were so busy trying to keep the boat from hitting rocks and from swamping in the rapids that we did not even have a chance to see the scenery which the articles referred to. We must have passed Steamboat Rock but didn't even know what it was.

We certainly feel that magazines of national circulation and reputation should publish accurate and true information concerning trips of this nature. The articles we read are very misleading and give the impression that it is a pleasant, safe and scenic boat ride down the Yampa and Green River canyons. We were very lucky and fortunate to have made this trip and still be alive. No one who is not trained nor has not the proper equipment should ever attempt this trip. In our opinion no one should enter these river canyons without experienced river guides. One would think that there would be warning and information signs placed at different places along the river to let people know where they are, that dangerous rapids are ahead and most of all, places where they can leave the river if there are such places.

We are impelled to write of our experience in the hope that perhaps others will not be misled into taking their life in their own hands on such a hazardous trip. We also feel that these magazines should correct the information which is contained in their articles. We were told by the rancher at Island Park, who was kind enough to drive us into Vernal, that a party from Albuquerque, N. Mex., had had a similar experience a week before.

We are thankful that we found a way out of the river at Island Park. It is doubtful that we could have completed the run from Island Park to the Dinosaur Quarry and come out alive.

Very truly yours,

Barbara L. Schall.
Wrightwood, Calif.
Richard Schall.
Wrightwood, Calif.

Resolution Opposing United States Participation in Indochina War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED E. BUSBEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1954

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to insert in the Congressional Record, under leave to extend my remarks, a resolution which was passed by the First Division of the American Legion, Department of Illinois, relative to the Indochina situation. In transmitting this resolution to me, my good friend, Comdr. Jack Smith, stated that it represents the voice of 78,000 Legionnaires in the First Division of the Department of Illinois. The resolution which follows speaks for itself and I should like to urge every Member of Congress to study it carefully:

Resolution Passed by the First Division of the American Legion, Department of Illinois, Relative to the Indochina Situation

Whereas the Government of the United States came to the aid and assistance of England, Belgium, Holland, France, and other European Nations in their war with Germany and other members of the Triple Entente in 1917 and 1918 and in so doing provided:

(a) An armed force of 4½ million of its citizens for that purpose, of whom 126,000 were killed in action or died of other war causes and 234,300 were wounded or incapacitated from or because of disease contracted in such war service which plus prisoners of war or those missing in action, created a total casualty roll of 364,800, and in addition,

(b) incurred a public debt of more than $30 billion,

(c) provided supplies of all descriptions for both the civilian population and the armed forces of their allies; and

Whereas despite the ungrateful attitude of the majority of both the subjects and the political and civic heads of the leading nations allied with the United States in World War I and the firm resolve of an overwhelming majority of all of our citizens and of the spokesmen and the members of all political parties in this country, that the United States would not again be or become involved in future European or Asiatic military or political entanglements, the United States Government again in 1939, 1940, and 1941 yielded to the entreaties of England, France, Belgium, Holland, Russia, and other foreign nations and 23 years later and at a cost of hundreds of billions of dollars in money and in war material, again provided:

(a) a fully equipped armed force of approximately 16½ million of its citizenry in the form of soldiers, sailors, marines, and air force men to fight side by side with the military and naval forces of those nations of Europe and Asia who were in 1941–45 engaged in a struggle against Germany and Italy in Europe and against Japan in Asia, in a Second World War; and

(b) provided most of the offensive and defensive war equipment and material required by our European and Asiatic allies; and

(c) in such Second World War 225,155 members of the Armed Forces of the United States were killed in action or died from injuries or disease and 571,822 were wounded or incapacitated from such war service and 151,592 prisoners of war or missing in action created a total casualty roll of 948,574 and the United States ended such war with a national debt of nearly $275 billion and a peacetime military budget of approximately $40 billion yearly; and

Whereas under repeated entreaties from the political heads of European and Asiatic nations that only by a pact between all or a majority of the nations of the world, of which the United States was a necessary member, could a continuation of peace throughout the world be insured, established, and maintained and under such assurance, the United States in 1942 and in 1945 executed a treaty with over 50 other European and Asiatic nations as and became a member of the United Nations; and

Whereas within 5 years after the formal ratification of such United Nations treaty a shooting war broke out in Korea in the spring of 1950 which was however classified by President Harry S. Truman of the United States as a police action, and into such wars the United States as a member of the United Nations pledged to stop aggression everywhere—

(a) Dispatched hundreds of thousands of its citizens to Korea as members of a United Nations military, air, and naval force; and

(b) Expended many billions of dollars of its money, wealth, and material, in an announced effort to repel from South Korea the armies of North Korea and of Manchuria and of Communist China, and is continuing to expend additional tens of billions of our wealth each year, as an aftermath of such Korean war or police action, and in such aftermath the United States has members of its various branches of the military, Navy, and air service in nearly 50 foreign nations; and

Whereas it was stated within the past week by Secretary of State John Foster Dulles that Indochina and other portions of southeast Asia must not be permitted to fall into the hands or under the control of Red China or Red Russia even though the United States must take such action, military, economic, or otherwise, which might cause the commencement of world war III; and

Whereas subsequent thereto President Eisenhower is quoted as stating that the free nations of the world should be prepared to meet any kind of a Communist attack against southeast Asia, and the report of the Associated Press relative to his comments was that "the President did not completely rule out the possibility of using American forces in Indochina and in southeast Asia under a plan of united action"; and

Whereas only a few weeks ago, Secretary of State Dulles (according to Senator HUMPHREY, of Minnesota) stated that "the United States has no plan of operation (in Indochina or southeast Asia) if the French should withdraw their troops from Indochina; and

Whereas on January 18, 1954, Adm. Arthur W. Radford, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, informed a House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee that there is no proposal pending to send American troops to Indochina, and again on February 16, 1954, he informed the Senate Foreign Relations Committee that American involvement in the Indochina war will stop short of sending thereto United States combat troops or pilots; and

Whereas on February 16, 1954, Gen. Walter Bedell Smith, Under Secretary of State, was quoted as assuring the same committee members that "there is no intention of putting United States ground soldiers into Indochina"; and

Whereas Representative WALTER JUDD, subcommittee chairman at the January 18 hearing, in summarizing the testimony, of witnesses from the Pentagon before him, stated that "there are no plans to send more United States forces to Indochina"; and

Whereas the Senate of the United States just a couple of weeks ago rejected the so-called Bricker amendment to our Constitution and many Senators who voted in opposition to the amendment did so because of their belief in a statement of Secretary Dulles, that they could be assured that the President of the United States would at no time dispatch any troops or any air forces to European or Asiatic theatres of war or aggression unless permission to do so was first obtained in a constitutional manner by the President from the Congress of the United States; and

Whereas Secretary Dulles, subsequent to the defeat of the Bricker amendment, stated that under the North American Treaty President Eisenhower had the unquestioned authority to dispatch our Air Forces, our fleet, or our ground troops to any country in Europe, if such country were attacked, without first obtaining permission to use such forces from Congress, to the same degree that the President could use them if New York or Chicago or any other city in the United States were attacked by some foreign invader, and this statement was shortly thereafter approved by President Eisenhower; and

Whereas the aforesaid recent conflicting statements of the President, the Secretary of State, and other spokesmen for the administration in or out of Congress have made it impossible for the average citizen to learn or to know, as he is entitled to learn and to know, just what plans the administration has, if any, for carrying into execution the threats of drastic reprisals against any nation violating the ultimatums of Secretary Dulles; and

Whereas we believe that the people of the United States, including members of this organization, have a right and a duty to petition our Congress and express their feelings on and their views regarding, both the military and economic situation in Indochina and southeast India, and further believing that it would be detrimental to the best interests of the United States for it to participate, with any portion of its armed forces in the fighting in Indochina: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That this council, after considering the general situation in Indochina and the Far East and the possible adverse effects upon the general economic condition of the United States and upon the youth of America—

(a) Greatly deplores the acts of aggression by Red China, by Soviet Russia, or any of the satellites in Indochina or in southeast Asia;

(b) Believes that the good offices of the United States should be offered in an effort to arrange an amicable settlement of the French-Indochina problem, even though either or both must withdraw or reduce some of its demands, or that the French Government should give freedom to the Indochinese;

(c) Believes that if punitive action is urged by or upon the United Nations and it recommends to its members such action as it recommended that such members pursue in Korea in 1950, that in such event the United States limit its participation in any such action to the furnishing of a limited amount of war material for use in defending Indochina from the Communists, and to furnishing supplies for the welfare of the civilian population of the allied or United Nations countries involved; and/or to the training and equipping of a native Indochinese force to defend its homeland;

(d) Believes that the United States should refrain from dispatching any of its Armed Forces to participate as combatants in the fighting in Indochina or in southeast Asia;

(e) Believes that the United States can less afford to suffer the loss of two or three hundred thousand of its young men in being killed or wounded, plus the expenditure of tens of billions of dollars for equipping and maintaining our Armed Forces in Indochina, than it can afford to permit Indochina to fall into the hands of the Communists;

(f) Believes that regardless of the outcome of any fighting in Indochina, United States cannot win, but must lose, at least economically and in the killing or wounding of tens of thousands of the lives of its youth, if the United States becomes an active participant in any Indochina or southeast Asian fighting to the same degree that we participate in the police action in Korea; and be it further

Resolved, That the council commander and its adjutant immediately address communications to the President of the United States, Secretary of State, to the chairmen of the Foreign Relations Committees of each House of Congress, to the two United States Senators from Illinois, and to each Representative in Congress from Cook County, Ill., informing them that we are unalterably opposed to the dispatch or to the use of any members of the Armed Forces of the United States in Indochina or in any other country in southeast Asia regardless of the outcome of the present fighting in Indochina and regardless of the recommendations of the United Nations or any of its members.

Dated at Chicago, Ill., this 7th day of April 1954.

Presented by Charles V. Falkenberg, Logan Square Post, No. 405, executive committeeman, ninth district.

Driver of the Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. HARRISON
OF WYOMING
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 11, 1954

Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, it is with no small amount of pride that I call attention to a letter I received recently announcing the selection of a Wyoming driver as recipient of the "Driver of the Year" title.

My State of Wyoming must share the honor with Colorado and South Dakota, since Mr. Gomer W. Bailey lives in Colorado and drives for a firm with headquarters in South Dakota.

Mr. Bailey was nominated for the Driver of the Year honor by the Wyoming Trucking Association, and the particular incident which swung the balance in his favor, in the view of the judges, occurred in Wyoming. So, with all due credit to the two neighboring States, I must claim the major share of the honor for Wyoming.

The splendid record compiled by Mr. Bailey in driving more than a million miles without a chargeable accident is one of which he may be justly proud. I know that all my colleagues will join me in expressing congratulations and highest commendation to him.

I am looking forward to seeing Mr. and Mrs. Bailey and offering my congratulations in person.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the letter I received from Mr. Jack Cole, president of the American Trucking Associations, Inc., advising me of Mr. Bailey's selection, and describing the Wyoming incident:

AMERICAN TRUCKING ASSOCIATIONS, INC.,
Washington, D. C., May 6, 1954.
The Honorable WILLIAM H. HARRISON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. HARRISON: It occurs to me that you will be greatly interested in knowing about a high honor which has come to a truckdriver representing the Wyoming Trucking Association. Gomer W. Bailey, Buckington Transportation, Inc., has just been awarded the coveted title of Driver of the Year of the American trucking industry. Although a resident of Denver and a driver for a line serving Wyoming out of headquarters in South Dakota, he is the nominee of the Wyoming association and the honor thus falls to a Wyoming driver.

Gomer Bailey has driven more than a million miles without a chargeable accident, and like most truckdrivers, has frequently helped motorists in distress. But the incident which persuaded the judges (Robert B. Murray, Jr., Under Secretary of Commerce, W. Y. Blanning, of the Interstate Commerce Commission, and Arthur C. Butler, National Highway Users' Conference) to single him out was a special action which occurred late in January, near Torrington, Wyo.

A couple and two children had wrecked their house trailer at a bridge when the trailer came loose, plunging the car into a 40-foot ravine. Mr. Bailey coming along, quickly rushed put out flares to warn other vehicles about the completely blocked bridge, rushed into the ravine and found the two children in rather bad condition, one choking on his own blood from a bad tongue cut and the other bleeding freely. He aided them, put them into the first car which rushed them to the nearest hospital. The father was ambulatory but moving around and Mr. Bailey immobilized him. The father wanted to move his wife who was badly injured by Mr. Bailey's first-aid training constrained him to forbid any lifting or moving of the mother despite the hubsand's insistence. The wisdom of this was apparent when the ambulance arrived since it was ascertained that she had a broken back and broken pelvis and such offhand handling is often responsible for permanent injuries.

As is customary with so many men of Mr. Bailey's character, his part in this highway episode was not reported by him but rather several days later, was officially reported to his company in a letter of appreciation from Lt. R. O. Galloway, chief, Wyoming Highway Patrol, who had personally come upon the scene after the accident occurred and while Mr. Bailey was still directing traffic after having given first aid and assistance as noted.

In addition to the honor of being the Nation's "Driver of the Year," Mr. Bailey and his wife will be brought to Washington by the American Trucking Associations. Each of the past Driver of the Year winners has been fortunate to have met the President in his office. As guest of our association, he will be with us here and in New York for his personal enjoyment and for the attention of the press, television, and radio which in the past has been actively interested in the top driver because of the current stress on highway safety and courtesy.

I am sure that you share the pride of the industry in Wyoming at Mr. Bailey's selection and I can assure you that we are deeply proud of him and the hundreds of thousands of safe and courteous truck drivers like him who, we think, reflect great credit on our industry.

We are hopeful that one of Mr. and Mrs. Bailey's most pleasant recollections of their visit here will be that of an opportunity to see you personally, and when arrangements for their visit here are further advanced, we shall be in touch with your office to see if it can be arranged. I hope this will be agreeable.

Sincerely yours,
JACK COLE, *President.*

St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI

OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 6, 1954

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, I speak in behalf of S. 2150, to provide for the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway project.

I voted in committee to report this bill for two reasons: First, because I believe the purpose of the legislation—to provide a large navigable channel in the St. Lawrence River—is meritorious; and, second, because I feel that the membership of the House of Representatives should have an opportunity to express itself one way or the other on the project.

For more than 50 years efforts have been made to provide effective navigation and power facilities in the St. Lawrence River. These efforts had the support of many Presidents of the United States, Democrat and Republican alike. The drive to enact legislation for the seaway gained momentum when President Franklin D. Roosevelt, on March 19, 1941, caused to be negotiated a seaway agreement with Canada which, by way of ratification, required but a majority vote of both the Senate and House instead of the two-thirds majority of the Senate required by treaties. But the enacting legislation was not reported from committee.

In 1947, in another effort to get the bill from committee, the suggestion was made that the navigation part of the project be made self-liquidating by charging tolls for passage through the locks. The committee, however, did not report the proposal.

Renewed efforts for approval of the project were made during the 1st and 2d sessions of the 82d Congress under the sponsorship of President Harry Truman. One bill called for approval of the March 19, 1941, seaway agreement by a majority vote of both Houses. Lengthy hearings were held on this and other suggested procedures. No legislation was reported.

Bills introduced in the past provided for both navigation and hydroelectric power facilities. However, New York State is willing to assume the power's construction costs, leaving the navigation to Canada and the United States, so the bill now before us is limited to the deep-water navigation facilities. The hydroelectric part of the project will be built by the State of New York under a license granted by the Federal Power Commission, which means that power quite properly will be distributed according to the provisions of the Federal Power Act.

Canada has made clear that she intends to put in the navigation on her own if we do not join her. The question to be decided, therefore, is whether the United States will join with its neighbor on the north in the construction and operation of this great international waterway or whether we will permit Canada to do the job alone and have entire control over the St. Lawrence Waterway traffic.

The navigation facilities provided in S. 2150 will help to give Canada and the United States a new seacoast more than 2,500 miles long and will open up major ports on the Great Lakes to oceangoing traffic, including Buffalo, Cleveland, Toledo, Detroit, Duluth, Milwaukee, and my own city of Chicago.

The seaway will be a valuable aid in the shipment of iron ore from the mines in Labrador to the steel mills of the Middle West. The critical iron ore situation is largely responsible for the fact that many former opponents of the project have changed their position and are now supporting the seaway.

A developed St. Lawrence River will prove a boon to Midwest manufacturers who will use its facilities to ship their wares cheaply and export them to other countries. The auto industry and the steel mills in particular will benefit by the new transportation route.

I am convinced that this waterway project will benefit industry and agriculture, that it will open up many new seaports and act as a stimulant to commerce and trade generally. I look for a tremendous increase in commerce and business, not only in the Great Lakes area, but throughout the Nation if this project is approved. Its benefits far outweigh any disadvantages claimed by its opponents. I urge the Congress to approve the project on a self-liquidating basis as provided in the bill reported by the House Committee on Public Works and utilize to the fullest extent the great natural resources which are available to us—the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence River.

One Hundredth Anniversary of the Founding of Gainesville, Fla.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. D. R. (BILLY) MATTHEWS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 11, 1954

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call to the attention of the Members of the House the fact that my home city of Gainesville, Fla., this past week celebrated the 100th anniversary of its founding. The occasion was significant not only to the citizens of Gainesville, but to all our people in Alachua County and the surrounding counties in the Eighth Congressional District of Florida, which I have the honor to represent.

The current progress and prosperity of the city of Gainesville is due to the pioneering spirit of her citizens throughout the years. Faced with Indian wars, and then the horrors of the War Between the States, the city of Gainesville emerged to face still other disasters in the nature of the great freeze at the turn of the century which destroyed the orange industry in the north central part of the State; destructive fires; and the ravages of the great depression. With indomitable spirit the citizens of Gainesville conquered all of these disasters, and today with their neighbors in Alachua County, and with the valued friendship of thousands of other central Florida citizens, they are making of their city a great cultural and educational center.

One of the outstanding programs of the week of celebration was one program presented by the Negro citizens of Gainesville. They sang with tender feeling and deep emotion a number of spirituals that captivated the large audience. This program was thoroughly enjoyed by all races and creeds in the city of Gainesville. It was an indication of the great progress of our Negro citizens and of the natural good feeling between races—a feeling that is not caused by the passage of laws, but by a dedication to the spiritual culture of our civilization. The understanding and friendship of one race for another will never be accomplished by legislation imposed for selfish political reasons. Those of us who live in the South are naturally apprehensive about the pending decision of the Supreme Court on the vital question of segregation. It has always been my belief that equal opportunity, equal consideration under the law, and above everything else, a basic good feeling of mutual trust and regard are the answers at the present time to our racial problems. I feel this conviction is shared by an overwhelming majority of the good citizens of both races throughout the South.

Gainesville, Fla., is the home of the University of Florida, which today has a $35 million plant spread over 1,800 beautiful acres of land. Just 8 years after Florida was admitted to statehood the city of Gainesville began her life, and one of the first institutions in the city was the East Florida Seminary, one of the mother institutions of the present University of Florida. The city is in the heart of a great agricultural area and growing industries are creating that balanced economy that is so typical of our great State of Florida.

I know that my colleagues join with me in wishing the people of Gainesville, Fla., and her neighbors on the occasion of this centennial celebration another 100 years of continuing progress.

Geneva Paralysis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 11, 1954

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, from time to time I have been warning of the dangers of defense and foreign policy by slogans, based upon the need for justifying a military budget designed to meet campaign pledges rather than the needs of national security.

Miss Dorothy Thompson, the well-known columnist, in her article published in the Washington Evening Star for May 10, has carefully shown the relationship between the slogans and the disaster at Geneva. While many of us may not agree with Miss Thompson all the time, we all agree that she usually makes us think.

I include Miss Thompson's article as a part of my remarks:

United States Paralyzed at Geneva—Revised Arms Policy, Designed Only for a General War, Tied Dulles' Hands Against Action in Indochina

(By Dorothy Thompson)

The United States, under Mr. Truman, declared a policy to contain armed communism throughout the world. To do so, it prepared for two kinds of warfare, conventional and atomic, employing in the Korean test only the former.

The Eisenhower administration entered office with a more, not less, aggressive foreign policy. Containment was not enough. We must be more dynamic, and take the offensive.

But the Eisenhower administration came into office advocating financial retrenchment, a program thrust upon it by the limits of taxation if the economy were not to be seriously deflated, and by the necessity of checking the national debt if inflation were to be halted.

This program, however, was incompatible with the military policy it inherited. Therefore, the military policy was revised. Reliance was shifted to atomic weapons and the capacity for massive reprisals. This logically meant that the United States had decided to arm itself only for a general war directly between great powers. We would "deter such aggressions as would mean general war," to quote Secretary of State Dulles as of January 12, and by the inference of the military policy would not, because of unpreparedness, deter anything else.

For it is fairly obvious that, as atomic weapons could not be used in Korea, they cannot be used in Indochina or as a means of intervention in any civil war or war of limited objectives. Their use in such conflicts could only serve to expand a localized conflict into a generalized one.

In essence, therefore, the New Look, and dependence on the capacity for massive reprisals, was a military program fitted for the defense of the United States, the Western Hemisphere, and perhaps for strictly limited other areas, such as Western Europe.

The adoption of the changed military program logically implied political consequences.

It implied, to put it bluntly, that the United States was returning to some degree of isolationism.

In conflicts where one is determined not to engage one's Armed Forces, the alternative role that a great power can play is that of more or less neutral diplomacy. One can seek to keep a conflict localized and to reach a negotiated settlement.

But that is incompatible with a crusade to extirpate communism from the world.

Now, the Secretary of State, I think, has accepted this reality in his own logical mind. So have our European associates. And if Mr. Dulles had entered the Geneva Conference determined and able to represent this policy, the Allies might—and probably would—have been united. But a large part of Congress and many members of the administration itself, among them Admiral Radford, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff; Vice President Nixon; and Senate Majority Leader Knowland, have publicly shown that they do not accept it.

Therefore, Mr. Dulles—and the same would have held true for any Secretary of State—entered the Geneva Conference with his hands tied.

He could not commit the United States to decisive military intervention in Indochina, for the United States military policy and condition were not geared to that kind of war.

He could not negotiate a settlement which would mean further losses to communism because that would be branded at home as appeasement.

Therefore, all he could do was, in effect, to withdraw from the conference, in which the United States has demonstrated paralysis.

When a great power can make neither peace nor war, its role as a world leader becomes fictitious.

During the whole Geneva Conference the Secretary of the Army, Robert Stevens, has been utterly unable to have a lucid thought or make any contribution whatever to the solution of America's gigantic dilemma, as day after day he has faced the inquisition of his critics.

The scandal has pointed up, for all the world to see, the collapse of American dignity, prestige, and unity, and, with it, the further immobilization of American power. And the Russians did not do this to us.

The Republican Party in New Jersey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. ALEXANDER SMITH
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 11, 1954

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an outstanding address delivered by my colleague, the distinguished junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Hendrickson], at the New Jersey State Republican Convention on April 29, 1954. I may say with all sincerity that the junior Senator from New Jersey made one of the outstanding addresses which were delivered on that important occasion.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Keynote Address by Hon. Robert C. Hendrickson, of New Jersey, Before the New Jersey State Republican Convention, April 29, 1954

My fellow Republicans all, I have come here today to talk about victory. Not just to talk about it—or think about it—but to believe in it; to plan for it this fall, and to work for it now. Perhaps in a stricter sense, it is not quite correct for me to say "to begin to work for it."

Certainly, the sturdy Republicans in the Senate and House of Assembly, and among the county and municipal officeholders here in New Jersey are working for it right now.

Surely, the members of your congressional delegation have been working for it since the Republicans took over the reins of Government in Washington less than a year and a half ago.

But in a larger sense, there comes a sobering moment in the political life of any group of Republican workers when it becomes essential to check our bearings and reset our course to avoid the rocks and shoals of political defeat and to navigate the murky seas of political controversy.

We Republicans need only reckon with one thing. True north on the navigator's compass is always true north. Political principles of decency and honesty and fair dealing must remain just as fixed for us.

Your speaker has been an active participant in the conventions of our party here in the State for more than 20 years. I have had the honor of occupying the chairmanship of resolutions committees on three occasions in the past, and I know that those principles which we formally embrace as a result of this convention will measure up to the tenets which have always been part of a Republican philosophy of government.

I have been signally honored by our party over the years. It has been a part of me to give everything that I have to the service of my country and my party. Whether I personally enjoyed the fruits of victory or tasted the dregs of defeat, my spirit, within the bounds of human error, has never faltered in its determination to strengthen that party and build for its future. It shall not; it will not falter now. Today, I am as determined as ever that our party must not fail.

Without magnifying this plea out of proportion and because I know of no other way, I sincerely and humbly ask my friends and supporters to join with me in a pledge of dedication to victory this November—a victory which above all shall mean that we are a party fit to govern.

This is a significant year for the Eisenhower administration. It is significant because it will make the record upon which Republican candidates must stand, and it is significant because on that fateful Tuesday in November next will be decided the control of those committees of the Congress which will determine the future history of the President's legislative program.

Republicans here in New Jersey still control the legislature and because of our majorities we must reassume our responsibilities as the instrument of action and accomplishment.

In Trenton we must steer our course clear of purely obstructionist tactics. Our duty at the State level is as a party of opposition devoid of destructive political considerations. At the county and municipal levels, our respective local governments—under Republican control—have become models of efficiency, economy, and good government.

The nominees of our party for these local offices possess all the necessary qualifications to preserve this enviable record.

At the Federal level, our Representatives in the Congress completely reflect the needs and the views of the people of their districts. They have proved themselves capable of leadership in so many instances.

It would be childish for anyone in the so-called upper Chamber to tell a group of the worldlywise that he has never had differences of opinion with members of the lower House. But I have worked with the Republicans of our congressional delegation for many years, and I know how sound and conscientious and hardworking they all are.

Have you paused to reflect on the absence of "flannelmouth" disease among our colleagues of the House of Representatives? It is a political disease, you know. Its absence among New Jersey Republican Representatives is a healthy sign these days. This is the mark of men—in opposition to the methods of demagogs.

It is not only our privilege and duty to reelect our sitting Congressmen, but our solemn obligation to support these party men and insure the successful continuance of the Eisenhower program, for they have loyally supported the principles of that program.

Moreover, Republican voters have nominated fine young men to accomplish what we have failed to do in the past in regard to the unseating of 5—now 6—Democratic Congressmen from our State.

Bill Freeman in the 4th District, Ed McGlynn in the 10th, Fred Shepard in the 6th, Phil Insabella in the 11th, Norman Roth in the 13th, and Vincent Dellay in the 14th are fine men whose records of public service merit the favorable consideration of the people of their districts.

Only one thing seems to me to be missing from this galaxy—a feminine name. I truly hope that our party will some day soon nominate a member of that wonderful sex and give women the opportunity to rally their own and make good use of their innate respect for good government in high national places.

There are, after all, 11 lady Representatives and 2 lady Senators down in Washington these days.

Senator Margaret Chase Smith has compiled an enviable record of accomplishment and forthrightness in her years of public life. Her presence as a next-chair neighbor of mine on the Senate floor has been inspirational to the point of making me wonder why we don't have many more like her in the Senate.

The political situation in the Senate of the United States is naturally quite near and dear to my heart.

No less important than in the House is the need for numerical control so that Republican committee chairmen can carry the ball for the Eisenhower administration.

We need look no further than our own distinguished senior colleague, Alec Smith. In his committee chairmanships, he has served and sacrificed, and he must be supported by the election of a junior colleague of the Republican faith.

My friends and associates, don't let anyone tell you that this coming campaign for the Senate seat will lack interest and become anything like a routine matter.

Already we hear talk of our energetic and personable Governor under discussion for higher office on the Democratic ticket.

What grander and more glorious feather could be claimed by our opponents for their political caps than a Senate seat which has been traditionally Republican?

Yes; the governor and his party will sound the alarm for all loyal party workers this fall—of that, you may be quite sure.

There are now 47 Republicans in the Senate of the United States compared with 48 Democrats and a single independent. None of us requires an adding machine to determine what will happen to our Republican-controlled committees if the party should lose a single seat—say, in the State of New Jersey. No need, therefore, to ask why victory is essential.

For the sake of our Nation—for the sake of the free peoples of the world who look to us and depend upon us for leadership, that progress must continue under the competent, skilled helmsmanship of Dwight D. Eisenhower.

Let me hasten to add that with all the President's patriotism, all his rich experience, all his courage, and all his skill, he cannot survive the storms by which we are buffeted today unless each member of his crew is loyal to his command and to the principles under which he has sailed forth so brilliantly.

Our political fortunes of this fall are intertwined with our hopes for the presidential year of 1956. The Republican Party is not going to win the Presidency at that time unless the Congress brings to flower the carefully pruned buds of the President's legislative program. The American people will expect nothing less.

I hope that Dwight D. Eisenhower runs for reelection—even if he must be drafted in 1956—but not even this immensely popular President is apt to win again unless a Republican 84th Congress enacts the bulk of his farsighted and fairminded legislative proposals,

When I came to Washington to represent in the Senate what in my opinion is the greatest single State in our Union of States, our Government was beset by a decadence which has had no counterpart in our Nation's history.

Graft, corruption, and subversive influences had well nigh destroyed integrity in most high places in our Federal Government. Twenty years of laxity and promiscuous treatment of major programs, both at home and abroad, had corrupted our Congress to the extent that both the House and the Senate had virtually made a complete surrender of their constitutional authority and in too many instances a surrender of their constitutional responsibilities.

It should be remembered that this transition from the ways of the constitutional Republic to autocratic bureaucracy was not a sudden thing, but had taken 20 long years to entrench itself.

Then, in November of 1952, the people of America remembered Jefferson's warning of "eternal vigilance" and they delivered their Nation from political bondage and gave their mandate to a new administration.

Now, during the past year and 4 months, we have been able to observe the contrasts between mediocre government, to put it mildly, and sound, progressive government. We have sensed and seen a revived spirit of integrity—a desire on the part of the administration to serve all of the people, not just those who contributed in one fashion or another to keep a political machine rolling along.

My call to you today is simple. It requires the subjection of any personal will to the goal of victory this November. It has been done before in the interest of party unity. I call on all of you to maintain a single-minded purpose once again.

The Republican Party of New Jersey has nominated for the United States Senate a man who embodies all the principles of President Eisenhower.

Clifford Case stems from a most distinguished New Jersey family which has contributed much to our State and to our party. His distinguished uncle, our former Chief Justice, Clarence E. Case, has set an example for my own personal standards of conduct.

Clifford Case served in the house of assembly with distinction and with a particular sense of responsibility for his duties. His service was all the more dedicated because this was during the period when the annual salary of a poor assemblyman was only $500 a year, plus a sometimes helpful railroad pass. Cliff Case went on to big things in the house of representatives. For five terms the people of Union County overwhelmingly elected and reelected him to office.

Now, we hear a good deal about party loyalty these days in New Jersey. There is talk about being a good Republican or a bad Republican; a middle-of-the-road Republican, or a left-of-center Republican; a real Republican or an imaginary Republican.

As one who has been a Republican all my life, I naturally am concerned about these political tags. Surely, there are basic tenets of the Republican Party whose banner party candidates are expected to grasp firmly and lovingly.

Naturally, there is a solid line to which all candidates are supposed to hue.

But as I think back over these years, I get to pondering those definitions, and somehow they seem to take on new meanings and new shadings, so that what seemed a bit on the radical side when my blessed father was an ardent Republican, no longer is disturbing to me in the fresher context of present-day national and world conditions.

We thus recognize the obvious fact that our party must keep in constant step with progress.. There can, of course, be no compromise of basic principle; no begging of the simple, human, Republican ideology that government which governs least, governs best.

I know Cliff Case to be a man of honor, and having accepted the nomination of our party, I feel deep in my heart that he will adhere to its fundamental principles and support its platform.

I hold the conviction that Clifford Case will at the same time exert the kind of leadership which is to be expected of an enlightened follower of the Eisenhower program.

I carry within me a belief in his elemental goodness and that he will give the people of New Jersey a United States Senator of outstanding stature in the troubled years which lie ahead of us all.

In politics, we take the bitter with the sweet. All of us have learned to do just that. There is no place for rancor in this party.

Personal misgivings must stand aside for the permanency of loyalty to a good cause—a cause in which all of us Republicans gathered here today must passionately believe.

I join you today in the prayerful resolve that no obstacle, no division, no factional or local loyalties dare raise their heads to circumvent unselfish unity, to prevent the establishment of an unshakable oneness of purpose, sufficient in its power to carry to a sweeping victory on this November 2 the New Jersey forces of an Eisenhower crusade.

Let us here in New Jersey dedicate our stake in this crusade to a renewed faith in our State leadership and in the surging standard borne by Clifford Case, for faith in our just cause must come easily when that dedication has as its purpose a profound belief in our God and in the people of our country.

The War Against Public Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY M. JACKSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 11, 1954

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, on May 4 my colleague, the senior Senator from Washington, addressed the American Public Power Association's meeting in Chicago at its annual convention. He described the tactics the private power interests of this country are using in their war against cheaper and more abundant kilowatts.

I ask unanimous consent that Senator MAGNUSON's address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WAR AGAINST PUBLIC POWER

(Speech by Hon. WARREN G. MAGNUSON, of Washington, to American Public Power Association's convention in Chicago, May 4, 1954)

I am delighted to be here today to discuss with you problems of great mutual interest. I thank Alex Radin and your officers for the invitation. The American Public Power Association and its members are fighting for their very existence.

The private power interests of this country have declared war on you. They have mapped their strategy; they have launched their campaign. The battle is on; the password today is "Fight together or be decimated separately."

What have you done to merit this attack?

You have brought more and cheaper kilowatts to consumers in many sections of this great country. You have established yardsticks which demonstrate that power can be generated and delivered to the consumer at rates far below those charged by private companies before you came into the picture.

Further, you have demonstrated that the farm people of this country can have electricity without having to build the line and give it back to the power company.

You are a threat to monopoly—and so war has been declared and the fight is on.

Your opposition is not fighting alone. The power combine has strong allies. Those allies sit high in the councils of the present administration, and they are using the powers of this Government to cripple your program.

Who are some of these allies?

At the head of the list is Secretary of the Interior Douglas McKay. Standing at his right is his Under Secretary, Mr. Tudor—and on occasion, these two great warriors are joined by their Chief, the President of the United States.

It was President Eisenhower who dubbed TVA an outstanding example of "creeping socialism."

You, in this audience, who believe that TVA has been good for the States and the country it serves, are "creeping Socialists."

Because I happen to believe that there are some things the Federal Government can do—that there are some things the Federal Government should do—to develop resources of the people for the benefit of the people, I, too, am in that category.

Those who would cripple or destroy the Federal and public power program in this country have a variety of weapons in their arsenal. During the last 20 years they were quiescent. They were present in the halls of Congress—they were present in the halls of the executive departments—but they trod softly.

Those were the years when the Federal Government was, in truth, a senior partner in the development of our water resources. A stiletto was thrown occasionally—but the program went forward.

Today the climate in Washington is symbolized by the term "big business"—and the private power companies of this country are big business.

To prove the point, I read from the April 18 issue of the Nashville Tennessean. Here's the lead paragraph:

"Purcell L. Smith, head of the Nation's private power lobby, declared yesterday his organization got its money's worth from the $547,789.32 it spent on influencing legislation and other activities last year."

According to the reporter, Purcell Smith declared—among other things—"our objective, of course, is that the Federal Government should not appropriate one nickel for TVA."

I am sure that same thing applies to the Northwest, South, and the Northeast. There is plenty of evidence that the private power lobby is winning some skirmishes—and gradually the overall strategy—gradually the pattern of attack is being revealed.

Here are some of the actions designed to cripple you and ultimately to eliminate you from the power picture.

Without a continuing and expanding power supply, you cannot serve your customers. In my own section of the country the Federal Government accepted the responsibility for developing the main stem of the Columbia River and its tributaries.

We were making good progress. An attack has been launched at the very source of low cost power, namely, the dams themselves.

Appropriations for Chief Joseph and the Dalles Dams were cut so deeply by the Bureau of Budget and again by the House that those great projects will be delayed at least 1 full year. The loss in revenue from a year's delay on the two dams is over $18 million.

Furthermore, there are no new projects in sight. So the tactic becomes clear—delay the projects under construction and block any new starts.

Another tactic is to cut your transmission lines. How is that done? By cutting appropriations.

Last year Bonneville Power Administration had a construction program of $43 million. This year Bureau of Budget trimmed it to $30 million and the House of Representatives cut it to $18 million.

The Secretary of the Interior is asking the Senate committee, on which I serve, to bring it back to $25 million. Even with this restoration, there will be no new lines started in fiscal 1955.

The tactic is even better illustrated in the Southwest and Southeast. There the administration has declared that the construction program is completed. Public agencies can come to the bus bar to get their kilowatts, or they can take them from the lines of the private power companies.

Another tactic is to drive up the rates of the public agencies. How is this done? Well, there are a variety of ways—the first is what I call "the allocation of cost method."

It is best illustrated by McNary Dam. There it is proposed that 92½ percent of the cost of the project be allocated to power. That means higher rates—and higher rates on the Federal system mean less competition for the private companies.

Another method is the wheeling agreement. The transmission line of the private company is inserted between the bus bar of a Federal dam and the preference customers. Ultimately this will mean higher rates.

Then there is the tactic of filing on power sites to block the people from developing, through their own Government, their own rivers. This is best illustrated by the Hells Canyon fight.

A Maine corporation—which calls itself the Idaho Power Co.—would like to retain the Snake River as its own private preserve.

First, it came to the Federal Power Commission with a scheme for five dams in the Hells Canyon stretch of the river. Now, it is battling for a three-dam development, or so it alleges.

No one knows, if the company gets a license, whether it will build 3 dams, 2 dams, or 1 dam. There is plenty of evidence that one dam is the actual objective.

Recently the company made its annual report to the Oregon Public Utilities Commissioner. In that report it listed its engineering expenditures, and those expenditures are the tipoff.

The company has spent $248,000 for engineering on the Oxbow project—$61,000 for engineering on the Brownlee project—and $15,000 on Little Hells Canyon.

Those figures tell the story. All they intend to do at this time, at least, is to build a little dam at Oxbow. The experts tell me that for the $61,000 the company has spent on Brownlee, they can't even find out whether a dam at this site is feasible, could not even ascertain whether the geology will support a dam.

So the pattern is clear, build a little dam at Oxbow and foreclose the possibility of a high dam at Hells Canyon. Then, having insured underdevelopment of that section of the river, wait until the Idaho market has absorbed the output of Oxbow, at high prices, and then build Little Hells Canyon or Brownlee, but don't run the risk of getting too much power in the Idaho market at one time, because too much power might endanger the rate structure. There is never an oversupply of power, or any other commodity or service, if the price is high enough.

There are still other fronts in this war against public power, this war against cheap kilowatts.

I mentioned earlier that your opposition has strong allies both in the Congress and in this administration. These allies come to the aid of the party through administrative orders, through innocuous-looking legislation and by sowing confusion within your own ranks.

In the Pacific Northwest we had a comprehensive plan for development of the Columbia River System. It represented 20 years of engineering effort. Today we have no plan.

What happened?

Candidate Eisenhower made a speech in Boise, Idaho, and another in Seattle, Wash. He had just conferred with the Northwest governors, one of whom is the present Secretary of Interior.

The candidate announced that if elected there would be a great partnership between his administration and local governments.

That was in the fall of 1952. Now 18 months later, we're still wondering what partnership means. We have a strong suspicion that it means complete abdication—complete surrender—to the private power companies.

The Under Secretary of the Interior and his chief have talked about selling or leasing the Bonneville grid system. Schemes have been devised to sell falling water. It has been proposed that the Federal Government—that means the people—pay for the nonreimbursable and nonrevenue producing features of the projects with private companies owning the power features. Uncle Sam puts up his money but they take their choice.

There has been talk of building projects through sale of revenue bonds—because, it's alleged we can't afford to finance the program by Federal investment. That may be worth exploring, but don't forget, a 1-percent increase in the interest rate on 50-year bonds produces a 14-percent increase in the power rate.

The Federal investment in our projects is being paid off at interest of 2½ percent. All students of the problem agree that money from revenue bonds would cost us at least 3½ percent. Assuming, therefore, that a nonprofit corporation were to build the projects on a revenue-bond basis, rates would be at least 14 percent higher.

If a private company were to build the dams, it would be entitled to a 5½ or 6 percent return on its investment. No one has yet been able to figure out for me how much this would add to the cost of power. I can give you some idea of the increase, however, by citing figures compiled by an eminent engineer when he compared the annual operating costs of the Idaho Power Co. at Hells Canyon with the annual operating costs of a Federal dam.

This engineer contends that the annual cost of the private company would be 10.8 percent of its total investment. Annual costs under Federal ownership would be 5.9 percent. The chief difference between the two is the guaranteed rate of return to the private company of 5.3 percent.

On a billion dollars worth of construction this would mean annual fixed charges of $108 million for the private company and $59 million for the Federal Government. So there go our cheap kilowatts.

So the campaign phrase "partnership" has thrown confusion compounded into the Northwest. Our united front has dissolved—and unless we close ranks our great dream of a Columbia River, producing kilowatts at low cost for the benefit of the people, is shattered.

In the Appropriations Subcommittee a few days age the Bonneville Administrator and Assistant Secretary of Interior Aandahl were on the stand. I had in my hand an Executive order issued by Mr. McKay on April 7, 1954. It replaced an order issued by the same gentleman a year earlier.

The 1953 order was in harmony with the policy followed by Secretaries of Interior for the last 20 years. It designated Bonneville Power Administration as the marketing agent in the Columbia River watershed for dams completed, dams under construction and dams hereafter to be constructed.

The 1953 order went even further. It directed the Bonneville Administrator to operate an integrated transmission system—to interconnect the Federal dams and tie his operation into other publicly owned systems.

The Secretary's 1954 order, however, restricts Bonneville Power Administration's planning and marketing activities to dams completed and those under construction. It lists by name those projects over which Bonneville shall have jurisdiction. It prohibits the Administrator from doing any advance planning on any project in the Northwest that might hereafter be constructed. The order clips his wings; cuts him down to size; is completely silent on the extremely important responsibility of operating an integrated power system.

When I suggested that the order means no new starts and the first step toward the ultimate decimation of the Bonneville grid system, Assistant Secretary Aandahl jumped into the discussion. The only significant thing he said, by way of explanation, was that other Federal agencies could market power from some dams in the Northwest better than Bonneville. He cited as an example the Bureau of Reclamation.

Now the Bureau of Reclamation is building a dam on the Snake River at Palisades. Does this mean the Bureau of Reclamation will market the power from that dam or does it mean that the Idaho Power Co. will come to the busbar to get it? Does it mean that this great Federal project will have but a single customer—that the people will build a dam and the Idaho Power Co. will take the power?

Personally, I'm convinced that is precisely what it means. The company has won a major victory. It has always opposed having Bonneville Power Administration operating in the State of Idaho. The present Secretary of Interior and his associates have capitulated.

There is still one additional tactic in this war against cheap kilowatts—against public power—that I wish to mention.

You have all heard of the electric companies advertising program and its counterpart, the public-information program. In combination they represent a nationwide effort to poison the minds of the people against TVA, against the Southwest Power Administration, against public development of Niagara, against municipally owned systems, and against Federal development in the Northwest.

This program of vilification is financed by contributions of the private power companies across the country. The program is paid for by dollars collected from the customers of these companies. It is directed at the ratepayers themselves. Its objective is to discredit any and all kinds of public-resource development.

The theme song of this nationwide campaign is that the private companies pay taxes—that public development is creeping socialism.

Now, no company pays taxes. The users of the service—the customers—the ratepayers—pay the taxes. A private power company is merely the collecting agency.

The groceryman who collects the sales tax on a can of beans pays that money over to the State—but no one would contend that the grocer pays the tax. The customer pays the tax.

So the argument advanced in this nationwide advertising campaign is a phony. The people who read the ad are paying the tax through the charge for the electricity that lights the very page on which this message is carried.

Electric energy is a basic factor in the cost of doing business in this country. A basic factor in the cost of all the commodities and services we produce. In the aluminum industry, for example, an increase of 1 mill in the cost of electricity results in a 1-cent increase in the cost per pound of the product.

The cheaper kilowatts supplied by the Federal and other publicly owned systems have saved the people, the businessman, the industries of this country millions of dollars. Those savings in cost of production are reflected in profit and loss statements of thousands of firms and hence in tax returns to the Treasury. I say again that the tax argument propounded by the private power companies in their million dollar advertising program is a phony.

There's another attitude or argument advanced by the private companies that deserves attention.

The electric utility business is monopoly in one sense of the word. It is true that it is a regulated monopoly. The companies operate under franchise, and in the case of hydroelectric plants, they obtain a license for the site.

Why and how do they obtain a license?

In the first place the rivers and streams of this country are a public resource. They are owned by the people. The Congress has recognized this fact since the beginning of the Republic.

So if a company wants to use a public resource, it must obtain permission to do so. It is acquiring a valuable asset. Since the people own the asset they have a right to expect it will be used to the maximum.

The Congress has decreed, therefore, that any company that wants a power site must apply to the Federal Power Commission for a license. The Federal Power Commission acts as the agent of the people of the United States in deciding how and whether a license should be granted.

Some people overlook these facts. They resent regulations. They resent control.

They argue thusly: We're a private company; we're free enterprise; we, therefore, have priority on hydroelectric sites, even though the people own them and even though the people themselves would benefit more from public development.

This line of argument is followed with particular fervor—when the site at stake is part of a comprehensive plan—when Federal development can be blocked by sticking a small dam in a big river.

I'm thinking, of course, of the Hells Canyon fight, of Niagara, and of maneuvers in

California—all aided and abetted by allies in this administration.

I don't want to be misunderstood. The private power companies of this Nation have performed a great service to the country and to their customers. We need their investment, their ingenuity, and their efforts, but those efforts should be directed along constructive lines.

I said earlier, the electric utility business is a monopoly. Each utility is dominant in its own service area. Usually the customer has no choice as to which company he will patronize. Competition in the field comes chiefly through the yardsticks provided by utilities in neighboring areas.

In recent years, the real yardstick has been provided by REA's, public utility districts, municipal systems, and the Federal Government. In my judgment, it will be disastrous if the power combine is successful in its campaign against any and all kinds of public development.

No nation—no society—has devised a substitute for the profit incentive. Men work harder and better if there is opportunity for private gain.

Monopoly, however, feeds on itself. It is never satisfied, always it tends to overstep, always it tends to milk and bilk the public, always it wraps the flag of "free enterprise" around it.

We saw this happen in the twenties. You remember the abuses which led to the Utility Holding Company Act. The Federal Power Commission squeezed almost $2 billion in water out of their stock. The holding companies milked the public for that amount. We do not want a return to that decade of plunder.

The Utility Holding Company Act dissolved a nationwide combine—clipped the wings of Electric Bond & Share. But I fear that conspiracy is on the march again.

Personally I believe the private power companies of this country are acting in concert. I don't know whether they are violating the letter of the law. Their techniques are different than in the twenties, but they may be just as deadly.

I have already mentioned the half-million-dollar-a-year power lobby in Washington, D. C., and the electric companies' advertising program and the so-called public information program.

In addition, policy control of many companies is exercised through interlocking stock ownership by investment bankers and insurance companies. Furthermore, there are the service contracts between most of the private companies and EBASCO—and EBASCO is the wholly owned subsidiary of Electric Bond & Share.

Through these media each company knows what the other is doing. Through these media the war against cheap kilowatts—the war against public power—is waged.

Senator Langer is chairman of the Antimonopoly Committee of the Senate. I am confident he will uncover some very interesting information in this field.

In closing I go back to my original thesis. Private power companies of this country have declared war against you. You are in a fight for your very existence. The companies have strong allies in this administration.

In the name of a balanced budget, free enterprise, and an advertising slogan, these allies are aiding and abetting the private power combine.

The tactics are cut transmission lines, stop new dams, file on hydro sites, raise rates, sow confusion, divide public-power forces, and ultimately conquer.

You, too, have allies in the Congress of the United States. We are with you in this battle and there is good prospect that a better climate will prevail when the 84th Congress convenes.

I have enjoyed being with you. We have just begun to fight.

Twenty-Sixth Anniversary of American Forum of the Air

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER FERGUSON

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 11, 1954

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, on May 9, 1954, the American Forum of the Air observed its 26th anniversary. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record a congratulatory statement which I have prepared in connection with this occasion, and also a letter which was written to Mr. Theodore Granik, founder and producer of the American Forum of the Air.

There being no objection, the statement and letter were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Congratulations on 26th Anniversary of American Forum of the Air

(Statement by Senator Ferguson)

On Sunday, May 9, many of our Senate and House colleagues attended an outstanding anniversary in the history of American radio broadcasting and telecasting.

It was the 26th anniversary of the founding of Theodore Granik's National Broadcasting Co., American Forum of the Air, radio-TV program.

A tremendous crowd was on hand to celebrate this fine occasion. A unique program was featured, with the distinguished chairmen of the Republican and Democratic National Committees, Mr. Leonard Hall, and Mr. Stephen Mitchell, serving as guests. Each of the chairmen was interrogated in turn by four legislators from the opposing party. A lively, rapid fire of questions and answers ensued.

Someone remarked that this was in effect a Congress Wants To Know program, somewhat similar to the famed Youth Wants To Know show. This is the companion radio-TV program which has been produced by Ted Granik with such outstanding success, and which has contributed so significantly to the education of our young people, and to increased respect for their role in the American way of life.

The 26th anniversary of an entertainment show might ordinarily go unnoticed. But this particular show—American Forum of the Air—has played an important role in American history.

If you and I were to turn back the pages of history to 1928, we would see that there were no such things as the forum, discussion type of program, such as occupy the airwaves today.

It remained for an inspired, enterprising, courageous young lawyer, Ted Granik, to think up the idea to sell the idea to radio leaders, and then, most important of all, to carry out the idea.

For 26 years the forum has prospered. It ushered in a dramatic new era in radio and television history. All sorts of imitation shows followed in its wake.

During this period there has been no significant issue which American Forum has not fearlessly reviewed.

I think it is an amazing record that in all this period, although issues of the most explosive nature have been debated, although feelings have time and again run high, there has always been a universal respect for the integrity, the impartiality, the dignity with which the founder-producer conducted the program.

During this over quarter of a century virtually every chairman of every single significant Senate and House committee has been on the program. Former Presidents of the United States have been on it, holders of every Cabinet post, outstanding leaders of private life. All have enjoyed the experience, as I have, and as the American people have—in viewing and listening to its provocative discussions.

In connection with the 26th anniversary, I send to the desk the text of a letter which was signed by the leadership of the Senate and the House of Representatives, as a fitting and eloquent tribute to Ted Granik.

It is a tribute, however, not just to the man, but to the NBC network and to all the individuals who have contributed to the program. It is a tribute to the civic-minded sponsors who have helped maintain it, as well as to the public-spirited stations who have carried it as a public service.

So long as the airwaves feature programs like American Forum—wholesome, spontaneous, unrehearsed, fearless—we need have little fear for our free way of life, for such discussion means an enlightened, thinking America.

United States Senate,
Committee on Appropriations,
May 3, 1954.

Mr. Theodore Granik,
Founder-Producer, American Forum of the Air, Washington, D. C.

Dear Ted: On the occasion of your 26th anniversary in the broadcasting and television industry, we want to convey to you our warmest congratulations and best wishes for many more years of outstanding success.

America today needs, more than ever before, the type of frank, fearless, spontaneous discussion of the great issues of our times, such as the American Forum of the Air—the Nation's oldest such program—pioneered in and today continues to symbolize so well.

America needs the constructive participation of America's young people; the encouragement of their thinking and bringing forth of their contributions—which Youth Wants to Know pioneered in and continues to so ably present.

The National Broadcasting Co. can indeed be proud of these two programs which add so greatly to the prestige of broadcasting and telecasting as a whole.

We join with your countless friends within the Congress and in private life in our heartfelt felicitations on this inspiring anniversary of your service.

Sincerely yours,

Joseph W. Martin, Jr.
Richard Nixon.
Charles A. Halleck.
Earle C. Clements.
Homer Ferguson.
Styles Bridges.
John W. McCormack.
Lyndon B. Johnson.
William F. Knowland.

What Ails the United States Senate?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. HENDRICKSON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 11, 1954

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues in the Senate an article written by the distinguished junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. Flanders] entitled

"What Ails the United States Senate?", appearing in the New York Times magazine of Sunday, May 9, 1954. I congratulate the junior Senator from Vermont on this outstanding article. It points up many of the faults of the Senate and does it very courteously. I feel, Mr. President, that this timely article should be incorporated in the Appendix of the RECORD, and I ask unanimous consent that that be done.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT AILS THE UNITED STATES SENATE?

(By Hon. RALPH E. FLANDERS, of Vermont)

WASHINGTON.—Public opinion, we are told, inclines strongly to the idea that the repute of the United States Senate has gone into a decline. It is said that it has lost much of its prestige and dignity in the public eye and there is a feeling that it must radically change its procedures.

The number of people who hold this view of the Senate undoubtedly has been increased by the acts of some Senators who, while adhering to senatorial courtesy in dealing with fellow Members, do not extend the same courtesy to the general public. To pinpoint the matter, some of the loss of prestige is clearly the result of the irresponsible methods of a few Senators in their recent conduct of investigations.

It is the purpose of this article to examine the reasons for this view and the specific charges made against the Senate, and to suggest remedies for such of the charges as seem to be well taken.

The criticism of the Senate boils down to three things: (1) That it wastes too much time, especially in filibusters; (2) that it lacks discipline and so acts slowly and irresolutely; (3) that it often abuses its investigative powers. I am going to take these criticisms up in order.

Before doing so, however, I want to say that the Senate looks much worse from the outside than it does from the inside. The writer came to the 80th Congress in 1946 with preconceptions much like those of other private citizens. Without being acutely conscious of the fact, I somehow carried along the cartoonist concept of fat, stupid, narrowly self-seeking politicians. Of course, I knew this was not the fact. Yet somehow this cartoonist's expectation accompanied me in a subliminal sort of way.

I found, to my delight, that I had been elected by my fellow citizens in Vermont to the most able and intelligent body of men that it had ever been my fortune to meet. I did not agree with all of them all of the time. With some of them I was never in agreement. Yet they were, with very few exceptions, extremely able.

Another pleasant discovery, not unexpected, was the general rectitude of their private lives, which was not always displayed by some of the conspicuous members of the Senate in past generations. These qualities I have found to continue through all my service in the Senate.

But enough of the merits, let's get down to the demerits.

First. It is charged that the Senate wastes time on an enormous sccale; that it is given to fiddling while Rome burns. It is said that members pay little attention to their duties on the floor and that, even worse, they often waste time in a purposeful, organized way of engaging in filibusters.

There is some basis for the charge of time wasting. There are a few subjects on which a Senator cannot make his point effectively in a half hour at the most. Some of us take 2 hours instead. Prolonged harangue is one of our worst faults.

Yet there is also some misapprehension on this point. Casual visitors to the Senate Gallery go away with a dim view of that body's attention to business, unless they chance to sit there in the concluding hours of debate or during a rollcall vote. Many of them must suppose that they are seeing the important work of the Senate and that it is being neglected. As many visitors have come to know, they are not observing important matters, but perhaps only an unnecessarily extended oratorical effort. They might not be far wrong if they viewed the visits of occasional Members to the floor as cases of men who are being run ragged and come in for a brief breather.

The trouble is that Senators are under a great pressure of routine duties away from the floor of the Senate, especially those connected with committee assignments. To illustrate this pressure of committee work, take my own case, which is about the average. I am a member of two Senate committees, the vice chairman of a joint Senate-House commitee, the chairman of three subcommittees, and a member of three other subcommittees.

Now these duties for the most part involve details, though interspersed among the details are subjects of major significance. These latter are seldom plainly evident. They appear as matters relevant to the details, and in view of their magnitude and complication, are all to easily neglected. For the details are immediately insistent. They almost compel concentration on the minute and neglect of the eternally essential.

Besides this spate of legislative detail we are beholden to our fellow citizens in the home State. We can and should represent them in hundreds of matters which arise with them as veterans, dependents of enlisted men or of veterans, Federal employees, business employers and employees, farmers, recipients of social-security payments, and all the other contacts of the citizen with his National Government. Let it be said at once that this personal relationship does not produce the strain that comes from the multitude of legislative responsibilities, because the efficient, loyal, and intelligent office staff which most of us possess takes much of the routine load from us.

But with all of these multitudinous duties and responsibilities to be looked after, there is not a great deal of time left to spend on the floor unless the matters there actually require a Senator's presence. Absence from the floor is not neglect of the public's business; frequently it is the only way to get it done.

A more serious time waster is the filibuster. The purpose of the filibuster is to give to the minority the power to delay or prevent legislation on a question before the Senate. The rules of the House do not allow this power to the minority. Their Rules Committee controls debate, and the 5-minute rule is in frequent effect, whereby the individual Congressman confines his remarks to that period and then extends his remarks in the printed RECORD.

The application of such a procedure in the Senate is out of the question. The number of Senators is smaller, permitting more time for each. Most importantly, by custom and by the intent of the Founding Fathers, the Senate is a deliberative body. This is taken for granted in the House. It has not been unknown for that body to send us a bill containing certain undesirable features in the hope and expectation that we will amend and correct it.

All that does not mean, however, that there should be no way to close debate. Our present rules are faulty in that they provide for cloture only on a favorable vote of 64 Members. Unfortunately, experience has shown that it is almost impossible to obtain this number of votes on a cloture motion; any Senator may block the closing of debate simply by staying away from the floor when the vote is taken. He need not vote on the motion at all, but, by failing to appear, has just as effectively prevented the motion from being adopted.

The writer would not deny the right to filibuster. He recognizes that it has useful applications. As an example, a Senate filibuster blocked the passage of the bill to pack the Supreme Court. This served a useful purpose in that the weeks of debate finally aroused the electorate to the dangers of the bill, so that enough Senators changed their positions to insure its defeat. To preserve this useful delay we must never make cloture too easy. To apply it by a majority vote would be most unwise. Application by a two-thirds vote of Senators present after a reasonable period of debate and on due notice would more nearly remedy the evils in our present practice.

This is unlikely to happen, however, since cloture cannot be applied to a motion to change the Senate rules. Any attempt to change the antifilibuster rule can be filibustered to death at present, but support for a new rule is growing.

Second. It is charged that the Senate lacks a much-needed discipline.

True, party discipline in the Senate is notoriously weak. This does tend to delay action on many important matters. Yet senatorial individualism is essential in some ways to our form of government.

In one respect party discipline is strong. At the beginning of a new Congress, every 2 years, the parties organize internally. In the Senate this means that party floor leaders, whips, and chairmen for the policy committees and party conferences are selected in party caucus. The majority party also nominates its President pro tempore. Besides this a Committee on Committees takes on the involved task of assigning committee memberships on the basis of seniority preferences and, for the majority party, committee chairmanships on strict seniority.

Each party recognizes the right of the other to determine its own organization. It was possible to organize the Republicans as a majority party this year because the lone Independent member, Senator MORSE, of Oregon, announced that he would vote Republican on organization matters. This made an evenly divided Senate, controlled by the vote cast by the Republican Vice President in case of a tie. On these matters discipline is automatic. But the lack of a strong majority or, indeed, of any majority at all, has complicated party discipline at the next level, that of procedural measures.

It is a little difficult to define procedural matters as distinguished from substantive ones, but there is a recent case which will serve to illustrate the point. The resolution for Hawaiian statehood was then before the Senate. It would serve Democratic interests to admit Alaska if Hawaii were to come in, or at least so the Democrats believed. The motion to consider the two Territories together could be classed as a procedural one. The Democrats voted solidly for joint consideration, as they always do on a procedural matter. On the Republican side 2 Senators gave live pairs to absent Democrats, thus losing their own votes, and another voted with the Democrats, making a difference of 4 votes in the result. Had the lines held solid on our side of the aisle as on the other, the Vice President would have cast the deciding vote. It should be possible to bring the Republicans into as strict discipline as are the Democrats.

On questions of substance the situation is quite different. The loyal administration supporter cannot be expected to agree 100 percent with the administration's legislative program. Where a question of judgment is involved that is not fundamentally serious, the supporter should support. But when, as sometimes happens, he believes that a serious mistake is being made, he must vote according to his conscience. In that case party discipline requires that the Senator in question shall report his intention to the appropriate administration chief, and not wait until his vote is recorded before his defection is revealed.

This opens up a matter which is not generally appreciated. Since coming to the Senate in the 80th Congress I can recollect no instance in which a controversial bill of major importance could have been passed by one party alone. The passing vote was made up from both sides of the aisle. There is a deep division on the Democratic side between the North and the South. Among Republicans there is a similar division between the Midwest and the coasts. In the face of these divisions, party discipline on either side sometimes vanishes into thin air.

But this seemingly anomalous condition is a most fortunate one. It alone makes our two-party system possible.

The third and perhaps most serious charge against the Senate is that in its investigative capacity it has now descended to antics and fireworks which have demeaned and diminished its legislative function.

This is not true of most Members of the Senate. It is, unfortunately, all too true of a few Senators, whose actions have tended to cast doubt, not only on their individual responsibility but that of the Senate as a whole.

"Senatorial courtesy" is a well-known phrase that has real meaning. It preserves the amenities on and off the floor as between Senators. I well remember that early in my service I gave a burlesque touch to this formal courtesy. A little later Senator Alben Barkley, then Democratic floor leader, came over and gently suggested that the longer I stayed in the Senate the more I would appreciate senatorial courtesy. Senator Barkley was correct in his prediction.

But of late, sad to say, courtesy has not been stretched to cover the relations between Senators and citizens. Instead of courtesy, we have heard and witnessed inexcusable abuse of citizens, whether they be guilty or not guilty. The abuse is ineffective as well as inexcusable. It plays no useful part in getting the truth out of a witness.

It has been suggested that extremes of behavior by chairmen of investigating committees can be curbed by revision of the committee rules. With this in mind, the Republican policy committee formulated a set of rules and recommended their adoption by each comittee. These rules are intended to correct present abuses by insuring fair methods of investigation and by protecting witnesses' legal rights.

There is as yet no sanction back of these rules. Their acceptance or nonacceptance by each committee will be noted. In case of significant neglect to adopt them it will be possible to carry them to the Senate floor for formal incorporation in committee procedure. This may yet be done.

Another suggested way to deal with extreme cases of abuse of the investigative power is to unseat the Senator. This is a drastic remedy which would take months. How much better it would be if the good sense of the offending Senator should lead his practices into constructive channels.

Beyond all such efforts at internal reform to abolish abuses, there is, it should be pointed out, the problem of the electorate—the people themselves. After all, the real responsibility lies with the States for the kind of Senators they send to Washington. The electors of each State must realize that they are judged by the men they send. That judgment is automatic and inevitable.

There is another responsibility which lies both with the people and the press of the Nation. This is the responsibility to take note of and think about the real problems and dangers confronting the country and not to become obsessed with spectacular sound and fury. Let me illustrate what I mean.

I recently addressed to the junior Senator from Wisconsin some advice which was worded in the strongest terms that were consistent with senatorial courtesy. Important events resulted from this speech—results most pertinent to the subject at hand. The news of my speech covered the country, in the press, by the radio and by television. It went around the world. Letters and telegrams flowed in from all sections of the country. There were more than 3,000 in all, predominantly favorable.

Yet what happened in the coverage of the speech? It concerned itself with the sound and fury which, after all, were transient things. The basic purpose of the speech, however, was to call attention to the real dangers which are creeping upon us and by which we may be imprisoned from without. It made what I believe to be a constructive criticism of our foreign policy in action. It contained suggestion for improvement. The personalities were necessary, but incidental. But the news of the "fight" with Senator McCarthy went around the globe. The serious, constructive parts of the speech were for the most part, unreported.

Because of this, I want to quote from a letter I wrote a week or so later to an old friend, who had chided me, to set him straight on this misjudgment as to the danger—and as to the speech:

"Your friendly letter of March 11 is a clear indication of how far apart we are in our thinking. * * * Your point of view and that on which Senator McCarthy is waging his fight against communism is too narrow. In fact it has become in these last months puerile. Supposing that you and he turned in a 100-percent performance and there were not left in this country a single person to the slightest degree tainted with Communist ideas. What happens while you and he were so busy on the home front?

"What happens is that country after country, continent after continent, falls under Communist domination. Nine hundred million inhabitants enslaved now, 2 billion more in the next decade. With Europe, Asia, Africa, and Latin America in the grip of the Soviet Government, Canada and the United States become shut up inside an Iron Curtain not of our own making. We can sail the seas, trade with the nations, and communicate with peoples only as determined by our Soviet masters. What a fate for a once proud Nation.

"You and Joe are doing valiant work in your small sector. Please, don't interfere with, or discount, our greater and more serious task."

What ails the Senate?

Under the pressure of daily details it has taken neither the time nor the energy to apply itself to the great question of the survival of Christian civilization. Even if it did, the press would take little notice.

But what ails the press gallery?

Its members tell me that their editors will give brief notice to a resolution or bill but are really interested in a fight (e. g., only the polemic portions of my speech of March 9). Theer is no market for ideas (e. g., for constructive parts of my speech).

And what ails the news editors?

They think that the public has a passing interest in new legislation but a passionate interest in a fight. If they are right, then—

What ails the American people as a whole?

When I meet them as individuals, it does not seem that anything ails them. When I speak from California to Texas to New Hampshire to Florida to Minnesota on ideas I find the audiences keen and concerned.

Somewhere the chain of interest has been broken. Is it in the communications link via press, radio and television? Or perchance are there split personalities in our people? Are they one thing in their serious thinking hours when they view our global dangers, and some other things on election day?

If the latter is the case, we may well remember a quotation from the early writings of Woodrow Wilson:

"The Senate of the United States has been both extravagantly praised and unreasonably disparaged, according to the predisposition and temper of its various critics. * * * The truth is, the Senate is just what the mode of its election and the conditions of public life in this country make it."

The Dominant Yearning of Our Time

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 11, 1954

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record a splendid speech made by the Honorable Bernard M. Baruch at the Bernard M. Baruch School of Business and Public Administration on May 3, 1954.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Dominant Yearning of Our Time

(By Bernard M. Baruch)

Several months ago Dean Norton and Dr. Gallagher asked if I would come before you students to talk of some of the things I have learned in my long life. I told them that when I was a student here at City College of New York I never paid much attention to visiting speakers, but, still, if they thought I could help you who are starting out in your adult life I would be glad to try.

I would have preferred to deliver these talks in less troubling times and not when there is so much concern over the threat of war and of a possible economic downturn.

Nowadays it seems taken for granted that it is the Government's duty to prevent another depression. This represents quite a change from the old attitude that depressions were unavoidable calamities which had to be left to run their tragic course.

That old nothing-can-be-done philosophy never did appeal to me. I have never believed that man had to lie down dumbly before anything, whether flood, fire, famine, disease, drought, earthquake, or the effects of man's own stupidities, including that most incredible folly of all—war.

Still, I do not believe that one can ignore economic or natural laws without paying for it.

ACT IN TIME

Every excess has its aftermath—its hangover. Each abuse must be paid for in some readjustment. Often, in fact, we push ourselves to a breakdown, which requires a bitterly prolonged curing period, when that breakdown could have been avoided so easily.

Just think how inexpensive it would have been to have prevented Hitler from breaking loose, compared to the cost of the last war and what has happened since—nor is the end to that cost even in sight. To neglect acting in time can only mean more painful and extreme action later on.

TRUTH NEGLECTED

That may seem like an elementary truth. Yet how little attention is paid it.

Again and again in recent years we played with inflation as with nursery blocks, piling them ever higher even while we knew that the structure could not last. In the struggle for peace we have remained adrift and at sea, unable to achieve decision, or, failing that, to organize our strength to bring into existence the conditions on which a future peace might be built.

In the case of Indochina, for 7 years we let the war there drag on and suddenly we are called upon to act in desperation. What is there lacking there, and why in 7 years have we and our allies been unable to make good that lack?

AN AGE-OLD CYCLE

This apparent inability to act in time may be part of a larger pattern of human behavior, of man's age-old tendency to swing wildly from one extreme to another. In philosophy and in the arts we see this alternation of an age of religious faith with an age of skepticism, of periods of romanticism and realism, of soaring hope and deep despair.

In governmental affairs we are apt to rush from regulating nothing to attempts to regulate everything.

One year we will spend billions arming to our eyeteeth. Then abruptly, we will fling down our weapons, demobilize our forces and scuttle and run as in 1945.

FEAR OF BREAKDOWN

Over the centuries these chills and fevers—these spasms and counterspasms—have averaged out in a general improvement of man's status. This averaging out process—the succession of war and peace, of bust and boom, of enslavement and freedom—has been a bitterly painful one. Often this cycle of adjustment has meant the destruction of whole civilizations. Still, after each breakdown, time has always brought a rebuilding which lifted man to new heights, at least by material standards. If only we could point to comparable advances spiritually.

This chronicle of net progress through downs and ups may comfort the philosophers. It is not of much comfort to us, poor mortals. For there are grave doubts whether civilization, as we know it, could survive another cyclic breakdown.

New weapons of destruction make the prospect of another war an unbelievable horror.

SLAVERY FOR KEEPS

Living as we do, like so many bees in our metropolitan hives, we have become so dependent upon one another that we shudder to think of the social convulsions that might result if our economic machinery came to a temporary standstill as in 1929.

So efficient are the available instruments of slavery—fingerprints, lie detectors, brainwashings, gas chambers—that we shiver at the thought of political change which might put these instruments in the hands of men of hate.

Everywhere we look we could find further evidence of this dread of breakdown. In fact, I think it can be said that this is the dominant yearning of our time—to be freed of these cyclic spasms which have characterized man's history up to now. Can we devise a system of sustained progress in place of the old averaging out of collapse and recovery?

This is the challenge of our time.

This is the crisis of our time.

MAN CAN BE FREED

Now, I, for one, do not see us doomed to remain prisoners of this cycle of breakdown and buildup.

Utopia? That lies beyond us. Even if the perfect state of Eden were recaptured for a day, on the morrow some serpent of envy—or some new gadget maker—would make us discontented with what we had.

However, I do believe, that if we employ the intelligence and experience which is ours, we can transform the more erratic soarings and collapses in human affairs into gentler rises and dips. The valleys of economic depression can be filled up and the peaks of speculative inflation levelled. The dangers of aggression can be minimized while we strengthen that part of the world which is still free and even carry the challenge of peaceful achievement beyond the slave curtain.

Progress without relapse can be ours.

WHERE TO START?

How can we achieve it?

The task is not to think up a number of ingenious actions which can be headlined as a 7 or 10 point program of world salvation.

To achieve the stability we yearn for in this world, we first must find stability within ourselves.

In this quest one enduring principle can be taken as a starting point. That principle might be stated in these terms: We must understand the natural laws which govern our universe and human affairs, adapting those laws to our own uses and, where we cannot, adapting ourselves to those laws.

Savages, for example, crouched in terror before lightning. We have made electricity our servant. When man found he could not walk on water, he did not accept the law of buoyancy as an insurmountable obstacle. He applied that law to build ships. The germs that threatened to wipe out the human race have been made the basis of the antibiotics which destroy germs. I am pleased that medical science is now pressing beyond healing the sick to preventive medicine.

WAY OF PROGRESS

At all times in history, there have been some men who bowed in fearful submission before the forces aloose in the world. Other men rose in angry revolt to defy these same forces. But progress has not come through either of these two groups. It has come from those who learned to understand the natural laws governing these forces and through such understanding adapted them to our needs.

WHAT I BELIEVE IN

That, in short, is the philosophy I believe in, to seek out the course of reason that avoids both dumb submission and blind revolt.

It is a philosophy which does not oppose change, nor does it welcome change simply for its own sake. Instead, it seeks to guide and control change so it can be harmonized with the laws of human existence and thus be rendered less erratic and more fruitful.

It is a philosophy which neither clings to nor ignores the past. It studies the past to learn what can be used for the future and how to profit from the mistakes of others instead of repeating all the old mistakes.

Up to now, one must confess, man has been far more successful in applying this philosophy to chemistry, physics, astronomy, and medicine than to economics, government, or other human relations. Some persons, of course, do not believe that there are any natural laws which govern human affairs. They think of human society as something that has been flung together without rhyme or reason, with no inherent moral, political or economic values, but only artificial rules laid down by those who happen to rule.

THE NATURE OF MAN

I do not share this philosophy. My father, who was a doctor, often told me, "there are no such things as incurable diseases. There are only diseases for which man has not yet found a cure."

In that same spirit I believe there is a nature of things in human affairs as well as in the physical sciences. We may not have penetrated to this nature of things in many instances; but the laws that govern human behavior are there, if we can fathom them.

But even where we know the truth we often ignore it because of greed, hatred, or the unwillingness to discipline ourselves to meet the present unpleasantness, only to face greater sacrifices to make up for our neglects.

It is my hope in these talks to clear away a few of the illusions that obscure our understanding of these natural laws as they apply to several of the more important fields of human relations. My next talk will be devoted to some experiences in economics, to the relation of inflation and depression, or, if you prefer a simpler term, of booms and busts.

That talk will be followed by one which will explore the new role that government is playing in our lives and of the fateful choices this confronts us with.

MOST AWESOME PROBLEM

In the time that remains today, I would like to show how the principle of the adaptation of natural laws finds application to our most awesome single problem—atomic or nuclear energy.

When the task of devising a plan for the international control of atomic energy was put up to me, in my capacity as the American representative before the United Nations Atomic Energy Commission, I found that many persons thought nothing could be done. They felt that man, in sinking his teeth into the atomic apple, had finally bitten off more than he could chew.

Others, wishing that the atom bomb had never been invented, proposed that we repeal history. Specifically, they urged that the use of the atom bomb be outlawed, as if that would permit the world to believe that the atom had never been split.

However, when one studied the nature of atomic energy it became clear that to realize the full, peaceful uses of atomic power, some means had first to be found of assuring effective control over its military use. This fact, may I emphasize, stemmed from the very nature and processes of atomic energy.

THE GIANT'S WRIST

To get the picture think of atomic energy in terms of your own arm. From your shoulder down to your wrist, the production of fissionable material—which is the basis of all nuclear energy—proceeds by identical means, regardless of its ultimate use. Only in the very last stage is it decided whether this fissionable material should go into a power plant or a bomb, whether it is to be used for peaceful or warful purposes.

A would-be aggressor, through a figurative twist of the wrist, could change seemingly peaceful fissionable material into a means of international blackmail and destruction.

And so, to free atomic energy for its fullest constructive potentialities, one must put a controlling chain on its possible diversion to destructive purposes.

CONTROLLING THE H-BOMB

The proposals for such control which were put forward by the United States did not assume that this country would hold its atomic monopoly indefinitely. We had to figure that, in time, other nations would develop their own atomic sources. But whether 1 or 61 nations possess atomic weapons does not alter the fundamental problem. No nation can have effective insurance against atomic destruction unless there is a sure system of control against the diversion of atomic energy to military uses.

The H-bomb and the possible development of the cobalt bomb only shriek this truth all the louder.

NEW ATOMIC PLAN

Some persons would disregard the nature of atomic energy in hopes of getting so-called agreement with the Soviets. But no agreement which ignores the nature of nuclear energy can prove anything but a catastrophic delusion. If the needed controls are unacceptable to any nation that does not mean we should accept less than what is needed. Either we can bring nuclear energy under control or we cannot. If we cannot, why deceive ourselves by agreements which have no meaning?

President Eisenhower's proposal for an international atomic pool will be a worthy endeavor if it succeeds in widening peaceful atomic uses. Still, such a pool, in itself, cannot solve the basic problem of atomic control. Whatever is allotted this international pool, different nations will still hold back the larger part of available fissionable materials for developing atomic and other nuclear weapons.

The dangers of atomic attack would not be lessened.

The atomic arms race would not slacken.

WHOLE LOAF OR NONE

I have always hoped that some plan of effective control would be found that might be acceptable to the Soviets other than the one I proposed on behalf of our Government. We should never give up searching for such a plan. But I do not believe that we, or other nations, dare accept less than a truly effective, enforceable system of international inspection and control. This is one case where half a loaf is not better than none.

Merely to outlaw atomic weapons would penalize those nations which observe agreements to the advantage of those who might not. That was the experience after World War I with the Kellogg-Briand Pact to outlaw war. The authors of that treaty were honored with the Nobel Peace Prize. Yet, as the treaty worked out, it helped delude the peaceful nations into believing that they could neglect their own defensive strength. In doing so, it encouraged Hitler to gamble on overwhelming them with a lightning war.

BALANCED DISARMAMENT

If there is to be peace, we and the Soviets must, indeed, come to some disarmament agreement. But it must be a program of relative disarmament, which balances what one nation gives up against what others keep. Balanced disarmament cannot be built around any single weapon. All the major means of warfare must be brought under control. The difference among them is only one of the degree of destructiveness.

If we can control one weapon, we can control them all. That was our hope in presenting the American plan for atomic control, that in learning to say "A" we could learn how to say "B" and even to eliminate war itself.

But before we can get down to the details of such a balanced disarmament program the world must be assured of effective inspection and control. If nations do not know what other nations are doing, that very ignorance will be a sure temptation to violation of any agreement.

RUSSIA NO RIDDLE

In this day, there is one luxury that none of us can afford, none of us either here in this country or abroad—and that is wishful thinking in regard to the Soviet Government. We must learn to appraise it realistically for everything we cherish could rest on that appraisal.

It has been my own feeling that what should be watched most intently in the Soviet system is how its resources are divided, between what goes to the people who are entitled to so much more and what goes for military purposes, including investment in war-supporting industries. This decision, from its very nature, is bound to reflect the Kremlin's calculations as to the likelihood of war.

Employing that yardstick, the new Soviet budget is not too encouraging. Military expenditures are reported being cut about 10 percent from last year but the larger part of the resources released appears to have been shifted to expanding the war-supporting industries, like metallurgy and chemicals and not to improving Russian living standards.

NO SIGN OF PEACE

In other words, some stretchout in the Kremlin's war preparations may be underway, but the long-promised conversion of the Soviet economy from guns to butter is not yet in sight.

Nearly a year ago, Premier Malenkov admitted that over the last 30 years Russia's so-called heavy industries had grown fifty-odd times while the production of consumer goods had risen only 12 times. Of all of Russia's industrial workers, he confessed, only 30 percent were employed in consumer industries. This is a heavier distortion in the direction of war than characterized even Germany's economy on the eve of World War II.

Yet despite this terrible lag of the past, the current rate of expansion in heavy war-supporting industries is still greater than the rate of increase for consumer production projected in this budget.

There has been much talk of better living inside Russia. Some improvement has been permitted. But no fundamental shift in the allocation of Russia's resources to reduce the dominance of war preparations has yet been made.

I stress that because it has long been my feeling that an increase in Russian living levels was indispensable for peace and would help make the men in the Kremlin more responsive to the desires of the Russian people, who have suffered so much and for so long.

Perhaps it is because I feel so strongly on this point that I am so disappointed at how little more is being given the Russian people.

I wish I could end this talk on a happier note but the philosophy I have sought to set forth here is a philosophy of reasoning, based on experience, and free of either compromise for the sake of expediency or of wishful thinking to avoid what is unpleasant.

It is a philosophy which takes its stand on the solid enduring rock of understanding the nature of the thing, whatever it is, with which we are dealing, whether it be the Soviet Government, atomic energy, inflation, threatened depression, or threatened war.

Man cannot repeal the inexorable laws that somehow result from the great complex of our universe and world community. He might just as well try to repeal the multiplication tables. What man can and must do is to expand his understanding of those laws and to make these laws our allies and not our enemies.

Exactly in the measure that we have understood these laws in the past and have invented the means to adapt them to our need, exactly to that degree has man succeeded in solving his problems of existence. That must remain our guide for progress into the future.

The Consumer's Stake in National Food Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 11, 1954

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an address by Maxwell M. Rabb, Associate Counsel to the President of the United States, before the National Institute of Animal Agriculture, Purdue University, on April 27, 1954. I think this address will be of general interest to all.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

THE CONSUMER'S STAKE IN NATIONAL FOOD POLICY

(Address by Maxwell M. Rabb, associate counsel to the President of the United States)

Senator Vandenberg once told me that America had only one majority grouping in its economic and political life. This one majority group, he said, is a great sleeping giant that had not yet realized its tremendous strength—the consumer.

It is important for you, therefore, as farmers, farm leaders, and those who serve farm people to strive for a better understanding of the consumers' viewpoint.

And so tonight I would like to discuss with you, from the consumers' point of view, the basic question of "the consumer's stake in national food policy."

When I say that I intend to speak from the consumers' viewpoint, I do not mean to imply that I represent them in any official way, or that I have more than a normal understanding of what is in their minds. It seems to me that to speak from the consumer's point of view, one needs only to be a consumer and to allow himself to think as a consumer—in short to react as a consumer.

Now what is the attitude of consumers toward agriculture and particularly toward farm programs?

Most consumers recognize, I believe, that the Nation needs farm programs—programs to help keep agriculture sound, productive, and prosperous. Most businessmen, for example, know that farm income is important—important to them—because it provides a large and profitable market for industrial products. Laborers know that farm buying power is important—important to them—because it makes industrial jobs. Housewives know that agricultural abundance is important—important to them—because it provides the food and fiber for the health and happiness of their families.

Similarly, most consumers know that conservation of soil and water resources is vital. They believe in the value of extension and agricultural education. They are learning more and more about the benefits of agricultural research. They rightly view these programs as being in the national interest.

Many consumers also recognize the need for price supports to keep farm prices and farm incomes from falling too far in times when supply and effective demand get out of balance.

But what virtually all consumers do not understand is some of the obvious inconsistencies in our price-support programs.

The do not understand why farmers should ever have been paid for "not producing."

They do not understand why 350 million pounds of butter should have piled up in Government possession, while the price in the stores remained more than they could afford to pay.

They do not understand why so-called surpluses should mount higher and higher at a cost for storage alone of one-half million dollars a day. The informed consumer is overwhelmed by the fact that the Government now has in possession or under loan about 750 million bushels of corn, 900 million bushels of wheat, 8½ million bales of cotton, a billion pounds of vegetable oils, 385 million pounds of cheese, and nearly 600 million pound of dried milk.

Consumers are willing to go along with reasonable reserves. But excessive reserves just don't make good sense to them.

And that is why this administration has been determined from the beginning to take a good long look at the existing price-support programs, and to develop a program that will serve all the people better. We know that the present programs contain a great deal that is good. But they obviously also contain certain elements that in the long run are detrimental to agriculture in particular and to the economy of the country in general. It is the intention of President Eisenhower and Secretary Benson to keep what is good in the present program, to improve what needs to be improved, and to fill up the gaps that have appeared.

The Nation cannot continue indefinitely under a price-support program that does not fulfill the purposes for which it was intended. The present program has not provided farmers with a stable income—on the contrary, the net income of farm operators has dropped in 5 out of the past 6 years. Nor has this program given consumers the full benefits of agricultural abundance—on the contrary, it has resulted in the biggest Government-held stockpile of many crops in our history.

The American people want—and deserve—a farm program that will fairly represent the interests of producers and consumers. They want—and deserve—a program that will help provide stability. A fair share of the national income, and a maximum of freedom for the farmer. They want—and they deserve—a program that they can understand, approve, and support, whether they live in the city or on a farm.

One of the most obvious defects of the present price-support program is the fact that it excludes from consideration the great changes that have taken place in the diet habits of American consumers. Our people today eat far more fresh fruits and vegetables, livestock, poultry, and certain dairy products than they did a few decades ago. On the other hand, they do not eat as much of cereals, potatoes, and sweet potatoes as they used to.

The statistics reveal that the physical poundage of food consumed per person has changed very little over the past 45 years. But the quality of the diet has changed significantly.

I want to repeat what I said a moment ago—namely, that our present price-support programs do not take account, at least not adequately, of the changing trends in American eating habits.

The current price-support programs are historically related to a number of so-called basic crops: Corn, cotton, wheat, tobacco, rice, and peanuts. These are the crops for which price support is mandatory. But I am informed that these 6 so-called basic crops in 1951 accounted for only 21 percent of the total cash receipts from both crops and livestock. In fact, all farm products under price supports today—including basics and nonbasics, mandatory and nonmandatory—account for only 40 percent of total farm cash receipts.

Here is how the various commodities rank in terms of farm cash receipts: Cattle and calves, dairy products, hogs, cotton, eggs, wheat, tobacco, broilers, and other chickens, corn, and soybeans. I was deeply impressed at the luncheon today to hear that 72 percent of our agricultural production is utilized by poultry and livestock.

Now, it seems to me, speaking as a consumer, that these facts and figures have considerable significance.

There is ample evidence that you could expect a very satisfactory response by consumers if the prices of livestock products were lowered moderately, as they might well be if the artificially high-cost structure of price-supported feed grains were modified. The one significant exception to this might be butter, which is competing against a substitute with a terrific price advantage.

Livestock have become the balance wheel—or if you prefer to put it another way, the safety valve—of American agriculture. By properly emphasizing a livestock economy, we can turn to good use immense crops of grain and grass for which there is no other satisfactory and economical use.

But if we refuse to place a proper emphasis on livestock—proper from the standpoint of consumer desires as well as economic commonsense—we would, in effect, be tying down the safety valve. We would be deliberately permitting vast pressures to build up in the form of unusable grain and other commodities. And the end result might well be that the whole structure of farm programs—with all the good they have done and could do in the future—would be blown to bits.

The Government already has $2¼ billion committed to price-support operations in wheat alone. It has a total of $6½ billion obligated in CCC loans and inventories. During the 12 months that ended February 28, 1954, CCC loans and inventories increased by $3¼ billion, and even this may not be enough.

Consumers are rightly concerned about this rapidly growing accumulation of Government inventories and loans for farm commodities. They don't want to continue down this road indefinitely.

Consumers have clearly shown that they want a highly nutritious diet based upon high-protein foods of animal origin—meat, milk, and eggs. The farmers of the Nation have amply demonstrated that they are prepared to provide this kind of highly nutritious diet.

They indicate that the existing price supports, with their emphasis on the "basics," are bucking the trend of consumer food preferences. For example, they place a premium on production of wheat—despite every indication that consumer demand for wheat has seriously declined.

Our economists tell me that total domestic consumption of wheat as food in the period from 1949 to 1953 was about the same as it had been in 1910 to 1914—despite a 60-percent increase in population. In other words, the drop in per capita consumption of wheat in this period just about offset the gains from a much larger population. Now I do not want to leave the impression that it was price support which caused this decline in per capita consumption. On the contrary, I understand that high price supports have had virtually no effect on the quantity consumed as food. But they have largely priced wheat out of the domestic market as livestock feed. And they have also priced wheat out of the export market.

Now let us take a look at corn, our major American feed grain. The production of corn for grain expanded from about 2½ billion to 3.1 billion bushels between 1910–14 and 1949 to 1953. The domestic food demand and export demand for corn have never been of very great significance. Certainly, corn is "basic" to the entire livestock industry. But it is corn as livestock products rather than corn as grain which consumers want and need. Yet it is corn as grain that we are supporting under the present program.

What I am saying is just this: Much of our current trouble with grain stems directly from the fact that our price support programs have encouraged farmers to produce grain as cereals rather than as livestock feed—or to put it another way, to produce corn and wheat for storage, which consumers do not want—rather than for meat, milk, and eggs, which consumers do want and will buy.

This is something that rightly concerns you who are so keenly interested in animal agriculture. By properly emphasizing animal agriculture in our farm programs, our people could consume grain in the form of meat, dairy, and poultry products they prefer to buy.

And the administration has made it very clear that it wants to realign farm programs so that the emphasis will be placed upon the kind of agriculture that will result in this kind of diet.

According to recent testimony of Secretary Benson, when this year's crops are harvested and added to record carryovers of old stocks, assuming normal weather and yields, we can expect to have the largest to total supplies of grains and oilseeds in our history—8½ billion bushels.

We can do either of two things: We can go on accumulating billions of bushels of surplus cereals by holding grain prices artificially high relative to livestock prices until eventually the whole program breaks down; or we can introduce the element of flexibility which will enable these surplus cereals to be converted into, and used as livestock products.

A billion bushels of cereals is either much or little depending entirely on its use. It is a fantastic quantity if stored for Government account. In this form it poses problems, and threatens wastage, for which no one has answers. But worked off gradually in the form of livestock products, it can upgrade consumer diets. Reducing the incentive for excess production of cereals, coupled with price flexibility which will permit these cereals to be used, is a solution which is in the long run interest of all concerned.

Speaking as a consumer it seems to me that we cannot delay longer in attempting to build farm and food programs in line with the welfare and interests of consumers and producers alike. The 140 million nonfarm people in our great land are conscious of and concerned with what happens to agriculture. They will go along on any reasonable price-support program that serves all the people. But they are becoming increasingly alert to anything which they believe discriminates against them or which is unduly costly to the Nation.

Consumers in general don't like to see food stored out of their reach or to see products which they might like to have, such as butter, eggs, potatoes, etc., stored to a point where they spoil or are wasted.

The informed consumer readily agrees that we need more efficient farming and distribution. He gladly goes along with a policy of price supports, let's say, that he considers somewhat comparable with unemployment insurance.

But just as farmers wouldn't want the laborer to have unemployment insurance so high that he would no longer want to work, neither does the housewife want farmers' price support or price protection at a level where it is an incentive for him to produce far beyond what we can consume.

In our modern society there is an extremely delicate balance between all of the various groups of our economy—and particularly between the farmer and the consumer. That is why this administration is making a real effort to face up to the need of fitting our farm and food policy to the interests of the consumers as well as farmers.

I cannot close this discussion without paying to you, as farmers and farm leaders, a most sincere compliment. You have done, and are doing, a tremendous job in providing the American people with the abundance of food and fiber they need for an ever-rising standard of living.

Despite the fact that there are fewer and fewer people living and working on farms, the quantities of food and fiber produced continue to grow. This, in itself, is conclusive evidence of the remarkable job American farmers are doing and can do.

Though I have been speaking tonight from the consumer's viewpoint, I would not have you think that I have anything but the greatest admiration for farm people. Those of us who live in cities are almost totally dependent upon you for our daily sustenance. Most times perhaps we take it for granted. But every now and then the realization strikes home that the only reason there is always food around the corner in the store or market is because our agriculture—and the people who work on farms—never let us down.

By fostering flexibility in our economy and in farm programs, President Eisenhower and Secretary Benson are striving to promote prosperity and stability in the rural economy. They are attempting to do this by a gradual change in policy that is designed to make farm programs serve the best interests of all the American people.

This is an objective to which all of us can, and should, devote our reasonable efforts. The welfare of consumers and farmers is closely tied together. Neither one can long expect to profit at the expense of the other. Both of them can and will move forward to higher standards of living by promoting their common understanding and by working always for the best interests of all Americans.

Only Adverse Decision of British Cabinet May Have Prevented Us From Being at War Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1954

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to do so, I include with my remarks an editorial written by the Honorable John S. Knight, publisher of the Detroit Free Press, the Chicago Daily News, and other major newspapers:

[From the Detroit Free Press of May 9, 1954]

BOTH BLUFF AND PRESSURE HAVE FAILED MR. DULLES

At his news conference last Wednesday, President Eisenhower again urged the free nations to forge a collective-security pact to guard southeast Asia from Communist aggression.

He stated that "most of the free nations of the area and others directly concerned have shown affirmative interest, and conversations are actively proceeding."

This is putting the best possible face on an ugly situation.

True, the British have agreed to participate in preliminary talks on southeast Asian defense.

This does not mean they are prepared to act.

The milder language used by the President, following Britain's blunt rejection of the administration's plea for united action in Indochina, is a diplomatic retreat from our former advocacy of direct intervention.

However, both Eisenhower and Dulles are still hopeful that a regional security agreement, such as NATO and other pacts in the Pacific, can be set up for the defense of southeast Asia.

The realities of the situation do not support that hope.

To summarize briefly what has happened this far:

Prior to the Geneva Conference, France informed our Government that the military situation in Indochina was "desperate" and begged for additional aid.

Secretary of State Dulles then began to talk of "united action" and "massive retaliation" to block Communist aggression in Indochina without, according to James Reston, of the New York Times, "finding out whether he had the support of Congress, the French, and the British, whose backing of the 'united action' policy was known to him to be essential."

His motives were twofold: (1) To bluff the Chinese Communists and (2) to pressure the British.

The Communists called Dulles' bluff by actually stepping up their materiel support to the Viet Minh.

The British publicly refused to take any action pending the outcome of negotiations at Geneva.

The French appealed for a massive American air effort to turn the tide of battle at Dien Bien Phu. According to Joseph and Stewart Alsop, the administration was ready to seek congressional approval of United States air strikes against the besiegers of Dien Bien Phu, having "firmly concluded we ought to, if we could carry our allies with us."

Fortunately for us, the British declined to have any part of such a mad adventure and the intervention suggested by the French was then turned down by Washington.

That brings us up to date. The question is: Where do we go from here?

The interventionists make the point that all southeast Asia will fall to the Communists unless we "save" Indochina.

Conceding they may be right, how do we go about "saving" the situation?

In the absence of "united action" by the other free nations, do we "go it alone"?

The British have no intention of getting into the fight, and the French, although this will be denied, are planning to pull out of Indochina within 6 months.

Therefore, any intervention would be "our war" with American troops fighting not only the Viet Minh forces, but ultimately millions of Chinese Communists.

How would the interventionists carry on such a war? We now have 22 American divisions, 9 in Japan and Korea, 5 in Europe, and 8 in the United States. This is a modest force and spread very thin.

How many of these divisions could be diverted to Indochina without periling what the administration calls our "posture of defense"?

Or, do the interventionists believe we should draft American boys for jungle warfare in Indochina when the French use only regulars and volunteers to protect their own interests?

Do they think the fathers and mothers of this country would countenance another bloody, indecisive struggle like Korea?

And yet the Vice President of the United States has said that he would personally favor using United States ground forces in Indochina should the French pull out.

Senator KNOWLAND, of California, the Republican Senate leader, is even now proclaiming that he would give the "fullest support" if President Eisenhower should ask Congress to approve sending American troops to Indochina.

These are the same men who took credit for getting us out of Korea and bringing home two divisions because, as the Vice President put it, "we were pledged to end the fighting in Korea and avoid future 'little wars' all over the world with Kremlin satellites."

The Vice President said on March 14: "We have adopted a new principle * * * rather than let the Communists nibble us to death all over the world in little wars, we should rely in the future primarily on our massive retaliatory power which we could use against the major source of aggression at times and places that we chose."

As I have said before, Vice President NIXON completely reversed his position within the space of 1 month. He was against little wars on March 14; he and Senator KNOWLAND would be willing to get in them now.

What kind of leadership is this?

While the imminent threat of war has been lessened because our allies have balked at the policy of united action in Indochina, the danger of ultimate involvement is still with us.

There will be less talk for a time of massive retaliation, and the voices of the diplomacy-by-threat school seem temporarily to be muffled, but the pressures for intervention remain very strong.

It must be remembered that only the adverse decision of the British cabinet may have prevented us from being at war today. If Britain had said "yes" to Dulles, the administration was ready with a resolution asking Congress to approve immediate intervention.

A United States carrier task force was standing by in the Gulf of Tonkin with pilots in readiness to blast the Communists at Dien Bien Phu.

Should France's new proposal for settlement of the Indochinese struggle be rejected at Geneva, we could get that close to war again.

And war can provide no permanent solution for the problems of Asia.

JOHN S. KNIGHT.

Importance of America's Technical-Aid Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 11, 1954

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have often commented in the importance of America's technical aid program in helping to uplift the standards of living throughout the world.

In few areas is this program more dramatically visible in terms of its constructive effects, and in terms of its crucial significance, than in the Middle East.

I have in my hand the text of an editorial from the May 1 issue of the famed magazine, Wisconsin Agriculturist and Farmer, of which Mr. Dante M. Pierce is publisher and Mr. Richard S. Pierce associate publisher. The editorial is entitled "Help Others Help Themselves."

It is based on a recent news announcement to the effect that in the village of Nazareth, the birthplace of the Saviour, the Communist Party received more votes than did any other single party—36 percent of the votes. This is an incredibly grim commentary on the status of affairs in the Middle East that this should have occurred.

Certainly the United States must, through its point 4 program and through the United Nations technical-assistance program, continue to supply vital technical aid which is so sound an investment for the welfare of these peoples, and so sound an investment for world peace.

I point out that in the new edition of the boklet "Strength of the International Communist Movement," issued by the Special Subcommittee on Security Affairs of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, we devote several pages to the problem of communism in the Middle East, as well as communism throughout the world. I commend a reading of this committe print No. 2, dated May 1954, to my colleagues.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the editorial to which I have referred be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HELP OTHERS HELP THEMSELVES

The village of Nazareth, in Israel, recently elected more Communists to the city council than members of any other party. What a sad state of affairs in the hometown of Jesus Christ.

Nearly all of the 20,000 inhabitants of Nazareth are Arabs. Many of them refugees. Almost all poor, wretched, and without hope or ambition for the future.

Christ's boyhood home a Communist stronghold. And why are those people voting Communist?

Not because they love Russia. Simply because things look so hopeless. Communism is a religion which offers them a way out. It is a completely false religion offering completely false promises. But the downtrodden find that out too late.

The Western World needs to help such people to help themselves. It needs to practice, as well as preach, the words of Jesus of Nazareth.

America has done more to help others than any nation in history has ever done. But we can do much more to help other peoples to raise themselves by their bootstraps.

Giving away food or clothing won't do much good in the long run. Help them to grow and make their own. Technical assistance, advice, loans for machinery, and American know-how is what they need. Along with the hope and example and freedoms which America can give.

"Inasmuch as you have done it to the least of these you have done it unto Me."

One Hundred Percent Parity for All Basic Farm Commodities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 11, 1954

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a telegram addressed to me by Burnstad Commercial Club, of Burnstad, N. Dak., favoring 100 percent parity for all basic farm commodities.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BURNSTAD, N. DAK., *April 26, 1954*.

Senator LANGER,
Washington, D. C.:

We of the Burnstad Commercial Club go on record this 12th day of April in favor of 100 percent parity for all basic farm commodities. We do not favor any tendency toward flexibility of price support but urge Congress to maintain a production control program which is essential in order to have stabilization price supports.

BURNSTAD COMMERCIAL CLUB,
J. R. BURGAD, *President*.

New Roads to Take

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 11, 1954

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article written by Constantine Brown entitled "Now Roads To Take," which appeared in the Washington Evening Star of Thursday, May 6, 1954.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW ROADS TO TAKE—ALLIES STILL DEFAULTING, BUT WE HAVE MADE SOME NEW FRIENDS IN THE EAST

(By Constantine Brown)

Congress does not share the popular interest in the "great futility," as the Stevens-McCarthy dispute is now being frequently described. The legislators' gravest concern these days is the rapidly deteriorating international situation.

The confusion which appears to many observers to exist in Washington over our stand in Asia is more superficial than actual. There is no rift, according to Republican and Democratic leaders in the Senate, between the executive and the legislative branches of the Government as far as our basic policies of stopping the Reds in that area are concerned. There is also agreement between the two branches that a reappraisal of our overall policies has become necessary in the light of the present attitude of the British and French Governments.

The fact that President Eisenhower has made it clear that he will not send troops to fight in Asia without the approval of Congress should not be interpreted to mean that our policy has become passive. There seems to be no inclination to "repeat Korea"—that is to say, to rush in American troops under an international flag and let the military strategy be dictated by the political and economic interests of our allies. But the consensus of most congressional leaders is that should the free Asiatic nations appeal to us for help to resist the Red encroachments, it would not be denied them by this Government.

The Korean campaign proved a failure because we were tied politically to nations which had either already recognized the Red regime in China or were more interested in not "aggravating" the Muscovites than in obtaining a decision on the battlefields.

A military strategy confined merely to "killing Chinese" and a diplomatic strategy of "punishing aggression" resulted in a skimpy armistice. This gave the enemy good opportunity to open up another active military front in Indochina pregnant with political repercussions. It is no idle talk to say that the resumption of the large-scale military offensive in Indochina, the present epic fight at Dien Bien Phu, and the Geneva tragedy are the direct sequel of an ill-conceived armistice in Korea.

Those who examine international relations realistically cannot complain that the British and the French intend to make their own arrangements with the Communists and leave us in the lurch. Alliances are "alive" only as long as the interests of the parties coincide. The American and the British interests in Asia do not. To us the area from Korea and Japan to Malaya and the Philippines has a vital strategic value to our own security. To our allies Asia has become strategically unimportant, but trade with the 800 million people has become in their eyes a paramount necessity.

European manufacturing plants have been restored to their prewar efficiency, thanks to the Marshall plan and the Mutual Security Administration. These plants are now producing much more than can be consumed by the free nations. In order to keep the flow of production and employment at a high level, the French and British Governments feel that they must acquire some of the vast markets in the countries behind the Iron Curtain. They are willing to bid goodby to the alliance with the United States if we insist in our efforts to bar the Reds' expansionist plans in Asia.

Great Britain and France have already reappraised their international position. They have apparently decided that their best interests would be served in placating the Communists from Moscow and Peiping at Geneva. They have already turned down, at least temporarily, our proposal for a Pacific pact on the pattern of the North Atlantic pact.

In the light of Prime Minister Churchill's speeches, and the tone of the House of Commons, and the mood of the French National Assembly, there are legitimate suspicions that NATO itself may soon become a thing of the past.

Under these conditions, reappraisal of our own foreign policy has become necessary. Fears have been expressed that we may have to go it alone. An evaluation of the international scene shows that despite the defaulting on the part of the allies we have helped most over the years, we still have some faithful friends who are willing to be tied to us because of the common fear of Communist imperialism. In the last few months we have established without any extravagant outlays a new solid front in the Middle East extending from Turkey to Pakistan. While the industrial importance of this group is negligible, its strategic and manpower importance in the event of a conflict in the Far East exceeds by far that of our doubtful Western European allies. There also are more combat ready and fanatically anti-Communist divisions in South Korea and Formosa than there are in Great Britain and France. There is a stronger potential for effective assistance in Japan, with its 80 million people, than anywhere else across the Atlantic.

It is in the light of these possibilities that the administration is now prepared to reappraise our international position.

Texas Farm Prices Still Declining

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 11, 1954

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, a United Press news story, published recently in a number of Texas newspapers, tells how prices received by Texas farmers continue to decline.

The facts in this story, based on Department of Agriculture statistics, are of the greatest significance. They speak for themselves, and I ask unanimous consent that the United Press article be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Farm Price Index Down

Austin, May 8.—The mid-April index of prices received by Texas farmers dropped 1 point from mid-March, and was down 9 points from the same month last year, the United States Department of Agriculture reported today.

The decline resulted from a 3-point drop in the all-crops index which more than offset a 1-point gain in the livestock and livestock products index, the USDA said.

Decreases were noted for food grains, potatoes and sweetpotatoes, and commercial vegetables. Prices of most truck crops were down except for carrots and onions, both of which showed slight gains.

Hay prices increased $1.10 per ton, while alfalfa at $30.50 per ton advanced 50 cents during the month.

A slight decline in sheep prices was more than offset by increased prices on hogs, beef cattle, and calves, the USDA said.

Money Policy: Hands Off Until Fall

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1954

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include an interesting article entitled "Money Policy: Hands Off Until Fall," appearing in the issue of Business Week of May 8, 1954. This article is interesting in several important respects: (a) Showing the financial policy of the present Republican administration during the past 16 months; (b) its changes from the so-called hard-money policy to the so-called easy-money policy, and (c) that during the last campaign it severely criticized the Democratic policy of the past administrations, but that during the past 12 months it has been following those policies.

The article, in part, states as follows:

> For 16 months under the Republicans, the money market has swooped and jerked like a roller coaster. It looks as though that long, rough ride is over.

The article also states:

> Two days later, May 8, 1953, the Fed (meaning Federal Reserve System) started buying Treasury bills on the open market to ease the money supply. From that day on, for a year now, the administration has moved from one easy-money decision to another.
>
> This means that for three-fourths of its 16-month tenure in office, the Eisenhower administration has been on the side of easy money, easy credit, declining interest rates—badges of the very policy they castigated when Democrats were in charge.

The article in full follows:

Money Policy: Hands Off Until Fall

For 16 months under the Republicans, the money market has swooped and jerked like a roller coaster. It looks as though that long, rough ride is over.

The money managers of Washington—perhaps the most active and aggressive team in United States history—have decided to stick to a wait-and-see policy for a period that may last 6 months. Both Federal Reserve and Treasury officials expect to stay there—short of a sharp and unexpected switch in the outlook—until business trends clear up this autumn.

The administration gave a preview of this policy this week. It wasn't labeled that way—but the Treasury's $2 billion trip to the money market was a tipoff.

It raised the money with a 4-year, 9-month note, instead of the long-term bonds it had been hoping to issue.

AVOIDING THE BUMPS

Key officials were frank about the reason for the switch. Nobody wanted to risk even a minor disturbance of business by dipping into the supply of long-term money. A 20-year security would have put the Treasury in competition for investment funds with cities, States, and corporation bond offerings—the most active section of the market. Officials did not want to cause the postponement of a single public-works project, or delay the smallest industrial expansion program. They wanted to avoid even a minor jiggle in the economic recovery they fervently hope for—and are half convinced they now see. So they were willing to forego one of their main ambitions—to put as much of the public debt as possible into long-term securities.

CAREFUL STEERING

This action was a capsule of the larger decision that the chief money managers—the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System—had reached on their own.

The Fed's main purpose between now and autumn will be to avoid anything that might disturb the present satisfactory state of business confidence in the long-term outlook.

In terms of tight or easy money, it means this: The Fed has decided that money is now easy enough to meet needs, and that any further effort to push credit on reluctant businessmen by force-feeding would do more harm than good.

This means at least a temporary tapering off of the series of easy money decisions of the past 12 months. For weeks, the New York and Chicago money markets have expected a reduction of bank reserve requirements, for example. It has been recommended by some of the President's economic advisers, but so far has been stoutly resisted by key officials in the Federal Reserve and Treasury. It's clear now that if bank reserves are lowered at all, it will be described as a move made necessary by Treasury financing needs—not primarily as a move to ease the money supply still further. It's part of the Fed's determination not to overplay easy money as an economic cure-all.

This does not mean a return of tight money. Far from it. The Fed's managers still lean on the side of easy money, simply because we are in a business dip.

KEY

The outlook for interest rates is a key to their thinking. They believe the general trend is still down, because of rising competition among lenders. They are convinced lower rates will show up next in the home mortgage market—perhaps by midsummer. They think declining interest is the essence of good management in a time of business ease, and believe they are therefore fulfilling their chief function successfully. But at present they do not intend to speed up this process, or to try to force it by piling one easy-money decision on another.

Back of this decision is the fear of an adverse psychological reaction if easy money policies are pushed too far. The money managers are afraid of frightening businessmen by seeming to be frightened themselves. They seem extraordinarily sensitive to this possibility—probably because they underrated psychological factors last year, during the tight money period. They don't want to make a similar mistake this year. Their troubles a year ago show why.

1. THE BIG SWITCH

For the first 4 months after taking office last year, the Eisenhower administration was perfectly at home when it came to money and credit. The new officials did all the things they came to Washington to do—encouraged the Federal Reserve to tighten credit, applauded as interest rates went up, moved part of the public debt into a long-term issue, and in general made good on Eisenhower's campaign promises to halt inflation.

Into reverse

It all ended on May 6, 1953—a day when some stern language was heard from some of the governors in the seclusion of the Federal Reserve board room in Washington. The Fed—so this language ran—had committed the unpardonable sin for a central bank. It had allowed credit to get so tight that for a period of 48 hours it had become impossible for good risks to borrow money at any price. This condition was not general. It was, in fact, limited to a few places. But the basic mandate of the Federal Reserve when it was established 40 years ago, was to make sure that business and agriculture had access at all times to credit for legitimate purposes.

Two days later—May 8, 1953—the Fed started buying Treasury bills on the open market to ease the money supply. From that day on, for a year now, the administration has moved from one easy-money decision to another.

This means that for three-fourths of its 16-month tenure in office, the Eisenhower administration has been on the side of easy money, easy credit, declining interest rates, badges of the very policy they castigated when Democrats were in charge.

Mistakes

Officials will defend their decisions on technical grounds—but will confess that serious mistakes were made when it came to judging the reactions of money lenders and businessmen. Board Chairman William McC. Martin, for example, made a speech early in 1953 in praise of a free money market. Some financial experts interpreted this as meaning the Fed was going to remain passive no matter how high interest rates soared.

And Treasury officials, when they launched their 30-year 3¼-percent bond, drummed so hard on the Roman virtues of higher interest rates that the market decided lengthening the debt would be a major goal, at whatever cost to the price of money. Interest rates climbed rapidly, as businessmen scrambled for money to beat the expected price rises.

All this came to a head in the money stringency of last May. Bank reserve requirements were lowered in June, the most dramatic means available to remind the financial community that the Federal Reserve would operate on the side of easier money when events called for it.

No oracle

This decision has been widely misinterpreted, because of the business downturn that began in July. In retrospect, officials say it was done partly to shock the money market out of its obsession with rising interest rates, and partly because the Treasury was going to need a lot of money to meet an unexpectedly large deficit. Treasury needs were so great that it immediately sopped up most of the money made available by the lowering of reserve requirements. So this move, by itself, did nothing to loosen the market. The loosening began a few weeks later, when the downturn developed and private demand for loans slacked off.

The Fed is somewhat embarrassed when it is praised for lowering reserve requirements just ahead of the downturn. It denies any prevision or gift of prophecy, and doesn't want to be held responsible for exercising any such supernatural talents in the future. It did not know the downturn was coming in July, and eased up on the money rules for entirely different reasons. But the Fed is glad it happened.

II. MONEY POLICY AT WORK

The classical arguments for an active money and credit policy usually stress its effectiveness on the upside, to check inflation. But the present team of money managers argues that it is working on the downside, too.

Plainly it has not stopped the recession. But when the reduction in reserve requirements was followed by a decline in the demand for money by business, easy money conditions were automatically restored.

In 9 months, the yield on long-term United States securities dropped 19 percent, and the yield on triple-A corporate bonds dropped 16 percent. This cheapening of long-term money is cited as one of the reasons why municipal and corporate bond offerings in the first 4 months of this year matched the record-shattering first 4 months of 1953. It may also have had something to do with the stepped-up plans of corporations for investment this year.

At any rate, construction stemming from activity in the long-term market is a prime stimulator of business in a time of general ease—and the money managers aren't too modest to claim some of the credit.

Borrowing less

So far this year, the Fed has made two more easy-money decisions: A drop in the discount rate at Federal Reserve banks in January, and another in most of the banks last month. The effect was to make it cheaper for businessmen to borrow from banks. But it has not caused them to queue up at the loan windows. On the contrary, they continue to borrow less and less as they work down inventories and the recession retains its grip. What's more, consumers have lately joined the less-borrowing parade. They are now paying back substantially more than they are borrowing.

All this means that the competition among lenders, which administration analysts believe has been primarily responsible for the long slide in interest rates, is going to continue for a while at least. They know that mortgage lenders have recently joined the competitive push, and are out shopping around for places to put their money. That's why they think rates in that part of the market will drop by midsummer.

Explaining

In line with their increased sensitivity to what goes on in the minds of lenders and borrowers, Federal Reserve officials feel it is necessary to explain the two discount rate reductions with some care—especially the one that most Reserve banks adopted last month when they moved the rate from 1¾ percent to 1½ percent.

The Fed officials want to be sure that nobody interprets these moves as all-out easy-money decisions, intended to dazzle reluctant borrowers with bargain rates. Considerable pains are taken to describe them as merely technical adjustments to get the discount rate more in line with the new low rates on Treasury bills.

Their idea here is plainly to allay any notion that the Fed—backed by the administration—is off on an easy-money spree to try to cure the downturn.

Waiting till fall

It leaves the money managers applauding the results of easy money, but disclaiming the prime responsibility for making it so. This delicate regard for the mental processes of lenders and borrowers may be abandoned if it doesn't get results in terms of a business pickup by autumn. In that case, we'd see another batch of easy-money decisions. But until then, sound psychology has taken its place alongside the sound dollar as a guiding principle of monetary policy, vintage 1954.

Price Supports for Farm Commodities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 11, 1954

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter addressed to me by R. F. Gunkelman & Sons, of Fargo, N. Dak., with reference to support prices for farm commodities, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

R. F. GUNKELMAN & SONS,
Fargo, N. Dak., April 20, 1954.

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Almost every paper and magazine we pick up these days carries at least one or more articles critical of the farm-support program. The arguments used by some of these writers indicate that they know very little about the farm problem. These articles, however, have an effect on the people who do not live in the farming States, or who live in cities, and who in turn contact their Congressmen asking for a complete change in the present farm program. In most instances, these writers seem to leave the impression that agriculture is the only segment of our industry that is having Government support. Careful study of the situation soon leads one to believe that this is far from being true.

I would like to cite a situation that very few people seem to give any consideration to, and that is a continued flow of Canadian grain into our markets; not only does this grain compete with the grain that our farmers grow, but it takes up needed storage room in this country. All of us, I believe, agree that we should trade with Canada, as Canada is our best customer. The reason for our trading with Canada is to give us outlet for our manufactured products. In view of this situation, certainly, allowing the Canadian grain to come in and compete with our farmers is a direct subsidy to manufacturers who in turn find the market for their products in Canada. I attended a meeting of the PMA, Commodity Credit Corporation officials, and grain dealers a short time ago. We were discussing the need for additional storage to take care of any crop we may grow in 1954. A Department of Agriculture official told us that over 3 million bushels of barley crossed the line from Canada into North Dakota during the month of March, while here in North Dakota we have a tremendous bushelage of barley in store under Government loan. It so happened that in 1953 Canada produced a better type of barley than we did in most areas of North Dakota, so the buyers in our markets are naturally bidding up on the Canadian barley to the detriment of the barley produced here in our State.

Last fall, I spent some time in the Eastern States in areas where 25 years ago very little wheat was grown; but due to the fact that the support price on the soft winter wheat that they grow is as high as on our better grade hard wheat of the Northwest, these people have gone into the growing of wheat in a big way, and that is where our surplus has accumulated. I was raised in northern Ohio, and when I was a boy, practically all of the flour that was used in that area was either made by the Pillsbury Mills or by General Mills. This is not true today, as practically all of the flour now in use is made from wheat grown in that area as most flour is put through the bakeries. That is, the housewife bakes very little bread. The bakeries can use part soft winter wheat and part hard winter wheat in a blend and make a fairly good bread, although not the type of bread that we are used to made from hard spring wheat.

If we are going to have flexible supports, the flexible part should apply to the soft winter wheat which never did have anywhere near the market value that our northwestern wheat has had over the years. We should sell the Secretary on that differential. I well recall that in years gone by we saw as great a difference as 30 cents to 40 cents a bushel between soft winter wheat and hard spring wheat. We have no great surplus of hard spring wheat. A surplus that can rapidly disappear should we have a light crop like we had in the 1930's. In fact, nature will take care of considerable of our surplus this year, as the drouth in the Southwest is steadily working further north and gradually taking more and more acres out of production. The last report that we have indicates the reduction of at least 275 million bushels from the production of a year ago.

With the exceedingly dry situation now prevailing over the Great Plains areas, our total production this year may be much less than it has been in recent years, so if the situation should prevail in Canada these large surpluses would disappear very rapidly. I well recall the surpluses during the Farm Board days, a surplus that disappeared within a few years and we faced dangerously low carryovers.

If the matter of farm support comes up in Congress as it will in the near future, I certainly trust you will do everything you can to see that supports are kept on a high level, as that is the only way that agriculture in our State can survive.

Yours very truly,
By R. F. GUNKLEMAN & SONS,
R. F. GUNKELMAN, Sr.

Plight of American Delegation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 11, 1954

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article written by David Lawrence, entitled "Plight of American Delegation," which appeared in the Washington Evening Star of Thursday, May 6, 1954.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PLIGHT OF AMERICAN DELEGATION—CARPING, FAULT-FINDING INTERPRETATIONS IN PRESS BACK HOME TENDS TO DISCREDIT UNITED STATES GROUP AND WEAKEN ITS ATTEMPTS

(By David Lawrence)

GENEVA.—Teamwork between our allies—always difficult to achieve but absolutely essential if we are to checkmate Communist tactics—is slowly emerging here despite earlier discouragements.

Nobody who has not been on the ground at one of these very complex affairs can possibly imagine the plight of the delegation representing the United States of America at the Geneva Conference.

This correspondent has just read a summary of headlines and dispatches in several American newspapers for the last few days, as cabled to officials here, and could not but wonder how it feels to be an American delegate with a carping, fault-finding set of interpretations in many of the articles being printed back home which when reproduced in Europe tend to discredit the American delegation and weaken its hand here.

The facts are simple to state. The American delegation had a broad plan. It was torpedoed in London by the British cabinet before it was launched. Out of deference to our allies and with characteristic poise, Secretary Dulles kept silent. Some one with a more sensitive nature would have blown his top at the outright reversal by the British cabinet on a pledge that had been given. But the British have their troubles, too, and their reasons for moving cautiously. When however, they saw the criticism of their tactics mounting in official Washington, they took steps to repair the breach. The trend now is toward unity, but it is a difficult course to maintain because the British have interests far different from ours and they are apparently not as ready to accept the responsibilities of collective action in Asia, as many Americans had been led to believe.

Unfortunately, also, internal politics in every country, including our own, plays a damaging role and makes negotiating a precarious task. If it isn't a threatened overthrow of the cabinet in France, it's a general election in Australia and, of course, a constant effort by the British Labor Party to unseat the Churchill-Eden government.

None of this, however, handicaps the Communist side. Indeed, the Communists get an abundance of news space not only in Europe but in America. The obsolete propaganda statements of Chou En Lai got equal if not better news treatment in some of the large newspapers in America than the remarkable address by Secretary of State Dulles on the same day. This is a battle of publicity to influence public opinion, and it is tragic that the American press has in some instances been giving the impression that the chief of the American delegation was discredited back home. In fact, one headline from an American newspaper that made a deep impression at Geneva said that Secretary Dulles on his return faced in Washington the stormiest criticism of his career, and there were references to "defeat" and "failure," all of which is utterly at variance with the facts of what actually happened.

This conference hasn't really gotten started. There have been the usual propaganda statements and some informal discussions of ideas and proposals. Any impression that the United States doesn't want to stop the blood-letting in Indochina is false. Any impression that the United States wants to intervene militarily is also false. Any impression that America wanted to go into Indochina with the British alone, is also wrong. There was from the start a basic plan to line up the allies on a policy that would confront the Communists with an alternative if they didn't make peace in Indochina. That policy was conceived as a means of getting strength at the negotiating table. Great Britain approved the policy and then backed out just on the eve of the Geneva Conference, but since then there has been a reconsideration and some of the original plans have been given sympathetic support once more.

One thing needs to be made clear: The United States was given a pledge at Berlin that France would not consent to any plan that meant surrender to the Communists in Indochina. America wants a peaceful settlement there but not by a phony partition plan or by the coalition government trick that wrecked Poland and Czechoslovakia.

So far as Korea is concerned, there also have been some misleading impressions given. The Red Chinese leader called for a general election in Korea without supervision by the U. N. Some of the allies looked with favor on the idea in principle. But there is a lot more to the problem.

Thus, how can there be any free election in North Korea if Communist troops are there? How can there be any campaigning throughout the northern part of the country before the voting takes place if coercion prevails? And what happens to the government at Seoul which has been formally recognized by the United Nations and is operating under a constitution adopted by the people in a free election supervised by the U. N.? Is a constitutional government wiped out just because the aggressors want that done? South Korea will have its regular election for its National Assembly on May 20. Must it have another election later on, and does anybody think the central government at Seoul can maintain the morale of its army—the most powerful in Asia outside of the Communist orbit—if the constituted government is to be decapitated by order of the Communist delegations at Geneva?

These are not easy questions to determine and require a lot of delicate handling if the unification of Korea is to be accomplished.

Airplanes Need Navigators

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 11, 1954

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, on April 7 I raised a question with the Civil Aeronautics Administration at the hearing of our Appropriations Subcommittee as to whether the granting by CAA of permission to remove navigators from flights by Trans World Airlines across the North Atlantic, in Europe, and across the Mediterranean might not adversely affect the public safety.

At this point I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article published in Aviation Week for April 26, 1954, a McGraw-Hill publication, indicating that the Airline Pilots Association, A. F. of L., feels that the pending CAA permission for removal of navigators in the Mediterranean would endanger the public safety. The article is entitled "TWA Pilots Threaten To Walk Out."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TWA PILOTS THREATEN TO WALK OUT—ALPA FIGHTS REMOVAL OF NAVIGATORS ON ROME-CAIRO ROUTE, REFUTES CAA CLAIMS OF IMPROVED AIR NAVAIDS

(By Frank Shea, Jr.)

Trans-World Airlines last week faced the possibility of a mass walkout of its entire pilot force as a result of the company's action calling for removal of navigators from all aircraft flying the Rome-Cairo Mediterranean route.

First flights without navigators are scheduled to go into operation this week. TWA's international pilots have served notice that they will not board the plane without a navigator and threaten a general work stoppage if the company attempts to compel them to fly.

ONE-THOUSAND-FOUR-HUNDRED-MAN WALKOUT

Initially, the problem centered around the international pilots only. But last week, at a master executive council committee meeting of the Air Line Pilots Association, TWA's domestic pilots made it their problem, too. Standing firmly behind the international group, they passed a resolution whereby all Trans-World pilots, 1,400 strong, would walk out if they were required to fly the Mediterranean routes without benefit of navigators.

The airline management, on the other hand, stands just as firm, insisting that the navigators will be taken off the crews this week. Company officials met with pilot representatives last Monday, but neither group would budge. Management said the navigators definitely will be removed. The pilots countered with, "We won't fly."

SAFETY ARGUMENT

The pilots base their argument on the safety factor involved, holding that the running of flights over the Mediterranean between Rome-Cairo and Rome-Lyyda (Lod) Israel, relying on present navigational and communications facilities in that area without aid of a navigator, would be an unsafe operation.

"We're not necessarily sticking up for the navigators in this fight," reported a pilot spokesman. "All we know is that we need them badly in the Mediterranean area. We can't rightfully accept our command responsibilities without them."

CAA BACKING

The company, on the other hand, had Civil Aeronautics Administration's backing in the matter. A CAA staff of aviation safety advisers, headed by Theodore Eckis, recently returned from a tour of the area and reported that "slowly and continuously improving" navigational facilities in the Mediterranean area now are sufficient to permit operations without navigators aboard the flights.

The agency based its recommendation for removal of navigators on the following:

The technical assistance mission of Greece has provided several high-powered beacons and advanced communications facilities in and around Athens.

Radio ranges have been reconditioned at Cairo.

A new nondirectional radio beacon has been installed at Alexandria.

Two high-powered beacons are at strategic points on the island of Crete.

Another high-powered beacon has been installed on the island of Rhodes.

In addition, CAA reported that frequency assignments have been adjusted by various governments in the area and that the former difficulty of finding a clear channel for radio transmission has been cleaned up.

NO IMPROVEMENTS?

Pilots flying the routes, however, professed complete amazement at these statements. Their operational reports indicate that no additional facilities of any consequence have been provided since CAA's July 1953 study, in which it was recommended that navigators be retained because of "inadequate facilities."

They further argued that CAA fails to be specific in listing "new" improvements, "because CAA realizes that there actually haven't been any since their last adverse decision." As one pilot put it: "If anything new has been added, it would sure help if the pilots knew about it."

POINT BY POINT

The pilots took CAA's list of recent improvements and refute them, point by point. Here's their story:

The only improvement in Greece since July 1953 was an increase in the wattage output of the Athens range from 800 to 1,200 watts. But this had to be brought back down to 800 watts due to interference with the frequencies of other countries. The result, said the pilots, was no improvement in Greece.

As far as reconditioning of radio ranges at Cairo is concerned, pilots claimed it was "news to us unless CAA considers polishing and oiling the equipment as 'reconditioning.'"

The beacon at Alexandria is not new. It was there prior to July 1953.

There have been no changes in facilities on the islands of Crete and Rhodes since July 1953. In addition, present facilities on these islands have frequently been found "inoperative" or "off the air" when aircraft are attempting to establish contact.

Frequency assignments are constantly being adjusted by various governments in the area, but to no avail.

The difficulty of finding a clear channel for radio transmission still exists.

DITCHING PROBLEM

The pilots also said there is a distance of approximately 500 miles between Crete and Alexandria over open ocean with no facilities whatsoever. From Catmazaro, Italy, to Alexandria, they argued, there is a distance of over 1,000 miles with no islands or navigation-communication facilities.

"If I have to ditch my airplane over all water," said one spokesman, "I want to be able to get a fix on my location and be able to tell someone where to come and look for me. I exercise a tremendous responsibility over human lives, and I cannot conscientiously insure the safety of my passengers without the aid of a navigator."

RECOMMENDATIONS

In a special report, TWA international pilots make the following recommendations:

Development and establishment of reliable, interference-free, full 24-hour operating radio aids to navigation over every route flown by TWA international.

Installation of more VOR stations enroute and at terminals, and improvement of the reliability and continuous operation of VOR's in existence at Paris and Rome (pilots report facilities are not in continuous operation).

Improvement of and reliable full-time operation of ILS facilities at all terminals.

Continuance of the present crew complement, including radio operator and navigator, over all TWA routes unless it is established to the satisfaction of the majority of pilots flying those routes that, segment by segment, the facilities are adequate.

One major criticism of CAA's action in recommending removal of the navigators over the Mediterranean is that the pilots concerned were never consulted. Pilots claim that their views never were solicited, and that when they were offered CAA refused to listen. Pilots note that, according to CAA regulations, pilots must be consulted prior to any new route approvals including crew changes.

Repeated efforts by Aviation Week to obtain the viewpoint of TWA officials were unsuccessful. A company spokesman reported that the man "most familiar with the situation" was enroute to the Midwest and was not available for comment.

Pilots said the company's chief motive is economy, noting that not only would the navigators' salaries be saved but also absence of a navigator's station aboard the Lockheed Constellation 749A would leave room for an additional eight passengers.

Government Contracts in Foreign Countries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1954

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, the Corps of Engineers today achieved a new high in destroying the rights of American firms who spend their hard-earned money in trying to bid for Government jobs in foreign countries.

The Corps of Engineers has ignored, distorted, tortured, and suppressed the facts in order to make an award of a contract to a foreign firm introduced to them by the State Department. The victim is an American firm which underbid the Panamanian firm by some $60,000.

To cap it all a commitee of Congress, investigating the skullduggery and irregularities, has been told in effect by an Army spokesman to "go to hell."

The facts are these:

The engineers requested bids on November 24, 1953, for construction of nearly $2 million worth of ordnance facilities in the Canal Zone.

In accordance with the invitation to bid, an American firm, United Enterprises, of New Orleans, La., submitted a bid which was received through the mails, was accepted and opened and declared to be the low bid, which it was.

The second low bidder, the foreign bidder, Framoco, Inc., of Panama, protested on the basis of an alleged late bid, then ran to the State Department and what magic they possessed is shrouded in mystery, but the results are clear. Everybody reversed themselves, facts ceased to be facts, regulations evaporated and when the smoke cleared away everyone had changed his story and even a congressional committee was left standing on the sideline, trying to find out who did what and with what.

It was clear from the start that even the white light of a public hearing would not keep the Corps of Engineers from doing what they had planned to do in Washington.

They did not stop at twisting testimony, changing stories, admitting dereliction, suggesting suspicions of fraud, finding every excuse to come out with a decision in favor of the foreign company, although it was the high bidder.

Knowing that a committee of Congress had spread the sordid story on the public record, the Corps of Engineers without waiting for the committee's findings, arbitrarily finished the job they had set out to do and awarded the contract to the high bidder.

They even got the Comptroller General to rule on conclusions which are not supported by creditable testimony.

American contractors have another new and bitter example of bureaucracy unbridled.

Perhaps former President Herbert Hoover has something in suggesting that the activities of the Corps of Engineers be curtailed. My experience with the engineers in this instance has caused me to resurvey my previous position on the suggestions. Perhaps there are many similar cases which we should know about.

One thing is certain my faith in the Corps of Engineers has received a hard blow. At least we now know they do not give a damn about a congressional committee.

Commemoration of the 35th Anniversary of Declaration of Independence of the Ukrainian Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. PILLION

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1954

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am honored to include the following resolution introduced by the Organization of Defense of Four Freedoms for Ukraine, Inc., at a meeting held in Buffalo, N. Y., on January 26, 1954:

> We, the Ukrainian people of Buffalo, having assembled on January 26, 1954, to commemorate the 35th anniversary of the establishment of the Ukrainian National Republic declare that the Ukrainian Government, carrying out the will of its people, made the following proclamation on January 22, 1919, at the Sophian Square of Kiev to the entire world:
>
> "Let it be known, that from this day forward, the following states, Galicia, Bukovyna, Karpato-Ukraina are now united in one independent Ukrainian National Republic."
>
> In the Russian-Ukrainian War which followed, Russia defeated the Ukrainian Independent State, enslaved its people, and forced upon it the Moscow-Bolshevik dictatorship.
>
> Today, knowing that the Ukrainian nation has not really submitted to the occupying Bolshevik forces, but rather is continuing its fight for an independent Ukrainian State. The Russian Bolshevik government is compelled to falsify the history of the Ukrainian nation, in an attempt to make it appear in the eyes of the world that an independent Ukrainian State never existed. These false accusations made by the Bolshevik-Moscow government are supported by certain Russian-American anti-Communist groups.
>
> One of the most grievous of the aforementioned falsification of history concerns the Periaslaw union. This military treaty made some 300 years ago in Periaslaw, in 1654, by the leader of the Ukrainian state, Chmelnyckyi, and Moscow's Czar Alexis, gave Moscow certain rights, including the right to send an army to Ukraine. This army was used for the purpose of making Ukraine a Russian colony, just as is being done today in Poland, Rumania, Hungary, Bulgaria and Czechoslovakia, and other countries in Asia. Now, the Bolshevik government of Russia is trying to tell the world that the Ukrainians made this union with the great Russian nation of their own accord so as to obtain the benefit of Russia's protection from other aggressor nations.
>
> In its almost hysterical celebration of the 300th anniversary of this treaty, the Moscow Bolshevik government is attempting to show the world the indivisibility of the Ukrainian-Russian nations, and for this reason to

fulfill its own evil aggressive intentions, is falsifying the feelings of the Ukrainian nation in this matter.

Gathered upon this occasion, we declare that the war-torn Ukrainian nation, though its strength is sapped by occupying forces, never has recognized, and will never recognize, the Russian Government.

We, United States citizens of Ukrainian extraction, stand before the world to protest the effort of the Bolshevik Moscow government to distort the true picture of the history of the Ukrainian nation and to present the forced occupation of their country by the Russians as something which is agreeable to the Ukrainians.

We ask the American Government to assist the Ukrainians and all other enslaved people in their struggle for national freedom and recognition, since permanent universal peace can be attained only when all nations are free and can live without fear in their own lands.

JOSEPH KHOWAYLO,
President.

Results of the March Facts Forum Public-Opinion Poll

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 11, 1954

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement showing the results of the March Facts Forum public-opinion poll, as announced by its president, Robert H. Dedman.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The results of the March Facts Forum public opinion poll were announced today by its president, Robert H. Dedman, who explained that the percentage shown is the vote "yes" and the difference between 100 percent and the percentage shown represents the percentage voting "no."

This is not a cross-section poll.

	Percent yes
Should the schools take a stand to discourage smoking among students?	80
Should coffee be rationed because of high demand and a coffee shortage?	8
Is Eisenhower wise in minimizing communism as a campaign issue?	26
Should labor unions be subject to the antitrust laws?	86
Do social-security payroll taxes increase unemployment?	39
Do you approve of Ike's proposed Government health reinsurance plan?	25
Should we sit down in conference with Red China at Geneva?	18
Was the firing of Clarance Manion justified?	23
Should Senator MCCARTHY be permitted to question military personnel?	82
Should officials be subjected to criticism for coddling Communists?	94
Should postal rates be raised to wipe out the operating deficit?	60
Should the $600 income tax exemption be raised?	57
Should the Jenner Internal Security Committee become more active?	85
Do you favor Ike over the probable Democratic nominee?	76

The popularity of Eisenhower for President over the probable Democratic nominee remains high, with 76 percent in his favor. This figure is only 1 percent less than the vote favoring Ike in the December poll, and 13 percent less than the 89 percent vote in his favor of January 1953.

The vote indicates an overwhelming unwillingness on the part of the voters for coffee to be rationed or for the United States to confer with Red China at Geneva.

Ninety-four percent of the voters think officials should be subjected to criticism for coddling Communists. More people are in agreement in their answer to this question than on any other question in the poll.

Retirement of Supreme Court Justices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 11, 1954

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Retiring Supreme Court Justices" written by Thomas O'Neill and published in the Evening Sun of Baltimore of April 21, 1954.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POLITICS AND PEOPLE
(By Thomas O'Neill)
RETIRING SUPREME COURT JUSTICES

WASHINGTON.—Given his way, Senator JOHN M. BUTLER would make sure that the nine old men don't grow too old. Awaiting debate in the Senate is a proposal by the Marylander that would automatically retire all Justices of the Supreme Court at the age of 75. Senator HENNINGS, of Missouri, is suspicious. The first Justices retired by the age limitation would be Democrats. Mr. HENNINGS is a Democrat. He intends to fight. The impending debate will bring the structure and function of the High Court up for review by Congress for the first time since the 1937 rebuff to President Roosevelt in his attempt to pack the Court to get favorable decisions on New Deal legislation. Considerably less heat is anticipated in the new discussion.

Automatic retirement for age is merely one of a number of changes Senator BUTLER has in mind for the Supreme Court. Another would forbid Justices to go directly from the bench into a political campaign for the presidency as Charles Evans Hughes did in 1916. This ban is expected to take the minds of the Justices off politics. The Court's membership would be fixed permanently at nine, beyond the power of Congress to change. The existing congressional authority to restrict the jurisdiction of the Court would be curtailed.

All these changes are presented in a proposed amendment to the Constitution. It has been cleared by the Republican policy committee and has the active backing of the American Bar Association. Senator BUTLER believes its prospects for adoption are bright. Beyond the objections entered by Senator HENNINGS the amendment has stirred little controversy for so fundamental a piece of legislation, in marked contrast to the uproar over the Bricker amendment for curbing Presidential treaty powers.

Senator BUTLER's purpose is to correct oversights by the original authors of the Constitution, who seem to some students to have failed to anticipate the great powers the Federal judiciary was to assume. They left the Court open to interference from Congress and there has been such interference.

The Court now holds its appellate jurisdiction subject to the pleasure of Congress. Once in the tumult following the Civil War Congress withdrew the appellate power to prevent the Court from hearing an application for a writ of habeas corpus, thus effectively nullifying the Bill of Rights. Congress can juggle the number of justices to suit its political purposes and has done so. It once reduced the number of justices from nine to seven to prevent Andrew Johnson from filling two vacancies to which he would otherwise have made appointments. Senator BUTLER wants to make the Court independent of this meddling. Senator HENNINGS says the amendment is unnecessary for that purpose because Congress has mended its ways as the prestige of the Court has grown.

Justices with an eye on the White House would be ineligible for the presidency within 5 years after sitting on the high Court, putting them somewhere in a category between native American citizens and aliens. Since even Supreme Court justices can hardly predict the political weather 5 years ahead, it is considered unlikely that even the most politically ambitious would abandon the Court on the chance of a possible future major party nomination. Only two of the present justices are mentioned when the presidency is in speculation. They are Chief Justice Warren, a Republican, and Justice Douglas, a Democrat. Senator BUTLER says neither is the target of his amendment, which he sees as removing political temptation from the Court and discouraging raids on it by political parties in search of candidates.

Justice Frankfurter would be the first of the present justices affected by the mandatory retirement for age if the Butler amendment went into the Constitution. The Court's oldest member, his 75th birthday falls on November 15, 1957, 1 year after the next presidential election. Senator HENNINGS observes that the amendment, had it been in force, would have deprived the Court of many years of the valuable service of Oliver Wendell Holmes, the Great Dissenter.

Some Other World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE L. HAYS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 11, 1954

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Boston Post of May 6, 1954:

SOME OTHER WORLD

Even the most diligent apologists for the administration admit that the country has come very close to war. But President Eisenhower, if his statements at his press conference reflect his true opinion, is plainly living in another world or on another planet.

We list a few of his statements. Secretary of State Dulles is the greatest Secretary of State of his memory.

Most of the free nations of the southeast Asia area have shown affirmative interest in the proposed security pact and conversations are actively proceeding.

The fact that such conversations are taking place could have an important bearing on the Indochina phase of the Geneva Conference.

The southeast Asia countries are now thinking in constructive terms with respect to collective security.

We would like to know what free nations in southeast Asia have shown the affirmative interest in the proposed security pact other than those already committed to the American defensive plans by previous pacts, treaties, or defensive arrangements—none of which has shown any great weight in the Indochina crisis.

We would like to know how the so-called conversations taking place would outweigh the fall of Dien Bien Phu—the center of the last effective resistance to Communist military operations in Indochina—in the conference at Geneva.

We would like to know what nations in southeast Asia are thinking in constructive terms about collective security, and how thinking about it is going to prevent Communist domination of all of Asia and an inevitable Red tidal wave engulfing Korea, Japan, Hong Kong, Malaya, India, Burma, Formosa, and very probably all of Indonesia.

The pact with Australia and New Zealand is only effective if Britain gives the word. And Britain is for appeasement. Our defensive commitments in Japan and Korea are only effective if we alone can provide the military strength to defend them. The same goes for Formosa and the Philippines.

President Eisenhower falls rather short of showing any progress at all in his progress report. His mere statement that John Foster Dulles is the greatest Secretary of State in his memory does not establish Dulles in that position of eminence. In fact, it makes his stature more questionable.

No doubt the apologists for the administration can weasel around this latest position taken by the President, but the grim truth is that our recent humiliations have been the result of half measures taken from weakness and not from strength.

Great Lakes Seaway: A Shot in the Arm for the Midwest and America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 11, 1954

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, pursuant to the permission granted me today, I present for printing in the Appendix two articles from the Milwaukee Journal, an editorial from the same newspaper, and excerpts from an editorial from the Farmer's Friend, Green Bay, Wis., all having reference to the enactment of the bill providing for the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway project.

The matters referred to are as follows:

[From the Milwaukee Journal of May 7, 1954]

Large Benefits for State Seen—Kohler, Zeidler Views

Sharp stimulation of the economy of Wisconsin and its largest city was visioned by Governor Kohler and Mayor Zeidler, Friday as the result of construction of the St. Lawrence seaway.

Both the mayor and the governor have been active in the long political fight which ended in victory when the House of Representatives passed the seaway legislation.

"The advantages of seaway transport will benefit the people of Wisconsin by stimulating our whole economy," the governor said. "Economical transportation facilities make it possible for us to produce efficiently and sell competitively. Big ships are the cheapest carriers of heavy cargo on long hauls."

May Zeidler said the harbor commission and private agencies would have to survey port facilities and anticipated shipping tonnages to be sure Milwaukee was ready for an increase in port business. Milwaukee businesses and shipping will have to review their future programs, he said.

THANKS STATE DELEGATION

The mayor commended the entire Wisconsin delegation in Congress for its efforts in behalf of the seaway. He said he found Wisconsin Congressmen very alert to the significance of it.

The governor declared:

"The most important effects of the seaway will be those which serve the United States as a Nation, and all its citizens. We will all benefit by the contribution it will make to our national economy, our continental defense and our good repute in the world.

"The seaway will give to the north central States a favorable shipping service to the East and overseas. The continued growth and prosperity of this region, which is the greatest concentration of industrial and agricultural productivity in the world, is a most vital factor in our national economy. In addition, the New York-Ontario power dams will provide cheap and plentiful electric energy where it is most urgently needed.

"Our national defense will be made more secure by the utilization of a 2,500 mile shipping thoroughfare invulnerable to naval attack. During World War II enemy submarines inflicted a grievous slaughter upon our oil tankers and ore boats along the eastern seaboard."

WILL UNLOCK RESOURCES

"Since then, American and Canadian enterprises have developed new oilfields in the West, uranium in the North and tremendous iron-ore deposits in Labrador. The seaway will unlock the resources of Canada and thus enable us to maintain the production which we require for our high standard of living and for victory in war.

"The good name of America will be reaffirmed by our building of the seaway with Canada as a combined project.

"There is no doubt in my mind that the seaway will be profitable. On the basis of the most modest toll charges and very low electric power rates, the seaway is expected to pay for itself in 50 years. Meanwhile, and for many years thereafter, it will tend to decrease the transport costs of the materials and tools the Great Lakes people use, and increase the competitive potential of the products we sell to the world.

"The National Grange has estimated that midwestern farmers will be able to sell their export grain abroad at least 5 cents a bushel cheaper via the new seaway. It predicts that the seaway will carry 10 million tons of grain and flour every year, with increased cash income to the farmer and increased value to his land."

STATEMENT OF ZEIDLER

Mayor Zeidler said:

"Undoubtedly the creation of the seaway will have a great effect on the rural parts of the entire Middle West for there will be opened a tremendous new outlet for the farm surpluses of the United States in the food-short countries of Europe. We in Milwaukee could reasonably expect an increase in the amount of agricultural shipping from inland America.

"We can probably expect a certain increase in the shipping of heavy machinery and electrical goods; the seaway will make Milwaukee and Middle West manufacturers more competitive.

"The seaway will also have a braking effect on the movement of industry from this part of the Nation.

"Shipping and transportation industries will, undoubtedly, enjoy an increase in business, especially as the Chicago area becomes more and more of a bottleneck."

[From the Milwaukee Journal of May 9, 1954]

Seaway Development Expected To Have Wide Effects in State—States Adjoining Wisconsin Will Share in the Ultimate Benefits, Association of Commerce Officer Says—No Immediate Results To Follow Action in Congress, but Future Appears Rosy

Passage of the St. Lawrence seaway legislation last week opened the door to a future for Milwaukee and Wisconsin that appeared to have great possibilities.

The construction provided for by the legislation—a 27-foot deep channel in the International Rapids section of the St. Lawrence to open Lakes Ontario and Erie to ocean shipping—will not be an immediate boon to Milwaukee. But the seaway proponents believe that it will be only a matter of time before deeper channels also link up Lakes Huron, Michigan, and Superior.

What will be the benefits to Wisconsin, particularly Milwaukee, once the deep draft seaway permits big oceangoing ships to reach our harbors? That question was put to spokesmen for a score of organizations which know the seaway problem and whose interests will be affected most.

NOTES FREIGHT RATES

Their answers follow:

Wisconsin State Chamber of Commerce: M. W. Swenson, president of the chamber and vice president of the General Box Co., Sheboygan, said:

"The seaway definitely is going to help us. A lot of freight rates to the east coast are practically prohibitive. And some industries are expanding in the east rather than in our own State.

"The effects of the seaway would likely be both favorable and unfavorable. A great deal of harbor development will be necessary in Wisconsin if we are going to be able to accommodate oceangoing vessels."

Milwaukee Association of Commerce: Ray H. Weisbrod, executive director, said:

"The increase in traffic with world ports will bring about a great demand for terminal facilities, warehouses, and all types of transportation services. New jobs will be opened for steamship agencies, export administrators, freight forwarders, and stevedores. New industries which rely on foreign imports for raw material may find Milwaukee a strategic location.

"As payrolls and employment increase, wholesaling and retailing interests will profit correspondingly. New families moving into our community will require homes, furnishings, food, and clothing. Every business in Milwaukee and the surrounding area will profit. Furthermore States to the west of Wisconsin will share this increase in business."

RAIL PRESIDENTS UNSURE OF EFFECT

Railroads have been opposed to construction of the seaway for about 20 years although at one time they favored it.

John P. Kiley, president of the Milwaukee road, had this opinion:

"We don't think the seaway will affect us much either way. We may get a little more business at Milwaukee and Chicago, but that's purely guesswork. We may lose some grain business at Duluth. It's too early to be sure."

North Western road: Paul Feucht, president, said:

"I don't know just what the seaway might do to us. It is an intangible thing. Any guess I might make would be a straight guess. We really haven't analyzed the thing thoroughly. We should benefit a little bit in Milwaukee; how much, I don't know. There might be something at Green Bay; not much at Escanaba."

Allis-Chalmers Manufacturing Co.: Paul Dietz, export manager of the general machinery division said: "We are convinced that, once the waterway is deepened, it will be very useful to us. Other things being equal, there is no question we will get additional business. We feel it will offer us substantial advantages to using all-rail routes. If Milwaukee gets ships from the majority of large South American ports, then it would begin to reach maximum importance for us."

WATER ALREADY A HELP

Dietz said that Allis-Chambers had received some foreign orders because it could ship by water from Milwaukee via the existing seaway.

A. O. Smith Corp.: Walter H. Porth, director of the international division, said the seaway would serve as a "holding action" against the move-out of Milwaukee and Wisconsin industry and would result immediately "in a tremendous increase in direct shipment to foreign ports out of Milwaukee."

Export business of many heavy-industry plants here amounts to 10 percent to 20 percent of their total production, Porth said. "That is bound to increase with reduced shipping costs by water and a lower delivered price overseas," he said. "There have been marginal cases where the shipping rates from the Midwest meant the loss of business."

"The seaway will be a factor in holding some industries here which might tend to move away," Porth said. "That will be the indirect result of obtaining Labrador iron ore for Chicago area steel mills. The Milwaukee-Chicago industrial area now can use all this steel production. If that production should be reduced new industries would be shut out."

American Motor Corp.: Between 3 and 10 percent (right now, 6 percent) of Nash's production of automobiles is exported. "That will increase, definitely, when the seaway is built," said William J. Reagan, assistant export sales manager. "With an all-water route to foreign markets, we'll land cars much more cheaply and be in a better position to meet competition of foreign cars."

Reagan said that Nash's present savings in shipping to Europe in small vessels from Lake Michigan, rather than eastern seaboard cities, was 15 to 20 percent.

FARM LEADERS EXPECT GREAT GAINS

Wisconsin Farmers' Union: Kenneth W. Hones, president, said:

"Wisconsin farmers during the last 50 years have lost hundreds of millions of dollars in benefits due to the lack of waterway transportation.

"When I was in California, egg producers out there were shipping eggs to the east coast through the Panama Canal for much less per case than we were, and Wisconsin producers were only one-third of the distance from the same market."

Wisconsin Farm Bureau: Curtis Hatch, president, said the seaway would bring the farmer of the Midwest closer to eastern markets where he sells his feed grains. The reduction in transportation rates (one estimate, 5 cents and 15 cents a bushel on wheat) will be of great benefit to both the midwestern farmer who produces the grain and the easterner who uses it for feed. In foreign trade, it will put the midwestern farmer in a much better position to meet competition in the world's markets.

"If we had the deep-draft seaway now, we could do something with our oversupply of dairy products, competing in world markets," he added.

Wisconsin Council of Agriculture Cooperative: Milo K. Swanson, executive secretary, said:

"The council will never rest its efforts until the project is extended beyond the limits now contemplated.

"The union of Minnesota iron ore with Midwest coal was, in relatively recent years, America's great economic wedding. The seaway will make possible another wedding of new ore fields (Labrador) and existing coal fields.

"Unless the seaway is completed as soon as possible, the cost of steel and, hence, farm machinery might rise."

LABOR OFFICIALS HAVE NO COMPLAINT

International Longshoremen's Association: Unlike some ILA locals on the eastern seaboard, Local 815 (AFL) here has a reputation for honest operation. Its 140 members are the warehouse and dock stevedores. Its president, John Brzek, said:

"The seaway will do a great deal for the port of Milwaukee and for our union. It will increase the number of port employees tremendously, and I foresee a much larger membership in our union."

Would a larger union membership mean that Milwaukee's water-front labor situation would resemble New York's?

"We cleaned out our union many years ago," Brzek said. "There are no kickbacks here, and it couldn't happen here. That trouble in the east is deep rooted from years ago. Milwaukee would be nothing like New York."

FORCES MORE JOBS

Wisconsin State CIO: Charles M. Schultz, president, said:

"The seaway will expand industry and keep our people working. My rough prediction is, other things being equal, that if transportation within the State keeps pace, manufacturing plants in the State will increase in number or size one-third. Steel fabricating plants would enlarge and make more jobs.

"I'm afraid if the seaway did not come to pass, a lot of industries would move out of Wisconsin and go where there are lower shipping costs and better access to raw materials.

Wisconsin State Federation of Labor (AFL): George A. Haberman, president, said:

"Wisconsin labor is extremely fortunate in the passage of the legislation.

"This new avenue of transportation assures a continuity of our metal trades industries to produce with present or lower freight rates on raw material, thereby making possible a broader competitive market.

"Tragedy could have eventually taken its toll in these northwestern Great Lakes States if access to the new iron ore deposits were not made available at low cost freight rates to steel mills in the Middle West. Our present fears and concern of industries moving from North to South would have been multiplied tenfold."

Marinette (Wis.) Chamber of Commerce: George S. Robbins, executive secretary, said:

"The advent of the seaway will place Marinette on the threshold of an era such as was experienced around 1890 when Marinette and Menominee, Mich., became the white pine center of the world. The seaway can have a more permanent effect on our city.

He noted that Marinette "has more available water front property than most cities on Lake Michigan.

"It seems entirely possible to me that Marinette-Menominee * * * will become the gateway cities to the West as soon as the seaway is completed," he said.

P. and V. Atlas Industrial Center: Through divisions and subsidiaries this firm does most of the marine freight handling and warehousing in Milwaukee. Said William D. Vogel, president:

"There will be a definite growth in foreign trade in Milwaukee; how much we can't tell. We may have to spend a good many hundreds of thousands of dollars to increase our facilities, but I think the major port development will be municipal. I doubt if the railroads will do much about it (dock building)."

Vogel said there already had been a big growth in foreign trade here and there would be more, even without the deepened seaway. Last year his stevedoring payrolls doubled, he said. "I don't think there will be a tremendous change in Milwaukee, with the seaway, unless there is a big growth in foreign trade," he said.

Hansen Storage Co., a Milwaukee marine warehouse: Theodore L. Hansen, president, said:

"Without a doubt, the seaway will increase imports, and it should increase exports. The increase even in the limited type bottoms (small foreign vessels) indicates the trend. If the demand comes, we'll meet it by expanding."

SEAWAY PROSPECT PROMPTED OFFICES

First Wisconsin National Bank: Harry W. Sontag, manager of the foreign department, said:

"More foreign shipping in Milwaukee should mean more activity for banks. It depends on where the fellows who buy the merchandise get their credits. A lot of that, especially the big transactions, is done through the eastern banks."

Furness Withy & Co., Ltd., second largest steamship company in the world: On March 1, Furness Withy opened an office at 757 North Broadway. Why?

According to Joseph T. Wilkinson, Chicago, district freight agent, the opening was partly in anticipation of construction of the seaway—"if the United States doesn't go through with it, Canada will"—and partly because of the steady increase in foreign shipping in and out of Milwaukee and good port facilities here.

Midwest Steamship Co.: It opened for business March 1 at 208 East Wisconsin Avenue. The reasons, said Wallace F. Beulke, district manager, were (in order of importance): Increased foreign shipments here, good port facilities, and the prospect of the deepened seaway.

[From the Milwaukee Journal of May 7, 1954]

OCEANS, HERE WE COME

A 50-year fight came to an end in the House of Representatives Thursday with the passage of the Wiley-Dondero bill authorizing United States participation in the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway.

It was a most satisfying victory, for the 241 to 158 vote was ample proof that the Nation has come to accept the inevitability and the desirability of the seaway.

For Milwaukee and other lake ports the vote has particular importance. The economic advantages and potentials of the seaway have long been clear along the Great Lakes. Seaway proponents have never claimed that the project would turn the area into an Eden of prosperity. But they have been certain that the seaway will open up new possibilities for industrial development and bolster and strengthen the great industrial machine that exists in the lake areas.

Milwaukee has been in the forefront of the seaway fight almost from the beginning. Men like former Mayor Hoan and Harry Brockel, municipal port director, and many others have worked for years to get the seaway. Only recently have they been joined by some of the industrial groups which can expect great benefits from the project.

But perhaps the greatest satisfaction of all comes to Senator Wiley. More than anyone else, the seaway victory in this session of Congress belongs to him. He, too, has supported the seaway for years.

In the present administration he played a leading part in getting President Eisenhower to assume leadership in the seaway fight and to put the power of his office behind it, as at least six Presidents before him have done. It was Wiley's compromise bill which won new adherents in Congress. It was his persistence which kept the bill moving.

Senator Wiley deserves the credit—and the thanks of Wisconsin and the other lake States.

President Eisenhower has welcomed the House action and will sign the bill when the House and Senate finish straightening out routine technical differences in the bills each passed. There then remains only Canada's acceptance of United States participation. Canada's patience has been overstrained by years of American delays. But it is hardly conceivable that our good neighbor will not now welcome our participation and that job can't go full speend ahead.

Realization of the seaway is near. A long fight is finished. It was a tough fight, and often a discouraging fight. And that makes the victory that much the sweeter.

[From the Green Bay (Wis.) Farmer's Friend]

A Statesman's Reward

Wisconsin came nearer than ever this week to a realization of a 40-year ambition, when the St. Lawrence seaway bill was moved out of committee and onto the House floor for final debate.

* * * * *

(T)here is documentary evidence to prove that the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Association, backers of this measure, attribute major credit for their success to Senator Alexander Wiley's efforts.

Midwestern farmers and other business people who have been fighting high freight rates all their lives will laud Senator Wiley for his effort in bringing us low cost water transportation. At the same time, many of us, now in the senior bracket, can't help but wonder how we were ever part of a group which failed to recognize good representation.

Reappraisal in Southeast Asia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 11, 1954

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an article by Walter Lippmann appearing in his column Today and Tomorow, as it appeared in the Washigton Post and Times-Herald this morning. The title of the article is "Reappraisal in Southeast Asia."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Today and Tomorrow

(By Walter Lippmann)

REAPPRAISAL IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

Although there could hardly be a worse moment than this to make a reappraisal of the position and prospects in Southeast Asia, there are a few fundamentals which must be taken into account before we can form a new policy.

What, first of all, went wrong with the old policy? It was something unexpected—something that developed after the Berlin conference adjourned on February 18, and was not in fact realized in Washington until about a month later when General Ely arrived from Indochina. Then a crisis, unforeseen at Berlin, was produced by the news that the so-called Navarre Plan for victory in Indochina was not going to succeed.

What was the Navarre plan and what went wrong with it? There is available a description of it in the March issue of the French magazine Realities. The article is by M. Raymond Aron, who is a highly informed and responsible journalist. The article is particularly interesting because it must have been written before the Berlin conference adjourned.

"It is likely," wrote M. Aron, "That during the current year the balance of strength will alter in favor of France and Vietnam. At least, this will be true if the basic hypothesis of the French strategists continues to hold good. Their hypothesis that the Viet Minh army, which has not increased in size for 2 years, is limited not by lack of weapons but by lack of manpower. If the Viet Minh were in a position to create new divisions as fast as they could arm them, Russia and China could counter American aid by sending in a few hundred more light machine guns, trucks, and mortars each month. If, however, the Viet Minh lack trained men, especially officers and noncommissioned officers, China cannot make up for their deficiencies without direct intervention entailing unforeseeable risks."

This basic hypothesis explains two things. One is the repetition of our warnings against direct intervention by China. These repeated warnings appeared to be necessary because of the theory that the Viet Minh could not win the war—lacking manpower—unless the Chinese intervened directly. This basic hypothesis of the French strategists accounts also for the miscalculation which produced the tragedy—the glory but the tragedy—of Dien Bien Phu.

Writing before the Viet Minh mounted their attack on Dien Bien Phu, M. Aron said that "Gen. Henri Navarre's strategy is to force the Vietminh divisions into battle and, if possible, destroy them." On what calculation was that strategy based?

According to M. Aron, who is a faithful reporter in this matter—as I can testify, having had the same theory explained to me repeatedly in Paris and in Washington—"two kinds of fighting are involved in this war: guerrilla operations and battles between regular armies. The Viet Minh has six divisions, without heavy weapons, tanks or planes, but with infantry equal to any. Besides these divisions it has guerrilla units and regional militia more numerous than the 60 to 70 thousand men in the regular divisions. But if it lost the formally organized units, it would be incapable of fighting a pitched battle and would gradually be reduced to guerrilla warfare."

That was why the French command committed so large a part of the elite troops of the French Expeditionary Corps at Dien Bien Phu. They were there to invite a pitched battle which was to destroy the organized units of the Vietminh. After that, the Vietnamese army would take over and mop up the guerrilla bands.

We come now to the question of what went wrong with the Navarre plan, on which the French and we were basing our policy. Two things went wrong with it.

One was that the French intelligence estimate proved to be wrong about the strength of the Viet Minh Army—and its equipment, especially in artillery and antiaircraft guns.

The other thing that went wrong with it was that the military value of the Vietnamese battalions had been greatly overrated—both their political reliability and their will to fight. Because of the censorship, we do not know the whole of that story, including the whole story of Dien Bien Phu, and we have not seen the end of the story in the Red River delta.

What our people are entitled to know is that the crisis which developed so suddenly in March, after General Ely and M. Pleven had been to Indochina, turned primarily on the realization that the Vietnamese army and the Bao Dai government were weaker in a military sense, and less reliable in a political sense, than the existing policy assumed.

The battle of Dien Bien Phu, bad as it was in itself, became enormously worse because this spectacular blow to the prestige of the French authority in Indochina was deeply undermined. If the Vietnamese army and the Bao Dia government were politically reliable, the situation would be radically different from what it is.

This bears critically on the formation of a new policy—primarily because it shows that the critical issue underlying the effort to build an alliance to contain the spread of communism in Southeast Asia is political. The critical issue is whether the pact can include Asian peoples of the mainland of Asia. The French have failed in Indochina to enlist popular support for the Bao Dia government and for the war against the Vietminh. Can we repair that failure in Indochina or elsewhere in Southeast Asia? Can Britain, France, and America make an alliance with Asian peoples?

If it can be done, it will have to be done on terms and for objectives that command popular support among the newly emancipated nations on the Asian mainland. That kind of support cannot be bought. It cannot be compelled. It cannot be had by brandishing atomic bombs. It cannot be had by emphasizing military measures to the exclusion of all others. It can be had only by winning their confidence that we understand and respect and support their vital interests—not merely our own.

Failing that, failing an understanding with nations in Asia, we can have only the kind of policy which rests on what the Western alliance will support, and on the reach—which is limited on the Asian mainland—of our own sea and air power.

Credit Unions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1954

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting herewith an advertisement that appeared recently in a national magazine. The credit unions are doing a great service to the people. I want to encourage them every way I can. It is as follows:

A Credit Union Is Changing the Financial Outlook for Over 9 Million People

Most every person feels the pinch of financial problems at some time or other. For millions there was no place to turn in their need—no place until credit union service came into their lives.

Then suddenly, with a credit union back of them, the financial outlook changes. No longer is a person alone. Through a credit union, a man or woman is joined with friends to solve their own financial problems. There is help in saving money, for a credit union teaches thrift. Savings deposits are made so easily and conveniently. Credit union members have savings of over 1 billion. Dividends are good—better than most other places.

There are low-cost loans to pay bills and provide money for everyday needs. There is added protection through special life insurance on savings and loans that many credit unions provide at no premium charge to the individual.

What is this credit union idea that can change the whole outlook for a person—make life more secure, add to efficiency and morale on the job?

A credit union is simply people helping each other. The members run the credit union themselves. They have a place conveniently located right where they work or in their lodge hall or church building where they transact the business of the credit union. The credit union belong to them. Its only reason for existence is to serve them. All its profits are their profits.

How do you get a credit union started? Through more than 100 years of experience and through a national headquarters in Madison, Wis., a complete, easy, and simple plan has been all worked out for you. A credit union representative explains it. He helps you set up the credit union.

There are over 18,000 credit unions operating successfully in America. Many of the Nation's best known companies have credit union service. Credit unions do so much good for people that government, church, labor, and management all enthusiastically endorse them.

You can take the first step right now toward becoming a credit union member. You will get complete information on how a credit union can be started where you work, through your church group or lodge or even in the community where you live.

Credit Union National Association.
Madison, Wis.

Rodney L. Odell, of Passaic (N. J.) Herald-News, Gets Journalism Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 11, 1954

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I have been deeply pleased to learn of signal honors recently accorded by long-time newspaper friend and former constituent, Mr. Rodney L. Odell, telegraph editor of the Passaic Herald-News. The story is told in the following page 1 article appearing in the Herald-News of Friday, May 7, 1954:

Odell, of Herald-News, Gets Journalism Award—Seven Hundred and Fifty Dollars Foreign Correspondent Prize, Medal Go to Writer for Stories of Dutch Floods

New York.—A high award in journalism was presented to a writer from the staff of the Herald-News, Passaic-Clifton, N. J., here last evening.

It is the result of "Operation Holland," a flood-relief program sponsored by the New Jersey newspaper in which thousands of Herald-News readers participated.

CEREMONY AT WALDORF

The writer is Rodney L. Odell, telegraph editor. The award was a $750 second place in the annual William the Silent Foundation competition. It was for coverage of the disastrous floods which engulfed a large portion of the Netherlands in the winter of 1953, killing 1,800 persons.

Awards were presented in the Le Perroquet Room of the Waldorf Astoria Hotel, New York, before a distinguished gathering.

Among those who congratulated Odell at the dinner: Supreme Court Justice William O. Douglas; Belgian Ambassador to the United States, Fernand Van Langenhove; Baron J. A. de Vos van Steenwijk, Netherlands consul general to the United States; Dr. J. W. A. Van Hattum, consul; and William Oatis, AP foreign correspondent recently freed after being jailed 2 years by Czech Reds.

Telegraphed congratulations came from President Eisenhower and Secretary of State John Foster Dulles.

First prize of $1,000 and a gold medal went to a foreign correspondent for the Washington (D. C.) Star. He is Crosby Stuart Noyes.

Tieing for second prize with Odell was another foreign correspondent. He is Wade Jones, of Oberlin, Ohio, formerly of NEA Service, a news agency. He is now a free-lance writer.

The New York Times was awarded the International Award.

Oatis received a gold medal as a special award for bravery and exceptional service in the field of foreign correspondence.

Like Odell, Noyes and Jones covered the floods.

The prizes are awarded annually by the people of Holland to United States newspapermen. They are granted for best cementing United States-Netherlands ties.

In the last 5 years the award has been presented to some of America's outstanding foreign correspondents. They include: Anne O'Hare McCormack, New York Times; David Nichol, Chicago Daily News foreign service; and Daniel Schorr, Christian Science Monitor's European correspondent.

Judges for this year: Ernest B. Vaccaro, White House correspondent for the Associated Press and president of the National Press Club; Frederick W. Collins, president of the Overseas Press Club; Marshall McNeil, president, Gridiron Club; and Esther Van Wagoner Tufty, ex-president, Women's National Press Club.

Competition is keen. Entries come from some of the biggest newspapers, news agencies, and magazines in the United States. Newspapermen competing are among the best known foreign correspondents.

Odell made two broadcasts to Europe last night after the dinner. One was over the Voice of America. The other was an interview by a Dutch foreign correspondent here, for broadcast over the Netherlands radio network. In both broadcasts Odell praised the courage of the Dutch.

DR. KORTENHORST SPEAKS

The awards were presented by Albert Balink, executive committee chairman of the National Committee for the William the Silent award. He also announced the establishment of the international award, given to newspapers making outstanding contributions to imparting international news to its readers.

Another speaker was a high Netherlands Government official. He was Dr. Leonard Gerard Kortenhorst, chairman of the second chamber of the Netherlands Parliament.

High praise was given the Herald-News, its readers, and Odell.

Vaccaro, who announced the winners, said the newspaper was to be congratulated for its Operation Holland.

He said Herald-News readers were to be thanked for their generous contributions.

And he said Odell had served valiantly in the dangerous flood areas.

M'KELWAY ACCEPTS FOR NOYES

The first-prize winner was not at the dinner. He is in Europe. Accepting the award for him was Benjamin M. McKelway, editor of the Washington Star.

Here are some facts on the winners:

Noyes, 33, was a Phi Beta Kappa at Yale. His family owns the Washington Star. He was a World War II Air Force captain who won the Distinguished Flying Cross in 55 missions over Europe. Noyes is in charge of the Star's Paris bureau.

Jones was a GI writer for Stars and Stripes in World War II. He later became a European correspondent for NEA. Jones' award was accepted by Fred Ferguson, president of NEA.

Odell, a former Clifton and Passaic resident, lives at 2 Nassau Road, Upper Montclair. His wife, who accompanied him to the dinner, is the former Anna Marie Cole, Passaic. His parents live at 9 New Brier Lane, Allwood. Mr. Odell's father is a Manhattan Rubber Division executive.

Odell is telegraph editor of the Herald-News. He has been with this newspaper since his graduation in 1939 from Washington and Lee University, except for a period during the war. In World War II he was first an editor for Associated Press and was later a war correspondent and editor in Europe with PWD of the Third Army and SHAEF. He covered part of the liberation of the Netherlands. He also covered General Patton's advance in Germany.

He has covered many big stories for the Herald-News.

Perhaps the largest was the Dutch flood and the distribution of relief for Operation Holland. He was sent to Holland by air and spent many days in the cold, muddy, wet area of the flood. He was instrumental in setting up a food canteen and helped distribute clothing donated by Herald-News readers.

Indochina: Senator John F. Kennedy Called the Turn Over 2 Years Ago—His Warnings Were Ignored

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 11, 1954

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, last week I received through the mail a very interesting editorial from the pages of the Berkshire Evening Eagle, of Pittsfield, Mass. The person who forwarded it for my attention did so because he remembered quite well the warnings that were sounded in his city a long time ago—warnings about the terrific problem that was developing in Indochina and the whole of Southeast Asia. The editorial brought back to me the same warnings that were uttered in my city of Springfield, Mass., before a distinguished gathering of the Tuesday Club more than 2 years ago.

Mr. Speaker, at that time, the Honorable John F. Kennedy, of Massachusetts, was a Member of this House and he had just returned from a first-hand, front line inspection of the entire Southeast Asia region. In his travels, he talked with the high and the low, the military and the citizens, representatives of both the French Government and the associated states of Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia. He learned the temper of the place and the people and he quickly saw the danger that was looming on the not too distant horizon. He deplored the lack of concerted action and unity on the part of the allies in meeting head-on and trying to resolve the problem that was bound to increase with every passing day. He criticized the failure of our own Government to take the initiative on the diplomatic front and come to grips and deal effectively with the problem in Indochina. He warned that we were concentrating too much of our attention and our spending in Europe while we were almost closing our eyes to the terrible danger existing in Southeast Asia. Would that more attention had been paid to Senator KENNEDY's warnings. Recent events have proved how penetrating, accurate, and timely were his observations.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include the very fine editorial from the Berkshire Evening Eagle:

EVENTS CORROBORATE KENNEDY'S PREDICTIONS

Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, Democrat, of Montana, is taking the position that the best and perhaps the only way to get honorable peace in Indochina is by promising that country its independence. In this position he is supporting the contention of Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY, who has been arguing along this line for several years.

If Senator KENNEDY says, "I told you so," about the situation in Indochina, he has every right to do so. The files of the Eagle proved that he told his countrymen so, including the people of Pittsfield. On June 4, 1950, speaking at communion breakfasts of St. Mary's Church and Mount Carmel Church, the then Congressman declared that Indochina was the crucial front, and the one upon which the cold war might be won or lost. The issues, he predicted, would be settled "within 5 years."

Mr. KENNEDY followed up this warning with another on February 1, 1952, when he appeared on the Workshop for World Understanding held in the Pittsfield High School auditorium. "The puppet government has not been able to win the support of the natives," he declared, "and the mass of the people are sympathetic to the Communist cause." Intervention by the West is doomed to failure, he continued; America is being criticized for being allied with imperialistic regimes. The role of opposing communism, he insisted, must be taken over by the free native governments of the Far East.

Such quotations prove not only the soundness of Senator KENNEDY's judgment, but the fact that he is no Johnny-come-lately on Indochina. His opinions are not formed by reading or garnered secondhand, but are the result of personal observations made during a trip to Indochina. The indications multiply that his fellow Senators, as well as the State Department, can listen to what he says with great profit.

Question of the Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1954

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, the British have taken rubber off their strategic list for shipments to Russia but they will not ship direct to Red China? Who is kidding whom?

The Ghosts of Campaign Oratory Come Home To Haunt Republican Leadership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1954

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, recent events in international affairs—particularly occurrences in Geneva and southeast Asia—have reminded me of a striking phrase uttered about 2 months ago by the Vice President of the United States.

Before a nationwide radio and television audience, the Vice President posed this memorable rhetorical question:

> Isn't it wonderful that finally we have a Secretary of State who isn't taken in by the Communists, who stands up to them?

In addition to this, we were told, at the same time, by the very same Vice President that—

> We can be sure now that the victories that our men win on the battlefields will not be lost in the future by our diplomats at the council table.

It was further stated, and this statement, too, sticks firmly in my mind, particularly at this moment, that since the Republicans came to power, quote—

> In not one area of the world have the Communists made a significant gain.

Let me recall to you a few other grandiose boasts and claims made less than 2 months ago by this same Vice President of the United States. He stated:

First:

> We have finally seized the ideological offensive from the Communists all over the world.

Second:

> Does he [Adlai Stevenson] think that the Soviet Union and Communist China should not be held responsible when they commit aggression against a free nation by using one of their satellites?

Third:

> Rather than let the Communists nibble us to death all over the world in little wars we would rely in the future primarily on our massive mobile retaliatory power which we could use in our discretion against the major source of aggression at times and places that we choose.

Mr. Speaker, it is not my desire to make partisan comments on the tragic international events of the past 2 weeks. I do not impugn the motives or the patriotism of the Vice President, the Secretary of State, or any other high official.

But I do think that the above quotations, taken from the text of a speech by the Vice President of the United States, should be recalled for the record at this moment. Shortly after these statements were made, I stated in this House that such assertions by the Vice President were extraordinarily out of order and that many of his remarks were outrageous. I was referring particularly to his suggestion that the previous Democratic administration had not resisted firmly Communist expansion and aggression, and to his bold claims that this Republican administration had stopped Communist aggression in its tracks; had seized the initiative in world affairs. Recent events speak for themselves on this score.

As the distinguished Senate minority leader, the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] stated the other evening, regarding the Vice President's remarks:

> Maybe he never really said it. Possibly it was his famous dog Checkers. But Fala would never have said that.

Well, I can inform the senior Senator from Texas that it was not Checkers; neither was it Fala. I have checked the record and have ascertained that such words were spoken by Mr. RICHARD NIXON, the Vice President of the United States.

My purpose here today is simply to recall some of the boasts and extravagant claims made on March 13, 1954, by Mr. NIXON before a national audience, in reply to some responsible questions raised by Adlai Stevenson in an earlier speech. I ask my colleagues to compare Mr. NIXON's remarks with recent world events; and to hear some objective comments on these events by an impartial observer.

First, I want to interject part of a news report which came over the United Press wires from Hanoi, Indochina, May 8, 1954:

> Red Chinese took part in the overwhelming of Dien Bien Phu, Gen. Henri E. Navarra, French commander in Indochina, said today.
>
> Navarre said in Saigon that one regiment of Communist Chinese antiaircraft participated in the seige of the fortress.
>
> He said he now expects new intensive warfare—such as was fought in Korea—to spread through Indochina.

In the face of these and other events, I now ask the Vice President, or anyone else in this administration who might be willing to say: What is United States policy regarding Indochina?

With the Vice President's widely broadcast statements in mind, and in light of recent events in Geneva and southeast Asia, I want also to cite the following quotations from a newspaper noted for its objectivity. In a series of articles in the Christian Science Monitor on May 4, 5, and 6, Mr. Joseph C. Harsch has analyzed United States foreign policy. In this series of articles can be found these phrases:

> At the end of the first week of the Geneva Conference there was general agreement that the foreign affairs of the United States had sustained a major defeat. * * * To all practical intent and purpose, the western alliance had momentarily ceased to function. * * * The initiative had passed from Washington to London and Paris. * * * Here was a case where Moscow held the whip hand. * * * This is the first time since the war an American Secretary of State has lost all power to direct the policies of the alliance. * * * One of the first rules of diplomacy and power politics is never to be caught in a position which looks as though you had been bluffing. American foreign policy was caught in that position during the last week of April 1954; and by being caught, lost its ability to guide the alliance.

Mr. Speaker, these and other statements on recent events by an objective observer stand in sharp contrast with the Vice President's speech of 2 months ago.

Under unanimous consent, I include in the Record a series of three articles by Mr. Harsch, which appeared in the Christian Science Monitor of May 4, 5, 6, 1954:

[From the Christian Science Monitor of May 4, 1954]

United States Foreign Policy in Crisis and Transition—I

(By Joseph C. Harsch)

Washington.—At the end of the first week of the Geneva Conference there was general agreement that the foreign affairs of the United States had sustained a major defeat.

As matters stood at that moment, the Foreign Ministers of Britain and France were attempting to negotiate a settlement of the Indochina problem in spite of the opposition of American policy to the effort and in defiance of the premise of American policy on Indochina that no tolerable settlement could be achieved through negotiation with the Communist world.

Faced with this situation, United States Secretary of State Dulles did the only thing he could do under the circumstances—he summoned his second in command from Washington, took a plane, and went home, thus using an escape hatch from Geneva which had been prepared against the possibility that matters might evolve as they actually did. It would have been both humiliating and futile for him to do otherwise. He would have been an exleader of the diplomacy of the western alliance sitting on the sidelines watching while the other members of the alliance pursued a policy with which he could not associate himself or his Government.

To all practical intent and purpose the western alliance had momentarily ceased to function. The leadership in that alliance had been repudiated as far as Indochina was concerned. Britain and France had seized that leadership and were exercising it according to their own lights; the initiative had passed from Washington to London and Paris.

This, of course, was a situation which played into the hands of Soviet Foreign Minister Molotov. It was the first time since World War II that Moscow's diplomacy could operate against an openly divided western alliance. How Mr. Molotov would use the opportunity remained to be seen. He might press his advantage to the utmost and thus ultimately restore the alliance by his own extravagance.

If truly subtle, Mr. Molotov might strike at its very foundations by allowing Britain and France the viable settlement of Indochina which President Eisenhower stated to be the American purpose after it had become too late for Mr. Dulles to participate in the effort to reach such a settlement. If Mr. Molotov played his hand that way, France and Britain would end up indebted to him, not to Washington, for the salvation of their essential positions in southeast Asia.

Here was a case where Moscow held the whip hand. It could use that either to gain a new victory for communism in Indochina or to split the Western alliance further by giving Britain and France what American leadership could not give them. He would gain either way.

It remains for the Geneva Conference to disclose Mr. Molotov's choice. It will be extremely interesting, to say the least, to see how he plays the hand. However, in the meantime we have exposed before us the postwar low point in American influence, prestige, and power in world affairs. This is the first time since the war an American Secretary of State has lost all power to direct the policies of the alliance. It is the first time its three principal member nations have failed to be able to present at least the appearance of a united front against the Communist world. It is the first time American policy has marched up the hill of a declaration that a particular part of the world must be saved from communism and then collapsed into an admission that it is powerless to do anything to help a fighting ally save that place from communism.

The situation is typified, symbolized, and dramatized by the spectacle of the gallant French garrison at Dien Bien Phu. If American words uttered during March and April meant anything, if American commitments were ever to be backed up by American action, then Dien Bien Phu was the place and late April was the last time for action. The world was led to expect the action. American carriers steamed round the Tonkin Gulf alerted and ready for the order which would have sent their planes against the assailants of Dien Bien Phu. But the order never came. The words, the promises, the bold talk, and the repeated insistence that Indochina was of first importance were never implemented. The French asked for—and were denied—this form of aid. From the moment of the denial they were free agents, and used that freedom to seek the best deal they could get from Mr. Molotov.

This was the kind of situation which a great world power does its utmost to avoid. One of the first rules of diplomacy and power politics is never to be caught in a position which looks as though you had been bluffing. American foreign policy was caught in that position during the last week of April 1954; and by being caught, lost its ability to guide the alliance.

There was candid, though chagrined, admission in Washington that this situation existed. Defense Secretary Wilson expressed the situation for his colleagues in the Government when it said, with understandable understatement, that it might force a soul-searching review of the once vaunted New Look. Not only the New Look but also "instant retaliation" was in for review.

How did this come about and where would it lead? The following columns in this space will attempt to unravel the story of how it happened and where it might lead.

[From the Christian Science Monitor of May 5, 1954]

Crisis and Transition—II

(By Joseph C. Harsch)

Washington.—The great April defeat to American foreign policy, climaxed by the British and French attempt to negotiate an Indochina settlement with the Communists in Geneva after Washington had refused to back up its words by planes at Dien Bien Phu, derived from many causes.

These causes will be set forth and examined in this series. Of them all, probably the most important was an unresolved conflict in American policy which dated well back into 1953 and which led inexorably, like a strand of fate in a Shakespearean tragedy, to the crucial moment of indecision and therefore of collapse of policy.

It is no small wonder that United States allies were baffled and bewildered and finally took matters into their own hands. They were never able to discover whether Washington was prepared to make Indochina a Greece or Korea, or considered Indochina to be one of those places where a setback to the cause of freedom would be considered normal. They did not know, and could not know, which way Washington would go until the last anguishing moment. When the test came Washington, forced to choose, chose to withhold the planes from Admiral Radford's carriers in the Tonkin Gulf. The planes had been ready to fly to the aid of Dien Bien Phu.

The allies could not know American policy on Indochina because there was never, throughout the whole period of the Indochina crisis, a firm decision on that policy. Instead of a single policy there were two conflicting policies held and advocated inside the administration. Public statements over the period sprang sometimes from one and sometimes from the other. The inclination swung backward and forward between them. But there was never a moment when the highest policymaking agency in the Government, the National Security Council, took its stand decisively upon the one or upon the other.

The French, in their moment of agony over the fate of Dien Bien Phu, grasped at those expressions of policy which had implied a firm commitment in Washington to save all of Indochina. They had reason to believe that their plea would be answered. They could cite repeated statements by both the President and the Secretary of State on the importance of Indochina to the West. They had reports, later proved mistaken, that the National Security Council had reached a firm decision that all of Indochina must be saved. They had the statement by Vice President Nixon to the editors that American troops would be sent, if necessary, to save all of Indochina. They had the presence of the carriers in the Tonkin Gulf. They had strong indications of available support from Admiral Radford, Chairman of the United States Joint Chiefs of Staff.

What the French overlooked was that the Washington record for the same period contained another body of conflicting statements. On January 12, speaking to the Council on Foreign Relations, Secretary of State Dulles had repudiated the doctrine of meeting the Communists at every point around the world power frontiers with total resistance. "It is normal," he said, "that at some times and at some places there may be setbacks to the cause of freedom." Add the following other public manifestations of the contrary policy:

On February 12 President Eisenhower said that all-out United States intervention in Indochina would be a tragedy.

On February 17 the President said that the United States is not supporting colonialism in Indochina.

On March 10 the President said there would be no United States involvement in war in Indochina without the authority of Congress.

The truth of the matter, it turns out, is that the National Security Council never reached the decision frequently attributed to it that all of Indochina must be held. It never reached any agreed decision on the subject at all. It did, however, have before it position papers from the Defense and State Departments dating back to the fall of 1953 which pointed in that direction, which never had been formally accepted as basic policy papers, but which never had been formally rejected either.

These papers argued that southeast Asia could be defended only in Indochina and that the Communist countries never would accept in negotiation an Indochina settlement which would permit the West to remain in Indochina. The logical conclusion from these papers would have been United States military intervention in Indochina to save Dien Bien Phu. The existence of the papers encouraged the advocates of such a policy to encourage the French, and to make the kind of public statements which Mr. Nixon made to the editors on April 16.

But these papers did not commit the United States to a policy. They merely expressed a purpose on the basis of arguments which were never wholly accepted in the highest councils of Government. When the test came, the validity of the argument pending before the council broke down. Washington discovered, along with the French that Washington did not consider total victory over communism in Indochina to be vital to the security of the United States.

[From the Christian Science Monitor of May 6, 1954]

UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY IN CRISIS AND TRANSITION—III

(By Joseph C. Harsch)

WASHINGTON.—In looking back over the events which reached a climax in American refusal of the French plea for aid for Dien Bien Phu you see a landscape darkened by the shadow of atomic weapons.

The fact now so heavily underlined by Washington indecision over Indochina is that the Eisenhower administration has not yet succeeded any better than did the Truman administration in fitting the existence of atomic weapons into the pattern of its policies and programs.

The Truman solution was to avoid a solution. The Truman administration accepted the existence of a race in atomic weapons and poured billions into keeping the United States ahead in this race. But it did not answer the question whether the existence of atomic weapons rendered older varieties of weapons obsolete. With the Democratic Party tradition of resolving problems like this in the expensive way, it planned an American defense program which would equip the United States to fight either with or without atomic weapons.

The Eisenhower administration took office with a powerful bent toward budget and tax economy. It was appalled by the cost of a double defense program. It reached the conclusion that the United States could not afford to arm itself for two different kinds of war. Therefore it elected to trim the program in conventional arms and shift American defense reliance to its atomic weapons.

There was powerful logic behind such a decision, and in theory it could have been integrated with the domestic and foreign policies of the United States. But that New Look policy is now being subjected to the soul-searching review of Defense Secretary Charles E. Wilson, because in practice it was not integrated with domestic and foreign policy. This failure to integrate first and cut afterward was heavily responsible for the collapse of foreign policy which left the French and British trying to negotiate an Indochina settlement with the Communists at Geneva while Mr. Dulles came home.

The New Look must be reexamined and revised, because it failed to accommodate itself either to the powerful domestic political urge to deny any further gains to communism or to the alliance.

The logic of the New Look led to the Dulles doctrine of January 12 that if the United States could deter such aggression as would mean general war it could afford to let time and fundamentals work for us even if that should mean setbacks to the cause of freedom. The atomic weapon is a deterrent to total war. As Mr. Dulles recognized in his January 12 speech, it cannot prevent local losses to subversion or local insurrection. Mr. Dulles accepted the implications of the New Look when he accepted the possibility of local losses to communism.

However, while Mr. Dulles could accept this possibility himself, he found in experience that he could not accept it on behalf of the whole administration and the Congress. It would have been New Look logic to seek a solution of the Indochina problem by compromise and negotiation. It is possible that if the logic of the New Look had been applied consistently and from the start to the Indochina problem the United States, Britain, and France would be united today in a strong effort to obtain by negotiation a viable settlement which could satisfy the President's desire for a modus vivendi.

In practice, however, it did not work out that way. A powerful group of individuals inside the administration would not accept the doctrine that Indochina could be compromised without the ultimate loss of all of southeast Asia. Admiral Radford at the Defense Department, Walter Robertson at the State Department, and Senator Knowland and Vice President Nixon on Capitol Hill, insisted that all of Indochina must be held and that no compromise would be viable for the Western World. Their voices encouraged the French to ask for the aid which was finally refused. Mr. Dulles was prepared to accept the implications of the New Look, but they were not. They did not have the power, when the test came, to bring the United States into the Indochina war openly, but in the meantime they had prevented the logic of the New Look from being applied to the Indochina crisis.

At the same time the atomic weapons undermined and repelled the alliance. Britain and France are thoroughly familiar with frontier, local, colonial, limited, and brushfire wars. They are not familiar with the idea of regarding a local war as a reason for total war. Yet the atomic weapon is a weapon of total war. Whenever Washington speeches associated atomic weapons with local wars, even remotely, they drew away with horror. Much as France wants to save Dien Bien Phu, no French Government would for an instant conceive of saving it at the risk of precipitating an atomic war over the whole globe.

Washington could have taken the alliance with it into Indochina had it been abundantly clear that its atomic weapons would not be going along. But this never had been clarified. The atomic weapon never had been fitted precisely into the structure of the alliance. Unless and until it is so fitted into the alliance, Washington will have trouble bringing the alliance into situations like the one in Indochina, as it has.

Mr. Speaker, the time has come, I say again, for the return to true bipartisanship in foreign affairs. The minority Members of Congress, and I suspect many of the majority Members, have been kept largely in the dark on our foreign policy, particularly regarding Red-imperiled Indochina and southeast Asia generally.

I hereby urge that the President of the United States call at once a special meeting of the full membership of the House Foreign Affairs and Armed Services Committees for a full, frank, and candid statement on Indochina policy. The full membership of similar committees in the Senate should also be summoned to such a meeting.

I am not satisfied that a completely frank statement of this administration's policy, if it has one, has yet been given to Members of Congress under whose jurisdiction such matters should properly come. There have been briefings and more briefings of a selected few Members, but even in these meetings no firm, positive policy that was not contradicted from other high quarters the next day has come forth. The situation has now reached a crisis, and in the midst of it we seem to be drifting.

Not only are our friends and allies abroad wondering where we are heading, but I, as one Member of this House, am also wondering. The President should clear the picture at once.

The American people have had enough of the self-righteous boasts by Republican leaders about a bold, dynamic foreign policy. The ghosts of extreme Republican partisanship in the campaign of 1952 have come back to haunt Republican leaders. Their talk of liberating instead of containing Communist areas; their talk of more defense for less money by bluffing and rattling of atomic-hydrogen swords; their talk of Truman's war in Korea and their boastful chest-thumping at having ended that war—all of these chickens, and others, have come home to roost.

Instead of talking sense to the American people, Republican leadership, in its 16 months in office, has been offering international peace and security at wholesale prices; they severely cut the military budget but somehow forgot to cut our international commitments; and they assured us we had gained the initiative in the world simply by saying we had done so.

Mr. Speaker, I am fearful that Republican leaders actually believed their own campaign oratory; that they actually were taken in by their own sales promotion campaign. I suspect that most Republicans long ago contracted a disease which might be called minority-itis. Having been in the minority for almost 2 decades, they became accustomed to Monday morning quarterbacking, accustomed to the criticism of policy from the comfortable vantage point of hindsight. When they became the responsible majority party, they began to make and declare policy in the same way—the result, bluff and blunder.

I hear a herd of thundering elephants on the horizon. If I am not mistaken this is the Grand Old Party being stampeded back to minority status by the American people. After all, the record of recent history shows us that Republicans have provided our country with the best minority party we ever had.

Steel Looks Ahead to Good Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1954

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, steel has come to be regarded as a business barometer of first importance in our country. Looking at its figures for comparative forecasts is becoming an intriguing intellectual parlor game. If you take the 1953 figures as the basis for comparison, everyone looks tough. If you take the production figures for the period from 1947–49 as the base, things look a lot brighter.

The plain fact is that American productive capacity in the steel industry has increased so tremendously that although the operating average for the first 3 months of 1954 was 72.8 percent of capacity, we were turning out steel at an annual rate which would give us 90 million tons for the year. This is more than the total annual steel capacity we had a few years ago. On the present figures, we may produce more steel in 1954 than was made in any year of our history prior to 1950.

What this means is that our standards have become considerably altered in recent days. We have achieved what amounts to a miracle in the field of technical productivity. Anything less than that tends to take on a disappointing appearance. But 1954 may still be one of the finest years in American economic history. We are just so accustomed to recordbreaking in America that anything else doesn't raise an eyebrow.

The Late James Couzens and the Children's Fund of Michigan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 10, 1954

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, it is my great honor to bring to the attention of the House one of the examples of inspired charity by individuals in my State that make Michigan a wonderful place to call home.

I refer to a story appearing in the Detroit Times of May 3, 1954, concerning the final wind up of the Children's Fund of Michigan, a hard-headed, soft-hearted, $18 million dream.

The Children's Fund of Michigan was established in 1929 by the late Senator James Couzens, of Michigan, and on May 1, 1954, its 25-year existence came to an end with every last dime of it's $10 million original trust fund expended.

The quarter-century history of the fund and the good work it has done is a lasting monument to the charity, vision and faith of its founder which the passage of time will never erase. It was the Senator's intention, with this magnificent gift, to help provide for the children of his generation and he decided against a permanent trust fund because of his belief that every generation should take care of its own.

So he directed that at the end of 25 years, the entire amount of the trust fund would have to be spent, but with the foresight of faith he accurately predicted that the work of the fund would be carried on after the fund itself had been expended. Today in Michigan there are health and dental programs, child guidance clinics, summer camps for children, children's hospitals, programs for the care of crippled children, children with mental and emotional defects and scores of other programs and institutions whose origins can be traced directly to the initial inspiration provided by the spirit of the fund established by Senator Couzens. Not one of these or any of the undertakings of the fund itself bears his name, in accordance with a strict rule laid down when the fund was established.

To the gathering marking the end of the life of the fund, the Senator's widow sent this message:

> Thank you for all your tremendous contribution; without it, it would not have been possible.

In that message one finds the sweetness of character of the lady who inspired the many deeds accomplished by one of Michigan's great statesmen.

One can readily imagine the happy and prideful memories that were Mrs. Couzens' as she realized her husband's dream had come to fruition. She will know that a lasting monument to her husband's memory will forever be found in the happy, healthy faces of the children of Michigan who have benefited immeasureably from his charity.

It gives me a great deal of pleasure, Mr. Speaker, to include in the RECORD the article from the Detroit Times on the termination of the Children's Fund of Michigan:

SIGNAL FRUITION OF COUZENS DREAM

(By Jack Pickering)

They wrapped up a hard-headed, soft-hearted, $18 million dream Saturday night.

In terms of money and property, they closed the books on the Children's Fund of Michigan, which spent money at the rate of $750,000 a year for 25 years, intending to be penniless by May 1, 1954. They succeeded.

The late Senator James Couzens established the fund early in 1929, when getting rich quick was a nationwide hobby of anybody who could buy a few shares of stock on margin.

In that era of madness when nearly everybody believed implicitly in the magic of compound interest, the Senator refused deliberately to let his trust fund spend only the interest—which would have been tremendous, since he gave $10 million to start with.

The money had to be all gone in 25 years, he said.

The Senator died in 1936, but the men he left to finish the job did it, and they met for a banquet at the Rackham Building—the trustees, dentists, nurses, social workers, doctors, psychiatrists, and research workers.

William J. Norton, executive president for 25 years, insisted that "only 25 people will show up."

More than 250 arrived. In all those years, now that the glorious dream was over, for the first time this big group of people at last got together in a single room.

Said Norton, to open the meeting: "This is not a wake, but a celebration of a very great achievement, by a great group of people working with a very great philanthropist."

And Mrs. Couzens, unable to attend, sent a message by her daughter, Mrs. William R. Yaw: "Thank you for all your tremendous contribution; without it, it would not have been possible."

Only two trustees at the end were men who had been trustees in the beginning, Norton and Clarence E. Wilcox.

Wilcox told how it began—as though reciting something that had happened yesterday: "I remember the day Senator Couzens came in and said he had decided to create a $10 million fund for the benefit of children.

"He had a fully conceived plan of what he wanted to do.

"He thought that every generation ought to take care of itself; where permanent funds were set up, it lessened the interest of the community.

"What would he name it? Why, the Children's Fund of Michigan.

"Didn't he want his name in it: 'No,' he said, 'I don't want my name to appear in any way.'

"We asked, 'Aren't you afraid when the fund is gone, it will all come to a dead stop?' and he said, 'No, I'm not afraid of that. I think it will be carried on. How, I don't know.' "

However he arrived at this faith, it came true.

It seems now that Couzens and the men who devoted a quarter of a century to the extraordinary ideal must have been blessed with second sight.

In 1929 only three outstate counties had organized health departments, Oakland, Wexford, and Saginaw.

More than 50 have them now, and for the thinly populated counties there are centers which serve multiple counties.

Children had atrociously poor dental care. The Children's Fund sent dentists into the rural districts. More than 70 counties have effective dental programs now which no longer need to be propped up.

There weren't any clinics for emotionally disturbed children who, as a result, were delinquents, failures in school, or so upset that they were on the road eventually to mental hospitals—"insane asylums" was an accepted term then.

The fund established the Children's Center in Detroit, followed by 15 more child guidance clinics in Michigan, and these today are permanent State agencies.

The economic collapse brought the awful picture of children standing in the soup lines. It wasn't Senator Couzens' idea that the fund should be satisfied with giving handouts instead of building new health agencies which would continue, but he wasted no time in recognizing that hunger was the worst of all afflictions for children.

But the other dreams went on. (The Senator tossed another $2 million into the fund, and, with interest, the total sum spent is now $18,582,131.33.)

Particularly in the rural sections, either nobody recognized that some children couldn't see, or there wasn't money to buy glasses. Today the Michigan Crippled Children Commission is directed by a man who was one of the very early staff members of the fund, Dr. Carleton Dean.

He was at the banquet Saturday night. He said that when other agencies still do not exist, his department can carry on. A part of the Pardee Trust Fund (given by a former Dow Chemical Co. president) will pay for 2,000 pairs of glasses a year.

There were summer camps for white children but none for Negro children. The fund started the Green Pastures Camp in Jackson County. It, too, continues and will continue, the running expenses taken over by the United Community Services from Torch Drive Money.

Bay Cliff Camp, near Marquette, was started for children who were undernourished; it grew until it took crippled children, children with speech defects, children with bad hearts—children who needed any kind of physical care.

In Marquette, the Northern Michigan Children's Clinic was built adjoining St. Luke's Hospital, and another in Traverse City next to Munson Hospital—again without Couzens' name being attached to the building, a rule that was not violated as long as he lived.

And $2,234,000 went into research, aimed at anything from before birth to the age of perhaps 10 or 12 that might affect child health—and on to the basic problems of such cripplers as arthritis.

Dr. Icie Macy Hoobler is one of the originals of the Children's Fund, and has headed that research work all that time.

A great deal of it was done in the building put up next to Children's Hospital, and those laboratories will keep on working.

It is not generally understood that Children's Hospital is not a part of the Children's Fund. It already existed, and was one of Senator Couzens' favorite places, which accounts for the location of the fund's headquarters.

Wilcox handed over the deeds: The Marquette Clinic to John Morrison as president of St. Luke's Hospital; Traverse City's to Robert Dean, of Munson; the Children's Center to Father Ralph Richards of the State mental health commission; Green Pastures Camp to Ramon S. Scruggs for the Urban League which, with UCS, will keep it going; the research and headquarters building to A. C. Ledyard for Children's Hospital.

And, finally, another deed to the equipment in the building to Mrs. Yaw, the only thing out of $18,500,000 to go back to the Couzens family. The equipment, of course, will stay right where it is.

Thus was celebrated the end of it.

Norton asked that all stand and look for a moment at a big drawing of Senator Couzens which was set up at the end of the banquet table.

So he spoke all the benediction that was to be spoken for the final moment of a great dream.

He lifted both arms and said:

"The meeting is over. The Children's Fund of Michigan has come to an end, and we are all very happy."

The Struggle for Freedom Goes on in Ukrainia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1954

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, the urge to be free does not die lightly in the hearts of those who long to be free. To millions of people enslaved behind the Iron Curtain the hope of eventual freedom is the one incentive that keeps them from giving up to total despair.

This hope has been kept alive for the Ukrainian people by those who have kept the faith that some day Ukrainia would rise again, strong and free. Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include the following resolution passed by the Minneapolis branch of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, Inc., on the occasion of Ukrainian Independence Day, recently celebrated by millions of Ukrainian people all over the world. This resolution expresses the belief in freedom of the Ukrainian people and we join with them in looking forward to that day when all enslaved peoples will have the right to determine their own free destiny.

RESOLUTIONS UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED BY ALL PRESENT AT THE ANNUAL UKRAINIAN DAY, JANUARY 24, 1954, AT MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.

We, the Ukrainians, gathered together on this day to celebrate the 36th anniversary of the union of all the lands occupied by the Ukrainian people into one independent state, proclaim the following:

1. The Ukrainian Parliament—the Ukrainian Central Council, expressing the will of the Ukrainian people, on January 22, 1918, in the capitol city of Kiev proclaimed the independence of the Ukrainian National Republic.

2. On January 22, 1919, the Government of Ukraine, expressing the will of its population, proclaimed the union of all parts of Ukraine into one independent and sovereign state.

3. In the Russo-Ukrainian War which the Communist Moscow started against the young Ukrainian Republic, Muscovites occupied the country and enslaved Ukrainia by forcing upon them the Muscoviate Communist dictatorship.

4. The Ukrainian people never acquiesced to this occupation and constantly conducted and still are waging the fight of liberation of Ukraine from communism and the Muscovite imperialism. This fight is being waged on all lands of Ukraine in different forms: as a passive resistance and as an armed conflict which is being conducted by the Ukrainian Insurgant Army (U. P. A.).

5. The Muscovite Communist Government, knowing that the Ukrainian nation never will abandon its fight for independence, is forced to falsify the history of the Ukrainian people, in order to discredit the strife of the Ukrainians for independence.

6. By the order of the Communist Party of the U. S. S. R., a huge celebration of the 300th anniversary of the treaty of Pereyaslav is being organized. Following the ratification of this treaty, Moscow, using subterfuge, deceit, and force, gradually changed the military alliance between Hetman Bohdan Khmelnitsky, the head of the Ukrainian state, and the Muscovite Czar Alexy into a military occupation, thus brutally destroying the sovereignty of Ukraine. In the same way now Moscow, under the Communist leadership, is destroying the independence of Poland, Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia in Europe, and of some countries in Asia. At present the Muscovite Communists are trying to convince the world that the Ukrainian people, on their free will 300 years ago united forever with the "great" Russian people and thus "had chosen the only right way in their fight with the intruders."

7. By this huge and noisy celebration of the 300th anniversary of the treaty of Pereyaslav, the Muscovite Communist Government is trying to show to the world the inseparability of Ukrainians from Russia. Toward this end the Muscovites falsify the history of the Ukrainian people.

8. By this falsification of the historical facts Moscow is trying to inflict a spiritual and political harm to the Ukrainian people, harm which can be compared to that done during the famine of 1933.

9. These actions of the Russian Communists are finding support among the Russian-American anti-Communist groups. These groups, defending the imperialist interests of the Russian Empire, are trying to coerce the American principles of freedom and independence. Contrary to the principles of the American democracy they are opposing the independence of Ukraine and of other oppressed nations.

10. We firmly believe that the principles of freedom and independence have the same meaning for all nations. For the Ukrainians these ideals can be safeguarded only by the Ukrainian National Republic whose independence was proclaimed by the Ukrainian Parliament, the Ukrainian Central Council, on January 22, 1918.

The World Needs More Salesmen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. FALLON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1954

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, April 26, 1954, is known as a great day by the sales executives council of the Baltimore Association of Commerce, Baltimore, Md. On this day the Honorable James A. Farley, America's outstanding salesman, spoke before this group on the subject the World Needs More Salesmen.

Mr. Farley's address conveys the true American spirit, namely, that every American who has an idea, plus the nerve, and hard work to pursue and develop it, is able to achieve his own reward. This is one of the wonderful benefits under our free-enterprise system. More than ever we need this kind of salesmanship today.

I believe this address will be of interest to all Americans, and for this reason, I, under unanimous consent, insert it in the Appendix of the RECORD:

THE WORLD NEEDS MORE SALESMEN

(Address by Hon. James A. Farley, chairman of the board, the Coca-Cola Export Corp.)

What we need today is more salesmen.

Perhaps you may think there are too many already, particularly when you consider your competition. But that is not so. We do not have nearly enough; and the need is growing fast. In my candid opinion, the answer to most of the problems which beset the world today is salesmen—true salesmen.

Now I am not speaking of order takers as we used to call them—the fellows who would drop in occasionally on a regular customer and say, "Need any whatsits today?" and I do not refer to the kind of salesman who has spent most of his adult years saying, in a polite but firm way, "Sorry, Mr. Jones, we can't let you have more than a ton of grommets this month. Just can't make 'em any faster, you know."

No, gentlemen, the time for that kind of salesman is past. A new day has arrived and I think it is a good thing for all of us. This is the day for the true salesman, the creative salesman, the salesman who can envision a need, turn it into a want, find a prospect for it, and persuade him to buy it and enjoy its benefits.

I am thinking of the kind of salesman who is responsible in one way or another for the acceptance and enjoyment of every major step in the progress of mankind—from the roots- and herb-eating cavedweller to the well-fed, well-housed, well-traveled, and well-cultured atomic-age man of today.

Now I am not making that statement to flatter you—not at all. It represents my very sincere appraisal of the importance of salesmen and salesmanship in the whole scheme of progress and civilization. I am very glad, indeed, to have this opportunity to visit with you and to tell you why I hold your profession in such high regard.

I want you to know, also, that I strongly favor the good American practice of getting together in groups who have kindred interests and activities for mutual benefit through open discussion of mutual problems. Sales executives clubs throughout the country are doing a fine job in inspiring our salesmen to greater achievement, and I want to congratulate you men of the sales executive council of the Baltimore Association of Commerce for the fine record you have established as a leader among them all. I am very fortunate in having a great many close personal friends among you and that, of course, makes me doubly pleased to be here.

My good friend, Ed Parker, has told me that among you tonight there are many young men from colleges and universities, or now engaged in other endeavors, who are interested in making selling a career. I am glad of that, for it is always a pleasure to talk to young men who are about to embark on a new career and, gentlemen, much of what I have to say tonight is intended particularly for your ears.

There is not much sense of my trying to tell you oldtimers anything about selling.

You do not need my advice. You have met with success.

I do not know of a truer statement than the famous remark of my friend and fellow salesman, Red Motley: "Nothing ever happens until somebody sells something."

That is true in every field of endeavor and it has been true since the beginning of time. To translate any worthwhile project from abstract idea into concrete action somebody has got to sell something.

Somebody has been selling something to get action right here in your monumental city of Baltimore ever since the very idea of a city was just a hope in the heart of Lord Baltimore.

It took a job of selling before the first seven councilmen were authorized in 1729 to purchase the land and lay out a township out here where Jones Falls emptied into the mild Patapsco. It took the vision of a salesman to select so favorable a site, where the deep tidal waters of the Chesapeake cut deep into the heart of fertile colonial lands, rich in grain and tobacco. It was the same vision of a salesman that foresaw the heavy shipping trade with the British which made Baltimore an important port from 1750 on. And it was that same kind of salesman's vision, plus myriads of completed sales transactions that saw your port grow to draw its grain and products for shipping, not only from Maryland and surrounding States but from the entire Mississippi Valley.

It was somebody selling something, too, that brought Baltimore back and up and out of every crisis in her remarkable history. From the day in 1814 when the repulse of the British on the Patapsco inspired Francis Scott Key to write the Star-Spangled Banner—from the tragic, almost chaotic days that followed the fall of the Confederacy, from the devastating fire of 1904—through it all, creative salesmanship, somebody selling something has made or remade or made greater your grand city of Baltimore.

It is a real pleasure to be back and to discuss with you such a dynamic subject as salesmanship. The Coca-Cola organization, with which I am associated, is noted almost as much for its aggressive salesmanship as for the high quality of its product.

First, let us look at salesmanship in some of the technical phases.

Please do not misunderstand me. I am not going to try to wrap up the whole subject in one talk, and I am definitely not going to set myself up as an expert. I want you to remember that I am not a professor of salesmanship, although I have many fine friends who are. I am just a salesman myself, and I have tried to be a good one all my life.

I made my first sale in the little neighborhood store, in upstate New York, which my mother ran for a while after my father died. I was not yet in my teens, so you can see I have been at it quite a while.

No, I am just going to speak about salesmanship on the basis of experience and observation. I do hope, however, that you may find something in my comments which may be of help to you, particularly to the younger men among you.

Let us see, now. Just what is salesmanship?

There are a lot of fancy definitions, you know, and you may have read many of them. Of all I have seen, I like this one best. It was put together, I believe, by Dr. Alfred Gross, professor of marketing, of New York University. In his book on salesmanship he says: "Salesmanship is the art of increasing the satisfaction of customers by persuading them to buy specific goods or services as the best solution to their needs and desires."

That is very comprehensive, is it not?

Notice that he says: It is an art; that it increases satisfaction; by persuading customers to buy; specific goods or services; as the best solution; to their needs and desires.

Now let us take Dr. Gross' six points and consider them one at a time.

First. It is an art, he says. I do not necessarily limit it to art, for I rather consider it a profession and I think it is taking on those characteristics more every day. Of course, it is not taught as formally as other professions, but the successful salesman will study it in all its phases, just as a doctor or lawyer would study his profession. The label of art is appropriate, of course, when you consider that salesmanship, the most successful salesmanship, requires talent. Some people say a salesman is born, not made. I do not agree. I say all salesmen need talent. Some have more inherently than others but all need study and training, whether talented or not. Naturally, the greater native intelligence you have the more likely you are to succeed as a salesman.

In point 2, he says salesmanship increases satisfaction. I think that is obvious. It must increase satisfaction or the customer will not buy.

Point 3, by persuading them to buy, is very important. There is where the real talent comes in. Some people limit their definition of salesmanship to "the art of persuasion" and if we had no other that would not be a bad one. But do not overlook the last word in the point 3 phrase, persuading them to "buy." That word "buy," which means that the sale is completed, is the real essential. All the persuasion in the world is of no account unless the customer buys or, as they used to say, unless he signs on the dotted line.

Point 4 is easy, specific goods or services. He means, of course, your goods or services.

Point 5, as the best solution. In other words, any other action than buying will not solve the customer's problem. It must be the best solution.

And, point 6, to their needs and desires. I think he means that the salesman sees the need, points it out to the customer, then converts the need into a desire. Remember, this all takes place in the mind of the customer. And it happens when the need becomes a desire or, in my words, when the need becomes a want.

Now I know there are many good salesmen who never heard of that definition of salesmanship. And if they never learn it they will probably continue to be good salesmen. It just happens they have what it takes. But I would not venture to say that all of them might be better salesmen if they knew it and remembered the important elements. Surely I am safe in commending it to those of you who are entering the field for the first time.

Next, let us consider another important phase of salesmanship—the customer. Obviously, without a customer you cannot make a sale.

The business analysts tell us there are three kinds of customers. I understand this is particularly true in retail salesmanship but I believe it is true also to a degree of all the other kinds, too. They say there are the casual, the attracted, and the permanent customer.

The casual customer, of course, is the fellow you catch on the wing. He is on the move and he just happens to come your way. Naturally, you cannot borrow much money on the prospective commissions you are going to get from the casual customer.

The attracted customer is a little better security because he is your man. And he is your man because of something you or your firm has done, some of your effort maybe in the form of advertising or sales promotion, has brought him to you. And you can count on him, or others like him, coming to you if you continue the volume and quality of your promotion effort.

But the customer of the highest degree, of course, is the permanent customer. He is your man and you can count on him. He will continue to be your man so long as you treat him right; so long as you give him the quality merchandise and the quality of service and satisfaction it took to make him your customer in the first place. A good thing about him is that every time you sell him, under those circumstances, he becomes more permanent than ever. Now your job as a true salesman is to convert these three types, ultimately, into the one type. You turn a casual customer into an attracted customer, and you make the attracted customer a permanent customer.

How can you do this?

Well, that is where most of the art of selling comes into play. But, surely, the real basis of it all lies in creating a relationship of mutual trust and confidence between you and the customer. It goes without saying, you must have a good product, a product you know is good. And you must know it thoroughly. A complete knowledge of the product you are selling is indispensable to successful salesmanship. There is no place today for high-pressure methods or any kind of misrepresentation. The keynote of making any customer a permanent customer is the Golden Rule.

Let us not overlook this other essential, work—w-o-r-k. It is not very glamorous but it surely produces results. There is no royal road to knowledge; no royal road to success; and anyone will tell you that salesmanship is no exception to the rule. There is just no substitute for work—hard work, consistent, persistent work. Some salesmen do it easier than others; some organize it better than others; some are more proficient; some more talented. But this is always true, the more calls you make the more sales you make. It is just that simple.

Well, so much for a quick look at the technical phases of salesmanship. Just this quick glance should convince you that it is not a subject to be taken lightly. Let us return to some of its broader aspects.

As we have seen, there are some who would say that salesmanship is not a profession. Dr. Gross calls it an art. Others say it is a calling. If so, I say it is a noble calling, a very essential and noble calling. Let us consider it briefly in relation to some of the other great callings.

To great scientists, ancient and modern, we are indebted for discoveries that have revolutionized our lives. We owe great thanks to that early inventive thinker who gave us the wheel; to Copernicus who evolved the theory of the solar system; to Galileo who invented the telescope and proved that theory; to Newton for finding the force of gravity; to Einstein for the theory of relativity, which brought us the atomic age; and to many, many others whose diligent search after truth has uncovered miracle after miracle.

To great statesmen like Washington, Jefferson, Hamilton, Madison, Monroe, and others we are indebted for the foundations of our great system of government.

To great inventive geniuses like Robert Fulton, Eli Whitney, McCormick, Alexander Graham Bell, Marconi, the Wright brothers, and others we are indebted for the perfection of such marvels as the steam engine, the cotton gin, the harvester, the telephone, the radio, the airplane, and so on.

To great doctors like Hippocrates, Pasteur, Curie, Walter Reed, Alexander Fleming, and many others, we are indebted for the benevolent development of medical science.

To great lawyers like Lord Coke, Blackstone, Marshall, Webster, Holmes, Brandeis, Cardoza, Hand, and many others, we are indebted for a just legal system unparalleled in history.

We are indebted, without measure, to the great healers and prophets and religious leaders who have lifted up the soul of mankind and have shown him the true way of life.

I could go on and on through all the callings which have drawn and held great men down through the ages. But few, if any, of them would tip the scales of man's progress more than the calling of salesmanship. It took salesmanship and salesmen of the truest kind to bring to full fruition all the benefits to be derived from these great callings.

Let me give you a couple of random examples.

Whom do you think it took to sell and keep sold the grand governmental principles laid down by Washington, Jefferson, Hamilton, Madison, and Monroe? I will tell you. It took salesmen like Benjamin Franklin, Andrew Jackson, Abraham Lincoln, and Woodrow Wilson.

Whom do you think it took to bring all the scores of creations, appliances, and conveniences that make living easier and pleasanter out of the laboratory and experimental stage into the hands and homes of people everywhere? I will tell you. It took such salesmen as Andrew Carnegie, Henry Ford, Harvey Firestone, J. C. Penney, Robert W. Woodruff, Benjamin F. Fairless, Eddie Rickenbacker, and many others like them.

Yes; down through the ages and still today, for every worthwhile product, it takes salesmen—true salesmen—to have the vision to see the need, to turn it into a want, to find the prospect for it, then persuade him to enjoy its benefits. May I repeat, what we need today is more salesmen—more true salesmen.

I congratulate you who have made salesmanship your career.

Can Civil Service Be Restored to Its Rightful Place?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1954

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, when a good idea becomes an institution it sometimes suffers from a bad case of hardening of the arteries. A prime example is civil service. The phrase has become a sacred cow from which every public official shrinks in terror. But the fact is that this idea has now been altered to an unrecognizable degree.

As a result of the experience of the last 20 years, when examinations were unassembled, which means that they were not given at all, and when thousands of temporaries and indefinites were added to the payrolls by the Democratic administration, only one of every two Government employees now holds his job as the result of an examination designed to prove his fitness for the job.

These 50 percent of Federal employees who hold civil-service status got into this charmed circle by being blanketed under permanent civil-service status by Presidents Roosevelt and Truman. Herbert Hoover recently pointed out this remarkable change in conditions and indicated his concern with what has happened. In the 1932 to 1952 period Federal civilian employees rose from 600,000 to 2,400,000. The civil-service system for over 1,200,000 of these people is an absolute misnomer and ought to be reexamined to see that only competent people retain their jobs and to make certain that the folks down the ladder are not busily engaged in chopping off the rungs under the Eisenhower administration.

Public Laws 323 to 334, Inclusive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 10, 1954

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am extending my remarks to include my reports to my constituents covering Public Laws 323 to 334, inclusive, as follows:

Nineteenth Report on Legislation of the 83d Congress

Dear Friend: Continuing my report on bills passed by House and Senate, signed by the President, and now the laws of the land:

PUBLIC LAW 323

H. R. 5976, Intrastate gas companies

In our district we are interested in natural-gas legislation, especially as it affects the price we as consumers pay for our gas. The interest in the gas and oil areas is influenced by the producing and distributing companies. Back of each group should be of course the broader interest in the national welfare. The responsibility of your Congressman is to examine most minutely and questioningly the legislative proposals of the producers and distributors.

Public Law 323 takes from the jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission any gas company which (a) is regulated by a State public utilities commission and (b) does business exclusively within the borders of that State.

On the surface this might appear merely a restatement of the rule that a State controls business within its own borders and the Federal Government comes into the picture only when the business is interstate. But gas is an interstate operation. Producers, pipeline operators, distributors, retailers constitute a unified operation from well to gas station, Illustration cited in Senate debate: Ohio gets gas from the Hope Natural Gas Co. at the boundary of Ohio and West Virginia, the East Ohio Gas Co. distributes it solely in Ohio, but both Hope and East Ohio are wholly owned by the Consolidated Gas Co. of New York City.

Since the enactment of the Natural Gas Act in 1938, the gas companies have tried to get from under the control of the Federal Power Commission, which has enabled municipalities like Chicago to get costs and operating expenses previously not obtainable without difficulty. These figures are necessary in the determination whether rates to the consumer are fair.

Public Law 323 accomplishes the desire of the gas companies as far as subsidiaries doing intrastate business is concerned. It overrides the Supreme Court of the United States in the 1950 East Ohio Gas Co. case (338 U. S. 464), in which the Court held that the East Ohio Co. came under Federal jurisdiction because its operations are in fact in interstate commerce. Senator Burke, who was mayor of Cleveland when the East Ohio case was in the courts, stated in debate that the ultimate cost of the law to the gas consumers of the United States will run into millions of dollars.

I did not like the hurried way in which the measure was engineered through the House. The bill was introduced on June 27, 1953. On June 29 it came up with other gas bills in a brief 1-day committee hearing. On July 30, 1953, it was included in the legislative flood in the hectic closing hours of the first session. Many Members had already left for home, others were eager to be off, and the House was in no mood for record rollcall votes. The vote was by voice. I am sure my "No" was loud enough to be heard in the galleries. When the bill came up recently in the Senate a motion to recommit was defeated on rollcall, 25 to 52.

Public Law 323 presents a challenge to the Illinois Commerce Commission to protect the gas consumers of our State. I always have been happy that opportunity was given me as Lieutenant Governor (and president of the senate) actively to participate in the enactment of the law creating our first public utilities commission. It was one of my earliest public services. That epoch-making measure was passed over dogged opposition and the unprecedented (up to that time) expenditure of money by the gas and traction powers. Unfortunately, State commissions are handicapped in taking over from the Federal Power Commission in this matter because of unavailability to certain figures and a different system of accounting, favorable to the companies, adverse to the consumers.

PUBLIC LAW 324

H. R. 8224, excise-tax reduction

This law will save you a little money on your telephone bill and when you send a telegram or travel. It reduces the excise tax on local telephone messages from 15 to 10 percent, on long-distance calls from 25 to 10 percent, and on telegrams and transportation from 15 to 10 percent. Among other reductions are luggage, jewelry, furs, toilet preparations, from 20 to 10 percent.

Excise taxes generally are reduced to 10 percent except in the case of (a) household appliances, where the tax is reduced to 5 percent, and (b) in the case of automobile gasoline, beer, wine, liquor, and cigarettes, where the present tax is continued another year.

Admission tickets costing 50 cents or less to amusements and entertainments (dog and horse races excluded) are made tax exempt. The original bill did not contain this exemption. I supported the motion to recommit for the purpose of making tickets costing 50 cents or less free of the tax. It seemed to me that with economic conditions tightening and family budgets becoming more and more difficult to include provision for recreation, families should not be forced to pay an excise tax when they went to a 50-cent (or less) movie.

The motion to recommit lost, 200 to 213. Later, however, when the bill came from the conference committee with the 50-cent exemption included, it was adopted on a record rollcall, 395 to 1. Congressman Marshall of Minnesota was the sole dissenter. He is a farmer, represents a farming district, believes the Government cannot afford to lose $999 million a year in excise-tax revenue, which in large part comes from city folks. The $999 million estimate of the cost of Public Law 324 in reduced excise tax revenues is furnished by the chief of the congressional staff tax experts.

Public Law 324, thus putting the Government about another billion dollars in the red, smashes to a cock-hat any chance of redeeming Republican campaign pledge of a balanced budget. Real reason for its passage by an almost unanimous vote: fear of the recession going beyond check, hope that excise-tax reductions would spur fresh buying. (Authority: Report No. 1307 of the House Committee on Ways and Means.)

The excise tax (except possibly on items clearly in the luxury or extravagance class) is an unfair tax. It was imposed in the war-emergency period, when everyone accepted sacrifice as a duty. It should be done away with entirely as soon as conditions will permit.

PUBLIC LAW 325

H. R. 5337, United States Air Force Academy

This is the measure establishing an Air Academy similar to the Army Academy at West Point, the Naval Academy at Annapolis. I cast your vote for it as we are living in an age of air transportation and of specialized education.

I noticed that the "Flying Congressman," Peter F. Mack, Jr., voted against the Academy. He is a naval flyer (World War II, now Reserve), believes in separate air forces for Army and Navy. Mack was 1 of 13 Democrats who voted "no"; 171 voted "yes." Of the Republicans 158 voted in the affirmative, 22 in the negative. There was no division along party lines, some difference in judgments.

The site of the Academy will be selected by a board of five Members provided the decision is unanimous. Otherwise the Secretary of the Air Force will make the selection from three sites recommended by majority vote of the board; which includes Merrill C. Meigs, vice president of Hearst Corp. of Chicago.

The Academy will open in temporary quarters in 1955 with a class of 300. By 1960 the entrance class will number 624. Full educational course will cover 3,100 hours of social and scientific instruction, 2,200 hours of airmanship (including leadership, physical, air training).

Authorized appropriation for establishing the Academy is $126 million. The Department of the Air Force hopes that facilities such as a chapel, stadium, field house, may be the subject of donation by philanthropic citizens.

Cordially and sincerely,

Barratt O'Hara,
Member of Congress.

TWENTIETH REPORT ON LEGISLATION OF THE 83D CONGRESS

Dear Friend: Continuing where we left off:

PUBLIC LAW 326

S. 1548, exchange of land with Puerto Rico

Under the Treaty of Paris (Spanish-American War) the United States acquired without compensation the area of the original harbor defenses at San Juan, Puerto Rico. Later we purchased additional land for $355,000. Today the total appraised value (land ceded by Spain, plus land we purchased) is $1,561,399 because part is business property that soared in value with San Juan's growth. But it is no longer useful to the United States for military purposes. Reason: Artillery is vastly larger than in Spanish-American War days, military maneuvers require more room.

Public Law 326 authorizes the exchange of the land (1,550 acres) with the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico for 6,500 acres of agricultural land contiguous to our present maneuver site at Camp Salinas. Appraised value of the land traded to us is $820,202, a differential of some $700,000.

It is another evidence of the character of our country that we are not asking the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico to recompense us for the differential. That represents the value of the public lands of Puerto Rico set aside for military use at the time Puerto Rico was ceded to the United States by Spain. No longer of such use to us, it rightfully returns to the public lands of the Commonwealth.

PUBLIC LAW 327

H. R. 5632, Camp Butner Military Reservation

Of Camp Butner's original 40,201 acres in North Carolina the United States retains less than 5,000 acres. During World War II it was used as a small-arms and mortar range; since then by the North Carolina National Guard as a range. Result, the area is contaminated with unexploded shells, too dangerous for the Federal Government to dispose of at public sale.

Public Law 327 provides the happy solution by authorizing its transfer to North Carolina subject to two conditions: (a) its transfer back if used for other than military (National Guard) purposes, and (b) the right of the United States to repossess during (and for 6 months after) a national emergency.

PUBLIC LAW 328

Senate Joint Resolution, 143, Bataan Day

Your representative was happy to join with all other Members of the Congress in the resolution proclaiming April 9, the 12th anniversary of the fall of Bataan, as Bataan Day, to be observed with exercises and the flying of the flags of the United States and the Philippines. You will approve I know of this sentiment in the fourth paragraph of Public Law 328:

"The people of the Philippines have demonstrated to all other nations in the Asian sphere the fact that mutual friendship and mutual security are common goals, and the role of the United States in Asia is that of a friend of peoples, regardless of race."

PUBLIC LAW 329

House Joint Resolution 461, more money for Mexican farm labor program

Renewal of the bilateral agreement by the United States and Mexico governing Mexican farm workers employed in this country was followed by this appropriation of $478,000 for the operation of the program. The $1,250,000 previously appropriated was all gone by mid-March. I believe more of the cost should be borne by the employers who are the beneficiaries of the program. The promise of an employer reimbursement totalling $75,000 for the costs of physical and medical examinations seemed to me insufficient.

PUBLIC LAW 330

H. R. 1568, civil government in Alaska

There are 65 commissioners of the United States district court in Alaska. All an Alaskan commissioner has to do is: (1) perform all the usual civil and criminal court duties of commisioners in continental United States, (2) keep public records and vital statistics, (3) make adjudications of insanity, (4) appoint guardians for minors, insane persons and drunkards, (5) take care of juvenile cases and adoptions, (6) perform marriages, (7) conduct searches for persons missing in the wilds of Alaska, (8) grant writs of habaes corpus, (9) fill in as notary public and (10) when needed to serve as justice of the peace, recorder, probate judge, and coroner. For all this he gets $7,500 a year, provided the fees reach that maximum, otherwise what comes in. Only 4 of the 65 commissioners take in the maximum of $7,500.

Public Law 330 authorizes the judges of the district court to appoint deputy commissioners to help out. The deputy will be paid by the commissioner with whom he is working. Matter of dividing the work (and I suppose the travel, distances in Alaska being vast) and the fees. As this entails no additional expense to the public funds, and seems a commonsense arrangement, it had my support.

PUBLIC LAW 331

H. R. 2747, copyrights

Valuable copyrights are lost when application, fees, and other materials are not received by the Copyright Office in apt time. This has made it necessary to maintain a crew on nonbusiness days for the sole purpose of receiving and stamping mail. Public Law 331 sensibly removes this necessity (and saves the taxpayers' money) by providing that when the last day for copyright filings falls on Saturday, Sunday, or a holiday the Copyright Office may receive the filings on the day following.

PUBLIC LAW 332

H. R. 1529, Katmai National Monument in Alaska

Alaska is in urgent need of local building material, including siliceous volcanic ash, commonly known as pumicite. Huge quantities of pumicite are available along the Shelikof Strait within the Katmai National Monument, not elsewhere in Alaska to any extent. Public Law 332 permits its removal, under conditions affording the maximum protection of the monument. The House acted only after being assured the removal of the pumicite (vital to the building industry at this stage of Alaskan development) would not result in permanent damage to the monument, rains and tides quickly obliterating the effects of removal operation. The law, however, is limited to 15 years; meanwhile field studies will go on to locate other available deposits outside the monument. The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs unanimously recommended the passage of the measure.

PUBLIC LAW 333

S. 2405, quarantine station at Marcus Hook, Pa.

Quarantine service to shipping entering the Philadelphia area is furnished by the United States Public Health Service at Marcus Hook. Oil refinery developments around Marcus Hook have caused a health hazard and a traffic problem. Public Law 333 relieves the situation by authorizing the exchange of the present site to the Sun Oil Co. for another site of equal market value and more advantageously located for the use of the quarantine station. The Administrator of General Services is charged with the responsibility of determining that the property given the United States has an actual value equal to or greater than that of the present site.

PUBLIC LAW 334

H. R. 4024, Appomattox Court House

Because there is no monument at the historic site of Lee's surrender to Grant, Public Law 334 changes the designation of "Appomattox Court House National Historical Monument" to "Appomattox Court House National Historical Park." Tourists no longer will be confused.

Cordially and sincerely,

Barratt O'Hara,
Member of Congress.

Hesitancy of Allies at Geneva Called an Invitation to World War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 5, 1954

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following article by David Lawrence in the New York Times, May 11, 1954:

HESITANCY OF ALLIES AT GENEVA CALLED AN INVITATION TO WORLD WAR

(By David Lawrence)

Geneva, May 9.—This is May 1954, by the calendar, but, historically speaking, it so closely parallels March 1936, that the resembalance is startling. For it was then that Hitler marched into the Rhineland while the Allies stood indifferently by and quarreled with one another. Less than 3½ years later World War II had broken out.

Has world war III been brought nearer by the events of the last month? Has the atomic war which America dreads so much become inevitable as a consequence of the weakness of the Allies? For in every country on our side, including the United States, the dissension created by the politicians for partisan advantage has paralyzed the executive power, and what should be a firm stand against Communist aggression by an alliance of armed forces has become a faltering attitude at a crucial moment.

The German archives, discovered after Hitler's death, reveal that the Nazi leader was quaking in his boots as he marched into the Rhineland and could have been restrained had the Allies acted together. Instead, they failed to take any military action because their peoples were shell-shocked by World War I and they believed another war was unthinkable.

REDS FLUSHED WITH SUCCESS

Today the Communists are flushed with their successes. Perhaps the real turning point, future historians will say, was the refusal of Britain and our other allies in 1950 to sanction the plan of General MacArthur to pursue enemy planes into Manchuria and to destroy Communist bases of supply in Red China. The Truman-Acheson administration failed to assert American leadership at that vital stage and the whole course of history was changed. Indeed when MacArthur was summarily dismissed by Truman, it was like notifying the Communist world that the United States and its allies were scared and were being bluffed into inaction by talk about the possibility of an enlarged war.

It is too bad that Mr. Truman and the Democratic leader of the Senate, LYNDON JOHNSON, are indulging in political attack at this serious moment in world affairs. But if the Democratic Party insists upon making such an issue in the coming campaign, there is plenty of proof in the files that the Truman-Acheson administration lost China by listening to unwise advisers, some of whom—including Alger Hiss—were sympathetic to the Communist cause and operated from within the United States Government.

For today's troubles of the Allies stem largely from the fact that China was lost to the free world. There would have been no military aid for the Indochina Communists if China itself were not controlled today by a Communist government, and there would have been no Communist control of Red China if the Truman administration had not allowed Chiang Kai-shek to be undermined by withdrawing American moral support at a critical juncture. There would also have been no chance for a build-up by Communist armies in North Korea to compel the armistice of today if Mr. Truman and the Allies had stood firm and fought the Korean war vigorously in 1950 and 1951.

The danger now is that weakness on the Indochina question will incite the Communists in Moscow and Peiping to take steps that will bring on world war III. This grave situation is fully understood by at least some influential segments of opinion in all the Allied countries. Thus, the London Economist in a recent issue said:

"Long drawn out though the fighting has been (in Indochina), British public opinion has never been encouraged to think out what it means, and as a result, now that a crisis has blown up, people are inclined simply to cry for peace without caring who wins or loses. Any war can always be stopped at any one time if one side gives in. But if the French and their associated states give up the struggle now, the results will be most dangerous for the British people.

"Indeed, that way of putting a stop to the war in Indochina would actually bring an atomic war nearer. It is the considered opinion of the military experts that Indochina is, in President Eisenhower's words, the cork in the bottle. If it falls to the Communists, then there will be the greatest difficulty in preventing them from overrunning, in their own time, the whole of southeast Asia, reviving the insurrection in Malaya, spreading into Indonesia, spilling over into the whole Indian Ocean area, and thrusting a long red tongue of menace down to the shores of Australia.

"It is perfectly idle to suppose that at some stage in this quite possible chain of events Britain would not try to put its foot down. Indeed, we should be drawn into armed resistance as soon as the red tide reached the frontier of Malaya—which is an early stage, the next but one or two. If these are the possible, the quite probable, consequences of letting Indochina go, then it is obviously the right policy for Britain to help keep the cork in the bottle now. Recent history provides plenty of awful examples of the failure to marry logic and courage while there is still time."

DANGER TO AMERICA

A similar warning can be given about the danger to America if the western Pacific comes into Communist control, threatening Japan and the Philippines and affording bases for an attack on American outposts in the Pacific.

There was time just before World War I for the British to "marry logic and courage" and avoid that war, and there was again time between 1936 and 1939 for the British to "marry logic and courage" and avoid the Second World War. It is an ironic coincidence that a British envoy was in Moscow early in 1939 to negotiate a security agreement to defend Poland and was double-crossed by Molotov, who was secretly dealing with Nazi Germany. Will history repeat itself, and is world war III only a question of 2 or 3 years now because the Allies are again unwilling to act decisively against the inexorable advance of a dictatorship government?

Food Can Fight for Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 30, 1954

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, wherever poverty persists, communism grows. This is the "stomach" communism we have learned to recognize in the "have not" areas of the world. It does not matter how much we try to explain the reasons for these facts. They are there, ugly, difficult, and disturbing to all of us who fight for the free institutions we have created in the Western World.

Here at home, Washington reports indicate that we shall soon have a total of $6 billion worth of surplus materials, including food and clothing fibers piled in storage and unused shipping. At the same time, we are informed that more than one-half of the population of the world is living on the brink of starvation, often afflicted with the diseases which accompany poverty and hunger.

President Eisenhower has urged us to use some of our surplus food for overseas help. Presently, some foreign lands which desperately need food are able to pay for the shipment of our surplus. We must be concerned primarily with preserving our own economic stability by preventing any program from dumping commodities to a degree which may depress our own farm markets. But when we have established safeguards for this purpose, we can perform an effective and intelligent service for our own country by making surplus food available for our friends. Food has often fought for our enemies. Here is a chance to make it fight for us.

Congressman Hillings Supports Better Highways

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PATRICK J. HILLINGS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 10, 1954

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, as the Representative in Congress from California's 25th District, which composes the eastern portion of Los Angeles County, I consider an adequate highway system most important to the welfare of the residents of this area. During the present session of the 83d Congress, we have recognized the need for highway construction and improvement and have passed legislation toward this goal. I voted for the bill so that my constituents who are dependent on the automobile for their transportation will be able to pursue their daily tasks with speed, safety, and convenience.

It is well known that during the past year the 25th Congressional District has grown faster than any other area in Los Angeles County. New subdivisions have sprung up in Pomona, Whittier, Covina, Azusa, El Monte. Construction has increased sharply in Alhambra and in Arcadia. Since we do not have a public rapid transit system, the automobile provides the only means by which we can go from place to place.

This new highway bill corrects a previous injustice suffered by motorists. Formerly as much as 40 percent of Federal taxes collected on gasoline and motor oil sales were diverted for uses totally unconnected with improving highways and roads.

Now, for the first time in history, the expenditures for highways are within a few hundred thousand dollars of tax collections. This means that for the next 2 years, beginning July 1, the Federal Government will match State expenditures with almost $966 million per year. California will receive $43,061,000 for all highway purposes.

How will this benefit the 25th Congressional District? Under the new law, we will receive matching funds for construction of interstate highways and freeways. It should be noted that United States Highway No. 66, and United States Highways Nos. 60, 70, and 99 as well as United States Highway No. 101 pass through our area. We know them more familiarly as Foothill Boulevard, Garvey and Valley Boulevards, and Whittier Boulevard, respectively. The Ramona freeway and the Santa Ana freeway are also parts of this system. These highways carry the bulk of the traffic to and from out-of-State points as well as hundreds of thousands of our citizens who live in the 25th District but work in Los Angeles.

Not to be ignored are the roads and streets which constitute the vast network of our secondary system. These are the feeders to the freeways and they are the streets within our cities, towns, and neighborhoods which are important to our local businessmen.

Recreation is not forgotten either, as funds are available for the development of forest roads and trails.

The farmers in our 25th Congressional District will benefit from better farm-to-market roads, thus preventing undue crop spoilage.

Mr. Speaker, this is the first time that Congress has voted to help our State and district with a problem that we have wrestled with for two decades. A trend has been reversed in that the decision as to spending of the money will be with those who know our needs best—our local officials. Washington will not dictate how or where the funds will be distributed. If we need more freeways, we can build them. If some other part of the State needs some other type of highway, it can build it. Thus we will get a dollar's worth of highway for every dollar of highway tax money sent to Washington.

With these funds, matched by contributions from the State of California, our 25th Congressional District will see the growth of a modern highway system and the beginning of a long-overdue attack on the crucial problem of reducing the annual toll of highway deaths and injuries.

Let us not forget the effect the law will have on our local economy. More jobs will be created by these projects. This is an example of government working to build prosperity based on peace rather than on war.

Mr. Speaker, I was proud to vote for this new highway construction and improvement bill.

The Bryson Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 31, 1954

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert a petition which I have received from the First Baptist Church in Nitro, W. Va. The petition is signed by 50 persons, and it is in support of the Bryson bill, H. R. 1227, a bill to prohibit the transportation in interstate commerce of advertisements of alcoholic beverages, and for other purposes.

The petition follows:

Nitro, W. Va.

Hon. Robert C. Byrd,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

The undersigned do petition you in favor of the Bryson bill (H. R. 1227) which would prohibit the transportation in interstate commerce of alcoholic beverage advertising in newspapers, periodicals, etc., and its broadcasting over radio and TV. We understand this bill is to receive a hearing before the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee on May 19–21. We ask that you use your influence in favor of this bill and that you vote for the Bryson bill when it comes before the House. We respectfully ask that you present this petition to the House and have a note made of it in the Congressional Record.

Warren B. Moyer, Virginia Craig Moyer, Grace L. Peck, Ida Mae Stiff, Blanche Baumgartner, Lura A. Melton, Lula B. Ingles, Minnie Ethel Smith, Bertha Mabe, Dorothy A. Powell, G. P. Sizemore, Nitro; Georgia M. Brothers; Minnie V. Brewer, Dorothy M. Hudson, Clarence W. Hudson, Ina Sheets, Agnes O. Burdette, Mrs. Fay Gandee, Chloe Payne, A. W. Milhorn, Nitro; John C. Jarvis, South Charleston; Lillie McCoy, Ruth Viola Knight, M. A. Rutherford, Mrs. N. L. Gentry, N. L. Gentry, Arilda Sublette, Myrtle Lanham, Hilda Pearl McCallister, Gladys Meadors, Virginia Alderson, Marie Trout, Grace O. Draper, Lon Jackson Esteppe, Jr., Ruby Esteppe, Marie Dye, E. W. Dye, Franuline Goodall, Johnny B. Goodall, Mrs. John Santrock, Belle Dodrill, John F. Santrock, John F. Sheets, S. L. Burdette, Edith S. Sublette, Harvey A. Sublette, Ora Florence Eastes, Leon Eastes, Ella Marguerite Grover, Frank E. Grover, Nitro.

Armed Forces Coddling of Athletes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1954

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, a very vigorous editorial from the sports pages of the New Orleans Times-Picayune on the subject of coddling of athletes by the Armed Forces has just come to my attention. It was written by William McG. Keefe, sports editor of that newspaper, who, parenthetically, gave me my first newspaper job when I was still in high school. Bill Keefe's editorial strikes at the very heart of the situation. It is more the pity that other sportswriters in this country have not expressed themselves in like manner.

I have gotten the impression that instead of being eager to cooperate in bringing cases of coddling to the attention of the people, a certain segment of the press in the sports area has been inclined to minimize the seriousness of the situation.

In spite of this obstacle, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Hess], who headed the investigating committee, has rendered a distinct service. It must also be stated for the Record that every expression of cooperation was received from the Army through its spokesman, General Powell.

As a result of this investigation, a new monitoring system will be instituted by the Army in an effort to curtail a repetition of such practices, which admittedly were the exception and not the rule. Even one exception, however, is reprehensible as evidenced in the case of Sugar Ray Robinson.

This case smells as much now as it did 10 years ago.

And if "Sugar Ray" Robinson thinks an injustice has been done him, he has within his power the opportunity to right that wrong.

All "Sugar Ray" Robinson has to do is ask to appear before the committee and tell his story.

If he thinks the record does him an injustice and does not present his case in its true and taudry light, all he has to do is to ask for his record to be given public clearance by the Army. He alone holds the key to this situation. The Army, under the regulations, cannot and will not release his record, unless given permission to do so by the individual himself, in this instance, "Sugar Ray" Robinson.

I personally do not believe he will ask or give permission to have his record released to the public because I have a deep feeling that such public airing would make the whole mess smell far more rotten than at the moment.

Anyway here is what one sports editor, Bill Keefe, thinks about the situation:

VIEWING THE NEWS

(By Bill Keefe)

CODDLING AND DISLOYALTY

For the sake of the gallant and loyal boys whose bodies either lie in far-away South Pacific, European, or Korean graves, or whose remains were brought home, many times to widowed mothers; for the sake of the thousands of hopelessly crippled men who must go through life bearing crosses that include want and torture; for the sake of the millions of courageous and upstanding young Americans who served their country; let it be hoped that Eddie Hébert and other determined and courageous Congressmen and Senators push the coddling of athletes by Army and Navy to the limit. A prison term at hard labor would not be severe enough for the slackers who shirked duty to the country that takes such good care of them, or for the brass, however high, that either winked at or boldly perpetrated this coddling.

Several weeks ago Look magazine carried an article about a young soldier who had been sentenced to face a firing squad because he had refused to shoot a firearm at the enemy though he said he gladly would face enemy fire or do anything else that he could. He did not desert; did not even go AWOL. And he stepped into the unknown with the courage of his convictions, his only request being: "Please shoot straight." All the top "brass" approved his execution.

Yet here was a boxing champion—a great fighter possessing a perfect physique—who deserted, was brought back, forgiven and finally given an honorable discharge. "Sugar Foot" Ray Robinson, a Negro boxer who has been acclaimed one of the best fighters in modern ring history, did that; his act was covered up, he was pronounced "emotionally unfit" for military service and honorably discharged so that now he can avail himself of all the privileges of veterans' care.

There were scores and scores of others—most of them white men—besides Robinson and the big Negro Willie Mays. Their "coddling" certainly cannot be pleasing to a mother whose only son was called into service, a mother who felt her boy must go to the defense of the Nation.

Robinson's case will take lots of explaining. The American Boxing Association's policy committee was holding a meeting in New York at the time Robinson jumped off a Navy ship and deserted. Izzy Mattes, chairman of the Louisiana State Athletic Commission at the time, was on this committee and he said the military police not only rounded Robinson up but, when he resisted arrest, beat him to a pulp.

That wasn't what got Robinson excused from military duty, however. He simply did not choose to fight, like that young Michigan conscientious objector written up in Look—and who was shot by a firing squad.

Little will come of this investigation I guess. When you think of how the "snooze" job at Pearl Harbor was smoothed out and how the many blunders of top "brass" were brushed aside with the explanation "they are expendable" (meaning the loyal young Americans who were victims of these blunders), you can't hope to see justice done on behalf of the dead or maimed heroes who fought for these fair-haired wards of the "brass." Under the theory that "brass" can do no wrong, the "coddling" cases will be buried quickly, but not in honor as were so many thousands of loyal young Americans who were not lucky enough to be "coddled" athletes.

Some Views on Juvenile Delinquency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES R. HOWELL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1954

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, juvenile delinquency is a major problem in this Nation. It is interesting and valuable to hear the views on this problem of Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, the able Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and the editorial views of the Courier-Post, of Camden, N. J.

I include an editorial which appeared in the Courier-Post on May 1, 1954:

J. EDGAR HOOVER'S VIEWS ON JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

J. Edgar Hoover, who is in a position to speak authoritatively, shares the belief of many other experts that the alarming increase in juvenile delinquency and crime in this country is basically due to parental failure.

The Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation was asked this question among 12 in an interview by William K. Hutchinson, Washington correspondent of International News Service, which the Courier-Post printed Thursday:

"Is juvenile delinquency in many instances adult delinquency?"

"Most emphatically," was Hoover's reply. "The parents have the basic responsibilities of teaching their children to be good citizens. They know the child best—his interests, desires, and weaknesses. They must see that he learns to obey the law, respects the rights of others, and behaves as a good citizen.

"All too often parents abdicate this responsibility—that is today one of the great tragedies of American life. The home becomes merely a place to sleep, eat a few bites or change clothes. No longer is it a center of living and learning."

Hoover does not contend that parents alone have the responsibility for making good citizens out of their children. Responsibility also is shared by the schools, churches, civic organizations and law enforcement agencies. But, he insists, the primary responsibility is on the parents: "Nothing can replace the warm understanding, companionship and guidance of a father or mother."

Overcrowded and handicapped in other respects as they are, Hoover says, the schools are not able to do all they should in combatting juvenile delinquency. He thinks law enforcement officers generally are doing good work in this field, and that the Nation owes a great debt of gratitude to those who conduct programs designed to prevent delinquency.

Youth-serving agencies, according to Hoover, are doing magnificent work and without them he shudders to think what the delinquency rate would be. What we need is many more such agencies, he says, better supported financially.

Juvenile vandals—those who destroy and damage property—are dealt with too leniently in most cases, Hoover believes.

"They are more than potential delinquents," he says. "They are actual delinquents. Vandalism is a serious problem, especially the tearing up of school property, defacing churches, etc. To regard such actions as 'children's play' or the 'outlet of youthful energy' is to be highly unrealistic.

"Much delinquency, I am sure, could be prevented if the youngster knew he would have to face the consequences. Many times juveniles count on being released because of some technicality of the law because they are so young or for 'just one more chance.'"

Parents should be compelled to pay for vandalism committed by their children, in Hoover's opinion, both in the interest of justice and as to what would be a most effective means of instilling the proper sense of parental responsibility in them.

"I venture to say such a requirement would change the attitude of many parents," the FBI Chief comments, and in this as in other opinions expressed in this interview he undoubtedly is on solid ground.

The Courier-Post is glad to note once more Hoover speaks out for the policy followed by this newspaper on the subject of publishing the names of juvenile offenders, which is a controversial question in the press throughout the country at this time.

"While the wayward child who makes his first mistake should be treated with understanding," Hoover says, "I have come to the view that there has been too much coddling.

"Perhaps if the newspapers in the more serious cases were to start publishing the names of delinquents and their parents, the power of public opinion would have a salutary effect."

That closely coincides with the Courier-Post's opinion and policy on the question.

While the majority of American newspapers at present may pursue the opposite policy, we believe that eventually they will come to see that it works more harm than good and will swing round to our way of thinking.

Newsday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STUYVESANT WAINWRIGHT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1954

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, immediately after World War II the principal daily newspaper in the First Congressional District of New York, Newsday, was a relatively small and, outside of the area, unknown newspaper. In 8 years this paper has risen to the top of the journalistic family. After having been awarded the Pulitzer prize for meritorious public service on Monday last, May 3, Newsday now finds itself in the Hall of Fame of journalism.

Newsday earned this great honor for having exposed a racketeer, for having presented to the public the evils of an unscrupulous labor boss now serving his prison sentence. This newspaper has done a public service in many other fields. Its editorial policy has consistently defended the rights of free men. It is actively fighting to preserve the dignity of man in its present struggle against vicious legislative abuses. It has attempted to give Long Island daily news coverage from Montauk Point through Queens County. It has been successful.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the membership of the House would be interested in this newspaper's editorial following notification of its Pulitzer prize award:

THE PULITZER PRIZE

The Pulitzer prize is the greatest honor that can be bestowed on a newspaper or a newspaperman. It is the one award above all others that means a newspaper has fulfilled its obligation to its readers. We are profoundly grateful that Newsday has won the Pulitzer prize for meritorious public service. It is recognition of 4 years of work, frustration, and final success in ridding Long Island of William C. DeKoning.

The Pulitzer prize is awarded each year to the newspaper which is considered to best fill the requirements of the late Joseph Pulitzer, who was, until his death in 1911, publisher of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch and the New York World. Pulitzer described his ideal for a paper as "an institution that should always fight for progress and reform, never tolerate injustice or corruption, always fight demagogs of all parties, never belong to any party, always oppose privileged classes and public plunderers, never lack sympathy with the poor, always remain devoted to the public welfare, never be satisfied with merely printing news, always be drastically independent, never be afraid to attack wrong, whether by predatory plutocracy or predatory poverty."

The awards established by the terms of his will also provided for the establishment of a school of journalism at Columbia University. They are awarded annually by the trustees of the university, on the recommendation of a group of topflight journalists.

Newsday proudly joins the distinguished company that includes the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, the Baltimore Sun, the Milwaukee Journal, the New York Times, the Chicago Daily News, the Los Angeles Times, and the Atlanta Constitution.

COOPERATIVE EFFORT

No one person at Newsday can be cited for the prize. It was the result of years of cooperative effort on the part of many members of the writing, editing, photographic, and art staffs. Some of those who share in our honor have left Newsday for other jobs. Some, like the writer of the first series on the life of William DeKoning, had to remain anonymous at the time because of the danger of physical reprisal.

But if anyone can be singled out above the others, it is Managing Editor Alan Hathway. The nomination for the award was made in the name of Alan Hathway and staff, and there it rightly belongs. Hathway spent more hours, more effort, more energy on the story than any other Newsday member. It was he who was cited by David Holman, DeKoning's attorney, as the man most responsible for DeKoning's downfall.

Alan Hathway, however, is the first to realize that his efforts could not have succeeded without the courage and persistence of the staff.

We are proud of both. We trust that our pridefulness will not make us pompous or fat cat.

You our readers will be the final judges of that. And if perchance we start sounding boastful, please give us our comeuppance.

We will have deserved it.

In the meantime—"Oh, what a wonderful day."

Bagley and Shevlin, Minn., Businessmen Support Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 28, 1954

Mr. HAGEN of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include the following resolution adopted by the businessmen of Bagley and Shevlin, Minn., in support of parity prices for farmers.

This is another resolution in the long series of statements of support for farmers by businessmen in communities throughout my district. Our people know that the towns and villages cannot prosper when the farmers are impoverished, and it is indeed a tribute to the great cooperative spirit of the people of the area which I have the honor to represent to have so many testimonials of support for farmers by businessmen and townspeople.

It is also gratifying to me to know that so many citizens, in addition to farmers, are supporting my effort to get at least 90 percent parity, with our aim at 100 percent parity for farm products.

The resolution adopted by the Bagley and Shevlin, Minn., business and professional people as it appeared in the Farmers Independent of Bagley, Minn., on March 11, 1954, follows:

PARITY FOR THE FARMERS

Being the State of Minnesota is a majority agricultural State, the businessmen of this village feel that it is most imperative that we work side by side with those attempting to maintain a farm program which will enrich and develop the agricultural activities wherever they are a major industry or source of livelihood.

In view of the above conclusions, we, the following businessmen of this village, resolved that we go on record condemning any effort on the part of any Congressman, the Department of Agriculture, or any agency for attempting to disrupt the stabilization program affecting all farm commodities.

We further resolve that Congress shall not only maintain 90 percent of parity, but shall try to establish 100 percent of parity for all farm commodities. We do not favor any tendency toward flexibility of price support, but urge Congress to maintain a production control which is necessary in order to have stabilized price support.

We further resolve to condemn any form of prosperity based on war and bloodshed, but favor genuinely sane and sound economic program, particularly for the producer, which shall be based on industry, security, and individual initiative.

We further urge all business groups in other cities of this State as well as those of other agricultural States to go on record favoring similar resolutions.

Michels Tavern, Art Michel; N. A. Larson Insurance, N. A. Larson; C. V. Swanson, dentist; L. B. Hartz Store, M. A. Offerdahl; American Legion, Nels Herman; Community Locker Co-op, Art Brustad; Bagley Co-op Creamery Co., Chester Traaseth, manager; Bagley Cleaners, Bud Berg, owner.

Clearwater County Co-op Trucking Association, O. A. Brown, manager; Bagley Mercantile Co., I. Lee, manager; Martins Drugstore, F. Martin, owner; Goodnough Grill, J. B. Goodnough, owner; Bagley Bakery, Lowell McDougall; Fashion Shoppe, Alma Amundson; Chris and Olive Solee, Solee's Cafe; Dudley-Beaver Garage; Anderson Pure Oil Service; Kenneth Cease, Kenny's Sales and Service; Amundson Motor Co., Art Amundson.

Bagley Implement Co., Jonas Jonson; Central Co-op Bookkeeping Service, C. S. Brustad; Joe's Corner Tavern, Fred Huwe; Bagley Co-op Co., E. L. Prestemon, manager; Bagley Co-op Oil Association, Art Hopke, manager; Walker's Welding Shop, James Walker; David F. Edgar Machine Shop; Aune Motor Co., Melvin Aune; Everhart Bros.; Wilcox Lumber Co., G. E. Lebeda; Hank's Shoe Shop; Bagley Trading Post, W. M. Bertholf.

Nelson Upholstery, Norman J. Nelson; Honstad Implement Co., O. O. Honstad; Galli Home and Farm Store, Garl Galli; Lewy's Toggery, L. A. Vik; Lillegaard's Super Valu, J. Lillegaard; Pederson Drug Store, A. G. Pederson; H. C. Peterson Hardware, H. C. Peterson; Lundmark's Cafe, L. R. Holmgren; Merseth Clothing, J. P. Merseth; Miller's Barber Shop, George Miller; Hi-Way Store, Ed Spencer; Wolhowe Cash Market, Lawrence G. Wolhowe; Jasperson Chevrolet Co., Art Jasperson.

Olsons Meat Market, H. W. Olson; Borgerding Timber Co., N. Borgerding; Thorbeck's Standard Service, Dave Thorbeck; Coast-to-Coast Store, Andy Person; Gesell Concrete Block Co., Wm. Gesell; clerk of district court, John O. Hanson; register of deeds, H. Slaastuen; county highway engineer, Fred Harrison; land commissioner, Elmer Walde; county treasurer, Virgil Hill; county auditor, Geo. D. Allen; county assessor, R. S. Craig; county judge of probate, Melvin T. Anderson; county sheriff, Melvin P. Brustad; county superintendent of schools, Mae B. Barness; county veterans' service office, Geo. W. Anderson; county attorney, O. E. Lewis.

Shevlin: Ray Hines liquor store; Kivisto Repair Shop; Velaski Store; C. J. Paulson, general store; Larry's Standard Service; Heden & Wilde Garage; Gordon's Service Station; Almas Coffee Shop; Gordon Cafe; Theo. E. Olson, Farmers Co-op Creamery; Geo. Kirkeby, locker operator; P. E. Bromaghin, Shevlin Liquor Store; Even Ekre, livestock dealer; R. C. Hershey, gas-station operator; Genne Philp, road contractor; Hank's Barber Shop; F. Duphorn, depot agent.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized book dealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by book dealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Printing and binding for Congress, when recommended to be done by the Committee on Printing of either House, shall be so recommended in a report containing an approximate estimate of the cost thereof, together with a statement from the Public Printer of estimated approximate cost of work previously ordered by Congress within the fiscal year (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 145, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on Printing, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

DISTRIBUTION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

To the Vice President and each Senator 100 copies; to the Secretary and Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, each, 25 copies; to the Secretary, for official use, not to exceed 35 copies; to the Sergeant at Arms, for use on the floor of the Senate, not to exceed 50 copies; to each Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress, 60 copies; to the Clerk, Sergeant at Arms, and Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives, each, 25 copies; to the Clerk, for official use, not to exceed 50 copies; and to the Doorkeeper, for use on the floor of the House of Representatives, not to exceed 75 copies; to the Vice President and each Senator, Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress there shall also be furnished (and shall not be transferable), 3 copies of the daily RECORD, of which 1 shall be delivered at his residence, 1 at his office, and 1 at the Capitol.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

PRINTING DOCUMENTS AND REPORTS

Documents and reports of committees with the evidence and papers submitted therewith, or any part thereof ordered printed by Congress, may be reprinted by the Public Printer on order of any Member of Congress or Delegate, on prepayment of the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 162, p. 1940).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Frank Brodie is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

Appendix

What Is Money?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRY M. GOLDWATER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 12, 1954

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of an address entitled "What Is Money?" delivered by Harold B. Wess, professor of business administration and retailing, American University, Washington, D. C., before the Chesapeake Chapter of Robert Morris Associates in Washington, D. C., on May 11, 1954.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT IS MONEY?

(By Harold B. Wess)

In my opinion, inflation is still the No. 1 threat to our economy and our way of life. We could have runaway inflation if the Government should continue to spend more than it gets. This could come about by printing or by borrowing bank credit for which no corresponding goods are made available. Lenin is reported to have made the now famous statement that the surest way to destroy the capitalist free-enterprise system was to "debauch the currency," to wreck the monetary system upon which it depends.

For almost a quarter of a century we have been doing our best to fulfill Lenin's wish. Some of it was not of our own making; we fought one and a half wars during which time we created a supply of money for things that were ultimately destroyed. We have the money, but not the things.

We are, however, responsible for lots of money created for sheer waste, and that is criminal, and could result in national suicide. This debasing of our currency, started over 20 years ago, has taken such root in our thinking about money that even a conservative government such as we have now finds it extremely difficult to reverse the trend. In fact, an administration that would attempt to follow through on an honest but painful process of currency stabilization would risk its political life, because currency debasers are ready and willing with a promise of a money handout. Politicians have learned that money can be created faster than goods and money makes votes. Printing money is now one of the world's fastest growing industries, and sloppy thinking about money has become a characteristic of our times.

We ought to take warning from what happened to European countries which adopted the expedient of financing heavy government expenditures by, in effect, printing money. Serious inflation resulted with social and political disorders and collapse.

A Senator and two economists recently made public statements that the current economic adjustment is due to the attempted hard money policy of the present administration. I doubt that any business failed to prosper because it had to pay one-half percent more for the use of money or that a customer did not buy her dream house because she had to pay an additional half percent for her money.

Prof. Sumner H. Slichter, the eminent economist, stated in the New York Times on April 11, "The drop in production has been mainly due to the shift from building up inventories to leveling off inventories * * * people have more money to spend now than last year. Much light will be shed on the present recession * * * by understanding why consumers are spending such a small part of their income after taxes." In the same article Professor Slichter has this to say about deficit financing, "Deficit financing, whether it results from tax reduction or increased spending tends to expand the money supply. Unless contrary action is taken at an appropriate later time, the final result is a permanent dilution of the currency."

This point of view is also well stated by Beardsly Ruml: "Much as we want a fiscal policy that will help us to get and hold a high level of prosperity, much as we want high production and high employment, we do not want a fiscal policy that would depreciate the value of the dollar. We do not want any funny money, rubber checks, or trillion-mark notes. We want a sound currency, a stable dollar, a unit of value that we can count on, money that will be worth tomorrow what it is today—a medium of exchange that we can put our savings in, make contracts and leases in, do business in. We want to be sure that our money is good, that we can buy things with it at something like today's prices, today, tomorrow, and in the years to come."

The FHA scandal, and the RFC scandal before that, are tragic examples of the immoral climate that we have created by the belief that the sheer handing out of money will bring prosperity. Because FHA loans were made on evaluations considerably above actual cost of construction apartment house tenants are now paying a higher rent. The excessive rent paid by the tenants is similar to an inflationary increase in the price of a commodity. Money in the hands of bureaucrats, like power in the hands of bureaucrats, corrupts.

Once deficit spending becomes part of our way of life it creates powerful vested interests which demand the continuance of this deficit spending under all conditions. Adam Smith once said, "What is prudence in the conduct of every private family can scarce be folly in that of a great kingdom." We certainly should not tolerate the handling of money in the affairs of our Nation in a manner which would cause us to frown upon such conduct in the affairs of an individual. I recently heard a radio commentator characterize some of our Congressmen as "dollar-minded, penny-pinching." All I can say is that we should have more of the "dollar-minded, penny-pinching" Congressmen in our midst.

Inflation has a great appeal; inflation is the opium of the people; inflation rests on the error of confusing money with wealth, and, again to quote Adam Smith who said two centuries ago, "That wealth consists in money, or in gold and silver is a popular notion which naturally arises from the double function of money, as the instrument of commerce, and as the measure of value * * * to grow rich is to get money; and wealth and money, in short, are, in common language, considered as in every respect synonymous."

Wealth consists in the things we make and use, such as the food we grow and eat; the clothes we wear, the railroads we build and use, the factories producing ships, planes, automobiles, the churches and schools we build. The TV sets and books which adorn the houses we live in—that is the real wealth of the country. This is true now, and was true thousands of years ago when Aristotle observed, "The real wealth of a nation is not money but the productive powers of land and labor."

Money is simply a tool for measuring real wealth but it is not wealth in itself. It is important to grasp this concept in order to understand money. Even gold is not wealth if it is impossible to exchange it for things we need. King Midas who was able to turn everything to gold with a touch of his hand, found himself starving because he could not eat gold. A million dollars in itself is not wealth. It is only wealth if you can exchange it for something useful. During World War II when civilian cars were not being produced, no amount of money could procure a new car.

Along with the funny money philosophy goes the concept that the Government must guarantee prosperity to every group in our economy whether it be business, labor, or farmer. This goes contrary to the fundamental ethics of our society under which we believe that the individual makes his own prosperity. Along with this funny-money philosophy goes the belief that you can get something for nothing and that you can spend more than you have and still remain solvent.

The parable is still a very good form of teaching so let us see what we can learn from the following two stories:

An officer visited a foreign port some years ago. Knowing his usual bad luck at the races, he took the precaution of leaving a $20 bill with the bartender of the hotel before he went to the racetrack. The bartender put the $20 bill in the cash register and shortly thereafter went off duty. The proprietor of the hotel took the bartender's place and seeing the $20 bill in the register decided to use it to pay the liquor dealer. When the liquor dealer received the $20 bill he paid his tailor. The tailor paid the doctor with the same $20 bill and the doctor, residing at the same hotel, was so delighted with the unexpected promptness of payment that he turned the $20 bill over to the hotel as part payment of his rent. Thus the $20 bill found its way back to the cash register. When the officer returned from the races he claimed the $20 bill from the bartender and upon receiving it, tore it to pieces. "Hey," said the horrified bartender, "don't do that." "It's alright," answered the officer, "I was just told it's counterfeit."

Here is the other story. Once upon a time, England, France, and the United States each had a large supply of gold bars. When one country shipped more merchandise than it imported from a particular country, the practice was to pay the difference in gold bars. These were usually shipped to the creditor country. After a time the three countries decided that shipping gold back and forth, using a lot of valuable space on ships, was both cumbersome and expensive. They agreed to take all the gold the United States, Britain, and France had and ship it to a small island in the Pacific for safe keeping. They arranged the gold bars in three piles—one for each country. They engaged a native who lived on the island who could barely read and write but knew enough to transfer the gold bars from one pile to another as directed. If a transaction was such that Britain owed half a million dollars' worth of gold to the United States, the native took this amount of bars from Britain's pile and placed it on the pile of the United States, and this completed the transaction.

As the transactions between the three countries continued, the native periodically received slips of paper directing him to transfer gold from one pile to the other. Once a year representatives from each of the three nations visited the island to check whether the quantity of gold in each pile corresponded with their own records. They would report to their respective nations that everything was in order.

One year the three representatives came to make their annual inspection; but—no island. There had occurred a volcanic eruption and the island, gold, and native were all sunk in the bottom of the ocean. They did not know what to do. If they announced to the world that all the gold was gone, it would create a world panic. So, after deliberation, they agreed to report that everything was in order, that each pile of gold had the number of bars in accordance with the record. And so France, Britain, and the United States continued to send little slips of paper, keeping the same records, and business went on as usual. Billions of dollars worth of business continued to be transacted in the belief that the gold was being properly allocated, but actually there was no gold—only faith.

These two parables dramatically teach us the vital lesson that fundamentally money is faith—faith in the ethics of the managers of our money.

Money, as we all know, was not always gold, silver, or paper. There was a period before modern money evolved when people bartered things in exchange for other things and services. A story is told of a Parisian concert singer who entertained on a far off island and was paid with pigs, turkeys, chickens, tropical fruits, etc. This seems funny to us, but even today, there are places in this country where the doctor is still paid for his professional services in chickens, eggs, and other daily essentials.

Before the Revolutionary War, it was not unusual for students to pay their tuition with a cow. This is what is known as a pecuniary transaction in a very literal sense. the word pecuniary comes from the word pecunia which is Latin for money. It is derived from the word pecus which means cattle. This would seem to indicate that money traces itself back to cattle as a medium of exchange.

In 1618, the Governor of the Colony of Virginia ordered that tobacco should be valued at the rate of three shillings for the pound weight. In other words, tobacco became a medium of exchange. At different times in our country's history, sugar, racoon skins, a gallon of peach brandy, and other commodities were used as money or a medium of exchange.

From June 1932 to June 1952 the money supply of the United States increased 500 percent and wholesale prices rose 167 percent. If our country did not have the great productive capacity we are blessed with, we could by now have runaway inflation. But even our great productive capacity could not produce the goods and services as fast as we were able to create a supply of money and that is why our savings have lost half of their purchasing power. In spite of pious rationalization, the fact is that we are far from having achieved a stable dollar and the test is that the real value of the dollar has been going only one way—down. We will have to use heroic measures to stop this trend.

There are those who say that if you double the supply of money without increasing the supply of goods and services—"so what?" All it means is that everybody is using $2 instead of $1 for all the goods they buy or sell. But not everyone is sitting around with land, buildings, machinery, inventories, etc. What about those who have made contracts for future delivery? What about those living on fixed income? What about those who paid a dollar in insurance and stand to get back a dollar worth only 50 cents?

Subsidy handouts have become part of our funny money philosophy. Our Government is now running a large butter cartel by holding 264 million pounds of butter in storage with the result that millions of consumers are being forced to pay more for it. The Government is now paying to store three quarters of a billion bushels of corn that might well be used to produce cheaper pork. Through this money support handout we create the curious anomaly that corn in the warehouse is a surplus while corn for feed is scarce. Actually what the Government is doing is to tax successful private business in order to support unsuccessful private business.

Inflation brings benefits for a short time to favored groups at the expense of others. In the long run it brings disaster to the whole community. The Government inflates the currency when it begins to borrow and spend for nonproductive purposes. Thus it increases the credit currency without increasing an equivalent amount of goods and services. Increasing the money supply as a result of borrowing by governments, has been a fundamental factor in causing price increases and runaway inflations throughout the history of the world.

A government cannot keep piling up debt indefinitely because it will ultimately result in bankruptcy. Adam Smith observed, "When national debts have once become accumulated to a certain degree, there is scarce, I believe, a single instance of their having been fairly and completely paid. The liberation of the public revenue, if it has ever been brought about at all, has always been brought about by a bankruptcy; sometimes by an avowed one, but always by a real one, though frequently by a pretended one."

We have a tendency to use the words "hard money," "easy money," and "soft money" too loosely. There are degrees of "hard," "soft," and "easy." For instance, gold is hard; so is cast iron. Gold has no give to it. Cast iron is hard but only on the surface. Crack cast iron and it wil break. Many government-controlled currencies that appear hard on the surface will crack with the first jar in the economy. Rubber is soft and that is where we get the concept of the "rubber dollar." I prefer, when talking about money, to think of it in terms of leather, which does not stretch as readily as rubber but has more give to it than gold.

We know that so long as most of our existing national debt is in the hands of banks, we have the bases for currency and credit expansion that is inflationary. Let us get a substantial part of the existing national debt into the hands of the savers at an attractive, competitive interest rate.

We must take the management of money and credit out of the realm of politics. The time has come—we are at another crossroads. In 1908, as part of the aftermath of the disastrous panic of 1907, the National Monetary Commission was established. Let us now again appoint a board of experts who would be commissioned to make a complete study of our money and credit structure. It is not too late yet to reexamine all inflationary acts and practices of the last 25 years. Let this board recommend policies that will stabilize our dollar and reverse the trend toward inflation and an ever-rising public debt.

Development of Visual Teaching Aids

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 12, 1954

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the Thomas Fowler Post, No. 169, American Legion, Wichita Falls, Tex., is sponsoring a national competition to stimulate the development of visual teaching aids in our schools.

The Thomas Fowler Post has an entry of its own and is challenging all comers.

Details of the competition are set forth in an article sent to me recently by Frank E. Williams, adjutant of the post. I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Thomas Fowler Post, No. 169, American Legion, Wichita Falls, Tex., like many other such units, is named for a fine young American who fell in foreign service during World War II. It is dedicated to rendering every possible service to improve the prospects of every American boy and girl for fruitful long life. For that reason, this group turned its attention recently to a new method of teaching arithmetic in the elementary grades of Wichita Falls, Tex., public schools, and promptly voted to sponsor a national contest to reveal or stimulate the development of similar methods in any curricular subject, in other American communities.

What the Thomas Fowler Post discovered in the Wichita Falls Schools is the Attaboy Puzzle Game. Its author is Arvil Davis, a teacher in the elementary grade schools of Wichita Falls since 1937, save for 2 years as a staff sergeant with the United States Air Transport Command in Africa. He applied himself first to a device by which children could master their basic number combinations, quickly, surely—and pleasantly. Interested in testing the value of his system he arranged for a contest. The approximately 30 pupils in one of his classes were pitted against a selected group of like number in another school—one, in fact, in which the inherent IQ would be notably higher than in his group. The latter group tackled the assignment by the customary methods. Over a given period, the Davis class using the Attaboy method scored a decisive victory.

The Attaboy Puzzle Games consist of a series of board puzzles similar to jigsaw—one each for addition, multiplication, subtraction, and division. Each board contains 24 basic problems using different possible combinations of numbers zero through nine. The cutout pieces bear the answers to the problems thus posed. Only the correct answer will fit the opening under each problem. Mistakes, therefore, are impossible. The game may be played by one person, working against time in completion of the four boards. Or it may be played by as many as four in mutual competition. The player first completing the board first assigned him wins the first round. The boards are rotated so that each player has worked each of the four boards—when the final winner can be determined. The secret of it is, according to its creator, that "children learn very quickly that 'six times seven is 42' when it means winning or losing a game."

Davis put the Attaboy Puzzle Games into production in attractive contrasting colors, using the garage at his home as factory and warehouse. Soon production of boards was assigned to a commercial plant, printing to a printing firm. Davis continues to direct a circulation and distribution. Attaboy has been distributed in 29 of this country's States, more than 20,000 sets have been sold, and production in increasing.

To this impressive exhibit, the Thomas Fowler Post responded quickly. "It's possible no way will ever be found to make castor oil easy to take," they observed, "but anyway, this solves a problem in primary arithmetic." Furthermore, they observed, an increase of 100 to 200 percent in elementary grade school enrollment is a certainty for the next few years—scholastic censuses have proved it.

Davis' angle was equally practical. "Practically everyone more than 5 years old has to work with arithmetic, at least in some degree, the rest of his life. That's a long time to dislike doing something that can be fun."

This is why the Thomas Fowler Post has come up with $250 in cash prizes to be awarded through national channels for the three best visual teaching aids in any field of elementary education—$150 for first, $75 for second, and $25 for third place.

Any one wishing to enter this competition is asked to submit the plan and explanation of his device to the president of his own State Teachers Association, or directly to the Thomas Fowler American Legion Post, Wichita Falls, Tex. Submitted ideas then will be turned over to the president of the National Education Association. It will be suggested that he confer with the American Toy Manufacturers Association's Toy Guidance Committee, and then set up a committee of judges who will have full authority to name the three winners.

Will the Davis Attaboy Games be entered? They certainly will—and with the full support of the sponsoring post. After all, it's Texan. But that will have nothing to do with adjudication of results. What the Thomas Fowler Post is doing, in fact, is laying down the Texas cards, face up, on the table and is saying to all educators of the Nation: "Shower down. Let's see who's got the best plans for helping our youngsters master the ornery parts of necessary schooling."

Deadline for acceptance of entries by the Thomas Fowler Post, No. 169, in Wichita Falls, Tex., will be November 15, 1954. Announcement of results before January 30, 1955, is promised.

Corporal Dickenson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 12, 1954

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an editorial on the subject of Corporal Dickenson which was published in the Somerset Daily American of May 6.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

DICKENSON

Cpl. Edward S. Dickenson, who feared what would happen to him in the event of his returning to the United States and then yielded to a stronger impulse to return, has gotten his reward.

The Reds had told him what would happen to him if he returned to the United States. Twenty-three other American soldiers remained with the Reds rather than take the medicine. One other changed his mind later.

Dickenson has been given 10 years at hard labor for his misdeeds. He was convicted of having spied on his fellow American prisoners and worked the will of the Communists upon them.

Twenty-two of the Americans who refused to return home at the time the armistice was proclaimed in Korea are yet with the Reds.

The question before the court that tried Dickenson was difficult to answer. The evidence of his misdoings seems to have been convincing. But at a time when he could have escaped the prison sentences at hard labor, he repented of his sins and returned to the United States.

The question is:

Will the sentence imposed upon Dickenson deter other soldiers in like circumstances, perhaps in peril of their lives, from acting as Dickenson acted, or will it make service in the Armed Forces itself a penalty for something or other.

There will be a variety of opinions among Dickenson's fellow Americans.

The most likely foe American soldiers will face in the near future is the same sort that Dickenson faced. The so-called law of nations will have no influence upon that foe. Captives will face death, denying information the foe desires, or refusing cooperation with the enemy.

It is certain that an American should not imperil the lives of his fellows to save his own life, but psychiatrists before the court martial attested that there are conditions under which a soldier placed in Dickenson's position loses the power to choose between right and wrong.

The fact is that after hesitating, after tossing in his mind the question of returning home, Dickenson determined to throw himself upon the mercy of his fellow Americans.

The mercy he got is 10 years in prison at hard labor and dishonorable discharge from the Army.

Democratic Views on Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 12, 1954

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, on Thursday, May 6, I addressed a meeting of the nationalities division of the Democratic Party in the Vandenberg Room of the Capitol. I ask unanimous consent that my prepared remarks on that occasion be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

REMARKS OF HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN, OF NEW YORK, BEFORE THE NATIONALITIES DIVISION OF THE DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL COMMITTEE

It gives me much satisfaction to be at this luncheon meeting of the nationalities division of the Democratic National Committee. I am proud to be a vice chairman of that committee and to serve under the distinguished leadership of my good friend, Senator Green, and with my other colleagues of the Senate and House.

I need not tell those assembled here how deep is my concern for the welfare and the interests of all the nationalities groups in this country. They are, in composite, the breath and spirit of America. They give to America one of its special flavors which sets our country apart from all the other countries of the world.

Each nationality group has an interest in the country of its birth or descent. Added up, those interests are the interests of the United States in the world at large—in a world of which we are an integral part, in a world for whose welfare the United States of America bears a central responsibility.

Today we, as Democrats but above all, as Americans, have a growing apprehension concerning the direction of our international policies. We have a deep anxiety for the peace and security of the free world.

The strong unity of the free world which was forged during the administration of Franklin D. Roosevelt and Harry S. Truman is more dangerously strained today than at any time in our recent memory. And this is our greatest danger, in the face of the aggressive designs and purposes of the Communist world.

It was claimed by spokesmen for the administration recently that the initiative in world affairs is now ours and that great advances have been made in the struggle against Communist imperialism.

I wish with all my heart that this claim could be justified. But I fear it is not so. The march of recent events has shown this to be no more than a glib boast, unsupported by facts.

Life is not so simple as that—for either one side or the other to claim the initiative.

We face hard facts and a hard future, a dangerous future. We must pray for the leaders of our Government, thought they be of a different political party, an inspired guidance for the days ahead. Should they blunder badly, not only will Americans suffer equally, but the whole world will suffer. There is no political advantage in world catastrophe.

On these preponderant issues of our foreign policy, there is no Democratic Party line. There is only an American line—what will best serve the cause of fredom, peace, justice, and security—for us and for all peoples. What policy will best restore the unity of the free world? What policy will best serve to hold freedom-loving men together in firm resistance to the rule of savagery and tyranny?

There are no easy answers to these questions, but the questions suggest their own answers. Whatever policy we pursue must answer these criteria. I do not think our present policies are calculated to meet these tests.

While the immediate military and political policies with regard to Asia are first and foremost in our minds these days, there are other questions of policy closer to home, and more subject to our immediate control which we must not neglect or forget.

Among these are policy questions of immediate concern to the nationality groups assembled here today. I am thinking, for instance, of our policy toward human rights, and our policy toward the crime of genocide.

If the administration wants to convince peoples abroad of our sincerity in advocating the rights of all peoples, and in seeking the security of all peoples, whether they are in front of or behind the Iron Curtain, whether they are in Europe, in Asia, or in Africa—our Government should take a bolder stand in regard to human rights—in regard to the right of all peoples to aspire to freedom—freedom from colonialism, as well as freedom from Communist tyranny.

We should be advocating human rights in the United Nations.

We should be supporting, with whatever reservations are required, the human rights covenant.

We should be advocating, at home and abroad the Genocide Convention.

The surrender by this administration on the human rights front and on the Genocide Convention is one of the more shameful of our recent episodes.

Only this week Moscow announced that the Soviet Government had ratified the Genocide Convention. What a grim paradox that the nation that stands indicted before the eyes of the world of the crime of genocide should ratify the Genocide Convention, while we who should be the accusers, in the name of those millions who have been murdered, stand silent. At least our Government is silent.

The administration refuses to call on the leadership of the Senate to press for action on the Genocide Convention. The Genocide Convention is in the Foreign Relations Committee. It was submitted to the Senate by President Truman. It is still pending—pigeonholed—and this administration and the Republican Party leadership in the Senate refuse to take it out of that pigeonhole.

The nationalities division of the Democratic Party should and must, I believe, bring these points home again and again. Our party should ceaselessly advocate a change in policy in regard to this matter. We should bring home to every American citizen, and certainly to those with ties abroad, that the administration has surrendered to an isolationist wing within its own party, in throwing overboard the Human Rights Covenant and the Genocide Convention.

Instead of meaningless words about liberation, which administration leaders first say and then retract, the administration should be assuring those behind the Iron Curtain—both the enslaved and the enslavers, both the persecuted and the perscutors—that the tyrants will be held to account for mass extermination of peoples and for mass oppression of peoples, and that the oppressed may look to us to uphold and maintain their interests, and to strive for their freedom, in every practical way.

There is still another policy in which I am vitally interested—and in which all of you are vitally interested—immigration and citizenship.

President Eisenhower promised time and again that he would seek a revision of the iniquitous McCarran-Walter Act. What has he done to fulfill that promise? What has his party done to carry out that pledge? The answer is nothing. Almost less than nothing. There are several bills before the Congress to revise the McCarran-Walter Act—one a comprehensive bill—the so-called Lehman-Celler bill, with 31 Democratic sponsors—and the other a very limited bill—the so-called Javits-Ives bill, with 8 Republican sponsors.

But the Judiciary Committees of the Senate and the House have made no move to schedule hearings on those bills. There is no intention on the part of the Republican leadership to hold hearings on those bills.

It is up to you, among others, to demand hearings, and to demand them in a voice so loud and so lasting, that it will echo through the Halls of Congress, to the end that hearings will be scheduled. That is a job for all nationality groups—to demand that hearings be held. Then there is the Refugee Relief Act. Has their ever been a legislative fraud so shocking as this one? President Eisenhower proposed to admit 240,000 emergency immigrants—refugees, displaced persons, and surplus population—within a period of 2 years, outside the quota.

As enacted, the law chiseled the 240,000 down to 209,000 to be spaced over a period of 3 years and 8 months. Almost a year of that time has gone by. Do you know how many refugees, orphans, displaced persons, and surplus population from abroad have been admitted to the United States?

Well, the last time I checked—it was a week or so ago—the number was 8—not 8,000, but just 8 individuals, out of 209,000.

And there is no indication yet how the log-jam is going to be broken. The administration seems to have decided that the safest way to administer that law is to keep everybody out.

As of a week ago, there had been received only 3,924 assurances from United States citizens for the admission of particular aliens abroad. The process has been made so cumbersome, that it takes a courtroom full of lawyers to fill out a single assurance form.

. The Refugee Relief Act itself was a bad piece of legislation. It is being administered in the worst possible way. It is thus far a hoax. It can be amended. The administration of the law can be liberalized so that the homeless and hopeless abroad, who need to come to the United States, who would make good citizens here, can come.

I hope the organizations with which you are in contact will keep up a ceaseless pressure, will remind the administration day after day after day, of its pledges and hedges on this matter. I hope the tragic situation will be remedied.

I could say more, but brevity recommends itself. I wish you all a most pleasant, profitable and inspiring visit to the Nation's capital. This is a pleasant reunion. Let us resolve to fight on until our battle is won, in November 1954, and November 1956.

Making Economic Weather

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURNET R. MAYBANK

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 12, 1954

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record the second of a series of three lectures, delivered by Mr. Bernard M. Baruch at the Bernard M. Baruch School of Business and Public Administration, City College, New York, on May 11, 1954.

There being no objection, the lecture was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

MAKING ECONOMIC WEATHER

(By Bernard M. Baruch)

Last week the question was asked why man is able to perform such scientific and technological wonders as splitting the atom or conquering disease, and yet finds it so difficult to manage his own human affairs.

When it comes to sciences like medicine, astronomy, or physics we seem like supermen. But with Government and economics our fumblings are more like those of children.

Partly it is because we have not advanced as far in understanding the human sciences. In reading history one is struck by how certain patterns keep repeating themselves, such as the abuses that come from any man being given too much power, or how tinkering with the value of money always ends up as a failure, or those curious madnesses which sweep over a whole people, like John Law's Mississippi Bubble or, in our own day, the 1929 stock-market craze.

As we learn to distill the salt of wisdom from the vast ocean of man's experience, I believe we will discover that these patterns were clues to the natural laws that govern human affairs.

NOT IN OUR STARS

But more unfortunate than the gaps in our knowledge are our own shortcomings. Even where we have known of these natural laws and how they operate we still have failed to work in harmony with them. Often we grab greedily what we can for the day, letting the morrow bring what it will. We put off doing what we know is necessary, because it seems unpleasant or unpopular. Yet, particularly in these times when our whole civilization is under constant attack, neglect is one thing that never seems to go down in price.

We saw that in China and now in Indochina. I hope we and our allies will learn the lesson in time to bring the European Defense Treaty into existence, instead of repeating there the cycle of tragedy through failing to act in time.

A CASE HISTORY

In this talk today, I want to concentrate upon economic problems, on booms and busts. This subject could be approached from many different angles. My approach will be by reexamining something we are all familiar with—the law of supply and demand.

This is the most basic of all economic laws. It holds the key to the threat of another depression. Yet how well understood is it? And why, when so much is at stake, do we find it so difficult to discipline ourselves to what this law requires of us?

To begin with, just how does supply and demand really work? Any number of you students here may be itching to rattle off an answer to that question. Your reply probably would run like this:

When demand rises, prices go up. This stimulates production. With good profits being earned, new producers enter into competition, adding to the supply. Substitutes come onto the market. As prices rise, consumers also buy less. In time, as demand lessens and supply increases, a balance is struck and prices start coming down.

CHAIN OF REACTIONS

With this fall in prices, the processes of adjustment reverse themselves. The newest or highest cost producers are forced out of production or they lower their output. As prices fall, substitutes disappear from the market. Lower prices also stimulate demand. People go out to buy that automobile or house or new clothes which they put off buying when prices were high. Again, in time, as demand expands and supply shrinks, a new balance is found and prices start up again.

All of this is true, but it skips over two crucial factors which are easily forgotten.

First, the workings of supply and demand never stop. They form an endless process of adjustment which is always going on. This means that the workings of supply and demand must always be seen as part of a whole and not as piecemeal, spasmodic happenings. It is largely because this truth is neglected, as we shall see later on, that so many attempts to influence the workings of supply and demand fail.

TRAGEDY OF OUR AGE

Second, these adjustments take time. Supply and demand cannot be brought into balance with a presto push of the button. Often a whole year must pass before the ground can be cleared of one harvest and planted to another.

And what if we do not have enough time for these slow workings of supply and demand, as is the case during war?

Here we come to the most tragic, single failure of economic understanding in our lifetimes.

Nothing, may I repeat, nothing has cost this country and the rest of the world more, except the losses and maimings of war itself, than the failure to grasp the enormous difference in the workings of supply and demand under conditions of war and under conditions of peace.

WHAT IS NORMAL?

Since 1914 we have either been going into a war or coming out of one. Twice—and this does not include the lesser ordeal of Korea—we have had to turn our economy inside out to meet the needs of war, and, when the shooting was over, to turn the economy outside in to meet the needs of peace.

In that entire period, which more than covers your own lifetimes, hardly a year could be considered free of the pressures or shadow of war or postwar adjustment. Yet through this period most economic thinking assumed that we were dealing with peacetime problems.

There are two main differences between the economics of peace and those of war. First, in war there is no time. What is needed—guns and equipment for the men called to the front—must be furnished with the least possible delay. Time means lives. Time can mean the difference between victory and defeat.

War also requires a drastic redirection of the uses of a nation's resources. Instead of producing to improve living conditions, we must shift our emphasis to produce what is needed for survival.

WHAT WAR TAUGHT

To try to meet the requirements of survival through the peacetime working of supply and demand would lose us the war.

That was one lesson impressed upon me by my experience during the First World War as Chairman of the War Industries Board. Never before had the United States been mobilized for a modern war. We had to feel our way through trial and error. We quickly learned that, if the economy were left alone as in peacetime, defense production would be obstructed. While some profiteered, our soldiers and their families would suffer.

It was not always easy to make that clear to all of the leaders of American industry, many of whom believed the Government had no right to interfere with how they ran their businesses. I remember how Judge Gary, of United States Steel, balked over the price we set for steel; also how some auto manufacturers raged when we told them that three-fourths of their capacity would have to go for war. But we held firm. Only by curtailing civilian demand could military demand be met.

After that war was over, when I looked back upon our experiences, I realized that for wartime mobilization to be effective, supply and demand as it operates under peacetime conditions must be suspended. But that does not mean the principles of supply and demand can be ignored. Quite to the contrary.

FIRST THINGS FIRST

A sound mobilization requires that every aspect of the law of supply and demand be reproduced and adapted to the needs of war. Where during peacetime we look to the free workings of buying and selling to bring the economy into balance, in wartime the balance must be achieved through conscious direction.

Everything we tried to do in mobilizing America for World War I was really just that—a search for the wartime equivalent of supply and demand.

Instead of letting prices decide what was to be produced, the Government said where the Nation's resources were to go so that first things would come first. This necessitated not only increasing the production of all scarce resources, but lessening the demand for these resources by curtailing less essential uses, halting construction and other activities that could be postponed, encouraging the use of substitutes. We saved precious resources of material and labor by standardizing the number of models and through conservation, by making old things do.

Had the lessons that we learned in World War I been applied in World War II, the second war could have been shortened by a full year or more, with all the saving in lives and treasure. But instead of starting with a fully worked out mobilization, we proceeded in faltering steps, repeating the old trials and errors of advisory commissions and competing boards until we finally ended up where we should have begun.

PRICE WE STILL PAY

This neglect has been particularly evident in efforts to control inflation. Experience has shown that the fairest and most effective way of preventing inflation and profiteering is to couple, along with taxation to the limit and other money controls, a general ceiling across the entire economy, over all wages, all prices and all other costs. This should be done at the very outset of the emergency, before the economy has gotten out of hand. With the economy kept in balance, then all the necessary adjustments can be made to meet war needs.

Yet in both of the last two war emergencies—World War II and Korea—although what needed to be done was clear—action was delayed until too late and not before prices had jumped over the moon.

The failure to impose effective controls at the outset of World War II increased the cost of that war by perhaps $100 billion. The repetition of this failure when the Korean war broke out has added at least $40 billion to defense costs since then. Taken together, in other words, more than half of our national debt, which burdens us so heavily today, represents the needless tribute exacted by inflations which could have been largely prevented.

WALKING ON STILTS

As a result of these inflations, millions of persons with low or fixed incomes have been cruelly squeezed. The budgets of all our governmental units, colleges, hospitals, and other institutions have been deranged. Here in New York City the subway fare is increased but the additional revenue is swallowed almost in one gulp by higher operating costs. Teachers, firemen, and others, whose incomes lagged in the inflationary race, clamor for relief and justifiably so.

The inflation of the war and after-war years also pushed our whole price structure up onto stilts, far above levels that can be maintained under ordinarily competitive conditions. Now we face the painful process of readjusting those prices and costs, wages and rents.

As these adjustments take place people worry whether the whole structure will collapse unto another depression. There is much agitation over the Government's responsibility to forestall or prevent such a depression. But hardly anyone explains how is the Government to discharge such a responsibility unless it first has learned to prevent the inflationary booms which cause the busts?

Can we just inflate, inflate, and inflate and then, having run the whole gamut of economic sins, turn around and like a penitent child, say, "We want to behave now. Do something so we won't have to pay for the mess we have made."

WHEN THE LIGHTS WENT OUT

When I read or hear of someone demanding that the Government take this or that action, I ask myself why were those voices so silent when we were fighting the battle to halt inflation before it had rocketed out of hand?

The inflation of recent years was caused largely by a selfish struggle for special advantage among various pressure groups. Instead of accepting a common standard fair to all and which would have kept down all costs and prices, each group tried to keep its prices or wages or profits free, even while arguing "control the other fellow."

This same contest for special advantage is being repeated now in the process of readjustment. Each group seems bent upon having the burden of dislocation borne by someone else. Each wants tax relief for itself but not for others. Each argues that to avoid a depression its wages or its prices or its profits must be kept up, and that it is the other fellow's income which should come down first.

WE CAN PREVENT COLLAPSE

Now, I do not believe that the readjustment of costs and prices currently underway must bring on a collapse. Certainly, under no condition is there any reason for going through what happened after 1929. Still, we will have to pay some price of adjustment for the inflationary neglects of the past. How heavy that price may be will depend mainly on two things: On our success in subordinating to the higher national interest this battle for selfish advantage now raging among the various segments of our economy, and upon our skill in adjusting to the changed conditions of supply and demand all over the world.

The postwar sellers' market is gone. New competitive conditions confront us everywhere. The adjustments to these new conditions cannot be made by the Government. They must be made by individuals—by each of us in our businesses, on our jobs, on our farms. We must cut costs, work harder, sell harder. If we lose one market, we must find another. If what we produce has been outstripped technologically by some new development, we must find new uses for our product or shift to what is in demand.

NO KING CANUTES

The sooner these adjustments are made the better.

At the same time we cannot—and need not—let these adjustments go too far. Adjust, yes. Bust, no.

I have long maintained that in our complex, urbanized society a floor had to be kept under our economy at all times. But that is quite different from contending, as some do today, that there should be no downward adjustment from sky-high ceilings.

The simple reality we face is that even if it wished to do so, the Government could not keep prices at levels which reflected the shortage conditions of war and of the immediate postwar years. The adjustments to the changed conditions of supply and demand cannot be stopped, no more than King Canute could halt the tide.

The real choice before us is shall we ease these adjustments by working in harmony with them or shall we make things worse by fighting them?

EQUALITY FOR FARMERS

I have never believed in abandoning our economy to the ruthless workings of the marketplace, regardless of the human suffering that might be caused. During the 1920's I joined with George N. Peek and others in the fight to give farmers economic equality. As it turned out, when the last war came we needed all the food that could be raised, including he output of the millions of farmers who might have been forced out of production had they not been helped.

Nor am I alarmed at the so-called surpluses we now have. These surpluses are genuine wealth whose real value eludes us only because we have not learned how to manage them to raise consumption and living levels.

In the present farm situation I do feel that all of us should be content to pay something as insurance against poor crop years. But the incentives to greater production which might have been necessary in wartime should not be retained. During the war the habitual sources of food for many peoples were cut off. Our production had to be expanded to make up the difference. With most of these sources of supply restored to production—and this holds true for many other things besides food—price supports must be made more flexible.

NO TAX CUTS

Many farmers fear that their costs will not decline while farm prices do go down. We should strive to keep the various segments of the economy in balance. This really means approaching the problem in terms of what is good for the whole country and not in terms of any specific pressure group.

I have opposed all tax reductions until first, the needs of national security are fully met and, second, the budget is brought into balance. To reduce taxes with an unbalanced budget and so swollen a national debt is both uneconomic and immoral. It puts a premium on efforts to escape bearing a fair share of the heavy cost of the cold war.

Nor is this the time for Government to embark on vast public-works programs or to pump more money into the economic system, as some demand. Before we ask the "cook" in the White House to bake us up a new inflationary pie, let us try to digest the inflation already loose in our system and to restore the value of earnings and savings. I think the time has come to stop the lending by governments to governments and to give private investment the opportunity to show what it can do. It is also time that the currencies of the world were freed. Until they are it is futile to talk of reducing tariffs.

LIKE THE WEATHER

What is needed, in short, is for each of us to rediscover and reapply the law of supply and demand, making it our ally, not enemy, in the adjustments that lie ahead. The workings of supply and demand, as we have seen, are those of a never-ending chain reaction of adjustments. Whatever is done in one direction inspires some counterbalancing, compensatory action by other parts of the economy. Many acts of Government intervention in the field of economics fail for just this reason, that they are taken as isolated, piecemeal moves instead of being fitted into the whole economy.

Supply and demand are really like the weather, always with us, inescapable. Despite the efforts of rainmakers, we cannot decide when the sun will shine or the skies will cloud over. But that cost does not mean, despite what Mark Twain said, that we can do nothing about the weather. The clothes we wear and the houses which shelter us are examples of our adjustments to the weather, so are umbrellas, air conditioning, electric blankets, refrigerators. By studying the experience and records of the past, we can predict in advance what kind of weather we are likely to have and how best to prepare for the weather, fair or foul.

And so it must be with our efforts to improve upon the economic weather. We cannot eliminate the workings of supply and demand. We can only adjust its workings to our needs and ourselves to its principles. If we want to prevent depressions we must first learn how to prevent inflation and how to adjust to the changed workings of supply and demand under conditions of war and peace.

Even as we must have sense enough to know when to come in out of the rain, we must learn when it is wise for the Government to step into things—and when it should step out.

THE MORE THINGS CHANGE

In conclusion, as we glance around us today, all of us must be struck by the extent to which the old philosophy of "leave things alone" has been replaced by Government intervention.

If we look abroad we find more restrictions against the free flow of trade than ever before—quotas and tariffs, export subsidies, and currency controls.

Washington is full of regulatory commissions—the Federal Reserve, the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Federal Trade Commission, the Securities and Exchange Commission, and others. We have antitrust laws to stimulate competition and fair trade laws to restrict competition. In almost no field are supply and demand being permitted to work without interference.

It would be tragic if all this benevolent intervention led anyone to believe that we have freed ourselves from the basic economic laws that govern human behavior. If anything, the more deeply the Government intervenes in economic affairs, the more important these laws become.

Not only in economics but in every phase of life, the revolutionary transformation in the role of Government that has taken place in recent years has only sharpened our need to discipline ourselves to the basic truths and laws of human experience. How and why that is so is something I would like to develop more fully in next week's talk.

May Day Speech at Naugatuck, Conn., at Dinner Given in Honor of Congressman James T. Patterson by Gene Tunney, May 1, 1954

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 12, 1954

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, on the occasion of a testimonial dinner in my honor May 1, Gene Tunney, a personal friend and former heavyweight champion of the world, delivered an address.

I believe it to be an excellent commentary on the evils of communism, and the methods whereby an individual citizen may combat this menace. I, therefore, include the address as a part of my remarks:

Twenty-three years ago today, May 1, 1931, Mrs. Tunney and I stood alongside of Lenin's tomb in Moscow's Red Square. We had been persuaded to take a look-see at the Russian scene by a cleverly written propaganda opus, namely, Humanity Uprooted, by Maurice Hindus. On the whole, one was led to believe by the Russian-born Columbia professor, that Russia, after 14 years of Soviet rule, had become the utopia of the world.

We went to review the May Day celebration in Red Square, and what we saw of celebrating utopians led us to believe that there was widespread deception going on amongst the celebrants. It was an exhibition of pure hypocrisy on the part of the leaders and pure misrepresentation on the part of the millions of people who participated in the parade.

The parade, however, was not all that we saw in Russia. We were privileged, through the maneuvering of American engineers, working for the Soviet masters at that time, to see some off-the-beaten-track sights. We saw enough to convince us that the author of Humanity Uprooted was either a fool or a very skillful propagandist for the Soviet worldwide conspiracy.

A particular experience that stands out in my mind was at a smelting plant where I had been taken by an engineer named John McClenahan, who was technical adviser at the plant. This plant recovered precious metals from confiscated church symbols. We got into a discussion with the Russian commissar, who was manager of the plant. We got to talking about religion and working people; and while the conversation was going on, I noticed a huge pile, 50 feet high, of bundles of icons of brass, gold, silver, and platinum; candelabra of the same metals; holy vessels and altar pieces. They were all in machine-pressed blocks ready for the furnace. On top of this mound I saw what seemed to me to be a man asleep. The figure was clumsily covered with canvas or something of the sort and so sure was I that it was one of the workers taking a siesta out of hours that I asked the president of the workers' council about it.

For the first time he grinned. He winked at another Russian and, catlike, leaped up the hill of altar pieces. A shout from him made us step back. He raised his right foot and rolled the prostrate figure over with a thrust of his heel. It teetered on the edge and then came rolling down, crashing in a moment at our feet. It was a great bronze figure of Christ, a magnificent sculpture. It was more than life size and apparently had been wrenched from its pedestal.

The president looked at me squarely, his face wider than ever with the grin he had for my frown. I was astounded. Perhaps my resentment was even stronger.

"That," I protested, "is awful. The whole thing's ghastly. Why is this beautiful work of art destroyed? Even if there is no respect for religion and its symbols, you should, I think, preserve the art."

"We workers," he said coolly, "will no longer tolerate this nonsense. We were the slaves of the church for centuries. That's all over. We've abandoned superstition. We're struggling out of the old ignorance. This hurts you? We can't help that. This is only a little part of our plan. This figure symbolizes what we have decided is not necessary to our life. These things were stolen by the church from the workers; now we're giving them back to the workers in the form of bullets. We workers——" "But I, too, was a worker," I said. "My father was a worker—his father, too."

"The day will come," he said, "when even you will understand."

Again, today is May Day in Moscow. Today is Loyalty Day in America. It was not always so. For many years, the American Government and the American people tolerated on the first of May street parades and demonstrations by the Communists in this country, screeching their slogans and spreading disunity among our people. These demonstrations received headlines in every American newspaper the following day, giving to the Communist rabble much more publicity than was deserved. It is only recently that we have taken the initiative and proclaimed May 1 as Loyalty Day in America. Parades and speeches of loyal Americans on these occasions now overshadow the raving and ranting of the Communists who seek to overthrow the system of government we have enjoyed for so long.

We have not been as successful in many other instances in combating the propaganda which Communists have directed to the American people from Moscow and through channels from our large American centers of population. Communism takes two forms. Although both are centered in Moscow, it is essential that we understand the difference which exists. The dictator in the Kremlin and his henchmen have evolved a system of satellite nations completely under their domination. The sole purpose is military and political success in conquering the free world. They have built up in Russia and in the satellites a tremendous force of men and arms bent upon military domination. They have, in connection with this system, used every unscrupulous device to conquer the governments of these satellites so that the innocent people of many European countries are tyrannically ruled by would-be dictators responsible to Moscow.

This is the type of communism which our Government must fight through its resources and those of our allies by cooperative action. For this reason we maintain strong military forces, continue our research and development of weapons and defensive material, and seek concerted action through the U. N., NATO, and other alliances.

The other facet of communism is one which has received much public attention in the United States for the past 7 or 8 years. It is the spotlighting of those who would betray the United States because of misguided loyalty to Moscow. J. Edgar Hoover has recently stated that there are approximately 25,000 known Communists in this country. You may say what has a Nation of 160 million loyal people to fear from this number of subversives. It is an established fact that in no nation of the world do the members of the Communist Party outnumber the remainder of the citizens of that nation. We see then that this party is a minority even though it controls the destinies of over 800 million people in the world. What makes it difficult for Americans to realize the seriousness of the threat is that we are a people who believe in majority rule and have lived by this concept during all the years of our existence. A minority, such as the Communists, in control of government machinery would soon see to it that the vast majority had no voice whatsoever in government. Such has been the case in every instance where these subversives have taken control of European or Asian governments.

Most of you in this room tonight have perhaps never met or known a Communist. It may well be that you never will. If the American people as a whole are alert to the menace which faces us, there will be no occasion for you to have contact with any of this subversive element. If, however, we relax our vigil and become complacent about this danger, Naugatuck and all of our other communities may well be controlled by the Communists without your ever seeing one.

These are not ordinary people inspired by loyalty to a political party, because communism is not a political party but rather a way of life. These are people who are fanatical in their desires to see our system overthrown. They sincerely believe that should this come to pass, they would be the leaders of our Nation and the masters of our fate.

Let us bring this picture into clearer focus by talking about things which are most familiar to you. Were the Communists to secure control of this country, the Lodge of Elks, where we meet tonight, would necessarily be disbanded; the Knights of Columbus would no longer maintain their meeting room upstairs; the YMCA, north on Church Street, would perhaps be converted to a meeting place for the Young Communist League; the Masonic Temple, south on Church Street, would no longer exist. Across the street from us are three beautiful churches where people actively practice their faith throughout the year. Under communism there is no faith, there is no hope, there is no life, except that which is directed by the state. The minds of your children would be perverted; their futures consigned to service for the state; freedom as we know it would no longer exist.

This is a dark picture I paint but one which is in keeping with the pattern throughout other nations of the world where communism has taken over free institutions. There is no exaggeration. The evil of Communist treason is not made rosier or attractive by proclaiming the truth about it.

The leaders of Moscow have declared war on the free world. We are engaged in mortal combat. To us falls the lot of leadership of the free world.

We are long past the kickoff, and they still have, toward the end of the first half, possession of the ball. We must recover that ball before it's too late, and it's later than you think.

What am I to do, you say. I am but one person. I have no particular influence. I am not prepared to hunt spies and saboteurs. I do not engage in spying upon my neighbors or friends. This is not your job. This is the task of the FBI, which has done marvelous work through the years in unearthing and exposing Communists in America; and the job of congressional committees, under the direction of the majority of Congress, to ferret out the sly and numerous infiltrators in our Government agencies, administrative departments, school systems, public and private, and wherever they may be found gnawing at the foundations of our Government institutions. Your job is to know the truth, to recognize this evil, and to implant in the minds of your sons and daughters the glorious truths of our system of government.

Most of you are familiar with the work of the Reverend James Keller, founder and director of the Christopher Movement. It is a movement based upon the fact that one individual can accomplish much good if he will take unto himself the task of doing so. One does not necessarily have to be a member of any particular group or work in mass movements. This is what you can do. If you will repeat none of the untruths which the Communists seek to spread about our system; if you will work to unify America rather than create disunity; if you will live the good life and provide some measure of economic stability in your own family unit; and, above all, if you will practice the faith which each of us has in the Supreme Being, then you will have done as much as any man can expect.

No Howdy Doody

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL C. JONES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 12, 1954

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted, I am happy to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a copy of a recent editorial from the twice-a-week Dunklin Democrat, published at Kennett, Mo.

I think this editorial very accurately describes the feeling that the people of southeast Missouri have for our junior Senator from Missouri, and is typical of the esteem in which STUART SYMINGTON is held by the people living not only in the 10th Congressional District, but throughout the State of Missouri.

This Representative commends Editor Jack Stapleton, Jr., for this timely editorial:

NO HOWDY DOODY

Missourians who have been watching and reading of the McCarthy-Army hearings have been particularly interested in the manner in which Senator STUART SYMINGTON of our home State has conducted himself. Through most of the heated question and answer period, our junior Senator has been content to question calmly the witnesses, and has avoided, as much as possible, the grandstand tactics of less conscientious members of the subcommittee.

Several columnists, writing from their ivory towers, have said that STUART SYMINGTON has lost ground, so to speak, in a bid for the democratic presidential nomination 2 years hence. One columnist said SYMINGTON was "too inarticulate, too suave in the rough-and-tumble" hearings.

We can't go along with these columnists. In our opinion, the Missouri Senator has conducted himself quite properly, appealing neither to those who are out to scalp Senator MCCARTHY nor to the newspaper and television audience. He realizes—and apperently few of our other Senators do—that neither side will emerge without a blemish from this sideshow. We believe he has tried to soften the blows to either side, for we think he realizes that no Army private is important enough to cause either the Army or the Senate to be in disrepute.

To those who say he has been too inarticulate, too suave, we urge them to remember when Charlie Wilson tried to scuttle the Air Force. Senator SYMINGTON was right in the middle of the fight to save the present strength of the corps of which he once served as Secretary. Earlier still, during the Missouri primary and general elections—seldom noted for their politeness—STUART SYMINGTON was as articulate as the best of them.

No; STUART SYMINGTON has conducted himself as a gentleman during the hearings because somewhere along the line he has realized that the Army-McCarthy hearing should not be as much of a sideshow as Milton Berle and Howdy Doody.

Immigration and Citizenship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 12, 1954

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, on Friday, May 7, the committee on immigration and naturalization of the supreme lodge, Order Sons of Italy in America, a very fine, patriotic organization of Italo-Americans, held a meeting in Washington, D. C. A statement which I had prepared setting forth my views on the outstanding issues in the immigration and citizenship field was presented on that occasion. I ask unanimous consent that my prepared remarks on that occasion be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN, OF NEW YORK, BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION, SUPREME LODGE, ORDER OF SONS OF ITALY IN AMERICA

It is almost unnecessary for me to say that I am glad to be here at this luncheon meeting of the committee on immigration and naturalization of your supreme lodge.

My association with your organization, with Americans of Italian extraction, and with Italy, itself, is long and intimate. My interest in the particular problems with which your committee is concerned is, I trust, well known. No subject has attracted my greater attention, not only since I have been a Member of the Senate, but indeed for a period of more than 30 years.

When we speak of immigration and naturalization, we are speaking of the very process by which our country came into being, grew into a nation, and became the greatest single power in the world.

Every American, with the possible exception of our Indian and Eskimo citizens, is an immigrant, a child of an immigrant or the descendant of immigrants. And the process of naturalization, as well as of birth, has played a large part in the assimilation of generations of immigrants into the dynamic composite called America.

In the heroic drama of the building of our country, individuals of Italian birth and descent have played some of the major roles. And it is unnecessary to go as far back as Columbus and Vespucci.

The story of Italian contributions to the creation of America as we know it today does not need to be told by me. It is written across the face of this land. It is part of the fiber of this land. In the arts, letters, science, industry, culture, spirit, and ideology of America, the sons and daughters of Italy have made and are making an indelible imprint.

This is not the result of the work of a few talented individuals. It is the contribution of hundreds of thousands and even millions of Americans of Italian birth and extraction—of simple and unlettered people as well as accomplished and educated individuals. All have made their appropriate contribution to America, and America is their handiwork, as well as that of the *Mayflower* Pilgrims and of the Jamestown settlers.

I have singled out the Italian contribution because it has been outstanding. But an analogous contribution has been made by Greeks, Spaniards, Russians, Poles, Czechs, Norwegians, Swedes, Danes, Dutch, Hungarians, and Balts—by Syrians, Armenians, Indians, Chinese, Japanese, and Filipinos. I have left some out. I could name many more if I had time. America is the handiwork of all of them, and the typical American is the composite of all of them; if not in his blood, in his culture; if not in his ancestry, in his spirit.

Thus, it is peculiarly repugnant to some of us—it should be to all of us—that our immigration laws—those laws now on our statute books—are specifically designed to discriminate against some nationalities and in favor of others.

The heart of our immigration law is the national origins quota system which should be and is an insult to every one of us in this room. It constitutes a reproach to America, itself.

That system presupposes that persons born in one country are better suited to immigrate here and become American citizens than persons born in another. As reflected in our immigration quotas, an individual born in Britain is presumed to be 13 times more acceptable to America than one born in Italy and 200 times more acceptable than one born in Greece.

This assumption is not only utterly false on the face of it; it is basically repulsive to the very spirit and traditions—to the meaning of America.

Hence, I feel that one of the first imperatives of those interested in reforming our immigration and naturalization laws is to seek the total and complete elimination of the national origins quota system. There can be no compromise with it. It is evil in principle, as well as in actual operation.

Of course, the national origins quota system is just one of the many, many unfortunate features of our present immigration and naturalization laws.

The present law is harsh, cruel, and unjust—all in the false name of security. The provisions governing the admission of aliens confer extreme and arbitrary powers upon consular officers abroad, and upon immigration officers here at home. The provisions governing exclusion, reentry, and deportation result in heart-breaking incidents every day, affecting hundreds and thousands of individuals.

The provisions governing citizenship establish cruel distinctions between native-born and naturalized citizens which are thoroughly repugnant to the spirit and traditions of America.

I have described just a few of the general implications and consequences of our immigration and naturalization laws. There are scores of other implications and consequences—transcendental in importance and sweeping in effect. You know some of them as well as I. And these implications and consequences are built into the McCarran-Walter Act in hundreds of separate provisions. It is a badly conceived, badly inspired, and badly constructed law. It needs to be drastically revised and overhauled.

I am aware of the practical, political realities involved in seeking such a revision and overhaul. The prospects for getting any significant revisions in the McCarran-Walter Act at this session of Congress are dim to the point of disappearance. I know, too, that the chances of securing the elimination of the national origins quota system, for instance, is highly problematical at any time in the immediate future, without a very marked change in the temper of Congress and in the understanding of the general public.

Finally, I know that we have other immediate concerns in the immigration field; namely, the Refugee Relief Act, to which I shall address myself in a moment.

But let me say, here and now, that we must beware of the danger of losing touch with the moral principles involved in our present basic immigration and naturalization laws. It is possible to become so intent upon practical considerations as to forget moral considerations. To cut one's self adrift from basic moral values in the search for expedient solutions is to lose vital landmarks and finally to lose all direction.

In specific regard to our immigration and citizenship laws, we must never forget that deep moral principles are involved—the principles of justice and equality, to mention only two.

We must never forget that the national-origins-quota system was originally conceived as a device for keeping out of this country Italians, Greeks, Russians, Poles, and others from southern and eastern Europe. The national-origins-quota system was not conceived as a high principle, but rather as an expedient method of discrimination. We must fight against it ceaselessly, on principle, even while we pursue our immediate, practical goals.

Let me read to you, for instance, an extract from an official report, dated 1924, a report of the State Department of that day—a report which the Congress of 1924 used to justify the enactment of the national-origins-quota system. That report dealt with immigration from Italy.

"A large proportion of aliens from this district going to the United States," this 1924 report, dealing with Italy, said, "are inimical to the best interests of the American Government. This is * * * due * * * to their standards of living and their characteristics, which render them unassimilable. Practically all the immigrants from this district are of the peasant class. For the most part they are small of stature and of a low order of intelligence."

This is the kind of prejudiced and bigoted misinformation on the basis of which the Congress acted in approving the national origins quota system in 1924. And the provisions of law based on that misinformation are still on our statute books. Those provisions were revalidated and reaffirmed as part of our immigration law in 1952.

A year ago, at the first session of this Congress, the President of the United States, taking cognizance of the moral obligation on the part of our country to offer haven to a greater number of aliens than could actually enter under the McCarran-Walter Act, proposed an emergency immigration law for refugees, displaced persons, and so-called surplus population abroad.

After intensive committee consideration and deliberation and a considerable amount of back-room negotiation, Congress approved the Refugee Relief Act of 1953. The President had recommended the admission of 240,000 emergency immigrants over a period of 2 years, or 120,000 a year. The Congress approved the admission of 209,000 emergency immigrants over a period of 3 years and 8 months, or about 58,000 per year. The Congress all but eliminated authorization for so-called surplus population immigration—from Italy, Netherlands, Greece, and Western Germany.

And the Congress inserted into that act such barricades and barriers, under the spurious heading of security provisions, as to make entry into the United States, under the terms of the Refugee Relief Act, a difficult undertaking indeed.

Nevertheless, I, for one, voted for that bill, and many of you strongly supported it, on the grounds that half a loaf was better than none, and that some immigration was better than none at all.

The administration then proceeded, under the law, to set up the necessary machinery to implement the Refugee Relief Act. The actual responsibility for operation was vested, under the law, in the Administrator of the Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs, in the State Department, Mr. Scott McLeod.

A year has passed since the President sent his message to Congress recommending this legislation. Nine months have gone by since this legislation was actually enacted into law.

Do you know how many of the authorized 209,000 emergency immigrants have entered the United States in those 9 months? As of some days ago when I checked, the number was 8—8 individuals, who have actually entered the United States under the terms of the Refugee Relief Act. And two of those were orphans who were brought over for adoption by a very high official of the United States Government, a former United States Senator, who had to use all his prestige and perseverance to get the necessary visas for these children.

Every kind of excuse has been given for the failure—the dismal, inexcusable and heart-breaking failure—to implement the emergency immigration law. In the name of security and economy—oh, how many crimes have been committed in those two names—the emergency immigration program has been frustrated and thus far rendered a practical nullity.

As of April 16, about 3 weeks ago, less than one-third of the personnel that will be needed to administer this program had been hired. Only one-sixth of the number of employees scheduled to do investigative work had been hired.

The Administrator of this program told a committee of Congress that one-half of those who had applied for jobs to work in the refugee relief program had been ruled out on security grounds. He said that he had been unwilling to advertise the availability of jobs because of his fears of possible Communist infiltration.

And so the program, itself, has been almost strangled. Escapees from the Communist terror have found themselves trapped in the web of anti-Communist terror.

In the panic of concern lest we admit a single immigrant who would not be personally satisfactory to Mr. McLeod, Senator McCarran, and Senator McCarthy, we have given the Communists abroad a chance to make a laughingstock of us. We have paralyzed the program, and dashed the hopes of thousands, both here and abroad, who had expected to realize from this program the answer to their dreams and prayers.

It has been well said, I think, that if a person, out of hysterical fear of theft, tries to guard his buttons and his jewels with equal vigilance, he will certainly lose less buttons, but more jewels.

In the administration of the Refugee Relief Act thus far, we have strained at the gnat and swallowed the camel.

It took 4 months for the Administrator to process the regulations to implement the Refugee Relief Act. Some of the regulations are preposterous.

To secure permission for the entry of any particular immigrant, it is necessary to secure a certification under oath that a particular job in a particular place is awaiting that individual. Of course, after that certification is filed, it will take months to bring the person into the United States. It is ridiculous to think that if the job is a significant one, it can be held open that long.

The voluntary agencies in the United States which are engaged in facilitating the operation of this program are prohibited, under the regulations, from assuming, themselves, the responsibility for placing and housing the individual immigrant. This prevents the organized implementation of the program, rendering it rigid, inflexible, and all but unworkable.

The blank application forms for aliens seeking to enter the United States under the Refugee Relief Act are, in themselves, so constructed as to invite misstatements, thus furnishing grounds for denial of the application. And there is one question on the blank application form which consists of 805 words and 23 separate parts. That question is couched in the most legalistic language. Only a trained lawyer can understand it. To this entire question the alien applicant must answer "Yes" or "No." If the applicant misses any of the implications of any of the 23 parts of the question, he can be charged with having made a willful misstatement of a material fact and denied admission to the United States. Or if he is admitted and then, 10 years later, it is found that he made such an error, he would be subject to deportation.

Nevertheless, applications under the Refugee Relief Act are piling up in our consulates abroad. Many would-be applicants are being systematically discouraged from applying.

I would say in general that of this moment, and pending any remedial action which may be taken, the entire emergency immigration program is in danger of disintegration.

Of course, the law, itself, is a bad law. It sets up categories of ethnic Germans, ethnic Dutch, ethnic Greeks, and ethnic Italians—thus carrying racial and national discrimination to its ultimate. It contains so-called security provisions which are even worse than those in the McCarran-Walter Act itself. And, of course, the entire operation is carried on within the framework of the McCarran-Walter Act, with all its cruel and cumbersome restrictions, all its administrative duplication, all its breath of fear and suspicion of every alien.

The Refugee Relief Act calls for the negotiation of agreement with every country from which the emergency immigrants are to come—agreement that the country of origin will take back the immigrant if, at any time in the future—50 years from now—the United States decides to deport him.

This is, of course, an infringement upon the sovereignty of other nations that strikes some of them as being intolerable. And a number of the countries—Great Britain and Switzerland, for instance—have refused to enter into any such agreements.

I could go on and describe other unwise features of the law, and even more impossible features introduced into the administration of the law. There is no point to burdening you with more details on this matter.

The law is a bad law, but it could be administered to achieve its purposes, if the will were there, if those who are responsible for its administration were in fact eager to follow the spirit of the law, rather than to labor its letter—if they wanted to carry out its purposes rather than merely to justify its frustration.

President Eisenhower said only last week, at a press conference, that he is looking into this situation, to see what can be done to break the bottleneck, to start the flow of immigration. Certainly in the light of his repeated claim of credit for the passage of this law, I hope he will succeed in making it work. My heart goes out to all those who could and should benefit from this program. I pray that a way may be found, either by amendment of the law, or by drastic change in the means and methods of administration.

Security is a desirable goal. We must be vigilant at all times, and take all necessary precautions, to keep subversives out of our country. But the way the Refugee Relief Act has been interpreted is security gone mad.

While all these precautions are being taken, to the point of destroying the entire program, out of a frantic fear that some politically unorthodox person might succeed in running the gauntlet of our investigators, consuls, and immigration inspectors—while all this is going on, to implement a program for the admission of 209,000 aliens over a period of almost 4 years, hundreds of thousands of aliens are illegally entering this country every month, across the Mexican and Canadian borders, without any inspection whatsoever. And few are raising any outcry about it.

The Justice Department has officially estimated that in 1953, there were as many as 4 million illegal border crossings—across the Mexican border. At that border, there is no effective restraint to illegal immigration.

I do not know how many subversives are entering the United States every day across the Mexican border. I have no doubt there are many. Why bother to fill out all these forms in Europe, and face that gauntlet of consuls and inspectors, if you can walk across the Mexican or Canadian borders, without any inspection at all?

But the supporters of the McCarran-Walter Act and the wreckers of the Refugee Relief Act show no concern over illegal immigration from Mexico. The reason is that important commercial interests—the plantation owners and big-farm operators of the South, Southwest, and the Rocky Mountain States—they want that illegal immigration—the so-called Mexican wetbacks. It is a source of cheap, unorganized labor—labor that can be gotten rid of, if it proves untractable.

So we have these hundreds of thousands of illegal immigrants coming into our country, constantly, while the legal immigrants are kept out.

Eight immigrants have entered the United States under the Refugee Relief Act in 9 months. In those same 9 months, I would hazard a guess—I have no accurate figures—that more than a million or more illegal aliens have crossed the Mexican border into the United States.

I submit these facts to you. It is scarcely necessary for me to point up the conclusions. There is an ugly paradox here.

But there is also an obvious need to educate the American public as to the facts. There is a need to demand that our borders be safeguarded against illegal immigration, and that Congress vote the necessary funds and the necessary legislation to provide real security on our Mexican and Canadian borders.

We must also demand that the false security measures which now choke up legal immigration from Europe and Asia be relaxed to a reasonable degree.

The Refugee Relief Act must be made to work.

The McCarran-Walter Act must be drastically amended and its iniquities, its injustices, and its raw discriminations must be eliminated. American citizenship acquired by naturalization must be restored to its high and privileged place, on a par with citizenship acquired by birth.

You here have as much responsibility for these imperatives as I. You can help do the job—through your organization, through all the organizations with which you have contact.

This is a citizens' job—to arouse and to educate. A strong and informed public opinion will surely result in congressional and administrative action.

Let us, then, for our country's sake, and for the sake of the deserving and needy ones abroad who could find haven here, rise to this challenge.

Air-Policy Proposal Would End Subsidies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1954

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Post and Times-Herald for May 4, in a piece by Reporter John G. Norris, outlines the proposed new air policy of the administration.

This policy, according to Mr. Norris' story, which I include as a part of my remarks, has been cleared by all the sub-Cabinet officials dealing with aviation matters, and now lies on the President's desk awaiting General Eisenhower's signature.

We all know that a strong and healthy commercial aviation industry is the background for strong and healthy military airpower.

But, before the administration embarks on this new policy, we must be sure there are adequate safeguards to prevent a monopoly in this field, since a monopoly would be harmful to military airpower.

Is the new policy too harsh on new enterprise in commercial aviation? Will this field be forever foreclosed to free enterprise? Will the policy further the interests of big business at the expense of small business?

These questions must be raised in the light of the administration's past performance, which has been geared to aid big business and to put roadblocks in the path of little business.

During the 1952 campaign we heard much of threats to freedom. Is a policy which creates a tight monopoly in a major field furthering freedom?

Mr. Norris' article follows:

AIR POLICY PROPOSAL WOULD END SUBSIDIES—ALSO PROVIDES BAN ON NONSCHEDULED OPERATIONS AND ON SMALL AIRLINES

(By John G. Norris)

President Eisenhower has before him a proposed new civil aviation policy drafted by his air subcabinet, calling for a program of airline mergers and an orderly withdrawal of domestic subsidies.

Among other things, the subcabinet recommends virtual elimination of nonscheduled air coach operations, elimination of small and economically weak local service carriers and the absorption of some such routes by large trunk lines, and lessened competition among American airlines in the international field.

A report prepared by the Federal Air Coordinating Committee was submitted to the White House over the weekend in response to Mr. Eisenhower's request last September 23 for the preparation of a new national aviation policy for the United States.

Some features are expected to meet strong opposition. Once approved by the President, however, the proposals will stand as administration policy as new legislation is not required. The ACC consists of subcabinet representatives of Federal agencies concerned with aviation, who already have cleared the recommendations with their chiefs.

The report has not been made public, but a draft of the recommendations was circulated among aviation leaders last week. Highlights of the document, said to be essentially unchanged in the final draft, follow:

Definite schedules should be immediately established for the orderly transition of the domestic industry to a self-sufficient basis. In place of the present subsidy outlays of about $60 million a year, payments should be progressively cut back and confined to strictly temporary aid.

National interest requires the maintenance of many international routes under subsidy indefinitely, but the Civil Aeronautics Board should avoid or eliminate duplication of service between American carriers where uneconomical.

This appears to be a partial return to the earlier "chosen instrument" policy dropped after World War II in favor of directly competing United States lines. Foreign competition has proven tougher than anticipated then, it was said.

ONLY THREE LINES SUBSIDIZED

A program should be developed by the CAB to consolidate domestic trunklines "into a more limited number of systems capable of carrying their fair share of uneconomical and developmental service." The ACC noted that all but 3 of the trunklines, carrying 95 percent of the traffic, now receive no subsidy, but that the remaining 3 have always been subsidized.

"Healthy, financially independent carriers," it said, "can provide the public with better service—and more effective vigorous competition—than a larger number of carriers operating on an economically marginal basis."

There should be an adjustment of the route structures of the feeder or local service lines to put them in the best economic basis possible. But where such carriers fail to make significant progress toward self-sufficiency, they should be terminated in an orderly fashion.

BAN ON SMALLTOWN STOPS

Stops at small cities should be promptly eliminated on such feeder lines where there is now a lack of public demand to support them. In other cases where demand for service has been clearly shown, another carrier that can provide it without subsidy should be substituted.

The basic principle of the present Civil Aeronautics Act of controlling the entry of carriers into airline operation is sound, but current practice of permitting nonscheduled lines to carry individually ticketed passengers on large transport planes should be generally abandoned. This has been a major controvery in recent years. Bona fide charter operations by such carriers, however, should be encouraged it was said, with a new type of certificate required.

Private industry should undertake the development of new jet airliners and the prototype testing program, authorized by Congress, should be abandoned. However, the Government should underwrite simulated airline operations of such craft after development.

Asian Art Exhibit—Address of Hon. Richard M. Nixon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 12, 1954

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me, I submit herewith copy of the address delivered by Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON at the Dunbar High School, Washington, D. C., on the occasion of the presentation of Asian art exhibit by the Asian Cultural Exchange Foundation, Inc., on March 17, 1954:

Mr. Lofton, students and teachers of Dunbar High School, distinguished guests on the platform, and all the guests in the audience, I want to express my appreciation for having the opportunity to participate in this presentation ceremony of this Asian art exhibit to the public schools of Washington and particularly on the occasion of its being presented and shown at this high school. I think the reason that they selected me to make a few remarks this morning is that I happen to be among those individuals who recently has traveled in this area of the world which you are going to have a chance to visit, somewhat by remote control, by seeing some of the things that come from this area of the world. And I must say that I, in the very brief time that I have been here, have been very much impressed by the arrangements of the program and am looking forward to the balance of it. I want to say, Mr. Lofton, that I was particularly impressed by the honor guard that you had as I came in the steps—this fine cadet corps you have here at Dunbar High School. And also, I am very much impressed by this fine choir that you have. Now I want to make an admission to you. When I was in college, they had me try out for glee club, but I was such a bad bass that they finally made me master of ceremonies. So, therefore, you can see why I appreciate really good music when I hear it.

Now I would like to just talk briefly about Asia, because I think if I talk about it then you will have a better understanding of this Asian exhibit which all of you will have a chance to see. In your programs you will note that it says that about half the people of the world live in Asia. That's something that sometimes strikes us Americans very strangely, because usually in America we think of our area of the world—the two American continents and possibly of Europe and a few of us of Africa and northern Africa, that area—but when you get over to Asia it is so far away, almost halfway around the world, and some of it more than halfway around the world, depending on where you start from, it is very difficult for us to realize that Asia does contain the bulk of the world's population. Now, that in itself would make it important for us, as citizens of the United States, interested in the problems of the world, to study about Asia. But it is particularly important to the citizens of the United States and, for that matter, to all of the free world to know about Asia today. In the great struggle that's going on today, that all of you are aware of, and I am sure that you study in your history classes (or I think they call it social studies or something like that in these modern times) you are aware of the great struggle between the forces of freedom, on the one side, and the forces of totalitarianism, on the other side. And in that struggle the balance between the peoples of the world has shifted in the last 7 years a little against us. I would say we can probably count perhaps 600 million on this earth on the side of the free nations; we can count perhaps 800 million or so people that we will have to call uncommitted—they haven't made up their minds which side they are going to be on. So the struggle goes on as to which way they are going to go. It is vitally important how that struggle will turn out, because the way that it turns out will, in the long run—maybe not in our lives but certainly in the long run—will determine whether we are going to remain free or whether we are going to go under the totalitarian system.

Now, where do these 600 million people live? Of course, the great mass of these people live in the Asian countries. And I want to make it clear that the people of these countries are not on the Communist side, but neither are they necessarily on our side. And it is very important that we develop the ways and means to bring to them a true picture of the system that we believe in—that all free peoples believe in—so that in the struggle that is going on, which is fundamentally one for the minds, the hearts, and souls of men, that eventually they will turn in our direction rather than in the other direction for lack of a positive alternative. I say a struggle for the minds, hearts, and souls of men because sometimes when you read history, sometimes even today when you study current history, there is a tendency to put all the emphasis on great military battles—who is going to win the war? And that will determine the future of a nation—it will determine the future of the world; the military battles are very, very important. But more important than the military battles today, in the long run, is what people are going to do—what they think in their hearts. And therefore that is why we must create, between ourselves and the people of Asia, these great uncommitted areas of the world, a better understanding than we have at the present time.

How are we going to do that? One way, of course, we can do it is to associate ourselves with the things they want—the things they believe in. And so the question then arises, what do they want; what do they believe in? And the answer, of course, is not a simple one because people there, like people here, want lots of things. But I think if we get them in order of importance, that I would be fair and objective in saying that people of Asia want pretty much the same things we do. As a matter of fact, the strange thing is that though you often hear about the "Asian mind," "these strange orientals," and the like, Mrs. Nixon and I found as we traveled through the world meeting many of them that we were very much more alike than we were different. And incidentally, when I say we met many of them, I mean that, because instead of doing what is often done on trips of this type, just meet the so-called top people, the emperors, kings, prime ministers, and foreign ministers, which we did and enjoyed meeting, Mrs. Nixon and I made it a point to meet just as many people from all walks of life as we could. Now, I didn't keep track of this, but one of the newspapermen with me said that we shook hands with over 100,000 people on this trip. So that gives you an idea that we did get a chance to see what the people were like and what they were thinking.

Now, when we analyze what they want, I would list them perhaps in this order: First of all, they want to be independent. We want that too. We are willing to fight for our independence, and I think most of the great wars of American history have, in a sense, been fought to maintain the integrity, to maintain the independence of our country. So that it is a natural desire that they would want. Second, they want economic progress. I don't know of any Americans who don't want that. We want our country constantly to become stronger; we want our people to have a constantly increasing standard of living. But economic progress to the Asian is even more important perhaps as an aim and objective than it is to us in America because they have such a long way to go. I think I can bring that home to you by pointing out what I learned when I was in India. India is a very great country—a magnificent history, cultural monuments which you will have an opportunity to at least get an idea about as you look at these exhibits. But it is a country which is very, very poor. To give you an idea how poor, I learned that the per capita income in India (its 360 million people) is one-twentieth of what it is in Mississippi and the per capita income in Mississippi is one of the lowest in the United States. Now if you can just imagine that you can see the problem of why the people of India, the people in Thailand, the people of Malaya, the people of Indonesia—all of these people—want economic progress. So we have independence, then economic progress, and the third point, they want peace. We want peace too. They want it for the same reasons we do; first, because they know that if they have peace they may be able to maintain their independence and increase their economic progress, and two, of course, because they don't want to become involved in a war any more than Americans want to become involved in a war. And finally, and this is as important as all the rest, they want recognition of their equal dignity as human beings on this earth—recognition of their cultures, of their religions, and of their great traditions. There they are; that would be my analysis of what the Asians want. And if you look into your own minds, I think you will agree that that's what most of us want too. So we are pretty much alike in our desires.

Then what keeps us from getting together? Perhaps I can illustrate that by a story I heard when I was there—something that was told me. I told it before but perhaps some of you did not hear me state it when I returned from my trip to the Far East. As I told you, I met lots of kings, emperors, presidents, and the like on this trip and one of the most interesting men that I met in this category was the very young King of Thailand, or Siam as it used to be known. The King is very young and, incidentally, I know that all the boys and maybe some of the girls in the audience will be interested to know that the Queen is also quite young and quite beautiful too. But in any event we, Mrs. Nixon and I, had lunch with the King and Queen of Thailand, and it was a wonderful occasion as you can imagine. Strange foods of course, but we got pretty used to that as we moved around. But when we were talking to this young King, who is a very serious young man, very philanthropic in his attitude toward his people, he said a very interesting thing. I asked him, I said, "What does Thailand need, Your Majesty?" And he thought a moment and then he said, "Well, we need military aid so that we can be strong enough to defend our country; we need economic aid so that we can increase our standard of living; and we need education and understanding. And," he said, "the most important of these are education and understanding." Now that illustrates the problem, and I think he was right.

And that, of course, is what this exhibit is all about, as I understand it, to create better understanding between the peoples here, most of whom may never have a chance to visit Asia—it's too far away, they may not have the time and may not have the money to go there. But most of you are interested in this problem and therefore, being interested, want to understand the Asians a little better. Now, insofar as understanding is concerned, then, I think that as you look at this exhibit, as you see the arts and the crafts the Asians have been famous for for many centuries, you will reach a number of interesting conclusions. I can't go into all of them, but one of the things that impressed me the most was this: We meet our friends from India, Pakistan, Indonesia, Japan, and China, and the like, and when they come to the United States, we rather think of them as people far away about whom we know very little. But the thing that impresses you when you go there is this: That we are a very young country and that that area of the world is very, very old, and that they have very much to offer to us and to all of civilization.

I notice when I travel through the East for example, which to a westerner (I come from California as you know) to a westerner, the East seems old, as you go along you see a monument along the side of the road and you stop and read, "Here 150 years ago George Washington slept" or here 175 years ago somebody made a flag or something like that, and I remember when I first saw that when I came East for the first time back in 1934, I thought, "my, that was a long time ago—175 years." Of course, in Asia, 175 years is just like an hour here. When you take the great monuments like the Temple of Borobudur in Indonesia or Angor Wat in Cambodia—1,000 years, 1,200 years—and then in India, 4,000–5,000 years you go back in order to appreciate the great civilization that they have. And as you study these arts and these crafts you will realize that the traditions that were necessary to create the things that you saw were developed over centuries, and therefore, I think we in America can have a little better appreciation of the fact that the people of Asia have a lot to offer us, and we should deal with them on the basis of mutual respect, of mutual understanding rather than on the basis, well, we're a great advanced nation because we have all the motorcars and the television sets and the like, and these Asians, we can teach them a lot. Yes; we can teach them something, but we can also learn a great deal from them, and we should never forget that.

Well, I have already talked more than I should, but I would like to close with I think perhaps my favorite story which occurred on the trip to Asia. I think this is a very appropriate place to tell it because actually it occurred in a school, and I think, for that reason, perhaps you will appreciate it. It wasn't a high school as a matter of fact, but a grade school. But when Mrs. Nixon and I were in Hong Kong, which as you know is an island—built on an island—off the mainland of China (you cross from one section of the city to another by ferryboat), when we were in Hong Kong we traveled over to the mainland part by automobile one day and then traveled right along the Communist Chinese border for miles and miles. Only about a mile away was the Chinese border. As a matter of fact, from one spot where we stopped, we could see the red flag of the Communists flying over the city hall of a town which was perhaps 3 or 4 miles away from the border. The border, of course, was heavily guarded because the people of Hong Kong didn't want the Communist Chinese to come over there and I don't suppose the Communists wanted them to come over there either.

Nevertheless, that isn't the story. As we drove along, I noticed a country school. It was a relatively new one and I sort of adopted a practice of not just stopping at the places that my distinguished hosts wanted us to stop, because when you did that they just showed you what they wanted you to see, which is fine, we wanted to see what they wanted us to see, too. But I tried to make them stop from time to time just unexpectedly because that way I thought you would get a better understanding of what the people were really like if you just dropped in when they did not really expect any visitors at all. And so I saw this little school, and it looked like a very nice little school, and as the caravan was moving along, I said to the driver, "Let's stop here." So we pulled to a stop and we all got out of the car. Mrs. Nixon and I walked in through the schoolyard to visit the school. It was a grade school from one, I think, the first to the eighth grade. It happened to be recess time and, if you know, first, second graders, etc., up to the eighth grade you can imagine what it would be like in the United States—all of them yelling and playing and shouting. Well you know, the interesting thing is, these little Chinese youngsters—they're all Chinese, of course, in Hong Kong, were just like youngsters in the United States. The only difference was that we didn't understand their language. But there is a universal language and that's a friendly gesture, a smile as the case may be, or a handshake, and before long we were just as well acquainted as could be with these scores of youngsters swarming about wanting autographs and all the things, you know, that we run into whenever we visit a school here in the United States. And so we went in, and Mrs. Nixon, who used to be a schoolteacher (incidentally, she was a teacher of typing and shorthand in high school—that's where I met her. I don't know whether all of your teachers of typing and shorthand are married or not but that's an indication of what might happen.) In any event, Mrs. Nixon was very good with these youngsters, much better than I was, of course, because we have a couple of little girls of first and second grade age, and she went into the first grade room and sat down and they showed her how to write as the Chinese write. They write with a brush rather than a pen, and so they had her write her name with a brush and they got a great kick out of that. Well, we spent about half an hour visiting with the students and some of the teachers, and it was a wonderfully enjoyable occasion. Then we had to leave because there was a luncheon on up the road to which we could not be late.

As we were leaving, one of the Chinese teachers came up to me. He was a man about 27 or 28 years of age, I would say; he was a teacher of English in the school, and incidentally, you would be amazed at the number of people in this area of the world that speak English. I must say a lot more of them speak English than we speak Chinese. But in any event, the teacher of English (and he spoke it quite well) came up to me and said: "Mr. NIXON, I want to express my appreciation for your stopping." "Well," I said, "Mrs. Nixon and I want to tell you how much we appreciate your welcoming us as generously as you did. When you have your next assembly of your students, will you give them a message from Mrs. Nixon and myself? First, appreciation for their welcome and second, tell them that we bring the best wishes of the Government of the United States and our President, Mr. Eisenhower, and that we also bring the best wishes of all the people of the United States to the people of China." Now that was a significant thing for him as you can understand, because, you see, the people of China live some of them in Hong Kong, some of them in Formosa, but most of them under and behind the Iron Curtain, and I was making it clear, in other words, that despite the fact that they had engaged in a war against us in Korea that we understood that as far as the people were concerned, that we still had a bond of friendship between the people of the United States and the people of China. And this young Chinese looked at me and he said: "Mr. Vice President, I can't tell you how much I appreciate what you have said. The day will come when our two peoples will again live together in peace and in friendship. The day will come when all the peoples of the world will live together in peace and friendship, because, as your visit today, and Mrs. Nixon's visit, to this humble school of ours so eloquently proved, we are all brothers in our hearts." I think he was right and because he was right, I think we can have peace and friendship provided we have understanding. Because I can tell you that nobody that I met on this trip did I dislike if I got to know them. That's a paraphrase of something that Will Rogers said quite a few years ago.

And so with that I think perhaps I have spoken long enough. You want to get on with the balance of the program. And I urge you to study these exhibits well, get a good understanding of the great cultures of these countries and perhaps some day, who knows, you may have a chance to visit one of them as Mrs. Nixon and I had that chance. Thank you very much for listening so attentively.

Conservation of Oil

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 12, 1954

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Important Word," published in the Washington Reporter of May 5, 1954. The editorial relates to the conservation of oil.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IMPORTANT WORD

To an oil man, one of the most important words in the language is conservation. And it means a great many diverse things.

In a plant, for instance, it means taking care of the equipment and watching for leaks in pipelines. In the oil fields themselves, it may mean pumping gas or water into underground formations to increase the flow. In the laboratory, it means more efficient processes for making oil products.

In its full, overall sense, conservation means the least wasteful withdrawal of the oil nature created—and the greatest possible use of every gallon produced. And here the American oil industry has done a superb job. As a typical example, gasoline has been so improved that 2 gallons now do what required 3 in 1925. Another example is found in what has been done with gases that formerly were wasted. These are now being converted into valuable chemicals which supply raw materials for plastics, synthetic rubber, insecticides, and thousands of other products.

What has been conservation's principal achievement? One fact indicates the answer: Our oil consumption has soared, reaching heights that would have seemed inconceivable even a few years ago. Yet our reserves are at an alltime high.

Answers to Questions Concerning Communism and Congressional Investigations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN DIES

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 12, 1954

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, so many Texans, as well as people from other States, have asked my views with reference to communism in the United States and congressional committees now engaged in investigating and exposing communism that I have decided to make this statement.

One of the questions most commonly asked me is whether the Communist menace in the United States is serious. Of course it is serious, in spite of 20 years of investigation and exposure and the enactment of legislation such as the Smith Act, the Subversive Control Act of 1950, and the prosecution and conviction of more than 100 Communist agents. But it is not as serious as it was from 1938 until 1947, because during that period the Government and many people failed to appreciate the gravity of the threat. In 1938 when I began the investigation, there were about 200 Communist organizations with a claimed total membership of 10 million people, the majority of whom were gullible and unthinking people who joined these organizations without knowing their true purpose. At that time there were several thousand Communists on the Federal payroll, and there were more than a dozen important unions dominated by Communists. They were printing and distributing 600 magazines, newspapers, and periodicals in the United States. They had infiltrated many key industries, and especially the media of public information, such as moving pictures, radio, magazines, and newspapers. They were coddled and protected by Government officials.

However, after Russia had accomplished what she wanted to accomplish by her deceit and hypocrisy, and after her intentions had become crystal clear to everyone, including our blind leaders, the attitude toward Communists changed gradually in our country. The Government began to enforce existing laws against the Communists. Congress passed additional legislation. Fortunately, the Government was in possession of the mass of evidence and information which the Dies committee had assembled over a period of 7 years. This information was fairly complete. It contained in alphabetical order the names of the vast majority of Communists in our country. In 1941 we had submitted to the heads of the various departments the names and occupations of several thousand Communists on the Federal payroll. We had exposed the labor unions which were under Communist domination. In short, the Government had all the information it needed to break up the Communist conspiracy. All that was lacking was a real desire to enforce these laws. One reason for this laxity was the unwillingness to expose and involve hundreds of thousands of gullible liberals who had become enmeshed in the Communist conspiracy through their carelessness or stupidity. Another reason was the reluctance on the part of officeholders and politicians to admit that they had been mistaken and deceived. Finally, however, steps were taken to enforce our laws and to move against these conspirators. While it was a case of locking the barn after the horse was stolen, it was better late than never.

In 1938 there were 165,000 cardholding members of the Communist Party. Today there are 25,000 according to the FBI and other agencies. The Communist Party has been driven underground where it is not able to function with anything like the effectiveness as was true a few years ago. The front organizations which constituted the principal strength of the Communists have largely disappeared. Many of the leaders are now in the penitentiary.

This does not mean that the threat of internal communism has ceased to exist. The Communist apparatus is capable of sudden expansion. We must remember that at least 1 million people have affiliated with the Communist Party since 1919. While most of these people are no longer members of the party, there is no way of knowing how many of them still believe in communism and will resume an active role at the first favorable opportunity. No doubt some of them are sincere converts who will never return to the folds of communism. On the other hand, some of them quit for reasons of safety or expediency. The same is true with reference to the front organizations. We are not sure how many of the claimed 10 million people formerly identified with Communist-front organizations are sincere converts and repentants. Furthermore, even a small group of 25,000 hardcore Communists is a constant menace. If they are able to infiltrate key positions, they could commit irreparable injury to our country in the event of war. It must follow, therefore, that there is an urgent need to maintain our vigilance and not to fall asleep again.

The next question asked me is whether congressional investigations are necessary to expose communism. There are now some 3 or 4 committees engaged in this work. Each of these committees has done some good work. Much of it is a rehash of what our committee did from 1938 to 1945, but this rehash has been useful in alerting our people and prodding public officials. Some of the work of these committees has brought to light additional details and elaborations of the Communist conspiracy. I have been asked whether the criticism of these committees is justified. Some of this criticism emanates from Communists and fellow travelers who pretend to be against the methods of congressional investigations, but who are in fact against any investigation or exposure. Some of the people who affiliated with Communist-front organizations through carelessness or misguided zeal oppose the committees because they do not want their stupidity exposed. Furthermore, the subject of communism is most difficult to handle. This is shown by the difficulties encountered in the United Nations and at the various conferences that have been held with the Communists. The wisest and the fairest committee on earth could not escape a certain amount of criticism and abuse.

However, some of the criticism directed at some of the committees now engaged in the investigation of communism is justified. In the first place, there ought to be one joint congressional committee on un-American activities composed of Members of the House and the Senate, who have had sufficient legal experience to know how to conduct a proper inquiry. There is no justification for 3 or 4 committees competing with each other in this work. It produces confusion, duplication, and rivalry. During the 7 years I headed the Dies committee, we did not have this problem. Other committees did not want to enter such a controversial field. Furthermore, I think the procedure of such investigations can be improved without impeding the effectiveness of the investigations. I think that such investigations can be made more judicial. Based upon my long experience, I prepared and submitted to the Rules Committee a suggested draft of rules that, if adopted and followed, would eliminate much of the criticism which is justified. If we would establish one committee such as I have suggested, it would save the taxpayers thousands of dollars. The various committees engaged in this work spend more money every year than I spent during the 7 years of our investigation.

Another question asked me is whether we need any congressional investigating committee and whether we should leave the job to the FBI and other enforcement agencies. There are many things that a congressional commitee can do which an enforcement agency cannot do. A committee can subpena records, witnesses, and take testimony under oath. It can disseminate useful information to alert and inform the public. It can prod indifferent officials to increased vigilance. It cannot and should not take the place of enforcement agencies. There are certain jobs it cannot do and that must be done by Secret Service, FBI, and other enforcement agencies. Its primary purpose is to gather facts as a basis for necessary legislation and to inform the public. Therefore, I believe that a joint congressional committee such as I have suggested should be permanently established, and that it should be governed by fair rules of procedure and headed by experienced lawyers, to the end that congressional investigations can be improved.

Another question asked me is whether or not I believe that there are Communists in the Government. Since returning to Washington, I have investigated this situation to satisfy myself. I am now convinced that the several thousand Communists which we discovered on the Federal payroll in 1941 have been discharged or forced to resign. There may be others which we and subsequent committees failed to discover. In time these will be discovered and gotten out and the Federal payroll kept free of Communists if we will continue our vigliance.

What about labor unions? The majority of the Communist dominated unions which we exposed in 1938 to 1945 have been expelled from their parent organizations, but they are still operating in some of our key industries. However, the Attorney General has submitted legislation designed to break up these unions. The recognized labor unions in America are on the whole alerted to this danger and vigilant in combating the infiltration of their unions by Communists. Since one of the chief targets for Communist infiltration is the labor union, this will always be a serious problem and must be constantly watched.

What about innocent people who are smeared by congressional investigations? In my opinion, this is greatly exaggerated. Of course, you cannot conduct any investigation or any court procedure without occasionally hurting an innocent person. There are thousands of people indicted by our courts who are declared innocent by the juries. They have certainly been injured by the indictment and the prosecution, but we have found no way of avoiding this. Many so-called innocent people joined Communist front organizations. In the process of exposing these organizations these innocent people claimed that they were smeared. While the greatest precaution should be followed to distinguish between Communists and gullible people who joined Communist organizations, these so-called innocent people were not entirely blameless. They should have been more careful in joining organizations. Some of them received ample warnings but ignored them. Notwithstanding this fact, committees should improve their procedures to avoid a situation under which innocent people are condemned as Communists when they are not Communists. On the other hand, people must realize that they affiliate with organizations at their risk, and that they owe a duty to their country and to their own reputations to investigate the organizations before joining them. It cannot be overlooked that the affiliation of some 10 million people with Communist-front organizations gave the Communist conspiracy most of its influence and effectiveness in the United States.

Another question asked me is what I think of the present attitude of the Government towards Communists. On the whole, I think that there is a sincere desire to break up the Communist conspiracy in the United States. I have seen no evidence that President Eisenhower is seeking to stifle or embarrass any congressional investigation and exposure of communism, or any attempt to prosecute Communists. Few Presidents in our history have respected the rights of Congress more carefully than President Eisenhower. I wish that I had had one-tenth of the cooperation from the Roosevelt administration that the present committees are receiving from the Eisenhower administration. As an illustration of the kind of opposition which I received from the Roosevelt administration, I refer you to the late Harold L. Ickes' book, the Inside Struggle, as reported by the Associated Press. Ickes said that although Roosevelt wanted the Dies committee cut off sharp, DIES had no difficulty getting through a resolution continuing it another year with $100,000 to finance its fantastic investigation. He said this was another example of the complete falling down of the so-called Democratic leadership in the House. He added both Speaker William B. Bankhead, who died in 1940, and Representative SAM RAYBURN, Democrat, of Texas, then majority leader and now minority floor leader, feebly told the President they would do what they could to head off the Red-hunting Texan. I hope that President Eisenhower does not heed the advice of those who are urging him to go after Members of Congress who are trying to do their duty.

I hope that none of us in Congress will abuse this patient and cooperative attitude of the President, and that we will have the honesty and courage to acknowledge our mistakes and seek ways of correcting them. Let us remember that no committee or institution is so sacred that it cannot be criticized or so perfect that it cannot be improved.

We are living in times of violent extremes. Our constitutional safeguards are subjected to unprecedented strain. More than ever we should strive constantly to respect and perpetuate our precious civil liberties. The awful crime of communism is its preachment that the end justifies the means. Many other extremists on the left and on the right have practiced this same damnable philosophy, although to a lesser degree than the Communists. Those of us who profess love of America must avoid at all costs and under all circumstances the fatal error of employing the tactics and methods of the Communists in our efforts to combat communism.

The Voice of the Poppy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 12, 1954

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, as we approach ever nearer to that day when America pays homage to its honored war dead, it is appropriate to include in the RECORD a letter sent to me from a valued friend, Katherine H. Salm, sixth district president, Connecticut Department, American Legion Auxiliary.

The letter relates the symbolism of the poppy, worn by all of us on May 30. It is a moving bit of prose which should help us to remember in reverent thought the reason for the public display of this crepe paper flower on Memorial Day.

The letter follows:

CANAAN, CONN., *May 1, 1954.*

Hon. JAMES T. PATTERSON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN:

THE VOICE OF THE POPPY—STRAIGHT TO THE HEART OF AN UNDERSTANDING AMERICAN

I am not just a crepe paper flower. I am the glowing symbol of the sacrifice made by the gallant flower of American manhood who marched away at the call of country and who sleep here and over there, under their white crosses, row on row, where poppies sway and toss to kiss each cross.

I am just a tag flower offered by the American Legion Auxiliary. In remembrance of America's heroic dead and in helpfulness to her living disabled and dependents, "wear me on Poppy Day."

KATHERINE H. SALM,
Sixth District President,
American Legion Auxiliary.

Restoration of "Old Ironsides"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1954

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following excellent editorial from the Lawrence Sunday Sun, Lawrence, Mass., May 9, 1954:

A LANDLUBBER'S PROPOSAL

During the past week a bill for the complete restoration and maintenance of U. S. S. *Constitution* passed the House and is now due for consideration by the United States Senate. As reported the measure would authorize the restoring of "Old Ironsides" to as near her original condition as possible and her maintenance at Boston as a museum.

Undoubtedly this dastardly proposal is the work of some landlubber. What a craven phrase: "as near her original condition as possible." This does not smack of the true seafaring men and fighting men that strode her decks, handled her sails and manned her guns when she forced the *Guerriere* to strike her colors on August 19, 1812, off the Grand Banks. Let her be restored to exactly the same condition as she was on that memorable date when she won the respect of the world for the infant United States Navy and wiped out the disgrace of having American seamen impressed from the deck of U. S. S. *Chesapeake,* after three broadsides from a more powerful British ship.

And who, we ask, wants her maintained as a museum? This sounds as if her present crippled condition with stumpy masts, foreshortened jib boom, missing yards and sails, empty gun berths, specimen cannon balls, and closed off sections of her hull were to be perpetuated, so that she will forever cling as a barnacle against some wharf or pier. Why, with her present rigging, she couldn't weather her way past Constitution wharf, near where she was launched in 1797.

Let U. S. S. *Constitution* be maintained as a full rigged, well-found frigate. Let her top-hamper be restored so that her fore, main and mizzen masts may tower high in the skies with topmasts, topgallant and royal masts to carry long yards for courses, topsails, topgallant, and royal sails. Did she carry studding sails and a full set of stay sails? Let the bowsprit, jib boom and flying jib boom reach out to carry an inner jib, stay sail, outer jib and flying jib. Let her have the proper standing and running rigging. Then will the tumblehome of her sides be seen in its proper perspective and why it was feared that her tall masts with her heavy spars could never be properly braced, though they never let go.

Perhaps visitors will realize why she and her sister ships set a new pattern for men-of-war in her day and struck dismay into the ranks of the British Navy. Then they will realize why there were no frigates afloat to match her. Joshua Humphreys framed her hull with almost the weight and strength of a line-of-battle ship, but gave her the canvas to show her heels to a whole British squadron off Boston, to out-maneuver the supposedly easier handling *Java* off the coast of Brazil, and to outsail *Cyane* frigate and *Levant* ship in the same engagement that she was able to rake both of them fore and aft and take them as prizes. Then they will realize why she could sail within 11 points of the wind and beat anything afloat sailing close-hauled.

Let the gun deck of U. S. S. *Constitution* again carry 30 long 24-pounders. Let her quarterdeck carry 16 and her forecastle 6 32-pound carronades. Let 1 long 18-pounder and 2 long 24-pounders be mounted as bow-chasers. Let the long guns have the tackle to run them out through the ports and the carronades the same carriages and tackle that enabled a fighting crew to train them around to bear on the enemy, not fixed on deck as some immovable object. Let racks be built and stored with ready charges and hatches opened for passing shot and powder from the magazines. Then the visitor will realize why this ship, rated as a 44-gun frigate, was really the "pocket battleship" of her day.

Let the water casks and spirit tanks be replaced on board U. S. S. *Constitution*, and provision barrels be stored in her holds. Then with all the guns mounted and containers for stores aboard, visitors can wonder where some 450 men of her crew found space to live for months or years on a ship 204 feet in length overall, and with a beam of some 44 feet.

When U. S. S. *Constitution* is fully rigged and gunned, let her be manned and once more set sail and visit from port to port, always returning, of course, to Boston.

And if you ask if such complete restoration is worth the cost, we suggest you seek your answer from some child who has visited the present poor semblance of "Old Ironsides" and came away with a heart stirred by the historic part she played in her country's history from the shores of Tripoli to shaking the rule of the Mistress of the Seas on the broad reaches of the Atlantic.

The Bryson Bill: H. R. 1227

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HOWARD W. SMITH

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 12, 1954

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to state that I have today presented to the House for proper reference a petition signed by several residents of the Eighth Congressional District of Virginia supporting the Bryson bill, H. R. 1227, now pending in the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Address by the Honorable George C. McGhee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 12, 1954

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by the Honorable George C. McGhee:

Mr. Chairman, Ambassador Erkin, Chairman of the Board Keiser, members and guests of the Middle East Institute, it is a great privilege for me to participate in this auspicious occasion, sponsored as it is by one of the most distinguished of American organizations in the field of foreign affairs. The existence of the Middle East Institute reflects in itself the keen interest of the American people in that important and historic area of the world.

It is entirely appropriate that the institute has chosen this occasion to pay tribute to Turkey. I am pleased that the theme of our meeting, Turkey and the West, 1453 to 1953, includes both the historic role of the Turkish Empire and the quite different but even more significant role of the Turkish Republic of today.

Since I have only recently returned from my post as United States Ambassador to Turkey, it is a very natural thing for me to join in this tribute. During my stay in Turkey, I developed a deep admiration for the Turkish people and an insight into their true place among the great peoples of the world.

I am pleased to be associated on this occasion with our distinguished chairman, the Honorable Edwin Wilson, one of my predecessors as American Ambassador to Turkey. Ambassador Wilson will always be beloved by the Turkish people, as will he be remembered as one of the finest products of our own career Foreign Service. I am honored to be able to share the floor with my friend and onetime colleague, His Excellency, Feridun Erkin, the Turkish Ambassador, whom history will give a large measure of the credit for the remarkable advances that have been made in recent years in Turkey's relations with the Western nations. Since we are speaking to the same subject, I am sure you will forgive us both if our discourses overlap.

We commemorate on this occasion two historic events. On May 29, 500 years ago, the janissaries of Mohammed the Conqueror first placed his standard on the ramparts of the ancient city of Constantinople, a city which had, since its foundation by Constantine in the fourth century, represented the center of European culture and power in the East. In 2 days we will join with our Turkish friends in celebrating the 30th anniversary of the foundation of the Turkish Republic, which, under the leadership of the great Ataturk, arose from the ashes of a once great but defeated empire as the rebirth of the indomitable spirit of the Turkish peoples. It is from these two events that I will draw the theme for my brief remarks to you this evening.

The great migration of Turkish peoples from Central Asia to Asia Minor constitutes one of the major currents in the stream of history. We are inclined to forget that this migration began not with the families who came to Asia Minor under the leadership of Othman, but in the 11th century with the marches of the Seljuk Turks. The Seljuks rank among the great builders and patrons of the arts of history. But for the depradations of the Mongols under Genghis Khan, they might have changed the whole subsequent history of the troubled lands lying between the Indus and the Nile. Their monuments standing today in Asia Minor attest to their contribution to the land which was itself the cradle of civilizations.

The total movement of Turkish peoples to Asia Minor, including the Ottomans, was largely completed by the 14th century. It has been estimated as involving some 3 million people. The history of Europe is replete with similar movements of peoples from Asia—the great motherlode from which historians consider all nations sprung. Some, in very early times, came to Europe to stay and are the basic stock from which are derived the present groupings of European nationalities. Some, as did the Mongols, came only to retire back to the Steppes of Asia when their appetite for conquest was satiated.

The peculiar historic significance of the movement of Turkish peoples is not only that it was persistent and that the Turks came to stay and to found a great empire, but that the Turks were the last to become, as other peoples had before them, an integral part of Europe and the West. It is in this light that there is revealed the historic significance of an event that took place on February 18, 1952, when Turkey was admitted as a full member to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. It is the significance of the transition of the Turks from invaders from the East to defenders of the West that I seek to emphasize to you this evening.

To the Byzantines and their Venetian and Genoese allies who guarded Theodosius' land walls of Constantinople that fateful day in 1453, and to the crowned heads, clerics, and scholars of Europe, the capture of Constantinople was a catastrophe of the first order. It meant the end of their world in the East—a threat to their civilization and to their very existence.

During the 70 years of Ottoman rule that followed the conquest of Constantinople the Turks fought countless wars with the West. Frequently during this period the Turks made uneasy alliances with one or another European power—alliances usually taken by the Europeans out of opportunism in order to block the expansion of their European rivals. Thirteen times since 1677 the Turks, often in concert with one or more of the European powers, came in conflict with the half-European, half-Asiatic colossus to their north, whose aggressive designs constituted then as now the most persistent threat to the peace of the world.

Otfen the Turks were defeated by the Russians. Once the soldiers of the Czar pushed across the Thracian plain almost within sight of Constantinople. Always, however, sometimes seemingly by a miracle, Turkish courage and Turkish blood thwarted the Russian design to seize control of the Straits and establish herself on the Mediterranean. Russian aggression, the threat of which we have ourselves only recently experienced, is not new to the Turks. Not new, either, is Turkish determination to resist that aggression.

Throughout these years, however, Turkey imbibed deeply of the civilization of the West. French, Italian, and English were heard on the Pera. Western ideas and institutions made an impact on the inhabitants of the Serai. In turn the Turkish Empire had a profound effect on the West. There was not always war. Prosperity and progress followed in the wake of the unity, stability, and religious tolerance within the Ottoman domain. Turkish culture was indelibly imprinted upon the peoples of Eastern Europe. Through the numerous travelers of the times Turkish arts and customs became known in Western European capitals. It would be erroneous, in interpreting later events, not to give credit to the cumulative effect of contacts between Turkey and the West during this period.

But, nonetheless, Turkey and Europe were not one. Turkey was not admitted to the concert of Europe. At the height of Ottoman power Suleiman the Magnificent reached out the hand of friendship to his ally, Francis the First of France, only to be rebuffed. To the West, Turkey was still of the East.

No man ever had such a profound effect on the destiny of his country as did Kemal Ataturk, whom history will undoubtedly record as one of the great leaders of all times. He built upon foundations deeply laid, however, it was he who took the new, precarious Republic of Turkey, which he himself had been largely instrumental in creating, and turned it toward the West.

Indeed, it was a new Turkey that he turned—a Turkey that bore little relation to the loosely held polyglot of states which, at the end, served chiefly the interests of the Ottoman Sultan and his international coterie in Constantinople. It was not an Empire by or for the Turks of Anatolia. They were a part of it. Under Ataturk Asia Minor lay like a newly discovered, undeveloped continent, the peasants of Anatolia a liberated people.

It is these people of Anatolia, in whose veins flow the blood of the hardy nomads who a thousand years ago trekked from Turkestan, who rule the modern democratic state of Turkey. It was the members of the Grand National Assembly of Turkey, people from such places as Kars and Alanya, who voted unanimously for Turkish adherence to NATO. The Turkish people have taken their destiny into their own hands.

In doing so, Turkey has not only turned its face to the West but has offered us its friendship. It has opened wide its doors to the flow of western and American ideas. It has entrusted us with the education of many of its youth. In the United States alone there are today almost a thousand Turkish students. American opera plays in Ankara. Our books are read widely. The Voice of America enters countless Turkish homes. One feels instinctively that Turks are as one with the West.

And the West—particularly America—have accepted Turkey as friend and partner. We have given not only aid where needed, but more—the unselfish services of many of our most talented administrators, scientists and military leaders. In my own city of Dallas, Tex., for example, there was last year the spontaneous celebration of a Republic of Turkey Week. The adherence of Turkey to the NATO, symbolic as it is of the formal admission of Turkey into the citadel of the Western European Community, is but the reflection of more underlying ties that bind us all together.

The historic urge of the Turkish people is fulfilled. Turkey is no longer the outpost of the East. Turkey is the eastern bastion of the West—a bastion against the threat of Russian aggression. Russia alone has turned againt the stream of Western progress and reverted deep into the history of Asia. Russia alone has established, by means more ruthless than the Mongols, an unwilling empire of oppressed peoples in an age which has renounced empire.

In the immediate postwar years when the West had let down its guard, Turkey, as an isolated strong point, was in my judgment the only real deterrent to Russian seizure of the Middle East. Without Turkey, the great strategic prize of the Middle East would in all probability have gone to Russia by default in the "cold war," making infinitely more difficult a western reaction if there were forced on us a "shooting war." Today Turkey's 19 divisions, which face the Russians in the Caucasus and their satellites in Bulgaria, constitute the eastern anchor of the NATO line of defense against this aggression.

This is the historic meaning of the events we celebrate. This is the role of Turkey today. Today Turkey, linked arm in arm with an awakened West, is one of the great bastions of the West.

Cleveland Teachers and the Education Bills

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 12, 1954

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, three administration bills on education, vitally important to the welfare of our country, are before us today. I discussed them in some detail last Saturday before the Cleveland Area Business Teachers Association.

This fine young organization in my district is the outgrowth of the chairman of the business department of the various high schools in the Cleveland area who had been meeting since 1932 to discuss their problems, methods, and procedures.

Since my discussion of the education bills may prove helpful to other Members, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting the address herewith:

WIDER HORIZONS

(Address by Hon. Frances P. Bolton, Member of Congress, before Cleveland Area Business Teachers Association at Cleveland, Ohio, May 8, 1954)

Mrs. Brownfield, members of the Cleveland Area Business Teachers Association, and friends, it is a privilege indeed to discuss with you who have so great a responsibility in our community, some of the aspects of education in the United States today.

No free society can continue without an ever increasingly potent method—or system, if you will—of education. The strength of any nation depends largely upon the character, ideas, ingenuity, and competence of each successive generation.

GOVERNMENT AWARE OF IMPORTANCE

Your Government in Washington is deeply conscious of the magnitude of the task before us and of the many unfortunate conditions interfering with better schooling. Because an educated population is vital to the national welfare, your Government has embarked on a broad program to aid and promote the cause of education. Let me tell you about it briefly.

RECENT LEGISLATION DIRECTLY FOR TEACHERS

Most recently we in the House passed and sent to the Senate a measure of direct concern to you as teachers.

In the tremendous revision of the income-tax laws we included a provision to permit all retired people (or their widows) to exempt the first $1,200 of their retirement income from taxation. This particularly affects teachers, firemen, policemen, and civil servants. May I take this opportunity to thank those of you who were among the scores of interested Clevelanders who wrote me urging adoption of that provision.

A second measure of direct concern to teachers is the new social-security legislation urged by the President. Besides extending coverage to about 6¼ million more people, it will give persons like yourselves on State retirement systems the right to choose between your present system or social security.

After many conferences with responsible teachers' organizations, the committee included in the bill words which would authorize a referendum of those under present State retirement systems. Should two-thirds of those voting in each State be in favor of social security, it would be substituted for the present systems. The bill also contains a clarifying statement that it is the policy of Congress that the protection of the employees who are now under the State retirement systems will not be impaired as a result of coverage under social security.

The Republican leadership is anticipating the passage of this social-security legislation during this session of Congress. The ultimate decision in the matter, however, is one you will have to make for yourselves. I urge you to study all the provisions and vote carefully.

POOR STATE OF EDUCATION

You in the teaching profession hardly need be told the sorry state in which public education finds itself. Yet I cannot but wonder if even you know the gravity of the situation.

Today the Nation's overcrowded schools are trying desperately to educate some 29 million children. Do you know that by 1960 there will be 28 percent more children trying to crowd into our school buildings?

The school population is increasing at an even greater proportion than the increase in population. At one end of the scale a higher percentage of 5- and 6-year olds is enrolling than ever before. At the other end there are fewer dropouts among the teenagers. This last can mean a great deal to us as a nation if it does not mean that standards have been allowed to decline.

More children wanting to be educated is a healthy trend. But it becomes more and more apparent we cannot accommodate them. Some of us have been urging our local areas to face the fact that nature is pouring out upon us a steady stream of babies. Time picks them up and before we know it they are queued up at the doors of our preschool and school inadequacies.

I have been watching the actual decrease between 1930 and 1950 in the number of classrooms available with great anxiety. I know something of what overcrowding means for during the First World War we were in Washington. With the sudden influx of personnel, the schools were swamped. They attempted to meet the situation by having 2 sessions—1 in the morning, 1 in the afternoon. But there was only one set of teachers and exhaustion was inevitable.

We have been told that last year 50,000 new classrooms were built—50,000 in a nation whose Office of Education estimates as needing 117,000 additional classrooms every year. Better than nothing—but tragically insufficient.

Serious as the classroom needs are, the shortage of teachers has long since passed the danger mark. The report given me is truly disturbing, for instead of any increase at all there is an increased depletion of trained teachers. We are losing more teachers annually than there are new ones entering the profession.

Many school boards have been forced to put primary grade youngsters into overcrowded classrooms or on half-day sessions, as well as to grant temporary certificates to teachers with substandard preparation. This would seem to spell deterioration.

As a nation, we have taken pride in what we have called the right of every child at least to a basic education. We insist—by law—that children must go to school. We know that freedom demands intelligence from its citizens, and we believe education to be a fundamental bulwark of constructive representative government. We have considered public education one of the cornerstones of our way of life, one of the main arches of our national strength.

Eternal vigilance, the price of freedom? Surely, we are seeing on every side the cost of our lack of this essential element. Trained teaching personnel on the decline—children going to school in firetraps and hovels, to such a degree that 117,000 new classrooms must be built each year if we are to retrieve ourselves, protect our youngsters from possible tragedy and keep our word to ourselves as a free nation that knows freedom demands intelligence, training, and broad, basic education.

There is an actual percentage of our people, though smaller than that of other lands, who are as illiterate as can be. At a moment when we need every potential skilled worker, every potential trained leader, every potential bit of mental as well as physical power that exists among our one-hundred-and-sixty-odd million people, we are reaping the reward of our own carelessness and apathy.

I well remember the shock I received when in the first call of the very first draft we ever had, some 45,000 boys were shown to be illiterate. Rejections by the Army today show up many things we should know about ourselves. It seems to me that it is of tragic moment that in five of our States where more than 12 percent of the population between 25 and 34 years showed less than 5 years of schooling, selective service rejections were from 36 to 58 percent. The average rejection rate nationally being 19 percent. But it is not just in the Army that we suffer, it is in all phases of our living. Something needs to be done about it. If we carry through President Eisenhower's program we shall make a very real beginning.

You will recall that Senator Taft had become deeply aware of the situation and that after several years' study he became convinced that although it was particularly important that the Federal Government should be given no ways by which to control the public educational system there were ways in which Washington could help and so assume a part of the Nation's responsibility toward its youth. President Eisenhower shares this sense of Federal responsibility, as well as having a determination that States and communities shall assume their full share also. So, in recognition of the serious situation we are faced with, the administration has three bills before the Congress:

WHAT ADMINISTRATION IS DOING IN EDUCATION

One (H. R. 7601) authorizes a series of study-action conferences on education in each of the States and Territories, which would bring citizens and educators together to analyze school problems and to suggest remedies. Following these, the President would call a White House Conference on Education to be composed of leaders in education and civic affairs from all over the Nation.

What will these conferences accomplish?

Perhaps most importantly, they should inspire informed, enthusiastic, dynamic public opinion without which little can be accomplished. They are not expected to develop much new data. In the past 25 years there have been several national conferences, 6 major nongovernmental commissions, and some 50 research studies delving into our school needs. Much actual material is already at hand—but the will to do has not grown out of it.

Although you probably know most of the roadblocks in the way of improving educational conditions I want to bring them once more to your attention. The experts give us quite a list which can be resolved only by the States and the local communities:

1. Limitations in financing local school districts almost exclusively through property taxation.
2. Limitations on the rate of taxation for school purposes.
3. Maximum ceilings on bonded indebtedness.
4. Difficulties in securing teachers because State legislatures control budgets for teacher education facilities.
5. Limitations on freedom to reorganize school districts because of State laws.
6. Inequities raising local assessed valuations unless these are raised generally throughout the State.

These conferences will offer the machinery with which to start educational programs in the various States. They will show how local and State action can (and must) be taken to—

1. Change limitations on taxes and bonds.
2. Expand facilities for higher education.
3. Reorganize inefficient school districts.
4. Change property assessments.
5. Attract capable teachers.
6. Provide State aid for school construction.

The State conferences will stimulate local action and the White House Conference will give the broad picture of the importance of education to the national well-being.

The second bill before the Congress (H. R. 7434) would establish a National Advisory Committee on Education.

This committee would consider many problems of national significance in which there has been only limited study. For instance: What should the role of the school be in the tragic picture of juvenile delinquency? It could examine illiteracy in its broad relationship to constructive citizenship including Selective Service rejections. We need to know how best to give children with special abilities the preparation they should have. We need to know how best to help those with mental handicaps. Is it not time we considered the needs of the children of migratory workers?

These are but a few of the problems we as a nation should take hold of. This permanent body would identify the problems of national concern, consider them and advise on the action needed.

The third bill (H. R. 9040) would establish a cooperative research program. It would, as the President urged, enable the United States Office of Education to join its resources with those of States and local agencies, universities, and other educational organizations for the conduct of cooperative research, surveys, and demonstration projects.

This is not a novel idea. In the field of public health, for instance, we have accomplished much by utilizing the available minds in many parts of the Nation.

Today, educational research usually is confined to the study of local problems. Often this procedure is wasteful because many matters of local concern are actually common to many other areas around the country. Also, many localities hesitate to engage in an elaborate research program, but under this legislation such research could easily be encouraged by the United States Office of Education when it was apparent that the study was to be of general national interest.

IMPORTANCE OF TEACHERS

Thus you see the overall picture of what your Government is hoping to do in education.

There is always good reason to believe that citizens are taking a more direct interest in their schools. Within the past few years the enrollment in PTA's has doubled. Since 1950 the number of local citizen groups has climbed from 1,000 to more than 8,000 today.

We know that the American people, given the facts and some intelligent suggestions, will on their own make their schools better places for the training of their children.

Let me end with a personal word to you. Our Federal Government, especially under the present administration, adheres to the sacred American philosophy that the lifeblood of our Republic is the active participation of an informed citizenry.

As teachers, as leaders, you have the tremendous assignment of training our oncoming citizens. Into your hands comes the raw clay of civilization. Often with too little help you are asked to fashion it into thinking, responsible citizens. What a challenging opportunity.

You, especially, who are teaching commercial subjects are molding youngsters who may never have any further formal education after leaving your classrooms. I urge you to approach your task with a deep appreciation of its full implications. Keep abreast of current affairs in your community, your State, and the Nation. Know about our Government and what it is doing. Then apply your superior intelligence and interpret these matters fully to your wards.

If you and the thousands of other teachers in America meet your responsibilities, our Nation will be secure.

It is my earnest hope that the fathers and mothers, the aunts and the uncles, as well as the grandparents, may throw aside their apathy in this absolutely basic problem of adequate education for our youth. Nothing is more important if we are to be strong as a nation in a world that needs our strength. I fear we have been all too ready to leave everything relating to education to you teachers, forgetting that you must have roofs over your classes, tools with which to teach, some relief at least in the matter of your own later years. All this only an informed and electric community can provide. The privilege of securing these things for ourselves is one of the most wonderful parts of our American heritage.

Valuable Service Rendered by Weekly Newspapers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 12, 1954

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, there is no more truly American institution than is the weekly community newspaper. I know, from firsthand experience gained in reading the hundreds of such newspapers published in my own State of Texas, how valuable is the service they render in their respective communities.

Recently one of these Texas weekly newspapers, the Port Neches Chronicle, took an editorial look at itself and at other newspapers in this field. I ask unanimous consent that this editorial from the Chronicle be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Every once in a while, a country editor likes to do a little self back slapping. He writes about the community's comings, goings, and doings so much he doesn't have time to take stock of himself and the newspaper he represents.

Many people take the country weekly for granted. They don't stop to think of the personalities and work that is involved in getting out a weekly paper, week after week. And here in Port Neches, the editor has a rough time what with 2 full-paid correspondents from 2 large dailies working hard to get news also.

However, all of us in the workshop of this country weekly work hard to bring our readers the best in news, pictures, advertisements—all of people we know, love, and respect.

The thousands of country weekly newspapers in the United States stand in a unique position.

Absolutely nothing takes the place of the hometown newspaper. It leaves a printed record of community life and activity that can be found nowhere else. One might call the editor and the writers of the weekly, the diarists of the community.

Local history is recorded and preserved by the county press of the Nation—hopes, aspirations, facts, drama, marriages, births, deaths, political events, legal records—the whole chain of human activity.

A town without a local newspaper is like a phonograph without a record.

Retirement of Hon. Lindsay C. Warren

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. R. WALTER RIEHLMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1954

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with the Members on both sides of the aisle who have, in recent days, paid tribute to one of our greatest public servants, the Honorable Lindsay C. Warren, former Comptroller General of the United States.

Mr. Warren's retirement last month concluded nearly 40 years of truly distinguished Government service, including 13½ years as the Nation's Comptroller General, 16 years as one of the most respected Members of this House, and several terms in the legislature of his beloved native State of North Carolina.

Although many of us were not privileged to serve as fellow Members of the House during Mr. Warren's terms in the Congress, all of us have become greatly indebted to Mr. Warren over the years for his wise counsel in matters both legislative and administrative. During my comparatively short 7½ years as a Member of this House, particularly as a member of the Government Operations Subcommittee of the old Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, and more recently as chairman of the Military Operations Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations, I have had innumerable occasions to seek the advice and cooperation of Mr. Warren and his staff in the General Accounting Office. Invariably, I have been most gratified and inspired by his sincerely selfless dedication to the cause of governmental efficiency and economy. Mr. Warren's unique capabilities and exemplary conscientiousness made the General Accounting Office an indispensable arm of the Congress as an effective auditor over the expenditure of public funds.

Democracy requires the finest of men in public life, and the distinguished career of Lindsay Warren will long serve as a shining example for all of us.

I am sure that the entire membership of this body joins me in extending to our great friend the most sincere wishes that he will soon return to good health so that he may enjoy to the fullest the many long and happy years of retirement which he so richly deserves.

The Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, CIO—A Quarter Century of Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES R. HOWELL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 12, 1954

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, too often news of labor-management relations involves situations in which strife is present, mainly because strife makes dramatic news. Many instances of harmonious, constructive relationships do not receive the attention they merit.

One of the most advanced and successful labor-management relationships in our country exists between the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, CIO, and the Clothing Manufacturers Association of the United States. There has been no major work stoppage in the men's clothing industry in the past 25 years. Bargaining and day-to-day situations are met with mutual respect and a determination to work for the best interests of the industry.

The New York Herald Tribune has paid an editorial tribute to the amalgamated upon the occasion of the 40th convention of the union, now being held in Atlantic City. I am glad to bring to the attention of the House of Representatives this comment upon a close and successful labor-management relationship that can very well serve as a model for all industry in this country:

A QUARTER CENTURY OF PEACE

A record of 25 years of industrial peace deserves a celebration. The Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, CIO, has achieved this record with the help of the employers in the men's clothing industry. Two hundred employers from all parts of the country were guests of the union at a reception and dinner in Atlantic City this weekend. The employers were invited to stay throughout the union's convention. Generally it is a strike which makes news headlines. This splendid story of peaceful labor negotiations without a major strike in the last quarter century all the more deserves our comment.

This union was born on the picket-line nearly 40 years ago. The early years were stormy, but under the inspired leadership of young Sidney Hillman, the amalgamated grew in strength and wisdom. Finally the formula for peaceful settlement of disputes through voluntary arbitration was found and its acceptance won.

The amalgamated has not hesitated to loan money to employers who might otherwise have been forced to close shop. The policy seems to have paid off, for the union has grown from initially 25,000 members to 385,000, with net assets of more than $8 million. Its various union health centers, its low-cost housing developments are other achievements in which the amalgamated and its members may well take pride.

Lost Allies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 12, 1954

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, the United States with its 160 million people cannot hope to stand up against the Communist world with many, many times that population.

Even with our great productive capacity, we cannot stand up to the Communist threat without certain strategic materials which we must obtain from outside our borders.

These two facts, which no one questions, stress the vital importance of having allies whose manpower and resources, joined with our own, provide an effective position of strength from which to negotiate in the cold war. It has been the cornerstone of our foreign policy, in Europe and in Asia, since World War II.

Many of us have become alarmed over what may be the effect on our allies of irresponsible foreign policy statements, and of on-again-off-again approaches to policymaking.

That we have good reason for alarm is borne out in a dispatch from Geneva, Switzerland, written by Marquis Childs, a distinguished syndicated columnist, and published in the Washington Post and Times-Herald of Friday, May 7.

Mr. Speaker, I commend this column to every Member of the House, and suggest its import be given serious consideration:

WE'RE LOSING ALLIES OVER ASIA POLICY

(By Marquis Childs)

GENEVA.—The differences between America and the other Western allies over what course to follow in Indochina have been sharp during the past 10 days. They have been much sharper than the amiable language of public speechmaking would indicate.

It gets down to this: Most of America's allies and friends in both Europe and Asia believe it is necessary to recognize the fact of Communist control of the great land mass of China. They believe that however grim and hateful the prospect may be, the West must somehow accommodate itself to the tremendous alteration of power that this represents.

The dominant view in America both in Congress and in the Executive has been exactly the opposite, China must be isolated and the Communist regime broken down. It is not secret to informed Europeans that Admiral Radford believes that pressures such as a coastal blockade should be maintained over a long period, 50 years if necessary, to prevent the industrial and military development that have made Soviet Russia one of the world's great powers. The same view is held by Assistant Secretary of State Robertson in charge of far eastern affairs. It is the view of Senator KNOWLAND and many other influential Republicans and Democrats.

Among the British and the other Commonwealth powers represented at Geneva a strong suspicion existed that intervention to save Indochina would be merely the first step in a larger Asian war waged against China. Against that background of mutual suspicion and distrust—for Americans look sourly and suspiciously on allied reluctance to respond to the Indochina call—Communist strategy is to isolate America while at the same time trying to win away America's adherents.

President Eisenhower's press conference statement about the necessity for "an arrangement" with communism in southeast Asia may, of course, have completely altered the American position. Up until that Eisenhower statement American officials here were privately berating the British for refusing to go along with intervention in Indochina. Delegates with whom this reporter talked in the wake of the Eisenhower remarks were recalling that it was only a few weeks ago that Vice President Nixon was saying communism must be stopped in Indochina, if necessary with American troops.

Apart from the human tragedy, America has been providing war material for the French at the rate of $800 million a year. It may be possible to retrieve part of this material before it falls into the hands of the Communists. In fact, tentative discussions to this end have already been held. After China fell to the Communists vast stores of American guns, ammunition, and supplies were acquired by the Reds, and these same guns were turned over to Ho Chi Minh's guerrillas to be used against the French.

Many delegates here have been conscious that while the Geneva Conference was getting underway the Prime Ministers of India, Pakistan, Burma, and Indonesia were meeting with the Prime Minister of Ceylon in Colombo. These representatives of 550 million people called for a cease-fire in Indochina. For most Asians, including even Pakistan, with whom the United States has concluded a military alliance, the war waged by the French was a colonial war. American intervention would not have altered that outlook.

Increasingly it has seemed to many of America's friends that the United States was setting out to put down communism by force of arms, thereby failing to realize the necessity to win the allegiance of peoples by slow, painstaking efforts not just for a few years but for decades. This is unfair in that it underrates the far-reaching assistance programs. But in the past year and a half those programs have been cut back, with resulting doubt and uncertainty in the minds of many Asians as to America's intentions.

The gloomy prophets have been saying for a long time that the loss of Indochina would mean the loss of Thailand next and then all the rest of southeast Asia. Under economic pressure, Japan would quickly have to come to terms, and the strategic perimeter considered essential to American security would be gone. It is at that point under the most disadvantageous circumstances that America might be driven to a war of survival. That is the distant peril which, if the gloomiest prophets are correct, may not be so distant at that.

The Bryson Bill, H. R. 1227

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WAYNE L. HAYS

OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 12, 1954

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following petition forwarded to me by the Young Married People's Sunday School Class and Older Women's Class of Leavittsville Methodist Church, Bowerston, Ohio:

To Our Representatives in Congress:

We, the undersigned, your constituents, earnestly beg you to give consideration to our constitutional rights as American citizens to be free in our homes of an offensive invasion by those who wish to increase their huge profits from the sales of alcoholic beverages by high-pressure advertising directed through magazines, newspapers, and over radio and television at our children. We urge you to obtain consideration of and pass the Bryson bill (H. R. 1227).

Miss Irene Boyd, Bowerston, Ohio; Mrs. Louise Harper, Sherrodsville, Ohio; Ruth Antram, Mrs. Elain Walters, Mrs. Edna Higgins, Mrs. Ethel Higgins, Bowerston, Ohio; Mrs. Doris Boyd, Mr. Clifford Boyd, Mr. George Burris, Mrs. George Burris, Margaret Parker, Mrs. Lois Fish, Sherrodsville, Ohio; Mrs. Andrey Leggett, Mrs. Alma Bland, Mr. Murray C. Bland, Mrs. Ora B. Tripp, Mrs. Sadie Antram, Mrs. Amelia Gerber, Mrs. Erna Boyd, Bowerston, Ohio; Mrs. Lula Parker, Sherrodsville, Ohio; Mrs. Grace Tope, Mineral City, Ohio; Mrs. Pauline Coffey, Martha Burris, Bowerston, Ohio.

Morality in Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES I. DOLLIVER

OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 12, 1954

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorials from the Erie (Pa.) Daily News of March 20, 1954, and the Erie Times of March 22, 1954.

[From the Erie (Pa.) Daily News of March 20, 1954]

GENIAL JIM

One of America's best known and most distinguished gentlemen—James Aloysius Farley— will be the guest of a prominent group of Erie men Sunday, and today the Times tributes him in their behalf.

He will be the honored guest and chief speaker at the 35th annual communion breakfast of St. Ann's guard of honor tomorrow morning with some 900 men from all parts of Erie attending.

Mr. Farley, desipte his happy demeanor and celebrated capacity for awakening cheer and optimism in others, has probably suffered more internal turmoil than any other outstanding politcial figure of the age.

That is the personal appraisal of "Genial Jim" by another good friend, Raymond Moley, an early presidential advisor to Franklin D. Roosevelt and who, like Farley, resigned his post.

Writing in his book, 27 Masters of Politics, Mr. Moley described Farley as a sensitive but active extrovert who grew up in relatively simple surroundings, if any human environment can be called simple.

He was schooled in elementary matters of acquired knowledge. He was spared the mental task of answering for himself many questions about why he was alive, what was right and wrong, and what the world meant. For the church into which he was born had the answers, and Farley was a born believer.

Mr. Farley went to work at an early age, did well in successive jobs, married and by mid-1920's, in his own late thirties, he was comfortably on his way with a profitable business, a zestful career in politics developing, a growing family and a host of friends.

By 1928 when Franklin D. Roosevelt was first elected Governor of New York, Farley was secretary of the New York State Democratic Committee and upon him developed the responsibility of building up the party in the State. Much of the deficiency had to be made by Farley between 1928 and 1930 and he labored at it indefatigably.

He traveled almost incessantly the pathways of the State winning friends and remembering people. He possessed and cultivated more than any man of his generation the primary talent to mentally catalog names and faces, to learn and retain facts of association among people, to know who is related to whom by blood, business or politics; to labor with meticulous diligence by mail or otherwise to make and retain contacts.

It is understatement, Moley says, to say that beyond doubt he was a superlative salesman. He astonished and needled the egoes of countless humble persons by remembering their names, their homes, their days of happiness or sorrow, their needs and the needs of their friends. And wherever Farley went, Roosevelt was sold.

Farley's attitude toward the ideological side of the Roosevelt regime in Washington may provide some part of the evidence that his subsequent ordeal was not over matters of legislation or policy. There is still sharper illustration in the fact that Farley vigorously sought the passage of the Court bill in 1937 but demurred even to the brink of a break when Roosevelt sought to purge opposing Senators in 1938. The one was a matter of public principle and policy; the other, a matter of party unity and personal loyalty.

In speaking of Mr. Farley's personal ambition, Moley does not use the word to describe a selfish or ignoble passion. The simple code which had governed his life from childhood was that a man could expect advancement if he worked hard, lived a normal life, helped his friends, and told the truth.

He learned in bitterness that his code could be violated in high places and not fatally injure those who violated it. Farley thus confronted a conflict between loyalty to the methods which he always felt were the ways to achieve legitimate ambitions, and a realization of the denial of his lifetime beliefs.

He decided that he would stick to his early principles and contend with all he had against what opposed them.

[From the Erie (Pa.) Times of March 22, 1954]

MORALITY IN POLITICS

Here's what one of the keenest politicians of this generation had to say about corruption in government—Former Postmaster General James Farley's comment while in Erie Sunday:

"Corruption is the most familiar of the evils of the abuse of power. Man will ever be tempted by easy money even if he has to steal it.

"From early days some men have looked at bribes as the proper reward of public office. Some regard fees they collect as their own funds.

"I have known men who have yielded to temptation in public office. I wish that any person so tempted and so beset by insatiable ambition could have seen, as I have done, these poor, miserable, shattered men.

"I have seen them shed bitter tears of remorse, of regret, and of repentance. I have seen them stunned by the realization of the weight of their disgrace, not so much on themselves as on the ones they love—their parents, their families, and their friends.

"And I have seen them numbed by the realization that they had seen the value of morality too late. For them disgrace is forever.

"It is a frightening fate to contemplate. The judgment of history and the judgment of men are alike, unyielding for the violator of morality in politics.

"It is of utmost importance that men in public life exercise power most judiciously for the common good. They must not only shun temptation but avoid the suspicion of temptation.

"There is no greater crowning jewel in public men than true virtue. Virtue in politics can bring eternal fame, but it always gives the reward of a clear conscience and a deep sense of accomplishment."

Mr. Farley has lived by that moral code.

William T. Kvetkas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. BONIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 12, 1954

Mr. BONIN. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, May 2, I had the privilege of attending a testimonial banquet honoring Mr. William T. Kvetkas, commemorating 30 years as a member of the board of directors of the Lithuanian Roman Catholic Alliance of America in the American Legion Home in Wilkes-Barre, Pa.

Mr. Kvetkas was born January 27, 1894, in Wilkes-Barre, the son of the late William and Mary Kvetkas. American Lithuanians, wherever they are, feel proud, indeed, to number among them this man. His boundless energy and capacity for work are characteristic of his race and follow closely the lives of his parents.

At the age of 21 William T. Kvetkas was chosen to lead the St. Casimir's Lithuanian section of the Holy Name Society parade held in Pittson, Pa. Nine years later he was elected as a member of the board of directors of the alliance at a convention held in Shenandoah, Pa.

His wife was Miss Catherine A. Kizis, of Pittston, and two children were born of this marriage, Elaine and Bill, Jr.

Bill, Sr., has also devoted much time to politics. In the presidential campaign of 1952 he was named national chairman of a committee of Lithuanians by the National Republican Committee for the Eisenhower-Nixon tickets.

In 1940 the American Lithuanian Congress was formed to aid escapees from Communist-occupied Lithuania and to give all possible assistance in the movement to liberate their nation. As a member of this congress and an officer of the alliance, Mr. Kvetkas was a member of a delegation that called upon the President of the United States on two occasions to present data in support of the cause of Lithuania.

He is an active Legionnaire, and with the outbreak of World War II, the leading citizens of Luzerne County met to organize that county's civil-defense program. Mr. Kvetkas was named executive officer of this organization and served in dual capacity as secretary and executive officer. He was also active in serving on committees which sold war bonds.

This is a résumé of the activities of a man who is held in esteem and respect by the organizations he represents for his worthy public projects. The program follows:

National anthem.

Invocation	Rev. A. J. Sinkevicz
Remarks	Adolph Norvaisa
Toastmaster	Attorney John S. Lopatto
Address	Leonard Simutis
Solo	Paul Porter
Address	Congressman EDWARD J. BONIN
Solo	Helen Kosar
Address	Judge Benjamin Jones
Entertainment	Adam Yankoski
Address	Rev. John F. Boll
Duet	Paul Porter and Helen Kosar
Presentation	Peter J. Karazusky
Response	William T. Kvetkas
Benediction	Rev. John Savulis

Lithuanian hymn.

Mrs. Anna Mras, accompanist. Dinner music by Ann Pasko trio.

Why I Support 90 Percent of Parity for Basic Farm Crops

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BEN F. JENSEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 12, 1954

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, my reasons for supporting 90 percent of parity for basic storable farm crops—corn, wheat, cotton, tobacco, peanuts, and rice—are as follows:

Because our farmers are entitled to a dollar which will purchase 100 cents' worth of manufactured goods produced by higher and higher labor costs.

Because the proposed flexible price-support formula would within the next 3 years reduce the price of a bushel of corn, for example, at least 30 cents per bushel, and other products in proportion.

Because when the selling price of corn, for example, is reduced, the price of hogs, cattle, sheep, and poultry will in turn shortly be reduced proportionately, because the price of livestock ready for market, like finished manufactured goods, is determined by the cost of the labor and raw products it takes to produce the article. So, whether it be meat, marbles, or mowers, the producer must have cost of production, plus a reasonable profit or he will sooner or later be out of business. Also, let us not forget that the cost of raw products, generally speaking, represents only a small part of the price you pay for the finished manufactured product.

All new wealth springs from the surface of the earth, is mined or pumped out from beneath the surface of the earth, or fished out of the sea; from these sources come all our raw products from which is made everything we Americans eat, wear, and use every minute of our daily lives. And every American must find employment in producing, transporting, processing, manufacturing, marketing or using the finished product made from raw products. About 90 percent of all our raw products are consumed or made into finished manufactured articles within a year after it is grown, mined, or taken out of the sea; hence, each succeeding year new wealth is produced in the form of raw products and when the number of units and the price per unit is reduced, employment inevitably is reduced, and purchasing power is reduced all along the line; hence our entire economy suffers, forcing a reduction in our national income, and in turn reduced tax revenue to the respective States and Federal Treasury.

Also let us not forget that the American farmer buys on an average of about twice the amount of manufactured goods that the average American buys year in and year out. In normal times, approximately 70 percent of our people are employed in production, transporting, processing, manufacturing and marketing the raw products which spring from the surface of Mother Earth. Mr. Speaker, so long as over $90 billion is taken from the pocket of the American people in local, State, and Federal taxes annually, or any amount even close to that figure; we must maintain a high national income or be ready and willing to force every American to suffer the consequences by taking a greater percentage of their income for taxes.

Whether you farm the surface of the earth, or the bowels of the earth, or the sea for seafood, all are farmers, so far as producing raw products is concerned. Flexible supports as proposed would surely bring about an annual agriculture farm income loss of not less than $4 billion, which would in turn force a national income loss of about $28 billion, because our agriculture farm income over any 5-year period pyramids itself approximately seven times into national income. A fact which has never been and cannot be successfully disputed.

Who would pay the loss of revenue now collected by the United States Treasury because of the reduced national income of that $28 billion. Certainly we must not add it to our present Federal deficit of over $270 billion for our children and their children to pay. It is an agreed fact that the ultimate consumer of goods pays all taxes in the final analysis. Our latest census shows that about 17 percent of our population live on farms, and since our farmers who till the soil purchase and consume about twice the average of other Americans, our farmers will pay approximately 35 percent of the lost revenue. Our wage earners and our retired, elderly folks make up approximately 70 percent of our population, they will pay about 55 percent of the lost revenue, the remaining 12 percent are businessmen, big and small—who must add all taxes to their cost prices, or soon go broke—and professional people of every nature and folks like you and I would pay the balance of about 10 percent to make up the lost revenue. Who among you would like to pay your share of this lost revenue? Or I might ask who among you could pay your share and still make both ends meet without a terrific hardship on yourself and family?

I have heard some folks talk who seem to be worried because we Americans are blessed with a reserve of food, feed, and fiber, which actually amounts to only about 2 percent of the crops the farmers have produced since Pearl Harbor. Bear in mind we are having a population increase annually of over 2½ million. And also bear in mind that a couple of years of moderate crop failures would wipe out the reserves we now have in storage, then the price of food would go up, up, and up. No, my colleagues; I for one will not worry so long as God will bless us with a plentiful supply of food, feed, and fiber. The day I start worrying is when we suffer a scarcity, and that day will come again. We had better be prepared.

Believe it or not, we Americans are today spending on an average less than 25 percent of our income for food, while the other nations of the world are today spending on an average of 70 percent of their income for food. On my trip around the world last fall with other Congressmen, we saw how deeply grateful and friendly the people of those nations were to whom we had sent food. Also, there are many deserving, needy Americans who would be mighty thankful for some of our surplus food supply.

Lose the farm program? Not on your life. Why? Because the majority of the Members of Congress feel exactly as I do, not only those who represent the agriculture districts, but in addition a number of Congressmen who represent city districts, who are now fully aware of the fact, that the prosperity and welfare of the people they represent depends on the prosperity and the welfare of he who tills the soil, and they have educated their people to know the truth.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I must say that it seems mighty strange to many of us in Congress that so few people worry or seem to give a minutes thought to the tens of billions of dollars worth of military supplies of every nature which have been stockpiled and stored up since World War II. All of which would be useless without a plentiful supply of food, feed, and fiber to back it up in time of war. Remember, the final victors in every war in recorded history has been the side that God has blessed with the greatest supply of food, feed, and fiber. Pray God that war will not again be our lot, but should it come, let us make doubly sure of victory.

While Rome Burns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 12, 1954

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, this is a crucial period in our history as a nation. Never was the need for strong and courageous leadership greater than today. The world around us seems to be on fire. Grave dangers confront freedom-loving people everywhere. There is an urgent need for truth, honor, decency, and justice to rise above the totalitarian threat at home if America is to be strong enough to meet the challenge of Communist tyranny to democracy and human freedom.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the following verse from the current issue of the Reporter is most appropriate at this time:

Olympus rocks with laughter: the anarchist
Cries "Order!"; the brawler, plaintive, scolds delay,
The disrupter damns interruption to insist
On fairness, who—day after bullying day—
Disdains it. This is the kind of mortal show
To convulse the gods: seeing how indecent men
Through power and guile bring decent men so low,
So familiar with evil that they sit quiet when
Obscene and shaming insult slaps their face
Into a smile: this substitute for pride,
This genial coin with which a business race
Pays off its rage and pushes honor aside.
The gods may laugh; but let no man assume
That laughter is in order in this room.

The Challenge of Leadership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 12, 1954

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, on last Sunday, May 2, in my home city of Pittsburgh, there was held a banquet in honor of Hon. Samuel A. Weiss, now judge of the common pleas court, our former colleague in Congress, and one who we all so admired and respected during his incumbency here for his unselfish service, untiring efforts, and demonstrated ability in the causes which all truly patriotic American citizens cherish, and for which they struggle.

On that occasion many glowing tributes were paid to the sterling qualities of Sammy, and in addition, a very fine address was delivered by Mr. Philip M. Klutznick, national president of B'nai B'rith, who is known to many of us as former Federal Housing Commissioner, recipient of the Certificate of Merit Award from President Truman, and through whose initiative and direction was built the modern city of Park Forest, Ill.

Under unanimous consent, I insert the address delivered by Mr. Klutznick in the Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

I know no better way to pay tribute to my good friend Judge Samuel Weiss than to discuss tonight the qualities of leadership which are needed in this day and age. He so well exemplifies much of what is on my mind that I think of him as I say the things that are demanded this day.

The headlines of each day's newspapers bring home the perils of the continuing crisis in which our Nation moves. We live in a time of great tensions and violent reactions, of problems which involve the far corners of the world and solutions which demand extraordinary vision and courage. History moves at such a rapid pace that we live in constant danger of losing the power to control our own decisions.

These indeed are times that strain the qualities of leadership.

Within our lifetime we have seen our Nation grow into one of the greatest world powers in the history of mankind. Upon our country and our Government has fallen the mantle of international leadership, at least among the free peoples. We have developed the inventive genius and the productive abundance either to destroy the world in a holocaust of flame or to provide man with the good things of life. The free world looks to us for the decisions that will mean peace or war in Indochina just as it has looked to us in recent months for the decisions that determine the future of Germany, the fate of Korea, the control of Trieste, and the balance of power in Italy. The economic unity and military defense of Europe rests in large measure in our hands no less than peace and security for the teeming millions of southeast Asia.

Leadership in such times as these is a heavy responsibility and calls for men of great strength in body and soul. Our country needs clear-thinking men who act in the spirit of the American tradition and according to soundly constructed policies. There are such men of deep sincerity and devotion to principle at the helm of our Government, men who are willing to make sacrifices for the ideas they believe in. They are men who think and act without fear, men who in their positions of responsibility uphold the system of law and constitutional procedure that we have developed through the centuries. Their perspective ranges beyond the scope of national boundaries and contemplates the world within their sense of responsibility.

To such men the fate of the peasant on the plains of Asia is part of the same pattern as the rights and liberties of their fellow Americans at home. When they speak of peace in the Middle East, of friendship and support to all the nations in that uneasy region, they set forth principles which all right-thinking men can uphold and applaud. Here is a part of the world in which American interest goes back 120 years, when Yankee traders first sailed to the Levant. They came for trade purposes, to be sure, but who can say how great a part religious conviction played in directing their attention to this hallowed corner of the world. We know that the same spirit of religious devotion exists to this very day and inspires the principles of peace which our leaders pronounce.

But in this age of crisis, when the management of the state is more complex, more intricate than ever before in the history of mankind, men with the qualities of great leadership are all too few.

We have said that the demands of the hour are almost unbearable in their weight. Let us draw on one segment of the complex problems of our foreign relations, an area that vitally concerns many of us, the Middle East. Within the last 3 weeks the Assistant Secretary of State for Near Eastern Affairs has delivered two major addresses on this subject. One in Dayton on April 9, and the other only last night in this State at Philadelphia before the American Council for Judaism.

Except for one observation, I shall refrain from raising any question as to the judgment or propriety of choosing such a forum. To this audience the question and answer are obvious. But I fear that it would be an injustice to ourselves as Americans to permit the site of the speech to become the focal point of a controversy. This is a luxury that we cannot afford. It is the speech itself and what was said that we must examine.

I have said there is one exception concerning the forum of this Philadelphia speech. In addressing myself to this exception, I do so with the full intention of complimenting the Assistant Secretary, Mr. Byroade, whose integrity I respect but some of whose judgments I find unacceptable. In explaining his Dayton speech before the council, he chose to use the following words:

"I was not referring in any way to, or casting aspersions upon, the natural feeling of affinity one feels for a brother of his own religious faith, wherever he may be. The principles of the United States on matters of religious freedom are so well-known that this assertion of mine should need no expansion.

"Nor was I referring in any way to proper philanthropic support—in its broadest sense—by American citizens of Jewish faith in the economic development necessary to achieve a reasonable standard of living of Israel's people—nor to support of religious, educational, and cultural enterprises in Israel. There is no divergence between our Government and American citizens of the Jewish faith who are interested in the development and welfare of the State of Israel."

It is to Mr. Byroade's everlasting credit that with these words he laid at rest the ghost of dual loyalty and allegiance in the presence of those who have tried to give it life.

There are other aspects of this major pronouncement of American foreign policy in the Middle East with which I find myself in great sympathy. Mr. Byroade's concern with the attitude of the Soviet Union and its obvious efforts to obstruct decisive steps that would lessen the tensions merits our understanding and support.

But to me the speech, read and reread and reread again, is a source of profound personal distress. I was one of those who accepted the announcement of the Government's policy of impartiality with the objective of a just peace in the Middle East as one that deserved a fair trial. I have expressed the view that Mr. Dulles would make progress in this direction given the chance to work at it and the understanding of the people that is so necessary.

We deeply regret, therefore, that the Assistant Secretary of State has produced a document which, despite qualifications and explanations, stands as a most devastating confession of the failure of this policy. As one reads between all the lines and puts all the important sentences together, it becomes obvious that what the Philadelphia audience heard is that our policy of "impartial friendship" to the Arab states and to Israel has now earned us the enmity of both.

The attempt is made to justify our behavior under this policy of impartial friendship by making certain claims, by setting forth certain fundamental points some of which may not stand too careful scrutiny. In the determination of any policy, facts and balanced judgments are important. To charge that the people of the Middle East are at each other's throats because they each want to possess the same piece of land is not only an oversimplification but, in my judgment, it is wrong.

What we have been seeing in the Middle East not only since the establishment of the State of Israel but in violence and upheavals that have been taking place since the breakup of the old Turkish Empire is a battle between the old and the new, between the remnants of feudal autocracy and modern democracy. It is a battle between the poverty and degradation of the old concept of society and the living standards of the new; between ancient relations of lord and master and the emancipated ideas of contemporary civilization.

Is this narrow strip of coastal land which together with a barren desert constitutes the tiny Republic of Israel what the Arab chieftains really want?

Or, is it this beachhead of democracy and democratic living on a continent of poverty and oppression that they fear?

Indeed, there could be a cause for fear if their own oppressed millions begin to question their poverty in the midst of natural resources far superior to anything possessed by Israel. On such an issue we Americans are not impartial. We stand for freedom and against feudalism. We stand for an adequate standard of living to nurture the freedom we love.

In this address the Arabs are charged with maintaining an attitude of negativism toward efforts to promote peace in the Middle East. Negativism can mean many things, but to us we see the Arab States committed to resolute and positive acts to destroy the prospect of peace, not mere negativism to obstruct peace. The best that one can say for this attitude is that it is a superb example of the art of understatement.

Let us look at the record:

1. A martial call by King Saud for 10 million sons of Mohammed to sacrifice their lives in order to drive Israel into the sea.

2. A miserable boycott to the detriment of the Arab States themselves in an effort to choke Israel economically.

3. Closing the Suez Canal to Israeli shipping in defiance of the United Nations.

If this is mere negative obstruction to peace and not a calculated program to create belligerency and war, then we are permitting ourselves to be blinded to the realities of the hour. The great danger of such blindness is that we may open our eyes and find that the conflagration is beyond control.

I would urge Mr. Byroade to reconsider his evaluation of the policies and the needs which he interprets as mere negativism. In such a reconsideration, he might find pause and question the judgment that would make arms—no matter how small the amount—available to a country which in concert with others would breach the peace.

It is easy to agree with Mr. Byroade that in the absence of the possibility of total peace everybody involved ought to be encouraged to take every step that will tend to eliminate sources of irritation. He cites as an example the problem of the Arab refugees, and from the platform of our policy of impartial friendship he charges Israel with making statements in vacuo regarding the refugees. He urges Israel to arrange some step-by-step moves which would give assurance that she was not following a policy of total peace or nothing.

In this Mr. Byroade possesses more facts than we. Therefore, it is quite possible that in some areas this advice should be heeded. But in the case of the Arab refugees, it is the fact that a few years ago within the United Nations, Israel indicated that she was prepared to discuss this problem of Arab refugees independently of the issues of total peace.

This proposal fell on deaf ears.

It is unthinkable that if our State Department urged Israel to renew this proposal that Israel would fail to heed our American plea. Indeed, I cannot share the tone of helplessness that emanates from Mr. Byroade's statement on this subject.

We are deeply disturbed by the acceptance of the position that peace is not now possible.

What is worse, the implication of no peace in our time in the Middle East is an invitation to the continuance of belligerency. Peace in the Middle East is possible so long as we emphasize the possibility of peace and not its impossibility.

For us to give up is to destroy the real efficacy of the policy of impartial friendship. How can we be true friends to the Arab States and to Israel unless we persist against all odds to bring them together in the search for a just peace. When the peacemaker surrenders, all hope is gone.

We respect the leaders of our Government. We want Mr. Byroade to know that we are aware of the great cares of burdensome office during these critical days. In what we have said, we seek to help constructively rather than to hinder. In the full spirit of democracy we differ in the hope that out of this we may together find new avenues that will bring us to the goal we seek.

America is as strong as the hope it keeps generating in the hearts of men. To the Middle East no less than elsewhere in the world must go the message that the qualities of leadership bred here will yet help that troubled area find just peace.

Anticommunism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 12, 1954

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the Nation owes an eternal debt of gratitude to Barnard J. Shiel, auxiliary bishop of Chicago, for his timely and most brilliant talk to the American people on the question of anticommunism.

As a guest of Edward R. Murrow on his television program on the CBS network, Bishop Shiel delivered a message that was perhaps the most forceful and effective blow ever dealt to the totalitarian philosophy in the United States.

His courageous words, his sound logic and reason, and his brilliant presentation was inspiring and convincing. No one has contributed more to provoking thought—that second sober thought—than he. Undoubtedly he has won great praise and deep respect from good people of all faiths—people who hate communism and all other brands of totalitarian tyranny.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to include with my remarks the following TV message of Bishop Shiel:

I would like to talk about a subject we hear a lot of these days—anticommunism. Note that I said anticommunism. I think it is necessary that we give a little thought to just what form anticommunism should take at this point in America's history. That all decent Americans are against communism, I should think, would go without saying. That we are opposed to communism, both as individuals and as a nation—and why—hardly needs an explanation.

The problem is no longer one of alerting people to the danger of communism. We are all aware of that danger. The problem we are facing is what do we do about it. The unsolved problem, in other words, is what constitutes effective anticommunism. More than that, what kind of anticommunism is moral? What kind of anticommunism is proper in a freedom-loving country like ours? The three go together, in my mind. If anticommunism is immoral, it is not effective. You cannot effectively fight immorality with more immorality. If anticommunism flouts the principles of democracy and freedom, it is not in the long run effective. You cannot effectively fight tyranny with tyranny. And if anticommunism is not effective, it is so much sound and fury, signifying nothing.

It is not enough to say that someone is anti-Communist to win my support. It has been said that patriotism is the scoundrel's last refuge. In this day and age anticommunism is sometimes the scoundrel's first defense. As I remember, one of the noisiest anticommunists of recent history was a man named Adolf Hitler. He was not wrong because he was anticommunist. He was wrong because he was immorally anticommunist; he countered Communist tyrannny with a tyranny of his own. And inevitably, Herr Hitler was a dismal failure as an anticommunist. Half of his own Germany now lives under communism and half of Europe lives in Communist slavery. Would this be true, I wonder, if Hitler had been morally anti-Communist? If Hitler had fought Communist tyranny with democratic freedom, the world we live in—I am persuaded—would be quite different today. And I venture to say there would be less, not more communism in it than there is.

No Hitler has risen in America, and I must say that I think it is nonsense when foreign reporters and journalists describe us as living in a kind of Hitlerian reign of terror. We are still free, and we will remain free— let's have no doubts about that. But, it seems to me that now, while we are free, is the time to cry out against the phony anticommunism that mocks our way of life, flouts our traditions, and democratic procedures, and our sense of fair play feeds on the meat of suspicion and grows great on the dissension among Americans which it cynically creates and keeps alive by a mad pursuit of headlines.

How much more of this are we going to tolerate before we remember that we are proud Americans, with values of our own? If we throw those values away—and I am referring to our traditions of innocent-until-proved-guilty, I am referring to our concern for means as well as ends. I am referring to our trust in our basic institutions—then we will be left with our anticommunism, but very little else.

An America where the accused is guilty until he is proved innocent, where means don't matter but only ends, an America which has lost faith in the integrity of the Government, the Army, the schools, the churches, the labor unions, press, and most of all an America whose citizens have lost faith in each other—such an America would not need to bother about being anti-Communist; it would have nothing to lose.

I take it that a genuine anti-Communist is one who despises the court methods of the Communists. I take it he hates the Communist idea that one is guilty until proved innocent. I take it that the genuine anti-Communist is one who above all believes in the democratic procedures and is willing to stand by them, even in the face of great temptations to lose one's temper and to lose one's faith in the methods of freemen.

This great debate demonstrates the anxiety of people; the desire to have a clear understanding of the issues at stake, and it seems more to me, that the issue of freedom is of vast importance to every one of us.

It has seven and a half centuries of history behind it where men and women have given and sacrificed and even died in order that the law of the land might become a reality, and find its way into the Magna Carta in 1215. Aided and supplemented, then, a century later by the great Justinian statesman, Edward III, when he added the phrase, "through the due processes of law." Then James Madison brought all of his great legal mind acumen to bear and incorporated the law of the land and the due processes of law when he coined that phrase: "Life, liberty, and property cannot be taken without due process of law." You know, Dr. Mott, who is perhaps one of the great legal historians, characterized that sentence when he said: "This is a nugget of pure gold." We have been influenced by these great concepts of the relationship of people through due processes of law to their government, because the government, when due processes are put into practice, can never become tyrannical and can never be overbearing, which is contrary to the entire American way of thinking and acting. This freedom that is ours is a very precious thing. It can be frittered away. It can be lightly thought of, and it would seem incredible that seven and a half centuries of history would be thrown quickly and easily, and yet such things can happen unless we are filled with an understanding of its historical significance, and what it means to us for our protection as freemen, and then we are really the hope of the world as long as that freedom remains with us.

You know Chief Justice Stone, I believe, said that he had a tremendous belief in the second sober thought of the American people. At first, like the individual, they may become frightened and angry. They may become confused and doubtful, but that second, sober thought finds the people realistically reacting to a need in demonstrating a courage to protect the cornerstone upon which our liberty is based. Justices Brandeis, Jackson, Frankfurter, and others, have all demonstrated by their decisions and the things that they have said, the importance of this concept and understanding on the part of the American people. Maybe it's a good thing we have to have the idea for freedom brought home to us. Maybe it will make us more careful. Maybe we will understand better its precious quality, and we will act more reasonably to protect it.

Good night, Ed, and thank you so much for the courtesy that you have extended.

While We Dally and Forget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH P. O'HARA

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 12, 1954

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, Attorney L. G. Davis, of Sleepy Eye, Minn., who is 94 years of age, is still active in his practice and in civic affairs and is also the author of a number of poems.

I enclose one of his poems entitled "While We Dally and Forget," for inclusion in the RECORD:

[From the Sleepy Eye (Minn.) Herald-Dispatch of July 24, 1947]

FREEDOM BASED ON BASIC TRUTHS

Attorney L. G. Davis, 88, who took an active part in the 75th anniversary celebration in this city last week, thinks this generation isn't profiting much by the lessons history portrays, and that if we aren't careful modern civilization will suffer the fate which befell Rome, Greece, Babylon, and other nations of old. He has put his thoughts into verse:

"WHILE WE DALLY AND FORGET

"Basic truths are truths eternal.
  Stable laws on these are based.
Too, on these our recent forebears
  Had their freedoms firmly placed.
Now we flout these truths and concepts—
  Deep ingrained by blood and sweat—
Losing thus our well-earned freedoms.
  While we dally and forget.

"Ancient Rome and Greece, examples—
Blood-bought lessens, writ on sands—
Greed for power and vicious pleasures
Took its toll with ruthless hands.
Blindly careless of their freedoms,
Dreaming of an easier lot,
Drugged by thoughts of sensuous living,
While they dallied and forgot.

"Heeding not the fate of nations
That forgot what freedoms cost
And, through soft and easy living
Both their souls and freedoms lost,
'Slow but sure' we, too, are slipping,
Smoothly, as in pattern set,
Drugged by dreams of ease and pleasure
While we dally and forget."

—*LeRoy G. Davis.*

Gen. Hoyt S. Vandenberg

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM H. BATES

OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 12, 1954

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I wish to include a fine tribute to the late Gen. Hoyt S. Vandenberg by Col. Roland W. Estey, president of the Salem Evening News and distinguished Army officer.

The article is as follows:

SLEEPING ON THE GENERAL

(By Col. Roland W. Estey)

Have you ever dared to place your weary head on a general's shoulder and take a nice nap? Or, let's put it another way: Have you ever had a general put his head on your shoulder and go to sleep? Well, I've had both experiences and at a time when I was flying the Atlantic.

The general to whom I refer is Gen. Hoyt S. Vandenberg. General Vandenberg has recently died and his death removes another of my dearest wartime friends—a friendship continued through the cold-war years. My loss is small compared to the loss of this aggressive and forceful leader of the United States Air Force.

On May 30, 1946, I was seated in a military transatlantic plane waiting for the take-off that would return me to Washington after an extended tour of directing subversive and sabotage activities in Europe. The only empty seat was beside the one I occupied. Suddenly a handsome white-haired man flopped beside me—it was General Vandenberg.

With the general was his chief of staff and a junior officer as his military aide. There were no seats for them so I offered to wait over for the next plane—so did several other officers and enlisted men. As he stood up to look over the seating situation he realized every seat was taken. In reply to my offer, and, to the others, as well, he said, "Colonel, you and all the rest of us are anxious to get home. Everyone remain where you are. My staff will follow on the next plane." This is how General Vandenberg and I took turns sleeping on each other's shoulder.

This, incidentally, was typical of my friend General Vandenberg. Not only did he treat me in this humane and friendly manner but his relationship with all those who were associated with him was of the same thoughtful and reasonable manner.

As commanding general of the Air Force he was known for his strategic strength and he never hesitated to advance what he believed to be right regardless of the person by whom he might be called upon to present his views. He never sought an easy way out of any situation and his disagreements with President Truman and the Joint Chiefs of Staff are still topics of general conversation in high political and military levels of this Nation.

He never would compromise his professional estimates of the needs and requirements of the Air Force and what risks would exist if these requirements were not made an actuality. It can safely be reported that this Nation's strength in the atomic and hydrogen era is due in a large part to his demands for priority in airpower activities.

I saw much of General Vandenberg and I learned how he operated, for I was attached to his 9th Air Force Headquarters in France during the latter part of 1945 and the early months of 1946. I have never seen a general officer work as hard and for so many hours as did the general during those days of the Belgian bulge when weather conditions prohibited air reconnaissance and intelligence.

Few people know of his personal activities to secure information and intelligence during those days when it was not to be had from air observations. He placed himself and his position in jeopardy, day after day, by motor and foot advancement well beyond that which might be called in line of duty. During those hectic days and sleepless nights he was "on the prowl" ready to meet any sudden emergency that might arise. He was as good an infantryman as he was a flier. I can vouch for this—I know.

He was in command of the Air Force at the time of the Berlin airlift and its success became the basis of the free world and global Strategic Air Command. His strategy and ideas will live long in the histories to be written of air power and its application to defensive and offensive tactics.

During his leadership of the United States Air Force he was a sick man. He knew he was ill and he knew of his particular ailment. This knowledge was, in his mind, no excuse for the discontinuation of the service for which he had been trained and had gained through experience. My last meeting with the general was better than 2 years ago. At that time he said, "Estey, I am a sick man but this is no time to quit or think of my pains." And he didn't.

General Vandenberg possessed characteristics that could well be the guide to every young officer when he enters military service with the Armed Forces of this Nation. Never fearful of political civilians yet willing to carry out the decisions of those civilians who properly control the Armed Forces. Honesty and character were two of his greatest contributions to the country he loved.

I've lost a very good friend—one whom I admired and respected. I shall not forget him nor shall I forget those restful hours when I slept on his shoulder and he on mine.

Justice to the Aged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 12, 1954

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include excerpts from two letters from correspondents who are so-called beneficiaries under our social-security program. Both find themselves obliged to work, even though past the age of retirement; both resent the wage ceiling in the Social Security Act, which deprives them of benefits if their earnings exceed a fixed amount. Both ask, and rightly so, when the Congress will act to rectify this injustice in our social-security program. The letters follow:

PROVIDENCE, R. I., *May 8, 1954.*

Hon. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN OSTERTAG: I believe with millions of other citizens that the provision in the Social Security Act limiting the earnings of recipients over 65 years of age is unjust, uneconomic, and unconstitutional. One of the fundamental rights of our citizens is the privilege of working to better themselves. To limit the earnings of a worker in effect withdraws him from the labor pool and lessens the productive power of our Nation.

Very truly yours,
(Name Withheld.)

LANCASTER, N. H., *May 8, 1954.*

Hon. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: May I say that I am going on 71, and owing to extreme business conditions in this section, I was compelled to file for old-age benefits to piece out my income. I gave this long and serious thought before filing, as I realize that I am tying myself and my wife to an extremely meager income, as I am not allowed to earn in excess of $75 a month in addition to my small benefits. I hope and pray that the wage ceiling will be done away with in the proposed legislation. As everyone knows, the average man is 6 feet underground ere he reaches the age of 75. I feel that a man over 70 should not be penalized for wanting to work and earn what he is able to do and has the strength to do.

I am most sincerely,
(Name withheld.)

Mr. Speaker, I might add that my correspondent's comment about the average life of our citizens is very well taken. According to a study made public yesterday by the United States Public Health Service, the average length of life in the United States is 68½ years. To impose a wage ceiling in the Social Security Act at age 65, and remove it at age 75 is not only unrealistic and unjust—it looks to the aged like a scheming insult. Surely that is not what this Congress intended.

Congratulations to J. Edgar Hoover on 30th Anniversary as FBI Director

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 12, 1954

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I join millions of Americans in extending to J. Edgar Hoover sincere and warm congratulations on the completion of 30 years as Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

Those have been memorable years for the Bureau. Under Mr. Hoover's leadership and guidance, the Bureau has grown into an efficient law-enforcement agency, which has won and earned the respect of all Americans. It has cooperated with all State law-enforcement agencies in combatting organized crime. Its record of achievement is long and great.

Great credit and honor go to the man who reorganized and built this agency into the effective arm of law enforcement it has become.

The article which follows, which appeared in the May 10, 1954, issue of the East St. Louis (Ill.) Journal, reviews briefly the history of the FBI under the directorship of J. Edgar Hoover:

LAW ENFORCEMENT HONORABLE PROFESSION UNDER FBI

(By Don Whitehead)

WASHINGTON, May 10.—J. Edgar Hoover's greatest pride on this, his 30th anniversary as FBI Director, is this:

"I'm proudest of the fact that we've made law enforcement an honorable profession. In all my career that achievement has made me happiest.

"By observing civil rights, by eliminating the third degree and the evil practices that once existed, we have achieved a standing in the country of which I'm proud. And it's largely due to the character of our personnel."

Hoover said he is hopeful the FBI will be divorced for all time from partisan politics and that his own successor will come from FBI ranks.

Looking back over the stormy years of FBI development, Hoover said in one of his rare interviews:

"I'm heartily in favor of promoting from within the Bureau.

"When I took over the directorship in 1924, FBI agents held their jobs because of political ties. They were political appointees, and the only requirement was 'Do you have the endorsement of your committeeman?'

"I stopped that. All my assistants and associates have come through the ranks. My feeling is that my successor, when the time comes, should be designated from the ranks, not on any basis of seniority but on ability."

The general impression has grown through the years that the FBI is a one-man show largely because the name J. Edgar Hoover has become linked inextricably with the name FBI. Hoover does have the final decisions, but in the background is a 10-man brain trust through which Hoover works in directing his fight against crime, espionage, and subversion.

Each morning at 10:30 Hoover's 10 top aides gather in what is known as the executive conference. Associate Director Clyde Tolson is chairman in the absence of Hoover. With him are Assistants to the Director L. V. Boardman and Louis B. Nichols and the assistant directors and division chiefs.

One member of the conference said: "There are no holds barred in our meetings. We thrash out policies and procedures within the framework of our responsibility. Each decision is arrived at by a vote. If there is a split vote, we must give the arguments on both sides to the Director for his final decision."

Hoover recalled the first months of his career with the FBI. "There were some marvelous fights inside the Bureau," he said. "Some of the oldtimers complained we were getting Boy Scouts to do the work that could be entrusted only to the two-gun men."

Those first years were ones of reorganization, building up a corps of agents trained in law and accounting, and establishing uniform rules of conduct and procedure.

Then came the gangster era—the wild rampage of gang rule, gang murders, kidnaping, bank robberies, and reigns of terror by underworld mobs working with crooked politicians, crooked courts, crooked police officers.

The kidnaping of Charles A. Lindbergh, Jr., stirred the Nation. And then "Pretty Boy" Floyd, Vern Miller, and Adam Richetti slaughtered four police officers in trying to free a pal, Frank Nash, from their custody. This was the bloody Kansas City massacre of June 17, 1933. Ironically, the hoodlums killed Nash too in the wild shooting.

In the breakdown of local law enforcement, enraged citizens demanded action from the Federal Government. Congress in 1934 passed a series of crime bills which almost overnight changed the FBI from an unarmed force with no authority into a crime-fighting organization.

FBI men were authorized to carry arms and make arrests. It became a Federal crime to kill a Government agent. Laws were passed giving the FBI authority to go into action against kidnapers, extortionists, bank robbers, racketeers, and criminals fleeing across State lines to avoid prosecution.

Hoover built up a giant master file of fingerprints, established a national crime laboratory for scientific analysis of crime clues. He started the National Police Academy, where police from all over the Nation come to study FBI crime-detection methods and the scientific means of gathering evidence. The facilities of the FBI were opened to all local law-enforcement agencies.

By 1939, he reported that not a single organized crime gang was operating.

Suicide Circle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER F. MACK, JR.
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 10, 1954

Mr. MACK of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, Washington National Airport is the third busiest airport in the United States. Within one-half mile of its boundaries are located Anacostia Naval Station and Bolling Air Force Base. This additional heavy military traffic in the control area makes the Washington airport traffic circle the heaviest in the country, if not in the entire world. For the past several years, many Members of this body have warned our people of this critical situation, and have proposed several alternatives to alleviate this condition. While many of us have different views as to how this problem should be solved, we have unanimously agreed that immediate action must be taken. As one who has occasion to pilot planes in and out of this traffic circle, I make no reservation in saying that this situation is intolerable and that the traffic has been at the saturation point for several years. It is my understanding that last year the Secretary of Commerce and Secretary of the Army had agreed on the use of Andrews Field as a joint military-civilian operation to handle part of this traffic, but as of this date no further progress has been made and the traffic situation at Washington National Airport continues to grow worse.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it is time the present administration took positive action to alleviate this condition before we have a recurrence of the tragedy which claimed the life of one of our Members a few years ago.

Seven Lives: Two Thousand Dollars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT W. CRETELLA
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 12, 1954

Mr. CRETELLA. Mr. Speaker, I include an article from the May issue of Nation's Business entitled "Seven Lives: Two Thousand Dollars."

Judging from the figures as reported, it would appear that Mr. Godfrey in this recent incident has become the whipping boy of the CAA and CAB. An irresponsible Government agency has obviously taken it upon itself the ballyhooed chastisement of Arthur Godfrey, a pilot of many years good standing, with an admirable safety record and a reserve commission in the United States Navy.

Yet the tragic loss of lives remains a frequent occurrence in the operations of nonscheduled airlines. The CAB chose to overlook an 11.1-percent fatality rate per 100 million passenger-miles of these airlines and set their sights on Mr. Godfrey's takeoff, in which no lives were lost and no accident occurred.

The awkward, pitiful attempt of the supposedly responsible CAB and CAA for front-page headlines is almost as shocking as the air tragedies which have drawn shoddy investigation at best.

The article follows:

America's scheduled airlines carried more than 97 percent of the 34,554,000 persons who traveled on United States Government-regulated airlines last year.

These are the country's main trunk and feeder route lines, operating on regular schedules. They have been developing for more than 30 years on the foundations laid by our air pioneers.

The other nearly 3 percent, or 787,000 passengers, were carried on what the Government calls irregular carriers. These nonscheduled lines generate traffic wherever they can, and aim to take it where it wants to go. They have been particularly successful in getting Government contracts for mass movements, generally involving armed services personnel. In this classification they flew more passenger miles last year than did the scheduled lines. It accounted for one-third of their business.

Nonscheduled carriers in their present form are a comparatively recent development. Mainly, they result from the fact that World War II produced a surplus of military aircraft and experience in operating them.

Both types of airlines and all other civil aviation are regulated by two Government bodies, the Civil Aeronautics Board and the Civil Aeronautics Authority. They share responsibility for the safety of the public, in some sort of division that is not always clear. Nevertheless, they may act swiftly and surely when they are so moved.

Let's look at the air carriers safety record for last year. The CAB reports the fatality rates on scheduled airlines was .6 per 100,000,000 passenger miles flown. The fatality rate on nonscheduled carriers was 11.1, measured on the same scale. That is more than 18 times greater than the fatality rate of the scheduled lines.

Why? How could one be so much greater than the other? Not because of the nature of their flights, since scheduled airlines carried 221,000 persons on off-schedule charter service—comparable to the nonscheduled operations—without a single fatality.

Could it be because one operation is bigger than the other? Hardly, since size and safety do not necessarily go hand in hand. And some nonscheduled carriers are bigger than some scheduled airlines. The size issue seldom is raised, except by the professional bleeders for an imaginary segment of American business which they call, for their own political or economic gain, small business. Actually, some irregular carriers have as good safety records as have scheduled carriers.

But not all, as the figures prove. Let's look at the record of one nonscheduled carrier, picked at random, and not necessarily either typical or average:

The record starts with 1947 and a fine of $100 for various deviations from safety regulations, including overloading a plane. The CAA calls such fines civil penalties. They are not the result of court action, but are negotiated between the accused and the accuser.

In 1948 the same line was fined $200 for failing to comply with safety regulations. In 1951 it was fined $1,500 for overloading on 13 different flights and for other violations.

Later that year 56 persons were killed when one of the line's planes crashed shortly after takeoff from Newark Airport in what the CAB said was an overloaded condition, but which the CAA said was not a safety violation, or at least was not provable in court. There was no penalty or other disciplinary action, although the bureaus have authority to suspend or revoke the line's operating privilege.

Last year a plane of the same line crashed with a loss of seven lives in the mountains near Seattle. CAB investigations indicated that faulty maintenance, such as using spark plugs long after their recommended life span, caused the engine failures that preceded the crash. The CAA reports it is currently negotiating with the carrier for a $2,000 penalty.

Now, let's compare that shocking record of bartering for dollars over the loss of human lives with the swift, sure action of the CAB and the CAA in the case of Arthur Godfrey, accused of flying his airplane too close to a CAA control tower during a takeoff at Teterboro Airport. Mr. Godfrey, an experienced airman, said whatever swerving was done was caused by a cross wind and was unavoidable. There was no accident.

In this case, however, the CAA and the CAB took their responsibilities most seriously, even though no human life had been lost. They suspended Mr. Godfrey's license for 6 months.

The contrast in these two records indicates that it is the investigators themselves—those Government bureaus responsible for the protection of the public safety—who need investigation.

A Deserved Tribute to a Faithful Colleague: Harlan Hagen, of California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. MOSS, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 12, 1954

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, we are all aware of the fact that our job is a most difficult and responsible one. In performing it I am happy to be associated with my able colleague from California, Mr. HAGEN. I had not served very long with Mr. HAGEN in the California State Legislature before I acquired a profound appreciation of his political honesty and ability. Apparently these qualities have not gone unnoticed in his district. The Tulare Advance-Register on its editorial page of May 1, 1954, and the Wasco News on its editorial page of May 6, 1954, endorse Mr. HAGEN for reelection in language which reflects a sure knowledge of Mr. HAGEN's conduct in this body. I submit them to you as a deserved tribute to a faithful colleague:

[From the Tulare Advance-Register of May 1, 1954]

WHY WE SHOULD REELECT HAGEN

Although you'd hardly guess it from the lack of campaign oratory and spectator interest, there's a highly important election coming up soon—on Tuesday, June 8, to be exact.

A lot of vital things are going to be settled in the statewide primary election on that date. Among them are the party nominations for various State and Federal offices, plus the final outcome of several Tulare County races in which there are only two candidates competing on a nonpartisan basis.

We'll have more to say about the various races as time goes along, but today we'd like to concentrate on one of the most important contests, the one for the office of congressional representative from the 14th California District, which comprises Tulare, Kern, and Kings Counties.

There are two candidates for the job. They are the incumbent, Democrat HARLAN HAGEN, Hanford attorney, and Republican Al Blain, Visalia real-estate man. Both are young men.

With all due respect to Blain, who is a mighty likable fellow personally, we can't see any reason in the world why the voters of the 14th District should "change horses."

HAGEN, who winding up his first term in Congress after two terms as the Tulare-Kings Counties representative in the State assembly, has done a splendid job for a freshman Congressman. He has been an able Representative of his own district and he has proven himself to be a discerning thinker on questions of national and international import.

And, furthermore, he has been fair. During the first session of the 83d Congress in 1953, HAGEN compiled a record of 70-percent support of the Eisenhower administration's program—far better than most Democrats and better even than a great many of his across-the-aisle Republican colleagues.

He has worked willingly and successfully on behalf of the farmers of this district, who are the lifeblood of the San Joaquin Valley. He has an almost perfect attendance and on-the-record voting performance during the time he has been in Congress. And he has kept the voters at home informed as to what he is doing and trying to do, instead of blandly ignoring them, as was the custom of his predecessor.

In fact, HAGEN's performance in Congress has been a welcome and a refreshing change from everything that went before him during the terms of Republican Thomas Werdel, of Bakersfield.

To wrap it all up into a nutshell, we believe HAGEN has compiled a highly satisfactory record in Congress. His opponent, Republican Blain, on the other hand, is a novice in the field of politics, untested on the field of battle. We have a high regard for Blain personally, just as we have for HAGEN.

But when it comes down to a choice of which should be elected to Congress to represent the important 14th District, we'll gladly string along with HAGEN. You simply don't fire an employee when he is doing a fine job. And that's the way it should be with Congressmen, too. HARLAN HAGEN deserves reelection and we hope he gets it.

[From the Waco News of May 6, 1954]

BIPARTISAN SUPPORT FOR HAGEN

Except for the bleeding howls of a few extreme rightwing Republicans, bipartisan support for Congressman HARLAN HAGEN's reelection is deservedly mounting in the district. HAGEN has amply demonstrated in the past that his first and main concern rests with the interests and aspirations of all the people whom he represents and has consistently worked in that direction.

On national and foreign issues, HAGEN has proven himself one of the most level-headed legislators in Washington today, following an independent course regardless of party or group pressure. A Democrat, he has given President Eisenhower more support than most Republicans in the rare instances when the administration proposed an earnest program or solution to Congress.

Supporters of HAGEN's opponent, unable to find specific wrongs or mistakes in his record, have now started a vicious campaign of political clichés and well-planned hysterics. The cry has been raised that HAGEN works for State socialism, that he is a peril to our form of government.

The next accusation will probably be that an ancestor of his roamed Sherwood Forest with Robin Hood (the original Anglo-Saxon "pinko"), or that he contributed to the Red Cross (once headed by that infamous traitor, George C. Marshall) or even likes to read books (a dangerous occupation in this age of intellectual "egg heads").

We believe that the voters of this district are not so childish as to fall for such cheap, ludicrous, and illinspirited tricks. We are 100 percent for opposition in any race—if it proves constructive and lodges honest complaints against the incumbent.

But when smear tactics and underhand generalities start blurring the picture, it's time to call a fast halt to such damaging foolishness and set the record straight.

Case No. 6

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1954

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, Mrs. E. L. Moulton, cochairman of the New Mexico Republican National Committee, has drawn my attention to the case of Dr. Alma Stefanie Wittlin Frischauer, museum educator and author, who faces deportation by the end of August, unless Congress acts immediately on a private bill which has been introduced on her behalf.

Dr. Wittlin is a naturalized British subject, born in Lemberg, Austria, now Polish territory, and must come, therefore, within the Polish quota for immigration purposes. She was first invited to the United States in the spring of 1950 by the education department of the American Museum of Natural History, then again in March 1952 by UNESCO, and also in connection with a special project of the American Museum of Natural History. During this last visit, she was requested by a New Mexico group of educators to start a pilot young explorers museum, and it appears that, should she be deported, this undertaking would cease to exist.

Mrs. Moulton informs me that she has examined Dr. Wittlin's credentials thoroughly, and has found that they, along with letters from renowned American and Europeon educators, testify to her character and ability. Unless the private bills introduced by Senator ANDERSON and Representative FERNANDEZ are acted on with dispatch, Mrs. Moulton advises me we will lose a trained, skilled, and enthusiastic educator.

It should have been possible to handle Dr. Wittlin's case administratively, but the McCarran-Walter Act and its adherence to the quota system has made this impossible. The quota for Poland is oversubscribed for years to come, and Dr. Wittlin falls within it. A private bill should not be necessary in a case of this caliber. Senator LEHMAN and I have offered a bill which would have permitted administrative action in this worthy case instead of the unwieldly mechanism necessarily involved in the processing of a private bill.

Cases of this sort point to the imperative need to change drastically the McCarran-Walter Act.

A Formula for Citizenship—A Guaranty for Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1954

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, we hear a great deal said about liberty; much is done under the cloak of preserving liberty; but rarely do we have the opportunity to have clearly discussed the meaning of liberty; and rarely are we given an opportunity to read a formula for day-to-day actions on the part of each of us for preserving liberty.

It was the privilege of fourth-degree Knights of Columbus, in Springfield, the capital of my State of Illinois, to hear just such a discussion and formula, when they were addressed on May 2, 1954, by Col. John J. Griffin, vice president, United Bank & Trust Co., St. Louis, Mo.

Colonel Griffin, a busy man of affairs, has for years found the time to highlight the basic truths of what we refer to as the American way of life, as his own contribution to the battle against communism. From time to time I have inserted some of his speeches in the RECORD, because I believe them to be perhaps the most worthwhile statements being made in these trying times.

I commend to my colleagues this speech of Colonel Griffin:

The condition of the world today is such that it is the cause of much worry to us in America as an explosion anywhere in the world could cause its repercussion to strike us here. We are no longer an isolated nation. We are no longer protected by two great bodies of water. All the natural barriers that were our protection for centuries are now merely small obstacles that can be overcome in a matter of a few hours.

One of the great American pastimes has been and still is, to sit back in smug complacency and say "it can't happen here," when as a matter of fact, not only can it happen here but it is happening here.

Let us today discuss one subject, a subject I think is near and dear to the hearts of all true Americans, and that is liberty. Liberty is one of the blessings we seem to enjoy so freely and fully in America and yet value so lightly. The particular form of liberty I will discuss is what Webster calls "personal liberty" and defines it as follows: "The equality of the courts, security of private property, freedom of opinion and its expression, and greater than all these, freedom of conscience." I believe this definition is what our forefathers had in mind when they founded this Nation and dedicated it to Almighty God. Let us see in the short time allotted us today, just how well we are preserving this liberty. What sacrifice and effort are we making to preserve it? History shows that in time of war, we give up many liberties and freedoms on a supposedly temporary basis, that temporary becomes permanent as we never recover them. Supposing tonight, we take them in order.

Equality of the courts—we can thank God—has been maintained in spite of the fact that you and I; yes, too many of us, time and time again have found fault with what we were pleased to term the leniency of our judges in trying subversive elements, with a trial by jury in the prescribed judicial manner so as to determine whether they were guilty or innocent of the crime charged. Whereas we in place of condemning the authorities, finding fault with the methods, we should be proud of the fact that the sanctity of our courts is not violated, or, our judges stampeded into a violation of either the spirit or intent of the law. Yes; the sanctity of our courts has been maintained in spite of our every effort by indifference and neglect to destroy them.

Now we come to the security of private property. We are more concerned with the preservation of this liberty than we are of any of the others that are of much more importance. However, here again, due to our extravagence, waste, indifference and neglect, we have created and are continuing to create an everincreasing tax burden, that if it continues to increase in the future in the same proportion as it has in the past, it will amount to the confiscation of private property. If we continue the program of Government ownership, and we seem to be demanding it more strongly each day, there will be no need for private property. If we continue our program of educating our people in the belief that the Government owes them a living, we have no need of private property. We should in no unmistakable terms impress upon our people that the Government owes no man a living, it merely owes him an opportunity to earn a living. At the same time, we should impress upon them the fact, the Government has nothing to give except that which it takes away from someone else. We should further educate our people to the fact, it is necessary and essential to operate the Government within its income, not increase the income to meet operating cost. The economy we seem to demand today is tax—spend. Let us return to the economy that made America the land of opportunity, hope and success.

Freedom of opinion and its expression is one of the most valuable of our freedoms and at the same time, one of the most abused. I think in too many instances, we forget and overlook the fact that there is a place where liberty ends and license begins. Freedom of opinion and expression, in too many instances, is used by they who would willingly destroy this Nation for a dollar. Freedom of opinion and expression, is in too many instances violated in the type and kind of teaching found in the classroom, in the type and kind of filthy, vulgar, and indecent entertainment offered to the public, in the type and kind of vulgar, indecent, so-called literature, that is published and sold to the public. All of which have as their ultimate end the destruction of the moral fiber of our people to the point of where our enemies will be successful in completing their aim and fulfilling their boast that it is their intention to take this country without firing a shot, disturbing a car in a garage, or a pot on the kitchen stove. It certainly adds nothing to our security as we use a banner of patriotic platitudes as a screen to barter the souls of our youth for a dollar.

We now come to the last and, what I think is, the most important of all our freedoms and that is freedom of conscience, wherein a man has a right, not a privilege but a right, to worship his God in accordance with the dictates of his conscience or not worship Him, if he so chooses. Wherein a man has a perfect right, and again I repeat that it is a right, to go down his side of the street with his conscience, and no man dare interfere with him. Freedom of conscience, we must know and understand, is not something that is given to us by the state. Freedom of conscience is a right that is implanted in the soul of man at the very moment of his conception. The state merely guarantees to us that it shall not be interfered with or infringed upon. It must give our enemies a great amount of consolation as they scan our daily papers to read statements, accusations, and attacks of one group upon another, each and every one of them behind a so-called patriotic purpose, using a patriotic screen to loose their bitterness—hate upon their fellow men. Christians fighting Christians, Christians fighting Jews, Jews fighting Christians, ministers of the gospel quarreling among themselves, all supposed to be preaching a gospel of love and charity to lead our people to the same ultimate goal, the eternal reward promised by the Heavenly Father. In many, in fact in too many instances, ministers of the gospel use their pulpits and exalted consecrated position in life to teach hatred. Teach a man to hate his fellow man because he does not worship in the same temple; that certainly is not the gospel of the crucified Christ who died on the Cross for all men and gave absolution and forgiveness to the thief who asked for it; the Christ, who, dying on the Cross, implored His Father to forgive His persecutors because they knew not what they were doing. If love of fellow man were preached from all the pulpits, it would make a wonderful world. If the teaching of the particular doctrine of each church were done in a spirit of love and charity through educational means with malice toward none, that would be the religion the godless hordes fear. Again, if we wish to preserve our right to worship our God without interference with our freedom of conscience, then let us not impair or weaken that basic liberty by quarreling among ourselves. We and we only are the only ones that can take it from us.

We know and fully realize the time allotted to talk on this subject is such that we can only hit the high places. Each and every subject heading I have given you under the Webster definition of personal liberty would take hours of study to discuss in all their phases. If today by calling a few of the facts to your attention will reinvigorate our thinking along these lines, bring home to us the dangers, cause us to take an inventory of ourselves as to what sacrifice we are making or willing to make to guard and protect the liberty we enjoy so fully and seem to value so little, then the time we have spent together will not have been wasted.

Let us say that if we are determined to preserve this Nation, it must be preserved by deeds and not words. We, each and every one of us, must take our place upon the firing line of civic responsibility, do our job, assume our responsibility, be willing to pay the price demanded for the preservation of liberty.

Do you realize that if every small community or crossroad in America were to clean up and take care of their own little community the great national picture would take care of itself. Because, after all, you are the Government, you personally and individually are the Government. The United States of America is made up of multiples of States, States are made up of multiples of communities and cities, communities and cities are made up of multiples of you, and it therefore goes right back to its basic principle, and that is, you will have the type and kind of government you want, no better, no worse. Therefore, you individually, when called upon for jury service, serve on such jury. Serve with a feeling of pride and joy that we in America still have preserved that liberty wherein our courts are held invalid and our citizens are protected as their guilt or innocence is passed upon by their fellow men.

Place yourself in the position of the man that is being tried. Realize how much more safe and secure you would feel to know that the jury passing upon you is made up of men who are serving on such jury as a contribution for the preservation of our form of government and are not serving because they have not influence enough to get off said jury.

One of the most sacred obligations of citizenship that you have is to serve upon juries when called.

Another liberty that we have and seem to neglect so freely although we value it highly is the right of suffrage. The right to pick and choose the type and kind of men who represent us in government and by that the choice lies in our hands as to the type and kind of government we will have. We who do not use it, through our own personal neglect and indifference disfranchise ourselves. We are too much concerned with other things of so much less importance that we neglect the one important liberty, that without it, the others would be of very little value.

Today, people talk loosely and freely about politicians, crookedness in office and all the other crimes that are committed by a few, very, very small percentage of those holding public office. If we take the record, we will find that 50 percent of those criticizing government and the men in government have no right whatsoever to do so because they did not vote. They did not go to the polls to cast a ballot, they did not speak where their voices would be heard, they did not act by using the most powerful weapon at their command to correct the situation, the ballot.

We talk about the things that happen in the polling places on election day, many of which never happen but nevertheless we continually talk about them, where at the same time we refuse to serve as a judge or a clerk of election. If you have any objection to the manner in which elections are held, returns tabulated, or other activities of the politicians, the place to express such objection is to offer yourself to the board of election commissioners for service in the polling places on election day, then you can prevent these things from happening. In other words, when you are called upon to serve your government, no matter in what capacity it may be, serve and serve to the best of your ability. Realize that by taking your place without fear upon the firing line of civic responsibility, you have demonstrated your ability to serve your government in times of peace with the same ardor and devotion with which you served it in times of war.

Conduct yourself in the political life of your community so as to seek neither favor nor promise, insisting upon faithful performance. Let it be known that you are electing men to office, who, in your opinion, are more concerned with the safety and security of this Nation than they are with personal gain or party supremacy.

You men, who have this day had bestowed upon you the highest honor in the gift of the Knights of Columbus, the patriotic degree of the order, have the satisfaction that only comes from the knowledge you have now been admitted to the highest degree of membership in a select group of Catholic men. It is the belief of your fellow members that you can be and will be living, acting, daily examples of the meaning in the true sense of every word of that gospel "Render unto God the things that are God's and unto Caesar, the things that are Caesar's," the Gospel that your church from the very days of its founding, until the present time, has never ceased, not only to preach but to insist upon its members living in every moment of their lives. It says to the world that no man can be a good Catholic and a bad citizen.

In closing, may I say to you that I congratulate you upon the great honor that is yours today and remind you that with it comes a tremendous responsibility. From you will be expected the leadership that will give to us the type, kind, and form of government that was in the minds of our forefathers when they gave it life and dedicated it to Almighty God.

Let's Get Together

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD H. VELDE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 12, 1954

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call attention to the address of R. J. Riddell, executive vice president of the National Livestock Exchange, delivered at a livestock marketing forum at St. Joseph, Mo., April 23, 1954.

Mr. Riddell is a good constituent of mine. He knows the livestock business in and out, and his remarks are certainly deserving of our attention at this time.

The address follows:

LET'S GET TOGETHER

(Address of R. J. Riddell, executive vice president, National Livestock Exchange)

Mr. Chairman, members of the St. Joseph Livestock Exchange, the St. Joseph Stock Yards Co., and you who are interested in livestock marketing, the last part of my greeting, I am sure, includes all of us or we would not be here today. May I say that I am happy to take part in such a program as you have provided.

Since I have been introduced as the executive vice president of the National Livestock Exchange, perhaps I should tell you of what that organization consists. It is made up of some 21 of the principal and more progressive markets of the United States.

The officers and directors of the National Livestock Exchange feel that it is the desire and duty of our commission-men members to do more for those in American agriculture than just to sell their livestock. It is our desire to improve the public-market system in every way possible and to continue it as the best system of selling livestock that has yet been devised.

It is our belief that a similar desire exists on the part of many others. For that reason, the National Livestock Exchange has undertaken a program of cooperation with those other people; a program of offering our aid to them; a program which asks that they aid us in our worthwhile undertakings.

During the past few years much progress has been made with certain allied interests. These include particularly the stockyards owners, especially those who are members of the American Stock Yards Association.

The buyers at the markets, the packers, and the order buyers and dealers, have also been contacted, through the American Meat Institute and otherwise, in an effort to make a better market place for the American farmer.

Closer working relationships have been established with our agricultural schools and colleges.

A better understanding has been reached with Government people, especially those who write and enforce the regulations under the Packers and Stock Yards Act. The USDA must be concerned with the public markets, for all of those markets which are of any consequence are under its complete regulation and control. They, too, do have and must assume considerable responsibility for the efficient operation of our public markets.

Many other valuable contacts have been made in the immediate past, including some with farm organizations.

It was suggested at the Peoria convention of 1953 that farmers, businessmen, and others in the area of our markets should be included in our plans for market improvement, to a greater extent than has previously been the case. Surely the public market is one of the greatest assets of the American farmer. It really is his market, operated by commission men who are his paid agents along with others. It is his duty, as well as being to his own selfish interest, to devote more time and effort in having those markets operate as he would like them to do.

Town and city people, too, have an interest in our public stockyards, probably to a greater extent than they realize, for it is at those points that livestock is converted into cash and the amount of that cash affects the standard of living of almost everyone.

It was suggested at our Peoria convention that meetings be held with rural people and that an opportunity be given them to offer constructive criticism which might be helpful. Or, better, yet, that an advisory committee be set up to seriously consider marketing problems and to provide our market people with answers to those problems.

Today's meeting is the first, with such a purpose, that has come to my attention, and I wish to congratulate the St. Joseph market people for taking the first step. I assure you that many market members of the National Livestock Exchange are watching your efforts with extreme interest today. Some of them have representatives here who may carry on the program elsewhere. Among those representatives are our Gene Gunter, vice president of the National Livestock Exchange from Wichita, Kans., and Harold LeVander, general counsel of the National Livestock Exchange, from South St. Paul, Minn. Incidentally, Don Spalding, who is our chairman here today, is also secretary of the National Livestock Exchange.

Before you can be asked to lend a helping hand, however, I believe you should be informed of what we have been doing to improve market conditions. Last fall, at Shenandoah, Iowa, I addressed the Midwest Livestock Feeders Association on the subject, Self-Help Is the Best Help. We realize that such a statement applies to us, as well as to the man in the country, and we are willing to assume our share of the responsibility.

Our officers and directors, working generally through some dozen committees, and our 21 local member exchanges have developed what we think is a constructive program and we have made considerable progress with it.

Our local exchanges formulate their own rules governing trading practices and marketing operations for the selling side. These rules are, of course, in conformity with the regulations of the Packers and Stockyards Division of the USDA. They are made for the protection of and in the interest of our farmer patrons as well as our own. As time has gone on they have gradually become more uniform throughout the United States.

The local markets generally conduct their own public-relations programs, which are intended as a service to the community and particularly to the farming public. Radio, television, news publications, and public appearances by local people are generally used in that work. Of course, the program is intended to have advertising value for the market but that advertising value is based on service rendered to the patrons of the market, so that it may be deserved, rather than on ballyhoo.

It is the purpose of the National Livestock Exchange to coordinate the activities of its member exchanges, to stimulate them to greater effort and to help them with their local problems. However, the organization also conducts an expansive program of its own.

We believe that we have a well qualified committee ready to deal with every livestock marketing problem which might arise.

One of the busiest of these has been our hog marketing committee, whose chairman is Wilbur W. McBeth, of Indianapolis.

You are acquainted with the extent of the recent movement to produce a leaner, meatier type hog for the American housewife. Our people agree that such a hog would meet with a greater demand on the part of the consuming public, that it could be sold in larger quantities and at higher prices than overfat animals.

Such an enterprise, however, entails a broad educational program and a great deal of research. Farmers must be informed of its purpose and research must indicate to them that it is practical. Proper breeding stock must be available and put to use. It must be demonstrated that such meat-type hogs can be produced at as low a cost and within as short a time as our present type hogs. Packers must be convinced that meatier hogs will increase the demand for pork at the retail counter and provide a more reliable outlet for pork in larger volume. They must agree that hogs should be graded on the market, somewhat as cattle are now graded and that price differentials should be made according to consumer preference.

It seems rather ridiculous to talk of increased demand for pork under present conditions of supply and with prices at such a high level. Such conditions are, no doubt, impeding the progress of the meat-type hog movement. However, all interests generally predict sharply increased production of pork within the next year and a better product may be necessary to maintain sales at profitable price levels. Hog producers, too, should be alert against pricing themselves out of the market in times like these, and has partially been done by the butter people. Higher prices become more reasonable with the improvement of a product.

Our hog marketing committee has kept constantly informed of the progress of the meat-type hog movement. In fact, it has led the parade, working constantly for it since 1950. I have personally been a member of the swine industry conference committee, sponsored by the American Farm Bureau Federation. Our commission men have kept constantly advised of events and have been alert to keep step at the markets with the program.

From the marketing standpoint, we have opposed the Government grade terminology of Choice No. 1, Choice No. 2, and Choice No. 3 for live hogs as being hard to understand and explain, both to our patrons and to our own people. We have asked that more descriptive language be used and have supported the recommendation of the swine industry committee's terms of meat, good and overfat as a substitute. We have found very few who are satisfied with the present terminology. Meanwhile many other words have been suggested and it is our opinion that no change will be made until the industry comes to some general agreement as to what those terms should be.

Although commission men try to obtain the highest possible price for any and all livestock consigned to them, they have been quick to take advantage pricewise of any display of preference on the part of buyers for meat type hogs. Such a preference is now becoming quite pronounced at many markets and considerable progress is being made in obtaining price differentials.

Commission men have maintained, and I think rightly so, for years that the practice of buying hogs direct by packers has a decidedly weakening effect on the hog market generally. It is our contention that such hogs are bought with little or no competition at prices based on those prevailing at public markets. Much buying power is thereby taken away from the competitive markets. Furthermore a buyer who is assured of a large percentage of his needs at the country points can drive a harder bargain at the public market and so depress prices everywhere.

This is a field for much thought on the part of farm people and one in which they can be of help to the public markets and themselves. We believe that we are right in our position and have repeatedly asked for research by the USDA and by our agricultural schools and colleges to prove or disprove our contention. Your help might tend to offset the opposition which we have met to date.

The practice has been stopped by law, in the Province of Ontario, Canada, where all hogs must be sold through a central selling agency located at Toronto. That, to my mind, is not the answer but it shows that our Canadian brethren are conscious of the dangers of direct selling and are trying to do something about it.

Another Canadian practice from which many Canadian farmers would like to be relieved is that of selling hogs on a rail, weight and grade basis. By that system hog carcasses are sold rather than live hogs. It is really a system of selling hogs subject to post mortem examination. It came about through the payment of Government subsidies on hog carcasses of certain weights and grades.

Under such a system the farmer has little or no bargaining power. He has no commission man or agent to represent him in the sale of his livestock and to defend his interests. The packer needs no buyer and can make no buying errors. Hogs are tattooed for ownership and each individual carcass is figured separately. The system seems to work very well for the Canadian packers.

We doubt that it would work as well for the American packers. In the first place we have many more of them and many of them kill hogs outside of the area of production. Farmers would not ship to distant points, since they must assume shipping risks and extra shrink and order buyers could not operate unless they buy live hogs. It would be impractical for individual farmers to contact distant packers, which service is now performed for them by our order buyers. Consequently, there would be huge surpluses in some parts of our country and scarcity in others, as was the case when slaughter quotas were attempted under OPS.

Many hog slaughterers outside the area of large hog production would undoubtedly be forced out of business.

The considerably larger volume of marketing in the United States, the greater number of hog shippers, the greater variety of breeds and many other factors would make the handling, slaughtering, grading, and accounting a far more complicated, tedious, slow, and unsatisfactory process than it is in Canada.

Disadvantages to American farmers are far too numerous to go into at this time.

Our hog-marketing committee has also concerned itself with the USDA publication of livestock-market news and has registered considerable complaint against some of its practices.

At present we object to the practice of quoting hog sales entirely by weight brackets, since they show no price differential between best meat-type hogs and other grades, where such differentials are obtained. We ask for more descriptive language there again. The committee also objects to the publication of drove costs for hogs on an average-weight basis at the public markets and no publication of drove costs on hogs bought direct. Those figures do not seem to be available. Their absence may tend to mislead farmers and market people.

The committee objects to market quotations on hogs bought direct at interior points where those figures are not based on actual sales as is done at the public markets. We do not feel that the interior-market quotations are as accurate or complete as those of the public markets, nor do we feel that public-market quotations give a complete picture of operations there. There is a feeling that the public markets, as well as hog shippers, are being injured by present practices of the Market News Service.

Vigorous protests have been made against this situation by our hog committee.

I find that I have talked altogether too long about the activities of our hog-marketing committee and its problems. Many of our other committees are just as important and just as active. However, I use it as an example of our work.

Our market-promotion committee is chairmanned by Paul Dutton right here on the St. Joseph market. Its duty is to coordinate the public-relations programs of our individual markets to give them constructive suggestions and information and to be responsible for the publication of our national newspaper, the National Livestock Exchange Reporter.

At a recent meeting of public-relations directors of our various markets at St. Louis, Mo., a day and a half proved far too short to discuss matters of concern to that group. Therefore, I am sure you can sympathize with my effort to crowd a discussion of all livestock-marketing problems and the efforts of the National Livestock Exchange to meet them, into 30 minutes.

Another of our committees is the cattle committee. Certainly there have been many problems in the cattle industry during the past several years. It has been my own privilege to serve on the Livestock Advisory Committee of Secretary of Agriculture Benson since March of 1953. You are familiar with the program of his committee, which was to solve the problem through increased beef consumption rather than by subsidies and price supports. One of the valuable results of the formation of that committee has been the cooperation developed between various segments of the cattle and beef industry.

Our salesman's training committee, whose chairman is Rogers George, of St. Paul, has performed a good work in encouraging the training of young salesmen to take the place of those elder men who from time to time pass out of the picture. Classes have been inaugurated at many of our markets. The one here at St. Joseph has finished with its 11th meeting, and the course is still continuing.

A manual has been written by Dr. Robert C. Ashby, of Morningside College at Sioux

City and formerly of the University of Illinois. It is used as a guide and is full of important information about livestock marketing practices. There has been a great demand for this book from allied interests, colleges, etc., since it is the only one of its kind in existence and because it is an authoritative treatise.

Don Spalding, of the St. Joseph market, has been acting as chairman of the committee to deal with our land grant colleges and with the American Stockyards Association. Those two groups are combined because the American Stockyards Association has worked hand in hand with us in our relationships with the colleges.

A number of meetings have been held, with the next one set for April 29 and 30 in Chicago to be attended by representatives of 13 agricultural colleges, the American Stockyards Association, and the National Livestock Exchange.

Through the efforts of these committees, public markets are beginning to be used as college laboratories and information is being developed that will be helpful to all groups.

Others of our committees are the packers relations committee, the commission rates and market practices committee, the membership committee, the legislation and regulation committee, the market relations committee, the budget and auditing committee, and the resolutions committee. Several of these are primarily concerned with our own private affairs.

Val Blakley, of Denver, and I represent the National Livestock Exchange on the board of directors of the National Livestock and Meat Board. The meat board, as you know, devotes its efforts to the increased consumption of meat and is about the only means which our farmers have of advertising their own product, although their contributions are generally matched by the meat packers who buy the livestock. Our commission men are glad to contribute their services in collecting the assessments as their part in furthering that project.

At this time I would particularly like to comment upon the fine working relationship which has been established between our people and the stockyards owners through their American Stockyards Association.

Their president, Mr. A. Z. Baker, has constantly urged our people to do a better job of agency at the public markets. We have urged his people to provide better market facilities. He has gone along with that idea and his people have generally agreed. The result is that hundreds of thousands of dollars have been spent by stockyards companies throughout the country in such improvement, both of their facilities and services. No better example can be given than that right here in St. Joseph. I am informed that a million and a half dollars have been spent here within the past few years to improve facilities. Your cattle division has been completely modernized and a strictly up-to-date plant is available to you.

These, then, in brief, are some of the things which the National Livestock Exchange has been doing, on its own and through cooperation with others, to improve the marketing of livestock through its public markets. We have found that more can be accomplished by working collectively within our own group and with other groups, than by fighting it out alone.

Today's meeting is being held in an effort to enlist others in the work which we are trying to do; others who should and do have as great an interest in the results as we ourselves have. Let's get together in developing the public livestock markets to the extent to which they are capable of being developed. Let's have them as the man in the country, for whose benefit they are primarily intended, would like them to be. Let's make the system as practically perfect as it is theoretically perfect.

The Federal Trade Commission and the Administrative Process

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. HALLECK
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 12, 1954

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Hon. Edward F. Howrey, Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, before the section of antitrust law of the New York State Bar Association at New York, N. Y., January 28, 1954. In this and subsequent addresses Mr. Howrey sets out the policies of the Federal Trade Commission under the new administration. The address follows:

THE FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION AND THE ADMINISTRATIVE PROCESS

(By Edward F. Howrey)

The role of the Federal Trade Commission, as an administrative agency, needs to be further defined, better understood, and most of all, performed and implemented in the manner Congress intended.

It was designed to supplement the work of the Department of Justice and the courts under the Sherman Act. The job of the Department was to be primarily that of the prosecutor. The Commission, on the other hand, was meant to practice preventive law through administrative and regulatory activities as well as by the initiation and conduct of adversary proceedings.

Congress foresaw, and in fact intended, some mutual responsibility, but not mere duplication. Both agencies were to work in the same field, but with different tools.

In the light of this statutory setting, it may be helpful to give brief consideration to the history of the origin and development of the Federal administrative agency. It constitutes an important chapter in human affairs. The rise of administrative agencies has been the most significant legal trend of the last century. "They have become a veritable fourth branch of government."

I

The creation of the Interstate Commerce Commission in 1887 furnishes the first well-known example. The rapid development of the railroads, the complexity, significance, and abuses which attended this development, created a public demand for governmental regulation. This was accompanied by a breakdown of judicial processes—or to put it more accurately, an inadequacy, as applied to these problems. The courts were not equipped to deal with the unreasonableness of rates, the intricacies of ratemaking, the discriminations between shippers or communities.

Some continuing supervision over the railroad problem as a whole was required; the solution could not be left to the cumbersome and sporadic processes of private litigation. The creation of an independent commission provided the answer.

As the American economic system evolved, as various complex industries and occupations assumed significance in our national life, the Federal Trade Commission and other agencies came into being to supply the minimum of essential control.

The administrative agency was not born as a single philosophical concept but came into being by an involuntary process based on experience and necessity. As a rule the business of these agencies has related not to society as a whole but to its particularized aspects. Their concern has been with particular commercial activities, such as banking, commodity exchanges, packers and stockyards, aeronautics, communications, waterpower, utilities, shipping securities, and the like.

In a few instances, the jurisdiction of the administrative agency has been defined with reference to special problems that cut across different industries and occupations. The outstanding example of this tendency is the Federal Trade Commission, which was entrusted with the vital problems of trade regulation and the maintenance of our private competitive system.

II

The driving impulse in the creation of these new instruments of government was the need for specialization and expertise. The Federal Trade Commission, for example, was to be staffed with lawyers, economists, accountants, statisticians, and other business experts. It was intended that these gentlemen would become specialists in preventing price-fixing agreements, combinations in restraint of trade, boycotts, false and misleading advertising, price and service discriminations, exclusive dealing and tying contracts, acquisitions of competitors, interlocking directorates, improper labeling of wool and fur products.

In an early case the Supreme Court, quoting from the original congressional committee reports, declared that the Commission "was created with the avowed purpose of lodging the administrative functions committed to it in 'a body specially competent to deal with them by reason of information, experience, and careful study of the business and economic conditions of the industry affected' "; that "it was organized in such a manner, with respect to the length and expiration of the term of office of its members, as would 'give to them an opportunity to acquire the expertness in dealing with these special questions concerning industry that comes from experience.' "

In a more recent case, the Court said: "We are persuaded that the Commission's long and close examination of the questions it here decided has provided it with precisely the experience that fits it for the performance of its statutory duty."

The expertness of the Commission and the great weight accorded its findings have become so well established that in 1952 we find a court of appeals, in reviewing an order of the Federal Trade Commission, merely stating the facts of the case, holding that respondent was engaged in interstate commerce, and concluding that "The whole matter being clearly within the jurisdiction and competence of the Commission, its order is affirmed."

III

The deference with which the courts have spoken of the capabilities of the Commission should be gratifying to the Commission—and, indeed would be, but for two reasons:

First is the fact that the courts, with their self-declared limited knowledge and experience in dealing with complex economic and marketing questions, have found it necessary on occasion to overrule the Federal Trade Commission "experts." And, secondly, many of the court references to the expertness of the Commission, upon closer examination, are found to be mere restatements of general concept and legislative intent, rather than expressions of confidence.

Fortunately, when an agency fails in its duty as a body of experts, the courts usually find a way to deal with the situation. As Professor Davis said, "When judges have confidence in agencies' thoroughness and integrity, a strong case is required to move the judges to dig deeply into the problem, whether the problem is regarded as one of law or fact or discretion. But when the agencies' work seems slipshod * * * judges are likely, irrespective of formulas and theories, to do what is necessary to assure that justice is done."

The Federal Trade Commission has not always had the full confidence of the courts and has not been immune from criticism. It has been suggested by 1 or 2 critics, quite erroneously, I think, that the Commission no longer serves a useful purpose. This type of criticism is based, I feel certain, not on disagreement with legislative purpose or concept, but on alleged failure of implementation and administration. For these reasons it is appropriate, perhaps necessary, to reconsider the basic role of the Commission and its place in the administrative scheme.

IV

It has recognized and agreed as a general tenet of political philosophy that vigorous enforcement of antitrust and trade regulation laws is in the public interest. Once this general premise was accepted by the major political parties, it was evident, in views of our rapidly expanding economy, that the judicial system was deficient as the sole instrument of antitrust law enforcement.

Enforcement of private rights in the antitrust field could not adequately protect the public interest. Private parties often forego redress of legal wrongs, especially in the business field, because of fear of reprisal.

Individuals and small-business concerns often lack the resources to pursue their rights. "Wherever a continuing series of controversies exist between a powerful and concentrated interest on one side and a diversified mass of individuals, each of whose separate interests may be small, on the other side, the only means of obtaining equality before the law has been to place the controversies in an administrative tribunal."

Moreover, businessmen do not relish becoming litigants in order to develop and establish new principles, and as Jhering pointed out many years ago, it is only through this process that the common law affords the possibility of carving out new rights.

In the fast developing industrial economy which this country has witnessed, it could not be expected that the cumbersome method of developing a body of antitrust law by vindication of private rights would be sufficient to protect the free-enterprise system. A need was felt for an arm of government which could, on its own motion, initiate proceedings. "Courts are not expected to start wheels moving or to follow up judgments." Courts do not dig up evidence, analyze reports, or prepare prosecutions, and the "judicial power is reluctant if not unable to summon evidence until it is shown to be relevant to the issues in litigation."

Another reason for the inadequacy of private litigation was that such relief as might be obtained often came too late to protect the public interest. As stated by Freund, "It is obvious that the law of nuisance is inadequate as a substitute for modern [administrative] regulation; it takes cognizance of practices only when danger passes into actual mischief."

The Sherman Act of 1890 was a substantial first step toward the alleviation of the deficiencies of private remedies. By 1914, however, there prevailed a general climate of doubt, particularly in the Congress, that the Sherman Act and the judicial process provided the complete solution in an America emerging from an agricultural economy.

Strong sentiment developed in favor of the administrative process. It was suggested that a trade commission would be well suited to deal with the complex problems of industries and markets—problems which Congress was unable to solve and which it considered too burdensome for the courts to resolve unaided.

The view still prevails that the courts are not equipped to handle—without assistance—long, tedious, and highly complex antitrust cases. Chief Judge Knox of the southern district of New York, recently said:

"The thing that presently worries me is that antitrust litigations in the court over which I preside are monopolizing the time, energy and effort of judges who ought to be trying cases that have to do with the lame, the halt and the blind, and who are daily being deprived of simple justice."

Judge Knox illustrated his dilemma, by citing several antitrust cases which had consumed inordinate amounts of the time of the judges of his court. He referred to one case in which a jury trial had been demanded. Concerning this, he said:

"Had that case gone to a jury, each of the jurors would now be ruined. Those of them who were employed would have lost their jobs, and those who were self-employed would be in bankruptcy. Save in execeptional instances, the jury system is not adaptable to the trial of antitrust litigations and, in these prolonged trials, my disposition will be that the civil rights of jurors transcend in importance the legal rights of litigants."

A principal and additional advantage of the administrative process is that the undesired condition need not yet be in existence; there need be only a reasonable probability that it will come to pass if nothing is done to stop it. This, of course, was one of the underlying purposes of both the Federal Trade Commission and Clayton Acts, which are the principal laws administered by the Commission. They were designed to supplement the Sherman Act, to prohibit practices which singly and in themselves were not covered by that act, to arrest potential violations of the Sherman Act in their incipiency and before consummation.

Keeping in mind the fundamental reasons for the creation of the Federal Trade Commission, what attributes and characteristics are required to make it work in the manner Congress intended? They are many. Today I will mention three that I consider of overriding importance.

V

1. Sound administration requires strong, but fair, administrators who are in general sympathy with the objectives and policies expressed in the legislation which they administer. "[A] dominant point of view or bias may * * * color all activities, including even the factfinding function. Thoroughly conscientious men of strong conviction may sometimes interpret evidence to make findings which indifferent men would not make. The theoretically ideal administrator is one whose broad point of view is in general agreement with the policies he administers but who maintains sufficient balance to perceive and to avoid the degree of zeal which substantially impairs fair-mindedness."

Although the legislative history of the Federal Trade Commission reflects a basic dissatisfaction with the courts, Congress was not willing to confer carte blanche authority on the Commission without procedures for judicial review. As stated by Mr. Justice Jackson in the Morton Salt case, in reference to the combined prosecuting and adjudicatory functions of the Commission, "it is expected that this combination of duty and power always will result in earnest and eager action but it is feared that it may sometimes result in harsh and overzealous action."

Thus, while good administration requires a zeal and vigor in the prosecution of the statutes committed to the Commission, it likewise requires a balanced approach consistent with the whole body of antitrust law.

2. Another important characteristic of an administrative agency is that it arrive at a decision only after thorough exploration of all factors bearing upon the particular problem.

In the past the Commission has, I believe, followed the per se approach to a degree inconsistent with its status as an expert.

The laws given to the Commission to administer are, for the most part, general in nature and not clear of policy elements. "Congress advisedly left the concept flexible to be defined with particularity by the myriad of cases from the field of business." It contemplated clarification and completion by the Federal Trade Commission. If the administrative tribunal to which such discretion is delegated does nothing but promulgate per se doctrines, the rationale for its creation disappears. If a particular competitive act is automatically to be presumed unlawful, the administrative process of the Commission loses its purpose, and the justification for limiting the scope of judicial review and for exempting the Commission from executive control no longer remain. In such event, the administrative agency may as well give way to the prosecutor.

The courts consistently have recognized that the Commission was created for the purpose of appraising economic data and market facts, and they have repeatedly declared that the courts are ill suited to perform such functions.

Regarding the admissibility and relevance of economic factors, there has been much discussion of the Standard Stations case, which arose under section 3 of the Clayton Act. In that case, Mr. Justice Frankfurter, speaking for the majority, said:

"Our interpretation of the act * * * should recognize that an appraisal of economic data which might be practicable if only * * * [the Federal Trade Commission] were faced with the task may be quite otherwise for judges unequipped for it either by experience or by the availability of skilled assistance."

Mr. Justice Douglas predicated his dissent in large measure upon a failure adequately to analyze competitive effects. He said: "Whether it [the type of exclusive contract involved] is a substantial lessening of competition within the meaning of the antitrust laws is a question of degree and may vary from industry to industry."

Mr. Justice Jackson's dissent, in which Chief Justice Vinson and Mr. Justice Burton joined, leaves no doubt that they believed it was necessary to examine all relevant economic factors. He said:

"I regard it as unfortunate that the Clayton Act submits such economic issues to judicial determination. It not only leaves the law vague as a warning or guide, and determined only after the event, but the judicial process is not well adapted to exploration of such industrywide, and even nationwide, questions.

"But if they must decide, the only possible way for the courts to arrive at a fair determination is to hear all relevant evidence from both parties."

Thus, while the Court split 5 to 4 on the merits, the controversial Standard Stations case may nonetheless be taken as a unanimous expression that the Federal Trade Commission can and should make adequate appraisals of economic and marketing data.

The Motion Picture Advertising case must also be considered. There the Commission held that exclusive contracts for 5 years were unlawful but that exclusive contracts for a 1-year period "would not be an undue restraint upon competition, in view of the compelling business reasons for some exclusive arrangement."

The Supreme Court affirmed saying that "The precise impact of a particular practice on the trade is for the Commission, not the courts, to determine."

Mr. Justice Frankfurter, dissenting in this case, gave us a persuasive analysis of the practical reasons why the Commission should consider all relevant economic factors.

He began with the observation that the Commission had not explained its position with the simplicity and clearness necessary to tell the Court what the decision means before the duty becomes ours to say whether it is right or wrong; his primary concern was that the Commission had not related its analysis of this industry to the standards of illegality of section 5 with sufficient clarity to enable this Court to review the order.

He distinguished his own opinion in the Standard Stations case by suggesting that it turned on the seller's industry position; the large percentage of the market shut off by the contracts; the significance of the volume of commerce involved; the bargaining power of the large seller vis-a-vis the smaller retailer; and the fact that the filling station's entire inventory was subject to the exclusive arrangement.

He then suggested that the Commission should exhibit "that familiarity with competitive problems which the Congress anticipated the Commission would achieve from its experience" and to furnish the Court with expert guidance as to competitive effects, interests affected, how these practices, if full blown, would violate [the Sherman or Clayton] acts and the need for enforcement in the particular area.

Beginning then with the Keppel case in 1934 and continuing to date the Supreme Court consistently has defined the status of the Commission as an expert body possessing procedures and means not available to the courts.

3. The heart of the Commission's work, as an expert body, is its fact finding. The power to determine facts is probably as great a power, if not greater, than the power to interpret law. Chief Justice Hughes once said: "An unscrupulous administrator mignt be tempted to say, 'Let me find the facts * * * and I care little who lays down the general principles.'"

What was the reason for conferring upon the Federal Trade Commission the power to make findings of fact which, if properly supported, would be binding upon the courts? It was, as I have indicated, because Congress "expected that the problems which would be encountered would be of a technical and specialized character, calling for experience and training which a court might not possess but which could be found in a commission especially selected for the purpose, and authorized to employ technical experts as well as lawyers for its guidance. It was undoubtedly the belief of Congress that the Commission could perform more satisfactorily than a court the task of making findings of fact in the special field of which it was given jurisdiction."

Gerard Henderson, in his early work on the Federal Trade Commission, devoted an entire chapter to the Commission's findings of fact. He concluded that "regardless of accuracy and fairness, the formal character of the findings, the use of 'legal' phraseology and of ambiguous words and stock phrases, and the frequently obvious attempt to frame findings with a view to the legal result desired, rather than as a mirror of events and circumstances * * * tend to make the findings unsatisfactory and unconvincing."

Mr. Justice Jackson, in the recent Ruberoid case, said:

"If the independent agencies could realize how much trustworthiness judges give to workmanlike findings and opinions and how their causes are prejudiced on review by slipshod, imprecise findings and failure to elucidate by opinion the process by which ultimate determinations have been reached, their work and their score on review would doubtless improve."

There are a number of compelling reasons, in addition to technical legal requirements, why the Commission should adopt a new policy with respect to its findings of fact. I propose to deal with these reasons in detail in a later paper.

For the present, I merely suggest that the findings should include a specific statement of the salient facts, as well as the conclusions of fact. They should give a narrative and descriptive account of the controversy involved and the issues presented. In the recent Pillsbury opinion, an attempt was made to set forth the facts in a manner that may serve as a partial pattern for future findings.

In closing, let me say again that the Department of Justice and the Federal Trade Commission are not, or at least should not be, duplicating Federal agencies. They were designed to serve different, although complementary, purposes.

Putting aside the suggestion that the Commission may have strayed from the path of its statutory duty, it seems clear that its antitrust policy for the future should be firmly predicated upon a continuing purpose to perform—as Congress intended—its full function in the administrative process.

Revaluation of Commission's Responsibilities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH P. O'HARA

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 12, 1954

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Hon. Edward F. Howrey, Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, before the 1953 Institute on Federal Antitrust Laws at the University of Michigan Law School, Ann Arbor, Mich., June 18, 1953. The address follows:

REVALUATION OF COMMISSION'S RESPONSIBILITIES

(By Edward F. Howrey)

I welcome the honor of appearing before the University of Michigan's 1953 Institute on Federal Antitrust Laws to make my first public statement as Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission.

The Commission is, or at least should be, one of the most important and vital agencies in Washington. It exercises a jurisdiction which staggers the imagination. It supervises the competitive practices of our vast multi-billion dollar economy. It is charged with the basic duty of preserving our private competitive system.

The antitrust laws are deeply embedded in our business philosophy. They were enacted many years ago as the Magna Carta of economic freedom for an America emerging from an agricultural economy.

As Chairman of the Commission I will do my best to see that they are administered vigorously, fairly, and intelligently, with due regard for all segments of our economy, including the consumer, the small-business man, the medium size, and the large.

The purpose of this statement is to suggest certain lines along which the Commission's efforts may immediately be directed toward realization of this overall objective.

The time that I have been in office is too brief to permit revaluation of all phases of the Commission's responsibilities. Such a program will be filled out in the months ahead. I hope tonight to provide a substantial beginning.

II

The Sherman Act of 1890 is a broad statute setting up general standards which prohibit unreasonable restraints of trade and attempts to monopolize.

The Federal Trade Commission Act of 1914, as amended, is a general statute which prohibits unfair methods of competition and unfair or deceptive acts or practices. This statute supplements the Sherman Act.

The Clayton Act of 1914, as amended, is a special statute which prohibits particularized practices when specified effects upon competition are proved, such as price and service discriminations, exclusive dealing and tying contracts, acquisitions of competitors and interlocking directorates. This statute also supplements the Sherman Act.

There is no doubt that these statutes were intended to be in pari materia. No presumption or inference is necessary to disclose the congressional intention of treating them as interrelated expressions of the national antitrust policy.

In recent years, however, enforcement policies have grown up which seem to magnify conflicts and inconsistencies in these basic statutes.

Policy choices have been made, for example, between hard and soft competition. At other times these antithetical positions have received concurrent and simultaneous advocacy in separate counts of the same complaint.

There may be some inconsistency between legislative policies which enforce price competition (Sherman Act and Federal Trade Commission Act) and those which regulate price discrimination (Robinson-Patman Act), but this inconsistency has been accentuated and magnified out of all proportion by the application of unrealistic legalisms.

As Congress thought of it, the promotion of price competition and the prohibition of unfair and discriminatory pricing practices constituted a complementary dual program of fostering competition in the public interest.

The gearing of the privilege to compete with the obligation to compete fairly, is not necessarily inconsistent except as made so by strained statutory interpretation.

III

In creating the Federal Trade Commission, Congress had two principal ideas in mind: first, to create a body of experts competent to deal with complex competitive practices by reason of information, experience, and careful study of business and economic conditions; and second, to authorize this body of experts to deal with unfair competitive methods in their incipient stages.

The action was to be prophylactic; the purpose was prevention of diseased business conditions, rather than cure.

Critics of the Commission have maintained that it is not the body of experts Congress intended; that it has become a prosecuting agency employing laborious procedures and rigid per se interpretations without regard to the relationship of law, business economics and public policy; that its staff consists of a small coterie of rigid-minded men dedicated to the expansion of the Commission's jurisdiction by means of strained interpretations and test cases.

Supporters of the Commission, on the other hand, have maintained that a per se philosophy and test cases are necessary in order to deal with new, unforeseen and expanding unfair methods of competition created by a growing and dynamic economy; that the Commission would be unable to stop unfair practices, either in their incipiency or in their fruition, if it must employ the rule of reason in all cases or be limited to those unyielding categories of practices which had already been litigated or which were in violation of common law.

It would take a bold and adventuresome spirit to attempt to resolve these differences of opinion in one short evening.

I do suggest, however, that the expertise which the Commission is supposed to exercise plows barren ground if it is bound by absolute or per se rules; that it cannot acquire a special knowledge of competitive conditions and effects unless it examines all relevant economic factors, unless it tests public interest and competitive injury by such comparative facts as business rivalry, economic usefulness, degree of competition, degree of market control, degree of vertical integration, customer freedom of choice of goods and services, opportunities for small competitors to engage in business, costs, prices, and profits.

Mr. Justice Frankfurter in the Standard Oil of California case suggested that standards of proof of this type might be practicable for the Federal Trade Commission but were ill suited for ascertainment by courts which lacked skilled economic assistance.

The inference to be drawn from this comment, and the more recent Motion Picture Advertising case, is that the Federal Trade Commission can and should sift and appraise all relevant economic data. In the Motion Picture case the Supreme Court said: "The precise impact of a particular practice on the trade is for the Commission, not the courts, to decide."

For emphasis and appreciation of the proper concept of administrative law and of the true function of the Federal Trade Commission, we are indebted to the dissenting opinion of Mr. Justice Jackson in the case of *Federal Trade Commission* v. *Ruberoid Co.* Let us examine his analysis.

Congress was conscious of the convenient vagueness of the term "unfair methods of competition" in the Federal Trade Commission Act and similar phrases in the Clayton Act. These acts, like other regulatory measures, sketched a general outline which contemplated clarification and completion by the Federal Trade Commission and other administrative agencies before court review.

The importance that policy and expertise were expected to play in reducing the Clayton Act to "guiding yardsticks," for example, is evidenced by the fact that authority to enforce it was dispersed among several administrative agencies dealing with special types of commerce. The act vested enforcement in the Interstate Commerce Commission where applicable to railroads and common carriers; in the Federal Communication Commission as to wire and radio communications; Civil Aeronautics Board as to air carriers; Federal Reserve Board as to banks; and the Federal Trade Commission as to all other types of commerce.

The rise of administrative agencies has been the most significant legal trend of the last century. "They have become a veritable fourth branch of Government."

Courts and commenators "have differed in assigning a place to these seemingly necessary bodies in our constitutional system. Administrative agencies have been called quasi-legislative, quasi-executive, or quasi-judicial, as the occasion required. * * * The mere retreat to the qualifying 'quasi' is implicit with confession that all recognized classifications have broken down, and 'quasi' is a smooth cover which we draw over our confusion as we might use a counterpane to conceal a disordered bed."

Where a statute is complete in policy aspects (such as a revenue act) and ready to be executed as law, Congress yields enforcement to a wholly executive agency. Where the law is not clear of policy elements its enforcement is placed in the hands of an independent administrative tribunal. If the tribunal to which such discretion is delegated does nothing but promulgate per se doctrines the rationale for placing it beyond executive control disappears.

As Mr. Justice Jackson said, "* * * if the scheme of regulating complicated enterprises through unfinished legislation is to be just and effective, we must insist that the legislative function be performed and exhausted by the administrative body before the case is passed on to the courts."

This is the duality of responsibility imposed by Congress on the Federal Trade Commission and the courts—that is, ascertainment by the Commission of competitive effects and review by the courts.

IV

As an important first step in this direction the Commission should revitalize its Bureau of Industrial Economics in order to provide for greater coalescence of legal and economic concepts of competition and monopoly. Standards of proof for measuring injury to competition should be carefully explored.

Almost every antitrust case presents economic as well as legal questions. In important cases the Commission's economists, guided by legal principles outlined by lawyers in charge of the case, should take part in the field investigation and furnish an economic report to the Commission prior to complaint.

Economics can properly be brought to bear on antimonopoly cases at four successive levels:

1. Initiation of cases: Economic criteria are relevant as to whether or not particular complaints should be investigated, the relative importance to be attributed to different cases, the amount of business affected, the seriousness of the economic impact of the alleged violation, the likelihood that what can be done about it will be effective.

2. Development of a theory of the case: Complex cases should be made to depend upon an acceptable economic theory as well as upon a valid legal theory. This necessarily raises a question as to the type of remedy that is desired and the economic consequences of such remedy. Questions of this type cannot adequately be covered by legal analysis alone.

3. Invetigation: Restraint of trade and Clayton Act cases often require the development of statistical, accounting and marketing information. Such analyses can contribute to the planning of the investigation as well as to its actual conduct.

4. Decision: Economic analysis may be needed to evaluate the facts. Such analysis may be relevant at either or both of two stages—(1) in considering whether or not a complaint should issue, and if so, on what theory; and (2) after trial, in formulating the findings and determining the scope of the order.

The economic work of the Commission has not been adapted to the requirements of the Administrative Procedure Act. After trial is completed, neither the hearing examiner nor the Commission can ask for economic help in cases where the Bureau of Industrial Economics has participated in the development of the prosecution—the Administrative Procedure Act bars the furnishing of such advice.

This serious defect should be remedied by attaching economic advisers directly to the Commission, and possibly to the hearing examiners, to perform economic functions in the same manner as the General Counsel performs legal functions.

V

There is a particular need to formulate guiding yardsticks in matters arising under the Robinson-Patman Act.

Much discussion has taken place as to the relative merits and demerits of that act. Small-business groups, primarily retailers and wholesalers, strongly support it. Recently they have formed a committee called the Committee for the Preservation of the Robinson-Patman Act.

On the other hand, at the American Bar Association meeting in San Francisco, several speakers said "No" to the proposition, the Robinson-Patman Act—Is it in the public interest?

For my own part I believe in its philosophy and am obligated to enforce it. Enforcement by an administrative agency means, or should mean, making every attempt to obtain compliance, first voluntarily and then by order.

I long have thought that one of the main reasons for failure to obtain general compliance with the Robinson-Patman Act, is the mystery and ignorance (both in industry and Government) which surround distribution costs.

While savings in cost constitute the primary justification for price differentials under the act, there has been little advancement in the field of distribution cost accounting during the 17 years it has been on the books. Manufacturing cost determination has been reasonably well understood and recognized for many years, but this has not been true in the distribution field.

In Robinson-Patman Act cases it has been very difficult, if not impossible, to determine precisely what cost savings are allowable and how they may be proved. General accounting analyses made for management in the regular course of business seem to be unsuitable for the purpose of supporting price differentials under the act.

The few distribution cost studies that have been developed have been very expensive and have involved detailed functional analyses of the sellers' entire business. Even then the conflicts between respondent's accountants and Commission accountants with reference to theory, allocations, procedures and methods have prevented any reasonable evaluation of the actual savings in serving different customers.

I therefore intend to recommend the establishment of an advisory committee on cost justification consisting of accountants, economists, and lawyers representing all viewpoints.

This committee should be instructed to ascertain whether it is feasible for the Commission to develop standards of proof and procedures for costing which can be adopted by the Commission as guides to business enterprises desirous of complying with the statute.

If standard methods and procedures can be developed, then distribution cost accounting could be built into the seller's formal books of account. This would permit business firms to keep their costs in a form which would enable them to compute directly the distribution costs applicable to specific products, to specific classes of transactions, or to specific classes of customers.

At the present time most companies do not undertake any such prior systematic analysis, but develop their analyses only when they face an actual Federal Trade Commission complaint.

VI

Turning to another phase of the Commission's responsibilities, you will recall Woodrow Wilson said that businessmen "desire something more than that the menace of legal process be made explicit and intelligible; they desire the advice, the definite guidance and information which can be supplied by an administrative body."

In an effort to carry out this original intent, I propose to recommend the establishment of a Bureau of Consultation within the Commission.

The primary purpose of such a bureau would be threefold: (1) to act in a cooperative and consultative capacity to business, particularly small business; (2) to give informal advice on all kinds of matters involving the laws administered by the Commission; and (3) to seek voluntary compliance with such laws by means of conferences, informal hearings and other types of informal procedures.

One of the divisions of this bureau should be concerned exclusively with the problems of small business.

Small business has an essential economic and human role in American life. All inequitable handicaps should be eliminated so that small firms may grow in a healthy way and compete more effectively with their bigger competitors.

Big business and small business are interdependent, one cannot live without the other. The distribution system of the Nation consists primarily of small wholesalers and retailers who carry manufactured goods to market.

One of the complaints of small business is the mystery and delay which surround their applications for complaint; they say they drop their complaints in the hopper and never hear from them again unless and until a formal complaint issues or the case is dropped.

One of the duties of the Small Business Division would be to advise such applicants for complaint with reference to the precise status and progress of the investigations being made by the Commission.

A Conference Division should be established within the Bureau of Consultation to stimulate voluntary compliance. In the Sugar Institute case Chief Justice Holmes said: "Voluntary action to end abuses and to foster fair competitive opportunities in the public interest may be more effective than legal process."

Business concerns, large and small, generally favor voluntary compliance with the law.

It is the object of the Commission to stop unfair and deceptive practices. If the practice can be stopped, and surely stopped, by informal procedures, the Commission's object is attained. Under such circumstances no order is necessary, nor should one be entered. If, however, the action of the wrongdoer does not insure cessation of the practice in the future, an order to cease and desist is appropriate. Such orders are entered, not as punishment for past offenses, but for the purpose of regulating present and future practices.

But in cases where everything that can be accomplished by a protracted proceeding, has been or can be accomplished by voluntary cooperative effort, then the time and expense of trial should certainly be avoided.

Before a formal complaint is recommended the Conference Division should give the proposed respondent an opportunity to appear and show cause why a complaint should not issue. In those cases where the complaining party desires to do so, he should be permitted to appear and take part in an informal hearing. No testimony should be taken but it should be a joint conference between the Commission, the proposed respondent, and the applicant if willing. If this were done the Conference Division should be able to dispose of the majority of the potential cases of the Federal Trade Commission in harmony with the public interest and to the satisfaction of all concerned.

VII

In litigated cases involving legal and economic complexities, the issues should be carefully particularized in the complaint. Discovery procedures, of course, are not available. For this reason the pleadings and issues should be made as definitive as possible.

An adversary hearing of the type required under sections 7 and 8 of the Administrative Procedure Act cannot by its very nature be used as an investigatory process. Such a hearing, like any other trial, is for the determination of issues.

Surprise and tactical advantages should be frankly eliminated in all administrative hearings. Particularization in pleading should be accompanied, in the big cases at least, by pretrial procedures involving the identification and authentication of exhibits, exchange of exhibits, exchange of written drafts of the proposed testimony of experts, stipulations of fact not subject to dispute, and a detailed plan for the hearing.

VIII

There are many other phases of the Commission's responsibilities which I should like to discuss if time permitted.

Delay in disposition of cases is one of them. It is believed that a mangement survey by an outside firm of management engineers is an essential first step in dealing with this problem. I have already recommended to the Commission that such a survey be made in order to eliminate excess paperwork, simplify the structure of the Commission's staff, redefine the ground rules under which the staff operates, and decrease the workload of the individual Commissioners so that they are not overwhelmed by petty matters.

In closing, I want to stress the fact that the Commission seeks compliance, not punishment.

In order to accomplish this the lawyers, economists, and accountants representing the Commission must approach each case in a spirit of fair play; they must be governed by the statute and the facts of the particular case, not by preconceived ideologies or theories.

Representatives of business must approach the problem in the same spirit; they must place public interest ahead of private advantage.

In some instances compliance can be obtained only through formal hearings leading to cease-and-desist orders. In many cases, however, voluntary compliance can and should be obtained through informal procedures, through investigation and consultation. This is one great advantage the efficient administrative agency has over the courts.

In each instance, whether compliance be voluntary or by order, the goal is the same—the prevention of improper practices and the perpetuation of our free competitive system through practical and effective enforcement of law.

Compliance With Commission Orders

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN V. BEAMER
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 12, 1954

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Hon. Edward F. Howrey, Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, before the American Institute of Wholesale Plumbing and Heating Supply Associations at New York, N. Y., September 21, 1953. The address follows:

COMPLIANCE WITH COMMISSION ORDERS

(By Edward F. Howrey)

It is a distinct pleasure to take part in the national convention of the American Institute of Wholesale Plumbing and Heating Supply Associations.

I have read with interest and profit the history of the wholesale associations in your industry and noted the progress since the formation of your first association some 60 years ago. I congratulate you upon your steady and successful growth. I agree with you that the country's economic structure, if indeed it could long survive without the products of your industry, could not survive in comfort.

In my first statement as Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, made in June at Ann Arbor, I discussed certain phases of the Commission's activities which needed immediate revaluation.

Some of the suggestions there made have already been put into effect; others will follow. Although it has not been possible during the few months I have been in office to revaluate and make improvements in all phases of the Commission's activities, we have made a substantial beginning.

Today I want to discuss another and very important phase of the Commission's work which needs improvement, namely, compliance with existing Federal Trade Commission orders.

In looking through a recent bulletin of your association, I found the following: "It was brought out at this meeting [of the board of directors] that trade practice rules which were adopted in 1929 are still effective. Apparently our industry had forgotten such rules existed and it was not until Mr. Dennison recalled that 24 years ago the Federal Trade Commission had promulgated a set of Trade Practice Rules for the plumbing and heating industry that anyone had the faintest recollection of their existence."

This is hardly a question of the law's delay of which Hamlet complained—it is more nearly a case of law's labor lost. But perhaps I should remind you that the lost is sometimes found. Only last term the Supreme Court, in the Thompson restaurant case, resurrected a District of Columbia civil-rights statute that had been "lost" or "buried" for more than three-quarters of a century.

Mr. Dennison's statement, I confess, made me pause and consider. If you (and apparently the Commission) had forgotten the very existence of the trade-practice rules for your industry, how many others had done the same? Worse than that, how many individual respondents had forgotten, or were ignoring, FTC stipulations and formal orders to cease and desist?

I reflected on these questions and decided to make an immediate study of Federal Trade Commission compliance. The scope of such a study is indicated by the fact that the Commission has outstanding about 180 sets of trade practice rules, 8,400 stipulations and 4,500 orders to cease and desist. They cover almost every segment of American business. They range from baby chicks to steel and steel products, from liver pills and cancer cures to printing, insecticides, products of mines and wells, lumber and wool products, automobiles, foodstuffs, building materials, and a thousand other items of every type and description.

A substantial number of the 4,500 orders prohibit industry-wide price fixing, conspiracies to restrain trade, price and service discriminations, and other monopolistic and predatory practices violative of the Federal Trade Commission and Clayton Acts.

In order to highlight the problem of compliance let us deal today, not with trade practice rules or stipulations which involve voluntary compliance, but with formal orders entered by the Commission after extended hearings, briefs, and argument.

The prosecution of a single case of this type requires the expenditure of much time and money. Each order to cease and desist represents a substantial investment of public funds, the anticipated dividends of which are promotion of competition, savings to consumers, and the protection of business (large and small) from unfair competitive practices. The orders are not an end in themselves. They are a means to the attainment of the Commission's ultimate objective—the preservation of our basic system of private enterprise.

In final analysis, the American people are, or should be, the beneficiaries of each such investment. It is the duty of the Commission not only to make sound investments but also, and of equal importance, to protect those investments.

As stated by the Supreme Court, the Commission "has a continuing duty to prevent unfair methods of competition and unfair or deceptive acts or practices in commerce. That responsibility * * * is not suspended or exhausted as to any violator whose guilt is once established."

With respect to most of its orders, the Commission does not now know with any degree of certainty whether or not the respondents have continued to be in substantial compliance. An initial report of compliance is required within 60 days of the date of the order, but no further check is made unless and until a complaint is received from an outside source.

With a staff of hundreds of lawyers and economists working to obtain effective orders in the public interest, the Commission has employed a mere handful to see that the orders are obeyed. It have depended, in large part, on surveillance of respondents by competitors and local Better Business Bureaus. Only when prodded by complaints from these and other sources has the Commission checked on compliance.

I am certain that many of the Commission's order have proved ineffectual because of this inadequate review. In 1946 a House committee reported:

"What seems to be really crucial is that the Federal Trade Commission appears to go ahead issuing the cease and desist orders in the expectation that an * * * order and a compliance report solve the problem. Without any independent and systematic follow-up the Commission is unable to answer (a) Is the respondent actually complying with the precise terms of the order; or (b) has the respondent found another means by which to continue the same offense through a technique not covered by the original FTC complaint?"

This failure of the Commission has likewise been scored by representatives of small business. They have found that the promise of relief from unfair competitive acts given by an order to cease and desist has too often proved illusory because of inadequate follow-up.

It is useless, I submit, for the Commission to enter orders unless it sees that they are obeyed, either voluntarily or through appropriate enforcement proceedings against those who deliberately or willfully ignore them. Failure to obtain compliance constitutes a waste of money, has a demoralizing effect on competitors and members of the public who have been injured, and tends to encourage a general disregard by the business community of antitrust and trade regulation laws.

This past softness of the Commission in its program of compliance is contrary to my purpose to bring about a vigorous and fair enforcement of antitrust and related statutes. One of my primary aims, as Chairman, will be to correct this situation.

Accordingly I have this day appointed a qualified staff committee to survey and make recommendations to the Commission for improved compliance procedures.

This committee consists of Mr. PGad B. Morehouse, assistant general counsel; Mr. William Snow, director of stipulations; and Mr. Alex Akerman, Jr., secretary of the Commission. I have asked Mr. Akerman, a former judge, to serve as chairman.

As a part of the committee's study and as a partial frame of reference, I suggest the following:

First. An analysis of the Commission's powers under the recent decision of the Supreme Court in *United States* v. *Morton Salt Co.* (338 U. S. 632). In that case it was established that the Commission has authority to require corporations, subject to cease-and-desist orders, to file special reports of compliance; that failure to file may result in mandatory injunction and money forfeiture. The feasibility and authority of the Commission to inaugurate and maintain a systematic and continuous check on compliance by use of periodic special reports should be studied. Perhaps the orders themselves should incorporate a requirement for supplemental compliance reports at specified times.

Second. A survey of past antimonopoly orders to ascertain if they are still adequate in form and scope. Changed conditions may have rendered some of them inoperative or insufficient to accomplish the Commission's purpose of promoting and maintaining competition. In such cases they should be reopened and strengthened.

Third. A review of outstanding orders in order to reduce the number to be checked. It is probable, for example, that a large number of old orders may be classified as dead or inactive because of discontinuance of business or for other reasons; also, certain types of orders may not require the same vigilant attention as others. In certain types of false advertising cases there may be reason to assume that the order is being obeyed in the absence of a complaint by a competitor or the public. On the other hand, there may be no reason to make such an assumption with respect to other orders involving complex issues where competitors or the public have insufficient factual information to form the basis of a complaint.

Fourth. Segregation or arrangement of orders requiring field investigation into groups by industries, geographical location of respondents, or other appropriate groupings. The investigating division could then be supplied with these groupings and requested to assign them to field examiners for prompt investigation. In this manner compliance can be checked on a systematic basis with a minimum expenditure of time.

Last, and perhaps most important. The procedures of the Commission with respect to filing initial compliance reports should be reexamined. Orders uniformly contain a provision requiring the filing of a written report within 60 days, setting forth in detail the manner and form in which respondent has complied with the order. This is sometimes a difficult assignment, particularly in cases involving restraint of trade or Clayton Act violations. Pricing schedules, pricing formulae, and sales policies may need revision.

Orders of the Commission are "negative"—they require the discontinuance of the illegal practice and do not set forth affirmatively what practices a respondent can follow in the future without fear of violating the order. For this reason personal conferences between respondents and Commission attorneys, to discuss methods of effecting compliance, should be encouraged. Such conferences will be helpful to both sides. Standards of fair play require that respondents be informed, insofar as possible, as to what they can and cannot do under the order.

On the other hand, it must be remembered that it is not within the province of the Commission, and certainly beyond its ability and qualifications, to formulate affirmative business practices for a particular industry.

The staff committee, which I have today set up, will also study procedures for obtaining compliance with trade practice rules and stipulations to cease and desist. These, of course, depend on voluntary measures.

Of the 8,400 stipulations outstanding, it is estimated that the Commission is without current compliance information in 95 percent or over 8,000 of the cases.

It is my firm belief that business policy favors voluntary compliance with the law, and certainly favors compliance with up-to-date rules and stipulations. In cases like yours, where the trade practice rules were formulated 24 years ago, they should either be revitalized or stricken from the books.

In closing, I want to stress the fact that it is my goal to obtain better and wider compliance with the laws administered by the Federal Trade Commission.

Voluntary compliance, through consultation and such informal procedures as trade practice rules and stipulations, will be promoted and encouraged. However, where the public interest requires it, compulsory compliance will be vigorously enforced.

Small Business and the Federal Trade Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES I. DOLLIVER
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 12, 1954

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Hon. Edward F. Howrey, Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, before the convention of the National Association of Retail Druggists at Chicago, Ill., October 14, 1953. The address follows:

SMALL BUSINESS AND THE FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

(By Edward F. Howrey)

It is an honor to take part in the 54th annual convention of the National Association of Retail Druggists.

The corner drugstore is an American institution. From an ice cream soda after the show, and possibly a free review of the current magazines, to the desperately needed medicinal preparations in time of sickness, the retail drugstores of the country have become a permanent part of life in America.

Individually, retail druggists are small-business men; collectively, you are a highly important segment of the Nation's economy. As independent businessmen, you are interested in what the Government is doing to preserve our private competitive enterprise system, of which you are a vital part.

This morning I would like to talk briefly on the subject of small business as I view it from the Federal Trade Commission.

The primary objective of the Commission is to preserve effective and vigorous competition. In order to accomplish this, small business must continue to be strong and aggressive; it must be protected from unfair competition. All inequitable handicaps should be eliminated so that small firms may grow in a healthy way and compete more effectively with their bigger competitors.

It is startling to realize the dynamic and important position occupied by small business today. While we hear much about big business, the truth is that the typical business unit in the United States is small. Nine out of every ten business concerns engaged in manufacturing operations are small concerns. They employ close to half of all persons engaged in manufacturing, and they account for more than one-third of total output.

It is reported by one of the largest automobile manufacturers that 58 percent of the total price of an automobile represents more than 10,000 purchased parts and that such parts are obtained from more than 7,000 different suppliers.

One of our great steel companies says that 40 percent of its total revenue is paid out to 54,000 suppliers of goods and services, and that at least 50,000 of these suppliers are small business concerns.

The majority of new ideas, new methods, and inventions originate with small business. Of all the patents issued by the United States Patent Office during a 17-year period, approximately 77 percent went to individuals and small and medium-sized businesses.

In the field of distribution, I find that if the corporations doing business in 1949 were divided into two groups—those with assets of more than $250,000 and those with assets of less than $250,000—the smaller would contain about 90 percent of the retailers in the United States and 80 percent of the wholesalers. This is actually an understatement, because these figures do not take into account sole proprietorships and partnerships which are particularly important in distribution.

Figures of this kind are sometimes criticized on the ground that the number of small-business men is a bad measure of their importance because a few big concerns outweigh many small ones. It is, of course, true that the big companies do more than a proportionate share of the total business. This is what is meant by saying they are big.

But even when the place of small business is measured by the amount of business done, it remains a solid and substantial part of the total. In both wholesaling and retailing, corporations with assets of less than a million dollars received in 1949 approximately half of the gross revenue of all corporations in the field.

I noted with interest just recently that your able executive secretary, John Dargavel, estimated that of the $150 billion spent in retail stores in 1952 small retailers accounted for $119 billion, or 80 percent of the total.

To me, these examples typify the interdependence of small and large business; they lend perspective to the indispensable role of small business, both economic and human, in our free-enterprise system. The fact is that the American system, as we know it, cannot survive without both big and small business.

There are few topics, however, on which people are more likely to go to extremes than on the subject of small business. Some will whisper privately that there is no special problem and no occasion for a Government policy toward small business. This is not true.

Others will proclaim emphatically that small business is facing a crisis, that the very existence of the independent businessman is in danger, that unless drastic steps are taken to rescue him he will disappear and competition will disappear with him. This is also untrue, and such statements are less than complimentary to the brains and strength of the hundreds of thousands of small-business men in this country.

Those who speak about the small business crisis advocate a wide variety of remedies, some of which are good and some of which are not. Included among the latter are a number of remedies which would do much damage both to the public interest and to small business itself.

One of these is the grant of various kinds of public subsidy to small business. Along this line small business becomes the ward of the State and a charge upon the taxpayer. It loses both its independence and its usefulness.

Another is the protection of small business by the imposition of such tight controls upon large business as to enmesh it in a straitjacket of regulation. This runs counter to the public interest because, as I have indicated, there is a place for large business as well as small. It also runs counter to the small business interest because comprehensive regulation of the business process is bound to control all business, large and small.

Still another is a broad grant of immunity from the operation of the antitrust laws. Such a policy might conceivably help the first few small-business groups to which it was applied. But as further inroads were made upon competition, these groups would lose by the monopolistic practices of others. Small business as a whole would lose because of the deadening of the competitive incentive and initiative. If competitive checks and balances are weakened, the larger concerns are likely to attain greater market advantage than the small-business group.

Small business needs no such dubious remedies but rather special remedies adapted to its special problems.

I am confident that there is a greater awareness in Washington today of small-business problems than at any previous time. During the first session of the present Congress legislation was enacted establishing for the first time in the country's history a comprehensive, independent, peacetime agency for small business. It is called the Small Business Administration.

This agency, as I understand it, will provide financing for small business, will assist small concerns to obtain a fair share of Government contracts, and will otherwise help them with special problems.

The most obvious of these problems is that small enterprises are too small to do for themselves, individually, a good many things which large business can do, and which it is in the public interest to have done. Some of these things can be done by small concerns acting together, and where this is so, the proper role of Government is to encourage and facilitate such joint action. Technological research and market research are good examples.

While the Federal Trade Commission supervises the competitive practices of both small and big business, it should make a special effort to protect small business from predatory practices. It should, in fact, have its own small-business program.

With this in mind, I suggest the following:

1. A vigorous application of the antimonopoly and antidiscrimination statutes is an important part of a policy favorable to small business. So long as the vigor and fairness of competition is maintained, small-business men will have a fair chance to perform their economic functions and prosper accordingly. They should not want more, and they do not need more to preserve their place in the sun.

2. A separate Small Business Division should be established within the Commission. One of the principal complaints of small-business men is the mystery and delay surrounding their requests for action against unfair competitors or other suspected violators. They say they drop their complaints in the hopper and never hear from them again unless and until a formal complaint issues.

One of the duties of the Small Business Division would be to keep small concerns informed, and to expedite the movement of their matters through the Commission.

3. The Commission should strengthen the administration of the Robinson-Patman Act and seek wider compliance with its provisions. In this connection we propose to establish an advisory committee on cost justification.

Although savings in cost constitute the primary justification for lawful price differentials under the act, there has been little advancement in the field of distribution cost accounting during the 17 years it has been on the books. Business concerns have found it very difficult, if not impossible, to determine precisely what cost savings are allowable and how they may be proved. The few distribution cost studies that have been developed have been very expensive and have involved detailed functional analyses of the seller's entire business.

These difficulties have engendered widespread disregard of the prohibitions against price discrimination. This is so because sellers cannot, in our competitive economy, rely on a one-price policy. In order to compete they must be able, where the occasion requires it, to pass on to the buyer the actual savings created by the buyer's method of doing business.

It is our hope that this advisory committee will be able to ascertain whether it is feasible for the Commission to formulate standards of proof and procedures for costing which can be adopted by the Commission as guides to business enterprises desirous of complying with this important statute. The results of this activity, which should greatly stimulate compliance with the act, will prove especially helpful to smaller concerns.

It is recognized that no cost accounting system can give instantaneous Robinson-Patman Act answers, but in my opinion there is no necessary conflict between better costs for Commission purposes and more useful costs for management.

4. The investigative work of the Commission should be improved and expanded. All of the Commission's work, its successes or its failures, depend primarily upon the facts which are developed by the examiners in the field. The attorneys in charge of this work have received neither the recognition nor the support necessary for a successful administration of the Commission's laws. Subject to surveys now in progress, I propose to make recommendations that will raise the investigative work to a status equal with that of our other work.

5. Another problem affecting small business which we must solve concerns compliance by respondents with cease and desist orders entered against them. Hundreds of lawyers are being utilized to obtain cease and desist orders while a mere handful are employed in obtaining compliance with the 4,500 orders already on the books. There seems to be an unawareness of whether these orders are being complied with or violated. It is useless, it seems to us, for the Commission to enter orders unless it sees to it that they are obeyed, either voluntarily or through appropriate enforcement proceedings against those who deliberately or wilfully ignored them.

I have recently established a special staff committee within the Commission to formulate ways and means to correct this weakness.

Failure to obtain compliance constitutes a waste of public money, has a demoralizing effect on competitors and members of the public who have been injured, and tends to encourage a general disregard of the antitrust and trade regulation laws, oftentimes to the direct detriment of small-business men trying to enter or remain in a highly competitive market.

6. The Commission should not seek to nullify the McGuire Act, which has the strong support of small business, by the application of unrealistic legalisms or strained statutory interpretation. This act, as you know, exempts from the operation of the Federal antitrust laws vertical resale price maintenance contracts which are legal under State fair-trade acts.

At the time the McGuire Act was introduced the Commission deemed the bill not to be in the public interest and urged Congress to reject it. The act is now on the books; and Congress, by an overwhelming vote, has left no doubt concerning the basic purpose and intent of the legislation.

In closing, I want to emphasize that the Commission, in developing its future enforcement policies with respect to all of the statutes it administers, should hew closely to the intent of Congress. The prosecuting functions should be reserved for the swift and effective elimination of "hard core" violations of law.

n the past the Commission has not utilized its funds in a manner best calculated to prohibit those acts and practices which Congress found and declared to be injurious to competition. It has overemphasized, I believe, fringe issues which were punitive in nature and of no practical benefit to small business.

In the future I hope the Commission will forego peripheral "test" cases of doubtful validity and questionable economic consequence.

Only when this approach is taken can we venture to claim that the Federal Trade Commission is performing its duty to the competitive system and that the public is obtaining a fair return on its law-enforcement dollar.

Federal Trade Commission Decisions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 12, 1954

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Hon. Edward F. Howrey, Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, before the section of antitrust law of the American Bar Association, April 2, 1954. The address follows:

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION DECISIONS

(By Edward F. Howrey)

In my talk before the New York State Bar Association last January, I said that the heart of the Commission's work, as a body of experts, is its factfinding. It is also the most difficult.

My experience as a lawyer and as a quasi-judicial factfinder has convinced me that agency factfinding, or rather the lack of it, is one of the soft spots of administrative law. The manner and method in which administrative agencies arrive at decisions must be improved.

Ordinarily it is not my practice to criticize the "old" Federal Trade Commission. In order, however, to establish the need for a new Commission policy with respect to factfinding and elucidation by opinion, it seems necessary to deal with former practices and policies. To avoid any suggestion that my criticism may be personal or partisan, I will rely for my critique, on other commentators, on studies made under the aegis of official committees and commissions, and on judicial opinions.

Primarily, of course, learning, skill, impartiality and fairmindedness are personal qualities. There are quasi-judicial officers of great ability who can preserve a detached and objective point of view regardless of their relation to the controversy or their natural inclinations. There are other men who are not qualified, either by temperament or training, and who become partisans at an early stage. In any problem of administration or adjudication, these personal factors are far more important than the questions of form and procedure. Questions of personality, however, are beyond the scope of this paper.

Gerard Henderson, in his early work on the Federal Trade Commission, was perhaps the most devastating of all the critics. He referred to the Commission's findings as "masterpieces of ambiguity." Professor Davis, 25 years later, was equally unhappy about our decisional work. He said that the Commission "has been glaringly deficient in its failure to prepare reasoned opinions and to develop a reliable body of case law."

In the past, formal findings have been made by the Commission only in those cases in which the decision supported the charges of the complaint. This was manifestly wrong. If charges have been made which prove to be erroneous, the respondent is entitled to an unequivocal and detailed exoneration. And, of course, the published reports of the Commission's decisions suffer greatly, as a storehouse of precedents, from the fact that only decisions favorable to the Commission have been published. It is important that the business world know what it may do, as well as what it may not do.

The findings generally contained no narrative statement of the kind usually included in court decisons. Instead there were formalistic findings, in numbered paragraphs, phrased generally in the artificial legal phraseology of a common law pleading, and designed to embody ultimate conclusions of fact, rather than to set forth the happenings or events or economic considerations out of which the controversy arose.

Formal findings of this type are a poor means of conveying information. Almost any controversy, especially a business controversy of the kind that comes before the Federal Trade Commission, has a history and a setting. "To understand the business or economic significance of a practice, we must know something of its origin, of the objects and purposes of those who pursue it, of the persons who object to it and their reasons, and of its practical effect. We need a descriptive and narrative report, couched in simple and direct language."

Even a statement of a clear-cut violation suffers when it is made in formalistic terms. It does not satisfy our legitimate thirst for facts to learn that "numerous agents and representatives of respondents * * * while acting within the scope of their employment with the purpose, intent, and effect of stifling and suppressing competition * * * and for the purpose of embarrassing, harassing, and restraining competitors of respondent, * * * have by divers means and methods induced and procured and attempted to induce and procure a large number of * * * customers * * * to cancel and rescind orders * * * placed with competitors."

Nor does it help us to learn that "There are among respondent's competitors * * * many who sell soap similar in grade and quality * * * and many who sell soap of a grade and quality which has a retail value of, and sells for, the price marked by the respondent on said containers * * *."

These are not reports of facts, but conclusions as to the existence of a practice, and even the practice is not so described that we gain any conception of its scope, its effect, or the means used in carrying it out. This form of report has even served, according to some critics, to conceal serious conflicts in the evidence.

The hearing examiner formerly was charged by tradition, and sometimes by directive, to make formalistic and ultimate findings. Under such directions he was apt to approach the task in the wrong frame of mind. He was apt to begin with the legal conclusions which he wished to reach. Next he would ascertain what conclusions of fact were necessary in law to support the result. Finally, if he were conscientious, he would comb the record to ascertain whether it contained sufficient supporting evidence.

A person charged with writing a narrative, descriptive account of a controversy approaches the task from a different viewpoint. His first concern is to set forth as clearly and accurately as possible what has happened. Having stated the facts, he will endeavor to reach general conclusions of fact or judgment, and finally he will apply the law to these general conclusions. He will be concerned throughout with the fairness and accuracy and impartial character of the report, rather than with its sufficiency in supporting one or another legal conclusions.

The members of the Attorney General's Committee on Administrative Procedure were also severe critics. They said:

"The findings of fact [of the Federal Trade Commission] are phrased formalistically in language which closely resembles the language of the complaint itself. * * * In the absence of a narrative statement of facts, portraying the history and background of the problem, it is frequently impossible to appreciate just what business methods are involved in the case. Similarly, the findings of fact ordinarily do not outline or otherwise refer to the respondent's defense or justification. * * *

"The nakedness of the Commission's decisions extends not only to the facts, but also to questions of law. Except in a limited number of cases, the decisions contain no discussions of the principles of law under which the conduct in question is held to be illegal; neither is there any reference made to prior decisions of the Commission and the courts. The result is that most of the Commission's decisions * * * are of indifferent value as precedents for attorneys and businessmen. * * *

"The development of law through the deciding of individual cases is a process both of inclusion and of exclusion. That is, it is important to understand what is permitted by law, as well as to know what is forbidden. Not only, therefore, should the Commission seek to develop a body of precedent based on its holdings that conduct has been improper but also it should formulate, for their precedent value, those decisions which are adverse to the complaint."

The final report of the Attorney General's committee recommended that opinions accompany decisions. This was based on the following reasons: First, error and carelessness may be squeezed out in the opinion-shaping process. Second, the exposure of reasoning to public scrutiny and criticism is healthy. Third, the parties will be better satisfied if they know the bases of the decision. Finally, opinions enable the private interests involved, and the bar that advises them, to obtain additional guidance for their future conduct.

The 1949 Task Force Report of the Hoover Commission said that "A most serious deficiency of the Commission is its failure to write an opinion which sets forth the contentions and issues involved in the case and the policies, standards, or rules being applied * * * which refers to the precedents * * * and if the case represents an attack upon a new problem provides a full elucidation of the Commission's reasoning."

The courts have long been critical of Commission decisions. Mr. Justice Cardozo's statement, made in another connection, is often quoted as applicable to the Federal Trade Commission: "We must know," he said, "what a decision means before the duty becomes ours to say whether it is right or wrong."

Other Justices have said:

"The Commission has not explained its conclusion with * * * 'simplicity and clearness.' "

"If judicial review is to have a basis for functioning, the Commission must do more than pronounce a conclusion by way of fiat and without explication."

"If judicial review is to have any meaning, extension of principle to meet new situations must be based on some minimum demonstration to the courts that the Commission has relied on relevant criteria."

"If independent agencies could realize how much trustworthiness judges give to workmanlike findings and opinions and how their causes are prejudiced on review by slipshod, imprecise findings and failure to elucidate by opinion the process by which ultimate determinations have been reached, their work and score on review would doubtless improve."

In a recent case, in 1953, the Supreme Court said:

"While this Court ought scrupulously to abstain from requiring of the Commission particularization in its findings so exacting as to make this Court in effect a court of review on the facts, it is no less important, since we are charged with the duty of reviewing the correctness of the standards which the Commission applies and the essential fairness of the mode by which it reaches its conclusions, that the Commission do not shelter behind uncritical generalities or such looseness of expression as to make it essentially impossible for us to determine what really lay behind the conclusions which we are to review."

Some of my friends counter this criticism with the observation that more often than not, where the Commission merely announces its formal findings and conclusions, without explanation or supporting opinion, the courts have sustained them. They refer to the Chenery cases and suggest that an SEC order was set aside, because that Commission went beyond the formal findings and discussed the reasons and basis for its action; they say that if the decision had been limited to findings, the Court probably would not have delved behind them.

But surely an administrative agency should do more than merely win its cases. It is also important, I think, that the published decisions of an agency fulfill two objects. They should constitute the authentic public record of what was done by the tribunal in the particular case, and they should afford a collection of precedents by which its action in future cases can be forecast. The latter function is perhaps the more important of the two, especially where the tribunal is administering laws as general in their terms and as important to the business world as the Clayton Act and the Federal Trade Commission Act. Much can be said to the effect that this will contribute a great deal to the development of greater certainty in this field of the law.

It may be helpful at this point to summarize the practical reasons why the Commission's decisions should contain a narrative statement of basic facts and a supporting legal opinion. As we have seen the most prominent reason discussed by the courts is the facilitation of judicial review.

A second important reason is to protect against careless or arbitrary action. Judge Frank gives this first place: "It is sometimes said that the requirement that the trial judge file findings of fact is for the convenience of the upper courts. While it does serve that end, it has a far more important purpose—that of evoking care on the part of the trial judge in ascertaining the facts. * * * Often a strong impression that, on the basis of the evidence, the facts are thus-and-so gives way when it comes to expressing that impression on paper."

Other reasons for basic findings and opinions are to help parties plan their cases for appeal, to keep agencies within their jurisdiction, to test complex economic and competitive questions which require a special expertness, and finally to build up a body of trade regulation law which will afford an important degree of certainty for the guidance of businessmen.

Since the passage of the Administrative Procedure Act, in 1950, there has been great improvement in the procedures and decisions of the Commission. The hearing examiner now issues an initial decison which becomes final unless reviewed by the Commission. This has resulted in the proceeding before the Commission becoming appellate in nature. However, the decisions of the Commission on review have not been those of an appellate tribunal. Usually they are in the form of entirely new findings—sometimes identical with the findings of the hearing examiner. Until recently, opinions were prepared only in cases involving a novel or important issue. But even here the opinion, except in case of dismissals, has been accompanied by findings using legalistic stock phrases and ambiguous words. Occasionally it has been difficult to reconcile the ultimate findings and conclusions with the rationale of the Commission's opinion.

In order to improve the initial decisions of the hearing examiners and the final decisions of the Commission, I have made the following recommendations:

1. The hearing examiner should issue findings and conclusions and his reasons therefor in every case, whether they be favorable or adverse to the allegations of the complaint. He should abandon formal and legalistic findings and adopt instead narrative and descriptive reports. Such a practice would, in my opinion, greatly enhance the quality of the initial decisions. Where an examiner must review the evidence presented by both sides, analyze and dispose of arguments, give convincing reasons for his decision and distinguish or reconcile the precedents, and then apply the proper remedy, he is much more likely to reach a just and well-considered conclusion than if he is permitted merely to state in legal phraseology his ultimate findings of fact and law.

One word of caution: The initial decision of the hearing examiner should not be merely a legal opinion; that is the job of the appellate body—in this case, the Commission. While the initial decision (if it is to have value) should be narrative and expository in form, it must, under the provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act, indicate the examiner's findings and conclusions on material issues with such specifically as to advise the parties and the reviewing court or commission of their record and legal basis.

2. The form and content of the order to cease and desist, which is part of the initial decision, should be improved. The most serious recent criticism of the Commission has been that of Mr. Justice Jackson and Mr. Justice Frankfurter in their dissenting opinions in the Ruberoid and Motion Picture Advertising cases. They state that the Commission has failed to perform its quasi-legislative function of interpreting a general statute so as to clarify its application to a particular situation or practice. This criticism applies especially in Clayton Act cases where hearing examiners and the Commission have issued orders in the language of the statute rather than in specific language prohibiting the particular practices involved.

The prohibitions of the order should deal with the specific issues and should be so clear that respondents will have no doubt as to what is expected of them. The exact practice found be to illegal should be expressly prohibited, as well as such other practices as may be necessary to assure adequate relief.

There is no simple solution to the formulation of a proper remedy, but it is believed that findings of the type described above will greatly assist the hearing examiner and the Commission in drafting in each case the type of order required.

3. The Commission, on review or appeal, should not issue new or separate findings. There may be a rare case where the Commission will want to issue its own findings—it, of course, retains complete freedom to do so—but the appellate nature of the proceeding dictates appellate decisions. It was obviously the intent of the Administrative Procedure Act that agencies should attach considerable weight to the findings of the examiner who saw and heard the witnesses. I do not mean that the Commission should abdicate its fact-finding responsibility, but imagine the confusion of an appellate judge who may want to compare the two sets of findings, the hearing examiner's and the Commission's, which are often similar in form but which may or may not be identical in content.

Where the Commission disagrees with some of the findings in the initial decision, it is the purpose of an opinion to point that out, to explain why the Commission differs, and to order the findings modified accordingly. Since the Commission, under the statute, has the ultimate fact-finding responsibility, the opinion should, of course, expressly adopt the findings and conclusions of the hearing examiner as modified.

4. The Commission should write an opinion in every case. This is probably the most important single step which the Commission could take toward enhancing the value and authority of its decisions and in providing for a remedy adequate in form and scope.

Moreover, an opinion which deals impartially with the respondent's case and meets conscientiously the arguments which he has presented is much more likely to dispose of the controversy and satisfy the parties. Nothing is so exasperating to a lawyer as to find that a tribunal has ignored his carefully prepared defense. To do so is to create dissatisfaction and encourage appeals to a higher court.

The Commission deals with matters of vital importance to business. Many of the questions which come before it relate to controversies of long standing which are debated at conventions and in trade journals. If the Commission were to issue in all such cases informative and readable opinions, they would have an influence far beyond the immediate controversy.

Every lawyer knows the characteristics of a well-considered case. It states, according to Henderson, clearly and fully the relevant facts. It summarizes the contentions of the opposing parties in such a way as to bring out the main issue of law involved. Upon this issue, it reviews the precedents, reconciling conflicts and tracing the law through to the latest utterance of an authoritative tribunal. In the light of these precedents, the precise new issue presented * * * is clearly formulated, and a decision is reached. * * * Such a case at once takes its place as a precedent, and, if the point is important, may profoundly influence the future course of the law. The very same case, however, involving the same facts and decided the same way, may be utterly without influence if the opinion leaves the issues obscure or the grounds of decision uncertain.

My own formula for Commission opinions is a statement or history of the case, a statement of facts, the questions presented on appeal, a discussion of the applicable law, and the application of that law to the salient facts of the case. This formula must of necessity be flexible and may vary from case to case.

5. The only clearcut exception to the considerations I have discussed lies in the field of uncontested cases, namely, those cases which are disposed of by consent settlement. There, findings of fact are not only unnecessary but act as a deterrent to the accomplishment of greater compliance by voluntary means. I have recently proposed an amendment to the existing rules of practice dealing with consent settlement which would make unnecessary any recital of facts in the settlement other than those concerning the Commission's jurisdiction.

It has been suggested that a cease-and-desist order based on consent, and not containing factual recitations, might be unenforcible in court because the statute requires the Commission to make findings.

The case law, interpreting the National Labor Relations Act which contains the same provision, is clearly against this view. Also, consent orders of this sort, without findings other than jurisdictional findings, and without admissions, have been commonly used by the Department of Justice in prosecutions under the antitrust laws. Their validity and enforcibility have been emphatically upheld by the Supreme Court, which said that any error in facts "is waived by the consent to the decree."

The Commission's refusal to negotiate such orders has prevented the question arising under the Federal Trade Commission Act, except by way of dictum. In one case the Court said that "consent that the cease-and-desist order might issue waived every defense except a challenge of the jurisdiction over the subject matter."

Under the old rule, as most of you know, there could be no settlement that did not dispose of the entire case as to all respondents before the taking of any testimony.

The new rule, if adopted, will permit, in the discretion of the hearing examiner, settlement of all or any part of the case as to any respondent at any stage of the proceeding.

In closing, I should like to stress the fact that the Federal Trade Commission was intended by Congress to perform its duties in a field of administrative and regulatory law in which much pioneer and expert work was needed. It was expected to establish precedents by which businessmen could be guided in the conduct of their affairs. I do not see how this duty can be performed unless the Commission prepares and publishes basic findings of fact and well-reasoned opinions and provides remedies that deal with and correct the precise mischief involved.

Pakistan's Food Shortage Relieved by Only Two-Thirds of American Wheat Grant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1954

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, a remarkable and rare phenomenon has occurred in south Asia recently which appears to have gone almost unnoticed by the American newspapers and the American people.

I am referring to the action of the Government of Pakistan in announcing that the unshipped balance of the emergency gift of United States wheat granted last year will not be needed and will not be requested.

It will be recalled that when a subcommittee of the House Foreign Affairs Committee visited Pakistan just a year ago it recommended that the Congress provide immediately a grant of wheat to Pakistan to feed people who would otherwise starve before the next harvest, to prevent food riots and political instability in the country, and to prevent hoarding of grain with resulting rise in prices and increased fiscal difficulties. Amidst many prophecies that the grant would be misused or lead to further demands in the future, the Congress authorized shipment of 700,000 tons of wheat with provision for 300,000 tons more if it should prove necessary. It is important for us to follow through on such transactions. How has it worked out?

In simultaneous statements from Karachi and from the Pakistan Ambassador Syed Amjad Ali, in Washington, Pakistan has announced it will not need to avail itself of the United States offer of the additional 300,000 tons; and, furthermore, will not need the remaining 90,000 tons of wheat which has not yet been shipped under the 700,000 tons allotted by the United States Government on June 25, 1953.

In expressing Pakistan's appreciation of United States aid, and voluntarily scaling down a portion of it by honestly reporting an improvement in the internal food situation, Pakistan is setting a a rare and commendable example to scores of other nations around the world.

It is a refreshing note to find such a combination of appreciation and cooperation shown by one of the nations that the people of America are trying to help. Coupled with this forthright attitude on American economic aid, Pakistan is also to be congratulated by the American people and the American Congress, and—I should hope—by the rest of the free world, for its courageous stand in south Asia in support of united action to fight aggression.

With its 80 million people, Pakistan can play an important role in bringing stability and security to that great area of south Asia between Turkey and the South China Sea. It is acknowledged that the agreement for friendly cooperation in economic and military affairs between Pakistan and Turkey is one of the greatest things that has happened in that area in a long time. It gives strength where strength is needed.

Despite the protests of some of her Communist and neutral neighbors, Pakistan has refused to join the so-called neutral camp, but instead has taken the lead in working for collective security and strength in united action against aggression. In a significant action, Pakistan, without fanfare or publicity, raised no objections to the United States request for landing and refueling facilities in its capital city, Karachi, for the emergency airlift of French reenforcements to Indochina.

We always hear about the disappointments in this long hard task of building strength and unity among the nations still free in the world. It is important that we take note with due appreciation of the successes. Whenever two nations work in neighborly cooperation, with each contributing what it can to the other's need and thus bringing benefit to both, the example can be contagious. This has been a profitable experience to both Pakistan and the United States. We look forward to mutually helpful association of our two countries in the future and welcome similar relationships with all other friendly peoples.

Address of Samuel Sennet at Greater New York Fund 1954 Drive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDNA F. KELLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 12, 1954

Mrs. KELLY of New York. Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago I had the honor to be the guest speaker at the kickoff luncheon of the Greater New York Fund. This is a boroughwide organization whose objective is to give supporting contributions to a vast number of charitable agencies. A large array of public, private, and religious volunteers sponsor this charitable endeavor.

I want to compliment Mr. Samuel Sennet, the 1953 president of the Greater New York Fund, for the success of that year.

I am happy to have the privilege to insert in the RECORD the following address made by Mr. Sennet at the recent luncheon which launched the 1954 drive:

> Organizational names by themselves seldom explain or define the guiding principles of the organization or its purposes and objectives.
>
> Then how can we fully understand the meaning of the Greater New York Fund in Brooklyn unless we look behind the name and see the constituent parts that make it up. We must see human relationships, we must see people—living, breathing, sensitive human beings—hundreds of thousands of them who look to the Greater New York Fund for help, for health, yes, for life itself. We must see thousands of children in the safety and good care of day nurseries while their mothers are at work. Children of every race, every religious denomination.
>
> Yes; we must see the many thousands of the youth in our great borough of Brooklyn in the wholesome atmosphere of Y's and youth clubs and settlement houses having fun, participating in healthy activities; yes, we owe this to our children; it is their birthright and the Greater New York Fund helps them to attain it.
>
> We cannot understand, I say, the full meaning of the Greater New York Fund in our borough unless we also see, behind the name of this great organization, the thousands of our aged and lonely people in friendly homes, in special clubs and recreation centers, living once again in renewed security, finding occupation, companionship, and what's more, learning to live again with human dignity. Yes, this, too, is the work and the accomplishment of our organization.
>
> And then there's the family counseling services which keep families together, so that children may have the security of their own home. It takes expert guidance to advise parents being driven apart by the many disasters and vexations of living. Thousands of people each year are assisted and encouraged by the counseling services. This, too, is the work of our organization.
>
> Yes, hospitals, convalescent homes, homes for the chronically ill, visiting nurses, to provide medical care and nursing service that heal the sick and safeguard the healthy as well.
>
> Four hundred and twenty-three local health and welfare agencies helping the people of our community, the sick, the weak, the poor, the mentally disturbed, helping our children to a better life, helping our old and lonely to live in faith and hope.

This is the greater New York fund in Brooklyn. This is its heart behind the name. A heart that knows no difference of religion, or creed, or color. A heart that feels for and helps the needy.

Yes, friends, this is our heart because it is the heart of our people, our community. Our dollars provide the oxygen and the blood to keep it a healthy, active organism.

But our organization is like that worthy Brooklyn merchant who ordered some goods from a firm in Ohio. A week later he received the following letter: "We regret we cannot fill this order until full payment has been made on the last one." The merchant sent his reply: "Please cancel the new order. I cannot wait that long."

Yes, ours is a big order; and we must find the means, you and I and all of us, to fill it. Only our dollars can cancel human suffering, hunger, and need.

Fortunately we have with us in this ballroom representatives of every phase of the borough's life. Civic leaders, men and women from commerce, industry, labor, and the professions, as well as representatives of many of the institutions which are partially supported by the fund.

I wish to thank you, all of you, on behalf of the campaign leadership for taking time out from your busy day to be here to help assure the success of our campaign.

Despite the fact that most of the world now lives in fear and panic of atom and hydrogen bombs that could virtually destroy most of the civilized world—if we want to be so brash as to call it that—it is heartening, it is encouraging, to see so many well meaning, good people assembled here, willing to devote their time, energy, and talents to help build the edifices of health and life and brighter tomorrows. Yes, this is the noble purpose of the fund. This is our task, this is our goal.

How do we do it? Well, good friends, your executive committee has been working for the last month, laying the groundwork that formulated the plans for this drive. Twenty of your executive committee have already received mimeographed sheets listing the names of contributors and prospective contributors. Each selected 5 to 10 names whom they will contact. I, too, have contacted a number of prospects and have gotten considerable contributions from them; but only after I described the work, the accomplishments of the Greater New York Fund, and the imperative need for substantial contributions so that the fund could continue its great work.

The very fact that you are here proves that you want to help, that you want to do your part. It should be your assignments to take 5 to 10 names in your vicinity, contact these people, tell them the touching, humane story of the Greater New York Fund, and allow these good people the opportunity of giving as generously as they can. People will respond when they know the story and see the heart and the work and the achievements of the Greater New York Fund.

This is our job, yours and mine. In fact, let's do it like the zealous volunteer worker of the Greater New York Fund who visited an eminent Brooklyn physician who was determined to attain social distinction and, in the process, neglected some of the elementary communal obligations. He walked into the hospital where the doctor served as clinical professor of dermatology wearing a greenish derby hat, a rusty coat, and carrying a battered briefcase. "I wish to see Professor Mannheimer," he proclaimed. "Impossible," said the attendant curtly. "What do you mean 'impossible'? I'll wait," said the little man. He sat down on a bench in the receiption room and waited all day long. For several days thereafter he came and waited all day. On the fifth day, a new attendant decided to help the little old man. "I'll give you a tip," he said. "Professor Mannheimer gives a clinical lecture tomorrow, and he uses people as examples of diseases while he lectures. The only chance of ever seeing him is to join the line of these people. They pass through that corridor, over there, exactly at 3 o'clock. But you've got to undress."

"Well," said the old man, "if I have to undress, I have to undress."

So, the next day, at 3, the old man, naked except for his hat, his brief case still clutched in one hand, brought up the end of the line. In a moment, with the half-dozen other specimens, he found himself in the amphitheater. The professor entered and began his lecture.

Pointing with a long professional staff at the first of the poor souls, he said, "Here, gentlemen, we have a perfect case of dermatitis"; and, after a lengthy description of the symptoms, he thanked the "specimen" and waved his pointer to the next in line. Next in line, next in line, and next in line.

Finally the great professor stood face to face with the little old man. He looked the "specimen" over from head to foot, wiped his own spectacles and then, thoroughly puzzled, asked, "What's the matter with you?"

"What's the matter with me," echoed the little man.

"What's the matter with you, Professor Mannheimer? For 4 years you haven't paid one cent to the Greater New York Fund."

Let's go out and do likewise.

Mahnomen Boosters Association Support Hagen Bill To Stabilize the Dairy Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1954

Mr. HAGEN of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include an advertisement from the April 29 issue of the Mahnomen Pioneer, of Mahnomen, Minn.

A resolution was passed by the Mahnomen Boosters Association, an organization of civic-minded businessmen and citizens of Mahnomen, Minn., and they paid for the advertisement in the newspaper to demonstrate their support of my bill, H. R. 8359, which is designed to stabilize the dairy industry by providing a mandatory price support through March 31, 1956, for milk and butterfat used in manufacturing dairy products.

These Mahnomen people realize that their community, in the heart of a dairy-producing area, cannot be prosperous unless the dairy farmers and those engaged in processing dairy products are prosperous. It follows that none of us can enjoy real prosperity unless we safeguard and keep solvent an industry as vital as the dairy industry. I am sure many people will join with the citizens of Mahnomen in support of my bill, H. R. 8359.

The newspaper advertisement follows:

A RESOLUTION

We, the members of the Mahnomen Boosters Association and the business and professional men of Mahnomen, live in a predominantly agricultural area and we recognize that unless we have a prosperous agriculture we will not have prosperous business communities. For this reason, we view as serious the continuing farm price slump.

Any program to deliberately lower farm prices and income is dangerous to our rural communities and can only result in weakening our entire national economy.

The Mahnomen Boosters Association and the business and professional men of Mahnomen insist that Congress maintain a strong farm price support program not only on the basics, but on dairy products such as in bill H. R. 8359 Dairy Products Marketing Act of 1954, now before Congress. We also favor support of other perishables, and field crops such as corn, oats, rye, barley, flax, and soybeans as well.

It is important for all people to understand that a strong farm price-support system is in the best interests of all of us, farmers, businessmen, and townspeople alike.

We, the Mahnomen Boosters Association and business and professional men of Mahnomen, pledge ourselves to work side by side with farmers to extend and expand our agricultural program.

Lee Hardware & Implement, Corner Cafe, Honek's Barber Shop, Priske Hardware, Jensen's Store, Mahnomen Dairy, Kochmann's Standard Service, Wilcox Lumber Co., Mahnomen Auto Sales, Standard Bulk Service, Municipal Liquor Store, Mahnomen Pioneer, Edna's Market, B. & F. Variety, Flicek's Furniture, Agnew's Deep Rock Service, Snook's Hamburger Shop, Mahnomen Sheet Metal Works, Iverson Drug, Strandemo & Tonneson, Coast-To-Coast Store, Leslie Varty, Bee-Line Service, Roy's Garage & Machine Shop, First National Bank, L. E. Whiting, Tupa Wholesale, Dr. J. M. Gacusana, L. B. Hartz Store, Gamble Store, Anderson Jewelry, Hotel Letford, Sather Insurance, Dr. A. P. Eckel, Community Oil Co., Bonn's Hotel & Cafe, A. J. Powers, Ernest Fortier, Becker Plumbing & Heating, Mahnomen Hardware, Solar Gas Co., Agnew's Barber Shop, Model Meat Market, Wild Rice Body Works, Agnes & Mildred Shop, B. C. Ness, Red Apple Cafe, Anderson Implement Co., Rockwog Funeral Home, Mahnomen Lumber Co., Al's Auto Service, Reuben's Cleaners, Hausner Bros., Midway Service Station, Hi-Way Service, Welcome Traveler's Motel, Piche's Variety, Red Owl Agency, H. A. Daigle, Mahnomen Creamery, Dr. N. T. Diekman, Steak House 59, New Market, Keeley's Beauty Shop, Gene's Cafe, Tveit Real Estate, Hanson-Henry Motors, MWO Grain & Feed, Mahnomen Skelgas Service, Corner Drug Store, Nelson's TV Sales & Service, Tubby's Grocery, Bregel Electric, Mahnomen Cities Service, Kjos Implement, Farmers Union Oil Co., Mobiloil Bulk Service.

Why Scuttle TVA?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT E. JONES, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 12, 1954

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article which appeared in the Enginemen's magazine, May 1954:

Why Scuttle TVA?

(By Judson King)

An encouraging sign of the times is the growing resistance of the American people to the efforts of the powers that be to seize control of the Nation's natural resources—land, oil, gas, forests, minerals, and waterpower while the Nation is distracted over communism, hydrogen bombs, and the threat of another war.

Ever since progressives of all parties and no party under the leadership of Republican President Theodore Roosevelt put conservation on the map, the role of the Federal Government in river development and protecting basic resources from waste and monopolization by private interests has been considered sound Americanism by all save the exploiters.

But today the said powers that be are attempting to stand our people on their intellectual heads and convince them they would lose their freedom if such policy continues. They contend that Government must take a back seat and principal control be exercised hereafter by the States, local government, and private enterprise in a happy partnership. This would end Washington dictatorship, reduce the national debt and save the taxpayers millions of dollars. This is trumpeted in the face of the historic fact that but for the activities of Uncle Sam there would have been no conservation worth mentioning since it is easier for big business to control State and local politics and administration.

The most outstanding example of conservation principles at work is the Tennessee Valley Authority. We are informed that this is an alien thing, socialism or communism, according to the speaker or writer. It must be checked and its only big profitmaking function, electric power, be limited and ultimately sold to the power trust. We may expect expert reports to sustain this propaganda from the task forces of ex-President Hoover, Chairman of the Commission to Reorganize the Executive Branch. Let the public pay for the nonprofitable functions of the enterprise, however.

Now there are four methods to hamstring and destroy an institution to which reactionaries are opposed, and they are all in active operation at the present time: Fool the people by false propaganda; cut appropriations and starve it out; limit its functions; and appoint managers who will betray its purposes.

The amazing thing is that so many Americans condone these tactics and take seriously the charges against TVA. But not so the people whom it serves. They have organized the Citizens for TVA with headquarters at the Hermitage Hotel in Nashville to defend TVA against hostile action by the administration and tell the people of other States the truth about it.

Thus far TVA has kept out of politics and has efficient management. The term of the present Chairman of the Board, Gordon R. Clapp, expires in May. The people trust him and for obvious reasons have presented President Eisenhower with a petition signed by 60,000 citizens urging his reappointment.

They know their man. Taking his M. A. degree in public administration at the University of Chicago in 1933, when TVA started, he was at once employed as assistant personnel director, then director, then general manager, and in 1948 was appointed Chairman of the Board. As required by the act, he took an oath that he believed in the "wisdom and feasibility" of the project and has kept the faith.

All this is why, I assume, when the authorities at the University of Chicago wanted a lecturer to sum up for them the history and significance of TVA in this crisis, they extended an invitation to their alumnus which he accepted, giving six lectures during February.

These addresses are live stuff. The description of how men and management rebuilt a river—20 dams in 20 years—is instructive as to the efficiency of public enterprise.

A bewildering array of facts dissipates the myths befuddling so many people outside the valley that the TVA is a dictatorship, that it is subsidized by the Nation's taxpayers, that it inhibits private enterprise, and so on. But we must pass over the answers to these absurd canards and come at once to Mr. Clapp's conclusions as to the bearing of the Tennessee experiment on national power policy. He holds that TVA is a national—not merely regional—asset that has proved its worth.

He begins by putting on the line the basic principle that an ample supply of electric energy at the lowest obtainable cost is necessary for normal economic progress. But the building of plants to furnish this abundance at low rates must come first and stimulate growth. TVA has demonstrated this is sound financial policy in the public welfare. It is paying its way.

On the other hand, the policy of the power companies to charge high rates which result in low consumption while the industry waits for a profitable market before building new facilities, has always resulted in too little electricity. Also that there is no better prospect for the future from private enterprise. Says he: "America needs more power than the power industry is prepared to supply."

He warns that the new plant capacity which the Government has induced the industry to construct for defense purposes is no answer. Peacetime consumption increase is so rapid and great that these new plants will soon be in full use. There are shortages in many areas right now. If war hits, then what?

This raises the question whether it is fair to ask private industry to keep in advance of domestic needs and, in addition, to invest millions in surplus plants for war necessities which may or may not occur.

"No," says Chairman Clapp, "that would not be fair, but this interest-free loan feature of rapid tax-amortization method is costing too many millions and the companies will own the plants in the end."

As alternatives, he suggests that the Government might establish "guaranties against losses from surpluses which actually occur"; or it might "subscribe capital to the utilities in the form of second-preference stock without voting rights. This preference stock would have a fixed yield lower than required for private investment but high enough to cover the cost of money to the Government and a reserve for possible losses." Such capital subscriptions need cost the taxpayer very little, if anything at all. That would be based on actual and not forecast surplus.

Finally, he insists that the paramount issue is an abundant supply which transcends the controversy over private versus public generation. But we shall need tremendous amounts of power. Hence, expansion of Government plants should proceed with all possible speed. This is no time to depend primarily upon private industry fulfilling its obligations.

The benefits of TVA resulting from the above policies are enjoyed by all citizens, but there are other policies of a special interest to my readers which aroused the hostility of big business from the start—its handling of the labor problem.

In the first place, the Board decided to organize a work force of its own and not farm out the various construction jobs to private contractors. It had 20 dams to build with around 10,000 employees on the payroll; it wanted unity, efficiency, and peace. That decision not only forestalled an enormous amount of lost time but saved the Government many millions.

Next came the recognition of labor unions, a prime heresy in those days when it was maintained in high places that the Government had no legal nor moral right to depart from the open shop. But under the leadership of David E. Lilienthal, a board member with a heart as well as a brain, and Marion H. Hedges, then editor and research director of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, a brand new labor policy was evolved with vision, in cooperation with the national and local officials of the 15 AFL unions whose crafts were concerned.

The Tennessee Valley Trades and Labor Council was organized by these unions to deal with TVA management. The methods devised have worked so successfully that there has been no strike or labor disturbance worth mentioning during these 20 years and that is why both as citizens and craftsmen union labor is loyal to TVA and fears a change of management. Finally, it is evident that TVA has been practicing cooperation and partnership with State and local government and private enterprise proposed by the present administration as a new policy. There is one exception—at TVA private power companies cannot horn in on the power and keep rates up. There's the rub.

Mr. Nixon and Indochina

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1954

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, recently the President said that John Foster Dulles is the greatest Secretary of State in modern times. I think the same regard is deserved by our general conduct of international affairs.

This undoubtedly is due, not only to the ability of the Secretary and his chosen aides, but also to the working-team relationship created by President Eisenhower with his State Department, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and others whose duties directly or indirectly carry responsibilities affecting our relationships with other nations. No small credit for this happy state of affairs is due to Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON's able assistance, both publicly and behind the scenes—an assistance he is capable of giving because of the tremendous prestige he has earned at home and abroad.

Mr. NIXON was able on a recent occasion, both for our own people and for the world, to clear the doubts and uncertainties that existed with respect to the seriousness of the United States' defense interests in the Far East.

Critics of our international policies often forget three fundamental conditions under which they are evolved and implemented: First, the real threat to the peace of the world is international Communist aggression; second, the United States must conduct its international affairs with due respect both for the concurrence of (a) other nations of the free world and (b) public opinion at home; and, third, Communists can and do direct their international campaign of aggression absolutely without regard for the concurrence either of their satellites or public opinion behind the Iron Curtain, for both are in the dictatorial control of the Kremlin.

Under these conditions it is occasionally necessary for us to make clearly known, both at home and abroad, where in the world our basic interests lie, and why. The official who effects this responsibility is often rewarded by criticism for his statements rather than by praise for a courageous discharge of his duties in making them.

The following editorial, which appeared in the April 20 issue of the Christian Science Monitor discussing Mr. Nixon's remarks not only defines the Indochina problem but illustrates his courageous handling of the duties of the newly vitalized office of Vice President of the United States of America:

Troops to Asia If—

Vice President Nixon has roused a storm by his statement that the United States may have to send troops to Indochina. But his words—perhaps no more than a trial balloon—seem to be riding the storm successfully, tethered to political reality as they are by an important if.

If France stopped fighting in Indochina and if the situation demanded it, Mr. Nixon avers, the United States would send troops to prevent the Communist conquest of Indochina.

France could not, even if it wanted to, stop fighting overnight and simply walk out of Indochina. Long and difficult negotiations with the Reds, a gradual transfer of effective power to the Associated States, a gradual withdrawal of French forces, a gradual increase in American technical personnel and the training of Vietnamese troops to take over from the French—something like this is more likely than a sudden collapse demanding the immediate dispatch of American troops to the Indochinese paddies and jungles.

It is doubtful that any number of American troops could bring a quick, decisive victory in that area. For almost inevitably Chinese Communist troops would then be thrown into the war, as they were thrown into Korea when General MacArthur pressed toward the Yalu border. Either large-scale war with China would then have to be faced or the probability of military stalemate in a limited struggle would have to be accepted, as in Korea.

Even more important, the real struggle would still be then, as it is now, a political one—namely, the winning of Vietnamese support for an independent government that would seem to them worth fighting for with might and main. Even the withdrawal of the French would not achieve this result if the Vietnamese were convinced they were merely receiving a new American master for an old French one.

Yet, despite all this, it is healthy for Washington to make it clear that if necessary American troops will be sent to Indochina. The very willingness to take the extremest measures that may be called for and to accept whatever sacrifices may be necessary can help to prevent the crisis from arising that would demand these measures and sacrifices.

One of the persistent criticisms of American policy is that it expects to win a painless victory with other people's troops, to use "Asians against Asians" for its own purposes. In the light of Korea, this may seem a very unjust charge, but in the light of the Korean truce it seems to many people that the United States cannot expect French-Vietnamese forces to continue fighting indefinitely, backed only by American dollars.

Thus a willingness to face the necessity of sending troops under certain conditions not only serves as a warning to Peiping and Moscow. It enables the United States to speak with greater moral authority in efforts to stiffen the French will to fight. It may also help the French accept the inevitability of granting genuine independence to the Indochinese states.

Action of Corps of Engineers in Construction Contracts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 12, 1954

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday I directed attention of the House to the high-handed action of the Corps of Engineers in awarding a construction contract to a Panamanian firm over a low-bidding American firm in defiance of the House Armed Services Investigating Committee.

The shocking audacity of the Corps of Engineers becomes more flagrantly apparent as the story unfolds.

I understand that the action of the Corps of Engineers in taking action while a subject matter is pending before a congressional committee is without precedent.

It would occur to me that the Corps of Engineers, feeling a great security in the repeated favorable action of the Congress in past years has become "too big for its britches."

The Corps of Engineers, feeding upon this rare meat of self-confidence and self-importance, has now arrived at that period when it flaunts a congressional committee, thumbs its nose at Congress, and does as it pleases.

To better understand how the Corps of Engineers defied a congressional committee to accomplish what it had originally set out to do, i. e., give a contract to a foreign high bidder at the expense of an American low bidder, is best reflected in a recitation of what took place.

Being informed of the irregular action of the Corps of Engineers in originally reversing itself, the House Armed Services Subcommittee called for a public hearing.

It developed during the hearing that the Corps of Engineers, unknown to the low bidder, the United Enterprises of New Orleans, La., had had a charge of suspicion of fraud placed against them. According to the testimony of the engineers, that, in effect, blacklisted this firm without a trial.

Testimony showed that if there was any suspicion of fraud it should have been directed against Framorco also.

The committee has not released its report. It has not issued any finding of fact.

With full knowledge that the committee had not issued any conclusion on the subject matter, but fully aware that the matter was pending in the committee, the Corps of Engineers proceeded to invite a decision from the Office of the Comptroller General, which is an agent of the Congress.

The Corps of Engineers then presented a series of false conclusions of alleged fact and assumptions not based on the testimony presented to the committee during the public hearing. In other words the Corps of Engineers presented to the Comptroller General a doctored statement of facts and asked a decision be reached on the conclusions set forth in the latter presented by themselves in their own behalf. The letter of request was a purely self-serving device resorted to by the Corps of Engineers to get the decision which they wanted and in defiance of the committee.

The Comptroller General, without hearing from the subcommittee as to what witnesses told the truth to them, proceeded to take the distorted representations of this testimony contained in the letter of the Corps of Engineers, and proceeded to agree with the corps' long calculated and studied purpose to award this contract to a firm which had the most influence.

Relying on a decision of an agent of the Congress, and not the Congress itself, which had not passed on the facts, the Corps of Engineers, through the Office of the Under Secretary of the Army Slezak, awarded this contract to the high bidder.

In effect the Corps of Engineers has placed itself in the position of a private getting the opinion of a lieutenant on a subject matter which the general had under consideration and then acting on the lieutenant's opinion. It was as raw as that.

It would be well for the Congress to look with caution at all transactions in which the Corps of Engineers is involved in the future if this audacious action is to be an example of what to expect.

Let's Build a Better America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1954

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, as we move through one crisis to another it sometimes seems that our time of troubles is endless. Yet history records many such periods. Studying them, one is encouraged to feel that by calm, dispassionate, intelligent action, we too can win through to a better day. Certainly we know we must preserve for our children the freedom and liberty which was won and preserved for us by former generations of Americans.

The Challenge of Tyranny

The existence and awesome threat of tyranny is not new. It has long been a challenge to free men. Whether it be dictatorship of the right or the left; divine right of kings; nazism; communism; or by whatever other name, it is the same old tyranny ever challenging the will of men to achieve and protect freedom, and to direct their own destiny.

FREEDOM THROUGH STRENGTH

History teaches that only the strong and the brave can remain free. The aggressor who would destroy liberty is tempted by weakness but deterred by strength. A strong America, brave, prepared, and confident, is far less likely to have to fight an aggressor than an America weak and divided. Better then that we err, if we must, on the side of too much strength rather than too little. I, for one, Mr. Speaker, see nothing on the horizon to justify any weakening of American defenses. Last year some of us fought the unwise cuts in our Air Force. These have now been restored but 2 years time were irretrievably lost in the cut-and-restore process. This mistake must not be repeated. The stakes are too high. We must strive to avoid the barbarous carnage of war. This means we must not only build strength, we must maintain it until the threat has vanished.

INTERNAL STRENGTH

Of course, we all know that strength is more than planes, atom bombs, guns, and military forces. Strength is also people with a reverence for justice; a respect for each other; and a tolerant attitude toward honest differences of opinion. These attributes come easily to Americans but, nevertheless, they need to be constantly cultivated and encouraged. Conversely, demagogs who would divide must ever be discouraged. Truth is the most reliable shield of democracy.

AID TO OUR FRIENDS

The air age has reduced the relative size of our spinning globe. It has brought us close to once distant lands and peoples. We have now learned from experience that we have a stake in their freedom as well as our own. No people in all history have ever given to others so unselfishly as have Americans. Unselfishness and economic development have combined to make possible this vast material help to others. Our economic progress should not be neglected. Certainly it has not been completed. We are a comparatively new Nation—still less than 200 years old. We have come far. There can be even brighter horizons in the future. Of course, helping our friends has also caused them to help us. Our vital protective airbases close to Russia are on the soil of our friends. Without them our chance to avoid war would be lessened.

FALSE PROPHETS

Of late, we have witnessed defeatist governmental action based upon a false assumption that we are tired and old; that we must pull in our horns and stop expanding. So we had hard money, and sudden sharp curtailment and cutbacks, which so slowed our economy that we have not yet recovered from the shock. These erroneous policies have needlessly brought upon us the specter of millions of workers unemployed. Farmers are now threatened with a downward flexing of their already reduced income. This is not the road Americans intended to take. It is a road from which we must soon depart.

EXPANSION OPPORTUNITIES

Wherever we look, opportunity challenges our imagination. We need only the confidence and courage to move boldly ahead—modern pioneers of a better, finer America. We truly have nothing to fear but fear itself. True taxes are a staggering burden but they are high mainly because of defense costs. In reducing taxes we should give relief first to those who need it the most. The personal exemption for income-tax purposes should be increased to a more realistic level. No person can today subsist on $600 per year.

MUCH NEEDS TO BE DONE

Education is the very foundation of democracy. Yet years of enforced neglect have left us critically short of schools. Why not build them now while we need employment for millions of workers?

Our roads are literally falling apart. The traffic they carry is rapidly increasing. We need a real highway construction program with wide freeways crisscrossing the entire Nation.

We need hospitals. Our crowded cities need hospitals. Rural areas need hospitals. In some areas the shortage is very critical. And incidentally we all need to agree on a sound plan to bring adequate medical care within the financial reach of all our people.

Many of our people need improved diets. Here is the place to look for a sound answer to so-called farm surpluses. If we bring consumption into balance with production, there will be no surpluses. We need not start at the wrong end and try to solve the problem by bankrupting American farmers.

Old age is still a hazard to too many of our people. Why should this be so in our abundant land? But, we are asked, can we afford a real program of old-age security which will protect all of us in our later years? Of course, we can and we should. We will all benefit.

Last, but not least, we need to more fully develop and preserve our natural resources. As an example, far too much valuable water regularly wastes into the sea. Again we are asked, Can we afford to conserve it? The truth of the matter is we cannot afford to go on wasting it.

Our great national parks are beginning to show the signs of long neglect. There are power dams to be built and floods to be brought under control. These things add to our wealth and well-being. They add to our strength.

PROMISES VERSUS PERFORMANCE

Yes, Mr. Speaker, all around us are challenge and opportunity. Yet the present administration seems hesitant and uncertain. It appears to be divided between those who write the speeches and those who write the program. The promises are plentiful but the performance is not up to par.

Sometimes one is almost forced to conclude that the smug, cynical critics of what they call do-goodism are stalling us on dead center by their do-nothingism. But doing good offers us a key to progress. Moreover, it fits in with our deep religious beliefs. God gave us the intelligence to visualize progress and the will to achieve it. Fortunately, as we strive for the common good, we not only help ourselves, but we also build a better Nation to pass on to our children. Frankly, I hope the time will never come when a majority of Americans frown on doing good. It is much better that we continue to teach our children to know the deep satisfaction, the spiritual inspiration that comes from devoting oneself to the selfless service of others. Yes, Mr. Speaker, let us teach America's children to be strong and confident, to trust each other, to have faith in the right, and to know that our great Nation, with its free institutions, is a priceless heritage they too will one day hold in sacred trust for Americans yet unborn. Let us forever resolutely rekindle and keep alive that American pioneering spirit which charted our great Nation's pathway of progress.

The Eisen-Hoover Power Policy: It Can Mean Dim-Out

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 12, 1954

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include herewith an article from the current issue of the National Union Farmer:

THE EISEN-HOOVER POWER POLICY: IT CAN MEAN DIM-OUT

It is now generally agreed, both by friends and foes of public and cooperative electric power projects, that the Eisenhower administration is soldily backing the private electric utility lobby's policies on power legislation.

Developments in Congress, in the Federal agencies, and in the utility industry all point in this direction. Policies directly corresponding to those favored by the electric utility lobby are being followed aggressively and with a fine degree of coordination on all three fronts.

There is now enough evidence, in the form of specific acts by the administration, to paint a clear picture of what its aims are. The deeds that are on the record add up, point by point, to a plan spelled out in detail a year ago by ex-President Herbert Hoover for getting the Federal Government out of the business of generating and distributing power as soon as possible.

This plan became widely known as the Hoover plan, and it was warmly received by the private power lobby. The administration's adoption of Mr. Hoover's plan has been so clear-cut that it is fair, as some of its critics have done, to relabel it "the Eisen-Hoover plan."

Both as President, and before that as Secretary of Commerce in the Harding and Coolidge administrations, Mr. Hoover frankly and forthrightly favored the private utilities and fought such public power leaders within his own party as Senator Norris, of Nebraska; Borah, of Idaho; La Follette, of Wisconsin; and McNary, of Oregon.

Many of President Eisenhower's original supporters, who believed he would favor the pro-public-power wing of the GOP that produced those outstanding Senators, are now dismayed to discover that his administration has taken the side of the proutility forces instead. Outstanding among them, of course, is Senator Morse, of Oregon, who was one of General Eisenhower's first supporters before the nominating convention. Senator Morse turned against the general during the campaign and finally resigned from the Republican Party largely as a result of Eisenhower's espousal of the utility lobby's policies.

The three main steps in the "Eisen-Hoover plan," as spelled out by the ex-President, are quoted below directly from Mr. Hoover's speech, together with an account of the administration's progress so far in carrying them out:

"1. The Congress shall cease to make appropriations for steam and hydroelectric plants solely for power * * *," Mr. Hoover recommended.

The administration has announced it will make no appropriations for steam powerplants, even when (1) existing public power systems need them in order to keep up to their growing needs, and (2) when a steam plant to firm up the production of a hydro project would enable the Government to realize increased revenue from its whole investment.

In fact, the administration has not started any new power projects of any kind whatsoever since it took office.

"2. The Congress shall follow the precedent of the Colorado project (Hoover Dam) and make no appropriations for new multiple-purpose projects unless the electric power is first leased * * *," stated Mr. Hoover.

Budget Bureau Director Dodge, who works directly under President Eisenhower in the White House, recently told a congressional group that no more dams will be built by the Government unless arrangements are made in advance for local interests—generally private power companies—to install and operate the power generating facilities.

"3. The Congress should jointly with the President, set up a temporary commission on the reorganization of this whole Federal venture (in electric power) with resources to employ technical assistance * * *," Mr. Hoover said.

Shortly after Mr. Hoover's speech was made, President Eisenhower announced that the ex-President was to be the head of just such a temporary commission as Hoover had called for. Mr. Hoover promptly picked a staff (called Task Force) of specialists in utility financing, engineering, and accounting, not a single one of whom is favorable to public or cooperative power, to help him carry out the Commission's assignments.

Mr. Hoover suggested a set-by-step list of assignments for the Commission. It is now being carried out, just as Mr. Hoover suggested. The steps set forth by Mr. Hoover, and the Government's progress so far in carrying them out, follow:

1. Reallocate the costs of existing projects to be charged to power generation.

This has already been done for some projects, and is underway with the rest. The effects is to increase the rates which must be paid for electricity from Federal powerplants, by loading additional costs previously charged to navigation, flood control, and other benefits, upon the power component. This helps to break down the competitive yardstick effect upon power rates that has been one of the greatest benefits from the Federal power program.

Assistant Secretary of Interior Aandahl "let the cat out of the bag" perhaps more frankly than he intended some time ago when he told a Fargo, N. Dak., audience that rates for Federal power will be increased under the Eisenhower administration so that the possibility of savings would no longer be an inducement to municipalities and rural districts to form public or cooperative systems.

2. Set up a new system of bookkeeping and revise power rates at the Federal projects.

This is presumably being prepared now, both within the Hoover Commission and in the Federal power agencies.

3. Formulate standard plans and procedures for leasing or otherwise turning over Federal electric projects to private utilities.

4. Formulate standard plans and procedure whereby "non-Federal agencies" could, in the future, own or lease the electric-power facilities at multipurpose dams.

The last two points above are now, presumably, under study by the Commission, and have been announced as administrative policy by the Budget Director, as reported above. But in the meantime, the administration is aggressively pursuing an "intermediate" stage leading up to the "giveaway" step proposed by Mr. Hoover. It is:

To break down and eventually eliminate the "preference to the public law," so that private utilities will be able to obtain monopoly control over electricity generated at publicly owned dams.

Notable examples of this intermediate step are:

In Georgia: The Interior Department has offered Georgia Power Co. all the electricity from the Clark's Hill Dam allocated for sale within the State, despite the fact that the REA co-ops are legally entitled to first chance to buy it, are able and willing to buy it, and need it. (The cooperatives have promised to go to court if necessary in defense of their rights under the law.)

In the Southwest: The Interior Department is refusing to abide by contracts between REA co-ops and the Southwestern Power Administration (a part of the Interior Department in spite of a court order that it be done). Judge Curran of the United States District Court ruled that Secretary McKay's refusal to honor the contracts "is illegal, in violation of law, and beyond the scope" of his authority.

The Interior Department apparently intends to appeal the case, thus stalling moves to enforce the court order. In the meantime, Interior and REA officials are high-pressuring the co-op and others in the area that have similar problems in an effort to force them into the arms of the power companies in the area. The administration's strategy, apparently, is to get the co-ops tied down with long-range contracts with the utilities, who would be given monopoly-control of the power, before the fall elections can change the proutility complexion of Congress.

In the Missouri Basin: The Interior Department announced new marketing criteria last fall which offered private companies the chance to buy power, under long-term contracts, without protecting the rights of co-ops and municipalities to buy it under terms of the preference to the public law.

The marketing provisions of this policy were canceled, however, after bitter protests from co-op leaders and Congressmen in the region, led by Senator Langer, Republican, of North Dakota, in the brilliant investigation conducted by his antimonopoly subcommittee.

Government transmission lines: The administration has followed a rigorous policy of stopping the development of publicly owned transmission systems, with the apparent object of letting private utilities achieve a transmission line monopoly bottleneck wherever and whenever it is practical from their standpoint to do so. No new transmission-line programs have been undertaken by the administration.

"Bus bar" power sale policy: The administration is arranging to sell the electricity from the Falcon Dam, on the Rio Grande River, at the damsite to the Central Power & Light Co. with no provisions for transmission lines to make it possible for nonprofit systems to buy it. The administration likewise is refusing to protect the legal preference rights of nonprofit systems in the sale of power from Niagara Falls and the St. Lawrence power development. This precedent will also be applied in all likelihood to the Passamaquoddy tide-harnessing project in Maine, and Libby Dam on the Montana-Canadian border, which are similarly to be located in boundary waters.

Closely allied with these negative aspects of the administration's policy is its positive aid and encouragement to the utility companies. This takes the form of withdrawing governmental intervention in the public interest in the development of new projects, and a wide variety of subsidies to the power companies.

Hells Canyon is the notable example of retreat by the Government in favor of a power company. The administration has announced that the policy followed at Hells Canyon, of permitting the private company to take over part of a river-development project even though it will result in far smaller benefits and much higher-cost power, will be followed everywhere.

Announcement of this policy has been followed with a wave of power company claims on other power sites. The administration indicates that it will let the power companies take over the full value of Government-financed surveys and preliminary planning without contesting their applications to the Federal Power Commission.

In the meantime, the power companies are continuing to demand huge tax subsidies for the new projects. The total value of these subsidies over the next 25 years now approaches $3 billion—and the Federal Power Commission ruled recently that the full value can be retained by the companies without passing on any benefits to their customers.

The cost to the public of the "Eisen-Hoover power plan" in the form of higher rates for electricity is fairly well understood by the present customers of nonprofit power systems which have benefited directly from public power. It has been described by Clyde Ellis, head of the REA co-ops national organization, as "the reverse yardstick." Instead of acting to force power rates downward through federally sponsored "yardstick" projects, the Government is now openly seeking to raise public and co-op power rates upward so as to free the utilities from competitive pressure. The increased share of the power industry under private utility control will, of course, result directly in higher rates than if more projects were developed publicly.

But the same kind of unbusinesslike imprudence that is being applied to the interests of consumers of electricity is being followed by the administration in respect to its own purchases of electricity.

In order to favor the private power companies, the administration is sacrificing millions of dollars per year of taxpayers' money in its purchases of power, particularly for the Atomic Energy Commission's requirements.

Although the Tennessee Valley Authority is supplying much of the electricity used by the AEC at lower rates, the Government invited two private power combines to take over a big chunk of its future needs, under a cost-plan contract whereby the Government guarantees (1) to repay the full cost of the powerplants over a period of 25 years, after which the plants will belong to the power companies instead of the taxpayers who have footed the bill; and (2) to pay rates that include a guaranteed profit to the company and are substantially higher than those charged by TVA.

This deal was initiated under the preceding administration. But although the construction record of the private companies failed to come up to original expectations and indicate higher costs to the Government than was originally expected, the administration is now proposing to do more of the same, on a bigger and better (for the utilities) scale than ever.

TVA is running short of power, because the booming industries attracted to the valley by low-cost electricity and valley farmers are swiftly increasing their demand. The administration now proposes, instead of investing more money in self-liquidating powerplants for TVA, to replace the power being purchased by AEC with higher cost energy from private utilities.

Hon. Kenneth A. Roberts, of Alabama

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT RAINS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 12, 1954

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago the State Board of Veterans' Affairs of Alabama adopted a resolution with reference to our highly esteemed colleague the Honorable KENNETH A. ROBERTS, with the request that the resolution be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Accordingly I am happy to present the resolution for the RECORD.

Congressman ROBERTS, as we all know, was wounded in the fanatical attack on Members of the House of Representatives by Puerto Rican fanatics on March 1. After a long stay in the hospital, and under the very best of medical care, Congressman ROBERTS is now convalescing at his apartment here in Washington, and is steadily improving. He hopes to be back with us in the near future.

Congressman ROBERTS has received thousands of letters, cards, and messages of good wishes and good will, and I know that he will be grateful for the resolution from the State board of veterans' affairs, on which he served for a long while, and will be grateful for the sentiments expressed therein. I can say that the Alabama State Board of Veterans' Affairs expresses the sentiments of all the people of Alabama and of the Nation.

The resolution follows:

Whereas the State board of veterans' affairs is now meeting in its first official session since the dastardly attack upon Members of the United States of Representatives by Puerto Rican fanatics; and

Whereas the only Alabamian to have been wounded in the deplorable affair was the highly esteemed Congressman from the Fourth Congressional District, the Honorable KENNETH A. ROBERTS, a veteran of World War II, who has consistently demonstrated an intense interest in the welfare of his fellow veterans and for the good of the Nation; and

Whereas the State board of veterans' affairs enjoyed the honor and distinction of having Congressman KENNETH A. ROBERTS serve competently and devotedly as one of its Members for a period of 4 years; and

Whereas it is a source of extreme regret that such an unfortunate experience should have befallen our friend and comrade, after having returned unscathed from combat service in World War II; and

Whereas the State board of veterans' affairs is also desirous of taking some official cognizance of the exemplary service rendered to the veterans of Alabama and in the National Congress by Congressman KENNETH A. ROBERTS: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the State board of veterans' affairs, in regular meeting assembled, in Montgomery, Ala., on this the 10th day of May 1954: That we do express the earnest hope for a speedy and complete recovery of our comrade and former fellow member; that we do deplore the circumstance which brought pain and suffering to our friend; and that we herein give voice to the high regard which we hold for him as a veteran and a Congressman; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to Congressman KENNETH A. ROBERTS; that it be inscribed upon the minutes of the board; and that a copy be forwarded to his colleagues in the Congress with the request that the same be published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as a public evidence of our sentiment.

WILLIAM S. PERRY,
Vice Chairman.

Attest:

LAWRENCE A. MAY,
Recorder and Secretary.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Printing and binding for Congress, when recommended to be done by the Committee on Printing of either House, shall be so recommended in a report containing an approximate estimate of the cost thereof, together with a statement from the Public Printer of estimated approximate cost of work previously ordered by Congress within the fiscal year (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 145, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on Printing, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. The money derived from such sales shall be paid into the Treasury and accounted for in his annual report to Congress, and no sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized book dealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by book dealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

DISTRIBUTION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

To the Vice President and each Senator 100 copies; to the Secretary and Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, each, 25 copies; to the Secretary, for official use, not to exceed 25 copies; to the Sergeant at Arms, for use on the floor of the Senate, not to exceed 50 copies; to each Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress, 68 copies; to the Clerk, Sergeant at Arms, and Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives, each, 25 copies; to the Clerk, for official use, not to exceed 50 copies; and to the Doorkeeper, for use on the floor of the House of Representatives, not to exceed 75 copies; to the Vice President and each Senator, Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress there shall also be furnished (and shall not be transferable), 3 copies of the daily RECORD, of which 1 shall be delivered at his residence, 1 at his office, and 1 at the Capitol.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

PRINTING DOCUMENTS AND REPORTS

Documents and reports of committees with the evidence and papers submitted therewith, or any part thereof ordered printed by Congress, may be reprinted by the Public Printer on order of any Member of Congress or Delegate, on prepayment of the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 162, p. 1940).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Frank Brodie is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

PRICE OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

The Public Printer is authorized to furnish to subscribers the daily RECORD at $1.50 per month, payable in advance.

Remit by money order payable to Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C.

R

IN

M
ma
eig
are
C
wit
nat
the
T
sci
cou
An
gro
spe
cou
V
lio
clo
err
of
Sta
A
ing
cor
Un
I
ca
vie
rel
ma

up
a
po

re
wi
wo
po
It
lig
ti
tic
al

pe
cl
ve
th
pe
er

la
si
ic

s
w
u

Appendix

Report of the Foreign Relations Commission of the American Legion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 13, 1954

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, as chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, I know that my colleagues are familiar with this fact:

One of the foremost groups concerned with United States foreign policy is the national foreign relations commission of the American Legion.

This group is particularly expert, conscientious and diligent in review of our country's problems on the world scene. And it, as much as any single private group in the United States, is entitled to special heed by the Congress and by our countrymen.

Why? Because it represents the millions of men and women who know from closest experience the meaning of modern war, the tragedy of war, the necessity of avoiding war through adequate United States defense and eternal vigilance.

At its most recent meeting in Washington, it was my privilege to address the commission on overall problems of United States foreign policy.

I was one of a series of speakers who came to share with the commission our viewpoint on challenges in international relations, such as in Indochina, Guatemala, and elsewhere.

I believe that the commission has come up, as a result of its deliberations, with a constructive, stimulating, powerful report.

Some readers will not agree with the report in all its minute detail. But there will be very few patriotic Americans who would think of disagreeing with the report's fundamentally sound viewpoint. It is a viewpoint favoring strong, enlightened American leadership, continued vigorous opposition to international communism and strengthening the alliance of free nations.

I commend this eloquent report to the people of the United States, and I include in that commendation even those very few points of controversy on a few of the side phases on which others or I personally may have a somewhat different approach from the commission.

I welcome the overall report as the latest demonstration of the commissions and the Legion's constructive service to the American people.

I wish the commission continued Godspeed in its thoughtful deliberations. I wish it continued success in pointing up to the vast and devoted membership of the legion and its auxiliary the crucial areas of American foreign policy which merit the serious attention of our citizens.

America wants peace. America wants security. America wants freedom. We have to work, to study, to prepare if we are to achieve these objectives.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the commission's report be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Report of Foreign Relations Commission

Your commission, after due study and deliberation obtained from its hearings in Washington, after a detailed review of the present American Legion policy, as adopted by the last national convention at St. Louis, Mo., August 31–September 3, 1953, and after close examination of the present world situation, in relation to the national interests of the United States, presents and recommends the adoption of the following report:

1. Preamble: World tensions continue to mount, peaceful economic and social advance is frustrated, fear continues to dominate the minds of men—all because Soviet Russia is continuing to succeed in its global aims of world conquest through world communism. The cancer of communism is spreading. Our foreign policy must, therefore, be aimed directly at rallying the forces of freedom to stop this advance, and then to kill this cancer that feeds on fear, subversion, and aggression.

Our foreign policy, on the whole, has been revitalized in two significant ways in the past year. First, the United States and its free world allies have taken the initiative from Soviet Russia. For the first time since World War II the Kremlin is no longer surprising the world with dramatic moves. Instead, the free world is now forcing the Soviets to explain and defend and prepare.

Secondly, the United States has ended the policy of bankrupting ourselves by attempting to stop, with ground forces, aggression by Russia at any spot on her 20,000 miles perimeter. The United States now has established a dynamic new foreign policy which has put hope again into the hearts of all people, now downtrodden or threatened by the boot of communism.

The American Legion approves wholeheartedly the policy of (1) stopping the advance of communism through a system of collective security; (2) retaliation by such collective-security forces with weapons of our choice, if further aggression does occur. Such retaliation might be aimed at the heart of the enemy who has created such aggression.

It is our belief that our Government's announced and now established policy can and will end the threat of further aggression. It will destroy the temptation on anyone's part to set off world war III.

The risks we take in such a policy of immediate and effective retaliation are far less, in our opinion, than those that will face us a few years from now, if we dare not be resolute at this moment.

2. Russia: The Soviet Union has developed a malignant mania for world control that dwarfs the imperialist ambitions of Czarist Russia. From their headquarters in Moscow the leaders of international communism fanatically plan, foster, and support subversion, sabotage, and military action within the free world. The fundamental policy of the Kremlin did not change on the death of Josef Stalin and its godless program of world revolution and conquest is being vigorously carried out by its present rulers. We must meet the challenge of the Communist conspiracy with limitless courage and traditional fearlessness.

3. Western Europe: As the first national organization to recommend and support a unified effort among the free peoples of Western Europe to oppose the further spread of communism which resulted in the NATO, we again reaffirm our confidence in the effectiveness of this plan.

We earnestly hope that the plans for an effective European Defense Organization will be more vigorously and substantially supported by all of the free nations of Western Europe.

4. Near East, southeast Asia, and Africa: This area is another very critical and strategic spot on the world picture.

It is hoped that the Arab States and Israeli may at an early date be able to resolve their differences by peaceful means.

We heartily approve the aid recently granted to Pakistan by our Government. And we hope that the government of India will also come to a better understanding of the unselfishness of our efforts in opposing communism in southeast Asia.

5. Far East: We are gratified to note the increased attention being given the Far East by our military and diplomatic leaders. It is the area where world communism is on the march. It is the area which, on Russia's program, that must be subverted first, so that eventually Western Europe might be squeezed into submission. Then destruction of the United States, the true goal of world communism, might be accomplished.

Our Government is meeting the threat in the Far East. Even more, however, can and must be done.

The shooting war in Korea has been ended. The Republic of Korea is being rehabilitated economically, militarily, and spiritually. We must continue to insist that the provisions of the armistice be carried out so that there will be eventual unification of Korea through democratic and free procedures.

The rehabilitation of Japan continues. As we withdraw our forces and economic support we must remember that Japan must not become dependent upon trade with Red China, nor should Japan's independence be endangered by aggression or subversion by the Communists. Japan is a potential member of the collective security forces of this area.

We continue to urge support of Nationalist China. We must continue to recognize her representatives as the only and true representative of China. We must continue our economic and military support of our Chinese friends and allies on Formosa.

Red China cannot and must not be recognized. Further, we should ban all trade of any kind with Red China, by the United States, and we urge the same policy by our allies. To starve Red China and to shrivel her economy will drive the Chinese within Red China to arise and overthrow their Communist oppressors.

The situation in Indochina is serious and most explosive. The aggressive attitude of Red China, in its increased support of the

Viet Minh, should not and cannot be tolerated by the free nations of the world who are determined to stop any further advance of world communism.

We approve the program of military and economic support to Vietnam and other nations of this area.

We urge France to offer full independence to Vietnam so that the people of Vietnam will make even greater efforts to throw out the forces of communism.

We believe that Indochina must be the test as to whether or not the free world will stop the march of communism in the Far East. Therefore, we ask that our Government implement its stated policy by:

(1) Developing a collective security force composed of the nations of this area who see the true threat of further Communist aggression. Such a force has long been recommended by the American Legion, and was in fact first proposed by the Legion at convention in Philadelphia in 1949. Such a force would be a regional pact under article 51 of the United Nations Charter and its purpose would be to guarantee the mutual defense of its members.

(2) A statement by such collective security force that further Communist aggression in Indochina, and in particular in Vietnam, will not be tolerated, and if it should occur, the might of the member nations would be loosed against those forces and facilities that were creating and supporting such aggression.

6. Latin America: Any doubt of Communist infiltration of Latin America is now completely dispelled by the behavior of the representatives of Guatemala at the recent Inter-American Conference in Caracas, Venezuela. Communism has definitely established in Guatemala a beachhead on the American Continent, and if allowed to exist could spread to other Latin American countries, some of which are even now teetering on the brink of communistic control.

The political and economic importance of Latin America must no longer be ignored and in no way must the political solidarity of this area be allowed to disintegrate through communistic intervention.

We regret the apparent neglect of the Latin-American situation on the part of our Government and we strongly recommend that immediately all available means, economic and otherwise, be taken to destroy this threat to the security of, not only this country, but that of other nations of the Western Hemisphere. We especially urge our Government to encourage a consolidated effort on the part of all American nations to accomplish this purpose.

Further, within the American Legion we advocate the activation of a program to utilize the service of our 10,000 members in Latin America in the promotion of inter-American friendships.

7. United Nations: The United Nations, endeavoring to operate its program and exercise the jurisdiction of its charter, remains hampered and retarded in its efforts in the face of mounting world tension.

It is evident there is no intention on the part of Soviet Russia to join in any collective atcion for the elimination of world tension and the peaceful settlement of world problems. This fact is substantiated by Russia's indiscriminate use of the veto.

The fact remains the U. N. has been successful in many negotiations. The value of the U. N. as a world forum, giving opportunities for discussion and statements of policy of its members, is inestimable.

The U. N., as an association of sovereign nations, by its nature and the implications of its Charter, represents the hope of the free world that it will, in due time, be the instrument for the creation and preservation of world peace.

We urge a continuing support of its efforts.

8. United Nations Charter Revision: A special subcommittee of the Foreign Relations Commission has been making a strenuous and detailed study of what might be involved in possible changes in the U. N. Charter during the Charter review provided for by the Charter in 1955.

To date there has been no available data indicating the interest of foreign governments on any probable changes. Our own Government has just recently begun its studies and hearings on the subject and very few indications appear, as of this date, to signify the Government's intentions. We urge a continuing study of this subject, for the purpose of keeping the American Legion abreast of all proposed changes, by whatever government, so that we may keep our policy on a current basis.

The fact that no action can take place before 1955, and the further fact that the deliberations by the member nations involved, in a review or attempted revision, will be a procedure of long duration, affords ample time and opportunity to allow for further study. We urge the American Legion to continue its policy of opposition to any type of world government and consequently oppose any proposal that may be directed to this effort.

Once again we restate the Legion plan to strengthen the U. N. by limitations of the use of the veto in matters of aggression, international control of scientific weapons, and the establishment of an effective U. N. armed force.

We favor a change in the U. N. Charter that will restrict the U. N. to its basic purpose for which it was founded—to maintain peace throughout the world.

9. Treaties, pacts, agreements, etc.: The American Legion, at its last two national conventions, called for a proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States limiting the treatymaking powers, executive agreements, etc.

To clarify the Legion's current position we propose the submission by the Congress of the United States of a constitutional amendment, at the earliest opportunity, providing (1) no provision of a treaty or other international compact or agreement which conflicts with the Constitution of the United States shall have any force or effect; (2) no international compact or agreement which has not been concurred in by the Senate, as provided in article II of the Constitution, shall be, or have the dignity or legal effect of, a treaty under article VI of the Constitution; (3) no treaty or other international compact or agreement shall be effective as internal law within the United States except to the extent it may be made so by an act of Congress enacted to enforce or implement the same; (4) no treaty shall be concurred in by the Senate except by the affirmative vote of two-thirds of a quorum of the Senate, on which the yeas and nays shall be entered on the Journal; and (5) the Constitution shall not be in any way or to any extent altered or amended except by one of the methods provided in article V thereof.

The need for such an amendment demands our vigorous support.

10. Psychological warfare: The American Legion recommendation for the separation of the United States Information Agency from the Department of State has been consummated. The Agency is now operating independently, giving service to many branches of our government, broadcasting to the peoples of the world and particularly those in captive states and in Russia itself, the true message of freedom and democracy.

We consider this program a most effective instrument in the psychological warfare effort.

11. International Educational Exchange Service: We approve the program of this new agency operating under the guidance of our State Department.

In 1953, approximately 7,000 people participated in the program. Five thousand exchangees have come to the United States of America from foreign countries and 2,000 citizens of our country have gone abroad.

Those coming to the United States are classified as students, teachers, and technicians. Our citizens going to other countries may be classified as specialists and those in the academic field.

Seventy different countries have participated. Candidates are carefully screened as security risks before approval.

Exchangees often are or may become prominent in government, business, and the professions and their potential impact on attitudes toward this country is considerable.

The program enjoys a high prestige both at home and abroad and is, therefore, able to attract the voluntary participation of leading citizens.

It is partially supported by contributions from private donors.

12. Prisoners of war: Under the terms of the truce in Korea all American prisoners of war should have been either surrendered or accounted for—months ago.

Yet, evidence from United States Intelligence sources indicates that between 1,500 and 3,000 Americans who served our country and the United Nations cause against Communist aggression in that area have not been released by the Communist North Korean forces, but are still held as prisoners.

This is shocking to the American Legion and the American people because intelligence reports to a United States Senate subcommittee indicate that the survivors of these American prisoners are being subjected by the Communists to sadistic, brutal, and inhuman brainwashing treatment—contrary to all rules of the Geneva Convention of civilized warfare.

We, therefore, urge our Government to immediately: (1) Create a special commission to investigate and report on the status of our missing American servicemen; and (2) take all steps necessary to accomplish the release of all American prisoners of war.

CONCLUSION

In making pronouncements on the subject of foreign policy, the American Legion is deeply conscious of the seriousness of the subject matter and the responsibility which it has to arrive at capable, yet determined, judgments. These decisions must reflect the opinion and beliefs of Legionnaires at the post level. For that reason every effort must be made to obtain the benefit of the individual thinking of all the members of the American Legion.

And, furthermore, once a policy has been decided upon, every effort must be made to disseminate that policy not only to the individual Legionnaires but to the nonveteran public on as broad a scale as possible. Then, and only then, will the American Legion ever succeed in fully discharging its obligations and responsibilities in this most crucial field of leadership.

One of the purposes of your commission is to furnish department commanders and department foreign relations committee chairmen with pertinent information and reports of the commission as background material for publications and press releases, to be used by departments, and to be passed on to the posts of each department. We urge all departments to disseminate the foreign-policy program of the American Legion on as broad a scale as possible.

Your commission has called upon high ranking and informed American and foreign leaders to provide it with the information necessary to keep itself and the Legion fully informed on matters of national interest and national security. We will welcome the opportunity to provide information or counsel to any department official requesting further information on American Legion foreign policy.

Respectfully submitted.

Rogers Kelley,
Texas, Chairman, National Foreign Relations Commission.
Charles A. Gonser,
Washington, Vice Chairman, National Foreign Relations Commission; Secretary, Washington, D. C., Meeting.

Address by Hon. Thomas C. Hennings, of Missouri, to Members of Alpha Chi Chapter of Delta Kappa Epsilon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STUART SYMINGTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 13, 1954

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record the magnificent address delivered by my friend and colleague, the distinguished senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. Hennings] at the meeting of the Alpha Chi Chapter of Delta Kappa Epsilon at Trinity College on May 8.

It is with special pleasure that I make this request because I also have the honor of being a member of this great fraternity.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Mr. Toastmaster, distinguished guests, and members of Alpha Chi Chapter of Delta Kappa Epsilon, I am highly honored and very pleased by your invitation to visit with you here tonight.

We are celebrating the 75th anniversary of the founding of your distinguished chapter at Trinity College.

You gentlemen are at present in an academic world. You have been afforded the privilege and great opportunity of exploring ideas unfettered by the day-to-day necessities of earning a living. This is fine and as it should be. Most of you will in a very few years be taking your place in the practical world of business and industry and the professions.

It is, therefore, most appropriate that I read to you the words of advice uttered by a business leader and a very practical man, Richard L. Bowditch, president of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States:

"Education is our first line of defense. And it begins, like most other things, with money—more money for more and better schools; and more money for more and better teachers. The need is now, it is imperative, and it ranges the educational system from kindergarten to college, from primary to professional school. Surely the richest nation on earth can meet at least this material need. And surely the genius of American business can devise how best to do it.

"But there is a second need which must be met if education is to make its greatest possible contribution to the full flowering of the American people. Nothing must hamper its freedom of inquiry and discussion.

"This Nation was conceived and rose to world leadership on the ideas of nonconformists and freewheelers, of men and women of integrity and wide vision, of individuals with bold far-reaching minds who insisted on crossing the frontiers of the unknown. By every estimate, they were courageous people. They dared to disagree on many things, but our country and our culture are infinitely richer and stronger for their challenge.

"We must indoctrinate in our young people the desire to be courageous, to have the will to win, to seek the truth, never to stop learning, to have the will to find out, and, having found out, to hold fast to the privilege and never be afraid of changing their opinion on the basis of new facts."

Since the founding of our Republic, it has always been feared by some that freedom of speech—utterances critical of our Government, our Congress, or our elected officials—constitute a challenge to the established order and are inherently dangerous. With the full knowledge that free speech might jeopardize established credos and the generally accepted order of things as they are, the framers of our Constitution wrote into the basic law of our land the first amendment. They did so in the conviction that suppression of thought, of speech, of the press, and of public assembly, would be even more dangerous to the whole concept of a free democratic society.

The alarming tendency today to abrogate the first amendment in the name of patriotism finds an easy and vulnerable target in all of our institutions of learning. Any institution which is willing to place a straitjacket on academic freedom, to demand rigid conformity from its teachers, and to content itself with dead-level uniformity in the indoctrination of its students, will probably escape the slings and arrows of congressional committees and of sometimes misguided "patriotic" organizations. It may continue to be the recipient of substantial endowments and to enroll new students. A foundation which places restraints on academic freedom—of which Trinity College, to its great credit and with its great prestige is, happily, not one—will, by the same token, have acknowledged its surrender to the cult of mental regimentation which is gaining a dismaying popularity in some quarters.

There will, of course, always be those among us who fear new ideas, who shrink from the slightest hint of the unorthodox, who mistrust the unfamiliar. We must never belittle those who, by nature or by training, thrive best on conformity, for they are useful and valuable members of society and perform necessary and worthwhile functions as citizens of their communities and their country. It is not from the ranks of the timid, however, that have come the men and women who make significant contributions in terms of intellectual achievement, social progress, scientific advancement or industrial development. The threat to the very survival of a free society arises whenever there is a consolidated effort to suppress bold new ideas, to intimidate inquiring minds.

That Thomas Jefferson recognized the potential danger of such repression is apparent, not only in his important works on the science of government, but in the principles to which he held in his capacity as an educator. Writing to prospective faculty members of the University of Virginia, he set forth his ideal in clear terms:

"This institution will be based on the illimitable freedom of the human mind. For here we are not afraid to follow truth wherever it may lead, nor to tolerate error so long as reason is left free to combat it."

This is a principle to which, I believe, most colleges and universities in this country will adhere. They will do so, often in the face of sharp adverse criticism and misrepresentation, so long as they remain firm in the conviction that their proper function is to educate, not to regiment. All universities worthy of the name owe complete fidelity to freedom of thinking and of expression, to the opening of all doors to understanding, knowledge and inquiry, and the closing of none. The real function of a college or university, it seems to me, is not merely to implant in youthful minds so many facts, dates or formulas, many of dubious value. Unless, in the process, the student is encouraged to challenge existing theories, to examine and reject, if he will, prevailing opinion, unless, in short, it stimulated a student not to accept all that is handed to him, but to weigh and choose, to dare to formulate his own judgments, seek new solutions to old problems, the educational process will have failed.

A true American university cannot ignobly debase itself by restricting learning for fear of reprisals and loss of endowments, but in proclaiming the right of dissent it must scorn the consequences. Where education is shackled and the right of dissent denied, the spirit of liberty is dammed at its fountainhead. I do not minimize the fact that it will take a good deal of fortitude on the part of the colleges and universities to stand firm against attacks on academic freedom, for they will come from many quarters and in various guises. The temper of our times, sadly, indicates that there will be continued charges of subversive influences on the campuses, demands for loyalty oaths, condemnation of textbooks which may, in the opinion of some, contain "heretical" ideas. But we must not lose sight of the fact that the end goal of those who are so shrewdly exploiting the hysteria of our times is not the Americanism which they proclaim, but the stifling of intellectual freedom and the battering down of every liberal thought and idea.

Colleges and universities are perfectly capable of examining their own affairs, of determining who shall instruct, or who may be incompetent or unworthy of this trust and high privilege, and of deciding what textbooks shall be used and what ideas and philosophies shall be taught, without the assistance of public inquisitors. Whatever further programs educators may undertake to better inform the public and to increase understanding of educational aims and purposes will serve to buttress the defenses of freedom.

The battle ahead will not be easy, for there are strong forces who would destroy all freedom in the name of freedom, who would seek to make all education the instrument of the State, a mere propaganda tool—as it has become in the countries behind the Iron Curtain. What this discloses is a shocking lack of faith in our democracy and in our free institutions—in fact, a denial of our capacity as free men and women to think for and to govern ourselves. We know that totalitarian governments cannot permit freedom of speech, dare not tolerate criticism or dissent, but I, for one, am not willing to admit that our democratic system is so fragile or so sterile that it can be jeopardized by the fullest expression of our constitutionally guaranteed freedoms. Wherever we resort to the methods of totalitarianism, whether it be in the affairs of state or in the academic community, we do irreparable damage to our democracy. Only insofar as we hold firm and act responsible is there hope for the survival of our individual liberty and our national integrity.

Annoying, But Hopeful

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 13, 1954

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the Record an editorial by

Barnet Nover entitled "Annoying, But Hopeful," which appeared in a recent issue of the Denver Post.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Annoying, But Hopeful

Washington.—At a time when the fate of mankind depends to an incalculable degree on America's capacity for leadership, this country's preoccupation with the Army-McCarthy row is not easy to understand, even though justifiable.

Even friends and supporters of the United States abroad are alarmed. They deplore the sorry spectacle we are presenting to the world, while our enemies and critics on both sides of the Iron Curtain are licking their chops with delight over it.

A typical impression is that of the correspondent of the London Daily Mirror who flew over to cover the hearings and who recently cabled his paper:

"I have been watching a circus so fantastic, so degrading, so puerile, and so recklessly dirty that the disgust one feels is matched only by alarm over the behavior of our closest ally in the conduct of their domestic affairs."

Americans, too, are not too happy over much of what has been going on inside the committee room.

The proceedings have, at times, been simply outrageous. A vast amount of time has been spent on trivialities, with the same questions being asked endlessly of the witness.

Senator Joseph R. McCarthy withdrew as a member of the subcommittee. But under the subcommittee rules he has been allowed the privilege of cross-examination. Thus privileged, he has badgered the witnesses, denounced them, taken their words out of context, and accused them of saying things they had not said. He has grabbed the microphone, allegedly to make points of order, but actually to make speeches. He has dominated the hearings and helped make a circus out of the proceedings.

Only belatedly, and after his words had gone out on the air beyond recall into millions of homes, for instance, was McCarthy taken to task for making outrageous, guilt-by-association charges against the first witness, Maj. Gen. Miles Reber.

There has been much else that has been anything but edifying about the hearings. Yet the democratic process sometimes operates in strange and mysterious ways.

Despite all surface indications to the contrary, the Mundt subcommittee hearings have been and will be productive of much good.

First and foremost, they have brought home to millions of people, and more clearly than they ever were aware of before, the true nature of the thing we have come to call McCarthyism.

The snide approach, the reliance on the half-truth or the cleverly concealed lie have been on display. The technique of guilt by association, the use of the smokescreen and the diversionary maneuver, the device of the slick trick (the doctored photograph) have come into focus. All of these poisonous elements of McCarthyism have been made patent to the American people and particularly those who have watched the hearings on television. For them it has been a nightmarish education in realities.

Of equal importance, the facts regarding the Fort Monmouth investigations and the respective roles of the McCarthy subcommittee and the Army itself in the work of ferreting out security risks has tortuously but steadily emerged from the hearings.

The Army has not come out of the mess unscathed. The attention and care given by the Army to the efforts made to get special treatment for Schine have weakened the Army's case. That the insolent Schine did get special treatment, at least during the first stage of his basic training, shows how widely prevalent at one time was the fear of McCarthy and the readiness to propitiate him.

This fear is subsiding. A lot of people, including members of McCarthy's own committee, have discovered that, in the words of the Hans Christian Andersen fairy tale, "the king is naked."

In their own unique way the American people may be emerging from the paralyzing spell of McCarthyism. The process may not in all or even in many particulars be edifying. But the end result promises to be good.

Barnet Nover.

Case History of a Rural Electric Cooperative

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 13, 1954

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I have seen for myself in my State of Texas many proofs of the tremendous value of the work of the Rural Electrification Administration. It has changed the lives of farmers throughout Texas and all over the Nation.

The Snyder (Tex.) Daily News recently published the story of the Midwest Electric Cooperative, which serves an important west Texas area. The story told by the Snyder News of this electric cooperative is one which might be repeated in many, many other localities.

This inspiring case history of one REA cooperative is deserving of widespread attention. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Electric Co-Op Started With Hat Passing Back in 1938

Fifteen years ago the average rural home in this area used wood, coal, or distillate for fuel, kerosene lamps for lighting, and had no source of power for their convenience.

Today almost every rural home in Scurry and surrounding counties has added more modern facilities to make for better living. A very large percentage of them have available gas for heating instead of wood, modern bathrooms instead of outhouses, and electricity for such things as lighting, cooking, and power for the various types of farm facilities.

Electrification of the rural home was brought about by the organization of a cooperative movement here, now known as the Midwest Electric Cooperative. Midwest was set up as were many other cooperatives, through a loan from the Government. Loans for rural electrification began in 1936.

After the REA loan program was set up, Sterling Willingham, a Fisher County rancher, got the idea for a cooperative in this area after he had had much trouble with a 32-volt windcharger. Willingham, who was a trustee in the Hobbs Independent School District, began discussing the loan program with other members of that board, and they decided to investigate the prospects of securing a loan.

Cleveland Littlepage, agriculture instructor in the school and long an advocate of advancing the living standards of the farmer and rancher, was called upon by the board members for aid in organizing and effort to secure a loan. A countywide meeting was called at Roby, and about 15 persons attended. That group decided they needed more representation, so they called another meeting and spread the news about the county. But only 11 persons showed up at the next gathering. Littlepage, not ready to give up, passed his hat for donations to apply for a charter for an electric cooperative and came up with $13.11.

Officers were elected by the group, with Willingham as president, Homer Aaron of Rotan as vice president, Louis Singley of Rotan as secretary, O. O. Hollabaugh of Roby as treasurer, Ernest Kiser of Sylvester, James Beaver of Camp Springs, and the late Julius Edwards of Rotan as directors.

Joe Fender, county attorney in Fisher, aided the group with legal matters, and he agreed to apply for the charter with the understanding that he would not be paid if he did not get the charter. He and Littlepage obtained the charter, which was granted September 23, 1938.

The organization, which had its charter but no money, officially incorporated with the seven directors as charter members. Each director was then assigned an area to sign up new members, who were to put up a $5 membership deposit. Many farmers knew nothing about the rural electrification program and it had to be explained, then some would not sign up because they did not believe such a program possible. A few said they were afraid of electricity, because they believed it would draw lightning to their homes. Other similar reasons were given.

The directors finally sold the cooperative idea to 132 families and were ready to start the first 43 miles of line. The first contract was officially approved in January 1939. In February that year W. A. Jones was employed as project superintendent. The board, which had been meeting in the city hall at Rotan, rented a building for use as an office.

By July construction on the first line began, and it was completed that October. Actual construction of lines awoke many persons who had previously doubted the success of the program, and they began to make application for membership. Material shortages slowed construction during World War II, but following the war materials began to come in again.

From 1938 to now the rural electrification program has swelled from $13.11 donation to a $2 million organization. Midwest, which now has its main office in Roby, covers a territory 80 miles wide east and west and 40 miles north and south. It serves more than 3,200 members in Fisher, Scurry, Borden, Jones, Mitchell, Stonewall, Nolan, Kent, and Garza Counties.

The cooperative now employees 27 persons, operating 11 truck and car units. In addition to the Roby plant, Midwest has an office at Snyder.

Through the period of growth Midwest has had five managers. Jones was the first, followed by Olen Yandell, Troy Peeples, and Lon Adams. Johnny Ammons is present manager.

The electric cooperative program was established originally to furnish electric power to areas without access to other sources. Midwest Electric, however, serves some areas already served by a private power company.

Present directors of the cooperative are John Stavely, of Fluvanna; J. J. Henry, of Hermleigh; Grady Williams, of Snyder; Demp Carney, of Sweetwater; J. L. McArthur, of Rotan; Berman Harris, of Hamlin; and A. A. Aaron, of Rotan. Howard Davidson, of Lubbock, is the attorney.

Greetings and Tribute to Former President Truman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 13, 1954

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address which I delivered at the Truman Library dinner in tribute to former President Truman. The meeting was held on Saturday evening, May 8, at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GREETINGS AND TRIBUTE TO HARRY S. TRUMAN BY HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN, OF NEW YORK, AT TRUMAN LIBRARY, INC., DINNER, MAY 8, 1954

Reverend Clergy, Mr. Chairman, President Truman, Mrs. Truman, Mrs. Roosevelt, Mr. Mayor, Governor Meyner, my colleagues in Congress, this is a heart-warming occasion. I am proud to be here and proud to have an opportunity, not only on behalf of myself but of New York State, to speak briefly in tribute to a very great, a very much loved man, Harry S. Truman. Mr. President, I bring the affectionate congratulations of all New Yorkers.

A word frequently and accurately used in reference to Harry Truman is "courage." But true courage consists not in blindly overlooking danger, but in seeing and conquering it. The truly brave are never characterized by insolence, arrogance, brutality, or uncontrolled passion. In the very time of danger, men of true courage are the most circumspect, the most considerate, and the most serene—while yet the most firm.

Such a man is Harry Truman, blessed by this virtue above most others. And this virtue inspires all who come in contact with him. It is the keystone of his greatness.

President Truman will be remembered in history long after his detractors have been forgotten. Nor should we speak of him, this vital, vigorous, modest man, sitting here glowing with energy, as if he belonged to the past.

Harry Truman belongs very much to the present. There are millions of people in our land and abroad who today rightly regard Harry Truman as an inspiring leader of the forces of freedom and progress.

I know that he will not let those people down. This humble man is in the ranks, fighting just as hard today as ever.

I have spoken of the courage of Harry Truman in general, and he has demonstrated it in thousands of occasions. But Harry Truman's record is one of specific performance.

Let me recall two examples of Harry Truman's courage and unswerving dedication to the cause of freedom—causes which have been very near my heart.

One of the sharpest memories of my 5 years of service in the Senate is that of a vain fight against the unwise and harmful provisions of the Internal Security Act of 1950.

There were only a handful of us who openly opposed that bill in the Senate, and the same relative handful in the House. The vote on this bill in the House was 354 to 20; in the Senate, 70 to 7. I am proud to say that I was one of the seven in the Senate.

Yet in the face of this steamroller vote, it took Harry Truman just 24 hours after the bill was submitted to him to determine his course of action. He vetoed it—one of the most courageous acts of his administration.

The bill was passed over his veto, after an all-night debate in the Senate. History has already justified that veto, although as yet we have had only a taste of the evil features of that law.

It is almost 4 years since that bill became law, and the Communist Party has not been registered yet, although hundreds of thousands of dollars have been spent to set up an elaborate Government bureaucracy, for administrative proceedings and for court actions. In short, the registration provisions of the Internal Security Act have proved wholly inadequate—preposterously so—for the effective control or exposure of even the Communist Party. Meanwhile the potentialities for evil in that broad and sweeping statute—its incipient dangers—lie imbedded in our laws like a time bomb—aimed at labor unions, fraternal organizations, charitable foundations, and associations of every kind.

The immigration provisions of that law turned out to be even worse in their effect than we thought. They have eaten deep into the prestige of the United States in the world abroad. Countless injustices have been and are being worked upon hundreds and thousands of individuals—all in the name of security.

In 1952 the cruel and unjust immigration provisions of the Internal Security Act were incorporated into the McCarran-Walter Immigration and Nationality Act, again over the ringing veto of President Harry S. Truman. That veto was another act of far-sighted Truman statesmanship.

These two laws confer upon the Executive punitive and repressive powers which no executive should have. Those powers have already been used to ruin scores and hundreds of lives. Thus far the unjustified victims have been, for the most part, aliens. But there are broad and coercive powers in those two laws which can be turned against American citizens, and American freedoms, too.

We have reason, in the present atmosphere, to show concern. We have reason to pay honor to Harry S. Truman who had the courage, the wisdom, and the statesmanship to veto these two acts, and thus to label them for what they are.

In honoring Harry Truman today, in pledging ourselves to support the Truman Library, we do well to recall the current significance of his past achievements, and to pledge ourselves to carry forward the banners of freedom which he bore so courageously and defended so manfully during his years of stewardship.

I salute you, Mr. President. I wish the library well. With such efforts and energies of which I shall be capable in the months and years ahead, I pledge myself to carry on, by your side with you, in the battles of today and those awaiting us tomorrow.

One of the World's Best Investments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 13, 1954

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD the following speech of outstanding importance made by James J. Wadsworth, deputy representative of the United States to the United Nations, before the annual business meeting of the Rochester (N. Y.) Association for the United Nations, on April 30, 1954:

ADDRESS BY AMBASSADOR JAMES J. WADSWORTH, DEPUTY UNITED STATES REPRESENTATIVE TO THE UNITED NATIONS, BEFORE THE ROCHESTER ASSOCIATION FOR THE UNITED NATIONS, MEMORIAL ART GALLERY THEATER, ROCHESTER, N. Y., APRIL 30, 1954.

THE UNITED NATIONS AND THE LONG HAUL

We live in times that try men's souls. Our times perhaps are even more difficult in some ways than the times Thomas Paine lived in—for we are engaged in a struggle between freedom and tyranny across the entire world. And this struggle is naturally aggravating and frustrating, and sometimes, I suppose, it is just human nature to throw up your hands and say: "What can we do about it anyway?" These are times which call for all the qualities which made America great—for all the courage, wisdom, and faith in ourselves and the cause of freedom that we can muster. But we also need additional qualities—and I think that perspective and patience are perhaps the most sorely needed of these if we are to cope with our problems as well as our forefathers coped with theirs.

We need perspective to realize that we are in for the long haul. We are saddled with leadership responsibilities, which we cannot escape, for solving exceedingly thorny world probelms which have defied human wit for decades and even centuries. Most of the problems we confront abroad have deep roots—they have histories of a sort which do not yield easily to the best efforts of even such a powerful Nation as the United States. Take the collective security problem, for example. It goes back at least 2,000 years to the Greek city states—and there is much in the history of Athens and Sparta which has meaning for us today. Yet, there are some who expect the United Nations to accomplish more by a stroke of the pen, by the passage of a resolution, than has been achieved in all past history.

We need patience to work steadily and effectively on world problems over the long haul. It is self-defeating to hope that a burst of frenzied activity will unravel the Gordian knots; more likely, it will just draw them tighter. We cannot, for example, expect to obtain real security by feverishly building a Maginot line which would ward off any aggressor in 1955, but only at the price of later economic collapse which could bring surrender without the firing of a single shot.

Perspective and patience are as essential as military strength and political wisdom to our survival as a free Nation over the long haul. By the same token, these qualities are essential to our understanding of the United Nations and of its importance to us over the long haul. Yet, there are those who sell the United Nations short precisely because of impatience and a lack of perspective. These people—when they look at international institutions—are either perfectionists or nihilists. They apparently want the millennium right now or nothing at all.

We need to dispense with both the dark glasses of the cynics and the rose-colored glass of the stargazers—to look at the United Nations through the clear lenses of what it really is in the world as it really is. We need to make a hardheaded assessment of the United Nations and its value to us as Americans. We need to appreciate its imperfections without losing sight of its importance. We need to direct our energies at making it work better, at using it intelligently and imaginatively as an important instrument for our foreign policy.

Let me admit at the outset that the United Nations has not been able to live up to the expectations which many people had when it was launched in 1945. Certainly these expectations were far above what could reasonably be expected of any human institution in the relatively short span of 8 years. Certainly some of the suppositions underlying the United Nations, such as the expectation that the great powers would act in concert to preserve the peace, have proved ill-founded. But I suggest that this is much less the fault of the instrument than of the states who assumed solemn responsibilities for making the instrument work effectively. I cannot conceive of any changes in the language of the charter, for example, which would have prevented the Soviet Union from using its power to promote its foreign policy goals of weakening the democratic world and seeking to extend its dominion—that decision was made in the Kremlin and not in the halls of the United Nations.

This is part of the difficult context in which the United Nations has been forced to work. It has borne the responsibilities of keeping world peace even though its capacity to do this job has been badly undermined by the defection of a powerful element of the police force which was supposed to have been at its disposal. So we do need perspective to appreciate both the limitations and the capabilities of the United Nations in the realistic context of a turbulent world.

Now, there are guidelines which will help us cut through the superficiality of today's headlines to gain realistic perspective about the United Nations.

First, the United Nations is essential. It was born of, and is, sheer necessity. It is the latest step in the evolution of international organizations which began about a century ago. These organizations developed, not because foreign offices were filled with stargazers, but because they were filled with hardheaded realists who found that it was practically advantageous for nations to work together on such common problems as the control of epidemics, improvement of postal services, etc. The European states, for example, began to collaborate on health and quarantine measures in the mid-19th century because the spread of plagues and epidemics was a common danger to them all—because germs simply would not respect national frontiers. As the world grew smaller, the demonstrable need for regular channels of international action spawned more international agencies. And each of these developed because it made more sense for nations to work through international institutions than to work separately on common problems.

One of the best tests of need is to ask the cynic which United Nations activity he would do without. What plagues or epidemics which the United Nations has prevented would he let spread unchecked? Would he, for example, have preferred no United Nations action on the serious cholera epidemic in Egypt in 1947—when previous such epidemics had many times swept out of the Middle East to envelop Europe in black deaths which killed far more people than wars? Which of the hungry, homeless, and illiterate millions would the cynic see abandoned to despair and to communism? Which of our allies in the United Nations would he prefer to do without?

The hard fact is that if we didn't have the United Nations, the American people would be demanding that we create it—right now.

Second, the United Nations works for our best interests. The objectives of the United Nations and of United States foreign policy are virtually identical. We are both striving for a peaceful, secure, free, and prosperous world. Now this is not an accident—for we took the lead in establishing the United Nations, and our own ideas and ideals were written into its charter. It is important to remember that we did this because the bitter experience of American involvement in two World Wars proved that we could not escape international responsibilities. Staying out of the League of Nations did not keep us out of World War II. In fact, there is considerable evidence to suggest that if we had played a positive role in the League of Nations we might never have needed to send American boys to die on the beaches of Normandy and Iwo Jima.

Not only are the objectives of the United Nations and of the United States the same, but the activities of the United Nations run along the same lines as our activities. Whatever our temporary frustrations, we should not overlook the fact that we have consistently received the overwhelming support of the non-Soviet bloc members of the United Nations on thousands of ballots over the past 7 years—on an average of 45 to 50 votes against 5 of the Soviet bloc. Now, I could understand misgivings about whether the United Nations is good for the United States if we were in the minority or if there were some sort of even split between support of our policies and of Soviet policies. But the fact is that our own policies on major issues have been considerably strengthened in impact as a result of strong support from other United Nations members. Take the question of Chinese Communist representation in the United Nations for example. Our position has been upheld by the majority of United Nations members in more than 150 separate votes in various United Nations bodies. Take Korea as another example. Our support so consistently numbered 55 out of the 60 member nations that the 5 Soviet bloc members desperately sought to concoct issues on which they hoped to be outvoted by a slightly smaller majority.

Where else could the free world have been so firmly cemented together? What other means could we have used to promote friendships, agreements, and alliances with so many other countries on so many matters? Could we indeed have exercised world leadership at all effectively in the vacuum left by the absence of the only world organization? Would even the most short-sighted cynic like to see a headline reading: "United Nations Dissolved; United States Stands Alone"?

The hard fact is that if we didn't have the United Nations the American people today would be desperately seeking the same pattern of political support which we have been enjoying for 7 years.

Third, the United Nations does work effectively. Many of its programs produce results which could not be otherwise obtained; some of them produce greater results at less cost than even we ourselves could bring about. In technical assistance, for example, the United Nations is in a position to tap the skills of the whole world instead of just one country. Even though we have tremendous know-how here in America, we'd be hard-pressed to provide many Arctic fisheries experts or coffee growing specialists. Our technical assistance dollars go farther in the United Nations program because they are matched by contributions from many other countries. And our aid channeled through the United Nations is free of political connotations—it is not susceptible to resentment and fears of imperialism on the part of sensitive and suspicious countries abroad.

Shold we kiss off this type of help, and try to carry the whole load ourselves? Should we pay heavier taxes so that we can run our own show without bothering with foreign currencies? Should we take more of our experts from our own factories, mines and farms instead of working with foreigners?

The hard fact is that if we didn't have the United Nations, the American people would be demanding much the same sort of means for mobilizing foreign skills and moneys to help other people to help themselves toward greater economic and political stability.

Fourth, the United Nations has made encouraging progress in dealing with its most difficult problem—the maintenance of international peace and security. Some people, understandably critical of the United Nations effort in Korea, have overlooked the fact that the United Nations was not designed originally to take collective action against the interests of any great power. The expecation at San Francisco was that either the great powers would cooperate, or that their failure to do so would leave the United Nations powerless in case of aggression launched or sponsored by one of the great powers. But Korea was such an aggression—and the United Nations, far from being powerless, met the challenge because it was in our interests and its interests to stop aggression the first time it occurred. If we had let the Republic of Korea go under, there is not the slightest doubt that the Communist leaders would have been so emboldened to try and try again that we eventually would have been forced to fight on a much larger scale and much closer to our own shores.

Now the United Nations did not provide us all the support we had a right to expect in Korea. But the support it did provide was by no means insignificant. The fact that 15 other United Nations members contributed the equivalent of two divisions to the fighting in Korea saved many American lives, and a great deal more money than we have paid to the United Nations. If we had been forced to provide these two divisions ourselves, even at the World War II cost of $600 million a year, it would have dwarfed our annual contribution of $13 million to the United Nations proper. Some 45 other nations joined us in the United Nations strategic embargo which denied critical war materials to the Communist aggressors in Korea. And finally, all the non-Soviet bloc members of the United Nations endorsed the United Nations action in Korea—a unanimity of political support which is unique in modern history.

But this is not all that the United Nations contributed to our resistance of aggression in Korea. The fact that this was a United Nations rather than a United States action, the fact that the United Nations condemned Communist aggression, put the whole operation on the basis of moral and political principle instead of simply American self-interest. This made it completely impossible for the Communists to maintain that we were in Korea for imperialistic purposes. The fact that United Nations soldiers of so many races, religions, and colors were in the battleline made it completely impossible for the Communists to maintain successfully that we were in Korea in a white man's attempt to dominate colored people and restore colonialism. And the fact that Philippine and Thai soldiers, along with the Republic of Korea troops, were in the battleline with us kept it from being misinterpreted as a struggle between western and eastern peoples.

Where else could we have achieved even those results? Would the Ethiopians, the Turks, the Colombians, and other peoples far removed from Korea have sent their young men halfway around the world except for a United Nations cause? Would other countries have denied themselves the profits of lucrative trade with the aggressors except in the framework of a United Nations embargo? Would countries following a neutralist foreign policy have taken a political stand on our side outside the framework of the United Nations?

The hard fact is that if we didn't have the United Nations, the American people would have sacrificed more and gained less in resisting an aggression we could not have ignored.

Most of these guidelines for a realistic appraisal of the United Nations in the perspective of the long haul are reasonably well known to most Americans. But the United Nations, in many respects, is like an iceberg—much of its activities are below the surface of the daily headlines, and perhaps beyond the attention of busy people who, after all, have to make a living at other things. I want to take a look now at an area of United Nations activities which I think will add additional perspective to our examination of this young institution.

There are such things as wars that don't happen. There are the conflicts which are contained at the conference table and prevented from exploding on the battlefields. There is scarcely any area of the world free of deep-seated differences which could erupt into fighting if we did not have the United Nations machinery for containing, conciliating, and mediating conflicts.

And this is precisely the machinery which, in large part, has made the difference between an era of uneasy peace and a chain of explosions which most certainly would have spread into a third world war.

The fact is that the United Nations is one of the best insurance bargains for the American people and for other free peoples. It has provided you, the American citizen, and your counterpart in other free countries with a unique combination of life insurance, health and accident insurance, business insurance, and fire insurance. As in the majority of insurance investments, the holder of the policy may not fully appreciate the value of his insurance except in case of unexpected emergency or catastrophe. We may gripe about paying the premiums, small as they may be, and in the case of the United Nations they work out to 16 cents annually for each of us, but it seems to me that these are pretty cheap premiums to prevent wars from happening or to stop the ones that do happen short of atomic catastrophe.

There is a good deal of evidence to show that United Nations conciliation and mediation activities have saved many lives and many billions of dollars as a result of effective work in preventing dangerous situations from exploding into large-scale warfare.

Let me give you three tangible examples of how this United Nations peace insurance has worked in preventing catastrophes. These are the cases brought into the United Nations concerning Palestine, Indonesia, and Kashmir. In each of these cases fighting had actually broken out and threatened to engulf millions of people and a considerable number of countries—the loss of whose friendship, land areas and vital natural resources would have desperately threatened the United States and the rest of the free world. At the very least, these conflicts threatened to tear the free world apart internally and pave the way for Communist expansion. At the most they might have triggered a third world war.

Bringing these conflicts into the United Nations got them under control. There in the world forum, the majority of United Nations members were able to bring their collective moral and political suasion to bear on the combatants. Even though United Nations resolutions in these cases were not backed up by armed forces ready to go to the scene of the conflict and separate the combatants, they had such great moral force that they influenced the combatants to stop their fighting and start talking—to remove the conflicts from the battlefield to the conference table. The United Nations truce negotiators and conciliation missions then proceeded to the field and brought about a long-term armistice in Palestine, a peace treaty and independence for Indonesia and a long-term ceasefire between India and Pakistan over Kashmir.

Now, one way of assessing the real value of these United Nations peaceful settlement activities is to ask what the cost would have been in money and blood if the United Nations had failed in these three cases. Even a partial estimate shows for the United States alone the economic cost of war or rebellion in these areas—excluding possible military intervention—would have totaled many billions of dollars.

For example, the failure of Indian manganese supplies in 1949 because of a spread of the Kashmir conflict would have reduced United States steel production by as much as one-third in 1949 and 1950—unless we had drawn heavily on our own strategic stockpile. The loss of Indonesian rubber supplies would have reduced American consumption levels from 20 to 35 percent for at least 2 or 3 years until we could have brought new synthetic capacity into operation. The cutting off of Indonesian tin supplies would have precluded additions to our strategic stockpile, or reduced our consumption to a World War II level.

Aside from the higher costs of using substitute materials, increases in rubber and tin prices would have cost United States industry and Government stockpiling authorities as much as $1.2 billion over 3 years. Capital outlays for additions to American synthetic rubber capacity to replace Indonesian crude would have cost $200 to $300 million. As much as $100 million of direct American private investments could have been destroyed, and markets which absorbed $1.6 billion in American exports in 1949 would have been jeopardized.

Contrast these estimated costs of many billions of dollars with the actual overall cost of United Nations mediation work for a 5-year period—a total of $3 million in Kashmir; less than $1 million in Indonesia; and some $9 million in Palestine. And, of course, the United States only contributed a share of these overall costs. So, we paid a few millions to save billions.

No matter how you look at it, this is good insurance—it is one of the best insurance bargains in the world—and it certainly is one of the best investments that we and other free peoples can make in our own liberty, security, and well-being.

Tonight I have outlined certain guidelines for evaluating the United Nations in perspective. I have sought to show some of the cases in which I think the United Nations has proved of value to the American people. Let me add a word about the need for patience. Time is almost always a necessary factor in healing wounds and solving conflicts. Of course time is not neutral—it provides only the opportunity to exercise wisdom and judgment on thorny problems. But we do ourselves grave disservice if we take the all or nothing approach—if we try to slug our way through situations which can only be treated effectively by more careful and subtle processes. Let us not get too impatient with the United Nations because, on many occasions, it seems to do more talking than acting. Let us not be so shortsighted as to criticize it as an endless debating society when our own experiences—from the New England town meetings to today's legislatures—show us that a good deal of talking is an essential prerequisite to action. Our task is not to do away with the talk but to help guide inescapable debates along the course which will do us and the United Nations the most good.

If we can look at the United Nations with real perspective, and participate in it with patience and wisdom, I am fully convinced that it offers unique opportunities and real promise for helping us through the long haul to a far better world for ourselves and our children. As a human institution operated by human beings, let us recognize its weaknesses, understand its inevitable limitations, but appreciate its value to everything we stand for.

Anniversary of Israeli Independence and United States Recognition Spotlights Apparent Changes in American Policy in Near East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM T. GRANAHAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 13, 1954

Mr. GRANAHAN. Mr. Speaker, it was on May 14, 1948, that the beleaguered State of Israel declared its independence, and it was on that very same day that President Truman announced American recognition of the new state and its government.

A wave of gratification swept over the United States that day, 6 years ago tomorrow, for the success of the brave people of little Israel in winning through to freedom and independence, following the path pioneered here in this country in 1776. Our common interest in freedom and in democracy provided a kinship among the two nations and, in fact, among the people of Israel and free people everywhere.

Israel has had a hard and rocky road to travel in these past 6 years—trying to absorb the hundreds of thousands of the persecuted and oppressed, the sick and lame, and halt and blind, the homeless and the stateless among Europe's surviving Jewish population into a tiny nation and into a nation under armed attack from hostile neighbors.

During all of that difficult period, the people of the United States have applauded their efforts. During most of that time the Government of the United States has reflected in its official policy the sentiment of Americans generally in favor of a secure Israel and a sound Israeli economy.

In the list year and a half, however, we have seen a gradual change in emphasis on the part of the State Department—a precipitate willingness to blame Israel for every border incident arising out of the tensions and undying hostility of the neighboring nations, a catering to the politicians in those neighboring nations whose primary objective has been for 6 years the destruction of Israel.

This attitude, Mr. Speaker, disturbs me deeply. I know it disturbs many Americans of all religions. Constituents of mine of the Jewish faith are particularly conscious of the developing negativism of American official policy toward Israel, but they are not alone in that feeling.

The State Department seems to think that arms aid extended to Near East nations dedicated to the destruction of Israel will not be used for any such aggressive purpose but will be used only for defense. What guaranties does it have of that?

EXCHANGE OF CORRESPONDENCE WITH STATE DEPARTMENT

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I recently addressed an inquiry to Under Secretary of State Walter Bedell Smith, prior to his departure for Geneva, raising several pertinent questions on this matter. My letter was prompted by the agreement of this Nation to extend arms aid to Iraq.

The letter was as follows:

Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C., April 28, 1954.

Hon. Walter Bedell Smith,
Acting Secretary of State, Department of State, Washington, D. C.

Dear Sir: In the absence of Secretary Dulles, who is now in Geneva, I am addressing this inquiry to you in the hope of obtaining a prompt explanation of the Department's position in regard to the shipment of arms and other military equipment to certain Middle East nations.

Since the announcement Sunday of American arms aid to Iraq, I have received numerous protests from residents of my congressional district that such a step will tend to increase not only the explosive tension in the Middle East but the dangers of renewed warfare. I am sure you agree that this country should not take any step which would encourage any of the Middle Eastern nations to precipitate a new outbreak in that troubled area.

In view of this possibility, I should like to know—

1. What steps, if any, have have been taken by the State Department to guarantee that arms aid extended to Iraq or others of the Arab States surrounding Israel, presumably to deter Communist aggression, will not be used instead to support renewed aggression against Israel?

2. What steps, if any, have been taken by the State Department to urge these same nations finally to abandon the continued state of war they have maintained in regard to Israel, and to agree to conferences and negotiations leading to a peace treaty and to a state of real peace?

3. What prospects does the Department foresee for the solution of Near East tensions and warlike incidents through diplomatic procedures as between Israel and her antagonistic neighbors?

4. What value to United States foreign-policy objectives exists in the extension of arms aid to nations which maintain as their primary national objective the destruction of a democracy in their midst which is not only friendly to the United States but which won its independence largely as a result of the United States intercession?

Your answers to these questions would be deeply appreciated.

Sincerely yours,
William T. Granahan.

Following, Mr. Speaker, is the answer I have received from the State Department:

Department of State,
Washington, May 5, 1954.

Hon. William T. Granahan,
House of Representatives.

Dear Mr. Granahan: I refer to your letter of April 28, 1954, concerning the Department's position in regard to the shipment of arms to certain middle-eastern states. Under Secretary Smith, to whom the letter was addressed, has now departed for Geneva.

The present dangerous weakness in the defensive capabilities of the Near East constitutes a direct threat to the security of the United States and of the free world. Authority to take steps to improve this situation was granted by the last Congress in a new authorization (sec. 202 (b)) contained in the Mutual Security Act of 1953, and in Public Law 218, appropriating funds for military assistance to the Near East.

I should like to make the following specific comments with regard to the first question raised in your letter concerning steps taken by the Department of State to guarantee that arms aid extended to Iraq will not be used against Israel:

Should there be developments in the Near East showing that the policies of any government in that area receiving our military aid are no longer based on consideration of legitimate self-defense, the United States Government would immediately reassess not only its aid program, but its basic policy toward the countries concerned. On February 25, 1954, President Eisenhower said, in connection with the announcement of grant United States military assistance to Pakistan, that "if our aid to any country * * * is misused and directed against another in aggression I will undertake immediately, in accordance with my constitutional authority, appropriate action both within and without the U. N. to thwart such aggression. I would also consult with the Congress on further steps." The attitude of the President in this matter is consistent with the position taken jointly by the United States, the United Kingdom, and France on May 25, 1950, regarding the supply of arms and war materiel to the Arabs and Israel. The Tripartite Declaration of that date provides, inter alia, that "The three Governments, should they find that any of these states was preparing to violate frontiers or armistice lines, would, consistently with their obligations as members of the United Nations, immediately take action, both within and outside the United Nations, to prevent such violation."

The decision to grant military assistance to Iraq was not taken suddenly or without careful consideration. Any effective plan for the defense of the Middle East must involve Iraq, which is strategically located with reference to the important Persian Gulf area and is on the pathway from the Caucasus to the eastern Mediterranean. The understanding recently concluded between the United States and Iraq was the result of a request from the Government of Iraq made in March 1953. Under this understanding, which conforms to the requirements of the Mutual Security Act, the Government of Iraq agrees not to undertake any act of aggession against any other state and that the aid furnished will be used solely to maintain internal security and to provide for its legitimate self-defense. Included in the understanding is a provision that "assistance will be provided subject to the provisions of applicable legislative authority and will be related in character, timing and amount to international development in the area."

With regard to your second question as to steps which have been taken to encourage negotiations leading to a peace treaty and to a state of real peace between Israel and the Arab States:

The United States has endeavored to foster the establishment of stable conditions along the borders and to encourage a peaceful adjustment of relations between the Arab States and Israel. The United States has joined repeatedly in the United Nations deliberations toward this end and have taken diplomatic action outside of the United Nations as well. The United States will continue to contribute as best it can to efforts to bring harmony to the area. However, the primary responsibility for bringing about an enduring settlement of Near East problems lies with the governments of the states concerned. In order to achieve such a settlement, both Israel and the Arab States will have to modify their present attitudes. It is hoped the current Security Council discussions will bring about such cooperation and produce a strengthening of the armistice control machinery of the United Nations.

With regard to your third question concerning the prospects for the solution of Near East tensions through diplomatic procedures:

A sober analysis of the history of the Arab-Israel dispute makes it evident that the probability of an early and formal settlement is extremely remote. The solution of this dispute does not lie in the direct approach by outside powers, but rather in a step-by-step reduction of tensions in an effort to create conditions under which a comprehensive peace might be established. The United States will continue to encourage the creation of an atmosphere in which long-term solutions would be constructively examined.

With regard to your fourth question concerning the value to the United States of a program of arms aid to the Middle East:

The Department believes that it is in the interest of the United States to take such measures as it can to promote the defense capabilities and the internal security of the Near East area while at the same time taking all possible precautions to insure that the arms supplied will be used for the purposes for which they are intended. In this area, as in other areas, the Department considers that it would be unrealistic and dangerous to defer preparations for security pending final solutions to all disputes which may exist among States in the area. The provisions of arms to both Italy and Yugoslavia notwithstanding the Trieste dispute as well as the granting of military assistance to Pakistan and our willingness sympathetically to consider a similar request from India notwithstanding the Kashmir issue, might be cited in this connection. Notwithstanding the fear and resentment felt toward Israel by the Arab States, the Department does not believe that the destruction of Israel is the primary national objective of these states or that they possess the intention or capability of adopting a policy of military aggression against Israel.

Sincerely yours,
Thruston B. Morton,
Assistant Secretary
(For the Secretary of State).

SOLUTION IN A STEP-BY-STEP REDUCTION OF TENSIONS

It will be seen from this reply, Mr. Speaker and from the statements made recently by Henry A. Byroade, Assistant Secretary of State for Near Eastern Affairs, that our State Department takes a position of exaggerated neutralism if not disguised anti-Israel bias in the Near Eastern situation.

This paragraph in the letter from Assistant Secretary Thruston B. Morton is particularly interesting:

> A sober analysis of the history of the Arab-Israel dispute makes it evident that the probability of an early and formal settlement is extremely remote. The solution of this dispute does not lie in the direct approach by outside powers, but rather in a step-by-step reduction of tensions in an effort to create conditions under which a comprehensive peace might be established. The United States will continue to encourage the creation of an atmosphere in which long-term solutions would be constructively examined.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me we are not contributing to a step-by-step reduction of tensions by sending arms to nations anxious to destroy Israel—nations which need economic help rather than military help if they are to overcome their envy of industrious Israel and raise the standard of living of their own people. It is hard to see how all the arms and equipment in the world could enable Iraq, for instance, to withstand a Soviet attack without help from the rest of the free world. If the Red army is going to move in that direction, taking the risk of precipitating world war, would the rest of the world expect Iraq to hold the Reds off alone?

Tax Reduction and a Balanced Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 2, 1954

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

Our goal of a balanced budget will be achieved only by cutting Federal expenditures below their current level. Unquestionably, this can be done. However, this is only one-half of the coin. The other half is a program of gradual tax reduction, particularly for individual income taxpayers. This is necessary because, as Government spending declines, individual spending must increase if the economy is to be kept at a high level. Individuals must be allowed to retain a larger share of their earnings through a sound tax-reduction program.

Advocates of high taxes often ignore the fact that high tax rates do not necessarily mean high tax yields. No matter how high tax rates may be, tax yields will be low unless the economy of the country is in high gear. A tax program should be designed to increase economic activity. If it is so designed, tax yields will remain at a high level, even though rates are lowered. This fact is demonstrated by our experience from 1921 to 1929.

Individual income-tax rates were reduced six times during the 1920's. A comparison of the first two tables annexed hereto shows that the cuts in individual income-tax rates made during the years from 1921 to 1929 did not result in a net loss of revenue. During each of those years not only was the budget balanced but there was a substantial surplus.

Let us take the case of an individual taxpayer, married and with two dependents. From 1921 to 1929 his effective tax rate was reduced from 1.4 percent to one-tenth of 1 percent if he made $5,000 a year, from 5.3 percent to four-tenths of 1 percent if he made $10,000, from 18.3 percent to 8.3 percent if he made $50,000, and from 31.1 percent to 14.9 percent if he made $100,000.

Despite these tax cuts, revenues (on a liability basis) from individual income taxes increased from $719,387,106 in 1921 to $1,001,938,147 in 1929—an increase of about 30 percent. A similar percentage increase would bring in about $9 billion of additional tax yields today.

Secretary of the Treasury Andrew Mellon was well aware of the fact that prosperity (with attendant high tax yields) may be promoted by a sound tax-reduction program. For example, economic conditions in 1923 were similar to those in 1953. Business had started out well at the beginning of the year and then had declined; 1923 was classified by the National Bureau of Economic Research as "prosperity, recession." Mellon predicted that prosperity could be maintained if taxes were cut, and his recommendation was followed early in 1924. Mellon's prediction proved correct. Production which had fallen during the first half of 1924 rapidly recovered in the second half; 1924 was classified by the Bureau of Economic Research as "mild depression, revival." It will be noted that tax revenues from individual income-tax payers (on a liability basis) were $661,666,133 in 1923. In 1924 they had already increased to $704,265,390. Thereafter, despite comparatively large tax cuts, they continued to increase until they had passed the billion mark.

It is significant that during the period from 1921 to 1929, when these tax policies were in effect, the national income increased from $69.5 billion to $83.3 billion. (See table III.)

The conclusion which the experience of the 1920's compels is that judicious cuts in individual income tax rates have the effect of increasing the prosperity of the Nation, and that it is primarily the level of prosperity which determines tax yields, and not tax rates.

In comparing our present situation with the 1920's it should be further borne in mind that today our tax rates in the high brackets are not designed primarily for revenue purposes, but are the legacy of the social philosophies of the New Deal and Fair Deal.

This is demonstrated by the fact that if tax rates were reduced from the present maximum of 91 percent to a maximum of 50 percent the revenue loss (estimated by mathematical projection) would barely exceed $1 billion out of almost $30 billion collected from individual income taxpayers.

It would seem to be unquestionable that tax-rate cuts today would have an even more beneficial effect on the economy than they had in the 1920's when taxes, even in the highest brackets, were a relatively light burden.

TABLE I

Year	Level of net income			
	$5,000	$10,000	$50,000	$100,000
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*
1921	1.4	5.3	18.3	31.1
1922	1.4	4.6	17.2	30.1
1923	1.0	3.4	12.9	22.6
1924	.5	1.4	12.1	22.5
1925-27	.2	.8	9.7	16.0
1928	.2	.8	9.1	15.7
1929	.1	.4	8.3	14.9

TABLE II.—*Individual income tax liabilities*

1921	$719,387,106
1922	861,057,308
1923	661,666,133
1924	704,265,390
1925	734,555,183
1926	732,470,790
1927	830,639,434
1928	1,164,254,037
1929	1,001,938,147

TABLE III.—*National income*

[Billions of dollars]

1921	51.7
1922	59.5
1923	69.5
1924	69.1
1925	73.7
1926	76.6
1927	75.9
1928	78.7
1929	83.3

Coal Areas Need Federal Aid Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 13, 1954

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial:

COAL AREAS NEED FEDERAL AID NOW

With 150,000 miners unemployed and the plight of Pennsylvania's coal regions getting worse day by day, the need of prompt Government action in the matter has become increasingly urgent.

Community leaders in the hard coal counties, which have a population of more than 1 million persons, have made it clear at Washington that they are not seeking any Federal handouts. What they want for the people, now suffering because of the sickness of the coal industry, is the opportunity to be gainfully employed.

They believe the Government can help them achieve that reasonable goal, and they have backed up their belief with a number of suggestions which were placed before President Eisenhower on Tuesday.

The President's evident concern with the problem is encouraging. He had discussed it on Monday at a meeting with Senator DUFF, which was the prelude to the larger conference the following day, attended by Senator MARTIN, Governor Fine, a number of congressmen from this State and representatives of the coal industry, the miners' union and the Northeastern Pennsylvania Industrial Development Commission.

The President was described afterward as very responsive to the proposals submitted to him for rehabilitation of the coal regions.

These were mainly concerned with the anthracite areas, but they could, with certain exceptions, be applied also to meeting the equally grave problems in the soft coal areas.

Among the suggestions were transfer of certain Federal agencies to the coal regions; use of Federal road funds to finance construction in the area, thereby absorbing surplus workers; use of abandoned mine workings for defense storage purposes; assignment of future Federal military and civil installations to the coal regions; a reforestation program to restore natural resources of lumber to a region that once provided wood and wood products; Federal clearance of the Lehigh Valley flood project and restudy of the Susquehanna River Authority project; consideration of coal counties in the development program in the field of atomic energy, and expansion of Government research on the use of anthracite in metallurgical fields.

In addition, at the prior meeting between Mr. Eisenhower and Senator DUFF, the plan to export large quantities of hard and soft coal to Europe was discussed.

If there has been any puzzlement in Washington as to precisely how the Government might come to the rescue of the depressed coal areas and their people, the numerous suggestions made at the two conferences should put an end to it. Some of these proposals may turn out to be impracticable; but most of them need only the weight of administration endorsement to become effective, with unquestionably large benefits.

It has been the misfortune of the coal regions to be dependent for many years upon a one-industry economy. The decline of the coal industry has been due to a number of factors, including the stiff competition from other fuels, and the labor strife and successive strikes fomented by John L. Lewis. But the consequences of that decline have been disastrous to tens of thousands of Pennsylvanians, who are out of work or whose income has been diminished because of lowered coal production.

Senator MARTIN told newsmen following the meeting with the President that "we are going to get results." Not only those immediately concerned will hope so, but all other Pennsylvanians who see the prosperity and welfare of their State threatened by the continuing distress in the coal counties.

There should no longer be any question at Washington whether the Government should help in this crisis but only how it may help in the most practical fashion. With the President displaying active sympathy in the matter, positive action should no longer be delayed.

The Sandstone Creek Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD S. MILLER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 13, 1954

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and enclosure from Mr. Elmer T. Peterson, of the Oklahoma Publishing Co.:

THE DAILY OKLAHOMAN—
OKLAHOMA CITY TIMES,
Oklahoma City, Okla., May 10, 1954.

HON. HOWARD S. MILLER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR FRIEND: Many thanks for your letters. I thought you would surely be interested in a letter I wrote to Dwight Payton today. It is self-explanatory, but if there are any details you would like, I will be glad to supply them.

Sincerely yours,
ELMER T. PETERSON.

MAY 10, 1954.

Mr. DWIGHT PAYTON,
Overbrook, Kans.

DEAR DWIGHT: Your letter of May 7 just came to me, as I was out on a trip Friday afternoon and Saturday, getting the upper Washita story at first hand.

Anyone who says that the Sandstone Creek flood overflowed the spillways is a liar or grossly ignorant, because the official facts and figures completely disprove any such allegation.

Before going into the amazingly favorable data, I will mention what I presume to be the fallacious basis of what you report having come from the Army engineers' office.

The SCS men were right with us all the time, giving us technical facts and figures, and they are always very conscientious and, as you well know, never overstate their case.

Near the mouth of Sandstone Creek there is a crooked channel, clogged with logs. The completion of the project includes rectifying this channel. They have been unable to do this, due to chronic shortage of funds, so when the 10-inch cloudburst came down the Washita River from above the Sandstone project, as described in the news stories, there was slight flooding of the bottomland at the mouth of the creek, due to the combined backwater action of the Washita River itself and the clogging I mentioned. We crossed the Sandstone only half a dozen miles above its confluence with the Washita, and it was plainly evident that the water had not filled the creek more than half full. I have photographs plainly showing this. If you have a map of the Standstone project you will note that there is quite a stretch of the creek, beginning at its mouth, where no detention dams could be placed at the mouths of the small tributary creeks, so one would naturally expect a certain amount of runoff to produce trouble at the mouth. But even so, the whole watershed project did its work so well that there wouldn't have been any overflowing of the Sandstone Creek bank had it not been for the congestion noted above. The whole setup did the job far better than any of us expected. L. L. Males, president of the Security State Bank, Cheyenne, Okla. (former president of the Oklahoma Bankers Association) knows the whole story backward and forward, being highly active in the district conservation setup, and he says that the entire cloudburst was worse than the one which occurred on the Sandstone Creek in 1934, when a 14-inch rain fell within 1 day, because the storm area was twice as large. The 1934 flood did a vast amount of damage all the way down the Washita River, drowning several persons and destroying crops, property, and bridges. So the flood of April 29 would have done more damage than the one in 1934 if it had not been for the great load taken off the flood by the Sandstone Creek project. On the Sandstone watershed figures show that the total rainfall within 2-day period was more than 6 inches, of which about 4 inches or more fell during the same period that the 10-inch cloudburst hit the top of the watershed, west of the Sandstone area and over into Texas. It was said that in one spot in Texas there were 12 inches. Yet we found by traveling over the area from Sandstone down to Clinton that there was no appreciable flood around Clinton, and the flooding above that area was not great, and was caused entirely by water coming from untreated subwatersheds.

We inspected several of the detention dams, at least half a dozen. As you know, the engineering calculations are made so that each reservoir is built in proporton to watershed area, the bigger the watershed, the bigger the reservoir. So I assume that these dams were typical. On No. 16 the water was still coming out of the drawdown pipe from drop inlet, after 6 days. Here it was easy to see where the high-water mark was, and it was not more than 18 inches above the then level, and not more than 2 feet above the permanent pool. That means that the flood pool of the dam (above the permanent pool) had not held more than a very small fraction of capacity. I would judge the flood pool at its highest was not more than one-fifteenth or one-twentieth full.

Not a single 1 of the 24 detention dams had its flood pool filled. Not a single one of them had water running over the spillway. All of them could have taken a far larger amount of water than what came into them as runoff. They performed perfectly. And because they performed perfectly, Sandstone Creek was held very easily within its banks all the way down, until it reached the mouth area, and then a slight overflow developed purely because of the abnormal conditions I related, and not because any of the detention dams had failed to do its job properly. In fact they surpassed all expectations and everybody was delighted except the Army engineers, who wanted to see the project fail, and who, apparently, have tried to pick up some irrelevant detail and make it appear to be an argument against the SCS program.

Among the people who made the trip were: Mr. and Mrs. Charles Peters (producers of the Tuttle Creek Story), L. L. Males, former president of the Oklahoma Bankers Association; Jess Dewees, chairman of the Upper Washita Conservation District and the pioneer watershed flood control man of Oklahoma, a farmer; Curtis Murphy, a big farmer and conservationist of Clinton area; Glenn Beecham of the Clinton regional SCS office; Alvin Clement, regional conservationist; Pete Ottinger, Work Unit Conservationist at Clinton; Harold Dedrick, farm department manager of WKY radio and TV, Oklahoma City (a former county agent who has wide experience and background). They will all substantiate what I have said. All are highly enthusiastic about the Sandstone project and the one at Clinton, especially. That is the one where the city of Clinton gets its water supply from a small 10-mile square subwatershed (Little Monument Creek), by reason of insoak produced by conservation treatment, without help from detention dams. We inspected that earlier in the day and saw the incredible sight of a good flow of crystal-clear water coming down that creek, from springs replenished by conservation treatment, though the past 28 months have been the dryest in its history, and that same creek had been dry in the 1930 era because of the drought that was not as great as that of 1952–53. In other words, the Clinton people are now depending for their supply on water that fell on this little subwatershed prior to 1952. The indexes of prosperity on that subwatershed are also very conspicuous, by comparison with adjacent watersheds.

You are at liberty to quote as you like from the foregoing.

Sincerely yours,
ELMER T. PETERSON.

Federal Pay Increases

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CECIL R. KING

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 13, 1954

Mr. KING of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my statement before the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service urging Federal pay increases:

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am pleased to appear before the committee on behalf of our loyal Federal employees who I believe to be most deserving of a substantial increase in compensation.

The Federal employees in my district in Los Angeles County, Calif., have consistently felt the pressure of increased living costs and it is, indeed, difficult for them to provide their families with the bare necessities of living. As you all know, it is necessary for many of such employees to seek outside employment in order to properly care for their families. From the letters I have received from my constituents, and to my own personal knowledge, there are numerous hardship cases among our Federal employees due to the present inadequate wage scale. Of course, this means that the lower bracket employees are feeling the pressure the hardest.

The testimony before the committee for several years past has established the fact that it would rquire between a 20- and 25-percent salary increase to bring the Federal employees' income up to a rate paralleling the increased cost of living.

There are many bills pending before the committee proposing various increases for Federal employees. I have always supported reasonable and just benefits for the employees of our Federal service, and I am again most anxious to see them treated justly, and I hope that the committee in its wisdom, will decide on an adequate increase which will enable these employees to meet their necessary obligations and save something for the future.

We all know that the Government is continuously losing employees to private industry where they secure wages more in line with the increased cost of living. It is to the distinct advantage of the Federal Government not only to seek and obtain the best qualified persons but to retain their services wherever possible. It is just good business to do so. The turnover in this service has reached a starting proportion due entirely, in my opinion, to the inadequancy and unattractiveness of the Federal pay scale and the working conditions. The process of constantly training new employees certainly does not increase the efficiency of the Federal service, in which we have all taken such just pride throughout the years.

In my judgment, a pay raise is long overdue for our deserving Federal employees and I trust the committee will promptly and favorably report a substantial increase in their compensation.

The Geneva Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FREDERIC R. COUDERT, JR.

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 12, 1954

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial appearing in the New York Daily Mirror of May 3, 1954, which includes a reference to my proposed amendment to the Armed Forces appropriation bill dealing with troop commitments abroad:

THE GENEVA CONFERENCE

It is already clear that the Geneva Conference, from an American standpoint, is a failure. John Foster Dulles, Secretary of State, is returning to the United States; Gen. Walter B. Smith, Under Secretary, has gone over to represent us.

The Geneva Conference was called to settle the Korean problem by a political agreement. That is no longer the main issue. Now the Indochina situation looms larger than a Korean settlement.

On both issues the United States stands isolated. John Foster Dulles fights to keep allies for our country; he labors to prevent isolation from becoming a fixed condition. But it does not look as though he might succeed.

"Isolationism" is a bad word in American parlance. It has been developed into a campaign issue and our children in the schools have been taught that nothing can be more horrible than an isolationist.

But now we have become isolated against our wishes. Our Secretary of State goes to Geneva to find that his country has no allies; that France wants the United States to take over the Indochina war but will make no concessions to American opinion; that Great Britain will not join in such an enterprise, will not even send a token force such as she sent to Korea.

The British are utilizing Geneva to cater to the master of Chinese intrigue, Premier Chou En-lai of Red China, trained in Moscow, more orthodoxly Marxist than Malenkov, a hater of the United States and Great Britain and all other so-called white men. The British may end up with some kind of trade deal at the expense of the United States. So antagonistic to the United States has British public opinion become that it is even possible that Winston Churchill can win a political victory by a deal with Red China against the United States.

France wants a partition of Indochina between France and the Soviet Universal State, a sort of 38th parallel, based on a truce. In a word, France wants peace, no matter how temporary, at any price. Otherwise, France desires that the United States take over this war, and that would mean to take it over alone.

There is no question but that the Eisenhower administration would like to solve this problem by taking on the Indochina war and fighting it to a finish. Such a conclusion must be reached from the Nixon off-the-record speech. It was, when finally published, the most honest presentation of American policy on this subject we have yet had. It was a speech which was obviously designed to give our allies notice of what the American Government hoped to do.

But American public opinion is antagonistic to sending huge numbers of American boys to be slaughtered in Indochina or to die there of tropical diseases. Therefore, the administration hems and haws and tries it this way today and that way tomorrow. The American people are not convinced that America's best interests will be served by the Indochina war.

An excellent example of this uncertainty was the 2-day debate in the House of Representatives over the issue of the use of troops in overseas wars. Representative FREDERIC R. COUDERT, JR., introduced a measure to forbid the President to engage freely in war without consulting Congress, except in instances covered by existing treaties, and for immediate defense from attack. The President had said that he would not make war without consulting Congress.

It would therefore seem that the President's views and COUDERT'S views are identical. It was expected that the Coudert proposal would pass, as most Representatives, Republican and Democratic, favored the Coudert resolution. Then the Republican leadership got busy to oppose any limitation on the powers of the President. Their argument was that in this ticklish situation the President must have a free hand.

The Republican leadership maintains a fixed policy of always opposing any limitation upon the powers of the President. The Republicans are placed in an awkward position because they had attacked Harry Truman for an abuse of power in precisely the same kind of situation where they now demand freedom of action for Eisenhower. They criticized Truman for going into war without authority from Congress.

It looks as though the United States might face the alternatives at Geneva of accepting the role of an isolated nation, or of bowing to the demands of Chou En-lai, or of getting out with as much dignity as possible. World leadership has at last run the circle to isolation.

Unfair to the Poor Man

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 13, 1954

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks; I include in the RECORD today a letter from a correspondent in Andover, N. Y., with respect to the inequity of our social-security system as it now operates:

ANDOVER, N. Y., *April 1, 1954.*

Representative OSTERTAG,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The social-security system as it stands is very unfair to the poor man, who has labored hard and continuously ever since social security was put into effect, but has not been allowed to contribute to it. In my own case, I have been a laborer in the highway division of the State of New York from 1936 to 1952. The State did not give social-security rights until 1954. I worked until I was 78 years old, because the older men were the best workers and they were allowed to work. We never received time and a half for overtime and wages were very small. No chance for anything but a mere living, in hopes of gaining social security. I worked all through the war, keeping roads ready and sanded at all hours of the night, working by hand, as there was no machinery as there is now. The soldiers were granted social-security credits for their time spent in the Army. Why not us soldiers here at home, who kept things moving to them? I think the Federal Government should rectify this neglect. I had an operation for cataract of one eye and used up my savings fast; now there is a cataract in the other eye and my sight is totally gone. My wife is totally deaf. Yet we have to live. They are retiring all around us at 65 on social-security benefits. Don't you think that men who have worked past 70 on small wages are entitled to social-security benefits?

Why try to do so much for the poor in foreign countries and leave the decent poor man at home without social security? Don't delay too long in doing something to help us old fellows, for time is running short for us.

Hoping God will give you and your fellow Congressmen the courage and insight to do what is right and just for all, I remain,

Yours,

JAMES M. DEAN.

J. Edgar Hoover, FBI Director

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 13, 1954

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following editorial from the Boston Daily Globe, Boston, Mass., Monday, May 10, 1954:

FBI TRADITION

Those whom the immense prestige of the FBI makes slightly uncomfortable will obtain considerable reassurance in Don Whitehead's 30-year-anniversary interview with J. Edgar Hoover.

The only picture in the office of the FBI Director is that of his first boss, Attorney General Harlan F. Stone, later Chief Justice of the United States Supreme Court.

That helps bring Mr. Hoover's role back into focus. It recalls that Mr. Stone, who had made a name for support of civil rights as dean of the Columbia Law School, was appointed by President Coolidge to reorganize the Department of Justice, which had shown irresponsibility in the last years of President Wilson's administration, and something worse under President Harding.

Not only did Mr. Stone back Mr. Hoover's policy of basing promotion on merit, regardless of political pressures; on one occasion he complained that a party hack who had been discharged had not been let go soon enough.

There is importance also in the personal relationship of the two men. Though Mr. Stone's manner was stern at first, he later made a point of meeting Mr. Hoover, and chatting with him, when he had become chief of the Nation's highest tribunal. These talks cannot have failed to contribute to the FBI's tradition.

Within 5 years of his appointment, the methods established by Mr. Hoover began to pay off. The country woke up to discover that leading criminals, who had been unloosed on the country by the prohibition era, and seemed invulnerable, were being eliminated one by one.

But neither Chief Justice Stone nor the FBI Director could have contemplated 30 years ago the difficult periods in which the organization would be compelled to function. First came World War II and the danger to internal security. There followed the cold war and the stepped-up problem of rooting out Communist infiltration, especially in Government.

Vastly expanded burdens were placed on the FBI. This called for maintaining quality of performance in an increased volume of business; it also demanded something equally difficult—that the FBI keep its head.

In an era that has become familiar with the methods of Hitler's Gestapo and Russia's MVD, it should not be necessary to labor the point that any secret police organization, by its very nature, is potentially dangerous to freedom. In periods of public excitement, this is especially the case, for there is pressure to gain results by whatever means, and frequently temptation to grasp for political power.

Though Mr. Hoover would hardly endorse every action of every FBI agent—in fact he has discharged many who got out of line—his record with regard to civil rights has remained good. Not only has he kept the organization free of political pressures; he has fought to maintain its nonpartisan standing as well. It obviously is no Gestapo.

Mr. Hoover is convinced that it could never become such an organization. He points to the checks imposed by the courts and Congress. He emphasized the exceedingly important fact that the FBI has no secret funds and must publicly account for every penny it spends.

Despite the great value of these guaranties, a secret police organization is still potentially dangerous to any society, and there is even something a little disquieting in the immense prestige the FBI has earned. Mr. Hoover cannot live forever; just before his time the organization was sometimes turned to uses for which it was not intended.

It is imperative that Congress and especially the people, become imbued with the tradition established by Mr. Hoover and Chief Justice Stone and insist that it be maintained. By adhering to it, in spite of its limitations, the FBI has done its work with marvelous efficiency in the most difficult times.

So long as that tradition continues to control, it will serve the country well and constitute no danger to freedom.

Uncle Dudley.

Anniversary of the Polish Constitution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDMUND P. RADWAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 13, 1954

Mr. RADWAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I want to insert in the Congressional Record a resolution adopted at a mass observance commemorating the Polish Constitution at a meeting held in Buffalo, N. Y., on Sunday, May 2:

"Whereas we met here today to commemorate the 163d anniversary of the Polish Constitution of May 3; and

"Whereas our speaker of this day is Representative Edmund P. Radwan, Member of the House of Representatives; and

"Whereas Representative Edmund P. Radwan has introduced a resolution in the Congress of the United States to protest the unjust and destructive tax which the Soviet Government of Poland has levied upon gift packages sent by American citizens to the unfortunate people of enslaved Poland: Therefore, be it hereby

"*Resolved*, That we here assembled join in the protest by supporting the aforesaid Radwan resolution; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That we hereby commend Representative Edmund P. Radwan for introducing said resolution and that we also commend Representative Edmund P. Radwan for the outstanding service and excellent representation that he has rendered as a Member of the House of Representatives; and be it finally

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be sent to Senators Irving Ives and Herbert Lehman; Representatives William E. Miller, John R. Pillion, and Edmund P. Radwan."

The resolution committee consisted of the following members of the New York bar: Raymond R. Niemer, chairman; Joseph P. Kussynski, Joseph S. Matala, Walter T. Sendziak, and Victor E. Manz.

The above resolution was unanimously adopted at a mass observance of the Polish Constitution of May 3, 1791, and which meeting was held Sunday, May 2, 1954, at Polish Cadets Hall, 927 Grant Street, Buffalo, N. Y.

An Anti-American Conspiracy?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM C. LANTAFF

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 13, 1954

Mr. LANTAFF. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the Americas Daily, an outstanding newspaper published in my district and devoted to creating a better understanding between the Americas, is so timely and significant that I am including it in the Record at this point for the benefit of my colleagues:

AN ANTI-AMERICAN CONSPIRACY?

A protectionist campaign is under way in the United States in relation to foreign trade, the like of which has never been seen before. Interested parties are spending money by the handful, making personal contacts with influential people and the voters, calling on Congressmen, undertaking lecture tours, and trying to influence other vested interests which could, at a given moment, give them a majority in Congress. However, strangely enough, little has been noted in the press or in publications supporting this campaign. It seems that something sinister is being hatched in certain spheres, as if to create a favorable climate to submit, at the last moment and by surprise, when the time is considered ripe, certain concrete and specific measures deemed adequate for the end sought.

The argument between the two economic theories—protection and free trade—is an old story in the United States. The country for many years adhered to the neomercantilist theory based clearly and simply on the doctrine that all exports are good and all imports evil. This theory does not take into account the incontestable fact that trade is a process of exchange and that without imports there could be no exports. In 1953, the protectionist campaign was stubborn, but since the 83d Congress convened, it was clearly seen that the campaign was being directed toward obtaining approval of certain specific laws restricting the importation—through quotas or high tariffs—of some products and raw materials.

There were protective bills on the importation of zinc, lead, watches, cheese, and very significantly, petroleum. This year, President Eisenhower's point of view contained in his message to Congress of March 30, 1954, and covering "recommendations concerning the foreign economic policy of the United States," has been made known. These recommendations in substance are reiterations of those contained in the Randall Commission report known to all.

The President has spoken clearly and in good time to the country. The protectionist forces, however, persist in a backstage campaign directed at the very source of power, the voters. It is a general and theoretical campaign, not exposing any specific or concrete measures which may be had in mind. It is in contrast with the President's attitude of defining his position frankly and simply, followed up by a bill, H. R. (8860). Just what is the intention of the protectionist, what do they seek with their tactics of priming the fuse and holding back the fire until the right time, perhaps until the last minute?

The clash of different ideas, the free and frank discussion of conflicting principles, the call on public opinion when opinions vary, are the essence of government in this country. To reach the voters themselves to convince them, by means of sounding reasoning and an abundance of figures and data, on an honest approach of a given subject.

The forces supporting protectionism have every right to campaign in favor of their own convictions. It does not seem fair, however to ask the citizens of this country to take sides on such a complex matter as foreign trade without informing them, until the last minute, of all concrete and specific measures intended to be submitted to the Congress of the United States. This attitude smells of conspiracy against the rights assisting every man and woman in the United States to know to the fullest detail whatever specific measures their Congressmen plan to propose in Congress. Their support does not mean carte blanche. Otherwise, the practice of the public addressing letters to the lawmakers to let them know the reaction of public opinion regarding certain specific matters, would be useless.

Talk is rampant about taking the American people by surprise. Should this be true, it would be an anti-American conspiracy, implying an attempt to deprive the people of their right to prior consideration and study of national matters and to advance their opinions as to how Congressmen should vote in each instance. It is said that when the time comes for the pertinent congressional committee to examine bill H. R. 8860, a plan is afoot to change it radically, though using the same heading and number, and thus placing the President in a difficult position, forcing him to use the veto power. It is rumored that even hearings will not be held to accomplish this maneuver. It is likewise rumored that specific legislation might appear at the last minute to nullify the effect of a bill based on the President's suggestions.

The unprecedented activity displayed by protectionists and the secrecy surrounding the measures they propose to submit is rather strange. Tactics of this kind will not gain the support of the American people. Men and women in this country should be informed with frankness and sincerity. They like to be consulted on the country's affairs.

On another occasion we shall examine the disastrous effects resulting from the adoption of a protectionist system in the foreign policy of the United States through legislative action of this kind. We shall then see what this would mean for the entire Western Hemisphere, for also Americans are all those born in the other republics of the continent. We all are Americans, and we are all interested in a move of this nature. We cannot talk of political solidarity if it does not go hand in hand with economic solidarity. What we want to ask today is: What is behind this silent and hidden campaign to enlist followers without disclosing to them definite plans or measures? We are against the blind support of merely general principles without thorough knowledge of the facts and projects that may be translated into laws.

We ask all Americans in this continent to be on the alert.

Flag Presentation and Flag Raising, Suitland High School, Prince Georges County, Md., May 11, 1954

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK SMALL, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 13, 1954

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following address made by the Honorable Theodore R. McKeldin, Governor of Maryland, at the flag presentation and flag raising ceremonies held at Suitland Hight School, Prince Georges County, Md., on May 11, 1954:

I think we have too few flag raisings in these times of taking things for granted.

Oh, yes, if we happen to glance upward in the morning or during the day, we see the flag over the school, the Government building, or the firehouse. But we do not give it a second thought. It is just there. It belongs there. So what? Maybe, after glancing at it, we do not even remember having seen it.

We just take it for granted.

But at a ceremony, such as this, we are inclined to give it more thought. We see it carefully attached to its cords. We see it slowly raised. We see it unfurl to the breeze.

Then something stirs in our hearts—something too often forgotten. We realize then what it meant to those early Americans who were fighting to establish a nation. We know a little of what it meant to the daring revolutionists who saw it wave over Yorktown.

We get an idea of what inspired Francis Scott Key to write the beautiful hymn that became our national anthem off the shores of Fort McHenry.

We begin to understand what it meant to Pershing's men at Chateau Thierry in 1918, to the boys at Okinawa, at the surrender of the Nazis, and on hundreds of frozen ridges in Korea.

In times of ceremony, we realize what the Stars and Stripes mean—the blood, sweat, and toil that went into our flag's establishment and its defense as a symbol of true freedom in this Nation under God.

Yes; I am in favor—strongly in favor—of the adoption of Senator Ferguson's resolution to insert officially the significant words "under God" in our recognized and honored pledge of allegiance.

When you read the proposal in the pledge, you wonder why it has not always been there: "One Nation, indivisible, under God, with liberty and justice for all."

How could there be liberty and justice in any land without their Supreme Author?

We know it was with faith in God, and only with His good guidance, that our forefathers established government in this land.

Morals, based on religious teachings, were prescribed for that Government by law, or were understood in the hearts of the founders.

Our very freedoms were inspired by and are based on religion.

It should be remembered—and never forgotten, lest forgetting make us careless—that of the 25 billion people who have lived in recorded history, only 3 billion have known the blessings of liberty.

Yet, long before the first settlers came to these shores, Moses was telling men who had lived in slavery that it was God's will that they be free from the shackles of other men.

Then came Jesus Christ to raise the human soul higher in dignity and to remind men that they should know the truth and the truth should make them free.

The teachings of Christ and Moses were contained in a book which men and women carried across a stormy sea in their search for that freedom for which their descendants were to go to war in 1776.

The early settlers saw clearly the need for God and for religion in their colonial governments.

"Unless we are governed by God," said William Penn, "we will be governed by tyrants."

With the founding of this still young Republic, the early leaders turned often to religion for guidance and for hope in that which they were founding under God's direction. The honesty necessary to the success of the experiment called for religious thought.

"I believe that religion substantially good," said Thomas Jefferson, "which produces an honest life, and we have been authorized by one whom you and I equally respect, to judge the tree by its fruit."

In 1790, while the American experiment in free government under God still hung in the balance, John Philpot Kern, the great Irish patriot and political advocate warned that "the condition under which God hath given liberty to man is eternal vigilance." He cautioned that if this condition is broken, "servitude is at once the consequence of your crime and the punishment of your guilt."

In looking at religion in government, we must remember that our form of government recognizes what God prescribed—that man has a soul—a source of dignity and individual worth, as compared with the Marxian Communist theory which we are fighting today—that man has worth only as he serves the state.

We must remember that if our freedoms and our rights—our right to freedom of religion, freedom of speech, freedom of assembly, and the ownership of property—were merely gifts of the state, why then the state could take them away.

But, if we are true to our religious fundamentals, the state did not give them and the state cannot take them away, because our Government recognizes it as self-evident that the Creator has endowed man with certain inalienable rights.

Yes, indeed, if we are to "pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the Republic for which it stands, one Nation, indivisible," we must pledge it under God—the True Giver of "liberty and justice for all."

Bipartisan Foreign Policy Urgently Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 13, 1954

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following excellent and timely editorial from the Christian Science Monitor, Boston, Mass., Wednesday, May 12, 1954:

BIPARTISANSHIP: TWO-WAY STREET

When Harry Truman was in the White House this newspaper pointed out that the chief responsibility for maintaining a bipartisan foreign policy rested with those in power. We have not changed our view. For that reason we find much that is persuasive in Mr. Truman's appeal to President Eisenhower to exercise more active leadership to foster the conditions of bipartisanship.

While Mr. Truman's record in this field was far from perfect, he has a considerable knowledge of it and deserves a hearing on this subject. For all his partisanship, he went much further than the present administration has in appointing members of the opposition party to high posts—particularly in the foreign service. These included members of the Cabinet and top-ranking ambassadors. Mr. Dulles himself was given free rein in making the Japanese Peace Treaty.

But this is not Mr. Truman's main point. His chief argument is that the essential foundation of mutual respect and trust required for cooperation on foreign policy cannot be built while Republicans are charging Democrats with "20 years of treason." There is really no answer to this argument, and we suspect that President Eisenhower realizes it. Indeed, he has taken steps which have removed the Republican National Committee's imprimatur from this charge by Senator McCarthy. And Senator Knowland has now repudiated it.

One trouble is that in the effort to end 20 years of Democratic rule many Republicans went to extremes in campaign speeches in 1952. Not only did they call Korea "Mr. Truman's war"; not only did they underscore every failure of American policy and ignore every success—they intimated that China and eastern Europe were purposely given to the Reds. Then they talked themselves into believing that they could establish completely new foreign and defense policies.

The evil legacies of this campaigning have continued to bedevil current diplomacy. Half of Mr. Dulles' effort has been expended on words or gestures to satisfy the right wing of his own party. In the technical operation of foreign policy both he and President Eisenhower have gone to great lengths to consult with Democratic congressional leaders. But at the same time Mr. Dulles was impelled to talk of great innovations and the New Look.

Also many Republicans thought they could gain advantage in this year's elections by continuing to criticize Democratic handling of foreign policy. They sought to make the charge of softness toward communism—even with suggestions of treason—a major political asset, despite the President's statement that communism should not be an issue. Then came the severe setback in Indochina—and the Democrats grabbed the chance to reply in kind.

They have seized on this gain by the Reds and the blow to American prestige with the same eagerness Republicans picked up similar embarrassments in the Truman regime. They recalled Vice President Nixon's assurances in March that the Reds would no longer be allowed "to nibble us to death." Even before the fall of Dien Bien Phu, Senator Lyndon Johnson, minority leader in the Senate, was so caustically critical of Secretary Dulles' course as to serve warning that little bipartisanship in foreign policy remained.

Now, this Democratic reaction is natural enough. Considering what has been said about them, the temptation must be very great to seek both personal satisfaction and partisan advantage in underscoring Republican failures. But such temptation must be resisted. No American can get any pleasure out of his country's failures. The truth is that foreign policy cannot wisely be reversed at every election, and both parties should refrain from exploiting it for partisan purposes.

Constructive criticism is always needed, and the Democrats can contribute to the shaping of a firm position against Communist aggression. But the major responsibility, as we said before, rests with the party in power. Particularly with the President.

To gain effective bipartisanship in foreign policy he may have to take a more vigorous stand against those in his own party who are still trying to make partisan use of foreign policy. When Republicans stop saying Democrats are not reliable allies against communism, Democrats will become more effective partners.

Meeting of Foreign Relations Commission of the American Legion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 13, 1954

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have earlier arranged for the reproduction in the RECORD of the report of the foreign relations commission of the American Legion. I believe that my colleagues will be interested in noting the outstanding membership of the commission. I also believe that they will be interested in noting the list of speakers who addressed the commission.

I send now to the desk the forepart of the report of the commission, which describes the background of the Washington meeting, and lists the membership of the commission, as well as the schedule of speakers whom the commission heard between April 12 and 14 here in Washington. I ask unanimous consent that both of these items be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPORT OF THE FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMISSION, THE AMERICAN LEGION

To the National Executive Committee, the American Legion:

Your national commission on foreign relations met in Washington, D. C., April 12, 13, and 14, 1954. All 14 members of the commission, together with the two liaison chairmen, were present as follows: Rogers Kelley, chairman, Edinburg, Tex.; Charles A. Gonsner, vice chairman, Spokane, Wash.; Leon Happell, vice chairman, Stockton, Calif.; Chester Trumbo, vice chairman, Arlington, S. Dak.; Emilio S. Iglesias, vice chairman, Montpelier, Vt.; Jacob Kessler, Worcester, Mass.; Sherman W. Mason, Jeannette, Pa.; J. Ben Warren, Monticello, Ga.; John J. Barnhardt, Concord, N. C.; George W. Cregg, Syracuse, N. Y.; Joseph D. Fitzstephens, Cody, Wyo.; William Verity, Ashland, Ky.; Alton T. Roberts, Highland Park, Mich.; Harry E. Jackson, Manchester, N. H.

Dr. Carl J. Rees, chairman, foreign relations commission liaison committee, Newark, Del.

Warren H. Atherton, chairman, inter-American committee, Stockton, Calif.

Also present were: Seaborn P. Collins, chairman, national security commission, Las Cruces, N. Mex.; W. C. "Dan" Daniel, chairman, economic commission, Danville, Va.; James F. O'Neil, past national commander, New York, N. Y.; Edward F. McGinnis, director, national public relations; William F. Hauck, director, Washington office.

In this connection it should be pointed out that your commission received considerable assistance from Dr. Rees and Past National Commanders Atherton and O'Neil. We desire to express our since appreciation and gratitude to the amiable and efficient director of our Washington office, William F. Hauck, who made the arrangements for our Washington meeting and rendered valuable service in many ways.

During the 3-day meeting, the commission conferred with and was briefed by various officials and representatives of the State Department and several other governmental agencies. Conferences were also held with the Ambassadors of India, Pakistan, and Vietnam; with Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, chairman of the United States Senate Foreign Relations Committee; and with Dr. WALTER H. JUDD, member of the United States House of Representatives Foreign Affairs Committee. A copy of the agenda and list of speakers appearing before the commission is attached hereto.

PROGRAM, NATIONAL FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMISSION, THE AMERICAN LEGION, WASHINGTON, D. C.

MONDAY, APRIL 12, ROOM 5106, NEW STATE BUILDING

9:30–9:45 a. m.: Welcome, Carl W. McCardle, Assistant Secretary for Public Affairs.

9:45–9:55 a. m.: Informal remarks, Gen. Walter Bedell Smith, Under Secretary.

9:55–10:45 a. m.: Far East, Kenneth T. Young, Director, Office of Northeast Asian Affairs; and Robert E. Hoey, Officer in Charge, Viet Nam-Laos-Cambodian Affairs, Office of Philippine and Southeast Asian Affairs.

10:45–11:15 a. m.: Western Europe, C. Burke Elbrick, Deputy Assistant Secretary for European Affairs; and Laurence C. Vass, Officer in Charge, North Atlantic Treaty Economic and Military Assistance Affairs.

11:15 a. m.–12 noon: Latin America, Henry F. Holland, Assistant Secretary for Inter-American Affairs.

12:15–2 p. m.: Lunch, Army-Navy Club, Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, guest speaker.

2:15–2:45 p. m.: Russia, Walter J. Stoessel, Jr., Acting Officer in Charge U. S. S. R. Affairs, Office of Eastern European Affairs.

2:45–3:15 p. m.: United Nations, Joseph J. Cisco, on the staff for United Nations affairs.

3:15–3:45 p. m.: U. N. Charter review, Lincoln P. Bloomfield, Planning Adviser, Bureau of United Nations Affairs.

3:45–4:15 p. m.: Germany, Geoffrey W. Lewis, Deputy Director, Office of German Affairs.

4:15–4:45 p. m.: Near East, Henry A. Byroade, Assistant Secretary, Near Eastern, South Asian, and African Affairs.

4:45–5:15 p. m.: Informal remarks, Allen Dulles, Director, Central Intelligence Agency.

8 p. m.–12 midnight: The American Legion Headquarters, 1608 K Street NW., executive session, foreign relations commission.

TUESDAY, APRIL 13, ROOM 5106, NEW STATE BUILDING

9–9:30 a. m.: Central Asia, William O. Anderson, Office of Chinese Affairs.

9:30–10 a. m.: Special briefing on China, WALTER H. JUDD, Representative from Minnesota.

10–10:30 a. m.: FOA, John H. Stambaugh, Assistant to the Director, Foreign Operations Administration.

10:30–11 a. m.: International Exchange Program, Russell Riley, Director, International Exchange Program.

11–11:30 a. m.: USIA, Theodore Streibert, Director, United States Information Agency.

TUESDAY, APRIL 13, ROOM 401, FOURTH FLOOR CONFERENCE ROOM, AMERICAN LEGION HEADQUARTERS

2:30–3:30 p. m.: Pakistan, His Excellency Syed Amjad Ali, Ambassador of Pakistan to the United States.

3:30–4:30 p. m.: India, His Excellency Gaganvihri Lalubbai Mehta, Ambassador of India to the United States.

4:30–5 p. m.: Trade agreements, Senator GEORGE W. MALONE.

8–12 midnight: The American Legion headquarters, 1608 K Street NW., executive session, Foreign Relations Commission.

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 14, ROOM 401, FOURTH FLOOR CONFERENCE ROOM, AMERICAN LEGION HEADQUARTERS

9–9:30 a. m: Film on Guatemala.

9:30–10 a. m.: Answering of questions on Guatemala, Julius Cahn, counsel for the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations.

10–11 a. m.: Vietnam, His Excellency, Tran Van Kha, Ambassador of Vietnam to the United States.

11–11:30 a. m.: Office conference, Clarence B. Randall, Chairman, President's Commission on Foreign Economic Policy.

11:30–5 p. m.: Executive session, preparation of report to the national executive committee.

Adjournment, 5 p. m.

District Attorney Stephen A. Moynahan: His Effective Educational Program Designed To Curb Child Attackers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 13, 1954

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, one of the significant aspects of service in the Congress is the discussion of and the diffusion of ideas and programs that a Member of this House believes would be of benefit in the districts of his colleagues. Time and again I have noted many members from all sections of the country bringing to the attention of his fellow lawmakers worthwhile projects that have been initiated in their localities. I believe that it is good that this be done. All of our regions are faced with common problems. Anything that assists in meeting and helping to solve these problems should have our attention.

Mr. Speaker, it is on this basis that I commend to the membership of this House an extremely effective leaflet prepared by Stephen A. Moynahan, district attorney for the western district of Massachusetts. Mr. Moynahan has been the distinguished and able district attorney in my district for many years. His outstanding record has earned the respect of the press and the public alike. Because of his activity as the chief law-enforcement officer of his area, he speaks with considerable authority on the myriad of problems that have his constant attention. His great experience, in and out of the courtroom, has convinced him that public vigilance and due care can do much to cut down the alarming growth of crime. Crimes involving sex perversion, particularly with reference to children, are the nightmares that face all prosecuting officials. With the cooperation of the newspapers, schools, churches, and parents, District Attorney Moynahan has instituted a program that is bound to be effective. It instructs the children and the parents in the rules that provide portection against would-be attackers.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the Members of the Congress would be interested in bringing District Attorney Moynahan's program to the attention of law officials in their districts. So, sir, through his cooperation, I will distribute to each Member one of the leaflets prepared by him. Since the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD has such a wide circulation throughout the Nation, I, under unanimous consent, include the following:

SPRINGFIELD.

To All Boys and Girls:

Your parents, teachers, and law-enforcement officials wish to keep you safe and happy. You can help us by: (1) Studying the safety rules shown on these pages; (2) remember to obey these rules always.

You know that your police officer is your friend. Always report or ask someone else to report any stranger who tries to join in your play, or asks you to go with him, or tries to have you disobey any of these rules.

Once again, study these rules carefully and remember what each one means to you.

SAFETY RULES

1. Never take rides from persons whom you do not know.
2. Get the license number of the car.
3. Never take money, candy, or treats from any stranger.
4. Never go with strangers when they ask for directions.
5. Get the license number of the car.
6. Never go with strangers who offer you a job with pay.
7. Never play alone in alleys or in deserted buildings. Keep together.
8. Get the license number of the car.
9. Never wait around toilets. Always leave immediately.
10. Never let strangers touch you.
11. Get the license number of the car.
12. Better take a pal along when you go to playgrounds, movies, stores, etc.

A WORD TO PARENTS

Children should be warned never to ride with strangers. If approached by strangers and offered a ride, candy, or a good time, they should refuse and mark down the license number of the car. Failing to have a pencil, they should scratch the number in the road with a stick or on the sidewalk with a stone. A license number is of the greatest importance. Then they should ask the first person they see—their parents, friends, storekeeper, or teachers—to immediately call the police department.

Any time a stranger is seen loitering at or near a school, playground, or other places where children congregate, the supervisor, teacher, bus driver, or parents should rapidly gather as much information as possible, including the license number, make, and color of the car, and immediately call the local police department.

Your care may save the life of a little girl or boy.

STEPHEN A. MOYNAHAN,
District Attorney for the Western District of Massachusetts.

Analysis of H. R. 7200

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT L. CONDON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 13, 1954

Mr. CONDON. Mr. Speaker, at my request, the director of the Department of Social Welfare of the State of California, the Honorable Charles I. Schottland, prepared for me an analysis of H. R. 7200, which is now pending. This analysis shows the devastating effects that this measure would have upon the very progressive old-age assistance, aid to the needy blind, and aid to the needy children programs as they are presently operating in the State of California. I feel that Mr. Schottland's analysis of the ways in which this measure would affect one State will be of interest to the Members of this Congress.

The analysis follows:

H. R. 7200

This bill proposes a variable grant formula for Federal sharing in public-assistance programs based in part on the ratio of State per capita income to national per capita income. For old-age assistance the formula also takes into account the incidence of aged OASI beneficiaries in the State. For California Federal funds would be less under the proposed formula than at present.

H. R. 7200 provides for continuation of the present sharing formula—McFarland amendment—through March 31, 1955. It also provides that the decrease in Federal funds under the new sharing formula shall not exceed 12 percent until after June 30, 1957. (This latter provision is of academic interest only so far as California is concerned, since the decrease is unlikely to exceed 12 percent prior to June 1957.)

SHARING FORMULA

Old-age security

Step 1. Federal share percentage equals—

$$100 \text{ percent} - 35 \text{ percent} \times \frac{\text{Per capita income, California}}{\text{Per capita income, United States}}$$

$$100 \text{ percent} - 35 \text{ percent} \times \frac{\$1{,}899}{\$1{,}553}$$

$$100 \text{ percent} - 35 \text{ percent} \times 1.223.$$

57 percent.

Step 2. Adjusted upward to statutory minimum=60 percent. (Minimum=60 percent; maximum=75 percent.)

Step 3. Adjusted for incidence of OASI. Federal share percentage reduced by 1 percent for each 5 percent of aged population receiving OASI benefits.[1] (36 percent of California aged population received OASI benefits as of June 1953.)

$$\frac{36 \text{ percent}}{5} = 7.2 \text{ percent.}$$

60 percent−7 percent=53 percent=Federal share percentage.
This percentage applied to average payment up to $55:
$55×53 percent=$29.15=Federal share per case.
(Maximum Federal share under present law=$35.)

Aid to needy blind

Federal share percentage=60 percent. (Same as steps 1 and 2 for OAS.)
This percentage applied to average payment up to $55:
$55×60 percent=$33=Federal share per case. (Maximum Federal share under present law=$35.)

Aid to needy children

Federal share percentage=60 percent. (Same as steps 1 and 2 for OAS.)
This percentage applied to average payment per person up to $27.50:
$27.50×60 percent=$16.50=Federal share per person. (Maximum Federal share under present law=$19.50 each for first child and eligible needy caretaker; $15 for each additional eligible child.)

[1] Beneficiary rate divided by 5; fractional percentage rounded upward if one-half or more, downward if less than one-half.

ESTIMATES

There are some legal questions as to the effect of the Federal sharing provisions of H. R. 7200 on the amount of grant sections of the Welfare and Institutions Code with respect to Old Age Security, Aid to Needy Blind, and Aid to Needy Children. However, for purposes of the present estimates we have assumed that the maximum grants for all three programs will remain unchanged. Also, in order to minimize the number of hypothetical elements to be considered, we have used the 1954–55 estimates of caseloads as presented in the executive budget and have compared estimates of Federal funds under H. R. 7200 with those estimated for the 1954–55 executive budget. (Thus, although H. R. 7200 would not actually become effective before April 1, 1955, we have made the estimates as though it were in effect during the whole year.)

Old-age security—Annual costs (assistance)

	1954–55 executive budget	H. R. 7200	Increase or decrease
Total	$228,442,000	$228,442,000	
Federal	109,652,000	96,160,000	−$13,492,000
State	101,867,000	113,385,000	11,518,000
County	16,923,000	18,897,000	1,974,000

Aid to needy blind—Annual costs (assistance)

	1954–55 executive budget	H. R. 7200	Increase or decrease
Total	$12,106,000	$12,106,000	
Federal	4,866,500	4,680,700	−$185,800
State	5,436,700	5,569,000	132,300
County	1,802,800	1,856,300	53,500

Aid to needy children—Annual costs (assistance)

	1954–55 executive budget	H. R. 7200	Increase or decrease
Total	$85,718,750	$85,718,750	
Federal	35,381,700	34,590,600	−$791,100
State	32,897,500	33,424,900	527,400
County	17,439,550	17,703,250	263,700

Estimated annual cost effects of H. R. 7200 on OAS, ANB, and ANC combined

Total	
Federal	$−14,468,900
State	12,177,700
County	2,291,200

FURTHER EFFECTS OF OASI ADJUSTMENT FACTOR

The OASI adjustment factor in the proposed old-age assistance sharing formula is intended to reduce Federal funds to the States as the proportion of their aged population receiving OASI benefits increases. For every 5 percent of a State's OASI beneficiary rate the Federal share percentage for old-age assistance is reduced 1 percent. Thus, when the California OASI beneficiary rate reaches 40 percent[1] the downward adjustment in the old-age assistance Federal sharing percentage would increase from 7 percent to 8 percent and the Federal share will drop from 53 percent to 52 percent.

A 1-percent drop in this sharing percentage amounts to 55 cents per case per month. At the 1954–55 estimated caseload level this would amount to an additional loss to California of $1,814,000 in Federal funds annually.

---

[1] The change would actually occur at 37.5 percent because of rounding provision.

Murphy Army Hospital Is Essential for the Proper Medical Care and Treatment of New England Military Personnel and Their Dependents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 13, 1954

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I would like to include the remarks I made on the floor of the House when the recent military appropriations bill was under discussion.

Department of the Army officials had testified at an open public meeting they did not have sufficient money to continue Murphy Army General Hospital in Waltham, Mass., for the next fiscal year. Because of my very deep conviction this general hospital provides an essential medical service to military personnel and their dependents within the New England States and parts of New York and New Jersey, I introduced an amendment from the floor to insure sufficient funds to maintain its full operation. My remarks on that occasion follow:

Mr. Donohue. Mr. Chairman, the fundamental purpose of this amendment is to enable the Secretary of Defense, through the Army Surgeon General, to carry out presidential instructions to provide adequate medical and dental care for military personnel and their families.

The immediate objective of this amendment is to enable the Department of the Army to continue the full operation of Murphy Army General Hospital, located in Waltham, Mass.

Testimony given by high military officials at a public meeting here yesterday revealed the Surgeon General does not want to close this admittedly superior medical facility. Statistics and charts of the treatment and services rendered at this hospital from its inception to this date demonstrated the resources of the hospital have been consistently and fully utilized. There is, therefore, no question and no doubt concerning the positive need for this medical military unit.

The location of the hospital, adjacent to Boston, Mass., one of the greatest and largest medical centers in the world, is an admittedly superior advantage over most other like hospitals. Patients are thereby accorded the particular benefit of observation and diagnosis, upon emergency, by some of the leading specialist and consultant civilian doctors in the country, without any obstacle of lengthy travel or contact difficulties. The military professional hospital staff is thereby easily afforded the educational and inspirational opportunity of intimate association with the most learned and experienced medical authorities in the Nation. Doctors, military personnel, and their dependents can go or be brought to the hospital in the speediest fashion as the highway routes are of the most modern type, and Boston possesses one of the largest and most efficient air terminals on the globe.

However, those are only the physical factors involved. This general hospital is practically the only military hospital in the First Army area. It is designed to serve Massachusetts and the whole New England region, which military officials have described as the densest recruiting area in the country. If this hospital should close, those needing treatment would have to go, at great hardship, as far away as the general hospital in Pennsylvania or Walter Reed in Washington.

Mr. Chairman, the highest Government sources have expressed grave concern over the many and increasing signs of lowering morale among our present and potential military personnel. In my considered judgment, it is axiomatic that a military unit is no better than the spirit existing among its members, and the morale of their families behind them, despite whatever powerful war weapons that may be possessed. I believe, and I am sure you will all agree, it is only commonsense to judge that assurances to military personnel and their dependents that their medical needs will be fully and completely provided for is the major factor in the maintenance of a high spirit and morale.

I must confess I know not how to measure morale and spirit in dollars and cents. As a Member of Congress, I am as vitally interested in promoting economy as anyone, but I emphatically feel, while we are granting billions to questionable allies, a comparatively small expenditure to insure an essential high spirit and morale in our fighting forces and their dependents is a very sound investment in the security of this Nation.

With the threatening shadow of Indochina hanging over us, no man can foretell the future. In the patriotic objective of preventing any further disastrous decline in our Armed Forces morale, I most earnestly and sincerely request and urge you, my colleagues, to unanimously approve this amendment in the national interest.

Excerpt From Gulliver's Travels

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 13, 1954

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record a quotation from Jonathan Swift's Gulliver's Travels, book III, chapter 6.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

I told him that in the kingdom of Tribnia, by the natives called Langden, where I had sojourned some time in my travels, the bulk of the people consisted wholly of discoverers, witnesses, informers, accusers, prosecutors, evidences, swearers; together with their several subservient and subaltern instruments; all under the colors and conducts of ministers of state and their deputies. The plots in that kingdom are usually the workmanship of those persons who desire to raise their own characters of profound politicians; to restore new vigor to a crazy administration; to stifle or divert general discontents; to fill their pockets with forfeitures; and raise or sink the opinion of public credit, as either shall best answer their private advantage. It is first agreed and settled among them, what suspected persons shall be accused of a plot; then, effectual care is taken to secure all their letters and papers, and put the owners in chains. These papers are delivered to a set of artists, very dexterous in finding out the mysterious meanings of words, syllables, and letters. For instance, they can decipher a closestool to signify a privy council; a flock of geese, a senate; a lame dog, an invader; the plague, a standing army; a buzzard, a minister; the gout, a high priest; a gibbet, a secretary of state; a chamber pot, a committee of grandees; a sieve, a court lady; a broom, a revolution; a mousetrap, an employment; a bottomless pit, the treasury; a sink, a court; a cap and bells, a favorite; a broken reed, a court of justice; an empty tun, a general; a running sore, the administration.

Federal Agency for Handicapped

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 12, 1954

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, there is now pending before our Committee on Education and Labor H. R. 3291, to establish a Federal Agency for Handicapped, and I am informed the committee anticipates taking early action on this bill and corollary measures.

We have no greater assets than our own people, and unquestionably, the 38 million handicapped represent our greatest undeveloped asset. When we reflect that there are millions who are blind, partically sighted, deaf, hard of hearing, amputees, arthritics, cardiovascular victims, cerebral palsied, cancer cases, epileptics, victims of muscular dystrophy, multiple sclerosis, poliomyelitis, osteomyelitis, rheumatism, tuberculosis, and many other crippling diseases, as well as congenital defects and deformities, we must realize that here, indeed, is one of the major problems of our Nation, which needs and must have adequate attention.

I have sponsored H. R. 3291, which provides an overall program for handicapped and does not, as do the administration proposals made in this field, merely skim the surface of this great problem. We assuredly must recognize the need for adequate medical treatment; education and training; vocational guidance, and selective placement, as essential parts of the handicapped program, and we must provide these and apply them so as to coordinate the varied activities of the present 35 Federal agencies which now each have a piece of the program.

I am somewhat surprised that this administration, which boasts that it represents a business viewpoint, does not adopt this measure literally, because, surely, it represents the only practical and efficient approach to the problem, now before the Congress.

It is a shortsighted policy, indeed, for administration representatives to prate of rehabilitating some 60,000 people yearly, when statstics show that at least 350,000 are annually injured in industry and elsewhere, to say nothing of the backlog of 7 million to 9 million who are severely handicapped to the extent of from 60 to 100 percent disability. The present results are pitifully inadequate and merely scratch the surface, without doing a real job.

If we spend a billion dollars on our own people, we are simply taking out insurance to aid ourselves, and it would be far better to spend that money, and not have to meet an international crisis, by having this vast reserve army of workers treated, trained, and in readiness to defend us, than it would be to need them, and not have them in time of great emergency.

On the humanitarian side, we all know that history is replete with the names of great geniuses who were severely handicapped. Blind Milton; deaf Beethoven; hard-of-hearing Edison; spinal curvature Steinmetz; arthritic Clarence Day—all these and many more, have made great contributions to arts and sciences, and, who knows but that, if we furnish—as is our bounden duty as representatives of the people—means to enable millions of handicapped to support themselves, their families, communities, and the Nation, we shall, thus, enable many a potential genius to bring the fruits of his talents to light, for the benefit of all of us.

My own people, in the Empire State, unfortunately, do not have, under its present Republican administration, an adequate system of rehabilitation and employment of handicapped, and its narrow scope of operations is such that I am ashamed to say that New York State, under its present Republican administration which, presumably, looks after the needs of some 15 million citizens, spends less money for that purpose in the rehabilitation field than does, for example, the State of Georgia, with approximately 3,500,000 people.

Obviously, the Federal Government must lead the way and furnish the base of operations for this essential program. There is, in fact, no other way that is feasible and practicable, except to expand the present Federal-State rehabilitation and employment of handicapped program and provide better means of coordinating, implementing, supplementing, and complementing that program.

The people of my State and district recognize the value and imperative necessity of enacting this Federal agency for handicapped bill at once, and therefore, I hope the Committee on Education and Labor will report it out, favorably, at an early date, so we may adopt it, and thus put into motion, means to bring renewed hope, happiness, and ability to become self-supporting, to millions of handicapped.

Supporting McCarthy May Become Expensive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 13, 1954

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an article entitled "Supporting McCarthy May Become Expensive," published in a recent issue of the Arkansas Gazette. It was written by one of the most astute and intelligent observers of the Washington scene, Mrs. Elizabeth S. Carpenter.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

IT'S TEXAS OIL MONEY—SUPPORTING MCCARTHY MAY BECOME EXPENSIVE

WASHINGTON, May 9.—Texas oil men who back Senator JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY are being told quietly but emphatically that their support may cost them the income-tax privileges they now enjoy.

Members of the Ways and Means Committee, who write the tax bills and so far have warded off repeated attempts to lower or erase the 27½-percent depletion allowance permitted on oil income, are telling Texas Congressmen that it has got to a point where a vote for the depletion allowance is a vote for MCCARTHY.

This turn of events is a result of a buildup of resentment against "Texas oil money," a term which recurs frequently on the cocktail circuit here.

Indeed, the smart talk in the political salons in the Capital is to attribute every political trend to Texas oil money. There's the Maine election, for instance, where Senator MARGARET CHASE SMITH, an anti-McCarthyite, is said to be opposed by Texas oil money backing up her pro-McCarthy opponent.

And there was Alabama where Texas oil money allegedly was trying to beat Senator JOHN SPARKMAN. Wherever the money came from, it was a dismal failure last week, when Sparkman won by a comfortable margin.

And the know-it-alls have it that Texas oil money is backing Senator HOMER FERGUSON in Michigan in what may be a tough race against Democratic candidate Blair Moody, an ex-Senator trying to stage a comeback.

Anyway, Texas oil money is getting lots of credit for penetrating lots of places. Countless millions would be loose if all the gossip were true.

The Texas oil money became the popular theme shortly after the epidemic of national publicity on H. Roy Cullen, H. L. Hunt, Clint Murchison, Sid Richardson, their bank accounts and eccentricities.

The talk, however, is significant from the political standpoint—and it may very well pave the way for a reduction in the 27½-percent depletion allowance which, of course, is not limited to Texas but is enjoyed equally by Arkansans whose income comes from oil.

The names of the rich Texans have been linked repeatedly with Senator MCCARTHY. As MCCARTHY comes in for more open criticism, so do, of course, his supporters. And since their income is derived from tax benefits not bestowed on other income sources, there has been rising indignation against the benefits.

Farm Price Supports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1954

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, on two previous occasions I have called the attention of my colleagues to the joint interest in farm prosperity among the farmers and the businessmen in the communities which serve them.

On March 31 I presented a resolution signed by 84 businessmen of Cut Bank, Mont., who favor maintenance of farm price supports at at least 90 percent of parity and ask Congress to try to establish 100 percent of parity for all farm commodities.

On April 21 I presented an identical resolution signed by 158 businessmen in Conrad, Valier, Brady, and Ledger, Mont.

Today I offer the identical resolution signed by 319 businessmen in Chester, Brockton, Wolf Point, Chinook, Harlem, and Fort Benton, Mont.

The resolution follows:

PARITY FOR THE FARMERS

Being as the State of Montana is a majority agricultural State, the undersigned businessmen of this city feel that it is most imperative that we work side by side with those attempting to maintain a farm program which will enrich and develop the agricultural activities wherever they are a major industry or source of livelihood. In view of the above conclusion, we, the following businessmen of this city, resolve that we go on record opposing any effort on the part of any Congressman, the Department of Agriculture, or any agency for attempting to disrupt the stabilization program affecting all farm commodities.

We further resolve that Congress not only maintain 90 percent of parity but shall try to establish 100 percent of parity for all farm commodities. We do not favor any tendency toward flexibility of price supports, but urge Congress to maintain a production-control program, which is necessary in order to have stabilized price support.

We further resolve to condemn any form of prosperity based on war and bloodshed, but favor genuinely sane and sound economic program, particularly for the producer, which shall be based on industry, security, and individual initiative.

We further urge all business groups in other cities of this State as well as those of other agricultural States to go on record favoring similar resolutions.

CHESTER BUSINESSMEN

M. A. Kinder, Grand Hotel; Sanvik Bros., Selmer Sanvik; Jim Carr, Rudyard Implement Co.; Don Twedt, Don's Garage; Petersen Jewelry, R. P. Petersen; Lawrence's Dry Goods, L. A. Struck; Ralph E. Line, Bank Tavern; C. A. Gustafson, Hi-Line Theater; Ray Warhank, Rudyard Lumber Co.; Leo Schaefer, Gamble Store; C. Wehr, Wehrs Garage; John C. Phillips, Phillips Chevrolet; Curt Phillips, Phillips Implement Co.; B. O. Wilson, Evans Cafe; Morris W. Ewald, Ewald's Store; Robert C. Rigg, International Elevator Co.; Albert Berge, Home Shoe Hospital; Joe Schwietzer, Vets Club; Thomas Floerchinger, Farmers Union Oil Co.; Wallace Abrahamson, Farmers Union Elevator.

BROCKTON BUSINESSMEN

Lien Mercantile Co., Oliver M. Lien; Brockton Bar, C. R. Lodmill; Farmers Elevator Co., Leonard Kallevig, manager; Brockton Cafe, Johnny Baker; Occident Elevator, L. L. Linquist, manager; Standard Service Station, Art Erickson; Log Cabin Bar, Emory Lundquist; Brockton Conoco Service, Homer Goodwin; Brockton Valu, R. D. Vaught, manager; sponsored by Brockton Women's Club.

WOLF POINT BUSINESSMEN

Rathert-Schreiber Co.; Wolf Point Floral; Marshall-Wells Store; Styer Apartments; Gamble Store; Camrud Motors; P. F. Eldridge; J. T. Fahey; Electrical Refrigerator Service; Public Drug Co.; Coast to Coast Store; Davey's Men's Wear; Jim Kurokawa, W. P. Cafe; Dasinger Cleaners; Larson Jewelry; Kelly's Hardware; Patterson Style Shop; Clack Service Station; Herald-News; Farmers Union Oil Co.; Moe Motor Co.; Dr. C. R. Grow; Dr. R. W. Sorensen; J. L Davey; Lerton Hall; Farmers Lumber Co; R. P. Hansen; Leland F. Jones; Philip Jackley; Floyd De-Witt; Montana Bar; Stockman Bar; Modern Cafe; Stephens Merchandise Co.; Hank's Barber Shop; K. L. Bryan, Federated Store; Art Zervas, Buttrey Foods; D. F. Kemper; W. E. Burnison Agency; K. E. Voss; Andrew Hansen; Hazel Winslow; Ellis C. Thorsen; R. P.

Madel; Farmers Union Lumber Co.; Ed Sassen; O. L. Stenslie; Guy Ault; John O. Garden; Coffey and Haranda Insurance Agency; Triangle Cafe and Service Station; Highway Motor Co.; George Meister; Baxter Larson; Robert Penner; Don E. Nelson; Hovey-Stone Chevrolet Co.; Robert Beery.

FORT BENTON BUSINESSMEN

Harold Thomas, Grand Union Hotel; Ed Davis, Davis Grocery; William Breiter, secretary-treasurer, Holman, Inc.; Howard Teschler, vice president, Chet & Tesch Chevrolet; C. L. Engren, president, Chet & Tesch Chevrolet; E. M. Peterson, Implement Sales; C. H. McClain, Lumber Dealer; C. J. Higgins, Greely Elevator Co.; O. S. Johnson, grain dealer; H. C. Brinkman, manager, Farmers Elevator & Trading Co.; W. G. Svoboda, Montana Elevator Co.; Warren Halley, D-H Service; J. A. Schieno, Bybee Machinery Co.; John Davison, D-H Service; Roy Willett, Roy's Electric Shop; Dwight MacKenzie, Overland Bar; James W. Aznoe, secretary-treasurer, Benton Equipment Co.; W. R. Lyle, president, Benton Equipment Co.; W. T. Morrison, Benton Hardware; Sol Stache, Chouteau Barber Shop; Bain Feltman, Bain's Garage; Harry E. Rowe, Harry's Welding Shop; C. D. Midlestadt, Midlestadt Pontiac and GMC; Taylor Sykes, Locker Plant; Bernice L. Flatt, Bernie's Cafe; Pioneer Insurance Agency, Hazel M. Young; Pioneer Insurnce Agency, Fred L. Young; Coast to Coast Stores, Neil M. Barkus.

J. B. Anderson, dry goods; John McCardle, Western Bar; Rudolph Lusin, Rudy's Shoe Shop; V. D. Merrill, Fort Benton Drug Store; Steve McSweeney, television and popcorn concessions; Raymond McDermott, Palace Barber Shop; Ray H. Pittman, Palace Bar; Mackenstadt & Jasper, owners, Price-Rite Groceries; Chris P. Courtnage, Benton Transfer; Joseph Gray, Pastine Tavern; H. W. Stranahan, Johnson Farm Equipment, Inc.; Gilbert Scott, Scott's Lumber & Supply Co.; Howard Hilton, the Clark-Hilton Co.; Frank F. Morger, Morger Realty & Insurance Co.; George R. Vielleux, Morger Realty & Insurance Co.; E. S. Gysler, implement dealer; J. W. Lynch; E. & N. Bar & Lounge, Norman Tacke; P. J. Sweeney, dentist; J. T. Lepley, service station; Dellman Bybee, real-estate broker; Robert L. Deck, carpenter; Erick Meyer, clerk and television installation; Mabel Derr, cook, Modern Cafe; Chouteau County Vets' Club; F. E. Zimmer, manager; Leland J. Edwards, Lee's Cab; Ken C. Morrow, Morrow Insurance Agency; C. L. Overholser, carpenter; Gamble Store, E. J. Serbin, owner; Joseph P. Jordan, Fort Benton Motor Co.; Eddie Albers, Albers & Drewiske; O. A. Tschache, Ott's Greenhouse; O. W. Nottingham, carpenter; George Paul, Paul Roofing & Masonry; Roy Lane, carpenter; Ray Flathers, construction; Ira W. Vinion, barber; McRay Ulrich, Palace Bar; Clyde Good, Good Apartments; Jos. S. Smith, construction; Llyod M. Nelson, Bybee Machinery Co.; Clyde Stovall, Bybee Machinery Co.; Clyde Stipe, Bybee Machinery Co.; Stella Meyer, Modern Cafe.

Arnold H. Campbell, car salesman; W. Siebenaler, lumber yard manager; W. A. Silvius, Chouteau House Hotel; George F. Rowe, Chauteau House Bar; Helen F. Hall, Chouteau Cafe; R. G. McMillan, carpenter; Geo. W. Wackerlin, clerk; Oscar Meyer, hauling; Opal Mauzey Pitt, E. & N. Cafe; Darlene Mauzey Pitt, E. & N. Cafe; Dagna Morger, secretary and bookkeeper; Martin Wolfe, Jr., plumbing; Darrel Smith, body shop; Louis Breiter, Holman, Inc., body shop; M. J. Crane, parts manager; Roy Homme, steel building contractor; George W. Carver, carpenter and contractor; Ray W. Uhl, dairy owner and manager; Walter R. Thomas, transfers, Fort Benton; Dell Holmstrom, mechanic; Ray Blohm, contractor, general; LeRoy W. Olsen, contractor; Howard L. Lett, Lett Plumbing & Heating; Jess E. Allison, mechanic; Tope & Thomas, William J. Tope; L. R. Olmstead, dairy; Oswald F. Mueller, mechanic; Neal J. Archer, land agent; C. W. Grantham, salesman; Emma Grantham, cosmetologist; John R. Drewiske, Albers & Drewiske; Harold A. Larson, painting contractor; Harvey Fox, bookkeeper; John Bradley, sheriff.

CHINOOK BUSINESSMEN

G. L. Maberry, Diesel Service Co.; R. B. Doughten, manager, Farmers Union Oil Co.; Walter Porter, manager, Farmers Union Elevator Co.; Al Wrick's, Al's Repair Shop; R. B. Campbell, O. K. Tire Shop; Carl Gomavitz, Highland Junk Co.; E. D. Lunden, Chinook Equipment Co.; Basil Hiner, Hiner's Cafe; Harold Peterson, Food Center; H. A. Martens, Martens Drug; Nondas Bruss, Nondas Shop; Robert J. Dolan, P. C. A.; John Lamey; Virginia Stein, Blaine Coffee Shop; Loretta Merkle, Blaine Coffee Shop; D. C. Mainwaring, upholstery shop; H. Kuper, Kuper Funeral Home; A. M. Dronen, Matulka Garage; E. J. Gallus, dentist; Ira S. Harbolt, insurance; Mrs. Doug Taylor, Taylor Cleaners; Murdock Matheson, liquor vendor; Mrs. H. O. Wittkoff, Gambles; Chuck Fralick, Coast-to-Coast; Harry N. Olson, blacksmith shop; Burgess Agency, insurance; Speers Implement Co., farm equipment; E. S. Taylor, Taylor Motor Co.; J. R. Jamieson, Jamieson Motors; Franklin D. Pehrson, Chinook Auto Court; Phil Brovold, Phil's Standard Service; R. E. Swenson, Standard Oil Co.; LeRoy C. Anderson, Andy's Service.

John Upshaw, Montana Hotel; H. A. Marsh, stockman; Murdo MacLean, Mint; G. S. Sargent, Milk River Coal Mine; LeRoy Christensen, Cozy Corner; Einar W. Johnson, Chinook Motors, Inc.; Art Keller, Bar X Bar; Jack DePriest; Orval Severson, Farmers Union Creamery; Phil Paulson, Paulson Hardware & Electric; Stanley Casteel, Independent Food Store; Louis Mohar, plumbing and heating; E. M. Wallner, Wallner's Furniture; Floyd White, Pastime; T. A. Babiak; Charles F. Ivey, Ivey's Drug; Bill Morrison, Silver Dollar Bar; Leonard's Shop, general merchandise; F. A. Sharples, Sharples Jewelry; Herb Bonifas, Blaine Theater; Oliver C. Paulson, Ben Franklin Store; O. C. Gratton, Gratton Barber Shop; Walter Seigle; Dick Peterson, Monarch Lumber Co.; A. L. Reser, manager, Home Lumber Co.; C. M. Boe, Blaine Lumber Co.; Edgar G. Obie, Obie's Flying Service; Floyd L. Sargent, Sarge's Shop; Thomas O'Hanlon, Chinook Lumber Co.; Howard C. Larkin, Chinook Heating & Equipment Co.

L. Jorns, Elk Cafe; Ted R. Johnson, Chinook Opinion; Ferald Taylor, Marshall-Wells Store; O. M. Bruss, Model Hardware; Mark Ambrose, Grill Cafe; William Johnson, draftsman; John Nelson, Dave's Texaco; Lynn Butcher, Baldwin Dairy; Donald V. Casteel, Quality Market; Clay McCartney, Blaine County Abstract Co.; Ivan H. Nelson, W. G. Woodward Co.; Joe P. Hoehn; E. W. Luckett, First State Bank of Chinook; John A. LaPlante, Aero Lounge; F. W. Boisvert, The Fountain; Fred Elsner, Blaine County treasurer; Roy Cox, barber; Maida McCartney, Chinook Hour; Chat's Pontiac, Chinook, Mont.; H. E. Coyner, Chinook Dray & Transfer; J. Ospelend, H. Earl Clack Co.; Glenn J. Hockett, Hockett Trucking; Clarence Hart, barber.

HARLEM BUSINESSMEN

E. F. Johnson, jeweler; G. H. Gallagher, Gallagher Grocery; L. E. Mollerstrom, Standard Service; George Klindworth, manager, Equity Co-op Association; C. H. Dolven, Dolven Chevrolet; Beecher Machine Co.; Gjullin Implement Co.; Elmer Bergh, Service Garage; Jim Walls, Montana Cafe; Norman McGuire, Mac's Recreation Hall; William Churchill, Churchill's Cafe; W. S. Dale, Coast-to-Coast Store; Andrew Nelson, confectionary; Ed Norskog, manager, H. Earl Clack Co.; The Hub, clothing; W. J. Lawr, apparel; Pete Jergesen, plumbing and heating; Vince Larson, Larson's Market; Mary O'Brien, Merry Market Grocery; Glenn A. Hartman, Gamble Store; J. A. Cassidy, Cassidy's Variety; Merle B. Wieres, Harlem Food Store; R. Cresswell, barber; A. W. Anderson, gas company; Frank Orlando, druggist; L. M. Miller, Grand Theater; Vernon R. Ude, Harlem Seed Co.; F. C. Ekegren, cafe; Steve O'Leary, service station; Donald L. Olson, Harlem Motor Co. (Ford); J. Frank McColom, Harlem Dry Cleaners; W. A. Brown, Monarch Lumber; Jim Pollard, blacksmithing-welding; E. P. Ekegren; D. A. Ring, groceries; P. C. Tompkins, Wellworth 5 & 10; Edith Benson, Valley Chickeries; Eric Berglund, Service Garage; Victor Knudson, Keck's Cabins & Grocery; Swen's Repair Shop.

Flood Prevention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD S. MILLER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 13, 1954

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following letters:

May 12, 1954.

Mr. Elmer Peterson,
Oklahoma City, Okla.

Dear Mr. Peterson: I am greatly pleased to receive a copy of your communication to Mr. Dwight Payton of May 10, relating the resulats observed during and following the recent heavy rainfall on the Sandstone watershed. It is highly gratifying to learn that over the area that had received full watershed treatment by way of soil conservation and detention dams, the results were highly satisfactory.

You are doing a great service, Mr. Peterson, in advocating and promoting these conservation measures. I am taking the liberty to insert your letter to me in the Congressional Record of this date, along with letters from Mr. L. L. Males, of Cheyenne, Okla., and Mr. I. C. Thurmond, Jr., of Thurmond Ranch.

Very truly yours,

Howard S. Miller,
Member of Congress.

Security State Bank,
Cheyenne, Okla., May 8, 1954.

Hon. Howard S. Miller,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Miller: Knowing of your keen interest in upstream flood prevention I am taking this opportunity to report to you on the recent heavy rains on the Sandstone Creek watershed which is a tributary of the Washita River. The watershed treatment has been completed on this creek except for a little channel work and some vegetative cover on old crop land.

We have had 3 drought years immediately preceding the heavy rains of last week and our grass cover and crop cover could not have been much worse. The rains fell with very high intensity. A small rain fell April 25, another rain of from 1 to nearly 4 inches fell April 27 and the April 29 rain was from 2½ to nearly 4 inches, giving the watershed from 5 to 8 inches, with no 2 gages registering the same.

I am most happly to be able to tell you that the structures on Sandstone Creek performed perfectly. The water got high enough in the reservoirs to go through the draw down tube in 12 structures but in no structure did the water approach the spillway level. Today, which is 9 days after the flood, a little water is going through the tubes on three structures but most of this is due to revived springs in the drainage area instead of flood water.

The streams in our area here which were not treated to prevent floods really put on a flood and the Washita River flooded. The bottom land on these creeks and the river is covered with sterile sand in many places and scoured out in holes in other places with all the crops destroyed and hundreds of miles of fences washed away. It is quite a contrast to go from these streams over to Sandstone Creek where the farmers are cutting alfalfa today and other crops are lush and green because of the moisture and none are washed away or covered with silt.

Have no hesitation in working for this program. It is even better than you think it is. We know now it will work and we are even more anxious to get all the tributaries to the Washita under treatment and of course would like to see the people living on other streams also get the benefit of this wonderful program.

Sincerely,

L. L. MALES.

MAY 10, 1954.

Hon. HOWARD S. MILLER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MILLER: Thanks for your nice letter of the fourth, and I join you in being mighty proud of the results shown on our upstream control program. When the rains finally came, they came.

As you no doubt know by our previous conversations my ranch lies at the head of Sandstone Creek and the very first dams were built there. If memory serves me rightly I believe there are now about 35 dams on the project and I have 4 of them.

The ranch comprises some 11,000 acres and we have about six rain gauges located in strategic spots which are maintained by the Government in conjunction with these dams. The rainfall in my particular area measured about 5 inches, while further west they received anywhere from 8 to 10 inches in a very short period of time.

Naturally anyone can realize that after the prolonged drought we have had, the runoff was tremendous and had all this water hit the Washita at one time the loss of property would have been tremendous.

As an unqualified "nonengineer," but as (I think) a better than average farmer-stockman, I am of the firm belief that these dams are the solution to a great extent to our problem in this area for flood control.

Sincerely yours,

I. C. THURMOND, Jr.

American Policy on Israel Not Served by Byroade's Recent Statement, Says Celler

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 12, 1954

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, as Assistant Secretary of State for Near Eastern, South Asian, and African Affairs, Mr. Byroade's statement on May 1, Facing Realities in the Arab-Israeli Dispute, sidesteps two significant objectives of United States foreign policy, the promotion of peace in the Middle East and the cementing of ties with friendly nations.

Mr. Byroade attempted to step warily on a tightrope between the sensitivities of the Israeli and the sensitivities of the Arab world, and like the overcautious always do, succeeded in losing balance.

He plunged heavily into the area of the immigration policy of Israel. The right to establish an immigration policy is an acknowledged attribute of national sovereignty. Mr. Byroade urged by implication that Israel adopt a policy of limited immigration lest by not doing so, it enhance Arab fears that an overpopulated Israel will propel Israel forward to aggressive seizure of additional territory.

Mr. Byroade proceeds to set forth a purely hypothetical situation based on guesswork future developments. The argument he poses runs like this. There is no overpopulation in Israel today, but some day, maybe, the Soviet Union will permit the Jews of Russia to leave for Israel—a policy it does not pursue now—to enter Israel in vast numbers and that maybe they will flood into Israel, and that then maybe Israel would not have room sufficient to hold them, and that then maybe Israel may be forced to seek expansion. Therefore, the Arab world has reason at present to fear, and therefore Israel should now adopt an immigration policy to allay these fears. Mr. Byroade says nothing of the guaranties offered again and again by the Government of Israel that she does not and will not seek territorial aggrandizement. He disregards the Tripartite Agreement of the United States, Britain, and France which guarantees the present borders of the Arab States. He asks instead change of internal law to meet a purely hypothetical supposition. This hypothetical supposition, stated in utter seriousness by a United States spokesman, does nothing to help the Arab world to rid itself of foundless fears. Nor is it supportable diplomacy of a spokesman on official American policy to intervene in a matter purely internal, such as immigration.

Such a statement can only increase the already existing tensions. It does not address itself to reality. If you carry that kind of logic forward you can come up with such absurdities as "do not develop your water resources lest you become economically strong and hence become the dominant economic force in the Middle East. This is what the Arabs fear, and you must allay their fears."

The United States policy in securing unto itself friends in the Middle East should not be one of catering to illusionary fears of either the Arabs or the Israeli. The Arab fear of Israeli expansion is an emotional disturbance. It serves no purpose for the United States to feed it and keep it alive through hypothetical supposition. The interest of the United States lies in promoting peace in the area. It cannot gain it by feeding fears on one hand and injecting itself into internal domestic policy on the other.

There is room in Israel, especially in the Negev, for many more Jews, fleeing persecution, to settle. The gratuitous statement on Israel's immigration policy strikes at the very heart of the reason which has led to the support of Israel by both the United States and the United Nations both prior to and during the establishment of the state. To urge that Israel withdraw from its immigration policy is to deny the very reason for its existence.

Billions of American Dollars to France Yet the Lowest Standard of Living in Western Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 13, 1954

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, a Reuters news article from Paris under date of May 12 reports that a plan is under way in France to raise the lowest standard of living in Western Europe.

This will come as a shock to the people of the United States who have been led to believe that our investment of foreign aid billions had brought a high standard of living to the French people.

What has become of these billions, Mr. Speaker? Information presented to the Committee on Foreign Affairs last year indicated that production was ahead more than 100 percent over the prewar level. The article, which I shall include as part of my remarks, states that production levels are only about what they were in 1929.

Mr. Speaker, this news article deserves the attention of every Member of this body as we shall soon consider another mutual air program:

FRENCH BEGIN 4-YEAR PLAN TO MEET NEEDS

(By Harold Sieve)

PARIS, May 12.—The French Government has launched an ambitious 4-year economic plan designed to raise what is today the lowest standard of living in Western Europe.

Two thousand experts made a 6-month examination of every sector of the French economy before producing the plan, the second of its kind since the end of World War II.

The first, produced by Jean Monnet, now head of the European Coal and Steel Pool Authority, repaired the country's war-damaged economy, but could not hope to rectify the deficiencies which have grown up over the last 50 years.

These deficiencies have led to a present production level only just above that of 1929, while in the United States it has doubled in the last 25 years. Average income is only slightly above half the Canadian and Swiss levels, one-third of the American, and 65 percent of the British.

The average wage in industry and commerce has been kept at less than 25,000 francs ($70) a month, and for farm workers at a little over 18,000 francs ($50).

The new plan aims at remedying this state of affairs by a thorough modernization of plant, agriculture, and building methods.

It sets out to boost national revenue by 25 percent by 1957 through a 20 percent increase in agricultural production, a 25 to 30 percent increase in industrial output, and a 60 percent increase in building activity.

The result, it is hoped, will be to eliminate the French balance of payments deficit and raise the individual standard of living by 4 percent a year.

The plan calls for 6,610,000 million francs ($18,508,000,000) worth of investments over the next 4 years. The largest portion of this is to be devoted to housing.

The problem of providing homes for 42 million Frenchmen who need them today is one of the most difficult facing the country.

House and apartment building has been at a snail's pace since the war. Under the new plan, 240,000 homes will be built each year, and the average price will be brought down from 3.6 million francs ($10,000) to 2½ million francs ($7,000).

Second priority in the plan is given to the streamlining of French agriculture, grown rusty and cumbrous through decades of protection and neglect.

Present clumsy marketing procedures will be reorganized, farming techniques modernized, especially in the backward areas, and generous credits allowed for the purchase of new farm equipment.

In the industrial field, plans provide for stepping up the output of machine tools by 45 percent, of agricultural machinery by 80 percent, foundry work and clothing by 30 percent, automobiles by 20 percent, and leather, wood, and textiles by 15 percent.

The Government realizes that these increases will be worthless unless prices are brought down to a level at which they can compete with imports from France's European neighbors.

To this end the plan envisages an annual investment of 180,000 million francs ($504 million) for the standardization of factories, the replacement of antiquated machinery by up-to-date production lines, and the encouragement of specialization.

One Way To Reduce the Postal Deficit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 28, 1954

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, as we all know, the number of Government publications that crosses every Congressman's desk is just too much for the individual Member to give every document the careful reading he would like to. For that reason I call your attention to a chart which appeared on page 83 of the March 31, 1954, publication of the Post Office Department entitled "Financial Policy for the Post Office." The figures on that chart show that the Post Office is now making $11 million profit on parcel post. Earlier public statements by post office officials reveal that if Public Law 199, the law by which the last Congress limited the size and weight of parcel post packages, were repealed, the Post Office would be making $84 million a year on parcel post. What makes this especially remarkable is that, as I recall, one of the major arguments for the passage of Public Law 199 was that it would reduce the Post Office deficit and the cost to the taxpayer. Experience has proven that false. Public Law 199 has substantially reduced the net income of the Post Office Department. It penalizes every parcel post user. I regard it as a very real threat to the existence of a financially sound parcel post system.

But Public Law 199 has done even more damage to the economy of the country than it has to the Post Office. In hundreds of communities throughout the country citizens no longer have the parcel post delivery which they had enjoyed for over a generation, nor have they an adequate private substitute. In thousands of businesses the system of distribution of merchandise has been completely disrupted. For small business, especially, Public Law 199 has been a costly burden.

In barring some packages from the mails and thus forcing them to go by other means, we have not created any new jobs. We have taken jobs from one group and given them to another. Public Law 199 wears the free enterprise mask. But in fact it does daily damage to thousands and thousands of free enterprises in our country. They are operated by hard-working shirtsleeves Americans. If they cannot make good, they close up shop. But the Railway Express Agency, the free enterprise Public Law 199 was passed to protect, passes along losses to be made up out of the unlimited bankrolls of the railroads.

Back in the days when railroading was young and when miles of new tracks literally pushed back our frontiers, the railroads took on some nonrailroad activities to help make sure those new tracks got enough use. They built hotels, created resorts and, among other things, they started what is now known as the Railway Express Agency.

Nowadays the railroads have found that they do better without these extra businesses. And that includes the Railway Express Agency. In terms of dollars and cents the Express Agency costs the railroads far more than it brings in. If the railroads really took a management attitude toward the Express Agency, instead of treating it like an orphan child, I think they would find that its financial health depends upon it sticking to the freight business, rather than trying to grab the small package, small revenue items which can best be handled as parcel post.

A number of Members of this Congress are beginning to realize that they made a mistake when they voted for Public Law 199. I think it is time the Railway Express Agency and the railroads took another look at that law. In the long run any law which is harmful to the country as a whole is not going to help either the railroads or the Railway Express Agency.

Our country has grown rich because we worked hard to do things better and to do them at less cost. Public Law 199 is forcing many businesses to adjust to poorer service at doubled and tripled cost. It is nothing less than economic sabotage. It should be repealed.

Burning Our Seed Corn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FREDERIC R. COUDERT, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 12, 1954

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following statement by the distinguished Senator from Virginia, HARRY F. BYRD:

BURNING OUR SEED CORN

(By United States Senator HARRY FLOOD BYRD)

There is nothing before the country today more important than to stop suicidal tax reduction at the price of increased debt and inflation.

I have opposed in this Congress and will continue to oppose both Democratic and Republican sponsored tax reduction measures that must be financed by borrowing. That road has a dead end—insolvency. Only a solvent nation can long defend itself, or long remain free.

This does not mean that I oppose lower taxes. I advocate and have consistently fought for responsible tax reduction financed not by going deeper into debt but by reducing expenditures and living within our means.

That is the way prudent housewives do. That is the way business does—if it continues to meet its payrolls and stays in business.

That is the way our Government can do—if its elected representatives have the courage to cut expenditures until outgo at least equals income. This could be done now.

We have spent $47.6 billion in foreign aid since World War II, all added to our mountain of debt. The time has come when the necessities of our own situation compel us to call a halt. Our first obligation is to balance the budget in order to maintain our national solvency. Solvency is the foundation on which our security, as individuals and as a nation, must be built.

The present administration has taken important steps toward economy, but not fast enough nor far enough.

The Federal budget has been out of balance—that is, we have spent more than we have taken in—in 19 out of the last 21 years. President Eisenhower's first budget, even before the recent tax reductions, showed an anticipated deficit of $2.9 billion.

This estimate was based on dubious assumptions of continued peace and prosperity at high level. Unless expenditures are further reduced—and I have shown they can be reduced—the administration's estimated deficit of $2.9 billion may be at least doubled or trebled in the coming fiscal year.

The Federal Treasury's take in taxes averages now approximately 28 percent of the national income. If a decline in business activity should reduce national income by $10 billion, the automatic reduction in tax revenue would increase the estimated deficit by not less than $2.8 billion.

I have said on the floor of the Senate that unless the Federal budget is balanced this year it will not be balanced for many years. Therefore I have supported the efforts of the President to defeat proposals for tax reduction, originating within both major political parties and in various pressure groups, that would throw the budget still further out of balance.

Whenever a war or an economic emergency threatens, it is easy to say borrow now and pay back later. Later is too often never. It is easy, especially in an election year, to postpone the day of fiscal reckoning.

Tax reduction always has an appealing sound. Inequities in our tax laws, which should be corrected, reinforce the arguments for immediate reforms. The promise, or the hope, that reducing certain taxes will give certain people more money to spend, or will encourage investment, or stimulate production, or decrease unemployment are handy tools in politics. They can be disastrously misapplied.

Don't let us fool ourselves that we are reducing our tax burdens when we borrow the money to make reductions possible. We are only postponing taxes and adding to our burden, or our children's burden, the increased debt plus interest on the increase at 2½ percent compounded annually. It is simply a higher tax deferred. And hope deferred maketh the heart sick.

If there is anything that will lead quicker to national suicide than the habitual policy of deficit financing, I don't know what it is.

Again don't let us fool ourselves. The debt we now have is not a temporary debt. It has become a permanent debt. We have added $200 billion to it in the last 15 years. The present total, now scraping the legal limit of $275 billion, is twice the assessed value of every bit of tangible property in America, including all buildings and land (usually assessed at half their value) and all the capital and everything else of tangible value. We are mortgaged up to 100 percent.

The ugly truth is that our country is the victim of protracted fiscal irresponsibility. Interest on the national debt is now nearly $7 billion a year. Ten cents out of every tax dollar goes to pay interest alone.

Interest charges will have increased for the fiscal year 1955 by at least $300 million over fiscal year 1954.

There can be no permanent relief from this burden until we balance outgo with income and then begin, with harder work, greater production and more thrift, to save more and gradually reduce principal and interest. If we reduce taxes now, without reducing expenditures, there will be another demand to raise the debt limit.

My Republican colleague, Senator JOHN J. WILLIAMS, of Delaware, speaking in support of our joint amendment to eliminate most of the excise-tax reductions voted by the House, said in the Senate debate on March 25:

"Any Member of Congress who votes for a reduction of $1 billion in taxes without providing other means of obtaining revenue, instead of going home and claiming credit with his constituents for reducing taxes, should tell his constituents to look across the table and thank their children and their grandchildren for the tax relief that will be extended here.

"The Treasury will be required to borrow in the name of the future generations in order to make possible a little tax relief which is being granted here solely in the name of political expediency.

"I favor balancing the budget, and I believe that if we cut appropriations as we should, we can do it. * * * The only reason why we may not cut expenditures this year is that the Members of Congress may not have the courage to vote for cuts in those expenditures. * * * Let us cut the appropriations first before we vote tax reductions."

Nevertheless the Senate, 54 to 34, rejected the Williams-Byrd amendment and passed the excise tax reduction bill, 76 to 8. Differences between the House and Senate versions, ironed out in conference committee, left approximately $1 billion added to the deficit.

In all of my 21 years in the Senate I have never seen a more irresponsible piece of legislation. On final passage of the bill, as agreed to in conference, 4 Republicans and 4 Democratic Senators voted "No"—COOPER, of Kentucky, DIRKSEN, of Illinois, LANGER, of North Dakota, and WILLIAMS, of Delaware, Republicans; BYRD, of Virginia, DANIEL, of Texas, HILL, of Alabama, and RUSSELL, of Georgia, Democrats.

The battle to stop $1 billion of excise tax reductions was lost, but the war against fiscal irresponsibility gained recruits. Some who voted with the majority disclosed by their questions, during the debate and afterward, a growing realization of the danger from greater and greater deficits.

The country should be made aware of the consequences that are sure to follow if increased personal income tax exemptions are authorized. Exemption of $100 would create a deficit of $2.9 billion and a $200 exemption would increase the deficit by $4.5 billion.

It will require emphatic protests from civic and business organizations and factual presentations from such groups as the National Economic Council, the Tax Foundation, the Conference Board, the Foundation for Economic Education and many individual citizens to beat back the pressures from would-be tax privilegees and vote-seeking candidates.

Unfortunately for our country, tax discussions are brought down in some quarters to the low level of class hatred, envy, and greed. People are told that taxation is a struggle between the rich and the poor.

Politicians are told that votes never grow on economy trees. They are reminded of the success—transitory and disastrous though it was—of tax and tax, spend and spend, elect and elect.

The best political platform within my memory—the soon abandoned and long forgotten Democratic platform of 1932—said this:

"We favor the maintenance of the national credit by a Federal budget annually balanced, and a sound currency to be preserved at all hazards."

Now the value and soundness of our currency is threatened by tax-reduction expedients proposed by some in both major parties. And the longer the Eisenhower administration goes without making good on the President's cardinal campaign promise to balance the budget, the more difficult it will be, and the greater will be the economic deterioration that results from inflation.

The administration's budget estimates for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1954, could be brought into balance by additional expenditure reductions amounting to less than 5 percent of the listed total of $65.6 billion expenditures.

The Byrd budget, which I released on March 6, set forth in detail where reductions of $3 billion could be made. The largest item would be in domestic-civilian expenditures. These alone could be reduced by $1.3 billion.

It is in this domestic-civilian area that the welfare State spenders have their field day. Further reductions in Government civilian payrolls alone could save half a billion dollars a year and would still leave nearly a quarter million more employees on Government payrolls than at the start of the Korean war. The Federal civilian payroll in February stood at 2,340,767—a reduction of 128,873 in 8 months.

In the domestic-civilian category are six so-called business-type agencies or programs which for years have been open pipelines out of the Federal Treasury. These include the program for expanding and financing war plants, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and its successor Small Business Administration; housing loans for veterans, slum clearance under the Housing and Home Finance Agency, and housing loans for educational institutions.

It is high time these business-type agencies were conducted in a businesslike way, made to stop bleeding the Treasury and live within the income they are supposed to produce. I have suggested in the Byrd budget that these six be made to hold down expenditures to 75 percent of their receipts as estimated for fiscal 1955. This alone would make an estimated budget saving of $595 million.

I could go on with details of possible economies, in both domestic and foreign expenditures, filling many times the space available here. It should be sufficient to cite these few examples of opportunities now unused to balance the budget. There are ways to begin digging ourselves out of debt—if we have the will to do so.

We of this generation are merely trustees for the future. It does not make sense to borrow money which we must pay back, after paying interest for generations, to finance temporary tax reductions. Nor does it make good politics. There can be no permanent partisan advantage in deciding issues vital to the economic and military security of our country on any other basis than what is best for America.

Another series of deficits, another round of inflation could weaken us beyond hope of survival. We have cheapened the dollar in direct proportion to our deficit spending—from 100 cents in buying power in 1939 to 52 cents today. Deficit spending—spending habitually more than we take in—is the most inflationary factor that exists to cheapen the money of any nation.

We cannot afford to follow that course at any time. Above all, we cannot afford it now, facing as we do unforeseeable expenditures for our country's defense.

I, for one, will not be a party to nor have any responsibility for adding, as we have, $1 billion to the Nation's debt in order to reduce taxes mainly on luxuries.

In passing judgment on tax proposals which still await congressional action, I suggest that citizens prayerfully weigh each one on a scale something like this:

1. Can lost revenue be replaced by cutting expenditures? If not, then don't reduce taxes until the budget is balanced. After that is assured—

2. Will a lower tax rate encourage investment, production, and employment?

3. Will proposed changes distribute tax burdens fairly?

4. Is the purpose of proposed changes merely to win votes, or to serve the best interests of the Nation as a whole?

Public Laws 335 to 340, Inclusive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 10, 1954

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am extending my remarks to include my reports to my constituents covering Public Laws 335 to 340, inclusive, as follows:

TWENTY-FIRST REPORT ON LEGISLATION OF THE 83D CONGRESS

DEAR FRIEND: Continuing where we left off:

PUBLIC LAW 335

H. R. 6434, food standards

Fixing of food standards is the responsibility of the Food and Drug Administration. Public Law 335 is intended to simplify procedures. Also, it extends to manufacturers of substances for use in processed foods the same right to hearings on the merits of their products as is enjoyed by manufacturers of the finished product.

As the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare unanimously reported out the bill (recommended by Mrs. Hobby and all the witnesses before the committee) I, with other Members of the House, accepted its judgment.

PUBLIC LAW 336

H. R. 4984, Miles City., Mont.

In 1946 the United States conveyed to Miles City, Mont., some 37 acres with the provision that the title would revert to the Federal Government if the land was not used for recreational or industrial purposes. This reverter clause has made it difficult for Miles City to encourage industrial development because the city could not give clear title to industries otherwise interested. Public Law 336 removes the reverter clause and permits Miles City to sell the tract provided the sale is at a 1946 appraised value and the proceeds go into the United States Treasury.

Uncle Sam owns about a fourth of all the land in the United States. During the war emergency period the Federal real-estate holdings were necessarily increased. The manner of their disposal when no longer needed is reflected in legislation from time to time recorded in these reports.

Since 1935 the matter of Federal ownership of land and its bearing on State and local taxation has been the subject of extensive study.

PUBLIC LAW 337

H. R. 3306, relief for homesteaders

This measure excludes homesteaders in certain divisions of the North Platte reclamation project from the provision of laws of 1909 and 1914 reserving the mineral rights in homestead land patents.

Reclamation homestead entries in this area were allowed early in the century. The entrymen met residential and cultivation requirements (some 40 and more years ago) but a succession of events (including a lawsuit over water rights that dragged on to 1942) delayed the filing of proofs necessary to issue of patents to the lands. Meanwhile the laws of 1909 and 1914 came along. The homesteaders convinced the committee (and the Department of Interior) that they were entitled to their patents under the old law as they had complied fully with their contract with the Government before the laws of 1909 and 1914 were enacted and the delay in filing proofs came from causes beyond their control.

It was an application of an equitable principle which recommended itself to me as a lawyer, granted that the facts justified. In not objecting (the measure passed the House by consent) I of course was guided by the assurance of the committee and of the Department that hearings had established the validity of the factual contentions. Nevertheless, I would have felt easier if the matter had passed the scrutiny of Harold Ickes when he was Secretary of the Interior. Reserving mineral rights to the Government in Federal lands conveyed to others is just commonsense.

PUBLIC LAW 338

H. R. 5529, Manassas National Battlefield Park

On July 21, 1861, the first major engagement of the Civil War was fought 26 miles from Washington, the First Battle of Manassas, also known as the Battle of Bull Run. It was here that "Stonewall" Jackson received his famous nickname because of his marked courage. The Second Battle of Manassas (1862) was the second attempt of the Confederates to seize Washington. The story of the two engagements is known to every American schoolchild.

In 1935 small portions of the battlefield (1,500 acres in all) were acquired by the Federal Government. In 1944 these scattered tracts were established as the Manassas National Battlefield Park. The properties are not contiguous, being separated by non-Federal land. Public Law 338 authorizes the purchase of some 1,400 additional acres so that the entire battle site can be preserved. Necessary funds will come from the revenues of the National Park Service.

Subdividers are as busy as beavers in the Washington suburban areas. Already land between monuments erected by various States on the battlefield site was being subdivided for homes, and but for Public Law 338 the public character of the area and its historic appeal to tourists would have been destroyed.

PUBLIC LAW 339

S. 1456, Gorgas Memorial Laboratory

In 1928 the Gorgas Memorial Institute (named for the famous American sanitation expert of the Panama Canal Zone, Surgeon General of the U. S. Army) was founded for the study of tropical diseases and preventive medicine. It maintains a laboratory in Panama (donated in 1930 by the Republic of Panama) and headquarters in Washington. Cost of maintenance actually is borne almost entirely by the United States since pro rata contributions from other Pan American countries have not been forthcoming. In 1929 donations totaling $760 were received from Ecuador; in 1931 a total of $1,150 from Venezuela, nothing at all after that. Reason: the institute is under unilateral control, the board of administration is determined by the United States. Moreover, some Latin American republic are planning their own laboratories. Nevertheless, under the Act of 1928 the Institute must solicit annually contributions from other Latin American governments for the laboratory's operation. Repeated unproductive requests for contributions have created a feeling of annoyance and irritation.

In the interest of pan-American cordiality the State Department recommended that the Institute be relieved of its annual job of passing the hat, which always came back empty. Congress complied with Public Law 338. Hereafter the Institute in its discretion may accept voluntary contributions and is relieved of the annual hat-passing job.

PUBLIC LAW 340

H. R. 7110, school lands

You will find this an interesting case of how progress in mineral location retarded the school-land program and how an act of Congress set things right.

In 1927 Congress granted to the various States title to school sections in place even though they were mineral lands. The States, however, could not gain title to school lands under mineral lease (or application therefore) until the lease was terminated. Then came the great boom in oil and gas exploration, more recently in uranium. At present 60 million acres of public land in the United States are under lease. In Utah alone there are 10,330,730 acres of public lands, many belonging to the State of Utah as school lands under the original concept. With the intensive search for uranium and oil resources, several million acres recently have ben made subject to leases. The game is to tie up the property with a mineral lease, wait to see what's your luck.

Result is the States have been kept waiting, some of the Western States, for title to the school lands assigned to them when they were admitted to statehood. Congress solved the problem with Public Law 340. Hereafter, as soon as the land is surveyed and the location of the school sections determined they will be transferred to the States as originally intended even though subject to mineral lease or application for lease.

Cordially and sincerely,

BARRATT O'HARA,
Member of Congress.

Question of the Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 13, 1954

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Truman urges the President to act firmly, in riding Congress hard. Quaere: Is Mr. Truman's career a guarantee that this policy will prove (a) wise, (b) workable, or (c) winning?

Civil Liberties Safe Under FBI

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 13, 1954

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an article entitled "Civil Liberties Safe Under FBI," written by Don Whitehead of the Associated Press, which appeared in the May 11, 1954, issue of the East St. Louis (Ill.) Journal:

CIVIL LIBERTIES SAFE UNDER FBI

(By Don Whitehead)

WASHINGTON, May 11.—During his 30 years as Chief of the FBI, J. Edgar Hoover has been assailed as a sinister menace to American liberties, an enemy of criminal reformation, a college-trained flatfoot, and a political partisan.

What has been the end result? J. Edgar Hoover and the FBI still command a place of prestige which is unusual in the Nation's Government.

Over the years Hoover has run a gantlet of more criticism and emerged with fewer scars probably than any other man in public service.

His is one of the strangest and most absorbing stories in all of official Washington where bureaucrats come and go—but where Hoover remains year after year in a position that seems almost impregnable.

What does Hoover himself think of his criticism?

"I'm used to it now," he said in an interview. "I'm not as sensitive any more—except when I think the criticism is unjust and unfair.

"As I see our responsibility, it is to protect the American people and to see they are guaranteed their rights accorded by the Constitution. We are just as interested in proving innocence as establishing guilt."

The instructions given to FBI agents in the matter of observing civil rights are stern. Agents are admonished not to step beyond the boundaries of justice—not to give even an impression of bullying or to cast suspicion on anyone through their acts and manner of questioning. This is a matter of record.

Scandal has never touched Hoover in all his years as FBI chief—and neither has it involved the FBI.

A long standing complaint is that the FBI is moving in the direction of becoming a secret police.

What is the truth in this?

Hoover himself brushes off such a suggestion as an absurdity and points to his record of consistently opposing proposals—some originating in Congress—that the FBI become a national police force.

Hoover had been in the Department of Justice only a short time, as a special assistant to Attorney General A. Palmer Mitchell, when critics first assailed him. This was in connection with the so-called Palmer raids of the early 1920's.

In those raids, FBI agents acting on warrants issued by the Immigration Bureau, swooped down on aliens in a mass roundup of alleged suspects in the anarchist terrorism that followed World War I.

More than 2,500 aliens were arrested. Agents broke into houses in the middle of the night. Suspects were herded by the hundreds into auditoriums and mauled around. They were given no chance to call families or relatives. And the due process of law, it was generally admitted, was pushed about.

An FBI man, familiar with the raids (but not then with the Bureau), said: "It was a pretty gruesome proposition."

Hoover prosecuted the deportation cases against some of the suspects and 249 were deported to Russia. For years afterward, Hoover's name was linked with the raids although he protested that he had nothing whatever to do with the raids themselves and the manhandling of the suspects.

The records show that orders for the raids were signed by Frank Burke of the Bureau of Investigation, while Hoover at the time was in the Department of Justice.

Later in 1940 there was a flareup of criticism against the FBI over the arrest of persons in Detroit in connection with recruiting for Spanish loyalists. Senator George Norris sharply criticized the FBI for the methods used in these arrests.

An investigation by the Department of Justice absolved the FBI agents of wrongdoing.

Hoover has been criticized, too, for asking authority to tap telephone wires in cases involving espionage, subversion, sabotage, and kidnaping—and then bring this evidence into court. The use of wiretap evidence in Federal courts is now forbidden.

Years ago Hoover stoutly opposed the use of wiretapping by the FBI. Now, he said: "The FBI was the first agency to take a stand against wiretapping. But world conditions have changed since that time. I'm just as much opposed to wiretapping as ever—except in cases of espionage, sabotage, subversion, and kidnaping."

Commendation for Moss

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARLAN HAGEN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1954

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Speaker, a California colleague of mine, Congressman JOHN E. MOSS, JR., has been working diligently as a Member of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee to develop legislation which will provide adequate pay for Federal employees. His work has been recognized by a number of publications. The most recent newspaper to take editorial note of the activties of Congressman Moss is the Sacramento Bee which published the following editorial on April 29, 1954:

COMMENDATION FOR MOSS

Congressman JOHN E. MOSS, JR., of the Third, Sacramento Valley, District, received a well-deserved commendation at the 25th annual convention of the California section, National Association of Letter Carriers, in San Jose over the last weekend.

Although the convention endorsed several Representatives, Moss was the only one who received the approval of all branches of the statewide organization. The resolution commending him was proposed unanimously.

The Sacramentan is a member of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, and as such has fought for an across-the-board salary increase for underpaid postal employees in preference to the reclassification plan offered by Postmaster General Arthur E. Summerfield, which would aid those in the higher brackets but be of little or no benefit to others.

Moss' stand in behalf of the clerks and carriers who serve the public so faithfully is fair and reasonable.

He is not opposed to a reclassification which would reward efficiency and provide incentives. But he feels the pressing need is for salary adjustments for those in the lower brackets to compensate for the increases in living costs.

Then he has proposed there should be a committee of the House to give a full-dress and careful study to the subject of reclassification. It is a case of putting first things first.

Moss is to be commended not only by the postal employees' convention but by the public in general for putting up a fight for a fair salary deal for those who daily make their appointed rounds.

The Manganese Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 13, 1954

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, last week I inserted in the RECORD a statement by Mr. J. Carson Adkerson, president of the American Manganese Producers Association, regarding the manganese situation in America.

There is an article in the May 13, 1954, issue of the Iron Age, the national metalworking weekly, which, in my opinion, is the voice for the steel industry, dealing with the acute situation faced by the steel industry due to the lack of manganese secured domestically as well as the apparent failure of the present administration in understanding and realizing this situation which could prove disastrous to our country in the event of an international conflict anytime in the foreseeable future.

I hope that in the near future the veil will be removed from the eyes of the administration so that a real stockpiling program for domestic manganese could be set in motion which is imperative if we are to have anything like an adequate defense for our country.

Too long have those who have had charge of the stockpiling of strategic material been blinded to the urgent need and obvious necessity of a real stockpiling program for domestic manganese. Without a stockpile of at least a 5-year supply of manganese our country would be helpless in the face of an all-out conflict with the Communist. Manganese is the very lifeblood of our defense effort and I trust for the sake of the future of this great country of ours that the officials charged with carrying out this program will wake up to the facts of life before it is too late and before we are sold down the river again.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to include the article referred to above, which is as follows:

BLAST RED MANGANESE-FOR-FOOD HINTS

(By G. H. Baker)

Imports of Russian manganese may be in the offing.

Some administration foreign-trade experts, beguiled by Russian hints of scarce materials in exchange for food products, are working quietly toward a barter deal that would include big-volume imports of manganese for the United States.

What the policy planners prefer to ignore is that the low-cost (slave labor) imports of manganese will work to the detriment of the domestic manganese industry and eventually to the United States steel industry.

Present market for manganese is very quiet as a result of currently low steel operating rates.

PRODUCERS FEARFUL

Domestic producers, who turn out about 6.5 percent of the United States steel industry's manganese requirements are fearful that the Federal Government once more is about to lend a naive ear to Russia's siren song of cheap and plentiful manganese. They are urging Washington defense mobilizers not to turn their backs on the small but vitally important domestic industry.

India, South Africa, and Brazil have become our biggest suppliers of manganese in recent years.

There's nothing basically new about the recent Russian hints of high-quality manganese for sale or barter. Russia and her satellites have plenty of manganese—more than they can use. But the Reds have a long and treacherous record, dating back to 1927, of leading the United States down the garden path with respect to dependence upon manganese.

CUT OFF SUPPLY

Each time the United States has come to depend upon Russian manganese, the Reds have abruptly jerked the rug. Manganese shipments have been shut off abruptly and without notice. As a collateral development, United States mines—unable to compete on a cost basis—have gone to pot during each of these periods of Russian imports.

J. Carson Adkerson, president of the American Manganese Producers Association, declares bluntly that the Reds are out to stop further development of the United States manganese resources. And, he adds, the administration's leaders are "swallowing it—hook, line, and sinker."

Although the General Services Administration is on the record as urging the extension of the stockpiling program to include the high-grade Virginia ores, ODM procrastinates and speaks instead of the great improvement in the manganese situation. This, says Mr. Adkerson, is "a tragic example of delay and indecision within the ODM."

Still Asleep at the Switch

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1954

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, when on July 15, 1953, and again on January 20, 1954, the Committee on Government Operations threw roadblocks which prevented investigations by me of extortion and racketeering by certain labor leaders and others who were misappropriating union funds, and which prevented further hearings that would have protected hundreds of thousands, if not millions, of union employees who have been, are, and undoubtedly will be deprived of benefits which belong to them.

In my humble judgment, those who brought about this result, whether they realized it or not, did a marked disfavor to union and other employees. They also, undoubtdly contrary to their purpose, lost the Republican Party a large block of votes.

That the issue is not dead is shown in the following quotation from an article by Westbrook Pegler, published in the Tuesday, May 11, press. Pegler wrote as follows:

[From the Washington Daily News of May 11, 1954]

Congressman CLARE HOFFMAN, of Michigan, who had shown up brigandage and piracy by the teamsters in insurance, juke-box graft, and a variety of other criminal stratagems, went back to Washington from Detroit despondent and licked. He said he had been stopped dead by some mysterious political force. Bill McKenna, his counsel and chief investigator, was even more positive in charging a political fix. But Beck rides the crest of a sea of dishonest publicity which drenches much of our journalism with a strange disquieting quilt. Beck is the model of the new "labor statesman" and Meany, who was lifted from the status of union lobbygow to the high command by Joe Ryan, is courted for his political favor and his wisdom on great matters.

Joe Ryan fought Harry Bridges and the Communists back from the eastern seaboard and the Gulf coast from the very first threat.

He kept the traitors off the docks when the 20-year regime of Roosevelt-Truman-La Guardia, and Lehman would have called them nothing worse than agrarian reformers. He lives in a 5-room flat on the lower west side and he knows his people and walks without fear or bodyguards. His wife is aging and failing in health and he has come up busted after all, whatever he may have helped himself to in the careless, cafeteria manner of the typical boss unioneer in dealings with his treasury.

Little Mr. Waldman will do his best for Joe, but it would be easier if the law let him prove what other men did who now praise themselves for their great service to society in slitting an old friend's throat.

Joe looked up, startled as he saw me at the press table. When I smiled, he gave me the mitt, shaking hands with himself in the old gesture. At adjournment I asked, "Where is Meany? Where is Dan Tobin? Dave Beck?"

"I don't know," Joe said. "They must be busy. I am glad you came around."

Minuteman Pamphlets by Kiwanis International

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 13, 1954

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I was pleased to hear from my friend, Mr. O. E. Peterson, secretary of Kiwanis International, with regard to another outstanding program being carried on by this great organization.

In 1933 it was my privilege to serve as governor of the Wisconsin-upper Michigan district of Kiwanis International. I note, therefore, with pride and joy that Kiwanis is carrying on a program of telling and selling the American story throughout the Nation, so as to make our people salesmen of the American way of life.

I send to the desk the text of Mr. Peterson's letter regarding a series of Minuteman pamphlets, and I append to it the text of the first of the pamphlets. I ask unanimous consent that these items be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter and pamphlet were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KIWANIS INTERNATIONAL,
Chicago, Ill., May 10, 1954.

The Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR ALEX: Kiwanis clubs in the United States are now distributing three quarters of a million pamphlets each month on Americanism.

The international committee on public and business affairs for the United States under the chairman, Stary Gange, of Visalia, Calif., has developed a program designed to encourage every American to understand and appreciate the American way of life and to be willing to speak up for democracy.

The committee believes that the American heritage must be reearned in every generation and only those who understand and appreciate the basic principles of Americanism will be willing to put forth the necessary effort to preserve their Nation for themselves and for coming generations.

In the fight against all things un-American, we need live ammunition in the hands of citizens who have the courage of their convictions. The monthly folders are this live ammunition. I am happy to enclose copies of the first three of these pamphlets, as I believe that you will be interested in them.

Kiwanis International has always exhibited a keen interest in good government, and is anxious to assist in every way in the preservation of our way of life. We feel that you as a legislator need to have the support of the citizens whom you represent. You also need to know how they are thinking and how they are acting.

We sincerely hope that the three enclosed Minuteman pamphlets will demonstrate to you the desire of 230,000 Kiwanians to influence all Americans to study, understand, appreciate and speak up for their Nation and its principles and at the same time to defend it against the inroads of un-American ideologies.

Sincerely yours,

O. E. PETERSON,
Secretary.

THIS IS YOUR LAND

Yes; this is your land. It belongs to you, and me—to "We, the People."

And what a land it is—this land where we live better than any other people in the whole world. Where we have better homes, with better conveniences—many times more automobiles, bathtubs, refrigerators, television sets, and other luxuries—than all the rest of the world combined.

Yes, we have most of the material comforts, and luxuries, of this world. But there are countless other blessings which have been heaped upon us; and they are part of our priceless heritage.

Take, for instance, free speech. Any place we go, we can talk freely about our public officeholders. Can you imagine what would happen to such a talker back of the Iron Curtain? And, American newspapers can tell the facts about our Government. In many nations the newspapers print only what the government tells them to print. No wonder dictators flourish there.

Ours is a free land, too—where we can work where we prefer, buy anything we can afford, worship as our consciences dictate, and vote for the candidates we like.

We like our country this way. So, let's be modern minutemen, and fight to keep America great. There are people who want to change us into some kind of a welfare state like those back of the Iron Curtain. If they put over their system of government and public ownership, will you be willing to give up your car, your home conveniences, freedom of speech, your right to read free newspapers and your right to worship as you please?

Others want to introduce a different type of ism into America—public ownership of certain businesses and more control over the rest of our economy. If they do, their system will pull us down to the standards of living that exist in lands where such systems hold sway.

Won't you be a Minuteman to help maintain the free American system—the system that has worked better than any ever tried before? Let's fight any plan to change it—let's try instead to lift the rest of the world up to the American level.

FREEDOM MUST BE REEARNED

Freedom is not a gift to the American people. Our freedom and our liberties are achievements that were won for us, first, by our early patriots and pioneers and must be reearned in each and every generation or they may be forever lost.

You and I in the next few years will either nobly win or meanly lose the last great hope of this earth, and that is a morally strong and economically sound America.

We must keep our country free, where a person can climb as high as he can carry his own weight, and where anyone can forever reach for the stars and shoot for the moon. Minutemen, patriotic Americans just like you, working together and singing the song of America, can make these next years our greatest years, those years for which all the first were made.

(This is No. 1 in a series of 12 folders—prepared in the interest of the American way of life by Kiwanis International, 520 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.)

Coney Island

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1954

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to take note of the 300th anniversary of the purchase of an important part of my district from the Indians.

The following item from the Brooklyn Eagle of May 7, 1954, tells the story:

THE PRICE WAS $15—INDIANS SOLD CONEY ISLAND TO DUTCH 300 YEARS AGO TODAY

Coney Island today is celebrating the 300th anniversary of its purchase by the Dutch from the Canarsie Indians for 15 fathoms of sewan, 2 guns, and 3 pounds of powder.

At the invitation of Walter M. Jeffords, Jr., president of the Brooklyn Borough Gas Co., 125 local women leaders, representing all the ocean front volunteer services, are marking the occasion at a luncheon at Garguilo's Restaurant, West 15th Street and Mermaid Avenue.

Compared with the purchase of Manhattan Island for $24, Coney Island brought a higher price per acre, since its purchase price was the equivalent of $15. Sewan was a form of wampum, beads made from shells, used as money by the Indians.

Guttaquoh was the Indian who sold Coney Island to the West India Co. of the chamber of Amsterdam, Holland. Since the land was in the old town of Gravesend, an English colony, the deed of sale was written in English.

At the time Coney Island was the land used by the Gravesend settlers to put their cattle out to graze as well as for hunting and fishing.

The Dutch West India Co. bought the land because it wanted to avoid trouble with the Indians over their rights on the land.

A reenactment of the purchase, in tableau form, with a group of New York State Indians representing those mentioned in the agreement, highlights the luncheon.

Tribute to J. Edgar Hoover

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 13, 1954

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, J. Edgar Hoover, able Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, this week celebrates his 30th anniversary as head of the world's greatest law-enforcement agency.

It is significant that Mr. Hoover has served under 5 separate administrations, 3 Republican Presidents and 2 Democratic. The greatest growth of the FBI came under the administrations of Presidents Roosevelt and Truman. Yet the FBI has never been involved in partisan politics and happily no one identifies Mr. Hoover with either one of our great political parties. It would be a sad day for America and for the FBI if that organization or its director were ever asked to play a role in a partisan controversy. Any such attempt will always be fought by the wiser men of both parties.

In the words of an editorial in the Belleville Daily Advocate, Belleville, Ill.:

> As long as J. Edgar Hoover is Director of the FBI, and when he leaves it some man who is imbued with his ideals, the organization will remain one in which honest citizens may take great pride but from which dishonest citizens cannot fail to shrink.

I include the full editorial, Belleville Daily Advocate, May 10, 1954, in the RECORD:

J. EDGAR HOOVER ANNIVERSARY

Today marks J. Edgar Hoover's 30th anniversary as Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

The fact that he has survived five administrations and at times bitter and unjust criticism is tribute to his character.

Few men in public life so long have a similar record, one which is so nearly free of blemish.

His service to the American people consisted in taking a disorganized investigative arm of the Government and making of it an efficient law enforcement body which stands shoulder to shoulder with the best of similar organizations in the world today.

At the same time it has never degenerated into a system of State police prying into private affairs for political reasons.

Hoover's aim, and he has come as close to achieving it as is possible in a police organization, was to create an efficient body to aid the Department of Justice in the enforcement of Federal laws. The high standards for membership make it unique among police organizations.

As long as J. Edgar Hoover is Director of the FBI, and when he leaves it some man who is imbued with his ideals, the organization will remain one in which honest citizens may take great pride but from which dishonest citizens cannot fail to shrink.

National Advisory Committee on Education

SPEECH

OF

HON. SAMUEL K. McCONNELL, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 12, 1954

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 7434) to establish a National Advisory Committee on Education.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this bill is to make it in order for the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to appoint a committee of nine lay members, none of whom happen to be in the employ of the Federal Government. The job of this advisory committee is to assist the Secretary in an understanding of the types of study that should be conducted to help assess the results of research made under authorization of the bill we just passed and to assist the Secretary in obtaining a view, you might say, from the grassroots of the country as to the various types of problems that exist and methods for handling them. I think the 2 bills, the 1 just passed, and this 1 fit into each other.

The bill which we just passed authorized cooperative-research arrangements with various colleges, universities, and departments of education of the various States. This bill would set up a lay committee consisting of people with some knowledge of the problems of education in the country who would help suggest various types of studies that could be researched on or researched into, and also advise as to the setting up of task forces to conduct some of these studies.

I am at a loss to understand the extent of the opposition which has developed in certain quarters to this particular bill, as well as the one that preceded it. I feel that the problem of education is a serious one. It involves juvenile delinquency, helping the mentally retarded, helping the physically handicapped children, and so forth. It should be kept in mind that under Selective Service many draftees are turned down because of certain defects in health or in mental training. With a situation like that existing in this country I think we should welcome any type of setup that could be devised to help us understand the problems more completely.

This is not any back-door way of seeking Federal control of education. I cannot believe that a number of those who voted against this rule would be opposed to more accurate and complete knowledge of problems that so seriously affect the real assets of this country—the youth of America.

I do not want to talk too long on this particular bill because, as I said in connection with the other bill, I am very pleased that the bill has been sponsored by one of the new, capable, worthwhile young men of our committee and I am very proud that he has seen fit to sponsor it. I want to give him as much time as possible.

A Man of Great Stature

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 13, 1954

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following article appearing in the Fort Worth Press on April 20, 1954, by Mr. Walter R. Humphrey, the editor.

A MAN OF GREAT STATURE

(By Walter R. Humphrey)

WASHINGTON, April 20.—For 9 years I've been attending the annual sessions of the American Society of Newspaper Editors here and in that time have seen and heard some extraordinary performances.

This year I have witnessed what may well have been the best of them all.

It was by the young Vice President of the United States, RICHARD NIXON.

Mr. NIXON spoke for 45 minutes or so, then submitted to questions for that much more time—difficult and complex questions, loaded questions.

Some of the questions were questions the average high public official would not attempt to answer.

But the Vice President answered them all, not by evasion or doubletalk, but with complete candor and frankness.

Never in my life have I heard a public official handle himself under difficult questioning so expertly and so honestly.

He was eloquent to begin with. He was also sure. He knew where he was going and what he was doing.

And he showed an amazing understanding of the problems facing the Nation; a working, speaking acquaintance with those problems.

It has been obvious from all his public appearances that the Vice President has an agile mind, a rare ability to think on his feet and to speak in such clear and concise language that all could understand him.

What he showed to us, in addition, was an amazingly thorough background in world affairs and a keen perception of the points of view and national attitudes of friendly and enemy nations alike.

On top of that he showed a rare courage, a courage to face up to difficult issues and to put himself on the record no matter how difficult or unpopular the answer.

Those of us who saw Mr. NIXON in action saw an encouraging display of high leadership in the person of the Vice President.

This is indeed an unusual thing, because most Vice Presidents have been unable to meet this test, or they have been so restricted by the traditional confines of the Vice Presidency that they have been unwilling to step into a role of genuine leadership.

Traditionally, the Vice President has been the Presiding Officer of the Senate and the President's contact man there, but little else.

Mr. NIXON, on the other hand, sits in the high councils of the administration and is thoroughly acquainted with the policies, operations, and problems of the executive branch, also.

He thus stands in the rare position of being an expert on both sides and being a leader in both the executive and legislative branches.

I think Mr. NIXON soared high in the estimation of all the 500 or so who heard him.

He was impressive, not in a cocky or officious way at all, but in the sincerity of his performance and in the competence of it.

He is never dull or humorless, yet in dealing with the critical problems of our country he didn't speak lightly or condescendingly, but frankly, plainly, straight from the shoulder.

RICHARD NIXON showed himself to be a man of large stature; it was indeed a comforting revelation, for the Nation deserves the very best in the Office of the Vice President.

Economics Versus Politics, CIO Style

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 13, 1954

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, the determined effort on the part of some labor leaders to set up a class conscious system is continuing. In Washington, this week, the president of the CIO offered the opinion that the unemployment problem can be remedied in November by making about three dozen reactionary politicians unemployed. The observations were made before a special CIO conference on unemployment to mobilize the full political potential of organized labor for the congressional elections this fall.

There is no room for doubt about the CIO's position. If they have ever approved a Republican for any office, it was an oversight. But this notion which they are currently advancing is more than a political war cry. It is a weird effort to portray every Republican as an enemy of the workingman, and every Democrat as St. George dispatching the dragon of poverty. If political decisions could by some magic process abolish unemployment overnight and end all of the social and economic ailments of the modern industrial community, they would be adopted with the speed of light. We have discovered, however, that the kinds of devices most frequently urged by partisan labor politicians are seldom effective for any purpose other than to arouse hostility. Certainly, if we could simultaneously increase Government spending and decrease taxes, which is what some people are advocating in substance, we would be magicians. Congress and the administration are responsible public officials, but we are not practitioners of the black arts, legerdemain, and sorcery.

Good Government or Dirty Politics?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 13, 1954

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I read with interest a thoughtful article in a recent edition of the Independent Labor News, published in Jacksonville, Fla., by Mr. Roy Gatz, editor, and Mr. Jay Barrette, managing editor. The article points out the great need for everyone to become interested in good government in an active manner. It reads as follows:

GOOD GOVERNMENT OR DIRTY POLITICS?

Friends of ours asked us the other day why unions get mixed up in politics.

Our friend thought that the union ought to confine itself to helping its members become better citizens.

Is there a difference between good citizenship and politics? There certainly is, in the minds of many of us. When we say "citizenship" we think of good government and the loyal support of each of us for our Constitution and for American ideals. When we say "politics" we think of back-room deals, trading votes, smoke-filled conventions, and sometimes graft.

Certainly most of us would say that politics isn't for the likes of us. We aren't devious enough, even if we had the inclination. So let's stick to good government.

What's good government? When we talk about good government, we mean an honest government, staffed by officials who are completely divorced from selfish interests, and we think about good laws that protect all the people fairly.

Most of us could agree, for example, that good government doesn't write into tax laws special advantages for one group over another. Under good government, we could agree also that minimum wages, old-age pensions, and unemployment benefits have to go up when prices go up.

Yet, right there a lot of people honestly disagree with us on what makes good government. Some people still believe that the Government should not operate a social-security program at all. They believe that the only good government is a government that performs the fewest services and has the lowest tax rate.

The minute we accept the fact that honest men can disagree about what is good government, there's a political argument and we've gotten into politics.

It would be easier for some of our members to understand what we are trying to accomplish, if each issue came to the people for a referendum vote.

We vote indirectly. If union members had a chance to vote in referendum on the question of raising the minimum wage, or pensions, or unemployment compensation or special tax loopholes, or higher interest rates, there's no question where we'd stand.

But, we don't do it that way in this country; it wouldn't be practical. Instead we elect representatives who vote on these things for us. They decide not only minimum wage rates and the size of our old-age pensions, if any—but the interest rates we pay on our mortgage, the size of our Army, Navy, and Air Force, our public works, and a thousand other issues that make a difference in whether or not we have a job, in how much we make and in how we live.

Some of our people don't tie together the election of our representatives—our State senators and assemblymen, our United States Representatives and Senators, our Governor, our President and Vice President, and other public officials with citizenship. To them, these officials are just a bunch of politicians about whom union members should have no opinion and take no action.

Maybe it will be easier this year if we make it clear that good citizenship and clean politics go hand in hand. That's what our Independent Labor News has started out to do.

It's not going to be an easy job. But with the help of every union family, we can make a difference in the outcome this year.

State of Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDNA F. KELLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 12, 1954

Mrs. KELLY of New York. Mr. Speaker, 6 years have passed since the creation of the State of Israel. During that period, the state has weathered many storms involving the normal strain of organization and development, but none seems as formidable as the threatening storm involving international unrest and local tensions. From our vantage point we must review these past years to evaluate the present crisis for future action. No one can deny that a great deal has been accomplished by the new State of Israel within a short period of time. There is definitely established a nation for the Jewish people. The tragic problem of Jewish homelessness has come to an end. Whenever Jews are persecuted or whenever they choose to migrate to Israel the door is open to them.

Israel survived the struggle for existence in its early days with assistance from outside and with the stubborn determination of those within its borders. All who have worked for the creation of Israel and for its welfare can reap satisfaction in the result. Israel has taken its rightful place among the community of nations. At the present, Israel is beset with grave problems; problems arising out of its geographic location. Its hostile neighbors refuse to accept its existence. It is beset by the great number of refugees living on its borders—refugees who were dislocated when Israel's boundaries were fixed. Years have not decreased the tension of the area but have tended to accentuate the acuteness of the problems.

It is for the solution of these problems that I, as a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, will give my support to all measures which are designed to continue our friendly relations with Israel and to help her in her struggles for the good of mankind. I believe that the following fundamental principles must be borne in mind by all who are concerned with the peace and security of that area:

First. Israel has pushed forward along democratic lines its programs which will make Israel a bulwark of strength in the vital and strategic area of the Near East.

Second. Israel is a duly constituted and established independent state and a full-fledged member of the family of free nations. She is a member of the United Nations and other organizations and has assumed the responsibilities and obligations which devolve upon a member of the family of free nations. This is a reality which the Arabs, in their own interest and in the interest of the entire area, must recognize.

Third. The status of the Arab refugees constitutes a critical situation which seriously impairs the peaceful solution of Arab-Israeli tensions. Shifting of the blame for this tragic situation from one side to the other does not help solve this problem. The plight of the Arab refugees, including their resettlement problem, should summon up the highest degree of humanitarianism and spiritual qualities of which both Israel and the Arabs are capable. Just and reasonable compensation should be made by the Israelis for property of the Arab refugees.

Fourth. The Tripartite Declaration of May 1950, which pledges the United States, the United Kingdom, and France to prevent a violation of frontiers or armistice lines, should be adhered to. In this connection it should be pointed out that Israel, having taken the lead in that area in developing democratic institutions of government, must also take the lead in developing the utmost restraint in the face of border incidents on the part of the neighboring Arabs and rely on the machinery of the United Nations to deal with these violations.

Fifth. Underlying the many ramifications of Arab-Israeli tensions is the basic fact that the Arab States refuse to negotiate a peaceful settlement of their disputes with a neighbor who is in that area to stay. Israel has repeatedly made peace overtures to the Arab States and just as repeatedly these overtures have been repelled. More than that, these overtures have met with positive measures by the Arab States to isolate Israel socially, economically, and politically through economic blockades, nonrecognition, and statements by Arab leaders of their intent to push the State of Israel off the map.

Peaceful negotiations between the Arab States and Israel must be undertaken at once if the Arabs genuinely desire peace in the Near East area and social, economic, and political progress for their people.

The United States, in its own security and foreign policy interests, must continue economic assistance to Israel and the Arab States from the point of view of the vital needs of the area of the Near East as a whole.

Harry Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 13, 1954

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following editorial which appeared in the Sioux City Journal, May 11, 1954:

HARRY AGAIN

"It is too bad that Secretary Acheson has not been consulted on how to operate the policies of the United States."—Harry S. Truman.

There is the quote of the week. It was made by the former President at a Jefferson-Jackson Day Democratic rally in Washington, D. C.

Mr. Truman's thinking on the subject of Dean Acheson is about as sensible as usual. But it helps point up the fact that the Eisenhower administration has been intelligent enough to get along without assistance from Dean Acheson.

Secretary of State Dulles finds it difficult, indeed, to catch up the loose ends of American foreign policy left dangling by Dean Acheson, the man who would not "turn his back" on Alger Hiss, convicted traitor, and who helped devise the foreign policy that encouraged the Communists to take over China because of our refusal to back Chiang Kai-shek when he needed help most.

Mr. Dulles has his troubles and all is not smooth on the diplomatic front, but at least the American people seem to have more confidence in the Eisenhower-Dulles brand of foreign policy than they did in the Truman-Acheson brand.

Some persons are inclined to forget that American prestige in the world slipped considerably during the Truman-Acheson regime; that ill-advised agreements brought troubles which now are plaguing the Eisenhower administration. Secretary Dulles is in the process of trying to get the United States out of the diplomatic mess he inherited from the man President Truman would like to have him consult.

Privilege of the House

SPEECH

OF

CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1954

(Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, 2 or 3 weeks ago a question of the privilege of the House was raised and a resolution which was offered to inquire into that through the efforts of a special committee was sidetracked by a motion to refer the matter to the Committee on the Judiciary. Now, I have no objection to that; but the Committee on the Judiciary evidently, in spite of requests, has not been doing anything about it. The same facts which gave rise to the question of privilege of the House also, in my judgment, at least, created the same right for any Member who voted for a resolution to recommit a bill. He has the same right, and if the Committee on the Judiciary does not intend to report on that motion which was referred to them, then it is my purpose to again raise that question of personal privilege, a matter which will take an hour, and I dislike to do that. But that may become necessary.

Champion of the Railroad Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 13, 1954

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following editorial from the current issue of Labor, a national weekly newspaper, which has my heartiest endorsement:

BOB CROSSER SET AN INSPIRING EXAMPLE FOR ALL AMERICANS

Congressman Robert Crosser, of Ohio, old friend and champion of the railroad workers and the common people, will soon pass from the political scene in Washington. In last week's Democratic primary in Cleveland he was defeated by the slim margin of 442 votes, in a field split between 5 candidates. The winner was Charles Vanik, a former municipal judge.

Labor believes it speaks for all railroaders in telling Bob Crosser we revere him even more now than during his many historic victories, both at the polls and in Congress. And we are not alone in our feeling about Bob. Even the conservative Cleveland Plain Dealer, which has not been in his corner, said, "There is a measure of sorrow in the defeat of Representative Crosser. * * * We take this opportunity to thank him for his four decades of public service."

One of Crosser's greatest services is that he has set an inspiring example for all Americans, particularly those who are in public office or aspire to it. By his entire life, he has proved that, in this land of ours, a man still can rise from a humble beginning to the heights, without bending the knee to the forces of greed or wearing any other man's collar.

Bob came to this country as a boy of 7, with his Scotch coal miner father. The family went through hard times in Ohio, but Crosser worked his way through school and became a lawyer. Turning from profitable private practice, he followed the example of his hero Henry George, "the prophet of San Francisco," and devoted his life to working for the people.

Crosser helped in the historic battles of Tom Johnson, Cleveland's great mayor, who spent his fortune fighting for the people against monopoly and special privilege. Bob carried on the good fight as a member of the Ohio legislature and as delegate to a State convention which rewrote Ohio's constitution.

In 1912, a progressive wave swept Woodrow Wilson into the White House and Crosser into the National House of Representatives. With the exception of the 4 years between 1918 and 1922, he has been there ever since.

It would take a big book to tell what Crosser has done in Congress for the workers and people. Rail men and women know he, more than any other man, helped their unions win the Railroad Retirement and Unemployment Insurance Systems and repeated improvements in pensions and benefits. For similar reasons, he earned the gratitude of the millions of workers who are under social security.

Crosser pioneered in so many other great reforms that it's impossible even to list them here. It can be summed up by saying that no man who ever served in Congress played a bigger or more beneficial part in history.

Bob's hosts of friends wish him many years of well-earned rest, and hope to call upon his sage advice in the future as in the past.

In railmen's minds and hearts, a special place will always be reserved for Crosser.

If Vanik, the victor in the primary, wins again in November, he will face a great challenge and opportunity—to serve the American people in the House as faithfully as Bob Crosser did.

Changes Needed To Enhance Armed Services Career

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1954

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I should like to include an editorial from the Nashville Banner:

Changes Needed To Enhance Armed Services Career

Pertinent to the general subject: Deteriorating Attractiveness of the Armed Services From a Career Standpoint, Air Force Secretary Harold E. Talbott made a speech the other day. "Trained airmen and officers," he said, "represent the capital assets of the Air Force, and to replace those who are getting out will cost a great deal of money. By that I mean $2 billion to $3 billion in the next couple of years."

What the Air Force Secretary said applies equally to the Navy, the Army, and the Marine Corps. When attractiveness of the armed services from a career standpoint deteriorates, for whatever reason, security suffers. An extraordinary turnover requires a tremendous operation for replacements—and the training of officer material for such replacements is a time-consuming and expensive process.

We are speaking primarily of career men, who willingly have assumed the arduous duties with the idea of making that service a lifetime job; whose capabalities in whatever echelon are vital to their Nation's security; the cadre, as it were, of officer timber about which a command is built.

The disturbing fact is that the attractiveness of such career is deteriorating because it has been allowed to do so. Prestige has suffered; to an extent disruptive of incentive, emoulments have dwindled relatively—to the point that the earning capacity in uniform is vastly under the pay scale of comparable jobs in civilian life. Young men or older men are finding greater inducements in private life—and right at the time defense considerations, perhaps for decades to come, put a premium on the Nation's need of them in the capacities for which they have been trained.

The Congressional Record recently printed the explanation of one distinguished officer quitting after 22 years of service. It began:

"I recently resigned my commission in the United States Air Force because I believe this Nation is imposing conditions of second-class citizenship upon its professional military force. * * * Now that my lips are no longer sealed by military regulations, I am free to speak of these policies of expediency, indifference, and discriminatory legislation which are making military careers less and less attractive at a time when our Nation most needs them."

Citing these facts to Congress is a case of presenting them to the right place, because Congress it is primarily which has whittled away the inducements—or perpetuated circumstances of handicap which in the aggregate combine to discourage the military career either for officers or enlisted men. For one thing, while bestowing raise after raise on civilian personnel, Congress has dragged its heels on comparable benefits in the armed services. It even has curtailed such fringe benefits as in the past have compensated the service man and his family on posts far from home.

There is also, and on the other hand, the expensive policy of enforced retirement of officers at an age arbitrarily fixed, regardless of their capacity for continued efficient service beyond that age. The Nation thus is deprived of further contributions which many of these would prefer to make.

This is not the whole case—as these service men know, but it is symptomatic of the situation on which a complaint is lodged, and which needs attention if intelligent action is to rectify a harmful situation. Regardless of theory, the fact is that the Nation is losing too many men—too many trained officers whose retention is important and whose replacement will be expensive, time-consuming, and difficult.

We cannot afford to fritter away manpower or officer strength which otherwise would be readily available. Not only in dollars and cents, but in security, it is a wasteful neglect of an essential resource—and it is time that the whole Nation, including Congress assuredly, face the fact.

Island of Cyprus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 13, 1954

Mr O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am extending my remarks to include the following resolution passed at a large mass meeting in the Civic Opera in Chicago:

Whereas the right of self-determination by ethnic groups has always been the avowed policy of the United States of America, and more particularly so since World War I; and

Whereas even now in the year 1954, there are peoples in various parts of the world struggling for independence and for their right to determine their form of government without coercion or interference from outside influences; and

Whereas the population of the Island of Cyprus consists of 82 percent of people of Hellenic language and the Greek orthodox faith; and whereas, by an overwhelming majority the people of Cyprus, Greeks, and Moslems alike, have publicly and solemnly announced by plebiscite held in 1950, their desire for union with the Kingdom of Greece; and

Whereas justice, freedom, and independence are the inalienable rights of all mankind and recognized by civilized nations of the world; and whereas Greek concepts of government guided our forefathers in declaring the independence of the colonies and forming the Government of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That, on this, the 133d anniversary of Independence Day of Greece, celebrated under the auspices of the Federation of Hellenic Organizations of Illinois in the Civic Opera located at Wacker Drive and Madison Street, Chicago, Ill., this 25th day of March A. D. 1954, we go on record approving the result of the plebiscite held on the island of Cyprus in 1950, and give encouragement to the descendants of the founders of democracy in Greece, which is similar to the form of government we have in our United States; be it further

Resolved, That the aspirations of the people of Cyprus asking for union with the Kingdom of Greece be strongly endorsed; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be filed with the executive branch of the Government of the United States, and particularly the Secretary of State of the United States, to the end that our Government may assist the people of Cyprus in their struggle for their God-given right of self-determination, and copies of this resolution to be forwarded to the Members of the Congress of the United States; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the United Nations and to the press throughout the United States and the free nations of the world.

Upon motion for the adoption of this resolution, the same was unanimously adopted this 25th day of March A. D. 1954, at Chicago.

A. A. Pantelis, *Chairman.*
John L. Manta, *President.*

Attest:

Nicholas P. Geannopoulos,
Secretary.

Coudert Rider on Indochina

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 13, 1954

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following editorial from a recent issue of the Daily Evening Item, Lynn, Mass.

Let's Keep Reds Guessing

Congress acted wisely in defeating overwhelmingly the so-called Coudert rider which would have required congressional approval before United States troops could be sent to Indochina or anywhere else.

Naturally, the American public feels deep concern over the prospect of involvement in the Indochinese war. But President Eisenhower has given repeated assurances that he would not get into war without action by Congress, just as he has promised our allies we would not act without consulting them.

If the President has said he would not act without congressional endorsement, then one might ask: What is wrong with casting this restriction into formal law?

In this specific instance, there is a technical reason and a fundamental reason why it should not be done.

The technical reason is that the proposal was offered as a rider, a mere appendage, to an appropriation bill. As such, it did not get the full-debate treatment warranted for a matter of prime constitutional importance, which this is.

Fundamentally, the constitutional issue raised by the Coudert plan is whether the President is to retain his historic flexibility in foreign affairs and military matters.

To tie his hands when instant retaliation might be required for the Nation's defense could be perilous in an H-bomb age. If the Russians dropped a big bomb on New York, no sane lawmaker or citizen would want the President to wait for congressional action before dispatching American planes to the enemy's own heart. The delay could be fatal.

Furthermore, in the conduct of foreign affairs, the President and his diplomats need not only flexibility of maneuver, but the ability to sow doubt and uncertainty among potential enemies. Representative VORYS, of Ohio expressed the idea perfectly:

"Telegraphing your punches is bad enough. But telegraphing your enemies you are not going to punch is even worse."

There is no earthly reason, in other words, why we should tell the Russians what we are not going to do. So long as they think we might act, that prospect can serve as a deterrent. It is a powerful weapon in the hands of our diplomats.

The 214 to 37 vote by which the House rejected the Coudert proposal suggests that the wisdom of the President's constitutional position was brought home forcefully to the lawmakers.

Major Contribution to National Defense Made by All-Cargo Air

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 13, 1954

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, there has been a general belief that the subsidized passenger-carrying airlines have made the only substantial contribution in support of our armed services since the end of World War II and during the period of the Korean war. Many statements have been made indicating that this might be true, particularly statements made in support of airline subsidy appropriations.

Although I have no desire to detract in any way from such contributions as have been made by any of the United States civilian airlines during periods of national emergency or otherwise, I do feel that the important contribution made by the unsubsidized all-cargo airlines to our national defense should be recognized and brought to the attention of Members of Congress who may not be acquainted with the valuable contributions made by these cargo carriers.

On May 11, a representative of the all-cargo airlines group testified before the Subcommittee of the Senate Appropriations Committee which has under consideration appropriations for the Civil Aeronautics Board and subsidy aid to airlines. The testimony of the representative of the all-cargo airline group brought out many salient facts, which I feel should be of considerable interest to Members of the House of Representatives.

Under unanimous consent, I include the statement of the representative of the all-cargo airlines, Transport Air Group, Inc., before the United States Senate Subcommittee on the State, Justice, and Commerce appropriation bill:

STATEMENT OF TRANSPORT AIR GROUP, INC., BEFORE UNITED STATES SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE STATE, JUSTICE, AND COMMERCE APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, I sincerely appreciate the opportunity of presenting a statement before you in behalf of Transport Air Group, Inc. (TAG), the Association of Airlift and Airfreight Carriers. My name is L. R. Hackney and I am executive vice president of TAG. Our membership consists of California Eastern Airways, Inc., the Flying Tiger Line, Inc., Transocean Air Lines, Seaboard & Western Airlines, Inc., and Slick Airways, Inc.

I would like first to emphasize that I have not come before this committee to criticize the appropriation of subsidy aid to air carriers where this form of aid is essential to the maintenance of adequate postal service, or for the needs of commerce. However, as you are concerned with appropriations, and in the case of Civil Aeronautics Board the matter of subsidy, there are four salient points which I would like to clarify.

First, that contrary to popular belief it has been the nonsubsidized airlift and airfreight carriers that have made the major contribution to national defense since the end of World War II, rather than the subsidized passenger carriers or those passenger carriers eligible for subsidy. Unfortunately, there have been several statements made from the floor of the House, while the CAB appropriations were under vigorous debate, which have been made a part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.[1] These remarks likewise give the impression that it is the segment of the air transport industry which is subsidized or is eligible for subsidy, which has been practically the sole supplier of airlift. This entirely ignores the activities of the forgotten other segment, the airlift and airfreight carriers, which has been responsible for the greater part of the civil airlift support of the Defense Department since the termination of the Second World War.

It was TAG members who performed over 55 percent of the commercial support for the military on the Pacific airlift, our aerial supply pipeline during the recent Korean hostilities. Nor has this been the first instance that we have provided needed airlift. During the Russian blockade of Berlin it was one of our members who furnished approximately 85 percent of the United States civil support of the now famous Operation Vittles (Berlin airlift).

It was a TAG member who was first to have its transports flying in civil support of both the Berlin and Pacific airlifts. In each instance crews and planes were transferred from other activities on less than 48 hours' notice. In another instance a TAG member drew on its reserve crews and its remarkable organizational ability to place 50 Government-furnished C-54 transports into a trans-Pacific airlift in only 8 days. This was in support of our Armed Forces in Japan shortly after World War II.

On April 8, 1954, the Honorable HARRY R. SHEPPARD, of California, included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD remarks which I respectfully call to your notice, in part:

"The participation of the civilian carriers in the Korean airlift has been highlighted and strongly stressed as a major illustration of why subsidies to airlines are necessary—yes; indeed imperative. However, those who have most strongly propounded these arguments have failed to make mention that the airlines who participated to the largest degree in the Korean airlift were our own cargo airlines, who have never asked nor received one cent in subsidy payment from our Government."[2]

The second major point which I wish to bring out at this time, is the erroneous impression caused by statements in the House of Representatives[3] to the effect that airline subsidies should continue because the certificated passenger carriers constitute a great fleet of aircraft which can be used to great advantage by our military forces in time of national emergency. I feel I must take exception to this reasoning because the type of aircraft now in use by these carriers cannot be used by the military anywhere near as effectively as the cargo transports used by nonsubsidized airlift and airfreight carriers.

In the event of another national emergency our logistic planners are not counting upon railroad passenger cars, passenger buses, or passenger ships to transport critical military supplies by surface. They will utilize equipment designed for the carriage of cargo; boxcars, motor-trailer trucks, or cargo vessels.

Yet our much heralded Civil Reserve Air Fleet consists of approximately 80-percent passenger transports. These transports, constructed with small size passenger doors, and for the most part with lightly stressed passenger floors, are severely limited in their usefulness and ability to transport high-priority military supplies which frequently, because of their bulk or weight, cannot be carried.

It is upon the all too few all-cargo transports, that will fall the task of efficiently airlifting the bulk of military supplies. Military planners have long been concerned with the serious unbalanced ratio of passenger transports to all-cargo transports which comprise the CRAF fleet. Of the total all-cargo transports therein, approximately 50 percent will be furnished by the nonsubsidized airlift and airfreight carriers.

With your indulgence, I would like to quote from the testimony of the Department of Defense before the Civil Aeronautics Board in the matter of the Reopened Transatlantic Cargo case.

"The Department of Defense is responsible for the provision of efficient and economical transportation management for the movement of persons and things for the three military departments. In the fulfillment of that responsibility, it is incumbent upon the Department of Defense to encourage the expansion of commercial transportation facilities and services within sound economic limits to assist in meeting our peace and wartime requirements.

"This testimony is presented to give proper and full emphasis to the Department of Defense position as favoring establishment and expansion of civil air cargo service between the United States, Europe, and the Middle East for the following reasons:

"(a) The purchase and operation by the air transport industry of long-range aircraft in cargo configuration which can be converted expeditiously to military use, is in the interest of national defense.

"(b) International developments emphasize the need for transatlantic and Middle East air cargo service.

"(c) Present air cargo service provided by United States-flag lines is considered inadequate to meet military and civil requirements.

"(d) The Department of Defense has an existing requirement for additional air cargo service to Europe and the Middle East."[4]

From the foregoing statement of the Department of Defense it is apparent that they recognize the urgent need for increasing the number of long-range transports of all-cargo configuration (cargo floors and large cargo doors) that would be available to them. The certification of a nonsubsidized all-cargo carrier across the Atlantic as recommended by a CAB examiner would help to create a fleet of all-cargo transports of the type required by the military.

During the House debate of this bill it was was stated that "* * * the national defense * * * requires a continuing adjustment and utilization of aircraft of the most modern type so that the reserve fleet is never obsoluete."[5] It was further stated that "we have a reserve fleet for the military of this country today, built up by reason of the air-

---

Footnotes at end of speech.

Footnotes at end of speech.

line subsidy, to the value of approximately $350 million, that is available to us on almost instant notice if we need them."[6]

Now it is perfectly true that those aircraft now in use or on order by airlines eligible for subsidy are "of the most modern type," as far as the carriage of passengers, or even troops, is concerned. But these modern aircraft, "built up by reason of the airline subsidy," are hardly the type most desired by the Defense Department in the event of an emergency. The military has expressed a preference for more cargo aircraft in the civil reserve air fleet. Furthermore, these passenger planes now in use or on order by carriers eligible for subsidy could hardly be made "available to us on almost instant notice" to efficiently carry the military cargo that undoubtedly will have to be moved on M-day. In fact, they could be utilized to carry essential materiel only at the expense of considerable time and money, and are, therefore, of limited value, as far as their emergency airlift standby status is concerned.

The conclusion that springs from all this is clear. The House of Representatives has been given as a reason for continuing the subsidizing of those passenger air carriers eligible for subsidy, that the needs of national defense require it, since these carriers contribute a great deal to the Civil Reserve Air Fleet which can be used in the event of emergency. My purpose is simply to call to your attention that the needs of national defense as a reason for subsidizing passenger air carriers is no longer as valid a justification as when it first appeared in 1938, since the contribution of this class of air carriers to our reserve capability is mostly in passenger aircraft, a type not primarily desired by our military forces.

If airline subsidies are still needed by our certificated passenger carriers, it is only because the needs of the postal service and the commerce of the United States require it, but hardly because subsidy makes it possible for these carriers to contribute so greatly to our national defense by providing airlift for military supply.

The third major point for your attention is the apparent current policy of the Civil Aeronautics Board, as indicated in numerous recent board determinations and orders. This policy appears to be that the certificated passenger carriers (the carriers subsidized or eligible for subsidy) should be given preference in the award of Government contracts generally. This includes contracts for charter flights and contracts for the carriage of nonpriority surface mail by air, regardless of offers received from the airlift and airfreight carriers which in many instances were more advantageous to the Government.

TAG does not believe that it is proper or consistent with the intent of the Congress, or in the national interest that it be a prerequisite to the award of Government contracts that an air carrier be subsidized or made eligible for subsidy by the CAB. Furthermore, in following such a policy, subsidy takes on another form and, in effect, becomes a hidden subsidy.

Let me again quote from Congressman SHEPPARD's remarks of April 8:

"What is the Civil Aeronautics Board doing to foster the all-cargo airlines, this relatively new and extremely important segment of our air industry? I will tell you what they are doing.

"I have investigated this matter in quite some detail and have found beyond question that the Civil Aeronautics Board has imposed every restriction, inhibition, and difficulty imaginable on these all-cargo carrying lines. They have made it as difficult for them to operate as is possible."[7]

Fourth, as a major point, it is trusted that this committee will carefully reconsider the recommendation which has now been reported in the recent Air Coordinating Committee Review of National Aviation Policy. This pertains to the recommendation that route decisions in overseas operation should recognize the necessity of avoiding or eliminating uneconomic duplication of services between United States carriers. TAG offers these four facts for your consideration:

1. After carefully evaluating all economic factors, the CAB examiner has recommended the certification of an all-cargo United States flag carrier over the Atlantic to conduct scheduled service between the United States and Europe.

2. The Department of Defense has recommended the certification of an all-cargo carrier over the Atlantic. They further stated that such carrier was needed for national defense and in order to provide airlift not available by presently certificated carriers.

3. The all-cargo carrier recommended by the examiner has requested no subsidy.

4. A British all-cargo carrier has been granted a permit by the United States and is shortly to start operation over this route.

In conclusion may I make the following observation. Although our privately financed airlift and airfreight carrier members receive no subsidy, and are not here seeking subsidy, we do feel that it is in the national interest and consistent with the policy established by Congress in the Civil Aeronautics Act that this segment of the air transportation industry be encouraged in its development by the agencies of the United States Government, and that the maintenance of a healthy cargo and contract carrier industry be recognized as in the public interest and in accordance with the public convenience and necessity on an equal footing with other segments of the air transportation industry who have been afforded Government protection and subsidy aid.

We will not go so far as to request that the committee take formal action to place a limitation on the use or grant of subsidy funds to the effect that no airline receiving funds as subsidy aid shall, because of such grant, be entitled to preferential treatment in the award of Government contracts by virtue of having received or been made eligible for such subsidy; however, we do request that the intent of Congress in this regard be clarified by the committee at the time any funds for subsidy aid may be recommended by the committee.

Footnotes at end of speech.

[1] House of Representatives, Hon. FRANK T. BOW, of Ohio, March 3, 1954 (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 4, 1954, pp. A1716–17).

[2] House of Representatives, Hon. HARRY R. SHEPPARD, of California, April 8, 1954 (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, April 8, 1954, p. A2723).

[3] House of Representatives, Hon FRANK T. BOW, of Ohio, May 6, 1954 (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 6, 1954, p. 5834).

[4] Testimony of Col. C. Frank Snyder, USAF, Chief of Plans and Requirements Group, Directorate of Transportation, USAF, before the Civil Aeronautics Board in behalf of the Department of Defense in the matter of: Reopened Transatlantic Cargo case, Docket No. 3041, et al.

[5] House of Representatives, Hon. FRANK T. BOW, of Ohio, May 6, 1954 (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 6, 1954, p. 5834).

[6] House of Representatives, Hon. FRANK T. BOW, of Ohio, March 3, 1954 (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 4, 1954, pp. A1716–17).

[7] House of Representatives, Hon HARRY R. SHEPPARD, of California, April 8, 1954 (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, April 8, 1954, p. A2723).

This Is Your Land

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENN R. DAVIS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 7, 1954

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to call attention of my colleagues to the fact that three-quarters of a million pamphlets on Americanism now are being distributed every month by 230,000 Kiwanians. O. E. Peterson, secretary of Kiwanis International, explains that in the fight against all things un-American, we need live ammunition in the hands of the citizens who have the courage of their convictions. These monthly folders are this live ammunition.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to include in the RECORD part of the text of the first three of these monthly Kiwanis Club folders:

THIS IS YOUR LAND

Yes, this is your land. It belongs to you, and me—to "We, the People."

And what a land it is—this land where we live better than any other people in the whole world. Where we have better homes, with better conveniences—many times more automobiles, bathtubs, refrigerators, television sets, and other luxuries—than all the rest of the world combined.

Yes, we have most of the material comforts, and luxuries, of this world. But there are countless other blessings which have been heaped upon us; and they are part of our priceless heritage.

Take, for instance, free speech. Any place we go, we can talk freely about our public office holders. Can you imagine what would happen to such a talker back of the Iron Curtain? And, American newspapers can tell the facts about our Government.

In many nations the newspapers print only what the government tells them to print. No wonder dictators flourish there.

Ours is a free land, too—where we can work where we prefer, buy anything we can afford, worship as our consciences dictate, and vote for the candidates we like.

We like our country this way. So let's be modern minutemen, and fight to keep America great. There are people who want to change us into some kind of a welfare state like those back of the Iron Curtain. If they put over their system of government and public ownership, will you be willing to give up your car, your home conveniences, freedom of speech, your right to read free newspapers and your right to worship as you please?

Others want to introduce a different type of "ism" into America—public ownership of certain businesses and more control over the rest of our economy. If they do, their system will pull us down to the standards of living that exist in lands where such systems hold sway.

Won't you be a minuteman to help maintain the free American system—the system that has worked better than any ever tried before? Let's fight any plan to change it—let's try instead to lift the rest of the world up to the American level.

THIS IS YOUR LAND

Yes. This glorious, free land of America belongs to you—and you—and you. To the young, who have all its matchless opportunities before them. To the mature, who can live their lives out in security and in freedom. It is a land where thousands of good schools and fine teachers are available to all; where every youngster has the right and the opportunity to learn the trade or the profession of his choice.

LAND OF OPPORTUNITY

It is a land where awkward country boys have worked their way right up to the White House. Where railroad laborers have become presidents of great railroads. Where penniless young workers have become the heads of the most powerful unions. These opportunities are part of our great American heritage, handed down from generation to generation ever since the original Minutemen helped make this a free land of limitless opportunities. If this freedom, and this heritage of opportunity, are to be preserved, everyone must answer the clarion call to be a minuteman each in his own special way.

Right now there is a serious threat to this wonderful heritage of ours, to these limitless opportunities. A new and treacherous threat, by those who promote a strange, un-American cult that would make this a welfare state instead of a land where boys and girls can win their way to the very top through individual energy and ability.

FIGHT TO PRESERVE HERITAGE

Let's all fight these traitors and subversives—let's preserve our enthusiasm for the ideals and principles which have made this country great.

Won't you—whether you stand on life's threshold or are right in the midst of things—won't you agree to do a modern minuteman's job, to help preserve our American heritage for this and every coming generation? Speak up whenever you hear talk that points toward the downfall of our form of government and our free-enterprise system. Let's have a revival of the fighting spirit of 1776.

LET'S HANG ON TO OUR BLESSINGS

There is no such thing as a permanently free country. All over the world today there are whole nations that have lost their freedom. Sometimes the change has been forced upon them by an outside aggressor. Sometimes by traitors in their midst. But either way the results to the enslaved peoples are exactly the same—their cherished liberties are gone.

WE'RE IN DANGER, TOO

It can't happen here? Brother, it almost has happened. An evil enemy has planted agents in our Government offices and key industries all over America, and they have been able to do untold damage. How deeply they have penetrated, only time will tell. What does this foreign-sponsored group want? First of all, they want converts to their cult. Then, they want to overthrow our free Government by force and establish an all-powerful State, with a few of them in the saddle. Private enterprise—even small shops, stores, and farms; the contractor with a helper or two; and the right of every worker to seek employment where he chooses—all will be liquidated. What will happen to the unions, the trade associations, the farmers' granges, and the churches? Well, look what happened to them in the lands that have already been taken over.

LET'S BE ON GUARD

The agents of this foreign cult are shrewd and ruthless. They slip in alongside us as fellow workers and try to convince us we're all in chains; although the poorest of us live far better than do the best of the workers in the countries behind the Iron Curtain. Just for comparison, here are some figures:

The good things of life—Here and there

	Actual American production in 1953	Russia's promised [1] production for 1955
Meat, pounds per person	153.2	32.4
Butter, pounds per person	10.1	5.4
Shoes, pairs per person	3.1	1.5
Hosiery, pairs per person	12.3	3.8
Cotton textiles, yards per person	60.8	33.1
Radio or television, per 1,000 persons	125	21.7
Electric refrigerators, per 1,000 persons	21.7	1.6

[1] In every case, present actual production is way under these figures.

H. R. 9133, a Bill To Amend the Classification Act of 1949

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK J. BECKER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 13, 1954

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, in line with the permission granted me today, I am making this statement in explanation of the bill H. R. 9133 introduced by me today to amend the Classification Act of 1949 so that the membership of the Congress may be acquainted with the background for the need of this bill and its justification. I am very glad of the opportunity to give a little history of what has happened to make this bill necessary in the interest of fair play and fair action by our Government.

In 1953 the Civil Service Commission made a postaudit of positions in the Customs Service at the port of New York. Their original recommendations called for a downgrading of approximately 150 employees. After informal discussions with the Treasury Department, the number was reduced to approximately 100. Of the 100 employees affected, the Bureau of Customs and the Civil Service Commission are discussing the merits of approximately 60, upon which the Bureau of Customs is not in agreement with the recommendations of the Civil Service Commission. There are a number of positions, estimated at between 25 and 50, which the Civil Service Commission has selected for downgrading, and has directed the Bureau of Customs to downgrade the employees in such positions.

The purpose of this legislation is to protect the employees involved in the downgrading recommended by the Civil Service Commission for the following reasons:

Most of the positions involved were formerly covered by the Bacharach Act which provided a higher rate of compensation for clerks in the Customs Service than for clerks in other services and bureaus.

Soon after the Classification Act of 1949 went into effect, the employees involved agreed to relinquish the protection of the Bacharach Act when it was explained to them that they would receive fair and equitable treatment under the Classification Act of 1949.

The Bureau of Customs and the Treasury Department in good faith allocated these positions to grade in the Classification Act which in the opinion of the Bureau and the Treasury Department were fair and equitable.

Most of the employees involved have either been performing work in these positions, or have been promoted and replaced by employees who have been promoted from lower grade positions. The postaudit on the part of the Civil Service Commission in 1953 is the first time that the Civil Service Commission has made a postaudit of positions in the Customs Service. The result of the downgrading will mean a drastic reduction in the standard of living for many employees involved. Most downgradings are in positions of grade GS–4 and below.

It is the view of the National Customs Service Association that inasmuch as the positions were originally allocated to the existing grades by the Bureau of Customs and Treasury Department in good faith, and since the Civil Service Commission has allowed so much time to elapse before making a postaudit, the employees who accepted positions such as these in good faith should not be compelled to suffer a reduction in grade or salary by reason of errors made by the Bureau of Customs and the Treasury Department in allocating the involved positions to improper grades.

The purpose of this legislation is to make it possible for employees occupying positions which have been selected for downgrading by the Civil Service Commission, to continue to receive the rates of basic compensation appropriate to the grade from which reduced and to receive the appropriate step increases as provided in title VII of the Classification Act of 1949 so long as they remain in these positions but that when such positions become vacant the rate of compensation of any subsequent appointee shall be fixed in accordance with the Classification Act at the rate fixed for the lower grade.

What the St. Lawrence Seaway May Mean

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 13, 1954

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, one of the most important factors in determining the outcome of the St. Lawrence seaway vote in Congress was the determination of Canada to start off on its own. Control of so important a waterway leading directly into the interior of our country could not be vested in a foreign power, even so friendly a neighbor as Canada, without many reservations.

As matters now stand, control of the entire St. Lawrence program will be exercised by Uncle Sam and Canada jointly. Uniform rates will be in effect. Byproducts which result from the huge development, including electric power, will be shared in equal parts by both countries. From the economic standpoint, engineers and cost accountants have estimated that the seaway will bring in some $36 million annually in tolls. The cost of construction is figured at some $273 million, of which our share is to be approximately $91 million. The legislation adopted by Congress provides that our share must be paid off in 50 years.

The electric power developed through the dams which are part of the project will be sold in our country to private utilities to be distributed through New York, New England, part of Pennsylvania, and New Jersey. When the job is done it will be a magnificent engineering achievement. More than half of the world's ships will be able to use this route. Anchors aweigh. Let us start the work.

Asia for the Asians: The Slogan That Backfires

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1954

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, we are constantly reminded of the close analogies between the totalitarians of the left, today's Communist aggressors on mankind's freedom, and the totalitarians of the right, of the Nazis and Fascists under Hitler and Mussolini, and the militarists under Hirohito, who were, happily for mankind, decisively defeated in World War II. This analogy is very clearly brought out by the speech of Chou En-lai, Communist China's Foreign Minister, pleading for Asia for the Asiatics, for that is exactly what was the basis for Japan's conquest of so much of Asia and its creation of the slave area called the coprosperity sphere. What the Communists offer Asia is enslavement to replace the opportunity for freedom and well-being. This idea is splendidly developed in the appended editorial from the New York Times of April 30, 1954:

A SLOGAN THAT BACKFIRES

It is not at all surprising that Mr. Molotov should declare himself in full agreement with Premier Chou En-lai's program to drive the Western Powers out of Asia. At Berlin the Soviet spokesman sought to banish the United States from the continent of Europe, and it is logical that at Geneva he should heartily second Communist China's proposal to get us out of Asia as well. By western intervention he means American influence, which unquestionably is affecting the whole situation in Asia, as he charged; the course of Communist policy would certainly proceed more smoothly if this exasperating obstacle could be swept out of the way. "Asia for the Asiatics" and "Europe for the Europeans," with the Soviet Union sprawling in between, dominating both, are perfect slogans for a Communist world.

Unfortunately, the Asian peoples who have thrown off foreign rule in the effort to become free and self-governing are not yet strong enough to resist by their own forces the new imperialism that threatens to engulf them in the name of communism. They need the help of the older democracies to save them from being submerged in the totalitarian flood. But they are not likely to be misled so soon again by the same slogans. They remember too vividly what was done to them in the name of "Asia for the Asiatics." They recall Japan's "coprosperity sphere" as a label for exploitation and conquest.

The day of colonial power is over in Asia. The announcement that the French Government and Bao Dai have at last signed a declaration establishing the independence of Vietnam is a sign that France has resigned herself to the inevitable. It is also a reminder that American intervention in that particular Asiatic problem has been consistently exercised in favor of native self-rule. The truth is that at this stage of political development, whatever may have been their record in the past, the colonial powers of the West have been steadily and for the most part voluntarily turning back their powers to the people to whom they belong.

We have seen that "Asia for the Asiatics" need not be the formula of freedom. An oriental nation can suffer as much under an oriental as under a western despotism. The recipe for liberty is the same in both hemispheres. It is precisely on the question of preserving "Asia for the Asiatics," indeed, on guaranteeing the independent choice of the Asiatic nations, that the contest of wills in Geneva hinges. Between truly free elections and Soviet-style elections, for instance, lies the fathomless gulf between a self-governing state and a satellite.

The Bryson Bill, H. R. 1227

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HORACE SEELY-BROWN, JR.

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 13, 1954

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include herewith, at the request of Miss Sarah Louise Hadley, a petition signed by residents of my congressional district in support of the Bryson bill, H. R. 1227:

To our Representatives in Congress:

We, the undersigned, your constituents, earnestly beg you to give consideration to our constitutional rights as American citizens to be free in our homes of an offensive invasion by those who wish to increase their huge profits from the sales of alcoholic beverages by high-pressure advertising directed through magazines, newspapers, and over radio and television, at our children. We urge you to obtain consideration of and pass the Bryson bill (H. R. 1227).

Mrs. C. D. Geer, Mrs. C. R. Maip, Jr., Mrs. Frances Coggeshall, Susan P. Elder, Mrs. Annie E. Agard, Mrs. D. L. Browning, Mrs. Charles C. Hambleu, Mazie I. Stamm, Norwich; Ceiniren Reese, Preston City; Pearl Holden, Jane M. Wallace, Elizabeth C. Allyn, Mable P. Kanahan, Grace Palmer Miner, Lillian Kennedy, Norwich.

Edith Anderson, Mrs. Walter Hyde, M. Jane Hassler, Mildred Gill, Bessie M. Burdick, Marion Thornton, Jewett City; Emma Elizabeth Daniels, Norwich; Jessie R. Wilberley, Canterbury; Alice B. Golkouske, Taftville; Ann E. Seddon, Norwich; Malcolm R. Wibberley, Canterbury; Ethel L. Hull, Dorothy K. Fitch, Dorothy E. Mathes, Elberta Church, Dorothy Oldfield, George R. Humboldt, Norwich; F. J. Golkowske, Taftville; Israel Daniels, Norwich.

Rev. W. F. Tyler, Gertrude T. Tyler, Hubert M. Graves, H. Maud Graves, Margaret W. Robinson, Marguerite Simpson, Grace A. Wright, Canterbury; Eva E. Kimball, Scotland; Ida L. Sager, Canterbury; Jemie S. Woodmansie, Central Village; Denise S. Miller, Pearle S. Cleveland, Canterbury; Sadie C. Kimball, Scotland; Sarah Louise Hadley, Canterbury.

The Road Through Indochina

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 13, 1954

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an editorial from the Wall Street Journal of April 19, 1954:

THE ROAD THROUGH INDOCHINA

Vice President NIXON's remarks on sending troops to Indochina were well bordered with qualifications. He said it was only his opinion that troops should be sent to Indochina and even then only if other measures fail. He spoke confident words that this would not be necessary.

Yet it seemed quite clear to the editors to whom he spoke that Mr. NIXON, who enjoys the confidence of the President and who sits on the National Security Council, expressed a carefully considered administration view. The Vice President did not speak without the knowledge of his colleagues.

The administration opinion which he expressed is that the United States should march in Indochina if that be necessary in the end to save it from falling to the Communists. Further, the administration is prepared to consider having the United States fight alone, although it does not think the United States will have to do that.

This is truly a momentous decision in the most literal sense of that well-worn phrase. The citizens of this country ought to know why it was made. And they ought to think now on where it may lead.

The reason for the decision may be simply stated. It lies in the belief that for the Communists the road through Indochina leads on to all of southeast Asia and beyond that to the Philippines and the rest of Asia. The battle of Dien Bien Phu, said Mr. NIXON, is a battle for Japan.

The map lends credence to the view. To the south of Dien Bien Phu lie all of the Indochinese States and Thailand, British Malaya, Borneo, and the islands of Indonesia. To the west lie Burma and the borders of India.

This area embraces not only the great rice bowl of Asia but also some of the richest natural resources of the world which, in Communist hands, would immeasurably strengthen the Red war potential. It is an area upon which, so the argument runs, Japan and the Philippines are greatly dependent for their economic life. World War II is itself offered as proof of the Japanese opinion as to the necessity to them of southeast Asia.

The decision to fight in Indochina is supported by another argument. It is that, quite apart from the economic resources at stake, the battle of Indochina will tip the balance between communism and the free world in the minds of all the people of southeast Asia and the western Pacific. These millions want to be on the side of history, and if the tide seems to be flowing relentlessly out of Moscow and Peiping they will choose to ride with it.

And finally, the decision rests upon the conviction that the cold war is a war of erosion and that at some place and at some time the West must say "Here we will stand." If we do not say it now in Indochina we will only have to do it later under more difficult conditions, for if Indochina is lost communism will be stronger and the free world will be weaker.

In sum, the premise for this decision, which Mr. Nixon stated with a candor and persuasiveness that does him great credit, is that Indochina is vital to the security of the United States. Therefore, should it unhappily come to the ultimate choice, the United States must do what must be done.

Perhaps these arguments are conclusive. But the decision which Mr. Nixon so boldly advocates for his administration is, once acted upon, irretrievable. We cannot go to war in Indochina and then, finding our judgment in error, peacefully march home again. As we are now imbedded in Europe and in Korea, so would we be for years in southeast Asia.

Thus, if we are not to have more wars by inspiration, neither the necessity nor the consequences of such a decision should pass unquestioned.

No one can challenge the fact that Indochina is important to the struggle against Communist expansion. But to say that it is an absolute essential to be held at any cost whatever, is to say something entirely different.

That chain of reasoning is punctuated with a lot of "ifs." If the Communists in Indochina are not decisively defeated in a military battle, Indochina will go Communist. If Indochina goes Communist, so too will British Malaya and Thailand. If all these are lost to the Communists, so too will be the Philippines and Japan. It is only by means of all these "ifs" that so absolute a value can be placed on a military victory in the outpost of Dien Bien Phu.

And it is only by assuming, conversely, that a military victory in Indochina will rescue all the rest of Asia that so much can be promised from it. Yet before us is the example of Korea where we halted the Communist aggression in its tracks only to find ourselves now confronted with it again in another place.

At best these "ifs" lie in the realm of prophecy. At worst their unquestioned acceptance could lead us to terrible things. For make no mistake about it, the road through Indochina will be a long one for the United States also.

We will once more be fighting Communist expansion in a place where we, the strength of the Western World, will be wasting ourselves while Russia, the strength of the Communist world, will be risking nothing. In frank cynicism, why should not the Russians fight to the last Chinaman?

And we will be fighting there in greater hazard than in Korea. Not only is the battlefield more remote, we will be fighting with less support, and perhaps none, from our allies. Mr. Nixon made his remark about United States soldiers in Indochina in response to a question about what would we do if the French quit. He envisioned not a coalition war but a war in which the United States fought alone.

Few will question our obligation to aid the French and native Indochinese forces; we are already doing so. But what will we be in for if the French won't fight and the Indochinese won't fight in their own land but we will try to do it all? Are we to set ourselves up alone to save Asia from the Asians?

These are not the only questions which do not easily go away. Can we embark singlehandedly in a war in Indochina and hope again to stop short of the third world war? We have already recognized and said what a new outbreak in Korea would lead us to; can we with any hope see a different end to a total involvement in Indochina?

It does not seem to this newspaper that these questions can be lightly dismissed. Last February President Eisenhower said it would be a tragedy for the United States to become involved in Indochina. It may be that it has already become a tragedy that will have to be risked, but no matter what the compulsions it will be no less tragic.

Mr. Nixon, it should be repeated, does not believe the United States will have to come to this ultimate decision; nor does the State Department. Mr. Nixon does not believe the military situation in Indochina is by any means hopeless and he still has confidence that the United States will not have to act alone after the Geneva Conference. Perhaps his hope is that his bold talk will embolden our allies at Geneva.

Let us all pray these hopes are realized. If they are not, we are sure the people will listen to these arguments and if they are right, the people will do with courage what is right. But we also pray they will weigh them carefully and be under no illusion as to where they march when they take the road through Indochina.

Private Giving With Character

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1954

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, private giving is one of the most distinguished aspects of our national life. How splendid it is then when private giving shows inventiveness, originality, and initative as it does in the case of Mr. Carl M. Loeb and the late Mrs. Loeb, distinguished citizens of New York, who have just won the citation of the Park Association of New York City for 1953 for outstanding service to the city's park system by their ingenious and thoughtful and at the same time munificent gift of the Central Park boathouse to the people of the city of New York.

I insert in the Appendix the editorial on this subject from the New York Times of April 30, 1954, because I believe it may be useful to others of my colleagues especially from the cities who are also deeply interested in thoughtful, voluntary benefactions in their own communities:

HONORING THE CARL LOEBS

The Park Association of New York City is speaking for the whole community when it awards today to Carl M. Loeb and the late Mrs. Loeb the association's 1953 citation for outstanding service to the city's park system. Mr. and Mrs. Loeb gave the money to build the graceful and useful new boathouse, completed this spring, at the eastern bank of the 72d Street Lake in Central Park. In addition, the park department spent $110,000 on redevelopment of adjacent park areas.

The result is charming, a red-brick structure in the park's traditional Victorian architecture with whitestone trim, fitting comfortably into the pleasant vista from south, west, or north across the water. There is a dining terrace at the water's side, under the open sky, and a self-service restaurant counter inside. A rowboat ride on the lake in the park is one city pleasure that has changed little; they were doing it here nearly 100 years ago. The varied pastimes and services offered by the city of New York are well illustrated here, in provision of boating in the heart of the greatest, most crowded city, and a sculling policemen covering his beat in a rowboat with a police pennant—an attractive assignment in yesterday's bright, warm sunshine, if we may say so.

The dedicatory program last month said: "The park department and the people of the city of New York extend their heartfelt thanks to Carl M. Loeb for this generous gift of $305,000. The city also expresses its heartfelt regret that Adeline Loeb, who joined with her husband in making this great gift, did not live to see its completion." A gift to improve our parks is a fine memorial.

The Birmingham Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH F. HOLT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 13, 1954

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, a new and wonderful era is about to begin in our community, and I should like to tell you the Birmingham story.

Negotiations are in the final stages to turn over to our school system the Birmingham site. I have been working toward this goal since I first became your Representative in Congress. You may ask why. Well, there are really five basic reasons:

First. It hurt me to see our city school system pour money into land and buildings that they actually did not own and under law had to turn over to the Federal Government within 30 days, if so ordered.

Second. It bothered me to have the Federal Government owning this large section of land within the center and fastest growing section of my congressional district without there being a definite program for use of this property.

Third. The growing need for additional elementary, junior high, and high schools was evident. I knew it would be necessary to turn to Birmingham because of its size to help out the entire valley.

Fourth. None of us want to see, for obvious reasons, our children going to school on half-day sessions.

Fifth. My previous objection was carried out when recently an Army battalion of approximately 500 men and an antiaircraft gun moved right next door to our schoolchildren, occupying one-half the grounds. I was notified that it was going to be a permanent installation. In these trying times we all realize the necessity for Los Angeles to be well defended in the event of an all-out sneak attack; however, there was ample Government land just across the street owned in the Sepulveda flood-control basin.

As a veteran of World War II and the Korean war, I saw how important the education given our children was put to good use against our Communist enemy in Asia. We cannot match the numbers of the Communist conspirators throughout the world. We must see to it that our youth of today receives the very best of education in the most modern facilities with every opportunity to prepare themselves for the trying times ahead. Many of the difficulties our youth have today is because of the fact they are facing a troubled future world with their military service a fact and a necessity. They are not able to plan normal lives as perhaps their mothers and fathers. They are not allowed to be permitted to establish their chosen careers in the professional field or think what career he or she should follow. A child's American heritage is more fundamentally impressed upon his mind at the elementary, junior high, or high school level than at any other time.

The problem is acute in the entire United States which is why I chose to be on the Education Committee of the House. We are short over 300,000 classrooms in the United States and 100,000 teachers. As your Federal Representative to the Congress of the United States it is my responsibility to act on problems on a national level as well as on the local level.

The Birmingham story should be in the official historical files of our country which is why I have inscribed it in our official Congressional Record.

It is proof positive what can be done when we are determined to solve a problem and one is on the side of what is right. I want to say that I have had the cooperation of Mrs. Oveta Culp Hobby, the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; the Honorable Charles Wilson, Secretary of Defense; the Honorable Franklin G. Floete, Assistant Secretary of Defense, in charge of property; and Gen. Edmund F. Mansure, the Administrator of General Services Administration. They well know how important is the need for good education.

BEGINNING AS AN ARMY HOSPITAL

On what used to be a farm belonging to a pioneer valley family, the Birmingham General Hospital site was born. It was chosen for its location, beautiful landscape, and marvelous weather conditions. One hundred and thirteen acres were purchased at a cost of $600 per acre and the contractor undertook the task of building. Actual breaking of the ground began on June 18, 1943, in the center of a lima bean and carrot patch. The building was to be finished on October 15, 1943; however, due to various modifications and shortages of men and material, it was not completed until December 15, 1943.

The land underlying the 14,000-bed hospital facility is comprised of 117.31 acres owned in fee by the Government, and 14.12 acres leased by the Government. The fee-owned land was composed of three tracts: Tract No. 1, containing 72.81 acres; tract No. 2, containing 9.76 acres; and tract No. 3, containing 34.74 acres. These three tracts were acquired by the Government by declaration of taking on July 8, 1943, in the United States district court. Declaration of taking is a process used in emergencies, such as wartime, where the Government issues a declaration of taking and offers a price for private property—automatically taking it over. If the private owner is not satisfied with the terms at that time, he can later come in for a settlement. The acquisition cost of the land was $84,750. The remaining 14.12-acre tract was leased by the Government from a private party under a lease dated July 30, 1945.

The hospital was activated during the construction state as an unnamed general hospital. The War Department on August 24, 1943, gave the hospital its present name, Birmingham General Hospital, in honor of Brig. Gen. Henry Patrick Birmingham, of the Medical Corps of the United States Army. He died in 1932 after a brilliant career in the United States Army. Shortly after original activation orders were received, duty personnel began to arrive and civilian personnel were employed on a small scale. By January 1, 1944, sufficient personnel were available to operate the hospital, however various construction problems and existing policies prevented the receipt of patients at that time. The first patients were admitted from an overseas convoy on February 25, 1944, and the hospital proceeded to function as a typical general hospital. On June 21, 1944, the hospital was designated as a neuropsychiatric and neurosurgical center. The excellent operating pavilion and lay-out of the hospital made it an ideal center for neurosurgery and within a short period, the neurosurgical section of the hospital was buzzing with activity. In addition to the above specialities, on August 29, 1944, the Army designated the hospital as a debarkation hospital to serve the Los Angeles port of embarkation. This meant that our wounded servicemen returning from overseas that arrived in Los Angeles immediately were sent to the Birmingham Hospital. On May 21, 1945, the embarkation activity was transferred to Camp Haan, Calif. The Army did, however, treat a great many of returning American prisoners of war—over some 1,000 were treated. It is interesting to note that the number of patients treated by the Army when they were operating the hospital was:

Year	*Number of patients*
1943	43
1944	5,978
1945	7,160

The average number of employees of the Army hospital, including civilian and Army personnel, was between 1,300 to 1,800. Another interesting note is that included among this number were 143 Italian prisoners of war. The Army averaged 143 paraplegic patients a month when they ran the Birmingham Hospital. Thus it may be seen that during the major portion of the time it was operated by the Army, the hospital specialized in neuropsychiatry. In addition, an artificial plastic eye laboratory was opened in January 1945. On April 1, 1946, Birmingham General Hospital was transferred to the jurisdiction of the Veterans' Administration and was known as Veterans' Administration Hospital at Van Nuys, Calif. The hospital was transferred from the Department of the Army to the Veterans' Administration May 1, 1946, pursuant to the provisions of section 102 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION TAKES OVER

Under the operation of the Veterans' Administration, Birmingham Hospital was a 1,500-bed hospital. When operations were begun most of the effort was to staff the hospital and get it set up. The records show that during that year only a total of 480 patients were cared for, with over 73 of these paraplegics.

In 1947 when the hospital was in full operation, the total number of patients treated was over 1,400 per day. The Birmingham Hospital was set up as 1 of 46 veterans' hospitals that were called control hospitals on tuberculosis research. The other specialized division in the hospital was in the neuropsychiatric cases. The paraplegics came under this category. In order to train the paraplegic patients to build up the muscles in their arms, shoulders, and neck, they were put in the swimming pool. The pool was also used for the treatment of psychotic and neurotic aggressive cases, who must have active exercise, and for the muscle tone treatment of arthritic cases. The gymnasium was used for these same purposes and also for ambulatory patients from the general medical and surgical division of the hospital. Other facilities of the hospital included the usage of whirlpool baths for corrective therapy, outdoor athletic field for handball, a library affiliated with the Los Angeles County Medical Library, which contained research information, a special laboratory for the study of psychological cases beside the regular laboratory, an animal hospital with a pavilion for operations for studying new treatments and operative techniques, a theater, a nine-hole golf course, and a bowling alley. All of these facilities were built by the Army and the equipment left behind for the use of the Veterans' Administration. Over the 4-year period, a total of 40,000 patients were cared for and treated by the Birmingham Hospital.

The Veterans' Administration thought the hospital had several bad features about it. One was the fact that it was a horizontal hospital; that is, 109 one-story buildings connected by hallways—some 24 miles of hospital corridors. Another factor was the temporary structure of the buildings—wooden—and the difficulty and expense in maintenance. The feeding of the patients presented quite a problem, specially heated carts were needed for instance to keep the food hot until it reached the patient; then, under Presidential order, the entire hospital was transferred to the Long Beach Naval Hospital, June 1, 1950.

BIRMINGHAM HOSPITAL CLOSES—PATIENTS TRANSFERRED TO LONG BEACH

One of the biggest battles our valley has ever seen was when the Veterans'

Administration announced in May 1950 that the Birmingham Veterans' Administration Hospital was to be closed and moved to Long Beach. Long Beach was a naval hospital and this added fuel to the fire—no one could see why the Veterans' Administration hospital was being transferred when the Navy needed the hospital.

The Van Nuys Hospital was the center for the treatment of paraplegics—spinal-injury patients who were paralyzed through the lower part of the body, from the waist down. The town of Van Nuys had taken these wheelchair patients to their hearts, as did the nearby Hollywood movie colony. Thus the sudden order transferring the patients to another hospital stirred the area into an extraordinary emotional outburst of resentment. Many of the paraplegics were forced to sell their specially equipped homes which they had built in the area adjacent to the hospital, and it caused them great hardship to have to travel 51 miles to Long Beach for treatment. There was quite a bit of argument within Congress to keep the hospital open, as this hospital was the center of treatment for these paraplegic patients and also a center for tuberculosis patients.

A citizens Birmingham Hospital committee was formed and a delegation of paraplegic veterans arrived in Washington on May 19 to personally appeal to the President. Their trip was sponsored by the citizens Birmingham Hospital committee. The veterans' organizations took up the campaign to keep the hospital open. Their efforts were to no avail, however, and Birmingham never was opened up as an Army or veterans hospital again. We still have many of the original paraplegics living in our community and we all know them as a courageous gang of men who are dear to our hearts.

BIRMINGHAM JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL

The Veterans' Administration reported the property excess to its needs May 21, 1953, with the notification that the Department of the Army would request transfer. At this time, the property was held in the custody of the Department of the Army, under permit from the Veterans' Administration. It was not being used for defense purposes—just standing idle. Birmingham General Hospital was leased October 23, 1952, from the United States Government for junior high school purposes to serve the San Fernando Valley area by our city school system.

Birmingham Junior High School opened February 2, 1953, with 1,164 students. A year later Birmingham accepted 10th grade students due to overcrowded conditions in the surrounding schools. The present enrollment of 2,823 junior and senior high school students is estimated to reach 4,500 in 1957 and over 6,000 in 1959. Because of being able to use the Birmingham site for a junior high school, we have been able to maintain the secondary schools in the San Fernando Valley on a full-time basis. The past record of growth in this area surpassed the school district's ability to provide school buildings. It was impossible to maintain elementary schools on a full session basis. The secondary school enrollment estimates for the future will reach critical proportions.

The exceptional number of children per family unit is occasioned by the fact that this valley area is populated by a young group of parents, the vast majority of which are families of veterans with four or more children. This creates a school-enrollment problem which cannot be met by the normal school locations previously established. Twenty percent of the population in this area is under 5 years of age according to the 1953 special census. The Birmingham site provides possibilities for accommodating this overload of pupils by establishing a large educational center. An elementary school, a junior high school, and in all probabilities a senior high school will be established on this site. A school for physically handicapped high-school students is needed right now and the therapy facilities now at Birmingham can be put to good use for this program. For each of these school space for agriculture and horticulture training is available in the total acreage. As these youngsters progress through school and the enormous growth continues in the San Fernando Valley, there is no question that a technical school will be needed to serve the community and training needs of business and industry.

The increase in population in the San Fernando Valley area, according to census records, is shown as follows:

Year:	*Population*
1940	121, 095
1950	333, 954
1954	453, 230

The secondary-school enrollment in the San Fernando Valley increased from 9,224 in 1944 to 26,022 pupils in February 1954. The Los Angeles Census Tract 16, an area of 9 square miles within which the Birmingham property is located, registered census data as follows:

Year	Population	Elementary school enrollment
1940	4, 147	390
1946	[1] 7, 551	549
1950	16, 456	1, 413
1953	[1] 46, 944	8, 570

[1] Special census.

The census tract data is significant since it represents the territory in the immediate vicinity of the Birmingham property and shows that the school enrollment has multiplied 22 times. The estimated future junior-senior high-school enrollments for the valley area are as follows:

1954	31, 596
1955	34, 674
1956	38, 849
1957	42, 269
1958	46, 881
1959	51, 471

The above shows an anticipated increase for the valley of approximately 20,000 secondary students in the next 5 years, of which, it is calculated 3,200, or one-sixth, are in the vicinity of Birmingham Hospital in census tract 16.

Forty-four new elementary schools and six new secondary schools have been constructed in the San Fernando Valley in the last 6 years. Nine elementary schools and five secondary schools are in the present construction program. It is an ideal location for the establishment of the educational center previously described. The potential population of well over a million in the valley area will require future expansion of various educational facilities which can be accommodated in this site.

To me, I am proud to have been able to be of assistance to the children of our community. The cooperation extended to me by the Los Angeles Board of Education and the parent-teachers' association and the mothers and fathers of the Birmingham students has made all my efforts worth while.

Our Reserve Officers in Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 26, 1954

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to present a letter to Chairman DEWEY SHORT and members of the House Armed Services Committee from Col. Thomas H. King, president of the Reserve Officers Association of the United States. This letter is a report of Colonel King's meeting with the European department convention of the Reserve Officers Association. All of us in Congress are closely related to the Reserves and I feel this report will be of universal interest. The letter is as follows:

RESERVE OFFICERS ASSOCIATION
OF THE UNITED STATES, INC.,
Washington, D. C., May 7, 1954.

Hon. DEWEY SHORT,
The House of Representatives
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I have just returned from a 2 weeks trip to Europe where I attended the European department convention of the Reserve Officers Association held in Berlin. I believe that it is desirable to report to you the picture which I obtained insofar as the personnel of the Armed Forces in Europe is concerned.

With few exceptions, the morale of the officers is very high. This applies to both Regulars and Reserves. There are a number of things, however, which constitute a disturbing element to the officer corps as a whole and other elements which disturb materially the approximately 80 percent of the officers in Europe who are reservists. I trust that you will appreciate the fact that in talking with these people on their own level you should not feel that when they express their personal views they are in any way letting down in their efforts to do a superb job in the positions which they hold.

The first item is that they feel the pay of the armed services is not in keeping with the cost of living. They feel that where the civilian employees have had a 10-percent pay raise, their raise has been approximately 5 percent. They favored the passage of the Career Compensation Act with the attendant pay raise, but the removal of the $1,500 income tax exemption wiped out, insofar as most of them are concerned, the benefits of the pay raise, and in some instances their take-home pay was in fact less.

There is also a feeling that there has not been a realistic approach to the commissary situation, and that they are being charged to a great extent with the cost of maintaining commissaries and shipping food to the areas where they purchase it. Generally, the officers who use the commissaries the most are those who are raising families. They are subject to such orders as their Department may issue. That they are overseas and the cost of shipping food over there is high is not their responsibility and they should not be charged the cost of getting the food to them. The men in the enlisted ranks, of course, are furnished their food free of charge regardless of their station. These officers are confronted with the same thing in their purchases from the post exchanges of essential items such as toothpaste, shaving equipment, soaps, clothing, and the like. They have to have these items and the additional financial burden should not be imposed upon them with their pay at a rock-bottom figure, especially when they are far from home serving their country. The inequities in the temporary promotion system are an additional worry to them. This is particularly true in the field-grade ranks where men who have been on continuous active duty serving in the same permanent grades since prior to 1950 are being passed by, and Regular officers are serving 2, 3, and 4 grades above their permanent rank. You will find majors with great experience at age 45 serving under lieutenant colonels with comparatively nominal experience at age 30 to 35. The reservist does not ask for preferences, all he asks for is a fair deal. You and your committee have always endeavored to recognize a fair deal and endeavored to see that it was followed through.

On my return from Europe I learned that the hearings on the Reserve Officer Personnel Act have been postponed for some weeks at the request of the Assistant Secretary of Defense. I am happy that our executive director, Colonel Boyer, and the chairman of our legislative committee, Mel Maas, consented to the extension of time requested, but, Congressman, the people who are in the faraway sacrifice spots like Berlin and Vienna don't understand, nor do they appreciate, the attitude of officials sitting cozily in Washington, like the Assistant Secretary of Defense, stalling on one of the matters of legislation which means so much in those faraway places behind the Iron Curtain. The officers sitting by in alert positions with jet aircraft ready to do battle don't appreciate that either.

This communication is being sent to you because I feel that you want to know the whole truth, and further, so that when this matter is again brought before the committee the members will thoroughly understand that these men serving their country are looking to them for the protection which only the Members of our Congress can give. These officers are not crybabies; they are out there sincerely doing their very best to protect their country. They are at places where they cannot look after their own interests, and entrust to our association the responsibility of presenting their views to you. It is my privilege, for the time being, to be their spokesman, and I sincerely urge that this session of Congress see to it that these men are not the forgotten people of our Armed Forces.

Respectfully yours,

THOMAS H. KING.

Abolition of Segregation in Veterans' Hospital at Lake City, Fla.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. DAVIS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1954

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I have received a copy of a resolution adopted by Chapter 20 of the Disabled American Veterans, Lake City, Fla., on March 29, 1954, protesting the abolition of segregation between the races in the veterans' hospital at Lake City, Fla.

This shows a complete disregard of the welfare of disabled veterans, and a willingness on the part of politicians to bid for bloc votes at the expense of sick and wounded veterans.

The issuance of the order in question abolishing segregation shows a callous disregard of the wishes of the veterans in that hospital.

The result of this order has been, as the resolution shows, to cause some patients to leave the hospital against medical advice; and many others, both white and colored, are hesitant to apply for hospitalization which they need.

It is pathetic to see an administration which did not receive the Negro bloc vote, and which is not going to receive the bloc vote, engage in such tactics for political purposes.

I insert the above-mentioned resolution herewith as a part of these remarks.

LAKE CITY DAV,
Lake City, Fla.

At a meeting of Chapter 20, Disabled American Veterans, on March 29, 1954, a resolution requesting the reestablishment of racial segregation at the Lake City Veterans' Hospital was passed by unanimous vote. Nearly all members of this post have been at some time a patient in this hospital prior to the abolishment of segregation and have been observers of the effects of segregation. We believe that separation of the races in wards, mess hall, and recreation halls is desired by the overwhelming majority of colored patients and by all of the white patients. The abrupt change from an established way of life is unsettling in every circumstance and is particularly so when people are sick. Nurses, attendants, and doctors cannot give proper care to the patients when their primary effort must be devoted to prevention of incidents which would lead to fights between the races. We know that this policy of nonsegregation has caused some patients to leave the hospital against medical advice and that many others, both white and colored, are hesitant to apply for hospitalization which they need.

It was further resolved that this policy was put into effect in the hope of gaining northern Negro votes, in direct contradiction of the campaign speeches of the President in favor of States rights, which were largely instrumental in swinging the Democrats for Eisenhower into carrying this State for the President.

It was further resolved that the members of Chapter 20, DAV, feel very strongly that the President of the United States should not further a policy which is detrimental to the veterans entitled by law to hospital care, in order to secure a partisan political advantage.

As adjutant of this chapter, I have been directed to mail a copy to the President of the United States and to all Senators and Representatives who represent the patients in the Lake City VA Hospital.

J. E. JACOBS,
Adjutant, Chapter 20, DAV.

Dien Bien Phu Proves We're Right

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 13, 1954

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, one battle is not a war. Whatever the moral effect created by the fall of Dien Bien Phu in Indochina, the war for southeast Asia is by no means over. If any one deduction can be drawn from the experience record of this long-drawn-out struggle against communism, it is this—there can be no gain derived for the free world from any singlehanded policy.

Secretary of State Dulles has been preaching collective action in every western capital. Presumably, British refusal to accept his viewpoint prevented effective action in Indochina. The Communists are banking heavily upon divided opinions in the free world. They expect to succeed by a policy of attrition. Bit by bit, they hope to chew away segments of Asia, hoping eventually that India, the traditional jewel of the East, will fall into their hands like a ripe apple.

There is small comfort to be derived from losses, in any area. But if the present position in Indochina has demonstrated to our potential allies the futility of a policy which delays united responsibilities, it has given rise to some measure of comfort. From now on in, Uncle Sam is not acting on a unilateral basis, but if new disasters occur, the responsibility will not be ours.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

PRICE OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

The Public Printer is authorized to furnish to subscribers the daily RECORD at $1.50 per month, payable in advance.

Remit by money order payable to Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C.

PRINTING DOCUMENTS AND REPORTS

Documents and reports of committees with the evidence and papers submitted therewith, or any part thereof ordered printed by Congress, may be reprinted by the Public Printer on order of any Member of Congress or Delegate, on prepayment of the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 162, p. 1940).

IN T

M
imou
Appe
addr
Klur
Inc.,
ing
Man
Rato
Klur
ute t
Offic

Th
was
as fo

TALK

W
N.

Th
we r
in th
publ
jobs
ning
petit
that

No
male
at hi
and
on t
are c
we a

Mo
we g
are
mast

Bu
and
their
They
mess
and
coul
wom
no w
the
the

We
one
This
been
of h
disti
bette
Flore
to 1
tribu
salva
an i
inga
phys

Th
than
have
guisl

Appendix

Tribute to Miss Mary Switzer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. IRVING M. IVES
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, May 14, 1954

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of an address delivered by Dr. Theodore G. Klumpp, president, Winthrop-Stearns, Inc., New York City, at the annual meeting of the American Pharmaceutical Manufacturers' Association, at Boca Raton, Fla., on March 30, 1954. Dr. Klumpp's address is a well-deserved tribute to Miss Mary Switzer, Director of the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TALK BY DR. THEODORE G. KLUMPP, PRESIDENT, WINTHROP-STEARNS, INC., NEW YORK, N. Y.

This is a man's world. Through the ages we men have been careful to keep women in their places. We have generally reserved public honors, distinctions, and important jobs to ourselves. We men have been running a monopoly in restraint of female competition. The obvious reason is, of course, that we are scared of their competition.

Nothing is so deeply disturbing to the male ego as a woman who can best a man at his own game. Every woman knows this and most of them are content to let us go on thinking that we are superior. Some are even glad to play dumb to let us think we are bright.

Most women are satisfied with other favors we graciously bestow on them and in return are willing to let us think we are the masters.

But women are coming up in the world and demonstrating a willingness to assume their rightful places in the world of affairs. They are straightening out some of the messes we men have gotten the world into and solving some of the problems we men could not lick. I venture to say that if women ran our governments there would be no wars. In the animal kingdom it is always the bantam rooster, the buck that fights, the female rarely.

We are here this morning to do honor to one of the truly great women of our time. This is the first occasion this award has been given to a woman. During the course of history there have been many able and distinguished women who have made this a better world in which to live, but not since Florence Nightingale, who lived from 1820 to 1910, has there been one who has contributed so much to the healing and physical salvation of men as Mary Switzer, and it is an interesting fact that neither Miss Nightingale nor Miss Switzer were trained as physicians.

This audience can appreciate, more fully than any other that I can think of, why we have gathered to do honor to our distinguished guest, Mary Switzer, and the Office in Washington which she represents. For me it is a great pleasure to share with you a recounting of the accomplishments of her many years of lifesaving, suffering-saving work.

In a sense, in a very real sense, there are 60,000 reasons why we make this award. In just 1 year this is the number of crippled and disabled people who were restored to useful living through the efforts of Mary Switzer and her coworkers. You can get an even broader picture of these accomplishments by recalling that year after year this work has been going on in all States and in many of the cities and hamlets of this great country. When one considers the families, friends, and relatives affected, one finds not 60,000, but hundreds of thousands of reasons for our giving recognition today to such a remarkable record.

You and I know, but for the world outside let it be more fully known, that the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation has accomplished magnificent results in rehabilitating great numbers of wrecked human beings to the point where they can again work, earn a living, and free their families and friends from the heavy burden which they perforce had to impose.

It is the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation that provides the leadership and assistance which is necessary for the rehabilitation of the disabled. This is a job which no private organization can accomplish alone and on its own. Many private organizations are doing a magnificent job and deserve a great deal of praise and credit for their help in this field. We are reluctant to see Government extending its influence too deeply into our everyday lives, but in this we take our cue from Abraham Lincoln, who said that Government should do for individuals what they cannot do for themselves or cannot do so well for themselves.

The rehabilitators of this agency employ a wide range of medical knowledge and they leave no medical stone unturned in the constant search for better methods and better results. They use not only surgeons, internists, and physical therapists, but also neurologists, psychiatrists, orthopedists, social-service workers, indeed, any specialists who can contribute to the fullest possible restoration of the handicapped person. It is a comprehensive system of treating and preparing the handicapped for self-supporting work of which they may well be proud.

The economic gains thus made are very impressive. The yearly addition of more than 60,000 handicapped people to the Nation's productive effort has salvaged annually more than 1 million man-hours of work. The 60,000 persons treated during fiscal year 1953 had aggregate earnings of $16 million during the year before they came to the attention of the OVR and after their rehabilitation their earnings rose to $112 million. This is equal to almost one-third of the total Federal-State cost of their rehabilitation. Within 4 years they are expected to repay in Federal taxes the equivalent of this outlay.

About 12,000 of these rehabilitated persons had been on the public assistance rolls before rehabilitation was completed. It would cost approximately $8 million to maintain them and their families as public charges for 1 year alone. On the other hand, it cost only about $7 million to restore them to usefulness—a one-time expenditure.

These people who present themselves or are referred for rehabilitation comprise a variety of the handicapped, with disabilities caused by amputations, blindness, deafness, tuberculosis, epilepsy, and other disorders of the nervous system, such as multiple sclerosis, and paralysis. About 60 percent are disabled through illness and approximately 30 percent from accidents. The rest are born with handicaps or sustained serious damage from other causes.

What, more precisely is done by the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation for these maimed, crippled, and sick people? The services, made available through State rehabilitation agencies throughout the Nation, are briefly as follows:

There is, of course, the general medical examination which is made with special attention to the appraisal of the disability and to determine the capability for work. Medical, surgical, and psychiatric care are given, where indicated, of course, and here, too, special attention is paid to the disability and its correction to the fullest possible extent. Prosthetic applicances, such as artificial limbs and braces are supplied. Other services available to the handicapped through the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation are job training, in schools and colleges, or on-the-job training by designated tutors. Occupational tools and equipment are given to some who need them for their start on the way to earning a living. Finally there comes placement on the right job, that is, the one that the disabled person will be able to do, the one for which he has been prepared. Follow-up after placement is made to make certain that the rehabilitated individual and employer are satisfied with one another. For these services the handicapped person pays what he can; if he is destitute then public funds are used to restore him to the best physical condition obtainable and to the fullest earning power.

Let us take a glance at the magnitude of this problem of disablement. In a study made in 1952 it was estimated that there are 200,000 amputees in this country who require prosthetic appliances. Every year there are an estimated 25,000 to 35,000 new civilian amputees. There are 500,000 cases of tuberculosis, 800,000 epileptics, 260,000 blind persons, and 9,200,000 cases of heart disease. Of course many of these handicapped people have the funds with which to secure treatment but great numbers are not so fortunate. Here is where the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation functions to give these people an opportunity to be put in better physical and mental condition so that they can obtain and earn a living. This right to work was recognized by Congress when in 1920 it passed the original Federal Vocational Rehabilitation Act and again in 1943 with the passage of the Barden-LaFollette Act.

Rehabilitation not only helps the victims of disease and accident, it also constitutes sound economics. I referred before to the economic gains afforded by vocational rehabilitation and cited some figures regarding the income earned when total or partial rehabilitation is obtained. It is to be stressed that through the work done by the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation tax consumers become taxpayers. The figures here are likewise impressive. Thus, during the fiscal year 1951 the rehabilitation program cost $30.3 million. The Federal Government paid $21 million of this sum. But the persons rehabilitated with this money were paying an estimated $9,200,000 in Federal income taxes in the very first year after they were able to secure gainful occupation. And, of course, their tax payments continue from year to year. In short, it has been estimated that rehabilitated men and women pay back to the Federal Government more than $10 for every dollar spent for their rehabilitation. Not a bad investment.

Not a bad investment, too, when considered in human, not financial terms. Despair is replaced by hope, helplessness by self-sufficiency, the dependent are made independent, and the incompetent and often ostracized cripple becomes a socially acceptable and useful citizen.

In his January 7 message to Congress on the state of the Union, President Eisenhower stressed the concern which his administration has for what he called "the human problems of our citizens." He said that "In a modern industrial society, banishment of destitution and cushioning the shock of personal disaster on the individual are proper concerns of all levels of government, including the Federal Government. This is especially true where remedy and prevention alike are beyond the individual's capacity." The President went on to say that "The program for rehabilitation of the disabled especially needs strengthening. Through special vocational training, this program presently returns each year some 60,000 handicapped individuals to productive work. Far more disabled people can be saved each year from idleness and dependence if this program is gradually increased. My more detailed recommendations on this and the other social-insurance problems I have mentioned will be sent to the Congress on January 14."

And in that later message the President said, "Working with only a small portion of the disabled among our people, Federal and State Governments and voluntary organizations and institutions have proved the advantage to our Nation of restoring handicapped persons to full and productive lives."

"There are now 2 million disabled persons who could be rehabilitated and thus returned to productive work. Under the present rehabilitation program only 60,000 of these disabled individuals are returned each year to full and productive lives. Meanwhile, 250,000 of our people are annually disabled. Therefore, we are losing ground at a distressing rate. The number of disabled who enter productive employment each year can be increased if the facilities, personnel, and financial support for their rehabilitation are made adequate to the need.

"Considerations of both humanity and national self-interest demand that steps be taken now to improve this situation.

"There are no statistics to portray the full depth and meaning in human terms of the rehabilitation program, but clearly it is a program that builds a stronger America.

"We should provide for a progressive expansion of our rehabilitation resources, and we should act now so that a sound foundation may be established in 1955."

Let me give you also what President Eisenhower said which clearly gives his stand on something else that must have already occurred to you with regard to Federal aid for the handicapped. He said in his message to Congress, "I am flatly opposed to the socialization of medicine. The great need for hospital and medical services can best be met by the initiative of private plans. But it is unfortunately a fact that medical costs are rising and already impose severe hardships on many families. The Federal Government can do many helpful things and still carefully avoid the socialization of medicine."

It now becomes my pleasant assignment to introduce to you the Director of the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation, the woman who administers the Federal portion of the nationwide cooperative State-Federal program of rehabilitation.

Mary Switzer began her career in Government service in 1922. She has served under six Presidents—Harding, Coolidge, Hoover, Roosevelt, Truman, and now Eisenhower. Time does not permit of my even mentioning all of the important posts she has occupied in her distinguished career. She was at one time Assistant to the Secretary of the Treasury in charge of the Public Health Service, the Mint, and the Coast Guard.

Subsequently, she was assistant to several administrators of the Federal Security Agency and in that capacity had administrative responsibility for the affairs of the United States Public Health Service and the Food and Drug Administration. In that capacity she was my boss, Mr. Campbell's boss, Mr. Dunbar's, Mr. Crawford's, and Mr. Larrick's boss.

She was a representative of the United States at the first International Health Conference which developed the constitution of the World Health Organization. For her wartime service in several vital fields she was awarded the Certificate of Merit by the President.

Following the war, Mary Switzer was a member of the President's Scientific Research Board. She has represented the United States in a number of delegations at international congresses and assemblies. She is a member of the board of trustees of the Menninger Foundation, a member of the Professional Advisory Committee of the International Society for the Welfare of Cripples; of the Committee on Professional Education and Publications of the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis. She is an honorary member of the American Psychiatric Association.

Of the recipients of our award, six have been winners of the Nobel prize. But there is a prize that is more significant and more precious than even the Nobel award—it is the gratitude that abides in the hearts of the hundreds of thousands who have been resurrected from the living dead and transformed into useful, happy, self-supporting, and self-respecting citizens. This prize Miss Switzer has earned as no other woman since Florence Nightingale.

It is an honor to recommend Miss Switzer for our annual award. Its citation reads:

"Nineteen hundred and fifty-four annual award ceremony by American pharmaceutical manufacturers' association in honor of the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation, Miss Mary Switzer, Director, in recognition of the great leadership, expert technical advice, and assistance given by this agency and its distinguished and dedicated Director to the end that many thousands of handicapped persons have been restored to useful lives, given economic independence, with the dignity that is work instead of desolation, and spared untold suffering, both physical and mental—all of which would otherwise not have been accomplished."

Address by Hines H. Baker Before the Independent Petroleum Association of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, May 7, 1954

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, Mr. Hines H. Baker, president of the Humble Oil & Refining Co., delivered an extremely informative address before the Independent Petroleum Association of America meeting at Denver, Colo.

This address contains facts and figures which should be extremely helpful to all of us who are involved in the legislative problems affecting the oil industry. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OIL, ALERT!

(Address by Hines H. Baker, president, Humble Oil & Refining Co., before the Independent Petroleum Association of America, Denver, Colo., May 4, 1954)

In the field of human rights it has been wisely said, but too often ignored, that "eternal vigilance is the price of freedom."

Vigilance is a form of alertness. * * *

Alertness is no less important in maintaining economic independence in industry than is vigilance in preserving freedom in the field of human rights. The petroleum industry faces both danger and opportunity. And so I say today, "Oil, alert!" Let us be wide awake, on the lookout, ready, and prompt in meeting both the dangers or problems and the opportunities ahead.

The major opportunity ahead is in the outlook for a large increase in demand over the long rūn. Even at a cumulative annual rate of growth of 3 percent, which is modest by comparison with our past experience, the domestic demand for petroleum would double in 25 years. Such a development would mean an expansion ahead of us comparable with all that has been achieved to date. On this basis, if we are to supply from domestic resources a major part of the oil needed by this country for continued economic progress and for national security, the opportunity is great and the challenge truly arresting.

* * * * *

INCREASING COSTS

Our greatest problem is that costs continue upward, particularly in exploration and in the development of new reserves. * * *

The physical volume of exploratory effort in the United States, as measured by statistics on seismic crews and wildcat wells, is now about three times the prewar level, although production has not yet doubled. The cost of this exploration, of course, has increased much more. The proportion of exploratory to total well completions has more than doubled since 1941. As a result of this change and the smaller size of fields, the proportion of oil wells to total completions has decreased from around 2 out of 3 prewar to around 1 out of 2 in the past 2 years. Last year nearly 40 percent of the wells drilled were dry holes. The number of dry holes has nearly doubled since 1947, whereas total completions have increased only about 50 percent.

The oil discovered and developed by exploration and drilling has not kept pace with the expenditures for these activities. Consequently, unit costs of establishing new reserves have advanced sharply. While we are still finding a substantial amount of oil, the average size of new fields seems to be considerably smaller, and we do not as often have the benefit of the discovery of major fields. Instead of finding fields with thick sands, we now generally encounter fields with thin sands and smaller reserves per acre. In fieds with numerous sands, the costs of completing and producing wells are higher than they would be if the same sands occured in a single body. In addition, the necessity of drilling deeper wells has added to costs. The average depth of all wells completed in the

United States exceeded 4,000 feet in the last 2 years compared with around 3,000 feet before World War II. This change has come about as a result of a larger proportion of the deeper wells. These are particularly expensive. Unfortunately, a 10,000-foot well tends to cost 3 or 4 times as much as a 5,000-foot well. Since 1944 there has been a marked increase in the proportion of wells deeper than 5,000 feet and a decrease in the proportion of wells shallower than 2,500 feet.

The preceding factors have operated to increase the cost per well at the same time that new oil developed per well drilled has declined. If we relate our completions to the new crude oil resulting from discoveries, extensions, and revisions, according to the reports of the American Petroleum Institute, we find that the new oil per well decreased from 158,000 barrels in 1946–48 to 144,000 in 1951–53 considering oil wells only, and from 87,000 to 75,000 barrels considering all wells drilled. These statistics will be a great surprise to people who believe that domestic production is a fabulously profitable business. If one considers the money spent on exploration and drilling relative to the average results per well drilled, it is not hard to understand why domestic producers are concerned about increasing costs.

THE BASIS OF TAX POLICIES ON PETROLEUM PRODUCTION

Because there is no general appreciation of the situation described nor of the basic fact that the production of oil and gas represents the depletion of capital assets, there is much misunderstanding of the principles controlling the taxation of income from oil- and gas-producing operations. * * *

One of the tax problems relates to the option either to capitalize or to expense intangible development costs. Tangible costs for casing, tubing, pumping equipment, and other items that have a salvage value are capitalized, and the costs are recovered over the useful life of the property through depreciation in the same manner as tangible investments in other businesses. The expenses for intangibles, such as wages, fuel, hauling, and so forth, incident to and necessary for drilling wells and preparing for production do not result in a tangible asset which can be sold or salvaged for other uses. Usually, operators exercise the option to charge off intangible costs in the year they are incurred rather than over a period of time. The total charge under this practice is exactly the same as if the operator were allowed to depreciate such costs in the same manner as tangible costs. The only difference lies in the time the charge is made. Once taken it cannot be taken again. It tends to lower the tax paid in the year when taken but to increase taxes in all subsequent years during the producing life of the well. The effect is to encourage prompt development in this high-cost, high-risk-taking venture. As a result reserves are developed more quickly and the additional oil supplies benefit consumers generally and also yield substantial tax revenues.

Percentage depletion at rates provided by Congress since 1926 is an important provision of the income-tax laws designed to deal fairly with the oil and gas producer in order not to tax capital as income and to stimulate the discovery and development of new oil and gas reserves to replace those being depleted through production. In most businesses a specific investment will result in productive facilities, and can be recovered fully through depreciation. In such case the risk incurred is with regard to the rate of earnings that may be realized as a result of demand, competition, price fluctuations, and other market factors. The oil producer faces these same risks along with every other businessman, but in addition he has a unique problem of being required to risk in exploration and drilling a great deal of money with the certain knowledge that a large part of that money will be lost in unsuccessful ventures. The right to deduct his losses in computing income subject to taxation does not return to him the money lost. He can only recover his losses and be justified in taking the risks involved if the income-tax laws enable him to recover as capital from a successful venture more than he puts into it. Percentage depletion takes this into account. The maximum amount of depletion permitted was determined by experience with what was originally termed "discovery value" depletion. Discovery value depletion recognized that the capital depleted through production was the value of oil after discovery, not its cost, and that this amount was required to replace production with new oil by exploration or purchase in order to enable the producer to stay in business without a reduction of his real capital. Percentage depletion at the present rates was adopted as a simpler means of achieving the results of discovery value depletion. It must be continued at present rates to avoid what would amount to a tax on capital, since the authority under the 16th amendment is limited to the taxation of income.

Even with the present tax provisions, the oil industry has not earned a larger rate of return on its net investment than the average for manufacturing industries, and has earned less than several successful large industries. The difficulties of establishing capital values are such that only because of tax provisions that recognize its peculiar problems can the industry earn on the average a rate of return comparable with that in manufacturing and trade. Contrary to the popular belief, oil production is not a fabulously profitable business. On the average, it is only about as profitable as other businesses, and it would be far less profitable than other businesses if it were not for the tax provisions adopted by Congress in recognition of the peculiar nature of its operations.

The tax provisions applicable to petroleum are based on the nature of the business and are not special tax favors. The industry does not have or seek a tax advantage; but it does expect fair treatment, and would like to have an understanding consideration of its peculiar problems by the public and the Government. Oil has been a great boon to us in the United States through what it has done for our production in industry, for our comfort and standard of living, for personal transportation, and for our defense and victory in war. We are inescapably dependent upon tremendous quantities of petroleum for our national security as well as for improved standards of living. It would be sheer folly for this Nation to endanger its economic progress and the capacity to defend itself by discouraging the development of new petroleum resources. Any change in this important tax provision which has become part of the economic structure of the industry would not only penalize oil producers but very shortly would hurt all consumers and in time reduce the tax revenues realized from petroleum operations.

The Congress has understood the problem from the beginning. It adopted percentage depletion in 1926 after careful study and has maintained it in effect continuously after further review of the facts.

THE NEED FOR COST REDUCTION

Before turning from a discussion of increasing costs to the peculiar nature of our business which requires special tax provisions, I mentioned the fact that in the last 3 years the new oil found in the United States for each oil well drilled averaged about 144,000 barrels. The cost problem of the domestic industry can be illustrated by comparison of this experience with the production in foreign areas.

The average well in Kuwait and Arabia (considered together) produces better than 6,000 barrels a day. Thus, it will produce more in 1 month than the typical domestic well now being developed will produce over its life of 20 or 30 years. Even in Venezuela, where the well production is slightly more than 200 barrels daily, it would take only 2 years for a well to produce as much as the typical new oil well in the United States produces throughout its life. * * *

Among the major avenues of cost reduction in our petroleum production are technological improvements, better control of reservoir behavior, and wider spacing of wells. Improvements of our drilling techniques and our means of completing and working over and producing wells are constantly being made which operate to counter the tendency toward diminishing returns and increasing costs faced by this natural resource industry. The knowledge acquired regarding benefits from control of rates of production and gas-oil ratios and reinjection of gas and water all contribute to increased recovery from underground reservoirs and thereby to lower costs. Perhaps the greatest possibility for a reduction of costs, however, is in wider spacing of wells so that we may develop more reserves per well, despite the poorer quality of sands. Because of the high costs of wells, it is perhaps more important than ever before that operators in the petroleum industry work toward the widest possible spacing of wells in each new field consistent with maximum recoveries. Wherever possible, we should seek the spacing of wells on 40 and 80 acres and even wider, rather than on 20 acres or less. This is more particularly true when we maintain reserve producing capacity with production restricted on conservation grounds. The effects of such practice on cost can be tremendous, and they will certainly be needed if we are to remain competitive with other sources of oil and with other fuels. Such a course would be the best way to reduce drilling now that we have developed the producing capacity needed for the time being and are faced with the prospect of only small increases in demand.

* * * * *

RESERVE PRODUCING CAPACITY

At the beginning of World War II this Nation enjoyed the ability to produce crude oil efficiently at a rate in excess of a million barrels daily above the current production, as a result of the good conservation practices developed by the industry and the State regulatory agencies. This amount was referred to as reserve producing capacity. It proved of incalculable value to the United States and its allies in carrying on World War II. Unfortunately, the shortage of materials and men during the war slowed down exploration and drilling even though demand increased rapidly. Consequently, by the end of the war the industry was operating at its maximum efficient rate and no longer had any reserve producing capacity. For several years thereafter demand increased so rapidly that the industry was hard pressed to supply all requirements, even though it was generally considered desirable for national security that we restore a reserve producing capacity on the order of a million barrels daily.

Since the war the petroleum industry has been striving to attain this objective at the same time that it met rapid gains in demand. By intensive effort and large investments the goal has been achieved. In fact, by the end of 1953 crude oil could have been produced in the United States under good conservation practices at about 1,500,000 barrels daily above the actual rate of production. The industry had also achieved a reserve capacity in excess of 1 million barrels daily in its transportation and refining facilities. Thus, a goal desirable for national security has been attained.

The consequences of this success, however, include certain penalties. For one, it is obviously quite expensive to carry this reserve capacity. The much larger investment in wells and the higher operating expenses mean that it is much more expensive to maintain reserve capacity now than it was before the war. The effect on unit operating costs can be illlustrated by the fact that the proratable wells in Texas last year were restricted to 65 percent of their maximum efficient rate. Since the cost of operation is relatively constant regardless of the rate of production, the unit cost of lifting the oil is thus increased considerably. It would seem, therefore, that the price should reflect these costs in order to encourage the industry to keep the reserve capacity needed for national security. The very existence of the reserve capacity, however, tends to make it appear that supplies are abundant and therefore to make it difficult to realize a price directly commensurate with the higher costs.

The discovery of oil in the Williston Basin and across the border in Canada has introduced additional competition on this continent. Some Canadian oil is now moving to the west coast and also to the Midwest. The increasing production in the Rocky Mountains and the discovery of oil in new States suggest that competition will continue to be keen from our own domestic sources. In addition, however, we are faced with increasing competition from foreign oil.

IMPACT OF FOREIGN DEVELOPMENTS

Since World War II important developments of petroleum reserves and production have occurred abroad. Vast quantities of oil have been discovered in the Middle East to add to the previously known reserves of Iran and Iraq. In Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, and the neutral zone tremendous production is being realized from partially developed fields. The magnitude of these reserves is not known and still remains to be determined. But we know already that they exceed greatly the proved reserves of the United States and may be several times as large. The daily crude-oil production in the Middle East increased from about 700,000 barrels in 1946 to more than 2,400,000 barrels in 1953, even though Iranian production had in the meantime been practically shut down as a result of expropriation.

The development in foreign-oil supplies has proceeded at a rate even more rapid than the increase in demand, with the result that increasing quantities of oil have moved to the United States. Petroleum imports to the United States in 1953 were as follows in barrels daily: Residual fuel oil, 373,000; other products, 29,000; crude oil from the Western Hemisphere, 389,000; crude oil from the Eastern Hemisphere, 259,000. Total imports of 1,050,000 exceeded exports by about 650,000 barrels daily. The importation of crude oil from the Eastern Hemisphere is a relatively new development and has increased rapidly.

A sound basic policy with respect to petroleum imports was set forth by the National Petroleum Council in 1949 in a document entitled "A National Oil Policy." This statement stressed the importance of a healthy domestic petroleum industry in the United States for our economic progress and national security. It defined the proper role of imports as one of supplementing domestic supplies. In this connection, it should be borne in mind that domestic residual fuel oil refined from domestic crude oil is not enough to meet all requirements. Consequently, there is a certain amount of foreign residual fuel oil needed to supplement domestic production. The amount needed is that required to make up the deficit in domestic supplies when fuel-oil prices are at or above a parity level with coal prices on the east coast. Imports of residual fuel oil can be greater than needed to supplement domestic production, and in that case will affect the domestic industry adversely.

For reasons of national security the United States cannot afford to become unduly dependent upon foreign oil. The amount of crude oil needed to supplement domestic supplies depends upon the changing relation between domestic demand and domestic production available under good conservation practices, probably after maintaining a million barrels daily of reserve capacity for national security reasons. At some times, as in 1947 and the early part of 1948, when production is at maximum efficient rates, additional imports may be very useful to the domestic economy in meeting requirements. At other times, as in 1949 when demand failed to increase, imports should be adjusted downward if they are truly to supplement domestic supplies. Without a rigid formula, the relation of imports and domestic supplies could be worked out if the importing companies voluntarily and as a result of individual decisions adjust crude-oil imports to changing conditions so that they do not arrogate for foreign oil a perferred position and force all adjustments to be made by domestic producers. If there is to be a preference, the spirit of the national oil policy would require that the domestic production, rather than the foreign production, should have the preferred position in the United States. In my opinion, the majority of the domestic producers are willing to be reasonable about imports if the sound principles announced in the national oil policy are adhered to, and if the importing companies adjust their imports downward when it is clear that domestic producers are having to be cut back substantially below what they can produce even after carring a million barrels daily of reserve capacity. Adherence to these principles would have meant a reduction in crude oil imports in 1953 and would require that such imports be now reduced substantially below the 1953 rate.

COMPETITION FROM NATURAL GAS

Another important competitive factor which must be recognized by oil producers is the increasing use of natural gas. Since 1946 the marketed production of natural gas has more than doubled, whereas the consumption of petroleum has increased only about 50 percent. Natural gas now supplies 55 percent as much energy as oil in the United States, whereas in 1945 it only supplied 40 percent as much energy. The increasing use of natural gas affects the market for oil, particularly for home heating.

There are sound economic reasons for the growing use of natural gas. It has been made available to market by the construction of large trunk pipelines from the producing areas to the large consuming areas of the country. Natural gas has for some years generally been cheaper than oil or coal. The retail price today is about what it was in 1939, while the prices of coal and heating oil have doubled. On a heating-unit basis, it is being sold in the Southwest by the producer at a price equal to about one-fourth the price of fuel oil at gulf coast refineries and about two-fifths the price of coal at the mine. It is being sold to consumers at retail in many large cities, including some in coal-producing States, at prices lower than coal or heating oil.

These conditions have led not only to a vast increase in the volume of natural gas sold, to a spectacular increase in the percentage of gas participation in the United States mineral energy consumption; they have led also to a substantial decrease in the ratio of reserves of gas to demand in spite of an actual increase in reserves. The ratio of proved reserves to annual production has already decreased to about 23 to 1, and a continuance of past trends would reduce it to the minimum desirable level of 20 to 1 within a few years. This trend raises a real question regarding the future supplies of natural gas. Given time and the free operation of competition between oil, coal, and natural gas, the relative prices of these three forms of epergy in the market place will bring about an adjustment between their relative demand and supply.

The extent of price adjustments necessary to do this will depend upon the relative costs of producing the different fuels and the degree of consumer preference among them.

However, this problem is further aggravated by the continuing threat of regulation by the Federal Power Commission of the producer's field price of natural gas moving interstate. For a number of years the Commission has been regulating the charges for gas produced by natural gas companies on the basis of a fixed return on the depreciated investment in producing properties. The threat is that this will be extended to the independent producer, who is in no sense a public utility.

Regulation on this basis of the field price of natural gas moving into interstate commerce for resale would produce many harmful results. It would for the immediate future make natural gas under sell other fuels and greatly increase the demand for it at the expense of oil and coal. This in turn would bring about a shortage of gas. The business of finding and producing oil and gas is a highly risk-taking venture. Unless the producer can realize a fair market price on his production to compensate for his losses and risks and operating expenses he cannot carry on the effort necessary to find and produce gas in the increasing quantities needed to meet demand. In most cases gas is still selling in the Southwest for less than its full share of petroleum costs, if consideration is given to all exploration, development, and production expense. Recovery of the costs and a reasonable return on the successful investment alone will not long attract effort and capital into the search for oil and gas. In such case the consumer would no longer enjoy a dependable supply; and in the end there would result higher prices as well as shortages.

The full interplay of the forces of supply and demand in a freely competitive fuel market, involving natural gas, oil, coal, and other sources of energy, gives the consumer a better opportunity for dependable supplies of each at reasonable prices. Any control over the end use of fuels would be to the disadvantage of consumers. There is no reason for regulating the producer's field price of natural gas, just as there is no reason for regulating the price of oil at the well, the price of coal at the mine, or the price of agricultural crops and manufactured products. None of these businesses has the characteristics of a public utility. Furthermore, price regulation on the basis of cost would lead to chaotic variations in field prices among different producers.

The oil industry must, therefore, be alert to all of the competitive conditions mentioned, aware of the forces at play, prepared to meet the dangers and seize the opportunities. But with half the heat units embraced in proved oil and gas reserves of the United States consisting of natural gas, it has particular reason to be alert to a situation which threatens to subject the principal part of the producer's gas moving in interstate commerce to price regulation as though the business were a public utility. * * *

For the welfare of the natural gas consumer and the natural gas producer as well, and in the long-range interest of the oil producer, the coal producer, and the general economy, everything necessary should be done to prevent the Federal Power Commission from (1) regulating the production and gathering of natural gas; (2) fixing or regulating the price at which the producer of natural gas sells his gas to a natural gas company; and (3) fixing the rates of a natural gas company below a figure that will allow as an expense the actual price paid for gas purchased from nonaffiliates, or the market price or fair and reasonable value in the field considering market conditions of that produced by the natural gas company or acquired from an affiliate, plus reasonable compensation for gathering. This is essential to the orderly functioning of our fuels economy and to bringing forth the supplies required to meet the needs of the American consumers. Fortunately, the Federal Power Commission itself today appears to appreciate the problem; and if we may judge by its action in the Phillips case and the recent Panhandle Eastern case, there is reason to hope that, as now constituted, the Commission wishes to see its authority clearly defined in keeping with the original intent of Congress in this respect as set forth in the Natural Gas Act of 1938.

Editorial From Sheboygan (Wis.) Press Praises Senator Wiley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 14, 1954

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I was extremely interested to read in the Sheboygan (Wis.) Press, a fine editorial commending our colleague, the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], for his role in connection with the victory as a result of the enactment of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway bill. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WILEY PERFORMS OUTSTANDING SERVICE

One of the key figures in the successful fight for the St. Lawrence seaway was Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, of Wisconsin.

It was his bill that was passed by the United States Senate on January 20 by a roll-call vote of 51 to 33. It was a companion bill, introduced by Representative DONDERO, of Michigan, that was passed by the House last week.

Senator WILEY's bill broke the log jam that prevented favorable action by either House for more than 25 years. His measure and the companion Dondero measure concentrated on only one part of the work and set up a new method of financing. The companion measures received vigorous support from the Eisenhower administration. Lopped off were the power projects and the channel-deepening proposals for the western Great Lakes, with the result that the United States share of the seaway will be only $105 million. Under an earlier proposal the United States share would have been $566 million.

The power phases of the St. Lawrence development will be carried out jointly by the New York State Power Authority and the Ontario government.

After the introduction of his bill, restricting the United States share to navigational projects—dredging, canals, locks—on the American side of the International Rapids section of the St. Lawrence, Senator WILEY fought on and off the Senate floor for approval of the proposal. When the bill was debated, he singlehandedly presented the seaway's case and refused to be deterred by the arguments and heckling of the opponents. He argued that the seaway would bring great savings in freight transportation costs, improve the competitive position of Midwest manufacturers and farmers, provide cheaper power for the northeastern area, and open wider the door to Canada's valuable resources. Another argument was that the seaway would lead to cheaper rates on imports and shipments of raw materials to Midwest manufacturers. Senator WILEY also emphasized the importance of the seaway in regard to national defense—a landlocked route protected from submarine warfare—and making accessible the vast iron-ore deposits of Laborador and Quebec.

The clincher argument was that Canada was prepared to go ahead alone, should the United States refuse to join. Either the United States got in on navigational control and toll revenue or it left those to Canada. As one of the two principal benefactors, it did not make sense for the United States to remain aloof.

Both Republicans and Democrats have highly praised Senator WILEY for his leadership in the seaway fight. Among them were Senators DIRKSEN, of Illinois; POTTER and FERGUSON, of Michigan; THYE, of Minnesota; AIKEN, of Vermont; KNOWLAND, of California—all Republicans; and DOUGLAS, of Illinois; LEHMAN, of New York; KEFAUVER, of Tennessee; HUMPHREY, of Minnesota; and STENNIS, of Mississippi—Democrats. Senator BUTLER of Maryland, who fought the seaway, congratulated Senator WILEY as a worthy adversary. The executive board of the Wisconsin Young Democrats also commended Senator WILEY at a meeting Sunday.

Passage in the House was the result of solid votes by the delegates from such States as Wisconson, Minnesota, Iowa. Michigan, North and South Dakota, Nebraska, Wyoming, Montana, Washington, Oregon, Idaho, Nevada, Utah, Colorado, Rhode Island, Delaware, Vermont, and Ohio, and near-solid votes by Illinois and California. The big New York vote was split, 22 for and 20 against. Indiana produced 6 votes for the seaway and 4 against. Only seven favorable votes came from the large Pennsylvania and Texas delegations.

But the important thing is that the seaway project finally has been approved. Much of the credit rightfully goes to Senator WILEY. We have no doubt that once the benefits of the seaway are felt in Wisconsin, all the people of this State will look back with a deep sense of appreciation to the efforts put forth by Senator WILEY to get the bill through Congress.

The Arab States—The Arabian Peninsula

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1954

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the official publication of the American Jewish Congress, Congress Weekly, has for the past several weeks presented a series of articles on the Arab States. I am pleased to direct the attention of our colleagues to the sixth article in this series, which appeared in their May 3, 1954, issue:

THE ARAB STATES—THE ARABIAN PENINSULA

(By Sh. Yin'am)

The vast expanses of the Arabian Peninsula—desert for the most part—contain today two independent Arab States, Saudi Arabia and the Yemen; a British crown colony, Aden; and a number of semi-independent Arab principalities under British protection on its eastern shores along the Persian Gulf. The two main characteristics of the peninsula contrast with each other: the backward, medieval character of state and population—mostly nomadic and tribal, living in a completely autocratic monarchy, on the one hand; and the staggering development of a huge, mostly American-owned oil industry, on the other.

The political structure of the peninsula has not changed very much during the last century as far as the Kingdom of Yemen, on its southeastern corner, the British colony and protectorate of Aden, adjoining the Yemen, and the principalities on the shores of the Persian Gulf, are concerned. The Yemen, with an area of about 75,000 square miles and a population variously estimated at three to seven million (there are no statistics in this area), is ruled by an autocratic king bearing the religious title Imam (Leader of the Faithful). The present king is Imam Ahmad, who assumed the throne in 1948, after his father, Imam Yahya, had been assassinated in an attempted coup d'etat, and the rebels, whose program included certain modernistic, quasi-liberal features and who were halfheaterdly supported by certain Arab interests outside the Yemen, had been defeated and executed. This coup, however, far from being comparable to the upheavals brought upon the countries of the Fertile Crescent by the vicissitudes and crises of modern development, was true to medieval patterns of regicide and court intrigues.

Up to 1918, the Yemen officially was under Turkish-Ottoman suzerainty; de facto, however, the Ottomans hardly ever established control. When the Ottoman Empire was dismembered, the Yemen attained its complete independence without having made any effort toward that goal. Despite certain great power intrigues, power rivalry has kept Yemen independent. A war between Saudita and Yemen in 1934, ended in defeat for the Yemen but established an inter-Arab balance of power on the peninsula. Anglo-Yemeni relations are frequently tense, because of almost permanent border friction on the Yemen-Aden frontier; resulting crises, however, have remained minor ones. Yemen is a member of the Arab League and of the United Nations.

Internally, Yemen's regime is extremely conservative and, as foreigners are not usually permitted to enter, is very little known. Attempts of foreign interests to introduce modern development, to explore and exploit natural resources, to establish communications, etc., have so far met with bland refusal. The only hospital in the country and the only doctor—Italian—have been serving the royal family and household exclusively. While most of the population is, in contrast to Saudia's nomads' sedentary, its villages owe allegiance to feudal chieftains. Slavery is practiced—a fact which did not prevent the U. N. from admitting the Yemen as a full-fledged member. Since last year it has been reported that German firms have been entrusted with certain development works and explorations.

The principalities on the Persian Gulf shore—mainly Kuwait, Qatar, the Sultanate of Muscat and Oman, the shiekdoms of the Trucial Coast, and the island of Bahrain—are all small and very sparsely populated. Their foreign relations have been managed since the 19th century by British agents and advisers; internally they have remained under the autocratic rule of their local sheiks. Oil income—fairly large in the case of Bahrain, tremendous in the case of Kuwait, and just beginning on a large scale for Qatar—has made possible the first beginnings of modern developments in the economic and social spheres.

The western part and the interior of the peninsula have seen a great deal of political changes during the last half century. The western part, the Hejaz, containing the holy cities of Mecca and Medina, was under the rule of the Hashemite Sherifs of Mecca. An Amir ruled Assir, the area between Hejaz and Yemen. The interior, the Nejd, and the northern part of the Persian Gulf share, were the domain of rival, warring tribes under their chieftains. The strongest among those, at the beginning of the century, were the House of Rashid and the House of Saud, in constant feud with each other.

During the First World War, the British supported Abdul-Rahman Ibn Abdul-Aziz of the House of Saud—called Ibn Saud—and helped to him establish his ascendancy in the interior and the east. He did not, however, join their forces against the Turks, but remained neutral. While the British India Office, through its political officers in the Persian Gulf area, thus worked with Ibn Saud, the foreign office, through its oriental staff at the embassy in Cairo, made the famous deal of 1916 with Hussein, the Sherif of Mecca. The "Revolt in the Desert," organized by Hussein and his sons Ali, Faisal and Abdullah, with British gold and the help of Col. T. E. Lawrence, in return for a promise of Arab independence after the war, was not militarily as important as is sometimes romantically maintained. It remained a desert guerrilla campaign waged by a few beduin groups loyal to their tribal chiefs rather than a national movement of liberation. When these nomad troops reached the Fertile Cresent in Palestine and Syria, on the right flank of Allenby's army, the Arab population of those countries did not join them. Still, the deal of 1916 established later claims—ultimately fulfilled in their entirety—for Arab independence in the whole Fertile Cresent and laid the basis for the leading role of the Hashemite dynasty.

While Sherif Hussein's sons Abdullah and Faisal were staking out their claims to the Fertile Cresent in Syria, Jordan and Iraq, Hussein proclaimed himself king of Hejaz. He was not, however, strong enough to deny Ibn Sa'ud's claims to all of Arabia, and the British (the India office financing and arming Ibn Saud; the foreign office—Hussein) did not support him strongly enough. In 1924, Ibn Saud defeated Hussein and his son Ali in a brief campaign; both fled, and Ibn Saud established himself as king of Hejaz. Later he renamed his entire domain "The Saudi Arabian Kingdom." The small principality of Assir was incorporated in 1930.

Relations between Saudia and the Hashemite countries of Transjordan and Iraq remained strained for many years, punctuated also by unceasing frontier trouble caused by migrating nomadic tribes; but gradually, and with British assistance, both sides made their peace with the status quo. Gradually, too—and especially since Aramco started exploiting Saudia's oil—the United States took Britain's place as Saudi Arabia's chief ally and protector. The United States maintains an air base at Dhahran on the Persian Gulf, under a treaty that, at first provisional, was finalized in 1951 and runs till 1961. It trains and equips the Saudi Army and Air Force.

Ibn Saud's victory, first over the House of Rashid, then over the Hashemites of Mecca, and finally over the unruly chieftains of the desert tribes, was accompanied by the establishment of his creed. For he and his tribe adhere to the Wahhabite sect or rite—a puritan Muslim school established in the 18th century, which negates and seeks to eliminate later developments of Islam, regarded as idolatry and a perversion of the true faith, and to return to the original tenets of Muhammad's simple desert religion. Ibn Sa'ud's missionary zeal, however, seemed to have gradually mellowed, especially after the conquest of Mecca, which made him the host and the financial beneficiary of the annual pilgrimage of the Muslims of the world—non-Wahhabites all. Ibn Saud also initiated an ambitious scheme for the settlement of the Wahhabi "brethren" and the other nomads of the desert; this scheme, however, petered out—although economic development causes a gradual process of settlement of many nomads.

Ibn Saud's state is a medieval autocracy. The Koran is the law and the constitution. The death penalty is most usual. Even for petty crimes a thief's hand is hacked off. Slavery is practiced. There is no separation yet of the state's finances from the King's private coffers. For years large parts of the huge oil income have been spent on palaces for the King, his scores of concubines, his forty-odd sons, his harems, and his special planes and gold-plated Cadillacs. Of the ordinary budget, 16 percent, about $26 million, are spent for the upkeep of the 325 princes of the realm and the 10,000 members and employees of the royal household. Ibn Saud died in 1953, and his son Saud assumed the throne, but the character of the state has not changed.

Gradually, of course, certain social changes are bound to occur following the economic development caused by the oil venture. Electricity, air travel, modern roads, air conditioning are being introduced especially in the oil area on the shores of the Persian Gulf. A railway from Dammam, in that area, to the desert capital of Riyadh was inaugurated in 1951. Thousands of young Saudis are settling in the oil area, employed by Aramco, learning modern trades. The fascinating spectacle of that social revolution has hardly been investigated.

Oil production in the area was started in the early thirties in Bahrain by an American company, a subsidiary of Standard Oil of California, joined later by the Texas Oil Co. A concession for the Saudi shore was granted in 1933. Aramco, originally composed of the same two companies, was widened in 1948 to include also Standard Oil of New Jersey and Socony-Vacuum. First yields were extracted in 1936; later it was discovered that this area might contain the richest oil reserves of the world. Production rose in a steep curve: it passed the 10 million ton mark in 1946–47, 20 million in 1948–49, 30 million in 1950–51, and was over 40 million ton in 1952 and 1953. Aramco constructed refineries, harbors, townships, a pipeline to the Mediterranean. Aramco was the first company to conclude, at the end of 1950, a new agreement granting Saudi Arabia 50 percent of its net profits (thereby initiating a similar process in most other oil bearing countries of the Middle East). Saudia's income from direct oil royalties alone reached $160 million in 1952. Its entire annual budget was $6 million in 1933, and is more than $200 million now, of which only 5.3 percent are spent on social, health, and education services.

Kuwait's oil development, owned by a joint British-American company (Anglo-Iranian, with Gulf Oil) is no less spectacular. Although the concession dates back to 1934, production started only in 1946. It surpasses Aramco's production today—43 million ton in 1953. The tiny principality, with hardly 200,000 inhabitants, had in 1953 an oil royalty income of $168 million. In a neutral zone in the desert between Kuwait and Sa'udia, the Independent American Oil Co. and Western Pacific struck oil in 1953 and rich production is expected. In Qatar and the other principalities concessions are held by subsidiaries of the Iraq Petroleum Co. (Anglo-American-Dutch-French); production started in Qatar in 1949–50 (1952: 9 million ton). Underwater rights on the Continental Shelf outside the territorial waters were separated from the existing concessions, after litigation; those concessions are now held by Shell (British-Dutch).

There are small Jewish communities in Bahrain (mostly Iraqi Jews) and Aden (mostly Yemenites). The ancient Jewish community of the Yemen itself had lived in that country for many centuries under truly medieval conditions—not only as second-grade citizens, discriminated against and held in virtual bondage, as protected subjects of the Imam, but even humiliated by special regulations as to dress, behavior, and symbolic deference and submission to the ruling Muslim believers. The Jewish community of the Yemen, almost in its entirety, trekked to British Aden in 1948–50, when the tidings of the rebirth of Israel reached it, and was transplanted by air to Israel, almost 50,000 souls, in "operation flying carpet." There are no reliable data as to the situation of the few thousands of Jews who may remain in Yemen. There are no Jews elsewhere in the Arabian peninsula. Jews are officially barred not only from the holy cities of Islam, Mecca, and Medina—as all "unbelievers" are—but from the whole of Saudi Arabia.

Saudi Arabia and Yemen are members of the Arab League. Although both are not very active in the League's councils and wield very little influence, they fully join in and are coresponsible for Arab hostility toward Israel. Moreover, since they have little actual contact with or real interest in the problem, they can afford an extremism in verbal declarations unmatched even by the Fertile Crescent's not-too-moderate politicians. Saudi sent a token force, serving with the Egyptian Army, into the Palestine war of 1948; Yemen, having no army, did not participate.

The principalities of the Persian Gulf are not members of the Arab League and do not participate in Arab politics. However, some participation, at least of Kuwait, in regional schemes of economic development is envisaged, considering the huge oil income that has to be invested outside Kuwait, in the absence of sufficient local potentialities. Such economic ties might gradually draw Kuwait, and later the other principalities, too, into the all-Arab orbit.

Communist Propaganda

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 14, 1954

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled, "Bold Red Bid," published in the Russellville (Ark.) Daily Courier-Democrat. The editorial is a very penetrating analysis of some Communist propaganda which I believe has been received by every Member of the Senate; I refer to a pamphlet entitled "The American Way," which was sent to me and, I believe, to all other Senators.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BOLD RED BID

In a bold bid to capture the imaginations of the American people, the Communist Party in the United States has issued a book entitled "The American Way." This is in black type, and the subhead says "To Jobs, Peace, and Democracy."

At first glance, the book looks as American as baseball. It sets forth the usual platitudes, and declares in favor of such things as prosperity and peace. Obviously, no one will argue with that, and the writers are careful to avoid an argument—at least on the first page.

But early in the book the pattern takes shape. There is the warning finger which calls attention to the fact that there is a threat of war and the possibility of a depression. Because America has traveled this road, the writers say, we are operating under the wrong philosophy. We should cease to be Democrats or Republicans and become Communists. Only they have the answer.

But the omissions of the book are probably more revealing than the statements. It fails to point out, for example, that the countries who have accepted communism—the doctrine the book offers—are faced with the same threat of war. But the threat, in their case, comes from an urge to expand their doctrine by force, thus creating a danger for the world that dares disagree with them.

Still more interesting is the broad assumption that McCarthyism is the only alternative to communism. By pointing to the victims of the McCarthy witch hunt, the writers attempt to convince people that this doctrine will spread unless the Communist Party is so strengthened that it will be able to stamp out the philosophy.

Unfortunately, neither the Communist Party nor Joe McCarthy seems able to grasp the simple fact that Americanism is the product of all our history and of the history of the people who settled the United States. William Z. Foster classifies all his opponents as being in the Joe McCarthy camp. But this view is so narrow that if it were not for international pressure and the postwar maelstrom through which we are passing, neither camp would be able to create a great deal of excitement.

America is the sum total of all its people; democracy is the orchestra in which the smallest voice becomes a part of the symphony.

Under communism, opposition is trampled and there is no room for the individual. Under McCarthyism, the man who disagrees immediately becomes a dangerous spy for the opposite camp. America is none of these.

True Americanism would not stamp out its Joe McCarthys or its William Z. Fosters by force until they reach a point in their crusade where they violate the laws of the land. Then they would be asked to answer to the law at the bar of justice in the same manner as any other citizen.

Americans can answer their arguments and point out their absurdities. Action against them must be confined to the provisions of constitutional government.

If we keep this rigidly in mind, neither Mr. McCarthy nor Mr. Foster constitutes a real threat.

The Importance of the Republican Party in Indiana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 14, 1954

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an editorial entitled "Save the Party," published in the April 27, 1954, issue of the South Bend (Ind.) Tribune.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

SAVE THE PARTY

A statement issued from Washington by Indiana's senior United States Senator, Homer E. Capehart, and the State's junior United States Senator, William E. Jenner, should create a powerful incentive among sound thinking citizens of Indiana, especially Republicans, to keep the Republican Party in Indiana intact not only for the good of the State but also for the good of the Nation. There appears at the moment a desire and a determination to separate the party from the sound and progressive policy it has adopted under present direction and to turn the management over to those who hope to gain control and use that control for purposes that may not be for the best interests of Indiana and its citizenship as a whole. Evidences of this appear from numerous quarters in which activity is more than normal and which, it is felt by what probably is the majority of Indiana Republicans, is not for the best interests of the party or the citizenship.

As at present constituted there can be no unbiased, unselfish denial of the Capehart-Jenner statement that "the ability of the Republican Party to retain the concepts of an organized and responsible political party is of benefit to all the people of Indiana." Beyond question this is a statement with which Indiana Republicans can heartily agree unless it be those few who desire to run the party for their own selfish desires, and those few are becoming known as their motives appear. It is crystal clear that if the Republicans of Indiana desire to see their party kept on a solid, sound, cooperative basis they must appreciate what cooperation means and work earnestly to that end. It must not be inferred that cooperation does not exist but it must be realized that too many have lost the significance of the word and are likely to create conditions destructive to the Republican Party's usefulness in Indiana resulting in an intolerable situation which will mean defeat next November 2 and possibly for years to come.

To date Senator Capehart and Senator Jenner are giving acceptable service. We believe this will continue. There is no evidence that it will not. But if certain influences, now weak, gain strength, the party will be split and the results be disastrous. This would please those elements that are trying to bring such a condition into being but it would be a sad thing for the people and especially for the Republican Party. Save the party. Sound thinking is needed.

American Workers Want No Communist Leadership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 14, 1954

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, the question of legislation dealing with the problem of communism in labor organizations will soon be considered by the Congress. I therefore ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record a thought-provoking editorial, relating to this situation, which appeared in the May 1, 1954, issue of the Saturday Evening Post.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

AMERICAN WORKERS WANT NO COMMUNIST LEADERSHIP

The efforts of international communism to dominate labor unions, especially those in sensitive industries, may be slipping. At any rate, the strategically important Local 301 of the United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers of America has apparently decided to return to the CIO, from which it had previously been expelled on account of alleged domination by the Communists. This union, which has a contract with the General Electric Co., at Schenectady, N. Y., has a membership of about 20,000 and has been a unit in the Communist-dominated UE. But management officials doubt if there are as many as 50 Communists in their whole plant. An NLRB election will determine the status of the union. In the meantime, the company takes the position that it cannot deal with either union until the matter is settled.

Presumably the members of local 301 have been more interested in the ability of their leaders to get, or appear to get, better wages and working conditions for the employees than in the political affiliations of the leadership. But when Senator McCarthy's committee revealed the existence of fifth amendment Communists in the plant, and when the company took the position that it would discharge employees who hid behind the fifth amendment when questioned by congressional committees, the rank and file apparently asked itself, "How long has this been going on?" and took the plunge. At any rate, the boss of local 301, who up to that time had shown no revulsion to his left-wing associates at the national level, took the plunge for them.

How does a union composed of non-Communists and anti-Communists get to be Communist-dominated? Was there nothing which management, Government, or labor itself could have done to clean up this situation? For, after all, the fact that a Communist-dominated union contains few Communists does not mean that such a union isn't dangerous.

One thing which the Government could do, and has so far left largely undone, is to make it possible for rank-and-file union members to obtain definite, copper-riveted information upon the Communist connections of their leaders. As of now, the Taft-Hartley law requires leaders to file affidavits declaring that they are not Communists. However, this requirement has been consistently evaded by means of formal resignations from the party on Thursday, followed by an affidavit of nonmembership on Friday, and also by the election of stooges who are not actually Communists but carry out the policies of their Communist bosses. Until recently the National Labor Relations Board has not investigated the truth of these affidavits, but a more aggressive position is now being taken by the Board. Nevertheless, the Government should go further and clearly identify those who are ineligible to hold union offices and see to it that they do not hold them.

In a statement to a congressional committee, the General Electric Co. declared that it "suspects" that the Government has a list of persons employed in defense industries of whom there is reasonable ground to expect that they "will engage in or probably will conspire with others to engage in acts of espionage or sabotage" upon the outbreak of war. The law now provides that upon the outbreak of war such persons shall be rounded up. But, says the GE statement, "the defense contractors in whose plants these persons are employed * * * are not informed or advised as to whether such employees are subversive in this sense. * * * It is our opinion that it is unwise to knowingly permit suspected subversives to remain in the employ of the critical defense industries until the outbreak of war."

If there is any explanation of the Government's reluctance to identify people who might blow up our defense industries upon the outbreak of war, we do not know what it is.

Senator BUTLER, of Maryland, and Senator GOLDWATER, of Arizona, are working toward some law to block this important gap in our security arrangements. The twin objectives of effectively barring Communists from top jobs in labor unions and excluding subversives from defense plants represent the minimum which the country has a right to expect.

The Republican Party in Indiana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 14, 1954

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Prevent the Split," published in the May 8, 1954, issue of the South Bend (Ind.) Tribune.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PREVENT THE SPLIT

Too many Republicans do not realize and appreciate the danger confronting their party in Indiana, a danger that should deeply concern them at the moment. That danger is a split in Indiana's Republican Party which, should it happen, and it can happen within a few days, is likely to take from the party its influence in State affairs for years to come and might prove even more disastrous to the party and to the people irrespective of political adherence. This should not happen. Indiana needs the Republican Party, a fact that ought to become apparent to all who watch the desires of certain elements in the party, elements that appear to have selfish motives which, if the motives prompt hurried and vigorous action may result in party division which could cause tremendous harm.

Republican county chairmen, chosen by precinct committeemen Saturday afternoon, are scheduled to meet Tuesday to elect district chairmen. These chairmen will meet later in Indianapolis to elect a State chairman. The future of the Republican Party in Indiana depends largely on what is done in the district meetings and then entirely on what these district chairmen do in the State meeting in the election of a State chairman. It is most regrettable that the entering wedge has been started in the party split. All unselfish, loyal Republicans who desire their party to be and remain on a solid foundation surely must hope that the progress of the wedge will be stopped in the State meeting, permitting the party to operate on a solid basis not alone for Indiana but for its part in the national picture.

The aim of those trying to take control of the Republican Party in Indiana is to win everything possible for themselves. Gov. George N. Craig is credited with desiring to oust United States Senator HOMER E. CAPEHART and hoping to win for himself that high office. Could this be accomplished, United States Senator WILLIAM E. JENNER would be affected by the impact, and that impact could be a Democrat United States Senator. In other words, the proposed split of the Republican Party as a result of the efforts of Craig and his followers could give Indiana two Democrat Senators, after which would be the labor of trying to unite the party in the hope, perhaps vain, of returning it to power in Indiana.

Those persons who are endeavoring to cause this split will find it most difficult to replace Senator CAPEHART and Senator JENNER. This is a fact which those being drawn into the efforts of the Craig group should weigh with unusual care and commonsense. Indiana has two United States Senators who are officially operating on a sound, solid, progressive business basis. They are interested not only in Indiana but in the Nation. Comparatively few persons know of the sensible, productive efforts of Senator CAPEHART in his recent business trip to South America, the hard work that kept him busy, and the satisfactory results he accomplished. Senator JENNER is credited with doing even more in the search for subversive elements than Senator MCCARTHY, but little is heard about it.

The endeavors to oust these two efficient Senators to make a place for Governor Craig hardly can be endorsed by those Indiana Republicans who place the welfare of Indiana above personal desires. A split Republican Party could lead to almost anything not in keeping with what Indiana deserves and should have. All of this combines to mean something every Republican State committeeman and every other Republican should think about most sincerely. Do not allow the party to be split. Do not allow Indiana to be controlled by persons whose motives may not conform to the high place Indiana occupies.

Foundation Inquiry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1954

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, the appended editorial from the New York Times establishes an excellent set of standards according to which the Select Committee To Investigate Tax Free Foundations can do its work in the best interests of our country and its free institutions and the encouragement of private and local initiative in preserving and implementing them:

FOUNDATION INQUIRY NO. 2

The opening statement of Norman Dodd, director of research for the Special House Committee Investigating Tax-Exempt Foundations, can hardly fail to arouse grave apprehension as to the direction this inquiry will take. Its tone is, however, not surprising in view of the remarks made by Representative REECE, of Tennessee, last July when, in persuading the House to establish the committee, he suggested that the foundations were participants in a diabolical conspiracy whose aim is the furtherance of socialism in the United States.

It will be recalled that Mr. REECE, former chairman of the Republican National Committee, was dissatisfied with the results of a previous investigation into foundations conducted by the late Representative Cox, of Georgia, which, while starting out with some hostility toward the foundations, ended by recommending that there be more of them and that further tax advantages be granted to persons who contributed to them. The new group, of which Mr. REECE is the chairman, seems to be heading into a frontal assault on the whole spirit of free inquiry in this country as it has been promoted and advanced by the foundations for the last half century.

What is alarming about Mr. Dodd's opening statement is that it indicates a belief that intellectual advancement, if any, must conform to a rigid pattern of thought set in the 18th century. It suggests that the social sciences have been developing in a way contrary to what Mr. Dodd conceives to be in the public interest; that the pattern supposedly in process of formation is an unhealthy one; that there is something conspiratorial and subversive in all this; and that the foundations that to a great extent have subsidized these studies are responsible for the theories that have resulted.

Mr. Dodd is, of course, entitled to express any views about the social sciences and about foundations that he wants to hold; but a reading of his statement leaves the strong impression that he would guide this committee into an expedition into the realm of the mind, with the idea that a philosophy of politics, education, and research that some citizens believe to be right is therefore American and that a differing view is wrong and therefore un-American.

This is a very dangerous course for the committee to follow, because it constitutes a form of pressure on freedom of teaching, it suggests that advocacy of social change is in itself unpatriotic and it encourages a conformity of thought that is the antithesis of the dynamic, democratic society for which our country—and the great foundations—have always stood.

Fifty-six Percent of New Yorkers Believe United States Could Not Defend Itself Without Allies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 26, 1954

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following release from the League of Women Voters of the City of New York, I think, is most illuminating, and I am pleased to call it to the attention of our colleagues:

"The majority of New Yorkers favor international cooperation, both military and in trade," announced the League of Women Voters of the City of New York today, quoting from the results of a poll just concluded by the league in this city. Highlights of the poll show that 56 percent of this city's residents believe that if it came to war, the United States could not defend itself without military help from its allies. The poll also revealed that 73 percent of New York City residents feel that greater prosperity would result for all, if the United States and other countries of the free world increased their trade with each other.

Based on a scientific sample devised by the Elmo Roper Institute of Public Affairs, the study covered 2,100 people throughout the five boroughs. Columbia University and the Massachusetts Institute of Technology were responsible for the questionnaire and for the analysis of the answers to the poll. The aim of the survey was to determine how a cross section of New Yorkers feel about international cooperation, particularly with respect to world trade.

This was a pilot study, and it is believed that it will stimulate similar polls by other League of Women Voters' organizations in the different cities of the country.

The local survey revealed that support for military and trade cooperation with our allies was voiced by the majority of New Yorkers in both sexes, all age groups, and all educational and income levels.

A significant fact revealed by the survey concerned the United Nations. Only 7 percent of the respondents indicated that the United States should drop out of the United Nations.

"The fact that 73 percent—almost three-fourths of New York's citizens—are aware of the mutual benefits deriving from world trade is particularly encouraging," said Mrs. Ralph B. Morris, president of the League of Women Voters of the City of New York. "We believe that one of the most effective approaches to peace is through a greater exchange of goods among the nations of the free world. This finding from our survey is also encouraging because it indicates that most New Yorkers support the President's position on world trade. This position was defined by the President in his message of March 30 when he said:

"'If we fail in our trade policy, we may fail in all. Our domestic employment, our standard of living, our security, and the solidarity of the free world—all are involved.'"

With the Reciprocal Trade Agreement Act expiring on June 12, 1954, the two Senators from New York State and all the Congressmen from this city have indicated that they are very anxious to know the thinking of their constituents on the subject of international cooperation and world trade. The survey of League of Women Voters is thus of great importance to the lawmakers who represent New York City in the Nation's Capital.

On tariffs, 44 percent of the city's inhabitants feel that an important argument for a low tariff on goods coming into this country is that it will make other countries financially stronger so that they will not need our help. Thirty-one percent were for decreasing our tariffs, 19 percent for retaining them at present levels, 16 percent for increasing them.

The poll was conducted by volunteer workers, members of the League of Women Voters with some help from other women's groups. It was the first poll of its kind to be undertaken by any volunteer women's group.

The findings of this study are expected to be incorporated in a book on world trade to be published by the center for international studies of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Tribute to the Late Senator Dwight Griswold, of Nebraska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, May 14, 1954

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, on behalf of the distinguished senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], who is ill, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a fine editorial published in a recent issue of the Nebraska Farmer, over the signature of the publisher, former Gov. Sam McKelvie, with reference to our late colleague, Dwight Griswold.

This is one of the finest statements that has appeared, and the Senator from Nebraska believes it should be made a part of the permanent memorial which ultimately will be printed with reference to the death of the late Senator Griswold.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Life of the late United States Senator Dwight Griswold was exemplary of what constitutes good citizenship in this Republic of freedoms and human initiative. Biography of his 60 years on earth will be inspiring to others for years to come.

A native son of Nebraska and born of fine pioneer parents, Dwight was reared amid environs of industry and thrift during many hard years when only those who observed sound principles of economy and social services prospered and progressed. That was the foundation upon which he built.

He was studious in school and college, graduated with honors from the University of Nebraska, and at an early age got into business on his own in Gordon, Nebr.

As opportunties arose he took advantage of them, entered the publishing business, was interested in his father's bank, acquired some land and handled livestock, and kept abreast of basic principles as his native State grew. So it is readily seen that he was industrious, managed well, and succeeded financially though not rich.

Together with all that he was ambitious politically. When still in his twenties he sought membership in the State legislature and was elected readily. His record was commendable.

His next ambition was to be Governor of Nebraska. That was not so easy. Indicative of his determined disposition he made the race three times before being elected. His first term was so well received that he was elected by substantial majorities for two more terms.

His wife Erma made her contribution to his success in every branch of his endeavors. She had plenty of initiative on her own. That together with her neighborly and industrious disposition made their community of effort complete.

Two fine children, son and daughter, were born to them. Following the example of their parents, they were studious, industrious, and planned for the future. Quite naturally they got encouragement and a helping hand from dad and mom.

A bank was purchased in Gering, Nebr., the main purpose of which was to aid in a promising business future for Dwight, Jr. Then lo, the unhappiest moment of the parents' lives occurred. The son was stricken with polio and passed away on short notice. The daughter, Mrs. John A. Gayer, and her husband are now in Switzerland.

Dwight, Sr., did his turn in military services. He was sergeant on the Mexican border, and served as a first lieutenant and captain of field artillery in World War I. In later years he was delegated by President Truman to be Director of American Aid Mission to Greece. That was when Greece was in hard straits on account of Communist threats to take Greece over. Dwight's knowledge of government, together with diplomatic ability, enabled him to overcome that seriously threatening situation. He took with him several Nebraskans, including former Gov. Roy Cochran.

After that Dwight Griswold returned to Nebraska, started in business again, and retired from politics. Ere long another popular call came for his services. On comparatively short notice United States Senator Kenneth S. Wherry died from heart trouble. Urge was for Griswold's candidacy when election came on that fall. He was elected readily, and would have come up for reelection this fall, but for having got a final call from heaven.

The Shipbuilding Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, May 14, 1954

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, the surest way to ascertain if our laws and Government agency directives are being administered properly and in the public interest is to get the reactions of that segment of the citizenry most immediately affected by such administration.

On this basis, I believe the statement I have in my hand, from the Marine Exchange, Inc., of San Francisco, Calif., is worthy of attention on the part of Members of Congress and the Government departments concerned.

It was prepared for submission to the Senate Water Transportation Subcommittee, and will have the earnest consideration of our group.

The officers of the Marine Exchange, Inc., are: Louis Ets-Hokin, president; Chalmers G. Graham, first vice president; Dudley W. Frost, second vice president; James West, third vice president; C. De B. Haseltine, treasurer; M. A. Cremer, secretary manager.

I ask unanimous consent that the statement be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

1. INVITING FOREIGN YARDS TO BID ON PIPELINE DREDGES

On November 5, 1953, the Philadelphia district engineer, Corps of Engineers, United States Army, issued an advance notice to bidders for the construction and delivery of three pipeline dredges for the Governments of Cambodia and Vietnam Indochina. (Invitation No. ENG 36–109–54–123.)

The notice listed 20 nations, including the United States, whose nationals are eligible to submit bids.

Previously bids were invited by the Corps of Engineers for a pipeline dredge for delivery to the Philippine Government. Upon that occasion the low bid, which came from a firm in Holland, was found to be qualified—and in accord with long-established bidding procedure, should have been declared unacceptable and the contract awarded to the next highest bidder, namely, the Pacific Coast Engineering Co. of Alameda, Calif. Instead, the Corps of Engineers threw out all bids received and called for new ones.

We have protested in both instances the inviting of bids from other countries when the shipbuilding business of the United States is in a depressed condition. It has been frequently reported in the press that the shipbuilding industries of other countries are more active than that of the United States.

Our protests to the Corps of Engineers, Foreign Operations Administration, and the Department of Defense all result in these agencies stating that they are powerless in the face of congressional directives intended to assist the economic recovery of other countries and to conduct procurement so as to minimize the prices paid and to reduce the need of foreign countries for United States assistance.

We submit that it has never been American policy nor the intent of Congress to aid the shipbuilding industries of other countries by weakening this same arm of our national and mutual defense. We conclude that the agencies of Government responsible for the procedure outlined above are acting in violation of established national and mutual defense policies carried out at terrific expense by American taxpayers.

We submit that the procedures outlined above are in violation of the Buy American Act. Department of Defense Directive No. 4105.20, May 27, 1952, which is intended to define the application of the act, in reality leaves it to the discretion of the Department of Defense whether this law passed by Congress shall be complied with or not.

We submit that since American taxpayers must add roughly 25 percent of their costs to make provision for Federal taxes, that this share of American taxes must always be allowed for when comparing American with foreign bids. Most of our Federal taxes, it must always be remembered, are for national defense purposes.

We submit that where the use of counterpart funds is concerned, that it was never intended by Congress that they be used under any circumstances to deprive an industry whose importance is vital to national defense, of business that it needs to maintain itself.

2. INVITING FOREIGN BIDS ON PROPELLERS

Again with reference to the Buy American Act, attention is called to an invitation by the Navy Purchasing Office, invitation No. 622-S, December 18, 1952, extended to Canadian manufacturers for propellers.

The low bid of a Canadian company was not accepted only because of strong objections of the American Manganese Bronze Co.

The propeller-manufacturing industry of the United States is suffering from a lack of business.

We submit that it should not be necessary for an American manufacturer to be put to the expense, time, and effort to assure that a Government agency should do its own duty; namely, to abide by the will of the people as expressed by Congress in the form of a law.

3. BUILDING SHIPS ABROAD AND OPERATING SHIPS UNDER FOREIGN FLAGS

It is not necessary to burden you with details to support what are well known facts—that American citizens have and are having vessels built for them in foreign yards and are operating vessels under foreign flags.

The reasons for these actions are similarly well known—lower shipbuilding costs abroad and lower wages paid seamen sailing under foreign flags.

We know the American citizens so engaged to be truly patriotic. We know that they would much prefer to build vessels in American yards and to operate vessels under the American flag.

We are not prepared to present a solution to this problem, but—

We submit that since the American shipbuilding and operating industry is a most vital part of national and mutual defense, that the administration and Congress should devise a means to make it possible for these American citizens to build and operate vessels under the flag of their country.

4. BUILDING SHIPS FOR NATIONALS OF OTHER COUNTRIES

Objection is voiced to the severe handicap imposed on American shipbuilders by not permitting them to furnish full title for vessels constructed for nationals of other countries.

Under section 37 of the American Merchant Marine Act of 1916, an American shipbuilder must obtain permission from the Maritime Administration to enter into a contract to construct a ship for an alien during a period of national emergency. No criterion was established by law as a basis for such approval and no conditions were required. However, the Maritime Administration has been willing to grant such approval only on the basis that the owner agrees that his ships be subject to requisitioning by the United States, that there will be no change of flag or ownership of the vessel without prior maritime approval, and that he will abide by all of the trade restrictions which apply to American vessels. He must post an expensive bond to assure performance and he risks the forfeiture of his vessel without compensation for even a technical violation of his agreement.

Aliens not desirous of submitting to these restrictions are placing contracts for building vessels in Japan and Europe. When they do so, our shipyards have not only lost the business; our Government has, furthermore, not gained anything, since the vessels built abroad are subject to no control whatever.

We submit that section 37 of the 1916 act be modified forthwith so that American shipyards, facing a standstill, can give clear title to vessels constructed for nationals of other countries.

5. CENTRAL DESIGN AND PROCUREMENT

Objection is hereby expressed to the method of central procurement presently carried on by the Navy and with particular reference to the Ships Parts Control Center at Mechanicsburg, Pa.

Established originally to primarily assume utilization by the Navy of surplus ships parts then located in various parts of the country and secondarily to have on hand especially designed parts, the center has been expanded for the procurement of practically all parts necessary for the maintenance and operation of naval vessels.

The post-World War II expansion of the activities of the center has been a serious deterrent to the commercial and financial stability of business firms engaged in the business of furnishing and servicing equipment and material necessary for the maintenance, repair, and operation of vessels.

It should be emphasized here that just as no vessel is of any value without a trained crew, neither is its continued operation possible without shore bases where it can readily secure the help and material needed to maintain, repair, and supply it.

On the west coast the privately owned and operated steamship companies require a great deal of material, supplies, and services to enable them to secure quick turnaround of their vessels while in port. Consequently over a long period of years there has been developed by trial and error a sound practice, principally by seafaring men who have come ashore. With the aid of substantial capital investment, large quantities of equipment and material are carried on hand for immediate delivery and attending staffs of skilled engineers, mechanics, and artisans to service it are maintained.

The Navy enters into competition with these private sources of supply and service except when an emergency arises. By means of the center at Mechanicsburg the Navy attempts to supply vessel requirements at long range to its vessels based on the Pacific coast. Instead of providing western industry with business badly needed to maintain its existence the Navy only buys from local stocks in case of urgent need and then in most cases only those small quantities the supplier has on his shelf. The Navy gives western industry no opportunity of looking forward to continued business for vessels based here. If the supplier invests his capital in stock in anticipation of future Navy orders he has frequently found himself subsequently completely ignored and his investment a total loss.

We submit that the cost advantage claimed by the Navy for the purchase of many ships' parts by the Ships Parts Control Center at Mechanicsburg, Pa., is based on an entirely erroneous premise. The higher cost here in San Francisco of a locally procured item as against one shipped out from Mechanicsburg does not take into consideration the freight from Mechanicsburg. The Ships Parts Control Center does not add the cost of shipment to the parts it supplies. This cost is charged to another Federal account. The same procedure applies also to shipments direct from factory ordered by Mechanicsburg. In a recent case when the Military Sea Transportation Service ordered two small items from Mechanicsburg, they were sent to San Francisco under Government frank. This particular instance is evidence of the ridiculous extent to which the avoidance of buying locally is being carried on. The evidence comes from a local supplier who did not have on his shelf two items required. Two orders were thereupon issued by the local commander of MSTS. The Ships Parts Control Center sent the items out direct from a factory in New Jersey. They were invoiced respectively at $2.66 and $3.96. In both cases, the factory's local representative, who was thus circumvented, could have secured and delivered the parts in one-half the time it took MSTS to get them in this roundabout procedure. We learned that this delayed method of procurement is demoralizing not only to our members but also to those responsble for ordering ships' parts. Rather than experience the delay in delivery of parts from Mechanicsburg, the parts are not ordered and vessels sail without them.

We submit that Navy central procurement and particularly the Ships Parts Control Center at Mechanicsburg, Pa., are operated in a manner that is not only damaging but catastrophic for west coast marine supply and attending service industries. We cannot too loudly or vehemently protest that this industry, vitally necessary to the maintenance not only of the Navy but the American merchant marine has every right to receive all of the supply business of the Navy just as it does from private industry and that immediate steps should be taken by the administration and Congress to protect the industry by compelling the Navy to completely withdraw from competition with it. We find it difficult to find words strong enough and vehement enough and a voice loud enough to cry out for the life of our western marine supply industry. The Navy should be a party to fortifying it, not killing it.

6. PLANS OF MSTS FOR CENTRALIZED PROCUREMENT

The bitter gall of the situation described in the previous chapter is made infinitely more astringent by the announcement of plans by the Military Sea Transportation Service that it too will assist in ringing the death knell of the western marine supply industry by establishing its own ships parts control center similar to that operated by the Navy at Mechanicsburg, Pa.

Indication of MSTS plans appears in the Bureau of Ships Journal printed by the Government Printing Office, issue of January 1954, page 47. In an article entitled "MSTS Directorship Presents Challenge" there appears this statement:

"A good example (of the challenge of service to officers in MSTS) lies in the controversial issue of Government-furnished material versus contract-furnished material. Expanding the scope of Government-furnished material is a project in which some progress has been made but one in which much remains to be done."

7. CENTRAL DESIGN AND PROCUREMENT IN SHIPBUILDING

It has been the Navy's practice in placing orders for a large number of small craft, such as minesweepers, to centralize purchasing of material needed for their construction with a central design and procurement agent. For instance, a naval architect or shipyard in New York City may be designated to draw the plans for a group of vessels and arrange for the purchase of the machinery, equipment, etc., needed to build them. The contracts for the construction of the vessels may be placed with a number of yards throughout the country. All of these yards then look to the procurement agent in New York to supply plans and material.

By thus placing the procurement of material in the hands of one buyer in New York, it is intended that the Navy will secure the advantage of lower prices to accrue from buying in large quantities.

The savings that should follow from procurement in this manner are unfortunately dissipated by the delays encountered by the yards in securing material and by changes in the plans. When such changes in plans are made, the result is frequently that material already purchased is not required and is disposed of as surplus. It is not unusual for such surplus material to be sold at a loss.

To our knowledge, no contracts have been placed with naval architects or shipyards on the Pacific Coast to act as design or central procurement agents. The result has been lack of employment of western naval architects as well as gross inefficiency in delivery of material at western yards.

We submit that greater efficiency at no increase in costs over recent and present expenditures would follow from the elimination of the central design and procurement agents in the preparation of detailed working drawings. In lieu thereof, we propose that the central design agent prepare only the contract plans and specifications and that each shipyard have the responsibility of preparing detailed working drawings.

We submit that by following this procedure the shipyards would by employing local naval architects to prepare detailed working drawings to fit the facilities of the yards, thereby secure greater efficiency and economy.

We submit that centralized procurement has in many instances resulted in greater total cost to the Government than where material, equipment, etc., is procured independently by the shipyards and that it should be discontinued.

Respectfully submitted.

M. J. Gigy,
Chairman, Vendors and Shipyards Committee, Marine Exchange, Inc.
San Francisco, Calif.

Political Conditions in Evansville and Vanderburgh Counties, Ind.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER

OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, May 14, 1954

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an editorial entitled "Rule and Ruin," published in the May 9, 1954, issue of the Evansville Press.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Rule and Ruin

Yesterday may well have seen the dawn of a new Democratic era in Evansville and Vanderburgh County.

The rule-and-ruin Roberts-Taylor-Bartlett GOP regular organization succeeded again in ramming J. Ervin Taylor down the throats of Republican voters of this county by reelecting him as the head of the Vanderburgh Republican Party.

They did this despite the fact that the voters of their party overwhelmingly defeated the bulk of the Roberts-Taylor-Bartlett ticket at the polls Tuesday and despite the fact that all major GOP candidates nominated Tuesday said that under no condition would they accept Mr. Taylor as party leader in the fall campaign.

These major candidates who said they didn't want any part of Mr. Taylor included the only winners on the regular slate: Superior Judge John D. Rawlings, State Representative Walter Acker, County Commissioner Roy Durre, and William E. Buente, nominated for county recorder.

Why are all these Republican nominees so intent on having nothing to do with Mr. Taylor this fall?

It's because they know he would be a Gibraltar around their necks—and they want to win. If a majority of Republican voters don't want his brand of leadership (as shown by Tuesday's results), how can independents and Democrats be enticed to support a team captained by him?

There are a number of good nominees on the Republican ticket that deserve election this fall on the basis of their records and personal qualifications.

But whether they can divorce themselves far enough from Mr. Taylor and his machine brand of politics to have a chance for election remains to be seen. That will be one of their main tasks; to show clearly to the voters that they are in no way Taylor henchmen.

Why, in the face of the overwhelming evidence of a desire for a change in the leadership, were Mayor Roberts and Mr. Taylor so intent on hanging onto the GOP county chairmanship?

The answer is simple. They didn't want to lose any of the pap being handed out by Republican Gov. George Craig, even though their stand threatened disaster to the entire Republican ticket in Vanderburgh County this fall.

And right here is a good place to say that though this newspaper has made mistakes in the past and undoubtedly will make more in the future, recommending George Craig to the voters was not one of them. We did not support Mr. Craig and each passing day makes us more sure we had him analyzed correctly.

Mr. Craig is using every patronage plum at his disposal in his battle for power with GOP Senators Homer Capehart and Bill Jenner and he wants a county chairman in Vanderburgh County who will dance to his tune. The $30,000-plus a year county auto license bureau managership, which Mr. Taylor holds at Governor Craig's pleasure, is one of the means by which Governor Craig remains sure of Mr. Taylor's ardent support.

This pap, as we said above, seems to be more important to Messrs. Roberts and Taylor than the welfare of the Republican Party in Vanderburgh County.

Said one of Evansville's leading businessmen the other day: "It's almost impossible to live in Evansville very long and remain a good Republican."

Yesterday's performance is only an added example showing the correctness of this statement.

While the Republican organization under Mr. Taylor's leadership was denying the sacred democratic right of secret ballot in the county chairmanship election, the Democrats—without argument—went ahead and elected by secret vote.

The Democratic precinct committeemen reelected by more than 4-to-1 their present county chairman, R. Vance Hartke.

We think the Democrats chose wisely.

Certainly, the Democratic nominees go forth to battle this fall with a party leadership they won't be forced to disown. That's a great advantage.

The End of Colonialism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, May 14, 1954

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the Record an editorial entitled "The End of Colonialism," originally published in the Texarkana Gazette.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The End of Colonialism

A few days ago President Ramon Magsaysay of the Philippines stated that the Philippines would support a Pacific alliance if the Western Powers promised to grant independence to Asian territories under their rule.

It seems to us that this pinpoints one of the troubles in Indochina and something which is of vital importance in southeast Asia, Africa, and other sections of the free world. It appears to us that the Philippines is certainly the nation which should introduce a resolution in the United Nations recognizing the fact that the days of colonialism are over and urging that full independence should be granted to all colonies. Such action by the Philippines, we believe would add greatly to the prestige of that country and they are certainly in a much better position than any other country in the world to speak with authority from experience on this subject. They were promised eventual independence almost from the time we occupied that country some 55 years ago and, except during the period of Japanese occupation, every effort was made through education and the training of Filipinos for governmental service and the full independence which was granted them in 1946. Certainly, the United States could not oppose such a resolution but because of our relationships with countries still possessing colonies, England, France, Belgium, Portugal, and others, the United States is not the one to initiate such a resolution.

National sentiment has become a strong force in practically all colonies but it must be recognized that few of these colonies have the education, the training, and experience to be ready now for self-government. During the interim, however, which is well proven by the experience of the Filipinos, there should be some arrangement by the United Nations to keep closely in touch with the colonies to see that training for self-government is properly carried on and expedited.

It seems clear that Great Britain recognizes that colonialism must come to an end from their recent action on some of the Southeast Asia colonies and in British Honduras and the Gold Coast of Africa. France evidently also realizes the situation as evidenced by their negotiations with their colonies in Indochina. In fact, it appears that quite possibly there would be no organized opposition to the adoption of such a resolution by the United Nations.

Very likely, from his long experience in government, in international relations, and as head of the United Nations, Gen. Carlos P. Romulo might well be the best man to introduce this resolution in the United Nations.

It is to be hoped that the Philippine Government will see the desirability of such action on their part and will take advantage of the opportunity which is bound to be to their advantage in recognition and standing among the nations of the free world.

The Contributions of James E. Scripps and Mr. and Mrs. Edgar B. Whitcomb to the Cultural Life of Detroit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 10, 1954

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, my native city of Detroit is known throughout the world by the title it earned in World War II as the Hub of the Arsenal of Democracy. It is a city whose very streets are extensions of factory assembly lines because over them travel the heavy trucks bearing automobile subassemblies of every description. The towering smokestacks, bustling factories, and teeming masses of workers of Detroit give it the appearance of an industrial colossus solely intent on setting new production records.

The nerve cells of this industrial giant, however, are the people of Detroit, who, like men and women everywhere, seek to establish for themselves the full and well-rounded life which human nature demands.

A reflection of the cultural interests of Detroit's citizens is the famous Detroit Institute of Arts, whose early benefactor and constant patron was James E. Scripps. Mr. Scripps established the Detroit News in 1873 and he was the publisher of that paper from 1873 to 1906. His gifts were inspired by a vision of the future cultural life of Detroit, to the assurance of which he devoted a great deal of his time, interest, and fortune.

Of his donations, an article in the New York Times of Sunday, May 2, 1954, had this to say:

> Mr. Scripps must have had both a perceptive eye and a catholic, independent taste. Among the paintings which he gave to the Detroit Institute in 1889 are, for instance, an altarpiece by the 14th century painter in the Marches, Alegretto Nuzi, and a splendid head by the Spanish Baroque painter, Ribera. The remainder of his collection, which went to the museum in 1909 and continued many Dutch little master canvases, was until much later the most important bequest of works of art the institution had received.

Mr. Scripps devotion to the institute was carried on after his death by his daughter and son-in-law, Anna Virginia and Edgar B. Whitcomb. Mr. Whitcomb was a director of the Detroit News. In 1928 he became a trustee of the Founders Society and in 1931 a member of the Arts Commission, and he served as president from 1943 until his death. In 1953, within 6 months of each other, Mr. and Mrs. Whitcomb died.

From 1926 on the Whitcombs donated over 70 art works to the institute and their record of benefaction was climaxed in 1953 with the bequest of 15 master paintings and two sculptures, all of which are now being specially exhibited at the museum. In the 1920's the Whitcombs established a traveler scholarship for Detroit artists and throughout his connection with the institute, Mr. Whitcomb contributed generously of his own funds to provide for the continued progress of this cultural center.

We Detroiters are proud of many things about our city. We are proud, of course, of the production miracles that are worked daily in our huge factories. We are no less proud of our fine cultural institutions and traditions and of some of our most eminent citizens whose enlightened philanthropy has contributed so much to the fullness and happiness of our lives.

I am pleased and honored to offer this simple salute to the memories of Mr. Scripps and Mr. and Mrs. Whitcomb.

Time To Establish a Federal Agency for Handicapped

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1954

Mr. HAGEN of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I am informed that the House Committee on Education and Labor, of which our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Hon. SAMUEL K. MCCONNELL, JR., is chairman, will now consider and discuss a bill to cover the varied and grave problems of our 38 million handicapped citizens.

I hope that committee will report out, favorably, H. R. 2096, to establish a Federal Agency for the Handicapped, which I had the honor of introducing. This bill makes a businesslike approach to what is, in fact, one of the gravest problems before our Nation today.

Unquestionably, when we reflect that, now, some 35 Federal agencies each have a piece of the handicapped program, but, there is no coordination of their efforts, such condition, unquestionably leads to duplication, waste, and unnecessary expense, on one hand, and does not contemplate the necessity or range of an overall program.

H. R. 2096 provides, among other things, means to grapple with important phases of the handicapped program that are not now even dealt with in the present, inadequate program. The bill establishes—

First. An independent agency, based for housekeeping purposes, and also, because of the proximity of the Employment Service, without which the whole handicapped program would be virtually useless from an economic standpoint, in the Department of Labor.

Second. An Advisory Council on Affairs of the Handicapped, consisting of 3 representatives of industry; 3 of labor; 3 who are, themselves, physically handicapped; 3 to represent farmers and stockraisers, and 3 from those experienced in public affairs.

Third. An Interagency Committee on Rehabilitation and Employment of Handicapped, in which all Federal agencies having a part of the program, would be represented, with the objective, through proper coordination, of developing efficient, economical, and at the same time adequate services to handicapped.

Fourth. An Office of Services to Blind, to bring under one head the present far-flung activities of blind in the Federal Service.

Fifth. Cooperative enterprises for handicapped.

Sixth. Rehabilitation centers at strategic points throughout the Nation.

Seventh. Special programs for severely handicapped—those from 60 percent to 100 percent disabled.

Eighth. Sixty dollars a month grant to those who are totally disabled and/or are termed by Federal or States' rehabilitation agencies to be unfeasible for rehabilitation.

Ninth. Federal services to handicapped revolving loan fund, from which fund States may borrow money at such times as their own funds may be exhausted, between sessions of their legislatures, so that fundamental, needed services to handicapped, by these agencies, will not suffer failure or prolonged interruption, as is now too frequently the case.

Tenth. A Division of Handicapped in the United States Civil Service Commission, to facilitate recruitment, examination, and appointment of otherwise qualified but handicapped applicants.

Eleventh. Promotes public-safety programs designed to eliminate and prevent conditions which tend to promote injuries and disease in public buildings, institutions, parks, and so forth.

Twelfth. Provides for reports from all Federal agencies which may now receive, or may in future receive, as a part of their functions, reports relating to handicapped persons.

Thirteenth. Provides variable grants, based upon the successful experience of more than 30 years of Federal-State relationships, and operation in this field, to States for vocational rehabilitation.

Fourteenth. Provides grants to handicapped who require special home training, being bed-bound, in wheelchairs, and so forth.

Fifteenth. A second injury act, which is a logical and necessary part of any worthwhile program for handicapped.

Mr. Speaker, this is a clear-cut plan which embraces all phases of the needs and problems of handicapped, and, in good faith to our handicapped people, we should stand squarely behind it, as a matter of sound public policy, since it has been proven that, for every dollar spent by Government in the handicapped field $10 has been returned in productive services, taxes, and so forth.

I believe most Members join with me in hoping that the Committee on Education and Labor will approve the Federal Agency for Handicapped bill and soon bring it out for immediate action.

Economic

EX

HO

IN THE S

Mr. FE
unanimou
the Appe
an addre
Tax Exec
City. Th
nomic Po
There b
was order
as follows

ECONOMIC

(Address o
gan, bef
Waldorf
May 13, 1

Tonight,
the major
adopted, al
what we h
they cost u
Two gen
heavy price
edy in two
that our pe
the peace
that mode
clear to us
turn from
other war.
Everyone
the Soviet U
with the fr
aggression.
treachery, c
World from
seas and h
around 800

NATU

The Com
pronged ass
sists of (1)
threat; (2)
versive appa
(3) a diplon
hearten the
lated strate
wherever it
free world a

AMERICAN LE

We could
courses in
but we fina
nomic and m
of the free
against Com
of mutual
alliances wi
the United
take a bold
of aggressio
those who a
side of freed
strong natio
massive reta
bases when
arises. If na
will not hest

Appendix

Economic Policies in an Uncertain World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER FERGUSON
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 17, 1954

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of an address delivered by me before the Tax Executives Institute in New York City. The title of the address is "Economic Policies in an Uncertain World."

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ECONOMIC POLICIES IN AN UNCERTAIN WORLD

(Address of Hon. HOMER FERGUSON, of Michigan, before the Tax Executives Institute, Waldorf Astoria Hotel, New York City, May 13, 1954)

Tonight, I want to talk about some of the major policies our Government has adopted, abroad and at home, in terms of what we hope to get from them and what they cost us.

Two generations of our people paid a heavy price in lives, money, pain, and tragedy in two world wars to learn the lesson that our peace and security is bound up with the peace of the world. After each lesson that modern war does not pay seemed so clear to us that we assumed nations would turn from aggression rather than risk another war.

Everyone is now sadly familiar with how the Soviet Union turned her wartime alliance with the free nations into a springboard for aggression. Before we could believe this treachery, communism had overrun the Old World from the Elbe in Europe to the China seas and had dropped the Iron Curtain around 800 million people.

NATURE OF THE RUSSIAN THREAT

The Communists then began a four-pronged assault on the free world. It consists of (1) a potential and powerful military threat; (2) a worldwide propaganda and subversive apparatus to weaken us from within; (3) a diplomacy designed to divide and dishearten the free nations; and (4) a calculated strategy of seizing the opportunity wherever it arises to chip away bits of the free world as in Korea and Indochina.

AMERICAN LEADERSHIP IN FREE WORLD DEFENSE

We could have followed any number of courses in meeting the Communist threat, but we finally settled upon four: (1) Economic and military aid to strengthen nations of the free world and to build defenses against Communist aggression; (2) a series of mutual security pacts creating regional alliances within the general framework of the United Nations; (3) a determination to take a bold stand and provide aid to victims of aggression as in Korea, Greece, and to those who are willing to be counted on the side of freedom; and (4) the building of a strong national defense capable of quick and massive retaliation from home and overseas bases whenever the supreme emergency arises. If national survival is threatened, we will not hesitate to use all weapons.

We adopted this rounded set of policies because we know that no single nation, including one as powerful as our own, can deal adequately with the Machiavellian techniques of communism, or with modern arms in the hands of a major aggressor.

The alternative is to develop as best we can an effective combination of local strength, regional security alliances, and collective action generally through the United Nations. Six of our mutual security pacts have been negotiated since 1947 and are now in force. We are now working on others, including one in southeast Asia.

Our object is to confront a potential aggressor with a collective defense in depth, backed by a retaliatory power so certain and so formidable that his fear of disaster to himself will overweigh his hopes of gain. Such a condition finally came about in Korea in 1953 and had much to do with stopping the war there. We are also engaged in firm determination to expose to the gaze of the entire world all of the devious treachery which the Communists use as a matter of course.

At the same time that we strengthen our European friends and aid the emerging and undeveloped nations of Asia, we seek to raise the economic standards of all by working to reduce tariff barriers, to increase our trade with the world by simplified customs procedures and gradual reduction of rates, to ease currency conversion, and to improve the climate for private American investment abroad, and to provide technical assistance.

As we see it, we are now inescapably intermeshed with the world. Through our mutual defense commitments, our security stands or falls with the security and economic health of the rest of the free world.

Over 4 million American workers depend on international trade for their employment. Some 40 million acres, or 10 percent of our agriculture must have export markets. Rich as our country is in resources, we are dependent on other areas of the world for a wide variety of important raw materials. And we still have large interests and investments overseas. All these things, as a brief glance at our budget shows, have a substantial bearing on the taxes we pay.

Surely, we can and must find some way to increase our overseas trade by gradual tariff reductions while at the same time protecting our home industries. With several reports before them, congressional committees are studying this problem and we hope they will come up with some constructive solution.

We firmly believe time favors these policies. There is good reason to believe that the road ahead for Communist aggressors will be well barricaded and defended. It is then, that the spiritual, material, and cultural values of freedom will become so clear in contrast with Communist tyranny that even the men in the Kremlin will be compelled to shorten their operations and reappraise their aims.

Genuine peace may then be possible, and all nations of the world may then resume the long upward struggle of civilization toward a better life in freedom.

DOMESTIC POLICIES

Turning to our domestic policies we have the broad aim of maintaining a strong, healthy, and stable economy. We want it to be self-reliant—less dependent on Government subsidies, grants, and spending. We want it to be free from major depressions and subject to the minimum Government interference and controls. We want it to be capable of maintaining the cost of security over the steady, long pull. We want it to yield the maximum measure of freedom and well-being for all our people.

We want a strong agriculture, self-sustaining in the market place, with supports serving chiefly as a balance wheel to bring forth production when needed, to discourage surpluses which merely eat taxes and glut markets, and to maintain an equitable balance in prices between what the farmer sells and what he buys.

We want a steadily expanding industry, capable of providing an increasing number of jobs at good pay, and free from Government controls or Government competition.

These, I submit, are reasonable aims of national policy. No political party can remain in office in these modern times unless it works with reasonable success to provide freedom to accomplish these aims.

A wise national administration will select policies to accomplish these aims which produce the least tax drag on our enterprises, leave more income in the hands of our people, eliminate inequities, and work generally toward a lower tax take in proportion to the whole national production and income.

DIFFICULTIES WE FACE

Our efforts to reach these desirable goals have not been unopposed or without difficulties. Some tremendous problems stand in the way.

We have faced an appalling collection of economic difficulties. Federal Government activities have increased out of all proportion to necessity. There have been over 2,500,000 employees in 2,055 departments, bureaus, and agencies, and spending up to $71 billion annually. Government was up to its neck in the control of industry, agriculture, labor; and, its competition with private enterprise was rapidly spreading.

Ever-increasing stocks of farm surpluses confronted us with the idiotic choice of either destroying the produce of our farmers' hard labor, or of giving their products away to foreign nations, while our own people paid high food prices and our taxpayers footed the bill.

Government spending pushed the national debt close to the legal debt limit of $275 billion. Intermittently we have suffered from inflation and deflation. The value of the dollar fell to 52 cents. It seemed that only a war could keep our economic machine running and our people fully employed.

Budgetwise, there have been huge deficits. Taxwise, the Federal Government was taking 76 percent of all taxes collected in the Nation; and, the tax take reached 25 percent of the national income in 1953. In addition, we faced some $81 billion of bills coming due in these present years.

That was the state of domestic economy with which we had to deal. It was an economic crazy quilt, cross-stitched with the difficult problem of making the transition from a war to peacetime economy. Rarely in history have these transitions been made without severe economic dislocations or depressions.

THE ACCOMPLISHMENTS ACHIEVED

Yet, in a little over 2 years, we are making this transition from war to peacetime economy and putting the Nation back on a sound foundation. We are doing it without disrupting the economic mechine and without seriously reducing the high level of employment and national income. Sixty million people are working today. The slump in our employment has tapered off and we are steadily reducing the small number who became temporarily unemployed as we leveled off our defense production.

More than $12 billion has been cut from the spending program of the Federal Government. The Federal Government establishment is being cut down to a reasonable size. Budget deficits are being lowered and we can look forward with confidence to a balance which will eliminate the many economic difficulties caused by spending more than we take in. The Federal debt is steadily being shifted from its dangerous short-term basis to safer long-term obligations.

We have kept the price level remarkably stable now for 2 years. This has arrested the decline in the value of the dollar and provides business, industry, and farmers with a more stable climate in which to make their plans.

Burdensome wage, price, and rent controls have been eliminated. We are actively encouraging local initiative, private enterprise, and State and local bodies to do the work.

We believe that the closer these enterprises are to the people who are directly affected by them, the cheaper and more efficient they will be. And a most important byproduct is the preservation of the people's freedoms.

Where it can be shown that a needed project is beyond the capacity of the people to do for themselves privately, or by State and local organizations, the Federal Government stands ready to cooperate without centering absolute control in Washington.

All things considered, America today is on a sounder economic foundation than it has been in the past. There is less Government spending; more and better national defense per dollar; a more stable economy; and, less Federal taxes for all.

TAX REDUCTIONS

As tax specialists, controllers, and financial executives, you have a professional interest in the Government's tax program. Everyone listening to this program has an interest in taxes because taxes today are no longer paid by the rich, but by everyone who works for a living.

Tax reductions effective this year will total $7.4 billion. This is the largest tax cut ever made in any year in the history of our country. This recordbreaking tax cut of $7.4 billion was made possible only because spending has been cut and economy a constant by-word.

About two-thirds, or nearly $5 billion, of this tax cut directly benefits individuals. The remaining one-third goes to increase production, to create more and better jobs, for cheaper and better goods, and, a higher standard of living.

PRINCIPLES OF THE REPUBLICAN TAX PROGRAM

Our present tax program makes a full-scale attack on high taxes. We are using the trickle-down theory, the trickle-up theory, and the trickle-around theory.

Let me illustrate. In January, we carried through the individual income tax reductions which will leave some $3 billion more purchasing power in the hands of consumers. This is called the trickle-up theory.

Then we allowed the excess-profits tax to expire. Every competent economist knows that excess-profits taxes are thoroughly unsound. By removing such taxes, we leave nearly $2 billion in the hands of producers with which to expand industry thus creating more jobs. Those who charge that this is a favor to business do not know what it takes to make and meet a payroll. They do not know that it takes an investment of $6,000 to $10,000 to provide 1 job in industry. That is the reason why small and large industry need these earnings. The worker and the consumer are indirectly but most certainly benefited. That is the trickle-down theory.

In March, we enacted the excise-tax reductions amounting to another $1 billion. This will bring about a wide reduction in prices, increase sales, and make the consumer's dollar go farther. Here, we have the trickle-up-and-down theory.

Now, Congress has before it the tax revision bill to straighten out the hodgepodge of injustices and inequities in our tax laws. This is not primarily a tax-reduction measure, but it will result in further tax cuts of $1.4 billion. These cuts will benefit all kinds of taxpayers—parents and dependents, retired pensioners, widows and widowers, people who have medical bills to pay, farmers for soil conservation, investors who are now taxed twice on the same dividends, and all enterprises who need more liberal depreciation allowances to improve their operations. Many other benefits are included in the tax revision bill. These tax cuts can best be described as the trickle-around theory.

Taken together, all these tax cuts total $7.4 billion. Every single taxpayer in the Nation will receive some direct benefit and have less tax dollars to pay. Millions of people will be relieved of tax injustices of one kind or another from which they have been suffering for years. The whole economy will benefit from the provisions stimulating enterprise, increasing payrolls, and creating more and better jobs.

Why did we decide upon a full-scale attack on all taxes instead of concentrating tax cuts on 1 or 2 big items? For example, we might have increased exemptions for individual income-tax payers alone. That might have been the politically popular thing to do.

Well, if we increased the exemption by only $200, each individual taxpayer would have benefited by only a few dollars a month, but the Government would lose $4½ billion in revenues, and 7½ million taxpayers would go off the tax rolls. How do you think remaining taxpayers would feel when they would be compelled to pay their own shares and also make up for those removed from the rolls? Americans have a good sense of fair play, and even those who could have been removed from the rolls would insist on paying their fair share. Moreover, tax relief solely through exemptions would stimulate only the buyer side of our economy, and only in a small degree. A little more production would quickly drain off this money and then fall off when the money is spent. This would be unsound economics and faulty psychology.

Then again we might have concentrated on reducing only the 52-percent corporation and other .business taxes. Here again the loss of revenue would have been great and the stimulation of the economy would have been lopsided.

We studied every proposal for tax cuts carefully and from every angle. Tax experts in the Treasury worked closely with tax specialists on congressional committees, and with tax advisers from business, agriculture, industry, and labor. Congress held extensive hearings where everyone had a chance to speak freely. We did not do everything that each advisory group suggested.

We struck a balance by adopting a widescale attack on all tax fronts with the idea of benefiting all taxpayers and stimulating the entire economy. We did not make this choice for political advantage. We did it regardless of politics, because we think this is a sound, fair, and effective approach for the good of the whole Nation.

FUTURE TAX PROGRAMS

What about the future? We still think taxes are too high. I believe taxes are too high. We intend to make further reductions as fast as conditions permit, but it cannot be done with a meat ax. Our security programs take 70 cents out of each tax dollar. We cannot and will not risk the Nation's security by wild tax cuts in defense. But we have made savings in this item, and we hope to make greater savings by getting better defense for less money. And, we will pass these savings on to the Nation in the form of lower taxes.

There is another important element to consider. Tax cuts mean less Government spending. We have already demonstrated that we enthusiastically favor less Government spending, but we have to bear in mind that any drastic cut in Government spending will seriously upset our economy. It results almost immediately in production shutdowns and unemployment. To be done safely, it must be done gradually and carefully watched.

By designing a balanced tax program operating on all fronts, we can make this transition smoothly, quickly, and successfully. This is being demonstrated right now by the healthy state of the economy despite a drop of more than $12 billion in Government spending.

But whenever we think that economic developments are tending toward a real recession, we have powerful economic weapons which we shall not hesitate to use. We can reduce taxes further, ease money and credit, increase public works and highway construction, stimulate new housing, and take other measures to counteract any serious slump.

All these are powerful measures and must be used carefully so as to preserve our basically free economic system. We must not distort the economy. Such a cure would eliminate the patient along with the disease.

Here, then, in major outline, you have our economic policies dealing with modern conditions at home and abroad. We believe they are good policies yielding sound, practical results. We have accomplished a great deal. We have strengthened the free world against any major Communist threat. We have made good friends all over the world. They may differ with us from time to time, but when the chips are down, they will stand with us because we have right, justice, and freedom as our motives and goals. Our own defense is secure. Our economy is stable, sound, and progressive. We have little to fear and every right to confidence. All we need do is carry on in the faith of our fathers whose vision pointed the way we have followed to freedom, peace, and prosperity.

Congressional Election Taking Shape

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 17, 1954

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I want to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article written by Roscoe Drummond entitled "Congressional Election Taking Shape," which clearly demonstrates the New Dealers in the Congress are giving no help to the Predisent's program. One concrete example of this, Mr. Speaker, was the solid Democratic vote in the Senate returning to the committee the Taft-Hartley bill which would have given some clarifying amendments to the existing law.

Obviously, Mr. Speaker, it is the intention of some to do everything they can to hinder President's Eisenhower's program. I ask the Members to read this article:

Congressional Election Taking Shape

(By Roscoe Drummond)

The shape of the oncoming congressional campaign is already coming into view.

Despite the present anxieties over Indochina, it is likely that the result will turn principally on domestic issues.

This means that the record of the present session of Congress can decisively affect the outcome, as it did in 1948. Whether this Congress does much that is important and does it well, or does little and does it badly that issue will bear greatly on the voting.

But the test which many, if not most, voters will apply will concern not merely what happens—or doesn't happen—at this session of Congress, but which party is responsible.

If the Democrats vote more consistently than the Republicans to support the Eisenhower program, then they will be entitled to argue, if they wish to do so, that they are more valuable to the President than his own party.

If the Republicans vote more consistently than the Democrats to support the Eisenhower program, they will be entitled to argue that a more Republican Congress would be more valuable to the President.

On this criterion the positive decisions taken by Congress thus far show substantial Republican unity. Some very critical tests lie ahead, but the record to date is one of visible Republican cohesion behind the President.

Two test votes came this past week.

When the House of Representatives voted for the St. Lawrence seaway, there were far more Republicans than Democrats backing the bill. The Republicans outnumbered the Democrats 144 to 96. There were 94 Democrats to 64 Republicans against it.

When the Senate rejected, 50 to 42, the administration's Taft-Hartley amendment bill, the Republicans voted almost solidly—though unsuccessfully—to support the President. Only three Republicans voted against the President and they couldn't possibly have changed the outcome since the Democrats, voting solidly for recommitting the Taft-Hartley amendments, have, with Senator WAYNE MORSE, a majority.

When, earlier, the House took its key vote on the tax bill, 199 Republicans voted for the administration's views, only 10 against. The Democrats marshaled nearly their total opposition against the President.

Opinions will honestly differ as to whether Mr. Eisenhower's position on these three issues is the right one or the more popular. But it is clear that on three significant tests, the Republicans have either voted solidly behind the President or have voted more substantially for the President than the Democrats.

On the St. Lawrence seaway bill Mr. Eisenhower's success was notable. Since 1920 no sequence of Republican or Democratic Presidents—all of whom advocated this project—was ever able to unite even their own party behind the necessary legislation. Mr. Eisenhower united a substantial majority of his own party and a little more than half of the House Democrats.

And even though the President was defeated on his campaign-promised effort to amend the Taft-Hartley law, he was not defeated by his own party. He sought to make good on his pledge. His party voted to make good his pledge.

The thesis which I am offering for inspection is not whether the President was either right or wrong on the Taft-Tartley amendments or on the St. Lawrence seaway or on the issue of raising personal income-tax exemptions. I am simply noting that on the basis of these three principal votes the Republicans in Congress have established a beginning foundation for the contention that more Republican Members in Congress will mean more support for the President.

Obviously the situation can change. If the Republicans subsequently oppose important aspects of the President's program or neglect it, the case for electing more Republicans to support a popular President will be undermined.

Some of the most important votes are still to come—on health, social security, unemployment insurance, housing. If the President loses much of his program through Republican votes, the party will be throwing away its prime campaign asset. If the President loses despite substantial Republican votes, the case for increasing the Republican membership will be strengthened—if the country wants to see Mr. Eisenhower supported.

The Communists Are After Their One World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 17, 1954

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial which might properly be entitled "The Communists Are After Their One World," which appeared in the May 12, 1954, issue of the Henderson Gleaner and Journal, of Henderson, Ky.

The editorial is as follows:

Sometimes the sun passes behind a cloud and the landscape is darkened. Our international affairs are going through such a period.

What is it about?

It is the same old story. The Communists are after their one world. It is their nibbling, their reaching out for more land to dominate, their constant push to take over more weakened nations. World communism means just what it says—the world for communism.

The Communists took over Latvia, Estonia, Poland, East Germany. They took over Rumania, Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, Albania, and got their hands on Austria. But then the great land area of China was swung into their control. Communists control over 800 million people and reach out for more.

Always it is the same pattern—infiltration, establishing Communist cells in existing organizations and governments, securing control of the police and armies, a coup d'etat or civil war, partition of a country that cannot be conquered immediately, setting up puppet regimes, expansion to control the free part of government, and final annexation with the Soviet bloc. Thus nations have died. And where they have died freedom has died. Fear, murder, dictation, slavery has taken over.

This monstrous devouring of nations in the treacherous onsweep of communism has been checked by one process—the resistance and the banding together of the nations not under Communist control. Allied resistance kept West Germany from falling into Communist hands. It saved Greece and Turkey. It saved Iran. Allied resistance kept South Korea from being swallowed, Formosa from falling to the Chinese Reds.

But with Korea in stalemate the Reds put new pressures on southeast Asia, and that is where their expansion is breaking through today. Blocked in the north in their designs to take over Japan, they have moved south to gain control of the rich rice lands of southeast Asia. Red China's Chou En-lai shouts, "Asia for the Asians." By that he means, Asia for the Communists.

The present dark clouds are caused by a double event. The present weak link in the common defense against communism is France. Her loss of the battle of Dien Bien Phu has cast gloom and pessimism over that nations long fight in Indochina. Further the united diplomatic front against communism formed by the United States, Britain, and France has fallen apart, and a mixture of voices has arisen. But the Communists stand united and insistent, and encouraged by their largest victory to date on the Indochinese battlefields, they are ready to push forward their gains.

The differences in our allied councils are created by a mixture of causes. Britain's Prime Minister Churchill thinks that he can negotiate with the Communists, wants no military commitments in Indochina. France is torn and divided, tired but proud. She needs help but will not submit to joint control of military training or operations, necessary ingredients to victory. She too desired to negotiate with the Communists for peace.

In the United States what? Secretary Dulles, believing that the Communists have never listened to anything dictated by military weakness has sought to create a position of strength in southeast Asia. He believes that only by the free nations forming the same kind of alliance for Southeast Asia that checked the Communist spread in Europe, can the further expansion of communism by force be stopped. He proposes a SATO (Southeast Asia Treaty Organization) like NATO (North Atlantic Treaty Organization).

It may be too late to save much of Indochina—now. But talks with Australia, New Zealand and the other nations like India and Pakistan are designed to plan against what may happen next in Communist aggression.

But we have trouble in our own Nation too. We must make up our own mind. Either we are to implement international cooperation with the necessary force, if need be, or we admit that the dam against communism has broken—and they will flood through.

We must be prepared to let Washington speak with the backing of the people of the United States. During this period it is the citizens who must do some thinking.

Mahomet High Seniors Typify Best in Youth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 17, 1954

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, many of my colleagues here in the House have been deeply disturbed during the past few months at the reports that have been coming into Washington from all over the country as to the prevalence of juvenile delinquency. There have been many stories even on the local situation in Washington where children enjoy advantages far beyond those in many rural areas of the United States.

In my previous experience as a judge, I have listened to many of these cases both from the standpoint of the children and of their parents and of community officials and officers who have been forced to take action. However for every case of a delinquent child which receives publicity in the newspaper, there are thousands who are doing well. Sometimes I think we fail to emphasize the importance of those children who are doing a good job in the light of their training both at home and at school.

In a community in Champaign County, Ill., the home of a high-school teacher was recently completely destroyed by fire. The senior class in the Mahomet (Ill.) Senior High School had raised some $800 to take a week's trip to the Ozark Mountains in May. When these children heard of this loss they came together and voted to donate the entire $800 to the teacher and her husband to assist them in replacing their home.

As long as we have this kind of a spirit existing in America among young people, I still have a great faith in our country. I dare say there are similar children in every community in this land. Sometimes it only takes a challenge such as was presented in this case to bring out the real worthwhileness of those children.

I am appending herewith an editorial from the News-Gazette of Champaign-Urbana, Ill., as of May 11, 1954, commending these students for an outstanding job well done, and I personally wish to add my commendation to these children:

Mahomet High Seniors Typify Best in Youth

In these days of increased juvenile delinquency, it is refreshing to learn that there are many good youths, capable of good deeds.

In the past few weeks, a rash of vandalism by a few youths has given their friends and their friends a black eye in the eyes of their elders.

Redeeming is the action of 26 Mahomet High School seniors.

Last Friday, the farm home of Dean and Mrs. Calvin Sifferd near Urbana was destroyed by fire. Mrs. Sifferd, for the past 6 years, has been English teacher at Mahomet High School.

Monday morning, Marilyn Ninmer, president of the Mahomet senior class, called a special meeting of the group. When the meeting was over, by secret ballot, the seniors had voted to give Mrs. Sifferd the $800 they had accumulated for a 6-day trip to the Ozarks later in May.

As long as there are such youths as these Mahomet High School seniors, there is no need for despair of today's youth.

Dictatorship or Partnership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 17, 1954

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, ex-President Harry S. Truman's presumptuous action in boldly advising President Eisenhower to be "master in his own house" recalls to mind the extent to which he and his predecessor, Franklin D. Roosevelt, tried to make a rubber-stamp out of the legislative branch of our Government in complete disavowal of the age-old doctrine of the separation of powers among the three branches of the Federal Government.

The following timely editorial appearing in the May 10, 1954, issue of the Wall Street Journal aptly contrasts the difference between the dictatorial tactics of the Roosevelt-Truman regimes and the effort being made by President Eisenhower to recognize Congress as a partner in Government entitled to exercise its constitutionally ordained powers.

The editorial follows:

Dictatorship or Partnership

On Friday evening Secretary of State Dulles, speaking for President Eisenhower, said that in making commitments "which might involve the use of armed force, the Congress is a full partner. Only the Congress can declare war."

On Saturday evening former President Harry Truman said that the expansion of congressional power "raises the threat of a legislative dictatorship, and that's the worst dictatorship in the world."

Mr. Truman continued: "Our Government cannot function properly unless the President is master in his own house and unless the executive departments and agencies of the Government, including the Armed Forces, are responsible only to the President."

Between these two views of the Presidency lies a wide gulf. And the difference between these two views explains much of the difference between the administration of President Eisenhower and the administrations of the preceding 20 years.

Presidents Truman and Roosevelt thought they should be able to do as they pleased, and any cavils from Congress or the courts were unwarranted interference. Mr. Roosevelt tried to remake the Supreme Court to his own liking. Mr. Truman, when he seized the steel industry at home and when he went to war in Korea, preferred to ignore the Congress.

President Eisenhower, not merely in this matter of Indochina but in every aspect of his legislative program as well, has preferred to recognize Congress as a full partner in the task of governing. This is a view which the American public ought not only to understand but to welcome.

There is an easy attraction in the Truman view, not only for Presidents themselves but also for the people. Governments can always act with more dramatic decisiveness at the will of one man than when many minds must be brought together to a decision. Dictatorships, like those of Hitler and Stalin, do indeed seem to move with more purposefulness.

But it is with good reason our President was never given such broad powers, and it is not comforting that they have been seized. For they were seized, as Mr. Truman himself says; they are not found in article II of the Constitution. These powers not written into the Constitution, as he also says, "are the powers which no President can pass on to his successor. They go only to him who can take and use them."

Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Truman took all they could, and there are many people who think they used their powers well. These people doubtless think it is wise to prevent Congress from having any check upon the White House, from investigating the actions of the executive departments, from exercising any control over the Armed Forces. They reason thus because the Presidents have wanted to do what they wanted done while Congress has often opposed their plans.

Yet even these very same people ought to consider what would happen if some President successfully took all these powers and used them in ways which they did not like. A President free from the restraints of Congress would be free to use his power however he chose.

The Eisenhower view, as expressed by himself and Secretary Dulles, is a novel one for this generation. But it is not an encroachment upon the just powers of the Presidency nor does it pose the threat of a legislative dictatorship—an absurd phrase on the face of it. It is rather a return to the awareness that only through a true partnership of the executive and the elected legislature can we reach decisions that will merit the support of the whole country while preserving the people's control over their own destiny.

The Langer-Bryson Bills

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD H. POFF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 17, 1954

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, I call to the attention of the chairman and members of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee that I have received in the last several weeks from churches, church organizations, civic clubs, and individuals from all walks of life a total of 226 personal letters and 68 petitions bearing the signatures of 1,889 constituents urging the passage of H. R. 1227 and S. 3294, popularly known as the Bryson bill and the Langer bill, respectively.

Of course, the House will not have an opportunity to pass upon the Langer bill until the Senate, where it was introduced, has acted upon it. However, it is similar in content and purpose to the Bryson bill which has been referred to your committee, with the provisions of which each Member of this House is or should be, familiar. For the sake of clarity, however, I herewith quote the language of the Bryson bill in its entirety:

Be it enacted, etc., That it shall be unlawful for any distiller, brewer, vintner, manufacturer, wholesaler, or retailer or for the agent, broker, or factor of any of them, engaged in the sale of alcoholic beverages to cause to be transported in the mails or otherwise from any State or Territory or the District of Columbia to any other State or Territory or the District of Columbia any newspaper, periodical, newsreel, photographic film, or record for mechanical reproduction advertising alcoholic beverages or containing the solicitation of an order for alcoholic beverages.

SEC. 2. It shall be unlawful for any publisher or for the agent of any publisher to cause to be transported in the mails or otherwise from any State or Territory or the District of Columbia to any other State or Territory or the District of Columbia any newspaper, periodical, newsreel, photographic film, or record for mechanical reproduction advertising alcoholic beverages or containing the solicitation of an order for alcoholic beverages.

SEC. 3. It shall be unlawful for any common carrier or for any private carrier for hire to transport from any State or Territory or the District of Columbia to any other State or Territory or the District of Columbia any newspaper, periodical, newsreel, photographic film, or record for mechanical reproduction advertising alcoholic beverages or containing the solicitation of any order for alcoholic beverages.

Sec. 4. It shall be unlawful to broadcast by means of any radio station for which a license is required by any law of the United States, or for any person operating any such station, to permit the broadcasting of any advertisement of alcoholic beverages or the solicitation of an order for alcoholic beverages.

Sec. 5. No letter, postal card, circular, or pamphlet of any kind containing any advertisement of alcoholic beverages or a solicitation of an order for alcoholic beverages shall be deposited in or carried by the mails of the United States, or be delivered by any postmaster or letter carrier, when addressed or directed to any place in any State or Territory of the United States, or the District of Columbia, at which it is by the law in force in the State or Territory or the District of Columbia at the time unlawful to advertise or solicit orders for such beverages.

Sec. 6. When applied to any advertisement or solicitation of an order, the term "alcoholic beverages," as used in this act, shall be construed to include any spirituous, vinous, malted, or other fermented liquor, or any compound containing any spirituous, vinous, malted, or other fermented liquor fit to use for beverage purposes as defined by the law of the State or Territory or District of Columbia into which such advertisement or solicitation of an order may be transported. The Postmaster General is authorized and directed to issue annual bulletins or notices giving the names of the States in which it is unlawful to advertise or solicit orders for alcoholic beverages.

Sec. 7. Any person knowingly violating any of the provisions of this act shall be fined not less than $100 nor more than $1,000 or imprisonment not less than 6 months nor more than 1 year, or both; and for any subsequent offense shall be imprisoned not less than 1 year.

Mr. Speaker, I have been much disturbed by the growing liquor problem in our great Nation. Last year while the Congress was in recess, I was shocked to learn of the Defense Department directive legalizing the sale of bottle liquor on military posts. On November 24, 1953, in a speech before a joint meeting of the Williamson Road Lions Club and the Villa Heights Lions Club in Roanoke, Va., I made the following remarks:

> Personally and as a representative of my people, I indignantly protest the outrageous action of the Pentagon bureaucrats in legalizing the bottle sale of liquor on military posts. While Congress was in session, I did everything in my power to help block it, and when Congress reconvenes in January, I intend to redouble my efforts to have this insane action rescinded.
>
> No one offers any sound reason to justify it. The only excuse advanced is that our servicemen can buy all of the liquor they want off the post anyway. This is a foolish argument. The boys can buy all of the narcotics they want off the post, too, but that would not justify their sale on the posts. Instead of making it easier, the military authorities should be striving to make it harder for our fighting men to obtain intoxicating beverages. The great bulk of our service personnel are in their young, habit-forming years. They are away from home, lonely, out of touch with their parents, neighbors, and churches. Often they are restricted to their bases for weeks at a time, and with a liquor store next door to the PX, the pastime of their off-duty hours soon would be a dormitory cocktail party.
>
> Entirely aside from the moral issue involved is the issue of States rights. Many States, like Virginia, maintain strict supervision and control over the sale of liquor. They own and operate the retail outlets and make the laws with respect to buyers, price, resale, storage, et cetera. This new regulation would completely thwart our laws in Virginia. Sales to minors could be made on the Federal posts in utter disregard of Virginia law. The liquor, which would be bought direct from the distillers, would escape State taxation in many cases. Moreover, this cheap liquor would be an open invitation to bootlegging.

I am pleased to say that after Congress reconvened in January 1954, this scandalous directive was countermanded, for which all thoughtful Americans, and more particularly those parents who have or later may have a son or daughter in the Armed Forces, should be grateful.

An aroused American public, Mr. Speaker, is the most powerful force on earth. These letters and petitions, I submit, demonstrate the development of a strong ground swell of public ire and fire which has long been smoldering in unvocal breasts awaiting only the spark which will ignite it into the unquenchable flame of united action. More particularly in this dark hour of national and international tension and crisis, the security of our Nation depends upon the sobriety of our people. This is especially true of the young people who follow in our train. We who mold the environment in which they are raised hold in our hands the seeds of their destiny. Let us be careful to sow good seeds and we may be certain that they will fall in fertile ground.

> But whoso shall offend one of these little ones * * * it were better for him that a millstone were hanged about his neck, and that he were drowned in the depth of the sea. (Matthew 18: 6.)

In the name of those who have so courageously written these letters and signed these petitions, I call upon this great committee to take this bill out of its pigeonhole, hold hearings and report it favorably to the floor where all of the representatives of all of the American people may work the composite will of the House upon it.

Lay Off, Mr. President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 17, 1954

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, I insert herewith an editorial from the Roslyn News, of Roslyn, N. Y., one of the outstanding weeklies in my congressional district. This editorial, which appeared in the Roslyn News on Friday, May 14, 1954, is concise and to the point. It shows real grassroots opinion. These weeklies are seldom given any credit for the wonderful job they do and I am happy to give some recognition, which they rightfully deserve:

Lay Off, Mr. President

Were we in the position of close adviser to President Eisenhower, we would council him to steer clear of ex-President Truman's advice that he extend the powers of the Presidency by saying "No" to the congressional powers of inquiry into communism in our Government. Mr. Truman's famous extensions of executive powers were his attempt to seize the steel companies and his starting the Korean war without the consent of Congress. On communism in the executive offices his extension of power was to ignore the peril as a "red herring." The combination of these extensions was one main reason for his defeat.

No, Mr. President; just lay off Mr. Truman. The country has overwhelmingly rejected him as an American adviser.

The Current Debate on Trade Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. SMITH

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1954

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include the address made by Mr. John S. Coleman, president of the Burroughs Corp., before the Delta Council annual meeting at Cleveland, Miss.:

The Current Debate on Trade Policy

(Address by John S. Coleman)

Mr. President, Governor White, ladies, and gentlemen, Congressman Smith has been very generous to me in his words of introduction. But I would like to take this opportunity to say a word about him and to congratulate the Congressman and Senator Eastland on their fine records in the Congress. In their consistent support of the reciprocal trade act, they have given great encouragement to all who have worked for more liberal trade policies. And, perhaps a Michigander may be permitted to take note of their part in the final passage of that measure vital to the further development of the middlewest—the St. Lawrence seaway bill. By their votes in Congress, Senator Eastland and Congressman Smith have well served both the State of Mississippi and the Nation.

I am delighted to be in Mississippi and to have the privilege of participating in the annual meeting of the Delta Council. For those of us who come from beyond the State, the pleasure is twofold. There is, first, the opportunity to participate in a meeting with the unique tradition of national affairs. There is also, however, the opportunity of seeing the remarkable growth of this State. This is an area of change. Long famous as an agricultural region, it is now being transformed by industrial development. As the 1952–1953 report of the Delta Council points out, over $200 million has been invested in industrial plants within Mississippi since the end of World War II. And, undoubtedly, this is just a beginning. Mississippi is thus in a state of transition, balancing agriculture with industry, growing in strength, and responding creatively to change.

This vigorous spirit has long been reflected in these meetings. The Nation has come to expect from them constructive contributions to the discussion of public issues. And a speaker who is honored by your invitation cannot but be challenged by the high standards his predecessors have set. I find, however, that challenge somewhat disturbing.

For my subject hardly lends itself to new and original thought. The arguments on trade policy have been aired for a hundred years and more. And there is not a major idea put forward in the current debate which cannot be found in pamphlets and speeches in the days when Cobden and Bright were arguing in England for repeal of the corn laws.

I have then no new discoveries to offer. At the same time I would not wish to go over old familiar ground, parading again arguments which have so often been heard. And, indeed, it is not necessary. There is hardly a reputable economist who does not reject the idea that a nation prospers by shutting off foreign goods. Equally there is hardly a student of this problem who does not affirm the advantages of the freest possible exchange of goods and services across our borders. Here in Mississippi you need no proof of this. I would hesitate before reading a lesson in trade to those who are growing cotton for the markets of the world. But there is something else I can do this afternoon. To men who have such a great stake in the outcome I can, as one participant, report on the current debate on trade policy. And that is what I propose to do in the time allotted to me.

About a year ago at a time when the policies of the new administration were still in process of formation a bill was promoted in the House of Representatives which would have restricted severely the imports into the United States of residual fuel oil, crude petroleum, and other items. In addition, by the conditions it imposed it would have made very difficult further tariff reductions of any kind. The effect of that bill on imports, both immediately and potentially, would have been severe. By consequence, many exporters would have found their foreign markets restricted, for to the extent that their customers abroad could no longer earn dollars by selling their products here, American exports would have been reduced. But this was not the most serious aspect of this bill. Its dangers were more fully evident when the thinking it represented was set against the new international responsibilities of the United States.

At the very time when the United States was undertaking to draw the free world together in unity of purpose against Soviet expansion, the Congress almost gave its approval to a bill of economic isolationism. There is no doubt where the support for this measure came. It came not just from the men who sponsored it in the Congress. Behind them were a number of business groups which would benefit from the restrictions the bill proposed. It was clear then that if other businessmen, and they are the majority, did not arouse themselves, the issue would go by default, and businessmen in general would be blamed for the application of policies contrary to the economic interests of the great mass of our people. And that, gentlemen, was the genesis of the committee for a national trade policy, of which I have the honor to be chairman.

In the past few months the debate has gone forward at times with some heat. And at times some of our friends have urged us to answer heated charges with equally strong retorts. I hope, however, and I believe that we have avoided this temptation. We are not interested in whipping up a controversy among the businessmen of this country. On both sides of this trade issue are men sincere in their views who are presenting, as is their right, those views to the Nation. Never before, perhaps, have businessmen given so much time to the discussion of public issues and this, I believe, is a healthy state of affairs. Responsibility for participation in national affairs cannot be delegated by any citizen, least of all by those who play such a large part in the management of the economic resources of the Nation. Whatever views are expressed, whatever the outcome of the debate, I welcome business participation in the process of national decision.

But what will be the outcome of this debate? Much has happened in the past year. The voices which have always argued for greater protection are now balanced by other voices. And the old arguments no longer circulate freely without contradiction. Undoubtedly, however, the major development has been the report of the Randall Commission. I believe this document will come to be regarded as a watershed in the development of United States foreign economic policy. There have been other reports and their conclusions undoubtedly go further in the right direction. It was not, however, Mr. Randall's purpose to write a document which would restate conclusions economically sound but politically impractical. His purpose was in a sense less ambitious, though in another sense more difficult. He wished to find an enlightened policy on which the great majority of Americans might agree.

Before the Randall Commission began its deliberations, the President said to its members, "I commend to you an attitude both realistic and bold. Above all, I urge you to follow one guiding principle; what is best in the national interest." And it was in this spirit that the Commission worked. The President committed the problem of trade policy to the process of democratic decision. He had faith that a cross-section of Americans could reach agreement on what was in the national interest. His faith proved justified. Much publicity has been given to the dissenting voices in the Commission's report. But this is to miss its significance. The dissents were not the story; the real story was in the wide area of agreement. Despite originally conflicting points of view, the Commission was able to formulate a series of practical recommendations on the central issues.

As you know, the Commission recommended the President's power to negotiate trade agreements under the Trade Agreements Act should be extended for not less than 3 years. They recommended, too, that the President be given additional power to cut tariffs a total of 15 percent during those 3 years. They recommended the waiving of the Buy American requirements on Federal purchases where bidders from other nations treat our bidders on an equal basis with their own nationals. And they urged that further steps be taken toward the simplification of customs procedures. These and other recommendations made by the Randall Commission have now been made a part of the policy of the administration.

The impelling reasons for a liberal trade policy have been set down by the President in his message to Congress. "For our own economic growth we must have continuously expanding world markets; for our security we require that our allies become economically strong. Expanding trade is the only adequate solution for these two pressing problems confronting our country." Thus, our own domestic interest and the interest we have abroad in the solidarity of the free world—both these factors point to the necessity of a higher level of international trade. And what is the alternative? It is a reduction of exports. Economic aid has been cut, as indeed it should. And eventually military aid will also be cut. When those dollars are no longer available to our friends they have no alternative but to reduce their purchases from us. Trade is important for our allies; it is also important for us. Conceived as a whole, the President's program consists of four major parts and each requires the other: Aid, which we wish to curtail; investment, which we wish to encourage; convertibility, which we wish to facilitate; and trade, which we wish to expand.

Against this program some objecting voices are being raised. The United States, it is said, for example, has had a protective system. The United States has a high standard of living. Therefore, the high standard of living is due to trade barriers. Not this conclusion, however, but precisely the opposite must be drawn from our American system. Not the existence but the absence of restrictions has been the source of our strength. Our high standard of living is due not to protection. It is due to the fact that we have rich resources within a continental area through the length and breadth of which free trade is practiced.

Again it is said many industries will be injured, that there will be widespread unemployment. The Randall Commission's staff papers, however, show that the possibility of unemployment is greatly exaggerated. Moreover, if injury is an argument for a tariff, injury is also an argument against a tariff. The question is, who is to be injured—the protected industry or the export industry. I need not remind this audience that one-third of our wheat, 40 percent of our cotton and rice, and one-fourth of our tobacco have been exported in recent years. Over 4 million American workers directly depend on international trade for employment. If injury be the issue, then, by the fact that they employ more workers, the export industries may claim prior consideration. Indeed, on this point it is not difficult to show that these industries are in fact the highest in the American scale, highest in productivity, highest in wages, and highest in number of employees. These are the industries, in short, whose expansion will contribute most to a rising standard of living for all Americans.

Yet me make it clear that those who are proposing freer trade are not free traders. We are not proposing drastic changes. We are only arguing for a continuation of a trend which has proceeded for over 20 years. Certainly, some adjustments will have to be made. But is this new for America? On the contrary, change is at the root of our dynamic way of life. If we had sought to avoid adjustments or even dislocations, we would have had neither automobiles, nor television, nor air travel, nor any new product or service which has displaced another in the market. And by the same token, in order to protect northern interests, we would seek to prevent industry from moving to the South where so much opportunity for development awaits enterprising Americans. But, if we will not run the risks of change, neither will we reap its rewards.

Around us we are hearing voices of fear, fear of depression, fear of change, doubt as to our business ingenuity. Great and growing industries speak nervously of competition. And advocates of the American way see no incongruity in seeking shelter from their Government. Is this, we may well ask ourselves, the country of free enterprise? Do the American people believe in individual initiative? Are we who have preached the gospel of competition for so many years now to reveal ourselves as hypocrites? God knows, we cannot expect the world to follow us unless we first lead. As a businessman and as a citizen I reject any effort to limit the horizons of American enterprise to our own shores. I reject the view that presents our economy as strong enough for the imitation of the world, but too weak to meet the world's competition.

But what, it may be asked, of our defense needs? It is often argued that we must maintain some industries or skills as a part of our military potential. And who can deny the truth of this argument? The question is, however, what industries are vital to defense, what products of those industries are vital, what skills and in what degree? No one would recommend a trade program, least of all a former commanding general, which would fail to take into account matters essential to the safety of the Republic. But who is to determine these highly technical points? Surely not the interested parties. By all means let us do everything essential to our defense, but the National Security Council, or some such agency, not the organizations who will benefit, is the appropriate body to determine our military needs.

It may be that we must assist some industries to stay in business a part of our defense structures. But, is the tariff the best way to assist them? The tariff is nothing more or less than a sales tax paid by the consumer through the retailer. In this way an invisible subsidy is paid by the consumer to particular industries. But for this subsidy no accounting is required and no specific performance. If it is agreed that certain industries must be assisted, then I submit that the citizen has the right to know just how much that assistance is costing him and what he is getting for his money. If assistance is to be given, then let it be a direct and visible subsidy rather than a hidden sales tax in the form of a tariff.

This defense argument has, however, another side. The central purpose of our foreign-trade policy is to build a community of democratic nations. We need strong allies, able to support adequate defense forces, with progressive, viable economies, and, above all, able to counteract the internal threat of communism by the decisive arguments of rising standards of living. Yet the economies of our allies are, in many cases, still only precariously balanced. They have made progress, but their situation still remains unsatisfactory. It is clear they would find it difficult to meet either a significant recession here, or the new burdens that would arise from a graver international crisis. No one believes that the further removal of American trade restrictions would be a panacea for all their ills. Such a policy would permit them, however, to earn more dollars. It would do something to strengthen their economies and thus their ability to contribute to the common cause of the free world.

The great debate of our generation has been between those who affirmed and those who denied the need for positive American action in building a community of free nations. The outcome of that debate is no longer in doubt. The Atlantic community exists. And the test of its existence is the way in which we act. Our troops in Great Britain and on the continent, our ships in the Mediterranean, our air bases in North Africa, are proof enough that the affairs of the United States and Europe are inextricably joined. The people of Western Europe recognize that they live in our shadow. But the corollary is also true. Two world wars and the contemporary struggle with the Soviet Union have taught us that we live in the shadow of European events. They have taught us that security is indivisible and that in strengthening our allies we strengthen ourselves. We know these things, and militarily we are acting on this knowledge. Surely it is only common sense to pursue economic policies which also reflect our common destiny.

And so, ladies and gentlemen, there the issue stands. The President has sent his legislative recommendations to the Congress. We elected this man to the heavy responsibilities of the Presidency. We placed upon him staggering burdens. However we voted, whatever our party, he now asks for our assistance in implementing his trade program. He has asked for our support, and I believe he deserves it. The matter is now before our Congressmen, but they can speak for you only if you will tell them where you stand.

Is Doubt the Enemy a Graduate Faces?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 17, 1954

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial entitled "Is Doubt the Enemy a Graduate Faces?" which appeared in the May 14, 1954, issue of the Courier-Journal of Louisville, Ky.

We know that the young hopefuls graduating from the state schools of the Soviet Union are in every respect graduating. This is no commencement for these young people but the culmination of a period of incubation and training to fit them into the mold of the Communist world. They are finished products and a blueprint has been made of their lives for them. They have no decisions to make and their highest ambition can only be utter and absolute conformity. All instruments of public opinion such as music, education, and the movies are under government direction and control. They have no bill of rights guaranteeing to them their right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Only God can help any of them who try to enlarge or break the mold by expressing any new or anti-Communist thought whether it is tried through teaching, the press, or any of the arts.

The thousands of young Americans graduating from our schools and colleges would under no circumstances trade the uncertainty of their future careers for the deadly certainty that awaits their young contemporaries in the Soviet Union. Here we have a liberal Constitution and a Bill of Rights guaranteeing to our young people their right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Our young people should have no fear of ideas and realize that our Founding Fathers made freedom to think, to speak, to exchange ideas the very core of our Bill of Rights and the basis of the Government of the Republic. They should have no fear of being classed as liberals and should not be accused of being Communists just because they are concerned about our liberties, oppose religious prejudice, work for more effective labor unions or cultural exchange with foreign countries.. They should understand fear of communism is causing us to confuse treason with dissent, and that it is leading us to abhor deviation of any kind. Regardless of the fact that a great many of our leaders are being frightened into reluctant conformity, our young graduates should take a stand for the rights of the unregimented mind not only for a desire for knowledge but for liberty of thought and speech as a right on which every person should be able to depend. We as Members of Congress, our schools, our courts, the press, our churches should be ever vigilant and assume the task of eliminating ignorance, thereby granting unto our young graduates proper conditions for the free movement of life, thought, speech, and a true affection for our country and its institutions.

I include at this point in the RECORD the editorial:

IS DOUBT THE ENEMY A GRADUATE FACES?

Many thousands of young Americans will soon be graduating from school or college. With appropriate oratory, they will be launched upon the often troubled seas of life.

At this same time of year, other thousands of young hopefuls will get their diplomas from the state schools of the Soviet Union, but they will emerge into no world of personal doubt. Their jobs and future careers will be assigned to them by the state.

Such assignments leave nothing to the choice of the individual. An official committee makes all the decisions. Each young man or woman is directed to the area and the job where his training can be most useful to the state. This may mean the assignment of a Moscow youth to a village in far Siberia. Only the lucky few are allowed to stay with their families in their own home towns.

As a proof that human nature still functions under even the tightest of Soviet controls, there is a crop of scandals about this time every year. The newspapers report with shocked disapproval that certain parents have tried to get special consideration for their children.

It is a criminal act to question the committee's decision. It is also a criminal act for any worker to leave his job at any time without official permission. Thus the young graduate's assignment is likely to be a sentence for life.

Some young Americans may feel that they are stepping out of the shelter of the classroom into a very uncertain world. Some may feel, perhaps, that life owes them a living, and a pretty good one at that. It would be a rare American graduate, however, who would trade the uncertainty of his future career for the deadly certainty that awaits his young contemporaries in the Soviet Union.

Our Congressman-Author

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 17, 1954

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, I think the House ought to be apprised of the fact that we have a famous Congressman-author in our midst and I refer to our colleague, the Honorable FRANK E. SMITH, of Mississippi, who recently has written a book entitled "The Yazoo River," which has received very favorable reviews, one of which is by Mr. Lewis Gannett in the New York Herald Tribune of May 11, 1954, and I insert it herewith.

Belated congratulations are due to Mr. SMITH. May he always be as successful. The review follows:

BOOK REVIEW

(By Lewis Gannett)

THE YAZOO RIVER, BY FRANK E. SMITH;
RINEHART, 362 PAGES, $4

The Yazoo is the 47th volume in the Rivers of America series, and it is written by a Congressman—two items which must establish some kind of record. The Congressman, as you might expect, is an easy storyteller; but he is no romantic. His picture of his delta country is sternly realistic, primarily concerned with high water and levees, schools and hospitals, mechanical cotton pickers and tractors.

Delta country

When Mississippians talk about the delta country, they usually leave Yankees confused. Delta to them does not mean the swampy region below New Orleans but the Yazoo delta, the region which David Cohn once defined as beginning in the lobby of the Peabody Hotel at Memphis and ending on Catfish Row in Vicksburg. It's an area with soil so rich that they used to say, Mr. SMITH tells us, that a man planting corn had to step lively so that the shoots wouldn't tear his pants. It was timbered swamp territory, known as the wilderness until after the Civil War; the delta is a postbellum, cotton-boom phrase.

It is rich literary and political territory, too. William Faulkner lives in a county bounded by two of the Yazoo's tributaries, one of which used to be called the Yockinapatapha, which is interesting for those who try to bound the imaginary Yoknapatawpha County of Mr. Faulkner's novels. Stark Young was born on another Yazoo tributary, though the country he romanticized in So Red the Rose was down south near Natchez. The delta didn't have many stately mansions; it couldn't, because of its periodic high waters. But from its dog-trot cabins and homes came such characters as the great Senator John Sharp Williams and the ranting Vardaman, as Casey Jones of ballad fame and W. C. Handy, the Negro bandmaster who made the blues famous—and Congressman-author FRANK E. SMITH.

The storied past

One of the stateliest delta mansions is Malmaison, built for Greenwood Leflore, the last Choctaw chieftain, in 1854, and still the showplace of the Greenwood region. Leflore had negotiated the treaty which ended the Choctaw empire in Mississippi, and sworn an oath of allegiance to the United States. He had prospered as a cotton-grower and sat in the State Senate. When the War Between the States came, he refused to recognize secession, and such was his prestige that he sat the war out at Malmaison, never permitting Confederate money to be brought into his home. When a Confederate general sent his orderly to ask for lodging, Leflore replied: "Tell the general that I will entertain him as an esteemed old friend, but, it must be understood, not as a Confederate soldier."

John Sharp Williams, "the last of the planter-statesmen," is another of Mr. SMITH's heroes. He was famous alike for his wit, his devotion to the League of Nations, and his alcoholic content. Senator Heflin, of Alabama, once challenged Williams in a senatorial debate. "At any rate," said Heflin, "I always come into the Senate Chamber in full possession of my faculties." "What difference does that make?" retorted the proud old Senator from Mississippi.

Dramatic present

But Congressman SMITH's chief interest is in the changing basis of life in the delta, especially the recent and coming changes. The delta used to be the classic share-cropper, hookworm, and malaria region. Never have I read a clearer exposition of the growth and decline of sharecropping than this book offers. As for malaria, Mr. Smith notes: 65,271 cases, and 477 deaths in 1920; 9 cases, no deaths in 1951. It's gone. So, almost, is venereal disease.

When the Rust brothers demonstrated their mechanical cotton-picker, in the delta, in 1933, there was alarm lest it "displace labor" and create a new landless proletariat. The delta farms have a shortage of labor today, Mr. SMITH tells us, and he tells us why. They still haven't altogether solved high water, but they are diversifying crops, planting rice instead of cotton, grazing cows; in some erstwhile flood areas, they are actually pumping water for irrigation? And it was the white planters of the delta council who sold the State legislature on the need for a new Negro college.

Farmers-owners don't want illiterate hoehands any more, we learn; they need trained men to operate their tractors. That is why, as Mr. SMITH sees it, the delta didn't need to be prodded by the United States Supreme Court to wake up to the need for Negro education. There may be chapters of the story that he misses, but there is an up-and-coming, look-into-the-future note about his picture of a Southern region that is different from most of the "river" books and from the traditions of legislative oratory.

Decline in Stocks of Dairy Products During Month of April

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 17, 1954

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, the United States Department of Agriculture has released figures on purchases and sales of dairy products for the month of April 1954, which show an encouraging drop in stocks on hand.

It will be remembered that the support level on dairy products under existing law is required to reflect changes in supply. A continuation of the trend here indicated would suggest eventual improvement in prices.

Believing that the figures are of paramount interest to the entire dairy industry, I ask unanimous consent to have the statement by the Department of Agriculture printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT
OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, May 11, 1954.

Purchases during April 1954 amounted to 14,834,214 pounds of butter, 9,818,054 pounds of cheddar cheese, and 41,601,764 pounds of nonfat dry milk. In April 1953, purchases amounted to 25,155,588 pounds of butter, 27,123,489 pounds of cheese, and 46,214,600 pounds of nonfat dry milk.

Commercial sales of cheese and butter, particularly of cheese, were very heavy in April 1954. These sales amounted to 93,430,569 pounds of cheese and 6,276,134 pounds of butter. Other uses accounted for 7,521,126 pounds of butter, 6,755,793 pounds of cheese, and 48,135,822 pounds of nonfat dry milk leaving the USDA inventory. These latter uses were largely section 32 distribution for school-lunch use and to other domestic outlets, section 416 donations chiefly for human feeding abroad, and noncommercial export sales for welfare feeding.

Following are purchases and uses through April under the 1952–53, 1953–54, and 1954–55 dairy-support programs and estimated quantities on hand April 1, 1954:

	Butter	Cheddar cheese	Nonfat dry-milk solids
Purchases:	*Pounds*	*Pounds*	*Pounds*
1952–53 (Apr. 1, 1952–Mar. 31, 1953)	143,348,182	75,236,130	210,410,097
1953–54 (Apr. 1, 1953–Mar. 31, 1954)	380,383,620	455,864,174	667,195,301
1954–55 (Apr. 1, 1954–Apr. 30, 1954)	14,834,214	9,818,054	41,601,764
Total	538,566,016	540,918,358	919,207,162
Uses:			
Commercial sales	9,760,333	101,914,885	64,979
Sec. 32 outlets	92,286,825	27,065,986	20,420,708
Sec. 416 donations	46,887,560	26,119,300	105,996,880
Noncommercial export sales		465,000	193,696,760
U. S. Army sales	22,887,957		6,830,765
Other [1]	1,918,410		1,694,356
Total	173,741,085	155,565,171	328,803,438
Estimated supplies as of Apr. 30, 1954	364,824,931	385,353,187	590,503,724

[1] Other uses include butter salvage sale, cocoa butter substitute sales, butter sales to the Veterans' Administration, conversion of butter into butter oil for U. N., and nonfat dry milk sales for animal feed and donations for research.

Following are the purchases of dairy products by months under the dairy price-support program during the 1953–54 marketing year which ended on March 31, 1954:

Month	Butter	Cheese	Nonfat dry milk
	Pounds	*Pounds*	*Pounds*
April 1953	25,155,588	27,123,489	46,214,600
May	42,255,757	35,104,647	74,272,345
June	66,804,733	40,827,696	84,440,119
July	50,189,182	42,500,982	67,374,340
August	27,067,625	30,273,094	47,261,979
September	4,921,638	24,072,068	34,839,783
October	963,745	7,287,390	20,412,282
November	3,243,987	4,470,334	17,106,363
December	11,028,397	6,903,727	36,583,631
January 1954	28,372,725	22,668,826	82,810,242
February	24,001,061	33,222,584	55,341,774
March	96,530,585	186,796,083	132,295,452

A British Appraisal of Americans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 17, 1954

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Americans: A British Appraisal," published in the Manchester (England) Guardian, and recently reprinted in the Washington Post and Times-Herald. I particularly commend this editorial to the attention of Senators, because I believe they will derive some satisfaction from the point of view of our friends in Great Britain.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Americans: A British Appraisal

There is a story of the American Senator who had been dozing before a rollcall vote, and when his name was called he stood up and shouted in a clear voice, "Not guilty." Perhaps some of the Senators have a good deal on their consciences: They certainly should have. But may they (and their constituents) not have legitimate ground for feeling that all America's hard work in the interests of the outside world earns her little or no appreciation?

May they not ask themselves whether it is really worth trying to help foreigners thousands of miles away when all they get in return is a hearty kicking? One wonders—especially when one sees figures such as the News Chronicle provided in last week's Gallup poll. They show that 40 percent of the people answering in Britain disapproved of the role now being played by the United States in world affairs, 37 percent approved, and 23 percent were uncertain.

If one thinks in broad terms of the role played by the United States in world affairs since the war three things stand out.

First, the United States has done more than any other country to guarantee peace in the world. Secondly, America remains the foremost country in the world, whose ideal, in the words of its own Constitution, is to "promote the general welfare and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity." Thirdly, the United States has done more than any country in the world to help others and secure their health, prosperity, and welfare.

Proof of the first point lies in American help which saved Greece from falling to rebellion, in the swift reaction to the Berlin blockade and the saving of that city from being strangled by Communist pressure, in the guaranty given through the North Atlantic Treaty to Western Europe and the backing of that guaranty with the troops and aircraft now stationed in Europe, and in the American resistance to aggression in Korea.

The list is dull through familiarity. But is it not sometimes forgotten? And do we not sometimes too easily assume that because the United States did these things she was bound to do them anyway? The assumption is false. It would have been easy for all the Kennicotts to retire to their gopher prairies, as they did after the First World War, and there forget about all the torments and troubles in the distant continents of Europe and Asia. Or it would have been easy for America to take the MacArthur line, and go it alone. But she did neither of these things. She has sought conscientiously—if at times rather impatiently—to do her duty in the world and to stand by her friends and allies.

If they forget it they will do so at their own peril. There is a real risk that the apathy, ingratitude, and unthinking criticism of other countries will turn Americans inward again upon themselves. They are disillusioned because so often the presence of American troops in Germany and France and other foreign places is treated as if it were solely a policy of American self-interest.

They are disillusioned because the Americans in Korea were left to fight almost the whole war on behalf of the United Nations, unsupported by other members. (It will be hard for any American administration again to intervene on behalf of others, as President Eisenhower has discovered over Indochina.)

They are disillusioned because the world seems to think that the Marshall plan and point 4 were merely designed to give America control of new markets. (As a result there is strong resistance now to any further programs of foreign aid, however urgent the need.) They are disillusioned because they set out after the war to help the world to its feet, and yet nobody seems to like them.

One day they may take the critics at their word and go home, back to America and back to isolation. That would be a catastrophic day for Western Europe and many other places where liberty still matters. Let us hope it does not come: and let us be careful not to hasten its arrival. There are many valid grounds for criticizing American policy and American methods. There are valid grounds, too, for alarm over the apparent tarnishing of America's own ideals. But the broad soundness, honesty of purpose, and worth of the role America has been playing in world affairs ought not to be in doubt.

The Lesson of Dien Bien Phu

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 17, 1954

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include herewith an editorial entitled "The Lesson of Dien Bien Phu," which appeared in the May 12, 1954, issue of the Owensboro Messenger of Owensboro, Ky.

The editorial is as follows:

The Lesson of Dien Bien Phu

The French are a proud people. They have a great military history. That it was tarnished in the last World War makes them the more determined to recover its glory.

The fall of Dien Bien Phu may turn out to be a greater calamity to the Communists than to the French. The heroic defenders of the doomed fortress who gave their lives through almost 2 months of superhuman efforts against a foe that outnumbered and outgunned them in an untenable position, have fired the French martial spirit as nothing had since the stand at Verdun, to which it has been compared.

Dien Bien Phu may be for the French and Vietnamese what Corregidor was to the Americans and Philippines, who did come back and did mop out the invaders who overran it.

Nor is the wave of aroused anger limited to France. It crossed the Atlantic and brought an emergency session of the National Security Council in Washington. It even touched London, whose refusal to join united action before Geneva delayed united action that might have been taken for its relief.

A handful of men and one woman, isolated on an errand of mercy and who remained with the wounded and dying to the end, have electrified the world and recalled it to the grave danger that threatens freemen. While our eyes and ears have been riveted on a shameful brush fire in Washington, an explosion halfway around the world all but escaped our notice, until it blew up in our faces. It should recall us all to the main fight, the fight against Communist aggression the world over, that is driving relentlessly to its goal of world conquest. Ours must be the stamina, the will, and the fight of the men of Dien Bien Phu if the Red hordes are to be kept within their own bounds to stay.

Services of Senator Wiley in Connection With Enactment of St. Lawrence Seaway Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. THYE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 17, 1954

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I was pleased to see that a great many of the newspapers of Wisconsin commended the great contributions made by our colleague the senior Senator from the Badger State [Mr. Wiley] in achieving the passage of the Wiley bill, S. 2150, to complete the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway.

I send now to the desk a series of excerpts from several representative editorials and I ask unanimous consent that these editorials be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Wisconsin State Journal of May 10, 1954]

A Victory for Wisconsin

Wisconsin and the Midwest won what we believe is an important economic victory last week with passage of the St. Lawrence seaway bill. It should go to President Eisenhower, who favors it, soon.

This State also can be proud of its many hard-to-lick citizens, public and private, who have fought for the seaway for more than 20 years.

In that category must be included Senator Alexander Wiley, Gov. Walter Kohler, and the entire State congressional delegation.

It was Wiley, perhaps more than any other individual, who kept the seaway issue alive during its darkest days.

In addition, every major community in Wisconsin has had its mayors, councilmen, and business groups who have plugged for the plan in season and out until they wore down the opposition of eastern port cities and rail and coal interests which were its chief attackers.

Construction of the deeper waterway to America's interior, we predict, will mean a brighter future for us all.

[From the Wisconsin Rapids Daily Tribune of May 12, 1954]

Wiley and the Seaway

Terminating a long and often discouraging fight, proponents of the St. Lawrence seaway have won final congressional approval for joint United States-Canadian development of the project which means so much to the future economy of this Great Lakes region.

Every President since Woodrow Wilson has advocated the development of a deep waterway linking the lakes with the Atlantic Ocean, via the St. Lawrence River. But legislation to bring this about encountered repeated rebuffs from Congress, until the current session.

Passage of the enabling legislation last week represents a distinct achievement for the Eisenhower administration, one of the biggest single accomplishments since the Republicans returned to power after 20 years as a minority party. During his campaign Mr. Eisenhower went on record in support of the seaway, and since taking office he has used his influence to break down congressional opposition and win favorable action.

Principal spokesman for the administration in steering the St. Lawrence seaway legislation to final enactment was Senator ALEXANDER WILEY. He led the fight in a manner which gained for him the admiration and respect of all his colleagues, Republican and Democrat alike, regardless of whether they favored or opposed the project. He deserves a great part of the credit for bringing the seaway close to realization. Wisconsin should be proud to acknowledge his splendid work and thank him for it.

* * * * *

We are happy to note that seventh district Republicans, in their caucus at Clintonville Sunday, made amends for some of the past affronts to Senator WILEY by acknowledging that he has worked "long and tirelessly against formidable opposition" to win approval of the seaway legislation. Better late than never, we presume.

We suspect that Senator WILEY may feel that some of the most formidable opposition he has faced, in his efforts to be a true spokesman and leader for the Eisenhower administration, has come from his own fellow Republicans in Wisconsin.

Too few of them seem to comprehend that the party's national stewardship is on trial, and that its best hope of success rests with those who, like WILEY, are loyally devoted to the administration and its program.

[From the La Crosse Tribune of May 6, 1954]

For his leadership in winning Senate approval of the St. Lawrence seaway alone, Senator WILEY is deserving of the plaudits of this State, and most of all by the Republican Party.

From his position as chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee he has been outspoken in his support of President Eisenhower all down the line. The respect he has earned from his Republican colleagues in the Senate as a result is as enduring as are his achievements.

* * * * *

Whatever support and commendation flows to President Eisenhower for his position in international affairs—and properly a great deal has from Republican sources—must in all fairness inure to Senator WILEY as well.

[From the Eau Claire Leader-Telegram of May 9, 1954]

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY GETS UNITED STATES BACKING

A 35-year fight on the part of advocates of a St. Lawrence Waterway resulted in victory when the House of Representatives voted approval of United States participation in construction of a seaway that will permit oceangoing steamers to unload cargoes in Lake Ontario and Lake Erie.

The Senate passed a similar bill January 20.

Four times previously the Senate turned down a more comprehensive seaway project which involved power facilities and deeper channels as far as Duluth, Minn.

This was the first time a seaway plan ever got to a vote in the House but in 1951 the House tabled a seaway measure.

Every President from Warren G. Harding to Dwight D. Eisenhower supported St. Lawrence seaway legislation and the project was made a plank in party platforms by both Democrats and Republicans.

A long line of Wisconsin governors have advocated and worked for seaway legislation as have Wisconsin Representatives in Congress.

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, of Chippewa Falls, has been in the forefront of seaway battles during his three terms as United States Senator and it is fitting that the legislation finally passed bears his name—the Wiley-Dondero bill. WILEY led the fight in the Senate and Representative DONDERO, Michigan Republican, was floor manager of proseaway forces in the House.

Wisconsin legislatures have memorialized Congress time after time on behalf of seaway legislation and a deep-water commission has been functioning as a part of the State government since 1919, organizing sentiment for the seaway and lobbying in Washington.

Two years ago Governor Kohler set up a special commission to accentuate the Wisconsin campaign for the seaway and he has worked diligently for final success.

However, chief credit for favorable action by Congress on the waterway must be given to Canada. The Dominion, after waiting patiently for the United States to cooperate in an ocean-to-lakes project, decided to go ahead with the seaway alone.

Canada adopted necessary legislation and negotiated a power agreement with New York State. It was prepared to proceed at once and passage of the Wiley-Dondero measure was not received with enthusiasm in the Canadian capital. Apparently our northern neighbors were not only prepared to build the seaway alone but would prefer it that way. They could set then the rates and collect the tolls.

Behind Canada's determination to build the waterway is the problem of transporting iron ore from the new ore fields in Labrador to steel mills on the Great Lakes. This ore can only mean wealth to Canada if it can be economically moved to market. A seaway will make this possible.

American steel companies became interested and in recent years shifted their active support to seaway legislation.

President Eisenhower pressed for seaway construction as a national defense measure and won considerable support because of the importance of iron in fighting a war. It is no secret that the high grade iron ore in the Mesabi Range of northern Minnesota is nearing exhaustion after being the main source of supply in two world wars. New sources must be found and Labrador offers the richest supply.

For Wisconsin, Minnesota, and Michigan, chief advocates of the inland waterway, the complete battle is not yet won. But indications are that it will be. A supplemental all-United States project for deeping channels into Lakes Huron, Michigan, and Superior must be approved by Congress before ocean-going ships can dock at Milwaukee, Duluth, or other important ports on the larger of the Great Lakes.

The Honorable Charles R. Howell Proposes Campaign Ethics Code

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER JOHNSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 17, 1954

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HOWELL], who is Democratic candidate for the United States Senate from New Jersey, has proposed to his opponent a code of campaign ethics for the New Jersey senatorial campaign.

Representative HOWELL's code of campaign ethics has received nationwide attention. Recently the Milwaukee Journal, in commenting editorial on this code, has called it an admirable goal to work toward. The Milwaukee Journal is somewhat pessimistic about the full-scale adoption of such a code of campaign ethics at this time, but comments: Ours will be a better democracy when we do.

We owe a debt to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HOWELL] for his efforts to raise to a higher level our political campaigning. I say that what is good for New Jersey is also good for Wisconsin.

Under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD the full editorial entitled "A No-Name-Calling Campaign," which appeared in the Milwaukee Journal of May 11, 1954:

A NO-NAME-CALLING CAMPAIGN?

Can you imagine a big political campaign in present-day America in which there would be no name calling or rabble rousing? A candidate for the United States Senate in New Jersey has made such a proposal to his opponent. His code of campaign ethics, as reported by the Democratic Digest, recommends to the opponent:

That we campaign on the issues and confine ourselves to an intelligent presentation of viewpoints on national public policy.

That we refrain from unfounded attacks against the personal honesty, loyalty, and integrity of the other.

That we appeal to the rationality of New Jersey voters rather than to hate, fear, suspicion, and meanness.

That we do not exploit international issues involving our country's welfare on the basis of extreme partisanship, and we adhere as much as possible to a bipartisan approach to foreign policy.

The author of this code is Representative CHARLES HOWELL, Democratic candidate for the Senate. His opponent is former Congressman Clifford Case, the Republican nominee. Explaining the reason for his code, HOWELL wrote to Case:

"Too often one side wages a war of extermination against the other, filling the air with indiscriminate charges of sadism, disloyalty, and treason. The purpose of a political campaign is to present the voters with a choice between individual representatives and alternative plans for public policy."

We are not optimistic enough to believe that the Howell code will be adopted in New Jersey or anywhere else, not for a while, at least. That doesn't mean it isn't a worthy code. We just don't consider the American people politically mature enough to demand that politicians follow such a code. And most politicians are not courageous or principled enough to adopt it on their own.

Like so many codes, it is an admirable goal to work toward. Maybe some happy day we can attain it. Ours will be a better democracy when we do.

Responsibility of Committee Members

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 17, 1954

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, it may be that out of this recent war, with its ghastly toll of maimed, crazed, blinded, and dead, we shall be brought to a keener sense of our responsibility as citizens of a great Republic. The heritage of liberty and opportunity bequeathed to us as a sacred trust to be enjoyed and then passed on unimpaired can be preserved for future generations only by sacrifice on our part.

Perhaps I can illustrate what I have in mind by a story. During the early days of the Civil War, a young man from the State of Massachusetts enlisted in the Union Army. He fought so gallantly and so well that he was promoted to the rank of captain, and also granted a furlough. He returned home for a visit. The one person he was anxious to see was a teacher, a widow with several children, who had befriended him in his youth. Her life had become a great struggle to keep her body and soul together. This young soldier suggested to his old teacher that he be permitted to take her small boy, Johnny, back with him to live in his tent and to become a drummer boy. The mother consented. The townspeople presented the young soldier with a gold-handled sword as a mark of their esteem. The captain and Johnny returned to the Army and occupied the same tent. One day the captain found Johnny reading a book. He inquired of Johnny what he was reading. Johnny replied, "The Bible." The captain said, "Johnny, never let me catch you reading in that book again; there is not a word of truth in it."

Tears came to Johnny's eyes and he replied, "But, Captain, I promised my mother I would read in the Bible every day." "Oh," said the captain, who was an atheist, "so your mother asked you to read in it; well, do as she told you, but read it outside of the tent."

One day it rained and as the captain entered his tent, he saw Johnny reading the Bible. The captain said, "What did I tell you about reading that book in the tent?" The boy said, "It is raining outside and I thought you would not care." That evening the captain invited some of his fellow officers in for a good time. To make some sport the captain said to his officers, "You did not know that I have a clergyman staying with me." He sat Johnny up on a box and said, "Preach us a sermon." Johnny said, "Captain, you are an awful wicked man, but I love you." "That will be enough," said the captain.

Next day there was a fight and the Union forces were driven through a burning bridge. Johnny was at the captain's side as the fight raged. No sooner had the army retreated through the bridge to the Union side than the captain looking down, said, "Johnny, I have lost my gold-handled sword." The lad started through the burning bridge, reached the other side, found the sword and then ran, clothes on fire, and came staggering out on the Union side, dropped the sword at the captain's feet. The lad died on the spot. The captain in the presence of his men, lifted his cap and looking toward Heaven said, "Men, you see that little fellow's corpse. He had to sacrifice his life to make me realize my duty and responsibility. Today, here and now I pledge my allegiance and service to the King on High."

This captain was Russel Conwell, the great philanthropist and lecturer. He worked throughout a long and useful life 18 hours every day; 9 hours for himself and 9 hours for Johnny Ring. By recognizing his responsibility to the one who had sacrificed for him, he enriched and ennobled his countrymen and his country.

It is our task to dedicate ourselves to the formulation of wise legislation to preserve the heritage that has been purchased for us by the blood and suffering of our fellow countrymen.

Is it not incumbent on each of us to work extra hours for our country to in some measure meet our responsibility to those who fought, bled, and died for the cause to which our country was committed?

Next to winning the war the greatest responsibility facing the American people today is to see to it that every young man and woman returning from the war shall come home to a good job, to a sound national economy. I am not speaking of a made job, a pauper makeshift financed by the Government. I mean a really bona fide productive job in private enterprise. A job where the American boy and girl can find opportunity for advancement, and then look forward to owning, in whole or in part, an enterprise of their own. This can come about only through a tax program that will make possible a healthy system of free enterprise. We must have tax legislation so balanced that every citizen will bear his just portion of the tax burden necessary to keep the fiscal affairs of the Nation sound and expanding.

It has been the practice in years past to see that the farmer had seed corn for the next year's crop. Business enterprise, if it is to prosper, and bring forth an abundant crop of jobs and opportunity for millions of men and women must be permitted to share the seed for future development.

The extent to which postwar commitments to foreign governments have been made and may be made involving billions of dollars make it difficult to prepare a postwar program. Private industry with its jobs and lifegiving payrolls can come into being, thrive, and expand only so long as there is a thrifty, self-reliant middle class of citizens with an incentive to invest in private enterprise. This class must not be destroyed by excessive taxation. I firmly believe that the educated, temperate, thrifty, self-reliant people, are the backbone of private enterprise and the very foundation upon which the structure of a representative republic must stand. It is from this class, as I see it, that venture capital must flow to expand our economy and insure new jobs. I am told that on the average about $8,000 in plant equipment and machinery is invested for each industrial worker. If this be true, excessive and unjust taxes will destroy the incentive to invest, thus preventing the creation of jobs in private enterprise. I would like to see a postwar tax system that will release American energy and initiative under adequate incentives in risk-taking enterprises. It is to this end that I have directed my energy.

I do not want to see this Nation, by unwise and oppressive taxation, destroy the principles which have made this Nation great.

In this connection, may I say that there has already been passed by the House of Representatives a bill, H. R. 8300, to lift a crushing tax burden from the shoulders of the people and to provide incentive to establish payrolls and stimulate industrial expansion.

Once H. R. 8300 becomes a law, there will be ushered in an era of prosperity that will bring hope and happiness to our people. There should be no delay in enacting legislation that will achieve this worthy end. Each day of delay in enacting this tax legislation means more closed plants, more idle men and women, more hard-pressed communities, and less revenue collections.

There is other legislation now pending which should be enacted into law without delay for the general welfare of millions of our people. This proposed legislation relates to the social-security bill, H. R. 7199, now pending in the Ways and Means Committee. A grave responsibility rests on each member of the Ways and Means Committee to be present at each executive session of the committee; forenoon, afternoon, and evening, if this social-security legislation, H. R. 7199, is to become law.

In the words of Sir Edmund Burke, speaking of the duty and responsibility of a representative to his constituents:

> It is his duty to sacrifice his repose, his pleasure, his satisfaction to theirs, and, above all, ever, and in all cases, to prefer their interests to his own.

The McCarthy-Army Hearings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 17, 1954

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "The Big Brawl," written by Mr. Walter Lippmann, and published in today's Washington Post and Times-Herald. The article deals with the McCarthy-Army hearings.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TODAY AND TOMORROW

(By Walter Lippmann)

THE BIG BRAWL

Much was said last week about "expediting" the disgraceful and degrading McCarthy-Army hearings. But nothing could come of the talk because what was intended was not to expedite them but to shut them down. The only proposals considered were designed to turn off as soon as possible the television and the publicity.

What the people are being shown is one of the great constitutional crises of our history. But from neither end of Pennsylvania Avenue, neither from the White House nor the Congress, has anyone in authority made a move to clarify the issue of this crisis, or indeed said much to show that he knows what it is. Politicians realize that they are all being scorched, some more and some less, by the bright lights in which they are caught. But because the actors do not understand the fundamental issues of constitutional principle, they cannot think of anything to do about their discomfiture except to hope that the people will soon become disgusted and bored enough to permit them to get away with turning off the lights.

The reason the hearings are so long, so confused, so incompetent, and so irrelevant is because the two branches of the Government are locked in a struggle, of which neither of them has as yet grasped the meaning. The hearings run on and on and never get to the point because none of the principals seems to know what is the point that he is quarreling about. The point cannot be whether Private Schine did kitchen police duty on a weekend. The whole country has become involved in trying to settle that momentous problem.

It is the failure of either side to show that it knows what it is fighting about that is causing the public disgust. Because the principals do not know what they are doing, but are furious about it nevertheless, the performance is neither a judicial process nor a debate, nor an inquiry, but in fact a brawl, less objectionable in a barroom than in the halls of the Government, a brawl in which no one knows how the fight began and what it is about.

Yet this sordid fight was precipitated by flagrant and systematic trespass upon the constitutional prerogatives of the President, and it goes on and on because he does not defend his rights. This affair is degrading and disgracing the United States Government with our own people and in the eyes of the whole world. The remedy for it is to vindicate the principle of the Constitution. The medicine of the Constitution is the cure for the evil, and there is no other cure.

It is the President whose prerogatives are involved, and it is by the President and only by the President that the remedy can be applied. If and when he acts to recover his prerogatives, the balance of the Constitution will have been restored, and the remedies that Congress alone can apply will begin to be used.

Someone whom General Eisenhower trusts and to whom he will listen should explain to him that the action he needs to take is not to issue a statement telling the world what a so-and-so he thinks McCarthy is. No one is asking him to demean the dignity of his office; only, but only, to defend its dignity. For some reason or other, let us say his inexperience, he is inclined to exaggerate grossly the effectiveness of issuing statements. In this matter what he needs is not someone to write a statement for him denouncing McCarthy. He needs a constitutional lawyer to advise him how to defend and recover the rights of his office.

What is it that he should do? It is easier to say, I admit, what he should have done 12 weeks ago when this brawl began—that is to say, after McCarthy's assault on General Zwicker. At that time he should have done himself, firmly and unequivocally, what Secretary Stevens—acting on the decency of his instincts rather than on serious constitutional principle—meant to do. President Eisenhower should have ordered all personnel in the executive branch to refuse to deal with McCarthy on the ground that he was abusing the congressional power to investigate and was invading the constitutional rights of the Executive.

There is no question at all that the Senate would have upheld the President by an overwhelming majority if his decision to boycott McCarthy had ever been put to a test. Almost certainly, McCarthy himself never would have been willing to put it to a test.

Had the President acted to defend his rights, as his predecessors have had again and again to do, Congress would have been denied not the right to investigate but the right to abuse the power to investigate. The question of whether the Army was dealing efficiently with security risks at Fort Monmouth or elsewhere would have been put where it belongs—with the committee that is concerned with the Army as a whole—that is to say, with the Armed Services Committee.

In this imperfect world there is no such thing as an automatic panacea, and so no one can be sure that even this committee would always have worked effectively and soundly. If a McCarthy were by the rule of seniority to become its chairman, the committee would surely work badly. And then the President would have to defend his rights before that committee. But as a matter of fact, this is now a committee that is concerned with the honor and the morale and the welfare and the interests of the Army, and the members of it would not have allowed a public degradation and humiliation of the Army.

That then is what the President should have done—actually on that Tuesday after Washington's birthday, when he came back from his vacation in Palm Springs. Having failed to act, and having let the country stumble into this television show in consequence, what can be done now?

The hearings will have to go on. The President cannot afford to agree to any scheme which in fact protects McCarthy and Cohn from the full and prolonged exposure to the bright lights that Stevens and Adams have had. But the exposure of publicity will not settle the issue or restore the deeply damaged prestige of the Government. And, no matter how much the people continue to like the likable Ike, the exposure in these hearings will not restore the deeply damaged prestige of the President of the United States.

President Eisenhower will have himself to vindicate the constitutional principle which has been violated because he has failed to defend it. This must mean, it seems clear, that at some suitable moment when these hearings have reached the end of some chapter, he must come to the Nation, he must explain what he hoped to do by yielding, how he hoped for harmony in the public interest, and why he has failed. And he must say, as brave men are never afraid to say, that he was wrong and that he has changed his mind, and that he is now issuing the appropriate orders to all personnel in the executive branch of the Government.

Navy Times Editor Refutes Pearl Harbor Charges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 17, 1954

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, on May 7 I called the attention of my colleagues in this body to the comments of former Associate Justice Owen J. Roberts, of the United States Supreme Court, on the recently published book charging President Roosevelt with provoking the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor. Mr. Roberts, who headed a Pearl Harbor investigating committee, completely refuted the charges made in this book, written by a retired admiral of the United States Navy. The former Supreme Court Justice, who was a political antagonist of President Roosevelt, branded the charges in this book as without foundation and outrageous.

More recently, the editor of the Navy Times, Mr. John Slinkman, has written a thoroughly documented, carefully reasoned refutation of these Pearl Harbor charges of Rear Adm. R. A. Theobald.

In the words of Navy Times Editor Slinkman, the Theobald book "is probably the most vicious conglomeration of misconstructions, omissions, and misstatements ever to be given national publicity in this country."

Now, lest it be assumed that Navy Times Editor Slinkman is an apologist for Franklin D. Roosevelt, the record should show that Mr. Slinkman has been a military and congressional reporter since 1937, and regards himself as no great admirer of President Roosevelt. In fact, his political affiliation is Republican and he had a long record of disagreement with many of the acts of the late President Roosevelt. But he is apparently unwilling to let go unchallenged Admiral Theobald's attacks on the late President regarding Pearl Harbor.

Mr. Slinkman's review of the Theobald book, which appeared in the Navy Times of May 8, 1954, shows clearly that the retired admiral's Pearl Harbor charges are unsupported by evidence.

Under unanimous consent, I include the review in the Record:

ADMIRAL AIMS, FIRES, AND MISSES BY A MILE

(By John Slinkman)

The United States has seen a second day of infamy. A just-published book attempts to place all the blame for the original day of infamy—the Pearl Harbor debacle—on dead President Roosevelt.

We have carefully read the Theobald book. It is probably the most vicious conglomeration of misconstructions, omissions, and misstatements ever to be given national publicity in this country.

Theobald, 70, was a subordinate of Adm. Husband E. Kimmel when the Japanese attacked Pearl Harbor on Sunday, December 7, 1941. Specifically, from September 1940 he had commanded Destroyer Flotilla 1, and from December 1941 had been commander, Destroyers, Pacific Fleet. In February 1943 he took command of the First Naval District and Boston Navy Yard. He was relieved from active duty October 28, 1944, and was retired February 1, 1945.

Theobald contends:

"President Roosevelt deliberately let the fleet be caught at Pearl Harbor in order to arouse public-opinion for the was he wanted with the Axis powers. To accomplish this, F. D. R. ordered withheld from Hawaii information which would have enabled the commanders there—Kimmel and Short—to defend themselves."

Roosevelt, Theobald maintains, caused Pearl Harbor. The military, including Kimmel, Pacific Fleet commander; Maj. Gen. Walter C. Short, the Army commander, and the civilian Secretaries—Stimson of War, Knox of Navy—are blameless. The Chief of Staff, Gen. George C. Marshall, and the Chief of Naval Operations, Adm. Harold R. Stark, must have known information was withheld, he says, but were powerless to interfere.

Theobald amasses a whole book of facts and theory to prove his theory. Both his theory and his facts are dead wrong. We intend to set straight the record—befouled by Theobald—for the military personnel of the United States.

To do this, we must quote some of Theobald's book, but we do not intend, by republication, to dignify his remarks any more than necessary.

To set the stage, let's restate some history.

Italy, Germany and Japan had a mutual-defense agreement.

In September 1939 Germany attacked Poland. England and France thereupon declared war. In May 1940 the Nazis swarmed over all of Europe except Spain, Switzerland, and Portugal, and drove the British into the sea. In the midst of the aerial devastation of Britain, Germany in June 1941 attacked Russia (with whom she also had had a treaty).

At the time of Pearl Harbor Nazi planes were over England, Nazi armies menaced from across the channel, threatened Alexandria and Moscow, battled in the streets of Stalingrad. Small wonder Japan felt it a good time to attack us. We declared war the next day, December 8; Germany and Italy declared war on us December 11.

American-Japanese relations had been troubled throughout the 20th century for a number of reasons, some of which do small credit to our Nation. We had given moral support to China, which Japan had been invading since 1937, and when Japan moved into French Indochina in July 1940 and threatened the Netherlands East Indies, we imposed a series of economic sanctions on Japan.

Long diplomatic conversations followed. Japan proposed in a note—which Theobald does not criticize, although it was an arrogant ultimatum—that we give her a free hand in the Far East and lift our embargoes.

We replied in a note November 25—which Theobald does criticize, calls warlike, a gauntlet flung into Japan's face, though the note (which he does not quote) belies his charges.

Meanwhile, we had been fighting an undeclared war with Germany. We gave the British 50 destroyers in exchange for leases on bases. We sold munitions. Congress, in effect, declared war by enacting lend-lease, and we gave Britain material. We convoyed. Before December 7, we were sinking German subs.

Germany took all this.

We do not say all this in derogation of F. D. R., though we personally opposed this undeclared belligerency in 1940–41—a lot of us did not then have the appreciation of the Nazi menace that F. D. R. did. But all this undeniable truth is needed to comprehend Theobald's theory.

THEOBALD'S THEORY

R. A. Theobald says that F. D. R. wanted war. That F. D. R. was anxious for the enemy to strike the first blow. That he applied ever-increasing diplomatic and economic pressure on Japan. That he put the Pacific Fleet in Pearl Harbor as bait to entice a Japanese attack after weakening it by shifting vessels to the Atlantic.

We say that what F. D. R. wanted was victory, victory for the European nations, especially Britain. To get it, he was willing to commit warlike acts against Germany and to try to protect his Allies' Far East possessions against encroachment by Japan.

How could F. D. R. accomplish his aims; By getting Japan to attack, as Theobald charges? On the contrary. By keeping Japan out of the war. This would leave him free to aid Europe against Germany.

If Japan fought, F. D. R. would be compelled to divert much might from Europe to the Pacific. Particularly would this be true if Japan alone fought because then the American people would insist that F. D. R. divert forces from the Atlantic to the Pacific. (And when war did come, despite the infamy of Pearl Harbor, our major effort was where F. D. R. wanted it all along until Germany was beaten.)

But Theobald would have us believe that war with Japan was F. D. R.'s objective.

How, we ask further, could F. D. R. know Germany would fight if Japan did?

That F. D. R. did not want war with Japan alone but instead feared that possibility is shown by two documented excerpts from the report of the joint congressional committee which investigated the Pearl Harbor attack (hereafter referred to as report).

Said Adm. Kelly Turner, Navy War Plans Officer: "It was felt * * * that there might be a possibility of war with Japan without the involvement of Germany, but * * * it was determined that in such a case the United States would, if possible, initiate efforts to bring Germany into the war against us in order that we would be able to give strong support to the United Kingdom in Europe" (Rept. 266–O).

And on page 325 is quoted a cable of early October 1941 from Foreign Minister Toyoda to Ambassador Nomura in Washington, stating that Germany had demanded that Japan tell the United States this: That, if the United States continues to attack the Axis Powers, fighting is inevitable between Germany-Italy and United States, and the Axis Pact might lead Japan to join her Allies against us.

We intercepted that cable, as we did all Japanese messages. And we knew, up to Pearl Harbor, that Japan had served no such warning. Was not this evidence to F. D. R. that he might be able to continue against Germany without fear of what Japan would do?

Of course, F. D. R. knew there was a Rome-Berlin-Tokyo alliance. He knew also that there had been a Berlin-Moscow pact.

Theobald can refer in one breath to F. D. R.'s aggression against Germany; in the next to the withdrawal of ships from the Pacific just to "weaken it," but not admit that these ships didn't hole up in United States ports but went to work in the Atlantic.

ENTICED ATTACK

We are compelled now to quote Theobald:

"Diplomatically, President Roosevelt's strategy of forcing Japan to war by unremitting and ever-increasing diplomatic economic pressure, and by simultaneously holding our fleet in Pearl Harbor as an invitation to a surprise attack, was a complete success. * * * One is forced to conclude that the anxiety to have Japan beyond all possibility of dispute commit the first act of war caused the President and his civilian advisers to disregard the military advice which would somewhat have cushioned the blow. The President, before the event, probably envisioned a *Panay* incident of somewhat larger proportions."

We have proved the desire for war with Japan wrong in theory and soon will prove it wrong in fact. As for Theobald's dastardly imputation of F. D. R.'s desire to be attacked and his willingness to take losses, let's look at page 266–N of the Pearl Harbor report.

Here, in his minority report, Representative Frank Keefe, Republican of Wisconsin, cites a February 11, 1941, memo from CNO Stark to the President commenting on a plan by F. D. R. to send a detachment of vessels to the Far East. Stark quoted the President as saying that he would not mind losing 1 or 2 cruisers, but that he did not want to take a chance on losing 5 or 6.

Why was the fleet at Pearl Harbor anyway? Admiral Richardson, Kimmel's predecessor, protested so strongly against its being there that he was relieved of command.

Richardson did not say that Pearl Harbor was too exposed. He did say Pearl did not have the facilities to maintain the fleet ready for real action, that basing on the west coast, where there were facilities to keep the fleet at maximum potential, was likely to impress Japan more (Rept. 266–B).

If that was a military man's view, and Japan also was ruled by military men, would she not be likely to conclude that Pearl represented less of a threat to her than a west coast based fleet?

That proves Pearl was not bait, but, supposing for a moment that she was, and recalling that Japan was posted on Pearl ship movements, why did not F. D. R. make the bait more attractive by insisting that the fleet, based at Pearl, stay at Pearl?

On the contrary, as much of the fleet was out of Pearl on December 7 as was in it. Halsey was at sea with the *Enterprise*, 2 heavy cruisers, 9 destroyers. Newton had the *Lexington*, 3 heavy cruisers, 5 destroyers.

At Pearl were 8 battleships, 8 cruisers, 29 destroyers—some of which were outside the harbor. The attackers sank or damaged: 8 battleships, 3 light cruisers, 3 destroyers, 4 miscellaneous craft.

Grievous as these losses were, they did not destroy America's offensive potential. Even assuming belief by Japan that the vessels hit could not be rather quickly repaired—as most of them were—Japan knew that her blow could not be mortal to this country.

"Weakening" the fleet by transfers to the Atlantic by no means was an enticement to attack Pearl, as Theobald says again and again. A weak fleet could just as well encourage Japan to attack in the Far East (see Rept. 149 for a fuller development of this point).

WE PROVOKED JAPAN?

Having demolished Theobald's charges that F. D. R. wanted to provoke Japan in theory and partly in fact, and having pricked his Pearl-bait bubble, let's look at these November notes he so badly misrepresents in his effort to make Roosevelt a warmonger against Japan.

Then having done that, we'll prove Kimmel had plenty of warning, Theobald to the contrary. Then we'll show that Theobald distorted the investigations.

This is the November 20 Japanese note which Theobald seems to find unobjectionable. We checked his chapter 2 summary, which follows, against actual text (Rept. 361):

"(1) The United States give Japan all the oil she needed and release the frozen Japanese assets. (2) United States cooperate with Japan to secure the goods and commodities from Dutch East Indies which the two nations needed. (3) Japan agree to withdraw troops from French Indochina upon either the restoration of peace between Japan and China or the establishment of an equitable peace in the Pacific. In the meantime, Japan would withdraw troops from southern Indochina when the United States agreed to the foregoing proposals, provided the United States and Japan should mutually agree not to advance troops into southeast Asia and the South Pacific, except into that part of French Indochina where the Japanese troops were then stationed."

But Theobald omits this other foregoing condition: That the United States undertakes to refrain from such measures and actions as will be prejudicial to the endeavors for the restoration of general peace between Japan and China.

In short, the United States is to give everything—oil, commodities, frozen assets its own and NEI's. It's to keep hands off China.

Japan is to do what in return? Just promise not to attack any more countries and pull out of southern Indochina.

That's all. The promise to pull out of all Indochina was meaningless since it was conditioned on an unlikely Sino-Japanese peace.

While that note apparently was all right, Theobald applies all kinds of epithets to the American reply of November 25, which he summarizes thus:

"In exchange for a new trade agreement and the unfreezing of each other's assets, Japan agree to: (1) the acceptance of complete defeat in the Sino-Japanese war by the withdrawal of all her forces from China; (2) her tacit surrender to the economic encirclement by a similar withdrawal from French Indochina, whose inviolability would thereafter be respected; (3) her participation in a nonaggression treaty whose practical effect would be to guarantee the following lands from attack: the Philippines, Siberia, the Dutch East Indies, China, Thai; (4) the abolition of the Japanese-created puppet governments in China and Manchukuo, by promising with the United States to support no government in China but that of Chiang Kai-shek; (5) the practical abrogation of Japanese obligations to Germany and Italy under the provisions of the Tripartite (Axis) Treaty."

The actual note also had the United States offering to give up its own extra-territorial rights in China; promising to try to get Britain out of there, too; offering to keep raw silk (Japan's principal export, and one threatened by the development of synthetic textiles) forever on the free duty list; offering to go 50–50 with Japan on a curreficy-stabilization fund.

And what was Japan really asked to do, despite the way Theobald worded it? Nothing unreasonable, with one exception—China. (We'll discuss abrogation of the Axis in a second.)

Now, looking at the matter through Japanese eyes, no government in that land could concede defeat in China, and survive. But the Pearl Harbor report shows much discussion between Japanese war lords and diplomats as to whether some concessions could be made on this point, with the war lords saying no.

After all, notes are intended to be compromised, but despite Theobald, the unwillingness to compromise was all on Japan's part.

This is a personal opinion, but since Theobald fills a book with them, we should be allowed one: We believe that if Japan had agreed to peace with China and withdrawal from the southern regions, keeping Manchukuo and some northern provinces, F. D. R. would have told Chiang to accept or be on his own.

This point so resolved, what was the rest of the note but many United States concessions if Japan would get out of Indochina and promise not to attack other countries?

As for so-called abrogation of the Axis, let's see just what the note said:

"Both governments will agree that no agreement which either has concluded with any third power or powers shall be interpreted by it in such a way as to conflict with the fundamental purpose of this agreement, the establishing and preservation of peace throughout the Pacific area."

We do not see that such an agreement would prevent Japan from honoring her pact with Germany and Italy should the latter declare the United States to have attacked them in the west.

FOUR MORE DISTORTIONS

1. Another Theobald distortion is this:

"When the Washington negotiations were, in effect, terminated by the American note of November 26, it was necessary that some word be sent to the outlying commands. Failure to do this would have been too challenging a fact to the future reader of history of these events. The President himself directed that this be done * * *. Normally the preparation and sending of such a message would be a routine matter * * *. The fact that the President considered it necessary to direct the Army and Navy to send the so-called war-warning message of November 27 is positive proof that he not only knew that vital information was being denied the Hawaiian commanders, but that he expected that denial to continue unless he ordered otherwise."

F. D. R.'s notification, R. A. Theobald's insinuations to the contrary, is positive proof of nothing more than that the President wanted Hawaii notified and took the natural course of telling the proper people that he wanted the warning sent, rather than assume that they would send a warning.

2. F. D. R. on November 25 commented to State Secretary Hull that the Japanese were notorious for making attacks without warning and stated that we might be attacked, say next Monday, for example.

F. D. R.'s selection of Monday, says Theobald, is most arresting. Sunday in Pearl Harbor is Monday in the Far East and so on.

Well, in the first place, on November 25, next Monday is December 1—not December 8.

And to anyone not determined to use every possible artifice to support a wild idea, the President's remark falls into that category of remarks everyone makes—and forgets—except on that one occasion in 10,000 when the chance prediction is realized.

3. Theobald makes much of the fact that the Philippines were furnished a machine to break the Jap code, but Pearl was not. The fact that the Philippines were closer to the danger point, that communications might be disrupted, while Pearl could be—and was—advised of what it was pertinent for them to know is completely ignored by Theobald.

If F. D. R. wanted to deny information to Pearl, as Theobald alleges, how could F. D. R. overlook the fact that furnishing a machine to the Philippines created the "danger" that Manila might tip off Honolulu?

If F. D. R. wanted an attack, one on United States personnel in the Philippines would suit his purposes as well as an attack on Pearl.

4. Theobald also referred to the Japanese request of their own emissaries on Oahu for ship berthing data—a request Pearl was never told about.

This was a culpable and gross error. The congressional committee roundly and thoroughly condemned Washington for it. But to read in it more than that—a negligence—or that F. D. R. inspired it is not warranted.

For, in his exoneration of the military in both Pearl and Washington, Theobald completely omits to state this:

"The message was discussed several times by Colonel Brattan, Chief of the Far Eastern Section, Military Intelligence Division, War Department General Staff, with his opposite numbers in the Navy Department. They discussed the possible significance of the message as indicating a plan for an air attack on ships in Pearl Harbor. In the course of these discussions officers in naval intelligence stated that the Japanese were wasting their time in getting such meticulous detail about the location of ships in Pearl Harbor because the fleet would not be in Pearl Harbor when the emergency arose." (Rept. 266–G; Record, p. 12105).

KIMMEL KNEW

Theobald's argument that warning was withheld from Kimmel is completely false.

We're not going to comment on what Theobald said, nor do more than list the many messages Kimmel got between April 1 and December 7, 1941. They're set out in full in pages 89–100 of the congressional report. The reader can judge for himself whether there is a shred of truth in Theobald's charge that Kimmel didn't know what was going on, particularly that he didn't know what the broken Jap codes were revealing:

April 1, 1941: CNO Stark told all commandants that "past experience shows the Axis Powers often begin activities in a particular field on Saturdays and Sundays or on national holidays."

July 3: CNO advised Kimmel of substance of intercepted messages that Japan probably goes to war soon.

July 7: CNO tells Kimmel of other intercepted messages indicating warlike moves by Japan.

July 15: Ditto.

July 19: Ditto.

July 24: Kimmel gets copy of letter by CNO to Asiatic Fleet, expressing Stark's belief that Japan planning no immediate move against United States, but saying he had talked with President and hoped no rupture would come but that conditions were not getting better.

July 25: Kimmel advised that United States would impose economic sanctions against Japan next day. Message said, "Do not anticipate immediate hostile reaction by Japan through the use of military means but you are furnished this information in order that you may take appropriate precautionary measures against hostile eventualities."

August 14: Kimmel advised that Japanese were pulling in merchant marine from all over world except in China and Japan sea areas.

August 24: Letter from CNO to Kimmel said Japan seemed to be in an indecisive period, that Stark had not given up hope of Pacific peace, but wished thread by which it hung were not so slender.

October 16: Dispatch to Kimmel stated that Japanese Cabinet change created grave situation. * * * "Possibility that Japan may attack. (United States-Britain) * * * you will take due precautions. * * *"

October 16: Letter CNO to Kimmel same day tempered dispatch warning as a personal opinion, but added "we should be on guard. Marshall * * * anxious * * * that we make some sort of reconnaissance so that he could feel assured that on arrival at Wake, a Japanese raider attack may not be in order on his bombers."

October 17: Kimmel advised that trans-Pacific shipping was being routed south of and well clear of the Japanese Mandated Islands; also advised to take all practical precautions for safety of Wake and Midway airfields.

October 23: Kimmel told that military shipments should be escorted between Honolulu and Manila.

November 4: Kimmel informed that complete withdrawal of all Japanese shipping from Western Hemisphere was in progress.

November 7: CNO wrote Kimmel: Things getting "worser and worser. A month may see, literally, most anything. * * * It doesn't look good."

November 14: CNO wrote Kimmel that he was not hopeful arrival of special Japanese Envoy Kurusu would make any difference in relations, that Japanese newspapers were saying "complete capitulation by the United States on every point of difference * * * was indicated as a satisfactory solution. It will be impossible to reconcile such divergent points of view."

November 24: Kimmel received dispatch expressing pessimism over negotiations; Japanese statements and movements of their forces indicate "surprise aggressive movement in any direction * * * possibility."

And on November 27 the dispatch to Kimmel:

"This dispatch is to be considered a war warning * * * aggressive move by Japan is expected within the next few days * * * execute an appropriate defensive employment take appropriate measures against sabotage."

November 28: Kimmel got copy of Army message giving warning to be ready. Stated United States "desires that Japan commit the first overt act. This policy should not be construed as restricting you to a course of action that might jeopardize your defense."

December 1: CNO sent dispatch to Kimmel reporting on Jap intrigue in Malaya.

December 3: Kimmel informed in two dispatches that Japanese were burning their codes and papers in American, British, and Dutch missions.

December 4: Kimmel given information copy of order to Guam to destroy some papers, be ready to destroy rest.

December 6: Kimmel authorized to have outlying islands destroy their documents "now or under later conditions of greater emergency."

Said the congressional committee at this point:

"From a review of dispatches and correspondence sent Admiral Kimmel it is concluded that he was fully informed concerning the progressive deterioration of relations with Japan and was amply warned of the imminence of war with that nation" (Rept. 100).

Kimmel's contentions that he was not clearly warned, said the committee (Rept. 109) "must be judged in light of the fact that on November 28 on his own responsibility he instructed the fleet to depth bomb all submarine contacts expected to be hostile in the fleet operating areas."

Halsey told the Hart inquiry (one of the many Pearl Harbor probes) that, on leaving for Wake, November 28, he got orders from Kimmel which he interpreted as permitting him to sink "even a Japanese sampan" if he found it. (Rept. 109, Hart Record, pp. 297-298.)

KIMMEL IGNORED

Now we come to the famous 14-part Japanese note, to be delivered exactly at 1 p. m. on December 7 (7:30 a. m. Pearl Harbor time). When intercepted and decoded messages were shown to F. D. R. the night before, he exclaimed, "This means war!"

Even though—but Theobald won't admit it—1 p. m. Washington time would be significant to a lot of areas besides Pearl Harbor, Washington has much to explain about not communicating with Pearl that night. All the congressional reports considered this in assessing part of the blame on Washington.

But the facts remain:

1. Kimmel had all the warnings referred to previously.

2. Kimmel knew the Japanese fleet was on the loose, lost, but with a big part, including carriers, last reported in the Mandates, from which a strike on Pearl was feasible—and less liable to detection than a strike at the Indies or Malaya.

3. Kimmel had even remarked to one of his own officers, Captain Layton: "Do you mean to say that they (two missing carrier divisions) could be rounding Diamond Head and you wouldn't know it."

4. Though Kimmel had not been told that Japan long ago had asked for Pearl berthing position data, the FBI on December 6 told Army and Navy intelligence officers in Hawaii that they had intercepted a message indicating that Japan was interested in plane and ship movements on Oahu. Short got this report December 6; Kimmel, December 7 (Rept. 137).

5. Kimmel, as a professional military man, knew that Japan had a long record of starting wars with surprise blows. (Theobald mentions this record; never admits that Kimmel should have known it, too.)

PEARL SNAFUED

Now we come to the events of early December 7. Theobald makes no mention of the famous radar interception of the Japanese planes at 7:02 a. m. This omission is perhaps proper, for while it reflects on the sad state of affairs in Hawaii under Short and Kimmel, the intercept was neither reported to them nor to anyone high enough to take action.

But how about the submarine sighted by the minesweeper *Condor* at 3:42 a. m. Honolulu time?

And the sighting and sinking by the destroyer *Ward* of a submarine off Pearl? The *Ward* and a navy patrol plane attacked at 6:45 a. m. *Ward* radioed naval district headquarters at 6:51. Bloch's chief of staff had the information at 7:12. Kimmel's duty officer had it at 7:15. Kimmel said he got it between 7:30 and 7:40.

The first Japanese attacks were at 7:55 a. m.

Naval district headquarters had 1 hour and 4 minutes—from 6:51 to 7:55—to alert the island. Bloch's chief of staff had 43 minutes. Kimmel's duty officer had 40 minutes. Kimmel himself had 15 to 25 minutes.

Only result of all this warning was to close the submarine net.

All the thousands of words Theobald spews cannot erase the responsibility for Pearl Harbor.

VERDICT RIGHT

The people through their Congress had opportunity to judge, and they rendered the verdict.

The majority of the congressional committee found:

"The disaster * * * was the failure * * * of the Army and the Navy to institute measures designed to detect an approaching enemy force, to effect a state of readiness * * * and to employ every facility at their command in repelling the Japanese." (Rept. 251.)

It then laid specific blames on the Hawaiian commands, on the Intelligence and War Plans Divisions of the War and Navy Departments. (Rept. 252.) It criticized Kimmel and Short for failing to communicate with each other (Rept. 264).

That was the majority verdict. What said the Republicans—and it would have been great political stake if they could have pinned even one-tenth of Theobald's charges on the President?

Senators Brewster and Ferguson said the President and his advisers were guilty of some shortcomings, too. One of them was this:

"Whatever errors of judgment the commanders at Hawaii committed and whatever mismanagement they displayed in preparing for a Japanese attack * * * they were designated for their posts by high authorities in Washington—all of whom were under obligation to have a care for competence in the selection of subordinates for particular positions of responsibility" (Minority Rept., p. 11).

In short, Washington could not dodge responsibility for Short and Kimmel's competence.

What said Representative Keefe in his conclusion (Rept. 266T)?

"On the evidence before us I concur in the findings of the committee with respect to responsibilities of our commanders in Hawaii. * * * Those in command at the Washington level must bear their full share of responsibility."

THE INVESTIGATION

It is interesting to note that Theobald criticizes the actions of the legal staff of the congressional committee (ch. 12) but never once mentions their names. For good reason.

For the great William D. Mitchell himself headed the four-man staff until January 14, 1946. Then when the probe dragged on (the committee originally was to report January 3, 1946; actually reported on July 16, 1946), only John E. Masten could stay on.

The report actually was compiled by Masten and four others, the chief counsel being Republican isolationist Seth W. Richardson—also a giant in the legal profession.

Theobald says of Naval Court of Inquiry and Army Pearl Harbor Board opinions, "withheld as they were until buried in the 40-volume report of the joint committee hearings, it is doubtful if they have even received even passing public attention."

Those two reports, on the contrary, are cited page after page in the congressional report.

Theobald says Roosevelt's files were not accessible. But President Truman on October 13, 1945, informed Senator Barkley, chairman, that if there was any difficulty about the committee's getting access to files of the previous administration, either at Archives or Hyde Park, "I'll be glad to issue the necessary order so that you may have complete access."

Truman's October 28 order to cooperate with the committee was broadened November 7 to direct every official in Government to authorize every person interrogated by the committee:

"To give any information of which they may have knowledge bearing on the subject of the committee's investigation.

"You are further requested to authorize them whether or not they are interrogated * * * to come forward voluntarily and disclose * * * any information * * * which they may have reason to think may not already have been disclosed to the committee."

Many other statements of Theobald can be refuted but the result would be a book bigger than his.

We've said enough, more than enough, to demonstrate that Theobald's book is so much vicious garbage, an infamous attack on a dead man.

Taft-Hartley Fiasco—Hope on Social Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 17, 1954

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the decision of the Republican leadership in Congress and in the administration Monday to shelve all efforts this session to change the Taft-Hartley Act was, of course, inevitable. When the Senate recommitted the bill last week—that is, sent it back to committee for further study—it was, in effect, declaring that the bill was to be buried for this year.

Under the circumstances, there was no surprise in the announcement at the White House Monday by House and Senate Republican leaders that there would be no more work done between now and congressional adjournment on this subject. We have been working on this bill in the House Committee on Education and Labor for many weeks, and, of course, that now turns out to have been a complete waste of time.

It was pretty obvious from the first that Taft-Hartley revision would not get anywhere in this session despite the President's professed desire to see some of the more extreme union-busting, antilabor provisions taken out of it. A moderate bill might have had some chance. But what the congressional Republicans most influential on labor-management legislation were insisting on was not a moderate improvement in the measure but rather a further restriction and kicking around of labor.

SOCIAL SECURITY IS ONE BRIGHT HOPE IN THIS CONGRESS

The fiasco on Taft-Hartley, the murder in the House of public housing, the extreme one-sidedness of tax legislation suggested by the Eisenhower administration to aid big business only and ignore little business and the average taxpayer, the indecision on agricultural policy, the failure to come forward with any practical solution to the widening recession—all these things make it clear that the GOP 83d Congress will have very little to brag about.

It still had a chance to make good on one promise which is popular with all of the people and which could be put through Congress promptly once the Republican leadership gets the wheels moving. I am speaking, of course, of an amended and improved social-security system.

While patiently waiting for the President to come forward with his program on social security, a large number of Democrats in the House introduced their own bill early this year. The President's subsequent proposals included most of these Democratic suggestions, some with modification.

For instance, we proposed that benefits be based on incomes up to $4,800 a year instead of the present $3,600; the President suggested a top of $4,200. Again, we suggested that a beneficiary be allowed to earn up to $1,200 a year instead of the present $900 top limitation; the President suggested $1,000. In most other respects, the President's proposals similarly closely follow if not echo the Democratic suggestions.

The one major difference in philosophy between the two sets of proposals—the other differences are mainly differences of degree—involves the treatment of workers who suffer complete physical disablement before reaching the retirement age of 65. Under the Democratic bill, such a worker could immediately begin collecting social security benefits; under the President's proposal, he would be kept on the rolls as if still working and would be excused from making any further contributions to the fund, but he would not receive benefits until he did reach retirement age.

In view of the general agreement among Republicans and Democrats on the need for improving social security, this is one type of legislation which could pass easily—if the Republican leadership of the Congress gets busy on it. Time is getting short.

Labor's Interest in a Long-Range Farm Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 28, 1954

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, last year the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives held extensive hearings on a long-range farm program. On October 12, 1953, such a hearing was held at Minneapolis, Minn. One of the witnesses was the Honorable Howard F. Pellant, Wisconsin assemblyman representing the United Automobile Workers, CIO. His testimony exemplifies the deep interest that urban dwellers and laboring people have in a sound farm economy. Under leave to extend my remarks, I am including the testimony of Mr. Pellant:

Statement of Howard F. Pellant, Wisconsin Assemblyman, Milwaukee 17th District, Representing the United Automobile Workers, CIO

I have a short brief pertaining to my appearance before your committee, in which I have outlined some of the effects low farm income has on the residents of the urban areas.

I realize that my brief does not contain a detailed program to solve the farm problem other than some general thoughts. I do not believe that I, as a resident of the city, have the experience nor the right to spell out a program for the farmer.

It has been called to my attention that there are some people who have attempted to destroy good farm programs by making statements indicating that the urban dweller is opposed to farm price-support programs and other good legislation that is aimed at aiding the farmer.

I am a resident of the urban area, a legislative representative of an urban area, and also a union representative of industrial workers, and as such I have been very close to said people in discussion of the farm topic. I therefore felt it was imperative that I appear before your committee to dispel such rash and irresponsible statements and make it absolutely clear to the committee that the city resident understands the farm economy and how it affects him, and therefore he is in full support of a sound farm program.

I am making this appearance before the United States House of Representatives Committee on Agriculture because of my interest in the economy and the standards of all of the citizens whom I represent. Being a member of the Wisconsin State Legislature, Milwaukee 17th Assembly District, I am interested in all of the citizens of our State: farmers, workers, small-business men, et cetera. Also, being a representative of the United Automobile Workers, CIO, I am naturally interested in the welfare of our working people.

In my opinion, as well as the opinion of many others, the economy of one segment of our society is reliant upon the economy of other segments of our society, and this is particularly true of farmers and factory workers. These two segments are the actual producers for not only the citizens of America, but for the people of the world, and when the income of one is lowered, the effects are felt throughout the entire world.

I therefore believe that it becomes the responsibility of our union leaders and our public officials to represent all the people involved in our economy. The happenings of today are the best examples as to why we should and must be interested parties. The falling of farm prices has naturally reduced the income of the farmers; the farmers in turn have stopped purchasing the necessary farm equipment; equipment which paves the way for farm operation at greater efficiency., The results are as follows:

1. Our small farm towns suffer as the result of fewer purchases of basic commodities in these small farm communities. The small-business men, the country store, the gasoline and oil dealer, the clothier, the automobile and tractor repairshop, and even the tavern keeper must adjust their purchases of not only the goods that they sell but also of the goods that they use. The small town cannot expect to function properly in an area of low income. We must, of course, understand that the small town or community is a stalwart pillar of our farm economy.

2. The working people in the large industrial areas not only feel the loss of purchases by the farmer himself, but also the loss as the result of the lower income of the small-town businessman. These effects are obvious for already in the farm-implement industry thousands of workers have been laid off from their jobs.

In the J. I. Case farm-implement plant in Racine, Wis., almost two-thirds of their production working force has been laid off, a reduction from 3,200 to the present level of 1,200, these layoffs coming in the last few months and, if conditions do not improve, more layoffs are in sight.

Massey-Harris, manufacturers of farm implements, has laid off 600 workers and the International Harvester Co. has layoffs running into the thousands. These layoffs have their effect on other manufacturers. Nash Motors of Kenosha, Wis., has reduced their working force from a peak of 11,500, immediately prior to July 1953, to the present level of 6,500. Their Nash body plant in Milwaukee, Wis., has reduced their forces from 5,500 prior to July, to a level of 2,400 today.

Wisconsin Motors Corp., a Milwaukee, Wis., industrial concern, has laid off 300 to 400 workers in recent weeks. Walker Manufacturing Co., Racine, Wis., manufacturers of hydraulic jacks, laid off 200 employees. These layoffs by the manufacturers of our basic commodities have resulted in large curtailments of the working forces in supplier plants, such as foundries which have reduced production by 30 to 40 percent; forge shops and many others too numerous to mention have reduced hours of work from 40 to 32 hours per week.

3. The cycle continues on through the small retail store to the manufacturer and on back to the farmer and the rest of the world.

There can be only one result if present farm conditions are allowed to continue in their present pattern, and that is another severe depression. We do not have to go back too many years to find out the result of a drop in our farm economy, for the great depression of the early thirties was without a question brought about by the farm depression of the twenties. We have the experience today to cope with these problems; we must put our know-how to work and prevent another chaotic and sad experience.

America has not yet reached the stage of overproduction, and that time should never come. The needs of the people here in America alone are sufficient to keep our farms and factories producing at peak levels for many, many years. While economic conditions, not need, prevent many people in America from purchasing our farm products, the demand for food by our friendly foreign nations is more than enough to pick up the slack.

Recognizing that it is not overproduction, as far as the needs of the people are concerned, that is causing the drop in our farm income, we must embark upon a farm-distribution program that will make available to the consumer farm products at the lowest possible cost and at the same time assure the farmer of a reasonable return.

Past experience has proven that the farmer will produce at an increasing pace if we make it possible for him to do so. We must assure him of a market for his product, the tools and equipment with which to work efficiently, and, most important of all, a cushion so that he does not suffer should he produce more than current consumption.

It is necessary to encourage more production on the part of the farmer for many reasons, such as listed above. However, one important point we cannot overlook is the fact that our population is increasing at the rate of 7,500 per day, and that in 20 more years we shall need an increase in farm production of 20 percent to properly feed people of that day.

We have noted the sharp decline in farm income. However, while farm income is dropping, we find only a very slight reflection in consumer-food prices. Since 1946 consumer-food prices for an average family have increased $294, and of this amount the farmer received only $66, while the processors, middlemen, and retailers received $222. While we recognize the importance of profit in our way of life, we at the same time cannot allow exorbitant profits to destroy the very incentive of the farmers to produce.

It was reported in the Wall Street Journal on May 2, 1953, that first-quarter profits, after taxes, of 18 food-product manufacturers were 29.1 percent higher in the first quarter of 1953 than the first quarter of 1952.

The reasons for this sharp increase in profits are obvious. This type of profit program, however, is disastrous for an improper distribution of the total food income. A distribution which leans toward the processor, etc., can only mean less income for the farmer and, therefore, less production on his part and less purchasing power on the part of the consumer of farm products. It is, therefore, imperative that this committee make a very complete and thorough investigation of the profits derived from farm products by the so-called middleman.

We have seen how disastrous a farm recession or depression can be to our entire economic structure. It becomes, therefore, absolutely necessary that a strong farm program be instigated immediately.

As a representative of the city residents in the Wisconsin State Legislature and a union representative of working people, I know that these people from urban areas are in full support of the farm price-support program. Our Government has spent billions of dollars for guns and ammunition in an attempt to defeat our common foe. However, what better ammunition do we have than our surplus foods?

The food-distribution program of East Berlin is the best example of how potent a weapon food really is. In the past we were willing to spend billions to destroy lives while being reluctant to spend any amount to save lives.

Here in America we suffer as the result of an overabundance of food, while in friendly nations the people suffer because of the lack of food. Would it not be feasible then to put our excess food to good use by using it to fight communism, and at the same time keep our farms at a high level of production and income, and thereby protect the rest of our citizenry?

We, the people of the urban areas, wish you Godspeed in adopting a strong and workable farm program.

Aid To Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1954

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, Americans are justly proud that the United States has risen to a position of leadership among the free countries of the world. I wonder how many of our citizens have thoughtfully pondered the reasons for our national rise to greatness.

No doubt many factors have contributed to our phenomenal national development, but certainly one of the most basic factors—and perhaps the most important cause—has been our nationwide emphasis upon education in years past.

For many decades our Federal, State, and local governments, working together, provided educational advantages for our people as a whole superior to those made available to the whole populations of most other countries. Some other nations living in lands having resources equal to those of the United States have not equally progressed. Why? Objective studies support the conclusion that the lesser advancement of some other nations has been due mainly to their failure to provide the education necessary for the development of their resources—especially their human resources.

Within recent years, however, a number of other countries have awakened to the cry of their whole people for better educational advantages, while America has neglected the educational needs of millions of her children. The effect may be disastrous for our great Nation. Already a warning is heard in the alarm over widespread juvenile delinquency in this country.

We are not lacking in knowledge of our educational deficiencies. Data compiled by our Bureau of the Census, Selective Service System, United States Office of Education, National Education Association, and other agencies and organizations, public and private, have furnished ample evidence of the educational shortcomings and inadequate educational opportunities of millions of our people. Many official and authoritative publications have drawn attention to the facts that in numerous localities in every State of the Union teachers' salaries are lower than they should be, there is a shortage of qualified teachers, classrooms are overcrowded, instructional materials are lacking, and school housing conditions are deplorable.

In December 1953 the United States Office of Education published its report of a nationwide school facilities survey which was carried out by Federal, State, and local educational agencies with the aid of an appropriation by the 81st Congress. The survey showed that in 1952 there was a need for about 312,000 classrooms to house nearly 9 million pupils. The need is rapidly growing greater. Many hundreds of thousands of the Nation's children are attending school in firetrap buildings, barracks, garages, church basements, former industrial buildings, and other makeshift quarters.

The national school facilities survey revealed that in 1952 about 870,000 or 43 percent of the schoolchildren of California needed new school housing. Because of the rapid growth of school population in this State a greatly accelerated rate of construction will be necessary to overtake the need for additional facilities.

Early this year President Eisenhower recommended the convening of State and national conferences to consider the crucial problems of public education. More recently Mrs. Oveta Culp Hobby, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, has suggested that legislation providing Federal aid to school construction be deferred until after these conferences have been held—probably in 1955 or 1956. She advanced arguments to support her position. On May 12, a spokesman for the American Federation of Labor, testifying before the Senate Subcommittee on Education, called these agruments spurious and ludicrous and gave his reasons for using these epithets.

Some other persons have expressed the opinion that the administration, by delaying tactics, is attempting to prevent establishment of a general program of Federal participation in financing school construction.

A cartoon in the Washington Post and Times-Herald of May 13, represented the "Department of Not-Too-Much Health, Welfare, and Education," shutting out two schoolchildren representing "immediate school-construction needs." The departmental leadership represented in the cartoon is telling the children, "You can go to school a few years from now."

It will be an inexcusable blunder for any political party in this country to ignore the present great and urgent needs of public education. Our school-construction needs, especially, are immediate and critical. The education of our Nation's children cannot be postponed.

Several millions of dollars were spent on the national school facilities survey just completed. It has shown that the States and localities are unable to raise, from revenue sources presently available to them, all the money needed for school facilities. Part of the money must come from sources of revenue already being utilized by the Federal Government.

The term "Federal aid to education" is a misnomer—an unfortunate misrepresentation. Under the Constitution the Federal Government is responsible for the national defense and for the promotion of the general welfare. In can, with propriety, assume some responsibility for helping to finance public education, which is essential to the national defense and to the general welfare.

The question is only one of how much of the necessary funds for education should be drawn from Federal sources of revenue, and how much should be drawn from State and local sources of revenue. Data already compiled indicate that it has become necessary to draw a larger percentage of school support from Federal sources of revenue.

I have introduced a bill to provide Federal participation in financing school construction throughout the country. My bill is H. R. 9179, and is similar to a measure, S. 536, introduced by Senator HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, in January 1953.

The bill would provide for an allotment of Federal funds by the United State Offices of Education to the respective State educational agencies in accordance with a prescribed, objective formula. The bill would place upon the State educational agency the responsibility for the allotment of funds to the school districts within the State. The bill would give slightly greater allotments per school child to States in which the per capita income is relatively low.

I am also in favor of measures to increase the attractions of the teaching professions, including increase of salaries for teachers and increase of teachers' pensions, and other retirement benefits. I believe that by maintaining the prestige of the teaching profession and otherwise adding to its attractions, and by strengthening all other provisions for education we can greatly strengthen our Nation for its tremendous task of leadership in the free world.

The Blight of Socialism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 10, 1954

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an article entitled "The Receding Icecap of Socialism," that appeared in the May 1 issue of Economic Trend Line Studies, by Mr. J. H. Kelleghan. This is a most interesting article on the subject of socialism:

THE RECEDING ICECAP OF SOCIALISM

(By J. H. Kelleghan)

In one of the brilliant flashes of insight of which he is capable, Whittaker Chambers in his book Witness, called the New Deal a great socialist revolution which, in the name of liberalism spasmodically, incompletely, somewhat formlessly, but always in the same direction, has been inching its icecap over the Nation for two decades.

No statement in his book has infuriated leftwing and Socialist groups quite as much as this one. Socialist columnists still mention it occasionally as if it continues to haunt their consciences.

And haunt their consciences it should because the word, "icecap," describes with complete accuracy the effect of socialism, or its ominous shadow, communism—on a national economy. Socialistic government, wherever it has achieved dominant national power, has proved conclusively that it is incapable of managing a dynamic economy. Government bureaus can deal effectively with an economy only by checking its dynamic motion—freezing it with price controls, production controls, the whole paraphernalia of rigidities that reduce the economic atmosphere to frigidity and check economic growth.

We are all familiar with this phase of our recent history and we would all like to put it behind us and forget it, if we could. Unfortunately, it cannot be dismissed that easily. We have quite forgotten to take into consideration the fact that when the political weather moderates, economic icecaps melt. Icecaps, or glaciers as they are more commonly known, turn into rivulets and the rivulets become rivers. The rivers spread rich alluvial deposits over broad valleys before they form deep channels, and the fertile soil springs into life. In short, a frozen economy, when it thaws under the benign influence of a congenial political climate, regains its dynamic motion and resumes its natural growth.

Viewed from this standpoint the present economic situation takes on a quite different complexion than that which some current interpretations give it. Imagine how an Eskimo in the frozen north might feel if the domicile beneath him suddenly turned into water. A similar sensation must be felt by a large proportion of the American population who have lived on a socialistic icecap for so long that they scarcely know any other kind of existence. As the rigid economic structure beneath them begins to show dynamic movement they are filled with fear and trepidation.

When one surveys the wet and shivering economic terrain left nakedly exposed to unaccustomed freedom as the icecap recedes over the horizon, the view is fascinating. We see whole economic groups left perched on ledges of unduly high price levels, mortally afraid of the descent into the plain below. Whole labor organizations, jacked up to imposing heights on the boom of government economic power, must now know the imperative necessity of coming down if they are not to suffer the slow economic starvation of prolonged unemployment. Corporations, accustomed to send their output tobagganing over the ice, propelled by the winds of inflation, are now reluctant to cut their production back to the volume that can be pushed away in sleds.

Farmers, who hugely overproduced crops for an economy gripped in glacial immobility, stacked their production in bins that need only to be painted white to look like veritable ice-made igloos of the Arctic Circle.

Small wonder that people are troubled and afraid. Frozen into rigid patterns for 20 years, many must have lost the use of economic limbs not to mention the feebleness of neglected economic intellect. Some, perhaps, would even prefer slow economic death on the frozen icecap to the unwanted animation now being thrust upon them.

From the top of an icecap the present attitude of some manufacturers toward their price structure is perfectly comprehensible. Price levels in a frozen economy become sacrosanct. Fishermen who have only to drop their lines through holes in the ice to catch the fish they need, resent the effort of casting nets into running water.

The workers who could once climb to higher and higher wages on ice blocks piled by the Government, now resent it deeply when there are no more blocks being piled.

Businessmen who have known only the limited and uncompetitive activity of a rigid economic mechanism will now find that a live, a warm economy makes a man hustle to keep ahead.

As we waken from our long economic sleep in the Arctic twilight of socialism, it is interesting to speculate on how Rip Van Winkle must have felt when he awoke from his 20-year slumber. Certainly he must have felt completely helpless, fearful, and lost. The habits and skills he possessed when sleep closed his eyes were probably useless and outdated. For a time his progress must have been slow and faltering until he had restored his powers to full vigor.

Thus it is not strange that we find an economic icecap mentality lingering all around us—in congressional leaders and politicians, in newspapermen, businessmen, labor leaders, workers and educators. Accustomed so long to the lethargy and comparative security of igloo life, a world of vigorous activity has become distasteful.

Sooner or later, however, everybody is going to have to recognize that the Washington refrigerator has stopped working, that the icecap is melting, and that the strange, dark material upon which they now rest is earth in which they are expected to dig.

It is extraordinary how swiftly the twilight of socialism fell upon us Americans, a Nation of pioneers. It seems as if the ring of the pioneer's ax had hardly stopped echoing through the forests before the national economy collapsed around us, and fear laid its clammy hand on our brows and said, "you can't restore it yourselves. You'd better let the Government in Washington do it."

The Government in Washington, we learned, could take punitive action against the erstwhile leaders who were blamed for the economic collapse but no Government power could be found that would restore the dynamism of the enterprise economy.

Two administrations in this socialistic twilight concealed their failures in war, as the leaders of enterprise threw their wholehearted cooperation behind the Government in the national war effort. Each time, war's end found the economy again helplessly locked in the freezing controls of bureaucratic incompetence.

Bureaucrats have learned, but many are not even yet willing to concede, that when economic controls stifle and crush enterprise the economy is left without a starter. They try with ever greater futility to push the economy into high gear with the Government steamroller, apparently unconscious of the fact that a glacial formation has no means of self-propulsion.

With the administration now in Washington conscious of the Government's inability to replace enterprise as economic motive power, we should soon find our economy responding to the long unused incentives of enterprise and resourceful effort. From our heritage and our traditions we can best qualify as pioneers of enterprise and apostles of freedom. We can never qualify as pioneers of socialism. The lives of these pioneers were snuffed out in blood purges, extinguished in concentration camps, or were spent congealed in cold terror at the prospect of nocturnal visits by the secret police, an agency that is inevitable where socialism—and communism—are made to function.

Informal Procedures of the National Labor Relations Board

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. IRVING M. IVES

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 17, 1954

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of an address on the subject Informal Procedures of the National Labor Relations Board, delivered by Louis G. Silverberg, Director of Information, the National Labor Relations Board, at the Second Annual Central New York Labor Law Conference, in Syracuse, N. Y., on March 20, 1954.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INFORMAL PROCEDURES OF THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

(Address by Louis G. Silverberg, Director of Information, NLRB, at Second Annual Central New York Labor Law Conference, Syracuse, N. Y., March 20, 1954)

I

In the discussion of labor-management relations, attention tends to center upon the controversial issues. But we all know that no human activity can be carried on in an atmosphere of incessant controversy. The everyday work of labor-management relations, like that of other fields, is considerably less spectacular than the big issues that make the front pages. The same is true of the operations of the National Labor Relations Board. The bulk of our activity is devoted to cases that get little if any attention from the daily press or even the specialized reporting services which devote so much time to reporting the precedent-setting decisions in the field.

The precedent-setting decisions of the Board, of course, have a widespread impact and their effects reverberate through the industrial relations departments of industry and the offices of labor unions. But I would like to talk today about some aspects of our agency's work which are seldom discussed and rarely make a newspaper headline. As you well may guess—I speak of the handling and settling of cases in the field, those cases that never get to Washington.

Last year, for instance, over 80 percent of the unfair labor practice cases handled by the agency were closed in the field. In terms of actual cases, that means that, out of more than 5,800 unfair labor practice cases closed, 5,100 were closed without the necessity of issuing a complaint or taking any other formal action.

Collective bargaining election cases present a somewhat different picture. The percentage of these cases that can be disposed of without the necessity of formal action runs quite a little lower—about 75 percent. The reason for this undoubtedly lies in the nature of a representation case. While such a case is not an adversary proceeding in the technical legal sense, it must be recognized that the parties often have directly opposing interests in such things as the extent of the bargaining unit, or the validity of a contract urged as a bar to an election, or even in the time the election should be held. Representation cases that come up to the Board members for decision often involve little more than questions of whether a particular employee is or is not a supervisor, or whether a contract has been renewed or not. These are issues of fact on which it sometimes is difficult to obtain agreement among the parties; and, without agreement, they can be resolved only by decision of the Board. Nevertheless, when it comes to actual representation elections conducted, our field people have been able to achieve a very respectable batting average of agreements obtained—over 65 percent. For example, last year the Board conducted a total of 6,200 representation elections. Of these, 4,200 were held by mutual and complete agreement of the parties.

II

Now to turn to the informal disposition of unfair practice cases at the level of the regional office. The biggest share of the cases settled in the field are closed by withdrawals; that is, the one who filed the charge withdraws it. Last year over 45 percent of the cases closed were handled in this fashion. However, this does not mean merely that the charging party had a change of mind. The bulk of these cases undoubtedly were found upon investigation to lack merit—either because there was not sufficient evidence to prove the allegations or because the conduct involved actually did not amount to a violation of the law. However, a substantial number of the withdrawals reflect settlements of the cases. This is readily illustrated by a hypothetical case of an alleged refusal to bargain. Let us say, either an employer or union has refused to bargain in good faith as required by the act, and the other party filed a charge. If, after conferences with the Board's field examiner, the party charged with the refusal becomes aware of the nature of his duties under the law and he should desire to remove the impediments to full-faith bargaining, it certainly would be appropriate for the charging party to withdraw his charge despite the past violation. And this happens not infrequently.

However, the charging party has no legal right to withdraw a charge. And it makes no difference that he has obtained some settlement or adjustment that suits his private purposes. To illustrate, take a case of an employee discharged because of his union activities. It may be that the employer or the union responsible—as the case may be—has offered him a cash settlement to withdraw his charge and just forget about the whole business. And suppose the employee is willing to take the cash and let his job go. But it may be that the discharge of the employee was effected in a manner that would make several hundred other employees fearful of exercising the rights that the statute guarantees them. In such a situation, it would hardly be proper to permit the one employee, for his own ends, to sacrifice the protection of the rights of the other employees. Moreover, it might well be such a flagrant violation of the act that only a Board order would effectively protect these employees' rights.

In short, the act is neither designed nor intended to vindicate private rights; its administration, as applied to individual cases, is concerned with the effectuation of a public policy, with the realization in each case of that national policy which governs our labor-management relations. The charging party has, by filing a charge, invoked that policy. Consequently, once a charge is made it may be withdrawn only by permission of the General Counsel if it is still under investigation, or by the permission of the Board members if the case is before them. However, the Board specifically provides in its statement of procedure that, if investigation reveals that there has been no violation of the act or the evidence is insufficient to support the charge, the regional director will recommend withdrawal of the charge by the person who filed it.

Furthermore, if the charging party declines to withdraw a charge which investigation reveals to be unsupported by good evidence or otherwise without merit, the regional director has authority to dismiss the charge. In case of such a dismissal, the General Counsel has provided that the charging party may appeal to him in Washington within 10 days after the dismissal. Upon such an appeal, the entire file of the case is sent by the regional director to Washington and fully reviewed by the General Counsel. After such a review, the General Counsel may sustain the dismissal or he may direct the regional director to take further action. A substantial number of dismissals are appealed, and for several years, the General Counsel has published his rulings in appeals cases, but without identifying the parties. This use of anonymity is intended to avoid the unnecessary tagging of unions or employers with unfounded charges.

So much for the withdrawal of charges at the threshold of proceedings. Let us now turn to other types of early dispositions of cases. Of course, the first step after a charge is filed is to investigate it. Withdrawals, dismissals, and settlements are not undertaken until there has been careful investigation of the facts. However, as soon as the field examiner has gathered sufficient evidence to obtain a clear picture of the case, there is nothing to prevent him from seeking an informal settlement if that seems to be indicated. Moreover, when the investigation indicates that a charge of violation is true, the field examiner is required to offer the offending party an opportunity to settle the case before formal proceedings are begun. This is in accord with the requirements of the Administrative Procedure Act. However, he is not required to accept a settlement which does not remedy the unfair labor practice.

A settlement or adjustment, to carry out the purposes of the act and to be acceptable to our regional office, must provide that the party in violation take steps adequate to remedy the unfair labor practice indicated.

At the same time, it must be kept in mind that the field examiner's job is not to arbitrate or conciliate disputes between the parties. His task is simply to obtain settlement which will remedy the violations of the act. The approval of the charging party is also sought; but, if he should decline, the settlement is still effective. However, settlements, like dismissals, may be appealed by the charging party to the General Counsel in Washington.

In Board terminology, adjustments of cases are divided into two categories: (1) informal adjustments, which are those that require no Board order or court decree; and (2) formal adjustments, under which the party charged with violation agrees to issuance of an order by the Board in Washington and a decree by the appropriate United States court of appeals. Formal adjustments ordinarily are obtained in cases where the evidence of violation is clear cut and there is a possibility that the violations may be repeated.

The mere fact that formal proceedings have started, however, does not foreclose an adjustment or settlement. The Board's statement of procedure provides that the parties have an opportunity at every stage of the procedure to dispose of the case by an amicable adjustment which satisfies the law. Thus, even after a complaint has issued and a hearing begun, the General Counsel's attorney in charge of the case and the regional director ordinarily will afford all parties every opportunity for the submission and consideration of offers of settlement and proposals of adjustment. Of course, all settlement stipulations which provide for entry of a Board order are subject to approval by the Board members. If the party who is subject to the order fails to comply with the settlement, the Board of course may seek to enforce its order or the court decree, as the case may be.

That these various types of settlements are beneficial to all concerned, goes without saying. They benefit not only the Government but the parties as well. There are substantial savings in time and money and litigation, not to mention the avoidance of the ill feelings that sometimes develop among the parties in the course of protracted litigation. In addition, in a hotly-contested case, bitterness may develop at the plant level which may seriously impede, or even prevent, the resumption of peaceful relations between management and the representative of the employees. To remedy and avoid this ill feeling is of the prime importance in carrying out the mandate of Congress in the statute, to encourage harmonious relations between management and labor.

In sharp contrast to the quick and amicable adjustment of a settled case, a contested case must run the gamut of investigation, preparation of witnesses, public hearing and cross-examination before the trial examiner, the filing of briefs with the trial examiner, formal exceptions to the examiner's recommended order, briefs filed with the Board, and perhaps an appeal to the courts, with the further accompanying round of briefs and arguments. The Board members and the General Counsel have reduced considerably the amount of time consumed in the handling of those unfair labor practice cases coming up to the Board; however, a contested case still consumes an average of about 330 days, from the filing of the charge to the issuance of a decision by the Board members. And, as I have indicated, that is not always the end of the case; nearly as much additional time may be consumed in appeals to the courts. In sharp contrast to the 330 days required for a contested decision, cases that are settled take less than one-third of that time; the average in 1953 was about 100 days.

Settlements, moreover, play a large part in the actual enforcement of the law. For example, in cases involving charges of discrimination against employees, over 3,000 employees were awarded back pay during 1953. Of these, 66 percent received back pay as a result of settlements agreed to by the parties. Moreover, these settlements clearly appear to be considerably less costly to the parties than a case taken up before the Board for a full-dress decision. This is indicated by the figures on the back pay: During the past year, the 66 percent of the employees who received back pay through settlement agreements accounted for only 45 percent of the total back pay awarded—or $590,000 out of the $1,355,000 in back pay disbursed by both companies and labor unions. This can be attributed mainly to the fact that it takes considerably less time to settle cases, when the parties are willing.

than it does to take a case up through hearing and argument, to the Board members for a decision. As a consequence of shorter time lapse, the bill for back pay is smaller. Thus, back pay per employee in settlement cases averaged $290 last year; but back pay per employee in cases that were contested up to the Board averaged $760.

Settlement agreements also account for the greatest number of reinstatements of employees and for the bulk of the cases in which collective bargaining is resumed after being initially unlawfully withheld. Thus, in 1953, employees reinstated by agreement of the parties numbered 1,240. This was more than 70 percent of the 1,750 employees reinstated as a result of action by the agency. Collective bargaining was begun as a result of settlement agreements between the parties in 200 cases. This was over 75 percent of the 265 cases in which bargaining was begun as a result of action by the Board.

These figures, I think, not only underscore the importance of the Board's informal proceedings in the administration of the act, but also reflect a very heartening willingness on the part of both employers and unions to take the necessary remedial action when the existence of a violation is brought to their attention.

III

Turning now to the collective-bargaining election cases—the fundamental question in each of these cases is simply this: Who, if anyone, represents a majority of the employees? Debate of this question, though, often arouses considerable feeling at the plant. Moreover, long debate often tends to become acrimonious; as nerves fray, so do tempers. Therefore, it is exceedingly important that all concerned—the employees, the labor unions, and the employers—get an authoritative answer to the basic question as soon as possible.

Here again, informal procedures play a large part in the disposition of issues. As I mentioned earlier, more than 65 percent of all our representation elections in the past year—or 4,200 out of 6,200 elections—were held pursuant to complete agreement between the parties. And of all 9,900 representation cases filed last year, 7,300 were closed without the necessity of a decision by the Board members. In other words, only about one-fourth of the representation cases had to go to Washington.

The time saving that results from the informal settling of representation cases is proportionally just about as great as the saving in unfair-labor-practice cases. Thus, during the past year, the Board devoted an average of 64 days to processing contested representation cases from the filing of the petition to the Board decision. However, in representation cases that were disposed of by mutually agreed upon elections, the time from filing of the petition to the actual time of the election averaged only 24 days—or almost two-thirds less than the time consumed in a contested case.

Because the issues of a representation case are ordinarily simpler than those of an unfair-labor-practice case, the informal procedures for obtaining agreement of the parties are correspondingly simpler. As a matter of fact, the technique used to conduct the investigation of a representation case may indeed be symbolized by the telephone. If the petitioner has submitted a showing of interest or a showing of a representation claim which is adequate, the field examiner will immediately telephone the employer or the union involved, as the case may be. It usually can be determined by telephone whether the issues will require a formal hearing or whether the parties are so disposed that the case can be settled quickly by a consent election or some other type of informal adjustment. The use of informal techniques by our regional offices has resulted in spectacular reductions in the time required, not only for consent elections but also in the time required for the initial handling of cases that must go to hearing. For instance, by the end of last year, the time between the filing of a representation petition and the issuance of the notice of hearing on a petition had been cut by the General Counsel from 19 days down to 4 days—a reduction of 80 percent.

When a representation case is filed, three basic questions have to be answered. These are: (1) Whether the petitioner, if a labor organization, has complied with the filing requirements of the act; (2) whether the operations of the employer are within the area in which the Board exercises jurisdiction; and (3) whether the petitioner, if an employer, has received a claim by a labor organization that it represents the employees; or, if the petitioner is a labor organization, whether it has submitted authorization cards from at least 30 percent of the employees. These are the minimum prerequisites to the Board holding an election. If they are not met—that is, if the answer to any of the three questions is "No"—then the regional director can only dismiss the petition. But if the answers are all "Yes," the field examiner can begin to explore the possibilities of an informal handling of the case by some type of election agreement.

There are two types of election agreements used by the Board. The most frequently used is known as a consent election; the second, a stipulated election.

Pursuant to the consent-election agreement, the parties agree to the Board's holding an election among a described unit of employees on a specified date. In addition, they also agree that the regional director is to determine any questions that arise in the course of the election and that he is to issue a certification on the basis of the results. This type of agreement was used last year in 3,300 elections, or over 50 percent of the elections conducted.

In these agreed-upon elections, as in all other elections held by the Board, the actual voting is supervised by Board agents. The ballots ordinarily are counted and tabulated immediately after the polls close, and representatives of the parties are entitled to be present.

As soon as the counting is finished, a tally of ballots is served upon the parties. The ballots of voters whose eligibility has been challenged by any party or by the Board agent are individually sealed and counted separately in this tally. If the challenged ballots are numerous enough to affect the outcome of the election, the regional director conducts an investigation of the individual challenges and rules on them. If he finds the challenges without merit, the ballots are counted. If the challenges have merit, the ballots are not counted. After the issuance of the tally of ballots, the parties have 5 days in which to file objections to the conduct of the election. If objections are filed, the regional director investigates them and rules upon them. If he finds that the objections have merit, he will declare the election void and conduct a new election. The election agreement provides that the ruling of the regional director on all questions relating to the election are final and binding. If there are no meritorious challenges that will affect the results and no valid objections, the regional director will issue a certification reflecting the results of the election. This certificate has the same force and effect as if issued by the Board.

In the second type of election agreement, the stipulated election, the entire procedure is identical to that of a consent election, with one exception. The difference lies merely in the identity of who shall resolve any questions that may arise. While the regional director is given authority to resolve any questions in a consent election, the stipulated-election agreement calls for the five-member board to rule upon any questions relating to the election. This type of agreement was used in over 900 elections last year, or about 15 percent of the elections.

IV

The formal decisions of the board members in the contested cases, of course, expound the law. They are the guideposts. But it is too often forgotten that the great bulk of the work of an administrative tribunal is not done by formal adjudication of contested cases, but rather by its informal procedures. A distinguished group of investigators thus concluded its thorough study of all Federal administrative agencies currently operating in our complex society:

"In the great majority of cases an investigation and a preliminary decision suffice to settle the matter. Comparatively few cases flower into controversies in which the parties take conflicting positions of such moment to them that resort is necessary to the procedure of the courtroom."

This is as true of the work of the board as of that of any other administrative tribunal. And, to burden you with one final statistic—in the past year the board closed 5,800 unfair practice cases; for every 100 of these cases, only 7 required a formal decision of any type—either by a trial examiner or by the board members. As for the office of the general counsel, it issued complaints in only 13 percent of the thousands of cases filed. In view of these figures, it is not surprising that the United States Attorney General's Committee on Administrative Procedure in 1941—who were the group of investigators I just mentioned—should have declared that "informal procedures constitute the vast bulk of administrative adjudication and are truly the lifeblood of the administrative process."

Reminiscences of a Renegade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURNET R. MAYBANK

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 17, 1954

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able address delivered by Hon. Donald R. Richberg to the South Carolina Bar Association on Friday, May 14, 1954.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMINISCENCES OF A RENEGADE

(Address by Donald R. Richberg (introduced by Gov. James F. Byrnes) at annual banquet of South Carolina Bar Association, Charleston, S. C., May 14, 1954)

Having been accused of being a renegade from the New Deal and from organized labor, I welcome the opportunity you have graciously given me to explain why I glory in my sinning. When a Sunday school teacher asked: "What must you do before you can obtain forgiveness of sin?" a young pupil answered: "You must first sin." If I had never sinned, how could I now seek forgiveness?

But it seems to me most important of all to know that one has sinned. There are thousands of earnest young men of my generation who have gone to their graves unrepentant, never realizing that, as they polluted our politics with socialism, they were inviting the spread of Communist doctrine and its new slavery all over the globe.

There are thousands of once zealous fighters for underpaid, overworked wage earners who have died without realizing that they had helped to build up a new monopoly of huge labor unions. They died without knowing that labor monopolists would, in a blind struggle for power, play a leading part in tearing down our system of free private enterprise that has lifted the average standard of living far above even the dreams of a hundred years ago.

It is fashionable nowadays to lay all sins on parents and other ancestors. So I am going to start my confession by explaining that both my father and mother were idealists who were not afraid to be called renegades. When their fellow idealists developed delusions of grandeur and tyrannical complexes they did not hesitate to turn against them, to denounce them and oppose them.

Without embarrassment I recite here in South Carolina the fact that in 1861 my father ran away from Knox College at the age of 16 to join the Union Army. His father had enough political influence to get his son removed from the Army and placed in the Naval Academy. After 3 years' education he graduated to serve 3 years in the Union Navy. Then he went South to study law and became so outraged by the evils of reconstruction that he became a Democrat and remained one to the end of his days.

Throughout her life my mother espoused one crusade after another intended to wipe out sin and enthrone virtue. But any time she found that self-seekers, greedy men, and lovers of power were taking over the leadership of one of her crusades, she worked with as much zeal to defeat them as she had previously shown in supporting them.

Let me make it plain that I am no blushing, embarrassed renegade. I am proud of my so-called apostasies. John L. Lewis once publicly denounced me as a renegade from union labor who, in his mild language, had "turned against the breast that had suckled him." The only way, which I could recall, that labor had suckled me had been to pay me smaller fees than any other client for days of much harder work. What Mr. Lewis was gently criticizing was that I was opposing certain arrogant stupidities of labor leaders which he thought I ought to support.

Another former labor client of mine, who took a more realistic view of my opposition, was a modest violet named James Caesar Petrillo. A few years ago, when I was in company with Lewis Douglas, we ran into Petrillo and he was generous enough to tell Mr. Douglas that I had once rendered him a valuable legal service. He concluded: "I could certainly use you now, but I suppose you wouldn't represent me." To which I answered with a grin: "No, I would not."

It has been my experience that a lawyer who aids in holding up the power of any rising political or economic group is likely to find himself eventually in agreement with the Lord Acton that all power is corrupting. If his clients are strikingly successful he may find himself faced with the choice someday of either aiding corrupt power or renouncing some of his associates.

In a broad way I would say that my experiences in the line of being a New Deal lawyer followed this course. Let me explain this particularly in terms of constitutional law, a field in which I have been particularly active during 50 years of practice.

My professional life began at the turn of the century, to be exact in 1904. The development of the industrial revolution was raising problems concerning which all solutions seemed to point in the direction of increased governmental power and increased concentration of that power. With the growth of huge enterprises and vast interstate commerce, the efforts of the States to utilize the police power for the protection and promotion of the general welfare met constant frustration. Yet when one attempted to invoke the powers of the National Government to deal with national problems through national action, there arose the obstacle of time-honored limitations written in the National Constitution.

The early progressive movement, which sought to advance social justice by laws regulating our political economy, gathered strength in State and local activities, notably in States such as Wisconsin, and every now and then in a reform movement in a great city. But with the foundation of the Progressive Party, the Bull Moose Party of Theodore Roosevelt in 1912, and the resulting victory of an outstanding Progressive Democrat in the election of Woodrow Wilson, the drive toward a politically regulated economy became a national movement.

The First World War and our entrance into it slowed up this drive. Indeed, Jane Addams exhibited the gift of prophecy when she said to me in 1914: "This war will set back progress for a generation."

The disillusioning effects of the war became vividly evident in 1920 with the election of President Harding on the retrogressive platform of "a return to normalcy." Instead of a moderate effort to go forward with the progressive gains of the prewar years, the philosophy prevailed that government should attempt very little in the way of promoting a sound economy. The pent-up demands accumulated during a period of war sacrifices gave such motive power to private enterprise that for some years we were assured that such evils as developed in the economic system would right themselves. The less overall supervision, direction, and control by Government, the better.

Then, after the unhappy period, 1929–32, the Roosevelt call for vigorous political action in 1933 was welcomed even as a downpour in a parched land. But the strict constitutionalists dominated the courts, and as a result the New Deal philosophers spearheaded a demand for a liberal construction of constitutional powers.

The New Deal philosophy which had captured a majority of the voters was originally a conviction that something must be done and something could be done within the constitutional powers of the Federal Government to relieve national economic distress and to provide measures to prevent a recurrence. But this New Deal idea ran into the obstacle of contrary judicial opinion that the Federal Government had not been given and could not exercise adequate powers. Unfortunately, the counterattack on this opposition was directed at the expounders of the Constitution instead of at the Constitution itself.

In saying that it was unfortunate that we New Dealers attacked the Court instead of the Constitution I do not mean to assert that the "old Court" was right and the Constitution was in fault. On the contrary, I still think that a more liberal construction of the Constitution by conservative judges was warranted and would have preserved the essentials of our form of government, which might have been destroyed if a sweeping constitutional amendment had been adopted to meet emergency demands.

But, on the other hand, if we had attempted to write amendments, such as one increasing the power of Congress to regulate commerce, we would have soon discovered the grave danger to local self-government in any large increase of Federal power. We would have never dared to propose that the Federal Government have power to regulate anything which affected interstate commerce, no matter how trivially or indirectly.

We would have never dared to propose that Congress regulate the window washers in our cities because their sanitary labors might affect interstate commerce. We would have never dared to propose that Congress regulate the amount of grain that a farmer could raise and feed to his livestock because this domestic activity might affect interstate commerce. Yet the new Supreme Court has undertaken to write such an amendment into the Constitution in candid language, which I quote from two of its major decisions:

"The power of Congress over interstate commerce is not confined to the regulation of commerce among the States."

This ruling is plainly an amendment to the Constitution, because the power delegated to Congress in the Constitution is specifically confined to the regulation of commerce among the several States, and the 10th amendment provides that "The powers not delegated to the United States * * * are reserved to the States, respectively, or to the people."

It is exceedingly doubtful whether any such amendment as the Court has made (extending the powers of Congress over all activities which in the judgment of Congress may affect interstate commerce) could be approved even today by a two-thirds vote of both Houses and ratified by three-fourths of the States. Certainly a national debate as to the wisdom of such an amendment would have been desirable before its adoption.

Your thoughts, like mine, may turn to a current national debate over the Bricker amendment. Here is an example of the need and the difficulty of formally adopting a constitutional amendment in order to get rid of another amendment which has been casually written into the Constitution by the Supreme Court.

You will recall, without my going into details, the extraordinary expansion of the treaty power in a series of Supreme Court opinions. It should be sufficient here to point out that the law laid down by the Supreme Court for a long time was that the treaty power could not be extended "so far as to authorize what the Constitution forbids, or a change in the character of the Government, or in that of one of the States." Thus, in a conflict between the Constitution and a treaty it was plain until recently that the Constitution was still our supreme law.

But, in 1936, the Supreme Court, without dissent, announced its opinion that "the investment of the Federal Government with the powers of external sovereignty did not depend upon the affirmative grants of the Constitution" (299 U. S. 304). The legal inaccuracy of this opinion was appropriately grounded on a rewriting of history unique in the annals of our Supreme Court, although apparently standard practice in the Soviet Union.

Under a later decision the Court gave to Presidential agreements similar dignity as the law of the land. In this manner the executive acts of the President, with or without the approval of two-thirds of the Senators present, may become our supreme law, even apparently if in conflict with the Constitution. It seems clear from the widespread support of the Bricker amendment that the people of the United States would not write an amendment into the Constitution authorizing any such expansion of the treaty power as was authorized by the Supreme Court.

These two examples of Supreme Court law making in amending the Constitution, to erase limitations on legislative and executive power, should show why I am a renegade from political association with those who still advocate such a liberal interpretation of the Constitution. I still believe in a liberal interpretation—by conservative judges. But I denounce interpretations which are so liberal that they would liberate our Government from constitutional limitations imposed long ago upon it and faithfully maintained for nearly 150 years.

Let me candidly admit that for many years, beginning 20 years before Franklin Roosevelt, I was an advocate of a liberal interpretation of the Constitution. Indeed, I have a letter from Theodore Roosevelt telling me he approved of my proposal of interpretive amendment as an improvement on his ill-fated recall of decisions.

But I never conceived that Justices of the Supreme Court could interpret a provision in the Constitution so that the original meaning entirely disappeared, or was reversed. I never imagined that Justice Holmes, whom I idolized, who insisted that plain meaning should be given to plain words, would write an opinion sarcastically referring to the plain meaning of the 10th Amendment as an invisible radiation. Nor that later judges should further devitalize that Amendment by describing it as only stating a truism. No, I never imagined that even a super-liberal Supreme Court would or could write down and out of the Constitution those limitations that prohibit our public officials from transforming a decentralized republican form of free Government into a centralized socialistic tyranny.

Never have I intended by any act of mine to give support to national socialism or its doctrines and programs. I deny any individual guilt, but if I am fairly accused of guilt by association with advocates of this brand of liberalism, let me follow the example of a humble Negro who was caught in the proverbial henhouse and, when brought into court, announced loudly: "I plead guilty and waive a hearing." The puzzled judge inquired: "What do you mean by that, Sam?" And Sam replied: "I mean, I done it and I don't want to hear no more about it."

Our individualistic ancestors brought forth a nation conceived in liberty; and if this nation is to endure we cannot too often remind ourselves of the justified fears of our forefathers who believed that Government, even in its best state, is but a necessary evil; in its worst state, an intolerable one.

Why are we today so fearful of a third world war that we are spending billions in preparation for, and to defend ourselves against, atomic devastation? How often do we realize that, were it not for the vast powers of the centralized governments of great nations, no world war would be possible? Oh, it is easy to say that we are not warmongers, that we were only forced into two world wars. It is at least plausible to contend that we were forced into another war in Korea as a measure of defense in anticipation of a third world war. It is easy to argue that we are helpless to prevent a third world war—that the decision to postpone or to start it will be made behind the Iron Curtain—in Russia. I do not propose here to argue that it would have been right or possible to avoid engaging in these wars, or that it will be right or possible to avoid engaging in another world war.

The point which I am seeking to make is simply that we are playing our part—and a very important part—in the progress of the human race toward bigger and bigger wars, indeed toward self-destruction, when we follow a worldwide insane trend toward bigger and more tyrannical governments.

Throughout the world, and here in the United States, we have been steadily abandoning, not only individual liberty but individual morality in favor of collective domination and collective immorality. No one of us could justify in himself the deceiving, the torturing, the wholesale murder of others that we collectively plan and justify as a national policy.

Of course we Americans are self-righteously assured that we would only inflict the horrors of war on another people in self-defense. We denounce Communist rulers as satanic plotters against the peace and freedom of the rest of the world. If they are mortal enemies of peace and freedom, as I believe they are, how can we justify joining and continuing to work with them in an international misgoverning organism which is most efficacious in developing international dissensions and in advancing international socialism? Yet, despite the tragedy of the United Nations, many people still chatter senselessly about forming a world government, which would either result in establishing the biggest and worst tyranny that had ever afflicted mankind or break down through racial, religious, and national conflicts into the most complete and devastating world war that the human mind can imagine.

Of course, when I inveigh against big government as the principal source of some of the worst ills from which we and the rest of the world are suffering, I am not questioning the need of selecting more public officials and spending more money to govern 160 million people than to govern 10 million. Nor am I an anarchist who would eliminate all government and leave the unorganized weak or virtuous at the mercy of the organized strong or vicious.

But, in a few words, let me heartily disagree with those who contend that the big industries and other complexities of modern life make bigger and more paternalistic governments essential. On the contrary, I believe that politically chosen officials are less competent to plan an economy and to direct business enterprises today than they would have been 100 years ago. Then business problems were simpler, and more easily understood. Then inability to earn a living by private enterprise was not so often a reason for seeking public employment. Today business problems and social responsibilities are so complex that the best thing for a bewildered politician to do is to lay down widely accepted business and social moralities in broad terms and then impose on private enterprise the responsibility and obligation to use its powers and opportunities to advance the general welfare.

You may recall that I graduated without honors from the NRA school of political education, with the degree of "N. G." awarded by the Supreme Court.

Up to date the prevailing historical verdict is that the NRA happily failed, because it was a socialistic effort at Government control of industry and, contrariwise, also because it promoted private monopolies by legalizing industrial cartels.

How we could have been trying to accomplish both of these evil designs at the same time, I do not understand. But probably the clue to the mystery lies in the corrupting influence of power on alleged rulers of industry and government. At least I know that my 2 years in public service were one long struggle to prevent public officials under my supervision from asserting and exercising too much governmental power, and to prevent private enterprisers from abusing their newly discovered private powers of self-advancement.

If I entered upon my brief bureaucratic career with any latent faith in the wisdom or value of a political direction of industry, I can assure you that I retired from government thoroughly cleansed of any such impure ideas.

But in the ensuing years I have been forced to watch the controls of the National Government being extended further and further into the lives and work of the American people; State lines overridden; local governments made subservient to national policies and programs; and, worst of all, the independence and liberty of men and women in their homes and workshops subjected to a host of obligations and restraints emanating from a remote Government which they as individuals are helpless to control.

All this has been accomplished by a persistent miseducation of our people into the belief that through bigger and bigger Government and more and more paternalistic laws we would make ourselves not only individually and nationally more secure, but also angelically virtuous. We would enjoy not only the noble feeling of being our brother's keeper, but also the comforting feeling of being able to call on our brother to support us in case we failed to support ourselves.

The promise of greater security is the big lie by which every would-be tyrant seduces people to give up their liberties. The Communist autocrats and their little brothers, the socialistic politicians in the free nations, advance their tryannical programs with the same big lie. In truth, capable people who exchange their freedom from government for dependency on government make themselves more insecure than they were in self-reliance.

Those who put their faith in a paternalistic government have lost faith in themselves. Faith in ourselves was once the religion of America. In that faith we found, and I pray that we may continue in that faith to find, the greatest freedom and security that so many people under one government have ever known.

Another Step Toward Peace on the Waterfront

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 13, 1954

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, all of New York is hoping that the new election ordered by the NLRB among longshoremen working on its waterfront will bring about better conditions there for the public, for industry, and particularly for labor.

It is with that in mind that I call attention to the following editorial from the New York Times of May 13, 1954:

THE OLD ILA FOUND GUILTY

The Federal court jury's verdict against the old International Longshoremen's Association, 8 locals and 3 officials, should encourage all forces fighting for waterfront reform. The jury, before Federal Judge Harold P. Burke, found the defendants guilty of criminal contempt of court as a result of the paralyzing waterfront strike that ended last month. The defendants are appealing the verdict, as they have the right to do, and final judgment will await the outcome.

The parent union was fined $50,000, smaller fines were imposed on the locals, and 2 officials were each sentenced to prison for 3 months and 1 for 6 months. The total in fines is a slight fraction of the cost of the strike, and so as monetary punishment can hardly be called excessive. The National Labor Relations Board had asked that the parent union be fined $25,000 for each day of the strike, or a total of $725,000, and that the locals be assessed $100,000 each.

The fines if upheld will, of course, come out of the backs of the union members. Perhaps this will give those who have not yet rejected the authority of the old union's leaders something to think about. We are sure that the many disillusioned longshoremen who have already turned away from the old union to join the AFL will be more determined than ever to make their voices heard by laying the foundation for a democratic organization of their own.

All dockers will have an opportunity to register their choice of a bargaining agent on May 26 when an election will be held under the auspices of the NLRB. Special police and other precautions are being planned to avoid the disgraceful coercion and intimidation by old ILA elements that led to the voiding of last December's election. The outcome is in the hands of the pier workers themselves. The ballot is secret. They need fear no coercion when they strike a blow for their own industrial freedom.

When States Rights Are States Wrongs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1954

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial from Labor, official publication of the Railway Labor organizations:

WHEN STATES RIGHTS ARE STATES WRONGS

Regardless of their party, Labor wishes to congratulate all 50 Senators who this week shelved the toughened-up Taft-Hartley bill by sending it back to a committee. These Senators so voted for varying reasons but the effect of their action was to place the Senate on the right side of an issue which goes far beyond labor legislation. That's States rights.

To illustrate what that means, let's begin back in the 1930's, when William O. Douglas, now a Supreme Court justice, was chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission. He repeatedly pointed out that the 48 States were carrying on a competition in laxity.

To go into business and stay in business, Douglas explained, a corporation must get and hold a charter from one of the States. Granting such charters is profitable for a State, because it collects fees and taxes from the companies which incorporate under its law.

Corporations shop around to find the State which will grant the loosest charter with the fewest restrictions. The State with the worst corporation law get the most fees and taxes, regardless of the results to the people of all States.

For example, that's why shady "health and hospital insurance" companies chartered by one State, are able to swindle millions of Americans everywhere. Any attempt to change such a situation is met by the old familiar cry "States rights."

In labor legislation, States rights works the opposite way. Instead of a competition in laxity, it's a competition in toughness. The State which puts the most shackles on organized labor profits by catering to antiunion employers and getting the most factories.

The Taft-Hartley revision bill, as backed by the administration, even without the proposed Goldwater amendment, would have encouraged this competition in toughness among the States. Some of them already have gone to extremes, with phony right-to-work laws, and other legislation hostile to workers and their unions.

Congress has retained for Uncle Sam a major say over labor relations in industries engaged in interstate commerce, but if it were to give away more of that jurisdiction, in the name of States rights, the clock of labor relations would be turned back to the Dark Ages.

Let's look a little further behind this States rights smokescreen. It was the alibi used for turning over to the oil trust, through the governments of 4 States, fabulously valuable offshore oil resources which belong to the people of all 48 States. This was a competition in laxity. The giveaways went through because oil magnates knew they would get a more profitable deal from the four State governments than they would get from Uncle Sam.

Similarly, the administration and reactionaries in Congress are using the States rights alibi to give away the people's rivers to the Power Trust through obedient State governments. Also to emasculate or abolish Federal regulation of electric power and natural gas monopolies, leaving only lax State regulation. All this is costing consumers dearly.

Looking over these examples of States rights, it becomes clear that all of them, except one, are competitions in laxity. The sole exception is labor legislation, which is a competition in toughness.

We are all proud of our States, and they do have rights which are guaranteed by the Constitution and should be protected. But those who shout States rights loudest seldom mean anything good for the workers and the rest of the people. Congress should reject all such competitions, whether in toughness of laxity.

Our Newest Legislative Body

SPEECH

OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 12, 1954

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the newest legislative body of the United States of America is the Legislature of Guam. The distinguished speaker of that body, the Honorable A. B. Won Pat, is now visiting in Washington, meeting on the plane of warm friendship and of mutual understanding, members of the oldest and the national legislative body of our country. We are happy that he is with us, and we extend to him, the legislators and the people of his country our best good wishes.

Under the organic law the legislature of Guam came into being 4 years ago. The present speaker, the Honorable A. B. Won Pat, was the speaker of that legislature when laws were enacted covering the entire range of the legislative experience of our States in continental United States. The visit in Washington of this statesman of Guam, the most far-flung domain of our country, has served to focus attention to a fact worthy of greater attention that on this small American island, part of the United States of America, far in the Orient, representative government is functioning through a legislative body elected by the people and on the same pattern of my own State of Indiana and of the other States of the Union.

The visit of the Honorable A. B. Won Pat has served the purpose again of reminding us that government of, for, and by the people, is our national mission and accomplishment. I am glad to join with other Members of the Congress in welcome to the presiding officer of our newest legislative body.

Truman's Advice to Eisenhower Timely, Sincere, and Sound

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 13, 1954

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to direct the attention of our colleagues to the following very fine editorial, which appeared in the Brooklyn Eagle of May 12, 1954:

At the age of 70 and having held the highest honor within the gift of his countrymen, former President Truman is without further political ambition. He continues to be what he has been in the past—a patriotic citizen with pride in the office he has held and devotion to his country's progress and security. His counsel to his successor, based upon long experience and an intimate knowledge of the operation of government, must be recognized as sincere and sound.

In his speeches in New York and in Washington, Mr. Truman discussed two issues made timely and important by conditions in Washington and by the crisis abroad. A domestic problem brought vividly into prominence by developments in Congress is a trend toward legislative usurpation of Executive prerogatives. Our position in world affairs is deteriorating, with great danger to our leadership, by reason of the disintegration of bipartisan cooperation in foreign policy.

Geneva has made this situation tragically clear. At Geneva, where so much that is vital to world peace hangs in the balance, we have been futile, isolated from our friends, incapable of commanding a respectful hearing. At least in part the responsibility for this failure abroad rests at home. The bipartisan support of foreign policy preserved so consistently during preceding administrations no longer exists. Democratic support has not been enlisted and even among Republicans has not been clearly understood.

The responsibility of stating foreign policy so that it will be clear at home and abroad belongs to the President of the United States. It cannot be delegated to someone else. To the President also belongs the obligation, as Mr. Truman has emphasized, of preserving unity of support against the political assassins who would destroy it. It is the President's great misfortune that the enemies of his policies are to be found even in his own party.

It was not necessary for Mr. Truman to name these enemies. They operate quite boldly and it is entirely possible that they gain in affrontery by reason of the President's reluctance to come to grips with them. Certainly such reckless charges as that of "20 years of treason" are not calculated to win Democratic support for even the best of causes.

It can be charged by Republicans that Mr. Truman's administration was not a model of wisdom, enlightened vision, or competency. The American people were eager for a change. The weaknesses and failures of his own regime do not affect the soundness of his views on foreign policy or his concept of the involving powers of the Presidency.

Mr. Truman has a lofty regard for the office of President. He would permit no intrusion upon its authority and prerogatives. "The President is responsible for the administration of his office," he declared in Washington. "And that means for the administration of his entire executive branch. It is not the business of Congress to run any of the agencies for him. Unless this principle is observed it is impossible to have orderly government."

Mr. Truman's counsel is not inspired by a spirit of partisanship or a desire to embarrass or discredit his successor. It reflects his respect for the office he once held and his concern for his country's welfare.

United Nations Proper Forum for Indochina

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 13, 1954

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I have been advocating for some time United Nations action in the case of Indochina. Appended is an article on this subject by David Lawrence from today's issue of the New York Herald Tribune:

U. N. ACTION IS SUGGESTED TO SPEED AID TO INDOCHINA

(By David Lawrence)

GENEVA, May 16.—The United Nations may have to order the action permitting the United States and associated governments to take the military steps in Indochina that are necessary if Communist aggression in southeast Asia is to be stopped immediately.

This procedure would be separate from what is contemplated in the southeast Asia Security Treaty, which is designed for the long-range protection of the area and not for the current situation. The mere fact that this pact, too, is being planned now could buttress the United Nations approach to the Indochina problem in the near future.

It will be recalled that President Truman felt that no congressional authorization was necessary to send American forces into Korea in June 1950—merely a notification to leaders of both parties in the Senate and House. The military operations that followed were held to be implicit in the treaty by which the United States had accepted the obligations of the United Nations Charter.

WORLD OPINION MOBILIZED

For a long time world opinion has been mobilized behind the thought that, if aggression occurs which threatens the territorial integrity of any country—that is, if there is a threat to peace anywhere—the members of the United Nations have a duty to collaborate in a collective action to remove the threat or to put down the aggression.

Certainly as of today there are aggressor armies in Laos and Cambodia, and these invaders come from Vietnam in the form of a Communist-led force known as the Viet Minh. For many months the question has been asked why, with such an obvious case for United Nations action, no use has been made of the U. N. machinery. The truth is the French have been hesitant for fear it would raise more issues than it would settle. But this reasoning has been based on the idea that the controversy would deal with independence and colonialism only and prove embarrassing in north African disputes and might not win favor among Asian nations.

Now the situation has changed and the issue is no longer whether the three States of Indochina will cease to be colonies and become independent—for independence has been granted in the case of Cambodia and Laos and the final details for the independence of Vietnam are in process of being consummated. So the real issue is what happens to any states newly born when they try to live in a world of aggressors. Also Thailand, which is a member of the United Nations, has been threatened and has a right to ask U. N. action.

For many weeks now, as the Indochina question has been debated in Washington, the administration has made clear that it would not intervene alone in the Indochina crisis, but would take military action only if the states or nations concerned wanted America to do so. The fact is that the French forces, together with the native troops, are adequate for the fight against the Communist armies, but there is a dire need for air and sea power, both of which the United States has available for immediate use in the Indochina area.

Already talks are going on among the major powers of the free world as to how best to use combined military forces in the Indochina war. This has been done for two reasons: (1) the Communist delegates here must understand that they cannot refuse to agree to an armistice on terms which take the aggressor amies out of Cambodia and Laos and be immune from collective action, and (2), if the Geneva Conference is going to fail, there must be planned now an alternative policy to prevent a continuance of the aggression against the Indochina states.

ARMISTICE DECISION NEAR

The next few days will tell whether Moscow and Peiping have any intention of agreeing to a sensible armistice setup and a form of international supervision that can be trusted by the free world or whether they will continue their unyielding position. Thus far the Soviets have made some minor gestures but nothing that the Americans and the British consider substantial.

As for the move into the United Nations, this would take only a few weeks. Fortunately, there is a permanent United Nations commission to which the case can immediately be brought. After the commission completes its investigation of the facts, it can report to the Security Council, where a veto from the Soviet Union would be expected. But this would lead immediately to an emergency meeting of the United Nations General Assembly, which could by majority vote call on all members of the United Nations to act together militarily to curb the aggression in Indochina.

The fact that this procedure is available and has been discussed by the British, French, and American delegations here in the last few days is known to the Communists and could have a salutary effect on their attitude toward the making of an immediate armistice. If an armistice doesn't come now, the issue is certainly headed for the United Nations, with military action to be taken by a group of associated powers analogous to that which occurred in Korea. In fact, the military planning for such a contingency is under way now on a theoretical basis, as it inevitably must be or else the Communists would be expecting to take Indochina by default and there would be no need for further meetings at Geneva. Whenever the possibility of military action comes into the picture, the prospect of peace brightens.

The Speaker of the Legislature of Guam

SPEECH
OF
HON. PETER F. MACK, JR.
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 12, 1954

Mr. MACK of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA] and to join with him in recognizing the distinguished speaker of the Legislature of Guam, who has so ably presided over that democratic body for the past 4 years.

Guam stands as a lighthouse of democracy, 6,000 miles from our shores. It permits a ray of light to seep into the dark areas of Asia, where millions of people are existing under the treacherous dictators. It serves as a ray of hope that some day the Asiatic people will govern themselves under a democratic form of government which respects the dignity of the human individual.

Mr. Speaker, we are proud of this tiny island and of the people who are charged with the responsibility of governing this Territory.

The Natural Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 17, 1954

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, during the recent peace negotiations at Korea between the United Nations and North Korea, Cardinal McIntyre, of Los Angeles, addressed the students at UCLA at Los Angeles, on the fallacious present-day philosophy which departs from the fundamental of the natural law and seeks to establish the fact that the past is not prolog, that the ultimate is now.

Following is a review of Cardinal McIntyre's address:

[From the Tidings, Los Angeles]

THE NATURAL LAW—UCLA HEARS CARDINAL

Because of the abandonment of fundamentals, the Korean negotiations present a traversty of justice, James Francis Cardinal McIntyre told an assembly of faculty and students recently at the University of California at Los Angeles.

Departure from the natural law, a material conception of life and the spread of a morality rooted in force were cited by the Cardinal as causes for national alarm.

Speaking to the UCLA students and teachers at a traditional university meeting, during which all classes and offices are closed, Cardinal McIntyre said the fruitless negotiations in Korea present striking evidence of a departure from fixed norms to an everchanging now.

MORAL BREAKDOWN

"We may be well concerned over our national and political disintegration, with the abandonment of conventional conduct, with the departure from the wholesome respect for family authority, with the breakdown of morals in family and society, with the exploitation of immorality in the press, in the cinema, and in art," the Cardinal said.

"There are all striking evidences that departure from the fixed produces a crumbling of the foundations of society. In past ages and in other places such a departure has resulted in the decay of civilization. In our age can it be otherwise?"

His Eminence was introduced to the University meeting by University of California President Robert Gordon Sproul. Chancellor Raymond B. Allen presided at the Royce Hall meet.

"The former fundamentals are now classified as archaic and substituted by fluctuating standards of academic freedom, a freedom wherein nothing is fixed, nothing at least in thought or in teaching," the cardinal told his UCLA audience.

"In our time we have witnessed a departure from all principle—a flight from that which is fixed to that which is constantly in flux, to the everchanging now. That now which is ever being consumed by the incoming future and immediately discarded as the future becomes the present, leaves little, if any, impression of the past.

"And the residue that inevitably remains is paid the dubious compliment of being speedily ignored. This is the background of the so-called new democratic education."

His Eminence defined the natural law as "a rule of action, established and promulgated by the Author of nature and imposed upon all men through their very nature."

Asserting that the natural law was "fixed, unchanging and absolute," His Eminence rejected the attitude that absolutes have no application in the current affairs of life.

"The application is very real. Because it is not expressed or commented upon does not make it any less real. Because one hides himself in a room and shuts out the sun does not make the reality of the sun shining any less.

"Let us look for a moment at some of the effects of the denial of an absolute.

"Recently some obiter dicta of the Supreme Court of the United States received much publicity in the press. These dicta declared an inability to define such concepts as morality and blasphemy. Because of this supposed vagueness the court was reluctant to decide with precision the point of contention.

"The philosophy of some of the members of our court, however, does not admit of anything which is not subject to change, and hence their reluctance.

"It is interesting to note that when these judges took office, they swore loyalty to the Constitution. If they deny the existence of an absolute it makes a mockery of the Constitution."

VACUUM CREATED

"Can we swear loyalty to something that is constantly in flux? Their concept would negate the fixity of our Constitution. The denial of an absolute means to deny God and reject religion. The denial of an absolute discards the principle upon which our government was founded."

Ignorance, denial and misrepresentation of the natural law, create a vacuum into which "seeps the doctrine of atheism, the spread of a morality rooted in force, and the supremacy of the omnicompetent state," His Eminence said.

It is time, he added, "to heed more the positive, preduring, persevering principles that can be the only purveyors of peace."

Case No. 7

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1954

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, here is a case of extreme and exasperating hardship caused by the rigidity of the McCarran-Walter Act.

Helga Josefa Wiley committed what section 212 (a) (9) of the McCarran-Walter Act calls "a crime involving moral turpitude." In 1946 she took some firewood from a forest in Bremen, Germany, when no other fuel was available in that devastated part of Germany. She was fined the equivalent of 5 cents for her crime.

In 1952 her husband, Harold Wiley, of Meridian, Okla., applied for a visa for his bride. The visa was denied because of this theft of firewood, which was determined to constitute a crime for which existing immigration laws bar an alien from this country.

Were the the hardship caused in this instance not so severe, it could, indeed, be called laughable. It is mandatory that we direct our energies toward a drastic evaluation of the provisions of the McCarran-Walter Act.

More About Bank Holding Companies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 26, 1954

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, in his column, Washington and Small Business, Mr. C. Wilson Harder, president of the National Federation of Independent Business, talks sense about the need for bank holding companies.

I am pleased to direct it to the attention of our colleagues. It follows:

Independent businessmen favor greater grass roots control of money and credit.

In just completed nationwide membership poll by National Federation of Independent Business, voting was 75 percent in favor of companion bills by Senator CAPEHART and Congressman MULTER.

These bills seek to place bank holding corporations on same footing as independent banks.

Holding corporations would be barred from controlling both banks and nonbanking enterprises; from adding branches without securing same approval required of independent banks.

For many reasons, independent business wishes independent banks made more secure. One reason is local control of the communities' cash and credit by people with firsthand knowledge of local conditions is better for all. Another major reason is belief bank holding corporations have aided local governmental extravagance. Much extravagance blamed on Washington has been at the local level, as local politicians love to spend money, too.

A political subdivision, wishing to issue bonds to pay for any scheme thought up, usually finds who will buy the bonds before an election is decided upon. Politicians know how to ballyhoo across bond elections, but don't want to end up with a batch of bonds that can't be peddled. In contemporary times, local politicians have found bank-holding corporations very helpful.

As bonded indebtedness is a lien on all the real estate in a subdivision, distant financciers, faced with huge sums of cash siphoned off from many sources, are only interested primarily in whether the total assets of the community adequately back up the bonds; not in a long-range viewpoint of community needs.

Thus, even with grandiose schemes that no local banker will endorse, politicians can go to a bank-holding corporation.

With a constant feel on the community pulse, the local banker knows whether or not the county can afford a gold-plated courthouse at this time, or whether it should settle for a more modest structure, and reserve some of its bonding capacity for needs of the near future such as more schools.

But when politicians can hock the community assets with a distant financier on the basis of cold balance sheet figures, and thus the wise counsel of local bankers conditioned by an intimate knowledge of local needs is lost to the community, local political subdivisions are in for future trouble.

Even today some communities with urgent needs have found their bonding birthright already pledged by politicians in a manner that would have never been possible if the sale of bonds had depended upon the judgment of strong local banks.

Thus today, a few bank-holding corporations through ownership of Federal, State, county, and city bonds, own much of the United States Government. Tomorrow the whole world may pay interest to Caesar. And that is why independent businessmen want this trend stopped, want not smaller, but much bigger locally owned independent banks.

Federal and State Credit Unions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 17, 1954

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting herewith an article by Al Marble, managing director, Michigan Credit Union League, that appeared in the May 1954 issue of the Credit Union Bridge—the way to economic betterment.

Mr. Marble discusses a question that is giving the credit unions great concern. It involves the proposal that the credit unions be placed under an FDIC type of insurance.

I am impressed from the reading of Mr. Marble's article that he believes the States are dealing more fairly with the credit unions than the Federal Government. This should not be, if it is shown to be true. I wonder why excessive examination fees should be placed upon them by the Federal Government? I wonder why the Federal credit unions are subject to more restrictive limitations than those required by the States? Why are the State credit unions growing in numbers faster than the Federal credit unions?

It is my opinion that our Committee on Banking and Currency of the House look into these questions without delay. We should do everything possible to encourage these very worthy and constructive organizations. They are thrift institutions. They protect their members in many ways and particularly against high, excessive interest and carrying charges. They make money available when it is badly needed without red tape or delay and at a very reasonable cost. It can be paid back on terms that are the most convenient to the borower.

The article is as follows:

FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE OPPOSED

(By Al Marble)

This is a word of warning to those who are looking for a panacea for their troubles. We do not believe that such a panacea is to be found in adoption of an FDIC-type insurance and placement of credit-union responsibilities in the hands of a governmental agency.

A recent article written by James J. Girvan of Pennsylvania (Bridge, February 1954) outlined the desirability of FDIC-type insurance of accounts for credit unions. There were many statements in this article which were broad in scope but which in my mind require serious thought and challenge on the part of credit-union leadership. We should examine carefully in the light of actual experience whether or not we want this type of insurance. There are three major considerations. (1) Is there a need for this insurance, (2) will it serve the purpose that we want it to, and (3) what will be the advantages or disadvantages that must of necessity go with the insurance, such as costs, additional regulations, etc.

EVIDENCE FROM MICHIGAN

The Michigan credit-union law was enacted in 1925. Almost 30 years have passed, and in that time only two State credit unions have liquidated at a loss to the members. Losses in these 2 cases totaled $999.39. The Federal law was enacted in 1934, and since that time 9 Federal credit unions in Michigan have liquidated with a total loss of only $8,597.83. This out of millions of dollars invested by our members in every type of credit union. It would thus appear that losses due to liquidations certainly would not justify the insurance. Now, the question has been raised about scaledowns. In Michigan there have been three cases where there was a fairly substantial scaledown of shares. In two of these cases the scaledown has already been recovered. Unquestionably in our mind the other will be fully recovered. Certainly the scaledown of shares as experienced by credit unions in Michigan would not justify the insurance.

Is this insurance going to accomplish the thing that we hope for? Actually it is very possible that it will accomplish the very opposite. Because of the tremendous number of banks which closed their doors during the period 1923 to 1933 never to reopen, it became necessary for Government to organize the FDIC type of insurance so that the faith of the people in banks might be reestablished. History has shown that such an insurance is not essential in order to establish the faith of our people in credit unions. This type of insurance for credit unions might actually result in officers taking a more casual attitude toward their credit union, to the detriment of the entire operation.

COST SECOND REGULATION

We must remember that although cost is not a major factor, if based on figures indicated in Mr. Girvan's article it certainly could become important and could result in lesser service to our members. Many credit unions have already experienced an undesirable situation brought about by the excessive examination fees of $56 per day placed upon them by the Federal bureau. Careful comparison of this rate with other examining groups would indicate that it is too high. Also a very important result of this type of insurance for credit unions would be to subject our credit unions to additional Government regulation. This type of regulation in similar organizations has proven burdensome, extremely restrictive, and limits materially the service they may render. It might well, in many instances, prevent credit unions from providing the service to their members that was originally intended. In the cases of these other organizations it was proven necessary. It has not been proven necessary for credit unions.

Experience with the Bureau of Federal Credit Unions has shown us that such regulation can be to the detriment of the credit unions. Witness this evidence as shown by the experience of Federal credit unions in Michigan where operating over a lesser period of time, involving lesser assets, their losses were over 8 times as great as those of the State chartered credit unions. Federal credit unions in Michigan have been subject to many restricting limitations whereas State chartered credit unions have been subject to very few. This in itself would indicate that Government regulations are not necessarily the answer to better credit unions. Experience in Michigan has shown that a strong and virile State league can materially reduce potential losses as well as build larger, stronger, more serviceable credit unions.

The following quotation expresses well the feeling of the majority of credit union leaders who are well informed on this subject. "I would brush aside the officious interferer in our credit union affairs who would offer on behalf of the State what we should and could do far better ourselves."

Congressman Hillings Supports Working People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PATRICK J. HILLINGS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 17, 1954

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, as the Representative in Congress from the 25th district, I beileve it is important that I report to the people of my district on some of the issues considered by the Congress and my action on such issues.

The 25th Congressional District, located in the eastern section of Los Angeles County, is composed of almost 500,000 citizens in such cities as Azusa, Monterey Park, El Monte, Baldwin Park, San Gabriel, Temple City, and others. The vast majority of these people are conscientious, thrifty, energetic persons who work hard at their jobs to earn their livelihood. Some of them have passed their productive years and have retired after a lifetime of labor.

Because most of the people are working or have worked and are retired, I intend to discuss legislation of importance to them. To conserve time, I will list the matters in brief summary form.

TAXES

During this Congress tax relief has been effected which has drastically slashed the excise taxes on drugstore items, cosmetics, baby oils, ladies' handbags, telephone bills, movie tickets. This means that when you go to the store, you have more to spend on yourself and your family, and the tax collector gets less from you. Earlier this year, the tax bill of each individual taxpayer was reduced 10 percent. This saved a total of $3 billion. In addition, the House of Representatives has passed a tax-revision bill which would mean more generous deductions for medical expenses, freedom from taxation for a retired couple if they have $200 monthly pension income, children working after school or during summer vacation can earn more than $600 in a year and their parents can still list them as a dependent, salesmen would have fairer means of computing expenses thus saving money. More than two-thirds of the tax relief goes to wage earners, families, and other individuals. I supported these tax-relief measures.

HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Construction of hospitals, diagnostic, and clinical centers will continue.

Research into health problems is encouraged through the National Heart Institute and the National Institute of Dental Research.

Last year we passed a bill to aid State and local governments in construction of hospitals and health centers. The 25th Congressional District has already been allotted $581,000 for this worthwhile purpose.

Problems of air pollution—smog—which tend to retard our economic development are being fought at the United States Sanitary Engineering Center.

A new law aids Federal law officers in seizing and destroying unsafe fabrics used in certain inflammable cowboy suits and explosive sweaters which have burned many children in home accidents.

It is now also against the law to ship dangerous fireworks into any State which bans their sale.

The Senate has passed a bill which makes it a crime to ship obscene and filthy literature in interstate commerce, in order that juvenile delinquency may be prevented.

Congress has authorized a 2-year extension of the program of assistance in construction of schools in crowded defense centers and other areas which have grown abnormally because of Federal activities. Congress has also granted similar assistance for school-operating expenses.

At the present time Congress is considering legislation to encourage voluntary health-insurance groups to broaden their coverage and legislation to expand the State-Federal vocational rehabilitation system which is designed to help disabled persons to become economically independent.

As one who is interested in the welfare of my constituents, the above-listed items all have my support.

HOUSING

The Housing Act of 1954, as passed by the House of Representatives is intended to encourage as many Americans as possible to own their homes. I voted for this bill because of its provisions which, among other things, provide for lower down payments, extend period of payment of GI loans to 30 years in most cases and as high as 40 years in others, and interest rates remain at 4½ percent. The limit on home-improvement loans has been raised to $3,000; the period of repayment has been extended to 5 years instead of the present 3 years. Eyesores and potential slums can now be torn down and replaced with private homes without necessity of permission from the Federal Government.

ROADS AND HIGHWAYS

The new highway law means that we in the 25th Congressional District can drive our cars with greater convenience and personal safety. Almost all of our gasoline-tax money will be used for highways instead of being diverted for other uses. California gets a big share of funds authorized in this law for freeways, secondary roads and streets. I cast my vote for more and better roads for my district.

VETERANS

Worthy veterans will have plenty of hospital space for treatment required as a result of service to our country. Previously the Congress had enacted the Servicemen's Indemnity Act to provide for the needs of next-of-kin to servicemen killed in Korea. Last year I joined with my colleagues in voting for an extension of the GI bill of rights for veterans of the Korean war.

Mr. Speaker, the above is only a partial listing of our work during the two sessions of the 83d Congress. Time does not permit full discussion of each and every bill considered. I feel certain that the people of the 25th Congressional District will be interested in this record.

Let Us Build a Better America—Part II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY

OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 5, 1954

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, I should like to add to my remarks of May 12 the following:

"SMEAR" TACTICS

Now, Mr. Speaker, one final word, our Republican friends need to learn to campaign on issues instead of relying on "smears." I was first chairman of California's Committee To Combat Subversive Activities. This was way back in 1939. We vigorously fought Communists, Nazis, and other subversives but we did not permit "smears" or loose charges.

In those day, as now, the Communists were attacking the FBI. I came to its defense and helped expose the real source of these attacks. Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, who is now being justly congratulated for 30 years of outstanding public service, sent me a personal letter of thanks. I am proud of this letter, written 14 years ago. It reads as follows:

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION,
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
Washington, D. C., June 20, 1940.
Mr. SAMUEL W. YORTY,
Los Angeles, Calif.

DEAR MR. YORTY: Your committee's Resolution No. 28, introduced in the State assembly on May 24, 1940, has just been called to my attention, and I want to write you this personal note to thank you for your expressions of confidence in the work of the Federal Bureau of Investigation and my administration as Director.

The support of such outstanding men as you is a source of real encouragement and inspiration at this time when certain elements are attempting to undermine public confidence not only in the FBI but in law enforcement generally.

I am reassured, however, after reading resolutions such as yours that the people of this country will evaluate the sources of the attacks.

Your action in this matter is deeply appreciated, and I do hope that our future activities will always merit your high esteem.

With best wishes and kind regards.

Sincerely yours,

J. EDGAR HOOVER.

Mr. Speaker, in spite of my long and active fight against the Communists, a Republican-financed professional "turncoat" Democrat is now planning a last-minute smear against me, deliberately distorting my record. It is time they stopped such juvenile tactics and debated important issues in an adult manner.

Clinton Academy, 1784-1954

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. STUYVESANT WAINWRIGHT

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 6, 1954

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, one of the historic landmarks found in the First Congressional District of New York is Clinton Academy, located in East Hampton, Long Island, N. Y. This school was the first to be awarded a certificate by the regents of the State of New York after our country became a sovereign nation. One hundred and seventy years ago the Reverend Samuel Buell dedicated the remaining years of his life toward establishing this institution of learning, the first of its kind on Long Island.

The cultural heritage and tradition of eastern Long Island is surpassed by none. Our forefathers were amongst the earliest students at the Colleges of Kings, Yale, Harvard, and Princeton from the mid 1600's through all the formative years of the American tradition. In the War for Independence our citizens fought on the side of liberty. And, as I have said, immediately after the war they established this academy.

The East Hampton Historical Society has prepared a brief statement of Clinton Academy's history, which I set forth in the RECORD at this point:

CLINTON ACADEMY

For 170 years a tall brick-and-frame, 3-story gambrel-roofed building on Main Street has played a significant part in the cultural life of East Hampton. The vital spark that resulted less than a year later in full-fledged Clinton Academy was struck on January 21, 1784, by Gov. George Clinton in his speech to the New York Assembly. Said he, "Neglect of the education of youth is among the evils consequent on war—perhaps there is scarce anything more worthy of your attention than the revival and encouragement of seminaries of learning."

Promptly acting on these words, the residents of East Hampton, under the wise and able leadership of the Reverend Samuel Buell, raised the sum of nine hundred thirty-four pounds, eight shilling and sixpence," of which over half was contributed by 12 men—Samuell Buell, Nathaniel Gardiner, Samuel Hutchinson, John Miller, Jr., Jeremiah Osborn, David Mulford, Seth Barnes, Aaron Isaacs, Reuben Hedges, Elisha Mulford, Recompense Sherrill and David Hedges.

Construction of a building was quickly begun, and carried on under the tireless supervision of the Reverend Buell, who on October 6, 1784, wrote to a friend "Our academy has especially engrossed my attention and care. The joiners are this week finishing off the outside work which they have done in an elegant manner. It is a building 50-foot in length, of proportionable weth (sic.). The gable ends are all brick. There are belonging to it near 40 windows."

On January 1, 1785, the academy was opened with appropriate exercises; beginning with "Psalmody suited to the ocasion" and continuing with prayer and a sermon by Mr. Buell, a recitation by Miss Fanny Rysam "pronounced with her more than usual elegance," and an address by Mr. John Gardiner.

On September 25, 1787, a petition was forwarded to the regents of the University of the State of New York, signed by the 12 men who had contributed over half of the funds raised by the academy building. It asked that the school be incorporated under the name of Clinton Academy, and listed 18 men to be appointed as trustees. The regents granted the petition and the certificate of incorporation was issued, bearing date of November 20, 1787. Governor Clinton later presented a bell to the school that was named for him.

When the academy opened its doors to its first classes, Jabez Peck was master of the classical department and William Payne, father of John Howard Payne, was master of English and writing. For several decades these two men and their successors prepared scores of young men for college and gave to the boys and girls of the common school a firm foundation in the three R's. The number of students averaged over 80, with a high-water mark of 156 in 1815, including many college-preparatory students from other towns who boarded with the local families.

After the middle thirties, as more and more secondary schools were established in the State, the number of students began to decline and in 1868 Clinton Academy ceased to report to the board of regents. After the academy ceased to function as a school, the trustees rented the building to teachers of private schools, to artists for exhibits, to the town for town meetings and the other like purposes. In 1887 an extension was added to the back of the southern end and called Clinton Hall. Here was the center of East Hampton's social and cultural life, and here were held high-school commencements, entertainments by local talent, concerts, and lectures, and plays by a summer stock company. Local artists exhibited here; groups of young folk organized dances in the wintertime and watched the local basketball team fight its way to victory or defeat with the teams from neighboring towns.

The East Hampton Star had its quarters in the northern end for a time, and later in 1898, the newly organized East Hampton Free Library became a tenant, and remained here until it removed to its own building in 1912.

In 1919, a plan was proposed for the restoration of the old building to its original appearance, and by 1921 the undertaking was complete. The generosity of Mr. and Mrs. Lorenzo E. Woodhouse made it possible for those in charge of the work to do a fine job, sparing neither time nor expense. Since the restoration of the old building, it has been maintained as a historical museum, open to the public, by the East Hampton Historical Society. Here are gathered hundreds of articles of use and beauty which were handled and cherished by our forefathers—a source of education and pleasure to their descendants, and to the many visitors from near and far, who come to our town.

To the knowledge, skill, and taste of Miss Mary Eldredge, who was curator of the collection until her death in 1952, is due in great measure the collection and arrangement of the exhibits.

United States Near East Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 13, 1954

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, appended is the address of Representative JACOB K. JAVITS on the occasion of the 35th anniversary of the Rodeph Sholom Men's Association, Rodeph Sholom Temple, New York City on Friday, May 7:

I urge upon the administration a clear definition of its policy with respect to the Near East and Israel for events are confusing public opinion in the United States. The present meaning of the policy of "impartial friendship" for all the Near East states announced by the Secretary of State and the President earlier this year is in much doubt.

This administration has a unique opportunity to exercise a strong and perhaps decisive influence for peace in the Near East, regional economic development and the resettlement of the Palestine Arab refugees for the very reason that its policy of impartial friendship was in the first instance accepted at face value by both the Arab states and Israel. But this influence cannot be exerted until our Government decides that the Near East is an area of vital interest for us rather than an area of special interest for Great Britain and that we have obligations there to bring about resettlement of the Palestine Arab refugees and respect for the three-power declaration of May 1950—United States, United Kingdom, and France—guaranteeing the existing armistice frontiers between Israel and the Arab States which can only be protected by a firm and definite policy. With this end in view I urge the announcement of the following as the Near East policy of the United States:

(1) Arms should not be furnished any of the Arab States which are maintaining a state of war with Israel or unwilling to enter into peace negotiations.

(2) United States will not accept the Arab definition of friendship to the Arab States as calling for enmity to Israel to guide its policy;

(3) The United States policy objectives in the Near East are peace in the area between Israel and the Arab States, regional economic development, security against Communist subversion or aggression through regional defense and improvement of standards of living and development of free institutions in the area; and

(4) The United States economic and technical assistance programs within the area will be pursued on a country basis but will provide that projects now pursued in individual countries can become regional projects open to participation of the other states in the area.

Confusion has been created because the announcement that arms are to be made available to Iraq under the mutual security program has raised grave questions in the country about the ability to control the use of such arms to prevent renewed aggression by the Arab States against Israel with which Iraq is still technically at war. The statement of Assistant Secretary of State for the Near East Byroade urging limitation of the immigration of Jews into Israel has dismayed millions of Americans who consider an open door for persecuted and harassed Jews into Israel as a fundamental reason for Israel's establishment and who favored our Government's stand for partition in 1947 and recognition of Israel in 1948.

On the other hand, our Government's insistence upon a full discussion of all border incidents between Israel and Jordan which motion carried in the United Nations Security Council brought forth violent protests from the Arab States because they thought they saw implications in American policy of partiality toward them in the earlier policy declarations by our Government.

Israel's Sixth Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 17, 1954

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I should like to take this opportunity of joining the many people, in the many different lands, in extending our best wishes to the State of Israel upon the occasion of its sixth anniversary as an independent, sovereign state.

The people of the United States have, on many occasions, manifested their friendship and their understanding of the aspirations of the Jewish people to rebuild their ancient homeland, and to secure freedom and independence. Those aspirations were realized in 1948, when the State of Israel came into existence.

During the past 6 years, the Government and the people of Israel have endeavored to establish a stronghold of freedom and democracy within their land. I am certain that they will continue in these efforts. It is my hope that the present disturbances and conflicts in that vital region will be resolved peacefully and expeditiously, and that the people of Israel shall work with us for the establishment of a lasting and just peace in the world.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following resolution which was unanimously adopted at a meeting held on May 6 at Beth Am, in Milwaukee, Wis., in honor of the sixth anniversary of Israel's independence. A list of the signatories accompanies the resolution:

We, citizens of Milwaukee, Wis., assembled this 6th day of May 1954, at the Beth Am Center, 5418 W. Burleigh Street, to celebrate the sixth anniversary of Israel independence, view with grave concern the mounting hostility toward Israel on the part of the Arab States, coupled with the indecisive foreign policy of our State Department, which tends to encourage the Arab States.

We, therefore, urge our Government to use its powerful influence toward restoring and strengthening the U. N. armistice agreements; to make it clear that it does not condone aggression and blockade; and to insist that the Arab States and Israel enter into direct negotiations to restore peace.

Furthermore, we recommend that the arms program for Arab countries now under contemplation by our State Department be suspended until peace is restored. Economic assistance by our Government both for Israel and the Arab States, can best express the friendship of our Government and the people of America for the people of the Middle East.

Leo Ferman, Max Platkin, Jack Schulman, Peter Pikofsky, Charles Kahn, H. Belnikoff, Reva Bookstaff, Nathan Weinberg, Leo Rakita, H. Zilberbrand, Pearl Balkansky, Norman Balkansky, O. Waldman, Vera E. Stein, S. F. Lakritz, Arthur Domsky, Mrs. H. Mirroff, Herman Mirroff, Sol Teplinsky, S. Ziebelman, Sam Ruskin, Mrs. Bertha Waldman, Mrs. Silvia Schuster, Mildred Domsky, Abe Welman, George W. Moder, Sal. J. Perchonok, L. Sedlit, Wm. Evjue, Israel Safer, Jacob Goldberg, T. Matsoff, Mrs. Herman Wemgrid, Gertrude Melrood, Paul Melrood, Sam Kahn.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Printing and binding for Congress, when recommended to be done by the Committee on Printing of either House, shall be so recommended in a report containing an approximate estimate of the cost thereof, together with a statement from the Public Printer of estimated approximate cost of work previously ordered by Congress within the fiscal year (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 145, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on Printing, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. The money derived from such sales shall be paid into the Treasury and accounted for in his annual report to Congress, and no sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

Debat
Mar
East

I

HON

IN THE

Mr.
ask un
in the
ticle e
East: A
York T
Sunday
of a de
tor fron
the sen
ticipate
There
was ord
as follo
OUR POL
TWO
INDOCH
NEEDE
OF ASIA

(EDITO
Indochin
policy in
made ur
successes
The New
outstandi
cuss thes
Senator V
of Califor
tor MIKE
a member
tee. Both
Indochina
the Time
recorded

Mr. KRO
the probl
Vietminh
lightening
of the spe
tor KNOW
bring to i
for you to
this count
we should
china; an
long-range
the East.
The sta
pected, ne
been overw
whole que
der, Senat
the implic
of the wh
nists?
Senator
world in I
falls to th
up the doo
east Asia,
Asia as we
nations of
That certai

Appendix

Debate Between Senators Knowland and Mansfield on Our Policy in the Far East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 18, 1954

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an article entitled "Our Policy in the Far East: A Debate," published in the New York Times magazine section of last Sunday. The article contains the text of a debate in which the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. Mansfield] and the senior Senator from California participated, along with Mr. Arthur Krock.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Our Policy in the Far East: A Debate—Two Senators Discuss the Threat to Indochina and the Measures That May Be Needed To Prevent Communist Conquest of Asia

(Editor's Note.—What should we do about Indochina? What should be our long-range policy in the Far East? These questions are made urgent by the dramatic Communist successes in the distant jungles of Indochina. The New York Times magazine invited two outstanding congressional authorities to discuss these questions informally. They are Senator William F. Knowland, Republican, of California, the majority leader, and Senator Mike Mansfield, Democrat, of Montana, a member of the Foreign Relations Committee. Both have visited the general area of Indochina several times. Arthur Krock of the Times acted as moderator of the wire-recorded discussion which follows.)

Mr. Krock. Gentlemen, this discussion of the problem created by the advance of the Vietminh in Indochina can be unusually enlightening to the American people because of the special qualifications that you, Senator Knowland, and you, Senator Mansfield, bring to it. Broadly speaking, I would like for you to discuss two phases of the problem this country faces in southeast Asia. What we should do in the immediate crisis of Indochina; and what we should do in terms of long-range policy in that whole region of the East.

The staggering, but not wholly unexpected, news that the French finally have been overwhelmed at Dien Bien Phu puts the whole question in very sharp focus. I wonder, Senator Knowland, what you regard as the implications of the possible conquest of the whole of Indochina by the Communists?

Senator Knowland. The danger to the free world in Indochina is that if that country falls to the Communists, I think it opens up the door not only to the balance of southeast Asia, but to the balance of continental Asia as well and, ultimately, to the island nations of Japan, Formosa, and Indonesia. That certainly would put us in grave threat, and Australia and New Zealand as well, and it would upset the world balance of power from the point of view of strategic resources and manpower and make far more difficult the holding back of communism in Europe.

Mr. Krock. Senator Mansfield, in summary, do you agree with that?

Senator Mansfield. I agree with it.

Mr. Krock. What immediate steps do you think could be taken to avert this, Senator Knowland?

Senator Knowland. One is, I think, that every effort should be made to give the native population of the Vietnam, as well as Laos and Cambodia, an opportunity to develop the same support to resist Communist aggression that was shown by the people of the Republic of Korea.

Now, they are not going to do that, in my judgment, unless they have the right to say whether they will remain in the French Union or stay out of it. I have always felt that it was not necessary that they have immediate independence; that is, tomorrow or next week; providing they have, as we gave to the Philippines, a date certain. Unless we develop within them the feeling that they should resist to the utmost, we are not going to have the support of the native population, and that is one thing which is essential.

The second is that I believe we should try to get as many people in a collective security system there as would agree on the importance of this in that area of the world.

Mr. Krock. You mean in Asia?

Senator Knowland. In Asia and such European powers as recognize the danger, to stand together on this. I have never felt that we should say that unless a particular country comes in, that we can do nothing, because, to me, that would be to put a veto in the hands of a foreign power of what may be our vital security interests.

The third condition which I think is essential is that the administration should come to the Congress of the United States and lay the matter before them and ask for congressional approval.

Mr Krock. In specific terms?

Senator Knowland. In specific terms.

Mr. Krock. Senator Mansfield, will you give your idea of the immediate steps that should be taken? And it would be very interesting if you would discuss the point about the essential quality of the British-American rapport in that area of the world.

Senator Mansfield. Well, I don't know that that is necessary at all. I think one of the dangers we face is the possibility that there will be a southeast Asia pact created which will be manned entirely by white nations. If that is done, the effect of the pact will be lost. I think in any pact, the first and most important consideration should be given to the Asiatic states in the immediate area.

I think also, as far as the Indochinese states are concerned, that Senator Knowland has the right idea about independence at a date certain and he was the one who made it first on the Senate floor. But you have to go further than that; you have got to give the Vietnamese, the Laotians, and Cambodians the right to decide for themselves whether or not they want to become members of the French Union.

I think, also, that many of these people who are French citizens should give up their French citizenship and should become full-fledged citizens of one of the three Associated States.

I believe, also that this country should do something to help develop morale out there by dispatching Ambassadors or Ministers to the three Associated States in return for the three plenipotentiaries that they have in this country.

As I see it, there isn't much more we can do than what has been done already with the possible exception, if there is to be any American participation in the training of Vietnamese troops, which I would like to see, that part of the elements now stationed on Formosa should be transferred to Saigon, Haiphong, and Hanoi and put to use where they can be most effective in the immediate conflict.

Mr. Krock. We seem to attach vast importance to Indochina as a military base, yet the Japanese took it in the last World War; we didn't seem to need it, and we won that war in that area. So why do you think that Indochina is absolutely indispensable? Suppose Ho Chi Minh overruns Indochina and stops there. Do you think that is an irretrievable calamity from the standpoint of the defense of the non-Communist countries?

Senator Mansfield. That would be a terrible calamity. If you will remember, before the Japanese struck at Pearl Harbor, they consolidated their conquest of Indochina. That was the last thing they did. But the importance of Indochina lies in the fact that it has materials which the Communists and their partner-state do not have: rubber and things of that nature. And the rice surplus is the most important of all because the armies of Asia march on it. Furthermore, it is an area in which Japan might be able to develop something in the way of trade, and the Japanese need that. If all these markets are taken away from them, I think it is only a question of time before Japan will go Communist.

Senator Knowland. I agree that it would be a calamity if the Communists overran all of Indochina, even all of Vietnam. Vietnam is the door to southeast Asia, to India, to Pakistan, and perhaps to the Middle East. It is, so to speak, the cork in the bottle.

Mr. Krock. Let's get on now, to the broad field of this problem. Senator Mansfield, by what long-range policy do you think the advance of world Bolshevism in Asia can be finally halted?

Senator Mansfield. I would think that one of the ways would be to implement the point 4 program as much as we could and to see to it that it is carried out along its original lines. I think it is hitting at the core of what I believe is the field of the Communists and that is hunger, disease, and things of that sort.

The average life of an individual in southeast Asia is about 28 years. Some of them go hungry and eat only one meal a day and some exist on less. Communism isn't something that gets by on ideas; it is something that gets by on belly hunger and the desire for security on the part of people.

Mr. Krock. Would this be just a United States effort, or a general one?

Senator Mansfield. I think that for the time being the United States should continue its effort independently, but I would hope in time that the United Nations and the United States could get together and both work out a cooperative program. I think that will only come when the United Nations has sold itself and is established in the hearts of the American people.

Mr. Krock. Now, what will we do about the feeling in Asia that we represent, in some sense, colonialism, European colonialism, and also what you might call the "sahib" psychology?

Senator Mansfield. I am afraid that we have been guilty along that line, though to a lesser degree than the Dutch, the French, and the British. I feel that one of the reasons why we should not go into Indochina with combat effectives is that we will be creating in the minds of not only the Indochinese, but of the other Asiatic people as well, that we are just going to pull the French chestnuts out of the fire.

Mr. Krock. Senator Mansfield, isn't the problem essentially a military problem?

Senator Mansfield. No; it is essentially a political problem and that is one thing we have lost sight of all the way through this Indochinese operation.

Mr. Krock. Senator Knowland, it seems to me that this gives you an opportunity to take up the question of the long-range policy to check the advance of world bolshevism. If you were to enunciate such a policy, what would you put into it?

Senator Knowland. Well, first of all, I would like to say that, relative to point 4, I agree with Senator Mansfield—and I saw a lot of the point 4 program.

I do not quite agree, however, that as far as communism or bolshevism is concerned, it is merely a matter of belly hunger. I remember being in Czechoslovakia, which had one of the highest standards of living of all the states of Eastern Europe and yet they lost their freedom almost overnight in a Communist coup d'etat, largely because they were intimidated by a Soviet force on the frontier.

That country was lost to the free world and went behind the Iron Curtain, not because of belly hunger, but because of the conspiracy to destroy freedom which exists in the world. So I would want to put in that reservation at least at this point.

Mr. Krock. You mean the centrifugal force of the powerful neighbor?

Senator Knowland. That's right. Now, each country that is allowed to go behind the Iron Curtain, that force becomes greater, and sooner or later we and the free world are going to have to draw a line because our own vital security is at stake. The loss of southeast Asia would lead to the loss of the balance of Asia. That might mean the ultimate destruction of Europe based on Lenin's theory that the road to Paris is through Peking. And if we had the entire world pass into the Communist orbit, it would make, in effect, a continental Dien Bien Phu out of the United States. I think military action, as well as point 4 and other things, is going to be required.

Mr. Krock. Now, this is the long-range program?

Senator Knowland. This is both the long-range and the short-range because I don't think you can disassociate one from the other. You may say as a housekeeper would, "you may brush your problems under the carpet, but sooner or later you are going to have to have a house cleaning."

Mr. Krock. You mean it is like fighting a fire, that the immediate and long-range problems are about the same?

Senator Knowland. About the same. That is going to require, in my judgment, a sufficient force in being so that the Communists in Peking and in Moscow will feel that there is no cheap and easy expansion that they can get. They ran up against resistance in Korea. Had Korea been lost, I think that possibly by now they would have been in Japan.

Now, they are on the march in Indochina, and I think it is necessary that they be stopped.

Now, to have this depend only on the western nations would be a great mistake. I think it is extremely important to bring the Philippine Republic into a collection security system, and we must bring in Thailand, which is an independent country. We must do everything possible to get Cambodia, Laos, and Vietnam, if there is yet time to do it, into a collective security system. We should try to win Burma away from the neutralist attitude into a collective security system.

Mr. Krock. Now, at this point you are talking about what Burma will do, and what India will do, and Thailand, and all these things, but what will the United States do? Will the United States provide the power to hold back this menace as we did in Korea? Is this country willing to take that action in the Rice Bowl of Indochina?

Senator Knowland. I think that the way public opinion is today—well, they certainly want to avoid war, if there is any way of avoiding it. But I don't think that they have yet had pointed out to them what the full implication of the alternatives are.

Mr. Krock. How do they feel about this in Montana, Senator Mansfield?

Senator Mansfield. They would be opposed to it at the present time. While we are not as close to Asia as Senator Knowland's California is, and because we look northward over the pole to possible danger, nevertheless, we think that in view of the circumstance, with the Communist's superiority of manpower and material, that there isn't much we could do.

I believe that under the New Look which reduces our Army by 2 divisions this year, and 2 next year; that takes away 75,000 men and 50 ships from the Navy, and that holds our Air Force to 137 groups instead of 143, we don't know where you are going to get the manpower.

It is my understanding that in this country today, and not counting what we have deployed in Europe and Asia, we only have one combat-ready division and that is the 82d Airborne. Are we going to plan to meet this Communist charge every place in the world with American manpower? We will never have the men to do it.

Senator Knowland. As I have said, we must get the countries in the area we are talking about to say, "We are prepared to join in a collective security system." And I would accentuate the Asian countries very much, particularly the Republic of Korea and the Republic of China, on Formosa. These 2 independent countries have over 1 million troops in their combined armed forces. All the rest of the free nations of southeastern Asia have between them several hundred thousand trained troops. And we should include, of course, the other nations of Asia who oppose bolshevism, and also Australia and New Zealand.

Now, I think there is ample manpower in Asia to furnish the ground forces that will be needed in Indochina. But I don't think, if we ever come to that point, that we should limit our activity to fighting a war in Indochina at a place and time that the Chinese would select. I think we should use whatever power we have and what our national interests would require.

Mr. Krock. Senator Mansfield, do you differ with Senator Knowland on the applicability of the massive retaliation idea in Indochina?

Senator Mansfield. I don't see how it can be applied there with any effect.

I believe that there is a tremendous deficiency in this massive retaliatory striking arm of ours. It is all right to have these things on paper but when you get right down to it, the foot soldier is going to be the guy who is going to win any war. Of course, that doesn't take into consideration the dropping of the atomic bomb, but where would you drop them in Indochina? There are very few places you could drop them in China except at Mukden or Harbin. I think that many of these people are looking to China today as the champion of the colored races. And they are going to say, "Why, these white folks are taking it out on us. They don't drop atom bombs on white people but they drop them on the Japanese, the Chinese." And I think the revulsion against us would be great.

Mr. Krock. You were talking about the necessity of having the collaboration of the other Asian people to make this pact work. Can you get that without the cooperation of India?

Senator Knowland. I think you are not going to get the cooperation of India for a collective system of defense in that area of the world within any foreseeable time. I may be wrong but I think you will always have India saying, "Don't take any step now that might possibly lead to a conflict." I would like to have India take a stand and say that any further encroachments by communism in southwest Asia would be against her own vital interests, and she would be prepared to resist them militarily. I don't think the present Government of India is in any mind to do that, and I think that we are just kidding ourselves.

Mr. Krock. You heard what Senator Knowland said about India. Would you speak on that for a moment?

Senator Mansfield. I think we ought to try and exercise a little forebearance with India. I wasn't happy about the fact that the Indians did not allow American troop transports to cross India carrying French paratroops to Indochina. I was perturbed about that, but I thought this was not the first time that Nehru did that; that in previous years he had forbidden the British and the Dutch to transport troops across his country to Malaya and Indonesia, so all he does is based on a policy which has become pretty basic with him and which he thinks is necessary to preserve his neutralism. I believe that this young republic has a lot of difficulties at home and that we can in time allay their suspicions and get them on our side.

Senator Knowland. I would not be in favor of cutting out the point 4 program in India, but I do think there comes a time when the people in that area of the world must be prepared to stand up and face the consequences of possible Communist invasion. The Indians at the United Nations, you know, 85 percent of the time voted either with the Communists or abstained during the Korean war. It reminds me of the old story of the fellow who was run up a tree by a vicious bear and finally said, "Good Lord, if you can't help me, at least don't help the bear." Well, it seems to me that we can at least say to the Indians, "If you are not going to help us, at least don't help the bear."

Mr. Krock. Now, I think we have time for this question. Senator Mansfield, do you think if there is ever military intervention behalf of Indochina, that it should be undertaken without concurrent readiness to fight world war III?

Senator Mansfield. I think that if we intervene in Indochina that we had better go all the way because it is an even guess, in my opinion, that if we go in there either alone or otherwise, that Red China will go into Indochina and that she will reopen the war in Korea again; that Red China will call upon the Soviet Union to honor its mutual security pact, and I think maybe this time, contrary to all previous practices, that the Soviet Union might honor this treaty. If that happens, then I think everything will have to go by the board and we should be prepared to go all the way, no Korean type operation, and we should also expect the loss of Western Europe as a result.

Senator Knowland. Where I differ from Senator Mansfield is, and we will never know in advance, that I think while Communist China would become involved, as of now I don't believe the Soviet Union will. But I think in 4 years from now, or 6, when they have stockpiled their atom weapons, and they have consolidated their position in Asia, they will then be prepared to turn with overwhelming power against the West and maybe serve notice on some of our NATO nations in Europe that unless they declare their neutrality within, say 5 hours they will be prepared to atom bomb them out of existence. So, what could be done now may not be able to be done 5 or 6 years from now.

Mr. KROCK. Do you think the American people are aware of this potential involved and how, if they are not, they could and should be made aware of it?

Senator MANSFIELD. I do not think they are aware of the potential involved. I think that the administration has been responsible, and some of you newspaper people as well, for not telling the true story of Indochina and what it means until too late in the game. I think it is not even too late now for the American Congress and the administration to try and bring to the American people just what Indochina means to us and the free world.

Mr. KROCK. Would there be a way to awaken them to the present danger?

Senator MANSFIELD. Yes; but I think it could have been done more gradually through various administration spokesmen.

Senator KNOWLAND. I would like to say this in conclusion, that I agree with Senator MANSFIELD as to the importance of the American public being fully informed because they have a great stake in this issue.

I think there is much to be learned from Chou En-lai's statement at Geneva, and as I read his speech, he seemed to be speaking to the United States of America, that "You can have peace in Asia if you break your security pacts with Japan and with Korea, with the Philippines and with the Anzus nations and get your forces out of there. If you take your military mission out of Formosa and permit its passage into Communist hands, with those conditions you can have a settlement in Asia." If the American people should accept that, it would set off a chain reaction that would lead to the loss of Europe, and our children would be faced with overwhelming odds in manpower and resources in the hands of the Communist world.

Dempster Shows How TVA Helps Utilities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. PERCY PRIEST

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 18, 1954

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks, I desire to include here an article written by Lowell Mellett, and appearing in the Washington Evening Star of May 13, 1954.

The article follows:

Among the important matters being obscured by the McCarthy-Army hearings is a life-and-death struggle over the Tennessee Valley Authority, the battle of the aroused citizens of the valley States against the efforts of the private utility companies to whittle the great regional project down and out of existence—out of existence, that is, as a public enterprise. The open and undercover conflict has grown violent since President Eisenhower, soon after his election, was led to refer to TVA as an example of creeping socialism.

Obscured also has been a salty citizen of Knoxville, Tenn., the city that produced Ray H. Jenkins to act as counsel for the Senate subcommittee now seeking desperately to save some remnant of the Senate's dignity and some prospect of Republican victory in the coming congressional elections. Not many cities of Knoxville's size could produce two equally colorful characters; although not having the benefit of television, Mr. Jenkins' rival in this respect is unlikely to achieve the same national renown.

The man is George R. Dempster, mayor of the city, just reelected to that office in a special election this week. Mr. Dempster is also president of an organization called Citizens for TVA, composed of thousands of citizens in the seven States of that region. In the light of his energetic activities in this capacity it had seemed at this distance that the recall election he was forced to face may have been motivated by TVA's opponents, but Knoxville folks say TVA scarcely figured in the campaign, nobody being against it. In any case, Democratic Mayor Dempster was reelected in this Republican city by a vote exceeding that of his three opponents combined.

The reason he bears comparison with Lawyer Jenkins is illustrated by some remarks he made in New York on Sunday. He was engaged in a debate with C. Hamilton Moses, board chairman of the Arkansas Power & Light Co., a leader in the fight against TVA. One point the mayor sought to make was that the private utilities in the States surrounding TVA, while forced by the TVA yardstick to grant lower rates than elsewhere in the country, are actually among the country's biggest profitmakers.

"Around the Tennessee Valley," said the mayor, are nine private power companies. They have the lowest private-utility rates in the United States. TVA has forced them to toe the mark. I can almost feel sorry for them. It's not their fault they happened to be located so near TVA. * * * Here are the figures on their common stock earnings. Between 1937 and 1952 the common stock earnings of all class A and B utilities in the United States a little more than doubled. In the same period the earnings of the nine companies contiguous to TVA increased fivefold. TVA's example of low-rate and high-use has forced the neighboring utilities to make money.

"Gentlemen, it's been a hard fight. Brother Ham has screamed and yelled and kicked and bitten and frothed at the mouth every inch of the way. He's still carrying on. But we finally dragged him across the line into the land of high earnings. We had to hold his mouth open and stuff those fat profits down his throat. He gagged and turned purple, but we finally got him to take them."

Why the debate was held in New York is hard to tell, but it happens that more than 90 percent of the stock of the Arkansas Power & Light Co. is held by New York corporations, according to figures recently furnished the Senate Appropriations Committee.

Milk Versus Oranges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. McCARTHY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 18, 1954

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Alfred D. Stedman from the St. Paul Pioneer-Press of Sunday, May 16, 1954:

MILK VERSUS ORANGES

(By Alfred D. Stedman)

In one of his most intriguing hints of an "out" for dairy surpluses, Secretary Ezra Taft Benson remarked that production of a good, nutritious whole milk concentrate or powder could well do for the dairy industry what frozen concentrates have done for the orange grower.

The implications are fascinating for several reasons. One is that the industry now has the whole milk concentrate. Like orange juice, it saves on freight costs by evaporating water. Reconstituted, it also is delicious. Its quality is so high as to meet even the Armed Forces' choosy standards. So it might seem all set to repeat for dairying the feat of concentrated orange juice that in a few years has increased its sales from zero to a new high record of around 47 million gallons this year.

Why is concentrated milk of so little help, while concentrated orange juice is of so great help, to producers?

The United States Department of Agriculture's Federal milk price orders do not allow free expansion of sales of concentrated milk. They do not permit concentrated milk to bid with attractive prices for consumer purchases.

Such orders compel handlers to pay the full local fluid milk price for milk used in making the concentrate. Thus they cancel the savings in freight and handling on a long haul of milk from the Midwest to high-priced markets of East or South. They knock out price incentives for dealers to handle or housewives to buy the concentrate. The Government is proposing to do this under the Twin Cities order right now.

If this were its only hobble, Midwest dairying might find progress less halting. But this load on concentrated milk is just a sample of the shackles being fastened on free trade in milk by Federal orders, States and municipalities.

First is the Federal orders' familiar requirement that dealers pay the full local class I or fluid-milk price for all milk used in making concentrate. That applies the orders' tariff or penalty or "compensatory payment" levy to all outside milk. Under this, the Government collects any saving an eastern or southern dealer might make by buying cheaper milk in the Midwest. It pays the tariff receipts to dairymen inside the local tariff wall. That in turn compels housewives to pay the local high price for milk concentrate. It is one way of shutting out the Midwest's cheaper milk.

Another way is erection of sanitary walls. These bar outside milk regardless of purity. Washington health authorities bar outside milk even though it complies fully with grade A standards of the United States Public Health Service. The Government milk orders accept such city or State "health" walls.

The results? Fairly bristling with facts about them are the pages of the Government's own reports and of the Dairy Record, published in St. Paul. Two weeks ago, Washington dealers complained they couldn't cut the home-delivered price more than half a cent, to 24 cents a quart. In New York State, consumers were paying 21 to 25 cents a quart in stores. In Georgia, store prices ranged from 25 to 28 cents. In Arkansas, the governor was being urged to punish dealers for cutting prices 2 cents a quart. In Pennsylvania, storekeepers were haled into court for contempt for price cutting.

Other results are that in the high-priced cities milk consumption is going down. Unconsumed fluid milk in those places is pouring into competition with Midwest butter and cheese. United States surplus buying to support dairy prices goes right on. The Government pockets the loss.

The remedy? Federal orders could unshackle milk as orange juice is now unshackled. Congress could adopt the Andresen bill abolishing sanitary tariff walls. Milk could be given the free market the Constitution is supposed to guarantee. Consumers could be encouraged to drink up instead of pile up the milk surplus.

Export Trade and Tariff

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALLAN OAKLEY HUNTER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 18, 1954

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of the Members of the House an address by Mr. O. R. Strackbein, chairman, the Nationwide Committee of Industry, Agriculture, and Labor on Import-Export Policy, before the Mississippi Valley World Trade Conference at New Orleans on April 29, 1954. The address follows:

New Orleans is not unlike some of our other ports that have an active interest in a thriving foreign trade. The outward flow of heavy cargoes of cotton, wheat, and wheat flour, corn, and many other products through this port gives evidence of a profitable export trade for the Mississippi basin no less than lucrative activity for the port itself.

But obviously trade cannot for long flow in only one direction. Economically this is axiomatic. (However, lest this statement be taken out of context, let me add that it does not amount to an endorsement of free trade, as you will learn soon enough.) The inward flow of goods through New Orleans as a port of entry, such as sugar, molasses, bananas, aluminum ore, coffee, etc., also contributes to port activity, but not as much as the outward flow. Import tonnage is something over 4 million short tons a year, compared with exports of something over 6 million short tons. Import trade helps to maintain employment along the waterfront; it brings profits to many merchants, brokers, tradesmen; it helps to support banks and insurance companies. Railroads and river boats benefit from the long and short haul of the imported wares inland to their ultimate destination. Shipping lines earn freight charges and this income helps to keep up our merchant marine.

Nor should we overlook the shipping enterprises centered in New Orleans if we would assess the total benefit of land and water-borne trade for New Orleans. Merchant ships are used for the transport of inward no less than outward-bound cargoes. Without trade there would be no need for such ships.

Surely, you will say, all this adds up to a ringing endorsement of freetrade or at least the liberalization of trade.

On the face of it, it probably does; but like icebergs, economic facts sometimes expose only a small part of themselves to superficial view.

For example, among the heavy tonnage items of exports that go out through New Orleans and that arise, no doubt, in great part in the great Mississippi Valley, are wheat, wheat flour, and cotton. Since the facts are not widely known, I will tell you that these three products are among the most highly protected in the United States.

Both wheat and wheat flour are not only protected by a duty but by an absolute and inflexible import quota, imposed under section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act.

The quota limitations on these imports are highly restrictive, amounting almost to an embargo. Only 800,000 bushels of wheat may be imported annually under this quota. This is less than one-tenth of 1 percent of our own wheat production.

The quota on wheat flour is even more restrictive. Only 4 million pounds may be imported per year. This is equal to about one-fiftieth of 1 percent of the flour produced in this country.

There can be no doubt that Canadian wheat and wheat flour would flood this market but for these quotas. We do not object to these quotas as such—but more of this later.

The fact is that in benefiting from the movement of wheat and wheat flour as exports through its port, New Orleans becomes a partner in the unspeakable crime of benefiting from protection. It just about breaks my heart to tell you this.

The case of cotton is almost the same. Cotton is also protected against a high rate of imports by a very restrictive import quota. Imports are limited to a quantity that is less than 1 percent of our domestic production. In the absence of this quota cotton would flow in from Brazil and elsewhere. Here again, New Orleans as a port joins willing hands with a beneficiary of protection. I begin to wonder about New Orleans.

Another heavy export, at least in some years, is corn. In 1952 and 1953, over a million tons per year moved out through New Orleans. Corn is protected by a tariff of 10 cents per bushel. This, however, offers less protection than the quotas on wheat and cotton; but corn is not under as great an import threat as the other two products. Argentina is the principal source of corn imports, and that country is a considerable distance away.

I have said that we have no objection to the cotton and wheat quotas as such. What we do say is that it is ironic indeed to find the cotton and wheat interests so solidly lined up for lower tariffs in this country.

The speaker who follows me, Mr. Charles Taft, can bear me out when I say that one of the high officials of his organization, the Committee for a National Trade Policy, is the president or chairman of the board of one of the leading flour milling companies in the country. Now, the Committee for a National Trade Policy thinks that trade barriers are just awful—i. e., unless, of course, a beneficiary of such barriers happens to be one of its high officers.

Also it is no secret that the National Cotton Council busies itself in the National Capital and elsewhere beating the drums for lower tariffs. I am sure that in New Orleans it is unnecessary to identify the National Cotton Council. It crowns more queens per year than any other organization, I am sure, and unless I am mistaken, New Orleans provides its share to the annual assemblage of Cotton-State beauties.

The utter inconsistency of the position of the two highly important agricultural groups mentioned above, namely, cotton and wheat, has probably not occurred to them. Otherwise, it completely passes the understanding how they can assume their dog-in-the-manger attitude.

I say let them go to the Secretary of Agriculture—let the wheat growers and wheat millers and the cotton growers go to the Secretary of Agriculture and file an official request for abolition of their import quotas under section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act. Let them testify before the Tariff Commission that they were in error when they came to that agency requesting a quota. Let them denounce these interferences with the free flow of trade. Let them spurn such economic heresy.

If they do that and actually relinquish their quota protection, we will be disposed to credit their words when they plead for lower tariffs. So long, however, as they remain the eager beneficiaries of extremely restrictive import quotas whilst inveighing against their brothers and neighbors for their sins of tariff protection, I leave to you what it is they are guilty of.

Mind you, many of the protectionist industries and agricultural producers who take a stand against further tariff reduction and who feel that a more responsive administrative remedy against import injury is a pressing need, face imports far beyond the fractional percentages to which wheat, wheat flour and cotton imports are held. In the case of wool, some 70 percent of the market is now being supplied by imports. Only a few years ago we supplied well over half the market. In the case of lead and zinc, imports have also taken over half of our market. Watch imports have usurped over 80 percent of it. Imported groundfish fillets have in the past 10 years grown from about 10 percent of the market to nearly 50 percent.

There are many instances of encroachment of imports on our own producers where there is no stopping the import rise. Administrative remedies, such as the escape clause of the Trade Agreements Act, have failed almost completely to give relief. Compare this situation with the secure and illiberal position of wheat and cotton. If you do make the comparison you will begin to sense the feeling that is bulding up over the rank discrimination and favoritism shown these two products.

You would think that the wheat and cotton groups would at least go into hiding when the subject of tariffs is discussed. Beside the quota protection, wheat is heavily subsidized under the International Wheat Agreement. This has drained over $500 million from the Treasury.

But ask for a reasonably protective tariff or quota on microscopes, or bicycles, or on tuna, glassware, watches, residual-fuel oil, pottery, wallpaper, wine, chemicals, or a number of other products, and the pious free-trade champions begin to groan.

"How," they ask, "can we expect to sell abroad if we refuse to buy?" This question is meant to wither the protectionists into abject silence. There is raw irony in this question if we consider who it is that asks it.

What products are protected by the most stringent of all protective devices short of an embargo? By now you know the answer. They are, of course, wheat, wheat flour, and cotton.

If we turn from exports to imports we find New Orleans in a no less interesting position.

In terms of cargo tonnage, sugar is the heaviest import. Molasses comes next. Bananas and coffee also bulge large.

Well, you know about sugar. A complete quota system protects the domestic beet and cane sugar producers. This system goes back to the days of 1934 when the duty on raw sugar was dropped sharply, that is, by 75 percent. Imports are allocated each year by the Department of Agriculture; and imports are limited to specific tonnages.

Thus the tariff cut was neutralized by direct restrictions of importable quantities. It happens that the tariff on numerous other items, both agricultural and industrial, also have been cut by 75 percent since 1934. But where are the quota limitations?

Did you know that our State Department agreed to outlaw import quotas in the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade? Of course, that did not apply to sugar, wheat, and cotton because these quotas fall within certain exceptions carefully made to the outlawry.

Insofar, therefore, as New Orleans benefits from the import traffic in sugar, the city once more shares in the fruits of protectionism.

But what about bananas and coffee? New Orleans is a great port of entry for these tropical products. It happens that both items are on the free list and are, therefore, untouched by the tariff.

We turn now to another form of protectionism. New Orleans is a considerable port. Unless my information is wrong, this port stood second in the country in 1953 in the value of the cargo clearing through it in both directions. In tonnage the rank was somewhat down the line. Nevertheless some 10 million tons of freight went through, inward and outward bound.

This fact gives New Orleans an interest in the merchant marine. At least three of the shipping lines with headquarters in this city are beneficiaries of governmental subsidization.

Now what is the reason for these subsidies?

There is no mystery about it. Shipowners and operators will tell you, and official data will confirm it, that the wages of our seamen are considerably higher than on foreign merchant ships. Ship supplies and maintenance charges are also higher. These various cost factors would lead to freight rates so high that few or no cargoes would be carried in bottoms flying the American flag. Therefore the subsidy is necessary as an offset to high costs. Only in this way can competitive freight rates be established.

This is the same thing as a tariff on imports, namely, to offset the foreign competitive advantage based on lower wages and lower living standards. If we want an adequate merchant marine we must make it possible for our ship operators to compete with foreign-flag vessels.

What has been said here about New Orleans applies with almost equal force to the whole Mississippi Valley region. Many beneficiaries of protection overlook or forget the very fact that they are beneficiaries of the system they condemn.

Protectionism suffers from the bad name fastened upon it as a result of past abuses and the error of the academic economists in attributing the 1929 depression to the Tariff Act of 1930. So far as the generation of 1930 or earlier is concerned, as well try to change the name of Arkansas as to give protectionism a clean bill of health.

But let me point out:

1. The average protective effect of our tariff has been reduced a full 75 percent since the 1931–35 period, when the average level was slightly over 50 percent on dutiable items. Today this average is down to 12½ percent. Moreover, nearly 60 percent of all our imports are free of duty altogether.

2. The United States is no longer a high-tariff country. In fact, we are among the low-tariff nations of the world. In recent years we have ranked about 7th or 8th from the bottom in our tariff level on total imports among some forty-odd countries of the world. Moreover, despite the import quotas on cotton and wheat we make much less use, in fact almost no use, of the many nontariff trade barriers employed extensively by other countries.

3. Our imports have increased from $15.92 per capita in 1938–39 to $70.32 in 1951–52. This is almost a fivefold increase. A great part of this is attributable to the price increase in the past 15 years, but even if allowance is made for this price increase we would still find our physical volume of imports about doubled per capita during this period.

4. The dollar gap was on its way out in 1950 when the Korean war broke out. From an excess of exports of $8.6 billion in 1947, the figure dropped to $1.4 billion in 1950. In 1953, i. e., only last year, foreign countries gained over $2 billion in gold reserves. Our nonmilitary exports were balanced by imports plus what we spent abroad as tourists and for offshore military procurement.

I realize that a world-trade conference wants to hear about trade expansion. Also I am aware that my subject is Exports and the Tariff. Nevertheless it seemed most desirable that we reexamine our tariff position in the world and within the United States itself before saying much about our export position. A reorientation is necessary if we are to see clearly where we stand in the world of trade today compared with 20 years ago. Again, our changed internal position is of utmost importance.

We are faced in 1954 by a growing threat of unemployment from import competition. In fact, we have already experienced it in material form. But you will ask whether a decline in exports will not also cause a drop in employment.

The answer is, of course, "Yes. A decline in exports not only will cause but has already caused unemployment."

However, let me point out that our exports, unlike our imports, were highly stimulated during and after the war by noncommercial considerations. As the world recovered physically and economically from the war it was inevitable that these artificial exports would decline. No better example could be found than wheat.

As more and more of the hungry nations resumed feeding themselves the demand for our wheat naturally fell off. Nothing else could in all good sense have been expected. The same trend hit our cotton exports; as well as other agricultural products. Our raw cotton exports fell from a little over 5 million bales in 1951 to a little over 4 million bales in 1952. This was a decline of 20 percent. Wheat exports fell over 10 percent in the same period; wheat, flour, about 15 percent.

This all happened at a time when our overseas aid was still at high tide.

I ask you frankly, if our export markets begin to collapse even under these circumstances, how reliable are they? How soundly are we building when we cast our economic lot with exports? What would it take to keep the outside markets propped up?

What sort of policy is it that seeks consciously to increase our dependency upon other countries? The countries that have long experienced such dependency, namely, Britain, Germany, and Japan, do not look kindly upon it. They regard it as a curse. Here we are, asked to advocate a national tariff policy designed to lead us into the same corner.

That is what a slavish adherence to GATT will do for us. It will deprive us of our tariff autonomy, as it was designed to do—without anyone knowing it was being done. The signing of GATT, but more particularly its subsequent history, brands it as a sneak play perpetrated by our Department of State to fasten upon our economy a system under which other countries rather than we would determine our national trade policy.

In the course of time all our lesser industries, as distinguished from the mass-production giants, would be liquidated on the ground that they are only marginal and uneconomic. We would become a country of specialists and find ourselves more and more dependent upon the rest of the world for what we need in order to live. That is the GATT philosophy.

I make this statement in complete sincerity and feel that the Department of State has purposely failed to enlighten the public on the facts.

Finally, let me say that I hope you will reexamine your position with respect to trade. A maximum volume can be built only upon a foundation of fairness of competition and it will not help the flow of trade to undermine a vast segment of our economy in order to force exports up. That is the way toward the economic decline of the United States.

The Late Joseph P. Tumulty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. HART

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 18, 1954

Mr. HART. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I append herewith in the order mentioned an excerpt from a radio broadcast by the famous Washington correspondent, Earl Godwin, delivered on Thursday, April 8, 1954, the date of Mr. Joseph P. Tumulty's death, over radio station WRC in Washington; a memoir by the distinguished Arthur Krock which appeared in the New York Times on April 9, 1954, from which I have taken the liberty of deleting the last paragraph which, in my opinion, neither adds to nor detracts from his tribute to Mr. Tumulty; an editorial from the Roanoke Times of Saturday, April 10, 1954; and one from the Washington Post and Times-Herald of April 11, 1954, all evoking thoughts of the greatest of all Presidential secretaries:

EXCERPT FROM BROADCAST BY EARL GODWIN THURSDAY, APRIL 8, 1954, RADIO STATION WRC

Joe Tumulty died today—75 years old. I knew him well. Secretary to President Woodrow Wilson and a man of infinite capacity and variety. As a politician, I believe he was the most complete natural in that field ever to come to Washington—center point for the concentrated politics of the Nation. As a human being he was endowed with rich Irish warmth and humor. He never lost it and never laid it aside.

He meant more to Wilson and the Nation that anyone has reported so far. I believe truly he kept Wilson's reputation from sinking more than once, because Wilson did not know or understand people as Joe Tumulty did. And whether or not Wilson understood Joe Tumulty right straight down to the ground is more than I can say. I do know that many a time Joe Tumulty handled a delicate situation and brought it through to a conclusion, whereas his boss, "The Governor" as Joe called Wilson, would probably have ruined it with misunderstanding.

There will be said and written today about the late Joseph Tumulty a great deal about his political manipulation of things connected with the Government in the Wilson era. I cannot help but direct attention to the humor in his life and in his daily walks. I can recall one evening when he and I and another friend turned into a small Pennsylvania Avenue restaurant for a late bite to eat and Joe Tumulty went to a telephone booth, called the Secretary of State, William Jennings Bryan, and in a perfect imitation of the voice of the German Ambassador, whose name was Bernstorff, began to bawl out Mr. Bryan in a most terrific manner. On our end of the telephone conversation it sounded at times almost like something from the German comedy team of Weber and Fields. What Mr. Bryan said, I don't know, but that was at a time when we were close to war with Germany and Bryan was a pacifist of undoubted principle. And what happened after that, perhaps Joe Tumulty knew, but he never divulged it to anyone I know.

I am sure I've never known any man who had more sincere love and devotion of home and family.

And one more memory. At the time when Woodrow Wilson lay sick abed and unable to conduct the affairs of the Nation there might have been some reason to find out just what the Constitution meant when it prescribed that the Vice President should take over in the event of the inability of the President. But the inability was never made official. Tumulty helped divert people's attention from the President's illness. Men would call at the White House; they couldn't see the President. He was reportedly too much engaged, but Tumulty would hear their story and say that he would go into the President's office. And so he would walk into the empty office of the President; stay a while and come out with a decision or an answer which he himself had devised. I have here given you just a trifle, but there has been so much said and wrritten about the influence of Louis Howe on Franklin Roosevelt that I believe it's time to measure that odd little man against the much more human and colorful and powerful secretary, the man who passed on today, Joseph Tumulty.

[From the New York Times of April 9, 1954]

In the Nation—Recalling the Dawn of Our World Leadership

(By Arthur Krock)

Washington, April 8.—Thirty-seven years and six days after President Wilson went to the Capitol to ask Congress to declare war on the Central Powers the news comes of the death, in total retirement, of Joseph Patrick Tumulty, Wilson's devoted secretary. His death reduced to a number which can be counted on the fingers of one hand the men around that President who played important roles in raising the historical curtain which theretofore had excluded the United States from participation in wars of European origin and locale.

To those who were observers of that regime and those times in Washington the news of Tumulty's passing brings a host of vivid memories. But none who figures in them was more colorful than the White House Secretary, pink-cheeked, blue-eyed, fair-haired, and merry, whose influence and labor were steadily exerted to effect the triumph of Woodrow Wilson's efforts to establish a system of durable world peace. A rebel against the Democratic machines in New Jersey and Jersey City, first opposed to Wilson's political rise on the fear that the president of Princeton might be subject to the corporate interests against which Tumulty equally rebelled, he became Wilson's loyal, and very effective, advocate and assistant.

THE ESTRANGEMENT

The emotional quality which was Tumulty's legitimate heritage from Irish forebears intensified the pain of his wound inflicted by the estrangement from Wilson—which began with the President's serious illness in the White House. Then a shadow came upon Tumulty's bright spirit, and though it lifted for a while, the gay charm that was heightened by the inflections of his pleasant voice was never fully restored. A kind of Celtic brooding invested him, and, despite great success as a lawyer in private practice and the unfailing devotion of a host of friends, he did not wholly dispel it thereafter.

The open cause for Tumulty's distress was a public statement made by the ex-President, repudiating the implications widely drawn from a message, attributed to him, to a Democratic dinner in New York held in 1922 in furtherance of a movement to renominate James M. Cox in 1924 as the Democratic candidate for president. At this dinner Tumulty had read a written statement from Wilson, describing in very general terms the type of Democrat Wilson would support, which, it developed, was Tumulty's summary of a conversation between them. The ex-President decided that the written form of the message and the surroundings in which Tumulty had it introduced were designed to seem to aline him with the Cox movement. In a letter to this correspondent Wilson gave this as the reason for repudiating his former secretary. And in this same letter Wilson revealed that he wholly opposed the renomination of Cox.

A FURTHER BLOW

Tumulty's wound was deepened by an unfriendly account of this incident in Mrs. Woodrow Wilson's memoirs, and thereafter it was a subject to which he constantly and unhappily reverted in conversation. Nevertheless, he remained the champion of Wilson's record, particularly Wilson's unsuccessful effort to have the United States join the League of Nations. In Tumulty's view the world crises and wars that followed were the direct consequence of the Senate's rejection of the League Treaty.

But before that, through the first Wilson Administration and part of the second, the blithe personality was undimmed that endeared Tumulty to his contemporaries and, with his militant idealism, made him so valuable a presidential aide. Then it was that he engaged in amiable practical jokes, drew on his inexhaustible fund of Jersey City political stories about old Irish politicians whose brogue he could imitate faultlessly, and otherwise made himself the delight of every company of which he was a part. In those days Tom Pence, of North Carolina, who was an unofficial public relations consultant for the administration, had a bachelor flat in New York Avenue to which every evening noted Democrats of the day resorted. Among these were Senators Ollie M. James, of Kentucky, and William Hughes, of New Jersey, Tom Heflin, of Alabama (then a Member of the House), and Jesse H. Jones, who had just begun creating the skyline of Houston, Tex. The fount both of serious political conference and anecdote there was the President's secretary.

[From the Roanoke Times of April 10, 1954]
10, 1954]

Joseph Tumulty: Wilson's Friend

Joseph P. Tumulty's death at 74 recalls an era when liberalism in politics connoted a philosophy little like that of the liberals of today. Mr. Tumulty was a liberal in the tradition of Jefferson and Woodrow Wilson.

It was as President Wilson's private secretary for 8 years that he wielded a potent influence in the shaping of programs and policies of Government. Their association began when Mr. Wilson was running for Governor of New Jersey in 1910. The State legislator, schooled in the rough politics of Jersey City, and the intellectual from Princeton University found common ground. Between them was bred a mutual trust and affection that continued until Mr. Wilson's death.

Mr. Tumulty gave up his personal career to serve as private secretary to his friend when the latter was elected governor. His knowledge of practical politics and his experience in the State legislature were important factors in putting across Governor Wilson's progressive proposals in 1911–12.

When Mr. Wilson moved into the White House on March 4, 1913, Mr. Tumulty went along and soon assumed an outstanding role in national affairs as the President's close adviser. He performed his duties with such skill and diplomacy that the post of private secretary took on the dignity and importance of a Cabinet office. He was on intimate terms with the country's political leaders and with diplomats. One of his main tasks was to serve as a buffer between the President and the stream of White House visitors, official and private, a job he performed with remarkable tact and acumen.

Secretary Tumulty possessed to an unusual degree the capacity to sense public attitude toward the administration's policies, and as a result he was able to advise the President soundly.

He exhibited great skill in the trying days of President Wilson's incapacitating illness. Through it all he served his chief with devotion. The fact that he stood so high in the estimation of a great President is a tribute to the character and talent of Joseph P. Tumulty.

[From the Washington Post and Times-Herald of April 11, 1954]

Joseph P. Tumulty

Joseph P. Tumulty was one of the most influential and persuasive of the Wilson men. He also was one of the most popular. He was called the secretary to President Wilson, but he was much more than that. In a very real sense, he was a presidential assistant. His word carried great weight with the President even after Wilson, in 1916, wanted to fire him. Tumulty was the only secretary to the President where now there is a secretariat. He advised on everything—press relations, requests for appointments to see the President, patronage, and congressional liaison. His political advice, based on a long experience and an extensive acquaintance with politicians, was extremely useful to the President. Tumulty's great personal charm and lovable disposition drew people to him and won their confidence in a way that made him an invaluable assistant.

Above all, Tumulty's loyalty and devotion to the President set him apart from those who are always around to serve the President to serve themselves. He had been with Wilson when the latter was governor of New Jersey, and he had been one of his most confident supporters at the Baltimore convention. During the first 3 years in the White House there was complete rapport between Tumulty and the Wilsons. The first Mrs. Wilson recognized how important he was as a complement to her husband. The breach came with Wilson's marriage to Mrs. Galt. But Tumulty, who was as ardent in his support of Wilson's principles as he was of the man, did not allow this to shake his allegiance. His service to the President in those later, tragic years was without stint. When Secretary of State Lansing went to the White House during the President's illness and suggested that the Vice President take over the presidential duties, Tumulty almost threw him out.

Wilson respected Tumulty in those last years and valued his advice, but he refused to bestow upon him the thing that Tumulty most wanted: the same confidence as in the early years. Yet shortly before Wilson's death he urged Tumulty's nomination as the Democratic candidate for the Senate in New Jersey. Tumulty's "political training has been more varied than that of any other man I know," the former President wrote. But he saw little of the man who had served him with affection and selflessness, who had made a substantial contribution to his administration and who was to spend the rest of his life devoted to the vision he always had of Wilson's indomitable spirit.

Jeannie Sargent, Winner of Greater Lowell Spelling Bee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 18, 1954

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, in the gallery at this time is 13-year-old Jeannie Sargent, of St. Margaret's School in Lowell, Mass., who topped 7,600 contestants in the Greater Lowell spelling bee and is here for the national finals on Thursday.

Jeannie is president of her class, valedictorian of the graduates, and already has won a scholarship for her high-school education.

Speaking for all the people of Greater Lowell and, personally, with highest praise, I am extremely proud of her and congratulate her on her great accomplishments, retentive mind and her becoming modesty.

Elimination of Pollution and Improvement of Rivers of New England

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 18, 1954

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following editorial from the Lawrence Sunday Sun, Lawrence, Mass., of May 16, 1954.

This is truly a fine editorial which expresses the sentiments of thousands of peoples in the New England States who feel that this part of the United States is not being treated fairly in the spending of Federal money and rightfully so. The writer of this editorial, Attorney Charles A. Mahoney, of Lawrence, Mass., has been a student of Government affairs for several years and quite qualified to express the rousing interest of New Englanders in this very important subject matter:

THE NEW ENGLAND BLOC MIGHT HELP

Whenever a proposal is made for some Federal project in New England, there seems to be a feeling of futility among the residents of this region about securing funds. But when one considers the millions, yes, even billions of dollars that have been spent by the Federal Government and are going to be spent to develop other sections of the country, it appears that we have been too modest in our ambitions.

The great Tennessee Valley Authority's scheme has served to help rob New England of its industries, and yet the power charges are not even paying the interest on the investments. Great power projects have been erected, such as Grand Coulee and Barnable Dams on the Columbia River to attract industry into those regions.

Great dams have been erected on the Colorado River at spots where the power developed must be carried hundreds of miles by expensive transmission systems for use. Now the St. Lawrence seaway has been pushed through as a new Federal project to further isolate New England and cut it off from the channels of trade and commerce.

Probably the most unjustifiable projects from a taxpayer's viewpoint are the various irrigation schemes, especially those now proposed for the upper Colorado Basin. Millions of dollars will be spent to irrigate land worth some $150 an acre. The Federal outlay will be the equivalent of $1,000 an acre to benefit these private owners, and under present practice the owners of the private land will pay 15 percent or less of the cost of the development and will not be required to pay interest or carrying charges upon the enormous investment.

It would seem that the elimination of pollution and the improvement of the rivers of New England for recreational purposes is as important to this region as the watering of wasteland in Washington, Arizona, Colorado, and Kansas. As time goes on, the recreational areas of New England are becoming a more valuable asset. Clear, pure rivers flowing through scientific areas and abounding in fish and wildlife would provide new attractions to countless visitors. The cost of purifying and improving these streams would be small in comparison with the Federal funds spent in isolated and uninhabited areas.

Perhaps with the New England bloc of Senators and Congressmen, which is supposed to have been organized in Washington, this area may receive some compensation for the improvements that have been financed in other parts of the country with an unfair proportion of New England's tax money. We might thus not only have an economic advantage, but happier and better communities in which to work and play.

B. Frank Whelchel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHIL M. LANDRUM
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 18, 1954

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Speaker, last Tuesday morning I was saddened to learn of the sudden and unexpected death of a friend, and a former Member of this House from the Ninth District of Georgia, the Honorable B. Frank Whelchel. Many of the present Members of this Congress have expressed to me their own personal grief at the untimely passing of this warm-hearted friend.

Mr. Whelchel represented Georgia's Ninth District, the district I am presently honored to serve, for five consecutive terms from 1935 until his retirement at the close of the 78th Congress in 1944. During his tenure of service he established himself as one with a keen and sympathetic understanding of all people everywhere and endeared himself to those with whom he served as a warm and kindly friend of all humanity.

Probably no one has come to the Congress from Georgia who possessed a more intimate knowledge of his constituency than did Frank Whelchel. His naturally cheerful and friendly attitude made him well and favorably known to people from all walks of life. No man received more intense loyalty from his friends than did Frank.

He was better known in legal circles of Georgia as the defender of the unprivileged and his skill at defending those charged with criminal violations was known throughout Georgia.

A young and industrious editor of the Gainesville (Ga.) Daily Times in an editorial of Thursday, May 13, 1954, has captured the real feeling all people had for this distinguished Georgian, and by unanimous consent I include that splendid tribute with my remarks:

B. FRANK WHELCHEL

A colorful, well-known and respected member of the northeast Georgia bar is dead. His warm manner, his always dapper appearance, and especially his skill at defense in criminal law will be missed in the courtrooms of this circuit.

B. Frank Whelchel served as Congressman, judge, and businessman. But his greatest service was rendered to unfortunate people innocently or inadvertently involved with the law. Under American rules of justice, accused persons in our courts are entitled to every doubt and every consideration. In Mr. Whelchel they had a champion to present their case and to obtain for them the full protection which is their due.

When word got out that he was to appear in court, spectators filled every seat in the chamber to hear him exercise his powers of oratory and persuasion on a jury. It was seldom that he failed to achieve at least a partial victory for his client.

In the courtrooms his reputation as a judge of human nature and a striker of juries made him a formidable legal opponent. For a man who studied law in pullman cars, as the Washington Post reported when he went to Washington as a freshman Congressman, he saved many a man from long years in prison or even worse punishment.

We knew him as an always friendly, interested person sympathetic and helpful toward young reporters trying to get a complicated story. In his passing, something bright and very much alive leaves the daily scene in this already all too humdrum world.

Mr. Speaker, I am glad to have had the privilege of knowing Frank Whelchel and I am happy that I was able to observe the many fine qualities which endeared him to his thousands of friends. I join with them and with you in expressing sympathy to his widow and to his family.

Israel Cannot Halt Immigration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY W. WIER
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 18, 1954

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the American Jewish World, dated May 14, 1954, which editorial is entitled "Israel Cannot Halt Immigration."

The editorial follows:

ISRAEL CANNOT HALT IMMIGRATION

The outraged indignation with which Isral Government officials and spokesmen have greeted the suggestion of Henry A. Byroade, United States Assistant Secretary of State for Near East Affairs, that Israel terminate its policy of unrestricted immigration, should not only have been foreseeable, but could not have been anything other than what it has proved to be.

The whole concept of modern Israel, the basic premise on which the state came into being 6 years ago, developed around the guaranty that Jews anywhere in the world shall have, not just the opportunity, but the right to find haven or refuge in Israel if desire or circumstance leads them to exercise the right.

To call a halt now to that policy would, in effect, be to nullify the cardinal consideration which led in 1948 to the establishment of Israel as a sovereign state.

"We will never give up our freedom to welcome with open arms any Jew who chooses or is forced to come to our country," Joseph Saphir, Israel's Minister of Communications and General Zionist party leader, declared during his weekend visit to the Twin Cities.

And Dr. Nahum Goldmann, chairman of the Jewish Agency for Palestine, has asserted that Mr. Byroade's proposal may have gravely prejudiced efforts to rescue Jews from troubled areas. Dr. Goldmann declared that Israel will not be deterred by ungracious and harsh advice resulting from dubious political expediency.

Plainly the Byroade suggestion was intended to placate the Arab States. Not only is it highly doubtful that anything short of Israel's extermination will ever satisfy many of the Arab leaders, but the speech has only served to throw a further strain on Israel-American relations at an extremely critical period.

Like the State Department's recently announced decision to ship arms to Iraq, one of Israel's most virulent foes, the gratuitous advice that Israel abandon the unrestricted immigration principle must be viewed as a most inept pronouncement. It has been likened by people who are critical of the administration's handling of our foreign affairs, to our dealings with India, leading to a deteriorating situation which—in the present troubled state of southeast Asia—may prove to be costly in the extreme.

We view such developments with grave concern. We do so because we are fully mindful of the tremendous contribution by the United States to Israeli independence. (Ambassador Abba Eban only a few days ago said, "The American people, a people of immigrants and pioneers which fought for its independence less than three centuries ago, has been our chief partner and ally in the consolidation of our independence.") We deplore events and policies which, in our judgment, are capable of shaking the very foundation on which Israel is being built.

Relinquish the policy of unrestricted immigration? You might as well say: "It's all a mistake; there never should have been an Israel."

There are at least 1½ million Israelis who will challenge the point—with their lives, if need be, is the way Mr. Saphir put it.

H. R. 1227, the Bryson Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 18, 1954

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following petition with reference to the advertising of alcoholic beverages on television:

Because of the widespread dissatisfaction with the beer and wine programs on the radio and television, and with the unwholesome ads in magazines and newspapers, we, the undersigned, ask you, Representative CHARLES S. GUBSER, to please present our request to the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee to grant a hearing on House bill 1227 (BRYSON) soon.

Mrs. Jennie Lind Pyles, Miss Viola Gillander, Mrs. Marie Skrām, Mrs. Estelle Rider, Miss Lillian King, Charles B. Pyles, Dora G. Thomson, Bessie M. Brewer, Dale G. Adams, Florence Flanary, Mary J. Sutton, Lucy A. Dill, Marie Skram, May E. Yingst, Ina L. Yingst, Alta King, Ohanna Bardon, Estelle R. Lewis, B. C. Carlton, S. Rowe, Marie Rice, Elizabeth Mickell.

PALO ALTO, CALIF.

Some Signs of Business Recovery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED E. BUSBEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 18, 1954

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, the editorial in the Chicago Sunday Tribune of May 16, 1954, contains some very enlightening facts and figures concerning the upward trend in business activity and employment. It is particularly interesting to note the editor's conclusion that the principal reason why the 1953–54 recession has apparently stopped short of the low levels reached in the 1949 recession is the great increase in residential construction since housing has been restored to the field of free economy. Under leave to extend my remarks, I am pleased to direct the attention of my colleagues to the editorial:

SOME SIGNS OF BUSINESS RECOVERY

Nearly everyone not blinded by selfish political interests must be impressed by signs that the decline in economic activity has stopped. Although there has been only a slight increase in the operating rate of the steel mills, there has been no adverse change for more than 2 months. Likewise the all-embracing index of industrial output has shown very little change since February. And then there is the recent report on unemployment.

After reaching a peak of 3,725,000 in March, the number unemployed declined by 260,000 in April. The recession of 1953–54, so far, at least, has turned out to be milder than the one of 1949–50. In that unhappy episode, unemployment soared to 4,684,000 before recovery got under way.

One should not go overboard after a single month's reversal of a trend in unemployment, especially when it occurs in April, a month when work out of doors is resumed after winter suspension. In the 14 years for which unemployment figures are available on a monthly basis, only once did the number out of work fail to go down in April. However, the seasonal influence, on the basis of experience, accounts for only about 100,000 of last month's cut in the ranks of the jobless. Most of the recent improvement in the labor situation appears to be the result of a business recovery that has nothing to do with the calendar.

Meanwhile, aggregate personal incomes have held rigidly at last year's levels, compared with a drop in the 1949 recession of as much as 5 percent. Because of the 10 percent cut in individual income taxes which went into effect in January, a larger percentage of what is earned in 1954 is spendable. Moreover, since April money has gone further because of the cut in the excise taxes. In some sectors of the economy, but not all, spending has been well sustained.

There are divergences of trend in the same line. Two automobile companies are doing exceptionally well, while the others have suffered a severe shrinkage of business. Department store sales are sharply lower in some cities and in others fully as large as in 1953. Chicago stores have done exceedingly well. Sales of the big stores here last week were not only greater than in the same week last year, but the largest ever known so early in the year.

Personal savings, which fell nearly 30 percent in the recession of 1949–50, not only have not declined but are at a higher level than in 1953. The consumers have the money to support a sharp business recovery.

Why have people been reluctant to part with their money? The National City Bank bulletin for May has an answer: "Manifestly, it is up to business to coax the public to loosen up on its purse strings, by producing the kind of goods that will appeal by hard selling and by attractive pricing." The Tribune's annual distribution and advertising forum in which 24 of the Nation's business leaders will take part on Monday and Tuesday comes at an especially fortunate time.

Why has the recession apparently stopped short of the low levels reached in the year and a quarter following the election of Mr. Truman in 1948? Why has betterment this time come before four and a half million were jobless, before total incomes were reduced by 5 percent and current savings were reduced by 30 percent? The most obvious explanation is the great upturn in building construction. Contracts for residential construction in the 37 Eastern States as tabulated by the F. W. Dodge Corp. totaled nearly $2.5 billion in the first 4 months. The April total was the biggest month in history. By contrast, building slumped in 1949.

Here in Chicago, permits for residential housing, tabulated by the Tribune's statistical department, show that more private housing was authorized to be built in April than in any month in 25 years. In the year through April 30, permits were issued for 3,857 residential family units in Chicago, compared with 1,464 units in the like period in 1949. This is private building alone.

As many places to live were certainly needed in 1949 as now. Commonsense tells us that the need then was greater, for in the meantime more than 50,000 dwellings have been constructed. The difference is that the Truman administration attempted to bring about a residential building boom at a time when many kinds of controls, including rent control, were in force, and he failed. The present administration restored housing to the field of free economy. Private enterprise has succeeded where Government failed.

The Bryson Bill, H. R. 1227

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 18, 1954

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert a petition which I have received from Oak Hill, W. Va. The petition is signed by 50 persons and it is in support of the Bryson bill, H. R. 1227, a bill to prohibit the transportation in interstate commerce of advertisements of alcoholic beverages, and for other purposes.

The petition follows:

OAK HILL, VA., *May 8, 1954.*

Hon. ROBERT C. BYRD,
Member of Congress, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: In view of the damaging effects, not only to our youth but to all people, we, the undersigned, respectfully urge that you use your influence and vote for the Bryson bill (H. R. 1227) to prohibit the transportation in interstate commerce of alcoholic-beverage advertising in newspapers, periodicals, etc., and its broadcasting over radio and TV.

Mrs. Everett Bragg; Everett Bragg; Mrs. Steve Sotok; I. J. Boher; Mr. S. H. McNeeley; Mrs. Guy M. Yeager; Mrs. John Frisk; Jean Sharon Frisk; J. Paul Bandy; Mrs. E. S. Hamilton; Robert Ray; Mrs. J. W. Jones; J. W. Jones; Mrs. James Mathews; Jackie Hilton; Mrs. J. K. Lilly; Mrs. D. H. Jones; Mrs. S. H. McNeeley; Mrs. Danny E. Davis; Mrs. Otis D. Morton; W. H. Level; Mrs. W. H. Level; Mrs. E. B. Davis; Emmett Phillips; Mrs. V. P. Newland; Mrs. C. P. Anderson, Sr.; Mrs. E. A. Masters; Mrs. E. R. Arnole; Mrs. L. E. Allman; Mrs. Ann Tatum; Mrs. John Scott; Mrs. W. F. Bays, Sr.; Clara May Martin; Miss Eunice Herndon; Mrs. R. C. Russell; Wanda Davis; Mrs. G. E. Davis; V. P. Newland; Mrs. C. R. Hill; Mrs. Orville Rich; Mrs. H. P. Thomas; Mrs. E. E. Straughan; Mrs. Lillian Ropp; Mrs. G. Stule Callison; Mrs. J. Warden.

May Day Message of Secretary of Labor James P. Mitchell

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. AYRES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 18, 1954

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, the following is the May Day message of Secretary of Labor James P. Mitchell, which was used extensively by the Voice of America and the International Press Service of the United States Information Agency. I understand that Radio Free Europe also used this material. I feel that the Secretary's message was well designed to reach the average European or Asian at a time when it is so urgently needed:

It is fitting for us to reflect today upon the common goals of all decent people—freedom, prosperity, and peace.

Freedom is the essential raw material without which neither prosperity nor peace can be achieved.

But with forced labor, forced thought, and forced unity no nation can find lasting prosperity nor can the world find enduring peace.

This is why we, of the free world, become so concerned about the enslavement of large masses of people as evidenced by the thousands of forced labor camps in the Communist world.

This is why we abhor the tyrannical system of government which denies the individual freedom of association, thought, and action and substitute for these freedoms abject fear and blind obedience.

This is why we condemn so-called worker organizations in the Communist world which are the result of forced unity and which lead to excessive work norms, sweatshops, and low living standards.

For the workers, the best test of the adequacy of the system under which they live is the real earnings that workers enjoy under the system. While the standard of living of workers throughout the free world have steadily improved in recent decades, it is a statistically proven fact that real earnings and food-purchasing power of workers in the Soviet Union today are considerably below the 1928 level. The Russian workers must labor 53 percent longer today than in 1928 for a pound of bread, 43 percent longer for a pound of beef, and 244 percent longer for a quart of milk.

When forced labor, forced thought, and forced unity exist anywhere, they threaten free people everywhere. This makes us all the more disturbed not only as human beings but as a Nation, about the world menace of communism. We have seen how the absorption of once-free countries by Soviet communism has decreased the living standards of the workers in those unfortunate lands. The countries of Eastern Europe which were once the breadbaskets of the European Continent are now blighted areas of hunger, want, and desperation. If further proof is required, we need only look at the dramatic contrast in workers' living standards in Eastern Germany under Communist domination and Western Germany in the free world. The spontaneous and courageous uprising of Eastern German workers last June was an outcry of protest of desperate workers against privation and loss of freedom.

This is a time for people all over the world to rededicate themselves to the high principles of humanity—to the recognition of human dignity, and the basic freedoms without which there can be no prosperity and peace.

Partition of Ireland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 10, 1954

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to include an item from the Irish World of May 1, 1954. It is a report of a speech made by Mr. Terence O'Conlon, of Philadelphia, Pa., in Dundalk, Ireland, on Easter Monday. The occasion was a commemoration parade of all 5 Northern Divisions of the Irish Republican Army from the 9 counties of Ulster and North Louth. Mr. O'Conlon was an official delegate from the Irish organizations of Philadelphia and had been invited to the tostal.

The above-mentioned follows:

On July 4, 1776, an important document was signed and published in the city of Philadelphia. Among the many interesting paragraphs in that document was one which stated: "We hold these truths to be self-evident that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these rights are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights governments are instituted among men deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed." This document, friends, was the Declaration of Independence of the United States of America. Three of the men who signed this document were Irish-born—Thornton, Smith, and Taylor. Five others were of Irish descent—Rutledge, Lynch, McKean, Read, and Carroll. This Declaration was printed by an Irishman from the North, Thomas Dunlap. It was first publicly read by another Irishman, Charles Thompson.

Just 38 years ago another document with a strange similarity of content and purpose was signed and published on a fateful Easter Monday in the city of Dublin. This document stated, in part: "Irishmen and Irishwomen, in the name of God and of the dead generations from which she receives her old tradition of nationhood, Ireland through us summons her children to her flag and strikes for her freedom. * * * We declare the right of the people of Ireland to the ownership of Ireland and to the unfettered control of Irish destinies to be sovereign and indefeasible. The long usurpation of that right by a foreign people and government has not extinguished the right, nor can it ever be extinguished except by the destruction of the Irish people."

It seems that if we are to understand the presence of a foreign army in occupation of six counties of the Irish Republic and if plans are to be formulated for their removal, both these documents and their backgrounds should have careful evaluation.

When the Declaration of Independence was signed in America, that country was a weak colony of about 3 million souls scattered over its thousands of miles of territory. England was then one of the most formidable and aggressive imperial powers in the world. There were many then who claimed that opposition to England was utter insanity. On March 28, 1775, Patrick Henry spoke before the Virginia Convention of Delegates and said: "They tell us, sir, that we are weak; unable to cope with so formidable an adversary. But when shall we be stronger? Will it be next week or next year? Will it be when we are totally disarmed, and when a British guard shall be stationed in every house? Shall we gather strength by irresolution and inaction? * * * Three millions of people, armed in the holy cause of liberty, and in such a country as that which we possess, are invincible by any force which our enemy can send against us. * * * I know not what course others may take; but as for me, give me liberty or give me death."

The Boston Massacre, which occurred on the night of March 5, 1770, was the spark which set the American Revolution flaming. On that night the civilians of Boston were fired upon by a squad of British soldiers. Five men were killed and many more were wounded. A monument to those five men in Boston Common lists one of them as Patrick Carr, a native of Ireland. * * *

One hundred and forty-four years later the soldiers of the same imperialist power staged another massacre in Bachelor's Walk, in the city of Dublin. Again the civilian population was fired upon by the Crown forces. (It seems the mighty Empire was rather peeved because the Volunteers of Dublin went to Howth and collected 900 rifles and an appropriate amount of ammunition which had been delivered to their order.)

The massacre in Bachelor's Walk resulted in the killing of 1 woman and 2 men and in the maiming of 32 civilians. It is strange how history repeats itself. If the Boston Massacre sparked the American Revolution, the Bachelor's Walk Massacre was the torch which resulted in the conflagration of 1916, and in the Declaration of the Irish Republic.

Today when the United States of America is a mere 10 hours away by fast airplane, when we are to be even closer neighbors in the future, it is well for us to know the debt of gratitude which America owes to Ireland.

When the first battle of the Revolution was fought at Lexington, the man in command of the American forces was Capt. J. Parker, whose mother came from County Clare. He was wounded in the first fire but he continued to discharge his gun without retreating. He was finally bayoneted to death by the British soldiers. Again history repeats itself. Do you remember the story of Commandant Jim Connolly of the Irish Citizen Army in the General Post Office, Dublin, in 1916?

The martyrdom of Capt. J. Parker was well avenged by another Irishman, Jack Barry of Wexford. Barry organized the American Navy of which he was the first commodore. He is known today as the Father of the American Navy. In memory of Capt. J. Parker he named his first battleship the Lexington. He captured and sank the pride of the English Navy on the high seas. His daring exploits won him the admiration of friend and foe. Sir William Howe, then commander in chief of the English forces in America offered this daring Irishman 20,000 guineas and the command of a British frigate if he would only desert the services of the United States. History records that Jack Barry scornfully answered: "Never, not the value and command of the whole British Fleet can seduce Jack Barry from the cause of his country." Today it is well that we remember another young Irishman named Barry who died defiantly in Dublin on November 1, 1920. We may also remember, with pride, another Barry who wiped out the enemy forces at Crossbarry in County Cork.

FRIENDLY SONS ELECTS WASHINGTON

George Washington was elected a member of the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick in Philadelphia on December 18, 1781. He attended many meetings of that organization and among his letters are many to the Friendly Sons. This is still a powerful and active organization in Philadelphia and it is deeply interested in the cause of Irish freedom. Some years ago it featured Sean McBride, then Minister for External Affairs, as the main speaker at the St. Patrick's Day banquet. It is interesting to note that over half the members of this organization are Protestants.

Listen to George Washington addressing an Irish delegation in 1788: "Patriots of Ireland, champions of liberty in all lands, be strong in hope. Your cause is identical with mine. You are calumniated in your day; I was misrepresented by the loyalists of my day. Had I failed, the scaffold would have been my doom. But now my pay is honor. Had I failed, I would have deserved the same honor. I stood true to my cause, even when victory had fled. In that I merited success. You must act likewise." Today we honor the men of the north who stood true to the cause of the Irish Republic, even when victory seemed to have fled and when all others seemed to have deserted. For these men and all the people in the 6 occupied counties, the past 30 dark and gloomy years may yet be the brightest chapter in Irish history.

Listen to Col. John Parke Custis, adopted son of Washington, in a report given after the end of the Revolution: "Of the operations of the war—I mean the soldiers—up to the coming of the French, Ireland furnished at the rate of 100 for 1 of any nation whatever. Then honored be the old and good services of the sons of Erin in the War of Independence. Let the shamrock be entwined with the laurels of the Revolution, and truth and justice guiding the pen of history inscribe on the tables of America's remembrance, 'Eternal gratitude to Irishmen.' "

AMERICAN DAY OF TRIUMPH

March 17, 1776, was a day of triumph and glory for America. That day the English troops, horse and foot, marched out of Boston, and the army of Washington took possession. The countersign on that day was "St. Patrick." The officer of the day was, Gen. John O'Sullivan. We of the recent generations have been privileged to see the English troops march out of most Irish towns and cities. We have reason to hope that the day is not far away when they will also march out of the cities of Belfast, Derry, and Newry.

Friends: The facts of rights and freedom whether relating to nations or individuals are simple facts. Those who distort these simple facts and try to present them as something very complicated are generally people who are not sympathetic toward democracy or freedom in the first place. A man has a right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness or he does not have that right. In 1776, the people of the United States decided emphatically that he does have that right. The people of Ireland have a right to a free, united, independent and unfettered Republic for their country or they do not have that right. The men of 1916 asserted that right in arms and enthroned it with their blood. The overwhelming majority of the Irish people voted to uphold that right in 1918. The Parliament of the Irish people ratified that right in 1919 and made that right the permanent law of Ireland. Today we are privileged to see the determined men from all Ulster including the six occupied counties, who are determined to stand by their rightful heritage of the Irish Republic despite the fact that the enemy is camped on their doorstep.

It is well that we should ask: Why is this army of occupation in six of Ireland's counties for the past 30 years? The answer seems to be simply that Ireland is less determined to be free than the aggressive enemy is determined to keep her in bondage. There are indications today that this situation will soon be corrected. Speaking of rights. Just what rights has this army of occupation in Ireland. There is probably not one man, woman, or child in this vast throng today who doesn't know that the only rights an army of occupation or other foreign force has in Ireland today or ever are the rights of a highway robber.

ARTIFICIAL BORDER

Within a short distance of this place a foreign government has set up a crude and artificial border which is a scar and mutilation upon the fair face of Ireland. There is no justification for this act of vandalism. No election, no plebiscite of the Irish people has been held to determine if the Irish people want such a spite fence. We know that if such a plebiscite were held tomorrow, if the democratic voice of the Irish people were heard, then this artificial border would be past history by tomorrow night.

Today we stand at the dawn of a new era in world history, a world rapidly rising from the shackles of colonialism and feudalism. We see weak nations becoming strong and powerful. We see small nations thumbing their noses at the arrogant masters of yesterday. This is the age of new and vast power. An age when the horizon of man's knowledge is advancing toward limits never before dreamed of. Today you may travel in comfort to America in 10 hours. Tomorrow men are planning to travel to the moon and to build artificial satellites to encircle the earth above the atmosphere. Yet despite this advance in science, knowledge, and rapid communication and despite the growing appreciation of moral values in relationships between men and nations; despite Ireland's right to freedom and unity and despite the growing protests of Irish people in Ireland and throughout the world; yes, despite all this, England's attitude today is the same arrogant, imperialistc attitude of iron heel oppression which brought her disaster in the American Revolution and which will surely bring her disaster again if she persists in violating the democratic rights and sovereignty of the Irish Republic which is the de jure and rightful authority of all 32 counties of Ireland. May I conclude with a few lines from the pen of Brian O'Higgins that are as true today as when first printed in Irish Freedom in September 1914:

"Who is Ireland's enemy? Not Germany nor Spain,
Not Russia, France, nor Austria—they forged for hernochain,
Nor quanched her hearths, nor razed her home, nor laid her altars low,
Nor sent her sons to tramp the hills, amid the winter's snow."

Thank you.

What Are My Responsibilities as a Teacher?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OREN HARRIS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 18, 1954

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, in 1950 the Lion Oil Co., with its home office in El Dorado, Ark., established a program to provide scholarships to students for writing essays on selected subjects, and awards to teachers who sponsored the essays.

A year later, realizing that continued progress in the guidance of our school boys and girls is dependent upon the continuing progress of our educators, the scope of the Lion Oil scholarship fund was widened to include essay contests for high-school teachers. Scholarships were provided to winners in order to assist them in obtaining advanced education.

These scholarship contests are endorsed by the Arkansas Education Association, education associations of other States, and various other educational organizations. Teachers in public, private, and parochial schools are invited to enter these contests.

Recently the Lion Oil scholarship contest for southern teachers was concluded, the subject was What Are My Responsibilities as a Teacher? The teachers entering the contest prepared and submitted an original essay of 1,000 words, or less, on this most important subject.

The winner of this contest was Miss Marjorie Walker, senior English and French teacher in the high school at Lewisville, Ark.

She was awarded a $1,200 scholarship for her fine work which was chosen as the best of the hundreds of essays which were submitted in this contest zone.

Miss Walker's prize-winning essay was written in the form of a letter to a young friend planning to enter the teaching profession. She has distinguished herself with this outstanding accomplishment. It is an example of the desire of our school teachers to improve themselves, to devotion to their work and thoughtful consideration of the problems of the profession.

I commend this work to other teachers, the public, and the attention of the Members of Congress, and therefore, under unanimous consent, include this prize-winning essay of Miss Walker in the RECORD:

WHAT ARE MY RESPONSIBILITIES AS A TEACHER?

TEACHERVILLE, ARK., *September 8, 1953.*

DEAR KAREN: Litttle did I dream that last summer's vacation would put you in my path. I must thank Duncan Hines for directing us to Friendship House between Biloxi and Gulfport for lunch.

Often I've seen someone who reminded me of a friend. I wonder why this happened to be the occasion on which I finally mustered courage to ask: "Are you, by any chance, related to Winnifred Roberts?"

It was wonderful to discover that you are her first cousin. You are like her in countless ways, which makes me feel that the teaching profession is fortunate to have you as a recruit.

It's gratifying to know that you are already so fully mindful of the responsibilities teaching carries. Many is the night I've shared my feelings on the matter with Dear Diary.

Would you consider me presumptuous if I enclose a few excerpts from this litttle journal?

"JANUARY 1, 1949

"DEAR DIARY: Eleven o'clock and bedtime. I'm really too tired to write you tonight but faithfully filling your pages is one of my New Year's resolutions. You see, I love you already. * * * I know your binding is only imitation leather, but I also know that the appreciation in Charles Waring's eyes as he hung you on my Christmas tree was the real thing. * * * Suppose I'd dismissed him as hopeless back in the days of his resentment. Why, if I hadn't visited in his home, I wouldn't have known that his parents attached practically no importance to the 'schooling of a boy who is just going to stay on the farm anyway.' * * * The following weeks weren't easy. But the results were worth every effort. Mr. and Mrs. Waring are expecting great things of their boy when he enters agricultural college. * * * Do you see, Diary, why I cherish you? The one who gave you to me taught me such important lessons. He proved that patience and understanding are musts in any teacher's life. He showed me, too, that if I am to bring out the best in the Charleses, and the Stuyvesant Vanderbilt Van Smythes as well, I am obligated to learn as much as I can about their individual personalities, home life, and interests. It's to the building of men and women in the finest sense of the word that I'm dedicated.

"MAY 10, 1949

"Oh, Diary. Looks as if I'll be burning the midnight oil; so while I'm catching my breath, I'll chat with you. * * * Why can't I learn to say no? I would get involved with a rotary club talk, chairmanship of the teen-age canteen publicity committee, and an article for the local weekly. * * * Well, to be perfectly frank, it's my job to give the community a fair share of my time. Shouldn't a license to teach represent a pledge to participate in worthwhile projects? * * * Of course, the right thinking citizen's don't expect me to go overboard to the extent that I am in a constant state of exhaustion and frayed nerves. That would be a breach of responsibility itself.

"OCTOBER 3, 1950

"Thought for a few minutes today that Elsie the cow had joined English II class. I might have known that it wasn't a Borden at all * * * only Dennis the Menace Johnny Cargill with a carnival-acquired gadget. Now, confidentially, Diary, I once would have thought this was the moment for a lecture. But what's wrong with a good laugh occasionally? * * * Sense of humor important? Ah, yes; I'll hold on to mine.

"DECEMBER 20, 1951

"Am studying university catalogs again. Have decided to take a sociology course, too. I know I should keep growing in my own field; but let it never be said I'm one of those creatures who can't see beyond the confines of his own classroom.

"AUGUST 1, 1952

"Greetings. As the tourist wrote his banker: 'Am in Boston having a great time. Wish I could afford it.' * * * However, I never feel guilty about summer trips. If I can't add a little spice to the textbook, I'm not worth my salt.

"NOVEMBER 4, 1952

"Voted today. Am always thrilled over the privilege. * * * Had a lively discussion along this line in French I class. Never did get "vouloir" conjugated but heard some interesting comments on our democratic principles. I'll sacrifice a verb to the American way of life any time.

"JANUARY 4, 1953

"Accepted an invitation to a Methodist youth meeting. A young Negro boy told of a summer conference of Protestants, Catholics, and Jews he'd attended. * * * No intolerance at that meeting. I hope we teachers are not shirking our part of the responsibility to blot out prejudice and its associates. * * * We played games during the social hour. Presbyterian Bob Beatty said he wouldn't have dreamed a Baptist schoolteacher could scramble like an egg. * * * Ichabod Crane was never in a worse predicament than the pedagogue who doesn't endorse wholesome entertainment. I defy anyone to say Peewee Brent didn't learn a lot about the game of life from those softball matches we enjoyed at his class picnics.

"MAY 29, 1953

"Dear Diary, * * * If a tear spots your pages, please don't scold. You see, another group graduated tonight * * * and they always manage to get such firm grips on my heart. * * * Twenty-two of them * * * twelve going on to college, the other ten into various lines of work. * * * Have I endowed them with an adequate knowledge of French and English? Have I helped them to meet the outside world with a feeling of confidence, a sense of responsibility, an earnest desire to cope successfully with the physical, mental, and spiritual hurdles which lie ahead? * * * As I bid you goodnight, faithful little book, I offer a prayer that my counseing may be wise, my conduct worthy of emulation, and my instruction sound."

And there, Karen, is a glimpse at the thoughts that have been mine. In all humility I send them to you to consider as you ring the school bell for the first time.

My every good wish goes with you.

Most sincerely,

WINNIFRED'S OLD ROOMMATE.

The Social Security Act Amendments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 18, 1954

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, there has been considerable interest on the part of the Members of Congress in H. R. 7199, a bill to amend the Social Security Act and the Internal Revenue Code. As stated in the title of H. R. 7199, the purpose of the amendments is to extend coverage under the old-age and survivors insurance program, increase the benefits payable thereunder, preserve the insurance rights of disabled individuals, and increase the amount of earnings permitted without loss of benefits, and for other purposes. The bill contains 76 pages. The Committee on Ways and Means held extensive public hearings, and now the committee is considering the bill, H. R. 7199, in executive session.

It will require morning, afternoon, and some evening sessions of the Ways and Means Committee to bring this legislation to the floor of the House for action this month. The importance of H. R. 7199 as a part of the President's legislative program places a responsibility on each Member of Congress to be informed on this bill. To that end I place in the RECORD at this point a preliminary section-by-section analysis of H. R. 7199 as introduced. I have received notification from the Public Printer that the estimated cost of printing this material in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will be $821.70. In my opinion, the benefit to the Members of Congress and to the public will more than justify the expense.

The analysis follows:

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS—H. R. 7199, MR. REED OF NEW YORK, JANUARY 14, 1954

The first section of the bill contains a short title, "Social Security Amendments of 1954." The remainder of the bill is divided into three titles: Title I, which amends title II of the Social Security Act; title II, which amends the Internal Revenue Code; and title III, which makes a conforming amendment in the Railroad Retirement Act and other laws.

TITLE I. AMENDMENTS TO TITLE II OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT EXTENSION OF COVERAGE

Section 101 of the bill amends sections 205, 209, 210, 211, and 218 of the Social Security Act so as to extend coverage to additional groups.

Domestic service, service not in course of employer's business, and agricultural labor

Domestic Service

Section 101 (a) (1) of the bill amends paragraph (2) of section 209 (g) of the Social Security Act, which relates to domestic service. This paragraph now provides for the exclusion from wages, for purposes of old-age and survivors insurance, of cash remuneration paid in a quarter for domestic service in a private home unless such remuneration paid in such quarter for the service is $50 or more and the employee is regularly employed by the employer in the quarter—i. e., he performs such service for that employer on at least 24 days in the same or preceding quarter. The amendment would eliminate the requirement of regular employment, thus making coverage of domestic service depend solely on receipt of $50 in cash wages in a quarter by an employee from an employer for domestic service.

As under existing law, domestic service will not include service described in section 210 (f) (5) (service not in the course of the employer's trade or business, or domestic service in the employer's private home, if such service is performed on a farm operated for for profit).

Service Not in Course of Employer's Business

Section 101 (a) (2) of the bill amends section 209 (g) of the Social Security Act by adding a new paragraph (3). This paragraph relates to cash remuneration received for service not in the course of the employer's trade or business and should be considered together with repeal of section 210 (a) (3) of the Social Security Act which would be accomplished by section 101 (a) (5) of the bill.

Section 210 (a) (3) of the act now excludes, from employment covered by it, service not in the course of the employer's trade or business performed by an employee in a calendar quarter unless the cash remuneration paid by an employer for such service is $50 or more and the service is performed by an individual regularly employed in that quarter by such employer to perform such service. The test of regular employment for this purpose is the same as the test used under existing law for domestic service in a private home (described above). The effect of the new paragraph (3) of section 209 (g) plus the repeal of paragraph (3) of section 210 (a) is to eliminate the requirement of regular employment and to make coverage under old-age and survivors insurance of service not in the course of the employer's trade or business depend solely on receipt of $50 or more for the service.

The $50 test is also changed slightly. Under the existing law the $50 must be paid for service performed in a quarter during which the employee is regularly employed by the employer to perform the service, and the time of payment is unimportant. Under the new section 209 (g) (3), the test is payment of $50 in a quarter for the service and the time of performance of the service is unimportant. This change (which parallels a change made in the Internal Revenue Code by the bill) should ease the burden on the employer for reporting purposes.

Agricultural Labor

Paragraph (3) of section 101 (a) of the bill would amend section 209 (h) of the Social Security Act by inserting a new paragraph (2) (the existing provisions of section 209 (h) would be made paragraph (1) thereof). The new paragraph would exclude from wages, for purposes of old-age and survivors insurance, cash remuneration paid by an employer to an employee in any calendar quarter for agricultural labor, unless such remuneration paid in such quarter by that employer to the employee for such service is $50 or more. This amendment should be considered with the amendment to paragraph (1) of section 210 (a) of the Social Security Act which would be effected by section 101 (a) (4) of the bill.

Under the existing provisions of section 210 (a) (1) of the Social Security Act agricultural labor performed in a calendar quarter is excluded from employment covered by old-age and survivors insurance unless the cash remuneration paid for such labor is $50 or more and such labor is performed for the employer by an individual regularly employed by him to perform such labor. The "regularly employed" test for this purpose is both more substantial and more complex than the "regularly employed" test now applicable to domestic service and service not in the course of the employer's trade or business. For purposes of section 210 (a) (1), "an individual is deemed to be regularly employed by an employer during a calendar quarter * * * only if (i) such individual performs agricultural labor * * * for such employer on a full-time basis on 60 days * * * during the quarter, and (ii) the quarter was immediately preceded by a qualifying quarter. A qualifying quarter is defined as (I) any quarter during all of which the individual was continuously employed by the employer, or (II) any subsequent quarter meeting the test of clause (i) above if, after the last quarter during all of which the individual was continuously employed by the employer, each intervening quarter met the test of clause (i). An individual is also deemed to be regularly employed by an employer during a calendar quarter if he was regularly employed (upon application of clauses (i) and (ii)) by the employer during the preceding calendar quarter." (H. Rept. 2771, 81st Cong., 2d sess. (Conference Rept. on H. R. 6000), p. 95.)

The main effect of the amendments made by paragraphs (3) and (4) of section 101 (a) of the bill is to eliminate the requirement of regular employment for purposes of determining whether an individual's agricultural labor is covered under old-age and survivors insurance and to make coverage depend solely on payment of $50 or more in the quarter by the same employer to the employee for such labor. As in the case of the amendments relating to service not in the course of the employer's trade or business, the $50 test is to be applied in terms of when the remuneration is received rather than when the agricultural labor, for which it is paid, is performed.

At the present time, services performed in connection with the ginning of cotton and services performed in connection with the production or harvesting of crude gum (oleo-resin) from a living tree or the processing of such crude gum into gum spirits of turpentine and gum resin, if such processing is carried on by the original producer of the crude gum, are excluded from coverage under old-age and survivors insurance (sec. 210 (a) (1) (B) of the Social Security Act). Also, these services may not be counted in determining whether an individual meets the $50 60-day test in connection with other agricultural labor, discussed above, although it may be counted for purposes of a qualifying quarter. The amendment to section 210 (a) (1) of the Social Security Act would also remove the exclusion of these services.

The exclusion of services performed by foreign agricultural workers under contracts entered into in accordance with title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended (Public Law 78, 82d Cong.), would, however, be continued in section 210 (a) (1) of the Social Security Act, as amended by the bill. Title V of the Agricultural Act now provides that no workers may be made available under it for employment after December 31, 1955. The exclusion in section 210 (a) (1) of the Social Security Act would be inoperative when title V of the Agricultural Act ceases to have any effect.

Redesignation of Paragraphs of Section 210 (a)

As indicated above, paragraph (5) of section 101 (a) of the bill repeals paragraph (3) (exclusion of service not in the course of the employer's business) of section 210 (a) of the Social Security Act. This paragraph of the bill would also make the necessary technical change of redesignating paragraphs (4) through (14) of that section, and references in the rest of the Social Security Act to the redesignated paragraphs. This paragraph of the bill does not redesignate paragraphs (15), (16), and (17) of section 210 (a) of the Social Security Act since they are dealt with by later provisions of the bill.

American citizens employed by American employers on foreign-flag vessels

Under section 210 (a) (5) of the Social Security Act (redesignated by the bill as sec. 210 (a) (4)), seamen employed on foreign-flag vessels and airmen employed on foreign-flag aircraft are excluded from employment covered by old-age and survivors insurance both with respect to services performed on or in connection with the vessel or aircraft outside the United States and services performed in port in this country. Section 101 (b) of the bill would amend this section of the act so as to make the exclusion apply only if the seaman or airman is not an American citizen or the employer is not an American employer. Consequently, if the seaman or airman is an American citizen and the employer is an American employer the services of such seaman or airman on foreign-flag vessels or foreign aircraft will be covered whether performed here or abroad. This change would have the effect of treating services performed by these individuals the same as other services performed by American citizens as employees for American employers, which are now covered whether performed here or abroad.

Certain Federal employees

Section 101 (c) of the bill amends section 210 (a) of the Social Security Act to extend the coverage of old-age and survivors insurance to certain services performed for the Federal Government.

Employees of Federal Home Loan Banks

At the present time, service performed by employees of the district Federal home loan banks is excluded, pursuant to section 210 (a) (7) (B) of the Social Security Act (redesignated as section 210 (a) (6) (B) of the bill). This provision excludes service performed in the employ of any Federal instrumentality which was exempt on December 31, 1950, from the old-age and survivors insurance employer tax imposed by section 1410 of the Internal Revenue Code.

There are a number of instrumentalities (listed in clauses (i) through (iv) of the present sec. 210 (a) (7) (B)) which are excepted from this exclusion and section 101 (c) (1) of the bill would add Federal Home Loan banks to the list of exceptions (in clause (ii)), thereby covering under old-age and survivors insurance service performed for such banks.

Civilian Employees of Coast Guard Exchanges

Among the exceptions to the exclusion of service for Federal instrumentalities exempt from the old-age and survivors insurance employer's tax on December 31, 1950, mentioned above, are the Army and Navy exchanges and similar activities conducted by Federal instrumentalities subject to the jurisdiction of the Defense Department. Service performed by civilians for these instrumentalities, not compensated for from funds appropriated by the Congress, is covered under old-age and survivors insurance. Section 101 (c) (2) of the bill would amend the redesignated section 210 (a) (6) (B) of the Social Security Act (now sec. 210 (a) (7) (B)) by the addition of a new clause (v), which would except similar service performed for Coast Guard exchanges and similar activities conducted by instrumentalities subject to the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Treasury from the exclusion, thereby covering such service under old-age and survivors insurance.

Paragraph (4) of section 101 (c) of the bill would make a complementary amendment to paragraph (3) of section 205 (p) of the Social Security Act. This section of the act deals with determinations of employment and wages in the case of Federal employees. Paragraph (3) of the section makes these administrative provisions applicable to the exchanges and related activities conducted by Federal instrumentalities under the jurisdiction of the Defense Department. The amendment to section 205 (p) (3) of the act would make such administrative provisions applicable also in the case of the Coast Guard exchanges and similar activities conducted by Federal instrumentalities subject to the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Treasury.

Employees in the Postal Field Service Not Covered by Any Federal Retirement System

At the present time employees in the field service of the Post Office Department who are excluded from the civil service retirement system by Executive order because they are serving under temporary appointments pending final determination of eligibility for permanent or indefinite appointments are covered under old-age and survivors insurance. The services of employees in the postal field service covered by the civil service retirement system are excluded from coverage under old-age and survivors insurance as are the services of all other Federal employees covered by that system. The bill would not make any changes as to these excluded services. However, also excluded, by reason of clause (iii) of section 210 (a) (7) (C) of the Social Security Act (redesignated as sec. 210 (a) (6) (C) by the bill), from old-age and survivors insurance are services performed by employees in the postal field service who are not covered by the civil service retirement system and who are not excluded from that system because they are serving under temporary appointments pending determination of their eligibility for permanent or indefinite appointments. Some of these employees are employed for short periods of time, e. g., during the holiday rushes; others may be employed for relatively substantial periods. Section 101 (c) (3) of the bill would repeal clause (iii) of the present section 210 (a) (7)

(C) of the Social Security Act, thereby covering under old-age and survivors insurance the services of these postal employees not covered by the civil service retirement system and not awaiting a determination of their eligibility for permanent or indefinite appointments.

This repeal necessitates a renumbering of the succeeding clauses of the section, and section 101 (c) (3) of the bill would also effect this renumbering.

Ministers

Section 101 (d) of the bill amends the present paragraph (9) of section 210 (a) of the Social Security Act (redesignated as paragraph (8) by the bill) to permit coverage of certain ministers and members of religious orders employed by nonprofit religious, charitable, educational, or other organizations exempt from income tax under section 101 (6) of the Internal Revenue Code, if the organization has filed a certificate under section 1426 (l) of the Internal Revenue Code waiving its exemption from the taxes imposed pursuant to the Federal Insurance Contributions Act (concurrence of two-thirds of the clergymen employees is required).

The present subparagraph (B) of section 210 (a) (9) of the Social Security Act excludes lay employees of these organizations unless the organzation files a certificate of waiver under section 1426 (l) of the Internal Revenue Code. This provision would be retained without any substantive change and would be redesignated as subparagraph (A). The present subparagraph (A) excludes services performed by a duly ordained, commissioned, or licensed minister of a church in the exercise of his ministry or by a member of a religious order in the exercise of duties required by such order. This would be eliminated and in its place would be substituted a new subparagraph (B) excluding such services if performed in the employ of an organization exempt from income tax under section 101 (6) of the Internal Revenue Code. The new subparagraph (B) would, however, permit coverage under old-age and survivors insurance of ministers and members of religious orders (not including any member of a religious order who has taken a vow of poverty as a member of such order) employed by such organizations if the organization has filed with the Bureau of Internal Revenue a certificate indicating its desire to cover its ministers and members of religious orders. (The conditions governing the filing of such a certificate are contained in the Internal Revenue Code, and are explained in the portions of this statement applying to amendments in the code.) The clergymen who concur in the filing of the certificate, and those employed after the certificate became effective (or after the certificate was filed, if the certificate was made effective retroactively) would be covered.

The new subparagraph (B) would also have the effect of covering under old-age and survivors insurance, without any option on the part of the employing organization or the employees, any services performed by a minister or member of a religious order as an employee of an organization other than an organization exempt from income tax under section 101 (6) of the Internal Revenue Code. Services performed under such circumstances were covered prior to the 1950 amendments to the Social Security Act, and this change merely restores the situation which existed prior to 1951.

Interns

Section 101 (e) of the bill amends the paragraph redesignated by the bill as paragraph (13) of section 210 (a) of the Social Security Act (the present sec. 210 (a) (14)). This section now excludes from employment covered under old-age and survivors insurance, service performed by a student nurse or by an intern. The amendment which would be made by the bill would repeal this exclusion insofar as it relates to interns.

Fishing and related service

Section 210 (a) (15) of the Social Security Act now excludes from employment covered by old-age and survivors insurance, services performed by employees in fishing and similar activities unless performed in connection with commercial salmon or halibut fishing or on a vessel of more than 10 net tons. Section 101 (f) of the bill would repeal this exclusion and renumber the succeeding paragraphs of section 210 (a) accordingly.

Homeworkers

Section 210 (k) (3) (C) of the Social Security Act includes as an employee, for purposes of employment covered by old-age and survivors insurance, any individual performing services for remuneration for any person as a homeworker, according to specifications and on materials furnished by such person, which materials are to be returned to him or his designee, but only if the performance of such services is subject to State licensing laws. (Under section 209 (j), which would not be changed by the bill, the remuneration for homework in any quarter is not counted unless the employee received $50 or more in cash in the quarter from the same employer for such work.) Section 101 (g) of the bill would amend section 210 (k) (3) (C) of the act so as to eliminate the requirement that the services be subject to State licensing laws.

Farmers and professional self-employed

Section 101 (h) of the bill amends section 211 of the Social Security Act to provide coverage for farm operators and professional self-employed people with net earnings from self-employment of at least $400 annually.

At the present time, paragraph (2) of section 211 (a) of the Social Security Act excludes from the definition of "net earnings from self-employment," for purposes of coverage under old-age and survivors insurance, income from any trade or business in which, if it was carried on exclusively by employees, the major portion of their services would constitute agricultural labor. Section 101 (h) (1) of the bill would repeal this paragraph (thereby covering such income under old-age and survivors insurance to the same extent as other income from self-employment), would renumber the succeeding paragraphs accordingly, and would add a new sentence at the end of section 211 (a). The new sentence provides that in the case of any such trade or business carried on by an individual the net earnings from self-employment may, at his option be presumed to be computed by deducting 50 percent of the gross income therefrom instead of the amount as otherwise computed under the section. This option will be available, however, only if the gross income (as computed under the section) from the trade or business is $1,800 or less. If such gross income is more than $1,800 and the net earnings therefrom, as computed under the section, are less than $900, the farmer may at his option presume such net earnings to be $900 for purposes of old-age and survivors insurance.

Section 101 (h) (2) of the bill would amend the present section 211 (a) (4) of the Social Security Act (redesignated as sec. 211 (a) (3) by the bill) so as to exclude from "net earnings from self-employment" the gain or loss derived from coal royalties under certain conditions. This is a technical amendment needed to bring this definition in title II of the Social Security Act into line with the definition of the term in the Internal Revenue Code. Section 325 (d) of the Revenue Act of 1951 amended section 481 (a) (4) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to the old-age and survivors insurance tax on self-employment income) but failed to amend the corresponding provision in the present section 211 (a) (4) of the Social Security Act.

Section 211 (c) (5) of the Social Security Act now excludes, for purposes of net earnings from self-employment and self-employment income on which old-age and survivors insurance coverage is based, income from the performance of service by an individual in the exercise of designated professions. These are physicians, lawyers, dentists, osteopaths, veterinarians, chiropractors, naturopaths, optometrists, Christian Science practitioners, architects, registered, licensed, or certified public accountants, funeral directors, or professional engineers. Section 101 (h) (3) of the bill would repeal this exclusion, thereby covering the self-employment income from the practice of these professions by self-employed individuals.

Employees covered by State or local retirement systems

Subsection (i) of section 101 of the bill amends section 218 (d) of the Social Security Act to permit service performed in positions covered by a State or local retirement system to be included, under prescribed conditions, under an agreement between a State and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare covering State and local government employees for old-age and survivors insurance purposes.

Paragraph (1) of subsection (i) would amend the heading of section 218 (d) (which now reads "Exclusion of Positions Covered by Retirement Systems") by striking out "Exclusion of." It retains the present provisions of the section, but adds it to provisions which would permit the coverage of individuals performing service on the date of enactment in positions covered by a State or local retirement system under certain conditions. These provisions do not apply, however, to those in policemen or firemen positions. With respect to services in such positions existing law continues to apply. This change would have the general effect of providing that after enactment of the bill individuals in positions subject to a State or local retirement system after the effective date of enactment of the bill could be covered only if the members of the system vote in favor of coverage. Paragraph (1) would also add five new paragraphs to section 218 (d).

The new paragraph (2) of section 218 (d) contains a statement that it is the policy of the Congress in enacting provisions permitting the coverage under old-age and survivors insurance of employees under a State or local retirement system that the protection afforded employees in positions covered under a retirement system on the date a coverage agreement is made applicable to service in such positions, or receiving periodic benefits under the retirement system at that time, will not be impaired as a result of their coverage under old-age and survivors insurance or as a result of legislative enactment in anticipation of coverage.

The new paragraph (3) permits coverage under an agreement of service performed by employees in positions covered by a retirement system (other than policemen's and firemen's positions and certain positions in police and fire departments specified in paragraph (5)) if the governor of the State certifies that the following conditions have been met:

A. A referendum by secret written ballot was held on the question whether service in positions covered by the retirement system should be included under an agreement;

B. An opportunity to vote in the referendum was given (and was limited) to the employees who, at the time the referendum was held, were in positions then covered by such retirement system and were members of such system (other than employees who were not in such positions at the time notice of the referendum was given, employees who would not be affected by the referendum because they are in positions already covered under the agreement, and employees in the police and fire department positions referred to in paragraph (5)); [1]

C. Ninety days' notice of the referendum was given to all such employees;

D. The referendum was conducted under the supervision of the governor or an agency or individual designated by him; and

E. Two-thirds or more of the employees who voted in the referendum voted in favor of including such positions under an agreement under section 218.

No referendum would be valid for the purposes of paragraph (3) unless held within the 2-year period which ends on the date of execution of the agreement or modification which extends coverage to the retirement system involved, nor would any referendum be valid if held less than 1 year after any prior referendum with respect to the same retirement system.

The new paragraph (4) establishes, for the purposes of the existing section 218 (c), a separate coverage group consisting of all three of the following categories of employees:

A. All employees in positions covered by the same retirement system on the date when an agreement (or modification) entered into in compliance with the conditions in paragraph (3) was made applicable to such system. The employees in this category are those to whose services an agreement cannot be made applicable under existing law because the services are performed in positions covered by a retirement system.

B. All employees in positions which were covered by that retirement system at any time after the date an agreement was made applicable to the system. The employees in this category are those in positions which are brought under the retirement system after the agreement is made applicable to the system.

The bill, therefore, needs clarification in these respects:

C. All employees in positions which were covered by the same retirement system at any time prior to the date when an agreement was made applicable to the system and to which the old-age and survivors insurance system was not extended because of the existing provisions of section 218 (d) (which, under the bill, are contained in section 218 (d) (1)). The employees in this category are those in positions which were covered by the retirement system at the time an agreement or modification was made applicable to the coverage group of which they were members, but which were later removed from coverage under the retirement system.

The new paragraph (5) provides that the referendum procedures in paragraph (3) for extension of old-age and survivors insurance coverage entered into under section 218 are not applicable to cover under an agreement service performed in any policeman's or fireman's position covered by a retirement system or service in any position covered by a retirement system applicable exclusively to positions in one or more law-enforcement or fire-fighting units, agencies, or departments. By nature of the provisions of existing law which continue to be applicable to such policeman's and fireman's positions, services in such positions cannot be covered under an agreement if the positions are covered under a State or local retirement system.

The new paragraph (6) provides that a retirement system which covers positions of employees of the State and positions of employees of 1 or more political subdivisions thereof, or covers positions of employees of 2 or more political subdivisions of the State, may be deemed, at the option of the State, to constitute a separate retirement system with respect to each such political subdivision, and, where applicable, a separate retirement system with respect to the State. If the State determines that the retirement system shall not be deemed to constitute separate retirement systems, then any referendum must apply to the entire retirement system and any agreement or modification entered into must be made applicable to service performed by all employees in positions covered by the system.

Paragraph (2) of section 101 (i) of the bill amends section 218 (f) of the Social Security Act, which relates to effective dates of agreements and modifications thereof. Under the existing provision agreements or modifications executed prior to January 1, 1954, may be made retroactive to January 1, 1951, thus enabling the States to negotiate agreements in the early days of the provisions relating to coverage of State and local employees without unduly penalizing the employees under the eligibility and benefit-computation provisions of old-age and survivors insurance because of unavoidable delay in this process. In the case of agreements or modifications executed after December 31, 1953, the coverage provided thereby may be made retroactive only to the beginning of the calendar year in which the agreement or modification is consummated. This provision would be modified by the bill to permit agreements or modifications entered into during 1955 and 1956 to be made retroactive to January 1, 1955. This will give the States 2 years within which to enact any legislation necessary to enable them to enter into agreements or modifications of agreements designed to take advantage of the new provisions of section 218 (d) of the Social Security Act which have been added by the bill.

An agreement or modification retroactive to a date prior to its execution, either under existing law or by reason of the provisions of section 101 (i) of the bill, may not be made applicable with respect to service in the retroactive period performed by any individual who is not a member of a coverage group to which the agreement or modification applies on the date of execution of the agreement or modification. Thus, service performed by individuals who die, retire, or otherwise leave the employ of the State or political subdivision prior to the date of execution of an agreement or modification would not be covered for retroactive periods.

Section 101 (i) (2) of the bill also provides that deductions under section 203 of the Social Security Act) on account of earnings in excess of the permitted amount) shall not be made from any benefits certified and paid before an agreement or modification is agreed to on account of service covered retroactively by the agreement or modification. This section of the bill also provides that in such cases the deductions which would have been made under section 203 had the agreement or modification been agreed to on the date it became effective, shall be deemed to have been made for purposes of section 215 (f) of the act (relating to recomputation of benefits).

The amendment made by section 101 (i) (1) of the bill is made effective as of January 1, 1955.

Paragraph (3) of section 101 (i) of the bill amends section 218 (m) of the act (relating to coverage of employees under the Wisconsin retirement fund) by changing the reference to "subsection (d)" to "paragraph (1) of subsection (d)."

Effective dates

Subsection (j) provides effective dates for the amendments made by section 101 of the bill. The exclusion of coal royalties from "net earnings from self-employment" (sec. 101 (h) (2) of the bill) would be effective for taxable years beginning after 1950. The extension of coverage to farm operators and the self-employed professional groups (sec. 101 (h) (1) and (3) of the bill) would be effective for taxable years beginning after 1954. The provisions relating to the coverage of the agricultural labor and service not in the course of the employer's trade or business (section 101 (a) (2), (3), (4), and (5) of the bill) would be effective with respect to remuneration paid after 1954 (in the case of the amendments to the definition of "wages") and with respect to service for which the remuneration is paid after 1954 (in the case of the amendments to the definition of "employment"). The provisions relating to coverage of domestic service (sec. 101 (a) (1) of the bill) would be effective with respect to remuneration paid after 1954. The amendment making applicable to Coast Guard exchanges the administrative provisions of section 205 (p) of the Social Security Act (sec. 101 (c) (4) of the bill), which are now applicable in the case of other service for the Federal Government covered under old-age and survivors insurance, would become effective January 1, 1955. The amendments made by the rest of section 101 of the bill (other than subsec. (i), relating to employees covered by State or local retirement systems, which permits retroactive coverage) would be effective with respect to services performed after 1954.

Increase in benefit amounts

Primary Insurance Amount

Section 102 (a) of the bill amends section 215 (a) of the Social Security Act to provide increases in benefit amount, both for individuals already on the benefit rolls and those who will come on the rolls after the effective date.

Paragraph (1) of section 215 (a) as amended by the bill sets forth a new benefit formula to be used in computation of the primary insurance amount of individuals who: (1) Have acquired at least 6 quarters of coverage after 1950 and become eligible for old-age insurance benefits no earlier than the first day of the second month following the month of enactment of these amendments or who die no earlier than that day and prior to becoming eligible for an old-age insurance benefit, or (2) acquire at least 6 quarters of coverage after June 30, 1953. The new benefit formula would be used only if it resulted in a higher primary insurance amount than would result for such individual if his benefit amount were computed under the new conversion table provided in section 215 (c) as amended by the bill.

The benefit formula provided by the bill would replace 55 percent of the first $110 of average monthly wage plus 20 percent of the next $240 of such wage. Under present law, the formula replaces 55 percent of the first $100 of average monthly wage plus 15 percent of the next $200.

Paragraph (2) of the subsection as amended by the bill provides that any other individual shall have his primary insurance amount computed through the conversion table in subsection 215 (c) as amended by the bill.

Average Monthly Wage

Section 102 (b) amends section 215 (b) of the Social Security Act to provide that, in determining an individual's average monthly wage, up to 4 calendar years in which earnings were lowest (or nonexistent) be dropped from the computation. The exclusion of such low years is of special significance to individuals newly covered by the bill, since they can drop from the computation the years 1951-54, during which they had no covered earnings. Persons already covered could drop any 4 or fewer years, past or future, in which their earnings were lowest.

---

[1] As set forth in the bill, employees in positions covered by a retirement system but who, because of personal disqualification are not members of such system have no voice in the referendum. Likewise, since membership in an existing retirement system is a condition of voting, those who were under such a system and were excluded from coverage because they were subject to the system when their coverage group was brought under old-age and survivors insurance, would have no opportunity to come in at all if the entire system had been repealed prior to the effective date of the bill.

Paragraph (1) of the subsection amends subsection 215 (b) (1) of present law to provide that the minimum divisor used in computing the average monthly wage would be 24 in cases where one or more low years are dropped from the computation. The purpose of this change is to assure that the minimum period used in the computation is substantial enough to cover a fairly representative portion of the individual's wage history. The minimum divisor of 18 would still be used in cases where no low years are dropped. In the future, this minimum divisor of 18 would be used only in cases where individuals died prior to attainment of age 22, or prior to attainment of age 24 with a starting date of the first day of the quarter in which age 22 was attained, or where an individual was first eligible for benefits in 1952, and that date is used in the computation.

Paragraph (2) of the subsection directs the Secretary to determine, and to exclude from the computation of an individual's average monthly wage, the 4 or fewer calendar years which, if the months thereof elapsing after the individual's starting date and prior to his divisor closing date, and the wages and self-employment income for such years, were excluded from the computation, would produce the highest primary insurance amount.

Determinations Made by Use of the Conversion Table

Section 102 (c) of the bill amends section 215 (c) of present law to provide a new conversion table to be used to increase the benefits of individuals already on the rolls and to compute the primary insurance amount of certain individuals who come on the rolls after the effective date of the bill.

Paragraph (1) of the subsection sets forth the new conversion table. Column I of the table contains amounts of primary insurance benefits computed on the basis of average earnings from January 1, 1936, on and using the benefit formula provided by the social-security amendments of 1939. Column II contains primary insurance amounts computed under the Social Security Act Amendments of 1952, either through the conversion table in the act, or through the benefit formula provided therein in cases where average earnings after 1950 are used in the computation. Column III sets forth the new primary insurance amounts to which the amounts on corresponding lines in columns I and II are to be increased. Column IV sets forth the average monthly wage to be used in setting the maximum amount of benefits payable to the family.

The table is designed to provide an increase of at least $5 in primary insurance amounts. The amounts in column III of the table for which there is in column I a corresponding primary insurance benefit were computed by applying the new benefit formula in the bill to the amounts of assumed average monthly wage in column III of the conversion table in present law, and further increasing any of the resultant primary insurance amounts so that they were at least $5 more than the primary insurance amounts in the present conversion table corresponding to such assumed average monthly wage. Thus, except at average monthly wage levels below $130, where the guaranteed $5 increase applies, benefit amounts for individuals having the same average monthly wage will be identical, regardless of whether the benefit is computed through the conversion table or the new formula. Where the individual's average monthly wage, even after a dropout of low years, is less than $130, the conversion table may give a more favorable result. The amounts in column III for which there are no corresponding primary insurance benefits are, in general, derived from actual average monthly wages derived on the basis of earnings after 1950.

The amounts in column IV are derived partly from actual average monthly wages on the basis of earnings after 1950 and partly from assumed amounts which would yield the primary insurance amount on the corresponding line in column III by applying the revised benefit formula in the bill. Such amount in column IV will determine the maximum amounts of benefit payable under section 203 of the act, as amended by the bill.

Paragraph (2) sets forth the methods to be used for computation of the new primary insurance amount for values that fall between the amounts on any two consecutive lines of column I or II of the table. Subparagraph (A) of the paragraph provides that when the primary insurance benefit falls between the amounts on any two consecutive lines in column I, the new primary insurance amount would be determined by applying the new benefit formula to the average monthly wage which would be determined for the individual under regulations in effect on January 1, 1954, for determination of intermediate benefit amounts under the conversion table in present law. The primary insurance amount thus obtained, if not already a multiple of 10 cents, would be rounded upward to the next higher multiple of 10 cents and further increased, if necessary, to the extent that is less than $5 greater than the primary insurance amount that would be derived from the individual's primary insurance benefit under the provisions of present law.

Subparagraph (B) of the paragraph provides that when an individual's primary insurance amount (computed under the benefit formula in present law) falls between any two consecutive lines in column II of the table, the new primary insurance amount shall be computed as in subparagraph (A) in those cases where the primary insurance amount under present law can be related to a primary insurance benefit under regulations now in effect. Where no such relationship exists, or where the primary insurance amount derived under present law is more than $77.10, the new primary insurance amount would be derived by applying the new benefit formula in the bill to the average monthly wage from which the present primary insurance amount was determined. The resultant amount would be rounded to the next higher multiple of 10 cents if it is not already a multiple of 10 cents and further increased to the extent, if any, that it is less than $5 greater than the primary insurance amount computed under present law.

Subparagraph (c) of the paragraph provides that in cases where the individual's primary insurance amount can be computed under the provisions of both subparagraph (A) and subparagraph (B), the subparagraph that yields the larger primary insurance amount shall be used.

Section 215 (c) (3) of the Social Security Act as amended by the bill designed to facilitate the mechanical processing of the increases provided by section 102 (c) by providing for an assumed primary insurance benefit 1 or 2 cents more or less than the actual primary insurance benefit from which a benefit under section 202 had been computed.

Section 215 (c) (4) of the Social Security Act as amended by the bill provides that, for purposes of section 203 (a) (setting the maximum monthly amount of benefits payable on a single wage record), the average monthly wage of an individual whose primary insurance amount is determined under paragraph (2) of the amended subsection (providing a method for computing the new primary insurance amount for persons whose primary insurance benefits or present-law primary insurance amounts fall between the amounts on any two consecutive lines in columns I or II of the conversion table) shall be a sum equal to the average monthly wage which would result in such new primary insurance amount if the new benefit formula provided in the amended section 215 (a) (1) (A) were applied to such average monthly wage, except that such average monthly wage (if not already a multiple of $1) in lieu of being rounded to the next lower multiple of $1 would be rounded to the nearest multiple of $1 (or to the next multiple of $1 if it was a multiple of $0.50).

Primary Insurance Benefit and Primary Insurance Amount for Purposes of Conversion Table

Section 102 (d) of the bill amends section 215 (d) of present law to add provisions for computation of a primary insurance amount for purposes of the conversion table to the present provision for computation of a primary insurance benefit for such purposes.

Paragraph (1) of the subsection changes the heading of subsection 215 (d) to read "Primary Insurance Benefit and Primary Insurance Amount for Purposes of Conversion Table."

Paragraph (2) changes the introductory sentence of subsection (d) of section 215 to provide that primary insurance amounts required by the conversion table procedures would be computed under the provisions of the subsection.

Paragraph (3) amends paragraph (4) of subsection 215 (d) of the Social Security Act to provide that a primary insurance benefit would not be computed in the case of any individual who attained age 22 after 1950 and with respect to whom not less than 6 of the quarters elapsing after 1950 are quarters of coverage. Such an individual is precluded from a primary insurance benefit computation under present law. He could still have a primary insurance amount computed for purposes of the conversion table.

Paragraph (4) adds a new paragraph (6) to section 215 (d) of the Social Security Act, to provide that an individual's primary insurance amount for purposes of the conversion table be computed under the provisions of present law except that provisions of the bill relating to increase in earnings counted after 1954, elimination of periods of disability from the computation, and establishment of closing dates for computations in 1955, 1956, and the first half of 1957 would be applicable. The provisions for dropping up to 4 lowest years, however, would not be applicable to computations made under this paragraph, although they would be applicable to computations of primary insurance benefits for purposes of the conversion table.

Maximum Benefits

Section 102 (e) of the bill amends section 203 (a) of the Social Security Act to provide that the maximum amount of benefits payable on the basis of a single wage record be raised from the present $168.75 to $190. Where the total of family benefits computed under the bill on the basis of a single wage record exceeded $50 and was more than 80 percent of the insured individual's average monthly wage, that total could not be reduced to less than $50. The comparable amount in present law is $45. The amendment made by this subsection would permit increases in benefit amounts for dependents and survivors in cases where such benefits are now reduced by the maximum provisions of present law, and would permit the payment of larger total amounts than under present law to dependents and survivors who come on the rolls in the future.

Effective Date

Section 102 (f) of the bill sets forth the effective date of the provisions of sections 102 (a), (b), (c), (d), and (e) of the bill.

Subsection (f) (1) provides that, except with respect to the provision in subsection (b) (2) for dropping up to 4 years of lowest earnings from the computation of average monthly wage, and regardless of the restrictions on recomputation of benefits in section 215 (f) (1) of the act, the provisions for the increase of benefits under sections 102 (a), (b), (c), (d), and (e) of the bill shall apply in the case of lumpsum payments with respect to deaths occurring after, and in the case of monthly benefits, for months after, the effective date of the bill. For the purpose of subsection (f) and succeeding subsections of section 102 of the bill, the effective date is the last day of the month following the month in which the bill is enacted.

Under the provisions of subsection (f) (2) (A), subsection (b) (2) (providing for a drop-out of up to 4 years of lowest earnings in computing benefits) becomes applicable to a worker only in the following cases:

(1) he becomes eligible for old-age insurance benefits (i. e., attains age 65 and is fully insured) after the effective date; or

(2) he dies after the effective date without becoming eligible for old-age insurance benefits; or

(3) after the effective date he files an application for recomputation of his primary insurance amount under section 215 (f) (2) of the act relating to recomputations to take account of earnings after entitlement to old-age insurance benefits to which he is entitled (or would be entitled except for the requirement that the recomputation result in a higher primary insurance amount); or

(4) he acquires 6 quarters of coverage after June 1953 (subject to the provisions of subparagraph (b) regarding a recomputation of benefits for workers having such 6 quarters); or

(5) after the effective date he files an application for a disability determination under the provisions of section 106 (d) of the bill; or

(6) he dies after the effective date and his survivors are entitled (or would be entitled except for the requirement that the recomputation result in a higher primary insurance amount) to a recomputation of his primary insurance amount under section 215 (f) (4) (A) of the act.

Subsection (f) (2) (B) of the bill provides that the primary insurance amount of an individual who was entitled to old-age insurance benefits or who was 65 or over and fully insured in the month in which the effective date occurs and who has 6 quarters of coverage after June 1953 shall be recomputed upon his application, or if he dies without applying, upon the application of any person entitled on his record to monthly survivors benefits. This recomputation is to be made under section 215 of the act (but without regard to the recomputation provisions in subsection (f) or the restrictions on recomputation in subsection (f) (1) except that in computing his average monthly wage his closing dates shall be the same as if he became entitled to an old-age insurance benefit in the month in which he filed his application for such recomputation or in which he died. This recomputation is made effective beginning with the month in which he filed such application, or if he had died, beginning with the first month for which his survivor was entitled to survivors monthly benefits. It would not be effective unless it increased the primary insurance amount or if there had been a previous recomputation under subsection 102 (f) of the bill.

Subsection (f) (2) (C) of the bill provides that no increase in the benefits by reason of section 102 of the bill (or the recomputation provided in subparagraph (B) shall be regarded as a recomputation for purposes of section 215 (f) of the act (except for the amendments made by sec. 102 (i) of the bill, described below).

Section 102 (g) of the bill amends section 2 (c) (2) (B) of the Social Security Act Amendments of 1952 (designed to facilitate the computation of benefit increases under that act for dependents and survivors on the benefit rolls), to provide that that section would become inapplicable after the effective date of the bill. The section has served its purpose and is no longer needed.

Saving Provisions

Section 102 (h) of the bill sets up saving provisions to prevent the reduction of benefits in certain cases.

Subsection (h) (1) provides that where an old-age insurance beneficiary and two or more dependents are receiving benefits on the basis of his wage record, in the month in which the effective date occurs, and the total family benefits would otherwise be reduced by reason of the maximum limitation on total family benefits provided by the bill, the family shall be guaranteed the largest of the following total amounts: (a) The maximum amount permitted by the bill; or (b) the maximum amount permitted under present law plus the increase provided by the bill for the old-age insurance beneficiary; or (c) the amount being paid to the family under the saving provisions of the Social Security Act Amendments of 1952 plus the increase provided by the bill for the old-age insurance beneficiary. Thus, even though the increase made in the retired worker's old-age insurance benefit exceeded the maximum allowable increase for the entire family, the benefits paid to his dependents would not be reduced for months subsequent to enactment of the bill.

Subsection (h) (2) provides that where two or more individuals are receiving survivors benefits on the basis of a deceased individual's wage record for the month in which the effective date occurs, and the total of their benefits would otherwise be reduced, under the provisions of the bill, to 80 percent of the deceased individual's average monthly wage, that average monthly wage shall be the larger of his average monthly wage as determined under the bill, or the average monthly wage as determined under present law, plus $7. The provisions of this subsection will permit the total of survivors benefits, in cases where the maximum limitation of 80 percent of average monthly wage applies, to be raised by about $5.

Recomputations of Benefits

Section 102 (i) of the bill amends section 215 (f) (2) of present law, relating to recomputation of benefits in certain cases, and sets up an effective date for the new provisions.

Subsection 102 (i) (1) makes the following changes in section 215 (f) (2) of the Social Security Act:

Subparagraph (B) of section 215 (f) (2) is amended to provide a recomputation for a worker who (1) attained 75 in or before the month of applying for recomputation, (2) had become entitled to benefits without having 6 quarters of coverage after 1950, (3) had not previously had a recomputation under section 215 (f), and (4) prior to the quarter of applying for recomputation had 6 quarters of coverage after 1950.

Subparagraph (C) of such section, as amended, provides that the recomputations under subparagraph (A) and the amended subparagraph (B) shall be made according to the new formula and computed as if the month of applying for recomputation was the month in which the worker became entitled to benefits. The subparagraph also provides that the recomputation would be effective for and after the month in which the application for recomputation is filed.

Subsection 102 (i) (2) provides that the amended provisions shall be applicable in the case of applications for recomputations filed after the effective date.

Amendments relating to deductions from benefits

Section 103 (a) of the bill amends section 203 (b) of the act to put into effect an annual retirement test for beneficiaries whether they have wage or self-employment earnings, or both, and a provision for making deductions on account of noncovered remunerative activity outside the United States.

Paragraph (1) of section 103 (a) strikes out paragraphs (1) and (2) of section 203 (b) (relating to deductions from benefits on account of wages and net earnings from self-employment, respectively) and replaces them with a new paragraph (1) to provide for deductions for any month in which an individual under age 75 is charged with any earnings under the provisions of subsection (e) of section 203 as revised by the bill.

Paragraph (2) of section 103 (a) of the bill inserts a new paragraph (2) in section 203 (b) of the law to provide that deductions from benefits shall be made for any month in which an individual is under age 75 and on 7 or more calendar days of which he is engaged in noncovered remunerative activity outside the United States.

Section 103 (b) of the bill amends section 203 (c) of the act by striking out paragraphs (1) and (2) and replacing them with paragraphs that provide that deductions would be made from the benefits of a wife, husband, or child for any month in which the old-age beneficiary on whose record of earning the wife's, husband's, or child's benefit was payable—

(1) was under the age of 75, and for which month he was charged with any earnings under the provisions of section 215 (e) as amended by the bill; or

(2) was under the age of 75 and on 7 or more different calendar days of which he was engaged in noncovered remunerative activity outside the United States.

Section 103 (c) of the bill amends section 203 (d) of the Social Security Act to provide that the charging of any earnings (rather than net earnings from self-employment only, as in present law) shall be treated as an event occurring in the month to which such earnings are charged.

Months to Which Earnings Are Charged

Section 103 (d) of the bill amends section 203 (e) of the law to provide a method for charging earnings to particular months of the year for the purposes of determining the deductions required under the provisions of sections 203 (b) and 203 (c) of the act as amended by the bill.

Paragraph (1) of section 103 (d) of the bill changes the heading of section 203 (e) of the law to read: "Months to Which Earnings Are Charged," to indicate that all earnings, whether from employment or self-employment, are to be treated alike.

Paragraph (2) of such section 103 (d) amends paragraphs (1) and (2) of section 203 (e) of the law to provide that:

(1) If an individual's earnings for a taxable year of 12 months are not more than $1,000, or if his earnings for a taxable year of less than 12 months are not more than the product of one-twelfth of $1,000 times the number of months in such year, no month in the year shall be charged with any earnings.

(2) If an individual's earnings for a taxable year exceed the amounts stated in the preceding paragraph, the first $80 of excess earnings would be charged to the last month of the taxable year and the balance, if any, of such excess would be charged at the rate of $80 per month to each preceding month of the taxable year until the entire balance has been applied. No part of the excess

earnings would be charged to any month: (1) In which the individual whose earnings are involved was not entitled to a benefit under title II of the Social Security Act; (2) in which his benefit was suspended because of noncovered remunerative activity outside the United States; (3) in which the beneficiary, if a wife or widow under retirement age or a former wife divorced, had her benefit suspended because of failure to have a child beneficiary in her care; (4) in which the beneficiary was age 75 or over; or (5) in which the individual did not engage in self-employment and did not render services for wages (determined as provided in section 203 (e) (4) (c) of the act as amended) of more than $80.

Section 103 (d) (3) amends paragraph (3) (B) of section 203 (e) to provide, in addition to the present authority given the Secretary to presume, with respect to any month, that an individual has engaged in self-employment in such month, a presumption (for purposes of charging earnings to calendar months) that an individual rendered services for wages of more than $80 in any month. In the case of self-employment such presumption will apply until it is shown to the satisfaction of the Secretary that the individual rendered no substantial services in such month with respect to any trade or business the net income or loss from which is includible in computing his net earnings or net loss for the taxable year as provided in paragraph (4) of section 203 (e) as amended. The presumption with respect to the rendering of services in a month for wages of more than $80 (determined as provided in paragraph (4) of sec. 203 (e), as amended) will apply until it is shown to the satisfaction of the Secretary that such individual did not render such services in such month for more than such amount.

The paragraph continues the authority of the Secretary to prescribe by regulations the methods and criteria for determining whether or not an individual has rendered substantial services with respect to any trade or business.

Paragraph (4) of section 103 adds 2 new paragraphs (4) and (5) to section 203 (e) of the act.

Subparagraph (A) of the new paragraph (4) defines an individual's earnings for a taxable year as the sum of his wages for services rendered in such year and his net earnings from self-employment for such year, minus any net loss from self-employment for such year.

Subparagraph (B) of the new paragraph (4) provides that in determining the amount of an individual's net earnings and net loss from self-employment, for purposes of charging deductions because of earnings, the provisions of section 211 (which define net earnings for coverage purposes) shall apply, except for the exclusion from the definition of trade or business of the performance of the functions of a public office, and the performance of service by a duly ordained, commissioned, or licensed minister of a church in the exercise of his ministry or by a member of a religious order in the exercise of duties required by such order. Net loss from self-employment is defined as the excess of income over deductions resulting from the computations applicable in determining net earnings for the purpose of charging deductions.

Subparagraph (C) of the new paragraph (4) provides that an individual's wages for the purposes of charging deductions shall be computed without regard to certain limitations on amount of remuneration stated in section 209, and, if for services as an employee performed within the United States, without regard to whether the services constitute covered employment under title II of the Social Security Act. The limitations on amounts of remuneration referred to in the preceding sentence are those relating to the $4,200 limit on wages in any calendar year, and the exclusions from wages of remuneration paid by an employer to an employee in any calendar quarter for domestic service in a private home, service not in the course of the employer's trade or business, agricultural labor, or service as an industrial homeworker, if the cash remuneration paid in such quarter by the employer to the employee for such service is less than $50.

The new paragraph (5) provides that, for purposes of the subsection, wages (determined as provided in sec. 203 (e) (4) (C) of the act, as amended) which, according to reports received by the Secretary, are paid to an individual during a taxable year shall be presumed to have been paid for services performed in that year, unless it is shown to the satisfaction of the Secretary that they were paid for services performed in another taxable year. The paragraph also provides that, if such reports show the individual's wages for a calendar year, his taxable year will be presumed to be a calendar year until the contrary is shown to the satisfaction of the Secretary.

Penalty for Failure To Report Certain Events

Section 103 (e) of the bill amends section 203 (f) of the Social Security Act to provide that any individual who is receiving benefits (whether for himself or on behalf of another individual) subject to deduction because of the occurrence of an event other than earnings in excess of the permitted amount, who fails to report such event to the Secretary prior to the receipt and acceptance of a benefit for the second month following the month in which the event occurred, would suffer a penalty of an additional deduction of 1 month's benefit for each month for which deductions are required because of the occurrence of the deduction event, and in an amount equal to the deduction imposed because of the occurrence of the event. For the first failure to report, however, only 1 penalty deduction is to be imposed, even though the failure to report is with respect to more than 1 month.

Report of Earnings to Secretary

Section 103 (f) (1) changes the heading of section 203 (g) to read: "Report of Earnings to Secretary."

Section 103 (f) (2) of the bill amends section 203 (g) (1) of the act to provide that if an individual entitled to any monthly benefits in a taxable year has earnings (or wages) in the taxable year in excess of the amounts permitted under the provisions of subsection (b) (1) of section 203, he (or the individual who is in receipt of benefits on his behalf) must make a report to the Secretary of his earnings (or wages) for such taxable year. As under the present provision for reports of net earnings from self-employment, the report must be filed on or before the 15th day of the third month following the close of the taxable year, and must contain such information and be made in such manner as the Secretary may by regulation require. A report would not be required for any taxable year during all of which the individual was 75 years of age or over.

Section 103 (f) (3) amends section 203 (g) (2) to provide a schedule of penalty deductions for failure to make required reports within the time prescribed by paragraph (1) of section 203 (g) if any deduction is imposed because of earnings in such year. For the first failure to file a timely report with respect to which a deduction is imposed the penalty would be an additional deduction equal to the individual's benefit (or benefits) for the last month (for which he was entitled to a benefit) of the year for which the report was required. For the second such failure, the penalty would be an additional deduction equal to twice the benefit for the last month of such year, and for the third or subsequent failures, to three times such benefit. In no case would the number of additional deductions with respect to a failure to report earnings for a taxable year exceed the number of months in that year for which the individual received and accepted monthly benefits and for which deductions are imposed by reason of his earnings. The amended paragraph also provides that in determining whether a failure to report earnings is the first failure for any individual, the Secretary shall disregard all taxable years ending prior to the imposition of the first penalty deduction imposed under the amended paragraph, except the latest such year. Thus, even though the failure to file timely returns had persisted over a period of years, only one additional deduction would be imposed and that for the latest such year.

Paragraph (4) of section 103 (f) of the bill amends paragraph (3) of section 203 (g) of the act to make the provisions of such paragraph (3) applicable to earnings from employment and self-employment as defined in section 203 (e) (4) of the act as amended, rather than to net earnings from self-employment only, and to relate the paragraph to the provisions under which deductions are made because of earnings. A new sentence is added at the end of such paragraph (3) to provide that if, after the close of a taxable year, an individual fails to comply with a request of the Secretary for a report of his earnings for the taxable year or for any other information with respect to such earnings, the failure to comply would in itself constitute justification for a determination that the individual's benefits are subject to deduction because of earnings for each month in such taxable year, or for such months thereof as the Secretary may specify.

Noncovered Remunerative Activity Outside the United States

Section 103 (g) of the bill amends section 203 of the Social Security Act to add a new subsection (k). The new subsection provides that an individual shall be considered to be engaged in noncovered remunerative activity outside the United States if he performs services as an employee outside the United States that are not covered employment as defined in section 210 of the Social Security Act, or if he carries on a trade or business outside the United States, the net income or loss of which cannot be included in computing his net earnings from self-employment for a taxable year, but which would be includible if the trade or business were carried on within the United States. The term "United States" when used with respect to self-employment in a trade or business would exclude Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands in the case of an alien who is not a resident of the United States (including Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands).

Good Cause for Failure To Make Reports Required

Section 103 (h) of the bill adds a new subsection (l) to section 203 to provide that the failure of an individual to make any report within the time required by subsections (f) or (g) of section 203, as amended by the bill, would not be regarded as a failure to file if it is shown to the satisfaction of the Secretary that the individual had good cause for failing to make the report. The Secretary would have authority to determine by regulation what constitutes good cause in such situations.

Section 103 (i) provides effective dates for the various amendments made by the bill in section 203 of the Social Security Act.

Paragraph (1) of the section provides that the amendments made with respect to deductions from an individual's benefits because of his own earnings would be applicable in the case of monthly benefits for months in any taxable year (of the entitled individual) beginning after December 1954. With respect to dependents from whose benefits deductions are made because of earnings by the insured individual on the basis of whose earnings the dependent's benefits are payable, the amended provisions would be applicable in the case of months in any taxable year (of such insured individual) beginning after December 1954. With respect to failure to file timely reports of the events causing deductions other than the charging of earnings, the new provisions would be applicable in the case of monthly benefits for months after 1954. The remaining amendments made by section 103 of the bill (other than subsec. (h), which would become effective on enactment of the bill) would be applicable with respect to old-age insurance benefits, in the case of monthly benefits for months in any taxable year (of the individual) beginning after December 1954, and with respect to secondary benefits, in the case of monthly benefits for months in any taxable year (of the insured individual on whose earnings those benefits are based) beginning after December 1954.

Paragraph (2) of the section provides that, after enactment of the bill, no additional (penalty) deductions would be imposed under the provisions of present law for failure to file a report of an event which would give rise to deductions because of work under present law, and no deductions for such reasons imposed prior to enactment would be collected after enactment. Taxable years beginning prior to January 1955 would be disregarded in determining whether a failure to file a timely report occurred under section 203 (g) (2) as amended by the bill.

Increase in Earnings Counted

Section 104 of the bill amends various sections of the Social Security Act to provide that, after 1954, earnings of up to $4,200 a year be counted in the computation of benefits under the old-age and survivors insurance program.

Section 104 (a) of the bill amends section 209 (a) of the act (relating to the definition of wages) to provide that, for years prior to 1955, the term "wages" would exclude any remuneration in excess of $3,600 paid to an individual with respect to employment in any calendar year, and for years after 1954, would exclude any remuneration in excess of $4,200 paid to an individual with respect to employment during a calendar year.

Section 104 (b) of the bill amends section 211 (b) (1) of the act (relating to the definition of self-employment income) to exclude from that definition, for taxable years beginning after 1954, any amount in excess of $4,200 minus the amount of the wages paid to an individual during the taxable year.

Section 104 (c) amends clauses (ii) and (iii) of section 213 (a) (2) (B) of the act to provide that for calendar years after 1954, an individual shall be credited with a quarter of coverage for each quarter of the year if his wages for that year equal $4,200. He would be credited with a quarter of coverage for each quarter of a taxable year beginning after 1954 in which the sum of his wages and self-employment income equal $4,200. The crediting of quarters of coverage under these amended provisions would remain subject to the provision, contained in present law, that no quarter occurring after the quarter in which an individual dies shall be a quarter of coverage.

Section 104 (d) amends section 215 (e) (1) of the act to provide that earnings up to $4,200, in any calendar year after 1954, be used in the computation of an individual's average monthly wage.

Retroactive Applications for Benefits

Section 105 (a) of the bill amends section 202 (j) (1) of the Social Security Act to increase from 6 to 12 the number of months for which benefits may be paid retroactively to individuals who failed to file their applications as soon as they were otherwise eligible.

Section 105 (b) (1) of the bill provides that the liberalized provisions with regard to retroactivity of benefit payments should become effective only in the case of applications filed after the effective date of the bill for monthly benefits for months after such effective date.

Section 105 (b) (2) provides that where an individual files an application for monthly benefits after the effective date of the bill, and would (but for the provisions of the bill) be entitled to such benefits for any prior month, he shall be deemed entitled to benefits for such month to the same extent and in the same amounts as though the bill had not been enacted.

Section 105 (b) (3) defines the "effective date," for purposes of section 105 (b), as the last day of the month following the month in which the bill is enacted.

Preservation of insurance rights of individuals with extended total disability

Section 106 would preserve the insured status and benefit amount of disabled insured individuals for the duration of their disability. Upon the individual's subsequent death or attainment of retirement age his period of disability would be excluded in determining the benefits payable at that time to him and his dependents, or to his survivors, if it is to their advantage to do so.

Quarter of Coverage

Section 106 (a) amends section 213 (a) (2) of the Social Security Act, which defines "quarter of coverage."

Paragraph (1) of this subsection amends subparagraph (A) of section 213 (a) (2) of the Social Security Act by redefining "quarter of coverage," for quarters occurring before 1951, to exclude any quarter in a period of disability, other than the initial quarter of such period; in addition, any quarter any part of which was included in a period of disability (other than the first quarter of such period) could not be counted as a quarter of coverage in a calendar year in which wages of $3,000 were paid. Existing law, as applied to calendar years before 1951, provides that each quarter of such year following the first quarter of coverage shall be deemed a quarter of coverage, except any quarter in such year in which the individual died or became entitled to a primary insurance benefit and any quarter following such quarter in which he died or became entitled.

Paragraph (2) amends subparagraph (B), clause (i) of section 213 (a) (2) of the Social Security Act by redefining "quarter of coverage," for quarters occurring after 1950, to exclude any quarter any part of which was in a period of disability, other than the first and last quarters of such period. Since an individual's period of disability will not necessarily consist of full calendar quarters, a substantial amount of wages may have been paid to him in the early part of the calendar quarter in which his period of disability began or in the latter part of the calendar quarter in which his period of disability ended. This provision, while preventing the crediting of quarters of coverage for calendar quarters in a period of disability, recognizes that the first and last calendar quarters in such a period may help the individual in meeting the insured status requirements.

Freeze of Fully and Currently Insured Status

Section 106 (b) (1) amends section 214 (a) (2) of the Social Security Act to "freeze" the insured status of a qualified disabled individual. Fully insured status is redefined to eliminate from the count of elapsed quarters used in that determination any quarter any part of which was included in a period of disability unless such quarter was a quarter of coverage.

Paragraph (2) of this subsection amends section 214 (b) of the Social Security Act to similarly "freeze" the currently insured status of a qualified disabled individual. This is accomplished by redefining currently insured status to eliminate from the count of elapsed quarters used in that determination any quarter any part of which was included in a period of disability unless such quarter was a quarter of coverage.

Freeze of Average Monthly Wage

Section 106 (c) "freezes" the average monthly wage of a qualified disabled individual during a period of disability.

Paragraph (1) of this subsection amends section 215 (b) (1) of the Social Security Act to exclude from the divisor of the average monthly wage computation all months in any quarter any part of which was included in a period of disability, unless such quarter was a quarter of coverage.

Paragraph (2) of this subsection amends section 215 (b) (4) of the Social Security Act to exclude from the dividend of the average monthly wage computation all wages paid in any quarter any part of which was included in a period of disability unless such quarter was a quarter of coverage. This subsection also excludes from the average monthly wage dividend all self-employment income for any taxable year all of which was included in a period of disability.

Paragraph (3) of this subsection adds a new paragraph (5) to section 215 (d) of the Social Security Act to exclude from the computation of the primary insurance benefit for use with the conversion table all wages and divisor months in any quarter before 1951 any part of which was in a period of disability, unless such quarter was a quarter of coverage.

Disability: Period of disability

Section 106 ((d) adds a new subsection (l) to section 216 of the Social Security Act, defining "disability" and "period of disability," setting forth the requirements necessary to qualify for a period of disability, and establishing certain time limitations for the filing of applications for the disability "freeze."

Disability

Paragraph (1) of subsection (l) defines disability as "(A) Inability to engage in any substantially gainful activity by reason of any medically determinable physical or mental impairment which can be expected to result in death or to be of long continued and indefinite duration, or (B) blindness." The term "blindness" is defined as central visual acuity of 5/200 or less in the better eye with the use of a correcting lens. An eye in which the visual field is reduced to 5 degrees or less concentric contraction shall be considered for the purpose of this paragraph as having a central visual acuity of 5/200 or less.

Period of Disability

Paragraph (2) of subsection (l) defines "period of disability" as a continuous period of not less than 6 full calendar months during which the individual was under a disability (as defined). It further provides that a period of disability cannot begin unless the individual, while under a disability, files an application for disability determination. A period of disability will be considered to begin if the individual satisfies the insured status requirements of paragraph (3) on such day, on the day the disability actually begins, or on the first day of the 1-year period which ends with the day before the day on which the individual files his application, whichever occurs later. However, if the individual does not satisfy the insured status requirements of paragraph (3) on such day, his period of disability is considered to begin on the first day of the first quarter in which he satisfies such requirements. An application for a period of disability would remain effective for 3 months after its filing; if the individual has not in that time met the remaining conditions of eligibility a new application would be required. The earliest date on which an application can be filed is April 1, 1955. A period of disability would end at the close of the month in which the disability ceased.

Work Requirements

Paragraph (3) of subsection (i) sets forth additional requirements for a period of disability. An individual, to meet these requirements with respect to any quarter, must have at least 20 quarters of coverage out of the 40 calendar quarters ending with such quarter and 6 quarters of coverage out of the 13 calendar quarters ending with such quarter. Any quarter any part of which was included in an earlier period of disability would not be counted as part of the 40-quarter period or as part of the 13-quarter period used in this determination, unless such quarter was a quarter of coverage.

Retroactivity

Paragraph (4) of subsection (i) provides that, for applications filed before July 1957, an individual's period of disability could begin on the earliest day he was disabled and met the requirements set forth in paragraph (3), provided his disability continued without interruption from that day to the time he filed his application. Under this provision, a period of disability could be established beginning in October 1941, the earliest time he could have met the work requirement of 20 quarters of coverage.

Section 106 (e) adds three new sections to the Social Security Act, namely, 220, 221, and 222.

Disability provisions inapplicable if benefit rights impaired

Under the new section 220, which is a "saving" provision, a period of disability need not be used where the exclusion of earnings in such period would destroy an individual's insured status or reduce any benefit payable on his account.

Disability determinations

The new section 221 sets forth the conditions under which disability determinations will be made for individuals qualified under the provisions of this bill.

Subsecton (a) provides that determinations of whether or not an individual is under disability and of the day such disability began and determinaions of the day on which such disabilty ceases shall, except as provided in subsection (g), be made by State agencies pursuant to agreements with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. These determinations shall be considered as the determinations of the Secretary, except as provided in subsections (c) and (d).

Subsection (b) of section 221 provides that the Secretary shall enter into agreements with States for the making of disability determinations by the vocational rehabilitation agencies or any other appropriate State agencies of such States. An agreement may cover all persons in the State or only certain groups of persons in the State.

Subsection (c) of section 221 gives the Secretary the authority to review, on his own motion, any determination made by a State agency, that a disability exists but limits the Secretary's action, as a result of such review, to a finding that no disability exists or that the disability began later than determined by the State agency.

Subsection (d) of section 221 gives any dissatisfied individual the right to a hearing by the Secretary and to judicial review of a determination of the Secretary, to the same extent as provided in section 205 (b) and section 205 (g) of present law.

Subsection (e) of section 221 authorizes the Secretary to pay the cost to the State of carrying out the terms of an agreement under this section. These payments may be made in advance or by way of reimbursement, and prior to audit or settlement by the General Accounting Office.

Subsection (f) of section 221 requires that all money paid to a State under this section be used solely for the purposes for which it is paid and that any money not used for such purposes shall be returned for deposit in the trust fund.

Subsection (g) of section 221 authorizes the Secretary to make disability determinations for individuals in any State which has no agreement under subsection (b), for any group of persons not included in an agreement with the State, and for persons outside the United States.

Referral for rehabilitation services

The new section 222 declares it to be the policy of the Congress that disabled individuals applying for determinations of disability be promptly referred to vocational rehabilitation agencies for necessary rehabilitation services.

Effective Date

Section 106 (f) provides that the foregoing disability provisions will take effect with respect to monthly benefits payable for months after June 1955, and with respect to lump-sum death payments in the case of deaths after June 1955. Increases resulting from recalculation of benefits to exclude periods of disability will be excepted from the limitations placed on benefit recomputations by section 215 (f) of present law.

Technical provisions

Section 107 of the bill contains certain technical provisions designed to alleviate handicaps that would otherwise be suffered by individuals who retire or die shortly after enactment of the bill, and to remove certain anomalies in present law.

Death or Entitlement in 1955 or 1956

Section 107 (a) amends section 215 (f) of the Social Security Act by redesignating paragraph (6) as paragraph (7) and inserting a new paragraph (6). The new paragraph provides for a recomputation of benefits to take into account certain self-employment income which was omitted from the initial computation of the benefit amounts.

Under existing law (sec. 215 (b) (4)) an individual's self-employment income for the taxable year ending in or after the month in which he first became entitled to benefits or died, whichever first occurred, cannot be taken into account in a computation of his average monthly wage. Under section 215 (b) (1) of the Social Security Act as amended by this bill, a minimum divisor of 24 is required in computing the average monthly wage if any low years are dropped from the computation. As a result, for example, an individual whose self-employment was newly covered as of January 1, 1955, and died or became entitled to benefits in 1956, could in the computation of his average monthly wage have at most 1 year of self-employment income divided by 24. A self-employed individual who was first covered in 1951, and who died or retired in 1955 or 1956, could make only limited use of the provision for dropping low years from the computation of his average monthly wage, since 24 months of earnings would have to be left in the dividend for the computation.

Under the new paragraph (6) in the case of any individual who becomes entitled (without the application of the provisions for retroactivity in section 202 (j) (1)) to an old-age insurance benefit, or who files a valid application for a work recomputation under section 215 (f) (2) of the law, in 1955 or 1956, or in 1957 in a taxable year which began in 1956, and who had self-employment income in the taxable year in which he became entitled or in which he filed an application for a work recomputation, whichever is applicable, such individual would have his benefit recomputated if he filed an application for such recomputation after the close of such taxable year. In recomputing his benefit the Secretary would take into account the self-employment income during such taxable year. Any increase in the amount of such benefit would be payable retroactively, in the case of entitlements to old-age insurance benefits, to the first month in which he became entitled to such benefits. In the case of work recomputations, the recomputation would be effective beginning with the month in which application for the recomputation was filed.

Similarly, where an individual, on the basis of whose wages and self-employment income survivors monthly benefits are payable, dies in 1955 or 1956, or in 1957 in a taxable year which began in 1956, or where an individual entitled to old-age insurance benefits for any month prior to 1955 dies in 1955 or 1956, or in 1957 in a taxable year beginning in 1956 and would have been entitled to a work recomputation under section 215 (f) (2) of the law had he filed application therefor in the month in which he died, the survivors could have the primary insurance amount of the deceased individual recomputed to take account of his self-employment income derived in the taxable year ending with his death. Any increase resulting from such a recomputation would be payable retroactively to the month in which the survivors became entitled to survivors monthly benefits.

No recomputation under these provisions would affect the amount of the lump-sum death payment under section 202 (i), and no such recomputation would render erroneous any such payment certified by the Secretary prior to the effective date of the recomputation.

Section 107 (b) of the bill provides that in the case of an individual who died or became (without the application of sec. 202 (j) (1) of the Social Security Act) entitled to benefits after 1954 and prior to July 1, 1957, the wage closing date for computation of his average monthly wage shall be whichever of the following yields the highest primary insurance amount: (1) The first day of the quarter in which he died or became entitled to benefits, whichever first occurred; (2) if death or entitlement occurred in the second quarter of the year, the first day of the preceding quarter; or (3) the first day of the second quarter preceding the quarter of death or entitlement.

Section 107 (c) of the bill amends section 215 (b) (3) (A) of the law to provide that an individual's divisor closing date for purposes of computing his average monthly wage would be the better of his wage closing date or his self-employment income closing date, in cases where the wage closing date is the first day of the quarter following the self-employment income closing date. Under present law, where the later of the two dates must be used, an individual who has only self-employment income in the year of death or entitlement will have 3 months added to his divisor.

The amendment made by section 107 (c) would be applicable only in the case of applications for monthly benefits under section 202 of the Social Security Act and for recomputations under section 215 (f) (2) of that act filed after the effective date, and for applications for lump-sum death payments filed with respect to the death, after the effective date, of an individual who was not entitled (without the application of the retroactive provisions of sec. 202 (j) (1)) to old-age insurance benefits prior to the day following the effective date. The "effective date," for purposes of the subsection, would be the last day of the month following the month in which the bill is enacted.

Section 107 (d) provides that, in the Social Security Act as amended by title I of the bill, the term "Secretary," except when the context otherwise requires, means the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

TITLE II. AMENDMENTS TO INTERNAL REVENUE CODE

With one important exception, the amendments to the Internal Revenue Code made by title II of the bill parallel amendments made by title I to the old-age and survivors insurance provisions of the Social Security Act. In such cases the effective dates of the amendments are the same. Consequently, the explanations above in connection with title I of the bill are applicable here and will be referred to in lieu of repetition of those explanations. The exception is the amendments to section 1426 (l) of the Internal Revenue Code, relating to the filing of certificates waiving the tax exemption of nonprofit organizations. The bill also provides for an increase after 1969 in both the employer and employee tax rate and the self-employment tax rate.

Amendments to definitions of self-employment income and related definitions

Farmers

Section 201 (a) of the bill repeals section 481 (a) (2) of the Internal Revenue Code relating to income from farming, and adds a new sentence at the end of section 481 (a). See explanation above of amendment to section 211 (a) of the Social Security Act made by section 101 (h) (1) of the bill.

Increase in Amount of Self-Employment Income Counted

Section 201 (b) of the bill amends section 481 (b) (1) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to the definition of "self-employment income"), to provide that, for any taxable year beginning after 1954, the term "self-employment income" would not include that part of the net earnings from self-employment in excess of $4,200 (rather than $3,600 as under present law) minus the amount of wages paid to the individual during the taxable year.

Professional Self-Employed

Section 201 (c) of the bill amends section 481 (c) of the Internal Revenue Code by eliminating paragraph (5), relating to income from the practice of certain professions derived by self-employed individuals. See explanation above of amendment to section 211 (c) of the Social Security Act made by section 101 (h) (3) of the bill.

Effective Date

Section 201 (d) provides that the changes made by subsections (a), (b), and (c) shall be effective for taxable years beginning after 1954.

Refund of certain taxes deducted from wages

Section 202 (a) of the bill amends section 1401 (d) (3) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to special refunds of employee taxes to employees who, in any calendar year after 1950, receive wages in excess of the maximum taxable amount and who pay taxes on such excess amount, by reason of work for more than one employer). The amended paragraph provides that the tax refund, in such cases, would apply, for the years 1951–54, inclusive, to taxes deducted from the employee's wages on amounts of wages in excess of $3,600 in a calendar year whether or not paid to the collector. For calendar years after 1954, the tax refunds would apply to the tax on such wages in excess of $4,200.

Section 202 (b) of the bill amends section 1401 (d) (4) (A) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to special rules for determining tax refunds due to Federal employees who receive wages in excess of the maximum taxable amount by reason of work for more than one Federal agency) to provide that after calendar year 1954, the rules would apply to wages in excess of $4,200, rather than $3,600.

Subsection (c) of section 202 of the bill amends section 1420 (e) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to taxes imposed with respect to service performed in the employ of a Federal agency or instrumentality) to permit such agencies or instrumentalities, for administrative convenience, to report, and make payments of employer taxes with respect to, such services and to provide that such agencies shall not be required to obtain a refund of the excess taxes, without regard to the $4,200 limitation for years after 1954. The provision of present law, permitting payment of such taxes and not requiring refund, without regard to the $3,600 limitation, is retained for 1951, 1952, 1953, and 1954.

Subsection (d) of the section provides that the amendments made by the preceding subsections of the section would be applicable only with respect to remuneration paid after 1954.

Collection and payment of taxes with respect to Coast Guard exchanges

Section 203 of the bill amends section 1420 (e) of the Internal Revenue Code which contains the provisions relating to the collection and payment of taxes on Federal employment covered by old-age and survivors insurance. It would make those provisions applicable to Coast Guard exchanges and similar activities conducted by instrumentalities subject to the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Treasury. A similar provision has been added to section 205 (p) (3) of the Social Security Act by section 101 (c) (4) of the bill, explained above. The amendment would become effective January 1, 1955.

Amendments to definition of wages

Section 204 (a) of the bill amends section 1426 (a) (1) of the Internal Revenue Code to provide that the term "wages" shall apply to payments of remuneration for employment of up to $4,200 in any calendar year, rather than to amounts up to $3,000 as in present law.

Domestic Service

Section 204 (b) (1) of the bill amends section 1426 (a) (7) (B) of the Internal Revenue Code, relating to cash remuneration for domestic service. See explanation above of amendment to section 209 (g) (2) of the Social Security Act made by section 101 (a) (1) of the bill.

Service Not in Course of Employer's Business

Section 204 (b) (2) of the bill amends section 1426 (a) (7) of the Internal Revenue Code by the addition of a new subparagraph (C), relating to cash remuneration for services not in the course of the employer's trade or business. See explanation above of the new paragraph (3) added to section 209 (g) of the Social Security Act by section 101 (a) (2) of the bill.

Agricultural Labor

Section 204 (b) (3) of the bill amends section 1426 (a) (8) by the addition of a new subparagraph (B), relating to cash remuneration for agricultural labor. See explanation of the new paragraph (2) added to section 209 (h) of the Social Security Act by section 101 (a) (3) of the bill.

Section 204 (c) provides that the changes made by subsections (a) and (b) shall be effective with respect to remuneration paid after 1954.

Amendments to definition of employment

Agricultural Labor

Section 205 (a) of the bill amends section 1426 (b) (1) of the Internal Revenue Code, relating to agricultural labor. This amendment complements the amendment to the definition of wages made by section 203 (a) (3) of the bill. See explanation above of amendments to section 209 (h) and section 210 (a) (1) of the Social Security Act made by paragraphs (3) and (4), respectively, of section 101 (a) of the bill.

Service Not in Course of Employer's Business

Section 205 (b) of the bill amends section 1426 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code by deleting paragraph (3), relating to service not in the course of the employer's trade or business. This amendment complements the amendment to the definition of wages made by section 204 (b) (2) of the bill. See explanation above of amendments to section 209 (g) and section 210 (a) of the Social Security Act made by paragraphs (2) and (5), respectively, of section 101 (a) of the bill.

American Citizens Employed by American Employers on Foreign-Flag Vessels

Section 205 (c) of the bill amends the redesignated section 1426 (b) (4) of the Internal Revenue Code (now sec. 1426 (b) (5)), relating to service performed by seamen or airmen on foreign-flag vessels or aircraft so as to permit their coverage under old-age and survivors insurance if they are American citizens and the employer is an American employer. See explanation above of the amendment to the redesignated section 210 (a) (4) of the Social Security Act (now section 210 (a) (5)) made by section 101 (b) of the bill.

Certain Federal Employees

Section 205 (d) of the bill amends section 1426 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code so as to permit coverage under old-age and survivors insurance of service performed by certain employees of Federal home loan banks, civilian employees of Coast Guard exchanges and similar activities of instrumentalities under the Secretary of the Treasury, and certain employees in the field service of the Post Office Department not under the Civil Service Retirement Act. See explanations of the amendments to section 210 (a) of the Social Security Act made by section 101 (c) of the bill.

Ministers

Section 205 (e) of the bill amends the redesignated section 1426 (b) (8) of the Internal Revenue Code (now sec. 1426 (b) (9)), relating to service performed in the employ of nonprofit organizations exempt from income tax under section 101 (6) of the code, so as to permit coverage under old-age and survivors insurance of certain ministers and members of religious orders employed by such organizations. See explanation above of amendments to the redesignated section 210 (a) (8) of the Social Security Act (now sec. 210 (a) (9)) made by section 101 (d) of the bill.

Interns

Section 205 (f) of the bill amends the redesignated section 1426 (b) (13) of the Internal Revenue Code (now sec. 1426 (b) (14)) so as to delete the exclusion from old-age and survivors insurance coverage of services performed by interns. See explanation above of the amendment to the redesignated section 210 (a) (13) of the Social Security Act (now sec. 210 (a) (14)) made by section 101 (e) of the bill.

Fishing and Related Service

Section 205 (g) of the bill would repeal section 1426 (b) (15) of the Internal Revenue Code, relating to certain services in connection with fishing. See explanation above of the repeal of section 210 (a) (15) of the Social Security Act effected by section 101 (f) of the bill.

Amendment to definition of employee

Section 206 of the bill amends section 1426 (d) (3) (C) of the Internal Revenue Code, relating to individuals performing services as homeworkers. See explanation above of the amendment to section 210 (k) (3) (C) of the Social Security Act made by section 101 (g) of the bill. The change is effective with respect to services performed after 1954.

Waiver of tax exemption by nonprofit organizations with respect to ministers in their employ

Section 207 of the bill amends section 1426 (l) of the Internal Revenue Code, which now provides for the filing of a waiver of tax exemption by nonprofit organizations with respect to their lay employees, so as to provide for the filing of waivers under substantially the same conditions with respect to certain ministers and members of religious orders in the employ of such organizations.

Subsection (a) of section 207 of the bill revises pargraph (1) of section 1426 (l) by limiting its application to employees other than ministers and members of religious orders. The subsection also deletes the provisions regarding the list to accompany the certificate, the effective date of the certificate, and termination by the organization of the waiver of tax exemption. These provisions are incorporated in new paragraphs applicable both to certificates for lay employees and to certificates for ministers and members of religious orders.

Subsection (b) of section 207 of the bill redesignates paragraphs (2) and (3) of section 1426 (l) as paragraphs (6) and (7), respectively, and adds four new paragraphs after paragraph (1).

The new paragraph (2) of section 1426 (l) provides that a nonprofit organization may file a certificate certifying that it desires to have the old-age and survivors insurance system extended to services performed by its employees who are ministers or members of religious orders (other than a member of a religious order who has taken a vow of poverty as a member of such order) and that at least two-thirds of such ministers and members of religious orders concur in the filing of the certificate. However, such a certificate may be filed by an organization with any lay employees only if a certificate has already been filed by it with respect to its lay employees (actually, the filing could be almost simultaneously).
be almost simultaneous).

The new paragraph (3) of section 1426 (l) provides that a certificate with respect to either lay employees or ministers and members of religious orders must be accompanied by a list containing the signature, address, and social-security account numberd (if any) of each employee who concurs in the filing of the certificate. The names of additional employees may be added to the list at any time by filing a supplemental list (but see explanation of new paragraph (4) for limitations on retroactive effect for supplemental lists). This constitutes a change with respect to lay employees. Under existing law supplemental lists may be filed only up to the end of the first month following the first calendar quarter for which the certificate is in effect. Any individual employed at that time who fails to concur in the filing of the certificate may not have his service for the nonprofit organization covered if he later changes his mind unless he resigns and is reemployed by the organization. Such resignations and reemployment would be unnecessary under the amendments to section 1426 (l) made by the bill.

The new paragraph (4) of section 1426 (l) provides that a certificate for covering lay employees shall be effective for the period beginning with the first day of the calendar quarter in which the certificate is filed or the first day of the succeeding calendar quarter, as may be specified in the certificate. This is a change from the present law, which makes all certificates effective with the beginning of the quarter following the quarter in which the certificate is filed.

The above provisions also apply to a certificate for covering ministers and members of religious orders. In addition, however, such a certificate filed during the calendar year 1955 may be made effective beginning with the first day of any prior quarter in 1955.

In case any individuals are added to the list accompanying a certificate of waiver, by the filing of a supplemental list after the first month following the calendar quarter in which the certificate was filed or following the first calendar quarter for which the certificate was in effect, whichever is later, the certificate will be effective insofar as service performed by such individuals is concerned only with respect to service performed by them after the calendar quarter in which the supplemental list is filed.

The new paragraph (5) of section 1426 (l) provides that an organization may terminate the effective period of a certificate filed pursuant to paragraph (1) (waiving its tax exemption with respect to lay employees) upon giving 2 years' advance notice in writing, but only if the certificate has been in effect for not less than 8 years, and only if it, at the same time, gives notice of termination of the effective period for the certificate filed with respect to its employees who are ministers or members of religious orders (if it has filed such a certificate). The effective period of a certificate covering ministers and members of religious orders may also be terminated by giving 2 years' advance notice in writing after the certificate has been in effect for 8 years. The notice termination may be revoked by the organization by giving a written notice of such revocation before the close of the calendar quarter in which the effective period was to have been terminated.

Section 207 (c) of the bill amends the present section 1426 (l) (2) of the Internal Revenue Code (redesignated as section 1426 (l) (6) by the bill) to provide that if the Secertary terminates the period covered by a certificate of waiver filed pursuant to paragraph (1) of section 1426 (l) the period covered by a certificate, if any, filed by the same organization pursuant to paragraph (2) thereof shall be terminated at the same time.

Section 207 (d) of the bill amends the present paragraph (3) of section 1426 (l) of the Internal Revenue Code (redesignated as paragraph (7) by the bill) to make it applicable both to certificates for covering ministers and members of religious orders and to certificates for covering lay employees. The paragraph provides that once an organization has terminated a waiver of tax exemption it may not again file a certificate of waiver under the same paragraph.

Subsection (e) of section 207 of the bill provides that the amendments made by the section shall become effective January 1, 1955, but shall not affect the validity of any certificate of waiver with respect to lay employees previously filed under section 1426 (l). It also contains special provisions relating to the cases in which the certificate may be accorded effect prior to the calendar quarter in which it is filed. In such cases, if the return is filed not later than the due date for the return for the quarter in which the certificate of waiver is filed, the return will be deemed (so far as the newly covered services are concerned) to have been timely filed. Similarly, if the taxes for the earlier quarters are paid not later than the due date for taxes for the quarter in which the certificate is filed, they will be deemed to have been timely paid (so far as the newly covered services are concerned).

Subsection (e) of section 207 of the bill also provides that deductions under section 203 of the Social Security Act (on account of receipt of earnings in excess of the amount permitted) shall not be made from any benefits certified and paid prior to the date on which the certificate is filed, on account of services covered retroactively by the certificate. However, in order to permit an individual in receipt of old-age insurance benefits to obtain a recomputation under section 215 (f) of the Social Security Act on the basis of his earnings prior to the filing of the certificate—earnings which are covered retroactively as a result of the filing of the certificate—deductions would be presumed to have been imposed under section 203 of that act as a result of such earnings in excess of the amount permitted by that section.

Changes in tax schedules

Section 208 (a) of the bill amends paragraph (5) of section 480 of the Internal Revenue Code to provide that the rate of tax on self-employment income for taxable years beginning after December 31, 1969, would be at the rate of 5¼ percent, rather than 4⅞ percent as in present law.

Section 208 (b) amends paragraph (6) of section 1400 of the code (relating to the rate of tax on employees) and paragraph (6) of section 1410 of the code (relating to the rate of tax on employers) to provide that the rate of tax with respect to wages, both for employees and employers, for years after 1969, would be at the rate of 3½ percent, rather than 3¼ percent as in present law.

TITLE III. MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

Amendment preserving relationship between railroad retirement and old-age and survivors' insurance

Section 301 of the bill amends the Railroad Retirement Act so as to maintain the relationship between the old-age and survivors' insurance system and the railroad retirement system that was established by the amendments made in 1951 to the Railroad Retirement Act by Public Law 234, 82d Congress.

Cross-references to redesignated provisions

Section 302 of the bill provides that references in any other law to sections or subdivisions of sections of the Social Security Act or the Internal Revenue Code redesignated by the bill shall be deemed to be references to the redesignated sections or subdivisions.

One More Dinosaur Myth Exposed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM A. DAWSON

OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 17, 1954

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, Members of Congress from the Western States are often accused of not appreciating our scenic natural resources. This criticism often originates and has its most fertile growth in areas and among persons who seldom visit our States and have very little information as to our needs.

Such criticism of late has been directed against the construction of Echo Park Dam in Dinosaur National Monument. This dam is an integral part of the upper Colorado River storage project which has been recommended to Congress for authorization by President Dwight D. Eisenhower.

Those of us familiar with Dinosaur National Monument in its present undeveloped state have maintained that without the dam its beauties will forever be hidden from the vast majority of our people. We have emphasized that the canyons in the monument are now only accessible to those intrepid few who have the time and inclination and money to run the often treacherous rivers at the canyon bottoms.

This statement of fact resulted in a raft of articles in several magazines and newspapers. These articles belittled the statements of the people who live in the area and pictured the rivers as gentle streams and gave the false impression that all one need do is take a boat, launch it and settle back to enjoy the spectacular scenery.

I would like to insert in the RECORD at this point an editorial from the Salt Lake Deseret News-Telegram and a letter from two Californians who, taking the ill-informed conservationist articles at their face value, ran into some interesting experiences.

The editorial and letter follow:

[From the Deseret News of May 12, 1954]

ONE MORE DINOSAUR MYTH EXPOSED

Being hospitable by nature, Utahans are heartily sorry for the unpleasantness and personal danger experienced by Mr. and Mrs. Richard Schall of California as described in the letter at the bottom of these columns.

But Utahans can also be grateful that these two visitors have had the forthright fairness to strike an effective blow at the heart of the clever, unprincipled propaganda of some of their fellow Californians.

The keynote of the campaign centering in California to prevent the building of Echo Park Dam has been the cry that these canyons in Echo Park should be preserved in their natural state as the mecca of thousands of future river runners. The Sierra Club and others have tried—and have succeeded among the uninformed—to give the impression that most anyone with a boat and a few days' provisions can have the time of his life exploring the canyons.

G. E. Untermann, director of the Utah Fieldhouse of Natural History at Vernal, put his finger squarely on the nature of this propaganda campaign in testimony he gave before a House committee hearing on Dinosaur. His statement deserves far greater attention than it has had.

"With true missionary zeal nearly 200 members of the Sierra Club, in three separate groups, came to Vernal last summer (1953) to make the trip through the canyons of Dinosaur National Monument under the guidance of competent river pilots * * * Headlines and pictures in the second section of the Sunday Los Angeles Times, under date of August 30, 1953, clearly showed what they were up to. "Children in Boats Run Utah Rapids. Californians Refute Claim that Wild Green River is Dangerous," blared the headlines * * *. But all these people were passengers, not river runners. A corpse could make the trip if Bus Hatch, ace riverman, wanted to take it through. No ability is required of the passengers other than that they can get in and out of the boats * * *. While most of the Sierra Clubbers made the entire trip (although the water was the lowest in years), some of them left the river at Island Park or Rainbow, rather than go through Split Mountain Canyon (two rapids of which have claimed human lives)."

The anti-Echo Park campaign has been full of just such confusion and misinformation as this matter of river running. One after another, the falsehoods have been tracked down and destroyed by the facts. But it is an unending job; truth is always slower of foot than unfounded rumor. Mr. and Mrs. Schall in their own way have made a significant contribution to truth that should not go unheeded in Washington.

LUCKY TO GET OUT ALIVE—CALIFORNIANS CRITICIZE RIVER MISINFORMATION

VERNAL, UTAH, *May 7, 1954.*

SIERRA CLUB,
San Francisco, Calif.

GENTLEMEN: After reading the articles in the March 1954, issue of the Sunset and National Geographic, we felt perfectly safe in arranging for a boat ride down the Yampa and Green Rivers through the Dinosaur National Monument.

We went into the river at Lily Park on May 3, 1954, and there assembled our folding kayak. Had the boat been large enough we would have no doubt also taken our young son with us. We are now extremely thankful that we did not do so.

After 5 hours on the Yampa River our boat was swamped in the rapids. Luckily we were able to reach shore, where we camped and dried out our equipment. On the second day and near Hardings Hole on the Yampa River, we struck a rock, tearing a 4-foot hole in the bottom of our boat. Fortunately we had a can of glue with us and with patches cut from our mattress were able to patch and repair the boat. Had we been able to quit the river we would certainly have done so. However, we could find no way out nor did we have any idea where we were. On the third day we were in the river for 10 hours before we reached a ranch, which we were informed was Island Park. During this entire day the boat was leaking badly and we were barely able to keep it afloat. We had many narrow escapes from other rocks and how we kept from tipping over we still do not know.

We certainly feel that magazines of national circulation and reputation should publish accurate and true information concerning trips of this nature. The articles we read are very misleading and give the impression that it is a pleasant, safe, and scenic boat ride down the Yampa and Green River Canyons. We were very lucky and fortunate to have made this trip and still be alive. No one who is not trained nor has not the proper equipment should ever attempt this trip. In our opinion no one should enter these river canyons without experienced river guides. One would think that there would be warning and information signs placed at different places along the river to let people know where they are, that dangerous rapids are ahead and, most of all, places where they can leave the river if there are such places.

We are impelled to write of our experiences in the hope that perhaps others will not be misled into taking their life in their own hands on such a hazardous trip. We also feel that these magazines should correct the information which is contained in their articles. We were told by the rancher at Island Park, who was kind enough to drive us to Vernal, that a party from Albuquerque, N. Mex., had had a similar experience a week before.

We are thankful that we found a man and a way out of the river at Island Park. It is doubtful that we could have completed the run from Island Park to the Dinosaur Quarry and come out alive.

BARBARA L. AND RICHARD SCHALL,
WRIGHTWOOD, CALIF.

The Arab States: Libya and the Sudan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 11, 1954

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to direct the attention of our colleagues to the seventh of a series of articles on the Arab States. It appeared in the May 10, 1954, issue of Congress Weekly, official publication of the American Jewish Congress:

THE ARAB STATES: LIBYA AND THE SUDAN

(By Sh. Yin'am)

On February 17, 1953, the Kingdom of Libya was admitted to full membership in the Arab League, thereby bringing the number of the Arab States allied in the League to eight.

Libya has a territory of more than 1,000 square miles. Most of that area, however, is barren desert, while only about 7 percent or 20 million acres, are considered economically productive and only 800,000 acres are regularly farmed. The sparse population of about 1,250,000 is concentrated mostly in the coastal area and in a few desert oases inland; more than one-third of that population is nomadic or seminomadic. All of it is Muslim in religion and Arabic in language, although ethnologically mixed with a fairly strong Berber element.

Libya is divided by nature and history into three parts, separated from each other by deserts that are not crossed yet by modern arteries of land communications, except for the coastal road linking Cyrenaica with Tripolitania. Tripolitania, the western part of Libya, contains about 70 percent of the entire population of Libya, including the very few urban and semiurban elements from among whom the budding intelligentsia, the nationalistic opposition, is drawn. The Fezzan, largest part of Libya in area, includes most of the desert inland, with only about 4 percent of the population, 40,000 to 50,000. While the rest of Libya was, after the Second World War, under British military occupation, the Fezzan was occupied by the French, and French influence is still strong there. The French are especially interested in the area as it forms, geographically and in several other respects, part of the hinterland of French Tunisia.

Libya's third component part, Cyrenaica, the eastern part of the coastal area and its immediate hinterland, has only about one-third of Libya's area and 27 percent of its population, about 300,000, but it has played a major, if not the decisive, role in the formation of the Libyan State. Libya's ruler, King Muhammed Idriss as-Senussi, is a Cyrenaican and the roots of his strength and support are in Cyrenaica. Cyrenaica's main city, Benghazi, is Libya's alternating capital (Tripoli being the other one), and the rivalry and mutual suspicion between the Cyrenaicans and the Tripolitanians have been—and are destined to be in the future—Libya's foremost single internal problem.

For Cyrenaica is the home and the stronghold of the Senussi Order, of which King Idriss is the present head. The Senussi Fraternity—in some respects a puritan reform movement in Islam, not unlike the Wahhabis in the Arabian Peninsula, was founded in the early 19th century in the area of Cyrenaica and the western desert on Egypt's fringes. Its leadership has been hereditary in the family of its present head.

When, in the Turco-Italian War of 1911, Italy conquered Libya and made it an Italian colony, the Senussi supported the Turks and fought the Italians. During the 30 years of Italian rule they were the backbone of local resistance. Although in the First World War the Senussi remained loyal to their Ottoman fellow-Muslims and fought against the Western Allies, they developed a strong sympathy for and a loyal alliance with the British in the period between the two wars and gave some assistance to them in the Second World War. Although their original domain was Cyrenaica rather than the whole of Libya, and although Tripolitanian nationalism was rather anti-Western, similar to that of Egypt and the Levant, the Senussi laid claim to the whole of Libya when the prospect of Libyan independence was raised in the postwar era. Against strong opposition on the part of the Tripolitanian nationalists, Libya's leaders and groups finally accepted these claims, and Idriss as-Senussi, who had been proclaimed Amir (Prince) of Cyrenaica in May 1949, was in 1951 accepted as King of all Libya. The price was a federal system granting the three component parts a large measure of regional autonomy.

The solution of these internal problems was paternally watched over and facilitated by the United Nations. For the foreign ministers of the four great powers had failed, from 1945 to 1948, to find an agreed solution to the problem of the Italian colonies conquered in the war, and had thrown the unsolved question, in September 1948, into the lap of the U. N. General Assembly. Several plans—mostly revolving around some system of trusteeship (British in Cyrenaica, French in Fezzan, Italian in Tripolitania), since most observers were united in the view that the people of Libya were not yet prepared for full independence—were rejected. Finally, the Assembly decided in November 1949 that Libya should be fully independent by January 1, 1952. Under the eyes of a U. N. Commissioner, assemblies and governments were set up in the three regions, and finally, in November 1950, a National (constituent) Assembly for Libya. That Assembly adopted a constitution in October 1951, and Libya was declared independent on December 24, 1951. The first elections were held in February 1952, resulting in a victory for the pro-government and pro-Senussi forces against the nationalist opposition.

As Libya is economically non-self-supporting, despite considerable U. N. aid, it is in need of additional support on the part of the powers—given in return for special privileges. The United States maintains an air base near Tripoli, and proffers economic and technical aid, but its privileges in and relationships with Libya have not yet been finalized in a formal treaty. France is reported to be negotiating for a treaty specifying its privileges in the Fezzan, but Libya seems to be reluctant. An Anglo-Libyan treaty, however, providing for Britain's underwriting of Libya's budgetary deficit as well as other forms of aid against British military and political privileges similar to those Britain enjoys in Jordan—was signed in July 1953 and duly ratified, much to the dismay of Egypt and other anti-British forces in the Arab world.

Libya's Jewish community—about 35,000, mostly in Tripoli—was transferred to Israel almost in its entirety, and only about 4,000 to 5,000 Jews remain. About 40,000 Italian settlers pose Libya's main minority problem.

The Sudan, only partly "Arab," has not yet reached full political independence, nor has it joined the Arab League; it may, however, be expected to do so within the next 3 years.

After a successful uprising of local fanatics, under the banner of the Mahdi, had driven out British and Egyptian rule from the Sudan in the 1880's, the country was reconquered by the British (with Egyptian troops taking part) in the 1890's. In 1899 an Anglo-Egyptian treaty laid down the rules for an Anglo-Egyptian condominium (joint rule). A British Governor General, appointed by the King of Egypt, headed a regime that was de jure joint, but de facto a British colonial administration. The Egyptian nationalist movement resented this regime and never ceased to demand the "unity of the Nile Valley," that is, a full union of Egypt and the Sudan. Britain championed, on the other hand, the Sudan's right to self-determination as to ultimate independence, after a period of (British) trusteeship and transition, or union with Egypt.

After more than 30 years of conflict and bitterness, an Anglo-Egyptian agreement was made possible by a volte face on the part of Egypt's General Naguib. Although Egypt had unilaterally, without asking the Sudanese, proclaimed its sovereignty over the Sudan and bestowed upon its king the title "King of Sudan" in October 1951 Naguib accepted the principle that the Sudanese themselves would have to determine their own political future. After a preliminary agreement made by Naguib with Sudanese leaders in October 1952, an Aiglo-Egyptian agreement on the Sudan was signed on February 12, 1953. A Sudanese parliament was to be elected, under the supervision of an international commission; an all-Sudanese cabinet was to take over the administration—responsible to that parliament and in cooperation with the Governor General, who was to be advised by another international commission. After a period of 3 years of such administration and gradual transition to independence, a constituent assembly was to be elected that would determine the political future of the Sudan, its form of government, and constitution.

This program is being carried out more or less according to plan, despite considerable Anglo-Egyptian rivalry. Elections for the first parliament were held in November 1953; the first Sudanese cabinet was sworn in on January 9, 1954.

Even if it be assumed that the programs and procedures provided for in the agreement of February 1953 will be fully and fairly carried out without causing major crises—an assumption that would be highly optimistic—this would not solve all the problems of that country. A deep cleavage separates the northern Sudan from the south. The north, with a population of 5 millions to 6 millions, is Muslim in religion and Arabic in language (although anthropologically and ethnologically with a predominantly Hamite and largely Negroid admixture and very little Arab blood). The south, with a population of 2½ million to 3 million, is pagan and wholly belongs to Negro Africa and its primitive tribes. There can be no doubt that these African tribes are not prepared for full self-government, know nothing of the problem of independence versus union with Egypt, and have very little in common with the urban Arabic intelligentsia of Khartoum.

Politically, the Sudan is split between Unionists, advocating eventual union with Egypt, and Separatists, preferring complete independence. This political split, however, is to a large degree superimposed on a religious-sectarian rift. For Sudanese Islam is split into two major groups: the Khatmiya, led by Sir Ali al-Mirghano, who represents the orthodox version of Islam; and the Ansar, led by Sir Abdul-Rahman al-Mahdi—a sect retaining certain semimystical tenets of the Mahdi's movement and somewhat resembling the Derwish fraternities of north Africa. The Khatmiya, by and large, support the Unionists, while the Mahdist Ansar prefer complete independence.

In the elections of November 1953, the Unionists won a decisive victory. Many observers believe, however, that this was a victory of the Khatmiya over the Ansar rather than an ideologically motivated expression of preference for union with Egypt. Violent anti-Egyptian riots in March 1954 strengthen the view that the elections of 1953 can by no means be considered as the Sudah's final say in favor of ultimate union with Egypt. Externally and internally, the affairs of the Sudanese body politic are still entirely in flux.

The two semi-independent North African countries under French rule—Tunisia and Morocco, and Algeria—considered as part of metropolitan France, are outside the scope of this series. They are not "Arab" states in the usual sense and they do not belong to the political world and climate of the countries of the Arab League. It must be remembered, however, that the nationalist-Arab movement in these countries, and especially its extremist wing—the Neo-Destour party in Tunisia, and the Istiqlal in Morocco—do consider themselves and their countries as part of the Arab nation and movement, and are so considered by the official leadership and public opinion in the Arab states. Despite strong non-Arab or separatist tendencies, particularly among the Berbers of Morocco, this western fringe of the Arabic-speaking world would be strongly drawn in to the orbit of the middle eastern Arab group of nations, if and when they are given complete independence.

Address by Hon. Estes Kefauver, of Tennessee, Before Arkansas Bar Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 18, 1954

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address which I delivered last Friday, May 14, before the Arkansas Bar Association at Hot Springs, Ark.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CODE OF CONDUCT FOR CONGRESSIONAL INVESTIGATIONS

I am deeply honored to have been invited to address this meeting of the Arkansas Bar Association today.

I was glad when you indicated interest in a discussion of one of our knottiest problems today—the necessity for establishing a code of fair procedure to cover congressional hearings.

The whole situation which has been highlighted by congressional hearings is most disturbing. It is disturbing to me because I believe that committee hearings, with legitimate aims and properly conducted, are a necessary adjunct to our legislative process. Yet they should be characterized by fair and sound procedure. There is no reason why fair procedure cannot exist in the Senate and House of the United States, just as it does in any other governmental agency or body.

One of the great weaknesses is that we have no uniform rules to establish that code of procedure. The substantive rights of witnesses before congressional committee hearings can be no better than their procedural rights, but nowhere have we written down those procedural rights and said: "They will be followed by all committees."

One often hears Congress spoken of as a deliberative body. Some people have the impression that the two Houses of Congress sit down from time to time in stated sessions and consider what laws should be passed for the Government and that in these sessions the principal work of Congress is done. You and I know this is far from the actual truth. What happens is that most of the work in Congress is done in committees. It is in committee that facts and policy are thrashed out. The committee is the efficiency factor of the legislative process.

The official objectors in the House and Senate usually object to the passage of any bill of consequence unless hearings have been held on it. They are wise in doing so because only testimony pro and con can bring out the loopholes, shortcomings, hidden motives, or real value of any proposal.

If the Congress is to learn the true facts with respect to legislative proposals, it must rely chiefly upon its committees which in turn must know what the facts are before they can act efficiently.

Parliamentary bodies have always recognized the value of investigative power and have employed it since the first legislative investigation in the House of Commons in 1571.

Perhaps the forerunner of the activities of a congressional committee in our own time which had for its function the investigation of governmental aid to small business, was the appointment of a committee of Parliament "for the examination of the merchants' business" in the early 1660's. As a matter of fact, the report of this committee sets forth the case of Sheriff Acton, of London, who was found guilty by the House of Commons for prevarications before this committee and in consequence was sentenced to the Tower of London.

The inquiry into the discharge of Gen. Douglas MacArthur by the Joint Senate Committees on Foreign Affairs and Armed Services had its counterpart 230 years previously when the Massachusetts House of Representatives conducted an investigation of the Indian War of 1722, which amounted to a determination of a lower house of the Massachusetts Legislature to supervise the Executive in the prosecution of the war. I have no ready reference to a counterpart of the present hearings—but there probably has been one in history.

Investigations have been increasing rapidly during the last few Congresses. It has been estimated that more than 200 separate investigations were underway in the first session of the 83d Congress. Some have taken a wide range, dealing with subjects which have little connection with legislative proposals. However, there can be no doubt of the propriety and the necessity of Congress securing facts upon which to base legislation; to determine whether the Executive is following the congressional intent; and, as a very important byproduct, to inform the people so that the educational process which is so important in a democracy can play its part.

I do not think that legislative powers need impinge on civil liberties in order to properly carry out their functions. I appreciate the the fact, however, that even if inquiries are guarded by the best rules and properly supervised that there may be an occasional embarrassment of a witness or even an inadvertent impingement of his legal rights.

The great majority of all members of legislative bodies in this country want to carry on investigations properly, without embarrassing witnesses or holding them up to scorn or depriving them of any basic rights. We all recognize, however, that rights of people have been violated, that some congressional inquiries have been haphazardly carried out and many persons have been harmed unnecessarily. I think the important problem is how to get the facts and keep the public informed while at the same time avoiding, or at least holding to a minimum, evils and pitfalls coming from investigations—of which we are all fully aware.

From 10 years in the House and give years of service in the Senate serving on both special and select committees, I have some familiarity with the problem. I wish to state briefly my ideas concerning the solution.

First, let us consider the question from the viewpoint of the legislative body.

Undoubtedly, congressional committees have been unnecessarily hampered in their efforts to secure facts by the unjustified reliance of witnesses upon the self-incrimination clause of the fifth amendment. The courts have been most maticulous in protecting the rights of citizens against investigation by the legislative body, by the liberal interpretation they have given the fifth amendment.

I am very glad that this is true, even though I think some courts have sustained the defense of self-incrimination to a point beyond reason and this has meant that a number of those cited for contempt by the Senate Crime Committee, which I headed, were cleared by the courts. Frankly, however, I had rather the courts would err in extending the protection of the fifth amendment rather than in constructing it.

The length, however, to which this refusal to testify is attempted to be carried under the protective cloak of self-intimidation is an absurdity in some cases. Consider, for instance, the recent testimony before a congressional committee of a school professor who was asked three questions: the first was his name—which he gave; the second and third involved his age and residence—which he refused to give on the ground that this would tend to incriminate and degrade himself and he, therefore, stood on his privilege.

In our Senate crime investigating hearings, one witness at a hearing in Cleveland refused to answer any questions. He simply stood mum. The Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals, under a mistaken impression that his testimony would have been carried over TV, radio, etc., refused to sustain his conviction for contempt.

These cases indicate the difficulty congressional committees have had in getting facts in the face of absurd claims of immunity under the fifth amendment. Undoubtedly, however, it is necessary or highly desirable that on rare occasions committees of Congress obtain testimony from witnesses which the witness could legitimately refuse to give under the protection of the self-incrimination provision of the Constitution. Therefore, Congress should have in a limited number and type of cases the right of granting complete immunity in exchange for their testimony.

We of the Senate Crime Committee made a recommendation which we felt would be at least a partial solution to this problem. It was that a committee could require the production of documents and the testimony of witnesses if immunity from prosecution were granted, and, in order for such a grant of immunity to be tendered by a committee, the consent of the Attorney General of the United States, the chief prosecuting officer, would have to be obtained.

This legislation was not enacted, although the Senate adopted a variation of it at this session of Congress. The variation in its original form provided simply that a committee of Congress could grant immunity. I opposed that and filed a minority report against it in the Senate Judiciary Committee. I did so on the grounds that a congressional committee could very well seriously hamper the executive branch in the enforcement of law if it held such authority—though, perhaps, unwittingly. The Attorney General might very well have a perfect case, which would be spoiled by a grant of immunity by a reckless committee chairman.

When this legislation came up on the floor of the Senate I offered an amendment requiring that the Attorney General agree to the granting of immunity. An amendment substantially in this form was adopted. Frankly, I have some misgivings about this bill as passed in the Senate. I am not sure that it is constitutional because unless and until the Supreme Court holds that a grant of immunity by a committee is applicable to state prosecutions the witness will not have been given full immunity which is required by the fifth amendment.

At any rate, an effort should be made to compromise the protection given with the necessity of getting the facts by testimony. The bill which passed the Senate is at least an honest effort for that purpose.

I have said that some compromise is necessary because the fifth amendment is being put to some uses which were never intended. None would be more vigilant than I, let me assure you, in protecting the right of a citizen against these hardships, but I am afraid that with the coaching of some members of the bar some of our worse criminals have been claiming immunity when the evidence sought would not be in the least incriminating to them.

Next, let us consider rules of procedure. As you will note, I have thus far been discussing this problem in the framework of the legitimate aims of investigating committees of legislative bodies. When legitimately conducted, a legislative investigating body is not a prosecutor and it is not a court. It seeks information only as a basis for future legislation, or to determine how previous legislation is working out in practice, or in its legitimate function as a check upon the executive authority.

Unfortunately, not all legislative investigating bodies act according to this pattern. Some are shamefully used by their chairmen and by some of their members. In such cases, the parent body—whether it be the Congress of the United States or a State legislature—should not be allowed to escape responsibility for the behavior of its offspring.

Two years ago, I began sponsorship of legislation which I felt would be some improvement over the present situation whereby individual members of legislative bodies can shatter reputations at will, either on the floor, under the cloak of immunity, or in committees, where they enjoy subpena powers and immunity.

I have reintroduced this legislation in the present Congress. It is now in the Senate Rules Committee, where I have unsuccessfully tried to obtain hearings and some action.

A number of other Members of the Senate and of the House have introduced similar legislation. Not long ago all of those of us in the Senate who have such measures pending got together an worked up a bill which has not been introduced but which we will jointly sponsor. It includes what we believed to be the best features of all our individual proposals. We hope that since we will all be united on one proposal we will therefore be successful.

I would like to outline the principle features which this new Code of Fair Procedure will cover:

PROVISIONS COVERING COMMITTEE ORGANIZATION, INVESTIGATIONS, REPORTS

1. Approval of full committee required for appointment of subcommittees with less than three members.

2. Selection of committee staff and personnel subject to approval of the majority of committee members.

3. Written notice must be given 16 hours prior to committee meeting, unless waived by the majority of committee.

4. The resolution setting forth the subject and scope of committee hearings or investigations must be specific and can only be amended by majority vote of full committee.

5. Submission of any official committee report to all members 24 hours prior to its consideration by committee is required.

6. Testimony taken in executive sessions cannot be released by members or staff without prior authorization by majority of a full committee.

PROVISIONS COVERING THE RIGHTS OF WITNESSES

1. Twenty-four hour prior notification must be given a witness called by committee outlining the subject matter on which the witness is to be interrogated.

2. The right to make an oral statement or submit a sworn statement is given to every witness, and the statement must be included in the transcript of the hearings.

3. Release of statements or material adversely affecting an individual by a member of committee staff is prohibited, unless there has been prior or simultaneous release of rebutal statement.

4. Persons adversely affected by testimony taken in public hearings are given the right to: cross examine witnesses in public hearings, be represented by counsed, and subpena witnesses and documents on his behalf at the discretion of the committee.

5. Persons adversely affected by the release of testimony taken in executive sessions are given the same rights to cross examine,

etc., as if the testimony had been taken in public hearings.

SUPERVISION AND ENFORCEMENT

1. The Vice President and four other members of the Senate are constituted as a group to receive complaints and investigate violations of these rules. They can advise the committee chairman of their findings, and present their findings to the Senate with such recommendations for remedial action as they deem appropriate.

It is not necessary for me to outline the abuses which these rules seek to correct. I think you are familiar with them.

One very important result of the adoption of rules covering both Senate and House committees is that by this method a system of uniform rules will be established. Heretofore, each committee has had its own rules, and a witness called before the committee and his attorney could never be quite sure just what rules the game was being played by.

Thus you will see that the rules which we propose to govern committees seek only to guarantee basic rights.

They would not hamper committees seeking to perform legitimate legislative functions.

They might very well hamper those seeking to aggrandize their chairman, and I would certainly hope they would, for it is this type of committee which anyone interested in the preservation of freedoms, interested in liberty and democracy and justice, as opposed to slavery and tyranny and dictatorship, must curb.

There are other policy decisions which Congress should make and carry out that would go far in helping avoid some of the abuses growing out of congressional inquiries.

The first of these is that inquiries should be related to subject matter over which Congress has jurisdiction. That is, they should be limited to legislative proposals or to checking over executive departments to ascertain if legislative intent is being carried out.

Several recent inquiries have gone beyond any congressional proposal or subject matter which Congress should or might deal with. I think the suggested inquiry by the Velde committee of the clergy fell into this class.

The McCarran-Walter Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 18, 1954

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, on May 10 the St. Louis Post-Dispatch published a very interesting and constructive editorial on the subject of Legislative Proposals To Amend the McCarran-Walter Act. Those proposals, one of which I introduced, are now pending before the Senate Judiciary Committee. I hope that hearings will shortly be held on all these pending proposals. The editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch makes some salient points concerning this legislation, and I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COLD-BACK TREATMENT

Congress so far has done nothing about the administration's early appeal to revise the McCarran-Walter Act. But now 3 Republican Senators and 6 GOP Congressmen have revived hopes for action by introducing a revision bill.

Lately even the administration's attitude on this topic has been puzzling because, after calling for an immigration review in his first state of the Union message, President Eisenhower ignored the issue in his second message this year.

Mr. Eisenhower sought to clear this up recently when reporters asked about the new bill. He noted his past criticism of injustices in the immigration law. But he added that he had been compelled to give his attention to the slow and difficult administration of another measure entirely—the special refugee law.

This act has certainly not worked out as the administration expected. It was signed in August in hopes it would admit 200,000 refugees, but as of February only five refugees were reported to have been admitted.

Meanwhile the regular immigration law has also been working badly. In its first year of operation immigration did increase slightly but deportations increased even more. The country lost more immigrants than it gained.

While the United States has to guard against excessive immigrants, not even the authors of the law would contend it was supposed to eject more aliens than it brought in. This is a cold-back treatment in the world's oppressed.

Senator LEHMAN, New York, Democrat, has led a fruitless effort to rewrite the McCarran Act. The issue has now been revived by nine Republicans, who include Senators SALTONSTALL, of Massachusetts; IVES, of New York; and HENDRICKSON, of New Jersey.

Both the Lehman and Republican proposals would permit pooling of unused immigration quotas of any nation. Under the McCarran Act this is not permitted. Consequently only 54 percent of the quota of 154,657 was filled last year.

The situation is traceable to the national-origins theory behind the law. Quotas for different nations are based on the national origins of the American people as of 1920. Just why 1920 should reflect the ideal American population is anybody's guess. But the theory keeps out people from southern Europe who press to come here, while some northern European nations do not even use their quotas.

The Republican bill would measure national origins by the 1950 census, which is a little more realistic. Senator LEHMAN, however, would throw out the whole theory. He would replace it with a more rational policy based on the need for asylum, for bringing families together, for admitting skilled workers, and so on.

The sponsors of these immigration proposals should get together. With bipartisan support, the administration would have an opportunity to push its pledge for immigration reforms in Congress. The record so far shows that the pledge will require some pushing.

Advocacy by Bernard M. Baruch of Standby War Powers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 18, 1954

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Baruch Bids United States Enact Standby War Wowers," which is a summary of a very splendid adress delivered by the Honorable Bernard M. Baruch as 1 of a series of 3 lectures at the College of the City of New York, and was published in the New York Herald Tribune of May 17, 1954.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BARUCH BIDS UNITED STATES ENACT STANDBY WAR POWERS

Bernard M. Baruch, in the last of his series of three City College lectures based on his long experience as an adviser to Presidents, reiterated yesterday his call for enactment on a standby basis of all the powers that would be needed by the Government in the case of another war emergency.

These mobilization powers should not go into effect now, Mr. Baruch said, "but should be put into law so they can be invoked at once." He also saw the need for more weapons "in hand and in reserve," and less reliance on the mere capacity to produce them.

Mr. Baruch brought his lecture series to a close before a capacity audience at the branch of the City College which bears his name—the Bernard M. Baruch School of Business and Public Administration.

NEITHER WAR NOR PEACE

He said that one of today's most pressing questions was the kind of government the United States must have "in a world in which there is neither war nor peace." As a result, he said, the relations between the President and the Congress must be defined for an "uneasy twilight which, while not one of all-out war, certainly is not a state of peace." In the past, he said, almost unlimited powers were given to Presidents in wartime but the Constitution insured their "return to legislative authority when war ended." Now, war and peace, and consequently wartime and peacetime powers overlap.

Before television cameras in a packed lecture hall at 17 Lexington Avenue, the tall, whitehaired, elder statesman appeared both as the expert on public affairs and as the college's distinguished alumnus. Buell G. Gallagher, president of the City College, had introduced him simply as "Bernard M. Baruch, C. C. N. Y., '89."

"Virtually all our political and economic institutions and habits are conditioned to a sharp separation between war and peace, as between day and night," Mr. Baruch said. But since the separation between war and peace is no longer clear, he warned that "if ever this country is attacked and destroyed, it will be in those 'too little and too late' months before we will have been able to turn our gigantic productive power from peace to defense."

PLAN TO NARROW GAP

To narrow the gap to mobilize from peace to war, Mr. Baruch outlined seven adjustments:

1. To hunt for peace and security through agreement, thinking through the terms on which "we would be willing to settle as well as what we will fight for";

2. Maintain sufficient immediate striking power to deter aggression;

3. Put greater stress on weapons in hand and in reserve and less on mere capacity to produce them;

4. Evolve, with America's allies an "overall global strategy for the whole of the peacemaking" instead of relying on piece-by-piece action;

PEACEMAKING PLAN

5. Create one overall thinking body in the Government to devise this strategy of peacemaking, doing this and nothing else;

6. Organize the Nation to see the peacemaking through instead of indulging in "de-

sires for lower taxes or wishful thinking about Soviet intentions";

7. Enact now all the powers that would be needed in case of another war emergency on a standby basis.

Mr. Baruch charged that we have acted as if an effective foreign policy could be laid down by making a fine speech or by proclaiming lofty aims. He said the acid test of any policy is the question what are we willing to give up to see the policy through.

STRESSES NEED FOR FACTS

A major thread that ran through the three lectures was Mr. Baruch's stress on the need to act on carefully studied facts. In the first address on the dominant yearnings of our time, he had held that "in the National Security Council, the men are so busy with executive problems that they don't have time to think about them." In his second lecture on making economic weather, he told students that "young persons starting in business should learn to think, to discipline yourself. * * *"

Yesterday he reverted to this theme, pointing out that modern democracy constitutes the first government in history which depends on the mass of its citizens being able to think.

CALLS LAISSEZ FAIRE DEAD

Mr. Baruch called dead the idea of do-nothing or laissez-faire government. The real issue today, he said, "is whether all this Government intervention can be made just and fair."

Asked why he had agreed to give the lectures, Mr. Baruch said that the City College 70 years ago had given him the opportunity to get some kind of education. He did not think a veteran coming home from the wars could do for the young soldier what only experience can do for him; but he hoped that talking about some of the difficulties and problems he had met and experienced might help young people to avert defeat in the future.

Address Delivered by Hon. Herbert H. Lehman, of New York, at the 60th Anniversary Celebration of the Ukrainian National Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 18, 1954

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, on last Sunday, May 16, I addressed the 60th anniversary celebration of the Ukrainian National Association in Carnegie Hall, New York City, on May 16, 1954. The subject of my address was Liberation, Self-Determination, and Independence: Outline of a Policy for Europe and Asia.

I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Liberation, Self-Determination, and Independence: Outline of a Policy for Europe and Asia

I am glad to express my welcome and to be welcomed to this 60th anniversary observance of the Ukrainian National Association.

May I pay tribute to the Ukrainian National Association for the efforts it has long been putting forth to stimulate the faith of Ukrainians here and abroad in freedom and democracy. I am grateful, too, for their fine help and encouragement they have given to me in my efforts to secure just, humane, and workable immigration and citizenship legislation.

It is good for all Americans to be reminded regularly that there are many groups of people behind the Iron Curtain, enslaved, brutalized, and tyrannized, who yearn for the same freedoms which Americans enjoy almost unthinkingly.

It is good to be reminded that almost all the people behind the Iron Curtain remember intervals in their history, of greater or lesser duration, in which they were free and independent.

Finally, it is good to know that there are many American citizens with a special and immediate concern for the victims of Soviet slavery, who will continue to raise their voices in behalf of their fellow men beyond the seas who are bound in the chains of Communist imperialism.

Seldom in all history have there been hours of greater crisis, of graver doubts and more widespread confusion, than the present. In every quarter of the compass, in every region of the world, there is tension if not actual conflict. In southeast Asia there is open war.

Vast areas of the world whose populations have been regarded in the past as inert masses of faceless people throb today with public fever and ferment. Once upon a time, in those areas, only the warlords, sultans, sheiks, or rajahs counted and had to be reckoned with. Today, ever increasingly, the people count. The people of those regions are stirring. They are moving with the irresistible power of massive numbers. They are demanding to be heard. They are demanding the dignity of recognition and the benefits of progress.

Overlaying this violent upheaval and sometimes intermingled with it is the worldwide conflict between Communist imperialism and the forces of freedom. But some of the forces of freedom are unfortunately identified with colonialism, which remains, in most areas, the hated symbol of a hateful past.

And so the confused conflict is joined: the forces of freedom on the one side and the forces of Communist imperialism on the other. But freedom's forces present that most vulnerable flank—colonialism. And on almost every front that flank has given way, threatening freedom's forces with disaster.

Our problem today—our urgent necessity—is to mobilize our forces for the countercharge against communism—not under the banners of colonialism but of freedom.

This analysis pertains, of course, largely to Asia.

Europe presents a somewhat different picture of conflict. We must look hard at that picture, lest we overlook its distinctive features.

The Atlantic world is still the source of the greatest power. While we concentrate on Asia, we dare not forget that the first prize in the world struggle is Europe. We can survive a setback in Asia, but let the lights of freedom go out in Europe and all is lost.

But let us not think only in terms of what we must save. We should also be thinking in terms of what we must gain. Our banners are inscribed with the word "liberty." Those banners must not only be prevented from retreating. They must advance.

It was Marshal Foch who said, "My center gives way; my right wing falls back; the situation is excellent. I shall attack."

I do not propose—and they are reckless with words who propose—liberation of the enslaved peoples of Europe by military force. This kind of liberation is the liberation of total destruction. To speak of it, or to infer it, as certain high officials of our Government did during the Presidential campaign of 1952 and thereafter, is to show a lack of both understanding and responsibility.

Military force on a large scale—or total war—has become unthinkable. It would be mankind's final cataclysm. That is not the path of faith, but the path of fear. Only men possessed by fear—unreasoning, desperate, and insane fear—could possibly contemplate a general world war under the present circumstances.

We must, of course, assume that there are such men in the Kremlin, and we must be prepared for even this total catastrophe, prepare to control it as best we can, and to face it as bravely as we can.

We must be prepared, too, to retaliate—to retaliate with overwhelming and destructive force, if that unhappily becomes necessary as a last resort.

But retaliation must not be regarded as a policy. We must not regard our ability to retaliate with atomic bombs as a substitute for a balanced military force. The power of retaliation must not be merchandised to the American public as the total basis of our security. No; the recent effort to sell that slogan to the American people was a total fraud. The power of retaliation is, indeed, a partial guaranty against a general war, and a last-resort weapon in case such a war is forced upon us. But it is no more than that.

As I said a moment ago, military force itself is not the real answer to the challenge that confronts us. If we depend upon it exclusively, we are in for a tragic disillusionment.

Liberation, in the European sense, cannot be accomplished by atom or hydrogen bombs. Liberation, in the European sense, must be achieved not by general war, but by general peace.

In this age, peace and not war is the truest ally of freedom. If we can establish a lasting peace, we will advance the cause of freedom. Tyranny cannot endure in a peaceful modern world. The chains of slavery will snap and break like chains of straw, once they are exposed to the irresistible strains of peace.

The Ukrainian people, I know, have experienced through their history many long nights of oppression and tyranny. They have felt for as many centuries as any other people on earth the racking pain of slavery.

But through the long years there have flashed across the Ukrainian sky brilliant meteors of freedom which have illumined and inspired the hearts of the Ukrainian people. The names of Kostomarov and Schevchenko are only two of those on the roll of Ukrainian heroes in the cause of liberty.

The brief period of the independent existence of the Ukrainian Republic is certainly to be recalled as an earnest of what may come again in the future.

Those of us here assembled of Ukrainian origin or descent, or of any origin or descent, have the deepest sympathy with the people of the Ukraine in their present state of subjugation. We share their yearning for the dignity of freedom and the richness of liberty.

It was a great President of the United States, one of the greatest of all time, Woodrow Wilson, who defined the concept which we call the right of self-determination.

Every people, Woodrow Wilson said in 1917, has that right. That right, of course, is not unconditional. It is not the right of any people or any nation to do what it pleases, regardless of its neighbors and the peace and security of the world.

Nationalism within the framework of international cooperation is a noble concept. But nationalism in an isolationist framework is a dangerous, a fatal concept. Nationalism for the sake of the dignity of freedom is an ideal to be recognized. But rampant nationalism for its own sake can be a mad dog, threatening the health, the peace, and the security of the world.

Year by year, and even day by day, the world grows smaller and more interdependent. The earth is swiftly becoming one large neighborhood. A conflict in far-off Indochina, raging around cities whose very names were unknown to most of us a few weeks ago, is now of immediate concern to all of us. Our defense frontier is no longer at the water's edge, at the Atlantic and the Pacific, but rather at Hanoi, and Haiphong, and Saigon.

In September 1940, less than 14 years ago, Japanese forces entered Indochina and Japan seized that rich territory. The American people took only a vague interest in this event, although, in fact, it paved the way for the attack on Pearl Harbor on December 7, 2 months later.

And when President Franklin D. Roosevelt wisely remarked in 1940 that our eastern defense frontier was, in fact, on the Rhine River, he was violently denounced here at home as irresponsible and impractical.

Today we recognize that what happens not only on the Rhine and the Elbe but on the Vistula, even on the Don and the Volga, in the east, and on the Mekong and the Yangtze in the west, is of immediate concern to the United States.

Yes, the world is one neighborhood. The jet plane has helped make it so. The hydrogen bomb has helped drive the lesson home.

And in a neighborhood, the neighbors must act together to prevent plague, to put out a fire, to control gangsters. The neighbors must act together so that all may enjoy security. One neighbor, however rich and powerful, cannot, by himself, enforce security for all. One neighbor, without the full consent and cooperation of the others, cannot presume to be the policeman and the fireman of the neighborhood. Nor can he dictate regulations or standards of conduct.

Yet sometimes it has seemed that our Government has been laboring under this misconception. Sometimes the leaders of this administration, in their conduct of our world policy, have seemed to wish to play this kind of unilaterial, domineering role. We cannot succeed that way. We cannot win either a cold war or a hot war in that manner. We must find a way—a formula—acceptable to the majority of our neighbors. We must reach firm agreements with them, on the basis of our common interests—of their interests as well as our own—or we will fail, dismally and tragically.

This is the basic answer to the situation in Indochina, as it is to the situation in Europe. The united will of all the freedom-loving peoples of the world, united under the banners of freedom, can save southeast Asia.

The united will of all the freedom-loving peoples of the world can also liberate the enslaved peoples of the Ukraine, of Rumania, Bulgaria, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and all the rest.

But this cannot be achieved by shallow slogans. It cannot be achieved by reckless talk designed to win not freedom for the enslaved abroad but elections for the party in power at home.

It can be achieved only by solemn resolve and dedicated consecration. It can be achieved only by long and patient labors in the vineyards of free-world unity, by expanding the horizons of freedom wherever and whenever possible.

Freedom is like mercury. It can be dispersed. But let it flow together, and build up the pressure behind it, and it will shatter the thickest wall. There is no curtain, whether of iron or steel, which can permanently prevent the infiltration of freedom, whose penetrating qualities are far greater than those of any other doctrine ever known.

But, of course, the advocates of freedom must demonstrate a sincere faith in the exercise of freedom. They must practice what they preach. Those who trample upon the banners of freedom in their own land cannot carry those banners abroad.

The fact is that the outside world has been but poorly impressed in recent months with our sincerity as a leader of the forces of freedom.

We cannot gain support for the struggle against Communist imperialism if we give comfort or support to colonial imperialism.

We cannot ask the colored peoples of Asia to support our leadership in world affairs, if we, in our immigration and other laws, openly discriminate against colored peoples from Asia.

We cannot ask the world to recognize us as the champion of freedom if we, in our country, show an abject fear of freedom, and permit congressional demagogues to ride rough-shod over all individual rights and decencies.

We cannot ask our allies to refrain from compromise with the enemies of freedom abroad if our own administration makes shameful compromises with the enemies of freedom here at home.

We must take a bold stand—our Government must take a bold and forthright stand—in favor of freedom and the rights and dignity of freedom—for every American, and for all men everywhere—not only for those under Communist domination, but also for those under colonial domination—not only for those oppressed by our enemies, but also for those denied their freedom by our friends.

We must stand for self-determination for all peoples—self-determination within the framework of a free and cooperative community of nations.

The enslaved peoples of Europe must be liberated not by destruction, but by construction—by the construction of a free world order which will rend and destroy the Iron Curtain by the sheer power of the force of freedom.

As Supreme Court Justice William O. Douglas said only a few days ago: "We must resume our historic revolutionary role. We have been preoccupied with military bases. We must begin to seek bases in the hearts of men of all races."

This is our historic mission. This we can do. To this task we must bend all our energies. Our military power is limited by our physical capacities. But our ideological power is unlimited. It has no horizon save the horizons of the human spirit, itself.

Animated by these purposes, and dedicated to these ends, we will, under God, surely prevail.

The Judaists and Mr. Byroade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1954

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, in order to clarify the atmosphere and eliminate some of the confusion which some people try to inject with respect to the relationship of the American Jews to the State of Israel I direct the attention of our colleagues to the following editorial which appeared in the May 10, 1954, issue of Congress Weekly, official publication of the American Jewish Congress:

THE JUDAISTS AND MR. BYROADE

It is a bit shocking, but not wholly surprising, that the recent conference of the Judaist sect, known as the American Council for Judaism, should have been the occasion for making publicly known the affinity that exists between Israel's Arab enemies and their Judaist counterparts. Thus it was not inconsistent for the conference to publicize the greetings it solicited and received from the diplomatic representatives of Egypt and Lebanon, who bestowed their blessings upon the Judaists for the high aims of their anti-Israel activities. The Jewish community will be further reassured to know that the Arab dignitaries also gave their endorsement to the brand of Judaism espoused by the council.

But what is both shocking as well as surprising is that an official spokesman of the American Government should have chosen the platform of the Judaists to make a pronouncement of American policy on Israel and the Middle East. By his appearance at the conference, the Assistant Secretary of State, Henry A. Byroade, gave color to the boast of the council's president, Lessing Rosenwald, that the policy of the Eisenhower administration with regard to the Middle East puts the council's principles into practice. Surely this is not what Mr. Byroade intended, but the impression will be given nonetheless that by choosing to speak from the anti-Israel and anti-Zionist platform of the council he identified himself at least partly with its views.

And some of the things Mr. Byroade said on this occasion, as in his Dayton speech on April 9, come close to parallelling the Arab thesis. Thus he dilated on the Arab charge of Israel's alleged expansionist ambitions: "The Arabs," he said, "know the capacity of the territory of Israel is limited; they see only one result—future attempt at territorial expansion." He therefore advises Israel to correct its stand calling for greatly expanded immigration of Jews from other countries. Such a move, Mr. Byroade presumably believes, would allay the Arabs' fear of Israel's expansionism and make them more amenable to recognizing the fact of Israel's present existence.

Clearly, however, the idea of an arbitrary limitation upon Jewish immigration cannot possibly be accepted by Israel. The Jewish State came into being largely as a result of a successful struggle against the attempt to impose such a limitation from the outside. Israel's policy of keeping its doors open to any Jew needing or desiring a home is basic to its existence and it gave legal recognition to this cardinal principle in the very first of the constitutional laws enacted by its parliament. Even if there is presently no real prospect of mass immigration from the areas where large Jewish populations now live, Israel cannot abandon its open-door policy without betraying the fundamental principles upon which the state was founded. Mr. Byroade's seeming acceptance of the Arab claim that potential Jewish immigration to Israel is indicative of Israel's aggressive intentions and its expansionism can only serve to strengthen the Arabs in their intransigent opposition to peace.

Mr. Byroade apparently sought to enlarge upon the advice he gave in his earlier speech at Dayton, on the relations between world Jewry and Israel, by telling the Council that "there is no divergence between our Government and American citizens of the Jewish faith who are interested in the development and welfare of the Jews in Israel." We never had any doubt that our Government which has contributed so much to the economic development of Israel, regards with favor similar efforts on the part of its Jewish citizens. But Mr. Byroade, in his Dayton speech, had undertaken to particularize upon the mutual interest of Israel and world Jewry by suggesting that Israel cease to regard itself "as a headquarters—or nucleus so to speak—of worldwide groupings of peoples of a particular religious faith who must have special rights within and obligations to the Israeli State."

Mr. Byroade had gone far afield when he undertook to advise Jewish communities on their relations to Israel. As Dr. Nahum Goldmann said in a recent address at the dinner of the American Jewish Congress on behalf of the United Jewish Appeal: "This intra-mural Jewish issue is certainly not a legitimate concern of American foreign policy, within the jurisdiction of the Department of State." In this regard, Dr. Goldmann said, Mr. Byroade has apparently accepted the theories and concepts of the American Council of Judaism.

Dr. Goldmann said further:

"The relationship between the Jewish people and the State of Israel is rooted in the most basic concepts of Jewish history, Jewish religion and metaphysics. These are not problems for diplomats and must not become enmeshed in tactical considerations of foreign policy. To assume that the Jewish people can or would sever its unique, historic ties with, and its deep responsibility for, the future and destiny of Israel is to misunderstand, not only the meaning of Zionism, but the raison d'etre of Israel and the profoundest lessons of Jewish history.

"The State of Israel was not created for the sole purpose of providing political sovereignty for 1½ or 2 million Jews. Israel was created to put an end to the global homelessness of the Jewish people, to secure the survival of this most threatened of all peoples, whose very continuity in history was undermined by the destruction of the great strongholds of Jewish life and civilization in Europe. If Israel cannot be the moral center of the Jewish people, a source of spiritual inspiration for Jewish communities the world over, then this tremendous historic effort to establish the State of Israel is wholly without purpose. To order away this relationship is to insist that Israel must be a small satellite of the Arab world and to deny the Jewish communities the greatest source of their spiritual revival."

We believe Dr. Goldmann has pointed up the essence of the relationship between world Jewry and Israel. We are certain that the moral and spiritual relationship between them will survive both Mr. Byroade's attempt to define it out of existence and the Judaists' efforts to destroy it.

The Communist Challenge Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 18, 1954

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article from Villanova Alumnus, published in the interest of Villanova Alumni Association by Villanova University.

Rev. Charles J. McFadden, OSA, Ph. D., is the author of the book, the Philosophy of Communism, about which Bishop Fulton J. Sheen, Ph. D., said:

From now on there will be no excuse for anyone, not even Communists, for not knowing communism, as there will be no excuse for a reasonable being for being a Communist. For Dr. McFadden has made it synonymous with the antirational.

In no single work is there marshaled such an array of devastating arguments against the communistic position as in this book. One cannot understand the system of communism without understanding its basic philosophy, such as is outlined in this book, which is without a doubt the best treatment of the philosophy of communism in any language.

No one has adequately touched on the philosophy of communism with an equal thoroughness until this work appeared.

Father McFadden is a professor of philosophy at Villanova University.

The article follows:

THE COMMUNIST CHALLENGE TODAY

(Rev. Charles J. McFadden, OSA, Ph. D.)

The purpose of this article is to present an analysis of some of the problems which confront us in meeting the present challenge of communism. I have said "some of the problems" because in this article we shall treat only three of the many which currently beset us. Some of these many difficulties pertain to the handling of the Communist threat on the international level; others are specifically related to the national scene alone. Some of the problems are theoretical in character and have their roots in the psychology and philosophy of the American mind; others are practical in nature and necessitate a prudent judgment as to the best way to handle a difficult situation. At a later date we may have the pleasure and opportunity to analyze more of these difficulties. At this time, however, we shall limit our remarks to a consideration of the fifth amendment to our Constitution, the loyalty oath, and the proposed outlawing of the Communist Party in the United States.

THE FIFTH AMENDMENT

Those who are most familiar with communism know well that one of its favorite techniques is to use democracy to destroy democracy. Actually, communism looks upon any form of democracy as a weak and inept form of government—and, with a mixture of ridicule and delight, proves the point to its followers by carrying on its subversive program under the protection of our Constitution.

The manner in which the fifth amendment to our Constitution is being flaunted by the Communists is a typical example of this procedure. Thus, Nathan Gregory Silvermaster, who was for years head of a Soviet espionage ring in this country, refused 250 times at 1 hearing to answer questions directed to him. Another Soviet agent of the same espionage group, Irving Kaplan, invoked the privilege of the fifth amendment 244 times at 1 hearing before the Committee on Un-American Activities.

In the face of this situation, it becomes necessary for us to review the nature and purpose of this amendment. According to constitutional lawyers, the only portion of the amendment which has any bearing on the conduct of witnesses reads as follows: "No person shall be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself." This provision is unlike the rights of free speech and habeas corpus which are guaranteed by the first 10 amendments to our Constitution. This immunity from testifying against oneself is not one of the ancient civil rights of man; it is not to be found in the basic charters of Anglo-Saxon legal tradition; nor does it constitute any portion of the Magna Carta or the English Bill of Rights. Rather, this privilege became a part of our legal tradition when our sense of justice rebelled at some of the crudity and ruthlessness of earlier days. In past ages, as we will recall from our history, it was not uncommon to subject a man to extreme physical torture, extract a confession from him (as is the practice in Communist countries today), and then convict him on the sole basis of his supposed confession of guilt. In recent years, however, the interpretation of this privilege has been broadened by our courts so that it now applies also to testimony before the various legislative and investigating committees, even though these are not courts and have no powers of conviction.

It has thus become a principle of our legal procedure that we may not insist upon a man (whether before a court with powers of conviction or before a governmental committee with no powers of conviction) offering any testimony which might tend to incriminate himself. Moreover, when testimony is freely given by a man against himself before a governmental committee lacking powers of conviction, such testimony may not be used as evidence against him in a later criminal proceeding.

The foundation in justice for this amendment and the nobility of the ideals involved are certainly evident. But the abuses to which the Communists have subjected this amendment are equally clear.

First, the only legally accepted ground for a witness's refusal to answer is that his reply would tend to incriminate himself. No other grounds for its use are recognized by our law. Hence, recourse to the fifth amendment is implicitly an acknowledgment of guilt. And—while it is clear that we may not use this implied admission of guilt for criminally prosecuting the man—it should be equally clear that it would necessitate the removal of the man from any position involving the common welfare of our Nation.

This implication of guilt was aptly analyzed by the Supreme Court of Massachusetts when it remarked:

"Instant impulse, spontaneous anxiety and deep yearning to repel charges impugning his honor would be expected from an innocent man. Refusal to testify in his own behalf under such circumstances is conduct in the nature of an admission. It is evidence against him. This principle of law has long been established. Culpability alone seals lips."

Similarly, in 1952, when a number of United Nations employees invoked the fifth amendment before the Internal Security Committee, a panel of renowned international legal experts insisted that refusal to testify was justification for dismissal. In their words: "The exercise of this privilege creates so strong a suspicion of guilt that the fact of its exercise must be withheld from the jury in a criminal trial." In other words, if a man invokes the fifth amendment before a committee which has no powers of prosecution, the fact that he has done so must be withheld from a jury in any later criminal prosecution. The reason is evident: his implicit admission of guilt is so obvious that the latter jury could not possibly formulate its verdict in an impartial manner. We shall also mention this matter in our consideration of the loyalty oath. Hence, suffice to say here, that recourse to the fifth amendment should automatically result in a man's dismissal from any position in the Government, defense industry, education, or labor organization which is vitally associated with the common good of our people. If a man freely chooses not to refute the evidence which labels him a traitor to his Nation, the choice is his own. But if he does refuse, there is certainly no reason under the sun why he should be allowed to continue in his key position. In fact, since proper authority has a strict moral obligation to safeguard the common good, it would be bound in conscience to remove the man from his post.

Second, the fifth amendment does not confer upon a witness the right to refuse to testify against other persons. The privilege revolves only around evidence which would be self-incriminatory. Hence, there is no legal title whatever to withhold evidence incriminating other persons nor evidence relative to any activities which fall within the proper scope of the committee or court in question. It is the definite duty of the citizen to aid proper authority, when called upon, to uphold law and order, protect his Nation, and eradicate crime from society. To contend that the ordinary citizen could refuse to testify against criminals when called upon to do so by the State would result in the complete collapse of law enforcement.

We might conclude these reflections by remarking that if a Supreme Court decision on the interpretation and scope of this amendment is required to protect our Nation, let it be made quickly. Neither the Constitution nor the fifth amendment needs to be changed. But—if perchance the precise wording of the latter needs to be altered to safeguard our Nation—the step should be taken without delay. A short time ago, as I stood in the Jefferson Memorial in our Nation's Capital, I reflected that Thomas Jefferson would have been the first to suggest the need of such a procedure. Carved into the stone walls of the monument I read these words of his:

"I am not an advocate for frequent changes in laws and Constitutions. But laws and institutions must go hand in hand with the progress of the human mind. As that becomes more developed, more enlightened, as new discoveries are made, new truths discovered and manners and opinions change, with the change of circumstances, institutions must advance also to keep pace with the times. We might as well require a man to wear still the coat which fitted him when a boy as civilized society to remain ever under the regimen of their barbarous ancestors."

THE LOYALTY OATH

During the past few years there has been an effort made to eliminate persons who are dangerous security risks to our Nation through the medium of the so-called loyalty oath. Persons employed in various Governmental agencies, defense plants, and educational systems have been compelled to take such an oath in order to retain their positions. The precise nature of the oath is not identical in all instances; all forms require the person to testify that he is not currently a member of the Communist Party; some forms also require testimony to the effect that the person never was a member of the Communist Party.

While there is surely some aid derived from the loyalty oath procedure, we should appreciate its limited value in combating communism. We must be realistic enough to understand that, in the case of the Communist, we are dealing with a confirmed atheist. Factually, therefore, we must evaluate the loyalty oath from both a moral and a practical viewpoint.

From the moral point of view, the loyalty oath means absolutely nothing to the Communist. It is, in his mind, a naive capitalistic farce. Imagine, says the Communist to himself, how childish democracies are when they believe that we would tell them that we intend to betray the Nation in our specific positions in government or industry.

The American mind has never quite grasped the Communist norm of morality: whatever fosters the progress of communism is good; whatever delays or impedes communism is bad. If the truth will serve the purposes of communism today, it is good to tell the truth; if lying will serve the ends of communism tomorrow, it will be good and compulsory to lie. How naive we are to sit down and to formulate a treaty or agreement at Yalta, Potsdam, or Korea—under the impression that the Communist intends to keep his word. He has already warned us in his basic philosophy that he will lie and deceive us at the conference table if it will hasten the Communist overthrow of our Government. He has already warned us in his basic philosophy that he will live up to whatever agreements are made only so long as they serve his subversive program. For these same reasons, a loyalty oath from a Communist has no moral value whatsoever—it isn't worth the time it takes him to sign it.

Recent investigations have made it very clear that numberless dyed-in-the-wool Communists have taken loyalty oaths. When the oath merely requires them to state that they are not currently members of the Communist Party, they simply resign from the party the day before they are scheduled to take the oath. Their resignation is, of course, in name only—but it serves their purposes. When later questioned in court or before an investigating committee, they are able to say that they were not a member of the Communist Party when they took the oath. Thus, by their fake resignation, they safeguard themselves from any charge of perjury which could otherwise be made against them. Characteristically, we might add, these people immediately have recourse to the fifth amendment when asked if, previous to the time at which they took the loyalty oath, they were ever members of the Communist Party.

From a practical point of view, the loyalty oath possesses certain limited advantages. It makes it possible to imprison the Communist for perjury whenever we are able to prove that he was actually a member of the party at the time the oath was taken. In those forms of the oath which require testimony that the person was never a member of the Communist Party, the possibilities for conviction on perjury are, of course, still more extensive.

It has sometimes been remarked that there should be some provision in our procedures which would allow for reform in a man's life. Often through ignorance, sometimes through malice, men were members of the Communist Party, subversive groups, and front organizations in their earlier years. This situation was especially prevalent in the 1930's. In their more mature life they have seen their error. Should we now hold the mistake of 20 years ago against a man and deprive him of a good position today because of his earlier lapse? The question is a good one and merits an answer.

It is certainly praiseworthy for a man to abandon the errors of his earlier years. Surely we would not hold his remote mistakes against him. But, in general, we should definitely never allow him to hold a position vital to our national security. Let him do his reforming in some sphere of our vast society which does not directly involve the common good. We would not think it wise for a reformed alcoholic to become a bartender, nor for a reformed dope addict to run a pharmacy. These analogies may not be perfect—analogies never are. Our point, however, is simply this: no matter how happy we may be over the man's reform or how confident we are that it has truly taken place, we see no reason for placing him in a position involving national security. We must remember that men do have relapses; former associations often hold strong powers over them; blackmail about an individual's past is a weapon Communists use to force one who has abandoned their ranks to secure information for them; and a dyed-in-the-wool Communist will fake reform just to get into a vital key position.

In the extremely exceptional instance wherein the reformed Communist is capable of making a unique and valuable contribution to our national security I would seriously consider using his talents. If a searching investigation proves the long-standing character of his reform, let him make his contribution under a constant surveillance of his activities and associations.

These reflections on the loyalty oath may be summarized in a few sentences. From a moral point of view, the oath has no value coming from a Communist—never be so naive as to believe that the Communist will tell the truth. From the practical point of view, the value of the procedure is restricted to whatever value it may have as a medium for imprisoning Communists on a perjury charge—after we have succeeded in proving that they have lied under oath.

OUTLAWING THE COMMUNIST PARTY

Another of the issues currently attracting much attention is the proposal to make membership in the Communist Party a criminal offense. In fact, 11 bills to outlaw the United States Communist Party have been introduced at this session of Congress, and a House Judiciary Subcommittee is now considering them. (On April 15, 1954, the State of Texas passed a law attaching 20 years imprisonment and $20,000 fine to membership in the Communist Party.)

It should appear evident that the adoption of such a law would do an injustice to no one. We know that the Communist plans and participates in efforts to bring about the violent overthrow of our Government. In its place he is determined to substitute an atheistic and tyrannical dictatorship which would deprive our people of their basic natural rights. Surely such activities constitute a grave crime against our citizens, against our Government, and against the common good.

In spite of these facts, however, I would seriously question the prudence of making membership in the Communist Party a criminal offense. Two reasons underlie my attitude on this matter.

The first of these reasons is a practical one, which questions the effectiveness of such a law. The second is a psychological one, which makes me believe that such a law may actually tend to strengthen communism.

(Parenthetically, I cannot help reflecting that the most damaging Communist personalities and activities have always been underground. And we have always had to depend principally on the excellent work of the FBI to ferret out these subversive individuals. Be that as it may, however, I would place a very high value on any recommendation which the FBI and the Department of Justice would make along these lines. Their practical experience in combatting this menace is unsurpassed and their counsel should be followed.)

The last time that J. Edgar Hoover, Chief of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, expressed an opinion on this proposal, he advised against it, stating that it would make the Communists harder to identify and to supervise. Similarly, Attorney General Herbert Brownell made it clear in talks on April 9 and 12, 1954, that the Department of Justice does not desire a law outlawing the Communist Party. He noted that such a step would force the Communist Party underground and would "increase the already difficult investigatory job of the FBI." In addition, he noted that there are constitutional doubts about the legality of such legislation, that it would take several years before the courts could complete rulings on the constitutional aspects of such a law, and that it would be a tremendous task to prosecute the Nation's estimated 25,000 members.

On the other hand, the Attorney General emphasized that a definite five-point program was required at this time. These five recommendations are so worthwhile that they merit mention at this time:

"1. A law should be enacted which would allow an employer to dismiss from a defense plant during a national emergency, any person whose record shows that he is likely to engage in sabotage or espionage.

"2. A law should be enacted to eliminate Communist control of any industrial organization or labor union in vital sections of the country's economy. Already proposed legislation would prohibit any employee from paying dues or contributing goods or services to an organization found to be dominated by Communist leaders.

"3. A law should be enacted which would allow (but not compel) the Government to grant immunity from prosecution to persons who otherwise would plead the protection of the fifth amendment.

"4. A law should be enacted authorizing wiretapping evidence in cases involving treason, sabotage, or espionage.

"5. Other laws should be enacted which would impose the death penalty for peacetime espionage, deprivation of citizenship for any person found guilty of advocating the violent overthrow of our Government, and the extension of the statute of limitations in espionage cases."

If these proposals were enacted into law, the FBI and the other investigating agencies of the Government would have new and constitutional weapons to destroy by legal, orderly processes, the Communist Party in the United States. Such legal weapons would enable the Government to imprison everyone who held a key position in the Communist Party program and this would constitute a heavy blow at the top organization and operation of the party in the United States. In fact, even under our inadequate existing laws, 105 of the principal leaders of the Communist Party in this country have been indicted and of these, 67 have been convicted of conspiring to overthow this Government by force and violence. In 1953 and so far in 1954, 36 active Communist leaders have been convicted and sent to jail. And, at the moment (May 1954) trials are underway involving 5 Communist leaders in St. Louis, 9 in Philadelphia, and 11 in Cleveland.

Still another important legal weapon will be provided if the courts sustain the findings of the Subversive Activities Control Board that the Communist Party in this country is under the control of a foreign power and pledged to the overthrow of our Government by force and violence. This case will be argued on appeal by the Justice Department during this month (May 1954). If this verdict is upheld it will make possible the enforcement for the first time of an important provision of the Internal Security Act which requires all organizations fronting for subversive groups, as well as the Communist Party itself, to register with the Justice Department and to disclose officers, membership, activities, and finances.

These indirect methods of smothering the Communist conspiracy appeal much more strongly to me than the direct measure of making membership in the party a criminal offense.

Finally, a psychological reason makes me regard it imprudent to outlaw the Communist Party—and this is the reason upon which I place the greater emphasis. Ideas cannot be destroyed by force. In fact, whenever coercive measures are adopted to crush an ideology, such measures seem only to serve the opposite purpose of intensifying a person's determination to hold the idea. More parents than we could ever calculate have driven their son or daughter into marriage with a particular person by their stern orders to give up all relationship with the questionable party. The periodic violence and cruelty of the English has surely served to enkindle the antagonism felt for them by the Irish. And—while we acknowledge the vital role of the gift of faith and the strengthening influence of divine grace—we cannot help feeling that the persecutions of the early Roman emperors served only to strengthen Christianity. Under the impact of coercion, the weak members of a movement will give up their ideas and drop by the wayside. But the ardent followers will be doubly determined to carry on and will steel themselves to any sacrifices to keep alive their cause.

For these latter reasons, I fear that direct legal efforts to outlaw communism might serve only the purpose of making the dyed-in-the-wool Communist more determined than ever. Ideas must be met with ideas, and error in the final analysis will succumb only to truth. These psychological truths should be seriously considered before we adopt any legal measures to outlaw the Communist Party in our country.

Scope of Congressional Investigatory Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. MALONE

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 18, 1954

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter to the editor of the New York Times entitled "Scope of Congress Examined—Regulatory, Investigatory Rights of Legislative Branch Upheld," written by Watson Washburn and published in the New York Times of May 14, 1954.

Mr. Watson Washburn is a graduate of Harvard University; a member of the New York State Bar Association and of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York; a member of the firm of Perkins, Malone, & Washburn since 1920; formerly a captain in the field artillery of the United States Army; and a member of the United States Davis Cup Team of 1920–21.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SCOPE OF CONGRESS EXAMINED—REGULATORY, INVESTIGATORY RIGHTS OF LEGISLATIVE BRANCH UPHELD

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

So many comments have recently been published by pseudo-historians to the effect that Senator MCCARTHY's investigation of the Army was in some way a violation of the letter or the spirit of the Constitution of the United States that the following historical data may be of interest.

In the first place, the Constitution of the United States (drafted under the supervision of George Washington) specifically provides as follows (art. 1, sec. 8):

"The Congress shall have power * * * to make rules for the Government and regulation of the land and naval forces."

Early in the Civil War Congress appointed a joint Committee on the Conduct of the War, which is thus described by Nicolay and Hay in their official biography of Abraham Lincoln:

"This committee, known as the Committee on the Conduct of the War, was for 4 years one of the most important agancies in the country. It assumed, and was sustained by Congress in assuming, a great range of prerogative. It became a stern and zealous censor of both the Army and the Government; it called soldiers and statesmen before it, and questioned them like refractory schoolboys. It claimed to speak for the loyal people of the United States, and this claim generally met with the sympathy and support of a majority of the people's representatives in Congress assembled. It was often hasty and unjust in its judgments, but always earnest, patriotic and honest; it was assailed with furious denunciation and defended with headlong and indiscriminating eulogy; and on the whole it must be said to have merited more praise than blame."

Nicolay and Hay were not particularly sympathetic with the personnel of the committee; hence their qualified commendation is the more impressive.

Neither of our greatest Presidents, who went through the most terrible war crises in our history, protested against the right of Congress respectively to make rules for the Armed Forces and to question even commanding generals of the Army in the midst of a great civil war. But it was left for President Truman in 1948 to issue the blanket directive which purported with one stroke of the pen to close the congressional investigators all information whatever regarding the loyalty of Government employees.

This unparalleled defiance of the legislative branch of our Government was the more daring because in the preceding 15 years disloyalty in the executive branch had flourished to such an extent that great departments, such as State, Treasury, Agriculture, Commerce and the National Labor Relations Board, had been not only heavily infiltrated but in some cases, incredible as it may seem, effectively controlled by Communist conspirators.

President Eisenhower must utilimately determine whether he will follow the course of conduct toward Congress of Lincoln or of Truman in this grave crisis.

WATSON WASHBURN.

NEW YORK, *May 11, 1954.*

The Crisis in Indochina

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 18, 1954

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Crisis in Indochina Must Not Distract Attention From the One in the Americas," appearing in the Americas Daily of May 16, 1954.

I think this is a timely editorial, particularly in view of the fact that in today's press there appeared a story that a British-owned ship, presumably loaded with arms gathered from behind the Iron Curtain, unloaded its cargo in Guatemala yesterday. The arms apparently are to be used in the revolution smoldering in Guatemala, and now beginning to flare up in Honduras. The editorial points up the fact that we have been giving much attention to Europe and Asia, which is proper in every way, but we should not forget to give attention to the Latin American countries which at the moment look as if they are beginning to get away from us.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CRISIS IN INDOCHINA MUST NOT DISTRACT ATTENTION FROM THE ONE IN THE AMERICAS

Anxiety and admiration have marked the progress of a struggle carried on by French Union forces at Dien Bien Phu, with the world in awesome expectancy of the outcome. Western statesmen have been witness to the catastrophe involved in the fall of the Indochinese bastion and they are justifiably reduced to consternation and alarm over the new triumph of communism in the southeast Asian sector.

At the same time, the policymakers of the United States must not make the fatal mistake of concentrating all their efforts on Indochina while here in the America many-sided issues are demanding their proper share of attention. Here problems are arising daily and need adequate study without delay. The habit in Washington, however, is that of procrastination, shown in one way or another. Whenever it is felt that these inter-American problems have reached the point where they can no longer be put off, the usual procedure is to treat them all in a vague sort of manner, without due respect for their respective degree of gravity.

In a recent press conference Secretary of State John Foster Dulles alluded to certain international aspects of a strike which has paralyzed operations of United Fruit Co. banana plantations in Honduras. Later on the Honduran Foreign Minister himself corroborated what Dulles had said. Both of them implicated the Guatemalan Government in their statements.

The fact that the two men went out of their way to refer to the strike in such a particular fashion shows that something was in the wind, yet since those statements were originally made nothing more has been heard of the matter, this despite the well-known infiltration achieved by the Communists in Guatemalan labor organizations.

Neither Secretary Dulles, the Foreign Minister of Honduras, nor any other statesman in the Americas has let out a peep since those original disclosures—disclosures which are definitely meaningful. All one hears in Washington is talk of the Asian situation. The result of this is that overconcentration on that world area has led to neglect of serious affairs right here in this hemisphere. We repeat here what we have given as a title to this editorial: The crisis in Indochina must not distract attention from the one in the Americas.

TVA Chairman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT GORE

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 18, 1954

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a timely editorial published in the Washington Post and Times-Herald of May 17, 1954, entitled "TVA Chairman."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TVA CHAIRMAN

Gordon Clapp's term as Chairman of the Tennessee Valley Authority comes to an end on Wednesday. The position calls for a man free from political partisanship, gifted in the administration of large affairs, experienced in resource development, devoted to public service and capable of bringing into harmonious accord and balance the varied needs, interests and demands of a vast region of the United States. The position calls, in short, for a man like Gordon Clapp, who has demonstrated in 20 years of association with TVA that he possesses the requisite attributes in abundance.

Such men are extremely difficult to find—as indicated by the fact that the President, even at this late date, has not yet announced the choice of a successor. Would it not be well, then, to choose Mr. Clapp to succeed himself? The choice would fortify the TVA's freedom from politics. Because it would be based patently on merit, it would redound to the credit of the administration. And it would assure the TVA continued leadership of the highest caliber.

Steel and Industry in the South

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 18, 1954

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a very timely article written by Mr. Garrison Siskin, who is one of Tennessee's finest citizens and president of the Siskin Steel & Supply Co., Chattanooga, Tenn. Mr. Siskin traces the development and expansion of the steel industry in the South and gives a very graphic illustration of its present magnitude. This is a vivid example of the South's industrial development and how important a part the South plays in steel consumption.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Yale Scientific Magazine of May 1954]

STEEL AND INDUSTRY IN THE SOUTH

(By Garrison Siskin, president, Siskin Steel & Supply Co.)

STEEL CONSUMPTION IN THE SOUTH HAS SKYROCKETED TO UNTOLD LEVELS—AMERICAN INDUSTRY HAS MOVED SOUTHWARD EN MASSE—WHAT FACTORS HAVE CONTRIBUTED TO THIS INDUSTRIAL MIGRATION?

Possibly nothing has been a matter of such great concern in this country during the past two decades as the rapid strides of southern industrial development, and how it has come to play a leading role in the Nation's consumption of steel, with southern industry alone destined to consume during 1954 an amazing proportion of the approximately 125 million ingot tons of steel that will be available to their industry.

From the days of Daniel Boone and other pioneers, when early settlers built covered flatboats and other crude conveyances and moved their families, livestock, and household goods along the various rivers and overland trails to this southern area, a great people based on the strong, sturdy stock of pioneers was in the making—a people who would, in time, become the foundation of true American democracy, destined to produce great men of vision and action: United States Presidents, Army generals, Navy admirals, and great statesmen to cope with international affairs. From this southern people have come many leaders: as Presidents of our country, Andrew Jackson, hero of New Orleans, and Andrew Johnson; and statesmen such as Henry Clay and Cordell Hull, without peer among the world's greatest.

From these early days, through the Civil War and wars following, the South, especially the region of approximately 400 square miles bordering on the "Great Lakes of the South," has come to the fore. Since 1929 over 1,600 manufacturing and chemical plants, most of them vitally connected with the production of steel and steel products, have been erected in this region. Let us glance at some of the results of the past two decades.

At Calvert City, Ky., the Pittsburgh Metallurgical Co., Air Reduction Co., B. F. Goodrich Chemical Co., and Pennsalt Co. combine to represent an investment of over $100 million in plant construction, with facilities to manufacture steel products, ferro alloys, chemicals, and other basic raw materials. In the territory around Muscle Shoals lie the sprawling plants of the Reynolds Metals Co. and Reynolds Aluminum Co., producing tremendous quantities of aluminum products. At Sheffield, Ala., is the Electro Metallurgical Corp., producing ferro manganese and ferro silicon.

Next we visit Decatur, Ala., where we find the modern plants of the Wolverine tube division of Calumet & Hecla Consolidated Copper Co. and the Chemstrand Corp. Here, too, is the several-million-dollar plant of the Worthington Corp., placed in operation during late 1953 to produce air-conditioning equipment, opening new markets for steel products unknown and not produced in the South at any previous time. In addition, this area houses several fabricating steel companies, including Ingalls Shipbuilding Co. and Decatur Iron & Steel Co., the hub of unusual activity, having played a leading part in furnishing steel products to many Government agencies, such as the Arnold Engineering Center at Tullahoma, Tenn., a development of over $100 million, located in the center of this new industrial area.

We move on to the Huntsville, Ala. area, where the Redstone Arsenal and its related installations hum with activity. This is the backbone of our great chemical warfare planning, where scientific minds have used the new production of steel products in secret research of ways to combat all new ideas toward the New Look in war material, with new ideas coming forth daily from the drawing boards of our engineers and scientists.

Following the many bends of the rivers along the "Great Lakes of the South," attention is focused on the area around Chattanooga, Tenn., which has made outstanding progress in the industrial development of the new South, pressing progressively forward to become not only the "Pittsburgh of the South" but also one of the outstanding production centers of the entire United States in the diversified use of iron and steel products. Chattanooga is the home of Crane Co. where all the enamelware, boilers, and radiators manufactured in the United States by this company are produced. Sometime in late 1954, Chattanooga will be the titanium center of the world with the completion of the new Cramet titanium plant, Crane Co.'s subsidiary, now under construction by the Turner Construction Co. under the supervision of Vitro Engineering Co. Combustion Engineering Co., with its tremendous fabricating facilities for the production of superheater boilers and other fabricating units among the largest in the South, together with its production of waterheaters and soil pipe from foundry operations, has earned its place as one of the prime producers of these products in the South, and one of the largest in the Nation.

Wheland Ordnance Plant, also in Chattanooga, produces guns for our Armed Forces, while the Wheland Foundry—one of the large suppliers of gray-iron castings for the automotive industry—ranks as one of the most modern foundries of its type in the United States. Volunteer Ordnance Works, on a standby basis since the last war, has been reactivated, ready now to step to the front, an arsenal of protection in case of sudden national emergency. Tennessee Products & Chemical Corp., with giant electric furnaces producing ferro alloys and ferro silicon at Chattanooga, pig-iron furnaces at

Rockwood, Tenn., and chemical and other iron producing centers at various other strategic points over the valley, has come to the fore, an example of how perseverance, good management, availability of raw material, together with the determination to go forward, has succeeded in its bid to develop the entire area into a market for steel and other related products.

E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co., now has in operation one of the largest plants in its entire chain, located a stone's throw from the powerful Chickamauga Dam near Chattanooga, a plant so modern in construction and operation that it has become one of the most talked-about facilities in the entire new look of industrial development. With their progressive management and techniques, it is understandable that in the not-too-distant future this plant will be a prime factor in new research and development in its field. Together with such operations as Ross-Meehan Foundries, Mueller Co., United States Pipe & Foundry Co., Somerville Iron Works, and others, the plants of the Chattanooga area constitute some of the largest users of pig iron and other basic raw materials in the entire South. Technique and know-how of foundry operations has brought them to the forfront of the iron and steel users in the United States; and already new foundries and new and improved facilities are springing up within the companies mentioned, so new techniques from the drawing boards of their engineers can be placed in action, enabling the new industrial development of the South to keep pace with, or ahead of the challenge which the entire country has received during these postwar production years.

We cannot pass over the Chattanooga area without viewing the mighty Atomic Energy Commission plants at Oak Ridge, Tenn., and Paducah, Ky., whose birth heralded the forging of a strong steel ring around our United States, extending to our allies. These plants—of worldwide import, bastions of security—were born in this area of abundant low cost electrical energy made possible by the harnessing of the Tennessee River and stand in our valley today, mighty fortresses for our Nation and for the world.

Perhaps a concrete example of how and why this area is attractive to industry will be illuminating. On the banks of the Hiwassee River at Calhoun, Tenn., a $50 million pulp and paper mill is now under construction by the Bowaters Southern Paper Corp. When finished—sometime in the summer of 1954—it will employ several hundred people and will consume thousands of cords of pine from a forest area extending over a radius of 100 miles, providing an area income of several million dollars for the land and timber owners of the region. There are many reasons why this English corporation came into this wonderful valley of ours, principally because of the prior forestry development by the Tennessee Valley Authority providing adequate wood supply, along with the wonderful transportation facilities including water, rail, and highway, plus the availability of an abundance of cheap power. Several thousands of tons of steel are being used in the construction of this plant, which on completion will be one of the most modern of the paper industry in the entire Northern Hemisphere. Thus Bowaters' coming into this southern valley is one more instance of how private enterprise is taking over the job of using profitably and wisely great natural resources which, if left undeveloped, would remain wastefully idle.

The steel industry can look with much pride at the progress of the giant Aluminum Co. of America operations at Alcoa, Tenn. Alcoa is one of the first producers of aluminum products, the backbone of the aluminum industry, and one of the largest consumers of steel and its related products in the South. Furnaces, belching their hot metal, light up the skies in the Great Smoky Mountains in the eastern part of our United States—a panorama never to be forgotten by anyone having opportunity to see it.

The great Tennessee Copper Co., at Copperhill, Tenn., is one of the prime suppliers of acid and other chemicals used by the basic industries, as well as other basic raw materials fundamental in steel and industrial plants of a wide market area extending to all sections of the country.

The eastern Tennessee industrial empire of Tennessee Eastman at Kingsport, American Enka at Lowland, and American Zinc at Mascot, together with other industrial plants of various chemical and fabricating companies on the heel of this great circle, perform a job in the true manner of hardy pioneers who helped hew their way through the natural barriers and obstructions in their paths.

As we turn to Rome, Ga., area, two new large industrial plants now nearing completion are silhouetted against the sky. Rome Kraft Co.'s modern new paper mill, when in complete operation in the near future, will have a production which will reach a vast market area. General Electric's new transformer plant, the only plant of its type in the South, with the use of varied steel products, will produce transformers to supply the utilities not of the South alone, but of the whole Nation.

Further south, Republic Steel Corp. has its southern mills at Alabama City, Ala. Their tremendous plant is one of the bulwarks of our industrial economy with pig iron and various other steel production from its blast furnaces and open hearths. Republic is one of the largest producers of steel pipe for use by the natural-gas industry to harness the flow of this vital fluid from the shores of the Gulf of Mexico to the whole of our Nation.

Mills of the Tennessee coal and iron division of the United States Steel Corp. in the Birmingham district include blast furnaces and open hearths. Their giant rail mill at Ensley, Ala., furnishes rails and accessories to our great railroad industry for its transportation network across the land.

The Pullman Co., major producer of railroad equipment, and Ingalls Shipbuilding Co., producers of great vessels used by our Navy and Maritime Commission during the past decade, along with many other plants essential to the industrial picture, have their main offices located in Birmingham. Nashville Bridge Co., with plants both at Nashville, Tenn., and Bessemer, Ala., a prime supplier of barges as well as fabricated steel equipment for many units of the armed services, has made great strides, and has had its share in the new South markets as developed by the steel industry.

Large high-pressure pipe foundries located throughout the Birmingham district have been another mainstay of the steel and iron industry of this area, with their markets gradually extended from coast to coast of this country. Plants of the Alabama Pipe Co. and Kilby Steel Co. at Anniston, Ala., and Rudisill Foundry at Sylacauga, Ala., add to the panorama of progress.

Other plants and factories too numerous to mention dot the horizon south to the Gulf of Mexico and west to the Mississippi River. Of these industries, one of major importance is the manufacture of farm implements. These modern plants, scattered throughout the entire valley area, have a production almost entirely of steel, which covers a vast distribution area, playing a great part in the southern industrial picture.

The interest of the varied industries which have come into this valley has been stimulated by a new spirit of confidence which is animated in the chambers of commerce and the promotional development agencies that have kept pace with this new development. Thirty years ago this region was in a grave economic crisis. The people had lost their spirit. Two decades later these same people and their organizations are standing up on their hind legs telling the Nation about the advantages and resources of a revivified region.

The junior Senator from Massachusetts, JOHN F. KENNEDY, in a prepared address before the Chattanooga, Tenn., Rotary Club early in December 1953, commented that it is unfair for this valley to lure industry away from New England and other points by tax-free bonds and other means of new industry tax-exempt subsidies. Senator KENNEDY commended this area for the Tennessee Valley Authority and said in effect that the way for New England industry to meet the competition of cheap Tennessee Valley Authority electricity is to get some cheap electricity of its own. He admitted that the natural advantages of this valley have something to do with the industrial migration from New England and other northern sections to this region. He also recognized the good labor supply, climate, and nearness to raw materials of this region.

To quote from the Chattanooga Times editorial of December 11, 1953, with reference to Senator KENNEDY's address:

"We imagine that a lack of real enthusiasm in New England is partly responsible for the industrial losses. The new South has a new vision. We have public-spirited citizens right here in Cattanooga, who, out of their own generosity, would donate a huge tract to bring a new industry to this city, as was demonstrated only recently. We don't really need to offer new industry tax-exemption subsidies. The Chattanooga Times believes that Senator KENNEDY's address deserves a careful reading by the people of this region. We certainly hope that it will also be widely read in New England, which can profit by getting some of the spirit which Senator KENNEDY will observe in his tour of the Tennessee Valley."

Standing atop Umbrella Rock at the highest point on Lookout Mountain near Chattanooga, one can vision the generals of the Union and Confederate Armies locked in battle on the mountain for days, the Confederate Army finally driven from its impregnable stronghold, turning the tide of the battle of the Civil War. When one can stand on the same spot today, and with the use of strong field glasses see seven States of this great southern valley, he can envision the great Tennessee River Highway winding its way between mountains, and think of the many reasons why industry has been so attracted to the South and why this valley is destined to become the "Ruhr of America":

1. A good labor supply,
2. Accessibility of raw materials,
3. Low transportation costs offered by an improved new river highway,
4. A balmy climate, and
5. Friendly people with their good churches, fine schools and universities, and suberb new recreational opportunities available in 10,000 miles of new lake shores on the Great Lakes of the South with their fishing, boating, and picnicking advantages.

The fundamentals of our democratic way of life were born in this valley in the days of the Cherokee Indians and are now paying dividends in the form of the wonderful new development that has come to pass in this part of our great United States, and now play a major part in planning for the economy of our country.

Important as is the stupendous increase of electrical energy in this valley which has energized a new industrial development, there is another type of energy more important than the power of falling water, expanding steam, open hearths and blast furnaces with their molten red-hot metals. That is the energy of the minds of freemen working intelligently and cooperatively to change their environment constructively, to build new plants and facilities to manufacture new products, to create new and active mass markets, and to create in a once depressed economic area wonderful and great opportunities which help stabilize the economy of our Nation, making us truly the arsenal of democracy.

A Challenge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 18, 1954

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Harold G. Stagg, appearing in the Navy Times on February 27, 1954.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A CHALLENGE

(By Harold G. Stagg)

I know of no magazine which enjoys more universal popularity than the Reader's Digest. Therefore, when the Digest goes deliberately haywire in the field of antiveteran propaganda, it becomes doubly important to try and set the record straight.

Every couple of years or so, the Digest comes up with an editorial pipedream that is a nightmare of misleading information about veterans' affairs. These articles reflect the usual prejudices of those who count profits and taxes before principles, truth, loyalty, or gratitude. As a consequence, my experience has taught me to take with a very large grain of salt anything that appears in the Digest in relation to veterans' affairs.

I've just finished reading the March issue of Reader's Digest. It carries an editorial camouflaged as a magazine article under the trick title: "Must We Follow the VA Route to Socialized Medicine?" It is—to put it mildly—as phony a piece of scare propaganda as I have read anywhere.

It is dollars to doughnuts that the Digest will ignore this, but I'd like to challenge Editor DeWitt Wallace to prove that the camouflaged editorial was not written and published for the express purpose of striking fear into the hearts of the American taxpayers and to turn the Nation's entire nonveteran population against veterans. He can do this by authorizing me—or any member of the Times' staff—to prepare an honest 100-percent factual and documented article giving Digest readers the true story about VA hospitalization.

In March 1949, the Digest printed an abusive piece of VA entitled "How Bureaucracy Swindles the Taxpayer." VA, in a 26-page rebuttal, said the article was made up of unsupported generalizations designed to create a state of mind where the reader will accept opinions as facts and half truths as truths.

Then, in June 1951, the Digest took a few more drags on its dream pipe and came up with a specially prepared article entitled: "Veterans' Medicine: Back In the Doldrums." In another 26-page rebuttal, VA said that article was resigned to create the belief that VA medicine has suffered a dire setback.

Now, 3 years later—and wailing a different tune—the Digest bemoans the fact that VA is providing eligible veterans with hospital care and treatment by one of the finest medical staffs in the world.

Certainly that unintended praise of the VA medical setup would seem to contradict a prediction in the June 1951 Digest that "on the eve of tackling its biggest job—care of our Korean casualties in addition to veterans still hospitalized from World War II—the Veterans' Administration medical program seems headed back into the doldrums from which it was rescued so dramatically in 1945."

Now, sounds the Digest false alarm, VA's medical program—instead of heading back into the doldrums—is bringing the United States to the verge of socialized medicine with bewildering speed. This is unadulterated nonsense compounded by the do-you-still-beat-your-wife technique of asking "Must we follow the VA route to socialized medicine?"

The Digest article offers rather conclusive evidence that the writer—one Holman Harvey, a staff writer for the Digest for the past 4 years—and the Digest editors are either bewildered or have, with malice aforethought, decided to join the American Medical Association in its determination to destroy VA's hospital program.

The latest Digest article comes to its frantic and wholly false conclusion that VA policies are leading us "with bewildering speed into socialized medicine because—after 3 major wars in the past 40 years—VA finally has enough hospital beds to treat at any given time a mere one two-hundredth of the Nation's total living veterans' population or one-half of 1 percent.

This is a terrible situation, indeed, and my heart aches, and bleeds in sympathy for the frightened editors of Reader's Digest.

What worries the Digest is that all 20 million living veterans are potentially eligible for VA hospital care and that within 10 years half of all-able-bodied Americans will be able to claim free hospitalization—though why any able-bodied person would claim something he didn't need is beyond my unbewildered reasoning.

Take this statement from the Digest article:

"One of the foremost authorities on veterans' affairs in the United States conservatively estimates that, if present policies permitting NSC care (non-service-connected care) at Federal expense are continued, the current VA system will have to be augmented by at least 200 more hospitals of 1,000 beds each."

Who is this nameless authority? Could it be a spokesman for the American Medical Association? And if, after all our past wars, the Congress has seen fit to authorize only about 130,000 VA hospital beds to care for over 20 million veterans, why does the Digest seek to create the impression that Congress will appropriate funds to build an additional 200,000 beds?

Why this very phoney and unrealistic prediction from a "foremost" authority whom Readers' Digest is unwilling to identify? We are presently discharging a mere 50,000 servicemen a month. At that rate, it will be 35 more years before 20 million additional veterans can be even potentially eligible for hospital care. And 35 years from now how many of today's potentially eligible will still be around to test—and find wanting—the objective honesty of writers of the ilk of Holman Harvey?

The Digest goes deeper into the realm of irresponsible fantasy when it accuses the four major veterans' organizations of having "a clique of political sharpshooters * * * intimidating Congressmen * * * a powerful lobby" which "has abused the natural sympathy of the American public toward war veterans" and which "if its designs are carried out, socialized medicine may in the end be foisted upon a people who do not want it" and which "will continue to abuse this sympathy until exposed and curbed, preferably by veterans themselves."

Well, I practically live with the political sharpshooters who make up this powerful lobby. As political sharpshooters they could not hit the broad side of a barn. They are lucky these days if they can even get the right time from Congress—let alone any broadening of veterans' benefits.

Now, to wind up this overly long discussion, I think a quotation from the March 1949 Digest article is applicable to the author and editors in connection with the 1954 editorial:

"Little people who are displeased with their lives sometimes make the most of their miserable authority by pushing veterans around," the Digest said in 1949.

Enough said.

The Challenge of the West's Dynamic Growth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 18, 1954

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following article which I commend to the attention of my colleagues:

THE CHALLENGE OF THE WEST COAST'S DYNAMIC GROWTH

(By Jane Eshleman Conant, member, editorial staff, San Francisco Call-Bulletin)

(It is a cliché on the west coast that "the abnormal becomes normal in California." Certainly the tremendous and now historic growth of the Golden State since the beginning of World War II has imposed precedent-breaking challenges on the public-utility systems of that State laboring under the obligation of rendering service to the public.)

When California's manufacturing industry payroll grew 81.6 percent between 1947 and 1952, it was naturally a matter of interest to the Census Bureau and the chambers of commerce.

When the once sleepy, sunny county of Contra Costa, for instance, grew 197.6 percent between 1940 and 1950, it was of considerable importance to homebuilders, retailers, and real-estate men.

And when California auto registrations increased from 2,573,264 in 1940 to 4,320,124 in 1951, there was substantial reaction in such widely varying fields as highway construction, tire repair, and the collection of taxes.

But the agency which has been most directly affected by the tremendous and now historic growth of the West since the outset of World War II is probably the Pacific Gas & Electric Co.

The utility may be called the weather vane of the great migration which has almost doubled California's population since 1940 and will probably add another 2 million or more by 1960.

All these new people brought with them new demands—for food, homes, jobs, schools, and countless other needs. And almost all of these required power, fuel, or both.

When the agricultural valleys' crops were rushed into unheard-of production levels, electricity was needed to pump the irrigation water and light the packing sheds.

When new manufacturing plants blossomed in what had been farm fields, more power was wanted to run the machinery. And when thousands of new homes were built, still more was needed to operate the cement mixers and then the refrigerators, washing machines, and stoves.

The result has been a spectacular one for Pacific Gas & Electric.

To meet the unprecedented challenge caused by one of the greatest population shifts ever known, the company has recorded this outstanding industrial achievement:

More than $1 billion was spent on plant expansion between 1945 and February of 1953.

Another $500 million will go for additional development through 1955.

The company's system-wide electric generating capacity was more than doubled between the war's end and September 1953, growing from 1,658,300 kilowatts to 3,540,200 kilowatts after 7 years and 8 months of construction.

By 1955, the system-wide capacity will be 4,526,100 kilowatts, almost 3 times the total of just 10 years before.

Besides, the company acquired 363,935 new gas customers between 1946 and 1953. To match the need, it built 4,900 miles of transmission and distribution mains, including the California end of the new, 34-inch super inch main running 502 miles from Topock, Ariz., to Milpitas, south of San Francisco in California.

More construction is planned, above and beyond the $1.5 billion outlay of 1946–55. The company's engineers are studying undeveloped electricity sources and designing even more powerhouses.

It all adds up to more growth than Pacific Gas & Electric had recorded in all its previous existence before 1940, a true weather vane performance pointing the direction of the California development winds.

The relationship is seen by examining two sets of statistics—those describing the State's expansion, and those showing how Pacific Gas & Electric has not only kept pace but managed to stay at least a step ahead.

Some of the State figures might well be written off as fiction, if it were not that they are vouched for by such reputable agencies as the California State Chamber of Commerce, the State department of employment, and the United States Bureau of the Census.

For instance, the population in April 1940 was 6,907,387. Just 13 years later, it was 11,830,210—an increase of almost 5 million. The best estimates are that the 1960 figure will be over 14 million.

In other words, California, which started out with 13,000 residents of European descent in 1848 and took 92 years to reach the 7 million mark in 1940, will be just twice that big 20 years later.

Contra Costa County's increase is a dramatic example. This once quiet county on rolling hills along the northeast shore of San Francisco Bay had 100,450 persons in 1940, but collected 198,534 more for a new total of 298,984 in 1950, due first to war industry and later to tremendous residential expansion.

Another revealing set of figures shows what has happened to California manufacturing. The State's plants had a $4,108,760,000 payroll in 1952, as compared to $2,262,006,000 only 5 years earlier. The production of transportation equipment, for instance, cost $1,003,000,000 in wages in 1952, as against only $373,423,000 in 1947.

In 1951, California had $3,508,800,000 worth of new construction, a fabulous 324.2-percent increase over 1939's $827,200,000.

Generating capacity added, 1946–53 [1]

Plant	Type	Location	In service	Kilowatt capacity
Donbass	Steam	Humboldt County	1946	4,800
Kern:				
Unit 1	do	Kern County	1948	75,000
Unit 2	do	do	1950	120,000
Electra	Hydro	Mokelumne River	1948	92,000
West Point	do	do	1948	15,000
Salt Springs addition	do	do	1953	29,000
Station P additions:				
Unit 2	Steam	San Francisco	1948	110,000
Unit 3	do	do	1949	110,000
Colgate	Hydro	Yuba River	1949	25,000
Cresta	do	Feather River	1950	70,000
Rock Creek	do	do	1950	110,000
Moss Landing:				
Units 1 and 2	Steam	Monterey County	1950	226,667
Unit 3	do	do	1951	113,333
Units 4 and 5	do	do	1952	235,000
Contra Costa:				
Units 1, 2, and 3	do	Contra Costa County	1951	340,000
Units 4 and 5	do	do	1953	235,000

[1] Retirement of the old Colgate, Electra, and Folsom plants subtracted 35,700 kilowatt capacity during the same period.

Additional capacity under construction [1]

Plant	Type	Location	In service	Kilowatt capacity
Pittsburg	Steam	Contra Costa County	1954	600,000
Pit 4	Hydro	Pit River	1955	84,000
New Murphys	do	Calaveras County	1954	3,800
Morro Bay	Steam	San Luis Obispo County	1955	300,000

[1] Shutdown of historic Old Murphys, built in 1899, subtracts 1,900 kilowatts.

Projected plants—(construction dates not determined)

Plant	Type	Location	Kilowatt capacity
Pit 6	Hydro	Pit River	60,000
Pit 7	do	do	64,000
Butt Valley	do	Feather River	36,000
Caribou No. 2	do	do	109,000
Belden	do	do	113,000
Poe	do	do	106,000
Wishon	do	Kings River	13,500
Haas	do	do	106,500
Kings	do	do	39,000
Balch Additions	do	do	80,500
Humboldt Bay	Steam	Humboldt County	50,000

Civilian employment totaled 2,574,000 in 1940. Twelve years later this was up a hearty 83.6 percent to 4,726,000. Keeping even, transportation and utilities employed 186,000 in 1940, and boosted that figure 84.4 percent to 343,000 in 1952, according to the State Department of Employment.

Farm crops were valued at $430,629,000 in 1940. The 1952 total was $1,796,394,000, or just 317.2 percent more. Individual incomes totaled $5,606,0000,000 in 1940, and grew 318.2 percent to $23,450,000,000 in 1952.

Californians paid $1,075,513,345 in all sorts of taxes in 1940–41. The tax coffers overflowed with $7,521,889,507 in 1952–53 collections.

The staggering statistics do not record the headaches and the growing pains attendant on this phenomenal record of growth.

Pacific Gas & Electric had its share. To keep ahead of California's growth was a monumental job.

When World War II started, the company had plans for additional electric generating capacity and other facilities to meet the normal development for which a utility must naturally prepare several years in advance. But the war changed all that, in many ways.

It produced a great and immediate need for power and fuel for military establishments and war industries. It took away much of the skilled manpower Pacific Gas & Electric could otherwise have used to good advantage. It clamped down rigid controls on many materials needed for utility expansion.

And, perhaps most significantly of all, the war opened the migration floodgates which brought tens of thousands of wartime workers and then the second, and continuing, big wave of new postwar population.

During the fighting, the company had its hands full providing for war industries and the military installations, while still maintaining adequate service to the general public. When the war ended, there were some who predicted a slump. They said plans should be revised downward in accordance with the original prewar forecasts.

But early in 1946, Pacific Gas & Electric had its chips down on the future. Its big expansion program was already well under way in the belief, now thoroughly substantiated, that the war boom was no temporary thing.

In his 1946 review, Company President James B. Black put it this way:

"Last year we observed that the war served to accelerate an already significant westward movement of population and industry. It is now even more apparent that much of the wartime growth is of a permanent character, and that the industrial, commercial, and agricultural development of this region will continue on a far higher plane of activity than before the war."

The "far higher plane of activity" applied to Pacific Gas & Electric, too—$1.5 billion worth.

Its hydro capacity totaled 1,039,500 kilowatts in December 1945 and steam, 618,800 kilowatts, for a system total of 1,658,300. The September 1953 figures were 1,347,400 hydro and 2,192,800 steam, or 3,540,200 over all.

Additional capacity under construction and planned for completion by the end of 1955 calls for 87,800 kilowatts in hydro plants and 900,000 steam, or a total of 987,800 more in the next 2 years.

And on the books for "after 1955"—further work not included in the 1946–55 expenditure total of $1.5 billion—are 10 more hydro installations with 717,500-kilowatt capacity, and substantial amounts of new capacity.

The powerhouses themselves are not all, of course. The 1946–53 projects have added 2,100 miles of new electric transmission lines and 14,600 miles of new electric distribution lines, plus 283 new substations and substantial substation capacity additions.

The huge postwar expansion program began in colorful and ingenious "make-do" fashion at Eureka, on the northern California coast near the Oregon line. The first system addition after 1945 was the 4,800-kilowatt-capacity Donbass steam plant, described by the company, in something of an understatement, as a "novel installation."

Donbass is the salvaged after-half of *Donbass III*, an American-built tanker which was operated by the Russians and which split in two during a violent storm south of the Aleutians on February 17, 1946. To meet the extraordinary postwar demand for power in the Eureka area, Pacific Gas & Electric bought the half-ship, had it beached on the Eureka waterfront, reconditioned its steam boilers, turbine, and generators, and made it an efficient 4,800-kilowatt producer of power for shore industries. It went into service December 16, 1946, just 10 months after its Pacific disaster. The price tag: $320,000.

In gigantic contrast are the central California "twins"—the Moss Landing steam plant in Monterey County south of San Francisco and the Contra Costa steam plant over the hills to the east of San Francisco Bay. Each has 575,000-kilowatt capacity, each cost $80 million, and each has 5 units, put into operation as fast as manufacturers could deliver the equipment.

Bigger yet will be the Pittsburg steam plant, also in fast-growing Contra Costa County, a 600,000-kilowatt-capacity titan costing $80 million and due for operation in 1954.

A significant item in the after-1955 program is the Kings River hydro development, calling for 3 new powerhouses and additions to another, totaling 239,500 in new kilowatt capacity. This is the work which was held up so long by the Department of the Interior's efforts to give the Kings hydro rights to the Bureau of Reclamation as a so-called part of the Central Valley project. That battle has just ended with the new administration's announcement that it is dropping litigation designed to reverse the Federal Power Commission's award of Kings River licenses to Pacific Gas & Electric.

The early part of the postwar expansion program was on a scale of almost emergency proportions, as shown by the Donbass project. The Kern steam plant, near Bakersfield at the southern end of the P. G. & E. system, came close to fitting into that category, too. It was originally set for immediate construction in 1941, but the war compelled postponement. So, as soon as the fighting stopped, it was given a rush-order signal. Ground was broken in September 1946, and the first 75,000-kilowatt unit went into service on May 10, 1948, after 1 year and 8 months of work by a crew of 1,000 men. Even airplanes helped; at one point, 20 tons of valves and other parts were brought in by air to save time.

The second Kern unit, of 120,000-kilowatt capacity, went into operation on January 17, 1950. The total cost was $30,500,000.

Another major new source of power after the war was at Station P steam plant in San Francisco, on the shore of San Francisco Bay. The original installation was a Great Western Power Co. project dating back to 1929, just before P. G. & E. acquired the Great Western system. Ground was broken for two additions in July of 1947. The first new unit started operation on December 12, 1948, and the second on January 25, 1949, providing a total of 220,000 kilowatts of added capacity.

On the hydro side, Pacific Gas & Electric has added 343,600 kilowatts in postwar developments on the Mokelumne, Yube, and Feather Rivers, including 341,000 in six new projects and 2,600 in minor plant changes.

Three separate projects on the Mokelumne brought this river in California's mother lode gold-mining country to its rightful importance as a producer of power. It now has four generating plants with an aggregate capacity of 206,000 kilowatts. The postwar additions are Electra, 92,000-kilowatt capacity, placed in service August 1, 1948; West Point, 15,000 kilowatts, December 31, 1948; and the Bear River unit addition to the Salt Springs powerhouse, adding 29,000 kilowatts, March 31, 1953.

The Bear River unit has some unusual aspects. When Salt Springs powerhouse was built in 1931 on the upper Mokelumne space was provided for another generator to be operated by water from the Bear, a tributary of the larger stream. Work started on this project in July of 1949. A new reservoir was created by two rock-fill dams at 5,800-foot elevation, on the Bear, and the stored water was carried to the penstock head through a 2½-mile-long tunnel, thence into the penstock pipe extending 4,700 feet down the mountainside to the new Salt Springs generator.

Thus Salt Springs gained novel status, since the first of its generators is driven by water from the Mokelumne, and in the second by water from a different river—the Bear. Also, the water wheel for the new generator is the first of its kind installed by Pacific Gas & Electric—a vertical-shaft machine operated not by 1 nozzle but by 3, spaced around the wheel to give higher efficiency.

The new Colgate powerhouse on the Yuba River is linked with California's early power history. The first Colgate, built before the turn of the century, was the third project of Eugene J. de Sabla, Jr., John Martin, and Romulus R. Colgate during the early years of their hydroelectric pioneering. It made news when it transmitted its power 61 miles to Sacramento and 142 miles to Oakland in 1901, long-distance records at the time. Fire partly destroyed the old structure on September 13, 1946, but it continued in operation at a reduced level until it was shut down in 1948. The new Colgate, of 25,000-kilowatt capacity, took over on June 13, 1949.

The Feather River, one of California's most beautiful streams and a first-class producer of hydroelectric power, gained 180,000-kilowatt capacity in 1950, with completion of the Cresta powerhouse 70,000 kilowatts, and Rock Creek powerhouse 110,000 kilowatts. It is marked for still further development in the after-1955 program when the Butt Valley, Caribou No. 2, Belden, and Poe projects will add 364,000 kilowatts more.

Other works, now under construction or on the drawing tables for future accomplishment, include three new Pit River powerhouses, the 300,000-kilowatt capacity Morro Bay steam plant and the 50,000-kilowatt Humboldt Bay steam plant, the Kings River projects, and little Murphys, in Calaveras County, replacing historic Old Murphys which furnished power for the Utica Gold Mining Co. mines in the mother lode.

The Pacific Gas & Electric postwar record may well be rated high as an instance of private capital and private individuals facing up to a big task and bringing it through to accomplishment—managing, in the process, to pay dividends as usual. From storm-wracked Donbass at Eureka and little 3,800-kilowatt New Murphys in Calaveras County to the huge Pittsburg setup and broad-scale Feather River hydro additions the company has not only kept up with the West's development but has helped to make it possible.

In brief, the overall Pacific Gas & Electric expansion picture is shown in the preceding tables.

A Second Look

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN L. McCLELLAN

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 18, 1954

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, Dr. George S. Reuter, Jr., of the Arkansas Agricultural and Mechanical College, has written another very constructive article on education entitled "A Second Look." I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A SECOND LOOK

(By Dr. George S. Reuter, Jr.)

Arkansas Agricultural and Mechanical College recently completed the second conference of consultants in general education. The subject for 1953–54 was General Education as a Pattern in Our World. The related aims were those of the International Council on Education for Teaching, of which Dr. George W. Diemer is the first president.

These seven aims are: to foster a conception of education directed toward promotion of international understanding and good will, with a view to safeguarding peace, freedom, and respect for human dignity; to improve teaching methods, educational organization and the academic and professional training of teachers, to equip them better to serve the interests of youth; to defend the rights and material and moral interests of the teaching profession; to promote closer relationships between teachers in the different countries; to define and explore ideas and principles underlying the education of those preparing to teach; to examine problems of the continued education of teachers in service; to promote opportunities for consultation and collaboration among organizations and persons engaged in such education in different countries.

Dr. Judson R. Butler, dean, College of General Education, Boston University, began this series with the subject Developing These Understandings. Rev. Gerald L. Stover, pastor, Grace Bible Church and dean, Grace Bible Institute of Souderton, Pa., was scheduled for the subject Related to Social Ethics, but he was unable to come and Dr. Earl Harding, pastor, First Baptist Church, Joplin, Mo., was then scheduled. When Dr. Harding declined, this phase had to be canceled because of the time element.

Mr. Arch W. Troelstrup, professor of consumer education, Stephens College, was concerned with the subject Related to Consumer Problems. Professor Troelstrup's book Consumer Problems, which was published by McGraw-Hill Book Co., was well received by all concerned. The students showed a sincere interest in this phase of general education.

Dr. Roy W. Jones, of Oklahoma A. & M. College, was concerned with the subject Related to Life Science and Conservation. His workbook was well received.

Mr. David B. White, of Macalester College, St. Paul, Minn., was speaking on the subject Related to Humanities. Then, Dr. M. Ray Karnes, of the University of Illinois, centered his thoughts around the idea Related to Industrial Education. He also spent some time in a conference with leaders in this area.

Dr. Byron Lamar Johnson, long-time dean of Stephens College and now professor of education at the University of California, ended the series by considering Uniting These Understandings, as well as addressing a group of guidance workers.

The first series are recorded for posterity for careful study and restudy in the author's 1954 publication In School and At Work, by Edwards Bros., Inc. This study should likewise be of major concern of those interested in general education.

Shifting Ground on the Colorado

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALLACE F. BENNETT

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 18, 1954

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs this morning approved and sent to the House a bill to construct the upper Colorado River project. I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Shifting Ground on the Colorado," published in the Deseret News of May 14, 1954.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SHIFTING GROUND ON THE COLORADO

Suddenly and rather remarkably, the opponents of development of the upper Colorado River Basin have shifted their ground. In doing so, they have come closer to exposing their real motives than ever before.

The California interests haven't been talking much lately about spoiling scenery in Dinosaur or about "invading" national parks. Neither have the newspapers and national magazines they have inveigled into spreading their propaganda. Enough fairminded people have raised their voices that the public is no longer an easymark on that issue. Only yesterday the full House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee defeated, 13 to 10, an attempt to remove Echo Park from the upper Colorado River storage project.

But the committee delayed its vote on the project itself. And, significantly, that is where the new attacks are being made—on the whole project.

The old divide-and-conquer technique has been reversed. Those who want all the Colorado River water to continue flowing downstream haven't been able to kill the upper storage project by attacking one important part of it. Now, in a sort of desperation, they attack the whole thing.

Raymond Moley, in Newsweek magazine, devotes three pages to trying to show the project is economically infeasible. The Sierra Club joins in with a two-pronged attack: (1) An item by the club's executive secretary in the Pacific Spectator substantially asks why we should spend money to enable upper-basin States to use water when the same water can be used effectively in California with existing dams. (2) The club's vice president attempts to show that producing electric power by coal-operated steam plants would be cheaper than by power dams in Dinosaur.

The Sierra Club's arguments hardly rate an answer. Leaving this area's great resources and potentialities out of it, it is astonishing that anyone can so blithely ignore the solemn covenant which in 1922 divided the use of Colorado River water. Great Federal dams on the lower Colorado enable California to use her share and more. To suggest that Federal dams should not now be built in the upper basin because California could use the upper basin water share is arrant immorality. As for the steam powerplant scheme, even supposing the figures to be accurate, it merely ignores the water storage and evaporation factors that after all are what the whole project is about.

Mr. Moley's comments get into something more profound. He bases his opposition on two points:

(1) He hints darkly, without any details at all, at huge hidden subsidies not repayable by earnings of the project. He is off base here. Except for $6.9 million written off for fish and wildlife benefits, the entire cost of the billion-dollar project will be repaid. There is none of the huge subsidy for flood control, navigation, etc., that has been written into other projects—$25 million for flood control at Hoover Dam, for example.

(2) He criticizes the fact that, in repaying costs charged to irrigation, no interest is paid and that much of this no-interest repayment will be postponed for years and eventually will be paid by profits from power sales. This is true. But the same principle has applied to Federal multipurpose dams for many years. For comparison: Of the $597 million cost of the Upper Colorado storage project, $500 million will be paid out of power earnings—at 2½ percent interest—leaving less than $100 million no-interest irrigation repayment. In the Columbia Basin project (Grand Coulee Dam) costing $700 million, only $160 million is repayable with interest from power, leaving $540 million irrigation cost with no interest.

If Mr. Moley or anyone wishes to criticize the Colorado project on this basis, he must attack the whole Federal multipurpose dam concept. Yet one recalls no criticism of Grand Coulee. Or, for that matter, of the Federal All-American Canal which takes Colorado River water to California farmlands at a cost of $38.5 million—without a cent of interest charge.

The difference, then, between Grand Coulee and Colorado? Well, to our knowledge, there was no California lobby spending thousands of dollars stirring up opposition in order to get Columbia River water. And that's quite a difference indeed.

Green Peter Dam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 18, 1954

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a resolution from the Linn County Farmers' Union convention of April 10, 1954, with reference to the building of the Green Peter Dam.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolved, That we affirm our former action relative to our Government building multipurpose Green Peter Dam, including all electric generating facilities and to be owned wholly by the Government and operated as a part of the Bonneville Power Administration.

Presented by resolution committee. Resolution carried unanimously.

The Situation in Indochina

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 18, 1954

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, Mr. William H. Stringer, chief of the Washington news bureau of the Christian Science Monitor, in an article published in that newspaper under the title "The Washington Scene," on May 17, 1954, gives an extremely good description of the situation in Indochina. The first paragraph of the article, which I think is extremely important, reads as follows:

> The solution for Asia these days must be, surely, the concept of NATO, combined with the concept of point 4, combined with the gospel of independence and good will. An Asiatic "NATO" alone—a military alliance to hold back the tide of communism in southeast Asia—isn't enough.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WASHINGTON SCENE

(By William H. Stringer)

THROUGH ASIAN EYES

WASHINGTON.—The solution for Asia these days must be, surely, the concept of NATO, combined with the concept of point 4, combined with the gospel of independence and good will. An Asiatic "NATO" alone—a military alliance to hold back the tide of communism in southeast Asia—isn't enough.

It is possible to go along with Admiral Mahan's views, and by means of sea power, modernized by air power, hold the island chain off the coast of Asia against Communist aggression—and hold, perhaps, the seaport cities of Indochina, plus Singapore and a few other coastal bastions. But what about the millions of inhabitants of Vietnam, of India, Burma, Indonesia, Ceylon? These, many of them, are the "neutralists" of Asia, the undecided fence sitters in the cold war between the Soviet bloc and the "free world."

They are not sure that intervention in Indochina is not in support of colonialism. They are not sure about American atomic weapons. They are not sure about the blessings of Western freedom. Interestingly, even Sir Zafrullah Khan, Foreign Minister of Pakistan, which has concluded an agreement with the United States for military aid, declared in a recent speech at Lahore that any Asian people faced with the choice between dependence and the achievement of independence through Communist support would accept the Communist aid, whatever the risk might be.

There was a time when the United States was regarded as a champion of independence for colonial peoples. We freed the Philippines. During World War II Washington pressed Sir Winston Churchill to grant independence to India, and President Roosevelt proposed that Indochina be freed at the war's end. Now, however, because of the desperate need to persuade France to support the European Defense Community treaties in Europe, and because the Communists have attacked at the weakest point—politically, in Asia—the United States finds itself supporting a war which many Asians still stubbornly and bemusedly regard as a fight to throw off a colonial yoke.

Part of our difficulty today in obtaining widespread Asian support for a united front to hold the military line in southeast Asia is just this: We have neglected to make every effort to keep burnished bright our reputation as a champion of freedom and a helper of backward peoples. This is no easy task when Communist propaganda is painting Americans as power-mad and materialists, spreaders of bacteriological warfare, and supporters of colonialism. But we, including Members of Congress, need to work harder at improving our relations with the non-Communist nations of Asia.

The other day the National Security Council reportedly came to the point of considering whether in the event the United States sent military forces to Indochina, it would be prepared to use tactical atomic weapons there. It was decided they would not be used. Part of the reason was military; targets are too dispersed in jungle warfare. There was also the impact on Asian opinion. This opinion still believes that the United States, which dropped an atomic bomb on Hiroshima would never have dropped such a bomb on Germany. "Asians are expendable."

On April 2 when India's Prime Minister Nehru appealed for a "standstill agreement" on tests of nuclear weapons, it is significant that the phrase most generally emphasized in Indian newspapers was his comment that American nuclear experiments always seemed to be situated near Asia.

Is the United States doomed to live under perpetual Asian suspicion? If a proper background could have been laid for Secretary of State Dulles' appeal for a united front in Asia—for instance, if there had been a grant of independence to the Indochinese states months ago and if Secretary Dulles could have proposed a police action under the aegis of the United Nations—there would exist a larger measure of popular Asian support for holding the line in Indochina today.

India, of course, leads the neutralist camp, and there are some members of Congress who would make sure that India remains in the frame of mind by voting against the $100 million foreign-aid allocation proposed for India by the Eisenhower administration. This money is not designed to placate Mr. Nehru, who is a complex and contradictory character at times. It is designed to assist India's millions in village rehabilitation, better crops, improved transport, and more effective education.

We can use more propaganda composed of point 4 aid, friendliness, and humility. Immediately ahead is the stern necessity of building a military defense line across southeast Asia. But this task will be more successful and the long-term job of containing an aggressive Chinese communism in Asia will be possible if we do not forget that this is also a battle for the hearts and minds of Asia's undecided millions.

Bipartisanship Urgently Needed in Determining and Implementing Our Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER F. MACK, JR.

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 10, 1954

Mr. MACK of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, with the international situation growing more critical each day, I believe the advice and counsel of all our people from both political parties are essential. The present administration should immediately implement a program for bipartisan support in determining our foreign policy. We have had a warning from our former President in a speech he made at the National Press Club asking for unity and bipartisanship in foreign policy, which was most timely in view of the international situation.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include an editorial from the Washington Evening Star concerning the remarks made by the former President, Harry S. Truman:

MR. TRUMAN ON BIPARTISANSHIP

Former President Harry S. Truman, in his good-tempered address to the National Press Club, has spoken at his mellow and statesman-like best in appealing for unity and bipartisanship in foreign policy. Certainly although some parts of his comment on "the apparent abandonment or neglect" of such a policy are open to challenge, there can be no question about the soundness of his basic view—a view deeply rooted in the traditions of America—that factional politics, mean, narrow, irresponsible, self-serving politics, should end at the water's edge.

Quite obviously, as Mr. Truman has declared, politics of that type are completely out of key with what is urgently needed to "meet the crisis that exists in the world today." For it is a crisis so severe, and full of so many grave potentialities for our own country and other free lands, that we simply cannot afford to be divided among ourselves as we strive to deal with it. As he has put it, "The responsibilities of the United States are vast. Much as we might wish to, we cannot escape them. We cannot escape the fact that our Nation is looked to for leadership. And leadership requires taking hard decisions, carrying heavy burdens, making great sacrifices. For our people to join in those decisions and sustain those burdens requires, in turn, a broad measure of agreement and support from both of the great political parties and on overwhelming sense that the national interest is being put above partisan interest in the conduct of our foreign policy."

In view of recent statements from some Democratic Members of Congress—such as Senator JOHNSON of Texas—there is plenty of reason to question Mr. Truman's suggestion that the Eisenhower administration is alone responsible for the apparent abandonment or neglect of bipartisanship in this field. Yet, without mentioning any names, he has taken a defensible position and voiced a legitimate complaint in warning that interparty cooperation on international matters cannot be fostered, but can only be set back, by the failure of the Republican high command to dissociate itself completely from things like Senator McCARTHY's speeches about 20 years of treason under the Democrats. He has made a valid point, too, in declaring that it is the responsibility of the President not merely to shape foreign policy in a way that will be confusing to nobody, but also to do whatever he can to win the strongest possible bipartisanship support for it.

In saying this, Mr. Truman, who has been at pains to avoid any direct criticism of the President, has not spelled out specific measures to promote bipartisanship. However—"as one who wishes with all his heart to close ranks, to support and strengthen him upon whom now rests the burden which I once bore"—he has called for a clear foreign policy lead and made a timely plea to the Nation to unite behind it. "The days and months and perhaps years before us," as he has said, "hold dangers and problems of infinite complexity and delicacy," and in such a period his counsel against factionalism ought surely to be heeded by patriotic Americans of every political persuasion.

New Concepts in Business Management

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 18, 1954

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Frank M. Folsom, president, Radio Corporation of America:

NEW CONCEPTS IN BUSINESS MANAGEMENT

(By Frank M. Folsom, president, Radio Corporation of America)

Mr. Bishop and fellow students of advanced management, it is good to be back at Harvard, and I thank you for the thoughtful invitation that brings me here.

Seven years ago, it was my privilege to talk with the graduate school's Marketing Club. It was a stimulating and rewarding experience for me.

So, when your director, Mr. Bishop asked me to meet with you, I was happy to accept. Again, I expect to receive as well as to give.

I came away from my meeting with the Marketing Club deeply impressed by the work being done in this school. The grasp and understanding of business problems as shown by the students in their questions and comments were a revelation.

It reaffirmed and increased my regard for the modern method of training young men for leadership in American business and industry.

It gave me a deeper understanding of the contribution being made by the graduate school, and other similar educational institutions, toward a stronger national economy.

One of the greatest potentials for still further progress in our economic development is, of course, this study you are making in the techniques of advanced management.

Here, the essence of good management is being given to you. The expectation is that it will be applied quickly and effectively in approximately 120 major business and industrial organizations. In addition, there are representatives here from Government and the military services.

ADVANCE IN BUSINESS TRAINING

We cannot place an exact measurement on the beneficial results of this program for the Nation's business, but we know they will be great.

Viewed against my own background of training and experience, your work here represents a truly radical advance in the art of training for business leadership.

When I was a youth, we did it the hard way.

Our economic system, still largely based on agriculture, was not so complex as it is now. Unless they were headed for one of the professions, or had enough money so that it did not matter, young men did not seek a higher education.

They simply went to work in the business of their choice. They acquired knowledge and experience and judgment on the job. Those with ability, aptitude, and application moved ahead. In general, progress was slow while—if you will pardon the expression—the boys were separated from the men.

This method produced its business giants—men like Carnegie, Field, Wanamaker, Hartford, Sarnoff, to name but a few.

These men learned their business through the sometimes painful trial-and-error method. But they learned. And because of their outstanding success, many men patterned their own careers after them. There was a popular misconception that the "school of hard knocks" was the best school of all.

COMPLEXITY OF MODERN BUSINESS BRINGS CHANGE

My own training was acquired in this way, and I confess it took me a long time to gain respect for any other method.

The growing complexity of modern business and industry, however, caused many of us to change our minds. The demand for specialists in virtually all branches of major business enterprises has increased tremendously.

The day of the one-man show is over.

As someone so aptly said: no man knows too much, unless he knows too little.

The new approach to the solving of management problems is highly significant, and one that should be most reassuring to you.

The American system of free competitive enterprise is dynamic. It presents a constantly changing pattern of new ideas, growth, and expansion. In fact, growth and expansion are the very lifeblood of modern industry.

MANAGEMENT SUPPORTS ADVANCED METHODS

Thus it is only natural that today's top business management not only accepts but supports advanced training methods such as you have here.

That is why Larry Kanaga and Bob Macrae are members of your group, and why six other RCA men are enrolled in the regular extended course of the graduate school.

Their presence here reflects the increased attention, as well as importance, we in RCA are giving to the basic concepts under which we operate and to the development of executive personnel for present and future needs of the business.

The fundamental concepts of a business and the development of executive talent constitute one of the major problems of management. A good case in point is RCA's recent activity in these areas.

A problem was posed by the fact that during the last 15 years our business had increased by eightfold and the number of our employees had trebled. Our assets had risen from less than $100 million to nearly $500 million.

New products and services, largely the result of expanded and intensified research, played important roles in this growth.

As you probably know, RCA was founded in 1919 to engage in worldwide radio communications. But almost from the beginning our organization has been a growth company.

EXPANSION AND ORGANIZATIONAL REALINEMENT

Today we are operating in virtually all areas of radio, television, sound record and reproduction, and electronics. Our activities include scientific research and engineering development, manufacturing, and merchandising, distribution and servicing, broadcasting, international and marine communications, and technical training.

Throughout the last year our products and services in the television, radio, and phonograph fields continued to expand. Sales of air conditioners and ranges in the home appliance field also were increasing. Production of military communication and electronic apparatus reached new high levels. The new and promising fields of color television, industrial television, and magnetic tape recording of sound and pictures were well underway.

So, to keep pace with this continued growth, we decided upon a major realinement of our organizational structures. We have made such realinements in RCA about every 4 years, since 1939, to permit and encourage progress.

At the end of 1953, RCA was made up of a number of operating divisions and wholly owned subsidiaries. An operating head was in charge of each of these fully staffed units, and most of them reported individually and directly to the president and chairman of the board of RCA.

OBJECTIVES OF NEW PLAN

Our examination of this structure, in the light of our continuing growth, indicated a clear-cut need for a more highly decentralized and diversified staff and line organization.

We realized the necessity for creating a degree of flexibility that would not only meet present requirements, but also provide for the future.

We wanted to shorten the line of profit responsibility between RCA's top management and the heads of divisions and subsidiaries. We also wanted to sharpen staff responsibilities.

All of these objectives are accomplished, we believe, in a new plan of organization that became effective in RCA on January 11, 1954.

This plan is based almost entirely on our own ideas and concepts of how our business should be run. To make sure that we were on the right track, however, we engaged in the services of management consultants to help develop the plan in full detail.

Here, in brief, is our new organization:

1. A special staff reporting to the chairman of the board and the president, which is composed of a small group of highly skilled, mature executives. While responsible for specific assignments, they are basically advisory and consultant to our top management.

2. A corporate staff that serves all units and subsidiaries of RCA. Under an executive vice president, who reports to the chairman and the president, this operation contains administrative staff services such as finance, law, personnel, distribution, purchasing, engineering, and others needed in our business.

3. Specialized operations having chief executive officers who report to the chairman and the president. These operations include scientific research, foreign trade and associated companies, radio and television broadcasting, and international radio communications.

4. Three groupings of product and service operations—electronic products, consumer products, and sales and service subsidiaries—each under the direct supervision of an executive vice president, who reports to the chairman and the president. Each of these groups, as well as their divisions and subsidiaries, is, in effect, a separate business with its own chief executive and the needed management, facilities, and manpower to carry on independently.

The electronic products group consists of engineering products, tubes, and marine electronic equipment. Consumer products group is comprised of home instruments such as radio and television sets, victrolas, and parts; records, kitchen ranges, and room air conditioners. The sales and service subsidiaries group includes product distribution in certain areas, product servicing, and technical training.

5. A general staff council has been established to act as an advisory body to the chairman of the board and the president. Its purpose is to discuss and resolve matters of top policy, subject to the approval of the chairman and the president and to the action of the board of directors when such action is required.

PRELIMINARY PLANNING SPEEDS CHANGES

We have made rapid progress in these realinements of responsibilities and functions, as the result of months of preliminary discussion and planning. So much so, in fact, that the major changes and appointments involved have already occurred.

A principal aim in devising a plan of organization is to make it simpler for management at all levels to run the business effectively. Sound as such a plan may be, it in itself is not enough.

A business really runs by the joint effort of many people.

And because of this, particularly in a complex business like RCA, the key to success is a good teamwork. Specifically, there must be active cooperation from top to bottom.

It was only natural, therefore, that during the development of a more streamlined, flexible organization, we gave equal attention to the concepts that govern our operations.

FOUR BASIC ORGANIZATION CONCEPTS

Sound principles of business conduct have always guided RCA's management, but until recently they had never been available in a formal statement of policy.

Now, these concepts are a fundamental part of our plan of organization. We are publishing them in booklet form, and they will soon be in the hands of all of our management personnel. Copies are also available here, and will be distributed later today.

We call them the four basic organization concepts of RCA, and their observance is a required duty of every RCA executive. They are:

The RCA concept of management development

In accordance with sound principles of organization and good management and to insure competent executives for the future of the Radio Corporation of America, every individual in a management position has the duty and responsibility to:

1. Develop a suitable successor.
2. Develop and administer a sound organization staffed with able personnel to perform the functions of his organization.
3. Develop and train managerial replacements at all levels in his organization.

A principal mark of successful executive is his demonstrated ability to select and train promotable subordinates.

The RCA concept of channels of contact and communication

The organization structure and the organization chart define lines of responsibility and authority, but do not indicate channels of contact.

The RCA organization permits and requires the exercise of common sense and good judgment, at all organizational levels, in determining the best channels of contact necessary for the expeditious handling of the work.

Contact between units of the organization should be carried out in the most direct way.

In making such contacts, however, it is the duty of each member of the organization to keep his senior informed on:

1. Any matters on which his senior may be held accountable by those senior to him.
2. Any matters in disagreement or likely to cause controversy within or between any units of the corporation.
3. Matters requiring advice by the senior or his coordination with other units.
4. Any matters involving recommendations for change in, or variance from, established policies.

RCA could not operate without freedom of decision at many key action points down the line, yet those who carry senior responsibility must be kept in a position to exercise the direction and control for which they are held accountable. It is the job of everyone to make good use of channels of contact and communication in making this concept work throughout RCA.

The RCA concept of line and staff teamwork

From top to bottom of RCA and across all of its activities, teamwork between line and staff—in the sense of distinguishing between major functions rather than as referring to chain of command—is vital to successful conduct of the business.

Line management includes all those, from the chairman and the President down, who exercise significant operating control over one or more of the three basic things RCA does: Develop, produce, and sell profit-making goods and services. Because it carries direct profit responsibility, line management runs RCA.

All other executives serve in staff capacities. They work for line management. Their principal job is to help line management develop, produce, and sell new or improved goods and services better and more profitably. To that end, they inform and advise line management on a variety of topics—such as market research or budget administration—involving specialized knowledge. They perform similar functions requiring specialized skills. They prescribe, guide, audit, and evaluate the manner in which their specialties are carried on throughout RCA. While some of their work contributes to RCA's profitability, they bear no direct responsibility for it.

It is the duty of every line executive to use staff services to best advantage in planning, directing, controlling, and improving his operations.

It is the duty of every staff executive to safeguard the interests of his superior line executive by giving him the facts on performance in his area, to identify opportunities for operational improvement and to propose means for exploiting them, to help line executives attain the results expected of them and to supply information requested by staff or line executives at levels above him.

The creation and maintenance of productive teamwork between staff and line at all levels are major and continuing responsibilities of every RCA executive.

The RCA concept of basic executive responsibilities

In doing the work which is his contribution to the corporation's successful operation, every RCA executive is expected and required to promote the interests of RCA and to carry on his activities within the framework of corporation-wide policy and procedure. This requires every executive to assume, in addition to the specific duties of his post, the following basic executive responsibilities:

Prepare as appropriate, and submit for approval, long- and short-range objectives, policies, and plans for programs and organizational arrangements aimed at producing the most profitable results attainable from his assigned area.

Interpret approved policies and plans to his organization and direct its day-to-day operations so as to attain established objectives in accordance therewith.

Submit budgets realistically reflecting the anticipated income and/or expenditures of his activity and conduct his activity within approved budgets.

Staff his organization with capable people, train subordinates in the competent performance of their duties, develop suitable replacements at all levels and provide a successor for himself. Require and appraise performance and report results fully to his senior; detect the need for and propose such modifications in plans and departures from established ways of doing things as are necessary to produce satisfactory results.

Keep abreast of developments of all kinds affecting his product, service, or area of specialization and make such use of them as may properly be turned to RCA's benefit.

Cooperate actively with his associates, both line and staff, for the attainment of RCA's overall objectives.

An executive's success in RCA largely depends on his ability to bend his talents and his efforts to the advancement of the corporation's broad interests as much as to the advancements of his own immediate concerns.

With these organizational concepts, I believe you will agree, RCA has a very solid foundation for good executive performance, excellent teamwork, and profitable operations.

RIGHT MAN FOR RIGHT JOB

Before concluding, I should like to go back for a moment to our concept of management development. It quite rightly is ranked first. For, if we are going to continue to advance as a profitable business organization, we must make certain that we always have available qualified executives to man our organization.

Briefly, we must have the right man for the right job at the right time.

This is no small task, for we have approximately 4,500 supervisors, managers, and executives.

To accomplish it, we have established a management development program covering management personnel at all levels and in all locations. Its three principal objectives are:

1. Continuous evaluation of executive and specialized personnel.
2. Planned individual development of promotable management personnel.
3. Systematic selection of properly qualified candidates for position openings.

UNIFORM TECHNIQUES AND PROCEDURES

For operating this program, we have a small central staff, as well as skilled personnel attached to each of our operating units.

Basic techniques and procedures, established through research and experience, are used uniformly throughout RCA. They let us determine, through factual, objective appraisals, the areas of needed improvement in management personnel.

To me, it is most heartening and encouraging to know how rapidly and expertly modern business is advancing in the handling of human, as well as technical problems. Through such progress, American business and industry will continue to lead the world.

I congratulate you upon the opportunity you have to contribute to this leadership.

If you have any questions, I shall be happy to try to answer them.

Thank you.

Farm Price Supporters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 18, 1954

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a resolution from the Linn County Farmers Union convention, dated April 10, 1954, with reference to price supports.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas Congress is debating the issue of farm-price supports, and in a great number of instances is offering separate bills which fail to cover the entire problem of farm-price supports; and

Whereas the Secretary of Agriculture, in carrying out the administration's plans, is greatly reducing the parity income of farmers; and

Whereas there is an urgent need for Congress to consider farm legislation to uphold the purchasing power of agriculture, and at the same time assure the abundance of food and fiber for all consumers; and

Whereas the National Farmers Union has proposed a 10-point program fulfilling these objectives in the following order, namely—

1. Extension of mandatory supports at a minimum of 90 percent of parity for the basics—wheat, cotton, corn, peanuts, rice, tobacco—and tung nuts and honey.
2. Mandatory supports at the feed value equivalent ratio to corn for rye, oats, barley, grain sorghums, cottonseed, soybeans, flaxseed, and other storables.
3. Mandatory supports at a minimum of 90 percent of parity for milk and butterfat, beef cattle, calves, and wool.
4. A food-allotment program to enable the unemployed, elder citizens, relief recipients, and other low-income consumers to obtain good nutrition diets.
5. A farm trading post and international food reserve to expand exports of abundant farm production so as to relieve famine, promote economic development, and promote the quest for permanent world peace.
6. An adequate safety reserve of food and fiber for the United States.
7. Extend marketing orders and agreements to more fruits and vegetables.
8. A loan program for improved marketing facilities.
9. Renewal and extension of the agricultural-conservation program.
10. A program of incentive payments to farmers for conservation practices on land taken out of production under acreage allotments and marketing quotas.

Therefore, we the members of the Linn County Farmers Union do urge that our Congressmen consider forthcoming legislation in the light of the above objectives; and we further

Resolve, That a copy of this resolution be sent to each Oregon Congressman, Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Benson, and members of the House and Senate Agriculture Committees, and to the State and National Farmer Union offices.

Presented by Dave Boshart for the county legislative committee of the Farmers Union.

Passed unanimously April 10, 1954.

Jerome J. Keating on H. R. 8648

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 13, 1954

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, with unanimous consent of the House, below are cited two items, one, a letter from Mr. Jerome J. Keating, vice president of the National Association of Letter Carriers, and second, the Postal Bulletin of Tuesday, May 4, 1954. Both items concern H. R. 8648, and the attitude of the national association thereon. Because both items concern the welfare of over 100,000 Federal employees, they are listed at this point in the RECORD. I trust action taken will result in the complete satisfaction of these workers in our Federal Government.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF LETTER CARRIERS,
Washington, D. C., May 17, 1954.

Hon. ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SIEMINSKI: The postal employees, as you well know, have been seeking a pay increase, and I believe we have established the justice of our cause. The Postmaster General has countered with a proposal which is found in the Rees bill, H. R. 8648, generally referred to as a reclassification bill. We do not believe that this bill is strictly a reclassification bill in that it will destroy procedures that have been effective in the postal service for the past 70 or 80 years, and would substitute a proposal wherein Congress would turn complete authority over personal matters to the Postmaster General.

In a recent issue of the Postal Bulletin, an official publication of the Post Office Department, the Postmaster General set forth his arguments for the reclassification bill. A copy of this statement was sent to all Members of the Congress recently by an organization whose members stand to benefit substantially from the passage of H. R. 8648, even though the rank-and-file employees do not stand to benefit.

For your complete information, we have reprinted the statement of the Postmaster General, but we have supplemented it with additional facts that will permit you to draw a fairer conclusion.

H. R. 8648 is vigorously opposed by the 100,000 members of our organization and by at least 90 percent of all other employees in the postal field service. The bill would destroy many of the benefits that we have secured from Congress in the last 50 years, and we urge you to oppose it vigorously and to support our cause for a proper pay increase.

Sincerely,

JEROME J. KEATING,
Vice President.

THE COMPLETE FACTS ON H. R. 8648

In the Postal Bulletin of May 4, the Postmaster General once again used an official publication to advance the cause of his postal salary plan.

In order that our members will be properly informed we are reprinting the statement of the Postmaster General, together with supplemental information that will give a complete understanding of the Fry-Summerfield-Rees plan.

The quotations from the bill, from the Fry report, and our own comments, are printed.

"[From the Postal Bulletin of May 4, 1954]

"POSTAL SALARY PLAN

"Letters to the Postmaster General from employees indicate they have received an extraordinary amount of misleading and confusing information concerning the postal salary plan recommended by the Post Office Department. Such misleading rumors from unofficial sources injure morale and have an adverse effect on service given to the public. Therefore, it is important that all employees receive an explanation with regard to some of the more prevalent misunderstandings. There follow examples of these misleading rumors and the Department's official explanation:

"The rumor: The plan would remove the Post Office Department from control by Congress by giving the Postmaster General unlimited authority to change salaries of employees.

"The facts: The legislation proposed to implement the salary plan would require the Postmaster General to see that all postal jobs are fairly graded by a job evaluation system on the basis of their actual duties and responsibilities. Such a requirement would restrict the Postmaster General more than under the present law, since it is possible under this law to change an employee's pay by simply changing his title without regard to the work the employee performs. The proposed new plan would delegate, with proper stipulated controls, the responsibility for salary administration, as it has been delegated for many years to other agencies and departments of the Federal Government. Congress would—and should—retain complete control over salary schedules."

THE COMPLETE FACTS

H. R. 8648, the Summerfield-Rees bill, reads:

"*Title III—Classification of positions and Preparation of Standards*

"Classification of Positions

"SEC. 301. The Postmaster General shall place each position in its appropriate grade in conformance with standards established by him under section 302. The basis for determining the grade in which each position shall be placed shall be the level of difficulty, responsibility, and qualification requirements of the work of such position. Whenever the facts warrant, the Postmaster General may change any position which he has placed in a grade under this section from such grade to another grade. Actions of the Postmaster General under this section shall be the bases for the payment of compensation and for personnel transactions.

"Preparation of Standards

"SEC. 302. (a) The Postmaster General shall prepare standards for placing positions in their appropriate grades. In such standards the Postmaster General shall (1) define the various positions that exist in the postal field service in terms of duties and responsibilities; (2) establish qualification requirements for all entrance positions; (3) establish the official position titles; and (4) identify the grades in which such positions are placed. Such standards shall be available for inspection by employees.

"(b) The Postmaster General shall keep such standards up to date. From time to time he may revise, supplement, or abolish existing standards, or prepare new standards, so that, as nearly as may be practicable, positions existing at any given time within the postal field service will be covered by current standards."

The grant of power to the Postmaster General under H. R. 8648 is absolutely complete. Under the Classification Act of 1949, which covers Federal employees, the Civil Service Commission, a bi-partisan agency, has the authority to supervise, inspect and revise the classification structure. Even under this system, with such a protective feature, there are many instances of downgrading by merely changing the written description of the job. Downgrading occurs in individual instances and also in many instances where groups are involved. The enclosed reprint describes a case of downgrading on a fairly large scale. Congress would retain supervision and control of salaries under H. R. 8648 only in that they set the minimums and maximums. The lowest salary grade is $2,750 and the maximum grade is $14,800.

"The rumor: The plan would result in general downgrading of jobs and lowering of entrance salaries in the future.

"The facts: The proposed pay plan would upgrade thousands of jobs, including about 20 percent of the clerks (about 40,000 employees). A small number of routine jobs when entered by new employees would have lower pay ranges than at present, but no present employee would have his pay reduced as a result of the proposed plan. One of the most important features of the proposed plan is to increase starting salaries—by $210 a year for most jobs, by $510 or more for many others."

THE COMPLETE FACTS

H. R. 8648, the Summerfield-Rees bill, provides that nothing in the act shall be deemed to reduce the per annum or hourly pay, but the bill gives the Department the authority to reduce employees' pay the following week if they desire. The now-you-have-it-now-you-don't clause of the bill reads as follows:

"*Prohibition on reduction of former salary rates*

"SEC. 404. Nothing in this act shall be deemed to reduce the per annum or hourly rate of basic compensation of any employee on the rolls on the effective date of this act to an amount less than his rate of basic salary immediately prior to such date, so long as such employee is assigned to perform and does perform work of the same level of difficulty, responsibility, and qualification requirements as the work which he was performing immediately prior to such date.

"The rumor: Supervisory examinations taken by nearly 50,000 employees would be disregarded and supervisory positions filled with persons outside the postal service.

"The facts: Results of the supervisory examinations compiled by the Civil Service Commission already have been forwarded to postmasters with specific instructions for their use in making promotions. This action confirms the intention of the Postmaster General to fill post office supervisory positions from employees of the postal service on a merit basis with due consideration for length of service. Promotions already are being made in many offices from the supervisory examination registers. This action refutes completely the false rumor."

THE COMPLETE FACTS

On page 4 of the Fry report we read the following:

"*Inequities of present promotion system*

"The Postal Pay Act, by providing fixed service requirements for those eligible to promotion to supervisory positions (7 years as clerk or carrier in first- and second-class post offices, 7 years as clerk in the postal transportation service, except for the requirement of 9 years as clerk in class B railway and highway post-office runs) has restricted the lateral entry of qualified personnel into supervisory positions in the postal field service.

"Although it is traditional in the postal service for supervisory positions to be filled by employees advancing up through the ranks, there should be no arbitrary barriers to prevent these positions being filled if necessary by qualified personnel who have gained the necessary experience outside of the postal service."

H. R. 8648, the Fry-Summerfield bill, contains the following provision:

"(b) In the discretion of the Postmaster General, any individual who has been employed in a civilian capacity in any branch of the Government may be appointed to that step in the appropriate grade of the postal field service schedule which is less than one full step above the highest rate of basic compensation which he received from the United States."

Chairman Philip Young, of the Civil Service Commission, testifying before the Post Office and Civil Service Committee in the House of Representatives, stated that the Post Office Department should be permitted to recruit employees at all grades, not only at the entrance grade.

"The rumor: The proposed salary plan would remove the protection of civil service and veterans' preference laws from postal employees.

"The facts: The legislation to implement the salary plan specifically states (sec. 1009 of H. R. 8648) that postal employees shall continue to be covered by the Civil Service Act and rules and by the Veterans' Preference Act. Thus, the career nature of jobs in the Post Office Department would receive additional emphasis."

THE COMPLETE FACTS

The total lack of appeal rights from the reclassification decisions of the Postmaster General, plus lateral entry, plus the repeal of many other provisions, would definitely weaken civil service.

"The rumor: Lower caliber of employees would enter the postal service as a result of the plan.

"The facts: The salary plan would help to attract an improved caliber of employees by increasing nearly all entrance salary rates, by increasing most maximum rates, by creating opportunities for promotion, and by reducing by 2 years the time required to reach the top of the pay grade for most employees. In further efforts to make a postal career more attractive and to increase job security, the Department supported a bill recently passed by the United States Senate, repealing the Whitten amendment."

THE COMPLETE FACTS

The automatic pay increase would be no more. Increases will depend upon administrative whim under the following provision of H. R. 8648:

"(2) That his current performance is satisfactory under standards established by the Postmaster General."

The substitute ratio is eliminated by the following provision of H. R. 8648:

"Substitute employment

"Sec. 706. (a) The Postmaster General shall establish the conditions under which substitute positions may be established."

"The rumor: The salary plan would fail to provide adequate increases.

"The facts: The salary plan was not intended to be a general increase but to establish a sound pay structure based on the principle of equal pay for equal work. Nevertheless, the plan would provide a salary scale comparing favorably with the pay for similar work in American industry. It would result in salary adjustments for more than 400,000 of the 500,000 postal employees and would provide additional benefits on a long-term basis. The largest groups of postal employees would receive an adjustment of $100 a year on the effective date of the plan. Smaller increases which have been mentioned represent merely adjustments designed to bring the employee's present salary on a step rate of the new pay range. These adjustments would not interfere with the employee's scheduled automatic increases, which in the great majority of cases would be larger under the plan than they are at present.

"The rumor: Certain postmasters would receive $5,000 increases.

"The facts: No employees would receive $5,000 increases. The postmasters of the largest cities, such as New York and Chicago, could receive a maximum increase of $1,030 a year. Those who would receive adjustments larger than these are career employees in subordinate positions which have been for years recognized as being severely underpaid."

THE COMPLETE FACTS

The table at bottom of page is taken from the Fry report. Grade 19 is held down by the $14,800 ceiling. However, there is no change in grade 16, under which the maximum increase is $5,005.

"The proposed salary plan is regarded as one of the most important steps necessary to bring about a proper relationship between the pay of employees doing many different kinds of work. The plan is intended to correct many inequities which have grown up over the years and to provide opportunities for advancement and greater earnings. Such a program has been recommended repeatedly as essential for sound personnel administration by Commissions and committees of the Congress which have investigated postal field-service problems. The Department believes that all employees are entitled to a complete explanation of such an important proposal affecting them, that they are interested in such proposals and that they should be permitted to reach their own conclusions as to the merits of the plan after receiving full official information."

We believe that a properly conducted study is in order and we subscribe fully to the following statement by A. H. Clemens, Ph. D., in his analysis of the Fry plan.

"The report, as it now stands, falls short of an adequate sampling technique and abounds in comparisons of incomparable data. It evidences a clear preference (which is the opposite of being scientific) in emphasizing repeatedly the very real need of supervisors for salary increases while it labors strenuously to prove that nonsupervisory employees require little salary increases. Furthermore, it remains silent on equally important considerations and comparisons such as:

"(a) Postal wages to per capita national income.

"(b) Postal wages to per capita personal income.

"(c) Postal wages to per capita personal expenditures.

"(d) Postal wages to postal productivity.

"(e) Postal wages to the rising standard of living of the Nation as a whole.

"This silence may be due to the Post Office Department's request that postal wages be related only to cost of living, a most unscientific approach to the complexities of the wage problem. Again, the report emphasizes the technical aspects of wages and job classes, but almost entirely ignores the human relations aspects. It ignores completely the policy of advanced industrial personnel systems, the policy of consultation with employees about matters of intimate concern to them. In so doing, it posts a retrogressive industrial relations policy for private industry to imitate and copy.

"Finally, the inadequacies of this study, the unilateral and non-human approach to the problem, have already effected an extremely deep-seated and widespread resentment not far from antagonism amongst the rank and file of the employees."

Proposed title	Present title	Proposed pay grade	Present pay range	Proposed pay range	Increase	
					Minimum	Maximum
Superintendent, finance, Chicago post office	Superintendent	11	$6,470	$6,700-$8,020	$230	$1,550
District superintendent, PTS	District superintendent	12	6,770	7,430- 8,900	660	2,130
General superintendent, buildings, Philadelphia post office	General superintendent	12	6,970	7,430- 8,900	460	1,930
Postmaster, Silver Spring, Md.	Postmaster	13	7,370	8,250- 9,900	880	2,530
Station superintendent, Chicago (old post office)	Station superintendent	13	6,470	8,250- 9,900	1,780	3,430
Director, finance, Chicago post office	General superintendent of finance	14	7,470	9,160-10,990	1,690	3,520
Postmaster, Wichita post office	Postmaster	15	9,770	10,170-12,210	400	2,440
General superintendent, PTS division, Cincinnati	General superintendent, PTS division	16	8,470	11,225-13,475	2,755	5,005
Postmaster, Chicago post office	Postmaster	19	13,770	15,770-18,920	2,000	5,150

The Progress of the Negro in the Past Half Century

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 18, 1954

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, in this present era, with the United States under continuous, bombastic, psychological attack by her enemies to the effect that she does not adhere to the principles of freedom that she advocates, and in answer to these assertions, I take pleasure in introducing an article which appeared in the Christian Science Monitor on May 6, 1954, entitled "The Harlem Nobody Knows," written by Alex Haley.

Author Haley's writing adroitly sums up the advance that has been made in this great Nation of ours toward eliminating racial inequality, and his comments are a direct answer to communistic allegations that enslavement exists right here in our own back yard.

The article is as follows:

THE HARLEM NOBODY KNOWS

(By Alex Haley, a Negro resident in Harlem, currently serving in the U. S. Coast Guard)

Harlem, that roughly triangular 6-square-mile section of New York City where lives the largest concentration of Negroes in the world—375,000—is pointed to by critics as a sinkhole of United States capitalism. Foreign diplomats and businessmen freely report that the greatest obstacle to friendship between America and the colored races who comprise two-thirds of the world's population is discrimination against the American Negro, seemingly typified by this overcrowded, dilapidated area.

These critics of our democracy would do well to take a closer look at the Negroes of Harlem today. Probably no community on earth has come so far so fast.

In this area where hardly a Negro owned property at the turn of this century, the collective Negro assessment today approaches $300 million. One bank with four branches in Harlem reports $20.7 million in checking and savings accounts. The postmaster of New York reports $72 million in postal savings in the entire city, $12 million of it in Harlem.

Said an old pharmacist who moved to Harlem in 1905, "All we owned were our barbershops and beauty parlors and a few restaurants." Today his drugstore is one of 4,300 businesses which Negroes operate in Harlem. Elsewhere in New York City they own 2,200 more.

Three years ago a radio station conducted a survey for its advertisers. Income of the average Harlem family has tripled since 1940, it informed them. This community, as an annual market, represents a billion dollars.

Before 1900, most of the Negroes in New York City were settled in a squalid colony in the middle fifties. Then a Negro realtor, Philip A. Payton, persuaded several Harlem landlords to fill their vacancies with Negro tenants. A trickle of migration soon became a tide.

From the first, the new community was in economic trouble. At least half its population was unemployed. Having nothing but the labor of their unskilled hands to sell, they suffered from poverty and discrimination. In one city count of 9,561 apprentices in the trades, only 56 were Negroes. Thousands of families managed to escape the public dole only because Harlem's women found jobs as laundresses or household servants.

AREA FELT WAR'S IMPACT

Manpower shortages created by World War I gave the new community a start. Hiring taboos relaxed, and soon Negroes worked in more than 300 occupations. Both the Government and industry sent representatives into the southern States to recruit laborers. Harlem absorbed more than 100,000 southern Negroes, lured by glittering opportunity; 25,000 others came from the British West Indies.

From churches came the first sign of a financial build-up. Abyssinian Baptist marketed its property in midtown and built in Harlem at a cost of $350,000. St. Philip's Protestant Episcopal sold holdings near the site of Pennsylvania Station and hired a Negro architect to design its present brick church and parish house. Soon afterward it paid nearly all cash for a row of 13 apartment houses that it yet controls.

Hundreds of individual Harlemites capitalized on steady wages and a buyers' market to make down payments on homes. Hundreds more invested in small businesses. Spectacularly, "Pigfoot Mary" Dean, a popular Lenox Avenue vendor of pig's feet, fried chicken, and hot corn, bought for $42,000 a 5-story apartment building. In one year the number of licensed Negro realtors in the city rose from 3 to 31.

But for the most part the efforts of Negroes to set down tap roots in the city went unnoticed by the general public. Harlem was gaining it prominence, instead, as a Mecca of Jazz. By the height of the "Roaring Twenties," its cabarets and dance halls swarmed with revelers nightly.

In this manner Harlem met the depression. Few communities were so hard hit. Night life had supported flourishing businesses, provided an aura of intraracial camaradie—and suddenly both were gone. And from the war-inflated payrolls, Negroes were the first to be fired—by the thousands.

The race riots of this era made headlines around the world. But little notice was taken when the same forces—racial pride and the desperate flight for survival—were subsequently channeled in more disciplined ways to shape Harlem's future.

For example, consider the Harlem Businessmen's Club which was organized in 1931. One of the first acts was to circularize the slogan, "Don't Buy Where You Can't Work." Negro employees above the level of porter were rare in Harlem retail stores. Then the Amsterdam News, Harlem's largest newspaper, threw its power into the campaign. The slogan produced roughly the effect of a picket line; in a few months Negro clerical and sales help were more common.

The New York Urban League prevailed upon officials of government, unions, and private industry to widen the variety of jobs opened to Negroes. Simultaneously it urged Negroes to develop new talents and skills, and it has never relaxed its campaign.

In 1953 a spokesman for the powerful New York State Commission Against Discrimination said, "There is still not a job for every Negro, but more doors have been opened than there are Negroes qualified to enter."

For those who are qualified, and for countless others willing to qualify, these doors lead to gratifying successes.

Amie Associates, Inc., is a family enterprise begun in 1944 by brothers William, Errol, and Cyril Jones. With $1,600 and some electronics equipment, they hired a loft and solicited Government contracts. By V–J Day they had hired 75 technicians and grossed $200,000 for the design and manufacture of electronics devices for the Navy and Signal Corps and for subcontracts from Bell Telephone and Western Electric.

Now Amie Associates, Inc., is making equipment for the Army and Robinson Aviation, in addition to servicing television sets exclusively throughout the city.

In 1938 Jimmie Adams got a job as shipping clerk in a downtown camera store; in 1951 he became its manager. This year Mr. Adams and two friends raised $20,000 and opened Uptown Camera Exchange on 125th Street.

WOMEN FORGE AHEAD

Roy Mills moved from a Yonkers dairy to portering for a sportswear firm. Today he is its national distribution manager and also has a Harlem cleaning business.

Lou Borders arrived in New York in 1931 with 30 cents. He pressed clothes, studied at night, and became the fourth Negro to join the Amalgamated Clothing Workers Union. In 1937 his local elected him treasurer; in 1942, president. Five years ago he bought a failing Harlem haberdashery business which is now worth $150,000.

Harlem women, too, are forging ahead as dramatically as the men.

Barbara Watson, daughter of a municipal court judge, heads a downtown New York agency of nearly 200 Negro models serving accounts for nationally advertised products.

Louise Varona, a Hunter College graduate, took over her father's restaurant supply house when he went into bankruptcy. She resumed business on a shoestring, paid off creditors, and today has 7 employees and 2 trucks, with customers in the Bronx, Brooklyn, and Manhattan. Last year her firm grossed $140,000.

Olivia Stanford, a YWCA executive, and Rose Morgan, a hair stylist, in 1943 pooled $7,000 savings. They leased a 5-story Harlem brownstone, and after 4 months of renovation and publicity put "Rose-Meta, House of Beauty" into landslide business. Today there is a second, larger salon on 125th Street with branches in Brooklyn and Long Island. A total of 302 Rose-Meta personnel earn from $55 to $200 weekly.

Two blocks west of Rose-Meta on 125th Street is the Carver Federal Savings & Loan Association, an enterprise that many residents of the community view with a proud and proprietary air.

NEGRO BANK ESTABLISHED

At the end of World War II, a group of Harlem business and professional people set out to establish the first Negro bank in New York State. For several years they visited homes, churches, and civic assemblies, explaining the project and what it would mean for Harlem. Then they solicited pledges of deposit. Within 3 months after the bank opened in 1948, its tellers took in $200,000.

Last December the Carver bank marked its fifth anniversary, with savings accounts totaling $3 million. The past Christmas it distributed $200,000 in Yule Club checks, double the amount of 1952.

A special 1953 survey reveals that 8 percent of Harlem families have incomes about $5,000 a year; 24 percent of American families in general earn this much. In Harlem 15 percent earn $1,500 or less, about paralleling the national average. But more than 60 percent of Harlem families have reached the $2,000-to-$5,000 level; nationwide, only 48 percent are in this bracket.

Harlem's appalling housing conditions have been shouted about in sensational exposés. During World War II one of Harlem's blocks was found actually accommodating 3,781 people. At this density the population of the United States could live in one-half the acreage of Greater New York City.

Slowly, however, the situation was improving. Since Harlem River Houses was completed in 1937, a total of eight Federal, State, and city projects have been occupied or are under construction. Altogether they represent 12,859 apartments.

Riverton, Metropolitan Life Insurance Co.'s private development, raised the number to 14,127.

GUIDANCE CENTER

At this writing, private investors have city authorization and Federal Housing Authority aid to clear 24 slum acres and build 2 projects, "Harlem" and "North Harlem," to contain approximately 1,100 apartments each. These will cost nearly $30 million and will raise to more than 14,000 the number of Harlem families able to move into new homes in the space of 20 years.

It is safe to forecast that many of the social corrosions which plague Harlem will dwindle with its congestion, which tends to nurture them. Gangs, delinquency, and addiction already are under the steady attack of a wealth of guidance and corrective agencies.

Exemplary among these, and one of the largest, is Manhattanville Neighborhood Center, Inc., which functions in a teeming, multiracial area of West Harlem between 122d and 135th Streets. (Of the 436,000 people in Harlem, 61,000 are non-Negroes.)

In the center headquarters on 126th Street, 51 professional and student social workers conduct adult and youth forums, supervise athletics and recreation, and teach arts, crafts, and dramatics. About 10,000 families are in the area served by this aggressive agency, whose chairman of the board of directors is Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick.

Public schools continue the pattern of progress for Harlem, whose ratio of slum background is only one of many staggering problems. A school at Fifth Avenue and 130th Street (Public School No. 133), for instance, serves an area of so many pupils that classes must be held in shifts.

"READY TO BE COMPARED"

Yet it manages the distinction of being among the top five elementary schools in the city. (Relief is in sight: the New York City capital budget for 1954 provides for the building of a new school 6 blocks away at a total estimated cost of $2,730,000.) Overall, more Harlem youths are enrolled in high schools throughout the city than at any point in history. And 10 times as many as in 1940 are in college.

Harlem now contains nearly 400 churches, including missions, whose total replacement value has been estimated at $21 million. Their role remains the same—a bedrock and potently progressive force. Commented a young attorney: "Once our churches prepared you to die; now, they help you to live."

Julius J. Adams is the executive editor of Harlem's oldest newspaper, the New York Age. "Man for man, as a community, we are ready to be compared with other communities," he said. "What we need is a crusade of public relations. Harlem's biggest trouble now is that in too many minds the Negro remains a stereotype."

But minds are changing, fast. On New Year's Day 1954, Hulan Edwin Jack, a Harlem Negro, was sworn into office as president of New York City's Borough of Manhattan—the center of metropolitan business and industry, the richest island in the world. In a cornucopia of races, where Negroes are outnumbered 5 to 1, this man, who already had risen from stock boy to vice president of a manufacturing firm, was elected with the votes of 215,000 of his fellow citizens.

It happened in New York City, in America, in 50 years.

An Emperor Comes to America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 13, 1954

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, in anticipation of the visit this month to this country of the Emperor of Ethiopia, I desire to call the attention of our colleagues to the following article which appeared in the May 16, 1954, issue of the magazine This Week.

The world should remember that if the free countries of the world had come to the aid of Ethiopia when her sovereignty was endangered by the invasion of a dictator, the League of Nations might have survived and World War II might have been prevented.

That should be a good object lesson today. The United Nations will not survive unless the free countries that make up the United Nations will stand as one against all totalitarians in their attempts to subjugate the world. If we do not implement the United Nations with a police force which will prevent aggressions in Korea and in Indochina, and wherever else they may occur, the United Nations cannot survive and civilization will perish.

In 1936 Haile Selassie I of Ethiopia Was a Lonely Hero in an International Tragedy—This Month, He Makes His First Visit to the United States, Still Dedicated to His Life's Task, Ushering His African Domain Into the 20th Century

(By Curtis Lubinski)

Haile Selassie I, Emperor of Ethiopia, is paying his first visit to America this month. He will be an overnight guest in the Executive Mansion, as is customary for visiting heads of state. For the remainder of his 3-day stay in Washington he will reside at Blair House, across Pennsylvania Avenue. He will then proceed on a tour of the United States.

His visit comes at a time when his 3,000-year-old nation is breaking out of an isolation forced on it by its geography and history. One important indication has been Ethiopia's participation in the Geneva Conference, as one of the countries that contributed to the U. N. forces in Korea.

Another is the new economic treaty between the United States and Ethiopia, which went into effect in October 1953. And about 1 year before, the former Italian colony of Eritrea became, under U. N. auspices, a part of Ethiopia, giving Haile Selassie's landlocked domain Red Sea ports and a chance to regain its former maritime power. These ports may play an important role in the future of the Middle East, for through them Ethiopia can now export grain raised in a fertile, three-crop-a-year region that could eventually rival the Ukraine or the American wheat areas.

UNLIKE HIS CARICATURES

As Haile Selassie makes his way about on his tour of the Nation, many Americans will expect to see him as cartoonists have perpetuated him—a bearded man in a pith helmet and enormous sunglasses, with a short droopy cape below which protrude tight white ankle-length pants, the Ethiopian version of jodhpurs, and bare feet.

But this was the Haile Selassie prior to 1930 and at that largely a figment of artistic imagination. For many years since he has favored a British-style field marshal's uniform, adorned with golden epaulets and many rows of ribbons, and impeccably pressed trousers above shiny brown army-style shoes. This is undoubtedly how he will appear on his visit.

Though only 5 feet 4 inches tall, slender, almost frail, weighing only about 100 pounds, Haile Selassie will look every inch an emperor. His ink-black beard will show no trace of gray, despite his 62 years. His face will have its characteristic expression—a singular mixture of melancholic sadness and cold determination. He has a way of scrutinizing new acquaintances with a penetrating flash of his eyes which denotes an alert diplomat and statesman.

A RULER'S TRAINING

This is what he was brought up to be. His father, Ras Makonnen, cousin to Emperor Menelik II and his favorite adviser, very early recognized the gifts of young Tafari—this being Haile Selassie's original Christian name. At the age of 18, after an education by European private tutors, Tafari was appointed governor of the Province of Sidamo. This post was followed by positions of increasing importance in the provinces of Harar, Muleta, and Salale. He absented himself, however, from Salale to complete his studies at a French school in the Ethiopian capital, Addis Ababa.

His later character was shaped in these days by adverse circumstances accompanying his career. His father, heir presumptive to the imperial throne, passed away when Tafari still was a boy of 15. His guardian, Ras Tassama, died of poison, as have so many political figures in Ethiopian history. For centuries poison has played such an appalling role that it gave rise to a singular custom: a servant will present a drink to his master only after having sampled it in his presence. It took me some time to get used to seeing my own domestics go through this precautionary routine when I was in Ethiopia.

THE CONQUERING MIND

Something almost as bad as poison was in store for young Tafari. Another prince 4 years his junior, Lidj Yassu, was chosen to be Emperor. He was the exact opposite of the scholarly Tafari—that is, an athletic and handsome extrovert.

But Tafari learned the lesson that a strong mind is stronger than any physical strength. He watched all movies which could serve to disqualify Lidj Yassu as the ruler of Africa's ancient Christian Empire. Tafari was aided by the fact that Lidj Yassu favored Mohammedanism and polygamy. Finally, when in 1916 Lidj Yassu sided with the Germans and the Turks, Tafari found the ready support of the Allies. He defeated his adversary's followers with great slaughter at Sagalle on October 27, 1916, and emerged as "Ras Tafari Makonnen, Heir to the Imperial Throne, and Regent" at the side of Empress Zauditu, Menelik II's daughter. Lidj Yassu was captured and interned for life. Immured with princely honors, yet in chains, he died at the town of Harar in 1935.

There was no letdown in the difficulties which confronted Ras Tafari. The Allies had put him at the helm of the government. Travels in the Middle East and Europe widened his horizon. But the Empress Zauditu, who had never had anything comparable to a Western education, was the rallying point of reaction. Each time I saw Ras Tafari in the company of this 200-pound Majesty, she was surrounded by a fantastic medieval retinue of warriors wearing curved swords, spears, and shields of buffalo skin. When the situation became unbearable, Ras Tafari found his way out in a coup d'etat which ended with his being proclaimed king and all power resting in his hands, though the Empress retained nominal power.

But eventually, her husband led a plot against the Negus Tafari. March 1930, saw a full-scale battle at Zebit between the comparatively well organized troops of Tafari and an army of 10,000 men of the prince consort whose antiquated ideas of warfare, supported by one lone cannon, were of no avail. He fell in action. Zauditu died of heart failure when she received the news of his death, on April 3, 1930.

PLAYFUL ROYAL LIONS

Tafari Makonnen, victorious, was crowned His Imperial Majesty Haile Selassie I on November 2, 1930, with the ancient title "Elect of God, King of Kings, King of Zion, Conquering Lion of the Tribe of Judah, Branch of the Tree of Solomon, and Implement of the Holy Trinity."

Into this title the entire distinguished Biblical past of Ethiopia is condensed. Today, it is still the privilege of royalty in Ethiopia to keep lions as the symbol of rank. This custom led to an unforgettable incident on the occasion of one of my visits to the Royal residence. When my wife and I were passing through the front garden, we met a keeper who was promenading two of the lions in dog-fashion on a leash.

The comparatively young animals looked very playful. Indeed they were. In fact, they showed so little regard for the evening dress of my wife that they tried their claws on it. In no time its train was in shreds, and there was some explaining to do when we finally stood before the monarch.

The great test of Haile Selassie's strength of character, of his perseverance, of his faith in humanity, came when Mussolini's troops invaded Ethiopia in 1935. Haile Selassie was the first victim of totalitarian aggression. And overnight he became the hero of a drama watched by the entire world.

MR. TAFARI IN EXILE

As simple Mr. Tafari, now wearing the familiar bowler, the exiled monarch walked ashore in England. He was the self-appointed representative of his helpless country. Accompanied by a few of his field commanders, witnesses of the tear- and mustard-gas war the Italians had waged against soldiers and civilians alike, he made his historic plea before the League of Nations in its Assembly of June 30, 1936. It was in vain. In November 1938, Britain recognized the Italian King Victor Emmanuel III as the new Emporer of Ethiopia.

Through these blackest of all days, Haile Selassie unrelentingly carried on his counteroffensive with the weapons of the mind he had so well learned to use. He moved into an old gray Georgian house at the English watering place of Bath.

RETURN TO AFRICA

Although he sent his family to the more beneficial climate of Palestine, he himself stubbornly withstood the ordeal of colds which came with the British winter. Sitting close by the fireplace, he diligently studied English. He managed to speak it with a persuasive fluency the day when he hurried back to London after Italy's entry into the war. There was no corridor in Parliament which the little man with the imposing black beard did not explore, presenting the letters of his far-away followers as evidence that they were loyally fighting on.

Recognized as an ally, he boarded a plane to Alexandria. Still wearing his English overcoat and bowler, he entered the men's room of the former Italian Yacht Club. A few minutes later he emerged in a military uniform appropriate for a commander in chief. He and a British liaison officer exchanged a toast over a bottle of Italian wine.

Everything was a matter of days now. In Khartoum the Emperor was greeted by chieftains who kissed the ground at his feet and were the first to renew the oath of allegiance. Others joined them when the imperial plane finally landed hidden by a forest in West Ethopia on January 15, 1941. Today, a new bridge over the Blue Nile commemorates the point of his return. In 4 months the Italian garrison, completely cut off from both Italy and her African colonies, was routed and the triumphant Haile Selassie reentered Addis Ababa in an open army car on May 5, 1941.

A week later, with a sense of history, the Emperor sent a cable to President Roosevelt: "The creed of stupid brutality which uselessly destroyed the liberties of Europe and now seeks to spread its cancerous growth through all lands, has met it first decisive defeat."

As he had promised, he set about reorganizing Ethopia. Education, industrialization, the development of natural resources, trade, commerce, air transport, and a modern defense force were foremost in his program. If a subsequent rise in the general standard of living is the measurement, Ethiopia can be said to be one country that really won a war.

Ironically, the Italian invaders left a substantial contribution behind. A network of highways, numerous factories, electrical plants, barracks and buildings, trucks and private cars survived demolition attempted by their defeated owners.

The first thing Haile Selassie did was to give his country, which is about the size of Texas, Pennsylvania, and New York combined, a centralized government. What this means is reflected in the name "Ethiopia" which is often used interchangeably with the term "Abyssinia," although the latter points at a mere part, the central tableland.

Actually, Haile Selassie began his centralizing efforts back in 1931, when he gave his country a constitution as his free-will grant, with the understanding that the self-governing functions of the bicameral parliament and the universal vote of the male population over 21 would go into full force after general literacy had been attained. At present only landowners may go to the polls.

There are, of course, two sides to this picture. If you talk to educated Ethiopians, they will tell you that the Emperor is steering a wise middle course in favoring progress and simultaneously preserving tradition. Others will argue that Haile Selassie's clever move in becoming the self-styled prime instrument of democratization is designed to consolidate his personal imperial power. Most likely, both interpretations have an element of truth.

TRADITION WITH CHANGE

An example of Haile Selassie's political skill is the way he settled a centuries-old religious feud. Since St. Frumentius, of Phoenicia became their first bishop in A. D. 327, the Abyssinians have been Christians. Frumentius was appointed by the Patriarch of Alexandria, in Egypt, as were his successors, and Ethiopian Christians were ruled by the Egyptian Coptic Church.

Egyptians remained the heads of the Ethiopian Church until 1948. Then Haile Selassie secured from the Patriarch in Alexandria a concession that permitted Ethiopia to select its own archbishop. Again, the Emperor succeeded in reconciling tradition with change. He kept the old ties to the Coptic Church, yet made it a national institution within the borders of Ethiopia.

To his people, Haile Selassie I is just "John Hoy" which is "Your Majesty" in Amharic. Forty-three years ago, he married an Ethiopian princess, Woyzero Menen, who has devotedly shared with him all the trials of his career and borne him 6 children, 3 boys and 3 girls.

His family life has not been spared tragic incidents. Two daughters died, each of them, as it were, the representative of a different world: Lilt Kaluma Work, Princess of the Golden Ink, was given in an unfortunate child marriage to one Ras Gugsha and died, in her teens, in 1930. Five years later her husband turned traitor and sided with Mussolini.

The other daughter, Princess Tsahai, became the first president of the Ethiopian Women's Welfare Work Organization, took courses in nursing and died in the performance of her duties. A Princess Tsahai Memorial Hospital has since been erected in Addis Ababa. Her only surviving sister, Tenegn Work, eldest daughter of the Emperor, has become her successor in social welfare leadership.

RISE OF AN AGE

Ethiopia was so often shaken by internal feuds that public attention turns with a particular eagerness to the relation of the Emperor to his sons. Characteristically, court intrigues tried for a time to alienate the Crown Prince, Asfa Wassan, from his father. Asfa's younger brother, Makonnen, Duke of Harar, a bright man with a quick intellect, is generally regarded as the Emperor's image and favorite. Sahle Selassie, the youngest, attended secondary school in Addis Ababa, sitting with the other students in the classroom.

Like everything else around the Emperor, his personal way of life is full of contrasts. Modern simplicity dominates his private day; miraculous pomp his affairs of state. At his coronation he wore clothes of pure gold, and his crown had a value of $6 million.

Haile Selassie belongs to a unique generation of Africans who in their lifetime have seen both the flourishing and the passing of an age, and the rise of a new one. Once I had a conversation with him on the increasingly European appearance of his capital.

The sovereign agreed and said, in a strange tired voice: "Formerly there were beasts of every kind in Addis Ababa. Now it is the motorcar which rules the streets."

Yet from his unchanging expression it was impossible to tell whether he welcomed, or deep in his heart regretted, the rapidity of the progress he himself was urging to bring his country in line with the rest of the world.

Breakfast at the Wigwam, Headquarters for the Cleveland Indians, Daytona Beach, Fla.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1954

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, any kid would have given his right arm to have had breakfast at the Wigwam, headquarters for the Cleveland Indians, at Daytona Beach, Fla., that recent cool, crisp morning of April 20, 1954. He would have been with people in the big time—ballplayers, managers, sports writers, scouts, and others.

In addition, had he taken a good peek, the kid would have seen two Congressmen and the boy of one of them load their trays to the gunwales with orange juice, oatmeal, and cream, ham and eggs, bacon, country sausage, hot cakes, jelly, marmalade, toast, coffee, and milk. All the food they could carry.

At table, he would have heard Congressman HAROLD HAGEN, of Minnesota, thank Tony Pianowski, secretary of the Cleveland farm system, for the gracious breakfast invitation extended to himself, to his son Harold, Jr., of the United States Navy and to Congressman ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI, of New Jersey. Had he asked, the kid could have had the right arm of all three of them.

Talk was lively and brisk. As ballplayers trooped into chow, one suddenly became aware of a bounce, a spunk and a sparkle of give and take that appears to make it impossible for anyone to vanquish an American, be he ballplayer, soldier, coach, sportswriter, manager, secretary, or scout.

Mamma's boys, prima donnas, flash in the pans, wise guys, cement headed, and hot rocks were raked over the coals. In every case, kids who listened, who were willing to learn, to absorb the lore of the game were the kids who fielded their leagues into the big time. Mamma's boys, prima donnas, flash in the pans, wise guys, and hot rocks fizzled and folded. Names were mentioned, games were reviewed, and the big time rolled by. What a treat, Mr. Speaker, what a treat. And the ball players? Young, clean-cut kids in their upper teens and early twenties. There's great hope for America, Mr. Speaker. These kids have got it, just as did the kids in North Korea, on the Yalu, and in the Chosen Reservoir, and the Tokyo hospital, frostbite or not, Reds or not. One wished the crying towels, the prophets of gloom and doom could have been at breakfast in the Wigwam with us, Mr. Speaker. It was a treat we shall ever remember.

A slip of paper sent to me at my request, through the Congressman from Minnesota [Mr. HAGEN], records quite modestly the following, which, under unanimous consent, is now cited:

> Present at the Wigwam, headquarters for the Cleveland Indians minor league spring training base at Daytona Beach, Fla., for breakfast on April 20 were Phil Seghi, manager of the Fargo-Moorhead Twins of the Northern League; Eugene Fitzgerald, sports editor of the Fargo Forum, of Fargo, N. Dak.; Laddie Placek, head scout for the Cleveland Indians farm system; Harold Hagen, Jr., son of Representative Harold Hagen, Republican of Minnesota; Representative Alfred Sieminski, Democrat of New Jersey; Len O'Donnell, sports editor of the Sherbrooke Daily Record of Sherbrooke, Quebec, Canada; Ivan Boisvert, photographer for La Tribune, Sherbrook French language daily; and Representative Harold Hagen and Harry Oram of Ft. Myers Beach, Fla., a former Fargo resident, now retired.
>
> The Congressmen were guests of Tony Pianowski, secretary of the Cleveland farm system, who is in charge of the spring training base, known as Indianville.

Preservation of Forests and Grazing Lands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 18, 1954

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a resolution from the Farmers Union of Oregon, Newberg Local, No. 261, on the subject of the preservation of our forests and grazing lands.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEWBERG, OREG.
May 6, 1954.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Whereas there are at present before Congress two bills, S. 2584 and H. R. 6787, that would take from the Forest Service the full management and direction of grazing rights in our national forests; and

Whereas we believe that this action would be against the best interest of the continued preservation of our forests and the preservation of the longtime use of grazing lands: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we are very definitely opposed to the passage of the above-named bills.

H. R. BRISTOL,
President, Newberg Local No. 261,
Farmers' Union of Oregon.

Competition, Monopoly, and Countervailing Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN

OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, May 7, 1954

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Competition, Monopoly, and Countervailing Power." The article was written by Dr. Walter Adams, an associate professor at Michigan State College, and a member of Attorney General Brownell's National Committee to Study the Antitrust Laws.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Quarterly Journal of Economics of November 1953]

COMPETITION, MONOPOLY, AND COUNTERVAILING POWER

(By Walter Adams)

I. INTRODUCTION

"Political liberty," a leading exponent of economic conservatism once remarked, "can survive only within an effective competitive economic system. Thus, the enemy of democracy is monopoly in all it forms: gigantic corporations, trade associations and other agencies for price control, trade unions or in general, organization and concentration of power within functional classes." Failure to check the growth of concentrated economic power, he warned, would ultimately result either in giant pressure groups controlling the Government or in the direct regulation of pressure groups by the Government. In either event, he concluded, the result would be the triumph of collectivism over free enterprise and the destruction of a democratic society as we, in America, have known it.

The implications of this analysis for public policy were clear: economic power had to be dispersed among many buyers and sellers competing actively in open markets. While scrupulously avoiding any direct interference with private enterprise, the Government had to provide and enforce certain basic rules of the game, so as to keep the channels of trade free, prevent monopolistic preemption of opportunity; preserve the incentives for efficiency and progress; and forestall the growth of both economic feudalism and political tyranny. This was the philosophy of America's antitrust laws—the core of our traditional belief in competition and hatred of monopoly.

Somehow, in spite of the efforts to translate this blueprint into reality, economic power became progressively more concentrated and the decline of competition a common phenomenon in many industries. To the neoclassical economist, this fact was a cause for alarm and a source of despair. To the collectivist, it seemed but the manifestation of natural law—the operation of inexorable technological and economic forces which could not be reversed. To the defender of the status quo, however, it presented a unique challenge to explain the great transformation of the American economy—to demonstrate the compatibility of monopolistic and oligopolistic power aggregates with the stability and soundness of modern democratic capitalism.

In the advance guard of the new enlightenment was Prof. J. M. Clark, who urged that the effectiveness of competition be judged in terms of its results, viz., the extent to which it promotes an efficient use of resources. It was Clark who suggested that the abstract theoretical model of pure competition be replaced by the more realistic concept of workable competition as a gage for judging the performance of specific industries in the public interest. Similarly, Prof. E. S. Mason recomended that, in our public-policy deliberations, we emphasize the constructive accomplishments and achievements of an industry rather than its market structure; that we accept an industry as workably competitive—regardless of its degree of concentration—if it evidenced, among other things, a progressive technology, the passing on to consumers of the results of this progressiveness in the form of lower prices, larger output, improved products, etc." And finaly, Prof. J. K. Galbraith—in an attempt to explain not just the workability of specific industries but of the whole economy—theorized that the American economy can perform quite brilliantly in spite of the widespread prevalence of industrial oligopoly. He tried to demonstrate that the American economy can provide better things for better living notwithstanding the fact that it operates in defiance of the rules laid down by men of such Newtonian stature as Bentham, Ricardo, and Adam Smith.

In developing his theory, Galbraith credits Clark and Mason with a pragmatic concern for results—a recognition that consequences, which in theory are deplorable, are often in real life quite agreeable. Yet Galbraith criticizes the exponents of workable competition for failing to make clear why what is unworkable in principle becomes workable in practice, a failure which he attributes to their preoccupation with competition. He says:

"In the competitive model the restraint on the power of any producer was provided by the competition of other producers—it came from the same side of the market. The tendency of any seller to exploit his customers was checked, not by the customers, but by another seller across the street and by many others in the same market: It was natural that in looking for restraints on the behavior of the large seller, who was one among few in the market, the search would be made in the same place. Competition, even though it might be different in kind from that of the competitive model, was still the object of the search. Indeed it was assumed that competition was the only possible restraint on private market power. This preoccupation with competition kept the investigators from seeing the actual restraints on market power—those that made not competition but the economy workable."

The actual or real restraints on a firm's market power are, according to Galbraith, vested not in its competitors but in its customers and suppliers; they are imposed not from the same side of the market, but from the opposite side. Thus "private economic power is held in check by the countervailing power of those who are subject to it. The first begets the second." A monopoly on one side of the market offers an inducement to both suppliers and customers to develop the power with which they can defend themselves against exploitation. Thesis gives rise to antithesis, and there emerges a system of checks and balances which makes the economy as a whole workable, a modus operandi which lends stability to American capitalism. Most important of all, it relieves the Government of its obligation—imposed by the now antiquated antitrust laws—to launch any frontal attack on concentrated economic power. No longer need there be concern about the decline of competition, the fewness of sellers in a particular market. Countervailing power (supported, where necessary, by Government action) can be relied on to eliminate—through a process of creative destruction—the danger of any long-run exploitation by a private economic power bloc.

* * * * *

II. TOP-LEVEL FINANCIAL CONTROL AND VERTICAL INTEGRATION

According to Galbraith, the existence of concentrated power on one side of the market will eventually give rise to countervailing power on the other side of the market. Powerful sellers will cause the growth of powerful buyers and vice versa. As a result, the concentration of the steel barons will be offset by similar concentration among their automobile manufacturing customers, thus precluding, or at least reducing, the likelihood of monopolistic exploitation.

This argument leaves out of account the possibility of undermining and subverting the effectiveness of countervailing power as a regulatory mechanism. This objective can be accomplished by the coordination and centralization of both the buyer's and the seller's business policy within a single decision-making unit. It can be achieved through the common techniques of top-level financial control and vertical integration. Countervailing power can be exercised only so long as the forces on opposite sides of the market engage in arms'-length bargaining, only so long as they are controlled by separate and financially independent decision-making units. Once we admit, however, the existence of economic-interest groupings and giant vertical integrations, the opposing sides of the market are blended into one, and any potential countervailance is automatically vitiated.

A fitting illustration of this process is Pullman, Inc., which, for many years, had a virtual monopoly over the manufacture and operation of sleeping-car equipment. Its customers were the Nation's railroads, members of a highly concentrated industry. Here, then, was an almost perfect setting for the development of countervailing power—a monopolistic seller facing a number of economically poweful buyers. The expected countervailance, however, never materialized. Its potential development was frustrated by the existence of an intricate maze of interlacing relations among several large investment banking concerns, insurance companies, the railroads, and Pullman, Inc. The Morgan, Vanderbilt, and Mellon interests had a substantial representation on the boards of directors of Pullman, while simultaneously dominating a large number of major railroads—both through ownership and, more importantly, through the financial syndicates floating the securities of such railroads. Equally significant were the connections between Pullman, Inc., and several of the largest insurance companies holding considerable investments in railroad securities.

It was through such banker and insurance nexus that the railroads were affiliated with Pullman, Inc. It was through such relationships on the top level of big business finance, that the railroads—far from countervailing the power of the Pullman monopoly—were made an integral part of it. It is an ominous and perhaps ironic reflection on the inability of countervailing power to function in accordance with theoretical expectations that, as a result of this interlocking control, the competition of progressive sleeping car manufacturers was stifled, and that the public, as well as the railroads, were detrimentally affected by the technological backwardness of sleeping-car service.

Outright vertical integration between powerful suppliers and powerful customers is merely a variation on the above theme. It is but another technique for subverting the arm's-length-bargaining and countervailing power which may otherwise operate under conditions of bilateral monopoly and/or oligopoly. A case in point is the recent merger between Paramount Pictures Corp. and the Du Mont television network. * * *

III. BILATERAL MONOPOLY AND COUNTERVAILING POWER

As was pointed out above, countervailing power operates primarily through the creation of bilateral monopoly and/or oligopoly situations. A monopoly on one side of the market finds its power neutralized by the appearance of a monopoly on the other side of the market. There thus develops a system of checks and balances, built on the foundation of bilateral power concentrations.

The labor market is cited as an area where this process can be observed with the greatest clarity, for it is in the labor market that giant unions bargain on a national, industry-wide scale against groups of employers acting jointly either through a trade association or an informal ad hoc bargaining committee. The countervailing power advocates defend this type of arrangement in highly concentrated industries like steel, rubber, automobiles, etc. They point out that "not only has the strength of the corporations in these industries made it necessary for workers to develop the protection of countervailing power, it has provided unions with the opportunity for getting something more as well. If successful they could share in the fruits of the corporation's market power." Bilateral monopoly in the labor market is thus justified on the grounds that it prevents unilateral exploitation, while simultaneously allowing one monopolist to share in whatever exorbitant gains may accrue to the other.

The fly in this ointment is self-evident, viz., that unions and management—without necessarily conspiring—can jointly exploit the consumer. This is true especially in times of inflation when employers may grant wage increases with relative impunity, and then pass their higher costs on to the consumer in the form of higher prices. These higher prices thereupon become the basis for new wage demands, and the inflationary spiral is sent on another merry spin. The bilateral monopoly of union and management fuels the engine for accelerating and perpetuating inflation.

The inadequacy of bilateral monopoly in the labor market is rather pointedly illustrated by the recent wage dispute in the steel industry. After collective bargaining procedures had broken down, the case was referred to the Wage Stabilization Board. The Board promptly recommended a wage increase which would have raised production costs by approximately $6 per ton. To offset these higher costs, industry representatives demanded a price increase of $12 per ton, a demand which the OPS was compelled to refuse. The agency did agree, however, to permit a $3 per ton price increase in line with the provisions of the Capehart amendment to the Defense Production Act. This increase would have yielded the industry a return of more than 28 percent on stockholders' investment—a return which was far higher than the 1947–49 profit rate of 18½ percent, which in turn was higher than any the industry had enjoyed since 1918. In spite of its apparently generous terms, this OPS offer was rejected by the industry—thus precipitating a strike, the seizure of steel plants by the Government, and the invalidation of this seizure by the Supreme Court. The result was that eventually the Government was compelled—in the interests of uninterrupted production during the emergency period—to authorize both the requested wage increase and the $12 per ton price increase. The irresistible force had met the immovable object. Bilateral monopoly, instead of providing countervailing checks and balances, was instrumental in wrecking price controls and supporting the inflationary forces which drove the economy into dizzy spirals of ever higher prices, wages, costs and prices.

Given the existence of power concentrations on both sides of the market, this result was perhaps inevitable. Indeed it was predicted by Robert Liefmann, the great exponent of industrial cartels, as long ago as 1927. In justifying cartels ex visu the workers, Liefmann pointed out that cartels were in a better position than competitive firms to grant wage increases, since they could more easily shift the resulting cost increases on to the consumer in the form of higher prices. Said Liefmann:

"Where the firms are in a cartel, they are more inclined to concede the workers higher wages than in a state of free competition, because they find it easier to pass the increased costs on to their customers by charging higher prices. The workers will therefore, generally speaking, find it easier to impose higher wages upon organized firms, and it is in their power, at least if they can form strong trades unions, to demand wages increasing with the cartel's prices, i. e., a sliding wage-scale."

Here indeed were prophetic words, foreshadowing the kind of escalator arrangements recently popularized by General Motors and the United Automobile Workers (CIO). Here were the naked implications of bilateral monopoly as a technique for wage determination—resulting not in the countervailance of power between union and management but rather in a combination of the two against the consumer. That such labor-management cooperation rather than widespread industrial strife is likely to become more common in the future, and that it might even be formalized by structural reorganization of the decision-making unit in the economy, is indicated by the spread of codetermination schemes in Germany and other countries where industrial monopoly is unchallenged by national economic policy. Whether or not such arrangements will prove of long-run advantage to capital and labor is problematical; whether or not they will redound to the benefit of unorganized consumers, however, is a question which can—unfortunately—be answered with greater certainty.

IV. TECHNOLOGICAL AND INTERINDUSTRY COMPETITION

The advocates of the countervailing power thesis maintain that competition in the neoclassical sense, i. e., competition among sellers and among buyers within a particular industry, is outmoded. Their argument runs somewhat as follows. Old-fashioned intra-industry competition tends to promote maximum output, minimum prices, and optimum utilization of capacity; in short, it stimulates efficiency. But this efficiency is static and unprogressive in character. It makes no allowance for the research, development, and innovation required for economic growth. While it prevents concentration, it stifles progress. To have progress, we need more, not less concentration. Only bigness can provide the sizable funds necessary for technological experimentation and innovation in the industrial milieu of the 20th century. Only monopoly earnings can provide the bait that lures capital on to untried trails. While progress may thus require high power concentration in many industries, this need not be a source of concern to society at large. Technological development will serve as an offset against any short-run position of entrenchment which may be established. The monopoly of glass bottles will be countervailed by the introduction of the tin can; and the dominance of the latter will in turn be undermined by the introduction of the paper container. The consumer need not rely, therefore, on the static competition between large numbers of small firms as protection against exploitation. In the long run, he can find far greater safety, and better things for better living, to boot, in the technological competition of a small number of large firms, which through research and innovation eventually destroy any position of market control that may be established.

There are two basic flaws in this argument. The first is that history seems to contradict it. "As a general rule monopolistic combinations and cartels have followed, not preceded, periods of extensive capital investment. For example, before the American trust movement from 1897 to 1903, the merger movement of the twenties, and the widespread resort to cartels during the thirties, industrial expansion was rapid and the volume of new capital commitments large. Moreover, the biggest single expansionary influence in 20th century industrial development has been the automobile industry and in that field monopoly has been conspicuously absent." It must always be remembered that neither Morgan's rationalization of the railroad industry in 1889, nor Morgan's organization of the United States Steel combine in 1901, nor Roosevelt's NRA in 1934 were conspicuous for stimulating technological innovation or increased capital investment. It must always be remembered that the phenomenal performance of American capitalism over the last hundred years may have been achieved not primarily because of the behavior of well-entrenched large-scale firms, but "because there was still enough virility left in the competitive process to permit innovations and the breaking into established fields to go on." Certainly we would be guilty of the post hoc ergo propter hoc fallacy were we to argue that since monopolization accompanied the long-run growth of output, it also was its cause. Certainly, the European experience with the restrictionism of monopoly capitalism should give us pause before society places exclusive reliance on the countervailing influence of technological competition as a protective device against exploitation, inefficiency, and monopolisitic retrogression.

There is another flaw in the argument that inter-industry, product, or technological competition is an effective offset against entrenchment or market domination in any one industry. The facts are that when the paper container began to threaten the tin can duopoly, Continental Can entered the paper container industry; when magnesium threatened the aluminum monopoly, Alcoa started its participation in the magnesium cartel; when aluminum began to be used as a substitute for copper, Anaconda embarked on its venture in the aluminum industry. Today, newspapers control radio stations, and TV outlets are operated by the licensees of AM stations. But most significant of all, perhaps, is the recent merger between the

United Paramount Theaters, the largest motion picture theater chain, and the American broadcasting Co., the third largest radio and television network.

Here is a combination between giant firms in two separate industries which formerly competed with one another both with respect to audience (people's time and money) and with respect to product (films, talent, stories, etc.). It seems hardly in doubt that this merger tends toward the elimination of inter-industry competition between TV broadcasting, theater TV, theater exhibition of motion pictures, and subscription TV (when developed)—to the end of obtaining the largest possible monopolistic benefit for UPT-ABC's overall operations. As FCC Commissioner Hennock pointed out:

"In such a situation there is a substantial risk that the merged company, through the medium of * * * restrictive practices, may subordinate its television interests to its motion-picture exhibition interests, particularly so when the company's greater investments in theaters may be in an especially vulnerable or precarious position. Given the opportunity for economic gain through such restrictive practices, and in the absence of adequate safeguards against them it cannot be assumed that the merged company will push its motion-picture theater and television interests fully and independently of each other, or to anywhere near the same extent that completely unfettered business competitors normally would."

It would seem too much to expect full, vigorous, and unrestricted competition between different parts of the same company when the obvious result of such activity would redound to the disadvantage and loss of the company's total operations. Truly, the Brandeis maxim that "one cannot be expected to compete against one's self" is as applicable today as it was 40 years ago. Interindustry competition and technological innovation become a farce when public policy permits them to be subverted by merger and combination. Yet that is exactly what has been happening recently to an increasing extent. That is exactly why the argument of the countervailing power advocates is unconvincing if not outright erroneous.

The Simple Country Parish Priest—Pope Pius X

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1954

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article from a recent copy of The Working Boy, published quarterly by the Working Boy's Home, Newton Highlands, Mass., in the interest of homeless boys:

PIUS X

(By J. F. Dunne)

Day after day, hour after hour pilgrims stream across the threshold of St. Peter's in Rome, the greatest church in the world. They have come to pray at the tomb of the prince of the apostles, that humble fisherman of Galilee, raised by God to the highest pinnacle of glory as His vicar upon earth.

Never for a moment from dawn to dusk is there any noticeable interruption in that flow of pilgrims.

After the visit to the central shrine, this tomb of St. Peter, all these pilgrims retrace their steps almost the length of the basilica to visit and to pray at another shrine. It is the altar of the presentation, the first on the left as one enters St. Peter's. Under the altar in a precious crystal case can be seen the white-clothed remains of yet another servant of God, Pope Pius X.

Usually all morning long there is Mass being offered at this shrine. The celebrant very likely is a pilgrim. He may have come from any corner of the globe. The celebrant of the following Mass may be black, white, red, or yellow. Pius X is loved around the world.

It is nearly 2½ centuries since the last successor of St. Peter was solemnly raised to the highest honors of the altar. It was precisely in the year 1712 that St. Pius V, who ruled the church during the years 1566 to 1572, was proclaimed a saint.

Pius V and Pius X had a great deal in common. Both sat in the chair of Peter at critical periods in the history of the church. The former held a steady hand on the helm during the stormy days of the Reformation. The latter had to face the no less fierce attacks of modernism.

In July 1907, Pius X condemned 65 modernistic theories. In September he issued the encyclical letter, "Pascendi Dominici Gregis." Here were exposed not only the fundamental errors of modernism but also set forth were the ways in which these errors were to be opposed.

The successor of Pope Leo XIII had come to the papal throne endowed with inspiring paternal kindness and an amazing simplicity. Never for a moment did he forget his humble origin. Very soon after his election as Pope, a group of people from his native village came to Rome to offer their congratulations. In the group was his aged mother. When her son, now the Vicar of Christ, entered the room, she went on her knees to receive his blessing, but Pius X immediately raised her to her feet saying: "Mother, it is rather for you to bless your priest-son."

The spirit of the age, denying the supernatural and undermining religious fervor, demanded firmness. Despite his kindly character, saintly Pius X proved equal to the task. In his very first encyclical he summarized in simple terms the sole remedy for the evils of the age: "We declare that in the supreme pontificate we have no other program than to restore all things in Christ so that everything and in everything there be Christ."

Many of his contemporaries considered Pope Pius X, "the simple country parish priest," as "retrograde, naive, and simple" because he presumed that he could succeed in rechristianizing society. However, he faced the situation with unfaltering courage and foresight. In France he restored to the French hierarchy complete freedom for their pastoral ministry even at the cost of great material advantages.

It was Pius X who in 1909 founded the now flourishing Pontifical Biblical Institute which has rendered such invaluable service to the church. It was he who began the studied codification of cannon law, so that every Catholic, priest and layman, could know in a precise and accurate manner his duties and his rights.

The return to the liturgical music of St. Gregory was decreed by Pius X. This same saintly Pope took energetic action for the establishment of a truly Catholic press to counteract the influence of those newspapers which, "under the appearance of catholicity with the occasional mention of papal audiences or Vatican events, seemed to ignore the incessant campaign waged against the church and never carried a word in defense of the freedom and independence of the church."

Midst all the cares and anxieties caused by the ceaseless attacks against the faith and despite the daily routine and ceremonial of the Papal Court, Pius X always remained the simple country parish priest.. His first thoughts were ever for the millions of the faithful filling the churches and chapels in all parts of the world. For these he compiled his catechism. Regularly he gathered the people of the parishes of Rome in one or other of the courtyards of the Vatican to explain the gospel of the day and to instruct them in the faith.

He ordered that children be admitted to the reception of Holy Communion as soon as they reached the use of reason. When some people were shocked and cried "scandal," he replied: "There will be saints among these children. Let the Lord enter their hearts before Satan does." How significant it is that the last chosen soul to be raised to the highest honors of the altar in the Square of St. Peter was precisely one of these children, St. Maria Goretti, who undoubtedly acquired the strength and fortitude to defend her virginal purity at the cost of her life's blood, through her devout and frequent reception of our Divine Lord in the Blessed Sacrament.

These are some of the thoughts that come to mind as one gazes at the mortal remains of Pius X. Perhaps he, with the divine light that was given him, foresaw the glory with which one day he would be surrounded. In his humility he ordered that his body be buried with the greatest simplicity and that in his case the traditional embalming be omitted. His wishes were respected, but this last act of humility has become the reason of added glory; these mortal remains that we now see have been preserved in an amazing manner from the ravages of natural corruption.

The Independence of the State of Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 18, 1954

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, as one of the earliest peoples of the ancient Middle East, Jews have a long recorded history. That history, running back more than 3,000 years, shows that the unfortunate Jews have, during most of their known history, been forced to live in dispersion because despotic conquerors who overran Israel expelled the Jews from their historic homeland. During all those years of dispersion they suffered much, but they never gave up the ideal of regaining their lost national independence. On the contrary, in the course of years, as their suffering seemed to have no end, this idea became permanently fixed in their minds. Jewish leaders clung to the idea as their creed and pursued its realization with religious fervor. Finally, they had their reward in the declaration of the independence of the State of Israel 6 years ago, on May 15, 1948.

That date is an historic landmark in the recent history of the Jews.

Wherever independence, liberty, and freedom are held as sacred and priceless human possessions, Israel's independence day is an event of importance. It is especially significant for us in this country because we had a great deal to do with the creation of Israel. Israeli leaders had not only our sympathy and support but they also had material and financial aid from this country.

However one may view the birth and the growth of that youthful, vigorous, and dynamic new state in the Middle East, one cannot but admire the way all Jews, both in and out of Israel, have joined hands in the realization of their cherished national dream. In the terms of sheer accomplishments their record is extraordinary. What they have done is almost miraculous. A few years ago the State of Israel comprised about 5,000 square miles and its population was just 600,000; today, only 6 years later, its area is more than 8,000 miles square and its teeming population has more than doubled, totaling more than 1,500,000. In the task of settling some 750,000 immigrants Israeli leaders have worked diligently and conscientiously, and have remarkable results to show. In a short time they have made Israel a new and decisive factor to be reckoned with in middle eastern affairs. Socially, culturally, ideologically, and politically, this progressive and dynamic land stands today where the ancient kingdom of the Jewish people stood in all its glory some 3,000 years ago. Today we gladly join in the celebration of the sixth anniversary of the independence of the modern State of Israel and pray that it will continue to advance and will become a positive factor for peace and prosperity in the Middle East.

Mr. Speaker, the following editorial which appeared in the May 8 issue of the Newark Star Ledger tells very succinctly the story of Israel:

A BIBLICAL SAGA

The story of Israel, which celebrates its sixth year of independence this week reads like a chapter out of the Bible.

There is the same quality of epic achievement, of monumental labor, of bitter strife, of enduring faith.

It is a story of striking contrasts. The newest nation was born out of age-old aspirations. Centuries of waiting and hoping suddenly whirled into 6 swift years of breathtaking activity. The hopeless pleader suddenly became the warrior.

And as in all great changes, there has been much suffering. The gas chambers of Europe, the exodus to the Promised Land, and the struggle with the Arabs, and now the tension of border clashes.

The struggle is still intense.

But the achievements are heroic.

And hope is bright that soon there will be no pillboxes in the olive groves.

Polish Constitution Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 13, 1954

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, recently the friends of Poland throughout the free world, including millions of persons in the United States, celebrated and commemorated Poland's Constitution Day, May 3.

The traditional friendship of the American people for the people of Poland, a feeling which I share with countless fellow Americans, is even stronger in these days of Poland's slavery and misery.

Americans know well the name of Kosciusko, Polish soldier and patriot who became an officer in America's first Army and aided our Founding Fathers in their struggle to make the colonies an independent nation. Some years ago, on February 12, 1947, I remarked in this House that 200 years have failed to dim the luster of Kosciusko's glory.

I remarked that the Polish people have known and have endured oppression before, as they endure it today, looking forward to the day of freedom. Our Government cannot ignore, and has not ignored, the Soviet attempts to perpetuate a puppet, totalitarian regime in Poland.

I repeat what I said in this body 7 years ago: As a nation dedicated to freedom—recognizing the blessings of liberty as we do—America should continue to exhibit the liveliest concern for the welfare of Poland. America's great weight must be thrown behind the fight of all true Poles for a truly free Poland.

The Polish people should be assured that the United States will continually resist the existence of a puppet regime in Poland and will do all possible to restore Polish freedom.

I am pleased to again pay tribute to the proud Polish people in their continuing hope and fight for freedom from oppression.

Power for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 6, 1954

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit below an editorial appearing in the Shreveport Times of May 15, 1954. I feel this editorial presents in the proper light and importance our observance of Armed Forces Day. The editorial is as follows:

POWER FOR PEACE

Today is annual Armed Forces Day, observed here and throughout the United States under the theme of Power for Peace.

No more meaningful slogan could be devised, in our opinion. Diplomacy always must be the first weapon in efforts by nations to keep peace with each other. But it is simply a matter of history that there are always aggressors in this world who are willing to disregard agreements of diplomacy unless they are backed by power.

Among the greater nations of the world these days diplomacy cannot even be made a weapon for peace unless there is military might behind it. There are nations which could get along with each other without military might, but always there are one or more other nations willing to use force to gain their own ends from nations that would be peaceful.

President Eisenhower recently pointed out that the present struggle in the world against communism "is waged in every arena in which a challenged civilization must fight to live." In other words, the battle affects the military, the economic, the political, the scientific, the intellectual, and the spiritual affairs of this Nation and of all others which are the direct or indirect butt of Communist aggression or Communist plans for future aggression; whether this aggression be cold or hot in temperature.

If freedom and liberty are to win against communism, they must fight against it, vigorously and actively and with all of their might, in every one of these arenas.

Armed Forces Day symbolizes the preservation of American freedom and liberty in the past through the might and sacrifice of American fighting men, and the willingness of Americans to fight again to maintain what they now have.

It is also a day for taking stock of our condition of preparedness to fight again and to carry on the battle to preserve freedom and liberty whenever enemies of freedom and liberty make an overt move.

In this taking stock, perhaps our first thought should be toward making sure always that those who are willing to fight and may have to fight again in a not very distant future are not betrayed at home either before or after they go into combat.

The Korean war and the Asian mess were brought on by our constant yielding to Communist causes, and that yielding was brought about to considerable degree by the incompetency and indifference of national political leadership in the matter of Communists, not merely on our own national doorstep, but figuratively lying on the most comfortable couches inside the doorways—particularly inside the doorways of our Federal Government.

On this Armed Forces Day we may well consider the fact that it doesn't make much sense to shed the blood of American youth overseas in combat against Communists while opening the gates to them at home, and that each and every step toward closing those gates and keeping them sealed forever must have the full support, not only of the people, but of those who administer the Federal Government from the White House on through the lesser employees of the smallest Government agency.

Scholarships for Worthy American Youth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 18, 1954

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, although education is an institution of every civilized society, its role varies widely in different societies. Under totalitarian government education is an instrument of the state. Dictatorship deliberately plans and utilizes education for the purpose of regimenting the minds of men and molding them into conformity and servitude. .

In a democracy, on the other hand, education is an instrument of freemen. The citizens utilize education to prepare themselves to defend and preserve their individual liberties and to promote the welfare and happiness of all the people.

Organizations such as the Herbert J. Pascoe Educational Scholarship Foundation of New Jersey are peculiar to our democratic society. An organization such as this would have no place under totalitarian government. In America, however, foundations such as this play an important role in our social order. Educational foundations especially are making an important contribution to the perpetuation of our democratic society and to the promotion of the cause of freedom at home and abroad.

Recently within our country there has been a dangerous growth of anti-intellectualism and pressure toward conformity of thought. Leaders of Protestant and Roman Catholic faiths have strongly denounced this trend. Several weeks ago, 12,000 delegates to the National Catholic Educational Association meeting in Chicago adopted a resolution attaching conformity in thinking, which they considered would standardize our attitudes, reduce the critical judgment, and abdicate reason.

At the 1954 meeting of the board of education of the Methodist Church the executive secretary of the board's division of educational institutions deplored the fact that—

> The right of free inquiry and free discussion, upon which all sound education is dependent, is being openly challenged in many places.

Other prominent American leaders, not only in the field of religion but in political, educational, and other fields, have warned against the danger that in our country the individual may become fearful of dissenting from majority opinion. Regimentation of thought is inimical to the basic principles of democracy.

In America our educational task is primarily that of providing more and better educational opportunities for all our youth. The Herbert J. Pascoe Educational Scholarship Foundation is working together with many other private as well as governmental agencies for the accomplishment of this task.

Economic difficulties constitute the greatest barrier to the post-secondary education of many of our worthy and capable young people. If a low-income family sets a sufficiently high value upon a college education the family may make economic sacrifices in basic needs and comforts so that the children can receive a better education. Also if young people are ambitious and have a driving thirst for knowledge they may sometimes overcome serious financial difficulties by working their way through college. However, even such heroic individual efforts may not result in the attainment of a college diploma; and sometimes the cost to the student or to the family in the nature of injury to health or other losses is very great.

The city of Newark has its share of low-income families. The price of post-secondary education, like the cost of everything else, has markedly risen within recent years. I know of no more commendable expenditure which a Newark citizen could make than that to help provide worthy young people better educational opportunities.

We must extend the educational opportunities of the greatest possible number of the youth of America, in order that they may be prepared to provide the free world with the intelligent leadership it so greatly needs. The educational needs of our young people are urgent; provisions for meeting them cannot be postponed. Investment in the education of American youth is investment in the future of America and in the future of all mankind.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend Mr. Gerald La Torraco, the founder of the Herbert J. Pascoe Educational Scholarship Foundation of New Jersey, for his great contribution to our community.

Celler Introduces Bill To Amend Federal Communications Act Which Would Prohibit Commercial Sponsorship of Television or Radio Coverage of the McCarthy Hearings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 18, 1954

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, two television networks have indicated that they will seek commercial sponsorship for the televised coverage of the McCarthy-Army hearings. It is the general rule to preclude the use of the profit motive in broadcasting or televising official investigatory proceedings. I am amazed that Senator Mundt, the acting chairman of the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, would permit such a relaxation of the rule against commercial sponsorship. It will certainly not enhance the dignity that should attend congressional hearings. This show in particular is sufficiently grotesque. Adding the profit motive would not only increase its absurdity, but might well cause further injury tp legislative prestige in the eyes of the American people.

The networks will be permitted to announce at the beginning and the end of the sessions and even during the recesses, that the hearings are being brought to the public as a public service, under the sponsorship of whatever outfit it may be. The next move will be the interruption of the proceedings to advertise the sponsor. I suppose the more circuslike the atmosphere becomes, the higher the charges will be to the sponsor. Imagine this vaudeville performance with its present considerable ham acting, being used to advertise dog biscuits, mouth wash, toothpaste, refrigerators, and so forth. Future recorders of present history may well be astounded at the abysmal depths to which our standards and values have sunk, at this highly critical juncture in a menaced world.

I am this day offering a bill to amend the Federal Communications Act to prohibit commercial sponsorship of television and radio coverage of congressional investigative hearings and proceedings. Let us keep vaudeville where it belongs. Congressional activities are, and should be, seriously deliberative and should not be substitutions for the Show of Shows.

The text of the bill follows:

Commercial Sponsorship of Congressional Proceedings

Sec. 605a. It shall be unlawful for any person or corporation to sponsor commercially the telecast, broadcast, or transmission, whether directly or through such devices as wire recording, tape, moving pictures, or other mechanical means, of any of the official meetings, hearings, or other proceedings of any committee or subcommittee of either House of Congress.

This section shall not prohibit the telecast, broadcast, or transmission of excerpts of any official congressional meeting, hearing, or other proceeding on a regularly scheduled news program, or the full or partial telecast, broadcast, or transmission, by a telecast or broadcast company or by a common carrier, engaged in interstate or foreign communication by wire or radio, when such communication service is furnished without commercial sponsorship as a public service.

Sixth Anniversary of the Independence of the State of Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 18, 1954

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record a resolution from the Portland Zionist Council, dated May 10, 1954, concerning the celebration of the sixth anniversary of the State of Israel.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

> We, the 300 citizens of Portland, assembled on May 6, at the Jewish Community Center to celebrate the sixth anniversary of the independence of the State of Israel, and representing more than 2,000 members of various Zionist organizations in this community, are deeply concerned by the announcement made last week by our Department of State that arms aid will be granted to Iraq. There is no question in our minds that such a development would seriously threaten not only Israel's security but the peace and stability of the entire Middle East.
>
> We are convinced that giving arms to Iraq would not deter any major aggression against the Middle East, especially in view of the demonstrated weakness of the Iraq armed forces in the war against Israel. On the other hand, it would bring about increased regional tensions by encouraging the aggressive policies of the entire Arab League and by compelling Israel to increase her armed strength accordingly. It should be stressed that Iraq was a leader in the armed aggression against Israel in 1948 and refused, alone among the Arab States, to negotiate an armistice agreement with Israel.
>
> To arm Iraq at a time when Arab-Israel tension has been mounting, and without a firm commitment to make peace with Israel, is to fortify Arab intransigeance and risk a renewal of open hostilities. The way to win the friendship of the Arab people for our country and for the cause of freedom is to give them economic and technical assistance to raise their standards of living. But we shall not befriend them by giving them arms to be used for war in the region, or to bolster despotic military regimes.

In view of all these considerations, we respectfully urge our Government to reconsider this provocative decision.

Mrs. Miriam F. Rosenfeld,
Chairman, Portland Zionist Council.

Address of Democratic National Committeeman Carmine G. DeSapio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SIDNEY A. FINE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 17, 1954

Mr. FINE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks, I am including herewith the following address of Democratic National Committeeman Carmine G. DeSapio, of New York, before the annual dinner of the Sullivan County Democratic Committee, Monday, May 10, 1954, at Monticello, N. Y.:

I am very happy to be here with you in Sullivan County tonight and I deeply appreciate your invitation to attend this wonderful dinner.

In these happy and beautiful surroundings this evening, I cannot help but reflect on the sad irony that this glorious world, with which a benevolent Creator has endowed us, should be torn with so much emotional, political, social, and economic strife. There is abundance. And there is room for the development of much more abundance. There is every natural resource for assuring to all of the people on earth an adequate standard of living and healthful, moral pursuits. And yet, since the beginning of civilization, almost every generation has either been beset by war, or threatened with conflict.

That is why so much of the strength and the blessings of the world have not as yet been used for the common good.

And that is why I should like, with your indulgence this evening, to lay politics aside, that we may think about and discuss the deeper and the more meaningful problems of world peace and world security.

It is indeed regrettable that the wonder and the power and the miracle of the atom should not be used for peaceful attainments, for the creation of energy to run our machines, for the development of medicines to cure our diseases and for progress toward an increased standard of living.

Think, my good friends, of what could be done with the billions of dollars spent for war and defense, if that money were made available, instead, for irrigation of land, for clearance of jungles, for building of cities. Think of what man, with his knowledge of the magic of science, and with his ability to create ever greater wonders, could do, if he were not diverted by the fear of war, and the need for self-protection against war.

That is why it is so important that our dreams, our thoughts and our deeds should concentrate and focus always on the search for peace.

It would be nice if we could close our eyes to the unpleasant truth and, on the assumption that it takes two to make a fight, just isolate ourselves from the dangers and the threats from without. But we have learned—bitterly and expensively—that in the dealings of nations it takes one to start a war.

Tyranny cannot long survive without the help of outside distraction. That is why those who practice godlessness, and assert upon their people ruthless dictatorship, ultimately find need for the diversion of a war. Somehow in the excitement of patriotism, you can make people forget that they are hungry. Somehow in the firing of a national imagination with the promise of bountiful conquest, you can ease the pain of denying to people their freedom. Many, many years ago, when somebody injured his arm, the tribal "doctor" would hit him on the head so that he would forget the pain in his arm. So it is and has been with dictators. As soon as they find the people ready to rebel against tyranny, they hit them on the head with a war.

And they were able to get away with it. They got away with it in Manchuria, in Ethiopa, in the Rhineland, in Austria, in Czechoslovakia, and in Poland.

And they thought they could get away with it in Korea. They thought that by conquering new countries or scaring them into surrender they could delude their people into believing that better days lay ahead. They also thought that they could bully the peace-loving nations into allowing them to get away with robbery—with plunder.

We fought many wars—bloody, costly wars—before we learned that courage and vision and the determination to resist aggression, is, in the final analysis, the only certain way to secure peace.

Today, the Communist tryanny is not quite so sure that the old formula works. Russia has been shown that it just cannot move in on nations. That it cannot bleed and use peoples for the development of its own war machine on the one hand, and for diverting the attention of its people on the other.

And I can tell you, my friends, that the Russian rulers are uneasy and the Russian people restless. We have built a United Nations which has meaning. It is more than a philosophy. It is more than a dream. It is a functioning, working family of free peoples who have united in their determination to establish in the minds of those who feel they need war to survive, that no stone will be left unturned in concerted efforts to assure that freedom, instead, shall survive.

Imagine if we had a United Nations in 1918, or imagine if we didn't have one in June 1950 when Korea was invaded.

Communism is a creeping philosophy, a malignant program, whose leaders seek to bring the entire world under its yoke. There is no step which the Communist will not take to achieve the result he wants. He rationalizes his moral perversion by contending that communism is his religion and, therefore, that the end justifies the means. The Communist understands only the language of force. He twists all reason and logic. He is an opportunist who looks with scorn upon the ideals of freedom, faith, and love. He is cynical and callous and takes pride in his moral bankruptcy.

It would be national suicide for us to relax our vigilance for a single moment. We must be keenly alert to the threat of Communist aggression, as well as sensitively watchful of its menace from within our own borders. We must be determined at all but one cost, to protect our freedom from communism. The one cost we must not pay, the one sacrifice we must not make, is that of our own freedom.

Communists read history as we do. Communists study the psychology of the people as we do. And Communists, better than we, are versed in the techniques of deviousness and subterfuge. They are cold and calculating and they always know precisely what they are doing. And I tell you that they take great pleasure and considerable comfort in some of the things that are going on in this country under the guise of anticommunism.

It is a terrible thing when the fifth amendment to our Constitution—the pillar of our democracy—is interpreted as an instrument of subversion.

It is a frightful state of affairs when decent men and women are afraid to speak out for liberal thought lest they be branded as Communists.

It is horrible to contemplate that the star chamber—the inquisition—finds sanction in the hallowed halls of the United States Senate.

It is dreadful to observe the vast, vital machinery of the great Government of the United States virtually at a standstill over an absurd offshoot of a self-assumed crusade supposedly against communism—a campaign which usurps the responsibility and authority of the Executive, and which has caused the world to look with incredulous amazement upon the antics of high public officials in this country.

It is painful to see the reckless irresponsibility with which great Americans have been maligned and villified.

It is discouraging to note the unreasoning hysteria and the demogoguery which is being practiced in an attempt at partisan and self-aggrandizement—and at the high cost of our national prestige.

It is shocking to see the increased threat to our bill of rights and the increased danger of our loss of dignity and freedom.

If we lose our calm; if we lose our perspective; if we lose our comprehension of the meaning of the world struggle for democracy, we will lose our world leadership and our own freedom.

But I believe, and history with an understanding smile in its heart will concur, that this, too, shall pass. For as Mark Anthony said over the bier of Julius Caesar, "The evil that men do lives after them." The evil that men do in each generation lives after them to teach each succeeding generation the error, the foolhardiness and the uselessness of evil.

We stand on the brink of a great new era. God, in his infinite wisdom, has given us mortals new insight into the wonder and use of that which He has created. He promised Noah that never again would the earth be destroyed and He looks to us to help Him fulfill that promise.

We Democrats have faith in the world and in its people. We have confidence in the inherent decency of man. As a party, we have great hope for the leadership which will stem from America.

Francis Bacon said, 350 years ago, that a man who is young in years may be old in hours if he has not lost any time. Let us lose no time that our hours may be productive of peace, of security, and of happiness for ourselves and for our children.

Thank you very much.

Case No. 8

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 12, 1954

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, here is another case of extraordinary hardship applied to an infinitesimal offense by the drastic provisions of the McCarran-Walter Act.

Edith Ruth Smith—nee Kunick—married Sergeant Smith of the United States Army in Germany in 1952. Their marriage had the prior approval of the American military authorities, but when the time came for the issuance of an immigration visa for Mrs. Smith it was discovered that when she was 18 years old she committed a crime involving moral turpitude. Here are the facts as reflected in official reports.

During an outing in 1948 in Stuttgart, Germany, Edith's sister, 16 years old, climbed a walnut tree and while shaking the nuts from the tree, fell and fractured both arms. She was subsequently notified to appear at police headquarters for questioning. Edith, although not summoned, accompanied her sister because of the latter's injuries. At police headquarters, both of them were charged with stealing walnuts from a tree, which was the property of the city of Stuttgart. The two girls paid a fine—roughly equivalent to 10 cents—but Edith Kunick, now Mrs. Paul William Smith, has been refused a visa under section 212 (a) (9) of the McCarran-Walter Act.

It is not necessary to ponder the need for revision where such palpable inequity is evidenced.

Good Sound Americanism—Part I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 18, 1954

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Charles R. Tyson, a constituent of mine, the founder of the American Patrol, a publication devoted to good sound Americanism, vigorous defense of the Constitution of the United States, and pledges to maintain the American way of life, made a speech before the Women's Civic Club in Los Angeles recently which, in my opinion, contains the kind of commonsense and educational value on our American heritage and what we should do to be eternally vigilant to defend it, of which there is too little today. I am confident that all Members of the House will find Mr. Tyson's speech educational, interesting, and profitable reading:

GOOD SOUND AMERICANISM—PART I

(Remarks made by Mr. Charles Randolph Tyson, before the Women's Civic Club, April 12, 1954, at the Elks Club, Los Angeles, Calif.)

Good morning, ladies of the Women's Civic Club. Madam President Barnard, officers and members of the club, honored guests, loyal Americans all, once again I am honored and privileged to speak to you. On January 19, 1953, it was my pleasure to address you and my subject matter at that time was America's New Era—What of Tomorrow. I was signally honored by having that talk entered in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 8, 1953, with a wonderful introduction by that fine American, Congressman GORDON L. McDONOUGH. At the time of my talk last year, General Eisenhower was about to be inducted into the office of the Presidency of these wonderful United States, and I stressed the fact of the important things the American people can look forward to under the new administration, even though the complement of the Congress was very closely lined up politically, with very little of a majority for the Republicans. Some of the things of immediate importance to attend to were elimination of the dangers of communism at home and abroad, lowering of taxes, the war in Korea, foreign affairs, the Bricker amendment, the farm situation, taking the shackles off business, the reduction in governmental personnel, and cuts in the budgets of governmental agencies. As I go along in this talk, I will try to cover briefly what has been accomplished by the Eisenhower administration during the past 14 months. At this time I would like to quote one paragraph of my talk before you last year. I said, "All reasonable Americans will realize that the task of bringing about some semblance of normalcy from the debris of the past administration will take some time and that miracles cannot be performed or expected. It is a huge task and will require time and careful consideration. But there is one thing we must resist to the fullest—that is, giving away the prerogatives of the Congress under the Constitution to make all the laws of the land, and not allow any individual, no matter how great or popular, to have that primary power."

My friends, how much do you value your freedom? This month we commemorate a great day in the annals of American freedom. For on April 18, 1775—179 years ago as dusk fell on that fateful Tuesday, things seemed about as usual in the city of Boston, Mass. No man knew that the next 24 hours were to be perhaps the most momentous in America's history, the day of the shot heard round the world. There long had been tension between the people and the British Government; many angry colonists were ready for open rebellion. Now they learned that British troops were marching to Concord that night, to confiscate muskets and powder hidden there. Paul Revere and William Dawes rode out to give warning. (A famous poem tells of the lanterns in the Old North Church.) Next morning in Lexington and Concord the aroused minutemen fought the first battles of the Revolutionary War. That event followed by many other stirring actions by famous patriots marked the beginning of this great Nation. Again I say, how much do you value your freedom? Lincoln said: "To sin by silence when they should protest, makes cowards of men." So with those introductory remarks I will now proceed with my topic for this talk which is: American Affairs—What To Do About Them.

My friends, my business is public relations, and in addition to analyzing legislation both governmental and State I constantly meet people in all walks of life daily and through my public appearances. So you can readily see that I do have an unusual opportunity to get the viewpoint of the men and women in the street, at church, at business, and at social affairs. The topics of the day are usually discussed and from these meetings I am able to gather the average citizen's reactions toward the affairs of his Government. Upon that pretty fair basis, the following is what I believe to be in the hearts and minds of the average citizen—all the propaganda handed out by Government agencies, slanted radio commentaries, pressure groups, newspapers, and TV to the contrary notwithstanding.

Dear ladies, this year is an election year when the American citizens proceed to the polls to elect a new House of Representatives and one-third of the United States Senate, plus officials of State, city, and otherwise. This is the year when the pressure groups hold forth in full sway. When from every rostrum, platform, radio station, TV station, newspapers, magazines, and other media cogent voices and stirring editorials will propound the good or indifferent qualities of the various candidates seeking office. Now is the time for each citizen to take heed of his own conscience and his devotion to his country and before voting find out about the honesty, integrity, patriotism, and fitness for office of each candidate in his or her district. I believe it was Rudyard Kipling who said:

"I have six faithful serving men,
They taught me all I know,
Their names are what and why and when,
And who and where and how."

This year, no one party has a monopoly on the votes in the Congress. The lines are drawn very tight and frankly it is up to the people to make themselves heard in regards to the passage or not of important legislation. Each and every one of us must ask ourselves this question, "Is it best for America?" The founders of our great country accepted their responsibilities without equivocation. They never at any time, thought of shirking their duties in citizenship. They were afraid of Government controls and shied from imposing them. As citizens of this Republic we have become soft. We are selfish. We have neither the time or the energy to get behind jobs in our local community. We have been more concerned with what we can buy, what we can own, what we can get for nothing. We criticize but we are unwilling to assume the responsibilities of Government. If some of the foregoing remarks apply to you, then take heed. If not, then carry the message to others and urge upon them their duties to their Government.

What does the 83d Congress have in store for us in this 2d session? It promises to be a momentous one. Many important issues must be resolved and we the people must see to it that our representatives in the House and Senate know where we stand on them. Let us not be selfish and consider that which is to our particular advantage—but let us think of America first. If we don't we can lose all that we have gained during the 177 years we have been a free people. We can lose by spending ourselves into bankruptcy; by conspiritorial acts in the higher echelons of our Government; by Communist infiltration; by diplomatic chicanery; by spreading ourselves thin militarily all over the world; by overtaxing our people; and in a multitude of ways that are detrimental to the interests of this country; and lastly, but in no wise least, by remaining in the grasp of the United Nations under its present charter which permits any of its acts to supersede our immortal Constitution. So, my friends, it behooves each and every one of us to acquaint ourselves with just what is going on in the Congress. That being the case, let us review some of the important issues coming before the Congress for action.

Communism: During the recess of the Congress, there were many comments made about the difference of opinion relative to action against the Communists in this country, between President Eisenhower and Senator McCARTHY. At one time the President was quoted as saying that he did not think that communism would be an issue in the forthcoming elections. Well, it now appears the President fully realizes the enormity of the threat and menace of that godless conspiracy against this country and the world, and has recommended to the Congress that legislation be enacted to wit: "That a citizen of the United States who is convicted in the courts of conspiring to advocate the overthrow of this Government by force or violence be treated as having, by such act, renounced his allegiance to the United States and forfeited his United States citizenship." Not only the President but the Secretary of State and many other high officials of the Government are constantly warning us of the dangers of communism abroad and at home. So, until that menace is minimized, it is going to be very much of an issue. Communism, the coddling of Communists in this country, and the vacillating policy of dealing with Russia has, in the main, been responsible for the enormous debt we now have, for the tremendous expenses entailed in arming this country against possible war and the present fear of what Russia may or may not do.

For the past 25 years I have been fighting the Commies. I am in constant raceipt of information relative to the hearings before the House and Senate committees, and if you could but read them and know of the kind and type of witnesses that appear before these committees, the insults they throw and their sneering attitudes and uncooperativeness, it would make your blood boil. For your definite information and earnest consideration, I would like to at this time read to you the conclusions of the United States Senate Subcommittee To Investigate the Administration of the Internal Security Act and Other Internal Security Laws. This investigation was directed at the interlocking subversion in Government departments. Herewith the conclusions:

"CONCLUSIONS

"1. The Soviet International Organization has carried on a successful and important penetration of the United States Government and this penetration has not been fully exposed.

"2. This penetration has extended from the lower ranks to top-level policy and operating positions in our Government.

"3. The agents of this penetration have operated in accordance with a distinct design fashioned by their Soviet superiors.

"4. Members of this conspiracy helped to get each other into Government, helped each other to rise in Government and protected each other from exposure.

"5. The general pattern of this penetration was first into agencies concerned with economic recovery, then to warmaking agencies, then to agencies concerned with foreign policy and postwar planning, but always moving to the focal point of national concern.

"6. In general, the Communists who infiltrated our Government worked behind the scenes—guiding research and preparing memoranda on which basic American policies were set, writing speeches for Cabinet officers, influencing congressional investigation, drafting laws, manipulating administrative reorganizations—always serving the interest of their Soviet superiors.

"7. Thousands of diplomatic, political, military, scientific, and economic secrets of the United States have been stolen by Soviet agents in our Government and other persons closely connected with the Communists.

"8. Despite the fact that the Federal Bureau of Investigation and other security agencies had reported extensive information about this Communist penetration, little was done by the executive branch to interrupt the Soviet operatives in their ascent in Government until congressional committees brought forth to public light the facts of the conspiracy.

"9. Powerful groups and individuals within the executive branch were at work obstructing and weakening the effort to eliminate Soviet agents from positions in Government.

"10. Members of this conspiracy repeatedly swore to oaths denying Communist Party membership when seeking appointments, transfers, and promotions and these falsifications have, in virtually every case, gone unpunished.

"11. The control that the American Communications Association, a Communist-directed union, maintains over communication lines vital to the national defense poses a threat to the security of this country.

"12. Policies and programs laid down by members of this Soviet conspiracy are still in effect within our Government and constitute a continuing hazard to our national security."

Fellow Americans, I suppose you have all read and/or heard on the radio and TV about the controversy between the Army and McCarthy. Do not let the hysteria of the pressure groups affect your close attention to the facts in the case. The main issue is communism and its imminent danger to this country and the world. All departments of the Government are and have been infiltrated by the Commie scum and strong measures are necessary to rout them out before they destroy us. If some innocent toes are stepped on, well it's too bad, and I am sure that the committee will right those wrongs. Nobody is perfect and some mistakes are bound to be made. There's an old saying—where there's smoke, there's fire; and most of these people called before the committee are involved somewhere along the line. The fact that a decorated general was called down by McCarthy, because he would not answer legitimate questions about who was responsible for granting a higher rank and an honorable discharge to a Communist is no reason to castigate McCarthy for doing the job he has to do. One general or a dozen generals' feelings are not near as important as safeguarding the security of this country.

Lincoln never sanctioned subversion in the name of freedom. He knew that in time of crisis, the Nation's survival depended on vigorous measures against internal foes. He believed there was a wide divergence between political differences and subversive activities. Let us enthusiastically endorse the work being done by the House Un-American Activities Committee, and the Jenner and McCarthy committees of the Senate. It is they who are bringing to the forefront for public scrutiny and action the spies, traitors, and front organizations. We cannot handle scum with kid gloves. We must use the iron fist or they will swallow us up. Furthermore, we must outlaw the Communist Party.

Good, Sound Americanism—Part II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 18, 1954

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include part II of the speech by Mr. Charles R. Tyson, entitled "Good, Sound Americanism":

GOOD, SOUND AMERICANISM—PART II

Foreign policy: The same group of internationalists, both foreign and domestic, that have formulated the ruinous policies of the past two decades are still in the saddle. The Department of State has many hundreds, yes, thousands, of career men and women in this country and all over the world that have been schooled and placed in their respective positions, whose placement was contingent upon their carrying out the policies of the Roosevelt, Truman, Acheson regimes. Most of these are still intrenched in their jobs and many are in the higher echelons that formulate our policies. They and their minions are also secure in the United Nations. So many are the same ones of Teheran, Yalta, Potsdam, and since. If we will but review their omissions, errors, and blunders, we will hesitate in giving them authority to act for us. In fact, we should with all haste separate them from the Government. Let us embark upon a firm policy of independent action, with fairness to all nations and an iron glove for our enemies. If we are to be a just and powerful nation, then let us act like one, and not allow any nation, big or small, to belittle us. Let us measure up to our vaunted stature. Furthermore, it is time that we stopped trying to make over other nations to our liking. They resent it. My friends, it is too early to base any opinion on what our foreign policy is going to be. So far we haven't any. We have a lot of hopes, statements, and promises, but real positive action on a steadfast set of principles have as yet not been enunciated, nor have any been brought to fruition. We must have faith in our President and give him time to show us that there is to be a real American foreign policy and that he will live up to it. It is going to take a strong man, plus a real statesman, to free us from the tenacles of the wiley foreign diplomat and the domestic one-worlder.

Taxes: This talk was in the making during the action in the House and Senate on the momentous tax bills being presented. By the time this speech is made action will have been taken on the new tax Americans will be called upon to make to their Government. This subject is so vast and important in its potentialities that any lengthy discussion is bound to get us nowhere. Suffice it to say that no matter which bill is finally adopted it will not be satisfactory to great numbers of citizens. The ever-increasing burden of taxation is becoming a definite hardship on the average citizen. We are becoming tired of continually paying for wars, socialization of our own and foreign countries, political skullduggery, graft, and corruption—plus feeding and supporting in many other ways the governments and peoples of the rest of the world. All in the name of the elusive theory that it is for our own protection. This with no thanks or gratitude, but with suspicion and hatred. The average citizen knows and resents this. We owe them nothing, but we have given them a heck of a lot. Let us never stop in our efforts to let our Representatives in the Congress know how we feel about taxes and insist upon their action in having them reduced. We can build this country into an impregnable fortress without feeding our funds and ammunition all over the world with questionable assurance of being able to trust our so-called allies in the event of actual warfare.

The farm problem: Here is a ticklish problem for our legislators. It is definitely a class problem and one that has been years in the making. It is full of political dynamite and needs courageous handling. But such tremendous waste has evolved through the present price-support system, and such enormous surpluses are on hand and increasing daily, that a stop order must come from somewhere. The farmers are entitled to a fair profit, but they must also practice frugality and proper changes in planting to take care of the lean and full years. Now this may seem out of the province of most of you, my listeners here. Some of you may know something of the problems of the farmers and some may not, but all of you are interested in the cost to you, through taxes, that you must pay to eternally keep up a program that is so terribly wasteful.

The Taft-Hartley Act: Those of you that have read or heard the recommendations made by President Eisenhower may, no doubt, have ideas of your own as to them. As for me, I feel that any changes to be made in that controversial act, must be considered in the light of what is good for the employer and employee alike, consistent with the welfare of the country as a whole. No change that will increase the powers of the labor bosses should be considered for a moment. In fact, such power should be diminished. We have seen conclusive evidence in the last two elections that the labor bosses do not have control of their members when it is time for them to go to the polls.

They vote their convictions politically and not as they are told to do. Sure, this is an election year, and the sooner our Representatives realize that the bug-a-boo of the labor bosses' power of the vote is phoney, the less they will be frightened as to what these labor tyrants can do to them at the polls. Mass picketing and secondary boycotts should be outlawed. Rioters, assaulters of citizens, arsonists, and/or destroyers of property should be punished to the fullest extent of the law and such punishment should be heavy.

Social security: This law needs a complete overhauling. The amount of beneficiaries being paid under the law as is presently administered is far below the actual number that have paid into it. A large percentage that pay for years, never receive any of the benefits; nor do they ever get any return on the money paid in. The present increase in social-security payments by both employee and employer now in effect should be repealed. All funds collected should be held in reserve and not go into the general fund. No new bonds should be issued for future promise of payment. There is supposed to be a reserve of more than $18 billion at the present time, which is more than enough to take care of current costs and payments, and in addition to take care of a more generous benefit to those reaching the age of retirement. Penalties should not be meted out to those hardy souls past retirement age who are enabled to earn a little more each month. They have already paid in full their obligations under the law, and are entitled to full benefits therefrom.

Veterans: Three wars within a 30-year period have disrupted the peaceful continuation of our natural progress. These wars have caused untold hardship, suffering and anxiety to millions of our people. There is hardly a family in the United tates that has not had a direct contact with its terrible toll of life, disability and/or financial reverses. The cream of our youth has been called to the colors each time war has been declared, plus the latest one called a police action without the authority of Congress. This is not a dissertation of why there should be wars or how to stop them—but—I would like to bring to your earnest attention a few pertinent facts relative to our war veterans. When war is in the making or has already begun; feeling runs high, patriotism is at its most intense pitch and the glory voices of our leaders, politicians and other spellbinders are regaling the populace with all the fervor at their command in the righteous cause. Millions of our youth are called to the colors. They are taken from the cities, farms, schools and from every conceivable walk of life and thrust into a rigid regime of training and discipline almost before they are (to paraphrase a slang expression) "dry behind their ears." Well that's war, so you would say. But—what of the highly voluble promises made to them as they marched to their terrible experiences—fighting somebody else's battles? They are told that a grateful Nation considers them heroes, and will see to it that their loved ones are taken care of; and that when they come back, nothing would be too good for them in consideration of their sacrifices.

Now don't mistake me—the vets are not beefing—but they are a wee bit bewildered at the casual disregard of the promises made; the indifference of the public to their suffering; the miserly and pitiful allowances the Congress awards them for their wounds and/or other disabilities incurred in service. Little by little they see the promises made to them regarding their rehabilitation and hospitalization broken. Little by little these important services which mean so much to their ultimate recovery and return to worthwhile citizenship being chopped away. I am speaking now of those that cannot help themselves. The veteran that came back whole-skinned and without visible scars, can take care of himself—he shrugs his shoulders and says, "C'est le guerre," that is the war. If the politicians forget well that's politics—but my friends it is you that are to blame. You are the ones that must demand that the Congress keep its promises to its veterans. We hear talk about the United States making treaties and executive agreements with other countries, and the sacredness of these treaties and agreements; and our State Department insists that we keep these agreements even though many of these foreign governments do not hesitate to break them or ignore them completely. But when it comes to giving a little more compensation, hospitalization, education, and keeping its promises to our own veterans—they have the unmitigated gall to call these veterans treasury robbers. My friends you have a duty and an obligation that rests upon you, to let your Representatives in the Congress know how you feel regarding the treatment of our war veterans—especially the disabled, and let no one—but no one tell you that they are being treated generously.

As a final argument, wouldn't you rather pay taxes chargeable to the fulfillment of our promises to our veterans than for the handouts made to countries that neither will pay in money, materials, or even gratitude?

Business: For more than 20 years business has been the "whipping boy," so to speak. All of the ills of the Nation were laid at the door of business, big and small. Legislation and Presidential directive were aimed at reducing the potentiality of powers inherent, and initiative so badly needed was stifled. Agencies without the authority of the Congress (which abrogated its rights to make and enforce the laws) plied business with a multitude of forms and directives requiring adherence to orders having the force of law without the enactment thereof. Labor bosses through threat of strikes and damage to property held the whip over business and there was no recourse to the courts, because the judges and other officials appointed or elected owed their allegiance to the political henchmen or labor bosses and refused to act to protect business from their depredations. Today there seems to be a change in the attitude of government to business, and rightfully so. Were it not for the ingenuity, inventiveness, daring, and pioneering of men of vision and courage, plus the confidence of investors, this country would not have achieved its primary place in world affairs. They are responsible for the opportunities afforded for employment and good wages. Organized labor if contained within its original scope of interest in the advancement of the working classes would be the right thing. But when the labor bosses in their greed for more power not only want absolute authority over their unions, but encroach upon the rights of business to run its own affairs, then it is time to put a stop to it. Many of the legislative acts and directives enforced during the past 20 years through pressure of political punishment are and have been declared unconstitutional by competent authority, but the Government hesitates to give up its powers once erroneously granted. There are many instances where it hesitates or doesn't dare to thrash it out in the courts. It is now time for business to come rightfully into its own—that of bringing forth the best in productiveness and incentive for the good of the entire country. Let us take off its shackles and see if we cannot have normal prosperity instead of that caused by wars and emergencies of all kinds. No longer should the wage earner be regarded as the only important person. Important he is, but not any more so than those in other categories that go to make up the productive forces of this great Nation.

Amendment to Constitution: Hats off to those patriotic Senators, 60 of them, that voted to change the Constitution through amendment, to limit and define the treaty-making powers of the President. Oh, I know that the amendment was lost by one lone vote, but one defeat never means the battle is lost. At best it is a temporary setback. It is heartening to know that there are still men in the Senate who think of preserving the liberties guaranteed the citizens of this great country; rather than be political stooges. Highest of plaudits should rightfully go to those courageous Democrats whose patriotism stood above party allegiance.

Senators Bricker and George have stated that the fight is by no means over, and that it will be carried on vigorously into the election campaign. And it should. When nearly two-thirds of the voting strength of the Senate, representing an overwhelming majority of the American people, after prolonged debate and with party lines crossed, express the sentiments of their constituency; there must be exceptional merit in the decision. No, by no means is the battle over. In the coming election this fall, the battle cry and slogan for the forces of constitutional government should be the watchword given out at Valley Forge by General George Washington—"Let none but American patriots stand guard." Let us see to it that only those Americans of either party who are patriots and not political opportunists be elected to the Congress.

It is time that rule by law and not by men be made a definite part of our Constitution, the way it was originally intended by our Founding Fathers. They sought not power of the individual but readily relinquished it in behalf of the people. This country will endure long after the tenure of any President or Secretary of State. Acquisition of power seems to go to the head of those that are given it, and they cannot relinquish any part of it. They seek more and more and their ego increases with each additional grant, until they feel it is they who are endowed with all the wisdom of the world and the people are merely puppets to be moved at will. History and experience are evidence enough of the above statement. That's how tyrants are born. All the arguments to the contrary notwithstanding; all the legal tactics employed, all the statements to the effect that President Eisenhower or any other President would not take advantage of his position and the loophole in the Constitution to act as he or they see fit—with advice from pressure groups or individuals—all of the above and many more, will not take away the simple fact that—the Constitution is supreme and forceful in its position that the liberties of the individual come first and before any treaty and/or agreement.

Diplomacy; vintage, 20th century: Well, my friends, as you know and I am sure have guessed, the Big Four conference in Europe was a total flopperoo. It is what one would call diplomatic surgery—the operation was a success, but the patient died on the table. Just another continuing instance of our diplomatic infantilism. When our Secretary of State, Dulles, and the President's mouthpiece, Gen. Walter Bedell Smith, publicly stated that the conference was productive of something worthwhile, they belittle the intelligence of even a third-grade child. This European gabfest was nothing else but a phoney gesture. In fact every conference that we have with the Commies is a waste of time and money, and believe me it is trying the patience of the American people. For a long time—too long in fact—we have been the laughing stock of the rest of the world. We are not going to get anywhere with Russia until we start telling her off, and taking away from her some of the generous handouts of peoples and countries we so foolishly surrendered.

And now comes the next fiasco. The Far Eastern Conference to be held at Geneva in April. Red China is to be allowed in as an observer—what a laugh. Any child can foresee the results. All our protestations to the contrary—once she gets her foot into the door of our conferences it means she is established as a nation to do business with.

And anyone with a grain of sense knows that is all they want. It is the platform upon which they can broadcast their filthy propaganda and lies to a world that at best does not know what it is all about. They gain prestige—and they don't give a tinker's damn about whether we grant them recognition or not. Who is so dumb or naive in Washington or elsewhere for that matter, that believes that the combination of Russia, China, and Viet Minh Indochina will do anything constructive or give evidence of any cooperation at Geneva. This ages-old Asiatic triple alliance, shrewd in Asiatic diplomatic skill and propaganda will be a most powerful force to grapple with. Upon what basis can anyone conceive that out of that conference will come any solution or constructive effort toward a peace in Korea, unless it is on the terms they lay down.

Why must we, the United States, always be the fall guy in all of our diplomatic dealings? Why must we always buy our way in or out of these hassels? When we minded our own business, we were respected. Now we are hated and misunderstood, because we are trying to mold them into our way of life and thinking.

CONCLUSION

Dear ladies, it is indeed possible that some of you may disagree with some or all parts of my talk—and that is your God-given right and privilege in this wonderful country of ours. I would be the last one to deny you that privilege. The material in this message was prepared by me. I have no ghost writers. These are my own thoughts gathered from observations and analysis made during the past 35 years of following and studying legislation and the reaction of the citizenry to it. May I close with deep appreciation of your kind attentiveness and leave with you A Prayer for Our Country, by George Washington:

"Almighty God, who hast given us this good land for our heritage, we humbly beseech Thee that we may always prove mindful of Thy favor and glad to do Thy will. Bless our land with honorable industry, sound learning and pure manners. Save us from violence, discord, and confusion; from pride and arrogancy, and from every evil way. Defend our liberties, and fashion into one united people the multitudes brought out of many kindreds of tongues. Endure with the spirit of wisdom those to whom in Thy name we entrust the authority of government, that there may be peace and justice at home, and that through obedience to Thy law, we may show forth Thy praise among the nations of the earth. In the time of prosperity fill our hearts with thankfulness, and in the day of trouble, suffer not our trust in Thee to fail. All of which we ask through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen."

Four-Year Term for Representatives Opposed — Amendment To Protect Wealthy at the Expense of the Poor Opposed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 17, 1954

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, under the proposal of Senator Case in Senate Joint Resolution 155, an amendment is to be submitted by the Congress to the States providing for a change in our Constitution that will allow Members of the House of Representatives to be elected for 4 years instead of 2 years, as now provided in the Constitution, with one-half of the Members elected every 2 years.

Such a change for the convenience of the Memebers of the House and, from the standpoint of convenience of the Members, would naturally be looked upon with favor. Unquestionably it would be more convenient for a Member of the House. He would have security for 4 years instead of 2 years; he would have a longer time his first term to demonstrate his ability; he would not have to commence campaigning immediately after his election to the House of Representatives; and, he would be saved 1 expensive campaign every 4 years. All this is very fine for the Member who is affected, but, from the standpoint of the people, I do not believe that it is in the interest of our country that the change be made.

At the present time, I believe we have a fine balance in our Constitution as it affects the people who are privileged to assume the burdens of carrying on our successful democracy in a republic. In the Congress, in the one House where the most important laws are exclusively introduced, the elections are for 2 years and every Member is elected by the people—not a one is ever appointed.

Although I have not done any research on the questions raised by this proposed amendment, I do believe that the following points should be given consideration:

First. The United States Constitution has very wisely provided tenure of office in the administration of the three branches of government. (a) Legislative: 2 years for the 435 Members of the House of Representatives; 6 years, with one-third elected each year, for the 96 Members of the United States Senate. (b) The executive: The only 2 elective officers in the executive branch are the President and Vice President, who are elected for 4 years, commencing January 20 after every leap year. (c) The judiciary: The judges are appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate for life.

Second. The House of Representatives was set up to be composed of Members who are very close to the people. This body is given the exclusive power over the Nation's purse strings, the sole power of impeachment, and the power to choose a President in the event a candidate does not receive a majority of the electoral votes.

Third. Issues coming before the House of Representatives cannot be anticipated by the people 4 years in advance.

Fourth. If a question of impeachment or possibility of an election of a President should be a matter of paramount importance preceding an election on an even year the people should be allowed to pass on the election of all the Members of the succeeding House of Representatives that would pass on the question or questions, not just half of them. Evidently this was considered when the Constitution was written.

Fifth. A 4-year term for Representatives, instead of a 2-year term, is less important now because of rapid, in fact, almost instantaneous, means of communications, and the modern methods of transportation. A much better argument could have been made for the 4-year term when the Constitution was adopted and for the next 150 years thereafter. It has now been in operation for 165 years.

Sixth. A Representative is elected to serve in a definite Congress. The Members of the present House of Representatives were elected to serve during the 83d Congress. If the term is changed to 4 years the House that is expected to be so close to the people will be elected for 2 Congresses instead of 1.

Seventh. The State legislatures will be retarded in their constitutional privilege to redistrict their States after each census, as such redistricting could not be effective for 4 years.

Eighth. The Congress will be prevented from reapportioning representatives after each census without a delay of 4 years.

Ninth. Such a proposal embodies a major change in our form of government. If we are to remain a democracy in a republic, the House of Representatives must remain close to the people in order that any bad trend in government or any bad conduct in government may be stopped within a 2-year period.

Tenth. The collective mind of the people is an honest, sincere, intelligent mind. The people through their collective mind, in our elections and expressions of opinions, make mistakes occasionally. Two years is long enough for the people to suffer because of a mistake made in the selection of a representative. A good representative should welcome the opportunity to make a report to his constituents at the close of the Congress and ask for election to the succeeding Congress.

It appears to me that too many proposals are being presented for the changing of our United States Constitution. Most of them, if adopted, will weaken the power of the people to control and influence their own Government. The only substantial change we have had concerning the election of the Members of the Congress was when the 17th constitutional amendment was adopted compelling the direct election of United States Senators by vote of the people instead of by State legislatures. This move was in the direction of more power in the people and making it easier for them to have control of their Government at all times.

Now, if we are going to have 4 years for the Members of the House the question will come up—since the Senators are elected by the people just as the House Members—why should they not be elected for 4 years instead of 6 years?

MORE HELP FOR INDIVIDUAL MEMBERS

There is nothing wrong with the Congress that more help for the individual Member will not cure. The Members are not equipped to do the work that they are in duty bound to perform. Their duties involve intricate, involved principles and policies. Since the Members generally are not informed in economic matters they should have people working for them who possess this educational training and background to help them. Each Member of Congress should not only have an administrative assistant but should also have a economist on his staff. It is my belief that if the individual Members were assisted in this way laws, policies and practices of our Government would soon result in a saving of at least a billion dollars a year in interest charges on the national debt alone. It could be done in a way that the country would be helped and not harmed, in addition to the billion dollar savings to the taxpayers.

MINORITY CONTROL PROPOSALS SHOULD BE STOPPED

Too many proposals are now pending in the Congress, providing for a change in our Constitution, that would absolutely turn the control of our Government over to a minority in each House. For instance, it is my opinion that if the Reed-Dirksen proposal now pending should be adopted, the poor folks could be taxed without limit on all sorts of sales and excise taxes by a majority of the Members present, but in order to tax the wealthy—according to ability to pay—it would be necessary to secure the votes of 75 percent of the Members in each House. Since it is so seldom that all the Members are present, for all practical purposes this would mean almost 100-percent vote in each body of the Members present. It means, further, that a very small minority would be able to block and prevent any taxes on the wealthy. At the same time, there is no effort made in this proposal to reduce spending or make the burden on the poor less burdensome—it only protects the wealthy. Then, if by chance such a proposal should pass Congress, providing for a tax on the wealthy of over 25 percent, such a law would only be good under the constitutional amendment for 1 year. This would give a small minority another chance at the end of the year.

Such amendments as these are in the direction of tearing down our democratic fabric. Our democracy should be strengthened, not weakened. Any change in the Constitution should be in the direction of giving the people more power—not less—making it possible for the people to act more quickly and more effectively—not slow them down in their efforts.

J. Edgar Hoover

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. HART
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 18, 1954

Mr. HART. Mr. Speaker, for 30 years Mr. J. Edgar Hoover has served as Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. To say it is difficult to conceive that any nation ever had a finer civil servant is not to indulge in fanciful exaggeration. The admiration and respect accorded him by all patriotic Americans over the years tend to justify the above statement. I shall not attempt to labor the point here but in confirmation thereof append an excellent article by Andrew Tully, concerning Mr. Hoover, which appeared in the New York World-Telegram and Sun, and perhaps other Scripps-Howard newspapers, which lends further credence to such an appraisal of Mr. Hoover's eminence as an administrator par excellence:

J. E. HOOVER, FBI HEAD FOR 30 YEARS, HAS WON UNPRECEDENTED RESPECT—BACHELOR G-MAN STARTED IN 1917—CAPITAL PESTS LEAVE HIM ALONE

(By Andrew Tully)

WASHINGTON, May 8.—It is perhaps fitting that as John Edgar Hoover prepares to celebrate his 30th anniversary as FBI director Monday the public has been furnished with a prime example of the kind of thing which has made this long tenure possible.

This ingredient in Mr. Hoover's success story, of course, is the immunity from political squabbles granted to him during most of his official life by the politicians around him.

Thus, when there was a dispute at the Army-McCarthy hearings over a letter purportedly prepared by Mr. Hoover, the Senate investigating committee did not summon the boss G-man to take the witness stand and explain the matter under oath. It sent an emissary to FBI headquarters to get Mr. Hoover's story in the coziness of his private office.

KEEPS ALOOF

Presumably, Mr. Hoover would have had to comply with a request from the subcommittee that he testify. But he has shown over the years a distaste for becoming involved in such matters, and over the years a Congress aware of his mass popularity has bowed to his wishes, thus giving him a place in Government shared only by the President.

There was a most important exception to that immunity last November. That was when Mr. Hoover testified before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee on the Harry Dexter White espionage controversy. Sitting beside his new boss, Attorney General Herbert R. Brownell, Jr., Mr. Hoover bluntly denied former President Harry Truman's implication that he, Mr. Hoover, had been a party to an agreement to keep Mr. White in his post with the International Monetary Fund so the FBI could maintain a closer surveillance of him.

JOINED FBI IN 1917

But this calculated aloofness from Washington's burly-burly is only one major reason why Mr. Hoover has served under 7 Presidents and 13 Attorneys General. The other is that throughout his career he has been a public servant of tireless—sometimes ruthless—efficiency, and of unswerving devotion to his job. The result is that even his detractors acknowledge the almost unprecedented confidence reposed in him by the American people.

Mr. Hoover, a native Washingtonian, joined the Department of Justice in 1917 with a brandnew law degree from George Washington University here. Woodrow Wilson was President, and the FBI was a club for political hangers-on. The citizens joked about it when they were not outraged by its scandalous and intemperate activities.

Young John Edgar, a fireball with a deeply religious strain inherited from his Calvinist ancestors, set his eye on the FBI. He felt a national investigative organization was sorely needed, but he was repulsed by the immorality of the political henchmen who were its operatives. He started up the ladder in 1919 when Attorney General A. Mitchell Palmer made him a special assistant in charge of deporting aliens under the Sedition Act. In 1921 he was named Assistant Director of the FBI—and shortly caught the ear of Attorney General Harlan F. Stone, later to become a Supreme Court Justice.

TOSSED OUT CROOKS

Young Hoover peppered the Attorney General with his ideas. The riffraff and ex-convicts had to be weeded out of the FBI. A merit system of promotion was needed. The Bureau had to be operated according to professional police procedures. Harlan Stone listened, liked what he heard, and in 1924 got President Coolidge to name the 29-year-old Hoover boss of the FBI.

The result was one of the administrative achievements of the Nation's history. Mr. Hoover made G-man a title of respect. He tossed out the petty crooks, set up a standard whereby every FBI agent must be either a lawyer or a certified public accountant. Under his direction the FBI smashed the lawless gangs of the 1930's, kept the enemy from achieving a single act of sabotage during World War II, and all the while carried on a relentless fight against the forces of communism.

In the process, Mr. Hoover emerged as a kind of American idol. He's probably had more publicity than any American public figure with the possible exception of Franklin D. Roosevelt. Congress has treated him with unique gentleness; he always gets as much money as he wants and always with words of praise from the lawmakers.

QUIET PRIVATE LIFE

There have been dissenting voices, of course. The late Senator George Norris, of Nebraska, once called him "the greatest hound for publicity on the American continent today." And former Senator Kenneth McKellar, of Tennessee, suggested that the FBI boss lacked personal courage. Shortly thereafter, Mr. Hoover personally arrested gangster Alvin Karpis in New Orleans, although his associates were quick to report that Mr. McKellar was due no credit since the FBI director had been on numerous raids in the past.

But if John Edgar Hoover, $20,000-a-year director of the FBI, gets plenty of headlines, there is surprisingly little information available on Mr. Hoover, the man. His private life is zealously protected by his subordinates, who are apt to stumble and stammer even when asked whether J. Edgar prefers Scotch or bourbon. (He drinks Scotch with plain water, but rarely takes more than two.)

Today at 59, Mr. Hoover lives quietly in a big brick house on 30th Street in Rock Creek Park. His household menage consists only of a housekeeper—Mr. Hoover has never married and his name has never been linked with any prospective Mrs. Hoovers.

He has no car, but is driven back and forth between home and work in a Bureau Cadillac. Most mornings he alights from the car around 14th Street and Constitution Avenue to walk the remaining several blocks to the Department of Justice building on Pennsylvania Avenue, between 9th and 10th Streets. These walks and occasional fishing trips are his only forms of exercise these days; he has given up tennis.

A baseball and racing fan, he is often seen at the Washington Senator's ball games and at the nearby Maryland tracks. He likes good food and dines almost nightly at a special first-floor table at Harvey's a restaurant featuring giant portions of seafood and beef. As a result, he has added considerable bulk over the years to his 5-foot-11 frame and is forced to go on periodic diets to keep his weight down to around 190 pounds. When in New York, he is a regular at the Stork Club.

LOOKS YOUNG

Despite his added girth and his graying hair—he has the gray parts clipped short—the FBI boss gives the impression of youth as he moves swiftly about his office or supervises a raid with short, staccato orders. His big head and flattened nose give him a look of eternal toughness and great energy. He had a serious bout with pneumonia a few years ago, but today he says he never felt in better health.

But, above all, Mr. Hoover radiates self-confidence and a serenity that is almost aggressive. It is, more than anything else, the outlook of a man who for 30 years has survived the political snakepit which is Washington.

For a More Realistic United States Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 18, 1954

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following radio address I delivered over WMEX, Boston, Mass., on May 15, 1954, from 7 to 7:15 p. m.:

Recent events on the international scene have confused and disturbed most Americans.

To put it bluntly, we have suffered reverses.

It would be better for ourselves and the free world if we could have a united foreign policy, one with more foresight, cohesion, and vigor, that would not become a spectacle in the congressional elections this fall, dividing us here at home, and weakening our cause before the world.

The situation is serious, requiring us to put the war against communism above any partisan or personal considerations.

Our foreign policy needs revision to make it effective.

I describe the global picture as the war against communism. Perhaps I should change it to say the war of the Communists against us. In any event it is a conflict being waged in deadly earnest by our foes. On the diplomatic, economic, and psychological fronts, the enemy shows a suppleness, imagination, and persistency, that is dangerous. Like the "mole-men" in Indochina, who burrow underground from their lines, and then attack you from the rear. Or the guerrillas who hit you, and when you try to fight back, you find that they have faded into the jungle, or have assumed the protective coloration of civilians, temporarily. Or the Communist diplomats who use the bait of trade, and the lullaby peace, to divide the Western World.

Recent events have demonstrated that we have counted too heavily on support from England and France. I do not say that we should abandon them as poor risks, because that would play right into the hands of the Reds. But, remembering how their timid counsels and mere token assistance handcuffed us in Korea and how they suggest the gradual surrender of all southeast Asia to the Communists under the face-saving devices of a truce, a partition, or a coalition government for Indochina, we would be less than sensible if we followed their defeatist advice again.

It is not that we are without blame ourselves.

Policies contrived at Washington, with one eye on the international crisis and the other, at cross-purposes, flirting for your vote in November, have sometimes resulted in contradictions and indecision.

These high-level brains assume that the American people are too young and impetuous to be told the truth. They fear that we cannot face up to disagreeable necessities. They hope that the world situation will clear up, somehow, without disturbing us.

As if we did not have enough experience already to leave behind the irresponsibilities of childhood.

I believe the administration is making a great mistake in not taking us into its confidence. By telling us the realistic facts of international life, it will do more to consolidate American public opinion in support of a more vigorous foreign policy than by keeping us in the dark.

Furthermore, I believe that the administration should hold no secrets back from the leaders of the Democratic Party in Congress. Under a patriotic agreement that it shall not become an issue in November, leaders of both parties can formulate a united policy instead of the present frantic improvisation that is so often trying to catch up with events that have already happened.

Take the Geneva Conference, for example, where we were maneuvered into an impossible position even before the Conference started. Or Indochina, whose significance we only discovered a few weeks ago. Or West Germany, that could contribute so much to an integrated force for defense of Europe, if fearful France did not forever block this step that France herself first suggested.

Or the formation of a defensive alliance of nations in southeast Asia, with technical and material assistance from us, to seal off Communist expansion in that strategic area.

We did not win in Korea, when we could have won. The mistakes were political and not military. But at least we accomplished two results. Aggression was halted in its tracks and a South Korean Army, battle-tested and vigorous in its opposition to communism, now stands in the way of Communist expansion toward Japan, and ties down a number of Red Chinese forces that might otherwise be used to attack India, or pour through Indochina, the Malayan Peninsula, bringing pressure to bear upon the Philippines, Indonesia, and eventually Australia.

It is imperative that we build up a new system of firm alliances, train and equip and inspire these nations to defend themselves. Where they have not acquired a genuine independence to fight for, as in Indochina, we must use every persuasive means to bring about self-government.

Young and unstable nations, new to the responsibilities and problems that come with independence, must be given every possible assistance to become strong, before communism undermines them.

American foreign policy has been dragging its heels on these vital matters. As a result, we have been losing the battle for mens' minds among the teeming millions of Asia. In our efforts to bolster England and France, we have been made to appear as the receivers in bankruptcy of their outmoded imperialism, and Communist propaganda has not missed the opportunity to exaggerate it one hundred times over, to our disadvantage.

There will be painful readjustments for England and France in gradually giving up their colonial holdings. There will be economic loss and military risk that must be compensated for by other arrangements.

But if we hope to stop the creeping slavery of communism from taking over the whole world piece by piece and transforming it into a monstrous empire of despair, we must be more alert and realistic in our counterattack for freedom.

In other words, we must develop a consistent and courageous foreign policy, one that is tailored in part by a fully informed American public, characterized by initiative and intelligence, that employs our resources effectively, without negligence or waste.

Waiting for each crisis to arise and then rushing in with half measures to meet it is the way that the Communists would have us follow because it keeps us off balance, and lets them call the tune every time.

We have shown leadership occasionally.

Aid to Greece and Turkey was one case.

The Marshall plan was another.

The airlift that broke the blockade of Berlin was a third.

The North Atlantic Treaty Organization and the European Defense Community were well conceived, even though the prospects for them do not look too bright at the moment.

And Korea?

A daring decision, sandwiched in between an unintentional invitation to aggression, and a truce that will leave us right back where we started, if we are lucky.

We must not forget the United Nations—symbol of hope, where men can debate instead of fighting..

Where Red China was labeled the aggressor and now, without apology or restitution, is shooting, and blackmailing, and bribing its way into membership not only of the U. N. but into the select circle of the Big Five.

It has been estimated that over 35 million words have been spoken in the U. N. on the subject of peace and how to achieve it, while the aggressors, under one disguise or another, move on, slowly but surely, along the road to conquest of the world.

In the U. N. no one speaks up to demand the release of the 944 missing GI's who are held as slave-laborers by the Communists in cynical contempt of the Korean truce agreement.

I believe that we must keep the U. N. going, feble as it is, in the hope that it will gain the moral courage which is the source of strength and justice to stop aggression anywhere, anytime.

I regret to say that it does not have the courage at the present time.

If we do not develop other and practical means at once to curb the unsatisfied appetite of communism, then the whole free world as well as the U. N. may be swallowed up by it piecemeal.

In the race between intelligence and disaster, between civilization and tyranny, it troubles many Americans that our Nation does not show more initiative.

Politics, both domestic and international, seems to get in the way of steady purpose and resolute leadership.

Our last recourse is to appeal to all Americans so that the invincible power of public opinion will insist on a more positive foreign policy.

One of stern appraisal, cool decision, and effective action.

But first we must have the facts, all of them.

Give us the true story of our position, Mr. President, even if it hurts.

Some will be afraid. Others will grumble. The majority of us, however, will back you up on a firm policy of calculated risk to turn the tide against communism.

A little more determination now would save us from a lot more danger later on.

Parity for the Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1954

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, 3 times in the past 2 months I have called to the attention of my colleagues that the businessmen in our farm communities share the farmers' interest in our agricultural programs.

As part of my remarks on each occasion, I appended resolutions signed by a cross-section of these businessmen favoring the maintenance of price supports at least 90 percent of parity.

Previously I have introduced such resolutions signed by 561 businessmen in 11 Montana towns. Today I received identical resolutions signed by 520 businessmen in 6 more towns. This brings to 1,081 the number of signatures on resolutions from 17 Montana towns.

The resolutions I received today follow:

PARITY FOR THE FARMERS

Being as the State of Montana is a majority agricultural State, the undersigned businessmen of Great Falls feel that it is most imperative that we work side by side with those attempting to mtaintain a farm program which will enrich and develop the agricultural activities wherever they are a major industry or source of livelihood.

In view of the above conclusion, we, the following businessmen of Great Falls resolve that we go on record opposing any effort on the part of any Congressman, the Department of Agriculture, or any agency for attempting to disrupt the stabilization program, affecting all farm commodities.

We further resolve that Congress not only maintain 90 percent of parity, but shall try to establish 100 percent of parity for all farm commodities. We do not favor any tendency toward flexibility of price supports, but urge Congress to maintain a production-control program, which is necessary in order to have stabilized price support.

We further resolve to condemn any form of prosperity based on war and bloodshed, but favor genuinely sane and sound economic program, particularly for the producer, which shall be based on industry, security, and individual initiative.

We further urge all business groups in other cities of this State as well as those of other agricultural States to go on record favoring similar resolutions.

Arthur Briggs, Briggs Implement Co.; Ray P. Smith, Smith Equipment Co.; R. J. Roseth, Roseth Bros., oils and gas; R. L. Wirth, Thisted Motor Co.; Mrs. G. Selekovich, Frontier Inn; Neil Beatty, Haas & Associates Implement Co.; Robert Ralph, The Strong Scott Manufacturing Co.; H. F. Lambertson, H. F. Lambertson Co.; Harry E. Marsh, Montana Oliver Distributing Co.; G. D. Hollecker (limited to some farm products); Geo. G. Mill Implement Co.; George T. Hopkins, Hi-Way Lumber Co.; Floyd Killion, Ferris Killion Implements & Hardware; Robert L. Rahn, Midland Implement Co.; Robert L. Rahn, Wymont Tractor & Equipment Co.; Robert L. Rahn, Midland Distributing Co.; Charles Steffani, South Side Service Station; Clarence Ulmer, Ulmer's Auto Service; Norman Traber, Idowell Creamery, Inc.; C. N. Oswald, Riverside Machine Works; W. E. Bowen, Blais Bowen Realty; F. E. Lowrie, Drapery & Venetian Blind Co.; William Fox Realty Co. by William Fox; Chas. M. Joyce, Joyce's Custom Furniture; M. W. White, White Refrigeration Co.; Dick Hogan, Shamrock Bar.

Alvin T. Westdal, Uke's Sports; Jerry Olson, Top Hat Cafe; Ethel R. Gunniss, the Curiosity Shop; Tom Green, Club Barber Shop; J. F. Hoppe, L. S. Cohn Co.; Sam Dallas, New York Shoeshine Parlor; Edward L. French, Eddie's Army Store; Ben Bolen, B. & J. Trading Post; Andy Balko, Pension Bar; Lee Costin, Senate Bar; C. E. Bernkner, Berk's Bar; Ernest A. Payne, P. O. News Stand; Ira M. Kaufman, Kaufman's; Ralph Schell, Schell Restaurant; Mrs. K. Smith, manager, Reeds Millinery; Richard P. Murrill, Stockman; L. A. Eneboe, Eneboe Motor Co.; Robert F. English, English Realty Co.; Walter S. Thisted, the Hub; E. T. Montgomery, Sears Roebuck & Co.; A. J. Hedensten, Montgomery Ward & Co.; L. K. Quam, American Dixie Shop, Inc.; C. E. Frame, J. J. Newberry Co.; M. E Gay, Killorns; Julius Palagi, Maverick Bar.

E. S. Thoreson, Rexall Drug; S. & L. Co., E. P. Astley; Josephine Moye, manager, Dotty Dunn Hats; Irvin R. Potter, Nate Morgan Jewelers; L. A. Christison, Dundas Office Supply; Jack C. Throckmorton, All Sports Supply Co.; A. S. Farago, Carlson's Shoes; Deane Hopper, Thriftway Drug; E. B. Johnson, E. B. Johnson Co.; Robert K. Porro, Montana Bar; Nick Wolf, Wolf's Pastry Shop; F. Koetter, Central Market; R. W. Bowker, Bowker Realty Co.; J. V. Voegele; C. W. Hansen, Green Lantern; M. J. McDonnell; A. Hindoien.

C. B. Rodger; Duff S. Culwell; W. L. Brown; N. S. Young; Charles A. Burrell; R. W. Walsh, Walsh Anderson Lumber Co.; Paul Matteucci, Super-Save Market; W. C. Spater, Drive-In Drug; L. W. Wallace; Ted's Conoco Service; Mrs. J. R. Flynn, Flynn Steel Buildings Co.; R. T. Anderson, Great Plains Supply Co.; James P. Scissons, Jim's Cash Grocery; C. L. Briggs, Monarch Lumber Co.; Jack T. Young, Rainbow Bakery Service; G. V. Mundale, Mundale Body Works; Raymond J. Bremar, B's Mart; W. R. Woods, Second Avenue Pharmacy; E. E Champion, Champion Grocery; Charles Patterson, Pat's Upholstery Shop; Elmer Bofto, Bofto Upholstery Craft Shop.

D. H. Sutherland; Fred M. Chavez; James Giese; Pete Brajcich, Central Floor Covering; Lyman J. Ferguson, Ferguson's Phillips 66; Bertha Eskers; Herbert C. Anderson, Statewide Gift Novelty Co.; Katherine Olson, Clock Cafe; Walter G. Dudra, The Pin Cushion; T. M. Ginn; Geoge Merrill; Frank S. Courtnage, Frank's Cream Depot; Jim Sowa; Joe Rege, Martin's Shoe Shop; Harvey Hill, Elmore Bar; Mel Witsoe, Mel's Cycle Service.

Chris Gerhart, Falls Washer Service; Carroll Bennett, Great Falls; Bell Insurance Co.; Mrs. David Johnson; Daisy A. Anderson, Corner Grocery; Ambrose's Hi-Ho Tavern; Earl Cox, Town & Country Store; Mary V. Hall, Hall-Mark Shop; Shirley DeWeese, Fairview Grocery; J. J. Gregoire; Henry Myskewitz, 10th Avenue 66 service station; George Hall; James Merlo, Merlo's Union Service; J. E. Reed, Reed's Tavern; Albert L. Young, Young's 10th Avenue Conoco Clack Station; E. P. Simms; Mrs. Bert J. Goettel, Handy Cash Grocery; Joseph Chase, Parkdale Variety; John Wrynn, Parkdale Bakery & Ice Cream; C. E. Saylor, 417 First Avenue North; Frank Longway, Pennant Bar & Lounge; Bartley Distributing Co.; J. M. Bartley.

Harris M. Olson, Olson Motors; William R. Davis; Arthur L. Cole; F. F. Baney, Great Falls Transportation Co.; Park Hotel, Frances Gleason; Fannie Rounds, Red John's Cafe; George D. Anderson, Anderson-Cooke Supply; Herman Gettel, Atlantic Bar; Walter Meisenbach; Laurence J. McIntosh, McIntosh Tailors; Larry McIntosh, Foreign Motors; Charles, L. Carlson, Sturrocks; Nick Panich, Jr., Nick & Martin Standard Service; Homer Taylor, Auto Wash Oiling Station; C. L. Carlson, Carlson Music Co.; K. R. Bailar, Bailar's Super Cream; Bill Bryant, Bill Bryant's Conoco.

Paul M. Seese, Seese Chevrolet; M. C. Marvin, Marvin Maytag Shop; E. S. LaCombe, Vallet Fur Co; L. LaCombe, Vallet Fur Co.; D. J. Hagen, Vallet Clerks; Harold R. Patton, Town & Ranch; R. B. Schroeder, Schroeder Oldsmobile Co.; George J. Pinski, Pinski Bros.; Curtis V. Weisman, City Glass Co.; Douglas Rudd, Cascade Camera; D. F. Goggans, Goggans & Pennie; R. E. Lydiard, Barbers, Inc.; J. J. O'Leary, O'Leary Electric Co.; S. E Rumford, Great Falls Sporting Goods; George M. Smith, Big Six Barber Shop;John L. Shy, Davenport Barber Shop; Warren D. Roll, Fritz Roll & Sons; K. D. Nelson, Great Falls Radiator Repair; George Bowen, Service Center; Les Hackett, Union Club.

A. L. Hasbrouck, F. U. Oil Station; N. L. Julian, Julian's Furniture; L. F. Peck, Peck's Radio T–V; John J. Yaw, Yaw Photo Shop; John J. McNaught, McNaught Service Station; Robert W. Ford, Aristocrat Cafe; Stanley G. Meagher, Mike's Welding Supply Co.; Emma Gewald, Falls Maid Fountain; James R. Hansen, Great Falls Dairy; Russell D. Honaker, Russ's Sixth Street Service Station; Donald R. Ross, Graham & Ross Merc. Co.; C. A. Gemberling, Valley Motor Supply; Edwin C. Zipperian, Victory Food Market; Lee Kronschnabel, Lee's Agency; Jack Carver, Great Falls Watch Service; Frank A. Silvius, Western Bar Co.

Harry L. Prigge, Prigge's Home Improvement Co.; G. H. Manning, Warehouse Furniture; R. J. Moze, Western Furniture; Roy Bennett, Smith Sales; Jack Staley, Montana Meats; Sid Kelman, Zollie's Jewelry Co.; Harold Pesis, Max the Clothier; Paul Morris, LaRosa's Store; Walter A. Olson, DeLuxe Barber Shop; T. J. Mitchell; Carl E. Lingwall, Lingwall's; Noah D. Clark, Clark's Key Shop; A. G. Brown, Brown's Furniture; W. H. Cole, Wilson Cole Furniture Co.; W. E. Sims, Singer Sewer Machine Co.; L. A. Kolar, The Famous Mint; Jack Little and James M. Carlisle, Star Cigar; Roy A. Anderson; Donald E. Greene, Greene's Sheet Metal; J. M. Simpson, Electric Motor Service; Thomas M. Smith, Tommy's Ice Cream Bar; Buster Kahn, Sav-On-TV.

Russell Traber, Frozen Assets, Inc.; Charles Brady, Brady Grocery; W. L. Anderson, Wally's Superette; Eddie Newman, DeLuxe Lounge & Steak House; Minnie Wolter, Wolter's Grocery; Clynis E. Whitmore, Whit's Market; Warren R. Jones, Hall-Perry Machinery Co.; L. E. Mann, Mann's Sewing Machine Shop; Mel Maguire, Vic's Ice Cream & Donut Shop; Cecil M. Malloy, Palace Bar; Gertrude Madsen, Great Falls Cafe; M. J. Peklewsky, Anchor Bar; C. L. Swanson, Sullivan Hotel; Dan Gooselaw, U. S. Barber Shop; Carl Hjeresen, Manager, F. U. Creamery; Stewart Hogeland, Great Falls Army Store; Jerry Longan, Jerry's Radio & T. V.

B. A. McDowell, Auto Craft Shop; Leo Beeker, Beeker's Radiator Service; Harry Schultz, Schultz Body Shop; E. L. Vick; David J. Jensen, Jensen Service Station; O. Mason; George Weber; James H. Baker, Rainbow Radio & T. V.; John N. Mosch, Mosch Electric Co.; Lillian Turnquist, Curiosity Shop; Mrs. Gordon Ford, Unique Lettering Shop; Will Dardis, Barber Shop; Montana Welding Co.; Emmett Stewart, Ozark Cafe; M. E. Skoog, Red Boot Shoe Store; C. W. Pannage; R. H. Koth, Albrechts Furniture; Mervin C. Andersen, Andersen's Sales and Service; Edwin Johnson, Edwin Johnson Plumbing Co.; Jas. Charteris, Charteris Hardware Co.; James Bryant, Gerald Cafe.

Salmenson Jewelers, A. Salmenson; Peter Cladouhos, Liberty Corner Confectionery; Fox Theaters; Liberty Hat Shop, J. Soupos; McClains Sewing Machine Store, Lloyd S. McClain; Bistodeau Jewelry, George Bistodeau; J. E. Wells, The Paris of Montana; Block's Shoe Store; E. Kinkaid, Diana Stores Corp.; Boyd's Jewelry; Crown Jewelry Co., Mrs. Rozan Thomas; Classic Shop, E. C. Mettler; Club Cafeteria, Julius G. Rinan; Central Cigar Store, Clara Wolk; Jim Kovich Jeweler, Jim Kovich; Styles Shop, D. Stapp; Buttreys Department Store, Bernard Murphy; J. C. Penney Co., Roy S. Currell.

Mode O'Day, Esther G. Smith; Josephine Devorik, Cascade Candy Co.; Don Stanfield, Texaco Station; C. J. McCharles, Carter Oil; R. L. Davidson, Phillips 66; A. W. Winkelman, Rainbow Hotel; P. J. Gilfeather, Great Falls; W. J. Toy, Falls Alleys; Koffee Kup Cafe; Tom Kendrigan; Frank Weldele, Copper State Cleaners; Vera E. Adams, North Side Bar; G. L. Vesser, Vesser Hotel; L. F. Borchers, American Furniture; R. H. Palmer, Palmer Bros.; Wesley R. & Walter Atchison, Atchison Garage; J. P. Gabriel, Union 76 Service Station; Leonard Haggerty, Great Falls Motor Co., Inc.; Leslie's Inc., R. C. Nehls; Public Drug Co., Inc., H. V. Morrow.

Martin J. Gillespie, real estate and insurance; H. G. Clark, Mountain States Supply; J. Owen, National Cash Register Co.; Irving Fineman, furniture and appliances; Arnold Berhow, Berhow's Auto Shop; Gene Shaffer, Midwest Motor Welders; Earl Baker, blacksmith shop; N. K. Teleff, Champion Shoe Shop; Henry Carlson, Goldsmith; B. G. Poulos, Olympia Barber Shop; Elmer V. Teddy, Teddy Jewelry; Violet Wills, Liberty Beauty Shop; Perry C. Freel, Stockman Bar; D. E. White, White Realty, Inc.; W. W. Huntsberger, Huntsberger Insurance & Realty.

Norman Dalbec, Liberty Shoe Shop; James McAndrews, Liberty Barber Shop; Mrs. Gladys Bobier, Montana Agate & Gift Shop; Jay R. Brown; J. A. Hasterlik, Park Grocery; Alexander Warden, Great Falls Tribune; John A. Makela, Eddy Cafe; Henry W. Bredenbroker, 15½ Fourth Street South; Floyd L. Rouse, Floyd L. Rouse Agency; William H. Artz, Artz Accounting; A. E. Schwingel, insurance; W. T. Hodges, Moon Agency, Inc.; Edwin Verzatt, Quick's Barber Shop; Fred F. Pluhar, Turf Barber Shop; Edward J. Gruter, Falls Barber Shop; William J. Wendling, The Hobby Shop; Arthur Paka, DeLuxe Cleaners; David J. Ryan, attorney at law; E. J. Erickson, printer; Blanche Morton, Falls Upholstering Co.; Albert McCune, Town Tavern; Seedon S. Williams, Great Falls Mattress Factory; A. T. Fox, Ideal Laundry.

J. E. Duncan, Joe Duncan Signs; D. L. Suhr, Suhr Motor Co. (Buick); James J. Flaherty, Great Falls Paper Co.; Mrs. William R. Greenizer, Shopper's Bazaar; W. W. Kelly; Thomas H. Spring, Spring's Market; C. P. Mieyr, Mieyr's Coffee; Harley Olmstead, Harley's Glass Shop; B. B. Burk; L. A. Wall, Geneva Kitchen Co.; Ben F. Stephens, Falls Hotel; John J. Daly, Goodman's Bar; Ray H. Ford, Club Cigar Store; Clay Penland, Club Cigar Store; Vernon C. Flesek, Young's Cafe; A. E. Teddy, Teddy's Pastry Shop; L. J. Mogstad, Midway Bar & Lounge.

J. B. Robinson, Grogan-Robinson Lumber Co.; Paul R. McClure, Beatrice Foods; Henry Sheffels, Central Machinery Co.; Virginia H. Blend, The Copy Shop; J. L. Heaton, H. O. Auto Supply; Don Voegel, Service Station; Arthur I. Tucker, Stop & Shop Grocery; Elgin Wuerfel, 5th Avenue Ice Cream Co.; Al F. Rossberg, Jr., Howdy Standard; Wm. L. Gianoulias, Howdy Drive In; John W. Devine, Devine Asselstine Bartley Co.; Merle C. Ryan, A & M Root Beer; Mrs. I. Neumann, Farmers Electric; L. E. Peterson, Peterson's Shoe Shop; Mrs. Edward Moltzan, Etta's Cafe; M. A. Sterling, Sav-Ur-Self Service Station; Clifford C. Haugen, Cliff's Tenth Avenue Carter; Charles Mora, Flying Saucer Cafe; R. E. Wandke, Farmers Union Central Exchange; S. J. Holland, Holland's Carter Service; H. G. Prescott, Prescott Food Market.

Palmquist Electric Co., C. A. Palmquist; Ray's Fountain, R. R. Bergman; Coast to Coast Store, Armond Gable; Joyer's Georges LeRoux; Furan-Omundsen, Radio TV. Wm. G. Omunson; Frank Duval; Gus & Eddie's Lounge, Inc., Tom Grasseschi; 3–D–Club, Tom Grasseschi; Benny's Cleaners, Ingmar Hippe; Top Notch Lunch, Jack Peterson; Rogers 66, Sam Rogers; Culligan Soft Water Service, Pat Tice; Silver State Auto Co., Curtis O. Hanson; L. M. H. Co., T. C. Matsko; E. A. Notti, Great Falls Office Equipment Co.; Forrest L. Zion, Zion Construction & House Moving.

Carl Weissman & Sons, C. Weissman; Graybill, Bradford & Graybill, Leo Graybill; D. C. Ledger, Service Station; Jay Croft, Fay's Food Store; Charles M. Kranz, Kranz House of Flowers; Great Falls Brick Co., W. J. Gunniss; Katherine F. Morger, Stockyard Cafe; Mrs. G. Seokovich, Frontier Inn; Glen A. Schultz, Montana Concrete Pipe Co.; George M. Thompson, Shawhan Poultry Co.; L. C. Minikler, Omaha Standard; J. J. McLaughlin, General Truck & Tractor Co.; Paul Skarsten, Seitz Machinery Co.; Raymond S. Sweeney, Snyder Construction Co.; George Taber, Taber Trucking Co.; John J. Guerra, Black Eagle Texaco; George A. Wargo, Wargo's Tavern; Edward Breska, ACM Co. Employee; William Ellis, Black Eagle Barber Shop; Joseph Restelli, Black Eagle Commercial Co.; Gino Marianetti, Black Eagle Bar; John Vukasin, Ranger's Club, Black Eagle.

Emelia Grasseschi, Borrie's Place, Black Eagle; Rudolph B. Carney, Hi-Hat Club, Black Eagle; Tony Antonich, Chicago Mercantile Co.; Fred A. Geisser, manager, F. U. Oil Co.; L. J. Gutenberg, 89 Bar; H. C. Phillips, Wrecking Yard; R. B. Kernaghan, Kernaghan's Service; Hansen Bros., wholesale oil; John Obstarczyk, West Side Realty; Robert T. Johnson, service station operator; H. G. Sutherland, G. F. Feed & Supply Co.; Ray P. O'Connell, Peoples Gasoline Co.; Frank O'Connell, Peoples Gasoline Co.; Union Oil Co.; E. Odegard, Odegard Bros.; C. M. Merritt, Barrell Drive-In.

W. C. Augustine, Coca-Cola Bottling Co.; Robert B. Nesbit, West Side Texaco; Frank Youngdale, W. M. Woodward Co.; Don R. Messman, Grogan Robinson Lumber Co.; E. B. Danforth, F. U. Grain Terminal Association; Roy Houseman, Great Falls; Jack Little, Little's Lanes; A. J. Scanlon, Great Falls; C-Q Radio, TV; H. T. Topel, American Liner Supply Co.; Robert A. Gilmon; D. C. Bulen; E. J. Harberson; Lou Richmond.

BELT BUSINESSMEN

Farmers Elevator Co.; J. M. Howanach Barber Shop; Fender Chevrolet; Belt Bar; Cal's Place, barbershop; Belt Self Service; Walt's Tavern; Irvine Grocery; Thos. Benoy; Hansen Bros. Garage; Veleber's Market; G. Ryffel & Sons; Belt Valley Creamery; Dr. James S. Stewart; Cinker Plumbing & Heating.

Kelsey & Dorr; Morris Store; N. H. Browning, Jr.; Ed's Bar, Ed Ehret; Legion Bar; Irv Sturm; Belt Valley Times; W. A. Johnson; Belt Beauty Shop; Oliver Larson; East Belt Coal Mine; Belt Theater; F. E. Brown, Black Diamond Bar; Wayne Falls; M. J. Machine & Repair; Elmer Lazure, Belt; Waldo Hotel, Belt; Belt Texaco Service Station; Nobel's Cafe; Earl B. Kennedy; L. & M. Frosted Foods; Black Diamond Cafe.

POWER BUSINESSMEN

James W. Anderson, Andy's TV Sales & Service; J. P. McDonnell, Montana Mustard Seed Corp.; E. G. Bakke, Les' Bar; Irving Olmstede, Honey Co.; John Oberosler, Les' Bar; Herman Helsper, Power Garage; Herbert M. Dittus, H. & V. Bar; Rollie Emch, Power Farmers Elevator Co.

SUN RIVER BUSINESSMEN

O. L. Krouse; Irene C. Anderson; Ramble Inn Tavern; J. E. Sysla, grain buyer; Walter W. Wight, Wight's Garage.

FORT SHAW BUSINESSMEN

John D. Gage, Fort Shaw Tavern; J. E. Hanson, gas station; Paul Caldwell, gas station; Ora J. Anderson, tavern.

DUTTON BUSINESSMEN

Ben N. Loch, Farmer Mercantile; S. & P. Motor Co., Harold Roser; James A. Cheetham; L. E. Bellamy; D. L. Curtis, Curtis Auto & Implement Co.; J. F. Maxwell, manager, Dutton Cooperative; C. M. Weeks, manager, Farmers Mercantile Co.; C. J. Walker, manager, Dutton; Floyd L. Goodrich, Dutton Theater; Robert Scott, Dutton; L. E. Johns Barber Shop, Dutton; B. R. Schlichten, Fireside Inn.

F. W. Orr, Dutton Market; Ray Van Heel, Club Tavern; Clara Clemenson, coffee bar; Olive Nelson; Harlan Clapshaw, Carmon O. Thorne, Stanley W. Haglund, M. E. Fichtner, Dutton Machinery; W. M. Scott; Dutton Electric Shop; Archie R. Johnson; Emmett Munroe, Munroe's Hi-Power Service; Roy Dixon, Dutton Motor Co.

John C. Schabel; Loren D. Schabel; J. B. Decker & Co., J. B. Decker; Lester E. Wiprud; O. T. Wiprud; Charles L. Cascaden, Dutton Confectionery; George Sollid, Sollid & Mell; E. H. Holzknecht, Jr., Monarch Lumber Co.; E. M. Chevalier, Hi-Way Garage.

New Power Policy Hurts Labor, Too

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 18, 1954

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by W. P. Kennedy, president, Brotherhood of Railway Trainmen, entitled "New Power Policy Hurts Labor, Too." The article appears in the January 1954 issue of the Rural Electrification magazine.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW POWER POLICY HURTS LABOR, TOO

(By W. P. Kennedy)

The same administration electric power policy which threatens adequate wholesale power supply for rural electric cooperatives is a threat to American labor, including trainmen whose jobs are dependent on an expanding level of business activity in the Nation.

Without abundant, reasonable-cost energy, there will be a slowdown in industrial development and activity as surely as there will be a slowdown in rural electrification, low voltages and inadequate power on the farms.

HELLS CANYON, AN EXAMPLE

The meaning of the new give-away policy to both farmers and labor is well illustrated in the case of Hells Canyon, where the administration has withdrawn objections to the Idaho Power Co. building three little run-of-the-river dams in the place of one huge multipurpose Federal dam.

Farmers need abundant, low-cost power in this area for their rural electric systems and for the development of large cooperative phosphate fertilizer projects in southeastern Idaho. Three farmer co-op groups—Western Farmers of Walla Walla, Wash., Central Farmers of Chicago, Ill., and Farmers Union—have phosphate rock holdings in the area and are waiting for electric power to develop huge fertilizer plants.

But if the Idaho Power Co. gets the permit, there will be no electric furnace fertilizer plants—the power will be too costly.

Hearings show that the proposed Federal dam at Hells Canyon would add 1,460,000 kilowatts of generating capacity to the Columbia Basin power system. The three small Idaho Power Co. dams would add only 885,000 kilowatts of capacity—575,000 kilowatts or about 40 percent less than the Federal structure.

POWER RATES COMPARED

The Government power would sell for $21 per kilowatt year or about 3.5 mills (about one-third of 1 cent) per kilowatt-hour. The Idaho Power Co. electricity would have to sell at $38 per kilowatt year, or 6 mills (six-tenths of 1 cent) per kilowatt-hour.

Under a recent Supreme Court ruling, sustaining the right of the Federal Government to use spare capacity of a transmission line built across Federal lands in Idaho, Hells Canyon power could be transmitted to the phosphate area for sale even lower than the 3.5 mills cited above.

The 3.5 mill power would make electric furnace processing and the development of the phosphate plants possible. That would mean low-cost fertilizer for the farmers of the West and Midwest. It would mean jobs for workmen, more freight for the railroads and, as railroad trainmen put it, more freight would mean more "beans for brakemen."

The loss of the 575,000 kilowatts of power potential in the Snake River Canyon—and such a loss is involved in the fight between Federal and private development—would mean tremendous economic and job losses to the area and the Nation.

The 1950 census showed that there had been a gain of 325,000 jobs in the Tennessee Valley during the existence of the TVA. The TVA had provided 3.5 million kilowatts of low-cost energy capacity up to that time. This figure, and Bonneville Power Administration experience, both indicate that a new job is provided by approximately each 11 kilowatts of new, low-cost generating capacity.

INCOME, JOB LOSS

Simple arithmetic therefore indicates that the loss of 575,000 kilowatts of potential, low-cost energy will mean the loss of 52,000 jobs in the area, and of tremendous industrial income, taxes, and new service business opportunities.

The Public Affairs Institute has estimated the loss would be at least $180 million in payrolls, $525 million in products value, and around $30 million in Federal taxes annually.

Industries are lined up waiting for low-cost electricity so they can get started. Both TVA and Bonneville have had to turn away many private enterprises because they lacked generating capacity to supply new industries. The electro-process industries especially need electric power sources. So there is no doubt that the development of abundant power at reasonable cost will mean industrial growth.

An advantage always claimed by the private power companies is that they are taxpaying enterprises and Federal projects are not.

Idaho Power Co. claims that it would pay $9,750,000 a year in taxes as a result of its 3-dam scheme. This probably would prove untrue, for the company is already applying for Federal accelerated tax amortization certificates on its two upper dams. If granted, this would mean large tax savings.

But assuming it paid full taxes, the cost to the citizens of this tax revenue would be—

Increase of $17 per kilowatt year in the cost of power (from $21 per kilowatt year to $38 as cited above). The extra power cost would be more than the taxes collected.

Loss of the 575,000 kilowatts of salable power capacity, and of all the jobs, payrolls, and production outlined above.

Loss of taxes from the industries and workmen, and their properties, which would be lost to the area.

Loss of irrigation, farmsteads, and increased property values and business activity which irrigation aided by Hells Canyon revenues would bring to the region.

Again the experience of the Nation with the TVA is an excellent example of the falsity of the power company's short-sighted arguments.

Before the TVA started, the 7 Tennessee Valley States paid 3.4 percent of total national income taxes. In 1952, with TVA, the 7 Valley States paid 6.2 percent of all national income taxes. This was an increase of 2.8 percent in the proportion of the Federal income taxes borne in the basin. That equaled a $900-million increase in Federal tax payments from the TVA States in 1952 alone.

Over the years, the increase in proportion of taxes paid by the Tennessee Valley States has amounted to $7 billion and the annual amount is still climbing.

Such increases in revenue—based on the increased prosperity of the area—make the amount of taxes which Idaho Power Co. would pay look picayune indeed.

A policy of abundant, low-cost electric power for the Nation is a must for all of us—farmers, workers, and the true, free-enterprise segment of our economy alike.

Geneva Convention on Asian Problems—An Integrated Report on Its Progress and Proceedings by Vicente Villamin From Geneva—Part I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 18, 1954

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, a great international conference is going on in Geneva, Switzerland. It is dealing with the Korean, Indochinese, and other Asian problems. The conference may be the beginning of peace or the prelude to war in the world. Already millions of words have been uttered or written at the conference and about the conference. There is an imperative necessity to understand what is going on there. For this purpose, Mr. Speaker, I include as part of my remarks an integrated study of the progress and proceedings of the Geneva Conference by Mr. Vicente Villamin, a Filipino writer, lawyer, and economist, who is at Geneva covering the conference.

Mr. Villamin's article follows:

THE GENEVA CONFERENCE ON ASIAN PROBLEMS—PART I

(By Vicente Villamin)

GENEVA, SWITZERLAND, May 8, 1954.—Monday, April 26, was a lovely spring day in this beautiful Swiss city of Lake Lehman. At 3:08 o'clock in the afternoon of that day, at the magnificent Palais des Nations, delegates of 19 countries met to inaugurate the conference that would try to settle the Korean and Indochinese questions, as well as related questions touching Asian affairs.

The delegates represented in their alphabetical order the following countries: Australia, Belgium, Canada, Colombia, Ethiopia, France, Greece, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Philippines, People's Republic of China (Communist), People's Democratic Republic of Korea (North Korea, Communist), Republic of Korea (South Korea), Thailand, Turkey, United States of America, United Kingdom (Great Britain), and the Union of the Soviet Socialist Republics (Russia).

The conference was decided upon by the foreign ministers of the United States (Dulles); France (Bidault); the United Kingdom (Eden); and Russia (Molotov) at their conference in Berlin in a resolution dated February 18.

At the instance of Secretary Dulles, the resolution contains the following proviso, which has reference to Communist China:

"It is understood that neither the invitation to, nor the holding of, the above-mentioned conference shall be deemed to imply diplomatic recognition in any case where it has not already been accorded."

The first day of the conference lasted 31 minutes. It dealt mainly with the question of the chairmanship of the conference. It was decided that the chief delegates of Thailand, Britain, and Russia shall rotate in presiding over the meetings. Prince Van Waithayakon Krommun Naradhip Bongsprabandh, the head of the Thailand delegation, was the first one to preside. He speaks perfect English and French.

EISENHOWER AND MALENKOV

The European newspapers of April 27, the day after the opening of the Geneva Conference, contained dispatches from Washington and Moscow that indicated the temper and thinking of the heads of the United States and of the Russian Governments, at the time the conference got underway.

President Eisenhower was quoted as saying in an extemporaneous speech before the Chamber of Commerce of the United States as follows: "And then we turn our eyes to Geneva, and we see representatives of great—and some antagonistic—powers meeting there, trying to arrive at some situation that at least we could call a modus vivendi [a way to get along, honorably as it was explained later]. We do not hope, I think, very soon to have the type of understanding that we believe we can ultimately develop among ourselves as to great issues. But we would hope that the logic of today's situation would appeal to all peoples, regardless of their ruthlessness, so that they would see the futility of depending upon war, or the threat of war, as a means of settling international difficulty. * * *"

President Eisenhower continued: "The great problem of this meeting this week is time, so that it does not become a major catastrophe, but that we do adhere to the old principle that 'a stitch in time saves nine.' But as we think about all these crises in the world, and their effect upon us, it does illustrate emphatically a doctrine by which the chamber of commerce has long lived: that no nation can live alone. We are dependent upon others, as they are dependent upon us, a truth that you have well exemplified in all your actions for many years, including your support of the United Nations."

MALENKOV AND KRUSCHEV SPEAK

Addressing the Supreme Soviet (equivalent to the Congress) in Moscow on April 26, Premier Georgi M. Malenkov, obviously referring to the United States, stated that if any aggressor attacked the Soviet Union with atomic weapons "there is not a doubt that the aggressor will be crushed by his own weapon and that any such adventure will inevitably lead to the downfall of the capitalist system." He said that the Communist and capitalist systems could and should cooperate, but "aggressive circles" in the United States prevented its execution.

Premier Malenkov further said: "It is known that in the Soviet Union there is an atmosphere of boldness, confidence and peaceful and creative labors. In the United States, however, even American official circles admit there is a social atmosphere marked by a feeling of terror, fear and uncertainty. This is what results from a policy of threats and intimidation." That statement is, of course, self-serving and means exactly the opposite.

The secretary of the central committee of the Communist Party, Mr. Nikita S. Kruschev, one of the most powerful men in Russia, having obviously the United States in mind, told the Supreme Soviet these warlike words: "If anybody thinks, like Hitler thought, that we are weak, we will show them, like we showed Hitler, just how weak we are. If the imperialists are thinking of attacking us, we will teach them a lesson like we taught Hitler." There are two facts that are relevant to state as to Mr. Kruschev's statement: (1) It is precisely because the United States believes that Russia is strong that she is trying to make herself strong also, and (2) it was with the material help of the United States that Russia successfully resisted Hitler's attacks.

SOVIET RUSSIA'S BUDGET

Parenthetically, the Supreme Soviet approved a budget of 563 billion rubles for the next fiscal year. At the official rate of 4 rubles to a dollar, that amounts to $140 billion. That is much more than Russia's annual national income as reported by a United Nations agency a few years ago. It is roughly two times the United States budget.

THE MEANING OF WORDS

One of the major objectives of the Geneva conference is to achieve a united, democratic, and independent Korea. The Communist delegations from North Korea, China, and Russia declared that that is exactly their wish. The desire is therefore unanimous. But what is really desired by the Communists is diametrically different from what the non-Communists have in mind. The explanation for this is that they have a different understanding of the meaning of the words "united," "democratic," and "independent." The difference stems from the fact that those words are not given their ordinary signification by the Communists. Since this is well known both in theory and in practice, it would be well-nigh impossible for the conference to consider plans or programs to achieve the desired objective unless and until a definite agreement is reached as to the meaning of the three basic words.

INDEPENDENCE UNDER RUSSIA

An independent Korea would not be really independent under the Russian concept. When a country like North Korea becomes a Communist country, it becomes a part of the Russian orbit and its independence is thereby subjected and subordinated to the interests of Russia. On the contrary, a democratic country does not become a satellite or puppet of the United States and its independence is meticulously respected. International puppetry is alien to the American constitutional system and political philosophy.

DISTORTION AND FABRICATION OF FACTS

With a cold-bloodedness that defies description, the Communists will distort and fabricate plain facts to support their claims and justify their conclusions, and they do so posing dramatically as if they are being oppressed and victimized by those whom they intend to browbeat, terrorize, mislead, and overcome. What they said at this Geneva Conference proved this beyond cavil. Thus a small free country would be playing fast and loose with its security from prospective Communist aggression if it adopted the defeatist and self-deluding policy that it would not face the facts of international life of today by seeking solace under the words "we must not antagonize the Communists." When the Communists want to do something about that small country, it will do it even without the slightest provocation on the part of that country.

DIFFICULTIES OF NEGOTIATION

The Netherlands Minister of Foreign Affairs, Dr. J. M. A. H. Luns, addressing the Conference, said: "Thus far the general debate has not made it any easier for this Conference to obtain practical results. If two parties wish to agree it is essential that there be at least some agreement as to the underlying facts. * * * We are used to the Communist representatives introducing their statements with the words 'it is common knowledge,' or 'everyone knows,' or 'or it is known to the whole world,' and the like. It does not surprise us any longer—8 years of U. N. debates have taught us a clear lesson—if such opening words are being followed by interpretations of recent history which are at variance with the facts. But what surprises us on this solemn occasion of a special conference for the establishment of peace in Asia is that the same technique is being used here."

COMMUNISTS MONOPOLIZE VIRTUE

Continuing, Dr. Luns, declared: "How will it be possible to reach any agreement if the events in Asia of the past few years are referred to (by the Communists) in such a way as to make the common man believe that everything the non-Communist world is doing is an assault upon the free will, the liberty and the interests of the peoples of Asia? How can we reach any agreement if everything which is in conformity with a dogmatic blueprint of Communist theory is being labeled as good, and everything which is not fitting in with this blueprint is being condemned in offending terms? * * * I fail to see what common base is left to this Conference for fruitful discussion leading to mutually satisfactory agreements * * *. Disappointed as we are at the negative way the representatives of the Soviet Union, China and North Korea have thus far seen fit to handle the problem under discussion, I nevertheless sincerely hope that this initial sterility will give way to a more fertile approach." Since Dr. Luns uttered those hopeful words, the Communists have not budged a bit from their position of intransigence supported by fact fabrications which have no relation with the truth.

WHAT THE COMMUNISTS ARE SAYING

To describe the atmosphere of tension, disagreement and unnaturalness that hovers over the Conference, it is pertinent to quote what the Communist delegates said during the first 10 days of the deliberations. The reader should be warned that what they said were at variance with the proven facts. They said them because it suited their purposes to say them.

CHOU EN-LAI ATTACKS THE UNITED STATES

The foreign minister of Communist China, Mr. Chou En-lai, educated in China, Europe and Russia, told the Conference what he thought of the United States in plain words:

1. "The peoples of Asia, like the peoples of the rest of the world, love peace and freedom * * *. The influential circles in the United States of America, however, for the purpose of continuing their colonial rule in Asia, intensify their interference so that they can obstruct the movement of the Asian peoples for national liberation; they develop plans to create an aggressive bloc in Asia and spread the war over Asia."

COMMUNIST CHINA'S NONRECOGNITION

2. "The People's Republic of China (Communist) has already been recognized by more than 20 countries with an aggregate population of 1,000 million. However, certain states—the United States of America, first and foremost—still refuse to recognize the People's Republic of China and endeavor to ignore the right of the Chinese people to choose their own state system. Refusing to reconcile themselves to the defeat suffered by them in China, they are dreaming to impose upon the Chinese people the power of the Kuomintang remnant clique, a clique long ago thrown out by the 500 million Chinese people. Up to now at various international conferences they are still planting the henchmen of the Kuomintang clique to pose as representatives of the Chinese people. * * * The peaceful development and security of China are being constantly threatened. * * * The existence of this state of affairs and its further continuation hinder the peaceful settlement of the urgent international questions, especially those of Asia, and aggravate uneasiness and tension in international relations. It is clear that this state of affairs should not prevail any longer. Our conference should mark the beginning of change in this situation."

UNITED STATES LAUNCHED KOREA WAR

3. "In June 1950, the United States launched its war of intervention against Korea. Simultaneously the United States occupied China's territory, Formosa, and then incessantly bombed Northeast China and bombarded China's merchant shipping, thereby encroaching upon China's territorial and air space and waters."

4. "Moreover, in defiance of the warnings of the Chinese people and world public opinion, the United States Government ordered its troops to cross the 38th parallel. These troops approached the Yalu and Tumen Rivers, thus endangering seriously the security of China. Quite obviously the United States was playing the old game of the Japanese militarists of occupying Korea to establish a base for invasion on the mainland of China. The Chinese people could not permit such a situation in which Korea could be used once again as a springboard of aggression against China."

WHO PROLONGED ARMISTICE TALKS?

5. "After the Korean People's Army and the Chinese People's volunteers had driven the interventionist troops and reached the vicinity of the 38th parallel, the Korean and Chinese peoples, in conformity with their consistent policy of the peaceful settlement of the Korean question, quickly responded to the proposal of the U. S. S. R. made on June 23, 1951, at the U. N. regarding negotiations on the cessation of hostilities in Korea.

"Under the pretext of the so-called question of war prisoners, the United States Government dragged out the subsequent negotiations, thus preventing over a long period of time (about 2 years) any agreement being reached in the Korean armistice negotiations. Nevertheless, the Korean-Chinese side made great efforts in this respect. As a result, an armistice was concluded in Korea to the immense relief of all peace-loving people. In spite of this, the authorities of the United States and South Korea continued as before to put up obstacles in the way of the settlement of outstanding questions between the two sides."

WAR PRISONERS DISPOSITION

"This has found its expression particularly in the fact that before and after the armistice the authorities of the United States and South Korea forcibly retained more than 48,000 Korean and Chinese war prisoners who thus were prevented from returning home. The Government of the People's Republic of China in no way considers this question closed. The delegation of the People's Republic of China holds that this conference should not bypass this question."

6. Mr. Chou En-lai said that, in violation of the armistice terms, the United States of America has not withdrawn its troops from Korea and, instead, concluded a mutual defense treaty with South Korea. "All this," he added, "not only proves who unleashed the war in the past and started the aggression, but also testifies as to who is continuing at present to prevent the peaceful settlement of the Korean question in attempt to break once again the peace in Korea." He said that "from the first day of the negotiations on the cessation of hostilities in Korea, we have formally put forward the proposal for the withdrawal of all foreign troops from Korea."

CHOU EN-LAI ON FORMOSA

7. Declaring that the United States occupied Formosa illegally, Mr. Chou En-lai asserted: "Since the outbreak of the war in Korea, a territory belonging to China, Formosa (Taiwan), has been occupied by the United States of America. This question is not yet settled. As is generally known, For-

mosa is a part of China's territory, and its occupation by anybody can in no case be tolerated. The United States occupation of Formosa is an act seriously violating the territorial integrity and sovereignty of China. At the present time Formosa is turned into a base of the United States of America for conducting subversive activities and further aggression against the People's Republic of China. Japanese militarism which had committed aggression against nations in Asia for a long time is now being revived at an accelerated pace. This state of affairs is menacing with increasing seriousness the peace and security of the Far East and Asia."

CHOU WANTS UNITED STATES OUT OF ASIA

8. After saying that the United States of America is creating a "Pacific mutual security system" and "intervening in the Indochina war and using it as a pretext to scheme for the organization of the so-called defense communities in the west Pacific and southeast Asia, and these blocs have actually aggressive purposes and are directed at the establishment of a new colonial rule in Asia and preparation for a new world war," declared as follows:

"We consider that the aggressive acts on the part of the United States should be stopped, that peace in Asia should be ensured, that the independence and sovereignty of the Asian nations should be respected, and that the national rights and freedom of the Asian peoples should be safeguarded.

"We also hold that interference in the internal affairs of the Asian nations should be stopped, all foreign military bases in Asia be removed, foreign armed forces stationed in Asian countries be withdrawn, the remilitarization of Japan be prevented, and all economic blockades and restrictions be abolished. The statement just made by Mr. John F. Dulles is contrary to these demands. His views are completely at variance with the interests of the Asian peoples. We absolutely cannot agree to his views.

"The government of the People's Republic of China considers that the countries of Asia should consult among themselves with a view to seeking common measures to safeguard peace and security in Asia, by assuming obligations mutually and respectively."

CHOU TALKS ON EUROPE

Injecting himself into the European situation, which might lead Russia to think that Communist China has an eye at world leadership, Mr. Chou En-lai uttered the following words: "The people of China, as all the peoples of Asia, are concerned not only about peace in Asia but also about peace in Europe and other parts of the world. The policy of reviving German militarism and splitting Europe into mutually hostile military blocs now menaces the peace and security in Europe and at the same time affects the situation outside Europe, aggravating tension and uneasiness in Asia. That is why we consider that in order to safeguard world peace it is necessary, through negotiation, first and foremost between the great powers, to put an end to the armament of Western Germany and to ensure security in Europe on the basis of joint efforts of all the European states, as proposed by the Soviet Union."

CHOU RENEWS ATTACK ON UNITED STATES

Five days after his first speech, whose points are set forth above, Mr. Chou En-lai addressed the Conference again, following a second speech by Mr. Y. T. Pyun, the Foreign Minister of South Korea. He repeated his previous charges against the United States in more bitter language. He said that "the United Nations was placed in the position of a belligerent in the Korean war and consequently became disqualified to deal impartially with the Korean question." He was making a case for the All-Korea Commission to deal with Korean questions, including elections, unification, and rehabilitation. He does not want any United Nations participation in the matter in any way, shape, or form. This is, besides disagreement of the facts of the Korean case, the stumbling block to any substantive agreement.

THE CHINESE "VOLUNTEERS"

Mr. Chou glorifies the mission in Korea of the Chinese "volunteers" with the following words: "* * * The United States Armed Forces came to Korea for aggressive purposes, whereas the Chinese people's volunteers came to Korea to fight aggression. * * * It was the United States Armed Forces that had returned to Korea after their withdrawal, and that it was not until the United States had committed aggression against Korea and threatened the security of China that the Chinese people's volunteers went to Korea to repel aggression in defense of the security of their motherland." It will be remembered that the United Nations General Assembly, by a decisive vote, declared Communist China as an aggressor in intervening with a great army in the war in Korea. Before that aggression China was given by the United States and her allies the most solemn assurance that the United Nations forces would not go beyond the Korean frontier and violate China's territorial integrity.

Geneva Conference on Asian Problems—An Integrated Report on Its Progress and Proceedings by Vicente Villamin From Geneva—Part II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 18, 1954

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include part II of the article by Mr. Vincente Villamin, entitled "The Geneva Conference on Asian Problems":

THE GENEVA CONFERENCE ON ASIAN PROBLEMS—PART II

(By Vicente Villamin)

WAR PRISONERS QUESTION RAISED

In his second speech, Mr. Chou En-lai stressed his demand for the return of 48,000 North Korean and Chinese war prisoners. He said: "If the United States Government had faithfully abided by the international conventions which the United States had entered into, the question of war prisoners would not have arisen, since the Geneva Convention (for the humane treatment of war prisoners) explicitly stipulates that war prisoners shall be released and repatriated without delay after the cessation of hostilities. But in the Korean war the United States Government conducted the war with savage and inhuman means and, in violation of various provisions of the Geneva Convention, maltreated and persecuted Korean and Chinese captured personnel and persisted in its erroneous view, which is in contradiction with the Geneva Convention, in respect to the release and repatriation of war prisoners."

Mr. Chou alleged that "with the connivance of the United States," South Korea "forcibly retained more than 27,000 Korean and Chinese captured personnel and impressed them into the army, thereby depriving them entirely of the opportunity of exercising their right to be repatriated."

CHOU CHARGES OBSTRUCTION

He charged further: "After the Korean armistice, the authorities of the United States and the Repvblic of Korea (South Korea) used all means to obstruct the work of the Neutral Nations Repatriation Commission, which was presided over by an Indian representative. As a result, the overwhelming majority of the Korean and Chinese captured personnel under the custody of the said Commission did not have any opportunity to exercise their right to be repatriated. Consequently, the said Commission did not fulfill the functions and responsibilities entrusted to it by the Terms of Reference for Neutral Nations Repatriation Commission of the Korean Armistice Agreement."

Then Mr. Chou referred to the other 21,000 Korean and Chinese war prisoners, saying that the Commission handed them over to the United States side, and the United States side used force and threats of force to hand over these more than 21,000 Korean and Chinese personnel to the South Korean Government and the Chiang Kai-shek remnant clique, which impressed these captured personnel into their respective armies.

To return those war prisoners to their motherlands, Mr. Chou proposes a new commission composed of representatives of North Korea, South Korea, China, Russia, the United States, Great Britain, and France.

NAM IL, NORTH KOREAN, ASSAILS

Communist North Korea's foreign minister, Gen. Nam Il, the chief delegate of his country at the Kaesong-Panmunjom marathon armistice talks, assailed the United States along the line of Mr. Chou En-lai's attacks, emphasizing that it was South Korea, at the instigation of the United States, that started the Korean war, mentioning that the whole world witnessed the barbarous methods of warfare by the American interventionists and their supporters. He adverted to the fact that on June 19, 1950, North Korea proposed the amalgamation of North and South Korea. It will be recalled that 6 days after, on June 25, the North Korean army crossed the 38th parallel and attacked South Korea and thereby started the Korean war.

NORTH KOREA WON THE WAR

Gen. Nam Il said that North Korea, with the help of China, won the war which ended with the armistice. His words were: "The assistance rendered by the Chinese People's volunteers to the Korean people was a most important factor for securing the victory over the foreign armed interventionists in Korea."

ALL-KOREAN COMMISSION

He proposed an all-Korean commission composed of representatives of North and South Korea independent of the United Nations in every way. The body will provide for an election law, conduct the elections, bring about the cultural and economic welfare of all the Korean people, and effect the unification of all Korea into a united independent, and democratic Korean state. This sounds good and noble, but it is all Communist words with Communist meaning, which is the opposite of what the rest of the world understands.

RUSSIA'S MOLOTOV BOOMS

The voice of Russia's foreign minister, Mr. V. M. Molotov, has been heard many times before at international conferences. It was heard last in dissent and attack at the Berlin Conference in January and February of this year. But his speech at the present Geneva Conference excels in bitterness his former attacks against the United States. His purpose may be to impress the delegates from North Korea and Communist China who are attending for the first time such conferences with free countries.

Charging the United States with responsibility for the war in Korea and for imperialism and colonialism in Asia, Mr. Molotov said, "It is common knowledge that the Chinese People's Republic has committed no aggressive acts against the United States of America. The position is quite different when we speak about the United States policy in regard to the Chinese People's Republic."

Mr. Molotov continues, "Ever since the Chinese people drove off from their territory the bankrupt clique of Chiang Kai-shek, which had not cared about the needs of the Chinese people but had acted simply as a servant of foreign capital, and the Chinese People's Republic was established, one aggressive act after another has been taken against the Republic. The main responsibility for this rests with the ruling circles of the United States of America.

"They seized the island of Taiwan (Formosa) and made the remnants of the Chiang Kai-shek clique masters of the island. By all impermissible means they prevent the Chinese People's Republic from taking its legitimate place in the United Nations Organization * * * the ruling circles of the United States present the case in such a way as if China and not the United States is the aggressor.

"Under the pretext of defending the puppet regimes in Indochina plans have recently been made to form a military alliance in southeast Asia, although not a single self-respecting Asian state proposes to participate in that military alliance. These plans reveal once again the intention of the colonial powers to use some Asian nations against other Asian nations."

After giving his blessings to Communist China's Chou En-lai and North Korea's Nam Il, Russia's Molotov indulged himself in some historical references, saying that Western nations in the past had appropriated parts of the territories of China. He failed to mention that Czarist Russia, the predecessor of Soviet Russia, was the country that had seized more territory from China than all other countries combined. The former Russia took about 2 million square miles of Chinese territory in the Amur River region and the region where Vladivostok is located. If Soviet Russia is so friendly to China today, she should take steps to return at least parts of the territory Czarist Russia took. On the contrary, Soviet Russia is taking some Chinese territory in Manchuria and other places.

THREE IDENTICAL COMMUNIST SPEECHES

A reading of the speeches delivered at the Geneva Conference by Messrs. Chou En-lai, Nam Il, and Molotov readily leads to the conclusion that they came from the same source—from 1 mastermind and 1 pen. The concepts and the composition are identical. They present a literary solid front. From the tone of the language they used, they came to the conference as firm antagonists determined to have their way, and not as collaborators seeking settlement to problems in the spirit of give and take, and in the light of the truth and the good.

COMMUNIST STRATEGY REVEALED

Out of the contradictions and nebulosities of the first 10 days of the conference the strategy of the Communist delegations manifests itself with clarity. That strategy is to set themselves up as the martyrs and victims of the war in Korea which they affirm was inflicted upon them and which they won; to appear irreconcilable and intransigent; and to demand compliance with their plans and solutions of problems.

CHINA'S ADMISSION TO THE U. N.

Two major objectives are aimed by the strategy: (1) To prepare the ground for the admission of Communist China to the United Nations; and (2) to have North Korea acquire control of all Korea. The Communists would relax their irreconcilability for concessions made by free countries and enter into agreements provided that they do not militate against their two objectives. At the moment, the fall of Dien Bien Phu in Indochina and the lack of unity in policy and action on the part of the Western powers are contributing to the strengthening of the bargaining position of the Communists.

UNITED STATES POSITION IS FIRM

The position of the United States is firm. It is based on the facts and justice of the situation. The United States will not bow to the misrepresentations and threats of the Communists. It will be a party only to honorable arrangements. It is willing to explore every possibility of agreement in the spirit of liberalism and cooperation. It will make sacrifices for the cause of freedom and right. The United States is sincerely eager to have peace in the world.

PRESIDENT EISENHOWER AND SECRETARY DULLES

President Eisenhower and Secretary of State John Foster Dulles are the embodiment of the United States policy toward the Communists. The former approved emphatically what the latter had said and done at the Geneva Conference, and for that matter, at the recent other conferences which dealt with world problems. They have the backing of the American Congress and people. The Communists and some non-Communists, too, should know that by heart. Those who believe, maliciously or ignorantly, that a small country that agrees with the United States is its puppet should revise their belief because they are dead wrong. Countries that believe with the United States in questions concerning communism and the Communists do so because, like the United States, they thoroughly detest communism and disapprove Communist purposes and methods.

DULLES ADDRESSES CONFERENCE

United States Secretary of State John Foster Dulles addressed the Geneva Conference, giving a factual recital of what happened in Korea and refuting the claims of the Communists. Vis-a-vis the Communist front of irreconciliability, he declared: "Communist doctrine authorizes accommodation when the opposition is strong. It is our task here to show such strength of honorable and nonaggressive purpose that the Communists will find it acceptable to grant unity and freedom to Korea."

Mr. Dulles said: "The problem which we face here at Geneva is the same problem that has been faced elsewhere. It is the problem of achieving 'peace' and 'democracy' in the historic meaning of those words. These are alluring words, rich in their traditional meaning. Communist propaganda has adopted them as lures to trap the unwary. It must be remembered that when the Communists speak of 'peace,' they mean a society of conformity under a single directing will. When they speak of 'democracy,' they mean a 'dictatorship of the proletariat.'

"The sum of the matter is this: When we negotiate with the Soviet Communists and their satellites, we are confronted with something far more formidable than individual or nationalist lust for glory. We are confronted with a vast monolithic system which, despite its power, believes that it cannot survive except as it succeeds in progressively destroying human freedom."

DULLES' RECITAL ON KOREA

Mr. Dulles began his story of Korea by saying that after the war in August 1945 a temporary military arrangement was made to have the Japanese army in the north of the 38th parallel surrender to the Russians and that in the south of it to the Americans, but the Communists subsequently made that the dividing line between North and South Korea. He said that in 1947 the United Nations created the Temporary Commission for Korea to help organize the government of Korea and observe the initial elections. The Soviet Union, he added, refused to permit the Commission to have access to North Korea, which did not take part in the elections. In December 1948 the U. N. General Assembly, accepting the report of the Commission, passed a resolution by a vote of 48 to 6, with one abstention, declaring that a lawful government had been established in Korea, the Republic of Korea, and "that this is the only such government of Korea," in the language of the resolution.

NORTH KOREA STARTED THE WAR

Continuing, Mr. Dulles declared: "The United States, trusting to the moral authority of the United Nations and the charter undertakings of its members, withdrew its own Armed Forces from South Korea. That left South Korea with only local forces suitable for maintenance of internal order. In contrast, the Soviet Union rapidly built up the war power of the Communist regime it had installed in North Korea. On June 25, 1950, these forces launched a full-scale attack, implemented with many Russian-made tanks and planes. The United Nations Temporary Commission, which was present on the spot, and the membership of which included India, instantly and unanimously found that this was armed aggression, and so reported to the United Nations Security Council. That Council, in turn, by a vote of 9 to 0, with 1 absence (Russia) and 1 abstention, certified to the fact of aggression, and called on the members of the United Nations to help to resist the aggression. Sixteen nations responded with military contributions and over 40 responded with either military or material aid."

THE MILITARY SITUATION

Describing the military situation following the North Korean attack, Mr. Dulles said: "The small and lightly armed forces of the Republic of Korea were initially overpowered by the assault. The Communist aggressors quickly occupied all of Korea except a small beachhead at Pusan. But the forces of ROK's quickly rallied; the United Nations members gave increasing support. A brilliant military operation (under Gen. Douglas MacArthur), involving a bold landing at Inchon, caught the aggressors off balance, and enabled the United Nations command to break out of the Pusan beachhead. The aggressors were routed and destroyed as an effective force."

The United Nations-Republic of Korea forces drove the Communist forces back past the 38th parallel. But in November 1950 the so-called Chinese volunteers entered the fight in great numbers and pushed the free forces back south of the line. But the latter rallied and drove the North Korean-Chinese armies past the 38th parallel again. When the armistice was signed in July 1953 the United Nations-ROK armies were in strong positions in North Korea. The Communist claim of victory is, of course, empty. The Communists have no right to cash on it.

THE UNITED STATES PROPOSAL

Secretary Dulles proposal is couched in the following words: "The United Nations Commission on Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea (UNCURK) (created on October 7, 1950) is at this moment waiting in Korea ready to fulfill its clear and precise mandate from the United Nations. Accomplishment of that mandate would complete the unification and freedom of Korea which was interrupted first by Soviet obstruction in 1948, then by Korean Communist aggression in June 1950, and then by the Chinese Communist aggression of November 1950. Now that aggression has been thwarted, the interrupted work of the Commission should proceed. That is our proposal. It would require the Chinese Communist regime to withdraw their forces of aggression and occupation from North Korea so that the United Nations can complete its task in an atmosphere free of menace."

THE COMMUNIST PROPOSAL

As mentioned above, the Communist proposal of an all-Korean Commission was presented by North Korea's Gen. Nam Il and endorsed by China's Chou En-lai and Russia's Molotov in lyrical terms. Of that proposal Mr. Dulles said: "The Communist proposal is in essence the same as that made in June 1950 as a prelude to the armed attack upon the Republic of Korea. Also, it is strikingly similar to the scheme which the Soviet Union presented last in Berlin (by Mr. Molotov) last February for the unification of Germany. Conformity, you see, is the Communist rule."

Explaining the proposal, Mr. Dulles declared: "The present Communist proposal on Korea provides that the freely elected Government of the Republic of Korea, representing at least three-quarters of the Korean population, would be forced into combination, on a basis of equality, with the Communist regime ruling a small minority of the people in the north.

"General elections are proposed by the Communists under a law, the terms of which would be subject to veto by the Communist regime. The proposal stipulates that the election conditions should exclude all foreign interference. Presumably, this is intended to exclude United Nations supervision. The scheme is designed to destroy the authority of the existing government and to replace it by a Communist puppet regime."

WITHDRAWAL OF TROOPS

Mr. Dulles continues: "The North Korean Communist proposal likewise requires that all foreign forces should be withdrawn from Korean territory within 6 months. The U. N. forces would have a long way to go. The Chinese Communist forces would have only a few miles to go. They could quickly return. The United States does not desire its troops to remain indefinitely in Korea. But we remember that once before we had our troops in Korea and withdrew them, as it turned out, prematurely. We do not want that history to repeat itself.

"This, then, is the North Korean proposal. The United States must reject that proposal because it does not meet the requirements of a free, unified, and independent Korea, for which so much blood has been expended and suffering endured. Peace is always easy to achieve—by surrender. Unity is also easy to achieve—by surrrender. The hard task, the task that confronts us, is to combine peace and unity with freedom."

IS COMPROMISE POSSIBLE?

The Communists do not want any plan on the unification of Korea or in anything else relating to Korea in which the United Nations has anything to do. On the contrary, Mr. Dulles is resolute and adamant when he declared in his speech the following position: "It is important that we should constantly bear in mind that what is here at stake is not merely Korea, important as that is; it is the authority of the United Nations. * * * If this conference is disloyal to the United Nations and its decisions, then each of us will bear a share of responsibility for destroying what protects us all."

The Republic of Korea (South Korea) is willing to have an election throughout all Korea. It was reported at first that it was willing to have the election restricted to North Korea so the 100 vacancies left in the National Assembly for them could be filled. And other plans more or less favorable to North Korea have been reported under contemplation by delegations other than the United States. But the Communists are insisting on their own plan, the creation of an All-Korean Commission, presented by North Korea's General Nam Il, which is entirely independent of the United Nations.

A JUSTIFIABLE SUSPICION

North Korea has only one-fourth of the population of all Korea. The other three-fourths are in South Korea. How could North Korea expect to gain control of all Korea with its minority? Since it does not expect to place itself under the control of the majority, it is a justifiable suspicion for a reasonable person to entertain that North Korea does not wish any outside supervision of the elections, by the United Nations most of all, because it could not rig up and otherwise pollute those elections to its advantage. If North Korea recedes in this respect, then there is a chance for an agreement; otherwise there is none.

KOREANS HOPELESSLY DIVIDED

If the attitude at the conference of the North and South Korean delegates is an index to the attitude of the people in both regions toward each other, then they are hopelessly divided and no plans or elections could unite them. The Republic of Korea Foreign Minister, Mr. Y. T. Pyun, said in his two dramatic speeches, that Communist China already controls North Korea, with Chinese advisers alongside North Korean officials in all levels of government. Chinese peasants in great numbers have come to displace North Korean farmers, who had to flee from the country to South Korea. Exploitation and oppression by Chinese Communists are rampant, he said.

CHINA SPEAKS FOR NORTH KOREA

Mr. Pyun made a direct discourse to the North Koreans, with his eyes focused on Gen. Nam Il, as follows: "Now let me once more call to my Communist brethren. Please come back to us. You are not even Russia's satellites. You are Russia's satellites' satellites. Unlike the Communist promises, our promises are good. Remember, and come back." It was Communist China's Chou En-lai who made the reply to Mr. Pyun's speech, saying: "The statement just made by Mr. Pyun Yung Tai was filled with slanderous ravings against the governments and peoples of the People's Republic of China, the Soviet Union, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, and other countries of people's democracy. His ravings, like his disreputed ravings of the past, were uttered for the benefit of his master—the United States—who wanted him to do so."

OTHER DELEGATES ARE HEARD

While the three Communist delegates from North Korea, Communist China, and Soviet Russia stuck to each other, the other delegates, with those silent like Great Britain and France considered as acquiescing, answered the Communists and aligned themselves with the United States.

Mr. Carlos P. Garcia, Vice President of the Philippines and concurrently Secretary of Foreign Affairs, declared: "As to the charge that the United States of America pursues a policy of imperialism in Asia repeatedly obnoxiously by the Communists, let the Filipinos bear witness before the world that such a charge is a violent distortion of history * * * The United States, true to her democratic traditions, granted us complete independence on July 4, 1946 * * * It marked the beginning of the end of colonialism in Asia, as after Philippine independence there followed in the logic of events that of India, Pakistan, Burma, Ceylon, and Indonesia."

Mr. Lester B. Pearson, Canada's Secretary of State for External Affairs, said: "If, indeed, the United States did not respect the rights and interests of others, Canada would not today be an independent power, but merely a satellite of her great neighbor."

Mr. T. Clifton Webb, Minister of External Affairs of New Zealand, asserted: "Mr. Chou En-lai has laid claim to a seat in the U. N. I confess I am unable to understand why he should wish to join an organization he has so roundly condemned. In my country, that is called approbating and reprobating * * * The Communist accusations that the United States is militaristic bent on territorial aggrandizement will not stand a moment's impartial investigation."

Prince Wan, of Thailand, Minister of Foreign Affairs, said: "On the question of Korea, Thailand, as a firm supporter of the U. N., was among the first to respond to the U. N. appeal and to furnish both economic and military assistance to the Republic of Korea. The key to the solution of the Korean question is the U. N. General Assembly resolution of October 7, 1950," which created the UNCURK—the same solution that the United States has proposed.

Mr. Eduardo Zuleta Angel, the chairman of the Colombian delegation, refuted the claims of the Communists and upheld the steps taken by the United Nations in Korea; he also stated that the United States is the leader of the democracies of the Western Hemisphere and has proved to be a good neighbor in every way.

Ambassador Acikalin Cevat, head of the Turkish delegation, stated that Turkey sent a military contingent to Korea to uphold the authority of the U. N. and to stop the Communist aggression, and express his belief that the U. N. could bring peace to Korea.

The minister of external affairs of Australia, Mr. R. G. Casey, said: "In this conference we will strive to continue to play a constructive part designed to support U. N. principles and objectives and to develop the armistice in Korea into something more permanent and satisfactory."

Dr. J. M. A. H. Luns, minister for foreign affairs of the Netherlands, declared: "The attempt to picture the United States as a ruthless colonial power or as guilty of launching a war of aggression against Korea is at such variance with the facts that it can only strengthen the free world in its convction that the United States were right in taking the initiative in the defense of collective security in 1950."

Mr. Y. T. Pyun, Republic of Korea's foreign minister, stated: "The Communists in China have not only sold their country to Russia but replaced their peerless Chinese culture with Russian barbarism. Can it be true that such an un-Chinese Quisling government is enthusiastically loved and supported by the people as the Communists say? Americans have brought us food when we were hungry, clothes when we were freezing. American intervention will help us * * * Mr. Molotov, you may judge American intervention by the type of intervention you know by practice. In short, unlike yours, Sir, American intervention never implies taking things away from the native population. I repeat, it never implies that."

WHO STARTED KOREAN WAR?

The author of this study believes that the identity of who started the Korean war, North or South Korea, is a fundamental matter to determine, for the side that started it should bear the obligations that it gave rise to such as reparations and the like as well as the ignominy of being an aggressor and the stamp of being an international outlaw that it carries.

The Communists assert that it was South Korea that initiated the war. They further assert that it was done at the instigation of the United States.

The part of the United States as instigator can be easily dismissed. If the United States had any such design, it would not have ordered its Army out of Korea a year before and left a small, inadequately equipped Republic of Korea Army to maintain internal order and meet a possible attack from North Korea. The United States—almost naively, it must be said—thought and hoped that South and North Korea could settle their differences amicably.

CONVINCING STATEMENTS

Four convincing, responsible statements at least can be cited to prove that it was North Korea (Communist) that started the war by launching the invasion against South Korea across the 38th parallel on June 25, 1950:

1. The United Nations Commission on Korea, headed by a delegate from India, which was in Korea before, during and after the invasion reported that its team of observers "had, in the course of a 2-week inspection been left with the impression that the Republican Army (South Korea) was organized entirely for defense and was in no condition to carry out a large-scale attack against the forces in the North. The observers found that the Republic of Korea forces were disposed in depth all along the 38th parallel with no concentration of troops at any point, that a large number of the Republic of Korea troops were actively engaged in rounding up guerrillas and were, in any case, entirely lacking in the armor, heavy artillery, and air support necessary to carry off an invasion of North Korea."

INDIA'S NEHRU TESTIFIES

2. In a public statement, dated June 29, 1950, upholding the U. N. Security Council's resolutions of June 25 and 27, Premier Nehru said: "The Government of India have viewed with grave concern the developments in Korea involving, as they do, not only civil war but also a threat to world peace. There have been a number of border incidents between North and South Korea in the past, but whatever the nature of these might have been, it appears clear from the information available to the Government of India that a large-scale invasion of South Korea took place by armed forces of the North Korean Government. This information was supplied by a variety of sources, the most authoritative among them being the U. N. Commission on Korea on which India is represented, and which at the time of invasion was in Seoul."

GENERAL MAC ARTHUR REPORTS

3. In his first report, dated July 25, 1950, to the U. N. Security Council, Gen. Douglas MacArthur, the supreme commander, said: "The North Korean invaders were reported to have committed initially 6 divisions of infantry, 3 border constabulary brigades, supported by approximately 100 Soviet-made T34 and T70 tanks and ample heavy artillery. Their air force held control of the air and was at the time estimated to be composed of 100 to 150 Soviet-made combat planes. The total strength of the North Korean forces was placed at between 90,000 and 100,000, organized in approximately 7 divisions and 5 brigades, well trained and equipped chiefly with excellent Soviet materiel.

"Opposed to this mobile army, Republic of Korea troops were initially deployed along the 38th parallel with elements of 4 divisions, with the remainder in the interior, without tanks or heavy artillery, and with only 16 trainers as an air force, an organization assigned primarily for preserving internal security.

"With such a discrepancy in character and armament between North and South Korea, the actual date of the assault is immaterial; the potential for it was present for months.

"In the light of the above facts, it is apparent that the attack upon South Korea was a carefully planned, full-scale invasion in force."

INCRIMINATING COMMUNIST DOCUMENTS

4. On May 2, 1951, the United States delegate to the United Nations submitted to it documents which were captured in Korea. They were military orders and operational plans for the invasion of South Korea which were issued by the North Korean Army high command. The genuineness of these documents have not been successfully questioned.

INVASION OF FORMOSA BY UNITED STATES

The Communists love to assert that in 1950 the United States invaded and occupied Formosa and from there attacked China. At that time there were actually 48 Americans on Formosa, most of whom were acting as technical advisers to the Chiang Kai-shek government. What the Communist call invasion was the military neutralization order of President Truman of June 27, 1950, whose purpose was to protect Formosa, with the stationing of the 7th Fleet in the Formosa Straits, from Communist attacks from the Chinese mainland. The order, contrary to attacking the mainland, called "upon the Chinese Government on Formosa to cease all air and sea operations against the mainland."

THE 48,000 WAR PRISONERS

The Communists demand the return and repatriation of the 48,000 Chinese and North Korean war prisoners that did not want to rejoin them. The 27,000 North Koreans among them were released by President Syngman Rhee without consultation with the United Nations command, and most of the rest of the 21,000 Chinese war prisoners were sent to Formosa because that was their deliberate wish as expressed openly to the screening commission. To the sugary invitation by the Communist explainers to return to Communist China to be welcomed there by Father Mao Tse-tung, those Chinese war prisoners answered with a loud and emphatic negative. The commission which the Communists proposed to locate the 48,000 war prisoners would be a surplusage.

THE ARMISTICE MARATHON TALKS

The Communists claim that it was the United Nations negotiators at the Kaesong and Panmunjom armistice talks that dragged the talks for 2 years. The fact was that those negotiators were the victims of the usual Communist endless palavers and practice of discussing the minutest details and the most irrelevant facts and circumstances. The United States negotiators nearly went crazy with the repetitiousness of the Communist procedures and argumentations—it was almost like they were being brainwashed—that they had to be changed during the period of the talks.

UNITED STATES NOT ENEMY OF CHINESE PEOPLE

The Communists do not tire in proclaiming that the United States is the enemy of the Chinese people. Any normal person who reads history will know decisively that the United States has been the consistent and helpful friend of the Chinese people and it wants to continue being so, while Russia has been their despoiler, exploiter, and oppressor and now mean, if they can, to control them and their government, as witness the innumerable Russian advisers in all levels of the Chinese Government.

COMMUNISTS AS CHAMPIONS OF ALL ASIA?

The Communists, with eloquence that does not conceal their cunning and hypocrisy, announce that they are the champions and defenders of all Asians, including the free Asians, from American imperialism and European colonialism. No free Asian believed them. The Philippine chief delegate, Mr. Carlos P. Garcia, was emphatic in denying that the Communists are champions of all Asia.

HOPING AGAINST HOPE

The Geneva Conference is still in session. It is the earnest hope of all lovers of peace and conciliation that the Communist delegates may yet see and understand the facts of Korea as they are and, with a will to reach mutually agreeable compromises and plans, decide at last to be reasonable and rational and make the conference the beginning of honorable coexistence between the free and the Communist worlds, since the realization of one world is not yet to be.

The Weather and Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SIDNEY A. FINE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 18, 1954

Mr. FINE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herein an interesting address of Walter A. Lynch, Jr., to the merchandising clinic of the New York chapter of the American Marketing Association on April 28, 1954. Mr. Lynch is an economist with the Baxter International Economic Research Bureau. In his dissertation, he points out by factual evidence that the Torrid Zone is moving northward with a resultant effect on many businesses. His statement follows:

Gentlemen, I am appearing before you in a rather different capacity than most of the previous speakers. By trade, or profession if you wish to call it, I am an economist. Actually, I am a lot more familiar with the figures of the Federal Reserve Bank and the various economic indicators than I am with the techniques of marketing and merchandising that have been mentioned during this clinic. However, in the overall business picture, with competition growing and profits declining, there is one factor which strongly affects everyone's business with which I am quite familiar. This is our weather revolution.

You may find it strange to hear an economist talk about the weather. For some time now the Baxter International Economic Research Bureau, with which I am associated, has been conducting a great amount of research in this field. In handling the financial problems of the several thousand clients that we have, it was discovered that many of their problems, particularly in the field of business expansion, real estate and the commodity markets, were closely related to the weather.

Unfortunately, in the economic field, as in the medical field, we are overloaded with specialists. We have labor economists, bank economists, production economists, and a whole range of specialized thinkers, each of whom often thinks of his branch as the entire field. We have tried to shy away from this. We find that the one important aspect that many economists ignore is the one thing that the rest of the world talks about—namely, the weather.

The world talks about it because it is the one thing that affects everyone. You people who produce, who package and who merchandise are also directly affected by it. Remember, you cannot change the weather. But you can work with it to push your product.

I mentioned a weather revolution. Well, that is exactly what is going on. You, in your daily life, have undoubtedly come across evidences of these changes. The water shortage in New York City this spring is due mainly to the lack of precipitation that we had during the winter. The early action taken by Mayor Wagner, and he must be commended for it, in curtailing use of water is nothing to what he may be forced to do in the coming months. That is New York's problem and to a great extent, that is the picture of the rest of the United States.

Afer compiling our research, some of which was published in a best seller called Today's Revolution in Weather, we came up with several basic facts that have attracted a great deal of comment. These are:

1. We are now in a long-range warm weather cycle.

2. Here in the United States, and also in Canada, there is a definite change in the seasonal pattern, with winters becoming warmer, shorter and with much less snow.

3. The summer season is becoming hotter and drier.

4. A sharp retreat of the glacier ice in the northern section has occurred. At the same time, there has been an accelerated increase in the water level of the ocean.

Not all these findings affect us here today. Purposely, I will say very little concerning the changes in European and Asiatic weather, since I believe that for most of you changes occurring there are not of immediate importance. However, the changes in Canada and the United States are definitely of immediate importance. In addition, the accelerated increase in the water level of the ocean, while of importance to the overall picture, is only of secondary importance to you.

As to my remaining points, namely, the warm weather cycle and the resultant effects of warmer and shorter winters and hotter and drier summers, let me state that those do affect much of your business. It was not a quirk of nature, but part of the trend, that saw advertisements in the Anchorage Alaska Times, announcing the sale in early January of winter parkas, snow jackets, fur-lined boots, and even the renowned "red flannels." Winter, in the old style, just did not come to Anchorage. The stores were stuck with winter merchandise that they never had trouble moving in previous years. Check back on the December and early January weather and you will find that Anchorage on several occasions had weather as warm as Jacksonville, Fla. Again, this is but one scene, but it reflects the sharp change in the overall weather picture. The torrid zone is moving northward.

Keep in mind that this is not a temporary change. But rather it is part of a long-term cycle that is going to continue long after you and I are gone. Prof. Hidia Nishuoka, a noted Japanese weather authority, wrote in 1949 that we were in the beginning of a 350-year warm-weather cycle. In the same vein, a noted Finnish meteorologist, Professor Keranen, states that the increasing temperatures have been noted throughout this century and that in the winter months, the average temperature rise in Spitzbergen was 5° and along the Petsamo coast it was 3.5°. In concluding, Keranen makes the following strong statement, "No comparable change in climate has occurred on earth in the last centuries, at least not for as long as reliable temperature measurements have been available."

If my tendency to revert to authorities and to cite proofs may be uninteresting, I must apologize. However, the statements I am making are not to be taken lightly and if it would do good to run through the list of those who support this position, I would be glad to do so. This weather cycle is important to you.

Bringing the warm-weather cycle down to you and your customers, just what does it mean in our everyday life? We are not interested in the next 200 or 300 years, but what happens now, this summer, next year, and for projecting schedules the next 5 to 10 years we are quite concerned. Keep in mind this change—warmer winters with less snow, drier and hotter summers.

Any doubts about it? As that famous New Yorker, Al Smith, used to say, "Let's look at the record." Go back a year or so. Here is your picture.

July and August: The worst drought in many years struck the Southwest, causing disaster to the cattle industry.

September: Droughts continued. At the same time, the remnants of glacier ice in Europe retreated sharply.

October: Record high temperatures prevailed over the entire country and a New York real-estate expert stated that the hot humid weather was causing a great demand for airconditioned office space.

November saw a continuation of drought and heat. The water table level in the West fell dangerously.

December: Many wonder if winter bypassed them entirely. An AP European dispatch in mid-December related people bathing and sunning themselves in almost 90° temperatures in Brighton, England. President Eisenhower appointed a special commission to look into the effects of this changing weather and to do something about it.

January: Fuel-oil supplies soared to record highs even with cutbacks in allowables by many States. The ore boats were still plying the Great Lakes at this late date bringing all the ore needed by the steel mills.

February and March saw the start of a great winter drought with dust storms hitting many parts of the West. The winter wheat crop was literally being blown away. Millions of bushels of wheat were lost. This will be reflected soon in our food prices.

Project this picture. This summer will be hot and dry. What is happening to your own market? Is the weather helping you, or is it hurting your business? Are you in the air-conditioning or in the fuel business? Do you handle overcoats, or do you sell ice cream and soft drinks? Do you own a southern winter resort, or are you lucky enough to operate a New Jersey or New England summer resort? Basically, do you see the picture that is created by the revolution in weather?

Here today, we have representatives from many industries. Some are going to benefit immeasurably; some will be hurt. Old man weather cares little if you are riding high or if your books have shown red ink. The industry that is in the best position is the air-conditioning business. You will hear more about this from the representative of the air-conditioning industry. Let me say that we should be as fortunate as these people upon whom the weather revolution smiles so favorably. The weather is his ally, and combining good equipment and good merchandising, he is in a wonderful position. Other lines that will do well because of the weather change are the ice-cream, soft drink, and beer manufacturers, the outdoor toy field, outdoor furniture and accessories, garden equipment, sports clothes, and sport cars. America is being forced out of doors by the weather.

On the other hand, many businesses will suffer. At the top of the list stand the coal and fuel-oil people, commercial fishermen, the book and magazine industry, most phases of the wool industry. These people must face up to the fact that the weather is against them and either shift their markets accordingly or diversify with products that can take advantage of the changes.

Time does not allow me to go into each one of the affected industries. But let me show you how you can be hit by this weather revolution. I use the commercial fishing industry as an example. A resultant effect of the rise in temperatures has been a rise in the ocean temperature. The fish, who seem to be a lot smarter than we humans, moved along with the warmer water. They left their old habitats. The tuna runs have changed entirely. Ten years ago, they were almost unheard of off Norway. Yet, today, the annual Norwegian catch of tuna is 25 million pounds. Shrimp, once found only in southern waters, are now found off the coast of Greenland where the largest shrimp bed in the world is located. To meet this northern movement, the entire fishing industry must change its thinking, yes, and change its equipment. Those who follow the weather are reaping rewards. Fishermen must adopt the policy of men like Ralph Fleming, who operated from Westport, Wash. He might rightfully be called the king of the king crab industry, for he is the largest dealer in king crabs. When they disappeared from the waters where he normally caught them, he followed them north to Alaska. Now, he is flying all he needs in from an area that could not support a peasant crab, much less a king crab.

Each business faces a separate problem. It may mean new packaging, moves to new sources, or sending to new markets, but it does require thought. Keep in mind the changes I mentioned—they are here to stay. The solution lies with you.

Boston Army Base in the Port of Boston

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 18, 1954

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement which I made this morning before the Armed Services Committee in support of H. R. 9099 concerning the Boston Army Base in the port of Boston:

I have been informed that the Department of the Army has no current requirement for the pier facilities at the Boston Army Base but would require such facilities for mobilization purposes. Accordingly, the Department requested no funds for the repair of the facilities at the Boston Army Base in the fiscal year 1955 public works bill and the fiscal year 1955 military construction appropriation bill.

The foregoing action can best be described as a hands-off policy. It neglects to consider the real state of deterioration of the pier facilities, and invites disaster and the inordinate expense which could conceivably result from further deterioration. The catastrophe which would result from collapse of the pier would not only be primarily expensive in the avoidable loss of life and property, but would be doubly expensive in the loss of the facilities to the port of Boston and in the cost of removing the debris from and reopening the channel.

The other alternative lines of action available to the Congress are as follows:

(a) Authorize funds to dismantle certain portions of the wharf structures to reduce the existing danger of collapse. I understand that various estimates of the costs of this work vary from $1.3 million to $4.3 million depending on the degree of relative permanency and safety to be obtained. This alternative is manifestly unsatisfactory by reason of the fact that it would render unusable the piers themselves, and deprives the facilities of any real economic value either to the Army for mobilization purposes or to the port of Boston for commercial purposes. This alternative would, likewise, be expensive from the viewpoints of the initial cost with no prospect of a return on the investment, and from the continuing long-term annual costs for maintenance of the hulk.

(b) Authorize funds for the rehabilitation of the pier. The estimated costs of this work range from $9.37 million to $13.28 million depending on the serviceability, anticipated service life, and estimated future costs of maintenance. Certainly, this alternative is much more preferable and advantageous than the other alternatives providing for inactivity and removal which I have previously discussed.

H. R. 9099 authorizes and provides for satisfactory rehabilitation of these pier facilities at nominal cost. In addition to providing for rehabilitation with an estimated service life of 60 years, the construction plan is practical and economical from the viewpoints of safety, both during and after construction, and subsequent maintenance charges.

Under this bill the work necessary to rehabilitate the pier facilities and put them in workable condition would be done by the United States. Thereafter upon execution of the lease to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, the obligation of maintenance would rest on the Commonwealth which would be authorized to sublease. In the event of a national emergency and a determination by the Secretary of the Army that the pier is necessary for military purposes, the Army would have a right to reoccupy it. The Commonwealth would thus most properly contribute to the repair cost of the facility, and will, in turn, be able to utilize the revenue derived from operation to recover the funds contributed for repairs and to further develop commercial use by the port of Boston.

The Boston Army Base is an asset in which the Federal taxpayers have already invested a substantial amount of money, which is valuable to the Nation in peacetime as an aid to international trade and to our general economy, and which in time of war or national emergency is of vital importance to our national defense. Failure to restore these facilities now would mean that our future mobilization efforts would be delayed while the base was reconstructed or reconverted, a delay which could well be crucial. The Boston Army Base pier is the only pier in Boston suitable for use as a port of embarkation in time of war. It has a direct, spacious, and uncongested approach from the city and provides for both railway cars and trucks. It has ample office and warehouse space. During World War II, the facilities were activated by the Army in 2 months and handled millions of tons of military cargo and was in constant use as a port of embarkation. The remaining facilities in Boston Harbor are insufficient for purposes of such magnitude.

Similarly, the pier facilities of the Boston Army Base are an integral part of Boston's shipping industry. In 1953, it was used by more than 300 general cargo ships, about 25 percent of Boston's total. It is estimated that if the 326 ships which berthed at the Army base in 1953 had not come to Boston, the revenue loss to the port area would have been more than $3.5 million. This commerce provided jobs for thousands of railroad workers, truckers, and longshoremen. The necessity to properly restore and maintain these superior facilities appears self-evident in view of the objectives of the administration to expand international trade; the Army pier provides approximately 30 percent of the berthing piers available in Boston.

Mr. Chairman, I urge that the Congress recognize the responsibility of the Federal Government to undertake the rehabilitation of this valuable national asset which, as I have pointed out, is valuable to the Nation in peacetime as an aid to international trade and to the general economy, and in time of war is of critical importance to our national defense. The Congress has an obligation to the taxpayers in this matter to insure the security of our Nation, to maintain the local economy, and to preclude those greater expenditures which would be incurred in the future through failure to authorize rehabilitation at this time.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

Code of Laws of the United States

Title 44, Section 181. Congressional Record; arrangement, style, contents, and indexes.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the Congressional Record, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the Congressional Record semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

Title 44, Section 182b. Same; illustrations, maps, diagrams.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the Record without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the Congressional Record the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily Record as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided,* That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the Record with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the official reporters of the Congressional Record, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the Record shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the Record issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the Record for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the Record of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the Record shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the Record style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the Record.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the Congressional Record any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix, but this rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the Congressional Record.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the Congressional Record Appendix the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed.

10. *Official reporters.*—The official reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the Congressional Record by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this restriction shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. The Public Printer or the official reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the Congressional Record which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Illustrations.*—Pursuant to section 182b, title 44, United States Code (as shown above), requests for authority to insert an illustration in the Record should be submitted to the Joint Committee on Printing through the chairman of the Committee on Printing of the respective House in which the speech desired to be illustrated may be delivered. Illustrations shall not exceed in size a page of the Record and shall be linecuts only. Copy for illustrations must be furnished to the Public Printer not later than 12:30 o'clock p. m. of the day preceding publication.

13. *Corrections.*—The permanent Record is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

Appendix

Address Delivered by Hon. Alexander Wiley, of Wisconsin, Before Inter-American Bar Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 19, 1954

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, last evening it was my privilege to address the Inter-American Bar Association. I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF HON. ALEXANDER WILEY, CHAIRMAN, SENATE FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE, AT DINNER HONORING LATIN AMERICAN DIPLOMATS, MAYFLOWER HOTEL, WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, MAY 18, 1954

It is indeed a high privilege to appear before such a distinguished group.

No greater honor can come to a man than to represent his country abroad—and the responsibility is commensurate with the honor. I need not dwell on that aspect of it here; certainly this group, of all people, is acutely aware of the great responsibility of the diplomat. It is obvious that the Latin American governments are also aware of it; otherwise, they would not send such able and distinguished men to represent them in Washington.

It is particularly appropriate that one of our cosponsors tonight should be the Inter-American Bar Association. Nowhere else in the world has the law played so large a role in international relations as in the Americas. In this hemisphere, international relations are based on juridical concepts—the concept of the sovereign equality of free and independent states, and the concept of individual freedom with legal protection for basic human rights.

PREPARATION FOR U. N. CHARTER REVIEW

For this reason, among others, I was particularly happy to learn that at its conference in Sao Paulo in March of this year the Inter-American Bar Association directed the establishment of a committee to study and report on revision of the United Nations Charter and that it urged member associations to make their own independent studies of the same question. I am sure that the results of such studies will be of great help to all our governments in preparing for the question of charter review which will come up at the United Nations General Assembly in 1955.

Georges Clemenceau once said that war was too important to leave to the generals. I am sure you will agree that peace is much too important to leave to the diplomats.

We need the best thinking of all our people, especially those in the legal profession who are peculiarly well equipped by training and experience to make constructive suggestions.

It is none too soon to begin thinking of the questions which will arise in connection with charter review. Indeed, as early as last summer, the United States Senate established a special subcommittee, of which I have the honor to be chairman, to consider this very thing. This subcommittee has not retired to an ivory tower to meditate upon the question in solitude. On the contrary, it is actively seeking the thoughts and advice of as many different private citizens as possible. To reach these citizens, the subcommittee has held hearings in Akron, Ohio; in Milwaukee, Wis.; and in Greensboro, N. C. We have a hearing scheduled in Louisville, Ky., next month, and we plan to have others over the country.

These hearings have been not only helpful in that they have produced concrete proposals for strengthening the United Nations, but also inspiring in that they have provided dramatic evidence of the support which the United Nations has won among the people of the United States.

I am sure that the U. N. has won similar support among the people of the other American Republics and that such support will be reflected in the reports of the bar association groups.

UNITY OF AMERICAN REPUBLICS

I suspect, also, that these reports will reveal a striking similarity of attitudes toward the U. N. I base that prediction on the fact that the American Republics by and large have always approached international problems from the same general point of view. I could cite countless examples, and you could doubtless supply many more from your own experience. The actions of the Organization of American States have repeatedly given impressive demonstrations of hemispheric unity. The votes of the American Republics in the United Nations have been a further demonstration of this unity, which is one of the outstanding facts of the world today. It is one in which we can all take a great deal of pride and satisfaction.

This unity is not the monolithic facade with which the Soviet bloc confronts the world. The Soviet bloc is not united; it is regimented. The two are diametrically opposite.

Behind its false front, the Soviet bloc is torn with powerful tensions and internal contradictions. The social pressures generated by these forces must someday lead to an explosion which will blow the whole phony structure to bits.

In the Americas, on the other hand, we make no pretense of concealing our differences. Indeed, we sometimes go to the other extreme and shout them from the housetops. The important point is that we content ourselves with shouting about them. To shout instead of to shoot is a good rule in international relations.

It is a healthy thing to ventilate differences in public. But let no one mistake the nature of such differences. They are not fundamental; they are superficial. Underlying them is the basic unity of freemen who have arrived at the same principles and purposes, each in his own way and of his own free will.

This is a unity which allows for differences, and the settlement of those differences in turn makes for greater unity.

BASES FOR HEMISPHERIC SOLIDARITY

Let us examine, briefly, the bases for this unity and what can be done to strengthen it.

I have already mentioned the importance of juridical concepts in inter-American relations—the concepts of the sovereign equality of free and independent states and the concept of human freedom. There are two other principles which would have to be included in any list—the principle of nonintervention and the principle of consultation.

No one in the Western Hemisphere tries to tell anyone else how to manage his own affairs. Furthermore, we resent outside powers trying to do so. We have made this clear on a number of occasions, most recently at Caracas when 17 American Republics declared in a single voice that "the domination or control of the political institutions of any American State by the international Communist movement, extending to this hemisphere the political system of an extracontinental power, would constitute a threat to the sovereignty and political independence of the American States, endangering the peace of America, and would call for a meeting of consultation to consider the adoption of appropriate action in accordance with existing treaties."

The last clause recognizes the other principle on which our unity is based—the principle of consultation. We meet together to talk things over. We exchange views in a spirit of mutual respect, and we arrive at an agreed on common course of action.

Our mutual devotion to these principles is what has drawn us together and made us strong. But there is something more to it than that.

MASSIVE SHIPMENT OF IRON CURTAIN ARMS

I want to add a few words now with regard to a news development with which you are all familiar and which occurred following my preparation of the formal text of my remarks tonight.

I refer to the ominous arrival at a country in this hemisphere of a tremendous shipment of arms on a boat which was loaded at a port behind the Iron Curtain.

All of the distinguished Ambassadors and all of the members of the audience tonight are, I am certain, keenly aware of the grim implications of that news.

I say that this news is alarming and it is of the utmost gravity to the cause of inter-American unity, the cause of freedom and sovereignty within the Western Hemisphere.

This news is the latest concrete demonstration in a long series of similarly disturbing events pointing to the fact that the international Communist conspiracy is intervening directly in the affairs of this hemisphere.

You can be absolutely certain that no ship is loaded behind the Iron Curtain with 1 ton, or 1,000, or 2,000 tons of arms, unless that shipment is a part of the master plan of world communism. That plan is aimed at one principal objective—the domination of the world.

I speak in humility in making these observations, but with the frankness which I believe this situation requires.

The overall situation—of which this latest disquieting news is but the latest confirmation—has long been developing, or, we may well say, disintegrating. Month after month, year after year, we have watched the international Communist conspiracy expand its beachhead of intervention and disintegrate its local opposition. We have seen it spread its tentacles out to neighboring countries.

Now, after the latest development, all who have eyes to see and ears to hear—note that, by force of arms, the international Communist conspiracy proposes to accelerate its treacherous plans.

Communism, we know, is a system intrinsically of force and violence. It is a worshiper of force and violence. It rises to power by force and violence. It perpetuates itself by force and violence.

The massive shipment to which I have referred is a part of the Communist global pattern of force and violence.

It is a shipment totally disproportionate to any legitimate needs of that country.

It is a shipment contrary to the best interests of all that for which the Organization of American States stands. But not only is the size of the shipment its self-indictment, but the origin of the shipment and the destination of the shipment and the probable uses to which the shipment may be put.

I respectfully submit that this and other aspects of the Communist intervention merit the closest and most continuous consultation of the leadership of the Western Hemisphere, dedicated, as it is, to the cause of inter-American unity; dedicated to the cause of advancing the moral law which governs this universe.

This event to which I have referred, and the context of which it is a part, is not a United States concern nor a United States interpretation alone. It is a hemispheric concern. It is a basis for hemispheric consultation.

We know each other in this hemisphere. We have lived as neighbors for a long time. Hundreds of thousands, perhaps millions, of our people go back and forth between different countries each year.

There is a vast interchange of knowledge, skill, and cultures, all of it accompanied by a growing number of personal friendships on an international basis.

The more of this that goes on, the better it is for all of us.

EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE

In the cultural and educational fields, such exchanges are the best long-term defense against the insidious Communist efforts to divide us by spreading lies among us about each other. When someone has seen for himself what other people in this hemisphere are like, he recognizes the absurd distortions which the Communists propagate.

The Inter-American Bar Association, as well as the American Bar Association and the District of Columbia Bar Association, are to be commended for their work in encouraging educational exchanges, particularly in the field of comparative law. The more private groups do to promote such exchanges, the greater our progress will be in developing firm bonds of friendship and understanding throughout the Americas.

There is also a large area in which governments can operate effectively, and the various American Governments have done so, through the Buenos Aires convention and other means.

But none of us—and I most emphatically include the United States—has done enough. There are, of course, limits on the size to which an exchange program can grow and retain its effectiveness. But we have not yet nearly reached those limits.

Yet even with the United States Government program as small as it is, one House of the Congress has made what I consider to be a most ill-advised reduction of 40 percent in the budget for next year.

Actually, if this reduction stands, it will mean a cut of more than 40 percent in the program, because it is made up of separate funds over which the reduction cannot be spread evenly.

Thus, the proposed cut would totally eliminate from the educational exchange program 46 countries, including all of Latin America.

The cut would also eliminate the United States contributions to the more than 200 American schools in Latin America. The budgets of these schools total around $7 million, and the United States Government contribution is only $135,000—a small, but in many cases a critical, percentage. I must say that this seems to me to be a very extravagant way to economize.

The appropriation for international educational-exchange activities has not yet been voted on in the Senate. I am very hopeful that the full amount requested will be restored, and I shall do what I can to that end.

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

The exchange of technical information is equally important as a contribution to better international understanding and, concretely, to bringing about long-term improvements in standards of living.

In this field, too, the Western Hemisphere's record of international cooperation is outstanding. The technical-assistance program of the Organization of American States deserves the support of all of us.

I have also been much impressed with the results I have seen of the technical-cooperation programs which are operated on a bilateral basis with the United States in most of the American Republics. It is worth emphasizing that the Institute of Inter-American Affairs started these programs in Latin America several years before the point 4 concept spread to the rest of the world. In this, as in other fields, the Western Hemisphere has been the laboratory for testing and perfecting new ideas and new techniques in human relations.

One has only to look at the results of technical cooperation in the American Republics to be convinced of its basic soundness. Many dramatic instances of its success have come to my attention, but I am sure I do not have to argue the case before this audience.

I merely want to give you my assurance that, as chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, I will do what I can to keep the program going, to keep it on an even keel, and to keep it supplied with funds.

INVESTMENT AND DEVELOPMENT

In the field of technical knowledge and economic development, however, as in the field of educational exchange, what governments can—or should—do is limited. What private enterprise can do is virtually unlimited. Throughout the Western Hemisphere private enterprise has prospered. United States private capital has poured into Latin America in greater volume than into any other region of the globe except Canada. It has gone not to exploit but to develop. Given the proper environmental conditions, I am confident our capital will continue to flow southward in even larger quantities.

At the same time we must all recognize that there are some things that private capital cannot do, or is justifiably reluctant to do. I refer to basic developmental projects in such fields as power and transportation. Here international developmental loans from such agencies as the World Bank and the Export-Import Bank can appropriately enter the picture.

The long-term results of all these endeavors—educational exchange, technical assistance, private investment, and economic development—will be not only to strengthen our international relations but also to increase our mutual trade and to improve the standards of living of all of us.

Some of the problems involved are forbidding and complex—but no more so than some of those which have yielded to solution in the past.

Here in the Western Hemisphere we of the American Republics have carefully and patiently built something at which we can look and say, "This is good."

We have only to go along the same path together, settling our differences in the spirit of mutual good faith and good will, to reach an even brighter era.

Address by Hon. Lyndon B. Johnson at Diamond Jubilee Commencement Exercises, Sam Houston State Teachers College, Huntsville, Tex.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN DOWDY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 19, 1954

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, last Sunday, May 16, 1954, Sam Houston State Teachers College, at Huntsville, Tex., one of the fine teachers colleges in the congressional district I have the honor to represent, had commencement exercises for its diamond jubilee graduates. The commencement address was made by Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON, of Texas, the Senate Democratic leader. Under unanimous consent, I insert his address in the RECORD:

This is a solemn and a precious moment for all of you.

There is no other event in life which has quite the same magic as commencement.

It has been more years than I care to remember since I reached this stage of my career. It was at your sister college of San Marcos, not very far from my home in the Central Hill country.

A SENSE OF ACHIEVEMENT

I can well recall that feeling of hope and expectation; a beginning regret for past associations underlined with impatience to get out in the world and get going.

But above all, there was that sense of achievement—of accomplishment. There was that exhilaration that goes with goals which have been won—and new goals that automatically follow the victory.

I imagine that no person at this point can avoid a feeling of destiny. There may be some of us who try to conceal our pride. But they are few.

There are just too many years of work and effort behind the person who participates in a commencement exercise. The labor and the sacrifice that went into it are too great to be lightly dismissed with a few scoffing remarks.

A HALLOWED SHRINE

At Sam Houston State College, this sense of achievement and destiny must be doubled. This is more than merely the site of a first-rate educational institution which takes a back seat to none.

It is also a hallowed shrine of Texas and American history.

The grave of the immortal Sam Houston—the father of Texas independence—is nearby.

A short distance away is the monument to Capt. James Gillespie, who fought at San Jacinto.

On your campus is Austin Hall—the original building of Austin College, erected in 1851.

No one can spend years in these surroundings without feeling the spirit of our pioneer ancestors. No one can be in close—almost daily—contact with our shrines without feeling a sense of history.

A DOUBLE ROLE

It is said that no nation can survive unless its people truly honor the great men of the past. This college is a memorial to one of the greatest of our great men.

As such, it plays a double role. It preserves the memory of those who shaped our destiny in the days that are gone. It prepares the young men and women who will shape our destiny in the days that lie ahead.

Actually, that is why you are here today. You are assembled to symbolize the years of preparation which have gone into your graduation. Tomorrow, you will step out into the world of struggle where those years will make all the difference to you—and to your country.

THE WORLD AHEAD

I have never been entirely certain of the role of an outside speaker at a college-commencement exercise.

Certainly, I cannot add to the knowledge you already have gleaned from the academic world. That is the job of your hard-working teachers and I know they have suceeded admirably.

Certainly, I cannot add to your sense of achievement and well-being. The praise and plaudits you want—and deserve—come from your parents, your teachers and your friends who have so much faith in you.

Perhaps, however, I can shed some light on the world into which you are stepping.

It is not a quiet world nor a peaceful world. It is not even an orderly world such as that which our ancestors enjoyed at times in the past.

TWO COMPELLING FACTS

It is a troubled world, a divided world. It is a world sorely in need of fresh, vigorous ideas such as only you and your fellow graduates from the Nation's colleges can provide.

There are problems to be solved; obstacles to overcome. There are barriers which must be broken down; and dark places which must be lighted.

This is an age of two compelling and overriding facts—the cold war with communism and the hydrogen bomb. Neither will vanish if we just close our eyes and pretend they have gone away.

There are some who are frightened by these facts—who run in panic searching for a place to hide. There are others who respond in a spirit of bravado—who call for rash countermeasures in the hope that something wild and impossible will succeed.

In these troubled times, I have taken great comfort from the attitude of our youth. I find those with whom I am in contact neither panicky nor hotheaded.

I find all the buoyant confidence that has characterized youth since the beginning of time. I find little of the exaggerated cocksureness that frequently mars that confidence.

ADULT PROBLEMS

It is well that this is so. We are living in times when manhood cannot be postponed into our later years. We have adult problems to face—and they must be faced by every citizen in our land.

A few decades ago, Americans thought that farm problems concerned only our farmers and their representatives in Washington. Today we know that they affect every person—regardless of his station in life.

A few decades ago, Americans thought that foreign policy concerned only a few diplomats in the State Department. Today we know that it is the responsibility of every American.

A few decades ago, Americans thought that national defense was the concern of a few generals—and maybe the President as Commander in Chief. Today it preys on the mind of every thinking person.

The list could be extended indefinitely—labor, taxes, social security. Each represents a living reality—and not just a vague abstraction—to all Americans.

PRIVILEGES AND OBLIGATIONS

You are going forth to become leaders in your communities. You will not step into leadership positions automatically. This is a world in which every man must prove himself.

But as the years go by, the knowledge and the wisdom to which you have been exposed will tip the scales heavily. You will find that the burdens will increase with each passing day.

This is simply due to the fact that with every privilege goes an obligation. You have had the privilege of education. With it goes the obligation of service to your fellow man.

IDEAS MORE THAN WEAPONS

The greatest service that can be performed in the world today is the production of new ideas—new, fresh, vigorous, bold ideas.

We need new, challenging ideas more than we need tanks, jet planes, or atomic bombs. With weapons, we can defend ourselves—we would be lost without them. But weapons alone will not solve the problem of preserving our freedoms in a world where slavery is creeping on the face of the globe.

I would like to throw out one point for your consideration.

ON THE DEFENSIVE

Almost since the end of World War II, we have been on the defensive in the cold war. We have gained some victories; suffered some reversals. But both the victories and the reversals have been defensive.

We have been engaged in a gigantic holding operation.

Our possession of atomic and hydrogen weapons has prevented world war III. The Communists are unlikely to launch an attack upon the United States so long as we are capable of devastating retaliation.

NIBBLES AND GULPS

But they have adopted another tactic—slower than direct attack but possibly more effective in the long run.

They have nibbled away gradually at the boundaries of freedom—a chunk here, a morsel there—and in the case of China, a whole big gulp.

It is a clever strategy. It is one that is difficult to counter. It is one that exhausts our strength and leaves their's intact.

They do not have to use their own men; others do their fighting for them.

They do not run the risk of launching world war III; the fighting is always on soil that belongs to others.

It is a tactic from which the Russians can gain—at practically no risk whatsoever. The risks are all assumed by those who have been deluded into doing their fighting for them.

THE RISKS ARE ONE-SIDED

On our side, the picture is quite different.

We have to do our own fighting—sometimes we get help but always we bear the main burden.

We have to run our own risks—our troops fight under our own direction.

Obviously, we cannot keep this up forever. We could win a hundred battles—and be so exhausted from winning the battles that we could not win the war.

PAST THE AGE OF WEAKNESS

At first, we could do little else but react defensively. We had disbanded the armed might that was assembled in World War II. The military machine could not be put together again in a matter of hours or days.

We have now passed the age of weakness. We have stepped into a new stage where we are strong—not as strong as we would like to be but still strong.

It is time that we seriously consider going on the offensive—on the cold-war offensive.

This is not a step that can be taken lightly. We do not want to touch off world war III. World war in the hydrogen age could mean the complete destruction of all civilization.

CALCULATED RISKS

But we can cooly and calmly calculate the risks of creating counter tensions to those that have been created by the Communists.

We must not deceive ourselves as to what is—and what is not—possible. We must not assume strengths where they do not exist—or weaknesses where they do not exist.

The Communist empire is vast and forbidding. It stretches across the largest land mass on the face of the globe. It has enslaved hundreds of millions of people who are helpless pawns in the Kremlin game.

THE SOFT SPOT

But like every other structure built on fear and hate, the Communist empire has its soft spots. The most vulnerable point consists of the people themselves.

There are many men and women who have welcomed Communists into their country because they were deceived by the false promises of Marxist paradise. There are few, however—very few—who have tasted the Communist whip and who do not burn with a desire to be rid of it.

They are helpless now. The police state does not permit the slightest expression of unrest or dissatisfaction. It is fully capable of executing whole populations if they cannot otherwise be kept in subjugation.

SAVAGE FURY

But there can be little doubt that these people would shake the Communist empire to its foundations if they had any opportunity whatsoever. They have proved that in Eastern Germany; in Poland; in Czechoslovakia.

Their resistance was beaten down with savage fury. It was futile in the sense of immediate accomplishments. But it proved that the spirit of independence still lives and cannot be crushed completely.

A MEANS OF EXPRESSION

We must bend our thoughts and our efforts to a search for means by which this spirit can find expression.

Perhaps we should organize to better advantage the refugees from communism who swarm across the Iron Curtain at every point where it is not guarded by dogs and armed soldiers.

Perhaps we should organize armies of freedom among the very men who have most felt the loss of freedom.

Perhaps we should throw greater weight behind those who are struggling to keep the spirit of independence alive in their own lands.

No step should be accepted; no step should be rejected without a careful calculation of all the risks.

NO FALSE HOPE

Above all, no step should be taken that would fill people with false hope or incite them to futile action. We must deal realistically and aboveboard.

Our objective is greater freedom, not greater oppression.

EVERYBODY'S BUSINESS

I have raised this issue today because preservation of freedom is everybody's business. We will all lose our liberties if we fail. We can save them only if we all work together.

And nothing, absolutely nothing, can be done unless the American people understand all the issues and are united.

Issues can be understood only when they are discussed and thought through to the end.

As American citizens, the burdens of these issues are upon your shoulders. The skill and the knowledge which you have acquired must be turned to them. Otherwise, the world for which you have been prepared may be living through days that are numbered.

I believe you are ready to accept your obligations. A generation that took Korea in its stride is certainly ready for the problems of the present and of the future, no matter how great.

The stakes in your lifetime are and will be enormous. They are the security of constitutional government and of the whole concept of liberty.

This day is the symbol of your preparation. Your parents and your teachers have worked and sacrificed for this moment.

Go forth in the spirit of their teachings and America will be proud of you.

Leo Pavelle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER HOLTZMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 19, 1954

Mr. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to include herein a clipping from the New York Mirror of April 25, 1954: Camera Highlights, by John Reidy.

This article indicates that a citation from the Hobby Hall of Fame was given to Leo Pavelle, one of the most prominent leaders in the photographic field, and one who has revolutionized the photofinishing business.

The story of Leo Pavelle and his contributions to the industry reflects a combination of ingenuity, determination, and courage. It is a story that would be well worth reading and could be an inspiration to many young people who are interested in photography as a hobby or as a business.

The article follows:

CAMERA HIGHLIGHTS

(By John Reidy)

The Hobby Hall of Fame citations to be made during National Photography Week, April 25 to 30, will include, among prominent leaders in the photography field, Leo Pavelle, president of Pavelle Color, who turned a hobby into a $2-million-a-year photofinishing business.

Leo was born in 1907 in Dvinsk, in what is now Lithuania. He came to America in 1920 with his father, attending high school and 2 years of college, when a lack of funds caused him to seek ways of earning money to finish his engineering course.

He had one of the very first Leicas to reach this country from Germany, using it as a hobby. With the financial pinch, he decided to turn the hobby into money and began shooting home portraits. He then won a reputation by photographing Broadway shows during rehearsals. The only hitch came when the photofinishers of the day did not know how to process 35-millimeter film. They gave it the fishy stare whenever Leo brought it in.

The hobbyist turned professional, then studied all available literature on fine-grain miniature film processing as practiced in Germany and began dreaming of a finishing plant of his own. At this time he met his future wife, Carrie. Carrie's 2 brothers ran a photo-finishing plant. Leo worked there summers while he was attending college, successfully trying out his theories of how to get good engagements from Leica film.

In 1932 Carrie and Leo got married and went into the photo-finishing business on their own. Around this period the Zeiss Co. introduced the Contax 35 millimeter camera to America and with it a commission to Pavelle to do a raft of display pictures to advertise the advantages of the new miniature for candid work.

Leo spent a week at the Bronx Zoo shooting hundreds of pictures, finally producing 100 16 x 20 prints from the 35 millimeter negatives. Tremendous interest was created in miniatures which could produce such huge grain free pictures.

In July 1934, the husband and wife firm moved into the building at Fifth Avenue and 42d Street, where Zeiss had their United States headquarters.

Leo's engineering background, attained in college, now began to make itself felt as he began to redesign and rebuild his enlargers in his own machine shop to improve and speed up their performance.

After the outbreak of World War II the Pavelles were engulfed with Government orders for 15,000 to 20,000 8 x 10 prints per day. The problem became one of fast quantity and uniform quality. Leo locked himself in his machine shop and produced automatic devices to time exposures by means of photoelectric cells, linking these up to enlargers.

The course of photographic events increased the pressure on the Pavelles. In March 1944, Ansco introduced Printon, a sensitized material on which positive-transparency color film could be printed. After a week of probing into all phases of the Printon process at the Ansco, Binghamton, N. Y., plant, Leo was firmly convinced that his brightest future lay with color.

The thought was easier said than done because his new venture involved among other things, new machines and new capital. The machines were the greatest challenge Pavelle was ever faced with, but again he locked the door of his machine shop and came up with the answer which today is a huge $600,000 plant on West 57th Street, where about 275 employees turn out more than 30,000 color prints a day. This all from a hobby with a Leica.

Feeder Airlines Serving Small Communities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 19, 1954

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I am inserting in the RECORD a very informative and thought-provoking letter I have received from my very good personal friend, Mr. L. E. Leverone, of Chicago.

Mr. Leverone is one of the leading businessmen of Illinois. In addition, he has an extensive background in aviation. For a number of terms he served as president of the National Aeronautic Association. He has also served as a member of the Air Council and as a member of the Air Coordinating Committee.

The letter relates to policy with respect to commercial airlines, particularly with respect to the feeder lines serving the small communities. All of us are keenly interested in commercial airline developments, and we are especially desirious of seeing that the needs of the smaller communities are met.

In view of the importance of this matter and Mr. Leverone's knowledge of the subject, I wish to call attention to his letter to me, which follows:

NATIONWIDE FOOD SERVICE, INC.,
Chicago, May 14, 1954.
Hon. LESLIE C. ARENDS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR LES: The local service, or feeder airlines have come into existence since the end of World War II. They are, in fact, the new and small businesses that have been established in the scheduled air transport industry. The oldest of these carriers has been operating less than 9 years, while the youngest carrier has been operating only 3½ years.

The economic benefits of air transportation to the smaller communities has long been recognized. So great was the nationwide interest in this type of air transportation that the Civil Aeronautics Board on March 22, 1943, decided, upon its own motion, to investigate the propriety of extending air transportation to communities and localities throughout the continental United States, to which such transportation may not appear warranted under usual economic considerations, and the coordination of such air transportation with air transportation already authorized or which may be authorized under usual considerations and existing standards.

At the close of extensive hearings, in which all segments of the air transport industry, as well as other transportation groups presenting evidence, the Civil Aeronautics Board announced its opinion in July 1944.

In this opinion the Board recognized the many problems involved in certificating a new class of air carriers to serve the intermediate cities, but it also recognized its responsibility imposed by the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938:

"SEC. (a) The encouragement and development of an air-transportation system properly adopted to the present and future needs of the foreign and domestic commerce of the United States, of the postal service, and of the national defense; * * * and the encouragement and development of civil aeronautics."

Because of this congressional directive the Board decided to authorize local, or feeder, airline service on an experimental basis.

In authorizing this new local service, the Board opened the field of scheduled air transport to new, small, independent companies rather than utilizing the existing trunk lines.

Why was this done?

In the Rocky Mountain case, one of the first cases, the Board said, "In view of the limited traffic potentialities of the points of the new system, an unusual effort will be required to develop the maximum traffic. Greater effort and the exercise of managerial ingenuity may be expected from independent local operators whose continuation in the air-transportation business will be dependent upon the successful development of traffic on the routes and the operation of the service on an adequate and economical basis." (6 C. A. B. 736–737.)

The result of certifying new local, independent airlines has proven the wisdom of the Board's action. This new, small-business section of the industry has generated traffic far in excess of that attracted by the trunk lines.

The statement of the Air Coordinating Committee would throw this concept overboard and permit the large carriers to take over the local air lines. A complete reversal of original Board policy which has been amply demonstrated to be sound by (1) the remarkable development of local traffic in the hands of the local carriers (4,452 passengers in 1945 to 1,998,128 passengers in 1953); (2) the provision of greater schedule frequency, with its development of traffic;

and (3) the emphasis on service more suitable to intermediate points than to terminal points.

Proof of the wisdom of the Board's original policy is born out by a study made by Frontier Airlines for the year 1952. This study showed that in the year 1952 Frontier Airlines developed 297.8 passengers per 1,000 population from 25 cities served on its route system which were under 25,000 population each, while 30 cities under 25,000 population, each in the same general geographical area served exclusively by trunklines, developed only 132.4 passengers per 1,000 population.

Another example will demonstrate this. Johnstown, Pa., was served in 1948 by one carrier—a trunk. In that year approximately 3,300 passengers were served. In 1949 Allegheny Airlines, a local service line, was certificated and began serving Johnstown, and the trunk line was suspended. In 1949, 7,600 passengeres used Allegheny's service from Johnstown, and in 1953 more than 20,000 passengers were served.

Today we have 14 local service airlines which have a route structure of approximately 30,000 miles and serve more than 430 cities in 42 States. Over 43 million people reside in the cities served by the local airlines.

The record of progress of the local airlines is pointed up in the following tables:

Local service airline traffic, 1945–53

Year	Revenue passengers	Airmail (tons)	Miles		Total revenue (ton-miles)
			Express	Freight	
1945	4,452	74,510	11,482	----------	202,000
1946	25,118	60,088	24,354	25	688,000
1947	235,585	167,564	117,523	62,039	4,682,000
1948	425,696	361,984	189,550	264,794	9,040,000
1949	683,811	432,628	320,143	435,903	14,328,000
1950	987,931	559,085	614,139	714,346	21,480,000
1951	1,462,083	765,456	864,946	884,417	30,709,000
1952	1,703,730	893,057	866,526	1,081,319	35,130,000
1953	1,998,128	976,003	927,571	1,149,905	39,625,000

Local service airlines revenue growth, 1946–53

Year	Passengers	Mail	Express and freight	Other
1946	$314,638	$1,558,614	$13,008	$44,797
1947	2,280,124	5,057,097	60,179	150,931
1948	4,666,549	11,282,490	147,159	195,511
1949	7,362,007	14,054,998	252,159	271,466
1950	10,302,859	16,384,321	442,046	763,718
1951	15,757,569	18,575,430	629,886	962,801
1952	19,171,798	21,151,074	593,661	805,878
1953	22,651,768	24,182,057	903,003	763,760

This type of growth was possible because the local airlines are devoted completely to the small- and intermediate-sized communities and have geared their flight operations and sales programs to fit these communities' requirements.

The principle of local service by local service carriers should be maintained, and local carriers should, wherever possible, be given access to heavier density traffic in order to reduce Government cost.

The air coordinating committee proposes that the airline industry has become of age and is no longer primarily dependent on subsidy; also, that the local service portion of the industry (whose average age is about 6 years) has generally failed to live up to original expectations and should be eliminated through a process of absorption by the larger lines and/or elimination to eliminate the subsidy payments.

The stage of development of the local airlines as of 1953 was comparable to the situation in which American Airlines, United, TWA, and Eastern found themselves in 1939, 14 years earlier. In 1953 the 14 local airlines carried a total of 1,998,128 passengers 386,881,000 revenue passenger-miles. The total mail pay of the local-service airlines as $24,182,057 and the total commercial revenues were $24,318,531, resulting in a ratio of mail pay to commercial revenue of 99 percent. On the other hand, in 1939 the Big Four hauled a total of 1,025,281 passengers 450,701,087 revenue passenger-miles. Their total mail revenue was $25,381,935, their ratio of mail pay to commercial revenue being 44.5 percent. It cannot be expected that the local carriers operating over lean traffic routes with artificial restrictions on service, which prevents them from taking full advantage of all possible revenue, can have reached a position where continued subsidy support is unwarranted. In 1939 the Big Four had the cream of the traffic routes and were in a stage of development roughly comparable to 1953 for the local-service airlines. Yet, it was not until the last 3 years that these carriers reached a stage of development where they could exist without subsidy.

The local airlines are only in their sixth year of operation as opposed to over 20 years of operation for the trunklines, and their progress should be compared, not to the trunklines of today, but to trunklines of 14 years ago. When so compared, it cannot be said that the local airlines have in general failed to live up to original expectations. The success to date of the local service airlines cannot be judged upon the progress made toward economic self-sufficiency alone. They have brought adequate air transportation service for the first time to several hundred communities, tailored, with respect to number and timing of schedules, to the needs of such communities rather than to the needs of the distant terminal points. The speedier travel and airmail and airfreight services have made their indelible imprint upon the lives and business customs of the communities, as is attested by the enthusiastic support given by the small communities to the local airlines in their bids for route renewals. Although the local service airlines may not reach self-sufficiency within the foreseeable future, this does not alter the fact that the local lines meet a distinct and pressing public need which cannot and will not otherwise be feasibly met.

It costs more to serve the smaller communities per unit of revenue produced because the pay loads are smaller than at the heavily populated centers. This is true whether the service is dependent upon Government support or private capital. This additional cost factor should not permit Congress, or least of all an administrative agency, to withhold service from these areas. More than 51 percent of the Nation's population lives on farms or in communities under 10,000 population. Approximately 75 percent of the United States Senators represent these areas as well as about 60 percent of the Representatives. These gentlemen know what this vast segment of the population requires, and demand that these requirements be dealt with in an intelligent manner. Local service air transportation is one of the needs of this segment of our population.

Air transportation is not a luxury to be used by the few, but a universal economic necessity. The universal acceptance of air transportation makes it a necessary part of our overall national transportation scheme. The local service airlines are a large and vital part of the transportation scheme. They are designed to do the kind of a job necessary to obtain the full traffic potential of the areas served and to offer the kind and type of service most needed by their patrons. Rather than gradually eliminate this segment of our air-transportation pattern, the local-service airlines should be preserved and strengthened.

Sincerely yours,

L. E. LEVERONE.

Communists on Warpath

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ALBERT H. BOSCH

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 19, 1954

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Speaker, last week I received the first mail that has ever been addressed to me by the Communist Party of the United States of America. The letter was a form letter calling for a united people and there was enclosed a booklet entitled "The American Way to Jobs, Peace, Democracy." It appears that the Communist Party is actively working to expand its sphere of influence, but we are constantly hearing that there is no danger to our country from these Communists who are within the United States. It is time we all awoke to the danger around us.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article by George Sokolsky entitled "Communists on Warpath," which deals with this pamphlet being circulated by the Communist Party, United States of America:

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald]

COMMUNISTS ON WARPATH

(By George Sokolsky)

The Communist Party of the United States has issued a new program which is entitled "The American Way." They are circulating this as a "draft program" inviting discussion and criticism. If read without background, this document does not quite make sense, but related to the history of the party and the general attitude of the Kremlin, it is indicative of continued vitality and a new aggressive attitude.

The first point in the draft program calls for a renewal of united-front activities. The most successful united front in the history of the Communist Party was the League Against War and Fascism (the League for Peace and Democracy), which, at one time, reached a membership of 4 million. It was the greatest achievement of the leadership of Earl Browder. Many who joined it did not know that it was a Communist-front organization.

Under the battering of congressional committees, many united-front organizations were destroyed. This was supplemented by the Attorney General's list, which became a determining factor in pinpointing these organizations.

Now the draft program calls for a renewal of united-front activities. It says:

"At a time of great national fear and anxiety, the Communist Party submits this program as an appeal to reason, an appeal to the common sense of our fellow Americans. The crisis of our Nation cannot be resolved by any one group alone. Therefore, we offer this program for the consideration of the working class and all Americans who are concerned with the welfare of our country.

"We are convinced that only the widest unity of the American people can avert the disaster of economic ruin, fascism, and war."

In a word, the Communist Party, in peril of being ostracized if not outlawed, is seeking to develop a united front, headed by innocents and dupes, staffed by fellow travlers, and controlled by Communists.

The second point is that the Eisenhower administration is not representative of the American people. The draft program says:

"There is an ever greater subordination of Government to big business. The Eisenhower administration is an administration of, by, and for big business. Corporate wealth—General Motors, United States Steel, Standard Oil, and Du Pont—America's biggest, richest, and greediest trusts, run the United States Government just as surely as they run their own corporations, and for the same end of ever more exorbitant profits."

The third point is the constant emphasis on the danger of war, which goes back to the pre-1939 program of the Communist Party and was departed from only after the Stalin-Hitler alliance was broken:

"Powerful social forces are at work in the world that will not accept Wall Street dictation or domination. One-third of mankind is emancipated from imperialist oppression and capitalist exploitation and has taken the path of socialism. The rise of the Soviet Union, its tremendous industrial and cultural advance, the victory of the Chinese people and the peoples of Eastern Europe, prove that socialism is here to stay and is indestructible."

Therefore, as socialism is inevitable, why resist? This is an old argument, used very effectively by the Communists in the 1930's. When the slogan was "The Yanks are not coming," it was the same emphasis on the inevitability of the success of socialism and the ultimate failure of the United States.

The fourth point is the menace of McCarthyism, which is identified with fascism, anti-Semitism, and anti-Negroism. It says:

"McCarthyism is on a rampage. It is trying to browbeat into submission every independent point of view, every thinking person. It burns books and destroys art and culture. It aims to smash the labor movement, to further enslave the Negro people, to stir up racism and anti-Semitism, to gag the young generation, and to wipe out all vestiges of liberty * * *."

This same argument was used against Charles Lindbergh, Herbert Hoover, Col. Robert R. McCormick, and nearly every American who opposed the Communist Party and the Stalin-Hitler pact. Despite the fact that no such fascistic movement has developed in this country, it nevertheless arouses the fears of large numbers of persons who are more frightened by fascism than by communism. There are many such persons in the United States who can never forget the existence of Hitler and the consequences that arose therefrom.

This Communist program will add a new divisive factor in American life.

To Combat Subversion by Law and Enforcement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 19, 1954

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following radio address I delivered over station WORL, Boston, Mass., on Sunday, May 16, 1954:

Passions are running high in the United States concerning the dangers of subversion and how to combat it.

There is some disagreement as to methods.

Basically, however, the American people are united in their dread of communism and in their insistence on more positive methods to root out espionage and treason.

The pattern of Red conquest shows, if any further proof be needed at this late stage in the game, that a few Communists in sensitive positions can do great harm to any nation.

In cleaning our house of Communists, we must avoid totalitarian procedures, for then we would become but little different from the Communists themselves.

Under the system of government that we enjoy, intended to protect our rights and liberties as well as protecting us from those who would undermine the Constitution of the United States, we must operate according to laws and the proper enforcement thereof.

The slimy techniques of subversion are new to the United States. We never had to contend with such a secret and insidious threat before.

Without experience in such matters we have had to strengthen our internal security program on a trial-by-error basis. Through the medium of congressional investigating committees operating with a free hand we have learned of the wide ramifications of the Soviet espionage network. It is shocking to find that even a few Americans could be agents or dupes of the Communist conspiracy.

Through the years congressional investigating committees have done good work, even if they do make mistakes at times.

But we cannot stop here.

The true purpose of such committees is exploratory. By revealing information and discovering conditions that might not otherwise come to our attention, they are laying the groundwork for legislation that will effectively deal with the problem of Communist activities within the United States.

The Committee on Un-American Activities of the United States House of Representatives has been working to ferret out the Communist underground for many years under Democratic and Republican leadership.

The report of its findings and recommendations covering the year 1952, when the committee was operating under a Democratic chairman and a Democratic majority, is a guide to the steps that must be taken to remove the danger of subversion.

The need for corrective legislation is sometimes forgotten in the highly charged emotional atmosphere of the present.

As the committee states: "It is regrettable, however, that in numerous instances, recommendations that the committee has made which would serve as a security safeguard against subversive activities in the United States, have not yet been enacted into law."

What are some of those recommendations made by this vital committee under a Democratic administration?

Let me mention just a few.

We must have a single, comprehensive espionage statute applicable to both peacetime and wartime. This should incorporate the present provisions of wartime espionage statutes, carrying a capital-punishment sentence. The statute of limitations would not then apply in espionage, any more than it applies to other crimes carrying a capital punishment. The provisions of legislation dealing with the unauthorized taking of classified Government papers and documents should be broadened to include the transportation of such papers and documents in interstate or foreign commerce.

The committee is also aware that the executive branch of the Government, is seriously being hampered in the prosecution of persons engaged in espionage, because of the present limitations on evidence that may be presented in the courts. The committee realizes that the restrictions against the admissibility of evidence secured from wiretapping has been imposed to protect the rights of the individual. The committee, while desiring to maintain all of the rights of the individual, feels that the rights of the individual can be preserved only if the national security remains. It is the committee's opinion that, if Soviet espionage continues unchecked, the rights of American citizens are being placed in graver danger than would be the case with legalized wiretapping. It is suggested, therefore, that Congress consider legislation to permit as evidence the results of wiretapping in matters affecting the national security, as well as in such cases as kidnaping and extortion. In order that a proper control might be exercised, it is felt that, as in the matter of arrests, searches, and seizures, the judicial branch of the Government should be empowered to authorize the use of such techniques.

The House of Representatives a short time ago passed a bill of this nature. Further action on it is up to the Senate.

The committee also feels that, since it is essential to any investigation, whether it be congressional, executive, or judicial, to have the testimony of competent and informed witnesses, legislation should be enacted to effect a greater latitude in granting immunity from prosecution to these witnesses.

The committee has frequently experienced instances where witnesses, while having information of undoubted value to the work of the committee, have refused to answer questions on the basis that to do so might tend to incriminate them. If such legislation as suggested by the committee were enacter, it would, while maintaining the rights of the individual, permit the proper investigative bodies to gather a true and comprehensive picture of the information they seek.

The committee's investigations have also disclosed that Soviet espionage has been assisted by the fact that Soviet nationals have been given unlimited freedom to travel throughout the United States and to and from Canada an Mexico. The committee's reports dealing with Soviet espionage show that Soviet officials have abused this freedom to actively engage in espionage operations. This situation exists, even though United States diplomats in Russia and her satellites are virtually under house arrest and under constant surveillance by the Russian secret police.

For these reasons, there should be reciprocal restrictions enforced by this country with the Soviet and satellite countries.

Since our espionage and internal-security legislation is now gaged upon times of war and peace, these distinctions should be removed in order that war measures may be enforced during this and similar critical times.

The committee during its hearings has had the unfortunate experience of having had before it witnesses, who, while holding commissions in the Armed Forces of the United States, have refused to affirm or deny allegations of membership in the Communist Party, or Communist-front organizations. The committee is aware that a commission in the Armed Forces of the United States is a privilege accorded to citizens of the United States of unquestioned loyalty, and not an inherent right provided for in the Constitution. This being the case, the committee recommends that, in any instance where a person holding a commission in the Armed Forces chooses to refuse to answer questions concerning his present or past membership in the Communist Party, such commission shall be immediately revoked.

The enactment of legislation to outlaw every political organization which is shown to be under the control of a foreign government. As long as these organizations have a legal status in the United States, it will be difficult for any agency of the Government to deal with them. We now know that they furnish the legal apparatus for the operations of saboteurs and the window dressing for espionage. The committee believes that legislation can be worked out to outlaw such organizations, and that this will in no sense constitute a violation of the Bill of Rights, since such legislation would only affect organizations controlled or directed by foreign countries.

The attention of the committee was called to alleged subversive conditions in the top-secret Army Signal Corps Intelligence Agency. This came about through a remarkable petition to Congress signed by 10 Agency employees, both military and civilian.

After investigation the committee was assured that tight security precautions were put into effect.

That incident emphasized the value of a standing congressional committee to which Government employees may appeal when they feel, for one reason or another, that conditions exist which need correction. The unusual petition to Congress undoubtedly alerted the military to strengthen security in the Agency and to remedy conditions which were not in the best interests of national defense.

One of the most important recommendations, in a matter which has been sadly lacking in the past few years, was made by the committee on March 15, 1950, calling for the fullest cooperation between the legislative and executive arms of the Government in the matter of dealing with subversive activities. It is a tragedy that during the past few years this cooperation has been for the most part one-sided, in that it was only congressional committees which were furnishing information to agencies of the executive branch. Effective action against the well-coordinated, interlocking Communist network requires the utmost teamwork among the branches of the Government. Petty rivalry or separatism can only work to the advantage of the Communists.

Our security laws need tightening.

So does enforcement thereof.

We cannot afford to play politics with internal security.

Too much is at stake, involving the future of ourselves and the Nation, already under visible and invisible attack by Communist forces seeking nothing less than enslavement of the whole world.

House Concurrent Resolution 58

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL C. KING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 19, 1954

Mr. KING of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following letter which I have received from the Allentown, Pa., branch of the Organization for the Defense of Four Freedoms for Ukraine:

Organization for the Defense
of Four Freedoms for Ukraine,
Branch 20, ODFFU,
Allentown, Pa.

Pensylvania Congressman Karl King,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Honorable Congressman King: It is our understanding that House Concurrent Resolution 58, advocting the establishment of diplomatic relations between the Soviet Republics of Ukraine and Byelorussia and the United States, is soon to be brought before the House Foreign Affairs Committee for final consideration.

This resolution won the unanimous approval of the subcommittee assigned to study the proposal under the chairmanship of the Honorable Mrs. Frances P. Bolton.

There are many benefits to be derived by America from such an exchange of diplomats. Assuming that the Soviet Union would accept the offer, we would have an access, formerly denied us, to the capitals of the two most important and largest non-Russian republics in the Soviet Union. (The most astute observers and students of the Soviet Union have all concurred on the constantly growing importance of Ukraine in Soviet affairs.

Such a move would also provide new hope and faith for the Ukrainian and Byelorussian people that their miserable plight under the Soviets and their aspirations toward independence from Moscow are fully appreciated by the United States to which they look for aid in their struggle.

A Soviet refusal of this diplomatic proposal would expose once again not only the well-known fact that the Ukrainians and Byelorussians in the Soviet Union are not free to govern themselves as they choose, but would also undermine Moscow's fraudulent claims of a desire for friendly, peaceful relations with the West.

We urge you to report the resolution out favorably for it is of vital importance to American security and victory in America's dealings with the Communist threat. We will appreciate your inserting this statement into the Congressional Record as a matter of public record.

Sincerely yours,

Jaroslaw Karpiak,
Secretary.
Dmytro Chorwat,
President.

Federal Agency for Handicapped

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDMUND P. RADWAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 19, 1954

Mr. RADWAN. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply interested in and keenly desirous of advancing the welfare of our millions of handicapped citizens and, therefore, am pleased that our House Committee on Education and Labor, under the able leadership of our distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania, the Honorable Samuel K. McConnell, Jr., is now considering the various bills on handicapped pending before that committee, with a view to bringing to the floor, soon, an overall bill that will meet many of the present-day needs in this field.

Development of a sound program for handicapped is imperative, and such should not be a matter done by partisan politics, because, whatever program is presented must meet, insofar as may be possible, the needs of all citizens, regardless of party affiliations.

When we reflect that records show that for every dollar spent to rehabilitate and put into suitable employment, our variously handicapped people, $10 has been returned in productive effort, and these people, thus, have been enabled to lift their heads and take pride in a citizenship that not only permits and makes possible their earning a living, but, also, confers the priceless privilege of all good Americans, to do their part in supporting our Government, by paying a fair share of taxation.

I introduced H. R. 8042, to establish a Federal agency for handicapped, and believe that this bill would furnish a sound base of operations for the whole program, providing, as it does, for necessary coordination of the present widely dispersed activities of the Federal Government in the handicapped field which now embrace some 35 agencies.

It is obvious that, for reasons of good public policy, we must make a beginning on coordinating the work of all such agencies in Federal service, so we may know what is being done; who is doing it; to whom it is being done; the costs, and the results. That is simply carrying out business principles which we must use, whether in Government, or private industry.

The bill, H. R. 8042, provides a most comprehensive program, including necessary medical, educational, counseling and guidance, and selective placement services to handicapped. Its adoption, I am sure, would put us on the right road to providing not only essential services, but, also, through establishment of a Federal revolving loan fund, provide means for States which have exhausted their appropriations for vocational rehabilitation between sessions of their legislatures, to borrow from this fund, and thus continue, without interruption, vital services to handicapped.

I am well aware that one of the great weaknesses in this field is the lack of trained specialists to handle the various phases of rehabilitation work, and I am certain that the proposed cooperative enterprises for handicapped, contained in H. R. 8042, would go a long way toward meeting this need.

There are many other phases of H. R. 8042 which are important and desirable, and I sincerely hope the Committee on Education and Labor will report it out, favorably, at an early date.

I Am An American Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. BONIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 19, 1954

Mr. BONIN. Mr. Speaker, on May 8 I attended the annual observance of I Am An American Day, sponsored by the Unico Club, of Hazleton, Pa. August H. (Gus) Genetti, a prominent businessman, was chosen as the outstanding naturalized citizen of the Hazleton area for 1954.

One of the principal speakers for the occasion was Rocco C. Sicialiano, Assistant Secretary of Labor in the Eisenhower administration, who delivered the main address.

John B. Colombo, of Hazleton, was toastmaster for the evening, and during his remarks he read to the assemblage a letter he had received from his son, Louis R. Colombo, now a member of the staff of Senator Jenner. I have met this young man on several occasions, talked with him, and found him to be a man who loves his country and continually strives by word and deed to preserve all that is good in America. I am proud to place in the Record the letter he sent to his father. It is not only a tribute to the Colombo family but is a distinct pattern by which all true Americans can be guided. The letter, which follows, volubly sets forth the deep feelings of all those who love their country:

> APRIL 24, 1954.
>
> DEAR DAD: Your selection as toastmaster for the Unico I Am An American banquet is indeed a great honor and one that reflects great credit upon you as a citizen of your community and upon all your family members.
>
> As your son and as one who greatly appreciates being an American, may I present a few personal comments with respect to the main theme "I Am An American."
>
> First, I believe the title is entirely too restricted. Because of its magnitude, should not the theme be made stronger, more forceful, and more widely applicable if entitled "Thank God I Am An American"?
>
> For example, look around you. I'd venture to state that, just as you and I, between 50 to 75 percent of the people sitting before you are either first or second generation American. I wonder how many of us have ever attempted to construct a picture of what our lives would have been like had not our parents and grandparents had the courage to leave home, friends, and native lands and cross an ocean to begin life anew? And for what reason? Deep in their hearts did they not feel that here in these wonderful United States of America was a better land to raise their children? That here, if not they, then their children, would have the God-given opportunity they would not have had in their native lands. Yes, Dad, I wonder how many of us have ever said, if not in public then to ourselves, "Thank God I Am An American."
>
> As a closing though, I would like to quote from an address made by Cardinal Spellman in Brussels. In this address he made the following statement: "There are many individuals who have seriously compromised themselves by a flat refusal to state whether they are now or have been Communists. It is impossible for me to understand why any American should refuse to declare himself free of Communist affiliation, unless he had something to hide. In that event he deserves to be held in suspicion because he constitutes a threat to our country's freedom, which has been won at too great a cost to be lightly lost."
>
> Dad, I hope and pray that if ever the time should arise when any man, woman, or child living in our fair city should have to answer the question "Are you or have you ever been a member of the Communist Party?" they will not have to hide behind the fifth amendment, but rather, will look their inquisitor in the eye, even if their inquisitor be the devil himself, and state in unequivocal terms, "No, I am an American."
>
> Sincerely,
>
> YOUR SON.

Protect America by Safeguarding American Industry

SPEECH

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 19, 1954

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the current observance of World Trade Week has drawn to Washington an assortment of vociferous internationalists bent upon destroying America's protective barriers without regard to the welfare and security of the people of this Nation. Among this group are honest individuals who without question are sincere in their belief that the philosophy of free trade will eventually rebound to the best interests of the United States; unfortunately, however, the movement is spearheaded by greedy industrialists and investors whose sole purpose is self-aggrandizement, and by paid foreign agents who care for naught but the pieces of silver which are their own personal reward.

These groups has come to the Nation's Capital to promote the removal of the remaining constitutional and legislative trade safeguards. They are here to lobby for their own turnpike to greater wealth—and a road to ruin for thousands upon thousands of workingmen in every section of the country.

Typical of the international traders, one of the kickoff speakers at this week's convention has long ago admitted his affiliation as paid mouthpiece of the Venezuelan chambers of commerce. He conveniently asserts that United States fuel markets should be kept wide open for all the residual oil that comes from Venezuela's rich wells. As he spoke to the convention on Monday, thousands of American coal miners and railroad workers were actually foraging for food to sustain their families. These men are unemployed because the fuel which they produce is being undersold by the international profiteers who ship that oil from South America to coal's rightful markets in this country.

But the position of coal miners and railroad workers is not unique in the state of economic confusion that our absurd trade practices have created. Excessive imports have brought unemployment and destitution to workers in our glass industries, in our domestic oil industry, in textile, machine tools, wood and lumber, fish, bicycles, pottery, toys, confections, lace, watch, and in scores of other industries.

Today I speak for the men, women, and children who depend upon those industries for a livelihood. It is in their behalf that I have introduced H. R. 9178, which was conceived to return to Congress the powers originally assigned by the Constitution for the regulation of foreign commerce. The objective of my bill is to establish imports on a fair competitive basis by avoiding injury to domestic producers without impairing legitimate competition from friendly peoples in other lands.

Instead of using the tariff as an instrument of diplomacy or as a means of bargaining for concessions from other countries, H. R. 9178 would merely designate the security of our Nation and the welfare of our people as the primary standard under which foreign trade is to be regulated. In effect my bill is to assure the largest volume of imports that may be absorbed in this country without causing injury by imported goods.

I am happy to find that a number of my colleagues are introducing similar measures, but I would like to call your attention to one provision which I have included that has not necessarily been specified in all of the related legislative proposals. My bill provides for a 5-percent quota on residual fuel oil based on domestic demand in the corresponding quarter of the previous calendar year; it is the same provision which may be found in H. R. 2870, as filed by me in February 1953, and which later appeared in bills sponsored by numerous other Members of the House and Senate. Only by enactment of such a provision can this Congress remedy the distressed conditions that residual oil imports have created in our great coal-producing areas, and I ask the studied cooperation of my colleagues in bringing about this necessary relief to the men whose jobs are left in the wake of the tankers that have been assigned the mission of enriching selfish importers and their alien associates.

Mr. Speaker, let us also be realistic about the security of this Nation. As long as there is a possibility that another world conflagration may be set off by the tyrants in the Kremlin, we cannot in conscience gamble with our future by permitting our own vital industries to be dismantled in favor of increasing reliance on foreign producers. The very fact that Russia, in less than a decade, has risen from the shambles of a near-fatal battering to a status where she now presents a challenge to us is proof enough that our policies have not been sound. We shall remain generous with our friends wherever they may be, but under no condition should we permit further weakening of our industrial strength by those who persist in the promotion of nebulous theories in the direction of a never-never land—whether this support comes from world dreamers on cloud 18 or from those who seek added opulence through ocean routes.

H. R. 9178 is our protect America bill. It must be adopted for the safeguarding of this Nation's economy and security.

Resolution Adopted by the Frederick (Md.) Chamber of Commerce Covering the Agricultural Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DeWITT S. HYDE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 19, 1954

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD a copy of a resolution adopted by the Frederick Chamber of Commerce, Frederick, Md., covering the agricultural program. The Frederick Chamber of Commerce has sent me this resolution and urges me to assert my influence in getting the needed and desired legislative proposal before the Congress to carry out the intent of the resolution.

The resolution follows:

> Whereas the farmers of the country are caught in a situation of increasing production costs and lower prices for their products; and
>
> Whereas a new farm program is being considered by the Federal Government;
>
> Therefore we urge early action by Congress on this important matter.

We believe that an adequate farm program should contain the following features:

1. In general we feel that commodity prices should stand on their own feet with a minimum of Government price support and controls.

2. That price supports should be variable and adjusted in accordance with supply and needs.

3. We emphasize the obvious need for continuing and increased funds for research as a means of finding additional uses and markets for farm products.

4. Any change from present price supports should be gradual to make changes less drastic on individual farmers and less disturbing to the overall economy of the country.

5. In any program dealing with the surplus production of dairy products, any market which has not contributed to the surplus will be exempt from any program reducing production, until such time as the particular market contributes to the surplus.

6. When production controls are in effect the use of diverted acres should be controlled by the Secretary of Agriculture.

7. We favor the modernized parity formula in figuring price supports for farm commodities.

We urge you as a Member of Congress to take appropriate steps to obtain early and appropriate action embracing the principles herein set forth.

MEHRL H. RAMSBURG,
Chairman, Agriculture Committee.
RAYMOND C. BREHAUT,
Chairman, National Affairs Committee.

Fifth Amendment Public-Opinion Poll

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HAROLD H. VELDE

OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 19, 1954

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, I have just had brought to my attention results of public opinion poll No. 4 conducted by Analysis—Information—Direction, Colorado Springs, Colo., dealing with the fifth amendment.

The questionnaires were sent to persons representing a cross section of the people residing in El Paso County, Colo. I do feel that this is a truly representative American county, and that the results show clearly and vividly what the loyal American is thinking with respect to the fifth amendment.

Following is a résumé of the results tabulated to May 10:

Of the total ballots mailed, approximately 54 percent, or over 1,000 ballots, have been returned and tabulated through May 9. This percentage figure compares with only 49 percent at a comparable date for the presidential poll of 1952. Our records show that our margin of error in the 1952 poll as compared with the actual results, was less than two-tenths of 1 percent.

From all indications to date, it would seem that interest in the present poll even exceeds the presidential poll, though the results are so lopsided that they provide little reason for controversy. They are as follows:

1. Do those citizens of the United States of America who invoke the fifth amendment against possible self-incrimination when questioned about alleged Communist or pro-Communist activities, create a serious doubt in your mind as to their loyalty? Yes, 94.4 percent; no, 3.4 percent; undecided, 2.2 percent.

2. Do you believe that those who invoke the fifth amendment against possible self-incrimination when questioned about alleged Communist or pro-Communist activities should be employed by our Government? Yes, 3.4 percent; no, 94.3 percent; undecided, 2.3 percent.

3. Do you believe that those who invoke the fifth amendment against possible self-incrimination when questioned about alleged Communist or pro-Communist activities should be employed by the United Nations? Yes, 3.8 percent; no, 92.1 percent; undecided, 4.1 percent.

Perhaps the most interesting and significant feature of this poll are the unusual comments which accompany the flood of nearly 100 ballots being returned—and many delivered personally—to our office daily. Nearly 10 percent of all ballots received are accompanied by some remark and many of them are signed personally by people who want to be identified with their stand on this matter.

Most common of all is this typical statement on a ballot. "Every Communist, or anyone who was ever connected with their movement, should be banished from the United States."

Another remark, "Any loyal American should be grateful for the opportunity to clear his name of suspicion through our own constitutional court procedure." This man voted "yes" on question No. 1 and "no" on questions No. 2 and No. 3.

Another remarked, "I know this does not require a signature, but I want to let you know just how strongly I feel about this matter." This man also voted "yes" on question No. 1 and "no" on questions No. 2 and No. 3.

Another stated, "I think that fifth amendment should be revoked."

Another who voted "yes" on question No. 1 qualified his remark by stating, "However, I question my right to do so, after all, they are within the law." This man stated he believed his answer would be "yes" on question No. 2, "providing the charge cannot be proved." This man further stated as follows: "Personally, I think we might get along without the fifth amendment, not only for those accused of communism but for other reasons also."

Another suggests that, "We would all be better off if we could find some way to keep Eleanor Roosevelt from traveling outside the United States."

Another remarked that, "The United States has no business in the United Nations as it is strictly a Communist setup."

Another states that, "There are plenty of unquestionable people to run this Government, and it should not be necessary to employ people of questionable loyalty."

Another who marked his ballot "yes" on question No. 3 states, "All the Communists in the United States should be employed by the United Nations—then we should promptly kick the United Nations out of the United States."

Some interesting letters were also received which are too lengthy to quote at this time. They will be released later with the final report.

Dedication of American Legion Home, Wilkes-Barre, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDWARD J. BONIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 19, 1954

Mr. BONIN. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, April 25, I attended the dedication program of the new American Legion Home, Post 609, Hanover Township, in Wilkes-Barre, Pa. The post commander is Stanley Czajkowski. The dedication program follows:

DEDICATION CEREMONIES

1. Presentation of an American flag which flew over the United States Capitol, Washington, D. C., by EDWARD BONIN, Member of Congress.

2. Raising of flag—to the colors. National anthem played by Hanover High School Band.

3. Cutting of ribbon and opening of doors by township officials.

DEDICATION PROGRAM

1. Invocation: Joseph Kasacavage, post chaplain.

2. Welcome and introduction of master of ceremonies: Joseph Sukaloski, chairman, dedication committee.

3. Master of ceremonies: Hon. Frank L. Pinola.

4. Greetings: Stanley Czajkowski, post commander; Francis Connors, president, Hanover Township Board of Commissioners; Anthony Zuchoski, president, board of school directors; Leonard T. R. Stigora, commander of district 12.

5. Address: Hon. EDWARD BONIN, member, Veterans Committee of Congress.

6. Musical selections: Lynwood Junior High School orchestra.

7. Address: Paul R. Selecky, commander, Department of Pennsylvania, American Legion.

8. Presentation of distinguished guests.

9. Benediction: Joseph Kasacavage, post chaplain.

Peace at Last in the Philippines?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CARL D. PERKINS

OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 19, 1954

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Louisville Courier-Journal of Tuesday, May 18, 1954:

PEACE AT LAST IN THE PHILIPPINES?

In the Philippines the dramatic surrender of Luis Taruc may indeed mean the "end of the rebellion" of the Hukbahalaps and "peace and order for all the islands, as Carlos Romulo predicts. But the history of the last 8 years indicates that such optimism will not be justified unless the Magsaysay government lives up to its vigorous promises of land reform.

The need for land reform, after all, was what put the poetic Taruc in business as a professional revolutionary. He had given brilliant leadership to anti-Japanese guerrillas throughout World War II, and when liberation came he demanded for his armed peasants the chance to own the land for which they had fought—land exploited for 300 years under a system of feudalism by which a handful of wealthy landlords kept thousands of landless peasants in perpetual subjection.

Taruc didn't get land reform in 1946, though every leading Filipino politician had advocated it for years, and he and his men took to the swamps. They made monkeys of the Philippine Army units chasing them, chiefly because the great mass of unarmed peasants in the rich hinterlands gave the Huks full sympathy and aid.

Taruc "surrendered" once before, it is worth remembering, in 1948, when President Elpidio Quirino promised him and his men full amnesty—and land reform. Both promises were short of fulfillment, and Taruc took to the swamps again 3 brief months after he had returned to Manila.

In these muddied waters the Communists characteristically increased their activity, and there has been no doubt for some years that the Hukbahalaps were Communist-dominated. But they are not the only champions of land reform in the Philippines. The Republic's energetic new President, Ramon Magsaysay, the Army chief who gained fame for fighting the Huks more effectively than anyone else during a corrupt and inefficient regime, advocated land reform even as he chased the Huks. Since coming to office he has more specifically offered to resettle the insurgent peasants on newly developed public lands, and this conciliatory offer undoubtedly helped to precipitate Taruc's break with the island's No. 1 Communist, Jesus Lava.

Lava is still in the swamps, still with armed Huks the Communists would like to keep convinced that the fledgling democracy of the Philippines will never live up to its promises. With Taruc a trusting prisoner, and with a new mass of proposals before the Philippine Congress to implement Magsaysay's promises, it may well be that Philippine communism is on its last legs. But there, as elsewhere, this will require that democratic achievement match democratic promises, if the victory is to endure.

The School Building Construction Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 19, 1954

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I most heartily approve of legislation authorizing the Federal Government to make allotments to the several States of the United States to aid in the school building construction program. In my home State of Kentucky, the need for this assistance becomes more urgent each year. No doubt, this same statement can be made and with accuracy, by most of the other States, but according to a recent national educational survey, the various percentages arrived at showed Kentucky very near the top of those States with conditions obtaining that called for help other than the State was able to render. I regret to have to say this is true, but at the same time I recognize the fact that unless the true conditions are shown, the Congress has nothing upon which to make its decision.

The demand for additional classrooms in practically every school in the Second District of Kentucky, which I represent, seems to be a most critical need. The number of schoolchildren has increased even when the population has decreased, until I have heard many teachers say the pupils are practically "sitting in each other's laps." One of the reasons for this situation aside from the increase in the birthrate is the consolidation of schools. This process has been continuing in my State with great speed, and school plants that were originally built to care for the needs of a town cannot contain the additional large number of children brought in from several small schools brought into the consolidation.

In many communities Federal installations have brought in a large number of children of school age, and this influx of the federally employed was never considered by the small communities in planning their building programs.

In some localities the schools have been forced to place attendance on a half-day basis, but for many reasons this does not prove to be satisfactory, and at the best is only a temporary solution for the problem. Some surveys have stated that this program is contributing to juvenile delinquency since children are in school only a small part of each day.

While construction for additional classrooms will be of great assistance to some schools, still there are many places where the school plant is so antiquated and inadequate that nothing but a new building will answer the need, and in my State this urgent need cannot be met without Federal assistance.

The State of Kentucky participated in the nationwide study of school facilities made in 1950, in which the United States Office of Education coordinated and one of the facts recorded was that of 5,013 school plants in our State, 3,004 were 1-room, which is over one-half of the plants. Another fact shown was that of this 5,013 plants, only 122 were rated satisfactory by United States standards. Eighty percent of the plants had no central heat, 5 percent had no water on the grounds, and only 99 high schools had libraries in rooms designed for that purpose, and 147 elementary schools had libraries in rooms suitably designed or adapted. These figures were obtained in the first phase of the survey, and it is my understanding that preliminary figures from the second phase of the survey, which is now underway, are even more startling in revealing inadequacies.

The per capita income in Kentucky is not sufficient for taxation to provide the necessary funds for educational purposes, and too much of our tax money is drained out of the State to leave an amount adequate for the construction of the schools we must have soon by some means.

Mr. Speaker, I approve legislation that will provide for Federal assistance in proper form for construction of educational facilities that the States are incapable of constructing alone.

Senator Hoey

SPEECH

OF

HON. GEORGE A. SHUFORD

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 12, 1954

Mr. SHUFORD. Mr. Speaker, the news of the sudden death of the senior Senator of North Carolina, Hon. CLYDE R. HOEY, has been a great shock to me. He was a real friend of mine, and his passing leaves a vacancy that cannot be filled.

Senator HOEY entered public life at the early age of 20, when he was elected to the State legislature. For over 50 years he faithfully served the people of North Carolina and this Nation. He was an outstanding Governor of the State of North Carolina, and served with distinction in the House and the Senate of the United States Congress. He was a great man and will be missed.

Senator HOEY was a religious man. He was loyal to the precepts of his church. He was considerate of the views of others. He was a man of great principles, unbending to those things that he felt was right, but not intolerant of others.

His place in history will be with the other great men who have guided our country, for his life was dedicated to the welfare of man.

Mere Words Cannot Bring True Bipartisanship—Who Put Great Crusade Into Reverse?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 19, 1954

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, the Republican administration has been backed into a corner by the excesses of its political campaign oratory and by Republican National Committee sponsorship of a calculated and well-designed campaign attacking the loyalty and honor of Democrats. Republican money has been used to spread abroad in our land the false and vicious idea that honorable men of the Democratic Party were guilty of treason.

No less a person than the Vice President of the United States has suggested to a wide national radio-TV audience that previous Secretaries of State were unwilling to fight communism. Many, many others in the President's official family and leading Republican Members of Congress have been engaged in a campaign to distort, misrepresent and smear the great record of the Democratic Party.

Now these same Republicans are in trouble. They need our help. They suddenly are reminded that bipartisanship in foreign policy is a vital need of this country in time of international crisis. So we have heard more recently gentle whispers that maybe Democrats are, in fact, just as loyal and patriotic as Republicans. President Eisenhower even came around to saying in a press conference that Democrats were just exactly as loyal as Republicans. What has our Nation come to, Mr. Speaker, when the President of the United States finds it necessary even to make such a remark?

The St. Louis Post-Dispatch has stated, in its editorial wisdom, that these mild apologies to the Democrats from the President and other leading Republicans are coming a little late. Who was it that allowed the great crusade to go into reverse in the first place? Who allowed the Republican National Committee to sponsor the spreading of the lie that the Democratic Party is the "party of treason"? Who still allows members of the President's Cabinet to make false and imbecilic charges against the Democrats?

Mr. Speaker, I agree with former President Truman that there is only one man who can stop this extreme partisan nonsense; who can set this Government back on the track of bipartisanship in foreign policy. That man is the President of the United States. And the time is growing late.

I include in the RECORD an editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of May 16, 1954, commenting on this issue:

WORDS ARE NOT ENOUGH

The country has heard more from high-ranking officials about bipartisanship in foreign policy since the situation in Indochina became critical than in the preceding 15 months of the Eisenhower administration

This is not to say that the President himself has not on several occasions, going back more than a year ago, said that members of both parties should join hands to present a united front to the world. Mr. Eisenhower has said just that. The trouble is there has been little if any implementation of the President's sentiments.

It is only in this past week that Senator KNOWLAND, the administration leader in the Senate, has formally repudiated the accusations against the honor and patriotism of the Democratic Party. Appealing for a new national unity in a period of world crisis that might involve the "very life of the Republic," the California Senator said in a major speech:

"Republicans and Democrats alike should and do resent any reflection upon the patriotism and the devotion to public service of our two great political parties and the lesser ones that now, and from time to time in the past, have played a part in our constitutional system wherein the right of the people to change their public officials and even their fundamental law by constitutional means in an integral part of our free way of life.

"Let us here and now, Republicans and Democrats alike, recognize the fact that there is only one group that can be properly charged with being the 'party of treason' and that is the Communist Party and the underground conspirators who may, in the interests of the Communist Party, seek to infiltrate whichever party has the responsibility for determining national policies."

This is a sound statement and it is to Senator KNOWLAND's credit that he has made it. But it would have been infinitely better had it come 3 months ago when Senator MCCARTHY, of Wisconsin, and his cohorts were disgracing Lincoln's birthday by condemning the Democratic Party as the "party of treason." Certainly it would have been better if Senator KNOWLAND had spoken before a very pointed prompting from former President Truman.

For it was only 1 day before Mr. KNOWLAND made amends in the Senate that Mr. Truman told the National Press Club: "Traitor and treason are words you can't use in friendship. They make a very poor steppingstone to bipartisan cooperation. If the President wishes a bipartisan foreign policy, it is his responsibility to make one possible."

And so it is, Franklin D. Roosevelt, when President, made bipartisanship possible by giving Republican Senator Arthur H. Vandenberg, of Michigan, virtually equal status with Democratic Senator Tom Connally in the development of foreign policy. This was continued in the Truman administration. It made almost no difference whether Mr. Vandenberg or Mr. Connally was chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. They worked together so harmoniously that the bipartisan approach provided both unity and continuity.

Yet Secretary of State Dulles seems to think that the same kind of bipartisanship has existed in the Eisenhower administration. At least he says he feels nothing but satisfaction and cites the continuation of David K. E. Bruce as evidence of it.

Secretary Dulles' example falls so far short that it is hard to believe he presents it seriously. Mr. Bruce, it is true, was Under Secretary of State for a while when Dean Acheson headed the State Department, and this same Mr. Bruce now is United States Representative to the European Coal and Steel Community.

But Secretary Dulles cannot possibly mean that the continuation of this lone Democrat, who has never held political office, in a minor post compares with the series of major diplomatic assignments Mr. Truman gave to Mr. Dulles himself. Senator John Sherman Cooper, the late Senator Warren Austin, the late Senator Dwight Griswold—a notable list of Republican officeholders, called for diplomatic service, could be added to Mr. Dulles's own case.

There is a big difference between briefing congressional leaders and working out policy with them. Ernest K. Lindley, a careful and informed Washington observer, writes in the current Newsweek that for more than a year before the Indochinese crisis the Eisenhower administration spurned bipartisan practices and seemed intent on forcing the Democrats to make issues of foreign policy by insidious attacks on the Truman regime. Bipartisanship could be restored and public opinion mobilized if the President decides to take the necessary steps.

Words of apology help. But they are not enough. It will take more than generalities—particularly when a congressional election is little more than 5 months off.

Committee on Un-American Activities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KIT CLARDY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 19, 1954

Mr. CLARDY. Mr. Speaker, on the day after a subcommittee of the House Committee on Un-American Activities concluded its hearings in Michigan, an editorial appeared in the Flint Journal commenting on those hearings. As chairman of the subcommittee which held those hearings, I feel it would be most appropriate to bring that editorial to the attention of this House. It is such a refreshing change from the attacks being made upon us constantly, I am sure this House will join with me in extending thanks to this newspaper and its publishers and editorial writers. The editorial reads:

IN OUR OPINION

SATURDAY REFLECTIONS

The people of Flint and vicinity have had an excellent opportunity the last 3 days to see and hear the House Un-American Activities Subcommittee in action in its probe of Communist activity here.

Prior to its appearance here various pamphlets and booklets were distributed in Flint, to factory workers and others, depicting the committee in most uncomplimentary terms. These pamphlets described the committee as "un-American," and its members as "witch hunters," union busters," and so on.

During the 3 days of the hearing, a series of witnesses appeared on the stand. Most of them sought refuge in various amendments to the United States Constitution, and refused to answer the questions asked them. Several of them attempted to make impassioned speeches defending their views and attacking the committee, its members, and its purposes.

The hearings were not without their humorous touches. At least two of the so-called unfriendly witnesses tripped themselves in making statements to the committee. One man referred to himself as a New Yorker, and then almost immediately declined to answer a question regarding his home. Another man described a prior witness, and then declined to admit that he knew the witness. One of the committee members, commenting on the incident, stated, "In your zeal to overstate your case, you slip in a word or two which betray you." The point was well taken, and served to emphasize the fact that these people are neither so smart nor so shrewd as they have been pictured.

There can be little doubt left in the mind of anyone who heard these hearings that the charges against the committee have been distorted almost beyond belief. Its members who appeared here showed almost superhuman patience and restraint in questioning recalcitrant witnesses. Their attitude was in sharp contrast to that displayed by several of the witnesses. And they showed almost unfailing courtesy to witnesses whenever the witnesses themselves permitted.

The hearings have demonstrated very clearly the extent and viciousness of the Communist conspiracy to infiltrate and disrupt the labor unions here, and they have emphasized the common sense displayed by Flint workers in resisting the efforts of trained colonizers sent in here from other localities.

They have served a useful purpose, too, in demonstrating to Flint people the contemptuous attitude of most of the people who hide behind the Constitution in refusing to answer even the simplest questions regarding their past.

And they have revealed also the handicaps under which the committee must work in trying to disclose Communist subversion, as well as the restraint it employs in carrying on this difficult task.

The people of Flint, having seen and heard the committee and the various witnesses in action, will have little difficulty in reaching a decision as to the fairness, the patriotism, and the purposes of the committee as contrasted with a majority of the witnesses it heard here.

REGRETTABLE

It was reported Friday that one of the "unfriendly" witnesses who appeared at the House Un-American Activities subcommittee hearings here, was escorted to the gate of the Flint factory which employed him and "invited" by scores of fellow workers not to come back.

Another witness was reported to be the cause of a refusal to work by those employed with him in another Flint plant.

The attitude displayed by these Flint citizens toward the two witnesses is understandable. Loyal Americans all, they are reluctant to work with people who, by their own actions, have left their loyalty and patriotism open to question.

But, understandable as the attitude may be, the wisdom of their actions toward the two men can be questioned.

Some of these balky witnesses want nothing more than to make martyrs of themselves for the cause in which they believe. Forcible ejection from a place of employment will help them attain that quetsionable ambition. In a similar way, a successful work stoppage brought about by such people, for whatever reason, is considered by them to be another battle won in their "cause."

Difficult as restraint toward such persons may be, and certainly they furnish plenty of provocation for nonrestraint, such actions only play into their hands, and for that reason are to be deplored.

A Bill That Should Be Passed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. SHUFORD

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 19, 1954

Mr. SHUFORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I insert herewith an editorial from the Charlotte Observer, an outstanding newspaper in North Carolina. This editorial gives a grassroots appraisal of H. R. 8603, introduced in the Congress by the Honorable Dwight W. Rogers, of Florida. I am happy to bring to the attention of the Congress the views expressed in this editorial:

A Bill That Should Be Passed

Representative Dwight L. Rogers, of Florida, has introduced a bill prohibiting picketing of the White House. It would forbid any such activity within 1,000 feet of the Presidential residence.

Picketing of the White House has in many cases becomes a disgraceful racket. The parade of left-wing elements that carried placards demanding a pardon for the Rosenbergs was disgusting to every loyal American. The more recent demonstration by a well-heeled gang of longshoremen financed by one of the fattest of union treasuries was equally repulsive, because many in the mob were known racketeers.

The President of the United States certainly should not be subjected to such indignities. Representative Rogers cites as precedents for his bill the laws prohibiting picketing of Congress and of the Supreme Court. The bill sounds reasonable, because most such picketing expeditions are composed of crackpots, extremists, and in some cases downright subversives.

Yet we have here a question of violation of the first amendment, which guarantees the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for redress of grievances.

Where are we to draw the line between an attempt to influence the Government and a petition for redress of grievances? Picketing the Capitol is obviously an attempt to influence Congress. A demonstration before the Supreme Court is an effort to influence a court opinion. Neither can be called a petition for redress of grievance.

The wording of the first amendment clearly implies that a grievance must actually exist and that the petitioned authority must have the power to redress it. In very few cases does the President have personal power to redress a grievance; hence, picketing of the White House is in most instances pointless and intended only for publicity. Further, it is doubtful that picketing can be defined as a petition.

The Rogers bill, therefore, ought to be passed.

Secretary of Defense at Long Last Recognizes the Strength and Danger of the Russian Air Force

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR ENGLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 19, 1954

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, only a year ago Secretary Wilson shrugged off the Russian Air Force with the remark that it was a defensive air force, made up of fighter planes, and inferior to our Air Force in offensive weapons. Some Members of this Congress, moreover, ridiculed pictures of Russian heavy bombers that appeared in the American press last February. It was not so easy to dismiss reports from our diplomatic representatives in Moscow of the heavy bomber that flew over Moscow on May Day, this year.

General Twining, our Air Force Chief of Staff, marked Armed Forces Day last Saturday with the honest admission that the Rusian Air Force "is by far the biggest air force in the world. In fact, the Reds have thousands more combat planes than the United States Air Force, Navy, Marines, and Army combined." General Twining also pointed out that while the Reds could reach any important target in Europe, Asia, or North Africa with their existing medium bombers, this new superjet heavy bomber is needed for one purpose only—to reach targets in the United States.

If Secretary Wilson is getting intelligence and advice from the Air Force he has not given evidence of paying much attention to it. The record of his complacency in the past makes the thoughtful citizen suspicious of his program today. Too litle, too slowly, and too late may be the verdict on his administration of the office once held by Mr. Louis Johnson. We shall be fortunate if nothing bigger than war in Indochina writes on this administration the verdict that war in Korea wrote on the Johnson administration.

Thoughtful citizens share these thoughts, Mr. Speaker, and conservative editors are beginning to express the public sense of alarm. Under the unanimous consent of my colleagues, I insert in the Record an editorial on this subject that appeared in the Washington Star on Tuesday, May 18, 1954, which follows:

No Time for Complacency

There seems to have been a change in high-level thinking at the Pentagon regarding Russia's airpower potentialities and America's need for matching or exceeding them. Only a year ago this month Defense Secretary Wilson was commenting optimistically on the state of our air strength, as compared with that of the Soviet Union. Defending proposed Air Force budget cuts, he told a Senate committee that we had more long-range bombers than the Russians and that they were concentrating on fighter planes and defensive craft. He thought our citizens could take some comfort in that.

Few citizens could find anything comforting, however, in recent stories and pictures about the unveiling over Moscow on May Day of a formidable new Russian jet-powered heavy bomber. Nor did the dispatches support the theory that Russia has been concentrating on fighters and defensive aircraft. More reassuring is the Pentagon disclosure, this week, that we have become greatly concerned over Soviet progress in warplane design and production and that we are expediting work on a test model of a supersonic jet bomber. But while the latest Russian bomber, possibly of supersonic speed, already is flying, our new model is not expected to leave the ground until sometime within the next year.

Certainly the recent Moscow exhibition of aerial might was not of the sort to warrant any complacency here on the part of our military experts. Last October, Mr. Wilson, at a press conference, expressed the opinion that Russia was 3 or 4 years behind us in the development of atomic and hydrogen bombs and in the means for delivering them. The urgency with which the Air Force now is pushing its faster-than-sound jet-bomber program indicates that our experts are not counting on any such time margin in our favor. The fact may be that the Russian air force has forged ahead of us in producing a jet bomber capable of delivering the "hell bomb" from one continent to another. At any rate, it would be exceedingly risky—in view of what we know about Russia today—to take any comfort in an assumption that the Kremlin high command is building up Russian air strength primarily for defensive purposes and that we can afford to let cur own air program fall behind in either the strategic or tactical field.

Administration Should Take New Look at Army Requirements in Light of Commitments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 19, 1954

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, when we returned to our desks Monday morning after a day of rest, we were greeted with disturbing news.

We learned that the Republican leader in the Senate had said, on a television program, that it may be necessary for the United States to intervene in Indochina with sea and air power. He was further quoted in press dispatches as saying it would not be "in our national interest to permit the balance of Asia to pass into Communist hands."

From these same dispatches we learned of a statement issued by the chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, in which he said that the United States must undertake joint action with its allies for the defense of southeast Asia, and that it must be prepared to give specific commitments, involving militarily feasible plans to prevent further aggression.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that these statements carry the gravest implications. They become increasingly grave when we realize that the men who made the statements fall into that category characterized by the press as "administration spokesmen."

We have every evidence that the administration is considering the seriousness of the situation in Indochina, and undoubtedly it is assessing the possibility of armed intervention, now or at some future date.

I further submit, Mr. Speaker, that we are less well equipped for such intervention, now, or in the future, as a result of the false economy program which was instituted soon after January 20, 1953. As a result of this ill-advised economy program, the Air Force budget for the present year—which has less than 2 months to go—was cut back by $5 billion. We were told that the cut would result in no reduction in aircraft procurement. We were led to believe by the hucksters that the entire cut would be absorbed by administrative efficiencies, such as reducing the use of buck slips, paper clips, and the like.

Later we had testimony from the military that clearly proved the disastrous cut last year was in fact interfering with adequate air strength.

Then came the budget for fiscal 1955, which, we were advised was designed to emphasize air strength. I do not intend to restate what I have stated many times on this floor, but I would just like to point to the contrast between two sets of figures.

The 1954 budget was prepared by the Truman administration on the basis of an Air Force buildup to 143 groups by 1955; the 1955 budget is based upon an Air Force buildup to 137 groups by 1957. In other words it was not only a cutback in air strength, it was a stretch-out in what strength we have.

Mr. Speaker, I have noted that the administration has lately been very wise. I have noted no references to such slogans as "More Bang for a Buck," "New Look," "Instant Massive Retaliation," and so forth. Perhaps it is true, as suggested in an editorial cartoon last week, that the administration has filed these slogans in the wastebasket and is now ready to talk sense.

I sincerely hope so. In view of the grave situation in Asia, and in view of the evidence, of which the statements of Senators KNOWLAND and WILEY are additional, weighty testimony, that armed intervention is still considered a possible solution, it is high time to talk sense.

I suggest that the most sense that can be made is for the administration to send up a supplemental request to restore the military budget to a point which will give us the strength in the Army required to act quickly if the occasion arises.

I Speak for Christian Citizenship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 19, 1954

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to submit the enclosed letter I Speak for Christian Citizenship, by Rita Jean Trent, of Vincennes, Ind. This letter and her record of citizenship activities won for Miss Trent second place in the 1954 Christian citizenship award contest sponsored by the International Society of Christian Endeavor:

I SPEAK FOR CHRISTIAN CITIZENSHIP—A LETTER TO MY CONGRESSMAN

MY DEAR SIR: "Car Hit at Intersection—High-School Bandsman Killed," "Crime Rate on Increase," "Commission Probes for Reds in Government," "House Burned as Negro Family Moves Into White District." These are typical headlines carried almost daily in our newspapers and magazines. They are echoed to our attention by radio broadcasts and brought before our eyes by television and newsreel.

Why did this accident happen in which our bandsman was killed? (My friend and last year's county Christian Endeavor's treasurer and toastmaster.) Why has our crime rate increased? Why do we have Communists within our Government? Why does race hatred exist?

Why? Why? Why? Heartbroken parents cry it, law enforcement officers seek it, underprivileged races ask it. There is a reason; lack of Christian attitudes. There is a hope; Christian citizenship.

What is Christian citizenship? I define it as citizenship attained by harmonizing the teachings of Christ with the full political rights guaranteed to me by my country.

I'll never forget that first headline. Nor can I ever forget the manner in which death occurred—hit by another young man (near my friend's age) who was speeding, had been drinking, and was on the wrong side of the street attempting to drive. Disobedience of the law resulted in death to a very fine young man and the memory of being a killer indelibly printed upon the conscience of the other. Two young lives ruined because one was lacking in Christian teaching. The Bible teaches, "Let us walk honestly, as in the day, not in rioting and drunkenness."

Five major causes of crime are carelessness, idleness, ignorance, criminal environment, and heredity. When will the crime in our country cease? Not until all people realize that the old saying, "An ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure," is true. The teachings of Christ are the prevention—and the cure.

A friend of the family was visiting Billy's home. She asked him what he wanted to be when he grew up. Billy told her he wanted to be a politician. Billy's folks were horrified at his answer! "Now, Billy," said his Dad, "You don't want to be a politician, They're just a bunch of crooks." What an attitude. How much better it would have been to encourage Billy to be a politician and see to it that he is brought up in the Christian way of life. If he is taught Christian principles he will not be tempted to be dishonest when temptations come his way, for if a person really believes in Christ and is educated to know His way, he would not be willing to throw it away for such things as communism. It appears to me that a person accepting communism is one who is searching for something he doesn't have. Perhaps security. Then he listens and falls for Red propaganda. A Christian has found in Christ the things he has been searching for—security, peace, and happiness.

The subject of racial discrimination is much discussed. For instance, the Negro is a citizen of our country but he is still not socially accepted by most people. We are all equal in God's sight—the division is between believers and unbelievers. Not between black and white, not between red and yellow.

Long ago the Negroes were brought to this land as captives to work as cheap labor for men desiring wealth. Through Christian principles they have been freed as slaves. Nevertheless, they still lack the social freedom that the white race enjoys.

Two weeks ago a very intelligent Negro man and woman from Liberia, Africa, were in Vincennes. They are in the United States studying our American educational system. The teacher, who was to be their guide, called the restaurants to make arrangements for meals for this couple. Each restaurant called replied that their presence would be most unwelcome. What kind of opinion of our freedom will they take home to their people? How would I feel if I were in their place—shunned because I was born a different color? If the world knows that we treat part of our citizens this way then how can we possibly have world peace?

In a democracy public opinion tends to rule. However, public opinion can rise no higher than the beliefs and ideals of its citizens. Because of this fact, no nation can be more intelligent, more just, or more righteous than are its great masses of citizens. What better guide for our ideals could we find than those inspired words of Christian citizenship written in the 13th Chapter of Romans, verses 7 to 10, inclusive; "Render therefore to all their dues; tribute to whom tribute is due; custom to whom custom; fear to whom fear; honor to whom honor. Owe no man anything, but to love one another: For he that loveth another hath fulfilled the law. For this, thou shalt not commit adultery, thou shalt not kill, thou shalt not steal, thou shalt not bear witness, thou shalt not covet; and if there be any other commandment, it is briefly comprehended in this saying, namely, thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. Love worketh no ill to his neighbor: Therefore, love is the fulfilling of the law." How much better our country would be if we would all apply these teachings to our lives.

Mr. Congressman, Christianity has always been, is, and will forever be, a powerful moral force working for the betterment of home, national, and international relationships. This is why I speak for Christian citizenship.

Sincerely,

RITA JEAN TRENT.

The Late Honorable Clyde R. Hoey

SPEECH

OF

HON. SAM RAYBURN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 13, 1954

(Mr. RAYBURN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday when remarks were made about the late Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Hoey], I was not present. I do desire, however, to say a word about the services and character of Senator Hoey.

I have known Senator Hoey a long time. I knew him when he was making a great Governor of the great State of North Carolina, and North Carolina has had many great governors.

He came to the Senate where he impressed everyone with his sincerity and his high character and great ability. I wish to express to the family of Senator Hoey my deepest sympathy and to say that I do not think there ever served in the Congress, in either branch, a man of higher character or a finer American gentleman than Senator Hoey.

Federal Fisheries Research and Marketing Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 19, 1954

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following editorial from the Standard-Times, New Bedford, Mass., Monday, May 17, 1954:

A Big Step Forward

The Senate has passed legislation authorizing a $9 million Federal fisheries research and marketing program over the next 3 years on a trial-run basis. It would be financed by a percentage of annual customs receipts from foreign-fish imports. At the end of the 3-year period, the program's money from imports would be stopped; from then on, it would be financed out of direct annual appropriations, if it proves to be worthwhile.

This latter provision, calling for an evaluation of the project and a change in its financing if it becomes permanent, was included in the measure as a compromise to opposition from farm-State Senators. Farming interests opposed the measure, particularly in the original form which called for permanent financing from customs receipts, because all of this money under the present arrangement is available to the Department of Agriculture. Fisheries interests felt money derived from imported fish tariffs might logically be diverted to aid fisheries, rather than being spent exclusively to help other American food products.

Thus the proposed legislation which now awaits action of the House, was not a clear-cut victory for either senatorial bloc, but for the fishing industry it already assumes history-making proportions. The American fisheries, split by sectionalism, and often as not, hamstrung by selfishness and shortsightedness, have been going to Washington for years without any real result. Most of their efforts have collapsed after committee hearings, and never attained consideration on the congressional floor.

That this particuular bill has had better fortune is due to its sponsorship, timeliness, and concept. The very able guidance of Senators SALTONSTALL and KENNEDY, and the support of a corps of New England legislators have enabled it to survive and progress. Much of this support is spontaneous because of the pressing economic problems which cloud the industry's future. And in concept the measure poses no conflict between industry protection and the State Department's good-neighbor policy, an impasse which has thwarted most of the fisheries' previous legislative efforts.

The proposal also would appear to offer a compromise within the industry itself, between those who advocate and those who oppose subsidy. The aim here is to make possible the production of more fish and more fish products, coupled with an effort to make fish available to more of our population. No Federal funds would be available for price support or similar cushioning; the principle of self-help still would prevail.

The research and marketing study needs to be done; objective findings, which it is hoped such work will produce, might well instill new health into one of our most important resources and industries.

The fishing industry, for many reasons, financial and otherwise, has not undertaken to perform a program with private funds. Because of this bill there now is hope it will be accomplished, nevertheless, and all of those aspects of New England's economy which are affected by the fisheries await with great interest the action of the House in this matter.

Pay Legislation for Postal Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER HOLTZMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 19, 1954

Mr. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have spoken before on the responsibility of the Congress to enact adequate pay-raise legislation for our postal employees, and today I am again urging the Members of the House to give this matter serious consideration so that something can be done about this problem before we adjourn.

Almost 2 weeks ago the postal employees in the New York City area held a tremendous rally which was attended by over 3,500 workers—the largest meeting of postal employees in the history of New York City. This group had met to express the unity of the postal organizations and affiliations in their drive for an adequate pay increase, and to express their opposition to the recommendations of the Fry report, which have been incorporated in a bill just recently introduced in the House.

The postal employees have been endeavoring for a number of years to catch up with the rapidly rising cost of living. They have received increases in the past—the last one several years ago—but those increases have never enabled them to break even, for by the time an increase was granted the cost of living had spiraled upward out of reach again.

It has been pointed out previously that a vast majority of postal workers must take on other employment, or have their wives work, in order to provide themselves and their families with the necessities of life. Many of them are in debt and have been forced to borrow on insurance policies or from banks and loan agencies in order to meet the daily cost of living.

This should not be. All Federal workers are entitled to a decent wage, and the comparisons of postal employees' wages with wages in private industry, as set forth in the Fry report, are, I am afraid, inaccurate. The reclassification bill as recommended by the Postmaster General would permit increases averaging from $10 to $100 per year for only a portion of our postal workers, and, in addition, would endanger the gains made by these employees during the last few decades.

Statistics have been presented to the Congress on many occasions which justify the request for the $800 per year increase. It is obvious that a realistic approach to the problem is necessary, and for that reason I am hopeful that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service will report out the Withrow bill, H. R. 2344, which will provide this across-the-board increase.

Upper Colorado River Basin Development Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. HARRISON

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 19, 1954

Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, there came to my attention a few days ago a booklet titled "Dinosaurs, Parks, and Dams." Authorship of this booklet is credited to Mr. David R. Brower, one of the more vigorous opponents of the upper Colorado River Basin development plan. Mr. Brower is in his second year as executive director of the Sierra Club, whose headquarters are at San Francisco, Calif. The Sierra Club, in its turn, has been most active in opposition to the upper Colorado plan.

I mention this background simply as a preliminary to the comment I feel I must make with regard to certain statements contained in Mr. Brower's booklet, reprinted from the spring 1954 edition of the Pacific Spectator.

Mr. Brower's booklet constitutes a continuation of his attacks upon the upper Colorado development plan. He has spearheaded the opposition on behalf of his Sierra Club and its membership.

Among other things, Mr. Brower writes in the booklet:

> The intelligent layman * * * might further wonder how fervently the Federal Government should support, at financial risk to all the Nation, a 1922 river-allocating compact which in 1954 emerges as a costly device to lift Colorado River economy by its bootstraps. Or to take what 4 Peters are using in the lower basin (population 12 million), and can continue to use at their own expense, in order to give it to 1 Paul in the upper basin (population 3 million)—a Paul who hasn't used it yet, but thinks he can if Uncle Sam will stake him to it and throw in Dinosaur free.

I am positively amazed at this statement, coming from a man who professes to be interested in abiding by earlier pacts. On the one hand, Mr. Brower decries the alleged invasion of a national monument—an allegation, by the way, which has been shown clearly to be completely false—and on the other hand he implies that he would abrogate a compact agreed upon in good faith by States using Colorado River water.

He refers to what he terms a device to lift Colorado River economy by its bootstraps, and apparently places use of Colorado River water upon a strictly population basis rather upon one considering also the irrigable acreage and potential benefit from irrigation works. He arrives at this conclusion, of course, without noting that Federal reclamation benefits already accrued accounts in great measure for the superior population of the lower basin, of which Mr. Brower boasts. His conclusion conveniently excludes any mention of the vast reclamation work already achieved, now underway, or proposed for future construction in the very area championed by Mr. Brower.

Just to keep the record clear—and make it a bit more complete, Mr. Speaker—let me insert here some observations on that latter point. Permit me to list projects in the lower basin of the Colorado River which have been completed, which have been authorized and are under construction, and which are proposed. Accompanying the list are the best available cost estimates, rounded to the nearest million.

Already completed in the lower basin below Lees Ferry, are the following:

All-American Canal, $66 million; Hoover Dam and power plant, $172 million; Salt River project, $26 million; Yuma project, $6 million; Parker Dam, $25 million; San Diego, $15 million. Total cost in this group; $310 million.

Authorized and under construction: Davis Dam, $120 million; Gila project, $51 million; San Diego, second phase, $14 million; Yuma auxiliary, $3 million; Colorado River front work and levee system, $10 million. Total cost in this group, $198 million.

Proposed:

Central Arizona project, $738 million; Dixie project, $27 million; Marble Canyon, $125 million; Bill Williams project, $5 million; Las Vegas pumping project, $20 million; Moapa Valley, $5 million; Palo Verde diversion, $4 million; Pilot Knob, $6; Winslow project, $30 million. Total cost in this group, $960 million.

I call your attention, Mr. Speaker, to the total estimated cost of this entire list, in all three groupings. The total is nearly $1½ billion—$1,468,000,000, according to the best available estimates.

All this, I emphasize, is actual or proposed reclamation in the lower basin. It is sheer nonsense to pretend that it has not benefited that area, helped its population growth and bolstered its economy, if not actually made it. These projects would not have been possible had not the Colorado River compact been in existence. This is the same compact, Mr. Speaker, which Mr. Brower now would abrogate. He is saying, in effect, that although the lower basin is benefiting to the extent of a billion and a half dollars through Federal reclamation and under the Colorado River compact, the upper basin can dry up and blow away for all of his concern. He charges that the upper basin wants to take something away from the already benefited lower basin. This is grossly untrue. Any development—any effort to benefit the upper basin through reclamation—would take into account the terms of the Colorado River compact. Not 1 acre-foot of water would be withheld from the lower basin outside the compact allocation, duly agreed upon by the whole of the basin area. The compact terms would be respected to the letter and the spirit. The upper basin, Mr. Speaker, never has sought anything beyond the rightful distribution of Colorado River water. Our entire effort has been directed toward an attempt to control the unruly river, and put its water to maximum beneficial use for the entire basin.

Now Mr. Brower, in so many words, calls upon the Federal Government to withdraw its support of an honorable compact of long standing, agreed upon by the Colorado Basin States. I refuse to believe, Mr. Speaker, that this represents the official position of the people of the lower basin. I prefer to believe that it is the position assumed by one man, based upon fallacious reasoning.

Focal point of the entire controversy, of course, has been Echo Park. The major unit of the overall development plan located at this point coincides with the Dinosaur National Monument, and emotional outbursts against so-called invasion of national parks and monuments have been aimed at this particular portion of the plan. I might note in passing that much of the criticism of the development plan has been based more upon emotion than upon thorough consideration of solid engineering facts.

Continuing his argument about "invasion" of national parks, Mr. Brower claims to recognize a "potential jeopardy to our way of life." This comes about, he says, through a progressive trimming of budget of natural resources. On the very face of it, this is so much stuff and such. Our Federal Government owns roughly one-fourth of the land surface of the United States, a good portion of it of scenic beauty and of some scientific interest. Echo Park actually constittutes only a small part of Dinosaur National Monument, and the development of this small part would not detract from—possibly even would enhance—the area's recreational value, if that is what Mr. Brower is worrying about.

I certainly do not intend, Mr. Speaker, to minimize the value of our national parks and other publicly owned areas, nor do I fail to recognize their multiple use. I do not advocate either "invading" them or eliminating them. I do not know of any responsible person who advocates such action.

I do not mean to say that we can dispense with any particular national park or national forest, just because there are plenty more where that one came from.

I do mean to say, though, that we cannot be narrow sighted about the values attached to these publicly owned areas. Most of them offer good opportunities for multiple beneficial use. Many—indeed, most—of our national forests, for example, are of great scenic beauty. Some of them have scientific interest; all of them are valuable for recreation—fish and game, camping, boating, and so on. Many of them are used is an economic way, too. Permits are issued for cattle and sheep grazing, timber is sold from them. Soil conservation practices, watershed protection work and reforestation are beneficial activities carried on in our national forests and in many of our national parks.

Thus, I point out again that I do recognize the value of our public areas from the several viewpoints, and I am not intending to say that I believe we should "invade" or do away with national parks. Let me make that perfectly clear.

I regret, Mr. Speaker, that I have felt it necessary to prepare this statement. I regret that obstructionism endangers reclamation development of the West.

Since this current controversy began taking definite shape a few months ago, tempers have flared and nerves have been rubbed raw. I am afraid that reclamation in Western States has suffered gravely, and that this damage, in turn, may be reflected in our Nation's economy. As a grievous wound affects one's general health, so does damage to beneficial reclamation efforts relate to the national well being.

It is my sincere hope that the damage which I am fearful has resulted from this prolonged wrangling, will not be permanent and that we can push forward with vital reclamation development in the United States. It is to the best interest not only of my own State of Wyoming but of the entire country, that we exert our best efforts in this direction.

Immigration and Naturalization Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER HOLTZMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 19, 1954

Mr. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, much has been said in the House of Representatives and in the Senate on the inequities and discriminations in our present immigration and naturalization laws.

Since the passage of the McCarran-Walter Act it has been demonstrated on many occasions that some of the provisions of the law are unduly harsh and restrictive.

Legislation has been introduced in both Houses which would correct the major defects of the present law, and which would provide a more liberal immigration policy, one which would be more in keeping with our democratic traditions and our sympathetic desire to lend a helping hand to those who seek a new life in this great country of ours.

I certainly hope that the appropriate committees in Congress will give serious consideration to this corrective legislation, and will report out a bill which will be flexible enough to permit us to meet our immigration responsibilities under changing world conditions, and yet will provide the necessary safeguards to our security and welfare.

In line with my desire to bring about the enactment of an equitable immigration policy, I am also concerned with the apparent failures in the administration of the Refugee Relief Act, which was passed last year, and which was to provide for the admission of 209,000 refugees into the United States, and for the adjustment of status for some 5,000 aliens now in this country, over a 3-year period to end December 31, 1956.

Since the passage of that act in August of last year, less than a dozen such visas have been issued, although we know how eagerly these thousands await the opportunity of coming to the land of the free.

I am sure we all realize the tremendous task of setting up such an agency which could administer this program. However, in the 8 months since the passage of the act, I believe that more definite progress could have been made. It had been anticipated that approximately 60,000 such visas could be issued the first year. I now understand that that estimate, which had been revised downward a while ago to 15,000, has now undergone a further revision, and that the figure is now set at 10,000. I must admit that with the lack of any definitive action in the past, I am doubtful that this goal will be reached during the current fiscal year.

The passage of the Watkins bill was a humanitarian gesture on the part of the United States, and indicated to the world that we were willing and anxious to assume our responsibilities in relocating those who have had to flee from behind the Iron Curtain and who are seeking political and religious freedom. That this program has not been put into full operation is a tragedy.

I know that the voluntary agencies such as the National Catholic Welfare Conference, American Friends Service Society, Church World Service, Hebrew Immigrant Aid Society, and other similar organizations which assisted in the administration of the displaced persons program, stand ready to cooperate to the fullest extent in the operation of this program.

President Eisenhower himself had indicated his interest in the emergency refugee legislation, and had expressed the hope that these refugees would be admitted without delay. The Congress echoed the President's sentiments when it passed this legislation, and the responsibility for administering it effectively and efficiently now lies with the Department of State.

That responsibility must be discharged, and I urge the appropriate agency to take the necessary steps to put the program into full operation without further delay.

Separate Schools Are Not Equal Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL D. PERKINS

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 19, 1954

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Louisville Courier-Journal of Tuesday, May 18, 1954:

SEPARATE SCHOOLS ARE NOT EQUAL SCHOOLS—THE SUPREME COURT, IN A DECISION MARKED BY REASON AND RESTRAINT, HAS ENUNCIATED A DOCTRINE OF MORALITY

For some time every sign pointed to the decision which the Supreme Court finally came to in the question of school segregation. The doctrine of separate but equal facilities in public schools, on which 17 States (including Kentucky) had based their two-race system of education, is set aside.

In a way, the decision was an anticlimax. The Justices had but to look around at the facts of today's life in the United States and the world. They had but to look back at their own recent decisions. The milestones toward equal treatment of all citizens and their children are plainly marked.

One after another the steps had been charted, the Supreme Court had spoken. The restrictive covenant in real-estate contracts, forbidding sale of property to members of minority groups, had gone. The white primary of the Southern States, a historical tool of disfranchisement, was knocked out 10 years ago. In transportation, the decision in the Henderson case and others had held that separate but equal accommodations were impractical, artificial, and made no sense.

Kentucky and several other States years ago began admitting Negroes to graduate and professional schools, heeding the Supreme Court's rule in the McLaurin, Sweatt, and Sipuel cases that separation cannot hold, if equality is lacking. And the latter usually is lacking—not only in standards but also in outlook and in acceptance of individuals as Americans among whom fundamentally there can be no difference in rights.

In the Armed Forces, white and Negro soldiers had come to fight side by side, taking strength from common associations and adding strength to the Nation's total might. The integration of fighting men as men, not as white or dark men, was started by President Truman's order 4 years ago and pressed on by President Eisenhower's order. Barriers between races in schools of the military posts were knocked down only recently. A public policy was accepted. In light of this, the principle of separation in school systems took on an unreality.

What the Supreme Court has ruled in the public-school cases is that the separate but equal rule is without meaning. In effect it ruled that things separate cannot be equal. The very fact of separation means a condition, an attitude, a state of mind that connotes a sense of superiority as against inferiority.

As a matter of ironic fact, there had never been a solid legal or constitutional basis for the two-race school system. States of the South (including Kentucky) had clung to it as justification for their method though the sanction which they claimed did not really exist.

The separate but equal doctrine was uttered by the Supreme Court in 1896 in the case of *Plessy v. Ferguson*. But this case had nothing to do with schools. Plessy, a light-colored man of one-eighth Negro blood, said his rights were violated by a Louisiana law, requiring separation of the races on trains. The Supreme Court held that the law did not hurt anybody, because with equal facilities there were equal comfort, safety, convenience.

The mischief was worked when the decision dragged in the matter of school separation by the back door, as it were. The majority decision pointed to the custom of certain States in operating separate schools for the two races. It said this was a valid exercise of the legislative power, apparently because the custom existed and had been upheld by local courts.

Here was an obiter dictum, an incidental comment on the real point. Somehow there was sustained an impression that school separation was upheld by the Plessy decision, when it was not. The Southern States had fancied, perhaps honestly but mistakenly, that their separate schools were backed by the Constitution as interpreted by the Court. By yesterday's decision in the school cases, it is proved the dual system was not so supported.

However, even to the Plessy separate but equal decision there was a vigorous dissent by a single man. He was Justice Harlan, a Kentuckian, a former owner of slaves. He went deeper than his colleagues in their more or less safe, expedient—and in view of the times, practical—decision. He looked at the moral and intellectual effects of segregation. He said:

"Our Constitution is colorblind, and neither knows nor tolerates classes among citizens * * * The destinies of the two races are indissolubly linked together, and the interests of both require that the common government of all shall not permit the seeds of race hate to be planted under the sanction of the law.

"What can more certainly arouse hate, what more certainly create and perpetuate a feeling of distrust between these races, than State enactments which in fact proceed on the ground that colored citizens are so inferior and degraded that they cannot be allowed to sit in public coaches occupied by white citizens?"

It was the Harlan view that came to prevail, little by little over the years. The intangible elements of mind and spirit of which the old Kentuckian spoke came out again in the case of G. W. McLaurin, an elderly Negro teacher who was admitted to the University of Oklahoma. Because he was of dark skin, custom claimed its obeisance. Though in the class of white students, McLaurin was seated in an alcove, had to sit in an isolated corner of the library, eat outside the student cafeteria. When the Supreme Court looked at this, it held that the treatment "impaired his ability to study, to engage in discussion and exchange views with other students; and in general to learn his profession."

These were the words of another Kentuckian—the late Chief Justice Fred M. Vinson. Equality is not confined to the physical arrangement, not even to mere association. It must be complete. And this, again, came out yesterday.

"We must consider public education in the light of its full development," said Chief Justice Warren in reading the Court's unanimous decision, "and its present place in American life. * * * Does segregation in public schools solely on the basis of race, even though the physical facilities and other 'tangible' factors may be equal, deprive the children of the minority group of equal educational opportunities? We believe that it does."

Thus a dogma to which the old South clung, sometimes in confidence, sometimes in desperation, receives a mortal blow. Segregation is unconstitutional. It is so because in it there can be no essential equality.

The South's efforts to hold on to the old idea have been at times almost tragically beset by sacrifice With more Negroes and yet with fewer public resources, the 13 States of the South have struggled to maintain two school systems in a fashion of equal facilities. Now the Supreme Court says that no laying out of treasure, no burden of taxes, no reduction of white standards to try and build up the standards of segregated Negro schools, will ever suffice. It is not a matter of money or buildings or teacher training. It is a matter of mind.

However, the end of the world has not come for the South or the Nation. The Supreme Court's rule is not itself a revolution. It is rather acceptance of a process that has been going on a long time and that is like an ocean's steady pressures—not easy to see as they move in, but finally impossible to restrain by any man-made devices. Even mountains crumble and the earth recedes.

The pressures upon segregation in schools have been of the political, the economic, the ethical, the religious. They have brought in international considerations, with today's need of new definitions and assurances of democracy for an uncertain and skeptical world to hear and be convinced by what we stand for.

The very complications of all these matters are seen by the Justices. Rarely has the Supreme Court been so careful to bridge the gap of tradition. Rarely has such a moderation been shown as in the delay of final judgment and orders.

Once more all sides are solicitously sought out, for opinions and discreet guidance. Every effort is made to compose the passions of certain States—as in South Carolina, Georgia, and Virginia—where the prospect of abolishing public education is waved incitingly. It is a mad and impossible idea. Threat of violence is an unworthy idea. People everywhere could well match the Court's moderation and caution.

Statement by Andrew A. Kucher Before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. POTTER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 19, 1954

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record a statement by Andrew A. Kucher, director of the scientific laboratory of the Ford Motor Co., submitted at an open hearing before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy on May 10, 1954. His statement will, I believe, be of value to all Members of the Senate, as well as to the members of the joint committee.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

STATEMENT BY ANDREW A. KUCHER ON S. 3323 AND H. R. 8862

My name is Andrew A. Kucher and I am director of the scientific laboratory of the Ford Motor Co., one of the companies associated in the Dow Chemical-Detroit Edison and Associates atomic power development project.

The scientific labortory of the Ford Motor Co. was established to explore basic phenomena related broadly to problems of transportation with emphasis on propulsion. All forms of conversion of energy into mechanical motion are of major interest to the scientific laboratory. Therefore, any new and significant source of energy—such as nuclear energy—is of primary importance to us. It is our business to be on the alert for new techniques of propulsion for cars, trucks, tractors, locomotives, etc. Although at the moment the direct use of nuclear energy for this purpose appears to be fraught with great technical difficulties, nevertheless, such an important source of energy must not be dismissed nor the technology ignored. The vast future implications of atomic energy are in an area of pertinent technical interest and, therefore, we seek to be as broadly informed as possible.

Expenditures for research and development in the atomic energy field have indeed been enormous and rightfully so: The United States has a family of effective weapons. In order, however, that the public take advantage of these expenditures for peacetime uses, it is important that the results of research and development from the many AEC sponsored projects be disseminated as quickly and broadly as possible so that our industrial organizations may adapt pertinent information for peacetime public uses. This is the effective way to increase our national equity and maintain world industrial leadership.

We are intensely interested in nuclear technology as it might broadly affect the Ford Motor Co., and as a scientific tool in our research. We wish to have greater knowledge on the effects of intense radiation on industrial processes and on the structure of materials. During the past several months, my staff and I have visited two active centers of reactor research—Argonne National Laboratory and Oak Ridge National Laboratory—and the centers at Arco, Idaho, and Hanford, Wash.

The future national interest will be influenced to a large degree by the extent to which organizations such as the scientific laboratory of the Ford Motor Co. are permitted to be involved in the intimate technical subject matter relating to peacetime applications of atomic energy. Collaboration with the Dow-Edison and associated companies nuclear power development activity has provided entree to technical subject matter and for mutual exchange of techniques. This access has led to our contribution to the Dow-Edison effort in the area of metallurgy. As knowledge has evolved, it has become apparent that metallurgical problems are of fundamental importance to the overall program, and our effort is directed toward contributing to the solution of some of those problems. In addition the Ford Motor Co. has contributed a million dollars to the University of Michigan for a nuclear reactor—this to encourage unrestricted research in nuclear phenomena.

The scientific laboratory of the Ford Motor Co. is but one of the great number of establishments which possess highly technical talent and competence that should contribute enormously to the more rapid development of peacetime uses of atomic energy. A more general liberalization of the factors which control the dissemination of technical information is, therefore, necessary and desirable.

Rights and Lefts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 13, 1954

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Ray O. Edwards, immediate past president general of the National Society of the Sons of the American Revolution, lives in the district which I have the honor to represent here in Congress. It has recently come to my attention that Freedoms Foundation has made an award to him for his excellent address on American principles, heritage, and traditions. Under leave previously granted to me, I include this speech as follows:

RIGHTS AND LEFTS

Citizens of the United States of America should, at all times, be most grateful. During November and December we have special days for expressing our appreciation. On Thanksgiving Day, we had the opportunity to be humbly grateful for our material blessings, our freedoms, our privileges, and to renew our faith in the dignity of the individual, in our Government, and in ourselves.

On Christmas Day, we have the special privilege of thanking our Creator for our spiritual blessings and to give thanks for a Supreme Being who will guide us through troublesome times.

On Bill of Rights Day we have the opportunity to show appreciation and respect for those who, with a devout belief in individual rights, have passed on to us our heritage of rights and freedoms.

Citizens of the United States too often accept their citizenship without thought as to how it was made possible and what it has cost. We vaguely picture former generations as those who had freedom without care, rights without responsibilities. This is especially true in our thoughts of the first arrivals in this country, refugees from the tyrannies of their native land, whether it be the colonists at Jamestown or the better-known Pilgrims. We picture the tourists of *Mayflower* days as having wild turkey for every meal, a leg of venison at all times, and no worries more serious than an occasional shooting match with the Indians.

But how wrong we are. Actually the Pilgrims unwittingly made an early experiment in communism. Their travel in the *Mayflower* and the provisions necessary to start the colony were financed by a group of English merchants. They were bound by a contract that everything produced by the settlers must be handed over to the governing body. Those settlers could not own land. They were not allowed to work for themselves. The houses they built and any improvements they made would pass to the merchants in a future settlement. There was no such thing as private property except for a few personal belongings. Actually, the settlers were "bond servants," for a period of 7 years, and as such they could not personally profit from their ability or from their labors.

Only about a third of this group were searchers for religious freedom. They had fled from England to Holland and then to the New World to establish their congregational form of worship. The other two-thirds came from many walks of life. Some were small merchants or professional servants. Many were ne'er-do-wells and adventurers. All were dissatisfied with their lot in England. Most were seekers for quick profits from gold mines which they expected to find, or for a life of idle pleasure in the wilderness.

But after 2 years of this experiment, those who were workers and produced, began complaining that the profits of their labor went to feed other mens' wives and children. Men who had matured and had experience felt that it was unfair that they should be treated the same as the younger inexperienced ones who were just starting in their active productive life. The only satisfied ones were the lazy and incompetent, for this system allowed them to be unproductive but still to profit. For self-preservation, the producing colonists determined to break their contract. They required that each family should be responsible for raising its own food, but, for those unable to produce, the Christian spirit of responsibility for the needy was retained. The going was still tough but the Pilgrims came through and established our basic law—the right of the individual under the free enterprise system. Of course, those London merchants, who had financed this colony, insisted upon and were repaid their investment with a good profit. By these acts, the Pilgrims had switched to capitalism and had established the American faith in the dignity of labor and the rights of the individual.

Some 150 years later, after 13 States had been formed by those seeking individual rights and freedoms, oppression again caused a united action. The first Continental Congress, held in Philadelphia, September 5, 1774, brought forth the Articles of Confederation, giving to the Congress control over the Thirteen Original States but giving it no power to enforce its decisions and requests.

The Revolutionary War, which followed, demonstrated many weaknesses in the Articles of Confederation, weaknesses that would have to be corrected in order to "form a more perfect union." It was recognized that a Constitution, to be effective, must be an expression of the people, limiting and defining the powers of Government and reserving to the people all rights not expressly granted to the Government.

The Continental Congress called a Constitutional Convention in 1787, which in 4 months of concentrated, determined effort produced our Constitution. This document has been declared to be the most wonderful work ever struck off at a given time by the brain and purpose of man. But, even in its perfection, it would not have passed the legislature of a majority of the 13 States had they not been given assurance that amendments would be immediately made giving protection to the rights of the individual States, and to the rights of the individuals in the States.

We must not forget that the creators of our Consitution were sincerely devoted to their own States, to their own local governments and to the rights of the individuals. They intended to make sure that the Government of their creation could not possibly become another tyrant, the equal of the one from which they had just escaped.

Their experience with governments had instilled within them a determination never again to permit a government to have controls which could take from them their hard-earned freedoms. They had seen that a strong central government would take away individual rights—rights which are basic in the lives of every citizen of the United States. This is the reason for and the purpose of the Bill of Rights, the ratification of which we celebrate December 15.

It is interesting to note that our Constitution makes reference many times to a "citizen of the United States" and seldom refers to a "citizen of a State." So we are citizens of the United States rather than citizens of some individual State.

So in our Bill of Rights and in the other later laws of our land there have been set down principles to protect the rights and freedoms of the individual, the citizen of the United States.

Our Bill of Rights guarantees to us the right to freedom of speech, of the press, of every means by which man may express his thoughts on any subject; the right to freedom of assembly so that individuals may act in groups for the benefit of all; the right to worship as one desires, and religions themselves are free and equal; the right to security of person and property and that laws must be of equal power over all without special privileges for any particular individual or group; the right to work when and for whom one desires and, by like reasoning, the right to employ such individuals as an employer should desire; the right to petition the Government for redress of grievances, which right has been exercised by our national society in our recent petition in the matter of subversive schoolbooks, teaching methods, and teachers. (The Congress has recognized this petition and is now investigating those books and persons whose educational value is considered detrimental to our Republic.)

The right to vote for the person of our choice. This is the most effective weapon available to us for the protection of our rights and freedoms but it must be used constantly, wisely, and by all those eligible for this privilege. As has been said, "The penalty good men pay for indifference to public affairs is to be ruled by evil men." Too often, we, the people, are mislead by those who are in the best position to control the freedom of speech to continue themselves in power.

All of these rights guarantee to each citizen the right to an education equal to his needs, to live and labor where and how he wishes, to be a member of any organization in which he can get membership, to own property and businesses, to manage them as he desires, to become wealthy or go bankrupt depending upon his own wisdom, energy and perservance. But all of these rights are limited in that they must not interfere with the rights and privileges of others, nor with the welfare of the people, as a whole, and that they are not in violation of our Constitution. This limitation has been given a most picturesque definition by one who said: "Your right to swing your arms ends where the other fellow's nose begins."

But where we have rights we also have lefts. Webster defines left as the opposite to right, but common usage has also caused it to mean those who would limit or take away our rights as citizens of the United States. It is the lefts who are the greatest menace to our freedoms.

We have seen the provisions of the Bill of Rights against self-incrimination used by the lefts to avoid legitimate questioning by courts of justice and by the Congress of the United States. Nevertheless, all right-thinking citizens would prefer to keep this safeguard even if it does mean a miscarriage of justice in some cases.

We have seen friend turned against friend and populations aroused by use of the whispering campaign and the big lie but, we would still retain our freedom of speech although congressional immunity seems too liberal in some cases.

Each individual must give obedience to the laws under which he lives. Each individual has the right to talk against a law, to work and vote to change that law, but not to disobey it.

It is the violation of these restrictions, rather than over-emphasis of the rights of the individual, that has brought our National Government to the condition in which it is today. We, now realize that the office of government is not intended to confer happiness but to give man an opportunity to pursue it, that is, to work for his own advancement, assuming his own risks and accepting his own mistakes without recourse to Government guarantees and grants.

This is not intended as a condemnation of assistance for those who need it, for to "live and let live" is a right for which our ancestors fought. But it is a warning against that small selfish minority in business, in industry, in labor, in Government itself, and in both major political parties, which has come to depend upon special interest preferment, upon influence peddling, upon profit without risk, upon legislative control and upon tax fixing to take the rights away from the citizens of the United States.

We have seen in other countries the ability to conquer by infiltration, by restricting the rights of man, by controlling freedom of speech, by limiting freedoms of all kinds.

But the most dangerous of our national "lefts" are the users of indoctrination of subversive thoughts to our future generations by raising questions as to the strength and value of our form of government and, through inference, by giving praise to those "isms" which have limited and destroyed the rights of individuals in other countries.

Most of us are still confident of ourselves, of our society and of our country. We do not claim perfection but we do have faith in our ability to move forward, to improve, to grow, to provide more free, independent individuals with more and more of everything they want and need in life.

The citizens of the United States, however, must solve those serious problems which our recent national election did not settle. The majority seem to believe that it has started us on our way toward the proper solution but all the hazards to the rights of the citizen did not disappear on the morning of November 5. We cannot expect the impossible from a new administration. What we must develop is a continuing, questioning and supervisory relationship between the elector and the elected representative in Congress. After all, our State legislatures and the Congress must be and should be the guard against loss of our rights by legislation or by usurpation of power by other branches of our Government—they must be the first and the last sentinel of our American freedoms. But, we, as voters, must put aside that "sheep-like" trust in the wisdom and integrity of our elected officials and be ever on the alert, to criticize, but, of greater importance at the same time, also to advise, to assist and to encourage those whom we have elected and our efforts must be without thought of selfish profit or power. It must be the combined efforts of great men and great women, not necessarily the "greats" in Washington, for the strength of our Government does not lie there. Our national strength lies throughout our entire Nation and the hearts and the minds of our people, the great men and women of the present generation.

Our heritage was given to us by great men—men, born with the opportunity for greatness and with the ability, in varying degrees, to acquire it. Our destiny depends upon the efforts of great men and women of the present.

We need men and women of the type so vividly described, in the early 1800's, by Josiah Gilbert Holland, when he wrote:

"God give us men! A time like this demands
Strong minds, great hearts, true faith, and ready hands;
Men whom the lust of office does not kill;
Men whom the spoils of office cannot buy;
Men who possess opinions and a will;
Men who have honor—men who will not lie;
Men who can stand before a demagog,
And damn his treacherous teachings without winking!
Tall men, sun-crowned, who live above the fog
In public duty and in private thinking!"

Our way of life has been founded upon the dreams of men whose minds were bold and whose faith in mankind was unlimited. They visioned a new society in which the individual human beings, created in the image of God, would be free—the master of his own destiny. Out of their dreams—our heritage—came a mighty Nation of free people. By our own unselfish dreams, faith and labor, and with God's blessing, this priceless heritage will be a brilliant destiny.

Members of Congress and Their Families Visit the United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 19, 1954

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, during the recent visit of Members of Congress and their families to New York City, one of the highlights was a tour of U. N. headquarters as guests of Hon. Henry Cabot Lodge, United States Ambassador to the United Nations.

During the tour the Members of Congress in the group assembled in the political conference room of the United Nations to hear a statement from Ambassador Lodge and to ask him questions for the purpose of receiving information.

Ambassador Lodge's statement, together with the questions and answers, were as follows:

CONGRESSIONAL VISIT TO THE UNITED NATIONS, MAY 8, 1954

Congressman JAMES E. VAN ZANDT. We have been accorded the very distinct pleasure and high honor to assemble in this political conference room of the United Nations this morning for the purpose of not only hearing a statement from the United States Ambassador, the Honorable Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., who represents the United States in the United Nations, but also to ask any questions that the Members of Congress may wish to put for the purpose of receiving information.

We are also honored by having Ambassador Lodge's deputy here this morning, the Honorable James J. Wadsworth.

After Ambassador Lodge has made his statement, he will submit to questions, and it has been requested that each Member of Congress when he puts his question to please raise his hand and state his name plainly and the State from which he comes. I now introduce to you Ambassador Lodge.

Ambassador LODGE. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, before you came here you went into the meditation room and the first thing that the President did when he came here last December 8 to make his proposal for an atomic stockpile was to go into that room and to say a prayer.

On your way in here you may have seen the tourists. The United Nations has become in the last few years the biggest tourist attraction in New York City. These galleries are always full. We have had spot checks made at various times and have found that people from practically every State in the Nation come here; almost always there is someone from each of the 48 States and as many as 30 different foreign countries.

I would like to give you just a brief enumeration of what I think the United Nations has accomplished and why I think it is advantageous for the United States to belong to it.

In the first place, it was, of course, founded as a device to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war. That is quoted from the charter. It was based on the theory that the alliance which then existed between the United States and the Soviet Union would continue and would be a basic fact for foreign policy upon which everything else could be based. This, of course, turned out to be an erroneous assumption. In spite of the fact that that basic assumption has not materialized, the United Nations has played a very useful and decisive part in preventing outbreaks of violence from turning to wars, as follows:

The withdrawal of Soviet troops from Iran in 1946 was brought about almost entirely by the wave of world public opinion which was generated here.

The ending of Communist encroachment in Greece, in which of course the United States played a very large part.

Bringing about the independence of Israel and the ending of the war in the Holy Land, in which Count Bernadotte was killed and peace was eventually brought about through the efforts of Ralph Bunche, although the situation is still dangerous as I told you in the Security Council.

Bringing about the independence of Indonesia which is a nation of 76 million and in which the struggle for independence had caused violence.

Ending the fighting between India and Pakistan over the Kashmir dispute.

And, of course, the part which the United Nations played as regards the aggression in Korea.

I would like to say a word about that because that is the first time in human history that collective military action under the auspices of an international organization has stopped aggression. You will hear it said quite often that the United Nations sucked the United States into Korea and then sat back and let the United States carry the whole load. That statement is not accurate. The United States decided to resist aggression in Korea, and in my opinion it decided quite rightly, on the grounds of strategy and national interest—apart from world interest. The United States then came in here and tried to get the United Nations to take the same position and, quite rightly I think, the United Nations did so.

Now, it is true that the contribution of the United States was absolutely overwhelming. Except for the Republic of Korea, no one has had as many casualties and did as much as we did, and the Republic of Korea Army was created by the United States Army. Nevertheless, it is true that the other United Nations members contributed the equivalent of two divisions. And if there had not been a reversal of the World War II lend-lease policy in Washington, whereby these countries were required to provide their own dollar and logistic support, I believe we would have had 5 or maybe 6 divisions from the other United Nations members. There are a number of countries in the world who have quite excellent military manpower but who, for various measons, cannot supply dollars, cannot supply shipping, cannot supply mechanized equipment.

Two divisions at World War II figures cost $600 million a year. So, putting this entirely on a financial basis and leaving out the fact that two divisions saved us many casualties this doesn't look too bad in comparison to what the United Nations costs us, which is $13 million a year for the United Nations proper.

Then, as I said upstairs in the big plenary hall, the United Nations is the only word forum, and we have utilized that world forum last year in as vigorous a way as we possibly could.

We utilized it, first of all, to show up some of the dreadful facts about the Soviet Union.

We have used it to show up some of the dreadful facts about Communist China. We used it to show the monstrous mendacity of the charges that United States personnel had engaged in germ warfare in Korea. Dr. Charles Mayo, of the Mayo Clinic, was on the United States delegation last fall, and he made the presentation of the falsity of those charges. He did it with his authority as a doctor and his prestige and standing in the world. The result was that we held the front pages for about 10 days.

We showed how forced labor was being used behind the Iron Curtain, and we based ourselves on an official United Nations report to that effect.

We showed up the maltreatment by the Soviet Union of World War II prisoners of war from Japan, Germany, and Italy.

We set forth for the record Chinese Communist and North Korean atrocities against our own troops.

We used the United Nations as the forum in which to announce President Eisenhower's belief that if the Legislature of Puerto Rico ever voted for independence he would be glad to do all in his power to see that they got it. This statement had a very good effect for our prestige with Latin American countries and with Asian and Arab countries generally, where the memory of colonialism is still very recent.

That is just a snappy identification of a few of the specific accomplishments of the last year.

As far as the financial side is concerned, my office, which, of course, is not here but over at 2 Park Avenue—I have a sort of miniature State Department to advise and help me in the work which I do here—we reduced the personnel 29 percent. We reduced the square footage in office space 25 percent. We have tried to get economy all the way up and down the line in my office.

As far as the United States dollar contribution to the United Nations is concerned, we got that reduced 11.6 percent under last year, and we got the contribution of the Soviet Union increased 7.7 percent in 1954 as against 1953.

So there has been a net saving in the last year of $1,970,000.

As far as United States personnel employed by the United Nations is concerned, there are about 1,895 United States nationals. The first thing I did on arriving here was to get set up a screening system in accordance with Civil Service Commission and Federal Bureau of Investigation standards. As of recent date, 1,733 of those United States nationals have been screened and there were 162 cases pending. We hope to have that cleaned up very soon.

One of the things we look forward to in the future is of course Charter review. The Charter review question comes up in 1955. Another, is the possibility that the President's proposal for atomic stockpiling, which is now being discussed bilaterally between the United States and the Soviet Union, will eventually come into the Disarmament Commission here.

Gentlemen, that is just an enumeration which is up to date and authoritative, and which I prepared to submit to you here. Now, if there are any questions, or any counsel or advice, I would very much welcome it from you.

Congressman HAROLD A. PATTEN (Arizona). Mr. Ambassador, in view of the President's statement here on stockpiling and the international situation as it exists—I know you deal with international problems, but being from a western State we feel that part of our impetus has gone into international stockpiling when it should be national. If we can produce the ores necessary for stockpiling in strategic metals, how would you feel on what we should do? Should we get into the international picture or try to stimulate our own industries within this country?

Ambassador LODGE. That is a matter of internal policy which I do not think I ought to get into. Of course, the point you are making is not in contradiction with what the President said here on December 8. What the President proposed was that the principal atomic powers would set up this bank in which atomic energy could be used for peaceful development. That had a tremendous effect here on the underdeveloped countries and is a very good thing. Your idea of national self-development and self-sufficiency is another idea and if I were still in the Senate I would certainly have a vote and a voice on that. But in view of my capacity here I do not think I ought to get into that.

Congressman PATTEN. He established that we should have a national stockpile but doesn't follow it through. The other question I asked you earlier, and which you said you might mention, is the Red China issue. Would you like to avoid it?

Ambassador LODGE. No; I don't want to avoid it at all. The United Nations is founded on a moral sanction, which is that it shall be composed of peace-loving nations. Those two words "peace-loving" are right in the charter. It is not a mere diplomatic conference in which the virtuous and the criminal sit side by side without regard to whether they are virtuous or not, or criminal or not. It isn't that. Some people say it is, but it isn't. Some people feel it ought to be that, but it isn't. And it was never ratified that way.

Therefore, to admit a nation which flagrantly advocates the use of war as an instrument of national policy would be a complete stultification of the United Nations.

The argument is made that the Soviet Union is here and they have engaged in similar tactics. I make the following observation about that. If the Soviet Union in 1945 had openly espoused the policies which they have adopted since, it is very doubtful whether we would have favored admitting them to the United Nations. There is a big difference between a condition arriving later and knowingly doing it deliberately when you don't have to.

There are 10 or 15 major reasons, specific reasons, to illustrate that argument, but that is the basic argument against admitting Red China to the United Nations.

Does that answer your question?

Congressman Patten. It does, very well, thank you.

Congressman Howard S. Miller. I wish to say that I have been very greatly impressed with this physical plant. It is perhaps the last word in the matter of human structures. I am wondering just how far mankind lacks of coming up spiritually and morally with its development along physical lines. And I am wondering in commenting upon some of the things that have been said just recently, whether there could have been or could be a United Nations without Soviet Russia and whether there can be a United Nations without China with some form of government, whatever it may turn out to be?

Ambassador Lodge. You raise two points. I will try to take them up in order.

The first point is you are impressed with this physical plant and you ask: Is the mentality and spiritual strength of mankind equal to man's ability to make material things. Of course, that is the question which arises in all our minds all the time. This place here is a place in which the nations of the world can take whatever common action they may at any given moment be capable of taking. Now, that changes from issue to issue, from country to country, from time to time, in accordance with the political conditions of each country. Certainly, it is a useful thing to have a place like that where common action can be developed to the extent that it is capable of being developed.

On your second point, I quite agree with you that you cannot have a world organization consisting entirely of nations that you agree with. The thing that gives it value and utility and the chance to accomplish something in the future is that you have got a lot of people that you don't agree with. But I think there has got to be a minimum willingness to subscribe to the purpose of the organization. When the United Nations was founded, they did not say "this is going to be a universal organization in which everybody can sit." They did not say that. They said "it must be an organization of peace-loving nations."

Now, when people look at the difference of opinion between the United States and the Soviet Union, they say, "Well, what's this phrase 'United Nations' mean? What are they united about?" Well, we hope that we are united in our common aversion to being exploded into total destruction. We hope we are united on that. This organization is created to prevent you from going to hell. It isn't created to take you to heaven. If you can prevent that, why that certainly justifies its existence.

I realize that does not completely answer your question. Your question is a very, very big question, and I don't know that any one man has the answer to it.

Congressman Oakley Hunter (California). Mr. Ambassador, the United Nations, I believe, has recommended the internationalization of Jerusalem. I am wondering if any progress has been made toward the carrying out of that particular recommendation?

Ambassador Lodge. Nothing has happened since I have been here, no. Not in the last year.

Congressman John M. Robsion, Jr. (Kentucky). While you touched on the cost, I would like to have something a little closer to the figures. For example, the approximate total cost of the United Nations for 1 year, the past year?

Ambassador Lodge. I've got all that right here. The cost of the United Nations and the specialized agencies—may I say a word about the specialized agencies, which are not here in New York? You have got the Food and Agriculture Organization which is in Rome. You have the International Labor Office in Geneva. You have the International Civil Aviation Organization in Montreal which maintains all these beacons and radar systems across the Atlantic. You have UNESCO. You have about 10 of these. Of course, they are entirely outside of my jurisdiction.

The cost of the United Nations and the specialized agencies is as follows: Our share of the United Nations proper is $13 million; our share of the total, adding in the specialized agencies, is $24 million.

Congressman Robsion. What is the Russian share, and the total, please?

Ambassador Lodge. The total is $41 million without counting the cost of the specialized agencies.

Congressman Robsion. What is that, the total?

Ambassador Lodge. The total budget for the United Nations proper is $41 million.

Congressman Robsion. All right, sir. Now, the Russian share.

Ambassador Lodge. Well, our share is a third and their share is about 14 percent, or $5.8 million, of the budget of the United Nations proper.

Congressman Robsion. Ours is about 33 and their is about 14?

Ambassador Lodge. That is correct.

Congressman Robsion. May I ask another thing? Do you have some brochure that gives a lot of factual information about the operation of the United Nations, and if it is available?

Ambassador Lodge. Yes.

Congressman Robsion. Could we have it today or do you want to mail it, or what?

Ambassador Lodge. We have got it right here on the table.

Congressman Robsion. Thank you.

Ambassador Lodge. I sent everyone, I think some weeks ago, a concise statement of mine on what the United Nations means to the United States. In addition to that there is a kit of factual material right on the desk that you can take on the way out. But to answer your question, the total cost of the United Nations is $41 million and the Soviet Union pays about 14 percent of that. And, of course, the Iron Curtain countries should be added to that. They are really completely under the domination of the Soviet Union.

Congressman Don Magnuson (Washington). Mr. Ambassador, the Charter comes up for review next year; is that right?

Ambassador Lodge. The question of Charter review comes up in 1955.

Congressman Magnuson. Do you foresee any probability that there will be major changes in the Charter?

Ambassador Lodge. Well, I think it depends on public opinion—United States public opinion and world public opinion. I think if United States public opinion can get united on the changes they want to see made in the Charter, that then a great part of world opinion will follow the lead, and then we can get some changes. I think if you wait until the last minute with some changes that haven't got world opinion behind them, then I think the chances of changing the Charter are very slight.

Congressman Magnuson. In your opinion, is the United Nations idea workable without the veto power?

Ambassador Lodge. My personal view is that the Soviet Union has abused the veto power in a very flagrant way, as regards the admission of new members. There are 14 countries now that ought to be in the United Nations that are not in it because of the Soviet veto. So I think we ought to eliminate the veto on that.

Then I think they have abused the veto on pacific settlement of disputes. I will give you an illustration of that. There has been this dispute about the development of the waters of the Jordan and the other rivers in Palestine. We worked on a resolution a long time last December, and it was very laborious work of the kind that you gentlemen understand very well. We finally got a resolution that looked like some progress for that part of the world. Well, after all these weeks and weeks and weeks of work, at the last minute the Soviet Union vetoed it. That is what I mean by the veto of pacific settlement of disputes. I think we ought to get away from that.

I think we should retain the veto on using troops. Whenever a question comes up here having to do with United States troops, that ought to get back to Washington.

Congressman Magnuson. Has there been any instance in which the veto power has been exercised by us where it was vital to the protection of our own interests?

Ambassador Lodge. I am quite sure it hasn't. The question of troops has never come up, but I think we have got to reserve that right because it is fundamental and affects you gentlemen as basic policymakers. Now, on those other things that I have just mentioned, I think the Soviet Union has abused the veto. I think we should amend the charter to that effect. However, this is just my personal view. The administration has not developed its views yet. They want to hear from you and from the country.

Congressman Charles R. Jonas (North Carolina). Can any member of the United Nations bring this Indochina case here?

Ambassador Lodge. Yes; any member has a right to bring it up.

Congressman Jonas. France, I believe, has the paramount right to and has declined to bring the case to the United Nations; is that not true?

Ambassador Lodge. France has not done it. Last summer there was a great deal of talk that Thailand was going to do it. But it has not yet been brought up.

Congressman J. L. Pilcher (Georgia). Mr. Ambassador, in going through this great building this morning and through that little prayer room, if I had one request, one question to ask that is a request, it would be this: that is to ask Almighty God to give you and other peace-loving members of the United Nations the wisdom and the power and the strength to bring about what this great institution was organized for, and that is peace, love, and goodwill toward all men.

Ambassador Lodge. Thank you very much.

Congressman Jeffrey P. Hillelson (Missouri). Mr. Ambassador, how may a member be eliminated from membership to this body?

Ambassador Lodge. Well, there is a provision for expulsion in the Charter but that has to come through the Security Council, and in the Security Council you have got the veto.

Congressman Hillelson. So the expulsion system has never been used?

Ambassador Lodge. It has never been used.

Congressman Hillelson. In other words, if a permanent member of the Security Council would choose not to be ejected from membership they would not be ejected; is that it?

Ambassador Lodge. That's right.

Congressman Hillelson. In other words, there is no provision at present?

Ambassador Lodge. You could probably expel a nation which is not one of the five permanent members, but I don't think you could expel 1 of the 5 permanent members against his will. You would have a lot of trouble.

Congressman Thomas S. Gordon (Illinois). Mr. Ambassador, in coming back to this question of the power of the veto, what is the comparison of vetoes that the Russians have used to what other nations have used? How many vetoes have they used?

Ambassador LODGE. The United States has never used the veto. The United Kingdom has never used the veto. I think France has used it once. I think the Soviet Union has used it 58 times. You'd better get that accurate. That's out of my head but I think that's about right.

Congressman HARLAN HAGEN (California). What percentage, if any, of agreements involving some international activity which the United States and other governments enter into have their origin in some activity of the United Nations?

Ambassador LODGE. Well, it is very hard to estimate. Of course, we have bilateral diplomacy going on all over the world just as it always has been. We have all these embassies in foreign countries and they have their embassies in Washington. There is still quite a lot of international intercourse that way. I would have a very hard time——

Congressman HAGEN. For example, on a subject like the international control of narcotics, that would be a proper subject for this body?

Ambassador LODGE. Oh, yes. We had a meeting here recently at which the United States representative, Mr. Anslinger, who is the United States Commissioner of Narcotics, made the flat statement that the Chinese Communist regime was trying to flood neighboring regions with drugs in order to demoralize them. He made that flat statement here 3 days ago.

Congressman HAGEN. The League of Nations produced much valuable activity in fields like that which the public generally did not recognize and I was wondering whether this organization was doing the same thing?

Ambassador LODGE. This organization is doing a great deal in that way. Technical assistance through the United Nations is one of the most valuable expenditures of the United States dollar that I know of in terms of accomplishing good things and doing good things for us. It has certain advantages over doing it bilaterally. You get a lot more countries in on it. You get less of a feeling that it is a sort of poisonous obligation that harms so many of these international ventures. A great many good things are being accomplished in the way of eliminating disease and draining the swamps and irrigating the deserts. There is the Children's Fund that does a great deal of good. There is all the work of the Economic and Social Council, of the specialized agencies. Much can be said about what the World Health Organization has done to eliminate certain types of epidemics and what the Food and Agriculture Organization has done to increase the food supply in parts of the world.

Congressman HAGEN. Does the United Nations now or in the future intend to offer any program for international monetary reforms?

Ambassador LODGE. That comes under the International Monetary Fund, which is one of the specialized agencies, and I haven't got the specialized agencies.

I might say that you could write a book about all the useful things that the United Nations does in the humanitarian and economic fields, and many people have written books about it. What I am always afraid of is that the emphasis will be so much on those good things the people will forget that its prime purpose is to prevent World War III. That is the primary purpose and we must never look at these things with so much satisfaction to cause us to forget what we are really here for—to prevent war. That is the basic purpose.

Congress GUBSER. Mr. Ambassador, there is a great segment of our population which believes that the United Nations can only grow as a force in promoting world peace at the expense of sovereignty on purely domestic matters, our national sovereignty. Now, I disagree with that point of view.

Ambassador LODGE. I disagree with it, too. There isn't any loss of sovereignty in the United Nations. When Congress created my job in 1945 they wrote right into the law that I was to be an Ambassador in order to show that the United States Government was not giving up any sovereignty. The place where I live, the hotel, is an embassy, the only United States embassy that is in the United States—in order to show once again that I represent a sovereign country and that no sovereignty has been given up at all. To my mind it is out of the question to have any such thing as world government unless there is a world sense of justice and a world sense of right and wrong. If you try to have a world government when you have got the Communist bloc the way it is now, it wouldn't be a government—it would be a tyranny. If there is one thing worse than having tyranny in any part of the world, it is having tyranny in all of the world.

Now, when the 13 States got their independence, if one of those States had had an idea about justice and an idea about the nature of man as different from what the other States had as the idea of the Soviet Union is different from that which the other nations hold today, there wouldn't have been any United States of America.

There have got to be similar ideas of justice.

Of course, this organization is not set up to be a world government. You have an organization like the General Assembly in which every country has one vote. A big country has one vote and a little country has one vote. Obviously, you can't have a government on that kind of a basis. This isn't meant to be that. This is a device, an instrument to prevent war. If it accomplishes that, it has certainly justified its existence and what it costs us—one-fourteenth of what we spend on cigarettes, half of what it costs to clean the streets of New York City. If it does that, that's enough without asking all these other things of it.

You started me off on quite a speech there.

Congressman G. P. LIPSCOMB (California). Mr. Ambassador, what is the basis for the apportionment of costs of the United Nations?

Ambassador LODGE. The basis for the apportionment of costs is supposed to be the productivity level—the capacity to pay.

Congressman LIPSCOMB. How is it arrived at?

Ambassador LODGE. Mr. Hall is an expert on this subject. I would like to have him answer that.

Mr. HALL. There is an expert committee of statisticians and economists which takes the national income figures presented by the various countries and prepares a recommendation on contributions for the General Assembly. The General Assembly then goes over that and adjusts it, reconstructs it to some extent, and comes up with a recommendation which is then adopted by the Assembly. The United States contribution is fixed on the basis of a ceiling of 33⅓ percent, which has been established by the General Assembly. While United States productivity is higher than one-third of the world's total, at least in the view of most of the economists from various countries, our contribution is fixed on the basis of the ceiling which has been established by general agreement.

Ambassador LODGE. When Senator Vandenberg was here at the beginning, when our assessment was about half, he said to the Communists "If our system is so good, that we have such a tremendous capacity to pay and such a high level of productivity, obviously such a wonderful system should be adopted by all the countries in the world."

Congressman LIPSCOMB. Do those economic reports go through a committee or a conference?

Mr. HALLL. They go to this expert committee of statisticians and economists, which prepares a recommendation to the General Assembly. The General Assembly has a committee on administrative and budgetary questions which considers this type of report. After analysis and debate in that committee, a recommendation to the Assembly is adopted. The plenary session of the Assembly then adopts a resolution setting the scale of assessments.

Ambassador LODGE. When I was here as a delegate when I was in the Congress, I handled that question. We took all the speeches that the Soviet leaders made about what a great system they had and what wonderful progress they were making and how they were having this great agricultural production, industrial production, and everything—we quoted them and said then you ought to pay more to maintain this organization. It is on the basis of that argument that the nations here have voted steadily an increase in the Soviet Union's assessment.

Congressman JOHN J. RHODES (Arizona). Mr. Ambassador, going back to the question of the gentleman from North Carolina on Indochina, I understand that any nation may bring the Indochina situation into the United Nations.

Ambassador LODGE. Any member nation or nonmember.

Congressman RHODES. Does that require a vote of the Assembly or the Council before that matter can be brought up?

Ambassador LODGE. They can bring it to the attention of the Assembly or the Council, but a vote is required to take it up.

Congressman RHODES. Then actually the question could be considered in the United Nations concurrently with the Geneva Conference; is that correct?

Ambassador LODGE. It could be. I don't think that would be right timing.

Congressman PATTEN. Mr. Ambassador, is China a member of the Security Council, the Nationalist Government?

Ambassador LODGE. Yes.

Congressman PATTEN. And in that is the veto power?

Ambassador LODGE. Yes.

Congressman PATTEN. And therefore it would be impossible for Red China to be recognized unless we did something with Nationalist China; is that right?

Ambassador LODGE. Well, recognition is another matter. Recognition is not a matter that is considered in the United Nations.

Congressman PATTEN. Yes; but I mean——

Ambassador LODGE. Admission of Red China would involve some rather elaborate steps.

Congressman PATTEN. They have the veto power in the Security Council, didn't you say?

Ambassador LODGE. Yes. It would come up in the form of an objection to the credentials of the Nationalist Government representatives. You see, China is in. It is a question of who represents China. It would come us as a credentials problem. That is where the thing originally would come.

Congressman MILLER. Do we understand that Nationalist China has a veto power, is one of the five nations with the veto power?

Ambassador LODGE. Yes; China is a permanent member of the Security Council and the Nationalist Government is the legal representative of China.

Congressman MILLER. Yes; I understand, thank you.

Congressman VAN ZANDT. Are there any further questions?

Congressman COON. To pursue that a little further on percentage that we contribute to the United Nations, is there any likelihood that our share may be reduced a little from the 33⅓ percent?

Ambassador Lodge. We got it down to 33⅓ this year. This has been a bipartisan objective for the last 8 years. Senator Vandenberg, Senator Wiley, Governor Stevenson, Senator Sparkman, all have served here and have subscribed to the 33⅓ percentage. And having gotten it down to that, I would not anticipate its being reduced in the near future again. If you get other countries in, then there may be a general reallocation of ratios.

Congressman Armistead I. Selden, Jr. (Alabama). Mr. Ambassador, pursuing this Indochina question a little further, do you think there is a good possibility that it will be brought up in the United Nations some time in the near future?

Ambassador Lodge. I would like to have an off-the-record meeting after we get through with the public part of it and then I can discuss that. I don't want to say any more than that on the record.

Congressman Hagen. Unless it could be assumed or proved that Red China is participating in Indochina, that is superficially an internal matter; that is not a matter for this organization.

Ambassador Lodge. You are talking about bringing Indochina in here? Well, I'd rather discuss that off the record. We will have an off-the-record meeting, because that's a little bit hot right now.

Congressman Van Zandt. Mr. Ambassador, Mr. Mitchell, who sits on my left, has asked this question: In case of the revision of the charter of the United Nations can the veto be used?

Ambassador Lodge. Yes; it can. That is why it is so important to develop world opinion and get propositions which have got such a hold on world opinion that the Soviets will think twice before they start vetoing.

Congressman Van Zandt. In other words, they can use the veto power to outlaw almost any suggestion regarding a revision of the charter?

Ambassador Lodge. Yes; but they do react to world opinion, so the thing to do is to build world opinion and then that may slow them up.

Congressman Van Zandt. Are there any other questions? If not, I am going to ask the Members of Congress to remain so that we may confer with the Ambassador privately for a few minutes, and the rest of the party will proceed to the buses so that we may continue our itinerary, which takes us next to La Guardia Field.

Mr. Ambassador, on behalf of the Members of Congress and the party assembled, I want to thank you and your staff.

[Applause.]

Statement by Walker L. Cisler Before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. POTTER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 19, 1954

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record a statement by Mr. Walker L. Cisler, president of the Detroit Edison Co., submitted at an open hearing before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. His statement is an enlightened presentation which I believe will be of benefit to the Senate.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

STATEMENT BY WALKER L. CISLER ON S. 3323 AND H. R. 8862

My name is Walker L. Cisler and I am president of the Detroit Edison Co. With me are Mr. Alfred Iddles, president, the Babcock & Wilcox Co.; Mr. Andrew A. Kucher, director, scientific laboratory of the Ford Motor Co.; and Mr. Paul W. McQuillen, of the firm of Sullivan & Cromwell, general counsel for the Detroit Edison Co.

Our appearance at these hearings concerning the proposed amendment of the Atomic Energy Act of 1946 is made on behalf of the group of privately owned electric power, industrial, and engineering firms associated in the Dow Chemical-Detroit Edison and Associates atomic power development project.

This project, which had its beginning in 1950, and is being carried out under an agreement with the Atomic Energy Commission, has as its main objective the development of a nuclear reactor, which can be used on a commercially competitive basis for the generation of electric power and the production of useful byproducts. It is fully anticipated, if a reactor holding this promise can be developed, that private funds for its construction and operation will be made available when the law permits private investment. In other words, we look upon atomic energy as a natural resource which will have many important and valuable peacetime uses that will bring significant advances to the world, particularly as a fuel to supplement conventional fuels. The optimum development and application of these uses can be brought about only if the principles of free enterprise, upon which our great strength and economy is founded, are permitted to function as they have in the past. Obviously, adequate controls in the interest of national security, health, and safety must be observed.

In a public hearing before this committee on July 1, 1953, we expressed our opinion that the country would be served best by a modification of the Atomic Energy Act which would permit ownership rights and patent protection to private industry, and thus bring about greater participation by industry in the development of atomic energy.

In presenting our testimony today concerning the proposed bill, we first wish to point out the increased urgency for remedial legislation which has developed during the past 10 months. Scientific and engineering developments have proceeded more rapidly than anticipated a year ago, and there has been an increasing awareness of the potentialities of atomic energy in the United States. This is clearly shown by the fact that commitments have been made for the construction of a large pressurized water type power reactor, and that programs are being formulated for the construction of other types of reactors within the next few years.

We are now at the time when the initial steps are being taken to bring about industrial applications of atomic energy here in the United States. Industry is ready to participate in the development, as it demonstrated by the proposals made in connection with the pressurized water-type power reactor. Participation by indusry on a far more substantial basis can soon become a reality if a reasonable opportunity is afforded.

The question Congress must consider is whether, at this critical period in the development, industry using its own funds will be given the opportunity to perform its natural function of seeking out economic methods of utilizing this natural energy resource and making the resulting benefits available to all in a normal manner, or whether industry is to be restricted in its opportunities by a continuation of the existing law. In our minds we must proceed along natural and traditional lines.

This consideration has been given added importance by the President's address of December 8, 1953, before the General Assembly of the United Nations. The President proposed the creation of an Atomic Energy Pool, to be used in bringing the peacetime benefits of atomic energy to all the world. That was a most worthy proposal, and the world is looking forward to its fruition. In this the United States has assumed a very great responsibility. When we embark upon such a course, we must also make rational and adequate preparations to meet our needs here at home.

Effective cooperation with other nations can be accomplished only by drawing upon the experience of our own industry. Unless we move more rapidly in the matter of industry participation, we will not be able to fulfill our responsibility. Initiative in this rests with us.

The bill to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, I believe, is a definite step in the right direction to encourage and permit private industry to participate in the research and development work in the field of atomic energy, having as its objective the full utilization of atomic energy for peaceful purposes. Subparagraph (d), section 3, is an excellent statement of principle with which our objective is consistent. The adoption of such a program will, in my opininion, bring about the similarly full utilization of a large and untouched source of scientific and engineering knowledge which exists in this country.

We have considered the complete text of the proposed amendment as carefully as time has permitted and find in it many sections which are in keeping with this principle. Other sections fall short of this objective, and still others, particularly those related to licensing, would establish awkward and unnecessary complications.

I will present our thoughts concerning the proposed act as we understand it in broad terms and later Mr. McQuillen will discuss details concerning specific passages.

In our earlier appearance we stated that in order to bring about conditions under which private competitive industry can be enabled to invest its own funds in the development, the Atomic Energy Act should be amended to permit private enterprise to do the following:

1. To build, own and operate atomic-energy plants.
2. To acquire, own and dispose of fissionable materials.
3. To acquire, own and dispose of source materials.
4. To sell and distribute end products and byproducts produced in an atomic-energy facility.
5. To obtain licenses from the Atomic Energy Commission subject only to the requirement that operations thereunder be conducted in compliance with conditions set forth in the license in accord with standards to be prescribed by the act.
6. To attain normal patent and trade secret protection subject only to full disclosure to the Commission for its own use and military purposes.

The bill does permit the ownership of production and utilization facilities by industry; it permits the manufacture and construction of such facilities, and the new patent provisions are very close to the normal patent law.

The bill falls short of the needs of industry in that ownership of special materials is retained solely to the United States and in that the provisions with respect to licensing are confusing, vague, and perhaps even unworkable.

We fully realize that the purpose is to protect national security by retaining all title to fissionable materials in the Government. I am sure that the industry of our country is completely sensitive and responsive to our national security problems, as demonstrated by its accomplishments during the past years. We believe that national security can be as effectively protected by appropriate controls of special materials privately owned, and that there are important basic advantages to both Government and industry in permitting industry ownership.

Government ownership of special materials poses difficult problems in financing and in free enterprise under Government subsidy for industry. When the time comes that we, the Detroit Edison Co., for example, may decide to build an atomic power plant, we must go to the public to obtain a substantial part of the funds which are required. Many millions of dollars will be involved. As a regulated public utility, we cannot build up undistributed reserves which would be adequate for such a purpose.

To bring about this financing we must first go to our Michigan Public Service Commission and demonstrate (1) the need for the facilities which are to be constructed, and (2) the engineering and economic soundness of the project which is involved. We then must register our proposed securities with the Securities and Exchange Commission.

Finally, we would go to the public and offer to sell either capital stock, or bonds, or both, for investment in the new facilities and materials. You may be assured that none of these requirements is or can be taken lightly.

The lack of ownership of special materials would make financing difficult and costly if not impossible. The proposed licensing arrangements are not sufficiently definite for a full evaluation, but certainly industry would have a much more secure standing if in time of national emergency Government might requisition special materials which are private property, rather than merely repossess special materials which are already the Government's own property. The Government's ability to acquire physical possession of the material would be the same in either case, but with private ownership the rights of private investors would be more adequately protected.

With respect to subsidy, the provisions requiring Government to purchase all special material may operate as a Government subsidy to business. We do not know, except in a general way, the cost of producing special materials, and we can see great difficulty in allocating those costs between materials required for military purposes, materials for other uses, and for power production. Finally the provision that Government must acquire all special materials relieves industry of its responsibility to find a market for its products. Industry should be able to look to Government as a customer for fissionable materials which it may produce, but the matter should be one of negotiation rather than of compulsion, and the potential market should be broadened to include all licensees.

All of these considerations, in our mind, point to the desirability of granting ownership rights of special materials to industry.

The licensing provisions which I referred to earlier are confusing, in part because the proposed law does not establish standards or minimum requirements, and in part because an unreasonable number of special licenses is required for an integrated power facility.

There must be assurance that the owner can use its facilities without interruption for long periods of time, and the license must not be subject to revocation except by reason of failure to observe the terms of the license. Such assurances should be a matter of law rather than left to the discretion of an administrative body.

Under the bill a license is the foundation of any atomic-energy enterprise. Large investments will be made in reliance upon the license. I am sure the committee realizes the significance, therefore, of the licensing provisions to any industry that plans to construct and operate an atomic-energy facility, particularly a facility which would be used to generate electric power.

Another aspect is the fact that the number of licenses required by the bill would be a burden upon applicants and would be extremely difficult to administer. A single license certainly should cover all of the requirements of any project. This is a matter which can be corrected most readily perhaps by authorizing the Commission to issue one license to cover all integrated operations. Definite standards and minimum requirements for issuance and revocation should be established by law.

My final comment concerning the proposed bill has to do with section 102, report to Congress. This section does much to nullify the improvements which have been written into the proposed bill, in that it requires a report to Congress and a waiting period of 90 days, and perhaps further amendments, before any license may be issued. Congress would have the responsibility of passing on each and every type of use of special materials. The potential complications are beyond imagination.

We should move forward courageously and confidently in the application of atomic energy to peacetime purposes. We should do this in a way which will not jeopardize the common defense and national security, and at the same time we should endeavor to move along those paths that have made our country the leader of the nations of the world.

I urge the committee to give careful consideration to the modifications we have suggested and, further, that the law be amended at the earliest possible time so that we can proceed to make this great scientific discovery useful in advancing our economy, and demonstrate to the world our determination to make atomic energy a servant of mankind rather than primarily a weapon of destruction.

The So-Called McCarthy Hearings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 19, 1954

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record three editorials on the subject of the McCarthy hearings. The first is entitled "The Hearings Must Go On," and is from the New York Times of May 18. The second is entitled "Challenge To Mr. Mundt," and is from the New York Herald Tribune of May 18. The third is entitled "Presidential Discretion," and is from the Washington Post and Times-Herald of May 17.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the New York Times of May 18, 1954]

THE HEARINGS MUST GO ON

The incredible decision of the McCarthy investigating committee to suspend hearings becomes more incredible the longer one looks at it. We do not presume to inquire into the motives of the 6 members of the 7-man committee who voted for suspension; but, as we stated yesterday, their action was entirely unnecessary and it plays directly into the hands of Senator McCarthy.

It was worse than unnecessary. It was stupid and harmful, because it builds up the totally fictitious theory that the President's order forbidding his subordinates to testify about private conversations on the McCarthy affair within the executive departments somehow prevents the committee from learning the relevant facts in the case of McCarthy against the Army. All the sanctimonious talk by Democrats and Republicans alike on the investigating committee—and there was plenty of it—cannot conceal the transparent fallacy of this contention.

Admittedly, the President has been slow to recognize the necessity of protecting his executive authority from legislative efforts to infringe upon it. But when the committee attempted to elicit from John G. Adams, counselor of the Army, details about a meeting he had had in January with other top administration officials on the McCarthy-Cohn-Schine affair, the President finally issued his order because "it is essential to efficient and effective administration that employees of the executive branch be in a position to be completely candid in advising with each other on official matters and because it is not in the public interest that any of their conversations * * * concerning such advice be disclosed." The President specifically added that his order did not foreclose testimony on matters "where the communication was directly between any of the principles in the controversy within the executive branch on the one hand and a member of the subcommittee or its staff on the other."

In other words, the President merely put his foot down on congressional prying into private discussions at which policy was being thrashed out. If such discussions had been held at a cabinet meeting, probably not even Mr. McCarthy would have had the effrontery to demand a transcript of what went on. The present situation is entirely similar, and in fact the conversation at issue took place very close to the cabinet level. The President has not in any way prevented the committee from inquiring into the action taken by the Army in the McCarthy dispute, which is a proper subject of the committee's inquiry.

Now, what did the committee do when it learned of this perfectly correct, if belated, Presidential order? Democrats and Republicans alike seized on it, for reasons best known to themselves, as an excuse to suspend the investigation. Senator McClellan made a speech to the effect that it was now "impossible for this committee * * * to determine where the final responsibility lies for the action that was taken" after the January meeting. What nonsense! Surely Senator McClellan and Senator Mundt and the other experienced Senators on the committee know perfectly well that the responsibility before the January meeting lay with Secretary Stevens, and the responsibility after the January meeting lay equally well with Secretary Stevens.

And behind Secretary Stevens before, during and after this and every other meeting stood the President, whose agent Secretary Stevens is. What difference does it make whether Ambassador Lodge or Sherman Adams or John Doe advised the Secretary within the inner councils of the administration? The Secretary took certain action and that is what is, or ought to be, under investigation. If it was evil action, then he has to be held for it, and the President has to be held for it, no matter who inspired them. It is fantastic for the members of this committee to ignore the chain of Executive responsibility; and their doing so only serves to emphasize their evident failure to understand the workings of the tripartite system of executive, legislative, and judicial branches under which our Nation has successfully operated since its founding.

As Senator SYMINGTON alone suggested, the hearings could have and should have, gone on. But now that they have been suspended for a week, it is doubly imperative that they be resumed at the appointed time. Senator McCARTHY has not been slow to weep crocodile tears over the situation and to complain that unless the President's order is rescinded his hands are tied. He must not be allowed to seize the opportunity afforded him by six Republicans and Democrats of the committee to squirm off the witness stand under the utterly false pretense that he now cannot get his story before the public. There is not the slightest valid reason for the committee to permit Senator McCARTHY and Mr. Cohn to escape the fullest examination and cross-examination under oath.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of May 18, 1954]

Challenge to Mr. Mundt

The suspension of the Army-McCarthy hearings is a disturbing turn of events. Senator McCARTHY achieved by this means a greater amount of delay than by all his previous interruptions and diversions. Even assuming the full intent of the Republican members to resume the hearings next Monday, there will be strong pressures upon them to change their minds. At best, the end of the hearings will have been postponed for a week, thus further reducing the time in which the country can give attention to the serious tasks of legislation before the congressional adjournment.

A delay of a day might have been understandable—but why this prolonged hiatus? There is no practical need for it. A consultation with the President and with the Attorney General could have been arranged at short notice to clear up whatever doubts are left by the President's order. As for changing the order, there seems no reasonable hope of that. In forbidding testimony on what his advisers discussed among themselves, the President acted according to commonsense and constitutional precedents. It is hard to see how he could have done otherwise. Meanwhile, as his letter made plain, there is no bar whatsoever to having his aides testify fully on conversations which they had—not with each other—but with the principals in the case.

Let it be assumed the committee will not be able to discover what Mr. Brownell said to Mr. Lodge or Mr. Lodge to Mr. Brownell. Surely that is no reason for the committee to throw up its hands and say all is lost. The result of their counsel was made apparent in the actions of Mr. Adams—and those are fully open to committee investigation. If the inability to get at every last fact were reason for calling off the hearings, that should have been brought out when Senator McCARTHY invoked an alleged legislative prerogative to shield the name of a manifest wrongdoer.

The Republican members of the investigating subcommittee have a grave responsibility. If they permit the hearings to be cut off, they will be guilty of a coverup which the voters will find intolerable. After all, it is the subcommittee itself, no less than Senator McCARTHY, which is on the spot; and the subcommittee cannot now end the hearings when only the Army side has been subjected to cross-examination. The issue is not political, but one of elementary justice and fair play. A severe challenge confronts Mr. MUNDT and the Republican colleagues who voted with him for the week's suspension. If they do everything that is required of them, they will repair what seems a bad mistake.

If they fail, if for any reason they permit the proceedings to cease permanently, they will stand—and their party will stand with them—scathed and compromised in the eyes of the country.

[From the Washington Post and Times-Herald of May 17, 1954]

Presidential Discretion

Senator McCARTHY has moved with characteristic effrontery to sabotage the whole Senate inquiry into his controversy with the Army. He has grasped an indubitably legitimate exercise of presidential discretion as an excuse for obstructing the proceedings; and his Republican colleagues on the subcommittee have cynically voted to suspend hearings—in a transparent effort to bring the embarrassing spectacle to a close. The suppression attempted in Senator DIRKSEN's unsuccessful proposal last week to shift to closed hearings has now been accomplished—temporarily at least—by outright suspension. We can only hope that an outraged public opinion will force a resumption of the inquiry.

The President's authority under the Constitution to withhold from Congress confidential executive information, the disclosure of which, in his judgment, would be incompatible with the public interest, is altogether beyond question. His obligation to do it in vindication of the American constitutional system is equally clear. For the independence of any of the separate branches of the United States Government can be breached not only by invasion of its domain on the part of another branch but also by complacement disregard of its rights and dignity on its own part.

This aspect of the American constitutional system appears to be widely misunderstood, in Congress no less than in the country at large. The memorandum concerning it submitted to the President by the Attorney General and made public in connection with the President's letter to the Secretary of Defense is therefore an extremely useful document. It sets forth a long list of instances in which Presidents have denied confidential papers or information to Congress when they thought the public good required such denial. The precedent was established by George Washington in relation to the very first of all congressional inquiries—an investigation of General St. Clair's unfortunate expedition against the Indians in 1792.

As Mr. Eisenhower pointed out in his letter to Secretary Wilson, confidentiality of executive communications is "essential to efficient and effective administration." To let the Mundt subcommittee probe into every discussion of Army-McCarthy relations among high-level executive officials would be to make candid communication in the executive branch impossible. The executive branch under President Eisenhower has been more than deferential to Congress—as the Army's appeasement of Senator McCARTHY makes abundantly plain. It was high time for the President to put a stop to what was becoming a dangerous impairment of executive independence.

Senator McCARTHY no doubt will try to use the President's refusual as a pretext for ending the hearings altogether—to escape the embarrassment of having to explain his phony photograph, his faked FBI letter and Mr. Cohn's arrogant telephone calls. He should receive no encouragement in such a ruse from the subcommittee members—and least of all from the Democrats who foolishly raised the issue for him. The subcommittee can get all the information it needs to resolve the Army-McCarthy charges and countercharges. Its paramount obligation is to resolve this issue, resisting all attempts to divert it into sideshows.

Michigan Week, May 2–8

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. POTTER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 19, 1954

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Michigan Week, May 2–8," published on April 14, 1954, in the Michigan Tradesman, of Grand Rapids, Mich., of which Mr. Russell J. Boyle is the publisher.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Michigan Week, May 2–8

Draped on the coat of arms of the State of Michigan is the Latin motto, "If you seek a pleasant peninsula, look about you."

Citizens of the State will do just that during Michigan week, May 2 through 8. It will be the time for Michiganders to look at themselves, their neighbors and, most of all, Michigan.

What they will see is a beautiful and rare sight. Beautiful with its sparkling blue lakes—more than 11,000 of them—its green forested hills, and miles of nearly white sand dunes. Rare because the combination of industry and beauty can be matched nowhere else in the world.

Michigan put America on wheels, and year after year it produces more and better automobiles. Other industries stand with the automakers as national leaders; pharmaceutical products, quality furniture, machinery, food products, and others. It stands fifth in the Nation in value of all goods produced, and third in defense materials.

Industry in Michigan is not all big. Growing every year is the number of small towns that are attracting smaller manufacturing plants to their communities.

The State's bountiful natural wealth in minerals, timber, soil, water, and favorable climate have attracted many of her industries.

Nearly half of the land in Michigan nurtures prosperous farms that produce a wide variety of fruits, vegetables, and grains. Her cherries, apples, plums, blueberries, celery, potatoes, beans, sugar beets, and other products are produced in quantity and with excellent quality.

For everyone there is plenty of room for recreation and vacations in Michigan. Close to every city and town are lakes for good fishing and swimming. There is fine hunting, particularly deer throughout the Upper Peninsula and the northern half of the Lower Peninsula. The tourist business is a big income producer throughout the State, summer and winter.

Beside the small lakes that attract visitors are the shores of the Great Lakes. There are more than 3,000 miles of shoreline, the longest in the United States, ringing Michigan. Touching Lakes Superior, Michigan, Huron, and Erie, the State is naturally important in lake commerce. Coupled with the great Soo Locks, Michigan is the key State of the Great Lakes.

The lakes and rivers early brought the white man to Michigan. The French built the first fort here in 1679 at St. Joseph. Later the British came to Michigan. Mixing them with the French and Indians the State has a colorful history, including the day that the Spanish flag flew on Michigan soil.

The State also played important roles in the early history of the United States.

As the American frontier moved west, Michigan lumber built the wooden cities of the Middle West, and even part of England's Buckingham Palace.

As Michigan became American the people who settled here built homes, churches, and schools. Today there are more homeowners in Michigan than in any other State. Her churches from the first were a major force in every community and fine church schools and colleges dot the State.

Public education was not ignored. The public schools have always received close attention from the citizens. The idea of State support of higher education found its beginning in Michigan. From this has grown a marvelous group of universities and colleges that the State has built with pride.

Is there another State in the United States that holds such preeminence in so many things? We know of none. Such a growing, miraculous State is a living monument to its people. Michigan people, with blood of all races, are a pretty fine breed.

Fittingly, Michigan Week has as its theme, "This is your Michigan." Look around, enjoy it, you have made it great, let's continue to make it good.

Michigan tells the world on its auto license this year, "Water wonderland"—may we say, "What a wonderland."

The Bryson Bill, H. R. 1227

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 17, 1954

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I bring to the attention of the House the very deep interest and enthusiastic support of the Bryson bill (H. R. 1227) demonstrated by a great many people in my district. This conscientious group of citizens is extremely concerned about the effects that advertising of alcoholic beverages might have upon the Nation and particularly the children of the country. It is pointed out that the American Medical Association has banned such advertising in its journal. Hearings on this proposal are now being held by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. I have presented to the committee a great number of petitions from my district asking favorable action by the committee.

Since these citizens have expressed the desire that their approval of H. R. 1227 be presented to the Congress of the United States, under unanimous consent, I insert the petitions in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD along with the names of those who have signed the petitions:

To our Senators and Representatives in Congress:

The American Medical Association having seen for years the sad effects of the use of beer, wine, and distilled beverages have banned all alcoholic-beverage advertising from the Journal of the American Medical Association, effective January 1, 1954, in the face of heavy loss in income from such advertising.

We beg our national body of legislators to serve the citizens of our country in like manner and free our homes and our children of the influence of alcoholic-beverage advertising. Our television sets are being rendered worse than useless and our children are being led to believe that alcohol is harmless and to glorify crime by such advertising.

In the interest of this we respectfully request you to use your influence to support the Bryson bill (H. R. 1227), and vote for it. Public hearing to be held at Washington, May 19, 20, 21.

Springfield, Mass.: Mrs. David H. Brown, Mrs. Edward C. Grandy, Mrs. Henry C. Tarbell, Mrs. E. P. Caldwell, Mrs. W. A. Aschenbach, Mrs. Charles H. Bent, Ethel Matthews, Mrs. Andrew H. Westervelt, Mrs. Edwin S. Brooks, Marjorie M. Eaton, Elizabeth Cone, Effie E. Littlefield, Mrs. Lelia R. Vanderscoff, Mrs. Wallace Powers, Mrs. W. Harold Miner, Mrs. Nellie Rosenberg, Mary E. Bemis, Jessie Dinnie, Mrs. Carmella Bruno, Mrs. Ralph M. Cohen, Hope S. Massee, Eva Luke, Margaret Macleod, Dorothy W. Jacobs, Carrie E. Hoppe, Dorothy I. Ramey, Mrs. Bessie Sicard, Mrs. Minnie W. Randall, Mrs. Mary Murdock, Mrs. A. J. Moselle, Miss Mildred A. Tyler, Mrs. Lucy M. Raynor, Mrs. Laura Fanning, Mrs. Ethel Carr, Mrs. Alma Vance, Beulah M. Kennedy, Edith L. Hughes, Gladys H. Hubbard, Ida M. Woods, Rose C. Mahoney, James E. Mahoney, Miriam K. Freedman, Edna P. Goold, Evangeline W. Shaw, Gladys D. Williams, Ellen L. Steele, Lillian E. Rhoades, Harriet Knapp, Alice M. Rose, Gladys W. Worcester, Alma R. Walters, Ivah Sibley, Clara Henshaw, Alice Seaver, Ruth Beebe, Netta Davies, Anna A. Riggin, Susie P. Morgan, Mary S. Goodenough, Freda M. Carter, Mrs. Ralph M. Cohen, E. G. Moselle, Elizabeth S. Abbe, Mrs. Alma Walters, Frank A. Walters, Gertrude M. Woods, Walter A. Aschenbach, Pauline Stever, Isabelle Asborne, Vivian Sabourin, Fred G. Mallalieu, Sr., Fred G. Mallalieu, Jr., Mrs. Paul E. Potter, Irene O. Dorman, O. Rowena Blake, Leon Tinkham, Mrs. H. E. Fillmore, Olive M. Allen, Mary Falvey, Elizabeth Whispel, Harry Fillmore, Paul A. Neal, Lois Neal, Bella H. Leete, Gordon Martin, Rev. John B. Lewis, Mrs. Charles Edson, Mrs. Helen Mason, Charles D. Edson, Bertha M. Cross, Mary I. Allen, Mildred J. Parsons, Jennie Eva Aldrich, Clarke T. Parsons, Lawson H. Simpson, Robert W. Rosenberg, Charles S. Marriott, Edith M. Davis, Charles E. Davis, Charles B. Fitts, Florence G. Fitts, Wilhelmine Munson, Cecil J. Cummings, Annie M. Thomson, John D. Banks, Evelyn F. Halstead, Harriet B. Hollingworth, William G. Hollingworth, Ida V. Rodenhizer, Laura M. Savoy, Grace M. Barth, Henrietta S. Manley, Lulu R. Crane, Lila M. Penney, Ruth S. Field, Wordley J. Kline, George H. Foss, Aleck Donello, Albert Cluley, James R. Smitherman, Mrs. A. Cluley, Douglas R. Kline, Mrs. Mary Crofton, Carl Crofton, Mrs. Sylvia Foss, Mrs. T. M. Burgoyne, Winona Blair, Mrs. Lillian Blair, Grace Reynolds, Dixon Wetherbe, Judith L. Foss, Elizabeth Trask, Carmen Rainboth, H. A. Hewins, Robert W. Mello, Glenn Rhodes, Eva G. Hucks, Harry O. Reimers, Jr., R. E. Martin, Nathan D. Case, Mrs. I. C. Bradway, Elsie M. Converse.

West Springfield, Mass.: Mrs. Lowell R. Kantzer, Mrs. John F. Schutt, Mrs. Harvey C. Holland, Ruth L. Brocklebank, Mildred A. Meiers, Beatrice T. Baldwin, Beatrice P. DeLano, Jean Hemmings, William J. Hemmings, Mrs. V. Hemmings, Rosemary Hemmings.

Ludlow, Mass.: Charlotte W. McChesney, Rachel F. White, Doris V. Moore, Vera J. O'Brien, Edward F. O'Brien, Marion M. White, Margaretta Robbins, Arlene Begin, Natalie T. Ashwell, Raymond S. Ashwell, Dorothy H. Wallace, Eunice W. Nelson, William H. Nelson, Herbert L. McChesney, John F. Pelham, Mr. and Mrs. Wallace Dunlap, Emery L. Wallace, Mrs. James B. Fenney.

Feeding Hills, Mass.: Shirley M. Williams, Norma Whitaker, Edith Minney, Lucy A. West, Rachel Williams, Thomas C. Williams, Earle M. Williams, Frances Williams, John A. Caswell, Clara S. Caswell, William G. Campbell.

Agawam, Mass.: Eleanor B. Benson, Dorothy A. Wright, Lois C. Buiniskas, Elsie M. Thomas, Glenn A. Rainboth, Evelyn Rainboth.

Longmeadow, Mass.: Marie A. Peters, Violet V. Whipple, Mrs. Robert J. Bjorn, Mrs. E. A. Sundburg, Mildred S. Westbrooke, Flora J. Strout.

East Longmeadow, Mass.: Ruth B. Kimball, Mrs. Ernest Bass, Ernest O. Bass, Harvey O. Reimers.

Indian Orchard, Mass.: Irene Castonguay, Glenn C. Stewart, Maurice Castonguay.

Chicopee, Mass.: Armand Desmarais, Glenn O. Thorp, Charles Dyer, Mrs. Glenn Thorp.

Amherst, Mass.: Paul C. Bumpus, Sarah L. Bumpus.

North Wilbraham, Mass.: Harry C. Pendleton, Mrs. H. Pendleton.

Wilbraham, Mass.: Annette B. Flocken, Violet R. Strong.

Granby, Mass.: George N. Glauska, Robert M. Carpenter, Alice R. Nutting, Gertrude Burgess.

World Trade Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 19, 1954

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, the Greater Philadelphia area is this week marking the 20th annual observance of World Trade Week. This observance will focus attention on the importance of world trade to full employment, a higher standard of living, and to our overall economic wellbeing.

The following events will take place in Philadelphia, the country's second largest port during the week of May 16–22, 1954:

Sunday, May 16, International Aviation Day. Events: Displays by airlines, movies, exhibits of equipment, special events at International Airport.

Monday, May 17, International Commerce and Industry Day. Events: Opening of window, interior store, bank, and so forth displays; open houses; world-trade week ads start; special publicity for participating firms.

Tuesday, May 18, International Friendship Day. Events: Special programs in schools, by Rotary, Kiwanis, other clubs, World Affairs Council—international cultural, scientific relations.

Wednesday, May 19, International Exhibition Day. Events: Opening of World Trade Exhibition at Commercial Museum; unveiling of plans for North Building; foreign dress fashion show.

Thursday, May 20, World Trade Conference Day. Events: Luncheon, Henri Bonnet, French Ambassador, speaker; panel discussions on various aspects of export-import business; dinner, nationally known speaker, Bellevue-Stratford Hotel.

Friday, May 21, Port Day. Events: Harbor festival; annual maritime day cruise on Wilson Lines.

Philadelphia is one of the more important centers of the export and import business. This port handles more tonnage than any other in the United States with the exception of New York. The industrial and commercial growth of the Delaware Valley in the field of international commerce is expected to continue in the years ahead.

Philadelphia is to be commended upon its fine observance of World Trade Week which I am sure will be among the most outstanding in the United States. The members of the committee and all of those who devoted so much of their time and energy to this observance are to be commended for their fine work.

Certificate of Merit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT P. MORANO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 19, 1954

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, it has long been a part of my political philosophy that among our best good-will ambassadors are our private enterprise establishments that engage in foreign trade. Outstanding among these is Pan American World Airways which, while not certificated to fly in our domestic field, spans its great wings to the four corners of the world.

Recently, in recognition of its many accomplishments in the field of international good will, Pan American was cited by Mr. Theodore C. Streibert, Director of the United States Information Agency. Many reasons were behind the certificate of merit awarded to Pan American World Airways by USIA, all of which are outlined in Mr. Streibert's letter to Pan American President Juan T. Trippe, who lives in my hometown, Greenwich, Conn.

I wish to call particular attention to one paragraph of Mr. Streibert's letter to Mr. Trippe, which says:

> I also want to thank you for the fine cooperation extended to our Office of Private Cooperation in connection with these activities. I hope this association with the information program by private organizations such as yours may be even more productive in the future so that, as President Eisenhower envisioned, "the minds of men, the hopes of men, the souls of men everywhere can move toward peace, and happiness, and well-being."

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include this testimonial to a great example of American free enterprise in the Record:

United States Information Agency,
Washington, April 15, 1954.

Mr. Juan T. Trippe,
President, Pan American
World Airways, New York, N. Y.

My Dear Mr. Trippe: The United States Information Agency, in recognition of the importance of voluntary private participation in helping to develop world understanding of American concepts and purposes, is awarding a certificate of merit to organizations which have made a real contribution.

I feel that Pan American World Airways, its management and staff, have made a noteworthy contribution through its regular public relations work, and through its many special projects. Outstanding among the projects undertaken are the special flight to the United States of the Egyptian Town Hall Mission, the transporting of exhibits to South American countries in connection with Dr. Milton Eisenhower's tour, the distribution of the tourist booklet, What Should I Know When I Travel Abroad? to Americans traveling overseas so that they might realize their importance as goodwill ambassadors for the United States, and distribution abroad of highlights and texts of President Eisenhower's speeches. The assistance given by Pan American World Airways in these and other instances is helping to achieve overseas the information and cultural objectives of our country.

It is a pleasure to award this certificate of merit of the United States Information Agency to Pan American World Airways.

I also want to thank you for the fine cooperation extended to our Office of Private Cooperation in connection with these activities. I hope that this association with the information program by private organizations such as yours may be even more productive in the future so that, as President Eisenhower envisioned, "the minds of men, the hopes of men, the souls of men everywhere can move toward peace and happiness and well-being."

Sincerely yours,

Theodore C. Streibert,
Director.

Indochina: How the Folks at Home Feel About It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 10, 1954

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including a letter I have just received from a constituent who expresses his views on the situation relating to Indochina. His letter is identical with many others I have received on the same subject. It reads as follows:

Hon. Lawrence H. Smith,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Smith: This is an expression of opinion from one of the little men back home—one of your ardent supporters—an honest opinion that has developed from listening to bickerings at Washington, and reading of bickerings of nations at Geneva.

We should not under any circumstance, consider sending American men abroad to fight another nation's battle, and in particular, to Indochina, the current so-called hot-spot. Since 1946, yes, and before 1946, we have been attempting to support the free world, and all we have gotten for our philanthropic endeavors, is a label likening ourselves to a power-grabbing nation—a nation that considers itself first because of our wealth, developed through years of application, efforts, and initiative.

Some few short years ago France had an opportunity to gain respect, and prestige, by releasing Indochina from its stranglehold of exploitation, and permit the Indochinese to govern themselves. This was not done, as France through its selfishness decided that the natives were not intelligent enough for self-government, and that the potential wealth of Indochina should fill the pockets of the politicians back home. The lack of intelligence was in Paris, as this decision made the ground fertile for communism. From reports and records, Indochina was not anti-Communist, but anti-French, with the result that the fight there will spread until the French are driven out of the country.

Paris is now asking us to intervene and protect her Asian possession, not only with money and materiel, but with manpower, not caring a hoot about the result to the United States as long as Indochina remains in her possession.

How many years are the American people expected to finance other nations that to all intents and purposes are not interested in self-preservation? There are a few instances where our money has been used to good advantage—Greece, Turkey, Finland, West Germany, and Japan—but the unselfish aid given to our so-called allies Great Britain and France, has had an adverse effect. They are more than reluctant to admit our generosity has helped them tremendously, and to the contrary, both are extremely critical of our well-being, and are continuously asking for more of the share-the-wealth plan.

It is about time our Government, composed of representatives of the people, consider the welfare of the majority, which is their first purpose for being in Washington, and stop thinking that the taxes collected must be distributed all over the globe. It apparently has never occurred to the majority in Congress that there is a limit as to the potentiality of wealth in the United States, and with the continuing of free spending such as has never been seen, or even thought possible, we will, without too much further effort, be the bankrupt Nation Russia hopes we will be.

It is unfortunate that we do not have the firmness in our Government that Teddy Roosevelt demonstrated, and through which gained world respect for these United States. There appears to be no honest confidence in our ability to take the consequences of refusals to render additional financial, or physical aid, to those countries that apparently are incapable to help themselves to some extent. Until such a stand is taken, we will continue to have unjust criticism thrown at us from all parts of the world, which is something every clear-minded citizen of the United States resents.

Is it impossible for our governing body to think and act along these lines?

Sincerely,

——— ———.

Of Law and Religion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 26, 1954

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to direct the attention of our colleagues to the following very fine editorial which appeared in the Washington Post and Times-Herald of May 18, 1954:

> On behalf of some of his constituents, Senator Flanders has introduced a proposed constitutional amendment that flies in the face of the basic principles on which our Government was established. The proposal declares that "this Nation devoutly recognizes the authority and law of Jesus Christ, Saviour and ruler of nations, through whom are bestowed the blessings of Almighty God." A Senate judiciary subcommittee has heard witnesses in support of the amendment.

Undoubtedly those who want this addition to the Constitution are well intentioned. But adoption of such language would have a divisive rather than a unifying effect, and it would not further the cause of religion. It would lead to endless argument as to what the law of Christ is; today there are scores of Christian denominations that cannot agree in their interpretation of that law. It would be ridiculous to think that a secular authority could resolve those differences and make clear the meaning of the amendment.

The Constitution says that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." That provision has served us well and has safeguarded the rights of all religious groups. It would be extreme folly for a nation made up of different religious groups to alter that noble part of the Constitution even by indirection. The brotherhood of man and the fatherhood of God are not furthered by attempts to write religious dogma into the law of the land. Senator FLANDERS' greatest contribution now would be to withdraw his resolution.

Removal of New York Quartermaster Purchasing Agency to Philadelphia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 19, 1954

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, appended is the correspondence from Hon. Harold Keller, commissioner of the New York State Department of Commerce, to which I referred in my address on the floor of the House today. Commissioner Keller points out that the removal of the New York Quartermaster Agency to Philadelphia will result in no savings to the Government but actually an increase in cost:

STATE OF NEW YORK,
DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
Albany, May 17, 1954.

Hon. JACOB K. JAVITS,
United States House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR JACK: Our department has analyzed the study made by the Army on which it made its decision to remove the New York Quartermaster Purchasing Agency to Philadelphia. Our analysis raises grave doubts as to the purported savings in this move, and I am attaching a copy of a letter to Secretary Stevens urging that the order be rescinded and that the purchasing operations of the Quartermaster Corps be combined in New York City.

You may want to take further appropriate action in support of this objective.

Sincerely,

HAROLD KELLER.

STATE OF NEW YORK,
DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
Albany, May 17, 1954.

Hon. ROBERT T. STEVENS,
Secretary of the Army,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SECRETARY STEVENS: On March 26 I wrote to you expressing my concern with the proposed removal of certain functions of the Quartermaster Purchasing Agency from New York City to Philadelphia. At that time I urged strongly that those Quartermaster functions now performed in New York City be retained there.

On May 3, the Department of Defense announced that the New York City Quartermaster Purchasing Agency would be relocated in the Philadelphia Quartermaster Depot as soon as arrangements could be completed. This announcement stated that a study of the proposed transfer had shown that an annual savings of some $700,000 would be realized.

I have examined the series of charts prepared by the Army as a result of this study which attempts to illustrate that a net annual savings of $400,000, rather than $700,000, will be effected. This material presents several claims which are either unsupported by fact or which do not take into account all of the elements necessary to substantiate claimed savings as net savings. It is quite possible, using the Army's material, to conclude that there will be a net increase in cost if the Quartermaster Purchasing Agency is moved to Philadelphia.

The following points are offered for your earnest consideration:

1. The presentation states that the industries (producing or manufacturing plants) which supply the Quartermaster Corps are as accessible to Philadelphia as to New York. To illustrate this point, the study includes such States as North and South Carolina, Georgia, and Florida in the Philadelphia orbit. It does not include metropolitan New Jersey, a large producer of apparel and textiles, less than 10 miles distant from Manhattan, in the New York City orbit.

While this method of analysis is subject to serious question, the point which this portion of the studies attempts to make has little bearing on the proposed transfer. The location of producing plants has little relationship to the purchasing function. With rare exception, purchasing is a matter of negotiation between the Quartermaster Purchasing Agency and the main office or sales office of the supplying company. These offices—the actual points of contact with the Quartermaster Purchasing Agency—are shown by the Army's study to be heavily concentrated in the New York metropolitan region. Of all the contractors in the country supplying commodities to the Quartermaster Purchasing Agency, 37 percent are located within 45 miles of New York City, while only 8 percent are within 45 miles of Philadelphia.

2. Certain items of new expense have been ignored in arriving at an estimated net annual saving. According to the Army's study, the functions of the New York Quartermaster purchasing office, which employ the greatest number of people, are those functions requiring expert and trained personnel. More than half of the 987 civilian employees of the New York agency are engaged in purchasing and inspection. On the basis of figures presented by the study in its estimate of "cost of moving," only approximately half of the present New York City employees will move to Philadelphia. Quite probably even a smaller percentage of technical personnel will move. It will be not only costly but difficult to recruit replacements for these technical people in Philadelphia and even more costly to train them in the details and techniques of the Quartermaster operation. Private industry estimates the cost of training technical or subprofessional employees at from $3,000 to $20,000 each. Using the minimum figure, this will constitute a very substantial item of new expense which will be added by the move to Philadelphia.

The charts estimate savings in certain "miscellaneous activities" by the elimination of various jobs which are considered duplicatory. One of several examples is in personnel assigned to "Signal Communications." At the present time the existing Philadelphia operation is staffed by 10 employees and the New York City operation is staffed by 30 employees in this category. The study indicates an elimination of half of this total, or 20 employees. Although the plan calls for removing from New York City where communications with the greatest concentration of its suppliers are a matter of telephone or subway usage, it claims that it can service all communications for the combined operation with less than the number of people now assigned to this function in New York alone. Even if this were possible, no consideration has been given to the increased cost of communications. Instead of local telephone and subway contact with suppliers, the agency will substitute long-distance phone calls, individual letters involving expensive time to process, and increased travel expenditures on the part of the Quartermaster personnel. This is another of many new expenses which were ignored in arriving at a conclusion of "net savings" in the proposed removal.

Almost the entire claimed net savings of $400,000 is represented by savings in personnel salary. On a general basis, the study claims that duplicate administrative services can be eliminated. The charts do not support this general claim. Of the 114 jobs which will be eliminated, only 41 are classified as being assigned to administrative services.

3. The study states that a purchasing office can be located satisfactorily in any large communication and transportation center on the eastern seaboard because of the fact that the producing industries (the manufacturing plants) are concentrated on the eastern seaboard of the United States. This statement might be true in relation to a warehousing or distribution function. It definitely is not true in relation to the purchasing function which has a unique requirement for successful and economic operation—location as close as possible to the greatest concentration of negotiating offices.

This concentration is overwhelmingly in or adjacent to New York City. However, if the only means of economic operation is to consolidate the New York and Philadelphia operations, it is as reasonable to assume that duplicatory personnel could be eliminated by combining these operations in New York City as it is to make the same assumption for a combined operation in Philadelphia. As the communication and transportation center of the entire Nation, New York, by the Army's own definition, would be a more advantageous and economic location than Philadelphia for those quartermaster functions now located in the latter city. In addition, if the matter of expense to the general business community which supplies the quartermaster agency is of any concern, it can be demonstrated that a combined operation would be more economic to all concerned in New York City than could possibly be the case in Philadelphia.

4. The Department of Defense news release announcing the removal of the New York Quartermaster Purchasing Agency to Philadelphia states that "the move to Philadelphia is in conformity with Department of Defense policy to relinquish leased space wherever possible, to accomplish maximum possible utilization of Government-owned space, and to effect utmost economies through consolidation of activities."

"Utmost economies through consolidation of activities" can be realized in existing and available Government-owned space either at the Army or Navy Brooklyn bases. Both bases have ample, suitable, and available Government-owned space for the combined quartermaster operations. To devote it to this purpose would accomplish maximum possible utilization of Government-owned space in the New York City area.

I respectfully call to your attention an additional policy of the Department of Defense embraced in Federal law 413, 1948, and Armed Services Procurement Regulation, section 4, subject: "Coordinated Procurement," part 4-000 (c), dealing with the procurement of items used in common by all branches of the Armed Forces. I suggest that the proposal to move the quartermaster purchasing function to Philadelphia does not coincide with the intent of this law and directive in that it would result in separating the consolidated purchasing of many items now procured by the New York Quartermaster Purchasing Agency.

In conclusion, it is my opinion that the Army studies have shown no basis whatsoever for determining that the transfer of the New York Purchasing Agency to Philadelphia would result in any real or net savings to the Government. On the contrary, they suggest that very real savings could be realized by transferring to New York any functions of the Quartermaster Corps now conducted in Philadelphia which must be combined with those now conducted in New York. I suggest that this course would be more in conformity with the stated policy of the Department of Defense than the removal of the New York City purchasing function to Philadelphia.

I urge very strongly that the order for removal of the functions of the Quartermaster Purchasing Agency from New York to Philadelphia be rescinded and that you give immediate consideration to removing those purchasing functions now performed in Philadelphia to New York City where they can be combined with the functions of the Quartermaster Corps Purchasing Agency to the benefit of the Government, the armed services, and the Nation as a whole.

Sincerely yours,

HAROLD KELLER,
Commissioner of Commerce.

The Place for Your Burdens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER JOHNSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 19, 1954

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to place in the RECORD a sermon delivered by Dr. Albert P. Shirkey on February 14, 1954, at the Mount Vernon Place Methodist Church.

I wish to commend in particular for my colleagues' attention that part of his sermon which deals with methods of combating Communists here and abroad. There are many of us, including myself, who are as strongly opposed to communism as some people who shout the loudest and constantly seek headlines for their efforts.

Dr. Shirkey, in his sermon, emphasizes the fact that we need a positive approach in our fight against the encroachments of Communists. As he points out, we must solve the social and economic problems that provide the seedbeds for Communist doctrines to take root.

Following is Dr. Shirkey's sermon:

THE PLACE FOR YOUR BURDENS

(By Dr. Albert P. Shirkey)

"Cast your burden on the Lord, and He will sustain you" (Psalm 55: 22).

I, personally, am indebted to the late Dr. George W. Truett for pointing out to us that the Bible has three things to say concerning our burdens:

1. Every man is to bear his own burden.
2. Bear ye one another's burdens and so fulfill the law of Christ.
3. Cast your burden on the Lord and He shall sustain thee.

This is all that the Bible tells us about our burdens and it doesn't need to say another word for it covers the complete field.

BEAR YOUR OWN BURDEN

Learn to stand upon your own two feet, upright as a child of God, under all manner of suffering, difficulty and trial, learn to be strong. This is the underlining theme of the Bible. There is much in our educational philosophy today, much in the field of psychology that has a tendency to make people weak, showing them that they are not really responsible for so much in their life. The tendency is to shift the responsibility to one's environment, or to one's bloodstream, but the New Testament teaches that regardless of what comes or what brings it, we are to be strong, not weak. I believe we would make a real contribution to the world about us if we learned the habit of not complaining and whining every time a little thing happens. We would relieve the situation in our homes, in our busines world and in our work-a-day world if we would learn to stand upright as good soldiers of Jesus Christ. "Be strong, we are not here to dream, to drift, we have hard work to do and loads to lift. Shun not the struggle, face it, 'tis God's gift, be strong." "A charge to keep I have, a God to glorify; A never dying soul to save and fit it for the sky. To serve my present age, my calling to fulfill and may it all my powers engage, to do my Master's Will." This is the message of both poet and prophet. The tone of the Christian philosophy of life is to be a good soldier. Take your own share of suffering and stop whining and complaining.

I remember a lesson that I learned when I was just a boy playing on the farm, in the midst of a lot of puppies. We had a thoroughbred bird dog and she had given us this little family. Dad had stopped with me to play with the puppies. Presently, he took a puppy by the back of his neck and held it up without a sound out of the puppy. I had other dogs on the farm and you could pick them up and they would do a lot of complaining about it. I said to my father, "Why doesn't this dog whimper and whine like my puppy." He said to me, "Son, a thoroughbred puppy never whines." That made a great impression on me when I was a child and I have been asking myself all through the years—"God help me to be a thoroughbred so that I can keep my complaining and my whining away from people and stand upon my own two feet—take the disappointments and the trials and troubles of life like a good soldier."

We are individual people, regardless of how we are bound together in a family, regardless of how we are bound together in society or in groups. You are an individual—there are some things that as an individual you are going to do and no one can do it for you. No one else can repent for you. You are an individual and you must repent for your own sins; no one in the world can believe on the Lord Jesus Christ to save your soul but you yourself. Regardless of how much we love and how tenderly we want to do it, no one will ever be able to go down into the valley of the shadow with you, no human friend. No one in the world will be able to take your place before the judgment seat of Christ. You must stand there alone, and I must stand there alone. We are individuals. Then—may God help us to be strong, to be able to stand on our own feet and be a good soldier. Let us quit whimpering and complaining about everything, and, like a good soldier, learn to stand up and take it.

I believe, of course, that there is a place when faced with the great things of life when we need a friend and when we need to share life with someone. I am not talking about these great things; I am talking about all of these little things. There are times when we need a friend. There isn't any question about that. We need, in such an hour, to find someone who is able to share it with us if we are going to make it.

CAST YOUR BURDEN ON GOD

Here is the second truth of this text—"Cast your burden on the Lord and He shall sustain you." This is the art of being able to take our burdens and put them on God. That's the reason why a lot of people do a lot of complaining and a lot of whimpering, because they have never learned the art of taking their troubles to God. A woman got on a bus with a large, heavy package. When she sat down on the bus she put the package on her lap. The man who sat across from her couldn't stand it any longer so he said, "Madam, I would suggest to you that the bus is capable of carrying both you and your package." Then she put it down on the floor and let the bus carry it. You know it would be a wonderful thing if you ever learned the art of taking the burden that is on your mind and heart and putting it on the heart of God where it belongs instead of letting it break your life as it is doing. It is sapping your energy, taking the joy and the gladness from your spirit, and taking away the lightness from your step—all because you do not put the packages down where they belong.

God is a shock absorber; didn't you know that? My dad taught all of his boys to hunt and how to shoot a gun. He took me up one day and he aimed a gun at a tree and said, "Now you pull the trigger." I was only a very small boy and instead of having the gun up against my shoulder he had it up against his shoulder, and when the gun went off, dad was the one who absorbed the shock. We have a Heavenly Father who does the same thing. A wonderful thing for us to learn is the art of living so close to God that when the great shocks come, He is the one who will take it. "Cast your burden on God and He shall sustain you." He will be the one who will carry you up in His hands and give you the strength that you need for every step of the way. Not long ago I read this about a certain woman: Somebody said to her, "How in the world did you ever raise these children as a widow, how did you ever do all of this work, how did you do these impossible things that you have done?" She went to the calendar and said, "Because they only came 1 day at a time"—just 1 day at a time. God isn't going to give you today what you are going to need for tomorrow. Just believe me, He will not. He will give you tomorrow what you are going to need for tomorrow. Why? Because if He did, you would walk by sight and not by faith. He wants us to walk each day holding His hand and saying, "Father, another day has arrived, come now and walk with me. Let us bear the burdens together." "Cast your burden on God and He will sustain you." This is one of life's great certainties.

BEAR ONE ANOTHER'S BURDENS

Now there is another truth in burden bearing added to the other two: "Bear you own burdens, cast your burdens on God." It is, "Bear ye one another's burdens and so fulfill the law of Christ." It is amazing how people rally to this thing of bearing a public burden. Did you ever see some disaster overtake an area such as a great explosion that almost destroys a city? Have you ever been near an area where they had a volcano eruption? It is inspiring to see the people getting together to bear up under their common burden. Have you ever seen the grasshoppers come across the land devouring everything in their way, then see the people sharing their burdens together? Have you ever seen the shifting sands cover up the green grass in the fields, then see people bearing their burdens together?

Have you ever been in a depression and noticed the people bearing their burdens together? Have you ever been in a war situation and watched the soul of a people rise to a place where they can be counted on?

"Bear ye one another's burdens and so fulfill the law of Christ." Now, of all the burdens that have been faced in our world—I am going to measure my words when I say this—of all of the burdens that we have faced in our world—pestilence, famine, depression, wars and rumors of wars, duststorms, fire and explosion, and all of the rest, the greatest burden that the world has ever faced since the dawn of history is the burden of communism. It presses down on the world with a weight that is so terrific that there is no way to express it. It makes its way into children's minds behind the Iron Curtain, changing their total life. It has changed the life of youth, changed the social order of people, changed their outlook, erased from them their religious convictions and continues to make inroads here, there, and everywhere across the world. The burden that the world is under right now is the burden of communism, and it is a terrific burden. I hate communism.

WHAT IS COMMUNISM?

It is a godless obsession, a freedom-killing passion, an individual crushing philosophy, and a ruthless destroyer of the democratic way of life. Whoever he is who falls for communism is wrapped up in not one, but all, of these things.

Communism is as subtle as a snake and as deadly; it is as cunning as a fox and as elusive; as cruel as the wolf and as bloodthirsty; and, as life draining as a leech. Let him who has eyes, see. Let him see this thing as it is, weigh it for what it is worth. It is the mother of lies and the brother of false hopes. It leads to but one end—a precipice. It is the sister of disaster, and its followers ride the pale horse of death. To be in its coils is like a diver in the suction tentacles of an octopus, or a hunter caught in the tightening hold of a python. It is as conscienceless as a stone, and, like Judas, kisses man and hails him as master, all the while working for his complete overthrow.

This is what you mean when you call a man a Communist. Therefore, it is a heinously wicked thing to call a man a Communist if he is not one.

Now I believe that there are positive ways of meeting the issues. And I believe that our approach must be positive. In the first place, there is the approach that we do not like, but we must have, it is the approach of the police action around the world that says to these opposing forces, "You shall not pass." Wherever communism raises its ugly head, in any part of the world, the freedom loving people of the world must rise in this police action to say, "We will not let you pass." This must be done. This is not the best approach but it is a positively necessary approach. We must have it, just as you must have a police action in this city against all of the forces that would tear it asunder. Secondly, we must see to it that we give ourselves unreservedly as a people across this Nation to the crusade for freedom and to understand that when we do it we are giving ourselves for the peace of the world, and are giving courage and confidence to the people behind the Iron Curtain to shake off the shackles of communism and be free. We are giving to the peoples across the boundaries of the world, where communism has settled down, the opportunity to know that they have friends on this side of the curtain. Nothing will give them more heart and courage.

Another positive approach must be made to discover where communism makes its inroads into life—and one of the places is where the economic order is low, where there is hunger, nakedness, poverty. Here communism comes in and gets a foothold. We must so share with the rest of the world until there isn't a spot across the world where communism can get in. Another place where it has been coming in, is not only where people are hungry, and where there is desperate need, but where there are bad race relations. These are the places where communism is making its greatest inroads. Somehow or other, by the Grace of God, and it's going to take the Grace of God to do it, we must stop communism in its onward march.

Our approach must always be a positive one. One of the greatest of all mistakes would be the wrong kind of an approach in getting rid of communism. One of the bad approaches in getting rid of communism is to try to burn the books in which these ideas exist. Now, you will recall that a few months ago I had a lot to say about the age of burning books. When I stated from this pulpit that once you begin to burn the ideas that are latent in the books and libraries of the world you are not far from the place where you desire to burn the men behind the ideas—to burn the lives of the people where these ideas exist. A lot of people took me to task for that. They did not like that statement, they thought it was farfetched, and just out of line. I hold in my hands a newspaper clipping, a statement of one of our great governors—Gov. Allen Shivers, of Texas. He is a personal friend of mine. However, in this approach I think he is definitely wrong. He is seeking the death penalty for every Communist in the country. Two months have passed since we heard about the burning of the books and now the Governor comes up with exactly what I said someone would—"when we burn the books we are not far from burning men," and here is a man wanting to put all of the Communists to death. Let's analyze it for a second—what committee is going to be selected to be the judge of who is a Communist—do you know any committee in this Nation you would trust to be the judge on that score? There are three legally constituted committees operating in this country. Would you trust any of the three of them? They have made glaring mistakes and continuous mistakes, and added to this they have made hit and runs into certain areas—absolutely assassinating the character of men. A long time ago Shakespeare said something like this, "He who steals my purse steals trash, but he who steals my good name takes that which does not enrich him and leaves me poor indeed." He that would take a man's good name and brand him with being a Red—when he is nothing of the kind—has taken that which leaves a man poor indeed. Many of these men, who themselves have had their characters assassinated will never be able to rise again and their children will will not be able to do it either, because of the stigma attached to them. Had Governor Shivers, of Texas, had his way of putting all Communists to death, these men in certain areas of our country who have been proven not to be Communists would have been dead. What are we going to do with a thing like that? If we would get a hate movement started in this country by saying we are going to put all Communists to death, do you know what somebody is likely to come up with? Let us put all Catholics to death, let's put all Jews to death, let us put all Protestants to death. It is possible that somebody will come up with the suggestion—let us put all the Republicans to death. And then somebody will make the suggestion, why not the Democrats? And then somebody will come up with the suggestion, why not put all of the men who were once Democrats who voted the Republican ticket, to death? And that, I might say to you, would put my friend Governor Shivers on the roster to be destroyed. And, if they were going to kill Catholics, it would put his wife on the roster to be destroyed. You can't start a hate movement in America, of any kind, of any description, against anybody. I know some people in this country who hate Republicans more than they do Communists. You cannot get a hate movement going in these United States without imperiling every group in this country. A hate movement now, with the death penalty for every Communist, might erect a place of execution in every crossroads of the Nation. France did it with the guillotine, gushing forth its crimson flow of blood upon the city streets. Spain did it and lost 2 million lives in her civil war. The idea of the great Governor is unthinkable. No, Allen Shivers, as much as I love you as a friend, never has any man said a thing that was perhaps not meditated on long enough. When we have a movement to destroy men who disagree with us—believe me, it will tear America apart.

What is America, anyway? America is not a color, it is not a creed, it is not a class, it is not a condition—what is America? America is a spirit, it is a spirit of those who are so passionately in love with freedom that they will dare to work together in order to attain that freedom—that's America—and you touch a Catholic in this country and no Protestant is free—you touch a Jew and no Catholic is free. Freedom shall be our possession only as long as we give to every other man the rights and privileges we ask for ourselves. You remember the incident when Simon came over and took a sword in the Garden of Gethsemane and cut off a man's ear and Jesus said to him, "Simon, put away your sword, put it up, put it in its sheath. Simon, my Kingdom shall not come this way, my Kingdom shall come with better ideas, with better ideals, with a better life, my Kingdom will come with a better spirit or it shall not come." Our method is a positive method—it is a method of giving a better standard of life, a better set of ideas, a better set of ideals, a better life everywhere in order that men might have freedom. This is the way to conquer communism. Little by little the walls will start crumbling and it shall be written in the record books of history, "They conquered, because they outthought, and they outlived commuism." That's our way to victory.

Bear ye one another's burdens—we are in this thing together. And may God help us in our little part of the world to do the kind of thing that will rid this world of the terrible pressure that falls down upon us—in the way that God himself has ordained that all of His causes shall win. "Not by might and power alone but by my Spirit," says the Lord of Hosts.

PRAYER

Our Father, this hurtful, dreadful thing called communism has come like a cancer eating at civilization's heart. It is a monster that strides across the world without conscience and without a heart. Give unto us the ability through every positive means open to us to defend by writing, speaking, living, working, in order to keep our Nation free. With malice toward none and brotherhood for all may we strive to build a better America—a better world. Keep our feet on the sure and solid path that leads to final victory. It is a long hard pull, but make us men who are willing to endure. In Thy Holy Name. Amen.

Congratulations Kiwanis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDMUND P. RADWAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 19, 1954

Mr. RADWAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to congratulate

Kiwanis International on the patriotic work it is doing in distributing three-quarters of a million pamphlets each month on Americanism.

Time and again we Americans are warned that we just take our Americanism and our American way of life for granted. Such apathy is not the way and will not make for dynamic Americanism. To plug this hole, the Kiwanis Clubs in the United States are performing a great service in the fight against all things un-American. This they are doing in a very affirmative way to engender the necessary enthusiasm which should be present in the heart of every American. The present program of Kiwanis International is consistent with the interest that they have always displayed in good government, and is one of the finest assists that they can give at this time in the preservation of our way of life.

The first 3 in the series of minuteman pamphlets have already been placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD under date of May 13. I found them not only very interesting but 100 percent American.

The Jewish Cultural Heritage in the Library of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. D. ROOSEVELT, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 10, 1954

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call attention to the article which appeared in the April–May 1954 issue of Jewish Voice Pictorial entitled "The Jewish Cultural Heritage in the Library of Congress." This very interesting article concerning the collection in the Library of Congress of works dealing with the Jewish cultural heritage was written by Murray Frank who is known to many of us in his capacity as assistant to Congressman HELLER, of New York.

The article follows:

THE JEWISH CULTURAL HERITAGE IN THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

(By Murray Frank)

The Library of Congress in Washington is universally recognized as the greatest institution of its kind, with huge collections in every sphere of civilization and culture created by man since the dawn of history. There is hardly a nation whose major cultural creations are not found in one of the Library's sections. Housed under the same roof with the huge collections of Americana, the great European literatures, the cultural wealth of the Hispanic, Arabic, Oriental, Slavic, and other civilizations, is also the collection of Judaica which has taken on added importance in recent postwar years.

The Jewish section of the Congressional Library is now celebrating 40 years of its existence as a central depository of Jewish cultural treasures of the past and present. The section, however, is more than a mere collecting station for books, manuscripts, and documents in Hebrew, Yiddish, and other Semitic languages. It is a very important center of culture, research, and information about all aspects of Jewish life throughout the ages all over the world. Its significance as such has grown immeasurably in the past decade since the destruction by the Nazis of the great Jewish libraries and Jewish book treasures in Europe during World War II.

Today the Library's Jewish section ranks among the 3 of 4 largest Jewish libraries in the world, others being the National Library of the Hebrew University in Jerusalem, the Library of the Jewish Theological Seminary in New York, and the fine collection of the Yiddish Scientific Institute in New York.

If we were to include all books and manuscripts about Jews and Judaism which the Library of Congress possesses in all languages, it would make the largest collection of its kind in the world. Although assembled under one roof, it is actually not located in one section but is scattered over several sections in the Library. The Jewish Section itself contains about 40,000 volumes in Hebrew, 12,000 in Yiddish, and many thousands of newspapers and periodicals in these languages. That is not all, however. Under the Jewish section's jurisdiction are also to be found some 200,000 volumes about Jews or subjects of direct interest to Jews, but in languages other than Hebrew and Yiddish. These books are located in the various linguistic sections. For example, books in the English language on Jewish subjects are to be found in the Library's general collection. There are many books in Russian on Jewish themes, but these are located in the Slavic division. Books about Jews in Oriental languages are in the Oriental division, and so on.

Thus, it is estimated that the Library of Congress has a collection of Judaica in various languages numbering approximately a quarter of a million books. This constitutes a huge collection of the Jewish cultural heritage of all ages which no other library possesses. It is comprised of larger and smaller collections dealing with Zionism and Israel, with Jewish history of all times, rabbinical literature, biblical literature, poetry and belles-lettres, works on science and philosophy, on travel and education, children's literature, art—in short, every human endeavor and every phase of thought.

The Jewish section was first established in 1913, just four decades ago. The year before, i. e., 1912, the well-known Jewish philanthropist and communal leader, Jacob H. Schiff had purchased the famous "Deinard Collection" of Judaica assembled over a period of years by the bibliophile Ephraim Deinard. This collection consisted of about 10,000 volumes in Hebrew, Yiddish, Ladino, Arabic, and other Semitic languages, but all deal with Jewish themes and Jewish thought. Schiff then presented the Deinard collection to the Library of Congress as a gift to the American people, but with this stipulation: That a specially qualified person, not a mere cataloguer, but one who is a real Jewish scholar and bibliographer, should be placed in charge of the collection and that by his personality and through this collection he should represent Jewish scholarship in a dignified manner. A short time later, Congress placed its official stamp of approval on this project by enacting a bill to establish a Semitic Division in the Library of Congress, and the Deinard collection served as the nucleus for the division.

Schiff subsequently purchased smaller collections of Judaica which he, likewise, presented to the Jewish Section. Thus, in 1914, he presented the Library with a collection of 4,200 volumes, in 1917 another 2,300 books, and finally in 1921 he added 3,000 more, making a total of nearly 20,000 volumes which the Jewish Section acquired through his generosity. This constituted a very sizable beginning for the new section during its first decade. Since then it has grown nearly three-fold through acquisitions of other collections and through purchases, not counting the approximately 200,000 volumes concerning Jews in non-Semitic languages which are to be found in other sections.

It would take considerable space within the limitations of this article to describe the various fields and subject on which the Jewish Section has larger collections. We shall therefore limit ourselves to mention briefly a few of the more important of these.

One of the largest collections is the literature dealing with the Bible, with or without commentaries, consisting of various editions published since the 16th century to the present day. Many of these volumes contain translations of the Biblical text in ancient and modern languages, including Greek, Latin, Syriac, Arabic, Persian, English, French, German, Italian, Spanish, and others.

For the study of Biblical Hebrew the Jewish Section has a variety of dictionaries, concordances, indices, and grammatical texts, as well as historical and archaeological studies, introductory material, and studies which deal with Biblical influence on literature. Then there are many works concerning the period of the rise of Christianity, works of a polemical or apologetic nature, studies of Jewish religious sects, Jewish ritual and religious ceremonies.

The Jewish Section has built up a noteworthy collection dealing with the "Golden Era" of Jewish cultural achievements in Spain during the Middle Ages, as well as many volumes of rabbinical Responsa, and royal documents concerning Jews which influenced the development of Jewish law.

Nor were the developments of modern times overlooked by the Jewish Section, which has assembled considerable material dealing with Jewish life in recent decades, minority problems, the Nazi period and the extermination of European Jewry, the establishment of the State of Israel, the growth of the American Jewish community and Jewish life in this country.

Thus, on the one hand, the Jewish Section possesses works which are designated as incunabula, namely, books published before the year 1500 and are therefore recognized as rare and valuable, as well as unusual manuscripts, literature on Kabbalah, etc. And on the other hand, it has works of modern Hebrew and Yiddish literature, leading Yiddish newspapers and periodicals from all over the world and Hebrew dailies and periodicals from Israel, and the largest collection of official documents published by the Government of Israel which is to be found outside of Israel.

The Jewish Section also boasts of its collections of Semitic literature dealing with the development of the various civilizations in the Near East, the literature of the Haskalah period of the 18th and 19th centuries, and also the many monographs, brochures, periodical publications, newspapers and books published in the Soviet Union until a few years ago before all Jewish cultural life and activity there had ceased.

These are, briefly, the major areas of cultural achievement on which the Jewish Section has concentrated its efforts in preserving everything of value concerning Jewish life and Jewish creativity throughout the ages. Any work dealing with Jews, Judaism and the State of Israel is of interest to the Jewish Section. The result is that this section is today generally recognized for its rich cultural treasures and for its contribution to the preservation of the Jewish cultural heritage. Not only does the United States Congress and the various governmental agencies utilize its resources to a greater degree than ever before, but so do also many scholars and institutions of higher learning in this country and abroad.

During the four decades of its existence, the Jewish Section of the Library of Congress has had three prominent Jewish scholars who directed its growth and activities. The first of these was Dr. Israel Shapiro, a noted scholar and bibliographer, who was its director for over 30 years from 1913 until the end of 1943. He was succeeded by Dr. Theodore Gaster, a philologist and student of archaeology and the religions of the ancient Near East, who held the post for about 4 years. The present chief of the

Jewish Section is Dr. Lawrence Marwick, a bibliographer and noted Judeo-Arabic scholar, who took over in the fall of 1948.

Dr. Marwick, who is 43 years old, studied at the University of Chicago and Dropsie College in Philadelphia where he obtained his Ph. D. in 1937. He specialized in ancient history and archeology, did research work in Judeo-Arabic literature in the British Museum, and even studied at the National University in Cairo, Egypt. Following his return to the United States, he continued to do research work on Judeo-Arabic poetry of the Middle Ages and writings of some of the contemporaries of the great Jewish philosopher Saadiah Gaon. This work was interrupted during World War II when Dr. Marwick served for a period of 5 years in the Intelligence Corps of the United States Army. He was among the first Americans to enter Berlin and also witnessed the liberation of the first concentration camps in Germany.

In the 5 years since he is administering the Jewish section, Dr. Marwick has established contacts with libraries, book publishers, authors, and cultural institutions in many countries throughout the world. He has instituted a regular exchange of books with the Hebrew University in Jerusalem and with libraries in other countries. He has considerably enriched the section through the acquisition of many volumes in Hebrew and Yiddish heretofore overlooked or previously unobtainable. He often arranges cultural exhibits in the Library of Congress in connection with some important Jewish event, such as on the occasion of the 100th anniversary of the birth of the noted Yiddish author J. L. Peretz, the anniversary of Israel's independence, an exhibit of the Israeli press, and another of Yiddish books published in Argentina, etc.

In 1951 Dr. Marwick represented the Library of Congress at the International Conference of Orientalists in Istanbul, Turkey. From there he proceeded to Israel, where he spent several weeks, and presented to Prime Minister David Ben-Gurion a gift from the Library of Congress—a book by the Greek philosopher, Proclus, on the philosophy of Plato. The story behind this presentation is that when Ben-Gurion visited America in the spring of 1951 he had expressed a desire to obtain a copy of this book. The Israeli Embassy in Washington approached the Library of Congress, but the Library had no copy. A search was then undertaken and a copy was located at the Harvard Library, published back in the 16th century. The book was microfilmed, and this was the copy presented to Ben-Gurion by Dr. Marwick.

The Jewish section of the Library of Congress enters its fifth decade with the hope of locating and preserving much of the Jewish cultural heritage, particularly a good deal of this treasure which was lost or destroyed through Nazi barbarity in the recent war. Much of it will probably remain lost and destroyed forever, but much will be saved through the efforts of men like Dr. Marwick and preserved in the Library of Congress for posterity.

The International Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY W. WIER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 19, 1954

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a very interesting letter from Harry Entrikin, 4160 West 44th Street, Minneapolis, Minn., on the international situation, particularly Korea and Asia.

Mr. Entrikin's letter is as follows:

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., *May 17, 1954.*

Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
Mr. ROY WIER, *Member of Congress,*
Washington, D. C.

DEAR FRIENDS: Some 2 or 3 years ago I was impelled to write you a letter giving my views on our international policies, with particular reference to Korea and the whole Asiatic picture. This letter seemed, even to me, out of line with popular thinking, so naive and visionary that I rather hesitated to send it, feeling you would consider me a little off the beam.

At that time I quoted Dr. Frank Laubach, the now famous originator of the Each One Teach One World Literacy Campaign, which is credited with teaching over a million backward peoples of the world to read and write in less than 25 years and has been, I believe, the greatest generator of good will towards the United States of anything that has been tried.

I had just returned from a retreat at which he was one of the leaders and I told you that in my opinion he could give the Congress more real, down-to-earth information on Asia than they would ever receive from the so-called experts, most of whom are swayed by their own selfish interests. He has felt the pulse of the little man, whose unbearable misery is forcing the social upheaval which is so glibly ascribed to communism.

Yesterday, May 16, Dr. Laubach addressed three full houses at Hennepin Avenue Methodist Church (approximately 4,000 to 5,000) and Edna and I were again privileged, as members of the benevolent committee, to sit in on still another more intimate meeting with him. As a result, I am convinced that I was not off the beam, for he painted a picture of United States psychological blunders so appalling that the only way to visualize it is to make a mental image of a fire department trying to extinguish a fire with gasoline.

He said, "take my word for it, you can stockpile atom bombs as high as Washington monument but you cannot frighten the little people out of their desire for better living conditions. They don't know a thing about communism or capitalism. They only know they are hungry, ignorant, and oppressed. Either you lift the world (with understanding love, and true friendship) or you lose it and Russia will have world leadership laid in their laps without firing a shot. Nehru is our friend (is trying to be) but elections are coming up in 1956 and if we continue to antagonize the Asiatics will oust him and turn toward Russia as their only friend."

What I would like to know, is this still a government by and for the people or is it not? When, in the face of almost overwhelming public opinion and an unsolved Korean problem, the Executive, the Pentagon, and the "merchants of death" insist on taking another calculated risk to protect our legitimate interests in Indochina then it would seem democracy has come to the end of the road and we had all just as well start to learn the goose-step and "heil Hitler" salute.

In my estimation such a course can only result in two alternatives, a stalemate similar to Korea with losses a hundred times greater or the use of the A, H, or C bomb. For a nation that even pretends to be Christian either one is unthinkable.

Furthermore, if we institute the use of the bombs it is, to me at least, a foregone conclusion that the rest of the world will band together to exterminate us as they did Hitler Germany or as a neighborhood would unite to kill a mad dog. Even our so-called allies fear us and what we fear we hate and what we hate we kill. I do not pretend to know the answers and my heart goes out to all of you men who are faced with the task of finding them but three fruitless wars in as many decades seems to me ample proof that neither mass murder or the fallacious idea that you can buy friends is one of them.

I also feel that colonialism, either the old-fashioned British, French, Spanish, Dutch kind, or the more subtle, sly kind as practiced by international industrial cartels during the past 25 years is a dead issue and any effort to maintain or revive it will only add fuel to the flames. This applies to South America and Africa as well as Asia.

In concluding his talk Dr. Laubach said, "I am going back to my people in Asia as soon as possible for they are my friends and neighbors and I love them. I do not fear them. I fear you." Believe me there were many troubled faces as that congregation passed out through the church doors.

All I can ask of you is that you really get down on your knees and ask for God's guidance before you make any decision that may set this old world on fire and rest assured that Edna and I are holding all of you in prayer every day.

May God bless you.

HARRY ENTRIKIN.

P. S.—Please don't bother to answer this for I know you must be swamped with work. I just wanted to let you know how we feel and I think I know pretty much how you feel so that is all that is necessary.

High Cost of Reclamation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1954

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee has suddenly become very active in considering irrigation and reclamation problems.

The comments of Mr. Raymond Moley in this regard deserve the special consideration of all the Members of Congress:

MOLEY ON RECLAMATION: OUTDO DEMOCRATS—RIVER TO RETURN—COST UNJUSTIFIED

(By Raymond Moley)

The administration, seemingly frightened by the left-wing Democrats who claim that reclamation and public-power projects are being neglected, is approving one new project after another. Some of these are supported by very hazy figures, and the total for which authorization is asked of Congress exceeds even the extravagant demands of the Truman regime.

Now, the Interior Department recommends 2 projects in the upper Colorado Basin that alone would cost 2½ times the abandoned Hells Canyon project estimate. I described one of them—the upper Colorado project—recently. The other is the Fryingpan-Arkansas transmountain diversion scheme.

HUGE PROJECT HAS VARIETY OF AIMS

This would gather water from a number of the small tributaries of the Colorado west of the Continental Divide and carry it by tunnel through the mountains and dump it in the Arkansas River near Leadville. Then a number of power dams, municipal water plants, and irrigation projects would be built along the Arkansas to the border of Kansas. Estimates for this plan have been boosted from time to time. The most recent one is $172 million for the construction alone.

This project has been recommended by the Interior Department and bills to authorize it are before Congress. Hearings have been held before both Senate and House committees. The Senate subcommittee has reported its bill, and the full

Interior and Insular Affairs Committee probably will pass on it on May 17. The House committee probably will come to the proposition after disposing of the upper Colorado project in a week or two.

This Fryingpan project has been a dream of the Bureau of Reclamation for a long time. Three years ago I wrote a piece in this column from Aspen, Colo., pointing out doubtful features embodied in it. Those features still afflict it.

COSTLY PLAN OPPOSED BY BUREAU OF BUDGET

The Bureau of the Budget in a letter last June to Secretary McKay raised serious doubts and ended by saying that it would not object to having its report submitted to Congress. This, to say the least, was damning even without faint praise.

The Bureau of Reclamation's record shows that on an average all of its projects have cost at least twice its estimates.

But assuming that the Fryingpan project will be built within its estimate, and considering only that item assigned to irrigation, $78 million, the accumulated subsidy would be somewhere between $425 million and $500 million. That subsidy would consist of the interest and also the part of the cost that irrigators would be unable to repay. There would be provided from the project some supplementary irrigation for 309,000 acres of land. However you may figure it, the subsidy would be several times the value of the land.

The Late Joseph P. Tumulty—Setting the Record Straight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. HART

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 19, 1954

Mr. HART. Mr. Speaker, Joseph P. Tumulty, secretary to the immortal Woodrow Wilson throughout his entire service as Governor of New Jersey and President of the United States, died in Olney, Md., April 8, 1954. In his obituaries appearing in the morning papers the following day, the main facts of his public life were accurately recounted. Here and there some misimpressions were advanced, for 33 years had elapsed since the end of the two Wilson administrations. It is unfortunate, however, that in one important instance a few of these newspapers, unwittingly, no doubt, actually inverted history. Even that great daily organ of intelligence, the New York Times, known the world over for the high quality of its reporting, its impartiality in conveying the news, and its steadfast adherence to fact, was guilty on this occasion.

In its account of Mr. Tumulty's public activities, the Times said, on April 9, 1954:

> One of Mr. Tumulty's greatest indiscretions as secretary to the President was a letter he sent to Robert Lansing, then Secretary of State, after Mr. Wilson had been stricken ill during a post-World War I tour of the country. In it Mr. Tumulty suggested that Mr. Lansing and Rear Adm. Cary Grayson, the President's physician, declare the President to be incapacitated and thereby allow Vice President Thomas Marshall ("what this country needs is a good 5-cent cigar") to assume the duties of Chief Executive. This suggestion was a probable cause of the estrangement between Mr. Wilson and Mr. Tumulty that took place after the President left office.

The reference to this incident as quoted above was not the first made mention of in print. Mr. Tumulty himself had long before related the story of Mr. Lansing's visit to him. After leaving the White House in March 1921, he wrote the book Woodrow Wilson as I Know Him. It was published in that year by Doubleday, Page & Co. If recollection serves me right, before its publication in book form it appeared serially in the New York Times. On pages 443 and 444 of that volume is to be found Mr. Tumulty's reference to Mr. Lansing's conversation with him concerning the former's view on the alleged or supposed physical inability of the President. Mr. Tumulty writes:

> A few days after the President returned from the West and lay seriously ill at the White House, with physicians and nurses gathered about his bed, Mr. Lansing sought a private audience with me in the Cabinet room. He informed me that he had called diplomatically to suggest that in view of the incapacity of the President we should arrange to call in the Vice President to act in his stead as soon as possible, reading to me from a book which he had brought from the State Department, which I afterward learned was Jefferson's Manual, the following clause of the United States Constitution:
>
> "In case of the removal of the President from office, or his death, resignation, or inability to discharge the powers and duties of the said office, the same shall devolve upon the Vice President."
>
> Upon reading this, I coldly turned to Mr. Lansing and said: "Mr. Lansing, the Constitution is not a dead letter with the White House. I have read the Constitution and do not find myself in need of any tutoring at your hands of the provision you have just read." When I asked Mr. Lansing the question as to who should certify to the disability of the President, he intimated that that would be a job for either Dr. Grayson or myself. I immediately grasped the full significance of what he intimated, and said: "You may rest assured that while Woodrow Wilson is lying in the White House on the broad of his back I will not be a party to ousting him. He has been too kind, too loyal, and too wonderful to me to receive such treatment at my hands." Just as I uttered this statement Dr. Grayson appeared in the Cabinet room, and I turned to him and said: "And I am sure that Dr. Grayson will never certify to his disability. Will you, Grayson?". Dr. Grayson left no doubt in Mr. Lansing's mind that he would not do as Mr. Lansing suggested. I then notified Mr. Lansing that if anybody outside of the White House circle attempted to certify to the President's disability, that Grayson and I would stand together and repudiate it. I added that if the President were in a condition to know of this episode he would, in my opinion, take decisive measures. That ended the interview.

The book had a wide sale. It is a safe assumption that Secretary Lansing and Dr. Grayson knew its contents. But though both men lived long after the publication of Mr. Tumulty's book, I am quite sure that neither attempted a refutation of what Mr. Tumulty had written of them in relation to this episode.

Within very recent years, Houghton, Mifflin Co., published a biography of Mr. Tumulty, bearing the title "Joe Tumulty and the Wilson Era," authored by John Morton Blum, of Smith College. The volume is fully documented and authoritative. In the course of its preparation, Professor Blum had access to voluminous papers and documents dealing both with the men and the era he undertook to portray. I quote, below a letter which he addressed to the editor of the New York Times—and willingly published by that paper on Friday, April 30, 1954—after reading its obituary of Mr. Tumulty as published in its edition of April 9, referred to above. It sets the record straight:

> TUMULTY'S POSITION CLARIFIED
>
> To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:
>
> Your obituary of Joseph P. Tumulty contained an error that would, I believe, have deeply disturbed Mr. Tumulty.
>
> As his many contributions to your letter columns indicated throughout the 1920's he displayed at all times a warm and unfailing devotion to the memory of Woodrow Wilson. A comparable devotion guided his every act during the unhappy period of President Wilson's physical incapacity. It was not he who suggested that the Vice President assume Wilson's duties. Rather, when Secretary Lansing suggested that this be done, Mr. Tumulty and Dr. Grayson, Wilson's personal physician, immediately told Lansing that they would countenance no such action. In his memoirs Mr. Tumulty made this clear. The manuscripts of the eminent Wilsonians confirm the substance of his recollection. In short, the "indiscretion" which your obituary mentions was not Mr. Tumulty's. It would have grieved him to have this misunderstood.
>
> JOHN MORTON BLUM.
>
> CAMBRIDGE, MASS., *April 22, 1954.*

Tax Bonanza for the Wealthy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES R. HOWELL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 19, 1954

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, national tax policy is still under debate in Congress with the Senate considering the administration's tax proposals.

One of the most controversial of these proposals is the Republican administration's desire to give preferred treatment to recipients of income from corporation dividends.

In the opinion of Prof. Richard A. Lester, of Princeton University, one of the Nation's ablest economists, the administration's proposal on dividends would, in his words:

> Mean taxing earned income from wages, salaries, and professional fees much more heavily than dividend income. The administration's proposal represents a tax bonanza for the wealthy.

I include in the RECORD a letter on this subject by Professor Lester which appeared on March 18, 1954, in the New York Times:

> TAX PROPOSAL QUERIED—ADMINISTRATION PLAN FOR DIVIDEND INCOME SAID TO FAVOR WEALTHY
>
> To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:
>
> I have just heard President Eisenhower's tax talk. Unfortunately, he was not forthright in discussing the administration's proposal to give preferred treatment to one kind of personal income—namely, income from dividends received from corporations.

Instead of recommending a reduction in the double taxation of corporate profits by reducing the flat-rate corporate profits tax, the administration, in effect, proposes to exempt from taxation a significant part of a particular kind of personal income, which is subject to the progressive rates based on personal ability to pay.

The result would be that personal income from one type of security holdings would get highly favored treatment over income from other types of security and property income, such as interest, rent, and profits from farms and unincorporated businesses.

Such favoritism for dividend receipts would mean taxing earned income from wages, salaries, and professional fees much more heavily than dividend income. The administration's proposal represents a tax bonanza for the wealthy.

An example will indicate the unfair results. Under the proposal to take effect in July 1955, which permits one's calculated income tax to be reduced by a sum equal to 10 percent of all dividend income, a man with 3 dependents and a personal income of $12,000 a year, all from dividends, would have a tax of only about $900, whereas his neighbors with the same size of family and exactly the same income but received from wages, salaries, or professional fees, would pay about $2,100 in Federal income tax, or more than twice as much.

The revenue loss from this sort of dividend exemption is apparently estimated at $240 million in the fiscal year starting next July and at $640 million a year the following year.

It would be much more equitable to have such revenue losses take the form of equivalent reductions in corporate income taxes or in personal income taxes for the benefit of all personal income-tax payers. I firmly believe that, even though I personally would gain much more tax relief from the dividend exemption proposal than from either of the suggested alternatives.

RICHARD A. LESTER,
Professor of Economics,
Princeton University.

PRINCETON, N. J., *March 15, 1954.*

A Distinguished Oklahoman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 18, 1954

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, in the development of every great movement, of every great industry, of every great service to mankind, there must be pioneers—men who are first to take the epochal steps that must mark the way for progress.

It is my desire to do honor to one of Oklahoma's sons for his thrilling and splendid accomplishments for aviation for more than 35 years.

He is Bennett H. Griffin, director of the Washington National Airport and operator for the United States Government of one of the largest business enterprises in the Nation's Capital. An outstanding man of affairs by the dual appraisal of aviation experts and businessmen, Colonel Griffin combines deep knowledge and experience in the air and in the business world. He has throughout his career been a businessman of the air, combining factual flight skill and experience with the practical aspects of aircraft manufacture, sales, and airport and airlines management.

He was born in Barton, Miss., and after early schooling in Oklahoma graduated from the University of Oklahoma with a bachelor of arts degree. He entered the Army immediately, was commissioned a pilot and served in Europe until the end of World War I. He remained in aviation following the war, serving as test pilot, salesman, executive, and owner and operator of the Bennett H. Griffin Flying Service of Oklahoma City. He was among the first to blaze the air trail across the Atlantic Ocean, establishing a flight record from America to Berlin, Germany, in 1932. The pilot exploits of this pioneer airman will always be part of the record of American aviation achievement.

He became an aeronautical inspector for the Bureau of Air Commerce in 1933 and in 1942 his services as an aviation expert were transferred to the United States Army Air Forces where he was commissioned a major and rose to the rank of colonel.

He commanded the Second Operational Training Unit, ATC, at Homestead, Fla., from its outset until 1943, when it became the main source of flight crews for the Air Transport Command. Thousands of safe oceanic flights were attributable to Griffin-trained crews. Along with this mission he organized and operated a cargo service for the ATC between Miami, Fla., and Natal, Brazil—some 4,000 miles in length.

In 1943 he was ordered to duty at Washington headquarters of the ATC and drafted the air-inspection system for the Air Transport Command. From this post he traveled to all theaters of war, flying approximately 200,000 miles on emergency war missions over every route of the Air Transport Command. Half of the mileage flown was over ocean waters. He received, among other awards, the Presidential Unit Citation, Air Medal, and the Legion of Merit for outstanding service. Currently Griffin is a colonel in the Air Force Reserve and holds a command-pilot rating, and in civil aviation he holds an airline-transport rating.

After the war he returned to the Civil Aeronautics Administration. Soon after establishing the large Aeronautical Center at Oklahoma City for the CAA, he became the Washington National Airport Administrator. A large portion of his duties here consists of negotiations with the airlines and various concessionaires, from whom the airport derives revenue, on all phases of their operation.

The National Airport is considered one of the best managed in the world, a pattern almost daily for inquiries as to management from world authorities. It is a distinct tribute to the aviation knowledge and business acumen of the man who operates it.

It gives me great pleasure to introduce a bill to authorize the President of the United States to present the Distinguished Flying Cross to Col. Bennett Hill Griffin, of Oklahoma.

The Committee for New York City's 300th Anniversary Celebration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 19, 1954

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to direct the attention of our colleagues to the following report by Mr. Lee Thompson Smith on New York City's 300th anniversary celebration:

REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT TO THE COMMITTEE FOR NEW YORK CITY'S 300TH ANNIVERSARY CELEBRATION, INC.

Just before the turn of the year, 1952, your President became the head of a committee for the commemoration of the 300th anniversary of the establishment of Municipal Government in the City of New York by designation of the then Mayor, Vincent R. Impellitteri. The latter stipulated that the undersigned not only was to form and administer the committee, but was to be responsible for raising the money necessary for its functioning without any financial assistance from the city.

Invitations were sent to 78 leaders in all walks of life on January 16, asking them to serve on a sponsoring committee. Within a matter of days 60 out of the 78 replied affirmatively. Gradually the committee was enlarged to its present total of 130. Steps were taken at the outset to incorporate as the Committee for New York City's 300th Anniversary Celebration, Inc. A ruling was obtained from the Treasury Department to the effect that contributions to the committee would be deductible as a business expense for income tax purposes. Corporate officers and a board of directors were elected. At the same time the New York City Committee for Historical Research, 1653–1953, Inc., was incorporated.

Despite what seemed to be universal acceptance and great enthusiasm for the idea that there should be a proper celebration of New York's 300th anniversary, there was extreme difficulty in one respect. Efforts to find a chairman for a finance committee and to form such a committee were fruitless. During the first few months the raising of funds became the main and, at times, almost the exclusive function of your chairman with some assistance from members of the executive committee.

The uncertainty of the fund raising picture adversely affected planning for the celebration since it was difficult to know what to plan without knowing what the budget would be. This added to the already existing handicap of starting to work upon an anniversary celebration with the anniversary date, February 2, 1953, virtually upon us right at the start.

It was also soon apparent that the original thinking which called for a budget of about $1 million for the year would have to conform to reality; therefore, the executive committee decided upon a budget of $1,000 per week.

THE PURPOSES OF THE CELEBRATION

In my view, and that of the committee, the celebration offered a unique opportunity, not only to commemorate an important historic occasion, but to dramatize and emphasize the developments that have taken place in New York during three centuries; to stimulate interest in our rich heritage, and to call attention to the vital forces in all fields of endeavor that have contributed to the city's growth.

New York City needs such reminders of her past. There is not only a continuing need for a better understanding of the city by her own citizens and by oncoming generations, but by the country and the world at large. New York is something more than a big city. It is a great metropolis whose intangible assets far outweigh in importance and influence her wealth, skyscrapers and other physical features. It is an orderly city and the greatest of democratic communities.

Our assignment was indeed challenging. The opportunities offered to us appeared almost limitless and stirred the imagination.

The difficult problem was that of financing our activities. I believe ours was the only celebration of the kind ever undertaken without assistance from the city treasury. However, your committee went ahead, hopefully and persistently.

OUR FIRST CEREMONIES

Prince Bernhard of the Netherlands was the guest of honor at special services on February 1 at St. Mark's Church In-the Bouwerie sponsored jointly by the St. Nicholas Society of the City of New York and the committee. On February 2, he was a guest of honor at a luncheon sponsored by the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York and your committee. The visit of the prince was interrupted by the devastating floods which swept his country on February 1. He flew home at once, but later returned to New York and on March 30 he was a guest of your committee at a luncheon at the University Club. I am confident I express the feelings of members of the committee in recording our appreciation of the splendid cooperation of Prince Bernhard during our celebration.

SOME CULTURAL EXHIBITIONS

Early in January meetings were held with the representatives of the leading cultural, educational and historical institutions, who readily pledged support to the committee and immediately began planning special events for their several institutions. The trustees of the Metropolitan Museum of Art inaugurated the celebration by opening the exhibition of works of art and historical documents assembled by the Municipal Museum at The Hague. Prince Bernard spoke at the opening ceremonies on February 2. Following an exhibit of rare historic documents loaned by the Netherlands Government, the Museum of the City of New York opened another anniversary exhibit, The Sea and the City, showing the development of the port through 3 centuries. This museum opened a third exhibit centering on the city's history as shown by pictures gathered by John A. Kouwenhoven for his volume, Columbia's Historical Portrait of New York, commorating Columbia University's 200th and the city's 300th anniversaries. The Long Island Historical Society likewise arranged a special 300th anniversary exhibit of the history of Brooklyn and Queens Boroughs and Nassau and Suffolk Counties.

DUTCH CONTRIBUTIONS

On April 6, Baron J. A. de Vos van Steenwijk, Consul General of the Netherlands, formally presented to Mr. G. S. Eyssell, president of Rockefeller Center, Inc., tulips sent from Holland especially for an anniversary display in Rockefeller Center Channel Gardens. Most appropriately, on April 19, a Friendship Scroll was presented to the Consul General by New York school children.

Another distinguished visitor from the Netherlands was the Honorable Arnold J. D'Ailly, mayor of the city of Amsterdam, who was the guest of the committee at the University Club following an official reception by Mayor Impellitteri at City Hall.

We recall, with pleasure, Miss Meike Meurs, the charming Dutch girl from Leyden University, who came over as a special representative of the people of Holland. She was designated "Miss 300th Anniversary". With Miss Jill Oplinger, of Hunter College, who was designated the American "300th Anniversary Girl," Miss Meurs took part in the Hunter College 10th anniversary celebration of Sara Delano Roosevelt House. These lovely young ladies were subsequently featured in many other anniversary observances.

Perhaps the most stirring ceremony of the year, emphasizing the continuing close relations between the Netherlands and this country, and their common efforts to promate peace, was the greeting extended to a company of 160 Dutch troops en route to Korea as replacements for the United Nations Command. This ceremony took place on September 18 on the steps of Federal Hall. Dr. Jan W. A. Van Hattum, acting Consul General of the Netherlands and Lt. Gen. Withers A. Burgess, commanding general, First Army, and your president greeted them.

A lasting memento of our anniversary was the presentation by the Government of the Dutch Antilles of a beautiful stained glass window, which was installed in Butler Hall, Columbia University, on December 30, 1953. This gift to the city was made through the anniversary committee, and it was my pleasure and honor to represent the mayor at the dedication. In this role I accepted the gift on behalf of the city of New York and, in turn, presented the window to Columbia University.

Dr. Wybo J. Goslinga made the presentation on behalf of the Netherland Antilles. Dr. Grayson L. Kirk, president of Columbia, accepted the window on behalf of the university. This artistic creation symbolizes the friendship that has always existed between our comunity and the Dutch Antilles.

A GIFT FROM THE BELGIANS

Other international aspects of the celebration included the active participation by foreign governments in several impressive ceremonies. The Walloon Monument in Battery Park, unveiled in 1924, commemorates a group of Walloons—French-speaking Protestants—who came to Manhattan Island with Peter Minuit on the *Nieu Nederland* in 1624 and were among the first settlers here.

On September 30 a ceremony was held at the Walloon Monument in Battery Park, where Belgian Foreign Minister Paul Van Zeeland spoke and placed a wreath on the monument. As an anniversary gift the Belgian Government presented to our committee a splendid 20-foot Mechlin tapestry, specially woven to commemorate the part played by the Walloons in settling Nieuw Amsterdam.

This artistic tapestry was conceived by Floris Jespers, a noted Belgian artist, and shows the landing of the early Belgian settlers on Manhattan Island. On September 22 the tapestry was formally presented to the committee by the Belgian Foreign Minister, Paul Van Zeeland, and it was my pleasure to accept it and, in turn, to present the gift to Dr. Fenwick Beekman, president of the New York Historical Society, who accepted it for public display at the society's building.

Another international gesture of good will was the presentation to the committee, by the Swedish-American Line, of a specially designed orrefors glass vase. This ceremony took place on December 7 at a luncheon aboard the new motorship *Kungsholm*, on the maiden trip of this vessel to New York. The presentation was made by Erik Wijk, president of the line. The beautiful vase was accepted by your president and on January 14, 1954, was presented to the museum of the city of New York, who president, John Sloan, accepted it for the museum.

TRANSPORTATION

The New York Central System cooperated by holding a 5-day exhibit at Grand Central Station commemorating its own 100th anniversary as well as that of the city. The opening ceremonies were held on September 22, in which President White of the New York Central System, Miss Gladys Swarthout, and your president took part. Hundreds of thousands received brochures regarding the two anniversaries, which were given additional publicity on the railroad's menus and in other printed matter.

EARLY CITY HISTORY RECALLED

The first of three events relating to New York's three city halls took place on February 24, when the 300th anniversary of the official opening of the old Dutch Stadt Huys—on the site of what is now 73 Pearl Street—was commemorated. On March 15 a ceremony was held at Federal Hall commemorating the building of the wall at Wall Street and the site of the second city hall. On May 26, the 150th anniversary of the laying of the cornerstone, in 1803, of the present city htll, was reenacted in costume. Our participation in these ceremonies was in cooperation with the Downtown Manhattan Association, Inc., and the Holland Society of New York.

An all-day celebration dedicated to "Historic Richmondtown," Dutch settlement on Staten Island, was held on May 9. This program was arranged by the Staten Island Historical Society and the committee was represented by your president.

RETAIL TRADE WEEK

The period of June 8–13, proclaimed by the mayor as Retail Week, covered a number of events arranged in cooperation with the New York World-Telegram and Sun (which published a special anniversary edition on June 8), the Fifth Avenue Association and Fifth Avenue, 34th and 57th Street stores. The week's program began with the cutting of a tape extending from the top of the Empire State Building to the corner of Fifth Avenue and 34th Street. This ceremony was followed by a "Hands Across the Hudson" reception at the Port Authority Building where members of your committee were hosts to the mayor of New York and to the mayors of 75 New Jersey communities.

Other features of Retail Week, in which the president took part included the opening of the fourth annual store modernization show at Madison Square Garden; a luncheon at the Hotel Roosevelt by the Sales Executive Club (at which an anniversary cake was presented to the committee), and the Golden Mile parade up Fifth Avenue, on the evening of June 11. The procession was led by the oldest existing double-deck bus of the Fifth Avenue Coach Co. The gilded bus and others transported the mayor, the official party and celebrants over the amberlighted avenue past specially decorated and illuminated store windows to the Brass Rail Restaurant where a reception was held.

Uptown Community Week in Harlem began on June 23 with the cutting of a 300-foot ceremonial ribbon and the release of hundreds of helium balloons containing gift certificates from Harlem merchants, who also donated 10 percent of their sales on June 27 to local charities. Mayor Impellitteri, and community leaders participated in the opening ceremonies in which your president represented the committee.

INDIAN FESTIVAL WEEK

Indian Festival Week—June 20–26—sponsored by the committee in cooperation with Arrow, Inc., a nonprofit affiliate of the National Congress of American Indians, proved to be most interesting and impressive. The special committee in charge of arrangements included Will Rogers, Jr., president of Arrow; Miss Jeffie Kimball, vice president of Arrow, Leon Miller, professor of physical education at C. C. N. Y. and former coach of the Carlisle Indians, and Miss Gloria Youngblood, Indian actress and singer.

Many picturesque ceremonies took place during the week. On June 20, 300 members of the Seneca, Mohawk, and Onandaga Tribes of the Iroquois nation paraded down Fifth Avenue to Union Square, where Indian dancing followed the formal review and speeches by the mayor and the committee president, who later escorted a delegation of Indian leaders to city hall for a visit to the mayor.

On June 23, descendants of the original sellers reenacted the purchase of Manhattan Island by Peter Minuit on the spot in Inwood Park where, according to tradition, the transaction occurred. On February 2, your president was master of ceremonies at the unveiling of a plaque placed on the site by the Peter Minuit Post, No. 1247, American Legion, in cooperation with the department of parks.

The final event of the Indian festival took place when a reenactment of the 1789 Indian treaty signing was staged on the steps of Federal Hall at the site where the original signing occurred. Seneca Chief Jesse Cornplanter, a direct descendant of Chief Cornplanter, one of the original signers, participated in the costumed drama.

RELIGIOUS FREEDOM WEEK

From its inception our program contemplated giving due emphasis to the importance of religion as a primary factor in the moral, social, and civic life of the city. The setting up of a municipal government in Nieuw Amsterdam, marking the first step toward political freedom, was quickly followed, in 1657, by the Flushing Remonstrance against Governor Stuyvesant's ban on Quakers. The States-General, in Holland, by sustaining John Bowne of Flushing in his defiance of Stuyvesant's edict against Quakers, assured freedom of worship here.

For the purpose of assuring that due stress be placed on the part played by religious freedom in the history of the city and as a part of the 300th anniversary, an interfaith committee on the observance of religious freedom was formed with the following outstanding religious and lay leaders: Dr. Gilbert Darlington, third vice president of the St. Nicholas Society, chairman; Hon. Charles S. Colden, president of the Bowne House Historical Society, vice chairman; Capt. Joshua L. Goldberg, district chaplain, Third Naval District; Rev. James E. Hoffman, Reformed Church in America; Clifford W. Petitt, executive director of the Protestant Council of the City of New York; the Reverend Dr. David de Sola Pool, Congregation Shearith Israel; the Right Reverend Monsignor Edward J. Waterson, secretary of education, Archdiocese of New York; and the Reverend Edward Nason West, canon of St. John the Divine.

This committee, on July 19, adopted a resolution calling on all religious bodies in the city to cooperate with your committee and make known to their congregations plans for observances of the occasion. Subsequently, a proclamation designating the period from November 20 to November 26, concluding on Thanksgiving Day, was issued by Acting Mayor Joseph T. Sharkey urging all members of the community to take cognizance of the historic contributions made by New York to the cause of religious freedom "and to the great good that has flowed from them." As a result of the committee's efforts, special services and meetings were held throughout the city and feature programs were presented by radio and television stations.

THE ANNIVERSARY MARINES COMPANY

In cooperation with your committee, the United States Marine Corps, on July 17, initiated a recruiting drive to raise a special 300-man company in honor of New York's 300th anniversary. The company was to be divided into four 75-man platoons, each representing a borough—with Richmond and Manhattan represented by a combined platoon. Within a month the full complement was reached and a ceremony marked the climax as the 300th recruit joined the company.

On August 17 the entire company took the oath of enlistment on the steps of city hall, in a colorful ceremony at which your president presided and Mayor Impellitteri and Brig. Gen. Reginald H. Ridgely, Jr., Marine Corps director of personnel, were the principal speakers. Guidons were presented to the several platoons by members of borough sponsoring committees, after which the recruits departed for training at Parris Island.

The 300th Anniversary Company of United States Marines returned to New York on November 9 and marched, in full regalia, up Broadway to city hall over the same route they had traversed in mufti to be sworn in on August 19. Your president presented the committee trophy to the honor man of the company and each member received a 300th anniversary medallion key-ring. Committees in the several boroughs, appointed by your president, later entertained the company members at luncheons.

THE ANNIVERSARY IN THE SCHOOLS

Many schools and history classes marked the anniversary in one way or another, with special features in some schools.

An anniversary pageant was staged by the students of Thomas Knowlton Junior High School in the Bronx, where your president addressed the gathering. On June 12, the mayor and your president, accompanied by Dr. William Jansen, superintendent of schools, and other school officials, visited the Isador and Ida Straus Junior High School (No. 109) in Brooklyn to view an anniversary exhibit planned and executed by the students of the ninth grade.

On December 15, the class 7–2 of George Washington High School, under the direction of Mrs. Gladys Hood Detwiler, gave an inspiring presentation of the Dutch settlement of Manhattan Island, at which your president was pleased to be a speaker. Many unlisted observances took place in public, parochial, and private schools and other educational institutions throughout the city.

THE COMMEMORATIVE STAMP

Following several months of negotiation, special cancellation dies commemorating the anniversary were put into use at the General Post Office in New York. Acting Postmaster John H. Sheehan and your president canceled the first mail with the slogan "New York City's 300th Anniversary, 1653–1953."

After protracted negotiations the United States Post Office Department agreed to issue a special stamp commemorating the anniversary. November 20 was the date set for the issuance of this attractive stamp, showing a Dutch ship with the city's skyline in the background. The day of issue was signalized by a dramatic reenactment, on the steps of Federal Hall, of the swearing in by George Washington, of Samuel Osgood as the first Postmaster General of the Federal Government.

After this costumed ceremony, the actor impersonating Postmaster General Osborn handed a packet containing the first of the commemorative stamps to a post rider, who rode uptown, stopping at strategic points to change horses, to the 71st Regiment Armory. At this point he was met by Assistant Postmaster General Albert J. Robertson, Mayor Impellitteri, Thomas J. Watson, Sr., our honorary chairman, and other notables who took part in opening the National Stamp Show at the armory.

In Federal Hall a special post office had been installed, where the stamps were sold throughout the week, and a historic exhibit showed the development of the postal services and the transportation of mail since colonial days. These interesting exhibits were provided by the Smithsonian Institution, the Museum of the City of New York, the New York Historical Society, the New York Post Office and Federal Hall Associates. Ten million 3-cent commemorative stamps were issued and the cancellation dies left their imprint on the millions of letters.

MEDALLION

Earlier we ordered the striking of an attractive medallion designed by Julio Kilenyi; the obverse of the medallion depicts the three centuries which have passed. The Battery is shown exactly as it looked 300 years ago. The family group stands as a symbol of the founders. Above is a mirage of the present-day skyline as it appears from exactly the same spot where the family group stood 300 years ago. To the right side of the design appears the buildings of the United Nations, symbolizing New York's new status as the world's capital city.

On the reverse side of the medallion is the official seal of the city of New York, exactly as it was used when Stuyvesant surrendered the city to the British. The date of 1664 was added at that time.

The design was copyrighted, was much publicized, and served as a symbol of the committee in its subsequent publicity. It was the motif for the official first-day covers. These covers became collectors' items. A special flag with the medallion design replacing the city seal was used as decorations at dinners and other functions where the anniversary was the theme.

THE ANNIVERSARY AS A THEME

The anniversary theme was featured at many ceremonies and in many ways. An appropriate float was a part of the Coney Island Mardi Gras parade in September. The anniversary was the motif of the pageantry at the ball of the American Artists' Professional League at the National Arts Club on November 7. Oil Progress Week, starting October 13, sponsored by the American Petroleum Institute, and the National Business Show, October 19–24, also made the city's anniversary the theme of their shows and other activities.

The National Business Show was opened by the mayor and Thomas J. Watson, Sr. Your committee received generous cooperation and volumes of publicity through this organization of nationally known enterprises.

Among the many other gatherings during the year that emphasized the anniversary were the 187th annual dinner of the Economic Club of New York, on November 17; the annual ball of the New York Medical School, on November 13 and the choral division of the Town Hall Club, which gave a special recital on December 5, dedicated to the anniversary. Your president represented the committee at ceremonies held by the Avenue of the Americas Association inaugurating the new street lighting system on the avenue, on December 15, and the anniversary was the theme of the luncheon of the Circus Saints and Sinners at the Waldorf-Astoria on December 28.

SOME OTHER INTERESTING FEATURES

With our limited staff the committee was unable to organize elaborate celebrations or spectacles and merely undertook to stimulate interest in the Anniversary and to help other organizations and groups in various undertakings in which we participated. A complete list of such events is appended in a calendar of the year's celebrations. However, I wish to record some of the more interesting ceremonies in which your president took part, as well as others in which the committee and staff cooperated.

The tulip festival at St. Mark's Church In-the-Bouwerie, arranged by Richard E. McEvoy, rector, and dedicated to the anniversary was such an occasion. So was the ceremony, held at the same church on July 14, commemorating the 100th anniversary of Commodore Matthew C. Perry's historic visit to Japan in 1853.

At this ceremony your president represented the mayor, Ambassador Renzo Sawada, permanent observer at the United Nations, and Rear Adm. Roscoe Hillenkoetter, of the United States Navy and a distinguished assembly of Japanese and Americans were guests. A United States Marine Corps firing squad, a Navy color guard and representatives of National Guard and militia units that participated at the Perry funeral took part.

A demonstration of American airpower took place on June 10, when massed jets and C-119 cargo planes from the Continental Air Command made flights over the city as a salute for the anniversary. The mock attack was reviewed by Lt. Gen. Hubert R. Harmon, United States Air Force Representative to the United Nations.

The committtee provided a special bronze plaque honoring the memory of the late Lou Gehrig, which was unveiled at the site of the former Yankee star's birthplace, at 309 East 94th Street on August 21. The guests included the mayor, Mrs. Christine Gehrig, and city officials as well, as friends and a group of "oldtimers."

As the climax of their sesquicentennial celebration, a thousand New Englanders, most of them in costume, arrived in New York on the evening of September 19. They were nostalgically retracing the route of the old Fall River Line. The merrymakers from Fall River were greeted by your president on behalf of the city and was their guest of honor at a luncheon the next day.

LETTING THE PUBLIC KNOW

Throughout the year anniversary activities received generous treatment from the press and other publications; over the radio and television, in house organs, institutional bulletins, public utility bill inserts, etc. Below are noted some of the helpful cooperative efforts that made it possible for millions to read and hear about the celebration:

The New York Times, on February 1, published an elaborate and highly authorative tercentennial edition, in which old and new New York were treated in a comprehensive and attractive manner. On the same date the New York Daily News published a special tercentennial section in color. The World-Telegram and Sun published a special anniversary edition on June 8 and gave additional space to features throughout Retail Week. The Christian Science Monitor had a special page feature on August 6. The fall issue of the American heritage magazine was officially designated as a special feature of New York's tercentenary, and your president contributed an introduction.

The East River Savings Bank published a handsome brochure dedicated to "New York's 300 Years." The New York Telephone Co.'s inserts in the September bills to subscribers featured the anniversary. Of special educational value was the September issue of Curriculum and Materials, the publication of the New York City Board of Education, which was rich in material bearing on the anniversary suitable for use by teachers. A series of attractive brochures commemorating the anniversary were published by Browne & Co., Inc.

Our promotion over radio and television was exceptionally effective. On May 10 Life magazine and the National Broadcasting Co. launched a 13-week series on TV (channel 4 and station WNBC) entitled "Life in New York." The series was inaugurated at a telecast of a luncheon in the rainbow room of Rockefeller Center, where committee members were interviewed by Tex McCrary on a special WNBC radio program.

Columbia Broadcasting Co. made a fine contribution to the celebration by a television show, New York Portrait, presented on a national network on January 17. This half-hour show traced New York's history from Indian days. The script, written by Cleveland Rodgers, took its main themes from Walt Whitman. Little Old New York Comes to Life, another special anniversary show, was given on WCBS television on December 31.

The Subway Sun—Hudson-Manhattan Tube: The New York Transit Authority and Hudson & Manhattan Railroad Co. (William Reid, president) showed splendid cooperation by displaying a car-card calling attention to the city's anniversary in all subways, buses and Hudson and Manhattan trains.

SOME DISAPPOINTMENTS

The commemorative coin: Bills were introduced in Congress calling for the coinage of 50-cent pieces to commemorate the tercentennial. Congressman Multer was extremely active and spearheaded a drive for this coin which resulted in the bills being passed by the House and the Senate. The Under Secretary of the Treasury, however, stated he was opposed to the passage of all coinage bills. Efforts made at the White House and other high political quarters were fruitless and President Eisenhower vetoed the bill.

The New York City model: The modernization and reconstruction of a huge plastic scale model, an exact reproduction of the five boroughs of the city of New York, was one of our major projects and consumed a great deal of time. We had hoped to be able to raise the money for this project and then leave this model behind as a permanent display. We had countless meetings with various groups in the hope that we could get support for this project. We found great interest and enthusiasm but not enough to warrant financial participation so we reluctantly gave up the idea.

John Golden: Mr. John Golden, famous producer-playwright, wrote an original play known as The Dawn's Early Light. The theme of the play was religious freedom. Arrangements were made to have this play televised in conjunction with Religious Freedom Week. Due to circumstances over which we had no control, arrangements were canceled.

Another disappointment was our failure to tell the story of shipping and the contributions made by New York in developing foreign trade. However, thanks to the cooperation of Louis H. Pink and the Port of New York Authority, a dinner was held on January 26 under the joint auspices of your committee and the Citizens' Conference on International Economic Union. Mr. Pink, chairman of the conference, presided and Howard Cullman, Cleveland Rodgers, and your president spoke on the importance of removing the barriers to world trade and peace.

THE CLOSING ANNIVERSARY DINNER

The 300th anniversary celebration closed with a memorable dinner in the grand ballroom of the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel on February 23, 1954. This was a notable gathering of leaders in all fields of endeavor. Herbert Bayard Swope presided and the speakers included Mayor Robert F. Wagner; Robert Moses; Dr. J. H. van Roijen, Netherlands Ambassador; and your president, who was delighted to receive a handsome memento of the celebration. A specially pleasing feature was a musical program under the direction of Deems Taylor, which included a collection of songs from early Dutch.

The speakers at this dinner selected themes that shifted emphasis from the past to the present and future of New York and her role in the larger scheme of things. Mayor Wagner sounded an optimistic note as to the future. Commissioner Moses, in characteristic forthright fashion, stressed the need for a quickening of civic pride and the development of leaders who will carry on the great traditions of the community.

On this note the celebration came to an end.

Our staff operation has been extremely economical especially in view of the quantity of work undertaken. Expenditures have been consistently below the budget allowed by the executive committee. The staff has never exceeded a total of 5 and probably has averaged something under 4.

Cooperation from any individuals, firms, and corporations as well as from the Armed Forces, the city of New York, and various museums, historical, civic, religious, and other organizations made possible our operation with such a limited staff. Space does not permit proper recognition of all in this report, however, I do want to express the thanks of the committee to Mr. Edward L. Bernays who gave freely of his time, without compensation in getting the committee under way.

Our operation probably could not have been possible at all if it were not for the Federal Hall Memorial Associates, Inc., which furnished us with space for our staff and equipment in Federal Hall and Gardner Osborn, its executive director, whose advice and counsel, as well as active participation in many events of our committee at Federal Hall, were invaluable.

If I may be permitted a few personal observations based on what was to me an interesting and stimulating experience, I would like, first of all, to thank all of those who have been so helpful in our efforts. I wish, especially to thank the members of our executive committee—Lt. Gen. Julius Ochs Adler, John T. Cahill, Bernard F. Gimbel, Keith McHugh, Clarence G. Michalis, John J. Redfield, Adrian Van Sinderen, Thomas J. Watson, Sr., whose interest and cooperation was helpful and stimulating.

A special word of praise to Thomas J. Watson, Sr., honorary chairman, who gave freely of his time whenever called upon.

I would be remiss in my obligations if I did not express my appreciation to the Saint Nicholas Society of the city of New York for permitting me as their president to take on this assignment, and I thank them for both their moral and financial support. The assistance given by third vice president, Dr. Gilbert Darlington, is especially appreciated.

There are others who should be singled out, but if I attempt to enumerate all those who should be mentioned, I might unintentionally overlook some. Nevertheless, I can't close this report without mentioning the Honorable Robert Moses who persuaded me to accept this assignment and from time to time made helpful suggestions.

The Downtown Manhattan Association, Inc., which cooperated so splendidly, is entitled to special mention and thanks.

I am very grateful to Lester B. Stone, our public relations counsel, whose lamented death occurred before this report was written.

I wish also to pay tribute to Cleveland Rodgers who served as historian and to Frank Corwin of our staff.

I believe our celebration, while it may have lacked some of the more spectacular features of other public occasions, was decidely worthwhile. On reflection, it seems to me that we need more of such activities, not on occasional anniversaries, but similar, continuing efforts, to help bring about a better understanding of New York City on the part of her own citizens and the country and the world.

Sincerely,

Lee T. Smith, *President*.

Flammable Fabrics Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 19, 1954

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I have made several public statements, and I have advised the State Department and the Federal Trade Commission that the congressional intent expressed in the Flammable Fabrics Act of 1953 should be maintained in the best interests of the public of the United States, both adults and the young, so many of whom in the passing years have suffered serious maiming and even death through tragic burnings. I am one of the sponsors of this Federal statute.

Recently, I have been advised that certain importers have been seeking to obtain a possible admission to this country of Japanese silks barred by the law. I think that it is only fair to state that some of the worst burnings have resulted from the use of some of these imports. Recently, I addressed both the State Department and the Federal Trade Commission expressing my concern and Mr. Robert M. Parrish, secretary of the Federal Trade Commission, has advised me, in part, as follows:

> As you know, this act prohibits the marketing in commerce of wearing apparel and fabrics intended or sold for use in wearing apparel which, when tested according to the standard of flammability prescribed in the act are found to be so highly flammable as to be dangerous when worn by individuals. We have been informed by both Government and private testing laboratories that certain of the very sheer silks presently being imported from Japan and Europe, in the form of handkerchiefs, scarfs, and bolt goods, have failed to pass the prescribed test. Silk fabrics falling within these classes have been those of the habutae variety under 5 momme as well as certain georgette and crepes of even heavier weights. The Japanese Government, we are informed, is presently searching for a practical fire retarding treatment for these fabrics.
>
> Under the act the standards of flammability are definite and certain, and no provision is made for the relaxation or change other than by congressional amendment. Also, no authority is given the Commission to exempt from its requirements any materials subject to the act.

The Senate has recently passed S. 3379, to amend the Flammable Fabrics Act, so as to exempt from its application fabrics and wearing apparel which are not highly flammable, which I must oppose in the House as weakening the act established to protect our people. It has to do with scarfs and changes the standards on flammability.

Today I am in receipt of a letter from Mr. William Gordon, director, dyers and plastics division, Textile Workers Union of America, New York, N. Y., opposing S. 3379 and stating that there is absolutely no reason why silk scarfs should be exempt. And I have also on this same date received a protesting telegram from Mr. Dominick Plescia, president, Dyers, Finishers, Printers, and Bleachers Local, Passaic, N. J. I agree fully with these employee organizations that there should be no tampering with the Flammable Fabrics Act. The letter and telegram follow:

Textile Workers Union of America,
New York, N. Y., May 18, 1954.
Re Purtell bill (S. 3379).
Hon. Gordon Canfield,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Sir: The Purtell bill would exempt silk scarves from the provisions of the Flammable Fabrics Act. There is absolutely no reason why silk scarves should be exempt.

Silk scarves are worn as apparel and therefore are as much a danger to human safety as other improperly protected garments.

The screen-printing industry, which formerly employed 4,000 workers, has already been seriously damaged by the importation of Japanese scarves printed, finished, and hand rolled in Japan.

Approximately 1½ years ago the Textile Workers Union of America joined with the screen-printing industry in requesting an increase of the ad valorem duty on imported finished scarves from 32½ to 65 percent. The union and the industry pointed out at that time the severe damage that had been inflicted on the screen-printing industry. As a result of our petition for relief the Tariff Commission unanimously recommended that the ad valorem duty on the imports on fully finished scarves be increased from 32½ to 65 percent.

In June 1953, President Eisenhower turned down the recommendation of the Tariff Commission and sent it back for further investigation. In the meantime, the screen-printing industry has gone from bad to worse. At the present time there are only about 800 workers employed in this industry working on fabrics other than scarves.

The Purtell amendment would have the effect of immediately eliminating any possibility of the curtailment of the importation of fully finished and printed scarves into this country. This is in sharp contract to the treatment given to both the employers in the screen-printing industry and the Textile Workers Union of America representing the employees in the screen-printing industry.

It is now a year and a half since the petition for relief was submitted by both the industry and the union. Up to the present time there is still no help in sight for the dire plight which the screen-printing industry finds itself.

We urge you to vote against the Purtell amendment to the Flammable Fabrics Act.

Very truly yours,
Textile Workers Union of America,
William Gordon,
Director, Dyers and Plastic Division.

Passaic, N. J., *May 19, 1954.*
Hon. Gordon Canfield,
House of Representatives:

Urge you to vote against the Purtell amendment to the Flammable Fabrics Act. This amendment would seriously affect the employment of workers in our industry.

Dominick Plescia,
President, Dyers, Finishers, Printers, and Bleachers Local.

Agonizing Reappraisal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES R. HOWELL

OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 19, 1954

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the Trenton (N. J.) Times of Wednesday, May 12, expresses very clearly the doubt that has arisen in all sections of the country as to the adequacy of the so-called New Look in military policy. I believe, as the Times editorial points out, that an essential part of the "agonizing reappraisal" of our foreign policy that Secretary Dulles indicates we must undertake will be an evaluation of the merit of the policy of "massive retaliation." Can we afford to have as our only military reprisal in the event of the breakdown of diplomacy the use of nuclear weapons? I do not think so.

The editorial follows:

AGONIZING REAPPRAISAL

The agonizing reappraisal of American foreign policy foreseen as a possible necessity has not been long delayed. The urgency with which it must now be undertaken suggests that it has been fundamentally unsound from the beginning. In fact, the disaster at Geneva, which found us deserted even by our allies and friends, brings home in dramatic fashion to the administration and the American people the need of revision of foreign policy and of a new look at military policy. Nothing in the developments of recent days is reassuring. Aggressive communism is a little more menacing today than it has been in the past. It is also substantially stronger.

In the light of the crisis as it now exists, the so-called New Look in military organization assumes the aspects of colossal folly. It was designed to save money at the risk of national survival. The principle of "massive retaliation" concedes the first blow to the opposition, an advantage that might be decisive in view of the inadequacy of our defenses against atomic attack. And a reduction of the Army from 20 to 17 divisions concedes another advantage to an enemy who has enormous resources of manpower under arms and in reserve.

Notwithstanding the increased importance of air power and atomic weapons, the traditional principle that wars are won by men on foot who take and hold ground—cities and towns, fields and orchards—has not been discarded. Masses of men still carry the day, as was made evident at Dien Bien Phu, where "human waves" submerged the indomitable defenders.

The "new look" and threats of "instant" and massive retaliation gained a fairly wide acceptance because they were presumed to represent the best judgment of President Eisenhower, who is qualified to speak authoritatively on military problems. As a matter of duty and in the Nation's best interests, the Army Chief of Staff, Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway, expressed without hesitancy his conviction that the Armed Forces were being reduced below what is needed to meet commitments.

President Eisenhower, according to Washington reports, is expected to consider increases in the defense budget, which was cut $5 billion as compared with last year, and to take action toward introduction of a form of universal military service. Steps toward these objectives are urgently necessary as also is the formulation of a foreign policy which recognizes the disheartening fact that our allies have gone off in some other direction and are not with us any more.

Televising of Judicial Proceedings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDWARD J. HART

OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 19, 1954

Mr. HART. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following address on the subject of Legality of Televising Judicial Proceedings, delivered by a distinguished New Jersey lawyer, Lester J. Kramer, of Teaneck, N. J., on behalf of the bar association of that State, before the eighth conference of the Inter-

American Bar Association, conducted at Sao Paulo, Brazil, March 15–22, 1954:

For centuries the problem of publicizing judicial proceedings has caused conflict between the courts and the press. The invention of the still camera, the motion picture camera, radio and, finally, television, have aggravated this conflict. The presence of representatives of the press at legislative hearings and in the courtroom quietly making notes in pencil, occasionally accompanied by a staff artist, did not impair or disturb the dignity of the proceedings. The artist was replaced by the photographer with his flash powder or flash bulbs, who demanded admission to the court as a representative of the press. In his wake followed the newsreel reporter, with his motion picture camera and sound-recording apparatus, and close behind, the radio broadcaster, all seeking entrance to legislative halls and judicial proceedings as representatives of a growing group called the press. The invention of television again brings this serious problem to our attention and the bench and bar realize that steps must be taken to protect the dignity of the court and the rights of parties and witnesses, without impairing the freedom of the press.

Television is a boon to mankind, as a medium of transmitting information and educating the public. There is much to be said in favor of televising legislative proceedings, but our experience with television thus far shows that there is no justification for televising legal proceedings.

All of us are familiar with the televised hearings of the Kefauver Senate Crime Committee a few years ago, but even Senator KEFAUVER has said: "I have a great deal of doubt as to whether or not radio and television broadcasting ought to be used in court proceedings. I would feel that they should not be." (97 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 10001 (August 10, 1951).)

We are dealing today not with the threatened intrusion of television apparatus into our courtrooms, but with the actual intrusion. Television cameras have already invaded North American courtrooms to telecast actual judicial proceedings, and the impact of such invasion upon the rights of the accused has been felt.

In one case, the court stated that it was improper to allow the taking of news photographs or televising of scenes in the courtroom but the broadcasting or photographing, unaccompanied by some other deficiency in the proceedings, would not violate the accused's right to a fair trial. (*People* v. *Stroble* (36 Cal. 2d 615, 226 P 2d 330 (1951), affirmed 12 C. C. H., U. S. Sup. Ct. Bull. 879 (1952)). But see the dissenting opinion written by Justice Frankfurter in this case.)

Experience shows that the press should be limited to its proper scope, but one cannot expect broadcasters and telecasters to restrain themselves during a trial, unless a stronger position is taken by the courts than that set forth in the Stroble case.

It has been said that the right to use cameras, radio broadcasting, and television equipment during trials is an integral part of the freedom of the press. The newspaper photographer, the newsreel cameraman, the radio broadcaster, and the telecaster, in their capacity as members of the press, will urge that they have a right to attend and report trials of persons who are accused of crimes which are public proceedings and that photographic reproductions of the scenes of the trial, if obtained without disturbance, are as legally permissible as verbal descriptions (*Asbury Park Press* v. *City of Asbury Park* (20 U. S. L. Weekly 2154 (N. J. October 23, 1951)); *U. S.* v. *Paramount Pictures* (334 U. S. 131, 166 (1948)).)

It should be noted that the Asbury Park Press suit involved the right of the plaintiff to broadcast a tax hearing, and not a judicial proceeding. In the Paramount Pictures case, freedom of speech was not involved. However, the court said, "We have no doubt that motion pictures, like newspapers and radio, are included in the press, whose freedom is guaranteed by the first amendment."

Civil and criminal trials in the United States are public proceedings, but it is doubtful whether the general public may attend such trials as a matter of right. The sixth amendment of the Constitution of the United States grants to the accused a public trial, but the requirement of such a public trial is created for the benefit of the accused and not for the benefit of the public who might wish to attend the trial. The amendment was adopted for the purpose of protecting the accused against a miscarriage of justice, resulting from the secret trials or hearings which have been used as instruments of oppression in the past, and which, even in this enlightened age, are used to oppress people in certain parts of the world. (Cooley's Constitutional Limitations, eighth edition, 1927, p. 647.)

Trials have been public for many centuries, without cameras, radio, or television and they will continue to be public even if the photographers, radio broadcasters and telecasters are barred from the courtrooms.

The purpose of a trial or judicial proceeding is to furnish the participating parties with a forum, wherein they can peacefully adjust their differences with each other or with their government and where justice may be promoted. A trial should consist only of an investigation and consideration of the matters at issue and it is of the greatest concern to the parties involved in such a trial that there be no outside disturbances. The use of photographic, radio or television apparatus during a trial, is not only disconcerting to the parties involved, but impairs the dignity of the proceedings. Such apparatus transforms a solemn forum into a means of entertainment and impedes the serious quest for truth, for which all judicial forums are established.

The presence of such apparatus in the courtroom distracts attention from the single object of promoting justice and diverts the attention of the court, counsel, witnesses, the jury and others participating in the trial. These persons will consciously or unconsciously attempt to adapt themselves to such apparatus and become concerned with the impression their appearances, voices or actions will make on the absent audience.

Most persons testifying in a courtroom exhibit nervousness in more or less degree. When, in addition to the courtroom audience they see before them the television camera, the microphone, and the accompanying bright lights, their discomfort increases. The rare, self-confident person who escapes the sensation of nervousness will be tempted to dramatize and exaggerate in order to create a favorable impression upon the unseen audience of millions.

To the accused, the trial itself is an ordeal, and there is no necessity for imposing upon him the additional hardship of requiring that he submit to a television broadcast during a period of time when he is distressed emotionally. The testimony of the accused and his witnesses would be hampered by what is commonly known as stage fright or microphone fright.

The freedom of the press grants no license to intensify the humiliation of the accused and there is no privilege to take advantage of a person accused of crime by broadcasting photographs of his face and body against his will. It is unjust to demand of the accused that he respond and be expected to be judged on his response to questions when he cannot appear to the best of his ability, due to the psychological torture of being the subject of a television broadcast against his will.

If the parties or their witnesses were given the privilege of refusing to be photographed during a telecast of the judicial proceedings, a legal question would arise as to whether there was a fair trial, for such unwillingness might reflect unfavorably on such parties.

The televising of judicial proceedings involving a scandal or sordid crime would not be educational as far as the general public is concerned and would actually be detrimental, since the publicity of trials of this nature may contribute to the desire of abnormal criminal minds and have an injurious effect upon public morals.

There are numerous other reasons why the televising of judicial proceedings should not be permitted. For instance, a person sitting in the courtroom may hear the entire trial, but a person watching a telecast would see only such portions of the trial which the broadcaster might want him to see and not only would the television viewer fail to secure a fair impression of the trial, but the telecaster could arrange for intermittent telecasting of commercial announcements. A viewer seeing and hearing only part of the proceedings would not receive a fair impression, as a result of which the courts might be criticized. Responsible newspapers edit reports with restraint, but the roving television camera in the courtroom cannot be edited.

In *Ex parte Sturm*, a Maryland case (reported in 152 Md. 114, 136, Atl. 312, 315 (1927); 51 A. L. R. 356), the court, in its decision, said:

"The challenge in this case of the court's right to forbid the use of cameras in the courtroom during the progress of the trial, presents an issue of vital importance. If such a right should yield to an asserted privilege of the press, the authority and dignity of the courts would be seriously impaired. It is essential to the integrity and independence of judicial tribunals that they should have the power to enforce their own judgment as to what conduct is incompatible with the proper and orderly course of their procedure. If their discretion should be subordinated to that of a newspaper in regard to the use of photographic instruments in the courtroom, it would be difficult to limit the further reduction to which the authority of the court would be exposed. It would be utterly inconsistent with the position and prerogatives of the judiciary, as a coordinate branch of government, to require its submission to judgment of an ungovernmental agency as to a question of proper conduct in the judicial forum.

"The argument for the appellants concedes that a judge may regulate as to the time, manner, and number of the taking of photographs in the courtroom, but it is contended that the bounds of his discretion are passed when he substitutes prohibtion for regulation. The basic theory of the contention is that representatives of the press have a right to attend and report trials of persons accused of crimes, which are public proceedings, and that photographic portrayals of the trial scene, if obtained without disturbance, are as legally permissable as verbal descriptions. This theory assumes the right of a person desiring to procure and publish pictures to enforce his own views, in opposition to those of the court, as to whether the use of cameras in the courtroom, to photograph the participants in the trial, during its progress, is consonant with the proper and customary standard of decorum and with the concern and responsibility which the court should feel for the protection of the normal sensibilities of the persons to be affected by such a form of publicity. The constitutional right of the accused to a public trial is a privilege intended for his benefit. It does not entitle the public to take advantage of involuntary exposure at the bar of justice to employ photographic means of picturing his plight in the toils of the law. The privilege of the public to attend trials in court is not unrestricted."

However, in the case of *Irwin v. Ashurst*, reported in 158 Ore. 61, 74 P. 2d. 1127, 1130 (1938), the Supreme Court of the State of Oregon said, "Undoubtedly there is a diversity of opinion as to the propriety of installing a microphone in the courtroom for the purpose of broadcasting judicial proceedings, especially in cases involving the sordid details of crime. This court is not prepared to say that it is unlawful per se to install a microphone in a courtroom to report judicial proceedings."

The great difference between the Irwin and Sturm decision demonstrates the need for restrictions in the form of rules of court or statutes which would forbid radio and television apparatus in our courtrooms. Unless the courts are armed with such mandatory restrictions, they will fall prey to the fear of judicial infringement of the freedom of the press, for however strongly the individual jurist may feel about the disturbing presence of the microphone and the television camera, he will proceed most cautiously before attempting to act as a censor and interfere with what is said to be the freedom of the press. (See Cornell Law Quarterly 1952, p. 701.)

Wisconsin and Georgia are the first States to prohibit broadcasts of judicial proceedings by statute. Our Federal courts in the United States have solved the problem by establishing rule 53 of the Rules of Criminal Procedure, which reads as follows:

"The taking of photographs in a courtroom during the progress of judicial proceedings or radio broadcasts of judicial proceedings in the courtroom shall not be permitted by the court."

Rule 223 (b) of the Rules of Civil Procedure of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania prohibits the taking of photographs or radio broadcasting during a trial.

The Supreme Court of the State of Ohio, in January of 1954, also adopted a rule banning cameras and radio and television equipment from the courtrooms of that State.

The Supreme Court of the State of New Jersey had adopted two rules applying to all courts of the State. These rules state that all trials shall be conducted in an orderly manner according to law. No photographs shall be taken or sketches made, nor shall radio or television broadcasting or transmitting be permitted of any proceedings in any courtroom during any criminal proceeding therein or during the presence of a defendant in the courtroom.

In May 1951 a special committee of the American Bar Association was appointed to make a full appraisal of the subject of televising and broadcasting judicial and legislative proceedings. This committee, headed by the distinguished John W. Davis, filed its report in 1952 and recommended the adoption of resolutions by the American Bar Association condemning the practice of televising or broadcasting judicial proceedings. The committee also recommended certain changes in Canon 35 of the Canons of Judicial Ethics (77 ABA Reports 607 (1952).)

In accepting the recommendations of this committee, the house of delegates of the American Bar Association, meeting at San Francisco, Calif., in September 1952, amended Canon 35 so that the same now reads as follows:

"Canon 35. Improper publicizing of court proceedings: Proceedings in court should be conducted with fitting dignity and decorum. The taking of photographs in the courtroom during sessions of the court, or recesses between sessions and the broadcasting or televising of court proceedings are calculated to detract from the essential dignity of the proceedings, distract the witness in giving his testimony, degrade the court and create misconceptions with respect thereto in the mind of the public and should not be permitted." (77 ABA Reports 110 (1952).)

CONCLUSION

It is recommended that the following resolution be adopted:

"*Resolved*, That the Inter-American Bar Association condemns the practice of televising or broadcasting judicial proceedings and recommends the adoption of rules of court or legislation to the following effect:

"All trials shall be conducted in an orderly manner according to law. No photographs shall be taken or sketches made, nor shall radio or television broadcasting or transmitting be permitted of any proceedings in any courtroom, whether such proceedings are civil or criminal in nature, or in the case of criminal proceedings, while the defendant in such proceedings is present in the courtroom."

Respectfully submitted.

LESTER J. KRAMER.

Page Boy Makes Good

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD W. SMITH

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 19, 1954

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Cavalier Daily, the students' publication of the University of Virginia. It is a dignified and thoughtful editorial on the recent Supreme Court decision and is of special interest to the Members of the House because it was written by a former page whom many of us will remember, Frank M. Slayton, now a student at the University of Virginia and editor-in-chief of the Cavalier Daily.

The editorial follows:

THE DECISION

It is too early to tell what effects the Supreme Court decision to abolish segregated schools will have on the South. Undoubtedly there will be many varied reactions; they will vary from quiet comments to violence.

Although it is hard from a strict legal point of view to justify any action contrary to law we feel that the people of the South are justified in their bitterness concerning this decision.

To many people, this decision is contrary to a way of life, and violates the way in which they have thought since 1619. Because the Supreme Court has said "thou shalt not," it does not follow that the people of the South will adopt a new set of mores as easily as a man changes his coat.

While the decision was expected, many of the leaders of the South have voiced violent objections to the expected outcome. Many of the leaders have begun crying "States rights." This appears to be a strange argument since States rights have ceased to exist, and we are no longer a Nation of 48 States, but a nation that has only a strong central government.

The South has been the only section of the country which has held out over the years, and has fought for States rights. The other sections have been content to allow themselves to be absorbed in the gigantic size of the national Government.

Segregation has from the very beginning been a political question, to be kicked back and forth by our northern neighbors who have screamed for the liberation of the Negro, but who have offered them the equality of the Chicago race riots.

Attorneys for the NAACP have used "equal rights" arguments to line their pockets at the expense of the majority of the Negro race when actually their chief concern was in advancing their reputation, and fattening their purse.

Ultimately the people who will suffer most from this decision will be the average Negro. Time, which has a habit of correcting all problems, was denied its proper place in curing one of the major ills which has faced the Negro. We will now have the opportunity of seeing what effect legislative morals will have on a way of life.

Soil-Conservation Week Reminds People of Their Debt to the Land

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 19, 1954

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, during the recent observance of Soil-Conservation District Week, the Tulia (Tex.) Herald joined many other newspapers in calling the attention of the people to the responsibility they have for maintaining the productivity of the land.

An article in this newspaper sets forth the principles on which the nationwide soil-conservation program is based. These principles are of fundamental importance to the entire country.

I ask unanimous consent that the article from the Tulia Herald be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Soil Conservation District Week is being observed this week by the Association of Texas Soil Conservation District Supervisors, according to Cy Freeman of the local office.

Supervisors of Swisher County Soil Conservation District include Bob Francy, Happy, chairman; Bayard Sadler, Vigo Park; Felix Mote, Tulia; and E. E. Cox and E. Y. Young, Kress.

"They have assumed an enduring responsponsibility to the land and to the people who live by the land," said Freeman. "That responsibility is to maintain an agriculture that will keep our Nation strong and our agriculture economy sound."

"Supervisors of the 166 organized soil-conservation districts in Texas, as well as others throughout the country, are filling that responsibility under State law giving them the authority to carry out their responsibilities," said Freeman. He also said that they are contributing to a permanent American agriculture by working toward control of erosion and the restoration and maintenance of the productiveness of the farmland.

Swisher County supervisors are striving toward this goal through a coordinated soil-conservation program that treats the land according to its needs for protection and improvement and uses it according to its capabilities or what it is able to produce best and most safely over the years.

The program is based on these principles:

1. Sound land use: Under this principle there are no idle, unproductive acres. Every acre is used for what it is best suited, be it row crops, grass, or trees.

2. The right combination of conservation practices: There is no one conservation practice that will adequately check erosion and restore and maintain soil's productivity. A coordinated plan worked out for each farm contains a number of practices that dovetail together, one supplementing the other in solving the variety of conservation problems.

3. Improvement and maintenance of soil productivity: Control of erosion alone is not enough if our farmland is to produce. Erosion and wasteful farming methods deplete the soil of its mineral organic content, of nutritional elements needed by vigorous plantlife. Therefore an integral part of any permanent conservation program is those practices that restore and maintain soil productivity.

4. Economically sound conservation farming: Conservation is not an end in itself. It is only a means to the end of better living and greater security for all our people. The coordinated soil conservation program takes this into account. It provides for the maintenance 'or advancement of the economic welfare of the farmers. Attainment of this objective helps all the people.

In application of a coordinated conservation program to the land, the soil conservation districts are receiving the assistance of the United States Soil Conservation Service, county agents, vocational agricultural teachers, and other agricultural agencies. On the timely application and success of this conservation program, the future of the Nation depends.

As in other countries, the conservation job in Swisher County is immense. It is a job that offers an opportunity to all the people, not alone the soil conservation district supervisors and owners and operators of farmland. the actual work of conservation is carried on through the districts, but all can contribute to this task. In many localities district supervisors are receiving help from private organizations and businesses such as newspapers, chamber of commerce, banks, public utilities, merchants, industrialists, service clubs, civic groups, and garden clubs. The Swisher Soil Conservation District is receiving and needs all of this help and encouragement, according to Freeman.

"The district supervisors and the farmers working with them have learned that conservation means harmony between man and land," Freeman said. "This becomes evident as the district works toward its ultimate objective—advancement of the general welfare of all the people through the conservation and improvement of our soil, water, vegetative, and wildlife resources."

The Bryson Bill, H. R. 1227

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 19, 1954

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a petition concerning the Bryson bill, H. R. 1227. The petition follows:

We, the undersigned, believing that the cause of total abstinence can be served by the reduction of advertising of alcoholic beverages over radio and television, urge that our congressional representatives insist on getting a hearing and voting for the Bryson bill, H. R. 1227, which would prohibit the transportation in interstate commerce of alcoholic-beverage advertising in newspapers, periodicals, and its broadcasting over radio and TV, also to present the petitions to the House and to have a note made of them in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mrs. Haynes T. Morgan, Mrs. Thomas E. Van Sant, Mrs. Harry R. Morgan, Mrs. L. H. Robertson, Mrs. F. F. Woolf, Mrs. J. W. Van Sant, Mrs. G. R. Franks, Mrs. H. T. Little, Mrs. J. T. Formley, Mrs. Geo. T. Ledbetter, Mrs. Ray E. Hamrick, Mrs. Grant Parris, Mrs. R. H. Kinabreid, Mrs. G. C. Hamilton, Mrs. W. L. Love, Mrs. I. Wischman, Mrs. C. W. Hill, Mrs. Preston Wilson, Mrs. Talmage Pollard, Mrs. Jesse P. Haslam, Mrs. Carl S. Morgan, Mrs. T. B. Jordan, Mrs. Fred Pope, Mrs. Granger Latta, Miss Annie Lee Kerr, Mrs. Frank Nichols, Piedmont, Ala.

Transocean Airlines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. ALLEN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 19, 1954

Mr. ALLEN of California. Mr. Speaker, on several occasions I have made comments concerning the Transocean Airlines and the president of the organization, Mr. Orvis M. Nelson. Transocean has its principal office in Oakland, Calif., and the community is very proud of its accomplishments.

Recently Richard Thruelsen, a senior editor of the Saturday Evening Post, wrote a book entitled, "Transocean, the Story of an Unusual Airline." I include as a part of my remarks a review of the book by Prof. Bradley Jones, head of the Department of Aeronautics of the University of Cincinnati, in the April 1954 issue of United States Air Services.

This country needs the know-how, the spirit, the courage, the ingenuity and the resourcefulness of men like Orvis Nelson and his associates in Transocean. On March 19, 1954, Assistant Chief Examiner Wrenn, of the Civil Aeronautics Board, recommended that Transocean receive a certificate to transport persons and property between the United States and points in the Pacific Ocean areas. If this recommendation is favorably acted upon, this great nonsubsidized airline will have a further opportunity to contribute to the national defense and to the advancement of our Nation's air-transport industry. For the community, I wish it success.

The book review to which I referred is as follows:

A SAGA OF ORVIS NELSON

Transocean, the story of an unusual airline, is a book of 240 pages. It is both a history of an airline and a biography of an aviator. The author has written many magazine articles and two books. He has served as major in the Air Force and is familiar with airplanes and aviation matters.

Transocean Air Lines is the largest American nonscheduled air transportation company. Because most of its operations are overseas, not many Americans are too familiar with its magnitude and importance. Also, because he is the founder of and driving force in Transocean, any story of this airline is the story of Orvis Nelson. In writing his account, the author frequently quotes Nelson in the first person. This makes the book distinctly readable and makes for a pleasing informal method of treatment.

While the story is not told in chronological sequence, the frequent flashbacks do not detract in any way from the continuity. The anecdotes aid the reader in visualizing the many problems involved in starting and developing an air-transportation system. From this account there is bound to be a kindly feeling for the men who have pioneered so successfully.

Telling his story of the struggles of this independent company, the author must perforce mention difficulties engendered by bureaucracy, and opposition by other airlines is hinted at. The reader is impelled to give some thought to the matter of how much Government regulation is economically advisable in air transportation. No one will gainsay that if individuals or corporations on their own initiative risk capital in undertaking a new enterprise, they are entitled to some privileges and protection as a reward for such effort. It is a moot question whether or not these exclusive sanctions and franchises should be held in perpetuity.

Essentially the book is a thrilling history. It is replete with accounts of adventure. The author knows flying. His vignettes are fascinating. While Orvis Nelson is the hero of the tale, the recital of his ventures make him very likable and human.

The building of Transocean has been a glorious achievement. Serving the entire world involves many affairs of political and economic nature. The book is a, saga of Orvis Nelson, it is not panegyric, it is a matter-of-fact account of his accomplishments. If the reader acquires a sympathetic attitude toward the "non-scheds," it is merely incidental to a factual recital of an interesting phase of aviation history.

Ancient Mariner Thompson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 19, 1954

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, May 1, at Camden, N. J., one of the finest Americans of our time, Mrs. Geraldine L. Thompson, of Red Bank, N. J., christened a ship of the United States merchant marine, the *Silver Mariner*. It was a great event in her life which has not been an uneventful one. Mrs. Thompson is over 80 years of age and known throughout the State of New Jersey as an active woman, full of good works. She is a pioneer in social security and public health activities; she is indefatigable in the promotion and management of institutions for the sick and underprivileged; and she devotes much of her time in the interest of good government. How she finds time for her many activities and good deeds amazes her many friends, and her tireless energy and cheerful disposition is an inspiration to all who come in contact with her. She is a wonderful person and beloved by all.

Geraldine Thompson made an address on the occasion of the launching which I am pleased to include at the end of my remarks, and from it I am sure my colleagues will get a glimpse of her character. Her pride in her ancestry, her devotion to her religion, and her deep love of her country are plainly discernible. She calls herself the "Ancient Mariner," and I am sure the *Silver Mariner*, as she slid down the ways, was grateful for her blessing.

Her address follows:

Mr. Chairman, a grateful ancient mariner—and obviously an ancient one—has come today to dedicate a ship, the *Silver Mariner*. She has chosen as her lady in waiting a Mariner Girl Scout, Barbara Bill, who has been chosen as 1 of 12 Girl Scouts to cross the sea to Europe this summer. And there is also a gentleman in waiting, a boy Sea Scout, Marvin Wigfall. The ancient mariner has also reached out to two younger members of God's children, and we are glad to have a Cub Scout and a Brownie Scout with us. To me this Cub Scout is like a little Samuel who might be saying to the sea, "Speak, Lord, for Thy servant heareth."

I am told this ship has a speed so great it needs no protection crossing the seas—a ship that travels fast and travels alone; a ship that has as its crew 13 officers and 45 crewmen; a ship which has been built by 2,000 skilled men who are with us today, and my few words of greeting are given especially to these men and to their wives and to their children, as after all these children are the "ships of tomorrow."

When the date for the launching of this ship was decided upon, I was granted the great honor of christening her and so, naturally, my mind has been "afloat," afloat on the seas of the past.

Today I feel I am coming ashore to introduce myself and tell you of the many sea memories that have come back to me—memories of my grandfather, Capt. E. E. Morgan, who sailed many steamships between the United States and foreign countries and who brought Joseph Bonaparte to America on what was then a fast-moving ship, the *Hudson*. As a child I saw many gifts Joseph Bonaparte had made to Captain Morgan and, because of these possessions which came to me, I have always been aware that ships crossing the ocean are part of the shared history of all nations. There are pictures on the walls of my room, pictures which were given to Captain Morgan by the London Sketching Club, and 1 by a famous artist of 2 schooners in midocean to illustrate the verse—

"And doth not a meeting like this make amends,
For all the long years I've been wandering away."

My Livingston ancestors lived on the banks of the Hudson River where I spent my childhood years and they were on the *Robert Fulton* when that ship made its first voyage up that river. I remember a very famous Spanish doctor—a Dr. Lazarus—who came across the seas from Spain with his niece, Emma Lazarus, to visit us in our Hudson River home, and afterward because of our affection for her, we children all claimed the honor of Jewish ancestry. This Emma Lazarus was the great poetess who wrote the verse that is engraved on the Statue of Liberty.

"Not like the brazen giant of Greek fame,
With conquering limbs astride from land to land.
Here at our sea-washed, sunset gates shall stand
A mighty woman with a torch, whose flame
Is the imprisoned lightning, and her name
Mother of exiles. From her beacon hand
Glow world wide welcome; her mild eyes command
The air-bridged harbor that twin cities frame
'Keep ancient lands, your storied pomp!' cries she
With silent lips, 'Give me your tired, your poor,
Your huddled masses yearning to breathe free.
The wretched refuse of your teeming shore.
Send these, the homeless, tempest-tost to me.
I lift my lamp beside the golden door!' "

We also remembered the background of one of our great Livingston aunts, Mary Garrison, who came from Maryland and who, with her family, had always belonged to the Roman Catholic Church. When one of her southern relatives visited her and asked her if she did not find it difficult to live with the Huguenot Protestants, she answered quietly, "In my Father's house there are many mansions"; perhaps if she were here today she might say, "On my Father's ocean there are many ships."

I would like to say a few last words in memory of my grandfather, a captain of the ships that crossed the seas, and of others of my family who sailed on the *Robert Fulton*. On a day like this the sea seems very close and very powerful, a world in itself and of itself. The launching of this ship brings back not only what might be called a world of seafaring ships, but also a world of eternity; not a world where we see trees being cut down and mountains being made a land of plains, but where the past, the present, and the future cannot be separated—a true world of eternity.

This surely takes our memories back to great people of the past who seem almost to be with us in the dedication of this ship and I would like to quote two great men: Abraham Lincoln said, "If we do not make common cause to save the good old ship of the Union on this voyage, nobody will have a chance to pilot her on another voyage"; and another great President, the present captain of our ship of state, Dwight D. Eisenhower, who, while not a graduate of Annapolis, but of West Point, certainly made the most historic crossing of the British Channel to win our last World War, which brings back to our memory the Bible story of the great crossing by Moses of the Red Sea. Our President said, "Happily, our people, though blessed with more material goods than any people in history, have always reserved their first allegiance to the Kingdom of the Spirit, which is the true source of that freedom we value above all material things."

This ancient mariner closes with her benediction, a verse from the Book of Psalms:

"They that go down to the sea in ships, that do business in great waters;
These see the works of the Lord, and his wonders in the deep."

Then she adds these words of benediction: "In the beauty of the lilies, Christ was born across the sea."

In saying goodbye, she again repeats her thankfulness for this great moment of her life saying, "May God bless us all."

The following is a list of Mrs. Thompson's guests: Mrs. M. A. Vreeland and her son, Mrs. J. Ward Ryan, Dr. C. Morris Cain, Dr. James W. Parker, Mrs. Edward L. Katzenbach, Mrs. Lillian Cicio, Mr. and Mrs. Henry R. Bowen, Mr. and Mrs. Harry Roman and their son, Mrs. Russell Caution, Mrs. Kathleen G. Hopler, Mr. Frederick A. Fitch, Mr. and Mrs. Wayne D. McMurray, Mrs. Helen M. Glaeser, Mrs. O. Blake Willcox, Mrs. Lewis Gayner, Mrs. Alice H. Springhorn, and Mr. and Mrs. Robert Donaldson.

Indochina

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON
OF COLORADO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 19, 1954

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an AP dispatch from Hanoi, Indochina, under the byline of Larry Allen stating that the people of Indochina are apathetic about their war, together with an editorial from the current issue of U. S. News & World Report on the same subject:

There being no objection, the article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INDOCHINA APATHETIC ABOUT REDS

(By Larry Allen)

HANOI, INDOCHINA, May 13.—French efforts to bolster Indochina's key Red River delta, possibly the Communist-led Vietminh's next target, are being hampered by the general apathy of the Vietnamese inhabitants.

Most of the 500,000 Vietnamese and Chinese who dwell in Hanoi appear unconcerned whether the French Union forces or Moscow-trained Ho Chi Minh's rebels eventually win the Indochina war, now dragging into its eighth year.

In an effort to offset this apathy the French have placed the north Indochina capital under a virtual state of siege. The city, where Ho Chi Minh launched his revolt in December 1946, is being patrolled by loyal Vietnamese troops. The Doumer Bridge, only span connecting Hanoi with the east, is guarded by Senegalese brought from Africa. A midnight-to-dawn curfew is in effect.

KEY POINTS BOLSTERED

Artillery emplacements have been bolstered all along the 64-mile stretch eastward to the key supply port of Haiphong, through which flow American supplies for the Union forces.

Defenses are also being tightened throughout the entire rice- and mineral-rich delta encompassing more than 5,000 villages populated by nearly 8 million Vietnamese.

The French regard the delta as their main bulwark against the spread of communism into all southeast Asia.

For that reason they have ringed the 400-mile perimeter with 1,200 steel and reinforced concrete posts and fortifications. Behind these they have tanks, mobile, artillery, armored cars and bomber and fighter planes.

[From U. S. News & World Report of May 21, 1954]

Things are going bad for United States out in the world. That's becoming clear.

Communists are winning in Indochina. French are on the way out.

Defense pact of Asian nations, United States backed, is a long way off. Britain is dragging her heels on that one. Britain and France, both, with big stakes in that part of the world, aren't willing to stand and fight on present lines.

United States, left to hold the bag, can fight alone or pull back.

This country isn't going to fight to save Indochina for France.

War, as a result, is not in the cards. Conditions to be met prior to war are these: (1) an appeal by independent peoples to be saved, (2) combined action by a united group of nations, not United States alone, (3) prior approval by the United States Congress."

None of those conditions exists in southeast Asia now.

United States military, too, is adamant in opposition to a jungle war.

War, when and if it comes again, is going to be the real thing, not a fringe fight in a remote area, where nothing is settled whoever wins.

If you want to know it, what's happening in the world is this:

People, in many places, are fed up with the United States urge to save them. They're glad to take American dollars but don't want any more advice.

Churchill, for Britain, has just told American diplomats as much. Eden has done the same. France is getting set to go her own way, which isn't the way the United States planners figured it. India long ago told this country off.

What the non-Communist world seems to want is new leadership. Feeling is that United States has had its chance and has muffed it. Now it's the turn of somebody else, with a few new ideas, with less emphasis on the sword.

Alliance United States built is not in a happy state at the moment.

There is just this other point: The United Nations is helpless in the present situation. Russia stands ready to veto any U. N. action directed at the Communist aggression in southeast Asia. The U. N. action in Korea came when the Russians were boycotting the Security Council. They weren't around to veto. Now they are. The United Nations, as a result, is just an onlooker.

The Bryson Bill, H. R. 1227

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 19, 1954

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the Appendix of the Record a petition concerning the Bryson bill, H. R. 1227. The petition follows:

We, the undersigned, believing that the cause of total abstinence can be served by the reduction of advertising of alcoholic beverages over radio and television, urge that our congressional representatives insist on getting a hearing and voting for the Bryson bill, H. R. 1227, which would prohibit the transportation in interstate commerce of alcoholic beverages, advertising in newspapers, periodicals, and its broadcasting over radio and TV, also to present the petitions to the House and to have a note made of them in the Congressional Record:

Mrs. J. W. Mills, D. O. McClendon, W. T. Newman, W. H. Gibbs, Attalla, Ala.; U. V. Weels, Alabama City; John Ramby, Baxter Brock, W. J. Ellis, Mrs. John Spulloch, Mrs. H. H. Thomas, Mrs. Jamie Ogles, Mrs. F. P. Graham, Mrs. Joel Rhea, Mrs. W. L. Gillilan, Mrs. Lora Simpson, Mrs. Joe George, Mrs. W. H. Gibbs, Mrs. E. G. Norton, Mrs. J. G. Fulglew, Mrs. Lois Clotfelter, Mrs. John Polk, Mrs. H. L. Bennett, Mrs. R. B. Putman, Mrs. W. S. Bromlett, Mrs. H. E. Veazey, Mrs. Frank Moore, Mrs. S. C. Stutts, Mrs. Bertha Russell, Mrs. Henry C. Gerber, Mrs. W. J. Ellis, E. B. Tuckee, M. J. McClindon, D. W. Rowan, Chas. E. Waldrop, W. L. Gilliland, S. M. Hinton, W. P. Moore, Joe George, Bert Jones, Mrs. Dewey Rowan.

Mrs. George Walker, Jr., Mrs. Bud Jones, Mrs. Charles E. Waldrop, Mrs. Monroe Giles, Mrs. Russell Harbin, Mrs. M. D. Hensler, Mrs. Alice Ingram, Attalla; Mrs. Harrison Gilliland, Alabama City; Mrs. C. W. Robinett, Mrs. Katherine Burke, Mrs. Kathryn M. Summerlin, Attalla.

Elinor Russell, Mrs. E. B. Tucker, Mrs. E. G. Pilcher, Mrs. T. E. Parker, Mrs. A. H. Brannon, Louise Hutcheson, Mrs. G. M. Lowe, Mrs. V. W. Dunn, Mrs. J. M. Moore, Mrs. A. I. Brown, Carrie Belle Norton, Mrs. Leura M. Liddle, Attalla; Mrs. U. V. Weeks, Alabama City; Florence Brothers, Clyde O. White, H. E. Veazey, H. M. Harris, E. M. Broswell, Attalla; W. H. Gilliland, Alabama City; Frances M. Mason, Attalla.

Rev. R. R. Mathews, J. D. Smith, Jr., E. L. Dobb, Attalla; Howard Martin, E. C. White, Lillian White, Mr. and Mrs. T. J. Countryman, E. T. White, Mrs. H. M. Smith, Mrs. C. M. Montgomery, William Johnston, Godsden; Wilma Osborne, Alice Helon Osborne, Kindness Hulgan, Attalla.

Miss Mattie Davis, Gadsden; Mr. and Mrs. R. E. B. Smith, Alabama City; Mr. and Mrs. Ervin Smith, Mr. and Mrs. H. H. Hood, Attalla; Mr. and Mrs. Leon Beardin, Gadsden; Mr. and Mrs. Dewey Stone, Attalla; Mr. and Mrs. Austin Thacker, Mrs. B. A. Rickey, Mrs. Maude Thacker, Mr. O. E. Perry, Mr. Bobby Hicks, Attalla; Raymond Frye, Dunbar, W. Va.; Glenn Mathews, Attalla; Tula Mae Dobbs, Lora Cornelius, John E. Dobbs, Sue Dobbs, Claude Fortenberry, Aulsey Harris, Mrs. Aulsey Harris, Miss Inez Hamrick, Miss Janice Kilgore, Attalla.

Rev. Bobby Perry, Rev. Billy Rigsby, Huey Perry, Sara Jo Mynatt, Sue Robertson, Attalla; L. S. Marbut, Alabama City; Welch Dobb, Nancy Mathews, Ellis J. Clayhorn, W. Z. Potter, Joe D. Wood, Attalla; W. A. Brock, Gadsden L. McCrelen, Arthur J. Wilson, Attalla; Arlyn J. Nunn, Gadsden; Oliver Holland, Mrs. Willie Baswell, Mrs. Bernice Phillips, Attalla, Ala.; Mrs. Gertrude Nunn, Gadsden; Mrs. Flora Mathews; Mrs. S. C. Cline; Mr. Howard Phillips; Mrs. J. E. Maddox; Mrs. Oliver Holland.

Rockdale, Tex., Citizens Have Faith in Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 19, 1954

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the people of Texas are known for their realistic optimism—for their unswerving faith in the future of their respective communities, of their State, of their Nation.

This faith was well expressed in an editorial in the April 22 issue of the Rockdale Reporter, published in the Texas town where the Aluminum Company of America has established a large plant. The editorial breathes the spirit of Texas.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial from the Rockdale Reporter be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

A Future as Big as Texas

Sometimes chamber of commerce slogans tend to lean a bit to the ridiculous. Sometimes they are just a mite overly optimistic. And sometimes they are just a plain statement of fact dressed up in a catchy manner.

The slogan of the Rockdale Chamber of Commerce comes under the latter category: "Rockdale, a Future as Big as Texas."

It's as simply as that. On this eventful weekend, when Rockdale and the State celebrate the opening of Aluminum Company of America's Rockdale works, it is clearly evident that Rockdale is proud.

And proud she has a right to be, for industry has come to central Texas. More specifically, industry has come to Rockdale. While it means much to central Texas today, and undoubtedly is going to mean more to the entire area in the years to come, right now Rockdale is the favored child.

J. C. Puterbaugh, president of McAlester Fuel Co., the man who placed his faith in lignite many years ago and backed his judgment with money and energy, said this about Rockdale: "I know of no other city in Texas, large or small, that has been comparably as fortunate as Rockdale."

Speaking of the central Texas area, W. W. Lynch, president of the Texas Power & Light Co., said: "The new Alcoa plant has brought many benefits to Texas * * * providing new jobs and new wealth for this area. And for the future many associated industries using aluminum will find this growing Texas area a profitable site for their location."

Rockdale, a future as big as Texas.

Along with the entire area, Rockdale faces the future with confidence. Thank you, Mr. Puterbaugh; thank you, Mr. Lynch; thank you, Mr. Alcoa.

Editorial Comment on Supreme Court Antisegregation Decisions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES O. EASTLAND
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 19, 1954

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record a very timely and appropriate editorial entitled "Bloodstains on White Marble Steps," which was published in the Jackson (Miss.) Daily News of May 18, 1954. The editorial deals with the recent decisions of the Supreme Court in the antisegregation cases.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Bloodstains on White Marble Steps

The United States Supreme Court decision abolishing segregation in the public schools of the Nation, even when equal but separate facilities are provided, is the worst thing that has happened to the South since carpetbaggers and scalawags took charge of our civil government in reconstruction days.

It is even worse.

It means racial strife of the bitterest sort.

It can conceivably lead to much bloodshed and loss of life.

Even though it was delivered by unanimous vote of the 9 members of the Nation's highest tribunal, Mississippi cannot and will not try to abide by such a decision.

Mississippi will never consent to placing white and Negro children in the same public schools.

The white people and the thinking Negro people did not want that to happen. Both look on the decision as a calamity.

Every possible human effort will be made to prevent it from happening.

Members of the Nation's highest tribunal may be learned in the law but they were utterly lacking in commonsense when they rendered Monday's decision—commonsense of the kind that should have told them about the tragedy that will inevitably follow. When the courts toss commonsense out the window and substitute specious reasoning, shallow subterfuge, silly sophistry, and sordid politics, then our Nation is in a deplorable plight.

There was no rejoicing among the substantial colored citizens of Jackson when the decision was announced. On the contrary, they read it with troubled faces, fearing what the consequences might be for the schools their children are now attending.

Human blood may stain Southern soil in many places because of this decision but the dark red stains of that blood will be on the marble steps of the United States Supreme Court building.

White and Negro children in the same schools will lead to miscegenation. Miscegenation leads to mixed marriages and mixed marriages lead to mongrelization of the human race.

The War in Indochina

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 19, 1954

Mr. **BRIDGES**. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an article by David Lawrence which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of May 11, entitled "Peace at Any Price Views Called Big Peril at Geneva," which I think will be of general interest.

I should also like to have inserted an editorial from the New York Herald Tribune of May 11, entitled "Indochina: The West's Hour of Decision."

There being no objection, the article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Peace at Any Price Views Called Big Peril at Geneva

(By David Lawrence)

Geneva, May 10.—They are trying here the unprecedented job of endeavoring to negotiate a military armistice at a political conference. It means all the jockeying back and forth of a Panmunjom palaver plus all the doubletalk of official propaganda that goes on at a political conference of 19 delegations.

If out of all this comes a cease-fire in Indochina satisfactory to the Allies, it will be a miracle. If there emerges a sellout to the Communists, this will not surprise the left-wing elements throughout the world which have been clamoring for it, but there could be some grave consequences from such a surrender.

As Secretary Dulles said in his main speech here, "Peace is always easy to achieve—by surrender." The United States has already announced it would disassociate itself from such a so-called settlement.

The United States has given the go-ahead to the French to explore the whole subject in further discussions on the basis of the proposal made last week by Foreign Minister Bidault. This doesn't mean that America approves it or will guarantee it in the end but merely that it is a desirable starting point. There is always the possibility that the Communists will reject any proposals that are offered, and hence America cannot be in the position now of refusing to see any plans advanced in the parleys with which it might in some respects be in disagreement.

MANY "IFS" INVOLVED

The general principles of an Indochina settlement have been stated only in part thus far. The question of whether the United States will join in guaranteeing by military force an armistice line depends on whether, as a practical matter, the proposed line does or does not constitute a means by which the Communists will obtain control of Indochina. There are so many "ifs" involved that a long, drawn-out negotiation seems in prospect.

The key to this conference is the peace-at-any-price attitude which exists in so many countries, including the United States.

It is wrong to generalize that none of the free nations today has the will to fight, for, given a real crisis—such as a threatened invasion—the situation would change overnight. But to mobilize strength to ward off such an invasion, to bring some sort of united will into being in advance of a crisis seems to be well-nigh impossible. The reason is that the facts are glossed over by the governments concerned and the truth is concealed for fear of giving offense to allies and implicating further a situation that it is often wishfully assumed might be healed by continuing conversations in secret. What gets into the newspapers, therefore, are inspired versions guardedly phrased to put the best possible light on the friction that exists.

But the Communists know today the weaknesses of the Western alliance and its limitations. Despite all the talk about a southeast Asia pact, Britain hesitates. The official reason given out is that London wants to wait until after the Geneva Conference, but the truth is that both Prime Minister Churchill and Foreign Secretary Anthony Eden are afraid to offend their own peace-at-any-price elements and to become estranged from India, which has taken a positive position against a southeast Asia pact.

SILENT SINCE APRIL 13

The British have tactfully allowed the impression, nevertheless, to be conveyed that they still are, as they said on April 13, actively engaged "in an examination of the possibility of establishing a collective defense within the framework of the charter of the United Nations to seek the peace, the security, and freedom of southeast Asia and the western Pacific." But there has been no formal statement since that same evening when, in the course of a Parliamentary debate, Secretary Eden backed away from this declaration, saying it was not any commitment whatsoever. The talks of staff officers at Singapore have proceeded, to be sure, as a sort of concession to American pressure and as a piece of camouflage to give an outward appearance of unity, but in reality it may be doubted whether a southeast Asia pact is sincerely desired by the British Government and whether they will go along with it wholeheartedly despite the pledge of unity which they gave Mr. Dulles when he was in London on April 12.

What this means to the negotiations at Geneva for a settlement of the Indochina war is that, at a moment when the United States made a constructive suggestion for a plan that would encourage the whole of Southeast Asia to resist further aggression by the Communists, the British Government decided to pour cold water on the idea in a debate which was forced upon it by the opposition Socialist Party in Parliament. This is not the way to impress the Communists. It is the way to cause them to miscalculate the resoluteness of the free world. Such a miscalculation, once made by Hitler, can be made again by Malenkov and in the end, as a result of some overt act, would come a world war.

Indochina: The West's Hour of Decision

With the fall of Dien Bien Phu there comes a momentary dip in the high level of tension that accompanied the last, desperate days of the defense. The form of the Indochinese crisis has altered, and the new state of affairs cannot be accurately appraised until it is clear just how the Communists intend to capitalize, militarily and politically, on their victory. There may be long debate at Geneva; the Viet Minh forces may be deterred by weather and their losses from immediate, large-scale action in the field. The rebuff which the Viet Minh spokesman at Geneva has given the French armistice plan, however, and the flareup of fighting in the Red River Delta warn that only a very little time may be allowed for planning. Certainly the United States, and all the free nations, must be prepared to take far-reaching decisions.

The first objective of the West, the one which the United States is now pursuing, is to close ranks. The broadest and firmest possible unity must be secured for a plain warning to the Communists that if they pitch their demands at Geneva too high, if they push their campaign in Vietnam too far, they will confront not the French Union alone, or the French Union backed by American supplies, but a powerful coalition, rich in military resources and determined to use them. The very existence of such an alliance may be all that is needed to bring the Indochinese war to an end. To be effective, however, it is estimated that it be real, not paper; that it be ready, if the Reds are not deterred, to meet them with positive action.

To this there are Americans (and British and French) who will complain that the Indochinese struggle is a colonial war in which the West cannot intervene in good conscience or with hope of success. They will point to the difficulties of terrain which the French have already encountered, to the long lines of supply which the United States experienced in Korea, to the danger of incursions in force by the Red Chinese and of a spreading war in Asia.

The difficulties and dangers of positive action in Indochina are numerous and should not be minimized. The need is to set them against the alternatives. If Indochina is abandoned in the name of self-determination, it is Russia, Red China, and their Annamese tools who will do the determining. Indochina's progress toward independence wil be ruthlessly halted. Malaya would be next; Thailand—never a subject of Western imperialism—would be endangered by Eastern imperialism. Indonesia, struggling with the problems of its new freedom, could provide a highroad for Communist aggression into the heart of the Pacific. Somewhere a stand would have to be made. Is Hanoi any more dangerous a place to take a stand than Macassar Straits or the Coral Sea? Would a co-prosperity sphere dominated by the Kremlin, virtually unchallenged from the Elbe to New Guinea, be less of a threat than the Mikado's jerry-built empire in 1941?

These are the questions that Americans, that freemen throughout the world, must ask themselves now. Just how their answers can best be shaped will depend on many factors, diplomatic, economic, and military. But that the Indochina crisis constitutes a grave threat to the free world, one that can neither be ignored nor shrugged aside, is indisputable. It must be met with a well-thought-out strategy and unflinching resolution.

The Service of Secretary Harold E. Talbott to the United States Air Force

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 19, 1954

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, last year, as I listened to Air Force officials testify at the budget hearings, I had the feeling that Secretary of the Air Force Talbott was a reluctant witness. I differed with him, but I respected him because I was convinced that he was only doing what he had been given orders to do. He was being a good soldier when he went along with the budget cuts ordered by the administration. But ever since then, he has been a good airman in doing all that is within his power to build up the Air Force, and to convince the Secretary of Defense and the administration that this country needs the Air Force, and the Air Force needs appropriations to achieve its necessary buildup.

Last Saturday night in New York, Secretary Talbott was the chief speaker at an Armed Forces Day banquet. Secretary Talbott has grown up with airpower. As a boy, he flew in a plane piloted by the Wright brothers. Out of a lifetime of experience with aviation, he expressed his belief in air power. "The Air Force is the keystone of our efforts to be the pillar of strength to the free world," he said. Mr. Speaker, I think Secretary Talbott has himself been the keystone of the buildup of airpower during the past year; for that, I salute him.

Secretary Talbott has been for many years interested in industrial aviation. He knows that air power depends primarily on the industrial potential of the Nation. Our potential is great, but so is Russia's. In his New York speech Mr. Talbott asserted:

> We cannot afford to permit the quality of our equipment nor the quality of our personnel to drop below that of the enemy.

Mr. Talbott is deeply concerned about the people of the Air Force. He has recently been making many speeches in an effort to present the problems of the Air Force to the American people. In all his speeches that I know anything about, he has stressed personnel problems, and made a convincing plea for a better break in pay and benefits for Air Force personnel.

Secretary Talbott is thoroughly realistic about his approach to Air Force problems. Without being an alarmist, he knows that we live in the presence of danger. Without being a pessimist, he knows that we will have to maintain strong and ready forces over an indefinite period. Without being an optimist, he believes, and states his conviction, that the United States Air Force is ready and prepared to meet an attack. His hope is that we are strong enough that no nation will dare to attack us, and that we will be able to prevent a war from happening. His determination is to keep the Air Force strong.

Mr. Speaker, Secretary Talbott has done a good job on a difficult assignment. He has been a devoted, loyal, efficient Secretary of the Air Force in an administration that up until now has not been notably airminded. I for one am grateful that we have Secretary Talbott in this administration. That we still have a strong Air Force, and that we are soon to have an even stronger one is due in large part to him. Much as I may differ with him on some matters, I feel that we see eye to eye where airpower and the United States Air Force are concerned.

With the consent of my colleagues, I wish to extend my remarks and insert in the RECORD the Armed Forces Day address by Secretary Talbott, as follows:

> Ladies and gentlemen, you honor the Air Force by having me, its Secretary, speak to you tonight. It is an honor to be your Secretary of the Air Force, a position which I have now held for a period of 16 months. In all of my years of business I have never had a job at which I have worked harder, nor a job in which I have been as interested.
>
> We are all proud of the Air Force. We are proud of the people in it. It is made up of outstanding men and women who have dedicated their lives to the service of their country. It is a pleasure to serve with them. My strong feeling of respect and affection toward the Air Force and the men and women in it has increased during my travels and associations since I became Secretary.
>
> When I was sworn in as Secretary on February 4 a year ago, the President told me to get in my plane and travel—to spend at least 25 percent of my time outside of Washington. He told me that I would never know the Air Force or its people and their problems unless I got out and saw the bases and installations and talked with the officers and men who are doing the job.
>
> I have taken my orders literally, and in this last year have traveled something over 160,000 miles and have visited over 175 bases and installations. In these travels I have become more and more impressed and convinced of the transcending importance of our Air Force and of airpower to the peace of the world.
>
> You will recall that the President said: "Of all those sobering effects, none is greater than the retaliation that would certainly be visited upon them if they were to attack any of our nations or any part of our vital interests aggressively and in order to conquer us." Further, you have heard Secretary Dulles' statement: "The basic decision was to depend primarily upon a great capacity to retaliate, instantly, by means and at places of our choosing." Airpower alone has this capacity of massive retaliation.
>
> The development of the airplane and of the firepower which together make up our airpower has been the most spectacular advancement in recorded history. Many of you have participated in and observed this advancement during your lifetime.
>
> As a boy in Dayton I remember watching the Wright brothers build their first airplane. One of my first flights was as a passenger in one of the Wright planes with Orville Wright as the pilot. I think our maximum speed was 50 miles an hour. One of my most recent flights was in a jet bomber at speeds of more than 600 miles an hour.
>
> The developments which have made these speeds possible have been primarily in engines. Piston-engine development advanced rapidly during World Wars I and II. Their development leveled off about 3,500 horsepower. The Whittle jet engine, which first flew in an aircraft in 1942, opened up new vistas in engine power.
>
> We are now talking in terms of engines which develop about 10,000 pounds of thrust. When I say pound of thrust, I mean roughly 1 horsepower. However, this is a relative term, since 1 pound of thrust developed at 350 miles an hour is equivalent to 2 horsepower.
>
> We have engines in our development program of almost 25,000 pounds of thrust, and our development planners talk in terms of newer and bigger engines—ramjets, pulsejets, and rocket types which will develop almost unlimited power. This was brought home to me as I stood at the end of a runway at the Boeing aircraft plant in Seattle with our President last summer and watched the mighty, new heavy jet bomber, the B-52, being demonstrated. That plane in flight develops over 10,000 times the horsepower of the original Wright engine, or to put it another way, its engines are more powerful than the engines of the largest Japanese battleship of World War II.
>
> Our airframe development along with all the other equipment—equipment such as bombsights, navigation devices, radar communication equipment, which are necessary to exploit the tremendous advances in horsepower—have also improved rapidly. The development of the airframe has improved to meet and exploit our developments in engines. The wood and linen structure of the original Wright aircraft gave way to the steel and aluminum structures in the 1930's. We still use aluminum, but the tapered wing covering of our new jet aircraft is 10 times thicker than the thin aluminum sheets of our World War II aircraft.
>
> The speeds we are capable of with these new airframes and these new engines no longer have the speed of sound or Mach I, as a barrier. This myth has been punctured. We now have a new barrier which our scientists must deal with. This is the thermo or heat barrier. The friction of air passing over the wing at high speeds creates temperatures so high that, despite the fact that at extreme altitudes the outside temperature is 70 below zero, the present aluminum alloy structure goes spongy and loses its strength. We must develop new materials if we are to go faster.
>
> These advances have not happened without cost. The DH-4 of World War I cost about $12,000. The fighters of World War II—the F-51, the F-47 average $75,000 apiece. The B-17, the Boeing Flying Fortress of World War II cost $225,000 apiece. Today, however, with the higher speeds and higher thrust engines, our aircraft, our present fighters, cost $300,000 to $500,000 while our newest fighters on order will cost us between $1 million and $2 million apiece. Our medium bombers are costing over three and a half million dollars, while our new heavy bomber will cost over $8 million apiece.
>
> To give you another example of the cost of new equipment, we will spend about $100 million annually in the development of a new medium bomber to replace our B-47's.
>
> The development in firepower is almost beyond human comprehension. When we realize that the largest bomb dropped on Germany in World War II contained less than 2 tons of TNT, and that we are today talking in terms of kilotons and megatons or thousands and millions of TNT equivalents to describe our bombs, you get some idea of the mighty advances that have occurred. Truly, man has devised an instrument with which he can destroy himself.
>
> Unfortunately, these advances are not the exclusive knowledge nor possession of the free nations of the world. Communist Russia has shown us and told us that she possesses both the airplane and the secret of the atom. The Communists pose a real threat to the free world—and by that I mean this country.
>
> You may have noted that the Russians, just 2 weeks ago, in their airshow at Moscow displayed two new types of jet bombers. It

was significant that these aircraft, which had been carefully concealed up to that time, should be displayed so freely at this time of international crisis. The first model they displayed was a medium jet bomber comparable to our B-17. The second bomber was much larger and heavier than our B-47 and comparable to our new heavy bomber, the Boeing B-52, which is just coming into production. One of the significant points in this development is the fact that extremely powerful new engines must be imbedded in the wings of these bombers. Both the aircraft and the engines represent significant advances in Communist aeronautical achievements. These new bombers give a real increase to the Communist capability of attack—especially against targets in the United States.

Communist Russia is a self-sufficient continental power. We know they have a mighty land army. They have little use for a navy, although we know they have a sizable submarine fleet. Her air force, her offensive capability, is, however, becoming more and more her principal instrument of foreign policy.

Communist motives are dominated by the driving ambition of militant communism. We have a good idea of their capabilities, but we do not know their intentions. How I wish we did. It would be worth billions of dollars to us to know them. We believe the Comunists have as their goal the destruction of the basic human rights for which we, as a Nation, have been willing to fight throughout our history.

As I have said before, our airpower—that is our airplane combined with the capability of the atom bomb—gives us the deterrent that has and will prevent Russian communism from achieving its aims. Therefore, so long as the aim of militant communism remains unchanged, we must maintain this deterrent.

I have already touched on the cost of modern airpower. These costs will remain high. We cannot afford to permit the quality of our equipment nor the quality of our personnel to drop below that of the enemy. There is no second place in a two-horse race.

Your United States Air Force is ready now. The air crews are ready to man their interceptors to defend this country and to take off in their bombers to attack targets at any point of the globe. On my travels, literally along the face of the Iron Curtain, I have watched many fighter outfits do a scramble. A scramble is an interception problem to identify an unknown aircraft. In every case the fighters were airborne and ready for combat in less than 3 minutes.

When we realize that 1 airplane today with a crew of 3 can deliver 3 times the firepower of the entire combined effort of the British Royal Air Force and the United States Air Force during World War II on Germany, you can get some idea of the magnitude of our capability. The men of the Air Force and of all the Armed Forces are deeply conscious of their responsibility to maintain the peace of the world. Our great hope is that by remaining strong, so strong that no nation will dare to attack us, we will be able to prevent a war from happening.

I now want to talk to you about people. We can build the best bombers, the best fighters and have the best equipment in the world, but that equipment is only as good as the people who maintain and fly it. The personnel problem I want to tell you about is a serious one. It concerns your security as well as mine. However, I'm assuming it as my responsibility.

It is difficult to assess the value of people to any organization. You will all agree that they represent a large port of any outfit's capital assets. The United States Air Force is no exception. We have today about 930,000 officers and airmen in the Air Force. Each of these men represents a value to his Air Force and to his country. Let me explain what I mean by this value. We must pay to recruit our airmen as well as to feed, clothe, and house them while they are in the service. We must pay to train them and to move them about from one station to another. The most expensive part of their training however is in the initial cost, and in the maintenance and operation of the expensive equipment on which we must train them.

The Air Force is made up of voluntary enlistees who come to us for a minimum of 4 years. It is difficult to assess or to evaluate what each of our airmen is worth at the end of his 4-year enlistment period. However, if one of our men in uniform, especially a radar or jet mechanic, should decide to leave the service after 4 years, we cannot go out and hire a trained replacement as can be done in industry or business. We must repeat the training cycle to bring another man up to the same state of training and experience.

As an example of what I mean by complicated equipment and the requirement for quality in the cockpit of our aircraft, I have brought here tonight two pilots equipped for flight. I wish you could imagine yourselves in their position. I wonder if you appreciate the nerve, the guts that our boys who are guardians, must have deeply ingrained in them. We are indeed ungrateful, if we do not.

I now want to present to you Maj. Chuch Yeager, dressed for flight in our latest jet aircraft. Major Yeager has flown faster than any other man. On December 12 of last year he flew 1,650 miles an hour, which is 2.5 times the speed of sound, or in our new jet-age vernacular, Mach 2.5. He has flown practically every experimental aircraft in the book. You might think Major Yeager to be the man from Mars. I have also brought Lieutenant Ashleman. He is an interceptor pilot assigned to the defense of the east coast area. I want Major Yeager to explain to you the function of the flight equipment he and Lieutenant Ashleman are wearing. All of this equipment is necessary for pilot safety in modern aircraft.

It would be ideal if the Air Force could be made up of career airmen and officers with just the normal turnover from sickness and old-age retirements. We know that this is impossible in our democracy, and we have to expect some turnover. However, when a recent survey of a cross-section of our airmen showed that only 24 percent planned to reenlist I was determined to do something about it. I checked further and found that in some of our key units the reenlistment rate was as low as 10 to 15 percent. This all means that in the next year we wil lose as many as 200,000 men. We must recruit and train replacements for each of these 200,000. The cost of retraining will be enormous—between $2 and $3 billion.

I was alarmed, not only by the drop in the reenlistment rate, but to see many of our fine, well-trained, well-qualified officers choosing to resign and leave the Air Force. While I know of many of the reasons for our people leaving the service, I have had an independent impartial survey made. I have this report. I think you should know some of the things that were found.

The report shows that the men of the Air Force are loyal and devoted to their service and their country. They are proud to serve and to be part of it. Questions revealed that few men would choose to leave the service if they could just make ends meet. They ask only to be able to live and provide their families a normal American life.

The report shows however that many of our men chose the Air Force as a career some years ago. They recognized that while they would not get rich in the service, their pay plus additional rights and privileges along with retirement benefits would make them relatively indifferent to finances. It concludes that the basic cause of our airmen and officers getting out of the service—the cause of our lowering reenlistment rates is twofold. The first is that service pay has not kept pace with rising costs of living. The second is that the traditional rights and privileges considered as augmentations to pay have been slowly whittled down or eliminated. Buying privileges in commissaries and post exchanges now save little money. Restrictions have been placed on the type and quality of merchandise on sale. Medical care of dependents is limited and difficult to get. Retirement benefits and incentive pay have been subject to annual question by special commissions and congressional groups. Housing has been poor and scarce.

I find that the low pay rates and the reduction of traditional rights and privileges are the results of efforts by Congress and others to save money. These reductions affecting as they do the lives and morale of all the services have certainly been penny-wise and pound-foolish. While it would appear on the surface to cost money to raise service pay and to restore traditional benefits and privileges, such expenditures would be repaid many times by the savings in retraining costs of new men—not to mention the priceless increase in efficiency of our Air Force—and other services. I would guess that we would get as much as $4 to $5 back in savings for each dollar we spend. Private industry and business have long recognized the fact that adequate compensation and good working conditions will attract and hold skilled, loyal employees.

I am telling you of this personnel problem tonight because it affects each and every one of us. Unless the inequities in the treatment of our servicemen are corrected, and our forces stabilized by higher reenlistment rates, the efficiency of our forces will be impaired. I fear the peace of the world—the security of the very rooms in which we are sitting tonight—will be jeopardized if the quality of our striking forces—the forces capable of inflicting instant and massive retaliation—should drop.

As Secretary of the Air Force, I am determined to do everything in my power to make service in the Air Force attractive to the young men of America. We want to make service in the Air Force sought after by the able young men of our country.

The Air Force is now conducting a drive to restore many of the traditional benefits that make service life more attractive to our people. The program that we are conducting to improve life in the service includes many things that the armed services cannot do for themselves. We along with the Army and Navy are asking Congress to assist by removing legislative blocks which now prohibit the restoration of certain privileges. We have bills in Congress to equalize survivor benefits, to provide medical care for servicemen and their families, and to improve service housing.

We are asking for the removal of the surtax on commissary purchases. We are urging a return to the prewar post-exchange system and privileges.

It is vital that each of you support these efforts. You can do much to encourage the young men of our country to consider seriously a service career. While we may dislike the thought, we will have to maintain our Armed Forces strong and ready over an indefinite period. Finally, I would appeal to you to let the men who are now in the service know that you do appreciate the sacrifices and efforts they are making in the defense of our country. We all fall back on the man in uniform when the shooting starts. We need them now as never before in our history. Why don't we tell them that we are grateful.

I had hoped tonight to announce to you the location of the new Air Academy. Congress and the President authorized this new

Academy in Public Law 325 which directed that I appoint a Commission to determine the site for this Academy. This Commission has been named. It is composed of five outstanding Americans:

Gen. Carl Spaatz, first Chief of Staff of the United States Air Force and a member of the previous site selection board; Merrill C. Meigs of Chicago, vice president of the Hearst Corp.; Brig. Gen. Charles A. Lindbergh, of Connecticut (U. S. Air Force Reserve), who last week added a Pulitzer prize to his long list of accomplishments; Dr. Virgil M. Hancher of Iowa City, Iowa, educator and president of the University of Iowa; and finally Lt. Gen. Hubert R. Harmon (U. S. Air Force retired), who has acted as a special assistant for Air Force Academy matters and who was a member of the original Air Academy Site Selection Board.

The Air Force has received requests from over 600 communities in 45 States to receive consideration as the site for the new Air Academy. The Commission has considered the proposed sites on the basis of a series of factors which deal with the location, attractiveness, accessibility and desirability of each site. The Commission has flown over 18,000 miles and has visited numerous sites, in addition to utilizing all the data compiled and submitted by local interests and by the previous board to assist them in making a recommendation.

I have been in contact with them today, but they still have not reached an agreement. I hope to be able to make this announcement soon.

These are hectic times. We live in a troubled world. It is a world that has split itself into two camps with opposing views on basic human values. I am sure that you all agree with me that we can and must afford to provide the security to insure the preservation of our liberties and our way of life.

The Air Force is the keystone of our efforts to be the pillar of strength to the free world. We must maintain this strength—maintain ourselves so strong that no nation will dare attack us. We must provide this strength as a shield which will permit our statesmen and our leaders the time and the posture to deal with the other nations of the world and erase the tensions which lead to war. Let us pray that the efforts of our leaders to secure and hold the peace do not fail.

The Bryson Bill, H. R. 1227

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 19, 1954

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the Appendix of the Record a petition concerning the Bryson bill, H. R. 1227. The petition follows:

We, the undersigned, believing that the cause of total abstinence can be served by the reduction of advertising of alcoholic beverages over radio and television, urge that our congressional representatives insist on getting a hearing and voting for the Bryson bill, H. R. 1227, which would prohibit the transportation in interstate commerce of alcoholic beverages advertising in newspapers, periodicals, and its broadcasting over radio and TV; also to present the petitions to the House and to have a note made of them in the Congressional Record:

Howard Hickman, Ira Hickman, P. F. Hickman, David M. Sayers, A. J. Gilmore, Mrs. Ira Hickman, Fred Spradley, Mrs. Fred Spradley, Mrs. Frank Hickman, Mrs. Howard Hickman, Mrs. Cora Lee Lynch, Mrs. Earl Collins, Ray Collins, Mr. and Mrs. James L. Hamilton, Mrs. Marion Hickman, Marion Hickman, D. B. Motes, Brantley Motes, Earl Collins, Mrs. Paul Hickman, Mrs. George Creel, Mrs. M. G. Brooks, M. G. Brooks, Grover C. Beasley, Mr. and Mrs. Ralph K. Gravette, Mr. and Mrs. Ralph F. Brooks, H. N. Williams, A. A. Spradley, Mrs. Eula DeMedicis, Viola Hickman, Mrs. H. N. Williams, Mrs. A. A. Spradley, Mrs. J. B. Hickman, Mr. J. B. Hickman, Mrs. Viola E. Thompson, Sylacauga, Ala.

Tribute to Gen. Douglas MacArthur by the Governor of New Hampshire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 19, 1954

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, his excellency, Hugh Gregg, Governor of my home State of New Hampshire, recently paid a very fine and well-deserved tribute to one of the Nation's most distinguished military leaders, Gen. Douglas MacArthur. I have endorsed everything Governor Gregg said about our eminent general.

The occasion for the Governor's remarks was a statewide dinner at which the Governor introduced General MacArthur to nearly 2,500 persons who later heard the general deliver a stirring address. It was my privilege to have the general's remarks made a part of the Record of May 4, 1954. I now ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record the remarks of Governor Gregg.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Ours is a proud tradition dating back 331 years when the record of history discloses that, at Odiorne's Point in the town now known as Rye, there appeared the first party of New Hampshire Whoopers. Discovering a land with scenic wonders aplenty and a climate invigorating of both body and spirit, they set forth to hew the wilderness into this greatest State of the 48.

One hundred and fifty years later, in 1774, again it was New Hampshire men who first led this Nation in its beginning struggle for the selfrespect of free men everywhere. Their earnestness of purpose was kindled by the uncompromising courage of such leaders as Gen. John Stark with his fighting words, "live free or die."

We are justly proud of these colonial patriots whose strength of character, ingenuity, and resourcefulness gave birth to a new society based on the equality of all men. Today, in the complexities of modern life, we particularly revere those fellow citizens who have pioneered throughout the world in charting a course of liberty and justice for all peoples.

Tonight we honor such an American—a man who demonstrated the ultimate in courage and devotion to country when, at the height of his career, he refused to compromise his ideals.

He did not remain silent when the soldiers of many nations, but principally his fellow Americans, were being sacrificed in a wasteful war which they were no permitted to win—an involuntary stalemate from which he knew no real peace would ever be fashioned. Fearlessly, he spoke out in a firm voice which hurled its thunderous accents across the seas and around the world.

The foresight then displayed by this outspoken leader is now bitterly apparent as we see the continuing wastage of human lives occurring in Indochina. Lives which tomorrow may be American lives. A tragedy of our own making, with maybe more misery to come—all because we failed to resolve the Korean fighting by the complete crushing of the Communist armies to the point where further aggression in the Far East would have been impossible.

Millions of freedom-loving peoples everywhere still want the guidance of this greatest military leader—the one man whom the Communists fear the most.

North of here, embosomed in the magnificence of our mountains, God Almighty hung out a sign that in the Granite State—men are made. Tonight, while the citizens of all States and free nations look to New Hampshire, even our Great Stone Face appears to have a majestic warmth as he views with pride the presence of this great man.

His spirit is of the same uncompromising courage with which our forefathers and Daniel Webster made our State and Nation. Strong men of resolute purpose have always guided us through paths of prosperity and progress so that on this Muster Day the people of New Hampshire do rightfully claim they are blessed with a variety of riches possessed by the people of no other State.

Gen. Douglas MacArthur exemplifies the best of all these qualities of our cherished heritage, so every citizen of New Hampshire now joins in admitting him as an honorary member of our own exclusive fraternity—a whooper for New Hampshire.

Need for Correction of Existing Oil Depletion Allowance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 19, 1954

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an editorial which appeared in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch under date of May 10, 1954, in which they endorsed the need of a correction in the existing tax law regarding depletion allowance.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

SIX TIMES OVER

Senator Williams' proposal to reduce the oil depletion allowance is a moderate approach. The Delaware Republican only suggests reducing it from 27½ percent to 15 percent. This is the deduction from gross income allowed to oil and gas companies for income-tax purposes.

The United States Treasury in the last 15 years has repeatedly advocated eliminating the depletion allowance altogether. It has pointed to the allowance as an example of special privilege. In addition to at least the reduction proposed by Senator Williams, a major loophole for abuse of the privilege should be closed. This loophole permits the deductions on oil and gas wells to continue long after the wells have paid for themselves. On an actual cost basis these tax deductions are said to average six times the depletion sustained on the wells.

Manufacturing industries could charge part of the cost of their physical plant to expense, and deduct depreciation until it aggregated six times the original cost of the plant, if they enjoyed a similar privilege. Oil and gas producers may require—at least in times of short supply—some degree of tax incentive to spur them on to bring in new wells. But does the incentive need to run to such absurd extremes?

Public Laws 341 to 351, Inclusive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 19, 1954

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent, I am extending my remarks to include my reports to my constituents in the Second District of Illinois in the laws enacted by the 83d Congress, as follows:

TWENTY-SECOND REPORT ON LEGISLATION OF THE 83D CONGRESS

DEAR FRIEND: Here are the new laws since my last report to you:

PUBLIC LAW 341: H. R. 7380, NEW HOME FOR BUREAU OF STANDARDS LABORATORY

National Bureau of Standards, high in the esteem of our scientists, this week is moving its Radio Propagation Laboratory to Boulder, Colo. New buildings there just completed will house laboratories (a) for testing the effect of atmosphere on radio transmission and reception, and (b) to conduct for the Atomic Energy Commission the cryogenic engineering program (studying methods of producing very low temperatures).

In 1950 the city of Boulder donated 210 acres of land to the United States for the site of the buildings. The Federal construction activity and increase in population resultant from an influx of Federal workers from Washington brought new problems to Boulder. The water supply was inadequate. Boulder is meeting the situation by constructing a new reservoir. Public Law 341 helps out by conveying back to Boulder 2 acres of the 210 given to the United States in 1950. The 2 acres are not needed for the Federal facilities, they are necessary to the building of the reservoir.

PUBLIC LAW 342: SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 146, NATIONAL OLYMPIC DAY

Authorizes the President to proclaim October 16, 1954, as National Olympic Day, and urge the country to support the Olympic games (Melbourne, Australia, 1956); the Pan American Games (Mexico City, 1955); and the winter games (Cortina d'Ampezzo, Italy, 1956). I like especially paragraph 4 of Public Law 342:

"The people of the world in these trying times require above all else occasions for friendship and understanding, and among the most telling things which influence people of other countries are the acts of individuals and not those of governments."

PUBLIC LAW 343: SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 63, CIVIL DEFENSE, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The Federal Civil Defense Act authorizes interstate compacts to provide mutual assistance in the event of major disasters. Public Law 343 empowers the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to enter into compacts in form similar to the model civil defense compact developed by Federal and State bodies in 1950.

As the District does not have a governor, Public Law 343 states: "and with respect to the District of Columbia the word 'governor' means the Commissioners of the District of Columbia."

PUBLIC LAW 344: SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 130, NATIONAL MENTAL HEALTH WEEK

Because of this enactment, followed by the President's proclamation, May 2 to May 8, was the officially designated Mental Health Week. It was intended to serve the useful purpose of alerting the American public to what the committee (Judiciary) termed the "No. 1 health problem of the Nation."

The committee report states that there are now 650,000 patients in our mental hospitals, more than the combined number of polio, cancer, heart, pneumonia, and other physical disease patients. Each year 250,000 new patients are received by the mental hospitals. In World War II in excess of 2 million men were either rejected or discharged from military service because of mental or emotional disorders. Annual loss to taxpayers (State and Federal) in maintaining hospitalized mental cases and paying benefits to dependents of persons mentally ill is estimated at $1 billion. This does not include dollar loss in crime and upkeep of courts, prisons, and welfare services.

Unfortunately, we have such a multiplicity of "weeks" (possibly overworked on the local level) that it is difficult to keep track. This is the 6th year we have had National Mental Health Week. Those close to the problem say the results have been satisfactory.

PUBLIC LAW 345: H. R. 6436, WHERE TELEPHONE COMPANIES USE RADIO

Local telephone companies (mainly rural independents) in some instances use radio instead of wires to reach moving vehicles, isolated farmhouses, mines, and the like. While the companies are strictly in intrastate business, occasionally the radio messages do cross State lines. Public Law 345 quiets their worries. They will not be taken over by the Federal Communications Commission as long as they are engaged primarily in intrastate operations. State and local regulations will continue to fix rates.

PUBLIC LAW 346: H. R. 0539, SURVIVOR BENEFITS FOR SERVICEMEN

Qualified members of the armed services desiring to provide for their survivors, please take note. Public Law 239 (enacted in the 1st sess., my Rept. No. 10) afforded certain members of the uniformed services the option of reducing the amount of retired pay to build up survivor annuities. The final date of election was set at April 30, 1954. Public Law 346 extends the date to November 1, 1954. More time was needed for those eligible to study a system of survivor benefits entirely new to the military services and to make elections which will be irrevocable. If they have not done so already, members who have completed 18 years of service should give attention. After November 1, 1954, it will be too late.

PUBLIC LAW 347: H. R. 3477, THE PRICE OF PROCRASTINATION

Public Law 636 of the 81st Congress simplified methods of settling accounts of deceased civilian government employees. Employees of the Canal Zone and the Panama Canal were excluded, because the related agencies failed to act in time. Thus the 83d Congress had to pass another law (Public Law 347) to include them in the coverage.

PUBLIC LAW 348: H. R. 7402, PARKING LOT FOR ST. JOSEPH, MICH.

Chicagoans visiting or passing through St. Joseph, Mich., will be glad to learn that there will be additional parking space in old St. Joe thanks to Public Law 348. This act authorizes the sale to the city of St. Joseph of a federally owned lot on Lake Boulevard (no longer of use to the Government) for $3,300, conditional on the use of the property exclusively for parking purposes.

I approve of the policy of the Federal Government in cooperating with municipal governments in working out local problems, especially in connection with highway transportation. The large investment of Federal money in highway grants ($1,932,000,000) will be covered in my report on Public Law 350, to follow. It is self evident that municipal parking problems will be intensified by the growing volume of traffic passing through the cities on highway routes.

GENERALS AND ADMIRALS

What Congress is doing to safeguard against promotional pyramiding in the armed services (we now have 151 generals and 38 admirals on detached duties the world around) will be covered in my next report. Also Public Law 350, the $2 billion highway construction measure.

Cordially and sincerely,

BARRATT O'HARA,
Member of Congress.

TWENTY-THIRD REPORT ON LEGISLATION OF THE 83D CONGRESS

DEAR FRIEND: Here are the new laws of the land, beginning where we left off, and the manner of my thinking it out in the casting of your vote:

PUBLIC LAW 349: H. R. 7103, OFFICER GRADE LIMITATION ACT OF 1954

Temporary appointments in the armed services can run wild. In war it is unavoidable. After World War I the problem of readjustment was simple. The services quickly went back to a peace basis, reservists no longer needed returned home, and Regular officers reverted to their permanent grades. I recall meeting in the Adjutant General's Office in Washington a year or so after the peace an officer who had been the commanding general of a division. He was back at the old stand, a major working at a desk in the outer office.

But World War II left us with the cold war and commitments almost everywhere. Today we have 6,241 officers (including 151 generals, 38 admirals) serving with the United Nations, North Atlantic Treaty Organization, Allied Powers in Europe, military-assistance advisory groups and missions, civilian agencies in areas where billions of dollars of foreign-aid funds are being spent, and on other similar assignments not properly of military character. Most are in temporary grades, some as much as four grades above the permanent grade.

No one knows the military future, and there is the responsibility of maintaining the morale of younger officers with reasonable promotional prospect. Also there is the responsibility to the taxpayers of guarding against promotional pyramiding.

A rider in the 1953 defense appropriations set off the fireworks. It placed a limitation on the number of officers in the grade of Army captain, or equivalent, and above. The Navy said this threatened the demotion of 5,000 naval lieutenants, thus was unfair to younger officers. Limitations (grade of major and upward) again were imposed in the 1954 defense appropriations. Riders of this nature are not popular with many Members of the House. They constitute an invasion of the jurisdiction of other committees.

The House Committee on Armed Services responded with exhaustive hearings to determine a better way to proceed (a) to meet the demands on the services in a greatly enlarged program, and (b) to hold open the prospect of earned promotions as an attraction to younger career officers. It inquired if the fault was in an excessive number at the top (colonels, admirals, and generals). The committee's finding was that there had been no abuse of promotions in the armed services; nevertheless there was a danger.

Public Law 349 provides a method of congressional control over the military structure. It is based on the theory that as the total officer strength increases the proportion of senior officers decreases. Under existing law the officers in any grade are limited by number. Public Law 349 puts it on a percentage basis. Illustration: the maximum number of generals is seventy-five one-hundreds of 1 percent of the total number of officers. Here is how it works out: if the officer strength were 50,000 there could be 350 generals and no more, 3,352 colonels, 6,940 lieutenant colonels, and 9,350 majors. That would leave 30,008 commissions in the lower grades.

I thought it was a move in the right direction. Nevertheless, it left to be answered (I hope in later legislation) the question bothering me: Is it absolutely necessary for the Nation's security to tie up in nonmilitary assignments so large and expensive a number of top personnel? The same rigid rules of economy applicable to Federal civil employment should hold with the armed services.

PUBLIC LAW 350: H. R. 8127, FEDERAL AID ROAD ACT OF 1954

This law is grouped with the St. Lawrence seaway and excise-tax reduction measures as constituting the three major legislative achievements of the 83d Congress up to the present time, a month or so before the expected final adjournment. Authorizing the expenditure of $966 million a year in 1956 and 1957, a total of nearly $2 billion, it has been termed the "biggest highway aid bill in history." Heretofore we have been putting annually $575 million in Federal moneys into highway construction.

Public Law 350 authorizes $700 million to match money put up by the States for construction and $175 million for work on the interstate Federal system. I think you are interested in knowing how much will be available to Illinois. Mr. Allen, of the Bureau of Public Roads, compiled, at my request, the following approximate figures (to be apportioned and made available to Illinois not later than January 1, 1955):

Federal-aid primary	$12, 135, 000
Federal-aid secondary	6, 608, 000
Federal-aid urban	12, 068, 000
Interstate highway system	8, 085, 000
Total	38, 896, 000

Reason the authorizations for 1956 and 1957 are made in 1954: To enable State legislatures, convening in 1955, to provide matching authorizations on the State level to assure orderly continuance of highway-construction program for another 2 years. The 1954 act is substantially on the basic pattern established by Congress in the acts of 1944, 1948, 1950, and 1952.

Some reasons cited for increase in total authorizations: (a) Growth in traffic, 55 million motor vehicles on our roads now, compared with 34 million in 1946; (b) need of repairs and reconditioning, American Association of State Highway Officials claiming Federal-aid system of highways require $35 billion to bring it up to date, also testimony of National Safety Council that 13,000 traffic fatalities in last year were caused by faulty roads; (c) expanded program of highway construction through forest lands; (d) contribution to the national defense; and (e) means of fighting off growing unemployment.

I was especially pleased by the authorization of $48 million a year for the 5 years ending in 1959 for the Inter-American Highway and $2 million for the Rama Road in Nicaragua. The completion of a highway from Canada certainly as far south as the Panama Canal is a must to national security and pan-American cordiality.

Someone said in debate that about a billion dollars a year is derived from the tax on gas. The House by a teller vote, 93 to 90, refused to earmark this for application on the Federal roads aid program for the reason that tax legislation properly comes under the jurisdiction of the Ways and Means Committee. The revenue from the tax on gas goes into the general treasury, the bill for highway aid is paid from the general treasury; it amounts to the same thing, a billion dollars in gas tax pays for a billion dollars in road benefits, fair enough I would say and hope I have your agreement, otherwise your letters telling me what I overlooked in thinking it out.

PUBLIC LAW 351: HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 347, ALABAMA-FLORIDA BOUNDARY

Constitutions of Alabama and Florida fix the mouth of the Perdido River as the common boundary line. But winds, waves, and currents have shifted the river mouth so it was anyone's guess just where Alabama left off and Florida began. Both States now have entered into a compact fixing the boundary in terms of longitude and latitude. Public Law 351 gives the consent of Congress.

Cordially and sincerely,

BARRATT O'HARA,
Member of Congress.

The Regional School Program in Massachusetts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 19, 1954

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following very interesting article from the current issue of State Government, published monthly by the Council of State Governments. The article is by Dr. John J. Desmond, Jr., commissioner of education in Massachusetts, summarizes the background, essential features, and promising results to date of the regional district program. Consolidation of public-school units has been an important means of educational improvement in America for many years. Massachusetts, one of the leaders in the movement, has been aided greatly in it since 1949 by legislation facilitating the establishment of regional school districts.

The article follows:

THE REGIONAL SCHOOL PROGRAM IN MASSACHUSETTS

(By John J. Desmond, Jr.)

In recent years few educational responsibilities have had greater far-reaching importance to the people of a State than the establishment of a sound local district structure for administering the public schools. The objectives of economy and efficiency are always significant for any branch of State or local government. The desire to discharge their responsibilities to the children and youth of the Nation by extending free universal educational opportunity to young and old and to equalize this opportunity in accordance with the ability of the individual has had priority in the thinking of sound educators.

If equal educational opportunity is to become a reality rather than an ideal or merely a mandate of the law, it is obvious that the still overwhelming number of small school units must be subject to study, reorganization, and consolidation.

Together with other States Massachusetts has made progress in this matter since 1930. It has reduced its 1-teacher schools from 498 in 1930–31 to an estimated 128 in 1953–54. This reduction, of 76.3 percent, has been accomplished by consolidation of small units in central schools. In that period the reduction for the Nation has been from 148,711 to 48,735 such schools. The resultant elimination of multiple grade classes and the wider offerings, better classification and more extensive equipment undoubtedly have tended toward the realization of equality of educational opportunity.

Until 1949 the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, comprising 351 cities and towns as political subdivisions, has had separate school systems, each under the administrative control of an elective school committee of not less than 3 members. Of the smaller towns 185 are organized in superintendency unions of from 2 to 5 towns each, and are administered by the separate school committees, which employ union superintendents. A joint committee, representative of the constituent towns in each union, elects the superintendent for a term of 3 years. If elected for a second term, the union superintendent continues thereafter to serve at the discretion of the joint committee without further reelection.

In 1948 the Massachusetts General Court enacted chapter 645, acts of 1948, creating a commission "to encourage the establishment of regional and consolidated public schools and to provide financial assistance to cities and towns in the construction of school buildings." This legislation followed studies by recess commissions of the general court in previous years on problems of education in which, recurrently, the question of the small high-school units—those with an enrollment of less than 100 pupils—arose. Approximately 65 such schools were operating, with 3- or 4-year programs in grades 10–12 or 9–12. In Massachusetts the enactment of 1948 is viewed as the most significant step in the progress of reorganization since Horace Mann's valiant battle for adequate districts, as recorded by that pioneer educator in his ninth annual report as secretary of the board of education in 1846.

The following quotation is from the report of Secretary Mann for that year:

"The practice of subdividing districts, in order to bring a school literally to every man's door—a practice so suicidal to all the best interests of education—is nearly discontinued. During the last year, I have reason to believe that more districts have doubled their resources and their strength, by union, than have pauperized themselves by division."

A "union school" statute passed in 1868, permitting parts of adjoining towns to merge school districts, was never used. The districts numbered 2,258 at that period. The various legislative efforts to abolish small school districts between 1869 and 1882 were ineffective, until finally, by chapter 219 of the acts of 1882, school districts were "forever" abolished; and effective January 1, 1883, the 346 cities and towns constituted 346 school systems, each under an elective school committee.

The second significant legislative step of recent years was chapter 638 of the acts of 1949, which amended previous legislation and set up the machinery for the establishment of regional school districts. Subsequent amendments clarifying procedures and definitions have been enacted in successive years, which give evidence of the intelligent appreciation by the citizens of the purposes and objectives of the regional school district program and a willingness on the part of the general court to liberalize the interpretation of the legislation and provide generous financial assistance.

The school building assistance commission, created in 1948, administers the regional school district program in the department of education. The commission is composed of 5 members, 3 appointed by the Governor with the advice and consent of the executive council. The remaining two members are appointed by the board of education. The commission is unpaid; its members receive compensation for expenses actually and necessarily incurred in the performance of their duties. It employs an administrator, who is the executive officer, and such assistants, experts, clerks, and other employees as it may deem necessary.

The powers and duties of the commission are, generally, to encourage and foster the establishment and building of consolidated and regional or union public schools in and among the cities and towns of the Commonwealth, to conduct surveys and studies relative thereto, and to administer the provisions of the act relative to grants to cities and towns for the planning and construction of school buildings. The commission is specifically authorized to make contracts for surveys or other technical services within the scope of its duties; to provide legal, architectural, or other technical advice and assistance to cities and towns or to joint committees thereof in the planning and establishment of regional or consolidated schools; and to recommend to the general court such legislation as it may deem desirable or necessary to further the purposes of the law.

Although the commission is amply staffed with competent leadership and assistants, the commissioner of education has kept closely in contact with the program of the regional school districts. He has the function under the law of approving the agreements finally drawn before the region is formed.

In discharging its responsibility of encouraging the formation of regional districts the commission makes available to the contracting towns State aid for school building ranging from 35 to 65 percent of the cost of site, plans, building, and equipment. The amount of the aid is based upon the financial ability of the individual towns in the regional school district. The commission's professional staff assists communities in planning to meet their school plant requirements. It participates at all stages from identification of educational needs to approval of final working drawings. The staff also assists in the preparation and submission of documentary evidence on which the State construction grant is based.

The mechanism of the regional school district law is substantially as follows:

1. Towns study regional organization informally through school committees, Parent-Teacher Association groups, the League of Women Voters, the Civic League, veterans' organization, or by a combination of these and other groups.

2. When ready for formal action, a town votes to create a three-member Regional School District Planning Committee, its membership including one member of the existing school committee.

3. Regional School District Planning Committees from two or more towns specified in the statutes merge to form a regional school district planning board.

4. The board studies the educational and financial implications of the establishment of a regional school district consisting of the towns represented on the board.

5. If the board agrees, after such study, that a regional school district should not be established, it so reports to the selectmen of the towns and is dissolved.

6. If the board recommends the establishment of a regional school district, it must submit a formal report of its study and an agreement to the selectmen of the towns; the agreement, before submission to the selectmen, must secure the approval of the Massachusetts Department of Education and the Massachusetts Emergency Finance Board.

7. Within 30 days of submission of the report and agreement to the selectmen, each town must vote upon acceptance or rejection of the agreement and the provisions of law relating to regional school districts.

8. The regional school district is established only if every town involved votes affirmatively.

Ten districts already have been formed successfully under the 1949 law, and an increasing number of towns are in various stages in the development of reports or agreements. Several distinctive features of the law undoubtedly account for that progress:

1. The agreement is written locally, and the agreement, not the law, provides for the number, composition, method of selection, and terms of office of members of the regional district school committee; the selection of the town in which each regional school building is to be erected; the grades to be regionalized; the method of sharing operating costs; the method of sharing construction costs; the time and manner of payment by the towns to the region of their shares of costs; the method by which transportation shall be furnished; conditions for admission of new towns to the region; conditions for withdrawal of towns from the region; procedure for adoption of annual budgets; the method by which the agreement may be amended; any other matters not incompatible with the law.

2. The regional school districts are offered four financial inducements: Greater construction grants, greater transportation aid, greater reimbursement for planning costs, a 15-percent bonus to towns within a region for local operating aid.

The present status of the regional school movement in Massachusetts is that 150 towns and 1 city have initiated steps toward the formation of regional districts. Of these communities 135 towns and 1 city have appointed representatives to regional school district planning boards. Seventy-two towns already have voted on joining to form regional school districts—from 1 to 4 times each on different proposals. Sixty of these votes have been favorable, 38 negative and 1 a tie. The possibility of a regional school district is being studied formally by 38 towns. As of April 1, 1954, 10 regional districts have been established; children of the first two will enter their completed buildings in September 1954; those of the third in March 1955; and those of the fourth in September 1955. The remaining six will be functioning at later dates upon completion of structures now in the planning stage.

The public reaction to regional school districts has been interesting and illuminating. The policy of the department of education has been to use no high-pressure salesmanship but to offer encouragement and assistance with the utmost patience and tolerance of all points of view. The result has been a complete change of attitude of original opponents; the friendly relationship has resulted not infrequently in a second study when the reaction to the first had been unfavorable. Proponents have recognized the advantages of improved educational programs and the valuable financial assistance from the State. Communities which may have had local high schools have been willing to consolidate to gain the advantages specified above. Those communities without high schools, which sent pupils to neighboring towns on a tuition basis, welcomed the opportunity to gain a voice in the education of their children through regional organization.

Opponents of consolidation have exhibited the following attitudes:

1. A nostalgic feeling toward local "small" schools on the part of local educators and lay people.

2. A refusal to believe that added State aid does not involve State control.

3. Unwillingness to share control with a neighboring town or towns.

4. A belief, in towns without high schools, that paying tuition is cheaper than sharing in the operating costs of a regional district school; refusal to accept the fact that the host town may not be able to accommodate tuition pupils indefinitely or that it may take advantage of the absence of State control over tuition charges.

The future success of regional district organization in the pattern now successfully developed in Massachusetts in the past 5 years appears to be assured. The sincere interest of representative citizens serving on regional committees and planning boards, the wise guidance of the school building assistance commission and its staff, and the insistent demand of parents for improved educational programs, with equality of opportunity for their children, have combined to accomplish as a fact what has been an ideal and a mandate of the law for generations in this Commonwealth.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Printing and binding for Congress, when recommended to be done by the Committee on Printing of either House, shall be so recommended in a report containing an approximate estimate of the cost thereof, together with a statement from the Public Printer of estimated approximate cost of work previously ordered by Congress within the fiscal year (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 145, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on Printing, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

DISTRIBUTION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

To the Vice President and each Senator 100 copies; to the Secretary and Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, each, 25 copies; to the Secretary, for official use, not to exceed 35 copies; to the Sergeant at Arms, for use on the floor of the Senate, not to exceed 50 copies; to each Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress, 68 copies; to the Clerk, Sergeant at Arms, and Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives, each, 25 copies; to the Clerk, for official use, not to exceed 50 copies; and to the Doorkeeper, for use on the floor of the House of Representatives, not to exceed 75 copies; to the Vice President and each Senator, Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress there shall also be furnished (and shall not be transferable), 3 copies of the daily Record, of which 1 shall be delivered at his residence, 1 at his office, and 1 at the Capitol.

Appendix

What Policy Should Be Followed in Indochina?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 20, 1954

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record the text of a debate between the distinguished majority leader [Mr. Knowland] and myself on the question, "What policy should be followed in Indochina?" which was broadcast over the CBS radio on May 16, 1954.

There being no objection, the text of the debate was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

WHAT POLICY SHOULD BE FOLLOWED IN INDOCHINA?

Senator Mansfield. Senator Knowland, what is our policy in Indochina?

Senator Knowland. Senator Mansfield, that is a good $64 question which I think we should take up on this program, and I would like to propose one for further consideration:

Do you believe it is in our national interest to have all of Asia pass into Communist hands?

Mr. Bancroft. Well, to discuss this week's leading question on Indochina, we have two prominent members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, both of whom have recently been in Indochina, and one of them, Senator Knowland, Republican, of California, is the Republican leader in the Senate and can speak of policy matters, and suppose we start with that first question from Senator Mansfield, Senator Knowland. What is our policy in Indochina?

Senator Knowland. Well, I think basically that our policy in Indochina is to help preserve a free world of freemen in Asia. I think that that requires both the encouragement of real independence from colonialism; I think that it requires an effective system of collective security.

I think it furthermore requires that we shall not have a far eastern Munich, because international communism grows with each victory that it gains in the world, and I believe that it would be adverse to our national security interests to permit these countries to be taken over one by one.

Chou En-lai, the Premier and former Minister of China, at the opening speech at Geneva made it clear that we could have peace in the Pacific, providing we would scrap our mutual-security pacts with Japan, with Korea, with the Philippines, and with the Anzus nations, and get our troops out of Korea and out of Japan, take away our training mission from Formosa, and get our bases out of the Philippines and remove our great airbase at Okinawa.

That, of course, the Communists say would mean Asia for the Asians. Actually it would mean Asia for the Communists. It is a type of a dictate that one would expect from a victorious power to a defeated rival. I don't believe that the Government of the United States or the people of the United States should yield to that type of a Far Eastern Munich.

Mr. Bancroft. Senator Mansfield, how do you feel about that policy as outlined by Senator Knowland?

Senator Mansfield. Well, first I would like to refer to Senator Knowland's previous question: Can we afford to lose all of Asia.

No; I do not think that we can afford to be on the losing end in Asia, but I think there are different methods by means of which the security of Asia, even southeast Asia, can yet be possibly maintained.

I think that we ought to place priority not on the creation of a southeast Asia pact manned entirely, or almost entirely by white nations, a pact which would comprise the United States, Britain, France, New Zealand, and Australia.

I think rather than that, that what we ought to have is a southeast Asia pact based primarily on Asiatic nations in that area, nations like the Philippines, Indonesia in time, Thailand, which has already indicated its willingness, Burma, and possibly India.

And I would like to see laid down in that area a sort of a Monroe Doctrine, perhaps by Nehru, which would be somewhat comparable to the Monroe Doctrine issued by our country, with the idea in mind that behind this Asiatic southeast Asia pact would be the might of the United States and other interested nations.

And I would like to see also in this pact the three free states of Indochina, Cambodia, Laos, and Vietnam. In that way I think there is hope for the future.

If we don't bring those people primarily concerned into this picture, then I think the outlook is pretty hopeless.

Senator Knowland. Well, on that, Senator Mansfield, I fully agree that any pact, whether it be a Pacific or a southeast Asian pact, will not be effective unless the free countries of Asia are brought into it, and I think they should be brought in as full partners. Certainly on that point we agree.

I disagree, however, on holding up such a pact until India might come into the picture.

Now I would like to see India join a collective security system in the Far East. But my own judgment is that based on the votes of Mr. Nehru's representatives and India's representatives at the U. N. where, during the Korean war they rendered no assistance to Korea, and they voted with the Communists about 85 percent of the time, and where they recently refused to let our planes that were flying French troops pass over Indian territory, I think it is highly unlikely that presently at least they would join in such a pact. And if we wait for them to make up their minds, I am afraid all of southeast Asia will go down the drain.

Now in addition to the countries you have mentioned, Thailand and the Philippines, which certainly should be a part of any pact, I would like to suggest that both the Republic of Korea and the Republic of China on Formosa should be included, because those two countries, small as they are, the Republic of Korea has over 600,000 well trained people in their armed forces, the Republic of China on Formosa has over 500,000, that is 1,100,000 in their armed forces, which is many times what all the other nations you have mentioned in Asia have put together, and if we are not to be called upon to have manpower in Asia, I think that then the people who want to defend themselves against communism must be invited to be full participants to a Far Eastern pact.

Mr. Bancroft. Senator Mansfield.

Senator Mansfield. Well, Bill, that is an idea, but I think when you include Formosa and Korea, you are stretching the pact pretty far.

I would like to see a southeast Asia pact composed of nations primarily concerned in that area, and another western or northwestern Pacific pact comprised of Formosa, of Korea and Japan. Maybe in time the two could be joined, but of course that is purely conjecture.

About India, I recognise the difficulty which confronts us there, but I also see that there are 360 million people inhabiting a young nation trying to get by without harming its own integrity and, at the same time, in a certain sense sitting on the fence between the East and the West.

This neutralism is pretty hard to understand in an area which is in the process of being on fire, but perhaps if we do try to bring about a better understanding of Mr. Nehru and his needs, and forget for the time being the difficulties which he has and has been causing us, that in the long run that policy might well pay off.

It is true that we might not have that much time, but perhaps if Nehru and these other groups were able to recognize the fact that leadership should be in that part of the world and not in the Occident, maybe they would get off the fence and come around to our side, in the interest of their own self-protection.

Senator Knowland. Well, I certainly think we should continue to carry on discussions, and others interested should continue to carry on discussions with India, and hope that they may eventually join such a pact, but I would be very much concerned if we were to remain and do nothing toward the effective creation of such a pact, waiting for India to decide that if the Communists moved on further aggression, waiting to make up their minds.

I am reminded of the old story about the fellow who was run up a tree by a very vicious and hungry bear, and he finally said in desperation:

"Well, good Lord, if you can't help me, at least don't help the bear."

And I think that at least we can expect the Indians, if they aren't going to help us affirmatively, that at least they not give aid and comfort to the bear.

Mr. Bancroft. Well, as I understand it, India, Burma, and Indochina have pretty firmly rejected this pact up to now at least. Would you, Senator Mansfield, go along without them or would you wait for all three of them?

Senator Mansfield. Well, I would go along working on the other angle, but I would always lay stress on the fact that this must be an Asiatic pact primarily.

I think as far as Indonesia is concerned, their reluctance is understandable because the present government, which is not too unfriendly, has elections coming up in January or February.

I think that the Burmese have made remarkable progress, and I think they would become interested. I think there is a possibility that India in time, if given the proper recognition, could assume the leadership of such a federation, and maybe a man like Nehru in those circumstances could lay down a Monroe Doctrine which would be effective in the security and the well-being of all southeast Asia.

But I think perhaps before we get to that stage, or during the same period, that we ought to give a little more credence to the desires of the Indochinese states, Cambodia, Laos, and Viet Nam, for immediate independence, because I think there is still a chance to retain at least a good portion of the Indochinese area, and I certainly do not write it off as being lost already.

Senator Knowland. Well, I agree with that, and I think that if the Vietnamese and Laotians and Cambodians can have the assurance that they will have the determination as to whether they remain in or get out of the French Union, that they can become even at this late hour an effective force in the Asian collective-security system out there.

When we have been mentioning countries, I don't think we should leave out of consideration Pakistan, which is kind of a link between the Far East and the Middle East, because they do have interests in that area of the world, and I think they, like the Turks further on in the Middle East, are pretty stout allies, if the situation should get really tough.

Senator Mansfield. Well, there is no question about the importance of Pakistan. The only question in my mind is from a geographic standpoint.

But because of the fact that Pakistan is split in two, you do have the eastern part of the country well within the zone, the other part, the area around the Sind Desert and Karachi, the capital, that is more in the western, or Near East, area.

Senator Knowland. That is right. We should not lose sight too, of course, of Ceylon, which is an Asian country.

Senator Mansfield. That's right.

Senator Knowland. And then while they are European in descent, both Australia and New Zealand are geographically in that area of the world, and I would think would have vital interests in preserving a system of international law and order to prevent constant Communist aggression.

Senator Mansfield. Well, that is true, Bill. I didn't mean to not mention Ceylon. I just didn't think about it at the time, but she is one of the most important nations, and certainly because of geography you can't rule out Australia and New Zealand.

Mr. Bancroft. I would like to get one point straight here you mentioned, Senator Mansfield. Am I right in believing that both of you agree that France should make a firm promise of independence to Indochina?

Senator Mansfield. Well, Griff, let me say for the record that Senator Knowland is the first one who advanced the idea of independence at a date certain, based on our policy with the Philippines.

Of course I concur with him fully in that respect, and I also concur with him in the idea that these three states, once given their complete independence, should make up their own minds as to whether or not they want to become members of the French Union.

Personally I think they would, and if they did, they would come in as co-equals and partners, and the French Union, France, and the three states would be strengthened as a result.

Mr. Bancroft. Well, let's see if we can find something you don't agree on. A lot is talked about possible American intervention in Indochina, so let's see what the thinking is on that.

Can you, Senator Knowland, foresee any possibility, and if so, what possibility, of actual American intervention in the fighting over there?

Senator Knowland. Well, of course, no one in being frank and candid with the American people could say that there are no conditions wherein we might feel that it was in our national interest to intervene.

I think the President of the United States has made it very clear that in his judgment, should that time ever arise, and we would all hope that it would not arise, but should it ever arise, he would not commit American sea or air forces or land forces without bringing the matter before the Congress of the United States and laying it fully before them.

Furthermore, I think that Secretary Dulles has made it very clear that he believes that we should have a basis for a collective security system where each nation, having a responsibility in that area of the world, should be prepared to declare in advance what it could contribute toward the common defense.

Now if you have a massive Communist, Chinese Communist intervention that would endanger not only all of southeast Asia but the balance of Asia as well, and tie into the Communist orbit 1,100,000 people of Asia and the vast strategic resources in that area of the world, I think that it would be very crucial from the point of view of our own national security, and I think if that should happen with that type of intervention, that the matter must be laid before the American people.

I don't believe that it would be in our national interest to permit the balance of Asia to pass into Communist hands.

Mr. Bancroft. Even if it meant actual fighting on our part?

Senator Knowland. Even if it meant actual fighting.

Mr. Bancroft. Senator Mansfield, how do you feel about that?

Senator Mansfield. Well, I would have to disagree with Bill there to a certain extent, because you must remember at the present time the French, French Union, and associated states have something in excess of 500,000 combat effectives.

On the other hand, Ho Chi Minh and his group have something on the order of 300,000 combat effectives, a 5-to-3 superiority on the non-Communist side.

You have in addition, at least, also a 10-to-1 superiority in war materiel on the French, French Union, and Associated States side. I think that is quite a factor, and it is because of that partly that I am not too downhearted because of what is happening in Indochina.

I am downhearted but not to the extent that some people are, because I think that the recuperative possibilities are there, if these people do not give up too soon or too easily.

I don't see how we can do any good by going into Indochina with combat effectives, for a number of reasons.

One, because of the superiority in factors which I have mentioned both in manpower and materiel.

Secondly, we just haven't got the manpower at the present time, and under the New Look our manpower in the Army, the Navy, and in the Marine Corps is being reduced considerably.

Furthermore, the French, who have been waging this war now in its 8th year can't, under the law, send any of their conscripts to Indochina unless they volunteer to go there. It is true they have sent most of their commissioned officers, and a great number of their noncoms, but if we were to become involved in Indochina, we would have to be sending our draftees, whereas the French do not and probably would not, at least on the basis of information to date.

Furthermore, we have to think of all the possibilities, and before we make a decision carrying us as far as intervention, I think we ought to recognise the fact that in my opinion at least there is a 50–50 chance that the Chinese would come in from Communist China into Indochina, that they would reopen the war in Korea, and that if things got tough, they would call upon the Soviet Union to honor its mutual security pact with Red China.

Senator Knowland. Well, now right at that point, I think we should make it perfectly clear I have said at the outset of my statement that the matter of intervention in my judgment at least would not arise until the Chinese Communists had intervened in force.

Secondly, I believe that it would be a great mistake at any time for the United States to get involved on the continent of Asia with ground troops, because it would be like trying to cover an elephant with a handkerchief. You just can't do it.

But we do have a supremacy on the sea and we do have a supremacy, in my judgment, in that area of the world in the air.

I believe that if you do not make this an exclusive society and cut out the Republic of Korea and the Republic of China, which between them have 1,100,000 troops, and where the Chinese Communists would find it very difficult to leave their Manchurian-North Korean flank unprotected, and move all their troops south, or where they wouldn't dare strip their coastal areas opposite Formosa, for fear of a commando-type raid, so they would never know where they might be struck, that with the Asian land forces and sea and air assistance, and a complete blockade, in the event Communist China should enter, I believe that the Communists would not be able to take over the balance of Asia.

Now I quite agree that no person should even consider those grave possibilities without recognizing the fact that the Soviet Union might enter the contest at that point, but I do raise this question which is one that all thoughtful Americans must face up to.

If we sit idly by and permit the Chinese Communists to overrun the balance of southeast Asia, they are ultimately going to take over Japan, Formosa, the Philippines, Indonesia, India, and Pakistan. That may take them 3 or 4 years to do, but it will give them 1,100,000,000 people or more in manpower.

It will give them vast strategic resources, and in the 3 or 4 years they are digesting those vast resources and that vast amount of manpower, they will also be stockpiling their atomic weapon. And then when they prepare to turn against the West will we be any better able to face up to the problem at that point than we are to face up to the problem now?

Senator Mansfield. Well, you have got a good argument there, Bill. I think also that Communist China and the Soviet Union likewise must consider the full possibilities if this develops, as far as a possible world war III.

They recognize, of course, that if they invade, reinvade South Korea, at the present time there is a good, an extremely good, South Korean army ready to do battle.

They recognize the fact also that in case this eventuality does come about, that Chiang Kai-shek and his men will finally become unleashed and will attack in some manner or form the mainland of Red China.

But we must not lose sight of the fact that the Chinese Communists have received valuable battle experience because of the Korean conflict and, to a lesser extent, because of previous warlike activities.

It is my understanding that the Chinese Communists have at the present time at least 4 million men well trained and armed. I understand also that they have something like 2,500 planes, many of them MIG's which have been turned over to them by the Soviet Union.

So you are going up against a power which is not deficient, or not as deficient as many of us think, but which is in fairly good shape and ready to carry on activities.

Now I understand since the fall of Dien Bien Phu that General Navarre has issued the statement that a Chinese antiaircraft regiment had been engaged in that battle. If so, of course, that means that instead of technicians and advisers, the Chinese Communists have now sent fullfledged combat effectives into that country.

How does that fit in with your theory or your statement that if the Chinese enter the war in Indochina that we would have to consider taking action?

Senator Knowland. Well, I saw the newspaper reports which purported to represent a statement by General Navarre. Personally, I have not seen any evidence to date, nor have I received any information to date, which would indicate that there were Chinese units as Chinese units.

Senator Mansfield. I would agree with you in that respect, because it is open to question.

Senator Knowland. It is open to question, whereas in the Korean struggle we knew that there were divisions, Chinese divisions, and corps and armies, that had actually crossed over from Manchuria, engaged in that struggle there.

But I do think we, of course, should make every effort to arrive at a peace with honor. Certainly the whole world and every person in their right minds wants to preserve the peace for ourselves and for our children.

But I think there does come a time in life, and we have had that come during our own existence as a nation, when you can't accept a situation where it is an abject surrender of the type that a defeated nation would accept from a conquering nation, and completely remove us from the whole Pacific area, and result in all of Asia going down the drain, which, I think, inevitably would make it most difficult to hold Europe, drive us back as an isolated continental Dien Bien Phu, where the Communist world would then be organized against us.

I think we have to recognize that we are entitled to know whether we can get peace with honor; and if we can, if we are going to be faced with a constant menace of communistic Russia, then I think the American people have always had the courage to face up to that type of a danger confronting them and their children, and perhaps their whole way of life.

Senator Mansfield. Well, Bill, don't you think that it should be the duty of the administration and the Congress to keep the American people fully informed of developments so that we will be aware of just what is happening in that part of the world?

Don't you think, for example, that the American people ought to know that the present administration has been doing everything it possibly could to bring about as great a degree of complete independence among the Chinese states as is possible?

I think those things ought to be brought home, and I think that it is up to this administration and to those of us who serve in the Congress and to the press and radio to really tell the American people just what the stakes are and, at the same time, to tell them what the possibilities are, in case it comes to a real showdown.

Senator Knowland. And what the alternatives are.

Senator Mansfield. That's right.

Senator Knowland. Then I quite agree with you that this is a matter of vital concern to every American man, woman, and child.

We, of course, want, and our whole effort should be devoted, to building a system of international law and order, as I pointed out before. The people are entitled to have all the facts. I don't think we should sugarcoat them.

I think there are no easy solutions of this problem we face, and we can't make any decision without that decision involving some risks.

Senator Mansfield. Not only no easy solutions, no cheap solutions, and no quick ones either.

Senator Knowland. I agree on that.

Mr. Bancroft. Senator Knowland, you mentioned peace with honor, which of course we all want, and I believe we are attempting to secure, at Geneva. Do you think we are following the right policies at Geneva?

Senator Knowland. Well, of course, until the conference perhaps goes on a little while longer, you can't tell whether it is possible.

Certainly on the opening statements of Chou En-lai an dthe Communist representatives there, there is nothing to indicate that they will accept anything that won't result in the ultimate loss of Indochina, Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia into Communist hands, and wouldn't result in all of Korea going into Communist hands.

Now, it may be that that was their first asking price, so to speak. They may modify their stand.

It looks to me, however, as though they are becoming more arrogant as they think more divisions are being created in the free world.

Mr. Bancroft. Well, Secretary Dulles came back and, of course, reported to you people on the Foreign Relations Committee. Senator Mansfield, how do you feel about things at Geneva?

Senator Mansfield. Well, it appears to me that there are two possibilities, both bad.

One is the possibility of a coalition government, which I think would be playing right into the hands of Red China and would only forestall the gradual absorption of all of Indochina by Ho Chi Minh and the Chinese Communists.

The second is the matter of the partition line. I don't like the idea, but it may well be that that is the solution that might come out at Geneva. If it does, and it is a reasonably good line, then I think that ought to be the line which should be defended.

Senator Knowland. Yes; but that line, of course, can't be defended unless there is sufficient power created and nations willing to defend it at that point.

Senator Mansfield. That is absolutely correct, and that is where your pact comes in, and I hope that if there is a pact, it will be based primarily, going back to what I said originally, on southeast Asian nations.

Senator Knowland. And, of course, the Communists may try to stall at Geneva, as they did at Panmunjom, while they are building up their power, and that is why I don't think that we should wait until Geneva is finished before work on the pact.

Mr. Bancroft. I am afraid that is all the time we have, and thank you very, very much, Senator Knowland and Senator Mansfield."

Imports of Cheaply Produced Foreign Products

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1954

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, an editorial appearing in a recent edition of the Seattle Post-Intelligencer points out the need for our Government to give more consideration to the welfare of American industries which have been adversely affected by imports of cheaply produced foreign products.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include it in the Appendix of the Record, as follows:

Another Side

The American Government recently advanced a very large sum of money for the development of lead mines in Africa, with the agreement that repayment was to be made in that metal.

Lead is an important metal to the economy of America, and in wartime is indispensable. So at first blush this seems a good deal.

But there is another side to it.

There are tremendous deposits of lead in the United States, and if the mining industries were encouraged and supported by our Government to the same extent that the African enterprises are being encouraged and supported, all of our peacetime and wartime needs would be amply supplied.

And many thousands of Americans would be usefully and profitably employed.

There is no disputing the fact that lead can be produced in Africa at a lower cost than in America.

The average pay of an African lead miner is less than $12 a month plus keep, whereas the American mine workers gets an average pay of $360 a month—if and when he works at all.

One way to correct that adverse competitive situation would be to cut the American wage standards to the African level, which nobody wants to do.

But is it any better to turn our markets over to foreign competitors and close our mines and deny our people jobs?

In all fields of American production, in which cheaply produced foreign goods are permitted to have an advantage in American markets, the ultimate price of the imported article must include the unemployment it creates in America.

Those who give away American wealth so lavishly, and reject American resources so carelessly, are quick to impugn the motives of those who want our country to achieve self-sufficiency and to be self-supporting first.

But what is wrong with putting American welfare, prosperity and security first in the considerations of our own people and Government?

H. R. 8300, To Revise the Internal Revenue Laws of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1954

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following stenographic transcript of hearings before the Committee on Finance on H. R. 8300, an act to revise the internal revenue laws of the United States, April 8, 1954:

TESTIMONY OF CHARLES C. MACLEAN, JR., ASSOCIATION OF THE BAR OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK

The Chairman. Will you identify yourself for the reporter, please.

Mr. MacLean. My name is Charles C. MacLean.

I appear on behalf of the committee on taxation of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York.

Mr. John H. Alexander, chairman of our committee, found it impossible to be here today and asked me to substitute for him. Our committee very much appreciates this opportunity to be here and to file reports on various sections of the bill.

Since the bill was not made public until March 9, and was not generally available until a few days thereafter, our study of many of the provisions of the bill has not advanced beyond a preliminary stage.

We have, however, been able to make substantial progress in consideration of a few of the more important parts of the bill, and we are filing at this time a report covering these sections.

The Chairman. It will be made a part of the record.

Mr. MacLean. We hope to follow this with one or more additional reports relating to other parts of the bill.

Our committee recognizes the tremendous effort that has gone into the preparation of this bill. We are in complete agreement with the overall objectives of simplifying the structure of the Internal Revenue Code and bringing a higher degree of certainty to its operations.

It was, however, quite a shock to be confronted in mid-March with a proposed new code containing extensive changes, which had not previously been made public, and to learn that we had only a few weeks in which to digest the bill and submit our comments, and that your committee had similar time to make the necessary amendments.

The Chairman. The Senate Committee on Finance is under the same difficulty.

Mr. MacLean. I appreciate that, Senator.

We decided then to undertake the job and within a few days after the bill was released we met and assigned the major topics to subcommittees and topics of less importance to individuals. And since then we have devoted as much time as humanly possible to a study of the bill. Within the limited time available, no member of our committee has been able to analyze more than a relatively small segment of this bill. This experience has served to emphasize to us the magnitude of the task that confronts your committee and its staff. In our view the bill presents many problems on both the policy and technical levels.

Further study and revision are, we believe, necessary, and it is our earnest hope that the Finance Committee will be able so to schedule its consideration of the bill so that sufficient time may be allowed for the work that remains to be done.

Some of the problems suggested by the bill are not complicated and should be subject to solution without reference to other provisions of the bill. The retroactive effect of the provision relating to payments of estimated income tax by individuals is an instance of such a problem. Under present law, if an individual underestimates his tax, he normally has until January 15 of the following year to bring it up to 80 percent. Under section 6654 of the bill, this rule would no longer apply, and unless the taxpayer was within one of the exceptions, he will be liable for a penalty unless he estimates and pays each quarter on a basis of the amount equal to 75 percent of his final tax. The bill would make this change effective for the year 1954, even though only a handful of people could have known on March 15 of the change proposed.

Another instance of a problem that might be considered as a separable problem is a proposed change in the estate tax law, which Mr. Tarleau mentioned. For many years a decedent has been permitted to elect to use for valuation purposes the value of the estate 1 year after death, in place of the value of the estate at the date of death. Section 2032 of the bill permits the use of the alternate valuation date only if the value of the estate has declined in value at least one-third. And to illustrate the difficulties which this presents, a comparison can be made between two estates, each with gross valuations at the date of death of $600,000. After the exemptions and deductions, the taxable estate in each case as of the date of death is, say, $500,00. A year later, one estate has declined in value from $600,000 to $450,000. Since this decline is less than one-third, the optional valuation date may not be used and the tax is $145,700. The other estate declines in value from $600,000 to $400,000, and the taxable estate is $300,000. In this case, since the decline is equal to a third of the value of the gross estate, the optional valuation date is available. The tax is only $81,700. The balance left, after paying the estate tax, would actually exceed the balance left in the case of the estate with a smaller decline in value.

These two illustrations are problems in the bill that can be separately considered. The bill, however, makes extensive changes in entire areas covered by the code. Thus the field of employees' trusts has undergone considerable revision, and an examination of the changes indicates problems which it is believed require further consideration.

For example, section 505 would prescribe the manner in which funds of a pension trust may be invested without loss of exemption. One limitation is that any one investment in real estate may not exceed in value 5 percent of the value of the total assets of the trust. In the case of a small pension trust, this probably means virtual elimination of real estate as an investment.

On the other hand, no limitation is imposed upon the amount which may be invested in securities of the employer. Our committee believes that there should be some limitation on investments in such securities, and that there should be a more liberal rule with respect to investments in real estate.

The consideration our committee has been able to give the bill so far has led us to the conclusion that probably the two most troublesome areas are those relating to the taxation of partnerships, and to the treatment of corporate distributions and adjustments.

The present Internal Revenue Code contains relatively new rules with respect to partnerships. The bill under consideration deals with this subject in detail.

An example might be the case of a brokerage partnership holding in its inventory stock which costs $1,000 and which is now worth $2,000. This stock is distributed to a partner who has a basis for his partnership assets in excess of these amounts. Under the bill no gain or loss would be recognized at the time of the distribution, and the distributee would have a basis of a thousand dollars for the stock. Upon subsequent sale for $2,000, the profit of $1,000 would be taxed to the partner. Although the $1,000 gain would be treated as ordinary income by virtue of provisions in the bill, the ability to shift among partners in differing tax brackets the incidence of tax in such cases has obvious tax avoidance possibilities.

A somewhat more startling example of the provisions inherent in the new partnership provisions is illustrated by the following case. A partner retires from a partnership and receives as his liquidating distribution an asset worth $200, with a basis to the firm of only $100. The basis to the retiring partner of his partnership interest is $150. The retiring partner thus has a true economic gain of $50 on his retirement. The new law, however, would require a comparison to be made between the basis to the partner of his interest in the partnership and the basis to the partnership of the asset distributed.

Since the basis to the retiring partner of his interest in the partnership would exceed by $50 the basis to the partnership of the asset distributed, the retiring partner would have a loss on the liquidation of $50. He has, of course, a potential taxable gain of $100 upon the eventual disposition of the property, but whether he will ever have a taxable gain will depend upon whether he sells the asset prior to his death.

Clearly, the rule in the bill would permit considerable latitude to a partnership in determining the incidence of taxation on its partners in the case of liquidation.

It is, however, in the revisions of the law relating to corporate distributions and adjustments that our committee has found the greatest difficulties.

The revisions are incorporated in subchapter (c). The bill proposes a complete structural revision of the law governing the field of corporate distributions, liquidations, and readjustments. There is no need to emphasize the importance to the Nation's business of maintaining the ability of corporations to conduct normal transactions in this field with at least a reasonable degree of certainty. It is also of vital importance, in this area, particularly, that the provisions be carefully designed to circumvent tax avoidance.

The approach of our committee to subchapter (c) was to consider how the new techniques employed would operate in practice, what difficulties there might be in various provisions, and to the extent possible in the time available, how such difficulties might be corrected.

As a result, our first report contains many detailed recommendations for revision of subchapter (c).

As a further result, however, our committee, after careful reviewing of its studies of subchapter (c) has concluded that the problems posed by subchapter (c) cannot be answered by piecemeal patching in time for legislation in a bill which is scheduled for early action by the Congress. We think that there are far too many difficulties presented for such an effort to hold any prospect of success. It cannot be emphasized too strongly that virtually every change in a provision of subchapter (c) requires restudy and probably revision of other sections of that subchapter covering this whole integrated area.

Our committee recommends that subchapter (c) be supplanted by reenactment of the existing provisions relating to corporate distributions and adjustments. There should follow, we urge, a period of further intensive study by legislative, administrative, and professional groups, looking toward the presentation as soon as feasible, of provisions that will effectuate the legislative intent manifested by subchapter (c) to improve and clarify the law in this important area. It is believed that, on the basis of such a study, it would be possible to develop provisions that will give effect to congressional intent, and would not unduly interfere with either the collection of the revenue or the carrying out of normal transactions.

We shall try to illustrate a few of the difficulties which our committee has found in part I, subchapter (c), dealing with distributions by corporations. One of the problems which the authors of our internal revenue laws have always faced is the development of a satisfactory means of frustrating attempts to withdraw corporate earnings at capital gain rates through the medium of stock redemptions. As long as the stockholder holds the same proportion of interest in the corporation, it makes little difference to him how many shares represent that interest.

In an effort to provide more precise rules than those employed in previous legislation, the bill has attacked this question by setting up an elaborate statutory scheme based upon varying treatments of redemptions of participating and nonparticipating stock. This treatment has involved the drawing of arbitrary distinctions. For example, an individual who owns 1 percent or more of the participating stock of a corporation, purchases for cash 1,000 shares of nonparticipating stock at $100 per share. "Participating stock," and "nonparticipating stock" are defined in terms intended generally to cover the usual common stock and preferred stock, respectively.

A year later, the nonparticipating stock which he purchased is called by lot at a redemption price of $105. Under the bill, the shareholder will receive a taxable dividend of $105,000. In addition, since the bill makes no provision to the contrary, it would appear possible that he would lose permanently his $100,000 basis for his nonparticipating stock. If, however, he had received adequate warning of an impending redemption, he could have avoided the dividend tax by selling his nonparticipating stock to a third party, in which case he would incur only capital gains tax on about $5,000 gain.

Now, it may be said that arbitrary results, while unfortunate, are the reasonable price that must be paid for certainty and precision. But the inevitable——

Senator Bennett. Mr. MacLean, do I understand—and I haven't studied the bill as carefully yet as I will before we get through it—that under the provisions of the bill, if a man makes a purchase of prefererd stock and within 1 year his stock is called by redemption, he is assumed to have had no cost on that stock and it is all to be treated as dividend?

Mr. MacLean. If he is the holder of more than 1 percent of the participating stock, that is what will happen, Senator.

Senator Bennett. That is obviously——

The Chairman. Mr. Stamm, what is the theory of that?

Mr. Stamm. Well, he could reduce his participating stock and that wouldn't apply, but theory back of this, what we were trying to do was to get around this problem of bailouts, of where the shareholder is attempting to get a distribution without paying the dividend tax. And the bill, as written, thought the best way to do that was to put some kind of a tax on a corporation when it redeemed the stock, the theory being that the corporation would not necessarily have to redeem the stock, and the shareholder would have a free disposition of that stock in his hands. I mean he could sell that stock, and there would be no uncertainty about whether it is going to be taxed as an ordinary dividend or not. But the corporation in that type, where there had not been a reduction of his participating stock, his common stock, the corporation would know if he redeemed that stock and would have to pay this penalty. That is the theory of it.

We are looking into some of the problems that have come up about it, and we may have some suggestions to make to the committee on that.

Mr. McLean. But in this I put, the corporation would not, as I understand it, Senator, be subject to the 85-percent tax, because the stockholder would have been subject to the dividend tax.

The Chairman. Take a good look at that, Mr. Stamm.

Senator Bennett. Wouldn't that have the effect of denying to small closely held corporations all use of the preferred stock basis of getting initial capital?

Mr. MacLean. Mr. Tarleau pointed that out correctly this morning, Senator.

Senator Bennett. A man who is one of a small group, holding substantial amounts in a corporation, couldn't reduce his common stock to 1 percent. That would be impossible.

Mr. MacLean. But that could also work inequities where a man holds stock on the New York Stock Exchange to the extent of 1 percent, inherited from his father in a large company, and was thereafter called pursuant to a signing fund provision.

The Chairman. We will take a good look at that. Go ahead.

Mr. MacLean. I think the inevitable consequence of drawing a precise line of the nature embodied in the provisions under discussion is that for future transactions taxpayers may choose to sail close to the line. More than one method is frequently available to the taxpayer to accomplish the substandards of what he wants. Unless a line is drawn to cover each method, he can often conduct himself in a way that will avoid a particular rule. It is our belief that any endeavor to perfect the wide variety of specific rules, which would protect the revenue and at the same time prevent undue hardship, would be a time-consuming task.

The point is illustrated by the definitions in the bill of interests in a corporation. All such interests fall into three classifications under the bill. Securities, nonparticipating stock, and participating stock. The definition of participating stock is so restricted that it would be possible to capitalize a corporation with no nonparticipating stock and with at least 2 types of participating stock, 1 of which would contain special redemption features. This stock could be sold to a person holding no other stock of the corporation, and the subsequent redemption thereof would result in capital gain to the purchaser and the corporation would not be liable for 85-percent tax on redemptions, since that is limited to nonparticipating stock.

It would also seem entirely possible to set up a corporation with no participating stock. Since the application of many of the provisions of this subchapter (c) is based on the distinction between participating stock and nonparticipating stock, their operation can hardly be effective.

Taxpayers may also take similar advantage of the definition of "securities." The definition excludes corporate obligations held by persons owning 25 percent or more of the participating stock of a corporation, where such obligations are subordinated by claims of trade creditors. Thus, a dividend of debentures that are so subordinated to trade creditors would constitute a distribution of nonparticipating stock, rather than of securities. As such, as I understand it, the distribution would not be subject to tax. If the corporation is in sound financial condition, a provision in short-term debentures, subordinating them to trade creditors should not have any material effect to their availability. When the debentures are sold, capital gain will result to the selling stockholders. In the hands of the purchasers, the debentures are securities rather than participating stock, because they don't own 25 percent of the participating stock of the corporation. As such, their redemption by the corporation is without any adverse tax effect on either the corporation or its share-shareholders.

The bill deals with the problem of distribution of nonparticipating stock, followed by sale and subsequent redemption by imposing this 85 percent penalty tax on the corporation on redemption of such stock, with exceptions specified in certain cases. The penalty tax is imposed only on redemptions within 10 years of issuance. Presumably, the theory is that the distribution of preferred stock as a dividend for the purpose of subsequent sale will be deterred if any redemptions of such stock within a period of 10 years are subject to the penalty tax.

Aside from the question of whether the tax it imposed would deter redemptions in the case of closely held corporations, it is doubtful whether 10-year postponement of redemption would destroy the salability of a nonparticipating stock of a company; and perhaps even more important, if there is a difficulty in this respect, it could probably be avoided by advance planning.

Thus, a liberal dividend of preferred stock declared today, with sinking fund provisions operative 10 years hence, might be held by the stockholders until a date close to the scheduled time of redemption, at which time the stock may be readily salable.

While the primary problem here is one of tax avoidance, the provision can penalize unfairly corporation that issued preferred stock many years ago with mandatory sinking fund provisions that are operative today. Although for the future, the bill requires only a 10-year waiting period after issuance, all outstanding issues will be subject to possible application of the penalty tax, if redeemed within the next 10 years, even though they have been outstanding for many years. That results from the provisions of 309 (c) to the effect that if they are issued before January 1, they are deemed issued that date.

Now, to our committee, it seems that if a 10-year-waiting period is sufficient to eliminate the danger of bail-out with respect to future issues, the same period should be adequate with respect to past issues. The question is also presented of the extent to which a new legislative rule should be applied to redemptions pursuant to a sinking-fund agreement entered into prior to the development of the new rule. Also, it seems unfair to impose an 85-percent tax on a corporation that redeems nonparticipating stock, such as certain types of debt obligations issued in years past, where the value of the property paid in will be extremely difficult to prove, because of the lapse of years.

The difficulties which our committee finds with subchapter C may be further illustrated by the provisions of part III relating to spin-offs, which are now governed by provisions formulated by the Congress as recently as 1951. Here, also, the provisions must operate to permit legitimate business adjustments and at the same time prevent taxpayers from taking advantage of such transactions by realizing, on accumulated corporate earnings of a continuing business at capital gain rates. The classic pattern of the spin-off is the transfer by a corporation of a portion of its assets to a newly organized subsidiary, followed by the distribution to its stockholders of the stock of the new corporation. Although such transactions may often be motivated solely by business reasons, the tax avoidance possibilities are presented of transferring corporate surplus to the company to be spun off with the eventual realization of capital gain on the sale or liquidation of the spun-off company by the stockholders.

The technique adopted in the bill for dealing with the spin-off situation is altogether different from that of the 1951 legislation. The problem of tax avoidance is attempted to be met by introducing the concept of inactive corporation. Any stockholders who, within 10 years of a spin-off, receives money or property with respect to the stock of an inactive corporation received or held as a result of the spin-off, is taxable thereon at ordinary income tax rates. The principal test for determining whether a corporation is an inactive corporation is an income test. Under this test, a corporation is inactive unless 90 percent or more of the gross income of the business of the corporation for each of 5 years was other than personal holding company income—that is, the income was not from interest, dividends, and certain other types of investment income.

Thus, a manufacturing corporation which, in any years of the 5-year period suffers a loss from operations, perhaps as a result of a strike, or simply a decline in inventory values, may be an inactive corporation if it had any investment income. If this corporation is liquidated, the stock sold, the entire proceeds are taxes as ordinary income, under the bill.

On the other hand, where an investment subsidiary is spun-off, an escape is afforded from the inactive class of corporation by selection of investments which produce income not within the personal holding company classification, as, for example, where all the assets are invested in tax-exempt securities, income-producing real estate, or oil leases.

In the judgment of our committee, virtually every provision contained in subchapter C contains difficulties similar to those that have been discussed. Our initial report, filed this morning, contains more than 50 pages devoted to problems we have so far seen in suchapter C. We know, certainly, that we have not developed all of them. Whether the structural concept of subchapter C could be retained if time were available to study and to iron out the problems, we cannot say. We do recommend, however, that in the limited time remaining before action on H. R. 8300 is scheduled, the efforts of all concerned be spent on revision of other parts, where the work has a real prospect of success.

Reference has been made only to a few provisions of the bill. As pointed out in the report which we are filing, limitations of time require us to confine ourselves largely to comments of a critical nature, and our committee is, of course, fully aware of the many valuable improvements that the bill would make in the structure and operation of the internal revenue laws.

Two things that we have wanted to emphasize today are, first, that there is need for careful consideration and further work on various parts of the bill; and second, that in the judgment of our committee, there is insufficient time for the preparation of a workable subchapter C for enactment at the current session of Congress.

Thank you, Senator, and I would like permission to file a later report on other sections of the bill which we have not been able to cover.

The Chairman. I wish you would. And I suggest to you, also, that if you have any amendments that you think ought to be in the bill, submit them in definite shape and keep in close touch with Mr. Stamm.

Mr. MacLean. We have incorporated a good many already.

Senator Byrd. Mr. MacLean, how long would it take your committee to make a critical examination and recommendations on the entire bill?

Mr. MacLean. On the entire bill, Senator?

Senator Byrd. Yes.

Mr. MacLean. I hesitate to say. This report covers a few. Our next report, which will be in by sometime the end of next week, we hope, will cover other major portions.

Senator Byrd. What percentage of the bill does this present report cover?

Mr. MacLean. The major revisions?

Senator Byrd. The one you are now testifying on.

Mr. MacLean. I would say of the major revision, we have, perhaps, covered 25 percent.

Senator Byrd. Then if time won't permit you to testify on the balance of the bill—Mr. Chairman, will he have an opportunity to testify again?

The Chairman. He will have an opportunity if he is ready by the date that we agreed to close these hearings.

Senator Byrd. But your present testimony covers about 25 percent of the major parts of the bill?

Mr. MacLean. We have not touched foreign income, partnerships, consolidated returns, for example.

Senator Byrd. Do I understand at the beginning of your testimony that you thought parts of the bill should be deferred in enactment at this session?

Mr. MacLean. Subchapter C, dealing with corporate distributions and readjustments. Our position is, Senator, that the present provisions of law should be incorporated in that subchapter C, and made effective with the rest of this bill, and that the rest of the time this year will be needed for preparation of a revised subchapter C for submission to the next session of Congress.

Senator Byrd. Are there any major parts of the bill that you think should be deferred, and given the same study and same treatment later?

Mr. MacLean. The one I would like to reserve on particularly is the partnerships, on which our committee has been unable, so far, to complete its work and resolve on a group view.

Senator Byrd. But you think that you could make a report on that before the committee goes into executive session?

Mr. MacLean. We are doing our best, Senator.

The Chairman. I urge that you report in by the end of next week at the very latest. We will have 2 weeks of hearings, but the staff, in the meantime, has a prodigious task. And immediately following the hearings, we will have our staff hearings, so they must have their material in hand before them.

Senator Bennett. Mr. Chairman——

The Chairman. Yes?

Senator Bennett. I would like permission to ask a question of Mr. Tarleau, if he is still in the room. Apparently he is gone.

The Chairman. Any further questions? Thank you very much.

Address of Governor Muñoz-Marín of Puerto Rico on Armed Forces Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. FERNÓS-ISERN
RESIDENT COMMISSIONER FROM PUERTO RICO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 20, 1954

Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN. Mr. Speaker, May 15, Armed Forces Day, is a day of honored significance in Puerto Rico as it is in all of the States and Territories of this great Nation.

Nowhere was Armed Forces Day this year more warmly and proudly observed than in Puerto Rico. In observance of Armed Forces Day, the Governor of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Luis Muñoz-Marín, addressed members of the combined forces in a public ceremony held under the auspices of Rear Adm. Austin K. Doyle, United States Navy, commander in chief, Caribbean.

I am sure that the Members of Congress will be interested in Governor Muñoz-Marín's message on this occasion.

The address follows:

Admiral Doyle, distinguished members of the Armed Forces, and guests, the responsibility of the Armed Forces for maintaining peace until wisdom shall come to the enemies of freedom, makes this an occasion of deep significance to all of us. Armed Forces Day has become the traditional time to express the pride and confidence that we feel at all times in the servicemen whose dedication to the task of holding the fort until wisdom and understanding come to the rescue deserve the homage of freemen everywhere. I welcome this as a fitting occasion to pay tribute to the Armed Forces of the American Union and to make special mention of the men and women of Puerto Rico who have dedicated themselves in unity, strength, and understanding of the ideals of democracy to which we are commonly devoted.

In safeguarding civilization toward a future that will be free from wars and fears, and worthy of the sacrifices of the men and women whom we honor today, we must bear in mind that one of the cornerstones of peace is the development of genuine international good will, based on an abiding faith in the rich potentialities which democratic institutions unfold. As President Eisenhower said in his speech of April 22 there has never been a time more compelling and rewarding than the present time to work for international understanding and to labor for a real peace founded upon it.

In this task the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico has been doing its part, through the brave and devoted men and women which it has contributed, many of them as volunteers, to the Armed Forces of the United States; and in an equally significant way by its effort to make the spiritual values that are at the root of the greatness of the American people understood by other peoples of our language, traditions and historical background who have been persistently bombarded for years with the big-lie propaganda of communism. Our association with the American Union is a most fraternal one, strengthening the bonds of respect and affection in defending, with the weapons of war and the tools of peace, the values that we commonly hold dear. This places the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico in a position to show the world what the two great cultures of the Western Hemisphere can do in terms of liberty for the good of their members and of mankind when they meet and work together on common ground. I believe that as a cultural frontier of the Americas, we have helped, and hope each day to help still more, to dispel many of the misconceptions and fears and suspicions of neighbors who have been led at times to misunderstand the sincerity and devotion of the United States toward the ideals of freedom and human dignity. We have become, in more ways than one, a bastion of democracy, a stronghold of faith and hope.

If the Armed Forces of the United States and of all freedom-loving peoples had not curbed the enemies of democracy by their readiness and power, we would be inhabiting today a world devoid of hope and strength for the high purposes of the human spirit. The Armed Forces have not only been vigilant and courageous, but they have also inspired all free people with confidence to stand up and resist aggression. They have set a splendid example of fearlessness, devotion and sacrifice which is necessary to protect the chances of the world to continue building the kind of civilized life to which we aspire for all human beings, in all the countries of the earth. With God's help, this goal shall be reached, and we shall continue our dedication to the job of making it possible with the same sense of faith and devotion that characterizes the men and women whom we honor today.

Welcome to the Speaker

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN R. BUSH
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 20, 1954

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I am pleased to include the following editorial from the Williamsport Sun, Williamsport, Pa., May 14, 1954, issue, welcoming the Honorable Joseph W. Martin, Jr., Speaker of the House of

Representatives, as guest speaker at the annual meeting of the West Branch Manufacturer's Association at the Lycoming Hotel, Williamsport, Pa., Friday, May 14, 1954, whose address appears in another extension of my remarks:

WELCOME TO THE SPEAKER

Not within the memory of any resident of Williamsport has this city ever before entertained the Speaker of the National House of Representatives. Consequently, the honor of being host to Speaker Joseph W. Martin, Jr., of Massachusetts, is one in which we delight.

The Speaker visits Williamsport to address the West Branch Manufacturers' Association. But in a larger sense, his visit serves to bring to the people of this locality a new appreciation of the exalted office which the speakership represents in the American system of government.

He is the No. 3 man in the presidential line. Should any event occur rendering President Eisenhower and Vice President Nixon unable to discharge the duties of the Presidency, then Mr. Martin would succeed to that office.

Speaker Martin is visiting a city which already holds the office of Congressman in high esteem. We have learned to value it because of the character and caliber of the men who have occupied the position from this district.

They have been men like post-Civil War Congressman William H. Armstrong, described as one of the most brilliant legal minds in the county's history; Congressman Henry Clay McCormick, later an attorney general of Pennsylvania; Congressman William B. Wilson, who became the Nation's first Secretary of Labor; and Congressman Robert F. Rich, with whose economy-mindedness the Nation is only now falling into step.

Incidentally, the closest we have ever come to the speakership was in 1861–63 when Congressman Galusha A. Grow, of nearby Susquehanna County, occupied that office during the first years of Abraham Lincoln's administration.

In fact, Pennsylvanians have held the position only three times. The first Speaker came from our Keystone State and was Frederick A. C. Muhlenberg. Then in the late 1870's, the office was filled by Samuel J. Randall.

Speaker Martin, on the other hand, hails from the State which has claimed the speakership most frequently. Six times it has fallen to Massachusetts.

So to the Speaker of the House, a cordial welcome.

The Tide Turns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ERNEST WHARTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1954

Mr. WHARTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the Record a recent editorial from the Hudson (N. Y.) Register-Star as published on May 13. This nonpartisan approach on the part of an independent publication is refreshing indeed, following the many dire predictions hopefully inspired by the prophets of doom. A responsible press is surely a desirable asset to the community.

The editorial follows:

THE TIDE TURNS

Statistics are notoriously tricky, but they do seem to prove that the business tide now is stationary or on the upgrade. According to a joint report of the Commerce and Labor Departments, April was the first month since last October to show a decline in unemployment.

While the drop apparently is not substantial, it is a heartening sign that it has taken place at all. Compared, moreover, with figures for other recent months it furnishes abundant cause for believing that the Nation is on its way out of the economic woods.

Between October 1953 and March 1954 the number of idle in the country jumped from 1,300,000 to 3,275,000, or at an average rate of 400,000 a month. That a trend of such proportions has now been reversed must be gratifying to Government officials, who contended all along that spring would result in stabilization of employment.

For 15 years the country has existed under a war economy, with huge Government spending and millions in the armed services to create a labor shortage. During that period there have been various shortages, rationing, and price-control experiments. That the transition, in part, to a peacetime economy has been no more disruptive is an encouraging indication.

There were many Americans who said—and sounded as if they hoped—that Government controls could never be relinquished, that industry had fed for too long on Government orders to return to a pre-World War II scheme of operations. They were wrong on both counts.

Schools and Graduation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MORGAN M. MOULDER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1954

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Speaker, this is the month and the season of graduation for many young men and women throughout the United States. We all recall, with a feeling of nostalgia, our graduation from grade and high school as the proudest and happiest occasions of our lives.

Our school systems have helped this Nation reach its peak of leadership today among the nations of the world. And to our loyal teachers we owe a great deal. For generations we have confidently placed our children in their hands. In recent years, in many cases, our teachers have accepted even more school responsibility in the guidance of our young people. More extra curricular activities have been added to our educational systems and our teachers have graciously accepted this additional responsibility.

I cannot help feeling—and I hope others will realize it—that our teachers are our "first line of defense." I am sure, in fact, that they always have been, but we have never talked about it enough. Our school teachers are the quiet force in this country that molds our most precious resource—our children. The full impact of the valuable service school teachers give to the people of this country and its future, in a sense, ultimately guides the destiny of the free world.

I have received notice of graduation exercises from superintendents of the following schools or school districts in the 11th congressional district of Missouri: Armstrong, Bogard, Boonville, Bosworth, Brunswick, Bunceton, Bynumville, Cairo, California, Camdenton, Centralia, Columbia, Conway, Carrollton, Clifton Hill, Cross Timbers, Eldon, Eugene, Fayette, Glasgow, Green Ridge, Hale, Higbee, Houstonia, Iberia, Jefferson City, Keytesville, Lake Ozark, Lebanon, Lincoln, Macks Creek, Malta Bend, Marshall, Mendon, Moberly, Nelson, New Franklin, Norborne, Otterville, Phillipsburg, Renick, Russellville, St. Elizabeth, Sedalia, Slater, Smithton, Sturgeon, Stover, Sweet Springs, Tina, Tuscumbia, Urbana, Warsaw, Weaubleau, Versailles, Tipton, Wheatland.

I extend my sincere congratulations to each graduate with best wishes for success and happiness.

Refugee Act Is Cruel Hoax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN LESINSKI, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1954

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, it is sometimes entertaining to be fooled, and that is why good magicians are always popular with audiences. When people go to see a magician, they go with a challenge to the performer: "Let's see how good you are at fooling me."

But they do not elect people to public office to pull sleight-of-hand tricks on them; and they do not like it when that is attempted by public officials.

This Congress last year passed a bill which was supposed to be emergency legislation to provide haven in this country for some of the refugees from Iron Curtain terror. It was described by the administration as a good law which would have humane consequences.

Everyone knows by now what a cruel hoax this law has been, largely because of unsympathetic and even antagonistic administration. It has been used not to help refugees from Soviet terror come to the United States, but rather to keep them out.

As the Polish-American Journal commented recently in an editorial: "This cruel hoax must be eliminated."

The text of the editorial is as follows:

REFUGEE ACT IS CRUEL HOAX

It is becoming increasingly clear that the emergency refugee bill passed in the closing days of the 1st session of the 83d Congress is likely to turn out to be a cruel hoax or as Senator Lehman recently termed it "a legislative fraud and delusion."

When the bill was passed, thousands of Polish refugees, a great problem has arisen veterans in the British Isles, had great hope of coming to this country. Now this hope is vanishing as in most cases the refugees and their sponsors are unable to meet the rules and regulations established by the Republican controlled State Department.

Among the Americans of Polish descent who are wiling to act as sponsors for the

Polish refugees, a great problem has arisen from the law's demand that a sponsor of a refugee must sign assurances of his employment, housing, and support. Moreover, these assurances must be verified, certified, or otherwise documented. For example, an assurance of employment must be certified by the State employment service serving the area of proposed employment, and assurance of housing must be certified by a State or local public agency having jurisdiction over the area of prospective housing. Assurance of support must be such as to satisfy the Administrator (Scott McLeod of State Department), the consular officer and the immigration officer that the refugee will not become a public charge. This means in practice that the sponsor must have substantial means (property, large amount of cash or savings, etc.) to be acceptable to the above-mentioned overlords of the program.

And then even after all the requirements of sponsorship are met, it is still impossible to predict whether the sponsored refugee woud pass the rigid security and other tests, especially since there is a tendency to consider those with relatives behind the Iron Curtain as security risks and most, if not all, Polish refugees do have relatives behind the Iron Curtain.

While the avowed purpose of President Eisenhower's demand for the Refugee Act was to help those who have escaped from communism, the application of this act actually bars most of these refugees from coming to this country.

This cruel hoax must be eliminated.

We appeal to our 11 Congressmen of Polish descent and to all others who want to see justice done to initiate a revision of the Refugee Act, so that thousands of Polish refugees would not be barred by technicalities or unreasonable demands from finding haven in this country.

Isn't the Indochina Question a Matter Now for France To Settle?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. USHER L. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1954

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, it is a matter of record that since 1863 France has maintained in Indochina a colonial government, and the people there have been denied the right to establish a government of their choice. After many years of remonstrance and petitioning they revolted and started a movement to throw off the yoke of France and to set up their own government.

That revolution is in progress now and after suffering many defeats the French Government nows say to us, "If we—the French—continue resistance will you—the United States—enter the contest and aid and support us?"

I am not the President of the United States, nor am I in control in Congress, but to this question by the French Government my answer would be a decided "No."

Why should the United States become involved in a revolution in any particular country? Revolutions have been going on for centuries and will continue until the people finally gain freedom. Are we in favor of colonial empires? Does this great leader of democracy want to have colonial systems perpetuated?

Secretary Dulles says that it is to our interest to get into this revolution, as that is the only way to stop communism. Our entrance into the struggle would only aid communism, because it would be placing this country squarely on the side of imperialistic government and would prove the charges that Russia has continuously made against us.

If we desire world peace—and I think 100 percent of Americans want it—the sooner colonial governments are withdrawn and no longer try to keep people in subjection anywhere, the sooner world peace will come. There will be no world peace until all peoples have the right and privilege of forming a government of the kind they deem proper for them. This right of self-determination will live until freedom is achieved. We should studiously avoid any departure from our own conception of government, namely, that the people have the right to govern themselves. If that is a right principle here, it is a right principle everywhere. If this country goes about denying this right to any people, anywhere, we are building communism instead of stopping the spread of it.

Russia will not always remain as a dictatorship, but will eventually emerge into a democracy. No one can tell how long it will take, but time is not a measure of success and we may look for several more revolutions in Russia before the goal of a free and independent nation is reached.

But this Nation cannot afford to support colonial systems, which, in the first place were set up to exploit the resources of a backward country. We should let France settle her own troubles, as France set up this colonial government in Indochina in the first place, and not us.

Our involvement in Korea was a thousand times more justified than our entry into the revolution in Indochina would be, and I am sure that if this question is left to Congress that there will be no declaration of war against the people of Indochina.

H. R. 3203

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD T. MILLER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1954

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, the amendments to the Interstate Commerce Act, contained in H. R. 3203, passed by this body, are of real importance to farmers and vegetable growers of the Nation.

Under leave granted, I am here inserting the statement on this subject of one of the citizens of my State made before the Bricker subcommittee of the other body on May 11, 1954:

> I am Ridgely Todd, a director of the Vegetable Growers Association of America, and a working vegetable grower. I am also chairman of the association's legislative committee. Our national Vegetable Growers Association welcomes the opportunity to present these views concerning H. R. 3203 relating to the movement of fresh vegetables by motortruck.
>
> So far as we know vegetable growers across the Nation, without exception, are opposed to the burdensome principle involved in MC-43 motortruck-leasing order issued by the Interstate Commerce Commission. Consumers are opposed to increased food costs.
>
> We are asking that H. R. 3203 be voted out of this committee and sent to the Senate floor without further delay.
>
> It is our opinion that the Motor Carrier Act should be changed to conform with H. R. 3203 permanently protecting return load leasing of agriculturally exempt trucks.
>
> It is believed that the intention of the original congressional act was not to give the Interstate Commerce Commission control over the duration of return trip leasing of agricultural trucks. This appears to be independent agency assumption over legislative prerogatives.
>
> The Motor Carrier Act of 1935 included the exemption clause which took into consideration the best interests of producers, proving that farm commodities would not be subject to the orders, rules, and regulations of the ICC.
>
> Mr. Chairman, at this point, I would like to insert into the record an editorial on trip leasing, from the leading publication of the vegetable-producing industry, the Vegetable Growers Messenger, page 10, in the March 1954 issue.
>
> Over a period of years the present return trip-leasing arrangement has been entirely satisfactory to growers and consumers. If the proposed ICC 30-day leasing order supersedes the present very satisfactory trip-leasing arrangement it is believed that the exemption part of the Motor Carrier Act would be practically worthless.
>
> We believe in fair play and we feel that any increase in the cost of transporting vegetables, due to absence of return loads, will fall upon farmers and consumers, most of the increased cost on the farmer.
>
> The farmers have long known that the spread between what they get and what the consumer pays is too great.
>
> Exempt truckers are apparently satisfied with the present rates they get for hauling vegetables—exempt cargo one way, and when available, manufactured products on the return trip.
>
> These truckers are a vital part of our economy, and while they have no widespread organization, they do have a very sizeable investment in equipment. They are the little businessmen who move the Nation's food from field to market. They're entitled to the right to work.
>
> It is not believed that the dollar interests of the common carriers should supersede the dollar interests of growers. It is our observation that very few of the common carriers are prepared to move fresh produce direct from the field by long haul to metropolitan markets, or that they want this business. It is reported that many common carriers depend upon the leasing of exempt trucks to balance out their operation especially on seasonal cargo.
>
> The continuation of the present trip-leasing plan will not affect the present tonnage hauled by common carriers, but it would continue to preserve for the vegetable grower the cheapest and most flexible method of transporting farm products. Much of the national vegetable production is far removed from highways traversed by regular scheduled common carriers. Present exempt trucks, when necessary, go directly into the field to load, and after icing the vegetables go all the way to destination without any change of tractor or trailer, thereby saving labor and other costs, but more important, they deliver vegetables to the market in the freshest possible condition.

To our way of thinking the Interstate Commerce Commission seems to be seeking standardization of truck operation in order that its reports may become an accomplished fact with the least amount of effort. The Commission's control over private operation may be attractive to them, but unattractive to the farmer and many distributors, because of the assessment of higher freight charges and delays in handling.

Vegetables must be handled fast and with good equipment. The present system is entirely satisfactory. Our association believes most other farm organizations would appreciate it if the Congress would keep the Interstate Commerce Commission out of our agricultural business.

We are opposed to a complete regimentation system that allows an agency to invoke a mandate, or issue an order at will, which will result in taking more dollars away from the farmer and the consumer and increase transportation costs. We feel that exempt for hire trucks should not be regulated off the highways by an agency order.

We also feel that the Interstate Commerce Commission could be consistent in the orders it issues. If the ICC is willing to make trip leasing for 30 days legal, why is a trip for just a few days illegal?

We would appreciate knowing who the Interstate Commerce Commission expects will profit from this order. We believe the real issues before this committee are whether or not the committee wishes to (1) increase the farmer's distribution costs, (2) saddle growers and food distributors with additional unnecessary regulations, (3) destroy the exempt truckers who constitute a large segment of what is generally termed as little business, (4) increase cost of food to consumers.

It is the sincere request of our vegetable growers that H. R. 3203 be promptly enacted into law.

First Test of the Caracas Anti-Communist Resolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM C. LANTAFF

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1954

Mr. LANTAFF. Mr. Speaker, the recent disturbing revelation that an important shipment of arms had been effected from the Reds to Guatemala puts the Caracas anti-Communist resolution to its first test. The question is, Will a meeting of consultation by hemispheric foreign ministers be called to meet this test? I should like at this time to insert in the RECORD an extremely timely editorial concerning the serious turn in events in the Western Hemisphere which appeared in the Spanish-American newspaper, the Americas Daily, of Miami, Fla., on May 19, 1954:

HEMISPHERIC FOREIGN MINISTERS SHOULD MEET FOR CONSULTATION IN VIEW OF THE NEW TURN IN EVENTS IN THE AMERICAS

We are faced with an inter-American situation of dangerous and far-reaching proportions embodied in a report issued late Monday night by the State Department which revealed that a ship laden with an important arms cargo had arrived at the Guatemalan port of Puerto Barrios and that the shipment being discharged at that Caribbean port city had come from a Soviet satellite nation. This event is closely bound up with the hemispheric defense picture because it shows that Guatemala and the Soviet Union have intimate ties and that the Central American nation is being used as a pawn for Soviet imperialistic interests through the field of action it provides for Communist infiltration.

It can be taken for granted without the shadow of a doubt that the arms shipment in question was sent at the behest of the Moscow government, since everyone is aware by now that no transaction between a Soviet satellite nation and a foreign government can take place without the acquiescence of the Kremlin. If such a state of affairs is true of ordinary, run of the mill transactions, then the degree to which Kremlin imperialism is mixed up in the current deal is readily inferable from the fact that weapons of war are involved.

In the face of such a serious turn in events, the inter-American system must put the Caracas anti-Communist resolution to its first test. The resolution in question said that "the domination or control of the political institutions of any American state by the international Communist movement, producing as a consequence the extension to the Americas of a political system of a nonhemispheric power, will constitute a threat to the sovereignty and political independence of the American states, jeopardizing the peace in the Americas, and it will necessitate calling a meeting of consultation to consider the adoption of proper measures in according with existing treaties."

Because of certain suspicious moves made by Guatemala in the field of its foreign relations, from one point of view this would be a proper time to invoke the Rio de Janeiro Mutual Defense Pact, although the most appropriate course of action would probably consist of a meeting of consultation by hemispheric foreign ministers. Using a resolution adopted unanimously by hemispheric foreign ministers at Washington in 1951 and the unmistakable anti-Communist resolution adopted this year at Caracas, such a meeting of consultation would allow the governments of the Americas to take defense measures to check the imperialistic drive of Moscow and the subversive activities of agents it has planted here in the Americas, agents who are intent on wiping off the face of the earth everything common to the way of life of the American nations.

The fourth meeting of consultation held by hemispheric foreign ministers at Washington resolved to ask the American governments to take proper steps for their own protection and asserted that there must be "a high degree of international cooperation in order to uproot the dangers posed to the American states by the subversive activities of international communism."

The need is imperious to summon a fifth meeting of consultation by hemispheric foreign ministers so that the truth about the landing of Soviet arms in Guatemala can be revealed and so that the proper steps can be taken to cope with the matter. This meeting is required by considerations of hemispheric security, for the political future of the Americas and the prestige of their political institutions demand such action at once.

Citizens Protest Liquor Advertised on Radio and Television

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. USHER L. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1954

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I present the following correspondence from the Spokane (Wash.) Public Forum, which will explain itself:

SPOKANE PUBLIC FORUM,
Spokane, Wash., April 19, 1954.

Hon. USHER L. BURDICK,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BURDICK: In behalf of public welfare the Spokane Forum joins in the fight to outlaw many of the crime-breeding programs on the radio and television.

Herewith a copy of a forum resolution most of the press will not give to their public. It would offend the big business gentlemen and the paper would lose their advertising.

This is right in line with the fine letter you inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD from Grafton, N. Dak. Kindly insert this resolution to further awaken our members and public to all like exhibitions which endanger the youth they seek to mislead.

Sincerely,

JOSEPH E. NESBITT,
President.
MARY JANE WELSH,
Secretary.

Whereas the Washington Temperance Association is preparing an initiative measure against beer and wine advertising on radio and television; and

Whereas the reapers of this soiled revenue will go in the lobby of Congress with plenty of gold to thwart the efforts of all good citizens working to clean up this stench in society that smells into high heavens; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Spokane Public Forum go on record unanimously in accord, and will join hands with all groups working to curb this nauseous daily exhibition, reaching into the family home for converts to liquor and cigarettes.

JOSEPH E. NESBITT,
President.
MARY JANE WELSH,
Secretary.

Impending Loss of Federal Funds for Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1954

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, one of the strong friends of public education in Oklahoma has just made available to me some very alarming figures concerning the impact of one of the changes in Public Law 874, which this Congress adopted during the last session. I am referring to the effect of the so-called 3-percent absorption amendment upon funds provided by our Government to federally impacted school districts of the Nation.

Details of this amendment are somewhat complicated, but there can be no question about its operation to the great detriment of States in which most federally connected children do not meet the double requirement of having parents who both live and work on Federal property. In instances where their parents merely live on Federal property, or merely work on Federal property—section 3 (b)—the actual effect of this amendment and its reduction formula is to impose a double absorption rate on these particular districts.

The result, according to calculations taken from the Third Annual Report of the Commissioner of Education, is a loss in daily attendance qualifying for Federal funds in federally impacted areas (through 3 percent absorption under sections 3 (a) and 3 (b) of the law) which ranges from 13.8 percent for the State of Nevada to 99 percent for the State of West Virginia. My own State of Oklahoma will suffer a loss in attendance qualifying for funds under these sections through this amendment of 38.8 percent—which is calculated to mean a loss in funds of $715,419.22.

I am sure this new formula is going to result in similar drastic losses in Federal allowances for impacted areas in all of the States receiving such thoroughly justified aid—and the table which follows—giving changes in attendance figures for the various States and showing the loss in qualified attendance in most States—is offered for the information of all interested in this vital problem:

Recap of losses in secs. 3 (a) and 3 (b) through 3 percent absorption (expressed in pupil ADA)

The following facts have been tabulated from the data found in table 2 of the 3d annual report of the Commissioner of Education, June 30, 1953, through applying the 3 percent absorption amendment to Public Law 874 which will become effective July 1, 1954.

State (1)	Total ADA (2)	3 (a)+½ 3 (b) ADA (3)	Non-Federal ADA (4)	Loss (3 percent col. 4 ADA) (5)	Percent of loss (col. 5÷col. 2) (6)
Alabama	140,770	10,847	129,923	3,898	35.9
Arizona	43,712	2,844	40,868	1,226	43.1
Arkansas	94,473	5,201	89,272	2,678	51.5
California	723,992	84,577	639,415	19,183	22.7
Colorado	136,519	7,376	129,143	3,874	52.0
Connecticut	89,483	5,652	83,831	2,515	44.5
Delaware	---	---	---	---	---
Florida	195,763	12,435	183,328	5,500	44.2
Georgia	207,842	13,634	194,208	5,826	42.7
Idaho	32,863	1,973	30,890	927	47.0
Illinois	60,717	5,693	55,024	1,651	29.0
Indiana	80,852	6,457	74,395	2,232	34.6
Iowa	10,993	1,488	9,505	285	19.2
Kansas	148,905	15,055	133,850	4,016	26.7
Kentucky	96,380	8,388	87,992	2,640	31.5
Louisiana	59,942	3,075	56,867	1,706	55.5
Maine	29,150	2,763	26,387	792	28.7
Maryland	135,949	12,655	123,294	3,699	29.2
Massachusetts	46,879	2,918	43,961	1,319	45.2
Michigan	68,772	5,850	62,922	1,888	32.3
Minnesota	11,095	555	10,540	316	56.9
Mississippi	25,076	3,537	21,539	646	18.3
Missouri	52,080	3,738	48,342	1,450	38.8
Montana	10,701	1,110	9,591	288	25.9
Nebraska	20,465	3,034	17,431	523	17.2
Nevada	19,527	3,494	16,033	481	13.8
New Hampshire	12,429	1,538	10,891	327	21.3
New Jersey	59,621	5,036	54,585	1,638	32.5
New Mexico	53,325	6,141	47,184	1,416	23.1
New York	49,800	4,319	45,481	1,364	31.6
North Carolina	53,745	5,086	48,659	1,460	28.7
North Dakota	5,367	851	4,516	135	15.9
Ohio	196,986	12,790	184,196	5,526	43.2
Oklahoma	164,680	11,823	152,857	4,586	38.8
Oregon	14,106	2,040	12,066	362	17.7
Pennsylvania	105,161	8,382	96,779	2,903	34.6
Rhode Island	19,552	2,347	17,205	516	22.0
South Carolina	118,417	12,381	106,036	3,181	25.7
South Dakota	13,788	2,406	11,382	341	14.2
Tennessee	102,604	6,514	96,090	2,883	44.3
Texas	380,387	33,714	346,573	10,397	30.8
Utah	38,627	5,566	33,061	992	17.8
Vermont	6,682	234	6,448	193	82.5
Virginia	183,466	31,971	151,495	4,545	14.2
Washington	215,525	22,511	193,014	5,790	25.7
West Virginia	10,233	301	9,932	298	99.0
Wisconsin	10,633	1,144	9,489	285	24.9
Wyoming	22	18	4	0	0
Alaska	3,530	2,025	1,505	45	2.2
Hawaii	94,794	6,426	88,368	2,651	41.3
Total	4,456,280	411,287	4,044,993	121,350	29.5

Recap of Federal responsibility by States and percentage of loss through absorption

[This tabulation is made from the data included in the 1952-53 Annual Report of the Commissioner of Education on the Administration of Public Law 874]

State (1)	Total per pupil cost (2)	Local contribution rate (3)	Percentage Federal payment of per pupil cost (4)	Percentage of loss (5)
Alabama	$124.15	$51.82	41.74	40
Arizona	264.02	157.35	54.25	43
Arkansas	132.28	72.14	54.54	52
California	308.74	137.64	44.58	23
Colorado	259.42	187.12	72.13	52
Connecticut	257.23	205.96	80.07	45
Delaware	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)
Florida	189.83	79.51	41.88	44
Georgia	154.18	74.94	48.61	43
Idaho	215.28	136.72	63.51	47
Illinois	333.85	223.06	66.81	29
Indiana	237.70	105.97	44.58	35
Iowa	260.31	129.82	49.87	19
Kansas	219.74	164.24	74.74	27
Kentucky	142.62	107.94	75.68	32
Louisiana	191.53	53.77	28.07	56
Maine	189.39	125.10	66.05	29
Maryland	292.91	101.43	34.63	29
Massachusetts	277.51	202.76	73.06	45
Michigan	291.45	97.13	33.33	32
Minnesota	250.57	119.80	47.81	57
Mississippi	132.66	93.55	70.52	18
Missouri	185.06	131.24	70.92	39
Montana	271.10	184.73	68.14	26
Nebraska	262.10	201.26	76.79	17
Nevada	234.07	130.94	55.94	14
New Hampshire	$240.40	$219.14	91.15	21
New Jersey	263.11	177.48	67.45	33
New Mexico	215.49	48.74	22.62	23
New York	602.18	181.80	30.19	32
North Carolina	179.81	42.55	23.66	29
North Dakota	228.13	188.15	82.34	16
Ohio	239.37	141.46	59.09	43
Oklahoma	205.30	150.57	73.34	39
Oregon	364.42	178.08	48.86	18
Pennsylvania	252.52	132.32	52.40	35
Rhode Island	219.34	212.14	92.72	22
South Carolina	143.03	66.82	46.72	26
South Dakota	219.71	188.39	85.74	14
Tennessee	133.45	51.31	38.45	44
Texas	214.96	96.99	45.12	31
Utah	197.39	81.09	41.08	18
Vermont	309.54	211.79	68.42	83
Virginia	198.42	128.54	64.78	14
Washington	257.86	70.02	27.15	26
West Virginia	221.77	92.50	41.71	99
Wisconsin	325.33	183.32	56.35	25
Wyoming	336.68	169.03	50.20	0
Alaska	889.62	159.30	17.9	2
Hawaii	204.97	140.11	72.7	41
Total	233.47	120.23	51.40	29.5

---

[1] No application.

We Must Help Our Physically Handicapped

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1954

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, we have spent billions of dollars rehabilitating the peoples of Europe, Africa, Asia, and way points, but we have been singularly remiss in attending to the needs of our people here at home. For example, more than 350,000 people yearly are shown to have been disabled through accident or disease, with an overall total of 38 million handicapped, some 7 million to 9 million of whom are severely handicapped, or from 60 to 100 percent disabled. Yet we have been miserly and dilatory in providing means for their rehabilitation and employment, as approximately only 60,000 a year are cared for under present Federal-State plans, leaving about 300,000 on the human scrap pile annually.

This condition is wrong, and we should immediately remedy it in a practical way. The House Education and Labor Committee now has before it a bill to establish a Federal agency for handicapped, which provides the most comprehensive program yet devised for these millions of American citizens who are blind, partially sighted, deaf, hard of hearing, amputees, arthritics, cardiovascular victims, cerebral palsied, epileptics, victims of muscular dystrophy, multiple sclerosis, poliomyelitis, cancer, rheumatism, tuberculosis, and congenital defects and deformities, as well as many other diseases and results of injuries.

Every day it becomes more apparent that we must bring our own people to the highest possible pitch of physical and mental proficiency, if we are to have the power as a nation to withstand the economic and military might of those who seek to destroy the United States by imposing upon it communism or other isms inimical to our way of life.

From the standpoint of self-interest, it is even more important to take imperative steps to save our own hides than it is to save the hides, however humanitarian and otherwise necessary it may be, of the peoples of other nations.

Many Americans consider it a national disgrace that we here in Congress, charged with responsibility for the general welfare, act the role of misers when it comes to attending to the needs of handicapped who, as the records of the past 34 years conclusively show, when adequately treated, medically, provided necessary education and training, given vocational guidance and selective placement, are enabled thus to earn their own way and make their contributions as citizens to the support of our country, themselves, and their families.

H. R. 2147, the Federal agency for handicapped bill, of which I am sponsor, provides for establishment of an independent agency, which would coordinate activities of the 35 Federal agencies which now have a part of the program but no coordination. It would bring about more efficient and economical services and benefit, thus, not only handicapped but all taxpayers.

The bill covers many fields, including special education for homebound, who cannot attend schools; sets up cooperative enterprises for handicapped to provide a practical means of employing, under proper supervision, handicapped who require training under actual work conditions; provides grants to those who are totally disabled and unfeasible for rehabilitation and who, now, having nothing to support themselves, except inadequate public assistance or charity; sets up a Federal services to handicapped revolving loan fund, from which States which have exhausted their appropriations for rehabilitation, may borrow between sessions of their legislatures, and thus enable this great and necessary work not to suffer interruption, as is the case now, among about half the States all the time; establishes rehabilitation centers throughout the country, and provides many other practical means of restoring handicapped people to a work status.

In view of the urgency of this situation, Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope that the House Committee on Education and Labor immediately reports out the Federal agency for handicapped bill, favorably, so we may vindicate our position in the eyes of the American people, as conservators of our greatest asset, human beings.

The Real America Has Lost One of Its Greatest Champions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER ROGERS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1954

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I take the floor today with a heavy heart. Word has just come to me that one of the great men of America has been called to his reward. I speak of Mr. T. E. Johnson, the editor of the Amarillo (Tex.) Globe-Times. It has been my pleasure and my honor to know and be associated with this great man for a number of years. The varying circumstances under which I have had the opportunity to observe him led me to the conclusion early in our friendship that here was one of God's real noblemen. A man who did not seek personal acclaim for himself, but who gave unselfishly of his time, his efforts, and his outstanding ability to the building of the community in which he lived and the betterment of those individuals who could so proudly call him "neighbor."

His deep understanding and unbelievable patience afforded him the means with which to approach the problems of his fellow man in a calm and reasonable manner. These fine characteristics, together with many more, were evidenced by the numbers of people in all walks of life who sought his counsel and advice in a troubled world. He always had a word of encouragement for those in need. He was never so pressed for time that he had to sacrifice the graciousness and courtesy of the school of southern gentlemen, of which he was truly an honor graduate. His column, These Times, which was read and reread by those who were blessed with the opportunity of having access to it, will stand as a monument to the great success that he enjoyed as a member of the fourth estate. Newspaper people, great and small, throughout this Nation, deeply respected T. E. Johnson for the honesty, integrity, and ability that carried him to the top in his chosen profession, and always stood him so well in his fight for understanding among freemen. His was not a selfish battle for a chosen few nor a demagogic display for the supposedly oppressed. It was no more or no less than a crusade for clear understanding between men, based upon the concepts of freedom upon which this Nation was founded and has so long endured. His was truly a battle for "Mr. American." His enemies were few, his friends many. Like many of us human beings, he had his shortcomings, but unlike so many of us, his greatness and his fine characteristics shone so brightly that his few shortcomings faded into insignificance.

To his splendid wife and his fine children and grandchildren, may I say that the Nation mourns with you. We extend to you our deepest sympathy, because so many of us know the weight of the cross which you have as your burden. We know the loss that has been suffered by Amarillo and the Panhandle of Texas. We know that the real America has lost one of its greatest champions.

The Traffic Situation in Metropolitan Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALT HORAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1954

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am pleased to include two articles bearing on the traffic situation here in metropolitan Washington.

This is the Nation's Capital. It belongs to all of us. Let us keep its desirable features unscathed.

ROCK CREEK

Mr. Speaker, I am completely in sympathy with what the gentleman from California has said on last Friday respecting this very real threat to the existence of Rock Creek Park. For almost 12 years I have owned property in the area affected and have maintained my Washington residence there.

Enjoying rather close acquaintance with those communities in Maryland which have been fighting the proposal to let Rock Creek Park be converted to the site of a speedway, I can appreciate the local mind. And I have been sensing the extent to which this problem, at first a wholly local problem, has become a national issue, with conservation-minded people and national organizations clear across the country adding their voices to the protest of a proposal which would bring so much destruction to this magnificent park in the heart of of our Capital City.

It is claimed that there is no other solution to the Washington traffic problem than to build new and additional arterial highways into the city. To me that approach is only going to give us more agonizing traffic congestion in Washington. We would but bring existing traffic, plus more traffic, into the heart of Washington faster to add to the jams that already plague the city during the rush hours.

There are other ways to meet this traffic problem in the capital city area. It has seemed to me that the Citizens Action Committee for Fair Road Planning, an organization representing 15 citizens' communities in the Chevy Chase area, has pointed up the answers to the problem well in a pamphlet entitled "Is the Use of Rock Creek Park for an Expressway Really Necessary?" A 7-point plan to meet the traffic situation without molesting Rock Creek Park is embodied in that pamphlet and, under unanimous consent, I include pages 6 and 7 of the same at this point in the Record:

A Program To Save Rock Creek and Solve the Traffic Problems

The issue over which we battle is one forced by the Maryland and District road authorities who insist there is need for one or more new arterial highways into downtown Washington, more spokes in the District traffic wheel than now exist. The first new arterial, they insist, must be one through Rock Creek Park, no other plan can precede it they, argue.

These highway authorities have been parties through the years in other plans to solve traffic problems, plans they now seem to turn their backs upon as being not sufficient to meet the present needs, plans to be pursued in the future. It is fair to review these long-standing plans to determine how far their fulfillment might possibly meet the traffic needs of metropolitan Washington.

Plan 1: Maryland is now building trunk 240 from Frederick southward toward Washington. Its authors would split this highway into two 6-lane parts at a point north of the Naval Hospital and west of Wisconsin Avenue, one leg to run southwestward into downtown Washington through Cabin John, the other to reach southeastward into and through Rock Creek Park. Why two legs for this special expressway is not understood except that the road authorities want it that way. Would not the southwest leg be sufficient since it would conveniently reach arteries into Washington such as MacArthur Boulevard, Massachusetts Avenue, River Road, Georgetown Road, and Wisconsin Avenue? Why do they feel that we must punch a great 200-foot wide elevation into and through Rock Creek Park? Can't we be content with one leg of 240, for the time being at least?

Plan 2: Long-planned is a belt route route around the District of Columbia through Montgomery and Prince Georges County, a route that would take off the streets of suburban and downtown Washington that traffic seeking to get through and beyond Washington and that traffic, particularly trucks, seeking to get into the wholesale, trucking, and shipping section of the city. Why not build now in keeping with this plan, not 12 or 15 years from now as the highway authorities plan. And not just a 3 or 4 mile stretch of belt in order to compromise Rock Creek Park? The present proposal to build a few miles of belt would find the belt running parallel to what now serves crosstown needs, East-West Highway, and only a mile north of it when it ought to be out where it could serve its broader purpose as a belt and not need to cross Rock Creek Park lengthwise.

Plan 3: Long in the planners' books has been the Fort Memorial Freeway proposal which would meet so many District traffic problems as an inner-belt route around the city. Over 90 percent of the right-of-way needed for this belt is now in District possession. The undertaking to build this great traffic aid is not even in the present thinking of the authorities seeking to bring a new arterial speedway down Rock Creek Park. Why?

Plan 4: Hundreds of thousands of dollars have been spent on plans for the belt routes and proposed improvement and extension of such arteries as 16th, Massachusetts, Connecticut, River Road, Georgetown Road, and Wisconsin Avenue. These steps would bring tremendous relief to traffic pressures. What has become of these plans during the persistent campaign to drive an expressway through Rock Creek Park?

Plan 5: Another fine plan to help traffic was, and still is, that plan to construct bus bays on 16th and Connecticut, bays into which buses would pull to discharge passengers without halting streams of cars during the rush hours. What has become of it?

Plan 6: Thousands upon thousands of automobiles could be taken off the streets of Washington each day if only we were afforded an adequate mass transportation service during the rush hours between the suburbs and downtown Washington. Are we to understand that this will not be necessary if only we can have a speedway through Rock Creek Park?

Plan 7: The extension of Beach Drive from East-West Highway through Rock Creek Park to Wisconsin Avenue would afford a delightful route for suburbanites in their trips to and from the city and relieve other roads of congestion. But Beach Drive should ever be kept the parkway that it is, never a speedway.

It was inevitable that traffic authorities and city planners would sooner or later awaken to the fact that we reach traffic saturation points in our growing cities, points beyond which there can be no reasonable use or place for more automobiles. I hope our Washington area traffic and planning authorities will open their eyes to facts and dare to be as plain spoken as are the traffic authorities of New York City. These authorities are agreed that "the ultimate solution of traffic congestion strangling American cities is to get the private automobiles off the streets and substitute efficient mass transportation," to quote the report of the New York Herald Tribune of April 30,1954. The report of this traffic conference is so revealing of new thinking on the traffic problem that I ask unanimous consent that this newspaper article, under the heading "See Doom of Private Car in Cities," be printed following my remarks.

Unless we are realistic and open our eyes to the very positive limitations of cities for traffic accommodation, we will but continue to further tangle traffic that already has reached a point where it threatens the very life of the business city itself.

We've gone crazy on the subject of expressways as they relate to our great cities. They have their place, to be sure, but they ought to be around rather than through cities. Expressways in cities can only further tangle the traffic jams of Washington. Bruce Bliven, in a March 20, 1954, editorial in the Saturday Evening Post, clearly expounds the folly of expressways such as that proposed for Rock Creek Park. I ask that this editorial entitled "Expressways are Wonderful, But They Don't Untangle a City's Traffic Jams," be printed as a part of and following my remarks.

Mr. Speaker, the mere thought of losing Rock Creek Park to a great limited-access expressway, with a 200-foot right-of-way accommodating six lanes of divided speedway, is disturbing and ought to disturb any mind that is conscious of the part that internationally famous park plays in making Washington the great and beautiful city that it is, and the part it plays, recreation and parkwise, in the lives of thousands of people who use the area. It is inconceivable that consent could ever be had to use this great park for such a highway purpose as it proposed. I want to assure the gentleman from California, who has just spoken so well on the subject, that he will find many of us ready to rally to the cause of amending the Capper-Cramton Act if it is found that the existing language of the law is not sufficient to guarantee the preservation of Rock Creek Park to the causes which its far-sighted sponsors were obviously seeking to serve.

In the instance which threatens Rock Creek Park expressway enthusiasts are outdoing themselves. In this instance they want Expressway 240 coming into Washington from the northwest to have two legs into the city, one reaching to the Potomac at the north city line, the other coming down through Rock Creek Park. Why does not one leg for such an expressway answer present and future needs? Could it be that our highway builders and planners just cannot resist using this beautiful park to set off their engineering abilities? After all, the site through the park would cost them nothing and would make a beautiful surrounding for their dream road. They would better open their eyes to what they would be doing to the great and lasting purposes which Rock Creek Park is serving, and be content with an expressway with just one leg, which is the way of most expressways.

The above-mentioned follows:

[From the New York Herald Tribune of April 30, 1954]

See Doom of Private Car in Cities

(By Robert S. Bird)

Four top traffic experts, including New York's Traffic Commissioner T. T. Wiley, agreed yesterday that the ultimate solution for traffic congestion strangling American cities is to get the private automobiles off the streets and substitute efficient mass transportation.

Mr. Wiley and three colleagues gave an audience of transit experts harsh facts and even harsher fancies on traffic congestion here and in other cities. Their panel discussion assignment for a luncheon of the American Transit Association and the Commerce and Industry Association of New York was to get to the nub of the subject without waste of time.

DOOM CARS IN CITIES

They rattled off these opinions with no detours for pleasantries or frills:

1. Use of the private car merely for convenience in cities in the future is doomed. All traffic in the years ahead must be productive traffic. Automobiles are already moving slower than horses and buggies used to travel in this city, anyway.

2. Private cars, driven for convenience only, are not important in filling city stores with customers. Buses and subways are what bring customer volume.

3. The average block in New York City during the daytime traffic flow contains 2 buses, 6 trucks, 3 taxicabs, and 11 automobiles. These are contained in 4 lanes, 2 of which are in use but on the average are temporarily stalled, and 2 of which are jammed with parked traffic.

4. One bus carries as many passengers as 36 automobiles on the average, which should give the bus priority in use of the city streets.

5. Mass transportation—buses and subways—will have to carry the bulk of future street traffic, and so this form of transportation should be encouraged to the fullest.

6. Taxes on mass transportation, erroneously based on the monopoly principle nowadays, should be drastically cut. Higher subway fares in New York have substantially increased street congestion, and the beneficial effect on the city budget must be measured against that costly handicap.

7. The next traffic solution for New York City should be an effort to stagger people's working hours so as to spread out peak traffic loads both of people and working vehicles.

CITIES HERE TO STAY

8. Cities are here to stay. Talk about decentralization of New York City is exaggerated. The city has more construction under way today in its central areas than in any time in its history. New York is rehabilitating, not decentralizing.

Participants in the rapid-fire airing of opinion were, besides Commissioner Wiley, Robert W. Dowling, president of the City Investing Co. and head of the citizens budget commission; Kenneth C. Richmond, vice president and treasurer of Abraham & Straus and chairman of the transit committee of the National Retail Dry Goods Association; and Laurence Wingerter, president of the San Antonio Transit Co. and president of the American Transit Association.

Edmund F. Wagner, president of the General Realty & Utility Corp. and vice president of the Commerce and Industry Association of New York, was moderator of the discussion, which followed a luncheon at the Hotel New Yorker, where the American Transit Association is in convention .

Referring to his proposal for staggered hours as the next needed step in this city, Commisisoner Wiley said:

"This whole country is undergoing a sociological development through reduced working hours and number of working days, and the result in traffic terms is we are trying to do too much in too little time. We must do something to broaden the working base, to spread out peak loads not only of people on the streets but of the loading and unloading of vehicular traffic at the curbs."

Holding that New York's traffic congestion could be fairly well solved by eliminating any 1 of the 4 types of street traffic—trucks, buses, taxicabs, and passenger cars—Mr. Wiley added that none unfortunately could be entirely abolished.

"But the most important point now is, what is the future place of the passenger automobile in the city?" he said. "The idea used to be that the city should be developed so that everybody could get around in an automobile. Now it is apparent that this can't be done. We must devise some means of separating productive use of the automobile from its use as a convenience.

"What we can do immediately is to stop building off-street parking space in downtown Manhattan for persons driving to and from work, for example. Answering the question as to what place the automobile has in the city, it is essential when used for productive purposes; it is unnecessary when used for convenience."

Mr. Wingertner, agreeing, said that the right to use automobiles in American cities should be handled the same way that Texas now deals with the traditional right of its citizens to carry guns in the cities—"restrict their use."

Mr. Dowling and Mr. Richmond spoke of the financial burden real estate bears as the result of street congestion, and the need to encourage mass transportation as a means of improving and expanding the healthy cores of the city.

[From the Saturday Evening Post of March 20, 1954]

Expressways Are Wonderful, but They Don't Untangle a City's Traffic Jams

(By Bruce Bliven)

Nobody needs to be told that most American communities are slowly strangling with automobile congestion. It has been one cause of the great migration to the suburbs, not only by householders but by business and industry. A recent expert study guessed that the pile-up in New York City streets now costs at least $3 million per day in excess gasoline consumption and lost time.

All over the country, municipalities are trying to solve the problem. They are tunneling under parks for garage space or building fancy mechanisms which stack cars above one another in the air. And most of all, they are building expressways—limited-access, high-speed roads. They are usually called freeways in the West, superhighways in the Middle West, and throughways or parkways in the Northeast. Some of these expressways are enormously expensive; in Pittsburgh, for example, a series of dramatic bridges and tunnels is necessary. In Chicago one of them bores right through the post office.

Considered by themselves, these expressways have undoubted merits. They generate far fewer accidents per car-mile. They save up to about 2 cents per car-mile in gasoline and time. In congested city streets, you get, on the average, 8 miles to the gallon, and on expressways you get about 20. Most of the country's new expressways amortize their total cost, directly or indirectly, in 10 or 12 years.

If drivers would be content just to ride back and forth on the freeways, everything would be fine. Unfortunately, they won't; of all the nearby traffic heading toward a big city, about 90 percent wants to go into the middle of town and park. When the drivers come down into the city streets trouble begins. Unfortunately, too, whenever you make the roads and the parking better, you also make the problem still more serious. When road conditions are made better, a certain number of people who have no car, buy one. A certain number of families with one or more cars buy an extra one. People who had been riding the commuting trains show an increasing tendency to drive into the city instead. Almost always, the new improvement fails to help matters as much as the optimists expected. Sometimes, at least temporarily, it makes things worse.

The experts in city planning believe they have the answer to downtown congestion. They point out that a private automobile with one or two passengers takes about half as much space in the street as a bus which may carry 40 or 50. They want a circle of big parking lots strung around the congested area like beads on a loop. The expressways from out of town would lead into these parking lots, where you would leave your car and change to a bus to take you downtown. Parking fees would be small, and the bus fare would also be low, and might be combined in some way with the parking fee. Each bus would be routed to get to the heart of the city rapidly.

The only trouble with this beautiful plan is that people don't like it. Buses rarely go as near your destination as your car can go, assuming of course that you can park it at that spot. When a motorist buys something, he wants to put it into his car then and there, or have a sturdy young clerk from the store do so for him. He certainly does not want to carry it himself, get on a bus, get off again, and then lug his packages to his car. He usually forgets that he couldn't park where he wants to. The bright dream of the circle of parking lots still remains mostly on the drawing boards of the hopeful planners.

Countries with dictators, of course, can put through elaborate and drastic plans. Napoleon III swept away a great part of Paris in order to create his magnificent series of radiating boulevards. Stalin ripped apart much of Moscow in preparation for a torrent of automobile traffic that has thus far failed to materialize. By contrast, the American way is the one now being pursued all over the country: trial and error, patchwork, compromise, and constant complaint from everybody. This is probably just as well. The automobile age is still too new for any city planner to say with authority how the problem should be solved.

The New Look in the Philippines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1954

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, at a time when some of our historic allies in Europe are divided and weakened due to their desire to get peace for themselves at almost any price, it is thrilling to hear the authentic voice of liberty, combined with courage and imagination, coming from various leaders in Asia who have gained their freedom so recently that they treasure it above all else. If, as some say, we are losing allies in Europe, we have others in Asia whose influence there is greater than any European government can have east of Suez.

An Asian who has the vision and a deep understanding of what freedom and self-government require of those who would retain them, is our former colleague in the House of Representatives serving as Resident Commissioner from the Commonwealth of the Philippines, Hon. Carlos P. Romulo. He recently discussed the new day in the Philippines in an address before the National Press Club. Much of it deals with another great Asian leader, the new president of the Republic of the Philippines, Ramon Magsaysay. If any tend to despair of Asia, I invite them to read this address, and take heart. The address follows:

The Philippines' New Look

(Address by Gen. Carlos P. Romulo, special and personal representative of the President of the Philippines)

I have given a good deal of thought to the expression "the new look," when it was assigned to me as my subject today, to try and tell you something about the "new look in the Philippines." Tracing its origins, I find that here in America it was first used some 7 years ago, when skirts came down. I am not sure that it was used, or a variation was used, when they went up again, or whether the trend was referred to as the old look back.

Then more recently the term has been applied to the new defense policy as announced by President Eisenhower for the United States. I gather that President Eisenhower is not too pleased with this description of his program. This, I can also understand. Because in the last analysis there is substantially nothing of a "new look" either about a defense policy or about the forces which make it necessary. You may call it the New Look in the Army, but from where I stand, when you can hit the other fellow harder at less cost, I would say it is nothing more than a "better look," and there is really nothing that is new about it—unless saving the taxpayers' money is something new.

In this sense, there is really a New Look in the Philippines—and I am happy to tell you that it promises to be a better look as well. But before I can give you a notion of what this New Look is like, I shall have to let you in on the old look in our country—give you some idea of what things were before our people decided that they wanted the New Look—any New Look.

So let us take a look at the old look in the Philippines.

First of all, allow me to take you back in history to a time when our people first awakened to the fact that the government was theirs—that they, the governed, had in their possession the right to grant or to withhold the power to govern. We began our acquaintance with America about 50 years ago, before the concept of government by consent of the governed gained general acceptance. True, the English had their Magna Carta. But Europe came to the Philippines, you will recall, at a time when English notions were not favorably considered by the Europeans who first came to our islands—the Spanish of King Philip II.

After Magellan discovered our islands ("discovered"—whatever that means—may be in the sense that he landed on one of the islands and took possession in the time-honored fashion of those days), came Urdaneta and Legazpi—strong, courageous, sincere, devout, loyal men, who carried out their mission of bringing to our people the incalculable benefits of a faith, of a culture, which contributed immeasurably to make us what we are today—but who also brought a system of government by a ruler and his minions—a system in which the people, now regarded everywhere except behind the Iron Curtain as the ultimate source of power, had only one unalienable right—the right to obey without question. The people held what few rights they possessed at the will and by the grace of the King of Spain and of the prefects and consuls whom he or his court chose to set over them.

In the latter years of the last century a group of brilliant and brave Filipinos came into being—agitators, subversives, from the standpoint of Madrid and of the Council of the Indies—men of the breed of Otis and Sam Adams in your own history. They were the first to proclaim the fact that "Filipinos" no longer meant the man of pure Spanish blood who made his home in the Philippines, the colony of Spain, but also included the lowly people of the islands themselves—those peoples whom the Spanish rulers then called Indios.

These men were inspired by the history of the United States and its Revolution; of France, and of the influence of the French of Voltaire and Rousseau. Boiled down, their creed was that all men are created equal, and that all are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights—but you all know the rest of that. The period from their day to the beginning of this century was a period of struggle, of revolt, to prove to the world and to the rulers in Madrid that the people of the Philippines were aware of their right to grant or withhold power of government. With American help—and, let it be admitted, not without some fighting against American power by our Aguinaldos, Lunas, del Pilars, Malvars—our people established on our islands a government of, for, and by the people. These words, too, are as familiar to you as they are to us.

Then followed 40 years of self-government and of struggle and aspiration for full self-government. The Pacific war interrupted the development, but we had had enough of real self-government to realize what a boon it was. The people came to know their power, to realize and to act on the sense of power to control those whom they chose to govern them. In those 40 years, as we continued the struggle for complete sovereignty, we knew that we had to be close to our governors—and those who governed us then, by our free choice and with our consent, also knew it, and the men your country sent out to us to exercise the functions of American sovereignty also knew it. That is why the names of William Howard Taft and of the brilliant roster of the men who followed him are today revered in the Philippines. Show be another former dependency of a great power whose public places still bear the names of that power's preconsuls.

Then came the horrible interlude of the Pacific war, in which the people again for a brief time lost the power over their government. After the war had ended they regained it—but their hold on it was not strong enough to cope with the phenomenon which was born of the disintegration that was a natural if deplorable aftermath of 3 years of enemy occupation and of enemy oppression. Tragedy stalked our newly restored freedoms. The first president of our Republic, Gen. Manuel Roxas, able, brilliant, and a real statesman, died 2 years after his election. After his untimely death, in the space of 3 years following our liberation from the Japanese, a group of selfish, greedy men took advantage of the disordered state into which the country had been plunged, and established a curtain between the people and their government. It was not a curtain of iron, but it was impenetrable just the same, because it consisted of influence, of misuse of wealth, of subversion of the powers of government to the requirements of those whom easily gained wealth had endowed with influence over venal officials. Such officials, supported and financed by persons with ill-gotten wealth, formed a barrier between the government and the people.

This, fundamentally, was the old look—not old in the sense that it was what the Filipino people had been accustomed to—on the contrary, it was a look alien to all that three generations of Filipinos had struggled for and largely achieved.

The disease was this old look. What were some of its symptoms? On the domestic scene, they appeared in a general breakdown of the people's faith in their government. There was nothing to have faith in. Government employees, from the highest to the lowest, seemed to have lost a sense of obligation to the people who supported them. Public works, needed for the progress of the country and for the welfare of the masses, were either held up or started only where they were politically useful. The American point 4 program was shackled, immobilized because the counterpart section was not functioning. Mishandling of the police power gave the subversive elements their opportunity—an opportunity they were kept from seizing only by the force and devotion of the one man who was to emerge later as the man who restored the government to the people.

In the sphere of foreign affairs, ultimate power was handed over to incompetence personified and complicated by greed. Important negotiations were shelved, delayed, ignored. The last year of the administration, there was an ignoring of the functions of the country's representation in the United Nations and as a result the country's prestige in the eyes of the world plummeted down to a record low. There was the case of a delegate who in 1953 was sent to New York—and who spent all of his time in a hospital because he came as a patient and he was really sent to the States for medical treatment. The foreign service became a stepchild, a dumping ground for incompetents with influence, with drag. A high foreign service official in one of the key foreign posts got himself into an unsavory mess. He was recalled to Manila—not to answer for his misdeeds, but to campaign in the last election. His misdeeds caught up with him only after the new administration—the new look—had taken office.

I could cite you innumerable instances of these symptoms of the disease of the old look in the Philippines. Many of them have been reported by your own comrades. The mistake those able observers and writers made in reporting them was to paint a picture of inevitability—of a people so far gone in acquiescence to governmental corruption, so supine before bad government, that there was no hope of restoring good government, of saving democracy. That is where your friends, and mine, were wrong.

First came the mass reaction of an outraged people, who retained the memory of the power to grant or withhold consent to be governed. For one thing, neither the observers nor the men in control under the old look reckoned with the one force in the Philippines which no one could destroy or control—not even the Kempeitai of the hated and feared Japanese—the force of public opinion, buttressed and stimulated by a press, a radio, and other means of public expression who refused to be silent. So strong was this force that the most virulent of those interested in maintaining the old look did not dare to challenge it on any broad front. The old look signed its own death warant when it tried to manipulate a convention against all tenets of justice and fairness. A great deal has been said about American influence behind Magsaysay. At this time it cannot be denied that such influence was essayed, nor would I dream of denying what, had it been exercised in furtherance of interests not Filipino, I would wholeheartedly deplore. But the fact remains that the old look was not overthrown by any Machiavellian machinations of so-called king-makers from abroad. The people simply got tired of it, as God, according to Victor Hugo, got tired of Napoleon. And the people, as God did to Napoleon, simply threw the old look in the Philippines out of their way and into the discard.

So our people made their New Look in government. They simply reasserted their basic faith in the principle of a government by the consent of the governed. All they needed to do this was the leader—the man—or as we call him, the guy. They voted for him literally in the millions, and they expected him to make good on his promises. And forthwith, the day after his election, weeks before he was even inaugurated, he began to redeem his pledge.

Ramon Magsaysay, the Guy, began by initiating inquires into every aspect of governmental activity. He chose men whom he could trust, mainly on the basis of their lack of standing with the Old Look crowd. Before he took his oath, he had a pretty good idea of the basic faults in the whole governmental setup. Then, with his inauguration, he went to work.

His first concern was the home problem. You all know that the Philippine economy, following a principle set up by our American governors, operates on a principle of government participation in business and industry—a sort of pump-priming operation. Government corporations function in most major economic spheres. Under the Old Look some of these corporations were, to put it mildly, operating in an aura of an ancient and fishlike smell. The Guy went into them without a gas mask, and old jobs began to fall. New men, young men, earnest, sincere, and above all, able men took over, manned the directorates, and the corporations began to lose their old aspect of preserves for favored incompetents.

One of the key jobs at his disposal was that of collector of customs. I needn't tell you how important this job is. His appointee in an interim capacity, without pay, was Col. Jaime Velasquez, a retired army officer, who was one of our most distinguished graduates of West Point. Jimmy Velasquez has his own idea of honesty in the customs. And he wielded the big broom effectively. Nor did the Guy spare old friends. In the case of one army officer, who had been a trusted supporter, a confidante, he did not hesitate to fire him when he found out that the officer whom he had elevated to a high post, had developed Old Look notions in a New Look setup. He has, in the few months in which he has been in office, instilled a new spirit into the Government; a spirit in which government officials are entering the service in the spirit of service, not to enrich themselves or to make things easy for their friends.

Magsaysay has reestablished an old Filipino custom, in which the head of the state is always in close personal touch with the people. He has established directly under him an office to which all complaints against government officials are sent, and he placed at its head one of his most trusted aides. Every single complaint is attended to, not one is ignored. He dislikes large delegations. He prefers to talk to individuals, to citizens who have a grievance. He detests cliques. As he campaigned in the barrios, in the villages, so he meets the people now—going to the barrios himself, with a minimum of escort, of security guards—and to tell the truth, he needs no security guards. He has opened the palace, Malacanang, to the people. He receives callers himself, to the consternation of horrified protocol officers.

Now, this is not all by the way of a polilitician's play for public favor. When the Guy tells the people they may come to the palace, he is not indulging in a new version of babykissing for votes. He does it because he sincerely believes that the only way he can serve the people is to learn what they want—and he refuses to get their wants second-hand from interested politicians.

In the broader phases of government, he has replaced confusion with order, by the simple method of bringing to all public servants the cinviction that they, like he, are in their job as servants of the people, not as overlords, large or petty. Where he saw that lack of coordination hampered the true function of government, which is the service to the people, he acted drastically, radically, even ruthlessly, to restore coordination.

There was some doubt in some circles about his capacity in handling foreign affairs. But here, too, the Guy brought to his job the twin tools of his native commonsense and his deep faith in the service of the masses. First, he asserted his leadership when confusion in policy developed as to the position of the Philippines in the international sphere. He took an unequivocal stand, not only because he personally favored that stand, but because he was convinced, and rightly, as events will show, that it is the stand his people want.

He knows that the people want peace, stability and security at home. So he naturally rejected a suggestion that would involve him in foreign problems. Where an ambitious man would have yielded to the prospect of emerging as a leader of Asia, the Guy made it clear that he had to do his homework first. Yet this does not mean that he is indifferent to the major international problems of the day. He refuses to be anybody's puppet and he acts with firmness and courage on his own, spurning such advice as he thinks is inimical to the Nation's welfare.

Came the proposal by Secretary of State Dulles for united action in Indochina. Considering the fact that there is an important sector in his own party that does not believe in involving the Philippines in a war not of its own making and which holds to the belief that the Philippines should not invite reprisal by taking an aggressive attitude against Red China, it is significant that on April 11, President Magsaysay made the following statement:

"The President pointed out that the nation's security requires, and that the policy of his administration has declared, Philippine commitment to the principle of associating itself with the other free nations of the world in resisting Communist aggression in southeast Asia.

"The President expressed the readiness of the Philippines to discuss with the other nations, in accordance with this principle, how best to present a united front against further Communist aggression, subject to agreement on details among all participants.

"Special significance is attached to the conflict in Indochina because the area is considered the key to the defense of southeast Asia and because of its proximity to the Philippines.

"The fact that the fighting now in progress is within several hours flying time to Manila, and that the Communist forces are using powerful and modern military equipment, it was pointed out, makes it a matter of grave and immediate concern to Philippines defense officials."

Then on April 17, President Magsaysay issued a statement which, in the long-range view of history, may prove to be the most statesmanlike approach to the problem of Indochina and the most effective weapon against communism in Asia. He proposed, and it is the first time that such a proposal has been made by anyone, that if a joint declaration is made, as suggested by the United States, such a declaration be the Asian equivalent of the Atlantic Charter.

President Magsaysay's statement on April 17 follows:

"The Philippine Government agrees in principle with the United States proposal to issue a joint declaration against Communist aggression in Indochina. At an appropriate time we shall give more detailed consideration to the actual text of the declaration itself.

"Our first concern is, and has always been, our national security. This concern today has become more grave with the deepening crisis in Indochina.

"In the interest of our national security, it is our duty to strengthen ourselves in every way. But in the face of the Communist peril in Asia, it has also become our grave duty to multiply our strength through joint action with our allies in the free world. It is particularly important to maintain our alliance with the United States, which is today the principal bulwark of the free world against Communist aggression and tyranny.

"In the Indochina crisis, however, there is an element which is of great concern to the Philippines as an Asian country. This is the political element of independence of the peoples of Indochina.

"Our Government believes that the proposed declaration should contain an affirmation of the rights of all peoples to freedom and independence. Thus, it would not only be a warning against further Communist aggression in Asia but an assurance that the contemplated united action is aimed at the defense of the independence of the Indochinese peoples against Communist imperialism or any other threat.

"The joint declaration, to have maximum effectiveness, should approach as closely as possible the guaranties of the Atlantic Charter. As a matter of fact, it should be the Asian equivalent of that historic document."

The treaty of mutual defense between the United States and the Philippines provides for consultations "whenever in the opinion of either of them the territorial integrity, political independence or security of either of the parties is threatened by external armed attack in the Pacific." Even without this treaty provision, the special relations existing between our two countries would have required consultations for joint action in the face of the rising Communist menace in southeast Asia.

President Magsaysay won fame among our people as a fighter for the freedom and security of his country, first against the Japanese invaders and later against the Huks. Therefore, as President, he may be expected to be uncompromising in the pursuit of these objectives. Nevertheless, when he says, as he does in his latest statement on the Indochina situation, that the political element of that problem is of great concern to the Philippines as an Asian nation, he does so not out of mental reservation but out of a clear understanding of the basic issues that are involved in the conflict.

The conflict in southeast Asia involves not merely rich lands and strategic territories. It involves human beings and their God-given aspirations to a better life in larger freedom. President Magsaysay, therefore, recognizes that Philippine participation in any joint action against the Communist threat in Indochina must have as powerful a justification as the relentless campaign which is bing pursued at home under his personal direction against the internal enemies of the country's freedom and security. If, as may eventually be necessary, such joint action should require direct military cooperation, then it must be made clear to the Filipino people that such action is being undertaken not merely against something but for something, namely, the right of the Indochinese peoples to freedom and independence.

The tradition and history of the Filipino people would require this political motivation as a necessary precondition for the united action that is contemplated in southeast Asia. I think it is true to say that this would be equally true of the American people, whose own traditions of liberty cannot allow them to ignore the fundamental right of self-determination which lies at the heart of the Indochina conflict.

It has been said that there is need for an Asian equivalent of NATO in Europe. The comparison is based on what appears to be considerations of a strictly military character. President Magsaysay has made what is undoubtedly a most pertinent observation regarding this proposal. While recognizing the importance of arrangements that might be made to insure the military security of the region, he has introduced the political element which alone can give meaning to any security arrangements in southeast Asia. Instead of invoking NATO, he has gone somewhat farther back in history to invoke the Atlantic Charter. He is thus the first statesman to refer to a document which enshrined the ideals of the Allied Powers of World War II and to insist that those ideals be made applicable to Asia.

The four freedoms which were guaranteed under the Atlantic Charter are not a dead letter. In the context of the struggle in Asia they possess startling relevance. This is specially true when it is recalled that Winston Churchill had made it plain that the Atlantic Charter did not apply to Asia. It is fitting that the head of state of the first Asian country to achieve freedom after World War II, should invoke the principles of the Atlantic Charter as the pillars which must support and sustain the contemplated united action of the free states of Asia and Europe against communism. In effect, what President Magsaysay is saying to America and to the West is this: "In order to defend southeast Asia against the Communist menace, we need not only the armaments and the manpower which could be established under a Pacific NATO, but also the principles and the faith which can only be aroused by the reiteration of the four freedoms of the Atlantic Charter."

I stress these two statements on a burning international topic of the day because it shows Ramon Magsaysay in a new light and it throws into bold relief what the new look in the Philippines really is. Here is a man of the people, one who sprung from the masses, who with his native intuition and unalloyed patriotism, senses an imminent danger to his country. He did not pussyfoot. He acted. He knows that his country cannot be secure with the forces of communism on the rampage in Asia. And as one of the first truly Asian leaders, he is of pure Malayan stock, elected overwhelmingly in an uncontaminated popular election, he strikes at the root of the Asian revolution and speaking for the masses whence he came proposes the equivalent of the Atlantic Charter for Asia.

You once had a President here in Washington who also came from the people, who took over at a critical time, when the head of the Nation had to be an expert in international affairs as well as in domestic problems. Your history readings will tell you that that man, in his study just up the street, was not highly regarded by the so-called cultured statesmen of the day, because he came from the people. Yet America was saved, at home and abroad, by that man, who applied to his task the great touchstone of what the people wanted—and of what he as a man of the people, knew that the people wanted. Abraham Lincoln did not govern by what was accepted as the book of government. Lincoln fought and led the fight against disunion, because he saw the danger to the Nation and to the people in disunion. He saved America.

On a smaller stage, yet one just as significant, Magsaysay is fighting for the salvation of his people. The issue as he sees it is not the danger of disunion, or only partly that. It is the disrupting influence of international communism that Magsaysay sees as the great problem, the major threat to his people—because he has fought the Communists and he knows what they want, and what their program means. His devotion to the basic principle of serving the people is closely linked with his conviction that communism constitutes the greatest threat to the people. As he sees the problem in an unorthodox way, so he tackles his solutions. Like Lincoln, or should I say, after the manner of Lincoln, he is not governing by the book. He writes his own book, and in doing so he gives democracy a deeper meaning, a stronger implementation.

Because of this he has won his people's faith—and he is strengthening it daily. To our older people he has opened a vista which brings to them the memories of the days when they believed in a government that was their government. To the youngest of them he brings the new look, which in its essence is a reaffirmation of the basic principle of democracy: That the governed alone have the power to consent to government.

Address by Hon. Theodore Francis Green, of Rhode Island, at the 13th Convention of the Ukrainian Workingmen's Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 20, 1954

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address I delivered at the 13th convention of the Ukranian Workingmen's Association, held at the Sylvania Hotel, in Philadelphia, Pa., on Wednesday, May 19, 1954.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Officers and delegates of the Ukranian Workingmen's Association, I am glad to be with you here tonight as a guest of your 13th convention. You are now marking the 44th year of your organization's existence with justified pride. Over 20,000 members and well over $5 million of assets prove that you have done well as a fraternal society, and for this I want to congratulate you sincerely. You have taken advantage of the freedom and opportunities which America gives. At the same time, you have done your part in preserving for America the important values of your notable culture.

It is people of your kind, of many different races and different creeds, who have made the United States what it is today, and are developing it to assume the leadership of the nations of the world, a leadership unsought which has been thrust upon it. You make me feel at home with you here even if some of you still speak with a foreign accent. That does not detract from your Americanism. On the contrary, it adds to your value here, because you are evidently another living link connecting the United States directly with countries abroad. In your case it connects us with the large, rich, beautiful, and freedom-loving Ukraine.

We old stock Americans have had much to learn in the last 2 or 3 score of years. We have come to realize that the Atlantic and Pacific oceans and the Rio Grande River do not isolate us from the rest of the civilized world. We have learned that the qualities of personal and national characteristics which we value highly, and sometimes exaggerate in ourselves, are not our monopoly, but also exist and flourish among peoples of other countries, other races, and other tongues. We have discovered that various diseases—of the body, as well as of the mind, and of the soul, do not respect geographic boundaries, and that they have to be restrained, and if possible exterminated, by the united effort of all mankind.

We are proud that the man who recognized these facts, and decided to do something about them on a universal scale, was an American, our late President Woodrow Wilson. Faced with a half ruined Europe, realizing the possibility of another similar or worse conflagration, appreciating the advantages of cooperation between nations, and aware of the potentially explosive danger of oppression of one nation by another, Wilson conceived the concept of the League of Nations and formulated the right of every nationality to self-determination and to a government of its free choice. I quote his words, "We believe these fundamental things: First, that every people has a right to choose the sovereignty under which they shall live. Second, that the small states of the world have a right to enjoy the same respect for their sovereignty and for their territorial integrity that great and powerful nations expect and insist upon. And, third, that the world has a right to be free from every disturbance of its peace that has its origin in aggression and disregard of the rights of peoples and nations." The ideas of President Wilson were slow in taking root but they remained not only as an ideal but also as a guidepost of the American foreign policy.

Following his great predecessor, President Franklin D. Roosevelt reaffirmed these principles by including them in the Atlantic Charter which expresses the (and again I quote) "desire to see no territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned" and promises to "respect the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live."

Finally, following the bipartisan foreign policy established by President Roosevelt and continued by President Truman comes the declaration of President Eisenhower that, I quote, "We can never rest—and we must so inform all the world including the Kremlin—that until the enslaved nations of the world have in the fullness of freedom the right to choose their own path, that then and then only can we say that there is a possible way of living peacefully and permanently with communism in the world."

I must add, however, that while I share fully the President's sentiments regarding the full freedom for enslaved nations, there are serious doubts as to the imminence or permanence of peaceful living with the Kremlin Communists.

To you, who for 44 years have lived here an organized life, many of the things I have said may not be new. You may have had, and still may have, the feeling that your old country, the Ukraine, somehow was not drawn into the orbit in which those principles operated. Some of you may feel that so far as Ukraine is concerned, these declarations were unimportant or even meaningless. For my part, I think somewhat differently.

It seems to me that it was not a mere coincidence that Lenin threw out the slogan of, I quote, "self-determination including separation" after President Wilson had announced his own principles. The result was a nominal Ukrainian Soviet state, but one not so completely divided as before. Nor can it be considered an accident that Soviet Ukraine became a charter member of the United Nations after the Atlantic Charter was signed and publicized.

I do not mean to say that the American attitude was decisive in those matters. The brunt of the struggle for a nation's liberation must in each case be carried on by the people themselves, and the Ukrainian people have had more than their share of struggle, suffering, bloodshed, starvation, heroism, and martyrdom. The fact, however, that their struggle finds favor in the eyes of the American people and of the American Government, and that not the Ukrainians, but their oppressors stand condemned before the public opinion of the greatest democracy in the world; that fact to my mind, helps them in that struggle. And it will help them even more in the future.

The events which I have briefly outlined do not leave in my mind any doubt that Ukraine will become free and independent. The courage of Ukrainian people at home, and the devotion to the cause of that freedom on the part of their American kinsmen, will gather enough force in Ukraine itself, and enough moral and material support here in America and in the rest of the world, so that the final glorious result is almost a question of time only.

I have said "almost" advisedly and I will explain why.

In the first place, experience has taught us that freedom is indivisible and independence is interdependent. In the world as it is now, it is impossible to contend for independence of one country only. Ukraine cannot expect to achieve freedom leaving Poland, Czechoslovakia or even far-away Turkestan or Armenia in the clutches of the Kremlin dictators. Ukrainians trying to help their motherland, or Georgians fighting for their independence, should also support those who fight the oppressors of Byelorussia and Bulgaria. You cannot demand liberty for United Ukraine and pay no attention to freedom for Lithuania or unity for Korea. All enslaved or endangered nations have a common cause—liberty—and all must cooperate in order to achieve it, to keep it, and to defend it.

Another point which I would like to make is that independence may not always mean freedom. There are several independent nations which are not free. We deal with them but we know that the American people (that means you and me and millions of other freedom-loving Americans) do not like them because of their undemocratic, totalitarian, dictatorial systems. If it will be in our interest, we may even defend them. But after the interest passes under the pressure of our own domestic public opinion, we will try to have as little to do with them as possible. Our more or less correct relations with them are the product of expediency. There is no people's heart in them.

On the other hand, for countries with genuine liberty in their political system, or on their battle standards, we will always have warm sympathy. They will always find plenty of friends in America who will be looking for ways to lend real support and, more often than not, such ways will be found.

For these two reasons, I said, a free and independent Ukraine is almost a question of time only. To assure and accelerate the final result, the Ukrainians abroad and their kinsmen here, should keep these two factors in mind; cooperation with other enslaved peoples, and establishment of genuine freedom for their own people, and not just nominal independence, should be their aim. Then you can be sure that good people everywhere, including this United States, will be on the Ukrainian side. In other words, maximum of support from the outside world will come to Ukraine when the struggle of her people and friends for independence is identified in the minds of freedom-loving people elsewhere as a struggle for democracy, peace, good neighborliness, and international cooperation.

From what I know about the history of Ukraine and of her present struggle, those ideals are inherent in the Ukrainian people. The greatest minds and hearts of Ukraine looked to our Presidents Washington, Lincoln, and Wilson for inspiration. Your organization is a living example of that inspiration in action. Otherwise you would not have so grown and prospered in the democratic atmosphere of America.

Your officers have been wise enough and far-sighted enough to throw the support of your organization behind the Genocide Pact. They traveled to Washington and made their depositions before the United States Congress, urging the Congress to ratify that important document. In that, they cooperated with representatives of other oppressed nationalities, thus demonstrating the solidarity of groups and peoples who want to establish a better world and to punish those who threaten freedom of thought, and of political activities, or who try to exterminate people because of their race, culture or religion. Your organization has a long record of support of liberal immigration laws not only for Ukrainians who want to find shelter in America, but for all those who look upon our country as a refuge from oppression and persecution. Your newspaper stands firmly for democracy, for tolerance, for the rights of labor and for all those lofty ideals for which the best men of America and of Ukraine have always stood.

Continuing along this path and profiting by your past experiences, moved by love of America and sympathy for your brethren in Ukraine, I am sure you will continue your contribution to the well-being and progress of this United States, and to the liberation of the country of your ancestors. And in that you will always find all good Americans on your side.

May God bless you in your endeavors.

Judgment Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. MALONE

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 20, 1954

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "Judgment Day," delivered by George E. Sokolsky, on May 9, 1954.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUDGMENT DAY

I read an editorial in Saturday's New York Times, which began with the sentences:

"It may have been a mistake to permit the little French fortress with the unfamiliar name and its garrison of a few thousand men to become a symbol of resistance to communism in Indochina. Southeastern Asia does not fall because one garrison is, as Premier Laniel said yesterday, 'submerged.' The fate of some 12,000 men cannot determine the fate of Asia's restless, hoping, fearing, despairing, millions. But Dien Bien Phu did become a symbol. So let it be."

I do not know who wrote that article and what authority he has for his judgment. But Dien Bien Phu is not a symbol; it is a fact. It is a fact that the Soviet Universal State has added territory and manpower. It has made a step forward in the control of about 22 million people to be added to its already vast domain. It has made a step forward in gaining mastery over the rice bowl of the world.

If you will look at a map, you will see why this frontier pacification city is important and why this loss is tragic.

I shall give you some history on the subject:

After the Manchus had conquered China in 1644 and had pacified and taken control over that country, they decided to do exactly what the Soviet Universal State is doing today; they decided to gain mastery over a number of buffer states—we call them satellites today—surrounding China. We shall only refer in this broadcast to those in the south. Nepal, Burma, Laos, Siam, and Annan became tributaries of the Chinese Emperor. Loas and Annam are in Indochina and are the precise areas that are most affected by the fall of Dien Bien Phu. Annam had been conquered by China for the fifth time in 1407 and it has been a back-and-forth relationship since then. Whenever the Chinese Government became weak, Annam reverted to vassalage or independence.

I cite this little segment of history only to show that for about 550 years, from 1407 until today, large and important parts of Indochina have been under the control of China. The present reconquest, therefore, is as much a part of the effort of the Soviet Universal State to conquer the world as it is an effort on the part of Red China to expand to the historic limits of imperial China. For such expansion, tremendous nationalistic enthusiasm can be aroused among the Chinese masses.

Two great river routes connect the centers of China with Indochina. From Canton, the historic southern metropolis of China, the West River serves as a great trade route; through Tonkin in Indochina runs the Red River. By means of these two routes, the Provinces of Kwantung, Kwangsi, and Yunnan are tied into a trade relationship with Indochina. It was this trade with China in Indochina that interested the French, first to explore, then to establish a protectorate over, and finally to control Indochina. In their efforts to use Indochina as a base for French penetration into China, the French failed. Although European powers recognized a French sphere of influence in southwestern China, the Chinese never did. The Red Chinese are now restoring the ancient authority of their country over territory that they had regarded as a vassal for at least five centuries.

Another psychological factor in this situation needs to be understood. While Russia, Japan, and Great Britain were feared by the Chinese, while Great Britain, the United States and Germany were respected, France was never feared or respected by the Chinese. And for many reasons, France deserved the disrespect. For instance, the French concession in Shanghai developed into a sanctuary for the Chinese and foreign underworld and the center for opium smuggling; similarly, Hanoi in French Indochina was a smuggling center. The Chinese never liked the French as many of them did like the British, the Americans, or the Germans. I need only make this further point, to make a contrast, that during my years in China, which included World War I years, the Germans were very popular.

It is therefore true that quite apart from Communist propaganda, the conquest of any part of Indochina will prove tremendously popular among the Chinese masses. For any Chinese to defeat a European country is stimulating to national pride. First, the Chinese defeated the Americans in Korea; now they defeat the French in Indochina. From now on, if I know anything of Chinese psychology, and I have devoted my life, with some measure of success, to the subject, the Chinese people, even anti-Communists, will be strengthened in their support of the Communists and they know, what Americans do not know, that it was Chinese troops and Chinese supplies from Canton and Kweilin that captured the fort at Dien Bien Phu. It was, for them, a great historic victory. Additionally, the possession by China of any area of Indochina means an increased per-capita consumption of rice by the Chinese; it means more food for the coolies. That, too, will strengthen the existent regime. There is no surer way to stabilize a regime than to make sure that the people eat.

How any editorial writer of the New York Times or any other newspaper can refer to Dien Bien Phu as a symbol is beyond me. They probably fall back on the propaganda efforts of so-called statesmen who always invent alibis to cover up their failures.

While our newspapers and radio and television devote themselves to the profane circus in Washington, the danger not to France, not to Indochina, but to the American people in this defeat in Indochina is being overlooked. Every time the Soviet universal state wins a victory, we have to wonder where the next battle will be. And we have to ask ourselves, who is to fight the next battle?

Certainly the French cannot defend Indochina. They have not the army; they have not the manpower; they have not the will. Because France was a great military power in the time of Napoleon does not mean that it is a great military power today. It was not in World War I or in World War II.

Those in the United States who demand that France do more than she can are simply not thinking realistically. France has already done as much as her population and resources will permit. Therefore, it will not be long before France must withdraw from Indochina altogether.

The question then is, Who will take over? The United States is now trying to form a coalition of nations to continue the Indochina war. That war can only be continued with any measure of success by bombing the mainland of China. The Chinese cities of Kweilin and Kunming must be bombed to smithereens and the Island of Hainan must be seized. The British fear that if this is done, Red China may retaliate against Hongkong, as well she may. The answer to the British objection now, at this moment, is that either we do fight to hold Indochina or we do not fight to hold Indochina. We do or we don't—that is all. If we do—then we bomb the China mainland; if we do not bomb the China mainland, then we don't fight this war.

Those who advocate that we pour a huge army of American foot soldiers into Indochina are about as batty as those geniuses of the infantry who lost the Korean war. They are utilizing ancient methods in an impossible situation. They waste manpower; they waste the lives of our sons in futilities. Such planners will only produce in Indochina another Korea. Such men are unworthy of our confidence no matter how many lines of ribbons they gave each other. The strategy failed in Korea; it must fail in Indochina. Only the Air Force and the Navy can do this job with any degree of effectiveness.

Either we become realistic about our wars or we must expect our diplomacy to fail and for our country to be isolated.

In just a moment, I'll be back with you.

I should today have spoken of the loveliness, the beauty, the Godgiven joy of motherhood.

But those of my listeners who expected that of me will forgive me, because it is the mothers who, in every country, give the sons who die in wars. It is the mothers who go through their years with the heartache of a lost son. No gold star is a substitute for a living child grown to manhood.

May God give the mothers of America the wisdom to recognize that in this country they have the inalienable right to use their voices for the protection of their families.

Thank you. This is George Sokolsky. Good night.

Hawaiian Statehood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH BUTLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 20, 1954

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record a statement in the form of a letter from Jack P. King, a member of the Territorial Legislature of Hawaii, in support of Hawaiian statehood.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Honolulu, T. H., *January 8, 1954.*

Senator Hugh Butler,
Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Sir: My name is Jack P. King, 45 years old, representative of the Fourth District, Honolulu, in the Territorial Legislature. I have served three regular sessions and two special sessions.

I was born in Richmond, Va., in 1909. My parents were Dr. Aubin T. King and Daisy Hancock. When very young I traveled with my parents all over the United States, Panama, and eventually made my home in Honolulu. I attended local high schools and the University of Hawaii.

My father was a medical missionary and a transport surgeon. He was born in North Carolina. My brother Richard was born in South Carolina. He was an electronic officer in China, Burma, and Japan. He also went to school in Honolulu, New Mexico, and other places. Dick is now a farmer of Kings Acres, Hobbs, N. Mex. I am a director there also.

Now to the statehood question:

I have heard a lot about benefits to Hawaii, such as two Senators and a House Member in Congress, a vote for President.

Hawaii pays more taxes than 11 States.

These are important, but the important thing is what good is statehood for the security of the good old continental United States of America and its entirety.

We Americans preach democracy, free enterprise, no prejudices, equality, freedoms. Well, let's practice it by showing the people—I emphasize people—of China, Japan, Philippines, India, and, yes, even Russia, that we practice what we preach by giving Hawaii statehood that it deserves.

Signed by Jack P. King and family, of Virginia, New York, North and South Carolina, and now of New Mexico, Texas, and a public servant of Hawaii, as one of its representatives.

Jack P. King.

Education: Brave or Safe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VERA BUCHANAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1954

Mrs. BUCHANAN: Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include in the Record an editorial from the Christian Science Monitor of May 17, entitled "Education: Brave or Safe":

What concept of education do Americans wish to prevail in their colleges in the years to come?

A concept of education as indoctrination into some preconceived system of ideas and theories? Or a concept which cultivates independent thinking and the open mind?

The struggle between these two approaches has been going on in American society probably since colonial times. Rarely, however, has it been brought to so sharp a focus as that created by a staff report presented to a select House committee set up to restudy the Nation's great tax-free foundations.

These foundations were investigated once before in 1952 by a similar committee. This group found that while such vast concentrations of capital should be watched, that although a few malodorous individuals had infiltrated some of them, the Communists had failed signally to gain control, and that on the whole these foundations had been doing a good job and there ought to be more of them.

Representative B. Carroll Reece (Republican national chairman during the days of the 80th Cong.) signed this report as a minority Member. But evidently he later regretted his assent, and fathered a bill to set up another investigation, of which he is now chairman. He charged that some of these foundations support efforts to overthrow our Government and to undermine our American way of life.

The staff report, though less spectacular, follows Mr. Reece's early hints as to the direction the inquiry would take. And were it not for our confidence that its postulates do not represent a majority American view they would make melancholy reading, indeed.

Some of the statements will have to be spelled out before it would be fair to evaluate them. Some, if they mean what we hope they mean, we would go along with—such as the desirability of local support and a measure of local control for schools. (But do they mean a return to the little red schoolhouse—and for universities, too?)

In the main, however, the staff seems troubled by the foundations' part in building what it calls a social science that might change American thought. The principal bogies appear to be an international viewpoint and anything that suggests that the course of public policy might be planned.

The foundations receive cooperation from organizations which, in the context, the report deems questionable at the least, but which most people have considered eminently enlightened. Such, for instance, as: The National Education Association, the Parent-Teachers Association, the National Council of Churches, and the Committee on Economic Development.

There is in all of this an undertone of fear—a fear of changes not understood; a fear like that of a child who finds himself lost, away from the home he thought was all there was to the world; a fear lest the wrong, if allowed to be seen, will prove more attractive than the right.

What would Thomas Jefferson think of all this? What would the Founding Fathers, who dared to plan a form of government new and different?

This second, obviously hostile investigation may conceivably unearth some infiltration, find some errors of judgment not discovered by the first committee. But if this staff report is any index, its basic philosophy is a century behind the times.

Light Primary Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 20, 1954

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, it is most unfortunate that so many Americans do not take an interest in general elections and primary elections. In Pennsylvania we had a primary election last Tuesday, when less than 28 percent of the eligible voters took the opportunity of casting their votes.

A very interesting comment on the light primary vote has been made by Capt. John M. Cummings, a political columnist, in the Philadelphia Inquirer of May 18, 1954, and I ask unanimous consent that his article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A LIGHT PRIMARY VOTE IS POLITICIAN'S DELIGHT

(By John M. Cummings)

All estimates which have come under the observation of this corner of the paper agree a light vote will be cast in today's primary election. It's the same with nearly every primary election. Unless there is a bitterly fought contest in one party or the other the voters stay away from the polls in droves. Why?

Well, let us see. For one thing the run-of-mill voter takes the position the primary belongs to the politicians. There is considerable truth to this. What is frequently called the controlled vote, or the "organization" vote, is sure to get to the polls. This is the ultimate objective of every well-run organization and some that are not so well run.

So the voter who likes to call himself an independent, says, "what's the use, it's in the bag already," and he goes about the routine affairs of his daily life and misses one of the highly important phases of citizenship.

This is the attitude of untold thousands of voters in Pennsylvania and elsewhere in the country. To be sure you'll hear complaints tomorrow. They will come from folks who won't like this candidate or that, but who didn't participate in the primaries. It was ever thus.

The primary election in the spring is the steppingstone to the general election in the fall. A primary is an intraparty affair. The Republicans and the Democrats, each in their own primaries, nominate the candidate. And the two sets of nominees have it out in the fall.

Consider today's primaries: Candidates are to be nominated for every congressional seat in the State. These are the mid-term primaries. Which is to say they come in the middle of the President's tenure, in this case President Eisenhower. The Republican leadership, naturally, thinks it important that the party have a majority of the next Congress to uphold the hands of the President. On the other paw the Democrats, not too deeply concerned for the political well-being of the President, will fight in the fall for dominance in the legislative body. Yet there are folks who will tell you primaries are not important.

Candidates for Governor will be nominated in Pennsylvania today. And for lieutenant governor and secretary of internal affairs. Candidates will be chosen for half the membership of the State senate and the entire house of representatives. Important? No? Tell that to the birds.

There will be elections all over the State today in connection with the party primaries. In each senatorial district the major parties will elect two State committee members, a man and a woman. It is well to remember they will be elected—not nominated. It is the function of the State committee to elect a State chairman and other party officers and to draft the platform on which the candidates of the party will stand for election. If you think this isn't important stay away from the polls as usual.

It takes a rip roaring party fight to stir up interest in a primary election. These are relatively few. Fight or no fight, the feeling still prevails that primaries are unimportant and to miss voting in one is not to breach your good citizenship.

Thousands of educated and civic-conscious women are in this town for a 3-day convention which opened yesterday. You read this in your paper: "Because of the elections (officers of their own organization) the convention is expected to attract a record number of delegates."

These women come from every section of Pennsylvania. It's a State convention. Few, if any, will be home to vote on today's primaries. And remember candidates are to be nominated for Congress, Governor, and so on.

While in session the gals will discuss a lot of subjects, all of them pertaining in one way or another to the common weal. Yet nothing they might say, nothing they might do, can hold a candle with the fundamental importance of the election system in this country. And the way to uphold that system is to exercise the franchise at every opportunity. Too bad the gals missed this point.

Education Deferred

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VERA BUCHANAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1954

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an editorial entitled "As the Twig Is Bent," which appeared in the Washington Post and Times-Herald of May 15.

I am sure that anyone with even the slightest interest in education will agree that this opposition of Secretary Hobby to an immediate program of Federal aid to education is, in the light of our educational crisis, indeed shocking:

AS THE TWIG IS BENT

One incorrigible characteristic of children is that as long as they live they keep on growing. If they are soundly and democratically educated, their intellectual growth is likely to keep pace with their physical growth and they will turn out to be mature adults capable of assuming the responsibilities of citizenship in a free and self-governing society. If they are denied good schooling, they may well turn out to be incapable of such responsibility. Thus the future of the Nation is tied intimately to the education of its children.

It is this consideration which makes Secretary Hobby's expressed opposition to an immediate program of Federal aid to education seem shocking. In a letter to Chairman ALEXANDER SMITH, of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, Mrs. Hobby urged that action on proposed legislation to help the States finance the construction of new school buildings be postponed until after the projected State and White House conferences on education are held to determine the resources of localities for meeting school construction needs. This would delay any Federal aid until after 1956. The tragic trouble with this procrastination is that it amounts to telling children to mark time for 2 years. The children who need schools now will not only not have them now; they will never have them. Children can't wait.

In her letter to Senator SMITH, Mrs. Hobby said:

"There is no question as to the need for the construction of additional school facilities, not only at the elementary and secondary level, but in the field of higher education as well. The school facilities survey conducted under title I of Public Law 815 shows an existing shortage of instructional rooms for public elementary and secondary schools of approximately 340,000 in 1953. Furthermore, enrollment figures indicate that school construction is not keeping pace with enrollment increases."

What this means in practical terms is that a great number of American youngsters who ought to be in school next year will be pushed out into the streets to get an education of a very different sort; that a still greater number of American youngsters will get their schooling in classrooms that are overcrowded, unsafe, and unsatisfactory from a teaching standpoint. This is not a condition that any democracy can confront with equanimity. It cannot be met by temporizing or delay. This country has been studying the educational needs and capacities of its localities for a long, long time, and it has waited too long already to take remedial action. The only help that can have meaning for today's children is help that is given today.

Segregation Edict

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL BROWN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1954

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a timely editorial on segregation appearing in the Augusta (Ga.) Chronicle of May 18, 1954, the South's oldest newspaper:

SEGREGATION EDICT

By its decision outlawing segregation in the public schools, the United States Supreme Court has confronted the South with one of the gravest crises in history. Regardless of how one feels about the merits or the justice of the matter, the Court has created a situation which is fraught with danger—one in which our people, both whites and Negroes, are caught up in a web of circumstances which might well work out to set back progress in the South 50 years or more.

The decision, in our opinion, is the culmination of a developing philosophy in Washington which gradually has subjugated the States, placed a yoke about their necks, and subjected them to rule by Federal fiat. Much of this philosophy is politically inspired, and those who espouse it do it for the sole purpose of winning support and getting votes. Too, it is based on the mistaken idea that social customs, and the relations between people, can be changed or regulated by Government edict.

This is the cruelest blow of all aimed at the destruction of the most fundamental rights of the States to govern themselves. If the Court's edict is followed, we might as well tear up the constitution of Georgia, and toss it on the trash pile. It means nothing any longer if what is written in it doesn't mean what it says—and the Georgia constitution explicitly provides that there shall be separate school facilities for members of the two races.

The pattern of the evolutionary processes which govern the relations between the races in the South, which over the years have brought our people, both white and Negro, happiness and progress, is so plain to see that it is tragic indeed that the Supreme Court has moved to upset it.

Our people have worked together, in harmony and in an atmospheric of good will and mutual respect, and none can say that the Negro race has not moved steadily forward within the framework of the traditions which are well understood by all southerners of both races.

And now the Court, in its rash determination to make haste in the field of reform, has declared that it is unwilling to wait on the slower but surer and safer processes of evolution. It is demanding an almost overnight, revolutionary change in the social customs by which we have lived and thrived for generations in the deep South.

Sometimes reform, when sought too speedily and by too drastic a means, defeats its own purpose, and the bad results it accomplishes outweight the good. Let us hope and pray that this will not be the case in the school segregation question.

But it might well be if we do not meet the crisis calmly.

It is fortunate that the Court's edict does not go into effect immediately, that there will be no compulsion for the present. This gives the people of the South time to plan, coolly and without passion, to fortify themselves against its full impact, to make some arrangements to accommodate the decision and still maintain separate schools for the races.

It is a time for coolheadedness, for the curbing of passions, for clear thinking, on the part of both races, for the consultation between calmer heads, and above all for the repression of all forms of demagoguery and incitation.

The southern people owe it to themselves and to their children to face up to this crisis with the determination that it shall be resolved without tragedy, without any offense to the person of anyone, and without creating any rancor and unhappiness for our people. Our history and traditions are too glorious, and our progress has been too steady, to have them marred by our mishandling of this troublesome and delicate situation which now confronts us.

We can meet the crisis as true southerners and as true Americans. We simply must.

Our Economic Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN R. BUSH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1954

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I am pleased to include the address of Hon. Joseph W. Martin, Jr., of Massachusetts, Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, at the annual meeting of of the West Branch Manufacturers Association at the Lycoming Hotel, Williamsport, Pa., Friday, May 14, 1954. It was my pleasure to introduce the Speaker on this occasion.

The address follows:

I want to talk to you tonight about our economic future. I think I should preface what I am about to say by reminding you that on January 23 of this year I discussed the same subject in a speech in Philadelphia before the Philadelphia Real Estate Board. Almost 4 months have passed since then.

On that occasion I dealt with the gloom and doom propaganda that was emanating from the political leftwing in this country. I pointed out that these gentlemen of the leftwing traded on human misery; that pessimism was their stock in trade.

They were the ones who in the thirties were telling us that our plant was built, there were no more horizons.

They were the ones who in the forties as World War II ended were telling us that we were going to have 10 million unemployed.

They were the ones who have been fomenting depression talk in America during the past year.

This egg-head wing of American political life simply cannot stand inspection. I pointed out in my Philadelphia speech that these gentlemen were strangely silent back in 1950 when the climate in Washington was more suitable to the leftwing.

I selected 1950 because in February of that year unemployment in this country jumped to more than 4,700,000, and these prophets of "gloom and doom" were strangely silent in those days. The words "recession" and "depression" were not in their vocabulary—then. In short, their loud cries of recent months could be charged off to political motivation.

I pointed out then that we were in a position of transition from an economy based on manufacturing weapons of war to an economy based on manufacturing the utensils of peace. I said we were still in this period of transition and that the adjustment, while it would continue for several months, would be most remarkable for the fact that it would not be a severe one.

Nearly 4 months have passed since I made that speech. True, unemployment figures rose in the interval, but at no point did they come within a million of the figures of February 1950. This despite the fact that our population had increased and despite the fact that a relatively higher level of so-called normal or transitional unemployment might be expected.

Just a week ago today the Government released the latest figures on unemployment. I am happy to report to you that they did not contain any good news for the "gloom and doom" squad. On the contrary, they showed that during the preceding month unemployment had dropped by more than a quarter of a million. That hardly sounds like a headlong rush into the depression which these four-alarm prophets had been predicting.

Now I do not think you or I want to spend this evening examining the professional pessimism of the political leftwing. It is their business to always see doomsday just around the corner. That is their side of the coin, and they are welcome to it. Let you and I take a look at the other side.

What kind of future is ahead of us?

Have we reached the end of new horizons as the pessimists predict or are new worlds about to unfold?

The fundamental rule of our economy is supply and demand. When demand is firm and consistent, we enjoy prosperity. When demand is poor, we suffer depressed economic conditions. To judge the future, we must first judge demand, then relate it to supply.

In addition, there are other factors, many of them peculiar only to America. I refer to American inventiveness and ingenuity, to productive know-how, to methods of distribution and salesmanship.

By any measurement for the future, we are living in an era of ever-expanding demand. It is the biggest single factor in our economic situation today.

Our population is increasing at an astounding pace. In 1950, our census showed the population to be 151 million Americans. Today, just 4 years later, our population has increased by 11 million.

During the last 4 years, the average number of births has been 3,800,000 annually. Last year the figure was almost 4 million. That is the equivalent of adding another State the size of Iowa to our Union each year.

At the present rate our population will reach 177 million persons by 1960. That is equivalent of annexing the population of Canada in the next 6 years.

There are other factors marching along beside this increase in the birthrate. Our people are living longer. Today we have 13,500,000 persons whose age is in excess of 65 years. At the present rate of increase, this population will be 2 million greater by 1960. Statistics show that our older people are more active, travel more, and have more money to spend. Thus not only is our birthrate increasing, but longevity is increasing.

And there is a third and very important factor. The number of our family units is increasing.

In 1950 we had 43,500,000 households.

Today we have 47,750,000 households—a gain of four and a quarter million in 4 years. By 1960 we will have 5 million additional households.

Thus our birthrate is increasing, our people are living longer, and our household units are growing at a remarkable rate.

Now, if this three-pronged increase in our population statistics had occurred a thousand years ago in China, where American ingenuity, inventiveness, productive capacity, and methods of distribution and salesmanship did not exist, we might have looked forward to stagnation. But in these days of a dynamic America, these astounding increases in our population statistics spell only one thing—greater and greater demand; greater and greater opportunity for everybody.

It is almost impossible to calculate the amount of demand created by the establishment of one additional family unit. The family unit must be fed—that requires production on the farm. Next, the family unit must be clothed—that requires production by our fabricators and distribution by our wholesalers and retailers. Next, the family unit must be housed—that touches off the vast cycle of production and employment embraced by the construction business.

It goes without saying that once these three necessities of human existence are satisfied, then the family unit is in the market for the modern conveniences which all Americans enjoy, and eventually they are in the market for the luxuries which most Americans enjoy.

Let us examine for one moment what the increase in our population means in terms of our agricultural problem.

During the past 20 years, due to a combination of inherent pessimism in Washington and the fact that we have spent a great deal of that period at war, we have been given such a distorted picture of our farm problem that it is difficult to recognize it. Through artificial devices, we have overstimulated production when we didn't need it and retarded production when we did need it. Yet the fact is that we are not many years away from the day when the American public will consume all the food that our agriculture can produce.

Americans, on the average, eat about 1,600 pounds of food per person per year, or about four-fifths of a ton.

Just to provide for our annual increase in population at present rates of consumption will require an increase in our annual food supply equal to the present output of all the farms in New Jersey, Delaware, and Maryland combined.

To state it another way—on an acreage basis—we must add to our production approximately 7,500,000 acres annually just to meet the increase in our population.

The anticipated 15 million increase in our population in the next 6 years will mean that 1 billion additional pounds of beef will be consumed, one-half billion dozen additional eggs and 6 billion additional quarts of milk.

What is true of agriculture is, of course, true of our manufacturing industry. It is true of our system of distribution and our entire system of enterprise, advertising and salesmanship. Each and every segment of our productive economy must expand to keep pace with the demand which the increase in population has brought about.

Now, it can be argued that while population increase does, of course, increase demand, it also increases the need for jobs. The pessimist will take a longer look at this part of the proposition. What do we have to say to that?

I think the answer is simple. It resolves itself on how much faith you have in American ingenuity and inventiveness, how much foresight, how much vision you command. Do you subscribe to the theory that there are no new horizons, no opportunities for progress? Do you hold that our plant is built? If so, line up with the pessimists.

But let me suggest to you that a short 50 years ago only a few men with vision could see the great future that the gasoline motor held in store for the world. Scarcely 40 years ago only a few men with vision could see what the wireless held in store for the world. Less than a short 20 years ago only a few men could see what the electronic tube held in store for the world.

But today we ride in automobiles, we fly in planes, we turn on our radios, and the wonders of television are at last being unfolded to us. If that isn't an answer to the pessimists, then I don't know any.

The truth is that our technological progress is even more astounding today than our increase in population. There is more power under the hood of an ordinary automobile today than there was in the average factory of 1890—an amazing fact in itself. Yet we stand on the threshold of the atomic age with only the minutest grasp of what it offers us. Already an atomic battery has been developed that is 200,000 times more effective than any previous battery devised by man. It is only an inkling of the vast source of power that man unleashed with the freeing of atomic energy.

Yes; new horizons are born—we find them whichever way we turn.

We look into the sky and we see jet-propelled transportation. We look into the ocean and we see hundreds of new methods to extract from those great bodies of water minerals and chemicals we never dreamed they possessed.

We glance to our right and we see a whole new electronic world, only in its infancy. We glance to our left and we see the terrific advances made in the field of wonder drugs and medicine for man.

We pick up our science journals and we read about a new device no bigger than a pea called the transitor, a tiny energy-producing bundle which may eventually produce radios no bigger than your wristwatch.

And then there are needs all about us—hundreds of needs, hundreds of demands we must fulfill. Many of them are the result of years of war during which our civilian requirements went unsatisfied. Let me give you some examples:

Our entire highway system needs remodeling. We are driving 55 million vehicles on a 1940 system that was designed to handle at the most approximately 25 million vehicles.

Our schools for the most part are still operating on the basis of 1940 population figures. At this moment, our elementary-school system could use 345,000 more classrooms; and every year our high-school and college enrollments increase by leaps and bounds, and yet we do not have the facilities to match those increases.

There is not a community in America that does not need an expansion in its hospital system. There is not a community in America that does not need civic improvements of all kinds. There is not a section in America that does not need more dwellings for its residents.

In short, America is underbuilt—underbuilt according to one estimate by $40 billion in schools and hospitals, by $60 billion in highways, by $100 billion in housing, and by $300 billion in modernization of industry.

Do such figures make you think that we have reached the end of the road? Do they indicate to you that the only way America can sustain its economy is by producing weapons of war?

Now, so far we have examined the material side of our progress. It has been said that we live in a materialistic age. I concede the point only to this extent: We have been living in a politically materialistic age in which the emphasis has been on man's stomach and pocketbook rather than on his mind and his soul.

You and I know all the material progress that man can achieve is worthless unless it is accompanied by comparable cultural and spiritual progress that makes for real happiness. I have no patience with the materialism of the left wing, and I thank God that at long last we have in the White House a man who is dedicated to the simple virtues of honesty and prayer, to the spiritual values that we all hold dear.

Think a moment.

On every hand we see a tremendous growth in the cultural outlook of our people. The circulation of literature, through huge increases in the number of publications and the methods of distributing books, has grown in leaps and bounds.

In the last 25 years the number of our museums has increased from 600 to approximately 2,500. Interest in architecture, sculpture, and art has spread at an amazing rate.

Increased interest in the art of music can be measured by the fact that we give three times as many concerts as all the rest of the world combined.

Television has brought theater into every home. There is more interest in cultural values in America today than at any time in its history.

In the realm of the spiritual, our progress has kept pace. Church memberships have increased at twice the rate of our population growth. In the last 15 years we have added 22 million new church members, 40,000 active clergymen, and thousands of churches. There were more Bibles published between 1940 and 1950 than in the previous 40 years combined.

Yes; this may be the age of materialism, but one of the healthiest signs in America today is the fact that we are once again turning more and more to cultural and spiritual things. There can be no doubt about it, a rebirth of idealism is upon us.

For nearly 30 years it has been my privilege to participate in the Government of our country at the national level. In that time I have seen the role of the Federal Government changed from that of servant to near-master of the people. And today, under the leadership of our great President, Dwight D. Eisenhower, I am seeing it changed back.

In those years I have seen political principles abused and even abandoned. I have seen moral values deprecated and all but destroyed. And I have seen fundamental ideals ridiculed and driven into hiding.

Today it is my privilege to witness the restoration of political principles, moral values, and fundamental ideals to their rightful place in our way of life under President Eisenhower.

This process of rebuilding the foundations of our Government can be seen in many fields. Last year, the Eisenhower administration and the Congress cut the budget by $14 billion, and this year that cut shows up in the form of the three separate tax reductions which have taken place or are taking place.

The importance of the tax reductions goes beyond a matter of leaving more dollars in the pockets of our taxpayers. Also involved is the goal of restoring the individual freedom that goes with being permitted to spend one's own earnings as he sees fit instead of turning them over to the Government to be spent as it sees fit.

We have a new military policy based on building our strength and maintaining our strength for the long pull, instead of the former practice of helter-skelter rearming to meet each new crisis. As a result of the new policy, we will be able to maintain our security for however long may be necessary without subjecting the country to the risk of national bankruptcy or excessive militarism.

We have a new foreign policy based on historic American ideals of freedom and justice. While the new policy will have to undergo many sore trials, I am confident it holds far greater promise for a peaceful future than the former policy of stumbling appeasement. We will stop Soviet aggression in Asia provided there is the will to do so by the free countries of the world.

We have restored honesty, integrity, and efficiency to the National Government. We have cracked down on the Reds, pinks, and all other kinds of security risks, and we have banished the influence peddlers, the fixers, and the 5-percenters.

We have stopped inflation; we have junked unnecessary wage and price controls; and we have laid the groundwork for permanent prosperity based on peace.

We have made these and many other achievements because of our belief in man and man's ability to govern himself. By our success, we are not only improving the well-being of every American, but we are also giving new witness to the everlasting rightness of the republican form of government—which means simply that the people govern themselves.

True progress can never be attained in a climate dedicated only to material ends. Man's own confidence in his future can never be real unless within him he know that the cultural, moral and spiritual surroundings keep abreast of his material progress.

The greatest single contribution that the Federal Government can make to the wonderful future ahead of us is to maintain man's faith in himself and his institutions. The quick and the easy, the short-cuts and the panaceas of the politically dishonest, will probably always be with us. But in the final analysis the only future course of America must rest on the highest moral and spiritual values.

The door is open. We need only the energy and the vision to walk through.

Hon. Harold E. Talbott, Jr., Secretary of the United States Air Force, Travels Global Airways

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL F. SCHENCK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 19, 1954

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, it is my great honor to represent the third district of Ohio, of which the city of Dayton is an important part, in the Congress of the United States, and it is with pardonable pride that I point to the fact that Dayton and the great Miami Valley is the birthplace and cradle of aviation. Wilbur and Orville Wright did all of their experimental work, research, development, and building the parts of their airplane in Dayton, which became the first heavier-than-air machine to make a powered flight on December 17, 1903. It was my privilege to know the Wright Brothers, and as a boy, I took my bicycle to their shop on West Third Street in Dayton for needed repairs and adjustment from time to time. Their cabinetmaker, Mr. Zorn, who built most of the wooden framework and parts for their experiments and airplane, was also my Sunday-school teacher for a time. It was, therefore, with a sense of real pride, happiness, and satisfaction that I learned shortly before President Eisenhower was to be inaugurated that he had chosen a native son of Dayton, Ohio, Harold E. Talbott, Jr., to become the Secretary for our United States Air Force. This, I felt, was not only a very fitting recognition of the ability of Mr. Talbott, but it was also a special honor for Dayton, Ohio, the birthplace of aviation. Mr. Talbott, whom I have personally known for many years, has great ability as an executive, an organizer, an administrator, and a fine history of successful business experience. He is an indefatigable worker with tremendous capacity and ability and has proved to be a very successful and able Secretary of the United States Air Force.

Recently another native son of Dayton, Richard Cull, Jr., whom I have known during his entire life and who is the very able Washington correspondent of the Dayton Daily News, wrote a very fine story of the accomplishments and work of Mr. Talbott since becoming Secretary of the Air Force. Richard Cull has recounted the amazingly broad knowledge that Secretary Talbott has acquired of the detailed operation of our Air Force through his worldwide travels, during which Secretary Talbott has become properly known as the most widely traveled official of the Eisenhower administration. Mr. Cull also points out that this unusual amount of traveling has gained for Secretary Talbott such a worldwide, firsthand knowledge of the operations, functions, purposes, and ability of our United States that he has become one of the most able administrators in the great history of our Air Force. Because of the importance and value of this story, Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert this story written by Mr. Cull as a part of my remarks here:

Dating back to a 1953 preinauguration-day tip from President Eisenhower, Dayton-born Harold E. Talbott, Jr., the Secretary of the Air Force, has traveled more miles by air than any other high official of the first Republican national administration here in 20 years.

As of the end of April 1954 the hardworking Air Secretary had logged 167,396 miles in official business trips around the United States and to familiar and remote foreign lands. All told, he had visited 167 United States air bases and installations around the world.

Whenever and wherever he went the idea was the same—to try to help the Air Force do a better job of guarding the national defense.

Talbott's travel total is well-ahead of what has been accumulated by such seasoned air passengers in the Eisenhower administration as the President himself, Secretary of State John Foster Dulles, Vice President Nixon, and Air Force Chief of Staff Gen. Nathan F. Twining.

In addition to providing much valuable background on operational problems, the air journeys have given the trim, meticulous Air Secretary a chance to rub shoulders with the men who keep 'em flying wherever the United States Air Force operates.

That personal interest association has paid off two ways. It has boosted morale and it has given the Dayton native some experiences to be remembered long after a flight to faraway places is logged in the book.

As he sat at his desk this week in the office of the Secretary of the Air Force at Defense Department headquarters in the Pentagon, Talbott gave his account of how President Eisenhower's tip started him on the road to No. 1 air traveler status here:

"A few days before President Eisenhower was inaugurated," he said to me, 'Harold, if you are sworn in on the 20th of January (1953), get into your plane on the 21st and get out over the world and see your Air Force, see your officers, your airmen, your bases, the storage depots, and your various commands.

" 'Spend at least 25 percent of your time outside of Washington or you will never really know your Air Force.' "

That advice was heeded, as is attested by these words spoken by Talbott last December in a speech before the New Orleans Chamber of Commerce:

"Since February 26 (1953) I have flown about 115,000 miles and visited some 135 air installations throughout the United States, the Far East, the Far North, Europe, and the Mediterranean."

That first get-acquainted trip on February 26 of last year carried Secretary Talbott exactly 20,090 miles, according to Maj. Bernard F. Hartnett, the pleasant, capable pilot, who has been at the controls on all the record-breaking trips.

Traveling as usual in the special four-engine Constellation assigned to Military Air Transport Service for special missions, Talbott checked carefully over outposts in Hawaii, Japan, Korea (including a trip over battlelines), Formosa, and Alaska.

As is the case whenever possible, Talbott was accompanied on that 11-day trip by ranking Air Force officers with special problems in the areas visited. Gen. Edwin W. Rawlings, head of the Air Materiel Command at Dayton's Wright-Patterson Airbase, was one of those aboard.

After spending much of March 1953, at his desk in the Pentagon, Secretary Talbott was off in April on a 6,200-mile sweep of aircraft factories in the Pacific Northwest and west coast. From this on-the-spot check, he had a better idea of how the plane-production program was progressing.

The month of July saw him winging away on a 6,300-mile journey to Thule, Greenland, northernmost base of the United States Air Force and only 700 miles from the North Pole.

With a chuckle, Lt. Col. Lee Hogan, Cincinnati-born military aide to the Secretary Talbott recalls an incident that had its beginning when the Constellation stopped at an airbase at Naknek, Alaska, to refuel.

While the plane was being gassed, a base officer mentioned to Secretary Talbott that his wife was in New York. Ever anxious to help keep up the link between families at home and loved ones serving their country abroad, Secretary Talbott said he expected to be in New York soon and would be glad to call the wife and pass along a greeting from her husband.

The officer stationed at the bleak Alaskan outpost was delighted with the offer.

When Talbott got to New York some days later, he dialed the telephone number he had been given and the officer's wife answered. "This is Harold Talbott, Secretary of the Air Force," he said.

"Yeah," replied the disbelieving woman, "and what else."

"Since that happened," Colonel Hogan recalls with a laugh, "the boss tells the person who answers such calls he is a civilian working for the Air Force in Washington. He doesn't admit he's the Secretary of the Air Force."

It was on this trip to Thule (pronounced as though it were Toolee) that Mrs. Talbott accompanied her husband on an official foreign trip for the first time. She toured hospitals and discussed social matters with service people.

The Secretary feels—as many others here do also—her visits are a good morale builder for the wives and families of men at the bases.

Continuing to heed President Eisenhower's advice to get out and meet the men and machines of the United States Air Force face to face as often as possible, Secretary Talbott was off to Europe last August 6.

In the space of 12 days, he visited 19 different bases on a trip of 12,000 miles. He flew straight to Paris, and toured headquarters of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO). Then he was off to other parts of France, Germany, England, and north Africa.

Gen. Lauris Norstad, Chief of all United States Air Forces in Europe was along on this inspection trip.

From Dow Field in Maine last October, Talbott flew nonstop to Paris, the first leg of a jaunt of 15,200 miles to 24 bases in Spain, Tripoli, Libya, Greece, Turkey, Italy, and the Azores.

Last December 30 the Air Secretary paid a return visit to Thule, in Greenland. Before leaving, Capt. William A. Seward, the plane's navigator, made 40 long-distance telephone calls to 26 States and collected nearly 30 tape-recorded messages for military personnel of the far-off base, which then was cloaked in Arctic darkness 24 hours a day.

Making the service a two-way affair, members of Secretary Talbott's crew made wire recordings in the Thule Hospital and passed them on to the loved ones when they came home.

It was on this trip, incidentally, that an airman offered Talbott a $5 bill to call his home in Washington when he got back. "Why, I am going to Washington," Talbott said, declining the money. "There is no need for any money to pay for the call. I'll be glad to make it for you."

The airman wrote the number out on a slip of paper, and Talbott stuck it in his pocket. Not till he read the note a few days later when he was back in the States did he realize that the telephone was in the State of Washington, not Washington, D. C.

With the knowledge that the joke was on him, Talbott made the call at his own expense.

It might be pointed out that Secretary Talbott has a standing order to his crew to offer a free ride to service people, if they are going his way and empty seats are available. When he returned from the national aircraft show in Dayton last September, he brought along several ambulatory patients, veterans of the Korean war, en route to Walter Reed Hospital in Washington.

On a recent trip to Cuba he brought back the son of a United States Navy officer stationed at Guantanamo Bay. The boy, suffering from a brain hemorrhage, needed quick transportation in a pressurized cabin to the Navy hospital at Bethesda, Md.

All in all, it has been a busy time for Dayton-born Harold Talbott, ever since that day in mid-January 1953, when President Eisenhower advised him to keep in personal touch with the worldwide United States Air Force.

The Significance for Foreign Trade of Communist Conquests in Asia

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 20, 1954

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech delivered by me at the World Trade luncheon, New York City, May 19, 1954:

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, ladies, and gentlemen, seldom has the dependence of foreign trade on peace and security been more apparent than it is when one considers Asia today. It may seem almost irrelevant to talk about the problems and prospects of foreign trade in a continent where the most obvious characteristic is insecurity and uncertainty.

The immediate question that absorbs our attention in Asia just now is, What is to happen in Indochina next week or next month?

But is it not more important to consider how to keep the free countries of Asia free so that we can expand or at least maintain the trade we have with them, rather than to speculate about possible expansion of trade with the areas already conquered by the Communists?

Why hasn't the West had the will and the unity necessary to prevent these Communist conquests? One reason, I believe, is because we have failed to appreciate what our predicament is likely to be if we allow further expansion of Communist areas.

The report released by the Foreign Operations Administration just last Monday, on East-West trade covers far more adequately than I could, much of what I had in mind to say; so I want to discuss with you today not so much the figures of trade, but rather the philosophy of trade with Asia, especially with those parts which have come under Communist control or are threatened by it.

I

Let us begin by consulting that hardheaded student of political and economic world movements—Joseph Stalin. During the last year of his life, 1952, he issued three major public statements. All dealt with various phases of what he called "the deepening general crisis of the world capitalist system." All the steps taken by his successors in the Kremlin, which some people have hopefully regarded as deviations from Stalin's policies, are in reality faithful execution of the tactical line he laid down.

Stalin said that the crisis for capitalism had been caused by the "falling away of the Soviet Union from the capitalist system" in World War I—and the falling away of the "European and Asian people's democracies" during and following World War II. He then posed the question, "Is the general crisis only a political, or only an economic crisis?" This is his answer:

"Neither the one, nor the other. It is a general, i. e., all-round crisis of the world capitalist system, embracing both the economic and the political spheres. * * *

"The economic consequence of the existence of two opposite camps [the camp of socialism and the camp of capitalism] was that the single all-embracing world market disintegrated, so that now we have two parallel world markets, confronting one another.

* * * * *

"It follows from this that the sphere of exploitation of the world's resources by the major capitalist countries (United States of America, Britain, France) will not expand, but contract; that their opportunities for sales in the world market will deteriorate, and that their industries will be operating more and more below capacity."

From this he drew the conclusion that a deepening depression in the "capitalist" world is certain, and that "wars between capitalistic countries" are inevitable as each struggles to gain a larger share of the remaining shrunken world market.

Now no one can deny that the Communist world has been steadily gaining in Asia during the last decade while the western powers seem at times to be pulling apart. It would be foolhardy indeed to ignore the possibility that history might prove Stalin correct—if we were to be as shortsighted as he assumed, and were to concentrate on building up trade with our enemies instead of with our friends.

What we need as we examine this question of trade with Communist countries is not so much a New Look as a long look. Otherwise, the industrialized countries of the West may fall for the tempting trade bait the Communists hold out—for the present. They may grab for hoped-for short-term gains, even though the Communists themselves have made clear on countless occasions that their unwavering purposes are (1) to get military and industrial equipment and supplies which they cannot yet obtain within the Communist bloc—not in order that they can trade more with us, but so that they can become self-sufficient and not need to trade with us at all; (2) to induce countries to become more and more dependent upon trade with the Soviet bloc, and therefore at its mercy; (3) to take advantage of a favorable price situation which they cannot match even by exploitation of their satellites; (4) to divide the capitalistic powers; (5) to weaken and eventually to conquer all non-Commuist countries.

The possibility of expanding trade with the Soviet bloc is especially alluring just now, as Stalin predicted it would be, because the free-world market has been contracted by Communist conquests at the very time when our own productive capacity is most expanded. During World War II we built up a productive capacity in excess of what we at home could consume in peacetime, or at least more than we could pay for. As soon after the war as we began to catch up with pentup civilian needs, our shipments abroad under the Marshall plan and for the Korean war caused still further expansion of our agricultural and industrial plant.

Now we must either reduce our plant to the level of existing markets, which would mean putting men and women out of work at the time soldiers are being demobilized and we need more, not fewer, jobs; or we must find new markets for our overexpanded productive capacity. There are only two places to develop such new markets—at home and abroad.

Expansion at home has been phenomenal. But with all the domestic expansion conceivable, the American market alone simply cannot be enough to keep the American farmer and manufacturer and laborer at full employment. We must, therefore, lay long-range plans to increase our markets abroad.

But, at the same time, other countries, particularly in Western Europe, whose industrial plants we have so largely rebuilt under Marshall plan aid are catching up with their domestic demands. They also need larger foreign markets to keep their plants and workers busy.

Where is the greatest undeveloped potential for such expanded foreign trade? The obvious answer would seem to be Asia, where half the people of the world live. They are just beginning their industrial revolution. They are just learning to use machines to increase their production, raise their standard of living, and increase their purchasing power. They need and want what the industrialized countries have to offer them, especially technical assistance and engineering, industrial machinery, thousands of miles of trunk railways and highways, automobiles, trucks and buses. The list is endless.

The unchanging objective of the Communists—as was Japan's before them—is to seize control of these Asian peoples, under the slogan of "liberation," reduce their standards of living to subsistence levels, and build a vast industrial complex, based on captured raw materials, western machinery (as much as possible from their European satellites, like Czechoslovakia and East Germany), and slave labor. If successful, they could flood the world's markets with commodities at costs below those at which the West can produce them. Such an enslaved Orient would be an almost unbeatable competitor.

On the other hand, a free Orient can become a huge market. People who are free and at peace want most of all to raise their own standards of living. They turn their industry to producing consumer goods for themselves—food and clothing and housing first, and gradually, as their purchasing power increases, automobiles, radios, refrigerators, etc. America has an enormous stake in helping these peoples remain free and in helping them develop an enlarging, expanding economy, with new industries, more jobs, higher wages, greater purchasing power, more sales, and then more industries to start the cycle over again.

II

But to develop such a favorable trade situation, certain minimum conditions must be fulfilled:

First, the economies must complement each other, directly or through multilateral trade. Each country must have either money or goods that others want. If it were free, Asia's economy, almost in toto, would complement, rather than compete with ours. Its people produce a great many commodities which we need and with which they can pay for the items they want from the West. If this were the only condition, the trade prospects would be good.

But a second condition is political security and stability. One cannot enter into a contract with a firm in a foreign land, or even with its government, unless there is reasonable certainty that goods can go and come, that media of exchange will be stable and convertible, that war or revolution will not be breaking out, and that commercial relations will not be interrupted by the other government, no matter how economically profitable, as a means of furthering its political objectives.

In a time of political insecurity or danger of war, no prudent nation can permit itself to become too dependent on foreign sources for essential commodities from which it might be cut off.

The prospect in the Far East for satisfying this condition of political security and stability is close to zero.

Mr. Stalin said, "The mightiest ally of the Soviet Union is to have strife, conflicts and wars in every other country." Communist tactics in stirring up strife and conflicts in other countries are completely fluid and subject to reversal without notice. But from the standpoint of the "long look" they are ruthlessly consistent. When winning, as in Dien Bien Phu, the Communists press mercilessly; when losing, as in Korea, they assume the posture of peace, propose truce talks, and dangle the promise of unlimited trade. Then as soon as they have succeeded in dividing, disarming, or buying off their opponents, the terms of trade become impossibly difficult again.

What hope is there of substantial long-range trade under such circumstances? It must be almost on a hit-and-run basis. Furthermore, the larger the trade becomes, the more dangerous is the position of the nation that relies on it. It puts itself more and more at the mercy of the enemy.

A third minimum condition might be called mutuality—a common philosophy with respect to trade. They must accept and abide by the same set of rules.

The British have been characterized as a nation of shopkeepers. In a real sense that is a fair description of the Western World—and of most of the free world. It is reflected in a broad pattern of economic philosophy and conduct. The laws and courts protect the trader under accepted codes of commerce.

Against this philosophy is pitted the power of Communist state organizations and national monopolies that have as their single objective the strengthening of the state. The businessman from the West can seldom match their bargaining power which is used without scruples to obtain advantage for the state.

Our objectives in free world trade are to improve the lot of our people; to better relations between the countries involved; to promote peace and prosperity in the world; and in the process earn a profit much of which becomes capital for further expansion of production and trade with resulting further improvement of living standards.

But none of these is an objective of a Communist regime, nor can it be. They cannot trade under the accepted rules of the free world without ceasing to be Communists. They cannot cease to be Communists without their whole movement collapsing.

Communists of necessity must carry on trade, not for commercial reasons as do we, but for political reasons. Trade is primarily a weapon of Communist imperialism, to be expanded or contracted, to be directed here or shifted there, as those at the top determine to be expedient in promoting the world revolution.

A striking illustration was the action of the Chinese Communist regime in exporting millions of tons of rice (even though Chinese people in two famine-stricken provinces were starving) in exchange for rubber from Ceylon at considerably higher than the world market price. Human beings do not count in the Communist world, except as they can be used to further the objectives of the state.

III

Fewer businessmen in the West would be deceived by Communist trade maneuvers if they understood that the Soviet bloc's representatives are not plain businessmen like themselves, though they often try to act like that. They are representatives of government organizations tightly controlled by their Communist rulers whose purposes are political. This leads inevitably to such difficulties as the following:

1. Spokesmen and negotiators for the Communists frequently make attractive offers and promises but later prove unwilling to sign contracts in accordance with these offers. Such offers are made partly for propaganda purposes with intent to deceive. This was clearly the case at the Moscow Economic Conference in April 1952 when the U. S. S. R. offered to more than triple its billion-dollar trade with the West in "2 or 3 years." A year later, 1 billion was not up 300 percent, but had dropped about 40 percent.

2. Communist countries have proved unreliable as markets or sources of supply, even in the short run. Experience in many countries shows that trade contracts may be terminated arbitrarily despite satisfactory performance on the part of Western trade partners. The ups and downs of Communist purchases in the Australian wool market are a case in point. Often this is done systematically; dependence on trade with the Soviet bloc is created, then termination is used as a form of pressure tactic. Last year, when Pakistan appeared to be veering toward the free world, Communist China cut its purchases of Pakistan cotton from approximately $84 million in 1952, to about $7 million in 1953.

3. Communist planners direct all their economic efforts, including foreign trade, toward self-sufficiency. This is clearly seen in their writings and in actual performance. The U. S. S. R. has the longest history as a Communist country. Its peak trade was in 1929–33. In the late thirties it fell to about half, and the postwar trade volume was still lower, despite the large-scale increases in Soviet total output since 1928. In 1953 the whole bloc (including Communist China) did less than $3 billion of trade with the rest of the world.

A number of writers who take a more optimistic view about trade with Communist China point to continued existence of private industry and trade within that country. But where such does exist, it is only on sufferance of the Government and will be extinguished when it has served its purpose. This has never been denied by the Chinese Communist leaders. On the contrary, they have said on numerous occasions that complete nationalization of industries and collectivization of agriculture has to come, but in stages—which means just as fast as they feel themselves strong enough. Why should we help them to do it faster?

IV

If the ruthless use of trade as a political weapon were not enough to discourage the western businessman, he should take a long look at the difficulties and disadvantages from a strictly commercial standpoint:

1. Communist countries are afflicted with shortages and production problems and have difficulty supplying exports to pay for the imports they want. Western European countries have found themselves consistently forced to extend credit, to exert pressure to obtain payment, and they may end up by accepting goods they do not want to avoid taking a loss on debts, as the Austrians, for example, have discovered in dealing with Hungary. The London Economist in February reported that Sweden, which has long taken the lead in developing east-west trade, has recently refused to supply the Czechs with iron ore because of unsatisfactory payments.

2. Communist export prices tend to be high and are sometimes raised abruptly to take advantage of a favorable market. Poland, especially, has been noted for such tactics.

2. Continual complaints about the quality of products from Soviet bloc countries are heard. This is especially true of industrial goods, but also applies to raw materials and foodstuffs. Recent Soviet petroleum shipments to Egypt proved to be so filled with extraneous matter that the costs of its use were greatly increased.

4. Communist countries are noted for poor performance in deliveries which are often delayed and sometimes never come through. Occasionally delivery has been delayed on purpose to get concessions not included in the original agreement.

5. Communist trade representatives are often hard to deal with. They usually have to consult with their home offices before agreeing to terms, which causes unreasonable stubbornness and long delays. Currently they are under orders to act more conciliatory and friendly than in the past, but there is no slightest evidence that this will last; and it does not prevent bureaucratic rigidity. A shipbuilding firm in Falkenberg, Sweden, was forced into bankruptcy as a result of difficulties encountered in fulfilling a Soviet order for 10 fishing boats.

Although trade between China and the outside world was never very large, some optimists profess to believe that the Communists' present 5-year plan will offer great opportunity for profitable trade with the West. But if they will study the plan, they will find that the urge for industrialization arises from the determination to improve China's military posture, not the needs of its people.

During 1952 and the first part of 1953 Communist China was overextended in Korea and anxious to sow dissension among the Allied Powers in order to get more favorable truce terms. So it started its so-called trade offensive.

A good many western traders rushed Peiping, and others, including some Americans, journeyed to Moscow. But only a few months later when the Communists had managed to extricate themselves from the unprofitable operation in Korea which they could not win, and shifted their efforts to the far more promising field of Indochina, the trade offensive had accomplished much of its obviously diversionary purpose and the glittering prospects of trade with Communist China began to fade.

A British trade organization, the China Association, said in December 1953, "There is no doubt but that the potentialities have been greatly exaggerated in the public mind, partly as a result of the superficial successes of the various unofficial trade missions which have paid visits to Peiping this year. This overeagerness has unfortunately been reflected in an increasing severity of the terms which China now demands."

Despite all these difficulties, there are those who find it hard to resist the attraction of China as a potential market, because it is proving so difficult for the free world to work out acceptable trade patterns within itself. But the more the free world ties itself to the Soviet orbit, the less likely its members are to move toward greater international trade among themselves, which is the way that offers by far the greater possibilities.

V

There are two other situations in Asia which we should mention because of the special attraction they present to the Communists. Everyone understands the reasons for the Communist drive into southeast Asia—Indochina, Thailand, Burma, and Malaya. That is where the riches of Asia are: rubber, tin and other metals, oil, and rice surpluses.

But Japan is also a particularly desirable Communist target because of its industrial capacity. It is also particularly vulnerable because of its lack of rice, iron ore, coking coal, oil, and many other essential materials. It simply cannot maintain its solvency or even its independence unless it has access to markets where it can sell its manufactured products in exchange for food supplies and raw materials. The three main areas with which it might conceivably develop such trade relations are: Southeast Asia, the United States, and mainland China. Japan has been unable to regain its former markets in southeast Asia because of popular hostility resulting from Japanese occupation during the war, unsettled reparations accounts, and efforts by European countries, particularly the United Kingdom, to keep Japan out of those markets. Britain needs or wants them for itself, as Stalin predicted.

Unless the United States is willing to continue underwriting the Japanese economy in an amount approaching a billion dollars a year, or to permit greater Japanese trade with ourselves, Japan has no choice except to expand its trade with Communist China. The latter will not help Japan out of its dire predicament, no matter how profitable the trade would be to China itself, unless Japan is willing to break with the United States. Chou-En-lai has just reiterated this demand bluntly at Geneva.

That would give the Soviet bloc, in addition to the gigantic manpower and resources of the China mainland which it already controls, the Japanese workshop, the best in Asia.

The difficulties we face today in trying to check Communist expansion in Indochina are small, indeed, compared to the problem we will face should Japan's industrial might come under Communist control.

There are no ways to prevent such a disaster except to devise means to keep southeast Asia free, reduce barriers to Japanese trade with the free world, and intensify pressures on Communist China itself until the hold of its tyrannical regime is weakened, loosened, and eventually broken.

The Asia mainland can live without Japan; Japan cannot live indefinitely without the mainland.

Unless ways are found to return China to the free world, Japan will almost certainly wind up in the Communist world.

I am fully aware of the difficulties in returning China to the free world; but any other course presents still greater difficulties.

VI

How then shall we deal with Communist forces on the march in Asia? How can we prevent new conquests and overcome those already accomplished?

There are no easy solutions. But it seems to me we must begin by ending the illusions that have led us into one pitfall after another.

One illusion is that by expanding trade with the Communist bloc we can convert Communists into capitalists. Of all the possibilities, this is the least likely. Why should they desert when they are winning?

It is like the woman who imagines the way to reform a brute is to marry him. It never works, but some still try it. If the Communists really want our hand in a workable trade relationship, let them show good intent by reforming first.

A second illusion is that by increasing trade with the Chinese Communists we can detach them from the Russian Communists, or can drive a wedge between Peiping and Moscow, or can make a Tito out of Mao Tse-tung.

But why should Mao move away from the Kremlin if he can have all the advantages of trade with the Western World in addition to those of closest relations with the Soviet bloc? Besides, does anyone believe the hardheaded men in the Kremlin would be moving heaven and earth to get Communist China accepted in respectable society if that would lead or enable China to break with Moscow and thereby wreck its whole world movement?

Mao conceivably might pull away from Moscow if he were compelled to in order to get absolutely essential goods—that is, if he began to lose in China. The first aim of our foreign policy in Asia should be directed to making him lose. The way to do that is to make him fail, not to help him win. The best hope of creating friction between China and the Soviet Union is to keep the Chinese Reds locked, preferably smothered, in the Russian bear's arms.

A third illusion we should end is that trade with Communist China can assume the vast proportions some have glowingly predicted, and thus substantially meet the needs of the industrialized countries for larger markets. If the Chinese want to improve their trade relations, as some would have you believe, why do they not start correcting the abuses imposed on foreign traders already there? Until they are willing to do the most elementary things necessary for carrying on civilized trade and intercourse, why should we walk into any more blind alleys?

VII

In addition to determining what policies we should not follow with respect to Communist countries in Asia—because too undependable economically and undesirable politically—we must ask, What are the policies that we ought to adopt and pursue?

It is unfortunate, but inescapable, that since the Communist bloc makes its economic policies completely subservient to its political objectives, we, too, must put political considerations first. At the least, we cannot afford trade policies that defeat our foreign policy.

The immediate objective of our foreign policy in Asia must be to prevent any further gains there by the Kremlin. To achieve that objective—

1. We must recognize that what is at stake in Asia is the peace and possible survival of the free world, not just its trade.

2. We must not let the Reds win any more economic victories. That means we must resist resumption of trade with them. If they are not our enemies, why do we draft and arm men to be ready to fight them? If they are our enemies, how can anyone suggest we help them become stronger?

3. We must not let them win any more diplomatic victories. Admission of Communist China to the United Nations would be the greatest possible diplomatic victory. Free Asia will crumble once it becomes convinced the Communists are going to win. Admission to the U. N. would mean to the people of Asia, and should mean to us, that the Reds have already won.

4. We must not let the Communists win any more political victories. For America to intervene alone in Indochina, for example, would enable the Reds to convince millions, not that we are helping Asian peoples to defend their own freedom, but that we are helping defend French colonialism, which the people who have been under it hate worse than they hate the Communist imperialism which they have not yet been under.

5. We must not let them win any more military victories. This requires that we get at last the Pacific pact which the Congress called for in 1949 an alliance of the free nations of southeast Asia and the Pacific to resist further Communist expansion. To develop in the Asian peoples now threatened the will to fight as did the South Koreans, they must know it is for their own freedom. They will not believe it is for their freedom unless the alliance has as its nucleus genuinely independent Asian and Pacific nations (of which the United States of America is one), supported by the European powers, rather than a nucleus of the former colonial nations of Europe, to be supported by the people of Asia.

6. On the positive side, we must give greater encouragement and assistance to the free Chinese on Formosa to enable them to maintain a symbol of freedom and hope; and, as a preliminary, to smuggle agents and suitable supplies to the China mainland in order to keep hope alive and to enable the resistance forces to do to the Reds exactly what the Reds did to the Nationalists—destroy communications, isolate the cities, disrupt the economy. That is, when the Chinese Communists are in trouble at home, we must do all we can to keep them in trouble, not help them out of it.

7. We must, above all, do our best to help the free countries of Asia remain free by becoming stronger. The great expansion of trade in Asia which we need, is not to be found in Communist China. It is in the non-Communist areas around China. We must seek to apply there more effectively the same philosophy of an expanding economy and reduced trade barriers which are responsible for America's own huge internal trade. Let us concentrate on expanding the $148 billion of trade last year within the existing free world, rather than jeopard that for the less than $3 billion of trade between the free world and the whole Soviet bloc and only three-quarters of a billion with Communist China.

8. We must always weigh the possible but uncertain economic benefits of trade with Communist tyrannies against the certain political and psychological losses. To build up trade with the Chinese Communists would give enormous benefit to our enemies; it would not bring substantial economic or other benefit to ourselves or our allies in the West; and it would do very great injury to one ally that we generally seem to forget—the ally which, in my book, is the most important of all because the most dependable, and in a position to do the enemy most damage—namely, the nearly 800 million oppressed peoples behind the Iron Curtain who know Communist tyranny for what it is and silently resist it. We must not betray their hopes or weaken their resolve or undercut their strength by any act that would increase the strength of Communists anywhere.

When there is already such determined opposition behind the Iron Curtain as was demonstrated by the revolt in East Germany last June and by the decision of Communist prisoners of war in Korea to refuse to return even to their homes and families in enslaved China, there is reason for great hope, not despair—if we in the free world will prove steadfast.

In the last analysis the decision we must make on this trade issue is a moral decision. Shall we put our faith for the future in the millions of oppressed peoples? Or in deals with their oppressors?

We cannot win our enemies by letting down our friends and loyal allies. On the contrary, the best way to influence our enemies is to stand steadfastly by our friends, especially those who are already fighting the enemy from within and may make it unnecessary for the rest of us to fight it from without.

If we take the long look, there can be no question of the decision we and other free peoples will make.

The Quartermaster Purchasing Agency Should Remain in New York City

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS B. HELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1954

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleagues from New York in a vigorous protest against the Department of the Army for its decision to transfer the Quartermaster Purchasing Agency from New York to Philadelphia. This is another example of false economy which is being practiced at the expense of New York City. It is hurting not only the morale of other Government employees and the nearly 1,000 civilian employees and their families who are directly affected, but it is also a severe blow to business and industry in New York and to its whole economy.

In February of this year—February 4, to be exact—I described to this House the unemployment situation in my congressional district in Brooklyn. I listed some of the reductions in employment during the past year due to closing down or transferring certain activities from New York. I said then:

> Last April the naval clothing factory was closed and some 1,200 families lost their means of a livelihood. In January of this year the naval supply facilities was transferred from Brooklyn to a depot elsewhere and another 700 employees lost their jobs. * * * A further reduction in employ-

ment will take place during the latter half of fiscal 1954—which means by June 30 of this year. The new reduction may affect perhaps another 700 employees and will bring down total employment at the Brooklyn Navy Yard to a low of 17,500.

Mr. Speaker, I tried to be cautious in my estimate last February of a reduction of only 700 employees at Brooklyn, lest I be accused of being an alarmist and an advocate of "gloom and doom." I have just been informed that employment at the Brooklyn Navy Yard "will approximate 16,750 after separation notices already issued become effective." Which means that already 1,450 people have received notices of separation since then, or more than twice as many as I estimated in February. And we still have nearly a month and a half until June 30.

What is more, I have also learned that an additional 1,000 employees may lose their jobs at the Brooklyn Navy Yard by September 30, 1954, since total employment there is now "expected to decline" to 15,800.

Now, the Department of the Army proposes to remove its Quartermaster Purchasing Agency from New York and throw out an additional 1,000 employees on the labor market. I ask of our responsible authorities in the present administration: Are you, gentlemen, determined to transform the great city of New York into a "ghost city"? Do you realize that by your actions to close down, to remove, or to reduce these activities, which have become such a vital part of our commercial and industrial life, you are contributing to the ruination of New York City as the Nation's center of commerce and you are gradually strangling it economically?

We are struggling with a difficult unemployment situation in New York today. The removal of the Quartermaster Purchasing Agency will only worsen this situation. Not only will it bring economic ruin to many families, to business firms and possibly to whole industries, particularly the textile industry, but once the flames of depression begin to spread throughout New York and neighboring communities it may be difficult to stop them later.

I urge the Department of the Army to reconsider its decision and to rescind its order to transfer the agency from New York. I call on the responsible authorities to give most serious consideration to these protests. Justice and decency require that this agency should remain in New York.

Mr. Speaker, I want to insert into the Record the text of a letter which I have received from the mayor of New York, the Honorable Robert F. Wagner, dealing with this matter:

City of New York,
Office of the Mayor,
New York, N. Y., May 15, 1954.

Hon. Louis B. Heller,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Congressman: I urge you to join in the efforts to persuade the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of the Army, and the commanding officer of the United States Army Quartermaster Corps to keep the clothing and textile purchasing units and administrative divisions of the Quartermaster Corps, United States Army, in New York City after July 1, 1954.

Recently it was announced in Washington by an Army spokesman that these operations would be removed from 111 East 16th Street, New York, and relocated at Philadelphia after that date. Official reasons advanced for this action were annual savings in rent and payroll expenditures.

Examination of the facts show there will be no saving for the taxpayer in this move, which, it is estimated, will cost the United States Government more than a million dollars to move personnel involved, and for terminal leave and retirement pay for those employees forced to resign. The Government will save nothing in rent for the East 16th Street premises since other Defense Department agencies are prepared to take over this space. Furthermore, there exists at the present time in New York City Government-owned facilities that could accommodate the Quartermaster operations involved. The reduction in force advocated in the proposed transfer could be made as easily in New York as in Philadelphia.

The Quartermaster purchasing and administrative offices were located in New York in 1944 because New York was the center of the world's textile and clothing manufacture, and still is. Procurement of needed Army supplies here is logical and efficient because of the strategic location of these industrial plants and offices.

The transfer of these Quartermaster functions from New York to Philadelphia would mean the loss of an $8 million annual payroll to New York City with consequent lessening tax returns to both the city and the State.

Industry, veterans groups, and my administration unite in urging you to make every effort to halt this drastic and useless relocation of activities by the Quartermaster Corps of the United States Army.

Very truly yours,
Robert F. Wagner, *Mayor.*

The Bryson Bill, H. R. 1227

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WAYNE L. HAYS

OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 20, 1954

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a petition forwarded to me by Mrs. E. R. McCort, of Conotton, Ohio.

To Our Representatives in Congress:

We, the undersigned, your constituents, earnestly beg you to give consideration to our constitutional rights as American citizens to be free in our homes of an offensive invasion by those who wish to increase their huge profits from the sales of alcoholic beverages by high-pressure advertising directed through magazines, newspapers, and over radio and television, at our children. We urge you to obtain consideration of and pass the Bryson bill, H. R. 1227.

E. R. McCort, Zelda McCort, Conotton, Ohio; Charlotte Gotohale, Margaret Davis, Nedra McCann, Lamartine, Ohio; Jean Burton, Scio, Ohio; Ethel Gamble, Annie Umpleby, Mildred Butterfield, Mary Palmer, Bessie Logan, Georgia McIntosh, Conotton, Ohio; Annie Burton, Scio, Ohio; Marjorie R. Nees, Forrest G. Nees, Carrollton, Ohio; Bernice J. Brooks, Olive Tope Brooks, Lena Rutledge, Williard Rutledge Mervin Rutledge, L. H. Gamble, Conotton, Ohio; Harriett McCann, Lamartine, Ohio.

National Association of Cotton Manufacturers 100th Annual Meeting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 20, 1954

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following remarks of Mr. William F. Sullivan, president of the National Association of Cotton Manufacturers, on the occasion of its 100th annual meeting:

Today we mark the beginning of the second century of a novel undertaking first conceived by a few textile manufacturers here in New England. In 1854 our founders adopted the then radical idea that the free and unselfish exchange of ideas and information among business competitors would be of benefit, not only to themselves, but to the industry and the Nation. They embarked upon an experiment in mutual trust and respect contrary to the then general business belief in secrecy and distrust, a condition which had retarded a full realization of the fruits of the industrial revolution. They substituted knowledge for secrecy and shared it so that all could have an equal opportunity to compete. Each had a chance to gain from the ever-increasing industrial expansion which stemmed from the new industrial knowledge they jointly created through their association. Most American industries have since accepted the premise that knowledge freely exchanged in an atmosphere of trust benefits all. One hundred years have proven its value.

We can therefore look forward today with greater confidence than our founders did who began this experiment. The mill men of New England a century ago must have turned their thoughts to Samuel Slater, Francis Lowell and others, who had broken the barriers of secrecy, to bring the first technological advances to this area.

The concept of freedom and equal opportunity which had flowered in political thought since the Revolution and which was soon to face its most severe test was applied for the first time to business and industry in an organized way by this association as our transactions vividly demonstrate.

The significance of our association is that it pioneered, at a time when others doubted; that for a century it has actively espoused free and unhampered pursuit for truth, accurate scientific information, and knowledge for the benefit of all; and lastly, that it has proved that these principles are as vital to free enterprise as to a free nation. These principles could have been subjected to no more severe test of soundness and durability than in our industry in this area in the past century.

The formation of our association here in New England 100 years ago was perhaps inevitable. The time was ripe to depart from a practice of secrecy and to embark upon a policy of enlightenment.

In the spring of 1854 the bitter debates over the Kansas-Nebraska bill stirred men's minds to reexamine existing practices and reappraise the principles of freedom and human dignity upon which the Nation was founded. The passage of that bill proved the impermanence of compromise with principle. Men's minds were released from the bondage of political expediency and appeasement. Among the many organizations and societies which sprang into being, ours represented the quest for knowledge and enlightenment in manufacturing.

It is no accident that the founding of a new national party of freedom and this association took place in the same year and within a few miles of each other. Nor is it any accident that the men instrumental in the founding of that party and this organization were close associates.

The association has provided a stimulus and a forum in which the minds of its members meet and impart with freedom and truth the knowledge and information so important to the growth and welfare of our industry. Association meetings have been the battlefield upon which campaigns for improvements in the industry have been carried out.

Today is not to be devoted to contemplating the past nor to attempting to fathom the future. Today is an occasion upon which we should repledge and rededicate ourselves to those enduring principles upon which we are founded—search for knowledge and free exchange of ideas in a spirit of mutual trust and confidence. By applying these well-demonstrated principles to the central tasks before us, we can go forward to great new achievements both in this industry and in our society.

The Government of South Korea Must Not Be Jeopardized or Undermined by Red Propaganda and Maneuvers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1954

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following article from the New York World-Telegram and Sun of May 19, 1954:

Red Shadow Hovers Over ROK Election

(By Ludwell Denny)

Washington, May 19.—The Reds are expected to use tomorrow's congressional elections in South Korea as excuse for another propaganda campaign against the Rhee government and for an appeasement deal at the Geneva Conference.

This is old stuff. But it is particularly dangerous now because of American-British disagreements, French weakness, and Communist initiative at Geneva.

Charges by the opposition party in Seoul, that President Rhee's supporters and police are intimidating voters, are made to order for Red propagandists. Considering the brief experience of the South Koreans with democracy, and abnormal conditions resulting from the war and present tricky truce, some election irregularities are perhaps inevitable.

TARGET OF APPEASERS

But the Rhee government is broadly representative of the people, as attested by the United Nations-supervised elections, which put it in power. Whatever mistakes it has made, it is not a dictatorship.

Unfortunately, President Rhee's success against the Reds has made him hated all the more by appeasement groups in Europe. And propaganda about him has been repeated so often that even many, if not most, allied officials and newspapers in Europe make him the scapegoat for frustrations of the Korean war.

This is the setting of the Korean deadlock at Geneva and of efforts of the British Foreign Secretary, Anthony Eden, to compromise the conflicting demands of the Communist block and the United States. The conference deadlock is over an election issue. That gives special significance to the balloting in South Korea tomorrow.

VACANT SEATS FOR NORTH

All sides at Geneva agree in theory that North and South Korea must be unified, and that elections must be held. President Rhee points out that unsupervised elections already have been held in South Korea, that vacant seats are reserved for North Korean districts where the Reds prevented U. N. balloting, and that such elections should now be held in North Korea.

Of course, the Reds object to that. Instead, they propose that the North Korean regime and the Rhee government jointly hold all-Korean elections, with no United Nations supervision. To begin with that would give the nonrepresentative Red regime legal equality with the democratically instituted and constitutional Rhee government, and with the usual Red trickery it would end with Communist control of the whole country.

Senator Lyndon B. Johnson Speaks to the Texas "Aggies"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1954

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished Senate minority leader, the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson, has honored Texas A. and M. College by participating in its graduation exercises. He has emphasized the part that the land-grant military colleges play in the production of skilled and educated manpower and outstanding military leadership. Senator Johnson has observed that at no time could these schools make a more significant contribution to the welfare of our country than they are making today.

Mr. Speaker, Senator Johnson's address appears below:

They tell me there are three supreme honors which can come in a lifetime.

First, to be a citizen of the United States. Second, to be a citizen of Texas. Then, and finally, to be a citizen of Aggieland.

As a native-born American and a native-born Texas, I qualify for the first two honors. But circumstances beyond my control preclude the third.

I only hope that tonight I can apply for a return passport that entitles me to a second visit. It is mighty refreshing to spend a little time at College Station where we can talk about a few bright prospects—like the Aggie football team next fall.

The Texas Aggies occupy a special spot in the heart of America. The spirit of the corps is the finest example of the spirit that America needs.

It embodies the determination and the will to win which is vital in the arena where America's destiny will be determined.

It is no accident that Texas A. and M. contributed more officers to the Army during World War II than any other institution. It was a direct reflection of the spirit of the corps—devotion to duty and devotion to country.

As the leaders of the free world, we are now engaged in a great race with the forces of tyranny. The outcome of that race will determine the destiny—not just of ourselves but of all who come after us.

It is a peculiar race—one in which the two leading participants have different objectives.

The Communists are seeking world conquest—they do not conceal their aim.

We are seeking the preservation of freedom—the right of the individual to justice and liberty of conscience.

They will win if they can spread sufficient confusion and doubt. We will win if we can hold clear to our goals and reject their divisive tactics.

There are strengths and weaknesses on both sides.

In terms of population, we can never catch up.

Today, the U. S. S. R. numbers some 200 million people. Its population grows at the rate of 3 million a year. We number approximately 160 million people. We are increasing at the rate of about 2 million a year.

The Soviet Army musters 3,100,000 men—plus secret police troops for which we have no figures. Our Army numbers only 1,300,000 men—and our police are not organized to supplement troops in battle.

The Communists direct their operations from the center of the largest land mass in the world—Asia and Eastern Europe. We must cross broad oceans before we even come close to the areas of conflict.

These facts and figures, of course, do not take into account the tremendous hordes of Communist China. They do not include the enslaved nations behind the Iron Curtain in Eastern Europe.

We have strengths too.

In 1955, the United States is certain to produce at least 123 million tons of steel. The best the Russians can hope for is less than 45 million tons.

In 1955, the United States can count on production of at least 1,800,000 tons of aluminum. The best the Russians can hope for is 286,000 tons.

In practically every field that matters, we outproduce the Soviet Union. We have a long, long lead. It will take years for the Russians to catch up—to come even within hailing distance.

Our present production superiority, however, is no cause for complacency. In the long view of history, many years count for little more than a moment.

The Communists take the long view of history. They are playing the game for the future. We must match their patience and their determination.

In the long view, the race will not be won by superiority of production or superiority of manpower. Both factors are important. But if they were decisive, the struggle would be settled by now.

In the long view, the winner will be determined by superiority of leadership and superiority of trained brain power.

That is where you come in.

The struggle between communism and freedom is a many-sided struggle. It is between atheism and religion; between tyranny and justice; between disregard for the individual and regard for the individual; between a free economy and a controlled economy.

One aspect too often overlooked is the struggle between two methods of education.

The Duke of Wellington once said that the battle of Waterloo was won on the playing fields of Eton. This, of course, is only a half truth. But it forms a basis for what could be a whole truth.

Our colleges and our universities do not pretend to turn out wise men. Wisdom cannot be injected into an individual like vitamins or penicillin. If it is not there, naturally it cannot be produced artificially.

But our colleges and universities can offer wise men the accumulated thought of the ages. They can add knowledge to wisdom and brain power that is already there. The method by which they do it is all important.

The Communists believe that colleges and universities exist to serve the state. They are part of the process by which Communist leaders and citizens are turned out on an assembly-line basis.

In this process, the individual has no choice. It does not matter what he wants to do unless his plans fit in with the plans of the Politburo.

We can—and we should—abhor this system. We can—and we should—scoff at some of its weird theories.

But it would be a sad mistake to underrate that system. It would be a grave error not to recognize that it produces first-rate engineers; first-rate chemists; first-rate scientists.

And every one of those engineers; every one of those chemists; every one of those scientists steps promptly into a machine dedicated to our destruction.

It is true that the Russians had to steal the basic facts of the atomic and hydrogen bomb. But that is secondary to the fact that once they had the facts, their scientists and technicians did go ahead and produce both.

It was an achievement of the first magnitude for a nation that only recently depended upon the oxcart for transportation.

We do not base our education on state planning. We do not try to turn out chemists in job lots; we do not produce scientists like bushels of wheat or bales of cotton.

We seek to give free reign to the imagination; to the development of individual tastes and preferences. We believe that in education—as in the broader struggle of life—a man should have the right of choice.

We believe that if he has that right, he will be a better man.

We do not expect education to serve the state. But we believe that men educated in freedom will best serve society. We are committed to that concept and we will not seek to alter it now.

As time goes on, we will almost certainly have to increase our funds for research. We will have to step up our efforts to explore the fields of basic knowledge.

I do not mean by this, knowledge in the field of weapons alone.

The cold war is as much a battle of ideas as it is of weapons.

We are badly in need of new and fresh ideas. We have been responding far too much to Communist aggression with tactics that are defensive only. We must explore the paths that will place us on the offensive without touching off world war III.

There was a time when a college diploma carried with it little in the way of obligation. By and large, it was a passport to a better life.

It meant a competitive advantage in the economic struggle.

Those times have passed. You, who will soon receive your diplomas, live in a world where a college education implies obligation as well as privilege.

The people of the United States are looking to you and to the other thousands who will soon leave our college campuses for the leadership that will save our country.

This is an obligation that cannot be avoided. As Americans, you must assume those burdens because you have as vital a stake in the outcome as anyone else.

At this very moment, thousands of Communist scientists and technicians are preparing to leave their colleges and universities. They are your competitors.

They are the men and women that you must better if we are all to survive.

I have great confidence in you. I know this confidence is shared by the overwhelming majority of Americans.

The future is in your hands in a very realistic and direct sense. Your brains, your imagination, your courage is the force that will preserve the freedom our ancestors won at such great sacrifice.

Here, at Texas A. and M., a foundation has been laid upon which you can stand like a rock. It is a foundation of knowledge, of spirit, of dedication to the principles that made America great.

Some day, a historian will write the history of this age. We cannot now foresee how it will end.

But of this I am confident. When he comes to the last paragraph, it will not record the silver taps over the body of our Nation because of any failure by the Aggie corps.

These are great days for you; great days for our Nation.

To all of you, my heartiest congratulations for your achievement. To our Nation, my greatest pride for the leaders who are now ready to join the struggle for freedom.

Cal-Sag Waterways

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 19, 1954

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent, I am extending my remarks to include a press release by the Cal-Sag Waterways Development Committee, which is composed of foremost leaders in industry, labor, the professions, and other activities of Chicago. The people and the press of the great Middle West are united in support of this waterways development, calculated to play a tremendous part in restoring full prosperity to the entire Nation and of strengthening the defenses of the country.

I trust, Mr. Speaker, that this Congress will not adjourn until favorable action has been taken on pending appropriation bills for the immediate start of work. The urgency is pressing, the approach is bipartisan, we have no excuse for further delay.

The news release follows:

CHICAGO, May 17.—At a meeting of the board of directors of the Cal-Sag Waterways Development Committee, Inc., today, it was announced by Chairman Henry E. Seyfarth that the committee will redouble its aggressive and constructive educational and legislative program to get favorable congressional action on the Cal-Sag project.

The leadership of the Chicago committee during the past year, Mr. Seyfarth said, has compiled such a record of outstanding accomplishment that it now becomes imperative for the Cal-Sag committee, into which the Chicago committee has been merged, to exhibit the same qualities of intelligent leadership.

To carry out the policy approved by the board of directors at this meeting, a policy committee was created composed of W. W. Huggett, president, North Pier Terminal Co.; Phillip G. Connell, president, FitzSimons & Connell Dredge & Dock Co.; Joseph Germano, director, United Steelworkers of America, CIO; J. J. Haines, Calumet Region Congress; and John R. Boyle, president, Sun Advertising Co.

The Cal-Sag committee and its board of directors are as follows:

CHICAGO CAL-SAG COMMITTEE

Henry E. Seyfarth, chairman, Seyfarth, Shaw & Fairweather; John R. Boyle, president, Sun Advertising Co.; Phillip G. Connell, president, FitzSimons & Connell Dredge & Dock Co.; Thomas Creigh, attorney, 231 South LaSalle Street; Col. Henry Crown, chairman, Material Service Corp.; Frank E. Doyle, president, South Chicago Trades and Labor Assembly; John W. Evers, Jr., president, Commonwealth Edison Co.; Matthew J. Fitzgerald, president, Standard Asbestos Manufacturing Co.; Paul V. Galvin, president, Motorola, Inc.; Joseph Germano, president, Illinois State Industrial Union Council, and district director, United Steelworkers of America, CIO; Donald Grace, vice president, Chicago Steel Service Co.; Daniel J. Hallahan, attorney, 3637 East 106th Street; John V. Hanberg, publisher, the Daily Calumet; W. W. Huggett, president, North Pier Terminal Co.; H. W. Johnson, vice president, Inland Steel Co.; Joseph Keenan, secretary-treasurer, building and construction division, A. F. of L.; Ray Kelly, publisher, South End Reporter; Herbert J. Lorber, president, Rollins, Burdick, Hunter Co.; Philip J. Malloy, Holeproof Hosiery Co.; John L. McCaffrey, president, International Harvester Co.; William V. McKinzie, president, Steel City National Bank; Col. R. H. Morse, chairman, Fairbanks, Morse & Co.; Carl J. Sharp, chairman, Acme Steel Co.; Solomon B. Smith, executive vice president, the Northern Trust Co.; Harold Truax, chairman, Truax-Traer Coal Co.; Col. Edward N. Wentworth, director, Armour's livestock bureau, Armour & Co.; Gen. Robert E. Wood, chairman, finance committee, Sears, Roebuck & Co.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS, CAL-SAG WATERWAYS DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE, INC.

Fred M. Gillies, president, Acme Steel Co.; Herbert J. Lorber, president, Rollins Burdick Hunter Co.; W. W. Huggett, president, North Pier Terminal Co.; Henry Platt, vice president, Truax-Traer Coal Co.; Phillip G. Connell, president, FitzSimons & Connell Dredge & Dock Co.; Harry S. Bercher, vice president, International Harvester Co.; A. M. Thompson, chairman, Mississippi Valley Barge Line Co.; Matthew J. Fitzgerald, president, Standard Asbestos Manufacturing Co.; Frank E. Doyle, president, South Chicago Trades and Labor Assembly; Joseph Germano, president, Illinois State Industrial Union, counsel and district director, United Steel Workers of America, CIO; John I. Hay, president, John I. Hay Barge Lines; Solomon B. Smith, executive vice president, the Northern Trust Co.; John R. Boyle, president, Sun Advertising Co.; Stuart B. Bradley, Seago, Pipin, Bradley & Vetter; C. P. Johnson, vice president, Interlake Iron Corp.; Charles E. Swab, vice president, Valley Mould & Iron Corp.; Harold G. Maidell, executive vice president, LaSalle National Bank; Chester R. Davis, Sr., vice president, Chicago Title & Trust Co.; Henry E. Seyfarth, Seyfarth, Shaw & Fairweather; Anthony G. Allison, executive vice president, Cal-Sag Waterways Development Committee, Inc.; Ralph K. Mangan, president, the Buda Co.; J. J. Haines, Calumet Region Congress; George E. Victor, president, Victor Manufacturing & Gasket Co.

Today's Unprotected Aged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. BYRNES

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1954

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the Ways and Means Committee is presently considering amendments to the old-age and survivors insurance system. It is anticipated that the committee will recommend extension of the system to provide coverage for over 10.5 million additional persons.

In connection with the committee's deliberation, it is my intention to propose an amendment which would grant some protection to 3.6 million of today's retired aged.

The present system of old-age and survivors insurance—OASI—coupled with the proposed broadening of the system will provide OASI coverage and a floor of protection for all gainfully employed persons. In addition, 6 million persons are presently receiving benefits under the system. Even with the broadening of the system to provide universal coverage, there will still be one group of our citizens whose needs are being ignored and against whom the system discriminates. That group is today's retired aged who through no fault of their own are not covered by OASI.

The factors which determine whether a person is covered or not covered are often very minor. The dividing line between coverage under the system and noncoverage is extremely thin. Gainful employment for as short a time as a year and a half can provide coverage. The payment of a total social security tax of as little as $6 can entitle some persons to the benefits of the system. The maximum that has been contributed in behalf of any person entitled to draw minimum benefits today is $106. Certain widows are entitled to survivors benefits under the system because their husbands died after September 1, 1950, whereas those widows whose husbands died before this date are denied benefits even though the taxes paid by the husbands under the program may have been the same.

We have gratuitously increased OASI benefits to persons already retired on two occasions; it is proposed to do it again by legislation now pending in the Congress. These increases for those already retired have a present value of over $11 billion. These increases take no account of the need of the individual. Those receiving them neither have paid, nor will they pay, anything for them. The lines of distinction between eligibility and noneligibility are so fine as to be without merit in determining whether an individual is entitled to the benefits provided by OASI to retired persons and survivors.

These fine distinctions discriminate against the very group that has the greatest need for the protection provided by OASI. Under the broadened coverage and relaxed qualifying standards provided in the administration bill now before the Congress, all of tomorrow's retired aged and most of those persons now between 65 and 70 years of age will be eligible for benefits upon retirement. For today's retired aged over 70 years of age this will not be possible. Yet it is today's aged who are most in need. Eighty percent of persons receiving relief on the basis of need under the old-age assistance—OAA— program are over 70 years of age.

Since we are providing benefits as a matter of right to all of tomorrow's retired aged, we should certainly provide minimum benefits as a matter of right for today's aged.

In order to make a real start in eliminating the discriminations in the present OASI system and to recognize the needs of today's retired aged, I propose that retired noncovered persons age 70 or over be granted insured status and be eligible for minimum benefits. Minimum benefits under the pending legislation would be a monthly benefit of $30 per month for nonmarried individuals and $45 per month for couples.

In order to limit the application of this proposal to the meritorious cases and to prevent windfalls, two restrictions are provided.

First, individuals receiving retirement benefits under other governmental retirement systems, such as civil-service retirement, railroad retirement, and so forth, would not be eligible. Second, any person receiving OASI benefits under this special provision would be required to give up the additional $600 personal income-tax exemption granted to persons over 65 and the special retirement income exemption provided in the tax-revision bill.

It is contended by some that such a blanketing-in of persons who have made no contribution by way of social-security taxes would not be fair to the social-security trust fund and those who have paid such taxes in order to obtain coverage. To meet this objection, I propose that for each person blanketed-in, a payment to the trust fund would be made from the general funds of the Government corresponding to the maximum employer-employee tax that would have been paid for any individual who had been covered under the system since its inception and which would produce the minimum benefit, plus compound interest at 3 percent. For those blanketed-in in 1955, the per capita payment to the trust fund would be $131.07. As far as the trust fund is concerned, it will be in at least as good a condition as it would be if the individual and his employer had been contributing to the system since social-security taxes were first collected in 1937.

Because the reimbursement to the trust fund from the general fund will amount to only about 7 percent of the cost of the benefits, there are some who will call this proposal a "raid" in the trust fund. It should be remembered that this ratio of 7 percent reimbursement represents more than the proportion of the benefit cost actually paid for in respect to current beneficiaries by themselves and their employers.

In addition to removing the discrimination present in the OASI system, the proposal would provide a real start toward the withdrawal of the Federal Government from the Federal-State old-age relief program of old-age assistance.

The old-age assistance program provides for Federal payments to the States on a matching basis. The maximum Federal contribution is $35 per case. My proposal provides that the Federal insurance payment paid to any blanketed-in individual would be offset against any Federal matching moneys that would otherwise be paid to the individual. Since 80 percent of those receiving aid under OAA are over 70 years of age, this provision would result in a substantial reduction in the Federal cost under OAA. It is estimated that the reduction would amount to in excess of $700 million per year. In some States the Federal Government would thus be withdrawn completely from the old-age relief program. It has always been contemplated that OASI would replace Federal participation in OAA. This proposal would be a real start in realizing that objective.

The initial group that would be blanketed in and given minimum insurance rights under the proposal would number about 3,600,000. In the immediate future, there would be some additional persons brought in. They would consist primarily of widows whose husbands had died before acquiring coverage under OASI, such as widows of farmers. Within 15 to 20 years, however, the total number of people qualifying would be relatively small. Under universal coverage all of tomorrow's aged, with very minor exceptions, will have coverage under the basic provisions of the present law. In other words, the problem presented by today's retired aged is constantly reducing and will be practically nonexistent within the next 20 years.

While we are prepared to provide benefits for some of today's retired aged and for all of tomorrow's retired aged, it is only fair that we try to give similar consideration to today's uncovered retired aged. This proposal will do so in a manner entirely consistent with the present system of old-age and survivors insurance.

Item Veto Might Save Taxpayers Millions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 13, 1954

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply grateful to the Florida Times-Union for the encouragement which they have given to efforts being made in Congress for the passage of a constitutional amendment to allow the item veto. This is a measure which could save the Federal Government tremendous sums of money. Under leave previously granted, I include a May 18 editorial from the Florida Times-Union, as follows:

ITEM VETO MIGHT SAVE TAXPAYERS MILLIONS

A democratic device fashioned by the Confederate States of America has been suggested as an amendment to the United States Constitution and is worthy of thoughtful consideration by Congress and the Nation. The measure—proposed by Representative CHARLES E. BENNETT, Democrat, of Florida, and Senator HARRY F. BYRD, Democrat, of Virginia—would permit the President to veto individual items or legislative riders in appropriations bills.

At present, the Chief Executive must approve or disapprove a bill in its entirety. He cannot accept part and reject part.

This leaves the way open for the attachment of all kinds of riders incorporating provisions of some wholly extraneous subjects which would have little chance of passage in any other way. Often they represent the work of self-seeking pressure groups and special interest blocs whose pet measures actually conflict with the public interest.

But the President must choose between signing the bill as it now stands and vetoing the good with the bad. When an Army bill, a rivers and harbors bill, or any other comprehensive measure appropriating money is placed on his desk, he may find scores of items to which he takes exception. But to veto the entire act would inflict hardships and could even seriously cripple the operations of some vital branch of the Government. Rather than incur these disadvantages, he is almost certain to affix his signature. It is in this manner that so many reprehensible pork-barrel measures get on the lawbooks as a result of legislative logrolling. Often this type of drain on the Treasury never comes to the attention of the public. A constitutional amendment correcting the situation might save the taxpayer millions of dollars a year.

For more than 70 years the item veto has been advocated for the Nation's Chief Executive. Some 70 amendments on the subject have been introduced since 1873. All but nine States give their governors this power. In 1938, the United States House of Representatives even wrote a provision for it in a major appropriations bill—at President Roosevelt's urgent request—but the Senate refused to concur.

Such an amendment might permit certain abuses. Congress could fall into the habit of voting appropriations far in excess of estimated revenues in expectation of Presidential whittling. The President might use the item veto to discriminate against certain items in a wholly undesirable way. But abuses are possible in any democratic system where unworthy men are permitted to hold public office.

Department of Agriculture Appropriation Bill, 1955

SPEECH

OF

HON. H. CARL ANDERSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 12, 1954

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 8779) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot let the remarks of the gentleman from Pennsylvania relative to the Farmers' Home Administration go unanswered. I feel that this is one of the great programs for agriculture. It has done a tremendous amount of good. I know it has in my Seventh District in Minnesota. It has helped thousands upon thousands of young veterans get started in farm operations who otherwise would not have known where to turn for financial assistance. It has kept thousands upon thousands of farmers off the direct relief rolls, farmers who have turned out to be prosperous members of their local communities and now have credit available to them from private sources.

This is the farm program for which I insisted 2 years ago on raising the loan authorization to $120 million. It is the one farm program that has to do with the people in this country engaged in agriculture who have no other place to turn. As far as I am concerned I think it is a very splendidly operated program at this time and that we would be penny-wise and pound-foolish to discontinue it or hamper it in any way. It is not wise to criticize without knowing the facts. The gentleman from Pennsylvania does not have the facts.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON].

Who's Right Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1954

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am including herewith an editorial which appeared in the Columbia Record, Columbia, S. C., under date of Wednesday, July 22, 1953, entitled "Doing the South Something of a Disservice." This article undertakes to criticize the distinguished gentleman from Georgia, who predicted the decision which the Supreme Court handed down Monday, abolishing segregation. It appears to me that our distinguished colleague from Georgia has had more courage and more vision than many Members of the Congress and many of our newspaper brethren.

The editorial follows:

DOING THE SOUTH SOMETHING OF A DISSERVICE

Representative JAMES C. DAVIS, Georgia Democrat, who was the speaker at the summer banquet of the South Carolina Press Association at Blowing Rock, N. C., is entitled to hold and to express any opinion he may elect to entertain.

But he did the South a disservice with his attack upon the United States Supreme Court on the theory that the Court has already made up its mind to abolish segregation in the Southern schools.

The Georgia Congressman comes to this conclusion on the basis of two facts, neither of which, taken singly or both taken together, proves what he undertakes to make them prove. The two facts are: (1) The Supreme Court order for the reargument of the school segregation cases in October, which seems to indicate that the Court has not made up its mind and desires more information on the issue than it had; and, (2) the invitation to the Attorney General of the United States to participate in this reargument, which if it signifies anything is evidence only of the fact that the Court desires to offer the Eisenhower administration the same courtesies that it allowed to the Truman administration, the courtesy of putting itself on record, for political purposes doubtless, on the issue.

But the Congressman sees something sinister in all this.

"Here we have, finally completely out in the open, the 2 departments of Government, the executive and the judicial," he charged, "combining to bypass Congress to perform an act which neither of them has the constitutional right to perform separately and which the 2 of them combined do not have the right to perform jointly. This is as brazen and unconscionable a violation of the Constitution as this country has ever witnessed * * *."

Representative DAVIS even saw something sinister in the series of questions to which the Court sought answers, questions which indicated that among the matters being considered by the justices was the problem, raised by southerners in the first arguments on the cases, of whether segregation, legal and constitutional ever since the Plessy case, should be overturned overnight or some time allowed for the necessary adjustments which most nonpartisan observers perceive would be necessary.

"I firmly believe," DAVIS said, "that this Court has already made up its mind to permit this unconstitutional act and that it approached the problem in this piecemeal fashion in the hope that an outrage which would be vehemently denounced and resisted with righteous indignation if perpetrated suddenly, might be forced upon a protesting people if perpetrated by degree."

The people of Georgia, Mr. DAVIS told the South Carolina newspapermen, would never submit to such a ruling and he hoped, he said, that the other States "will join with Georgia officials against the usurpation of the rights of the State and of the people which are ours under the Constitution."

Representative DAVIS overlooks the fact that the Constitution is what the Supreme Court says it is, an old and established legal doctrine in the United States dating back at least to the opinions of Chief Justice John Marshall. Georgia once defied the Supreme Court, it is true, in the days when Andrew Jackson was President of the United States. But the Court today has the means to enforce its decrees—even against State officials.

Representative DAVIS adopts a defeatist attitude, which the South as a whole should not fall into. The South had the advantage in the first argument of the case. Both logic and law were on its side, a fact that the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People recognizes in its proposal to spend $35,000 in research in an attempt to find answers to the arguments that John W. Davis presented on behalf of South Carolina. The South should stick to logic and not succumb to hysteria. It has a good case.

Case No. 9

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 13, 1954

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, here is still another case of extreme hardship caused by the inelastic provisions of the McCarran-Walter Act.

Anneliese Else Hermine Neumann, a German girl, who, according to the language of the official report rendered by the Department of State, stole two bags of coal while she was employed in a railway coalyard in Berlin, Germany, during the month of January 1947.

In 1951 Miss Neumann married Sergeant Ware, and applied for an immigrant visa to the United States. Under section 212 (a) (9) of the McCarran-Walter Act, she was refused a visa because she had committed a "crime involving moral turpitude."

Sergeant Ware pleaded in behalf of his wife, stressing the fact that in 1947 her father was still a British prisoner of war, and her mother was incapacitated because of wounds she suffered in both legs during the bombing of Berlin. There were at that time six younger children in the Neumann family, and the only reason Anneliese stole the coal was to keep the family warm.

There was no relief possible under the law, and Sergeant Ware had, therefore, to resort to the relief of a private bill.

It is absurd that so much distress should be meted out for so small a transgression. It should not be necessary to resort to the lengthy procedure of a private bill in such a case. Drastic amendment of the McCarran-Walter Act is certainly called for.

Prayer by Rev. O. H. Bertram

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT P. MORANO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1954

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, one of the most beautiful prayers I have ever read was delivered by Rev. O. H. Bertram, pastor of St. Paul's Lutheran Church, Naugatuck, Conn., on the occasion of a testimonal given in honor of my close friend and colleague JIM PATTERSON.

Reverend Bertram's reference to the Geneva Conference is most timely during these most crucial and trying days.

The above-mentioned prayer follows:

PRAYER FOR THE TESTIMONIAL DINNER GIVEN FOR THE HONORABLE JAMES T. PATTERSON, MAY 1, 1954

Our ever-present God, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit: We are gathered here this evening to bear testimony of the respect which we hold for our personal friend and Thy child, James Patterson. We are grateful for the upright actions, the wise counsel, the integrity with which Thou hast endowed this public servant who serves in our Government.

Continue to lead him in the paths of virtues which are pleasing unto Thee, and which will serve our Nation in a God-pleasing manner. Endow him with the Christian character to always place righteousness above politics, right above party. Grant him good health, a keen mind, pleasant relationships with his fellowmen.

And as we are gathered here in one accord to pay tribute to a national leader, our eyes are focused to the Geneva Conference, from which signs of peace or war clouds can emanate. Grant to our leaders sound judgment and the power of conviction. Change the hearts of those who seek selfish ambitions through bloodshed, that they may have respect for others and seek to do Thy will.

Teach us all to place our trust in Thee. Teach us all to walk with Thee. Teach us all to honor Thee. Through Jesus, our loving Saviour we ask it. Amen.

Penny Weisman: TV Critic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SIDNEY R. YATES

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 19, 1954

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, Larry Wolters is the TV columnist for the Chicago Daily Tribune. On April 28 his column was written by a guest critic—12-year-old Penny Weisman, of 1255 West Rosedale Avenue, Chicago, Ill. In introducing his guest critic, Mr. Wolters said:

Through the years, parents have had considerable to say about what their children watch on TV, and how they (the parents) feel about it. Teachers have had almost as much to say on the subject. Even preachers have put in a few words from time to time. But rarely have children had an opportunity to get their reactions into print. It's about time for a turnabout.

Mr. Speaker, I agree with Mr. Wolters that children should be given an opportunity to express their opinions about television shows, and Penny Weisman demonstrates conclusively that when given this opportunity they react intelligently and maturely.

Penny Weisman is a bright and shining Penny. Even at her tender years, she reveals the critical ability of a Dorothy Parker, who in reviewing the performance of a prominent American actress, said: "She certainly ran the gamut of emotions from A to B"; or of George Jean Nathan, who once said about a musical recital: "The blank trio played Brahms last night. Brahms lost."

Mr. Speaker, some years ago a cynic said the American entertainment industry keys its programs to the mentality of a 12-year-old. If this be true, the entertainment industry had better reexamine its offerings, for this is what 12-year-old Penny said about some of the programs now being televised:

Milton Berle: "I'm glad 'Uncle Milti' isn't my uncle."

Red Skelton: "He acts too silly."

Jackie Gleason: "Take him or leave him."

I Love Lucy: "It's a good show, but could be improved."

Robert Montgomery: "Very good drama."

Studio One: "Very good show. Commercial is too long."

This Is Your Life: "Ralph Edwards shouts too much. I don't think it is anybody's business about someone else's life."

Arthur Godfrey [morning]: "He is too foolish and should not have off-stage jokes. They are not funny to the TV audience."

Show of Shows: "Though this, in my opinion, is a good show, it should be cut to an hour."

I Married Joan: "A very foolish program. These things don't happen to a husband and wife in real life."

Make Room for Daddy: "I like this show. It is done without overacting."

On Your Way: "A dull show it seems to drag."

Dragnet: "It's not for children to know about people who have police records."

Kukla, Fran, and Ollie: "This is a very delightful program. These puppets are so real that when they are leaving you actually wave good-by."

Zoo Parade: "This is a very educational program for children as well as adults. You can learn things about animals that you probably wouldn't have known before."

You Are There: "This program is good for many reasons. It's educational, factual, and very well done. It makes you seem as though you are there."

Life With Father: "This program is new and different. The actors are very good. They do not overact as in most comedy shows."

Mr. Speaker, these are Penny's views. Mr. Wolters in his column stated that he did not agree with her in some cases. As for me, I think Penny has shown uncommon commonsense.

New York Democratic Delegation Denounce Under Secretary of the Army Slezak and Deputy Under Secretary Higgins for Their High-Handed Tactics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 13, 1954

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert herewith a news release issued on May 20 by the members of the New York Democratic delegation:

NEW YORK DEMOCRATIC DELEGATION DENOUNCE UNDER SECRETARY OF THE ARMY SLEZAK AND DEPUTY UNDER SECRETARY HIGGINS FOR THEIR HIGH-HANDED TACTICS

The New York City Democratic delegation visited Under Secretary of the Army, John Slezak, and Deputy Under Secretary Frank H. Higgins, at the Pentagon on Tuesday, May 18. The delegation voiced vigorous objection to the decision of the Department of the Army to remove the New York Quartermaster Purchasing Agency from its present headquarters at 111 East 16th Street, New City, to Philadelphia.

Despite the fact that appropriate arrangements had been made for 11 members of the delegation to meet with Under Secretary Slezak and his deputy, Mr. Higgins, the Under Secretary gave the delegation slight attention and saw fit to leave the conference room almost immediately after the meeting began. The members of the delegation deemed this action an affront and expressed their chagrin in no uncertain terms. Apparently Mr. Slezak is a novice in Government service and did not seem to understand the gravity of his discourtesy. Eleven Congressmen do not journey to the Pentagon for trifling reasons.

When the members hastily indicated the gravamen of the situation and pointed out that the transfer of the quartermaster facilities could result in the loss of jobs to hundreds of wage earners with great resultant distress to them and their families, Mr. Slezak answered abruptly: "We are not running a relief agency." Aside from his lack of tact, to say the least, Mr. Slezak was as curt as his remark was inhumane.

The rest of the meeting was conducted without Mr. Slezak and the members addressed themselves to Deputy Under Secretary Higgins, who was flanked on both sides by members of his military staff.

Mr. Higgins made the point that considerable savings would result from the removal of the Quartermaster Purchasing Agency, but the delegation was not impressed with the "paper savings" enumerated. The delegation emphasized that uprooting hundreds of employees and their families would be costly indeed, and indicated that there seemed to be evidence the move to Philadelphia was not unmixed with political motive to satisfy the political needs of a certain Republican Representative from the State of Pennsylvania. Mr. Higgins showed considerable political naivete in his denial of such political motive.

The members of the delegation brought out the fact that New York City has, within the last year, been forced to sustain the shock of the closing down or removal therefrom of a number of important agencies of the Government. The Voice of America has been transferred from the broadcasting center of the world in New York, to Washington. The naval clothing depot has been closed down and 1,400 workers left without jobs. The Brooklyn Navy Yard has reduced its corps of workers by doling out ship reconditioning and repair work to private shipowners. Much of the work done heretofore at the Brooklyn Navy Yard has been transferred to areas outside of New York City, with consequent loss of employment. Important wire-rope block contracts have also been diverted from the Brooklyn Navy Yard to plants outside of the city. We are informed that the New York office of the Signal Corps of the Army is about to be transferred from the city. All these transfers and changes are severe blows to the economy of the city of New York. The damage done and to be done is incalculable. The members of the New York City Democratic delegation cannot view these transfers with complacency. They have the right to complain. It is their duty to be highly critical of high-handed procedures.

The delegation realizes the need for economy, but the contention made by the Department of the Army that economy was the issue, was not successfully established. The cost of transportation of the facilities including personnel and household belongings; the cost of recruitment of new personnel in Philadelphia to replace the employees who will not or cannot make the move; the cost of the installation of the equipment transferred; the cost of remodeling the accommodations in Philadelphia; all will more than offset any economy effected.

But regardless of the merits or demerits of the economic basis for the move, there is still another issue involved. The delegation emphasized to Mr. Higgins and his staff that "we do not live by bread alone." We are dealing not only with "ships and shoes and sealing wax," but with human beings as well. In a time like the present, with mounting unemployment and expanding relief rolls, the displacement of New York for Philadelphia in this instance, becomes a highly serious matter. Those employees who cannot go to Philadelphia will not very easily find other employment, and among them are employees who have seen many years of Government service with high seniority.

If the removal of the Quartermaster Purchasing Corps were not an isolated case, and were not accompanied by other momentous labor transfers, the delegation would not have been so vigilant in lodging complaint with Mr. Higgins and his staff. Mr. Slezak, as noted above, was indifferent to the details of the complaint.

The Army officials indicated that the industries—that is the producing and manufacturing plants supplying the Quartermaster Corps—were as accessible to Philadelphia as to New York. The location of producing plants has little relation to the purchasing function. Purchasing is a matter of negotiation between the Quartermaster Purchasing Agent and the main office or sales office of the supplying company. These offices are the actual points of contact with the Quartermaster Purchasing Agency. They are heavily concentrated in the New York metropolitan area. Of all the contractors who supply commodities to the Quartermaster Purchasing Agency, 37 percent are located within 45 miles of New York City, while only 8 percent are located within 45 miles of Philadelphia. The added cost of doing business with the Quartermaster Purchasing Agency will undoubtedly be added to the selling price of the commodities. This addition will be consequential and militates against the argument of savings to the Government.

The Army authorities called the members of the delegation to a briefing on May 3, just before the decision on the removal was announced to the press, and gave the members such short notice that most of them were not able to attend. The staff members of some of the Congressmen attended. At the briefing the announncement of the decision was made as a fait accompli. No opportunity was given to enable the delegation to voice its opposiiton to the decision, despite the fact that a promise had been made to afford the delegation the opportunity to review the situation before a decision was reached.

The visit of the delegation to the Pentagon on May 18 was abortive from the start. Mr. Higgins was asked: "Is your decision irrevocable?" He answered: "It is."

The members of this delegation are just as much interested in savings and economy as are the two civilian Army Department officials mentioned. But considerations of economy must be tempered with decency and with regard to the human elements involved. Other communities must contribute to the savings as well as New York City. Savings can mean little when tens of thousands are forced onto relief rolls.

Neither Mr. Higgins nor Mr. Slezak have heard the last from the New York delegation.

CHARLES A. BUCKLEY, EMANUEL CELLER, JAMES J. DELANEY, ISIDORE DOLLINGER, JAMES G. DONOVAN, SIDNEY A. FINE, LOUIS B. HELLER, LESTER HOLTZMAN, EDNA F. KELLY, EUGENE J. KEOGH, ARTHUR G. KLEIN, ABRAHAM J. MULTER, ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, Jr., JOHN J. ROONEY, FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT, JR.

When Tax Cuts Are Immoral

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER NORBLAD

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1954

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith an editorial from the Oregon Journal of Portland, Oreg., of date of May 16, 1954:

WHEN TAX CUTS ARE IMMORAL

Bernard Baruch never so completely fulfills the role of elder statesman as when he speaks of "duty" and "obligations." He never seeks the easy way out of problems but only the honorable road.

He has just told the students of New York City College that it is "both uneconomic and immoral" to reduce taxes at this time.

Baruch added that a tax reduction "with an unbalanced budget and so swollen a national debt" places a "premium on efforts to escape bearing a fair share of the heavy cost of the cold war."

This adviser to Presidents knows that, when coming generations survey the size of the public debt they have inherited, they may be inclined to say some harsh things about their forebears and could even decide to repudiate it.

As we said, "duty" is a word that means much to Bernard Baruch.

Hoover Task Force

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1954

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, one of the hardest working task forces of the Hoover Commission is that group headed by Admiral Moreell, which is now making a study of the water problems of the entire United States.

It must be indeed disheartening to the group of distinguished men who give of their time and money in the service of their country, to have the Bureau of Reclamation of the Department of the Interior constantly attempting to enforce infeasible reclamation projects through Congress.

Raymond Moley, well known writer, points up many of the factors involved in these problems in the following article:

MOLEY ON HOOVER

(By Raymond Moley)

TASK FORCE IRKED, HOOVER SETS MARK DEBT COULD ENGULF

It was an angry and frustrated task force of the Hoover Commission that met recently in San Francisco and heard testimony on the vast problems of reclamation.

For this group, headed by Adm. Ben Moreell and consisting of distinguished engineers, lawyers, public officials, and former public officials, has undertaken a fundamental study of the entire problem of irrigation, flood control, public lands, and hydroelectric power.

Despite that, the Interior Department has proceeded to place before Congress a whole series of vast projects for authorization. No one can accurately estimate the ultimate cost of these if constructed, but a modest estimate would run into the tens of billions.

Hoover ill deserves administration treatment

One of these projects is the upper Colorado storage, power, and irrigation project which encompasses the entire basin of the Colorado River above the southern border of Utah. The construction cost alone would be approximately $1 billion, and the ultimate cost, counting subsidies and interest, would be many times that.

Another is the Fryingpan-Arkansas transmountain diversion project, with an estimated construction cost of $172 million. There are at least two other smaller projects also recommended and before Congress. This is a series of proposals that probably exceeds that of any year in past history.

The service of Herbert Hoover in giving his energies on the eve of 80 to this Commission ill deserves this treatment from the administration that summoned him to the task. For if any man has eternally associated his name with reclamation and conservation, it is he.

To begin with, he is an engineer with a luminous record. It was Hoover as Secretary of Commerce who in 1926 made a statement of policy about river development which is as sound today as it was then.

Will engulf taxpayers hopelessly in debt

It was President Hoover who meticulously looked after the building of the Hoover Dam and its related accessories. The planning of that great project and the financial conditions by which it was to be repaid stand today as the soundest public undertaking of its kind in our history.

But the proposals of the Interior Department referred to above, if authorized, would not only reverse past policies of repayment, but cut the very ground from under the efforts of the Hoover commission and its task force.

For the hearings both on the upper Colorado project and the Fryingpan-Arkansas scheme have shown not only vital miscalculations in engineering and finance, but the attempted establishment of reclamation policies and procedures which will hopelessly engulf future generations of taxpayers in debt.

Low Tariff on Woolens Crippling Mills in New England

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1954

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an article from the Boston Post, Boston, Mass., May 19, 1954.

The article is by James F. Leonard, and is the first of two articles on the tariff problems of the depressed wool textile industry. It tells some of the problems wool merchants and wool product manufacturers are experiencing under the present tariff structure.

The article follows:

A competitor much tougher than the southern mill operator has appeared on the scene to plague further the hard-pressed New England woolen mill owner.

This competitor has Government sanction—in fact Government solicitation in the form of reciprocal trade and Government aid in the form of a very low tariff—to compete for American textile business with a product manufactured by workers who make from a low of 14 cents to a high of 43 cents an hour in contrast to $1.56 paid to our mill workers.

Last year production of apparel fabrics containing 25 percent or more wool dipped to its lowest since the depression years of the early 1930's.

At the same time imports of woolen yard goods reached a new 30-year high. More than 30 million yards of imported woolen goods reached the American market from Great Britain, France, Italy, and Japan.

Even with duty paid, the imported woolen goods sell for less than a similar product manufactured in this country.

"The only way we can meet this competition," says Harry F. Blake, president of Blake & Co., Boston wool firm, "is for a speedy readjustment of the tariff rate."

Under the Reciprocal Trade Act there is a provision for raising the tariff rate on any class of fabric in which imports exceed 5 percent of the annual domestic production in the 3 preceding years.

It is called the peril point. When the point has been reached the tariff rate may be raised from 25 percent to 45 percent.

"There's just one hitch," says Edward Wilkinson, executive vice president of the National Association of Wool Manufacturers, "the machinery for this procedure is so cumbersome it might take a couple of years to get the measure through."

The Textile Workers Union of America, CIO, which has joined the manufacturers and the wool merchants in the fight for a readjusted tariff on wool imports, reports that 180 mills have been liquidated or closed down permanently and 70,000 jobs have been lost since 1946.

Meanwhile imports have risen from 4,169,000 yards in 1946 to 30 million yards in 1953.

"Irreparable damage is being done the industry because of the present low tariff," says Hugh Munro, of the firm of Munro, Kinkaid, Mottla, Inc., an old Boston wool firm. "But we can't seem to get the relief we need."

MOSTLY FROM BRITAIN

The majority of imported wool products come here from Great Britain, where the average textile workers' wage is 42 cents an hour. In 1952 Great Britain exported 79 percent of wool products to the United States.

Italy, where the worker gets 30 cents an hour, supplied 9 percent; France, where the wage is 43 cents an hour, supplied 3 percent.

Japan, where textile workers receive but 14 cents an hour, offers worsted yarn for about $4.10 a pound, duty paid, 85 cents to $1 cheaper than comparable American yarn.

How Tough Can He Be?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1954

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to direct the attention of our colleagues to the following article by Victor Riesel which appeared in the May 20, 1954, edition of the Washington Post and Times Herald:

HOW TOUGH CAN HE BE?

(By Victor Riesel)

Harry Bridges, friend of the Soviet Union, has just helped to finance lieutenants of "Tough Tony" Anastasia, friend of some of the underworld's toughest citizenry.

Tough Tony will forgive me if I appear to believe he needs further identification, while Harry doesn't. Tony, who has a whim and a fist of iron, is the brother of Albert Anastasia, ofttimes described as "the executioner" for the old Murder, Inc. This fraternal relationship did not slow down Tony's rise to power as the boss of the Brooklyn waterfront—or his becoming the prime target of the AFL's drive to clean up the Nation's docks.

Tony delivered many a vote for his old International Longshoremen's Association in the invalidated election sometime ago in which New York's terrorized dockwallopers were given a chance to choose the A. F. of L.'s new union or the old one thrown out of the federation on charges of being subsidiary of the underworld.

Now there's a new election scheduled for May 26—and it takes money to compete in these Labor Board popularity polls.

But my faith in the eventual rehabilitation of man is shaken. I find that in search of this money, two of Tough Tony's friends and lieutenants traveled across this land to San Francisco. There they made their public-speaking debut at a meeting of local 10 of Bridges' sovieteering International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union.

They said such nice things about Harry, these men did. Not the least of which was uttered by Anthony Impliazzo while his and Tough Tony's friend, Tommy DiBella, listened:

"If we had a leader in New York like you have here, we wouldn't now be in the situation we are."

That's what Impliazzo said in San Francisco on the night of Monday, May 11. The members of local 10 applauded this whimsy. So, with Harry's approval they voted Impliazzo and DiBella $1,500 to help defend members of the old New York Longshoremen's Union who were arrested during the recent strike.

I presume this meant the fund would also aid Harry Bowers, head of a unit colorfully referred to as the pistol local. Bowers and his friends have been fined $92,000 and face prison terms for defying Federal injunctions.

It seems downright unfair of Impliazzo not to think of Tough Tony Anastasia as a leader who could take the wilderness out of the waterfront.

After all, when Tony organized the Longshoremen's, Checkers' and Clerks' Social Club at 371 Court Street, Brooklyn, United States of America, he permitted Impliazzo to become a trustee. And Tony made available in that building a headquarters for the longshoremen's local 327–1 of the old ILA—head of which is Anthony Impliazzo, whose fellow traveler, Tommy DiBello, also holds office in that local.

I have little knowledge of what passes for the philosophies of Impliazzo and DiBello, but they must be aware of what they do when they speed across country as the avowed emissaries of a rank-and-file committee of members in 11 large eastern longshoremen locals and appeal to a section of the toughest pro-Communist international union of all for financial help.

When their union took some $300,000 from John Lewis, it took money from a labor leader who, growl though he does, still champions our own land. But to go to Harry Bridges is to appeal to the man who has consistently championed the Soviet line; who has been tied up with the Russians' global network of labor saboteurs, the World Federation of Trade Unions; who encouraged the brainwashing of our prisoners of war in North Korea; and who today is virtually the only labor official friendly to Ho Chi Minh, leader of the forces which took Dien Bien Phu.

Nor is this the only instance of old line longshoremen leaders taking money from pro-Communists. In Washington recently there was a meeting between such old-line longshoremen and an intermediary of Bridges. The middle man had $10,000 to offer—on condition that leaflets and other literature attacking the A. F. of L. be written, printed and distributed under Bridges' direction. The offer was accepted.

Tony is tough. But is he so tough and so cynical that he will permit his two lieutenants to use money collected from such sources? And won't Tony fight the use of the $10,000 by others on the waterfront? If he doesn't, he's being tougher on his adopted country than it's been on him.

Women Oppose Intemperance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 15, 1954

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, as always the women, the wives, and the mothers especially, are in the forefront, in the effort to prevent the evils growing out of the use of alcoholic beverages.

From the people of my hometown comes the following petition:

> Inasmuch as our Nation faces a world of dangers in which it becomes imperatively necessary to conserve our youth and to achieve a high degree of fitness, we, the members of the Woman's Christian Temperative Union and Friends of the Churches of Michigan, earnestly beseech you to support the Bryson bill, H. R. 1227, and the Langer bill, S. 3294, to prohibit in interstate commerce the transportation of alcoholic-beverages advertising in newspapers, periodicals, etc., and its broadcasting over the radio and television.
>
> Mrs. John Rankins, Mr. John Rankins, Carl McGeath, Stuart Werner, E. H. Miller, Mr. and Mrs. Tona Dannenberg, Mrs. Forrest Wedge, Wm. R. A. King, Violet A. Werner, Henriette Wilcox, Burke B. Hazelrigg, Emma Wynne, Rev. E. M. Yerden, Blain Michael, Jenny Brink, Gladys E. Hazelrigg, Lillian E. Wilcox, Rev. Ivan Yerden, Joann L. Wilcox, Earl Wilcox, Rena Farnum, Allegan, Mich.

Mr. Speaker, it may be assumed that other Members are receiving similar pleas.

Report From the Select Committee on Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. HILL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1954

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to include in the RECORD a news release I am issuing today on a report from the Select Committee on Small Business:

> WASHINGTON, May 20.—The Small Business Administration, created by Congress last June 30, is not as yet achieving its potential effectiveness and is not fully carrying out the intent of Congress. This is one of the conclusions drawn by the Select Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives in its progress report of the 1st session of the 83d Congress.
>
> The report (H. Rept. 1610), issued today by Chairman WILLIAM S. HILL, Republican, of Colorado, states that there is considerable dissatisfaction and resentment in Congress and throughout the country concerning the loan program of the agency, particularly over the prolonged period of time between filing of applications for financing assistance and disbursal or rejection of loans. "Of all the programs of the Small Business Administration," the report states, "the most important one at this time is that of making long-term credit available to the small-business community. * * * It is recommended that procedures be given a careful and immediate examination in order to determine what can be done to speed up this vital process of the agency's work."
>
> Six general problem areas of small business are discussed in the report: (1) Legislative background and operation of the Small Business Administration; (2) effect of taxation on small business; (3) adequacy of credit available to small firms; (4) Government procurement; (5) the antitrust and fair trade laws; and (6) other general problems.
>
> "It is understood that most of the problems of small business are those which affect all business," Chairman HILL said in announcing the report. "These business difficulties, however, become increasingly magnified in inverse ratio to the size of the business. It is apparent, therefore, that the need for special consideration more often appears among the smaller institutions of industry and commerce. The small manufacturer, wholesaler, or retailer, individually or in groups, is not always equipped to defend his interests successfully."
>
> With regard to the effect of taxation on small business, the report states that a heavy tax burden has, as much as any other factor, deterred the desirable strengthening of the small-business segment of the economy.
>
> "Only through an equalization of the tax burden on concerns of varying size can small business maintain and improve its competitive position in our economy. An equitable tax system must of necessity give recognition to the needs of small business for reinvested capital and to their ability to attract outside financing." The report discusses relief already given through the expiration of the excess-profits tax and reduction in personal income tax.
>
> The outlook for small business, according to the committee, can best be judged in relation to that of its larger competitors. "It can be pointed out that cutbacks in defense spending will undoubtedly affect small firms more than large. This will be due to many things, including a narrowing of the productive base, less emphasis on the procurement of items on which small firms normally compete successfully, and a tendency by prime contractors to commence producing what formerly had been subcontracted when Government purchasing was at a higher level. * * * Many large firms are able to use the advantage acquired through producing for defense to enter into and take over civilian markets normally handled by small firms."
>
> Accordinng to the report, the greatest need for credit by small business is in the field of long-term loans with terms of from 5 to 10 or more years. Inability to utilize retained earnings or to attract capital through the securities market has caused small firms to rely on direct borrowing for the purchase of plant and equipment and long-term working capital purposes. "The committee has found in its studies and hearings that the financing channels normally used by large concerns to attract long-term capital are not available to the vast majority of small-business enterprises," the report continues.
>
> The report discusses the effect of recent court decisions on the McGuire Act, which was to establish the validity of the application of nonsigner clauses to sales in interstate commerce. "The nonsigner provision is the heart of State fair-trade regulations," the report continues. "Without it a manufacturer's efforts to establish and enforce a resale-price system for his products would be largely ineffective."
>
> The section of the report on Government procurement deals largely with defense procurement, which is a problem area for small firms in this time of readjustment after the Korean emergency because "as the small-business share of prime defense contracts has decreased, the concentration of purchases with large corporations has continued to increase."
>
> In its report the committee recommends the transfer of small-business specialists from the Department of Defense to the Small Business Administration. The report states that it was clearly the intent of Congress in debate on the SBA bill that the new agency should centralize all small-business programs of the Government including those of procurement assistance.
>
> The report further recommends a return to the greater use of formal advertising of bids rather than negotiation procedures as basic to the more equitable distribution of defense contracts to smaller firms.
>
> The most persistent small-business problem in the area of Government procurement referred to the committee during the past year has involved contract specifications of the Armed Forces which, according to the report, have often been hurriedly written in such a restrictive fashion that only an extremely limited number of bidders could participate.

New York Quartermaster Purchasing Agency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1954

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to direct the attention of our colleagues to the following telegram which I have received from my constituents:

> Hon. ABRAHAM J. MULTER,
> *House of Representatives,*
> *Washington, D. C.:*
>
> In behalf of employees of New York Quartermaster Purchasing Agency we wish to offer sincere thanks for your efforts to prevent relocation to Philadelphia. The fact that transfer was motivated for political reasons and not economy becomes more evident because of tactics being exerted by Department of Army to hasten move. As loyal Americans and classified career employees we were given an alternative to either accompany the agency, terminate our leases, or sell our homes, receiving less than 30 days' notice, or else resign. As citizens and taxpayers, we deplore the inefficiency and added expense that will result after transfer is consummated. We therefore respectfully solicit your assistance in preventing this economically wasteful, unsound move.

For obvious reasons I have deleted their names.

Results of Questionnaire Mailed to 21st District of Texas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1954

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the results of a poll I recently took concerning the views of my constituents on 12 current issues.

This is the third questionnaire I have submitted to the people, and in each instance the responses have been most gratifying. This bespeaks an active, aroused public interest in governmental affairs and it provides a fairly accurate barometer of public opinion on the various issues.

The results of my 1954 poll follow:

	Yes	No	No opinion
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*
1. Do you favor a constitutional amendment making certain that treaties shall have no force and effect if they deny or abridge any right enumerated in the United States Constitution?	71	13	16
2. Do you favor continuation of the foreign aid program:			
A. Economic assistance?	51	34	15
B. Military assistance?	51	30	19
C. Technical assistance (point 4 program)	68	14	18
3. Do you agree with the warning that any further Communist aggression in Korea (or any comparable situation) will be met with full mass retaliation (perhaps including the employment of atomic weapons)?	68	17	15
4. Do you favor financial and military aid by the United States in the prosecution of the war against communism in Indochina?	64	24	12
5. Should Communist China be seated in the United Nations?	5	90	5
6. Do you favor outlawing the Communist Party?	81	14	5
7. Do you favor flexible (75 to 90 percent of parity) price supports as against present fixed 90 percent of parity support prices?	63	23	14
8. Do you favor the proposed Government reinsurance program to permit broader health-insurance protection through private and nonprofit insurance companies?	44	34	22
9. Do you favor an increase in the social-security tax and a broadening of the coverage	43	44	13
10. A. Do you feel that 18-year-old persons should be permitted to vote?	48	45	7
B. Do you think this is a proper subject for the States rather than the Federal Government to pass on?	49	41	10
11. Do you think the methods used by Senator McCarthy in conducting investigations should be changed?	58	30	12
12. Do you think that, in general, President Eisenhower is doing a good job?	83	9	8

Mr. Speaker, in the nature of things it is difficult to phrase any question to permit a categorical answer of "yes" or "no." Many of the answers are, therefore, qualified, and some have explanatory comments. But the answers as given provide, it is believed, the general attitude of the people in respect to the basic issues involved.

In response to various comments and inquiries from those who answered the poll, a brief discussion will be made of some of the questions.

BRICKER AMENDMENT

Question 1 deals with the so-called Bricker amendment, the gist of which states that no treaty or Executive order shall be superior to the Constitution of the United States, and no treaty or executive agreement shall take effect as internal law without the consent of Congress. While the exact wording of that proposal may be excessive and perhaps subject to some proper objection, the objective is clear—namely, to remove any question about the supremacy of the Constitution in instances where any conflicts occur with a treaty and where provisions in a treaty deny or abridge any rights enumerated in the Constitution.

The interest in an amendment to clarify the Constitution stems from paragraph 2 of article VI of the Constitution which states, in part:

> All treaties * * * shall be the supreme law of the land * * * anything in the Constitution to the contrary notwithstanding.

A number of decisions by the Supreme Court have added to the confusion with respect to if, when, and under what conditions a treaty may take precedence over constitutional rights. It is well to remember, however, that article II of the Constitution requires all treaties to be ratified by two-thirds of the Senators who are present when the matter of ratification occurs.

FOREIGN AID

It is proper to point out that a considerable number of the affirmative answers to the questions pertaining to military and economic assistance were given on certain conditions. Many expressed willingness to continue a measure of mutual aid provided the recipient countries were deserving and were fully cooperative with us and our purposes, and provided such countries do not engage in trade with Iron Curtain countries.

It will be recalled that last year the Congress appropriated more than $5 billion for foreign aid, of which 70 percent was for military assistance. Economic aid accounted for nearly $2 billion of the total.

I was one of those who voted against the economic aid during the past 2 years because I was convinced the allocations were not properly restricted. It seems to me such gifts should be limited to deserving countries that try to help themselves, and then—except perhaps for some technical assistance—where there is a direct relationship between the gift and our own national security and self-interest. I supported the Marshall plan, but it was supposed to end in 1952. In view of our burdensome taxes, our unbalanced budget, and our own economic problems here at home, it seems to me we should further reduce foreign aid and make sure that where it is spent it is appreciated and adds something to our own national security.

BATTLE ACT

It will be recalled that in 1951 the Congress passed a bill, authored by Representative BATTLE, of Alabama, which prohibited aid to countries that trade in arms, ammunition, and implements of war, atomic-energy materials, petroleum, transportation materials of strategic value, and items of primary strategic significance used in the production of arms, ammunition, and implements of war with Russia or any of her satellites. That act called for no military, economic, or financial assistance to any nation unless it applies an embargo on such shipments to any nation or combination of nations threatening the security of the United States, including Russia and all countries under its domination.

Under the Battle Act 300 items of strategic value to the Soviet-dominated area are now subject to embargo by the leading industrial and trading countries of the free world. While official reports are that this embargo has been fairly effective, reports persist of some trade continuing in violation of the wording and intention of the law. It is the duty of the Mutual Security Administration to administer the law and see to it that no aid goes to any country which violates the act of Congress.

SOCIAL SECURITY

Many comments relate to social security. Many specific instances of inequities and injustices in the application of the law are described. Clearly, corrections in these weaknesses and contradictions in the law should be made. I was not in Congress when the social-security program began, but I have watched its operation and have observed many inequities. A committee is presently studying a revision of the program. It is hoped some needed improvements will result.

Among other needed changes, it seems to me the present $75 ceiling on earnings by a recipient of social-security benefits should be removed or raised substantially. Another complaint pertains to the inability of a person 60 years of age to draw on social-security benefits even though such person becomes totally disabled. And there are many other valid complaints. Since social security is described as a form of insurance, it would seem that the benefits should in general be proportionate to the amount of contributions that are made by a participant.

CONGRESSIONAL INVESTIGATIONS

Public interest in congressional investigations, particularly as they pertain to subversives, is manifest by the answers to question 11, and many comments on that subject. Some feel that the FBI should have exclusive jurisdiction in this field. Others feel that congressional hearings, properly conducted, can implement the work of the FBI. Congressional committees have subpena powers, whereas the FBI, being an executive agency, does not have.

All such congressional investigations must be done by designated committees of the House and of the Senate. In the case of the House, the Un-American Activities Committee has been functioning for 16 years. Through its work, Alger Hiss, William Pennington, and scores of others have been exposed, and the work continues. That committee has been instrumental in prosecutions of more than a hundred traitors and subversives.

There is a need for granting the FBI more authority in collecting and making use of evidence. And there is need for increasing the punishment for peacetime espionage. Bills have been passed and others are pending which are designed to accomplish these laudable purposes—including a proposal, sponsored by the Attorney General, to help prevent the abuse of the fifth amendment by witnesses who are accused of subversive activities.

WATER CONSERVATION

Many comments pertain to water conservation and flood-prevention practices. In an area that has been plagued by a disastrous drought, the value of water is more appreciated than ever before. Already through local cooperation the Soil Conservation Service has undertaken a series of upstream flood prevention projects in the area, and a number of others are under study.

A bill recently passed by the House encourages these practices, and implements existing authority. The measure recognizes the fact that the soil is the most marvelous reservoir ever devised; that the earth itself will hold more water than all the structures that man can ever build upon it. Indeed, the basic purpose of the bill is to hold a larger part of the water where it falls, either in the earth or in small structures which will help to prevent accumulated runoff.

The plan is democratic and under local control. All projects must be initiated on a local level. Local people, to participate in it, must furnish all necessary easements and rights-of-way; assume such proportionate share of the cost of installing works of improvements as the Secretary of Agriculture determines to be equitable in consideration of anticipated benefits; and make satisfactory arrangements for defraying all costs of operation and maintenance.

The effective control and use of water and the conservation of our irreplaceable topsoil are of the highest importance to our economy and to our future.

The Bricker Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 20, 1954

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I was extremely interested to read in the April 1954 issue of the Texas Bar Journal a most stimulating presentation of the issues in connection with the treatymaking controversy.

An article was written by Mr. Fagan Dickson, vice chairman of the State bar committee on American citizenship. Regardless of whether readers may agree with it in its entirety, most readers will find Mr. Dickson's article a fine contribution to the continuing review of this important subject.

I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE BRICKER AMENDMENT

(By Fagan Dickson)

Proponents of the Bricker amendment have the burden of proof. Their burden is doubly heavy because the change advocated is in a basic provision of our fundamental law—the treaty power of the Constitution. Every constitutional amendment in the past has been adopted to meet a situation which has actually happened and not something which is vaguely apprehended. The backers of the Bricker amendment do not point to a single American treaty that was ever ratified, and say, "This treaty is so bad that it shows the urgent need for changing the Constitution." They give fears, not facts. As Secretary of State Dulles has pointed out, "We have a system which has survived for over 160 years without there being a single instance of treaty abuses such as are feared." (39 American Bar Association Journal 1065, December 1953.)

The proponents of the Bricker amendment base their case for change in the Constitution on their claimed discovery of a loophole. In introducing his bill, Senator BRICKER said:

"The joint resolution just introduced is designed to plug a growing loophole in the Constitution. * * * The menacing loophole we see in the Constitution today was simply not visible in 1787. * * * The Founding Fathers did not dream that the relationship of the American people to their Government could be altered by treaty. (98 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 921–922, Feb. 7, 1952.)

The complete answer to this remarkable discovery is, that if by chance an un-American treaty should slip through the so-called loophole, all that Congress has to do to protect the American people is to pass a law repealing it. Congress itself has said that—

"A treaty is regarded as equivalent to an act of Congress if it operates of itself without the aid of any legislative provision. Where a treaty and an act of Congress are in conflict the latest in date must prevail. A treaty may supersede a prior act of Congress, and an act of Congress may supersede a prior treaty." (P. 43, the Story of the Constitution, United States Constitution Sesquicentennial Commission, 1937.)

The Supreme Court agrees with this construction (*Chae Chan Ping* v. *U. S.* (1889) 130 U. S. 581, 32 Law Ed. 1068).

Let's look at this loophole. The United States Constitution provides:

"He (the President) shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur" (sec. 2, art. II); and "this Constitution and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof; and all treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land" (art. VI); and "no State shall enter into any treaty" (sec. 10, art. I).

It is claimed that article VI of the Constitution, above quoted, makes treaties superior to the Constitution itself, and that this is the loophole which the Founding Fathers overlooked. I dispute this. I could quote higher authority, but considering the source, none more convincing than the Lynn Landrum column from the editorial page of the Dallas Morning News of January 25, 1954. Mr. Landrum there correctly said:

"The Constitutional Convention didn't doubt in the least that treaties would override the laws of the individual States. It quite obviously so intended, and its reason for doing so was its experience under the Articles of Confederation, which gave but little power to the Central Government.

"Thomas Jefferson tells us, 'it was at all times perfectly understood that treaties controlled the law of the States,' and filed a brief to the effect that when a treaty was adopted, it invalidated any State law to the contrary, so that State legislatures need not even repeal such laws—the treaty automatically repealed them."

The case of *Missouri* v. *Holland* ((1920) 252 U. S. 416), is frequently cited as proof of the loophole, because it is stated that this case holds that a treaty was superior to and took precedence over the Constitution. This interpretation of the case is incorrect. * * *

* * * Mr. Justice Holmes, who wrote the opinion, pointedly stated that "We do not mean to imply that there are no qualifications to the treatymaking power. The treaty in question does not contravene any prohibitory words to be found in the Constitution" (252 U. S. at p. 433). The Constitution (art. VI) says that not only treaties but "this Constitution and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof" shall be the supreme law of the land.

Missouri v. *Holland* did not announce a new doctrine and the holding is not an encroachment on States rights under our constitutional system. In 1796, soon after the Constitution was adopted, the Supreme Court held, in *Ware* v. *Hylton* (3 Dall 199, 1 Law Ed. 568), that a State confiscation law was nullified by a treaty with Great Britain.

1806 HOLDING

In 1806 the Supreme Court held, in *Hopkirk* v. *Bell* (3 C. R. 454, 2 Law Ed. 497), that a State statute of limitations was superseded by a treaty. In 1817 the Court held in *Chirac* v. *Chirac* (2 Wheat. 259, 4 Law Ed. 234), that a State law as to capacity to hold realty was superseded by a treaty. In 1880 the Court held, in *Haunstein* v. *Lynham* (100 U. S. 483, 25 Law Ed. 628), that a treaty superseded a Virginia law on the right to inherit land. In the recent case of *Asakura* v. *City of Seattle* ((1924) 264 U. S. 332, 44 Sup. Ct. 515), the Court, in a unanimous opinion, held that a treaty with Japan superseded an ordinance of the city of Seattle prohibiting Japanese aliens from engaging in the business of pawnbroker. The Court said:

"The treatymaking power of the United States is not limited by any express provision of the Constitution, and, though it does not extend 'so far as to authorize what the Constitution forbids,' it does extend to all proper subjects of negotiation between our Government and other nations.

"Treaties for the protection of citizens of one country residing in the territory of another are numerous, and make for good understanding between nations.

"The rule of equality established by it cannot be rendered nugatory in any part of the United States by municipal ordinances or State laws. It stands on the same footing of supremacy as do the provisions of the Constitution and the laws of the United States. It operates of itself without the aid of any legislation, State or national; and it will be applied and given authoritative effect by the courts."

Space does not permit a discussion of *United States* v. *Curtiss-Wright* ((1936) 299 U. S. 304); *United States* v. *Belmont* ((1937) 301 U. S. 324); and *United States* v. *Pink* ((1942) 315 U. S. 203). None of these cases hold that "treaty laws can override the Constitution" or that "they can cut across rights given the people by the Constitutional Bill of Rights." The classic statement of the Supreme Court's position in this regard is that of Mr. Justice Field in *Geofroy* v. *Riggs* ((1890) 133 U. S. 258, 267):

"It would not be contended that it (the treaty power) exists so far as to authorize what the Constitution forbids, or a change in the character of the Government or in that of one of the States, or a cession of any portion of the territory of the latter, without its consent."

It should be noted that the 10th amendment provides that "the powers not delegated to the United States, nor prohibited to the States, are reserved to the States * * *." The treaty power is both delegated to the United States and prohibited to the States. Therefore, States' rights are the rights that are left after the treaty power has been exercised. There could be no conflict, if the particular treaty is within the scope of the power delegated. There never has been a loophole.

The overwhelming opinion among legal scholars is that the Bricker amendment is bad. Eighty-four deans and professors of constitutional law of the leading law schools of the country have concurred in writing a formal statement that the Bricker amendment is unnecessary and dangerous and that it "is an attack upon the Union itself."

Prof. Joseph O'Meara, Jr., dean of the School of Law of Notre Dame University, says:

"Those who are working so hard for the adoption of the Bricker amendment, for the most part at any rate, are people who want to secede from the world."

President Eisenhower has said:

"I am unalterably opposed to the Bricker amendment. * * * It would so restrict the conduct of foreign affairs that our country could not negotiate the agreements necessary for the handling of our business with the rest of the world. Such an amendment would make it impossible for us to deal effectively with friendly nations for our mutual defense and common interests.

"The matters are fundamental. We cannot hope to achieve and maintain peace if we shackle the Federal Government so that it is no longer sovereign in foreign affairs. The President must not be deprived of his historic position as the spokesman for the Nation in its relations with other countries.

"It would impair our hopes and plans for peace and for the successful achievement of the important international matters now under discussion. This would include the diversion of atomic energy from warlike to peaceful purposes."

The proponents of the Bricker amendment have built their case on half-truths, misinformation, and by exploiting fear. The two chief noncongressional advocates of the Bricker amendment, Hon. Frank E. Holman, past president of the American Bar Association, and Dr. Clarence E. Manion, former dean of the School of Law of Notre Dame University, say that the dissenting opinion in the steel seizure case (*Youngstown Sheet and Tube Company* v. *Sawyer* ((1952), 343 U. S. 579)) upholds the right of the President to seize industry on the basis of the United Nations Charter and the North Atlantic Treaty.[1]

ERRONEOUS CONCLUSION

This erroneous conclusion has been repeated and repeated but it is nevertheless absolutely untrue. Attorney General Brownell has correctly stated that the dissenting opinion in the steel-seizure case "rests on the view that the President's alleged power to seize the steel mills arose from his duty to execute the legislative programs of the Congress and not from any implication that any treaty gave the President power to seize private property" (hearings, p. 927). If anyone doubts this, the 43-page dissenting opinion is available (343 U. S. 667 to 710).

Others place reliance on holdings that have been overruled to support their loophole view. *Fujii* v. *California* (217 Pac. 2d 481 and 218 Pac. 2d 592 (Cal. App. 1950)) generally cited as holding that the United Nations charter invalidated California's alien property laws, has been overruled by the Supreme Court of California (28 Cal. 2d 718, 242 P. 2d 617 (1952)).

* * * * *

Supporters of the Bricker amendment never mention these facts but move on to a discussion of the horrible things that might happen to the country if certain conventions which are being hatched by agencies of the United Nations should become effective in this country as treaties. This effort to create hysteria is not a valid argument against our true and tried constitutional system which has served us so well for over 160 years. The answer is that if any of these conventions should ever be signed by the President and submitted to the Senate for approval, we shall expect these same Senators, who are now so doubtful of their own judgment, to accept the good treaties and repudiate the bad ones. One might surmise from the evident lack of faith exhibited in themselves and in each other, that a change of Senators is needed rather than a change in the Constitution.

The Bricker amendment is dead as far as the 83d Congress is concerned but Senator ALTON A. LENNON, of North Carolina, who was not present when the vote was taken on the George amendment, has moved to reconsider it. The George amendment should not be adopted because:

1. It is wholly unnecessary. Section 1, which invalidates a treaty which conflicts with the Constitution, is declaratory of existing law.

2. It would not repeal the holding in *Missouri* v. *Holland* and treaties would continue to override State laws and State constitutions as they have always done. The Brickerites would not be satisfied.

3. Section 2 of the George amendment which deals only with international agreements other than treaties will hamper the President in the conduct of foreign affairs. An executive agreement differs from a treaty in that it usually embodies adjustments of detail carrying out well-established national policies and traditions and those involving arrangements of a more or less temporary nature. Also, an executive agreement cannot overrule a prior statute of the United States. *United States* v. *Guy W. Capps, Inc.*, (204 F. 2d 655 (1953)). Furthermore, President Eisenhower is opposed to it.

4. The third section of the George amendment requires a rollcall vote. This requirement as well as section 2 can be taken care of by changes in Senate rules, without the necessity of a constitutional amendment.

See, Amending the Treaty Power, address by Arthur H. Dean, March 5, 1954, before the southern regional meeting of the American Bar Association. Copies obtainable from Committee for Defense of the Constitution by Preserving the Treaty Power, 527 Lexington Avenue, New York 17, N. Y.

Guam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 26, 1954

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, last week Washington was visited by the speaker of the Legislature of Guam, the Honorable A. B. Won Pat.

This legislative body is but 4 years old, having convened for the first time in 1950.

The island of Guam is a tiny bulwark of democracy in the Pacific, 6,000 miles from our shores. We here in America are proud of this island and its people and we know that with the guidance of able legislators, such as Speaker Won Pat, constructive laws will be passed which will build this democracy even stronger.

I am happy to join with the other Members of Congress in a well-deserved welcome to the presiding officer of our newest legislative body.

Flammable Fabrics Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON CANFIELD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1954

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, following up the protests of CIO unions against the enactment of S. 3379, which would weaken the standards set up in the Flammable Fabrics Act of 1953 in favor of Japanese and European imports, I present today two more communications, one from an A. F. of L. union, the other from a CIO union, expressing their opposition to House approval. These communications follow:

INTERNATIONAL LADIES'
GARMENT WORKERS' UNION,
New York, N. Y., May 18, 1954.

Hon. GORDON CANFIELD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: On behalf of the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union and its 430,000 members employed in the women's garment industry, including those engaged in the production of scarves, I urge you to oppose the passage of S. 3379, or any companion bill presented to the House. This amendment would materially weaken the Flammable Fabrics Act. Under the proposed amendment, which has already been passed by the Senate, although introduced only on April 29, 1954, scarves and other apparel items made of flammable fabrics would be exempt, with the ensuing perpetration of danger to consumers. The objective standards now embodied in the law and which correspond to the commercial standards 191–53 were previously worked out by joint efforts of industrial, scientific, and technical groups and were repeatedly endorsed by industry representatives at the hearings leading to the passage of the Flammable Fabrics Act.

The proposed bill will substitute for objective tests of this standard subjective testing which would fail to determine the flammable property of the fabrics under all conditions. There are cases on record which show that dangerous burns did occur to persons in case of inflammation of the fabrics and materials for which S. 3379 proposes to relax the existing flammability standards. The proposed exemption of plain surface scarves from coverage as to flammability ignores the indisputable fact that scarves as an article of apparel are usually worn around the head or neck, tied on with a knot which is not easily removable; once inflamed, the danger of hair catching on fire is very great. Scarves cannot readily be discarded under such circumstances, contrary to the claims of advocates of the proposed amendment.

Congress was aware of this when the present Flammable Fabrics Act was adopted; the record of the 1953 hearings before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House of Representatives attests to that. It is incomprehensible that the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee in approving the amendment should have disregarded this. I trust that the House committee will give greater weight to this legislative history.

I strongly urge you to safeguard the standards of protection for the consumer now in the act and to oppose enactment of S. 3379.

Very truly yours,

F. F. UMHEY,
Executive Secretary.

---

[1] See statement at p. 27 of Holman's pamphlet entitled "The Erroneous Arguments of the Opponents of a Constitutional Amendment on Treaties and Effective Agreements." Also, speech of Dean Manion at Lufkin, Tex., as reported in the Dallas Morning News of January 21, 1954. See, also, "The Need for a Treaty Amendment," by Eberhard P. Deutsch, 38 American Bar Association Journal, 737, September 1952.

PATERSON, N. J., *May 20, 1954.*

Congressman GORDON CANFIELD:

Urge you to vote against Purtell bill. Its passage positively a detriment to the United States textile industry.

CHARLES LAZZIO,
President, Dyers Local 1733.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to repeat that some of the most tragic burnings resulting in the death and maiming of American people, both old and young, particularly the latter, have been caused by flammable cloth imported from abroad, particularly Japan, and it is inconceivable to me that the House would agree to tampering with the standards set up in the Flammable Fabrics Act which were developed by the United States Bureau of Standards in conjunction with American industry over a period of several years' study and testing.

The Bryson Bill, H. R. 1227

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 5, 1954

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I ask to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a petition favoring the passage of the Bryson bill, H. R. 1227. The signers of the petition are residents of my district and have requested that their approval of this bill be made known to the Congress of the United States. Therefore, I insert in the RECORD the petition together with the names of the signers, as follows:

To Our Senators and Representatives in Congress:

The American Medical Association having seen for years the sad effects of the use of beer, wine, and distilled beverages have banned all alcoholic-beverage advertising from the Journal of the American Medical Association, effective January 1, 1954, in the face of heavy loss in income from such advertising.

We beg our national body of legislators to serve the citizens of our country in like manner and free our homes and our children of the influence of alcoholic-beverage advertising. Our television sets are being rendered worse than useless and our children are being led to believe that alcohol is harmless and to glorify crime by such advertising.

In the interest of this we respectfully request you to use your influence to support the Bryson bill, H. R. 1227, and vote for it. Public hearing to be held at Washington, May 19–21.

Springfield, Mass.: George S. Stone, Doris N. Stone, Mrs. Ethel Barrett, Melvin G. Barrett, Mrs. Edna Farnham, Byron P. Hayden, James B. Mears, Rhoda L. Kempkes, Florence B. Lyman, Allan M. Robinson, John B. Lewis, Mrs. Bette Barentine, Hope E. Katsamanis, Ruth F. Marsh, Helen C. Bryce, Margaret Robinson, Nettie M. Sanders, Mabel A. Hayden, Ruth A. Lock, John W. Martin, John W. Hayden, William G. Bryce, Percy V. Lock.

West Springfield, Mass.: Mrs. Ann Brassard.

East Longmeadow, Mass.: Mrs. Mary L. Moore, Ralph A. Moore.

South Hadley, Mass.: Mr. and Mrs. Roy Stiles, Edna Tetreault, Mrs. William Leonard, Marion S. Ward, Ora B. Thornton, Barbara J. White, Bertha S. Baker, Helen L. Goodwin, Mr. and Mrs. A. John Miller, Grace Whitcomb, Ruth S. Julow, J. L. Lancaster, Ruth V. Washburn, Leonard B. Warner, Albert Dzuris, Bessie C. Brainerd, Robert Burnett, Lottie I. Judd, M. W. Lippman, Ruth M. Ford, Blanche E. Hanson.

South Hadley Falls, Mass.: Elsie Davey, Herman Davey, Cora H. Titus, Samuel A. Watson, Marion J. Reed, Lillian W. Brown, K. G. Atwater, Florence M. Frye, Carrie E. Frey, Dorcas Smith, J. Eleanor Johnson, Harold D. Smock, Jessie H. Reynolds, Mary Brooks, Nancy Brooks, Fred T. Moos, Mrs. Fred T. Moos, Hubert O. Ranger, Patricia B. Ranger, Ethel M. Childs, Robert S. Childs, Florence J. Smock, Rosa Lee Motyka, Anthony Motyka.

Fairview, Mass.: Marion E. Winters.

The Passing of a Cliché?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI

OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 20, 1954

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, one wonders whether the recent Supreme Court decision reaffirming the right of all citizens to an equal opportunity for an enlightened education at public expense, spells the passing of the cliché, "race, color, and creed."

In place of the cliché, "race, color, and creed," perhaps now will grow the concept of "due regard for talent, temperament, and training." These three qualities, as much as any, bring people together, do they not?

Mr. Speaker, recently I addressed a mixed audience in Jersey City. Afterwards a colored lady said, "Thank you for talking like everyone in the room was people."

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Frank Brodie is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. The money derived from such sales shall be paid into the Treasury and accounted for in his annual report to Congress, and no sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Printing and binding for Congress, when recommended to be done by the Committee on Printing of either House, shall be so recommended in a report containing an approximate estimate of the cost thereof, together with a statement from the Public Printer of estimated approximate cost of work previously ordered by Congress within the fiscal year (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 145, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on Printing, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

DISTRIBUTION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

To the Vice President and each Senator 100 copies; to the Secretary and Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, each, 25 copies; to the Secretary, for official use, not to exceed 35 copies; to the Sergeant at Arms, for use on the floor of the Senate, not to exceed 50 copies; to each Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress, 68 copies; to the Clerk, Sergeant at Arms, and Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives, each, 25 copies; to the Clerk, for official use, not to exceed 50 copies; and to the Doorkeeper, for use on the floor of the House of Representatives, not to exceed 75 copies; to the Vice President and each Senator, Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress there shall also be furnished (and shall not be transferable), 3 copies of the daily RECORD, of which 1 shall be delivered at his residence, 1 at his office, and 1 at the Capitol.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

PRICE OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

The Public Printer is authorized to furnish to subscribers the daily RECORD at $1.50 per month, payable in advance.

Remit by money order payable to Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C.

PRINTING DOCUMENTS AND REPORTS

Documents and reports of committees with the evidence and papers submitted therewith, or any part thereof ordered printed by Congress, may be reprinted by the Public Printer on order of any Member of Congress or Delegate, on prepayment of the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 162, p. 1940).

Appendix

The Riddle of Self-Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FREDERICK G. PAYNE
OF MAINE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, May 21, 1954

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, on May 17, 1954, Hon. Bernard M. Baruch delivered a lecture entitled "The Riddle of Self-Government." This is the last of a series of three lectures recently delivered by him before the Bernard M. Baruch School of Business and Public Administration of City College, New York.

I ask unanimous consent that the lecture to which I have just referred be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, so that it, along with the other two, may be preserved for future reference.

There being no objection, the lecture was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE RIDDLE OF SELF-GOVERNMENT

I

Today I would like to discuss with you the changing role of government and what it means for each of us. I have left this subject for the last of these talks, because it sums up all we have been dealing with. It is through government that we must act to solve the crucial problems before us, of peace or war, prosperity or depression, liberty or enslavement.

In emphasizing that I do not want to leave the impression that government is everything and the individual little or nothing. Quite the opposite. Government is not a substitute for the people, but the instrument through which people act. If we, as individuals, fail to discharge our personal responsibilities, government becomes a blunt instrument indeed, often a deadly one to those it should serve.

Government should always remain a means to an end. When it becomes an end in itself, it quickly degenerates into a corruption of power and even tyranny, as in Nazi Germany and Soviet Russia.

Limits are rights

And when we propose to change our Government we should realize we really are proposing to change ourselves. One function of government is to define our relationships to one another. Changing the structure of government or what government is called upon to do really means changing the relationships of each of us—individuals and groups—to one another.

The limits put on government are limits on what we can do to others and what they can do to us. These limitations can be a powerful protection against infringements upon our personal liberties, homes, earnings, savings, and property. These limitations can also be sources of weaknesses if they deny the government and ourselves the powers needed to cope with the problems of survival.

Bearing that in mind let us reexamine what is at stake in the current struggle over the role of government. To treat this subject fully would require a shelf of books. All I can do here is pass on a few observations on some aspects of this immense problem.

II

Three riddles posed

What kind of government do we need today?

To answer that question, it seems to me, we really should ask ourselves three riddles:

Riddle 1: What kind of government must we have in a world in which there is neither war nor peace?

Riddle 2—and this one relates to personal liberties: Can we discipline ourselves or must we accept the disciplines that others are only too eager to force upon us?

Riddle 3: In the field of economics and the general welfare, how can the Government's actions be made any less senseless, less greedy, less unjust than the old "let things alone" order?

Face new issues

I hope all of you have noted how carefully these three riddles have been defined. For example, I did not say that the issue we faced was one of keeping our freedom for freedom by itself could destroy us. Nor did I say that we had to decide whether it was Government's responsibility to intervene in our economic and social life.

That was yesterday's battle. "Do nothing" or laissez-faire government is dead. Today virtually every phase of society is subject to some government control. In the economic field, even where the Government does not regulate things directly, its influences are felt through enormous tax collections and the heavily pressing national debt.

The real issue today is whether all this government intervention can be made just and fair.

Injustice by Government

A few years ago many persons thought government intervention and rendering economic justice were identical. But think of the inflation which has wracked this country in recent years, with such cruel injury to some and unjustified profit to others. The injustices of this inflation were not the product of do-nothing economics. They were the result of Government-managed economics, of Government favoritism to certain pressure groups to the disadvantage of the national interest.

Similarly, Government intervention was supposed to bring economic security. But how much security can there be when no one knows whether savings will have any value by the time one is too old to work or one's children have grown up?

New creeds for old

One of the sharpest criticisms of do-nothing Government was that it served as a cloak for powerful interests who wanted to be left alone to despoil the country's resources and the public. But how unselfish are those who today invoke the power of Government to further their own interests or to get votes? Is that the best we can do, to replace the old let-me-alone philosophy with a new gimme-mine philosophy?

I do not think so. We can—and must—do better.

To do better we must discard the notion that any problem is solved simply by having the Government take charge of it. Through Government, it is true, things can often be done which individuals themselves would be unable to accomplish. Because of that, however, the mistakes Government can make are enormously greater than any individual could perpetrate. When you or I fumble the ball, relatively few persons are hurt. But when the Government muffs one, a whole country can be lost.

Government intervention makes our problems more difficult in still another way. Under the old leave-things-alone order, it was assumed that if all the conflicting forces in society were left free, to compete with one another, that they would balance out, for the good of all. But with governments intervening to the extent that they now do, we cannot count on any such automatic balance. We must now achieve that balance consciously, by deliberate decisions. In short, where once we could let nature take its course, we must now be able to think things out.

Trial by thinking

And that is a terrible thing.

I don't mean that to be funny. But there never has been a government which depended upon the mass of its citizens being able to think. For a long time government was something which was left to—or should we say seized by—kings, or emperors, or war lords. Even in the ancient democracies of Greece and Rome, government was the responsibility of only part of society, of a so-called elite.

With the upsurge of modern democracy this ancient principle of government by a few was overthrown in favor of faith in man's ability to govern himself. Still for a long time that faith had only to overcome a partial test. The atmosphere of the last two centuries in which modern democracy flourished was one in which people and their problems were left largely to work themselves out. Through much of this period new continents were being opened to settlement. Many difficulties were really taken care of by the discovery of new economic resources.

Can't trust to luck

Now there are no more new worlds to be called into existence to redress the balance of this old world of ours. We can no longer trust to luck to muddle through. If democratic self-government is to survive we must now be able to think things through for ourselves.

Our plight calls to mind the difficulty one American soldier had during the last war. Whenever this soldier was required to make a decision he would just go to pieces. Finally, his commanding officer assigned him to peeling potatoes, telling him to put the small potatoes in one basket and the big potatoes in another basket.

Later when the commanding officer came back the soldier was staring at the potatoes in black despair. The officer asked, "What's the matter? Can't you even peel potatoes?"

"Oh, that's easy," replied the soldier. "It's picking out the big and the small potatoes. You can't imagine the decisions I have to make."

Think, think everywhere

If only the problems we had to decide were just big and small potatoes. But we must literally think, think, think, all the time and about everything.

Before the last war other countries decided when to call a halt to aggression. Today it is we, in this country, who must make that decision.

Not only has our role in the world changed to where the United States has become the central decision point—the think spot—of the free world, but our situation is made all the more agonizing by being neither at war nor at peace.

Never-ending twilight

Virtually all our political and economic institutions and habits are conditioned to a sharp separation between war and peace, as between day and night. Our Constitution, for example, has operated to give the President almost unlimited authority in meeting any armed emergency but to insure a return to legislative authority when war ended. But what are to be the relations of the President and the Congress in the present uneasy twilight which, while not one of all-out war, certainly is not a state of peace?

Similarly, as we saw last week, the workings of supply and demand differ tremendously under conditions of war and conditions of peace. Will we know when to drop the ways of peace for those of defense and survival?

If ever this country is attacked and destroyed it will be in those "too little and too late" months before we will have been able to turn our gigantic productive power from peace to defense. That is the only strategy any enemy can have—to try to overwhelm us while our store shelves are full but our arsenals are empty.

Narrowing the gap

Our own defensive strategy must center around bridging this gap of time that is required to mobilize our industries from peace to war. To see that no enemy is tempted to gamble on destroying us with one lightning blitz, at least seven adjustments must be made:

First, we must never give up the hunt for peace and security through agreement. This requires our thinking through the possible terms on which we would be willing to settle as well as what we will fight for.

Second, we and our allies must maintain a large enough military force of immediate striking power so no potential aggressor will be under any delusion that he could attack us without suffering instant retaliation.

Third, a far greater emphasis than in the past must be put on weapons in hand and in reserve, and less on the capacity to produce those weapons. Some people protest, "But these weapons will be obsolete in a few years." During the first 2 years of the war in Korea nearly all the ammunition we fought with was obsolete—left over from World War II. Who knows how long it would take our industries to recover from any initial blitz?

Fourth, we and our allies must devise an overall, global strategy for the whole of the peacemaking in which each front is seen as part of a whole. When the Korean war broke out I warned that we would never be able to stabilize the situation in Asia unless we and our allies rearmed in Europe as well as in Asia. As it is, since Potsdam we have tried to deal with a global struggle through piece-by-piece action. The result has been indecision, or worse.

Fifth, to devise this global strategy, balancing what must be done abroad with what must be done at home, there should be one overall thinking body in the Government, doing this and nothing else. The National Security Council has sought to serve as such a body, but it has not yet risen to what is needed.

Sixth, we must organize ourselves to see the peacemaking through. What the peacemaking requires should be calculated in its entirety and reduced to specific goals with everything subordinated to meeting the timetable that peace demands. We must learn to pace our efforts according to what our security requires and not to desires for lower taxes or wishful thinking about Soviet intentions.

Seventh, all the powers that would be needed in case of another war emergency must be enacted into law now on a standby basis. Like the pioneer who plowed with a musket within reach, we dare hold to our free economic ways on only one condition—that we are prepared to drop the plow and pick up the musket of mobilization at a moment's notice. These mobilization powers should not go into effect now, but should be put into law so they can be invoked at once.

Thirty-year war

For more than 30 years, I have fought vainly for such a standby mobilization law. Some of my friends have asked, "Why don't you give it up?" My reply has been that "this is the fight that must be won if our civilization is to survive."

It is not just one law that is at stake. What is on trial in this issue is our understanding of the kind of world in which we live and of our ability to adjust to that world.

The challenge we face was expressed rather well by an item I clipped from a newspaper back in 1947. It told of a boast made by a Soviet general that the western democracies were bound to be defeated because they would not make the necessary sacrifices. The western democracies prized their living standards too highly to accept the disciplines to put guns over butter.

The Soviet Government, though, this general boasted, would force the sacrifices to mobilize. A lean, hungry, but mobilized Russia would overrun a Western World which couldn't bring itself to mobilize—in time.

By what we give up

Wherever we have won in the cold war it has been where we made the necessary sacrifices. Wherever we have lost it has been where we failed to give up what was needed to insure victory.

Again and again we have tried to evade this truth. We have acted as if an effective foreign policy could be laid down by making a fine speech or by proclaiming lofty aims. For a time we seem to be getting away with this masquerade of words that some call foreign policy. Then something happens, as in Korea or Indochina, which strips off the mask and shows that our foreign policy is worth no more—nor less—than our ability to see that policy through with men and other resources.

And so it will always be. The acid test of any policy we lay down—and it is a test the Soviets will be sure to put us to—will always be our answer to one question: What are we willing to give up to see that policy through?

Freedom for what

Those who argue against universal training or readiness to mobilize because these things infringe on the freedoms for which we are fighting mistake both the nature of the cold war and the nature of government.

The only freedom man can ever have is the freedom to discipline himself. That is what we are fighting for, to maintain this right to self-discipline instead of having the disciplines of slavery and tyranny thrust upon us by a conquering enemy.

Nor is it only we in the United States who must learn this truth. It is the problem that faces our allies in the European Defense Community—to forge the common disciplines which will unite Europe in effective defense or to leave Europe exposed to those who would overrun and discipline it—only too well and for only too long.

Problems of colonialism

It is also the problem confronting all of the newly emerged governments of Asia and elsewhere. While the peoples in these countries were colonial subjects, they thought primarily of liberating themselves. With that aspiration, I sympathize fully.

But liberty is now theirs.

With the old order gone what is to be put in its place?

As they struggle with this question, these peoples are learning that to be politically independent in itself is not self-government. They are learning a truth uttered by one of the wisest of all Americans—Woodrow Wilson—when he wrote:

"Liberty in itself is not government. In the wrong hands, in the hands of the unpracticed and undisciplined, it is incompatible with government."

It will take time to solve the problems of producing and distributing the necessities of life in these countries. It will take time before these peoples have learned the arts and disciplines of self-government. For our part we must devise new and effective ways of helping these peoples gain this time so that the right to self-government which they have earned is not lost.

Soviet challenge

The Soviet system, of course, neither believes in nor needs self-government. The Communist creed preaches openly that the people are not to be trusted to manage their own affairs but must be dictated to by a self-appointed, monopolistic group which claims to know all the answers. To spread their system, the Soviets seek either to destroy the people's ability to govern themselves or, through promises which cannot be fulfilled, to lure these peoples into accepting a new foreign master.

Perhaps that is how we should envision the crisis of government that confronts us—that the time has come when those who would be free must prove that they actually can govern themselves.

Works, not faith

The test is not one of faith but of performance. It will not be enough to demonstrate that we believe in self-government. We must succeed in making self-government work, first by thinking our problems through, and second, disciplining ourselves to whatever actions may be necessary.

Think—Discipline

Those are the two weapons we must rely on in this crucial battle in man's long war to govern himself. If that battle is lost, the cause of self-government will sink into eclipse, not to rise again until after a new dark age of worldwide slavery has been undergone.

To sum up, on this vital issue of man's ability to govern himself, we must now either put up or be shut up.

IV

The path to follow

Two weeks ago in opening these talks the point was made that the dominant yearning of our time was to be freed of the threat of a breakdown of our whole civilization. To achieve this stability, I remarked that we first had to find that stability within ourselves. What I was driving at, of course, was the fact that we had reached the crucial stage in history where we had to show our ability to govern ourselves.

In seeking this stability I proposed that we avoid the extremes of either dumb submission or blind revolt but follow instead the path of disciplined reason.

There lies the key to self-discipline. It is the key to self-government. It is the key to sustained progress.

Indeed, all three of these, self-discipline, self-government and sustained progress, are parts of the one whole.

Change through law

There always have been those who would make government an instrument of enforcing submission on the people. At the other extreme have been those who would tear down government in angry rebellion and who, if they succeed, usually try to force the people to submit to them. To me the greatness of America rests mainly in the fact that we have a form of government in which the people have the means of effecting all necessary changes without enslaving one another.

No form of government—whether it be socialism, communism, fascism, or some "ism" not yet heard of—in itself can solve man's problems. Government is only an instrument for regulating society. A limited democracy—the political form we live under— is bound to have its faults since none of us who make up this democracy is perfect. But this democracy has given each of us the opportunity to better his own condition by his own striving—and more than that no government can give us.

In all our history we have never stopped trying to improve ourselves. We have only to continue in that quest to remain a free and self-respecting people, a sanctuary of strength to the weak and a model of hope for all.

Government is discipline

And if we are to continue to govern ourselves we must indeed do just that. We must understand that the extent of freedom which can be permitted us as individuals will depend on the extent to which each of us as individuals does more for himself or herself. We must further understand that to the extent that we do turn to Government, instead of doing things for ourselves, we increase the necessity for regulations imposed by the Government.

Government by its very nature is discipline. To paraphrase Thomas Jefferson, that government is best which governs the least because its people discipline themselves.

Some personal advice

Finally, may I leave with you, as a bit of advice to each of you personally, three rules which in the years ahead you can apply to any problem that may arise:

Rule 1: Get the facts.

Approach each new problem not with a view of finding what you hope will be there but to get the truth, the realities that must be grappled with. You may not like what you find. In that case you are entitled to try to change it. But do not deceive yourself as to what you do find to be the facts of the situation.

Rule 2: Get to know yourself.

Only as you do know yourself can your brain serve you as a sharp and efficient tool. Know your own failings, passions, and prejudices so you can separate them from what you see. Know also when you actually have thought through to the nature of the thing with which you are dealing and when you are not thinking at all. Nowadays, unfortunately, the prevailing habit seems to be to fasten upon some symbol or word—like "liberalism," "McCarthyism," or "appeasement," or the New Look in this or that, or the New Deal, Fair Deal, or other deals—and then to argue fiercely over this label without looking at what lies underneath.

Rule 3: Try to have the wit—but if not, have the discipline—to match up the first two rules.

Knowing yourself and knowing the facts, you can judge whether you can change the situation so it is more to your liking. If you cannot—or if you do not know how to improve on things—then discipline yourself to the adjustments that will be necessary.

These talks, coming at a time like this, have necessarily been focused on the many difficulties which beset us. In trying to picture these problems plainly I trust I have not left any of you feeling they are beyond man's capacity to solve. The means through which we can win out are in our hands, in the priceless tool of self-government built upon a better understanding of ourselves and of the forces and laws that govern our society.

I hope these talks will help start you, to whom the future belongs, upon the course of disciplined reason which draws from man's experience in the past to solve man's present problems.

Tribute by Hon. Paul H. Douglas, of Illinois, to Lt. Col. Henry J. "Hank" Adams, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 21, 1954

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement which I have prepared in tribute to Lt. Col. Henry J. "Hank" Adams, Jr., of the United States Marine Corps, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR DOUGLAS

I would like to take a few minutes today to pay a well-deserved tribute to an honest, courageous, two-fisted, straight-shooting officer of the United States Marine Corps, who has just been relieved from service at his own request, to run for public office as the Sheriff of San Diego County, Calif.

I am referring to Lt. Col. Henry J. "Hank" Adams, Jr., who served with me in the First Marine Division in World War II, fighting his way in the running battle across the southwest Pacific, from Guadalcanal to Okinawa. His record as a marine hero began on his first night of combat when he earned the title of the "One Man Army of Tulagi," for his exploit of killing 15 of the enemy single handed.

Although his exploits as a marine are legendary, Hank Adams is also known nationally, and internationally as one of the great rifle and pistol champions of America. He has some 700 medals and trophies to his credit, including the all-around rifle and pistol championship of the United States. He was also a firing member for 5 years on United States international rifle teams. Although I know him as a friend, and fellow marine, I am also proud of the Illinois background of his late father and his grandfather, both of whom lived for many years in Sterling, Ill., before moving out to the west coast at the turn of the century.

But Hank Adams is more than a fighting marine, and a straight-shooter. As a law enforcement officer he has the kind of background that is so vitally needed in all parts of America today to curb and clean up the growth of crime, corruption and lawlessness, and juvenile delinquency. As a special agent of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Hank Adams served for 2 years in 1940-41 here on the east coast, under the direction of J. Edgar Hoover. Among other assignments he captured more bank robbers in the New Jersey area than any other agent in that area. Later as undersheriff in San Diego, before being recalled to service, Hank Adams instituted many progressive methods of modern criminology and worked closely with State and Federal officers on numerous cases along the international border of Mexico. And, for the past 3 years, up to March 31 of this year he has rendered distinguished service as provost marshall of the United States Marine Recruit Depot in San Diego. It is a privilege and an honor for me to commend Hank Adams for his services to his country and his community as an outstanding young American, a red-blooded marine hero, and a courageous peace officer, and to wish him luck in whatever he does.

Farm Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. THYE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 21, 1954

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Farm Journal. It is entitled "Tell the City Folks," and gives recognition to the situation of the producer or the farmer, and the proportionate share of the consumer dollar expended for food.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TELL THE CITY FOLKS

We wish agriculture could speak more freely to its city customers. Because they do not hear the whole story of farming, city people tend to get some queer ideas. They do not understand farm legislation. They make the wrong complaints about food prices.

You could talk for hours to your city friends about such points as these:

Fewer hours of work buy more food now, and better food, than ever before. Food is the biggest bargain of 1954.

Out of each dollar the consumer receives as his income, only about 26 cents goes for food. The other 74 cents can be used for other things. Of the dollar the consumer spends for food, farmers get only 45 cents. Thus less than 12 percent of consumer income reaches the farmer.

If farmers gave away their wheat, the price of bread could fall less than 3 cents a loaf. Lobsters and fish grow free of cost—but they cost money at the store.

Not only do consumers now get more food for an hour's wages, but they get more convenience, wider selections, and better quality. They can have all breasts of chicken, or all legs, pick their vegetables and meats wrapped in transparent individual packages, and buy their milk in paper cartons with no bottles to return. Few farmers, however, get any of the money these extra services cost.

The convenient supermarket displays tempt buyers to toss various household and personal items which are not food into their grocery bags. These make the bill bigger, but add not 1 cent to farm income.

Nearly all farmers work considerably longer than a 40-hour week, and as much as anyone else are entitled to fair wages and overtime.

To provide land and equipment enough for one food producer requires $12,000 to $25,000; that's more than the average land and tool cost, per industrial worker. A farmer is entitled to a fair interest on this investment, and some compensation as a manager. Production costs have stayed high.

Power and machinery have not taken over quite all of the laborious tasks. The city grocery bag still represents lots of plain hard farm work.

Only a part of the food in the grocery bag comes from supported crops. And farmers are by no means the only economic group who have received Federal support at taxpayer expense.

Consumers can depend on it that their jobs may disappear if farm returns for foodstuffs fall to no-profit levels; agriculture's purchasing power creates high employment as surely as general prosperity helps agriculture's sales.

Farmers produce so abundantly that 85 percent of the population can now choose other kinds of jobs. If farmers were not so efficient, a lot more people would have to go to work farming. This is an efficiency that since before the war has increased farm output by about 40 percent, and does it with 17 percent less labor.

Louis Stark

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. IRVING M. IVES

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 21, 1954

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record editorials from the New York Times and the Washington Post and Times Herald on the distinguished career of Louis Stark, veteran labor reporter and editorial writer. Mr. Stark's untimely passing came as a shock to all who had the privilege of his acquaintance.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the New York Times]

LOUIS STARK

Louis Stark had been a newspaperman for 40 years, and with this newspaper since 1917. For nearly 20 years, beginning with the early days of the Franklin D. Roosevelt administration, he worked in the Washington bureau of the Times, and since 1951 he had been a valued and respected contributor to the editorial content of this page.

While a specialist in reporting the news of labor, and later in commenting on it, Mr. Stark had a range of interests, of reading, and of information that extended far beyond the limits of his specialty. Fairness and objectivity were the benchmark of his reporting in the labor field, and this integrity, this complete honesty of character, inspired the confidence of labor's leaders and the respect of management as well.

When Mr. Stark turned to the expression of opinion, in the writing of editorials on matters affecting unions, he wrote with a forthrightness based on long experience, full information, and ceaseless immediate investigation that in their product commanded attention and influenced action. His writing on the New York waterfront problems was an example.

He was a colleague for whom we had a warm affection. Quiet and unassuming, with a kindly sense of humor, he had a devotion to duty that found him writing a final editorial on the very day of his death, even though he had excused himself from coming to the office. That editorial is published elsewhere on this page, and, significantly, it bears the title "Trade Union Democracy." By contributing to full information on the problems of labor, its living conditions, its working conditions, and its aspirations, Louis Stark served, by his own efforts, to improve the lot of the workingman. The labor movement and we, his associates at the Times, have lost a good friend.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald]

LOUIS STARK

Louis Stark embodied the ideals of a good reporter to a superlative degree and in a pioneering role. He was the chief labor reporter for the New York Times in the tempestous years after the great depression. Because he insisted upon being a reporter and not a protagonist he was able to set a standard which for many years will serve as a guide to his fellow craftsmen. "I early learned to take no part or sides whatever," he said on his retirement from the Times' Washington bureau 3 years ago.

At a time when many labor reporters either were violently prolabor or violently antilabor, or lost in the factionalism of the labor movement, Louis Stark wrote with detachment and fairness. Thus his reports were followed closely by Government officials, by management, and by the rival union chieftains, all of whom knew that Louis Stark understood the issues and reported all the pertinent facts. He was known and respected by men in industry and labor all over the country, and he is especially remembered here by a host of friends and admirers. Few men have ever worked in so controversial a field and kept the respect of all the participants as well as did Louis Stark.

Dr. Calver Says "Walk"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR.

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 21, 1954

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an article entitled " 'Walk,' Says Dr. Calver to Congressmen," which was published in the Washington Post and Times Herald of April 22, 1954. For more than a quarter of a century Dr. Calver has had the confidence and high esteem of the membership of both Houses of the Congress. His professional services and advice have been of great value. Members of both political parties recognize Dr. Calver's competence and esteem him as a friend. The two able physicians who are serving at present with Dr. Calver are Dr. W. S. Matthews and Dr. R. F. Hass.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

"WALK," SAYS DR. CALVER TO CONGRESSMEN

(By William J. Brady)

There's a quiet sort of fellow with offices on the ground floor of the Capitol who's mighty pleased with this run of fine weather for reasons other than meteorological.

"Why it's the best incentive in the world to get them out for a nice long walk to wipe away the tensions and worries," he says.

Such things as a rambling walk now and then are the proper concern of this gentleman by name Dr. George W. Calver and by vocation the attending physician to Members of Congress and their staff personnel.

His "walking" prescription long has been a favorite with the doctor. He gave it to a Senator named Truman some years back, and the patient has followed it ever since.

We asked the doctor if he had in mind, for example, an optimum period during which Congress should meet in view of the harsh reality that many of his congressional charges are approaching the upper-age brackets.

He'd been asked that question before.

"Congress," he replied carefully, "meets with a job to do, and the Members have to stay here until they do it. My job is to keep them in the best physical condition I can so they can carry out this job."

This job has been the doctor's since 1928. In December of that year he was a naval commander on shore duty here. A number of heart cases occurred among Congressmen that year, and Commander Calver was sent up to the Hill to see what he could do about it.

A couple of years later, Calver was up for transfer back to sea duty. But only until Congress heard about it, and passed a law to keep him permanently on the Hill.

And there he's been ever since.

At the moment, he and his staff—2 young Navy doctors and 4 Navy corpsmen—occupy a five-room suite in the Capitol. It's a full-time job for all of them.

Calver's patients can include anyone with official duties on the Hill—and any of the thousands of daily visitors who might need medical attention.

Sometimes this medical care is administered under conditions of extreme emergency, as on March 1 of this year. Calver recalls that he was standing on the east side of the House Chamber when he heard some "popping" noises.

The "popping," of course, came from the guns with which a group of Puerto Rican fanatics sprayed the House floor with a deadly fusillade, wounding five Congressmen.

Calver supervised the job of emergency first aid, and had his patients en route to hospitals for treatment within minutes.

Calver is the author of a sort of "10 commandments" of health: eat wisely, drink plentifully (of water), eliminate thoroughly, bathe cleanly, exercise rationally, accept inevitabilities (don't worry), play enthusiastically, relax completely, sleep sufficiently, and check up occasionally.

A native Washingtonian and a resident of the Kennedy-Warren Apartments, Calver does his best to follow his own rules of health by spending most weekends on his farm in St. Mary's County, Md.

Importation of Crude Petroleum

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 21, 1954

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an editorial published in the Titusville (Pa.) Herald entitled "Stop the Flood." It is a very interesting discussion of the importation of crude oil into the United States.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

STOP THE FLOOD

Trade with foreign nations is one of those subjects which can be argued from here to there and back again without reaching a conclusion.

Such trade is vital to a prosperous and fruitful world, but should it be carried to the point where our own Nation is crippled? It's the old question of high tariff, or none at all, all over again.

Petroleum is now an import to this country. Fifteen years ago it was an export.

We've got to readjust our thinking completely.

Domestic producers claim that imports of oil have reached the point where the ability of the United States to produce oil in an emergency, such as war, is endangered. Companies which import oil say that if we are going to do business with the rest of the world, we've got to buy some things from them and oil is one of the things we should buy.

The argument can be endless, as we pointed out. Both sides have figures enough to make your head swim. But, judging solely from human nature, it is our view that those who import oil are going too far. Foreign oil is cheap. It is only natural to buy where the product is cheapest, and that's what some of the big oil companies are doing. But the desire to make a dollar is apparently carrying the importers past the point where they should go.

We dislike to see it, but Federal legislation is apparently the only way to stop a flood of foreign oil from wrecking our native industry. Other efforts to settle the issue apparently have failed. Congress should get along with laws to dam at least part of the flood. This Nation's ability to produce oil should not be endangered just because certain companies put their stockholders' interests ahead of the Nation's.

The International Crisis and What We Should Do About It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. THYE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 21, 1954

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address by John Cowles, president of the Harvard Alumni Association and president of the Minneapolis Star and Tribune, delivered at the annual meeting of the Associated Harvard Clubs in Rochester, N. Y., on the topic "The International Crisis and What We Should Do About it."

It is an excellent statement with reference to the international situation, and for that reason I should like to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Minneapolis Sunday Tribune of May 16, 1954]

UNITED STATES POLICY GOAL: FREEDOM WITHOUT WAR

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Following is the text of an address delivered Saturday by John Cowles, president of the Harvard Alumni Association and president of the Minneapolis Star and Tribune, at the annual meeting of the Associated Harvard Clubs in Rochester, N. Y., on the topic, the International Crisis and What We Should Do About It.)

In discussing the international situation today I want to emphasize two things at the start.

First, the problems facing us are as complex as they are grave, so my remarks will necessarily be an oversimplification with many omissions.

Second, some of the problems appear insoluble. We Americans are an impatient people. We want to get things accomplished quickly, to get foreign problems settled and disposed of, so that we can forget them and go about our normal activities.

Unfortunately, things aren't that simple, and many of the problems that we face, or worse ones, will be troubling us for a long, long time.

I think we can all agree on the purpose of our foreign policy. It is simply to preserve American freedom and security. We want to preserve our freedom without war if possible. If war should prove inevitable, then our foreign policy should have been so directed that we would be in position to win that war.

Perhaps I should amend that statement to say, be in position not to lose that war, because I doubt whether either side would win an all-out, atomic, hydrogen war in the traditional sense of winning.

But at least we should try to be in a position, if war should come, wherein despite the incalculable loss of life and staggering devastation, the surviving people in the United States would not be slaves to Communist Russian masters.

It should be obvious to every American, but sometimes I fear it is forgotten even by some of our leaders in Congress, that if war comes the more stanch allies we have the better. In addition, if we can't persuade certain nations to line up with us, it is incomparably better to have pursued policies that will have kept them as friendly neutrals rather than to have let them slip into the Russian orbit.

ALLIES NECESSARY

Since the United States contains only 6 percent of the population of the globe, our foreign policy, powerful as we are, must rest on a system of alliances.

Too many Americans, including again too many Members of Congress, seem to assume that the United States can unilaterally decide what we want to do, crack the whip like a circus ringmaster, and compel our allies to jump through the hoop. I don't believe it is that simple.

We tend to assume that all the rest of the people of the free world will naturally think and react exactly as we do on every issue. They don't, not even the British, although I have every confidence that, unless we prove incredibly stupid in our political and economic policies, in a showdown where the basic issue of human freedom is at stake the British will be our staunch, gallant and reliable partners.

Let's re-examine, realistically and with open minds, some of our policies which disturb some of our allies or potential allies, and divide us.

First of all is the fact that Congress apparently is going to be unwilling to make even minor concessions toward freer world trade through tariff reductions and simplifications. The recent Randall Commission report—directed, I am happy to say, by an eminent Harvard graduate—points in the direction we clearly should take for increased world trade and prosperity.

It seems unlikely, however, unless President Eisenhower develops far more influence over Congress than he has to date been able to exert, that the Congress will do much of anything beyond possibly extending for a year or two the present reciprocal tariff treaty powers.

At the same time that we are refusing to permit conditions under which foreign countries might increase their trade with us, congressional leaders are denouncing our allies for wanting or trying to increase their volume of trade with the Iron Curtain nations.

REDS ENTRENCHED

Let's next consider the question of our recognition of Red China. Diplomatic recognition does not imply moral or any other kind of approval of the government recognized. If it did, we would not be recognizing Russia.

Anyone who is open minded and realistic must accept the disagreeable fact that Communist power is now thoroughly entrenched in China, and many countries, including Britain, have recognized Red China. Mao Tze-tung's regime has been utterly ruthless, has exterminated hundreds of thousands of dissenters, has built a huge secret police, and is firmly in the saddle.

The idea some Americans hold that Chiang Kai-shek's Nationalist forces on Formosa could, with a relatively small amount of American naval and air assistance, invade and recapture the Chinese mainland is, to me, utterly fantastic.

Chiang probably has at the most liberal estimate 400,000 available troops. Their average age is 29. That they would prove effective in combat is highly questionable. Chiang has almost no sea or airpower. Formosa is more than 100 miles from the Chinese mainland.

Qualified experts have told me that a successful invasion of China from Formosa would require American sea and air forces comparable to those used in crossing the English Channel to France on D-day in 1944, plus a large number of American ground divisions. We should not forget, moreover, that in 1944 there was no atomic bomb or guided missile that could be used against such a concentrated target.

While I most certainly am not advocating the American recognition of Red China or its admission to the United Nations without a substantial and proved quid pro quo, it seems to me completely unrealistic for American Senators to proclaim that never, never on any terms will we recognize Red China or permit her entrance into the United Nations.

If, for example, it should prove possible to negotiate a settlement wherein Red China would withdraw all her forces in North Korea, permit free elections in a unified Korea, cease giving military aid to the Viet Minh in Indochina, agree to the complete independence of Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia, wouldn't we clearly be willing to recognize Red China and waive opposition to her admission into the U. N.?

RUSS AIMS IN DOUBT

In a settlement covering the admission of Red China into the U. N., it might be provided that Formosa should also continue as a U. N. member as an independent state. It might also be provided that China would no longer be automatically a member of the Security Council.

Two other aspects of Red China's possible admission into the U. N. deserve consideration.

First, isn't the U. N. more likely to prove more effective both as a forum for airing world problems and as a medium where diplomats could privately come to understandings if its membership becomes really universal?

Second, are we absolutely sure that Russia sincerely wants Red China admitted to the U. N.?

Some American experts on Russia have serious private doubts as to whether Russia really wants China in the U. N. So long as Red China is kept out, Russia in effect represents Red China at the U. N. as its agent and attorney.

Russia is fully informed as to all the proposals and exchanges between China and other nations. In functioning as an intermediary Russia may be distorting or suppressing certain diplomatic messages or exchanges of views between Red China and the west.

If Red China were negotiating privately and independently with other nations, there would seem to be a far greater possibility that China might conceivably tend to veer away from the Kremlin's absolute control.

DULLES' HANDS TIED

Perhaps nationalistic jealousy between China and Russia might gradually develop. Admittedly this is wishful thinking, but if China could negotiate independently, wouldn't there be more likelihood of the possibility of Mao Tze-tung's eventually becoming a second Tito? Wouldn't that be a tremendous gain for the free world?

When Secretary of State John Foster Dulles went to Geneva, Switzerland, he was in an impossible predicament.

On the one hand some Republican senatorial leaders had proclaimed that never under any circumstances could he agree either to our recognition of Red China or to the seating of Red China in the U. N.

At the same time other senatorial leaders had flatly declared that President Eisenhower could not commit American military forces to aid the French in Indochina without prior congressional approval.

They had further indicated that even if Mr. Dulles should prove successful in lining up a wide array of other nations in a new southeast Asian NATO, it would be at least open to serious question as to whether Congress would permit the participation of American forces in Indochina.

As a result, Mr. Dulles was handcuffed. No Secretary of State ever entered an important international conference with so little freedom in which to negotiate.

For several years we have been deluged with partisan political speeches attacking the Democratic administration for the loss of Nationalist China to the Communists. That was a catastrophic loss to American security, a shattering, incalculable loss.

I suggest to some of the Republican congressional leaders that they would do well to ponder what their answer will be if within a very few years the question is—God forbid—who is to blame for the loss of India? Who is to blame for the loss of southeast Asia?

JAPAN FACES PRESSURES

If first Indochina falls to the Communists, and then Thailand, Burma, and Indonesia, what about the pressures on Japan? The Japanese people must eat. They get 40 percent of their food from those parts of southeast Asia, selling their manufactured goods there in return.

Isn't it highly probable that unless the United States is willing permanently to subsidize the Japanese economy to the time of several billion dollars a year, economic pressures will tend to compel Japan to aline its policies with those of the Communist mainland?

Let's consider India. Three hundred and seventy-five million people live there. India is the most important stronghold of democracy on the whole Asian continent. Nehru is a Socialist, not a Communist. Nehru believes in freedom and civil liberties.

Nehru does not, it is true, believe in the American system of privately owned, relatively unrestrained competitive enterprise. Even if he did, however, our economic system is not suitable to India in the present stage of India's industrial development.

Nehru is a proud and sensitive man. He can be and frequently is exasperating and irritating in his criticism of the United States. But we must not let our annoyance with Nehru influence our good judgment of what is in our enlightened self-interest and in the interest of the whole free world.

Nehru's government is far from strongly entrenched. If Nehru fails to raise the pitifully low Indian standard of living sufficiently to maintain himself in power, India will almost surely fall to the Communists.

NEHRU OUR BEST BET

One of the most important items in the foreign economic assistance bill now being considered in Congress is an appropriation of $104 million for India. I wish it were larger than it is, but I am told that it is the one item that Congress is most likely to pare down or eliminate because of resentment of India's refusal to line up with the United States.

Yet it is clearly in the interests of our own national security to help Nehru, regardless of how his apparent inconsistencies and criticisms of our policies may at times annoy us.

I am increasingly inclined to the view that Nehru, if we handle the situation intelligently, is the one individual through whom we might without war be most likely to save southeast Asia from communism.

Most Asians, including Nehru, loathe colonialism. Most of them, possibly including even Nehru, instinctively fear that the westerner who talks about preventing the spread of communism in Asia secretly wants to exploit the natives, just as the French exploited the Indochinese for so many decades.

If we could privately prevail on the French and the Portuguese immediately and voluntarily to give up the enclaves they still hold in the Indian subcontinent, it might make a significant difference in Nehru's attitude toward us.

France still holds 4 small and economically unimportant colonies, and Portugal still holds 3 in India. The inhabitants are overwhelmingly in favor of uniting with India, but the European powers have so far refused to give them up.

Nehru's prestige throughout south Asia is enormous. If we could persuade Nehru to assume the leadership in forming an Asian alliance of free nations to stem the further spread of communism in south Asia, and if Nehru would then ask that the United Nations pledge that its members would resist militarily any external aggression, that, as I see it, would be the optimum solution, temporarily and possibly permanently, for the grave question confronting us.

COLONIALISM HATED

The people of Indochina had little enthusiasm for helping the French resist the Viet Minh, not because they wanted communism but because they wanted the French to get out. White, colonial exploitation was the devil they knew and hated. Communism was a remote and unknown devil.

I take it that our immediate national purpose is to prevent the further spread of communism in south Asia, but to accomplish it without involving American troops in a jungle war.

We were able to build the South Koreans into an effective fighting force because they wanted to maintain their freedom and they wanted our aid. They knew we had no imperialistic intentions toward them.

If the nations of southeast Asia, preferably under Nehru's aegis, asked the United Nations to guarantee them against external aggression and then invited the United States, Great Britain, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, etc., to provide them with military equipment and training contingents, our chances of building effective native fighting forces to resist any further Communist aggression would seem to me to be much better than they will be if we take any other course.

Even if Nehru declined to participate in such an undertaking, it would have a better chance of success if Nehru should be persuaded not to oppose it.

At the same time that we try to prevent any external Communist aggression, we should also, of course, endeavor to make sure, through stepped-up economic aid, that standards of living are raised sufficiently to reduce, if not altogether remove, the chance of an internal Communist takeover. With relatively little money, intelligently spent, we can help these underdeveloped countries help themselves.

No one knows how much, if any, of Indochina can still be saved. Provided we don't leave a vacuum into which the Communists would instantly move, the sooner the French give Laos, Cambodia, and what is left of Vietnam complete independence, the better.

TRANSITION DANGEROUS

The transition from French control to native independence will be extremely difficult and dangerous. Perhaps the United Nations should be asked to guarantee that complete independence will become effective at a stipulated future date, say in 12 months, and French administrative control should be continued in the interim.

I do not think our future national security can permit us to remain passive if all southeast Asia seems likely to fall under Communist control. If Thailand, Indonesia, Burma, and Malaya should be lost, I fear that subsequently India, Japan, and the Philippines would also go.

There is some point at which Russian imperial expansionism or international communism—call it what you will—must stop or be stopped. We cannot allow Russia to acquire such a preponderance of industrial power, natural resources, and manpower that we might lose a world war III.

I don't believe Russia wants all-out war now. I think it might be possible to prevent further Communist aggression in south Asia without war by such a program as I have outlined.

We probably will, I believe, have to send some American military contingents to southeast Asia. I hope we can accomplish our purpose with only training contingents and token forces, and without committing men to combat. Certainly we don't want to send a million American boys to fight in the jungles of Asia.

Conceivably the situation in southeast Asia will deteriorate to a point where it becomes evident that the plan which I am suggesting would be inadequate or ineffective.

SHOULD WARN RUSSIA

In that event I hope President Eisenhower will go before the United Nations, repeat the same magnificant proposals that he has made before, add a new declaration to the effect that the United States is prepared to do everything possible to bring about complete and universal disarmament, the abolition of all weapons, not just atomic weapons, provided the Russians will agree to complete disarmament with continuous and effective international inspection and control, but that if the Russians will not so agree, then if there is further Communist external military aggression anywhere, we will definitely regard it as a cause for war.

And by war I do not mean a local, jungle war, but a war to destroy the mainsprings of international Communist imperialism.

No one should underestimate the hostile reaction that such a clear-cut statement would produce in many parts of the world. If such a policy were going to be seriously considered, an enormous amount of advance preparatory diplomatic negotiation and conditioning of peoples both in the United States and abroad would be required, so that the maximum possible number of nations would instantaneously and unqualifiedly associate themselves with us in the announcement of that new policy.

In suggesting that this grave and awesome possibility might become a necessity, I am in no sense advocating it as a way to bring about a so-called preventive war. I would hope that such a warning might persuade the Communists to desist from further external aggression, and that an uneasy peace, without a further deterioration in our national security, would prevail.

In addition, during that possible period of a continuing uneasy peace but no new Communist aggression, it is conceivable that the people, not only in the United States but throughout the world, might come to realize that the unprecedented new dangers require radically new measures.

They might come, everywhere, to recognize the fact that an H-bomb war might mean the end of present civilization. They might come to realize that universal, enforcible, and complete disarmament, not mere control or reduction of armaments but their abolition, right down to the level of strictly limited and lightly armed forces for internal order only, is the key to peace.

EDUCATION NEEDED

A worldwide campaign of public education and discussion would be a prerequisite. Whether the Communist rulers would ever go along with such a proposal is highly unlikely. But ever is a long time, and, considering the alternative of a hydrogen-bomb war, we should explore every possibility, no matter how remote, of averting that war while maintaining our freedom.

Because of excessive nationalism and fear of impairment of so-called sovereignty, I am far from optimistic of the outcome.

But the peoples of the world might become convinced that a strengthened United Nations, with powers adequate to enforce universal disarmament and prevent violence between nations, but limited solely to that function, was mankind's one last best hope.

In conclusion, what I am today affirmatively advocating is, first, that the American people and the Congress reexamine, in the light of the gravity of the international situation, some of our present political and economic positions with a view toward modifying them so that we can attain a firmer solidarity between ourselves and the rest of the free world, namely, our potential allies.

Secondly, I am advocating that to the maximum degree possible we work through the United Nations and not act unilaterally.

I realize that I have expressed some unpopular views, views which may have shocked some of you, views with which many or most of you disagree.

But what is freedom if it is not an environment in which unpopular views can be expressed? Harvard or any organization stemming from it, such as the associated clubs meeting here today, would not be the traditional Harvard that we honor and cherish if it were not a place where freedom thrives.

Obviously no man who does not have access to all the information that is available to the President through the CIA (Central Intelligence Agency), the State Department and the Joint Chiefs of Staff should be dogmatic in his opinions, as to what we should or should not do to protect our national security, our very survival as a free nation.

I, for one, have confidence that President Eisenhower, being in possession of all the facts and being the kind of a man that he is, will make the right decision.

It is a terrible, awesome decision that destiny is forcing President Eisenhower to make. Whatever his decision proves to be, I pray that the American people will support him unreservedly.

Liverpool Cotton Exchange Reopens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. SMITH

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1954

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, one of the most heartening developments in the economy of the free world within recent years has been the reopening of the Liverpool Cotton Exchange, closed since 1941. Under unanimous consent, I include a news item from the New York Times describing this event, and an editorial from the Memphis Commercial Appeal on the same subject. They follow:

[From the New York Times]

Britain Resumes Cotton Trading as Liverpool Exchange Reopens—Bell Signals First Futures Deal in 13 Years at Price 3½ Times the Wartime Close—Commission Control To Lapse August 31

London, May 18.—A new era in the long history of the Liverpool cotton trade was signaled today by the ringing of a hand bell on the floor of the Liverpool Cotton Exchange. At the signal the president and vice president of the Liverpool Cotton Association made the first postwar Liverpool contract in cotton futures.

The cheers and applause of representatives from 18 cotton-growing and using countries quickly merged in the sharp cries of traders making bids again after 13 years of silence. For the last few weeks they had been rehearsing placing on futures—contracts for the purchase or sale of cotton to be delivered at a definite future date.

The market reopened quietly with trading confined to one 70-minute session in the afternoon—31.65 pence (a fraction less than 37 cents) a pound for October-November delivery. This was a rate 3½ times the corresponding price on March 31, 1941, just before the exchange closed. By the end of business the price had risen to 31.71 pence.

In an inaugural speech Lord Woolton, chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster, said the reopening of the market and the restoration of free trade in cotton proclaimed the financial recovery of Britain. "Sterling is strong again," he declared.

He replied to criticisms made by Labor Members of Parliament and leaders of trade unions in the cotton industry that restoration of the market would reintroduce unhealthy gambling and would harm the cotton manufacturing industry.

He said the necessity for some mechanism such as the futures market provided was shown by the fact that the Government of the time had to provide a system to effect the same results.

He was referring to the former Labor Government's setting up in 1947 the Raw Cotton Commission to centralize buying. This took over the traditional work of the Liverpool Cotton Market in maintaining stocks for Lancashire spinners and in protecting stocks against world price fluctuations.

The commission has incurred heavy losses, said to be £40 million ($112 million), which is a charge on taxpayers.

"HEDGE" AGAINST FLUCTUATIONS

With the reopening of private dealings, the function of providing a cover or hedge against price fluctuations will be returned to the cotton trade, although unlike the lapsing commission it will not be obliged by statute to do so.

Until the end of August the commission will continue to provide cover out of public funds. But after September 1 the Liverpool Futures Market will be the only steering medium available to the Lancashire cotton trade for hedging.

In some major respects the activities of the Liverpool market will be less comprehensive than before the war. There will be no futures contract for Egyptian cotton, although informal talks with representatives of Egyptian cotton interests may take place this week.

BASED ON $^{15}/_{16}$ MIDDLING

The new contract in Liverpool is based on Middling $^{15}/_{16}$-inch American cotton. The cover thus will not extend to changes that bring a new parity between the price of that standard American cotton and other qualities of American cotton, or between the prices of the standard quality of American cotton and those of cottons grown elsewhere.

Among many other changes is the restriction on price movements in each session to a penny (1⅛ cents) a pound.

United States policy will be a major factor affecting Liverpool prices. The United States Government holds about 8 million bales of cotton, and world production is outrunning consumption.

The situation has arisen that Britain, the consumer, has restored cotton trading to private hands, but that cotton growers in the United States are guaranteed both a minimum price and a market by their Government and thus operate as indirect Government agents.

[From the Memphis Commercial Appeal]

Liverpool Market Reopens

Cottonmen to the number of about 1,500 and representing all parts of the world were on hand to witness the reopening of the Liverpool cotton-futures market. It was a fair indication of the importance with which the event is regarded, though doubtless there was some sentimental feeling involved, too.

The historic market, once the world's biggest, was closed in 1941 as a casualty of World War II, and having it back in business will be of substantial benefit, first to British spinners and dealers, but also to American cottonmen. It is reported probable that only American cotton will be dealt in for the next year or so, until the market settles down, but it is regarded a sure thing that Egyptian cotton futures and those from other lands will eventually be handled.

The reopening of the Liverpool market also marks a move toward the renewal of the free-enterprise system. The British Government's raw cotton commission will end its protection of cotton users against price fluctuations on August 31. The commission has been in operation since the Laborites decided to nationalize cotton futures trading in 1945 to replace wartime controls in effect since 1941. The reopening augurs well on all counts.

Foreign Imports Damage United States Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RUSSELL V. MACK

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 5, 1954

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, the problem of import competition, with resulting unemployment and economic loss in American industry, is among the most serious questions before the Nation today. Many established American industries are threatened with extinction if too much imports invade our country. The gravity of this problem is demonstrated by the bipartisan introduction in the House of Representatives this week of legislation to revise the Nation's foreign-trade policy and restore to Congress the final responsibility for tariff adjustments.

I call to the attention of the House a speech by my colleague from the Sixth District of Washington, Representative Tollefson, before the Nationwide Committee of Industry, Agriculture, and Labor on Import-Export Policy here in Washington, D. C., on May 18. This speech graphically describes the insidious damage from cheap-labor imports that is so widespread among agriculture and industry in the Pacific Northwest. The import invasion is affecting other sections of our Nation, and I believe Representative Tollefson's speech is of interest to all of us at this critical time.

The speech follows:

An Address by Representative Thor C. Tollefson, of Washington, Before the Nationwide Committee of Industry, Agriculture, and Labor on Import-Export Policy at the Washington Hotel, Washington, D. C., May 18, 1954

Gentlemen, I must confess to some slight hesitation before I agreed to try to talk to this group on the broad question of tariffs and trade, for I knew that each of you knows the problem, at least in your own particular field, far better than I.

For a long time I have welcomed opportunities to call to the attention of fellow Congressmen and other groups the plight of the many industries in the Pacific Northwest which are being damaged by this country's shortsighted foreign-trade program, but that threat is not news to you. Else you would not be here.

However, the necessity of revising America's foreign-trade program in the real interests of the Nation is one that is very close to me and to a great many of the people of my own district, and I welcome the opportunity to talk it over with a group such as yours which represents others equally concerned throughout the length and breadth of America.

I believe we all can find some encouragement in the fact that this problem, and particularly our side of it, seems to be attracting more attention in recent weeks than it has in a long, long time.

And I think that is easily explained. The simple truth is that more different industries and agricultural groups are being hurt now than at any time since the Trade Agreements Act was first adopted some 20 years ago—and more and more of their workers are out of jobs due to the competition of goods from the low-wage areas abroad.

I understand that your committee recently made a survey of your own members, which disclosed that a minimum of 300,000 persons have lost their jobs to competition from these cheap foreign imports. If all other industrise subject to damage were included, I'm sure the total would be much higher.

For example, the Wall Street Journal recently quoted Mr. Emil Rieve, president of the CIO Textile Workers Union, as predicting that the ailing American textile industry will die unless some way is found to compete with the cheap labor countries such as England and Japan.

In the face of these increasing foreign imports, with a resultant shrinkage in domestic production, Mr. Rieve pointed out, the industry's normal employment of 1,250,000 persons is now down to only 900,000, with at lease 200,000 of them on short time.

In addition, we have seen recent public statements by a great number of industries, some of them very large and important ones, citing the growing damage and threats of damage from the lack of a fair and adequate tariff to compensate for America's superior wage rates and higher costs generally.

At first glance it might seem strange that this damage is just now spreading to some industries and becoming much more acute for others, when, after all, we have been living with the so-called reciprocal trade agreements for some two decades now.

Actually, however, it is not strange at all. For one thing, during this 20-year period our tariffs have been steadily and consistently lowered, until their protective effect is now about 75 percent less than it was in 1934. In addition, about 60 percent of all the items we now import come in duty free.

But most important, up until just recently we have never had a chance to see the trade agreements negotiated by the executive branch operating in a normal market.

First, of course, there was the world rearmament surge, followed by World War II, and then came the period of reconstruction, when foreign nations were supported by American cash and began rebuilding their shattered production facilities. And before that was accomplished there came the outbreak in Korea, new inflation, and another distortion of normal production and trade patterns.

So for 16 or 17 years, the world has been in a period of stimulated economy, with disruption of long-established trade channels and production facilities; with widely fluctuating currencies and an unbalance of trade between normal peacetime and military goods.

And throughout that period we have witnessed our State Department, to whom Congress relinquished its constitutional control over tariffs and trade matters in 1934, conclude agreement after agreement with various nations, all of them made in the interests of international diplomacy, and none with the real interests of American producers and workers in mind.

It is not a little ironic that these agreements have been called reciprocal trade agreements. If we look at almost any of them we find there is very little reciprocity on the part of other nations.

For example, look at the electrical industry.

We have recently seen reports in the press of the United States Government purchasing heavy equipment, like generators, turbines, and transformers from foreign manufacturers who are able to underbid our own domestic producers, even with the additional shipping charges and the small tariff on them. Our tariff on transformers and generators, for instance, has been reduced from 35 to 15 percent since 1930, and on hydraulic turbines from 27½ to 15 percent.

An official of the Westinghouse Manufacturing Co. recently estimated that his company's workers had lost more than a million man-hours of work, the firm more than $7 million in sales, and the Government more than $1,800,000 in taxes on Government contracts for heavy electrical equipment awarded to foreign producers.

Thus, foreign makers are taking over our markets for such heavy electrical equipment, even though it is recognized that a war emergency could be disastrous, since differences in specifications and design mean that replacement parts for any that break down or wear out would not be available from American companies.

But what about the much touted reciprocity?

Well, in this particular field, it doesn't exist. American producers of heavy electrical power equipment find it is virtually impossible to ship such goods to the United Kingdom, France, Western Germany, Austria, Denmark, Switzerland, and various other nations. The governments of these nations will not buy it, and they will not permit their private industries to buy it.

The proponents of free trade and lower tariffs make great claims about the higher productivity of American plants, contending that unless they are marginal or inefficient, they can undersell foreign goods, even though they are made by workers with wages of one-half to one-tenth those of American workers.

In some instances, of course, this is true. That is, it would be true if foreign nations were really interested in buying American products. Instead, however, in addition to the higher import duties most of them levy, they have set up quota limitations, currency inequalities, trading bloc areas, and almost every type of restriction you can think of to protect their own domestic markets from unwanted competition.

The making of electrical consumer goods is, in most cases, a production-line process, with highly modernized factories and mass-production output. That would seem to be one field, therefore, where we could find profitable markets abroad.

But it doesn't work out that way. Great Britain, for example, permits only token imports of many American consumer products. As a result, under that quota one of the largest American manufacturers of electrical appliances was able to ship to England in 1953 exactly 1 dishwasher, 35 electric ranges, 25 deep freezers, 19 washers and dryers and 194 refrigerators.

It was Great Britain's Chancellor of the Exchequer, you may recall, who originated the phrase, "Trade—not aid," which has been so effectively propagandized by the free traders in America.

A similar ban exists on American machine tools. No European country except Switzerland will allow imports of machine tools if domestic manufacturers can supply equivalent machines. One American power tool manufacturer, for example, had a sizable market in France before the war. But today he is allowed to ship in only $3,000 worth each year, on which he pays a 60 percent tariff. (The United States tariff on machine tools is 15 percent.)

The myth of reciprocity is only one of several which have been cleverly sold to the American public in the past two decades in the name of world cooperation and domestic prosperity.

Let us look at a few others.

For one thing, we have recently heard a good deal of talk about the necessity of increasing our imports so that foreign nations may make more dollars which they, in turn, will spend with us.

But does it always work out just that way? As a matter of fact, it doesn't.

There hasn't been quite as much talk lately from the lower tariff exponents about the so-called dollar gap, which has so long been cited as an argument that we should buy foreign goods, even though we produce them ourselves, just to provide other nations with spendable dollars. The real truth is that, except for our military shipments, the dollar gap has about disappeared.

It has been argued that as the foreign nations earned more dollars than they had been spending, the excess dollars would come back to us in payment for greater exports from us. But this does not seem to be confirmed by what has happened in the recent past. For example, last year we bought some $3.5 billion worth of goods from Latin America, but we sold them less than $3 billion worth—the first time in several years that our imports from these nations exceeded our exports to them. This certainly wasn't because they didn't earn the dollars to purchase American goods. No, it was because the productive capacities of Japan, Germany, France, Italy, and England are now equal to or ahead of their prewar levels, and they are again fighting for world markets.

If they can pay their labor anywhere from one-tenth to one-half as much as we pay, we should not expect to beat them out in the world marketplaces, any more than we can expect to compete with them on the American market unless we have an equalizing tariff structure.

As early as last October the Guaranty Trust Co. survey reported that foreign countries were able to build up their gold reserves by nearly $2.8 billion during the 15 months ended June 30, 1953. These reserves at that time equaled $21.6 billion, whereas the United States gold stocks had declined to $22.5 billion.

"Exports from the United States," the survey declared, "are running close to imports, and the small export surplus is much more than offset by the excess of invisible imports."

It has long been an accepted truism that tariffs are a local issue. There is some accuracy to that claim—at least in a political sense. However, under today's conditions, the question is far broader than that.

If we let American industries be crippled, 1 by 1, the consequence to our whole national economy—and thereby to the western free world—will be disastrous.

Thus, it is important that the suffering tulip-bulb grower and hardwood producer in my own Pacific Northwest realize that his interests are similar to the lace manufacturer of the New England and the bicycle and pottery makers of Pennsylvania and Ohio.

It has too long been the fashion of the opposition, including many ill-informed newspaper editorial writers, to refer to the proponents of fair tariff protection as a small, economically unimportant, and inefficient group of isolated industries.

Fortunately, this false impression is now beginning to die, and the country as a whole, I believe, is beginning to recognize the vast number of jobs and industries dependent on protection from the low wages and poor standards of living in competing foreign nations.

Actually, of course, these affected industries and agricultural enterprises are located all over the United States, and in surprisingly large numbers.

In my own Pacific Northwest, for example, there are thousands of people directly dependent on such affected or seriously threatened occupations for their livelihood. They are employed by the growers of tulips, iris, and daffodils; the tuna and Pacific groundfish industries; the hardwood and plywood producers; the Northwest tree-nut growers; and the raisers of such items as red raspberries, apples, and pears.

Let me cite a couple of short examples of the damage to which I refer. The two States of Washington and Oregon are the center of the production of daffodils, iris, and tulips in the United States. In my district alone growers have produced some 30 million King Alfred daffodils annually—more than are grown in all of Holland. But now an excess of foreign bulbs is being dumped on the United States market at prices below the cost of domestic production, and many growers of the Northwest are facing bankruptcy. They are being forced to sell below costs, and even to destroy substantial portions of their unsold surplus.

As you might expect, this situation has developed as a direct result of sharply lowered tariffs. The United States Tariff Commission reported last year that between 1937 and 1952, while the import duty on narcissus bulbs was being lowered from $6 per thousand bulbs to $3, the number of imported bulbs jumped from 6 million to more than 23 million annually. Likewise, the Commission said, the ad valorem duty on iris bulbs was reduced from 10 to 7½ percent between 1950 and 1952, and the total imports of bulbs increased from 50 million to nearly 70 million.

Or consider what is happening in the hardboard and plywood industries, or to the fishermen and fish processors of my area.

Under the reciprocal trade agreements program the duty on imported hardboard has been very sharply reduced since 1930. Census Bureau figures disclosed that, as a result, imports of this vital material last year were running far ahead of the previous year—up some 65 percent from Canada, and from 300 to 800 percent from the Scandinavian countries.

Naturally, this impact has been felt. One producer has been forced to lay off more than 350 employees; another reports a 50-percent cutback in production, and others are on 2- to 4-day weeks.

The fishing industry offers a similarly bleak picture. Imports of all kinds are up, and domestic production is sharply down. A look at comparative wages makes the answer clear. Canadian fishermen and processors earn an average of 98 cents an hour, while their American counterparts make an average of $2.04 per hour. Japanese fishermen and processers are paid far less even than the Canadians.

These are sketches of just a few low-tariff-affected businesses in only one section of the Nation. Multiply them several-fold by the similar situation in New England, the Mid and Far West, the Pennsylvania and Ohio coal and ceramics areas, the coal fields of the southeast and the textile, chemicals, and many other industries in many areas and you begin to have a picture of the true tariff damage this Nation is suffering.

As we all well know, the solution of the tariff problem is not an easy one. There are intelligent, conscientious people who completely disagree on the entire question, and both sides must be considered.

However, if we are to protect our domestic businesses and agricultural enterprises from serious, perhaps critical, damage and millions of workers from loss of income, it seems to me we must insist on several concrete moves at once.

1. We should return more control over tariffs and trade to Congress, where it was placed by the Constitution. I favor the encouragement of trade and commerce among the nations, as long as it is mutually profitable. But in the future, primary consideration in new agreements must be given to the effect on the American wage earner and on the American economy.

2. Congress should assume responsibility for either approving or rejecting the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (or GATT, as it is familiarly called). As you know, this has never been reviewed by the Congress, and yet is in the position of passing judgment on American tariff actions; and

3. Some method must be found to make the escape clause effective. Out of some 60 applications for import damage relief filed under it, only 3 have resulted in favorable action. Thus, it is practically meaningless as it has been administered.

These reforms can only be realized if all who believe in them present a united and solid front, realizing that in that lies their strength.

If these affected industries and their employees will all pull together in the common cause now, each recognizing that the problem can only be solved with legislation which brings real relief for all, there is a good chance that the course our Government has been following for the past 20 years can be altered. I, for one, will do all in my power to see that it is.

Poor Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 29, 1954

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial which appeared in the Brooklyn Eagle of May 16, 1954, is deserving of the widest possible distribution. It speaks volumes about an administration that talks about human values, but acts on the basis of dollarwise economy.

POOR ECONOMY

Not all of the economies made effective by President Eisenhower's administration have reflected practical wisdom. The 28 national parks and similar areas supervised by the National Park Service have suffered in many ways from reduced appropriations. They stand among the Nation's most valuable assets and failure to maintain them adequately represents poor judgment and false economy.

The records show that 46 million persons visited these parks last year. This consistently growing popularity justifies the expectation that the number of visitors will rise to 50 million during the coming year. There is nothing strange about this popularity. The beauty and the wonder of the Grand Canyon, Yellowstone, and Glacier are unsurpassed and the growing number of motorcars and improved highways make them more readily accessible.

Yet, the parks are being permitted to fall into a state of neglect as roads, trails, and buildings deteriorate and the service staff is curtailed. This condition should not be permitted to continue. Restoration of appropriation cuts is justified, but if Congress is not willing to make this adjustment the fees for entrance to the parks should be increased.

Unity of Action Is Lacking at Geneva

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 26, 1954

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an editorial that recently appeared in the Wall Street Journal. It is obvious to most everybody that the British have not been willing to support the American position which was to present a united front against the Communists in Indochina. The editorial in question follows:

MISREADING THE COMMUNIST MIND

As Mr. Chamberlin notes on this page today, there were two ways in which the West might have hoped for an Indochina settlement at Geneva. One was by appeasing the Chinese Communists; the other was by a show of strength and unity.

The West was able to adopt neither. Appeasement was ruled out by morality, experience, and American public opinion. Any show of united strength was wrecked by a succession of events for which the United States, Britain, and France must share the blame.

The United States publicly talked of united action before it had assurances of unity, especially from the British. The French misjudged Communist military power in Indochina; the result was the fall of Dien Bien Phu and the enhancement of Communist bargaining power at Geneva. But the British attitude, if it has not exclusively torpedoed Western hopes, is perhaps the most regrettable aspect of the spectacle of western disunity.

It is the British attitude that nothing must be done which might prejudice a successful outcome at Geneva—specifically, no commitment must be made on the projected southeast Asian defense alliance until after the conclusion of the conference. The reasoning appears to be that the formation of that alliance now might so antagonize the Communists that they would refuse to make agreements they would have been willing to make in the absence of the alliance.

This misreads the Communist mind and ignores a decade of experience with which Prime Minister Churchill and Foreign Secretary Eden are intimately familiar. Soviet expansion has been halted, where it has been halted, by western strength and joint determination to resist; where that has been absent, it has not been halted.

If the British, therefore, had agreed to the immediate creation of the southeast Asian alliance, the Communists at Geneva would not have been less, but much more amenable to a satisfactory Indochina settlement. They would have faced the certainty of powerful resistance, and this might well have persuaded them to stop the war and make as good a deal as the West would give them.

As it is, they face no certain resistance, not even continued French Union resistance for sure. They have every incentive for continuing the war and increasing its pressure; they have every incentive for sticking to their impossible "peace" conditions, which in effect are unconditional surrender terms, until the weak and divided West capitulates.

Without doubt Sir Winston and Mr. Eden understands this. The explanation of their attitude is presumably to be found in British public opinion. The Government is under fire from the Bevanites of labor's left wing for even thinking about a southeast Asian pact, and there is apparently a general disposition to avoid anything that might lead to involvement in Indochina. These circumstances may explain, but they do not alter, the fact that the British position contributes substantially to the West's difficulties at Geneva.

Iowa's Stake in Freer World Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GUY M. GILLETTE

OF IOWA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 21, 1954

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, the May 1954 issue of Nation's Business, the United States Chamber of Commerce magazine, contains an article by Sam Stavisky entitled "This Is Foreign Trade at Work." The article underlines in dramatic fashion the importance to the people of Iowa, as well as to the people of the rest of the Nation, of more liberal trade policies.

Pointing out that the Cedar Rapids, Iowa, Chamber of Commerce has led the way in Iowa in encouraging overseas trade through its Foreign Trade Bureau, the article demonstrates how greatly Cedar Rapids depends on exports for its prosperity. One out of every ten persons working in Cedar Rapids earns his living, directly or indirectly, from exports.

Ever since I have had the honor to represent the people of Iowa in the Congress of the United States, I have worked in support of those farsighted statesmen who were striving to liberalize our trade policies, to lower the mountainous tariff barriers erected in the heyday of protectionism, and to assure our farmers and manufacturing industries greater export markets through the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act and other similar measures.

Today the Nation faces great decisions in the field of international trade. The protectionists are organizing for another desperate assault on the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. The Eisenhower administration is wisely seeking to stimulate our prosperity here at home through increasing trade with foreign countries. If the President's program is to be approved by Congress, and is to continue to receive the strong congressional backing it will need in the years ahead, President Eisenhower is going to need the support of every Senator and Representative whose record demonstrates a forthright stand in favor of lower instead of higher trade barriers.

I ask unanimous consent that portions of this revealing article about a leading community in my State of Iowa be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THIS IS FOREIGN TRADE AT WORK

(By Sam Stavisky)

The wife of a Coe College professor in Cedar Rapids, Iowa, tosses a pound of sugar into her shopping basket and thus insures employment for a mechanic at the Iowa Manufacturing Co. in another part of town.

The mechanic never saw a sugarcane, his interest in foreign trade is negligible, and certainly he doesn't know a chunky little man named Julio Acosta who lives near Cardenas, Cuba.

Yet when the checker rings up the sugar sale on the cash register, the mechanic, the professor's wife, Julio Cardenas, and Cedar Rapids have been engaged in a piece of international commerce that affects the welfare and prosperity of every one of them.

That is foreign trade.

Cardenas is a thriving seaport on the northern coast of Cuba, about 75 miles east of Habana, proud of its year-round balmy climate of its Spanish colonial style palacio municipal, of its surrounding wealth of sugarcane.

Cedar Rapids is a thriving trading center, deep in the heart of the corn country, proud of its extremes of climate, of its battleship-like municipal center erected on an island, of its rich outlying topsoil.

Cardenas, population 45,000, has a few tanneries, and there's some activity in the raising of henequin, a fiber. Basically, though, Cardenas is a one-crop, one-industry town. The welfare of Cardenas is tied to the cultivation, processing, and sale of sugar.

In contrast, Cedar Rapids, population 75,000, is a city of diversified interests. Corn, oats, wheat and barley, cattle and hogs, all play a part in the area's economic health. An equally important role is played by its wide variety of manufacturing plants.

Yet, as sharply as the two cities differ, the relative prosperity of each is linked to the same chain of exports and imports between their two countries and the countries of the world. Both the one-crop city and the city of diversified products must have foreign trade to bolster and maintain their respective high standards of living.

Cardenas and Cuba sell cane sugar to Cedar Rapids and the United States. In return, Cardenas and Cuba buy hams, lard, cereals, tractors, rock crushers, radio transmitters, farm spraying equipment, and other products from Cedar Rapids, along with items from just about every other section of the United States.

Volumes of statistics show how much sugar the people of Cedar Rapids and the rest of the United States bought from Cardenas and Cuba; and how many Cedar Rapids and American products the people of Cardenas and Cuba bought in return. Statistics are forbidding, but not Julio Acosta whom I visited on his family-size cane plantation.

Julio was standing on the hood of his American-made truck, waving his arms proudly at the tall, shimmering ranks of cane which rose higher than the truck's cab, when he reduced the statistics to one apt sentence.

"Si, senor," he said. "If I get a good price for this cane, I will be able to buy another truck this year. If not, I will have to wait."

The colono (cane farmer) was acutely aware that his ability to get a good price for his sugar hinged on the sale to the United States, by far Cuba's biggest customer. If he got a good price, someone would sell a new American truck. Thus Julio's own prosperity is intertwined with that of the auto industry workers who build trucks in Detroit and other American cities. (In 1952 Julio's compatriots bought 24,300 American-made autos, trucks, and buses.)

The Acosta farmhouse is too far off the main highway to be served by central electric power, but the Acostas—father and two grown sons—were well enough off, as a result of their cane sales in recent years, to have bought and installed an American-made set of batteries and an American-made generator which produce enough electricity to provide lighting and to run an American-made radio. The farmhouse also contained an American-made kerosene refrigerator and sewing machine. Virtually every piece of farm equipment and machinery bore the phrase: Made in U. S. A.

Juan Perez Escanez is the unpaid secretary of the union at one of the sugar mills in Cardenas. Like other workers in the seasonal sugar industry, he supplements his income by working on the docks when the mill is temporarily shut down.

"The workers in Cardenas, whether they work in the mills, in the distilleries, or on the docks understand that sugar is their livelihood, and exports their source of prosperity," the impassive but bright-eyed Juan told me.

* * * * *

"My wife wants to buy a washing machine, but I told her she will have to wait a while because last year was not so good," Juan explained. "It all depends on sugar."

According to the local Camara de Comercio (chamber of commerce), some 1,000 householders there already enjoy the benefits of American-made washing machines.

The Camara de Comercio also estimates that 1,500 automobiles, 6,000 radios, 1,000 TV sets, 3,000 refrigerators, and 500 freezers—virtually all produced and assembled in American plants—are in use, bought with sugar-export dollars.

Any visitor to Cardenas can see, as I did, that the picturesque seaport is an excellent market for American producers. The stores of Cardenas are packed with American goods of all kinds and makes. So are the stores and shops of all of Cuba. In 1952 Juan's fellow Cubans bought 44,000 refrigerators and home freezers, 43,500 TV sets, 79,000 radio sets, 39,000 stoves and ranges, 33,000 electric fans, 6,000 washing machines, 3,700 sewing machines, 7,500 typewriters.

* * * * *

Cedar Rapids, which is 900 miles from New Orleans, its nearest port, lies in the heart of what was once the Nation's isolationist belt. Recently, however, Cedar Rapids families have begun to realize that exports have helped to give them their high effective buying power, after taxes, of $5,344 annually.

More and more farmers in the Cedar Rapids area, and in Iowa, today recognize that their own prosperity is wrapped up to an important degree in the exports of their farm products, according to Rex Conn, farm editor of the Cedar Rapids Gazette and former county agent, who still spends most of his time in contact with the farmers.

"The volume of farm exports varies from year to year," Mr. Conn explained. "In any case farm exports are important in holding down the temporary oversupply of unsold agricultural yields, and in returning to the farmers decent prices and fair profits."

Corn, cornmeal, popcorn, oat flour, cereals, stock and poultry feeds, meat products, lard are among the agricultural products exported from Cedar Rapids.

The breadwinners of Cedar Rapids, especially those who work in the many plants which over the past 20 years have increasingly developed foreign outlets, are even more conscious of the importance of exports to their standard of living.

"Just ask any of the men on the assembly line," commented John Evans, AFL Central Labor Union secretary. "They won't even have to talk to you about what exports mean to them. All they'll do is point to the machine on the line—a rock crusher, or a power crane, or something like that—and show you the ticket that says the machine is slated for Cuba, Venezuela, Belgian Congo, or Siam."

The businessmen of Cedar Rapids have taken positive steps to encourage overseas trade. In 1947 Cedar Rapids business leaders set up a foreign-trade bureau in their local chamber of commerce—a bureau unique in the State. Since then the bureau has helped individual firms with their export problems and has undertaken an educational campaign in the city and surrounding area.

As of today, a partial list of manufactured items exported from Cedar Rapids to Cardenas and other parts of the world includes navigation equipment, limestone spreaders, sensitized photographic paper, power cranes and draglines, television boosters, fertilizers, piston grinders, tractors, meat tenderizers, pharmaceuticals, precast concrete joints, grain milling machinery, asphalt plants, trampolins and other gymnastic equipment, pressure embalmers, passenger elevators, radio transmitters and receivers, machine chassis parts for trailers, seeders, creamery processing machinery, belt conveyers, sparkplug insulators, and scores of other items.

"In one recent month," noted Bob Caldwell, the quietly energetic executive vice president of the chamber, "I signed certificates of origin for local products being shipped to 58 countries." From memory he recalled vitamins to Iceland, dresser sets to Lebanon, radio sets to India, complete rice mills to Siam, and roadbuilders to Cuba.

Iowa Manufacturing Co., maker of heavy earth-moving equipment, is a home-grown industry which has long sought foreign business for its surplus production. Recently the firm has set up two export sales subsidiaries in an effort to go beyond surplus production sales.

"For instance, we sold $500,000 worth of equipment to Cuba last year," explained Frank D'Aquilla, export manager. "We feel we can sell more, much more, if we only go after it hard."

A number of Cedar Rapids firms have their own export departments. Some 15 of them sell overseas through Gordon Fennell, who operates an export division for these companies. Tall, lanky Mr. Fennell had a different angle on the value of exports to a business and its community.

"Exports," he said, "have no seasons. Summer is the slack season for oatmeal in the United States, but at the same time, it's winter in one-half the world." Two big companies, Quaker and National, prepare oatmeal in Cedar Rapids for export the world over.

Cedar Rapids industrial plants produce $200 million worth of goods a year. About $25 million worth is shipped abroad, according to the local foreign trade bureau.

"Our studies indicate that 1 out of every 10 persons working in Cedar Rapids gets his livelihood, directly or indirectly, from exports," commented youthful Bob White, of Collins Radio, who is chairman of the foreign trade bureau. "That adds up to 4,100 persons. It is obvious that any abrupt halt to exports, wiping out the work and incomes of the 4,100, would have a sharply injurious, if not disastrous, effect on the rest of the community."

The story of Cardenas and Cedar Rapids is, to a greater or lesser degree, the story of virtually every sector of Cuba and the United States.

The Cubans sell us around half of their sugar crop. In addition they sell us some tobacco, fibers, and—through our tourists—scenery and services.

We sell Cuba just about everything that's grown, processed, or manufactured in this country.

* * * * *

The interdependence of the prosperity of Cuba's colonos and American farmers can be demonstrated in several ways. For instance, Cuba's sale of sugar to the United States provides Cubans with the money to buy one-sixth of the American rice crop—a boon to 7 counties in Mississippi, 15 counties in California, 24 counties in Texas, 27 parishes in Louisiana, 31 counties in Arkansas.

One fourth of America's lard exports goes to Cuba—to the benefit of the farmers in the corn-hog producing States of Iowa, Illinois, Indiana, Ohio, Missouri, and Minnesota. American exports of cotton goods to Cuba are a definite help to this industry in New England and the South.

In 1952 Cuba cultivated 1,326,000 acres to provide sugar for Americans. In the same year, American farmers had to utilize 1,478,000 acres to produce the pork and lard, rice, wheat and flour, beans and peas, cotton, dairy products, barley and malt, eggs, fruits, oats and oatmeal, corn and corn products, and truck crops exported to Cuba. American farm products sent to Cuba required more crop land than was under cultivation in any 1 of the 6 New England States.

A little more than every fourth spoonful of sugar consumed in the United States—where the per capita consumption is 100 pounds a year—comes from the Cuban cane fields. A little more than every fourth dollar of Cuban per capita income, one of the highest in Latin America, is spent on goods from the United States of America.

In 1952 Americans bought $438 million in Cuban products, chiefly sugar. In the same year, Cubans bought $516 million worth of American goods. Little Cuba, with only 6 million population, proved to be our sixth most important foreign customer, providing jobs for more than 86,000 workers in the United States.

Just as the two cities, Cedar Rapids and Cardenas, are only a small, but important, part of the United States-Cuba story, so the United States-Cuba story is only a small, but important, part of the overall United States world trade volume.

In 1952 Uncle Sam exported $15,200,000,000 worth of products, providing jobs, according to the Department of Commerce, for 3,126,000 Americans. In 1952 Uncle Sam imported $10,700,000,000 worth, and these imports provided 1,250,000 more jobs in the United States of America.

Together, our exports and imports in a single year created 4,376,000 jobs in this country.

This is an impressive figure, and it strikes home when you stop to think in terms of Cedar Rapids again. Cedar Rapids employs 41,000 workers of all kinds. It takes the annual output of all the workers in 106 cities the size of Cedar Rapids to handle America's foreign trade. The export-import figures strike home—every American home.

City Club of Chicago Urges Appropriation for Calumet-Sag

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 29, 1954

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, complying with the suggestion of Dr. John Lapp, an outstanding leader in the civic activities of Chicago, I am extending my remarks to include a letter from the City Club of Chicago urging an appropriation for the Calumet-Sag Waterway development. The letter follows:

To the Members of Congress From Illinois.

GENTLEMEN: Following careful consideration of the proposed improvement of the Calumet-Sag Channel, the City Club of Chicago, by resolution of its board of governors, recommends that Congress appropriate the necessary funds to expedite this improvement and urges your support of the relevant legislation.

Our understanding is that this will require an initial appropriation of $5 million, as requested by the Corps of Engineers, and supplementary appropriations aggregating about $95 million for disbursement over a period of 5 years.

We believe such an investment is in the national interest, for the following reasons:

Chicago's position as a major world port is of growing importance. Last year foreign ships made no less than 165 visits to Chicago via the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence route. These ships have been designed and built to dimensions which permit their passage through the present restricted St. Lawrence Waterway and locks. The fact that a substantial number of shipping concerns, both foreign and domestic, find it profitable to build special ships for this trade is evidence of its importance and potential.

After deepening of the St. Lawrence is completed—and there is now no question but that this will be done in the near future—a much larger percentage of the world's ocean freighters will be able to reach the port of Chicago. Since this port is only about 850 miles farther than New York from Northwest Europe, and since some 25 percent of the foreign commerce of major eastern seaboard ports is generated in the Chicago area and hinterland, it seems probable that Chicago's direct overseas traffic will greatly expand.

Accordingly, the Chicago Regional Port District Board plans to install in and around Lake Calumet ninety to one hundred million dollars' worth of modern dock and port facilities. These will be financed by revenue bonds which will be self-liquidating and hence not add to the tax load.

2. The Calumet Sag Channel has large traffic volume and a much larger potential.

River traffic from the gulf coast and the Mississippi, Missouri, and Ohio Valleys now reaches Chicago in considerable bulk. Despite the fact that the Sag Channel is the one major bottleneck preventing full utilization of Great Lakes-to-gulf inland waterways and the big investment they already represent, this channel handles about 4 million tons of shipping per year. It is anticipated that when the channel is widened and bridges suitable adapted, 18 million tons of cargo will be shipped to and from Chicago via the inland waterways, 8 to 9 million tons of which will be transferred from one type of vessel to another in the prospective Lake Calumet Harbor.

3. The Sag Channel improvement would stimulate industry and employment.

The enlarged capacity of the widened and straightened 16.5 miles of the artificial portion of the Sag Channel will undoubtedly be an inducement to heavy industry to occupy from 2,000 to 3,000 acres of now vacant land with canal frontage. There is little question that the increased barge traffic, in conjunction with the increased lake and ocean traffic moving to and from the Calumet Port of Chicago, would benefit the Chicago region. In addition it would increase the prosperity of the entire Midwest and the country as a whole by expanding industry and employment and augmenting taxable values and national product.

4. The Sag Channel improvement would aid national defense.

In the event of war with its attendant strain on every form of transport, the availability of a high-capacity inland waterway as an alternative or auxiliary facility would offer enormous advantage. Coastal shipping and convoys could be released for other duties, and this one factor of flexibility alone might have values beyond present conception.

5. The Sag Channel improvement has been recommended by the Corps of Engineers and approved in principle by Congress.

In 1947 the Crops of Engineers completed extensive studies with the formulation of this plan for elimination of the inland waterway system bottleneck created by the inadequacy of this section of the Calumet-Sag Channel. Although its recommendations were approved by Congress at that time, the necessary funds are yet to be appropriated. We believe the implementation of this considered decision has an importance and an urgency which transcend the significance of the appropriations involved.

Yours very truly,

JOHN RUETTINGER,
President.

Approved by the board of governors of the City Club of Chicago.

DISTRIBUTION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

To the Vice President and each Senator 100 copies; to the Secretary and Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, each, 25 copies; to the Secretary, for official use, not to exceed 35 copies; to the Sergeant at Arms, for use on the floor of the Senate, not to exceed 50 copies; to each Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress, 68 copies; to the Clerk, Sergeant at Arms, and Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives, each, 25 copies; to the Clerk, for official use, not to exceed 50 copies; and to the Doorkeeper, for use on the floor of the House of Representatives, not to exceed 75 copies; to the Vice President and each Senator, Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress there shall also be furnished (and shall not be transferable), 3 copies of the daily Record, of which 1 shall be delivered at his residence, 1 at his office, and 1 at the Capitol.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. The money derived from such sales shall be paid into the Treasury and accounted for in his annual report to Congress, and no sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

Code of Laws of the United States

Title 44, Section 181. Congressional Record; arrangement, style, contents, and indexes.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the Congressional Record, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the Congressional Record semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

Title 44, Section 182b. Same; illustrations, maps, diagrams.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the Record without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the Congressional Record the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily Record as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided,* That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the Record with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the official reporters of the Congressional Record, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the Record shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the Record issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the Record for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the Record of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the Record shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the Record style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the Record.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the Congressional Record any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix, but this rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the Congressional Record.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the Congressional Record Appendix the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed.

10. *Official reporters.*—The official reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the Congressional Record by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this restriction shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. The Public Printer or the official reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the Congressional Record which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Illustrations.*—Pursuant to section 182b, title 44, United States Code (as shown above), requests for authority to insert an illustration in the Record should be submitted to the Joint Committee on Printing through the chairman of the Committee on Printing of the respective House in which the speech desired to be illustrated may be delivered. Illustrations shall not exceed in size a page of the Record and shall be linecuts only. Copy for illustrations must be furnished to the Public Printer not later than 12:30 o'clock p. m. of the day preceding publication.

13. *Corrections.*—The permanent Record is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

IN

Ha
ma

the
ab

bet
Ha
po
to

pap
cre
cial
pol
ter
del
sta

I
pri
sec
and
Gol

T
we
ORD,

W
blan
that
(thr
and
ende
sale
perc
Fran
resu
in t

Th
ing
sible
stan
resp
and
peri
But
ous
who
and
tegr
need
Crip
his
Sept
possi
(The
week

Th
man
gold
help
its o

Appendix

The Gold Standard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS CASE
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 24, 1954

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, Henry Hazlitt, writer of Business Tides of the magazine Newsweek, has very well said:

> Nothing has more clearly demonstrated the need for the gold standard than its abandonment.

In a remarkable series of 6 articles between January 4 and March 15, Mr. Hazlitt has effectively stated the importance to world economy of a return to the gold standard.

> Everywhere—

He says—

> paper money is aiding, prolonging, and increasing inflation, nationalism, statism, socialism, authoritarianism, expropriation, and political and economic chaos. The only alternative—which it would be perilous to delay further—is a return to the full gold standard.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD excerpts from the second article, Gold Means Good Faith, and the final article, How To Return to Gold.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GOLD MEANS GOOD FAITH

While the inflation everywhere has been blamed on the war, it has occurred in nations that were never involved in the war (throughout Latin America, for example), and it has continued to rage since the war ended. As an indirect index of this, wholesale prices have increased in this country 60 percent since 1945; in Britain, 92 percent; in France, 600 percent. And everywhere this result has been due primarily to the increase in the paper-money supply.

The monetary managers are fond of telling us that they have substituted responsible monetary management for the gold standard. But there is no historic record of responsible paper-money management. Here and there it is possible to point to brief periods of a stabilization of paper money. But such periods have always been precarious and short lived. The record taken as a whole is one of hyperinflation, devaluation, and monetary chaos. And as for any integrity in paper-money management, we need merely recall the record of Sir Stafford Cripps, who, in the 2-year period preceding his devaluation of the pound sterling on September 18, 1949, publicly denied any such possibility no fewer than a dozen times. (The record was cited in my column in Newsweek, Nov. 21, 1949.)

This is what happens under monetary management without the discipline of the gold standard. The gold standard not only helps to insure good policy and good faith; its own continuance or resumption requires good policy and good faith. The gold standard is not important as an isolated gadget but only as an integral part of the whole economic system. Just as managed paper money goes with a statist and collectivist philosophy, with government planning, with a coercive economy in which the citizen is always at the mercy of bureaucratic caprice, so the gold standard is an integral part of a free-enterprise economy under which governments respect private property, economize in spending, balance their budgets, keep their promises, and above all refuse to connive in inflation—in the overexpansion of money or credit.

So if, as it should, the American Government decides to return to a full gold standard, its first step must be to bring inflation to a halt. Without this preliminary or accompanying step any attempted return to gold would be certain to collapse. And once again the gold standard itself, rather than the inflation, would probably be discredited in the popular mind.

How, then, does one halt inflation? The economist, Ludwig von Mises, has maintained that no increase whatever should be allowed in the quantity of money and bank credit that is not 100 percent covered by deposits paid in by the public. While this is basically the result that should be aimed at, it would be politically more acceptable, I think, if this result were brought about by means in accordance with our own best practices and past traditions. I therefore suggest that the halting of inflation should be achieved by these four means:

1. Start balancing the budget.

2. Stop using the banking system to buy and peg Government bonds at fixed rates. (In fact, no further net increase should be permitted in the total volume of Government securities held by the country's banking system.)

3. Insist that the Federal Reserve Banks impose discount rates that would penalize borrowing by member banks rather than make it profitable. This means that the rediscount rate should be kept above the rate to prime borrowing customers at the great city banks.

4. Restore the legal reserve requirements of the Federal Reserve banks to 40 percent from their present "war emergency" reserve requirement of only 25 percent. There is no more effective way in which Congress could register its own opposition to further inflation—if it really is opposed to further inflation.

HOW TO RETURN TO GOLD

If we grant that there is a great potential danger in trying to return immediately to a full gold standard at $35 an ounce, by what steps are we to return? And how are we to determine the dollar-gold ratio—which would decide the new "price of gold"—at which the return should be made?

It is a sound general principle, that unless there are the strongest reasons for change, the dollar-gold ratio, once fixed, ought not to be tampered with. This rule certainly applied to the pre-1933 rate of $20.67 an ounce, because that was a real rate, at which anybody was entitled to demand gold, and got it. But the $35 rate, fixed by Roosevelt-Morgenthau whim in 1934, is not a rate at which real convertibility has existed. It is only foreign central banks, not American citizens, that are permitted to buy gold from our Federal Reserve banks at $35 an ounce, and even they are allowed to do this only under certain conditions. The present $35-an-ounce gold standard is a window-dressing standard, a mere gold-plated standard. There is no reason for treating the $35 figure as sacrosanct.

The new dollar-gold ratio that we should aim at is one at which gold convertibility can be permanently maintained, and that will not be in itself either inflationary or deflationary—that will neither, in other words, bring about a rise or a fall in prices.

There are some economists who contend on unconvincing evidence that $35 an ounce is that rate. Others profess to have some mathematical formula for arriving at such a rate, and on this basis confidently advocate $70 an ounce or some other figure. Their diverse results in themselves invite suspicion. Values and prices are not set by mathematical calculations, but by supply and demand operating through free markets.

And because of the enormous inflation in the 20 years since we departed from a real gold standard, and the enormous shock to confidence that inflations, devaluations, and repudiations have produced, we must test the state of confidence in a temporary free market for gold—a market that will also give us a guide to a new dollar-gold ratio that we can hold.

The following time schedule of gold resumption is set forward chiefly for purposes of illustration:

1. The administration will immediately announce its intention to return to a full gold standard by a series of steps dated in advance. The Federal Reserve banks and the Treasury will temporarily suspend all sales or purchases of gold, merely holding on to what they have. Simultaneously with this step, a free market in gold will be permitted.

2. After watching this market, and meanwhile preventing any further inflation, the Government, sometime before June 30, 1955, will announce the dollar-gold ratio at which convertibility will take place.

3. On and after July 1, 1955, and for the following 6 months, any holder of dollars will be entitled to convert them into gold bars, but at a moderate discount on the paper dollars he turns in. To put the matter the other way, he would be asked to pay a premium on gold bars above the new valuation—equivalent, let us say, to one-half of 1 percent a month. The purpose of this would be to spread out the first demands for conversion and discourage excessive pressure on reserves at the beginning. The same purpose could be achieved also by a wide but gradual narrowing spread between the official buying and selling prices of gold bars. Of course, the free market in gold would continue during this period, and if gold could be obtained in this free market for less than the official premium rates, it would not be demanded from the Government's reserves.

4. On January 1, 1956, the country will return to a full gold-bullion standard. Conversion of dollars into gold bars, or vice versa, will be open to all holders without such discounts or premiums and without discrimination.

5. On January 1, 1957, the country will return to a full gold-coin standard, by minting gold coins and permitting free conversion.

A full gold-coin standard is desirable because a gold-bullion standard is merely a rich man's standard. A relatively poor man should be just as able to protect himself against inflation, to the extent of his dollar holdings, as a rich man. The reason for returning to a full gold-coin standard in several stages is to prevent too sudden a drain on gold reserves before confidence has been reestablished. We achieved this end after the Civil War by delaying actual resumption for 4 years after passage of the Resumption Act. A program like the foregoing would provide a faster schedule.

Effect of Drop in Dairy Price Supports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. THYE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 24, 1954

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an article entitled "Milk Brings $150,000 Less to 4,000 Farmers," written by Sterling Soderlind, and published in the Minneapolis Morning Tribune of May 20, 1954. The article relates to the effect of the reduced support for dairy products. It shows how 4,000 farmers in the Twin Cities milk area have lost $150,000, or an average of about $75 a month each. That is the effect of the change in price supports.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Milk Brings $150,000 Less to 4,000 Farmers

(By Sterling Soderlind)

Some 4,000 dairy farmers in the Twin Cities area received about $150,000 less for their April milk than they did for March shipments because of the drop in dairy price supports from 90 to 75 percent of parity.

The farmers, members of Twin City Milk Producers Association, in April received an average of $37.50 less than in March, it was reported in the group's monthly bulletin.

Compared with a year ago, members received about $300,000 less, or an average of about $75 less per member.

"It is necessary to go back to the spring of 1950 to find a time when producer prices were as low as they are at the present time," the bulletin reported.

Prices paid producers by milk distributors for grade A milk ranged from $3.22 per hundredweight to $3.26 in the spring of 1950. This compares with $3.32 paid now for milk delivered to Twin Cities plants.

Two cents per hundredweight is withheld by the association for advertising and promoting the sales of milk products. Much of this campaign will be concentrated in June dairy month promotions.

Some dairymen estimated the loss on May milk will average $85 for member farmers. They will not receive checks for milk delivered this month until mid-June.

The association noted that Twin Cities consumers are paying about the same price for milk now as they did 4 years ago. But now more milk is sold through stores at prices averaging about 15 cents a quart, it was reported.

The association foresaw no imminent relief from the lowering of price supports and advocated disposal of accumulated Government dairy stocks as the first step to be undertaken.

In 1953 milk sales receipts in the Twin Cities market area averaged $460.66 a month per farm for some 5,700 dairy farms supplying the market, Federal marketing figures show. This represents average receipts for all area producers and not just association members.

University of Minnesota studies indicate two-thirds of gross receipts from milk sales go for the cost of producing the milk.

Sales of fluid milk in the Twin Cities area in April were 1.34 percent below March, but 1.63 percent above April 1953.

Production of association members in April was 1.12 percent above March and 2.26 percent above a year ago.

In April nearly 49 percent of this milk was sold fluid, 46 percent was separated, and 5 percent was used in other manufactured products.

Poland and Monte Cassino

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1954

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker—

> Polish soldiers—for our freedom and yours—have given our souls to God, our bodies to the soil of Italy, and our hearts to Poland.

This simple inscription is carved on the spire which stands on a hilltop above a military cemetery at Monte Cassino, in Italy. There lie buried more than a thousand Polish soldiers of the Polish Second Army Corps who gave their lives in the capture of the most crucial German fortification in Italy. The story of these Polish forces is perhaps one of the most tragic chapters in the history of World War II—but it is a chapter the last pages of which have not yet been written and will not be written until the free world proves that these men who were faithful to their service did not give their lives in vain. The Second Polish Army Corps was composed of the survivors of some million and a half Poles who, for one reason or another, had been detained in Russia after the Soviet invasion of Poland. With the outbreak of hostilities between Russia and Germany the Russians, for political and strategic reasons, decided to permit the formation of a Polish Army on Soviet soil. A military agreement to this effect was signed between Stalin and the Polish Premier, General Sikorsky. Gen. Wladislaw Anders, who had until that time been imprisoned under the most brutal conditions in the NKVD's infamous Lubianka Prison, was given the job of incorporating Poles in Russia into a fighting unit. The task that faced General Anders was a heartbreaking one. Many Poles could not be located or were not released, while those who were free to join were ill-clad, starved, and diseased. Gradually the camps began to disgorge some of the imprisoned Poles. They arrived by the thousands from the various Russian camps—men and women and children who had been prisoners of war or deported civilians. They came from all parts of Russia, barefoot, tattered, in remnants of old Polish uniforms. They represented a cross section of Polish life, for the Russians had systematically tried to drain Poland of all people of value to the nation. Some had been captured during the Soviet invasion, others had been arrested when they had tried to cross the frontier into some neutral country to join the Polish forces being organized in France, others were political and social leaders who had been imprisoned without trial on trumped-up charges of counterrevolutionary activity.

But, no matter what they had suffered, these people were eager to join the ranks of the new Polish Army. They came thousands of miles, in spite of Russian obstacles, with only one idea in mind—to fight once again for the liberation of Poland. Their single mindedness was matched only by their great religious faith, and, as the Polish Army knelt for its first mass even the faithless jeerings of the NKVD agents and the Russian soldiers were momentarily silenced.

In spite of the Stalin-Sikorsky agreement the situation was such that General Anders realized the importance of evacuating the Polish forces and their families. This was the only means of saving the thousands of lives which would have otherwise perished at the hands of the Russians. For the sake of expediency the Russians let the Polish forces and their families go. In Palestine, Iran, and Iraq General Anders completed the mobilization of the Second Army Corps. These men who had had to train with wooden rifles were now finally being fully equipped and prepared to join the Allied effort.

In the meantime Polish-Russian relations had deteriorated to the danger point, and in April of 1943 Russia broke off diplomatic relations with the Polish Government in London. In Poland itself the situation was no better. As the Germans retreated their terrorism increased, and as the Russians advanced it became evident that they were going to keep what they had liberated. But in spite of this, in early 1944 the Second Polish Army Corps was ready for action, and on February 6 the first troops landed at Naples.

This was not the first time that Polish soldiers had fought in Italy on behalf of freedom and Poland's independence. Almost 150 years before Polish legions had fought for liberty and Poland in Napolean's army under the leadership of General Dombrowski. In the mid-20th century they believed that, as in the 19th century, the fight for Polish independence would begin on the battlefields of Italy. Their zeal was heightened by the knowledge that on their performance would depend the Allied effort and the reputation of those freedom-loving Poles who were daily being slandered by the Soviet propaganda machine.

In May the Polish Army Corps was given the most difficult of the initial tasks in the Italian campaign—the capture of the German bastion of Monte Casino, which had withstood time and again all attempts at seizure. So long as the sixth century benedictine abbey, now fortified by the Germans, held fact, the road to Rome and the success of the Italian campaign were blocked.

The first attack against Monte Cassino was launched on the 11th of May, on the 17th the second attack came, in the morning of May 18 the red and white flag of Poland was hoisted over the ruins of the abbey. The Polish Second Army Corps had captured one of the most stubborn German strongholds. Victory in Italy was now assured.

Without respite the Poles marched on to victory at Ancona, at Bologna, and in the Emelian Apennines. Those were proud days for the Second Army Corps and for all Poles, and yet the goal of national independence for which they were all fighting seemed as far away now as it had in the grim days of 1939. First at Teheran and then at Yalta Poland was sacrificed to the delusion that Russia could be appeased and her friendship secured by such concessions. Polish troops had given their lives on behalf of freedom, and now that the Nazi tyranny had been destroyed their services were no longer needed. There was no V-day for Poland, only the bitter knowledge shared by every soldier that in spite of his duty well done he and his country had been wronged. Yet, despite their betrayal, the vow taken by the Second Corps at the celebration of their Soldiers' Day was "we shall continue our struggle for the liberty of Poland, regardless of the conditions in which we shall have to live and work." And they have been true to their fallen comrades and to their vow. We who so joyously shared in the victory that these gallant Poles helped gain for us must now help them gain theirs. As they saw and fulfilled their duty, so it is our responsibility to rectify the wrong done to Poland. On this day when we commemorate the brilliant and heroic victory of the Poles over the forces of nazism let us reassure them that they are not alone in their struggle for Poland's liberty.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include herein a resolution adopted by the Polish National Fund of New Jersey, Monte Cassino Anniversary Committee, of which my good friend, Rev. Francis Kowalczyk, is chairman:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED AT THE RALLY COMMEMORATING THE 10TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BATTLE OF MONTE CASSINO, HELD ON MAY 23, 1954, AT NEWARK, N. J.

We, the Americans of Polish descent, the free Poles, and the friends of free Poland, assembled on May 23, at the Continental Ballroom, Newark, N. J., to commemorate the 10th anniversary of the famous battle of Monte Cassino, pay tribute to the Polish soldiers of freedom, who under the command of Gen. Wladyslaw Anders captured that rugged and seemingly impregnable fortress in Italy, after previous attempts by the American, British, and French forces had failed, thus opening the way to Rome for the Allied armies. We especially honor the 923 Polish soldiers who were killed and the 2,931 who were wounded in the battle.

We wish to recall that this shining example of heroism and sacrifices of the Polish soldiers in the past war against the forces of totalitarianism in Europe, described by President Eisenhower as "a symbol of the Polish nation's inextinguishable love of freedom" was made at the time when Poland was already betrayed by the Allies and doomed to Communist slavery.

Today, the Polish people, bitterly disappointed by the betrayal at Yalta and subsequent enslavement by the international Communist conspiracy, are nevertheless looking hopefully to the United States of America as the only force in the free world to aid them in the resurrection of a free and democratic Poland.

We agree with the statement recently made in the United States House of Representatives by Congressman WILLIAM T. GRANAHAN, of Philadelphia, Pa., that "it is with good reason that friends of Poland in this country and elsewhere are deeply disturbed by the disparity in the degree of interest shown by our State Department in the plight of our former enemy—Germany—as compared with the seeming neglect and apathy in regard to a nation like Poland which fought so valiantly if unsuccessfully against the Nazi-Soviet alliance."

We share the view of Ambassador Jozef Lipski, representing the Free Polish Government in this country, that the United States needs allies not only on this side of the Iron Curtain, but on the other as well, but in order to have these allies, which in case of crisis can be of inestimable value, the United States must proclaim a firm policy of liberation of nations behind the Iron Curtain.

We welcome the statement of President Eisenhower, contained in a letter to General Anders of May 7, 1954, that the courage and faith in freedom of the Polish people "will not be in vain and that the cause of liberty and justice will prevail, as it did at Monte Cassino 10 years ago." We urge, however, the implementation of these words by President Eisenhower by the following deeds:

(a) Formation of a Free Polish Armed Forces in the framework of NATO.

(b) Withdrawal of recognition from the Communist regime in Warsaw and restoration of recognition to the Free Polish Government in London.

(c) Recognition of Poland's rights to prewar eastern and present western boundaries.

A message to the Poles, containing the above elements, will boost their morale and strengthen their faith in the United States of America.

We assure the people in Poland that we will not rest until Poland will be free again.

Long live the United States of America—champion of freedom and democracy—and the only hope of a free slave world.

Long live the indomitable spirit of a free and democratic Poland.

Rev. Major Albert Arthur Rojek, Chairman of the Resolution Committee; Leopold Dende, Edmund Hemmerling, Adela Jaskiewicz, Albert Klemp, Z. Poraj-Lukaczynski, Walter Marut, Dr. L. Obierek, J. Zaprawa-Ostromecki, J. T. Rospond, Stanislaus Wesolowski, Members.

Delinquency: Juvenile or Adult

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 24, 1954

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I call to your attention an editorial appearing in the Detroit Times of May 19, entitled "Adult Delinquency." There is little question but that a chain is no stronger than its weakest link. So, too, the family, basic unit of society that it is, can be no better than parents wish to make it. Children are great imitators; an indifferent attitude on the part of the adults of the family cannot but be reflected in the conduct, activities, and ultimately, the moral behavior of the youngsters. In their formative years children need advice and wise counsel. If they do not receive this at home they will receive advice of another type away from home. And it is from this that our grave national problem of juvenile delinquency stems.

Delinquent parents must be made to realize that, as the first citizens of our American society, and even though it entails a measure of hard work, planning, and sacrifice, they must measure up to their responsibilities and obligations. We must all take this problem to heart and work unceasingly toward its satisfactory solution.

The editorial from the Times follows:

ADULT DELINQUENTS

William Hutchinson, chief of Washington bureau of International News Service, interviewed Director Hoover of the Federal Bureau of Investigation about juvenile delinquency.

Among the questions was: "Is juvenile delinquency in many instances adult delinquency?

Mr. Hoover gave this answer:

"Parents have the basic responsibility of teaching their children to be good citizens. * * *

"They must see that the child learns to obey the law, respects the rights of others and behaves as a good citizen."

This reminds us of a wonderful man who many years ago founded a home for boys in Nebraska, later to become world-famed as Boystown.

Father Flanagan took all kinds of boys into the home, the homeless, the abandoned, youngsters who had committed every kind of crime in the book, including murder.

But the gentle priest said to his dying day that the one kind of boy he had never taken into the home was a bad boy.

He said there were bad people, parents among them, who let boys down, kicked them around, failed miserably in adult responsibility to the children they brought into the world.

He proved his point thousands of times over by making useful citizens out of boys reclaimed from the moral gutters of the country.

The tragedy of America as J. Edgar Hoover now says again, is not the bad children involved in our problem of juvenile delinquency but the moral blight that is put upon us when "the home becomes merely a place to sleep, eat a few bites or change clothes."

Thoughtless people too often say juvenile crime is a terrible thing, but nothing can be done about it.

Of course it can't, as long as we look to children to do it.

Adult responsibility is the thing that has fallen by the wayside.

Armed Forces Day Activities in Sheridan, Wyo.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. HARRISON
OF WYOMING
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 19, 1954

Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of my colleagues a brief item published recently in the Sheridan Press, Sheridan, Wyo.

This item is another of the Neckyoke Jones Sez columns published regularly by the Wyoming newspaper—this one having to do with Armed Forces Day activities in the community. Here is what Neckyoke Jones had to say upon this occasion:

"The State guard boys is celebratin' this week," I obserbs to Greasewood today. "Yep," he reserves, "an' folks 'll fine a lot of intrestin' things by lookin' at the displays they have been settin' up. Most Americans don't hanker for fightin'—espechully these days when you kin blow Tohpet outen a feller by pressin' a button, shettin' your eyes an' takin' no aim—it bein' all done by elecktrick lights an' stuff. I reckon we gotta have a defence—and' these here boys, who is a fine appearin' bunch, is keepin' up on all of the new things. You jest couldn't fine a finer bunch of young Americuns than these fellers—an' learin' soljerin' these days ain't got the romantick side to it that it had years ago—but it sometimes comes down to a passel of hard work, study and deep thinkin'. They don't fight wars no more with a sword an' cavalry charges with spurs. When the chips is down, these young fellers will be ready to do the job. Everyone ort to turn out an' see what they got to offer. They'll appreciate it—an' feel that there efforts is worth while, besides it'll kinda give you some idea of how your money is bein' spent, an' a feelin' that as long as we got young men like these we ain't goin' to be too easy to whip." Ol' Greasewood is proud of this outfit. Hopin' you are the same, I am

Yure fren,

Neckyoke Jones

Utilization of Diverted Acreage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. THYE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 24, 1954

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, on May 20, 1954, the St. Paul Pioneer Press published an editorial dealing with the utilization of diverted acreage by putting diverted acres back into grass. I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

BACK TO GRASS

The proposal by Dr. O. B. Jesness for a permanent "back-to-grass" program for large blocks of Dust Bowl lands commends itself to the most careful study by the entire wheat industry and the Government.

In the heat of debate over flexible versus rigid Federal price supports, there seems a tendency for each group to generate self-confidence that, if only its side wins in Congress, everything will be all right. But by a penetrating analysis, Dr. Jesness strongly supports his conclusion that such confidence is misplaced. The present problems of wheat surpluses and declining exports are plain to see. And he asserts those problems will be moderated somewhat but not solved by a shift to flexible supports at 75 to 90 percent of parity.

So Dr. Jesness raises the highly important question whether this country should not consider a program of inducing a permanent return to grass of considerable areas, particularly in the Southwest.

Whether or not the administration is counting altogether too much on the surplus-reducing effects of a shift to flexible price supports, it can wisely scrutinize Dr. Jesness' proposal. For one thing Congress may not go along with such a shift in 1955 or even 1956. For another, even if Congress does go along, flexible price supports alone, as he says, don't promise to do the job. For a third, the present plan of cutting wheat acreage, uniformity in all regions does not fit a wheat problem that varies with different areas and kinds of wheat, some of which like our hard spring wheat are not in surplus. Such cuts rest an unnecessary burden on this region.

In addition to all those points, made or suggested by Jesness, one other argues forcefully for his proposal. It is the human and financial costs of allowing successive waves of settlers to be pulled into the Dust Bowl in periods of abnormally good rain, only to be ruined or publicly supported when rainfall slumps back to the usual level of aridity.

The administration now is spending millions of dollars on emergency drought relief. But the measures are mostly stopgaps. For the most part they do not, as Secretary Benson himself points out, go to the heart of the problem. Any permanent solution, he told Congress on May 5, must include retirement to grass of millions of acres unsuited to cultivation. He estimated that about 8 million acres should go back to grass.

This would mean actual purchase of such lands for the public domain or other reserves. It would extend from storage products to the land itself President Eisenhower's plan of surplus set-asides. It would materially and in a sensible way reduce our surplus wheat acreage. But it would require new legislation and funds. The House Agriculture Committee, which right now is considering a new omnibus farm bill, could not do better than study the Jesness proposal's advantages for incorporation in that bill.

Need for Strawberry Pickers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1954

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, a few months ago we debated a bill which would facilitate the importation of Mexican nationals as supplementary farm laborers. Those of us who come from areas where such labor is often needed made it quite plain that this labor was to be used only when a labor shortage did in fact exist. During the debate I tried to point out that many workers who are now unemployed are either not qualified or are unwilling to perform agricultural labor.

As proof of the contention I made during the House debate, I insert herewith a news item from the Gilroy Evening Dispatch, of May 14, 1954:

STRAWBERRY CROP WORKERS NEEDED—FIVE HUNDRED WANTED HERE

A current crying need for 500 strawberry pickers here in Gilroy and Morgan Hill areas is voiced today by Jack Rocca, farm placement officer. Rocca said calls are being sent out to areas including Los Angeles, San Francisco, Sacramento, and Hanford in an effort to get the pickers.

Farm placement officers and centers will be open tomorrow, Saturday, in the recruitment drive, Rocca said. Offices remaining open will include the Gilroy employment department office, the Morgan Hill farm labor trailer and a recently added Pacheco Pass information center opened May 10.

Telephone numbers of the three are Gilroy 424, Morgan 9–1484, and Pacheco Pass, Gilroy 3–F–32. Personnel in charge of the workers, said Rocca, are Jack Jensen and Ed Healy at Morgan Hill, Milton Quadros and Don Callejon, Gilroy, and Gene Pacheco, of Hollister, at the Pacheco Pass station, located 12 miles out Pacheco Pass highway on the Louis Scaglioni ranch about one-half mile east of the Don Pacheco Y.

Mr. Speaker, from the above, it is quite apparent that supplemental labor is necessary in California. However, I repeat our previous pledge to give local labor the first chance at any job they are willing and able to perform.

Secretary Dulles on Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHAUNCEY W. REED

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1954

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert in the Record the text of a speech made by the Honorable John Foster Dulles, Secretary of State, before a meeting of the seventh session of the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration at Geneva, Switzerland, on April 30, 1954:

Mr. Chairman and honorable delegates, I welcome the opportunity of addressing the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration. Your work is of great interest to the United States, an interest proved by the presence of Members of the United States Legislature, particularly of Congressmen Reed and Walter, at so many of your sessions.

I have come here to confirm this United States interest which they have already so fully shown.

Your committee, by reason of its structure, is well fitted to work out the solution of the urgent problems of excess populations and of their productive resettlement. You are the only intergovernmental organization which, if adequately supported by its members, can actually solve some of these difficult problems.

There are many facts to show that your organization is dealing successfully with its problems. The member governments have increased so that they are now 24. Furthermore, the member governments have determined to establish the committee on a more permanent foundation through the adoption of a constitution. You already, I understand, are responsible for the movement of one-third of the yearly total number of migrants from continental Europe. The scope of your work is now being extended and your activities are being broadened.

All of this represents solid progress and confirms the vision of your founders.

I spoke of the interest of the United States Government in this work. That interest derives from many factors. We know that the growth of excess populations creates unemployment with all its disturbing implications. The problem with which you are dealing is not unrelated to that of the defense and security of the whole free world. All of this is of direct interest to the United States. Also the humanitarian aspect of your task has a strong appeal. The American people have always had deep sympathy for whatever alleviates the sufferings of mankind.

These are some of the major considerations which justify continued United States support of your committee.

I may add that it is encouraging to know that this compact and active organization with its clear-cut agenda is able to reach constructive decisions in its vital tasks. That is proof that free governments can effectively join together in the solution of great human problems. In this troubled world, where so many suffer and where suspicion reigns, your committee's work stands out as a welcome shining light.

Controlling the Colorado River

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1954

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement on controlling the Colorado River.

Mr. Speaker, the committee of which I am chairman has reported out H. R. 4449, known as the upper Colorado River Basin project. The one big objection to the measure was that of "Should Echo Park Dam be constructed?" The Congress should decide whether water and power are more important than rugged canyons which now are visited by a few people.

Mr. Speaker, this land of yours and mine is a growing, dynamic country. There must be a wise development of our natural resources if we are to meet the demands of the growing population. My colleagues will find that the development of this river, and the repayment plan, is financially sound. While it is essentially a power project, all of the costs, with interest, will be returned to the United States Treasury. This has not been true of the nearly $100 billion spent in 47 countries since the end of World War II.

Mr. Speaker, it is about time the American people began to build up their internal strength and develop their own resources for the benefit of future generations. The above-mentioned follows:

CONTROLLING THE COLORADO—THE COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT

In my remarks before the House on April 14, 1954, I pointed out that the plan of development recommended for the upper Colorado River Basin in very important legislation (H. R. 4449 introduced by the gentleman from Utah, Mr. DAWSON) now pending before my Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, to authorize the construction of the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, is a very comprehensive basinwide plan born of the national necessity for developing the unlimited natural resources of the area. It was further emphasized that this plan is a sound one resulting from the type of Federal-State cooperation recommended by the administration as its approach to water-resource development. It has been heartily approved by the President and given clearance by the Bureau of the Budget.

This comprehensive, basinwide plan for developing the water resources of the area is the direct result of many years of thorough and painstaking investigation by the Bureau of Reclamation in cooperation with the States of the upper basin and with other Federal agencies and departments of government. It fully illustrates the individual initiative and cooperative enterprise characteristic of our national spirit since the days of the American Revolution.

The necessity for the overall plan of development of the natural resources of the upper-basin States as envisaged in the pending legislation is to be found in the historical, geographical, physical, climatic, and economic conditions peculiar to the region. These same basic conditions were precedent to the necessity for, the formulation of, and the eventual signing of the Colorado River compact of 1922.

Historically, and generally speaking, river basins in their evolution from per-white-man conditions to their present status have passed through several rather distinct phases of irrigation and water-resource development. The first settlers inhabited the bottom lands of valleys along the banks of streams and by means of crude, temporary, brush, and rock dams irrigated the lowlands along the principal water courses and their tributaries because that was the easiest way in which to irrigate land with the tools, or lack of tools, of the early pioneers. Next, because much of the fertile land was to be found on higher benches, at times at considerable distances from the river, higher and more permanent dams of wood or concrete and steel were placed in the main water courses in order to divert larger quantities of water through long and intricate canal systems to lands at these higher elevations. Thirdly, as populations of the West increased and more and more lands were cultivated, the demands upon the water supply reached the point that during the low-water seasons of late summer and autumn there would not be sufficient natural-flow water available from the streams to serve all of the lands. This condition made necessary the construction of reservoirs, usually high on the watersheds, for the storage of water during the months of spring runoff for use later in the year when the late summer natural flows were unsufficient to meet the demands. In the late stages of water development of a river basin hold-over reservoirs are constructed to retain water from years of high runoff for use during those years when the runoff is below normal. In this manner the flows of the river can be equated from year to year and the maximum amount of water utilization can be accomplished on a long-term basis in a given area.

Due to the peculiar combination of geographical, physical, and climatic conditions of the upper Colorado River Basin, with its rivers intrenched in deep, magnificent canyons in an arid to semiarid desert region, the development in the upper basin States is, for the most part, in, or emerging from, the third stage of development mentioned above. There are a few storage reservoirs for storing the water of spring runoff for late-season use. There are no large holdover reservoirs for storing water during years of high flows for use during subsequent years of low-stream discharges. It should be remembered that large holdover storage units can be operated to serve on a seasonal basis as well as on a long-term holdover basis, thus performing double functions.

Projects have been completed on the lower reaches of the Colorado River capable of using most of the water allotted by the Colorado River Compact of 1922 to the lower basin. No water-consuming developments of similar magnitude have occurred in the upper basin, the upper basin States at the present time being able to utilise less than one-third of the water to which they are entitled. This inability to place to beneficial use the full measure of water apportioned to them under the terms of the compact has placed a serious unwarranted limit on the economy of those States.

The rugged physical conditions of the terrain characteristic of the deep-canyon Colorado River country make the use of the canyons for water-storage reservoirs possible only by the construction of massive and costly dams. We all realize that the easy-to-construct irrigation and water-conservation projects so valuable to the Nation are accomplished. The upper basin States are not unique in this respect. Irrigation projects to be authorized as consumptive-use features of the overall plan in these States, like those contemplated elsewhere, need the financial assistance to be provided by power revenues to pay for that part of the cost of the irrigation projects that is beyond the ability of the farmers to repay in order to make them financially feasible.

The above problems are among those confronting the upper basin States in their efforts to put to beneficial use the water to which they are entitled under the terms of the compacts to which they are subjected. As was pointed out in my remarks on April 14, the Colorado River Compact itself creates a problem of paramount importance to the upper basin, that of delivering to the lower basin not less than 75 million acre-feet of water in any period of 10 consecutive years. The greatly fluctuating flow of the river, with its erratic and unpredictable periods of drought and flood, makes the meeting of this obligation by the upper basin and any substantial development within the upper basin States at the same time virtually impossible without river regulation on a long-term holdover basis.

All of the aforementioned major problems will be met efficiently and in the best manner possible by the construction of the Colorado River storage project and participating projects.

Through this plan water will be made available for irrigation, municipal and industrial uses, and for the generation of hydroelectrical power. There will be substantial benefits to river regulation and sediment control which are needed at an early date in order to utilize to the maximum possible extent the power potentials of the Colorado River between Lee Ferry and Lake Mead. Thus, we see that great contributions are to be derived by the lower basin, too, from the storage units to be constructed upstream from Lee Ferry. Erratic annual flows of the river will be regulated, controlled, equalized. Sediment retained in storage reservoirs of the upper basin will prolong the life of Lake Mead and make possible the construction of other power-producing water-conserving reservoirs in the lower basin.

By means of the plan as outlined in H. R. 4449, the States of the upper basin—Wyoming, Utah, New Mexico, and Colorado, will eventually be able to put to beneficial use all the water of the Colorado River system apportioned to them under the various compacts and other documents which define the law of the river. The Colorado River storage project and participating projects will make possible the development and utilization of the upper basin's abundant natural resources, and, consequently, contribute in a large measure to the economy of the vast intermountain empire and the Nation.

The plan is financially sound. It has been subjected to the most rigid economic and financial analyses. The entire cost of the power features, which are principally in conjunction with the large storage units at Echo Park and Glen Canyon Dams, will be returned to the United States Treasury with interest, not only on the capital investment in the power features, but also, with interest accruing during their construction. The costs of both irrigation and power features will be paid back to the Federal Treasury in a reasonable length of time (a shorter period, by the way, than that proposed for many other Federal reclamation projects previously authorized). After the payout of all irrigation and power construction costs to be returned from power revenues, millions of dollars from these revenues will be poured into the Treasury annually.

We now find before Congress in H. R. 4449 ones of the most carefully studied best prepared, and most closely integrated methods yet conceived for the development of a river basin. The storage units for long-term holdover water storage, hydroelectric power production, necessary river regulation and control, and silt retention; and the participating projects, which are the consumptive-use irrigation and municipal water features of the plan, are closely interwoven into the pattern of development of the natural resources of the Upper Basin States.

Without the Colorado River storage project and participating projects the development of the resources of the basin will forever remain limited, and the related expansion of population, agriculture, industries, and general growth will not be indicative of the potentialities of the area. Upon the orderly and comprehensive development of its water resources depends the future of the Upper Colorado River Basin States. It is imperative that this Congress assure this future by authorizing the construction of the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, and, at the same time provide the United States, as a whole, with all of those valuable national benefits associated with the creation of new homes, new wealth, and new jobs which will be derived from such an important basinwide project.

Fear Kills Amendments to Taft-Hartley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 2, 1954

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, former Senator Taft proposed certain clarifying amendments to the Taft-Hartley Act, but in September of 1952 General Eisenhower, speaking before an A. F. of L. convention, said:

> I know the law might be used to break unions. That must be changed. America wants no law licensing union busting.

Then he added:

> Neither do I.

That statement frightened sincere friends of labor organizations, who believe unions are necessary for the protection of the employees in mass-production industries, but who thought it meant the emasculation of the Taft-Hartley Act.

When the President sent up proposed amendments to the act, a few powerful union leaders, who thought they saw a chance for the repeal of Taft-Hartley and the reenactment of the Wagner Act, also became alarmed.

Then, with friends of the law and those who had consistently characterized it as a slave-labor act both frightened, a stalemate was inevitable. That was demonstrated when the Senate sent the proposed amendments back to committee.

A similar situation exists in the House Labor Committee, of which it is my privilege to be a member.

In my opinion, the act should be strengthened so as to protect employees who want to work and employers from secondary boycotts. The employees should be given an opportunity to vote on the question of whether a strike should be called and, after it has been called, whether it should be ended whenever a majority of the union desires.

Vesting the power to call or end a strike in union officials or a bargaining committee is undemocratic—detrimental to the rights of the men and women who desire to work, as well as those who give orders for manufactured products.

States should be given more authority to control strikes in public utilities which injuriously affect the public health, safety, or welfare.

Notwithstanding the failure to improve the act, there is a bright spot in the situation.

On the House Labor Committee, representatives of the unions stated their preference for the Taft-Hartley Act as it is written, rather than for the amendments proposed by the administration or others.

When union representatives in Congress abandon the theory that the act is a slave-labor law, announce their willingness to give the act another try by continuing it on the books, as they now have, it is evident that we will ultimately get legislation which is acceptable not only to industry but to the employees upon whom industry must depend for its existence. Better yet, it is apparent the public is being recognized as being vitally interested in labor disputes.

As one who helped write Taft-Hartley, I am greatly encouraged by the present acceptance of the law by the great majority of union employees.

The bosses, both in organized labor and in industry, will ultimately be forced to yield to the needs and rights of the workers and the public.

Army Engineers Offer Overall Plan for Northwest Flood Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1954

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I include as part of these remarks a report on flood control in the Northwest which appeared in the Oregonian May 16, 1954, under the caption, "Army Engineers Offer Overall Plan for Northwest Flood Control." The article follows:

ARMY ENGINEERS OFFER OVERALL PLAN FOR NORTHWEST FLOOD CONTROL

Everybody talks about floods on the Columbia. What can be done about them?

Plenty, in the opinion of the Army Corps of Engineers. They have a plan that would knock 8 feet off the crest of a flood like that of 1894, which hit 34.2 feet in Portland and wiped out a goodly portion of that erstwhile river village.

The same plan would knock 6 feet off the crest of a flood of 1948 proportions, the potential for which has been reported by the Soil Conservation Service and other agencies.

That wouldn't leave much of a flood. Instead of topping the dikes at 30 feet in Portland area, it would flatten out a mere 24 feet, which existing dikes could cope with comfortably.

COST, TIME FACTORS

There is a catch, of course. This main control plan would cost about $1.5 billion and require years to complete. (The 1948 flood cost 41 lives and $100 million.) The plan calls for construction of 15 major dam and reservoir projects, plus construction and strengthening of dikes.

Flood-control features of the main control plan include: Grand Coulee, Hungry Horse, Anderson Ranch, Cascade, and Arrow Rock Dams, already completed; Palisades and Lucky Peak, under construction; John Day, Priest Rapids, and Libby, now authorized; Glacier View, Hells Canyon, and enlarged outlets for Grand Coulee Dam, not yet authorized.

Of the 15, the enlarged outlets at Grand Coulee would give the most flood control by far for the least money, increasing the effective flood storage area behind the dam to more than 5,000,000 acre-feet, compared to 1,200,000 now available.

HUNGRY HORSE ADDED

You can't fight today's floods with tomorrow's plans. But some progress has already been made. Addition of Hungry Horse Dam on the south fork of the Flathead River in Montana with its 2,980,000 acre-feet of usable storage, plus use of Grand Coulee's 1,200,000 acre-feet of usable storage will cut the crest of the flood expected in June at Vancouver and Portland by about 1.5 feet, the engineers report.

This does not mean the crest will be less than forecast by 1.5 feet. Instead, it means the crest would be 1.5 feet higher without these two dams. The 25.5 to 27.5 feet forecast to hit Portland sometime in the next month, would be 27 to 29 feet, within a foot of the 1948 crest, if it were not for the new dams, new experience and the coordination of all agencies provided by the Columbia Basin interagency committee, engineers declare.

While progress has been made in control, no new protection has been provided, with minor exceptions. Millions of dollars have been spent to plug the holes carved by old man river in levees from Bonners Ferry in Idaho to Puget Island in the lower Columbia. But no new dikes have been built and none raised, with two minor exceptions.

After the 1948 flood, Congress made available about $6,700,000 to the Corps of Engineers for rehabilitation work on levees throughout the Columbia River Basin. No record is available of the additional millions spent by local districts, States and the engineers.

KOOTENAI DIKES BOLSTERED

About $2,500,000 has been spent to repair the dikes along the Kootenai and raise a portion of the dikes protecting Bonners Ferry, Idaho, where a flood higher than the 1948 flood is forecast for this year.

On the lower river, the engineers and diking districts together have repaired all broken levees. The levees at The Dalles have been restored. The major levee along the Sandy River protecting the Troutdale Airport and Reynolds aluminum plant has been strengthened and enlarged. The Reynolds Co. has built a cross dike from the Columbia River across the west end of Blue Lake to protect against back water flooding in from the west as it did in 1948. This dike is also secondary protection against breaching of the Sandy dike from the east, which would lay open the river lowlands to the main force of the Columbia.

Columbia drainage district No. 1 at the lower end of Sauvies Island has been raised in the low places by the engineers and strengthened by the relocation of a section of the levee. Levees in the Rainier district have been rehabilitated and repaired by the engineers. Deer Island dikes have been strengthened. Longview, Woodland, Skamokawa, and Puget Island districts have repaired and to some extent improved their dikes.

Portland's airport and the lowlands from Blue Lake to the Willamette are possibly less vulnerable now than in 1948. But there is still no new dike or levee protecting this area from flooding from the west. The railroad fill which gave way in 1948 at Smith Lake on the west side of the Vanport site, could blow out again in a new spot. It was not constructed to serve as a levee, engineers point out.

The Denver Avenue and Union Avenue fills, which broke in 1948, could break again. The Multnomah diking district levee which blew out at the pumphouse, has been improved and a new pump house installed, however.

The Corps of Engineers has a plan that would protect this area against a flood of 1948 proportions with a 3-foot freeboard for added insurance. It would cost $21,520,800, according to a preliminary estimate released Saturday. New construction would cost $5,561,300; improvement of existing works, $15,959,500.

PLANNING FUNDS AVAILABLE

So far Congress has only approved $15,000 for planning funds. No construction has been authorized. The proposal calls for construction of levees at each end of the Sandy-Willamette River lowland area and cross dikes to divide the river bottom into three approximately equal compartments. The main levee along the river would be raised in low spots and depressions along the toe of the levee would be filled. If the crest of this spring's flood at Vancouver does not exceed the minimum forecast of 25.5 feet, it still will be the fourth worst flood in the past 50 years. The river has exceeded 25 feet at Vancourver only 4 times in 50 years.

At 25.5 feet, thousands of acres were flooded in 1948 and dikes began to break. At 27 feet dikes had broken at Woodland and Rainier. At 27.5 feet Vanport was wiped out. The river then rose to 30 feet at Portland June 1 by the engineers' adjusted figures, and hit 30 feet again June 14 before subsiding.

Mr. Reams Speaks for Polish People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRAZIER REAMS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1954

Mr. REAMS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I place in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement from the Way of the World column, May 11, 1954, of Mr. Grove Patterson, editor in chief of the Toledo Blade:

MR. REAMS SPEAKS FOR POLISH PEOPLE

Not only Toledo people of Polish descent but all who read his eloquent words must have been impressed by the address of Congressman FRAZIER REAMS in the House of Representatives a few days ago, when he spoke in tribute to the invincible Polish spirit on the anniversary of the adoption of the Polish Constitution 163 years ago. There are no people on the earth who love freedom more dearly or respect in greater degree the dignity of the individual than the men and women of Poland who today are held down by a ruthless Communist domination, the domination of a few selfish men backed by the power of the Russian Government.

Traditionally, historically, the Polish people have clung to the idea of independence. They have had liberty, and they will have it again. Too much of their history records painful and tragic disappointment.

In the course of his remarks Mr. REAMS said that the recognition of Poland's Constitution Day, May 3, is "recognition of the aims and aspirations of all people in the world to be free and govern themselves. The traditional friendship of the American people for the people of Poland is even stronger in these days of Poland's dark hour of slavery and misery than it has been at any other time.

"In the 163 years since that hopeful day when the Polish people proclaimed their constitution of 1791, there have been many reversals of freedom and fortune in that country. Few people have maintained their national integrity, their aspirations for freedom as the Polish people have. They have been helped in this by the encouragement of the people of this country, many of whom are related by blood to those who have maintained their spirit of freedom under the adverse conditions which exist today.

"We as Members of Congress, and we as American citizens individually, do appreciate the blessings which have come to us through our Constitution. That being true, we would be unworthy of the freedom which has blessed us and which we are enjoying if we do not hold a constant purpose in our hearts, and follow it in our actions, to restore freedom to Poland."

A Letter to Members of the Farm Union and Others

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 2, 1954

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to place in the RECORD copy of a letter to members of the Farm Union and others, as follows:

Your card, with many others, all carrying in effect the same message—"I want 100 percent of parity for all farm products"—just received.

As a farmer, your request for 100 percent parity on all farm products is a natural one.

There is, doubtless, a similar desire for the cost of doing business plus a profit on the part of every individual engaged in a business or in a profession. Some members of other business groups and professions have not yet put on the "heat" for the enactment of such legislation.

The demand of organized labor for maximum hours and minimum wages was granted long ago.

Then, too, those who, because of unavoidable conditions over which they have no control, are unable to earn an amount sufficient to enable them to live in even a modest but respectable way have long been asking for increased compensation from local, State, and Federal Governments.

It is not difficult to visualize the results if all of such requests or demands were put into effect by State and national legislative bodies.

The inevitable result would be to add to the tax burden, compel the members of various groups to make contributions toward the support of members of other groups; take from Peter to pay Paul.

In my judgment, that would be the result, because no government, even an absolute dictatorship, would be able to even approximately fix fairly the amount of the tax or contributions which members of one group should make toward the support of members of the other.

In my humble judgment, we may either submit to the workings of the law of supply and demand, with what incidental relief from extreme depressions the local, State, and Federal Governments can give, or surrender our freedom and submit to dictatorial rule, either by an individual or a group.

History discloses that when overall control of the individual's activities is taken, as when the Roman Emperor in 304 B. C. attempted to control the price not only of agricultural products, but of all other things, disaster followed.

If farmers are to receive 100 percent of parity for all farm products, the industries are to receive a fair price for what they produce, production must be limited. Would you advocate or approve doing that?

Carried to the extreme, it may also probably mean that each one of us is to do whatever, eat what, and live where and in the manner, the supreme power, whether it be a President and a Congress or a dictator, shall determine.

Just how much or how little socialism, regimentation or, if you prefer, controlled economy, the people wish or is good for us is an issue farmers must aid in solving.

Your views, individually expressed, will be gratefully received.

Americans of Ukrainian Descent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARGUERITE STITT CHURCH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1954

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like proudly to call attention to the fact that the 13th District of Illinois contains within its boundaries a large and respected group of Americans of Ukrainian descent, whose devotion to the ideals and memories of their country of origin is only equal to their devotion to our Nation and its high principles. I am enclosing, in tribute to to them, a statement of facts and quoted tributes, presented by Dr. Lev. E. Dobriansky, professor at Geogetown University, and president of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, Inc.:

DO YOU KNOW?

1. That over 40 million people, occupying the territory immediately north of the Black Sea, mostly within the basins of the Dnieper and Dniester Rivers speak Ukrainian, a separate and distinctive Slavic language?

2. That the city of Kiev forms and constitutes their ancient political capital and the traditional center of their cultural life?

3. That the Kiev-Ukrainian State had already achieved a high degree of culture

and prosperity in the year 1000? And that the political tradition of the Ukrainian people is thus rooted in the Kiev State?

4. That in A. D. 989, the Ukrainian Grand Prince Wolodymyr was baptized, and accepted Christianity from the Greeks of Constantinople (the Byzantine Empire)?

5. That the grand princes of Kiev were incomparably richer and more powerful than many of the rulers of the West, and held an honored place throughout Europe?

6. That the members of the Ukrainian-Kievan royal family married into the family of the emperors of Constantinople, and made matrimonial alliances with the Saxon royal family of England, with the kings of France, with Poland and Hungary?

7. That the Galician-Volynian area of Ukraine inherited and carried on the cultural life of Kiev during the period 1087 to 1340 and that the most outstanding prince during this period, Prince Daniel, a descendant of the Kiev ruling family, built and established the city of Lviv (Lemberg)?

9. That Kievan Rus was an ancient Ukrainian state and not a Russian, which did not yet exist at that time, for Russia took her shape as such in the times of Peter I (18th century), after the defeat of the Swedes under Charles XII and their Ukrainian ally at Poltava in 1709, when Muscovy assumed the name "Russia", and forbade the use of Muscovite State?

10. That after repeated periods of greatness and independence, the Ukrainian National Republic was again established on January 22, 1918, followed by the establishment of the Western Ukrainian National Republic in November 1918, and the union of these two Republics proclaimed on January 22, 1919?

11. That in Germany exists the legal Government of the Ukrainian National Republic which left Ukraine in 1920, and in 1948 its Parliament, the Ukrainian National Council, was formed, representing the majority of Ukrainian political parties?

12. That in Ukraine today the Ukranian Insurgent Army (UPA) and the Ukrainian anti-Soviet underground still wage a war for liberation, and in 1947 an agreement was reached between the U. S. S. R., Poland, and Czechoslovakia to combat the Ukrainian Insurgent Army?

"The Ukraine is an important factor in the European situation because of the extent of its territory, the richness of its resources, the size of its population, and its strategic position with reference to the Black Sea." (Prof. G. W. Simpson in the Ukraine, an Atlas of Its History and Geography.)

"It is my sincerest hope that a truly free Ukraine Republic will soon replace the present Klemlin-subjugated Ukrainian Republic and that its representation in the U. N. will be made up of genuine delegates instead of the present puppets stooging for the Kremlin.

"I believe the Ukrainian people are entitled to a government of their own free choice. Americans of Ukrainian descent should be proud of the record of resistance to bolshevism displayed by their valiant Ukrainian kinfolk, notably the splendid and indomitable record of the Ukrainian insurgent army." (Guy George Gabrielson, former chairman, Republican National Committee.)

"It is gratifying to know that valiant efforts are being made to keep alive the embers of liberty which are even now glowing in the hearts of the Ukrainian people who are under the heel of the Soviet dictatorship.

"Let us pray that it will not be long until deliverance shall come to these noble people who have contributed so much to civilization." (Pat McCarran, United States Senator from Nevada.)

"I wish to express the fervent hope that Ukrainians behind the Iron Curtain, suffering all the trials and tribulations and mass executions perpetrated upon them by the Soviet ruling clique, shall be allowed soon, with God's grace, to regain their liberties and live a life akin to our own—that of free men." (Gov. Thomas E. Dewey.)

"An up-to-date American foreign policy should skillfully and courageously build the resistance of the millions of prisoner peoples inside the Iron Curtain and hold the goal before them of ultimate freedom and self-government under God." (Harold E. Stassen, Director, Foreign Operations Administration.)

Religious Persecution Behind the Iron Curtain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. McVEY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 24, 1954

Mr. McVEY. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House have been concerned and greatly grieved many times when reports have reached us concerning the persecution of various types of religious advocates who lived behind what is now known as the Iron Curtain. In these persecutions it seems to make little difference as to the church to which a citizen belongs. Inasmuch as a high percentage of those who are now under the authority of the Kremlin belong to the Catholic church, the punishment which those of the Catholic faith have received has been outstanding and has been brought to our attention in many different ways.

There has recently come to me a report from Dr. Anthony Butkovich, who formerly lived in the territory behind the Iron Curtain, but who made his escape to this country. Dr. Butkovich attended the University of Croatia at Zagreb, and the University of Graz in Austria. He graduated as a doctor of legal law and political sciences in 1949. He was active as a journalist and lecturer in Croatia, Austria, and since his arrival in America.

He has been in this country for 3 years and has become pretty well acquainted with the American way of life. He has a profound feeling for the Christian principles of the American people and the part which this country has played in the historical events of world affairs. He is much impressed by the valiant American soldiers who have fought so gallantly on the battlefields of Europe and Africa, as well as in the Far East.

He holds personal knowledge of the persecution of many American priests and bishops behind the Iron Curtain. Dr. Butkovich has furnished me with 161 names of leading Catholic dignitaries persecuted or put to death by Communists in recent years. This list follows:

ALBANIA

Archbishop Nicholas Prennushi, of Durazzo, in prison and probably dead.

Bishop Francis Gjini, of Alessio, executed.

Bishop George Volay, of Sappa, executed.

BULGARIA

Bishop Eugene Bosilkoff, of Nikopol, sentenced to death.

Bishop John Romanoff, of Sofia, probably dead.

CHINA

Thomas Cardinal Tien, of Peiping, in exile.

Archbishop Anthony Riberi, papal internuntius in China, expelled.

Archbishop Theodore Buddenbroeck, of Lanchow, arrested.

Archbishop Dominic Capozi, of Taiyuan, imprisoned.

Archbishop Joseph Chow Chi, of Nanchang, imprisoned.

Archbishop Cyril Jarre, of Tsinan, died in prison.

Archbishop Ignatius Pi Shu Shih of Mukden, died in prison.

Bishop Theodore Breher, of Yenki, expelled, and died.

Bishop Philip Cote, S. J., of Suchow, an American, imprisoned.

Bishop Leo de Smedt, of Siwantze, died in prison.

Bishop Peter Joseph Fan, of Paoting, imprisoned.

Bishop Alfonso Ferroni, of Laokokov, imprisoned.

Bishop Francis X. Ford, of Kaying, an American, died in prison.

Bishop Rember Kowalksi, of Wuchang, an American, imprisoned.

Bishop Ignatius Arranga, of Pingliang, arrested.

Bishop John O'Shea, of Kanchow, an American, expelled.

Bishop Adolph Paschang, of Kongmoon, an American, expelled.

Bishop Ambrose O. Pinger, of Chowtsun, an American, imprisoned.

Bishop William C. W. Quinn, of Yukiang, an American, expelled.

Bishop Charles Weber, of Ichow, imprisoned.

Msgr. Julius Dillon, of Chasi, an American, expelled.

Msgr. Eugene Fahy, of Yangschow, an American, expelled.

Msgr. Jerome Haberstroh, of Tsitsihar, expelled.

Msgr. Ignatius Koenig, of Shaowu, imprisoned.

Msgr. Jon Romaniello, of Kweilin, an American, expelled.

CZECHOSLOVAKIA

Archbishop Joseph Beran, of Prague, imprisoned.

Bishop Paul Gojdic, of Presov, sentenced to life imprisonment.

Bishop Jan Vojtassak, of Spis, sentenced to 24 years imprisonment.

Bishop Michael Buzalka, of Trnava, life imprisonment.

Bishop Basil Hopkow, of Presov—sentenced to life imprisonment.

Bishop Stanislav Zela, of Olomouc, 25 years imprisonment.

ESTONIA

Archbishop Edward Profittlich, of Estonia, imprisoned in Russia.

INDOCHINA

Bishop John Baptist Tran Huu Duc, vicar of Winh, imprisoned by rebels.

Archbishop Mieciślaus Reinys, of Wilna, imprisoned in Russia.

Bishop Vincent Borisevicius, of Telsial, murdered by Russians.

Bishop Theophile Matulionis, of Kaisedorys, died in prison.

Bishop Francis Ramanauskas, of Telsial, prisoner in Russia.

Bishop Vincent Brizgyls, of Kaunas, exiled.

POLAND

Cardinal Hondl and Cardinal Viszlensky, imprisoned.

Archbishop Eugene Baziak, of Cracov, imprisoned.

Bishop Stanislav Adamski, of Katovice, imprisoned.

Bishop Karl Maria Splett, of Danzig, imprisoned.

RUMANIA

Archbishop Gerald P. O'Hara, of Savannah, Ga., an American, expelled.

All other bishops imprisoned or killed.

Archbishop Alexander Cisar, of Bucharest, persecuted.

Bishop Anthony Durcovici, of Jassi, imprisoned.

Bishop Augustine Pacha, of Timisoara, imprisoned.

HUNGARY

Joseph Cardinal Mindszenty, primate of Hungary, life imprisonment.

Archbishop Joseph Groesz, of Kalosca, 15 years imprisonment.

Bishop Vilmos Apor, of Gyoer, killed by Russian soldiers.

Bishop Zoltan Meszlenyi, of Eszertergom, died in prison.

KOREA

Bishop Patrick J. Burne, Apostolic delegate of Korea, an American, died as prisoner of Reds.

Bishop Boniface Sauer, of Hamhung, died as prisoner of Reds.

Msgr. Patrick T. Brennan, of Kwanju, an American, prisoner, fate unknown.

Msgr. Thomas Quinlan, of Chunchon, imprisoned.

LATVIA

Bishop Anthony Urbss, of Lepaja, exiled.

Bishop Joseph Rancans, of Riga, exiled.

LITHUANIA

Archbishop Joseph Skvireckas, of Kaunas, in exile.

Bishop Jon Scheffler, of Satu Mare, imprisoned.

Bishop Valerian Trajan Frentiu, of Aradea Mare, in prison.

Bishop John Suciu, of Alba Giulia, killed.

Bishop Basil Aftenie, of Faragas, killed.

RUSSIA

Archbishop John Cieplak, of Mogilev, died in exile.

Bishop Blesavus Sloskans, of Minsk, exiled.

Msgr. August Baumtriog, of Volga, imprisoned.

Msgr. Michael Juodakas, of Kazan, exiled.

Msgr. Ivan Roth, of Caucasus, imprisoned.

Msgr. Ivan Swiderski, of Kamienic, exiled.

UKRAINE

Archbishop Andrew Sheptytsky, of Lwiw, died in concentration camp.

Archbishop Joseph Slipy, of Lwiw, died in concentration camp.

Bishop Gregory Chomyshyn, of Stanislaviv, died in prison.

Bishop Gregory Lakota, of Peremyshl, died in Siberian camp.

Bishop Niceta Budka, of Lwiw, probably died in concentration camp.

Bishop Jon Buczko, of Lwiw, in exile.

CROATIA

Aloysius Cardinal Stepinac, of Croatia, in confinement after 4 years in prison.

Archbishop John Dr. Sarich, of Sarajevo, in exile.

Bishop Peter Cule, of Mostar, sentenced to 10 years in prison.

Bishop Gregory Rozman, of Slovenia, in exile.

Bishop John Simrak, of Krizevci, killed in prison.

Bishop Joseph Carevic, of Dubrovnik, killed by Communists.

Bishop Joseph Garic, of Banja Luka, died in exile.

Still 110 priests in prison, besides that 550 were killed.

Mr. Speaker, an examination of the above list of names leads one to feel that the persecution of the early Christians is being repeated today in those countries which follow the leadership of the Kremlin, and which have no respect for Christianity in any of its forms. Dr. Butkovich reacts to this situation as follows:

> It seems to me that the great struggle which we are facing in the world does not seem to be the question of Korea or Indochina, Berlin or Geneva, nor the question of economics and finances only, but in the last consequence the question of survival and victory or destruction and defeat of the free Christian world.
>
> I believe that the free world under the leadership of the United States of America should take the most energetic steps to stop the inhuman persecution of Catholic or any other clergy behind the Iron Curtain.

American Wage Earners Are Constantly Threatened by the Flood of Cheaply Manufactured Foreign Products

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1954

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, every Member of Congress should read the following article by Joseph A. Fox, Washington Evening Start staff correspondent, which appeared in the May 24, 1954, issue of that newspaper.

In my opinion the series of articles on foreign imports and their impact on American industry now being written by Mr. Fox will further expose the grave menace to American workmen resulting from the thinking of the free traders.

Mr. Fox's article follows:

TARIFF IS LIFE-OR-DEATH ISSUE FOR POTTERY CENTER OF UNITED STATES—EAST LIVERPOOL SEES DOOM IN FLOOD OF CHEAPER PRODUCTS FROM JAPAN

(By Joseph A. Fox)

EAST LIVERPOOL, OHIO, May 22.—Here at the head of the Ohio Valley, where the river that gives the region its name curves south from the Alleghenies, a 25-mile strip of hill country illustrates in miniature what Congress is up against on a national scale in the ageless battle over tariffs.

The big job in front of the legislators is that of reconciling the conflict between "little" industry that needs heavy tariff protection and "big" industry that sells overseas and can take care of itself against all comers. It is no mean task.

President Eisenhower last week took some of the heat off of Capitol Hill by dropping a plea for more liberal trade policies right at the moment. With an eye on the approaching congressional elections, the President agreed to go along for another year with the wornout machinery at hand for boosting commerce between the United States and the rest of the free world.

Why did General Eisenhower back down, for the present, at least, from the trade program he recently had launched so hopefully? Part of the answer can be found right here in East Liverpool, a typical high-tariff community. Foreign trade, these people are convinced, is poison to them. In fighting it they feel they are fighting for their lives.

Another part of the answer can be found a few miles south of here, where the powerful Weirton Steel Co. spans the river from Weirton, W. Va., to Steubenville, Ohio, with the biggest tinplate mill in the world. Weirton does a multi-million-dollar business annually in 36 countries, yet is supremely indifferent to the foreign-trade issue. But that is another story.

East Liverpool calls itself "the pottery center of America." It is the hub of an area of about 30,000 persons in Ohio and West Virginia. The livelihood of these people for a century and a quarter has depended on the manufacture of dishware.

Some of the inhabitants of this section today are descended from those early settlers who brought their skills from England, tapped the clay hills on the Virginia side of the Ohio, and peddled the products of their wheels downriver on flatboat.

FLOOD OF GOODS FROM JAPAN

Today the markets built up through the years are disappearing under the flood of goods from abroad. The resurgent Japanese are doing the most damage to East Liverpool, but Western Europe is contributing, too.

What has happened around here since 1947-48, when East Liverpool had its best year, shows up in the figures. Employment is down from 8,000 to about 5,500. The workweek is 30 hours instead of the standard 40. Sales had dropped by last year from $40 million to $22 million. And the payroll for 7 major potteries of the area had fallen from $25 million to $16 million.

If it had not been for the jobs available in nearby Pennsylvania steel mills, a lot of people would have been looking for work in this area. The current peacetime decline in steel production dims the future outlook.

In this situation, of course, the pottery workers want no part of a liberal trade program. The tariff barriers must be higher and stronger if they are to survive. As a matter of fact, in some respects the situation here has passed the point where tariffs can help any longer. The duties on Japanese pottery already are above 70 percent, and any further hike would be meaningless.

SEEKS TOTAL PROTECTION

What East Liverpool really wants is an absolute restriction on the quantity of pottery imports—at any price. But that is not in the cards. So this community must content itself with fighting any extension of reciprocal trade—for 1 year, no less than 3. It wants nothing to do with anything except total protection.

It is not hard to understand why.

Joseph M. Wells, grizzled general manager of Homer Laughlin China Co., of Newell, W. Va., pulls out a mail order catalog to demonstrate what he and others of the craft are facing.

A fine, 96-piece china dinner set imported from Japan—the kind the average American housewife would use only on special occasions—retails for $59.95. This is $2 less than Homer Laughlin, largest pottery maker in the world, has to charge for a 12-place setting of the domestic, semivitreous, or semiporelain ware that has commoner usage in the home. To duplicate the fine china would cost the American company $200.

Or again:

Hall China, of East Liverpool, the country's largest maker of teapots, turns out a prized product at $1.25. But the British who have to pay 20 to 25 percent in tariffs, still come along with the same thing for 98 cents—and throw in a supply of tea to boot.

"We could dry up unless we get help." That is the grim comment of Robert E. Boyce, youthful president of Harker Potter, which has been in business at Chester, W. Va., since 1840, and is the oldest outfit of its kind in the United States.

"We don't get much attention in Washington because we are a small industry," he adds, echoing a complaint often heard.

The truth is that the pottery industry—and other small businesses in pottery's situation—get a lot of attention in Washington. Their complaints carry weight out of proportion to their numbers for a good reason: The economic remedy to the East Liverpool situation may be obvious, but it poses a tough problem when you try to apply it to a living community of this sort.

THE STORY IN A NUTSHELL

The basic trouble is that American workers get such high pay that they cannot compete in industries like pottery where labor represents a large proportion of the costs. A Japanese pottery maker gets around 19 cents an hour. His American counterpart in East Liverpool gets $1.68 an hour. There is the story in a nutshell.

American industries can compete—can, in fact, defy competition—when they operate on a mass production basis. Both Homer Laughlin and Hall are turning to assembly line production as fast as possible. But that costs a lot of money. And as M. W. Thompson of Hall, remarks wryly: "There have been no millionaires made in pottery."

Regretfully, too, he observes that machine-made ware lacks the charm of the hand-turned product.

Freetraders have a simple answer to all this: If pottery is better made by hand, and if foreigners can do it cheaper than we, then East Liverpool should not be making pottery. The people here should be doing something else. Perhaps they should.

But East Liverpool doesn't like that answer, any more than it likes such slogans as "Trade, not aid" and "You can't sell if you don't buy."

Pottery is one of the over-age industries.

A top pottery workman, or woman, is apt to be in middle age or beyond. Years of experience are required to develop the skills that go into fine dishware—skills such as the delicate moulding and tracery of colorful patterns.

Craftsmen of this sort around Liverpool want to know what happens to them if their work goes and they have to look around for something else, under some sort of a retraining program such as has been suggested.

Take E. James Moore and Ben Barker, jiggermen at Homer Laughlin, who have spent a lifetime in pottery.

Mr. Moore is 62 and Mr. Barker 59. They are homeowners and proud grandfathers. They just plain don't want to become displaced persons.

Cleaning up their machines at the end of a day, they talk about this question, which is a hot topic of conversation in the union halls. They scoff at the whole idea of shifting to new work. They regard it as thoroughly impractical. They think the death of the pottery industry around East Liverpool would bring them only hardship.

"When people suggest moving, I wish they would suggest something I could learn to do," says Mr. Barker. "Who would want me, anyway, at my age?"

"It won't work," snaps Mr. Moore. "Once a potter, always a potter."

Whatever the economists say, Mr. Barker and Mr. Moore pose quite a problem for Congress.

From Brush to Grass

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TOM STEED
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 24, 1954

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, not long ago the House demonstrated its strong belief in agricultural research by increasing appropriations for these programs. In view of this action, I am attaching herewith an article recently published in the Oklahoma Ranch and Farm World, Tulsa, Okla., giving in detail the results of brush control programs sponsored in my State by the Red Plains Conservation Experiment Station, located in my district near Guthrie, Okla. This article will give Members a clear picture of some of the results being obtained by these appropriations. The article follows:

FROM BRUSH TO GRASS

(By Harry M. Elwell and Harley A. Daniel)

Scrubby brush and other troublesome plants are choking off production on nearly 100 million acres of range land in the great Southwest. In Oklahoma alone it is estimated that beef production could be increased by $100 million annually if the blighted land were cleared of noxious species.

Their severe competition for moisture, sunlight, and plant food greatly reduces growth of the better forage plants and represents one of the greatest detriments to range forage production. Droughts have been common in this area, resulting in fire damage and overgrazing. These factors depressed grass production, resulting in the rapid expansion of brush over these once productive grasslands.

One of our greatest opportunities for agricultural and industrial development lies in the improvement and full utilization of approximately 10 million acres of land covered with worthless brush and other troublesome plants and an additional 8 million acres of eroded class VII land in Oklahoma.

Much of this land is being only partially used and producing practically nothing. But scientists are learning how to put such wasteland to work. The matter of successfully combining commercial fertilizers, legumes, and grasses will do wonders for inherently poor, eroded soils. Moreover, once useless brush is removed from the virgin land, surprisingly large yields of grass are being realized.

The properly developed and improved pastures on the Red Plains Conservation Experiment Station near Guthrie, Okla., are producing 5 to 8 times more hay and beef than unimproved land. So tremendous is the potential gain in brush blighted areas and production in the regrassed eroded pastures that the resulting total income of much of this land, including the accompanying development in community betterment, civic improvement, etc., would be increased as much as 1,000 percent. But, before land of this nature can be protected and improved, the problems common to it must be overcome. Low fertility, poor physical conditions of the soil, and lack of moisture and organic matter are perhaps the most serious on the eroded land, and the brush must be removed and sprouts controlled on the virgin land.

Brush control investigations on oaks and other hardwood species were started on the Red Plains station at Guthrie, Okla., in 1935. The first work was done with hand tools, but since then various methods of removing brush with both machines and chemicals have been tried.

Chemicals were introduced into these studies in 1945, and the studies have now spread to various parts of the State through field trial tests in soil conservation districts. Methods of applying chemicals to control brush for grass production vary greatly because of the wide variety of woody plants and grasses and the wide differences in climatic and soil conditions. Methods that have been tried are foliage sprays, basal-bark, soil, and stump treatments. But the methods most commonly used during the growing season are the foliage sprays.

Foliage sprays may be applied on brush with motor-driven sprayers, air-blast machines, and the airplane. The most effective and satisfactory time to spray is when plants have just developed full leaf size, while photosynthesis is active. Best results have been obtained with selective herbicides when the soil moisture was adequate for ideal growing conditions, the humidity fairly high, a uniform air temperature of 60° to 80° Fahrenheit, and little or no wind blowing.

The low-volatile ester herbicides have consistently produced more effective control of native oaks than the high volatile formulations. In foliage applications with ground sprayers, 3 pounds total acid of either 2, 4–D or 2, 4, 5–T equal mixture, or the 2, 4, 5–T alone, in 100 gallons of water produced 93 percent kill of dense stands of oak brush. To obtain these results, the leaves, twigs, and stems of all the plants should be thoroughly wet with the solution.

Under humid conditions, spray solutions of water are satisfactory for selective herbicides and Ammate. But, when dry or more aird conditions exist, the addition of 10 gallons of diesel oil to each 100 gallons of spray solution of selective herbicides increases the kill. The effectiveness of water solutions of Ammate are also improved by the addition of a spreader-sticker material recommended by the manufacturer.

When mixed species of hardwoods are sprayed, some plants are resistant to the herbicides. Retreatments are therefore necessary. Sprouts from stumps are difficult to kill with 2,4–D, or 2,4-5-T foliage sprays. This is particularly true for sprouts that are well established on the old roots of the original plants. Ammate foliage sprays are usually more effective in treating young sprouts. However, it is generally advisable to let the sprouts grow for more than 2 years before attempting to treat them.

Large-scale field trial studies with airplane applications on oak brush were started in June 1952 at four locations in Oklahoma. These investigations were made cooperatively by the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Committees, Soil Conservation Service, Agricultural Research Service, Soil and Water Conservation Branch and Field Crops Branch of the United States Department of Agriculture; Aerial Applicator's Association; Oklahoma A. and M. College, and ranchers. Two of these tests were located in Osage County, one in Creek County, and the other in Grady County. One of the sites in Osage County occupied only 80 acres, but each of the others covered 160 acres.

Evaluations of the effectiveness on brush control and amount of grass produced were made of this study in September 1953. In general, 2,4-5-T was the most effective. It controlled brush sufficiently to permit the grass to establish a good cover, where properly managed. There was enough grass the second year for moderate use.

In earlier tests, diesel oil was most commonly used for airplane spraying. Some of the tests made in June 1952, however, with water-oil emulsions, at a rate of 4 parts of water to 1 of oil, appear to be about as effective as the oil treatments. Airplane spraying during the winter months was not effective on hardwood spieces.

The nonselective herbicide, Ammate, is also effective on hardwood species. The rate of application used is three-fourths to 1 pound per gallon of water. This material is safer to use along roadsides, fence rows, orchards, etc., adjacent to crops sensitive to the selective herbicides. It is also effective during a longer period of the growing season.

Substantial savings in material are made when Ammate is applied with an air-blast sprayer. This machine has produced as effective a kill of this oak brush as the hydraulic sprayer, with only one-third to one-half the quantities of Ammate and water.

Soil treatments of CMP, 3-(p-chlorophenyl)-1, 1-dimethylurea, give good kills of post oak and blackjack types of brush and small trees. An application of 7.5 pounds per acre of 80 percent wettable powder in 60 gallons of water on sandy-type soils produces very satisfactory kills of dense stands. However, on clay soil rates up to 15 pounds per acre may be necessary to obtain a good kill. This chemical is most effective when placed on the soil and in the zone occupied by the greatest amount of feeder roots. CMU is normally toxic to all plants, but established native grasses have survived and are making normal forage and seed production where rates of 15 pounds or less were applied.

Several kinds of machines may be used for removing brush and woody vegetation. Brush mowers, saws, beaters, crushers, buck rakes, and cutters have been tried at the Red Plains Station. All of them gave satisfactory results when used on material within the limits for which each is best suited. There is also some newer equipment, such as the cutter-type machines which operate on large track-type tractors.

A root-cutter type machine, which consists of a large sweep mounted on a D-7 caterpillar tractor, was used on the Red Plains Station in July 1952. There was a rolling colter 48 inches in diameter mounted in front of each of the two supporting beams. The depth of cut in the soil varied from about 12 to 14 inches. This machine was operated on an area of dense oak and covered about 1.25 acres per hour. The treatment killed a high percentage of the brush which was left on the soil for surface protection.

Tree cutters, often call V-shape treedozers, which operate on large track-type tractors are an innovation in land clearing. They shear off trees up to 20 inches in diameter. The tension bar, extending beyond the cutting edge, bends the tree, putting the fibers under tension. The sharp steel blade mounted on heavy-duty standards, then slashes through the free in a smooth slicing action. The tree is cut flush with the ground. Some operators report that this machine on a D-7 caterpillar tractor will cut brush and small trees of medium density at a rate of about 1.5 to 2.0 acres an hour.

After the brush was killed, surprisingly large yields of grass and pasture were realized. Where selective herbicides were properly used, the leaves, twigs and stems of sprayed brush accumulated in a mulch on the soil. There was an average of 7,598 pounds per acre of this litter 2 years after treatment. It conserves water and makes conditions favorable for the immediate growth of native grass intermingled in the brush. Measurements made during an 8-year period on the Red Plains Station show that 45 percent less water ran off annually from good grass on treated land than from an adjacent area of brush land.

The success of the pasture will depend largely upon its management after the brush is removed. The soils covered with scrubby oak are usually shallow and erodible. It is, therefore, important that a continuous protective cover be maintained on this land. In order to do this, burning must be prevented.

The erodibility and fertility levels of the soils are important. Their ability to produce palatable plants can often be determined by the kind of grass intermingled in the brush. On better sites, big bluestem, little bluestem, Indian grass, switch grass, purpletop, and sand love grass are usually in the undisturbed oak brush. But, due to the competition of the brush, these grasses are small, spindling, and greatly depressed in growth. The average yield of grass on fully cleared virgin land is 5 times that found on land 90 percent shaded.

Full grass production will be obtained more rapidly, and erosion more completely controlled, if clearing is limited to areas having only light or medium brush cover. The original grass cover is more dense on gently sloping soil where shade from woody vegetation is less. Under such conditions, a complete land cover is usually established in 1 or 2 years. There is also less likelihood of erosion starting between the time of clearing and the time the grass becomes well established. Therefore, through proper site selection and good management, much of the worthless brushland may be converted into valuable grassland.

These native grasses are highly nutritious and make good pasture. On virgin soil from which brush had been removed, the per-acre gain without fertilizer was greater than on the eroded soil where fertilizer was applied—84 pounds as compared to 80 pounds. When this virgin land was fertilized, the gains were increased by almost 60 percent—from 84 to 133 pounds.

In 1953 good fall rains occurred, and after the grazing season, the grass produced seed. An average of 78 pounds per acre of native grass seed was harvested from the fertilized pastures and only 42 pounds from the unfertilized. This is an increase of about 85 percent. Based on the price received for the cattle and the seed, the gross income in 1953 from the fertilized pasture was $42.96 per acre, compared to $23.34 from the unfertilized one.

According to native grass seed production records here at the Red Plains station, there is a possibility of this grass producing seed about 3 years out of 10, following summer grazing. Based on this record, the fertilization of native grasses on the better sites of cleared brushland would appear to be practical. There was a distinct improvement of stand and quality of native grass, as well as an increase of native legumes, following fertilization.

Fluoridation of Public Water Supplies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARGUERITE STITT CHURCH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1954

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to insert a resolution passed by the city of Evanston, Ill., on May 17, 1954, together with a letter from the department of health, city of Evanston.

Both of these statements testify to the great benefit, conspiciously and indisputably evident following the fluoridation of Evanston water supply during the last 7 years. Both the department of health and the city of Evanston have taken a vigorous stand against H. R. 2341, which seeks to prevent the fluoridation of public water supplies.

The above-mentioned follows:

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
Evanston, Ill., May 21, 1954.

Hon. MARGUERITE STITT CHURCH,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MRS. CHURCH: I should like to give you a summary of the experience of the city of Evanston in fluoridation of the public water supply, with reprints of some of our publications, for inclusion in the records of the hearings on H. R. 2341, on May 25, 26, and 27, 1954.

In 1939, dentists on the staff of the United States Public Health Service made careful examinations of the amount of dental decay of children who resided in eight Chicago suburban communities. It was found that children residing in Evanston, Oak Park, and Waukegan, Ill., who drank Lake Michigan water containing no fluorine, had 2½ times as much dental decay as children residing in Aurora, Elgin, Elmhurst, Joliet, and Maywood. The last 5 communities obtained their drinking water from deep artesian wells, which contain 1 part per million of fluorine as a natural constituent of the water which is obtained from the underlying strata of rock. As the commissioner of public health of the city of Evanston, it occurred to me that it would be wise to provide Evanston children with very minute amounts of fluorine in the public drinking water supply, for the purpose of determining whether or not dental decay could be reduced.

After studying the comparisons of dental decay in children from communities with fluorine and without fluorine in the drinking water, I communicated with the Illinois State Health Department for morbidity (disease) and mortality (death) statistics from all 8 communities for purposes of comparison. No illness of any sort was attributed to fluorine in the drinking water of the 5 communities where it occurred naturally and the death rates of all 8 communities were essentially the same. Accordingly, we were convinced that it was safe to add fluorine to the Evanston drinking water. This study was approved by the Evanston City Council, superintendents of schools, the Evanston Dental Society, and the Evanston Medical Society, and fluoridation of the Evanston public water supply was begun on February 11, 1947.

Dental examinations, including X-rays of all the teeth of 2,000 Evanston children 6 to 8 years old during the past year have revealed a decrease of 58 percent in dental decay in permanent teeth.

No detrimental effects of any sort have been found in children or adults on careful medical examination. I am not aware of any evidence published in medical literature showing that there is an increase of any disease which could be attributed to fluorine in a concentration of one part per million in a public drinking water supply.

We now have sufficient scientific evidence of the reduction of tooth decay as a result of fluoridation of our city water to recommend that other communities add fluorine in a concentration of one part per million to public water supplies. Results obtained by several other research groups studying this problem are uniformly favorable, and we therefore think that fluoridation should be encouraged.

I am enclosing herewith reprints of three of our papers already published in scientific journals, showing the results of our studies, which we should also like to have included in the official record.

Yours sincerely,
W. H. TUCKER, M. D.,
Commissioner of Health.

RESOLUTION ON FLUORIDATION

CITY OF EVANSTON, ILL., *May 17, 1954.*

Whereas the health department and the water department of the city of Evanston, Ill., on authority of the Evanston City Council, undertook a plan in February 1947 to add fluorine in a concentration of one part per million to the city drinking water; and

Whereas this plan included examination of the teeth of the school children prior to fluoridation and the careful checking of their teeth at regular intervals over a period of years to determine results which have been obtained; and

Whereas the Evanston Dental Society, the Evanston Medical Society, and the superintendent of schools endorsed this study, which is similar to studies now being carried out in other cities; and

Whereas the health department reports that through cooperation of the Zoller Dental Clinic of the University of Chicago and of the Illinois State Department of Health, extensive dental examinations of school children in the 6 to 8 year age groups during 1953 revealed a 58-percent decrease in the prevalence of dental decay as compared with the amount of such decay found in 1946, and that general health examinations reveal no detrimental or harmful effects on either children or adults: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the City Council of the city of Evanston reaffirm its support and endorsement of the plan and project of the departments of health and water involving the addition of fluorine in a concentration of one part per million to the Evanston city water supply.

Attest:

T.R. Timbare,
Mayor.
Edward W. Bell,
City Clerk.

Adopted by the City Council of the City of Evanston on May 17, 1954.

Unemployment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1954

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, the American Federation of Labor has recently complete an analysis of the current unemployment and partial unemployment situation in the United States. Because this analysis goes beyond the bare statistics on this critical problem and outlines the serious effects of present unemployment by industries and by localities, I know that my colleagues in the House will be interested in reading the summary report on the study issued by the AFL. Under unanimous consent I include it in the Congressional Record at this point:

UNEMPLOYMENT

Unemployment has risen sharply during the past 6 months. According to the census estimate, the number of unemployed workers has increased from a low of 1,301,000 in October 1953 to 3,725,000 for March. A sluggish response to the seasonal trend brought unemployment to 3,465,000 in April.

The census, however, defines unemployment narrowly. It counts a large number of workers as employed despite the fact that the wage earners in these additional categories are neither working nor earning pay. In order to determine economic unemployment, these additional groups should be counted as unemployed. This includes workers who have been laid off but expect their jobs to reopen within 30 days; those hoping to enter new employment or business within 30 days; and those not working or receiving compensation because their outdoor work has been curtailed by bad weather.

In April 1954 there were 462,000 workers in these three categories. Adding these these workers to the estimated unemployment as defined by the census, in April 1954 unemployment stood at 3,927,000.

In addition, account should be taken of wage earners who are at a given time without jobs because they are moving from one place to another, one job to another, or one occupation to another. Some workers in this group are incorrectly counted as employed, while others escape the census count altogether. It is our conservative estimate that in April 1954 this "floating" unemployment, with other miscellaneous categories not included in the unemployment count by the Census, was approximately 510,000. A complete count of economic unemployment representing all workers totally unemployed in April therefore equals 4,437,000, or 6.9 percent of the civilian labor force.

In order to arrive at a proper measure of the economic impact of unemployment, partial unemployment should also be taken into account. On the basis of official data, we estimate that the total number of workers involuntarily on part time in April 1954 was 2,710,000. The time lost due to partial unemployment is equivalent to a loss of more than 1 million full-time jobs. When this aggregate loss of employment is taken into account, it is found that in April 1954 economic unemployment represented a level of close to 5.5 million.

The following table shows how economic unemployment was distributed:

	April 1954
Unemployment as defined by the census	3, 465, 000
Laid off, and not on job	216, 000
Expecting employment, but not working	188, 000
Unemployed because of bad weather	58, 000
Floating and miscellaneous unemployment	510, 000
Totally unemployed	4, 437, 000
Full-time equivalent of partial unemployment	1, 000, 000
Total	5, 437, 000

This figure of 5,437,000 unemployed, representing 8.5 percent of the civilian-labor force, provides an accurate measure of the economic impact of unemployment on the American economy in April 1954.

INDUSTRIES

While there are no statistics classifying the unemployed by the last job which they have held, employment data of the Bureau of Labor Statistics provide an accurate indication of the industries which have been hardest hit.

These figures show that the sharpest declines in employment have been concentrated in the following four industrial groups:

Industry	Employment (in thousands)		Percent change April 1953 to April 1954
	April 1954	April 1953	
Mining	747	845	−11.6
Manufacturing	15, 965	17, 309	−7.8
Federal Government	2, 168	2, 326	−6.8
Transportation	4, 006	4, 197	−4.6

These four industrial groups account for most of the decline in nonfarm employment of almost 1,500,000 during the past year. Among other groups, service industries, State and local governments, public utilities, finance, insurance, and trade have either shown small increases in employment over the past year or only slight declines.

The decline in mining largely reflects conditions in the bituminous coal fields, although anthracite mining has been a depressed industry for many years.

The drop in Federal Government employment is the result of a scheduled decline in some defense activities together with the budget cutting and economy drives of the present administration. The drop in transportation employment is mainly due to a sharp decline in railroad jobs.

While the employment declines in these three industrial groups are substantial, by far the largest loss of jobs has been concentrated in manufacturing. The accompanying chart makes it possible to examine more closely the nature of this decline. It shows the percent decline in employment of production workers in each major manufacturing industry from the peak month in 1953 to April 1954. The figures have been adjusted for seasonal variation so that changes in employment caused by purely seasonal influences have been eliminated from the calculation.

The number of production workers in manufacturing declined over 1,400,000 from the peak month of June, a drop of over 10 percent. For individual industries, the decline is larger.

The sharpest drop (33.2 percent) was reported in the ordnance industry which, of course, has been hardest hit by the decline in defense spending. Other industries for which declines of over 12 percent were recorded are electrical machinery, primary metals industries, furniture, fabricated metal products, transportation equipment, and rubber. The industries which have been least affected by the general decline are food, paper, and printing and publishing.

In the key construction industry, employment in April 1954 totaled 2,512,000, an increase of 0.1 percent from the previous year. However, data showing employment by locality make it clear that this stability in construction conceals a number of increases and declines in different parts of the country.

The most substantial declines from March 1953 to March 1954 were recorded in a number of areas in the Far West (Albuquerque, Boise, Casper, Salt Lake City, Tacoma, San Francisco, Los Angeles, and San Diego). A number of other localities also experienced substantial drops, including Washington, D. C., Richmond, Va., Chattanooga, Tenn., and Topeka, Kans.

On the other hand, increases during the past year were recorded generally in most of the New England and southern sections of the country. Increases also took place in New York City, other industrial centers in New York State, cities in Connecticut and Maine, Baltimore, Atlanta, Knoxville, Little Rock, and Tulsa. In a number of areas, including Chicago, Boston, and Denver, there was little change in construction employment.

Detailed information on local construction employment is lacking for cities, in the States of Indiana, Michigan, Missouri, New Jersey, Ohio, Pensylvania, and Wisconsin.

LOCALITIES

Distribution of unemployment by locality is reflected in the statistics provided by the Labor Department's Bureau of Employment Security for the unemployment insurance program. Every 2 months, the Nation's major labor market areas are classified into four categories according to the severity of unemployment. Those areas where unemployment constitutes 6 or more percent of the total labor force are classified as group IV.

During the past year, the number of labor market areas classified as group IV has been steadily increasing. The most recent report indicates that 35 major areas are included in this category, compared to only 17 a year ago. In addition, there are 58 smaller areas classified as localities with substantial labor surplus, as compared with 18 a year ago.

Areas with the highest unemployment rates are those where unemployment has become chronic over the past 10 years largely because of the area's dependence on one industry for the bulk of its employment. In most cases, these areas are coal or textile communities in which the generally depressed market conditions for these commodities have forced factory shutdowns and substantial cutbacks in employment.

The hard-hit textile cities are concentrated in the New England area and include Lawrence, Lowell, and New Bedford, Mass. The coal towns are concentrated in Pennsylvania and include Johnstown, Scranton, and the Wilkes-Barre-Hazelton area.

Cities with important metal fabricating and machinery plants which have been hard hit are Detroit, Battle Creek, and Muskegon, Mich.; South Bend and Terre Haute, Ind.; Toledo, Ohio; Kenosha and Racine, Wis.; and the Davenport, Iowa Quad-Cities Area. The reduced demands for irone ore is reflected in the classification of the Duluth, Minn., and Superior, Wis., labor market area as group IV. The lack of shipbuilding on the west coast is reflected in the Tacoma classification in this group. Other centers of unemployment are Portland, Oreg.; Chattanooga, Tenn.; San Antonio, Tex.; and Albuquerque, N. Mex.

Beef From Gullies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM STEED

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1954

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, I am including in my remarks today two articles recently published by the Oklahoma Ranch and Farm World, Tulsa, Okla., which clearly indicate results that are being obtained by scientific application of new land usage technics.

Since these results stem directly from research sponsored by the United States Department of Agriculture through its Red Plains Conservation Experiment Station, located near Guthrie, Okla., I believe the Members will find this information of particular interest. It is graphic proof that we do obtain substantial results from funds Congress makes available to carry on these experiments. The articles are as follows:

EXAMPLES OF BRUSH CONTROL IN OKLAHOMA

Two outstanding examples of brush control in Oklahoma may be found on 2 widely separated ranches, 1 near Bristow and the other near Pawhuska.

Albert and Levan Kelly, near Bristow, in Creek County, and George McKinley, operator of the Rocking Chair Ranch near Pawhuska, in Osage County, are the two ranches where much progress has been made in the control of this undesirable brush.

"On these 2 ranches," says Harry M. Elwell, research agronomist, Red Plains Station, Guthrie, Okla., "the herbicides used were all formulations of low-volatile esters. The rate of application for the initial treatments, in June 1952, was 2 pounds of 2,4,5-T in 5 gallons of spray solution per acre (in flight swaths of 33 feet.

"Where equal mixtures of 2,4-D and 2,4,5-T were applied, one-third more acid was necessary to produce the same results," Elwell says. "The spray solution consisted of oil and water emulsions."

Elwell points out that on some of the areas retreatments using the same volume of spray were necessary in June 1953 to obtain satisfactory control for maximum grass production. Stands consisting mostly of post oak and white oak required only 1 pound of acid per acre for the retreatment; however, on those in which blackjack and black oak predominated 2 pounds per acre were necessary.

As a result of these applications, a high percentage of the brush was defoliated and prevented from making additional growth on both ranches, and, in general, very satisfactory grass production was obtained. In some areas the grass production was increased as much as 244 percent.

Widespread interest is shown in brush control, as is indicated by this statement from a recent issue of Armour's Analysis, a publication sponsored by the Livestock Bureau of Armour & Co., Chicago, Ill.: "In some areas, particularly the Southwest, chemical control with herbicides such as 2,4-D and 2,4,5-T has been gaining in popularity over mechanical clearance, the other method of major importance. Both chemical and mechanical control are far more satisfactory in reasonably moist years, when brush is making good growth, according to Dave Savage, superintendent of the United States Southern Great Plains Field Station. Active growth in late spring and early summer depletes the root reserves of plant food, making the brush more vulnerable to chemical treatment. Savage reports that, due to drought conditions, relatively little chemical control work was undertaken last year in his area."

BEEF FROM GULLIES

If we work with Mother Nature in the Southwest Plains, many additional cattle can be pastured on the 8.5 million acres of land that is now abandoned, eroded, and low in fertility.

We have a new slogan down in this area—"beef from gullies." It means reclaiming worn-out land and putting it back to nutritious grasses. Our work to date shows that it can be done successfully. But, we must carefuly consider the soil and climatic conditions and use the right grasses and methods.

Under natural conditions, grass re-establishes itself slowly on eroded land. In accelerating the process, we must overcome the problems common to this type of land. Low fertility, poor physical condition of the soil, and lack of moisture and organic matter are perhaps the most serious.

Low fertility can be corrected by the addition of commercial fertilizers and lime. By growing sweetclover and other legumes, we can build up the organic matter supply in the soil and increase the available nitrogen. Soil organisms can then thrive. Their activity improves the physical condition of the soil, which is extremely important in obtaining good seeding of native grass.

If the land to be regrassed is badly washed and gullied, our first step will be to reduce further erosion and stabilize the seedbed. In some areas we must divert the runoff water from the original channels by putting in contour furrows or ridges above the heads of the gullies.

After diverting the runoff water, we can install vegetative barriers of brush and crop residue and "slope" the gully banks by grading the soil. We are then ready to apply fertilizer and lime as needed in the legumes. After the legumes are established, grass can be seeded successfully.

On badly eroded land the "seed-hay" method has produced better stands than other methods of seeding native grasses. This has certainly been true at our Red Plains conservation experiment station at Guthrie, Okla. This method is also suitable for seeding bare spots in pastures in the tall grass area of the Great Plains.

The seed hay used in this method is mowed immedaitely after the seed matures, stacked, and spread on eroded land the following spring. On most farms in this area, there are patches of native grass along roads or in odd corners that usually produce seed. If the seed crop is heavy, the seed hay cut from one acre can be spread over 3 to 8 acres of land to be seeded. Clean, disease-free straw or crop residue can be added to make a total application of about 2,000 pounds per acre.

The hay not only provides seed but also tends to prevent erosion, conserve moisture, and keep the seed in place until germination. As the young plants emerge, they help to tie the residue down so that it doesn't wash off with the rains.

The hay and straw should be spread evenly, and it is a good idea to pack it down with a corrugated roller, cultipacker, or disk. The latter practice insures quicker germination.

In our experiments, the seed-hay method producted a density of grass 2.5 times greater than that from threshed seed. By the end of the second growing season, the sod was nearly as thick as that of virgin native gross. Even on shallow eroded soils, the runoff water was 39 percent less than that from cultivated terraced land nearby. Native vegetation, however, reduced the runoff loss by 94 percent.

Under favorable conditions, land reseeded by using mulches and the seed-hay method can be moderately grazed the second fall after seeding. However, it must be protected from burning.

Fall and winter mowing of poor stands develops a mulch, saves seed which otherwise would blow away, supplies organic matter, and protects the young seedlings. Light to moderate grazing, regulated by growth and moisture conditions, will improve the stand on reclaimed eroded pastures. Allowing the grass to produce seed by controlling the grazing periods will also help to maintain a good cover.

During 1952 and 1953, summer grazing tests with yearling steers on regrassed eroded land have produced an average of 42 pounds of beef per acre.

In these same trials of the Red Plains Station, the production of beef on the native grass pastures was increased 1.5 times by applying phosphorus and nitrogen fertilizers to regrassed land.

In a similar comparison made prior to 1952, the 7-year average animal gain on the fertilized pasture was exactly the same as the 1952–53 average in this test—80 pounds per acre. On the unfertilized pasture the 7-year average was 42 pounds per acre.

Introduced species of pasture plants have also been tested on eroded land. The most hardy appear to be KR bluestem, weeping lovegrass, and Arlington lespedeza sericea. Beginning in 1950, a pasture consisting of about two-thirds KR bluestem and one-third weeping lovegrass was grazed annually during the growing season. It is located on formerly cultivated class VII land which had become badly gullied.

Prior to seeding the grasses, the banks of the gullies were graded down, leveled, and properly fertilized. During the grazing period, however, the pasture has been treated with about the equivalent of 250 pounds of 16–20–0 fertilizer per acre. It has produced an average of 110 pounds of beef per acre during this 4-year period. The highest production was 155 pounds per acre in 1952. Through this type of pasture improvement, together with proper management, much of the shallow, poor, eroded, misued land can be converted into useful pastures and protected from erosion.

Views of Secretary Talbott on Reenlistment Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. BATES

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1954

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, there is a very serious concern felt by leading military authorities and Members of Congress in the low rate of reenlistments in the various services, and the following views of Secretary Talbott of the Air Force are timely and constructive.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am including the following excerpt from Secretary Talbott's speech on May 15, 1954:

It would be ideal if the Air Force could be made up of career airmen and officers with just the normal turnover from sickness and old-age retirements. We know that this is impossible in our democracy, and we have to expect some turnover. However, when a recent survey of a cross-section of our airmen showed that only 24 percent planned to reenlist I was determined to do something about it. I checked further and found that in some of our key units the re-enlistment rate was as low as 10 to 15 percent. This all means that in the next year we will lose as many as 200,000 men. We must recruit and train replacements for each of these 200,000. The cost of retraining will be enormous—between $2 and $3 billion.

I was alarmed, not only by the drop in the reenlistment rate, but to see many of our fine, well-trained, well-qualified officers choosing to resign and leave the Air Force. While I know of many of the reasons for our people leaving the service, I have had an independent impartial survey made. I have this report. I think you should know some of the things that were found.

The report shows that the men of the Air Force are loyal and devoted to their service and their country. They are proud to serve and to be part of it. Questions revealed that few men would choose to leave the service if they could just make ends meet. They ask only to be able to live and provide their families a normal American life.

The report shows, however, that many of our men chose the Air Force as a career some years ago. They recognized that while they would not get rich in the service, their pay plus additional rights and privileges along with retirement benefits would make them relatively indifferent to finances. It concludes that the basic cause of our airmen and officers getting out of the service—the cause of our lowering reenlistment rates—is twofold: The first is that service pay has not kept pace rising costs of living. The second is that the traditional rights and privileges considered as augmentations to pay have been slowly whittled down or eliminated. Buying privileges in commissaries and post exchanges now save little money. Restrictions have been placed on the type and quality of merchandise on sale. Medical care of dependents is limited and difficult to get. Retirement benefits and incentive pay have been subject to annual question by special commissions and congressional groups. Housing has been poor and scarce.

I find that the low-pay rates and the reduction of traditional rights and privileges are the results of efforts by Congress and others to save money. These reductions affecting as they do the lives and morale of all the services have certainly been penny-wise and pound-foolish. While it would appear on the surface to cost money to raise service pay and to restore traditional benefits and privileges, such expenditures would be repaid many times by the savings in retraining costs of new men—not to mention the priceless increase in efficiency of our Air Force—and other services. I would guess that we would get as much $4 to $5 back in savings for each dollar we spend. Private industry and business have long recognized the fact that adequate compensation and good working conditions will attract and hold skilled loyal employees.

I am telling you of this personnel problem tonight because it affects each and every one of us. Unless the inequities in the treatment of our servicemen are corrected, and our forces stabilized by higher reenlistment rates, the efficiency of our forces will be impaired. I fear the peace of the world—the security of the very rooms in which we are sitting tonight—will be jeopardized if the quality of our striking forces—the forces capable of inflicting instant and massive retaliation—should drop.

As Secretary of the Air Force, I am determined to do everything in my power to make service in the Air Force attractive to the young men of America. We want to make service in the Air Force sought after by the able young men of our country.

The Air Force is now conducting a drive to restore many of the traditional benefits that make service life more attractive to our people. The program that we are conducting to improve life in the service includes many things that the armed services cannot do for themselves. We along with the Army and the Navy are asking Congress to assist by removing legislative blocks which now prohibit the restoration of certain privileges. We have bills in Congress to equalize survivor benefits, to provide medical care for servicemen and their families, and to improve service housing.

We are asking for the removal of the surtax on commissary purchases. We are urging a return to the prewar post-exchange system and privileges.

It is vital that each of you support these efforts. You can do much to encourage the young men of our country to consider seriously a service career. While we may dislike the thought, we will have to maintain our Armed Forces strong and ready over an indefinite period. Finally, I would appeal to you to let the men who are now in the service know that you do appreciate the sacrifices and efforts they are making in the defense of our country. We all fall back on the man in uniform when the shooting starts. We need them now as never before in our history. Why don't we tell them that we are grateful.

Operation Jobs, 1953

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. BONIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1954

Mr. BONIN. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, May 11, I attended the Greater Wilkes-Barre Chamber of Commerce 70th anniversary dinner in Wilkes-Barre, Pa. The president of this organization is F. Thoburn Armstrong, and the speaker of the evening was Paul G. Hoffman, chairman of the board of the Studebaker Corp. Music was furnished by Vincent Lopez.

The well-arranged program included a progress report on Operation Jobs, 1953. Mr. William O. Sword is the chairman of the committee of 100. The report follows:

OPERATION JOBS, 1953—A PROGRESS REPORT

JOBS AND PAYROLLS AUGMENTED

In 1953, the first fruits of Operation Jobs, in terms of dollars and cents, became measurable. As of December 31, 1953, Operation Jobs, through its program of attracting new industry and expediting the expansion of existing industry resulted in 3,402 jobs and an industrial payroll of $5,966,305.45.

This growing upward trend, through still additional new and expanded local industry, is the definite answer to the challenge of a community undergoing intense economic transition. The base of support for the program must be broadened.

Late 1953 saw the acquisition of a second new industry for Crestwood Industrial Park where Foster Wheeler Corp., in 1952, was the first to locate a plant. This second new industry—King Fifth Wheel Co.—is a celebrated Philadelphia concern now observing its 50th year of service to industry. Among its many operations it is considered one of the top benders and welders of steel rings for industrial clients throughout the United States. It is also playing an increasingly large role in the growing jet-plane field.

King Fifth Wheel will occupy a 12-acre site in a modern plant along the new road leading to Crestwood which was completed recently by Luzerne County as a means of helping Operation Jobs attract industry.

Groundbreaking took place April 16, 1954. Construction is now underway.

Addition of King Fifth Wheel Co. to our industrial family at Crestwood Industrial Park is added evidence of the advantages to national concerns of this major industrial site. The industry will employ 150 men.

Muskin Manufacturing Co.: This 30-year-old New York firm, one of the country's leading manufacturers of doll carriages and strollers, as well as the nationally famed Lido line of play pools for swimming and wading, purchased and now occupies building units 1, 2, and 3 of former Wilkes-Barre Lace Manufacturing Co. Charles Weissman, a member of the committee of 100, cooperated in bringing the firm to greater Wilkes-Barre. The new industry spells jobs for 135 men and 65 women.

McGregor Sportswear: Another 1953 acquisition was David D. Doniger & Co., Inc., which was housed in the former Duplan building in Nanticoke through cooperation of the Committee of 100, Greater Wilkes-Barre Industrial Fund, and Nanticoke Industrial Fund, and Nanticoke Industrial Development Fund. Now employing 125 men and 121 women, with 300 expected, the new industry has meant new blood to the entire valley generally as well as to the Nanticoke area in particular.

Prestige Shoe Corp.: This successful new enterprise, owned and operated by Reuben Rosen at 421 North Pennsylvania Avenue, Wilkes-Barre, added another payroll in 1953. Already employing 125 men and 80 women, the number of jobs is expected to increase to over 300.

In 1953 a number of local existing industries expanded their facilities for production and employment. Here is the list.

Diane Footwear Co.: This is the first industry to utilize a portion of the new 10-acre Operation Jobs industrial plot formerly known as Franklin Field, on Blackman Street, Wilkes-Barre, where there is room for two additional industries as well. Established in Wilkes-Barre in 1946 through cooperation of the Industrial Fund, Diane Footwear is now constructing an attractive new plant at its new site which will mean jobs for 350 local persons. Announcement of the expansion was made at Christmas 1953. Groundbreaking took place January 5, 1954. Erection of steel framework was completed in April. Final stages of construction are now under way.

Faith Shoe Co.: Evidence of greater Wilkes-Barre's importance as a growing shoe manufacturing center was augmented through the expansion of still another shoe concern. Faith Shoe is adding 16,000 square feet to its present plant on Beekman Street which will make it one of the most modern concerns in the field. The expansion, when completed, will enable Faith Shoe Co. to bring to Wilkes-Barre a plant which it operates in Macungie, and thus enlarge its overall employment to 450 local people. The added jobs will be predominantly male. Faith Shoe was located originally in the valley 8 years ago through cooperation of the industrial fund. Its constant growth has richly merited the help extended.

Leslie Fay Corp.: In June 1953, Leslie Fay Corp. purchased 91,296 square feet of the Duplan plant in Kingston and turned it into a cutting, distributing, pressing, and shipping center for Leslie Fay's eight-factory organization. Leslie Fay Fashions currently employ 125 men and 750 women. A future employment of 1,000 is estimated.

Woodbury Manufacturing Co.: In May 1953 this progressive local firm acquired former Weave Building No. 5 of Wilkes-Barre Lace Co. and added another payroll to the community. The company operates the expansion as Woodbury Plant No. 2. Woodbury Plant No. 1 is located on Carey Avenue. The firm's splendid 1953 payroll was a boon to the entire community.

Square Apparel Co.: on the 10th anniversary of its establishment in Wilkes-Barre, Square Apparel Co. moved from outgrown quarters at 421 North Pennsylvania Avenue, to its present spacious home at 161 Darling Street. Comprising 33,000 square feet, the new factory was formerly known as Building 7-A of Wilkes-Barre Lace Co. It has been completely modernized. Square Apparel presently employs 300 men and women and anticipates a sizable increase.

Acme Metal Products: This precision tool and die works and machine shop expanded in 1953 from cramped quarters on New Hancock Street, Wilkes-Barre, to the General Pershing School, Parsons. The building has been transformed into a modern plant. A specialist in electronics and aircraft fields, Acme Metal Products is busy with orders from all part of the country.

INDUSTRIAL SITES PROCURED

In 1953 operation jobs moved forward in acquiring and expanding sites for new and existing industry. Proper sites are one of the community's major needs.

Crestwood Industrial Park: Comprising 1,200 acres is one of the major assets in the program to attract industry. Through cooperation of Luzerne County commissioners a modern road has been built, linking Crestwood Industrial Park and Wilkes-Barre-Hazelton Highway. Timber cutting and leveling of land are being carried out as needed, most recently in the case of the 12-acre tract for King Fifth Wheel Co.

Simpson Street plot: In November 1953, the industrial fund acquired this 10-acre plot in south Wilkes-Barre for industrial development purposes. Cleared and leveled, the plot has room for 2 or 3 industries. Several prospects are interested.

Franklin Field plot: Formerly used as a playground, this 10-acre tract was deeded to the industrial fund by Wilkes-Barre City as a means of helping Operation Jobs. Wilkes-Barre City felt that industrial use of the property would mean more local jobs, additional taxes to the city from industries locating here, and increased wealth for the community. Glen Alden Coal Co. cleared the way for transfer by leasing an abutting property to the city for playground use. The first industry has already located there—Diane Footwear. There is room on the plot for two additional industries.

INDUSTRIAL PROMOTION STEPPED UP

In 1953 the committee of 100 and industrial fund heightened their efforts in behalf of industrial development. Three hundred and twenty-nine industrial prospects were contacted. Negotiations are now underway with 16. Every possible lead was utilized and persistently followed through. Prospects were visited personally by the committee of 100—taken on survey tours of greater Wilkes-Barre—and presented with industrial promotion brochures and fact books. The promotional film "This Is Wilkes-Barre," was used to good advantage for showing before industrial realtor groups in New York, Philadelphia, and Detroit, as well as individual industrialists through the East. Several good prospects resulted.

WILKES-BARRE LACE MILL—A MORAL LESSON LEARNED

A moral lesson for the entire community is contained in the 1953 Wilkes-Barre lace-mill story.

When the mill—a cherished, 350,000 square-foot industrial landmark—closed, there was a feeling of despair. But today, the picture is entirely changed.

All facilities were acquired by a group of members of the committee of 100, headed by C. F. Goeringer and Reuben H. Levy, and made available for industrial development through Operation Jobs. From 1953 to the present, every available building unit, but one, has been occupied by new or expanded local industries.

These provided 1,085 jobs, with still greater future employment indicated—as contrasted with 600 jobs lost when the lace mill closed.

THE FUTURE

The lace mill may well be regarded as a symbol of the essential overall function of Operation Jobs—stopping downward trends and rebuilding, through community cooperation.

With your continued support, this program will continue to go forward in the year ahead.

Effect of McCarran-Walter Act Upon Exchange Teachers and Students

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 24, 1954

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an excellent article entitled "Immigration: Red Tape Bars Our Border," which appeared in the May 5 edition of the Harvard Crimson, the daily publication of the Harvard University student body, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

This article tells how the McCarran-Walter Act affects exchange students and teachers coming to the United States for temporary study.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IMMIGRATION: RED TAPE BARS OUR BORDER—McCARRAN-WALTER REGULATIONS BLOCK WAY OF FOREIGN STUDENTS

(By Jack Rosenthal)

In January of 1953, a Filipino girl studying social work under the exchange plan at a New England college, married an American citizen. The young bride applied for resident alien status, which usually accompanies marriage to a citizen. But in her case, it was not a matter of merely filling out forms; the girl, despite pregnancy, had to return to the Philippines at her own expense in order to qualify for residence. More simply, she had to go so she could stay.

The rationale behind this rigid administration of justice is Public Law 414—passed in the closing days of the 82d Congress, over President Truman's veto—better known as the McCarran-Walter Immigration and Nationality Act. And, it was not narrow interpretation of a broad provision of the law, but explicit instruction that forced immigration officials to make the girl return to the Philippines.

McCarran-Walter was written with the laudable object of codifying and unifying the hodgepodge of immigration laws that had existed in the United States since 1917. Equally laudable was the purported aim of clamping down on subversives entering under loopholes in the old statutes. But regardless, the law retains some of the most criticized aspects of former laws, and is accused of even expanding the objectionable provisions of the past through ambiguous, sometimes incomprehensible verbiage.

QUOTA OPENINGS MORTGAGED

Take, for example, the national-origins system, keystone of the entire immigration program, which determines who can come here and who can stay. This archaic method for determining quotas, the number of immigrants who are allowed here from any 1 country in any single year, was first devised 30 years ago. It is still based on the 1920 white population.

Its very formulation is unfair, for that population figure was broken down into national categories, and the determining of these categories was done by surnames. This disregarded how many Janowiczes had become Joneses, or how many Schmidts had become Smiths, and both Janowicz-Jones and Schmidt-Smiths were changed to the British total. Each nation was then given a percentage of the total quota—150,000—proportionate to the percentage of its immigrants then a part of the white population. This excludes the Orient, limited arbitrarily, and the Western Hemisphere, which has no quotas.

Thus England, whose annual United States immigration is about 30,000, was given 65,000 quota vacancies, while sources of heavy potential immigration such as Poland, Italy, Czechoslovakia, Austria, and 8 other countries shared 24,000 spots. Neither were the 35,000 unused British vacancies redistributed. They were merely wasted, and have been year after year, with the result that while 3 million immigrants have been theoretically admissible by quota, only 836,085, or about 27 percent, actually entered.

Such basic difficulties with national origins were further aggravated, strangely enough by a liberal immigration law—the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, which allowed about 400,000 DP's to enter the United States. In this law the totals from each country were computed, and 50 percent of the quota of each country which sent DP's here was ordered mortgaged each year until the total should be accounted for. As an example, only half of Latvia's quota of 235 is now admissible yearly—until the year 2274.

A more recent statute, the Refugee Relief Act, passed last fall, provides for admission of a potential 206,000 newly displaced persons outside of normal quota or mortgage provisions. But since then, while $671,000 has reportedly been spent on screening employees, only 8 have been admitted, and but 50 visas have been issued.

There are numerous other objections toward McCarran-Walter, particularly in regard to students, foreign scholars as well as exchange visitors—who presumably do not wish to remain here. For example, to even obtain clearance to come here to study, the foreign student must pass all of the mental, physical, and political requirements demanded of potential immigrants.

Once over this initial hurdle of red-tape, especially high because of frequent language difficulties, the student faces an almost identical barrier on his arrival here. Even after passing the original requirements imposed by the consulate in his country, he could be sent back if he doesn't also fulfill similar ones at the immigration agency in his port of entry.

Last fall a Chinese national from Singapore ran into such difficulty. As a displaced Nationalist, he was traveling from Singapore on an English certificate of identity. By error, he was landed in Boston, rather than New York, and here immigration officials discovered that his travel document was good for only 5 months and 6 days after landing—24 days short of the required 6 months.

GIRL ORDERED DEPORTED

Although the British consulate in New York readily granted the necessary extension, the student was detained incommunicado for almost 3 days, in the Boston Dentention Center, and as a result was late for the opening of his classes at a large midwestern university.

Even once here, the student, both exchange and regular, is not free from worry. According to the law, he must successfully pursue a full course of study at a school approved by the Attorney General. (This is no real handicap; for approval, a school must simply file reports of the arrival and departure of foreign students.

But most significantly, a foreign student cannot take employment without receiving explicit permission from his district immigration office. Officials are usually lenient in administering the no-work rule. Graduate students can take jobs, with permission, as research assistants in work relating directly to their major field. And, if foreign students establish need, they can be permitted to work, at least until such time when unemployment might spread.

But such permission is conditional, and in practice, there is no appeal from a denial of approval. Moreover, handicapped with tight budgets, immigration offices often take a long time to grant their essential permission, as illustrated by the case of a Chinese girl who was a trainee at a large local university. She applied for permission to work, but when she didn't hear from authorities after 3 months, she took private advice—wrong—that Chinese students did not need such permission, and took the job anyway.

When this was discovered, she was ordered deported, but has been allowed to remain here awaiting the outcome of a private congressional bill—a recourse open only to a small percentage of deportable aliens.

But presume a student does get here and obtains part-time work if necessary, while pursuing a full course of study. Then, say he wants to remain in the United States for good.

On this point, McCarran-Walter is at once good and bad. Previous to the 1952 law, such immigrants had to go across the border and reenter from Canada, under a procedure known as preexamination. Now, such change of status is possible without leaving the country under section 245 of McCarran-Walter.

In characteristically complex language, the section provides that "the status of an alien who was lawfully admitted to the United States as a bona fide nonimmigrant * * * may be adjusted by the Attorney General * * * to that of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence as a quota immigrant or as a nonquota immigrant * * * if the alien makes application for adjustment (and if) a quota or nonquota visa is immediately available to him at the time of his application for adjustment (and if such a visa) is immediately available to him at the time his application is approved. * * * Any alien who shall file an application for adjustment of his status under this section shall thereby terminate his nonimmigrant status."

So, with luck, the student-turned-prospective-immigrant, takes what is often a double gamble. A quota spot may be available to him when he applies—this much can be determined. But the applicant cannot know when his application will be acted upon, much less hope to predict if a quota space will be open. If there is not, the student is immediately deportable, for he has lost his temporary student status simply by applying. Moreover, the exchange visitor is not even eligible for adjustment under section 245: he must return to his homeland before being allowed to apply for immigrant status. Thus, the Filipino girl mentioned, had to return to the islands in order to be allowed to come here.

This strictness in dealing with exchange students is often justifiable. Such visitors are legalized by the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act, whose purpose is to offer American training to people from war-ravaged or backward countries, almost as part of point 4. Thus, as Professor Paul Chalmers, assistant dean of admissions at MIT points out, we have a binational responsibility—to, say France, which wants its bright young scholars to return to France to work, rather than to remain in the United States.

There is often difficulty for regular foreign students (not on exchange plans), however. In the case of one European student, officials asked a routine question: why was he coming to the United States. The student maintains he replied: "to study" but the immigration officials took him to say: "to stay." As a result, the student had to post $500 bond against remaining here.

But after studying here, the student was offered a teaching post in a leading university, and to accept it, he now must readjust to immigrant status, so he can remain. By readjusting under section 245, however, he would be violating the contract of his bond, and would thus forfeit the $500. If he returns to Europe and reapplies, he would keep his bond, but would run the risk of not getting back in time for the next academic year, and thus lose his university appointment.

ILL STUDENT PENALIZED

This raises the point that in many cases; the law, strict as it may be, is often even more strictly administered by the Immigration Service. In one case, a Polish DP student falsely stated at a hearing that he did not have a job. About a year later, he voluntarily admitted at another hearing that he had lied. Officials regarded the falsehood as an example of "moral turpitude" despite the fact that student made the admission without any pressure. He was ordered deported and now remains here only because of a private bill introduced on his behalf.

In many immigration offices, particularly in Boston, such extremely strict interpretation is rare, and usually great personal consideration is given, according to Capt. C. H. J. Keppler, counselor to foreign students in the university. He cites the case of a foreign student who was not able to carry a full course of study because of weak eyes; local immigration officials permitted him to distribute his academic load as his doctor suggested.

But on the other hand, in Chicago, a student lost status and was forced to leave the country, because he dropped from school—after suffering a stomach disorder.

In the case of nonimmigrants such as students who seek to adjust their status in order to remain in the United States, immigration officers often advise applicants to wait before applying, so as to retain present status until they stand a better chance of getting approval when a quota opening would be likely.

But if, through chance, the necessary quota spot is not open when the application is approved, even the immigration authorities have no choice but to offer voluntary departure, and then begin deportation proceedings. O. S. Remington, assistant director of the Boston United States Immigrant and Naturalization Service points out that "there is no way to take care of such people under law." And yet, these people may be of the caliber urgently needed here. Charles P. Schwartz, teaching fellow at the Law School, after comprehensive study of immigration laws, points out that "The United States needs the services of students who have special abilities. Yet under the present law, a foreign scholar, even a nuclear physicist, may be denied permission to stay here because of the irrelevancy that he was born in a low quota country. Regardless of his high aptitude, he 'chose' the wrong antecedents."

Thus, the law has been rapped for taking away too much discretion from officials who have personal contact with various cases. But McCARRAN-WALTER has also suffered criticism for leaving too much authority in the hands of underlings. For instance, aides in consulates can turn down all applicants for entry to the United States without appeal. Immigration boards have the same authority, with the difference that once here, an immigrant has limited appeal.

Such lack of review of visa denials has been embarrassing as well as costly to the United States. In his recent book, the Golden Door, a castigation of the McCarran-Walter Act, J. Campbell Bruce reviews the story of Michael Polyani, an eminent British chemist and social philosopher, long recognized as Britain's foremost anti-Communist scholar. Polyani was elected a chair of social philosophy at the University of Chicago for the academic year 1951–52. In January of 1951, he applied to the United States consulate in Liverpool for an immigrant visa, and completed forms which included such questions as: "Where have you lived since birth? Give exact addresses (including street name and house number) and exact dates since age of 14."

But months passed with no action, despite intercession by two United States Senators. Eleven months later—6 weeks after the Chicago appointment was to begin, Polyani was forced to withdraw his acceptance, but was fortunately able to remain at the University of Manchester. Chicago accordingly changed its offer to a temporary chair, and Polyani revised his application to ask for a nonimmigrant or temporary visa.

RELIGIOUS OPPOSITION

Finally, fully a year after his original application, the Liverpool consul summoned him for an interview. During the questioning, he was asked about an appearance before the Free German League of Culture. According to Bruce: "'During the conversation on this subject,' the professor says, 'the vice consul expressed uneasiness when I said that, while I had no idea that the (League) was a Communist organization, I would still have addressed them if I had known it. It appears that in his view, trying to convert them would have been a subversive activity.'" Polyani's speech before the group was severely censured by its secretary as a vicious attack on Soviet scientists.

Then, in June 1952, 18 months after application, Polyani was turned down flat, because, the consul said, of "certain political beliefs or activities; and membership in, or affiliation with, certain organizations." And the McCarran-Walter Act gave Polyani no right to appeal from this decision.

To be sure, there has been agitation against the inequities of the law since it was passed over the Truman veto. President Eisenhower has described the bill as "a glaring example of failure of our national leadership to live up to high ideals." Religious and social groups have actively opposed the act while trying to help the people admitted under it.

The Most Reverend Richard J. Cushing, archbishop of Boston, told a presidential commission studying immigration problems in 1952, that: "The * * * discrimination and undemocratic features of the McCarran-Walter law are to my mind a grave potential threat to our domestic development and our international leadership."

Mrs. Pauline Gardescu, executive director of the International Institute of Boston, has asked for a more positive, encouraging attitude toward immigration. There now seems to be, she notes, "a premium on being harsh * * * we should get together in the intention of building international good will."

LEHMAN'S SOLUTION

Such criticism of the spirit as well as the letter of the law is seconded by Miss Nanette Dreshfield, the Boston executive secretary of the National Council of Jewish Women, another agency which does a considerable amount of immigrant counseling. If no revision of the law is possible, she recommends changes in the act, which would reestablish the test year of national origins, as say 1948 or 1950.

An official of the Massachusetts Division of Immigration and Americanization—a counseling group not connected with the Federal immigration service—advocates several specific recommendations for students: Clarify the implications of exchange status to "visitors"; make it easier for regular foreign students to readjust under the quota system. Indeed, according to Oscar Handlin, associate professor of history, the "whole quota system is unreasonable." Such requirements as the double quota need of section 245 "impose needless hardship on students," he feels.

Most of these objections, and a good deal more complicated ones have been solved and resolved into a new bill, S. 2585, known as the Immigration and Citizenship Act of 1953, sponsored by Senator Herbert H. Lehman, Democrat, of New York. Briefly, the proposed bill, the first alternate to an existing immigration law in United States history, would recodify and unify the immigration statutes, and thus become the omnibus which McCarran-Walter purports to be.

It is, in part, based on the finding of the President's Commission, and include provisions for a united quota system, were really needed (e. g., to countries with skilled men who would be useful to the United States), and would allow reassignment of unused quotas. Senator Lehman's bill would also consolidate the overlapping duties of the State (consulates) Department and Justice (Immigration Service) Department, by creating a single commission. The proposed bill which would assign quotas where they also clarify much of the ambiguity of McCarran-Walter as well as providing for appeal, and now almost nonexistent statutes of limitation, etc., would be clarified and expanded.

If such an act were adopted, students would have an easier time of it here. They would be considered here principally to study, not solely, as under the present law, thus making it easier to obtain work on a part-time basis; the clause referring to a student's foreign residence "which he has no intention of abandoning" would be eliminated, thus easing the problem of adjusting status. Students who apply for adjustment would not automatically lose their original status by applying.

It is doubtful whether the Lehman bill will pass, at least in the present Congress. One immigrant guidance leader noted that there is at present an atmosphere of fear that support of such a bill might be considered subversive. Nevertheless, the redtape curtain around our borders is still as exclusive as it was a year and a half ago, when John H. Van Vleck, Hollis professor of mathematics and natural philosophy, told the American Physical Society: "We have spent billions on the Marshall plan, and then alienate much of the resulting good will by an unsympathetically and woodenly administered visa policy. This situation reminds one of the railroad that lavishes a mint of money on new streamliners and then lets the conductor insult the passengers."

A New Legend May Poison the Well of Allied Solidarity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL D. PERKINS

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1954

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following editorial from the Louisville (Ky.) Courier-Journal of May 21, 1954:

A NEW LEGEND MAY POISON THE WELL OF ALLIED SOLIDARITY

What passes for diplomacy in Washington nowadays passeth understanding. It suggests that, while history may never repeat itself, politicians and statesmen only too readily repeat the errors of yesteryear, and gladly seek to blame the shortcomings of foreign friends for their own failure to formulate a foreign policy certain of American as well as of allied support.

After more than a year of complacent inattention to the growing crisis in Indochina, the Eisenhower administration took fire with fright only a few brief weeks ago. A welter of confusing and contradictory statements as to what we would or would not do baffled the American people as well as our friends overseas. Then in early April Secretary of State John Foster Dulles spotlighted a flight to London and Paris to sell our greatest allies on a 10-nation threat of "united action" against overt Communist Chinese intervention in Indochina—a threat to be voiced before the Geneva Conference began on April 26. The proposal implied what Mr. Dulles had no credible mandate to promise: the use of American troops.

Mr. Dulles failed, despite misleading statements in Washington at the time. All he got from either country, as Foreign Secretary Eden and Foreign Minister Bidault made publicly clear within hours of his visit, was agreement to do nothing drastic before the Geneva Conference. There was a commitment only, as Mr. Eden put it, to a study of whether the defense lineup should be formed. Subsequently several Asiatic nations have said, "No, thank you," to Mr. Dulles' invitation, leading to the collective gibe of many American commentators that we may be out to save free Asians for themselves whether they want to be saved or not.

Ever since Mr. Eden's clarification, however, with Dien Bien Phu fallen, France more desperate, and Geneva floundering deeper in failure, the British have been painted as the obstructionist villain of the piece.

President Eisenhower contributed a fresh daub to part of the painting Wednesday, saying it might be possible for free nations to forge a collective defense of southeast Asia without British cooperation. This statement naturally startled and distressed officials in London, as the New York Times reported, for only 48 hours earlier Prime Minister Churchill had declared that Britain would certainly join in discussing the establishment of the proposed collective-defense system—a declaration we can hardly believe escaped the ears of the White House.

We make no brief here for Britain's case, which is as susceptible to criticism as our own. As summed up by the Times of London, it identifies Britain's interest with that of all the West in succoring and preserving southeast Asia (Britain would always fight in defense of Malaya and she has hardly a less direct concern in seeing that neighboring countries are in friendly control), but it seeks a policy based on abiding interests rather than one suddenly summoned up by a crisis. And it holds justifiably, it seems to us, that military action alone would certainly leave the Western Powers isolated in Asia, and it would fail unless accompanied by more economic help and by assurances that Asian views on all developments are heeded.

It may well be that Britain is too slow and we too fast in hammering out a policy upon which the free world can unite. But what we object to as exceedingly dangerous now is the beginning of a political legend that, if Indochina and Southeast Asia fall, the fault is solely Britain's and not that of France or the United States, so torn by conflicting counsel in its own governing party that the administration can get no mandate from the Senate even today for the policy or policies it bespeaks, with the Secretary of State known to have stated that the greatest obstacle in his path is his own party's majority leader, Senator Knowland.

This situation means to Walter Lippmann, as it must to our worried allies, that "the United States Government is not now competent to take decisions"—and will not be until the administration gets what so far it does not have, a mandate from the Senate for its negotiations with our allies and with our adversaries.

The incipient legend of Bratain's culpability meantime grows apace. It is not unlike a legend born in 1932—that Britain's unwillingness to back up the United States in a stiff note on Japan's rape of Manchuria encouraged aggressors everywhere and led directly to World War II. (The fact is that Secretary Stimson indeed wanted to threaten the Japanese with economic sanctions and possible force, that the British doubted American willingness to back up this threat, that Stimson could give them no assurances to the contrary because at that very moment in history, as various memoirs subsequently showed, President Hoover was opposed to sanctions or naval demonstrations and eager to assure the American people that "under no circumstances would we go to war.")

The trouble with such legend-building and such curious statesmanship, in 1954, is that it affords comfort only to the Communists. It threatens the very foundation of what both President Eisenhower and Secretary Dulles tell us the Communists seek to destroy: the understanding and the unity of the Western Alliance. And on that most Americans, we believe, will agree with Walter Lippmann: "The most important of all the facts of life for us is that the solidarity of our alliances is of infinitely greater importance than what happens on this or that spot on the great surface of the globe." Whatever we do or fail to do in Southeast Asia, we can never afford to forget that most important fact.

The Money Changers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MYRON V. GEORGE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1954

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I wish to insert the following editorial from the Chanute (Kans.) Tribune of May 12 entitled "The Money Changers":

THE MONEY CHANGERS

The House is considering an agricultural surplus disposal bill, already passed by the Senate, which looks like a step in the right direction.

The bill would permit export of farm surplus for sale for foreign currency. The reason some foreign nations can't buy our excess wheat and other commodities is not that they don't have enough money, but they don't have the right kind. We've been insisting on dollars, and dollars, in other parts of the world, are scarce.

Here's the way the new plan would work: We'd sell $100 million worth of wheat to Japan for yen, the Japanese currency. We would loan the yen to India for use by her in buying Japanese industrial products. India would repay the loan to us in her currency—rupees. We'd use the rupees to buy strategic war materials in Southeast Asia.

And so the money changers' wheels would turn. In effect, we'd be trading our wheat for war materials we need. But the barter would be indirect. Not only will we be helping ourselves by getting rid of embarrassing and costly surpluses and getting needed raw materials, but, in the process, we will be stimulating the economies of several nations.

Congress might go a step further. Where even native currency is lacking to buy our products, we could sell them on long-term credit. The worst loan risk could be no worse than the prospect of letting our surplus rot while men starve.

Two Thousand Dollars an Acre-Foot for Water Now Being Paid in the San Joaquin Valley Dramatizes the Need for California's Trinity River Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR ENGLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1954

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, one city in the San Joaquin Valley is paying $2,000 per acre-foot for their domestic water. Canalside water under the Central Valley project costs $3.50 an acre-foot. There could be no more dramatic evidence of the need for additional water along the west side of the San Joaquin Valley. In fact, that fertile area is less than 5 years from being returned to sagebrush and the grasshoppers. That is the reason the San Joaquin people are vigorously supporting the Trinity River project, which will shortly be before this Congress. I include the following article from the Tulare Advance-Register which shows the critical water situation that has developed in San Joaquin Valley:

THEY NEED TRINITY

If you think everything is ducky along the San Joaquin waterfront, guess again. We on the east side are living more or less in clover since the Friant-Kern Canal brought us the water we needed to stay in business.

But over on the west side, it's a far different story. There, they're plugging for congressional authorization of the Trinity and San Luis projects, which would carry water to their thirsty lands—and with good reason.

Take the case of Coalinga in Fresno County, for example. There, the residents are paying what amounts to $2,000 (yep, that's right, 2,000 bucks) per acre-foot for their water.

The lack of water is strangling Coalinga's development, according to Mayor W. L. Wallace. And here's what else he has to say about the subject:

"Homes, stores, and industries in Coalinga now have 2 pipe systems and 2 sets of faucets. One system carries local water which is usable only for gardens and similar purposes (local wells deliver water that is unfit for drinking). The other carries domestic water, hauled in by railway tank car from Hanford, 52 miles distant, at a cost of $78 for 12,000 gallons, which works out to more than $2,000 an acre foot, in contrast to the $3.50 or even up to $10 an acre foot which is considered normal in many cities. Even our local water costs us $30 an acre foot.

"We are anxiously awaiting the day when this city can go ahead with an ample supply of relatively inexpensive water, when there will be water for our most important industry, oil. We already have lost one major refinery, which would have been built in Coalinga had there been adequate water at a reasonable price. We are awaiting the day when our surrounding agriculture, now limited by the cost and quality of water, can expand on the thousands of acres of fertile land in this area.

"The cost and poor quality of water on the west side of the valley has limited the development of our communities as it has our agriculture. The possibilities of community development in this potentially rich land, with its otherwise unlimited resources, are very great if we can solve our water problem. A new empire can be added to California's economy and the entire State will profit from the trade we can create. Surplus water from the Trinity River, stored and brought to us by San Luis will in part be put to its highest and most important use as the domestic water supply of Coalinga and other westside cities."

No wonder the people of the west side are plugging for the early start of the long-discussed Trinity project. It is their very salvation. And we on the more fortunate east side should join them in their crusade for water to assure even greater development of this rich valley that is the heartland of America's agriculture empire.

The Economic Outlook

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1954

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, the executive council of the American Federation of Labor at a recent meeting in Chicago issued a statement calling attention to certain alarming conditions in the current economic situation in the United States, with particular emphasis on the present serious unemployment problem. The council, in assessing the economic outlook for the future, pointed out the need for immediate positive action to combat these conditions if the present dangerous trend is to be reversed and made specific recommendations as to the steps to be taken. Because of the great importance of this serious situation, I submit the complete statement issued by the AFL executive council to be printed in the RECORD.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT BY THE EXECUTIVE COUNCIL OF THE AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR ON THE ECONOMIC OUTLOOK

The American economy is not expanding. Substantial unemployment and heavy underemployment persist among the Nation's wage earners. The sense of confidence in the future is ebbing among the men and women who depend on wages for their livelihood. They now recognize that their Government is not preparing to take the necessary initiative to reverse the recession trend.

The 7-percent drop in unemployment in April, as estimated by the census, is less than a healthy, normal seasonal pickup in economic activity should have produced. Increase of 201,000 in farm jobs in April was also smaller than normal. The month's advance in the census total of all nonfarm employment of 297,000 was likewise short of the norm.

Factory employment, as reported by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, continued its steady month-to-month decline. The drop of over one-quarter of a million factory jobs between March and April reduced manufacturing employment to 1,344,000 jobs fewer than a year ago.

There was also a further shrinkage in the average workweek in manufacturing, with the March to April reduction from 39.5 to 39 hours. A half-hour's cut in the national average may seem minor, but actually it represents a loss of earnings of well over half a billion dollars on an annual basis.

We note with particular concern a far-reaching development in the employment pattern which has been glossed over in recent official reports—a sharp increase in part-time employment. The census figures show that between March and April in nonfarm industries the number of full-time workers (those working 35 or more hours a week) decreased by 687,000. At the same time, the number of workers on part-time workweeks of 34 hours or less increased by 691,000.

The spread of short-time work is alarming. The number of nonfarm workers in April who were working only part time involuntarily was 2,710,000. The loss of time represented by this partial unemployment is equivalent to a loss of more than 1 million full-time jobs.

Taking into account all workers who wanted work but were neither working nor earning pay, totally unemployed workers in April numbered 4,437,000 or nearly 7 percent of the labor force. When we add to this the loss of the equivalent of over 1 million full-time jobs resulting from partial unemployment, the level of April unemployment reaches close to 5.5 million fully unemployed, or 8.5 percent of the labor force.

Next June, 1,636,000 young people will graduate from colleges and high schools of the Nation. Of these, close to a million will look for jobs, seeking an opportunity to make a start in life to become steady breadwinners and self-reliant citizens. Many more, while expecting to return to school, will also be looking for summer employment. A total of about 2 million young people will swell the ranks of job seekers in the next 2 months.

It takes a dynamic economy to respond to this growth. Chronic unemployment and heavy underemployment will not provide the opportunities the rising generation of Americans can justly expect.

Speaking in Yonkers, N. Y., on October 20, 1952, General Eisenhower made this clear and unequivocal declaration: "All of those associated with me and I are dedicated to this proposition: At the first sign of any approaching recession in this country, there would be instantly mobilized under the finest professional, business, labor, and other leaders that we have, every resource of private industry, of local government, of State government, and of Federal Government to see that never again shall depression come to us."

The facts we have cited are not signs of an approaching recession. They are the results of an economic recession that has been under way for a year. Yet no move has been made to mobilize the resources and the leadership of the Nation in an effort to reverse the recession trend. Affirmative action that would come to grips with the realities of the already depressed economy has been neither taken nor proposed.

The economic task ahead is neither easy nor simple. It is my no means a task with which our Government can cope alone. But the Federal Government has a clear responsivility to initiate efforts to restore a full employment and full production economy. Not only would consumers, investors, and all others respond with firm confidence in the future to such initiative, but it would also unite the Nation in a drive for lasting prosperity.

The Government must discharge its specific responsibilities under the Employment Act of 1946. Its duty is to promote maximum employment, production, and purchasing power. To this end, it is essential for the President to define the future economic goals to which the national policy and the national effort should be directed. These goals have not been defined by the President or by his Council of Economic Advisers.

It is essential that they be clearly understood. America's economic problem is not only one of a decline from the levels attained in the past. It is, above all, the problem of resuming full and dynamic growth. In the first quarter of 1954 our total national production was $13.6 billion below the annual rate of the peak second quarter of 1953. But even more disturbing is the fact that this was $23 billion below the level of full production we should have reached in the first 3 months of 1954.

This difference between the actual and the full performance of our economy is the true measure of the national economic deficit we are running up. With every month in which the economy fails to expand this deficit becomes larger. And with every month the task of making it up—the task we must accomplish in order to regain prosperity—becomes more difficult.

Policies which would stabilize our economy at the present levels of shrunken employment and production must be rejected. In the 7 years following World War II, real national output increased, on the average, over 4.5 percent each year. Since mid-1953 it went down. In order to reestablish a full employment economy in the first quarter of 1955, national output would have to rise 10 percent over the first quarter of 1954. This goal will not be reached without a concerted drive toward full employment, with our Government pointing the way.

Not one, but many things need to be done to reverse the recession. Substantial increases in both personal consumption and investment are necessary to bring full prosperity. Right now we are long on ability to produce and short on ability to buy. Buying power of consumers must be raised as the first step to right this imbalance and to stimulate investment into facilities for the future needed production.

Higher real wage income, attained through collective bargaining, must provide the main leverage to increase mass buying power. But it is essential to reinforce this with legislation raising minimum wage standards and lifting the income of lowest paid workers. A national minimum of $1.25 per hour should go into effect without delay.

Balancing the Federal budget must not be made the overriding objective of economic policy or achieved at the price of perpetuating an unbalanced economy. Public investment in the construction of schools, hospitals, and other critically needed improvements should expand. In the meantime, a more comprehensive public-workes program of socially useful projects should be readied for quick expansion when needed.

A prompt initiation of a comprehensive housing program bringing good homes within the financial reach of low- and middle-income families is of foremost strategic importance. It would provide a powerful lift to the whole economy.

Such tax reductions as may be feasible should be designed to stimulate buying power where it is most needed. We also favor a $100 increase in the income-tax exemption. The one-sided tax relief to corporations in the form of accelerated amortization and the cut on dividend taxes will not help a balanced recovery and should be rejected.

At the same time full provisions should be made now to modernize the unemployment-insurance system. Unemployment compensation throughout the Nation should be sufficient to sustain the families of those thrown out of work. It must be made an effective cushion against the economic shock of unemployment without delay.

No less urgent is the action to strengthen the social-security system so that it would measure up to the economic needs of the aged and dependent.

A full program for prosperity must accomplish much more than these first essentials. Consumption and standard of living of farm families must be raised. Rural poverty still persisting in many parts of our land must be alleviated. Help must be given to chronically distressed industrial areas in attracting new investment and reviving stable employment.

Steadily rising productivity is bringing within our reach a higher standard of living. Unless public and private policies are designed to make sure that its benefits are shared by all, it will bring instead more unemployment and distress in its wake.

The time for action to regain full employment is now. We ask that such action be made the first order of business of our Congress and the Chief Executive and the first concern of all Americans.

Fifth Column Danger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MYRON V. GEORGE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1954

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to have inserted in the Record the following editorial from the Pittsburg (Kans.) Headlight of May 19 entitled "Fifth Column Danger":

FIFTH COLUMN DANGER

The fifth amendment has easily become one of the best known amendments to the Constitution of the United States. Other famous amendments dealing with liquor and suffrage, particularly liquor, have faded into memory after having had a long run of public attention. The fifth amendment is the one behind which the Communists seek to hide. Perhaps "seek to hide" is not a good way to say it. It might be shortened by merely saying that the fifth amendment is the one behind which the Communists hide when put on the witness stand. Hundreds of witnesses, it is shown, including a large number of Government employees, college teachers, scientists and deep thinkers in other professions, have jumped and run for the shelter of the fifth amendment.

Now, one who has had important places such as chairman and member of an investigating committee and who has seen at close range the parade of Communists to cover, offers an important observation. Senator Jenner, who is head of the Senate internal security subcommittee of the judiciary committee, points out the close connection of the fifth amendment and the fifth column in the activities of the boys and girls owing allegiance to Moscow. Jenner says that the congressional investigators are not dealing with individual Communists but are dealing with the fifth column and the fifth column is an army. Communists in America have their orders and according to Jenner they are "operating on American soil for one supreme purpose—to conquer inch by inch or mile by mile or agency by agency every sector of American national life and make it subordinate to Soviet rule." He says that the card carrying Communists are not those who are doing the big damage to America. If America had nothing to fear from communism except from those who are admitted party members, there would be no danger. But it is the other kind of Communist from whom this country may expect trouble. This is the loyal soldier of the Soviet who gets into the Government job or who gets into a vital industry or who infiltrates a college and does the bidding of Moscow.

Bringing it home, the blabber mouth gent who wore a straw hat in the cool late fall and walked up and down Broadway preaching the merits of Stalin not so far back was not a dangerous fellow in Pittsburg. His street corner speeches were not menacing. He was a Communist and said so and had a card and worked only for his cause. Some folks wanted to run him out of town, it may be recalled. But that was silly. He was an outspoken chap who said he believed the form of American Government should be changed to make it similar to that in Russia. But he was not a threat to Washington.

On the other hand the fellow who was a Communist in secret and worked in a large industrial plant, another one who was working on a railroad and another one who was in educational work were menaces. They made no speeches on communism. They offered no public praise of Stalin. They did not, in public, condemn the American form of government. Their job was to keep their purposes hidden, deceive their fellow workers and associates and contribute information to the Reds. They were the dangerous Reds in Pittsburg.

And the picture has not changed. The danger throughout the country today is not from the card-carrying Communists. It is from the spies protected in Government service or employed in huge industrial plants or otherwise stationed so as to do their work without the discovery of their true identity.

Fringe Benefits in the Armed Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1954

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following resolution:

"Whereas the alarming reduction of fringe benefits suffered by the Armed Forces of the United States has created a dangerously low morale; and

"Whereas the rumors of further slashes in these benefits have caused thousands of highly skilled and expensively trained servicemen and women to leave the Armed Forces; and

"Whereas the income of members of the Armed Forces have not kept pace with the increased cost of living; and

"Whereas the resulting condition of the Armed Forces morale and scarcity of career personnel have endangered this country's national security: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the 22d district of the American Legion, Department of California, again go on record in protesting these cuts in fringe benefits and further proposed slashes in these benefits; be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to our elected representatives of the Congress of the United States."

This resolution was unanimously adopted at the regular meeting of the 22d district meeting Sunday, April 11, 1954, in the National City American Legion Hall, National City, Calif.

ROSCOE T. MORSE,
Commander.
MEL THORNTON,
Adjutant.

Eisenhower's Bobbles on TVA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS G. ABERNETHY
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 24, 1954

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newspaper article by Doris Fleeson:

EISENHOWER'S BOBBLES ON TVA—HIS PAST CRITICISMS ARE NOT WATER OVER THE DAM; AVOIDING A POLITICAL APPOINTMENT TO CLAPP'S JOB HASN'T BEEN EASY

(By Doris Fleeson)

After 21 years in the Tennessee Valley Authority and 9 years at its head, Gordon R. Clapp was allowed to depart at midnight Tuesday without a word from the White House. In answer to a preconference request for comment on the departed administrator, President Eisenhower paid him grudging tribute in a grudging tone.

Later, acting on better advice, the President made public a polite letter to Mr. Clapp expressing "thanks for your service to your Government."

The President is in political trouble on TVA and his voice had that special edginess which comes to all men only when the speaker realizes he is himself partly to blame for the fix he is in.

The President—any President—has a right to choose his administrators. It is, however, only proper and certainly politically intelligent to walk softly where Congress has put a nonpartisan label on the job.

This was done in the case of the TVA Chairman both in congressional debate and by giving him a 9-year term. Actually both Tennessee Senators—McKellar and Stewart—voted against Mr. Clapp, when he was nominated by President Roosevelt.

It has been said that the only Republican Senator in the TVA area, JOHN SHERMAN COOPER of Kentucky, was against Mr. Clapp. What happened was that Senator COOPER discovered at the start of TVA discussions at the White House that the President was adamantly determined to let Mr. Clapp go.

Senator COOPER bent his energies then to enforcement of the principle that the TVA Chairman must be a nonpartisan expert. His insistence largely helped prevent the naming of the Republican State chairman of Tennessee, Harry Carbaugh. Mr. Carbaugh was a candidate of Representative CARROLL REECE, who is now going after the Ford, Rockefeller, and other foundations because they are too liberal for his tastes.

TVA Senators, who have been keeping discreetly silent in the now vain hope that Mr. Clapp might be renamed, put the blame for General Eisenhower's attitude on Secretary of Commerce Weeks. They point out that Mr. Weeks is a Boston capitalist and that major investments of that group are in private utilities.

While this struggle simmered underground, the President indiscreetly used TVA as an example of "creeping socialism." This has given Senator KEFAUVER, of Tennessee, his best campaign issue. It frightened the nine-State area which uses TVA power and Presidential reassurances have not made much impression.

The President has said repeatedly that he is seeking a partnership between Federal, State, and local governments on one hand and private power on the other. This, he says, is his power policy. If it were not for his indiscretion on "creeping socialism," he might have put it across without present alarms, but the phrase has too often been used by those who opposed the Federal power policies from their inception.

Senators hear that the name of Sam Morris, a Los Angeles engineer with Government experience, is being checked by the White House for the Clapp post.

Mr. Clapp himself grew up with TVA and the change of administration did not soften his ardent championship of it. For all who have long lived with the concept, first espoused by the late George Norris, such deep emotion seems natural. It has in fact communicated itself to the world and TVA has been for many years the American achievement to which visitors from abroad made pilgrimage. To the underdeveloped areas of the world, especially, it has been a symbol of hope and accomplishment.

Proposed Reduction of Federal Funds for Vocational Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 24, 1954

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to insert the following statement, which sets forth the position of the California Department of Education, Commission for Vocational Education, in regard to the proposed reduction of Federal funds for vocational education:

STATEMENT OF POSITION REGARDING PROPOSED REDUCTION OF FEDERAL FUNDS FOR VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

The United States Bureau of the Budget has recommended that Congress reduce its support of vocational education from $18,673,261 in 1953–54 to $17,500,000 in 1954–55. This decrease amounts to $1,173,261, and would result in a decrease for California in the amount of $55,792.

The following statements are made for the purpose of providing that this recommendation by the Bureau of the Budget should not be sustained:

1. The reduction is arbitrary and is not equitable. The recommended reduction of approximately 5 percent is made at the same time that the recommendation is made to increase Federal funds for the agricultural extension service by about 23 percent. In other words, the principle of Federal aid is not involved, but merely an opinion of need by the Bureau of the Budget.

Furthermore, it is a travesty upon American thinking when pursuing the course of economy we spend more Federal funds for foreign programs of vocational education than we do for vocational education in the United States.

2. The Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, authorized by Congress, is now studying the entire pattern of Federal-State financial relations. Any arbitrary action now would serve to preempt the judgment of this Commission.

3. Every evidence points to the fact that the vocational education program is being hard pressed to meet the needs of youth and adults at this very moment. If a recommendation for Federal support was based upon need, the appropriation would be increased rather than decreased.

Evidence of need for expansion of vocational education is widespread. One authoritative example is found in Dr. Flemming's report to President Eisenhower on manpower resources, which includes the statement: "There is evidence that our supply of highly trained and skilled workers is not keeping abreast of the current and potential requirements of the rapidly expanding technology upon which our growth and security depend."

4. There is no way the State of California can absorb such a proposed reduction without reducing operating programs. The legislature will not meet again until 1955. The tax rates for local school districts have been fixed and 1954–55 budgets already prepared.

5. The assumption that when the Federal Government reduces support for vocational education the various States will appropriate funds to balance the resulting deficiency is not sound. Reduction of financial support by the Federal Government is viewed as a lack of concern by the Federal Government, and the actual result is a tendency for the States to duplicate the Federal reduction.

The First Lady of American Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. BONIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 24, 1954

Mr. BONIN. Mr. Speaker, the National Secretaries Association is the world's largest association for women in one profession. It was organized in 1942 and incorporated in the State of Missouri as a nonprofit, nonunion, nonpolitical, and nonsectarian association. The purpose of the association is to elevate the standards of the secretarial profession by uniting, for their mutual benefit, women who are engaged in the secretarial profession.

It has as its code of ethics:

Recognizing the invaluable influence of woman's life in all she touches, we resolve to inject into our business association the highest ideals for which the National Secretaries Association stands; to lend grace, charm, and sobriety to all our dealings; and to maintain poise and dignity under all conditions and circumstances. We resolve to further the interest of whatever business we follow; to exemplify loyalty and conscientiousness and exercise patience at all times; to keep our lives clean and wholesome that our very presence may bring life and light to those about us; to encourage ambition, lend hope, and nourish faith, remembering that the eternal laws of God are the only ones under which we can truly succeed.

Today is the second day of National Secretaries Week. The theme for the week is "Better secretaries mean better business." Yesterday this association had a tea at the Sheraton Park Hotel. Tomorrow the proclamation for National Secretaries Week will be given by the Honorable Renah Camalier at the District Building at 9:30 a. m. On May 26 the National Secretaries Day banquet will be held at the Sheraton Park Hotel. Toastmistress for this occasion will be Miss Ellen Carey, acting president, Del-Mar-Dis division of the National Secretaries Association. The speakers at the banquet will be Dr. Samuel M. Brownell, United States Commissioner of Education; Congressman John P. Saylor, of Pennsylvania; Congressman Timothy P. Sheehan, of Illinois; and Elizabeth Fairall, vice president of Julius Garfinckel.

Let us observe this week by paying tribute to the American secretary as the first lady of American business.

Nebraskans Give Their Views—A Report on My Latest Poll

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1954

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD I include an analysis of a poll on 10 vital questions that I conducted in the Fourth Congressional District of Nebraska.

In order to get a good cross section of the views of my constituents, I sent the same poll to those living in the rural areas and those living in the cities. This, of course, entailed considerable time since they were separated for tabulating purposes.

The number of returns amounted to approximately 11 percent. This, as you all know, is considered very good for this type poll. It might be well to point out that of those who returned the questionnaire, a high percentage took time to sit down and write a letter expressing their views.

In making up this poll, I considered the questions I had previously asked in the 5 other polls I have conducted during my 6 terms in the House, as well as the questions which came up last fall when I conducted Government clinics in the 36 county-seat towns of my district. I asked for views on 10 important issues either pending or being considered by Congress. For the benefit of my colleagues, I will discuss each question separately, giving what I believe is the significance of the results.

THE FARM PROGRAM

The first question asked was, "Do you favor 90-percent parity on farm prices, 100 percent, or flexible support prices?" The results from the rural areas showed 53.3 percent favored the administration's flexible support program, 30.2 percent believed 90 percent of parity, 13.7 percent wanted 100 percent of parity, while 2.3 percent opposed any type of support program, since it also entailed controls.

The results of the city returns followed the same line except the flexible support program was accepted by a greater margin with 85.6 percent of those answering the poll favoring it. Only 5.7 percent wanted 90 percent of parity, 4.6 percent wanted 100 percent, and 4.1 percent wanted no supports whatsoever.

It might be well to point out that the Fourth District of Nebraska produces a tremendous amount of cattle. The "Sandhills"—described by many as God's own cattle country—is located within my district. Despite the millions of head of cattle and the large number of people engaged in ranching, I did not receive a letter expressing the view that there should be price supports on cattle. In fact, those who did discuss price supports on cattle said they definitely did not want any type of support or control. One reply was, "Let the Government tend to their business and we will take care of ours."

Other comments, all written in plain, ordinary English so there was not a chance of misinterpretation, included: "The 90 percent of parity doesn't seem to be the answer to our farm program, maybe we ought to try flexible supports," or "As long as we have more or less taken it upon ourselves to feed the rest of the world, we should continue to encourage big crops with 90 percent of parity so that we will have enough to feed all of the hungry people," or "Let us get back to the law of supply and demand—we were doing all right before somebody at a desk back in Washington decided we weren't."

On the other hand, some of the wheat farmers expressed their hopes that a two-price system similar to the McNary-Haugen idea could be written into law. They were afraid that wheat would price itself clear out of the market "like butter has."

EIGHTEEN-YEAR-OLDS VOTING

The No. 2 question of my poll was, "Should 18-year-olds vote?" As in the past, this continued to be a very close question. Greatest opposition to letting 18-year-olds vote came from the urban areas where 56 percent opposed any such move. In the rural areas, the question was closer with just 51.9 percent opposing it.

Typical comments from those who favored the granting of suffrage to 18-year-olds were, "If they are old enough to fight, they are old enough to vote." The most frequent comment in opposition was, "An 18-year-old isn't mature enough and is too easily swayed or influenced."

This question was discussed at great lengths at each of the Government clinics I conducted last fall. The first hour of the clinic was devoted to a Youth Wants To Know program, in which only high-school students participated. At one of the clinics a husky young man stood up and commented about being old enough to fight. Quick as a cat, a spry and pert young lady retorted, "That does not mean a thing. I've got a younger brother and he has been getting into fights for as long as I can remember."

In each community the students were almost equally divided on the subject. However, students from one of the schools were almost unanimous in objecting to lowering the age standard. Naturally, I was interested in determining the reason behind this. So, in private, I discussed the question with the students' teacher. I found him to be vigorously opposed to lowering the age, primarily on the grounds that they were too easily influenced. This could well be an example of the influence teachers and parents have on 18-year-olds. But other instances found adults being swung around to supporting the move. Sitting in on the youth program, many adults were amazed at the caliber of questions asked by the students.

In one small community where there were only 25 or 30 adults present during the 2-hour clinic, they unanimously agreed and asked that the students be allowed to continue after their hour was up. "They can ask better questions than most of us," the spokesman said.

This is one question that can only be resolved by a constitutional amendment. Sooner or later Congress will see fit to place this issue in the hands of the people in the form of a constitutional amendment to be either accepted or rejected. One State, Georgia, has already granted equal suffrage to 18-year-olds. The Constitution reserved unto the States the authority to establish voting requirements.

SOCIAL SECURITY

A very timely question presented to my constituents was, "Do you favor extension of social security to cover farmers or all groups?" This question was worded so as to let those in the rural areas express their opinion as to whether they should be included within the scope of social security, and the same being true for those living in the cities.

The rural results showed 58 percent favoring the inclusion of farmers within social security with the remainder opposing any such move. Those who opposed said, "Insure us a decent price for our crops and we will take care of ourselves when we get too old to work."

Those who favored being placed under social security said, "As long as Congress has seen fit to put some under social security, why should we not be included too. After all, we are citizens too."

A vast majority of those living in the cities wanted to be included—the results showing 75.4 percent favoring being placed under social security. Many indicated they could not understand why the person living next door was allowed to pay into social security and receive benefits while he was not given that privilege.

Many of the letters which commented on this subject were written on plain paper in shaky penmanship. Practically all of those indicated that the present social-security payments were entirely inadequate—that the amount of money one could earn and still draw his monthly benefits was very unrealistic in view of the present day cost of living.

In checking with the Ways and Means Committee of the House, I am very happy to report that it is in the process of studying the present Social Security Act. It has been long overdue for revisions to eliminate many of its inequities. The President has made certain recommendations—many of which I sincerely hope will be enacted into the law.

I am quite certain, Mr. Speaker, that you as well as my other colleagues are most anxious to see the final recommendations which will be made by the committee headed up by my good friend and very able person from New York. I feel quite confident that he will guide his committee in presenting some favorable amendments.

M'CARTHY INVESTIGATIONS

Perhaps the most controversial question asked in my poll concerned the present hearings now being conducted in the Senate. Not since the Kefauver Committee has any congressional investigation drawn so much national interest. The question asked was, "Do you support Senator McCARTHY in his investigating programs?"

From the rural areas came Senator McCARTHY's biggest support. There, 63.8 percent favored the Senator from Wisconsin with only 30.9 percent expressing disfavor. The remaining 5.3 percent gave him their qualified support—many indicating they felt his methods were defeating his purpose.

Even as late as last fall when I was conducting my government clinics, I found overwhelming support of Senator McCARTHY. Typical comments then were, "Senator McCARTHY should be supported wholeheartedly in his campaign to get rid of Communists and corruption in government," or "When you are fighting a bunch as rotten as the Communists, you should use every possible weapon at your command."

Last year in my poll, I asked, "What do you feel is the most important issue facing Congress: Taxes, a balanced budget, the Korean war, or communism and corruption?" The results on that question found the Korean war high above all with communism and corruption next in line. Now that we have a truce in Korea, I feel the people now place ridding the Government of communism and corruption on top of the list.

The letters I have received in response to my questionnaire indicate the people still feel this is one of the major issues facing Congress. "If there is still one Communist in government, that is one too many" was a typical reply.

The city returns found a much closer division of support. The replies from there found 51.7 percent favoring Senator McCARTHY with the remainder taking a dim view of the recent events.

It should be noted that the poll was sent to the rural areas before the so-called Army-McCarthy hearings were started. Most of those going to the cities went out after the hearings began.

Some of the replies indicated they wanted the hearings to be brought to an end at the earliest possible time in order to let Senator McCARTHY continue his inquiries into communism in government. Some of the later replies wanted the hearings to continue so that both sides would have equal opportunity to present their side of the story. At this point, I am reminded of what my father often told me when I was a youth. He would say, "Remember Art, a pancake never gets so flat that it doesn't have two sides."

It will be most interesting to read the final results of the hearing. Without question, there appears to be some dirty linen that needs washing. I feel that most of the American people, while they have some tentative opinions, are waiting to get all of the facts before they pass judgment on the controversy at hand.

TAFT-HARTLEY ACT

One question asked in my poll which has already been disposed of by this Congress was, "Do you favor changes in the Taft-Hartley law?" As we all know, the amendments reported from the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee were recommitted by the Senate and, for all intents and purposes, this has killed any chances for amendments.

The results from the rural areas showed 57.1 percent opposed to any changes in the existing law—the remainder thought some changes might be in order. Those who supported a change wanted more rights to be given the individual employee rather than increasing the power of the labor unions and their bosses.

The thinking on this question from the urban areas was more evently divided, with 51.9 percent opposing any amendments and the remaining 48.1 percent seeking some changes.

POSTAL RATE INCREASES

One of the sharpest difference of opinion between the rural and city areas was on the postal rate increase question. In reply to the question, "Should postal rates be raised to meet expenses?" the city returns found 65 percent favoring an increase as compared to the 35 percent who felt theiy should be left where they are.

The results from the rural areas showed the thinking was just about evently divided, with 52.7 percent thinking it would be proper to raise the rates to meet expenses. The remaining 47.3 percent thought it was all right for the Post Office Department to operate on a deficit with the difference being made up in taxes.

However, practically every comment on this subject mentioned raising the rates on unsolicited mail such as direct mail advertising. Many thought newspapers, magazines, and catalogs should be made to pay their own way. It is my understanding that the biggest deficit of the Postal Service falls within these two categories.

One comment, which just about summed up most of the replies, was, "Certainly not on first class mail, but on all the junk mail you file in the waste basket daily, but if for no better purpose than keeping our waste baskets empty and conserving wood pulp the rates should be raised on the junk mail."

Those who opposed raising the postal rates thought that Postmaster General Summerfield should be given more authority to remove the inefficiency and waste which has been associated with the Postal Department. They expressed approval of his actions of instigating new methods of distribution and transportation in order to save money and at the same time improve or continue the same service.

UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING

Another controversial subject brought out in my poll was, "Do you favor universal military training?" Whereas a few years ago I found very little support for any such measure, I now find the people living in the cities favored it.

This was the only question where the views of those living in the cities differed from those living on the farms. One of the reasons for this, I believe, is due to the growing number of veterans—most of whom are found in the cities. The American Legion and the Veterans of Foreign Wars are supporting a plan for universal military training.

The tabulations of the city returns show 63.3 percent favoring UMT, with most making some mention of the American Legion or VFW plans. Those who opposed UMT felt that it might give too much power to the military and the civilians would lose control of our military might. Most of those believed in George Washington's theory, which has been strictly adhered to down through the years, that the control of the military should always remain in the hands of the people, or, in other, words, the civilians.

While the people in the rural areas did not support UMT, it should be pointed out that support for it has grown a great deal. The results show 52.7 percent oppose UMT with the remaining 47.3 percent favoring it.

Some of the comments on this subject were, "The way they have been drafting men the past 14 years, we might as well have UMT." "Why should those who can afford to go to college be deferred while the rest must fight?", or "From the looks of the world situation, we are going to need a big reserve strength in case of all-out war."

FOREIGN AID

If there was ever a subject on which the people were almost unanimous in their opinions, it is foreign aid. The question was, "Should foreign aid be reduced, as is, or increased?" On the farms and in the cities, the opinion, by far, was that it should be reduced or completely eliminated. There was only about 1 percent difference in the compared results. The city results showed 77.3 percent in favor of reducing foreign aid while 78.6 percent of the replies from the rural areas thought it should be reduced. Only about 3 percent, from both the cities and rural areas, thought it should be increased. The remainder felt it should be left as is.

A similar question was asked in my previous polls and discussed during my government clinics. Only directly following World War I did I find wide support for foreign aid and that was primarily for food, medicine, and clothing.

Some of the typical answers on this question were, "We haven't bought any friends in the past, what has happened to change that?", "God helps those who help themselves," or "I think it is about time Uncle Sam started taking care of some of the things here at home."

One comment on foreign aid came from a gentleman who had just returned from an extensive trip throughout Europe. He said, "I see more patched overalls and work clothes in my hometown than I saw in any one town I visited in Europe." Another person said he found little appreciation for the aid we are sending them. "In fact," he said, "I found more resentment."

Many commented on the possible intervention in Indochina saying they did not mind too much sending bullets and other weapons of war, but that they definitely did not want to send any American troops to fight there. Some feared that it would break out into another Korea and a stalemated war, uselessly spilling the blood of American youths. As for myself, I would definitely oppose any move to send American troops to the jungles of Indochina to fight in a war which the French refuse to send their draftees to fight.

HEALTH PROGRAM

The one question which drew the least attention was, "Do you approve the President's health program?" "Haven't had much time to study it." "Don't know too much about it," or "You are a doctor and in a much better position to know" were common answers on this question.

Of those who did answer the question, 60.6 percent of the rural replies favored the President's program. A little more support was found in the cities where 63.7 percent favored it. Comparatively, more people from the cities answered this question.

This was one question which showed the popularity of the President is still at a very high point. Some of those who indicated they supported the program said, "If it is Ike's program, then it must be O. K.", or "It's Ike I like, and if it's part of his program, I like it, too."

TWO NEW STATES

A wide margin of support was found for Alaskan and Hawaiian statehood. The last question asked was, "Should Alaska and Hawaii be made new States?" Seventy-seven percent of the rural replies favored granting statehood to the two Territories. Even greater support for statehood was found in the cities where 85 percent favored it.

Some of the typical answers were, "If they are ready for it, give it to them," "Quit making a political football out of them and make them States," or "There doesn't appear to be any good reasons why they shouldn't be made States."

INCIDENTAL COMMENTS

My poll did not cover taxes and the budget, because this was a part of my questionnaire sent out last year. However, a few of the replies I received did mention taxes.

Those who did discuss taxes had high price for the tremendous accomplishments of the Ways and Means Committee in reporting out the revised tax bill H. R. 8300. They felt the added exemptions for working mothers, for those who are retired, and others, and the realistic tax depletion benefits, had been long overdue. Needless to say, they were pleased with the 10-percent reduction of income taxes which went into effect January 1.

Doctors Opposed to Social Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. D. R. (BILLY) MATTHEWS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1954

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to point out that the doctors in the Eighth Congressional District of Florida, which I have the honor to represent, are opposed to being forced under social security. It is my intention to support this position of our doctors for several reasons:

In the first place, it is very rare that our doctors retire. The need for them is so great that I suppose more doctors die in the harness than almost any other members of our various professional services. When at the present time the need for doctors is so great, why should we encourage them to go into retirement and accept social security when the need for medical services is so desperate, and will continue to be desperate for many years ahead?

Another compelling reason that I have for supporting the view of the doctors in my district on this matter of social security, is the fact that if they, themselves, do not want it, I cannot see how their inclusion would be helpful either to the doctor or to the general public. Certainly in this day when our individual freedom is curtailed in so many areas we should make every effort possible to give our people freedom of choice. I have had no expression of opposition on the part of any of the other groups who are to be included in the extended social-security coverage, which would indicate to me that we are not being exactly fair to our doctors when we impose on them something that they do not desire, when we do not make this imposition on any other group. Below are listed some telegrams from the various medical societies in the Eighth Congressional District of Florida:

The Medical Society of Putnam County, Fla., unanimously opposes compulsory social-security coverage for physicians. Few doctors ever retire, therefore will be ineligible for social-security payment. Why be made to pay for what you will never receive?

LAWRENCE HEBEL, M. D.,
President, Putnam County Medical Society, Putnam County, Fla.

Unanimous desire of the Nassau County Medical Society that physicians not be forced into social security as now before House. We earnestly request any and all help you can give us to prevent doctors who have been in practice years being forced into social security.

NASSAU COUNTY MEDICAL SOCIETY,
JOHN W. MCCLANE, *Secretary.*

Our doctors 100 percent firmly oppose being forced under social security. Do not oppose optional coverage by individual physicians. Please use your utmost efforts to get reconsideration.

R. B. HARKNESS, M. D.,
President, Columbia County Medical Association.

Southeast Asian Defense Pact Without Britain?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1954

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, the implications of a defense pact in southeast Asia without Great Britain, and, therefore, perhaps without some members and former members of the British Commonwealth, are serious and disturbing.

This problem has been raised in an editorial in America, the National Catholic Weekly Review, in the issue of May 29, 1954, which I include in the RECORD:

PACIFIC NATO MINUS BRITAIN?

On May 17, somewhat belatedly, Secretary of State Dulles ordered his staff not to discuss developments in the Indochina crisis. He wanted nothing said that might affect the delicate negotiations at Geneva. Unfortunately, the blackout could not cover foreign correspondents.

The day after the Secretary rang down the curtain a UP dispatch from Paris went far toward doing what he was trying to prevent. It was not a mischievous report. It probably reflected accurately enough the combination of confusion and desperation under which the harassed French are laboring. But its effect could only be to upset the British and confuse the American public.

The French were authoritatively quoted as being willing to "go ahead with the United States and other countries on a southeast Asia pact against communism, even if Great Britain holds out." British refusal "need not lead to the abandonment of the plan." What plan did the dispatch refer to?

Mr. Dulles is exploring two plans, distinct though related. One is short-range, the other long-range. One is an emergency measure, the other a permanent arrangement. The first involves internationalizing the war in Indochina in case Geneva collapses. The second involves internationalizing the defense of southeast Asia so as to be ready if Indochina collapses. Mr. Dulles has been sounding out the ambassadors of a number of nations on the two plans. Through United States Ambassador Dillon, he has been discussing the short-range project in Paris.

The distinction between the two plans is completely obscured in the UP dispatch. The Paris discussions are described as dealing with a Pacific version of NATO to be formed in time to internationalize the Indochina war if Geneva fails. The British, whose interests in southeast Asia are still extensive, are reported to be angry. We can dismiss their grounds for objecting to our talks with France about conditions under which we would increase our aid in Indochina, because it is the United States, not Britain, which has already invested substantially in its defense. But the British are entitled to be not only angry but stupefied if we are even considering going it alone with France on a SEATO for southeast Asia.

Everybody agrees that a viable SEATO must at least have the moral support of the nations which have just concluded the Colombo Conference: India, Pakistan, Burma, Ceylon, and Indonesia. These nations have made it clear that they still consider colonialism as their No. 1 enemy. They passed a resolution warning both Communists and anti-Communists against interfering in southeast Asia. Indeed, their warning would have been much stronger if Britain's Anthony Eden had not intervened to tone it down. The fact that he succeeded is one reason the United States, rather than rush in with France, now the archexample of colonialism in the Far East, must await British cooperation.

We should not have long to wait. Prime Minister Churchill told the Commons on May 17 that his government would discuss forming a SEATO within the framework of the United Nations when the outcome of the Geneva Conference is known. The folly of forging ahead without the British is implicit in its subtle reminder that his Government is maintaining the closest touch with India, Pakistan, and Ceylon, as well as Burma, and consulting with Canada, New Zealand, and Australia. All but Burma are members of the British Commonwealth.

Americans Unafraid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ERRETT P. SCRIVNER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1954

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, in Kansas City, Kans., Wednesday, May 19, 1954, was a red-letter day, marking as it did the opening of the Fairbanks-Morse & Co.'s big new pump and engine plant, a plant that will contribute to this Nation's future in peace and war.

At the formal opening ceremonies it was pointed out by Mr. John Walsh, general manager of the new plant, that—

> Without pumps there would be no large cities, no automobiles, no airplanes, no petroleum industry, no running water, and no modern agriculture industry as we know it, and our life expectancy would be lower by many years.

This new plant is a welcome addition to the growing industrial strength of the State of Kansas, so for that reason, and many others equally good, it gave me great pleasure to participate in the day's activities which culminated in a dinner, at the Town House Hotel, given by the Kansas City, Kans., Chamber of Commerce, honoring Mr Robert H. Morse, Jr., president of Fairbanks-Morse & Co.

As the Representative in Congress from the Second Congressional District, in whose hometown the plant is located, I was invited to deliver the banquet address which, eliminating formalities, follows:

AMERICANS UNAFRAID

I can well remember as quite a young boy seeing the famous Fairbanks-Morse trademark. I often wondered what kind of man belonged to the hand that held that suspended weight. From what we have seen today, I have learned the answer.

That trade-mark consists of a hand gripping a ring from which a weight is suspended. The wrist and clutched hand are to convey the strength of the company's product; the testing weight is to portray its quality.

Fairbanks-Morse is over 120 years old, having been started back in 1830 in Vermont by Thaddeus Fairbanks. The company, as did the country and industry, moved West as our Republic expanded. After the Civil War, Fairbanks-Morse acquired its plant in Beloit, Wis.

This new plant here in Kansas City, Kans., is but a further expansion of an old company still young enough to grow.

As you all probably know, Fairbanks-Morse's first product was a scale—still is one of its major products—but this scale in those early days was exceptional in that it was highly accurate.

After the Civil War, the company started its production of the gas engine and progressing with modern industry, is now one of the Nation's foremost producers of diesels, and has supplied many of our municipalities with fine modern powerplants.

The first Morse to be part of this great enterprise was Charles Hosmer Morse, who started as an apprentice with the Fairbanks Co. in 1850. Just before the Civil War he went West to Chicago, and after the war he established a branch in Cincinnati under the name Fairbanks-Morse & Co. Later in Chicago, as the firm's representative, he saw the need for many new scales as a result of the great Chicago fire; and was prepared to meet that need.

As a result of Mr. Morse's interest in the Beloit eclipse wind engine, a familiar sight on our early-day Kansas farms, the Fairbanks-Morse Co. established the factory at Beloit, Wis., home of its main plant.

Charles H. Morse served 23 years as the president and 7 years as the chairman of the board. Col. Robert H. Morse became president of the company in 1931, serving until 1950, and since that time Robert H. Morse, Jr., has been its president.

Today, Fairbanks-Morse is a multi-million-dollar concern with new sales of well over $100 million.

Summed up in a few words, this concern is typically American. It is typical of our free enterprise and capitalistic system, where men by their ability and nerve can invest their earnings, firm in their faith of the future—knowing all too well the possibility of loss and failure. It is typical, too, of the fact that here in the United States these great industries are built, and operated, by freemen, not by a dictatorial, dominating central government. No government said build here or build pumps. Like so many others it had a humble beginning by peoples who were willing to plow back profits into a plant; by men who had faith in themselves, the quality of their products—men who, by hard work and confidence in their venture built not only for themselves and their families but for the future of the Nation.

It is typical, too, of the courage of American businessmen. The easy, nonprogressive thing to do is to listen to the prophets of gloom, doom, and depression and sock away the dollars instead of investing them in industrial enterprise.

This firm and new plant with no Government funds is typical, too, of the fact that in this day and age it requires an investment of $10,000 to $14,000 of someone's money to create a job for one man by which he can earn his living, turning out with his skill a quality product. Without these investments of thousands of widows' or workmen's savings, new jobs would not be created.

In brief, here is an industrial example of Americans unafraid.

In this Kansas valley where we have seen in 2 short years such great extremes of nature—from the greatest flood in history to our most severe drought—the easy way would be to cry defeat and dismay, pack up and move out. Here in this community we have an outstanding example of Americans unafraid. Men and women who have fought back, who have rebuilt their homes, their stores, their plants, confident in the future; confident that in the long run things will be right; confident of their own ability to work their way out; confident that these conditions will be recognized and that whatever is necessary to control these ravages of nature will be done. Americans unafraid. That spirit, that courage, typified by these fine Kansans—these Americans unafraid, makes it very easy for me to take the floor in the House of Representatives to appeal for the funds necessary to give the flood protection needed for them to live in confidence. Those efforts will continue until such time as the need is adequately met or the proposed program is killed—deader than the proverbial doornail.

And then, in this day and age of atomic and hydrogen bombs, it would be quite simple to say: "Well, with all that devastating power loose in the world, why build for the future, why plan, why further my child's education?"

This is the first time in history Americans have had to live with the possibility of attack. Note, I said attack, not invasion.

The people who dwell in other countries are no more courageous than we are. In England, in France, in Germany, in Holland, in Belgium—they lived under the threat of attack and invasion for centuries. That threat did not stop them from progressing, from building homes, cities, great industry. It won't stop us.

I said a moment ago "possibility of attack." I did not say "probability."

That possibility I do not fear.

Russia emerged from World War II a strong military power. In recent years it has increased its industrial strength. It is a strong country. But it is not a free country. It is an atheistic, God-denying Communist dictatorship.

The United States is God-fearing, free, and it is strong industrially—a strength so great that it is greatly feared and highly respected by Russia.

In view of some comments recently made about reducing the number of Army divisions, it should be pointed out that the new divisions, today, have 17 percent more manpower and 85 percent more firepower than World War II divisions. Hence today's divisions are equal to 23 World War II divisions manpower and 33 divisions in firepower—all much more mobile.

Ours is the best Army in the world for its size. We are weak in land armies compared with Russia, but no one in his right mind would ever suggest a land attack against the great Russian mass. Napoleon learned how futile that would be.

Russia never was a seafaring nation, but today she is increasing her naval power. Under lend-lease we provided Russia with over 500 navy vessels of various types—mostly small ones. Very few of those have been returned. In some, as yet unexplained maneuver Russia did get two of the German Snorkel submarines and the plans and parts for 36 newer subs, along with the engineers who had developed them. She has built other submarines and some surface vessels, perhaps for missile use.

But even so, the United States is the world's strongest naval power.

As recently reported by Gen. Lawton Collins, Russia does have in the neighborhood of 20,000 planes in its air force. Many of them are jet fighters, the MIG and its more recent successors, with a new jet bomber reported to be coming along. Great as the MIG was reported to be, our pilots brought them down in a ratio of greater than 20 to 1.

The United States Air Force has more than 21,000 active planes. The Navy and Marines have another 10,000. Our airpower is 3 to 2 over the Russians, and our pilots are beyond compare in their skill and courage. Some of you, as businessmen, have seen some of the firepower demonstrations at Eglin Field, Fla., and have witnessed that skilled manpower.

Every day newer and better planes are being produced. The F-84F made here in

Kansas City at Fairfax is a great, fast, new plane, but already superseded by the F–100 and others.

The successor to the B–47, a fine, faster, bigger, long-range jet bomber is now being built for the Air Force.

Today the United States Air Force can and, if called upon, will deliver inconceivable death and destruction to any point in the world, and return to a safe base.

Just a year ago, discussing military appropriations on the floor of the House of Representatives, I pointed out that 3 bombers could carry as much explosive power as 2,700 World War II bombers.

Today a very small handful of planes can carry all the death and devastation carried by all of the Allied planes on all of their sorties in all of World War II and return to safe bases.

Of course, we assume that Russia has the A-bomb; we should assume she has the H-bomb as well. We should assume she might feel cocky enough to use them, although her present long-range TU–4 bombers are capable of one-way suicide missions only.

If she strikes, Russia knows we will immediately have planes on the way, and she will never, in a century, ever recover from the blows she will receive. As Russia grows stronger we must progress, and for the purpose our military research and development program is costing you, as taxpayers, $1½ billion each year. That research is giving us better missiles, better rockets, better ammunition, better bombs, better radar, faster and better planes. But that progress, too, is expensive. One of the new planes now about ready for production will at the outset cost us between fifteen and twenty million dollars each.

Our air defense continues, with expanded radar screen, radar planes, radar ships, and new interceptor bases at strategic points.

Although it does not tie in very closely with Americans unafraid any discussion of Russia or communism would be incomplete without some reference to French Indochina.

United States involvement in French Indochina is nothing new. We had Americans there knocking off Japanese headquarters during World War II. I remember well one young liteutenant who, after having commanded 4,000 French underground (Maqui) troops in France, with two sergeants, was parachuted into Indochina to organize former French Legionnaires. One night they drifted down river in a sampan. They had started toward the Japanese target when they noticed a sign, in French, painted on a wall: "Welcome, Americans, to free us from our oppressors." The first thought was that there had been a leak. Investigation showed the paint was fresh. They took a chance, knocked off the Japs and kept on going. After the Japanese surrender at Hanoi, the young officer was again in this town, pretending he had had a report of the sign. He told the French Indochinese there how happy the Americans had been to knock off the Japs for them.

"Ah! Monsieur," was the reply. "It is not the Japanese but the French who are our oppressors."

Upon his return to the United States in the fall of 1945, that young officer sat in my office for 6 hours discussing these matters with an Army intelligence officer.

Among many other things, he made these very interesting points:

1. That Soviet agents were there in 1945, active, and the source of much valuable information.

2. That French Indochinese and other eastern nationals expected us, as the shining example of independence, to help them gain theirs from the colonial powers, and if we did not, we would lose 300 million Asiatic friends.

3. That when I saw in print the word "Viet Minh," I would know the Communists felt strong enough to move in the open, and that when the time came look out.

How well this young officer analyzed things and how relieved I am to find out that we have demanded that the French Indochinese shall have their independence, if we are to go further.

Quite frankly, this is another situation—mess, in you prefer—that this administration inherited. We had been plunged deep into this affair, promises of great financial aid and military supplies had been made long ago—long before January 1953. Once made, those promises had to be kept. And, up to July 1 this year, that aid has cost Uncle Sam a little more than $2 billion, but, as yet, no lives.

I have no way of knowing what decisions will be made, but I am far from convinced that the United States has any call at this time to send young Americans to fight and die in far-off Indochina, especially if the French and Indochinese themselves won't fight, and if the British, and others, keep dragging their heels.

If and when Congress is called upon to make a decision as to Indochina, it will be a terrifically difficult decision to make—one that will call for careful, yes, prayerful, consideration.

Certainly, we do not want another Korea, which showed how easy it is to get into these involvements and how hard it is to get out. In fact, although there is an armistice, we still must maintain many thousand troops in that far-off land. Certainly, the United States should not be called upon to pay such a disproportionate share of the cost in casualties and cash.

In closing, may I point out why I feel we can be Americans unafraid? Courage is our heritage. But, even greater than that, the reason we can be Americans unafraid is well expressed upon our coins and our new stamp: "In God we trust."

From the very days of the Declaration of Independence, this country has had a firm faith in divine providence. The great hymn America is replete with praise of God. Our leaders—Washington and Lincoln—had, President Eisenhower has, a faith in that Supreme Being.

As Lincoln proclaimed, with that faith we cannot fail; without it we cannot hope to succeed. With that faith as a firm foundation upon which to build, we as Americans unafraid will have faith in ourselves, faith in our country, faith in the future, and faith in God.

Logic of Spite

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MORGAN M. MOULDER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1954

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following editorial printed and published by the daily Capital News, Jefferson City, Mo.:

Logic of Spite

There is not the slightest doubt of what will be Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer's fate if the security panel now studying his records concludes that he is a poor security risk.

He will be barred indefinitely from access to such atomic energy secrets as are not already within his head or within his capacity to think through.

More puzzling at the moment is the question, What will happen if he is cleared? Secretary of Defense Wilson has stated that the Defense Department won't want him no matter how he comes out on security.

The attitude of Chairman Lewis Strauss, of the Atomic Energy Commission, is unknown.

Until the decision is announced and Strauss has a basis for action, it is useless to speculate on what the AEC might do. But as for Wilson, he is on the record, and with a statement which must baffle any fair-minded person.

He has said that even if Oppenheimer is clean as a whistle he doesn't want him. In other words, the Defense Department is prepared to cut off its nose to spite its face. It is ready to dispense for good and all with the services of one of the country's most brilliant scientists, the man who gets chief credit for the A-bomb.

If Wilson can explain the logic in this position, we are listening. It sounds almost as if he thinks the Defense Department can get along without scientists in a day when war, more than ever, is a battle of scientific minds.

Tenth Anniversary of the GI Bill, a Truly Successful Measure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1954

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, we are approaching the 10th anniversary of what is widely known as the GI bill. This bill, signed on June 22, 1944, by President Franklin D. Roosevelt, was designed to cope sensibly with the enormous problem of transition from military to civilian life of about 16 million Americans. The success of this measure is attested to by the millions of American veterans of World War II who have benefitted from the GI bill.

The American Legion deserves much of the credit for the design of the GI bill. The Congress, and of course the American taxpayer, also deserves credit for the widely-acclaimed success of this veterans' benefits measure.

As drafted principally by the American Legion, passed by the Congress, and signed by President Roosevelt, the GI bill has, in 10 years, first, avoided many of the mistakes made with World War I veterans; second, given the World War II veterans a sound economic basis for postwar civilian life; and, third, avoided the potential chaos which might have resulted from our huge postwar demobilization.

I include in the Record an article entitled "The GI Bill, 10 Years Later," which appeared in the American Legion magazine of June 1954:

The GI Bill 10 Years Later

(By Peter Duffield Bolter)

"If the American Legion had never done another thing," said a young Air Force veteran of World War II and Korea recently, "and if it never did another thing, the GI bill of rights would fully justify its existence."

Charles Hurd, reviewing the GI bill for the American Legion as the bill approached its 10th anniversary, remarked that the bill "stands out more and more as a part of the

American tradition under which parents demand that mistakes made in their youth be corrected for their children." Hurd was formerly veterans' affairs editor of the New York Times.

The fact that the GI bill, which will be 10 years old on June 22, was a revolutionary document is, indeed, closely related to the fact that it marked the first time in American history that a program for the civilian readjustment of veterans of one war was written by, and out of the experience of, the veterans of an earlier war.

The GI bill was conceived as a special project of the American Legion in 1943. It occupied the major attention of the Legion for nearly a year, and became law on June 22, 1944. Much of the support that the Legion received for the bill from leaders on the American scene, in and out of Congress, came from other veterans of World War I and specialists who had tussled with the problem of the readjustment of the World War I veterans.

That four other veterans organizations tried to block the passage of the GI bill in 1944 does not alter the fact that the bill is the first postwar program for veterans that represents the experience of veterans of an earlier war. The bill was widely supported by the members of the same veterans groups whose officials opposed it, for the bill struck directly at the well-remembered and bitter experiences of discharged veterans after World War I. They felt it struck truly.

The photos that appear with this article dramatize the meaning of the GI bill then and now. In the historic news photo at the lower left, ragged, jobless veterans of the 1932 bonus army are being dispersed from their shacks and hovels in Washington, D. C., by soldiers armed with tear gas and wearing gas masks.

The scene is the sorry climax, 13 years later, of the Nation's failure to provide opportunity for readjustment to civilian life of the men of the AEF. The Government lent 5,500 of the bonus marchers rail fare home, but 5,000 more replaced those. Later, remnants of the bonus marchers were put to work in Government work camps, and nearly 200 of them were wiped out when caught by a hurricane while working on the causeway to Key West, Fla., in 1935.

The bonus army itself was an ill-advised march on Washington by more than 10,000 down-and-out veterans. It was encouraged, behind the scenes, by unscrupulous leaders whose aim was to embarrass the Government. Their strength lay entirely in the failure of the Nation to take necessary steps to reabsorb World War I veterans back into civilian life, so that when a depression struck 13 years later thousands of veterans with no economic foothold were easy prey to mischievous leadership.

The bonus marchers were but a small part of the commonplace of the maladjusted veteran of those days—when "down-and-out" and "veteran" were usually uttered in the same breath. As Hurd says: "Hordes of job-hungry veterans were pushed from town to town by vigilante committees; ragged, displaced veterans sold apples or cadged handouts on street corners."

The bonus was largely an illusion. It was no substitute for a sound readjustment program and came too late to be constructive. What the men had needed, at the war's end and not later, was an opportunity to take a firm place in the national economy. This applied to those whole in body no less than to the disabled. But such readjustment programs as there were after World War I were strictly for the disabled and sadly insufficient for them. At the Legion convention in 1944, when the GI bill had just become law, great hopes were held for it, though no such program had ever been tried.

Marshall Field hailed the GI bill when he addressed the Legion national convention in Chicago that year. "The longer you stay in the Army the better you are as a soldier," said Field, "but the less you are a civilian, and the bigger the gap that must be bridged when you come home. For the man who makes a hard readjustment, this gap may be as large as it was for the man who incurred a physical disability in service. It wasn't only those with physical disabilities who sold apples on street corners not so many years ago."

Dwight Green, then Governor of Illinois, called the GI bill a guaranty of opportunity."

Harry S. Truman, then Senator from Missouri, said: "The bill will prevent a repetition of the tragic mistakes under which World War I veterans suffered."

Robert M. Gaylord, then president of the National Association of Manufacturers, said: "In 1918 there has been no plans for the day of victory—none. * * * It is almost unbelievable."

The First World War involved the demobilization of 4 million veterans, and out of the demobilization came chaos. The Second World War created 16 million veterans, 14 million of whom were discharged in 2 years. Conceivably, the chaos could have been many times that of 1919.

Senator John W. Bricker, then Governor of Ohio, lauded the GI bill as a stop-chaos measure when he told the Legion's 1944 convention: "We had 4 million men to be absorbed into our economic life. We bungled the task. We handled the problem of reemployment and rehabilitation of our war veterans in a shabby and haphazard way. Men who were desperately in need of jobs were left to their own resources."

More than anything else, the GI bill that the veterans of World War I wrote in 1944 for the veterans of World War II was a bill to put veterans on their feet and make them self-sufficient and self-reliant—the very antithesis of the bonus.

Now, on the bill's 10th anniversary, Hurd points out that: "In all of the United States today there is no community of maladjusted veterans living in shanty towns, and the lack of such conditions does not seem strange. The normal thing is the educated young veteran with growing family, forging ahead of the average in his business, trade, or profession."

The old picture of the veteran as a conspicuous down-and-outer and a thorn in the side of the Nation is, in fact, reversed, for he is ahead of the national average in earning power. Reports Hurd: "Largely because of the educational program of the GI bill, World War II veterans have left nonveterans behind in earning power. In 1947, nonveterans held a slight lead, averaging $2,585 a year, compared with $2,401 for veterans. Four years later, in 1951, the veteran had jumped to an average of $3,359 a year (up 40 percent) while the nonveteran had climbed only 10 percent in the same prosperous days, to $2,875."

Would the veterans be the first to suffer economically if another depression should hit? In 1948–49, before Korean war military orders made a slight boom, the national economy slowed its pace a little. Census Bureau figures show that the income of nonveterans fell off then. Veterans, who had already passed nonveterans in earning power, continued to earn more.

That the GI bill has given veterans the economic foothold that was sadly lacking after World War I is fairly illustrated by the World War II veterans pictured with this article.

Tom Key, of Mount Laurel, N. J., shown with some of his prize cattle, is an infantry veteran of the CBI theater in World War II. He went to work as an insecticide salesman after the war, but found selling to be unsatisfactory work for him. Under the GI bill he had a chance to keep alive while learning a living that was suitable to him. Key took institutional on-the-farm training at Rancocas Valley Regional High School. Today he runs a model farm of 150 acres, has 3 tractors and 50 head of prize Jersey dairy cattle. He built the farm buildings himself. Key caught the meaning of the GI bill when he named his farm Weona Farm.

Tom Key typifies three quarters of a million World War II veterans who took farm training under the GI bill.

John Ciborski, another New Jersey veteran, is not a farmer. His interests run along more technical lines. Ciborski, a veteran of the 58th Fighter Group, Army Air Force, had duty in the southwest Pacific and the Philippines. When discharged he took on-the-job training in silk-screen reproductive work. Today he is a partner in the Color Craft Screening Co., of Union City, N. J. His firm employs from 25 to 50 people, and does enamel printing on glass and plastic containers, such as perfume bottles. It has accounts with several leading perfume makers and department stores, turns out millions of printed bottles a year.

Giborski is 1 of 1½ million World War II veterans who took on-the-job training courses under the GI bill, and 2½ million who enrolled in craft, trade, and industrial courses.

Robert Mangum, a World War II Army veteran of the Philippine campaign, returned to his job on the New York police force. He had lost several years in the competition for advancement. Under the GI bill, he studied at Brooklyn Law School, got a law degree, and passed the bar exams in 1949. He continued to study at night at New York University, doing graduate work in criminology and sociology.

This winter, Mangum was appointed a deputy police commissioner, the youngest—at 32—in the history of the city. Said Mangum: "The opportunity provided me under the GI bill of rights through the Veterans' Administration, enabling me to continue my education, had been decisive in shaping my career and contributing to the high appointment I have just received."

Mangum is 1 of more than 2 million World War II veterans who took college and graduate studies under the GI bill. In 1944, Robert Hutchins, formerly head of the University of Chicago, had gloomily predicted that the college training provisions of the GI bill would make academic tramps of the veterans. By 1950, the major colleges reported that the GI bill veterans had provided the best generation of college students in the Nation's history.

Alfred Hanak, of Ronkonkoma, N. Y.—shown on these pages working on his own home with his wife—is an ETO infantry vet. Hanak, a builder, has worked on dozens of veterans' homes in the huge housing projects on Long Island. Employment for veterans in the building trades is a byproduct of the GI bill home-loan guaranties.

Through last September, 3,385,000 veterans had got loans guaranteed under the GI bill. Nine-tenths of them were for homes, one-tenth for businesses. The loans have involved $21½ billion of Government guaranties. Today, half a million of the loans have been paid off in full. Losses and defaults have numbered seven-tenths of 1 percent of the loans made. This compares to a normal banking expectation of nearly a 5-percent loss ratio.

Douglas K. Counseller served 3½ years in the Army Air Corps in World War II. He was taking on-the-job training in the making of automobile upholstery in Topeka, Kans., when his boss decided to go out of business. With the aid of a GI business loan, Counseller bought into the firm—The Topeka Auto Fabrics Co.—and as its president is making a go of it today. He is shown at the beginning of this article with an employee, William L. Keefover. Keefover, a disabled World War II vet, will manage a new branch Counseller will soon open.

Counseller is one of nearly 400,000 World War II vets who set themselves up in business with a GI bill Government-guaranteed business loan.

The educational aspects of the GI bill have nearly run their course today for World War II veterans. Nearly twice as many veterans as the total World War I Armed Forces—7,807,000 up to last July—took some form of training under the GI bill. At the end of July there were 329,000 still in training. No such training was available for World War I veterans, when a shabby job-training course, for the disabled only, got under way slowly.

GI bill training came under Public Law 346. In addition to the millions of World War II vets who trained for civilian pursuits under the GI bill, the war-disabled of World War II had a specialized rehabilitation program of their own. It came under Public Law 16, which was 11 years old last March 24. A total of 602,000 war-disabled World War II vets had been trained for jobs in spite of their handicaps by then, bringing to nearly 8½ million the number of World War II vets who got training for civilian life under veterans' readjustment programs.

The success of World War II vets under the GI bill cannot be separated from the general prosperity of the last 10 years.

Conceivably, economic chaos could have followed the turning loose from the Armed Forces of 14 million men and women, if they had been demobilized on the you're-on-your-own basis of World War I. Even today, the spiraling buying power of veterans, chiefly due to their GI bill training, is a large part of our expanded economy.

At the moment they were discharged, most World War II vets were as unemployed as if they had been laid off by a factory. Some, chiefly the older ones, returned to former jobs. Others, along with war-industry workers, found jobs in the postwar-housing boom, when millions of houses were bought with GI mortgages. The construction boom worked backward, creating employment in the materials and related industries.

The veterans had thousands of wants besides a need for housing when they were discharged.

The World War I vets had had the same wants, but with $60 discharge pay thousands of World War I vets faced an immediate financial crisis in 1919. Their buying power was low.

The national economy was more responsive to the needs of the World War II vets. The vast majority of them got mustering-out pay running into several hundred dollars. This amounted to several billion dollars of immediate buying power. Though it never got the name, mustering-out pay was equivalent to the bonus. It was paid at the right time to serve as readjustment pay, rather than to bail ex-servicemen out of hock several years later. By translating veterans' wants into immediate buying power, mustering-out pay helped the uninterrupted expansion of the postwar economy.

The Legion at first planned mustering-out pay as a part of the GI bill. However, it was separated from the big bill and authorized as additional military pay by Congress somewhat earlier. In 1943, many veterans who had already been discharged were making a tough readjustment. Congress rushed mustering-out pay without waiting to debate the rest of the GI bill after the Legion presented thousands of case histories of early dischargees who needed immediate help.

Under the GI bill, the need to tide veterans over the period between discharge and reemployment was also met by 52–20—the provision whereby veterans who could not find work right away would get $20 a week for a maximum of 52 weeks, while out of work.

After World War I, the period of changing over had proved a very dangerous one for the discharged veterans, just as being summarily fired from a job throws anyone into a temporary crisis which can easily become permanent. The need to keep alive places him in a disadvantageous position in the job market.

Ten months after World War I ended, in September 1919, the infant Legion of those days was struggling with the problem of getting World War I vets started in jobs again. Marquis James, in a series of explosive articles in the first issues of this magazine, quoted a letter he had received from "the largest woman's war-aid organization in the United States," asking that the Government do something to get the recently discharged veterans on their feet again. "Daily, men * * * come to our headquarters asking for money, food, clothing, work, or any sort of help we can give. * * * The type of man who comes to us is not a beggar. * * * Usually he is simply asking for a job. * * * Our advice to him is to consult the Government employment bureau. * * * Repeatedly the men complain that they have consulted various Government bureaus, which delay so long in acting * * * that they lose hope completely." The 52–20 provision of the GI bill was an absolute guaranty that in 1946–47 jobless vetes wouldn't be driven to charities for life's wants.

In 1943–44, the 52–20 program was hotly opposed as a handout. But the World War I Legionnaires who had been through the mill insisted on its passage even though, for a time, it placed the whole GI bill in political jeopardy. As far as its effect on the postwar boom is concerned, 52–20 guaranteed that the buying power of every veteran (and now there were four times as many) would be maintained on the subsistence level at least.

In the end, a total of 9 million, out of 16 million World War II vets, had occasion to claim 52–20 benefits. They used that benefit for an average of 17.2 of the 52 weeks of eligibility. Less than a fifth of the potential 52–20 benefits were claimed, and these amounted to slightly less than $3½ billion, which were provided to jobless veterans between 1944 and 1949. That sum went into the postwar boom as added buying power.

Other aspects of the GI bill also forestalled the possibility of widespread unemployment when 14 million veterans were demobilized. One of these was a byproduct of the GI educational programs. Millions of veterans who might have competed in the job market in such disjointed times were enabled to go to school. There, with their educational allowances, they remained in the buying market while they did not compete for jobs. Two and a half million veterans were taking courses at one time, in December 1947.

Never, in the space of a single year, had so many men and women in the United States ended their jobs as in the 12-month period beginning with VJ-day in 1945. In that period, the Army and Navy alone laid off 9,387,307 servicemen. At the same time, tens of millions of war-industry workers sought peacetime jobs. The monstrous disturbance of persons in employment was by far the greatest in the Nation's history, yet it went off smoothly.

By comparison, the 1929 depression was puny. After the worst 4 years of that depression, unemployment stood at 11 million in 1933, or 3 million less than the total World War II demobilization alone. Yet the postwar period, which also included the shift of millions of war-industry workers, was a changeover and not a depression.

Without a constructive readjustment program such as the GI bill, the condition of the World War II vets could conceivably have been infinitely worse than that of the World War I vets. There were four times as many veterans of the second war and, on the average, they had been in the military for a much longer period of time. The opportunity for chaos for the veterans and the Nation was vastly greater. But no comparison of the evils of demobilization is possible between the two wars. Those of World War I are known, and make a sorry chapter in our history. The potential for evil days following World War II never materialized, for the GI bill successfully answered the major lessons taught by World War I.

In the test of 10 years, the GI bill (1) avoided the mistakes of the First World War, (2) gave the World War II veterans a firm economic foothold in the postwar civilian life, and (3) spared us the potential chaos of our hugest demobilization in history.

Those three achievements, as Harry Colmery stated in 1944, were the exact aims of the bill. Colmery, a past national commander of the American Legion, was a member of the special legion committee that wrote the GI bill and shepherded it through the Congress. When, in a concerted month of activity, the special legion committee had drafted the bill and presented it to Congress, Colmery explained the bill in these words:

"Never again do we want to see the honor and glory of our Nation fade to the extent that her men of arms, with despondent heart and palsied limb, totter from door to door, bowing their souls to the frozen bosom of reluctant charity.

"The American Legion proposed this bill first because we believed it to be the duty, the responsibility and the desire of our grateful people to see to it that those who served actively in the armed services in this war not only should not be penalized as a result of their war service, but also that upon their return to civil life they should be aided in reaching that position which they might normally have expected to achieve had the war not interrupted their careers.

"And second, we urge its enactment as sound national policy for the good of the Nation."

The special GI bill committee had been authorized by the Legion national convention of 1943. National Commander Warren Atherton appointed the committee, with former Governor of Illinois John Stelle as chairman, in November of 1943. The committee met in Washington early in December and placed the original draft before Congress on January 10, 1944. The passage of the bill in a 5-month drama that puts fiction to shame, was told serially in this magazine in September, October, and November 1949—as seen by Hearst correspondent David Camelon.

President Franklin D. Roosevelt signed the bill on June 22, 1944. It was the first law ever passed by the United States to provide a program of readjustment for civilian life for any war veterans except for those disabled.

When Public Law 550 for Korea veterans was passed, the new concept had become the accepted thing. Modeled after the GI bill, with changes born out of experience, the Korea GI bill became law almost as a matter of course.

Luckily for the veterans of World War II and Korea, veterans of World War I were at an age of vigorous national leadership when World War II came along. The GI bill could not have been written by men who had not been through the mill. And in the field of veterans' legislation it represents the pinnacle of considered thought on the problems of demobilization of wartime Armed Forces.

Geza Mihalotzy: American Hero

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 19, 1954

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith a statement on Col. Geza Mihalotzy, written and compiled by John C. Sciranka, American Slovak journalist:

COL. GEZA MIHALOTZY: NINETIETH ANNIVERSARY OF HIS HEROIC DEATH OBSERVED BY THE AMERICAN FRIENDS OF SLOVAK FREEDOM

On March 11, we paused as Americans paid tribute to a hero who played an important part during the Civil War. He is Col. Geza Mihalotzy, born in Hungary of Slovak parentage in the county of Zemplin, the same county that was also the birthplace of famous Louis Kossuth and Joseph Pulitzer, great American newspapermen. Colonel Mihalotzy was mortally wounded on March 11, 1864, and March 11 marks the 90th anniversary of his heroic death.

Colonel Mihalotzy escaped his native country after a revolution of the serfs and after many obstacles came to United States. He was an able organizer and on February 4, 1861, sent this petition from Chicago, Ill., to President-elect Abraham Lincoln:

"To the Honorable A. LINCOLN.

"DEAR SIR: We have organized a company of militia in this city composed of men of Hungarian, Bohemian, and Slavonic origin. Being the first company formed in the United States of said nationalities, we respectfully ask leave of Your Excellency, to entitle ourselves 'Lincoln Riflemen of Slavonic Origin.'

"If you will kindly sanction our use of your name, we will endeavor to do honor to it, wherever we may be called to perform active service.

"Respectfully in behalf of the company,

"GEZA MIHALOTZY, *Captain.*"

To this petition the Great Emancipator, President Lincoln, penned this approval:

"I cheerfully grant the request above made."

(The letter is from the Hertz A. Lincoln Collection, Congressional Library, Washington, D. C.)

It is interesting to note in connection with the above letter that a few days after his answer to the above-mentioned letter, Lincoln left Springfield, Ill., for Washington for his inauguration. Even at that time it was known that the Southern States wanted to secede from the whole; South Carolina had already seceded in December, and after her, there was to be formed an independent federacy with six other States.

There were no open hostilities as was observed by historians, since the cannons of Fort Sumpter at Charleston thundered later, the 14th of April, but Geza Mihalotzy and his Hungarian, Bohemian, and Slovak compatriots even then had organized volunteers among whom were the following whose names have been preserved: Geza Mihalotzy, Julius Kuna, Gustav Kovac, Sandor Jekelfalussy, Frank Langfeld, and Joseph Kis. That was the first volunteer company in America composed solely of immigrants. This company later gave rise to the 24th Régiment of Illinois Militia. Mihalotzy became its colonel and on March 11, 1864, he fell in a battle near Chattanooga, Tenn. And Fort Chattanooga is often mentioned as Fort Mihalitzy in older histories.

Rev. John Porubsky, noted American Slovak historian who died a year ago in Scranton, Pa., mentions in his writings that President Lincoln had previous connections with the Slovaks of Illinois, especially Chicago. It is certain that Julius Kuna often conversed with the Great Emancipator. Stachel Szamvald from the county of Spis, Slovakia, was in the immediate vicinity when Lincoln gave his historical Gettysburg address. Later Stachel was made a general and even received the Congressional Medal of Honor. No doubt that Slovaks and other Slavs were in the majority in Lincoln's Riflemen, since they chose the name "Lincoln Riflemen of Slavonic Origin." And please, let us remember that this happened in 1861.

Now let us look at the volumes of War of Rebellion, Official Records of the Union and Confederate Armies. Volume 32, page 102, contains a letter written by Colonel Mihalotzy to the general of his brigade. It is headed this way: "Headquarters, 24th Regiment, Illinois Volunteer Infantry, Chattanooga, Tenn., January 24, 1864." The letter is about 2 pages and is signed, "G. Mihalotzy, colonel, 24th Regiment, Illinois Volunteer Infantry, Commanding Expedition, Maj. Gen. J. M. Palmer, commanding 14th Corps." Colonel Mihalotzy is mentioned in volume 3, page 45; volume 10, pages 47–49; volume 16, page 637; volume 23, pages 411, 438; Second Brigade, volume 30, part 3, page 273; volume 31, part 2, page 791; volume 31, part 3, page 554.

Colonel Mihalotzy came to Chicago after the collapse of a revolution in his homeland in 1848. He enlisted in 1861 in the 124th Illinois Volunteers (first Hecker Regiment), and on the resignation of Colonel Hecker, a few weeks later he was promoted to the colonelcy. "A trained soldier, he served with gallantry and distinction but was fatally wounded at Buzzard's Roost February 24, 1864, dying at Chattanooga March 11, 1864." (This sketch was copied from the Historical Encyclopedia of Illinois by Newton Bateman, LL. D., and others, volume 1, page 374, Chicago, Ill., 1926.)

The following item was copied from the War of the Rebellion, Official Records of the Union and Confederate Armies, series 1, volume 32, part 1, reports, page 453: "About 12 o'clock at night (February 25, 1864) the rebel pickets advanced and there was considerable firing, in which some men were killed and wounded. Among the later was Col. Geza Mihalotzy, the gallant colonel of the 24th Illinois. I regret to report that he has since died.

"Very respectfully,

"R. W. JOHNSON,
"*Brigadier General, Commanding Division.*
"MAJ. D. W. NORTON,
"*Acting Assistant Adjutant General.*"

In a letter in regard to the Chickamagua campaign we have the following paragraph:

"Commanding officers, Cols. H. A. Hambright and G. Mihalotzy, Lt. Cols. G. B. Bingham and H. C. Hobart, and Lt. David Flansburg, with their staff officers, are entitled to great praise for their coolness and bravery exhibited during these protracted engagements.

"JOHN C. STARWEATHER,
"*Brigadier General, Commanding.*
"CAPT. B. H. POLK,
"*Assistant Adjutant General, First Division.*"

(Copies from the War of the Rebellion, Official Records of the Union and Confederate Armies, series 1, volume 30, pt. 1, p. 302.)

In all the official records of these volumes, Col. Geza Mihalotzy is mentioned as colonel of the 24th Illinois Regiment, therefore the statement in his obituary copied from the Illinois Encyclopedia in which he was mentioned colonel of the 124th Regiment is incorrect, for the official records must be right.

Col. Geza Mihalotzy is buried at the National Cemetery, Chattanooga, Tenn., in section A, grave No. 439.

On the 90th anniversary of the heroic death of this great soldier of Slovakian parentage, born and educated in Hungary, we think of his enslaved compatriots in Czechoslovakia and Hungary, who need today men of courage like Col. Geza Mihalotzy.

And in this great land of opportunity and freedom, when we pause to pay our tribute to Colonel Mihalotzy, we are reminded of another colonel, the Honorable John Slezak, also born of Slovak parentage in his native country, which was then Hungary, who came to this country at the age of 18, who enlisted in World War I as private and during World War II served as colonel and whom President Eisenhower appointed last April to the office of United States Assistant Secretary of the Army and elevated him last January to the office of Under Secretary of the Army. Col. John Slezak comes from the State of Illinois, the town of Sycamore, where he is loved and respected. It is men like Colonels Mihalotzy and Slezak who will guard this Nation against its enemies and see that the Government of the people, for the people, and by the people will not perish from this earth.

(The above facts and data were written and compiled by John C. Sciranka, American Slovak journalist and editor of the American Friends of Slovak Freedom of 218 Brook Avenue, Passaic, N. J.)

The Segregation Decision

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 24, 1954

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial by H. B. Snyder, of the Gary Post-Tribune, sets out some very sensible thoughts regarding the recent Supreme Court decision against segregation.

It is now time for the whole country to realize that this long-delayed decision again reestablishes in the minds of everybody all basic provisions in our Constitution:

THE COURT BARS SEGREGATION

With all the progress in recent years toward wiping out the color line, no other Supreme Court decision on segregation was conceivable. This is proved by the unanimity of the Court. When the nine judges had to take a stand before the American people they could stand only against segregation.

Throughout the North, of course, the public reaction could have been announced in advance. The North has been getting ready for the decision for the last decade and only in spots is there must to do about putting Negro and white children on an unsegregated educational standard. In Gary, where, on a percentage population basis, the situation is akin to the situation in southern cities, the job is complete.

During this same decade the South has made great advances in its handling of the Negro problem. Everywhere an effort has been made to improve Negro schools, often with the intention of providing facilities equal to white schools. But the South has never realized it could not solve its racial problem without ending segregation in the schools.

The basis for this situation is not in the desire of the Negro to force the white man to live next door to him or to intermarry with him, but simply in the belief that education is the fundamental basis on which democracy is built and that the Negro's education must equal the white man's if he is to be equal to the white man as a citizen and competitor.

From the start the Negro has understood that his education could not equal the white man's as long as he was set aside in a separate school and thereby considered a lower type human being. True education is not a mechanical process, it is a freeing and flowering of the human spirit. Every child in America is entitled to the opportunity of a true education.

Now the South is faced with the need of working out a solution of the edict of the Supreme Court, of doing what it has been insisting it would never do. The problem forms its biggest crisis since the Civil War. It is being met by foolish or restrained statements by governors and others, but most statements are much more restrained than those made before the Court's decision was announced.

The South will not rebel. Gradually, we have no doubt, it will carry out the national law because antisegregation in education is now the law. But the job is a terrific one. It involves not only ways of life, century-long projudices, honest beliefs in the superiority of the white race in many cases, memories of slavery and the social gulf between the races, but tremendous money costs as well.

The North must understand the mental and moral and spiritual struggle the South faces and it must not expect more than human nature can produce. Furthermore those organizations which have fought this issue to a conclusion and particularly those individuals who have led the fight should not repeat the sorry mistakes of the North at the end of the Civil War.

This is not a fight of one section against another. It is an action towards the settlement of an issue in which one section for no fault of the people living in it, is not as advanced as the other. They need time to catch up. Given time, we have no doubt they will adjust their thinking and lives to the new day. They are Americans and they will not stand against destiny.

George H. Todt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1954

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, Mr. George H. Todt, a constituent of the 24th Congressional District of California, has been honored with two very significant awards.

In a ceremony at the St. Francis Hotel in San Francisco, Calif., Mr. Manfred U. Prescott, president general of the Sons of the American Revolution, awarded Mr. Todt the national organization's good citizenship medal. Mr. Todt was also presented the award of appreciation of the California department of Veterans of Foreign Wars by Mr. Anthony R. Nagy, senior vice commander of department of California, in a recent ceremony at the National Broadcasting Studios in Hollywood, Calif.

The awards were presented to Mr. Todt in recognition of his outstanding contribution to the cause of Americanism through his unceasing efforts to alert the people to the constant menace of communism and his organization of an effective plan to rid the country of the Red peril, as exemplified by his news column carried in the Highland Park News-Herald, and his television program over KNBH, both titled "In My Opinion."

As the Representative of the 24th Congressional District, I am happy to join in congratulating George Todt on these awards and to commend him for his active work in the fight against communism.

The Bryson Bill, H. R. 1227

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1954

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the Appendix of the Record a petition concerning the Bryson bill, H. R. 1227. The petition follows:

We, the undersigned, believing that the cause of total abstinence can be served by the reduction of advertising of alcoholic beverages over radio and television, urge that our congressional Representatives insist on getting a hearing and voting for the Bryson bill, H. R. 1227, which would prohibit the transportation in interstate commerce of alcoholic beverages advertising in newspapers, periodicals, and its broadcasting over radio and TV. Also to present the petitions to the House and to have a note made of them in the Congressional Rerord:

Mrs. O. E. Kirby, Jasper, Ala.; Mrs. Merwin Koonce, Florence, Ala.; Mrs. T. B. Jardan, Piedmont, Ala.; Mrs. N. K. Grimes, Birmingham, Ala.; Mrs. W. S. Welch, Lakewood Estates, Bessemer, Ala.; Mrs. Jesse C. Smith, Birmingham, Ala.; Mrs. J. M. Plant, Birmingham, Ala.; Mrs. Dwight L. Evans, Anniston, Ala.; Mrs. R. A. Clark, Jr., Sheffield, Ala.; Mrs. Frank Hornsby, Roanoke, Ala.; Mrs. E. H. Blankenship, Tuscumbia, Ala.; Mrs. Victor H. Wood, Mrs. Hosea Hester, Russellville, Ala.; Mrs. W. A. Finley, Mrs. W. D. Boling, Cherokee, Ala.; Mrs. C. L. Frederick, Mrs. R. M. Biggers, Mrs. Ralph S. Smith, Martha D. Almon, Mrs. B. F. O'Steen, Jr., Florence, Ala.; Mrs. Lee R. Harris, Haleyville, Ala.; Mrs. C. R. Wells, Spruce Pine, Ala.; Mrs. John I. Thomas, Mrs. James E. Rice, Mrs. J. S. Rhodes, Sr., Mary Ellen Pruitt, Mrs. Rivers Lindsey, Sr., Florence, Ala.; Mrs. Sam Capps, Jr., Gadsden, Ala.; Mrs. A. H. Trotter, Cedar Bluff, Ala.; Mrs. J. Olens Jordan, Centre, Ala.; Mrs. Roy P. Brown, Sr., Gadsden, Ala.; Mrs. Joe Roberts, Collinsville, Ala.; Mrs. Hubert Stewart, Gadsden, Ala.; Mrs. G. W. Simpson, Alabaster, Ala.; Mrs. R. A. Jones, Ethelsville, Ala.; Mrs. L. C. Cash, Tuscaloosa, Ala.; Mrs. R. D. Cook, Mrs. L. M. Comer, Northport, Ala.; Mrs. Annie Price, Gordo, Ala.; Mrs. Wilburn Christian, Cokes, Ala.; Mrs. Jesse F. Peck, Sr., Tuscaloosa, Ala.; Mrs. E. P. Randle, Sr.; Mrs. P. W. Peeler, Mrs. H. E. Monroe, Huntsville, Ala.; Mrs. Olin Storey, Birmingham, Ala.

Mrs. George W. Floyd, Alabama City, Ala.; Mrs. B. Guy Smith, Birmingham, Ala.; Mrs. C. E. Chesnut, Gaylesville, Ala.; Mrs. Bruce Henderson, Gaylesville, Ala.; Mrs. S. R. Towns, Helena, Ala.; Miss Alice Bulter, Miss Zora Dunaway, Pelham, Ala.; Mrs. Paul Burkhalter, Birmingham, Ala.; Mrs. A. E. Burnett, Gorgas, Ala.; Mrs. C. L. Ellis, Cordora, Ala.; Mrs. Dan Robins, Jasper, Ala.; Mrs. R. E. Falkner, Vernon, Ala.; Mrs. J. H. Green, Gorgas, Ala.; Mrs. Henry H. Gary, Mrs. A. C. Bostick, Winfield, Ala.; Mrs. K. L. Hollis, Sulligent, Ala.; Mrs. C. H. Moresncon, Waverly, Ala.; Mrs. T. H. Wilson, Cottondale, Ala.; Mrs. Oliver Sanford, Sr., Dadeville, Ala.; Mrs. Homer Harper, Mrs. Mary Jym Hart, Mrs. Fred Hodges, Roanoke, Ala.; Mrs. Aubrey Lowe, Reform, Ala.; Mrs. Hillman Atkins, Mrs. D. H. Burns, Ethelville, Ala.; Mrs. J. W. Graham, Gordo, Ala.; Mrs. H. L. Farr, Tuscaloosa, Ala.; Mrs. J. K. Brown, Fayette, Ala.; Mrs. Wallace S. Kirksey, Aliceville, Ala.; Mrs. R. B. Davidson, Helena, Ala.; Mrs. L. E. Ford, Cottondale, Ala.; Mrs. L. B. Louor, Fayette, Ala.; Mrs. J. O. Sims, Tuscaloosa, Ala.; Miss Alice Price, Woodstock, Ala.; T. H. Wilson, Cottondale, Ala.; B. A. Broadwell, Mrs. H. P. Park, Mrs. C. E. Ross, Mrs. Gordon Davis, Tuscaloosa, Ala.; Mrs. Lewis Chapman, Eutaw, Ala.

Mrs. R. M. Howell, L. Wilkie Collins, Birmingham, Ala.; Mrs. O. D. Thomas, Tuscaloosa, Ala.; Mrs. L. L. Jackson, Birmingham, Ala.; Mrs. B. D. Peck, Athens, Ala.; Mrs. Walter W. Pearson, Tuscaloosa, Ala.; Mrs. W. T. Waites, Mrs. C. F. Guthrie, Birmingham Ala.; Mrs. E. K. Tyler, Palmerdale, Ala.; Mrs. P. P. Scott, Mrs. H. L. Raddam, Pinson, Ala.; Mrs. Tressie Pearson, Bradford, Ala.; Mrs. Woodrow Ledbetter, Sycamore, Ala.; Mrs. Earl Collins, Sylacauga, Ala.; Mrs. Dean Walker, Oxford, Ala.; Mrs. M. H. Harper, Eulaton, Ala.; Mrs. A. T. Stovall, Alexandria, Ala.; Mrs. J. C. A. Hamilton, Anniston, Ala.; Bessie A. Lee, Jacksonville, Ala.; Mrs. Frank Nichols, Piedmont, Ala.; Mrs. Mattie Lovell, Eden, Ala.; Mrs. J. A. Hardin, Anniston, Ala.; Mrs. J. E. Powell, Coldwater, Ala.; Mrs. Terry Barnett, Mrs. Ruth Davis, Bessemer, Ala.; Mrs. Stephen Moreno, Mrs. W. M. Barksdale, Mrs. M. G. Deshago, Mrs. Forrest Slater, Birmingham, Ala.; Mrs. L. M. Hames, Adamsville, Ala.; Mrs. O. I. Smith, Mrs. C. G. Price, Birmingham, Ala.; Mrs. Blanche Bradley, Docena, Ala.; Mrs. E. S. Butterley, Bessemer, Ala.

Mrs. Roland E. Echols, Mrs. M. M. Giles, Mrs. Sellers Stough, Mrs. Harry E. McNeil, Mrs. W. G. Groves, Mrs. Horace J. Menk, Birmingham, Ala.; Miss Mary Jane Baxter, Huntsville, Ala.; Miss Kate Malcolm, Mrs. W. W. Walker, Mrs. L. S. Montgomery, Mrs. Guy A. Foster, Mrs. S. L. Peavy, Birmingham, Ala.; Mrs. C. C. Gregg, Elkmont, Ala.; Mrs. Roy Whitt, Mrs. Tom Strain, Athens, Ala.; Mrs. Leonard Moody, Mrs. Russell B. Johnson, Decatur, Ala.; Miss Carolyn Teague, Mrs. W. V. Pattille, Decatur district president, Mrs. W. E. Proctor, Hartselle, Ala.; Mrs. C. P. Johnston, Somerville, Ala.; Mrs. L. L. McCulloch, Decatur, Ala.; Mrs. W. C. Quattlebaum, Mrs. Hobart D. Warren, Mrs. C. H. Thegpen, Mrs. W. M. Gantt, Hanceville, Ala.; Mrs. H. J. Saenger, O. G. Waid, Mrs. O. G. Waid, Mrs. H. H. Blankenship, Mrs. C. C. Darcey, Tuscaloosa, Ala.

Amendments to Social-Security Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1954

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, the Ways and Means Committee is working on amendments to the social-security program. Today, I requested that the committee give serious consideration to protecting the retirement systems now in effect in Ohio, which include policemen, firemen, public officials, school teachers, and others. I firmly believe the Federal Government should not interfere with present retirement programs.

I am wondering what will hapen to the teachers' retirement fund in Ohio. We do not want to jeopardize this group by forcing them under Federal regulations and denying them their rights under their own retirement system. This same applies to police and firemen, and other employees covered under State and municipal plans.

The Latin Soviets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1954

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following article by Constantine Brown, from the Evening Star, Washington, D. C., Friday, May 21, 1954:

The Latin Soviets—Anti-American, Pro-Russian Coalition South of Border Seen a Possibility

(By Constantine Brown)

High-level discussions are now proceeding between Washington and the capitals of the friendly Central American Republics. The purpose is to find out what should be done to strengthen them militarily, since it has been officially ascertained that the U. S. S. R. is very busy in making Guatemala a dominating military power in Central America.

The Guatemalan Government has been under Soviet influence for some time. Soviet arms have been trickling to that country. The arrival of a 7,000-ton Swedish freighter from the Polish port of Stettin carrying heavy military equipment placed a different complexion on the situation, especially since intelligence reports indicated that other vessecretly in the past under the guise of agrisels had unloaded quantities of weapons cultural machinery.

Heretofore, the warnings that the Kremlin planned to sovietize Central America had been discounted by most Latin political leaders. These warnings were also taken with a grain of salt by some policymakers in Washington.

Yet the details of those plans can be found in the files of our political and military intelligence. They began in the late twenties when graduates of the Lenin school of propaganda were sent to Guatemala, Honduras, and Costa Rica to spread the Leninist gospel and create unrest and uprisings among the native masses.

But it was toward the end of the last war that Soviet agents under diplomatic cloak began large-scale operations, directed this time principally against the colossus of the north. Their work was done among the office-hungry politicians as well as among the masses. It was not confined to Central America alone. Soviet agents attempted also to undermine the United States in Argentina and Brazil as well, where top-ranking Red agitators had the freedom of the land because they were our allies.

It was in the late forties that the plot to create a strong pro-Soviet union in America's backyard took definite shape. The principal operator was Russia's Ambassador Konstantin Oumansky, an NKVD official. Oumansky had been responsible for the creation of a number of important Communist cells in America while he was in Washington, first as counselor of the Soviet Embassy and later as Ambassador.

After the termination of Oumansky's subversive activities in this country he was sent for the same purpose as Ambassador to Mexico. There the Soviet Embassy became the center of all Communist intrigues in Latin and South America. It had a personnel of nearly 200 and reportedly vast quantities of gold. Special couriers carried it as diplomatic baggage to the Latin American Republics to be spent lavishly where it was most effective.

Oumansky was killed when his plane exploded in the air shortly after it took off from Mexico City. The real cause of that explosion has never been revealed. But there are some solid grounds to suspect that it was due to a bomb placed in the plane by Latin American patriots who feared the consequences of the Oumansky intrigues.

Guatemala was selected, reportedly in 1950, as the proving ground for the sovietization of Central America. Soviet agents from the U. S. S. R. and Europe found there a fertile ground to spread their doctrine of hate America and all she stands for. But these tools of the Red conspiracy realized that the diffusion of gold and the Marxist-Leninist doctrines never bring a free nation into Moscow's fold. Military power is needed. And since last year military equipment has been rushed in important quantities to that country.

According to military evaluations, the plans of Moscow are to make Guatemala the strongest military republic in the area. Thus she will be able to impose herself by force on all her neighbors in the south whose armies are just sufficient for internal police purposes. The plans go further, according to these evaluations. They intend to take advantage of the strong Communist element in Mexico and at a given time support materially a Red coup in that country.

The military plans seem to be to create first, by force if necessary, an anti-American, pro-Soviet coalition embracing all Central American Republics. In the event of a showdown between the Communist world and the United States, this coalition might assert its military force strongly enough to induce Mexico to join the union and threaten the southern borders of the United States.

This may appear fantastic at first glance. But we must remember that such a plan was formulated in Berlin during World War I. It existed to a more limited extent in World War II, when Tokyo intended to use the Japanese immigrant population in western Mexico for forays into the United States. The loyalty of the then Mexican Government frustrated Tokyo's intentions.

Communism has made important strides in Mexico, especially in the labor unions. It is a Mexican citizen, Lombardo Toledano, who is the voice of Moscow at all major labor conventions in Central and South America. To this must be added the unpleasant fact that America's prestige and popularity have diminished in the last few years in Latin America because we appeared to deal with Soviet aggressiveness from weakness instead of strength.

Elkins, Ark., High School

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES W. TRIMBLE

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1954

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, May 19, it was our happy privilege to have with us the graduating class of the Elkins, Ark., High School. Following are the members of the class:

Mart Patrick, Freddie Rogers, Jo Jones, Jack Ritter, Calvin Jones, Wade Blevins, Ralph Dudley, Harlan Aylor, Richard Nelsen, Bob Adams, Barbara Ann Draves, Sarijo Stokenbury, Alice Osburn, Janelle Gregg, Betty Lewis, Ann Price, Louise Tando, and Virginia Clark.

They were accompanied by J. David McCartney, superintendent of the Elkins schools, Miss Esther Harris, and Mrs. Grace Lawson.

They visited in the House Chamber; later saw both the House and Senate in session; visited the Supreme Court where they had luncheon in the Supreme Court cafeteria; made a boat trip down the Potomac River to Mount Vernon where they had a 2-hour visit at the home and grounds of our first President.

It is always an inspiration to have these young people with us—fine, clean, upstanding young folks who are a credit to this day and generation. It is good for them and for all the rest of us for them to come to Washington and to realize that they, too, are a part of this great Government of ours and are among the future leaders in business, agriculture, the professions, and government.

The Bryson Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1954

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, I have received many letters and petitions from my constituents in favor of the Bryson bill, which would place certain restrictions on the advertisement of alcoholic beverages. At their request, I would like at this time to insert these in the Record:

To Our Congressman:

We, the undersigned citizens of Virginia, in view of the appalling toll of murder on our highways called to our attention by the President, and of the recent frightening disclosures of the Senate hearing on juvenile delinquency, urgently beg you to remove unfair inducement to drivers to drink and the dangerous influence of sales talk for alcoholic beverages being channeled into our very homes over the air to the eyes and ears of our children by voting for and passing the Bryson bill, H. R. 1227:

H. E. Suddarth, Mr. and Mrs. M. G. Sanborn, Mrs. Cora E. Chittrem, Alexandria, Va.; Janet G. Eadie, Annadale, Va.; Mrs. Ann Osborne, Mrs. Baxter Blevins, Mr. and Mrs. John G. Kirby, Mr. and Mrs. Joseph W. Burvee, Elder and Mrs. Canada, Mrs. W. J. Palkinhen, Mrs. Hilton E. Suddarth, Jr., Mrs. D. S. Duvall, Mr. and Mrs. Paul Watson, Alexandria, Va.; Mr. and Mrs. L. H. Apilman, Falls Church, Va.; Mr. and Mrs. R. E. Rainwater, Arlington, Va.; Mr. Earl S. Ivan, Jr., Takoma Park, Md.; Mrs. J. Lee Price, J. Lee Price, Arlington, Va.; Earl Crell, Daisie E. Saufley, Mrs. Roland Smith, Sr., Alexandria, Va.; Henry A. Cheshire, Mr. and Mrs. Garrett Sanborn, Helen L. Manuel, Arlington, Va.; Mrs. R. L. Timmons, Alexandria, Va.; Earl S. Osborn, Arlington, Va.

Charlie Fry, Alexandria, Va.; Mrs. H. A. Cheshire, R. R. Sollenberger, Arlington, Va.; Roland B. Smith, P. A. Poling, Charlie Sanborn, Mrs. J. V. Johnson, Ethel Norton, Virginia Sublett, Arlene Pickering, Alexandria, Va.; Epelella Dinnriddie, Washington, D. C.; Eleanor B. Boley, B. V. Dean, W. N. Pickering, G. E. Hillie, Elizabeth Cheshire, Nettie Beach, Nina Neff, Julia Van Pelt, Merritt Semborn, Kelley Dove, Katie Dope, Lucille Fry, Mayme Taylor, R. N., Alexandria, Va.; Pearl Osborn, Arlington, Va.; Gladys Nealy, Alexandria, Va.; Louise Osborn, Takoma Park, Md.; Ira Padgott, Mrs. Olivia B. West, Alexandria, Va.; Mrs. C. L. Sullivan, Arlington, Va.

Ellen McGurgan, Kay Hinkle, Mrs. M. E. Hurtl, Maurice Hurtl, Mrs. Ella Love, Mrs. J. D. Wallace, Carrol Love, Mary Ruth Pack, Geraldine Hinkle, Alexandria, Va.; Rev. R. Lewis Adams, Fairfax County, Va.; Felix M. Pack, Jr., Jack D. Hiatt, Margie Payne, Perry J. Todd, Annie Sillex, Marvin W. Wampler, Norma D. Woods, Florence A. Price, Chloe Burns, Alexandria, Va.; Lloyd A. Meroney, Arlington, Va.; Agnes M. Reynard, Darrell D. Reynard, Helen Clause, J. A. Neal, Catherine Mitchell, Mrs. T. J. Decker, Miss Emolyn Decker, Mrs. Wm. Duppel, Alexandria, Va.

Rev. R. M. Price, Manassas, Va.; Pat McGurgan, Annandale, Va.; Wyoma L. Moffet, Harold S. Wolf, Pauline E. Kovach, Irene H. Peck, Mrs. Hazel Cantrell, Mrs. Robert Golladay, Samuel L. Jester, Mrs. Anne M. Purdy, Mr. and Mrs. Samuel L. Jester, Mr. and Mrs. Earl D. Smith, Alexandria, Va.; Edith P. Parker, Pershing Parker, Washington, D. C.; M. H. Gurn, Mrs. Lewis Adams, Mrs. Cecil Coffman, Mrs. H. A. Sweeney, Jr., Mr. Edward S. Lees, Mrs. Edward S. Lees, Mr. E. H. Childress, Mrs. E. H. Childress, Harry Williams, Mrs. H. E. Williams, Mrs. Gus Summers, Mrs. George A. Hinkle, Alexandria, Va.; John Meroney, Arlington, Va.; Evangeline Adams, Kenneth Phillips, Mrs. C. C. Monday, Alexandria, Va.; Della Berry, Fairfax, Va.

Mrs. L. Weinholdt, Milwaukee, Wis., Mrs. R. Weinholdt, Plover, Wis.; Ronald Dailey, Mrs. Blanche P. King, Arlington, Va.; Cpl. Paul Penie, Fort Belvoir, Va.; Bruce R. Graham, Norma Lee Graham, Easton, Md.; Betty C. Pittman, Mrs. Chas. Kovach, Mrs. Mattie Hill, Alexandria, Va.; Mrs. Lloyd Meroney, Arlington, Va.; Miss Betty Adams, Alexandria, Va.; Miss Jo Ann Meroney, Arlington, Va.; Jackie Dillon, Moody Berry, Alexandria, Va.

Mrs. D. L. Axtell, Mrs. H. B. Hodges, Mrs. Sara Black, Mrs. M. K. Holderman, D. L. Dalke, Mrs. D. L. Dalke, Mrs. Elizabeth Proctor, Mrs. R. K. Tyson, Mrs. W. F. Kesterson, Wilson D. Blount, Mrs. W. D. Blount, Mrs. Hasetter Fera, Mr. Wesley Clark, Mrs. W. J. Clark, Donald T. Black, Mrs. Merle G. Farence, Mrs. Ruth Stedman, Mrs. Caroline Crabill, Mrs. Ida Rogers, Mrs. Rolla Ompert, Mrs. E. Colman, Carrie Gee, Mrs. Ruth L. Holland, Mrs. R. E. Robertson, Roy E. Robertson, Lillie B. Stark, Mrs. J. P. Riddelle, Mr. John Gary, Mrs. Bessie Varny, Mrs. Maurice O. Crabill, Mr. and Mrs. C. Lee Bolton, Jr., Mrs. Betty Seemuller, Alexandria, Va.

Robert Booterbaugh, Clara Koch, Alexandria, Va.; A. D. Lowery, Mrs. A. Lowery, Springfield, Va.; Helen Kidwell, Myrtle Tschopp, William H. Koch, Priscilla Martin, Robert J. Kelly, Rev. Lewis W. Daist, M. O. Crabill, Alvan W. Clark, W. G. Olhm, Harry J. Leach, D. Lee Harris, R. K. Tyson, R. S. McGhee, W. B. Limerford, H. W. Gallaher, C. M. Woodley, Dorothy M. Woodley, Vance Steadman, John D. Wood, Jr., Bronson Procter, E. F. DeLand, Harry R. Boltwood, Russell F. Gearhart, Vera Gearhart, Goldie W. Larrison, L. S. Larrison, Mr. and Mrs. John York, Jr. and III, Mrs. C. L. Bolton, C. Turner, C. A. Woollum, Alexandria, Va.

R. B. Watts, C. M. McKarsie, M. L. Boltwood, Florence A. Norton, Chas. J. Ruylus, Mrs. C. J. Reighard, Mrs. J. H. Willett, Clara Clark, Lucy Payne, Pauline Causey, Bertie H. Gells, Victoria Embry, Mabel Spire, Virginia Durrett, Edna L. Hart, E. T. Carrey, W. T. Hicks, W. H. Bailey, Marie W. Wright, Grace B. Shockey, Pearl F. Harmon, Daisy F. Woods, Lula B. House, Mr. and Mrs. R. L. Sehoudt, Daisy F. Woods, Mary B. Abel, Mrs. D. Lee Harris, Mrs. Sallie C. Martin, Mrs. Mary Cary Waters, Mrs. H. A. Ziegler, Mrs. Ruby Parsons, Alexandria, Va.

Jessie Lee Clarke, Yvonne R. Copley, Barbara C. Gruver, Roberta Thomas, Esther G. McGrew, Carolyn W. Matthews, Anna R. Montgomery, Annie E. Wilkins, Corine V. Luka, M. Selma Schulze, Mrs. H. F. Squyres, Louise Marshall, Elizabeth W. Lake, Jean M. Gary, Irene Hendley, Norma Manville, Myrta Harper, Ethel H. Freeman, Mrs. Claudia Buckingham, Mrs. Gladys Campbell, Hazel Davis, Julia Coffey, Jura Weeks, Ruth Martin, Ida C. Dillaway, Gaylord C. Bowman, H. F. Squyes, C. P. Sheffield, Mrs. C. P. Sheffield, Mrs. Jack Zirkle, Mrs. G. Receveur, Mrs. Santiago Ortiz, Mrs. Francia G. Ortiz, Arlington, Va.

Horace R. Hood, Karen Hood, Marilyn Stephenson, Fairfax, Va.; Mrs. Wilson Campbell, Vienna, Va.; H. M. Stephenson, A. G. Stephenson, Lloyd Milliegan, Mrs. Homer Kidwell, Mrs. Margaret Faulkner, Mrs. Eunice Bryant, Mrs. Maxine Shenout, Mrs. E. M. Pinson, Mrs. James Hayes, Mrs. William L. Botts, Jr., Mrs. Dwight E. Nunn, Mrs. Margie Chappelle, Mrs. Claudia Thomas, Mrs. I. H. Prather, Fairfax, Va.; J. C. Mathias, Annandale, Va.; Mrs. J. A. Milstead, Arthur J. Conner, Jr., Samuel J. Coffey, Mrs. W. L. Scott, Fairfax, Va.; Ronald S. Clark, Derwood, Md.; Thelma P. Coffey, Fairfax, Va.

Doris J. Good, Eldrey Whaley, William L. Scott, H. R. Cupp, Mrs. Claude E. Riggles, Esther Good, Mrs. H. R. Cupp, Mrs. H. L. Jaynes, John F. Swart, Jr., Fairfax, Va.; Mrs. R. J. Urquhart, Mineral, Va.; Blair W. Cupp, Mrs. Dorothy Cupp, Claude A. Thompson, Reba Cupp, Fairfax, Va.; R. J. Urquhart, Mineral, Va.; Eleanor L. Chesley, Eudora W. Millegan, E. Virginia Carr, Grace A. Quarter, Dollie E. Smith, Mrs. Charles West, Mrs. Jas. Bohlken, Mrs. John L. Heckendorn, Mrs. Earl Emerson, Mrs. Frank W. Jones, Mrs. Mildred Pringle, Mrs. Mary L. Trenis, Fairfax, Va.; Mrs. Edna P. Teague, Falls Church, Va.; Mrs. Florence Whalen, Mary Moore Hughes, Mrs. Vance A. Myers, Mrs. Howard Stull, Mrs. Helen M. Lindsay, Mrs. Golde Williams, Mary L. Schana, Mrs. Raymond P. Ashman, Mrs. Clara Dennis, Winnie E. Sutherland, Esther D. Mosser, Fairfax, Va.; C. V. Taylor, Herndon, Va.; Virginia Organ, Fairfax, Va.

Remarkable Record of Religious Groups in Distributing American Surplus Foodstuffs for Relief Abroad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1954

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following report:

Religious Faith Groups Distribute 155 Million Pounds of United States Surplus Foods in Year—Handle 87 Percent of All Commodities Released by Government as Gift of American People to Needy Overseas—Thirty-seven Countries Share in $59,521,157 Shipments From Our Overabundance of Milk, Butter, and Cheese

More than 155 million pounds of United States surplus foods—given by the American people through their Government for free distribution to the destitute and hungry overseas—were distributed to these victims of war, famine, and disaster through agencies of Protestant, Roman Catholic, and Jewish faiths during the year ended April 30, 1954.

This surplus food—butter, cheese, and powdered milk valued at $52,226,015—represented more than 87 percent of all such surplus foods distributed abroad during the last year by all American voluntary relief agencies.

Of the remainder, 7.6 percent—13,660,000 pounds valued at $3,870,850—was distributed through the Cooperative for American Remittances to Everywhere, Inc. (CARE), and 5.3 percent—9,545,000 pounds valued at $3,424,292—through 8 other nonsectarian agencies.

This was made known today in the quarterly report to its membership by the American Council of Voluntary Agencies for Foreign Service, 20 West 40th Street, New York City, in which are represented 46 agencies for overseas relief and service registered and recognized by the United States Government.

Total of the surplus foods released by the United States Commodity Credit Corporation for free distribution during this period was slightly in excess of 179 million pounds, with a total value of $59,521,157.

Distribution of the large amounts of foodstuffs by the faith groups was through their existing overseas networks of relief personnel and associated religious agencies in 37 countries abroad, and was carried out, religious agency leaders here said, in addition to their on-going worldwide regular schedules of relief programs.

All handling costs of the "operation surplus," they said, were defrayed by voluntary contributions of their religious constituencies—in Protestant churches largely through the United Appeal and One Great Hour of Sharing, in the Roman Catholic church through the Bishops' Fund appeal, and through the United Jewish Appeal and other relief fund programs within the Jewish faith organizations.

Commenting on the surplus distribution by the American relief agencies, religious relief agency leaders pointed to its significance in view of pending legislation in the Congress looking forward toward a vastly increased program of disposal abroad of the Nation's huge stocks of over-abundant commodities.

Moses A. Leavitt, executive vice chairman of the American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee and chairman of the American Council of Voluntary Agencies, said:

"The successful pattern for free distribution of our surpluses, set by this experience, the careful carrying out of our programs in such manner as to preclude unfavorable effect on the economies of the recipient peoples, and the response of the American people, particularly through their religious institutions, to further this achievement of true compassion and brotherhood are guideposts clearly marking the way for the greatly enhanced free distribution of our surpluses now being contemplated by the Congress."

Msgr. Edward E. Swanstrom, executive director of War-Relief Services, National Catholic Welfare Conference, and vice chairman of the ACVA, said:

"The Catholic Church everywhere rejoices in the increased aid to the hungry and destitute of the world made possible through this use of our excess foods for free distribution in the areas of distress to those there without means to buy, without strength or opportunity to work and earn, victims of circumstance who must eventually perish unless they are ministered to by the more fortunate of the world.

"There can be little excuse for us, blessed by God with so much more of His produce than we can use, if we fail to share it with our starving and homeless brethren in every way possible, through our governmental as well as through our personal abilities."

Dr. Wynn C. Fairfield, executive director of Church World Service, interdenominational-relief arm of major Protestant churches, and honorary chairman of ACVA, said:

"This sharing of our overabundance with those in need abroad, motivated by the religious ideals upon which our Nation was founded, gives expression to the ever-present spirit of thanksgiving in the hearts of our people, their gratitude to their Creator for the great goodness He has shown them.

"It is highly gratifying that they have so pointedly chosen their religious agencies to implement so largely this sharing of their good fortune.

"While our main joy, as regards the surpluses, is that they greatly increase our opportunity to relieve the suffering of people, we also recognize the services those surpluses perform for world peace, identified as they are as the gifts of the American people—freely given, people to people, with no strings attached, and without cost or obligation to the governments of the nationals concerned.

"To a hungry man, woman, or child, a gift of food is a most practical and potent ambassador of good will."

Surplus commodity shipments made during the year by the agencies

	Dry milk	Butter	Cheese
Religious faith groups:	*Pounds*	*Pounds*	*Pounds*
American Friends Service Committee	2,395,000	595,000	800,000
American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee	315,880	516,000	278,000
Church World Service	18,449,000	4,485,560	1,732,300
Hadassah	4,000,000	18,251,000	7,161,000
Lutheran World Relief	12,935,000	3,600,000	1,550,000
Mennonite Central Committee	280,000	60,000	28,000
Unitarian Service	116,000		
War Relief Services	52,125,000	12,000,000	14,125,000
Total	90,615,880	39,507,560	25,674,300
Nonsectarian groups:			
American Friends of Austrian Children	80,000	460,000	80,000
American Middle East Relief	500,000	2,500,000	
American National Red Cross	1,200,000		
CARE	10,510,000	3,150,000	
Foster Parents' Plan for War Children	40,000	60,000	35,000
International Rescue Committee	2,630,000	1,150,000	300,000
Iran Foundation	380,000	60,000	
Save the Children Federation	40,000		
Tolstoy Foundation, Inc			30,000
Total	15,380,000	7,380,000	445,000
Grand total	105,995,880	46,887,560	26,119,300

Dollar value of commodities shipped, May 4, 1953, to May 1, 1954: Milk, $16,805,910.80; butter, $32,472,854.20; cheese, $10,242,392.50; total, $59,521,157.50 (based on Department of Agriculture figures).

Specifications for TVA Job

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS G. ABERNETHY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1954

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from a recent edition of the Evening Star:

SPECIFICATIONS FOR TVA JOB

President Eisenhower has written an exacting list of specifications for chairmanship of the Tennessee Valley Authority. The appointee, the President told a news conference, must be a man who is completely nonpolitical, who is professionally well qualified, whose integrity and probity are above reproach, and whose general philosophical approach to such undertakings as TVA agrees with that of the Chief Executive. Finding such a man, the President added, is a hard job.

The term of Gordon R. Clapp as TVA Chairman expired on Tuesday night, at which time he left the agency he had been serving since 1933. The TVA law specifically forbids appointment of officials on a political basis, and Mr. Clapp's confirmation as Chairman in 1947 came on a Senate vote that crossed party lines. Senator COOPER Kentucky Republican, who was paired in favor of Mr. Clapp's nomination in 1947, but who has opposed his reappointment this year, has said that the former Chairman kept himself "above partisan politics." Mr. Clapp's professional qualifications have not been challenged; neither have his integrity and probity. President Eisenhower told his news conference that all reports coming to him have been that Mr. Clapp operated as a very fine administrator and without any fear, favor, or affection.

There remains, however, the specification identified by President Eisenhower as the philosophical approach to TVA. The fact that Mr. Clapp has not been reappointed implies that his philosophical approach to such undertakings as TVA does not agree with that of the President. During the 1952 campaign General Eisenhower praised the accomplishments of TVA, but said it should not be considered "a rigid pattern for such developments in other regions." Last summer he referred to it as an example of "creeping socialism," but last fall he qualified this by saying he meant only certain features of TVA. Senator COOPER has criticized Mr. Clapp's "doctrinaire position" toward TVA. The oath taken by Mr. Clapp as Chairman, and required of any successor, includes a statement of belief in the "wisdom and feasibility" of the TVA project. Mr. Clapp often demonstrated his deep convictions about the "wisdom and feasibility" of TVA. President Eisenhower indeed is facing a hard job—as he said—in finding a Chairman to meet his specifications and, presumably, to match the standards already set by Mr. Clapp.

We're Imitating What We Oppose

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILL E. NEAL

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1954

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to include an article by Louis Bromfield:

WE'RE IMITATING WHAT WE OPPOSE

(By Louis Bromfield)

One of the dangers which always confronts a democracy in a struggle with some tyrannical form of government is that of picking up techniques and methods and general corruption from the enemy. This is not a new danger; the Greeks and Romans were in many ways corrupted by the manners and methods of the very people with whom they were at war or even conquered.

Almost without knowing it, we have acquired some of the evil techniques and methods of the Nazis, the Fascists, and of Communist Russia. One of the worst and dirtiest tricks is that described as conditioning or indoctrination.

Most of the propaganda, the near lies, the conditioning, the fear mongering, and the indoctrination with which the American people are belabored day after day come from the State Department and the Armed Forces. Indeed, millions of dollars have been spent by these agencies during the past few years simply in "selling a bill of goods" to the American people in order to induce them to follow and support the policies of a few men, not all of them by any means either scrupulous or able.

In all of this, the American press, save for a few rebellious examples, has played its part, sometimes willingly and deliberately and sometimes merely as a stooge. It has been consistently the victim not only of hundreds of thousands of tons of reports and mimeographed propaganda designed to indoctrinate the very taxpayers who were paying for it, but the press has suffered also from the blandishments of expensive cocktail parties, luxurious junkets and the flattery of being taken into the confidence of the Armed Forces and the State Department. Unfortunately this Nazi technique has frequently produced results.

One is tempted to place the blame for much of this situation upon the great number of generals and admirals installed throughout our Government in positions of great authority. Neither the German Government of the Kaiser, nor that of Hitler, nor that of Soviet Russia had or has today so many military and naval figures in positions of high authority and domination over the policies of Government of which the American people are frequently the victims. It should never be forgotten that the military brass is trained not for peace, but for war.

All this is a situation which affects gravely the future of the Republican Party. The bellicose declarations of Secretary of State Dulles and Admiral Radford and his belligerent friends among the Chiefs of Staff failed in the Indochinese situation, to meet the approval of the American people or of our allies.

There is a great deal of hubbub in certain circles in Washington and in the press about our allies letting us down. They have not let us down; they are merely showing some commonsense in the field of arriving at some kind of peace in the world. In the press, there have been the usual outcries from our more hysterical columnists working as stooges in the process of indoctrination, and almost daily there are, in what were once sober and honest newspapers, colored and slanted reports from Washington and foreign correspondents which make the papers of the late Mr. Hearst and of Colonel McCormick at their most violent seem objective and conservative.

The old trial-balloon technique was invented during the Roosevelt administration. Vice President Nixon's trial balloon about sending conscripted American boys to Indochina blew up in his face.

And let us never forget that the whole effort to saddle conscription or universal military service upon American young men as a permanent affair is borrowed straight from the totalitarian countries by the very military forces which today have infiltrated nearly all of our Government and surround President Eisenhower.

It is my guess that if the administration continues along its present course of intervention, aggression, conscripting Americans and sending them overseas to fight the battles of peoples who are not interested in fighting their own battles—even if it again brings up the subject of sending American conscripts to Indochina—the Republicans will have great difficulty in electing a single candidate to Congress next fall. The American people are far less hysterical than their Government and they are about fed up to the throat.

The Bryson Bill, H. R. 1227

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1954

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I have today filed a petition from Mrs. P. E. Decatur, president, Ashland, Ohio, WCTU, and one from residents of Stratford Community, Route 3, Delaware, Ohio, urging favorable support of the Bryson bill, H. R. 1227, to prohibit the transportation in interstate commerce of alcoholic beverage advertising in newspapers, periodicals, and so forth and its broadcasting over radio and television.

The petitions follow:

Stratford Community,
Delaware, Ohio, May 19, 1954.

Hon. J. Harry McGregor.

Dear Sir: We, the undersigned residents of this community, desire to urge you to use your influence in favor of the bill to ban liquor advertising on the television and radio as is numbered H. R. 1227, and is called the Bryson bill.

We want this petition taken to the House and have a note made of it in the Congressional Record.

William E. Smith, Mrs. Martha Swartz, Ralph W. Humes, Pearl M. Humes, Merl M. McKee, Mrs. Merl McKee, Mrs. Virginia Webb, Mrs. Howard Fisher, Mrs. Herman Stockdale, Mrs. Grace N. Jones, Mrs. Ward Simmons, Jean Matson, Edith Gutheil, Mr. Craig Beck, Mrs. John Breece, Mrs. Florence Breece, Arthur Swartz, Ward F. Simmons, Tillie Fathburckner, Anna M. Warden, Noel C. Allman, Noel Cunningham, Mrs. Noel Allman, Frank Swartz, Mrs. Frank Swartz.

Minnie Roloson, Mary Hall, Annabell Lindner, E. R. Cunningham, Mable Cunningham, F. J. Lindner, Nora Lindner, J. F. and Bessie E. Melson, Homer Trimmer, Jane Trimmer, Thurman Evans, Paul Winters, Mr. and Mrs. James Blinn, Mrs. Paul Winters, Mrs. Ray Curmitte, Mr. and Mrs. Robert Sealy, Mr. and Mrs. Glenn Sealy, Mrs. William Cox, Mrs. A. C. Farmer, Mrs. Russell Breece, Russell Breece.

Ashland, Ohio, *May 11, 1954.*

To Hon. Chauncey W. Reed, Chairman, and Members of the House Judiciary Committee:

We, the undersigned, petition that you and your committee vote favorably to get the bill introduced by Representative Hamer H. Budge, of Idaho, H. R. 8744, out of committee and onto the floor of the House for favorable consideration.

Mrs. Bertha Ledyard, Mrs. Jennie Boren, Mrs. Ethel Decatur, Mrs. Chlora Hazen, Mrs. Margaret DeLozier, Mrs. Hannah H. Newcomb, Mrs. Jennie McBride, Mrs. Winnie Smith, Mrs. Etta Hartsough, Mrs. Naida Keifling, Mrs. Eva Smith, Mrs. Anne Myers, Iva Mae Morr, Edna Riddle, Ashland, Ohio; Mary McLaughlin, Savannah, Ohio.

Maxine Ambrose, Mae M. Reaser, Bess Remy, Mrs. Emma A. Wriebigler, Mrs. Minnie A. Ryan, Ashland, Ohio; Florence E. Ewing, Mrs. Helen Davault, Mrs. Virga Neucomer, Mrs. Doris Weikel, Mrs. Hazel Batdorf, Mrs. Helen Ickes, Mrs. Mary Anderson, Mrs. Millicent Kyler, Mrs. Flo C. Lutz, Miss Flossie M. Ewing, Jeromesville, Ohio.

American Federation of Labor Proposals for Dealing With the Crisis in Asia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1954

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a clear and forthright statement adopted by the executive council of the American Federation of Labor at its meeting in Chicago, May 19, 1954:

THE CRISIS IN ASIA

Because some democratic powers have failed to recognize the real nature of the Chinese Communist dictatorship and its pivotal role in Moscow's drive for world domination, the international situation has deteriorated seriously in recent months. Furthermore, by discontinuing its immediate postwar policy of granting national independence and equal treatment to colonial peoples, the prestige and position of western democracy have been gravely weakened especially in Asia and Africa. Thus have the Communists been enabled to save their puppet regime in North Korea and to pervert the yearnings of the people of Indochina for national independence into a decisive phase of the Soviet campaign to conquer southeast Asia and dominate the world.

Against this background of events, must we now view the indecision and division in western diplomacy and Molotov's machinations and maneuvers at the Geneva Conference. Under these circumstances, the executive council of the A. F. of L. declares that the fate and freedom of Indochina are now the concern and responsibility not only of the Vietnamese, not only of France, or the United States, but of the entire free world, of liberty-loving people everywhere. Realizing the urgency of American initiative at this critical hour, we call upon our Government to be unsparing in its efforts to rally the greatest support of the Vietnamese people and secure the broadest collective international action for assuring the full national independence of Indochina and halting the tide of Commuist conquest. Towards thus furthering the cause of world peace and freedom, we suggest action by our Government along the following lines:

1. In view of the fact that, after the United Nations repelled Communist aggression in Korea, massive military support was rushed by the Moscow-Peiping axis from the Korean front to their Viet Minh puppets, there should immediately be convoked a special session of the United Nations General Assembly to mobilize maximum world support for ending the war in Indochina, safeguarding its national independence and territorial integrity and helping its reconstruction.

2. At this special session of the U. N. General Assembly, the United States representatives should insist on full application of the principle of free elections in Indochina—just as firmly as our Government has insisted on its genuine application in relation to Korea and Germany.

3. Within the provisions of the U. N. Charter for regional defense organizations, our Government should seek to build a Pacific alliance for peace and freedom which would include all freedom-loving peoples willing to join it.

4. America should likewise encourage and assist the free nations of Asia not yet ready to join the aforementioned alliance to develop their own effective resistance to Communist subversion of their democratic institutions and to organize united action to prevent Moscow-Peiping aggression against their national independence and territorial integrity.

5. Toward implementing the complete national sovereignty of the Vietnamese and toward proving that democracy and not communism can help them meet their needs, the United States and its democratic allies should give a practical demonstration of their sincere interest in the economic as well as political advancement of the people by transferring the foreign investment in Indochina (about $300 million) to the Vietnamese people as aid to the reconstruction of their war-ravaged land. Until such time as a democratically elected national government has been established, this transferred interest should be held in trust and administered by an International Commission representing Pakistan, Thailand, Burma, India, and the Philippines for the purpose of improving the working and living conditions of the people of Indochina.

6. Congress should grant President Eisenhower standby authority to take all measures he may require for helping to train a Vietnam National Army and build a Pacific alliance for peace and freedom strong enough to hasten the end of the war in Indochina, assure its national independence, and protect the free nations of Asia against further imperialist aggression and expansion by the Moscow-Peiping axis. In this connection, we emphasize that a strong united front of the democracies—demonstrated in immediate positive steps for collective action—would serve to improve the prospects of making the Soviet bloc less intransigent and thereby increase the likelihood of reasonable armistice terms. The policy of postponing until after the Geneva conclave, steps for attaining such collective action by the democracies only serves to encourage Soviet aggression and utterly unacceptable armistice terms in Indochina. The great task of the peaceful and freedom-loving nations is, therefore, to mobilize maximum military strength and insure the strongest resistance during the Geneva negotiations and not afterward when a reasonable negotiated settlement would no longer be possible because of allied weakness and disunity. We must not

lose sight of the fact that, given the present disarray in the democratic camp, the Communists are taking while the conferees are talking. History provides overwhelming proof that in dealing with totalitarian aggression—whether it be Nazi or Communist—democratic weakness and wavering breed war while democratic strength and united action block war. Fear of displeasing the Communist warlords during the Geneva Conference can lead only to disastrous appeasement, that is, to aggravating still more gravely the danger of a world conflagration.

7. Finally, we appeal to our Government to impress strongly upon France and Britain the urgency of learning from the costly experience in Indochina. Let our allies act now to break with their colonialist policies and practices—especially in Egypt, Morocco, and Tunisia—before the Communist agents of Soviet imperialism come into these crucial areas in full force to distort and destroy the national and democratic aspirations of these peoples. Once these peoples have gained their full national independence, equality, and democracy, they will have something really worthwhile to fight for and become our loyal allies in preventing another world war, preserving peace, and promoting freedom and social and economic progress.

Secretary Talbott Wages Good Fight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1954

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following article from the Army-Navy-Air Force Journal of May 8, 1954:

SECRETARY TALBOTT WAGES GOOD FIGHT

All of the services admire the persistence with which Secretary of the Air Force Harold E. Talbott has been carrying on the fight for a pay increase for military personnel. At a time when virtually all administrative leaders, except the redoubtable Assistant Secretary of Defense John A. Hannah, have ceased stressing the need for pay improvement, Mr. Talbott continues to carry on.

Furthermore, the Air Secretary has the facts and figures that make his arguments appealing. For example, he reported to the Secretary of Defense that the Government could save $100 million annually by a 10-percent increase in Air Force enlistments, and added that a pay raise would contribute to such a boost in reenlistments. In a subsequent address, Mr. Talbott proclaimed that current dissatisfaction among service personnel "comes from the fact that they believe their pay is not up to the standards of commerce and industry." With another increase for Government civilian employees in the offing, it is hard to brush off this argument.

That the administration has not encouraged a pay increase for its fighting services probably accounts for the slacking off of interest in other quarters. It also makes Secretary Talbott's persistence the more admirable.

Amendments to Social-Security Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1954

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, the Ways and Means Committee is now considering amendments to the social-security law. I have today asked them to carefully consider the provision making it mandatory for doctors, dentists, and farmers to participate in the social-security program.

In this free country of ours, I feel these people have the right to decide if they want to be covered by Federal social security, and not be forced by law to participate in a retirement program.

This is a free country. Let us keep it that way.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Printing and binding for Congress, when recommended to be done by the Committee on Printing of either House, shall be so recommended in a report containing an approximate estimate of the cost thereof, together with a statement from the Public Printer of estimated approximate cost of work previously ordered by Congress within the fiscal year (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 145, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on Printing, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

PRICE OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

The Public Printer is authorized to furnish to subscribers the daily Record at $1.50 per month, payable in advance.

Remit by money order payable to Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C.

PRINTING DOCUMENTS AND REPORTS

Documents and reports of committees with the evidence and papers submitted therewith, or any part thereof ordered printed by Congress, may be reprinted by the Public Printer on order of any Member of Congress or Delegate, on prepayment of the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 162, p. 1940).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized book dealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by book dealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

DISTRIBUTION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

To the Vice President and each Senator 100 copies; to the Secretary and Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, each, 25 copies; to the Secretary, for official use, not to exceed 35 copies; to the Sergeant at Arms, for use on the floor of the Senate, not to exceed 50 copies; to each Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress, 68 copies; to the Clerk, Sergeant at Arms, and Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives, each, 25 copies; to the Clerk, for official use, not to exceed 50 copies; and to the Doorkeeper, for use on the floor of the House of Representatives, not to exceed 75 copies; to the Vice President and each Senator, Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress there shall also be furnished (and shall not be transferable), 3 copies of the daily Record, of which 1 shall be delivered at his residence, 1 at his office, and 1 at the Capitol.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the Congressional Record, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the Congressional Record is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Frank Brodie is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the Record at $1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. The money derived from such sales shall be paid into the Treasury and accounted for in his annual report to Congress, and no sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

LE
a-
he
nt
st
er
of
to
ur-
er-
for
of
nd
ize
by
ov-
ov-
ons
nd-
re-
he
2a,

AL

tor
at
the
35
on
50
and
68
and
ves,
use,
por-
of
to
pre-
nis-
ur-
. 3
hall
fice,

ORD

nter
any
acts
rson
reof

n is
here
ring
for
per
be
the

n of
rint
the
Con-
ived
ens-
port
on
39).

Addr
ant
As

IN TH

Mr
20,
Adam
dresse
ton M
his ac
made
ing C
the F
lined
to ins
I a
dress
the F
Th
was o
as fo
The
dress
a fort
this n
of Bos
always
subur
cause
of pro
larges
indust
portur
and te
can m
chanc
been
and n
not o
standi
tues
This
many
streng
econo
backs
shoul
tation
I hol
prises
some
green
Engla
sough
thoug
to re
produ
sion
that
value
sets
closer
event
here
challe
busin
becau
and it

Appendix

Address by Hon. Sherman Adams, Assistant To the President, Before National Association of Cotton Manufacturers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. UPTON

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 25, 1954

Mr. UPTON. Mr. President, on May 20, 1954, the Honorable Sherman Adams, Assistant to the President, addressed the National Association of Cotton Manufacturers at Boston, Mass. In his address, he referred to the progress made by the administration in eliminating Communists and subversives from the Federal Government. He also outlined the program of the administration to insure internal security.

I ask unanimous consent that the address may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The privilege of being here today to address you provides a pleasant and, indeed, a fortunate occasion for me. First, because this meeting is in New England in the city of Boston which we in New Hampshire have always looked at as one of the important suburbs of the Granite State. Second, because this meeting commemorates a century of progress and success in what is still the largest, and in many respects, a flourishing industry in New England. It offers the opportunity to acknowledge publicly the zeal and tenacity of an ingenious body of American manufacturers. And third, it offers the chance to meet again many friends who have been steadfast to the ideals of their heritage and not the least of whom is one who I count not only as a friend, but the Nation's outstanding Governor who exemplifies the virtues of the truly dedicated public servant. This is an opportunity as well to speak to many old friends, many of whom have long strengthened the backbone of the national economy. I lay no claim to being a proficient backscratcher. Although believing that one should try to live up to the best in his reputation, I nevertheless will state a belief which I hold about many of you and your enterprises. There are among you those that at some time in their history might have found greener fields elsewhere than here in New England. There are those who might have sought other locations for advantages, even though trifling, which would have appeared to reduce the cost of manufacturing their product. Many of them made a cold decision about this opportunity. They decided that here in New England were even better values, not only sentimental, but real assets which were expressed in higher skills, closer cooperation, and greater promise of eventual success that made the opportunity here still the brighter, even though the more challenging one. You who conduct textile business in New England are here not simply because of sentiment of loyalty to a region and its human resources, but rather from the victory you wished to win, and could and did win, through your ingenuity, skill, and the dexterity of good management and applied commonsense. As New England has been an asset to you, so you have been a credit to New England.

Naturally, I have shared in the interest you have taken in this, continuing to make your enterprise a success. No governor worth his salt would have hesitated to lend his full influence to helping and encouraging you in any legitimate way he could. As you have so kindly mentioned, the situation in your industry did come up for the most careful study and discussion during the years when I was Governor of my State. You will not take it amiss, I am sure, if I tell you that occasionally I found a manufacturer who was skeptical, if not unfriendly, to any exhibition of political interest. There are those, though I could not immediately name them, who would be so selfish as to think simply of the dividends of such an effort upon his own political fortune. Yet, I will say that there were none with whom I worked but were genuinely motivated by the problems of economic stability and human welfare with which this industry is inextricably concerned. I have no doubt that some of that work and the diligent and selfless efforts of the committee headed by Seymour Harris did yield some good, though I am surprised that you would think so much value came of it. Surely, no partisan advantage was sought or gained, as you can well see from the ability to work together of such diverse political proponents as Paul Dever, Dennis Roberts, Fred Payne, and myself, for example.

It is, of course, some satisfaction to know that people can work together to report facts and opinions that are helpful to labor, to management, and to ownership, with a better understanding of the economic factors involved, as a source of ideas and plans upon which to make sound decisions for the future. The pessimist can sing the blues and dirges if he likes, but the realist, recognizing opportunities pointed out in such a report, cannot help but become an optimist. When, in addition, industry is so fortunate as to have a diligent, discerning National Association of Cotton Manufacturers as its champion, you cannot help having all the more heart for the future.

This association has a right to be proud of its claim as the oldest trade association in America. You were the first to carry out the revolutionary idea of bringing keen competitors together to pool their wits and to help each individual succeed by helping everybody succeed. In those days, it was quite a novelty to make a contribution to an organization which aimed to help your competitor. The more generally accepted goal was to find ways of cutting his throat.

A centennial is, of course, a fitting occasion for commendation and reminiscence, but your 100th anniversary is, as well, a mountain peak from which to take a long look ahead and to think about maintaining conditions that will promote both stability and progress which your successors can in turn celebrate on the 200th anniversary of this dynamic association in the year 2054. But to spend just a moment in looking backward, I am interested in a fact about your industry described in the census of 1860. That was the first census following your association's birthday. The chapter devoted to manufacturing says, "The growth of the culture and the manufacture of cotton in the United States constitutes the most striking feature of the industrial history of the last 50 years." Then it adds, "The average annual wage of each hand in New England was $205—the wages being upward of $9 greater than the average for the whole United States."

Then, as now, New England mills were able and did pay more to workers than anywhere else in the Nation.

Again looking back to the past century, I am impressed that the New England textile industry not only had the gumption to face and overcome obstacles, but also the good sense to junk old ideas and adopt new ones. They had the "git-up-and-go" trait that still characterizes the New England cotton industry.

Yankee ingenuity was born and thrived in your industry. When a British king banned from the colonies the knowledge of new manufacturing methods, it was a New Englander who outwitted the selfish monarch by reconstructing from memory an Arkwright power-driven spinning frame and started a surge of textile prosperity.

Your association proposed new methods in technical training of managers and operatives. You introduced statistical reporting on cotton manufacture. You supported better standards for industrial health and safety and other modern ideas which other sections copied and which improved conditions in the entire textile world.

Right here, somebody may want to stand up and make a speech. I can hear such a critic asking, "What about textile manufacturing as a declining industry, with old-fashioned management, moss-covered plants, and obsolete machinery?"

To my unenlightened friend, let me say that that mournful description might have hit the target in certain instances in these New England States a few years back. But such a target is harder to find now. During the postwar period, the New England cotton and fiber mills have spent about $185 million in modernization. This pace continues. I am told that it is 18 percent more per employee than all United States cotton and synthetic textile mills, and 37 percent more per employee than all New England manufacturing industries have spent.

As for management, an association of manufacturers that has survived a century of changing economic vicissitudes has now an unequaled backlog of experience, skill, and faith on which to rely in facing today's challenge.

These mills here in New England have passed through successive stages of adjustment not yet experienced by many of their competitors. Management has had to possess a lot more than pride and stubbornness to survive. With all of the handicaps and rising costs about which you know better than I, you have succeeded in the toughest competitive market in the world—and you will continue to succeed.

It wasn't the advantage of great natural resources, of patents, or monopoly or subsidy or any other privileged advantage that gave this industry in New England its longevity and its success. Rather, it was astute management, research, excellent fabrics, appealing styles, and aggressive merchandising. That kind of combination always wins for New England—brains, work, and guts.

As for any predicted decline in textile manufacturing, let us look at some facts rather than the fears of the jittery Jeremiahs who neither know the facts nor the progress nor the future promise that lie ahead of us. The fact is that the textile industry which processes and manufactures textile fibers for use in clothing and a great variety of merchandise is still the No. 1 industrial activity in New England. There are something like 125 cotton and synthetic fiber mills in this section, employing 65,000 men and women.

It is a growing industry. The consumption of cotton in the United States has increased 50 percent since 1933. The population of the United States, now over 162 million, is increasing approximately 2,700,000 annually. Each year new Americans require an additional 75.6 millions pounds of cotton. By 1960, only 6 years hence, our population will be up probably another 16 million and the demand for cotton will be over 450 million pounds a year. Somebody is going to make money producing and selling to that enormous new market. When any manufacturer feels down in the dumps, let him think about this growing market and make up his mind to go after a chunk of that business.

Before I turn to a discussion of quite a different problem on which I want to comment, permit me to offer a few suggestions.

First, insist that your association keep abreast of the times. This means, of course, your support of it—your contributions to its work. It means, too, holding it up to its traditional excellence—maintaining accurate information, market statistics, consumer demands, and a variety of indispensable information. This means as well, keeping informed of wage differentials, work-loads, the various elements of cost which are the criteria of your competitive advantage or disadvantage.

Second, keep vigilant to legislative trends and see to it that government—national, State, and local—is aware of the problems you face and the treatment accorded your industry is fair.

In this connection, may I refer briefly and somewhat out of context perhaps to the effect of more liberal policy on foreign trade as it relates to the merchandising of your own products here in the United States. No one can deny the need of friends in the world who will be prepared to fight as zealously for freedom as we will ourselves. Believing this, we are concerned with the ability of other free people to survive, to stand with us against the threat of any force anywhere in the world that would destroy our own free government and our individual privileges under it. We know, of course, that there can be no political freedom without economic stability. If we are to continue to have good neighbors, it is as important that other peoples have a chance to earn their own bread as it is for ourselves. This means that our neighbors, as well as we, must have a chance to sell their products in a world competitive market, and that the exchange of goods must be more than one-way traffic. We have, therefore, sought progressively to reduce the barriers which we impose against foreign goods in order that our friends may have a chance to participate in American markets, even as we share foreign markets in the disposition of our own goods. Yet, let me make one point perfectly clear—there is no desire or intention to subject the textile manufacturer of New England, or anywhere else in America for that matter, to destructive foreign competition. We can no more allow our own industries to be destroyed than we can allow freedom-loving friends to be deprived of the privilege of sharing the trade with our own country. The competitive factors in both American and world markets are delicate relationships. We ought, of course, to encourage every free government to negotiate with ours to its maximum advantage, provided that it does not weaken or destroy our own economy. It must be clear that nations producing exportable manufacturing surpluses are going to trade with somebody. If they cannot deal with us and the other free countries, they most certainly will be forced to deal with the Communists. It is our resolute purpose to forestall the availability of strategic goods and materiel which, but for free world markets, must inevitably force "trading with the enemy," with corresponding increased Soviet strength.

And third, may I stress this point: That you should impress your community, your State and your National Government with the significance of your enterprise and its contribution to the economy of your community. Keep telling your story better and oftener. The greatest danger is not your distance from raw materials, unfavorable cost ratios, or other handicaps of competition. The greatest danger is gloom psychology. That point of view spread widely enough will depress any economy and keep it down.

Finally, I should like to remind you that we here in New England gave the Eisenhower philosophy and program its earliest encouragement. It seems to me that the program of this administration is entitled not only to your support. It will be the realization of your hopes for the future. This Government must not fail. There is no question that the majority of Americans, irrespective of party, have sensed that the alternative to Eesinhower's success is a sharper turn to the left. With this, inevitably will come a more powerful federalism and the weakening of the privileges of private initiative and personal freedom. You can have your choice. On the one hand, you can have an increasingly prosperous economy based on private competitive enterprise, expanding in a free nation endowed with material, military, and spiritual power, which all its citizens share. On the other, you are faced with an increasing delegation of arbitrary power with attendant controls and regulatory bureaus, and the stealthy attrition of the freedom of the individual living in a weakening structure of declining enterprise, initiative, and self-reliance.

It would not be appropriate for me in these few minutes to enumerate the growing accomplishments of this Government, but there is one consideration which I know is of interest to all Americans, and which I know you share. Thoughtful citizens throughout the land have been genuinely concerned with the reported infiltration of bad risks not only in Government but in industry, commerce, and elsewhere. As manufacturers, you have a right to know of the care now being given to a program of protecting manufacturing establishments from sabotage and destruction should an emergency again strike our country.

Only last week an administration measure was submitted to the Congress to provide the Federal Government with authority to bar from defense facilities during a national emergency individuals who are subversive and may be reasonably believed to be disposed to engage in sabotage, espionage, or other subversive acts. Although there is authority to remove them in cases where work is being done under a classified defense contract, no authority presently exists to remove them from power plants and other important installations where the dangers of sabotage and espionage in time of war or an emergency are the greatest. These people may be summarily suspended but dismissal would come only after a hearing which determined them likely saboteurs or espionage threats to our national security.

At the same time, an additional administration recommendation was submitted to the Congress depriving any organization—industrial, front organization, or a labor union—which is Communist controlled or infiltrated, of the privileges and immunities of Federal laws. The Subversive Activities Control Board would conduct the hearings, and if it is determined that such an organization is controlled by Communists and that it might cause material damage to our national security, the Board would then issue an order prohibiting any person or employee from paying dues or contributing goods or services to such organization.

You have watched and listened intently, I suspect, to certain inquiries that are being conducted by committees of the Congress concerning the security situation in various departments of Government. You can rest assured that the executive department has been eager to cooperate, rendering every possible assistance in any authorized investigation of any situation the subject of legitimate inquiry. Our goals are the complete elimination of every Communist, Fascist, or of whatever subversive persuasion, who is, or might be intent upon the destruction of American institutions and the overthrow of this Government. The agency entrusted with the responsibility of eternal vigilance in this regard is the Department of Justice whose chief officer is the Attorney General of the United States and in whose office is located the Federal Bureau of Investigation. You will, I think, be interested in the progress of the Department of Justice in carrying out its responsibility. Since hardly over a year ago, in an accelerated program to denaturalize and deport subversives and other undesirables, the office of the Attorney General, through its immigration and naturalization service has: (1) Deported 79 alien subversives; (2) deported 1,399 alien criminals and racketeers, violators of narcotic laws, and persons with immoral conduct records; (3) issued orders for deportation of 208 persons with records of subversive activity or affiliation; (4) commenced denaturalization proceedings against 27 naturalized citizens who are deemed to be subversives.

Since January 1953, 36 Communist leaders have been convicted and 14 leaders are now on trial. The Attorney General during this time has ordered the addition of 62 new groups to the Justice Department's list of subversive groups, making a total of 255 such groups.

Between January 20, 1953, and January 15, 1954, the Department secured the conviction of 1 person for treason, and 2 persons for espionage. Four persons have been convicted for making false statements to the Government—one has been convicted for perjury.

And beyond this, the progress in the administration of a stricter governmentwide loyalty-security program for Government employees has undoubtedly come increasingly to your attention.

The intensive and comprehensive work continually in progress by the Federal Bureau of Investigation under J. Edgar Hoover includes the surveillance of every known Communist sympathizer who might be expected to engage in acts of violence in the event of an emergency. These numbers, while not spectacularly large, yet occupy Mr. Hoover's vigilant attention. The watching of Communist sympathizers is a well-organized and relentlessly pursued daily responsibility.

The review of the records of current security reports on not only every new employee of Government, but every holdover employee has now progressed so that a complete check and recheck will shortly have been completed. The severance of security risks from public employment is a matter that has been well-reported from time to time.

There is one thing for sure—that is that the Executive Department has and will continue to devote its every energy to protecting the internal security of the United States. It will take second place to no agency of Government in its zeal to provide the maximum vigilance to this end.

On May 10, the President of the United States announced the appointment of an Assistant Attorney General for Internal Security. His is the responsibility of coordinating and enforcing the President's program to insure the internal security of our country through the enforcement of laws presently on our statute books and the measures which this Administration has proposed to combat this menace. Many bills have been proposed to the Congress under a comprehensive program that has been carefully studied and designed. These measures will plug the gaps in our present laws which prevent proper control of subversive organizations and their individual members.

Following are proposals of this administration, the first two of which I have described:

1. The sabotage in industry bill.
2. Communist-infiltrated organizations control bill.
3. A bill granting immunity from prosecution to aid in obtaining convictions of subversives.
4. The antitraitor bill (the so-called wiretap bill).
5. A bill providing for the death penalty for espionage during peacetime.
6. A bill providing for expatriation of those advocating the overthrow of our Government by force and violence.
7. A bill to extend the statute of limitations in espionage cases.
8. A bill increasing the penalty for harboring fugitives from justice.
9. A bill amending the perjury laws to remove the requirement of proving which of conflicting statements is false.
10. A bill broadening the criminal definition of sabotage.
11. Bills to make more effective the Foreign Agents Registration Act by removing certain exemptions and by requiring registration of certain propaganda agents and of persons having knowledge of or trained in sabotage and espionage methods of a foreign government regardless of whether they are active agents of that government.

Thus the administration has accelerated and strengthened its inquiries, its investigations, and its actions. It will, of course, continue to accept this underlying responsibility, both at home and abroad. Even though some of the story is often less than spectacularly told, you can rest assured that alert, vigilant, dedicated men and women are devoting their full talents to this end. In all this work, keep this in mind: That every effort of the administration in opposing the Communist menace is made within the framework of the Constitution and in accordance with the traditional American concepts of due process of law.

May I suggest that the foregoing is but one reason that the Eisenhower program must succeed. To strengthen this Nation, to create an environment favorable to a growing economy and expanding employment, and assure a little more peace of mind to growing millions of Americans, this Government needs your support and your understanding.

Its objectives are closely allied to any true statement of the articles of American faith:

1. Your Government believes in decency. To continue our dedication to honesty and cleanliness is one of our high ideals of public service.

2. We believe in fairness. We shall continue to accord both the accuser and the accused equal justice, that truth and equity shall prevail.

3. We believe in freedom not only for ourselves, but hold that others shall have the opportunity to share in its blessings.

4. We believe in God. We confront bleak, cold, atheistic communism with the ethics of our religion with the spiritual belief which sustains us all in every dark valley.

5. We believe in the future of America—appreciative of the great gifts of resources, both human and natural, we confidently look forward to the future of our American system, its initiative and enterprise.

6. We are not afraid. Even in these crucial years of decision, we shall not fail to seize our opportunities to help others to the opportunities we share and the privileges which we have achieved. By leading others to see that, with them as with us, with the fruits of cooperation, labor, thrift, and industry, they can win for themselves what we have won for America.

No other generation has ever had thrust upon it the responsibility entrusted to us. May we have the vision and inspiration and self-dedication to merit that responsibility and that leadership.

Address Delivered by Hon. Barry M. Goldwater, of Arizona, at Annual Meeting of Retail Merchants Association of Baltimore

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 25, 1954

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, on Sunday, May 19, 1954, our distinguished Presiding Officer, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], addressed the Retail Merchants Association of Baltimore. The title of the address is "Who Keeps It Running?" I ask unanimous consent that his excellent remarks be incorporated in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A Senator has one very happy facet to his job: he gets the opportunity to talk with many, many people in this great country of ours, and from those conversations he forms opinions based on countrywide rather than local thinking.

In the course of these discussions during the past year and a half, I have stored many conclusions so formed in the bank of my memory, and it is to one of those in particular that I wish to direct my remarks today.

It is the idea that the Federal Government can absolutely prevent any future depressions, and, failing in that, that the same source can pull the economy out of a depression. By that statement you might assume that my conclusions are that there would be no effect in either case from Federal intervention, but let me say at the outset that I would not agree with such an assumption, for I do feel that Government action can have some effect—and, mind you, I say some, for as we proceed with this discussion it is my intention to develop the probable limits of the effects of those efforts.

There is concern today that too many businessmen in this country, and too many laboring people and too many professional people—in fact, just too many people—have forgotten the true source of our economic greatness, the free enterprise system, and now look to Washington as being the place "from which all blessings flow."

It is indeed a disturbing concern, for if we ever forget completely the fundamental sources of our strength, whether they be moral, governmental, economic, or the strength of our spiritual faith, then this free government in which we now live will join those others which have perished because of this same sort of forgetfulness.

It would be great if we could all speak with complete candor and frankness about this subject of what the Government can do in this field, but it might be not only politically unfeasible, but also it might require saying some things people don't want to hear.

I find people in the various areas of our economic system and, I might add, out of it as well, who prefer to live in a dream world—as well they should under the circumstances—so that if lightning strikes, they can at least cherish the hope that it will strike the other fellow's house.

To use a favorite old chestnut of the politician, let me quote to you the inscriptions to be found on the Archives Building in Washington—"What is past is prolog * * * Study the past." That is used at this point because no admonition could be more apropos to our discussion.

It must be written in the master plan of things that all governments must, in the course of their existences, come to the point where they cannot resist the urge to tamper and interfere with the natural and complicated flow of their commerce.

I might suggest, also, that it must be preordained that men must come to the same conclusion, for many now feel that things are different than in the past—that we have repealed all of the established laws of economics, physics, nature, and human nature.

This assumption on the part of Government and on the part of some individuals is not new. It is as old as the recorded history of men and nations. Governments as long as 4,000 years ago injected themselves into the operations of their economies with varying degrees of failure—but with one certainty: they all failed.

Hammurabi, the King of Babylon, tried it with his laws regulating prices and wages and fees. The Hittite Code of 1350 B. C. attempted to establish provision for wages and prices. And we can find no better example in history to illustrate the dire effects of too extensive an invasion of the normal functionings of an economic system than ancient Rome.

This great republic, operating under a constitution which guaranteed freedom, built herself up to be the leading world power of her time. She raised her standards of living above anything the world had ever known—and freedom, honor, and justice were recognized virtues in Rome and all her colonies.

Then, Rome reached that apparently unavoidable point in her history when someone allowed the thought to enter his mind that if freedom could do all that, what even more monumental advances could be made if the government helped this great economy along.

That did it. The idea germinated, was born, and grew into a controlled economy. Then, the inevitable happened. Production slowed down. Prices went sky high. Taxes multiplied. This great Nation deteriorated into a mass of people who had lost their productive initiative and the national self-esteem which is necessary to keep a people and a nation strong.

Yet, we don't have to look constantly at the ancients to find such examples. The early history of America is replete with attempts made by the colonies to regulate or to control or to inject themselves as governments into what was then the infant economy which has grown into the great force that it is today. Indeed, I might say grown in spite of efforts by some to inject Government into the free-enterprise system to an even further extent than it now invades that field.

History as old as that with which I have been indulging you, though, is rather stale, and it is easy for you to assume a so-what attitude, so I will end our journey through the pages of ancient proof and get up to date.

We, of this generation, are able to look back but a few years to see our Federal Government beginning to cast about for ways to get itself woven into the cloth of our economic system. We can also remember the results of these efforts, and weigh them in our considerations of further Government action, or, more importantly, in the consideration of the question which I am expounding on at the moment.

When the Democratic administration came into office in 1932, there was a depression in progress in this country—a depression that had its birth in the fall of 1929, and was still running its course at that date 3 years later.

It was natural, then, that this new administration should have applied itself to the task of helping the country pull out of its economic doldrums. It is of questionable value to trace, step by step, the development of the so-called built-in stabilizers through the period of 1932 to the present time, because there was no particular relation between those developments, and their effects were not felt immediately. With that in mind, we should recognize several achievements of this era that will have some bearing on the economy in the event it should go into depression instead of a period of adjustment such as we have witnessed during this past year.

Deposit insurance will protect bank and depositor alike, and should have a strong restraining effect on any surge of public demands on our banks. The strict and proper surveillance that the Securities and Exchange Commission maintains over the stock offerings of our economy has had a most salutary effect in preventing stabbiness in the market places.

Unemployment compensation will have a small but definitely noticeable part in the softening of any severe economic blows, but this stabilizer can only be of a fixed duration unless periodically changed by law.

The farm support program was originally considered as one of these stabilizing instruments of Government, but, of course, it has now become a must in even the normal operational planning of the farm. At least, many politicians feel that way, windshield farmers feel that way—but I am happy to say that a great segment of our farm economy frowns on this type of constant aid.

The use of the public works program has been, and is, the most frequently advanced theory of the best way to inject money into the lifestream of our economy should depression beset us, and a so-called progressive tax structure has been regarded in some quarters as the answer to our economic ills.

The biggest weapon that the Government has is one that it has had for a long time, and one which, in fact, is a responsibility charged to it by the Constitution. That is the power it has to make changes from time to time in monetary, fiscal, and regulatory programs, particularly as applied to the availability of money. This particular weapon is best wielded by the Federal Reserve System.

Much is being said today about the power of these stabilizers to accomplish the miracle of preventing economic fall-offs or curing them if they should, by some mistake, get past these Government barriers.

It is entirely proper, then, that we pause at this time to give heed to the record—the record of what was accomplished by these "crutches," first, in the period between 1933 and 1939, and then in the postwar period.

A tabulation prepared for me by the Joint Committee on the Economic Report shows that in the years of 1933 to 1939, inclusive, slightly over 51 percent of our national budget went into the servicing of these stabilizers. Briefly, this is broken down as follows: Relief and work relief, $13 billion; public works, $5½ billion; and aids to agriculture, slightly over $6 billion. This totaled just under $25 billion which, as I have said, was a little over half of the entire Federal budget for that period, which was between 49 and 50 billion dollars.

Total Federal Government receipts, expenditures, and budget surplus or deficit—and major direct Government expenditures to aid the economy, fiscal years 1933 through 1939[1] *on basis of daily Treasury statements (unrevised) adjusted to provide uniform classification of expenditures*

[Millions of dollars]

	1933	1934	1935	1936	1937	1938	1939
Total receipts	2,079.7	3,115.6	3,800.5	4,116.0	5,028.8	5,854.7	5,164.8
Total expenditures excluding public debt retirements	3,863.5	6,011.1	7,009.9	8,665.6	8,177.4	7,238.8	8,707.1
Net surplus or deficit [2]	−1,783.8	−2,895.5	−3,209.4	−4,549.7	−3,148.6	−1,384.2	−3,542.3
Relief and work relief: [3]							
(a) Direct relief: Federal Emergency Relief Administration [4]	336.0	707.8	1,820.1	494.3	[5] 933.0	4.2	1.7
(b) Work relief:							
Civil Works Administration	----------	805.1	11.3	.7	.3	.2	.2
Works Projects Administration and National Youth Administration	----------	----------	----------	1,263.7	1,896.4	1,472.5	2,239.6
Civilian Conservation Corps	14.2	331.9	435.5	486.3	385.8	326.4	290.4
Total relief and work relief	350.2	1,844.9	2,267.0	2,245.0	2,281.6	1,803.2	2,531.9
Public works [6]	442.4	698.0	883.4	729.7	1,023.9	803.5	1,000.5
Aid to agriculture [7]	203.7	775.3	1,071.3	932.7	970.5	853.8	1,228.2
Total major direct Government expenditures to aid the economy	996.3	3,318.2	4,221.7	3,907.4	4,276.0	3,460.5	4,760.6

Totals 1933 through 1939:	
Relief and work relief	$13,323.8
Public works	5,581.4
Aid to agriculture	6,035.5
Total major direct Government expenditures to aid the economy	24,940.7

[1] Source: H. Doc. No. 505, 77th Cong., 2d sess., The Annual Report of the Secretary of the Treasury on the State of Finances, pp. 416, 417, and 476.

[2] Net surplus or deficit is before giving effect to expenditures for retirement of public debt, chargeable to sinking fund, etc.

[3] Does not include total expenditures from emergency appropriations and allocations to other departments and agencies. Such allocations totaled approximately $2 billion for the period 1933–39.

[4] Includes Reconstruction Finance Corporation loans and grants to States, municipalities, etc., for direct relief.

[5] Excess credits (deduct).

[6] Includes Public Roads Administration, forest roads and trails, Public Buildings Administration, Tennessee Valley Authority reclamation projects, river and harbor work (including flood control), Public Works Administration (including administrative expenses), and U. S. Housing Authority.

[7] Includes agricultural adjustment program, Farm Credit Administration, Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation, Federal intermediate credit banks, Federal land banks, Farm Security Administration, Farm Tenant Act, Rural Electrification Administration, Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation, 1938 to 1939, Commodity Credit Corporation, and Department of Agriculture. Department of Agriculture expenditures include aids for the benefit of the general public such as meat inspection and enforcement of the Food and Drug Act.

Now I would say that that was giving these stabilizers a very liberal test of their powers and abilities. Not only was the Government generous with monies to provide these stabilizers every chance to work, but also we find, on further inspection, that these funds averaged approximately 5.7 percent of the national income for that period.

Let's peek a little further into this record of history and see what really did happen as a result of this expenditure of public monies. These results are rather astounding in their revelation of failure to accomplish the desired results, and they can well be heeded by those who now cry for the Government to step in and try it again.

First of all, these props were supposed to get people back to work. Did they do that? Well, here is what happened in the employment field. In 1933, there were 11,800,000 unemployed, and, after 7 years and nearly $25 billion, there were still 9½ million people in this country not working.

The following figures are indices, which were prepared for me by the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, and do not represent amounts in dollars or persons.

Comparison of present economic conditions to earlier dates

1932=100	1929	1932	1939	1949	1950	1954
Gross national product:						
Current dollar	[1] 178	[1] 100	[1] 157	[2] 447	[2] 454	[2] [3] 618
1939 dollar	[1] 139	[1] 100	[1] 147	[2] 232	[2] 239	[2] [3] 282
Industrial production	[4] 171	[4] 100	[4] 159	[4] 292	[4] 292	[4] 362
Unemployment as percent of labor force	[1] 13	[1] 100	[1] 69	[4] 21	[4] 30	[5] 23
Per capita real disposable income	[1] 133	[1] 100	[1] 133	[2] 180	[2] 188	[2] [3] 192

[1] Annual average.

[2] 1st quarter.

[3] Estimated.

[4] February figures.

[5] March figures.

For instance, let's see what happened to the gross national product during those 7 years. Using 1932 as the base year—because I think we will all agree that it was the bottom year of the depression—we will assign to it the index of 100.

In 1929, the index based on the current dollar was 178, but, after 7 years of the application of Government remedial medicine, the index for the gross national product had only returned to 157.

Industrial production has always been a good barometer for our economy, so let's see what happened in that field. Again, using 1932 as the base year of 100, we discover that 1929 would carry an index of 171, but when we again scan this field in 1939, we see that it had only gotten back up to 159.

Another thing that we hear a lot about today is the ability of the Government to increase the per capita income by the magic of these stabilizers. Now, we have a record here that we can look at before we become too certain that all that is needed is an injection by the Government into the veins of our economic body of some adrenalinlike serum to relieve us, as businessmen, of our responsibilities under the free-enterprise system.

Let's take that tragic year of 1932 once more, and for one more time hang on it the index of 100. Having done this, let's see what 1929 looked like.

Well, it had an index of 133. Then, and here is an interesting thing—interesting because it disputes rather well what some politicians and some economists are saying to us—by 1939, after 7 years of using up over one-half of the budget each year, that index was still 133, exactly no more and no less than 1929.

Then came World War II, and the problems of unemployment were solved and the economy hummed and buzzed as it never had before. Demand for everything became so great that our productive genius was strained in every field and prosperity was with us.

Then, the war ended, and these so-called stabilizers had a chance to go into operation again. Briefly, what happened?

Unemployment went over a 3-million monthly average by 1950. The farmer, in spite of a supposedly foolproof farm-support program, went through a year where his prices received did not meet his parity index.

Then, again a war, and again the solution to economic problems of the moment. People got jobs, the farmers made money, and businessmen began to think that maybe the old laws of economics really had been repealed and that there was, after all, an end to business cycles.

I have indulged you in these figures not to provide proof that these stabilizers are no good at all, but to allow you a means of appraising just what the Federal Government can do in the prevention of these cycles.

It seems clear to me that the active props do not provide the full measure of support which their proponents claim for them. It is also clear that some of the preventative measures, such as deposit insurance, SEC, and the proper use of the powers of the Federal Reserve System, can prevent some abuses connected with past depressions and can cushion others.

Yet, actually, if we want to be mathematically correct, we must say that there is only one way to prevent a depression, and that is to prevent the boom that always has preceded one.

We must not, in the course of this discussion, fail to recognize the advances that have been made in economic forecasting, and to remember that great faith is placed in the ability of these forecasts to warn us of approaching dangers.

I don't speak disparagingly about the economists. I have great respect for the profession, and I rely on them as much as you do, but there is a limit to their soothsaying, and I would say that limit is the human mind. It's true that we do have a vastly improved understanding of economic factors today over what we had 10 or 20 years ago, but we still haven't figured out what makes the human mind act the way it does, and neither can we tell when it is about to act contrary to actions that would be beneficial to the economy.

An economist friend said to me in discussing this field that "regardless of political considerations, economics is nothing more than human nature functioning in the imperfect and irrational manner characteristic of all human behavior. It may be affected adversely or favorably at times by acts of God, but it will never become impervious to acts of man. I, for one, see no hope for changing human nature."

It used to be that the economist was the positive soul and the politician was characterized by his ambiguity, but, today, we find that position reversed. It is the economist that says "maybe" and "if" and "but"; it is the politician who is now positive. At least, some of our politicians have, indeed, been positive economic hypochondriacs in their constant and dark prophecies of economic doom—prophecies which, I am happy to say, have not come true yet, and do not appear to be at all likely to develop in the near future.

From our brief review of the ancient and current history of the efforts made in this field, I suggest that we can draw three conclusions. To reach the first one, we delve only back through the last 20 years, and we find that the Government's efforts to stave off drops in the economy or to return the economy to a level which some mistakenly call stable have not worked.

Now, it will be said, I suppose, in defense of these efforts, that we did not go far enough. Maybe one-half of the budget is not a high enough figure for some people, but if we were to take this as a base and enlarge the moneys spent for this effort, then the present fiscal dilemma of the United States would become even worse.

If we were to take one-half of the Federal budget to apply to these stabilizers today, it would mean an addition of between $30 billion and $35 billion at the present time. The deficit is figured to be increased this year by, roughly, $3 billion, and the United States Government is now within reaching distance of its legal debt limit, so this addition could only result in a greater imbalance between income and outgo.

This recognition leads into the next conclusion, and for it we must lean on both ancient and modern history. It should be clearly evident by now that, as far as governmental action is concerned, governments are powerless to do much of anything except use actions that perpetually inflate the currency. Inflation ran a pretty unrestricted course during periods of the last twenty years, and particularly during the past ten years, and this inflation—probably more than anything else—has lulled the American people into a reluctance to face the economic facts of life and to handle them honestly and courageously.

In the formation of this conclusion, we must go one step further to complete the study fo the powers which governments might have over their economies and recognize one more possibility. If real control over the economic system is to be maintained, then the Government must exercise 100 percent dictatorship over production, consumption, capital investments, prices, wages, and all the other elements of the economy.

This fact was well brought out recently by Bernard Baruch, who decried the feeble, halfway, and too-late attempts at controlling the inflation of World War II and its after years.

At this point, someone will undoubtedly throw in that new thought that we can have unbalanced budgets and that, in fact, we should operate with deficits through trying times. I can't subscribe to that thinking, and I have yet to hear an adequate defense for it. If there is a way for the Federal or any Government to operate soundly at a constant deficit with a constantly unbalanced budget, then I suggest to you that business could do likewise.

Our bankers, however, have a different idea about our business budgets, and they get rather upset when any of us try that approach.

We must, then, recognize this: When we talk about Government intervention in our economy, with methods stronger than those we have on the books which have proven useful as cushions, such as deposit insurance, SEC, unemployment compensation, and proper handling of the powers of the Federal Reserve, then we tread upon the borders of complete Federal domination.

Before leaving this second conclusion, let me add a sobering reminder that appeared in a report by the committee staff of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report in 1951. "It is significant," the report said, "that almost without exception every country suffering runaway inflation in recent years has not only had rigorous laws on its books providing for direct controls over prices, wages, and materials, but certainly astronomical interest rates and drastic penalties for noncompliance."

Having investigated the abilities and the powers of the Government to prevent economic adjustments and to stabilize the economy in the event a depression should occur, and having found these powers and abilities to be limited if they are operated within sound financial bounds, we are led to a third and final conclusion; namely, that the answers to our economic problems rest within the full operation of the free enterprise system.

This does not mean that government has no place in our economic scheme, for it has; and if it confines itself to those responsibilities it will be discharging its duty of assisting in the maintenance of a good climate in which our economic system can operate. Government's role should be that of umpire, for there are rules and contracts to be enforced, and services and functions to be maintained, such as national defense, the administration of justice, the operation of the postal system, and the supervision of the money supply.

This very important fact must be remembered when we discuss government and business: Our free-enterprise system can only exist under a good social and political climate, and it is incumbent on both to do their utmost to provide that climate. There must be, therefore, complete freedom of choice by producer and consumer alike. There must be unhampered operation of the laws of supply and demand. There must be, at all times, the assurance that if investments are made in business and the business is properly and well run, there will be the opportunity for gain.

Government can aid in these necessary relationships. It can allow the markets to operate freely, without restraint of Government edict or regulation. It must recognize that one part of the economy cannot be supported and controlled without bad effects on that segment and, eventually, on all other segments. It must have the courage, should the occasion ever arise again—and God knows, we all pray it won't—when control of inflation rising through war becomes necessary, to establish rigid and complete control over all facets of the economy and not allow political expediency to grant favors to any segment or group.

Government must balance its budget and begin to reestablish the soundness of the dollar. It must refrain from listening to the "sirens' song" which says that deficits are all right, because, by their presence, taxes will remain high and the purchasing strength of the dollar will remain low and we will have the constant shadow of inflation before us.

By a properly and wisely operated fiscal policy, Government can lower taxes so that the stream of money needed to buy new tools and new factories will be ever-flowing, and the economy, therefore, ever-growing.

Government must remember that it has never added to the economy except in time of war, and I doubt that the American people enjoy or endorse that type of economic stabilizer. It must remember that the greatness of our economic system rests in its freedom—the freedom of the markets, the freedom of men to make their own economic decisions, the freedom of the worker to work where he pleases, the constant goal before the businessman and the worker alike that their efforts will be properly rewarded, and the freedom of all our people to develop the natural resources of the Nation.

I state these things in order to draw a comparison with Communist Russia. If the things I have said are not true, then the economic system of the Russian state should be the dominant pattern of the world. But it isn't. Yet here in the United States we find 7 percent of the world's population owning over 40 percent of the world's goods. This didn't happen by Government control, but by Government and business shouldering their joint responsibilities.

Where, then, lie our responsibilities as businessmen to this free-enterprise system? I would say that, first, we should refresh our minds as to the sources of the economic strength, which I have tried to do in this brief discussion. Then we should never be ashamed of this system, whether we call it free enterprise or capitalism. We should defend it against its attackers and explain it carefully to our children. We must have confidence in its ability to outproduce and outprofit, for the businessman and the worker alike, any other system known—and the only other economic system known is state control, which, by living evidence, is a failure.

We must be ready to invest in its workings, particularly at times of adjustment. In this vein, it is heartening to see the great investments being made in American business today. Building is at an all-time high and the investment in tools and machinery is keeping pace. Such a display of confidence speaks louder than all the demagogs who would by voice shatter the faith of the people in the efforts of our economic system.

We must be constantly alert to the needs of those who work with us and among us, to the end of seeing that the job is done in cooperation by all sides. Then, business must instill in the consumer a desire to own more and more of the goods that business can produce. Ours is a growing and a dynamic economy, and increased consumption becomes an immediate problem.

This problem won't be solved by the increasing population alone. It will be solved by better selling, which includes better advertising, better promotion, and better merchandising. The standard of living must continue to go up, and we, as businessmen, can perform our part in this effort by applying ourselves diligently to the task of making more people want more goods.

Then, there is one final thought I want to leave with you. The selling of American goods to Americans and the world is not our only job. We must be constantly selling our freedom to the people of America and of the world.

Neither dollars nor bullets nor bombs nor armies nor navies can change ideas, but examples can, and will. The lions of Nero didn't stop the idea of Christianity, and the strength of arms alone will not stop the curse of communism. But, if we, as free people, can show the rest of the world that we can live by freedom better than they can by communism, then, through the natural instinct of people to seek freedom and a better way of living, we will begin to win this conflict.

It becomes incumbent upon us, therefore, at this time in our history, more than at any other time, to conduct ourselves as Americans, to believe in our capabilities as Americans, and constantly to sell, by our actions and our words, this great freedom we possess to every person in the world.

You might ask, of course, "what can one man do?" And I suggest, in reply, that it is far better to light one candle than to complain about the darkness.

The Aluminum Centennial Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. IRVING M. IVES

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 25, 1954

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the texts of messages sent by the President and Secretary of State Dulles to the Aluminum Centennial Congress, which will open in Paris, France, on June 14. These messages were made public on May 24 by William P. Bittenbender, president of the International Selling Corp., and chairman of the American Committee for the Centenary of the Industrial Production of Aluminum.

There being no objection, the messages were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEAR MR. BITTENBENDER: My cordial greetings go to the Aluminum Centennial Congress which brings together the talents and ideas of aluminum experts from all over the globe.

It is fitting that you convene in France, the homeland of Henri Sainte-Claire Deville, the great scientist who a century ago first developed industrial aluminum. He was one of the host of distinguished French scientists who have enriched our lives by thought and service. Following his example, many minds in many lands have rapidly advanced the technology and applications of aluminum and brought improved industrial efficiency and higher standards of living to millions throughout the world.

By presenting new developments in this versatile metal, by strengthening international bonds of friendship, the Aluminum Centennial Congress will quicken the pace of progress and benefit all mankind.

I wish I could personally join your Congress as it assembles in the nation of which I have so many fond memories. But since this is not possible, I send my best wishes for an enjoyable and successful conference.

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

MESSAGE TO THE ALUMINUM CENTENNIAL CONGRESS

Few discoveries in the modern physical world can match in importance the industrial production of aluminum, the centenary of which you are observing this month. Within the memory of men alive today aluminum has been developed from a scientific novelty to a plentiful metal that has revolutionized many industries.

As I send my greetings and good wishes to the Aluminum Congress at the beginning of the aluminum industry's second century, I can best voice my hopes for your own and the world's future by echoing your expressed purpose of working for the improvement in universal standards of living and all the arts of peace.

JOHN FOSTER DULLES.

Tabulation of Returns From Questionnaire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 25, 1954

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include in the RECORD a tabulation of the returns from the questionnaire which I recently distributed to postal patrons throughout my 16th Ohio District.

I was extremely gratified by the excellent response to my poll. A total of 18,362 of my constituents displayed their interest in the affairs of our Nation by taking the time to fill in and return the questionnaire.

All of these replies are extremely helpful to me in my effort to represent the people of my district to the very best of my ability. I thought, however, that several of the responses were of particular interest.

Most significant of all was the fact that 92 percent of those replying said they oppose the admission of Red China to the U. N., while 5 percent expressed approval and 3 percent did not answer this question.

An overwhelming 70 percent expressed approval of the President's flexible farm-support program, with 22 percent opposed.

Closest vote of all was on the question of giving 18-year-olds the right to vote. My constituents voted against this proposal by a 50-percent to 46-percent margin, with 4 percent expressing no opinion.

The complete tabulation follows:

Percentage distribution of questionnaire replies

Question 1. Do you favor the Bricker amendment?

	Yes	No	No reply
Total response, 16th District	*Percent* 53	*Percent* 39	*Percent* 8
Canton-North Canton	62	32	6
Massillon	51	42	7
Alliance	47	46	7
Stark County rural [1]	59	34	7
Dover-New Philadelphia	50	44	6
Uhrichsville-Dennison	47	47	6
Tuscarawas County rural [1]	53	40	7
Wooster-Orrville	39	52	9
Rittman	34	53	13
Wayne County rural [1]	42	45	13

Question 2. Do you favor the President's farm program (flexible supports)?

	Yes	No	No reply
Total response, 16th District	*Percent* 70	*Percent* 22	*Percent* 8
Canton-North Canton	73	19	8
Massillon	70	23	7
Alliance	75	19	6
Stark County rural [1]	67	24	9
Dover-New Philadelphia	71	21	8
Uhrichsville-Dennison	57	37	6
Tuscarawas County rural [1]	63	28	9
Wooster-Orrville	79	15	6
Rittman	68	21	11
Wayne County rural [1]	67	24	9

Question 3. Do you approve of the efforts of Senator MCCARTHY to disclose the actions of Communists in this country?

	Yes	No	No reply	Qualified answers [2]
Total response, 16th District	*Percent* 68	*Percent* 25	*Percent* 7	18
Canton-North Canton	75	19	6	17
Massillon	72	23	5	16
Alliance	64	27	9	24
Stark County rural [1]	72	22	6	14
Dover-New Philadelphia	65	27	8	21
Uhrichsville-Dennison	61	35	4	13
Tuscarawas County rural [1]	66	28	6	15
Wooster-Orrville	53	34	12	27
Rittman	61	37	2	9
Wayne County rural [1]	61	28	11	20

---

[1] Rural figures include replies from all areas outside cities listed.

[2] This column indicates percentage of replies to which qualifying comments were added.

Question 4. Do you believe 18-year-olds should be granted the right to vote?

	Yes	No	No reply
Total response, 16th district	*Percent* 46	*Percent* 50	*Percent* 4
Canton-North Canton	41	56	3
Massillon	48	49	3
Alliance	50	46	4
Stark County rural [1]	46	51	3
Dover-New Philadelphia	47	50	3
Uhrichsville-Dennison	53	44	3
Tuscarawas County rural [1]	49	49	2
Wooster-Orrville	51	45	4
Rittman	49	50	1
Wayne County rural [1]	50	45	5

Question 5. Are you in favor of admitting Red China to the United Nations?

	Yes	No	No reply
Total response, 16th district	*Percent* 5	*Percent* 92	*Percent* 3
Canton-North Canton	4	94	2
Massillon	5	92	3
Alliance	6	90	4
Stark County rural [1]	5	93	2
Dover-New Philadelphia	6	90	4
Uhrichsville-Dennison	7	90	3
Tuscarawas County rural [1]	6	91	3
Wooster-Orrville	6	89	5
Rittman	5	92	3
Wayne County rural [1]	6	88	6

Question 6. Do you favor the extension of social-security coverage to 10.5 million additional persons, including doctors, dentists, ministers, farmers, and others who are self-employed, even though this might mean an increase in the social-security-tax rate paid by both employer and employee?

	Yes	No	No reply
Total response, 16th District	*Percent* 38	*Percent* 55	*Percent* 7
Canton-North Canton	36	58	6
Massillon	37	57	6
Alliance	44	49	7
Stark County rural [1]	37	56	7
Dover-New Philadelphia	39	54	7
Uhrichsville-Dennison	44	51	5
Tuscarawas County rural [1]	40	54	6
Wooster-Orrville	41	52	7
Rittman	43	46	11
Wayne County rural [1]	39	53	8

Question 7. Do you favor United States participation in construction of the St. Lawrence seaway project, to be financed by revenue bonds paid for by tolls?

	Yes	No	No reply
Total response, 16th District	*Percent* 86	*Percent* 10	*Percent* 4
Canton-North Canton	89	7	4
Massillon	87	9	4
Alliance	86	9	5
Stark County rural [1]	83	12	5
Dover-New Philadelphia	88	8	4
Uhrichsville-Dennison	75	21	4
Tuscarawas County rural [1]	79	15	6
Wooster-Orrville	87	8	5
Rittman	91	4	5
Wayne County rural [1]	83	10	7

[1] Rural figures include replies from all areas outside cities listed.

Question 8. Do you favor the continuation of the Un-American Activities Committee of the House of Representatives?

	Yes	No	No reply
Total response, 16th District	*Percent* 87	*Percent* 8	*Percent* 5
Canton-North Canton	90	6	4
Massillon	88	8	4
Alliance	87	8	5
Stark County rural [1]	86	8	6
Dover-New Philadelphia	88	7	5
Uhrichsville-Dennison	80	12	8
Tuscarawas County rural [1]	80	11	9
Wooster-Orrville	84	11	5
Rittman	75	11	14
Wayne County rural [1]	81	9	10

Question 9. Do you approve of controls on the production of farm crops?

	Yes	No	No reply
Total response, 16th District	*Percent* 25	*Percent* 68	*Percent* 7
Canton-North Canton	22	71	7
Massillon	25	69	6
Alliance	26	69	5
Stark County rural [1]	24	71	5
Dover-New Philadelphia	25	67	8
Uhrichsville-Dennison	25	70	5
Tuscarawas County rural [1]	28	67	5
Wooster-Orrville	30	60	10
Rittman	38	59	3
Wayne County rural [1]	31	63	6

Question 10. Do you favor continuation of:
(a) Technical assistance to Europe?
(b) Economic aid to Europe?
(c) Technical assistance to Asia?
(d) Economic aid to Asia?

[Percentage affirmative replies]

	(*a*)	(*b*)	(*c*)	(*d*)
Total response, 16th District	68	32	67	35
Canton-North Canton	69	28	68	32
Massillon	69	34	68	36
Alliance	72	40	71	42
Stark County rural [1]	64	29	62	32
Dover-New Philadelphia	69	33	66	34
Uhrichsville-Dennison	61	38	57	36
Tuscarawas County rural [1]	64	32	61	35
Wooster-Orrville	75	39	73	41
Rittman	73	46	74	43
Wayne County rural [1]	65	35	64	37

[1] Rural figures include replies from all areas outside cities listed.

The American Maritime Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 25, 1954

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, there was published in the Baltimore Morning Sun of Friday, May 21, the second of the series of articles by Miss Helen Delich on the condition of the American maritime industry.

In the sincere belief that this series will make a valuable contribution to understanding of the problems now pressing in the maritime field, I ask unanimous consent that the May 21 article be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WORLD KEEPS BUILDING SHIPS DESPITE OVERSUPPLY FEARS

(By Helen Delich)

The American flag on the high seas is 1 of 70 national emblems that today compose the largest merchant marine in world history—119,427,000 deadweight tons.

The high tonnage from so many other nations increases the competition for United States vessels and raises the question as to who gets the cargo when there are too many ships—the lowest cost operators, the most efficient, and/or the best salesmen?

The total tonnage might even be higher right now for the quoted figure was as of December 31, 1953, the latest computation at the Maritime Administration. And 9 million more deadweight tons have been contracted for in shipyards around the world.

OLD NOT BEING SCRAPPED

The new tonnage is not replacing old that is sent to the scrap yards. In some instances old tonnage is transferred to a cheaper-operating flag, but the actual scrapping does not begin to compare with the new being produced. The only country that has any large reserve fleet is the United States, whose World War II Liberties and some other types total about 20 million tons and which has numerous "active" ships on idle status.

The 1939 total was 79,231,000 deadweight tons, and, even at that level many ships were idle.

Many quarters feel the world today is oversupplied with ships and cite that as the reason for the general complaint that "business is off." Great Britain and Norway, the two other world leaders in merchant-ship operation, have some so-called "active" ships in idle status waiting for cargoes also.

AND STILL IT INCREASES

"There is only so much cargo to be transported," the authorities note, "and it can take up only so much ship space."

Yet the overall tonnage still is increasing. Construction everywhere except in the United States remains high, although some foreign yards complain it is not quite as good as it was a year or two ago. None of them are anywhere near the almost-nothing point of the American yards.

No country wants to make cutbacks in its fleets. Most foreign nations, therefore, grant subsidies, tax concessions, and preferred bookings to their fleets so they can compete on the market today.

TANKER'S SIZE INCREASES

Most of the new tonnage is in tankers—which are growing larger in individual size such as the 45,000-ton *World Glory*—although last year freighter tonnage represented 31.1 percent of the overall world construction.

Small countries like Venezuela and Colombia are building little except freighters to establish themselves in the maritime world. And to make certain their ships have cargoes, they make it mandatory their industries use ships of their own nationality.

The first public expression of the fear of overstocking ships was issued recently by the Norwegians, who control about 10 million active tons and rank as the third maritime nation in the world.

The Norwegian Shipping News said many dry-cargo freighters are reaching the age where they should be scrapped but there is a reluctance because of the number of wartime cargo vessels in the United States reserve fleet and because shipping is such an uncertain business.

The journal also noted the Western World was building up its tanker fleet at an unprecedented peacetime rate with 63.5 percent of the new construction on order last year being tankers for western owners.

RAPID REHABILITATION

Since the end of World War II, the rehabilitation of the Norwegian fleet has been rapid, due in large measure to new construction delivered primarily from shipyards in Sweden, Britain, Denmark, Germany, and Norway itself.

The real postwar phenomenon in the maritime world is the growth of the Liberian fleet, which was nonexistent in 1939.

By the end of 1953, it consisted of 182 ships of 1,808,000 gross tons, with scores still under construction, including the *World Glory*. At one point last year, 36.7 percent of the world construction was for Liberian registry.

In the early postwar period, tankers comprised most of the Liberian fleet. Today it is about evenly divided between tankships and freighters, practically all of which are owned either directly or through wholly owned subsidiaries of other nationalities.

MORE LAX THAN PANAMA

Operating conditions under Liberian flag are even more lax than those in Panama, and some owners are switching their flags from Panamanian to Liberian.

There are virtually no safety requirements, no wage minimums, or regulations concerning crew accommodations, manning requirements, and no remedies enabling seafarers to recover arrears of wages and no provision for the maintenance of seafarers when repatriated.

In fact, wages and employment conditions even on Panamanian ships in many instances have been considered well below international or good national standards.

BECOME ACTUAL SELLERS

Other countries which had no national fleets in 1939 and are included in the market today are Colombia, Costa Rica, Ireland, Iceland, Indonesia, Pakistan, and Switzerland.

"These countries as a group have been in a position to reduce sharply their purchases of shipping space from the more significant maritime countries, and in certain instances, have become actual sellers of ocean transportation services in the world market apart from carrying large portions of national seaborne trade," the National Federation of American Shipping reported last year.

Excluding Liberia, 51.3 percent of the construction ordered by the minor countries was for freighters, 5.2 percent for combination freighter-passenger, and 43.5 percent tankers.

SAUDI ARABIAN AGREEMENT

The Arabian flag soon may serve as another competitor on the world market, for Saudi Arabi's King Saud has made an agreement with A. S. Onassis, Greek shipping magnate, to use the latter's tankers to carry a big share of the oil produced there if Onassis would register about 25 ships in that Middle East land to give it a place in the world maritime picture.

United States companies have added 261 new postwar ships of 5,273,034 deadweight tons to other fleets, such as Liberia, Panama, and Honduras, according to a survey made by the maritime journal, Marine Engineering.

The maritime subsidy policy (known as the Murray report) noted that in 1951, there were approximately 27 foreign-flags nations in substantially competitive position to the United States. At least two more countries now can be included.

ISRAEL DEVELOPING

"Among foreign fleets, the Japanese and Germans are rapidly regaining their prewar positions in world-wide training," the report said. "Israel and Yugoslavia have developed as substantial competitors in the Mediterranean trade route, and Argentina, Brazil, Chile, and Venezuela are important in the South American trades."

The German merchant fleet on December 31, 1953, comprised 469 ships of 1,549,000 gross tons, an increase in 1 year of 399,000 gross tons, most of which was new.

Japan ranked eighth among national fleets on December 31, with 567 ships of 2,973,000 gross tons—virtually all of which is new tonnage. Japanese wage costs are about 10 percent of the American monthly payroll, the lowest reported.

FAVORED BERTHING

In addition to routing their products on their own flag ships foreign countries also assist their fleets in the following ways:

Argentina: Favored berthing for Argentine ships, holding those of other nationalities off for weeks; waiving manifest charges, bills-of-lading fees and consular invoices on cargo borne on Argentine craft; applying other port fees and cargo assessments against other flag ships; income-tax concessions to ship operators.

Brazil: Many of the same practices against United States flag ships and their cargoes existed but the berthing problem is no longer so serious; foreign operators (including American) must collect a special tax from the shippers for cargo sent to Brazil and remit it to the Brazilian Maritime Commission; since the Government owns all the ships, no income- or construction-tax concessions are necessary.

TRYING TO BUY VESSELS

[Brazil now is trying to buy several small C-type vessels from the United States Government for operation in their coastal trade, but there is some reluctance on the part of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee to permit the sale because of discriminating practices. The Senate has approved the sale.]

Denmark: The Government allows 50 percent of the costs of constructing a new vessel to be written off immediately upon signing of a construction contract on the basis that that amount of the cost is excessive.

France: Accelerated depreciation on new ships; operating subsidy; extra fees against American-flag ships for the use of a Couriers Maritime.

Italy: Very high construction subsidy; exempting from income tax all revenue derived from a new ship's operation for the first 3 years; remove duties from certain materials imported to build ships.

Sweden: Free depreciation so the owner can write off his vessel in whatever period he chooses; Government loans on ships.

Norway: Operating subsidies, accelerated depreciation on new ships.

CURRENCY REGULATIONS

Other countries impose currency regulations favoring payment for freight moved on their ships, which adds to the discriminations against American-flag ships.

Ever since 1936 administration leaders have felt it necessary to give merchant-ship operators some assistance in order to meet foreign competition.

However, in this country, unlike most others where operating subsidies are available, a provision was made in the law for the Government to recapture half of all profits the line makes over 10 percent profit up to the full amount of the susidy paid.

As a result, through 1952 two-thirds of the operating differential subsidies had been repaid.

$330,920,330 TURNED OVER

Thus, shipowners are the only recipients of Federal subsidies subject to recapture.

In 1949 the Maritime Commission turned over to the Treasury of the United States $330,920,330.21 from subsidized lines, ship-chartering proceeds, and the sale of war-built and Government ships.

Altogether the Maritime Commission on its war surplus showed an average return of 65 cents for every $1 spent on a ship. The War Assets Administration returned only 12 to 13 cents per dollar.

About 12 million gross tons of ships under foreign flags today were once registered in this Nation. The majority were sold in the Ships Sales Act of 1946, while others have been transferred subsequently.

United States Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 25, 1954

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, last Sunday night it was my privilege to address an outstanding west-coast forum on the subject of United States foreign policy.

One of the points which I raised in the address concerned the actual adequacy of United States military forces to fulfill the tremendous commitments which we face throughout the world. According to present plans, the Department of the Army is scheduled to be reduced by 19 percent by June 1955. This is in disturbing contrast to the fact that our commitments are expanding rather than dwindling.

Another point which I raised concerned the need for utter candor on the implications of our future possible Indochina policy.

I was glad to note that this morning's Washington Post promptly picked up and commented upon both of the above and other themes which I had outlined.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of my Los Angeles address and the Washington Post editorial of May 25 entitled "A New, New Look" be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHERE DO WE GO FROM HERE IN UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY?

(Address by Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY, of Wisconsin, at West Side Jewish Community Center Forum, Los Angeles, Calif., May 23, 1954)

Mr. Chairman and friends, we are met in this beautiful structure dedicated to the service of this community to consider a great issue of our times: "Where do we go from here in United States foreign policy?"

Ninety-one years ago, Abraham Lincoln began his dedicatory speech at Gettysburg with these words: "We are met on this battlefield."

My friends, we tonight are met on a battlefield. I am not referring alone to this fine forum series in which you hear the pros and cons of significant issues discussed. I am referring to this great community center as well.

It is a relatively quiet battlefield—of ideas—of right thinking, and right living.

It isn't a battlefield of destruction, except destruction of any wrong ideas, which might otherwise occur.

This battle which you are waging so constructively by means of this forum and this community center is symbolic of the worldwide battle which is raging.

You here are helping to contribute nobly to our success in the struggle.

THE MEANING OF THIS EDIFICE

It is altogether fitting and proper that we ponder our American role from within this noble edifice which is dedicated to the triumph of all that is right and just and good in the life of this community.

Into stone and steel you have poured not only your financial contributions, you have poured your hearts and souls, your visions of a more abundant life for the older and younger generation, and for those who will follow after you.

I congratulate you on this magnificent structure and on the ideas which it represents.

May this building and this forum series play an ever-more constructive role in the life of this community. May it continue to be an even higher source of inspiration to community centers elsewhere, to men and women of good will of all faiths—who take pride in man's service to man, particularly to the young.

Now what of the world-wide battle of good against evil—the battle of which this forum discussion is one small part?

I shall refer later on in detail to this battle—in which one historic crisis is now occurring in far-off southeast Asia. It is a crisis far away in distance, but very near in meaning to all our personal lives.

THE GREAT OPPOSING FORCES

In principle, what is at stake there and here is the question of who and what shall win the battle—the forces of good or the forces of evil.

For this is a battle between the ideology of Judao-Christian civilization and the barbaric ideology of communism.

It is a battle between those of us who believe in the dignity of the individual and those who have no concept of that idea or any sympathy with it.

It is a battle between those of us who believe that the state should be the servant of man, rather than the man servant of the state, as our opponents believe. It is a battle by us on behalf of the great freedoms of speech, of press, of worship, of assembly, the great rights like trial by jury, against those who have nothing but contempt for such rights and freedoms.

It is a battle which will test our faith in ourselves. It will test our faith in our institutions, faith in our economic way of life, as well as our political and social faith.

FAITH IN OUR FUTURE

If we are to win that battle, we must have such faith here at home.

Why?

Because upon the economic health of America depends in considerable part the economic health of the free world.

Nothing could be more damaging to the cause of a free world than an American depression. And few things could help bring on depression more than fear of a depression—blind, unthinking fear. It is in the Book of Job that we learn "The thing which I have feared hath come upon me."

Fear destroys. It paralyzes. It creates the very condition which it tries to avoid. We must get rid of such fear, get rid of the "little foxes" of anxiety and worry.

Here, in this great city, we see every reason for faith in America's future.

Here is a mighty metropolis to which the members of this audience are greatly contributing.

Here is a great state whose economic frontiers are extended with each passing day. Those frontiers demonstrate anew why fear over the future is pointless and unsound.

There is no reason to believe that we cannot overcome the slight economic difficulties which we as a nation have recently experienced.

And so, before I turn to the political and the military problems facing this Nation on the international scene, I remind you of such facts as these. Every day, there are 11,000 babies born in this country. (Some of these babies, as they grow up, are going to enjoy the facilities of magnificent centers like this.)

Every month, 330,000 souls are added to our population; this is a number equal to the size of many of our most important cities. This together with the even longer span of life means, as you know, a tremendous increase in the demand for consumer goods—goods which this great State of California is furnishing in large measure.

Back in 1940, individual savings in this country amounted to $68 billion. Now, the individual savings amount to $205 billion. The money is available to fill the needs and wants of our people.

All over America, suburban communities are springing up as they are in Greater Los Angeles. This requires new shops, new services, new public works.

We have a backlog of over $500 billion in urgent needs—$100 billion for housing, $60 billion for highways, $40 billion for schools and $300 billion for various types of durable equipment. All this spells greater prosperity for the businessman and the farmer and the worker.

Today, we have a population of 161 million. It will not be long before it is 200 million. Employment now is over 60 million, and it won't be long before it is 70 million. I submit these statistics and estimates to antidote the fear-mongerer and the doubter.

We are dedicating on this battleground of ideas to maintain the community and the Nation strong.

AVOIDING A PEARL HARBOR

That is the purpose of our domestic policy and of our foreign policy. To be strong, to be united, never again to suffer a Pearl Harbor or a great depression.

If we would avoid a disaster such as occurred, across the waters of the Pacific 12½ years ago, or as occurred in the 1930's at home, our people must understand the problem which we face.

THE ISSUE: SURVIVAL

An understanding of foreign policy in particular is an essential to our own survival. Make no mistake about it.

We are playing for the biggest stakes in the history of the world. We are not simply playing for so many miles of real estate or so many millions of people in southeast Asia or anywhere else in the world.

We are playing for the fate of mankind; we are playing for the avoidance of a global atomic Armageddon.

We are determining by our actions or our inactions whether we shall live as a nation or whether we shall go down, as Rome went down, before barbarian conquerors.

And, remember, if we go down, western civilization will crash with us.

This must not happen.

It need not happen.

It will not happen.

If we are to assure our own survival, we must constantly improve and strengthen United States foreign policy. It must be a policy of bold leadership, and not a policy of shrinking timidity. It must be a policy of collective security for the 20th century, and not a policy of 18th- or 19th-century isolation.

You and I know that our foreign policy has been running into increasing difficulties. We can and will overcome these difficulties. We must do so in a nonpartisan manner, because foreign policy is too critical an issue to be kicked around like a political football.

There are those who contend "we have no foreign policy." Of course, they are wrong. We have a definite, inspired foreign policy—a policy built over a period of years by many Americans, Republicans and Democrats. It is a policy to maintain freedom, to preserve the peace, to be adequate to meet any emergency, to seek in every way possible to bring about cohesion with our allies.

We know that the world of today is different from the world of 15 years ago because of man's ingenuity and inventiveness. We today can cross the continent in less than 4 hours. We can cross the Atlantic in a like period. We have the A-bomb and the H-bomb, and so do our adversaries.

These new factors require a bold new approach in our thinking, as Lincoln told us:

"As our case is new, we must think anew and act anew. We must disenthrall ourselves and we will save our Nation."

DISENTHRALL OURSELVES OF FALSE CONCEPTS

Disenthrall ourselves of what?

Of the moth-eaten concept that we can go it alone, of the obsolete notion of a fortress America, allegedly immune from attack, regardless of the fate of the rest of mankind.

Disenthrall ourselves of the concepts (a) that we either need no allies or (b) that we can or should dictate to our allies or (c) that we can ignore the feelings of the neutral peoples of earth.

We must disenthrall ourselves of these and other mental cobwebs and then we will be able to figure out where we should go from here, particularly as regards Indochina.

GET THE FACTS ON ALLIED REACTION

In that land is being written a turning point in man's history.

What shall we attempt to write in that chapter?

To help answer that question, I offer one particular piece of advice: Get the facts. Don't make up your minds until you do get the facts—not just the facts as of southeast Asia's one-quarter of a billion people, its vast mineral treasures, its rich rice fields, its strategic position.

Get the facts on our allies' position.

I ask those who try to give off-the-cuff answers or who ask for off-the-cuff answers:

"What will France do?

"What is France prepared to do at the present time and under certain circumstances which may arise in the future—assuming, for example, particular developments in Geneva and at Paris?

"What is Great Britain prepared to do?

"What are the Colombo nations prepared to do?

"What are Australia and New Zealand prepared to do? And the Philippines, and so on?"

Are they prepared—now or later—to enter into a genuine collective security pact?

Are they prepared, with us, to tell the Communists, "Thus far and no further. Because if you, the Communists, go further, we are prepared to take action to stop your aggression with more than words." What are the answers to those questions? Our State Department is now ascertaining the answers.

It is trying to determine precisely how far the other free nations are prepared to go in defense of individual freedom, in defense of principles which underlie the United Nations.

UNITED STATES WILL NOT ACT ALONE

America is not going to make up its own decision in a vacuum.

We know that we cannot attempt to shoulder all of southern Asia's problems all by ourselves, or even simply in conjunction with France and the Associated States of Indochina. We must have the moral opinion of the free world and a material pool of cooperation as well.

Collective security means just that. It does not mean United States—enforced collective security.

It means genuine regional and worldwide collective security, enforced by every single nation holding similar ideals to ours on behalf of justice and freedom and sovereignty against Communist aggression.

There is admittedly considerable doubt in our country as to our own future course of action.

But the preponderance of doubt is in the allied countries, and there is infinitely greater doubt in the so-called neutralist nations. Let those facts be remembered by the critics.

Let not our own national administration be accused simply because certain allied powers have failed to make up their minds.

We ourselves will, of course, continue our efforts for leadership. We cannot wait and fail to offer a constructive program while our allies are getting around to making up their minds.

But neither are we going to plunge ahead—all by ourselves, heedless of the opinion of other like-minded nations.

OUR SYSTEM OF SEPARATION OF POWERS

Now, with regard to our own future action. I am not going to attempt to spell out in detail what I think such action should be or what specific commitments our country should make. Under our constitutional system this is a responsibility basically of the executive branch of government rather than of the legislative branch of our government.

SO-CALLED LIMITED ACTION

I want to state, however, that regardless of what action may be recommended on Indochina, let this action be undertaken with our eyes wide open.

Let us be genuinely aware of what the action truly entails. Let us figure out what consequences it may lead to—if we are to commit ourselves. Let it not be called a so-called police action when, very definitely, it may prove to be an action of war—of belligerency.

We have heard of the possibility that air and naval forces alone might be requested, rather than in conjunction with ground forces.

I cannot say that I am impressed by any such distinction.

The history of the past is all too evident.

We should not begin a military action of this nature on a so-called limited basis, with Air Force and Navy, without very clearly recognizing that in this type of jungle and rice-paddy war especially, air and naval forces may not be able to prove the exclusive deciding factor.

Let the American people be told the facts.

They are mature enough to know the consequences of a military commitment. War means casualties. It means sacrifices in blood and treasure. Our people know that for an American boy to die in a bomber shot down by Chinese Communist radar-controlled antiaircraft is not one bit different—from an American infantryman dying with a bullet in his chest which was fired by a gun produced in Indochina or in Red China or in a Czech arsenal. And that in turn is not any different from an American sailor dying in naval action.

But let us all bear in mind that in this world, we cannot live, we cannot survive, unless we are willing to take risks. To do nothing is to take the gravest risk of all.

A BATTLE OF PRINCIPLE

But let me add that I am aware that victory in Indochina cannot depend alone on military prowess. Men and arms and ammunition cannot win a battle for the minds of men. We can only combat the inroads of communism in Indochina if we make individual freedom the issue. We cannot substitute free world military force for Communist military force and expect the peoples of sub-Asia to welcome the protection of the free world.

THE PARALLEL WITH THE 1930'S

Does anyone think that the world can afford to retreat, step by step, country by country, without suffering fatal consequences to the collective security effort and to all mankind?

I point out to you, my friends, that there is a grim parallel between our experiences in 1930's and in the 1940's and 1950's. It is a tragic parallel.

Once again we see how a dictatorial group, step by step, gobbles up nation by nation; how the autocrats grow bolder and bolder, stronger and stronger, while free nations shrink back from their responsibilities.

In the 1930's there were so-called good excuses, good alibis, why France and England would not take a stand as Hitler became more and more aggressive.

In the 1950's, once more, there are abundant reasons—reasons which appear rather plausible—why the free world should not take a stand against aggression.

Turn back the pages of history to read the story which it tells.

On January 30, 1933, national socialism came to power in Germany. In a little over 3 years, on March 7, 1936, the German Government denounced the Locarno Pacts of 1925, and German troops reoccupied the Rhineland.

That same year, October 27, 1936, the Berlin-Rome Axis was formed. Less than a month later, Japan in effect was added to the Axis.

The next year, on March 12, 1938, just 2 years after the Rhineland occupation, Germany invaded and annexed Austria.

Now the pace of conquest was quickening. That same year, September 29, 1938, occurred the Munich Conference, and the sell-out of Czechoslovakia.

A half year later, Germany occupied Bohemia and Moravia, thus swallowing up Czechoslovakia completely.

A few days later, on the 21st of March, Germany annexed Memel, and a half year later, the fatal die was cast when German troops invaded Poland on September 1, 1939. On September 3, England and France had declared war, and the second global conflict had begun.

From the rise to power of the aggressor—to his commencement of World War II—was but 6½ short years.

From 1945 to 1954 is a slightly longer period. But since the end of World War II, the Soviet conqueror has annexed more people, more real estate, than Hitler did, and the Soviets are more powerful than the Germany of 1939.

Now, my friends, I do not want to imply that the situation between the thirties and fifties is exactly parallel. In many respects, fortunately it is not.

The participation of the United States as a leader in world affairs has become a crucial factor which we hope will prevent world war III, and which will maintain freedom.

To a considerable extent, too, the world has evidenced that it learned the lessons of aggression.

NUMEROUS FACTORS INVOLVED

Now, I want to point out that the present situation should not be oversimplified so that we ignore all of the many factors which now prevail. We must consider such factors as:

1. The ability of the already heavily burdened United States actually to fulfill present and prospective commitments.

2. The fact that we do not want to be sucked into an endless series of bleeding wars at the periphery of the Iron Curtain.

3. The fact that neither we nor anyone else can possibly save any nation which does not want to save itself.

4. The fact that we must have the willing cooperation of our allies in Europe and of the free states of Asia and must not attempt independent, unilateral action by ourselves.

It is bad not to take a stand, but it is infinitely worse to take a stand which you cannot sustain, and where you are going to suffer debauch.

TIME IS OF THE ESSENCE

The point to remember is that these factors must be weighed extremely carefully. The world situation is changing so fast that we cannot give so-called irrevocable, fixed answers to our problems. We must constantly reevaluate the situation in which we find ourselves.

What we must remember, however, is that time is of the essence. We cannot delay indefinitely nor can our allies.

"There is a tide in the affairs of men, which, taken at the crest, leads on to fortune," we are told by one of Shakespeare's characters.

There was a great tragic hero of one of his plays who had all the noble features of a great man, except for one fatal flaw: that he could not make up his mind in time. He was constantly evaluating and weighing his actions. He was constantly tortured by the pros and cons.

So, too, were France and Germany in the 1930's. Should they take a stand or should they not; was this the right time, the right place, to take a stand; would their people back up a stand?

The result was the disaster of World War II.

Once again, we and other powers are, as I have pointed out, concerned by doubts.

By this I know, that you, the American people, do not want a foreign policy of timidity, of retreat, of surrender.

You want a foreign policy of courage, of strength, of leadership, of determination.

It is time that our people naturally wonder whether we are going once again to have to carry a disproportionate share of the burden, as in Korea. They naturally wonder what sacrifices in blood and treasure they may ultimately have to make.

We are a peace-loving people, and we deplore and despise war. But the American people have never failed their responsibilities when they were given the facts. They must be given the facts—even more facts than they have been given—concerning the crisis in southeast Asia.

They must be given the facts with regard to the adequacy of our Defense Establishment.

Frankly, I myself have doubts as to the adequacy of that establishment under the new circumstances in which we find ourselves. It is not that I doubt the leadership of our Armed Forces, because, to the contrary, I have the greatest of confidence in them, from our magnificent Commander in Chief on down.

It is that I doubt that we should be considering reducing our already shrunken Army by three divisions at the very same time when our responsibilities are increasing, rather than decreasing, throughout the world.

I doubt that we can be smug concerning our Air Force when, from the latest Soviet air parade, we learned that they now apparently not only have the equivalent of our B–47 bombers, but the equivalent of our B–52 intercontinental jet bomber as well.

I am convinced that the American people have the intelligence, the understanding, the vision, with which to come to grips with this problem in every respect.

So, too, the administration in Washington has the leadership with which to be adequate to this situation. I refer to the leadership of our President and of his able Secretary of State.

They know, as you and I should know, that there are disadvantages and advantages to virtually every single alternative now available to us and to our allies. Anybody who tells you that there is one cure-all road, one pat formula which will bring peace and security in southeast Asia or elsewhere in the world is misinforming you and oversimplifying the case.

FINAL COMMENTS

I want to conclude now with a respectful suggestion to all those who are interested in a constructive answer to our dilemmas. The admonition is severalfold:

1. Let no man misrepresent the earnest desire of the President of the United States to avoid war.

2. Let no man add to our difficulties with our allies by abusing them, misrepresenting their position.

Let there be constructive criticism of our allies or of ourselves, but let it be fair and factual.

3. In turn, let our allies not misrepresent our position, our motives, our desire for peace.

4. Let no partisan critic in this country endanger bipartisan nonpartisan unity in foreign affairs. Let us remain united at the water's edge. Let us speak with one voice so that the voice will be heard and heeded.

5. Let us view the global battlefield as one—never becoming so preoccupied with any one area that we allow ourselves to be caught off-balance in other areas—the Middle East, South America, or elsewhere.

6. Let us tell our people enough so that they will be informed and able to come to a sound decision on the Indochina crisis, particularly.

7. Let us inform our enemies so that they will know that, as dearly as we hold peace, we hold liberty still dearer, and we will fight for our liberty and for the liberty of others. Let our enemies not mistake our peaceful but vigilant intentions.

8. However, let us not telegraph our punches to our enemies, nor commit the even worse mistake of telegraphing that we are not going to send any punches, regardless of what our enemies may choose to do.

Let us not blueprint all of our actions to our enemies, lest they prepare effective counter-measures against them.

9. Let us condition our every action by what we find to be our own best interests.

10. Let us face the future with faith, with confidence, and with hope.

Things have not gone well for us and for our allies in some respects. But the situation is far from irreparable. Why should we abandon hope and lose heart? Why should we magnify guesses as to so-called diplomatic defeats as if those estimates were final and irreversible?

We never did that during World War II, or any of the other conflicts in which we have fought. There was never a defeat which we have suffered from which we have not rebounded to victory. The lowest point in the tide marks the turning of the tide. There is every reason to believe that the forces of right, of freedom, shall prevail and I would add, as did Mr. Dulles some weeks ago, I would not trade our troubles for Russia's troubles.

The Bible tells us that "without vision, a people perish." Without vision, we cannot look after the needs of coming generations. We must demonstrate vision and faith if we would survive.

Mr. Winston Churchill had asked of the British people in their hour of great travail that they act so that forever after men would say "this was their finest hour."

It is for us to act in that manner as well. It is for us to act so that future generations will say: "Our fathers acted nobly for a noble future for mankind. Our fathers acted daringly and courageously so that succeeding generations might live with hope. Our fathers were adequate so that we could enjoy the heritage which they had received from the past."

In conclusion, I point out that our forebears founded this Nation in the firm belief that under God's guidance, they could successfully work out their problems.

He who dedicated the battlefield at Gettysburg sought guidance through prayer in his cabinet meetings and elsewhere. He said, "When I have no other place to go, I go to my knees."

The present President of the United States opens his cabinet meetings with silent prayer, even as did those men who signed the Constitution, the Declaration of Independence, who crossed the prairies and the mountains when Indian attacks were a constant threat against those who sought to reach this great State.

Yes, today as we dedicate this building, the motto on the coin in our pockets reminds us to put aside small thoughts, to think great thoughts and thus renew our faith and our strength; "In God we trust."

A NEW, NEW LOOK?

Senator WILEY has voiced a question which many persons have been asking about the relation of the military New Look to the Indochina war. Are the cut from 20 to 17 Army divisions and the greater reliance on air power sound in view of the increased responsibilities the United States might have to assume on the continent of Asia?

It all depends on what is meant by the New Look, and right now might be an appropriate time to call a moratorium on the loose employment of this misleading phrase. If the New Look is construed to mean massive retaliation, with the emphasis on atomic bombing, then obviously its application in Indochina would be highly questionable. But if the New Look is regarded primarily as a means of taking full advantage of the new weapons, large and small, that have become available, there is every reason to think that it remains a valid concept.

Originally the New Look meant merely a reappraisal of weapons systems and their relation to strategy and manpower. For example, if it is genuinely possible to do with air strikes and tactical A-bombs what the infantry formerly had to do in close combat, then the need for infantry in a given situation may be lessened. If atomic cannon can be employed with the same effectiveness as a battery of artillery, it ought to be possible to economize somewhat on manpower. The same considerations apply to many nonatomic weapons. The New Look is not a wholly American concept. Much the same reappraisal and integration have been taking place in Britain and other countries. A great deal depends, of course, on close allies and the availability of bases.

By itself, then, the New Look is not a limiting concept. It is when false constructions are placed upon it—such as the exclusion of any possibility of fighting merely limited wars for limited objectives—that the concept becomes confused. For a flexible strategy must be prepared to meet all contingencies that may arise, including limited war and even guerilla warfare.

Force levels, on the other hand, are in a different category. They depend upon strategic assumptions and commitments of the moment. If the military is called upon to undertake a whole new complex of commitments, such as those that would be involved in Indochina, the force levels ought to be reappraised, and Senator WILEY may be right in questioning the reduction in Army strength. Assuredly he is wise in making the point that air and naval forces might not "be able to prove the exclusive deciding factor" in any intervention—in other words, that ground forces might be necessary "in this type of jungle and rice-paddy war." He also is wise in asserting that intervention may "very definitely prove to be an action of war" rather than a police action, and in insisting that any such plan "have the willing cooperation of our allies in Europe and of the free states of Asia."

Obviously it would be foolish to talk of intervention even in a collective operation if the Army could not supply the forces that might be required. But any reappraisal ought to be concerned with force levels rather than with the basic soundness of the weapons system and the New Look itself.

The St. Lawrence Seaway and Senator Wiley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GUY CORDON

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 25, 1954

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I have been glad to note that the newspapers of Wisconsin have given well-deserved credit to the senior Senator from that State [Mr. WILEY] for his valiant and successful sponsorship of the St. Lawrence seaway law.

I ask unanimous consent that several editorials which have appeared in Wisconsin papers be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Two Rivers Reporter of May 10, 1954]

SEAWAY AT LONG LAST

There was general jubilation expressed by people in the community about the seaway after the House last week had approved the measure, thus ending more than 40 years of anxious waiting.

It is true the dream has been a long time coming true, and even for Manitowoc results are still years away, but all the supporters in the Great Lakes area are happy. The seaway, when built, will make a potential seaport of every port on the inland lakes.

At the present time Manitowoc cannot handle oceangoing ships for either loading or unloading freight, although repairs could be made if that should become a necessity, but business and industrial interests are hoping that some of the results to come from the eventual completion of the seaway project will be reflected in the community's economic life.

Deepening of channels, of course, spell the ultimate realization for those in this area who hope to capitalize on the trade which can accrue from the seaway. It will take more legislation to get dredging operations beyond Lake Erie, now planned by the House, and when this takes place in the connecting lakes channels, Manitowoc ought to be ready to capitalize on the opportunity.

Excellent shipbuilding facilities exist, and while no immediate construction is expected craft for ocean commerce can be constructed.

The seaway represents a triumph for the administration, which has been actively supported by President Eisenhower. However, no man deserves more credit for the success of the project than Wisconsin's Senator ALEXANDER WILEY. It was he who, more than any other legislator, worked unflaggingly to engineer the undertaking through both Houses.

While Senator Wiley was, of course, thinking of benefits for his State, he was nonetheless an exponent of the seaway for the Midwest and the Nation as a whole. He wanted United States to have a voice in it with Canada, since that country was determined to build with or without the United States.

His efforts have borne preliminary rich fruit, and there are confident predictions he will watch the entire country bear even richer results in the years ahead when the seaway becomes a reality. The St. Lawrence seaway may someday stand as a monument to a man who would not admit defeat so the entire country would benefit.

[From the Sturgeon Bay Advocate of May 11, 1954]

Our Mayor Says

(By Mayor Stanley R. Greene)

THE WILEY BILL

After many years of struggle it now appears as though a jointly sponsored United States-Canadian Great Lakes, St Lawrence seaway will become a reality.

How long it will take to complete the project and exactly what effect that project will have when completed upon our community is entirely problematical.

We do know that it will add immeasurably to the strength and the mobility of the Nation's transportation facilities and that it will step up the economic tempo of the whole Great Lakes region.

Sturgeon Bay and Door County will share in those benefits. More than that, with our strategic position and the excellent natural harbor of Sturgeon Bay, it will be our own fault if we do not secure much more than the general benefits accruing to the area from the opening of the seaway.

The bill that makes the seaway a reality will be signed this week by President Eisenhower. The bill was sponsored by Senator Wiley and has become generally known as the Wiley bill. Senator Wiley in his efforts on behalf of the bill has displayed genuine statesmanship in the service of both his country and the State which he represents in the Senate.

Both senatorial Democrats and Republicans recognized this fact and paid the Senator an unusual tribute in recognition of those services.

[From the Chilton Times-Journal of May 13, 1954]

Passage of Seaway Bill a Major Achievement

The passage of the St. Lawrence seaway bill after 59 years of bickering is a real achievement for the Eisenhower administration. It is a measure that has been of special interest to the Midwest and adoption of it will be particularly welcomed by the people of this great area. It will open the way for the sea traffic of the world to reach the Great Lakes through the St. Lawrence River.

The measure had the strong support of the entire Wisconsin delegation in the Congress as well as the support of Governor Kohler. Wisconsin's Senator Wiley played a leading role in getting the measure past the stiff obstacles interposed in the Senate.

The admission of oceangoing freighters into the Great Lakes through the St. Lawrence seaway is expected to result in vast economic benefit to the Nation. It will mean, quite likely, that Milwaukee and Chicago are on the verge of great developments as ports of international trade.

Passage of the bill will be a historic highlight of the Eisenhower administration, though support for it was in a large measure bipartisan.

[From the Wausau Daily Record-Herald of May 10, 1954]

St. Lawrence Seaway

Whatever the Republican administration in Washington may accomplish, its success in winning congressional approval of the St. Lawrence seaway will stand out as one of its great achievements.

The seaway approval is truly, as Governor Kohler described it, a historic step forward for America which will be especially beneficial to the people of Wisconsin.

For 59 years, since 1895, the seaway has been the goal of men of foresight and vision. And every President, Republican and Democrat alike, starting with Woodrow Wilson has endorsed the idea. But it was not until the administration of President Eisenhower that proponents of the seaway could be unified to the point of overcoming bitter-end opposition which for the most part was based on sectional or industrial self-interest without regard for the benefits which would accrue to the Nation as a whole.

Wisconsin's Representatives and Senators, it may be noted, were in unanimous support of the legislation, but special credit belongs to Senator Wiley who sponsored the seaway proposal in the Senate and played a leading role in obtaining its passage.

[From the Burlington Standard-Democrat of May 13, 1954]

His Work Paid Off

Our congratulations to Senator Alexander Wiley for his successful labors toward the passage of the St. Lawrence seaway project. Our Wisconsin senior Senator worked hard for this State for many years, being the only man, at times, who would stand up and be counted.

Thirty-seven Mine Workers Freed in Taft-Hartley Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MATTHEW M. NEELY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 25, 1954

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an article published in the United Mine Workers Journal entitled "Thirty-seven Mine Workers Freed as Government Loses Case in Maneuver To Fit Taft-Hartley With Criminal Bite." The opinion in the case was rendered by Judge Watkins, of West Virginia, one of the most distinguished district Federal judges in the United States.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The motion of the UMWA to dismiss an indictment charging violation of Federal law against 37 UMWA members as an outgrowth of the organizational campaign at Widen, W. Va., was sustained April 12 by Judge Harry E. Watkins in the Federal district court at Charleston, W. Va., and the mine workers were released.

While the court's action is subject to appeal, it marks another important legal milestone in the history of the Taft-Hartley Act which was indirectly involved in the proceedings. The miners were actually charged under an 1870 statute enacted in the heated Civil War period and which was intended to protect the right of the newly enfranchised Negroes to vote.

Although the basis of the legal action against the miners was alleged violation of Taft-Hartley, the case was presented as a criminal conspiracy to deprive certain workers of rights protected by the old statute. This novel form of prosecution would have made possible heavy penalties—a $5,000 fine and 10 years in jail. Those convicted of a felony also lose their civil rights, such as the right to vote.

In a 52-page decision, which discussed the background of the 1870 civil-rights statute as well as the Taft-Hartley Act, and court interpretations of each of these statutes. Judge Watkins severely criticized the Government for choosing to enforce Taft-Hartley by charging criminal conspiracy to violate another statute. He said this was completely without precedent and contrary to well-established law and the intention of Congress.

Making the point that an employer who violated Taft-Hartley would, if the Government interpretation should stand, be subject to as much as 10 years in prison, Judge Watkins said:

"If that is the effect of the act it is time that labor, management, and Congress should know it. There have been thousands of cases (under Taft-Hartley and the Wagner Act) involving unfair labor practices, but to this date there is no record of any case where anyone has given the act this construction. What the Government is trying to do is to prosecute an unfair labor practice as a Federal criminal conspiracy."

Going even further, Judge Watkins pointed out that not even an unfair labor practice is involved but only a simple misdemeanor charge under State law. He said that in his view no violation of Federal law is involved because the charges were not against an employer or a union, but private individuals not identified as either employer or union agents.

Judge Watkins charged the Government in this case with seeking to make a crime of acts which Congress had regarded as not criminal under Federal law. Congress in Taft-Hartley did set up machinery to restrain unions and employers and provided enforcement machinery through processes of the National Labor Relations Board and, Ultimately, the Federal courts, if required. But in this case, the Government sought to shortcircuit the regular procedure and go directly to court with a felony charge under another law.

The irregular procedure adopted by the Government was sharply slapped down by Judge Watkins' action in upholding the UMWA motion for dismissal of the indictment and the case never even went before a jury. It was held by Judge Watkins that the acts charged do not constitute an offense against the laws of the United States. He cited numerous United States Supreme Court decisions in line with his thinking on this case.

One of the points brought out in the opinion is that the 1870 civil-rights statute, which courts have described as loosely drawn and vague as to its scope, was really intended to protect the citizen in rights guaranteed by law from abuses by the State itself. In the bitter reconstruction era after the Civil War there was thought to be need for such a law to force still rebellious officeholders to observe the 14th amendment and laws giving Negroes the vote and other civil rights which they had not heretofore possessed.

But the law was not intended to apply to acts of individuals who could themselves be prosecuted by the States or sued by other individuals. All this was on the theory that if a State violated Federal law, a citizen had nowhere to go for protection except to the Federal Government.

Therefore, to invoke this old Civil War statute in an effort to fit criminal teeth into the jaws of Taft-Hartley is a radical departure from proper judicial conduct and a distortion of both laws, in the opinion of the West Virginia Court. Judge Watkins pointed out that Congress in considering Taft-Hartley had refused to write into it criminal sanctions and instead chose to rely on the enforcement procedure of NLRB orders, which if defied could result in a court order and punishment for contempt. Even the "awful 80th" Congress that passed Taft-Hartley thought this was severe enough, but now the Government wants to add a new weapon to its arsenal against labor.

In passing, Judge Watkins expressed another fundamental principle which is often overlooked nowadays. He said: "The right of employees to unite for their own improvement and advancement, or to refrain from so doing, is a fundamental right that existed prior to either the Wagner Act or the Taft-Hartley Act. It existed prior to the adoption of the Constitution."

What Congress, therefore, did in enacting Wagner and Taft-Hartley was simply to provide machinery for enforcing rights which were already held by the people, and in so doing it set certain standards as to where, when, and how the law should apply.

Some far-reaching observations about the law and legal theory were embodied in Judge Watkins' opinion. In discussing a previous Supreme Court case under the 1870 statute, Judge Watkins after reemphasizing that labor's right to organize was not dependent on any Federal statute, explained that the task of protecting workers in the exercise of this right belongs to the States and not to the Federal Government. He stated that current Federal law protects workers in this right against encroachment by employer, labor unions or their agents. He added:

"For the protection of the right against interference by employers, unions and their representatives, Congress has established an elaborate procedure with remedies. For their protection of the right against interference by all other persons the people must look to the States. The power for that purpose was originally placed there and it has never been surrendered to the United States."

Then Judge Watkins declared that the offense charged in the indictment is not against an employer, a union, or its agents, does not charge a conspiracy to violate a right created and secured under the Constitution, but is against individuals and is limited to the Taft-Hartley Act, which contains its own enforcement machinery. Under the circumstances, there is no justification nor legal support for the Government's attempt to bypass the law's regular procedure, the court held. Citing debates on Taft-Hartley, it said such a process was contrary to what Congress intended.

In the course of his discussion of legal principles and history, Judge Watkins recalled a case where a similar conspiracy charge was filed against persons who were charged with interfering with the rights of a UMWA member in organizing a local union, and which was thrown out by the court on the same grounds he states in his opinion in the instant case. The earlier case arose prior to enactment of Taft-Hartley, but it pointed out clearly that as between individuals, the citizen must look to the States to protect this kind of rights.

Attacking the premise of the Government's case, Judge Watkins stated a final clincher point by recalling the debate in Congress and its refusal to make a felony of an unfair labor practice. He then observed:

"It seems unreasonable to believe that Congress would provide that the consummated violation of the rights under section 157 would constitute only an unfair labor practice, without even a fine or any punishment as a misdemeanor, but should punish as a 10-year felony the mere conspiring to do such a thing."

What the Government was seeking to do in this case Judge Watkins in effect said, would be to make a felony case of every charge of an unfair labor practice. In other words, every picket line scuffle or minor argument could be a potential criminal case on a Federal court docket. The Watkins decision in this case, unless reversed, is viewed generally by labor legal experts as of deep significance in slowing the drive toward injection of criminal law with its more severe penalties and time-consuming court action into the field of labor law, traditionaly reserved to the civil law.

The Guatemalan Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 25, 1954

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, events are breaking fast, arising from the Communist beachhead in Guatemala.

I expect in the not-too-distant future to comment in some detail regarding the grave implications of that beachhead.

For the present, I should like to send to the desk 3 newspaper clippings on 2 different phases of the problem. One is an editorial from the Thursday, May 20, issue of the New York Journal-American concerning the massive shipment of arms which Guatemala had received from the Iron Curtain.

The second is an editorial from one of the distinguished newspapers of my own State, the Sheboygan Press, edited by one of the leading citizens of Wisconsin, Mr. A. Matt Werner. This editorial is on the same vital theme of the danger of the Red arms shipment.

The third concerns the labor phase of communism in this hemisphere. It is an article by the noted columnist, Victor Riesel, as carried in newspapers throughout the country on Wednesday, May 19.

I ask unanimous consent that these items be printed in the Appendix of the Congressional Record.

There being no objection, the items were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the New York Journal-American of May 20, 1954]

RED ARMS

The huge shipment of Communist arms and munitions that was unloaded a few days ago in Guatemala creates, in the restrained words of President Eisenhower, a disturbing situation. The President added it would be a terrible thing if a Communist dictatorship were established on this continent. It would, indeed.

Our State Department views the shipment as "a development of gravity" and Senator Wiley, chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, calls it an ominous aspect of "Communist intervention."

Certainly the shipment is all of these things—disturbing, grave, and ominous.

Just as certainly it merits scrutiny under the terms of the Treaty of Rio de Janeiro dealing with the security of the Americas, and under the anti-Communist resolution recently adopted at the Inter-American Conference at Caracas.

For the arms shipment, particularly to Communist-conditioned Guatemala, in its implications ties in with the grand Communist design to establish bases in Latin America. These would be a constant threat to the Panama Canal and a constant threat to the United States. Equally endangered would be our anti-Communist hemisphere neighbors.

The Organization of American States, comprising 21 Hemisphere Republics, including the United States, should take immediate action to determine if this shipment comes under the Caracas Declaration as "the intervention of international communism, acting in the interests of alien despotism."

[From the Sheboygan Press of May 20, 1954]

DANGER IN GUATEMALA

President Eisenhower's statement that the establishment of a Communist dictatorship in Guatemala would be a terrible thing highlights the value of Senator Wiley's proposal that all American Republics confer quickly on the Red arms shipment to Guatemala.

Wisconsin's senior Senator believes that Communist Poland's shipment is proof that the Red conspiracy is "intervening directly in the affairs of this hemisphere."

Declaring that the shipment was massive and tremendous, the Senator pointed out:

"This is not a United States concern nor a United States interpretation alone. It is a hemispheric consultation."

American Republics should confer over the Guatemalan situation because the Caracas Conference of the Americas earlier this year called for consultation on appropriate action in the event of Communist domination of the affairs of any one of the Republics.

"You can be absolutely certain," the Senator stated, "that no ship is loaded behind the Iron Curtain with 1 ton or 1,000 or 2,000 tons of arms unless that shipment is a part of the master plan of world communism. That plan is aimed at one principal objective—the domination of the world."

There is no shadow of a doubt that the Guatemalan Government is extremely leftist. The arms shipment from Communist Poland to a revolutionary regime already Red-tinged is alarming and dangerous.

As Senator Wiley says, the time is already here for consultation by all American Republics over the Red threat in Guatemala. Communism already has secured a foothold in Guatemala. Only fast, strong, and united action by all Western Hemisphere Republics, from the United States down, can prevent this Red foothold from growing into a stronghold.

[From the Dallas Morning News of May 19, 1954]

INSIDE LABOR

(By Victor Riesel)

The Soviets may soon be 63 airports closer to the Panama Canal.

If we talk in these terms, perhaps we can take the Caribbean and its little nations out of the "banana republic" and musical comedy images in our minds. That romantic sea is now laden with guided missile bases, rocket launching sites, radar screens—and hungry, shoeless natives ready to follow the skilled Soviet agents into anti-United States adventure.

We lost the support of the Jamaican workers around the vital rocket depot there because we wouldn't give the anti-Communist labor groups enough money to maintain payments on their only jeep. We lost the British Guiana populace because no one would heed the warnings here.

We lost Guatemala because people snickered when it was pointed out that the Soviet global labor network was about to seize that nation. Now we are losing Honduras to the Soviets.

And Honduras will put the Russian agents 63 airports closer to the canal.

As I write, there is a general strike—which is the deadliest, although not the bloodiest, form of biggest cities and ports, La Ceiba. You probably know as little of that city as you knew of Pusan or Seoul. But it is just as important.

There, where there is no union, 15,000 banana workers are on the company gates. They control the police. They monitor the cases going into the local hospital. They guard the airport. They distribute the dairy products.

In other cities they have sent flying terror squads into the streets. They have military columns up to 2,000 moving across the country. Yet there seem to be no leaders. Just a "committee for workers unity" which refuses to accept wage increases and improved working conditions—but holds out for power over company management.

In all, there are 40,000 strikers who have been efficiently organized in several cities since April 30. Yet this most difficult of all stoppages is being run without a single union headquarters.

It is, of course, organized and directed by Soviet agents operating out of nearby Guatemala. They operate on schedule and on a pattern which must now be obvious even to us.

As Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, head of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, soon will point out on the basis of on-the-spot investigations by his aides in the Caribbean, the central source of this power and strategy is the Soviet's World Federation of Trade Unions.

As a result of his aides' searchings, the Senator now believes that this World Federation of Trade Unions is Moscow's single most important conduit of Communist literature, manpower, money and false-name bank deposits in the world.

It is the WFTU which first searches out the under-developed areas in which the natives have piled up grievances and debts over the last ten generations. A decade ago the Soviets selected Guatemala. They moved into the labor field. They captured the workers' imagination, built them a "General Confederation of Labor," tied to it the "peasants" and had themselves another Yenan.

Then they moved in on the South American Continent. They deposited money in British Guiana banks for the use of the Communist group in that bauxite-laden country. Finally, it took the Royal Navy and Marines to dislodge the Soviet's Peoples Party. In every area the Soviets need one base—here in Latin America they had two. It was now time to radiate. They next picked Honduras. They built an underground labor house. And they called a strike.

And on May 25, there will arrive in Moscow a Guatemalan labor chief by the name of Firgilio Guerra. He will report on the Honduras "victory" to the Council of Soviet Labor Unions. He will be briefed. Soon Guatemala will radiate again, always in the direction of the Panama Canal.

Senator WILEY believes we must find a formula with which to win the labor base in each nation. He believes that responsible unions must be built by anti-Communists in these underdeveloped lands—and that we must train and help these people to raise their standards of living.

Or we will face being slashed from the canal and South America—or being put in the ugly position of landing Marines again.

Why do we always get positioned?

A Tribute to Max Abelman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 25, 1954

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following tribute to a distinguished Brooklynite and which is reprinted from Through the Years, by Nathan Jonas, 1940:

MAX ABELMAN

Few men who have worked with me through the years, in various enterprises of mine, have been so closes, so useful in so many varied ways, as Max Abelman. He has come to be a part of almost any project of mine, as a matter of course, and has always acquitted himself with great earnestness, loyalty, energy, and ability. He has never spared himself, nights, Sundays, or holidays, and has a well-recognized genius for managing publicity enterprises.

Twenty-nine years ago, when he was only 23, he came with the Federation of Jewish Charities as a clerk at $900 a year. He became assistant secretary to the Manufacturers Trust Co. in 1923 after having risen to the executive secretaryship of the federation, which post he had filled most competently until his health was threatened.

As Justice Lazansky said of him at a testimonial dinner which the federation gave him at the Unity Club, February 1923, "His self-sacrifice was remarkable, his days endless. He gave his service out of his heart." At that dinner many prominent men, including Judge Geismar, Justice Lewis, Justice May, Justice Lazansky, and many others paid tribute to this man who almost worked himself to a point of breakdown in many causes he served.

Mr. Abelman has always been at his proud best when arranging a big dinner at one of our large hotels and handling all the details, from planning the menu, selecting the invitation list, handling the publicity, and securing famous artists to render entertainment. In this latter capacly I know of no one in New York who can equal him.

No one has more often charmed the great metropolitan opera songbirds and musicians to appear before our various celebrations, dinners, etc., than Max Abelman. A dinner with from 1,000 to 2,000 guests is really quite a difficult and extensive enterprise to manage successfully, but Max rarely misses any of the fine points in handling such affairs. He has a fine sense of the dramatic and a thoroughly competent knowledge of New York publicity ways and means.

Needless to say, such genius as this was very peculiarly useful and important in the various drives, celebrations, and fund raisings with which I have been so long associated. I gladly acknowledge my debt and my warm friendship for Max.

One other thing seems to me very worthy of note about Max's personality. He has aesthetic insight. His artistic nature combined most fittingly with his publicity sense when he conceived the idea of decorating the walls of children's pavilion at the Jewish Hospital with imaginative illustrations of child folklore. He got famous artists to do this, and, what is more, interested famous people, including Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt, to come to the hospital and autograph the murals.

Max had said to himself, "Why should the sick little children here, at the most imaginative period of their lives, lie on their beds, away from their loved ones, and gaze at bare, dull institutional walls? If they could look upon walls filled with good artists' conceptions of Snow White, Little Red Riding Hood, The Wind in the Willows, etc., how much more happy and productive would be their stay here." He made that dream come true in a way that Brooklyn children bless him for, now and in the future.

In his own special way, Max is a genius, and I am glad that Brooklyn charities have benefited so much from that genius. His continuing work for the hospital as head of the Public Relations Department, and other worthy enterprises, keeps up the standard he has set for himself. He was elected a director of the Jewish Hospital in 1928.

A record of my life would be surely incomplete without registering my admiration and gratitude for the many wonderful things he has done for Jewish and non-Jewish community matters and patriotic efforts of all kinds. I count him one of the Brooklyn community's most valuable civic assets, and so do others.

No wonder that at the testimonial dinner to him, besides Justice Lazansky's eloquent tribute already quoted, Judge Harry E. Lewis said of him, quite justly:

"In 1914 I was chairman of the membership drive. But I was chairman in name only. I realized then what Max Abelman was to federation, and also what he was to me. There was not a moment of the day or night when he was not at my beck and call. And as he was with me, so he was with every chairman, and so he was with every president. We have had many, many 'leaders,' but I think Max Abelman has led some of those leaders. We have had many 'chairmen of drives;' they were chairmen in name; Max did the work * * *.

"I have heard it said that Nathan S. Jonas was the father of federation. If that is true, Max was the mother. For as loyal as Mr. Jonas was to federation, Max Abelman was equally loyal; he has given of his time and effort and money; yes, of his life."

As a matter of interest, the children of two couples, very dear friends of ours, were born on the same day, August 1, 1923, August 1 also being my birthday. May and Bessie Abelman had their son, born on that day, named Alan Nathan, and Walter and Gertrude Gretch, whose daughter Gertrude was born on that same day. We have always felt these children to be proteges of ours in whom we feel a deep interest. Our friendship with the parents of these children has always been very close.

Another Frontier Yields to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRY M. GOLDWATER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 25, 1954

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Another Frontier Yields to Education," published in the Washington Evening Star of May 24, 1954. The article refers to the educational program being conducted under the Eisenhower administration on behalf of the Navaho Indians in Arizona.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ANOTHER FRONTIER YIELDS TO EDUCATION

(By Jesse Fant Evans)

Winning of the West was speeded by little one-room schoolhouses presided over by teachers who followed in the dusty wake of prairie wagons hauling pioneer families across the plains.

Today, mobile schools are breaking down the last educational frontiers in the United States by carrying the three Rs to isolated areas of the 17-million-acre Navaho Indian Reservation sprawling over Arizona, New Mexico, and Utah.

The man leading this foray on behalf of some 13,000 Navaho youngsters is the new, forward-looking United States Commissioner of Indian Affairs, Glenn L. Emmons, who before entering the Government was a well-known banker in Gallup, N. Mex.

The on-the-scene spark plug for this far-flung educational odyssey is Carl W. Beck, field representative for Commissioner Emmons. Mr. Beck's own early education was obtained in a one-room border town school in Arizona, where he learned Spanish from his playmates along with his formal schooling. He has been an Indian service career employee since, as a senior at the University of Arizona under the presidency of Dr. Cloyd Heck Marvin, now president of George Washington University, he got a summer job on an Indian reservation.

For 15 years Mr. Beck served in different capacities on the Navaho Reservation; he learned their language, and gained their confidence through his sympathetic understanding and sense of fair play. He knows thousands of Navahos by name and their faces light up as he approaches, for to them he will always be "Belinthakizi, the Man on the Spotted Horse." This was a pinto he once rode on his rounds among them and to their tribal ceremonies.

By way of stressing what even an elementary education can do for the Navahos, and what they can do for this country of which they are full-fledged citizens, Mr. Beck proudly points to the records of over 3,600 Navaho servicemen in World War II and in the Korean conflict, and of the 15,000 Navahos engaged in defense projects. "Many served with distinction, particularly in the Marine Signal Corps," he said. "Their native language was even used as a code—and that's one code no enemy has ever broken down."

Six trailer-school units already are functioning, according to Mr. Beck, and 40 or more are expected to be in operation by September. Children walk in from their nearby primitive hogans, so there is no expense involved in bringing them in by bus over rutty, unimproved roads. Furthermore, Navaho mothers are just as eager to have their little youngsters near at hand as any other American youngsters. Having the "white man's education" in sight from the hogans is a distinct advantage for the skeptical, too.

A hogan is a 6- or 8-sided inverted cuplike affair made of logs and mud, with an opening at the top to let smoke from the central fire escape. The entrance always looks toward the east and the rising sun.

Sites for the schools are selected near a waterhole, a mission, or a trading post. First, a prefabricated, portable, 1-room schoolhouse is asembled. It is capable of taking care of from 25 to 30 youngsters in the first 3 grades. Nearby is located the teacher's trailer. Another trailer houses a teacher's Navaho aid who serves as interpreter, general assistant, and prepares a hot lunch for the children. A third trailer provides kitchen facilities and a fourth has shower and toilet arrangements.

Already several of these mobile trailer camps are functioning as Navajo community centers, with Indian mothers shyly participating in demonstration cooking, sewing, and health work.

One of these trailer-school units is to be set up at Oljatoh, Utah, 195 miles from a railroad or a town. Another is to be at Whippoorwill Mesa, Ariz., high up in the Big Black Mountain country in the wildest part of the Navaho holdings. Here there are no improved roads, no outside communications of any kind, including telephones and post offices, and only 2 or 3 trading posts in the entire area. Still another is to be situated at Tohthlacon, in that part of Arizona where rich uranium deposits have been discovered.

Teachers are being recruited from all over the United States. When the trailer locations give promise of becoming permanent, they can be moved to other outposts and replaced by conventional structures.

Time To Call a Halt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 25, 1954

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, in the current issue of Town Journal there appears a very enlightening and provocative editorial headed "Time To Call a Halt." I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the Appendix, because I thoroughly agree with what is pointed out in it.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It's strange how history has a way of repeating itself. In the vacillation, indecisiveness and appeasement thinking of our allies we are witnessing a repetition of the same refuse-to-face-the-facts attitude that for over 20 years has made aggression a profitable adventure.

Way back in 1931, our State Department proposed collective action by the League of Nations when Japan invaded Manchuria. Great Britain refused to go along, nothing was done, and Japan's aggression was successful. She kept Manchuria until her defeat in World War II.

In 1935 Mussolini decided he wanted Ethiopia. Again our State Department proposed punitive action with the League of Nations against the aggressor. But the foreign ministers of Great Britain and France combined secretly in a pact that gave Mussolini the green light, and the right to boast that aggression was more profitable than appeasement.

The following year Hitler defiantly rearmed the Rhineland. We have learned since that a show of firmness would have made him retreat, but we all know what happened.

Only 2 years later, Britain's Foreign Minister, Neville Chamberlain, proved again the folly of appeasement when he agreed to let Hitler take over Czechoslovakia on that dictator's promise to be good.

One year later the free world was compelled to fight the war that appeasement had not been able to prevent.

Have we learned anything from all this? It seems doubtful. When the Communists tried to take over South Korea in 1950 (practically invited to do so by our withdrawal of troops and Dean Acheson's foolish statement implying our lack of concern for Korea) the United States was quick to leap to the rescue. But though the fighting lasted 3 years, only one fourth of the nations represented in the United Nations joined forces with us, and most of those made only token contributions.

And although Americans did most of the fighting, our partners in the U. N. prevented us from achieving complete victory, and thus made it possible for the Reds to switch their aggression to Indochina.

One would have to be a supreme optimist to expect any better results at Geneva than at Panmunjom. If Indochina falls to the Communists, it will be only a question of time before the rest of southeast Asia is swallowed up. And with each conquest the enemy that is dedicated to the destruction of the free world will grow stronger and more reckless.

Some day, somewhere, the nations of the free world must take a stand and stop the relentless march of the aggressors or submit to slavery. The place may not be Indochina; and this may not be the time. But certainly if freedom is to be preserved for ourselves and our children, those who believe in freedom must be willing to do something somewhere toward saving it.

The first thing necessary is a realization that appeasement has never paid. Nor will it ever accomplish anything except to make the aggressor stronger and more difficult to defeat.

The free nations must learn to work together, for otherwise they will fall together. Communism knows no compromise. Like a termite, it will keep boring and boring forevermore until the civilization that we have created comes crashing down around our heads.

No nation, not even the United States, is big enough, rich enough, powerful enough, to fight alone against Communist aggression. It is a struggle between the forces of freedom and the forces of tyranny. It is a battle that can and may go on for 20, 30, 40 years. Sooner or later there must be a showdown. But before it is too late let the free world band together for it in a solid, determined, and united front.

In the meantime, and until other powerful nations are ready to do their full share—not a token share, as in Korea—let us not be pushed into another hopeless and thankless mess in Indochina. It is not up to us to police the world single-handed, and it would be folly to try.

GRAHAM PATTERSON,
Publisher, Town Journal.

Text of Broadcast by Eric Sevareid Concerning Reactions to Supreme Court's Decision on Segragation in Public Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 25, 1954

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of a broadcast by Eric Sevareid, May 19, 1954, over the CBS radio news service. Mr. Sevareid's clear and temperate analysis of the reactions by the press and community leaders in Southern States to the Supreme Court's decision in regard to segregation in public schools, should be helpful and very encouraging to all of us as we move toward constructive cooperation with one another in this as well as in other matters.

There being no objection, the text of the broadcast was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

It is a fair statement, I think, to say that the overall reaction by the press and community leaders in Southern States to Monday's Supreme Court decision, has been a matter of profound relief and encouragement to responsible men in the Federal Government. The decision struck a deep blow at what millions of southerners look upon as a way of life, and yet with some notable exceptions, the southern reaction as far as it can be judged here in the Capital, has been steady, clear headed, and high minded. Coming in the midst of a distracting period generally, when there appears to be deep intellectual and emotional disunity in the country, this reaction to a most intensely personal development is the most magnificent kind of reassurance that Americans are one people, that this house is not divided in any of its foundations, and will not be divided. As the decision itself sweeps away a peculiar and nontypical American institution, so the southern reaction should sweep away any lingering notions in the North that southerners are somehow peculiar or nontypical as Americans. There have been a few explosions of wrath among some southern political leaders, but not very many. The South is represented, these days, by extremely few professional anti-Negro politicians of the type of a Rankin, who used to be described as the man who believed what Bilbo said.

In terms of history, there is a kind of fortuitous timing about this drastic Court decision. It is doubtful if it could have been done, and made to stick, without violent dislocations, even a few years ago. But no section of the country has changed as much as the South has changed in the last 20 years; the old image of an agrarian, torpid South, brooding in the weeds of its memories, letting the world of event and ideas pass it by—that image bears no resemblance to the reality of today; today the true image is one of an industrializing South, prosperous, electric with energy, new people, new ideas, developing a creative intellectual life perhaps more effectively than any other part of the country. All this, particularly the economic prosperity and its accompanying sense of confidence, has greatly reduced the racial tensions; for when fear diminishes, the irrational projudices growing out of fear must also diminish. And the Court's decision comes at a time that finds most Southern States by no means unprepared in practical terms. Advances in schooling practices, facilities and standards have been greater in the South in recent years than anywhere else. The whole picture has changed in this respect. The overall average for the 17 States with segregation shows somewhat less money spent per Negro than per white child, but in many places, Negro children have the best schools and, indeed, the best teachers, because the cream of Negro intellects of necessity goes into teaching, more often than does the best of white intellects. Consider the educational revolution in the State of Florida; 12 short years ago, the State spent a little over $6 a year per white pupil and 80 cents per Negro pupil. Today it is around $75 per white child and $80 per Negro child.

Altogether, the 17 Southern States spend a greater proportion of their income on education than do Northern States; if the average amount per child is smaller that is only because the income is smaller.

So the South is not unprepared. But no one would pretend that the practical difficulties, financial, material, psychological will not be extreme and lasting over several years ahead. It would be hard to think of any American parallel, where so many communities have been ordered by simple decree to make so difficult a readjustment in their normal way of living; how they do it in the period ahead should be a matter of the most intense and sympathetic interest for all Americans.

Somehow and one day, it must all shake down, and work. It is hard to believe to the contrary.

Financial Policy for the Post Office Department

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN WELKER

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 25, 1954

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record a statement in the form of a copy of a letter to Postmaster General Arthur E. Summerfield from R. E. Berlin, president of the Hearst Corp. It is in the nature of a minority dissent to the report transmitted to Congress by Mr. Summerfield last March. Mr. Berlin is a member of the advisory board for the Post Office Department, and as such has asked me if I would insert his remarks to Mr. Summerfield in the Appendix of the Record, in order that all viewpoints and opinions on the matter at issue may be made available to the public.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Hearst Corp.,
New York, N. Y., May 6, 1954.

Hon. Arthur E. Summerfield,
Postmaster General,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Art: This is to register respectfully my dissent, as a member of the advisory board for the Post Office Department, to certain recommendations in your report, Financial Policy for the Post Office Department, as transmitted by you to Congress on March 31, 1954.

1. The Post Office is not primarily and basically a business so much as it is a public service.

Your major premise is that the Post Office is fundamentally a business, or a "public utility" as you express it. Your position cannot be supported by the history and traditions of the postal service, by the judgment of your most eminent predecessors, or by the considered opinions of competent outside observers. You will note that I referred to "the postal service." Isn't that really what the Post Office is? It seems to me that the only realistic appraisal shows conclusively that the fundamental purpose of the Post Office is to provide mail service to the public.

Surely this service concept must be considered basic. The primary task is to deliver the mail. The public welfare requires the Post Office Department to engage in many unprofitable activities which no business could countenance. To cite a single example, over 40,000 post offices are maintained and over 90 percent of them lose money. Most of the post offices are necessary, as you have discovered in your effort to close down those that are not needed. No business would operate so many losing branches.

You claim the Post Office is really "a national public utility owned by the people." I fail to recognize a real parallel, except in the sense that the Post Office is a monopoly and utilities are also monopolies. Just as you cannot turn on the lights in your house without dealing with the electric company, you cannot mail a letter without using the postal service. Beyond this monopoly feature, the parallel does not seem to exist. Utilities are regulated businesses catering to various public needs. They are privately owned in most cases, and within the limits laid down by various governmental bodies they are operated on a purely business basis. The typical utility must earn a profit or go bankrupt. Contrarily, the Post Office was never designed to make a profit and necessarily provides many free or below-cost services as a matter of public policy.

History denies your public-utility theory If there has been one major purpose which has motivated Congress in all of its legislation affecting the Post Office Department, that purpose has been to improve and extend service. Surely I do not need to enumerate for you the enactments made over the years in which the primary goal was greater service. It was the service concept that motivated the establishment of second-class mail, third-class mail, and parcel post. Indeed, your own departmental terminology refers to one class of postal activities as "special services." Where is the parallel with the typical public utility? Would a utility give free service to the blind or to weekly newspapers? Does the telephone company provide service at any price to the remotest rural resident, let alone at the same price as for a customer located right next door? I believe your program is based on a false premise. The Post Office is basically a public service, not a business.

I do not believe that Congress will ever abandon or should abandon the service concept. The most recent congressional action on this question came on March 6, 1953, a few weeks after you took office. At that time, the Senate passed, unanimously, Senate Resolution 49, which directed the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee to investigate a broad range of postal problems. The text of the resolution makes it clear that the Senate regards the Post Office as a service institution. For example, the resolution asked for a study of "expenditures which may be jusified only on a national welfare basis and not primarily as a business function."

The advisory council to the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Commission, created under Senate Resolution 49, has completed its investigation and Chairman Frank Carlson has reported its recommendations to the Senate. Its very first recommendation is that Congress should make a policy determination "that the Post Office Department is fundamentally a public service to the people of the United States and should be so considered." I share this view.

2. This is the worst possible time to raise mail rates.

Step 1 in your program is "prompt enactment of increases in postal rates." I sincerely believe it would be a mistake to raise postal rates now, especially in the manner you have recommended. Postal rates are very similar to taxes, in that everybody pays them and most mail users have no alternative and are completely dependent on the Post Office. At the very moment when the administration and the Congress are considering further tax relief in order to help prevent an economic depression, you propose the reverse. I am not enough of an economist to be able to forecast how much closer to a depression a postal-rate increase would bring the Nation, but I am very sure that the type of increases proposed would have some effect in that direction. This is no time to risk accentuating an economic downtrend. The boat has already been rocked enough. Too may business concerns are already too close to the break-even point to risk forcing them into insolvency. Within recent weeks one important national magazine with a monthly circulation of 1,300,000 suspended, and the publisher cited higher postal costs as one reason for killing the magazine.

3. Congress should continue to set postal rates.

You now advocate establishment of a new commission to set postal rates, subject only to a formula set forth by Congress. This commission would act on motion of the Post Office Department to adjust rates whenever costs were out of balance with income. This notion seems to me to be indefensible. In effect, Congress would abrogate its legislative function in favor of letting a bureaucratic agency handle the delicate task of setting rates. This is far too much power for Congress ever to surrender. It is the power of life and death over many businesses. Remember that mail rates are a form of taxes and that our Constitution wisely restricts the taxing power to the legislative branch.

I had believed that one of the goals of the current administration was to reduce unnecessary costs of government, to discontinue unneeded agencies and commissions, and in general to contract the governmental octopus which has become so all-encompassing. Your proposal flies in the face of that thinking.

4. The post office is still inefficient.

The new team which now runs the Post Office Department has made considerable progress in bringing order out of chaos, but much remains to be done. The advisory council's report referred to above makes that plain, and your own report concedes. It seems logical to me that you should finish the job of putting your house in order before demanding drastic rate increases affecting every American.

As a matter of fact, if your program were adopted in toto, there would be no longer any real incentive to increase efficiency in the post office. You would simply raise rates every time a loss was threatened instead of following the businesslike practice of paring costs. One of the disheartening aspects of your 350-page report is its lack of any real hope that further substantial sums can be saved through adoption of modern methods. You have been properly applauded for your efforts to modernize postal operations, but much, very much, remains to be done.

5. Cost ascertainment is not a proper base for ratemaking. Your report stoutly defends the cost-ascertainment system which you continue to use as the basis for making rate recommendations. This is a technical subject which has been debated for years by experts, and no full discussion of the subject is possible in these brief comments. However, I must register my objections against the continued use of cost ascertainment as a basis for making rates. Cost ascertainment does not take into account such intangible factors as degree of preferment, priorities in handling, and similar elements which must be given weight in determining rates. Your own experts have repeatedly so testified, and yet you continue to cite alleged losses on certain classes of mail, quoting cost-ascertainment figures to justify your claims. But you are not even consistent in your use of cost ascertainment. You advocate raising the cost of first-class nonlocal letters when your own figures show that first class still makes a profit on an overall basis.

This minority report has attempted to touch only the major areas of my disagreement with your position.

Faithfully yours,

DICK BERLIN.

The Supreme Court's Decision on Segregation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 25, 1954

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Washington Evening Star of May 18.

I think this is one of the clearest and most logical expressions I have read on the question of the decision of the Supreme Court on segregation.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE BAN ON SEGREGATION

The Supreme Court's unanimous decision outlawing segregation in the public schools should be looked at from two points of view.

The first is concerned with the constitutional basis for the Court's position, and the implications which flow from the ruling. The second has to do with the wisdom, in the long run, of the decision.

There is a comment to the effect that "the law is what the judges say it is," and this segregation ruling lends a sturdy vitality to that old law. In effect, nine men have concluded that segregation in the public schools is a bad thing, and have asserted the power to outlaw it. The constitutional basis for the decision is obscure. No act of Congress or State law is relied upon. This momentous policy determination, in short, is imposed on the country by the will of nine men.

The decision applicable to the States was predicated on the "equal protection" clause of the 14th amendment. The Court did not go so far as to say that the post-Civil War Congress which submitted this amendment to the States intended that it should serve to outlaw segregation in the public schools. That would have been preposterous. For the same Congress which proposed the 14th amendment enacted two statutes a month later providing for separate schools for white and colored in the District. The Court got around its difficulty on this point by the simple device of saying that it could not determine "with any degree of certainty" what may have been the intent of Congress in proposing the amendment or of the State legislatures in adopting it.

This uncertainty, however, did not prevent the Court from moving on. It concluded that it could not turn the clock back to the time when the 14th amendment was adopted, nor even to 1896, when the Court decided that segregated facilities, if equal, were not unconstitutional. It concluded that public education must be considered in the light of its present place in American life. From this, it was but a short step to the finding, based on the flimsiest of cited authority, that segregation is psychologically harmful to colored children, that separate schools are inherently unequal, and that, therefore, they deprive colored children of that equal protection under law which is guaranteed by the 14th amendment.

Since the 14th amendment applies only to the States, the District case was brought under the 5th amendment provision that no one shall be deprived of life, liberty, and property without due process of law. This presented some difficulty, but not much. Chief Justice Warren disposed of it in seven paragraphs. It would be unthinkable, he said, for the Court to outlaw school segregation in the States under the 14th amendment, and tolerate it in the District under the 5th amendment. Therefore, he reasoned, segregation in the District schools is a denial of the due process of law guaranteed by the 5th amendment. And this in the face of the fact that the due process clause was never held to be a bar to slavery itself.

In short, with respect to this aspect of the decision, it may be doubted that any court—not even the "nine old men" of the Franklin D. Roosevelt era—has gone quite as far as this Court. If ever a decision made law at the expense of States rights, this one does.

Concern over a dubious assumption of power by the Court, however, does not alter the fact that this decision finds much support in wisdom and fairness.

It is an undeniable fact that the separate-but-equal doctrine has not produced equal school facilities for colored, especially in the South. And it may be doubted that equal facilities could have been provided in many areas, even if the Court had adhered to the separate-but-equal rule.

So, perhaps this decision, as a practical matter, merely requires a very early resolution of a social problem which, in any event, would have been resolved sooner or later by doing away with segregation. A better result might have been attained if the States had been left to work out this problem in their own way. Our own court of appeals was not indulging in idle comment when, in 1950, it said that "centuries of bitter experience in all parts of the world have proved that the [racial] problem is insoluble by force of any sort." In this instance, however, the die has been cast. The Court has ruled and the judicial power stands behind that ruling. So the problem now is to find the best means of implementing the ruling—a problem which the Court has recognized in its request for further argument on the point this fall.

Calumet-Sag Channel Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED E. BUSBEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1954

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, it was my pleasure and privilege to appear before the projects committee of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress this morning at the Mayflower Hotel, in Washington, D. C., to submit a statement in behalf of the Calumet-Sag project. As my statement contained much factual information which I am sure will be of interest to all Members of Congress in future consideration of the request for funds to start construction of this vitally needed project, which is of such prime importance to the entire Nation, I desire to insert it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point:

In almost every respect the Calumet-Sag Channel is unique as a Federal public-works project. Lying as it does in the heart of one of the richest concentrations of industrial production on the continent, it poses many construction problems. But, because of this location, it also represent a problem that must be solved regardless of construction handicaps. For, in this key position, it lies as the major bottleneck to the whole national system of the inland waterways. As such, it is the vital missing link between the Great Lakes—now destined to be connected with the Atlantic Ocean by the St. Lawrence seaway—and the vast, intricate system of the Mississippi River which leads to the Gulf of Mexico and the seas beyond.

In presenting a study of the Calumet-Sag Channel, we should, first of all, stress the fact that its existence, even in its present inadequate form, is entirely due to local efforts and local expenditures; notwithstanding the fact that, from earliest Chicago history, the Calumet-Sag Channel and the ridge of land it bisects have actually posed a No. 1 problem, the solution of which is specifically the responsibility of the Federal Government.

This artificial channel connecting Calumet Harbor and Lake Calumet with the Chicago sanitary and ship canal was constructed by local authorities out of sheer necessity, because such a channel was critically needed by the system of sanitation which sought to divert sewage and industrial wastes from Lake Michigan to the inland waterways. However, so great was the demand for a navigable channel in this key location, that the canal designed for sewage was forced into service as a barge canal and has continued to be so used, with tonnages carried upon it mounting year by year, until, in 1954, some 4 million tons will be carried through this channel.

Recognition of this fact, plus a growing problem affecting the whole Illinois Waterway System, led to the Federal Government taking over the waterway in 1930. Any study of Calumet-Sag must include a summation of this action and the problems which led up to it. By such a summation we may clearly see the true nature of the local problems, those surrounding Calumet-Sag at present, and the part played by the Federal Government up to this time.

As early as 1817, the necessity for a navigation link between the Illinois and Mississippi Rivers and Lake Michigan was rather clearly seen. Yet, the whole history of action taken is a purely State and local one, with the Federal Government playing little or no part until the action I have noted was taken in 1930. In fact, in this matter of the Illinois Waterway System, including Calumet-Sag, we find the State of Illinois and the local authorities of Cook County and the city of Chicago making a record that is almost unique in the history of inland waterway development.

Illinois is one of those few States which, in cooperation with the local authorities referred to above, assumed the responsibility for the development of its own inland waterways, with little Federal aid or encouragement.

This record is one which should now be closely studied when attempts are being made to arouse Federal interest in the sadly neglected Calumet-Sag. That record had its major beginning in the construction of the Chicago Sanitary and Ship Canal, completed in 1900 by the Sanitary District of Chicago at a cost of $36 million. In considering this figure, we should take into account the greater purchasing value of the dollar at that time. The Corps of Engineers, United States Army, has estimated that this canal would today cost approximately $215 million. To this figure, we must add the total spent by the same agency on the Calumet-Sag Channel, the south branch of the Chicago River, and the west fork of the same stream, as well as on the Calumet and Little Calumet Rivers: a total of $28,800,000, which, when adjusted to current cost levels, would amount to $128,800,000. (See table for detailed figures.)

The following tabulation shows the estimated cost of the work to be done on the Sag Junction to Lake Calumet section of the project:

Part I—Sag Junction to Lake Calumet

Item	Federal	Non-Federal		
		Railroad [1]	Other local	Total
Channel excavation	$34,450,000			$34,450,000
Railroad bridges	41,250,000	$5,010,000		46,260,000
Highway bridges			$12,030,000	12,030,000
Locks	4,538,000			4,538,000
Rights-of-way			800,000	800,000
Total	80,238,000	5,010,000	12,830,000	98,078,000

[1] Covers specific betterments accruing to bridge owner and for which they have voluntarily agreed to contribute.

(Figures compiled by Corps of Engineers, U. S. Army.)

In 1908, realizing the absolute necessity for the development of the Illinois Waterway System, the State of Illinois amended its constitution in order to float $20 million in bonds to improve its waterways. In the late 1920's, it became evident that the 20 million would not be sufficient for the job, and the Federal Government was urged to take over the project.

As I have previously stated, the Calumet-Sag Channel was taken over by the Federal Government in 1930. At this point, in view of the attitude taken on tolls, or user charges, by certain agencies, we should note one of the express stipulations laid down by the Federal Government when taking over the channel. This was that this system of waterways, including the Chicago and Calumet Rivers, must remain free and unobstructed waterways, dedicated to free public use for navigation. This stipulation, by the way, was in fact a reiteration of the same clause which was originally written into the Constitution of the United States to govern all federally controlled inland waterways.

All of the above should be carefully kept in mind at this time, inasmuch as there has arisen, in connection with the proposed Calumet-Sag Channel project, a definite problem regarding the nature and extent of local participation in the construction of the vitally necessary Calumet-Sag.

This set of facts should be kept in the foreground in our study of the complicated set of problems which are such integral parts of the whole Calumet-Sag situation. One should never forget, in this regard, that the total amount expended by the State of Illinois and the Sanitary District of Chicago adds up to a substantial $84,800,000, which the United States Army engineers have estimated as representing a value of $403,800,000 in terms of current prices.

The estimated cost of work done in the past by local interests in constructing or improving channels which, in varying degree, form useful parts of the Illinois Waterway System, of which the Calumet-Sag project is a part, is listed below:

Items	Approximate date of construction (average)	Estimated cost	Estimated cost adjusted to current price level
Chicago sanitary and ship canal	1900	$36,000,000	$215,000,000
South Branch of Chicago River and West Fork of same	1900	12,600,000	75,500,000
Calumet-Sag Channel	1918	14,600,000	48,500,000
Calumet and Little Calumet Rivers	1925	1,600,000	4,800,000
Illinois Waterway	1925	20,000,000	60,000,000
		84,800,000	403,800,000

(Figures compiled by Corps of Engineers, U. S. Army.)

These construction problems, around which the debate on the extent of future local participation centers, are many and important because the Calumet-Sag Channel cuts through such a rich and busy industrial section of the area. To present these problems clearly, it is necessary to narrow this study down to one covering that section of the overall Federal project that is now being so seriously considered. That section is the stretch of the Calumet-Sag Channel and the Little Calumet River which connects Lake Calumet Chicago Sanitary Ship Canal. This section is the vital core of the whole project.

Also, it is largely upon this section of the waterway that the bulk of the money noted above has been spent. Not only is this section one which lies in an expanding industrial section, but it is also one—as the accompanying map clearly shows—which lies squarely across a maze of railroad tracks and major highways leading south from the great transportation center of Chicago. Along the Calumet-Sag and the Little Calumet River, there are 26 highway bridges and 12 railroad bridges. The majority of these bridges must be removed or rebuilt when the Calumet-Sag Channel is widened and modernized. In addition, there is the maze of power and telephone lines, oil lines, sewer and water pipes, and other utilities, as well as the real estate involved in the rights-of-way and location for the dumping of excavated spoil.

In breaking down these costs, the question of local participation—past, present, and future—becomes inextricably interwoven and of the greatest importance. The question of relocation of utilities presents no insoluble problems, because pledges, in most cases, have already been given. Concerning the real estate involved, the major share of easements and relinquishments must come from the sanitary district. In this case, we have the clearest example of how impossible it is to separate present and future local participation from that which has already been given. For, as we have seen, the bulk of the costs involved in the Calumet-Sag Channel have already been paid by the sanitary district. In addition, the sanitary district has, for years, borne the maintenance and operational costs on the Calumet-Sag, despite the fact that it has been a Federal waterway since 1930. On top of that, the sanitary district has already placed itself on record as being ready to relinquish the land along the channel necessary for its widening. The same cooperative attitude has been taken by the sanitary district in relation to its utilities which must be altered when the Calumet-Sag is modernized.

When we approach the problem of the many bridges, we take up the largest item of construction costs. It should be clearly understood that, in the case of Calumet-Sag, this item for bridge costs is actually greater than that involved in the major job of channel excavation. And, of the bridges, the greater part of that cost is involved in the reconstruction of railroad bridges. The reconstruction work to be done on these 12 railroad bridges involves an estimated cost of $46,260,000, of which the Federal Government must pay $41,250,000. Here we have by far the largest item of cost, as channel excavation costs are estimated to be $34,450,000.

The question of Federal responsibility in the matter of these railroad bridges has already been fixed by the provisions of the Truman-Hobbs Bridge Act of June 21, 1940. Under this act, the Federal Government must bear the cost of bridge alteration involved in Federal public works projects—with the railroads paying only the portion of the costs which could be attributed to specific benefits; that is, the useful life replaced, added carrying capacity, reduced operating costs, etc. In the case of the Calumet-Sag Channel project, these costs have been estimated to be $5,010,000.

In the matter of highway bridges, we actually have before us two sets of figures. Yet, we should note, at the outset, the much smaller amount involved. The total cost of removing or rebuilding the highway bridges involved in the project is estimated to be $12,030,000.

The two sets of figures represent a question of as yet undetermined responsibility. While the Truman-Hobbs Act was amended to include highway bridges, as well as railroad bridges, the amendment was enacted after Calumet-Sag was approved and authorized as a Federal works project in 1946. The language of this amendment makes it applicable only to Federal works projects authorized after the date of the amendment. This would rule out the highway bridges involved in the Calumet Channel project. However, a subcommittee of the House Committee on Public Works, under the chairmanship of Representative Homer Angell., of Oregon, has under consideration a proposed language change which would clarify the act so that the highway bridges involved in this project could be given the same treatment as that accorded railroad bridges. I am very hopeful that this proposed amendment will be reported favorably in the very near future.

In this case, as in almost every other aspect of the Calumet-Sag project, we again find past local participation closely interwoven with that anticipated for the present and future. For instance, acting on the belief that the vital Calumet-Sag project would one day be undertaken, both the State of Illinois and Cook County highway authorities made provisions for a widened Calumet-Sag in their bridge construction programs of the past few years. As a result, the project is at present crossed by six modern highway bridges which call for no added alteration.

As we study this question of local participation, about which so much debate has been centered, we find the evidence strongly in favor of the State and local authorities. These authorities have already paid the major costs of the Calumet-Sag project in past performances and expenditures. And, as far as can be ascertained at this time, all of these authorities stand ready to make whatever concessions and easements may be necessary. I might add at this point that the Forest Preserve District of Cook County has agreed to make land available for dumping of spoil. Also, land required for the proposed new Calumet River Lock has been pledged by the city of Chicago.

This question of local participation properly raises another highly important point; namely, that of local interest. As we study this phase of Calumet-Sag, we find a most peculiar situation. For at least 50 years, practically every major industrial organization and civic body in the area has voiced its interest in this vital project. At every session of Congress, for instance, from 1930 to the present time, the Federal Government has been urged to start construction on the Calumet-Sag Channel. Yet, during all that time, there was a puzzling lack of any sort of unanimous action on the part of the interested groups. Various organizations and authorities have sent petitions to Congress. But, not until last year was any successful attempt made to unify the activities of the various organizations and to give cooperative and organized weight to the petitions submitted.

In recognition of the ineffectiveness of this unfortunate division of interest and lack of unanimity, steps were taken in 1953 to set up a coordinating body that would give practical weight and influence to the petitions on behalf of Calumet-Sag.

This coordinating body, called the Chicago committee, was composed of outstanding business and labor leaders in the area. The committee succeeded in uniting all interests on a concentrated program of education and publicity. This program was eminently successful in many respects. First, the full news and editorial support of every newspaper in the area, as well as many in adjacent areas, was obtained. Second, the placement of educational and informative articles in major national magazines was successfully accomplished.

This educational material was also utilized advantageously in informing Members of Congress to the subject of our vitally important waterways. Here again, outstanding success was attained. Through this educational campaign, Calumet-Sag became a major topic of interest in our National Capital. Once accurately and fully informed on the subject, Members of Congress responded actively to this intelligent and practical approach.

A direct result of this program was my introduction of H. R. 7514, asking for an appropriation of $5 million to start construction on the Calumet-Sag project. Congressmen McVey, O'Hara, and Velde—all representing Illinois districts—later introduced companion bills. Beyond that direct action, plans were laid for further and even more direct legislative action. The majority of the Members of the Illinois delegation in the House of Representatives indicated to me that they would be willing to introduce identical bills to H. R. 7514, if and when I requested them to do so.

A valuable lesson was learned during the course of this campaign, as the accomplishments proved that the action taken by the Chicago committee was correct and practical. As a result, the Chicago committee became affiliated this year with the Cal-Sag Waterways Development Committee, Inc. This organization, as its name implies, became the proper coordinating body to spearhead the drive to bring the program launched last year to a successful conclusion. This new organization has already gained the strongest approval of the leading industrial and labor figures in the area, as well as the cooperative support of those agencies which are wholeheartedly in favor of the Calumet-Sag project.

At the present time, the Cal-Sag Waterways Development Committee, Inc., continues to act as a sound and practical agency, with the proper congressional contacts and a background of solid achievement to insure its successful operation in this highly sensitive field of education.

Furthermore, the Cal-Sag committee has appeared on the scene at a most critical juncture in the affairs of Calumet-Sag. The recent passage of the St. Lawrence Seaway Act now makes construction of the Calumet-Sag an absolute must. With the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway, Chicago will become an Atlantic seaport located in the heart of the great midcontinent industrial area. This redoubles the practical necessity for a link with the Mississippi system of inland waterways. In other words, Calumet-Sag was a necessity when Chicago was merely a Great Lakes port. Now, with Chicago destined to become a great seaport in the foreseeable future, Calumet-Sag becomes an absolutely critical necessity.

In conclusion, I desire to reemphasize the fact that the Calumet-Sag project cannot, by any stretch of the imagination, be considered as merely a local project, of importance only to Chicago and the area through which the Mississippi River flows. It is a national project: a vital link in our program of national defense and, therefore, of prime importance to every section of the Nation and to every segment of its population.

I, therefore, submit these facts to this committee of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, with the urgent request that it give its full approval and active support to the Calumet-Sag project.

Mr. Chairman, I deeply appreciate this opportunity to appear before the projects committee of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress in behalf of this essential project. I thank the members of the committee for their attention and courtesy.

Outline of Address by John L. Lewis of the United Mine Workers of America to First Governors' Fuel Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MATTHEW M. NEELY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 25, 1954

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record the outline of an able, timely, and very eloquent address by President John L. Lewis, of the United Mine Workers of America, to the first Governors' Fuel Conference, as published in the United Mine Workers Journal.

There being no objection, the outline of the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

President Lewis Calls for National Fuels Policy as Governors Alert Nation to Action Need

Establishment of a national fuels policy with the purpose of preserving America's coal-based economy in peacetime and assuring its efficient operation in war periods was called for by President John L. Lewis of the United Mine Workers of America in a forceful and eloquent address in Washington April 26 before the first Governor's Fuel Conference.

Aroused by the curent decline in coal's market due to the unlimited "dumping" of foreign waste oil, the reckless burning under boilers of natural gas, and other causes, with consequent spreading unemployment and business losses in coal States, the governors of 15 States convened, at the call of Governor John S. Fine of Pennsylvania, to canvass the entire situation and then attempt to offer remedial proposals for action by the States and the Federal Government.

Lewis warned the governors that national disaster impends—coming overnight in the event of war—unless effective action is taken to preserve the coal industry in a healthy condition so it can furnish the essential energy required by industry. Imported oil, he stated, could be cut off in 24 hours by enemy submarine action, and domestic oil refineries would be the first targets of enemy bombers.

In the face of present world conditions, Lewis declared, it would be "more than suicidal" to permit the coal industry to drift into chaos—to let its large fixed investment be impaired and its miners dispersed. Recalling the oil and gas shortages of World War II, he reminded the audience how coal came to the Nation's rescue, just as it had done in World War I, and as it will do if there is a world war III, if it is kept functioning meanwhile.

The fearful consequence to the Nation if coal's mighty productive machine is allowed to become impaired was dramatically pointed out by Lewis, who shattered the illusions of those who dream of power from atomic energy in our times or who rest their confidence on ample supplies of oil or other fuels in an emergency.

Scientists, he explained, have not yet even solved the problem of what to do with the atomic ash which could not be dumped in our rivers or on land without destroying and polluting everything it touched. As for oil, he asserted that all the Russians needed to do was to bomb 10 refining centers and "America would be afoot."

Observing that the coal industry has operated on the principles of free enterprise and has not sought a subsidy of any kind from Government, the miners' spokesman denounced the generous depletion allowance of 27½ percent permitted for oil, which he termed a subsidy. Lewis also denounced in scathing terms the $100 million loan to Europe which he said would never be repaid and is just "another device that is designed to further cripple the American economy and throw Americans out of work."

Emphasizing that the wellbeing of the coal industry is not a mere question of economics but is tied in with our entire economic and foreign policy, Lewis said: "I know that if Dien Bien Phu is a test of the free world, as said by our President, that we won't be able to do anything about it unless be keep our own household here in order."

The UMWA executive advised his audience that some voices within the coal industry are suggesting a wage reduction as a partial way out of their dilemma, but he declared that this would solve nothing and definitely that there would be no negotiated wage decrease in either bituminous or anthracite. "On that rock I place my Ebenezer," he said with force, striking the table as he did so. He pointed out that a wage cut of as much as $3 a day would mean only 25 cents a ton.

For many years, Lewis stated, the UMWA has advocated a national fuels policy for the Nation. Such a policy, he said, would determine the lines of demarcation as between the solid and liquid fuels and examine fuel use policy in the light of the public interest and with a view to protecting investment and conservation of natural resources.

Certainly, he observed, a primary use for oil should be military, while its use for motive power and as a lubricant should be second, and oil for power and heat should come last. The policy should be one that would not destroy the great coal industry on which our economy has been built and on which we must rely in an emergency.

He outlined six points that should be considered in formation of a national fuels policy:

1. That coal is our only unlimited source of energy available within the continental limits of the United States.

2. That our petroleum supply is limited and we are already dependent upon foreign imports of oil to meet the needs of the Armed Forces.

3. That the Communist aggressors, with the largest submarine fleet in history, are capable of shutting off these foreign oil imports virtually at a moment's notice.

4. That atomic energy, our great new source of armed might, is not now, and will not be for an unpredictable period of time, capable of supplying both the weapons of defense and the power to operate the domestic and, if necessary, war production economies.

5. That the present danger makes it mandatory that the American coal industry be kept strong and efficient in order to meet the fuel and energy needs of our Nation and our allies.

6. That these problems are, most assuredly, life-and-death matters to the Republic.

Represented at the conference, which is expected to be the first of a series at which the governors will explore the coal situation, were 15 States, most of them by their governors in person, the bituminous and anthracite operators, the Federal Government by Secretary of the Interior Douglas McKay, and others, and the UMWA by President Lewis, Vice President Kennedy, and a large delegation of district officials.

Chief operator figures on hand were Harry M. Moses, president of the Bituminous Coal Operators Association; Joseph E. Moody, president of the Southern Coal Producers Association; F. W. Earnest, Jr., president of the Anthracite Institute; and Tom Pickett, executive vice president of the National Coal Association. In all, there were 74 participants, Governor Fine stated.

Although the meeting was called on almost an emergency basis, Governor Fine made it clear that, aside from the immediate impact of residual oil on coal's markets, there are many other long-range problems which will require the continuing attention of the governors. He said the governors should form a body that would "speak out fearlessly and prudently for the preservation of the welfare of our Nation's basic fuels and their industries and workers."

Recognizing that there is no magic formula to solve all problems, Governor Fine said, nevertheless, that the collective voice of the coal-producing States, symbolized by their chief executives, "should serve to muster the serious attention of our Nation to the increasing gravity of the deplorable conditions of this industry."

The background of the economic situation in the coal industry was outlined by Pickett, who stressed the fact that "coal is the most plentiful, most available, and most essential of all energy sources," and represents more than nine-tenths of all American mineral fuel resources.

Citing the high point of 630,624,000 tons produced in the postwar year of 1947, Pickett pointed out that production went down as low as 437,868,000 in 1949 and was only 453 million tons in 1953. Figures for the current year show production running 17 percent below 1953, Pickett noted. Likewise, he cited figures to show that anthracite production has decreased from a high of 63,701,000 tons in 1944 to 30,023,000 tons in 1953. Thus, combined production of anthracite and bituminous ranged from a peak of about 700 million tons to below 470 million tons.

Pickett then pointed out that a reserve capacity must be maintained if the economy is to be protected in emergencies, and he said this is threatened today because of mine closings, unemployment of miners, and reduction of transportation facilities.

As to the future outlook, Pickett remarked that electric energy requirements more than doubled in the last 10 years and estimates are that the energy demand load will continue to double in each decade, which in turn means an increasing demand for coal. Under an emergency, the industry would be called on to produce at least 200 million tons more than current capacity, which would mean opening new mines, he said. Pickett also emphasized the importance of coal transportation to the railroads and the demands on them in the event of an emergency. Coal, which he described as the keystone of our economy, has "at all times been able and willing to meet the demands placed upon it," Pickett stated. And he added that it will always do so if it is protected from unfair competitive handicaps.

Referring to the current difficulties as mainly due to the flood of foreign residual oil imports, the rapid expansion of natural gas and dieselization of railroads, Pickett described efforts of the coal industry to meet the situation by reducing production costs through improved mining methods and mechanization.

Going into some detail on residual oil, the surplus low-grade product left over after refining of gasoline and other petroleum products, Pickett charged the oil companies with dumping this on the eastern seaboard market at whatever price is required to beat coal competition. He then related the extent of the oil menace by citing these figures:

"In 1953, 136 million barrels of this waste product were imported into this country, an increase of over 300 percent since 1946.

"In 1953 it displaced the equivalent of 33 million tons of coal and resulted in economic losses to American industry and labor as follows:

"1. Coal producers—$160,000,000.

"2. Railroad revenue—$91,000,000.

"3. Coal miners—$81,000,000 (equal to 25,000 jobs for 1 year).

"4. Railroad labor—$45,000,000.

"5. Taxes (Federal, State, and local—direct) $41,000,000."

"It unfairly undersells coal and destroys its markets, causing mines to close and capital investment to be impaired; it retards domestic exploration and development of our own oil fields; it decreases potential traffic for American railroads; reduces opportunity for livelihood for thousands of coal mine and railroad workers. threatens the existence of thousands of small businessmen and imperils the nation's security by building up unwise dependence on foreign oil sources."

Another outstanding address was made by Earnest who posed 10 questions relating to the oil import issue and offered explanatory answers. One of his points was that the average consumer does not benefit at all from the oil being brought in from Venezuela as it is not used for heating purposes but under boilers to produce power and is incapable of being used as heating fuel in the home.

Earnest attacked also the assumption that a policy of drift can be followed with impunity, relying on American ingenuity to achieve a miracle in an emergency. He made the point that coal mines once closed and miners who once drift away cannot be restored to production suddenly and also "there is no known miracle process for developing a substitute for coal."

Joining with the UMWA and Governor Fine in calling for a national fuels policy, Earnest said:

"The question of the coal industry's survival is real, not imaginary, and not one that if left alone can be depended upon to take care of itself. It's as real as the financial statement of practically every coal producer, as pressing as the long list of companies that have gone out of business, as concrete as the 150,000 coal miners who have joined the ranks of the unemployed in the last few years, and as crying for solution as a 200-million-ton postwar curtailment of coal production can shout."

On behalf of a group of commercial operators, Moody offered a statement welcoming participation by the governors in efforts to assist the coal industry.

Moses, speaking for the large segment of operators he represents, discussed coal problems in general, hailed the governors' conference as a contribution to the solution of the industry's problems, and endorsed legislative, technical and other actions to expand coal's markets. He advocated pipeline transportation as one way of forcing down railway rates.

Final speaker of the day was Secretary McKay who voiced sympathy for the coal industry and deplored the current loss of market, but who omitted mention of residual oil, and spoke against any immediate governmental action. Affirmatively he said the Government is seeking new uses for coal and exploring the field of better utilization. He praised the governors for their initiative in tackling coal's problems, noted that the Interior Department's functions are limited, but said he hoped the conference would focus public attention on all the questions involved.

The Girl Scout Home

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PRINCE H. PRESTON, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 25, 1954

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Speaker, as many of you know the movement of the Girl Scouts of America was founded in Savannah, Ga., where from humble beginnings almost 43 years ago this great organization has grown to number more than 2 million girls in every section of the United States.

The city of Savannah, always sensitive to its great historic heritage, has restored the first meeting place of the Girl Scouts, which was also, at that time, the residence of its illustrious founder, Mrs. Juliette Gordon Low. This important restoration was done through the auspices of the Girl Scouts and the Colonial Dames in Savannah.

Now the Girls Scouts of America have embarked on another notable project to commemorate the birthplace and childhood home of its founder.

The historic Gordon home in Savannah, which was the residence of Mrs. Low and her family for more than 100 years, is to become a national shrine of the Girl Scout organization, which has been a constructive force in their formative years of more than 10 million American girls.

This charming, graceful ante bellum home will become a shrine and museum of the Girl Scouts of America who share its spiritual heritage.

To further acquaint this body with this significant undertaking, Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I include the following editorial on this subject from the Savannah Morning News of May 24:

THE GIRL SCOUT HOME

For many years, citizens of Savannah have been justly proud of our city. With its shaded streets, parks, and ante-bellum houses, it can boast of much more than its share of southern beauty. Now adding to the historic sites of the city, the Girl Scouts of the United States of America have started to restore another famous landmark—the Gordon home on Bull and Oglethorpe.

A graceful house in the Jay tradition, the Gordon home is not being restored for esthetic reasons alone. It has been the home of the Gordon family for more than a century, and it soon will receive worldwide recognition as the birthplace and childhood home of Juliette Gordon Low, the founder of the Girl Scout movement in the United States.

Through the energy and foresight of Mrs. Low, Girl Scouting has been brought to generations of girls in our country. It has become one of the most widespread and successful of the youth organizations. Nearly 43 years old, the movement has touched the lives of some 10 million girls and women. Today, Girl Scout membership is more than 2 million in every section of the Nation and in all United States Territories and possessions.

In recent years, Savannah has received increasing acclaim as the birthplace of Girl Scouting in the United States. The meeting place of the first Girl Scout troop and Low mansion where Mrs. Low lived in the early days of Girl Scouting have already been restored by the Girl Scouts and the Colonial Dames in Savannah. Now, with the restoration of the Gordon home, the national Girl Scout organization will complete this grouping of Girl Scout historic sites, and will make Savannah the historic center of Girl Scouting in the United States.

The Gordon home with its surrounding grounds and buildings will be more than a museum setting of a bygone era. Here many creative aspects of the modern Girl Scout program will be exhibited and much of the planning for future Girl Scout achievements will be developed.

As Scouting continues to expand, there is no doubt that Savannah, with its historic scenes and buildings, will become more and more of a focal point for future generations of Girl Scouts. The foresight of the national Girl Scout organization, in planning this new center, cannot fail to benefit both the city of Savannah and Girl Scout troops throughout the Nation.

Dr. Fred W. Rankin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. WATTS

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 25, 1954

Mr. WATTS. Mr. Speaker, the Commonwealth of Kentucky was saddened with the announcement Saturday of the death of Dr. Fred W. Rankin, Lexington, who for a number of years had been recognized for his remarkable achievements as a surgeon.

Coming to Lexington in 1933 to establish his private practice, he continued his rapid rise to national prominence, and to his door came patients from all over the country to receive the benefit of his services.

As head of surgery at St. Joseph's Hospital in that city, Dr. Rankin developed new technique in the science of abdominal surgery and became a recognized authority in this field.

His love of country took him into both World Wars, and in the last war he rose to the rank of brigadier general. He loved Kentucky, and especially central Kentucky, as much as were he a native son, and his passing will leave a deep void in the hearts of his legion of friends throughout the world.

The following editorial from the pen of former Representative and Senator Thomas R. Underwood, editor of the Lexington Herald, on Dr. Fred W. Rankin pays tribute to this great surgeon and adopted son of Kentucky:

DR. FRED W. RANKIN

Many parts of the world where his contributions to the healing arts were known and met with highest recognition, Kentucky which he selected for his home, and Lexington where many came to gain the services of his remarkable achievements as a surgeon, mourn the death of Dr. Fred W. Rankin. Outstanding in his profession, he was the third man in the United States to be named president of the three highest medical groups. He was serving as president of the American College of Surgeons at the time of his death and had previously been president of the American Medical Association and the American Surgical Association. Dr. Rankin was one of the five American surgeons who had been installed as honorary fellows of the Royal College of Surgeons at Edinburgh. He had hoped to attend the exercises 2 weeks ago at which this high honor was conferred, but illness prevented his attendance. Earlier this year Leeds University, England, had conferred the honorary degree of doctor of laws on Dr. Rankin.

After association in Rochester, Minn., with Dr. Charles H. Mayo, his father-in-law, and Dr. William J. Mayo, the only 2 other Americans to head the 3 major medical associations, Dr. Rankin established private practice in Lexington in 1933. During the period of his professional career here, patients came to Lexington from all parts of the country to receive the benefits of his services at his offices here and at St. Joseph's Hospital.

He wrote widely on professional subjects and following his election as president of the College of Surgeons his views dealing with current problems of surgery were widely published and discussed.

To many he had given relief from suffering and longer life and in his professional services he developed methods of surgery that have been widely adopted and followed.

In any field of endeavor, Dr. Fred Rankin would have been outstanding. A major in the Army Medical Corps in World War I he asked to be called to active duty during World War II. Entering the service as a colonel he later was attached to the Surgeon General's office with rank of brigadier general. The Distinguished Service Medal, Victory Ribbon, ETO Ribbon, Asiatic Pacific Ribbon and the cross of Chevalier of the French Legion of Honor were decorations which he had received.

In Statuary Hall in the capitol in Washington a Kentucky surgeon, Dr. Ephraim McDowell, who in pioneer days achieved what has been called a miracle of surgery and introduced abdominal surgery, is recognized. In present days, with all the developments which modern surgery has accomplished at his command, Dr. Rankin developed this great science to miraculous achievement. From his practice and his skill many lives were extended. The knowledge that he gained enlightens the field of American surgery as his interest and enthusiasm enriched this community and the life of central Kentucky which he loved.

Petition in Support of Bryson Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1954

Mr. HAGEN of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a petition from Mrs. John E. Gunderson, Gary, Minn., and of 10 residents, of Gary and Fertile, Minn., urging favorable support of the Bryson bill, H. R. 1227, to prohibit the transportation in interstate commerce of alcoholic beverages, advertising in newspapers, periodicals, et cetera, and its broadcasting over radio and television.

The petition follows:

Gary, Minn., *May 14, 1954.*

Hon. Harold C. Hagen,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Hagen: Since we are unable to come to Washington for the hearing on Bryson bill (H. R. 1227) by the chairman of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, Hon. Charles A. Wolverton, we are asking you to report the bill favorable to the House.

Please present this petition to the House and have a note made of it in the Congressional Record.

Very truly yours,
Mrs. John E. Gunderson, Gary, Minn.; Mrs. Martha Refling, Fertile, Minn.; Mrs. David Hamre, Mrs. Harry Matson, Gary, Minn.; Mrs. Melvin Bergeson, Mrs. Elmer Krogstad, Fertile, Minn.; Mrs. Christine Matson, Mrs. Peder Pederson, Mrs. Reuben Hamre, Reuben Hamre, John E. Gunderson, Gary, Minn.

West Virginia Folk Festival

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 25, 1954

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an interesting article on the West Virginia Folk Festival by Charles Harper which appeared in the June 1954 issue of the magazine Ford Times, published by the Ford Motor Co.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

WEST VIRGINIA FOLK FESTIVAL

(By Charles Harper)

"We're not trying to entertain anybody," Pat Gainer warned his eager audience at the opening of the 1953 West Virginia Folk Festival. "We're only presenting, as a reminder, some fragments of a dying culture."

With this grim forecast he beckoned 90-year-old Uncle Pat Cogar and his fiddle to the stage. The spontaneous applause that greeted Uncle Pat's "Sourwood Mountain" and "Sugar in the Gourd" would have gratified any violinist in Carnegie Hall, but Uncle Pat grumbled, "How could a feller play with a noise like that a-goin'?" and brought down the house.

Dr. Patrick W. Gainer, who teaches English literature at West Virginia University, is a soft-spoken, amiable fellow proud of his mountaineer ancestry and zealous in the preservation of mountain culture. He is widely known as a collector and singer of ballads. At the drop of an old-time fiddler's bow, he'll set you straight on the difference between hillbilly and folk music.

"The radio," he deplores, "has done much to still the voice of the folk singer and has given us instead a new creation—the commercial hillbilly singer. We've become a Nation of listeners. Mothers who once sang as they went about their work now turn on the radio instead. The shaped note choir now sings tricky, jazzy, showoff arrangements; they're reluctant to sing the old hymns. Even the old-time fiddlers now say, 'I don't play much any more—just listen to the radio.'"

In an effort to counteract this regrettable state of affairs, Gainer founded the festival. It is a 1-day reunion of folk musicians, handicrafters, and devotees held annually at Glenville State College in Glenville, W. Va., in connection with the summer course in folk literature which Gainer teaches there.

Gainer is never quite sure what his guests will do on stage; he only knows what they can do, and entrusts them with the proceedings. He serves merely as a casual master of ceremonies, occasionally contributing a folk song in his own fine tenor voice.

The 1953 festival program was as informal as corn husking. Mr. and Mrs. William Lockard, aged 90 and 78, sang together, I'm a Poor Wafaring Pilgrim. Aunt Mattie Long, aged 83, and noted for carding and spinning her own yarn, gave a tender, faltering version of Sweet William, a Scotch ballad of love victorious over death, and told a hair-raising ghost story with overtones of science-fiction. French Carpenter fiddled Camp Chase, a well-known favorite composed by his celebrated grandfather, "Ol' Solly" Carpenter. Ol' Solly wrote it for a fiddlers' contest staged by Union guards in Camp Chase, an Ohio prison, during the Civil War and won first prize, which was freedom.

Back in the days when folks met to sing just for recreation and the love of it, a system of teaching music by "shaped notes" was evolved. It was the special technique of traveling singing masters who settled in a community—which guaranteed payment by subscription—long enough to teach the local folk new songs. The method is simplicity itself. Each note of the scale is assigned a particular shape which thereafter determines its sound. You need only memorize the shapes and the corresponding sounds and you're ready to join the choir.

At last year's festival a group directed by Earl Hardman demonstrated how a song is learned by shaped notes. Taking their pitch from the tuning fork tapped by the choirmaster, they ran through the song with do-re-mi's until the tune was familiar to all, then substituted the words of the lyric.

One of Gainer's prize discoveries is Keith Simons, who makes delightful music on a 64-string dulcimer, a family heirloom which was damaged during a Civil War skirmish. Tappings the strings delicately with two mallets made of wool yarn wrapped on the ends of corset staves, Simons created a fragile tune lustily entitled "The Devil's Quickstep." This, Gainer pointed out to the audience, was the same tune his father used to whilstle while accompanying himself on the snare drum, but he called it Old Aunt Jenny With the Nightcap On. Gainer further observed that a folk song is apt to be known by various titles, so if you wish to hear a certain one you must ask for it by story, not by name.

Gainer's students, appropriately clad in period costumes, rounded out the program by interpreting in lively fashion such singing games as Four in the Boat and Jenny Crack Corn. Afterward everyone was invited to join the folk dancing in the gym, and to look at the quilts, rugs, guns, dishes, musical instruments and other antiques, loaned by families throughout the State, displayed in the art department.

Many of last year's performers, plus others, will be back for this year's program. Gainer is constantly on the lookout for new performers and new material, not only for the festival, but to rescue precious bits of mountain folklore from being completely forgotten. He takes his tape recorder with him into the hills, and often works in the fields with the menfolk to gain their confidence and become accepted socially. But he has trouble convincing some of his finds that they're good enough to perform at the festival. Others suffer last-minute stage fright. One old fiddler showed up just in time to play last year with the sheepish explanation:

"Don't feel well tonight. Wouldn'ta come if I hadn'ta taken a likin' to ye."

Federal Aid to Vocational Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER JOHNSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 25, 1954

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I wish to draw my colleagues' attention to objections raised by Mr. Verne C. Fryklund, president of Stout Institute, to some of the provisions in Senate bill 3271.

President Fryklund has summarized very well the objectionable provisions of S. 3271 which would eliminate Federal supports for various vocational education programs. There is little that I could add, as a layman, to President Fryklund's excellent analysis on the need for Federal encouragement of education; therefore I commend it for my colleagues' careful consideration. His letter reads as follows:

The Stout Institute,
Menomonie, Wis., May 12, 1954.

Hon. Lester Johnson,
Wisconsin District Representative,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Johnson: This letter refers to S. 3271, a bill sponsored by Senator Smith of New Jersey to promote and assist in the improvement of vocational education and to make more effective use of available Federal funds in the United States and its Territories. This bill may reach the House soon.

This bill proposes to eliminate Federal support under the Smith-Hughes and George-Barden laws and amendments after a period of 6 years.

S. 3271 should not be passed for the following reasons:

1. It would eliminate Federal support to a form of education necessary for 40 percent of the male workers of the United States. It is education of less than college grade.

(a) Vocational education prepares workers in the know-how of processing raw materials into finished goods.

(b) It also includes education in agriculture, homemaking, and distributive occupations.

(c) It is a national problem and responsibility, therefore.

2. Were it not for these Federal laws supporting vocational education, the United States would not now be in such a strong position as a leader in world affairs, and our makeready in time of war would have been slow indeed.

(a) Much credit must be given Federal support to vocational education between War I and War II for the quick preparation made possible for War II.

3. Every nation must support technical education as well as academic education. Federal encouragement had to be provided in the United States because the educators early in this century would not accept it as

worthy of a place because it was assumed to be devoid of instructional content. There are many who still think so.

(a) On the contrary vocational education is full of instructional content and requires special understanding and skill on the part of it's special administrators and teachers.

4. S. 3271 proposes to take administration out of the hands of the specialists and place it in the hands of the general administrators which could easily make a project out of it not unlike NYA, which was one of the doubtful educational projects of NRA.

5. If Federal subsidies to the States are to be eliminated, it certainly is unwise to start with educational legislation affecting the man on the street who is the one who benefits most from the Federal vocational laws. We should start higher up.

6. People with vocational skills must be ready to, and do, move from State to State, therefore vocational education is a Federal responsibility. Several States that need vocational education could not possibly carry on a program without assistance.

7. It is said that vocational education is now established in the several States. It is not fully established in the minds of educators who have objected to the necessary Federal controls.

(a) The controls are necessary lest the funds be misused and diverted to other channels. Most administrators are not vocational educators and do not know the techniques of the program, nor do they see need for controls.

(b) History shows that because of lack of controls, Federal land grants to the States for educational purposes prior to the Smith-Hughes law were grossly abused by sale of lands so cheap that funds did not accrue to education. The vocational education acts were written to prevent similar abuse. It must be kept in mind that education desired and needed by most male workers, is protected by such controls.

Bill S. 3271 is an unwise proposal. It will hurt the United States if passed, and, of all time, when technical education must be encouraged rather than discouraged the Federal vocational subsidies should be preserved. To pass this bill will hurt too many people.

Sincerely yours,

Verne C. Fryklund,
President.

Student Exchange Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 25, 1954

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, one of the most persuasive letters which I have received in support of the student-exchange program is from a young German girl who was an exchange student in Uniontown, Pa., and who has now returned to her native Germany. I ask unanimous consent to have her letter printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

(22 C) Germersheim, Rh.,
A. D. I. Fi 8F, Germany,
May 18, 1954.

Dear Mr. Kilgore: Perhaps you think it strange that a young German girl dares to write to you. I am at college studying English, Spanish, and French to become an interpreter. I love languages, and I love other countries, and that is why I write to you.

I heard that "Congress plans to cut appropriations that support the various exchange programs, including the teen-age high-school student exchange." Oh, please don't do it.

I have been an exchange student myself, and I cannot express how much good it did to me. Perhaps you do not care whether some German girl is helped to become liberal, generous, and more ready to help others. I don't know any politicians personally, so I do not know how you feel about it. But don't you really care whether the United States of America has many friends in Germany or only a few? It is not only for this year or the next, but it is for the entire future, isn't it?

Before I went to the States, I did not think too much of America. I was only told of you to be cool-hearted, businesslike people, only thinking of yourself, and, of course, that was not nice. Well, when I had the opportunity to go to the United States of America, I applied immediately for it because I wanted to learn to love you.

And then I had the most wonderful time in Uniontown, Pa., and I wrote long letters to my family and my friends, and they all answered that they, too, began to like the Americans. When I came home I told them more about you, and now we are all in favor of the United States of America.

I shall never forget how kind and understanding the American people have been to me. I always remember the Sunday services at church, the family picnics, and my school, and especially how good and amiable everybody had been to me.

Regarding all the other exchangees, who had about the same experiences as I did, you have already many friends in Germany. But wouldn't it be wonderful if you had all Germany for your friend? There are still so many people who have to learn better and more about the United States of America, and communism threatens to swallow them.

I love Germany and I love the United States of America; there is hardly anything that would make me as happy as if the two countries were true and good friends. I am sure it is in the power of you Congressmen to do something about it.

Dear Mr. Kilgore, I wrote to you because West Virginia is a neighbor State of my beloved Pennsylvania; please excuse this long letter. I know you don't have much time, but would you please tell your secretary to send me just a postcard with "yes" on it, so I know you will support my wish to keep up the various exchange programs?

Sincerely yours,

Marianna Vogelsang.

P. S.—I was in Uniontown, Pa., in 1950–51.

Would Arming the Arabs Promote Stability and Increase Security?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LESTER HOLTZMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 25, 1954

Mr. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to insert into the Record a very impressive speech made by one of our colleagues, Congressman Paul A. Fino, Saturday, May 22, 1954, at the annual convention of the Bronx Zionist Organization of America at Mount Freedom, N. J. Because of its timeliness and importance I urge all of the Members of Congress to read this speech:

Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, I am very happy to be here this afternoon and welcome the opportunity of speaking to you on a matter of great concern to all freedom-loving people.

It is an amazing commentary on our times that at this late date in world civilization we can actually debate the question: "Would arming the Arab States promote stability and increase security?" There was never a question that called for a more immediate, a simpler, a more obvious answer. There are problem that divide the free world against itself to the peril of the whole of western civilization. These problems divide the free world because they present profound difficulties. But this question about sending arms to the Arab States is the most easily answerable problem in the whole maze of international puzzles that confound the world's statesmen from Geneva to Potsdam and Potsdam back to the almost ancient days of the Treaty of Versailles.

The answer is, of course, a positive and an absolute "No."

No, arming the Arab States would not promote stability and increase security. It would do just the opposite, precipitating instability and insecurity, and creating probably the greatest havoc the Middle East has known in the last two generations. My answer is "No" whether the question comes to me as a citizen of the United States, as a Member of the Congress of the United States, or as a human being. The Jewish people will, of course, give the answer even more emphasis and no little emotion, for it is the nature of the human being to have, as he should, feelings of racial affinity and racial consciousness. But emotion or no emotion, it cannot alter the cold and brutal logic of the facts. My answer is, in fact, your answer—the answer of the Bronx Zionist Region of the Zionist Organization of America. But then you and I will be accused of bias and such an accusation is not without plausibility. Yet I hold that the absolutely negative answer—"No"—must be not only the answer of the wholly objective and disinterested analyst were he to come down from Mars to adjudicate the problem, but, I insist, solemnly, that it must indeed be the answer of the Arabs themselves.

That is, if they really mean to promote stability and security.

Let us, therefore, examine the position from the opposite direction. Let us even pretend that we are inhabitants of the North Pole and that our angle of vision is as cold as the climate we come from. No, let us go further and pretend that ideologically all of us here today are rabidly anti-Zionist, but that nevertheless we are dealing with a factual and a realistic situation. Now that we are all firmly established as rabid anti-Zionists, what is it that we are asked to believe—we fiery opponents of a homeland for the Jews in Palestine? Reduced to its naked essentials what we are asked to believe is this: Put a gun, a hand grenade, a machete in the hands of an Arab and that will promote peace and order. Put more and more guns, explosives, fighter planes, bayonets into the hands of Saudi-Arabia, Trans-Jordan, Lenanon, Syria, Iraq, and Egypt and you will have more and still more peace and order.

And once they are armed to the teeth you will have arrived at the millenium of a Babylonian tranquillity in the Middle East.

Can any proposition be more absurd? More ridiculous?

Let us rearrange the problem in still another light. Let us give the proponents of the fantastically self-defeating recommendation of arming the Arab States the best of it for the sake of argument. Let us suppose that there is no Israel—it just does not exist—and that there are no Jews at all in Palestine—no Jewish State. Let us, for that matter, suppose that the Jews have disappeared altogether from the face of the earth, as, indeed, one-third of them did under Hitlerism. Under that "ideal" condition, if the word is permissible, let us restate the question: Would arming the Arab States promote stability and increase security?

Find an honest Arab statesman and ask him what is the answer.

Ask Saudi Arabia.

Ask Transjordan.

Ask Iraq, Lebanon, and Egypt.

These 5 fierce and mutually contending Arab States would be swept up in a blood bath that would appall history, 5 despot dictators seeking dominion over each other. To arm them—even without the question of Israel appearing anywhere in the picture—would be an act of unconscionable cruelty to the Arabs—and I mean precisely to the Arabs—that would blot the pages of time beyond redemption. But with the existence of the Jewish State, to arm the Arab States in the present posture of the Middle East situation, is merely to provide them with a blood victim by an act so immoral that western civilization will never be able to live it down. It can well mean the utterest demoralization of western diplomacy and the loss of whatever honor and prestige remains to it in the minds and the hearts of the little peoples of the world. With the Jewish State in existence, to arm the Arab nations is to sharpen the teeth of the five Arab tigers who encompass the tiny nation of Israel so that they can claw and chew to pieces the one highly civilized, wholly democratic, desperately peace-loving nation in almost the whole of the Middle East.

How, possibly, can the United States of America be a party to such a deal? It is impossible in the present state of the deterioration of Arabic administration to render Arabic leadership harmless to the free world by persuasion or negotiation alone. Many portions of the Arab people can be restrained from cruelty to each other and to their neighbors—Israel included—only by reducing their physical capacity to do damage to one another. And the only immediate and definitely practical process for achieving that end, that I know anything about, is to give them no weapons to do damage with either to themselves or to Israel.

Can any proposition be more simple? More clear?

The Jewish people view the Arab-Israeli question necessarily through the perspective of Jewish history going back—perhaps—to Jacob and Esau. But the question to which I have addressed myself is not whether the Jews of the world who seek it have a right to some infinitesimal fragment of the earth's surface for a homeland of their own. History has long since passed that milepost and the answer is the State of Israel. If that question has not yet been resolved by the responsible nations of the earth in favor of the Jewish people, then no question of our time has been resolved. That question, along with kindred questions of which it was a part, belongs to a living body of thinking and morality, for which tens of millions of people perished in two dreadful and desolating World Wars. The responsible nations of our time cannot go back on that proposition without desecrating the graves, the memories, the ideals of these innumerable sacrificial dead—the dead for whom the Unknown Soldier in Arlington Cemetery is one tremendously moving symbol. That was a decision that was made and lived up to and which belongs forever with the philosophy of what President Wilson called the "rights and liberties of small nations" and the principle of self-determination. It belongs with making the world safe for democracy. It belongs with what Franklin Delano Roosevelt called freedom from fear. It belongs also with what President Eisenhower called the policy of the United States, "to stir and develop in these lands an understanding and a love of freedom which will reach the minds and move the hearts of the highest and the lowliest."

The substantive principles that were fought for since the dawn of the 20th century and all that has happened to this hour are wound up and tied in with the right of Israel—not as an act of sufferance but as an inherent, implicit, and explicit right—to be a nation. Israel is an integral part of the mosaic of righteousness among nations that was born of the awful travail of the two great wars. To renege on Israel—or any other part of the great moral structure that grew in pain and agony out of the devastation and the aspiration of the last three decades—is to undermine the whole and to weaken the peace and security of mankind.

I charge today that to provide arms and ammunition to the Arab States would be an act of blindness and blunder that would befoul the high aims and noble ends for which mankind has struggled at such frightful cost since 1914. This is not a local question involving the slight matter of providing some middle eastern nations with munitions and no more. It is a moral question. It is a question of how these arms are to be used—and against whom. It is a question that is joined with the very existence of Israel as a force for democracy in the unbelievably backward deserts and hinterlands of the Middle East. The question of the existence of Israel is no longer an open one, for to leave it open even by so much as the faintest shadow of a doubt is to laugh cynically and malignantly into the face of all that the free world has stood for in our time.

Arms to the Arabs is a challenge to America's moral position, which is the greatest force in the possession of the West for winning the minds of the peoples of the world. By that act alone, our country would lay itself plausibly open to the charge of international and diplomatic hypocrisy which is precisely the accusation we throw with such honest and devastating effect against the Soviet Union. What all this adds up to is that Israel is one of the most enduring nations of this earth. It has been set up to exist along with the other nations of the earth in perpetuity.

This is established.

This is a contract of the nations.

This is the bounden word of the whole of the civilization of our time.

To that contract it has affixed its word, its bond, its sworn oath.

If the whole of civilization favors a Jewish homeland—to which, indeed, some of the greatest Arab leaders themselves agreed—and the tribunals of the nations have made their decision, and the Jewish State is successfully and determinedly in being, then the contemporary aim should be to create a climate, psychologically and materially—a mental and a physical climate—in which Israel can live at peace with her neghbors, her Arab neighbors, as, indeed, she lives at peace with the rest of the world.

It is my contention that this is not only eminently desirable but wholly possible. But it will be made impossible if we send arms to the Arab States while vicious influences of great power among them inflame the depressed and impoverished masses with the fury of riot against Israel to divert them from seeking their own betterment from their own greedy and negligent governments.

Surely the path to peace in the Middle East is not to put lethal weapons in the unhappy and bewildered hands of 40 million Arabs.

It is their impoverishment which is a threat to the security of the world. It is their governments which out of greed or incompetence or both have neglected their peoples who, therefore, represent the danger to security.

The answer for the free world is to help them, not to arm them.

The Arab people are emerging now out of their dim and dismal feudal state into the modern world. We must keep them looking to the West—for the safety of civilization—for America's safety—not to the East, and not to Moscow.

We cannot do this if we become a party to a system in the Middle East which makes it a land of extremes—extremes of wealth and extremes of poverty. If we arm the Arab states now we sink them deeper and deeper and more and more hopelessly into an economy of distress and a life of mass destitution, overlaid with an empire of fabulous wealth and greedy indifference.

I am not going to discuss here the problem of the Arab refugees. There is no people in the world that understands better and sympathizes more deeply with the human species identified as the refugee, for the Jew has known that problem at first hand for more than 2,000 years. It has been proposed, I believe wisely, that the question be resolved by Arab resettlement. This, I may add, has been Israel's solution for itself. Haven't the Jews who today live in Israel been themselves the subject of a very major resettlement? Israel, I am sure, is ready and willing to "make a fair contribution" to a fund for Arab resettlement "by way of compensation for abandoned Arab land in Israel * * *." I brief, the Government and the people of Israel stand ready to offer a fair and an affirmative solution to the Arab refugee problem in agreement with the United States and other nations and through the cooperation and the good offices of the United Nations.

Nor am I going to discuss the conflicts in the border regions—the raids and the massacres. Again here Israel seeks a firm and an enduring solution, and has offered affirmative measures, but the Arab States on their side offered no comparable affirmative plan for correction.

Arms to the Arabs would aggravate both these problems into greater and more serious problems.

Arms to the Arabs would make Israel the sacrificial goat—tethered in the clearing—so that the Arab riger States can pounce upon and devour their prey. The fact that this area represents 53 percent of the oil reserves of the world presents, it seems to me, a complicating factor. But this could very well develop into a barter of human life for Arab oil.

Since when has the moral content of American diplomacy sunk so low?

The good will and the peace and friendship of 40 million Arabs can be won by the West by better and more enduring means than arms. Five small Arab countries with a combined population of less than 11 million earned $440 million in oil royalties in 1952 and much more in 1953. In Saudi Arabia, oil found in 130 miles of area only this year—1954—promises to yield 28 billion barrels, practically the equivalent in this single stretch of all the oil reserves of the United States. The consequent income from natural gas is enormous. The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development estimated that the royalties for 5 years are sufficient to finance development in Iraq from the ground up. This money has been poured into the coffers of the dictators to finance their follies. The most insignificant beneficiaries of this enormous wealth are the illiterate masses. Up to 90 percent of these masses live on agriculture—archaic, unfruitful, dismal, human drudgery at its worst.

The approach to the good will and the peace and friendship of 40 million Arabs, I say, is through the uplift of these people oppressed by their own despotic rulers. These peoples are restless and discontented. It would be a crime against humanity, on a plane equivalent to the worst crimes of genocide in our time, to permit the Arab despots to turn the fury of their impoverished masses away from their own self-improvement to a blood bath against the hopelessly outnumbered peoples in Israel—themselves escapees from blood baths in other parts of the world during World War II. Our country and the other nations of the West must not be identified with the perpetuation of the misery of 40 million Arabs.

It would be the greatest test of democracy, of the peacefully exerted power of the West, to guide the Arab nations into a dynamic and creative employment of their new-found wealth for their own uplift. It would be a challenge to diplomatic skill to achieve these ends with the prevailing governments, for no one wishes to impose governments on the Arab peoples unpalatable to their tradition. Certainly the political sagacity of the free world will know how to encompass the situation and master it in the interests of a genuine stability and security.

It is my duty as a Congressman of the United States to make my views known. This I have done in a letter to the Secretary of State, Mr. John Foster Dulles, under date of March 19, 1954. In this letter I discuss just in passing the disorders along the frontiers of Israel and their threat to world peace and stability. I express my concern over the contemplated policy of military assistance to the Arab States. And I urge the Secretary that giving guns and other—military equipment to the Arabs would certainly not help to advance or strengthen the security in the Near East but rather that it would further aggression against Israel.

Today it seems to me pertinent to add another point to my letter: Does not Israel have the right to ask the United States, the United Nations, or the whole free world this question: If arms are given to the Arab States would the free world agree to come to the aid of Israel if they are used in an act of aggression?

Finally, I have this to say: We are Americans and the United States has and always will have our total loyalty. Our patriotism is consonant with our tradition, with our faith, with the inner being created in us by our way of life, for the basic principles upon which this Republic is founded have roots in the Old Testament, the covenant of the law. It is these facts that guarantee our loyalty and our devotion to the United States of America and its Constitution. They make us the defenders of these American institutions against any and all enemies alike, within or without. It is the very essence of compatibility for a Jew, loyal to his ancient traditions, to be loyal to the United States. Israel may be said to be a projection from the United States to the Middle East of one of the arms of American democracy. The perpetuation of Israel in peace and prosperity, in security and stability, is an asset to America and a source of influence for good on the side of the free world.

Selling to Navy Prime Contractors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. HESS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 25, 1954

Mr. HESS. Mr. Speaker, I feel the Members of Congress will be interested in the recently issued second edition of the booklet Selling to Navy Prime Contractors, proposed as an aid to small business. I would like to call it to public attention.

In order for small business to obtain a greater share of Government business, I think we must recognize that the basic initiative must come from business itself. The Government is not equipped to search out every individual business concern somewhere in the United States for each particular contract or subcontract that may be available.

Nevertheless, there are certain things which the Government can do to make it easier for small business to exercise its initiative by finding out what prime contracts and subcontracts are available. If there is a sufficient dissemination of this information, then small-business concerns everywhere can bid on and obtain the contracts and subcontracts for which they are best qualified. The issuance of this new edition of Selling to Navy Prime Contractors is a significant aid in this direction.

This booklet emphasizes the policy of the Department of the Navy to assist small business generally. In the foreword from Robert B. Anderson, Secretary of the Navy, he points out that Navy policy is to encourage maximum subcontracting to small firms by prime contractors. In this way, the Navy desires to maintain an adequate reservoir of potential suppliers ready for the expanded requirements of a full mobilization effort.

The value of this booklet lies primarily in the unique information that it provides. It sets forth the principal prime contractors who do business with the Navy, and in addition it lists some 600 small business subcontract representatives who have been specifically designated by these prime contractors to discuss subcontracting in particular areas. The listing is arranged geographically. Accordingly, some 28 divisions of 1 prime contractor are listed in its home area, with a small business subcontract representative for each one. A number of other divisions of that prime contractor are listed in other cities throughout the United States, with the subcontract representative for each one, and the telephone numbers.

With the aid of this booklet any small-business man can look up the principal prime contractors in his particular locality, find the name and small business subcontract representative of each one and his telephone number, and readily arrange contact.

This booklet also provides the necessary word of caution: Selling to the Government, either as a prime contractor or subcontractor, is highly competitive. Only the qualified can hope to get a Government contract and successfully complete it. Extreme caution and deliberation should be exercised before contracting for an item completely foreign to a contractor's prior experience. Also, the Government insists upon strict inspection; goods produced must meet specifications; and the contractor must clearly understand the legal obligations he incurs when he takes on a Government contract; otherwise misunderstandings and trouble inevitably result.

Copies of this very useful booklet may be obtained from the Office of Naval Material, Washington 25, D. C., or from any major Navy purchasing activity.

Success Story of a Texas Farmer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 25, 1954

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, a 32-year-old Texas farmer named Chinton Harbers recently was presented the Hoblitzelle Award for the Advancement of Texas Rural Life.

This award, established by one of our great Texas citizens, went to Mr. Harbers as the man making the most outstanding contribution to Texas agriculture of any farmer or rancher during the last 3 years.

The story of this Texas farmer's work since 1946, when he returned to civilian life from service with the Armed Forces, is an inspiring one. I ask unanimous consent that the story, as published in the Longview (Tex.) Daily News for May 20, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RENNER.—Clinton Harbers, a broke farm boy in 1946 fresh from the fighting in the South Pacific, in 8 years has converted a neglected old central Texas farm into a capital investment of approximately $100,000 and is producing an income from farming in excess of $20,000 a year.

The story of Harbers' amazing success in agriculture was told here when the 32-year-old Fayette County farmer was presented the Hoblitzelle award for the advancement of Texas rural life. The presentation of the $5,000 cash award and gold medal was made at the 10th anniversary open house and field day of Texas Research Foundation at Renner. The Hoblitzelle award recognizes Harbers as having made the most outstanding contribution to Texas agriculture of any farmer or rancher during the past 3 years.

Commenting on the young man's work, Dr. C. L. Lundell, director of Texas Research Foundation, said: "Clinton Harbers has gone further than most men who farm the soil, and he has gone further than most scientists in seeing agriculture in its whole concept.

"For instance, others have planted legumes for years to improve the soil, but Harbers planted them in his own way to achieve certain preconceived effects. He was not content to follow others. Out of his own experience he devised farm machinery to plant legumes in a way they had never been planted before, and today four of the major companies which build farm equipment have tooled up to produce adaptations of the Harbers' machine. He has his own method of insect control; he has his own method of planting cotton; he has his own method for doing almost everything. And what's more, he has welded them all into a system—a program to produce more crops for less money and build back the land while producing more."

Dr. Lundell continued, "He has been restless in his search for information; he has understood the purpose of the research he has seen; and he has put it to work in a profitable way. He has provided an inspiring example to the farmer, the professional worker in agriculture, and to the scientist in showing the true teamwork relationship between science and farming. He has helped to advance his whole profession by seeing and giving practical interpretation to its greatest possibilities."

Today Harbers farms 400 acres at West Point, Tex., near La Grange where his grandfather pioneered and where his father was a sharecropper. When he bought land on a 100-percent FSA Government loan in 1946, it was nonproductive and sick. He built a good drainage system. He sodded his waterways. He developed a program of soil improvement, fertilization, proper land preparation and cultivation, insect control, and harvesting operations into a continuous job of rebuilding the soil for economic production.

His results speak of his success. He averages 738 pounds of lint cotton on land that produced 116 pounds 10 years ago. Last year he made a net profit of $211.76 per acre on cotton after deducting expenses, including the complete cost of the preceding legume crop, depreciation on equipment, and all other costs. Where 20 and 25 bushels of corn were considered a good crop, he is producing 75 and 80 bushels to the acre. Where 800 pounds of maize was being grown, he is now harvesting 5,000 and 6,000 pounds to the acre.

While he was making these big production gains, his land also was making a big comeback. Here are some of the improvements: 1. Increased organic content of soil up to 3.2 percent in 6 years. 2. Decreased weight of soil from 127 pounds to 86 pounds per cubic foot. 3. Increased storage of moisture for planting and growing crops. 4. Increased soil fertility with fertilizer and legumes. 5. Reduced compaction of the soil with tractor and implements. 6. Virtual elimination of cotton root rot. And 7. Reduced weed competition through mulching and increased microbic activity in soil.

Essentially his program is based on utilization of legumes for the conditioning and protection of the soil. After a crop is harvested, the land is chiseled and bedded. Legumes are planted on the sides of the beds and at the same time fertilizer is deep placed in bands under the seed. One-fourth of the land is planted to Hubam clover; the rest to Willamette vetch. A week or two before planting the cash crop in the spring, top growth of the legumes is cut from the beds with a row disk, leaving the roots undisturbed. After the legume has dried out sufficiently to shatter and break up easily, it is harrowed into the furrows between the beds, where it is left uncovered to decompose and at the same time serve as a mulch. Corn, cotton, or some other cash crop is immediately planted on the undisturbed and firm seedbed between the furrows. Preemergence weed control is used.

The mulch aids in weed control, conserves moisture, and protects the soil from the compacting effects of rain. Legume roots remaining in the soil open up land to the entrance of moisture. Insect control is carried on at regular intervals with sometimes as many as nine applications of insecticides. Cotton is harvested mechanically, and all hand labor reduced to a minimum. Except for 4 or 5 days each year, Harbers and his brother do all the work on the 400-acre tract.

He has shortened his cotton-growing season from 170–180 days to 112–115 days. His cotton matures uniformly and by adjusting planting rate to fertility, it can be defoliated, mechanically picked, and delivered at the gin for less than $5 a bale in contrast to $40 for hand-harvested cotton.

Harbers' amazing job on the land has been accomplished in the face of considerable hardship. The year he purchased the farm his father died, leaving to him the complete responsibility for his mother, 2 sisters, and 3 brothers. He sent 1 sister and 3 brothers to college, a fact which attests to how well he fulfilled his responsibility. In the meantime, he has paid off the debt on his farm and established a sound credit rating at the bank.

Resource Conservation Gets Growing Attention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAGE BELCHER

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 25, 1954

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech which was made by Mr. E. A. Norton, Soil Conservation Service, Department of Agriculture, at Resource Conservation Field Day near Tulsa, Okla., May 8, 1954:

RESOURCE CONSERVATION GETS GROWING ATTENTION

It was an unexpected privilege for me to have the opportunity to take part in your Resource Conservation Field Day. You may be sure that I didn't hesitate when your fellow Oklahoman, Assistant Secretary of Agriculture Ross Rizley, suggested that I fill in for him on your program because he had to appear before a Congressional Committee in Washington yesterday and today.

He asked me to tell you how much he regretted having to miss out on this event. I know he means it, too—not only because he enjoyed being home a few days last week, but because he is deeply interested in soil and water conservation as is Secretary Benson.

I am particularly impressed by the resource conservation theme you have chosen for today's program. Strengthening its activities for conservation of the Nation's resources of soil, water, grass, timber, and wildlife is one of the principal objectives of the Department of Agriculture. As President Eisenhower has said: "We must build a balanced program for the use and development of all our natural resources. Such a program is indispensable to maintaining and improving our standard of living as we make the future secure for a growing America."

Those of you who have traveled in southeastern Asia know what the President's statement means. In that part of the world resources have been depleted for so long that it was relatively easy for invading armies to conquer the people. They had little behind them, and they succumbed readily. Instead of the vigorous handshake with which we greet each other in this country under our freedom and security, southeastern Asians bow and scrape in a retiring position as if to say, "We would like to have freedom; we know how important it is but we haven't been able to have it."

Your resource conservation field day actually is symbolic of a growing interest and concern all over the United States with respect to soil and water conservation, especially. You may call it a revival of interest, an intensification of effort or whatever you wish. But it is a fact that, from Washington to Broken Arrow, conservation is on the move. Apparently the interest is growing by leaps and bounds. Resource conservation never was more conspicuous in the thinking, planning and action of the people and of their local, State, and Federal Governments than it is right today.

Is it because those who apply conservation have found that it is giving them greater security?

I'm thinking, for example, of such things as the increased activities and accelerated progress of work in your soil conservation districts. I have in mind the unprecedented public attention being given to watershed conservation all over the country, in many local communities and in most States. Then there is the impetus being given resource conservation by Congress and by Federal agencies concerned.

I might mention, among these activities or proposals, the small-watershed protection program initiated in the Congress last summer; pending increased appropriations for soil and water conservation; proposed legislation to give farmers and ranchers credit for conservation expenses on their Federal income taxes; emphasis on permanent-type practices under the agricultural conservation program; increased attention to diverting surplus crop producing acres to use for soil-conserving grass; diverted crop acres, that is, a soil bank program; and other resource conservation developments.

Also focusing national public and official attention on our soil, water, and land-use problems—for the second time in 20 years—is the renewed Dust Bowl threat. State and Federal interests have joined forces to cooperate with the people in the affected areas to relieve immediate distress, to head off any possible repetition of the disastrous results of the 1930's, and to push long-range soil and moisture conservation programs.

Mr. Rizley, of course, would have discussed these conservation moves and trends with you in a very frank manner because of his legislative experience, and his present position in the Secretary's office. But, in a general way, I'll attempt to spell out some of the activities and objectives of the Soil Conservation Service and of the Department of Agriculture with respect to these endeavors.

I have no intention of making you a Dust Bowl speech here in eastern Oklahoma. But I do think you are close enough to the situation, including going through several long, dry months yourselves this past year, that some discussion of conservation land-use with relation to dry weather conditions is in order.

The program of the Department for the Dust Bowl is essentially of two parts. First is the emergency aspect now underway. This includes a grant of funds from the President's emergency money, and also concurrence by Congress for an appropriation to effect emergency tillage on land that is blowing or in a condition to blow and obtaining some vegetative cover to prevent further blowing. These practices have the added significance of pointing in the direction of a permanent solution of tying down the land with a vegetative cover that remains on the land as much as possible.

The farmers in Oklahoma are to be complimented in that mostly by their own management and effort their lands were subject to less damage than surrounding States. My observations of the damaged area a month ago indicated Oklahoma farmers were doing an excellent job of handling their land to prevent damage from wind erosion. In fact, a comparison of the more seriously affected areas in the 1930's with that of the 1950's shows Oklahoma in a very favorable light.

The second part of the Department's program for the Dust Bowl involves using land for the purpose for which it is best fitted. That is, gradually reducing the acreage in cultivation and holding in reserve those lands which are least suitable for continuous cultivation. These are the lands that could return a good profit when used for grazing, and some of which probably never should be put into crops again.

Then there is the need for developing cropping systems on those lands which are suitable for cropping that will protect the soil against blowing. This pretty largely boils down to keeping a cover on such land almost constantly. I am sure most of you are acquainted with such applicable conservation practices called for under such conditions, such as cropping sequences that leave stubble on the ground between crops, contour and wind-strip cropping, using care in grazing so as to maintain good grass covers, terracing, and other measures for conserving every possible drop of moisture that falls on the land.

The Dust Bowl is a special problem of land-use and water conservation and one that likely never will be solved until a program specifically adapted to the area is developed. What I mean by that is that many of the present farm programs which were devised largely for areas with well-established farming assistance and reasonably stable climatic and physical land conditions must be adjusted to fit conditions in the Dust Bowl. It may be necessary for the people of this area to develop a special type of program, in which adjustments from present farm programs as they apply to the Dust Bowl can be made, and which would include specific project-like activities applicable to conditions within the area.

This might be described as a package-type project, in which the cost-sharing program would be redirected, and the crop-insurance program would be limited to crops grown on land suited to cultivation. It might involve changes in the adoption of the price-support and loan programs as well as specific assistance in adjusting the use of the land. A program of this sort would take time to apply, but the severe drought of these last few years has emphasized the need for land-use adjustments and changes in practices that will permit a permanent and stable agriculture for the intermittent rainfall area of the southern Great Plains.

Now the so-called dust bowl problem is primarily one of lack of water. Water, in fact, is a primary problem wherever you are in Oklahoma, as in almost all other parts of the country—either not enough of it at the right time, or too much at the wrong time. Here in the Tulsa area, for instance, with better than 35 inches of rainfall a year, some people might think there was no water problem. But, as you know better than anyone, drought and floods alike have brought home to you the importance of water and its management.

I hesitate to use the word "water" here in Oklahoma, because of an experience I had speaking to an audience at an annual meeting at the Guthrie Experiment Station several years ago. Just as I mentioned the word "water" to the audience sitting out on the hillside, the heavens opened and literally drowned them.

A better way than that of having the water you need when you want it is through irrigation systems. We are seeing various improved conservation irrigation practices here on the Sieteco Angus farm. Irrigation is spreading rapidly over the country, even into the more humid localities, because it helps solve that problem of water where and when you need it.

Obviously, though, only a very small portion of our farmland can be irrigated, because there isn't the available water supply. Also, soil and lay of the land very often aren't suited to irrigating, and so on. Then, as on this farm, also, we have the alternative of using cropping, tillage and structural measures to conserve the water that reaches the land as rain, snow or runoff from outside.

These two principles of farm water use and management—water conservation and water control, both together on the land and up in the creeks—are the key to the upstream watershed conservation approach we have been hearing so much about.

It is only natural, I suppose, for us to think about flood prevention and controlling sedimentation when we speak of watershed programs. Let me remind you, though, that what we may call drought prevention also is a most important phase of upstream watershed treatment. It is simply the long-recognized conservation technique of making beneficial use of the water on the land close to where it falls—for growing crops, for livestock, for replenishing underground water, for wildlife and recreational purposes, and for meeting municipal, industrial and other water requirements.

Fortunately, the same vegetative practices and structural devices which hold water on the land for use there also serve to slow down its flow in the creeks and rivers, and thereby to reduce soil erosion, flooding and siltation. Hence the basic plan of small-watershed protection involves the use of conservation practices on the farmlands, pastures and woodlands, supplemented by waterflow-retarding structures and other water-control measures on the small streams.

Our Soil Conservation Service studies have shown that more than half of the country's annual flood damage occurs on the headwater streams. This damage, moreover, is largely agricultural—to the land itself, to crops, to individual farm property and to community property like roads and bridges. Also, by far the greater part of this flood damage, 75 to 90 percent in most tributary valleys, results from comparatively small storms that happen more often than once in 10 years.

From the very beginning of its operations, in the old demonstration project days starting in 1933, the Soil Conservation Service has emphasized the necessity of treating entire tributary watersheds in its work with farmers and ranchers. Those projects, which came before your farmer-organized and farmer-directed soil conservation districts starting in 1937, were mainly on a watershed basis.

We always have recognized, of course, that the entire answer to our flood and other watershed problems does not lie in upstream tributary watershed treatment and management. Except where special and urgent downstream problems are involved, watershed conservation should by all means start at the headwaters. But it need not stop there. On most major rivers, downstream measures are installed—for additional flood protection, for navigation, hydroelectric power, water storage, anti-pollution, and other purposes.

"And that is the way the new small-watershed protection programs are intended to work out, also. I say "new," because when the 83d Congress last summer appropriated $5 million to initiate a pilot program, it was the first specific congressional authorization for the Department of Agriculture to cooperate with local people and organizations in planning and applying complete programs of soil and water conservation and flood prevention measures on selected small watersheds over the country.

All of the approximately 60 active pilot projects in this program already have progressed through the preliminary planning stage or beyond, for land treatment for soil and water conservation and for upstream waterflow-retarding structures and other flood-prevention measures. Actual construction, already started on some watersheds, is expected to be under way on all of them by June 30.

One of the pilot watersheds, as you know, is the Double Creek watershed up here in Osage and Washington counties in Oklahoma. Many of you no doubt are acquainted with what has been happening on this tributary of the Caney River. The people of this watershed have experienced devastating floods every 3 to 4 years, with costly floodwater and sediment damage resulting.

The Double Creek watershed conservation program includes practices such as contouring, terracing, stubble-mulching and grassed waterways; along with measures primary for flood prevention, such as structures to stabilize water courses and control sediment, and floodwater-retarding structures to hold back temporarily the excess runoff from groups of farms. It is estimated that benefits will exceed the cost of the watershed treatment by more than 2 times.

The Double Creek project was sponsored by the Caney Valley Soil Conservation District, and the Kansas-Oklahoma-Caney Watershed Council of Soil Conservation Districts. Local people provide easements and rights-of-way and do the land treatment. The Federal Government supplies the technical assistance and handles the contracting of flood prevention measures on the cost-sharing basis.

I want to emphasize that local initiative, sponsorship, and cost sharing are essential to the success of the small-watershed programs. This is not a Government program to be slapped arbitrarily onto any watershed. Experience has shown there is no other practicable way that the job can be done on our upstream watersheds than through the partnership approach. That is, with local people, acting through their soil conservation districts, watershed associations and similar groups, taking the leadership; and with local, State, and Federal units of government contributing their technical, financial, educational and other services.

These include in the Department of Agriculture the technical facilities of the Soil Conservation Service, as I have mentioned, as well as the facilities of its Agricultural Research Service, the educational help of the Extension Service, cost-sharing assistance of the agricultural conservation program, and so on.

The pattern of the so-called pilot small-watershed program is the same as that contemplated in permanent watershed protection legislation now under consideration in Congress. That is the Hope bill, which has passed the House, and the Aiken bill which is in Senate committee. As under the pilot program, it would call for full local sponsorship and participation and for local, State, Federal cost sharing.

Now here is something I would like to point out especially: Acre-by-acre land treatment and use and water management, according to the needs and capabilities of the land, remains fundamental to our whole conservation program. That is true whether we are dealing with individual farms and ranches or with watersheds or other units. Actually, the small-watershed program is the soil conservation district approach carried out on a watershed basis.

It is the regular district program speeded up and supplemented by the addition of flood-prevention measures on the small tributaries. Faster progress should be possible, through group action by people in small watersheds, and by better pooling of local, State, Federal resources to do the job.

What I want to bring out is that the kind of effective soil and water conservation work we are seeing here today continues to be our goal. The conservation program essentials are unchanged. These are:

Research fitted to the current problems on the land, and the results of that research transmitted to the land rapidly. Education to help everybody, both rural and urban, to understand the importance of conservation to our common welfare, and to inform farmers and ranchers about conservation principles and practices and how they are related to other features of good farm management. Financial aid, from public or private sources, where it is needed, to enable individual operators or watershed groups to move ahead with their conservation programs without undue delays. And technical assistance including the acre-by-acre soil survey on which conservation farm planning and treatment are based, complete conservation farm plans developed by the farmer and technician, and technical help in applying complex practices.

The small-watershed program in effect bridges the gap between the regular soil conservation district land-treatment programs and the limited number of flood-prevention projects authorized under the 1944 Flood Control Act, like the Washita River project here in Oklahoma. The outstanding flood-prevention work that has been done on Sandstone Creek in the Washita watershed has received nationwide attention. There, the Soil Conservation Service helped develop a watershed plan in cooperation with soil conservation district farmers and ranchers, other organizations and State and Federal agencies.

Farmers on Sandstone Creek had completed 85 percent of the land conservation job by last July. The land-treatment practices and the flood-retarding structures together will eliminate more than 90 percent of all flood damage on the Sandstone Creek watershed, and the benefits will be three times the cost of the program.

The Washita is 1 of 11 such flood-prevention projects. These projects have blazed the way for effective watershed treatment through local, State, Federal teamwork. But it has been clear that we need to move faster than has been possible under those flood-control authorizations. The small watershed protection program will enable us to do so.

Meanwhile the Service and the Department have continued to seek out ways of improving and speeding up soil and water conservation all along the line. The various steps that have been taken include improvements in procedures in surveys, planning and many other respects.

You are acquainted, of course, with the realinement of our Soil Conservation Service, with more responsibility shifted to the State offices by elimination of regional offices. Although it naturally takes a little time to complete such a shift, we have every reason to believe we can move ahead in the future more rapidly and effectively than ever before.

At the State level, our people are still Federal employees working under the direction of the Service and in close cooperation with the land-grant collegese and experiment stations, and, of course, with your soil-conservation district supervisors and cooperators. We know that here in Oklahoma our part of the conservation team is in good hands under the leadership of State Conservationist Ray Walker and his experienced State staff.

Personally—as this outstanding Resource Conservation Field Day so graphically demonstrates—I am sure that Oklahoma will keep in the forefront of soil and water conservation leadership and accomplishment in a Nation that has set the pace for the entire world in resource conservation.

Ozark, Ark., High School

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES W. TRIMBLE

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1954

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, we were honored to have with us Friday, May 21, the senior class of the Ozark, Ark., High School and their sponsors. The following members of the class were our guests: Cline Smith, John Porter, George Dybendal, Eldon Edgin, Edgar Wootser, Jr., Barbara McDaniel, Patricia Davis, Mary Lou Melton, Bobby Colvard, Dickie Caulk, John Greer, Billy Foster, Tommy Myers, Bill Matthews, Pauline Hopper, Golda Wyers, Sonya Hicks, Elva Walden, Betty Rae Williams, Reba "Dodie" Alston, and Roy Nichols.

Their sponsors are Greer Lingle, superintendent of the Ozark schools; Mrs. Norman Brooks; Mr. and Mrs. E. Z. Dickerson; Mr. and Mrs. Bob Adams and Beverly Sue Adams.

On Friday the class visited in the House Chamber, saw the Senate in session, had lunch in the Supreme Court cafeteria, and took a boat trip down the Potomac River to Mount Vernon. Saturday they visited the White House on tour.

Sunday morning they attended church at the National Presbyterian Church, where they saw President and Mrs. Eisenhower. On Sunday afternoon, in a colorful ceremony, the class placed a wreath on the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier in Arlington.

On Monday they visited the Smithsonian Institution and the FBI.

It is always an inspiration to have such fine young people with us. It is good for them and for all the rest of us for them to come to Washington. They can realize that they, too, are a part of this great Government of ours and are among the future leaders in business, agriculture, the professions, and Government.

We regret so much that the following members of the Ozark class were not on the trip this time. We hope they can come at a later date:

Wilma Haddock, Margaret Reed, Gary Bond, Marilyn Law, Bhurl Sossoman, Bill Mullen, Bill Kirkpatrick, Naomi Crouch, Janice Walker, Ludy McBee, Hilda Pippin, Melba Harris, Yvonne Chancey, Shirley McKinney, Joe Whitehead, William Barham, James Montgomery, Charles Standridge, Willie Thrasher, Lonnie Adams, Earnest Umholtz, Alvis Harding, Eleanor Holdar, Fannie Holdar, Wynell Rogers, Jerry Gaines, Betty Leverett, Pat Mullen, Paul Gaines, Jerry Prim, John Coley, Juanna Roland, and Marie Carter.

Airmail Subsidy Reductions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 25, 1954

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Record at this point an excellent editorial from the Standard-Times of New Bedford, Mass., May 13, 1954, entitled "For Subsidy Review" which discusses in detail the very well prepared and documented statement of my distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Kennedy] to our Appropriations Subcommittee wherein he advocates a reduction of $50 million in the request of the CAB for airline subsidy appropriations.

I should like to point out that if our committee and the Senate voted for that $50 million reduction, we would still be providing $60,223,000 in so-called service-mail pay for the airlines which is contained in the Post Office appropriation bill, H. R. 7893, already voted by both Houses of the Congress, which sum admittedly contains some subsidy and probably millions of dollars of it, and which takes care of the actual flying of the mail by all our airlines, domestic and international, and then we would be on top of that, providing, in the CAB appropriation bill, H. R. 8067, $23 million in new money for outright subsidies, and authorization to spend for subsidy purposes a leftover of about $8 million from the 1954 postal appropriation—which could possibly be stretched still further if the Civil Aeronautics Board instituted economies right away. In summary: $60 million plus $23 million plus $8 million for a grand total of airmail pay and subsidies combined of $91,223,000.

This $91 million for fiscal 1955 would be more than twice the combined total of airmail pay and subsidies in 1946, and considerably more than the sum involved in 1948, which was the first year our committee recommended a reform of these air mail subsidy procedures.

Mr. President, I do not think that if we voted a combined total of over $91 million of airmail pay and subsidy that anyone among the air mail contractors could call us, in any way, niggardly, and we would be, as this editorial recommends, displaying $50 million worth of tangible consideration for the taxpayers.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

For Subsidy Review

One of the major purposes of reorganization plan 10, passed by Congress last year, would be ignored if approval is given to pending legislation that would appropriate $73 million for airline subsidy payments in the next fiscal year.

Reorganization plan 10 separated cost of airmail pay from the subsidies given various airlines to help in cost of experiment, development and operation of vital air networks. Up to last year, the two costs were lumped together and the whole was charged to the Post Office Department. Congress was unable to change the appropriation materially, because it could not differentiate between genuine costs of carrying the mail and subsidy payments.

Senator Kennedy (Democrat, Massachusetts), who introduced the first separation bill in Congress in 1949 when he was a Member of the House, as well as the Hoover Commission and various committees of Congress have long urged "bringing the subsidy program into the open, for more adequate and effective review and control by Congress." This was clearly the intent of the reorganization plan which went into effect last October.

The present bill, however, does not incorporate these aims. Estimated subsidies were prepared by the Civil Aeronautics Board, and when added to the $60 million already appropriated for genuine airmail pay and the $8 million unexpended from last year's funds, represent the largest combined cost for mail and subsidy in United States history.

Protests involving at least $35 million of the proposed subsidies have been filed by Postmaster General Summerfield, on the grounds they are excessive. In two decisions this year, the Supreme Court has held that CAB's method of computing subsidy need was not based on the profit-loss sheet of an airline's entire operation, as required by the reorganization plan, but on needs of various divisions of an airline.

In view of curernt litigation and in order to give Congress an opportunity to examine the basis of subsidy payments, the House

Appropriations Committee recommended limiting the CAB request to $31 million at the present time. This would be sufficient for all feeder lines in the United States and all domestic lines. CAB would have to recalculate needs of international lines.

Senator KENNEDY has urged the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee to follow the House group's estimate. This would seem to be the only logical course. Perhaps CAB's proposed subsidies are justified, but no harm would be done by having Congress examine the question in an orderly way, as the law intends, and the taxpayer might get consideration.

Observance of First Day of Issue of Nebraska Territorial Stamp

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN L. HRUSKA

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 25, 1954

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. Speaker, on May 7, Nebraska City observed the first day of issue of Nebraska's Territorial stamp, which commemorates the centennial of that important event in the history of my native State, consisting of the passage of the Kansas-Nebraska bill.

The festivities were in high and colorful spirit, with appropriate decorations and attire very much in evidence. Well-attended patriotic exercises were presided over by Frank A. Bartling, chairman of history research for the Nebraska City Centennial.

Assistant Postmaster General Robertson, at the conclusion of his fine remarks, presented albums of the stamp to assembled distinguished guests.

J. Hyde Sweet, editor of the Nebraska City News-Press, delivered a timely and meaningful address. Mr. Sweet served as Representative in the 76th Congress from the First Nebraska District of that time.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include his splendid and well-written remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

REMARKS BY J. H. SWEET, EDITOR, NEWS-PRESS, ON THE OCCASION OF THE OBSERVANCE OF FIRST DAY ISSUE OF TERRITORIAL STAMP, NEBRASKA CITY, NEBR., MAY 7, 1954

From many points of view the beloved place we call Nebraska and whose centennial as a territory we now celebrate, beginning officially on May 30, had as stormy a beginning as any first-settled portion of this Republic.

Stephen A. Douglas, that Little Giant whose genesis was in the rock-bound hills of Vermont and chosen later home was Illinois, he who within 2 years from 1854 was to be contesting with Lincoln for a senatorship and the presidency—he was the father of the legislation which provided for the formation of this area, and Kansas, as territories of the United States.

Like so many far-seeing and prominent Americans of the era, Douglas saw the advantages of a trans-continental railroad, both for peace and war. He earnestly believed it should bisect the northern segment of what was the uncharted and almost entirely unexplored portions of the Louisiana Purchase not yet settled to any extent, rather than traverse the southern slave States. Back of his fixation of course was that thing we know as slavery, so closely approaching that tragic crisis, after so many years of evasion and compromise, we know as the Civil War.

Douglas' first bill was called Nebraska, and was referred to as such in the public debates and newspapers. Not only he but others who supported him used the name even when the final enactment officially became known as the Kansas-Nebraska bill.

Although Douglas tried to confine the issue and his arguments to the necessity of building the railroad across the mysterious wastes of western America, he found it impossible to so limit it. So it wasn't long until the Congress began discussing the measure almost entirely from the standpoint of whether slavery should be restricted to the States already pledged to its employment or to be extended to the new lands as of course southerners in Congress desperately wanted it. It was the era of geographical expansion; men were looking for new homes and chances to grow. Those southern people who sought the new places naturally insisted that they should be permitted without restrictive laws to settle in virgin territory where they could take with them and employ the slaves they had used in the old homes.

So the supporters of Mr. Douglas tried to find a compromise as Mr. Clay and others many years before had tried through similar but not long-lived agreements to settle a most disturbing question. They proposed to divide the huge Nebraska Territory as originaly laid out into two parts. One was to be called Kansas and the other Nebraska, and that is the way it turned out. Strangely enough, as we look at it today, people in the populous and older eastern sections of the land firmly believed Kansas was likely to become a slave-owning State, which certainly it did not as we know from the dark and bloody history of the Territory, and that Nebraska would stubbornly resist slave-ownership, which to the glory of all our generations it did, with a few exceptions of isolated bondage, including those relatively few families in Nebraska City who of southern birth and customs did bring their servant here.

The antislavery people led by such strong advocates as Senator Charles Sumner, of Massachusetts, and Representative Thaddeus Stevens, of Pennsylvania, were thoroughly angered by Douglas' bill. Sumner called it a fraud on the people and erroneously predicted little of the area, if any of it at all, ever would be settled except by roving bands of slave traders and bandits. The controversy actually resulted in the great realinement of political groups which had long existed and brought about the birth of the Republican Party whose centennial also is being celebrated this year.

At any rate, the two territories were simultaneously created as planned by Douglas and his friends in Congress. On May 30, 1854, President Franklin Pierce signed the bill granting territorial status to two areas which not only never justified Sumner's dire prophecies but in the years agone have become factors in our national life, especially with respect to the production of agricultural wealth, and provided homes for sturdy, reliable, God-fearing men and women of practically every race on earth.

Nebraska City was born of the Kansas-Nebraska bill. It was the child of such energetic, industrious, and ambitious young men from the Virginian Blue Ridge and the long-settled areas of Maine, New York, and Michigan as the Bradfords, Nuckollses, Bennetts, and Mortons. They arrived soon after the legality of settlement under the Kansas-Nebraska Act became effective. Studiously and with canny vision they established physically and spiritually the town we know and love and in which we have pride and faith.

These forerunners of our history foresaw prosperity and progress for all who had the will to plan and work. They were men possessed of confidence in their own works, who recognized the goodness of the Almighty who has smiled refulgently on us throughout the decades in spite of temporary setbacks. For that matter setbacks have pursued men of all races and climes throughout the recorded annals of the human animal.

I have no prophecy for the future of a community so uniquely born and so earnestly, with regard for the future, today observing the interesting issuance of a postage stamp in commemoration of the first 100 years.

But I do know that so long as men and women work with a will, enthusiastically and imaginatively, diligently and intelligently, and, as is said on our coins of the Republic, preserve their trust in God, not much which is wrong long will afflict them, nor swerve them from the appointed course of their manifest destiny.

The Wondrous Black Art

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1954

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I submit the following editorial from the Omaha World-Herald of the date of May 20, 1954:

How strange it is that we free Americans, we who take pride in our intelligence and rugged independence, sometimes allow ourselves to be victimized by those who practice the wondrous black art of propaganda.

For example, consider the things we have been looking at and worrying about for some weeks and months past.

Dien Bien Phu, for one.

In all honesty, had you, dear reader, ever heard of the place before it began to appear in the news shortly after the first of the year?

When you tride to look it up, were you even able to locate it in your home atlas?

Probably not. Yet, before we knew it the eyes of all of us were turned toward that distant jungle outpost of the French colonial empire.

Learned commentators and columnists began lecturing us on how enormously important it was to the whole free world, to the future of democracy, that a handful of French mercenary troops should continue to hold this speck of steaming real estate against the attack of native rebels. Leaders of this great Republic solemnly warned us that if Dien Bien Phu should fall, a chain reaction would be started which might destroy Washington and New York and Omaha.

And while we were keeping one apprehensive eye on Dien Bien Phu, suddenly we found ourselves watching, with the other, a funny little circus in Washington.

It seems that a United States Senator, a famed Communist chaser, had asked the War Department to grant a commission to a young man who was eligible for the draft. And when that didn't work, and the young man was drafted, the same Senator, or persons in his employ, asked that the lad be given an occasional week-end pass.

Things of the same sort have happened times without number since the peacetime draft was started.

But this time, almost as if by magic, the thing was whipped up into the proportions of an international incident. Writers and speakers argued as intensely about this affair as if the future of the Republic were hanging in the balance, and the young army private and the anti-Communist Senator and his friends and his accusers suddenly found themselves the stars of a coast-to-coast TV serial.

How did all this come about?

Why did we Americans permit ourselves to become so deeply engrossed in such utter trivialities?

How come our newspapers, our radio and TV people, our great public leaders, with only rare exceptions, fell into the trap?

We don't know. Possibly no one knows the full answer.

But it seems self-evident that someone planned it that way. Someone of great skill and cunning.

And what actually was happening nearer home while we Americans were day-dreaming about Dien Bien Phu and the Washington soap opera?

Well for one thing, it now develops, the Reds were running arms into Guatemala. To do this they used a ship which is chartered under the British flag.

And where is Guatemala?

It is on the North American Continent, the first country south of Mexico. It is no farther from New Orleans than New Orleans is from Omaha. It is within a couple of hours' flight of the Panama Canal.

Guatemala already is dominated by the Communists. The arms were shipped from Communist Poland. There is reason to think they were intended for sabotage of the canal, which is vital to the defense of America.

Here is a real 24-carat issue. Imagine if you can how Teddy Roosevelt would have reacted to such a threat. Teddy believed in guarding our own ramparts, not Dien Bien Phu.

But now?

High officials say there are concerned. Pundits say it's ominous. Then they hurry on to talk about the latest news from the McCarthy affair, and paw over the old plans for an Asiatic alliance.

Propaganda, it's wonderful. And wonderfully it has been planned and executed to turn the interest of the American people away from communism in the United States, away from communism in North America, and to keep American eyes focussed on a colonial disturbance in a jungle 10 thousand miles away.

Why Less Paper Currency?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 25, 1954

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, from time to time the economic seers of the present administration have sought to assure us that no recession is in sight despite mounting unemployment, sagging farm prices, and a falling off of sales in many lines. In fact, no less an authority on the subject than Herbert Hoover has given us the assurance that prosperity is on a sound footing.

Now in view of all of these assurances I am wondering why the Treasury Department is cutting back so drastically in the amount of currency to be printed in the fiscal year beginning July 1. It is my information that there will be 31 million less sheets of United States currency printed next year than this. At 18 bills per sheet this means a reduction of 558 million bills. This is a reduction of about 25 percent.

A great many economists contend that the volume of money in circulation and the speed at which it circulates is an accurate index of business activity.

Is it the conclusion of the adminstration that things are going to be so slack in business this coming summer, fall, and winter that we just will not need the currency?

It is also my understanding that the redemption of old and worn-out currency practically has been halted by the Treasury Department. Is this another sign that prosperity is retreating back around the corner where it remained hidden during the last Republican administration?

Experts in the field tell me that the reason our currency has never been successfully counterfeited is because of the high quality of our printing and engraving and because we have redeemed bills as soon as they become soiled or worn. When currency reaches the stage that it justifies the name of "filthy lucre," who can tell the spurious from the genuine?

If this is another so-called economy measure, I hope that it is not one that permits a torrent of spurious currency to be loosed.

I await with interest the Treasury Department's reply to the questions I have raised.

Worldwide Pool of Technical Aid Reducing Misery and Building United States Prestige—Part I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 25, 1954

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I have the honor to append hereto the first of five parts of a report of the worldwide correspondents of the New York Times showing the extraordinary and widespread progress made by the United States and U. N. technical-assistance programs:

WORLD TECHNICAL AID POOL REGISTERING BIG SUCCESSES—SURVEY OF UNITED STATES AND U. N. PROGRAMS IN 79 COUNTRIES SHOWS STRESS ON SELF-HELP—PRIVATE AGENCIES IN MAJOR ROLE

(By Will Lissner)

Famine-plagued India has increased her food production by 5,000,000 tons and thinks the time is near when, barring natural calamity, she will be self-sufficient in foodstuffs.

Italy has bettered Mussolini's record 1938 wheat crop by 1,000,000 tons. Greece has become self-sufficient in wheat; Turkey is one of the first four wheat-exporting countries. Jamaica is becoming self-sufficient in rice and Panama has a rice surplus. Ceylon is now exporting salt. Korea's hog cholera, which killed off 43,000 pigs in 1949, is virtually under control.

These are the first results of technical aid around the world, under which Governments are sharing their people's "know-how," particularly with underdeveloped countries and territories, at an ever-increasing rate. The bigger and better gains are yet to come, for the work is only in its beginnings in many lands.

Seventy countries are supplying help to augment self-help in 91 countries. Most of the donating countries themselves are recipients also under the technical cooperation and assistance programs.

The programs cost donors and recipients upward of $500 million a year. Several billions more are spent annually by governments and investors on parallel economic development plans.

These facts are shown in a survey and appraisal of government technical-aid programs in action, just completed by correspondents of the New York Times in 79 countries and territories where substantial projects are operating.

The correspondents studied on the spot work done by a variety of governmental agencies:

Technical cooperation specialists of the United States Foreign Operations Administration.

Technical assistance experts of the United Nations and its 10 specialized agencies in such fields as agriculture, labor and management, and public health.

The 16-nation Colombo Plan for South and Southeast Asia, through technical assistance administrators.

The administrations of more than a dozen governments, which direct aid as well as participating in international agencies.

The correspondents' country-by-country reports show that the sharing of technical know-how is one of the largest and most successful enterprises on which the world has ever engaged. The showing would even be somewhat larger if the countries of the Soviet sphere could have been included.

It would be considerably larger if account were taken of the technical aid given by the great missionary organizations, private business concerns, and private contractors and the world's philanthropic foundations and institutions.

Some general conclusions emerged from the reports: Technical cooperation here to stay; its cost should be treated as a standing item in national budgets. A few countries are taking the next step, establishing conditions that will encourage development investment by domestic and foreign capital. Accounting and expenditure of funds and supervision by Governments are good. Losses from project failures have been few and isolated.

But the picture is not wholly creditable. In one country experts from different agencies compete, whereas harmonious cooperation is the rule generally. Waste was found in one country, but foreign funds were not involved. Local elements impede progress in several countries.

Some changes were suggested by the reports. The United States program has a place of its own, that cannot be filled by other agencies. But it should be separated from military and economic aid programs so that it remains a "help for self-help" program. The United States taxpayer should not be asked to finance economic development abroad when private investors are ready to do so if the capital-receiving country offers competitive conditions.

The United Nations and its agencies have established places in the field that should be gradually expanded, but not at the expense of direct technical aid by the United States or any other single country. Priority should be given to establishing a reserve fund covering a year's costs, so firm plans can be made.

Countries that have made the greatest advances have done so by welcoming the investment of domestic and foreign capital. Part of technical cooperation funds might well be used to tell the underdeveloped countries the story of their progress.

Worldwide Pool of Technical Aid Reducing Misery and Building United States Prestige—Part II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 25, 1954

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, appended hereto is the second of five parts of a report of the worldwide correspondents of the New York Times showing the extraordinary and widespread progress made by the United States and United Nations technical-assistance programs:

SHARING OF TECHNICAL KNOWLEDGE IS TRANSFORMING RETARDED SECTORS OF THE WORLD

Following is a country-by-country survey by correspondents of the New York Times of governmental and international programs of technical cooperation and assistance in 79 lands. The statistical data have been compiled from reports of the several administrations. Totals are given for the last 2 fiscal or calendar years. United Nations totals are contingent upon payment of pledged contributions. Domestic contributions reported cover in most cases only part of recipient's expenditures. Staff totals are for foreign specialists only:

Asia and Pacific

	United States technical cooperation contributions			U. N. technical assistance grants		
	United States, fiscal 1953–54	Domestic, fiscal 1953–54	Staff, 1954	U. N. calendar 1953–54	UNICEF, calendar 1952–53	Staff, 1954
	Thousands	*Thousands*		*Thousands*	*Thousands*	
Afghanistan	$2,091	$5,000	22	$940.4	$267.8	45
Brunei	0			3.6	1.2	1
Burma	0			1,143.1	691.8	71
Ceylon	0			1,038.5	116.4	54
Hong Kong	0			41.6	105.8	3
India	72,894	65,737		2,169.6	4,343.5	103
Indochina	2,045	108,138	55	308.4	195.0	13
Indonesia	0			1,529.8	1,190.0	82
Japan	0			7.1	24.0	1
Korea [1]	8,500	(²)	8			
Malaya	0			127.6	67.7	18
Nepal	1,097	(²)	10	72.6	0	7
National China	4,150	128,467	43	309.8	232.0	19
North Borneo	0			92.3	6.6	6
Pakistan	19,505	15,120	74	1,917.9	1,210.7	93
Philippines	6,951	105,359	90	557.2	767.6	26
Samoa	0			2.1	0	0
Sarawak	0			40.9	8.3	2
Singapore	0			153.0	42.2	10
Thailand	3,750	(²)	55	1,151.4	763.4	63
Regional	0			1,210.4	30.0	
Total	120,992	427,821	357	12,849.6	10,064.4	617

[1] Korean aid from all sources may total $375,000,000 this year but technical assistance cannot be separated from relief and reconstruction. Figure given is United States estimate.

[2] Not available.

INDIA

NEW DELHI.—In 3 years of technical cooperation and assistance given in support of India's 5-year plan, this country has scored some notable achievements.

Food production has been increased by 5 million tons. New land brought under irrigation totals 3,500,000 acres. Fertilizer production has been increased from 35,000 tons in 1951–52 to 230,000 tons in 1952–53. The time is near when, barring natural calamity, India may be entirely self-sufficient in food.

Power generation has been increased by 315,000 kilowatts. Three ships have been built in the Vishakhaptnam yard. Ninety locomotives have been manufactured at the Chittaranjan works. Coal production is up 4 million tons, steel production 100,000 tons. Cloth output has been raised to 4,700,000,000 yards, a postwar record.

No less important are other achievements. Hundreds of miles of new roads and dozens of schools have been erected by the efforts of villagers. Such scourges as malaria and yaws have been eradicated from large areas of the country. Agricultural, medical, and social services have been extended to 46,000 villages inhabited by 37,286,000 peasants.

Help for 1 out of 4

By the end of the plan period, March 1956, if all goes normally, one-fourth of the population will have been reached by the community development program.

Admittedly, such results as these were only achieved because India receives the biggest individual share of foreign technical assistance from all sources and because she is willing to make extraordinary sacrifices for economic and social development.

United States technical cooperation has allotted in 3 years $189 million to India, including $23 million for salaries of American staff and expenditures by the American administration. In the last 2 years India received from United Nations agencies $6,500,000.

India shares in the Colombo plan for south and southeast Asia, and receives help from private foundations. In addition, she receives the bilateral aid of Norway, the government and people of which supplied about $3 million and 14 experts to help modernize the south India fishing industry.

Yet the total of foreign aid is miniscule compared with the outlay of the Indians themselves. This is programed at $4,488 million for the 5-year period.

India is thus an object lesson in what technical cooperation, given in adequate amounts and matched by adequate national sacrifice, can do.

Five million new mouths a year

In spite of the major effort in money and planning that the Indians themselves are making and the concentrated effort of other nations in their behalf, the vastness of the problem of bringing India up to western standards is staggering. India has a population of 357 million and must provide for nearly 5 million more a year. There seems to be no end to the work to be done.

But officials, both foreign and Indian, stress the need for waiting a few years before a sound assessment can be made.

All the programs are closely coordinated within the 5-year plan. The plan is in continual process of revision. It is considered a compliment to the planners—Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru is the active chairman of the National Planning Commission—that no project has yet had to be marked down as a failure.

Emphasis in the United States technical cooperation program shifts. In the first year it was entirely on agricultural development. In the second more attention was paid to health, education, and natural resources. Now it is expanding into industrial assistance.

It is the consensus of foreign experts here that India furnishes an outstanding example of the use that can be made of indigenous talent in employing foreign technical aid to the utmost. Indeed, in some fields India can share her specialized talents with other countries. More than 80 Indian experts serve abroad and 90 foreigners have received fellowships for training in India.

The impression grows from Indian experience that the basic factor determining the permanent effect of technical cooperation efforts is the sense of direction and degree of drive contributed by the recipient country.

KOREA

SEOUL.—The second battle for Korea has begun. Allied military force successfully repulsed Communist aggression. Another important campaign is on—to find places for the displaced, jobs for the jobless.

Relief has kept alive millions who otherwise would have died. Now experts from 27 nations are teaching the Koreans how to do everything from digging peat to dredging harbors. There is no separate technical cooperation program but teaching new skills and improving old ones enter every phase of reconstruction.

A financial expert from Thailand advises the Bank of Korea. A Danish engineer is showing Koreans how to find peat deposits and operate machinery that removes the peat and presses it into briquettes. An American veterinarian introduced new methods of vaccine and serum production. He was instrumental in reducing hog cholera fatalities from 43,000 pigs in 1949 to fewer than 100 last year.

United States specialists will train Korean engineers in the course of rehabilitating the important Hwachon hydroelectric powerplant.

In these and hundreds of other ways, Korea's friends are trying to put this nation back on her feet. But there are problems.

"The most pressing economic problem we have faced," President Syngman Rhee says, "is that American aid and assistance funds, given to Korea for the purpose of reconstructing and rehabilitating the Korean economy, have not been used for that purpose but to build up the Japanese economy."

But the average Korean who fears another outbreak of fighting does not want to start a business that may be lost or put up a house that may be destroyed. Competent technicians are difficult to get. Korean plans are frequently unrealistic, considering the woeful lack of resources and abilities.

NATIONALIST CHINA

TAIPEI.—United States technical cooperation with Nationalist China shifts major emphasis this year to industrialization of Formosa.

In the past few years United States and United Nations technical aid helped raise the standard of living and lay a sound foundation for a stable rural economy. The two biggest cash crops, sugar and rice, broke all records set by the Japanese.

The industrial program already has made progress. The industrial index last year stood at 136 compared with 100 in 1941 when the Japanese mobilized Formosan industry for war.

This year 148 Chinese technicians will be trained in the United States. Professors from Purdue University and Pennsylvania State College are helping to establish engineering schools.

United Nations projects have all but wiped out malaria and have almost completed tuberculosis control. A maternity and child health project failed.

PAKISTAN

KARACHI.—Last year 200,000 cultivators sowed 40,000 tons of ammonium sulfate on 500,000 acres of rice to increase the yield of the staple of East Pakistan. They acted on the advice of United States specialists, each working with a Pakistani counterpart.

United Nations experts are directing construction of vast irrigation projects. One, to be completed in 1958 at a cost of $60,000,000, will bring 2,200,000 acres into cultivation. Hydroelectric and land rehabilitation projects are transforming the way of life in once-isolated communities.

Other United Nations technicians, working with Pakistanis, are fighting disease, planning towns, organizing economic surveys, improving telecommunications, office administration and transportation.

Backing up these efforts are the Colombo plan administrators, who supply from the 16 donor countries facilities ranging from power plants to railway sleepers.

However, Pakistan suffers from an impulse to implement too many ideas at once. The United Nations alone will have 65 projects going this year. A committee to avoid duplication has been set up.

Some United Nations officials are planning to recommend that more efforts be concentrated on food cultivation and fundamental vocational training, in place of projects concerned with geophysical research and university science teaching.

PHILIPPINES

MANILA.—Technical cooperation accounts for about a third of the $18 million budgeted by the United States for economic development here. Together with the Philippine Government's own program and supplementary programs by the United Nations, it represents as much as the Filipinos can do by self-help.

However, the technical aid has stimulated civic projects designed to raise living standards of village and farm folk.

Half a dozen rural improvement movements have been organized by leading Filipino, Chinese, and American citizens, national in scope and financed by public contributions. Civic groups have instituted individual projects. The most recent project is the Liberty Wells Association drive for funds to install artesian wells in every town of the country.

The United States-Filipino projects follow the blueprint of the Bell report which surveyed the Philippines' economic needs and pursue familiar lines in agriculture, industry, and administration. The United Nations took over the stimulation of home handicraft industries and has undertaken efforts ranging from eradicating snail-fever in Leyte to establishing a marble industry on the island of Romblon.

OTHER COUNTRIES

Afghanistan: The most important contribution made by United States technical cooperation was to the Helmand River Valley Authority, multi-million-dollar irrigation and land-reclamation project on the southern border. The United Nations agencies have made notable contributions in teacher-training, malaria-control and maternity and child-care programs.

Burma: All projects in the vast rehabilitation and development program which were planned before the ending of United States aid in mid-1953 are being continued. Some American specialists are being continued under private contract. United Nations experts have helped in reducing malaria, improving livestock-breeding and producing handicraft textiles.

Cambodia: With United States aid ancient dams are being rebuilt for irrigation. The port of Pnompenh is receiving new installations, roads are being improved and new agricultural methods are being taught. Closely coordinated United Nations projects have reduced malaria, established training centers for health and educational personnel in a land with only six trained physicians and have begun to develop industry.

Ceylon: Colombo plan and United Nations experts have aided in promoting a mechanized fishing industry, in developing mechanized agriculture, salt and cement manufacture, nurse-training and other medical work. Salt is now exported.

Hong Kong: This colony's basic economic and health problems are far beyond the range of the comparatively small United Nations technical assistance programs here. Overcrowding in the disease-ridden slums restricts effectiveness of projects.

Indonesia: Technical cooperation and assistance have fostered nurse-training and industrial development. But foreign capital is still reluctant to come to Indonesia.

Japan: Private foreign concerns with capital participation in Japanese industrial and development projects provide the bulk of technical assistance, mostly in construction and manufacturing. The United Nations has aided education.

Laos: The incidence of yaws is being slowly reduced, malaria combated and personnel trained for health services. Teachers are being trained and engineering services provided.

Malaya: With British aid, vast resettlement, hydroelectric power, and agricultural development projects have been undertaken, with success. The United States has helped with the roadbuilding program.

Nepal: Indian engineers are opening the kingdom to development by building a truck road from Katmandu to Raxaul. United States technicians are helping improve agriculture. United Nations experts are assisting. Malaria control work is starting.

North Borneo: United Nations and Colombo Plan help has been of greatest value in the fields of public health and child welfare. Illiteracy has handicapped educational and training projects.

Sarawak: Roadbuilding and communications development are being spurred with British aid. The Colombo plan has provided technical assistance in education, medicine, forestry, engineering, social welfare, and administration. There is some United States help.

Singapore: Sea and air transport, housing, town planning, and road-development projects are being aided under the Colombo plan. Agricultural and industrial improvement plans get United Nations aid. Health projects are being undertaken.

Thailand: Malaria control is achieving sensational results and it is hoped the disease will be suppressed by 1957. United States and United Nations technicians are introducing talapia the "mad" fish—"eats like mad, grows like mad, multiplies like mad," and improved agricultural techniques.

Vietnam: The United States has given technical aid in connection with public works, aid to displaced persons, educational, agricultural, and training programs. United Nations experts have advised on long-range health, welfare, administration, and vocational training projects. Scarcity of technically competent Vietnamese restricts the projects.

Worldwide Pool of Technical Aid Reducing Misery and Building United States Prestige—Part III

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 25, 1954

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, appended hereto is the third of five parts of a report of the worldwide correspondents of the New York Times showing the extraordinary and widespread progress made by the United States and U. N. technical assistance programs:

Middle East

	United States technical cooperation contributions			U. N. technical assistance grants		
	United States, fiscal 1953–54	Local, fiscal 1953–54	Staff, 1954	U. N., calendar 1953–54	UNICEF, calendar 1952–53	Staff, 1954
	Thousands	*Thousands*		*Thousands*	*Thousands*	
Cyprus	0	----------	----------	$14.5	0	1
Egypt	$16,307	$16,022	52	919.7	$676	54
Iran	37,677	515	195	1,881.2	226	104
Iraq	4,333	n. a.	75	944.5	512	60
Israel	4,119	1,500	53	867.0	350	23
Jordan	5,090	909	53	416.0	609	28
Lebanon	3,724	n. a.	59	237.5	8	11
Libya	2,855	256	51	1,323.3	94	2
Saudi Arabia	3,203	1,750	31	349.1	0	21
Syria	0	----------	----------	800.5	142	42
Yemen	0	----------	----------	57.9	0	5
Regional	0	----------	----------	818.3	2,735	35
Total	77,308	20,952	569	8,649.5	5,352	386

EGYPT

CAIRO.—United States and United Nations technicians are doing a good job on the preparatory work for raising Egyptian physical, economic, and social standards. But the country lacks the capital-generating capacity to put development programs into effect on a broad scale.

The 100 international experts and technicians can show the Egyptians how to get better crop yields; to get more and better housing for less; to organize rural communities for health, education, and social welfare. They can set up pilot projects and they have reported exhaustively on possibilities for industrial development.

But with the resources currently available—about $5 million annually for United States technical cooperation and $543,373 for United Nations technical assistance—they are unable to do anything to offset Egypt's lack of capital.

On the political level there is a tendency to disparage United States aid and contrast it with the more liberal economic assistance to Israel. Lt. Col. Gamal Abdul Nasser, Premier, and dominant figure in the military regime, when asked about United States aid, replied: "What aid? United States military and economic aid goes to Israel, not to the Arab States."

Dr. Mohammed Selim, United States-educated engineer who heads Egypt's development board, credits United States and United Nations projects with making a real contribution. But he and those of similar opinion contend that too much is spent on technical assistance and not enough on materials and development programs.

Egypt is pinning its hopes for solving the acute shortage of arable land on plans for a high dam at Aswan, in upper Egypt, which they believe would reclaim 2 million acres. It would cost $500 million. Efforts to borrow a third abroad have been unsuccessful. Egyptians say foreign aid is being withheld because of their insistence on British evacuation of the Suez Canal zone and hostility to Israel.

IRAN

TEHERAN.—The revival of the pistachio nut crop in a dozen villages in the Damghan area 200 miles east of here illustrates United States technical cooperation at its best.

The area has been close to starvation since its nut trees were invaded 18 years ago by insect pests. Nonproducing trees needed for pollination were cut down for firewood.

Last year Mahmoud Safari, United States-trained Iranian technician, obtained approval for a scheme of spraying the trees to kill the pests and using the air blast of pumps to spread the pollen of the few remaining male trees in the air.

An Iranian mechanic built duplicates of a model air pump from the United States. The work was done at a cost of 2 cents a tree, paid by tree owners. Damghan harvested a $400,000 crop from 50,000 trees last fall. The program is being spread to other pistachio-growing areas.

Not all projects fare so well. The apparent lack of a social conscience among most Iranians is a great obstacle to progress.

Zamindars (big landowners) of Isfahan recently forced the abandonment of a $300,000 irrigation project because their products might face competition from those of small farmers who would benefit. The project would have reactivated an arterial irrigation canal built by Shah Abbas 350 years ago and destroyed by Afghan invaders in the 18th century.

Because of the scarcity of educated persons, the United States mission has been obliged to employ many members from the zamindar class, some of whom have obtained construction contracts for members of their families.

But in spite of these obstacles, plus Communist agitation and local politics, technical cooperation scores some notable achievements. In one village a health program enabled the first infants in 15 years to survive into childhood. It has initiated 90 projects that reach into most of Iran's 40,000 villages.

OTHER COUNTRIES

Iraq: United States technicians and United Nations experts participate in the Iraq Development Board, which gets 70 percent of all revenues for long-range projects such as flood control, cement plants, schools, and vast drainage schemes. This year's floods will delay the programs, since they make necessary heavy relief spending. Their damage of upward of $125 million might have been prevented by the Great Wadi Tharthar diversion barrage which was to have been completed by 1956.

Israel: A United Nations expert on metal-finishing has raised the quality of low-standard metal goods. In citrus growing one specialist is helping to increase orchard yields, a cost accountant is reducing transportation costs, and a paper expert is improving wrapping methods that have been criticized.

Jordan: British, United States, and United Nations technicians cooperate in the Jordan Development board. The main effort is to open hitherto desert lands for agriculture, chiefly by organizing limited water resources. Jordan was dissuaded from ending United States technical cooperation only by an offer of $8 million for road building and improvement of potash production. Similar pressure was used on the United Nations. Inability to solve the problem of 480,000 Palestine refugees handicaps development work.

Lebanon: Four United Nations experts trained Lebanese in radio, meteorology, airport management, and air traffic services, providing personnel for a leading international airport at Beirut. American specialists have completed a plan for a $30 million power network in south Lebanon. The Government is offering incentives for foreign investment and plans to adhere to the International Chamber of Commerce's agreement on fair treatment of foreign investments.

Libya: Britain, France, Italy, Egypt, Turkey, the United States, and the United Nations supply more than 800 technicians to man key posts in the Government of this newly established desert kingdom. The first objective of all programs is to train Libyans. Agricultural work is being spurred to end deaths by malnutrition.

Saudi Arabia: Most technical assistance is obtained by private contract out of oil revenues. However, United States specialists help in preparing the state budget and in revising the customs code. United Nations experts concentrate on agriculture. Progress is sensational, but comes from cooperation with foreign capital.

Syria: Technical aid is accepted from the United Nations alone, in development planning, education, agriculture, civil aviation, and health. Restrictions on foreign capital hinder development.

Yemen: United Nations experts are helping expand crop production, improve the money and banking systems, develop water resources and ports and map the country.

Africa

	United States technical cooperation contributions			U. N. technical assistance grants		
	United States, fiscal 1953-54	Domestic, fiscal 1953-54	Staff, 1954	U. N. cal- calendar 1953-54	UNICEF, calendar 1952-53	Staff, 1554
	Thousands	*Thousands*		*Thousands*	*Thousands*	
Bechuanaland	0			0	$35.0	
Belgian Congo	0			0	183.0	
British East Africa	0			$98.6	25.0	8
Ethiopia	$3,029	$2,223	30	595.2	77.0	22
French Equatorial Africa	0			0	150.0	
French West Africa	0			31.4	430.0	2
Gambia	0			6.0	0	1
Gold Coast	0			62.5	0	8
Liberia	2,983	1,383	59	476.2	100.0	23
Mauritius	0			0	10.0	
Morocco	0			17.3	250.0	2
Nyassaland	0			4.4	0	1
Nigeria	0			32.9	318.0	4
Somaliland	0			83.4	0	2
Sudan	0			14.0	43.0	1
Tunisia	0			41.2	111.0	3
Regional	0			186.4	0	4
Total	6,012	3,606	89	1,649.4	1,732.0	81

ETHIOPIA

ADDIS ABABA.—Ethiopians are learning to drive tractors and handle other farming machinery at an agricultural college organized by the United States technical cooperation mission and staffed by experts from Oklahoma Agricultural and Mining College.

An agricultural university is being planned in the rich Harar Province. Graduates will become Ethiopia's first extension agents. Emperor Haile Selassie's direct and personal interest in spurring his people's development in scientific farming is responsible in great measure for the smoothness of the work and the progress achieved.

United Nations experts help in several ways. One team is trying to save the country's great cattle herds from the ravages of rinderpest and other diseases by vaccination; 1 million head have been immunized. Another is training Ethiopian students as civil-aviation technicians. Others are working against venereal diseases and spreading knowledge of hygiene and insect control.

When thick locust swarms sweep across the Red Sea into Ethiopia, the United States and United Nations missions team up. The Americans supply the planes and the Food and Agriculture Organization the pilots and insecticides to kill the pests. Some tribesmen object to it, of course.

The impact of foreign-aid programs on the country has not yet been appreciable, since they must necessarily be devoted to training Ethiopians who only later will be able to teach their countrymen improved techniques. But they fill a felt need.

LIBERIA

MONROVIA.—Sixty-two American technicians are directing 28 projects embracing the country's entire economy. Much effort is being directed by Liberia to increase food and export crops, but half the projects are in the field of public works.

Liberia's one-crop economy, based on rubber cultivation, was first diversified by private development of iron-ore deposits. But now United States technical cooperation is seeking further diversification through agricultural development.

It has distributed coffee, cocoa, and oil palm seedlings to peasants in various parts of the country and has helped establish a central agricultural experiment station at Suakoko. In addition, two United Nations experts are working to improve fisheries.

Other United Nations projects operating are in the field of industrial development, including work in handicrafts and in technical education.

In addition, the United Nations is helping to improve educational services, with a fundamental education, a teacher-training and a university science-teaching project.

Public health work by the United Nations is concentrated on a pilot project in malaria-control and a yaws-control project. The Children's Fund cooperates in these fields.

OTHER COUNTRIES

Angola: This Portuguese province and Mozambique are being surveyed for minerals by Americans and Portuguese geologists. Underground water resources are being sought.

Belgian Congo: United States technical cooperation is aiding Belgium with specialized problems, including sewage and drainage in mushroom native cities, nonferrous metallurgy, road building, certain aspects of tropical agriculture, and statistical services.

British East Africa: A United Nations expert helped the Tanganyika Geological Survey investigate mineral ores. Others did preliminary work in nursing education and food production. Study opportunities in the United States are being arranged.

French West Africa: With French assistance, 90,000 acres of land have been reclaimed and are worked by 25,000 African settlers, grouped in cooperatives. The project is designed to expand at the rate of 10,000 acres a year.

Gold Coast: British assistance has turned the Gold Coast into a well-developed territory. Most is in connection with a 5-year $182 million development plan to be completed in 1956. Britain, Canada, and the Gold Coast Governments are exploring a $403,200,000 aluminum-production program on the Volta River.

Morocco: French technical assistance and economic aid have mechanized agriculture, conserved soils, and rehabilitated rural areas. A geological survey has been completed. Water for irrigating 200,000 acres in the Tadla Plain is expected to be available in 1957 from the Bin el Ouldane hydroelectric plant.

Nigeria: British technicians introduced electricity, developed the port of Lagos, built roads, railway, telegraph, and other modern facilities. Now Nigerians are being trained to replace them. United States and United Nations specialists are helping in development planning.

Northern Rhodesia: A United States foreign operations loan has helped develop a railway line to bring out copper, asbestos, cobalt, and chrome. It connects with the Portuguese port of Lourenco Marques.

Tunisia: France has done much over the years to develop this protectorate economically. Following a 7-year plan costing $215,700,000, a new 4-year plan went into effect last year that will cost France $41 million. Technical assistance provided will be in connection with this plan.

Worldwide Pool of Technical Aid Reducing Misery and Building United States Prestige—Part IV

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 25, 1954

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, appended hereto is the fourth of five parts of a report of the worldwide correspondents of the New York Times showing the extraordinary and widespread progress made by the United States and U. N. technical assistance programs:

Latin America

	United States technical cooperation contributions			U. N. technical assistance grants		
	United States, fiscal 1953–54	Domestic, fiscal 1953–54	Staff, 1954	U. N. calendar, 1953–54	UNICEF, calendar, 1952–53	Staff, 1954
	Thousands	*Thousands*		*Thousands*	*Thousands*	
Bolivia	$5,003	$3,952	40	$682.5	$71.0	27
Brazil	7,426	27,283	87	959.3	1,392.0	56
British Guiana	----------	----------	----------	60.5	18.5	1
British Honduras	----------	----------	----------	7.5	20.0	1
Chile	3,027	6,042	30	527.4	409.5	20
Colombia	2,606	6,699	22	408.0	103.0	20
Costa Rica	1,924	2,253	32	288.6	45.5	16
Cuba	505	215	10	34.6	----------	3
Dominican Republic	740	320	12	111.0	85.0	7
Ecuador	2,463	5,784	36	698.3	25.0	32
El Salvador	1,633	2,436	31	365.2	140.0	18
Grenada	----------	----------	----------	----------	32.6	----------
Guatemala	400	1,316	9	324.5	76.7	12
Haiti	1,670	1,925	24	351.8	425.0	14
Honduras	1,724	4,270	28	168.2	237.0	9
Jamaica	----------	----------	----------	116.6	46.0	6
Mexico	2,006	1,902	34	622.7	200.0	30
Nicaragua	1,437	2,098	21	137.0	30.0	7
Panama	2,035	3,339	40	257.5	74.0	11
Paraguay	2,392	2,167	41	498.0	130.0	27
Peru	3,833	5,046	54	376.7	73.3	15
St. Kitts	----------	----------	----------	----------	5.5	----------
St. Lucia	----------	----------	----------	----------	25.0	----------
Surinam	----------	----------	----------	----------	37.0	----------
Trinidad	----------	----------	----------	17.8	46.0	2
Uruguay	822	1,114	9	98.9	----------	3
Venezuela	320	2,732	5	71.8	----------	5
Regional	3,406	----------	27	2,221.9	----------	125
Total	45,372	80,925	592	9,396.0	3,747.6	448

BOLIVIA

La Paz.—Three years ago the agricultural service in which Bolivia and the United States cooperate with the other American republics brought a pound of Cuban yellow corn here. It was found to give twice as high a yield as the seed in use.

Now, virtually the entire Santa Cruz region grows that variety of Bolivia's staple food and the output per acre in the region has doubled.

Cooperative work in agriculture is financed by local currency derived from the sale of $12 million of United States surplus commodities granted to Bolivia. Besides the field of agriculture, joint cooperative services exist in health and sanitation and education.

The health program, now 12 years old, carries on disease-prevention education through radio, press, motion pictures, literature, mobile units and lectures.

The sanitation service helps to design and construct hospitals, health centers and laboratories and water and sewage systems. It is also fighting malaria and silicosis, prevalent diseases.

A notable improvement in efficiency in 6 Government departments has been achieved by a United Nations program, 1 of the organization's most ambitious undertakings in South America. Mission members work as technical advisers in the Central Bank, Controller General's Office, Social Security Administration and the Ministries of Finance, Agriculture and Labor.

Besides these, technical experts help on hydroelectric power, mining, metal-smelting, petroleum production and other specialized fields.

In a United Nations project to reduce illiteracy, first-grade children are said to learn to read and write correctly in an average of 48 days. This "pilot school" demonstrates improved teaching techniques. Some teachers are sent to the United States for advanced training.

BRAZIL

Rio de Janeiro.—United States and United Nations programs are complementary in this country, whose desire for technical cooperation is insatiable and whose willingness to share her facilities with other underdeveloped lands is almost unlimited.

Under the United States industrial program, 2,000 foremen in Sao Paulo and other southern states received training. More than 100 concerns in Sao Paulo alone sent representatives. The program is being enlarged. This year about 250 Brazilians will be sent to the United States for 3 months to a year, with both countries sharing the cost.

Assisting is the International Labor Organization, whose vocational training program is turning out needed skilled workers in mechanics, woodworking, cabinetmaking, metal heat treatment and other fields. Backstopping this is a vocational guidance project now installed in 10 schools.

Brazilians are enthusiastic about modern methods of public and business administration. Brazil collaborates with the United Nations in a school of public administration, begun in 1952, which will continue until 1956. The enrollment this year includes 125 Brazilians and 40 students from other countries.

The United States is aiding the Getulio Vargas Foundation in the establishment of the first university-level school of business administration. Professors from Michigan State College are providing guidance for the São Paulo institution.

In scientific research, too, Brazil is giving as well as receiving technical aid. In physical research she is pioneering in pilot studies of cosmic radiation. Geophysical research is carried on in cooperation with the American National Observatory and the United States Geodetic Survey.

The Institute of Agricultural Chemistry is conducting research on medicinal and toxic plants. In biophysics an expert of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization is assisting the Biophysics Institute of the University of Brazil.

The inter-American cooperative service and the Food and Agriculture Organization have varied projects in operation, not only to increase output from rich agricultural States but to aid immigrants in Parana and elsewhere. Other projects aim to spur mineral and resources development, health, welfare, and housing.

CHILE

Santiago.—In the first phase of an operational plan aimed to raise the country's level of development area by area, the United States technical cooperation mission is collaborating with the Chilean Government in an area development center. It serves three provinces, centering on the important industrial and commercial city of Concepcion.

The projects in operation in the Concepcion area include health and agricultural programs. The latter consists of projects in water utilization, soil conservation, irrigation, reforestation, dairy and livestock improvement, weed and pest control and forage improvement. Through these, the plan aims to assist in full development of the area.

The Food and Agriculture Organization has encouraged forestation. Its school of forestry in the University of Chile is expected to turn out at least 100 forest specialists in 5 years. Some of the 12 economists supplied by the Economic Commission for Latin America are cooperating with FAO experts in efforts to establish pulp and paper production. It is believed that Chile could fill Latin-America's newsprint requirements.

The FAO is also surveying land and sea resources with the aim of making available abundant, low-priced food, rich in nutrients. Better fishing methods, refrigeration and distribution centers, improved transportation, improved meat cutting and packing methods as well as modernization of farm production are being planned. In some fields the Organization of American States is cooperating.

The United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund, which produces powdered milk for central Chile, is considering the manufacture of fish flour.

Basic to the program are projects for training Chilean specialists and development experts. All the technical-aid projects dovetail with the Government's 8-year economic plan and are enthusiastically supported by the press and people.

COLOMBIA

BOGOTA.—Among Colombia's varied technical assistance projects, in which about 10 agencies are collaborating, is an educational project designed to bring schooling to peasants in the most remote parts of the country.

The project has a carefully chosen faculty which uses a radio broadcasting station to reach its students. Five thousand receiving sets with good amplifiers have been distributed in the rural areas of the central part of the country. Each receiver becomes a "school" for the peasants living nearby. It is estimated that about 100,000 pupils attend the lectures.

Begun several years ago by a Roman Catholic priest, the project is now being aided by the Government and by the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization.

Operation of a pilot plant for the processing of iodized salt is part of the public health program in an effort to reduce the incidence of goiter. Intensive work on insect control is intended to stamp out diseases. Good progress continued on yaws control.

Public health squads go from city slums to remote farms. They use many means of transportation, jeep, dugout canoe, and mule.

Central to all United States and United Nations projects is the training of personnel. Foreign advisers work closely with Colombians. Selected Colombian professionals receive opportunities for specialized training in the United States or other countries.

Industrial and agricultural programs cover varied projects. In agriculture these include soil research, development of acclimated crop varieties, coffee research, irrigation, machinery operation and maintenance, rubber development and cattle breeding. Industrial programs range from building materials and techniques to fisheries development.

Last year there were technical advisers from the United States, Austria, Canada, India, Mexico, France, the Netherlands, and Sweden. Colombian experts were supplied to a number of countries through the United Nations.

MEXICO

MEXICO CITY.—In view of the Mexican Government's sensitivity to foreign aid because it is foreign, most of the emphasis of technical cooperation and technical assistance programs here has been placed on the training of Mexican specialists.

Among the successes in this field the pineapple crop has been freed of disease through the recommendations of a United Nations expert.

However, an improved method for treating mineral ores could not be introduced in one of the poorer districts without a demonstration. It was accepted when United States specialists rigged up a portable plant in a jeep and gave practical proof of a treatment's value.

As much Mexican participation as possible is sought on the projects and they are turned over to Mexican personnel as quickly as possible. Only one project, rubber cultivation, has been pigeonholed.

Nothing has yet appeared to support the Government's fear that the people would resent foreign aid. The attitude is difficult to understand since, with popular support, the Government itself has undertaken bilateral assistance to 16 countries in the field of science. It has undertaken to operate on its own the Scientific Documentation Center established by the United Nations.

This is not the only instance of Mexican technical cooperation. The results of the corn and wheat program, for example, have been diffused widely. Foreign students particularly from the United States are welcomed in Mexico.

But the best results are obtained when the contact with the public is made through Mexican nationals.

Foreign and national observers agree that the technical aid programs have scored a brilliant success.

PERU

Lima: Put on a self-supporting basis with the aid of United States advisers in 7 years a 14-unit agricultural and earthworking-machinery pool was taken over this year by Peruvians.

Nine of the units in the network are operated commercially on a rental basis. Five are operated on a demonstration basis. In a single month 121 tractors put in 21,221 hours of work.

The Government has also taken over the health program in the Loreto region, one-fourth the national program. It includes extensive leprosy and malaria control work, operation of a large hospital in Iquitos and sanitation systems along the Amazon.

Peru now seeks United States technicians to work with the Mining Bank in devising a practicable system for processing mineral ores for small producers who cannot afford machinery.

To provide a new food source for the Andean area United States specialists are helping to develop two fish hatcheries for stocking mountain streams. United States geologists are also assisting Peruvians to assess the commercial possibilities of Peru's great and varied mineral wealth.

Elementary education is being developed through 19 nuclear schools each with 10 to 19 sectional or satellite schools under its direction.

An example of agricultural progress is castor-bean growing, developed from nothing in 1953 to a profitable industry today.

OTHER COUNTRIES

British Guiana: United States technicians are introducing the self-help housing project that has been successful in Trinidad, Surinam and elsewhere. They will train foremen to supervise local workers who will build their own low-cost homes to replace jerry-built structures. Health and agricultural projects are underway.

Costa Rica: Farm extension agencies established under the United States Technical Cooperation Administration have been operated successfully by Costa Rican personnel exclusively for more than a year. Costa Rica now covers four-fifths of the budget and will take over the whole program in 1956. Under a United Nations program, 24 communities in the El General Valley are building their own schoolhouses, working weekends.

Cuba: In 12 years' work, United States technicians have developed kenaf, a rope fiber, to the point where it is ready for large-scale production by private capital. Cubans have invested considerable sums in its cultivation and processing. Cuba has requested similar help in developing coffee and cacao. Twelve small farmer cooperatives have been organized by United States-trained agronomists.

Dominican Republic: With the aid of a United States specialist, a national school is being organized to train auxiliary and practical nurses. Other American technicians are helping Dominicans prepare a national development program.

Ecuador: Yaws sufferers have been reduced to one-tenth the number of 2 years ago. Malaria has been eliminated in some sections and drastically reduced in the rest. Eight rural normal schools, with United States advisers, have given intensive training to 685 teachers. United Nations experts are working on development of cottage industries, partly to offset declining demand for Panama hats.

El Salvador: The 300th project with United States technical cooperation has been completed and turned over to the Government. It is a national maternity hospital. Coffee fermentation, which formerly took 24 hours, is being carried out by a new method in 2 hours.

Guatemala: Experimentation is going forward on 925 acres with rubber production as a cash crop for small farmers. The Children's Fund feeding demonstration has been expanded.

Haiti: A United Nations expert put the tanning cooperative on its feet by spending 6 months in slaughterhouses, teaching butchers to use rounded knives in skinning instead of pointed ones that damaged the skins.

Honduras: Promotion of the forest products industries is one project in a program of agricultural and industrial development being pushed by the Government. Advice is being received on needed transport and resource development.

Jamaica: A soil-conservation project failed. But a rice-cultivation project has expanded production to the point where imports soon may be eliminated.

Nicaragua: Production of African oil palm on the east coast has proved very successful. A mill for independent growers will soon be completed. Funds budgeted for the agricultural school are being increased from $3,000 to $500,000 to expand enrollment from 30 to 300.

Panama: Sixty self-propelled rice combines are in use. Panama now has a rice surplus, which will be sold to Venezuela and West Germany. A pig farm has been established to reduce danger of epidemics spread through pig smuggling.

Paraguay: After 10 years' effort a variety of wheat has been developed that promises to give good yields from Paraguay's soil. A model dairy farm has failed. A 12-percent cut in tuberculosis sufferers was achieved last year. Five hundred Paraguayans have been trained as skilled workers.

Surinam: An experimental farm is investigating the coastal plain's possibilities. Another project is studying the practicality of 180-acre farms to avoid revival of plantations.

Trinidad: Ten years ago tuberculosis caused 100 deaths in each 100,000 of the population. A 2-year campaign by the World Health Organization and the United Nations Children's Fund has cut the toll to 64. The Food and Agriculture Organization is trying to develop rice growing in the swamplands.

Uruguay: Six public health centers have been established since 1943. Diphtheria and small pox have been wiped out; typhoid fever cut sharply.

Venezuela: Now receiving United Nations help in establishing a steel industry, electricity, and railroad systems, and a housing program; this country is using technical assistance to prepare the way for a long-range development program.

Worldwide Pool of Technical Aid Reducing Misery and Building United States Prestige—Part V

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 25, 1954

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, appended hereto is the last of five parts of a report of the worldwide correspondents of the New York Times showing the extraordinary and widespread progress made by the United States and U. N. technical-assistance programs:

Europe

	United States technical cooperation contributions			U. N. technical assistance grants		
	United States, fiscal 1953-54	Local, fiscal 1953-54	Staff, 1954	U. N., calendar 1953-54	UNICEF, calendar 1952-53	Staff, 1954
	Thousands	*Thousands*		*Thousands*	*Thousands*	
Austria	$1,661.7	(1)	13	$102.6	$59.0	4
Belgium	324.0	(1)	5	0	0	--------
Denmark	743.9	(1)	4	0	0	--------
Finland	0	--------	--------	66.7	0	2
France	2,625.4	(1)	(1)	0	0	--------
Germany	2,326.0	(1)	10	0	.9	--------
Great Britain	799.0	(1)	10	0	0	--------
Greece	2,202.0	(1)	61	270.3	269.0	10
Iceland	144.0	(1)	--------	39.9	0	1
Italy	2,749.3	(1)	28	88.9	290.0	7
Netherlands	837.4	(1)	6	0	0	--------
Norway	812.9	(1)	1	0	0	--------
Portugal	222.7	(1)	0	5.0	50.0	2
Spain	0	--------	--------	30.9	0	1
Trieste	0	--------	--------	7.2	0	0
Turkey	3,543.0	(1)	95	944.1	293.0	55
Yugoslavia	1,330.6	(1)	5	1,563.7	737.0	94
Regional	0	--------	--------	171.5	0	9
Total	20,411.8	--------	238	3,290.7	1,698.9	185

[1] Not available.

GREECE

ATHENS.—With only 25 percent of Greek land arable and that consisting of generally rocky soil, United States technical cooperation experts have introduced new techniques into Greek agricultural practice.

As a result, 850,350 acres will have been rendered suitable for crops by next July 1 through dams, levees, and reforestation projects and 207,722 acres will have been reclaimed through marsh draining and brush clearing. Greece, which has become an exporter of rice and cotton is approaching self-sufficiency in wheat.

ITALY

ROME.—United States technical cooperation has been successful in Italy in widening the economic base, improving industrial efficiency and raising agricultural production.

In agriculture the results are impressive. Last year Italy harvested an all-time record crop of 9 million tons of wheat, which made the country self-sufficient for the first time in years. It topped Mussolini's record crop of 1938 by a million tons.

The potato crop was also a record one and substantial increases were achieved in the corn, sugar beets, fruit and vegetable harvests. Favorable weather, hybrid and improved seeds and new techniques are credited with the showing.

Intensive work in the industrial field is being carried on. Managerial techniques are demonstrated by United States teams, work is done in Italian university institutes, and trade unionists and executives study in the United States.

TURKEY

ANKARA.—The United States has allotted more than $1,250,000,000 to Turkey in economic and military aid in the past 7 years, including $4 million for technical cooperation. Turkey has matched the latter outlays with about 10 million liras ($3,571,000). The United Nations granted $421,590 last year and has budgeted for this year $522,467, or 40 percent of 1954 technical-aid outlays for Europe.

The combined impact has been to make this country the most stable and prosperous in either Southeastern Europe or the Middle East. Production of strategic minerals has increased up to 200 percent. Turkey has become 1 of the first 4 wheat-exporting countries. Cotton output has tripled.

Since United States specialists brought in 6,000 tractors Turkey has imported 30,000 more. The use of $80,000 of smut-control disinfectant increased the yields of the wheat and barley crops by $6,100,000. Seed-saving seed drills are being made here and meat-packing plants erected in four cities.

Now United States technical cooperation specialists are aiding in developing a program of guidance to potential Turkish entrepreneurs. A Turkish staff will give engineering and financial aid to small-business men.

The United Nations program embraces long-term projects in a wide variety of fields. Among them are the development of accurate agricultural and industrial statistics, standardization of industrial products, worker safety, rural electrification, and health and social welfare.

YUGOSLAVIA

BELGRADE.—The United Nations, Britain, France, and the United States collaborated in a closely coordinated program here, on which they, together with Yugoslavia, will spend $4,322,000 this year.

Some results are spectacular. At a Zemun tractor plant a young Yugoslav foreman, trained at the International Harvester Co. plant in Neuss, Germany, reduced by 80 percent waste in the production of swinging wheels. Tibor Seke, trained at the Maag factory in Switzerland, introduced new techniques in assembling, finishing, and maintaining machinery at a Belgrade plant.

Ole Schyberg, of Norway, and Karl Ringdahl, of Sweden, revolutionized the teaching of welding. Societies have been formed to carry on their work.

OTHER COUNTRIES

Austria: One Austrian team that studied logging in the United States has returned more than the cost of sending agricultural and forestry teams abroad last year. It showed how to bring hitherto inaccessible timber over mountain roads built with bulldozers.

Belgium: More efficient methods have been introduced in production of precast concrete. Paint manufactuers have standardized products. The glass industry has partly reorganized; four glass works have introduced human-relations programs.

Denmark: An American team of management engineers convinced the clothing industry that output with existing facilities could be increased 50 percent and prices lowered by concentration on ready-to-wear apparel. A private food chain has reorganized 27 outlets as self-service stores.

Finland: United Nations aid is given in special fields of agriculture, veterinary science, and public health. Not all projects can be carried through because of the shortage of funds. One failure is a badly needed veterinary college, planned for Helsinki. There is keen competition for fellowships, but few places.

France: Thanks to United States technical cooperation, the largest manufacturer of men's clothing was able to increase wages 20 percent and cut prices 10 percent, in spite of an industry decline of 3 percent, by increasing output and sales 43 percent. Twenty-eight industries now have productivity centers.

Germany: Since the return of an industry productivity team from the United States, the papermakers and their engineers meet annually to exchange ideas on their technical experience. United States methods of financing homebuilding, studied by another team, are being urged on the Bundestag.

Britain: In 6 years Britain's productivity program has covered every industry. United States participation is being wound up and $254,000 of unexpended funds turned back. A permanent productivity council financed by the British Treasury is functioning. American materials-handling machinery and American systems of planning factory flow have been introduced widely.

The Netherlands: American management-training consultants have been provided for hundreds of Dutch plants. The Dutch now are prepared to finance on their own the visits of specialist teams to the United States. The first Dutch bilateral technical-assistance program is being planned for a far eastern country yet to be selected.

Norway: American specialists have aided in improving the management of the state railways and the production of ready-to-wear clothing, as well as management training. About 500 workers and foremen have studied in factories in the United States.

Portugal: With United States aid, power generation, mining, and navigation possibilities of the Douro River Basin have been determined. United Nations programs have improved culture of hybrid corn, rice, pasture, and fodder and control of endemic disease.

Spain: World Health Organization programs have cut the incidence of leptospirosis, a parasitic disease of the blood and tissues, 50 percent; and have reduced that of rabies. But owing to Spain's extreme poverty many projects cannot be carried through.

Peace Through Strength: Bernard Baruch and a Blueprint for Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 25, 1954

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the Record reviews of the book entitled "Peace Through Strength: Bernard Baruch and a Blueprint for Security," by Morris V. Rosenbloom.

This book, written on the philosophy and notable achievements of one of America's foremost citizens, deserves the attention of people everywhere who are seeking a truly lasting peace.

There being no objection, the reviews were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From Greater Philadelphia of October 1953]

America's No. 1 Peacemonger

Although Bernard Baruch spends much of time in such public places as on a bench in Central Park, few Philadelphians ever saw him before he came to town this June.

On that visit he was honored with the American Citizen of the Year Award by the Junior Order of the United American Mechanics at its centennial anniversary banquet. Following the presentation, he made a nationwide radio and TV address in which he spoke in his usual direct, forthright manner on the need for completing NATO's rearming, repeated his frequent urging of a standby mobilization law in readiness for any future emergency and spoke out emphatically in reminding the American people that only through the building of our strength can an honorable and lasting peace be established and maintained.

Despite his advanced years—he was 83 on the 19th of August—Mr. Baruch's bearing was as erect, his smile as warm, his speech as incisive and his mind as keen as in past years. And what he had to say to the Nation and the world that evening made as much hard sense as it did when President Woodrow Wilson dubbed him Dr. Facts many years ago.

His remarks pointed up the value of reading a recently published book entitled "Peace Through Strength: Bernard Baruch and a Blueprint for Security" by Morris V. Rosenbloom. It is a fascinating portrait of Bernard Baruch and his tireless advocacy since World War I of national preparedness as America's best peace insurance policy. The book clearly presents the impelling reasons why seven Presidents have leaned heavily upon Mr. Baruch for counsel and direction and it traces his recommendations over the years and—more important—what happened to them. The book reveals that Democrats and Republicans alike have considered him a bellwether of economic and social trends.

There are legions of Americans who admire Mr. Baruch without knowing why.

They have heard that he has given substance and depth to the American pattern but precisely how is beyond them. Peace Through Strength sets them straight. It etches the man against a background of sincere service; it is a key that unlocks a noble heart.

For more than 35 years, Mr. Baruch has stood before the Nation as a prophet and a wise counselor. Sometimes he has had to stand virtually alone, sometimes he has been hailed as a hero by almost everyone. But always he has preached the simple, understandable—if not always popular—doctrine that in a time of peace the Nation must lay careful plans, on behalf of all the people, to protect the economy against violent upheavals that may come in time of crisis.

Baruch's career is a remarkable one by any standards—his place in American life has had no precedent and may never have a parallel. From a start as a $3-a-week office boy, he amassed a considerable fortune as a financer but early in life he became dissatisfied, feeling that he should be doing something more important than just piling up money. The direction in which he turned was toward national politics in the year 1912, which proved to be a turning point in his life—the year he met and began his close friendship with Woodrow Wilson. Four years later, Wilson appointed Baruch to the Advisory Commission of the Council of National Defense, which launched him on the beginnings of a career of distinguished service to his country. Later, with the reorganization of the War Industries Board in March of 1918, Baruch was appointed its Chairman by President Wilson. It was then that Baruch began to establish the international reputation which he has since maintained as an authority on industrial mobilization.

In view of that reputation, it surprises most peopce, as Rosenbloom points out in Peace Through Strength, to learn that Baruch has since held only two other key Government jobs. He was a delegate to the Versailles Peace Conference after World War I, and he served as our country's first representative on the United Nations Atomic Energy Commission after World War II. His other activities on behalf of the Government have been advisory. For more than 30 years Baruch has acted as a special consultant to Presidents and the Congress, rather than as an appointive official. His advice has never been consistently accepted, yet today he remains that paradox, as Rosenbloom describes him—"a beloved but sometimes controversial elder statesman who has made a popular career of an unpopular task, that of goading the conscience of his countrymen."

Author Rosenbloom wrote the Baruch book to focus public attention on the status of our national security. He has written other works on industrial and economic subjects. His present book contains the urgent plea that America will pay heed to the lessons of the past in planning for the future.

Since Korea, Morris V. Rosenbloom has held key positions in the defense program. During World War II he left an executive post in private industry to join the War Production Board. Later, he served as commanding officer of a submarine chaser in the South Pacific. In 1951, he organized and directed the Institute on the Economics of Defense Mobilization, sponsored by American University. From 1947 to 1950, he worked in Philadelphia where he was an official of Publicker Industries, Inc.

In Peace Through Strength Mr. Rosenbloom has sifted Mr. Baruch's utterances and experiences with the care of a chemist and his gleanings have given the author substantiation for predicting the role Mr. Baruch might play during the Eisenhower administration. Rosenbloom summarizes Baruch's philosophy of "peace through strength" in nine points under the heading of "a blueprint for security":

1. Improve the efficiency of the defense mobilization effort.
2. Give the President authority to continue anti-inflation controls during the period of peril.
3. Hold taxes at a level that will eliminate excessive profits, meet defense costs, and absorb excess spending power.
4. Continue United States aid not only to Europe but to countries opposing communism in southeast Asia.
5. Establish a general staff to formulate a global strategy for peace-waging.
6. Maintain pools of trained men and equipment, plus ample reserves.
7. Establish soon a realistic United Nations control plan for atomic weapons.
8. Spell out our peace aims and at the same time be strong enough to support and enforce them. There are certain people who sneer at weakness, no matter how noble the aim of the seeker after peace.
9. Demonstrate, through resolute conviction and whatever sacrifices are necessary, our determination to preserve freedom at any cost.

As he again emphasized in his speech in Philadelphia before the Junior Order of United American Mechanics, Bernard Baruch for years has repeated his demand that the American people be given the facts, otherwise they can have no real comprehension of the threat to our freedom. "Tell the American people what is going on. * * * They have to fight, to die, to suffer, and they have to pay. Tell them all the facts. * * *" In this way, and only in this way, he believes, can we achieve that freedom and security which the whole Nation desires. Only in this way can America build and maintain that all-important condition of readiness: Peace through strength.

[From Foreign Service Journal]

Peace Through Strength: Bernard Baruch and a Blueprint for Security

(By Morris V. Rosenbloom, with foreword by Eleanor Roosevelt; published by American Surveys, in association with Farrar, Straus & Young, New York, 1953; reviewed by William L. Smyser)

This solid volume, rich in quotations from the elder statesman, Bernard Baruch, takes its place among the score of biographies which must be familiar to anyone aspiring to a knowledge of what has gone on behind the scenes in American Government at home and abroad throughout the past generation. It is peculiarly fitting that a book about Bernard Baruch should appear just as the economic situation shifts again to approach that of the day when he is reported to have told friends that the time had come to buy bonds. It is fitting that the policies of this man whose name is associated with the so-called American plan for atomic control should be the subject of this searching review just at the moment when the world is again discussing another American plan for the atom. Thus Mr. Morris V. Rosenbloom's volume is most timely, and in welcoming it the only problem for the reviewer is the evaluation of its effectiveness and accomplishment.

The book hits its bull's-eye. The author is loyal to his hero, after the current mode of favorably presenting recent Cabinet officers and diarists rather than trying to tear them down as in the mode of the twenties. His admiration for Baruch's foresight, however, does not blind him to the fact that although the financier did really advise some of his friends to buy bonds, and although, by 1929, "most of his own wealth was invested," he could still write for the American Magazine of June 19, 1929 that "The economic condition of the world seems on the verge of a great forward movement * * *." Thus the picture which folklore has given us of a 1929 Baruch who was all-prescient is placed in better perspective, more reassuring for the self-esteem of minor prophets unable to see today what is coming before the end of 1954. On the other hand there has been a consistency throughout Bernard Baruch's career in public service in his warning that we are consuming in a flash of geologic time, deposits which it took eons to concentrate. and in his proposal, from the days when he was chairman of the Committee on Raw Materials during the First World War, that we follow principles of conservation, substitution, and the development of new sources. The author devotes some time to illuminating the apparent disagreements between Baruch and President Truman, and concludes that the crux of the matter touched Baruch's concern that more support be given the National Security Resources Board and that more urgency be devoted to the drafting of a full-dress mobilization of all resources. From Mr. Rosenbloom's text it seems clear that Bernard Baruch would support today, as he has in the past, such conclusions as that of the Paley Commission that "We will have to become even more world-minded in the future than we have been in the past. * * *" The picture of a devoted and foresighted individual has value not only in its presentation of a leader in our time, but also in its repetition of facts and policies which we would be wrong to forget.

Stop the Witch-Hunt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 25, 1954

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, many are the sins which are being committed in the name of "security" and "loyalty." Using these scare words to intimidate reason, certain persons—many of them in high places—are seeking partisan and personal advantage by finding security risks under everybody's bed but their own.

In the name of "security" the new superpatriots are making a career out of attacking other people's patriotism. By their standards, whoever disagrees with them must be denounced as disloyal. And a person becomes a security risk not by what he is or does, but on the basis of something about his relatives, his wife's relatives, or his relatives' relatives.

These superpatriots have not hesitated to falsify the record by misrepresenting the facts as to the discharges of Government employees or by making untrue and unproven charges as to the prosecution of the Korean war. They have had no compunction about smearing the innocent. They have not hesitated to pick on the dead. They have become so reckless that they have impugned the loyalty of a former President of the United States, and they attack the loyalty of all members of the Democratic Party. They describe the period of Democratic administration as "20 years of treason."

The President has made certain mild observations which have been interpreted as a disavowal of such tactics. These remonstrances have not been heeded. And they will continue to be disregarded so long as they are so equivocal and so long as some of the worst offenders, who go unscathed, are members of the President's own official family—up to and including the cabinet level. The Attorney General of the United States is himself one of the leading offenders.

It must be clear to all but the willfully blind and the self-deluded that the Government employees security program has become a political tool for the superpatriots. It is one of the big sources of their ammunition.

Much attention has recently been paid to the bases on which employees have been discharged under this program. But there are other aspects to it which have passed virtually unnoticed, but which seem also to be employed for improper political purposes.

Take for example the provisions of the security programs which authorize the Attorney General to set up a list of so-called subversive organizations. Obviously, an attorney general can, if he is willing to abandon scruples, use this blacklisting power to injure or destroy organizations merely because he dislikes them. For this reason, the very existence of this power is, I think, a highly questionable thing. It is, after all, not authorized by statute nor fenced in by legislation which would guarantee procedural due process to all accused groups. There is something frightening in the sight of a political appointee being a judge, jury, prosecutor and executioner for any organization whose purity he decides to question.

Nothing illustrates my point better than recent action which the Attorney General has taken against the National Lawyers Guild.

The Government employees loyalty-security program has been in existence for about 7 years. During all that period no Attorney General saw fit to list the National Lawyers Guild as a subversive organization for the purposes of the program. Three Attorney Generals—Clark, McGrath, and McGranery—were in office during that period and none of them listed the Guild.

Now Attorney General Brownell has demanded that the Guild show cause why it should not be listed as a subversive organization, and he has charged that it has been a Communist-front from at least 1946 on—that is, during all the period of time during which the three preceding Attorney Generals felt that the Guild was not subversive.

Now it is true that the National Lawyers Guild can have a so-called hearing, in which the Attorney General is both prosecutor and judge, and in which he has authorized himself to rely on off-the-record, "confidential" information. But beyond this, the Attorney General has already gone on public record to denounce the Guild as a Communist-front. Before the Guild even received notice that he was moving against it, the Attorney General, in a speech to the Boston convention of the American Bar Association, announced that he had already determined that the Guild is a Communist-front. And though a hearing has still not been held, the Attorney General again publicly announced his verdict against the Guild to a convention of the AMVETS. This is what is known as sentencing first and holding the trial afterwards.

Moreover, the Attorney General's speeches and charges show that he is equating disloyalty with disagreement with his own political views. Thus, the Attorney General has served interrogatories on the Guild in which he more than suggests that he considers that it was subversive for the Guild to oppose universal military training—which the Congress rejected—enactment of the McCarran Act—Internal Security Act of 1950—and legalize wiretapping. Furthermore, in his speech to the AMVETS, Mr. Brownell cited as "proof" that the Guild was subversive the fact that the Guild has deplored attacks on academic freedom.

I am in no position to pass on the National Lawyers Guild. I do know that many fine and upright lawyers belong to it and that Senator LANGER, chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, has highly praised it. I also know that any organization which takes courageous stands on public issues runs a real risk of being unjustly attacked, in certain quarters, as being Communist dominated or tainted.

But I suggest that the circumstances surrounding the Attorney General's attack on the guild indicate more than a little that the Attorney General is using his listing power for political purposes, that he is utilizing improper standards, and that his procedures are anything but fair.

It is high time the President took a good long look at the Government employees security program and, not least of all, at the listing of organizations thereunder.

Merrimack River

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 25, 1954

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein letters I have received from the chairman of the board of selectmen, John J. Willis, of North Andover, Mass., and Mayor Henry Graf, Jr., of Newburyport, Mass., concerning my bill, H. R. 9208, which would appropriate money for the improvement of the Merrimack River from its mouth to Lawrence, Mass. I would also like to include an editorial which appeared in the Newburyport Daily News, Newburyport, Mass., on May 21, 1954:

NORTH ANDOVER, MASS., *May 18, 1954.*

HON. THOMAS J. LANE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN LANE: At a selectmen's meeting held on May 17, 1954, the subject matter of your proposed legislation dealing with the dredging of the Merrimack River was presented by myself and discussed with the board.

It was the unanimous feeling of the board that such a project could result in nothing but a benefit to this general area. In particular, it would result in more adequate flood control and cheaper transportation for the area.

It was, therefore, voted that the board of selectmen of the town of North Andover heartily endorse and go on record as in favor of such a proposed act.

If you are in need of any further assistance in this matter, please do not hesitate to contact our office.

Very truly yours,
BOARD OF SELECTMEN,
JOHN J. WILLIS, *Chairman*.

NEWBURYPORT, MASS.,
May 20, 1954.

Hon. THOMAS LANE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN LANE: I noted in the press that you have filed a bill in Congress for the dredging of the Merrimac River from Lawrence to the sea and may I say that such a project would be of the greatest benefit to the Merrimac Valley and you may rest assured that whatever aid or support that may be necessary from this office, it shall be forthcoming at once.

I am writing other Members of Congress suggesting that they lend all possible support to your bill and I shall do all in my power in this area to generate public opinion in favor of this bill. In my mind, too long has this section of the country been ignored in the matter of public works, especially improvements of this nature which are so vital to New England.

If convenient, I would appreciate a copy of your bill and any suggestions relative to same.

Very truly yours,
HENRY GRAF, Jr.,
Mayor.

[From the Newburyport (Mass.) Daily News of May 21, 1954]

DEEPEN THE MERRIMAC CHANNEL

How about it, Mr. Congressman?

Is New England, and specifically the Merrimac Valley, a forgotten and abandoned area unfit for Federal assistance?

We would like an answer, Mr. Congressman, to the fact that year after year bills calling for dredging the Merrimac River have been sidetracked.

We would like to know why other areas of the Nation get huge projects such as TVA, St. Lawrence seaway, dams in various mid- and far-western sections while we get almost nothing.

If, Mr. Congressman, you agree that cheaper transportation would result from dredging the Merrimac, why don't you get behind the bill now filed in Congress to accomplish that desirable situation?

There seems to be no doubt that dredging as far as Lawrence would stimulate business all along the river. New industries locating in this area would be pleased to find lower transportation costs than can be found in inland communities. Most of the labor surplus would be used, as business prospered, ending as miserable a period of depression as some cities in the area ever saw in the darkest days of the 1930's.

Congressman THOMAS J. LANE, of Lawrence, has filed the bill asking for $7½ million for this work. Compared to other appropriations by Congress, that's absuredly cheap.

It has been estimated that dredging to Manchester would only cost the price of 1 day's foreign aid.

Why, Mr. Congressman, should we be left in a hopeless situation here while Congress continues to spend such vast amounts for a cause that can be no more worthy than our own?

The mouth of the river is difficult to keep open now, even for pleasure craft. Oldtimers say that the location of the jetty, constructed by Army engineers, did something to the currents. These, they report, now carry in so much sand that navigation becomes very difficult.

That problem, too, can be solved if the Government will take enough interest in its citizens here to lend a financial hand.

Mr. Congressman—will you not step up and be counted in favor of this project?

And will you, behind the scenes as well as on the floor, promote passage of this bill with enthusiasm and sincerity?

Industrial Development Act of 1954

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 25, 1954

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein copy of letter that I have addressed to the mayor of every city in the United States, whose area has been classified as labor surplus.

I have requested support of my bill H. R. 9137, which would authorize Federal loans to assist local communities in building modern industrial plants in labor surplus areas. The letter follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., May 25, 1954.

DEAR SIR: I am most anxious to secure your active support of H. R. 9137, the "Industrial Development Act of 1954." This would authorize Federal loans to assist local communities in building modern industrial plants in labor-surplus areas.

You and I have much in common regarding this problem. Too many of our people have been out of work for too long a time, even though the national economy has been booming. Our communities are going through a difficult period of economic transition. In the past, we put "all our eggs in one basket," depending upon one major industry that is now moving away or declining.

We must build new factories to attract new industries—or die. Local industral development committees know what must be done. However, they are unable to obtain financial backing from normal banking facilities to go forward with their programs for industrial redevelopment. It is my belief that the Federal Government must meet this need through loans granted for this purpose—and on a self-liquidating basis—to areas that have had a substantial labor surplus for at least 1 year prior to application for such a loan.

Local initiative must provide the first half of the capital required, and the Federal Government the remainder. Experience has demonstrated that the people of labor-surplus areas can raise some of the capital needed to build medium-sized plants to attract diversified growth industries. But they cannot do the whole job, alone.

I am confident that H. R. 9137 is the missing link needed to round out the circle of cooperation whereby the people of distressed areas can work out their own modernization and industrial recovery programs. Medium-sized plants, tailored to modern needs attract new industries. There is case after case to prove that such plants, built by the initiative of publicly authorized industrial development committees, have been leased or bought outright before construction has been complete.

Industries are drawn toward ready-made facilities. They are also attracted by evidence of public spirit, courage, and a community's confidence in its future. Our first problem is to mobolize support for H. R. 9137, so that it will be enacted into law as soon as possible. To that end, may I depend upon you to secure your community's endorsement and your Congressman's support for this legislation?

Trusting in your cooperation on this vital issue, I remain

Sincerely yours,
THOMAS J. LANE.

Back to God Movement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 28, 1954

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I should like to include a very pertinent and timely editorial entitled "Back to God Movement," which appeared in the February 20, 1954 issue of the weekly magazine, America.

The article follows:

BACK TO GOD MOVEMENT

The American Legion deserves congratulations on the high quality of its third annual Back to God program broadcast nationally, over radio and TV, for 30 minutes on Sunday, February 7.

This annual interdenominational observance originated in a decision of the Legion's 1951 national convention to commemorate every year the heroic deaths of the four American chaplains aboard the transport *Dorchester*. The names of Father John P. Washington, Rabbi Alexander D. Goode and the two Protestants, the Reverend George L. Fox and Charles V. Poling, should be forever honored. Younger readers may not recall how, united in prayer, they gave away their lifebelts as their troopship was sinking on February 3, 1943. Their love of their fellowmen out of love of God, even unto death, has become an American epic.

President Eisenhower's address on this year's program, which reached the entire Nation through CBS-TV and the major radio networks, expressed his delight that "our veterans are sponsoring a movement to increase our awareness of God in our daily lives." "Our faith in God, and through faith in ourselves as His creatures," he solemnly declared, "our forefathers designed and built this Republic."

It was natural for the President to substantiate this proposition by referring to the religious faith, first, of the Pilgrim Fathers and then of General Washington kneeling in prayer at Valley Forge. Throughout the three centuries that separate the Pilgrims from the *Dorchester's* chaplains, he pointed out, "our common faith in God is a common bond among us. In our fundamental faith, we are all one." This faith, he insisted, requires "positive acts" of reaffirmation, of which "this 'back to God' movement is one."

The Legion's program avoids the bane of many civic pleas for more religion, which is their vagueness. The Legionnaires focus on three well-chosen recommendations: Regular public worship, daily family prayer, and the religious instruction of youth. If our people sincerely follow these recommendations religion will become, as Pope Pius XII has repeatedly urged it should, a strong cooperative influence against the social evils of secularism and materialism.

The Legion also circulates posters and postcards. Together with appropriate pictures, they carry such mottoes as: The Family That Prays Together Stays Together; Teach Your Children Religion. Take Them to Church Every Week; No Child Has a Chance Who Hasn't Been Taught To Pray and Love God.

This back to God movement should be of special interest to Catholics. We know from experience how ambiguous many Americans are about the role of religion in American life, and how unsympathetic many of them have been to efforts to spread its influence. The Legion is helping to dispel this ambiguity. It is helping to create a climate of opinion favorable to religious living—a truly godly work.

The Bryson Bill, H. R. 1227

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1954

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the Appendix of the Congressional Record a petition and names of signers favoring the Bryson bill H. R. 1227. These residents of my district have requested that their attitude relative to the Bryson bill be brought to the attention of the Congress.

The petition follows:

To Our Senators and Representatives in Congress:

The American Medical Association having seen for years the sad effects of the use of beer, wine, and distilled beverages have banned all alcoholic beverage advertising from the Journal of the American Medical Association, effective January 1, 1954, in the face of heavy loss in income from such advertising.

We beg our national body of legislators to serve the citizens of our country in like manner and free our homes and our children of the influence of alcoholic beverage advertising. Our television sets are being rendered worse than useless and our children are being led to believe that alcohol is harmless and to glorify crime by such advertising.

In the interest of this we respectfully request you to use your influence to support the Bryson bill (H. R. 1227) and vote for it.

Longmeadow, Mass.: Roger W. Hastings, Mildred B. Hastings, Charles H. E. Smith, George P. Becker.

East Longmeadow, Mass.: Rev. Ralph Crandall, Karl C. Bailey, Ruth F. Clark, Mildred Crandall, George H. Kearns, Nellie J. Kearns, John Hastings, Richard B. Beebe, Mrs. Carl Scott Hawley, Pauline Hanson, Malcolm R. Hanson, Ethel Feld, Marshall S. Hanson, Mrs. W. L. Wilson, Otto Kern, Mrs. Lena Ogden, Walter E. Cheever, Mrs. L. B. Cheever, Mr. and Mrs. O. Wendell Smith, Ebba E. Gustafson, Charlotte L. Fessenden, Mrs. R. J. Weagle, Elizabeth Goodrich, Mrs. William Hendrick, Jr., Mrs. Robert Underhill, Betty Carter, Mrs. Clara E. Green, Mrs. Mark Bourgeoise, Johanna Weidner, Karl H. Gustafson, Leo D. Glynn, Betty Benway, Florence Buffington, Madeleine Bly, Gilbert V. Fenton, Mrs. Eliza Carlson, James A. Frost, Tressa A. Fenton, Donald A. MacIntosh, Mrs. Clyde A. Tice, Mrs. Harriet Knowlton, Frederick H. Enos, Nettie Howard, Dorothy Carter, C. Leslie Carter, Mrs. Mildred Hanson, Mrs. Marjorie Childs, Charles Childs, Evelyn B. Bailey.

Springfield, Mass.: Robert B. Gibson, Leona E. Cosby, Harry B. Kittredge, Edgar H. Elkins, Annie E. Elkins, Mr. and Mrs. J. H. Warner, Harold Burr, Beata S. Peterson, Herbert Pomeroy, Florence Pomeroy, Mrs. Armand Locke.

Hampden, Mass.: Mrs. Faye Barron, Mrs. Barbara Moore, Stanley F. Moore.

Wilbraham, Mass.: Mr. and Mrs. Clyde LeBoeuf.

Supreme Court Decision: Another Victory for Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES R. HOWELL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 25, 1954

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, the United States Supreme Court's historic decision declaring unconstitutional segregation in the public schools was a great victory for democracy.

This decision, which has been compared in importance with the Emancipation Proclamation, will have its effect not only at home but throughout the world. A free nation, with liberties for all of the people, is not built in a day.

There is progress still to be made, and at times it may be made slowly, but there are landmarks of liberty to which we can point with pride and the decision of the Supreme Court is one of them.

The implementation of the Court's decision offers some problems, but in the words of the New Jersey Herald News:

> All we need is faith in America and in God and we will succeed.

I include in the Record the full editorial from the New Jersey Herald News of May 22, 1954:

A Victory for Democracy

The Supreme Court of the United States has given real dignity to our Negro youth by removing the blot of inferiority placed upon them through segregated schools. By a unanimous decision, the Court ruled Monday that segregation in the public schools in the 17 States in which it now exists is unconstitutional.

The Court also gave time for an adjustment period to permit these States to give sober and unemotional consideration to the opinion and prepare to change their school systems to comply with the ruling.

There will be those bigots in the South who will rave and rant over the imposition of social equality upon them, and there will also be people in the North who will be just as insistent upon the immediate integration of the schools. Neither school of thought has any place in this delicate and trying situation.

The elimination of segregation in education is in line with progressive thinking and development. The best brains in the South were expecting and prepared for this decision. They stand willing and eager to make the adjustment. Men like Talmadge and Byrnes do not represent the opinion of the new South but the old ante bellum school of thought that has been repudiated for years.

There is no reason to believe that this decision will cause any turmoil or confusion in these 17 States. The adjustment has been made here in New Jersey without incident. It was made in the Armed Forces in a like manner and it can be made in the South. All we need is faith in America and in God and we will succeed.

Sensible Confidence Versus Senseless Worry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 28, 1954

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I should like to include at this time a very pertinent editorial on the art of worrying, which appeared in the April 13, 1954, issue of the Waltham (Mass.) News-Tribune.

This fine article should be read as a commonsense tonic for all too many of us who are particularly prone these days to "die a thousand deaths" from extravagant and useless worry over things that mostly never happen.

The essay follows:

Matter of Confidence

Worry, worry, and more worry. Everybody's doing it. If the jitters aren't over what the H-bomb will do to civilization, the quaking might have to do with Senator McCarthy's effect upon civil liberties. Then there are the fears of a third world war, or another Korea in Indochina, or a recession, or what have you.

Now a little bit of worrying has merit. The furrowed brow isn't a badge of shame, to be despised, provided it doesn't become permanently etched in your countenance. But the whole secret about successful worrying is not to bite off more than your share of anxiety neurosis.

Be a selective worrier. Let those who are experts in their fields take care of the big things like nuclear fission, McCarthy, war, and economics.

There's no need for jitters if, as the philosophers, say, you take every day in stride and do the best you can. Save your own little bit of worrying for the particular task which is your own responsibility, whether you are a factory worker, office employee, professional man, or housewife.

As for us, our preoccupation with all the everyday problems that come streaming into a newspaper office leaves scarcely a moment to be jittery. When we get to worrying it's usually about something in the distant future.

Just to take your mind off those many perplexities of the present, we've got one worrisome thought that might serve as an escape. It's serious. Our motive in injecting it is neither to amuse nor frighten, but merely to demonstrate that you can extend your worrying to any length.

Our worry topic, a very real one, is linked to the warming cycle affecting all the world's weather. That evident in New England during recent years is symptomatic of a mildness in the Arctic areas to the north in which temperatures have been 11 percent above normal. This, in turn, has resulted in melting of glaciers at an accelerated rate with a consequent rise in the Atlantic Ocean water level.

If you haven't realized it, 71 percent of the whole globe is composed of oceans or frozen areas, we learn. Rising ocean waters are being experienced everywhere, and with the influx has come a series of destructive floods in many points of the world. Holland, the Baltic coast, Denmark, Russia, Italy, and the Asiatic, where typhoons rage, all have felt the lash of tumultuous waters biting into the land mass.

This "revolution of weather," as the article that came across our desk described it, is building up the biggest flood damage of a generation along the Atlantic coast and in the Gulf of Mexico.

The melting glaciers have raised the level of the ocean along the New Jersey coast by approximately 9 inches. Sea water has penetrated under the city of Newark. New York, with 575 miles of waterfront, is vulnerable to storms like that of last November 6 which caused losses of some $19 million.

A question to ask one's self is whether land masses are losing the fight against water, and how near are we to catastrophe? This is genuine, high-voltage, long-term worrying; more terrifying than the H-bomb jitters if you want to let it get you into a mental turmoil.

But the important thing to note is that good minds are working on the problem. We've got enough confidence to believe they will be able to keep pace with nature as its wondrous work unfolds.

You, too, should be confident enough in those who are charged with the bigger problems of foreign policy and domestic issues to feel sure they'll take them one by one, day by day, and handle them in reasonably good fashion.

That's the way it has worked out in the past.

Communist Beachhead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 25, 1954

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Post of Friday, May 21, published an editorial entitled "Communist Beachhead." It carries significant information on the infiltration of communism into the Western Hemisphere through Guatemala.

I request that it be printed in the Congressional Record.

Communist Beachhead

The shipment of arms to Guatemala from the Polish-controlled port of Stettin ought to remove any lingering doubts that Guatemala is the beachhead for active Communist designs in the Western Hemisphere. The 2,000 tons of arms, which arrived in Guatemala last weekend in a Swedish ship chartered by a British firm, are enough to upset the entire balance of power in Central America. The fact that the pier was surrounded by a cordon of soldiers and that the Guatemalan defense minister was on hand to supervise the secret nocturnal unloading makes eyewash of the explanation that the shipment was merely optical equipment. Nor, it may be safely assumed, is this quantity of armaments needed for purposes of keeping internal order.

Additional emphasis [illegible] given to a serious situation by the break in diplomatic relations between Nicaragua and Guatemala. This break had been building up for some time because of the Guatemalan plotting against the Nicaraguan regime. It also is significant that shortly after three Guatemalan consulates were established in neighboring Honduras, a crippling general strike broke out; the consular personnel have been declared personae non gratae but the trouble remains. There are similar reports that Guatemalan agents are now attempting to foment strikes in Panama.

Some Latin Americans have taken the mistaken view that the United States concern in Central America has been merely to protect the interests of the United Fruit Co. The naive explanation that Guatemala has been undergoing a social revolution similar to that experienced by Mexico after 1910 ignores, of course, the fact that there is now an aggressive foreign imperialism anxious to take over. The arms shipment ought to help dispel any such illusions. For the arms are entirely outside the pattern of normal defense, and far in excess of anything the United States has prepared to send under its assistance pact with Nicaragua or the proposed pact with Honduras. The shipment is not to be compared with the activities of the international freebooters who are continually making trouble in the Caribbean area.

No longer is it possible to believe that the Guatemalan Government is merely a dupe. Acceptance of these arms denotes active complicity in a Soviet plot—and in the vicinity of the Panama Canal. What apparently is in the works is a repetition of the excursions of the Caribbean Legion, coupled with the export of subversion to neighboring countries. In the circumstances the Guatemalan action constitutes an unmistakable threat to the peace. It affords full grounds for the United States to bring the situation to the attention of the Organization of American States and to explore the possibilities of collective measures, including those provided under the Caracas resolution and the Rio treaty. The United States further must convince its neighbors that it means business. What is of the utmost importance for the entire hemisphere to understand is that the threat of Communist imperialism is no longer academic; it has arrived.

Crusade Seen Hitting Snag

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 25, 1954

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following article by Thomas L. Stokes from the Washington Evening Star of May 24, 1954:

Crusade Seen Hitting Snag—President's Surrender on Trade Plan Surprises Writer—Thinks High Tariffites Will Aim for Complete Victory

(By Thomas L. Stokes)

Check off another casualty in the dynamic, forward-looking Eisenhower program.

Dead and abandoned is the elaborate, comprehensive foreign trade program recommended so hopefully to Congress several weeks ago by President Eisenhower. Among other features, the most essential is extension for 3 more years of the Reciprocal Tariff Act, and with authority to negotiate for further tariff reductions on a selective basis, and up to 15 percent over the next 3 years.

The President has now announced publicly that he'll settle, instead, for a flat 1-year extension of the act, as was voted by Congress last year, with no additional latitude for tariff cuts. This means another year of marking time, for there is virtually no leeway to negotiate further under the act as it stands.

The fine words of the President in his message to Congress about the need of expanded trade to strengthen our allies so they can help themselves have a hollow ring now. We are treated to the disappointing spectacle of the once dynamic military leader who pushed our armies across Africa and Europe transformed now, in his different role as our national leader in the White House, into one who is willing to "withdraw to previously prepared positions" at the slightest frown or squawk from a noisy high-tariff Congressman or lobbyist.

As a practical matter, because of the bitter opposition within his own party, it was recognized that the flat 1-year extension was about all that could be salvaged for the President out of Congress this session. But it was hardly expected that the President would surrender publicly, in advance. Such appeasement of the new resurgent high-tariff forces only whips them up to push forward to the complete victory.

That—their avowed aim—is destruction of the reciprocal trade program established by Congress 20 years ago—in 1934—under which the State Department was delegated to negotiate with other nations for tariff reductions. Now, as a result of the President's publicly announced retreat to the last line—for that is what the 1-year extension is—the high tariffites are talking hopefully of rolling over that and defeating extension of the law. That would kill it and automatically throw tariff-making back into Congress again.

That is ghastly to contemplate, at least by anyone such as this reporter, who saw samples of such congressional tariff-making, with its log-rolling, dealing, and double-dealing, its unscientific rate-fixing, in the 1922 Fordney-McCumber tariff law and the more notorious Hawley-Smoot Act of 1930. The last, you may recall, provoked other nations to raise their tariff walls against us and paralyzed foreign trade. That contributed, in turn, to the world-wide depression and even, or so some claim, to World War II.

These are gloomy thoughts, perhaps too gloomy. For the President has commitments from his leaders to give him the flat 1-year extension of the law, enough to save the skeleton, to retain the principle, that is, by the help of Democratic votes. He will get more of the latter, incidentally, than Republican votes.

If 1-year extension is achieved, then what? Well, what we have become so accustomed to—more study or at least talk. At the beginning of the next Congress, according to the plan, the House Ways and Means Committee would open public hearings on the basis of the report by the special commission headed by Clarence Randall, the steel man. That report was the basis of the President's original program that now is being ditched.

The administration's aim is to get in the next Congress what it failed so notably to get in this.

The prospects? They might be fair if there is a Democratic Congress with a workable margin. It is difficult to see, however, how the President could do any better with another Republican Congress than he has with the present one. That is, unless he should do what he heretofore has not done which is, first, to go before the people with his program and as if he meant it and, second, to give encouragement to the minority in his party in Congress which shares his views on foreign trade.

It is Mr. Randall's calculation that high-tariff advocates in industry are really much in the minority, though noisier and better organized than those who are for liberalizing our trade policy. But the latter lack leadership, and only the President can supply that.

Words of Wisdom and Praise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES R. HOWELL

OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 25, 1954

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, two editorials have appeared recently in the newspaper, Paterson News, Paterson, N. J., which I believe are worthy of wide circulation.

One editorial deals with some words of wisdom spoken by president William J. Jameson, of the American Bar Association, urging that the Nation be equally zealous in guarding civil rights and the national security. This was entitled "Political Adrenalin," and appeared on April 26, 1954.

The other dealt with the fine work of the Comptroller General of the United States, Mr. Lindsay Warren, recently retired after 13½ years of distinguished service to the Congress and to the Nation. This editorial, entitled "Important Job Well Done," appeared in the Paterson News of May 4, 1954.

I include both editorials in the Record:

[From the Paterson News of April 26, 1954]

POLITICAL ADRENALIN

If more Congressmen, and more citizens, could achieve the same balanced judgment exhibited by President William J. Jameson of the American Bar Association, there would be a great deal less smear forays in Washington, less fear over security, less hysteria and tension generally.

In a talk before the St. Louis Bar Association, Mr. Jameson urged that the Nation be equally zealous in guarding civil rights and the national security. He called for clear recognition of the right of the accused, no matter how unpopular, to benefit of counsel, fair trial, and other constitutional guarantees. But he warned against condemning as witchhunts all efforts to purge the Government and our institutions of Communists.

It is folly, he considered, to ignore the fact that, were communism to prevail, the Bill of Rights would be forever lost. It would be corresponding folly to scrap the very fundamentals we seek to preserve in our drives to rout subversives.

Here was a contribution of sane thinking and calm outlook. Extremists have their place in a democracy. They serve to prod the body politic. Their function should be recognized, however, for what it is—a sort of stimulation, perhaps a political adrenalin. The pervading sentiment and decision of a people should be dictated by a balanced perspective, to which Mr. Jameson gave articulate guidance.

[From the Paterson News of May 4, 1954]

IMPORTANT JOB WELL DONE

Lindsay Warren, Comptroller General of the United States, has voluntarily relinquished his office after serving 13½ years of the 15-year term to which he was appointed by President Roosevelt. Although chosen by the Chief Executive, the Comptroller General is an agent of Congress. It is his duty to pass on the legality of all financial transactions of the executive branch; also to report to Congress all cases of mismanagement or inefficiency, and to recommend changes that will promote economy.

Warren estimates that during his service, the General Accounting Office which he heads has forced return to the Government of almost a billion dollars, most of which had been illegally or otherwise improperly paid out. He played an important part in obtaining enactment by Congress of the Government Corporations Control Act of 1945, the Budget and Accounting Procedures Act of 1950, and the Post Office Department Financial Control Act of the same year.

Warren recalls that when he took office relations between the GAO and the Government departments were far from friendly; in fact both President Hoover and President Roosevelt had tried to destroy that agency. The law provides that the Comptroller General can be removed (except on impeachment) only by joint resolution of the Senate and House. For this reason, the Comptroller General and the office he heads are not amenable to executive pressure.

President Wilson vetoed a budget bill sent to him by Congress in 1920 because it placed the Comptroller General beyond his power of removal. This he believed to be unconstitutional. Congress waited until President Harding had taken office then reenacted the bill with the same provision. Harding's signature of the legislation on June 10, 1921, gave the country a budget system for the first time in its history.

Resolution Urging the Union of Cyprus With the Kingdom of Greece

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 14, 1954

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I should like to include at this time a resolution urging the union of Cyprus with the Kingdom of Greece, which was adopted on March 25, 1954, at a meeting in Chicago under the auspices of the Federation of Hellenic Organizations of Illinois.

The resolution follows:

"Whereas the right of self-determination by ethnic groups has always been the avowed policy of the United States of America, and more particularly so since World War I; and

"Whereas even now in the yehr 1954, there are peoples in various parts of the world struggling for independence and for their right to determine their form of government without coercion or interference from outside influences; and

"Whereas the population of the Island of Cyprus consists of 82 percent of people of Hellenic language and the Greek Orthodox faith; and whereas, by an overwhelming majority the people of Cyprus Greeks and Moslems alike, have publicly and solemnly announced by plebiscite held in 1950, their desire for union with the Kingdom of Greece; and

"Whereas justice, freedom and independence are the inalienable rights of all mankind and recognized by civilized nations of the world; and whereas Greek concepts of government guided our forefathers in declaring the independence of the Colonies and forming the Government of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That, on this, the 133d anniversary of Independence Day of Greece, celebrated under the auspices of the Federation of Hellenic Organizations of Illinois in the Civic Opera located at Wacker Drive and Madison Street, Chicago, Ill., this 25th day of March, A. D. 1954, we go on record approving the result of the plebiscite held on the island of Cyprus in 1950, and give encouragement to the descendants of the founders of democracy in Greece, which is similar to the form of government we have in our United States; be it further

"*Resolved*, That the aspirations of the people of Cyprus asking for union with the kingdom of Greece be strongly endorsed; be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be filed with the executive branch of the Government of the United States, and particularly the Secretary of State of the United States, to the end that our Government may assist the people of Cyprus in their struggle for their God-given right of self-determination, and copies of this resolution to be forwarded to the Members of the Congress of the United States; be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the United Nations and to the press throughout the United States and the free nations of the world."

Upon motion for the adoption of this resolution, the same was unanimously adopted this 25th day of March, A. D. 1954, at Chicago.

A. A. PANTELIS,
Chairman.

True and correct copy.

JOHN L. MANTA,
President.

Attest:

NICHOLAS P. GEANNOPOULOS,
Secretary,

Federal Deposit Insurance Proposed for Federal Credit Unions Not Necessary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 25, 1954

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, there is a strong effort being made to place credit unions under a Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. If I thought this was necessary at all, in order to protect the members of the credit unions or the public, I would certainly favor it. It is my belief that practically all the possibility of losses in credit unions can be provided against through proper insurance of employees and officials of credit unions.

If credit unions are to be placed under a Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, there is no reason why their powers should not be extended so as to allow them to receive deposits and, being permitted to receive deposits, demand and time, they should—to a limited extent—be allowed to expand these deposits through the issuance of credit.

The credit union movement is taking the country like wildfire and it should, as it is one of the most progressive and worthwhile proposals that is in existence. The more people know about credit unions the more they favor them and the more good they realize that they do for the entire country. Every local businessman should be a strong supporter of credit unions. A member of the credit union who is compelled to go into debt and borrow, can borrow from his credit union at a reasonable rate of interest. If such member did not belong to a credit union and was forced to obtain credit from a high-interest loan company, he would have less money to spend with the local businessman.

I am inserting, herewith, an article by G. V. Markey that appeared in the April 1954 official publication of the Credit Union National Association. It is as follows:

THE WAY I SEE IT

(By G. V. Markey)

DEPOSIT INSURANCE OR INTEGRITY?

The February issue of Credit Union Bridge came to my desk as I was leaving on a trip, so I slipped it in my briefcase to read while traveling. One of the first articles to attract my attention was the one entitled "Federal Deposit Insurance Supported," by James J. Girvan, of Philadelphia. I read it through not once but several times.

I congratulate the editor of the Credit Union Bridge for printing the article and Mr. Girvan for having written it. This is an important subject, and not only should both sides be heard but a thorough study made of it. Intelligent discussion can bring out the advantages as well as the defects, and broaden the point of view for those who have not gone too deeply into the matter. There is a surprising lack of understanding on the part of the public generally about FDIC and the FSLIC insurance, and how these Corporations function.

Mr. Girvan poses some important questions that should, and I believe can, be answered with at least some degree of satisfaction. As a consequence, perhaps he will pardon me for taking exception to some of his statements.

In commenting on losses, he says: "One must remember that to date there are no figures available regarding losses in State-chartered credit unions. In fact, the only figures published so far are those concerning the losses in liquidated Federal credit unions. The States, generally speaking, are not interested in credit unions."

As of December 31, 1952, the latest figures available at this time, there were in the United States and its possessions 6,362 State-chartered credit unions with $711,574,199 in share capital and 3,035,046 members, and 5,925 Federal credit unions with $597,374,117 in shares and 2,853,241 members. I wonder how Mr. Girvan arrives at the idea that States are not interested in credit unions? From the reports of other States that come to my desk it seems to me States are, and always have been, very much in the credit-union picture, and much information can be obtained from State supervisory authorities.

Now without engaging in a debate in favor of share insurance or opposing share insurance for credit unions, let's take a look at a few of the facts that are available.

I wrote an article which appeared in the October 1951 issue of the Credit Union Bridge under the title "The Problem of Liquidations." In that article I pointed out that here in Minnesota we had chartered 500 credit unions and that 198 of these had been liquidated. All of the completed liquidations had paid their members 100 percent or more on the dollar except 9, and the total dollar loss in the 9 was only $1,850.40. That bit of statistical information covered a period of 26 years of operations. Since that time 49 more charters have been granted, and 17 more credit unions have been liquidated. One of these failed to pay out, and members took a loss of $160.47; so the record now stands at 216 liquidations out of 549 charters granted during a 28-year period, and the total loss to members in liquidation is $2,010.87. We have had our share of defalcations, too, both large and small.

If an insurance program such as Mr. Girvan proposes had been in effect and participated in by all State chartered credit unions in Minnesota during those same 28 years, (1953 is not included—figures are not yet available), the premium for insurance at 10 cents per hundred, would have been $202,241.69. This amount is just a little more than 100 times the actual total loss to members during that same period of time. Another way of explaining the cost is that with total shares of $29,904,039 as of December 31, 1952, the premium for the year 1952 alone would have been $29,904 or almost 15 times the total losses incurred over the entire 28-year period of operations. If we apply this premium rate to the shares in all credit unions in the United States on December 31, 1952, the premium would be $1,308,948.30. Just how expensive ought insurance to be? I have used 10 cents per hundred, not the 15 cents proposed. Likewise, I used total-share capital, not total assets, because it is the liabilities that are to be insured, not the assets. However, accounts payable, bills payable, and other demandable liabilities ought to be included, which would increase the premium by $17,800. If one applies the 15-cents-per-hundred rate to these totals the premium cost would be increased by one-half, or a total premium of $1,990,122.15.

It is most unfortunate that any member of a credit union should suffer losses in the proportions mentioned by Mr. Girvan and something ought to be done about it. But, is the correction to be found in an insurance program, or are there other less costly and more effective remedies that should be applied? The cases mentioned are certainly isolated, very exceptional and unusual situations. Here in Minnesota credit unions are required to transfer 10 percent of gross earnings to a reserve for losses until the reserve fund is equal to 15 percent of total assets. Under normal operating conditions this reserve together with such precautions as adequate bond coverage, examinations, audits, and the tracing of accounts by the supervisory committee would provide adequate protection. We may assume, I am sure, that all of these precautions would also be necessary or required under any share insurance program.

There are, of course, other factors to be considered and reckoned with. Scaledowns, for instance, are not covered by any existing insurance program. Deposit insurance or share insurance does not cover operating losses, or losses from bad investments, defalcations etc., unless the institution is liquidated. Any share insurance program for credit unions would require that the credit union carry adequate fidelity bond coverage on all employees handling cash or having possession of credit union assets. Make no mistake about that—no saving can be counted on from that source. Insurance becomes effective when the institution goes into receivership, is liquidated and fails to pay its obligations. Credit union share insurance, if it had been in existence at the time, apparently would not have reimbursed those members who voluntarily or involuntarily took a scaledown in the cases cited.

I, personally, do not favor scaledowns. In my opinion their legality can be questioned and they are justifiable only under very rare and unusual circumstances. We do not go for that sort of thing here in Minnesota.

The Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation steps in or takes over a bank and pays off the depositors only after the bank is closed and in receivership. The Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, which insures the shares of savings and loan associations, pays off only after an association has been declared insolvent or unsound and is placed in receivership. Neither of these Corporations would cover a scaledown or prorate in shares or deposits. In other words these insurance corporations take over when the institution is all through. They pay the liabilities and take their loss in liquidating the assets. Recently, in Pittsburgh, I served on a panel of savings and loan supervisors when this question of when the insurance becomes effective was discussed. Sitting beside me on the panel was the General Manager of the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation.

Other important questions evolve around how such an insurance program is to be set up and operated. Mr. Girvan has succeeded in giving the impression that organizing and operating a share insurance corporation for credit unions is a simple matter. I wish it were so, but it just isn't that easy. There are any number of complex problems and situations that must be overcome and worked out. There are so many, in fact, I shall not attempt to enumerate them here.

The Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation operates independently of other agencies. It is not subservient to the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System or other Federal agencies, although the Comptroller of the Currency is a director of the Corporation. It operates on the fees it collects for insurance. It accepts examination reports of insured banks made by national bank examiners, and Federal Reserve bank examiners, but has a crew of examiners of its own who examine insured State banks and may examine any insured bank at its choosing. The FDIC does not charge a fee for its examinations. The insurance premium of one-twelfth of 1 percent covers the entire cost, and they are making money.

The Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation is under the Home Loan Bank Board along with the Federal Home Loan Bank System. The Board exercises supervision over Federal savings and loan associations, which by the way, are required to belong to the Federal Home Loan Bank of the district, and to the insurance corporation. The Board's examiners examine and audit all the Federal associations and State-chartered insured associations. They charge a fee for these examinations and audits, on a per diem basis, and this is plenty expensive.

It has been my privilege to know personally many of the men who have been connected with, or who carry the responsibility of guiding the destiny of these institutions, including Federal credit union supervision. They are all very capable men who are trying to do a difficult job well. They are swell fellows, and anything I have said or may say about the insurance program is not a reflection on any of these sincere gentlemen. It is, therefore, with some reluctance I make some observations that ought to be made by way of caution when considering an insurance program for credit unions, to avoid the difficulties that have resulted from these other insurance operations.

If a share insurance corporation is to be set up to insure share accounts of credit unions, it would be a mistake to overlook the fact that those responsible for its operations are going to hedge against losses, and they are going to insist on having something to say about the operations of the credit unions belonging to the insurance fund. A thorough study of the operations of the FDIC and the FSLIC ought to be made, their success should not be taken for granted in adopting a similar program for credit unions.

Such a corporation, in my opinion, if created ought to be entirely independent of supervisory authority either Federal or State. It must not be subservient to either. Credit unions operating under State charter or Federal charter should be permitted to join the corporation on an equal basis without regard to the source of their charter. The corporation should be required to accept the examination reports of insured credit unions made by either Federal or State supervisory authorities. If the corporation desires to examine any credit union the expense of such examination should be borne by the corporation.

It is practically impossible to tie the functions of one corporation in with another, without one or both being influenced by the other, and discrimination can easily creep in, regardless of how well intentions are focused.

One of the main sources of contention and dissatisfaction with the Home Loan Bank Board, Federal Home Loan Bank System, and the FSLIC is that State chartered associations have at times been discriminated against. The Board in a number of instances has disregarded State law and practice in a number of States and given Federal associations advantages over State chartered associations in situations where the State pattern ought to have prevailed. There is a bill now before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee which, if enacted, would bring about some needed corrections. Much more could be said, but this discussion must stop somewhere. The grass on the other side of the fence sometimes looks greener than it is.

Finally the credit-union movement has been built on faith in the individual, faith that man will live honestly, labor honestly, and treat his fellow man honestly. The idea of an insurance program, or the necessity for it is repugnant to this idealism, for when that faith is transferred from the credit union and the individual members of credit unions to an insurance corporation and share insurance is substituted for moral integrity, the credit-union movement will have lost one of its fundamental sources of strength. From my long experience with credit unions and other institutions, I am not convinced the time is right for share insurance.

(G. V. Markey, building and loan and credit union supervisor for the State of Minnesota, was engaged in banking business from 1909 to 1922. He joined the Minnesota State Banking Department as an examiner in 1922. Shortly thereafter he became interested in mutual corporations and was frequently called upon to examine buildings and loan associations and later credit unions. From 1935 to 1945 he devoted full time to examining these institutions and since 1945 he has served in the capacity of supervisor. In 1939 he helped to write the Savings, Buildings and Loan Code and has given much thought and study to improving accounting methods and to legislation. He wrote the present provisions of Monnesota statutes authorizing credit unions to insure the lives of members to the extent of their share accounts and worked for its enactment into law. Mr. Markey is also first vice president of the National Association of State Savings and Loan Supervisors and chairman of its legislation committee.)

Look Who's Talking

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRIS ELLSWORTH

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 19, 1954

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an editorial written by Mr. Frank Streeter and published in the May 12 edition of the Grants Pass Daily Courier, at Grants Pass, Oreg.:

LOOK WHO'S TALKING

Listen to who's talking.

Ex-President Truman demands that President Eisenhower put a checkrein on the political assassins in his own party.

Imagine such a demand coming from "Give-'em-hell Harry" who won the Presidency in 1948 by a nationwide campaign of political assassination.

Truman wants Eisenhower to restore bipartisan foreign policy.

How restore what never existed?

Certainly, it wasn't a bipartisan foreign policy which caused the United States to hamstring the efforts of the Nationalist government of China to put down its Communist revolution.

It was not even a partisan foreign policy which hurled our troops into war in Korea. The decision was by impulse of the then President, and required some rapid footwork to make it a United Nations decision, which it should have been in the first place.

It certainly wasn't a bipartisan foreign policy to prevent General MacArthur and his successors from rooting out the bases of supply of the Red hordes and their MIG's which could stage their daily raids and then wing back a few miles to sanctuary permitted them by Truman fiat.

The Truman bipartisan foreign policy was limited to just about one major step, the Marshall plan, and couldn't have been implemented without Republican support.

We never did have any illusions about the probable nature of the Eisenhower foreign policy. The Republicans determined that issue at the Chicago National Convention.

When Eisenhower was nominated, we wrote that we believed there would be little change in foreign policy if the Republicans won, that the major change would be in domestic matters.

At that, we believe the election of Eisenhower caused the Reds to be a little less precipitate in their campaign for world conquest. We grant Russia's aims to remain the same, her bump of caution being just a little more developed.

Great Britain remains our greatest problem, just as it was in the days of Mr. Truman.

While our present foreign policy isn't any great improvement over that of Mr. Truman, it certainly isn't any worse.

Greatest improvement from the change in administration has been in domestic matters, despite some rattle-brained procedures which have befuddled an anxious public.

The headlong march to socialism has been halted.

Wholesale corruption in top echelons of Government has been stamped out. Public officials being mere human beings, there always will be corruption and inefficiency to a degree. We believe the American people are convinced that Eisenhower will hit both hard when they come to his attention, however.

That constitutes a major improvement in our Government.

The Eisenhower administration has made a major effort to cut down needless spending of the taxpayers' money.

The Eisenhower administration has moved to make the Government the actual umpire in disputes between labor and management; not umpire and coach of one of the teams at the same time.

The Eisenhower administration has made a sincere effort to cope with the many powerful pork-barrel brigades which always will be struggling to get their hands on Government funds.

In connection with this bipartisan foreign policy discussion, we might mention another political subject heretofore made much of by the leaders of the minority.

We refer to the repeated claims that Eisenhower needs progressive Democrats in Congress to support his program against the onslaughts of Republican reactionaries.

The minority party is beginning to make its record in that respect.

The vote on amendments to the Taft-Hartley law is spectacularly illuminating. Every last Democrat in the Senate voted to bottle up the proposed amendments.

How's that for saving the Eisenhower policy?

We believe the greatest blotch on the administration record to date is the McCarthy-Army fiasco. The American people are rightly disgusted about it.

This stupendous television spectacle should not cause the people to lose sight of the many other more important matters which affect their welfare much more seriously, even though it is the greatest dust storm ever to becloud the national horizon.

How Many Are Unemployed?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 25, 1954

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein an article entitled "How Many Are Unemployed?" which was written by Boris Shishkin, director of research, American Federation of Labor. The article appeared in the Federationist, which is the official monthly magazine of the American Federation of Labor.

The eyes of the world are watching intently every indication of employment and unemployment in the United States. For America's ability to maintain a high level of employment and to keep unemployment to the minimum is the master gage of her economic strength.

Yet the reports supplied by Government sources to provide a factual basis for the appraisal of these vital employment changes are by no means clearcut. The gages used to measure the trends were themselves retooled and adjusted just at the time when a continuous count was most needed.

Three things have happened on the employment front in the last 7 months. First, between October and February unemployment registered the sharpest rise since the great depression, increasing by some 2,500,000 in 4 months. Second, the seasonal increase in employment and a corresponding drop in the number of unemployed failed to materialize in March. Third, the revisions in the sample surveys measuring employment and unemployment underwent an overhaul, producing a wide difference in figures yielded by the old and new samples, published since January. This has blurred the picture of the real sequence of events. It also has given rise to much free-wheeling, in and out of government, in the discussions and interpretations of the employment situation.

At this writing, official April figures have not yet been released. We have enough evidence, however, to know that, despite the belated seasonal pickup in employment, joblessness continues to be heavy.

When the April figures are made public, the several statistical series compiled by the

Department of Labor and the Department of Commerce will, for the first time, be incorporated in a combined report published jointly by the two Government departments. Putting these reports under one cover will not, of course, clear up the real problems, involved in the failure of the Government abetted by a penny-pinching Congress, to provide the country with a comprehensive, clear, and reliable count of employment and unemployment.

To understand these reports and the facts behind them, let us first take a brief look at the recent changes in employment and figure out what they mean.

With population increasing at a rate close to 3 million a year and employment at full or near-full levels, growth has been reflected in all these indicators until about a year ago.

LABOR FORCE SHRINKS

Between July 1953 and January 1954, the civilian labor force declined by some 2 million—a drop twice as great as a normal seasonal change could explain. By March 1954 the civilian labor force was still nearly a million smaller than the June-July level of 1953. There was no doubt that many workers, though not counted as unemployed, were without jobs. If they were not looking for work, it was only because there were no jobs to be had in their communities, as would be the case in one-industry towns.

It was also evident that overtime work was being curtailed, beginning over a year ago. Weekly hours in manufacturing, which averaged 41.1 in March 1953, were down to 39.4 in March 1954.

DECLINE IN EMPLOYMENT

In the meantime, employment, as reported by the census, reached a peak of 63.4 million in August 1953. A sharp drop followed, bringing the total down to 59.8 million or 3.6 million lower in January 1954. By March 1954, employment was still at 60.1 million, or 3.3 million below the August 1953 level.

With farm employment showing a fairly normal decline from last September to March, nonagricultural employment, as counted by the census, dropped by nearly 2 million.

The census includes, in its count of nonagricultural workers, proprietors, self-employed and domestic servants. The Bureau of Labor Statistics also estimates nonagricultural employment, but its estimate extends over smaller coverage, excluding these three groups. Yet the Bureau of Labor Statistics figures show a substantially greater decline in nonfarm jobs during the same period. Its count shows a drop from 49.7 million employed in September 1953 to 47.3 million in March 1954, or a loss of 2.4 million. Manufacturing, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, accounted for nearly 1.4 million of this drop.

HOW MUCH UNEMPLOYMENT?

In this age of world-shaking scientific discoveries made possible by the most complex computations, this age of the Univac and other forms of electronic brain, this age of statistics with their widespread and ingenious use ranging from market analysis to sex behavior, it is distressing to have to admit that our unemployment statistics are still developed with horse-and-buggy methods.

Until this year the Bureau of the Census estimated monthly changes in unemployment for the country as a whole from interviews conducted in only 68 areas covering 123 counties. These sample surveys not only provided inadequate coverage but also suffered from the faulty makeup of the questionnaires used in the door-to-door interviews, inadequate instructions given to interviewers as well as from poor supervision given these interviewers.

While the Census Bureau or the Commerce Department in which it nests has lacked either the inclination or the gumption to insist on a comprehensive periodic enumeration of unemployment and on the funds needed for the purpose, it did undertake last August a modest revision of its sample surveys of unemployment. The sample was enlarged to 230 areas covering 450 counties. Some improvements were made in the enumeration methods, although these can by no means be called adequate. Just how far the census was straying in its old estimates is seen from its official guess that the estimates based on the old sample understated unemployment by 6 percent last September, 19 percent in November, and 31 percent in January.

Working back from its January 1954 survey, the census has now made public these revised figures of how unemployment has stacked up since last August:

1953:	
August	1, 240, 000
September	1, 321, 000
October	1, 301, 000
November	1, 699, 000
December	2, 313, 000
1954:	
January	3, 087, 000
February	3, 671, 000
March	3, 725, 000

These census figures show that between October 1953 and March 1954 unemployment nearly trebled. They also show that in March 5.8 percent of the civilian labor force, or nearly 6 out of every 100 workers in the labor force, were unemployed.

How accurate is the picture of unemployment provided by these census figures? We have already seen the census figures are not the result of enumeration. They are an estimate. They are subject to serious limitations of a sample survey based on personal interviews. They are also affected by considerable faults present in the conduct of these surveys.

Despite all these shortcomings, the census estimates are the best figures we have that can provide us with at least a rough approximation of changes in unemployment. The good faith in the preparation of the census surveys or estimates has not been questioned.

We do question, however, and quite properly, whether the definition of who is unemployed and who is employed, on the basis of which the census reports are made, is either realistic or proper.

The purpose of the unemployment estimate is to determine the extent of economic unemployment. What such an estimate should show at any given time is how many workers who are available for employment and want jobs cannot find employment and are without work or wage income.

Yet, under the census definition, many workers who are without actual employment or income through no fault of their own at a given time are counted as employed. In March 1954, for example, the census estimated 3,725,000 as unemployed. The census, following its definition, left out of this unemployment figure a substantial number of workers without work and wage income.

In March 1954, according to the census' own figures, there were 236,000 workers who had been laid off but had a definite promise that they would be called back to work within 30 days. These people were not working. They were not drawing pay. Yet, instead of being classed as unemployed, they were counted as employed.

The same was true of people who were not actually at work but had a promise of being put on a new job within 30 days. The census put their number at 92,000 in March. They, too, were neither working nor drawing pay. Yet they were classed as employed and excluded from the unemployment count.

Workers in such employment as building construction or other outdoor work, who are generally paid by the hour, are often not at work and earning no pay because of bad weather. The census counted 46,000 such workers in its March report (an underestimate in this case). These workers as well were excluded from the unemployment figure and counted as employed.

Persons in these three categories, who at the time of reporting were out of work and out of pay, should be counted as unemployed. In March 1954 there were 374,000 in these 3 categories. If we add them to the official estimate of 3,725,000 unemployed, the March unemployment figure would increase to 4,099,000.

In addition, there is a large number of workers who are at any given time moving from one place to another, one job to another, and even from one occupation to another. They, likewise, are not at work and are not earning a living. Most workers in this group escape the census count altogether. Some are incorrectly counted as employed.

While we have no precise figures on the number of workers in this "float" of unemployed, it would be a conservative estimate to put this additional class of unemployed, with other miscellaneous categories not counted by the census, at not less than 500,000 for March 1954. The best approximation of economic unemployment in March 1954, therefore, would be represented by the following figures:

Unemployment as defined by census	3, 725, 000
Laid off, and not on job	236, 000
Expecting employment, but not working	92, 000
Unemployment because of bad weather	46, 000
Floating and miscellaneous unemployment	500, 000
Total economic unemployment	4, 599, 000

It is this total of almost 4,600,000 unemployed in March that must be relied upon in evaluating the economic significance of unemployment at that time. Revealing as it does that at that time 7.2 percent of the civilian labor force was unemployed, this figure indicates the magnitude of the economic problem raised by this level of unemployment. And in further evaluation of economic trends the categories included in the breakdown we have used should be included in the count of the unemployed.

PARTIAL UNEMPLOYMENT

Apart from the categories omitted from the census estimate of those completely unemployed, it is important to consider the number of workers who, although employed part of the time, were reduced to partial idleness because of lack of full-time employment.

The census estimates that last March, in addition to those totally unemployed, about 2,500,000 nonfarm workers were on parttime schedules due to slack work, job turnover, and a number of other economic factors.

Taking only those nonfarm workers who usually work 35 hours a week or more on their jobs, in the 2d week of March 1,700,000 were working only part time involuntarily—400,000 more than in December. According to the census, in addition to these workers with full-time or nearly full-time jobs who were on short time because of economic factors, 800,000 others on part-time work "wanted and could have accepted" full-time employment.

This involuntary short-time employment represented a heavy loss of time and a corresponding loss of earnings for the workers affected. This involuntary partial unemployment represented an equivalent of close to 1 million full-time jobs.

DURATION OF UNEMPLOYMENT

The length of time the worker remains without a job provides an important bearing on policies needed to deal with unemployment and to relieve the distress of workers subjected to enforced idleness. The Census Bureau's figures, defining unemployment as narrowly as they do, show that the duration of joblessness has been increasing.

In February 1954, according to the census, the average unemployed person had been without work for 9½ weeks, while in March the unemployed had on the average 12 weeks of joblessness behind him.

Of the 3,725,000 reported by the census as unemployed last March, 1,008,000, or 27.1 percent, had been jobless for 15 or more weeks. This was an increase of 400,000 over the preceding month. It should also be noted that 267,000 of the March unemployed had been without jobs more than 26 weeks. For workers in this group the going was the toughest, as the duration of their unemployment made them no longer eligible for unemployment benefits.

Unemployment compensation, inadequate as it is in enabling workers to make ends meet, is the last economic cushion for the worker forced into joblessness. When unemployment compensation runs out, only such relief as the local community can provide is available to keep such a worker and his family going.

Even the workers with maximum eligibility for unemployment insurance benefits cannot draw compensation beyond 26 weeks under even the most liberal State unemployment compensation laws. There is, therefore, a growing number of workers who are being thrown on relief because the duration of their unemployment has outrun the maximum eligibility for compensation.

That is why we find that in Kentucky, for example, according to a recent report, 1 out of every 20 Kentuckians was getting food from relief offices.

INSURED UNEMPLOYMENT

Significant light on the extent and geographical distribution of unemployment is thrown by the figures provided by the Bureau of Employment Security, showing the number of workers receiving unemployment insurance benefits. Insured unemployment began to move upward last September. It went into a steep climb between October and January, more than doubling during the 3-month period. The climb nearly leveled off between February and April. In the week ended April 17, however, insured unemployment, which then stood at 2,206,209, showed another rise of 2.5 percent.

Although initial claims reported for the week of April 17 showed a drop of 5.5 percent below the preceding week, the very fact that 304,987 first claims for unemployment compensation were reported in that week made it clear that unemployment still persisted. Normally, a seasonal rise in employment at this time would have drastically cut down the number of new claims.

It should be noted also that the Bureau of Employment Security reports fail to show the number of workers who have exhausted their unemployment compensation rights and are no longer drawing benefits although they are still unemployed.

LABOR SURPLUS AREAS

The Bureau of Employment Security makes available monthly surveys of labor supply in 149 of the country's major industrial areas and in a number of smaller areas. In March of last year 17 areas reported a substantial labor surplus. In March 1954 there were 34 areas reporting a substantial surplus and by the end of April there were 35. In March 1953 there were 18 smaller areas reporting a substantial surplus of workers. In March 1954 there were 46 such areas and in April there were 58.

TURNOVER RATES

Figures on hiring and layoff rates in manufacturing, supplied by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, also help in understanding the changes in the employment picture.

In March 1954 manufacturing industries added 28 new workers for every 1,000 on their payroll. This compared with the rate of 25 new hires per 1,000 in February, or a 12 percent increase in the hiring rate.

Although March hires showed some improvement over the preceding month, this March hiring rate was, nevertheless, the lowest for this month since the end of World War II. It was 36.5 percent below the rate for March 1953.

At the same time the March 1954 layoffs rose to 23 per 1,000, as compared with 22 percent in February—an increase of about 4.5 percent. Although the March factory hires increased more than the layoffs over the preceding month, almost three times as many workers were laid off in March 1954 as in the same month of the preceding year.

June 1953 was the last month in which factory hires ran ahead of all separations. All separations in factories—separations include layoffs, discharges and quits—exceeded hires 2 to 1 in December 1953. In March 1954 the rate for all separations was still far ahead of the hiring rate, with 38 separations per 1,000 against 28 hires per 1,000.

MAN-HOURS

Another check on intensity of productive employment is provided by the Bureau of Labor Statistics in the form of an index of weekly man-hours. This simply shows the percentage change in man-hours (number of men working times number of hours worked per week) worked per week as compared with the average for 1947–49.

In March 1953 weekly man-hours in manufacturing were 15.2 percent above the 1947–49 average. By March 1954 the number of man-hours worked in manufacturing dropped back to the 1947–49 level. This reflected an even bigger drop in hours worked in durable goods production. This latter included a sharp cutback in the number of man-hours employed in the production of ordnance and accessories: In July 1953 man-hours worked on this production were 7 times greater than in 1947–49, but by March 1954 they had dropped to only 5 times the 1947–49 average.

TIME TO CALL THE TURN

We have seen that, in addition to the unemployment officially estimated by the Census, there is considerable joblessness, both visible and concealed.

Last March the total number of workers subjected to economic unemployment approximated 4,600,000. In addition, there was a large number of workers partially unemployed. Their aggregate loss of employed time was roughly equivalent to 1 million workers fully unemployed.

These are the conclusions derived from a close analysis of piecemeal bits and pieces of data provided by the limited surveys and reports of the Government agencies concerned. It is time for Congress to decide that America must have and can afford a more complete and more direct periodic enumeration of unemployment. But there is more than ample evidence at hand showing that unemployment has already reached major proportions. The facts we now have show that it is high time for Congress and the administration to take courageous action to help reverse the unemployment tide.

Population and employment in the United States, 1947–53, and in specified months of 1953–54

	1947	1952	1953	March 1953	July 1953	October 1953	January 1954 [1]	January 1954 [2]	March 1954 [2]
Total population	144.0	157.0	159.6	158.8	159.6	160.4	161.1	161.1	161.5
14 years old and over [3]	107.5	113.1	115.0	114.8	115.1	115.4	115.7	115.7	115.9
Not in labor force	45.9	46.7	48.1	48.1	46.9	48.5	50.1	49.4	48.7
Total labor force	61.6	66.4	67.0	66.7	68.3	67.0	65.6	66.3	67.2
Armed Forces	1.4	3.4	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.5	3.5	3.4
Civilian labor force	60.2	63.0	63.4	63.1	64.7	63.4	62.1	62.8	63.8
Total employment	58.0	61.3	61.9	61.5	63.1	62.2	59.8	59.8	60.1
Nonagricultural	49.8	54.5	55.4	55.5	55.5	55.1	54.4	54.5	54.2
Agricultural	8.3	6.8	6.5	5.9	7.6	7.2	5.3	5.3	5.9
Unemployment	2.1	1.7	1.5	1.7	1.5	1.2	2.4	2.1	3.7

[1] Series based on old sample: 68 areas covering 123 counties.
[2] Series based on new sample: 230 areas covering 450 counties.
[3] Noninstitutional.

The World Needs Credit Unions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 25, 1954

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting herewith an article by Roy F. Bergengren, which appeared in the April 1954 issue of the credit-union publication, the Credit Union Bridge. It is as follows:

THE WORLD NEEDS CREDIT UNIONS

(By Roy F. Bergengren)

If we understand what further Communist penetration means to the world, to our country, to the credit union, and to you and me as individuals, then we may the better take steps to stop Communist progress.

Much has been written about communism. The word has innumerable definitions. Innumerable writers will write the word innumerable times in innumerable articles today, and the morning paper tomorrow will probably contain more references to communism than it will to anything else. It is a word which makes people afraid. Sometimes it is simply an epithet, which one applies to someone else, merely to show how much he dislikes the individual whom he calls a Communist, because he can't think of a worse word.

Before we get too jittery about communism we should occasionally define it, just to keep the record clear. Then we should note the purpose of the Communist government and the progress which it is making to establish that purpose in fact. This should lead logically to some consideration of what we can do to prevent the fulfillment of that purpose and any further progress toward it.

The difference between commmunism and democracy is, it seems to me, relatively simple. It has been repeatedly stated but will bear restatement if we are to understand the job we have to do.

Communism is based on the theory that the state is the master and that the individual, meaning you and me, is the servant of the state. The right to own property is eliminated. Individual initiative is destroyed. In practice, communism differs but little from the fascism of Hitler. There are no free elections. Power is concentrated in a topman, sustained by a few associates, all of whom have assumed authority without choice by the people. They are sustained in their control by absolute sway over the army and all the machinery for making war. This, incidentally, is probably one of the greatest weaknesses of communism because, with the military control gone, the Communist rulers are without power.

Early in the Soviet revolution, every attempt was made—not with complete success—to abolish the right to worship.

It is obvious that there can be no credit unions within a Communist-controlled state. The credit union is economic democracy in action. Each credit union is self-governed and each member has 1 vote—and only 1 vote—and the right to cast it. It is logical, therefore, that credit unions are reviving rapidly in democratically controlled West Germany.

At the opposite extreme of human association in government from communism is democracy. The democratic state is the servant of the people who compose it. The people elect their governors in free elections. They criticize their governors when they see fit. The people change their governors when they are dissatisfied. Any form of dictatorship is abhorrent to a democracy. "Of, by, and for the people" is an understandable code. Within the atmosphere of democracy the credit union readily takes root and flourishes. We must, in the credit unions, keep vividly in mind that we can operate only within the framework of democracy. Our stake, therefore, in the prevention of the further extension of communism is prodigious.

We should also remember that communism long since declared war on democracy, openly, without equivocation or qualification. Communist leaders, from the very beginning, have made it clear that they are committed to a plan of world dominion, of dominion over you and over me, whether we like it or not.

Communist leaders have made no secret of this conviction. Marx, Lenin, Stalin, repeatedly gave utterance to it.

Lenin expressed it this way: "The existence of the Soviet Republic side by side with imperialist states for a long time is unthinkable. One or the other must triumph in the end. And before that * * * a series of frightful clashes between the Soviet Republic and the bourgeois states is inevitable."

We must ever have it in mind that, in Soviet thinking, the one imperialistic and bourgeois state, which stands in the path of Communist control of the world, is the United States.

It is this avowed policy of Communist world dominion which accounts for the futility of diplomatic conferences with Russia. Communism does not recognize the validity of agreements. We deceive ourselves when we fail to understand that we are faced with an adversary which does not fight according to the rules of the Marquis of Queensberry—or any other rules.

How far, then, has Russia traveled, in a relatively few years, in their program of world dominion?

Take a look at the map of the world. In Europe, Russia is by far the largest national unit. Within Russian influence and present control are the Communist countries of Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, and Bulgaria. Russia controls the eastern sector of Germany and has a strong toehold in Austria. When the avowed purpose of communism is understood, there is nothing mysterious about Russian refusal to give up any territory which they control. As this is being written, the threat of Communist control of Italy grows hourly greater. All over the world there is a network of Communist intrigue, designed to capitalize any local weakness in favor of a switch to communism.

Turning to Asia, we find that the continent is composed primarily of Communist Russia and Communist China, with Communist agitation in all the smaller surrounding countries.

Bishop Fulton J. Sheen, in a recent article in Collier's, points out that 37 out of every 100 people in the world are now under Communist influence.

That gives us the dimensions of the job.

We have two alternatives. We can build a wall around North America, withdraw within it, arm to the teeth and give the rest of the world to communism while we wait for the final struggle. That might be the right solution were it possible to build a wall which could not be scaled by atomic weapons. The other alternative is to accept leadership in a free world and to do whatever may be necessary to bring freedom to all parts of it.

It seems obvious to me that we have no choice.

Our first job then is to contain communism within its present boundaries.

As we face up to this problem we must appreciate again that communism is smart. It capitalizes want, destitution, and economic despair. It finds in the world ample areas where people, without hope for a better tomorrow for themselves and their children, will listen to promises, not knowing anything about Communist performance.

In many books by well-qualified observers on the spot in countries, particularly in the Middle and Far East, we learn of these conditions which fertilize the soil for communism. We come face to face with landless, tenant farmers and city workers, crowded into slums, living in poverty, and always hungry.

When the Communist says to the man who has nothing, "Follow me and you will have everything," is it any wonder that such a man should listen?

Time and time again, in these books, we meet the high-rate moneylender, with a stranglehold on the people and on their economy.

Usury is something which we, in the credit unions, understand. The elimination of loan sharks has been our objective from the beginning. The credit union is the most effective device as yet to come from the mind of man, capable of destroying usurious moneylending.

Usury in the underprivileged countries, where democracy now struggles with communism, is our part of the overall problem of preventing the further extension of communism, by destroying the most flagrant abuse which makes people listen to Communist promises.

The business of containing communism within its present boundaries is a prodigious job. It calls for the combined operations of many democratic forces. Our part is within the field of small, personal credits. This is one of the most important segments of the entire problem.

If we can help to bring that measure of economic opportunity to submerged peoples which will prove to them the superiority of democratic action over Communist promises, we will do our bit for these people, for our country, and for the world.

Are we geared to do this? Will the credit union work in submerged countries?

We know what the credit union is doing in the United States and in Canada. Will it work as well in those parts of the world where the people lack every facility which has made North America so much a land of limitless opportunity?

Let us take another look at the map of the world.

Prior to the Second World War, Rev. Allen Huber organized the first credit unions in the Philippines. They now have a good credit union law and need promotional cooperation. With the enactment of the Federal credit union law in 1934, Lance Barden organized credit unions of Orientals in Hawaii. Father Peter Sullivan, a Jesuit missionary, is developing a splendid credit union movement in Jamaica and the Jamaica Credit Union League is a proud member of the Credit Union National Association. Another Jesuit, Father M. M. Ganey, took the credit union to the Caribs in British Honduras. Because of his success he was transferred to Fiji where he is already reporting credit unions. He writes of the "credit union hungry people of Fiji." Father Steele has a substantial credit union movement started in the Dominican Republic. A former league managing director writes me that her child's seventh grade textbook contains reference to the work of another priest who is organizing credit unions in Natal West Africa. Every news release from Madison tells of increasing contacts and of new interest in the credit union program in many parts of the world.

We have the samples. We have the technique. We have the know-how. We have $2 billion of assets in 18,000 credit unions and own the most rapidly developing life insurance company in North America.

We have the money. We have the opportunity. We have the responsibility.

We received the credit union as a gift. Now it is our high privilege to give it to people who need it in those parts of the world where democracy is at grips with communism and where the credit union may become a powerful ally on the side of democracy.

I have suggested the following general plan of action to as many credit union people as I could reach. Every reaction to the plan—and they have been many—has been enthusiastically favorable to it.

The outline is, of course, very tentative. The plan must be worked out carefully. If, however, we are to carry the credit union to submerged people, we must do it now. The problem of containing communism is a present problem. It is the greatest problem confronting the free world and its solution cannot wait on too many tomorrows.

The suggestions subdivide as follows:

1. That we create the overseas department of CUNA and that we assign to its direction a full-time, well-qualified man, to work under the direction of the national managing director.

2. That we invite, in the beginning, four countries, carefully selected on the basis of need and local cooperation (India, Pakistan, Malaya, and the Philippines for example) to each send one qualified man to Madison for training.

3. That the men so chosen, plus those added from time to time, be constituted as the

CUNA overseas field force and that they be trained to carry on credit union development.

4. That, in cooperation with them, we cause to be prepared adequate publicity materials, accounting forms, etc., in the language of the countries in which work is to be done, and that we supply them without charge.

5. That these men, when trained, return to their respective countries and go to work, developing a credit union movement in each country.

6. That the plan be extended after the technique has been adequately established.

7. That the CUNA overseas department cooperate in every possible way with such outstanding agencices at work in this field as World Neighbors, Inc., CARE, Inc., the point 4 program, with the local governments and with any and all agencies working to improve the economic lot of the people.

8. That the organized credit union movement finance the whole program, including salaries and travel of fieldmen, etc., and that an adequate plan of financing be worked out.

It is a most happy circumstance that the planning committee of the executive committee had this general subject under careful consideration. Such a plan could be worked out for consideration by the May meeting of the Credit Union National Association.

The whole foundation of the program is to be found in the acute economic needs of people. If we can bring the credit union to them, lifting from their backs the curse of usury, they, in their new found freedom, will be increasingly receptive to everything the free world has to offer.

We in the credit union movement, have long been committed to one basic objective, to prove that the principle of the brotherhood of man is a practical principle, to be taken literally. We believe we can make it work.

In Mark it is related how the risen Christ appeared to His disciples and "He said Unto them, Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to the whole creation."

Believing the credit union to be consistent with His principles, I offer the thought that that would be His instructions to us.

(Editor's Note.—During recent months CUNA has rapidly increased its worldwide encouragement of credit unions as a means of economic democracy and well-being of all peoples through membership in CARE, through contacts with officials of the point 4 program, the United Nations, and the Pan American Union, through development of CUNA-CARE self-help centers in the Philippines, and through an increasing volume of correspondence with peoples of the world, mostly as a result of CUNA's public-relations program and advertising in national magazines. Visitors, encouraged by Federal and United Nations officials, come to Filene House to learn about credit unions, and to bring the idea back to their homelands. During the past week, for instance, visitors have come from Germany, Mexico, and Chili. Finally, CUNA Planning Committee, appointed by President Yates, has made overseas development a major objective for the future. Mr. Bergengren's article is a notable expression of the urgency of this worldwide vision and thinking that is being felt increasingly by the whole credit-union movement.)

"And how do you fight communism in the underprivileged countries? Do you fight it by telling your people about your television, your automobiles? Is that the way to fight it? No. You send doctors, scientists, technical experts to the underprivileged countries. You fight it with unselfish aid * * * from individuals and groups as well as from their nation." (Trygve Lie, former Secretary General of the United Nations.)

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, by Oveta Culp Hobby, Secretary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1954

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, May 19, 1954, Oveta Culp Hobby, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare was guest speaker at the National Press Club. On that occasion she delivered an address that explained in detail activities within the Department. It is a comprehensive résumé of the duties involved, achievements attained, and the objectives of present and future activities. The importance and worthwhile character of the address is such that I include it as part of my remarks that it may have the general publicity an address of that character should have. It is as follows:

Mr. Vaccaro, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, today I am going to talk about four major and main subdivisions of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. I have chosen them because legislative proposals affecting the work of these four subdivisions of the Department are now before this session of Congress.

First, however, let me give you a word or two of background.

When the Federal Security Agency became a department last spring those of us who were charged with its administration were faced with two important immediate tasks.

One was to seek, as rapidly as possible, to integrate the work of the Department's principal subdivisions into a more unified pattern.

The second was to undertake a two-fold review: to determine whether the Department's operations were being conducted with the utmost regard for efficiency, economy, and effectiveness, and to review the basic legislation we were called upon to administer in an effort to determine whether this legislation was sufficient to meet the needs of this Nation in terms of today's world.

To conduct this review, task forces were appointed—one for each of the Department's major subdivisions—the Public Health Service, the Socal Security Administration, the Office of Education, and the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation.

These task forces were made up of the Under Secretary—Mr. Rockefeller, Mr. Larmon, Assistant Secretary, and Mr. Perkins, who later became an Assistant Secretary—the heads of the subdivisions, and a staff of technicians—that is, people with expert, technical knowledge of the programs under study. For most of these we called not only on people within the Government but also on persons outside the Government who could bring to the studies both experience and objectivity.

As this work progressed throughout the early months of this past year it became crystal clear that, in some instances, the original objectives of the Congress were not being met. Neither the mechanical operations of the Department nor the substance of our programs were as responsive to the needs of the people as they should—or could—be.

The reports of these task groups, then, concerned themselves with two principal matters: How to redesign our conduct of the presently authorized programs and how existing laws and regulations might best be amended to enable the States and the local communities to provide for the most pressing of their problems in health, in education, and in welfare.

A number of changes in the internal administration of the Department came as an early result of the task force review—one being the establishment of a departmental council. This is made up of the heads of the constituent units of the Department and members of the Secretary's immediate staff. It now meets weekly to consider questions of importance, not only regarding policy but the machinery of our operations, as well.

Another result of the task force studies was a series of legislative proposals drawn up for the Public Health Service, the Office of Education, the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation, and the Social Security Administration.

These are the proposals I should like to discuss. Let me begin with education.

When we analyzed the laws under which the Office of Education is operating and considered the purposes for which this office was established, we found that it was spending some $221 million annually. The increases in the expenditures over the past 30 years or so, however, were not all being devoted to carrying out the historic functions of the Office of Education.

These extra millions were going, for example, into the construction and maintenance of schools in federally affected areas, that is, into communities in which Federal installations, largely of a defense nature, had been built. These new Federal facilities had placed unbearable strains on the local communities' ability to provide satisfactory education.

Office of Education funds were going also for grants for vocational education, for land-grant colleges, and into other channels.

These programs were, and are, necessary. And they represent, certainly, areas in which Federal responsibility and, therefore, Federal effort, is clearly indicated.

Because of this fact and because of the steady growth in annual appropriations for education, it is easy to be deceived on what was being accomplished in aiding the States to meet the very real—and very pressing—educational problems that they confront.

What are some of these problems?

We found, for instance, that out of every 1,000 youngsters who entered the fifth grade, only 505 remained to graduate from high school.

We found a shortage of 340,000 public, elementary, and secondary classrooms—a shortage that has brought about double and even triple shifts for youngsters in far too many schools.

We found a shortage, in the elementary schools alone, of 72,000 teachers.

We found—and this fact is tremendously encouraging—that a vastly larger number of American parents during the past few years have become increasingly interested in improving their school systems. The membership in parent-teacher associations since the end of World War II, for example, has doubled to a total of 8 million.

In terms of legislative history, we found that dozens of bills for Federal aid to education had been introduced in Congress in the past 5 years. Indeed, Federal aid bills have twice been passed by the Senate, although not the House.

Despite these efforts—and they are efforts founded in good intentions and out of good will—educational needs are not only not being met, but the situation is worsening each year. It is imperative that we devise proposals that will meet with acceptance in the Congress, in the States, and in the local communities.

Much improvement has taken place, of course, in education during these postwar years. Many communities have moved ahead in building new schools and recruiting teachers.

But that progress has not been enough. Indeed, we are currently failing to meet the present and future nationwide shortage of classrooms by 67,000 annually.

Traditionally, the direction and control of our schools is a local and State responsibility. We believe in that principle.

There are certain aspects of American education that are of very great national significance, however.

Certainly, it is of national concern that as of today the Soviet Union has nearly as many scientifically trained graduates of higher educational institutions as does the United States. It is of great national concern that the U. S. S. R. is graduating more scientists annually than we are in this country.

Certainly it is of national concern when we study the armed services qualification tests and reflect upon the fact that from one State, of those called to duty during World War II, 58 percent were rejected for deficient education. Even the fact that the national rate was 19 percent, I think you will agree, should give us all pause.

We discovered, as a result of our studies, additional facts about the situation of many American school districts which are not as widely known as they should be.

Many districts, for example, cannot meet their educational obligations because they have reached the limit of their bonded indebtedness, or because of other limitations on the taxing power. In some States, no State aid is being provided. In other areas, for one reason or another, consolidations of school districts have not taken place, even though such consolidations would provide better education in terms of dollars expended and make for wiser use of teachers.

Despite the growing public interest in education which I have mentioned the significance of these facts has not been brought to the attention of the Nation.

If these facts are understood, we are sure that Americans will take timely action against them.

To aid the States and local communities, the President has recommended to the Congress three bills.

One is for a national Advisory Committee on Education to identify and study problems of national significance and recommend action to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. Among these problems, in addition to those I have mentioned, might be such matters as teacher certification, the education of children of migrant workers, and other matters of national concern.

The second bill calls for a series of conferences in the 48 States culminating in a White House Conference on Education. Attending these conferences will be educators and nonprofessional men and women who are concerned with the problems. Out of these conferences should come plans for attacking many of our education shortages.

The third legislative proposal dealing with the Office of Education is for an appropriation—and a very modest one, amounting to only $100,000—through which the Office of Education proposes to engage in cooperative research with colleges and universities. Such research is needed. Through this means, it can be carried out without what might be called an overweening interest in education by the Federal Government.

1. These bills, if passed, would permit us to do much needed research on a variety of problems.

2. Set up an advisory committee whose duty it would be to identify and study situations and trends in order to recommend preventive action.

3. Devise a formula which would have local, State, and Federal acceptance to the end that we build enough schools and train enough teachers, and properly educate our children.

Again let me stress the important point that the people of the United States themselves—and only the people of the United States—can cope with the problems of American education. The extent of these problems can be measured by a single statistic: the fact that the estimated cost of school construction currently needed amounts to between $10 and $12 billions.

And you ladies and gentlemen, who live and work here, know that, even in Washington, that is a sum not easy to come by.

Let us turn now to social security.

Chairman DANIEL REED, of the Ways and Means Committee, has sponsored a bill, as you know, to expand and improve old-age and survivors insurance—the program most people have in mind when they speak of social security.

This bill, which incorporates the President's proposals, would extend this social insurance system to some 10½ million more people—or, in other words, to virtually all civilian jobs. The opportunity to participate—and it is, indeed, a significant opportunity—is now denied this large group of our fellow Americans.

The proposal would raise by 10 to 15 percent the benefits paid to all present and future beneficiaries. It would increase the amount which retired persons could earn and still receive their social security payments.

It would remove the present discrimination against retired wage earners as compared with the self-employed. At present, a retired beneficiary cannot earn in wages more than $75 per month without losing all or part of his retirement benefit. His income from real estate, let us say, or from self-employment, does not affect his social security retirement benefit.

Under the current proposal, a retired beneficiary would be permitted to earn in wages as much as $1,000 per year without limiting the amount of his monthly benefit. This would enable many retired workers to take seasonal employment, to take one example, and earn a sizable sum during a short period of time.

Another provision of the bill would raise the wage base on which contributions are calculated. This increase from $3,600 to $4,200 would permit 18 million beneficiaries to earn high benefit payments.

Let me turn now to public assistance—the other major social security program.

As many of you know, the Department's public assistance program is one of grants-in-aid to the States. Federal money is added to State money, and direct cash payments are made by the States to the needy aged, the needy blind, dependent children, and to persons who are permanently and totally disabled.

For the most part, these recipients of public assistance are people who are not eligible for benefits under old-age and survivors insurance.

As the social-insurance system comes to cover more and more of our people, there will be a lesser need for direct cash payments for old-age assistance.

Old-age assistance is the largest of the four public-assistance programs. A bill now before the Congress would make the Federal payment to each State for old-age assistance depend, in part, upon the proportion of the State's population receiving benefits under old-age and survivors insurance.

The proposed new formula for the four public-assistance programs also takes into account the capacity of the States to meet the costs of public assistance. That capacity, as you know, varies widely.

Let me turn now to health.

For 8 years, as you know, the Federal Government has been administering the Hospital Survey and Construction Act, which provides aid to the States and local communities for building badly needed hospitals. Since 1947, the States and local communities have contributed a billion and a quarter dollars as against a Federal contribution of $600 million.

The formula used in this program has been widely accepted by the States and by local communities as one which produces real results with a minimum of friction.

Our survey of the progress that has been made and of the basic legislation yielded the immediate judgment that it has been a highly effective instrument in obtaining hospital beds and in building more public-health centers.

Again, however, it was apparent that the original legislation was not altogether meeting one of the largest of our national health needs, the growing problem of chronic illness.

With the drop in the toll of infectious disease and the lengthening life span, the chronic illnesses are assuming greater importance.

An analysis of the total need for hospital beds indicated that 88 percent was needed for patients with chronic illnesses.

We found, too, that building beds for the chronically ill patients costs substantially less than building beds for short-term patients.

We found also that to operate a hospital for the chronically ill requires only about one-third of the amount needed for a general hospital.

These are important facts.

There were additional important points of information that grew out of the task force studies.

We found that, particularly in rural areas, there exists a great need for diagnostic and treatment centers for ambulatory patients.

We found that there exists a backlog of 2 million disabled Americans who could be rehabilitated if comprehensive vocational rehabilitation facilities were available. Moreover, each year 250,000 people became disabled.

Through the current Federal-State vocational rehabilitation program we were able to rehabilitate into useful employment only 60,000 during 1952. Year by year we are thus adding to our backlog.

What do these facts indicate? They indicate, in our view, that the approach being followed under the Hospital Survey and Construction Act is meeting more of yesterday's crisis than tomorrow's.

A bill now before the Congress takes these facts into account and calls for greater emphasis to be given building chronic-disease hospitals, nursing homes, outpatient diagnostic and treatment centers, and special facilities for vocational rehabilitation.

The present effort in vocational rehabilitation—which I mentioned a moment ago—has also failed to look to the future. Like the hospital-construction program, it has been more palliative than remedial.

The problem here is to move forward—particularly against the backlog of 2 million disabled persons. This, of course, takes time. There is a need for more trained personnel as well as for specialized facilities.

The administration's proposal takes both of these considerations into account, and at the same time calls for stepping up the number of disabled civilians to 200,000 rehabilitated annually by 1959.

Let me cite, if I may, the dollars-and-cents side of vocational rehabilitation.

About one-fifth of the persons rehabilitated last year were receiving public assistance, directly or indirectly. To maintain them on the public assistance rolls for 1 year only would have cost about $8.5 million. Their average period of time on the public assistance rolls is 9 years. Their return to useful and productive living costs about $6 million—expended for only 1 year.

If the 360,000 disabled persons which we hope to aid are not rehabilitated, it is estimated that 107,000 of them (and their dependents) will become eligible for public assistance at some time. The average: 9 years. The cost: $722.3 million.

It seems to me that the question might well be asked:

How can we afford not to expand this program?

The second administration bill in the health field deals with grants-in-aid to the States. In the field of public health there are presently six such grants.

These six are exclusive of the grants for scientific research and training administered by the National Institutes of Health. Instead, they represent funds for the control of venereal disease, tuberculosis, mental health, cancer, heart disease, and the improvement of general health services.

Many of the States have felt that the funds they received under these separate categorical grants were too small to be used most effectively.

We have proposed a three-part revision of the grant structure.

The first new type of grants would be support grants to be computed under a new formula based on the one which has proved so highly successful in the hospital construction program. It is based on factors which include population and per-capita income within the States.

Under the new formula, the States will be able more readily, not only to maintain their basic public-health programs but also to determine how they themselves will spend the money which they receive from the Federal Government. It will permit them to make a direct attack on the public-health problems that are of particular concern within the individual State.

The second new type of grant represents what may be termed extension and improvement grants. These would be to assist the States in meeting the costs of improving their public-health services. Let me give you just one example of how these grants would work.

Approximately one-fourth of the United States population lives in communities which have no full-time local-health department. Extension and improvement grants could be used to assist in developing such health departments, as well as to incorporate new techniques or procedures in already existing programs.

The third new type of grant represents special project grants, which would be used, among other things, to carry out special projects which hold unique promise for solving problems that might be common to a number of States and to combat unusually severe public health problems in specific geographical areas.

Let me point out that this proposal has nothing to do with the amount of money which the Congress makes available for the use of the States.

The revision of the grant structure, we believe, provides for a more equitable distribution of these funds and represents the kind of progressive approach, based on thorough study, which I have already mentioned as part of our effort of this past year.

The third bill in the field of health is a bill calling for the establishment of a system of Federal reinsurance. It is a complicated bill. But it has a simple purpose, and it would operate very simply.

In essence, it represents the extension of the practice of reinsurance from fields such as fire and casualty insurance to the field of health insurance.

As great as have been the strides that have been made in the field of voluntary health insurance, there are less than 100 million of our population of roughly 162 million who have this protection.

Let me point out that the reinsurance fund will permit a carrier—either profit or nonprofit—to offer to those who already have policies the opportunity to obtain better protection both in extent of coverage and in the amounts they are actually reimbursed for their medical care expenses.

Pertinent to this fact, may I point out that out of total private hospital bills in the United States of $2.7 billions in 1952 only 38 percent—or $1.1 billions—were covered by insurance.

Out of a total amount of private expenditures for medical care in the same year of $9.4 billions only 17 percent, or $1.6 billions, were paid for by some form of insurance.

It can be readily seen, to put it mildly, that there is room for improvement in voluntary health insurance.

Now let me talk for a moment about the more than 60 million Americans who do not yet have the protection of voluntary insurance.

They can be broken down, very broadly, into three principal groups:

One quarter are persons who are chronically ill, are living in institutions, or are on public assistance.

One quarter are persons who have not bought health insurance for one reason or another—a major one being that they feel that they can afford to pay their own health and medical bills.

Fifty percent of those without insurance consist of the self-employed, students, farmers and farm laborers, and persons who work for small firms where group-health insurance is not available.

It is clearly possible, in short, that voluntary health insurance could be extended to include many, many more people, particularly within the third group that I have mentioned.

What is the present proposal?

Under its terms, the Congress would set up a fund of $25 million and would authorize the Secretary to employ this as working capital to reinsure plans submitted by any insurance carrier—commercial as well as such nonprofit organizations as Blue Cross and Blue Shield—who would wish to do.

This fund, let me emphasize, is not a subsidy. Its purpose is to encourage insurance carriers to extend coverage to greater numbers of people and to broaden the benefits that exist under present policies. To put it another way: It is designed to get more hospital bills and more medical bills paid for through prepaid voluntary health insurance.

Again, may I point out, that for some considerable time now there has been a great deal of talk about health insurance. Much testimony has been presented to the Congress in favor of schemes for compulsory national health insurance.

With due credit to the authors for sincerity of purpose in wishing to improve the health of the American people through this means, may I pont out that there has, so far, been no action.

We believe that the American people do not want compulsory-health insurance. The very wide acceptance of prepaid voluntary health insurance indicates, we believe, that the American people prefer this as a means toward health improvement in the Nation.

Our proposal is, in a sense, pioneering legislation which seeks to stimulate wide extension of the principle of voluntary health insurance to meet a pressing national need.

The insurance companies have been frank to admit that they have had insufficient actuarial experience in this field. We firmly believe that the reinsurance fund will encourage broader coverage and increased benefits.

With respect to this proposal there are four things which I should like to make abundantly clear. If the Congress adopts this proposal:

The insurance carrier's participation would be voluntary.

The policyholder's participation would be voluntary.

It would not affect in any way the doctor-patient relationship.

Federal activity would be specifically limited and confined to the plans insured by the reinsurance fund.

I have tried to review briefly the legislative proposals by the President in the important fields of health, education, and welfare.

They represent, in my opinion, an essential part of the administration's program for a better and a stronger America.

Thank you.

Starting the Atomic Machine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. STERLING COLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 25, 1954

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me before the Atomic Industrial Forum, at the Sheraton Park Hotel, Washington, D. C., 7 p. m., Monday, May 24, 1954:

I confess I would prefer to be here this evening in the role of an observer, rather than a participant in this conference. I am always somewhat hesitant to accept speaking engagements during the busy days toward the end of each session of the Congress, and these days have been unusually busy for those of us on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

As you know, the joint committee has been called upon to undertake the first major revision of the Atomic Energy Act of 1946. For the past 2 months the lights in our committee offices have been burning late every night.

Let me interrupt myself at this point to pay a brief but highly deserved word of tribute to the members of the staff of the joint committee composed as it is of men and women whose passion for anonymity is exceeded only by their zeal for constructive progress in the field of atomic energy primarily from the standpoint of our national security, but also from the standpoint of our national welfare. They are a sincere, loyal, selfless, nameless, hardworking, competent group, and I welcome this opportunity to make public recognition of the contribution they have made to the successful work of the committee.

No member of the committee expects that any changes we may recommend in the act will constitute the final word on wise national atomic policy. It is inevitable that reasonable men will have honest differences of opinion concerning the wisdom of our legislative recommendations. Let me only assure you that every member of our committee, on both sides of the aisle, is earnestly trying to frame policies which put our national interest above the interest of any narrow social or economic group—policies which will benefit all Americans. It will be for the Congress and the American people to judge how well we on the committee have achieved that objective.

When I accepted Mr. Cisler's invitation to speak, I was pleased that he asked me to talk on the subject Realistic Public Policy in Atomic Energy. Those words, it seems to me, describe with great accuracy the purpose of the revisions to the McMahon Act. We are trying to make public policy in atomic energy conform to the realities of the national and international scene in the year 1954.

In certain quarters, it has been suggested that the legislation now before the joint committee is an atomic-power bill. This is most emphatically not the case. Several years from now, I presume that the Congress will be required to stake out the ground rules for an atomic-power industry—to set forth the terms and conditions under which the American people will enjoy the benefits of electrical power derived from nuclear sources. That problem, however, is not the concern of the bills now before the joint committee. These are omnibus bills, aimed at an across-the-board modernization of the McMahon Act, both in the peacetime and military fields. These bills deal with a score of problem areas—of which atomic power is only one. It therefore serves neither the national interest nor the cause of truth to describe the current legislation as an atomic-power law. It simply is not.

In saying that we are trying to bring the Atomic Energy Act of 1946 up to date, I am far from criticizing the wisdom or the foresight of those who participated in framing the organic atomic-energy law. In fact, it is a tribute to their vision that the McMahon Act has served us so well, without major changes, for the past 8 years.

When the organic law was written, it was widely expected that the military atom might soon be put under effective international control. We hoped, and it was a magnificient hope, that the Atomic Energy Commission would soon be able to concentrate on the goal of peacetime atomic power. The framers of the McMahon Act, consequently, believed that the Commission, operating through industrial contractors, would have more than enough men, skill, and resources to press the development of atomic power with full speed and vigor.

In 1946, moreover, it was widely believed that only a few years would be needed to fulfill the military's requirements for nuclear weapons. Most of us did not foresee the revolution in military strategy to be wrought by tactical applications of nuclear weapons. Even in the absence of an international agreement regulating the output of atomic arms, we anticipated that the Commission would soon produce enough atomic weapons to meet all our military needs, and that it could then shift the focus of its attention to peacetime power.

By this same token, few of us in 1946 were wise enough to forsee the impact of nuclear weapons upon the agreements we and our allies would soon make to promote the common defense and security of the free nations. Soviet mastery of atomic energy appeared years, or even decades, away. Nothing seems more unlikely than the possibility of aiding the ground forces of NATO through tactical atomic weapons, or the necessity of defending these same forces against the atomic weapons in the hands of our foes. Accordingly, the time when we might have to exchange information on the effects of atomic weapons with our allies appeared far in the future. Today, we are wiser. A carefully circumscribed relaxation of certain information on the utilization of atomic weapons is already an urgent necessity if the NATO forces are to cope with the hard fact of growing atomic stockpiles on both sides of the Iron Curtain.

Despite our tremendous achievements in developing nuclear bombs, the day is not yet in sight when the Atomic Energy Commission can prudently relax its weapons effort. Each month that passes suggests new, and profitable, applications for the military atom. This applies not only to making more versatile and more effective nuclear bombs—it applies also to the fields of atomic propulsion, and power for military installations remote from sources of conventionally-derived electricity.

My point is this: The Atomic Energy Commission, though it is trying its hardest to promote peacetime applications of the atom, has its hands full in meeting the requirements of the military. This will continue to be so for many years to come. If our goal is achieving peacetime atomic power at the earliest possible date, we cannot put this entire job on the shoulders of the men and women of the Atomic Energy Commission. Unless we are prepared to face the bureaucratic nightmare of a Commission many times its present size, we simply cannot expect the already owerworked people of this superb organization, even with the invaluable help of industrial contractors, to furnish the main push in a drive toward economic power. I yield to none in my admiration for the people of the Atomic Energy Commission—but they are not supermen.

This is the last audience which needs to be told of the Commission's solid record of accomplishment in reactor technology, and I salute Dr. Hafstad and his associates. But of necessity, the pursuit of peacetime power has been subordinated to the overriding goal of strengthening the military defenses of our Nation. One yardstick of the relative priority assigned military and peacetime developments consists of a comparison of the funds the Commission has so far spent for these purposes. It is my understanding that somewhat less than a billion dollars of the moneys spent by the Commission have gone to all kinds of fundamental research and development including atomic power reactors, but also including weapons, medicine, agriculture, biology, physics and chemistry. Six billions have been spent to date for the construction of plants producing weapons material—and another three billion for the day-to-day operating expenses of the Commission. It therefore can hardly be said that the American taxpayer has already made a $12 billion investment in the future of peacetime atomic power. In actual fact, they have spent much less than one-twelfth this amount for this specific purpose.

Thanks to the efforts of the Atomic Energy Commission and its contractors, we can now begin to see our way clear toward atomic power which can compete in a commercial market with electricity from other sources. This day is in sight; however, it is not here today. I estimate that to reach this goal there will have to be invested perhaps another one-half billion dollars over the next 5 years on research and development, and perhaps an additional billion dollars for the construction of prototype plants and pilot models between now and 1964.

With the distance measured in dollars spent, and still to be spent, we are today not more than half way along the road to economic atomic power.

In not too many years we will no doubt face the problem of how to integrate a thriving and growing atomic power industry into the overall pattern of the American economic system. It may well be that the 85th or 86th Congress will bear the heavy responsibility of putting down ground rules for such an industry—ground rules which will both protect the taxpayers whose sacrifices contributed to making such an industry possible, and which will protect also the consumer of electricity.

However, the task of establishing a national policy for an atomic power industry actually in being is not the task of the 83d Congress. Atomic power as a practical economic proposition does not exist today, and it will not exist for many years to come. I therefore emphasise with all the force at my command that the problem before us in 1954 is not the formulation of Federal policy for a nonexistent atomic power industry. Our problem is one of devising ways and means of hastening the day on which we will have something to make power policy about—by encouraging the speediest possible attack on the technical problems which must be solved before competitive atomic power is a reality.

In certain quarters, we hear it suggested that what the 83d Congress does, or does not do, will determine how the melon of atomic power is to be split between privately owned and governmentally owned utilities. The only trouble with such talk about dividing the melon of atomic power is that the melon is a fiction, not a fact. Our task today is not one of dividing melons but of planting seed and cultivating the soil.

It is my personal hope that when an atomic power industry is a reality, it will take its proper place in the normal institutional framework of the American economy. Yet as one who believes not only in the rights, but also the responsibilities of free enterprise, I would say this: If free enterprise is some day to secure a fair return on money invested in atomic power plants, free enterprise must also be prepared to assume its fair share of the load in the pioneering years immediately ahead. During these years, for the most part, atomic power will not be cheap enough to furnish a reasonable return to private investors. If we are to speak in terms of equity for our taxpayers, it seems to me that the real atomic giveaway would result from private industry abstaining from participation in the development of atomic power until such time as entry into this field promised gererous and assured rewards. I therefore say that the participation of free enterprise during the pioneering days of atomic power should be regarded as a responsibility—not a privilege.

We need not worry about an atomic power industry attracting private capital when the period of major risk-taking is over. It will. What we must worry about is attracting private capital next year, the year thereafter, and the year after that—when the risks are great and profits by no means certain. I put it to you in the form of a question: Which constitutes the real atomic giveaway—keeping private industry out of atomic power until we have conquered its developmental problems almost exclusively with the Government's money? Or inviting private industry to share in this developmental task, with the hope that short-term sacrifices may lead to long-term rewards? To me, this question answers itself. There is another side to this giveaway charge that escapes notice: No doubt fortunes will be made in this new business—and I hope there are—but for every fortune, there will be hundreds of bankruptcies. The giveaway is simply giving free enterprise the right to go bankrupt if it does not produce.

Yet the case for asking private industry to share in the developmental costs of atomic power rests on more than arguments of equity. The case is also firmly grounded in the argument of practicality. Differences of viewpoint on the issue of atomic power center in the question of means, not the end to be attained. All of us, I presume, want the American people to share in the benefits of practical atomic power at the earliest possible date. How can we best reach that goal—through the exertions of the Commission and industrial contractors operating under cost-plus-fixed-fee contracts on the one hand, or through a developmental program which maximizes the cost-cutting incentives of free enterprise on the other? Once more, I believe the question provides its own answer.

You cannot expect cost-plus contracts to bring about engineering advances and dollar-saving techniques which result only from the give-and-take of vigorous economic competition. Neither can we press toward the goal of cheap atomic power simply by diverting Commission resources from other fields and into the power field. What we need is new people, new firms, new ideas, and new resources.

No right-thinking person wants the atomic power field to be dominated by a few industrial giants—either during these pioneering days, or when we have an atomic power industry in being. Participation in this great venture must be open to all who are willing to assume the risks of entering into a new and still largely unchartered field. We do not merely need vast corporations employing tens of thousands—we need just as badly the contributions of smaller companies. We need just as badly the ideas of the solitary inventor working with a few associates in a small home workshop.

I cannot believe that the wisdom of the United States Congress is unequal to the twin task of creating incentives to encourage private participation in the reactor field and guarding the American peoeple and other enterprisers from the perils of private monopoly. It is sometimes said that compulsory licensing of patents is the only possible way to prevent such monopolistic entrenchment. I fully respect the sincerity of those holding this view but seriously doubt the soundness of their position. In all honesty, I believe that the advocates of compulsory licensing do not fully appreciate the inherent right of the Federal Government to prevent the few from unjustly profiting at the expense of the many. For over 150 years, our Government has acted to make our economic development consistent with the requirements of the general welfare.

The problem of protecting the interests of the American people in the development of atomic power differs only in degree, not in kind, from the issues our Government has always faced in the economic realm. The general body of laws under which the Federal Government has been operating for more than a century and a half is applicable to the development of atomic power.

Because of the inherent and already existing powers of the Government are fully capable of preventing a few corporations from securing unfair advantages in the atomic-power field, I myself see no reason why we should forego the advantages of pressing developments in this field under the spur of normal patent incentives. These incentives have served our country well throughout its history, and I do not believe that compulsory licensing, or any other such halfway measures, can substitute for normal patent incentives if our goal is the earliest possible development of atomic power, at the lowest possible rates, and at the least cost to the American taxpayer.

I do not maintain that normal patent incentives will create an atomic-power industry in our country by the day after tomorrow. I do maintain that they will measurably accelerate our progress toward this goal. The longer we discourage competition in this field, the longer will we be in reaching the goal. To me, this is one of the chief reasons for revising the Atomic Energy Act at this time.

I feel the same sense of urgency in connection with international problems involving the atom. In the power-starved areas of the world, in nations not endowed with cheap conventional fuels, the need for practicable atomic power is more urgent than in our own country. Britain has already launched an ambitious program for building atomic powerplants, and we must expect other nations to follow in her footsteps.

Over the next several years, as a result, American enterprisers with atomic know-how may find foreign nations urgently in need of their services. Such participation in the developmental programs of other countries would be mutually advantageous. American enterprisers would help to strengthen the economies of our hard-pressed allies. In doing this, they would gain valuable experience in the actual development and construction of atomic powerplants—experience which would enable us to build more efficient plants here in the United States.

Yet the requirements of national security simply will not permit such cooperation in the atomic-power programs of foreign nations to proceed in a helter-skelter unregulated fashion. We need a code of orderly practices under which such cooperation could take place. Such a code of orderly practices is found in the proposed revisions of the act.

These revisions likewise set forth carefully defined procedures under which our allies could receive certain, and limited, information concerning the effects and utilization of atomic weapons. Without giving them such information, we cannot make realistic plans for the defense of Western Europe. Let me assure you that the case for such a limited exchange of data on the effects of atomic weapons does not stem from any curiosity of our allies concerning our atomic secrets. The case rests upon a real, a compelling, and an urgent military need—a need met by the revisions to the act.

All of us regret the fact that Soviet hostility compels us to cooperate with other nations in the area of military applications of atomic energy. All of us would much prefer that this cooperation could consist exclusively in joining with the other nations of the world in great programs enlisting the atom in conquering disease and poverty everywhere. The magnificent speech of President Eisenhower to the United Nations last December set forth the conditions under which this Government would join with other countries in a common effort to use atomic energy in a common attack against the problems besetting all men and women everywhere—the perpetual problem of human misery and want. All of us earnestly hope that the Soviet Government will see fit to join in such a great enterprise. If it does not, I believe we should ask the nations of the free world to join with us in this venture—leaving the door open for possible Soviet entry at a later date.

In the meanwhile, I believe the Congress should put itself squarely on record as supporting the splendid objectives of the President's speech. The modifications of the act would accomplish this purpose—they would permit our Government to enter into agreements with groups of nations for the purpose outlined in the United Nations address of last December 8.

I have every confidence that the domestic problems arising out of atomic energy can be solved through the application of willingness to compromise, wisdom, and patriotism. The outlook for successful resolution of the international atomic issues is much less promising. Yet despair would mean ultimate disaster. The future, our heritage tells us, is not preordained. We cannot be held accountable for what other nations may do—or do not do—to usher in an era of true atomic peace. We are accountable, however, for what we do—or do not do.

Let us never forget this simple truth as we strive to reach a world in which the atom will be not the destroyer of all we hold dear but a tireless servant in the great task of building a better future.

Ours is a great responsibility and even greater opportunity.

Only that future can determine the quality and success of our efforts.

Omnibus Rivers and Harbors Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 25, 1954

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, being chairman of the Rivers and Harbors Subcommittee, I was invited to speak before the 41st convention of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress which is being held in Washington this week. I addressed the meeting this morning on the subject of the omnibus rivers and harbors bill which is now under consideration in my subcommittee. Pursuant to leave granted, I include my address as a part of these remarks:

OMNIBUS RIVERS AND HARBORS BILL

(Address of Congressman HOMER D. ANGELL, chairman of the Rivers and Harbors Subcommittee of the Public Works Committee of the House of Representatives, before the 41st Convention of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, at the Mayflower Hotel, May 25, 1954)

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, convention members, ladies and gentlemen, I feel highly honored to be asked to participate in this important 41st convention of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress and to discuss briefly the proposed omnibus bill for rivers and harbors which is planned for early submission to the 83d Congress.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Rivers and Harbors of the Public Works Committee it has been my privilege and duty to preside over the hearings which we have been conducting before the Rivers and Harbors Subcommittee during much of the time of the 83d Congress, with a view to passing upon the merits of the various projects eligible for inclusion in this bill. There has not been an omnibus bill for rivers and harbors since 1950 and as a result there is a large accumulation of projects which have been examined in the field by the Corps of Army Engineers approved and cleared by the Bureau of the Budget for presentation to this committee. Our committee includes all such projects in one bill which has come to be known as an omnibus bill which permits the Congress to pass on all projects at one time rather than have them scattered throughout the session by individual bills. This procedure is a desirable one and results in the saving of much time for the Congress and at the same time gives adequate opportunity to pass upon the merits of each individual project included in the omnibus bill. Opportunity is given when the bill is presented on the floor for any Member to make a motion to strike any particular item from the bill, which insures majority rule.

The Committee on Public Works, which under the Reorganization Act, has jurisdiction over rivers and harbors, flood control, public roads and public buildings, has taken the opportunity during the 83d Congress to make inspection trips over most areas in the United States and to visit most of the important rivers and harbors in order to get first-hand information on the ground, as to the various projects coming before the committee for action. These trips included one up the Atlantic coast, through the New England States and along the St. Lawrence and Great Lakes, down the Mississippi and along the Gulf States, the central portion of the United States in the Ohio River area and on west to the Pacific coast, including the States of Montana, Idaho, California, Washington, Oregon, and the Columbia Basin area.

During these inspection trips we made actual examination of the projects on the ground and gleaned much local history and factual information as to the merits and demerits of the various projects. At the conclusion of these field examinations I set down for hearings before the subcommittee the projects which were eligible for inclusion in the bill.

I have heard it said that there is a backlog of approved rivers and harbors projects which would require many years for completion by the Army engineers and some comment to the effect that those should be completed before new projects should be considered. However, an examination by our committee into the merits of this suggestion and the appraisal of the projects now on the approved list as well as the new projects which are urgently needed to meet changing conditions shows the lack of merit in the suggestions and the necessity for authorizing the construction of many new projects and the elimination of some projects heretofore approved which by reason of changing conditions are no longer justified.

It may be of interest to consider the background of river development and a bit of the history surrounding it, as well as some statistical information which our committee has gathered in the various hearings we have held. First of all, you gentlemen of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress are well informed of the progress that has been made in water transportation in the last decade and the necessity for increasing the depth and width of our waterways, as well as docking facilities, in order to accommodate the type of craft that, under modern conditions, are being used in water transportation. This necessitates many improvements in rivers and harbors and the necessity of initiating new projects to meet the great demands of present-day commerce.

The water transportation system of the United States began with the founding of the Nation and recognition of Federal responsibility in navigation stems from the very beginning of these public works. Our committee has been advised by the Corps of Army Engineers that 1,769 authorizations on river and harbor projects have now been completed. There are a few multiple-purpose projects which include some navigation not included in this list. The total cost of this river-improvement program was $856 million.

Projects or modifications which are now underway but not yet completed total 143. The committee records show that the projects underway involve an additional cost of $1,409,000,000, of which $878 million has been appropriated through the fiscal year 1954, and it is estimated that $531 million will be required to complete the projects.

In addition to the projects completed or underway, there is another group not yet started totaling 254 in number, the total cost of which would be $911 million, of which $5 million has been appropriated to date for planning purposes, leaving a total of $906 million to complete the construction of the projects.

It is thus seen from these tabulations that the total active navigation program amounts to 2,156 projects or project modifications, having a grand total of $3,176,000,000, of which $1,739,000,000 for the cost to date has been appropriated and $1,437,000,000 is the estimated cost to complete. These estimated costs to complete are based on the 1953 price levels.

In addition to the active program, the Army engineers considering navigation projects have deferred for restudy 282 projects. These deferred projects are estimated to cost, if constructed, $1,170,000,000. The active authorized navigation program described includes about 28,600 miles of improved waterways, about 300 locks, 200 dams, and 290 commercial harbors. This embraces all authorized navigation projects, from those not yet started to those fully completed.

It is thus seen that the comprehensive program for river and harbor development throughout the United States has proceeded throughout our history on a coordinated program in which each project is based on careful and extended engineering studies authorized by the Congress and eventually submitted to the Public Works Committees having been cleared by the Army engineers and the Bureau of the Budget.

It is at this point in the proceedings that the work of my committee and the Public Works Committee of the Senate take over to determine whether or not authorization for any specified project should be granted. The omnibus bill which we are soon to report will embody the results of our deliberations and will include the projects which in the judgment of the committee are in the national interest, economically feasible, and desirable in furthering the needs of water transportation of the Nation, both for war and peace.

It would seem unnecessary to offer any proof to this organization that substantial and widespread benefits from the Federal navigation program have been demonstrated down through the years and that the investments we have made in these projects have been wisely made, both from the standpoint of internal economy and of national defense.

The latest commercial statistics which are available for the year 1952 show that the net waterborne commerce of the United States totaled about 890 million tons in that year, of which about 660 million tons were domestic and 230 million tons were foreign. This is a 50-percent greater waterborne commerce than the prewar peak in the year 1929. The statistics given to our committee in the consideration of the 1950 Rivers and Harbors Act, which was the predecessor to the present one, then amounted to an all-time total of 760 million tons reached in 1947, which has now been exceeded by more than 11 percent. In continuously mounting volume through the war years, traffic grew on the inland and intracoastal waterways of the United States, each year setting a new record in the ton-miles of barge-borne freight. It should be recalled that in addition to their value as carriers of commercial cargo, the inland waterways were used to float 3,943 war vessels and several hundred items of auxiliary war equipment from inland shipyards down to the ocean. America's rivers and canals thus served a twofold purpose during the war. They shared importantly in the transportation of strategic materials and they made possible a widespread geographical diffusion of manufacturing processes that otherwise would have been forced into congested coastal areas, with the hazards of bomb attack.

As I have said, this omnibus bill is the first one proposed since 1950, and needless to say it includes a large number of projects which have been accumulating. It covers 95 projects including 23 under beach-erosion programs with an estimated cost for the 95 projects of $251,700,146. Under the law governing beach-erosion projects, they are permissible only for the protection of public property and two-thirds of the cost must be borne by local interest and one-third by the Federal Government. It is estimated the cost of beach-erosion projects will be $13,746,731.

It is the thought of a good many students of our economic programs that it is a wise move for the Federal Government to have public projects of this nature examined and approved by the Army engineers so that their worth and economic feasibility may be established and have them available on the shelf of approved projects in the event of the need for public works to bolster our economy. In the meantime, however, such of the projects as are urgently needed for immediate construction are cleared for appropriation to enable construction to start.

I call attention to the fact that our committee is a legislative committee and merely authorizes projects and before construction can proceed the Appropriations Committee must provide the funds.

The economy of the United States, the foremost Nation of the world, is based upon our immense wealth of natural resources and our productive capacity and know-how in this highly developed machine age. It behooves us to guard well our natural resources and exercise every effort for their preservation, utilization, and full development in order that we may continue to hold the front rank of the nations of the world in the ability to produce the necessities of life not only for our own people but for many of the less fortunate peoples of the world.

The late Theodore Roosevelt as President of the United States in 1908 made a great contribution to this program for the conservation, development, utilization of our natural resources and particularly the forests, minerals, waters, and soil. He said:

"Each river system, from its headwaters in the forest to its mouth on the coast, is a single unit and should be treated as such.

"Running water is a most valuable natural asset of the people, and there is urgent need for conserving it for navigation, for power, for irrigation, and for domestic and municipal supply.

"The improvement of our inland waterways can be and should be made to pay for itself as far as practicable from the incidental proceeds from waterpower and other uses. Navigation should of course be free, but the greatest return will come from the increased commerce, growth, and prosperity of our people. For this we have already waited too long. Adequate funds should be provided, by bond issue if necessary and the work should be delayed no longer. The development of our waterways and the conservation of our forests are two most pressing physical needs of the country. They are interdependent and they should be met vigorously, together, and at once. There is urgent need for prompt and decisive action."

President Theodore Roosevelt in pleading for the conservation and development of America's natural resources was only following the sage advice of another great American statesman of long ago, Daniel Webster, whose words are chiseled in the plaque over our Speaker's rostrum:

"Let us develop the resources of our land, call forth its powers, promote all its great interests and see whether we also in our day and generation may not perform something worthy to be remembered."

As in the days of Theodore Roosevelt there was need, as he said, for prompt and decisive action in the conservation and development of these great natural resources, so today we in our time and generation will be derelict in our duty and shortsighted in our vision if we fail to provide the necessary funds and legislation needed to conserve and protect to the full these great natural resources which belong to all the people and which are being wasted and depleted. Unless we make possible the full use of our water, forests, soil, and hydroelectric power we will be unable to meet the heavy demands upon our economy and to provide for our own people the high standard of living they now enjoy, and at the same time to perform our full part in maintaining a peaceful and stable world.

As we visualize the immense billions the United States has expended around the world in attempting to bring peace to the world and goodwill among men of all nations, we cannot help but be impressed with the necessity of ending the worldwide race in armament in this age of the atomic and H-bombs and returning to international cooperation and the spiritual and moral values which dominated our forebears, with the hope that the millions expended in armaments and wars may be turned into channels of peace and internal improvements and improved standards of living in order to overcome hunger, disease, illiteracy, and despair which have been the prime causes of wars.

May I close with the words and admonition of our President with whom I most heartily concur when he said:

"We are prepared to reaffirm with the most concrete evidence, our readiness to help build a world in which all peoples can be productive and prosperous. This Government is ready to ask the people to join with all nations in devoting a substantial percentage of any savings achieved by real disarmament to a fund for world aid and reconstruction. The purposes of this great work would be: To help other peoples to develop the underdeveloped areas of the world, to stimulate profitable and fair world trade, to assist all peoples to know the blessings of productive freedom. The monuments of this new kind of war would be these: Roads and schools, hospitals and homes, food and health. We are ready in short, to dedicate our strength to serving the needs, rather than the fears of the world."

Little Business Gets the "Business"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 6, 1954

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, a different facet of the impact upon the economy of the Nation of the adoption of the slogan "What is good for General Motors is good for the country" is brought out in the following editorial from Labor's Daily:

Little Business Gets the "Business"

That there has been a literal acceptance by the Eisenhower administration of the creed, "What is good for General Motors is good for the country," is evidenced by the report in a business magazine that General Motors has received over $7 billion in war contracts since Korea.

And 25 large corporations have grabbed 45.5 percent of the total defense contracts, Labor Research Association reports. The biggies, as usual, have been hogging the orders. The "new climate" in Washington is indeed stimulating for them.

Attorney General Brownell admitted the plight of the little businessmen when he frankly reported to the President that the program written into the Defense Production Act of 1950 to channel defense contracts to combinations of small-business concerns had failed.

He admitted that Government procurement officials had been reluctant, perhaps even to the point of unreasonableness, to deal with these small-business men on the same basis as the big corporations.

He even questioned whether under present conditions (meaning under conditions where the biggest monopolies control the Pentagon) this act can be carried out.

Only 576 companies, with a total of 27,725 employees, are involved in the 26 production pools which have been approved for defense contracts. And the pools have received only $5.4 million of prime contracts out of some $68 billion of such contracts. The total of contracts awarded to the little fellows thus was approximately .00008 of all contracts awarded. Infinitesimal amount, isn't it?

The small-business men, of course, are blamed for this situation by the Attorney General. He said some of them sat back and waited for contracts. But Brownell deliberately ignored the facts that the littles, unlike the bigs, do not have the money to promote their cause, to employ the services of the 5 percenters and other go-betweens to land the orders.

An interesting admission by the Attorney General is that more vigorous standards are set in awarding these contracts to the small business production pools than are applied to other contracting firms, even in the instance where facilities surveys have established ability to perform.

Another factor that is retarding the efforts of the Small Business Administration's efforts to help the little fellows get a larger share of defense spending is that budget cutbacks have shrunk the dollar value of contracts awarded by the Defense Department.

In 1952 the dollar value of the contracts was $40.7 billion, in 1953, $28.5 billion, and for the first 6 months of 1954, only $4.2 billion.

Adoption by the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the National Security Council of a policy of concentrating orders in a sole efficient producer has diminished the number of subcontractors (smaller firms) likely to be called on to furnish components.

All of which leads us right back to where we began. General Motors and the other biggies are getting what is good for them from the business-dominated Eisenhower administration.

Whether this is best for the small-business firms in general and the people in particular is extremely doubtful. The voters will answer that in the 1954 congressional elections and in the presidential election of 1956.

Selling Milk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. ROSS ADAIR

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 25, 1954

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Geneva Progress. It seems to me that this contains something that is worthwhile as we search for a solution to the problem of using the surplus milk which is produced in our country.

The editorial follows:

Selling Milk

As goes the sale of milk so goes the prosperity of the dairy farmer.

A muddled condition exists as to the sale of milk. Much of the time the farmers have too much and the consumers have too little. It is generally agreed that Americans don't drink enough milk. They'll pay an extra cent or two for Brazilian coffee but not for milk.

Why is the sale of milk in a rut? In this mobile age some kind of milk is within reach of everybody and modern refrigeration has pretty well licked the problems once experienced in keeping milk around the home.

The dairy industry needs more advertising and better sales promotion.

What would happen to milk sales if milk was advertised in newspapers and magazines and on radio and TV the way the brewers are advertising beer? Nobody can say for sure but it's a good bet the old slogan "It pays to advertise" would more than hold its own in any such a promotion campaign. At any rate it would certainly be worth a try.

Another factor determining how a commodity sells is price and merchandising method.

Along this line is the experiment of 4 of the 12 dairies in the Cumberland, Md., area. They are selling milk only by the gallon and the price has already dropped 59 cents per gallon. Many families would find it satisfactory to buy 1 gallon of milk instead of several bottles and certainly the dairy would find it less costly to prepare for market. More originality and improvement is needed in the merchandising of milk.

The solution to the dairy farmers' problem is not in selling more milk to the Government but in selling more milk to the public.

Upper Colorado River Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1954

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed regretful that the proponents of the upper Colorado River development project have become so embittered by their local selfish viewpoint that they feel they have a monopoly on the knowledge of the water problems of the West. I sincerely believe that the proponents of the upper Colorado River storage project are so hopelessly lost in the forest that they cannot see the trees.

When people venture into fields for which they are ill-equipped, unprepared, and fail to use the simple rules of safety practiced in everyday life, they find themselves sometimes in very embarrassing positions. According to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 11, 1954, Appendix A3449, Barbara L. Schall and Richard Schall, of Wrightwood, Calif., are two such individuals.

In answer to Mr. and Mrs. Schall, I might say that I took the trip down the Yampa and Greene Rivers which the Schalls took, in company with Mr. Don Hatch, a qualified river guide, and experienced none of the horrors which are recounted in the Schall letter. This letter has been given widespread circulation, and I would like to place in the RECORD several letters from individuals qualified to be on the river, proving that if the usual safety precautions are taken the trip is a delight and one which should be experienced by every American.

Letters from Mr. Howard R. Smith, executive secretary of the Western River Guides Association, to Mr. Richard Schall, from Don Hatch, chief river guide, to the editor of the Utah Tribune, and from Mr. Hatch to me are included.

OPEN LETTER

WESTERN RIVER GUIDES ASSOCIATION,
Salt Lake City, Utah, May 13, 1954.
Mr. RICHARD SCHALL,
Wrightwood, Calif.

DEAR SIR: I have before me articles which were printed in local newspapers of which mention was made regarding your recent experiences on the Yampa and Greene Rivers. May I, as executive secretary of the Western River Guides Association, express our sympathy that you had such an experience. Knowing the genuine joy which can come from a successful trip, I can readily understand your anxiety, for not having accomplished your goal. Undoubtedly you were misinformed, for these trips, on western rivers, are all dangerous when not properly equipped and managed. It was with this thought of safety being uppermost in our minds, that our organization was formed, and we agree with you, that there should be more information given out through our public organs regarding the necessity of proper equipment and river experience prior to undertaking such a trip. There are hundreds of people who make annual guided excursions without incident.

In line with this feature of safety, and in anticipation of the possibility of an experience such as yours, the guides, with the wholehearted cooperation of the parks department, have established many disaster stations along the western rivers. You on your journey must have passed many of these unknowingly. Our marked maps also show two ranches, in addition to the one at Island Park, at which points one may leave the river, and return to the towns nearby. I believe you will agree with me that you did error in undertaking such a trek without first making local inquiry. Had you contacted Mr. Jess Lombard, ranger of the Dinosaur National Monument (incidentally such a contact is required before entering the park) you would have been notified of these stations. He undoubtedly would have also warned you about the extreme danger of running such an area in a kayak. Again I say that proper equipment and guide service are paramount before being safe on these western rivers.

We have been called upon on many occasions to lend assistance to those travelers who unknowingly set out unprepared and become stranded. These cases are indeed pathetic with each leaving its scar on the participants, including the rescuing guide. In spite of this however, in all fairness, I am sure that you will agree that the sport cannot be condemned because inexperience has lead to your disaster. Certainly the layman cannot equitably outlaw air travel, because he himself has not the equipment nor experience to fly.

I am mailing you, under separate cover, a copy of a letter recently sent to interested parties, newspapers, travel agencies, and other groups whom we thought might be interested in our associatons, and/or its purposes. Thus far, we have received little assistance. It seems that there must be some major disaster before we will receive publicity, and then undoubtedly it will be adverse. We are in no position to carry on an extensive advertising program to properly educate the public. As a result, we have periodic rescues, with each cutting into the next year's river business in direct proportion to the magnitude of the adjectives used when the report is made. It is a problem and we hope to solve it by more education of the true facts, and notification of them to key sources.

May I again express our regret that your trip ended with difficulty, and invite you to participate in one of the well-equipped guided tours of the river. I can say, without hesitation, that you will be rewarded beyond measure. The beauties and experiences which are obtained from a properly conducted excursion yield the kind of relaxing joys which remain in one's soul forever.

Yours very truly,
Howard R. Smith,
Executive Secretary,
Western River Guides Association.

Hatch River Expeditions,
Vernal, Utah, May 14, 1954.

To: Editor Tribune.
From: Don Hatch, guide, Hatch River Expeditions.

Dear Sirs: It's pathetic to note the many inaccuracies being circulated concerning dams and rivers, but the one that really took the cake, so to speak, was the Tribune-doctored and miscolored account of the two self-styled boatmen from California who took a trip down the Yampa River recently. It was apparent from the start of the article that these boatmen lacked preparation and commonsense so necessary for any boating venture. Had these same people been on a large lake, they'd have surely drowned since the shore is farther away in most spots than on the mild Yampa River.

The kayak incident could have been avoided had these rules been followed:

1. Contact the superintendent of the Dinosaur National Monument.
2. Follow at least a simple river map.
3. Seek authentic information from the Western River Guides Association.
4. Use boats, not tubs, logs, etc.

It's obvious that the Tribune found it convenient to play up this incident because of the Echo Dam issue. Now how about writing an article stating truthfully the fact that hundreds have and will see Dinosaur scenery safely and inexpensively with competent river-guide service?

Don Hatch,
Chief River Guide.

Salt Lake City, Utah.

The Honorable John P. Saylor,
Representative, House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Honorable Mr. Saylor: I would like to comment on the Yampa River trip taken by Mr. and Mrs. Richard Schall, of Fleetwood, Calif., on May 3, 1954, but before I do I would like to state my qualifications for questioning statements made in their letter of May 7, 1954, written in Vernal, Utah, to the Sierra Club, San Francisco.

I have been down the Yampa River in boats more times than any other person with the possible exception of my father, Bus Hatch, and can truthfully say that the river trips are perfectly safe and inexpensive if handled by competent guides and a little commonsense. The trips are delightful from all aspects whether you take a 1-day or 6-day trip, and anyone who is able to walk can make it; in some cases cripples, for we've taken them down, too, with groups of children.

Concerning the trip of Mr. and Mrs. Richard Schall, I would like to point out the following things:

1. They failed to leave the river when they had opportunities even after they said they ripped the canvas on the bottom of their tiny kayak. I support this point with the fact that they visited the Mantle Ranch after their mishap and then returned to the river to complete the run down to Island Park, some 24 miles downstream. They also passed the Chew's Ranch and a supply station before completing their trip to Island Park. Ranches, roads, orchards, vegetable gardens, and the supply station—all along the bank of the river—were easy to find. I conclude then that their plight couldn't have been as serious as their letter leads one to believe.

2. They failed to report their intentions to run through Dinosaur National Monument Canyons to Supt. Jess Lombard. Mr. Lombard has excellent maps available that will help anyone conduct safer trips through that area.

3. The collapsible boat the Schalls used was seriously overloaded since it had in it 2 people, supplies for 3 or 4 days, an extra paddle, plus camera, ropes, personal gear, patching material, and other miscellaneous equipment. I doubt whether any park official would allow them on a lake with such a load.

4. They failed to get adequate water-conditions data.

5. The Schall people were traveling far too fast down a river they, from all indications, knew nothing about. They made approximately 67 miles in their little boat in two and a half days; even at that rate, they made frequent stops for repair.

In conclusion, I can seriously say that I've seen people swim through Yampa Canyons more successfully on air mattresses than they ran their boat through. A case in point is that of Mr. John Hacking, of Vernal, Utah, who ran a boat trip for me for the first time last year. Not only did he float through Yampa Rapids on an air mattress, but later he told me in all truthfulness that he swam through Split Mountain Gorge without even a lifejacket.

I hope that this letter helps disprove the many unfounded statements that Dinosaur National Monument beauties are inaccessible. While I sympathize with the situation Mr. and Mrs. Schall were in while on the river, I hope that letters like theirs are based more on sound reasoning and commonsense rather than emotions brought forth by pressure groups who advocate the flooding of our national monument.

Sincerely yours,
Don Hatch, *Boatman.*

Salute to Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES R. HOWELL

OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 25, 1954

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, one of the bravest of the young democracies, the State of Israel, has recently reached its sixth anniversary, and it is with privilege that I rise to pay tribute to its notable achievements.

Having reached their sixth year of independence, the people of the State of Israel have reason to be proud of their small but vigorous nation. During these years, and against many complex difficulties, Israel has been sucessful in making magnificent progress toward economic stability and an economy which will enable its citizens to better their standard of living, and to absorb the many new ciitzens who seek haven in what they regard as their ancestral homeland.

With simultaneous industrial and agricultural development, Israel has established a democratic form of government, which embodies the basic democratic principles of the western free world.

The land of Israel today is the scene of active development—of new cities and towns, farms, industries, and mines. The achievements of the past 6 years foretell of higher attainments in the years to come.

I was fortunate enough to be able to visit the young and industrious State of Israel in October 1951. At that time I saw widespread evidence of the great zeal and industry on the part of the people of this young republic to make a success of this bold venture. There were, to be sure, also evidences of the great handicaps under which the people were working, such as the physical limitations of certain areas of the land and other geographic complications. Yet I had the feeling then, as I do now, that the energy of the people of Israel and their faith in this endeavor, will enable them to succeed, even against some very great obstacles.

I am proud that the United States is playing a significant part in the development and growth of Israel. I extend my greetings and sincere best wishes to the Government and people of Israel on the sixth anniversary, with deep admiration for their achievements and potentialities. I hope I shall be able to visit there again some day.

Anniversary of the Independent Republic of Armenia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT

OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 25, 1954

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I call to your attention at this time an anniversary of worldwide importance and significance. It is the celebration, on May 28, of National Independence Day of the independent Republic of Armenia. I respectfully recommend to your consideration this commemoration of a gallant and liberty-loving people. The valor and faith of Armenians all over the world are living proof that ofttimes freedom's flame burns brightest in the hearts of those who are the weariest and who have the least to be thankful for.

It was 36 years ago, on May 28, 1918, in the wake of the Russian revolution, and as a result of decisive victories by Armenian military forces against Turkey, the independent Republic of Armenia was founded. Its national life was short lived, however.

During the time it existed as an independent Republic, a truly democratic government was established, complete with legislative, executive, and judicial departments. Over 1,500 schools and colleges were opened throughout the land. Housing and irrigation were effected. Hospitals, churches, and theaters were built. Progress and economic rehabilitation were incredible.

The United States was most generous to the Armenian people during their time of trial, sending food, clothing, medicaments, and assisted greatly in fields of benevolent assistance.

The Western Allies recognized the Armenian Government one after the other; the United States gave formal recognition to the Armenian Government on April 23, 1920.

On August 10, 1920, at Sevres, a suburb of Paris, a treaty of peace was signed between the Western Allies, and the envoys of the Republic of Armenia and Turkey. Known as the Sevres Treaty, it meant the official recognition of Armenia by the Allies and Turkey and provided that the settlement of the Armeno-Turkish boundries be left up to the President of the United States, Woodrow Wilson. President Wilson delimited the Armenian boundaries on November 22, 1920.

Hopes of freedom were stilled when the Red army invaded Armenia and subdued the young republic on December 2, 1920. An heroic effort was made after the occupation by the Russians in February of 1921; they were ejected from the Armenian homeland and kept out for over 3 months. But in the face of overwhelming odds, the Republic fell, and has since been known as one of the so-called 16 "independent" Republics that form the present Soviet Union.

As a republic, Armenia existed for a short 2½ years. As an inspiration and a shining light, she will live in the hearts and the memories of freedom-loving men forever.

In Armenia, the people today are forbidden, under pain of death, the right of celebrating their national independence day. They are confident, however, that together with their powerful ally, the United States, they will one day walk arm in arm down the pathway of peace. Together with us, they pray for the happy day when all men will be held equal in the eyes of their fellowmen, just as they are equal in the sight of the God who created them.

Armenia is one of the oldest countries of recorded history. The biblical Ark of Noah landed on Mount Ararat. Already in the seventh century B. C., the Armenians had established their independent kingdom in Asia Minor.

In the year A. D. 278 Armenia, as the first state in the world, accepted Christianity as its religion. Thirty-five years later, Emperor Constantine followed their lead and proclaimed Christianity in A. D. 313 as the religion of the Roman Empire.

And so it is that we draw inspiration from the gallant people of Armenia on this May 28. Though they be broken in body, their spirit has never been crushed. Through many decades of subjugation by their godless oppressors they have nurtured an abiding faith in God; they have demonstrated time and again an unswerving confidence in themselves and the rightness of their cause. Together with the uncounted millions who have fallen within the awful penumbra of Soviet domination and irreligion they cry out for justice. And just as sure as night follows day they shall rise again and like the avenging angels of old shall banish forever from their fair lands the last of the conqueror and the last vestige of his philosophy of hate and malevolence.

Excerpt From Walter Winchell Broadcast of May 16, 1954

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI

OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 25, 1954

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith portion of the radio broadcast of Walter Winchell delivered on May 16, 1954:

Mr. and Mrs. United States, I have been covering the McCarthy-Army story in Washington for the last 10 days and believe me the partial photograph that you are getting on your television screen is not, in my opinion, a true one. It is no more a picture of the real Washington, D. C., than a corner brawl on Constitution Avenue is a picture of the Washington Monument. The overworked and the underpaid people who run our Government are still giving it service from their hearts. The Government scientists are not looking at the television hippodrome—they are too busy looking through microscopes to continue the fight against everything from potato bugs to cancer. Congressmen and Senators are working very hard on 60 other committees at a rate which would give most men heart failure. Army, Navy, Air Force, and United States Marine people are not worried about when the hearings will end or how. They are helping their Commander in Chief carry his terrible burden. Tired Cabinet officers are staying up late at night—not to hear the news—but to make it in agonized decisions. Almost as inspiring as the light of the Statue of Liberty in New York Bay are the midnight lights in the White House. There, ladies and gentlemen, one man alone—your President—peers through the international darkness. His problem is not whether one private was given a commission, but how to prevent your son and every boy in the Army from being sent to Indochina.

J. Edgar Hoover—A Tribute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDWARD J. HART

OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 25, 1954

Mr. HART. Mr. Speaker, in its issue of May 22, 1954, the Advocate, the official Catholic paper for the Archdiocese of Newark, published the following editorial, a tribute to Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation:

A TRIBUTE

There are few men in public life more respected than J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. This enviable position of regard has been acquired over a period of 30 years—the length of time Mr. Hoover has been directing the FBI.

From the time of his appointment by the then United States Attorney General, Harlan Fiske Stone, until the present, Mr. Hoover has striven, and successfully, to bring this very important arm of law enforcement to a position of respect and admiration. With characteristic humility, the Director attributes this fact to the personnel of the Bureau. However, it was the Director himself who insisted 30 years ago, that the Bureau cease to be a catchall for political hacks and be divorced from all politics. He has always insisted that appointments to and promotions within the Bureau be made strictly on ability.

He has served during the administrations of 5 Presidents and under 11 Attorneys General. All have testified to their personal regard for the Director and for the members of the Bureau whom he has molded into the group of individuals whose devotion to the protection of the people has often carried them above and beyond the call of duty.

Because of his position, Mr. Hoover has been called on frequently to comment on crime and its causes. He has often stressed the importance of a religious background and training in the prevention of crime. Nor has he underestimated the place of the home. "I strongly believe," he once said, "the molding of character begins at home. There is the best place to reverse the trend of juvenile delinquency."

The Nation can well pay tribute to him and to all who, under his direction, labor unceasingly for the security of the Nation and the protection of its citizens.

Internationalists Are Fine, But Home Folks Are Better

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1954

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, just a few days ago the House passed a bill to create a commission to advise the people of America on educational matters, that is, what the teachers should teach and what the pupils should learn.

No doubt there are some who have assimilated the courses available at the so-called higher institutions of learning, but, after all, the folks who live in the "sticks" or if you prefer, at the grassroots—seem to be getting along fairly well as is evident from a news item from the St. Joseph Herald-Press, published at St. Joseph, Mich., under the date of May 19, which reads as follows:

ASK DOWAGIAC BAND TO BOWL—HIGH SCHOOL MUSICIANS TO MARCH NEW YEAR'S DAY IN ORANGE BOWL

DOWAGIAC, May 19.—All 80 members of the Dowagiac High School band, attended by eight chaperons, will fly to the Orange Bowl game in Miami, Fla., next New Year's Day in a chartered plane.

Don Potter, president of the Band Parents organization, said the local band is the only group from this area and one of only two from the North, to be invited to the football classic.

The Dowagiac band earned the invitation by winning firsts in the southwest Michigan marching contest at Benton Harbor, and in parade marching at the Niles "Light Night," placing in the first division at the district concert contest in Kalamazoo, the State contest at Lansing and the Holland tulip festival.

The invitation came from Henry Fillmore, director of the half-time program at the Orange Bowl.

The trip is estimated to cost $14,500. A committee on arrangements includes Dexter Clough, band director, Frank White, Richard Judd, Dick Hunsberger, and James Thar.

In order to finance the trip, each band member must earn $25 personally by January 1. The band has also been divided into four groups, each of which must sponsor a money-making project to earn $200.

The Band Parents group will seek to raise the balance of the money elsewhere. The Dowagiac board of education has approved the project.

The band will present a free, public exhibition at 8:30 tonight at the athletic field.

Nor should I forget that in fishing tackle Heddon's Sons at Dowagiac, Mich., are successfully competing with the so-called experts of France, Italy, Germany, and Great Britain.

Even though the great minds in Washington seem to find it necessary to spend the taxpayers' dollars in creating boards and commissions to tell the home folks how to do things, the home folks seem to have been getting along fairly well prior to the creation of this last commission. I have seen photostatic copies of some of the letters written by Washington, Lincoln, and a few other great men of this country and even though at times they misspelled—according to our present-day standards—certain common words, they did very well for themselves, and more important, for this country of ours.

Perhaps it would be ironic if the home folks demanded the creation of a commission to tell the educational experts how to earn a few tax dollars which might be used to pay compensation for some of the boards created here in Washington.

Water: Our Nation's Greatest and Most Important Natural Resource

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RUSSELL V. MACK

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 25, 1954

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, a speech on Water: Our Greatest and Most Important Natural Resource was delivered by me this morning before the 41st annual convention of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress which was meeting in the Mayflower Hotel of this city.

Many Members of Congress have indicated to me that they are deeply interested in flood control, navigation, reclamation, power-dam development, and other problems connected with the full utilization of our Nation's water resources. Since my speech includes a discussion of some of these problems, I asked and secured unanimous consent to insert it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The speech follows:

WATER: OUR NATION'S GREATEST AND MOST IMPORTANT NATURAL RESOURCE

Chairman Brooks, my colleagues Senator Martin, Mr. Angell, and Mr. Davis, delegates to this convention, ladies and gentlemen, some years ago I was president of the Washington State Rivers and Harbors Congress, which is an affiliate of your organization. I, therefore, know not from hearsay but from personal experience of the aims, work, and achievements of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress. I know, firsthand, what the officers and members of this association, past and present, have done toward promoting a great forward-looking, progressive, and sound national program for the development of our Nation's water resources. I am proud to be on the list of speakers for the 41st national convention of this most worthwhile organization.

Most of the river, harbor, and flood control work of the Nation is planned, engineered and carried out by the United States Corps of Army engineers. The Army engineers have done an excellent job in developing our water resources. I have found their representatives, during my 7 years in Congress, to be the best informed, most cooperative and most constructive who come before our House committee on Public Works. These United States Army engineers have done great work for this Nation in the past. I am sure they will continue to do so for years in the future.

Bill Nye, the American humorist, once delivered a lecture on milk. He talked at great length on the subject of just plain, everyday, ordinary m-i-l-k. My assignment, today, is much simpler than was Nye's. I am to talk to you for only 15 minutes on a substance much more plentiful and much more commonplace than milk for the subject of my discourse is plain, everyday, commonplace, ordinary water—just w-a-t-e-r.

Of all the great natural resources with which a kindly and allwise Heavenly Father has endowed mankind, water and soil are the most important and contribute most to man's welfare and happiness.

Everyday, everywhere, we see water all about us. This is to be expected because three-fourths of the world's surface is covered by it. Water is the most common and most plentiful substance on this planet.

Because water is so essential to man's life and development, all but a small part of the world's human population lives near waterways. From the dawn of civilization water has determined where man dwells. George Washington built Mount Vernon where it is and established this beautiful Capital City in this place because when the foundations of these two national shrines were laid, the best highway in all the wildernesses of Virginia and Maryland was the Potomac River. Washington did only what all mankind always has done, established his home and his city by the side of the best and most convenient available highway of his time and place.

Rivers were and are the best highways for the low cost transportation of freight. When boats were small, the first settlements of men developed in the river valleys of the Nile and Euphrates. As boats became larger, man began to navigate the inland seas, such as the Mediterranean, and then Carthage, Rome, and Athens came into their glory. As boats grew sturdier, men ventured onto the open seas and soon thereafter the world's most populous cities developed on the world's ocean seaports.

It is interesting to note that in our own country, not until we come down to our 16th city in population, Indianapolis, Ind., do we find a city that is not a sea, a lake, or a river port. The 15 largest cities in our Nation are all on navigable water. Despite the vast developments in railroads, in automobiles, and in aviation, waterways still provide our most important highways for the movement of bulk freight.

Discussion, however, of water as the provider of highways of commerce and as the friend and benefactor of mankind, is the special assignment of my friend, Mr. ANGELL, of Oregon, who is the distinguished chairman of the House Rivers and Harbors Committee.

My task here, as chairman of the House subcommittee on flood control, is to discuss water, not as the friend but as the foe of mankind and to make suggestions for policing it.

Old Man River, despite all the laudatory things that have been said about him, it must be admitted, still has a Dr. Jeckyl and Mr. Hyde personality. Most of the time and in most places Old Man River is a kindly and friendly character. There are times, however, when the weather is too warm or too wet that Old Man River suffers periods of madness during which he leaves his usual haunts and runs amuk among the people, leaving death, destruction, and disaster in his wake.

It is to control Old Man River during his periodic spasms of madness that the congressional committees on flood control exist.

Floods are not new in America. De Soto encountered them when he first, in 1541, visited the interior of our continent. New Englanders were building dikes to fight floods long before they built ramparts on Bunker Hill to fight the British. Southern farmers were constructing similar works to battle the oncoming waters of the Mississippi long before the Louisiana Purchase.

The floods of pioneer days, however, did little damage if damages are measured in dollars. The river valleys then were only sparsely settled. These valleys were not crowded, then, as they are today with cities, factories, office buildings, churches, schools, highways, bridges, railroads, and developed farmlands.

Even when early-day floods washed fertile farmlands downstream towards the sea, pioneer farmers worried little for over the hill was more land, untouched by the plow, that could be had almost for the seeking.

Times, however, have changed. Good idle farmland is scarce and becoming scarcer. The river valleys have become heavily populated and are becoming more so every year. Billions have been invested in the river valleys for buildings, highways, railroads, and those things which civilization requires. These investments are increasing year after year. The urgency of protecting the increasing number of valley residents and their mounting investments is growing and will continue to grow as long as the population continues to multiply and prosper.

The Corps of the United States Army Engineers has made studies during recent years which reveal that the average monetary loss which this Nation suffers from floods is about $500 million a year. Some years, such as 1936, when New England experienced a flood that did a half-billion in damage, and 1950 in which the billion-dollar flood occurred in the Missouri and Kaw basins, the damages have far exceeded the half-billion dollar average. In other favorable years the losses have been less. But on the average, say the Engineers, the flood loss of the Nation is half a billion dollars a year.

These losses will tend to increase, rather than decrease, unless strong remedial works are undertaken.

Our Nation in 1900 had a population of less than 75 million. By 1950, our Nation's population had increased to more than 150 million. In short, our country's population in the first half of this century doubled. If we can judge the future by the past, we may confidently expect our country will have a population of 300 million by the end of this century.

The doubling of our Nation's population by the year A. D. 2000 will mean more people and more wealth in our river valleys to require flood protection.

The sooner Congress provides that protection the less it will cost since nearly all protective works demand land acquisition and land values increase in ratio with population growth.

Flood control in America was once a small and simple problem. The expanding populations and growing wealth of our Nation's river valleys have made it a complex and gigantic one.

It was not until 1936 that Congress, after years of urging by this association, recognized flood control as a national welfare responsibility of the Federal Government and made it so in the Flood Control Act of 1936.

In the 18 years which have elapsed since the enactment of that bill, the Congress has authorized the construction of 909 flood control projects. These 909 Federal flood control projects if all constructed at today's prices would require the expenditure of $6,736,000,000 of Federal funds.

Of this huge sum $2,286,000,000 already has been appropriated, leaving nearly five billions of dollars still to be appropriated before these 909 authorized projects can be completed.

Nor will the completion of these 909 authorized projects finish the Nation's flood control problems for there are today 446 flood control projects not yet authorized that are in the study mill of the United States Army engineers. Most of these, eventually, will come to the Congress for authorizations.

The pending House River and Harbor Flood Control omnibus authorization bill will, when reported, carry authorization for about a half-billion dollars of new flood-control projects. There are those who say that no new authorizations should be made until the existing half-a-billion dollars of authorized projects for which no appropriations have been made is cleared away. This would be unsound. Many of the new projects which are being submitted this year to Congress have a much higher benefit-cost ratio than some of those already authorized.

Then, too, it is desirable that Congress have on hand a huge amount of work authorizations ready for instant use to overcome any recession in business and employment that may occur in any future year.

The cutting down of flood-control backlogs of authorized projects should be accomplished not by refusing to authorize additional new projects but by appropriating more money with which to move construction of all authorized projects ahead faster.

No cost figures are available on the magnitude of the Nation's water resource development problems. My guess is—and I consider it a most conservative one—that it will require the expenditure of a billion dollars a year for 20 years to assure full protection of our river valleys from floods and to assure that the waters of our rivers will be used to the best advantage for the related purposes of navigation, reclamation, irrigation, recreation and power production.

The taxpayers will pay for these projects whether they are built or not. If these flood control, and other water development projects, are built, our citizens will pay for them in taxes. If these projects are not built, the taxpayers will pay for them just the same, in the half-billion dollars a year they will be compelled to spend to repair the damages of the floods which will repeatedly occur if protective works are not provided.

Since it will cost less to build these water development projects now than later when population growth has swollen land values, we of the Congress should move forward to providing funds for protective works as rapidly as the economy of the Nation permits.

Despite our zeal for river and harbor improvements, we, Congressmen, must ever keep in mind that we must maintain the Nation's strong national financial and economic system by guarding it against the inflation that results from overly large deficit spending and a national debt that is too colossal. It is, therefore, necessary that we first economize in some places that we may expand our spending efforts in other and more worthwhile ones.

President Eisenhower has been doing a great job in eliminating waste and extravagance from government. As his program for economy and efficiency in government goes forward there will be more money for two things: (1) For tax reduction to the people, and (2) for undertaking and expanding programs for such worthwhile and necessary improvements as the building of more, better, and safer highways and for undertaking more river and harbor, flood-control and water-resources development works.

Solution of the Nation's water problems, its flood control, navigation, power dam building, reclamation, and irrigation is a gigantic undertaking that will cost at a most conservative estimate at least $20 billion.

It is not wise that our citizens should expect and depend solely upon Uncle Sam alone to do it all. We should approve and applaud, therefore, the President's proposal for partnership development of the water resources.

Our highways today are being built under a partnership arrangement between the States and the Federal Government. It is just as desirable that our water resources developments should go forward with the States and local communities assisting wherever they can. Projects will go forward much faster under partnership than by expecting Uncle Sam, alone, to do it all.

The Public Works Committee of the House of Representatives has reported favorably and the House already has passed the two important flood-control bills which will permit two State publicly owned Oregon-Washington utilities to build two hydro-electric dams in the Pacific northwest. The building of these dams under the partnership arrangement will free more than $350 million of Federal money for use elsewhere on other river developments.

America's greatest source of strength is her unequalled industrial system which in peace and war has demonstrated that it can outproduce the world. The full utilization of our water resources adds to the strength of that industrial system. The prevention of floods saves that system from costly interruptions. When organizations such as the National Rivers and Harbors Congress works as it does for better water utilization, it works for a stronger America—an America that will remain in war invincible and in peace unrivaled in prosperity.

Proposed Internal Revenue Code Revision and Its Failure To Give Relief to Low-Income Groups

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1954

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, the administration's revision of the Internal Revenue Code fails to give due consideration to wage earners and other persons of low income. I protest the lack of opportunity which we in the House of Representatives had to amend the tax revision bill to give effect to our thoughts. I hope that the Senate can and will do better.

Let me explain what I mean.

The House Ways and Means Committee reported out an 875-page revision of the tax code. We in the House, though severely critical of many provisions in it, could only talk about it. The rules of the House denied us any real opportunity to amend the bill. We had to accept it or reject it in toto.

The revenue-reducing aspect of this revision bill is an extremely one-sided affair. Under the guise of presenting a measure which would rewrite many of the technical and administrative provisions of the tax law and introduce clarity and simplicity into other provisions, the majority members of the Ways and Means Committee presented a bill full of important substantive changes. When we now ask for consideration of a proposal to raise exemptions in order to grant a small bit of relief to persons of low income, they strongly protest that this is a tax-reform bill, not a tax-relief bill. But when we point to many of the tax-reducing substantive changes already in the bill, they defend on the grounds of equity and alleged reform.

A recitation of some of the facts will clearly show on whose side equity lies.

The bill which has already passed the House of Representatives will reduce taxes by $1.4 billion. According to the Ways and Means Committee, corporations during 1955—and I emphasize 1955—will receive $619 million of relief under the bill while individuals will receive $778 million. What the majority of the committee fails to point out is that the relief accorded to corporations in years after 1955 will be very much greater, while the relief to individuals will undergo no such increase.

Now we come to another important point which I want to emphasize. And that is that the benefits actually accruing to individuals do in fact accrue almost exclusively to persons in the upper brackets. As the minority of the Ways and Means Committee pointed out, there are only two relatively minor provisions benefiting the average wage or salary earner. The first one is concerned with interest on installment contracts, and the other is liberalized deductions for medical and dental expenses.

Contrast these with the hundreds of millions of dollars of relief granted in the form of dividend exclusion and tax credit to stockholders, much more liberal depreciation allowances to business, tax relief to pension trusts, increase in authorized percentage depletion allowances, and a net operating loss provision, as well as very favorable treatment for big businesses operating abroad. The revenue loss from the liberalized depreciation deductions to corporations over the next decade or so will be fantastic and will result during the single year of 1960 in a tax loss of about $2.2 billion.

It is sometimes almost funny to see the extent to which some go in attempting to show how it is the little man who is going to benefit from the tax bill. This becomes almost absurd when efforts are made to prove that it is the low-income group which will benefit from the dividend tax credit proposal. An example of this sort of misleading suggestion can be found in the testimony of Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey before the Senate Finance Committee. The Secretary said that three-fourths of all individuals who received dividends earn less than $10,000 a year. What the Secretary did not tell was the percentage of all dividends received by persons with incomes over $10,000 a year. The answer to that is that they receive almost three-fourths of all dividend income. This group accounts for less than 4 percent of all taxpayers. Ninety-two percent of American families own no stock whatever. Of the remaining 8 percent, six-tenths of 1 percent own 80 percent of all publicly held stock.

If the time for tax reduction has arrived, then personal exemptions under the income tax should be raised at least $100 from $600 to $700. When you realize that a man with a wife and 2 children, and an income of $2,000 in 1939 would need to have an income well over $4,000 in order to be as well off—taxes and cost of living considered—you can understand what I mean. In 1939 a married man had an exemption of $2,500. Today he has only $1,200.

I strongly protest the philosophy of those who claim that we should first give tax relief to the well to do, who—they say—will invest the savings in new business and somehow have the benefits trickle down to the mass of the people. They say nothing about the fact that already our industrial capacity to produce exceeds our capacity to consume, simply because people do not have the money with which to buy. It is my belief that we should give tax reductions to consumers who will spend the money for food to eat and clothing to wear. I have much more faith in the benefits of that kind of action trickling up to corporations and the well to do than I do in any trickling down which may come from tax reductions to General Motors and United States Steel. Anyway, General Motors already got $200 million knocked off its tax bill by the termination of the excess-profits tax. I think that is enough relief in 1 year for 1 corporation. Let us give the next break to the employees of General Motors and the 60 million other wage earners in the United States.

Should Our Boys Be Sent to Indochina?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1954

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, the situation with reference to Indochina becomes more and more confusing. It does not seem that the people of this country are being as fully advised as they should be as to the real underlying issues. On the surface it is made to appear that it is a war against communism. Unfortunately, it has developed to a stage where there is some justification for such thought. Such a contest would naturally claim the interest and support of this country. It is the opinion of many that our support should take whatever form is possible without sending our boys to be sacrificed on another foreign field of battle. This attitude is due to a feeling that it is time to call a halt on American boys being used to carry the burden of battle all over the world. Our experience in Korea shows that other nations are not willing to take their full part. The meager support given us in our noble endeavor in Korea is abundant proof of that.

Furthermore, it is a primary duty of France to adjust its policy toward the people of Indochina. I am of the opinion that the present crisis would not have developed if a more liberal policy had been pursued—a policy toward the people of that country more in accord with the ideals of liberty and freedom. I am also of the opinion that if such a policy is adopted even now it could work wonders in bringing the people of that exploited land into the struggle against communism. I hope it is not too late. It may be later than we think, but it is not too late to try.

On Saturday evening, May 22, 1954, it was my privilege to address the Gold Star Mothers of Camden County, N. J. Knowing the fear that exists in the hearts of all mothers at the present time that their boys will be sent again into battle on foreign fields, and knowing full well the anguish that exists in the hearts of Gold Star Mothers throughout our land because of the sacrifice they have been called upon to make, I thought it would be appropriate to express my views on this subject at that time.

I include as part of my remarks extracts from my address on that occasion as follows:

The uncertain conditions that prevail today in Indochina and all of southeastern Asia have created a fear that our boys will be called upon again to die on foreign battlefields.

I am absolutely opposed to our entrance into any such conflict.

The conditions that brought about the present war in Indochina were not created by the Communists in the first instance. It is the direct result of a French colonial policy that for years has exploited the natives of that country. The burdens placed upon these unfortunate people have, through the years, grown heavier and more obnoxious year upon year until they could no longer stand the injustice heaped upon them.

It is unfortunate that these oppressed peoples were driven toward communism in an effort to obtain relief. We know, and they will eventually find out, no real or continuing relief can be obtained through communistic sources; yet, for the time being, they do receive military aid in their struggle. If France had extended to them the treatment they were entitled to have, the present situation would not have been created.

I am of the opinion that the influence of America should be utilized to awaken France to its obligation of fair treatment to the people of Indochina.

If the people of Indochina were given their freedom quickly enough, I believe there is a good possibility they would turn against the Communists so fast that it would leave no doubt of their preference for free government rather than one dominated by communism and under the influence of Soviet Russia.

We cannot overlook the fact that there is today a surge among the downtrodden people of the world for freedom. Great Britain was forced to recognize it. In consequence, it withdrew from India and Pakistan. In Indonesia, Holland was forced to recognize, after centuries of rule in that area, the demand for freedom. And it withdrew. France must likewise give recognition to this spirit of freeedom. And it should do so before the whole of Indochina comes under communistic rule.

It is the duty of America—as the ideal of freedom, liberty, and justice—to demand that France shall give recognition to the ideals of freedom in Indochina.

It is not the duty of America, as I see it, to send our boys to be sacrified in the jungles of Indochina to uphold a colonial system that has been recognized for years as unjust and cruel.

Already our country has paid dearly in sacrificed lives in World War I, World War II, and Korea to uphold principles of liberty and freedom, and it is not in accord with our high ideals that our boys should be sacrificed in far-off Asia to uphold a decadent colonial policy that has meant hardship and injustice to a downtrodden people.

Communism in Guatemala

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 25, 1954

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, the problem of communism in Guatemala can no longer be brushed aside as inconsequential by the United States. It is a serious matter and one which deserves immediate attention and decisive action by the State Department and the administration. In the past few days, a number of well-written articles and editorials on this subject have appeared in the Washington newspapers. Under the unanimous consent of my colleagues, I include one of these in the Appendix, and I recommend that it be read carefully:

We're the Chief Buyer and Supplier—Economic Sanctions by United States Could Ruin Guatemalan Reds

(By Andrew Tully)

Pro-Red Guatemala's economy could be wrecked by its neighbors in the Western Hemisphere—but don't hang by your thumbs waiting for that.

The method would be economic sanctions, which could be imposed by the Organization of American States (OAS) in reprisal for the recent Communist shipment of arms to Guatemala's Communist-dominated Government. Such a move would so cripple Guatemala economically that the overthrow of the Guatemalan Government would be virtually inevitable.

The catch, however, is that the sanctions would be pretty much of a one-country show by the United States, since Uncle Sam is both Guatemala's best customer and its biggest supplier. And diplomatic experts hereabouts say that Latin American countries would be unwilling to set a precedent whereby the colossus of the north was permitted to put economic pressure on any of its neighbors.

OTHERS WARY

An indication of the wariness with which the problem is being regarded by the OAS is the fact the organization held a meeting yesterday and Guatemala wasn't even mentioned. And a check of the embassies of Brazil, Chile and Peru showed little interest on the part of three of the four biggest South American states in such a program. Argentina, the fourth of the Big Four, undoubtedly would oppose any move that seemed to permit the United States to wield a club over a Latin American country.

The legal grounds on which such sanctions could be imposed by the OAS on Guatemala would be that the Communist arms shipment constituted a threat to hemisphere security under the terms of the treaty of Rio de Janeiro. The Rio pact calls for action to meet any fact or situation that might endanger the peace of America.

Indications from State Department sources are that the United States would try to play a sideline role in any move to impose sanctions, leaving it up to the other members to decide what should be done. It is possible the United States might even abstain from voting, on the ground it is too heavily involved in Guatemala's foreign trade.

THE TRADE FIGURES

Last year Guatemala exported $68,145,000 worth of goods to the United States, including 85 percent of its coffee, which is its principal export. The total also included about $9,000,000 worth of bananas.

In return, Guatemala bought $51,307,000 worth of goods from the United States—accounting for 80 percent of its imports. The most sensitive item here is gasoline, which Guatemala buys from the United States and, in a much smaller quantity, from Venezuela. Cutting off Guatemala's gasoline supply would cripple the country's transportation system.

The ban on United States importation of Guatemalan coffee would have no appreciable effect here, since Guatemalan beans account for only about 10 percent of United States coffee imports. This could be made up by increased purchases of the Guatemalan-type highland coffee in such countries as El Salvador and Colombia.

Thus, on the surface, it would appear that economic sanctions would be just what the doctor ordered if the OAS is really worried about Guatemala's position as Communist headquarters in the Western Hemisphere. But few in diplomatic quarters feel the United States has enough influence among its neighbors to push it through.

Federal Social Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 25, 1954

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, according to reports, the House Ways and Means Committee, in executive session, has approved compulsory coverage of lawyers, doctors, and other groups under the old-age and survivors insurance program of social security. What is more, I have been told we can expect a rule which would not allow any amendment to the bill on the House floor.

I want to say I hope the mandatory provision will be reconsidered by the Ways and Means Committee.

If not, I certainly hope the Rules Committee will not see fit to bring the bill in with a closed rule.

The majority of the doctors and, I think, the lawyers too of this Nation and certainly of my district do not want to be forced to come under the social-security program. I do not think the professions should be so conscripted.

I support fully liberalized benefits under social security, but I think the members of this body under a closed rule would be put into a position of either voting in part against what they believe in, or in part for what they do not believe in, and I do not think that is right. It certainly puts a Member of Congress in a painful position.

If the worst comes to the worst I trust any motion to recommit will direct the committee to report the bill back with inclusion of the medical and legal self-employed on a purely voluntary basis. But of course it would be far more desirable if the Ways and Means Committee did away with the mandatory provision.

One of the original objectives of old-age and survivors insurance was to encourage retirement of senior citizens to make way for younger ones. Certainly with the present shortage of doctors which will continue for the foreseeable future we do not want members of the medical profession encouraged to give up active practice. As a matter of fact doctors rarely retire on account of age—mostly they limit their practice to a less arduous schedule.

Above all, however, I feel that physicians, dentists, and the professional self-employed should have freedom of choice to decide individually if they desire to be included under Federal social security. I strongly favor a voluntary provision just as I vigorously support a liberalized benefit program for all who are under social security.

Auto Industry Conforms to Pattern of Monopoly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. S. J. CRUMPACKER, JR.
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 25, 1954

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago I introduced a resolution in Congress—House Joint Resolution 484—calling for an investigation of competitive practices in the auto industry and their relationship to what appears to be a rapidly developing trend toward a monopoly in this field.

As stated in my resolution, the purpose of this investigation would be to determine, first, the extent of concentration of control and of monopoly in the manufacturing, warehousing, distribution, and sale of automobiles, including the methods and devices used by manufacturers for increasing their share of the total market, and the extent, if any, to which fraudulent, dishonest, unfair, and injurious methods are employed, including combinations, monopolies, price cutting, or unfair trade practices; second, the extent to which any of the antitrust laws of the United States are being violated; third, what changes, if any, may be required in existing antitrust laws to cope with undesirable practices which may have arisen in the automotive industry.

I have been most gratified with the reaction to my proposal both from within the auto industry and among responsible Government officials. One of these officials is the Attorney General of the United States who, in a recent speech, expressed grave concern over increasing concentration in this field and announced that the Justice Department is looking into several aspects of the problem.

In this connection, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the Record, I should like to include a newspaper column by Ed. Wimmer which appeared in the Cincinnati, Ohio, Enquirer on May 17, 1954. Mr. Wimmer is president of the Forward America Publishing Guild and vice president of the National Federation of Independent Business.

Mr. Wimmer has been campaigning against monopolistic forces for years and is particularly concerned by the threat they represent to independent businesses. His comments on the case of the Government versus the big automobile manufacturers follow:

AUTO INDUSTRY CONFORMS TO PATTERN OF MONOPOLY—BROWNELL DEFENDED

(By Ed. Wimmer)

Vigorous objections to the Kaiser-Willys merger were voiced in this column when the deal was in the rumor stage, and we took every action within our means to prevent the Nash-Hudson merger immediately after it was discussed in the press.

We based our objections on the grounds that such mergers were in violation of the antitrust laws; that they were against the public interest; that dealers and workers would suffer eventual loss of franchise and employment; that suppliers serving the independents would, in many cases, be cut off, and that within a few years the merged companies would be in worse trouble than they were before they merged. We asked for a thorough investigation of the whole industry to find out why the independents are moving out of the auto picture, and why auto men are predicting no independents in the future.

When Attorney General Brownell later announced an investigation would be made, he listed virtually all our complaints and recommendations, and voiced the same philosophical reasoning that we had put behind our request. Mr. Brownell (who hates witch hunts and is far from being an extremist on the monopoly issue) said:

"It is the American philosophy that freedom and progress are best served by multiple centers of activity rather than by undue concentration of power. * * * If economic progress is to continue and our prosperity maintained, the business world and your Government must be ever vigilant to seek out and halt those who, due to personal greed, falsely believe that progress can be maintained only through elimination of competition."

Here we have a clear-cut statement that freedom and progress are best served when competitors are being multiplied instead of subtracted. Yet, in almost every line of business, whether it is brewers, oil jobbers, grocers, bankers, coal mines, meat packers, or chicken farms, the bigs are getting bigger and the smalls are getting fewer, despite a population increase of an Omaha a month.

Since real trouble in the auto industry became apparent, suggestions have been made that the independents standardize frames, bodies, accessories, transmissions, etc., and buy up a few more of their suppliers. In other words, pursue the domestic cartel pattern of the giants and destroy more hatcheries of new ideas. Throw more workers out of jobs. Close down some more factories, and be less competitive.

In contrast to this uneconomic, dangerous conforming to monopoly patterns, we have urged a complete overhauling of the tax structure as it affects the independents: A divorcement of Du Pont control over General Motors; separation of General Motors from control of such corporations as Frigidaire; divorcement of General Motors from its giant financing company, and complete independence for all dealers handling any make of motorcar. We believe that if such a program is carried out in all fields, where merger and consolidation has taken place on a wide scale, that steps could be taken to decentralize the giant labor unions which are needed to deal with a giant business; after which a decentralization of our huge and unwieldy Federal Government would be possible.

We have seen, in the last year, what can happen to an industry when two giants start fighting it out for leadership. The independents went into red ink and merger. Auto dealers staggered under thousands of cars they did not want and could not sell at a profit. Price cutters demoralized whole markets, and the general public lost all sense of motorcar values. Even the guy who got $1,500 for a $500 car won't come up a winner (unless Mr. Brownell is a winner), because you cannot bring such chaos to an industry as important as the auto industry, without everyone getting hurt.

Regarding Mr. Brownell, we can safely predict that he and his antitrust department are in for plenty of uninformed criticism.

American Troops for Indochina?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NOAH M. MASON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 25, 1954

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, General MacArthur, in an address to Congress, and also in his testimony before the House Armed Services Committee, made the following emphatic statement:

> No man in his right mind would advocate sending American ground forces into continental China. It would be utterly reckless and foolish for the United States to even consider it * * *. Anybody who commits the land power of the United States on the continent of Asia ought to have his head examined.

General MacArthur made the above statement in 1951 when we were at war with Red China in Korea, and when he was urging a fight to win. MacArthur favored the use of our air and naval forces, and the use of Chiang Kai-shek's Army, in his plan to carry the fight to the enemy.

General MacArthur is one of the greatest military experts of all time. If we had followed his advice the war in Asia would have been won. We did not do so, and now our leaders say they are seriously considering sending ground troops into the jungles and morasses of Indochina. If it were master folly in connection with the Korean war, it would be doubly so today in connection with Indochina.

Mr. Speaker, the following explanation by David Lawrence of the attitude of Soviet Russia today as shown at Geneva and elsewhere, is so clear and reasonable that I include the same as a part of these remarks:

[From U. S. News & World Report of May 28, 1954]

WHY ARE THE COMMUNISTS DEFIANT?

(By David Lawrence)

The issue of peace or war for the world is wrapped up in the answer to this question: "What makes the Communist defiant?" It is but another way of asking what is the source of the intransigeance which they have exhibited at the Geneva Conference.

The attitude of the Communist negotiators at every conference or discussion or negotiation since 1945 has been in the main the same. Minor concessions on inconsequential matters have been made, but these serve only to emphasize what has not been conceded.

Some consciousness of strength must actuate the Communists to express publicly their contempt for the western nations and to carry on simultaneously their steady encroachmen on the smaller countries of the free world. What is back of it all?

Winston Churchill said repeatedly during the years immediately after World War II that it was our possession of the atomic bomb which deterred the Soviets from starting a third world war. Military men, inside and outside of government in America and Europe, said that, by refusing to demobilize her armies in Europe, Soviet Russia achieved a potential superiority. This presumably enabled the Communists to act with arrogance. But nevertheless this continued after the democracies began, through NATO and other steps, to reinforce their military position in Europe.

Within the last 5 years the Soviets have exploded an atom bomb and conducted tests of the hydrogen bomb. There is every reason to believe that we have a numerical superiority in atomic weapons. But still the Soviets show no signs of reasonableness in any negotiations on any issue of real importance. Such an adamant attitude can be rationalized only on the theory that the Soviets feel, if a war broke out, they could win.

What is the basis for such confidence? It must be that they are sure we will not throw the first bomb, and there may be good reasons why they themselves plan never to throw one either. Given a conventional set-up in a military sense, therefore, the western countries are at a serious disadvantage. They do not have enough manpower in Europe to defend themselves against the numerically greater number of divisions in the Red Army. It is asserted again and again that our side will use all weapons in our arsenal, but the Soviets probably do not believe it.

The Communists, moreover, may be assuming that America is not going to be able to launch any bombs from bases in Britain or France because of the prospect that "neutralist" countries will stay the hand of any British or French Cabinet which might be asked to sanction such a step. The British and French peoples are fearful that America may engage in atomic warfare and involve them unnecessarily.

The biggest source of reliance for the Soviets must be the conviction that the democracies will surrender area after area without a fight—that they will give in to almost any demand rather than risk the fury of another world war. The Communists are encouraged in this belief by the disunity of the Allies and by their hesitancy to face facts.

Just as Hitler was convinced that Britain and France wouldn't wage an all-out war in 1939 and that he could add Poland to his list of conquered countries, so the Soviets, looking about in Asia as well as Europe, see the extent of their own influence widening all the time without any really serious resistance. Our stand in Korea would have been impressive if we had allowed our Air Force to bomb bases in Manchuria and to destroy the lines of supply from China to Korea and if our Navy had been allowed to blockade the China coast, as our Joint Chiefs of Staff recommended. But our European allies vetoed that plan in the autumn of 1950.

So the Soviet rulers are playing here the same game that Hitler played and that, to a somewhat lesser extent, the Japanese war lords played in their negotiations with us in the summer and autumn of 1941. The Communists lead from strength and they will continue to do so until the western countries have a plan for united action that looks militarily as if it could be effective whenever the challenge comes. As Secretary of State Dulles says, we must be ready to take the risks of peace or we will find ourselves in war.

There is no substitute for military strength when dealing with a ruthless and intransigent foe. The test is here now in the Indochina situation. The peoples of Soviet Russia and the satellite states will be emboldened to throw off the Communist yoke only if they are sure we are strong enough to checkmate the Kremlin's army.

Moral force—the attempt to win away the peoples of Soviet Russia and China from the Moscow clique and the Peiping clique, respectively—must go hand in hand with the buildup of our military power in Europe and Asia. Then, and only then, will it be possible for international conferences to succeed in settling disputes between the East and the West.

Antidepression Act of 1954

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS B. HELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 25, 1954

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill in the House of Representatives today entitled the "Antidepression Act of 1954." This bill is aimed to strengthen the American economy so that this Nation can weather any economic storms or a severe depression that may be looming on the horizon.

Let me say at the very outset that I do not belong to that category of pessimists which prefers to view life through dark glasses, but at the same time I do not wish to look at life only through rose-colored glasses. I choose to be realistic. I have utmost confidence in the American way of life and in our economic foundations. It is for this very reason that I am firmly convinced we must ever be alert to maintain and to protect our economic defenses, as we do in the case of our military defenses.

In March of this year, when headlines across this Nation continued to paint a grim picture of mounting joblessness, I discussed the unemployment situation in an address in this House. I stated then that the situation pointed to a steady drift toward economic depression, unless effective means were taken to deal with this situation and I indicated at the time what some of these steps should be. I said:

> Now is the time to come forward with an effective program to deal with this problem before the drift swells into a deluge and inundates the entire Nation. Such program should include steps to strengthen the unemployment-insurance system, broaden the social security system, increase the minimum wage, extend tax reduction to the low-income people and the great mass of consumers instead of big business, undertake a huge housing program designed for low- and middle-income families, as well as a large-scale program of public works, new schools, good roads, and similar projects from which the people would benefit.

Mr. Speaker, since making those remarks on March 4 of this year I have given the matter a good deal of thought. Many people have approached me, personally and in writing, urging me to expand on the general thought, to spell it out in more specific terms, and to incorporate it into a bill which could serve as an effective program to bolster our economy. This I have now done. I call my bill the Antidepression Act of 1954, because its main purpose is to suggest a program of action now which could prevent a depression tomorrow.

In other words, the steps which I am proposing in my antidepression bill may be regarded as being in the nature of a blueprint for action to strengthen our economic system through a series of corrective measures which will help to maintain full employment, broader economic protection, expansion of our purchasing power, and the continuation of a high standard of living. This is not to be regarded, however, as a definitive blueprint for action, but rather as an initial program to reverse the present drift toward depression.

Let us not be fooled by the juggling of unemployment figures or the occasional statements by administration spokesmen that the worst is over and the current recession will soon disappear. At best, the reported improvements are slight, seasonal, and therefore temporary. As late as the end of April, a well-known columnist in one of our great newspapers stated that a nationwide buyers' strike is now taking place in the United States and that the length of the present recession depends on the length of that strike. Statistics show, he said, that the public is holding back on purchases waiting for lower prices; if this mood of consumer resistance continues for a length of time the recession could get lots worse.

In recent months unemployment reached the figure of 4 million, which is the highest total in the last 4 years. If by next fall or winter it goes up to 5 or 6 million, as some predict, then we shall really be in the throes of a serious depression. Are we prepared to cope with such a situation? Does the administration have a program of action to prevent a deterioration of our economic foundations? Can we afford to sit back and wait for economic chaos to overtake without initiating effective means to stave off a catastrophe?

Remedial legislation is urgent at this time, and my antidepression bill is designed to provide exactly that type of legislation. My bill seeks "to strengthen the unemployment insurance system, broaden social security, increase the minimum wage, extend tax reduction to low-income groups, provide for low-rent housing, and establish a program of public works." It incorporates exactly the very suggestions I made last March in my address, and now I have developed the whole idea into a bill.

Mr. Speaker, I shall now describe each of the major provisions of my bill and, where possible, present a brief analysis of these provisions:

1. UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

The unemployment insurance system should be strengthened and extended so as to provide wider coverage of unemployed workers. Section 2 of my bill seeks to extend unemployment insurance coverage by amending the Internal Revenue Code to include a larger class of employers liable to pay the tax for this purpose. At present, the unemployment insurance provisions of the law restrict the tax liability to employers of 8 or more employees in each of 20 weeks during the taxable year. I propose to change this provision to apply to all employers who have one or more individuals in their employment. It should be noted that because of provisions in the Federal law extending credits against Federal tax for payments made by employers of State unemployment taxes, my amendment will serve to induce States to increase the coverage of their unemployment insurance laws. Undoubtedly millions of workers would be benefited by this improvement in our unemployment insurance system.

2. SOCIAL-SECURITY BENEFITS

Broadening of the social-security system and extension of these benefits are prescribed in several sections in my bill, as follows:

Section 3 increases the minimum monthly benefit payable under social security, from the present minimum of $25 to a minimum of $40 each month.

Section 4 amends the so-called work clause in the Social Security Act which at the present time limits the amount of monthly earnings to $75. Under this section, I propose to allow beneficiaries to earn up to $100 per month without loss of benefits.

Section 5 seeks to lower the age of retirement under the Social Security Act from 65 to 60 years.

Section 6 deals with expanded coverage under the social-security system to include many millions of Americans who are not now eligible to these benefits. It seeks to extend coverage to some 10 million persons, employees and self-employed, including State and local government employees, agricultural and domestic workers, professionals and others who are self-employed—in fact, everyone who works for a living should be entitled to enjoy these benefits in their old age.

3. MINIMUM WAGE

The present minimum wage level of 75 cents per hour is unrealistic under our current high cost of living. Section 8 of my bill proposes to raise the national minimum wage from 75 cents to $1 an hour. In so doing, we shall make it possible to increase the purchasing power of millions of wage earners and thus directly contribute toward the welfare of our economy as a whole.

4. INCOME-TAX EXEMPTIONS

This proposal is a definite anti-depression measure aimed directly to aid the low- and middle-income groups. Section 9 of my bill provides for increasing the income-tax exemptions for the taxpayer and his dependents, as well as for the blind and the aged, from the present $600 per year to $800. This will provide added income for each family and will undoubtedly stimulate greater consumption and improve business and production.

5. LOW-RENT HOUSING

Lack of adequate housing and the need for slum clearance constitute ever-growing problems. Expanded construction to meet the great housing need would not only help to keep our economy healthy, but would also prove beneficial in meeting some of our social, moral, and health problems arising from slums and the lack of adequate housing. Section 10 of my bill provides authority for the Public Housing Administration to authorize the construction of low-rent housing units under the Housing Act of 1937. At the present time, the administration can authorize the construction of no more than 35,000 units per year because of the limitations placed by Congress in the appropriation bills. My bill proposes to override these limitations by authorizing the construction of 100,000 housing units per year for the next 4 years, or a total of 400,000 units.

6. PUBLIC-WORKS PROGRAM

One of the most effective ways to combat a depression, as we have already learned from experience during the 1930's, was through the adoption of a broad public works program. In this program should be included the construction of more schools and playgrounds, hospitals, and nursing homes, roads and highways to cope with present day traffic, irrigation and forestation projects, dams, and hydroelectric stations, and similar public works which would provide greater employment and valuable national assets. My bill provides that Congress should appropriate the sum of $3 billion to assist States and municipalities throughout the United States to undertake such public works projects in their localities with the approval of the Federal Government. This is covered under section 11 of my bill.

Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that adoption of the kind of a program suggested above would prove most effective in bolstering our national economy and stave off a depression. These are antidepression measures which should be applied now. It is a stitch in time. Let us use it while we still have the opportunity to save our economy, and not wait until the process of deterioration has made heavy inroads.

The President and Congress Have an Enormous Chore Cut Out for Them

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES R. HOWELL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 25, 1954

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, Congress has a long, hard row to plow in consideration of the President's legislative program. The record in this regard to date is not impressive.

In the words of the Trenton Times, Trenton, N. J., in an editorial of May 2, 1954:

The President and the Congress have an enormous chore cut out for them if they hope to rescue the record during the little time remaining for constructive accomplishment.

I include the full Trenton Times editorial entitled "A Laggard Congress," in the Record:

A LAGGARD CONGRESS

President Eisenhower, according to Washington reports, intends to wage a vigorous campaign by televison, radio, and travel to elect a Republican Congress in November.

Apart from considerations of partisan loyalty, why should the President turn a hand or utter a word for the election of a Republican Congress? What have the Republicans in Congress done to justify his support? In fact, without the help given by Democrats, the President's program would be an utter failure.

Now approximately half the last session of Congress is over. Only 3 or 4 months remain before adjournment. A frank appraisal of the score for Mr. Eisenhower's recommendations shows that the Republican majority in Congress is dragging its feet.

According to the Congressional Quarterly, of the 214 recommendations made by the President, 5 have become law, 1 has been finally rejected, 60 have been passed by 1 House, 36 have been reported favorably from committee, 54 have had committee hearings, and 19 have implementing bills pending in committee.

As of now, the time and attention of Congressmen are being pre-empted by the McCarthy-Army-Cohn-Shine imbroglio and the FHA investigation.

The President months ago laid down the principle that the Republican Party should continue in power only so long as its performance justified the confidence of the people. The President and Congress have an enormous chore cut out for them if they hope to rescue the record during the little time remaining for constructive accomplishment.

Security and the Middle East: The Problem and Its Solution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1954

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, a very distinguished and outstanding group of Americans have just prepared a very complete study entitled "Security and the Middle East: The Problem and Its Solution." It has just been submitted to President Eisenhower. The committee consisted of the following:

Dr. Henry A. Atkinson, general secretary, the Church Peace Union; Margaret Culkin Banning; Frank W. Buxton, former member, Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry; Dr. Donald B. Cloward, executive secretary, council on Christian social progress, the American Baptist Convention; Dr. Frederick May Eliot, president, American Unitarian Association; Rt. Rev. Charles K. Gilbert, retired, Episcopal bishop of New York; Rt. Rev. Henry W. Hobson, Episcopal bishop of southern Ohio; Very Rev. Ivan Lee Holt, Methodist bishop of Missouri; Howard Mumford Jones, professor of English, Harvard University; Freda Kirchwey, president, the Nation Associates; Dr. John A. Mackay, president, Princeton Theological Seminary; Dr. Arthur C. McGiffert, Jr., president, Chicago Theological Seminary; James G. Patton, president, National Farmers Union; Louis H. Pink, chairman, Citizens Conference for International Economic Union; Jacob Potofsky, president, Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, and chairman, International Committee, CIO; Dr. Russell H. Stafford, president, the Hartford Seminary Foundation; Bishop I. D. Warner, president, the Board of Bishops, the Evangelical United Brethren Church; Very Rev. Hazen G. Werner, resident bishop, the Methodist Church, Ohio area; Hon. James H. Wolfe, chief justice, Supreme Court of Utah.

Mr. Speaker, I quote but two pages from that excellent study:

IS ISRAEL A THREAT TO THE ARAB AREA?

Isreal is a danger to the Arab world—to its stagnation, to its human degradation, to the greed of its governing classes.

What the Arab governments fear is conquest—not by arms—but by example.

Israel is an inseparable part of the Middle East, surrounded by Egypt, Lebanon, Syria, and Jordan—the land link between Egypt and the remainder of the Arab world.

Among the depressed populations of these countries, as well as among their governments, there is awareness of the difference between what Isreal, by plan and sacrifice, has accomplished in 5 years and their own backwardness.

The infiltration of the concept that government is for the benefit of the people is a major threat to the Arab governments.

For the fact is that in 5 years, Israel has established the only democratic and stable government in the area; the only modern army; has had the courage to invite and rehabilitate 820,000 refugees; has searched for, found, and begun to develop resources lying buried for centuries to supplement the slender patrimony of its 8,100 square miles.

This dynamism and example is an obvious challenge to its depressed neighbors.

CONCLUSION

In the absence of a permanent settlement, border incidents with loss of life have sharply increased on the frontiers between the Arab States and Israel. Moreover, Arab marauding has, from time to time, evoked retaliation in kind from the Israel side. This chain of violence and retaliation is producing a high-voltage tension; while the armistice machinery after 5 years has lost its deterrent capacity.

It is the responsibility of the Arab governments to prevent violence. And it is no less the function of the Israel Government to oppose retaliation, if it does not wish to compromise its moral credit in the democratic world. Nor is it realistic to assume that this border violence can be maintained in status quo. The situation will either degenerate into larger chaos—or it can be made to progress toward harmony between the Arab world and Israel.

The situation with its dangerous overtones places a clear responsibility on the democratic world. It is to bring about discussions looking to peace between the Arab States and Israel at the earliest possible moment.

Both the Arab States and Israel need peace.

To the Arab people, peace offers their first real opportunity to reap the benefits which their ample natural resources, once developed, can give them by way of food and health, freedom from poverty and oppression, and to create for themselves a future as illustrious as their past.

To Israel, peace promises the release of its physical and financial energies to transform a poor country into one offering an abundant life to its people, living in amity with their neighbors.

A new war between the Arab States and Israel can only accelerate violent internal revolt, produce chaos, beneficial to no one—except perhaps to the enemies of freedom.

In the absence of regional peace, the grant of military aid to any of the governments of the Arab league is to help provoke that chaos.

The democratic world cannot afford to endanger either its only certain loyal ally—Israel—or its potential allies, the suffering peoples of the Arab world.

The democratic world can build its security firmly only when it has mobilized its resources to secure peace and the development of the region for the benefit of its peoples.

Grazing Land Bill Gains Support

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEE METCALF
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 6, 1954

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, the May 24 issue of the American Farm Bureau newsletter contains the following item:

GRAZING LAND BILL GAINS SUPPORT

Opposition to the grazing land bill (H. R. 6787) is disappearing and support for its enactment is growing as understanding of its provisions becomes more widespread, the American Farm Bureau Federation told Congress last week.

In a letter to Congressman CLIFFORD R. HOPE, Republican, of Kansas, chairman of the House Agriculture Committee, AFBF said that "it is our conviction that the enactment of H. R. 6787 will significantly improve the use and management of Forest Service lands."

"The game and fish commissioners of the 11 Western States recently went on record unanimously favoring approval of the bill," the letter pointed out. "The National Wildlife Federation at a recent meeting also recommended the enactment of the bill in the form approved by the Senate."

"We hope it will be possible for the House Agriculture Committee to give early and favorable consideration to the bill," AFBF concluded.

Far from disappearing, the opposition to H. R. 6787 is growing. The National Wildlife Federation still opposes H. R. 6787 in its present form. The National Wildlife Federation withdrew its objections to S. 2548, the companion bill in the Senate, after it was extensively amended, including an amendment providing for a multiple-use advisory board in administration of forest lands.

But, except for the National Wildlife Federation, all the other wildlife and conservation groups continue to oppose both bills even with the Senate amendments.

Some of the objections to the bill are contained in the following recent statement by the Emergency Committee on National Resources:

These comments refer to the bill passed by the Senate. They are based on the intrinsic merits (or lack of them) of the bill, and without reference to such, if any, political or other circumstances as may be involved.

They are not critical of Senator AIKEN and Congressman HOPE (who introduced the companion bill) who long record of deep interest and support for forest conservation is well known. But they do reflect our belief that there are aspects of this proposal which, notwithstanding a great deal of study, have not received adequate consideration.

We believe the proposal is unwise and undesirable for reasons we shall give later on.

The general purpose of the bill as stated in the title is "to facilitate the administration of national forests and other lands under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Agriculture; to provide for the orderly use, improvement, and development thereof; and for other purposes."

The phrase "to stabilize the livestock industry dependent thereon" was deleted but probably remains a general purpose.

Other general purposes stated in the report or by members of the committee on the floor include: To provide incentives to permittees to construct range improvements (which it is said they can do cheaper than the Government); to write into law various features of present Forest Service policy; to improve the method of handling grazing areas; and to place national-forest administration under the rule of law.

Some important provisions of the proposal are summarized as follows:

1. The Secretary is authorized (and by the report expected) to promote and encourage the construction of range improvements by permittees to the maximum practicable extent.

The grazing permittee is assured compensation for his improvements on a depreciated basis (maximum life 20 years) by the Government if he loses their use through governmental action. No other permittee can be allowed to use them until he has compensated the prior permittee on a similar basis. No prior permittee shall be compensated who has abandoned or lost his permit through fault of his own or act of God.

2. Reduction of preference solely on the basis of transfer is prohibited.

3. A new system of appeals is superimposed upon intra-Forest Service appeals from one administrative level to the next higher. This curtails the present flexible authority of the Secretary for the handling of appeals.

With certain exceptions this system of appeals, unlike the provisions about range improvements, is applicable to any action or decision with respect to any land occupancy or use. This is understood to include, for example, the whole gamut of timber management and sale activities. The exceptions referred to above are as to reduction or elimination of use for protection of the land, and as to change from one use to another. These would continue to be subject to the present, or such other appeals arranged as the Secretary might prescribe. This new system of appeals involves three levels above the Chief of the Forest Service:

1. Upon written request by the appellant an advisory board of three members will be established to review the matter. One member is to be designated by the Secretary from the Department of Agriculture (Forest Service excepted), and second by the appellant, and the third by the other two members to represent the general public, and who shall be neither a Federal nor State employee. If agreement is not reached on this third member within 30 days he shall be appointed by the district court. Members shall receive per diem and expenses. Hearings shall be held in the State where the matter is located. The board shall give its advice and recommendations to the Secretary who will then make his decision.

2. The appellant may appeal to the Secretary within 60 days after the above decision for a review de novo. Formal hearings, issuance of subpenas, and the taking of depositions by the Secretary or his representative, are authorized. Witnesses shall be paid the same fees and mileage as are witnesses in the district courts.

3. The appellant may appeal from the foregoing decision of the Secretary (under most circumstances) to the district court by petition within 60 days. The court will hear the petition upon the "record of the pleadings, evidence adduced, and proceedings before the Secretary." If the court finds the decision of the Secretary was "arbitrary, capricious, an abuse of discretion, or otherwise not in accordance with the law" it may remand the proceedings to the Secretary with appropriate instructions. It is presumed that these provisions, in effect, spell out the existing right of an aggrieved user to take a case into court, and prevent the court from passing on questions of technical or professional judgment, though what an "abuse of discretion" means that is not encompassed in "capricious" and "arbitrary" is not understood.

4. Establishment by the Secretary, of multiple-purpose advisory councils, is authorized. They are restricted to the consideration of questions of policy. Per diem and expenses are not authorized. In appointing members consideration must be given to recommendations of officers of organizations representing the principal interests concerned.

5. The Secretary's authority to limit or discontinue occupancy and use for the purpose of preventing injury to the lands, and to change the use of land from one use to another, is safeguarded. It is understood, too, that his authority to make distribution reductions is continued, but actions or decisions in relation thereto would be subject to the new system of appeals.

We consider the proposed legislation very unwise because—

1. It is unnecessary. It involves complex legal questions. Obviously it deals with matters of basic policy. How it would work out in years to come cannot be foretold. But we fear it would lead to great difficulties in, and to hampering of preventing effective administration of the national forests.

There has been adequate general legislative authority to enable the Forest Service for nearly half a century to do what is widely regarded as a generally good job of administering the national forests. An important factor in this has been flexible authority to function within certain general congressional legislative policies and provisions. Failures have been due to administrative policies and shortcomings rather than lack of specific legislative prescriptions.

The burden of proof should be upon adopting rather than upon not adopting this far-reaching proposal. The need for it has not been shown so far as we are aware.

2. Closely related to item 1 is the fact that long ago the Supreme Court validated the action of Congress in delegating to the Secretary of Agriculture authority to make rules and regulations governing the occupancy and use of the national forests, which regulations have the force and effect of law. (*U. S.* v. *Grimaud* (220 U. S. 506) and *Light* v. *U. S.* (220 U. S. 523), both 1911). In other words, the administration of the national forests has been pursuant to rule of law these many years, the implication of the committee to the contrary notwithstanding.

3. Further related to item 1 is the fact that the bill would spell into specific law many features of present administrative policy, practice, and authority. For example, it is understood that the Secretary now has authority to enter into substantially the kind of agreements with grazing permittees regarding range improvements that are prescribed by this bill. It may be safe to freeze in specific legislation some of these policies

and practices. Others may need to be modified as circumstances change. It will be much more difficult to obtain revision by legislation than by administrative regulation.

4. The bill is, in part, a special-interest proposal. While it sets up a new-appeals procedure applicable to administrative actions and decisions with respect to all land occupancy and use, it provides special treatment and guaranties only for range improvements. We certainly do not advocate some type of legislative guaranties for other categories of improvements. But we believe that efforts to widen the scope of such provisions are bound to follow, sooner or later.

5. The appeals prescription is much more complicated than present procedure, and restricts unwisely the Secretary's present authority in handling appeals. The makeup of the three-member board might operate to weight it in favor of the appellant. The proposed system could lead to a very burdensome or possibly intolerable load of long-drawn-out appeals in process. This is notwithstanding that a wholesale resort to the courts may be deterred by the fact that the appellant, if not sustained, must pay the costs.

The provisions for the establishment and use of multiple-purpose advisory councils represent undesirable limitation on the Secretary's present authority and practice. Moreover, they might lead to weighting membership in favor of the larger interests and away from the small users.

7. The policy enunciated with respect to range improvements will probably have the effect of minimizing still further the meager funds available to the Forest Service for the construction of range improvements. Public construction of range improvements on the national forests has the advantage of enabling greater flexibility in the management and use of related resources.

Finally the legislation raises two questions of over-riding importance which are discussed in the next two items. The conservation of national forest ranges is a crucial factor in the economy of the United States. They can help to underwrite a healthy, permanent livestock industry with its needed products. And even more important is their function in safeguarding the water supply of every important western irrigation project, and of most western cities. To render these and other services the ranges must be built up and maintained at their highest feasible level of productivity.

8. The first question is whether the enactment would not retard rather than advance conservation of the range resource in the national forests. Building up national forest ranges has been a long-drawn-out and very difficult job, one which is not yet completed. The chief difficulties have come from the opposition of the group of stockmen who have tried to obtain special legislation favorable to them. While the present bill does not meet their demands, we are convinced that the effect of its enactment, with its complex and time-consuming system of appeals, and the likelihood of private investments on problem ranges, and the provisions regarding administrative procedures would be to retard rather than to facilitate the correction of misuse of the ranges and the making of needed adjustments; and to make administration more cumbersome.

9. The second of these two questions is whether the proposed legislation would not be a definite step toward the establishment of private or vested rights in public property. We do not challenge the assurances that have been given that this proposal of itself would not establish vested interests in national forest lands or in their use. But the establishment of private or vested rights is not necessarily solely a matter of legal language and provisions. They can develop through a process of evolution. Certain intangibles are involved. In the present situation there is, for one thing, the background of demands by the stockmen. Unhappily, we believe the enactment of this bill would help set the stage for progress toward the establishment of such rights. Among the reasons are:

(a) In some degree the bill provides the same legal means for the protection of privileges on the national forests that are customarily provided for the protection of private property and private rights.

(b) The bill would spell into law certain administrative policies and procedures that have hitherto been subject to the Secretary's flexible authority and regulations under more general legislation. In certain respects his authority is definitely curtailed.

(c) This bill, if enacted, may readily become an entering wedge and be followed by even more aggressive efforts by stockmen's and other organizations to obtain objectives which this bill would not satisfy. It may be followed by efforts of other groups to obtain corresponding advantages.

Let us not adopt legislation that would make it more difficult in the long run to maintain range use as a privilege rather than as a private right.

Monopoly Trend in Auto Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. S. J. CRUMPACKER, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 25, 1954

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Speaker, during the past 9 months factory employment has dropped sharply in the four counties comprising the Third Congressional District of Indiana, and unemployment has become a major problem.

Early this year, as a result of a special survey conducted at my request, the Labor Department declared the South Bend employment area, which includes Mishawaka and all of St. Joseph County, to be an area of substantial labor surplus. This status gives manufacturers in the county a better chance at available defense contracts.

Two months later, again as a result of a special survey conducted at my request, La Porte County also was placed in this category.

Unemployment now stands at 8 percent of the labor force in St. Joseph County and 10 percent in La Porte County. The situation in the Third District is far more acute than it is in most areas of the State of Indiana or, for that matter, than it is in the country as a whole. The Third District, though it has only 10 percent of the State's population, has about 20 percent of its unemployment.

What has brought this about? In part it is a natural outgrowth of the end of the shooting war in Korea. But the most spectacular drop in employment in the district cannot be attributed to this. While the general decline in business in the country as a whole, this year as compared with last, has been somewhere around 10 percent, employment at the Studebaker Corp., the district's largest industry, has fallen from something over 23,000 production workers last August to about half that number at the present time. And those still on the employment rolls have been working only every other week rather consistently, so that the dollar payroll has been averaging only about one-fourth of what it was last August.

The economic impact of this is being felt far beyond the city limits of South Bend. Over 15 percent of the people who work in South Bend and Mishawaka factories come from outside of St. Joseph County. Some come from as far as 100 miles away.

DEMAND MADE FOR ANTITRUST INVESTIGATION

Is the automobile business generally depressed this much? Definitely not. The industry as a whole enjoyed its third best first quarter in history. The General Motors Corp. had the best first quarter in its history and is employing 30,000 more people this year than last year. Most divisions of Ford and General Motors have not only worked full time all year but have worked a lot of overtime as well. Sales during the first 3 months of 1954 were down only 6.5 percent as compared with the record levels of last year, which is a better record than many lines of business have made so far this year.

What really is happening in the industry is that a very marked shift in the sales pattern is taking place. Ford and General Motors are grabbing an ever bigger share of the total market, while Chrysler products—Chrysler, De Soto, Dodge, and Plymouth—and those of the independent manufacturers—Studebaker, Nash, Packard, Hudson, and Kaiser-Willys—are rapidly being pushed off the market. During the first 3 months of this year General Motors sales were up 1 percent above the record levels of the first quarter of last year. Ford sales have increased a whopping 26.1 percent over last year. But Chrysler sales have fallen 32.3 percent and the independents have dropped a terrific 55.9 percent. Studebaker, incidentally, is faring far better than the other independents, as their first quarter sales were down only 25.1 percent as compared with last year. But this comparison is colored somewhat by the fact that they were having production difficulties during the first quarter of 1953.

What has brought about this sudden shift in the sales pattern? Ford and General Motors officials—as might be expected—see in it only a public expression of preference for their products. To say that this view is not shared by all the industry is the understatement of the year.

On March 30 I introduced a resolution in Congress calling upon the Federal Trade Commission to make an investigation into competitive practices in the automotive industry to determine just what is bringing about this ever-increasing concentration in the industry. The introduction of this resolution was the culmination of a considerable amount of preparatory work, which included conferences with congressional leaders and members and staff members of the Federal Trade Commission, including a liaison man with the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice.

My resolution, among other things, called upon the FTC to determine if current practices in the industry constituted in any way any violations of the antitrust laws and if any amendments to those laws were needed to cope with the situation. In the speech I made on the floor of the House of Representatives in support of the resolution I charged that a competitive race between Ford and General Motors for leadership in the low-price field was demoralizing the market, and that some of the competitive methods they were using might be in violation of the antitrust laws.

FORD AND GM DENY CHARGES—AUTO DEALERS TAKE OPPOSITE VIEW

Spokesmen for Ford and GM immediately denied that they were engaged in any "production race" and stated that their production schedules were based on orders from their dealers. This last statement may well be technically and literally true in most instances, but the Ford and GM spokesmen failed to say anything about how they obtain these orders from their dealers. Here is the crux of the whole matter. For if dealers are actually ordering only as many cars as they think they can dispose of profitably by ordinary retail methods, then there is indeed no grounds for any charge against these automotive giants. If, on the other hand, dealers are being forced to order cars they do not want, by threats and intimidation—either expressed or implied—and as a result are bootlegging them into used-car channels or selling them at big discounts, then it becomes a horse of a different color.

Just to give you a sampling of the evidence I have accumulated on this point, I would like to quote briefly from a few of the hundreds of letters I have received. From a Dearborn, Mich., car dealer:

> One Ford dealer has 400 cars in stock, one Buick dealer 200.

From a Grand Rapids, Mich., car salesman:

> Why, if no coercion is being used, are Chevrolet dealers in Grand Rapids stocking over 100 cars apiece for total sales in 1 week of only 18 cars?

From a Ford dealer in Iowa:

> I cannot help but comment that the Ford dealers and Mr. Breech, executive vice president of Ford, would not seem to agree on the Ford Co.'s policy.

From a GM dealer in Fort Worth, Tex.:

> The automobile industry is in a mess, and this condition has resulted * * * from the attitude of certain manufacturers who changed their former allotments to quotas for the dealers, regardless of the demand. These manufacturers were working overtime to overproduce, and were forcing this overproduction down the throats of the dealers.

COMPLAINTS TURNED OVER JUSTICE DEPARTMENT

All cases which come to my attention which appear to involve violations of the laws are being turned over to the Department of Justice for investigation. One final quote, from the Greater New York Willys Dealers Association:

> The present war being waged by Ford upon Chevrolet for so-called leadership in sales is absolutely destroying the independent dealers. Ford and Chevrolet dealers who wish to retain their franchises are no longer free citizens of our country, but in truth and in fact are now forced to consider allegiance to their respective factories above loyalty to their country, * * * P. S.—And, damn it, we aren't Communists.

I would like to echo that postscript. Some people have evidently been viewing my activities in this field with suspicion. Many of my friends have asked me how I can charge monopoly and violation of the antitrust laws when obviously a hot competitive race is in progress. There are several explanations for this. In the first place, I have not said that a monopoly already exists. I have merely said that one appears to be developing. A look at business history in this country clearly indicates a standard pattern for the development of monopolies. In a line of business where to begin with there are many small companies, a few begin to get stronger than the rest. The smaller ones are gradually absorbed or driven out of business by the stronger ones until eventually the field is reduced to 2 or 3 giants. These giants then slug it out until they, too, are eventually forced to merge.

This classic example of this pattern is in the express business where originally there were hundreds of small companies—roughly comparable to the numerous regional motortruck concerns of today. After many years of cutthroat competition the field was reduced to two—Adams and Wells-Fargo. Eventually these two were also forced to merge and there has been a monopoly in this field ever since. Of course, it does not always work out that way. In many lines of business there are inherent limiting factors—economics, geographic, or otherwise—that prevent the growth of monopolies. But the automobile business, by its very nature, is peculiarly suceptible to an express-company type of development, and the process is already far advanced today.

JUSTICE DEPARTMENT ANNOUNCES PROBE

The antitrust laws are designed primarily to prevent monopolies, and it is only when a monopoly has already developed that they are invoked to break one up. To say that because there is at present fierce competition in the automotive field there can be no basis for antitrust action is akin to saying that a police officer who witnesses one man beating up another cannot intervene until the second man is killed and a corpse exists as positive proof of wrongdoing. It is much easier to save a company which is still operating than it is to reestablish one which has already gone broke. For this reason the antitrust laws operate on the basis that prevention is far easier than cure.

It is basic to our antitrust laws that price cutting for competitive purposes must be based on sound economic operation—selling at a loss for the sole purpose of driving out weaker competitors is prohibited. If Ford and GM dealers, in any substantial numbers, are being forced to operate at a loss by the production battle being waged by these two giants, then there would seem to be a clear case of antitrust violation.

My concern over this problem is shared by other Government officials. On April 28 Attorney General Brownell said in a New York speech that increasing concentration in the auto industry "contains dangerous potentialities" and announced that the Department of Justice is investigating several different phases of this matter. I have had conferences with Assistant Attorney General Barnes, who is in charge of the Antitrust Division, and with Deputy Attorney General Rogers, in regards to this matter. I also have relayed many complaints from industry sources which are being closely examined by the Department.

In conclusion I would like to reiterate the hope which I expressed in my House speech that the heads of Ford and GM will call off their dog-eat-dog race before further damage is done, and without being forced to do so by legal action. Such action would be long and costly, and not a healthy thing for our greatest industry to become involved in. In the long run these companies cannot but suffer from the continuing disregard by their leaders of the public interest.

American Textiles Are Not in Good Health

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES R. HOWELL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 25, 1954

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, the Nation faces a number of serious economic problems, and high among these is the recession in the textile industry.

The solution to this problem, a truly complex one, demands intensive study. A generally more prosperous economy will solve some, but not all, of these problems.

The dilemma facing those who would resolve this problem has been interestingly discussed in an editorial in the Bergen Evening Record, Hackensack, N. J., on May 4, 1954, which I include in the RECORD:

DYING TEXTILES?

Most of the time we armchair statesmen enjoy the strategic advantage which goes naturally with a forthright assumption of irresponsibility. It is as easy for Mr. Phillips' Mr. Twitchell to denounce Secretary Dulles for the mess American public opinion made of that job in Geneva as it is for Mr. Walter Reuther to notify President Eisenhower that nothing less than full recovery and full employment will do. We can't get the family to agree on these vacation plans of ours, but tell you how we'd handle Russia and the Red Chinese.

Occasionally we are confronted with the necessity to do a little a priori thinking of our own. Emil Rieve, president of the CIO Textile Workers Union of America, raised a question the other day, and it's a question we must answer, here and now. His phrasing will suffice: "It is simply this: Do we want to have a domestic textile industry or not?"

If the United States doesn't find a way to compete in the world textile market with low-wage countries—Mr. Rieve specified Britain and Japan—our textile industry will die. This is his prognosis. There is no evidence it's wrong. Normal employment in the industry is 1¼ million; today it stands at 900,000, and of the 900,000 who have jobs 200,000 are on part time. Unemployment in textiles is Bergen County's only real soft spot; except for that, the recession has passed us by. Now what?

The CIO, true to its Democratic tradition, is against tariff barriers. Mr. Rieve himself said his union knows high tariffs are not the way to bring about prosperity, or, he might have added, a stable world situation. Most of us are committed to free trade; we have come around, as has progressive Republicanism, to the principle of open commercial competition. Nations that can't make a living honestly will go seek their substance and success at the point of a a gun. All this is noted and granted. But American textiles, meaning northern New Jersey (which means Garfield, Lodi, Fair Lawn, Fairview, Paterson), are not in good health.

We'd not have sent Raschi to St. Louis, either, and General de Castries seems to have selected an impossible position in which to defend Dien Bien Phu. But you're writing your Congressman about textile tariffs. What do you say?

One Hundredth Anniversary of the Birth of Andrew Furuseth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. HART

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 25, 1954

Mr. HART. Mr. Speaker, each year the Friends of Andrew Furuseth Legislative Association celebrate the birthday of this great friend of American seamen. It has been my pleasure in former years to include in my extension of remarks tributes that have been paid to the memory of this great man.

This year the celebration of the 100th anniversary of his birth took place on March 12, 1954, and was marked by an address on the life and work of Andrew Furuseth by Silas Blake Axtell, Esq., broadcast over the city of New York municipal broadcasting system, WYNC.

Mr. Axtell was for many years prior to Andrew Furuseth's death associated with him in the great work that he performed. Andrew Furuseth did more for the seamen of the United States than any other man in American history. One of his most notable successes was the adoption of the LaFollette Seamen's Act of 1915. Mr. Axtell tells his story in a very interesting fashion in the speech which follows:

COMMEMORATING THE 100TH BIRTHDAY ANNIVERSARY OF ANDREW FURUSETH, MARCH 12, 1954

Mr. SHELLEY DOBBINS (announcer). As a special feature your city station brings you a talk in commemoration of the centenary of the birth of Andrew Furuseth, pioneer in securing protective legislation for seamen. Here now is Silas Blake Axtell, seaman and counsel for seamen since 1910.

Mr. AXTELL. I knew Andrew Furuseth from 1908 to 1938. As a young lawyer it was my great opportunity to help to draft and assemble the evidence to persuade northerners and southerners—Democrats and Republicans—to pass a law that became necessary after the Supreme Court of the United States in 1897 had formally declared that our great Constitution had not by Lincoln's 13th amendment made it illegal to arrest a seaman who fled a ship to escape slavery, as Andy himself had done.

We are too close to the event to properly appreciate—or compare—the relative work of Lincoln and of Furuseth.

Eight years ago from this microphone, Fiorella LaGuardia, whose own record was phenomenal, said:

"If there is today an American seaman who can retain the dignity of citizenship it is because of Andrew Furuseth."

Speaking of the Norris-La Guardia Act—basis of the Wagner Labor Act that was superseded by Taft-Hartley Act, the mayor made one of the most able arguments of equity jurisprudence that was ever made, and to climax his address he said, "Furuseth was a great soul; he lived to benefit others."

One thousand years hence, when our descendents are living in one world and holidays have been grouped, Washington's Birthday, Lincoln's Birthday may still be observed here in New York, but Furuseth's birthday will be observed all over the world because he was the man who seized time by the forelock and spread the American law and Constitution out to all men and lands through impressing it on the ships and crews that came here—impressed it by a new law, the Seamen's Act of March 4, 1915. Impressed it as a condition of entry. The young lawyears, the old lawyers, Congressmen, the do-gooders of this continent between 1865 and 1915 did nothing. Neither did our judges abolish slavery without another war. Furuseth was the first to prove that the awful suffering of our great Civil War could be avoided. Now due to progress—two great wars that have convulsed the world—we the descendents of the men and women who settled this continent are faced with the duty of spreading the American plan to the people of the world. Our lawyers and judges like our labor leaders have been so intensely busy doing other things that seemed more pressing that they have become confused, but a recent decision indicates that they are coming back to the true course and that the ship of world progress—by adoption of new world law, political philosophy, and means of production and distribution—is not going to be wrecked. You could call it an American revolution. Our great President has assembled a group of our best citizens. We are prepared to defend our institution wherever and whenever necessary. Meanwhile American trade will, with the enforcement of the Seamen's Act, be expanded all over the world on American vessels.

Andrew Furuseth was born just 100 years ago at Romedal, Norway, March 12, 1854.

He arrived in the United States about 1880 and was one of 30 or 40 seamen who met in March 1885 to start the first seamen's union in America.

He eventually became secretary-treasurer of the International Seamen's Union of America, and later its president, when the American Federation of Labor was founded in 1892.

Although thousands of American seamen and lawyers had read our statutes and our Constitution, including the 13th amendment—although they knew that corporal punishment of seamen was allowed by law—that living quarters and food aboard merchant vessels, American and foreign, were unfit for human use—no one had done anything about it.

The growth of the United States has been haphazard, phenominal, great—due, I think, to our Constitution, that guarantees all men equality of opportunity under the law.

The Constitution of the United States and its founders made no mention of slaves. The Civil War that followed the election of Abraham Lincoln nearly broke the United States into two parts—many think that except for Lincoln "slavery" would still exist in America—but many think that some other American would have led us through.

Following the American Revolution the French Revolution had come and gone. Frederick the Great and Bismark the Iron Chancellor had united the quarreling German states. The Russian masses were beginning to move. At the end of World War I the German high command had sent Lenin as a Marxist germacide to Moscow to demoralize the Czar's military forces—we know that as soon as Lenin and his Communists got control in Russia they sent emissaries all over the world to deride capitalism—the system that gave America a chance to grow—and to spread world revolution. They tried hard to use our seamen as carriers of their propaganda—and except for Andrew Furuseth, the great Norwegian born "Abraham Lincoln" of the Sea, they might have succeeded.

In 1897 his union carried the case of *Robertson* v. *Baldwin* (165 U. S. 275) to the Supreme Court of the United States. Four Sailors Union of the Pacific seamen—J. N. Bradley, Robert Robertson, R. H. Olson, and Morris Hanson—went to prison that others might be free. Though Jackson H. Ralston, James G. McGuire and Henry W. Hutton, all great lawyers briefed and argued, the great Court by 8 to 1 decided that the 13th amendment had not made arrest for desertion on the world's merchant vessels unconstitutional. Mr. Justice Harlan alone dissented—in a vigorous and learned opinion.

Andrew Furuseth and the seamen of his International Seamen's Union—with the help of lawyers—continued the battle for freedom. Samuel Gompers and all the voting members of the American Federation of Labor helped—the Seamen's Act was drafted. I was a clerk in the office of the Seamen's Branch of the Legal Aid Society in 1908 when Andrew Furuseth first showed it to me. When I became union attorney, I helped prepare affidavits and petitions—and amendments like section 20 of the Jones Act, to do away with the fellow servant rule as defenses. We provided that all treaties that might interfere with the enforcement of the Seamen's Act should be abrogated. This Seamen's Act improved living conditions, required shower baths and safety, shortened hours of labor. It gave the seamen of foreign-flag vessels the right to sue their employers without cost in the courts of the United States—to enforce their right to half the wages they had earned, on demand in any loading or discharging port, with penalties of 2 for 1.

No young lawyer ever had such an opportunity to serve in great cases; to go to the highest court with less training—but the act stood up—the wages of seamen trebled by 1919.

Then came the lockout of 1921—and Admiral Benson, head of the Maritime Commission, was persuaded to use the great might of the United States Government against the seamen, and they were locked out until 1935, when collective bargaining was renewed.

In 1920 I dedicated a book to Andrew Furuseth: "May his great service to humanity be recognized during his lifetime."

In 1928 I tried to get Columbia University to confer an honorary degree on him—in 1950 I tried again to have it done posthumously.

Andy died January 24, 1938. Senator Robert M. LaFollette, the son of fighting Bob, said:

"Andrew Furuseth was one of the truly great men I have ever known."

As he had requested, Andy was buried in mid-Atlantic, as far from land as possible, on April 21, 1938.

Old Bob LaFollette said of him:

"He knew the Maritime law of every country, the social condition, the wage level, and the economic life of every seafaring nation. He was master of his subject. His mind worked with the precision of a Corliss engine. He was logical, rugged, terse, quaint, and fervid with conviction."

Furuseth taught me that "We, the people" are sovereign. The government and all its officials and employees are public servants, and government exists by the consent of the governed.

Our senior trustee, Hon. William Denman, senior judge of the United States Court of Appeals in the Ninth Circuit, California, from this station on March 12, 1948, said:

"It is with deep regret that I am unable to be with you on the celebration of the birthday of the finest human spirit and the American of greatest individual accomplishment for his fellow man since Lincoln."

Judge John C. Knox, senior United States district judge, southern district of New York, friend of all honest seamen, most highly respected of jurists, spoke over this station March 12, 1947, and said:

"On March 4, 1915, Andrew Furuseth stood in the executive chamber of the White House. At a nearby desk was Woodrow Wilson, the President of the United States. That great man was about to sign the seamen's emancipation proclamation that Congress had passed, and which was to be a boon to sailors all over the world. As the President's pen scratched its way across the bill, Andrew Furuseth fell to his knees, raised his hands in prayer, and then broke into convulsive sobs. He had kept the faith of his belief in right, justice, and humanity; he had fought the good fight, and he had won. Thereupon he rendered thanks to God."

Judge Knox continued:

"Andrew Furuseth well served the merchant marine. In doing as he did he also served the cause of humanity. If the labor leaders of today were possessed of the vision, the integrity, the unselfishness—and if they also had the patriotism that animated Furuseth—this land would be free of the fear by which it is today consumed.

"Furuseth in his tours of union halls, and when he was lecturing the seamen who might be potential delegates and officials, often declared that a labor leader to be successful, useful, and efficient 'should have nothing of his own and want nothing for himself.' Would that our present labor leaders indulged in that self-same thought."

While Judge Knox was under the impression that not all union leaders attain Furuseth's high standard, I testify that during my long acquaintance with union delegates and patrolmen I have known many of the Furuseth type, who enjoyed serving the interests of their fellow man as did old Andy; but since the Nazarene came 2,000 years ago there has been no man in the field of labor who did so much to help his brothers as did Andy. I do mention Morris Weisberger and Harry Lundberg—men of his kind.

Occasionally lawyers, labor leaders, judges, have betrayed their sacred trusts—they are the exceptions. Seamen will repudiate men who try the enforcement of legal rights to gain the compensation ordinarily paid to lawyers.

The success of our Government of the people, by the people, and for the people depends upon the ability of individuals to enjoy that equal opportunity to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness which our Constitution guarantees. This Constitution contemplates that every individual shall be free to contact and will engage the services of a competent lawyer.

One of the results of the Seamen's Act was the freeing of all seamen from bondage. All foreign vessels gave their seamen the right to discharge on 7 days' notice.

And on May 1, 1917, Furuseth sent out a message, as follows:

A CALL TO THE SEA

"*To All Seafaring Men Ashore or Afloat:*

"The Nation that proclaimed your freedom now needs your services. America is at war. Our troops are being transported over the seas. Munitions and supplies are being shipped in ever-increasing quantities to our armies in Europe. The bases are the ports of America. The battlefields are in Europe. The sea intervenes. Over it the men of the sea must sail the supply ships. A great emergency fleet is now being built. Thousands of skilled seamen, seafaring men of all capacities who left the sea in years gone by as a protest against the serfdom from which no flag then offered relief, have now an opportunity to return to their former calling, sail as freemen, and serve our country."

Our American vessels are being transferred now to foreigners and manned by aliens who are imprisoned in Ellis Island—paradoxically under the shadow of the Statue of Liberty—if they stay ashore more than 29 days.

When they ship out they get only 25 percent of the wages that you taxpayers pay through subsidies to American crews. The Seamen's Act has not been enforced, because Congressmen have not provided enough judges to try the cases.

Workmen's compensation (a Communist idea)—security invented by Karl Marx and passed by Bismarck Reichstag in 1879—is just a form of shipowners' limitation of liability. So far seamen have not been forced under it, but the United States Army has a fleet of vessels where there is no collective bargaining, and the men have to sign to take United States employers' workmen's compensation. The Supreme Court itself departed in one case from a century-old rule of uniformity in applying a State compensation act for the benefit of the owner and to the disadvantage of the sailor.

One union funnels its members' personal-injury claims into a legal hopper which grinds out inadequate settlements and a few verdicts; the injured mariners of that group are wondering if their individual rights have become mixed with collective wage-bargaining rights of the able bodied. Little did he think when he wrote the conditional acceptance of the 1929 Safety Treaty, at the age of 82, that the legal system that protects seamen might be endangered by the wonderful welfare plan; $15 a week is paid by one union to anyone who gets sick or is injured on a vessel and it is paid while the seaman is in the hospital. Its only disadvantage is the costs of the big Olds regiment to take the dispenser of funds to visit the men in the hospitals. This, of course, is another insurance company sedative. The national insurance groups, as you probably know, have spent a lot of money to put ads and articles in papers and magazines, the purpose of which is to destroy the jury system itself. Already some of the men on the bench have suggested a universal compensation act—to tax the careful motorist in the interest of the careless motorist.

Our answer to this is to enforce the Seamen's Act, so that foreign-vessel owners will have to pay their workers the high wage that you pay to American seamen.

Specifically, we urge the passage of the Langer bill, S. 1313, which will make the maritime law uniform on the Great Lakes and on salt water, too. We would give seamen injured on foreign-flag vessels and merchant vessels of the United States the right to trial by jury in admiralty actions against the vessel or owner, too.

Now, if you want to help us, please write a letter to President Eisenhower, urging the printing of an Andrew Furuseth stamp on Maritime Day.

Mr. DOBBINS. You have been listening to Silas Blake Axtell in a talk on the life and work of Andrew Furuseth. This has been a special public-service feature of your city station.

Weak Security Links Too Often Result From Careless Neglect of Fundamental Rules and Regulations

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 14, 1954

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I should like to include a very timely essay, written by Dr. James Bernard Kelley, appealing to all of us, and particularly those in sensitive defense positions, to strictly abide by security regulations instead of carelessly ignoring them.

Dr. Kelley is president and director of research of the Physics Research Laboratories, Inc., and he knows whereof he speaks.

The article appeared in the February 20, 1954, issue of the weekly magazine America, and I earnestly believe merits wide reading.

The editorial follows:

WEAK SECURITY LINK: NEGLECT OF RULES

(By Dr. James Bernard Kelley)

There used to be a saying that the best way to get a story published was to tell it to a woman in confidence. It now appears that this method is outmoded, and that the best way to get a secret noised about is to have it classified either secret or top secret. Industrial-security regulations would seem to have been established for the sole purpose of being violated.

Actually, what any of us may think of security regulations as a means of preserving scientific and technical superiority in a world competing madly for military superiority has very little to do with the obeying of these regulations. For better or worse, there are certain regulations—I personally feel that far too much reliance is placed on them as a means of preserving secrecy—and it is not up to individuals to decide for themselves whether or not these regulations should be obeyed.

Present security regulations are based on an Executive order by President Eisenhower, issued on November 6, 1953, which went into effect December 15. This superseded President Truman's Executive order of September 24, 1951. It abolished the former category of "restricted" information, retaining, in ascending order of secrecy, "confidential," "secret," and "top secret." It also prescribed in detail how documents in each of these categories were to be handled and guarded. Since this article deals with the observance of such regulations rather than their precise details, it is not necessary to go into the differences between the two orders any more than that.

Suppose, for brevity, we consider only the "secret" and "top secret" categories of industrial security. In my own experience with these categories I observed the regulations with great exactitude and care—not because I was naturally careful, but because I had little choice to be otherwise. For instance, during my tour of duty in the Navy classified material of the "secret" category frequently came to my attention. This was scientific material and had nothing to do with military affairs. All of us guarded that material with a very strong fear. In fact, we disliked having anything to do with handling such material, so severe could the penalties be if we violated the rules.

All secret material was kept in a combination-locked safe (this was in accordance with regulations). It was delivered from its original source by special messenger and was passed by hand from one authorized person to the next. Top-secret material was always delivered by an armed guard, and none but those whose names appeared on the route sheet were entitled to see a given piece of top-secret material. Generally speaking, we were not overly anxious to have our names on such lists because this meant we would have the responsibility of handling the papers.

A person who was using a secret or top-secret document was not permitted to leave his desk without first locking the document in the desk. If he was to be gone from his desk for some time, the document was supposed to be returned to the person in the unit who was charged with the care and storage of secret and top-secret documents. Such documents were required to be concealed at all times from unauthorized persons—these included those who had the necessary clearance but who were not on the particular distribution list. In other words, however we might feel about the wisdom of classifying a document as secret or top secret, we treated the document with utmost respect, lest we find ourselves on the wrong end of severe disciplinary action, including a possible court-martial.

MORE HONORED IN THE BREACH

But from what has been appearing in the newspapers for the last 7 or 8 years, I should guess that in many Government installations secret documents are carried about with the same care and with approximately the same frequency as one carries a newspaper. There is nothing in the security regulations which provides for carrying secret or top-secret papers home. It is very carefully stated that such papers must be in safes or vaults possessing certain types of locks and that areas where these papers are kept must be guarded either by an armed guard on 24-hour duty or by a centrally controlled burglar-alarm system.

Recently the organization with which I am connected underwent a security check for secret clearance, as did each of the members of the technical staff. The clearance was granted for the personnel. But as far as the physical plant was concerned, no papers may be stored until the facilities are inspected and checked again. The man who made the check spent several hours on the premises and was quite precise about the rules and regulations. Specifically, we were forbidden to remove secret or top-secret documents from the premises unless they were transported in the manner prescribed by regulations and unless they were to be returned to our own plant or stored in another plant which had similar clearance and proper storage facilities.

Yet we have been reading that scientists and engineers were carrying secret documents home with them so they could work on them in the evening. This is absolutely contrary to regulations. While those documents were in the homes of employees they could neither be stored nor guarded in the manner required. A superior who issues passes for such transportation and storage of highly classified documents is giving himself a great deal of latitude in the interpretation of security regulations. If extra work is required which involves secret documents, there is no reason why such work cannot be performed at the facility, either Government or private, which is doing the work and which has been properly cleared.

FORT MONMOUTH

The recent Fort Monmouth experience is an excellent example. The Army Signal Corps Laboratories are located at Fort Monmouth, N. J. At these laboratories much of the highly classified work in the field of electronics is carried on. There are few electronic laboratories in the world to rival those located at Fort Monmouth. Yet we read that despite the dependence of the Army—and for that matter, all the branches of the armed services—on the research and development work being done at Monmouth and the obvious importance of it, dozens of secret documents were carried home on passes "for study." My own experience with secret documents that needed to be used after normal working hours was that these documents could be used and were used on the premises of the Government or industrial establishment, and not in buses, trains, or private automobiles.

All of this had nothing whatsoever to do with the political affiliations of the parties involved. A member of the Republican National Committee was just as guilty if he carted off secret documents as was a member of the Central Committee of the Communist Party. The security regulations with which I am still concerned are not a function of my political beliefs. They are not slightly less stringent for registered Republicans than for registered Democrats or vice versa. They apply to all persons equally, once those persons have been cleared for handling and reading such material.

It is assumed that unreliable persons are detected in the security check which the Federal Bureau of Investigation makes of all persons seeking secret or top-secret clearance. Though a duly appointed security officer of a company or Government agency may clear people—upon the submission of evidence of citizenship—to handle confidential documents, only a formal check through the FBI permits a person to handle secret or top-secret material. Therefore, once a person has been cleared for the two top categories, all violations of security regulations are independent of his own personal reliability, since it must be assumed that this has already been established to the satisfaction of the Government. Such violations must be judged solely in the light of their individual gravity.

Hence, when one reads that scientists are taking papers home for study, the question does not involve the associations, either past or present, of these scientists. It simply raises the query why they were allowed to act in violation of very specific security regulations. The mildest thing one can say is that superiors who issue passes for the promiscuous transportation of secret material are careless and indifferent. Knowing, as they must, that even the best security check in the world may fail to turn up disloyal or doubtful people, they have permitted classified material to be carried about in a manner which at best violates commonsense and at worst violates the law and may endanger national security.

From the Amerasia case in 1945 right down to the latest disclosures, the pattern has been unchanged. Security regulations have been flouted and violated with impunity. The only cases the public hears about are those where possibly disloyal persons are involved. How many thousands of other violations are going on every day? We do not hear of them because the people involved are not turning information over to the agents of foreign governments. If security regulations are a bad bargain at best, they are certainly being made no better by cavalier treatment at the hands of those whose positions carry both authority and responsibility.

It would seem to be time for people to learn that personal objection to a law is not synonymous with the right to violate that law. There are lots of things about scientific security which many of us think are foolish. But as long as the present regulations are on the books, we feel that as responsible citizens we should abide by these regulations carefully and seriously. This very simple procedure—of obeying regulations—could cut down the opportunities which spies and other disloyal persons have for obtaining highly classified information. In too many cases loyal but careless superiors have to share with disloyal employees the blame for breaches of security.

Return of Purchasing Department to Quartermaster Depot at Philadelphia Favorably Received by Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1954

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, the Department of Defense, on May 3, 1954, gave notice that, as a result of a careful study and survey made by the Department of the Army through the Quartermaster General, it was determined that it would promote economy and efficiency and be to the best interests of the Army if the purchasing department, presently conducted in New York City, should be brought under one roof with all the other related activities being conducted at the Philadelphia Quartermaster Depot. The saving to result from this change was expected to be not less than $700,000. Additional surveys since the original one have indicated that the savings may reach as much as $1,250,000.

Notwithstanding the desire of the Department of the Army to save money and promote efficiency in accordance with the program of the President, nevertheless, political influences in New York City have sought to have the Department of the Army ignore the facts in the case that justify the commendable action taken by it and reverse its stand. It is inconceivable that anyone would seek to set at naught merely for political reasons what has been done to promote governmental efficiency and economy. The Army should be commended for its desire to further the President's program.

I include the following communications I have received to indicate the favorable opinion that has been created in business circles with respect to the action of the Army:

PHILADELPHIA WOOL &
TEXTILE ASSOCIATION,
Philadelphia, May 11, 1954.

Hon. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We understand that there has arisen some opposition by New York interests to the announced moving to Philadelphia of the Quartermaster Corps Procurement Agency.

In all cases of removal of installations from one city to another there arises opposition from the city which is losing the agency. This opposition more often than not stems from injury to pride, and the logical reasoning and the economy being effected is disregarded.

The procurement branch of the Quartermaster Corps functioned perfectly in Philadelphia during World War II and for a long time previous and should never have been moved to New York City. The present administration has wisely made a commitment to rectify this error and the decision to do so should not be changed by political pressure and influence.

The reasons for the well-founded decision to move back to Philadelphia are well known to you and should not be changed by considerations which are being presented that are contrary to economy in the Army and against the good of the people.

Under the circumstances we urge that the move to Philadelphia be made without further delay and respectfully solicit your support in this direction.

Respectfully yours,
John C. Heston,
President.

Gibbs Underwear Co.,
Philadelphia, May 13, 1954.

The Honorable Charles A. Wolverton,
United States House of Representatives,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Sir: For many years the Purchasing, Inspecting, and Testing Offices of the Quartermaster Association, now known as the Armed Services Textile and Apparel Procurement Agency, were in Philadelphia.

There certainly can be no criticism of the magnificent job performed during World War II in that location. Furthermore, permanent brick and tile buildings were built during World War II for the particular purposes involved. It should never have been moved to New York following World War II.

From an economic move alone, it will save the country a great deal of money to move it back into this space which is available, and thereby avoid the high leases now being paid in New York City.

The decision was made by the military and publicized that this agency would be moved back to Philadelphia as of July 1. In talking to Gen. Robert Hollis, in charge of this installation, in New York last week, there was no indication that there would be any change in this decision. Since that time, judging by the press, there is being put forth a concerted effort on the part of some trade associations, some employees of the New York office, and the legislators of New York State, even to the extent of using the offices of Governor Dewey, to try to have this decision rescinded. From the press, it would seem that appeals are being made to Secretary Stevens, Secretary Wilson, and President Eisenhower.

There is certainly no justification for some of the claims being made, particularly that trained personnel would not be available in Philadelphia, whereas, as a matter of fact, a considerable percentage of the personnel in New York are looking forward to moving back to Philadelphia. Furthermore, the claim has been made that one of the trade associations backing the effort to rescind this decision is the Underwear Institute. As chairman of the board of the Underwear Institute, I can assure you that the institute has taken no stand either way in regard to this move.

Whereas I have no way of knowing what effect this concerted effort on the part of New York will have on those in charge, the decision having been made and publicized, it might be well, I think, to let it be known to those in a position to change this decision that there is still considerable feeling that the Purchasing Office should return to Philadelphia where it belongs.

Any effort you can make on our behalf will be greatly appreciated.

Very truly yours,
Wesley M. Heilman,
President.

Philadelphia, Pa., *May 13, 1954.*

Congressman Charles A. Wolverton,
Washington, D. C.:

We heartily confirm the return of procurement to the Quartermaster Depot once again back to Philadelphia where an efficient record of many years' standing was developed. Notwithstanding the savings involved the record proves beyond any doubt that an outstanding service to our country both in time of war and in peace has been maintained in this installation. This branch of the United States Army rightfully belongs here.

Philadelphia Textile Salesmen's Association.

On Second Thought

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 20, 1954

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article which appeared in the May 21, 1954, issue of Labor's Daily. I believe it to be most apropos.

On Second Thought

Washington.—It is painful to have to bring the subject up, but it might as well be recognized now as later that there is a religious lobby in Washington which is working to squirt some theology into the law which no one—and very notably the Founding Fathers—ever intended to be there.

The latest effort is a proposed constitutional amendment sponsored by Senator Ralph Flanders, Republican, of Vermont, which declares that "this Nation devoutly recognizes the authority and law of Jesus Christ, Saviour and ruler of nations through whom are bestowed the blessings of Almighty God."

This is before the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee. It is intended not only to rectify the Constitution's failure to recognize God in its text, but to designate a particular, sectarian, evangelical God to be legally recognized.

The Founding Fathers were a good deal closer in time to theocracy than we are today. That is why they were so cautious in the religious allusions they allowed in their public instruments. That is why George Washington wrote the Tripolitan Government that "this is in no sense a Christian country."

NEWSPAPER SLAPS BILL

The Washington Post slaps the Flanders amendment on the ground that it would lead to "endless argument as to what the law of Christ is; today there are scores of Christian denominations that cannot agree in their interpretation of that law."

But that argument misses the point. The fact is that there are millions of citizens in the country who are not Christians nor even believers and have exactly the same rights as the devout against being exiled from identification with their country.

Democracy is not the imposition of uncurbed majority will on a helpless minority. If it were, there would have been no Republicans left to win the 1952 national election. Assurance of minority rights is the major difference between democracy and dictatorship.

The true basis of opposition to the amendment is that nobody has to recognize blessings from on high unless he wants to. And any amendment which tries to coerce him into doing so makes him want to less and less.

RIGHT TO FREE THOUGHT

Jewish groups alone represent more than 5 million American citizens. There are about 3,120,000 stark, cold-turkey freethinkers of adult age and about an equal number in diverse stages and nuances of free thought.

All are entitled to their own world view, their own metaphysical preferences. If they are not, the United States might as well close down; it is out of business.

It is natural that organized Jewish groups are rallying to fight the proposed amendment. It is even more heartening that the American Civil Liberties Union is preparing to intervene. A number of groups committed to separation of church and state are taking alarm.

If it is painful that the issue should have been forced at all, it is even more painful that it brings the spotlight to bear on the fact that there have been powerful religious lobbies in Washington for more than 40 years and they have not always been distinguished for their respect for human rights. The WCTU, the Lord's Day Alliance, and the Prohibition Amendment belong to a package which will be easily recognized.

The position of the wealthy manufacturer-Senator from Springfield, Vt., in all this is rather puzzling. The Green Mountain State is as devout as any, but it is inclined to be literal on matters of tradition and Flanders can hardly be representing local sentiment.

The tradition he is following is probably political. Apparently his number came up. It was his turn to introduce something. It is too bad for his own reputation that it did not turn out to be something else.

Partisan P. S.—Why are the guys who do these things always Republicans?

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized book dealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by book dealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

DISTRIBUTION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

To the Vice President and each Senator 100 copies; to the Secretary and Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, each, 25 copies; to the Secretary, for official use, not to exceed 35 copies; to the Sergeant at Arms, for use on the floor of the Senate, not to exceed 50 copies; to each Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress, 68 copies; to the Clerk, Sergeant at Arms, and Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives, each, 25 copies; to the Clerk, for official use, not to exceed 50 copies; and to the Doorkeeper, for use on the floor of the House of Representatives, not to exceed 75 copies; to the Vice President and each Senator, Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress there shall also be furnished (and shall not be transferable), 3 copies of the daily Record, of which 1 shall be delivered at his residence, 1 at his office, and 1 at the Capitol.

IN

Mr.
to ex
the f
and

Thr
other
servic
might
during
to be
memo
in th
homel
fought
it stan
public
and pe
the fa
drawn
graves
since
hundre
Too
of the
signific
the de
know
erans'
who h
ment c
called,
relate
portanc
Every
will be
women
form.
practice
after th
when so
their ov
ently
buried
and thi
others
last res
had bee
demons
likly th
its ince
three U
lage jus
ing for
her chil
grave o
the ch
gathere
upon t
comrade
it is rel
Carbon
ner to d
veterans
Subst
the spe
Logan,
Mexican

Appendix

Memorial Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1954

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following editorial from the Stars and Stripes, Thursday, May 27, 1954:

IN MEMORY OF THE DEAD

Throughout this country, and in various other places in the world where American servicemen have given their lives that others might live in peace, there will be observed during the coming weekend what has come to be known as Memorial Day. It will commemorate not only the heroes who have died in the preservation and defense of their homeland but also the living who have fought for the ideals and principles for which it stands. Many will be the utterances from public platforms as speakers of every faith and persuasion pay tribute to the brave and the fallen, and varied will be the inferences drawn by speakers as they face hallowed graves and detail the progress of the Nation since it was saved from disunion nearly a hundred years ago.

Too few of our people have a knowledge of the founding of this day of days that is so significant to men who have borne arms in the defense of their country. Not enough know why it came about. Because this veterans' newspaper was founded in 1877 by men who had much to do with the establishment of Decoration Day, as it was formerly called, we deem it especially appropriate to relate in our own way the history and importance of the occasion.

Everywhere, on May 30, Springtime flowers will be strewn upon the graves of men and women who have worn this country's uniform. It has been said by some that the practice began deep in the Southland soon after the Civil War of 1861–65 was over and when some ladies, in honoring the memory of their own fallen, placed floral offerings reverently upon the soft mounds where were buried their own kin while at the same time and thinking in terms of the bereavement of others in the North, likewise decorated the last resting places of deceased "Yankees" who had been interred there. Thoughtful as this demonstration may have been, it is more likly that the general observance first had its inception in Illinois. The story is told of three Union Army veterans in a little village just outside Carbondale who, while waiting for services to begin, saw a woman and her children pause to place flowers upon the grave of their soldier husband and father in the churchyard, whereupon the three also gathered some spring flowers and laid them upon the graves of two of their Civil War comrades who were buried there. The idea, it is related, caught on and on April 29, 1866, Carbondale citizens turned out in like manner to decorate the graves of a score of their veterans in their own cemetery.

Substance is given to this story because the speaker of the day was Gen. John A. Logan, a Carbondale resident, veteran of the Mexican War, former legislator, and Member of Congress, who was returned to Washington in 1867 and, in the same year, was chosen commander in chief of the Grand Army of the Republic, an organization of northern veterans of the Civil War that grew to number nearly 410,000 by 1890 and became one of the greatest political orders of its time. General Logan, always a realist, issued his famous General Order No. 11 on May 5, 1868. In it he called upon his veterans to honor their dead on the 30th of May, when the flowers of springtime were in abundance, and he asked his followers to garland the passionless mounds with the choicest blossoms, to raise above them the flag they saved from dishonor, and to renew their pledges to succor the aging and disabled and their widows and orphans.

It has been our custom to reprint this Logan order each year in our issue nearest to Memorial Day, and it appears this week on another page. Here are found the words of a combat veteran of 2 wars, in 1 of which he led Illinois volunteers through 4 bloody years, the expressions of a statesman who understood the sacrifices endured not only by those who served but also by those who were widowed by those conflicts. He understood well the purposes of his comrades, "who have consented to this union, having aided in maintaining the honor, integrity, and supremacy of the National Government during the late rebellion," when uniting and establishing a permanent association with ideals and objectives not unlike most others that have been organized by veterans of succeeding wars. The text of General Logan's order creating Memorial Day contained all of the passion and deeply patriotic fervor that must have lived within those "who made their breasts a barricade of freedom to a race in chains, and their death a tattoo of rebellious tyranny in arms," and, as the once official spokesman of those warriors of whom only a single member survives, we consider the Logan message a challenge to every man and woman, who has since that day donned this Nation's uniform, to carry on in the tradition then declared.

Ninety-three years have passed since the first hostile shot was fired in the great Civil War on January 9, 1861. Only this month, 89 years since its close, there was a tablet placed in Arlington National Cemetery commemorating the alltime order bringing into being the annual observance of Memorial Day. We have very frequently devoted this column to the appeal General Logan made in 1868, and voiced in part earlier by Abraham Lincoln, to the gratitude of our people to care unerringly for the sick and disabled of our war veterans and to give thoughtful consideration to the needs of their dependents. Four more wars have since been fought by the young men of America, to say nothing of lesser campaigns in which they have been engaged. In the Spanish-American War of 1898, the Philippine Insurrection of 1898–1902, and the 1900 Boxer Uprising, lads of the North and South stood shoulder to shoulder and bound the wounds that separated their fathers. In 1917–18 they and their sons went abroad to stop aggression.

Their sons' sons put a victorious end to another world conflict a generation later and then halted the foe in an effort by Communists to conquer Korea. The flag they upheld was the same one that motivated the saving of our Union. It stands for the same brand of patriotism, for the ideals of our founders, for the rights of man and for exact justice to rich and poor alike and without discrimination based upon color or creed. The sacrifices made by younger generations deserve no less consideration than that given to their forebears and no more regard should be shown to the one dependent than to the other when need arises. It is the creeping forgetfulness of the beneficiaries of sacrifice in war that must be halted, and this should be a thought uppermost in the minds of all citizens as they very properly memorialize the veterans of all our wars on this Decoration Day.

When General Logan cautioned his followers against being forgetful, and even through the period of their greatest spiritual and political strength, this country had not entangled itself in foreign alliances. It was later to free Cuba and the Philippines. It went to the aid of stricken Europe in two destructive wars. It has won the peace in Asia, and it was forced to accept a makeshift appeasement in Korea because of the timidity of allies who owed to it their very existence. Twenty millions of American men fought those wars at fearful cost in life and property. As we now face a new foe in the vast Communist conspiracy, we are bearing 80 percent of the burden of the world's defense against an uninvited onslaught. We face as well the pressures of former allies who cannot agree on what course to pursue in meeting realistically the threat to theirs and our own survival. We approach these Memorial Day observances, therefore, with a feeling that we might better emphasize the teachings of the Grand Army of the Republic to never forget nor neglect those who have borne the battle, to cease following the wake of false prophets who are leading our people into a morass of world involvements, to study more the meaning of our form of government and to think harder in terms of self-preservation. This can be done with justice to all concerned, if we do not wait too long and if we leave to their own deserts selfish demagogs who care not what in the end happens to the United States. The revered Grand Army that is no more sought to inculcate in the minds of our people the three virtues that made this Nation great—love of God, love of home and love of country. Without violating any commitments, either national or international, we would do well to mark the memory of our honored dead by looking more selfishly to our own interests and by doing it with some of the determination that saved the Republic almost a century ago.

The Tennessee Valley Authority

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 20, 1954

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "The TVA Is American: Why Scuttle a Success?" written by Judson King, director of the National Popular Government League, and published on

May 4, 1954, as Bulletin No. 252 of that organization.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE TVA IS AMERICAN: WHY SCUTTLE A SUCCESS?

(By Judson King)

(Regarding six lectures delivered by Gordon R. Clapp, then Chairman of the TVA Board of Directors, at the University of Chicago in February 1954 on the origin, workings, and import of the Tennessee Valley Authority.)

I. TO CLEAR THE AIR

For the past 10 years the electrical industry and its banking, commercial, and other allies has conducted a gigantic propaganda campaign to convince the American people that the TVA is an alien institution, unconstitutional, a New Deal absurdity, and a financial failure, the latter on the grounds that it is subsidized by the taxpayers of the whole Nation.

Informed citizens past 60 years of age know that this propaganda is historically false and misleading as to the practical operations and concrete results of the project, local and national.

Furthermore, the cold historical record and numberless rollcalls in Congress through 56 years demonstrate that the TVA is the culmination of the conservation efforts of progressive Republicans, Democrats, and Independents and that it is a home-grown American product, if anything is. And it is so recognized by over 70 foreign countries whose more than 2,000 representatives came in 1952 alone to study it.

Millions of informed citizens were, therefore, astounded when President Eisenhower dubbed the TVA "creeping socialism" without any qualifications and, be it noted, that this was an illustration of the policy of junking conservation principles, turning all natural resources back to the control of a partnership between States and private concerns, and leaving Uncle Sam in the position of a back-seat driver.

The President's remark, unfortunately for him, threw a cloak of respectability and credence around the Power Trust propaganda, above mentioned, one purpose of which has been to create the impression that anyone who defends TVA or public power is disloyal.

Now the present generation knows nothing by personal observation of the origin of TVA; many oldsters never knew or have forgotten it and thousands do not know whom to believe as to statements of fact. The net result is that millions are in a confused state of mind over the whole issue, and that is what gave Mr. Clapp's lecture their importance.

No such confusion or misgivings exist, however, in the Tennessee Valley as to whether they are practicing socialism; whether their States' rights have been violated, or they are subjects of a superstate. Contemptuous of such nonsense and angered by being portrayed as charity patients, they have organized the Citizens TVA, Inc., with headquarters at the Hermitage Hotel in Nashville, and are engaged in a campaign to save TVA and inform the American people the truth about it with an energy that would do credit to Old Hickory himself.

An authoritative witness

But returning to Mr. Clapp: In this age of the "big lie" every man is suspect, so let us first examine his credentials:

Gordon Clapp is an alumnus of the University of Chicago and is that rare combination—a scholar of wide social vision and a competent executive. Taking his master of arts degree at the University of Chicago in 1933, when TVA started, he was at once employed by TVA as Assistant Director of Personnel, then Director, then General Manager, and in 1946 was appointed Chairman of the Board.

No man knows better than he the story and significance of TVA. His intelligence and integrity have never been questioned. As required by the TVA Act, he took an oath that he believed in the feasibility and wisdom of the project, and he has kept the faith.

He was chosen to deliver this series by Prof. Jerome G. Kerwin, chairman of the Charles R. Walgreen Foundation, under whose auspices the lectures were delivered in February. Professor Kerwin knows the subject. His book Federal Water Power Legislation, published by the Columbia University Press in 1926, was and still is a realistic masterpiece which appeared at a critical hour in conservation history.

II. TVA AND NATIONAL POWER POLICY, PAST AND PRESENT

In this short space we must omit reference to Mr. Clapp's highly instructive account of equally important functions and activities of TVA, such as flood control, navigation, soil recovery, public health, and conservation of human resources, etc., and come at once to the bone of contention which has bedeviled and delayed for 50 years multipurpose river development; namely, who should control and reap the benefits of electric power, the key to successful operation in the public interest of all functions—private corporations or the public which owns the enterprise.

The problem, then, before us, and to which Mr. Clapp especially addresses himself, is what TVA has to teach us in respect of power policy when compared with other areas of the Nation where private companies have a practical monopoly of the power supply and the multipurpose approach has not been tried.

Too little power from private utilities

Discussing electric power as a factor in the national economy, Mr. Clapp lays down this fundamental postulate:

"An ample supply of electrical energy at the lowest attainable cost is a basic force to stimulate the expansion of economic activity in a competitive enterprise society."

He then states that: "The present expansion of power-generating facilities, large although it be, does not assure the country an adequate supply in the years ahead." And further, that the goals of ample cheap power "have not been and will not be achieved by sole reliance upon privately owned electric utilities."

He holds that the Nation has always had "too little electricity," because the companies have always kept rates as high as possible as a policy, resulting in low consumption. Hence, the practice of waiting for the general economy to develop the market has held back normal progress in peacetime and failed the Nation in war emergencies.

Abundant power from TVA

In contrast, TVA is presented as an example of public initiative. Here the Government took the lead in doing certain things which had not been done and which have released private initiative to an unprecedented degree in manufacturing, agriculture, commerce, the professions, homemaking, and raising the general level of life.

Governors, editors, and others of the region declare that with the river harnessed, abundant, cheap, widely distributed electricity was a main, if not the key, factor in this remarkable progress described in the lectures.

We must here forego cataloging these benefits and pause only to dissipate the chief myths regarding TVA, which are making doubting Thomases of so many honest folk from New England to Oregon and back to Florida. Mr. Clapp demonstrates:

TVA is not a superstate. It actively cooperates with over 100 State and local agencies and private organizations in many fields and full team play is demonstrated daily.

The power division is paying its way. It had yielded an average return to the Federal Treasury of 4 percent on investment over the 20 years as of June 30 last, when it had repaid to the Federal Treasury $81 million and was ahead of schedule. Outside taxpayers are thus not penalized.

The people have not been deadened and made slothful by Washington bureaus which have no jurisdiction over the TVA Board operating in the valley. Over 2,000 new manufacturing plants have been built with only a very, very few moving in from the outside.

A national asset—"Built for the people of the United States"

The speaker reminds us that every TVA dam carries a tablet with the above legend. Passing over the recital of how 20 dams were built in 20 years on time and within estimates, he explodes the ancient fear that the Government cannot be efficient. He notes such national benefits as that flood crests on the lower Ohio and Mississippi Rivers are reduced up to 3 feet in times of critical danger by reason of the TVA dams; that its 630-mile navigation channel is saving shippers $10 million a year; that its newly developed concentrated fertilizers are being tested out in 38 States and are revolutionizing the use of fertilizers, especially in arid or soil exhausted regions. Beyond these matters we come to:

III. THE PRIMACY OF NATIONAL DEFENSE

Mr. Clapp emphasizes national defense, and at this point I desire to add a bit of history. The Muscle Shoals plants, which became the nucleus of the TVA, were authorized in 1916 primarily as defense structures and have remained so. Fertilizers were to be a byproduct in peacetime.

From 1921 to 1933 progressives in both parties, with George W. Norris in the Senate and the late W. Frank James, of Michigan, in the House, as outstanding leaders, both Republicans, refused to follow Presidents Coolidge and Hoover and rejected all private bids and voted for public operation.

Why? Mr. James, a war veteran, used to tell the House in substance: "I want these plants ready for instant use if war comes and to save money. I want them back if private lessees quit making fertilizers. Not one of the bids guarantees that." Congressman Lister Hill, of Alabama, now Senator, was a leader among Democrats taking the same position. He is the only remaining Member of the Congress which passed the TVA Act who had a major part in drafting it and securing its enactment.

In respect of defense we have the same problem today, with the exception, as Mr. Clapp points out, that electric energy has now become such an absolutely vital factor in every phase of our economy that an abundant supply is as necessary on the home front as on the war front, even for agriculture.

IV. THE FUTURE: WHOSE STATESMANSHIP?

The superiority of that statesmanship was amply demonstrated by the performance of TVA, Boulder, and Bonneville in World War II. But the public forgets, and so Mr. Clapp reviews the history of the opposition of private utilities to these projects and public power. He quotes their leaders over the years proclaiming the power projects were not needed, they would be white elephants, and that private enterprise could and would meet the Nation's need in peace and war. In both cases they proved wrong. This raises the question: What of the future? Can the statesmanship of private capital be trusted, either on the grounds of safety, efficiency, or economy?

Private power for AEC plants?—The Shawnee versus Joppa example

TVA has been denied funds to construct the needed Fulton steam plant. In lieu thereof, we are told, the Atomic Energy Commission is dickering with private companies for added supply. It is announced that the proffered rates will be as low or lower than TVA rates. It is probable the private bids will be accepted.

Hence Mr. Clapp's account of the AEC experience of a like character is likely to prove prophetic. He relates that in the fall of 1950 the Atomic Energy Commission decided to build a huge gaseous diffusion plant near Paducah, Ky., and contracted with both public and private enterprise for power. The TVA would build a great steam plant—the Shawnee plant—to supply one-half the electric power. The other half would be supplied by a newly organized private corporation, Electric Energy, Inc., that would build a steam plant under the same conditions right across the Ohio River at Joppa, Ill.

The utility press boasted that private enterprise would show Government inefficiency a clean pair of heels in this race. But, lo, TVA had Shawnee's first unit in operation on April 9, 1953—3 months ahead of Joppa's first unit—and on January 8, 1954, it had 4 units going and Joppa had 2.

And, lo again, Electric Energy, Inc., had underbid TVA on construction costs. But now it is higher. Says Mr. Clapp:

"The estimated cost of the private company Joppa steam plant of 4 original units has increased some 45 percent—from $81 million in May 1951 to $118 million in June 1953. The costs per kilowatt of capacity have increased over their original estimate of $126 to $184. Two more units at the Joppa plant being added to supply a smaller portion of AEC's expanded Paducah facilities show estimates even higher—$198 per kilowatt. The taxpayers bought this record and they will have to pay for it; the private companies lose nothing because these increased costs are paid by the AEC.

"In comparison, the TVA Shawnee plant of 4 units was originally estimated to cost $147.50 per kilowatt. TVA's actual cost experience to date, while building under the same physical conditions as the Joppa plant, shows that the total 10-unit Shawnee plant capable of producing 1,500,000 kilowatts will be completed by TVA at a capital cost well within our estimates."

Mr. Clapp does not pursue the question of consequent increased rates, so let us look into that. At the start TVA estimated that when in full operation the average energy charge from the Shawnee plant would be 3.58 mills per kilowatt-hours. Electric Energy, Inc., gave its figure as 3.57 mills, a little lower than the TVA bid, exactly as is expected from the new bidders.

The construction costs for Electric Energy, Inc., went up and their rates were raised. TVA's rates went up a little, not because of construction costs but largely as a result of escalator provisions tied to general economic indexes for operating labor costs. And now we find from information supplied by the AEC in April that TVA power costs 3.7 mills and the Joppa plant 4.2 mills, a difference of five-tenths mill. On this basis when the plants are in full operation AEC will be purchasing about 10 billion kilowatt-hours per year at a cost of $38 million from Shawnee and about 6 billion kilowatt-hours for $26 million from Joppa.

Multiplying 6 billion kilowatt-hours by 0.5 mill you get around $3 million annually which AEC will pay in excess of TVA rates.

The AEC has another huge plant at Portsmouth, Ohio, served wholly by private enterprise—the Ohio Valley Electric Co.—which ultimately will deliver some 15 billion kilowatt-hours annually. This company has already increased its construction estimate by 10 percent. The rate differential is lower, but, to cut it short, TVA rates would save the taxpayers $5 million annually at this plant.

One mill means $50 million

Now this $8 million annually may be worth the price to save us from "socialism," but the overcharge is small when compared to what AEC would be paying if there were no TVA in existence and its competitive effect absent. However, there are some clues which give us a rough idea:

AEC has three great plants in this region—Oak Ridge, Paducah, and Portsmouth. The total consumption of the three will be in the neighborhood of 50 billion kilowatt-hours annually. Now TVA faces a shortage and to meet its dire needs by 1957 it proposed to construct the Fulton steam plant on the Mississippi River north of Memphis. However, the President's Budget Bureau refused to grant the necessary appropriation and, in effect, indicated that the needed new power be purchased from private companies. Evidently relying on a continuance of the administration's new policy, two private concerns promptly approached TVA. The Southern Co. (a holding concern which controls the Mississippi, Georgia, and Alabama Power companies) proposed to construct a new plant and, on a 20-year contract basis, to sell TVA power at an average of 5.23 mills per kilowatt-hour, or more than 1 mill higher than the present rate of 4 mills at Shawnee. The Mississippi Power & Light Co. bid 2 mills higher.

Multiplying AEC's 50-billion-kilowatt-hour requirements by 1 mill, we get $50 million for the Southern and, by 2 mills, $100 million for the Mississippi. As aforesaid, this gives us some rough idea of what this one Government agency would be paying if there were no TVA, one-half of whose power supply will go to AEC.

It is to be hoped that Mr. Hoover's task forces will include comparisons of a similar nature to all expenditures of the Government for electric power, which runs into many, many millions. Such comparisons reveal values from TVA's successful demonstration that embarrass TVA's critics and save taxpayers a tidy sum.

Emergency power and the tax-amortization scheme

The Nation is being given to understand that, with assistance from the Federal Government, private utilities are building new generating capacity which will care for defense needs. Mr. Clapp sharply disagrees. Thus: "The present expansion program for new power capacity will do little more than meet normal civilian demands under conditions of economic expansion."

Specifically, as of June 1953, 636 electric power projects have received certificates for rapid tax amortization. They will increase capacity by some 22 million kilowatts over about a 3-year period—not enough for defense.

But should private utilities be asked to invest millions in surplus plants that might lie idle? "No," he answers. But the tax-amortization scheme is not adequate and is entirely too costly. He suggests, as alternatives, that the Government might guarantee the companies against actual losses or might subscribe capital to the utilities in the form of second-preference stock without voting rights.

V. FINDINGS

Chairman Clapp does not advocate Government monopoly of the power business; that is a scarecrow to fool the unwary. It is neither sought nor advisable.

But since regulation by State commissions has failed to meet expectations, and since the competition of public plants has forced the utilities drastically to reduce their rates while remaining solvent, and be more effective, public competition is absolutely necessary for the public welfare and safety. It would clearly be a tragic mistake to reverse this policy and install private-utility monopoly.

He pointedly reminds us that "the electric business, whoever owns and operates it, is a public business. * * * It is as native to this land as cornbread. * * * The operation of an electric system is a managerial job. The managers can be either private or public managers, as the public chooses.

"If the private utilities satisfy the public objective of providing low-cost electricity in abundance, they have a good chance of staying in the business. But if they fail; they should not be surprised if they are fired by the consumers and replaced by public managers. * * * In my view, the best way for private power companies to remain private is to show more enterprise."

These lectures constitute the most brilliant overall statemen tof the case for TVA in recent years. It is to be hoped that the University of Chicago Press will speedily issue them in book form for the benefit of sober people at home and abroad.

Agricultural Foreign Service Should Be Reestablished

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1954

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, at this time I want to speak in support of House bill 8033. This bill authorizes the creation of an Agricultural Foreign Service in the Department of Agriculture. It provides that the Secretary of Agriculture may appoint and assign personnel to service abroad, responsible to, and subject only to the orders of the Secretary of Agriculture with respect to their technical duties. Of course, they should be otherwise under our chief of mission in the country to which they are assigned.

At the present time the Secretary of Agriculture is compelled to work through representatives stationed abroad who, while they carry the title "agricultural attaché," are in fact employees of the Foreign Service of the Department of State. All contacts with, instructions to, and reports from the agricultural attachés must be relayed through the Department of State.

Investigating committees have reported that the agricultural attachés in many of our diplomatic missions have been relegated to inferior positions from the standpoint of compensation and prestige, and therefore, cannot perform as effectively as they should.

At one time we did have a Foreign Agricultural Service. An act in 1930 created a distinct Foreign Agricultural Service in the Department of Agriculture. Officers in this Service abroad were regularly and officially attached to the diplomatic mission of the United States. In 1939, under a Presidential reorganization plan, this Service was transferred to the Department of State.

The Foreign Service Act of 1946 repealed the act of 1930 which authorized a Foreign Agricultural Service and at the present time the Secretary of State is charged with the collection and dissemination of agricultural information abroad.

At the present time many of our agricultural attachés abroad do not fully understand the objectives, purposes, and operations of our farm programs. Our agricultural representatives abroad should be familiar with every part and parcel of the farm program and should be taking a more active part in creating a better understanding of them in foreign countries.

We particularly need representatives abroad who can counsel with the agricultural people in foreign countries regarding the quality and quantity of farm products available for export.

To a large extent our present sharp decline in farm prices and income is the result of a one-third drop in farm exports. We desperately need the best foreign agricultural service possible. Instead we are now operating through a State Department currently loaded down with diplomatic problems.

House bill 8033 has been drawn as a result of many investigations and much study of the problem of how best to develop and maintain a high-caliber, effective staff of agricultural representatives abroad. The need has never been greater; surely House bill 8033 should get early and favorable consideration by this Congress.

Let's Not Overdo It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1954

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following editorial from the Providence Visitor of April 29, 1954:

Let's Not Overdo It

Two facts transcend the sense of this editorial: First, James A. Farley is a distinguished American as well as a fine Catholic; secondly, not all Catholics in politics are a credit to their church or their Nation, and some have been a disgrace to both.

Mr. Farley's record in Government service speaks for itself. He has been praised by people of all parties and of all religious faiths. No doubt he has made enemies along the line, but no one has questioned his honesty. Recently in Boston, however, Mr. Farley went to considerable lengths to point out that some Catholic politicans have been more prone to abuse their power than non-Catholics. He went on, "In recent scandals involving men in public life, the identification of Catholics among the betrayers of trust came so often as to bring a heavy sense of shame. * * * Too often, especially among Catholics, men in public office feel there is one code of conduct for their private lives and an entirely different code for their public lives. * * * We should be something less than honest if we did not recognize that many of the most notorious political machines in America have been built by Catholics and operated by Catholics."

These thoughts have been expressed before, and there is some truth to them. But there is another side, too. First, dishonest people in Government who happen to go to church are not necessarily Catholics in anything but a nominal sense. To classify them otherwise is to mislead. Secondly, it is true that Catholics have been identified with scandals, but they have also participated in exposure of scandals. Thirdly, Catholics, at least in name, have been identified with political machines, but Mr. Farley should realize that newspapers are metropolitan and they are concerned with big city organizations. One cannot help wondering what would happen if the spotlight of intense publicity were turned on the one-party South or that other vast no-priest land to the west. Surely not is all utopia there.

Every Catholic is incensed at dishonest Catholics in government or anywhere else, but the numbers of such Catholics should not be exaggerated, nor the overwhelming majority of honest Catholics in government be overlooked. Mr. Farley has made a good point, but at least the news report indicates very onesided treatment and indignation probably disproportionate to its base. Maybe this report of Mr. Farley's speech is evidence of the kind of thing that has caused his apparent alarm.

There is no place in government or elsewhere for dishonest people, except maybe in the penitent's section of the confessional. Certainly some persons known as Catholics are dishonest. They should take serious heed of Mr. Farley's charges and of the warnings of other Catholics, including the clergy. But no one should close his eyes to the fact that Catholics in government have been a mighty force for good.

World Communist Conspiracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1954

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following statement:

Remarks in Part of Congressman Philip J. Philbin, May 23, 1954, Pittsfield, Mass.

Before a communion breakfast at Pittsfield yesterday morning, Congressman Philip J. Philbin, of Clinton, warned against the growing strength and expansion of the world Communist conspiracy which he said is understandably causing the American people gravest concern.

"The developments at Geneva are not only distressing but truly alarming, because they indicate," he said, "that the free world has apparently been unable to agree upon a formula for checking further aggression."

"The designs of the Communist conspiracy have been plain for sometime past," the Congressman asserted. It has moved steadily forward to embrace control of more than 800 millions of people. It was Korea yesterday, it is Indochina today, and it will be some other helpless nation tomorrow. Thus we observe the sorrowful spectacle of the almost complete cancellation by willful infiltration and aggression of our noble war aims of according to all nations, great and small, national sovereignty and self-determination by governments of their own choice.

"We have learned through bitter experience that the Communists respect neither God nor man. They move toward their objective of world domination under the Marxist pattern with ruthless disregard for the rights of other nations and the cannons of decency and justice upon which civilization is based. It is not surprising, therefore, that free people everywhere should be beset with deep anxiety and apprehension concerning the future."

"Despite these deplorable conditions, however" said Philbin, "our duty is plain and clear. Regardless of the obstacles and grave problems, we must never permit ourselves to be captured by the hysteria of the moment. We must pursue the great and necessary goal of world peace with firmness, with patience, and with all the earnestness at our command. We must sincerely continue to negotiate and counsel with other nations to achieve a just peace. At the same time, we must recognize that such a peace cannot be based upon the appeasement of those who are seeking to destroy this Nation and our free system.

"In this crisis it is imperative for us to marshall and mobilize our great strength as a Nation, military, economic, and spiritual, because it will be by virtue of our own resolution to preserve our blessed heritage, our armed might, economic vitality and innate sense of justice that we will be able in the end, not only to defend but to preserve our American way of life.

"We know that we have justice on our side. We know that our ideals of freedom will prevail because they derive from the Almighty. And we are building a mighty defense and striking force that will command the respect and fear of potential enemies."

Touching upon the effect of new military techniques, Philbin said: "Atomic and hydrogen weapons will make the next war almost too horrible to contemplate and the Communists know that fact as well as we do. These weapons, while awful beyond description, are the strongest arguments for peace. Let us hope and pray they will never be used in warfare and let us work to that laudable end. But at the same time, let us face all the realities of the modern world with that courage, fortitude, patience, and confidence which Americans have always displayed in the great crises of the past. Our Nation will continue to be stronger in arms, stronger in spirit, and stronger in the determination to preserve our liberties. This great strength will be our protection as well as the means through which we may be able to secure a just peace."

Philbin asserted that our Armed Forces were steadily growing in power and are capable not only of defending the Nation against attack but of inflicting powerful, devastating retaliation against any enemy. "The American people really have nothing to fear," said the Congressman, "if they keep alive their faith in God and their will to retain the benefits and blessings of this great democratic Government. If the American people adhere to the great spiritual truths which underlie our Constitution and zealously safeguard the individual rights of American citizens, and conserve and develop our national strength there will be no enemy capable of destroying us. So let us grapple with all these great problems without fear, without hysteria, and without flinching and appeasement. Our cause is just and it will triumph over communism and all the other evils of modern life."

Philbin complimented the group upon its inspiring devotion to American principles—devotion, he said, "to God and country more important now than ever, and devotion to the great principles of unity, brotherhood, and toleration which will keep this Nation strong, great, and enduring."

Choices in Indochina

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. J. CARNAHAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1954

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Christian Science Monitor of May 25, 1954:

CHOICES IN INDOCHINA

Everybody seems to be waiting for somebody else to decide what to do about Indochina. This applies not only to the governments in Washington, London, and Paris, each of which looks to the others for some indication of a firm policy. It applies also to individual citizens in America, Britain, and France, not many of whom are entirely clear as to how the situation is to be resolved or just what they are willing to do about it.

For these reasons it may be useful to sum up some facts about southeast Asia.

First, there is the question whether the free world can, should, or will do anything conclusive to prevent all Indochina from falling into the hands of the Vietminh, with its Soviet and Communist Chinese backing.

Americans and probably many Europeans and certainly many Asians would be more ready to increase aid there if they were assured the result would be real freedom of the Indochinese to control their own affairs. The French long since should have promulgated treaties of genuine independence with Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia. An appeal from autonomous governments in those states to the United Nations or to specific countries would carry more weight if relieved of the shadow of French colonialism.

If any part of Indochina itself is to be saved, time is very, very short. Given a convincing grant of independence, the Vietnamese in southern Indochina, plus the Laotians and Cambodians, might make a more effective defense of their country.

But the Communist delegates at the Geneva Conference already are demanding that all Indochina be treated as a unit. If anything is to persuade them otherwise, it will have to be either a pronounced swing of Indochinese centiment toward western ideal of liberty or a determination by western powers to furnish solid military strength—probably both.

If Britons, Americans, and others cannot bring themselves to want to share directly—and that probably means with ground troops—in the defense of Indochina, then will they declare themselves as to what they would do if Communist subversion and aggression did not end there but continued into Thailand, Burma, Malaya, or Indonesia?

Such a declaration, embodied in a southeast Asia defense pact, would strengthen the French hands at Geneva. Without it, is any of Southeast Asia safe?

It seems to us that at the very least there should be such a pact that it should be announced while the Geneva Conference is still in session, and that if France will make Indochinese independence explicit there should be a stepping up of military aid to Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia.

This involves a risk of having to send men to some part of southeast Asia. Unless that willingness exists, the Communists have in effect been notified they can walk in. But if the willingness does exist and is avowed, the need may not go that far.

If a defense line is pledged, then behind that line other factors will become more important than guns. Under such security there should be genuine release of Asian leaders and peoples to work out their own destiny. There should also be a substantial, even generous, commitment of technical aid both by the United States directly and through the United Nations to help them achieve fuller living. Facing that kind of cooperation, communism would become both less attractive and less menacing.

Armenian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1954

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement:

REMARKS IN PART OF CONGRESSMAN PHILIP J. PHILBIN BEFORE THE WATERTOWN BRANCH OF AMERICAN COMMITTEE FOR INDEPENDENCE OF ARMENIA AT FRANKLIN, MAY 23, 1954

Speaking before the Watertown branch of the American Committee for the Independence of Armenia yesterday at Franklin, Congressman PHILBIN denounced the Communist tyranny responsible for present conditions in Armenia as typical of shocking events that are transpiring in many parts of the world.

"Freedom is either stifled or threatened by Communist aggression in many countries," he declared, "not only behind the Iron Curtain, but in Asia and the Near East. Conquest of Indochina, if it is accomplished, will open the door to the entire Asian continent, much of which is already Communist. Such conquests by the Soviet are steadily narrowing the limits of the free world. It is a time of extreme anxiety for the cause of freedom."

It is clear that this situation cannot be met by appeasement or compromise of sacred principles of democracy, PHILBIN asserted. If the free world unites its forces, military, economic, and spiritual, behind a strong affirmative policy, it can prevent the further spread of communism by infiltration and force.

"Let us all realise, however," he continued, "that our free way of life faces gravest peril. We must act together with resolution and courage, or we may face the possibility of deadly attack. It is a time to marshal our strength, to build our strength, to conserve our strength, and to develop all the power necessary to ward off would-be aggressors."

Regarding the present negotiations, the Clinton solon said: "In the light of the Geneva conference, it will undoubtedly be necessary to reappraise our entire foreign policy. But come what may, this Nation must make it known to the whole world that we propose to defend our liberties and our security against every contingency."

Referring to Armenia's historic struggle, the Congressman stated that for more than six centuries the Armenian people had suffered terrible outrages by tyrants, but that their spirit of freedom has never been dimmed.

"It is as strong and resolute today as it was on that heroic day in 1921 when they threw off the Communist yoke," he said, "and the Armenian nation will again, with God's help, be liberated from oppression and restore its free institutions because a people willing to fight and die for liberty can never be truly defeated. They will always rise again to resume the free way of life which they love and to which they are irrevocably pledged.

"When liberation comes, more than a million Armenian refugees, victims of cruel tyrannical masters, will return to their proud homeland and live there in freedom, peace, and tranquility with the rest of their noble brethren."

PHILBIN lauded the Armenians in America as a group strongly attached to American principles and institutions. "Like all true Americans," he said, "they are dedicated to freedom and willing to give their lives to preserve it. It is in this spirit that our cause will triumph."

The Water Facilities Loan Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. HILL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1954

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, thousands of farm families throughout the country are working under severe handicaps because their farms do not have adequate water facilities when and where they are needed.

Fortunately, engineering progress coupled with adequate financing is reducing these handicaps to a marked degree. The whole country is better off because of it. Individual farm families have been able to install facilities or take advantage of irrigation systems that have more than doubled their farming efficiency. Countless formerly unproductive units now flourish as good farms or ranches supporting modern crop and livestock enterprises.

All through the western part of the country where annual rainfall is inadequate or irregular can now be found green, lush pastures, good crops, and farm homes supplied with running water. There is water for livestock in the barnyards and in the pastures.

Unfortunately, going from dryland farming or operations that depend on rainfall to irrigation farming often means a farmer is squarely up against the problem of making an adjustment that is too costly for him to undertake. If he has accumulated a good farm inventory and has sufficient means or credit to go ahead and make the necessary adjustments, well and good. But if he has not, then his potentially good farm must remain inefficiently operated.

It was because of prevailing situations like this that Congress passed the Water Facilities Act of 1937. This act and later amendments authorized the Secretary of Agriculture to furnish financial and technical aid for constructing and maintaining water facilities to encourage the best use of agricultural land. The Farmers' Home Administration was made responsible for carrying on the program.

I have been able to observe the progress made by farmers and ranchers in my State of Colorado who have availed themselves of the opportunities offered under the water-facilities loan program of the Farmers' Home Administration. Colorado is 1 of the 17 Western States in which that agency makes loans available under the act. A new bill, H. R. 8386, has now been introduced that would amend the act to extend its provisions to the entire United States, including Alaska and Hawaii and Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands. This proposed legislation should receive favorable consideration by the House.

Now I would like to tell about the water-facilities loan program as it is operating in the 17 Western States. Water-facilities loans are made in two categories as to types of borrowers: First, individual farmers may borrow either for facilities on their own farms or ranches or for obtaining the benefits of a water system owned and operated by an informal group service or an association. Second, loans may be made to nonprofit mutual water companies, water users' associations, or irrigation districts where a water problem cannot be solved except through a major community system serving the whole neighborhood. Costs of construction, operation, and maintenance are distributed over more than one farm, so that the costs of water per family are usually considerably reduced below the cost of installing a facility for only one farm.

Loans also fall into two different categories as to types of facilities involved and are classified as farmstead facilities and irrigation facilities.

Farmstead water-facilities loans are for such installations as wells, ponds, cisterns, and pipelines for bringing water to farm buildings for household use, for livestock, and for garden irrigation.

Irrigation water facilities loans are made in areas with proved water supplies. These loans provide new facilities and permit developing and improving existing facilities. The kinds of facilities that are financed vary with the needs of the locality and may include sprinkler systems, water wells, storage reservoirs, dams, ditches and canals, pumps and motors, land leveling and other means of bringing water to the land.

Water facilities loans are repayable over periods up to 20 years provided a borrower needs that much time and provided the facility will last that long. Loans are scheduled to be repaid as rapidly as possible, but are made for a long enough time to allow the operator to repay from income resulting from the use of the installation.

The farmer is expected to contribute to the cost of the facility as far as he can by furnishing funds, labor, materials, and equipment. The more he can contribute the less he will have to borrow.

The amount of a loan is limited by the cost of the facility, the farmer's ability to repay, and the law which, in the case of a loan to an association or group, sets a maximum of $100,000 to be loaned for any one project.

The program is intended to provide assistance for a large number of small farmers, and for that reason a high percentage of the loans are for $5,000 or less. The larger loans are made to associations for community facilities.

An individual applicant is eligible for a loan if he needs water facilities to make his farm operations more sound, if he cannot get the credit he needs on reasonable terms and in sufficient amounts from other sources in his community, and if the farm he operates is not larger than family-type farms in his area.

A nonprofit association of water users can qualify for a loan if a need for the facility can be substantiated, if the organization cannot get suitable credit elsewhere, and if most of the water to be made available by the facility will benefit farms not larger than family type.

Before a loan can be made to an applicant he must comply with water laws in his State. Most Western States regulate the appropriation and use of water and their regulations must be met.

Eligibility of applicants is determined by the Farmers' Home Administration county committee composed of three local persons in each county. At least two members of each committee must be farmers.

In addition to the water facilities loan program, the Farmers' Home Administration carries on various other farm credit and service programs. It makes farm ownership and improvement loans, advances credit for and helps farmers plan farming adjustments, and makes loans to meet certain emergency needs.

All loans are made at the county level where the county supervisor, backed up by his local county committee, is in charge. Policies and instructions relating to program operations are issued from the national office in Washington, which operates within the framework of the Department of Agriculture as administered by Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson. R. B. McLeaish is the Administrator of the Farmers' Home Administration. The policies and instructions reach the county offices through State offices.

The Famers' Home Administration is a vital and going concern set up for the purpose of offering family-type farm operators opportunities for self-help through credit they cannot obtain elsewhere. Since the agency has a staff at national and State levels to perform administrative and fiscal work in connection with its other loan programs, it has been necessary to employ additional personnel to carry out fiscal and administrative duties in connection with the water facilities program. In the 17 Western States, a very few persons are engaged in technical duties related entirely to the water facilities loan program.

The State director directs the program operations including the water facilities program. He makes use of the technicians who also work closely with the county supervisors as well as the farmers who receive the credit and service.

County supervisors accept applications for assistance, advise borrowers on all phases of farming, service security for loans, and receive payments. When applications are received for water facilities aid involving difficult farm adjustments, engineering, and legal problems, the county supervisor can call on the water facilities technicians for help.

I have gone to some length to show the administrative setup of the water-facilities program under the Farmers' Home Administration because the way in which the program is administered bears a direct relationship to the results obtained. Now let us look briefly at a few specific results.

Congress made $6,500,000 available for water facilities for this, the 1954 fiscal year. This is a half-million dollars more than the 1953 appropriation, all of which was obligated. Roughly, in 1953, $5 million was loaned to individuals and $1 million to groups or associations.

On December 31, 1953, outstanding principal on loans made to individuals amounted to $14 million. Only about 4 percent of that amount was delinquent, and much of the delinquency was temporary.

But more important is what the farm and ranch operators did with the money they borrowed, and how the results contributed to more security on the land as well as better farming and better living.

A study was made of individual borrowers who repaid their loans in full between October 1, 1949, and June 30, 1952, and continued to farm. The study shows that borrowers in this group who obtained loans for the installation of the first irrigation systems on their farms increased the production of corn by 205 percent per acre; small grain, 66 percent per acre; legume hay, 50 percent per acre; and milk, 25 percent per farm. Their income and net worth increased at the same time by approximately 150 percent.

Borrowers in the group who had repaid loans for farmstead water facilities had generally improved the efficiency and convenience of the homes and buildings and had more livestock and poultry and larger gardens. Many had acquired equipment for the production of grade A milk.

This, of course, is just a glimpse of the water-facilities loan program as it is operating in the 17 Western States. It does show, however, that the opportunity of having water when and where it is needed can make the difference between operating a farm at a loss and farming for profitable production.

Now, I understand proposals have been made to insure loans of this type made by private lenders, in a program comparable to the insured real-estate mortgage-loan program already carried on by the Farmers' Home Administration. Such a proposal has merit, I believe, and I hope it will be favorably considered.

Following is a letter and report from the Farmers' Home Administration:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT
OF AGRICULTURE,
FARMERS' HOME ADMINISTRATION,
May 24, 1954.

HON. WILLIAM S. HILL,
House of Representatives.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HILL: We are enclosing a copy of a report showing, by States, the number and amount of special livestock loans approved, and applications pending, as of Friday, May 21, 1954.

Sincerely yours,

R. B. MCLEAISH,
Administrator.

Special livestock loans as of May 21, 1954

States	Loans approved		Applications pending	
	Number	Amount	Number	Amount
Alabama	15	$154, 875		
Arizona	19	613, 245	4	$285, 910
Arkansas	392	650, 390	7	4, 785
California	22	717, 400	5	150, 625
Colorado	195	3, 693, 240	12	529, 740
Florida	43	606, 505	2	169, 500
Georgia	40	346, 800		
Idaho	30	922, 474	6	201, 776
Illinois	2	18, 600		
Indiana	8	108, 900	2	27, 500
Iowa	2	4, 000		
Kansas	109	1, 724, 505	15	124, 865
Kentucky	28	51, 020	2	2, 900
Louisiana	7	80, 650		
Massachusetts	7	13, 000		
Michigan	2	13, 000		
Minnesota	5	23, 395		
Mississippi	4	29, 195		
Missouri	825	1, 109, 265	9	2, 540
Montana	114	3, 050, 870	20	425, 580
Nebraska	7	97, 440		
Nevada	50	912, 005	5	86, 220
New Hampshire	6	5, 310	1	3, 000
New Jersey	33	53, 190	1	2, 500
New Mexico	329	3, 785, 990	21	462, 795
New York	45	60, 995		
North Carolina	1	3, 315		
North Dakota	5	17, 835		
Ohio	9	19, 845		
Oklahoma	198	2, 254, 830	14	126, 750
Oregon	9	371, 973	4	143, 425
Pennsylvania	58	64, 625	1	1, 000
South Carolina	1	7, 870		
South Dakota	76	1, 041, 800	1	8, 985
Tennessee	27	37, 920		
Texas	937	12, 244, 185	59	871, 690
Utah	43	573, 134	11	178, 470
Vermont	7	13, 680	1	1, 600
Virginia	65	201, 665	2	20, 500
Washington	1	3, 025	1	58, 535
West Virginia	43	74, 765	2	900
Wyoming	41	1, 007, 370	1	1, 000
Hawaii	7	55, 875		
Total	3, 867	36, 849, 971	209	3, 913, 091

Housing Statement for Mayors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. BARRETT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1954

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to include the joint statement of the mayors of 18 major American cities concerning the importance of adequate housing for all of the 18½ million citizens living in these cities. The Housing Statement for Mayors was called to my attention by the Honorable Joseph S. Clark, Jr., mayor of the city of Philadelphia, in view of "the size of this problem and because of the thought that has gone into this statement and the broad agreement that exists regarding its conclusions."

I have read this document in its entirety and commend it to the attention of all Members of Congress.

HOUSING STATEMENT FOR MAYORS

We, the mayors of 18 major American cities, are concerned with providing decent shelter for our citizens.

We are concerned with wiping out the blight of our slums.

We are deeply concerned with the housing program now pending before the Congress. We believe it falls far short of meeting America's housing needs. Investigation of reported scandals in Federal housing agencies cannot be permitted to kill the Housing Act of 1954. Federal assistance has made possible the inadequate progress made thus far in providing decent shelter for low-income groups and home ownership for many other American families. The Federal Government must continue to lead the fight against blight in our cities.

Every year there are about 900,000 additional households created in America. Moreover, about 300,000 housing units are demolished every year. This means that America requires about a millian and a quarter new housing units every year, just to keep abreast of current needs alone. Over and above this, however, there is an enormous backlog of past housing needs that have never been fulfilled. Millions of families are living in crowded, unsanitary conditions. The housing census of 1950 revealed that there were 10 million nonfarm housing units classified as substandard. Even if we were now to embark on the task of rehabilitating or replacing a half million of these substandard houses every year, it would take us 20 years to complete the job.

Coupling current demands with the backlog of substandard housing, then, it is clear that America's minimum housing requirements total close to 2 million new housing units every year.

Yet the housing program now before the Congress is apparently based upon the meager goal of 1 million units a year. At this pace we will never meet America's minimum requirements. On the contrary, we will fall farther and farther behind in the job of providing decent shelter for all our citizens.

There is still another danger in this million-unit goal: It represents a decline from the level of housing construction the country has enjoyed over the past few years, and, therefore, may accelerate the present economic decline rather than helping to reverse it. Ours is a growing country. Ours must be an expanding economy. We must plan for an expansion, not a shrinking, of all types of economic activity.

A major portion of the housing program now before the Congress deals with the stimulation of housing construction by private industry. Although this portion of the program contains a number of constructive features, it also contains, we believe, crucial weaknesses. As an example, the proposal for the building of $7,600—and in some cases $8,600—homes under a 40-year, 100-percent-guaranteed mortgage will, we believe, turn out to be a fruitless one, since the lowest price at which homes are now being built for the average family (3 bedrooms) is above this amount in most areas, particularly in the larger cities. Even if they were possible to build, the result would be a shoddy home of inferior design and construction and would tend to become the future slums of the Nation.

Perhaps even more significant is the absence from the proposed Federal legislation of any effective program to meet the needs of those earning less than $5,000 a year. Public housing, at least, holds the answer for the lowest-income families—those with $3,000 a year or less income. There is no realistic recognition of the problem facing our middle-income families—the $3,000 to $5,000 per year group. This group includes two-thirds of all urban American families. The liberalizing of FHA mortgage terms will leave home buying and monthly housing costs in a range still above the economic means of these families. Nor is there any guaranty that the private home-financing industry will provide the necessary funds, particularly for existing houses, whether for long-term mortgages or for extensive rehabilitation. If private industry cannot reduce the cost of building and financing homes, the Government must lead the way in bringing prices down for all houses—sale and rental—or we will be unable to check the continuing physical and economic deterioration of the country's housing plant.

In addition to the problem of stimulating private building, there is the urgent task of wiping out our slums—those breeding pots of disease and delinquency—and of providing decent shelter to those of our citizens whose incomes are low. When slums are removed, housing must be found for those displaced. The present legislation makes no adequate provision for meeting this requirement.

We are anxious to keep our cities self-reliant. We want to solve our own problems wherever possible without the help of the Federal Government. We recognize our responsibility to prevent the growth of slums through the enactment and enforcement of zoning, housing, building, fire, and sanitation codes. But Federal help is required to finance housing construction and slum clearance for two reasons.

First, the size of the housing job is out of range of the financial resources of the cities. The President's Advisory Committee on Housing estimated that it would require $4.2 billion to remove all of the substandard dwelling units that existed in 1940 in 14 representative cities, which have slum clearance programs underway. This is two and a half times the combined total annual revenues of these 14 cities today.

Second, our cities resources are limited by the fact that the Federal and State Governments have preempted most of the main sources of tax revenue.

Federal action, therefore, is a necessity if our housing problems are to be solved. Congress recognized this 5 years ago when it enacted the Housing Act of 1949 which authorized the Federal Government to undertake the task of slum clearance and public housing. This act represented a finding by the Congress that hundreds of thousands of American families needed and were entitled to better housing, at prices and rents they could afford. One of the cosponsors of that act was the late Senator Taft.

Five years have passed. Due to the Korean emergency the program envisaged by Congress in 1949 was temporarily curtailed. Only one-fifth of the public housing provided for in the 1949 act has been completed or contracted for.

The need for slum-clearance and low-rent housing is far greater today than it was in 1949.

Yet Congress is now asked to provide only 35,000 units of public housing a year—less than the minimum of 50,000 units required by the Housing Act of 1949. Moreover, the House of Representatives has failed to authorize even this inadequate number of units. In view of the shortchanged number of public housing units which have been authorized up until now under the 1949 act, the Federal program should more appropriately be set at the maximum permitted—200,000 units per year. The act already authorizes expenditures to build up to a total of 810,000 public units.

The Congress appears determined to choke off the public housing program entirely on the grounds that they are not much improvement over slum areas. We cordially invite any Congressman who shares this view to visit the public housing projects that have been constructed to date in our various cities. We are confident they will be recognized as substantial contributions to better living conditions for fine American families.

To others, who oppose public housing on the ground that it is socialistic, we invite attention to a statement made on January 7, 1946, by the late Senator Taft. Speaking of Federal aid for public housing, Senator Taft said, "Such assistance is in line with Government activity in many other fields. Public housing is not socialism by any stretch of the imagination."

We look around us and see the housing in our cities aging and deteriorating, while at the same time our population grows and our housing needs increase.

This is the time for decisive action. Such action has to recognize the full scope of the problem. The program must not be too little and too late.

To us, it is unthinkable that the richest Nation in the world should be a poorly-housed Nation. If America is to provide decent shelter for its citizens, and if our cities are to continue to prosper, it is imperative that the Congress reverse the crippling actions it has already taken and raise its sights far beyond the program it is now considering.

CITIES ENDORSING THE HOUSING STATEMENT FOR MAYORS

Atlanta, Ga., William B. Hartsfield; Baltimore, Md., Thomas D'Alesandro, Jr.; Buffalo, N. Y., Joseph Mruk; Denver, Colo., Quigg Newton; Kansas City, Mo., William E. Kemp; Knoxville, Tenn., George R. Dempster; Louisville, Ky., Charles P. Farnsley; Milwaukee, Wis., Frank P. Zeidler; Minneapolis, Minn., Eric G. Hoyer; Newark, N. J., Leo P. Carlin; New Orleans, La., deLesseps S. Morrison; New York, N. Y., Robert F. Wagner; Philadelphia, Pa., Joseph S. Clark, Jr.; Pittsburgh, Pa., David L. Lawrence; Providence, R. I., Walter H. Reynolds; St. Louis, Mo., Raymond R. Tucker; San Francisco, Calif., Elmer E. Robinson; Seattle, Wash., Allan Pomeroy.

The Administration's Sit-Watch-Hope-and-Dawdle Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1954

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the policy of this administration, and of its leaders in the Congress, is to sit, watch, hope, and dawdle. That kind of policy never brought about a sound basis of prosperity in this country. It has always been the kind of policy which led to economic disaster.

Many of the current developments in the economy look suspiciously like some of the things that were happening in the late 1920's right after the great depression. I insist there is no reason why the United States should undergo another depression like that one particularly since we enacted so many reforms under Franklin Roosevelt to prevent depressions. However, there are a few similarities which I would like to point out, namely:

First. The stock market is booming despite falling sales and employment.

Second. Favorable corporation financial statements showing increased earnings actually, in many cases, reflect only lowered tax rates and thus give a false sense of prosperity that is not based on more production, more sales, and better business methods.

Third. Farm income is falling dangerously, but food prices to the consumer remain at or near their record levels. Consumer prices generally also remain very high, despite reduced purchasing power and spreading unemployment, layoffs, and shutdowns.

Fourth. The administration is so heavily saturated with the thinking of big business representatives that it cannot see the dangerous trends in the economy while big business itself seems to be doing so well. It is paying no heed to the increasingly more difficult struggle of small business, and bankruptcies are mounting week by week.

Fifth. The needs of the average family for economic security are being neglected, and, in fact, ignored.

I am sure no one in the Eisenhower administration wants a depression, just as I am sure no one in the Hoover administration wanted one; but, despite all the economic reforms which have been adopted since 1933—unemployment compensation, agricultural supports, housing assistance, social security, securities and exchange regulation, flood control, loans to business, and so on—we know that we cannot have prosperity just by standing still. We must keep our economy expanding to provide opportunities for the millions of new workers coming into it year by year.

This administration seems to want to sit still and rest on past Democratic economic accomplishments. That is not good enough. We must go forward. Unless we do, we go backward; we slide further back into economic dislocation and recession, and the prosperity we have known these past years will become a thing of the past.

No one wants that to happen. But it will happen if we follow the GOP policy of sit, watch, hope, and dawdle.

Hospitalization and Medical Care for Veterans in Non-Service-Connected Cases

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDMUND P. RADWAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1954

Mr. RADWAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I want to take this opportunity to congratulate Mr. Samuel A. Levy, of Buffalo, N. Y., upon the courageous and unselfish one-man fight which he is waging in behalf of our sick veterans.

Mr. Levy, at considerable expense in time and money, has been carrying on a one-man operation in voluntary work at the Buffalo Veterans' Administration hospital, and he has earned the heartfelt gratitude of veteran patients and their families. In addition, he has been waging a countrywide one-man campaign for the continuation of the present Veterans' Administration hospital program for our sick veterans.

I include herein a letter which I have received from Mr. Samuel Levy:

BUFFALO, N. Y., *May 17, 1954.*

Representative E. P. RADWAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. RADWAN: As a citizen, and not a veteran, I wish to protest the action of the group or groups who are trying everything in their power to change the present legislation, giving hospitalization and medical care to veterans in non-service-connected cases, where they cannot defray the cost of same.

I have been active in this work for sick veterans since 1922. In New York, when I took shellshocked boys out of Kings Park State Hospital for occupational training, and in the past 30 years I have interested myself in this work, and have given assistance to sick veterans of World War I, World War II, and the Korean war.

In 1952, realizing the strong pressure being pushed by this group trying to do away with medical care and hospitalization for the veterans in non-service-connected cases, I instituted, and had printed millions of stamps known as Remember the Sick Veterans stamp. These were delivered all over the country, even to Germany, Japan, Korea, and some to Alaska, to try to get more of the American people to remember the sick veterans.

Since the early part of this year, articles appearing in newspapers and magazines condemning hospital and medical care for veterans of non-service-connected cases, with claims it was leading to socialized medicine, and that these veterans should apply to various charity organizations for help.

Contrary to allegations in one of the magazines in March of this year, that the American people have never sanctioned Government hospital care for non-service-connected ailments, this veteran's benefits has its roots in laws dating back 31 years in an act of March 4, 1923, Congress authorized hospital care for veterans who were suffering from specifically described nonservice disabilities of any war, where the veteran was unable to defray the cost of such care himself.

Statements that the Veterans' Administration is, or will provide free medical care for all veterans just are not realistic.

My interest in sick veterans has been commended by the executive branch of our Government, by the executive branch of New York State, and by the executive branch of the city of Buffalo, N. Y.

Our veterans have been protected for this service by our legislative bodies, and God knows they are entitled to this for what they gave us.

My hopes and prayers are that you, sir, and all the other representatives of both Houses, combat any move to change this legislation.

With kind regards,

SAMUEL A. LEVY.

Grassroots Letter Explains Why Small Farmers Want 100-Percent Parity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. USHER L. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1954

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, there is nothing like an unsolicited letter from back home to make crystal clear the small farmer's reasons for fighting for 100-percent parity. I have such a letter here today, and it deserves the careful attention of the Congress. Under leave to extend my remarks, I present it herewith:

RAY, N. DAK., *May 20, 1954.*

Hon. USHER L. BURDICK,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Will try to write you a few lines and let you know I am with you in the fight for 100 percent parity for agriculture, and here I state the reason why as follows: This year I'm allotted 160 acres of wheat on 1 section of land—and you know this part of United States better than I do; we may get a crop and we may not. We may get a 5-bushel crop, or 10 bushels, a 5-bushel at 75 percent parity will give me an income of $1,323, and a 10-bushel crop, $2,646. A 10-bushel crop at 100 percent parity will make me an income about $3,600 and, as my expenses are $3,000 a year, how can I make it on less than 100 percent of parity? I have been farming in this part of the United States for 33 years, and I believe for certain that acreage allotment is detrimental in western North Dakota, and that bushels be allotted: Basis family-type farm 100-percent parity, and farmer conserve his soil, without soil-conservation payment from our Government, as big operators have received the greatest benefit from same. The farmer must furnish his own storage, as it is the big operators that have received the benefit from Government loan and storage and is the cause of so-called surplus. A farmer now can under the agriculture formula borrow capital and build storage if needs for same exist on his or her farm. This I believe will create normal granary on farm where it rightfully belongs in first place.

Well, Burdick, you are free to use this letter as you see fit, and if you like to hear from me again, and what I'm thinking here in Williams County about the mess in Washington, D. C., it's yours for the asking. I'm 100 percent for you and 100 percent for 100-percent parity family-size farm.

Sincerely yours,

Henry Grondale.

Address of Carmine G. De Sapio, Democratic National Committeeman for the State of New York, at the Opening of the Annual Forum and Lecture Series of the National Democratic Club of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES J. DELANEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1954

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the Record, I include the following address by Carmine G. De Sapio, Democratic national committeeman for the State of New York, at the opening of the annual forum and lecture series of the National Democratic Club on Thursday evening, March 18, 1954:

Our party faces a great opportunity this year, and with opportunity, of course, comes responsibility. The people of the country look to us for leadership because they are discouraged and disappointed with the Republican record of empty promises and malperformance. The disillusionment and the dismay of the American people portends a change in political allegiance; but we Democrats do not want a change merely for the sake of a change. We want the people to understand our program, to accept our policies, and to mandate us definitely and decisively to restore the Government of the United States to the people; and thereby to regain the confidence, faith, and trust of the American public in their elected officers.

Government of the people is a common and much abused phrase. But to Democrats it has a very literal meaning; it means government for all of the people and not for the special, chosen few. It means government that places public interest above partisan welfare and government that recognizes that the primary responsibility of those in office is dedication to the best interests of the people.

We will win the Congress this year, and here in New York State we will, I am confident, elect our candidate for governor. But it is important that in so doing we also win the support of the people for the Democratic program. It is imperative that the philosophy of the New Deal, and the principle that government must always be a source of increased service to everyone, must have the understanding and the active backing of every single citizen.

It is a little disheartening, in these trying days, to observe the opportunism and the political hypocrisy which is practiced by those who would gain votes at all costs. Even insofar as the basic world issue is concerned—the issue of fighting communism—we find politics as usual to be the directing factor behind some partisans. I submit, my friends, that anyone who claims to have a personal monopoly on hatred for communism is a demagog and a fraud. Every decent American is repelled both by the doctrine of communism and the evil which is represented by Soviet aggression. Communism is a scourge and a disease, and its cure does not lie in the ranting of those who represent themselves to be alone in the crusade for its abolition. There are those who would have us forget that the Federal Bureau of Investigation, under the brilliant directorship of J. Edgar Hoover, forcefully and effectively fights communism and Communists every day. There are those who would have us forget that 96 Members of the United States Senate and an entire House of Representatives, made up of men and women of both political faiths, stand ready to enact laws and to fight, if necessary, to protect our heritage as a free democracy.

There are those who would erase from our minds the knowledlge that tens of thousands of our teachers in schools all over the country every day teach our young people the meaning of freedom and the ugliness of totalitarianism. Yes, there are even those who would pretend that they constitute a 1- or 2-man bulwark against the Communist invasion by the church, trying to have us forget that the ministers of all denominations have dedicated their lives to the teaching of brotherhood and Godliness and everything that is anathema to communism.

Even on this issue of fighting communism, the Republican Party stands divided against itself. Even on this one basic issue, the Republican Party is lacking in vision, and in leadership. How then can the people continue to look with confidence to the Republican Party for sound judgment and acumen on more controversial, but almost equally important issues such as unemployment, housing, public health, and education.

And here in our own State, the people have witnessed the sorry spectacle of the bubble of ardently proclaimed morality bursting in the face of the Republican leadership, leaving a sticky coat of revelation which no amount of whitewash can camouflage. How can the people look to leadership from a State administration which, after 12 years in office, now sanctiomoniously talks of a code of ethics on the one hand, and is steeped in shocking scandal on the other. How can the people look with hope to the kind of government which makes millionaires of a privileged circle of political cohorts, and increases rents and subway fares for everyone else.

Yes, we have the opportunity this year—we have the opportunity not only for winning the election but also for revitalizing and giving new meaning to what we as Democrats understand and cherish as government of the people. We know that the people will vote for our party and for our candidates this year; but that is only half of what we must seek to achieve. We must see to it that the people are informed—fully informed—as to the complete facts and the unvarnished truth. Because when they understand the issues, they will not only restore the Democratic Party to public trust, but will also support us, all the way, in our program for achieving peace, security, and a future of hope and happiness.

Thank you.

The Upper Colorado River Basin Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. DAWSON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1954

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, one of the most attractive promises inherent in the development of the upper Colorado River Basin through the construction of Echo Park and Glen Canyon Dams is the vast new recreation areas that will be opened up to the touring public of the Nation.

The highly scenic area is now virtually inaccessible. The character of the rivers limits fishing to an occasional channel catfish. The arid nature of the country contributes little to migratory bird life.

The construction of the dams will change all this. Glen Canyon will be another more scenic Lake Mead. Echo Park—high in the Uinta Mountain area—promises to become a fisherman's paradise.

In recognition of this fact, the Western Association of State Game and Fish Commissioners recently went on record approving the construction of the project, including Echo Park Dam. The resolution of the association follows:

RESOLUTION RECOMMENDING DEVELOPMENT OF UPPER COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT

Whereas President Franklin D. Roosevelt, in his proclamation enlarging the Dinosaur National Monument, published in the Federal Register of July 20, 1938, specifically stipulated that "the administration of the monument shall be subject to the reclamation withdrawal of October 17, 1904 * * * in connection with the Green River project"; and

Whereas the construction and development of the upper Colorado storage project is imperative to the progress and economic prosperity of the upper basin States; and

Whereas the postproject wildlife and recreational values of the upper Colorado River project will be far greater than the undeveloped river now possesses: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Western Association of State Game and Fish Commissioners goes on record as approving the report of the Secretary of the Interior recommending the development of the upper Colorado River storage project, including the construction of Echo Park Dam.

Adopted by the Western Association of State Game and Fish Commissioners' 34th annual conference, Las Vegas, Nev., May 5, 1954.

Our Orgy of Spending on Foreign Governments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. USHER L. BURDICK
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 26, 1954

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, if you do not think the one-worlders and the internationalists have finagled this country into a mess at the taxpayers' expense, read the following tables. From the year 1946 to 1953, inclusive, we have spent for foreign military aid and programs, including the activities of the United Nations, the sum of $47,793,685,385. Remember the first two figures are billions. At the same time, during this period through grants-in-aid, checks to individuals, including veterans of World War II and the Korean so-called police action, the people of the United States have received $32,696,160,427. In other words, we have spent on foreign governments over $15 billion more than has been expended here including our own defense and the abortive action in Korea and all soldiers' pay and hospitalization.

Ask yourselves, what have we gained? We started out to establish world peace and arrest the spread of communism abroad. Peace is not as near as it was when World War II ended, and the Communists have spread out all over Asia. Wars are still raging in spite of the great plan of the United Nations to bring about peace. Members associated together in the United Nations cannot agree among themselves; and, with the veto power lodged with Russia, there is no possibility of peace unless it is a Russian peace; yet we doggedly stick by the organization and keep on draining the cash out of the pockets of the taxpayers.

During the last year of the Truman administration we spent on foreign governments $4,595,477,000, and the people thought it was time for a switch from this procedure. The Republicans were going to change this squandering of money, but what happened? In the first year of the Eisenhower administration we spent on foreign governments $6,336 million, or nearly $2 billion more than Truman spent. It was a change, all right, but not the kind of change the voters expected.

Nothing about this foreign policy has been changed. Dean Acheson's buddy, John Foster Dulles, took his place and the international-minded disciples like Stassen and Lodge went to work, along with Dulles, in continuing the foreign spree. It is still going, and I am a poor guesser if we do not get snarled up with the Indochina war.

I have voted consistently against all these appropriations, and for that action I am branded as an isolationist. Those who do the branding are the one-worlders and the internationalists. I have never taken the position that we should withdraw from the world and hide our head in the sand, but have tried my best to keep this country where it remained for 150 years, dealing with all countries in a spirit of friendship.

I make no apology for standing up for our own country and trying to persuade Congress to direct this Government without the everlasting interference with one-worlders who think we have been called to direct the affairs of the entire world.

The above figures prove my case, and I submit them for the purpose of letting the people know what is going on.

Memorial Service, Red Rock Reservation, Lynn, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 26, 1954

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the program and part of my address delivered at the annual Red Rock memorial service, which are held in commemoration of departed veterans of all wars who made the supreme sacrifice and have become enshrined in a Nation's grateful memory:

OFFICIAL PROGRAM

Harlie G. Butters, commandant, North Shore Detachment, Marine Corps League, general chairman; Henry LeClair, North Shore Detachment, Marine Corps League, vice chairman; massing of colors, M. Sgt. Carl Jung, USMC, in charge.

Greetings------------------------------
Daniel R. Brown, Marine Corps League
Opening prayer ------------------------
Rev. Father William L. Wolkovich, St. Pius Church
Band selection dedicated to naval dead--
Wm. P. Connery, Jr., Post No. 6, American Legion Band
Remarks-------------------------------
Hon. Arthur J. Frawley, mayor of Lynn
Prayers for the dead--------------------
Rev. Robert V. Ozment, Lakeside Methodist Church
Band selection dedicated to Gold Star Mothers------------------- Post No. 6 Band
Remarks-------------------------------
Hon. THOMAS J. LANE, Congressman from Seventh District
Address by principal speaker-----------
Lt. Comdr. William Fuller, USN
Strewing of flowers on water-----------
Members of United States Armed Forces
Salute to the dead----------------------
Firing squad from United States Naval Reserve
Taps--------- Buglers from Post No. 6 Band
Recognition of guests, committee, etc.
Closing prayer and benediction----------
Rabbi Samuel Fox, Congregation Anshai Sfard
National anthem---------- Post No. 6 Band

ADDRESS OF HON. THOMAS J. LANE, OF MASSACHUSETTS

As restless as the sea is the bravery that makes a man.

We come to honor those to whom life was not as valuable as courage.

By sacrificing their lives to save us, they have become enshrined in a nation's grateful memory.

We grieve because no nation can afford to lose too many of its gallant sons and daughters, the elite of its manhood and womanhood.

Nations like France and England suffered such appalling casualties during World War I that they have not yet recovered from the loss of their finest youth. For who is to fill the vacuum when the bravest have gone?

We in the United States have suffered less, and so we remain strong.

And on our broad shoulders rests the burden of leading the free world in its struggle against tyranny.

We mourn those who have already fallen in the fight.

We see the gaps in our ranks.

On Memorial Day each year we pay tribute to the immortal souls of those who did not fail us in the hour of danger but went forth to meet it with a heroism that transcends all other experiences in the life of human beings.

Before their martyrdom for freedom we stand in awe and admiration, wondering if we can be capable of their firmness in the right, as God gives us to see the right in the peril now confronting our Nation and all of its people.

The battleground of today is not some strang and far-away land.

The battleground is here in the hearts and minds of all Americans, determining whether we have what it takes to unite our Nation in support of a clear and definite foreign policy, founded as it must be on moral values, rallying the fearful and the fainthearted everywhere to step forward and be counted on freedom's side.

These men we honor today were not confused.

They did not seek others to substitute for them in meeting the challenge that had to be met and mastered.

They did not try to escape from decision.

They went forth to face it with the best that was in them.

And so our grief in their passing is not without consolation.

A deep and fervent pride wells up in our hearts as we think of them.

We know that America can produce such men.

In every city and in every home there are millions like them, people who are thinking hard about the dangers that surround us, people who want to do their part in making our country strong and good and true.

Not the weak, not the selfish, not the indifferent.

Only the brave, who believe in principle and will give everything, if need be, to make it victorious.

There is no substitute for courage.

It does not check out when the 5 o'clock whistle blows.

It does not ask what profit it will receive.

It does not seek the easy road of pleasure.

Like this rock upon which we stand, it survives all storm and tempest.

Courage is the priceless gift that these men give to us as we commune with their eternal spirit.

We bow our heads in prayer, thankful to God that we had such men to protect us in time of peril.

But, as we raise our eyes to each other again, we, the living, recognize the duty before us.

For we are in the position that they once ocuupied.

The power and the responsibility for protecting freedom is now with us.

There is no turning backward upon the children who are behind us.

There is no detour from the straight road ahead.

There is only room for courage.

As we look out upon the sea and its far horizons, we seem to hear the voices of those who have gone before us, encouraging us onward.

Even death could not defeat them.

No, it is not their voices that we hear. It is the sound of our own hearts, inspired by the memory of their sacrifices, infused by the example of their unconquerable faith.

From this memorial service, we turn to pick up the banner that has dropped from their lifeless hands.

With gratitude toward the heroic dead for showing us that freedom and valor go forward, hand in hand.

God give us strength to be worthy of them.

Rewards and Adventures in a Life of Teaching

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD H. REES

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 25, 1954

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent granted me by the House, I am including herewith an address by Dr. John Rufi, head of the department of education, University of Missouri. The address was delivered by Dr. Rufi on a special occasion of awarding the title of master teacher to seven outstanding teachers of our State at the Kansas State Teachers' College in Emporia, Kans. I have known the author of this address over a period of years. He is one of the outstanding educators of this country. I am sure the Members will be interested in reading this constructive and informative statement.

The address follows:

Rewards and Adventures in a Life of Teaching

(By John Rufi, University of Missouri, Columbia, Mo.)

Some days ago, purely as a matter of personal enjoyment, I reread that delightful book by William Lyon Phelps entitled "The Excitement of Teaching." The title itself intrigues and fascinates me—"The Excitement of Teaching." Those of you who knew Professor Phelps would expect this to be an interesting book, and an interesting book it is. With certain of the author's views I emphatically disagree, but with his major thesis I am in complete agreement.

Professor Phelps discusses the adventures involved in teaching, in entering a classroom filled with students, of teaching or attempting to teach a collection of individual personalities more complex, more delicate, more intricate than any machinery. "Not only is every student an organism more sensitive than any mechanical product," suggests Dr. Phelps, "every student is infinitely more precious to some parent or relative, perhaps near at hand, perhaps thousands of miles away. The officials of the United States Mint, the head of a diamond mine, the president of a metropolitan bank, are not dealing with material so valuable as that in the hands of the teacher. * * *" Their mistakes are not so disastrous as his, their successes not so important. * * * Teaching," concludes Phelps, "has its perils, its discouragements, its successes, its delights. Far from being a dull routine, it is the most adventurous, the most exciting, the most thrilling of professions."

The single purpose of this occasion is to pay tribute to coworkers in our profession who have won recognition for their excellence as teachers. It appears appropriate then, that we briefly reexamine the calling of the teacher. What are its rewards and its delights? Its disappointments? Why does it challange those of us who have a spirit of adventure? What adventures and challenges does it offer? We are told that as Thackeray, the English novelist, went about his native heath he was fond of sitting on the rear seat of the coach, facing backward, so that he might view the road over which he had come. Included in our group tonight are a goodly number who have taught not merely 1 decade, but 2, 3, or even 4. Let us, for a few brief moments, essay the role of the great Thackeray, face backward, so to speak, and look at the road over which we have come.

The terrain we have traversed has been rugged, the road rough, and our journey has been neither smooth nor prosaic. As all of us can testify, teachers have troubles, many troubles. When I reflect on the public's general indifference toward schools during the tawdry twenties, the bitter battle for educational survival during the depression-ridden thirties, the unreasonable demands on our overworked personnel during World War II and the back-breaking burdens administrators, teachers, and other educational coworkers have carried during the last half dozen years, I am inclined to echo the refrain from the Negro spiritual, "Nobody knows the troubles we've had." This is neither the time nor the place for a melancholy recital of the problems we have encountered, the individual headaches and heartaches we have experienced. In the interest of honest realism, however, brief mention may well be made of some general problems that have beset us throughout the last 40 years and continue to bedevil us today. All of these are familiar to you, so I shall be brief.

High on the list of perplexing problems yet unsolved is that of financing our educational program. Year by year, the demands on our schools increase; year by year their financial support lags far behind their imperative needs. There are, of course, many dilemmas in education which cannot be solved by more money alone. Nevertheless, adequate financial support would go a long way toward solving many of them, and without adequate support many of them are simply unsolvable. Generally speaking, the American people seem to be able to finance the purchase of about anything on the market they decide they really want. Too many of them are, as yet, unwilling to pay the bill for a real program of education and, as a result, in the words of Benjamin Fine's scathing indictment, "Our children are cheated." (Many of the men and women who teach them are likewise cheated.) Much of this financial insecurity stems directly from an outmoded, unsatisfactory tax structure. Reasonable people will admit that our schools need more money, but it is easier to deprive them of their rightful share of the local, State, and National income than it is to correct the inequities of an antiquated system of levying, collecting, and distributing tax funds. In the meantime our schools get along as best they can. From the Ozarks of south Missouri comes the story of a hill boy who had brought his bag of corn to the mill for grinding. The mill was an ancient rattletrap, and as he impatiently awaited his turn, the boy began to make caustic comments about the mill. "You don't seem to think much of my mill, Son," said the miller. "Nope," replied the boy, "I could eat the meal as fast as your mill can grind it." "And just how long could you keep it up?" taunted the miller. "Until I starved to death, "scornfully replied the boy, abruptly closing the argument. Some of our schools (and their teachers) have for years been on the verge of starving to death. And in certain areas this condition will continue in the years ahead unless drastic remedies are sought and utilized.

A second problem that persists is the shortage of properly prepared personnel. Many of us recall our professional inadequacies as beginners. Certainly I vividly remember mine. Having completed the 8-year course in district 86 (the Little Friend School of Neosho County), possessing an eighth-grade diploma, and having attended a 4-week county normal (at Erie, Kans.), I took the examination and so armed with a third-grade certificate, valiantly undertook my first teaching assignment at the Hazel Dell School in Neosho County. (Surely this is a well-nigh perfect illustration of the blind attempting to lead the blind.) The school year was scarcely underway before I sensed my desperate need for preparation. Immediately after my 7-month assignment ended I came to Emporia, enrolled in the first year of high school and began what was to become an 11-year period of high school, college, and graduate school preparation for teaching.

Through unremitting efforts our preparation standards for teaching have been raised far above those of several decades ago, and in many of our excellent schools we have staffs that fully meet standards of which we are justly proud. But again and again, in periods of national crisis we are forced to give ground and to sacrifice the professional gains of decades. This occurred in World War I and World War II, when in order to remain in session many schools found it necessary to employ teachers of substandard preparation. And today, due to an unprecedented enrollment, we face the gravest teacher shortage in our entire history. Next year probably 1 out of 4 of our youth will have a teacher who by accepted standards is not qualified for his important task. Truly this recurring lapse of standards is one of the disheartening aspects of our profession. Although other factors contribute to this recurring shortage of teachers and the lowering of standards which inevitably follows, the extremely low salaries paid to too many of our competent, experienced teachers cause many of them to leave our calling. Professionally minded teachers sincerely want to give primary consideration to their professional work, but the financial compensation of many is so low that they are virtually forced to be unduly concerned and worried about their financial problems. The American Federation of Teachers announced in February that over 100,000 qualified teachers will leave the schools this school year for pay high enough to support themselves and their families. No wonder harried school administrators are frantically searching for replacements.

There are, of course, other areas of disappointment in teaching. Let me briefly cite one more, an area in which all of us have met and endured discouragement. Here I refer to certain frustrations that seem to me to be inherent in our calling. Devoted, conscientious teaching is work. Hard, demanding work. And there are times when it seems that the best we can do is not good enough. The perverse, contrary, ill-conditioned pupil. (You will recall Woodrow Wilson's comment about the amazing capacity of the human mind to resist the intrusion of information.) The stubbornly unresponsive class. The demanding but uncooperative parent who persists in being a hindrance instead of a help. The unwarranted community interference in our private lives. The inconsistent critic who lambastes us one day for neglecting the traditional subjects and the next day insists that we offer courses in diver training and the preparation of income-tax returns. The ever-growing demand for more more and more school services to youth, services which in many cases might well be provided by parents, homes, churches, or other community agencies. (If some parents had their way teachers would become mere baby-sitters with a pedagogical side line.) But why elaborate this point? Every teacher of experience can illustrate it endlessly from his own observations. No wonder we teachers become weary in well-doing. Our spirits are generally willing but at times the flesh is weak. We can perfectly comprehend A. E. Housman's feeling of futility when he wrote:

"Yonder see the morning blink
The sun is up, and up must I,
To wash and dress and eat and drink
And look at things, and talk, and think
And work—and God knows why!

Oh, often have I washed and dressed
And what's to show for all my pain?
Let me lie abed and rest.
Ten thousand times I've done my best,
And all's to do again!"

Who among us has not at times given way to feelings of discouragement, depression, or even sheer futility? Lest we take these temporary moods too seriously we may well recall the great Herbert Palmer, of Harvard University, who was nationally acclaimed for his instructional skill and for his enthusiasm for teaching. Yet, as he admitted in his inspiring monograph The Ideal Teacher, much as he loved teaching, at times he was insufferably bored by it. Who of us it not?

Although we have reviewed only three areas of professional disappointment and discouragement these three constitute such a lugubrious prelude that some will promptly ask, "Why would anyone, in his right mind, seriously want to enter this field? Why would any sane person remain in it?"

The answer is simple. Those of us who love teaching (and we are a goodly company) honestly believe that the gains are greater than the pains. Much greater. We believe the disappointments and perils, formidable though they be, are vastly outweighed by the rewards, delights, and compensations of our calling. To the professional veterans among you these rewards and compensations are likewise familiar. Hence I shall discuss them only briefly.

In the first place, we as teachers can significantly serve our Nation. I make no apology for considering this a compelling inducement. This is my country. Because of their love of liberty, because to them America was a land of freedom and opportunity, my ancestors deliberately chose to come and make America their home. In due time they took up arms in its defense and one lost his life in battle. Yes, this is my own, my native land, and as a citizen who is proud of his heritage, I want to contribute to its welfare. Today, like many others I am deeply concerned about our safety and our destiny as a nation.

It has been my privilege to visit many of the ancient lands which once were truly the seats of the mighty. The great Roman Empire. The vast and powerful empire of the Ottomans. What happened to these once proud and mighty nations?

How often have I wished that I could take my own students, who are preparing to teach, on a return journey to these ancient lands. We would walk through the towering Cilician gates and reflect on the conquering armies that long ago passed that way. Cyrus and his Immortal Ten Tousand on their way to Babylon 2,350 years ago. Alexander the Great and his conquering army. What finally came of these earth-shaking powers?

We would travel some 25 miles from Athens, "where the mountains look on Marathon and Marathon looks on the sea." Here Darius and his Perisan host were defeated by 10,000 brave Athenians. Finally we would stand on the ruins of Babylon, the mightiest walled city in the world in its day. We would gaze on the utter desolation and ask ourselves some sober questions. What came of all this glory and the greatness? What does this mean to America? Does their history have any lessons for us—lessons that will help us make our own country safe and strong and good? And what can we learn from yesterday that will make us better teachers today and tomorrow?

In the past 40 years crises have multiplied until they have become commonplace. Yet thoughtful men among our leaders believe and frankly say that we are today in one of the most crucial and critical periods in our history. Much of the world is in the throes of a revolution that spreads with frightening fury. The jet plane and the H-bomb have knocked all of the theories of the isolationist into a cocked hat. Suddenly, abruptly, whether we like it or not we must learn to live and work with a billion new neighbors. The cold war in which our Nation is engaged is obviously a war of ideologies, and in a war of ideologies, a struggle for the minds of men, we teachers are enlisted on the side of our country just as truly as if we were to don the uniforms of our armed forces.

A couple of years ago it was my privilege to spend some months working with our good friends the Turks. For these fine people I developed respect, admiration, and affection. Among all of our friends and allies I would place them second to none in stouthearted courage and in devotion to our common cause. Their great revolutionary leader Attaturk is held in very real veneration. This is easily understood when one sums up his services to his people. Courageous and able soldier! Resourceful diplomat! Outstanding statesmen! Dynamic leader! And last, but by no means least, a truly great teacher! He saw the necessity for strong military defenses, but he also recognized the imperative need for education, and he worked wonders in improving their educational program. It was he who said, "In the long run, it is only the teachers who really save nations." Let all who teach ponder these words: "It is only the teachers who really save nations." What a magnificent opportunity is ours to serve our country and to serve it significantly.

Secondly, we as teachers can significantly serve youth. More than one third of our 160 million people are youth, 20 years of age or younger. In a very real sense they constitute our most precious national resource. Within the next several decades, everything we call dear in our American heritage and tradition will be balanced on the knife-thin edge of this generation. Any serious neglect of this generation of youth would be nothing short of calamitious. Today's young people are the prducts of parents who suffered the disorganizing effects of a devastating depression and the disintegrating influences of a frightful world war, and now are enduring what is a seemingly endless cold war. Is it strange or remarkable that so many of our children are disturbed, disorganized, at loose ends, and deeply worried over their uncertain future? How could it be otherwise! No wonder that so many of them turn to us for help. The plight of at least some of these youth is poignantly illustrated by the recent tragic news story from Massachusetts:

"Swimmers at Green Pond, Millers Falls, Mass., paid no attention one afternoon last week when 18-year-old John Hawthorne began splashing and calling, 'Which way to shore?' as he labored through the water, only 30 feet from the beach. Finally a youth named Norman Gerber headed for him. But young Hawthorne went under. By the time Gerber found him and towed him to shore, he was dead. His weeping sisters, Elizabeth, 13, and Barbara, 9, who had brought him to the pond but had stayed on shore explained why he had acted so oddly. John Hawthorne was blind."

Our young people turn to us as teachers. In their bewilderment and worry they ask us, "Which way to shore?" What a magnificent opportunity for service to youth is ours.

In the year 1837 Horace Mann, then a successful attorney, at the age of 41 voluntarily relinquished his legal practice and accepted the secretaryship of the Board of Education of Massachusetts. In entering upon this new work he wrote to a friend:

"I no longer write myself attorney, counselor, or lawyer. My lawbooks are for sale. My office is 'to let.' The bar is no longer my forum. My jurisdiction is changed. I have abandoned jurisprudence, and betaken myself to the larger sphere of mind and morals. Having found the present generation composed of materials almost unmalleable, I am about transferring my efforts to the next." On November 3, 1837, he made the following entry in his diary: "The interests of a client are small compared with the interests of the next generation. Let the next generation, then, be my client."

We who teach have taken the next generation as our client. What a responsibility and what an opportunity for service.

Third, for many teachers our profession provides a satisfying, abundant, and rewarding life. This statement appears to contradict some of my previous comments. Let me clear up this seeming paradox.

It must be remembered that approximately a million persons are involved in teaching in this country. Of this huge number some are very poorly prepared. Some are very poorly paid. In educationally backward States and areas the number of teachers who are substandard in preparation and salary is distressingly large and seriously lowers the averages for these States, areas, and, indeed, for the entire country. Averages must, of course, be taken into account. They are part of the picture but they do not tell the entire story, and taken alone, they can be extremely misleading. (You will recall the story of the man, 6 feet tall, who drowned while attempting to ford a stream which had an average depth of only 3 feet.) Many teachers work under conditions that are bad, bad in various ways. Their classrooms are intolerably shabby and overcrowded. Their equipment is meager or archaic, their administrative leadership stupid and ineffective, their communities indifferent and unappreciative. For many of this group, teaching is indubitably a dismal and horribly frustrating occupation. We do not know the precise size of this unhappy contingent, but of one thing we are certain: It is far, far too large for the good of our youth and our country. Certainly we must labor constantly to remedy this tragic situation.

But let us not forget that the picture has a brighter, a much brighter side. Many of our teachers are well-prepared and are well-paid. Many work in clean, bright, attractive classrooms with classes that are reasonable in size. They have helpful, enjoyable coworkers, competent and inspiring administrative leaders, and the parents of their pupils are highly cooperative and deeply appreciative. In general, these teachers have invested heavily in preparation, and it has proved to be a splendid investment for all concerned. They are, in the main, a highly professionalized group. In short, for many of them our profession has provided and is providing a good, a very good life.

The literature of our profession is replete with convincing evidence that this statement is true. Reread Bliss Perry's delightful autobiography And Gladly Teach. Reenjoy Mary Ellen Chase's story in which she describes her rich life under the title A Goodly Fellowship. Revel again with William Lyon Phelps in his Autobiography With Letters. For these, and many other individuals who might be cited, teaching has proved to be a truly abundant and happy life.

It is true that some who attempt to teach obviously lack the qualities and attributes demanded for successful and happy work in this field. Some cannot or will not meet acceptable standards and, for the sake of all concerned, the sooner they transfer to less demanding occupations, the better.

On the other hand, individuals who possess the character and ability and the other requisite personal attributes and who, at the appropriate time, prepare thoroughly for their professional responsibilities, the prospects are not only favorable, they actually are very bright indeed. I have again and again pointed out to my own students (and reputable studies convincingly support my assertion) that never in the history of education in this country have the prospects been so bright for high-grade individuals who have in full measure the attributes the work demands provided they make the thorough academic and professional preparation one should make before entering a profession. It has been my privilege to serve as official adviser for a large number of young people who have demonstrated that they "have personal and professional goods of very high quality, and that they can and will deliver." I have few worries about their success or their happiness. What a pleasure it has been and is to follow them out into the professional field and observe them not only giving a good account of themselves, but deriving great and enduring satisfaction from their high calling.

Fourth, At its best, teaching involves challenge and adventure. In commenting on the work of the teacher some one has wisely said:

"When we deal with the minor problems of heat, light, ventilation, paper wads, and gum, we are day laborers. When we present our subject matter, we are artisans—more or less artistic, according to our medium and our ability. When we mold the human heart, which is at once the most resistant and the most plastic of all media, we enter the realm of the artist."

At its best, teaching involves adventures and thrills. The school year begins. We enter our classrooms. We look over the assembled group with an appraising eye. We survey the field, so to speak. Prof. Thomas H. Briggs, of Teachers Colege, Columbia University, a great teacher and choice spirit, used to say that when he entered his classes at the beginning of the summer session he felt like saying, "Lord God Almighty, here they are. Now what can I do for them?" You have experienced this feeling and so have it. "What talents will I discover here?" "What growth can I stimulate here?" "What ambition and drives will I uncover?" "What slumbering interests can I awaken?" "How can I best stimulate the indolent, arouse the lethargic, and stabilize the erratic?" To the casual eye many of the members of the group seem even to look alike. In her charming book, Teachers Are People, Virginia Church describes this situation for the elementary grades, the very young children. She says:

"On the first day of school they pour into their seats, little nonentities, all frowsy, all the same, like so much batter, in cake-rings. Then they begin to rise. Each reveals a separate sweetness and a worth all his own."

There is always the possibility of discovering the diamond in the rough, the latent talent, the kindred spirit, the mind to which we can really impart a ferment. Virginia Church describes it with such feeling in her verse called Common Ground:

"I waxed enthusiastic over the gerundive;
I grew eloquent in consideration of mood and voice,
When I started in zealously on subjective compliments,
I saw Mike's eyes feasting hungrily on the hills
Whose pine-crested tops he could see through the windows.
I closed the grammar
And read to the class Keat's Ode on a Grecian Urn.
Mike's eyes traveled back from the hilltops,
And smiled into mine.
We had both visioned the Vale of Tempe."

Surely Miss Church must have been a great teacher. She sums this up so much better than can I in seven short lines which she calls The Teacher's Pay:

"The thrill of seeing the procession go by,
The privilege of being one with youth,
Sensing their problems,
Sharing their sorrows:
Seeing their joy,
Could any labor
Be more richly requited?"

Teaching involves challenges—sharp challenges. This particular point is so terribly important that I might well have devoted my entire time to it. As President Eisenhower pointed out, the world is suffering from a multiplicity of fears. We fear depression; the loss of our jobs; we fear this and that and the other; and the impact on our minds of these and other fears makes us act almost hysterically. In this climate of fear and hysteria we shall, unless we are vigilant, fall victims to all sorts of silly delusions and vicious propaganda.

Many of the liberties we prize are under attack. The institutions we cherish are under fire. Irresponsible and dishonest headline hunters are having a field day. One of these high-powered but unprincipled demagogs makes the fearsome announcement that the American clergy is heavily infiltrated by Communists—heavily infiltrated. Just how silly can one get. We have an investigation. Weeks later the Un-American Activities Committee made its report and the chairman, who had much to do with starting the ruckus, now says, "A minute number of case-hardened Communists had infiltrated into the ranks of the clergy." Now it's a minute number.

Of course, our educational institutions offer a fine target for these self-seeking alarmists. Some of these scandalmongers on the air waves would have us believe that our colleges and universities are simply crawling with Communists. Nonsense. I have served on the staffs of more than 10 higher institutions in widely separated areas of this country and have encountered only 1 staff member I had reason to suspect was a Communist—only 1. But the air waves continue to be heavy with exaggerated accusations, wild charges, and vicious innuendoes. The technique of the big lie and the smear so beautifully developed by Hitler and Goebbels seems on its way to new refinement in this land of the free and home of the brave.

As Alvin Johnson recently pointed out, our American vocabularly is gaining a rich accession of weasel words. It may not be safe to call someone you dislike a Communist; you may be sued for libel. But if you really dislike him, call him a Red or a pinko. It might be very risky to call a man a traitor or a spy unless you have real evidence, so call him a subversive or a security risk. There is almost no limit to the amount of damage you can do and still remain within the law. (You will recall that even our Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, Earl Warren, was charged with having followed the Marxist party line when Governor of California.) Another popular weasel word is "leftist." Accuse a man with or without evidence, rob him of his honor and his living, and if he makes the mistake of standing on his constitutional rights, then call him a Communist whether he is or not.

The evidence is clear that, with extremely few exceptions, our million American teachers are loyal, patriotic American citizens. On this point the testimony of Dean Ernest Melby, of the School of Education of New York University, is significant. Drawing upon facts from his own career that took him through 45 of the 48 States, Dr. Melby says that he has known as many teachers as any man in the United States. He states he has never known personally a single Communist in his 40 years of teaching experience. I have known Dr. Melby for 20 years and have worked closely with him. His testimony is good enough for me.

We as teachers must and will rise to meet these challenges to our educational institutions and our profession. In the first place we must not allow ourselves to be frightened or intimidated. As Elmer Davis has pointed out, in resisting this general drive against the freedom of the mind, the first thing to remember is "don't let them scare you." We are more than a million strong and because we are armed with a good cause we have enormous power of resistance if we still mobilize and use it.

Our most eloquent reply to these attacks and the most important contribution we can make to our Nation in this crisis must, of course, be positive in character. We must strive without ceasing to make our work as teachers more and more effective, to make our schools pay the highest possible social dividends on our country's great investment in them. And our constant endeavor must be to develop in all of our youth an intelligent understanding of and an unswerving devotion to the best and highest in American ideals and traditions to the end that we shall keep America free and make her strong and good.

It is a privilege to pay tribute to you who are being honored here tonight. In complimenting and recognizing you we are honoring not only you but the great profession to which we are all dedicated. We wish for you many more years of effective, rewarding service. We are proud to be associated with you in the upbuilding of our youth and of our profession. In the years ahead we will continue to build together. And in the words of John Ruskin:

"When we build let us think we build forever. Let it not be for present delight, nor present use alone. Let it be such work as our descendants will thank us for, and let us think, as we lay stone on stone, that a time will come when these stones will be held sacred because our hands have touched them, and that men will say as they look upon the labor and wrought substance of them, 'See. This our fathers did for us.'"

Representation for Buffalo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDMUND P. RADWAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 26, 1954

Mr. RADWAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith 2 editorials, 1 which appeared in the Buffalo Evening News, Buffalo, N. Y., on May 21, 1954:

SPEAK UP, BUFFALO

Mayor Pankow's telegram to President Eisenhower urging the appointment of someone from Buffalo to the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation gives a welcome bipartisan echo of a similar plea from Congressman Edmund P. Radwan in a letter to the White House Wednesday.

In support of that campaign, the voice of western New York should be united and militant. If it is to get anywhere, it will doubtless need to be.

The clamor for positions on this seaway advisory board can already be heard from here to Duluth, and from here to New Orleans—from port cities that hope to gain vast advantage from the seaway, and from shipping and rail centers that expect to lose.

The Buffalo area's stake is obvious and vital. What may be equally vital, but not so obvious, is the stake the entire Empire State has in making sure that its principal Great Lakes port has a voice on the seaway board.

This is no routine bid for a patronage appointment. It is not a bid for patronage at all, but for representation. In fact, it makes little difference whether the Buffalo representative on the seaway advisory board is a Democrat or a Republican, since the statute setting it up contemplates that 3 members will belong to 1 party and 2 to the other.

What all of this area's representatives should insist upon—and what must be impressed upon New York's Senators, Governor Dewey, and the political leaders in both parties—is the logic of this double-barreled proposition:

1. New York State must obviously be represented at all times in the development of both the seaway and the harbor improvement plans that will flow from it, and

2. This State's interest should be voiced by someone intimately acquainted with the shipping economy of the State's principal Great Lakes port.

The time to sell that proposition is now, while the first seaway board is being set up. And it will call for some competitive selling—not only to President Eisenhower, who will be hearing plenty of the same from other port cities with an interest equivalent to Buffalo's; but also to the Senators and political leaders within this State, who will be getting their share of downstate pressures for representation of New York City's interest in minimizing seaway traffic.

Mr. Radwan and the other Buffalo representatives, in short, are going to need plenty of community backing—and the backing of other upstate and western New York communities that stand to gain or lose much from the seaway's impact on the economy of the Great Lakes region.

How soon the appointments are to be made, we have no idea, but they are not likely to be long delayed. We would suggest, therefore, that no time be wasted in letting this area's voice be loudly heard—not only in the White House, but in the Executive Mansion in Albany, in the offices of Senators Ives and Lehman, and wherever else it may do some good.

The other, which appeared in the Buffalo Courier-Express, Buffalo, N. Y., under date of May 22, 1954, follows:

A Way to Make Amends for Slight to Buffalo Port

The next episode in the unfolding saga of Buffalo and the St. Lawrence seaway has to do with the appointment of an advisory board for the Seaway Development Corporation. Will a Buffalo area resident be appointed by the President to that board? We submit that no area on this side of the border has more reason than Buffalo to expect representation.

The evidence that there has been discrimination at Washington against Buffalo in the appropriation of Federal funds for harbor improvements is convincing. Money has gone for harbor work elsewhere at the same time pleas on Buffalo's behalf were turned down.

This is a serious slight to a great industrial region of the Nation. It is especially so at a time when the area is disturbed over the need to accommodate deeper-draft vessels plying the lakes.

Will insult be added to injury when the time comes for appointment of the Seaway Development Corporation's advisory board? It will be if the appointee from New York State—and there certainly will be one—hails from elsewhere than Buffalo.

The New Economics of Medical Care, by Henry J. Kaiser, President of the Kaiser Foundation, Before the National Press Club, Washington, D. C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1954

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, today Henry J. Kaiser, president of the Kaiser Foundation, delivered a memorable address on the subject, The New Economics of Medical Care.

In his address Mr. Kaiser not only gave a fascinating and inspirational expression of his views with respect to the present and future needs of medical care, but, also a realistic picture of what can be done to give adequate and comprehensive medical and hospital care, by the use of a prepayment plan, and within the reach of even low-income groups.

His description of what has been already accomplished by the Kaiser Foundation, serving nearly a half million subscribers, was convincing that the Kaiser plan is a vision made practicable.

I include as part of my remarks the address to which I have referred. It is as follows:

The New Economics of Medical Care

(By Henry J. Kaiser, president of the Kaiser Foundation, before the National Press Club)

Mr. President, members of the National Press Club, and distinguished guests, I am convinced that it is more than just a coincidence that I have been asked to be here to talk with you today. In the first place, it was an honor to receive your invitation, and I am really grateful for the opportunity to be here.

But, let me explain what I mean about the coincidence; the last time I had the pleasure of having lunch with you, our Nation was in the throes of a global war. We were experiencing a national crisis. It was an unforgettable experience for me to see, here in this room, the birth of a rally on the part of the representatives of the press of this country, a rally that brought about a change in the attitude of the American people from growing despair to inspired confidence and victory.

It strikes me that this Nation of ours is again in a position of facing a serious problem and so I am again thrilled to be in this same room with this same group. I know that you will again rally the citizens of the Nation into positive action against a situation that is as serious in its relationship to the people's well-being as was the war to our national security. With you leading the way, we can do nothing but win.

Now what I am referring to may not sound as exciting as wars, atomic bombs, H-bombs, breaking sound barriers, or even the 4-minute mile. However, what I want to talk about and what I want you to tell and write about, is a subject that is very close to the heart of every man, woman, and child in this country. It is the personal problem of everyone in this room, and virtually everyone in this Nation. I mean the health and the medical care needs of us all. And believe me, there is an alarming and growing need for a solution to this problem.

The last time I was here with you, thousands of Americans were dying too soon. That was 12 years ago. Today too many Americans are still dying too soon, too many Americans are still suffering needlessly. In addition to the thousands who needlessly die and suffer, there are millions who are forced into financial bondage because of the expense involved in getting necessary medical care. If we can build ships, planes, tanks, guns, and bullets to protect our national security, can we not build hospitals and clinics to protect the lives of our people?

The last time I was here, people were saying "It couldn't be done." Today the sad-singers are still with us for I keep hearing the same old song, "It can't be done," "It can't be done."

The last time I was here you said it could be done and you went out and told your readers that it could be done and with a great deal of thanks to you, it was done.

Let's take a quick look at what these needs are and then at what can be done about them. For many months now the Wolverton congressional committee has been hearing witnesses testify on these health needs. Spokesmen for many millions of American workers and their families, leaders of major industries, physicians of unimpeachable authority and of eminent regard, have testified regarding the staggering costs to the people resulting from illness—and what to do about it.

Chairman Wolverton pointed out that "The annual costs to the Nation from illnesses is roughly equivalent to the total Federal income-tax revenues received from individuals, or $30 billion annually." Thirty billion dollars a year lost to the Nation because of illness.

The annual indebtedness incurred by individuals through illness is equally appalling. For 1 year alone, small loan companies made single-purpose loans for medical expenses totaling more than $480 million and charged interest, averaging 33 percent on an annual basis, totaling $84 million. This amount does not include medical loans by banks, insurance companies, and other lenders. It does not include an estimated $1 billion of debts owed directly by the public to doctors, dentists, and hospitals.

Don't you think these figures demand serious consideration and a solution?

Even the president of the American Medical Association agreed to that. Dr. Martin, the president of the AMA so testified before the Wolverton committee. He further testified that "the AMA has been interested in this problem for years and years and it has done a tremendous amount of work."

Well, that's fine. The people want the doctors of this country not only to be interested in this serious problem, but to do something about it. I am sure they will.

In the meantime, various plans or solutions have been put into operation in different parts of the country in response to the demands of the people for better medical care. Over the past 20 years, we in the Kaiser Health Organizations have been interested in this problem and we have done a tremendous amount of work on it, too. As a matter of fact, we have 35 clinics, hospitals, and other facilities serving the needs of nearly a half million people on the west coast.

I can't understand for the life of me, why there should be any conflict or controversy over any plan that brings comprehensive, high quality medical care to Americans at a low cost, especially when that plan was evolved and carried out under the American free-enterprise system. I can understand, and I am completely in sympathy with, those who would oppose any plan of socialized medicine. I, too, have always been opposed to it.

There are about 5 million people—or 3 percent of the population—receiving comprehensive medical care by prepaid medical plans across the country. When you stop to think that almost 100 million of our people have obtained some form of limited, voluntary prepaid insurance against hospital costs, you have a pretty good idea of what the people of this country are seeking—of what they really want. And I want to say right here that I'm going to do everything within my power to see that they get it.

This is what I think the average American wants. I think he wants to be able to go and see his doctor as often as he pleases or needs to without fear of running up a bill that he will have to borrow money to pay. When his wife or his child doesn't feel well, he wants to feel free to take them to the doctor and have them checked over. If he or any member of his family gets sick and requires a doctor to come to his home, he wants to feel free of the cost problem.

If he or a member of his family has to go to the hospital, he wants to know he can go to the finest hospital. He wants to know that he doesn't have to worry about paying the bill, because those few cents a day he has been paying, and will continue to pay, have already taken care of the hospital bill, the surgery bill, the X-rays, the drugs, and the medicines.

He wants to know that in his hospital room he can have not only the latest and best surgical and medical care, but the latest and best equipment to keep him happy and comfortable.

Wouldn't you like to know that, in a modern-designed hospital, the nurse is right outside your door—that she doesn't have to dash up and down a long corridor to answer your call? Wouldn't you like to have every possible patient convenience at your immediate command through the magic of electric controls? Wouldn't you like to be able to push a button and watch the drapes at the end of the room open, so you can look out through a wall of sparkling glass to see your family standing outside ready to visit you? Wouldn't you like it, if you wanted to sit up in bed, to not have to call the nurse, but just to press a button and have the bed adjust itself to any position you desire? Wouldn't you like to have hot and cold running water right beside your bed—to have a separate faucet of ice water there too? And to have a bed radio to be tuned in at your pleasure? Wouldn't it be comforting to know that oxygen was piped into every room, by each bed, ready to be used at a moment's notice?

Wouldn't you like to know that the best prenatal and postnatal maternity care will be available for your loved ones? That when the baby was born its mother would have this same, modern type of hospital room and, in addition, that the baby would have its own private nursery right at its mother's bed and that by merely a touch of the hand, the baby's bassinet and the baby would and could be by the mother's side to receive her loving care?

Yes. This is what the people want. They want the best medical care in the world and they want to pay for it—a few cents a day. I think the American people deserve all these things, don't you?

And I know they can have them, too. How do I know this? Because for 20 years we have been working on this type of plan. For 20 years we have been testing and proving these theories until today they are no longer theories but sound and accepted facts.

In our newest type of hospitals, which are entirely self-sustaining, the people get this modern, advanced type of medical care. If it can be done in some parts of the country, other groups of doctors can do it, too—in every area of the United States.

What I have just been talking about is known as prepaid, comprehensive medical care. It is based on four principles: Prepayment, group practice, well-planned, integrated facilities, and preventive medical care.

Prepayment is practically self-explanatory. It is not new in the American scheme of things. We pay for many things in advance, so why not pay our doctors in advance and let them keep us well and healthy? It is said that the Chinese believed in the theory of paying the doctor when they were well—but not paying him when they were sick. By small monthly payments, in advance, we, too, are putting that theory to work.

Group practice is not new either. But, today with the need for more and more specialization, it is even more necessary for doctors to share their knowledge and skills—to pool them—if they are to give their patients the best, comprehensive medical care. It is the clinical way to modern medicine.

Of course, facilities and equipment are fundamental. This means clinics, hospitals, and all the special equipment required by modern medical science. Under the group practice plan, the waste that comes through the duplication of these facilities can be eliminated.

The fourth principle is preventive medicine. This is vital to the complete functioning of the comprehensive plan. Every effort must be made to keep the subscribers well. Today, because the high cost of medicine keeps us away from doctors, the medical profession exists on sickness. Under a prepaid, comprehensive medical plan, the economics of the plan is healthiest when the subscribers are kept healthy. It not only makes sense to me, but I like to think of our doctors prospering through improving our health, rather than through our becoming sick. Don't you agree?

All right. Now, I've outlined—in broad terms—what can be done and what has been done to meet these medical-care demands of the American people. I just want to add, at this time, that for the average subscriber who joins this plan with a group, the cost for all of these benefits is $4.30 a month. For a subscriber and 1 family dependent the cost is $7.60, and for a subscriber and 2 or more family dependents, it is only $9.50 a month.

However, even though I've told you about some of the answers to our problems—such as we have worked out over the past 20 years and as the Health Insurance Plan in New York and other groups have worked out, there are many rows to hoe, many words to write, before all the people can have the benefits of this new economics of medical care.

Besides resistance to change and progress, the chief obstacle to hundreds of different groups of doctors providing comprehensive, low-cost, prepaid services to millions of Americans is their inability, up to now, to obtain adequate private financing for the necessary facilities.

When I sought the first bank loan to build critically needed hospital facilities, bankers said they wouldn't lend a dime on a hospital because they were such money losers. I had to arrange guaranties to underwrite the first loans. But since then, financial institutions have recognized the self-sustaining soundness of our foundation hospitals.

Now, if this same opportunity—insured private financing—were made available to other groups of doctors, then modern medicine—prepaid, comprehensive, medical plans—could be started all over the country as a free enterprise answer to the threat of socialized medicine.

That is where you and I come in. We must let the people of America know that there is a solution to their needs, their desires, and their hopes. I am having a motion-picture script written which will tell this story. Not just the story of the plan, but, of equal importance, the furthering of the pride all Americans should have in the representatives they elected to Congress, for I have seen and heard many of these Representatives working on this problem. Believe me, I think the job the Wolverton committee has done is a stirring story in itself.

They have spent many months hearing testimony on this great problem. They have drawn up a bill which will assist the many groups of doctors who are anxious to bring comprehensive medical care to their patients. This bill, H. R. 7700, and known as the medical facilities insurance bill, would establish Government insurance of private loans by banks, insurance companies, and other lending institutions for construction of financially sound medical and hospital facilities. This is the same type of loan insurance which the Federal Housing Administration has used so successfully over the last 20 years in stimulating the investment of more than $26,300,000,000 of private capital in the building of homes.

This bill can stimulate the investment of enormous sums of private capital in the building of these self-supporting medical centers without subsidies, without Government controls, and without lay interference in the practice of medicine.

We need more than a half a million additional hospital beds in this country. That means an expenditure of more than $8 billion just to catch up, and $280 million more every year just to replace general hospitals that are firetraps and hazards to health and to provide general hospital beds needed to keep up with population growth.

Organizations of insurance companies, mortgage bankers and large lending institutions have indicated to Congress in writing that they would be willing to make insured loans for sound hospital and medical facility projects, upon enactment of the Wolverton bill.

Given the stimulus of the Wolverton bill, 30 doctors in an area could raise a million dollars of private capital, build a medical center and provide comprehensive care to 30,000 health plan members.

With the investment of approximately $1 billion of private funds in medical centers, 30,000 doctors across the country could provide full medical care and hospitalization to 30 million Americans.

This is the story I want to tell the American public. This is the big story you can tell your readers. This is our rallying point. Tell them there's not merely one hearing going on in Washington—that there are extremely vital hearings being conducted on the health needs of the Nation. Tell them that there is hope for good health for all. Tell them about the Wolverton bill for FHA-type insured loans for medical and hospital facilities. Tell them that the Government, right today, authorizes similar type insurance of loans for ships and it ought to do the same for medical facilities. If I can put it on film, you can put it on paper.

You are the Voice of America. Let your voice be heard saying that the people rule and make their own free choices in a democracy, and the groundswell of demands from the people for a better way to be kept healthy and to meet their doctors' and hospital bills inevitably will bring full medical care within the reach of all.

Gentlemen of the press—your services are paid for monthly by the subscribers of the thousands of newspapers all over the country. You offer comprehensive news coverage on a monthly payment basis. We do have that in common.

We also have this in common—we know the health needs of the Nation and that these needs are a challenge to us all—especially to the doctors and health organizations, the leaders of labor, industry, and our representatives in Government. It is up to them and to us to feel the heartbeats of the people—to understand the people's wants and to help fulfill the people's needs. We must accept this challenge with eagerness and humility.

I would like to leave this thought with you in conclusion. It is a little poem by Lewis Newman and it goes like this:

> "I sought to hear the voice of God
> And climbed the topmost steeple.
> But God declared: 'Go down again,
> I dwell among the people.' "

Henry J. Kaiser, President of the Kaiser Foundation, Answers Questions Relating to His Speech—"The New Economics of Medical Care"—Before the National Press Club, Washington, D. C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 26, 1954

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, today Henry J. Kaiser, president of the Kaiser Foundation, after the delivery of his address—"The New Economics of Medical Care"—before the National Press Club, in accordance with the custom that prevails at the club, answered the questions submitted to him with respect to the views he had expressed in his address.

I have already made reference to his address, and included it as a part of other remarks I have made today. The answers that he made to the questions addressed to him at the conclusion of his address are made a part of these remarks. They are as follows:

ANSWERS BY MR. HENRY J. KAISER, PRESIDENT OF THE KAISER FOUNDATION, TO QUESTIONS ASKED FOLLOWING HIS SPEECH, THE NEW ECONOMICS OF MEDICAL CARE, BEFORE THE NATIONAL PRESS CLUB, MAY 26, 1954

AMA MEDICAL SOCIETIES ATTITUDE

Certain Medical Society officials from time to time make misleading and unfair attacks against group practice, prepayment plans.

Such opposition arises from fear of open, free competition.

It may take the following forms:

Refusing membership in county medical societies to group practice doctors, thereby depriving them of becoming eligible for their specialty boards.

Threatening group practice doctors with expulsion from medical societies.

Making public misleading claims against group practice, prepayment plans.

Attempting to curtail health plans by holding it is unethical for them to advertise or make known their services to the public.

Lobbying to obtain restrictive State laws.

COURTS HAVE OUTLAWED RESTRAINT OF TRADE TO PREVENT FREE COMPETITION IN MEDICAL CARE

1. The United States Supreme Court unanimously upheld the conviction of the American Medical Association for conspiracy to restrain trade in violation of the Sherman Antitrust Act. This was a 1940 case involving a group practice prepayment plan in the District of Columbia. The United States Appellate Court held AMA engaged in "commercial and business competition" against low-cost medical service. The court held:

"The licensed monopolies which professions enjoy constitute in themselves, severe restraints upon competition.

"The better educated laity of today questions the adequacy of present-day medicine.

"The people give the privilege of professional monopoly and the people may take it away."

2. Washington State Supreme Court decision unanimously granted an injunction against the King County Medical Society in 1951 to restrain it from an alleged conspiracy to destroy a group practice prepayment plan and eliminate competition in Seattle. The court held that the Medical Society's argument about "free choice of physician" lacked any merit.

3. The Journal of the American Medical Association in an editorial of July, 1949, stated:

"Instances have occurred in which physicians, for political, commercial, or emotional reasons have endeavored to utilize the Principles of Medical Ethics as a means of producing embarrassment, distress or loss of reputation of other physicians whom they envy or whose open competition they fear.

"The Principles of Medical Ethics were not designed for any such purpose, and the attempt to utilize the principles of ethics for such purposes may well be in itself unethical."

AMA IN CALIFORNIA

The California Medical Association recently has adopted a new approach in California.

California AMA officials now are publicly taking the position: Let's pay attention to what the people want. Instead of just telling them what we'll give them, let's pay attention to what the people are demanding. So the State Medical Association leaders are declaring the time has come to compete with the Kaiser plan. When that took place, I declared it was a tremendous victory for the people.

AMA OPPOSITION TO H. R. 7700

The American Medical Association states: "There is no proved need for this type of legislation."

This is double-talk.

AMA only last February 3 recommended passage of a bill (H. R. 7341) expanding the Hill-Burton grants of Government funds to assist in construction of hospitals and health centers. Thus, AMA recognizes the vast shortage of hospital facilities. It is past understanding how AMA could support Government grants, and then say "There is no proved need" for legislation which would stimulate the flow of private capital, on a private enterprise basis, to help meet the proven need for additional medical facilities.

FREE CHOICE

1. Members join the Kaiser Foundation Plan because they choose to do so. The people are entitled to the freedom to choose the services of groups of doctors, under a prepayment plan.

2. Members of the health plan have the free choice of selecting as their personal or family physician any of the participating physicians and surgeons and other specialists in the doctors partnership.

AMA has specifically recognized this concept of "free choice among participating physicians" in voluntary health plans.

3. Health plan members are free to employ outside solo doctors, whom they wish to pay, but at the same time they are entitled to all free hospital services under their health plan.

4. Most doctors today are actually informally practicing on a group basis. They refer their patients to specialists or consultants whom they recommend.

5. All Kaiser Foundation hospitals are open to all qualified physicians in the community.

6. A doctor who belongs to the Los Angeles County Medical Association recently wrote to the society's Bulletin:

"Are we in our organization free from the closed panel system? Decidedly not. The hospital staffs are based strictly upon closed panel systems. * * * In order for a patient in any hospital to have a free choice of surgeon, it would be necessary to completely change our method of organization."

REINSURANCE BILL (H. R. 8356)

The objectives of the bill are eminently desirable, especially the objective of encouraging insurance companies and voluntary health plans to extend much broader coverage and protection to the people.

Most of the provisions of the bill apply the reinsurance principle to commercial insurance companies and other indemnity-type plans. So they are in a better position to pass on the feasibility of applying reinsurance to themselves.

Provisions of the bill pertaining to service-type, comprehensive plans—like the Kaiser Foundation health plan—leave the basic details to be determined later in negotiations with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Therefore it is not possible to determine whether reinsurance would benefit our members until these basic features are developed. Our type of plan already covers most of the medical and hospital needs of our members.

However, I certainly would not object to the reinsurance bill because it seems to be designed more for limited, indemnity-type plans.

I certainly would not agree with those who condemn the bill just because it does not offer a complete answer to the health needs of the Nation.

It is imperative that effective partial measures be adopted which offer real promise of contributing to the people's health problems.

I would wholeheartedly endorse legislation that might stimulate the providing of comprehensive medical care to those who now have very limited coverage.

HOSPITALS THAT PAY THEIR OWN WAY

I am talking about a multibillion-dollar industry—the hospital industry of America—that tradition operates in the red.

The Kaiser Foundation has proved how this industry—the hospital—can operate in the black.

We have actually been accomplishing this for years.

Our hospitals pay their own way.

The nonprofit Kaiser Foundation has $20 million worth of medical center facilities.

We are completing a current $11 million hospital construction program.

The savings to health plan members from group practice prepayment services are so great that the savings more than pay for the cost of hospitals and clinics. About 6 percent out of the system's revenues meet all construction debts and interest and additions to facilities.

I emphasize that the Kaiser Foundation and hospitals are nonprofit.

We set aside substantial sums annually for medical education, research, and charity cases.

Thus we have demonstrated how hospitals do not have to depend upon Government grants, public taxes, or charity drives. They can stand on their own feet financially. It's being done.

How To Save Asia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 26, 1954

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the problem of southeast Asia faces the American people today with a pressing urgency that we cannot evade. We cannot be blind to the glaring facts that communism is advancing in that section of the world and our national security is endangered. It is for this reason that I wish to call the attention of our policymakers to an article by our former brilliant colleague, Gen. Carlos P. Romulo, a great world citizen of the Philippines, who knows Asia, who all these years has been stressing the need for America to pay more attention to Asia, and to make friends with the peoples of Asia by endorsing their legitimate nationalist aspirations to freedom and independence. This article was syndicated in all the Hearst newspapers in this country on Sunday, May 16, entitled "How To Save Asia."

I wish, also, Mr. Speaker, to insert in the RECORD excerpts of an article in the Washington Evening Star by Betty Beale about General Romulo and editorials from the Hearst newspapers; the Daily Home News, of New Brunswick, N. J.; the Oregonian, of Portland, Oreg.; and Bridgeport News, of Bridgeport, Conn. They have been selected at random from scores of newspaper comments from all over the country to show how General Romulo and his views are received by the American press.

The matters follow:

HOW TO SAVE ASIA FROM COMMUNISM

(By Carlos P. Romulo)

Everybody in the free world is agreed that Asia must be saved from communism. But as Asia is a vast place, the problem of saving it is formidable. Before tackling the job it would be well to know the dimensions of the problems.

The crisis in Indochina merely emphasizes the need to clarify the issues. Hazy generalizations are misleading and might indeed be dangerous at this stage.

The following pointers are intended to facilitate understanding of the problem of saving Asia by putting the problem in proper perspective:

1. The problem is to save, not a whole vast continent called Asia, but only those parts of it that are still free of Communist control or are uncommitted in the struggle.

This immediately excludes Soviet Russia and Communist China from the geographical limits of the problem. It also excludes, for the present at least, the strategy of a military rollback against communism.

2. It is not enough to say that the Asian peoples must be saved from communism. The important thing is to save them for something better, namely, freedom.

They will not fight with enthusiasm for any vague concept of a "free world," but only to the extent that they have a stake in freedom, being themselves free.

3. No Asian country can be saved from communism unless it wants to be. The basic consideration, therefore, is the real interests of the Asian peoples and not the interests of the Western powers or what the Western powers think the interests of the Asians ought to be.

It follows that united action in Asia between Asia and the West will be possible only if the West is ready and willing to base such action on the recognized interests of the Asian peoples.

4. In free, uncommitted, non-Communist Asia, these interests are basically two in number: First, the aspiration to human dignity, social progress, and economic well-being, and second, the desire to put an end to colonial imperialism .

5. No self-respecting Asian country will join any proposal for united action in Asia which, whether directly or indirectly, can be shown to be in support of colonial imperialism.

6. Conversely, the best hope of securing the support of the free or non-Communist Asian countries is to recognize as soon as possible the independence of the Indochinese peoples.

Once colonial imperialism disappears as an enemy, the only remaining foe in the field would be Communist imperialism. The issues and the battlelines would become clearly defined.

7. It may be asked whether these states, once they are free, could be depended upon to oppose communism and to fight it with all their strength. The answer to this question is provided by the example of all the countries in Asia which achieved their independence after the Second World War (India, Pakistan, the Philippines, Burma, Ceylon, Indonesia, Israel, Jordan, South Korea, and Libya).

None of these countries has turned Communist; all of them are in fact resisting Communist power and infiltration within their own borders; they would probably be willing to join in a concerted move to repel Communist aggression in the area.

8. Military power as such does not necessarily impress the Asians, and brandishing the H-bomb may produce a contrary effect. The Asian desire for peace is not mere cowardly fear of the H-bomb but a matter of basic principle which, incidentally, also provides a test of the sincerity and statesmanship of the West.

9. While the menace of Communist armed aggression is immediate and grave, we should not forget that the long-term problem is one of raising of the standards of living of the Asian peoples. The Communist countries, recognizing this, have begun to participate actively in the promotion of international trade and in programs of economic and technical assistance to underdeveloped countries.

The need thus becomes more urgent for the West, particularly the United States, to continue to give such assistance to the underdeveloped countries on a basis of mutual respect, and not as a special favor with political strings attached or as a disguised survival of colonial imperialism.

10. The "neutralism" of many of the Asian countries should not be regarded as a kind of "cryptocommunism." Most of them are bitterly and determinedly anti-Communist at home, and it would be foolish to argue that they are pro-Communist in foreign policy.

What their neutralism means is that they think it possible for the Communist states and the western countries to coexist, and that all the avenues which may lead to such coexistence should be explored.

[From the Washington Evening Star of March 11, 1954]

A SUPER AMBASSADOR

(By Betty Beale)

The remarkable Gen. Carlos Romulo, former Philippine Ambassador to the United States, and his charming wife, are back in Washington and installed in an apartment they have taken at the Westchester. That the latter is their address seems a little strange in view of the fact that the general is back here with the title of Ambassador, will use the Philippine Chancery at 1617 Massachusetts Avenue as his office, will have the Embassy personnel and staff at his disposal and there will not be another Ambassador living in the Philippine Embassy as long as he is here.

Actually General Romulo is back as personal representative of Philippine President Magsaysay with the rank of Ambassador-at-Large. Though he started out as an opponent of Magsaysay for the office of President, he ended up being the candidate's campaign manager. To prove that he wasn't bribed to withdraw from the presidential race in favor of Candidate Magsaysay, Romulo promised he wouldn't accept any appointive job after the election. But Magsaysay needed the talents of this "super Ambassador," as the State Department calls him. Hence the trouble-shooting general accepted the assignment without pay.

So Mrs. Romulo is now busy redecorating a seventh floor corner apartment at the Westchester which will soon be the scene of some interesting parties, as this couple knows everybody. Ambassador Romulo also has an office at the Westchester and he has just mailed his seventh book to the publishers. To hit the book stalls in September, Crusade for Democracy, takes up the problem of communism in Asia.

[Editorial published in all Hearst newspapers, March 13, 1954]

STRONG FRIEND

Brig. Gen. Carlos P. Romulo, of the Philippines, one of the strongest friends the United States has or has ever had in the East, has returned to this country with extraordinary powers as special and personal representative of President Ramon Magsaysay.

This gives General Romulo greater scope and influence than if he came as Ambassador. The team of President Magsaysay and General Romulo gives the assurance that the Philippines will be a bastion of democracy against Asiatic communism. We are delighted to welcome General Romulo again and to wish him well.

[From the Bridgeport (Conn.) News of March 13, 1954]

A DISTINGUISHED VISITOR

Seldom has a Connecticut city entertained so gracious and powerful an orator as Gen. Carlos P. Romulo, who delivered the University of Bridgeport's third annual Frank Jacoby lecture at the Klein Memorial Auditorium on Brotherhood and World Peace.

Today General Romulo is the personal envoy to the United States of Philippine President Ramon Magsaysay. The briefest review of his past achievements tell us General Romulo has served as president of the United Nations General Assembly, was a wartime aide-de-camp to Gen. Douglas MacArthur, and has been honored with a Pulitzer prize journalism award.

In 1945, at San Francisco, when allotted 2 minutes, he made a 30-second speech in signing the U. N. Charter for his country. He said: "The hand of the Man of Galilee is in this finished work—the United Nations Charter."

Those words summarize the spiritual fervency and the faith of General Romulo in world peace and brotherhood.

The world, he said, had come to the end of the trail in 1945 when 54 nations met to hammer out the charter of an organization designed to end war. With all its imperfections and defects, General Romulo declared, the U. N. is the visible, tangible interpretation of brotherhood. He said there is nothing better within reach as an instrumentality for peace than the U. N.

Because the U. N., he said, represents the ideal of brotherhood and peace, Ralph Bunche (a previous Frank Jacoby lecturer), the grandson of a Negro slave, acting for the U. N., ended the 1948 Holy Land war between the Jews and the Arab nations, and Israel, a new, young nation, was born under the U. N. aegis.

He spoke of the miracle of the 1948 Berlin airlift. He told how Gen. George C. Marshall, then Secretary of State and chief United States delegate to the U. N., brought America's answer to the world. General Marshall warned Russia not to mistake patience for weakness, making it clearly known this country was ready to fight to the last for freedom and liberty against aggression.

Fifty-four nations in the U. N., General Romulo said, welded together with hoops of steel, stood as one. Supporting Russia, including Russia, there were six nations.

Keeping our word, the Philippines were given their independence on July 4, 1946. As an Asian, paying us the highest tribute, the General said that his people died for us, fighting the Japanese, and will always be loyal, because we have respected their dignity and the dignity of the human soul.

To have America's inner greatness so magnificently described was truly inspirational.

[From the New Brunswick (N. J.) Daily Home News of April 30, 1954]

Inspiring Faith for the Future

Gen. Carlos P. Romulo fully lived up to his advance notices when he spoke at the annual dinner of the New Brunswick Chamber of Commerce the other evening.

General Romulo was all that had been expected, and more. A man of great personal charm and wit, General Romulo held the attention of his audience throughout. His picture of the decline of United States influence in Asia was painted with eloquence and pinpointed with accuracy. But more important was his faith in the future of free nations, with his little Philippine Republic backing up the world power of the United States and the other free nations. Tracing the strength of our country back to the great principles upon which it was founded, General Romulo showed how we had operated upon those ancient, sound principles in giving the Filipinos their freedom. And he saw our firm belief in the equality and dignity of man as the basis for a preservation of our principles and our form of government against all who would try to destroy it, for all time.

No one who heard General Romulo the other night could have come away from the dinner without a feeling of new faith and new hope and new courage to meet the troubles of an unsettled world. In bringing General Romulo here, the chamber of commerce performed a civic service of tremendous and lasting importance.

[From the Oregonian, Portland, Oreg., of April 5, 1954]

Carlos Romulo, Statesman

We were impressed by Gen. Carlos Romulo's control over pressures he may have felt to press the Philippines' case for ownership of United States naval and military installations in his country when he spoke to the annual dinner meeting of the Portland City Club recently.

Many spokesmen for friends abroad who appear before groups here have in the past fallen into one of two camps representing schools of thought on what to tell Americans.

One such line stresses X country's will to halt Soviet expansion and how much United States taxpayers should spend to steel X country's spirits.

The other line usually screened by varying degrees of subtlety simmers down to diplomatic blackmail. It runs: "Lend Y country a few million and Y country won't be so friendly to Russia."

It is rare indeed that someone like General Romulo appears to tell us how fine have been our relations with his country, period.

General Romulo, the personal representative of Philippine President Magsaysay, spoke here when the issue of the island bases was in dispute. The official Philippine stand is that the bases belong to them. Our view has been otherwise.

In his talk on mutual relations General Romulo took a stand in the theme: "You have kept every promise you have made to my people. You have made friends in Asia and you can do it again." Not a word about bases. That is diplomacy of the highest order and we may add, most effective. He is a statesman.

Western Massachusetts CIO Industrial Union Council 12th Annual Conference, Springfield, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 3, 1954

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, for the past dozen years the Western Massachusetts CIO Council has conducted an annual conference of officers and delegates of its unions. Over the years it has developed into one of the most important labor meetings in the area encompassed by the council. It has become a workshop for good ideas hammered out on the anvil of discussion and resolution. This annual pilgrimage of delegates from various CIO unions presents a review of the common problems that affect all. It serves to educate them in the progress they have made and the obstacles they have encountered. In this way, the members are acquainted with the task that lies ahead.

Mr. Speaker, on last Saturday, May 22, 1954, the Western Massachusetts CIO Industrial Union Council held its 12th annual conference at the Hotel Highland in Springfield, Mass. I was privileged to address the group and give a report on the Congress as it affected the problems in which they are interested. A message was transmitted from CIO President Walter P. Reuther and numerous members of the State legislature.

Mr. Herman Greenberg, president of the Western Massachusetts CIO Council, keynoted the gathering with the following message:

> This is our 12th annual conference. It comes at a very important time in our lives. There is every-increasing unemployment, talk of recession, poor legislation which will affect the United States labor force, and many other momentous decisions with which we will be faced. Now, more than ever, we just cannot sit back on our 12 years of fine progress. What has been done will be told in the reports you will get at this meeting—what lies ahead depends upon you. In extending to each and every one of you my best wishes, I look forward to your continued friendship and cooperation.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I insert in the Record a list of the delegates and their unions and the 10-point program discussed at the conference.

The list and program follows:

Delegates to Western Massachusetts CIO Council

ACWA Local 523: Evelyn Drawniak, Jane Torrey.

ACWA Local 26: Joseph Burleski.

IUE Local 266: Blair Mfg. Co.; Franklin E. Mazza.

P. J. & N. Local 224; Milton Bradley: George Driscoll, Joseph Donahue.

ACWA Local 541: Beatrice Kennedy, Kay Solin.

IUE, Hampden, Specialty, Local 273: Richard Frennier, president; Norman Worin. Alternates: Howard Belrose, Henry Brissette.

ACWA, Asinof & Sons, Local 290: William Shapiro, Albert Leone, Andrew Palpini.

USW, CIO, Local 3326; Baldwin Duckworth Steelworkers: Ted Katulka, Michael Lopenzo.

UFW, CIO, Local 137: Mello Pietrucci.

IUE, CIO, Local 278, Chapman Valve: Edward Brunelle, Edward King, Stephen Masley, Stanley Grandalski, Norman Hughes, Robert Yelle.

URW, CIO, Local 11, Fisk: James Rielley, William Baker, James Flynn, George McCoy, William Ferris.

UPWA, Local 245: Douglas O'Brien, Mary Simmons, Emilio Socco, Mary Roberts.

RWDSU, Local 515: Joseph S. Casey, Margaret Dupont.

RWDSU, Local 566, United B. & D. E.: Maximilian Roos, Jr.

IUE, CIO, Local 202, Westinghouse: William Lieberman, Sam Walker, George Abair, Rober Bergeron, Lucy Carmel, James Chase, Howard Dunlap, Reginald Funn, William F. Keane, Frank Gridrich, Harvey Rock, Louis Vi Venzio.

IUE, CIO, Local 213, Van Norman: Henry Lussier, Anthony Maruca, John Ramos, John Swachak, Peter Cienciwa, Brownie Szebeck.

IUE, CIO, Local 220, package machinery: Edward Lussier, William Waldron.

IUE, CIO, Local 206, American Bosch: James Parker, James Manning, Stephen Jaross, Joseph Gomez, John Daly, Thomas Moore, James Clarke, Cornelius Driscoll, John Wade, Lester Barre.

IUE, CIO, Local 288, Monsanto Chemical: Albert Kielbania, Wallace Wile, James Gibbs, Bernard Zisk, Arthur B. Miles, William Vasburgh, Edward Kaplita, John Gondek.

ACWA, Local 597, Julee Comforter: Agnes St. Martin, Evelyn Fitch, Rosemend Benoit.

Local 276: Wilfred Thibodeau, Homer Dushone.

Textile Local 73, Warren Thread: Jennie Senk.

Local 113, William Skinner: Anna Sullivan, Leo Riel, Joseph Brizard, Stuart Bilz, Irene Mainville.

Local 144, Chicopee Manufacturing: Louis Hamel, Doris Lewko, Roland Hamel, Julia Szady.

Local 65, Ludow Manufacturing: Mary S. Voz, Emile Dauphinais, Emily C. Gareti.

Local 693, Berkshire: Diana Halton, Rhea Turcotte.

Local 775, Hampton Mills: Edward Krzanowski, Joseph Lota, Donald Johnston.

Local 910, Rosen Textile: George Hutton.

Local 1058, Hart Top: George Gagnon; Morris Nakreyko.

Local 264, GE: Emdee Deroy.

Western Massachusetts CIO's 10-Point Program To Halt Unemployment

The American economy has been moving downward since early last fall. In the past 4 months unemployment has more than tripled. Over 3½ million workers are already officially counted as unemployed. Additional tens of thousands have dropped out of the labor force as job opportunities have dried up. Part-time work has become widespread.

To meet the present unemployment situation and to prevent it from spreading, CIO is recommending a limited, basic, national economic program. Swift action can reverse the tide of recession and return the country to full employment.

1. TEXAS

One of the most direct means of increasing personal consumption spending is to put through the proper tax changes. The first basic step in a full employment tax program is to raise the present $600 individual Federal income-tax exemption. A goal of $1,000 per person is sound in the light of the great price increases which have taken place since the $600 exemption was originally established. CIO supports an increase in the personal exemption to $800 per person this year, and $1,000 next year. Raising the exemption to $800 would put some $4.5

billion of added income in the hands of American families. Most of this tax relief would go to low- and middle-income families and this will stimulate consumption and start the wheels of industry moving at a faster rate.

In addition, CIO strongly maintains that the excise-tax cuts slated to go into effect this spring should proceed on schedule. These cuts on tobacco, liquor, gasoline, automobiles, and other selected products will also help to strengthen consumption. Moreover, as soon as possible steps should be taken to eliminate all forms of excise taxes which restrict consumption.

This program of reducing the taxes on low and middle-income families is in sharp contrast with that of the Eisenhower administration, which has stated its belief that the way to get out of a recession is to cut taxes on business and high-income families. On top of the recent elimination of the excess-profits tax on corporations, the administration proposed a new tax program which will eventually mean about a $3.3 billion cut in taxes. However, nearly $3 billion of this added tax relief would go to corporations and to the less than 1 percent of American families who own the lion's share of corporation stock. This will come about as the result of the proposed cuts of taxes on dividends and the proposed increase in permissible depreciation deductions on new investment by corporations. For the other millions of American families, minor tax adjustments worth around $300 million are proposed. Even these adjustments will be limited to very special cases involving dependents, working widows, high medical expenses, etc.

There is no general tax relief for the great majority of taxpayers in the administration's plans. It is based on the old trickle-down theory of economic life which failed to maintain prosperity in the past.

2. MINIMUM WAGE

As the CIO stated at its last convention, "The millions of American families with incomes below $3,000 per year constitute the greatest untapped market for goods of all types." Raising the minimum wage from its present unrealistic level of 75 cents an hour to $1.25 will be a major step in increasing the buying power of these families. Coverage of the Federal minimum-wage law should be extended to additional workers now unprotected.

3. STRENGTHEN COLLECTIVE BARGAINING

In most industries profits are still high and productivity increases are continuing; unions must, therefore, continue to press for wage increases to strengthen workers' buying power or consumption will be weakened even further in relation to production. Our labor-relations law should encourage free collective bargaining. The present Taft-Hartley Act does not do this, and the President's proposed amendments to the law would further restrict development of good labor-management relations.

4. UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION

A modern well-run unemployment compensation system can be the first line of defense against the spread of any economic downturn. Unfortunately, benefit levels in the present State programs have fallen to ⅓ of average earnings. This scale of payments fails to provide adequate support against the loss of income due to a recession. In addition, many States have raised arbitrary and unjustifiable barriers against unemployed workers who seek to obtain legitimate benefits.

We are advocating the immediate enactment of a strong Federal standards bill which will help prevent disqualification of qualified workers, assure essential increases in the amount and duration of benefits, and extend coverage. The CIO believes payments should be scaled to provide an unemployed worker with no dependents not less than 65 percent of his average weekly wage. Additional allowances should be made for dependents. Benefits should be payable for at least 39 weeks. A sound Federal standards law should also permit States which are hard hit by unemployment and threatened with exhaustion of funds to be able to draw on grants from the Federal Government.

Through such a program of standards and grants, Congress can protect family living standards, bolster purchasing power, and strengthen the unemployment insurance system.

The Eisenhower Administration has supported certain minor changes in the unemployment law, but it does not support a broad program of Federal action on standards and grants. Its only approach to raising benefits is to urge action by the States. But most State legislatures are not even scheduled to meet this year; besides they are the very bodies which have permitted benefit levels to fall to their present inadequate levels.

5. HOUSING

An expanded residential construction industry can lend great strength to our economy and also help meet basic social needs. To fill the vast housing backlog, particularly for homes for families with low and moderate incomes, and to keep our economy expanding we must aim at a target of 2 million new housing units per year.

The present administration apparently is content to keep new housing units in 1954 close to that of 1953. Yet last year's production of 1.1 million units was only slightly higher than the level over 25 years ago when our population was 45 million fewer and national income was less than half as large as today.

As part of his housing program President Eisenhower has recommended construction of 35,000 public housing units a year in each of the next 4 years. Even the late Senator Taft in 1949 helped put through legislation to build 135,000 public housing units in a normal year with provision to build as many as 200,000 units per year, as a counter depression economic measure.

CIO supports a public housing level of at least 135,000 this year, and up to 200,000 units when possible.

In addition to stepping up public housing, other steps needed to increase residential construction include; more liberal financing for low and moderate priced houses as well as for legitimate housing cooperatives; special long-term mortgage financing for moderately priced rental dwellings; long-term, low-interest mortgage financing for homes priced to $10,000.

6. IMPROVED SOCIAL SECURITY

Basic improvement in the old-age and survivors insurance program is one of the quickest ways to put money in the hands of a large section of the population which will spend practically all of this increased income. The CIO is supporting the Lehman-Dingell bill (S. 2260, H. R. 6034) to expand OASI coverage, add permanent and temporary disability insurance and increase monthly payments to a maximum of $200 a month. The Eisenhower administration as proposed improvements in old-age and survivor's insurance which are good as far as they go. They would extend coverage and raise benefits, though not to the degree necessary for adequate security. Moreover, the presidential proposals make no provision for payment of benefits to workers who become temporarily or permanently disabled and suffer loss of current income.

We also need Federal legislation that will assure more adequate public assistance payments by the States to the unemployed, the aged, and others in distress. The President's plan fails to do this.

There are over 5 million people receiving pensions and old-age assistance under the Social Security Act. Their pensions or assistance average around $50 a month, not quite $12 per week. For every increase of $10 a week in the payments they receive, $2.7 billion a year would be added to consumer purchasing power.

7. FARM PROGRAM

The present recession has been underway for well over a year in the farm community and the drop in farm income has already had a sharp effect on the sales of agricultural machinery, trucks, and many appliances. In turn this is causing serious unemployment in industrial centers. A full-employment economy is the only sound base for both farm and city prosperity.

To prevent the present farm recession from turning into a wholesale depression, the tested farm programs of price supports, marketing, storage, rural electrification and telephones, low-cost credit, and conservation should be improved.

Unfortunately, the Eisenhower-Benson farm program will weaken existing agricultural legislation rather than strengthen it. The President and Secretary Benson have introduced proposals for flexible supports of basic crops. This program ignores the needs of the family farmer in the United States. We are opposed to it.

Pending the preparation of improved legislation which will strengthen the income position of the family farmer and increase consumption of farm products, the Congress should continue the present support programs.

8. CREDIT FOR SMALL BUSINESS AND ECONOMIC EXPANSION

An essential feature of a strong and expanding economy is a liberal credit policy. As we are confronted with a downturn the need for credit is even more acute for many businesses, individuals, and local and State governments.

The Eisenhower administration has supported a general policy of encouraging higher interest rates. It has also eliminated certain valuable Government credit sources. Typical of its acts have been the authorized increases in VA and FHA housing interest rates and the elimination of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

CIO has condemned the increase in interest rates on federally guaranteed housing loans. We believe such increases should be revoked to help increase the demand for residential housing.

Economic experience during the past 20 years demonstrated the continuing need for a Federal credit agency such as the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. RFC or a similar agency should be reestablished to help with special depression lending programs, special defense loans and loans to many State and local bodies seeking to undertake public works.

9. PUBLIC WORKS

A well planned system of public works can alleviate many pressing social needs, also help support production and employment. Recent estimates indicate the need for at least 100,000 more classrooms each year for the next 5 years. As for hospitals, even by modest standards, the Nation requires 230,000 new general hospital beds. The road and public building backlog is also very great.

The Eisenhower administration has talked at length about expanding public works to head off a depression. However, it has failed to recommend legislation which could make public works effective in halting a downturn.

For example: Large numbers of State and local governments are confronted with great financial obstacles when it comes to expanding public works. In many cases there are statutory limits on the amount and types of borrowing these bodies can undertake—and in numerous instances these limits have been reached or exceeded. Yet, if public works are to really be helpful in combating a recession or depression, there must be quick action in getting them under way. Legislation should be put on the books now to enable the Federal Government to make special loans and financial grants to help States and local communities to get their own projects under way.

The Federal Government must have its own building and related works programs ready for commencement as they become necessary.

10. PROGRAMS AT THE STATE AND LOCAL LEVEL—WHAT YOU CAN DO

Many of the Federal policy proposals mentioned above need your support at the State and local level. In addition there are other programs, more purely local in nature, that can be adopted to reinforce the economy.

To tackle these State and local problems more effectively and to enlist support behind national measures, CIO recommends that all State councils give consideration to the prompt establishment of State CIO full-employment committees. Such committees can perform many useful functions.

They can help look into the public works situation in your State, and come up with answers to many questions such as:

Is there a shelf of plans which can be put into action quickly when and if economic conditions warrant? If there isn't such a self of works, the governor and other appropriate bodies should be pressed to prepare such plans. Inquiry should be made to determine whether there are: (a) Actual blueprints to get projects out of the planning stage and into the project state; (b) land rights which have been purchased for future projects; (c) State funds already appropriated for this work; (d) obstacles to financing these projects on a State and local basis.

In some cases the particular type of construction is normally financed in part by a Federal grant, which is then matched by a State appropriation. Inquiry should be made into the status of such so-called grants-in-aid programs in each State, particularly in the school, hospital, and highway fields.

President Eisenhower has called upon the States to improve their presently inadequate unemployment-compensation laws. Press this issue home in your State. If this pressure fails to produce action in the States it will strengthen the campaign to get national action on a Federal standards bill.

The Bryson Bill, H. R. 1227

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARLEY O. STAGGERS

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 25, 1954

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include in the RECORD a petition and lists of signers in support of H. R. 1227. These citizens protest the advertising of alcoholic beverages in magazines and newspapers and over the radio and television.

The petition follows:

We, the undersigned of Rivesville, Marion County, W. Va., do petition you to vote to report the Bryson bill (H. R. 1227) favorably to the House. This bill is to prohibit alcoholic beverage advertising.

Rev. M. O. Collins, O. L. Bowman, Stella Bowman, Grace Haldenion, M. Ethel Coogle, Hannah Blubaugh, J. A. Blubaugh, Manley Collins, Jr., Willa Collins, O. C. Henderson, Wendell Collins, Daisy Hamrick, Judy Satterfield, Judy Ash, Loraine Tennant, Lester Satterfield, George Ash, Pearl Satterfield, Fletcher Brown, Maxine Vitco, Maua Barkets, Patty Jones, Nancy Davis, Martha J. Michael, Mrs. Gertrude David, Mrs. Maude Brown, Mrs. Ruby Lambert, Helen Valentine, Mrs. Anna Mae Eddy, Mrs. Bessie Hamrick, Mrs. Harriett Layman, Mrs. Inez Layman, Marie Guy, Mrs. Walter O'Dell, Grace Nay, Josephine Huffman, Wanora Collins, Darlene Collins, Lulu Henderson, Mike O'Dell, Mrs. Hood Straight, Dora Bowling, Hood Straight, F. K. Bowling, Mary Ash, Bertha Ash.

Allen J. LaRue, Anna M. LaRue, Ida Menefee, A. A. Johnson, Ira LaRue, Caroline Spevock, Rev. Howard Prickett, Mrs. Howard Prickett, Amos White, Mrs. Hallie Copley, Mrs. Amos White, Mrs. Roy F. Willke, Miss Mary Radcliffe, Mrs. Albert Copley, Mrs. Nora Radcliffe, Albert Copley, Hattie Zimp, F. W. Towns, Ethel Towns, Minnie Cross, Elizabeth Cross, Cecil C. Cross, Pearl Morgan, Wilbert Vinart, Nancy E. Dulin, Kathleen Coburn, Alice Wilson, Madelyn Eddy, Beaulah Eddy, Harry and Connie Hess, Philip E. Dulin, Clifford Johnson, James A. Johnson, Iris Johnson, Mrs. Jeanett Johnson, Gussy Johnson, Donald L. Johnson, Mrs. Orin Eddy, Mrs. Rose Rote, L. E. Vincent, Shirley Yoak, Loraine Woods, Eva C. Young, Elda Mitchell, Loretta J. Mitchell, Eugene Inquento,

J. B. Staley (pastor), E. G. Dennison, Mrs. Mary Watson, Mrs. Maude K. Yost, Mrs. Clara V. Chapple, Mrs. Edna Watkins, Clifford Merrifield, Helen P. Rodgers, Doris Keefover, Blaine Sigley, Cecil A. Layman, Orva Malcolm, W. C. Ice, Hattie Summers, Ruth Keefover, Warren Luckey, Don Cornwell, Juniata Cornwell, Geraldine Tucker, Maxine Luckey, Mrs. J. B. Staley, Mrs. Pauline Sigley, W. M. Staley, John Davis, Amy Stewart, Ira O. Sigley.

GRANT TOWN

Mrs. D. E. Long, Mrs. Earl Long, D. E. Long, Melba Long King, Charles Cutney, W. R. Eskew, Don Swisher, Dean Sharp, Lawrence Clair, Fay Hibbs, Dale Dulin, Mrs. Frank Kolozy, Mrs. Vivian Dickinson, Mrs. W. R. Eskew, Mary C. Eskew, Julia Long, Sandra Hiser, Mrs. Jack Pratt, Jack Pratt, Margret Costo, Nancy Carol Dodd, Mrs. Evelyn Pratt, Ruby Clair, Lucille Straight, Glenn Fox, Zura Dulin, Dean Sharp, Delbert Boor, Richard Straight, Lottie Toothman, Reed Parker, Marcella Myers, Mrs. John P. Lesch, Mrs. Alma Lambert, Jessie Costo.

MANNINGTON

Bertie Devore, L. Boyd Hays, Betty Bowyer, Ella Davis, Virginia Furke, F. E. Furke, M. Beryl Stewart, Georgia Hawkins, Kathryn Hays, Mrs. Ray Keys, C. E. Bowyer, Mrs. P. H. Brummage, Mrs. Margaret Booth, Mr. W. V. Booth, Mrs. Nat G. Barnhart, Nat G. Barnhart, Mrs. Thomas Rea, Claude Devore, Beth Ann Broadwater, H. S. Broadwater, E. E. Hamilton, Chas. H. Phillips, Ira W. Davis, Frank H. Huey, James W. Cross, John L. Cross, J. B. Lazear, C. M. Charlton, R. Emmett Mockler, R. W. Moseley, A. R. Conoway, Clyde Cooley, J. E. Beall, Willie Robinson, Brooks Tapp, Robert W. Kent, J. D. Tribble, Alta Clemans, Jessie Coon, Mrs. I. W. Davis, Mrs. Alta Beveridge, Mrs. Ira C. Shaffer, Mrs. L. M. Campbell, Mrs. Harvey Floyd, Mrs. J. B. Lazear, Mrs. J. N. Kiger.

Clyde Wyckoff, Jennie Jones, Effie Wyckoff, Daisy Masters, Nettie McInturff, Mrs. Parrish, Ola Jones, Mrs. Donnis Sandy, Mrs. Gayetta Glover, Mrs. Minnie Moore, James Glover, H. F. Smith, Thomas Michall, Santford L. Moore, M. L. Jones, W. H. Antel, Jackson Roupe, Josephine Moore, Jay Antel, Nick Regillo, Arden J. Shock, Lillie Toothman, Mrs. J. N. Morgan, Mrs. Beatrice Armstrong, Pauline Murphy, Roxie Schrader, Sherwin Toothman, Rose Ann Jones, Dolores White, Anita Antel, Miss Donna Wetzel, Mr. James S. R. Hayes, Vance Armstrong, L. H. Heldreth, Irma Regillo, Lolla Glover, Nancy Hayes, Ruth Glover, Louise Yeater, Jeanne White, Betty Dye, Marilyn Hayes, Jannie Henline, Ramona Masters, Mavis Webb, Barbara Wright, Mary Hill, Mr. and Mrs. Clarence Glover, Mr. and Mrs. Martin Glover, Mr. and Mrs. Clark Hayes, Helen Glover, Edna Shingleton, Madelyn Hayes, Katherine Hayes, Cora Michue, W. L. Hayes, Mrs. Leslie Hayes, Evelyn Antel, Harold Antel, Murrel Moore, Guy White, Leah White, Edgar L. Glover, Mrs. Herbert Grimm, H. O. Grimm.

BASONETTSVILLE

Arlice Reese Lowe, Nellie Tennant, Hattie Surger, Pauline Eddy, Ida Lough, Goldie Moore, Fern Dicken, Pauline Wilson, Grace Haught, Annie Hunter, Bertha King, Grace Haught, David Blair Tennant, Vernon Williams, David Tennant, Ronnie Walls, Harry Dennison, Wanda Eddy, Betty Gail Eddy, Ruth Keefover, Mary Merne, Leona Rinehart, Virginia Emery, Mabel Morris, Wanetta Wilson, Bertha Wilson, Rosalie Chisler, Helen Haught, N. B. George, Daisy Wilson, Helen McCoy, Elaine Haught, Marjorie Tennant, Nerva Keefover, Ruth Mercer, Mabel Gusse, Catherine Eddy, W. Beryl Tennant, Buhl Tennant, Ray Wilson, Arlen Floyd, H. Kruseely, E. J. Michael, James G. Hunter.

FAIRVIEW

Thomas D. Fortney, Zelda Fortney, Nadine Layman, Aldine Goodwin, Etta Barr, Mrs. Guy A. Jamison, E. S. Roumberger, Guy A. Jamison, R. J. Michael, Bob Griffith, Mrs. Maude Haught, L. C. Emery, Evelyn Simcic, Alice Bennington, Ann Paugh, F. J. Snider, Dallas G. Paugh, J. W. Sutton, Joseph Simac, Francis Carpenter, Evelyn Carpenter, Minnie Snider, Mrs. Guy Toothman, Guy Toothman, Mrs. Ray Hise, Eileen Toothman, Ocie May Yost, Irene Miller, Mrs. J. M. Haught, Mary Yeager, Phyllis Gum, Ivan Gum.

WCTU, FAIRVIEW

Mr. A. O. Hanes, Mrs. A. O. Hanes, Mrs. Guy Barnett, Mrs. Mae Robison, Mrs. Irena Price, Mrs. Alice Toothman, Mrs. Edith Tennant, Mrs. Gertrude Haught, Mrs. M. B. Tonkin, Jack W. Dodd, Mr. and Mrs. Delmar Yost, Mrs. H. W. Dragod, Mrs. J. P. Jones, Virgil Baker, E. B. Price, C. W. Kitzmiller, Eloise O'Dell, Doris Myer, Mrs. Betty Hanes, W. B. Hanes, Lizzie Toothman.

Bertha Hanes, Clara May Musgrave, Elias Kennedy, Martha Kennedy, W. R. O'Dell, Lindsay H. Toothman, Woodrow Sloan, Geo. Burline, Geo. Haught, Sallie B. O'Dell, Flo Lorentz, Alice Ammons, Ruth Yost, Dove Eddy, Emma Murdock, Osra G. Shuman, Ressie Caffman, Ray White, Mrs. Brode Summers, W. C. Wilson, R. J. Wilson, Ruth Coffman, Monford Wilson, W. M. Lorentz, O. O. Eddy, E. J. Johnson, P. L. O'Dell, Mrs. W. S. Dean, Loretta Dean, Peggy Wilson, Mrs. Robert T. Carr, Miss Sallie Coffman, Miss Lucy Toothman, Lillie Toothman, Virginia O'Dell, Mary Sturm, Philip Toothman, Ethel King, Gwendolyn King, Mrs. Russell Bean, Russell Bean.

FAIRMONT

June Diddle, Mrs. James Diddle, Rev. James Diddle, Mrs. Alice Rowand, C. A. Rowand, Mrs. Lillian Kingcaid, Freddie Diddle, C. A. Rowand, H. F. Kingcaid, Elsie Lewis, Mrs. Delbert J. Shauer, Mrs. Chester L. Fast, Z. B. Nuzun, Myrtle M. Nuzun, Eugene Satterfield, Mrs. Ruth Swisher, Mrs. Loraine Satterfield, Thelma King, Freeman King, Esther Mitchell, Mrs. Mary Brooks, Jemima Linn, Allie Carpenter, Margaret Boyce, Vergie Hayhurst, Ruby McDougal, Bell Phillips, H. L. Moran, Robert Lee Watts, Linden Williams, Mary Emma Satterfield, Ann Smith, Elizabeth Carter, Mrs. Mary Hewitt, Mrs. Gladys Stanley, Betty Stanley, A. B. Brook

Slovak Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1954

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, on Slovak Independence Day, I am privileged, indeed, to address the House in behalf of the great Slovak people who in spite of Communist tyranny are still struggling bravely for national sovereignty and liberty.

The Slovakian people early demonstrated their ability to govern themselves. As far back as the ninth century these people established the Great Moravian Empire. Again, on March 14, 1939, after centuries of submergence and domination, Slovakia, following traditional democratic principles, was established and recognized by many great nations. At the end of World War II the Red Army put a tragic end to the short-lived freedom of the Slovak people, and the nation was speedily transformed into a Communist puppet regime. Notwithstanding that fact, the Slovak people, faced with great obstacles and discouragements, are tenaciously clinging to democratic principles and gallantly fighting against communism.

The Slovak people are deeply religious, and that is the strongest reason why they are so anti-Communist. The words of a great Slovak scientist-astronomer, Gen. Milan Tastislav Stefanik, after completing a trip through Russia in 1919, typify, not only Slovak, but democratic, reactions to communism. He said:

> Say it loudly to everybody; bolshevism is not only a philosophical ideology, but also a morbid phenomenon, an apocalyptic chaos, in which the lowest instincts manifest themselves and the Bolshevist leaders are dictators in the most terrible sense of the word. Clad in rags, they seize wealth and in reality claim privileges. Democracy must fight against this movement. To flirt with bolshevism means to leave the path of honor and of human commonsense. And I tell you out of the depth of my soul: The fight against all phenomena of bolshevism must dominate our policy. Let us act energetically as long as there is time. If we will not decide ourselves to act, bolshevism will weaken small nations and, at the end, cause their full dissolution.

I cannot conceive of any statement being more accurate or prophetic. It is tragic that the timely warnings of this able Slovak statesman were not heeded by the nations of the world and especially by the statesmen at Yalta, Teheran, and Potsdam. But it is not too late for us to heed them now.

Another Slovak leader, Dr. Jozef Tiso, spoke as follows in 1945:

> The Slovak people do not rely on international Moscow because under its rule, their national independence would be devoured and would disappear. The Slovak people will never support the power position of Moscow, because bolshevism is only a brutal negation of religion, the negation of higher culture, the destruction of human nature and the undermining of the bases of human society.

For these remarks, Dr. Tiso later paid with his life. Thus he joined the glorious martyrdom for human freedom.

I cite the above expressions, however, to indicate the obstinate, unyielding opposition of the Slovaks to communism. Their bishops, priests, nuns, and religious have been imprisoned and cruelly persecuted. Their people have been tyrannized and martyred. But they have not surrendered their honor, they have never ceased to clamor, struggle, and fight for independence and freedom.

Such a people are entitled, not only to encouragement but help. They are not alone in this fight. Many small nations and small peoples are with them in the tragic circle of Communist oppression. Poland, Lithuania, Estonia, Rumania, Bulgaria, and others are in human bondage. The time will come just as surely as God is in heaven, when they will be liberated. But that day will come only when the free world, the democratic world, awakens to the enormity of the present situation in which millions of people are bound with the heavy chains of oppression. If the principle of self-determination means anything, if the United Nations means anything, if our professions of freedom means anything, if the sacrifice of our boys mean anything, then the American people must stand by the great principles, heretofore so boldly espoused, that what we seek "is a reign of law based upon the consent of the governed and sustained by the organized opinion of mankind." We must stand for liberation and freedom. We must cancel out the terrible diplomatic blunders that consigned so many helpless free peoples to brutal Communist domination.

Let us never forget that we are the hope of these poor, helpless, oppressed peoples from Poland to Slovakia, and from the Baltic to the Mediterranean and Black Sea. Yes, everywhere men and women are in chains. We remain in their minds as the great inspiring hope of the future and the one great power in the world with strength, power, and idealism to stand boldly for the right, to lead the campaign for liberation and bring freedom and peace to the world.

American Aid Versus Foreign Aid, 1946 to 1953

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1954

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, the news bulletin of Paul O. Peters, editor, of Washington, D. C., dated Friday, May 21, 1954, is important in that it shows the extent to which aid to foreign governments has exceeded that of grants-in-aid received by our own people, including checks to individuals as veterans of World War II and the Korean incident.

The article to which I refer, and which is made a part of my remarks, is as follows:

POSTWAR FOREIGN ECONOMIC AND MILITARY AID PROGRAMS EXCEED COST OF GRANTS-IN-AID TO STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS PLUS CHECKS TO INDIVIDUALS

(By Paul O. Peters)

The title of this bulletin might well be "Foreigners Preferred," for while our Government has been collecting billions of dollars from the American taxpayers and sending back a small percentage of the internal-revenue collections as grants-in-aid and checks to individuals, including the veterans of World War II and the Korean fiasco known as an aggression, the amount which the American people have received is far less than the amounts in grants and credits to foreign governments in the postwar period.

The table which follows shows the aid extended to Americans and the aid extended to foreign governments for the fiscal years 1946 through 1953:

American aid versus foreign aid: 1946 to 1953

Fiscal year	Aid to Americans by United States	Net aid to foreign governments by United States
1946	$1, 290, 107, 183	$5, 763, 513, 843
1947	1, 694, 070, 076	6, 734, 885, 336
1948	5, 551, 054, 046	5, 715, 000, 000
1949	5, 493, 710, 763	6, 543, 029, 206
1950	5, 522, 020, 743	5, 842, 592, 000
1951	4, 850, 097, 620	6, 263, 188, 000
1952	4, 241, 158, 202	4, 595, 477, 000
1953	4, 053, 941, 794	6, 336, 000, 000
Total	32, 696, 160, 427	47, 793, 685, 385

Any well-informed taxpayer who studies the news reports of our adventures in foreign lands, and who takes time to inquire as to the foreign entanglements in which we have become involved, can look upon the record written by the economic internationalists and one worlders and decide for himself whether or not we need an American foreign policy instead of a foreign American policy. The table speaks for itself.

The Soviet's Second Front

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. GWINN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1954

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, just a little over 1 month ago I remarked before this body that TVA was America's first Socialist-Communist experiment. A heated discussion followed because some of the Members felt that I had exceeded the proprieties and dignities of the House by characterizing TVA as socialistic and communistic. To justify the terminology I used I read into the RECORD Webster's definition of communism, to wit, "a system of social organization in which goods are held in common, the opposite of the system of private enterprise." I then proceeded to square that definition with TVA. I ended my address with the following language:

> We fight wars on the theory that socializing and communizing economy is wrong because it cuts production and brings misery and tyranny to the people. If we take up

arms to defeat it abroad, why do we tolerate it at home?

It is perfectly clear that Congress is promoting and legislating socialism when it authorizes and appropriates money for public housing, TVA, subsidies for this, and handouts for that, at the expense of the inarticulate unorganized citizen—Kulak in Russia. The Members of the House were startled at the terms I used only because they had not read the dictionary definition of communism and were accustomed to think of these schemes in the spurious terms of social welfare, social gains, and planned economy.

This misleading use of labels is the subject of John T. Flynn's article entitled "The Soviet's Second Front," which appears in the May issue of the American Mercury. The following are excerpts from Mr. Flynn's article:

THE SOVIET'S SECOND FRONT

(By John T. Flynn)

Someone has said that many great wars have been lost because the leaders fought the wrong war in the wrong place at the wrong time. That is what we are doing here. And that is why we are losing the only war in which we are involved that is worth winning.

* * * * *

What is the Communist threat in America today? It has two objectives. One is to support the aims of the Communist world in Europe and Asia. The other is to make the United States into a socialist society. We have at last succeeded in alerting the American people to the Communist spy who inserts himself in some sensitive spot in our Government to collect unguarded secrets for Russia and to influence policy in Europe and Asia in favor of Russia. But the Communists have another objective. That is the spread of socialism here in this country. Any American citizen or organization who promotes socialism here is, whether he knows it or not, promoting the second great aim of Russia in the United States.

There are, of course, differences between Socialists. There are Socialists who seek to bring socialism into effect gradually, and fondly imagine they can operate it by democratic methods. There are some who want total socialism; others who seek to socialize merely a large sector of the system. There are some who believe it should be done gradually and others who think it can be done more effectively by swift, violent, revolutionary action. But all are agreed on the one great central aim—namely that the all-powerful state must assume total authority over the economic system.

The Soviet Government is a Socialist Government. Russia's official title is the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. The bible of all socialists, including the Russians, is the Communist Manifesto of Marx and Engels. When it was written, a question arose as to whether it should be called the Socialist Manifesto. But Engels urged that the word socialism had gotten associated at that time with such crackpot little utopias as Brook Farm, and they did not want their movement confused with that. They adopted the word communism for what today we call socialism. C. D. H. Cole, the British Socialist writer, tells us that the only difference between what is called socialism in England and communism in Russia is a matter not of principle but of tactics. The Communist has two war zones. One includes the promotion of Russia's international objectives. The other is the promotion of socialism in the United States.

Once upon a time we had an American Socialist Party, led by Norman Thomas. It called itself a Socialist party and made an honest appeal to voters for socialism. But the Socialist Party has disappeared. The Socialist label has no sales value. Now the Socialists cause is carried on by wholly different groups. They promote the Socialist revolution in America under a banner labeled "anti-Communist."

We do not fight with any degree of understanding or energy or success these new-style socialist revolutionaries who labor everywhere to introduce socialist institutions here, which is precisely what the Communists wish. To begin this fight is the greatest task before American statesmen and American patriots now—infinitely more important than wasting our substance in a futile struggle to save what still remains on the Continent of Europe outside of Communist authority. Now let us see and measure this revolutionary threat in America.

Eugene Debs and Norman Thomas tried to sell socialism to America. They failed because they labeled it socialism. Debs once polled nearly a million votes and Thomas nearly 900,000. But that was high tide in 1932. In the 1936 election Thomas got only 187,000. That was because other Socialist forces under a different and slicker leadership had found a better way. The leader in this movement was Sidney Hillman, head of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America—a heavily pro-Communist union. He was joined by David Dubinsky, head of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union, which was heavily Socialist.

Hillman formed a new party—the American Labor Party. His plan was to create one big stockade in which he could corral a great variety of Communist and Socialist votes. With this weapon he could blackjack the Democrats in New York into nominating candidates of his choice. In 1938, this coalition of Communist and Socialist votes proved its power. Dewey got 2,302,000 Republican votes; LEHMAN got 1,971,000 Democratic votes. But Hillman and Dubinsky gave LEHMAN an additional 409,979 Communist and Socialist votes and made him Governor. In 1940 Republican Willkie had 171,000 more votes than Roosevelt got from the Democrats. But the Hillman-Dubinsky combination gave Roosevelt 422,518 additional votes—enough to wipe out the Willkie lead and give Roosevelt New York's electoral vote.

By 1944 the Socialist group began to resent the domination of Moscow and split from the American Labor Party to form the Liberal Party. However, they voted alike in the elections. In the 1944 election, these two groups gave Roosevelt 825,235 votes in New York—enough to wipe out Dewey's majority over the Democrats. From this point on, the Democratic Party in New York State has continued as the prisoner of these Communist and Socialist armies.

This was true in other States, but the precise size of the Communist and Socialist minority cannot be fixed because in States like Connecticut, New Jersey, Illinois, Pennsylvania and others, the leftwing leaders operated inside the Democratic organization. It is a fact of startling significance when we realize that Harry Truman was told by Roosevelt in 1944 that to get the nomination for Vice President which ultimately made him President, he had to clear it with Sidney [Hillman]. Indeed, every important decision of the Democratic Convention in 1944 had to be, by Roosevelt's orders, cleared with Sidney. No one can refuse to recognize the great hold this collection of Socialist and Communist revolutionists got on American policy.

But, even more important, the Socialist Liberal Party got from Stuart Chase and George Soule early in the New Deal days a new name for socialism. They called it the Planned Economy. This was a stroke of salesmanship genius. It thus became possible for professors and journalists to adopt the great cause without the stigma of Marx on the label. After all, what could be more appealing to the practical-minded American that an economic system rationally and wisely planned?

But these men did not mean a planned capitalist system. They meant a planned Socialist society. This rational and persuasive brand label made it possible even for some luminous-minded businessmen to take the curse of business off their egos and act like intellectuals by embracing a philosophy of society which was planned. This Liberal Party is now the successor of the Socialist Party of Norman Thomas, but far more radical and aggressive, and impudent, in its respectability.

The next phase of this plan was the organization of a movement to direct and control the party on the model of the Fabian Society, which directed Britain's Socialist revolution. In 1947, therefore, the leaders organized the Americans for Democratic Action—the ADA—which is really the Socialist politburo—the planning body of the Socialist movement. Its purpose is not merely political. It is revolutionary. Its plan is (1) to introduce socialism one step at a time; (2) to introduce Socialist ideas into school textbooks, churches, the press and other media of information; (3) to couple Socialist objectives with reform movement; (4) to infiltrate whatever political party offers the best medium for propagating its ideas; (5) to advocate measures designed to cripple the system of private enterprise, such as heavy income taxes, Government invasions of business, handouts of every description, and measures to buy with money or favors large racial, economic, or religious groups—but never using the word Socialist.

And how much more effective it would be if the ADA could run its candidate for the Presidency on the Democratic ticket instead of the Socialist ticket. Impossible, you say? By no means. Adlai Stevenson was their candidate. They nominated him for President on the Liberal Party ticket, and he was nominated by the Democrats. Wilson Wyatt, former Housing Administrator, was the first head of ADA. He managed Stevenson's campaign for the Presidency. Mr. Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., is one of the ADA's most vocal members and apologists. He was Adlai Stevenson's speech writer in the last campaign. Not a bad job of infiltration, I would say. The ADA supplied the Democrtic candidate, his speech writer, and his campaign manager.

Mr. Schlesinger is one of the ADA's most outspoken philosophers. American New Dealers, he says, are "gradually advancing out of the jungle of private enterprise." He informs us that Britain has "submitted herself to social democracy and the United States will very likely advance in the same direction through a series of New Deals." He rejoices that "the next depression will inevitably mean a vast expansion in Government ownership and control" and, with complete contempt for the political insouciance of business, he sneers that "the private owners will not just submit" to Government control or ownership but in characteristic fashion "will demand it." He observes that there is no sign in either nation (Britain or the United States) "that the capitalists are putting up a really determined fight against those who would use the state to restrict their profits and reduce their power—even perhaps take their property away from them."

Why should he not hold them in contempt? Has he not seen a great political party led by anti-Socialists and financed by businessmen nominating the choice of the Socialist ADA for President? And has he not seen great numbers of businessmen and wealthy families and their rich foundations financing the incredible adventures of his red and pink companions—foundations which have been the principal support of the most extreme and daring Communist activities such as, for instance, the Institute of Pacific Relations which helped deliver China to the Reds? ADA is supported not only by the powerful CIO unions but by the two huge and rich leftwing garment workers' unions.

The point of all this, of course, is that here is a group doing infinitely more to lay the foundations for a Communist America than the Communist leaders can do. They promote socialism here. They do not peddle it. They are wholesalers. They have captured one of our great parties and have actually infiltrated the other. They swarm in our colleges and high schools, our publishing houses, our leading journals, our newspapers—even some of the most conservative. They are crowded into radio and television, the movies, and the stage. They have captured labor. And they cannot be tagged with the discrediting label of communism.

They actually call themselves anti-Communist and under this label of anticommunism they lay the foundation for a Communist America. They include among their supporters such men in high places as Senator Herbert Lehman, of New York; Senator Paul Douglas, of Illinois; Senator Estes Kefauver, of Tennessee; Francis Biddle, a former Attorney General of the United States, and their present chairman, and Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt—plus many, many others.

We will begin to fight American communism in America when we stop spending billions to fight foolish and losing wars against communism in Europe and Asia and direct our fire at this army of creepies in America which builds the foundations on which communism will later roost.

The Trinity River Project Should Be Started Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1954

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, the upper reaches of Trinity River lie about 1,500 feet above and 20 miles to the west of the upper Sacramento River near the northern end of California's great Central Valley. Eastward-moving storms blocked by the Trinity Mountains bring to the upper Trinity River Basin some of the highest annual precipitation recorded anywhere in the State, nearly 80 inches at the higher elevations.

Each year hundreds of thousands of acre-feet of water, which could be developed for irrigation and hydroelectric power, flow down the Trinity River and are lost into the sea. A plan to use these undeveloped resources for the benefit of northern California was submitted to the Congress in the report of Mr. Oscar Chapman, Secretary of the Interior, dated January 2, 1953.

The potentialities of the upper Trinity River have long been recognized. Previous and present investigations form the basis for the conclusion that the fullest and most economic conservation and use of the water resources of the Trinity River for the widest possible public benefit can be obtained by the diversion of surplus water into the Central Valley Basin.

In support of the Trinity River project, I want to briefly discuss the need for the development, the proposed plan of development, its justification and the effect of the diversion on the resources or future water requirements of the Trinity River Basin.

NEED

First, there appears to be no question as to the need for surplus Trinity River water to meet the expanding requirements for irrigation-water supply in the Central Valley. Maximum crop production is now restricted by inadequate water supplies on thousands of acres of farmland. As the population continues to increase the need becomes more and more acute. Failing ground-water supplies have added to the demands for supplemental water. Among the areas in the Central Valley suitable for early development with additional water supplies are the lands adjacent to the Sacramento River, including the Sacramento Canals unit of the Central Valley project. Here over 200,000 acres of land require water for irrigation.

The second principal need is for additional electric power for farms, homes, and rapidly developing industries. Throughout all of northern California the increasing population, more irrigation pumping and expanding industries are placing an ever-increasing burden on existing facilities. Studies by the Interior Department and the public-utilities commission of the State of California show that requirements for new generating and transmission works are not being met and that an acute long-range power-shortage problem results. In this connection it is important to note that almost half of the powerplant capacity of northern California is in steam-electric plants, drawing upon fuel sources which cannot be replaced. By making use of renewable water resources these fuel reserves can be conserved.

PLAN OF DEVELOPMENT

To conserve and put to beneficial use the surplus flows of the Trinity River as proposed by the Department of the Interior requires a large multiple-purpose storage reservoir and an afterbay on the upper reaches of that stream, tunnels to divert the conserved water into the Sacramento Valley, a series of powerplants to generate hydroelectric energy en route and the use of this water for irrigation in the Central Valley.

The Trinity River project would make available an average of over 1 million acre-feet of water annually for irrigation including water from Central Valley streams made usable by the project works. By this diversion water would be provided for some 300,000 acres of land. It would increase the amount of electric energy available from the Central Valley project by 1,617,000,000 kilowatt-hours annually for the northern California power market. In addition, it would provide important fish and wildlife benefits, as well as the enhancement of the recreational resource of the Trinity River area.

JUSTIFICATION

The Trinity River division of the Central Valley project and associated features are economically justified, producing benefits which will exceed the costs by a ratio of more than 3 to 1. Reasonable calculations indicate a return of over $35 million a year in benefits as against $11,500,000 a year required to operate, maintain, and pay off the project on a 50-year-amortization basis. This project is estimated to cost about $200 million.

The recommended development makes it possible to take advantage of the different hydrologic conditions and physical relationships in the upper Trinity and the Central Valley Basins so as to produce more water and power than would be possible from an independent operation of existing features of the Central Valley project or of the proposed features of the Trinity River division.

EFFECT ON FUTURE NEEDS IN TRINITY RIVER BASIN

The economic base for the upper Trinity River Basin is founded on the utilization of its natural resources. Livestock raising, mining, and lumbering are the chief industries of this area. The provision of goods and services to local residents, vacationists, and sportsmen comprises the remainder of the economic base.

The water resources of the Trinity River have not been developed appreciably. The principal demand for a substantial flow in the river at the present time is for support of the fishery resources, consisting mainly of salmon, steelhead, and trout. The proposed development will provide an adequate minimum flow for the protection and propagation of fish. In fact, a preliminary report of the Fish and Wildlife Service indicates that when the protective measures provided in the plan are taken, fish and wildlife resources as a whole will be enhanced by the development. There are no other major future requirements for upper Trinity River water.

There is a growing need for energy at attractive rates in the northwest counties. The new powerplants and transmission lines would increase the local power supply and make possible the expansion of extractive and processing industries.

It is particularly pertinent to note that the State of California, through its director of public works in an independent analysis of the subject, indicated in a letter to the Secretary of the Interior dated April 13, 1953, that in their opinion the Trinity River project will not reduce the usable water resources of the Klamath River watershed to any appreciable degree. This official further stated that, on the other hand, it is clear that Trinity County, which is the county of origin of the waters proposed to be stored and diverted, could be substantially benefited by reservation of power for use of industry in that county, as well as from the standpoint of improved fish and wildlife facilities and recreation.

A word as to the status of the project. Inasmuch as the Secretary of the Interior on the basis of the facts presented reported favorably in January 1953 as to a finding of feasibility, it follows that the Trinity River division is authorized under existing reclamation law. Funds for advance planning on this division of the Central Valley project were included in the President's budget estimates. Unfortunately, however, these funds were deleted in the action of the House of Representatives on the Interior Department appropriation bill for 1955. This project should be permitted to go ahead right now. Further delay is inexcusable.

In conclusion I would like to emphasize that the Trinity River project has engineering feasibility. No unusual construction problems are anticipated. It has very favorable economic feasibility. The plan of operation is such that it will have no detrimental effect to the fishery resources or to the present and future water requirements of the Trinity River Basin. The State of California supports the project recommending its construction at the earliest practicable date.

Great foresight and imagination has been shown in developing the possibilities of the Trinity River project. There is ample experience to show the far-reaching benefits in increased production from this investment of public funds. But the needs for water in the Central Valley and for power in the northwestern counties will not be met until the major works are planned and constructed and the falling water now going to waste is put to use. In the interest of the continued prosperity of California and the Nation, I strongly support all efforts to attain this end.

H. R. 8356, the Reinsurance Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 25, 1954

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to report that the leadership in the great life insurance industry recently met with President Eisenhower, and at the conclusion of the meeting announced their general support of the administration's proposal to develop a health reinsurance program. This is an important milestone in our efforts to speed the day when more Americans can enjoy the benefits of better insurance against the costs of hospital and medical care.

The significance of the statement released after the meeting is twofold:

First, it represents a realistic understanding on the part of leading insurance executives of the way in which Government and private industry can proceed hand in hand on a voluntary and not compulsory basis to help the American people in their quest for better health.

Second, it is a clear indication that leaders in the private insurance business recognize that real improvements are necessary in the voluntary health insurance movement if our fellow citizens are to be properly protected against the serious economic consequences of illness and accidents.

I am happy to call the attention of my colleagues to the statement which was issued by Horace W. Brower, president, Occidental Life Insurance Co., Los Angeles, Calif.; Asa V. Call, president, Pacific Mutual Life Insurance Co.; Los Angeles, Calif.; Paul F. Clark, president, John Hancock Mutual Life Insurance Co., Boston, Mass.; Frederick W. Ecker, president, Metropolitan Life Insurance Co., New York City; Louis W. Dawson, president, Mutual Life Insurance Co., New York City; W. T. Grant, chairman, Business Men's Assurance Co. of America, Kansas City, Mo.; S. J. Hay, president, Great National Life Insurance Co., Dallas, Tex.; Ralph R. Lounsbury, president, Bankers National Life Insurance Co., Montclair, N. J.; Ray D. Murphy, president, Equitable Life Assurance Society of the United States, New York City; Powell B. McHaney, president, General American Life Insurance Co., St. Louis, Mo.; Clarence J. Myers, president, New York Life Insurance Co., New York City; Adlai H. Rust, chairman of the board, State Farm Life Insurance Co., Bloomington, Ill.; Eldon Stevenson, Jr., president, National Life and Accident Insurance Co., Nashville, Tenn.; Carroll M. Shanks, president, Prudential Insurance Co. of America, Newark, N. J.; Frazar B. Wilde, president, Connecticut General Life Insurance Co., Hartford, Conn.; Claris Adams, executive vice president and general counsel, American Life Convention, Washington, D. C.; Eugene M. Thoré, general counsel, Life Insurance Association of America, New York City.

The statement follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE.

At the invitation of the President, 17 officials of life-insurance companies attended a luncheon conference at the White House today to discuss the administration's pending legislative proposal to establish health reinsurance facilities as a function of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Secretary Hobby and other officials of the Department were also present at the luncheon.

At the conclusion of the conference the life-insurance company representatives issued the following statement:

"During our conference with the President there was a general expression on the part of the life-insurance company representatives who were present favoring the general objectives of the bill. We believe the measure is directed toward encouraging and stimulating still further the development and expansion of health insurance services and coverage for the American public through voluntary plans. There was discussion at the conference as to how the bill may be improved. The plan includes many sound insurance principles. We feel that provision in the bill dealing with the utilization of State insurance departments under the plan may be further strengthened in order that they may be used to the maximum extent and that the system of State supervision of insurance should not be limited by Federal activity in any field."

Out of Both Sides of the Mouth Pours TVA and No TVA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 26, 1954

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the administration owes the Congress and the American people a forthright explanation in refusing to reappoint Gordon R. Clapp to the chairmanship of TVA. The President announced that Mr. Clapp had been a very fine administrator who acted without fear or favor.

Mr. Clapp's philosophy as to the need for TVA and all that it means to our national welfare is too well known to require retelling here.

None can doubt it is in exact accord with the pronouncement made by Candidate Eisenhower during his campaign for election when he said:

> If I am elected President, TVA will be operated and maintained at maximum efficiency. I have a keen appreciation of what it has done and what it will be able to continue to do in the future.

President Eisenhower now says he is looking to replace Mr. Clapp with a person whose philosophy is more in accord with his own.

We know Mr. Clapp's philosophy has not changed.

If the President's has, he owes it to the Congress and to the people to tell them about it.

Surely he cannot mean he wants a man who will not make a fine administrator. Certainly he cannot be looking for a man who will act with fear and favor.

The only alternative left is that the President has changed his philosophy and no longer wants TVA.

We await a clarification.

Some Statements of Policies and Programs for Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 26, 1954

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include some statements of policies and programs for agriculture, showing a comparison of the National Grange, the American Farm Bureau Federation, and the Farmers' Union, by John Kerr Rose, of the Senior Specialists Division, the Library of Congress, Legislative Reference Service, dated March 24, 1954:

Aspects of policy and programs	The National Grange	The American Farm Bureau Federation	The Farmers Union
General attitude toward Government support of farm prices.	The National Grange believes that a farm program designed to maintain adequate farm income and a balance between supply and demand of agricultural commodities is essential to the welfare of American agriculture and national economy.	Price support and production adjustment programs have a place in an overall agricultural program because we as a Nation sometimes fall short of achieving the more general policy objectives * * * and because of certain conditions peculiar to agriculture which cause farm prices to fluctuate more widely than farm costs.	* * * we assert the right of all farm families to an opportunity to earn by their work sufficient income to be able to obtain at reasonable prices enough goods and services to provide living conditions equal to those available to all segments of the population. * * * * * * * * * * * If successful family farming is to be sustained, the income realized from the sale of products must be large enough to provide for farm family living, cover cash operating costs, replace used-up machinery and equipment, repay operating loans with interest, return capital investment * * * pay taxes and conserve the soil and water resources of the farm.
Proposed level of price supports.	We recognize that the support prices which we have used recently have materially reduced the markets for products, especially our surplus or export products.	The goal we seek is a condition that will permit farmers to achieve full parity. Government programs for agriculture should be designed to help farmers achieve this objective but we do not consider it the responsibility of Government to guarantee profitable prices to any group * * *. * * * * * The price-support levels now in effect for the basic commodities and some others are a carryover from programs designed to encourage production for World War II and the postwar rehabilitation period * * *. The temporary provision of law requiring 90 percent of parity price support on the basic commodities without regard to supply should be allowed to expire at the end of the 1954 program.	Existing legislation should be revised to provide 100 percent of full parity price support up to a farm-family production of 500 units.
Attitude toward flexible price supports.	Flexible price supports should be available for use when necessary * * *. When previously listed measures have failed for maladjusted crops or products and for special crops when producers vote for and apply either marketing quotas or acreage allotments, we sanction fixed price supports.	* * * The principles of the permanent provisions of the Agricultural Act of 1949 with respect to variable price supports should be put into effect. In addition the law should be amended to provide that 90 percent of parity price supports shall be mandatory for the first year that marketing quotas are in effect for any commodity immediately following a year in which marketing quotas were not in effect on such commodity. Thereafter, the level of price supports would be determined by the producers' response in bringing supplies in line with effective demand.	We urgently demand the immediate repeal of the sliding scale of price supports in the Agricultural Act of 1949 and the substitution for it of a parity level of support * * *.
Acreage allotments and marketing quotas.	When previously listed measures [school lunch program and flexible price supports] have failed for maladjusted crops or products and for special crops when producers vote for and apply either marketing quotas or acreage allotments, we sanction fixed price supports. If acreage allotments are used, we urge that the inequities inherent in the historic base approach be recognized and corrected insofar as possible.	Under present and past acreage allotment and marketing quota programs, long range crop rotations and good farm management practices have not been given due consideration in setting up allotments for individual farms * * *. * * * * * We urge that State and county committees be given necessary administrative discretion to correct the glaring inequities that so often exist * * *. * * * * * The prerogative of the executive branch to avoid giving producers an opportunity to decide whether or not controls should be invoked to keep supplies in line with demand should be restricted and more clearly defined.	Until such time as this principle [above parity farm price supports for commodities desired in greater supply] is enacted into law and all monopolistic restrictionistic elements are removed from nonagricultural business and industry, we support the use of acreage allotments and marketing quotas. Acreage allotments and marketing quotas for individual farm families should be worked out in a single unified farm plan. Marketing quotas should be established on a bushelage or poundage basis rather than an acreage basis * * *. Both acreage allotments and marketing quotas, when they are invoked, should be determined for each farm family on a historical base adjusted for each of the following factors: (1) assignment of a minimum allotment on quota to each farm family, (2) a progressively graduated rate of percentage reductions such that the larger the historical base the greater the percentage of reduction, (3) a maximum allowable acreage or quota for any one farm family.
Methods of farm price support.	We * * * recommend that present general support methods be retained with such change as experience indicates is needed but we realize that new legislation is required to make it possible to dispose of our surpluses in expanded markets. We would legalize concerted efforts or sales campaigns of farmers, processors, distributors and retailers to push the sale of products in surplus supply * * *. We would legalize marketing agreements for all farm products which can successfully use them. * * * * * We favor the use of self-financing 2-price or multiple-price measures for such commodities as can use them. Such 2-price or multiple-price measure should be supplemented by special measures to stimulate export of surpluses and compensatory imports to balance our surplus exports.	* * * changes are needed to improve the workability of present legislation with respect to price supports and production adjustments. * * * The principles of the permanent provisions of the Agricultural Act of 1949 with respect to variable price supports should be put into effect. In addition the law should be amended to provide that 90 percent of parity price supports shall be mandatory the 1st year that marketing quotas are in effect for any commodity immediately following a year in which marketing quotas were not in effect on such commodity. * * * * * The modernized parity formula should be extended to the basic crops which are still using the old formula * * * * * * Proper authority should be provided to require that producers devote a percentage of their cropland to soil-building crops or practices as a condition of eligibility for conservation payments or price support on crops which are not under marketing quotas * * *	We urge the amendment of the Agricultural Act of 1949 to authorize more workable methods of supporting the prices of perishable as well as storable commodities. Production payments, when used, should be the difference between seasonally and regionally adjusted parity prices and regional average market prices computed monthly. We authorize the study of graduated production payments of the type used in the Sugar Act.
Use of diverted acres	When acreage allotments are in effect, we recommend that producers be ineligible for support prices if the diverted acres are used to produce any commodity on a commercial basis which would destroy the market for any other farm product already in sufficient supply.	The Secretary of Agriculture should be required to establish on an appropriate geographical basis, lists of crops which may not be produced for direct or indirect sale, or may be so produced to a limited extent, on acres diverted from any crop receiving price support when conditions are such that limitations on the use of diverted acres are necessary to prevent the production of excessive supplies.	

* * * * *

Aspects of policy and programs	The National Grange	The American Farm Bureau Federation	The Farmers Union
Use of diverted acres		* * * authority should be provided to require that producers devote a percentage of their cropland to soil-building crops or practices a condition of eligibility for conservation payments or price support on crops which are not under marketing quotas. * * * * * * * * By stockpiling fertility in the soil, we will build a "soil fertility bank" as a reserve for use in national emergencies. * * *	
Commodity reserves for stockpiles.		* * * it must be recognized: * * * * * That some commodities are reasonably storable at moderate cost, while others can only be stored for short periods, at a high cost, or after expensive processing. * * * * * Finally, it must be recognized that no price-support program can be expected to work satisfactorily within the framework of our present economic system when jeopardized by huge stocks of commodities overhanging the market. With this in mind, we recommend a vigorously prosecuted program aimed at achieving a sizable reduction in present farm commodity carryovers. This should be achieved in a manner which will minimize disruption of domestic markets for current production and not risk destroying the possibility of maintaining and expanding needed foreign markets. * * * * * * * * The financial losses of the CCC resulting from commodities in storage going out of condition should be reduced by proper rotation of stocks to minimize quality deterioration and waste.	We advocate the building and maintenance of safety reserves, equal to at least 1 full year's production of every storable commodity and of the storable products of perishable farm commodities. * * * * * Acreage allotments should not be put into effect until a safety reserve of at least 75 percent of a full year's production is on hand and marketing quotas should not be imposed until the equivalent of at least 1 full year's production has been accumulated.
Spread between farm prices and prices to consumers.	We urge a thorough, impartial and competent study of the various factors which enter into the prices paid by the ultimate consumer for staple items of food. * * *	Currently the cost-price squeeze in agriculture places a greater emphasis on the "business enterprise" part of family farming, thus necessitating the need to seek ways to increase efficiency, and lower costs in operation, production and marketing.	Farm family income now is less than 75 percent of parity with nonfarm income. To maintain sufficient manpower in agriculture to produce the food, fiber, oil crops and farm timber that will be required by 1975, we shall have to see to it that farm family makes up the current disparity of 25 percent and in addition keeps pace with rising national income.
Export of farm surpluses.	* * * To achieve a stimulation of such sale of our surplus products, we recommend: 1. * * * development of potential foreign markets. 2. * * * meeting competitive prices. * * * 3. * * * adjustment of import duties and restrictions to induce compensatory importation of goods into the United States. * * * 4. * * * effectively curtailing importation of agricultural commodities already in surplus. * * *	* * * whenever supplies threaten to become excessive, action should be taken in a timely manner to permit United States farm products to maintain a fair and stable competitive position in world markets. This should include the use of CCC or other funds, whichever is appropriate, to encourage the movement of commodities directly into world trade through private channels before they become the property of government.	We favor enactment of all practical means to narrow the gap between consumers dollar demand and their real needs for farm products. Among these are: * * * * * (e) Assistance to needy people abroad. * * * * * As much as possible of United States aid to assist international economic and social development should be extended through the international agencies. * * * * * * * * The United States must take the lead through the United Nations in sponsoring a gigantic effort to relieve hunger and misery in the world.
Sec. 32 funds	Sec. 32 is not mentioned directly but under health policies: We urge a continuance and improvement of all school-lunch programs, and active support of all other health programs designed to benefit and protect children from malnutrition in or out of school. * * * * * And under farm surpluses for relief: We recommend that wherever practical, and where our surplus farm products are needed as relief of distressed peoples, these surpluses be donated to these countries in lieu of a gift of money * * *. And under other measures recommended: * * * * * (1) We favor a judicious use of the school-lunch program, emphasizing a balanced diet.	Sec. 32 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act which makes 30 percent of each year's customs receipts available for programs to encourage increased utilization of farm products, should be continued in effect as a permanent appropriation. The provision of the section which permits up to $300 million to be carried over as a reserve for emergencies should be retained. Sec. 32 funds should be used principally for perishable nonbasic agricultural commodities.	Sec. 32 is not mentioned directly but under "Increasing consumption" the school-lunch program, a food allotment or food stamp program, direct distribution to private and public welfare institutions, special food programs, assistance to needy people abroad, and industrial use of surpluses are favored.
Federal budget and expenditures.	We urge Congress to oppose legalizing any further increase in the national debt beyond what may be required to care for expenditures authorized by Congress in previous years. We recommend to Congress the following methods for preventing any further debt increase: 1. A decrease in Government spending * * *. 2. Maintain tax rates at high enough level to provide funds for meeting essential Government expenditures. 3. Enforce tax laws and collect the full amount of taxes due.	* * * We have urged the necessity of balancing expenditures with tax revenues. We reaffirm and reemphasize this need and request Congress to meet its responsibility in accomplishing this objective: * * * We urge that: (1) Expenditures be brought within tax revenues as rapidly as possible. (2) No segment of our economy including agriculture be spared participation in efforts to achieve a balanced budget.	Farmers Union further recommends that any gap of increased expenditures not covered by increased revenues in twice the amount should be filled by the establishment of a compulsory savings program based upon ability to save. These savings should be in the form of bonds owned by the individual saver and have redemption values which would fluctuate with the value of the dollar.

Aspects of policy and programs	The National Grange	The American Farm Bureau Federation	The Farmers Union
Economic aid	We feel that the time has come to terminate in large measure our programs of economic aid to countries of Western Europe, and to place dependence upon trade for the stimulation of production in those nations. * * * * * We believe that direct assistance from our people to needy people abroad contributes effectively toward developing good will. We commend the assistance given by churches, CARE, granges, and other citizen groups. We recommend that the Foreign Operations Administration explore the possibility of utilizing our agricultural surpluses for economic development and capital formation abroad, and the possibility of taking foreign currency in payment for our food and fibers. * * *	Economic aid should be replaced as rapidly as possible by the expansion of mutually profitable trade. To the extent that economic aid is required, much greater emphasis should be placed on economic development of underdeveloped areas. * * *	The United States must take the lead through the United Nations in sponsoring a gigantic effort to relieve hunger and misery in the world. * * * * * As much as possible of United States aid to assist international economic and social development should be extended through the international agencies such as the Food and Agriculture Organization rather than direct from the United States to the country involved to remove the danger of imperialistic domination.
Technical assistance	We believe that technical assistance to underdeveloped and backward areas should be furnished as largely as possible through private investment. The main role of our Government should be to assist in lessening the risks of private investment abroad through stabilization of currency, the risks of unfair local practices, and of provisions to prevent expropriation of property.	We favor the continuation and improvement of the technical assistance program as an important part of our foreign policy. This program should be designed to offer underdeveloped friendly nations technical training and demonstrational services and should not be another program for the extension of economic or monetary aid.	* * * We regard the point 4 program as a stroke of the highest statesmanship. This bold new program if of sufficient size and quality can change the political and social climate of the world within a few years. We endorse pending proposals to expand and improve the program, with special emphasis on the need for working under the guidance of the United Nations. * * * We are convinced that the United States should embark now on an international development program on a comprehensive scale.
Trade barriers	* * * We favor the expansion of international trade through the stabilization of world currencies and the lessening of trade barriers. While we do not favor complete free trade, we feel that means are available for a considerable revision of our trade policies without undermining our agricultural and industrial economy. We recommend: That, to make effective the finding of the Commission on Foreign Economic Policy, a bipartisan governmental committee be given the assignment of developing recommended procedures for simplifying our cumbersome tariff and customs regulations and redtape, and for promoting the stabilization of world money values and the convertibility of currencies.	* * * the United States should: (*a*) Authorize and negotiate trade agreements and procedures under which the President may negotiate changes in United States tariff and import restrictions * * *, in return for concessions from other countries with respect to tariffs, import quotas, exchange controls, and other trade barriers. (*b*) Offer more stability in tariff rates and customs for reasonable periods in return for reciprocal benefits. * * * * * (*d*) Eliminate legislation and regulations which require "buy American." (*e*) Enact legislation to further revise and simplify United States customs laws, regulations, procedures. (*f*) Participate in an international organization to negotiate reductions in trade barriers, to develop sound principles of international trade, to bring about elimination of unfair or discriminatory trade practices, and to develop measures of international cooperation for the expansion of international trade.	
Farm labor program	We urge such revision of the regulations applying under the labor treaty with the Mexican Government as will correct existing inequities and will facilitate the use of Mexican labor by all farmers requiring that type of help.	* * * We favor a Mexican farm-labor importation program incorporating * * *: (1) Establishment of worker responsibility by temporary withholding of a portion of earnings until contract is completed. (2) Recruitment of workers in border areas as well as in the interior of Mexico. (3) Simplified entry provisions. (4) Minimum Government supervision and involvement in the contractual relationship between workers and employers. (5) Maximum decentralization of administration of the program. British West Indian and Canadian workers constitute another important source of farmworkers. We recommend continuation of present procedures for utilizing such workers. * * * * * We recommend transfer of the Farm Placement Service to the U. S. Department of Agriculture.	* * * We accept as an integral part of our parity income concept for family farmers a responsibility to assure parity of income to all farm labor and the acceptance of its democratic right to bargain collectively. * * * * * We urge immediate steps to require industrial agriculture employers to provide at their own expense to their laborers, domestic and alien, all the basic elements in the American way of life. Illegal immigration should be stopped. We urge the establishment of a Federal Commission on Migratory Labor reporting directly to the President. * * *
Marketing agreements.	We would legalize marketing agreements for all farm products which can successfully use them. They have proven in the past to be one of the most useful of farm measures. They should not be used to control production, but as a practical and profitable means of selling and using surpluses and assuring fair prices to producers and consumers.	We favor broadening the present Marketing Agreement Act to cover additional commodities * * *.	Until such time as monopolistic practices are outlawed in business and industry, we are convinced of the moral right of family farmers to obtain and use marketing agreements and orders to help them obtain parity returns for the commodities they produce.
Transportation (general).	We believe that the ideal transportation system should be freely competitive, unsubsidized, and regulated only to the extent that safety, health, and public welfare require. We, therefore, urge that measures should be taken as rapidly as possible to minimize and eliminate all subsidies, paid directly to all forms of transportation * * *. * * * * * We therefore recommend: 1. That the ICC grant more certificates and permits to applicants desiring to enter the trucking business * * *. 2. That the practice enforced by labor unions compelling farmers or other truck operators to employ standby drivers when entering certain communities or areas should be eliminated * * * * * * * *	Basic elements of our national transportation policy should include maintenance of privately owned transportation system, efficiently and economically operated, preservation of the inherent advantages of each type of transportation, and such minimum public regulation as is necessary in the public interest. * * * * * We will oppose any liberalization of the ratemaking standards of the Interstate Commerce Act. * * * * * Reduction or elimination of transportation taxes should have a priority in any tax-reduction program. * * * * *	A boldly planned integrated transportation system including highways, rail, water, and air on both a regional and nationwide basis should be developed to include individual, corporate, cooperative, and publicly owned facilities of every type. * * * * * We urge revision of freight rates to correct discrimination against Western and Southern development. No freight-rate increases should be allowed except on the basis of proved efficient operation and increased costs of operation.

Aspects of policy and programs	The National Grange	The American Farm Bureau Federation	The Farmers Union
Transportation (general).	Highway-user taxes should be levied by States only * * *. * * * * * All State-imposed highway-user taxes should be devoted to highway construction and maintenance purposes * * *. * * * * * The toll method of financing roads is not favored as a general method of highway financing.	Highway and road costs should be financed by fuel and vehicle taxes. Such revenues should not be diverted for other purposes. * * * * * The Federal gasoline tax should be terminated, leaving this source of revenue available to the States. * * * * * * * * We oppose the allocation of Federal aid to highway funds for the construction of toll roads. Trucks should bear their fair share of the cost of building and maintaining highways adequate to their use * * *. * * * * * We oppose Federal regulation of truck size and height * * *.	
Transportation (agricultural).	Our farm-to-market road problem is far from solved in many States * * *. We suggest that attention be given to the following steps: 1. Diversion of funds should be stopped. 2. State-aid highway tax revenue distributed to local roads should not be used to replace former local revenue, but should be used for additional road construction * * *. 3. A sound formula for the distribution of aid should be employed. * * * * * 5. A long-range highway plan should be used * * *. * * * * * 7. Secondary-road funds should not be dispersed to other types of roads. * * * * * We favor enactment of a law which will include, in the cost of the State or Federal highways, the cost of restoring secondary roads, damaged by their use as detours during construction of main roads * * *. * * * * * We are also opposed to rules which would have the effect of forcing trucks to run empty during any part of their return journey, or during their journey to the next area of maturing crops. A rule that forces trucks to run empty will either destroy the trucking service or greatly increase the rates charged shippers. We therefore favor continuation of the trip-leasing arrangement and ask that it be secured by legislation. We favor stricter enforcement of ICC and State regulations regarding soundness of equipment, hours of driving, qualification of drivers, and all other factors relating to safety. We also favor stricter enforcement of the weight-limit laws and the apprehension of those truckers who evade our transportation laws. * * *. * * * * * Since sec. 13 of the ICC Act is detrimental to agriculture by forcing the adoption of unwarranted local rate levels, we will seek to amend the 13th section of the Transportation Act to provide that State orders on interstate commerce be final where the State laws give due consideration to a fair rate of return and where they do not burden interstate commerce.	Funds available for State highway construction should be allocated among the various categories of highways with appropriate consideration for rural roads. Within each category of highways and roads, funds should be allocated on the basis of relative need as determined by objective analyses and rating. * * * * * We support the agricultural exemptions of the Motor Carrier Act. These provisions permit flexibility of movement and rates for agricultural commodities which are beneficial both to farmers and the consuming public. Common carriers cannot provide a comparable service. Trip leasing of trucks is a desirable practice to provide economic and essential service in the transportation of farm products. We recommend legislation to assure continuation of the practice of trip leasing of exempt trucks by regulated carriers.	We urge that every means be used to keep empty freight cars moving to areas of need and to modernize and enlarge the Nation's fleet of freight cars. * * * * * We favor the establishment of an integrated nationwide fully adequate transportation system including all-weather modern improved roads past every family farm in the Nation.
Family farms	* * *, we favor all practical means of strengthening the position of the family farm including: 1. Adequate expansion of the Farmers Home Administration's supervised credit, * * * with the necessary safeguards to insure soundness of loans. 2. Use of this agency to assist farmers who need credit to increase the size of their farms, or to add improvements necessary to develop their farm into an economically sound unit of operation. 3. * * * We urge the maximum use and expansion of the insured mortgage phases of the work of the FHA.	In the United States, farming generally is, and always has been, a family enterprise. The overwhelming majority of our farms are family farms but this term cannot be defined precisely because the size and nature of the family farm varies with the family, with the character of the enterprise, and with all the many other factors that influence the individual family's operations. * * * * * Currently the cost-price squeeze in agriculture places a greater emphasis on the business enterprise part of family farming, thus necessitating the need to seek ways to increase efficiency, and to lower costs in operation, production, and marketing.	The family farm is the bulwark of democracy * * * vital to the stability, preservation, arm improvement of representative democratic government. * * * * * * * * Where the family is owner, manager, arm laborer, where the business and home are one, tension and conflict along economic group lines cannot occur. * * * * * * * * On the family farm, the business and home are one. Everyday life is concerned with the natural processes of birth, growth, and death. * * * The child grows up with opportunity for well-rounded knowledge of life, nature, business, and home. He learns the meaning of ownership and the security of a place called home. * * * * * We reject the exploitation of human beings through industrial-type agricultural enterprises. * * *

Aspects of policy and programs	The National Grange	The American Farm Bureau Federation	The Farmers Union
Low-income farm families.	------	Provision must be made for * * * special assistance to help the operators of uneconomic farm units make necessary adjustments.	* * * As many of these families as wish to should be enabled to adjust their operations to sound economic units or other satisfactory employment. This Nation should not, by its inaction, force any farm family to leave the farm because programs are lacking that would enable the family to remain in farming on an adequate basis. Moreover we shall oppose proposals from any source to drive farm families off the land.
Power policy	* * * * * We favor, when justified by engineering and economic feasibility and need, adequate Federal appropriations for a continuing well-balanced program of river basin development for irrigation, hydroelectric power production and distribution of power to load centers, water conservation and related uses. Revenues from power on a public project should be considered as a source of income which may be applied as payment for any benefits of the project except navigation, flood control, recreation and other public service aspects. * * * * * We are opposed to elimination of the preferential clause for cooperatives, public utility districts, and cities in purchase of power from Federal projects, and are opposed to provisions for delivery of power from Federal projects at the bus bar only.	The production, transmission, and distribution of power should be primarily a function of private enterprise, either cooperative or noncooperative. The entry of the Federal Government into the power business should be restricted to those instances where proper development cannot be had otherwise. * * *, we favor the sale of the right to generate power at the dam site to private enterprise, either cooperative or noncooperative, or to States or political subdivisions thereof, which are able to and willing to purchase such right under mutually satisfactory terms. If the power is produced by a Federal or interstate agency, we favor the sale of power at the plant to private enterprise, cooperative or noncooperative, or to States or political subdivisions thereof * * * Power sold by Federal agencies should be sold at prices which will meet all obligations for reimbursable charges allocated to power plus payment to the Federal Treasury of an amount equal to the Federal taxes which would be paid if the property were privately owned. Federal agencies engaged in the production or distribution of power should be assessed local taxes on the same basis as private owners. * * * Cooperatives and municipalities should have the first opportunity to purchase Federal power. * * * * * Power shortages and inadequate grids or transmission lines continue to be a major problem in supplying adequate power to farms. We support sound and economic developments to assure farm people of adequate electric service. * * * we urge companies that are equipped to produce lower cost electrical energy to expand their facilities to meet the increasing demand of farm people for electrical energy.	* * * We support present provisions for preference in the sale of publicly generated energy to cooperatives, municipalities, and public agencies. To carry out this policy, we favor publicly owned transmission lines to deliver energy from the source to the load centers * * *
Rural electrification	We * * * insist that Congress make available annually sufficient loan authorizations and administrative funds to insure * * * continued progress * * * extension * * * into unserved areas and the existing systems modernized to meet increased energy demands. * * * oppose any proposal to increase the long-established interest rate * * * on REA loans. * * * Urge Congress to continue to make loan funds available to electric membership corporations * * * for use in constructing generating plants and transmission lines where reasonably necessary.	* * * supports completion of the rural electrification program on a sound basis and within a reasonable length of time. * * * * * We believe that the Rural Electrification Administration should be considered primarily a credit agency. As such it should not perform any operations or services beyond those normally performed by other lenders. * * * * * Where further expansion or improvement is contemplated serious consideration should be given to the possibility of seeking funds for the program from members of the cooperative on an investment basis. If revisions in legislation or regulations are needed in order to permit such procedures, we will support the necessary changes. * * * * * Unless satisfactory agreement is reached to supply the necessary amount of energy for farm use at reasonable rates, it may be necessary to use Rural Electrification Administration funds to finance the generation and transmission facilities farmers need. We will oppose any efforts to change the present law which makes this possible.	Few developments in agriculture can do as much to revolutionize living and production on the farm as rural electricity. It must be made available to every family farm with dependable service insured by an integrated transmission system amply supplied by low-cost power. * * * * * * * * We shall continue to support the right of rural electrification cooperatives to make their own decisions and be able to obtain loan funds to construct generating plants and transmission lines where needed to obtain access to low cost power. * * * We urge constant alertness against efforts of corporate interests to obtain control of rural electric cooperatives.
Taxation of cooperatives.	"* * * In the name of tax equality * * * groups * * * are seeking to have patronage refunds of cooperatives taxed as corporate income of the cooperative, even though the Commissioner of Internal Revenue and the courts have recognized that patronage refunds made pursuant to a contractual obligation are not income of the cooperative * * *. We are opposed to this unfair taxation which, if enacted would seriously impair the efficiency of farmers' cooperatives."	"We support the provisions of the existing law which (1) make it clear that cooperative savings allocated to member patrons are taxable in the hands of such patrons, and (2) provide that savings held by cooperatives in the form of unassigned surpluses shall be taxed in the same manner as the profits of other corporations. * * * * * "We will continue to oppose agressively any efforts to tax cooperatives on savings returned as cash, or clearly shown on the books of the cooperative to be property of the patron. * * * "We oppose the application of a dividend withholding tax to cooperatives or other corporations."	"* * * Success of enemies of cooperatives in bringing about penalty taxation of reasonable unallocated reserves are but a forerunner of stepped-up attempts to tax all patronage refunds and otherwise penalize and harass farmer-owned cooperatives. We will continue to expose * * * the National Tax Equality Association * * * misrepresenting the nature and functions of cooperatives. We deplore * * * that the NTEA has created unfounded enmity of small-town businessmen against their best customers. * * *"
Rural telephones	"We commend the telephone companies and the REA for the progress made in extending telephone service into rural areas, and urge the telephone companies to remove hindrances * * * * * * * *	"* * * We urge private companies to provide as much of this service as possible. We vigorously condemn practices which skim off the most densely populated areas and leave adjacent more sparsely settled areas without service. * * * * *	"The rural telephone program needs to be expanded rapidly. Liberal loan authorizations should be made by Congress to assure minimum delay in reaching farms with this essential service. The equity or stock deposit now required of applicants for rural telephone cooperative membership should be discontinued."

Aspects of policy and programs	The National Grange	The American Farm Bureau Federation	The Farmers Union
Rural telephones	"We also urge more appropriations for REA research for telephone service. Also we urge the formation of local cooperative telephone companies where REA facilities are not adequate to take care of this problem. We desire that the National Grange use its influence to have public telephone systems extend their lines to rural areas."	"We believe that the Rural Telephone Administration mortgage contract provision which places a lien on all the assets owned or later acquired by a telephone company is wholly unrealistic and unjustified. * * * * * "We urge the responsible officials * * * to change the contract provisions * * *"	
Vocational agriculture	"We advocate continued administration of the vocational agricultural program in the Department of Education, Health, and Welfare. "We believe that more adequate funds for vocational and industrial education should be provided by local, State and National governments."	"We commend the excellent school program in vocational agriculture. * * * "We favor continuing Federal appropriation for vocational agricultural education on a grant-in-aid basis."	"We urge the transfer of Federal activities related to vocational agricultural education from the Federal Security Agency to the U. S. Department of Agriculture."
Extension Service	"Since the offices of the county agent and the Extension Service are recognized as constructive and essential agricultural services, and since use of a public agency supported largely by public funds for the benefit of any private organization impairs its ability to serve all farmers well and equally, and is essentially undemocratic, the National Grange will seek Federal legislation providing: * * * * * 2. that it be made unlawful for the facilities and employees of the Extension Service to be used for organizational activities in behalf of any general farm organization, 3. that any private funds, accepted for the use of the Extension Service, be free from any control whatsoever of the contributor, and 4. that the legislation include specific and adequate safeguards to insure complete independence of the Extension Service from private organizations or contributors.	"The agricultural and home economics extension service has made a highly significant contribution to the social and economic advancement of agriculture. * * * * * * * * "The grant-in-aid system of the Extension Service provides an outstanding record of State and Federal relationships. We urge that the principle be maintained and its application be further improved."	"We urge immediate divorcement of State agricultural extension services from any formal or informal tie that may exist with the Farm Bureau Federation."
Land policy	* * *, we would vigorously oppose extensive transfer of land, water, mineral, or timber resources from public to private ownership.	* * * The ultimate responsibility for wise soil management rests with those who farm the land * * * Adequate farm income is the best assurance of the assumption of this responsibility by farmers. * * * The most important role of government is research, demonstration, and education. * * * * * * * * Research in this field is needed, not so much as a separate project, but as a balanced program of sound farm management. The national interest in preserving our soil resources justifies a measure of State and Federal expenditure for direct assistance to farmers to accomplish this objective. The administration of such governmental programs should be decentralized to the maximum feasible extent. * * * Payments should not be made for practices which have become a normal and accepted part of farming operations in the area in which a farm is located. * * * We urge * * * careful study [of] the possibility of substituting a program of long-term, low-interest-rate loans for the present agricultural conservation payment program.	* * * * * We reject the exploitation of human beings through industrial type agriculture enterprises whether on large individual or corporate owned factories in the field or agricultural collectives imposed by totalitarian governments.
FEDERAL			
Landownership	* * * in the past 2 decades some of our public land was purchased as submarginal land because it was used in units too small for a sound-sized family farm, and since little of this land has been returned to private ownership, we favor return of such land, not best adapted to forestry, watershed protection and public recreation, to private ownership; and we request that the House Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and the USDA make a special study of Federal lands and ascertain the amount and location of such lands that should be disposed of * * * in sound-sized units for private farm and ranch operations.	* * * * * Land which has been acquired by Federal agencies for national defense or other purposes but which is no longer essential to accomplish such purposes, should not be transferred to other agencies but should be returned expeditiously to private ownership with preference to original owners wherever possible and without reservation of mineral rights.	
Public grazing lands	We endorse the objectives of S. 2548 of the 83d Cong., 1st sess., the Aiken bill, as follows: 1. The Secretary of Agriculture to agree with lessee on improvements made and compensation of lessee on improvements when lessee relinquishes his leasehold. 2. The Secretary to set up and announce "base or headquarters" standards required of lessee. 3. The Secretary not to use termination of lease as sole reason for reduction of the number of livestock to be grazed. 4. Secretary to make a comprehensive study of "method of determining grazing fees," taking into account "all relevant facts and circumstances." 5. Disagreements between lessee and the Secretary to be submitted to 3-man board—1 appointed by the Secretary, 1 by the lessee and 1 selected by the 2—the first and third not to live in the area of the lease. Fair appeals to be available to aggrieved lessee.	We recommend the enactment of Federal legislation which will stabilize and clarify the rights of private users of Federal land suitable for grazing. The lease with the private user should encourage improvement of the land. Grazing users should be provided as much security of tenure as is compatible with the public interest in the management of the land. * * * Every effort should be made to increase the carrying capacity of these lands in preference to reducing the grazing permits. Where reductions in grazing use are essential for the protection of the resource, the users should have a sufficient period of time to adjust their operations.	* * * * * We favor reforestation and revegetation of national forest and range lands to help protect watersheds and increase wood products and forage.

Aspects of policy and programs	The National Grange	The American Farm Bureau Federation	The Farmers Union
FEDERAL—continued			
Farm conservation	We recommend * * * (1) Expanding the Soil Conservation Service as an independent and separate agency within the Department of Agriculture, * * * (2) Providing adequate educational and technical assistance to farmers. * * * * * (4) Requiring that conservation payments shall be made for practices and materials of a predominantly permanent character. * * * * * (7) Assuring adequate credit for sound conservation practices. * * * * * (9) Providing for conservation through districts established under State laws and for needed land-use regulations when approved locally by two-thirds of the landowners, rather than by Federal laws. (10) Authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to enter into contracts to put certain lands into pasture for specified periods.	* * * * * Appropriated funds for the agricultural conservation program should be allocated on the basis of conservation needs. Payments should not be made for practices which have become a normal and accepted part of farming operations in the area in which a farm is located. We urge the American Farm Bureau Federation board of directors continue to give careful study to the possibility of substituting a program of long term, low interest rate loans for the present agricultural conservation program. This study should include the possibility of reducing or postponing the loan repayments that fall due in years of low farm income.	We urge that the agricultural soil conservation program of the U. S. Department of Agriculture be maintained at levels equivalent to general public or social interest in preserving and improving the productive ability of our farmland. Specifically we urge that the program of Soil Conservation Service be not less than 70,000,000 and agricultural conservation payments at not less than 400,000,000 per year. Both of these programs should be fully integrated with coordinated watershed and river valley basin programs as rapidly as these are established.
Water policy	We recommend the attainment of a sound, adequate conservation program by: * * * * * 5. Planning first the upstream, on-the-farm, land use and conservation measures in order that flood-control and water-impoundment structures below may be smaller because of less siltation. * * * * * We believe that the water resources of the Nation's main rivers should be developed for the greatest good of all interests, both public and private. The existing established priority of uses of water should be preserved, and we especially insist that the priority of use for agricultural purposes should be held inviolate. Each new project should be planned so as to guarantee these priorities and at the same time protect existing water rights of individual users. All bills for the construction of Federal projects should provide for the preservation without impairment in any sense, of the established water rights for irrigation and other agricultural uses. We favor, when justified by engineering and economic feasibility and need, adequate Federal appropriations for a continuing well-balanced program of river basin development for irrigation, hydroelectric power production and distribution of power to load centers, water conservation and related uses.	* * * * * We recommend legislation to permit private enterprise (including cooperatives) and irrigation districts, local and State governments and political subdivisions thereof and agencies created by interstate compacts to receive the benefit of allocations of funds for nonreimbursable charges. * * * * * We believe a comprehensive revision of legislation relating to reclamation, hydropower, water control, flood control, water pollution, and other water use is necessary * * *. * * * * * The following measures are therefore recommended: (1) That Congress authorize interstate compacts for major interstate watersheds. * * * * * (2) That State governments establish boards or agencies to perform similar functions * * *. (3) That Congress establish a national board of review * * *. * * * * * The national board of review should submit to Congress those projects * * * for which authorization is recommended.	We urge the creation of valley authorities patterned after the Tennessee Valley Authority in the major river valley basins of the Nation * * *."
Flood control	The Grange has continually urged that our national water conservation and flood control programs place greater emphasis upon holding water where it falls on the land rather than placing great reliance upon huge river reservoirs. This involves more adequate watershed protection, reforestation, and regrassing of upstream areas, adequate control of runoff on farms, and the construction of small upstream and drainage area reservoirs. We favor a rapid expansion of pilot flood-control programs now being carried out by the Department of Agriculture, and recommend that States and localities develop means of cooperating in, or carrying on, related watershed protection programs. We recommend that Government credit be provided for this purpose where needed.	Both downstream dams and upstream watershed treatment are needed to minimize flood damage. * * * We urge national policy to provide increased recognition of the contribution that small watershed projects and land-treatment measures can make to the control of water runoff and reduction of flood volume. We recommend that not less than 50 percent of the cost of a watershed development program be provided by the local watershed district.	See water policy.
Forestry	We favor increased appropriation for agricultural and forestry research * * *. * * * * * We recommend a timber serverance tax for States to encourage the growing of timber, the tax to be paid in whole or in part at the time of severance.	We favor the development of a privately owned, sustained-yield forest industry with State and Federal Governments assisting with essential supplemental services * * *. We support State and Federal tax programs which will provide incentive for long-range investment required. We recommend increased emphasis on good management of public lands suitable for timber production * * *.	We favor the intensification and expansion of State-Federal cooperation in protection and improvement of privately owned range and forest lands. We favor increased appropriation for construction and maintenance of timber access roads in national forests. We favor reforestation and revegetation of national forest and rangelands to help protect watersheds and increase wood products and forage. We favor the transfer of the forestry and grazing functions of the Bureau of Land Management in the Department of Interior to the Department of Agriculture.
Farm credit	We favor farmer ownership and control of the Farm Credit Administration lending agencies, with a minimum of Government supervision, * * *. * * * surplus and earnings the agencies of the FCA have after payment of franchise taxes * * * should be used to retire the Government capital. * * * adequate long-term loan facilities (should) be available to farmers * * * to carry out good soil conservation practices. * * * * *	Provisions must be made for * * * adequate farm credit at a reasonable rate of interest. * * * * * The Farm Credit Act of 1953 is a long step toward a fully farmer owned and controlled farm credit system. Much remains to be done * * *. * * * * *	We view with alarm the increasing inadequacy of all existing sources of farm credit, both public and private, to serve the needs of family farmers. We are opposed to national fiscal policies that permit and encourage the rise of interest rates on farm loans * * *. We also urge the reenactment of a farmer-debtor relief law that will give the farm family every legitimate opportunity to retain ownership of their farm.

Aspects of policy and programs	The National Grange	The American Farm Bureau Federation	The Farmers Union
FEDERAL—continued			
Farm credit	The National Grange favors legislation providing for a farm debt moratorium law to protect owners of mortgaged farms against creditors taking over such farms, such legislation to provide for adjusting interest rates and amortizing farm debts, and to be effective only in cases where the condition is beyond the owner's control.	(1) Authority should be provided for the Federal land bank to purchase the remaining assets of the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation * * *. (2) There should be authority for the production credit associations to pay a preferential dividend on class A nonvoting stock to encourage farmer investment * * *. (3) Provisions should be enacted to encourage cooperatives borrowing from the banks for cooperatives to purchase stock in the banks. * * * * *	
Farm credit		(5) The maximum loan limit of the land banks should be raised to a more realistic level. (6) The banks for cooperatives should be authorized to issue consolidated debentures. (7) The farm credit system should be removed from the provisions of the Government Corporations Control Act.	
Crop insurance		We strongly recommend that the crop insurance program be placed on a sound actuarial basis * * * that the premiums charged under the program include reasonable charges for administrative expenses. * * * * * We * * * urge a careful study of the possibilities of converting Federal crop insurance to a reinsurance program for privately operated crop insurance programs.	We continue our support of universal leve premium crop insurance against all farm production hazards with automatic participation of all farmers sharing the benefits of farm programs * * * expand existing limited programs rapidly * * * commend the value of multiple-crop type insurance * * * cost should be borne by all participating farmers and by the Nation as a whole.
School lunch program	We favor judicious use of the school-lunch program, emphasizing a balanced diet.	Provisions must be made for at least the following: * * * * * (8) Continuing efforts to improve diets through education and promotional work as well as special programs such as the school-lunch program.	School-lunch program should be expanded until every school is served that wants the program.
St. Lawrence seaway	We reaffirm our long-standing support of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway, and urge Congress to approve participation in this project by the United States.	We strongly favor the enactment of legislation to provide for the participation of the United States with Canada in the joint construction and operation of the St. Lawrence seaway. The project should be built and operated on a self-liquidating basis.	* * * We urge immediate participation of the United States in the St. Lawrence seaway project.
Phosphate development.		We recommend that the AFBF continue the study of phosphate development, and aid, in whatever ways may be determined to be feasible, the development of the western phosphate deposits.	We favor Government development of phosphate production in the West and stimulation of production of all needed basic plant foods by use of liberal credit programs, construction and leasing or sale of plants, preferably to cooperatives * * *."

Source: Material abstracted from:

1. Summary of Legislative Policies and Programs of the National Grange for 1954, 36 pages.
2. 1954 Policies of the American Farm Bureau Federation; Resolutions Adopted by Elected Voting Delegates of the Member State Farm Bureaus to the 35th Annual Meeting, Chicago, Ill., Dec. 17, 1953, 56 pages.
3. Farmers Union Program for 1952–53; Adopted by Delegates to the Golden Jubilee Convention, Farmers Educational and Cooperative Union of America, Dallas Tex., Mar. 10-14, 1952, 36 pages.

The Great Commoner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE CANNON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1954

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an article from this week's edition of Labor on the work and record of Hon. Robert Crosser, of Ohio, one of the ablest and best beloved men who has ever served in the United States Congress.

The article is in part:

Bob Crosser Set an Inspiring Example for All Americans

Congressman Robert Crosser, of Ohio, old friend and champion of the railroad workers and the common people, will soon pass from the political scene in Washington. In last week's Democratic primary in Cleveland, he was defeated by the slim margin of 442 votes, in a field split between 5 candidates.

Labor believes it speaks for all railroaders in telling Bob Crosser we revere him even more now than during his many historic victories, both at the polls and in Congress. And we are not alone in our feeling about Bob. Even the conservative Cleveland Plain Dealer, which has not been in his corner, said "there is a measure of sorrow in the defeat of Representative Crosser * * * we take this opportunity to thank him for his four decades of public service."

One of Crosser's greatest services is that he has set an inspiring example for all Americans, particularly those who are in public office or aspire to it. By his entire life, he has proved that, in this land of ours, a man still can rise from a humble beginning to the heights, without bending the knee to the forces of greed or wearing any other man's collar.

Bob came to this country as a boy of 7, with his Scotch coal miner father. The family went through hard times in Ohio, but Crosser worked his way through school and became a lawyer. Turning from profitable private practice, he followed the example of his hero Henry George, "the prophet of San Francisco," and devoted his life to working for the people.

Crosser helped in the historic battles of Tom Johnson, Cleveland's great mayor, who spent his fortune fighting for the people against monopoly and special privilege. Bob carried on the good fight as a member of the Ohio legislature and as delegate to a State convention which rewrote Ohio's constitution.

In 1912, a progressive wave swept Woodrow Wilson into the White House and Crosser into the national House of Representatives. With the exception of the 4 years between 1918 and 1922, he has been there ever since.

It would take a big book to tell what Crosser has done in Congress for the workers and people. Railmen and women know he, more than any other man, helped their unions win the railroad retirement and unemployment insurance systems and repeated improvements in pensions and benefits. For similar reasons, he earned the gratitude of the millions of workers who are under Social Security.

Crosser pioneered in so many other great reforms that it is impossible even to list them here. It can be summed up by saying that no man who ever served in Congress played a bigger or more beneficial part in history.

Bob's host of friends wish him many years of well-earned rest, and hope to call upon his sage advice in the future as in the past. In railmen's minds and hearts, a special place will always be reserved for Crosser.

Know Your Waterways

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RUSSELL V. MACK

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1954

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, on April 5 I brought to the attention of Congress the excellent work being done by the Marine News of New York City, N. Y., published by Mr. George H. Palmer, in publicizing the need for better rivers and harbors facilities.

Under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I include the text of some additional advertisements of the Marine News which have appeared in the Washington Post. The advertisements follow:

Their Intrinsic Value

Deepening and widening waterways rarely makes any difference in their appearance. Thus it is that indispensable harbors and channels are developed throughout the Nation with many knowing little or nothing of what is being done. Consequently, the people have little conception of what such improvements mean to the Nation's commerce and defense, or of how they are benefited. Picture present-day America without its deep harbors and navigable channels. Future growth of the Nation continues to be largely dependent upon waterway development. In addition to their intrinsic value, the new projects provide employment during construction, stimulate business directly in improvement areas and indirectly throughout the country. When completed, they are productive and permanent assets. No other Federal expenditure of like amount is more beneficial to the Nation or to the people.

Different Concepts of America

During his campaign President Eisenhower said in part, in the magazine section of the November 2 New York Times, that. "The basic long-term issue of this campaign is between two totally different concepts of America and two totally different estimates of the American people.

"On the one hand, there is that school of thought whose spokesmen regard America as finished: a 'mature economy': a land of closed frontiers.

"There is another and opposite school of thought and of action. * * * It regards America not as a dead end but still at its beginning, in its youth * * * America is far from a mature economy."

Indeed, America is far from a "mature economy," but it is undeniable that the development of harbors and channels, vital both in peace and war, is being neglected and is falling far behind other national growth.

On November 4 .last, the President also said: "It was up to the party in power to carry out a sensible program of progress that the American public will approve." Is it part of a sensible program of progress at any time, to all but eliminate river and harbor development which means so much to the Nation, both during peace and war? This can but add to unemployment. And it is indeed an anomaly that idle men and plant and undeveloped projects with great potential benefits should go hand in hand.

When he was Secretary of Commerce, former President Herbert Hoover said, "Through the improvement of our waterways, it will be possible to distribute industry and population better, because the waterway tends to place many towns and cities upon an equality in transportation."

A vital part of the Nation's economic welfare and defense depends upon shipping. Shipping is dependent upon properly developed, integrated and maintained harbors and channels. The drastic curtailment of river and harbor development with the consequent withholding of great potential benefits is harmful to the Nation.

So Much Yet To Do

The United States has the greatest natural systems of harbors, rivers, intercoastal waterways and tidal estuaries in the world, and border on five of the world's largest lakes. All are splendidly adapted to improvement and integration as continuous waterways. Of the some 65,000 miles of navigable waters, only some 28,000 miles have been improved, with much of that mileage still having inadequate depths and widths. With a coastline (Great Lakes included) of more than 30,000 miles there are less than 200 improved harbors, many yet with insufficient area and depth.

Former President Theodore Roosevelt once said, "A channel is no deeper than its shallowest reach, and to improve it short of the point of effective navigability is a sheer waste of all costs."

For the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1954, the amount provided by the House on March 16 in the Civil Functions Appropriation Act, 1955 for harbor and channel development dwindled to approximately $8,550,000, less than 2 percent of the $430,983,700 total provided by this act.

Is it economy to make drastic cuts in expenditures for purposes which add to national strength and wealth, help the general welfare, and which furnish constructive employment?

Americans Need Help Too

There is much official talk in Washington, and discussion throughout the country, with respect to the vast sums of American money being spent about the world to help other nations. We are not qualified to discuss these expenditures. But we do feel competent to stress the importance of some things that will help America and Americans:

The straightening, widening, and deepening of channels and the deepening of harbors and anchorages is becoming increasingly pressing. Proper maintenance of channels is falling behind year after year; consider the Delaware from Philadelphia to the sea.

The natural island and intracoastal waterways and harbors of America are the finest in all the world. Though much development work has been done the potential benefits from those waterways that remain to be developed are immeasurable. Money so spent is not extravagance. Rather, it adds to natural strength; aids industry and commerce by lowering transportation costs; constructive employment is given to many Americans; all the people are benefited. The cost of waterway development in relation to benefits obtained makes the expenditure a sound investment of the people's money.

A Widespread Misconception

For the 15 fiscal years ending June 30, 1954, Army civil functions appropriation acts totaled $5,771,049,612; $3,155,733,900, or approximately 55 percent, was for flood control; $1,736,034,741, or about 30 percent, for rivers and harbors work, a large part of which was for dams for power development and other mulitpurpose projects. This 30 percent included not only new and maintenance work, but also planning and operation, and care of existing facilities. The remaining 15 percent provided for the Quartermaster Corps, Soldiers Home, Panama Canal and Railroad, and some other smaller items. Despite the varied distribution, year after year the act is labeled in the press and elsewhere as the "rivers and harbors bill."

Of the $1,736,034,741 under the heading Rivers and Harbors, only $232,154,000 was for actual harbor and channel improvement and development. This means that only about 13 percent of the river and harbor total was made available for this important work. This was less than 5 percent of the total appropriated for all civil functions for the 15-year period. For the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1954, the amount provided by the House on March 11 in the Civil Functions Appropriations Act, 1955, for harbor and channel development is approximately $8,550,000, dwindled now to less than 2 percent of the $465,160,000 total.

No other Federal legislation is more misrepresented or less understood than that part of the Army Civil Functions Appropriations Act which provides for the development of the Nation's harbors and channels, vital to industry, commerce, and national defense; indispensable during either peace or war.

House Joint Resolution Introduced Expressing Abhorrence of the Treatment by the Communist Rumanian Government of Its Jewish People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1954

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a House joint resolution expressing abhorrence of the treatment by the Communist Rumanian Government of its Jewish people. The Jews have been sentenced to long prison terms. Their only alleged crime was their expressions of faith in Zionist immigration. They have been guilty of no betrayal of their obligations as nationals of Rumania, yet many of them have been sent to prison labor camps in Siberia.

Some of these Jews who returned to Rumania from Israel are being brainwashed and conditioned to act as hostages and prosecution witnesses in the forthcoming mass trials of Zionist leaders now imprisoned in Rumania. Jews there are being ostracized, pillaged, and plundered and the situation is rapidly assuming proportions of a major tragedy.

I believe the dictates of humanity require us to condemn sharply the Communist Rumanian Government for these mass secret trials and persecutions. Such a pronouncement would direct world public opinion against the horrendous actions of a cruel government, which seeks to blot out the Jewish faith in Rumania.

The text of the resolution follows:

Whereas the Government of Rumania in further degradation of human values has steeped itself in new horrors against the Jews in Rumania by mass arrests, the imposition of cruel and excessive sentences by the Rumanian military courts, by the preparation for mass trials to be conducted against the Jews now imprisoned in Rumania, by the mass deportation of Rumanian Jews to prison labor camps in Siberia; and

Whereas the United States asserting its moral leadership has in the past refused to remain silent in face of oppression and persecution: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, etc., That the Congress of the United States express its condemnation of the Communist Government of Rumania for its persecution of the Jews of Rumania and express its abhorrence and revulsion of the criminal treatment of a minority people.

It Is Time To Stifle Guatemala's Reds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 26, 1954

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit an article appearing in the Newark (N. J.) Star-Ledger of Monday, May 24:

A Woman Senator's Views—It Is Time To Stifle Guatemala's Reds

(By Senator Margaret Chase Smith)

I think it is about time that we took a firm stand on the Guatemalan threat to the peace and security of the Western Hemisphere. It is clear the Reds have done more than make headway in that Central American country. It is clear they now dominate down there—and that such Communist domination constitutes a threat to our country and other nations of the Western Hemisphere.

We might well do away with the diplomatic niceties right away and face the fact that Reds have established a beachhead for a subversive assault on the freedom of this hemisphere. Surely we have by this time learned the folly of delaying a facing up to danger—look at the tragedy of China, Korea, and Indochina.

Perhaps there was something to the argument that we should pick the place of our own choosing to make the stand—a place not so far away that we would be handicapped by the disadvantage of making a stand in the area of the enemy, or exactly where he wanted and to his advantage.

Assuming that might have been the case in the past about Asia, clearly it is not the case now about what is happening under our very noses. For now a sizable amount of arms has been shipped by Communist Poland to Guatemala. It could not be clearer that Russia has now literally come out into the open. It is the Red challenge to start trying to take over the Western Hemisphere by starting first in Central America.

This is nothing less than a move to cut off North America from South America. It is nothing less than a real threat to the Panama Canal, the lifeline for shipping between the Atlantic and the Pacific—the Suez of the Western Hemisphere.

I tried to get some action started some time ago when I introduced legislation calling for a full investigation and study by our officials of the Communist threat in Guatemala and full consideration toward placing a ban against importing Guatemalan coffee. I did this because the hardest blow we could strike at the Reds in Guatemala was for our country to stop buying their exorbitantly priced coffee. Why should we trade with them and provide them the money needed to further the evil ends and objectives of the Reds.

What happened? The State Department playing the game of timidity and fear of offending someone—and a game dangerously close to appeasement of the Reds expressed its opposition to my anti-Communist legislation against the Guatemalan Reds. By such opposition the State Department stymied action by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

Yet, a member of the State Department with considerable knowledge of Guatemala and the Reds there told me privately that mere introduction of my anti-Communist legislation had done some real good. Why then don't we go all the way to do the best job and pass the legislation? What has happened to our Monroe Doctrine—guarantee of the independence of the Western Hemisphere from attack and domination by outsiders?

The best test of how my anti-Communist legislation could have hit the Reds was the manner in which the howls came from Guatemala and the way the Reds there made such vicious attacks on me. What is needed now is more courage to stand up.

Farm Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK T. BOW
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 26, 1954

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include in the Record a statement which I recently presented to the House Committee on Agriculture in connection with the committee's hearings on long-term farm legislation.

I have given a great deal of thought and study to the farm program in general and the dairy support program in particular. Secretary of Agriculture Benson and his assistants inherited a tremendous problem, but one which I am confident of their ability to solve.

At the present time, however, I believe that there are inequities in the dairy support program which should be rectified very promptly. It is with this subject that my statement deals for the most part.

The statement follows:

Mr. Chairman, I want to take this opportunity to outline my views on the dairy situation in general, and my two bills, H. R. 8560 and 8751, in particular.

First let me say that I am deeply concerned with the situation faced by dairy farmers throughout the Nation. I have in my own district some of the finest dairy farms in the country, and Wayne County is one of the leading dairying counties in the Nation.

The dairy farmers in my district are good farmers with but few exceptions. They practice good land use, they work far beyond a 40-hour week, and I have reliable figures which show that with dairy supports at 75 percent of parity these good farmers are now netting only approximately $2 per day for their labor.

I contend, Mr. Chairman, that $2 per day is just not enough to fairly compensate a dairy farmer for the time he spends each day in caring for his dairy herd and providing our Nation with an ample supply of milk. I think it should also be pointed out that this net income of $2 per day is for labor; it does not include any return on the farmer's large investment in his land, buildings, and cattle.

Before continuing further, let me make it clear that I am not an advocate of high rigid price supports on dairy products, or for that matter on any other farm products. Nor do the majority of the farm people in my district want rigid supports. This was verified by a poll which I conducted recently throughout my district. In this poll rural residents voted by approximately 65 percent to 26 percent in favor of the President's flexible farm-support program.

Now, to my mind, a flexible support program implies a program in which any changes in support level will be gradual, so as not to pull the rug out from under any segment of American agriculture. The President indicated in his farm message of this past January that this was also his position, and, as I pointed out earlier, the rural people of my district have expressed strong support for the President's farm program.

The present dairy support at 75 percent of parity does not, in my opinion, fit in with the President's program. This should not be construed as a criticism of Secretary of Agriculture Benson, who has been doing an excellent job under trying conditions. Secretary Benson will, I believe, solve many of the problems facing American agriculture today through his broad knowledge of agriculture and his high devotion to principle.

However, on this particular issue I have an honest difference of opinion with the Secretary. I do not say that dairy supports should be retained at 90 percent of parity; I do not say that never under any conditions should they drop to 75 percent of parity; I say only that a study of the situation as it has affected my own district, and as I am told it has affected other dairying areas throughout the Nation, convinces me that the drop from 90 percent to 75 percent of parity in one step is too sudden and too severe.

I have discussed this situation with outstanding dairy leaders in my district—excellent farmers all—and they tell me they have been hard hit by the dairy support cut. I have studied detailed statistics showing average costs of milk production and average income under the 75 percent dairy support, and it is apparent that the average farmer in my district is suffering. At the conclusion of my statement I am including in the hearing record some of these statistics.

In addition to the fact that the present 75 percent dairy support program is imposing a hardship on dairy farmers, I believe this support level is unfair because it is discriminatory. Virtually all other segments of agriculture are receiving 90 percent supports through this crop year.

This brings me to my own bills. I introduced H. R. 8560 on March 25, 1954, and it provides that the price-support level for milk, butterfat, and the products of milk and butterfat, shall not be reduced by more than 5 percent in any one year.

My second bill, H. R. 8751, introduced April 7, 1954, provides that the Commodity Credit Corporation shall sell feed grains acquired through price support operations to dairy farmers and feed processors who supply dairy farmers at the same percentage of parity at which dairy products are being supported.

I am convinced that the combination of these two bills will eliminate the present discrimination against the American dairy farmer. It is not right that the dairy farmer should have his income severely reduced while other farmers continue to receive 90-percent supports, and it is not right that the dairy farmer should be asked to buy his feed grain at 90 percent of parity and sell his milk at 75 percent of parity. My bills would eliminate both of these injustices. I urge the committee to report them to the House.

I also wish to include in the hearing record two statements which show how and why the dairy farmers of northern Ohio are suffering from the dairy support cut. These statements follow:

"DAIRY PRICE INFORMATION

"I. Blend milk price[1] *(f. o. b. Cleveland market for 3.5 percent milk)*

(Cleveland market includes or affects 40 to 50 northern Ohio counties)

[Price per hundredweight]

	1952	1953	1954
January	$5.20	$4.89	$4.47
February	5.36	4.47	4.16
March	4.62	4.43	3.88
April	4.47	3.88	3.34
May	4.17	3.75	--------
June	4.14	3.79	--------
July	4.46	4.17	--------
August	4.45	4.47	--------
September	5.05	4.64	--------
October	5.04	4.84	--------
November	5.53	4.88	--------
December	5.03	4.68	--------

[1] Deduct 35 cents per hundredweight for hauling to get price farmer actually receives.

"II. Factors responsible for 1954 price drop

"Twenty-five cents per hundredweight due to adjustment of supply-demand amendment to Cleveland Federal order (not in effect until August 1, 1953).

"Twenty-nine cents per hundredweight due to drop in dairy supports April 1 from 90 percent to 75 percent.

"III. Factors in April 1 price drop[1]

"Forty-five cents per hundredweight Cleveland Federal order differential drop on April 1.

"Twenty-nine cents per hundredweight due to drop in dairy supports.

"An increase in the class I utilization offset some of this drop.

"IV. Net income on a northern Ohio dairy farm

	1952	1953	1954
Pounds milk produced	200,000	200,000	200,000
Price	$5.00	$4.50	[1] $3.75
Gross income	$10,000	$9,000	$7,500
Cost ($3.35 hundredweight without labor)	$6,700	$6,700	$6,700
Net income (for labor)	$3,300	$2,300	$800

[1] Estimated.

"V. What will dairy farmers lose in 1954–55?

"Seventy-five cents per hundredweight drop[2] equals 17 percent drop in gross income and 65 percent drop in net income. There will also be an additional loss in values of cattle and land as a result of the drop in milk prices.

"VI. What will consumer gain?

"The Wall Street Journal of April 6, 1954, estimates that consumers will pay 5 percent less for dairy products because of the support reduction from 90 to 75 percent of parity on April 1, and that consumption of dairy products will increase 2 percent.

"VII. Total loss of dairy income and farm purchasing power in Wayne County, Ohio, in 1954

"As a result of 25 cents per hundredweight reduction based on supply-demand amendment and approximately 30 cents per hundredweight reduction by lowering dairy supports from 90 to 75 percent. One hundred and fifty million pounds of milk sold at 55 cents per hundredweight less equals $825,000.

"VIII. Percentage of parity northern Ohio dairy farmers actually are getting in March and April 1954

"Whole milk parity equals $4.75 per hundredweight (USDA, March 15, 1954). March price f. o. b. market equals $3.88, or 82 percent of parity.[3] April price f. o. b. market equals $3.34, or 70 percent of parity.[3]

"Thus, farmers were supposed to get 90 percent of parity in March and 75 percent of parity in April. Actually, northern Ohio farmers will get only 63 percent of parity in April, May, and June 1954 under present support prices.

"IX. Farm income from dairying, 1952[4]

"United States, $6,590,300,000, or 21 percent of total farm income; Ohio, $314 million, or 29 percent of total farm income; Wayne County, $11 million, or 46 percent of total farm income.

"X. Value of milk cows and heifers on farms, January 1, 1952

"United States, $5,854,600,000; Ohio, $255,769,000; Wayne County, $4,500,000.

"XI. Changes needed in Federal pricing formulas

"1. Many Ohio farmers feel that the Federal pricing formulas should be changed to rely less upon the price of butter and other manufactured products and put more emphasis on the economic factors, such as cost of production and consumer purchasing power. Such formulas are already in effect in many eastern deficit markets. Ohio is a deficit State, producing only about 90 percent of the milk it consumes.

"2. The price drop in Ohio in April was greater than in most other States where prices of butter and manufactured products are emphasized less in the Federal and State Pricing Formulas. In fact, it is doubtful if any other State experienced as severe a price drop as Ohio because of this fact. The USDA itself stated that 'some States experienced little drop and some no drop at all' in announcing the drop from 90 to 75 percent.

"3. Thirty-two States had average milk prices higher than Ohio in 1953, according to the USDA. It appears Ohio will drop lower in 1954.

"XII. Recommendations

"Suspension of the Cleveland market supply-demand amendment and revision upward of monthly differentials would give immediate relief. Revision of the pricing formula would give permanent relief to northern Ohio dairymen.

"Many northern Ohio dairymen would like to see less fluctuation in the differentials (the present formula provides for $.90 per cwt. or more between spring and fall prices while some States have only $.50 or less fluctuation); and more uniform producer and consumer prices the year round.

"Cleveland area (40–50 counties) abnormal situation

"1. Reason: In 1952, there were about 1,000 shippers added from Michigan and Indiana. Before this there were 7,000 Ohio shippers. After this and at present there are 8,000 shippers. This gives Cleveland 15 percent extra surplus milk above a normal situation.

"2. Result: The supply-demand amendment reduces the price every month by 25c cwt. A smaller percentage of the total supply goes into Class I. This lowers the blend price, because of this surplus milk and abnormal situation.

"In addition, there is a larger variation in differentials (90 cents between spring and fall) at Cleveland than in many other areas. The differential comes down 45 cents February 1 and 45 cents April 1, and goes up 45 cents on July 1 and 45 cents on August 1.

"Even before the reduction of supports, Cleveland had the 25 cent cut plus the two differential cuts of 45 cents each, or a total cut of $1.15 between February 1 and April 1. (This is more than most areas.) This made the 30-cent cut from lower supports on April 1 worse in the Cleveland area than in most others. It brought the total cut to about $1.45 between February 1 and April 1. (Most areas had much less cut and some none, according to USDA.)"

---

[1] The 25-cent supply-demand reduction was already in effect prior to April 1 in the Cleveland market.

[2] Estimated by Cleveland Milk Producers Federation.

[3] Farmers actually receive 35 cents per hundredweight less (hauling charge) or $2.99 per hundredweight, or 63 percent of parity.

[4] Ranks first as a source of farm income in United States, in Ohio, and in Wayne County and in 57 other Ohio counties.

Our Monroe Doctrine Still Makes Sense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON CANFIELD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1954

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit an article appearing in the Newark (N. J.) Star-Ledger of Monday, May 24:

OUR MONROE DOCTRINE STILL MAKES SENSE

(By George Fielding Eliot)

We're being sharply reminded that the Monroe Doctrine still makes a lot of sense—at least in the matter of preventing the establishment and expansion of hostile power systems in the Western Hemisphere.

Now we have a report that a ship flying the flag of Soviet Poland has landed a cargo of arms in Communist-run Guatemala.

This is the kind of thing we can't stand for.

We would have been entirely justified, as a matter of self-preservation, in stopping that ship on the high seas and taking her into New Orleans or Pensacola.

Nervous Nellies might cry, "That would mean war."

Nonsense. It would just mean a lot of note writing—while the arms rusted in a United States Government warehouse instead of being oiled up and put into action to spread the Red blight in Central America.

The Commies will go on doing these things just as long as they can get away with it. They can be stopped only by forcible opposition. That they respect.

Anyone who thinks that Malenkov and company are going to risk A-bombs over Moscow for the sake of a shipload of arms, or for the sake of every Communist agent and dupe in the Western Hemisphere for that matter, ought to have his head examined. As long as the boys are doing a job for the dear old hammer and sickle, they're good boys. If they're stupid enough to get themselves sunk, or shot, or tossed into the coop, that's just tough.

To get back to Monroe and his famous doctrine—which was the basis of our military and foreign policies for so many years—let's take a glance at the Presidential message in which the doctrine was announced to the world.

Speaking of the monarchical state of the Holy Alliance, Monroe said: "The political system of the allied powers is essentially different from that of America. * * * We owe it, therefore, to candor, and to the amicable relations existing between the United States and those powers, to declare that we should consider any attempt on their part to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety. * * * It is impossible that the allied powers should extend their political system to any portion of either continent without endangering our peace and happiness; nor can anyone believe that our southern brethren, if left to themselves, would adopt it of their own accord. It is equally impossible, therefore, that we should behold such interposition, in any form, with indifference."

In any form. Mark that. It was written so in 1823, but it has a meaning for 1954. A special meaning.

The Holy Alliance had no such insidious formula for extending their system as do the Communists. They had to come in sailing ships and land troops. The Communists pervert the minds of men and then put arms in their hands and send them out to do the bidding of their Red bosses.

We would surely use force to prevent the landing of Soviet troops anywhere in the Western Hemisphere without hesitation. If our Government did hesitate, it would soon be spurred into activity by public clamor. Well, why on earth should we let the enemy get away with landing arms for ready-made troops?

Fluoridation of Water Supplies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1954

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to insert into the Record a very earnest and able statement made by a very good friend of mine, Miss Florence Birmingham, before the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee in favor of H. R. 2341. Miss Birmingham is president of the Massachusetts Women's Political Club and has been very active in Massachusetts in opposing fluoridation proposals pending before the general court.

Under unanimous consent, I place her statement in the Record, as follows:

The Massachusetts Women's Political Club is a nonpartisan, nonsectarian organization, dedicated to teaching women the need for good government and educating them how best to use their political power and strength. It is over 30 years old. As its president, I am here to place our organization on record against fluoridation of water supplies and thus in favor of H. R. 2341.

For the past several years we have been engaged in fighting fluoridation as a threat to our liberty in that it is mass medication without parallel in the history of medicine. The battle has been long and arduous as the public health department, back by generous funds allotted to it by the Congress, has pushed fluoridation with a savage ferocity.

When I was appointed trustee of Wrentham State School for Feebleminded Children, I learned there quite by accident that fluorine was used in the water supply. A trustee takes a solemn oath before the governor and council. Therefore, I felt obligated to study this subject very carefully in order that the children might be protected. Many of them are State wards who have nobody else to look out for their interests.

I mentioned my fears to the board of trustees and told them that in our organization we had studied the Menace to Health of Fluorine published by the University of New Mexico in 1938 and knew fluoridation was harmful. The trustees requested me to investigate and inform them of my findings. I studied both sides of the fluoridation issue. It took me a long time to fit the pieces together in the fluoridation scheme at the institution, for information was given most reluctantly.

Although the section of the law governing certain powers and duties of trustees states, "All trustees shall have free access to all books, records and accounts pertaining to their respective State hospitals," I could learn nothing of the fluoridation experiment in progress there.

Dr. William D. Wellock, director, division of dental health of the Massachusetts Department of Public Health, referred me to a special report, in reply to my query asking why, of all institutions, schools for the feeble-minded children should be chosen. This report of 1945 mentioned Department of Mental Health Institutions. A subsequent report, he said, named Wrentham State School, the Belchertown State School and the Fernald State School as selected studies for the fluoridation of water supplies in this State. However, this report like so many key documents was out of print, I was told.

In the 4th Annual Conference, State Dental Directors with the Public Health Service and the Children's Bureau held in the Federal Security Building, Washington, D. C., in June 1951, Dr. John W. Knutson, Chief of Dental Public Health, stated frankly that the Public Health Service did not get around to approving water fluoridation until 5 years later. And yet they imposed this upon the little helpless wards of the State, not only in Massachusetts but in other part of the Nation such as the State School in Southbury, Conn.

In that year studies were begun in selected areas throughout the country, all under the jurisdiction of the Federal Government.

Dr. Frank Bull of Wisconsin in the 4th annual conference explained "Incidentally we never had any experiments in Wisconsin. To take a city of 100,000 and say, 'We are going to experiment on you, and if you survive we will learn something'—that is kind of rough treatment on the public. In Wisconsin, we set up demonstrations. They were not experiments.

In Massachusetts, there were studies.

The trustees voted to halt fluoridation, but to my shocked surprise we were told by the Department that it was not an experiment and the fluoridation continues on. And I still knew nothing specific about the setup at the school. However, I intensified my efforts to awaken the public to the threat to our liberty inherent in the program.

Natural water is a right the individual can expect from his municipality. In the use of that right no individual should be obliged to take a preventive medicine, especially when that medicine is a rat poison for which there is no known antidote.

Sodium fluoride is made from scrap aluminum. This former waste product is bringing in millions of dollars to the chemical companies and machinery manufacturers.

As an American citizen, I was frightened when I saw the iron curtain of secrecy surrounding every phase of the fluoridation scheme. All the more so when I found in the files a letter revealing that Dr. Wellock of the Public Health Department had come in the institution school and in a conference with administrative officials warned them there should be no publicity on the fluorine program there. In other words, I should not be enlightened.

We maintain that if this had been a bona fide, ethical, and true scientific arrangement, those who instigated fluoridation in the school would not have feared explaining it to the trustees, who represent the public. The shroud of secrecy was terrifying to me, especially when it cloaked up an experiment upon feebleminded wards of the State who should have been treated with more scrupulous care, if anything, because of their pathetic condition. Many of these little children live out their lives in the institution and are buried in the graveyard on its grounds with none but the angels to weep for them.

Archbishop Richard J. Cushing, of Boston, has said that such little children were put into the world to make us kinder and more gentle, for they are close to the saints.

It was not until January 1953 that I learned about the experiment. It came through a book published by the Department of Public Health, called Commonhealth, given to me by a medical doctor who condemns fluoridation. Fluoridation was established in two schools of the feebleminded as a result of studies being carried on in various parts of the country. Wrentham and Belchertown State Schools were fluoridated and became the pilot, but Fernald was maintained as the control station, no fluorides being added to the water there.

"Similar studies," said the senior sanitary engineer, "have been conducted on a citywide basis at Newburgh, N. Y., with the neighboring city of Kingston serving as a control. In Michigan, Grand Rapids undertook a similar study with Muskegon, the neighbor city, acting as the nonparticipating guide. Over a 6-year period a reduction of nearly 50 percent in tooth decay has already been noted among children of Grand Rapids and Newburgh.

Dr. Bull, of Wisconsin, told the dental officers from all over the Nation bluntly that the statistics gathered by the prefluoridation survey among elementary school—an essential step in mining a local propaganda field—are for the only purpose of building up the fluoridation program in any local area. To these dental health directors from all over the country he said, "Now why should we do a prefluoridation survey? Is it to find out if fluoridation works? No. We have told the public it works. So we cannot go back on that."

Moreover, in contradiction of the sanitary engineer's statement Grand Rapids was no longer paired off with Muskegon. On page 1500 of the hearings before the special congressional committee investigating fluoridation Dr. Bruce D. Forsyth said, "I believe this. We should continue to go back each year and study Grand Rapids population as we have been doing. We can even go back to Muskegon although we have lost our control city there. They felt they wanted the water fluoridated and so it is being fluoridated, and so we have lost it as a control. But we certainly want to go back each year and do reexamination."

In such perfectly childish language Dr. Forsyth confessed the loss of the control which it was convenient to lose, a blunder for which a scientist can never be forgiven.

The CIO Union, Local 396, at Wrentham State School, publicly protested fluoridation of water supplies and experimentation on human beings without their consent. The union president said: "We told the board of trustees and the superintendent that we strongly objected to being used as guinea pigs in this experiment which the administration at the institution now admits openly in the press was put into effect as an experiment. But they do nothing to stop it.

"We object to wild claims being made as to its benefits, so-called, at the institution; we object to the fact that it is not only a slow poison which can cause grave illnesses and death, but it is still being used no matter how we object. We protest to the lack of understanding of our concern and worry which has to our knowledge affected the health of employees mentally and physically.

"The method used in putting fluorine in the water at the State school is enough to cause panic at the institution among employees.

"Every employee at the school knows that the engineer has nothing to do with it. A boy patient does it, and the electrician drives him to the watershed, or pumping station for the school, which is about 3 miles from the institution. This working patient is an assistant to the electrician, who is not an engineer.

"I had a long conversation with this working patient who goes to the water station almost every day. He knows what it is, for he said, 'Come up with me and I can show you how I can take care of you if I get mad at you. Your life is in my hands now.'

"There is no fence around the building or pumping station where they put in the fluorine. In fact, no fence for miles around. Anybody could poison the whole institution. There are no warning signs at all. Imagine what could happen if some of the boys escaped, and not knowing that this is rat poison, broke into the watershed and threw fluorine about."

Yet the administration stated publicly they were not consulted when the Department of Public Health decided to launch the experiment.

This statement brings us back again to the United States Public Health Department, which has pushed this experiment by use of taxpayers' money without the consent of citizens who stand helpless before the combined power of the Federal Treasury, equipment concerns, and the chemical industry.

The special congressional committee of the Congress in Report No. 2500, on fluoridation of public drinking water, advised communities to go slow on fluoridation, but did not recommend Federal legislation.

We deem such legislation necessary as the Public Health Department insolently shrugged off the recommendations of the committee, and through its centralized agencies has used its vast resources to place fluorine in the drinking water without even informing the citizens. This was done in Salem and Beverly in Massachusetts where fluorine was polluting the water months before they were aware of it.

The Public Health Department is flouting the food and drug laws. In Massachusetts Mr. Cyril C. Sullivan, former chief inspector of the Food and Drug Administration for New England, until his retirement from Federal service, detected a small amount of fluorides being added to beer and ale as a preservative, that is, to stop after fermentation in the bottle, The amount added was so small that it could scarcely be detected by chemical analysis of the product, being less than 0.5 parts per million. The case came up for trial and the court and jury found defendants guilty. They held that the offense was of such a serious character that the defendant Corporation of Springfield was fined $5,000, and the defendant personally was also fined $5,000 and in addition, a jail sentence of 6 months was imposed and suspended, and the defendant was placed on probation for a period of 3 years. (See *U. S. v. Commonwealth Brewing Co.* (D. C. Mass., 1945).)

The same procedure should be followed in the case of fluorine in water supplies. Since the Food and Drug Administration is now winking at the violation of wholesale fluoridation, a legislation must be enacted to correct the situation. H. R. 2341 should be passed as an emergency measure.

If this mass experimentation upon human beings is not ended, then the complete dignity of man will be lost in the totalitarian mass medication fraud and the end will be wholesale adoption of euthanasia and death by the needle for the weakly and unwanted. Fluoridation is the opening wedge. The January issue of Red Book magazine quotes an anonymous highly respectable physician as confessing to putting people out of the way. "I think," he says, "that mercy killing undoubtedly goes on more frequently than many of us would believe. * * * To some it is murder whatever the circumstances, and murder, we know, is wrong. * * * Mercy killings will go on, whatever we try to do about it."

In London the needle is being talked about as a new method of execution. The issue is being raised, "Would doctors who agree to administer a death injection be breaking the Hippocratic oath which every doctor swears at the outset of his career?"

The oath declares, "I will give no deadly drug to any, though it be asked of me, nor will I counsel such."

We may ask, "Does a doctor advocating addition of fluorine, a most powerful rat and roach poison for which there is no known antidote, to drinking water break the oath of Hippocrates which he also has to take?" We believe he does.

The passage of this legislation would solve this problem and safeguard the citizens' liberty and health. We pray that this committee will act favorably upon H. R. 2341.

Results of Poll Listed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR ENGLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1954

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, following is the tabulation of the recent poll taken in my district on 18 domestic and foreign policy issues. Approximately 105,000 questionnaires were mailed to postal patrons in the 19-county district, and thus far 9,275 have been returned and some are still coming in. The total return will run about 9 percent, which is considered very good for a poll of this type. The answers vary but little from county to county; therefore, the results portray a fairly accurate cross section of the thinking throughout the district.

1. Are you in favor of the President's request for funds for the following?

(a) Forest timber access roads. Yes, 55.4 percent; no, 32.6 percent; no opinion, 12.0 percent.

(b) Federal aid for primary and secondary highways. Yes, 73.3 percent; no, 17.8 percent; no opinion, 8.9 percent.

(c) Aid in building hospitals and schools. Yes, 76.0 percent; no, 17.2 percent; no opinion, 6.8 percent.

(d) Irrigation and reclamation projects. Yes, 72.8 percent; no, 17.0 percent; no opinion, 10.2 percent.

2. Do you favor legislation providing interest-free loans for the construction of irrigation projects by local districts? Yes, 49.1 percent; no, 40.5 percent; no opinion, 10.4 percent.

3. Do you favor legislation permitting the gold miner to sell gold freely on the open market, thus lifting the present fixed price? Yes, 68.5 percent; no, 20.8 percent; no opinion, 10.7 percent.

4. Do you favor Secretary Benson's flexible farm support-price program? Yes, 55.8 percent; no, 29.2 percent; no opinion, 15 percent.

5. Do you approve the administration's wool-subsidy plan calling for direct payment to woolgrowers? Yes, 22.9 percent; no, 54.7 percent; no opinion, 22.4 percent.

6. Are you in agreement with the President's program for health and educational assistance? Yes, 65.4 percent; no, 20.2 percent; no opinion, 14.4 percent.

7. Do you approve of increasing social-security benefits? Yes, 75.5 percent; no, 19 percent; no opinion, 5.5 percent.

8. Do you favor increasing the first-class postal rates? Yes, 38.9 percent; no, 55 percent; no opinion, 6.1 percent.

9. Do you favor permitting 18-year-olds to vote? Yes, 41.7 percent; no, 53.3 percent; no opinion, 5 percent.

10. Do you favor the Bricker or a similar amendment limiting the President's treaty and international-agreement powers? Yes, 37.9 percent; no, 49.4 percent; no opinion, 12.7 percent.

11. Do you approve Senator McCarthy's method of investigating subversives? Yes, 26.1 percent; no, 67.2 percent; no opinion, 6.7 percent.

12. Do you favor the new military program relying mainly on atomic weapons? Yes, 41.1 percent; no, 42.3 percent; no opinion, 16.6 percent.

13. Do you favor raising the individual income-tax exemptions from $600 to $800? Yes, 71.5 percent; no, 23.7 percent; no opinion, 4.8 percent.

14. Do you favor higher pay for Members of Congress? Yes, 48.1 percent; no, 39.1 percent; no opinion, 12.8 percent. If "yes," check: $17,500, 26.5 percent; $20,000, 36.7 percent; $22,500, 7.3 percent; $25,000, 19.6 percent. A total of 9.9 percent of those voting "yes" on this question expressed no salary preference.

15. Do you think we should take a more active hand in the Indochina war? Yes, 18.9 percent; no, 67 percent; no opinion, 14.1 percent.

16. Should United States military aid to foreign nations be reduced? Yes, 59.8 percent; no, 28 percent; no opinion, 12.2 percent.

17. Do you approve, generally speaking, our handling of international relations? Yes, 52 percent; no, 30.8 percent; no opinion, 17.2 percent.

18. Would you vote for the President's suggested changes in the Taft-Hartley law? Yes, 49.5 percent; no, 27.8 percent; no opinion, 22.7 percent.

The Trade Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1954

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, another item Congress has failed to act upon at this session is the very important Reciprocal Trade Act.

I commend to its attention the following editorial from the New York Times of May 20, 1954:

THE TRADE PROGRAM

From the beginning it was evident that the President's trade program, based on the recommendations of the Randall Commission, had fallen in the Congress upon stony ground. Now there is talk of its being virtually abandoned for this session. The President has felt deeply on this issue. Wherever the choice has been presented to him for Executive action, he has taken his stand on the side of a freer exchange of goods. It is unfortunate that he cannot now induce the Congress to go forward in the broad program which he set forth with urgency and conviction.

To get at least something done along these lines is, it seems to us, vitally important. The Reciprocal Trade Act can be renewed for

1 year. Customs simplification can be achieved. These should be so far beyond controversy that not to do them would raise grave doubts abroad as to the direction in which the United States is moving. They are the minimum, and they are a test of the party and the administration.

No one need minimize the difficulty of bringing the Republican Party, traditionally the party of protection, around to a position where it can support unitedly and enthusiastically a program for freer trade. Powerful forces and entrenched prejudices work against easy acceptance. But a beginning must be made. It must be made at this session. We earnestly hope that in the priorities which are set for what time is left before adjournment, the basic trade measures will have a high place.

The Bryson Bill, H. R. 1227

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. SHUFORD

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1954

Mr. SHUFORD. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a petition concerning the Bryson bill, H. R. 1227. The petition follows:

To our Representatives in Congress:

We, the undersigned citizens of the United States of America, desiring to claim the right to be free in our homes, a freedom implied in articles III and IV of the Bill of Rights in the Constitution of the United States, earnestly beg you to grant us a hearing on, and to pass legislation prohibiting the broadcasting over radio and TV of advertising of alcoholic beverages, and also to prohibit the transportation in interstate commerce of magazines and newspapers carrying such advertising.

We request that this petition be noted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Grover C. Davis, J. L. Walker, James Palmer, S. C. Caldwell, H. R. Palmer, F. W. Messer, J. S. Rathbone, J. A. Singleton, J. B. Leatherwood, M. W. Carver, P. D. Turner, Robert Hogan, Tommie Rudisal, Mrs. J. P. Dicus, James Howell Dixie Campbell, J. B. Siler, M. G. Stamey, J. J. Ferguson, Jule Noland, Henry T. Gaddy.

C. C. Franklin; Jack Allison; James Kirkpatrick; Fred Campbell; C. W. Medford; R. L. Jenkins; D. J. Boyd; Pritchard Smith, Jr.

Glenn Boyd, W. C. Chambers, Doug. Worsham, James H. Coleman, Margaret James, Patsy Underwood, Jas. I. Green, Jim Moody, James Franklin, M. H. Caldwell, Deavy Price, Wm. Medford, M. R. Williamson, W. H. Queen, Grady Walker.

Gaston Barnette; R. G. Sandford; J. C. James; Joe N. Tate, Sr.; Marion Halcombe; Frank Howell; Mrs. Jack Kelley; Bob Wilson; Mrs. Ether Alexander; Mrs. Bob Wilson; James E. Hall; Noble W. Garrett, Sr.; Mrs. Carl Jones (Hattie S.); A. K. Houghton; Margaret Johnson; Mrs. James Atkins, Jr.

R. L. McKitrick, Harold Leatherwood, Jeff Lewis, T. G. Massie, C. J. Reece, Mrs. Sallie Lou Justice, Mrs. Carl Medford, Mrs. Jeanna C. Jennings, Mrs. Hilda Owen, Mrs. R. C. Kinsland, Mrs. W. S. Young, W. H. Massie, W. L. Matney.

Rufus Buff; R. A. Shehan; James B. Rich; Mrs. James B. Rich; Mack Pace; R. W. Noland; R. M. Parkman; David A. Taylor; Rev. G. H. Shope, Jr.; Joe N. Tate, Jr.; J. Louis Siler; Joe C. Howell; W. F. Freeman; Horace Ducket; L. N. Davis.

Mrs. H. C. Wilburn, Max Q. Rogers, Ruth Coffey, Helen Coffey, Mrs. R. G. Coffey, Mable Coffey, John E. Sentelle, Dr. A. C. Downs, W. K. Bolders, F. I. Teague, Henry F. Teague, J. M. Rogers, Jack Felmet, R. H. West, James A. Evans, H. M. Dulin, J. Earl Taylor, Rufus I. Carswell.

Carol K. Underwood, B. Frank Davis, Fred J. Davis, H. L. Davis, Henry Davis, W. Hursh Burgin, Emmett Green, Wm. P. Burgin, J. R. Mchaffey, E. W. Willix, Roy C. Parton, O. O. Burgin, Frank H. Leatherwood, Mrs. Frank H. Leatherwood, Robert L. Mills, J. E. Reggins, W. J. Potts, Floyd Nelson, Joe Stamey.

Posey H. Gentry, Ben Phillips, Guy Messer, Joe W. Davis, C. D. Ketner, Z. L. Massey, W. F. Strange, Joe Calhoun, W. H. Baldwin, E. H. Balentine, J. R. Morgan, Henry Foy, Dr. J. F. Fender, E. A. McCracken, Robt. L. Gaddis, K. P. Lowe, Mrs. Kenneth Lowe.

Capess Green; J. C. Partick; Frank Kirkpatrick; E. Wayne Rogers; M. Theo. McCracken; Mrs. R. N. Barber, Sr.; R. N. Barber; J. L. Robinett; Mrs. Turner Russell; Mrs. D. T. Worsham; Hiram C. Wilburn.

Good Police Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS G. ABERNETHY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1954

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an editorial which appeared in the May 24 edition of the Washington Evening Star.

It is my view that this editorial is worthy of insertion in the RECORD because it points up the outstanding record made by the Washington Metropolitan Police Department in efficiency and the solution of crime under the leadership of its able chief, Maj. Robert V. Murray, and further because the report which brought the record to light was made by an excellent young man, Jean Edward Smith, who is known to many of us about the Capitol.

The editorial follows:

GOOD POLICE RECORD

A Princeton University-sponsored study of the Metropolitan Police Department has provided some striking evidence of local police efficiency. A senior thesis submitted to the university's department of politics has given Chief Murray's force an outstanding rating for crime-solution work. A tabulation shows Washington leading all cities of comparable size in percentage of cases cleared. The situation today is in sharp contrast with that which prevailed only a few years ago, when crime was on the increase and police efficiency at low ebb.

The comprehensive report was prepared by Jean Edward Smith, a Princeton senior who devoted a great deal of time to an examination of police department records, facilities, and procedures and to interviewing police officials, citizens and representatives of various organizations, including the Washington Criminal Justice Association. Checking the local crime-clearance record with that for each of 18 cities of more than half a million population, Mr. Smith reported: "In terms of total major offenses cleared by arrests, the Metropolitan Police Department maintains a rate almost twice that of the Nation at large." A table showed only Cincinnati's police force with a higher clearance record in 1952—and latest reports indicate that even Cincinnati recently has fallen behind Washington.

The 1952 figures revealed a Washington clearance rate of 46 percent, as compared with Cincinnati's 48.4 percent. Next to Washington came Boston, with 43.2 percent and the percentages dropped steadily down the list to San Francisco's 15.6 percent. Incidentally, Los Angeles, which long had been credited with having a model police force, had a clearance rate of 24.8 percent. Washington stood especially high in arrests for such major crimes as murder, rape, robbery, assault, and burglary.

A favorable report of this kind brings reassurance to a community which in the past has had cause to be seriously concerned over the prevalence of crime here and an apparent inability of the police to cope with the problem. While Chief Murray naturally is gratified that conditions have changed for the better, he is not the type to permit his men to relax. Indeed, there can be no relaxation as long as the daily list of new crimes continues to challenge the department—and while such a vicious criminal as the Preinkert case killer remains at large.

Finding a Cure—They Question the Whole Theory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. HALEY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1954

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, I should like to include at this time an editorial column which appeared in the Meagher County News, White Sulphur Springs, Mont., on May 19. The column, written by Editor Fred Ward, includes two very pertinent editorials. The editorials follow:

FINDING A CURE

A good many people have tried taking opium to relieve some aggravating pain, only to find themselves in the grip of the opium habit, which can be infinitely worse than the pain it alleviates.

The same thing occurs in our practice of government. Sometimes drastic measures are proposed to wipe out some evil. Some of these measures would surrender constitutional rights which are the most valuable heritage of our race. Thus a few years ago it was seriously proposed in Montana to give game wardens the right to stop and search cars without a warrant. Another proposal was to allow members of the State highway patrol to arrest drivers promiscuously in the stray chance of picking up some driver of a stolen car. If these measures could accomplish what they started out to accomplish, it might not be so bad, but about all such high-handed measures could do would be to make these two police organizations so universally hated that their every effort would be hampered by public ill will.

Latest move is to alloy the RBI tap wires in collecting evidence against subversives. The telephone and the telegraph were invented after the Federal Constitution was adopted, so they are not mentioned in the constitutional guaranties against unreasonable seizures and searches. Yet the same spirit covers both cases and the Congress should think twice before any enforcement department of Government is allowed the blanket right without strict court supervision, to tap wires for any cause.

A few years ago the city of New York started out to stop prostitution, and a law was passed against women who loitered. Along with that, the right was granted the police to tap telephone wires and make tape recordings of private telephone conversations. It was not long before there was a big scandal about police accused of blackmailing women with threats of telling their husbands or bringing court action for what they said over the telephone to some close woman friend. How many women paid off, nobody knows, but fortunately they ran into a woman who was not afraid of what her husband would think nor of the prospects of a public trial. And this courageous woman, with the backing of her husband and a few loyal friends blew the top off the whole dirty mess.

A warrant can be obtained in this country to search a premise, but the person who gets the warrant has to appear in court and show reasonable cause why the search should be made and he must particularly describe the place to be searched and the thing or things to be seized. It would seem to me that the same safeguards should be taken as to tapping wires. To be a free American citizen should still carry its priceless constitutional rights.

THEY QUESTION THE WHOLE THEORY

The farm problem has plagued this country for almost a century and since the days of the Grange, following the Civil War, the farmers' troubles have been a hot political issue.

The Roosevelt and Truman administrations tried to establish parity prices, based on the years 1909 to 1914, when the agricultural population was at the peak of their prosperity.

But since 1914 the farm process, especially in the growing of cereal grains, has been mechanized to an extent that has turned the grain grower into a mechanic. And in other fields of agriculture, improved methods of operation, better seeds, and better fertilization have vastly increased the capacity to produce human food. Fuel-burning engines have largely replaced the horse and the mule and thereby released wide acreages formerly needed to grow hay for these draft animals.

At first the establishment of parity prices did not disturb the market to any large extent. During the war there was call for all the food the country was able to produce. Millions of tons of cereal grains were used to produce industrial alcohol, required in making munitions of war. But when the fighting stopped, the surpluses started to pile up; first in eggs that the Government dried and put in caves; then in potatoes that had to be used for stock food or dumped into the ocean. Now the surplus headache is in the products of the dairy farms and in grains. Altogether the people of America have spent billions in trying to bolster the prices of farm produce.

The same pattern has followed in each commodity. The Government bought the farm products at parity prices. Then the surplus began to pile up. The next step has been an attempt to cut down acreage or the amount that any grower could put on the market. In the meantime foreign nations cut down their buying American farm produce. In items such as cotton, Egyptian and Brazilian cotton fields were enlarged and foreign-grown cotton has largely replaced American cotton on the world's market.

It is not surprising that many friends of agriculture have become skeptical of the whole parity program. The first real break came from the stock growers of the West. Now the National Farm Bureau have taken up the issue. They propose to work out the farmer's troubles within the limits of supply and demand.

In a way, farming is no different than any other operation. There are good farmers and bad farmers; good managers and bad managers. In any field, whether it be managing a big corporation or a corner grocery, some men will make money and others will lose it. The trouble with Government meddling with prices and credit, the operation has worked toward bailing out the misfits, the lazy, and the incompetent. Parity prices have encouraged the use of marginal land. They have encouraged outsiders to jump into farming in the hope of a little easy money.

A member of the Farm Bureau will be in White Sulphur Springs within a few days. After all the high-pressure selling of the parity price idea, the man's talk should be interesting to hear.

The Picketing of the President and the White House: The Dignity of the Presidency, and the Reverence Which the American People Feel For the White House, the Home of All Our Presidents, Demand That the Congress No Longer Permit the Picketing of That Historic Shrine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRADY GENTRY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1954

Mr. GENTRY. Mr. Speaker, with one single exception, all our Presidents have lived in the historic building now known to every American as the White House. John Adams, our second President was its first occupant, and the present occupant, of course, is Mr. Eisenhower. Of all our Chief Executives, only George Washington, the Father of our Country, did not reside there. Yet, its cornerstone was laid during his first term in office and much of the construction had been done before he concluded his notable service to his country as its first President.

The White House is a great symbol of a great country. The 154 years in which it has been the home of our Presidents span almost the entire life of our country as the United States of America. It is not only the residence of the President and his wife, it is where he and his staff perform the arduous duties required of our Chief Executive. But it goes further than that. It is the edifice in which the crowned heads of Europe are received on visits to our country, the building to which the ambassadors of all nations come to present their credentials of office. It is there that the great, the near-great, the little folk and the humblest citizens in all our land come to meet and talk to their President. It is the one place in our country which each citizen, who has not already done so, has an abiding ambition to visit. To him, the White House and its environs is hallowed ground. It is above person and above party. It represents something of the stature and majesty not only of a great democracy but of all our Presidents of yesterday and today, and those that will follow on tomorrow.

It is an inspiring thing to view the great throngs that gather daily to make the tour of the White House and to view within its walls those age-old things that reflect the history of our country. It is quickening too, to stand near the North Entrance of the White House and observe the great flow of passing traffic from all parts of our vast country, in which there are always cars attempting a snail's pace because occupants desire to have a long look at the home of our President. The great reverence which they demonstrate for this historic edifice is a reflection of the unconscious feeling that the White House, in reality, is the home of all the people of America, which our Presidents occupy as their own chosen Chief Executives.

Mr. Speaker, I have introduced H. R. 3979, which makes picketing of the White House illegal. I have done so because I feel that something of the dignity, reverence and respect which has been accorded one of our two most hallowed shrines, as well as that for the Presidency itself, is in danger of being lessened, if not lost.

Coming to Washington 17 months ago to begin my service as a Member of the House of Representatives, one of the first sights to greet me was a picketing of the White House. I stood in amazement as I viewed the revolting spectacle. It was no spasmodic, faint-hearted effort by a few. Literally, legions of hundreds of picketers were massed on the sidewalks immediately around the White House, blocking all entrances. No citizen of our country, including members of the President's Cabinet, our ambassadors and Members of Congress, and no visitor from afar, regardless of the importance of his mission, could gain entrance to the White House, or exit from it, without breaking through the army of marching men which besieged it at close quarters. This did not go on just a few hours in the morning, or in the afternoon, or at night. It went on day and night, 24 hours a day. It did not last just 1 day or even 1 week. It went on for many weeks, both while Mr. Truman was President and while Mr. Eisenhower was President. As soon as the picketing did subside a bit, it would be renewed again in larger numbers and with greater determination.

It is inconceivable that such a disgusting spectacle, directed at the President of the United States, should be tolerated in a country where fairness and decency supposedly exist as common virtues. Certainly no President of any party should be made a virtual prisoner in our country's White House by a mob of fanatical, misguided people. It is unfortunate that we have many such people who are respectors neither of person, symbol nor tradition. The fact that they exist is evidence that this committee and the Congress should act in this matter.

Should the President of the United States have to perform his exacting duties in an atmosphere of pressure, compulsion, and fear? Just picture in your mind the Chief Executive of the world's greatest nation laboring on his country's grave problems while a horde of men, drawn up completely around him and only a few feet away, display their taunts and admonitions. Neither he, nor his staff, nor his family, nor those who visit him could look outside the White House without seeing those who would force a decision on him.

What can it profit our country and its people to permit such a display of incipient anarchy? Does all of this comport with an orderly, responsible administration of government? Can it be a good omen for our great country? How must other nations, which would not tolerate it, regard us for doing so?

The fact that we have reached the point in America where any group exercises the right to throw a cordon of picketers around the White House and the President for weeks on end, is the strongest reason why such a right should no longer exist. The fact that those who would try to force their will in such a manner are weak and misguided, only adds emphasis to the need for the elimination of the picketing of our Chief Executive.

In the recent attempted mass assassination in the House of Representatives we saw just what the ardor for a cause can lead to in the case of those who are misguided. There was evidence that the same thing in the attempted assassination of Mr. Truman at Blair House. What if such determination should seize a mob of picketers that are picketing the White House. What better opportunity would those of evil design want than that provided in such circumstances. As such picketings wear on through the weeks there must come a time when passions become high and tempers wear thin. At such a time anything might happen. Should not, therefore, reasonable precautions be taken to remove the possibility of such an occurrence in a country where neither compulsion nor violence are a part of everyday government?

Mr. Speaker, I commend H. R. 3979 to the careful consideration of this House, believing that its passage would be in the interest of all the people of our country, and that it would meet with their overwhelming approval.

Alcohol Problems Are Community Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1954

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith an article by the distinguished director, the Yale Center on Alcohol Studies, Dr. Selden D. Bacon, entitled "Alcohol Problems Are Community Problems." Dr. Bacon is one of the outstanding authorities on this subject in the whole world. He has made a great contribution to the fight this Nation is making on the problem of alcohol.

The article follows:

Alcohol Problems Are Community Problems

(By Selden D. Bacon)

Three times in the last 125 years we have experienced a prohibition wave in this country. The last one—the one most of us remember—went beyond a number of States and became a part of national legislation. Just as in the previous instances this last attempt was carried on for a little more than a decade, and was then dropped.

On the surface the conditions which brought about prohibition in the past were different from those of today. Naturally, the drunk and the alcoholic were obvious on the one hand and on the other were such factors as the employment of many thousands by the liquor industry; the high alcohol tax receipts collected by State, local, and National Government; and the almost constitutional antagonism of Americans to be told that they can't do something—especially when the Government does the telling. Today we have, as added problems, drunken driving and a potential shortage of manpower—a shortage not at all aided by the fact of some 3 million chronic problem drinkers, mostly men, in the age range 35 to 50. But these are surface manifestations, the immediate, practical headaches, which are obvious to all. The real problem is not nearly so apparent or so easy to attack as these obvious symptoms.

I think there is a core to the matter but it isn't an easy target for attack. If problems associated with alcohol could be solved easily our grandfathers or their grandfathers would have found the solution. Nor is it a problem we can turn over to somebody else. We have tried letting George do it in this field for a long, long time. We have tried to hide the problems. We have tried to blame certain people such as the liquor industry or the police or people we didn't like. The core of the matter lies in the fact that we, the American people, are ignorant about alcohol, frightened about alcohol, angry about alcohol, and badly misinformed about alcohol. As long as that situation continues there are going to be problems—problems in legislation, in religion, in medicine, in the family, on the highway, in industry. Alcohol has power. So long as that power is utilized in a setting characterized by fear, ignorance and hatred, there will be problems.

I think many would disagree that alcohol has the power to create problems for most of the people who use it. For example it is estimated that about 65 million people in the United States use alcohol beverages. About 4 million of these can be called alcoholics. Perhaps an even larger number occasionally get into some trouble—perhaps only once or twice in their lives—trouble stemming in part from their drinking. However, the great majority of the drinking public is not so utilizing the power of alcohol that it creates what are ordinarily called problems. It is a great mistake to confuse alcohol with the problems associated with it.

PROHIBITION AGAIN?

That has been the great mistake of the drys—the mistake that has lost them the interest and sympathy of the bulk of the population. The American public does not believe that taking a drink will, immediately or even later on, turn one into a Skid Row derelict. The American public does not believe that all those in the alcohol industry are evildoers or worse, and it does not believe that alcohol is a poison. By oversimplifying the drys have made many people disregard or laugh at the problems. Failure of the drys to see that alcohol serves functions as well as serving to increase problems resulted in the movement becoming rigid and sterile.

Unfortunately, it's a fact that there's always a chance of still another attempt to cure the situation by passing another prohibition law. Experience shows that failure of a particular means of action does not eliminate repetition of that action, especially if three conditions are met. The first condition is that the pains or problems continue. The second condition is that there be an interval of time in which many forget the failure. And the third condition is that there be no new knowledge or leadership or technique to meet the situation. Certainly the experience of the 1850's was no success. Certainly the repetition in the 1880's was no success. And the movement starting shortly after 1900 that culminated in national prohibition through the 18th amendment also failed.

The arguments for adopting this legislation were about the same in each instance. Also the arguments for repeal and explanations of failure were about the same in all three instances. Many people in 1917 just didn't believe that prohibition could possibly happen. Actually what some of them said was that they did not believe it could happen again.

I have said that the core of the matter is public ignorance, fear, hatred and misinformation about alcohol. Let me present an example: A man comes home from the office one evening and learns that his 15-year-old daughter was at a party and had cocktails. She was at a friend's house. The parents of the friend were friends of his. He is worried. He drinks himself on occasion. He doesn't want to forbid his daughter to act as her friends do. He doesn't want her to promise him she won't drink and then continue secretively. He is scared that she may drink too much, may ride home in a car driven by a boy who drank too much. He doesn't know what to do. The girl's mother may be equally uneasy. Maybe the father and mother disagree on what to do. Is the high school teacher or the minister or priest or the physician equipped with a confidence creating or tested answer? They are not. When they do give assured answers, it often turns out that their advice is exactly opposite.

What about the doctor, the clergyman, the legislator? Each of these comes in contact with the problems of alcohol. A doctor may believe that alcoholism is inherited or is a matter of will power. A minister may find his church not only split from other churches on the matter of alcohol, but split within itself. A legislator has probably seen more foolish bills and more foolish legislation on this topic than on any other.

DRAMATIC END POINTS

What of the teacher, the policeman, and the judge? They have met problem after problem. The poor educational materials which the teachers have to utilize, the arrestings and rearresting and re-rearresting of drunks, the enormous expenditures of lower courts and jails which exist, for more than 50 percent of their function, to handle cases of drunkenness and attendant behavior, all these are samples of the end result of ignorance and fear and misinformation. These, however, are the dramatic end points of the situation. For instance the skid-row derelict and the neurotic lost weekender are the dramatic surface manifestations of the alcoholism problem; they do not form the main body of alcoholics. The law in Mississippi which prohibits distilled spirits but allows the State to sell tax stamps for bottles of distilled spirits to retailers is a dramatic example of legislative malfunctioning, but it is only an example. That most hospitals and physicians are antagonistic to alcoholics is also one of these dramatic end points. All of these end points may be traced back to a common sphere—a sphere of chaos and anxiety and ignorance. The problem is basically social in nature. The technical, scientific, and medical solutions can only become effective as the general stigma and ignorance are removed. It does not mean, however, that we should cease trying to meet the jail problem, the medical problem or the traffic problem. As a matter of fact, as we come closer to more effective solutions in any such limited area, we necessarily reduce some of the fear and ignorance and automatically reduce the background area of anxiety and confusion.

That is what the Connecticut Commission on Alcoholism and Alcoholics Anonymous are doing. We used to get the worst cases—those in the last phases of this slowly progressive illness. Now we are getting the early cases of alcoholism and so are moving toward prevention. Through therapy we are reducing ignorance and fear not only among the alcoholics but also among their families, social agencies, employers, unions, police, and many others. And the commission through its educational program is making factual information available to the schools so that the old wives' tales and horror stories need no longer be the major teaching techniques in our educational system.

What about drunken driving? There is no doubt at all that drunken driving can today be attacked far more effectively than in the past. The techniques are available but until there is realization of this—serious, mature, realization by a good-sized segment of the public—it will be difficult to activate these techniques. It is good to report that in Connecticut judges, legislators, police, and others are learning the value of quick, accurate scientific tests to discover whether or not the driver has alcohol in his system. Increasing adoption of such techniques—adoption with public understanding—will form a major step in coping with drunken driving. And as such means are adopted they also will have an effect far beyond the immediate result of reduced drunken driving. By attacking these specific things we can gradually develop a more integrated and stronger society in the whole sphere of human life related in attitude or behavior to alcohol beverages. And it is a big sphere; we spent about $9 billion last year on alcohol beverages. If we can so progress, we will not need to repeat old failures. But the problems are there without any doubt—the drunk, the alcoholic, the worried father, the ill-equipped teacher. And if we don't develop better answers—and I emphasize we, for it is all of us who are involved—then we will probably fall back on emotional, primitive, repressive means, because the problems hurt.

There are no pink pills or royal highways to solutions. But we are making progress—greater progress these last 10 years than in the previous 100. It will take time and the cooperation of the public if we are finally to win. But it can be done.

Driving Under the Influence of Alcohol

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 26, 1954

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith the following article entitled "Driving Under the Influence of Alcohol," by David Lester, Ph. D., Leon A. Greenberg, Ph. D., and George R. Tiernan, LL. B.:

DRIVING UNDER THE INFLUENCE OF ALCOHOL—THE ROLE OF CHEMICAL TESTS IN APPEALED CASES [1]

(By David Lester, Ph. D., research associate, laboratory of applied physiology, Yale University; Leon A. Greenberg, Ph. D., associate professor of applied physiology, Yale University, associate director, laboratory of applied physiology, Yale University; George R. Tiernan, LL. B., prosecutor, Court of Common Pleas, New Haven, Conn.)

During the last decade the chemical test of the blood, urine, or breath has come into increasingly wider use throughout the United States in the apprehension and prosecution of the automobile driver under the influence of alcohol. An accumulation of police and court reports from municipalities and townships throughout the country has left little doubt in the minds of law enforcement agencies concerning the important part that can be played by these tests both in protecting the innocent and convicting the guilty. These reports have consisted mainly of data indicating a definite trend toward and often a marked increase in the conviction rate when the chemical test is used. But they provide no information as to the effect of the chemical test evidence on the number of guilty pleas or the number of nolles, for both have been included as convictions or acquittals, together with the cases actually brought to trial, in calculating the rate of conviction. Furthermore these data come from municipal and town courts often presided over by individuals of relatively limited juridical experience and, of more importance, where the trials are usually conducted without jury or record. These data therefore reveal little concerning the impact of education and knowledge about chemical tests on the various segments of the population who are deeply concerned with the matter of drinking and driving. To what extent has credence and confidence in the chemical test been accepted by the average layman when he is in the role of the defendant or when he is a juryman sitting in judgment of his fellow man? What degree of belief in the chemical test is shared by the court's prosecutors or judges? Answers to these questions are best approached by a more detailed examination of court records.

With this objective in view, all of the cases involving the charge of operating a motor vehicle while under the influence of alcoholic beverages, which appeared before the Court of Common Pleas of New Haven County in Connecticut during a period of 40 months, were examined. In Connecticut the Court of Common Pleas of each county is the first court of appeal from decisions rendered in municipal or town courts of that county. It is also the first court of record. The cases are therefore tried here de novo, so that all the facts are presented before the court, and the defendant has the option of trial by jury.

The number of cases examined, representing all of the convictions in the lower courts which were appealed, was 87 and covered the period from September 1949 to January 1953. During this period the use of chemical test evidence in the court first occurred in May 1951. Shortly prior to this time the New Haven City Police had instituted the routine use of the Alcometer breath test in all persons suspected of driving under the influence of alcohol. Since the city of New Haven contributes the largest proportion of arrests for this offense in the county, a sufficiently large number of court cases involving chemical test evidence was available for evaluation. Both the cases in which the Alcometer test was used and those in which no chemical test evidence was used were classified under 4 headings: (1) pleaded guilty, (2) nolled (dismissed), (3) convicted, (4) acquitted. The distribution is shown in table 1.

TABLE 1.—*Disposition of all cases of driving under the influence*

	Chemical test		No chemical test	
	Number of cases	Percent	Number of cases	Percent
Total	31	100	56	100
Pleaded guilty	19	61	13	23
Convicted	10	32	18	32
Acquitted	2	6	13	23
Nolled	0	0	12	21

Two significant features are apparent from this classification. First, of the cases in which no chemical test was used, 21 percent were nolled while among those employing the alcometer test none was nolled. A nolle represents the judgment of the prosecutor that there is insufficient evidence to warrant a trial. There is but one possible interpretation of the striking difference in the incidence of nolles: the prosecutor has confidence in the chemical test as corroborating and substantiating the other evidence which by itself was deemed inadequate in a certain proportion of the cases. More significantly, perhaps, the absence of nolles clearly indicates a more effective screening originally by the police, made possible by the alcometer test, thus protecting the innocent from the painful and costly experience of trial and possible conviction in the city court, and the necessity of appeal.

Second, as against 23 percent guilty pleas when no chemical test evidence was used, 61 percent pleaded guilty when such evidence was available. Whatever the reasons may be for taking an appeal with the intent of pleading guilty—whether in the hope of obtaining a less severe penalty or as a delaying maneuver—the reasons are, by and large, the same for cases with and without chemical test evidence. The wide difference between these cases in the number of guilty pleas strongly suggests the confidence of the defendants themselves in the validity of the alcometer test, particularly since, more often than not, the test result corresponds to the amount of alcohol they knew they had consumed, in contrast to the few beers they might have testified to. The public economy effected by this increase in pleas of guilty needs hardly to be pointed out.

In 31 of the 43 cases in which the defendant pleaded not guilty and was tried there was no chemical test evidence; in the remaining 12 the evidence of an alcometer test was available (table 2).

TABLE 2.—*Disposition of cases with pleas of not guilty*

	Chemical test		No chemical test	
	Number of cases	Percent	Number of cases	Percent
Total	12	100	31	100
Convicted	10	83	18	58
Acquitted	2	17	13	42

---

[1] From the laboratory of applied physiology, Yale University, and the prosecutor's office, Court of Common Pleas, New Haven, Conn. Presented at the Second International Conference on Alcohol and Road Traffic, Toronto, September 9–12, 1953.

Without the chemical test, 42 percent were acquitted; with the chemical test, only 17 percent were acquitted. The concentrations of alcohol in the blood as determined by the Alcometer at the time of arrest ranged from 0.14 percent to 0.40 percent, with a mean of about 0.2 percent. The concentration of alcohol in the blood set forth in the uniform motor vehicle code as prima facie evidence of being under the influence is 0.15 percent—a concentration resulting from the presence of about one-half pint of whisky or its equivalent in a person of average size. In all of the convictions examined here in which chemical test evidence was used the concentration of alcohol in the blood was close to and in most instances well above the level widely accepted in this country as giving rise to a presumption of being under the influence.

The markedly higher conviction rate when the Alcometer test indicated that a large amount of alcohol (resulting in more than 0.14 percent alcohol in the blood) had been drunk speaks clearly for the credence placed by the court in the chemical test. This is perhaps emphasized by the unusual circumstances under which the only two acquittals occurred. In one case, involving a young student, the original cause of the arrest was an accident in which the youth was involved but in which the negligence was clearly that of the driver of the other vehicle. Although negligence has no relevance to the statute under which the charge of operating under the influence of alcohol is brought, the accused was acquitted apparently in view of the other driver's gross negligence. In the second case, a police officer arrested a man found asleep in his car in front of a traffic signal. Since the police officer could not testify to any movement of the motor vehicle (although the ignition was on—a condition under which Connecticut courts consider the vehicle to be in operation) the man was acquitted of operating under the influence.

Of the 31 cases in which there was no chemical test evidence, 18 were tried without and 13 with a jury (table 3).

TABLE 3.—*Distribution of verdicts between court and jury in not-guilty pleas*

[Number of cases]

	Chemical test	No chemical test
Total	12	31
Court:		
Convicted	4	11
Acquitted	1	7
Jury:		
Convicted	6	7
Acquitted	1	6

The ratio of convictions to acquittals in both groups was essentially the same. Of the 12 cases in which there was Alcometer test evidence, 5 were tried without and 7 with a jury. In each group there was one acquittal. Obviously the confidence placed in the chemical test by the court, as manifested by the predominating conviction rate when the chemical test showed a large alcohol consumption, is shared equally by the jury. No significant differences between the judgments of the court or the jury are evident; the only difference is that caused by the absence or presence of chemical-test evidence.

If, in evaluating the present data, cases in which the arrests were made outside of the city of New Haven are excluded, no essential differences in the results are apparent. Similarly, if the cases dated before the use of the Alcometer are excluded, so that the same judges and juries were concerned both with cases using chemical-test evidence from the city of New Haven and those using no chemical-test evidence from other areas in New Haven County, no differences in the results are evident. Evaluation of the 87 cases examined for the present purpose is therefore not biased by possible differences between the character of police work in a larger city versus that in the smaller surrounding towns, by whether a judge or jury heard the case, or by whether different judges or juries heard the cases. Throughout the period studied the prosecutor and his staff were the same.

From the examination of cases presented here several features are clearly evident. A considerably higher percentage of guilty pleas occurs when chemical-test evidence is used. The conviction rate in a court of appeal on the charge of operating a motor vehicle while under the influence of alcohol is markedly increased (from 55 to 93 percent) if chemical-test evidence is available to indicate that the concentration of alcohol in the blood was above 0.14 percent and that the accused had consumed a considerable amount of alcohol. Before the use of chemical-test evidence in the New Haven County Court of Common Pleas. those who appealed convictions from the municipal and town courts had an approximately even chance of gaining an acquittal; with the use of chemical-test evidence, if the alcohol content is sufficiently high the defendant's chance for acquittal is poor. The introduction of chemical-test evidence in charges of driving under the influence of alcohol distinctly alters the disposition of these cases.

These changes clearly result from (1) the increased ability of the police to screen out those cases in which prosecution is not warranted and (2) an acceptance of the chemical test by the police, the judges, the prosecutor, the juries, and even by the defendant as a device for more effectively convicting the guilty as well as protecting the innocent.

SUMMARY

1. The role of chemical test evidence has been evaluated as the result of a study of pleadings, verdicts and dismissals in cases prosecuted for driving under the influence of alcohol.

2. In the cases examined, the concentrations of alcohol in the blood ranged from 0.14 to 0.40 percent, indicating the consumption of more than ½ pint of whisky or the equivalent amount of other alcoholic beverages.

3. The use of the Alcometer breath test to determine the concentration of alcohol in the blood resulted in a marked increase in pleas of guilty, from 23 to 61 percent. This increase indicates an acceptance of the validity of the test by defendants, since the test result actually corresponds to what they know they had consumed.

4. There was a significant increase in convictions by both court and juries, from 58 to 83 percent. This increase results from the confidence reposed by the court and juries in the chemical test and from the value of this test in corroborating other evidence.

5. The cases dismissed by the prosecutor for lack of sufficient evidence decreased from 22 percent to none when chemical test evidence was introduced. In addition to the confidence of the prosecutor in the reliability and corroborative value of the chemical test, this decrease results from the more effective screening by the police of cases not warranting prosecution.

6. The overall rate of convictions rose from 55 to 93 percent when chemical test evidence was presented.

7. This evaluation of the disposition of 87 cases brought before the New Haven County Court of Common Please reveals the acceptance of the chemical test by all segments of the community as an effective means of convicting the guilty and protecting the innocent.

Shall the Young Sons of American Mothers So Soon Again Be Sent to War, This Time in the Steaming Jungles of Indochina, 10,000 Miles From Their Homes?—Are We Once More Going Down the Road to Ruinous, Devastating Conflict?—While the Answer Should Be an Emphatic "No," American Youths May Soon Be Fighting and Dying Unless the People of Our Country Immediately Voice a Protest So Loud It Cannot Be Ignored by Those Who Control Our Destinies in the Matter of Peace or War

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRADY GENTRY
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 26, 1954

Mr. GENTRY. Mr. Speaker, it is not unusual for the people to be given a preponderance of information on one side of a public issue. This is always true when it involves an issue on which there is great feeling and prejudice. Yet, there have been few times in America's history when so little of the basic facts of a controversy have been given the people as is true with reference to the Indochina issue, an issue that some of our highest officials now speak of as sufficiently grave to justify our country again being plunged into the holocaust of war.

When Dien Bien Phu fell recently, the State Department, in the name of the President, sent a message to France. This message, given wide publicity in America, said:

> The entire free world has been inspired by the heroism and stamina displayed by the gallant garrison at Dien Bien Phu. Their devotion and the gallantry of their resistance has been so great that the battle will forever stand as a symbol for the free world's determination to resist dictatorial aggression and to sustain its right of self-determination and its dedication to the dignity of the human being.

The words of this message are lofty, but they convey a completely false impression in a matter involving life and death for many of our people.

Just who comprised the garrison at Dien Bien Phu of which the message spoke so glowingly? Approximately 40 percent of them were Moroccans, Tunisians, Algerians, and Senegalese, not French, but Africans, whose countries in recent times, like Indochina, have themselves been subjected to ruthless French aggression and conquest and are held in bondage today only by the force of French arms. Approximately one-fourth of the garrison were Foreign Legion forces, not Frenchmen, but adventurers and soldiers of fortune recruited by France from various other countries throughout the world, many of whom are exconvicts and former criminals. They are serving in the

French Army for pay alone but they would have served any country which would have accepted them. Approximately 20 percent of the garrison were Indochinese pressed into service by the French puppet, Bao Dai, some of whom deserted to the other side at every opportunity. The remaining less than 20 percent, actually fewer than 3,000 out of 17,000, were the only ones from continental France and they were professionals, not one of them being a drafted man. In fact, France has never sent even one drafted man to Indochina, having made certain that her draftees would not have to go there or any other foreign land by incorporating a provision into her constitution expressly forbidding it.

Can anyone imagine such a motley group of mercenaries, professionals, and colonials from French subject countries, having any real concern whatever regarding either the self-determination of peoples or the dignity of the human being? The message spoke of their devotion. Devotion to what? The State Department should tell the people of our country just what such a group could be devoted to as a matter of principle.

A message was also sent at the same time in the name of the President to Bao Dai, the native Indochinese who serves, by French appointment, as a French puppet ruler of Vietnam, largest of the three Indochina states, but who is a figurehead only, having no power or authority whatever. Here is what the State Department had the President say to this puppet:

> These brave men made their sacrifices in order that individual freedom and national independence for the people of Vietnam should not be lost to Communist enslavement. We of the free world are determined to remain faithful to the cause for which they have so nobly fought.

This message would appear to have been sent because it was felt that this puppet was in mourning as a result of the Dien Bien Phu surrender. Yet, at that particular time, he was lolling on a beach of the blue Mediterranean at the resort city of Nice, France, as he also was when the fighting was raging at Dien Bien Phu. Is it not fair to ask the question as to just what there was about the nondescript group of defenders of Dien Bien Phu which would give anyone cause to think that they were nobly fighting for anything?

The people of Vietnam and Indochina have every reason to know from bitter experience just what enslavement, of which the message spoke, really means. They have first-hand knowledge of enslavement, having been subjected to it for a long time. It must have been a severe shock to the 23 million Vietnamese people, most of whom have been resisting their French aggressors so long, to learn that anyone thinks that France is fighting for Vietnamese independence, instead of for their continued subjection. Their sensibilities must have suffered, too, at the thought that the President of the United States was made to say that the long resistance of the Vietnam people in desperately fighting for freedom in their own land was an act of dictatorial aggression on their part, rather than just the reverse. This anomalous situation in messages is brought about because diplomacy does not always relate words to facts. It is regrettable that the welfare of so many American boys may be affected by such laxity in diplomatic doubletalk.

What is the history of France and Indochina as it relates to each other? The two countries are 7,000 miles and 2 continents apart, more than twice the distance from the United States to France. Some 80 years ago, Indochina was a peaceful country and, like most Asian countries, practically without armed forces. France, with its great navies and strong armies and its history of militarism, simply decided to move in and ruthlessly gobble up a country unable to defend itself, which is exactly what it did. It sent its navy, with units of its army, to overrun and occupy Indochina as an act of purely military conquest. Indochina has been exploited and held in slavery by the French at the point of a gun ever since. Her people have had to live as a prey to French military force. While most countries of the world have made great strides in industrialization and in standards of living during the last 80 years, Indochina remains today a primitive nation. Her people have been exploited by France for French profiteers. It has been said many times that France has profited more on her opium traffic in Indochina than she has allowed to be spent on Indochina schools. As early as 1911, unrest and riots in Indochina evidenced resistance to further French occupation and exploitation. This resistance had swollen to greater proportions by 1930. Ever since that time, most of the people of Indochina, and especially of Vietnam, its largest state, have wanted desperately to throw off the yoke of their French aggressors.

Just who in Indochina have been and are now fighting the French? They are native Indochinese. France now claims one-fourth of them are Communists. There are very few Indochinese who are Communists, and this claim is a new one. Even if true, it is not as large a percentage as voted Communist in recent French elections. The French also claim that some Chinese are fighting with the Indochinese. It is another new claim. Actually, more than 3 million native Indochinese are actually Chinese. The leader of the fight against French aggression is a Communist, but he is said by all observers to be Indochina's most popular figure because of his lifelong fight for Indochina independence. Much is now made of the fact that Indochina gets some supplies from China. It is only natural that she trades with China, her next-door neighbor, from whom, along with India, she derived her culture. She trades with China, just as England and France trade with Russia. The Indochinese have had to fight, however, without tanks, without planes, and without heavy artillery, which they are financially unable to buy. It is admitted that Indochinese opposition to French aggression and occupation was bitter and intense even when Chiang Kai-shek was ruler of China. We might remember, too, that the same Indochinese who were and are now fighting France were fighting on our side against the Japs during their occupancy of Indochina from 1941 to 1945 and suffered severely in doing so.

Senator Edward Johnson, of Colorado, in a notable address in the Senate on April 26, had this to say:

> Our press and radio during the past few weeks have pulled no punches, have left nothing to the imagination, for the most part, in describing France's Indochina enemies, the Vietminh, as the Communist forces. This war has been going on for nearly 8 years. As recently as 5 years ago the Vietminh were not labeled, even by the less responsible press, as Communists. As recently as 5 months ago they were not so identified, even by the French. In fact, even 90 days ago, dispatches from Saigon discreetly and consistently called them the Communist-led Vietminh, but never the Communist forces, or the Communist Vietminh. At what point, and to what degree, has this war, which every record shows to have been a war for freedom and independence, a war against imperialism, at what point did it suddenly become a war of Communist aggression?

Senator Johnson knew whereof he spoke.

Can the struggle of the natives in Indochina for their freedom from France be considered as a Communist movement? Not at all. It is a struggle for independence that has been going on for more than 40 years. It is the same movement that has flamed in all Asian countries, the continuing effort of the brown race to throw off the yoke of their white oppressors. It happened in India against the British, in Indonesia against the Dutch, in Burma against the British, and is now happening in Malaya against the British.

Is there any reason why an Indochinese should not be willing to give his life to throw off the yoke of France on his native land? Listen to this: In all the time France has held that unhappy country under subjection by the force of arms, not one Indochinese has been permitted to hold public office in his own country, not one Indochinese has been allowed to be the manager of a business and not one Indochinese has been allowed to become a commissioned officer in the army of his country. They are allowed to do only the hard labor and be the menial servants of the French.

France's position in Indochina is such a flagrant example of military conquest and exploitation, President Franklin Roosevelt wrote his Secretary of State, Cordell Hull, on January 24, 1944, as follows:

> I told Lord Halifax a few days ago that Indochina should not go back to France. She has had the country almost 100 years and the people are worse off today than they were at the beginning. Each case must stand on its own feet, but the case of Indochina is clear. France has milked it for 100 years. The people of Indochina are entitled to better than that.

President Roosevelt was dead soon after he made this statement but no one could have better stated the facts. What must the Indochinese fighting today against great odds in their struggle against France think of the presently proposed action of America, a country supposedly committed to the idea of freedom for all people. Yet, we are now made to speak of the long fight of the native Indochinese for freedom from France as being an act of "dictatorial aggression," on their part.

Has France really tried to win the war in Indochina? Has her heart actually been in it, or better still, has the heart of the mercenaries she has sent there really been in it? In more than 8 years of warfare in Indochina, continental France has had less than 15,000 men killed. That is fewer than 2,000 per year. Yet, here is America today, getting ready to send its young boys 10,000 miles to fight a war for France which France actually refuses to fight for herself, a war that would, whether we want it or not, end in continued subjection in some degree for all those Indochinese who are fortunate enough to survive the rain of atom and hydrogen bombs that will fall on their unfortunate country. It is a contemplated action that would result in more hundreds of thousands of casualties among our young men and demoralization, if not destruction, of our system of Government. It could result in the death of millions of helpless, defenseless women, children, and old people in the cities of our country.

Regardless of the best intentions, our statesmen in recent times have always taken the course that finally led us into every war that has been fought. They do much soul searching, but in the end they always come to the solemn conclusion that only our entrance into wars in other hemispheres can make things just right in the world. In World War I in 1917, we went 3,000 miles to throw our young boys into a struggle for which even now, only 35 years later, some of our most informed men can find little reason for American participation. But, we won the war at a cost of 300,000 casualties and a $19 billion debt and the victors dictated the peace terms to suit their desires. At the conclusion everyone realized that it left the world in a more deplorable state than when it started and that the action of the world's statesmen had made certain the fighting of more wars.

World War II started in 1939. By early 1941, long before Pearl Harbor, we were in it, although our leaders were insisting that we were not. They again had solemnly concluded that throwing the young men of America into the struggle was the only thing that would shape the world's destiny aright, and so America was once more in a world war. The attack on Pearl Harbor in December 1941 made our participation official. In this war we extended our base of fighting operations a distance of 8,000 miles from our shores. Again, we won the war, this time at a cost of more than 1 million casualties among our young men and a debt of $262 billion. Once more, our statesmen shaped the war's conclusion and dictated the peace terms, yet it was already evident that that war had raised far more perplexing problems than it had solved and that the world was in the most deplorable state of its long history. Again, nobody could doubt that the cause of future wars had been set up.

Then in 1950, our statesmen, supposedly after meditation and consideration, decided that it would again require the participation of the youth of America in a war in order to bring peace to the world, the same reason given for our participation in the two recent world wars. So, again, the die was cast and once more we went to war. This war, that in Korea, was 9,000 miles from home. It ended in a truce in 1953. The casualties this time were 150,000 American boys and our national debt had jumped to $275 billion.

Korea, like World Wars I, and II, settled little or nothing. So, today, only 4 years later, our leaders, after solemn consideration, have already uttered the fateful words that a few thousand Indochinese who have been struggling and fighting more than 40 years for freedom against military conquest and exploitation by France present a problem that justifies another war and the sending of American boys 10,000 miles from their homes in order to fight it.

Possibly a logical question at this time would be whether we are under obligation to France. Let's see. In 1917 France was engaged in a death struggle with Germany. The scales were tipping against her. We entered that war and bailed her out, thus saving her country. At that war's end, France owed us a great sum of money, much of it loaned to her long before we entered the conflict. She defaulted this debt to us and then announced that she did not intend to pay it. In 1939, France declared war on Germany, thus assuring a second world war. At the first real fighting between them in that war, France quit. She capitulated outright and Frenchmen formed a puppet government which supported Germany during the remainder of the war. France's continuation as a free nation resulted solely from the fact that America entered that war, defeated the Germans and drove them out of France. The American people, with their hard-earned tax moneys, have supported France ever since. Notwithstanding our having done so, and notwithstanding the fact that France promised 4 years ago to join a European Defense Community for the maintenance of order in Europe, which she, herself, originally proposed, she hasn't done so and gives no evidence of ever doing so.

When we became involved in Korea in 1950 with hundreds of thousands of drafted American boys committed to that struggle, France conveniently found that she would be unable to render us substantial help because of her convenient constitution, which forbade sending draftees abroad. Also, she conveniently forgot that we had sent millions of draftees on two occasions to fight on foreign soil, her own, and save her country for her. Now, she is again getting whipped by a few Indochinese. The recent surrender at Dien Bien Phu is a vivid reminder of 1940 when the French raised the white flag of surrender to the Germans. Naturally, in this war in which she has faintheartedly engaged only with a few professional soldiers, not with a great body of drafted men which she could have utilized, she wants America to send her own drafted youth around the world to save her aggression for her. The evidence is completely lacking that France has further claim to our help.

Should we risk another world war by intervening in Indochina? Mr. Dulles has gone from country to country, frantically pleading and begging for some country, just any country, large or small, to join us in that venture. His appeals have been to those nations which are heavily indebted to us because of our sacrifices in financially supporting them. But for our aid, some of them would not now be free countries. Yet, one by one, they gave him the back of their hand. Great Britain was the first to say "no." Finally, even Japan and the Philippines, which our troops now occupy, refused us. Actually, not one nation has agreed publicly with our position on Indochina. Is not that sufficient to make us stop, look, and listen before we go too far? Specifically, are we not getting in deep water in sending our military forces farther into southeast Asia without the active cooperation of Great Britain, if not against her express opposition? These are questions the American people better ask themselves before they accept some of the thinking and contemplated action in Washington today. After all, the military leaders and civilian heads receive the glory in world wars. The people do the paying, fighting, and dying.

It is regrettable, but it seems war is to be risked. That is obvious from statements by the Vice President and Senate majority leader, both of whom indicate that our stake in Indochina is big enough for us to send our boys there to fight. Other leaders say that Indochina is the cork in the bottle. There is something vaguely familiar about all these statements. Much the same thing happened before we entered other wars. It is done to condition the American people for again sending their boys to fight in a foreign land. Maybe this does not mean war, but the only thing that might stop it would be the earnest appeals of the mothers of America.

Is it not only fair to ask when this madness is to end? Must weak and bleeding Indochina now become a major battleground and suffer the sad experience of complete devastation, a ruined economy, and a million casualties, as did Korea? Must our leaders so soon again hurl us into a fateful war without prayerful consideration as to just where all our armed interventions in the incessant quarrels of foreign nations are leading us? Is there no hope for another generation of Americans ever to live in peace? Must we go on engaging in wars until we shall have cemeteries of American war dead in every country around the globe? Must every mother who brings a son into the world live in the knowledge that it is only a question of time until he will be sent thousands of miles from his home to offer his life on the altar of needless warfare? Will not the time ever come when our young men have something better to look forward to than years of military service which, at the best, will completely disrupt their normal living and, at the worst, will take their lives? If we must send our young men into another war, cannot we find both a better issue on which to wage it and a better partner with whom to fight it than the present indecisive France? Must we appear to the Asians as ranging ourselves on the side of imperialism and colonialism and as the partisan of those who would oppress the weak? More important still, should not we now solemnly ask ourselves whether we must forever go on waging perpetual war, claiming it is for peace?

Eagles Launch Freedom Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE MEADER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1954

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, I am very much impressed by the activities of the Fraternal Order of Eagles in calling the attention of the people of this country to the importance of freedom. Among its activities, the Order of Eagles has established a special committee to support the crusade for freedom.

One of the activities of this committee was to sponsor a celebration at Springfield, Ill., at the Sangamon County Courthouse, on the occasion of Lincoln's birthday, February 12, 1954. This celebration was described in the Springfield (Ill.) Citizens Tribune, Thursday, February 18, 1954.

Two thousand helium-filled balloons were released carrying a message of freedom to widely scattered areas. That was to symbolize the crusade for freedom, to carry the story of freedom to those enslaved behind the Iron Curtain.

The principal address on that occasion was delivered by Martin J. Mol, of Michigan, national chairman of the Eagles Freedom Committee. I believe his words, reported, in part, by the Citizens Tribune, deserve the attention of all citizens willing to participate actively in the cause of carrying the message of freedom.

Under leave, I incorporate at this point in my remarks the article from the Springfield Citizens Tribune:

EAGLES LAUNCH FREEDOM WEEK

One of the most spectacular and dramatic demonstrations for freedom took place in front of the Sangamon County courthouse on Lincoln's birthday, February 12. The occasion was the official opening of Freedom Week under the auspices of the Grand Aerie of the Fraternal Order of Eagles in support of the Crusade for Freedom.

At noon, 2,000 helium-filled plastic balloons were released by Boy Scouts and Girl Scouts and school children of Sangamon County. The balloons carried freedom messages from Eagles Grand President Robert W. Hansen, urging support of Radio Free Europe. The scene took place on proportions of near frenzy as masses of large 7-foot balloons soared heavenward glistening in the sun-filled sky.

By Monday morning Dr. C. Robert Fults, local chairman, received acknowledgments from over 50 people in Kentucky, Tennessee and West Virginia telling of balloon findings. The first to report was a farmer who lived within two and a half miles of Hodgenville, Ky., where Lincoln was born.

Sharing the speaking program with Illinois' Governor William G. Stratton was Martin J. Mol, from Detroit, Mich., national chairman of the Eagles freedom committee. Mr. Mol's address was a brilliantly delivered description of the menace of communism today and the need for worldwide acceptance of the philosophies of Abraham Lincoln.

NATIONWIDE EVENT

Mr. Mol's vivid appeal follows:

"Our efforts here in Springfield on Lincoln's birthday anniversary is the focal point of a nationwide event heralding the opening of Freedom Week in support of the Crusade for Freedom. No such ceremony could be held in a more appropriate place or time. We are proud to have here with us our own Eagle brothers Gov. William Stratton, Mayor MacWherter and the local chairman, Dr. C. Robert Fults. We pay tribute to the Girl Scouts and the Boy Scouts of America for their valiant part in this ceremony.

"All members of the Fraternal Order of Eagles join in extending to our Grand Worthy President, Robert W. Hansen, our deepest sympathy through the untimely death of his beloved father whose funeral is being held this afternoon in Milwaukee. By his absence we are deprived of the rare privilege of hearing a message of the greatest exponent of freedom we have in our order. Bob Hansen was a pioneer in a crusade to awaken America to the menace of communism and to the virtue of a free life in a free society of men."

TO THWART REDS

"The Fraternal Order of Eagles, with a million fighting members, is proud to give its active support to the Crusade for Freedom. We do this because we are convinced that the maintenance of Radio Free Europe is the most effective means to thwart Kremlin aggression. This does not mean solely that we are giving something to foreign nations. When we contribute truth dollars to the Crusade we are protecting the very institutions that we hold sacred: our homes, our churches, our schools, our farms, and many others.

"We are stopping world war III by preventing the beginning of it. By piercing the Iron Curtain with radio messages of truth to those behind it we enkindle the fond hope of eventual freedom in the hearts of freedom-loving people, and maintain a devastating barrier to Soviet aggression. They will not move through countries in which the hearts of people are resolute, who are determined to fight as freemen. You cannot kill their spirit. Their ancestors were free. They have been robbed of it. All of the cunning, misrepresentation, dishonesty of a fearful Kremlin will not kill the love for freedom that you find among the true citizens of Poland, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, Rumania, and Albania. These 70 million people are our allies. They fight side by side with us to make the world free. Radio Free Europe is the means through which they hear truth messages from their loved ones who have escaped to the free side of the Iron Curtain and plead with them to keep the faith. We as Americans must not fail them now."

PURPOSE OF BALLOONS

"This demonstration here is not merely a colorful display of launching 2,000 helium-filled plastic balloons. The sending aloft of these balloons and many thousands of others from cities and towns where Eagle lodges are established is symbolic of the effective operation of Radio Free Europe in sending similar balloons over the Iron Curtain containing messages of hope to the minders in the captive countries of Europe.

"The message in our balloons today is from Grand Worthy President Robert W. Hansen urging the finders to support the Crusade for Freedom in its quest to raise $10 million to maintain Radio Free Europe. It is our dramatic way of telling the world that the Eagles fly again to join with our allies to fight to preserve freedom at home, extend freedom in the now free Europe, and to enhance the hope of freedom to those behind the Iron Curtain who had it stolen from them.

"This patriotic venture could never be held in a Kremlin-dominated country. At the first sound of the bugle or the ruffle of the drums hordes of secret police would be upon us and the leaders would be placed in concentration camps. Thank God we have the right to celebrate the birthday of Abraham Lincoln, who fought fearlessly to firmly establish our American freedoms. Thank God for the Boy Scouts and the Girl Scouts and for our schoolchildren who stand with brave hearts to defend these freedoms.

"Here in Springfield we naturally think of Abraham Lincoln. Worldwide disturbances now focus our attention to the Kremlin. One most noteworthy difference between the philosophy of Lincoln and the philosophy of the Kremlin is God. Lincoln said without His help he could not succeed; with His help he could not fail. The Kremlin says there is no higher power—the state is the master, and the people are its slaves."

WITH LINCOLN AND GOD

"The Eagles join in this fight because we are on the side of Lincoln and God. No Christian nation; no Christian citizen of any country can lay down the arms of battle and allow Godless communism to take its deadly hold upon our free way of life. We fight with the greatest and most effective weapon that man, fighting for God, can wield. The weapon is truth. Christ said to us, 'The truth shall make thee free.'

"We will not tolerate a return to a society in which exists the relationship of a master and his slave. No voice of tyranny will ever be heard that boasts, 'I am master—you are my slave.' We must help to remove the shackles of slavery that destroy the will to live. The oppressed people who live under Soviet tyranny must keep the hope and the faith. If they lose it, America is in peril. The Fraternal Order of Eagles asks your help to keep the faith today with Abraham Lincoln and join the forces that will preserve and reestablish the freedom of the world."

On Sunday evening, February 14, 1954, this address was rebroadcast from Munich, Germany, over the Radio Free Europe transmitter, with interpreters and with an eyewitness description of the events in connection with the balloon launching in Springfield. Those behind the Iron Curtain will hear this message from RFE. It will not be broadcast from the Kremlin stations.

Zionist Council Blasts United States Stand on Shipping Arms to Arab States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1954

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following article which appeared in the May 7, 1954, issue of the

Jewish Times entitled "Zionist Council Blasts United States Stand on Shipping Arms to Arab States":

Zionist Council Blasts United States Stand on Shipping Arms to Arab States—Group Passes Resolution Asking Firm United States Position—Charges Russia Courts Arabs Favor by U. N. Vetoes—Demands Armistice Agreement Be Sought To Bring Lasting Peace to Middle East

The Baltimore Zionist Council, in a strongly worded resolution this week, firmly called upon the United States Government to refuse military aid to Iraq, charged that the Arab League has refused to sit down and discuss peace with Israel despite the fact that it has been called upon to do so by both the United States and the United Nations and called for a reversal of the recently stated United States policy that arms and ammunition would be supplied members of the Arab League.

Contending that Russia was now brazenly courting the Arab League with utter disregarde for the U. N. and its principles, the Baltimore Zionist Council charged that the United States Government was failing to take a strong stand against both the Kremlin and the Arab League by courting the Arab League members with offers of aid. The council claimed that the United States should rescind its decision to ship arms to an avowed aggressor nation and make it clear to the Arab League that this country will not tolerate blockades, boycotts, threats, and aggression.

The council, composed of members of the Baltimore Zionist District, Hadassah, Mizrachi, and Labor Zionists, and representing some 12,000 people in Baltimore, sent copies of the resolution to all members of the United States House of Representatives from Maryland, to United States Senators Beall and Butler, and to members of the United States State Department.

RESOLUTION HIGHLIGHTS

High points of the resolution which were unanimously adopted by representatives of the Zionist council included:

"To arm Iraq at a time when Arab-Israel tension has been mounting and without its firm commitment to make peace with Israel, is to fortify and embolden Arab intransigence and risk a renewal of open hostilities. Iraq has been the most vindictive and belligerent member of the Arab League in the continued war against Israel; it has refused even to enter into an armistice agreement with Israel. This decision of the United States Government to ship arms to Iraq cannot serve the cause of peace, since arms for one Arab state means arms for all, and the use of arms cannot be controlled once an aggressor has them.

"The situation in the Middle East has continuously deteriorated. The United Nations armistice agreements which governed relations between Israel and the Arab States for the past 5 years have virtually broken down because the Arabs, emboldened by the pursuit of their favor, are persuaded that they can intensify their warfare with impunity. And the United Nations itself has now become unable to meet Arab defiance. Its attempts to enforce the armistice agreements are being frustrated by the ominous vetoes of the Kremlin which now is brazenly courting the Arab League with characteristic disregard for the United Nations purpose and principle."

ISRAEL HAS SOUGHT PEACE

"Israel has felt and still insists that national freedom and full sovereign rights are the inheritance of all peoples in the Middle East and not the monopoly of one. Each nation, large or small, has the right to its own area in which its life and spirit should develop under its own controls in perfect freedom. The State of Israel has repeatedly stated that it is willing to make its contribution in the closest and most direct unity with the efforts of the Arab governments.

"We respectfully suggest that the policy of the United States Government in the Middle East should be based on the establishment of a permanent and just peace in that area. For that peace no arms are needed. The Arab States should be made to understand that the fundamental concept of an armistice agreement is that the parties to this agreement should be actively seeking a transition to a permanent peace. This obligation to proceed from armistice to a permanent peace is not optional. It is mandatory and obligatory upon the parties of the armistice. A refusal to meet under the armistice agreement for the purpose of establishing a permanent peace is in itself a violation of the armistice agreement and a continuation of hostilities.

"We call upon the United States Government to direct its prestige and influence toward bringing the Arab States to a peace table with Israel. It should be made clear to the Arab League that it will not tolerate blockades, boycotts, threats, and aggression. The United States should rescind its decision to ship arms to Iraq, an avowed aggressor nation, with a publicly announced policy of the destruction of Israel. The way to win the friendship of the Arab people for America and for the cause of freedom is to give them economic and technical assistance to raise the standards of living of all people in the Middle East."

The meeting held at Beth Jacob Auditorium Monday evening heard addresses from Harry M. Miller, Baltimore Zionist district president; Mrs. Sigmund Feinblatt, Hadassah representative; Dr. Herman Seidel, LZOA honorary president; and Dr. Samuel Rosenblatt.

Resolutions of Convention of Episcopal Diocese of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 13, 1954

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, appended are resolutions on investigations and housing adopted by unanimous vote of the clergy and lay delegates of the 173d annual convention of the diocese of New York, held at the Synod House, New York City, on May 11, 1954. The convention is the legislative body of the Episcopal diocese of New York and represents 134,571 church members in 211 parishes and missions in New York, Richmond, Bronx, Westchester, Putnam, Dutchess, Sullivan, Orange, Rockland, and Ulster Counties.

The resolutions follow:

Resolution on Investigations

Whereas there has been aroused among American citizens a justifiable anxiety concerning the efforts of Communists to undermine the foundations upon which our ideals of liberty under law have been built; and

Whereas this anxiety has given rise to a trend to hysteria which has been exploited by self-seeking politicians; and

Whereas the trend so described has led to the abuse of loyal citizens and has generated in the officers and employees of our State Department and of our Department of Defense a fear to forward information and advice fully and adequately, lest their motives be misunderstood and their loyalty recklessly impugned; and

Whereas the efforts of certain committees of Congress to expose un-American activities and the incompetent conduct of the affairs of government have been characterized by such disregard of American concepts of justice and fair play as to make the committees the very exemplars of the evils which they were set up to extirpate: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this convention deems it to be its duty (1) to remind each and every member of any congressional investigating committee that it is of the essence of democracy in America to tolerate a difference of views and not to punish dissent until it has been pressed to violation of law and established as such by due proof and not by innuendo or suggestion; (2) to urge the said committees to end the practice of hearings conducted by a single committeeman; and (3) to suggest to the said committees that the public interest requires that they show due respect for the constitutional guaranties which witnesses called before them enjoy under the Bill of Rights; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, to the Senators from the State of New York, to the Representatives from every congressional district in this State lying in whole or in part within the diocese of New York, and to the personnel of each committee of Congress which has been entrusted with powers of investigation.

Resolution on Housing

Whereas this convention, meeting in 1947, expressed its concern over the gravity of the present housing shortage and its tendency to impair family solidarity and the physical health and spiritual welfare of hundreds of thousands of our fellow citizens, and to promote juvenile delinquency—phenomena which are peculiarly manifest in the city of New York; and

Whereas a commission appointed by the President has, after a year of study, concluded that the public welfare requires the construction of 140,000 additional housing units at the rate of 35,000 per year for the next 4 years; and

Whereas this figure appears to estimate correctly the minimum present public needs in spite of the commendable achievements in the housing field of State and local housing authorities, and of the completion of Federal projects heretofore approved by Congress: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this convention strongly endorses the President's recommendation that housing projects be approved for the construction of 35,000 units per year for a period of 4 years, and urges Congress to act accordingly; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, to the Senators from the State of New York, to the Representatives from every congressional district in this State lying in whole or in part within the diocese of New York, and to the personnel of each committee of Congress having jurisdiction in the premises.

Choices in Indochina

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1954

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I wish to include herein an editorial which appeared in the Christian Science Monitor, Boston, Mass., of May 25, 1954:

CHOICES IN INDOCHINA

Everybody seems to be waiting for somebody else to decide what to do about Indochina. This applies not only to the governments in Washington and Paris, each of which looks to the others for some indication of a firm policy. It applies also to individual citizens in America, Britain, and France, not many of whom are entirely clear as to how the situation is to be resolved or just what they are willing to do about it.

For these reasons it my be useful to sum up some facts about Southeast Asia.

First, there is the question whether the free world can, should, or will do anything conclusive to prevent all Indochina from falling into the hands of the Vietminh, with its Soviet and Communist Chinese backing.

Americans and probably many Europeans and certainly many Asians would be more ready to increase aid there if they were assured the result would be real freedom of the Indochinese to control their own affairs. The French long since should have promulgated treaties of genuine independence with Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia. An appeal from autonomous governments in those states to the United Nations or to specific countries would carry more weight if relieved of the shadow of French colonialism.

If any part of Indochina itself is to be saved, time is very, very short. Given a convincing grant of independence, the Vietnamese in southern Indochina, plus the Laotians and Cambodians, might make a more effective defense of their country.

But the Communst delegates at the Geneva Conference already are demanding that all Indochina be treated as a unit. If anything is to persuade them otherwise, it will have to be either a pronounced swing of Indochinese sentiment toward western ideals of liberty or a determination by western powers to furnish solid military strength—probably both.

If Britons, Americans, and others cannot bring themselves to want to share directly—and that probably means with ground troops—in the defense of Indochina, then will they declare themselves as to what they would do if Communist subversion and aggression did not end there but continued into Thailand, Burma, Malaya, or Indonesia?

Such a declaration, embodied in a southeast Asia defense pact, would strengthen the French hands at Geneva. Without it, is any of southeast Asia safe?

It seems to us that at the very least there should be such a pact, that it should be announced while the Geneva Conference is still in session, and that if France will make Indochinese independence explicit there should be a stepping up of military aid to Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia.

This involves a risk of having to send men to some part of southeast Asia. Unless that willingness exists, the Communists have in effect been notified they can walk in. But if the willingness does exist and is avowed, the need may not go that far.

If a defense line is pledged, then behind that line other factors will become more important than guns. Under such security there should be genuine release of Asian leaders and peoples to work out their own destiny. There should also be a substantial, even generous, commitment of technical aid both by the United States directly and through the United Nations to help them achieve fuller living. Facing that kind of cooperation, communism would become both less attractive and less menacing.

Public Laws 352–358, Inclusive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1954

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am extending my remarks to include my report to my constitutents on Public Laws 352–358, inclusive, as follows:

TWENTY-FOURTH REPORT ON LEGISLATION OF THE 83D CONGRESS

DEAR FRIEND: Continuing with the effort to keep you currently advised of new legislation:

PUBLIC LAW 352

H. R. 5627, aeronautical research study

School teachers with sabbatical privileges will find interest in the 4-year experience of the National Advisory Committee of Aeronautics. Under the Act of 1950 professional employees of the committee have been granted leave for university graduate study and research in science for periods of from a few weeks to longer. The employees pay their own tuition and sustenance expenses but the Government continues them in a pay status while attending school. Under this act 341 employees of the committee have been kept abreast of new developments in the aeronautical research field. The system worked so well that Public Law 352 increases the authorized expenditure for its continuance from $50,000 a year to $100,000.

PUBLIC LAW 353

H. R. 998, Idaho homesteaders get patents to lands

In 1910 some 14,000 acres of land in Idaho was segregated for reclamation purposes under the Carey Act of 1894. Entrymen received "final certificates" from the State of Idaho awaiting such time as the Federal Government issued its patent. But the land never was conveyed to Idaho because of litigation. As the entrymen of long ago complied with all the requirements, and underground water now has made feasible the development of the segregated district as originally intended, Public Law 353 at last makes it possible for Idaho to honor the "final certificates" with patents to the land.

PUBLIC LAW 354

S. 2247, decorations of foreign nations

This permits veterans of the Korean hostilities to accept and wear decorations of foreign nations participating with the United Nations in Korea. It is similar in character to the enactment of World War II applying to decorations conferred by our allies. President Eisenhower as the supreme commander received many such decorations. Under the Constitution of the United States consent of Congress is a prerequisite to acceptance of any decorations from a foreign government. Public Law 354 is such consent and applies to both officers and enlisted men of the Korean expedition.

PUBLIC LAW 355

H. R. 6702, drug addicts

In my fifth report to you I referred to the brave but experimental approach to the drug problem by the District of Columbia as envisioned in Public Law 76. This contemplated compulsory hospital treatment of drug addicts. Awaiting the construction of other facilities, the District presently is able to take care of only 16 cases, not sufficient to furnish the basis for a real test. Public Law 356 authorizes the Surgeon General to admit not more than 50 such patients to hospitals of the Public Health Service, the District of Columbia reimbursing the Federal Government for the cost entailed.

I am sure all are willing to cooperate in any way to meet the challenge of the drug habit.

PUBLIC LAW 356

S. 24, finality clause, Federal contracts

For years Government contracts have contained a standard finality clause providing that in disputes on questions of fact the decision of the Federal department head should be final and conclusive. In November of 1951 the United States Supreme Court held (*United States* v. *Wunderlich* (342 U. S. 98)), that this clause foreclosed a judicial review of the facts of the dispute unless fraud were shown. The Court defined fraud as "conscious wrongdoing or intention to cheat or be dishonest."

The effect of this decision was to leave the contractor without any protection against a Federal department head who, while practicing no fraud nevertheless acted contrary to the actual facts through passion, obstinacy, irrational conduct, or incompetency. Such a department head, his decisions being above the reach of judicial review, was vested with the powers of a tyrant.

Public Law 356 sensibly extends availability of review in the courts when the decision of a department head is "fraudulent or capricious or arbitrary or so grossly erroneous as necessarily to imply bad faith, or is not supported by substantial evidence."

This wise law, unanimously recommended by the Judiciary Committee, will save the taxpayers much money. Reason: Under the Wunderlich decision contractors were forced to puff up their bids as insurance against the risk of possible unrealistic and entirely erroneous decisions.

PUBLIC LAW 357

H. R. 8481, Third Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1954

Appropriation acts will be covered in a separate and later report.

PUBLIC LAW 358

S. 2150, St. Lawrence seaway

Simplified, Public Law 358 (a) creates the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation as an instrumentality of the United States Government, (b) authorizes it to construct (at $105 million maximum cost) and operate in cooperation with the St. Lawrence Seaway Authority of Canada deep water (27 feet) channels in the International Rapids section of the St. Lawrence River and in the Thousands Islands section.

The corporation is authorized to fix (in negotiation with the Canadian authority) charges and toll rates as well as an equitable division of revenues. Rates must be high enough to cover maintenance and to retire within 50 years the construction cost debt, along the general lines of the Chicago Traction Authority setup.

Public Law 358 represents 23 years of effort by Presidents Roosevelt, Truman, and Eisenhower, and by suceeding Congresses. In a sense it is the first step toward realization of the dream of La Salle, the great French explorer, who in the 17th century dreamed a dream of empire stretching from the Atlantic to the Gulf of Mexico: an empire with a great system of inland waterways, the St. Lawrence, the Great Lakes, and the Mississippi River.

There were two record rollcall votes in the House. A motion to recommit was defeated 157 to 242, your vote cast by me being "No." On the passage of the bill the vote was 241 yeas, 158 nays. Your vote was numbered among the 241.

Public Law 358 especially to us in the 2d District of Illinois is the most important achievement so far of the 83d Congress It well may lead to a new era for our city, with Chicago becoming one of the great ports of the world and metropolitan development swinging southward from the Chicago River in the direction of Lake Calumet. Properties in the second district are sure to benefit.

The next gigantic step will be the actual development of the Calumet-Sag Waterway, opening the way for shipping on an all-way ocean to gulf routing. Authorization for Calumet-Sag was voted by the 79th Congress as a result of the efforts of then Congressman William Rowan. H. R. 8490 (introduced by me as a cosponsor in a bipartisan effort) is now pending before this Congress. It would provide a $5 million appropriation for actual construction. The prospect for passage this year is only fair, in 1955 extremely promising. That is the sentiment in Washington.

Cordially and sincerely,

BARRATT O'HARA,
Member of Congress.

Social Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. RUSSELL V. MACK

OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 5, 1954

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, everyone, as far as possible, except those groups having adequate pension systems of their own, someday should be covered by social security. When full coverage is obtained, no one will be on State old-age assistance. All will pay something into the old-age social-security pension-retirement fund each payday during the earnings days of their youth, and then in old age receive retirement benefits from that social-security fund.

Such a plan serves two purposes. In the first place, it assures every person of a modest retirement pension in his old age that will keep him from want. Also, if all pay into this fund and all are entitled to pensions, then there will be no one on relief rolls who must be supported by public taxation.

Of the Eisenhower administration plan for expanding social-security coverage, the Longview Daily News, of Longview, Wash., recently said editorially:

BROADENING SOCIAL SECURITY

The House Ways and Means Committee has pointed the way toward coverage of virtually the entire working population of the country under the Federal old-age insurance program. If the committee-approved measure passes, it will be regarded as one of the major accomplishments of the Eisenhower administration, since Eisenhower is a strong advocate of broadening the base of Federal social security.

The committee voted this week to put the Nation's farm operators and the 500,000 professional self-employed—including doctors, dentists, and lawyers—under the social-security system. The 4,200,000 employees of State and local governments, including schoolteachers, firemen, and policemen, could obtain coverage on a voluntary basis.

The bill would leave Federal employees on civil service, members of the Armed Forces, and some part-time workers as the only groups completely out of the social-security system.

In addition to bringing more workers under the program, legislation in the process of enactment improves benefits to those already covered.

Gradually, Congress seems to be working toward what many believe to be an ultimate goal—a Federal social-security system so broad and so adequate that the widely varying State welfare plans will no longer be needed.

Address by H. W. Prentis, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PAUL B. DAGUE

OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 26, 1954

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, one of my most distinguished constituents, Mr. H. W. Prentis, Jr., is board chairman of Armstrong Cork Co., Lancaster, Pa., a leading industry in my district. Mr. Prentis, in addition to being recognized as a great industrialist, has also received deserved acclaim for his activity in civic affairs and enjoys an enviable reputation as an authority on international relationships in the fields of industry and commerce. The copy of his address which is included with these remarks was delivered in Paris, France, on Sunday, May 23, last, in his capacity as chairman of the United States delegation to the Second International Conference of Manufacturers. I commend it to your attention as a concise statement on Americanism and our free enterprise system.

The address follows:

BEYOND THE NIGHT

(By H. W. Prentis, Jr.)

The great American poet and doctor, Oliver Wendell Holmes, once said that the way to live to a ripe old age was to get a constitutional disorder and take good care of it.

A prominent American businessman expressed much the same thought recently when he said: "To survey America's problems is to behold her promise." I paraphrase that thought for this audience, "to survey the free world's problems is to behold the free world's promise." It is the reason why so many men of good intent are gathered in this beautiful city and traditional diplomatic capital of the world.

Indeed, I feel that in a single week we have already gone far toward a rich harvest, for like good husbandmen we accomplished much of the ground-breaking and seed-planting at the regional meetings, and at the same time we of the American delegation enjoyed your European hospitality to the full. We have had the pleasure of renewing old friendships made at the First International Conference of Manufacturers, and the advantage of seeing your methods and of meeting you face to face in your own home countries.

I speak of problems in the plural number but there is not need to tell you gentlemen of the crude and ugly monster that towers above all others. For more than a generation you have seen its festering shadow creep across the face of a troubled earth until today it threatens one-half of the world's population. You have heard the story of its terror from the lips of 9½ million refugees.

You have seen the animal fury it releases bully and destroy and tamper with men's minds. You have seen nations tunneled into, and sapped, honeycombed, and weakened from within until they were rotted, dry shells ready to be taken over by their Communist masters. No word I can utter, no picture I can sketch will alter your own conception of this unprecedented and unrelenting war which waxes hot one day and cold the next. Still the struggle of the Titans goes on. The stronger of the two will prevail, the weaker will go to the wall.

We must not be the weaker; indeed it would be tragic if we of the free world, who have had and still have in our hands the means to victory, were to fall victims to this monstrous ideology because of our negligence, connivance, or our complacency.

Gentlemen, you are aware as I am of the line of goods the salesmen of the Kremlin have been peddling about the world. It is definitely an inferior product which can appeal only to those who are so hungry and so without hope that they don't concern themselves with the terrible price tag that goes along with the stamp "Made in Russia."

We have the weapon to defeat the commercial travelers of the Kremlin—a weapon that, put into the hands of the people, will rout the Red agents at one fell stroke. You know the weapon of which I speak: it is a higher standard of living.

To raise the standard of living for free peoples everywhere is not only our goal; it is our responsibility. And it can be accomplished in one way only, through productivity, through decreasing the cost of things that wages buy. In other words, to make it possible to buy more of the things we need and want with a day's work, because that is the only way the standard of living can be raised.

Time and experience have made the facts of productivity clear and simple. If all production work were to be done by hand, as it was before the industrial revolution, we could increase the volume of production only by having each worker turn out more units during the work day. Long ago management found out there was a limit to how much a workman could produce, with his own hands, and when that realization came the world was ripe for the industrial revolution and the development of better and more productive tools.

And it is our great need to produce more that highlights and underscores the topic of this conference, economic and social conditions for the development of free enterprise.

I don't believe one of you will challenge the assertion that full and increasing productivity flourishes only in a climate of free enterprise—enterprise free from the dead hand of socialism and statism. As one American statesman said: "Only the productive can be free."

To accomplish this continuing miracle of science we must dig at the roots, we must be men of vision, we must look through the deceptive veil of things as they seem to be and discern the things that are; we must be like the old guide at London's famous picture gallery, who used to point out the gigantic painting of the Battle of Waterloo with the remark, "In the middle stands General Wellington on a white horse, but you can't see 'im because of the smoke."

Like the Old Guide we must peer beneath the surface at the hidden elements we know are there, and above all else, we must unite our efforts in a spirit of cooperation, and for this reason it gives me no little satisfaction that the emphasis of the agenda of this Conference has been placed on human relations.

In the long and painful history of the world man has tried many devices to keep each worker at his task. The Pharoahs employed battalions of laborers to drag the massive stones of the pyramids, spurring on the workers like beasts of burden with bloody scourges and cutting the dead from the traces and replacing them with the living. The Russians use the bayonet and brainwashing and the big lie.

We in the United States strive by every means to induce each worker to put forth his best effort voluntarily. We try to plan our production so that his self-interest and that of society are directed to a common goal. We not only teach, we practice the importance and sanctity of the individual. We have no class system. We care not who a man's father was. We care only who the man is, what he stands for and what products flow from his hand and mind. That competitive freedom of the individual to advance to any height his energy and ability can take him is in my opinion the greatest single factor in the success of our economic system.

This philosophy of human relations, it seems to me, takes on increasing importance in an age of technological change. The demands on management are great. The new technology is not merely a flood of gadgets and machines that has burst upon us willy-nilly; it is a whole new concept, a new philosophy of production methods. If we are not to be Napoleonic generals waging an atomic war with rusty muskets, we must learn to understand fully what is involved and add a new dimension to our competence and vision. We must realize that the new technology requires more trained and educated people in industry, and above all else, we must learn the more enlightened methods by which these educated and skilled employees can be led, not driven.

This realization will come with the understanding of the new technology as a means of augmenting man's control over his economic environment by multiplying his mind power, whereas in the past we have sought to multiply first his physical strength and then his skill.

This new technology demands that industry assume the leadership in encouraging scientific study and experimentation, in developing training programs for workers and in supporting private and public education in every way it can. Only through broad general education will management get the skilled hands and enlightened minds to man the machines, and foremen of sufficient vision and adaptability to stand in the front rank of supervision. The new concept of management already is doing wonders in the United States. It not only acts as a spur to increased production; in time it may entirely wipe out class distinction, intolerance, and hate, and bring about an age of reason the like of which even the penetrating eye of Voltaire never dared contemplate.

There are bright facets of the new technology other than those reflecting human relations. It can hardly be denied that the most modern methods require increased efficiency in the use of new tools, and new principles of production bring about a demand for the creation of new markets by deliberate, systematic work. In addition, we must learn to stabilize employment, not through a guaranteed annual wage as some of our union leaders suggest at home, but by stabilizing production and sales.

There has already been a leveling off of sales peaks, a filling in of valleys. Business ingenuity produces new commodities, new markets balance sales, and educate customers to buy in the off seasons. In many cases the production curve is smoothed out by stockpiling raw materials, building inventories, subcontracting work during seasonal peaks, and using air conditioning to eliminate production difficulties due to atmospheric conditions.

All of the instruments of the new technology are not wrought metal tools put into skilled hands and directed by skilled minds. Management needs also the tools to make long-range decisions, the tools of research and the tools of economic analysis. One such tool which my own company has found effective for more than 25 years may be called "management by objectives." Under it 5-year sales goals are set at frequent intervals for every major product line. Such objectives determine what capital investments we shall have to anticipate making; what profit margins we should seek; how much we should allot for research and development, for marketing organization, sales and public relations, promotion and advertising; how many management people we shall need. Of course, these objectives have to be reexamined frequently and adjusted to economic disturbances or to product development by ourselves or our competitors. This policy, however, enables us to determine where we are going and how we are to get there, and to measure our progress and achievements.

I have just now made oblique reference to competition, and I never do it in present company without a sense of trespass. For along the road of free enterprise, competition is the hard, rocky crag on which we split. Whenever I see a European businessman listening patiently to an American's lusty arguments for the rough and tumble of open competition, and vice versa, I am reminded of one of Phil May's cartoons on the seamy side of London life. It depicted night and a pale, wretched woman in a shawl urging her tipsy and truant husband to please come home, and the husband, with all civility, in a voice compounded of gin and fog, saying, "Maria, I'll do anything in reason, but I will not go home."

I don't believe Americans are any fonder of competition than other businessmen. Competitors can be very annoying; they are stubborn and persistent, and they shatter our fondest dreams. But they do serve one purpose; they goad us on along the road of progress, sometimes against our will.

Competition frees the potential might of the individual to create and to produce. It offers men the greatest incentive to put new revolutionary ideas to work. It is a spur to productivity, and productivity is self-regenerating like the dragon's teeth sown by Cadmus. And finally, competition cuts off the fat from prices, forces the improvement and reimprovement of products and generally sharpens business on the rough whetstone of a free economy.

This is not only a theory of American business, it is the philosophy of the American people, and it has worked. I tell it to you again because of a conviction that though we have mentioned it often it is still not understood over here in Europe. I say that because of an episode involving our good German friends earlier this year. They were quoted as having said they would oppose the introduction of the American concept of competitive enterprise in West Germany because it would lead to the crushing of weaker enterprises and, I quote, "a great concentration of economic power along the undesirable United States pattern."

This statement reflects, I believe, a widely held viewpoint of industrialists in Europe and is highly inaccurate. I want to discuss it briefly.

Is American competition cannibalistic? Every fact I have ever seen points to the contrary conclusion. Let me cite a few.

There are more economic enterprises per 1,000 of population in the United States today than there were 50 years ago. A careful check shows 22 business firms for every 1,000 persons in 1900—26 for every 1,000 persons today.

Only last month the magazine published by the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, ran an article pointing out that while in 1854, 100 years ago, there were 310,000 small-business firms to serve 26½ million persons—today there are 4 million small-business firms to serve 162 million. It comments: "Thus, while population has increased more than 6 times, the number of small-business firms has increased nearly 11 times." The article goes on to show that small-business firms account for 96 percent of our 4,212,000 enterprises excluding farms and professional offices, and for nearly half the value of all goods and services.

I recall only a few years ago wide criticism in a report that 50 companies in the United States had 80 percent of all war contracts. The critics had not considered the fact that every large business depends for its existence upon hundreds, even thousands of small businesses. One of the 50 companies, Radio Corporation of America, made a survey of its particular war contracts. It found that 76 percent of all its orders had been subcontracted to smaller companies. In one case it had subcontracted an order for $5 million to businesses in 39 States. As the magazine, Nation's Business says, small business is the biggest business in America.

Fifty years ago industrial output per man hour was about the same in Europe and America. Now the United States output is about 2½ times greater. That is the cold, hard fact, not ascribable to our wealth of natural resource, or our large home market. It is rather a reflection of the character of our people, energized by a freely competitive system and a philosophy of government based on the theory that they are governed best who are governed least.

This concept of government, incidentally, was most succinctly and effectively set forth by President Eisenhower in his recent Economic Report: "The best service that the Government can render to our economy, besides helping to maintain stability and insuring a floor of protection for the population, is therefore to create an environment in which men are eager to make new jobs, to acquire new tools of production, to improve or scrap old ones, design new products and develop new markets, increase efficiency all around, and thus be able and willing to pay higher wages and provide better working conditions."

For its part, American industry asks no more favorable climate in which to carry on enterprising business, free from any government ties with the possible exception of an occasional government consultation, but ready at any moment to respond willingly in the presence of a national emergency.

I touch upon two other subjects, one of them involving another governmental responsibility. The ruling powers of every nation have the duty of providing the proper atmosphere for foreign investment. Venture capital must be guaranteed such ordinary safeguards as free convertibility and assurance against discrimination and nationalization without adequate compensation.

American investment abroad will greatly expand if encouraged. A recent study in the United States points out that American imports and exports, now at high levels have tapped only a small portion of the ultimate markets to which we shall one day sell and from which will come the additional raw materials we shall need.

This study also predicts that if in 1975 the American national income doubles at 700 billions, as expected, there will be 15 billions a year to put into foreign investment. To give a basis of comparison, 15 billions is more than the total of our foreign investments over the last 13 years.

I have dealt with many points on the agenda of this second international conference of manufacturers. I should not be surprised if some of you feel that I have explored some at unnecessary length and brushed off others in rather an offhand fashion. Taste is an unpredictable factor in the human equation, as is illustrated in the story of the two friends who died on the same day, one going to heaven, and the other to the place that is diametrically opposed. They were soon able to get into touch with one another, and the one in heaven wishing to know how his friend was getting on received this answer: "Not too bad. We have to shovel I don't know how many thousands of tons of coal but there are a half million of us to do it." Then he asked, "How are you doing upstairs?" And the other replied, "Terrible. There must be 10,000 miserable trumpets to polish and blow every day, and just 2 of us to do it."

And that, gentlemen, illustrates almost any number of management problems, including distant sources of power, understaffing, and faulty market distribution.

And now, if I have managed to prime the pump, if I have been able to arouse curiosity and interest without inciting resentment, then I have served my purpose. Man's industry has, indeed, come a long way since that far-off day when he made his first capital investment in the form of a crude stone weapon and set off into the prehistoric rain forest to find out what profit it would bring.

It has come a long way since James Watt discovered the all-powerful genii concealed in a common tea kettle. It has made the long journey propelled by steam, electricity, and gasoline; and in the future, powered by atomic enregy soon available for commercial use, it will go on to distant and undreamed-of horizons.

Perhaps some historian of the future—some future Pliny the Younger or Francis Parkman—recording the chronicles of our day, will have occasion to mention that the industrialists of the West met in the shadow of the Arc de Triomphe and undaunted by the wanton destruction of world wars and the constant threat of struggle to come and neither blinded by the sunburst of atomic and hydrogen bombs nor deafened by the constant thunder of clashing ideologies had the vision and the courage to look beyond the night and to build a better world for tomorrow.

Legislation That Nibbles at a Basic Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. ANDREWS

OF ALABAMA,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1954

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following editorial from the Dothan Eagle of May 20, 1954:

LEGISLATION THAT NIBBLES AT A BASIC FREEDOM

Congress is again toying with a piece of legislation aimed at a special group and which, if put upon the books, would pull a brick—several of them, in fact—from the foundation of freedom of speech.

This special legislation, now pending in the House Commerce Committee, is a bill that would restrict the advertising of alcoholic beverages. In fact, restrict is used loosely. It would prohibit this sort of advertising in interstate commerce, which is to say every medium in this day of mass circulation.

As all its readers know, this newspaper does not accept advertisements of alcoholic beverages. Nevertheless, we are as opposed to this legislation as if it compelled us to accept such advertisements. For, at stake is a fundamental principle that is as important to the backers of this legislation—whether they realize it or not—as any of the freedoms they prize.

Once the Federal Government, or even a State government, takes upon itself the right to censor what appears in the newspapers or any other advertising medium, freedom of speech goes out the window. A logical next step is to pass other laws and censor what still other groups don't like.

The National Temperance and Prohibition Council, one of the leaders for the bill to outlaw liquor and beer advertisements, has made the point that the target of this legislation is a commodity that "can easily become a menace to morals and to the general well-being of the Nation."

Following this line of reasoning, why shouldn't the people who deplore tobacco—and the doctors who hold there is a connection between smoking and lung cancer—ask for, and get, a law prohibiting the advertising of cigarettes? Why shouldn't the safety experts stop the advertising of automobiles? Don't automobiles kill people?

This isn't farfetched. Nothing is farfetched when a principle is bobtailed to pacify a certain group, regardless of the seemingly high motive of the group. It is downright dangerous. For this sort of censorship, once applied to advertising, would—and without to much delay—be extended to embrace all whims.

It is but a few steps from censoring what is printed to what is said, and ultimately, to what is thought. That isn't looking under the bed with alarm, but looking at history dispassionately.

Eisenhower Thanks Publishers for Gift of JPS Bible

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES G. OAKMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1954

Mr. OAKMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following article from the Detroit Jewish News of May 21, 1954:

EISENHOWER THANKS PUBLISHERS FOR GIFT OF JPS BIBLE

DETROIT, MICH.—President Eisenhower sent a personal message of thanks to the publishers of English-Jewish newspapers for the gift he received from them of a specially engraved Jewish Publication Society Bible.

In a letter addressed to Philip Slomovitz, retiring president of the American Association of English-Jewish Newspapers, who made the presentation of the Bible at the White House on May 14, the President wrote:

"DEAR MR. SLOMOVITZ: I am most grateful to you and to the delegation from the American Association of English-Jewish Newspapers for bringing me a Bible, and I am particularly touched by the inscription you have placed in it. I hope you will accept for yourself, and to convey to all who joined with you, my deep appreciation for your thoughtful kindness.

"With best wishes to all,

"Sincerely,

"DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER."

Federal Agency for Handicapped Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 25, 1954

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, in the 6 years I have been a Member of this body, I have consistently fought for better programs for our 38 million handicapped citizens. Today there is pending before the House Education and Labor Committee H. R. 2300, to establish a Federal agency for handicapped. This is the most comprehensive approach to the handicapped problem ever laid before the Congress and provides for maximum extension of medical services, vocational guidance and counseling, education and training, and full employment opportunities to all citizens handicapped by physical or mental disabilities, and also provides for—

First. Effective coordination of functions relating to rehabilitation and employment of handicapped.

Second. Establishes an independent Federal agency for handicapped, based, for housekeeping purposes, in the Department of Labor, and establishes in this agency an advisory council on affairs of the handicapped and an interagency committee on rehabilitation and employment of handicapped.

Third. Establishes an Office of Services for Blind in said agency.

Fourth. Cooperative enterprises for handicapped, one of the most needed activities to meet varied problems of handicapped people.

Fifth. Rehabilitation centers for handicapped.

Sixth. Special programs for severely handicapped, including establishment of workshops.

Seventh. Financial grants of $60 a month to handicapped who are totally disabled and termed by Federal or State rehabilitation agencies to be unfeasible for rehabilitation.

Eighth. Established Federal services for handicapped revolving loan fund, from which States may borrow money at such times as their own funds for vocational rehabilitation are exhausted.

Ninth. Establishes a division for handicapped in United States Civil Service Commission.

Tenth. Promotes safety programs designed to eliminate and prevent conditions tending to promote injuries or disease in Federal buildings, institutions, and parks, et cetera.

Eleventh. Calls for reports from all Federal agencies which may now receive, as part of their functions, reports relating to handicapped persons.

Twelth. Variable grants to States for vocational rehabilitation.

Thirteenth. Grants to handicapped who require special home training.

Fourteenth. Establishes a Federal Second Injury Act.

This, Mr. Speaker, is one of the vital problems before the Congress today, and I sincerely hope our Committee on Education and Labor speedily reports H. R. 2300 out, so we may thus be enabled to vote for it, and do our duty toward these millions of disabled citizens.

Arguments in Support of H. R. 2446, Introduced by Congressman Angell, 3d District of Oregon, and Its Companion Bill, H. R. 2447, Introduced by Congressman Secrest, 15th District of Ohio, Generally Known as the Townsend Pay-as-You-Go Old-Age Social-Security Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 26, 1954

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, those of us in the House who are supporting an old-age security program, nationwide, on a pay-as-you-go basis, appeared before the Ways and Means Committee of the House recently in support of H. R. 2446, which I introduced, and H. R. 2447, introduced by our colleague the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SECREST]. We presented to the Ways and Means Committee at that time a joint argument in which a number of our colleagues joined.

I include the argument herewith, together with the names of those who joined in it:

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, some of us, your colleagues, who are supporting H. R. 2446 and its companion bill, H. R. 2447, are joining in this presentation to you of our arguments for a favorable report on this bill so that it may be considered on the floor of the House at an early date. We are joining together in a common argument to save you time as we know the heavy program you have makes the conservation of time a necessity.

It is of deep interest to note the decided trend toward the adoption of a universal, pay-as-you-go, old-age security program. Those of us who, through the years, have been fighting for a genuine pay-as-you-go program are very much encouraged by the trend of recent events which show public opinion increasingly supporting amendments of social security so as to make its coverage universal and place it on a pay-as-you-go basis.

As we all know, there is a large number of worthy aged citizens of the United States who are not covered by the provisions of existing social-security legislation and who cannot qualify to come under it. Nevertheless the tax for its support, while contributed in the first instance through employers and employees, is in reality borne by everybody, and it is illogical and unsound to impose such a tax, which protects only limited and special groups, as is now done. Under House bill 2446 all citizens would share in the benefits of the program.

While the President is to be commended for his recommendations for the extension of social security and increase of benefits—which every Congressman will agree are badly needed—the coverage still fails to take within its protective shield all those who are entitled to be covered, and the benefits, even increased by the recommendations of the President, are wholly insufficient to maintain the elderly people of America in decency and health according to American standards. It is not in any sense enough. The time has come for an overall, comprehensive social-security program, and the program presented by House bills 2446 and 2447 should receive the consideration of the Congress.

I wish to recall a statement to this committee as of April 6, 1949, by ex-President Hoover, then Chairman of the Commission for the Organization of the Executive Department. He said:

"I wish to say at once that I strongly favor Government provisions for protection of the aged and their dependents. The problem before the Nation is to obtain a workable system, with a minimum of bureaucracy, adjusted to the economic strength of the country which gives assurance of security to this group. In my view, we have not yet found that system."

We feel that ex-President Hoover's statement is every bit as applicable today as it was then. We do not yet have any such system.

In his message to this present Congress on social security, President Eisenhower urged expansion of coverage and stated that benefits provided by the present system are insufficient to combat destitution. Our studies of his recommendations leave us convinced that coverage would still remain inadequate.

In fact, almost without exception, qualified experts who have examined into the old-age security problem facing our Nation have reported the deficiencies of the present system and need for major overhauling or substitution of a new system therefor. In the field of collective bargaining between labor and management, recent years have seen the development of private plans in industry the reserve funding of which already totals just about as much as the reserve fund of our OASI system. In the course of these collective-bargaining sessions between management and labor, these private systems have been justified on the basis of the inadequacy of the OASI.

We in America can be justly proud of our achievements in the development of our industrial production. It enables us to stand in the forefront of all nations in the ability to produce food, clothing, shelter, and other necessities of life in abundance—not only for our own people but to help other nations in need. This was a major factor in winning the war, and it remains a major factor in our international efforts to win the peace. However, with machine labor and mass production, we have found that many elderly people of America, by reason of the very success we have achieved in production, are deprived of remunerative employment in their declining years, and many of them are in dire need.

Existing economic and social conditions force upon us the complex question of security for the individual in our modern industrial civilization. Since 1919 the number of self-employed individuals in the United States has remained fairly constant at about 9 or 10 million. During the same period our total labor force has doubled. As our population and labor force have steadily grown, the percentage of self-employed has just as steadily declined. An ever-increasing percent of our people come to old age and inability to continue in employment with no opportunity for self-employment.

The young and vigorous are on the payrolls of this machine-age and the elderly citizens are relegated to the sidelines. As a result of this increasing unemployment of the aged, we are faced with the problem of social security to meet the needs for livelihood of this steadily increasing part of our population.

To meet this problem the 74th Congress passed Public Law 271 setting up the present social-security program. Since that time this law has been studied repeatedly and amended repeatedly. It is now before you for further amendments which in many respects are more extensive than any of the past.

There are nearly 200 bills pending before this 83d Congress seeking to improve various features of this insufficient law. After practically 20 years, during which Congress has dealt with the social-security problem on the basis of the present OASI system, can more conclusive evidence possibly be demanded that it is not, as it stands today, a satisfactory answer to the problem?

The failures and shortcomings of the present system are more than mere theoretical failures. What they mean is that millions of good Americans have lived out their elderly years under conditions of tragically unjust, economic hardships; and that up to this moment we still have done nothing to change that sorry state of affairs. It is time to realize that we are not going to solve the problem by continuing this same policy.

The problem of caring for the aged, the disabled, and families bereft of their breadwinners, as seen today in the eyes of proponents of the Townsend plan and others, is that there are many millions of such persons in need among us who are not now, and cannot in the future, be cared for in an honorable and just way by the present system of social security. Under the present system, millions of old folks and disabled people receive either hopelessly inadequate support, or no support at all. While there are millions of senior citizens too well off to get an old-age pension, they are too poor to live decently.

While comparison of the philosophy and objectives of the Townsend proposal and the present system shows them to have much in common, there are marked differences. Our proposal would give recognition to the past labors of the aged and would provide them dividends from the wealth they helped to create. It would give this as a matter of right without any direct relation to specific monetary contributions. The existing OASI program gives benefits as a matter of right, to carefuly defined groups, but ties them to a principle of insurance—something that each prospective annuitant and his employer buy as they participate in the productive processes of the country. Finally, old-age assistance is provided for the aged who, because of inadequate OASI coverage or benefits, are in need and should be helped.

We believe that annuities should be offered with neither the stigma of charity nor of poverty. They should be offered as dividends from the national wealth which every citizen helps to create. A system should be adopted to replace the complicated, arbitrary, and inequitable provisions of existing law. It should be one which will have a stimulative effect upon our economy and one which will help to make jobs available to all the young who will replace the aged as the latter move into retirement at a decent standard of living.

A major defect in the present system is the smallness of individual payments and their failure to raise the aged to a decent standard of living. Present payments, averaging about $50 a month for insured workers, leave those with nothing else to depend on in an utterly impoverished condition; and these benefits fail miserably in raising the elderly as a group to anything resembling a fair comparison with prevailing American living standards. The old-age-insurance program is based, in respect to the payments to recipients, upon the contributions made by the covered self-employed, employees, and their employers. This principle damages the benefit rights of workers who encounter economic misfortunes in the course of their lives, thereby lessening benefits to the very people who are destined to need and deserve benefits the most when they reach retirement. Therefore, President Eisenhower's recommendation to ignore a worker's worst 4 years of employment for purposes of computing benefits is to be commended as a desirable improvement.

Another major and pathetic defect is that the present system attempts to measure, in terms of fixed dollars, benefits to be paid as long as 50 years in the future, to workers now just starting their working lives. Surely by now we have sufficient experience with the depreciating value of the dollar to realize the futility of attempting to determine a fixed dollar income for retirement 10, 20, or 50 years in advance. Annuitants today, with fixed incomes based on prewar values, are able to buy only about one-half of the food, clothing, and other necessities their meager annuities would have provided before the war. Changes in the purchasing power of the dollar are so great that the attempts of one generation to set minimum decent living standards for succeeding generations, in terms of fixed dollars, can be satisfactory only by chance.

In attempting to do this extremely difficult thing the present system requires keeping meticulous individual records of the wage and working activities of 75 to 100 million covered workers over periods of time running up to 50 years.

It is most difficult to continue under any system having such basic flaws and honestly hold forth any hope that the American people are ever going to have a satisfactory solution of their social-security problem. To do so is to delude ourselves and the public.

Earlier this year, we were all pleased to witness recognition of many shortcomings of the present system in President Eisenhower's message to Congress on social security. We certainly agree that millions more of our people should be covered under whatever system we have than are covered presently under OASI. We approve of extension of coverage; but, we do not agree that the present system can provide adequate and secure coverage for all the American people who should be covered, unless the system is so drastically changed as virtually to repudiate its present principle in respect to coverage.

We were all equally pleased to hear the President characterize the benefits provided for in the present law as insufficient to combat destitution. We certainly agree that benefits, under whatever social-security program we might have, should be much higher than those presently provided.

However, we certainly do not agree that increasing the minimum OASI benefits from $25 to $30 a month is enough of a contribution to combating destitution. We equally find agreement impossible on the point that increasing the maximum benefits from $85 to $98.50 a month is of general benefit when we realize that such benefits would go only to workers with an average earning record of a flawless $300 a month. It is clear to us that the same consideration is true regarding the proposed maximum of $108 monthly benefit to be based upon a flawless wage record in covered employment of $350 a month. What a stepdown of living standards, for a majority of our people will result, under the benefit formula inherent in OASI.

It is only a year ago that our great problem was to find ways of overcoming inflation. Now we have, in the full sense, at least 4 million unemployed, costs of living still at their peak, and the great worry and problem is to combat deflation, recession, to prevent depression. Surpluses, resulting in unemployment, are gathering while we harbor a system of social security that fails adequately to amplify purchasing power among those very parts of our population where purchasing power is most inadequate; the aged, the incapacitated, the widowed mothers with dependent children, where purchasing power is pared right down to the very bone and often enough right into the marrow.

We are intensely interested in every possible improvement in any part of our social-security system—in any way that will, however slightly, help these people in need—but we do not accept these improvements as constituting the kind of progress in social security that the American people should have. It is on this basis that we press with all our ability for a program that will really solve this problem, once and for all, and as soon as possible. It is on this basis that we press for the adoption of the Townsend program—for congressional action on social security through the identical bills, H. R. 2446 and H. R. 2447. It is high time to solve this problem.

The Townsend plan is flexible. It would automatically change with changing conditions, changing living standards and purchasing power of the dollar, in terms of the real value of its benefits. We simply cannot see how any social-security program can securely provide security for the people unless it is designed to operate in this way.

Because of the fact that no such program has ever been in operation, direct statistics do not exist, and it is not possible, precisely, to calculate the individual benefits that would be available under H. R. 2446. However, there do exist sufficient data on business operations and on our population to make a perfectly reasonable and sound estimate on the basis of conditions in recent years.

Continuous study of the program presented in H. R. 2446 over many years enables us to calculate a gross income-tax rate that would obviously provide a desired amount of revenue under specified business conditions. This means that a given benefit goal, in terms of its relationship to general living standards, can be adopted and the needed tax rate established, so that the resulting benefits to individuals would then be set in a fixed ratio to general living standards and economic or business conditions. This completely overcomes the problem of benefits in terms of fixed dollar amounts which become utterly ineffective as prices, standards of living, and business conditions change.

These principles have been found necessary for adequate pensions among nations having much longer experience with social security than we have. The Social Security Bulletin of January 1954 features this question in a special article. It shows Sweden, after 40 years' experience, adopting a cost-of-living adjustment in 1950, and on top of it, a standard-of-living adjustment in 1953. Operating together, these two adjustments increased Swedish pensions 75 percent above their 1946 base period.

Townsend plan benefits would stay in step, maintaining their real value. It would only be the development of great changes, or after long periods of time, that adjustments would be needed; and then they would be mere adjustments in the light of solid and obvious needs. Once in operation, direct data by which to calculate precise benefit values and tax rates would be readily available at all times. The whole picture of social security, in this respect, would immediately and permanently become automatically available.

Sinnce the amounts payable under the Townsend plan will be determined by subtracting administrative costs from tax receipts, with the balance being wholly distributed in the form of benefits, there would be absolutely no surplus; there would be absolutely no debt. As far as social security is concerned, the budget would be balanced exactly. The opposite state of affairs that exists under the present OASI program is certainly thoroughly enough known to require no comment here.

It is obvious that administration of the Townsend plan would be tremendously less expensive than the cost of the present system; especially is this the case when we realize that the problem would be fully solved while under the present program we are far from solving it.

The tax proposed to finance the Townsend plan is a gross-income tax. Practically every argument that can be raised against this tax can be raised against nearly every other tax in force today. Two strong counterarguments, however, do exist against the so-called regressive nature of the proposed tax. The first is that no tax should be considered apart from the use to which the revenues derived from the tax are to be put. While sales taxes, for example, are objectionable, in respect to being regressive, the laudable purpose of the proposed tax overcomes this objection. It is apparent that persons in low-income groups will receive benefits at relatively small cost, while people in high-income groups will pay relatively more for the same benefits. Under the Townsend plan all will receive the same benefits. Therefore, instead of the tax actually being regressive, its final effect is progressive. Furthermore, it is not improper to suppose that the taxes—to the extent that they are not dissipated by the positive stimulus that the currently paid benefits will have on the economy—will be borne willingly by all in the realization that by paying a tax today they will guarantee themselves an honorable annuity when they, too, are disabled or reach the age of 60. All individual, personal incomes in excess of $250 monthly will be taxed 2 percent. There will be no other deductions. The tax will be wholly justified by this direct and completely reliable benefit to every taxpayer upon qualifying.

The thought behind this proposal is this: We have repeatedly experienced the production of surpluses that could not be sold with the results of overproduction, underconsumption and unemployment. Now, again, with industry having surfeited the postwar demand for goods long unavailable, with our rearmament and defense program leveling off, we are face to face with the same forces; surpluses are a looming and foreboding economic fact and unemployment has reached threatening proportions. The Townsend plan would help greatly by creating a new market which would buy up this accumulating surplus; it would keep industry going; it would prevent unemployment; simply everybody would benefit by escaping the great losses which these situations cause to just about everybody, big or small.

Early this year the Senate had quite an open discussion of agricultural surpluses, revealing the astronomical figures to which they had risen, with some 331 million pounds of butter, for example, in Government-storage at that time. However, it has also become clear that agricultural surpluses are only a part of the picture. Right across the board of industry and business, accumulating inventories, failing demand and consequent unemployment—which further depreciates demand—have been mounting concerns. The construction of the Townsend bill has been dictated by the obvious fact that raising the tragically inferior living standards of the aged and other disabled citizens to general American standards would enable these millions of people to purchase and consume these otherwise recurring surpluses of every kind. It is our contention that a fully adequate social-security system of this design would, in the long run, not only solve the social-security problem once and for all, but would also have a steady, stimulative effect on our general economy which would benefit virtually everybody. The economic results would offset the theoretical costs of such a program, completely.

Under such conditions of stabilized prosperity, subject to the powerful forces of expansion and economic growth which we, as a nation, have proven ourselves capable of, there would be greater and more confident opportunity for every individual in our land to work, to earn, to risk and to invest without the plague of surpluses with their costs and losses constantly recurring. What other way is there ever to absorb our surpluses except to create the market that can buy them and use them?

This is no longer only the idea of the Townsend movement. In recent times, there has been a constantly growing demand for action to increase buying power in our economy. Even tax reduction has been proposed for this purpose on the theory that more money would be left in consumers' hands. A very notable instance in the business world was the observation of Mr. T. V. Houser, vice president of the Sears, Roebuck & Co., in addressing the recent national convention of the National Retail Dry Goods Association. He spoke of pension plans as permitting people to spend in a way that would not be "prudent if the protection afforded by these funds did not exist * * * the average family can more nearly use current income for the immediate enjoyment of better living standards * * * families having to draw on such funds when extended illness or retirement comes have more current income for a sustained standard of living than would otherwise be the case." He further explained that pension plans bring about "an accumulated buying power, increasing year by year, which in previous decades did not exist at all."

Mr. Chairman, this committee has long been fully aware of the continuous receipt by Members of Congress of the endless flow of mail from constituents, revealing the widespread, shameful shortcomings of the present act, especially emphasizing its failure to give any relief to millions of already aged people. This has been going on year after year.

In spite of the many efforts to improve this act by amendments, dissatisfaction has grown with the passage of time. As more and more people who have been basing great hopes on our social-security system have come to the point where they have had to depend on it for support, too often disappointment and disillusionment have been their rewards.

The further we go in our technological development in the field of production, the more critical and intense this whole problem is going to become. The President has said that we do not need to rely upon the demands of war and defense in order to have economic prosperity; and with this view nobody could possibly agree more completely than we do. However, it is perfectly plain to us that the present social-security program offers too little toward this great ideal. It is equally clear to us that a sufficient social-security program will contribute tremendously to it. Therefore, we ask this committee to clear H. R. 2446 to the House as the basis for congressional action aimed at establishing such a social-security program—one truly worthy of the hope it inspires.

Now, in approaching the end of these remarks, I wish to speak about the actual specifications of H. R. 2446. Our studies have shown us that there is a great gap between the average living standards of the American people as a whole and the living standards of the aged. Although we have a social-security program, operating at Federal, State, and local levels; although we have many thousands of private pension and welfare funds; Federal, State, and local retirement systems for public employees; the railroad retirement system; life insurance; although we have all of the many efforts of the American people to provide for future security by saving and investment—and these complicated efforts are mighty, indeed, in their cost—yet the latest official data from the Census Bureau, showing the distribution of consumer income, reveal the elderly people still enduring income levels barely better than one-third of the national average. This is inclusive of all the income they receive in the form of benefits from any and all existing programs and resources.

H. R. 2446, based on the 2 percent gross income tax it proposes, would provide benefits which would replace many of these programs now existing (such as OASI and OAA) and would, in addition, bring the elderly people to close equality of income with other groups. The aged as a group would no longer endure inferiority and dependency; they would be equal as a group and none of them would have less than the Townsend plan pension—close to $130 monthly as of 1952, or close to $140 monthly as of 1953. As it is, not only is the income average of the aged about one-third the general average, but over 25 percent of the aged are completely dependent having absolutely no money income from any source.

It is time to have done with poverty and despair as the final rewards of life. Let us have full freedom and equality for our aged and disabled, and with it let us have unprecedented prosperity.

We, the undersigned Members of the House, most respectfully urge that House bill 2446 be reported by your committee to the House, so that the Congress may work its will upon this vitally needed legislation for the welfare of the aged of America.

Homer D. Angell.
Robert T. Secrest.

NAMES OF CONGRESSMEN WHO HAVE SIGNED JOINING IN THE PRESENTATION OF THE ATTACHED STATEMENT TO THE WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE, APRIL 10, 1954

Homer D. Angell; Robert T. Secrest; C. W. Bishop; Paul Cunningham; S. J. Crumpacker; H. R. Gross; Earl Wilson; Joseph P. O'Hara; Paul F. Schenck; William S. Hill; J. Edgar Chenoweth; James E. Van Zandt; Paul W. Shafer; William C. Cole; Wayne N. Aspinall; J. Harry McGregor; Ivor D. Fenton; Frank T. Bow; Frances P. Bolton; Robert J. Corbett; George H. Bender; Sam Coon; Willliam H. Ayres; Thomas E. Morgan; Vera Buchanan; John Phillips; A. Oakley Hunter; John Lesinski, Jr.; George D. O'Brien; Edward P. Boland; Elizabeth Kee; Thaddeus M. Machrowicz; Cleveland M. Bailey; Thomas P. O'Neill; Roy W. Wier; Harold D. Donohue; Harley O. Staggers; Thomas J. Lane; Philip J. Philbin; Katharine St. George; Dean P. Taylor; Bernard W. Kearney; W. R. Williams; William L. Dawson; Gracie Pfost; Barratt O'Hara; Thomas S. Gordon; Melvin Price; Edward A. Garmatz; Samuel N. Friedel; Clement J. Zablocki; Gardner R. Withrow; Harold O. Lovre; Alvin E. O'Konski; Harold C. Hagen; Thor C. Tollefson; Sid Simpson; Leon H. Gavin; Robert Crosser; William A. Barrett; William T. Granahan; James A. Byrne; Earl Chudoff; William J. Green, Jr.; George M. Rhodes; Augustine B. Kelly; Usher L. Burdick; Lee Metcalf; Hugh J. Addonizio; Abraham J. Multer; Adam Clayton Powell, Jr.; James G. Polk; Wayne L. Hays; Michael J. Kirwan; Michael A. Feighan; Craig Hosmer; Chet Holifield; Clyde Doyle; Sam Yorty; John A. Blatnik; Peter F. Mack, Jr.; A. S. J. Carnahan; Frank M. Karsten; Don Magnuson; Mrs. John B. Sullivan; Eugene J. McCarthy; Robert H. Mollohan; Morgan M. Moulder; Cecil R. King; Harry R. Sheppard; Lester Johnson; Charles S. Gubser; John F. Shelley; Bob Wilson; Fred Marshall.

Why Negotiate With Them?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT B. CHIPERFIELD
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 26, 1954

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following editorial from the Evening Star of May 19, 1954:

Why Negotiate With Them?

In his address at Williamsburg the other day, Secretary of State Dulles made a timely and persuasive point in explaining why it is wise and necessary to keep on negotiating with the Communists despite their constant display of bad faith and their implacable drive to put an end to freedom everywhere.

At first glance this may seem to be an unrealistic view. For the Soviet world, as Mr. Dulles has said, now dominates 800 million people and is fanatically dedicated to the task of winning similar mastery over the remaining two-thirds of the human race. In other words, the long-range objective of the Red totalitarians encompasses nothing less than the communization of the entire globe, and they are ceaselessly working to that end not merely because they lust for power but because they regard freedom anywhere as a constant peril to themselves and their tyranny—a contagion that they must wipe out for their own safety, as fast as possible wherever they can.

That is why the men of the Kremlin and their coconspirators in Europe and Asia have persistently torpedoed every western effort to work out with them fair and honorable agreements on crucial issues like atomic energy, Austria, Germany, Korea, and Indochina. They do not want such agreements. They do not want to cooperate in negotiating any settlements that would serve to promote a decent peace of liberty and justice. Instead, in Mr. Dulles' words, they continue to insist unyieldingly "upon a formula which will not only assure their despotism within the areas they now control but also allow them to apply their ruthless methods to gain control of the areas which are still free."

Why, then, should the United States and like-minded countries bother to negotiate with these people? Mr. Dulles himself has raised the question, and he has answered it by saying that "no man has the right to assume that he sees the future so clearly that he is justified in concluding either that war is inevitable or that methods of conciliation are futile. Efforts for honorable peace are required out of a decent respect for the opinion of mankind. Also, they clarify the issues" in a way that should alert the free nations and impel them to stand resolutely together for defense against the Communist menace—by far the most powerful and threatening form of despotism in the history of the world.

As for himself, Mr. Dulles has made clear that he is not pessimistic about the ability of the free nations to cope effectively with this immense threat. On the contrary, in his judgment, by persisting in the negotiating effort, they may well succeed—if they maintain proper unity and strength—in preventing war and eventually achieving the good peace they seek. He feels this way for these reasons, among others: (1) It is basic Soviet doctrine to make concessions and retreats when faced by powerful opposition; (2) there is an important amount of restiveness and discontent behind the Iron Curtain, and (3) the Communists, in defiance of man's ineradicable craving for liberty, have undertaken an impossible long-run task in attempting to impose their will on a third of humanity.

In any event, whether or not these points are wishful, there can be no doubt that Mr. Dulles is right in advocating that every avenue of negotiation be explored as long as there is even the slightest hope of arriving at sound agreements. Certainly, in this age of atomic-hydrogen weapons, a policy that would seek to settle issues through an all-out war can only be described as a last resort likely to engulf the whole world in catastrophe.

Rhee's Integrity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. F. NORRELL

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1954

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following editorial from the Washington Daily News of May 25, 1954:

Rhee's Integrity

Mudslingers determined to do a job on President Syngman Rhee, of Korea, as they have done on Chiang Kai-shek, will find themselves short of ammunition as the result of two recent developments.

For one thing, they said Mr. Rhee couldn't be trusted; that he not only would break the Korean armistice but would blow up the Geneva conference if it came anywhere near settlement of the Korean problem.

Despite the provocation of several hundred thousand Red Chinese aggressors left in Korea under the ridiculous terms of an unrealistic armistice, and despite daily violations by the Communist side, Mr. Rhee has adhered faithfully to the truce. And as for the Geneva talks, whose futility he perceived from the beginning, it turns out that he has made the first and only reasonable conciliatory proposal yet offered.

President Rhee, through his foreign minister at Geneva, told the conferees that as a step toward unification South Korea would agree to countrywide elections. Previously, Mr. Rhee insisted that elections be held only in the Communist-ruled north, to fill vacancies in the Seol parliament, which is the legally constituted government of all Korea.

The concession Mr. Rhee made is an important one. He has just held elections in South Korea and his government party won by a slim majority. No other election is authorized by the constitution for 4 years. Yet Mr. Rhee is willing for another vote at an early date covering the whole country—provided, of course, the Chinese army withdraws a month before the election.

The fact that the Chinese Reds abruptly rejected the concession is evidence enough of its fairness and good faith. The fact that Mr. Rhee offered it, undoubtedly at the suggestion if not pressure of the western allies, should disprove repeated charges heard in America that the old patriot is a stubborn, unreliable obstructionist.

The smear against Mr. Rhee, usually from the left or those who favor a soft policy toward communism, suffered another setback in the South Korean election itself, last week.

The Rhee haters said he was a dictator who would have nothing less than a police state and the elections would be a farce. The balloting was carried out peacefully and without intimidation. The results were barely favorable to the government party of Mr. Rhee. A substantial opposition vote and the election of a sizable group of independents are a clear refutation of the dictatorship argument.

Though Mr. Rhee is highly opinionated and strong-willed, his compliance with the rules of decency and democracy in final analysis is impressive. His course of conduct will not be overlooked by other free Asians, and he rates plaudits, rather than sharpshooting, from the West.

Communism in Guatemala

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1954

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following letter:

Brooklyn, N. Y., *May 18, 1954.*

The Honorable John Foster Dulles,
Secretary of State,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Secretary: As former chairman of both the Panama Canal and Trans-Isthmian Committees of the House of Representatives, I am deeply perturbed over the recent news emanating from Guatemala. It is true that for the past several years we Americans have been made conscious of a growing Communist sentiment in that small Republic, but we have regarded it for the major part as a resentment on the part of the native people against poor economic conditions. The shipping of arms into that land from a Communist-dominated area is a sign that portends no good for Guatemala itself, and is also a threat to the entire Western Hemisphere.

As chairman of the aforementioned committees it was my duty to travel extensively throughout Central America. By reason of these experiences I came to the conclusion that nowhere in the world were we so strategically weak as in that isthmus that connects North and South America. The possession and governing of this small strip of land connecting North and South America could indeed be the axle on which the political future and liberties of the entire Western World might turn.

Guatemala bordered on the north by the Republic of Mexico, on the east by British Honduras, the Caribbean Sea and Honduras, on the west by another portion of Mexico and the Pacific Ocean, and on the south by El Salvador, is by nature an area naturally sought by the Communists in their desire to rule the world. From this point Communist propaganda, arms, and ammunition could be sent into Mexico. The Pacific and the Caribbean provide harbors for the landing of agents, supplies, and all of the other things that can be used to creat unrest on this hemisphere. The fact that Guatemala is less than 2 hours time by fast military plane from our lifeline, the Panama Canal, must not be forgotten. A continuing hostile government in that Republic, whose whole theme is communistic, will compel both the United States and Mexico to spend many hundreds of millions of additional dollars to strengthen the entire Caribbean perimeter.

In the course of my travels throughout the isthmus, I could see that the one republic in that area that was really friendly to the United States was Nicaragua. Here alone was a people and a Government that had a real admiration and respect for our own country. Here alone did there seem to be a willingness to cooperate fully with us in our plans to strengthen the Western World.

It is not necessary for me, Mr. Secretary, to refresh your recollection as to the feeling that exists relative to the United States in the Republic of Panama which entirely surrounds our canal.

If we wait too long to rout out this cancer that is eating into the bowels of Central America, we shall pay for it in the future with many lives, hundreds of millions of dollars, and perhaps our own liberty. To date communism has not been able to get a foothold of any size in the Western Hemisphere, but if we permit a bold extension of communistic ideas and communistic power in the Republic of Guatemala, we are doing nothing more than encouraging Marxist growth in many of the poverty-stricken areas of the isthmus.

It is my belief that immediate, positive, affirmative steps should be taken by the United States, Mexico, Nicaragua, and any other strong, friendly Central American government to suppress and drive out the dangerous elements in Guatemala that are creating conditions that might lead to the Kremlin procuring a foothold in the Western World.

It is my suggestion, most respectfully and humbly submitted, that a conference of these friendly and potentially affected nations should be called and a plan drafted that will handle this situation speedily, effectively, and finally.

Yours respectfully,

Donald L. O'Toole.

The Bryson Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HORACE SEELY-BROWN, JR.

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1954

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the Record, I include herewith, at the request of Mrs. Norma Burgess Moore, treasurer, the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Connecticut, Inc., 36 Pearl Street, Hartford, Conn., a petition signed by residents of my congressional district in support of the Bryson bill, H. R. 1227:

To our Representatives in Congress:

We, the undersigned, your constitutents, earnestly beg you to give consideration to our constitutional rights as American citizens to be free in our homes of an offensive invasion by those who wish to increase their huge profits from the sales of alcoholic beverages by high-pressure advertising directed through magazines, newspapers, and over radio and television, at our children. We urge you to obtain consideration of and pass the Bryson bill (H. R. 2188).

Dorothy J. Bartlett, Mary K. Stark, Laura C. Munyan, Putnam, Conn.; Elizabeth N. Chase, Olga Mitchell, Danielson, Conn.; Margaret W. Leggett, Hartford, Conn.; Mary Crouch, Elsie G. Marsh, Mansfield Center, Conn.; Lena P. Davis. Willimantic, Conn.; Eva E. Huntington, Putnam, Conn.; Sarah Louise Hadley, Canterbury, Conn.; Eva E. Kimball, Scotland, Conn.; Lucy D. Richardson, Danielson, Conn.; Alice K. Willoughby, Ida L. Sager, Canterbury, Conn.; Carrie E. Robbins, East Thompson, Conn.; Rose A. Munyan, Putnam, Conn.; Lottie R. Hildreth, Brooklyn, Conn.. Helen T. Pellett; Loreen Warrender, Mary M. Eldridge, Mrs. Wilcox, Ruth A. Fisk, G. Emery Pratt, Danielson, Conn.

Ac

HO

IN T

Mr
ident
R. O
land,
the I
gress
Wash
can I

An
nance
marin
and
the A
tute,
this i
thoro
the na

I as
dress
Appen

The
was or
as fol

T

(Addre
fore
Rive
Hote

We a
Nature
water r
to incre
to be
be util
aspect
this me

How
harbor
of our
hundre
haps ev
vital an
system,
transpo
to our
great N
ciate th
tion to
mind t
medium
ally. T
that va
tion of
media
specific

If, as
present
portatio
element
logical

We ha
ing day,
the surv
sea mer

E

Appendix

Address Delivered by Former Senator O'Conor, of Maryland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER

OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 27, 1954

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, on May 26 the Honorable Herbert R. O'Conor, former Senator from Maryland, addressed the 41st convention of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress at the Mayflower Hotel here in Washington on the topic: "The American Merchant Marine."

An ardent advocate of the maintenance of a strong American merchant marine while he served in the Senate, and presently Washington counsel of the American Merchant Marine Institute, Inc., Senator O'Conor's views on this important subject are based on a thorough knowledge of the industry and the national policy regarding it.

I ask unanimous consent that his address of May 26, 1954, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE AMERICAN MERCHANT MARINE

(Address by Hon. Herbert R. O'Conor before the 41st convention of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C., May 26, 1954)

We are indeed a Nation richly endowed by Nature, and one of our priceless gifts is our water resources. In abundance there is water to increase the productivity of our soil, water to be converted into energy, and water to be utilized for navigation. It is to the last aspect that I would like to turn attention at this moment.

How fortunate we are now that river and harbor improvements became a vital concern of our National Government well over a hundred years ago. Today, more than perhaps ever before, water transportation is a vital and growing link in the transportation system, along with railroad, highway, and air transport, which together have contributed to our industrial might and made us a great Nation. One can more readily appreciate the contribution of water transportation to the American economy by bearing in mind that today we move through this medium about a billion tons of goods annually. These goods are transported at rates that vary from between 50 percent to a fraction of 1 percent of that through other media depending upon the haul and the specific commodity involved.

If, as a Nation, we have assumed our present stature largely because of our transportation system, we must see to it that all elements remain in balance—each playing its logical and normal role.

We have reason, therefore, with each passing day, to be more and more concerned about the survival prospects of the American deep-sea merchant marine and the shipbuilding industry with which it is so closely connected. Both are vital and interdependent segments of our water-transportation system. Both are indispensable to our mass-production economy and our Nation's defense.

Today the American ship operator faces problems which at times appear almost insurmountable for they must be attacked simultaneously on so many fronts—our shipping customers, the national administration, the Congress, State and municipal authorities, and, perhaps most important of all, the general public.

A national policy for the development and promotion of an American merchant marine had its beginning as far back as 1790, 34 years, by the way, before the Corps of Engineers laid hands on its first shovel. From that time America went on, uphill, to the glorious days of the American clipper—perhaps the golden age of American shipping.

The last few decades, however, have been replete with peaks and valleys of maritime prosperity. So much so in fact that in spite of repeated congressional mandates in support of this essential American industry, this Nation stands today face to face with basic problems which are somewhat foreboding but of vital concern to you individually, as Americans first, but also as members and guests of the 41st convention of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress.

Twice within our memory we have turned our backs to these problems, in frustrated hopefulness that our logistical-support requirements in war could be supplied by the fleets of friendly allies. In World War I we paid over $3 billion for that error, but repeated it in 1941 at the staggering cost of about $15 billion. It is impossible to estimate the extent of the suffering endured, the deprivation, or the loss of lives which resulted from being ill equipped on the high seas in those two great struggles. The state of world affairs today is such that only the blind would dare run that risk again, probably at a far greater price than ever before.

Due to its complete absorption as a dual-purpose industry, the American merchant marine can be closest to ready for emergencies by being in use during times of peace. We, no more than any other American industry, can be fully mobilized so as to meet the tremendous demands of modern war. We must, however, be prepared to have the vitality and know-how in being, to meet emergency expansion requirements. With each passing day our vitality becomes sapped, our essential minimum nucleus of skills on both the labor and management fronts grows weaker.

In the immediate postwar period there were more cargoes than there were ships. American ships, products of World War II, were relatively modern and at their greatest comparative advantage during an era when any ship could have done the job or gotten the business. One of our greatest problems results from the fact that today, and apparently for some time to come, trade has resumed a more normal pattern and cargo offerings have been greatly reduced. American ships at sea face ever-growing competition from newly built, specialized vessels under foreign flag. These foreign ships can, of course, outcompete ours since they are capable of being built and operated at far lower costs than American ships, primarily in the area of labor costs.

One potential medium for overcoming this great cost disadvantage is for us to build larger vessels of highly specialized types and great speed for United States flag operation. Vessels of this type provide greater per ton capacity without proportionate increase in either cost of construction or operation. By this device we may begin to narrow the gap between American and foreign costs.

There has, however, for a variety of reasons, been no substantial resort to this approach to date. Over 80 percent of our present fleet was built during World War II, less than 5 percent postwar. In contrast, 30 percent of foreign tonnage has been built since 1947. If the order book of the world's shipyards is any indication, our disadvantage, it appears, is growing greater rather than less. With over 18.5 million tons of shipping under contract throughout the world, only 2 percent is for United States flag operation. Our shipyards will, according to present indications, be without a single ship on the ways within 12 months.

It is essential, therefore, that we formulate now, programs for modernizing our fleet with specialized large ships of high speed more capable of competing on the high seas—not only in an effort to keep our fleet in commercial operation serving its normal day-to-day functions but also as a most pressing and rational program for saving our shipyards from extinction.

I believe it is also essential to call attention to the fact that before the war, in fairly characteristic fashion, a ship spent about one-third of its time in port and two-thirds of its time at sea. Today, just the reverse is the case. This has resulted from the fact that cargo handling efficiency has degenerated, that harbor facilities have not kept pace with the development of modern craft and the shoreside facilities, particularly those dedicated to cargo handling, have seen virtually no improvement.

A ship makes money only when it is at sea—time in port is a growing loss. A remarkable improvement in ship earnings would result from even the slightest increase in turn-around time. This means there must be constant endeavor to keep the physical harbors at maximum efficiency with constant efforts at improvement. It also means that municipalities and private owners must be constantly striving to improve their shoreside facilities (docks and piers, warehouses, truck and railroad approaches to the piers). It is also mandatory that every effort be made by labor to speed up ship movement in port so that maximum utilization can be made of cargo handling capacity.

A program of this type has many facets and hurdles but we hope that an enlightened public and the great spirit of cooperation between ship operators, shipbuilders, maritime labor and the Congress will help lead us toward the realization of this goal.

As you gentlemen of this convention obviously realize, such programs will mean that many harbor works improvements and new and expanded projects will be forthcoming to keep pace with the growth of the American merchant marine. In the meantime, it is necessary that in order to protect the Government's investment of billions of dollars in the development of our coastal harbors, satisfactory provisions should be made available to assure the fullest possible utilization of these facilities through adequate maintenance.

Unfortunately, such is not the case today. We are currently spending only about $60 million on river and harbor project maintenance. This, in effect, allows essential maintenance work to be undertaken on less than 1 out of every 4 projects requiring such activity.

Proper maintenance of harbor development projects represents a forward step, an aid for the ailing American fleet and most significant of all, a boon to the American public which is growing adequately aware of its increasing dependence on our foreign commerce in the survival and improvement of the American standard of living.

The vitally important purposes which bring together such a representative group as comprise the National Rivers and Harbors Congress extend far beyond the borders of your membership, as extensive as is that membership. The national economy and the national security are interwoven and have been greatly benefited by projects and undertakings which have been initiated as a result of your enterprise and knowledge.

Our Nation must keep pace with other world powers and must be self-reliant, rather than dependent on other nations which may be unwilling or unready to assist us in time of dire need. That readiness can be accomplished only by an aroused public opinion which is directed by the experience and the judgment of men who realize what is imperatively needed—and who assert their beliefs while there is still time to prepare for peacetime pursuits, never forgetting the potential of world catastrophe.

Statement by Senator Gore on S. 3434

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT GORE

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 27, 1954

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record the text of a statement which I made today before the Subcommittee on Business and Consumers Interest of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on Senate bill 3434, to amend section 10 (f) of the Federal Power Act to provide that charges shall be paid by Federal power projects which are benefited by stream improvements constructed by other parties, the payment to be determined in the same manner as for charges to be paid by non-Federal interests, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR ALBERT GORE BEFORE SUBCOMMITTEE ON BUSINESS AND CONSUMERS INTEREST COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE ON S. 3434, MAY 27, 1954

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate very much the opportunity to appear before your subcommittee for the purpose of presenting my views with reference to Senate bill 3434.

I am seriously concerned about the effects of the policy enunciated by the bill. I am concerned about the bill not only because of its direct or immediate effect but, also, because of its relation to and because it constitutes a part of a power policy now in the process of being developed by the administration which, in my opinion, is contrary to our public interest.

As I understand the bill, it would, if enacted, require that any federall-owned hydroelectric power project, either now in existence or to be later constructed, be reyuired to pay to the owners of any reservoir or water-use facility now in existence or hereafter constructed upstream therefrom an annual charge which would help to defray the cost of construction and the cost of operation of the upstream facility. I realize that, under existing law, privately-owned hydroelectric power projects may be required to pay an annual charge for benefits accruing to such project as a result of upstream reservoir construction.

Proponents of S. 3434 seek to justify the bill on the basis of what they are pleased to call equity. They would say that, since a private power project must pay for benefits accruing from upstream development, a similar duty should be imposed upon federally owned projects.

While the arguments presented in favor of this bill appear plausible, on the surface, such arguments ignore the fundamental distinctions between the two types of operation involved. The fact most often overlooked is that the water resources of our navigable streams belong to the people. The Supreme Court has repeatedly held that the right to develop such resources for the purpose of generation of hydroelectric power, in conjunction with other purposes, is a right which belongs to the people. No serious contention to the contrary has ever been successfully asserted. When the people, operating through their government, erect a hydroelectric generating plant, they are doing nothing more or less than using their own resources for their own benefit. On the other hand, a private concern may acquire the right to utilize the resources of our navigable streams for private gain only by license or permission granted by the Government. When such a license is granted, certain rights to and control over resources belonging to the people are, in effect, granted to private firms or individuals. It should certainly follow that, in the granting of such a license, the Government, in behalf of the people, should impose such conditions as may be appropriate to protect the public interest.

Let us examine for a moment the effect of the proposal embodied in S. 3434. Let us assume that, on river X, there exists a federally owned hydroelectric plant. Corporation A applies for and receives a license to construct a dam and generating facilities at some point upstream from the federally owned facility. Under existing procedures authorizing accelerated amortization of construction costs for tax purposes, a portion of the cost of construction of the privately owned plant is paid by the taxpayers indirectly in the form of a tax subsidy. Efforts are now being made to have incorporated in the pending tax-revision legislation a provision which would make permanent the authority for accelerated amortization by utilities. If S. 3434 is enacted, the taxpayers may be called upon to provide a further subsidy in the form of annual payments which will help to defray, not only the cost of construction, but the cost of operation as well. This will be true despite the fact that corporation A—far from having its rights prejudiced—has been granted the right and privilege of developing public resources belonging to all the people and to retain the profits resulting from their operation.

It is important to note that, under the terms of the bill, the duty to make such annual payments would be imposed not only on Federal projects to be constructed in the future but on those already in existence as well. The determination of the economic justification of existing projects was made without reference to any such additional burden. Amortization schedules have been established to provide for repayment to the Treasury of the cost of power elements of existing projects, based on cost allocations which did not take into account the possibility that the Government might have to pay some private firm for the privilege of utilizing resources which are already owned by the people.

Then, too, as I understand it, the benefits accruing to such private firms would be made available not only to upstream facilities to be constructed in the future but also to those already in operation. As to such existing privately owned plants, this proposal constitutes nothing more than a proposal for the payment by the Government of windfall profits which were not contemplated either by the private concern or by the Government at the time the license to erect such a facility was granted. After all is said and done, the objective of this proposal is to increase the cost of generating power at federally owned projects and to decrease the cost of generating power at privately owned projects. This means, of course, an increase in rates for publicly generated power. Federally owned projects will still be required to amortize their construction cost and to make payment into the Treasury therefor out of revenues derived for their operations over the period of time already established by law.

Increased rates for publicly generated power continue to be the vital objective of private utility interests. Enactment of S. 3434, or any other measure embodying the same principle, will inevitably force such rates up to the detriment of the people.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is apparent that I am opposed to S. 3434 on principle, because I do not feel that payments by the Federal Government to a private concern, which has been allowed to develop public resources for private benefit, is justifiable or in the public interest.

I turn now to some of the specific provisions of the bill.

It is implied that the bill would merely impose upon federally owned power projects a duty of making payments for annual benefits similar to those now required of licensees under existing law. But the bill does far more than that. It makes substantial changes in the law. The effect of some of these changes is not easily ascertainable from a study of the bill's provisions. The existing law provides for certain payments to be made by licensees or permittees who are "directly benefited by the construction work of another licensee, or permittee, or of the United States."

The bill before the committee provides for payments in the event of any benefits (the word "directly" is omitted) accruing from construction, operation, or maintenance of any reservoir or other water-use facility. The bill specifically provides that the amount of such annual payments shall be determined by taking into consideration both the fixed costs and the operating and maintenance costs of the upstream facility.

The bill further provides for a redetermination or readjustment of the annual charges each 5 years. While the formula for determination of the charges is set forth in the most general terms, it appears that the amount of the charges would vary from time to time in accordance with changes in operation.

The administrative requirements for making such determinations are difficult to estimate. Certainly a considerable number of personnel would have to be added to the Federal Power Commission staff in order to administer the proposed law. I hope the subcommittee will develop that point fully during the hearings.

Other provisions of the bill would seem to require a payment by one federally owned project to another also owned by the Federal Government. A determination of the amount of annual charges is required, even among the several projects owned and operated by the same Federal agency, and even though no actual payments would have to be made. Substantial expenditures would be required for making such determinations, together with the additional expense of complicated accounting adjustments. No useful purpose whatsoever would be served. In many instances, one Federal agency has constructed a series of hydroelectric power projects in accordance with an overall development plan for a river system. What possible purpose could be served by seeking to compute the monetary benefits accruing to each of these projects as a result of the existence of the other? Who is to say which projects, and to what extent each project shall share the benefits accruing from the construction and operation of the extreme up-river project? Does the extreme up-river project provide benefits for the extreme down-river projects even if there may be 6 or 8 projects in between?

In my opinion, an effort to make such determinations would serve no useful purpose and would constitute a waste of the taxpayers' money.

As I have previously indicated, the proponents of this legislation insist that they seek only to have imposed upon federally owned projects the same burden which they themselves now have to bear. In this connection, I am informed that the existing statute has been invoked only upon those occasions when a privately owned project initiated action to compel payment from another privately owned project located downstream therefrom. The Federal Government has never collected a cent from private concerns through operation of the existing law.

Mr. Chairman, in examining S. 3434, I have not restricted myself to looking at it as an isolated bill. It appears to me to be another piece in the developing pattern of administration power policy—a policy apparently dedicated to the eradiction of further power facility development—a policy apparently designed to favor private utilities. Already a number of specific proposals are before the Congress. Many of these would alter fundamentally a public power policy which has worked very well over many years. Important among these proposals is a bill to amend the Holding Company Act, exempting certain types of power companies from its provisions, and H. R. 8862, the amendment to the Atomic Energy Act which opens the use of the public's great new energy resource to private development without any of the safeguards of the Federal power policy.

Also before the Congress are bills which revise previous policy on construction and operation of such projects as the Hoover Dam, the John Day project, the Priest Rapids project, and the Coosa River projects in Alabama and Georgia.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that the effect of all of these bills together would be to alter fundamentally our Federal power policy. I believe this hearing should be held up and all these proposals should be brought together in one comprehensive hearing so that the changes may be considered together. Broader hearings should be held so that the interplay of these various proposals, each upon the other, may be considered and so that full public understanding of the intent and ultimate effect of these proposals may be promoted. I believe it is unwise to attempt to resolve arguments around S. 3434 without taking into consideration other proposed changes in Federal power policy.

Though proposed with the label of equity, I hold the bill neither equitable nor fair nor in the public interest.

Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 27, 1954

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by George J. Burger, vice president of the National Federation of Independent Business, before the Senate Judiciary Committee on May 21, 1954.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 175

(Statement of George J. Burger, vice president National Federation of Independent Business, Washington, D. C., before the Senate Judiciary Committee, Friday, May 21, 1954)

Mr. Chairman, first of all I want to thank you and the committee for giving me the opportunity, by invitation, to appear and give testimony in support of S. 175.

I am speaking in a dual capacity, as vice president in charge of the Washington office of the National Federation of Independent Business which organization has the largest individual membership of any business organization in the Nation, comprised exclusively of independent business and professional men. Its membership is in every State of the Union and its total membership is approximately 100,000 individual voting members. The head office is located at Burlingame, Calif., and division offices in New York, Chicago, Cincinnati, and Washington, D. C.

I am also appearing as the Washington representative of the Burger Tire Consultant Service and the National Independent, which has a membership comprising independent tire retailers throughout the Nation. The publication, the National Independent, can rightfully be classed as the spokesman for independent tire retailers.

I speak with full authority for both groups and my views in support of this legislation will be their views.

Insofar as the National Federation of Independent Business is concerned, I or no other officer is permitted to speak officially for the Federation unless so directed by the nationwide mandate vote of its members. The federation members have repeatedly voted on this legislation—favoring its adoption. A recent poll of the federation membership on this legislation disclosed 75 percent voted for forbidding manufacturers competing with their retail outlets, 22 percent against, and 3 percent no vote, and all Members of Congress have been so notified of their position.

BACKGROUND OF LEGISLATION

I think it's necessary to trace back the origin of this proposed legislation. It is my intention to keep my remarks to the minimum. However, there is a situation in view of the magnitude of the action taken on this legislation during the past 12 years through congressional committees, particularly in the Senate, that makes it necessary for the committee to have the full facts on the need for this legislation to be approved by the Congress at the earliest possible moment.

We are not unmindful of the invaluable help of the Small Business Committees of the Congress when late in 1941 through the Senate Small Business Committee, then headed by Senator JAMES E. MURRAY, and members of that committee at that time being the late Senator Francis Maloney, Connecticut; Hon. Allen J. Ellender, Louisiana; Hon. James M. Mead, New York; Hon. Tom Stewart, Tennessee; the late Senator Arthur Capper, Kansas; and the late Senator Robert A. Taft, Ohio, made an extensive study of the Small Business Problems of the Tire and Rubber Manufacturers and Retailers. I refer to Senate Committee Print No. 3, 77th Congress, 1st session. This document in itself could be classed as the "bible" of the rubber tire industry problems, and to the credit of the committee these past 12 years, the findings in that committee print have never yet been challenged.

I think it is necessary for the committee to note the findings in that report of 1941 and these findings were brought about through a questionnaire sent out by the Senate committee at the time to all members of the rubber tire industry and the answers in that questionnaire resulted in the findings in this report. The summary of the findings in the committee print were as follows:

"With few exceptions the problems of the small tire dealer can be classified as follows: (1) the preferential treatment accorded company-owned stores by manufacturers owning and operating those stores; (2) the preferential treatment accorded large retail corporations by certain manufacturers; (3) the tire manufacturer-oil company tieup; (4) sales made direct by certain manufacturers to certain large and small trucking operators and to so-called national accounts; (5) sales made direct by certain manufacturers to city, county, State, and Federal Governments; and abuse of these privileges; (6) tires rented on a mileage basis to bus and taxicab operators; (7) the rising costs which result principally from higher labor costs; (8) misleading and deceiving advertising; and (9) lack of standards by which various grades and makes of tires may be judged."

The committee, being desirous of pursuing its studies on the problem, on September 20, 1941, issued another report "Small business problems, small business and defense, Senate Committee Print No. 6." In this report will be found some very important statements made by the president of the General Tire & Rubber Co., Akron, Ohio, the president of the Seiberling Rubber Co., also of Akron, Ohio, and the late president of the Norwalk Tire & Rubber Co., Norwalk, Conn.—all in substance confirming in part or in full the earlier findings.

Shortly after Pearl Harbor, due to the plight facing the independent tire retailers and the smaller tire manufacturers, the House Small Business Committee went into extensive public hearings on the problems faced by the independents. Public hearings were held by that committee early in 1942, in which, at that time the committee recommended that for the duration of the war all sales and servicing of tires and tubes be channeled exclusively through the independent retailers.

On February 28, 1942, the Senate Small Business Committee by unanimous action, recommended a similar resolution. It was the hope of the Small Business Committees that the major factors in the rubber-tire industry would relinquish their position for the duration of the war in the retail field and permit that business to channel exclusively through independents. However, there was no intent on the part of the big factors in the rubber industry to relinquish their position, and it resulted in the fact that extensive public hearings were held by the Senate Small Business Committee on March 3, 4, 5, and 6, 1942, acting on Senate Resolution 298, 77th Congress, 2d session.

At the completion of these hearings it was the thinking of the committee to delay further action, with the hope that the tire manufacturers operating in the retail field through their stores would voluntarily discontinue their operation. Apparently, by their own actions, the major tire manufacturers took the opposite course, which resulted in the committee chairman, the Honorable James Murray, inviting the proponents and opponents to meet with him and the committee at Atlantic City, N. J., in May of 1942, with the hope that these major tire manfacturers owning and operating retail stores would voluntarily withdraw from the retail field for the duration of the war. The conference in Atlantic City was attended by representatives of the big rubber companies, and they flatly refused to accede to the request of the committee. Their action resulted in the committee, by unanimous action, directing legislation, Senate bill 2560, "a bill to provide for the effective utilization of existing stocks of rubber tires to aid in making rubber tires available for essential uses, and for other purposes." This was the foundation, and the starting point for the present legislation now before this committee, which legislation has been in the Congress for consideration in each and every Congress since 1942.

The Senate Banking and Currency Committee beginning on June 9, 1942, and ending on June 11, held extensive public hearings on the proposed legislation. Government officials, rubber-tire manufacturers, and independent dealers appeared and gave testimony.

On July 14 and 15 and November 19, 1942, again the Senate Banking and Currency Committee held public hearings in which witnesses from the independent tire retailers, and Government officials appeared and gave testimony on the pending legislation, resulting in the Committee on Banking and Currency unanimously approving the legislation and sending it to the floor of the Senate for action. When the bill was brought up on the floor of the Senate the authorized spokesman for the legislation on the floor was temporarily absent, and we lost our position on the calendar and then the Congress adjourned shortly thereafter without reaching the legislation.

The Senate Committee on Small Business, realizing that the problem was still a serious one facing the independent tire trade, again resumed public hearings under Senate Resolution 66, "A resolution to appoint a Special Committee To Study and Survey Problems of American Small Business Enterprises," and I am referring to the committee print, part 19, Tire Dealer and Rebuilder Problems, dated April 5, 7, and 8, and May 6 and 13, 1943, pertaining to the bill now numbered S. 1122.

It is significant and important to note an observation made then by the late William M. Jeffers, who at that time was the rubber Administrator and on leave from the Union Pacific Railroad as its president. Senator Ellender, a member of the committee, put the question to Mr. Jeffers (the reason the question was put to Mr. Jeffers, no doubt, was that in a hearing in 1942, Jeffers urged the Banking and Currency Committee to delay action on the bill):

"Senator Ellender. Will you kindly give us your views with respect to it?

"Mr. Jeffers. I think I can do that rather briefly. My first comment on the bill: It seems to me there is a lot of language. I imagine it is necessary. I do not know much about the preparation of bills. What it seeks to do, as I understand it—as I said before Senator Taft came in, I have gone over the bill perhaps rather hurriedly. I think I understand its import. My first comment on the bill is that there seems to be a lot of language, which may be necessary. As I understand it, the purpose of the bill is to prohibit or prevent the big rubber companies from using outlets. Now, as to that I think my views are pretty generally known. I am rather sympathetic with the independent tire dealer. I say that because in the present emergency had it not been for the independent tire dealer, so-called, we might have found ourselves in a lot of difficulty in this country because of the urgent necessity of recapping, retreading, and repairing so much tire equipment. I have no brief for the big rubber companies. I had hoped, as I said in a previous hearing, that the situation could be cleared up, perhaps through getting together, if that is not a violation of some sort of law in restraint of trade, that would prevent cutting prices, cutting prices to the extent the independent could not live. Now, you ask me as to my view on the bill. My view is this: I hold no brief for the big rubber companies. I think it is important and imperative that the independent be permitted to operate. Still I appreciate that the big rubber companies with their outlets have a good many millions of dollars invested. As to what is to become of that investment—that is something else again and something I have no responsibility for. That is for you gentlemen to determine. So I say I have no objection to the bill as now written."

Again the Banking and Currency Committee on March 7, 1944, held hearings on S. 1122. The witness before the committee was Mr. William T. Kelley, counsel of the Federal Trade Commission. It is significant to note that Mr. Kelly took 1 solid day to give testimony before the committee opposing the legislation. He appeared, as he said, as a private citizen and I am referring to committee print of Banking and Currency, part 2, dated March 7, 1944.

Again on November 9, 10, and 17, 1944, Banking and Currency Committee held extensive public hearings on the pending legislation. Leading representatives of the major rubber companies, independent tire retailers, Members of Congress, and others appeared to give testimony for or against the bill.

It is significant and important to note that at the time of Mr. Kelly's appearance before the Banking and Currency Committee the Federal Trade Commission was instructed to give their overall views on the pending legislation. You will note that the report appears in Senate Banking and Currency Committee print, "Distribution of motor-vehicle tires, hearings before the Committee on Banking and Currency, United States Senate, 78th Congress, 1st session on S. 1122," page 130, "and in substance they had nothing to offer to bring relief for the independent."

I think it is necessary, Mr. Chairman, to bring in at this point a statement made by the present chairman of the board of the Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co. He was then president of the Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co. I am referring to Mr. Paul Litchfield. Such statement appears in part in Federal Trade Commission Docket 2116, in the matter of Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co., dated March 5, 1936, page 8:

"The great body of Goodyear dealers, through which Goodyear tires are marketed, constitutes unquestionably, we think, the most efficient medium of distribution and service available to the tire-consuming public the world over."

It would be my opinion, as an active independent member of the rubber-tire industry from 1909 to 1935, that any and all statements made then or now by presidents of leading rubber companies would be along the same line. However, in my opinion, it's just mere words and no sincerity in the statement.

Through the untiring efforts of Senator James E. Murray to follow up in his efforts to protect the independent tire retailers of the Nation, and no doubt the purpose of the Senator's act was the warning of the late William M. Jeffers as to the need for this essential service to be maintained solely as a national security, Senator Murray continued action on the legislative moves, resulting in, in the 79th Congress, having a similar bill introduced under the number, S. 713.

Again the Senate Banking and Currency Committee on July 2 and 28, 1946, held extensive hearings with witnesses from tire dealers and spokesmen for major rubber company interests. Ex-Senator John Danaher appeared and gave testimony. Mr. Danaher was representing the B. F. Goodrich Rubber Co., opposing the legislation.

I think it is necessary to call to the attention of the committee that during the legislative career of this bill at least 118 witnesses appeared for or against the proposition.

It is to be noted that during the hearings before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee July 2, 1946, Senator Taft remarked to the committee in answer to a statement by myself: "I tried to get the Federal Trade Commission to come in and say here is the thing—if a company is going to sell tires at retail they cannot cut in any way under the price at which their dealers sell. Some such rule as that. I could not get any sympathy out of the Federal Trade Commission. They seemed to me to have just ducked the problem right from the beginning. I agree with Mr. Burger, Mr. Kelly came back and said, 'There is nothing we can do.'"

Senator Capehart, a member of the Banking and Currency Committee at the time and at that hearing, made these remarks:

"Someday we are going to have to face this problem, not only on tires but on many other things, unless industry themselves clean up their own houses, because business in America is fast eliminating the small independent merchant in most every line. It is bad for America, and it is bad for our system of government. I am hopeful that industry will clean it up themselves."

I said at the same hearing, and it holds true today more than ever: "You gentlemen must bear in mind—I think Senator Taft gave the utmost consideration to it during all the hearings of the Senate Small Business Committee—that it was these independent tire dealers—and it was—right in this room who presented a program that brought into existence a program that gave facilities to 20,000,000 passenger-car owners during he war. That came out of the planning of these independent dealers right in this room in 1942. I think in view of that fact they have shown their worth to this Nation. I see no reason to delay again, insofar as the independent tire dealers are concerned * * *. The rubber companies are never going to change their method of doing business. I have been a member of the industry ever since 1909. I go into every State in the Union and I know the problem."

I said in the same hearing: "The competition is most vicious," and Senator Millikin, of the committee, remarked, "I have heard many complaints on that" referring to the manufacturer's operation in the retail field.

Mr. Chairman, I could go on and on with factual evidence and statements that would show the need for Congress to act immediately on this needed legislation to protect these independent tire and service stations throughout the Nation. I believe the above referred to actions stress the need for immediate action before the remaining independents and the smaller rubber companies are wiped out of existence and monopoly will then be in full control.

GOVERNMENT VIEWS

I have discussed this pending legislation with top-ranking officials of both the Federal Trade Commission and the Department of Justice, competent career men in the Government, and they say without question of doubt, the only relief which can be given for the future of the independent tire dealers is through the rubber tires bill, such as is now pending before this committee for consideration, and while I am on this it is well to note the annual reports of the Small Business Committees of the Congress, as to their recommendations on this legislation. I quote (79th Cong. 2d sess., Senate Committee Print No. 16, Future of Independent Business—Progress Report of the Chairman to the Members of the Committee of the Special Committee to Study Problems of American Small Business, United States Senate, Jan. 2, 1947): "Because of the striking trend toward concentration of tire distribution into increasingly fewer units, it is recommended that the proposed bill, set forth in the appendix on page 364, receive the sympathetic consideration of Congress."

The American Maritime Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER

OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 27, 1954

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, the third of the series of articles on the American marine industry, written by Miss Helen Delich, maritime editor of the Baltimore Sun, appeared in that newspaper on May 22, 1954. Captioned "Lack of New Orders Poses Threat to United States Shipbuilders," it reveals a situation that calls for urgent action by the Congress.

I ask unanimous consent that this article be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LACK OF NEW ORDERS POSES THREAT TO UNITED STATES SHIPBUILDERS

(This is the third of four articles on the condition of the American maritime industry.)

(By Helen Delich)

The shipbuilding and repairing branches of the American maritime industry have the most immediate need for a remedy.

After December, there will be only two commercial ships remaining in the construction yards for delivery.

And most major repair yards already are down to less than half of their normal operating staffs.

Both are principally dependent upon the American merchant marine, for standard higher United States prices make foreign owners reluctant to use American yards unless absolutely necessary.

EMPLOYMENT FALLS

That factor points up why the port of Baltimore particularly is interested in the American merchant marine. Shipbuilding and repairing normally employ about 12,000 persons here; during the war the figure neared 100,000 as Baltimore led the Nation in ship production.

Today's total of 5,000 is declining and along with it the number of workers in local steamship offices and ship maintenance businesses also goes downward. The number of unemployed seamen rises, for the Baltimore area provides 20 percent of the Nation's sailors.

The shipbuilding dearth is simply due to the lack of new orders either by American or foreign interests. Actually, the Bethlehem-Sparrows Point Shipyard has been kept as active as it has to this point since 1947 by the many ships ordered here by Greeks and Greek-Americans.

NEAR ROCK BOTTOM

Even though the number of ships entering the port is higher than ever, the repairing end is near rock bottom because more than 50 percent of the ships coming in are foreign. On foreign vessels, the crew members do most of the minor repairs, while the major repairs are done in foreign yards.

In February, 188 ships were foreign, 168 American; in March, 278 were foreign, 247 American, and in April, 244 foreign, and 191 American. Many of the American ones came in here to join Baltimore's growing idle fleet of active ships.

The two Baltimore ship-repair yards are the best in the Nation, it has been said on numerous occasions by leading shipping executives. Yet, they are working less than 2,000 persons according to figures testified to in the Senate Water Transportation hearings.

CONVERSION JOBS LOST

The local shipyards took a beating last year when they presented the lowest bids for the conversion of three C-4 freighters into combination ore carriers and tankers, but the Eisenhower administration would not grant funds for a construction differential subsidy to make up for the double cost of having the work done in this country instead of Japan.

The first of these altered ships arrived about 2 weeks ago from Japan, and the others are due to be finished soon.

The $4,500,000 sought for the subsidy would have been returned to the Government in taxes, it was contended, plus providing employment for a highly skilled group. But the executive department ruled out the Maritime Administration's approval for this.

WORKERS HARD TO TRAIN

Skilled repair-yard workers are even harder to train than construction men, for experts say it is easier to build a whole ship from keel up than to add sections or make changes.

Although all American ships are supposed to have their repairs done in this country or pay a 50-percent tariff on those done abroad unless they are proven emergency repairs, it is known that at least one major American operator has even his painting and drydocking done in the Far East to save the higher American costs.

There isn't any way the customs can check this, for the customs inspector accepts the word of the ships' masters when they arrive back home and are entering their ships.

EMERGENCY PROGRAM

Senator BUTLER, as chairman of the Water Transportation Subcommittee, is hopeful of getting $25 million from the Administration to repair some of the ships in the reserve fleet under an emergency program to help out the repair yards.

However, after the refusal of the $4,500,000, many persons are dubious that the Administration will accept such an emergency plan on ships that will return to the dead fleet.

The industry endorses the emergency measure, but points out that a long-range program for the American merchant marine is needed to keep the repair yards on a steady basis.

The construction picture at Sparrows Point is that only two ships are yet to be launched—one next week and one in July—and then the 1953 world's leading shipyard will have to shut down in October.

RECOMMENDATION

The Murray report recommends that 60 merchant ships a year be built in the Nation's shipyards to keep a nucleus of 36,000 skilled workers employed.

The construction workers already are down to less than 18,000 and headed for 10,800 by the end of 1954 and 1,200 next year.

Many of the unemployed are men with 17 and 20 years of training. The great concern for the shipyard workers is that it takes about 10 years before a man attains the necessary skill.

The Sparrows Point yard as well as others around the Nation have been kept in operation thus far because of the numerous orders placed over here by Greeks and Greek Americans.

ONASSIS PROPOSAL

In fact, one of these Greeks, O. S. Onassis, probably the world's best known shipping magnate because of his ownership of Monte Carlo, wanted to build 15 oil tankers at the Sparrows Point and Quincy yards of Bethlehem Steel to help him fulfill his hotly debated contract with Saudi Arabia.

Only last week, British leaders attacked the agreement between Onassis and King Saud as unfair, and threatened to try and break it.

Under that contract, Onassis is to place a fleet of 25 to 30 oil tankers under the Arabian flag and transport a majority of the oil out of that country at a substantial fee.

When Onassis returned to this country last winter to be indicted for allegedly purchasing vessels under the Ship Sales Act of 1946 under fraudulent conditions, he discussed the construction of several of the ships here.

TALK OF CHANGE

However, because of the indictment, this has not happened. In the meantime, there is talk that he will build them abroad as he has most of his recent ships.

And his brother-in-law, Stavros S. Niarchos, another fabulous shipping magnate, abandoned his plans to build two more 45,000-ton tankers in the United States—at the Bethlehem-Quincy yard—because of the claims that he also allegedly purchased ships fraudulently.

Until the United States court finally settles this issue with these two and other shipowners, the shipbuilding and repairing industry in this country will suffer.

SHIPS BUILT ABROAD

Both Onassis and Niarchos contributed considerably to Sparrows Point's operations from 1947 through 1951, and to the local ship repair yards even today. In fact, a considerable share of the entire repair business in the port today stems from Greek and Greek-American-owned companies.

While this national group was the only foreign one to build in this country, many of the largest corporations in the United States built ships abroad. From 1947 to 1953, United States owners built 261 ships in foreign yards.

Some of these companies are the Aluminum Co. of America, Republic Steel Corp., Reynolds Metals Co., Gulf and Atlantic Shipping Co., United Fruit Co., Esso Transportation Co., the Texas Co., Cities Service, United States Steel, Socony-Vacuum, Standard Oil of California, and M. A. Hanna Co.

In addition, several American groups financed by large banks have built fleets of tankers abroad and chartered them to oil companies.

Louis S. Rothschild, maritime administrator, only this past week pointed out to American industry that it should assume some of the responsibility of keeping an American merchant marine alive and should build ships in American yards and sail them under American flags.

And others have pointed out that when shipbuilding is down in this country, other industries such as steel are affected by the lack of orders.

WOULD BUILD FOR ANYONE

The American shipbuilders want permission to build ships for anyone who wants one in order to keep their yards in operation. The high-priced United States maritime unions do not, because they are afraid of the competition from foreign flags.

The Department of Commerce restricts would-be foreign-flag builders from entering into any trade with the Communists, although there now appears a tendency toward an easing of this regulation.

The builders point out that all other countries build for all other foreign accounts, including American, and that England, Germany, and Holland are gaining by their freedom of movement. Many of the West European countries are even constructing ships for the Russians.

MURRAY REPORT

The recommendation in the Maritime Subsidy Policy, or Muray report, that this country should build 60 ships a year is nothing new.

In 1946, the CIO Shipyard Workers Union issued a plan called The Nation That Invented the Steamship Must Now Use It, outlining a program of building from 60 to 70 ships a year to keep the necessary nucleus of manpower available and to keep this Nation from becoming overburdened with cumbersome war-built ships and from facing block obsolescence.

The President's advisory committee on the merchant marine in 1947 recommended the construction of 46 new passenger ships. The only three built thus far have been in such litigation with the General Accounting Office that every other company has been afraid to apply for a construction differential subsidy to pay for them.

"MATTER OF CONCERN"

That same report also said:

It will be a matter of national concern if the number of men actually engaged in the construction of vessels in private and naval shipyards should drop below 60,000 and that every practicable effort should be made to so schedule shipbuilding that the workload in the shipyards may be maintained at a reasonably uniform level."

No attempt was ever made by a unified industry to see that the recommendations of the President's committee be enacted into reality.

In fact as late as this year, the industry has never produced a complete program by which Congress could be guided in a long-range merchant marine policy.

Virtually everything related to the merchant marine that appears on the legislative program today was produced in Washington by Congress or the administration.

IMMEDIATE PROSPECT

The immediate prospects for relieving the shipbuilding situation are:

1. The construction of 20 tankers to be chartered for long terms to the Navy. This matter was first introduced by Vice Adm. E. L. Cochrane when he was head of the Maritime Administration 2 years ago.

2. The construction of special prototype ships as proposed by the Maritime Administration and Department of Defense. The latter last year said the merchant marine needed 214 special-type ships in order to be well rounded, as well as replacing the old ones.

3. The construction of seven special-purpose ships for the Military Sea Transportation Service (again Government).

TRAILER-SHIP PLAN

4. The construction of coastwise and intercoastal trailer and train ships, depending on the financing. Private companies have been the instigator of these on individual bases and it is hoped they will revive this domestic trade.

One of the biggest obstacles in the way of new ship construction is the tremendous number—1,989 ships—in the reserve fleet, although fewer than 500 are considered good.

Most of the 500, however, are Liberties, which were described as being obsolete when they were built during World War II.

It has been recommended in many quarters that the reserve fleet should be scrapped and the $50 or $60 million accruing therefrom used in building new vessels or serving as as a revolving fund such as was set up in the 1936 act for new construction.

CONDITION FOR CHANGE

This would also help relieve the block obsolescence worry of the industry if replacement began now.

But the shipbuilding and repairing industries depend principally on the operators, and as one industry leader wryly said last week. "The situation in America is going to change and be safe only when shipping becomes attractive to operators to make them want to build and expand.

"And everyone has to help with that."

The Forgotten Consumer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR.
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 27, 1954

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address by my distinguished and charming colleague from St. Louis, Representative LEONOR K. SULLIVAN. The address entitled "The Forgotten Consumer" was made at the recent 1954 Democratic National Committee Conference on the American economy.

Mrs. SULLIVAN has been waging a valiant uphill battle in behalf of the forgotten men and women in our economy—the breadwinners and the housewives—who must provide food, clothing, and shelter for their families. Mrs. SULLIVAN speaks for the American family. I hope that her words will be read with as much interest and profit by our friends on the other side of the aisle as they will be by the members of my own party.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FORGOTTEN CONSUMER

(Address by Hon. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN, of Missouri)

I am glad there is at least one forum these days in which a Member of Congress is actually invited to discuss the plight of the forgotten consumer. It is a subject which I find myself discussing frequently, but not always—I should say, not often—by invitation.

On the occasions when I have taken the floor of the House to discuss this issue, I have detected something of a collective groan rising from the other side of the aisle—from the Republican side—which I suspect reflects a certain amount of boredom with the subject.

I am very sorry that the leadership of the Republican Party, particularly in the House, appears to be so bored with the subject of consumer interest and consumer problems and the dilemma of the average American family in making ends meet. And, of course, there is the additional problem of the unaverage American family—several millions of them now, I am afraid—which are without jobs or regular income and in many cases actually destitute. That, too, seems to bore the Republican leadership in the Congress. It also seems to bore the administration leaders downtown who, if they have not shut their eyes to it, at least don't seem to be looking in that direction.

Under the circumstances, then, I am sure you can understand my pleasure in being on this panel today among Democrats who believe that one of the most important functions of government is to keep its eyes focused at all times to the needs of the people and to the problems of the American family.

This conference today, and others like it which have been held across the country on a regional basis, demonstrate clearly why it is that a majority of the people of the United States are Democrats and believe in the principles of the Democratic Party.

When the Republican Party starts talking and thinking about the problems of the people—when it begins making any effort whatsoever to solve these problems on behalf of the people generally—that will be the day.

What are these problems? I am sure you can recite them just as well as I can. They are problems involving the great paradoxes of today's economy.

We have so much food in this country that many of our farmers are losing their shirts due to low prices at the farm level. Yet the cost of food to the consumer is at or near record levels. I am speaking now of the consumer food budget as a whole and not just coffee. Thousands of families in America just aren't getting enough to eat. I don't mean they are going without artichokes and caviar; I mean they are going hungry. The farmer's income from milk production is down, I understand, about 25 percent, but the price of milk in the corner grocery store stays right up there—well over 20 cents a quart. Thus the glaring paradox in food production and food prices.

Let's look at another paradox—housing. I think all of us can remember—it was only a year or so ago—being told that the best thing we could do to encourage more and better housing for the people of the United States was to raise interest rates and kill rent control. Interest rates were raised; rent control was killed. Are we better housed as a people today than we were a year ago? Have we made any real progress toward eliminating slums in the past year? Are the builders breaking records in the construction of new homes and new apartments for the American people at prices they can afford? The answers to these questions are "no," "no," "no." Public housing is virtually dead; the private housing-construction industry has not snapped out of its doldrums; slums are getting worse; and our municipal redevelopment programs initiated under the Democratic administration and wholeheartedly supported by most of the major cities of our country are being held up by the horrible difficulties of finding decent, habitable, respectable shelter for the families being displaced by redevelopment. We need more housing than ever; we are getting less housing than before; another paradox.

What about the job market? The breadwinner's job is a key concern, if not the key concern, to every consumer. Job opportunities are supposed to grow and flourish as business develops confidence in Government and in the future. That is what we were told all through those years of Democratic administrations when the implication was that if only the administration was not so antibusiness (or if there were a Republican administration) confidence would grow and expand and flourish, and so would job opportunities and payrolls, and so would prosperity. Well?

We have a Republican administration—a businessman's administration—and many of the foremost business organizations in the country tell us in ecstatic terms how their cup of confidence is full and brimming over. The stock market zooms with confidence. But, month by month, plants shut down, workers are furloughed or discharged, pay-

E

rolls shrink, joblessness grows. Another paradox and an exceedingly seriously one.

I raise these points this morning not as grist for Democratic campaign purposes. They are relevant issues in a campaign, and I am sure that all of us on the Democratic side will be using them. But as I look upon this conference, I think what we are most interested in doing is to lend the combined weight of our party and its officials and supporters to doing something about this situation now—to spotlight it for the purposes of corrective action and not just for partisan ammunition in an election which is still 6 months away. I firmly believe, the way things have been going, that the Democratic Party could probably win control of the Congress next November if we didn't do a single thing except sit and watch the Republicans destroy each other and perhaps the country too. But I am not willing to sit by for 6 months, and I don't think any of you here today are willing to sit by and do nothing for 6 months and merely wait for an inevitable political revolt and revulsion by the people against the party in power. I would be ashamed of my party if that is all we felt our responsibility to be. I think we are here to try to help bring some sanity out of the chaos of national affairs. Our record during the years our party was in office is clear proof of the interest of the Democratic Party in furthering the cause of each and every American family and every citizen.

It is our economy too, and what happens to people is our concern and always has been and, I hope, always will be. It is the thing which has always distinguished our party. The distinction becomes greater and greater as we see the bankruptcy of ideas in the Republican administration and in the Republican Party for solving problems of this kind. They can't solve them if they don't see them. Their greatest evils, if you will, are that they see no evil, and they hear no evil, when it comes to the economic security of the American people. As long as profits of corporations show up well in the financial records, I am afraid they do not look behind the reports and see that the high profits are in spite of fewer sales and less production.

Many proposals have been put forward by influential leaders of the Democratic Party for getting us back on the track to full employment and to a full employment psychology in the United States. I am glad that many of those proposals will be discussed here at these panel meetings. They reflect the vigor and imagination and boldness of approach of a united Democratic Party.

I know—because our experience through the years has demonstrated it—that the Democratic Party looks at these problems from the standpoint not just of one industry or another, of one special interest or another, of one geographic area or another, but from the standpoint of all the people, and particularly of the consumer. That is why I am proud to participate in these panel discussions. We are intent on rescuing the consumer from this limbo of the forgotten man. If our families individually have opportunity, opportunity for jobs and for better incomes, we have a basis for prosperity which is unmatched.

That menas, we can't sit by and close our eyes to all of the devices now being used to raise consumer costs, to raise his utility bills, to raise rents and the cost of housing.

We are not the party in control, it is true. But we have a conscience and a sense of responsibility in government which makes us, although a minority, a potent force in the Congress and in the country. All we have to do is get the facts across to the people and keep on following the path which we have pursued in the last 22 years. We must drive it home; for it is in the home that the deficiencies of the Republican administration are so seriously felt today.

The Situation in Indochina

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 27, 1954

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Indochina Alternatives," from the Wall Street Journal of May 21, 1954. It is the sacred duty of every American to analyze carefully these and other alternatives before jumping into a jungle war.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INDOCHINA ALTERNATIVES

If, as expected, the Geneva Conference fails to stop the fighting in Indochina, the danger is very great that the United States will be in that war before many months have passed.

Yet, late though it is, there is still time for the administration, Congress, and the people to reconsider this fateful prospect of intervention. This interval before irrevocable decisions must be reached is more than we had before Korea, and we should all make the most of it.

The arguments for intervention are familiar and forceful. Not the least is that we have already assumed a quasi-obligation to go in. We have urged the French to stay in the fight, and we have argued persuasively that this is not just a French colonial war but one front in the East-West conflict. Now the French appear disposed to continue the war if it is "internationalized"—if we and some others will fight too. Our own past declarations and our own definition of the war leave us in poor position to refuse.

It is also contended that our strategic interests dictate intervention. If Indochina falls, it may be possible to stop the Communists farther back in southeast Asia, but it would be much more costly; we would have sacrificed territory and perhaps the bulk of the more than 400,000 French Union forces now engaged in Indochina.

And if we then did not or could not hold the rest of southeast Asia, the Communists would have added millions of people to the 800 million they now control, and they would have added untold quantities of tin, rubber, and other natural riches to their warmaking potential.

The Communists' next steppingstone, the argument continues, would be Indonesia; once in control there they would be poised for attack on the Philippines. Even if they were unable for the time being to move beyond Indonesia, their victories to that point would have exerted a powerful pressure on what remained of free Asia; it is questionable if India, for example, could long remain out of the Communist orbit.

In sum, the reasoning is that American failure to intervene in Indochina might lose Asia and therefore shift the world's power balance perhaps decisively in the Kremlin's favor.

The arguments against intervention are less familiar but to this newspaper they are more forceful. First, the Communist territorial progress assumed by the interventionists is hypothetical. It is possible that, on the contrary, Communist conquest of Indochina would finally alert the rest of free Asia to its danger and create what is now lacking—the will to resist. And free Asia could resist if it wanted to.

Free Asia's present apathy, however, raises serious moral and practical obstacles to successful intervention. The people concerned have not asked, and many of them do not want, us to defend them against Communist colonialism.

In Vietnam, the Indochina state which is the war's principal theater, the majority of the people either favor the aims of the Communist Viet Minh or are indifferent to the consequences of those aims. The Governments of India and Burma are neutralist, which means in practice they give comfort to Communist China. And even while the United States tries to build a southeast Asian defense alliance, the Government of Indonesia talks about a nonaggression pact with Communist China.

There is considerable doubt whether we have any right to intervene in that kind of situation. And there is even greater doubt whether intervention would do any good. A people can be saved only if they want to be, and if the United States thinks and acts otherwise it is courting disaster.

But the fundamental question is: How is it best to wage the worldwide struggle against communism, of which Indochina is only one part? Should we try to stop the Communist march every place it starts, no matter what it costs us? Or should we exercise discretion in the use of our resources, against the day when we might have to fight communism in a total war?

It seems to us the answer is clear. If we go into Indochina or southeast Asia, we will be bled for the second time on the Asian mainland, where the advantages—land supply routes stretching back through the vast reaches of China and Russia, inexhaustible Asian manpower reserves—are all the enemy's. And for the second time we will be fighting a war against the Soviets in which the Soviets themselves lose not a man.

In its earlier days the Eisenhower administration concluded that that was precisely the sort of thing we should not do. Instead, we should fight the Communists, if we must fight them, in ways and at places and times of our choosing. That still makes sense.

Our advantage is the power to control the air and sea. Strategically, therefore, if we must draw a final line against Communist aggression, it would be better to draw it off the Asian mainland than on it.

There is much the United States can do, short of intervention, to help those Asians who want to prevent Communist conquest. It is realistic for us to offer such help. But it is not realistic, it is not in the national interest, it is not wise, and it is not even courageous to charge into a fight where all the odds are against us.

Anniversary of Armenian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GUY M. GILLETTE

OF IOWA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 27, 1954

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a brief statement prepared by me on the anniversary of Armenian Independence Day, May 28.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Statement by Senator Gillette

On the 28th of May each year the Armenian people in the United States and throughout the world celebrate the anniversary of the independence of Armenia. Thirty-six years ago the people of Armenia established their freedom from foreign domination. Their country existed as an independent nation for 2 years, only to be swallowed up again in 1920 by the Soviet Empire.

I rise to express what I know to be the feelings of millions of liberty-loving Americans: We salute the brave Armenian people on the occasion of this 36th anniversary of their independence and we pray with them for the early deliverance of their oppressed homeland from the yoke of Soviet totalitarian tyranny.

The American Maritime Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 27, 1954

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the Record, an article by Miss Helen Delich, which appeared in the Baltimore Sun of May 23, 1954.

The last of a series of four articles dealing with the American merchant marine, it bears the title "Ship Slump Laid to Poor Public Relations." It offers considerable food for thought to all who have the interests of American shipping at heart.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Ship Slump Laid to Poor Public Relations

(This is the last of four articles on the condition of the American maritime industry.)

(By Helen Delich)

Rates to transport cargo on American flagships are not any higher than those on any foreign flagship within the same conference.

Yet American bottoms carried only 29.1 percent of the United States freight—including that for all military and foreign aid programs—last year, when the national goal was at least 50 percent.

Many sources attribute this to the failure of the American maritime industry to sell itself to American industries and the public. For instance, most persons do not know that the freight rates are not higher although they know ship costs are considerably greater.

POOR PUBLIC RELATIONS

Robert B. Murray, Under Secretary of Commerce in charge of transportation, and numerous Senators and Representatives on marine committees, constantly have criticized the poor public relations and selling program of the industry.

In fact, it is pointed out that American maritime interests spend less by far on solicitation, advertising, and public relations than any other industry.

Many industries spend as much or more than 3 percent of their gross operating revenue for this purpose. The maritime industry average is less than eight-tenths of 1 percent.

In a talk on Shipping's Greatest Need: An Informed Public, Eugene Hoffman, vice president of the American President Lines, said:

"The industry is like a sick man who goes from one doctor to another hoping to get a more favorable decision both as to the diagnosis of his ills and the cost of the cure."

JOB NEEDS DOING

He referred to the numerous surveys paid for by the industry on why the public does not support the merchant marine any better. Each one says virtually the same thing—an extensive, well-planned, public relations, and selling campaign is needed.

The most recent survey stated:

"This memorandum, as such, solves no problems and achieves no objectives unless it is implemented by shipping management with the leadership, the funds, the personnel, and the continuity necessary to assure success over a period of time. The success of any such effort calls for a conviction on the part of management that the job needs doing and a determination that management itself will participate actively and personally."

SPLIT WITHIN INDUSTRY

Part of the poor public relations and selling program is attributed to the sharp division within the merchant marine. In 1950 when the division was considered bad, there were only four groups within the industry.

Now there are five—each vying for itself.

The lack of one organization to spearhead the whole industry is held one of the principal reasons for continued failure to establish a firm congressional program before Congress gets started each year.

As a result, the session is almost over every year before important legislation reaches the floor (and some of it never does), with the result that it is killed. Then it takes months the next time to reach the same roadblock.

VOLUMES OF TESTIMONY

Senator Magnuson, Democrat, of Washington, a member of Senator Butler's subcommittee and former chairman of a similar committee, painted the matter up Wednesday when he commented:

"We have volumes of wonderful testimony that extend over several years confirming the fact that something should be done. We here are all in firm agreement that something should be done. But no one comes up here to the Appropriations Committee and asks for a check. Even this year we're almost through and no one has asked for appropriations for maritime except in one instance and that faces curtailment."

The Washington Senator meant that there has never been executive department pressure to enact legislation for the merchant marine because no one has sold those sources on the fleet's needs. Too, he indicated that the lack of selling members of the Appropriations Committee on the industry resulted in cutbacks of whatever appropriations were ever sought.

SELLING TO OURSELVES

"We do a beautiful job of selling our industry to ourselves only," an industry man present wryly commented.

Actual examples of how the maritime industry has muffed opportunities for promotion:

1. The Illinois Manufacturers Association sought a speaker to sell its members on using American bottoms on the basis that Government subsidies would be cut down and the taxpayer saved some money. The association also wanted a letter that could be sent after the speech. In fact, the association wanted to make arrangements in other States for similar meetings. Many, many months later the industry finally sent a speaker, but there hasn't been any follow-up.

2. The Maritime Commission public relations office established an excellent program in 8,700 schools for an annual cost of $50,000. The appropriation was curtailed, so an appeal was made to the industry to continue the program. Even after the amount was chiseled down to $7,000, no part in the industry would support it.

PUBLISHER'S OFFER

3. A book publisher wanted to have a popular type nonfiction book written on a phase of the industry, with emphasis on the one company that would post $5,000 to guarantee the first sale, with the publisher assuming all further responsibilities. No one picked up the opportunity.

4. A national foundation offered to make four excellent movies on the maritime industry with the only financial request being about $40,000 to help with extra copies and some small expenses. It was bypassed.

TV TIME REJECTED

5. The industry did not keep together the joint committee for the American merchant marine, which at one time was composed of 29 different organizations—including those not directly benefiting from shipping such as the American Legion and Veterans of Foreign Wars. These two veteran organizations still are active in behalf of the fleet on a lesser scale and independently, principally because 1 or 2 persons within the organizations love it.

6. Free television time is not used because no one in the industry will spend anything for production on an industry-wide basis.

7. Posters to promote National Maritime Day (yesterday) could not be printed because the almost negligible funds were not available.

NO BIDS FROM OWNERS

Some of the other faults pointed out in various surveys:

1. The maritime industries do not consider their public-relations men important and do not permit them to sit in on policy matters, nor do they keep these men informed of what is going on within the company.

2. A traffic manager for one of the Nation's leading manufacturers became sold on the United States fleet when he served with the Department of Defense. However, since he has been in private industry and received absolutely no bids from American shipowners, he routes his cargo on foreign vessels.

3. In the tonnage-heavy Midwest—Chicago—one man represents several American-flag lines, plus a few foreign ones, in freight solicitation.

4. The only apparent promotion is done at Propeller Club meetings and the national Propeller Club convention when the industry members reconvince themselves at regular intervals that the merchant marine is wonderful and must be kept operating. That promotion halts then until the next meeting of the Propeller Club, whose members consist solely of maritime interests.

"SYSTEMATIC LAZINESS"

One man close to the scene expressed it this way:

"This is a product where you know who the customers are. You don't have to go searching for the customers such as a car salesman who isn't certain whether a person is a driver until he makes an inquiry.

"There seems to be a systematic laziness on the individual company and industry basis. They don't want people to know about the product."

A number of Congressmen over the last year have expressed opposition to being appointed to the maritime committees because such appointments mean nothing to people at home, even though in many instances home is a seacoast State.

"NO ONE HAS TOLD THEM"

"My people don't know why we need an American merchant marine," one explained, "because no one has told them. They think I'm wasting my time."

Only last year, Senator Potter, Republican, of Michigan, was called to task by his constituents for his activity as chairman of the Subcommittee on the Merchant Marine because they didn't feel it good enough for him.

And others have advanced from the House to Senate after getting off of that committee and serving on one better known.

Last week, Representative Shelley, Democrat, of California, who has been one of the best friends the maritime interests have ever had for years, repeated his complete disgust with the industry because it will not be consistent.

ON MSTS HEARINGS

His particular reference was to the Military Sea Transportation Service investigation now underway in the House.

"For years they (private shipowners) have been complaining about the MSTS and begging us to do something about it so they can carry the freight by themselves on their own ships," Mr. Shelley said.

"So we set up the hearing. And what happens? They now come pleading for us to lay off because 'we're getting a little of that freight now.' And only one would get up and testify against the MSTS even though we know all of them felt that way and wanted the military out. I admire General Franklin for his courage."

The one was John M. Franklin, president of United States Lines.

UNDER $1 OUT OF $1,000

According to information gathered by John F. Rudy, former public relations director for the National Federation of American Shipping and now editor of the Whaley-Eaton News Service, the steamship industry spends less than $1 out of every $1,000 gross revenues on promotion.

He points out that if the substantial passenger ship advertising of a few prominent lines were curtailed, the amount would be 12 cents out of every $1,000.

And there isn't any planned campaign even for this expenditure.

This is compared to the railroad industry which spends $2.40 out of each $1,000 of operating revenue in a thoroughly organized approach.

THREE DOLLARS IN ONE THOUSAND DOLLARS FOR TRUCKERS

Not only are the railroads organized on a company-by-company basis, but on a State-by-State, region-by-region, and finally nationally, Mr. Rudy notes.

The trucking industry also spends about $3 out of every $1,000 on a campaign organized State-by-State, region-by-region, and nationally, in addition to individual company promotion.

One soap company spends $89 out of every $1,000 on advertising alone, not including public relations and selling; a food company, $44.79 out of every $1,000 for advertising; a tobacco company, $21.59; and a bus company, $3.32.

FILMS NOT INCLUDED

The American Telephone & Telegraph, whose institutionalism could be compared to the American merchant marine, spends $17.44 out of every $1,000 for advertising alone to keep itself on good terms with the public.

The bus company estimates that its total selling, public relations, and advertising bill amounts to $16 out of every $1,000.

These figures do not include pamphlets, movies, educational kits, free photographs, and other public relations items.

A survey in the maritime industry shows the following expenditure for solicitation, entertainment, and advertising among several leading companies: 1.03 percent of expenses for one; 0.43 percent another; 1.33 percent for the third; 0.60 another; 0.56 percent; 0.46 percent; 0.27 percent; 1.16 percent; and 1.36 percent.

TWO MILLION DOLLARS MAY BE HIGH

The overall estimated operating revenue of the entire American maritime industry is $2 billion. On the basis of the minimum of what most other companies and industries do, the total spent annually on public relations, advertising, promotion, and selling should be well over the $20 million mark. As it is, $2 million may be high.

The maritime interests are one of the few who do not have any market research programs. As far as could be determined, only one shipyard has ever had such a study made for potential customers.

Several recommendations made in overall surveys of the situation are:

1. Produce new and up-to-date films.
2. Establish more cooperation with schools, trade associations, veteran and civic groups through speakers and materials of various kinds.

(There is an untouched potential of 18 million to 20 million belonging to various organizations—industrial, educational, youth, veteran, political, women's, maritime, and others.)

3. Concentrate on today's activities, not the past history.
4. Include country newspapers, radio, and television in any program.

SUMMARY IN THESIS

The best summary of suggestions available was found in a thesis prepared by Miss Barbara Boardman, of the Maritime Administration's public relations office, recently. It reads:

"The appeal to the public should be kept simple and uncomplicated to prevent confusion and misunderstanding. It should have emotional basis as pride in the achievement of the United States in becoming the greatest maritime nation, prejudice against any attempt to drive it from that position, and fear of weakening the fleet to leave the country exposed in case of war.

"American-flag ships should be clothed with an aura which will make people proud to sail and ship in them. Stories about bad service harm the prestige of the merchant marine. Public-relations men should be encouraged to originate, circulate, and promote slogans and stories on the favorite side.

UNIQUE SERVICES SEEN

"Railroads and airlines have sold the people on the idea that American companies are the best in the world and offer every kind of service in freight and passenger accommodations that can possibly be obtained. Freighters should be publicized as part of the national transportation plant; the special and unique services which ships alone can offer should be played up.

"One public information official believed that the need was not to spend thousands of dollars on paid advertising, but to furnish the facts to local traders, shippers, chambers of commerce, and other organizations whose business is partly or wholly dependent on shipping.

"Translating such information on the basis of local self-interest as what shipping companies buy from inland communities, the development of foreign trade, and carriage of exports and imports which concern every community can be turned into valuable public relations and good will for the American merchant marine."

With sensible and truthful information, pictograms, posters, films, trade maps, and such materials, it was suggested that the industry should cultivate college presidents, ministers, columnists, organization leaders, and other influential people.

Citizenship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR.

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 27, 1954

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, a distinguished citizen of St. Louis, Col. John J. Griffin, who has devoted a great deal of time and thought to the problem of an effective functioning democracy, recently made an address which certainly merits our attention. His speech is entitled "Citizenship" and is dedicated to the proposition that too frequently we tend to think only of the privileges of citizenship and to neglect the duties and responsibilities inherent in our privleged status.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have Colonel Griffin's speech printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

CITIZENSHIP

(Address by Col. John J. Griffin, vice president, United Bank & Trust Co., South Side Kiwanis Club, St. Louis, Mo., November 13, 1953)

The definition I like of "citizen" is one given in Webster's: "A person, native or naturalized, who owes allegiance to a government, and is entitled to protection from it." I think that definition probably fits everyone in this country, qualified. So, let us look into the record and see how they who are enjoying the blessings so abundantly showered upon them in this great country of ours, are measuring up to the duty imposed, by the acceptance of these blessings, in repaying them.

There is no doubt in my mind that if anyone were to accuse over 50 percent of our population of the crime of not being good citizens, they would find reaction from those so accused that would not be pleasant. But are they good citizens?

My definition of a good citizen is one, who not only accepts the protection this great Government offers to him but realizes that with the acceptance of such, there comes a responsibility upon him to meet the obligation that the acceptance of such blessings bring. What are these responsibilities? Under the laws of this land you are entitled to the protection of rights which are yours, it is the duty and obligation of the Government to so protect your rights that they shall not be infringed upon; but with this also comes a direct obligation upon you, as a good citizen, of obedience to the laws as prescribed in the particular community, State or Nation, so that you shall not violate the rights of other citizens.

Unfortunately, today there are too many people in this country who have disregarded completely the laws of the land, and are living a lawless, selfish existence for their benefit and their benefit only, in defiance of both the moral and legal law. That, of course, you may say is a far-fetched statement. Nevertheless, the record shows the statement to be true. So, let us again consult the record. Uniform Crime Reports, as published by J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, reports that every 5 minutes during 1950 someone in the United States was feloniously assaulted or killed; during each day of the year 1950, 146 persons were robbed, 458 cars were stolen, 11,029 places were entered by burglars, and every 30 seconds throughout the year a larceny was recorded. During that period of time, the crime record had increased in percentage figures from 1½ percent to 10 percent above the 1949 figures. But the sad part of it is the records show that in 41 percent of the arrests for major violations, age 21 predominated in the frequency of arrests, and believe it or not, 9.6 percent of the total were females. I have used the year 1950 as a breakdown so that I could bring home to you more forcibly the fact that the situation is not improving. In 1951 the increase in the overall picture was approximately 6½ percent over the 1950 picture. In 1952 the percentage is approximately 8 percent above the 1951 figures. When the figures are compiled for the year of 1953 we will find that there will again be an increase. I am merely outlining and sketching this report, but if you wish to make a more detailed study, by city, town, and State, you can write J. Edgar Hoover, and I am sure he will be happy to send you a copy. A study of the figures in these reports shows an alarming trend of the people to utterly disregard the law. That is an indication there is much opportunity and need of an educational program to bring people back to living under the laws honestly and decently, which after all, are the only worthwhile things in life.

Of course, you can say to me that "I do not violate any law—this doesn't apply to me." That may be true, perhaps there is no record of your having violated the law, but examine your conscience, and you will find there are many, many times that you have been violators and have not been apprehended. When you drive your car, are you considerate of your fellow travelers on the highway? Do you observe the speed laws? Do you observe the stop signs, are you careful of the safety of the pedestrian, particularly the observance of the traffic regulations surrounding the schools? There are many ways in which you can become an indifferent citizen and, therefore, not a good citizen by failing to do the things that good citizens should do.

It is an alarming situation today when we realize that in our national elections only approximately 50 percent of the people of this Nation, eligible to cast a ballot to elect a President of the United States, are sufficiently concerned to go to the polls and cast such a ballot. Therefore, by their indifference and neglect, they disfranchise themselves—they, the people individually—the only ones under the law with the power to disfranchise them, do so. They fail to take advantage of the blessings that are theirs in America to go to the polls without fear of reprisals of any kind, cast the ballot of freemen in the process of picking and choosing the type and kind of men who, in their opinion, are qualified, competent, and able to assume control of this Government, as it faces one of the greatest crises in its history. Particularly is that true now, when never a time in the history of our Nation was it more necessary to elect men to office, whether it be in high or low place, who are more concerned about the safety and security of this Nation than they are with personal gain or party success.

To my way of thinking, the people who are eligible to vote and do not vote, either through indifference or neglect, cannot be called good citizens because they fail in the obligation to exercise the right of suffrage, to express their choice of the type and kind of men to represent them in the operation of this Government. Remember you will get the type and kind of Government you ask for—no better, no worse. And you only, personally and individually, are responsible and must answer to, not only yourself, but your fellow-citizens for any and all disappointments which come through that indifference and neglect.

As a good citizen, it is a duty and responsibility which not only cannot be shirked, but should be performed with pride and a prayer of thanksgiving in your hearts that today you still have the right to express your likes or dislikes at the ballot box. There are millions of people behind the Iron Curtain who would gladly and willingly change places with you, and who I am sure, would not fail their responsibility in this respect.

You may tell me you are not interested in politics, that all politicians are crooked, that all politics is dishonest—therefore, you do not vote. By your very neglect and indifference, you are contributing to whatever fault you may find in the operation of your government, whether it be local, State, or national, because you have done nothing to protect it.

Of course, you may say to me, "I have not violated any of the laws; I have not failed to exercise my right of suffrage at the polls, so that doesn't apply to me."

So we examine another phase of good citizenship equally important in the exercise and just as disastrous in the avoidance, and that is jury duty. I would venture to say that were an officer of the law to appear in this room now and serve a jury summons on everyone here, requesting them to present themselves before a court to qualify as jurors in a trial, greater than 50 percent of those present would take every effort to avoid such jury service. The judges of your courts can give you the answer to that. It may not be as prevalent in the small community as it is in the large city; but too many times you find people who are too busy, who haven't the time, who are going to be out of town, who use political influence, and who even attempt to get medical certificates to avoid jury service—that, in my opinion, is not a mark of good citizenship.

If and when you are served with a summons to appear to qualify for jury duty, before attempting to avoid such service stop and ask yourself this question: If I personally were on trial, would I want the better class of citizens avoiding the duty imposed by law of granting to me a trial by a jury of my peers? Why is it that your professional men, your businessmen, your outstanding citizens are too busy to give the few hours a year they would be called upon to give, to uphold the law of the land, in granting to a fellow citizen no matter what his status in the social or financial world might be, an opportunity of a trial, of being judged by 12 men, chosen by the court for such purpose, without any attempt of any of the 12 to evade the responsibility?

I have just scratched the surface of how one can, through indifference and neglect, take unto himself the title of bad citizenship. This description, of course, could be expanded and would require not only hours but probably days and weeks to go into in its entirety.

You might say, "What are we going to do about it?" One of the first things we must do is to take our place on the firing line of civic responsibility to perform the duty imposed upon us, by acceptance of the great honor that is ours in being privileged to be citizens of this country. Let us not forget that if every community in America were to clean up its own local situation, and if each and every citizen in each small community in America were to assume the responsibility of citizenship that is imposed upon him, then the major problems in America would become minor, because the Government is you. The United States is merely a gathering together of all the small communities into statehood, and all the States to make a national picture. As each community meets its responsibility, then the State must meet its responsibility and that, in turn, assures us of a national picture that is healthy and wholesome and secure.

We must, in our system of education, train the youth in such a way that they will have a thorough knowledge and understanding of the responsibilities which are theirs as citizens. Teaching the youth in our schools to recite the Declaration of Independence and the Bill of Rights verbatim, word for word, does not answer the question, because you could teach a parrot to do that. But teach them the meaning of that Constitution and that Bill of Rights, what they mean to them, what it cost this Nation in the sweat and blood of our forefathers to preserve them intact as a heritage to hand down to us—that is important and will instill the seeds of good citizenship in the youth of this land.

It is a peculiar situation today, that in these times of increasing crime and violence in our Nation, it has been declared unconstitutional to teach a child in the schools about God, and the things that God stands for. But it has not been declared unconstitutional to teach them there is no God.

Looking toward the future of this country, as we realize the great danger we are in of losing everything that we hold sacred and dear, it must give the enemy a tremendous consolation as they look in the crime record; as they examine the sorry spectacle of our indifference and neglect in exercising our right of suffrage; as they gleefully enjoy our avoidance of jury service, adding these up and taking it for granted there is a complete breakdown of the moral law in this land. What pleasure they must derive from it, because to them it looks as though the democracy of freemen has failed; that it has disintegrated, and they look with joy and glee to the day they can become victors, not by force and violence, but by the disintegration of the moral fiber of our people, and the most insidious enemy we have—defeat from within.

I think it would be well if all of us were to obtain one of the small circulars Uncle Sam is distributing to promote the sale of savings bonds—to bring into your home the message of a soldier in time of war, who asks you to look out your window onto your front lawn and see there a foxhole with a cold, tired, and hungry soldier, alert and willing to die in defense of your home; that is exactly what every man in uniform is doing. Now, what a mockery it would be if you and I, through our neglect, cause those defenders of our homes to lose here what they are fighting for over there. It is your community, it is your State, it is your Government, yours, personally and individually—it will be as honest, decent, and great as you wish to make it, or it will degenerate to the depths you force upon it, through your neglect of exercising the rights which are granted to you to participate in its operation and support.

Remember, you are the Government; it is your country, your freedom, your liberty. Your devotion in their service will determine the legacy you will leave to generations yet unborn. As they study the history of today, they will either bless or curse you. You and you only are the master of tomorrow and all the tomorrows. Will you measure up?

Prize-Winning Essay: I Can Be a Better Citizen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 27, 1954

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, it is a great pleasure for me to bring to the attention of the Senate an essay written by one of our young Minnesota citizens, Miss Judy French, of Duluth, Minn. The essay was a prize winner of a contest sponsored by the American Legion Auxiliary in our State. Miss French is 14 years of age and in ninth grade of the Cathedral Junior High School in Duluth. The subject was I Can Be a Better Citizen.

I ask unanimous consent that the essay be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the essay was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I CAN BE A BETTER CITIZEN

(By Judy French, 14 years old, ninth grade, Cathedral Junior High School)

"The youth of today are the citizens of tomorrow." Youth is the time to develop the characteristics of a good citizen. In my efforts to become a better citizen, ideals come to me from many sources. From home, church, and school. But it is up to me to weave these ideals into a pattern of life, into a useful, happy, Christian life.

The foundation for good citizenship is laid in the home. The training I receive under the sympathetic guidance of my parents is helping me to be a better citizen. At home I learn respect for authority. I learn to obey cheerfully. Obedience with a smile goes a long way to foster happiness in the home. By performing tasks about the house, going on errands for my parents, and caring for my younger brothers and sisters, I develop responsibility, initiative, industry, and reliability. I learn to live in harmony with my parents and the other members of my family—a basic asset to good citizenship. I learn to be clean in mind and body. Reading only good books and shunning all indecent literature is a great help in keeping my mind pure. Choosing my companions wisely is another tremendous help. Evil companions not only corrupt good manners, but are the downfall of many a youth. Home education is basic in molding my character and in preparing me to take my place in the world as a citizen.

Churches are the natural nurseries of character, and religion gives me inspiration and guidance to formulate that character which is essential to good citizenship. It is my duty to learn God's laws and His plans for life and destiny. It is not enough to go to church on Sunday. I must have courage to stand by my principles, principles of honesty, integrity, and self-respect. I must observe the moral law, "Do good and avoid evil." I can be a better citizen by keeping the Ten Commandments. If all youth kept the Commandments, there would not be so much juvenile delinquency. Every year I take the pledge of decency in church, that is, I pledge myself to stay away from immoral and indecent films and those that glorify crime. All this blends perfectly in the development of character and furthers my efforts to become a better citizen.

My parents share their responsibility in educating me to be a better citizen, with my teachers. American teachers who promote in the minds of youth the ideals and principles of American democracy; teachers who give generously of their knowledge and energy to the education of the young; teachers who strive earnestly to imitate the patience, the justice, and the wisdom of Christ, the only pefect teacher. At school I learn to think correctly, to develop a sense of duty. I learn that honesty is the best policy. I learn to be punctual, obedient, truthful, and reliable. If I obey the laws and regulations of the school now, I will be a law-abiding citizen later, take an active part in civic affairs, and even be willing to hold a public office. An active participation in school activities develops social attitudes. I learn much from my associations with fellow students. I learn fair play—to do unto others as I want them to do unto me, to give complete cooperation to teachers, and to get along with my companions. When school days are over, I hope to get along with my fellow workers, an important asset to good citizenship.

My home, the church, and the school are preparing me to take my place in the world with the citizens of tomorrow, and to do my part to make this world a better place in which to live.

Imbued with these ideals and principles, I can be a better citizen.

Whose Ox?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR.

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 27, 1954

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, the School of Journalism at the University of Missouri, in Columbia, Mo., recently observed its 45th Annual Journalism Week. In connection with this observance, Robert L. Riggs, chief of the Washington bureau of the Louisville Courier-Journal, delivered an address entitled "Whose Ox?"

This penetrating analysis of the role of a free press in a free society, together with some critical but thoughtful commentaries by this distinguished member of the Washington press corps, should be of considerable interest to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have the text of Mr. Riggs' address printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHOSE OX?

(Address by Robert L. Riggs, chief of the Washington bureau of the Courier-Journal, on April 29, 1954, at Columbia, Mo., at the 45th Annual Journalism Week held by the School of Journalism of the University of Missouri)

After all these years, Journalism Week is, of course, its own excuse for being. But it suits my fancy to feel that it is held this year for one specific purpose. That purpose should be to celebrate the fact that editors and publishers the country over have finally emerged from the political fog which has covered them for more than a year. After long months of acting like befuddled bridegrooms, the people who operate our newspapers have begun to return to the normal, natural state of mind in which every journalist should be clothed all the time. That is an attitude of amiable skepticism toward people who hold public office.

I should like to emphasize that I did not say newspapers should be in a constant state of growling, snarling animosity toward public officials. That extreme to which most papers went in their bitter hostility toward Harry S. Truman is as deplorable as the bootlicking, sycophancy which they displayed toward Dwight D. Eisenhower during his first year in the White House.

What I do mean is that political writers should have the same set of principles 24 hours a day, 12 months out of every year. I never heard that a music critic or a drama critic was entitled to have different sets of values for different groups of professional artists and actors. By the same token, newspapers should apply the same critical standards to Republican politicians that they apply to Democrats.

To the everlasting glory of the American press, let me say that its editors are once more beginning to do just that, tardy though they be. There was a lengthy period when it appeared that they had adopted permanently the slogan: "Let's not be beastly to Eisenhower." There was a time when it appeared that, because they had volunteered so enthusiastically in the fall of 1952 to fight the good fight against creeping socialism and the mess, they felt under obligation to forget that one set of political operators had been replaced in Washington by another set.

There was a time when it appeared that too many Washington correspondents were never going to be able to pierce the newsprint curtain set up by their own employers.

But, as one who never lost his faith in the inherent decency, the inherent intelligence and especially in the enlightened self-interest of the American press, I never really believed that such a state of affairs could go on indefinitely.

As I understand the formula, a newspaper man who addresses a journalistic gathering such as this has only two courses open to him. First, he can lash out at his fellow journalists as a bunch of stupid, venal, greedy, grasping creatures who seek to brainwash the American people for some sinister purpose and for the benefit of their economic masters.

Or, secondly, he can look upon all journalists as dedicated knights in shining amor, endowed with all wisdom and concerned solely with the welfare of their fellowmen.

Both views I reject as vehemently as I can. I would be greatly distressed if you thought that I, after a quarter of a century as a working newspaperman, had too many illusions about our craft.

I am more than willing to argue that we have in our ranks more stupidity, more hypocrisy, more downright venality, more complete ignorance than can be found in any other calling. I don't know of any business in which the phonies and the fourflushers and the front runners prosper more than they do in the newspaper business.

But I am equally eager to argue that in no other business can we find so many people who make good companions for a man of decent instincts, for a man who is interested in freedom of the mind and of the spirit, for a man who is mushy-headed enough to be concerned about the welfare of the human race.

Even among the newspaper people who frequently seem the most venal and stupid, there is a foundation of decency which won't let them go too far astray.

But perhaps the greatest asset the newspaperman has is that it actually is true that his own selfish interest, his own bread-and-butter needs, his own economic welfare do happen to coincide much of the time with the public interest.

When we yammer and scream at public officials who try to suppress news, we are working both for our own pocketbooks, and for the public interest. When we yell freedom of the press, we are working primarily for our own cash register, but we also are serving the public in protecting our right to purvey information to it.

It is, I believe, the inherent sense of decency, which even the worst newspapers and the worst newspapermen possess at least to some degree, that has been at work to free them from this strange self-imposed hypnotic state in which the Eisenhower victory of 1952 placed them.

But it certainly is true that, even though they are at last awakening, most newspapers of the United States have gone through a year of hearing no evil, thinking no evil, and seeing no evil.

There were certain aspects to this self-drugging that might seem amusing were it not so serious a matter for the watchdog to desert his post. When inauguration day approached in January 1953, there swept over many an editorial office a strange fear, a fear to which many editors gave voice.

Would it be possible, they asked, for the members of the Washington press corps to be fair to the new Republican President?

Can you imagine it? Can you believe that these very people, who for at least a decade had been slugging at Franklin D. Roosevelt and Harry Truman, both above and below the belt, should be concerned about being fair to a President?

Here were men who had sought by every device known to their trade to discredit two Presidents. Yet they were worried for fear their own reporters might not be fair to another President. If any of you wondered where I find the title for my address, I point out that it does, indeed, make a great difference whose ox is being gored.

This concern about the willingness or capacity of the Washington press corps to be fair to Eisenhower took strange forms. It almost furnished the excuse for the new administration to abolish the institution of the Presidential press conference as it had evolved under Roosevelt and Truman.

But for all their determination to protect the new President from reporters, the editors, and publishers came up on the right side of the press conference issue.

You couldn't ask for a better example of the way the self-interest of newspaper reporters, editors, and owners coincides with the public interest.

The presidential press conference has become such a regularized institution in the transmission of information about the people's business that few would want to argue it should be done away with.

Yet there was a period when the new administration almost was persuaded to abolish the open press conference. It was the voice of the pro-Eisenhower editors, speaking in their own self-interest—and in the public interest—which prevented that abolition.

How silly it was to be afraid to let Eisenhower face the reporters in open conference was soon demonstrated. Neither Roosevelt nor Truman was more adroit than Eisenhower in utilizing the conference for his own purpose.

But out of Eisenhower's capacity to be unrevealing, there grew a cry that reporters were abusing the President. Some of our own colleagues in Washington even wrote learned pieces asserting that the press was asking questions that were too sharply antagonistic, too argumentative.

Many of us were amused to note that the greatest concern was expressed by publications whose reporters had been noted for their hammer-and-tongs belligerency in interrogating both Truman and Roosevelt.

The sad truth is we are not doing nearly so good a job at the Eisenhower press conferences as we did with Truman and Roosevelt.

Our questions are beginning to sound like brief lectures—and not too brief, at that. They have long apologetic introductory sentences. They convey regret at bringing up unpleasant subjects. They review the situation in detail. Then, finally, they come around to specific requests for information, quite in contrast to the short, blunt, sharp questions we used to ask Harry Truman.

This is due, I feel, to the fact that many a reporter who comes to the conference prepared to ask a question feels too often that the President will know little about the particular subject the reporter wants to discuss. Hence he sticks into his question all this background material in the hope that the President will be responsive.

And I very much fear that there still hangs over too many of us an apprehension that an editor may feel we have been impolite to a Republican President.

Perhaps this apprehension will disappear as more and more editors demonstrate they have quit looking at this administration through special rose-tinted lenses.

It may seem strange to you, but I firmly believe that the country owes to one man more than to any other this reawakening by the editors to the facts of life. That one man is Joseph R. McCarthy.

Let me hasten to assure you that I have not come here to talk about Joe McCarthy or about McCarthyism. I have got to the point where I have virtually no feeling one way or the other about McCarthy. He is simply a festering sore which indicates where our fever is.

I am reserving all my righteous indignation for respectable, decent, intelligent people who are perfectly willing now and who have been perfectly willing in the past to use Joe McCarthy to attain their own ends.

I am extremely proud of the fact that an overwhelming majority of newspaper people—reporters, editors, and owners—instinctively recoiled from Joe McCarthy when he rose to prominence nearly 4 years ago.

If, to their shame, they compromised with their consciences in the fall of 1952 and persuaded themselves that the end justified the means—that they were entitled to walk along with Joe far enough to get rid of Trumanism—then they were in some eminently respectable company. And there is nothing that a newspaper executive yearns so much to be as to be respectable.

Hence, although too many newspaper people held their noses and swallowed Joe McCarthy in 1952, it should be said for most of them that they really did suffer from the delusion that once the Eisenhower administration got in power it would lose no time in clipping McCarthy's wings.

Surely, no editor dreamed that an administration elected by such a landslide would permit one Senator to take control of so many phases of the State Department's work. By the wildest stretch of his imagination, no editor could have conceived of McCarthy challenging the entire Pentagon.

It was this failure by President Eisenhower to face up promptly to the McCarthy issue which first awoke a number of editors from their trance. Having taken a good, sharp look at the new man in the White House for the first time, they noticed another thing. They saw that while President Eisenhower was failing to face up to McCarthy, he was, simultaneously, permitting such slick political lieutenants as Herbert Brownell to try to out-McCarthy McCarthy, to try to steal McCarthy's thunder.

It was the numbers game, played by Brownell, joined in by Eisenhower, and participated in by numerous high-ranking administration officials, which removed the last illusion of most editors. This numbers game, you will recall, was the proud boast that the new administration had removed from government in little more than a year, either 1,400 or 2,200 or some other number of persons.

These discharged employees were variously described, depending upon who was making the speech, as spies, traitors, perverts Communists or public enemies of one kind or another.

It turned out to be, of course, one of the most gigantic hoaxes ever attempted upon an intelligent people. But had it not been for the unceasing vigilance of three eminently respectable and conservative Washington newspapers, it is possible that, with the rest of the Nation's press still in a honeymoon daze, Brownell and his coworkers might have got away with it for an extended period.

Here was another splendid example of how a newspaper's economic self-interest, combined with a high degree of intelligence and integrity, served the public interest.

There are three fine newspapers in Washington, the Post, the Star, and the News, the latter a member of the Scripps-Howard chain. All supported the candidacy of Dwight D. Eisenhower. But they have one other trait in common. Each of them loves every hair on every head of every Federal Government employee.

Washington is strictly a company town. It's entire economic life is bound up with the welfare of the thousands of Government employees who live in the Capital. What's bad for the Government employee is bad for Washington. What's bad for Washington is bad for the Star, the Pôst and the News.

Until a short time ago we had a fourth paper in Washington, the Times-Herald. During the latter part of its life, the Times-Herald was owned by Col. Robert R. McCormick, also editor of the Chicago Tribune.

It long has been a fundamental doctrine of the Chicago Tribune that the following things are true about any man who works for the Federal Government: At best he is a lazy no-good bum who couldn't earn a living in private employment; at worst, he is a foreign agent dedicated to turning his country over either to England or to Russia.

That reasoning has been part of a most successful formula for operating a newspaper in the heart of Chicagoland. But it had certain unsound aspects for the conduct of a paper which depends for its subscribers and for its advertisers upon people whose primary source of income is the Government paycheck.

Hence, that may have been one of the reasons the Times-Herald recently gave up the ghost and left us with only three Washington papers.

The Star, the Post, and the News never faltered in their battle with the Eisenhower administration about this phony numbers game. Through the diligence of their reporters and their editorial writers, assisted by several of the bureaus from other papers, the whole shoddy fraud was exposed.

This was more than just another example of what the economic self-interest of the press can produce in the way of public service. It illustrates again that it is not enough, in reply to the charge of a one-party press, to say that the newspapers carry all the news of both sides. Carrying the bare-bones news about the conflicting claims made by each side in this numbers game would not have been enough. What was required—and what was given—was the unceasing demand of three vigorous newspapers that the administration either put up or shut up about the hundreds of subversives it had inherited from the Truman administration. Being unable to put up, the Republican had to shut up.

It may well have been this silly performance by the administration over the numbers game which first made the editors of the Nation aware of the unashamed hucksterism practiced by our present Government. Certainly newspaper people ought to be the first to recognize when politicians begin to substitute slogans for performance.

There have been plenty of opportunities to recognize such efforts in the past year. There is the New Look defense policy, sometimes called more bang for a buck, by which we increase our military strength by reducing our expenditures.

There has been the "unleashing of Chiang Kai-shek," the pronouncement by which the Republican administration instructed the Seventh Fleet to stop restraining the Nationalist Chinese on Formosa from swarming to the mainland to drive out Mao Tse Tung. If Chiang has got any closer to the mainland of China since Eisenhower and

Dulles unleashed him than he did while Truman was restraining him, it has not been called to our attention.

Notable among our new samples of hucksterism is our policy of instant and massive retaliation at points of our own choosing. But, at the same time that we are proclaiming that policy, we are apparently preparing to engage in a smaller-scale, or medium-scale or some-other-scale conflict in Indochina—despite an earlier slogan that fighting in Asia should be left to Asiatics.

And since the sloganeers of this Government were adroit enough to put the label of "Truman's war" upon the conflict in Korea, it has been reasonable for editors to ask if they intend to call the forthcoming Indochina conflict "Ike's war." They remember that Candidate Eisenhower himself said in 1952: "Let it be Asians against Asians."

These are the things that have finally aroused editors to put a sharper focus upon the Eisenhower administration and upon Eisenhower himself. It is not important for the purposes of this discussion whether the editors applaud what Eisenhower is doing, whether they condemn it or whether they just let it alone.

But it is vitally important to the country's welfare and to the health of the newspaper business that the editors have finally recovered from their school-girl infatuation and are able once more to cast intellectually mature and skeptical glances at Washington.

The Friendly Undertaker

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 27, 1954

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an editorial entitled "Ike Failed To Hear When the People Spoke on TVA," published in the Atlanta Journal and Constitution of Sunday, May 23, 1954. The writer of the editorial has taken a shrewd look at the administration's attitude toward the Tennessee Valley Authority. It seems to me that his conclusion is inescapable.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

IKE FAILED TO HEAR WHEN THE PEOPLE SPOKE ON TVA

It was about a year ago that President Eisenhower singled out TVA as an example of "creeping socialism." He said that next time anything like TVA was undertaken, the local people should have more interest and voice in it.

Mr. Eisenhower has just finished ignoring the voice of the people of the Tennessee Valley. He did not reappoint Gordon R. Clapp as TVA Chairman, although public sentiment appeared to be overwhelmingly in favor of Mr. Clapp.

Instead, the President is looking for a man who shares his general philosophy on public power—in other words, someone who is mostly against it.

The outlook is bad for TVA. It is faced already with a drastic appropriations cut. If, in addition, it gets an administrator who, like Mr. Eisenhower, does not believe in TVA, the future is most uncertain.

Is the President planning to give the local people more interest and voice in TVA, or is he preparing to press on them his own philosophy of public power?

His words and actions to date point to the latter course.

Campaigning in 1952, Mr. Eisenhower praised TVA. Perhaps, after all, he came to bury it.

Texas Businessmen Are Part-time Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 27, 1954

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, there has been a great upsurge of interest in farming among businessmen of my State. This is, of course, a very healthy development showing, as it does, recognition that the problems of farmers are community problems.

One result of this interest has been the growth of organizations composed of hobby farmers—businessmen who own farms where they carry on experiments to bring out facts of value to agriculture in general. An editorial in the Tyler (Tex.) Morning Telegraph of May 20 told of some phases of the work of one such organization, the East Texas Farm and Ranch Club. The editorial makes it clear that the club's work is of great worth to east Texas, setting a pattern that might well be followed in other areas. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Smith County and east Texas owe the East Texas Farm and Ranch Club a debt of gratitude.

The Farm and Ranch Club has rendered and continues to render valuable service to the east Texas agricultural community through its club projects and the efforts of its members.

Most of the membership is made up of successful east Texas businessmen who have become farmers on the side.

Due to their financial security in other enterprises these hobby-farmer members of the East Texas Farm and Ranch Club have been able to carry out experimental or recommended practices on their farms where professional or regular farmers could not afford to take such risks.

They have been the backbone in the various cattle associations which have been holding sales and shows in Tyler under the sponsorship of East Texas Agricultural Council.

Farm and Ranch Club members have helped to bring the best in the various breeds of livestock to east Texas where purebred stock is becoming less expensive and more available each year. A recent beef sale of breeding stock held in Tyler had an average below $200 with more stock offered than ever before.

The farming businessmen have tried expensive recommended agricultural practices, especially erosion control and pasture improvement. The special equipment needed has been made available to others and the results have been studied by local professional agricultural workers with whom these men cooperate.

Recently, under professional supervision, the Farm and Ranch Club conducted a test of winter cover crops on a plot of ground in Tyler. They have conducted tests on the plot which gave the professional workers information about various grasses and legumes growing under local conditions. The project is to be continued for the additional information it will provide club members and farmers in east Texas.

Through the club's support of agricultural activities, experts have been brought to east Texas to talk on varied agricultural problems. Next July, with support of Farm and Ranch Club members, Texas A. and M. extension service will conduct its beef cattle short course in Tyler.

Another proposed project of the club is an east Texas auction to be held in Tyler. Under present proposals the club will provide facilities to auction off at a nominal commission anything that can be used on a farm or ranch, from livestock to seed.

This project will make specialized equipment available to east Texas farmers at a reduced cost because some businessman-farmer has purchased it for a limited need and no longer has use for it.

The major contribution of the East Texas Farm and Ranch Club to the agricultural community has been that of winning business support and understanding of the farm problem. Many of its members are business, and they have gained first hand knowledge of agricultural problems through their farms. This has been reflected in the more favorable climate in financial circles toward long-range soil improvement and farm modernization programs.

East Texas has benefited from all these programs and the community is drawn closer together just as livestock exhibitors at the East Texas Fair this fall will feel more closely attached to this area because they have been guests of the Farm and Ranch Club at a barbecue, one of the club's annual projects.

Prize-Winning Speech: My Part as an American Citizen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 27, 1954

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, it is a great pleasure for me to bring to the attention of the Senate the text of a speech delivered by Mr. Richard Lundborg, a young student living in Minneapolis, Minn. With this speech Mr. Lundborg was a winner in the seventh annual Americanism oratory contest sponsored by the Veterans of Foreign Wars last month. Mr. Lundborg is a senior at South High School in Minneapolis. The subject of his speech was My Part as an American Citizen. I ask unanimous consent that the speech be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

MY PART AS AN AMERICAN CITIZEN

There is a voice in the soul of every human being that cries out to be free. America has answered that voice. America offers freedom and opportunity such as no land before her has ever known. There are over 160 million of us who are free to work, to speak, to love, and to live as we desire. We are an energetic, creative, and progressive people; we are free, big-hearted, and happy, for we are Americans.

A million and more of our countrymen have died for those freedoms and opportunities you and I now enjoy. Their blood has been left on the green at Lexington and the snow at Valley Forge, on the beachheads of Salerno and Normandy, on the hills called Pork Chop, Old Baldy, and Heartbreak Ridge. Many more millions have fought for a strong America on the home fronts with the power of their minds, the influence of their rank, and the convictions of their hearts.

And today, as a young American citizen, the unprecedented privileges and opportunities of this country greet me with outstretched arms—not because of what I have done, but because I have been fortunate enough to be born here, and because those before me have given their best to make America the greatest and freest power this earth has yet known.

The past is only history. America's strength no longer depends upon those soldiers, statesmen, and laymen; it depends now upon citizens like myself. Yet, as I view the tremendous tasks and challenges lying before us, I wonder what part I can have in such great undertakings. What, I have asked myself, can I do?

I believe this is the answer in the words of that old Chinese philosopher, Confucius: "It is better to light one small candle than to curse the darkness."

I may not do much. It may not even be noticed by others, but it is better to do well my own little part than sit back and balk at the actions of others. As an American citizen, I have some personal obligations which only I am responsible for carrying out, for actually, my part is really understanding and fulfilling my responsibilities.

Yes, when of age I should intelligently vote. I should obey the laws of the community and of society. I should take a stand against corruption, against injustice, and against heresies which would deprive us of the rights and privileges afforded us by this democracy.

But merely an American citizen, as myself, can play even a greater part than that. I have thought about some of the basic areas where, even now, I have a part to fulfill.

For instance, all good citizenship begins at home. I have a responsibility as a member of my family. The bulwark of America is made of the millions of homes it represents. Strong, united families make a strong and united nation. My family is small. There are only four of us. Yet, I have a part to play. Being patient with my younger brother when he shoots me in the eye with his squirt gun, helping to make it easier for mother to keep the house neat and clean, and helping father shovel the walk and put on the screens are some of the small parts I can play in keeping us working together and having fun together by giving my share of helpfulness and kindness.

As one progresses, he finds that his part is continually broadening. I find myself faced with responsibilities at school. Educated Americans make an educated and strong nation. I must absorb practical knowledge which will make me stronger in character and understanding and a citizen of usefulness in my surroundings. I must learn to develop the potentials of my mind and learn to think critically yet constructively.

School is primarily an educational institution, but it also gives the student the opportunity to do his part and learn of his responsibilities while doing so. For instance, being on the student council has taught me to always demand fairness and consideration of all views; being on the school paper has taught me to be exact, thorough, and follow through even though extremely pressed for hime; being a member of several clubs has taught me to be dependable and friendly; being on the track team has taught me to value a strong, healthy body and develop good sportsmanship and fair play. These things have enabled me to do some little part in upholding the principles of our heritage.

Then as one further matures he begins to take his part in the community. My part in the community is being a good neighbor and an intelligent consumer, as well as tolerating and respecting the beliefs and convictions of others. I feel that my part also includes keeping myself spiritually strong through my faith in God and my efforts in the work of the church. My faith in the Bible and in He of whom the Bible tells, has given me hope, companionship, and strength, for as Jeremiah said, "Be strong and of good courage, for the Lord thy God is with me." My real incentive for living comes from this faith.

But I believe my part in the community should extend ever further than that. I sincerely believe it is my responsibility as an American citizen to keep abreast of current events. I should be aware of the fighting at Dien Bien Phu, the serious political condition in France, and the results of the Geneva Conference. I should critically follow the charges being made against the Army, Dr. Oppenheimer, and the Housing Administration. I should observe the proposals of President Eisenhower and the actions of Congress. I should know the issues involved in the State's mental health, farm, and highway safety programs, and my alderman's stand on liquor licensing. These seem like little things, perhaps, but when multiplied by 160 million of us, it is something big, for well-informed citizens are valuable citizens, ones who will not criticize on ill-founded reasoning, but constructively on fact. Well-informed citizens will constantly be on guard against the forces which threaten our freedoms from both without and from within.

And after graduation, I can soon expect Uncle Sam to beckon, but I will respond without resistance or bitterness because I realize it is a part I must fulfill as a young and healthy male citizen and that this country is strong only as long as we protect our heritage from those powers which would destroy that which makes citizens like myself so proud and happy.

Yes, I believe Confucius had a great point when he said, "It is better to light one small candle than to curse the darkness." There are many who curse and condemn, but few who act and try to understand.

I wish to light my small and seemingly insignificant little candle by doing as best I can my part at home, at school, and in the community. I want to do my part in guarding and strengthening my great American heritage so that this country united can shine out as an exemplary beacon light to the rest of the world.

I wish to give myself to worthy causes without thought of personal gain, to learn and practice self-control, to be a creative force for good, being always a part of the solution and never part of the problem. I wish to be unashamed of my convictions nor have convictions that shame me, to promote peace, and to meet freedom's demands.

These are my desires and the part I have been challenged to fulfill as an American citizen.

The Flammable Fabrics Act Should Be Amended

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1954

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, on May 18 I introduced H. R. 9193, which seeks to amend the Flammable Fabrics Act. This is companion to S. 3379, which has been favorably considered by the Senate under unanimous consent.

In recent days there has sprung up a misunderstanding of the provisions of this legislation, there being attributed to it meanings which it does not have.

The Textile Workers' Union of America in particular has written Members of Congress asking that the legislation be opposed. We in New England are aware of the troubles which beset the textile industry. The causes are twofold—removal of substantial segments of the industry to the South to gain lower wage scales and to take advantage of tax-exempt inducements offered by communities there, and low tariffs which permit unlimited imports of low-cost textiles.

In the letter from the textile union copious reference is made to the union's opposition to further cuts in tariffs on textiles. With this position I am in complete agreement. H. R. 9193 makes no reference to tariffs, nor does it have any effect upon the problem which concerns the union, and concerns me also. I would not sponsor legislation detrimental to the textile industry.

H. R. 9193 proposes sensible and objective standards of testing for flammability. The intent of the bill is in accord with the intent of Congress in passage of the Flammable Fabrics Act last year. The public loses not one whit of the protection stipulated in the act, but the proposed amendment corrects inequities found to result from the testing provisions. Should there be no amendment of the act prior to its provisions taking effect on June 30, 1954, serious injury to reputable textile industries may occur. It is reasonable to assume that this injury would adversely affect the very people the textile workers' union and I are trying to help.

American Association of English-Jewish Newspapers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES G. OAKMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1954

Mr. OAKMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Detroit Jewish News of May 21, 1954:

WASHINGTON, D. C.—Members of the American Association of English-Jewish Newspapers were cited at the association's annual convention here by President Eisenhower as members of a group which "zealously guards the civil, political, and religious rights of our people." This followed the adoption of resolutions and action by the association making known that the Jewish publishers are backing efforts to oppose political extremists who are attacking President Eisenhower and other members of the executive department in an effort to inject anti-Semitism into national issues.

Fred Shochet, publisher of the Jewish Floridian, Miami, elected president of the association. He succeeds Philip Slomovitz, editor of the Jewish News, Detroit, who has served since the association's founding, 11 years ago, but who declined when an attempt was made to nominate him this year.

Others elected include Jack Fishbein, Chicago, Leo H. Frisch, Minneapolis, and Albert W. Golomb, Pittsburgh, vice presidents; A. Slabot, New Orleans, treasurer; Adolph Rosenberg, Atlanta, and Mrs. M. Milton Singer, Atlantic City, secretaries.

The association expanded plans for an improved AJP press service and announced the employment of David Harowitz, New York, U. N. correspondent. A letter discussing questions involving Jewish weeklies from a viewpoint of editorial and community service was addressed to the convention by B'nai B'rith President Philip Klutznick.

A resolution adopted by the association expressed a "sense of appreciation for the work of the Jewish Telegraphic Agency and for the vast improvements shown in the JTA service in the past year."

A delegation representing the association was received at the White House by Presidential Assistant Sherman Adams, who accepted on behalf of President Eisenhower the presentation of an inscribed Bible. The delegation was led by the association's retiring president, Philip Slomovitz, and Mrs. Slomovitz; Mr. and Mrs. Golomb; Jules D. Miller, Philadelphia; Mr. and Mrs. Eli R. Jacobs, Buffalo; Samuel Neusner and Melvin Friedman, Hartford; Samuel M. Schmidt, Cincinnati; A. Slabot; Bert F. Kline, Baltimore; Morris J. Janoff, Jersey City; Adolph Rosenberg; Fred Shochet; Mr. and Mrs. Fishbein, Barbara Schwartz, and Helmut Lorsch, Chicago; Mr. and Mrs. Milton M. Singer, and David Horowitz.

A highlight of the convention was an address by Maxwell D. Rabb, President Eisenhower's Cabinet operation officer. Rabb traced the background of behind-the-scenes developments in the field of civil rights, American-Israel relations and related matters. Other speakers included Y. Harry Levin, counselor of the Embassy of Israel; Congressman SIDNEY YATES, of Chicago; and I. L. Kenen, Washington representative of the American Zionist Committee for Public Affairs.

Wide public attention was attracted by a resolution adopted by the convention calling on Congress to revoke second-class mailing privileges from those who use the mails to distribute anti-Semitic literature. It was noted that legislation is now before Congress to bar subversive propaganda but that the proposed law would only affect Communist matter. Other resolutions adopted pertained to the question of American arms grants to Iraq and the reaffirmation of Jewish links with Israel.

Those who met with the association included Simon Sobeloff, Solicitor General of the United States; Dr. Arthur Burns, Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers; Maxwell M. Rabb, Cabinet Operations Office and associate counsel to the President; Charles M. Metzner, executive assistant to the Attorney General; I. Jack Martin, administrative assistant to the President; Representative Jacob K. Javits; S. Rothman, Solicitor to the Labor Department; Samuel Golan, International Boundaries Commission; Julius N. Cahn, counsel of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee; Bernard Katzen, consultant to the Republican National Committee; Beinish Epstein, Republican National Committee publicity staff; and Maurice Friedman, a member of the Republican National Committee.

The text of the resolution on religious bias and irresponsible allegations against President Eisenhower reads:

"Whereas the American Association of English-Jewish Newspapers, representing publications serving more than 5 million Americans of the Jewish faith, is concerned with maintaining the traditional freedoms of America from subversive attacks by left-wing and right-wing extremists; and

"Whereas the Congress of the United States has recently begun action on legislation to revoke second-class mailing privileges from those who exploit such privileges by disseminating subversive Communist literature which seeks to divide and destroy the American people; and

"Whereas little has been done about the alarming increase in extreme rightwing subversive literature which not only seeks to divide the American people through totalitarian appeals to religious and racial bigotry but which actually aims at the overthrow of our cherished form of Government; and

"Whereas this extreme right-wing propaganda cunningly and insidiously masquerades in a guise of anticommunism to hurl baseless accusations of 'treason' against responsible officials, thus dividing and weakening the United States; and

"Whereas it is alien to American tradition to inject religious prejudice into political controversy and since demagogues have shown an inclination to appeal to prejudice rather than reason in an effort to distort issues while cloaking themselves in the camouflage of patriotism when making irresponsible allegations of subversion against even President Eisenhower, the United States Army, and those national leaders who have done so much to defend this Nation from totalitarianism; and

"Whereas information from Congress indicates that in the last 2 weeks incoming mail has shown an increase in anti-Semitic printed tracts and propaganda pamphlets attacking the executive branch of the Government in an attempt to confuse current controversies by appeals to religious prejudice which range from extreme subtlety to extreme crudity; and

"Whereas such a striking similarity exists between subversives of the right and left with both elements seeking to appeal to prejudice and the very basest instincts in mankind: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we call on the Congress to carefully preserve freedom of speech and of the press but act to prevent the destruction of these and other freedoms by the right-wing extremists who are exploiting the second-class mailing privileges along with their Communist counterparts in an organized and treacherous campaign to effect the sort of division of America about which President Eisenhower expressed concern to our fellow publishers.

Resolved, That while our association and its member newspapers inform public opinion of the Communist menace, an undertaking which is so essential for the defense of freedom, that we also pay close attention to other conspiracies which so deceitfully disguise themselves behind the mask of patriotism and which have not yet been adequately exposed to public scrutiny."

In behalf of the delegation which met at the White House Friday afternoon with Gov. Sherman Adams, Mr. Slomovitz presented a specially bound Jewish Publication Society Bible to President Eisenhower through Mr. Adams.

Mr. Slomovitz asked Governor Adams to convey to the President the publishers' concern that American-Israel friendship should be strengthened and expressed the hope that the President will be successful in efforts to secure a peaceful solution of the Middle East problem.

The greeting inscribed in the Bible with the names of the delegation that accompanied Mr. Slomovitz to the White House reads:

"To our President whom we humbly greet on the occasion of the 11th national convention of the American Association of English-Jewish Newspapers in our Nation's capital: We pray that your hands be upheld in your quest for peace. In your selection of good men with whom you share the tasks of carrying out your high ideals, your prayers and our prayers are justly embodied in the 6th verse of the 101st Psalm and in the 21st verse of the Book of Exodus. We greet you with the Hebrew salutation, 'shalom' (peace)." The cited passages are: Exodus 18: 21 "Thou shalt provide out of all the people able men, such as fear God, men of truth, hating unjust gain." Psalm 101: 6 "Mine eyes are upon the faithful of the land, that they shall dwell with me; He that walketh in a way of integrity, he shall minister unto me."

Governor Adams presented to the delegations the following message from the President:

"To Representatives of the American Association of English-Jewish Newspapers:

"To each of you go my cordial greetings, with the confidence that together you will continue dedication to the cause of liberty and justice, and to the advancement of public enlightenment by accurate and objective presentation of the news.

"I am deeply conscious of your vital role in our Republic, so magnificently expressed by Thomas Jefferson's remark, 'When the press is free and every man able to read, all is safe.' To you—able and earnest participants in a profession which zealously guards the civil, political, and religious rights of our people—go my personal compliments, my good wishes, and my deep respect. I wish I could have stated these sentiments to you in person during your Washington stay.

"DWIGHT EISENHOWER."

The convention sessions, held at the Willard Hotel, concluded with a banquet Saturday night.

Mr. Levin, speaking for the Israel Embassy, reiterated the hopes of Israelis that American-Israel friendship will be strengthened and continued.

Congressman YATES told of the efforts that continue to be made to prevent the arming of Arab States at Israel's expense.

Mr. Kenen outlined the efforts that are being made by the new Zionist Committee on Public Relations to keep Americans informed on true conditions in Israel and to help retain United States friendship for Israel.

Mr. Slomovitz, who was toastmaster, turned over the presidency to Mr. Shochet at the convention banquet.

On American Policy in the Middle East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 27, 1954

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to direct the attention of our colleagues to the following statement of views adopted by the National Administrative Committee of the American Jewish Congress, at its meeting May 22, 23, 1954. It will be published in the May 31, 1954, issue of Congress Weekly, the official publication of that organization.

ON AMERICAN POLICY IN THE MIDDLE EAST

Americans of all political persuasions and religious faiths will agree without reservation about the importance of peace in the Middle East. The establishment of peace between Israel and its Arab neighbors has long been vital in order to enable Israel to continue its inspiring tasks of creative rehabilitation and to give to the Arab States the opportunity—once they develop the will—to improve the living standards and welfare of their populations.

Such peace is even more urgent today in the context of international developments. Tension and political instability in any part of the world constitute an invitation to the Soviet Union to promote unrest and to foster disorder. The actions of the Soviet representatives at the United Nations during the recent discussion of Israel-Arab problems leave little doubt that this has become the Soviet role in the Middle East.

America's commitment to the defense of freedom and the strengthening of democracy as well as our country's self-interest make it imperative that the American people clearly understand the realities of Middle Eastern affairs and be prepared intelligently to assess the new role which our country is now called upon to play in that part of the world.

It is, therefore, a matter of grave concern that Mr. Byroade, Assistant Secretary of State for Near Eastern, South Asian, and African Affairs, has in recent major statements confused rather than clarified the issues. The perspective he has provided will not enable our fellow Americans adequately or correctly to appraise the validity of our current Middle Eastern policy or meaningfully to participate in the formulation of a sound policy in the interests of peace and stability. And it is regrettable that some of his statements, however well-intentioned they may have been, are likely to impair rather than to enhance the prospects of peace between Israel and the Arab States.

It is vital that the American people understand that while deep and serious differences exist between Israel and the Arab States, certain facts are unchallengeable. Israel has repeatedly affirmed its readiness to discuss peace with the Arab States. The Arabs have consistently refused to enter into such discussions. Arab insistence that Israel must first give evidence of its good faith by accepting the Arab point of view on the basic issues in dispute is a tactic of refusal to negotiate that deceives no one.

The Arab States have continued their policy of nonrecognition of Israel. They have intensified their economic blockades and boycotts. They have subjected Israel to constant harassment of its borders with extensive loss of life and property, thereby provoking unfortunate retaliatory measures by Israel. Their spokesmen have uttered warlike and genocidal threats against Israel.

Mr. Byroade's two recent major statements presumably are intended to give expression to the administration's proclaimed policy of strict impartiality between Israel and the Arab States. Despite the appearance of a balanced objectivity, the impact and effect of those statements are neither objective nor impartial.

The only path to peace in the Middle East is through peace negotiations, however halting those negotiations may prove to be. Arab refusal to enter into any discussions with Israel has thus far prevented any negotiations. Mr. Byroade, by his categorical statement that no possibility of an early peace settlement between Israel and the Arab States exists, has further encouraged Arab intransigence. For his statement represents acceptance as an immutable fact the very situation it must be the priority of our policy to transform.

In his addresses, Mr. Byroade set forth what he regards as the bases of the mutual fears and distrust of the Arabs and Israel. His views of the roots of Arab fears, primarily large-scale Jewish immigration into Israel and territorial expansionism, are discussed at length. But he fails to state with equal emphasis the reasons for Israel's concern about Arab intentions.

For several years, Arab violence and aggression on Israel's borders have caused hundreds of fatalities and extensive property damage. Israel's border areas have been kept in a constant state of tension and anxiety. Arab spokesmen have asserted that they will not be satisfied with anything less than Israel's liquidation. The King of Saudi Arabia has declared that 10 million Arab lives would not be too high a price to pay for Israel's annihilation. It is only in this context, a context which Mr. Byroade failed to discuss, that our fellow Americans can fully understand Israel's apprehensions and particularly its grave concern over the shipment of arms to Arab States such as Iraq.

Mr. Byroade properly suggests that both Israel and the Arab States will have to make accommodations if they are to achieve any measure of agreement. He calls on the Arabs to accept the fact of Israel's existence and to abandon what he terms their policy of "negativism," a curious understatement for violence, threats of genocide, blockades, boycotts, and sabotage of the economic and social development of the region. He is much more specific, however, as to the concessions he demands of Israel. Two of these concessions, in particular, would destroy the entire raison d'etre and meaning of Israel's existence and the motif of centuries of unwearied Jewish hopes.

Mr. Byroade heavily stressed Arab fears of potential large-scale Jewish immigration into Israel, which the Arabs are said to believe will impel Israel to seek territorial expansion. Citing the Soviet Union and the United States as the only remaining possible, but highly unlikely, sources of Jewish migration, he called on Israel to take action to allay Arab fears. Although he subsequently disclaimed any intention of counseling Israel as to its immigration policy, the implications of his analysis remain—namely, that Israel should announce a policy of restricted and limited immigration for the future.

Objectivity and fairness would have required Mr. Byroade to have stated several facts. The Jews behind the Iron Curtain are doomed to certain spiritual and cultural annihilation, and to mounting physical insecurity, unless they can find their way to Israel. For Israel to renounce in advance any large-scale immigration of Jews from Eastern Europe, however remote prospects for such immigration may be at the present time, is to pronounce a sentence of death as Jews on hundreds of thousands of persons in these lands. Neither Israel nor Jews anywhere should be asked or expected to sanction such action.

Nor would renunciation of large-scale immigration by Israel be merely a political gesture, as Mr. Byroade suggests, since in his view such immigration is no longer a reality. Nowhere does he make the slightest reference to the fact that among the half million Jews of North Africa, most of whom live under conditions of abject poverty and serious insecurity, many seek to build a new life in Israel. The State of Israel was not brought into being in order to shatter the hopes by which these devout Jews have lived for centuries.

Mr. Byroade could have helped allay the Arab fears he emphasizes by pointing out that Israel's program for the absorption of immigrants has never been related to territorial expansion. It has rather been based on the expansion of the absorptive capacity of its present area through industrialization and intensive agricultural development. Through grants-in-aid and technical assistance, the American Government has contributed in great measure to that expansion. Because of scientific development and constantly unfolding prospects as well as the heroic efforts of Israel's citizens, the maximum of that capacity cannot be foretold; it has certainly not been reached; nor will it conceivably be reached in the foreseeable future.

Finally, Mr. Byroade urged Israel to see its own future in the context of the Middle East rather than as a headquarters, or nucleus so to speak, of worldwide groupings of peoples of a particular religious faith who must have special rights within and obligations to the Israeli State. Here again, he has seriously impaired American understanding of the problem by implying that Jews in other lands claim or exercise political or legal rights in or owe political or legal obligations to Israel. Jews outside Israel as well as the Government of Israel itself have repeatedly repudiated such unfounded charges. But they have insisted that people everywhere should understand the role of Israel in ending the centuries-old homelessness of the Jewish people, its contribution to the creative quality, the dignity and vigor of Jewish life everywhere, and the indefinable moral, spiritual, cultural, and religious bonds which link the Jewish people with their ancient homeland.

We regard it as necessary to make these comments on Mr. Byroade's statements not for polemical purposes but to document our conviction that our Government's policy with regard to the Middle East today is ignoring important realities in the situation and is based on a serious misunderstanding of Jewish relationships to Israel. That policy, because of the inadequate and faulty foundations on which it is based, is not achieving its professed purposes. Tension in the Middle East is mounting. Soviet machinations are becoming bolder and more serious. Pro-American feeling in the Arab lands has not been advanced. The apprehensions of Israel have increased.

We therefore earnestly urge our Government to undertake a fundamental reappraisal of our Middle Eastern policy and to develop a program more consonant with the needs and interests of the people in that area and therefore more likely to contribute to peace. That program should be directed toward:

(a) The initiation of direct peace negotiations between Israel and the Arab States;

(b) The ending of Arab economic and commercial boycotts and blockades against Israel;

(c) The launching of international projects for the fullest utilization of the resources of the region for the benefit of all peoples in the Near and Middle East.

In undertaking that appraisal and in formulating a new policy, our Government and the American people can have unqualified confidence in Israel's willingness to enter into peace negotiations with the Arabs, in its deep concern with the economic development and social welfare not alone of its own territory but of the entire region, and in its unwavering loyalty to the cause of democracy and freedom.

We are convinced that such a policy, imaginatively conceived and resolutely pursued, can lessen tension and strengthen freedom in the Middle East while giving full expression to the American desire to deal justly with all groups and peoples. The peace of the world may ultimately rest on our capacity to bring peace with justice to the Middle East.

Condition of Workers in the Communist World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 27, 1954

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an open letter signed by Arthur J. Goldberg, general counsel for the Congress of Industrial Organizations; Welly K. Hopkins, counsel for the United Mine Workers; and J. Albert Woll, counsel for the American Federation of Labor, be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

The letter is a significant weapon in the arsenal of democracy against the onslaught of Communist totalitarianism. It reflects the overwhelming sentiment of the American free labor movement in its defense of the American system of democracy and in its recognition that the Soviet Union enslaves both the working people and their trade unions.

In recent weeks an international lawyers' conference met in Vienna which passed the resolution distorting the nature of the American society. The resolution has been distributed throughout the world by the Communist-controlled Federation of World Trade Unions. The reply by Messrs. Woll, Hopkins, and Goldberg, the outstanding labor lawyers in America, deserves the widest circulation in its attack against Communist totalitarianism and its eloquent espousal of democracy.

The conclusion is inescapable that the trade unions in the Soviet Union cannot be called free. Indeed, "they do not deserve the appellation of 'trade union'."

I commend Messrs. Hopkins, Woll, and Goldberg for taking the initiative in exposing once again the fraud that is communism. The American trade union movement is again demonstrating that it is one of the most effective champions of democracy in the world.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Letter to J. H. Oldenbroek, Secretary-General of the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions, From J. Albert Woll, Counsel for the American Federation of Labor; Welly K. Hopkins, Counsel for the United Mine Workers; and Arthur J. Goldberg, General Counsel for the Congress of Industrial Organizations

We are addressing this open letter to you in our capacities as the chief lawyers for the American Federation of Labor, the Congress of Industrial Organizations, and the United Mine Workers of America—the three United States trade union organizations affiliated with the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions.

Our attention has recently been directed to the resolution of the International Conference of Lawyers, held in Vienna under the auspices of the International Association of Democratic Lawyers, which resolution was published in Le Peuple of February 1, 1954; and to the speech of M. Leon Lyon-Caen, honorary first president of the Court of Cassation of France at the Vienna conference as printed in World Trade Union Movement, the publication of the Communist-dominated World Federation of Trade Unions, dated February 1, 1954.

Speaking as individuals and as lawyers intimately and constantly concerned with the legal problems of the American trade union movement, we take this means of vigorously protesting and denying the implications of the speech M. Leon Lyon-Caen, and of the resolution adopted by the International Conference of Lawyers.

In addition, we take this means of expressing our vigorous protest at the statement of Prof. Sergei Bratus, of the Soviet delegation to that conference, who in a report in the publication, News, of Moscow, dated February 16, 1954, inferred that the International Association of Democratic Lawyers is "the movement of the honest lawyers of the world." It is no such thing.

It is clear to us that the Vienna Conference, sponsored by the International Association of Democratic Lawyers, was nothing more or less than a forum of undiluted Communist propaganda. If honest lawyers are so naive as to accept the flouting of logic which marked the resolutions and speeches of the Conference, they scarcely deserve the trust and respect of democratic peoples throughout the world.

An analysis of M. Lyon-Caen's address, which is being circulated by the WFTU, shows that he sought to establish two major points: (a) violation of trade union rights and civil liberties occurs only in the democratic countries of the free world; and (b) union rights and civil rights receive full protection only in the Soviet Union and the satellite so-called people's democracies. This conclusion is one that no honest lawyer fully aware of the facts and the law, can support by any known process of logic.

We have learned that the International Association of Democratic Lawyers was a sponsor of the vicious and false report on germ warfare in 1952. No group of honest lawyers could issue such a report, because the story of the use of germ warfare by the American and United Nations forces in Korea and China is an unfounded, deceiving, vicious fabrication for which there is not the slightest scientific basis of evidence.

Further study of the background of the International Association of Democratic Lawyers finds that it has uniformly extolled the alleged, but actually nonexistent, protection of civil rights in Communist-controlled countries while magnifying and distorting the facts about violation of civil and trade union rights in the non-Communist world. This background can scarcely appeal to truly honest and democratic lawyers, who seek to make determinations based on fact and to adopt progressive philosophies based on reality.

M. Lyon-Caen's speech, as reported in the WFTU Journal, is a long recording of the problems and difficulties faced by organized labor in the United States and other non-Communist countries.

As labor lawyers, we, of course, realize that the trade-union movement in the United States and other non-Communist nations has problems; but we are also fully conscious of the tremendous progress which the working people have made in developing their democratic trade-union organizations and, over the long run, of strengthening and improving the legislation under which they function.

We would be the first to acknowledge, as trade-union lawyers, that the Taft-Hartley Act was a backward step—but in perspective it does not merit the abuse for the American system of democracy which the International Association of Democratic Lawyers and other Communist spokesmen have heaped upon the American people in recent years.

We also would not deny that in certain underdeveloped areas of the globe great progress must be made in developing a free, democratic, and vigorous trade-union movement, in eliminating antiunion legislation, and in establishing a firm base for the progress of the workers' organizations.

But, as any truly honest lawyer must realize, the great strength of the democratic system is that it permits of change; that it offers a framework for the development of civil liberties, civil rights, and the orderly growth of trade unionism; that it encourages the participation of all the people and an accumulating understanding and strengthening of those fundamental liberties which are the basis of a civilized society. Certainly M. Lyon-Caen, if he were making an objective presentation, recognizing as he must the glorious heritage of the French people, would not fail to recognise the glories of the democratic process—of free thought and free speech, freedom to worship, and freedom of assemblage.

Certainly, also, he would have to recognize that in wide sections of the world the forces of totalitarianism are pledged to the destruction of those rights. That was true in Nazi Germany. That is true in Fascist nations, such as Spain and Argentina, and it is also true in the Communist world of Soviet Russia, Soviet China, and the satellite nations.

On the record of the facts of repression of trade unions, of slave-labor camps, and of harsh laws harshly administered against the independence of the workers, we are at a loss to understand how M. Lyon-Caen can say, as he did in his Vienna speech:

"One must not confuse these practices (i. e. repression of trade union and civil rights) with those of the Socialist countries where the state certainly takes an interest in the functioning of the trade unions, but to facilitate their formation and the functioning in order to accord them an ever greater role in the life of the enterprise and of the nation. Legislation in these countries threatens in no way the independence of the unions. On the one hand (in capitalist and colonial countries) we know a police control of the unions by the opponents of the trade union movement and the placing of workers' organizations in tutelage; on the other hand (in Socialist countries), in contrast there is the granting of very broad powers to the unions and the industry to facilitate the accomplishment of their task."

This statement—the only allusion in the speech to the relationship of the Soviet bloc of states to the trade unions of their countries, flies directly in the face of a massive amount of evidence.

In the Soviet Union and the satellite countries, there is no independence for the trade unions. The bylaws of the Soviet trade unions make clear that these trade unions are permitted no independence. The bylaws of the All Union Central Council of the Trade Unions of the U. S. S. R., according to the organization's own paper, Trud, May 11, 1949, reported:

"Soviet trade unions conduct all their work under the direction of the Communist Party—the organizing and directing force of Socialist society. The trade unions of the U. S. S. R. rally the working masses around the party of Lenin and Stalin."

Certainly, there is no indication of independence or freedom for trade unions when they are, by their own bylaws, placed under the control of a party or state—even when that party or state falsely claims, as does the Soviet Union and its Communist Party, it is the friend or the representative of the workers themselves.

No sane man can claim that the Soviet Union or its satellite countries has come close to approaching the utopia about which its founders and its leaders have spoken so ecstatically. The Soviet press occasionally, as part of official self-criticism, reports of bad working conditions, exploitation, shoddy construction of workers' homes and a host of other similar matters. Yet, never in a blue moon do the Soviet trade unions do anything about even these acknowledged problems.

Last year there was a shuffling of positions in the Soviet Government. When it had been accomplished, the chairman of the Presidium of the Soviet Union had suddenly become the secretary of the All Union Central Council of Trade Unions—by Government order and without any record of prior action to elect him by the Soviet trade unions. Can a case be argued for independence of the trade unions when they are not even free to pick their leader?

In every country where there is a bona fide trade-union movement, the agreement with management is the major goal of the workers and their trade-union leaders. Yet, in the Soviet Union, "The agreement of the parties [in negotiating collective agreements] plays a subordinate role in the determination of the amount of wages or salaries." (I. T. Gelyakova, Labor Legislation, Moscow, 1947.)

It is an essential of free trade unionism everywhere that the workers should have a voice in determining the rates by which they will be paid. Yet, in the Soviet Union (Trud, February 20, 1947), "It is well known that the rates of wages for workers, engineering-technical personnel, and office employees are established only by Government decisions." And this official trade-union organ continues, "It is the task of the trade unions and of managements to create conditions for increased productivity of labor, and thus to create the conditions for a raising of wages."

This impotence on the part of the unions was indicated by a delegate to the 1949 convention of the Soviet trade unions (the first convention in many years, incidentally) as reported by a member of a Swedish trade-union delegation which visited that convention. According to this Swedish unionist, writing in the Swedish trade unions' official publication:

"Comrade Koetkin made a still more grave complaint. He said that questions of wages and working conditions are being settled without hearing the union concerned. He considered this unreasonable because of the expert knowledge of facts represented by the unions. Yet he, too, avoided demanding that the interests of labor should be taken into consideration. It seems as if these interests are not identical with those of management—a fact hard to reconcile with the official theory."

The workers of the Communist world do not have the right to strike. Without the strike weapon, no trade union, regardless of the society in which it functions, has freedom to defend its members against repression, against attacks on the security of its organization, against economic deterioration, or to achieve effectively progress in social and economic matters. We are all well aware of the common Communist argument that strikes are unnecessary in a socialist country, but we cannot accept this fallacious argument. The long history of Soviet "self-criticism" by itself, let alone the real rather than official facts, proves that without trade unions permitted to strike or desirous of seeking the right to strike, abuses occur against working men and working women. Yet, the trade unions, harnessed as they are to the machinery of the Communist state, make no protest. In fact, they are silent partners in the exploitation of their own members.

Such unions cannot be called free. Indeed, they do not deserve the appellation of "trade unions."

The existence of slave-labor camps whose population runs into uncalculated millions, of whom a large portion are sentenced by administrative rather than judicial order; the heavy penalities for absenteeism or tradiness—punishment severe by any known standard in the modern world; the body of administrative law which ties the worker to his job and makes it most difficult if he seeks to move without the permission of management—all of these prove beyond doubt that in the Soviet Union as well as in the satellite nations, the major opponent of true trade union rights and fundamental civil liberties and civil rights is in fact, the Communist Party and the Communist-controlled government. This party and this government, though it falsely claims to speak for the workers, is actually the dictatorship of an elite group over the proletariat, and it treats the workers and their trade unions as a subjugated, capitive manpower force.

Honest workers throughout the free democratic world and truly honest lawyers know it is dishonest in the face of the facts, to equate the position of the workers in the Communist world with those in the free nations. Unions cannot be free unless they have the right to use the strike weapon, regardless of the type of society or government in which they operate. Unions cannot be free if they are controlled by a monolithic political party and have their freedom and initiative made subordinate to the will of a political dictatorship.

Trade unions cannot be free and independent unless they are prepared to take an active part in developing and strengthening the civil liberties and civil rights, not only of working people but of every section of society—for only a free society in which there is freedom of choice, lawful action and freedom of movement, can promise, over the long run, a better world for the people.

Thus, the question becomes one of honesty of approach to this vital problem of trade union and civil rights.

As counsel for organizations affiliated with the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions, we must challenge the approach typified by the resolution of the International Conference of Lawyers and by M. Lyon-Caen's speech, which seeks to make an illogical and baseless comparison between the dictatorships of the world and the democracies of the world.

We denounce the resolution of the International Conference of Lawyers and M. Lyon-Caen's speech as a disservice to all real trade unionists who everywhere seek the extension and development of truly democratic systems which will bring political freedom, economic security and the chance for economic and creative advancement to all the peoples of the world.

The Pledge of Allegiance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1954

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I believe the following letter which I have received from Gridley Adams, the founder and director-general of the United States Flag Foundation, to be most apropos:

May 25, 1954.

My Dear Congressman Multer: Thanks in conglomerate masses for your "remarks" in a recent Congressional Record condemning Senator Flanders' bill to amend the Constitution, no less, and insert "This Nation devoutly recognizes the authority and law of Jesus Christ."

Since the Senate has passed the Ferguson bill to insert the words "under God" in the Pledge of Allegiance, it seems everybody has thought up some similar scheme of his own.

Now, as the House has under consideration a similar bill, will you (and induce others to join you in chorus) get up in the House and yell to high heaven against this monkeying with the first amendment? (There is nothing irreligious in this plea of mine, because I am the son of an Episcopal minister.)

The Senate, in passing that Ferguson bill, is an actual break in the long-observed basic law of the separation of church versus state; and if this trend continues, it may eventually bring about a war of religions that will outrun the St. Bartholomew massacre and Bloody Mary's regime in England.

Unthinkingly (perhaps) the Senate has kicked that first amendment ("Congress shall make no law respecting the establishment of religion * * *") into a cocked hat; but don't let the House fall into that trap. Your fellow Congressmen do not get the full meaning of your rebuttal from reading the Record, but they will take notice of your voice. I am vehemently opposed to any and all attempts to write religious dogmas into the law of the land.

Right truly yours,

Gridley Adams.

The Stevens-McCarthy Hearings Before the Subcommittee on Investigations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. UPTON

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 27, 1954

Mr. UPTON. Mr. President, the hearing of the Stevens-McCarthy controversy before the Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations has aroused widespread interest and concern. The concern in no small part results from the time Senators serving on the subcommittee are compelled to take from other and more important duties. This proceeding, as distinguished from the usual investigations, is quasi-judicial in nature, involving the determination of issues of fact and findings. The question is being widely raised whether such a hearing might not better be delegated by the Senate to a special tribunal with authority to take testimony and to find and report the facts to the Senate.

I request unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a letter advancing this view from a distinguished lawyer of my State.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Wyman, Starr, Booth,
Wadleigh & Langdell,
Manchester, N. H., May 4, 1954.
Hon. Robert W. Upton,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

My Dear Senator Upton: I hold no brief for Senator McCarthy, and by this statement I mean no criticism of the Senator. I am not fully informed upon the issues in the present investigation; it has not been possible for me to follow the television. Yet, it seems to me that so long as it is conceded that civilian supervision of Army activity is desirable, there is likely to be conflict between civilian and Army control. If it is impolitic and perhaps injurious to Army morale for a civilian investigator publicly to criticize an Army officer for promoting or granting an honorable discharge to a known security risk, it is nevertheless inherent in such a situation that there is something wrong in the Army system which requires such an officer, knowing the facts, to follow orders. In the overall picture, the basic question seems to be whether it is more important to be drastic and perhaps overdramatic in ferreting out the Red influence, or to let the Army continue in its own method of investigation and control which permits serious mistakes to occur.

I submit to you that an investigation of such a conflict could properly be handled through competent counsel on each side before a master or a board who could report to the Senate without requiring the continued presence of so many Senators whose duties require attention to other and more important matters.

Sincerely yours,

LOUIS E. WYMAN.

The New Communist Line

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1954

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, the statement below appeared in the May 1954 issue of the AVC Bulletin, a publication of the American Veterans Committee, Inc. The author, Gus Tyler, a member of the staff of the International Ladies' Garment Workers Union, AFL, is one of the most effective anti-Communists in the country. What Mr. Tyler has to say about the new Communist line deserves the careful attention of all those who would strengthen the United States and democracy at home and abroad.

THE NEW COMMUNIST LINE

(By Gus Tyler)

Today the American Communist Party is aware of its isolation—the most thorough isolation it has known as a movement. At the same time, world communism is aware of the weak position of the United States as a political and moral force in the world. The result is the new line of the Communist Party.

The new line of world communism is to create the impression that there is no such thing as the Communist threat in the world. It is a readiness to submerge everything to create the impression there is no such thing as the Communist movement. Internationally, it is to create the impression that the Soviet Union is ready to cooperate with everybody totally and completely. The EDC was put together as a form of action against the Soviet Union, yet today the Soviet Union say EDC's a fine thing. In fact, they're ready to join it. They're ready to join NATO, and I understand that they're now coming into the ILO and all the U. N. agencies. In short, they're going to cooperate. "We are no threat, we are no menace," they say. I suggest (this is only one man's opinion) that given half the opportunity, they will try to negotiate a peace in Indochina. That's the international operation. Why?

SELF OBLITERATION

As anybody who studies the Western World must be aware almost instantaneously, the normal frictions in the Western World are enough to explode the whole non-Soviet world. To the extent that Germany and France have been brought together, to the extent that England has been ready to accept certain agreements, to the extent that the United States, if you please, has displayed a degree of internationalism in the last 5 or 6 years, to the extent that any kind of alliance has been built up, they have been built up by Soviet aggression. In the absence of Soviet aggression, they probably would have never existed. In the absence of Soviet aggression, it is very doubtful that we ever would have had a Marshall plan, or an EDC, or NATO. Now is the time for the Soviet Union to say, "Let's take off the pressure and see how this thing goes to pieces."

This international line ties in very closely with the domestic line. The domestic line is to give the impression there is no Communist Party. This is not self-annihilation, this is organized self-obliteration. You are there, but you can't be seen.

Now, of course, it's not unusual for the Communists to have an underground apparatus which they've always had. Nor is it unusual for a Communist to say, "I'm not a Communist." But I'm not talking about that. I'm now talking about a new line which is total self-obliteration, not forever, but for a while to create the impression that there is no separate movement.

How do they do it? One, they fold up their separate organizations. Two, they fold up their separate factions within organizations. So that some of you who may have had contact with this thing will suddenly discover that the Commuists in unions and other organizations have no separate programs, no separate demands, no separate slates, no separate anything. Somebody whom you know to be a Communist, you absolutely know where he stands and what he is, and he knows that you know, is very apt to come up to you and give you a little talk like the following: "You know, we've got to go back to the old cooperative basis. You can put us to the test. You'll find we'll make no trouble. You want to run for office? You want someone to distribute your slates? We'll distribute the slates, wash the windows, scrub the floors, man your picket line, sell lace curtains for you." This is the line: total self-obliteration. (I want to suggest a subhead to this that I think the party would welcome outlawing at this point. If the party is outlawed, then nobody could say that there's a Communist danger around—they don't exist. What is more, they're completely able to operate illegally. Whether they welcome it or not, theirs is an operation that makes it possible for them to operate under totally illegal conditions.)

NORMAL FRICTIONS

The new line gives them an opportunity to make new contacts to break out of their isolation because they're no longer separate groups, they're no longer separate organizations. They're just individuals—nice, active, decent, loyal individuals in organizations making contact with others. But most of all, they're out to create the impression that there is no Communist Party around at all. On what theory? On the theory that if there is no danger of communism, then if you permit the normal frictions to go to work, the free world falls apart. Now, the normal frictions here are not only frictions between France and England, France and Germany, England and the Continent, United States and other countries; they're the normal frictions within the United States. I don't have to spell out what those normal frictions are for you, because you know them. In the light of * * * operations, these normal frictions are frightfully clear.

NEW APPROACH

Now some of the comrades don't quite accept this line, or didn't quite accept this line as of last Christmas. Some of them asked: What's this big push here to create the impression that there is no Communist threat internationally? Why don't we instead throw all our forces into the * * * movement? Or why don't we take advantage of the high cost of living? Or the problem of civil rights? Within the party there were people who wanted to advance any one of these as a more important idea than this new idea that it's important to break up the alliance of the United States and other countries to undermine the present anti-Soviet war alliance.

This is the new line and it calls for a new approach. This is called the fight for peace. And to the Communists who say, "What about * * *?" they have an answer. They say, that if we create an atmosphere in the world where there's no feeling of a threat of communism, McCarthyism will lose ground. (By the way, I think there's a large element of truth to that.) And therefore, the way to deal with McCarthyism is through this tactic of creating the impression that there is no Communist threat. What about the economic crisis? Here the reply was that the war danger was creating the economic crisis; therefore, if the war danger passes, the economic problem is solved. What about the struggle for civil rights? Even there, they've got a cute explanation: If the apparent threat of communism disappears internationally, it will solve the problem of civil rights. Why? Because the drive to war is what brings assaults on civil rights. So say the Communist leaders, if the drive to war is weakened, the Anglo-Saxon white ideology is weakened, and the Negro people will have a better break. What's happening here is that they're arguing with their own party members, saying, "Don't push civil rights too hard. Don't push separate movements on * * * too hard. Don't push the economic fight too hard. Create the impression there is no Communist movement." That's the strategy.

Now this strategy is aimed at a bigger thing, obviously, and the bigger thing is the disintegration of the free world. The moment it disintegrates, the moment it is possible to separate the United States from Europe and divide and economically weaken the United States, then the line reverses and these nice, quiet, nonbelligerent people take up militant communism again. Then they're ready for the kill. We're isolated, divided, and weak. There's the strategy as I see it.

Now, how do you further the movement toward the isolation of the United States? It is fundamentally to lean on the organized isolationist forces in the United States. I have a piece of evidence here that's simply fantastic.

Here is the Daily Worker, April 21, page 2: "Five Illinois Congressmen tell Mine, Mill they oppose United States intervention in Indochina." What is this Mine Mill? You know the Mine, Mill, and Smelter Union. It is fundamentally a Communist-led union. One of their locals passed a resolution. The resolution says: "Stewards of the local, representing 2,000 members, most sincerely urge that no Americans be sent to the Indochina War. We urge our Government to use its good offices instead to encourage truce negotiations, which both the Indochinese leaders and most French people favor." They sent this resolution to their Congressmen and they got an answer. One of the answers printed in the Daily Worker with great approval comes from a man called Senator ———. He says: "I quite subscribe to your thinking with reference to sending troops to Indochina. I am confident the overwhelming majority of the Members of the Senate would go along."

In the Daily Worker, too, are reprints of other letters, reprinted with great approval. From what paper? The Chicago Tribune. One of the letters from Chicago: "I wish to commend you"—a reader writes to the Chicago Tribune—"I wish to commend you on your editorial today on Indochina. As all my friends are draft age, the policy of Dulles to save Indochina for the French has a direct concern for me." There are other letters like that to the Chicago Tribune reprinted with approval and delight by the Daily Worker.

The Daily Worker at the present time finds its strongest ally in the isolationist forces in this country. And this is no longer a backdoor alliance. The Daily Worker now regularly runs reprints from the isolationist journals in the United States, and quotes with approval.

Fundamentally what the Communists would like people to say is: The United States should have nothing to do with the rest of the world; and secondly, that we should label social reform in the United States as preparation for communism. That's what the Communists would like. Their ultimate purpose is to destroy the liberal movement. To quote them: "We can only make progress in proportion as the policy of the liberals (Social Democrats) experiences one catastrophe after another." And when they can get any kind of organized force that says (1) isolate America, and (2) concentrate internally on blocking social reform by labeling it as red, they've got what they want.

Here is an example of the kind of thing which is almost the perfect Communist line—and is straight McCarthyism. This is from the American Mercury. I am quoting from an article by John P. Flynn called The Soviet Second Front: "We will begin to fight American communism in America when we top spending billions to fight foolish and losing wars against communism in Europe and Asia and direct our fire at this army of creepies in America which builds the foundation on which which communism will later roost." And that, I think, is a more inclusive definition of this thing called McCarthyism. It is more inclusive than the man, for it is a point of view, a philosophy.

What we have at the present is a reformation of that little old alliance between the reactionary American isolationists, whose prime target is American liberalism and internationalism, just using communism as a weapon; and the Communists, whose prime purpose is the isolation of the United States and the destruction of the American liberal movement, using the other forces occasionally as a weapon. I think at this point, in seeking some kind of orientation for American liberalism, we have to think less and less in terms of McCarthyism and communism as extremes. I think they need each other, they feed on each other, and if they didn't have one another, they would invent one another. * * * does invent Communists, but I'm not so sure the Communists didn't create him. We're dealing with a united and joint phenomenon.

What's Wrong With France?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 10, 1954

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I am including an editorial by Mr. Lahey which appeared in the Washington Star. Mr. Lahey in this article points out that the real difficulty in France is the atrophied condition of its economic society and that France has neither the dynamic capitalism of the United States nor the compulsive weapons of totalitarianism as the means for realizing a fuller material life.

WHAT SEEMS

(By Edwin A. Lahey)

For any one who has visited Paris and pondered her contributions to the culture of the West, as I did recently, there's a temptation to say nothing's wrong with France.

But the frequent twitches from social, economic, or political crises in France are more than a bad case of indigestion.

The informed men in our own Government point to a couple of serious ailments in the body politic and economic of France.

First of all, France is living in a dynamic world with a status quo mentality. The capitalism of France, or the free-enterprise system, is in such an arrested state of development that the country simply cannot attain its full potential of wealth.

If a television company in this country, for example, curtailed its manufacturing and sales program to the cautious target of replacing old sets, instead of looking for new markets, it would be operating about the way the French economy has been operating, and would have as many crises.

Secondly, the French Government is in business up to its neck. Its adventures in socialism, which make hundreds of thousands of industrial workers government employees, tend to convert the economic problems of a stagnant society into explosive political issues.

The French Government owns 51 percent of the railroad system; 64 percent of the French Line of steamships; 72 percent of a steamship line to the Far East; all of Air France; 30 percent of a pipe line in France; 35 percent of a boat line on the Rhine; all the coal mines and potash deposits; all the utility companies.

The French Government likewise owns the Renault Automobile Co., which it took away from its private owners after the liberation. The Government also has taken over several banks and a few life insurance companies.

The Government owns 99 percent of the facilities for the manufacture of aircraft; has a partial interest in a company selling petroleum; manufactures commercial alcohol from Government subsidized beets; has a proprietary interest in the national radio network, a newsreel company, and a news agency; and virtually controls cigarettes and matches through the use of the excise tax machinery.

The static nature of French capitalism means that there is no room for adjustment if the worker finds his economic condition on the downgrade. There are no new industries competing for labor which finds itself unhappy in the old job.

And the extensive Government holdings in business establish a direct political link between the workers and their bosses, which makes it easy to turn an economic dispute into a political crisis. (There are 500,000 railroad workers and 100,000 miners working for the Government, just to take two instances.)

Despite the potential wealth of beautiful, fertile, and creative France, the condition of its people has improved little since the nation was stabilized in the postwar period.

Real wages in France today are actually about the same as what they were prior to the war, according to statistics compiled by our own Government people.

The average weekly earnings of single French workers in January 1953, were 5,720 francs. This is about $16, a sum which wouldn't get an American tourist and his wife out of a good restaurant in Paris.

Money wages, however, are not all of the income of a French worker. He has extensive social-security benefits. Wage statistics are given for single workers because the family benefits for married workers are too complex to include in arriving at averages.

This social-security setup in France had most of its growth in the period immediately after the liberation, when the leftwing atmosphere prevailed in French political life.

Today the pendulum has swung to the right, as it has in other countries, and the unrest in France is largely founded on real and imaginary fears that the government plans to trim the social benefits.

But the real difficulty in France is probably the atrophied condition of its economic society.

France has neither the dynamic capitalism of the United States nor the compulsive weapons of totalitarianism as a means for realizing a fuller material life.

One possible reason for the caution and sterility of French capitalism is the static population of France. Its population of 42 million never seems to vary. United States industrialists and economic planners, on the other hand, are always setting their sights on constantly increasing population and production.

The "institution of consumer credit" as we know it in the United States, the gimmick that gets people to buy on time, does not exist in France. If the Frenchman needs something, he stashes his pennies away until he's got the price.

The "institution of advertising" which is the essence of American merchandising techniques, and without which consumption in this country would decline speedily, exists in France only in a most rudimentary stage. There's practically nothing to read in the Paris papers but news.

No Depression Is Still Our Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1954

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, the Democratic Party's chop-licking expectation that we were headed for bad times is gone with the wind. Without a single major issue on which to base their campaign this November, the Democratic high command has been looking into every economic breeze to predict that it will whip up an economic blizzard. Their brain trust can stop looking. It is not going to be.

In Washington this week one of our most conservative economists gave the Democrats their quietus. He pointed out that from January to April the drop in industrial production was less than half the decline in the 3 months before January. For the first time since last summer no drop at all took place between March and April. Manufacturing orders have increased in the last 2 months. Durable consumer goods have been improving in sales on a nonseasonable basis, and the summer months are expected to see further rises in retail sales, which have been a weak spot throughout the first months of 1954.

We may not be out of the economic woods yet, but the sun is shining and the skies are blue overhead. Increased population, expansion of basic industries, and the constant rise in America's standard of living penetrating all levels of our population give us far more cause for optimism than for pessimism generated by political motivation. Take off those dark glasses, Messrs. Stevenson, Truman, and Reuther. It is daytime.

The Minnesota Foundation for Political Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 27, 1954

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a thought-provoking address entitled "The Minnesota Foundation for Political Education," recently delivered by my friend, Byron G. Allen, the able Democratic national committeeman from Minnesota. The efforts of Mr. Allen and his associates to broaden the understanding and participation of the public in the Nation's political life, which he there describes, are serving the best interests of our American democracy.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MINNESOTA FOUNDATION FOR POLITICAL EDUCATION

(Address on Democratic Recruitment Day at the Institute for Practical Politics, Ohio Wesleyan University, Delaware, Ohio, March 8, 1954, by Byron G. Allen, Democratic national committeeman for Minnesota)

In Minnesota, members of the Democratic-Farmer-Labor Party, as individuals, are sponsoring the Minnesota Foundation for Political Education, patterned on the foundation system of the British political parties. As far as we know, it is the first such effort in the United States to work toward financial stability and long-time planning for the needs of a major political party. It is a venture aimed at gaining the confidence and support of the general public, especially those who usually support the national Democratic Party and affiliate with our Democratic-Farmer-Labor Party in the State.

We are confident that our ideal will succeed and that it will furnish a guide to the party units in other States and to the national committees of the major parties.

(As late as 1942, Minnesota was a three-party State. The Democratic Party, that year, ranking third in votes to the Republican and Farmer-Labor Parties. President Franklin D. Roosevelt had carried Minnesota in 1932, 1936, and 1940, but with the exception of one congressional seat which was held for a short time by a Democrat, all of Minnesota's congressional representation had been by either Republicans or Farmer-Laborites. The Farmer-Laborites and Democrats, from 1932 on, had united to carry the State for the Democratic presidential ticket. Then in 1944, a fusion convention was held and under the leadership of HUBERT H. HUMPHREY and others, what we refer to as the Democratic-Farmer-Labor Party was created and affiliated with the national Democratic Party. I happened to be the fusion party's candidate for governor that year.)

It is the opinion of the trustees who founded the foundation that our campaigns in Minnesota are biennial emotional binges, that the contests are, too often, popularity contests, and that real and important issues are obscured by the name calling and the techniques of the politicians and the press and the radio commentators who leave the impression that the candidates are either good men or bad men.

Actually, far too many are mediocre. (This is a personal opinion, of course.)

No wonder so many parents, 7 out of 10, according to a recent survey, do not want their children to take part in politics. No wonder but a very few of our ablest people enter the competitive political arena to make a career and but few take part in party affairs as an avocation or hobby.

The chief responsibility lies with the politicians themselves; and sometimes I think that those who control the mediums of communication, press, radio, and TV, want it so.

An accusation * * * is sure to make the headlines and be featured by an impassioned spokesman for a tablet which, when dissolved in a glass of water and gulped by a man with a headache, produces a resounding belch.

The careful research of political scientists first set forth in statistics and dry tomes, then filed away on the shelves of university libraries to gather dust, does not shape public opinion.

Such work only leads to Ph. D.'s.

However, the work of these students could bear fruit. The efforts of scholars could be translated into political literature and turned into appeals to the public by the working politicians, if the scholars and the politicians could get together in their efforts.

The work of the Citizenship Clearing House, affiliated with the Law Center of New York University is doing much to accomplish this cooperation between the political scientists and the working politicians.

Incidentally, the Citizenship Clearing House was the inspired idea of a great Republican, Arthur T. Vanderbilt, chief justice of the Supreme Court of New Jersey.

Judge Vanderbilt saw the necessity for training college men and women for participation in politics.

The administration of Ohio Wesleyan University is to be commended for its pioneer efforts in this regard.

There are far too many institutions of higher learning who are reluctant to permit political activity on their campuses.

In my day in college, in the early twenties, the surest way to become personna non grata was to show an enthusiasm for political activity, unless, of course, your learnings were toward the dominant political factions of the majority Republican Party in the State.

For a faculty member to participate was most dangerous and the students were not on safe ground, either.

To keep the record straight, I ought to tell you that my class graduated from Iowa State College in 1924, I received my degree 8 years later, after a summer session in 1932.

In the interim, I had been elected to the Iowa Legislature and had been one of those instrumental in securing an appropriation for new buildings, faculty salaries, and other items of importance for that great institution at Ames.

Though all was forgiven, I have never been recommended for a county agent job or work for the extension department of any agricultural college in the land.

FINANCIAL METHODS AND NEEDS

With each and every so-called scandal in Government and politics the American people have raised a howl and, in almost every flagrant instance, Congress or the State legislatures have responded with restrictive legislation designed to end some particular heinous practice of the politician, and, sometimes, the practices of the businessman who would corrupt him.

The Corrupt Practices Acts, both State and Federal, the Hatch Act, certain parts of the Taft-Hartley Act, all came about because of so-called scandalous conduct of politicians, in and out of office. Of course, both Federal and State forms of civil service came about because of the evils of the spoils system. It is doubtful, however, that civil service has proven to be as reliable a method as it is possible to inaugurate, and it is generally conceded that incompetents are often frozen in their jobs, as well as those in the public service who are loyal, competent, and dedicated.

It is conceded by all that the party system is not strengthened by the loss of the spoils system. Many a party worker, a few years ago, was recruited and worked hard for the party in the hope that he would be rewarded. Not all of these were venal or incompetent. Party workers are more difficult to find nowadays.

Checkoff contributions by those on the public payroll are frowned upon. Contributions by labor unions and corporations are prohibited. All such methods of financing political activity have caused the upset of parties and incumbents in times past.

Scandals have been followed by restrictive and prohibitive legislation. Never have we had permissive legislation follow these incidents in our history. This is not so in some other western democracies. I am told, for example, that in Britain donations for political causes and candidates, within reasonable bounds, are encouraged by both the law and public opinion. There, the law treats the conscientious giving of money to political activity as having laudable status such as giving for educational purposes.

Even though I may have been misinformed in this regard, it is logical that political donations should be so rated by law and public opinion.

Restrictive laws, together with the lack of permissive legislation, has made corruption inevitable in the United States and in Minnesota.

The Newberry case in Michigan created a stench when I was a boy of high-school age. I read about it in the newspapers and was made to feel outraged by the cartoons of J. N. Ding. It was an eye opener because a wealthy man and his friends spent $195,000, most of it to win the Republican nomination to the United States Senate, and to win the election in a then one-party State. After conviction in a Federal court for violating the Corrupt Practices Act of the day, the United States Supreme Court set aside the conviction by a 5-to-4 decision. The Senate seated him by a close vote, but Senator Newberry resigned shortly thereafter and dropped out of public life like a stone falling into a lake.

Two hundred thousand dollars is a realistic sum now. With modern and expensive means of communication, such as radio and television, billboards, and airplanes rushing the candidate from one end of a State to another, it is only reasonable to expect that from $50,000 to $200,000 should be spent on any important statewide candidacy in several of our larger States.

Many times the Newberry $200,000 amount was spent in Ohio by the Taft and Ferguson forces, of the Republican and Democratic Party in 1950, and the furor was mild, undoubtedly too mild. Yet our restrictive legislation, growing out of the Newberry scandals as contained in the Corrupt Practices Acts, limits the expenditures of a candidate for the United States Senate to $25,000, and to a similar amount for each committee organized on behalf of the candidate. How ridiculous and unrealistic.

As a working politician, I know the subterfuges that are used. I know that the realities require money which must be passed under the table. I also know that the rank-and-file citizens, notoriously generous with the March of Dimes and the Red Cross, do not finance political causes, candidates, or parties. Few are donors who do not have an ax to grind, a special favor to be had, or a personal ambition to realize.

Though our two-party system presupposes on opposition candidate, many minority party candidates in many States, and most of them in Minnesota and Iowa, find it hopelessly impossible to get enough financial backing to make a respectible showing in the presentation of issues or personal qualifications. The result is that minority party leaders are frustrated by the search and recruitment of candidates because self-respecting and busy men and women of strong character want to make a creditible showing, even if they lose. The result, under the primary system, is that the mediocre, the unskilled and untrained, or the screwball does file or is filed and too often is nominated to the disgrace of the minority party. Not so often, but sometimes the traditional, majority party is also so afflicted.

A competetive career in politics is most insecure. Therefore, it is difficult to encourage skilled, trained, able and conscientious people to leave their normal vocations to enter the political arena. All must feed and clothe themselves and their families and have a roof over their heads. It is almost equally difficult to show most people that there are pleasures of friendship and association to be had in such an avocation as being a participant in a party caucus, as a poll watcher, or serving as a county chairman. This again is more true of the minority party, in any given community, because the senior members of the firm, the employer or the man himself says, "It will hurt the business."

Oftentimes the wife or husband raises the truly effective objection.

As one who was once in the majority party, in the Middle West, but left to join the minority party, because his conscience so dictated, and has been a party worker or party official for a period of more than 25 years, I am convinced of what I have stated in this regard.

Sometimes, moved by a realization of the importance of issues, the spirit of adventure, a willingness to take a chance, or righteous indignation with affairs that exist, well-to-do and able citizens have gone into campaigns as candidates, or supporters of candidates, and have spent their own money. Whether winner or loser, the sacrifice is more than should be expected. Some of these persons have impoverished themselves. I have known several, personally. Because of a few such instances, I live with a feeling of personal guilt for having helped recruit their services.

A citizen can advertise his business or personal skills and qualifications, if in the pursuit of money, and deduct the expenditures so made as legitimate business expense, for purposes of taxation. But, that same citizen cannot expend his money to further a political career and tell his neighbor of his thoughts on the needs of the community and expect any consideration from the taxgatherer.

A citizen may give to a myriad of causes, as a matter of conscience and deduct such expenditures from his taxable income, provided, mind you, that the conscientious giving had nothing to do with his political conscience.

Because of all the reasons I have stated, let me ask: "How can honorable and capable people be interested in making political activity or public service a career, or even political work an avocaiton, in the light of the great expense to be borne in such activity and the methods currently used to meet such expense?"

No doubt this question needs answering.

Perhaps some study should be made to effect even a few partial answers.

In Europe, particularly in Britain and in Sweden, I am told, political party foundations built and replenished in their resources by the rank and file citizens, are fostered by directive law and public opinion. There the expenses and salaries of district field men, traveling lecturers from parliament and the universities and other walks of life, schooling for prospective candidates, and the campaign funds are all financed in full or in party by the party foundations.

It would be valuable to the American people to have some knowledge of the strengths and weakness of the foundation system of Europe.

The trusteeships of such foundations should be in the hands of competent and honorable people, outside the party officialdom or political careerists, in my opinion.

ETHICS IN POLITICS

Having been in politics and business for many years, and because I am gregarious, it is my observation that politicians are as ethical a group as other general groups.

In any event, the battle for men's hearts and minds is an endless one and the practice of more ethical standards in all fields needs advancing.

The rank and file, however, are quite certain, in their own minds, that politics is a dirty business. This is substantiated by a recent Gallup poll which reported that some 72 percent of the parents of the United States did not want to have their children go into politics. Some 6 or 7 years ago, a similar percentage of parents in this State gave the same answer as reported by the Minnesota poll.

Politics is dirty and corrupt, was the main reason and there is no security in politics was the second ranking thought behind the parental attitude.

So we have a dilemma. And we have a very, very serious series of questions:

1. Do we Americans want to abandon our system of government and turn that field over to some so-called elite group in our society?

2. Do we want to leave matters as they are and let our political system drift, as it pertains to political parties, candidates, and the presentation of issues?

3. Or, do we desire to understand our dilemma, study what other responsible and self-respecting democracies have done, make some innovations of our own, and carry out a sensible and practical reform movement in our American political-party system?

A group of Minnesota Democrats (Democratic-Farmer-Labor) have decided on course No. 3.

About five years ago, Lee Loevinger, a young Minneapolis attorney wrote the various headquarters of the various British political parties and secured copies of the charters of their foundations. Mr. Loevinger has done a splendid piece of work in rewriting these documents so as to adapt them to meet the standards required by United States and Minnesota laws. In doing this drafting, he found that American laws are nearly all prohibitive and rarely directive or permissive, thus even the name of the Minnesota foundation is a concession to the law and American public opinion.

From time to time, since the early 1920's, when I first heard of the British system from one of my college mates at Iowa State College at Ames, I have attempted to learn more of the apparently successful British program.

Through one of my professors of history at Iowa State College, Dr. Louis Bernard Schmidt, I became a friend and associate of a young Scotchman who came to Ames for graduate study of animal husbandry. His avocation or hobby was politics and while in the United States he desired to observe the American and Iowa scene. We often read, studied and talked politics together and, when the opportunity presented itself, we attended meeting, rallies and caucuses. Frankly, the interest in such matters in that community was at such a low ebb, there was not much to see or hear, and my young friend was disappointed and somewhat disgusted with the lack of interest.

My fellow student used to question other students on the campus to learn of their attitudes and party allegiances.

One day he came to me with this observation: "It seems, Barney, that all these students at Iowa State think that they belong to the same party as their fathers. Since Iowa is overwhelmingly Republican, nearly all the students think they are Republicans but they cannot tell me why they are Republicans or Democrats, as the case may be. So, I have come to the conclusion that the expenses for holding an election in Iowa should be eliminated. You should have all your decisions based on the scientific computations of the Department of Vital Statistics which could, with less expense, take a census of Republicans and Democrats and thereafter keep an accurate account of the deathrate and birthrate of Republicans and Democrats."

My college mate, who incidentally was the colonel of a Scottish regiment in World War II and is now the head of an agricultural experiment station in Scotland, was the one who first told me of the great difference between the organizational structure, financial system and campaign methods of British parties and our own. For example, he told me of the university bureaus of the several parties which are supported by the party foundations, which have the cooperation of the administrative authorities of British educational institutions and hold regular lectures, meetings and sessions to recruit on the campuses. Thus they arouse the interest and gain the allegrance and enthusiasm of trained minds for politics.

Ohio Wesleyan's Ben Arneson is the pioneer in this field in America. It is to him, I understand, that we are indebted for this Institute of Practical Politics, meeting on Democratic Recruitment Day, here in Delaware, Ohio.

I salute Dr. Arneson and thank him for his great contribution and the honor he has brought to Ohio Wesleyan by his recognition of practical politics as an essential part of the life and activity of any well-rounded citizen.

Briefly, I can outline some of the first and faltering steps which have been taken by the Minnesota Foundation for Political Education, sponsored by Democrats (D. F. L.) in Minnesota, as citizens but not by the party, officialy. To do so as a party is to be almost criminal in America, I am sorry to say.

I am proud to report to you that:

1. The charter of the Minnesota Foundation for Political Education has been completed, agreed upon and signed by the first group of trustees.

2. The first, full-scale sessions of the trustees have been held.

3. The first report will be issued shortly, and that report will show some interesting facts:

(a) That there is widespread interest among all who have been approached with the plan, from among the membership of the Democratic-Farmer-Labor Party in Minnesota.

(b) That the first donors have been people of small and modest means, and their gifts have ranged from $1 to not more than $100 in money or value when in the form of investments.

(c) That with the fund-raising activities of the Democratic-Farmer-Labor Party a plan or custom has been started whereby a lowly 1 percent of the net proceeds from such events as the Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner and the congressional district dinners have been appropriated to the endowment funds of the foundation. This will, one day, be raised to 5 percent, it is hoped.

(d) That one research project is underway, the project of Miss Margaret Foley, now Mrs. Ira Pelley, a member of the State executive committee of the party, now in England, who will give us some first-hand and preliminary information on the political party foundations there.

(e) That we have made an award for the leading editorial of 1952, written by a Minnesota writer presenting our party's cause in the campaign of that year; and

(f) That we are making preparations to push our fund-raising campaign in 1954, and have many plans in the making to carry out the broad educational program of the foundation to improve political ethics in this State to the end that campaigns in Minnesota will be educational in value rather than merely biennial emotional binges.

This is all said because I truly believe that our political life needs the thought and concern and the activity and financing of more than incumbent officeholders, the politically ambitious, journalists, newspapermen, radio commentators, and the leaders of pressure groups. These are the ones who run the show now, but we need much more. We need the participation and faith of the rank and file.

We are confident that we shall succeed and eventually establish a base for a more ethical practice of the science and art of politics in Minnesota.

It is our dream that we may have foundation- and party-sponsored lecture courses in Minnesota communities as well as political reading rooms such as political parties sponsor in Sweden; schools for candidates and, where needed, "fellowships" for young and older citizens too, who need financial help, to prepare for a campaign and a career in elective office; and political "internships" of a practical nature in the offices of United States Senators, Congressmen, governors, State legislators, and party officers, such as is now being attempted in New York State by the leaders of both major parties in cooperation with the universities and colleges of that State.

I shall be proud if I have interested you in our Minnesota experiment. I hope that we can show the way to other States and to our Republican adversaries at home and elsewhere. I hope you Ohioans will take up the plan and that we, in turn, can learn from you.

United States Gives Away $129.619 Billion Under Foreign Assistance Programs Since 1917—Taxpayers Foot the Bill—This Money Has Bought Neither Peace, Security, nor Friends

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 24, 1954

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, with the assistance of the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress, it is my privilege today to place in the RECORD a statement and various detailed tables relating to grants and credits to foreign governments since 1917. This aid has been in the form of military, economic and technical assistance.

It is very interesting to note, Mr. Speaker, as we consider again another so-called foreign aid bill, that during the period July 1, 1940 through December 31, 1953 the United States extended $93,549,000,000—that is billions—in net grants and credits to foreign governments.

Mr. Speaker, it is estimated as of January 1, 1954—this year—that approximately $14 billion already appropriated or otherwise authorized by the Congress for transfer as foreign grants had not been delivered or had not been disbursed as foreign credits.

Why then, Mr. Speaker, is it necessary to authorize and appropriate any more money for this program in this session of Congress?

Mr. Speaker, in general, grants are taken to be outright gifts for which no payment is expected. As most such grants are assumed to give rise to possible reciprocal obligation to extend some aid to the United States of America or other countries to achieve common objectives. Credits, on the other hand, are loans or other agreements which give rise to specific obligations for repayment. All known repayments are deducted and only the final totals are stated as net grants and credits. Since July 1, 1945, such reverse grants and principal collections on credits have amounted to $4,065 million.

Mr. Speaker, the gross tabulation of sums advanced to foreign countries April 1917 to June 30, 1954, is as follows:

[In billions]

World War I indebtedness	$17.152
Interwar assistance	1.533
Grants and credits	93.549
International Bank and Fund	3,385
Undisbursed funds	14,000
Grand total	129.619

Mr. Speaker, it is apparent that the American taxpayer through his government has been more than generous to other nations in attempting to assist them economically and militarily since 1917. Following are several detailed tables indicating the assistance granted:

TABLE I.—*Balance of indebtedness (principal and interest) of foreign governments to the United States arising from World War I—Status as of Dec. 31, 1953*

Armenia	$32,273,333.92
Austria	26,024,539.59
Belgium	574,265,077.60
Czechoslovakia	214,065,965.51
Estonia	29,358,205.81
Finland	7,027,908.00
France	5,328,939,383.11
Great Britain	7,706,809,301.93
Greece	40,578,175.10
Hungary	3,305,084.46
Italy	2,111,994,409.34
Latvia	12,148,333.04
Lithuania	10,896,463.33
Poland	367,405,594.20
Rumania	90,325,735.06
Russia	530,046,425.94
Yugoslavia	66,015,781.28
Total	17,151,479,717.22

Source: Division of Deposits and Investments, Treasury Department.

TABLE II.—*Interwar period assistance, 1918–June 30, 1940*

Under the various Liberty-Bond Acts cash advanced to European governments amounted to $9,596,236,575.45, known as the principal of World War I debts.

At the end of World War I war relief was extended to Europe by the American Relief Administration. In addition to the food and clothing so distributed large amounts of surplus war materials were also consigned to the war-ravaged areas. Grain was shipped in 1920 and again in 1931. The Export-Import Bank of Washington authorized just under one-fourth billion dollars in loans to foreign countries.

Total aid was furnished as follows:

1. Surplus war materials—relief	$575,844,295.54
2. U. S. Treasury—relief	84,093,963.55
3. U. S. Grain Corporation	56,858,802.49
4. Federal Reserve System	422,350,000.00
5. Export-Import Bank	248,577,702.00
6. Grain Stabilization Corporation	11,250,000.00
7. Reconstruction Finance Corporation	54,000,000.00
8. Second Export-Import Bank	26,900,000.00
9. U. S. Treasury—shipping	15,903,628.42
Total	1,532,778,392.00

TABLE III.—*Lend-lease aid provided foreign governments by the United States since Mar. 11, 1941—Status as of Dec. 31, 1953*

American Republics:	
Bolivia	$5,523,017.51
Brazil	361,393,036.96
Chile	23,244,099.68
Colombia	8,290,446.18
Costa Rica	156,330.15
Cuba	6,551,280.35
Dominican Republic	1,617,367.10
Ecuador	7,794,772.09
El Salvador	878,275.90
Guatemala	3,086,029.05
Haiti	1,423,147.25
Honduras	368,364.24
Mexico	39,276,246.29
Nicaragua	887,199.28
Panama	667.33
Paraguay	1,954,442.85
Peru	18,916,471.85
Uruguay	7,132,260.54
Venezeula	4,528,492.62
Total	493,021,947.22
Other governments:	
Belgium	156,254,519.40
British Empire	31,610,813,206.15
China	1,627,572,442.83
Czechoslovakia	435,446.23
Denmark	4,002,034.71
Egypt	2,322,611.92
Ethiopia	5,151,480.09
France	3,269,936,471.02
Greece	81,424,112.31
Iceland	4,366,404.50
Iran	5,303,624.18
Iraq	891,469.57
Italy	186,371,678.87
Liberia	18,151,715.47
Netherlands	246,369,309.96
Norway	47,023,452.37
Poland	12,232,889.88
Saudi Arabia	22,670,314.52
Turkey	42,850,057.19
U. S. S. R.	11,054,449,197.21
Yugoslavia	32,188,847.92
Total	48,430,781,286.30
Total	48,923,803,233.52

Source: 35th Report to Congress on Lend-Lease Operations, 83d Cong., 2d session, H. Doc. No. 366, Government Printing Office, 1954, p. 22.

War period July 1, 1940 to June 30, 1945
Postwar period July 1, 1945 to Dec. 31, 1953
War and postwar periods July 1, 1940 to Dec. 31, 1953

TABLE IV.—*Foreign grants by United States agency and program*

[In thousands of dollars]

United States agencies	War period	Postwar period	War and postwar periods
Grand total	48, 127, 892	36, 886, 992	85, 014, 884
Agriculture Department:			
Donations of surplus		92, 113	92, 113
Foot-and-mouth-disease eradication		90, 401	90, 401
American Red Cross	62, 163	10, 435	72, 598
Commerce Department: Mutual security (military aid): Administrative		264	264
Defense Department:			
Civilian supplies:			
Army Department	807, 260	5, 073, 720	5, 880, 980
Navy Department	6, 049	18, 856	24, 905
Army and Navy Departments		4, 413	4, 413
Relief in Korea		379, 054	379, 054
Military equipment loans		178, 118	178, 118
Refugee assistance		8, 937	8, 937
Mutual security (military aid):			
Europe		6, 210, 946	6, 210, 946
Construction programs		163, 724	163, 724
Near East and Africa		863, 053	863, 053
Asia and Pacific		1, 387, 974	1, 387, 974
American Republics		210, 759	210, 759
Administrative		88, 953	88, 953
Office of Defense Mobilization: Mutual security (military aid): Administrative		14	14
Executive Office of the President: Chinese military aid		122, 185	122, 185
Foreign Operations Administration:			
Civilian supplies		172, 533	172, 533
Interim aid (Public Law 389)		555, 684	555, 684
Post UNRRA (Public Law 84)		298, 748	298, 748
Mutual security:			
Wheat for Pakistan		71, 106	71, 106
Emergency famine relief		2, 272	2, 272
Economic and technical assistance:			
Europe		12, 792, 294	12, 792, 294
Near East and Africa		213, 680	213, 680
Asia and Pacific		790, 468	790, 468
American Republics		40, 924	40, 924
Administrative		25, 650	25, 650
Foreign Operations Administration—Continued			
Mutual security—Continued			
Military end-use production:			
Europe		271, 609	271, 609
Near East and Africa		11, 790	11, 790
Asia and Pacific		3, 832	3, 832
Philippine War Damage Commission (private claims)		397, 540	397, 540
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	2, 382	53	2, 435
State Department:			
Berlin investment fund		12, 857	12, 857
Greek-Turkish aid		659, 347	659, 347
Institute of Inter-American Affairs	50, 436	37, 846	88, 282
Yugoslav assistance		37, 560	37, 560
Technical assistance	5, 260	13, 532	18, 792
Philippine rehabilitation:			
Surplus property		100, 000	100, 000
Reconstruction and rehabilitation		136, 888	136, 888
International agencies:			
Children		97, 231	97, 231
Refugees		231, 829	231, 829
UNRRA	82, 696	2, 588, 659	2, 671, 356
Economic and Technical Assistance:			
Chinese-Korean students		7, 061	7, 061
Through international agencies:			
Migrants		15, 740	15, 740
Technical aid		36, 318	36, 318
Palestine relief		90, 450	90, 450
U. N. Korean relief		65, 750	65, 750
Economic assistance from military aid		15, 003	15, 003
Military aid:			
Europe		893	893
Near East and Africa		386	386
Administrative		27, 758	27, 758
Treasury Department:			
Chinese stabilization	380, 406	119, 594	500, 000
Civilian supplies		134, 487	134, 487
Lend-lease	46, 727, 882	1, 905, 702	48, 633, 584
War Refugee Board	3, 357		3, 357

War period July 1, 1940 to June 30, 1945
Postwar period July 1, 1945 to Dec. 31, 1953
War and postwar period July 1, 1940 to Dec. 31, 1953

TABLE V.—*Foreign grants by country*

[In thousands of dollars]

Foreign country	War period	Postwar period	War and postwar periods
Total	48, 127, 892	36, 886, 992	85, 014, 884
American Republics	423, 028	401, 050	824, 078
Argentina	1, 239	198	1, 437
Bolivia	6, 952	6, 478	13, 430
Brazil	360, 639	15, 257	375, 896
Chile	24, 902	7, 280	32, 182
Colombia	10, 509	3, 648	14, 157
Costa Rica	1, 879	4, 625	6, 504
Cuba	6, 658	780	7, 438
Dominican Republic	1, 858	1, 189	3, 047
Ecuador	11, 340	5, 458	16, 798
El Salvador	1, 903	2, 513	4, 416
Guatemala	3, 220	4, 638	7, 858
Haiti	2, 493	4, 889	7, 382
Honduras	3, 088	2, 287	5, 375
Mexico	46, 751	99, 720	146, 471
Nicaragua	2, 142	1, 812	3, 954
Panama	989	3, 006	3, 995
Paraguay	4, 358	5, 284	9, 642
Peru	21, 486	9, 186	30, 672
Uruguay	7, 756	1, 506	9, 262
Venezuela	7, 038	1, 811	8, 849
Unspecified	[1] 104, 171	219, 485	115, 314
Afghanistan		492	492
Albania		20, 444	20, 444
Austria	1, 022	1, 031, 492	1, 032, 514
Belgium-Luxembourg	68, 774	574, 644	643, 418
British Commonwealth	30, 467, 428	3, 652, 070	34, 119, 498
United Kingdom	28, 616, 955	3, 493, 315	32, 110, 270
Australia	896, 749	12, 539	909, 288
Bermuda	1		1
British East Africa	301		301
British Guiana		5	5
British Honduras		62	62
Canada		3, 964	3, 964
Ceylon		46	46
Federation of Malaya		10	10
Gold Coast		4	4
Hong Kong	368		368
British Commonwealth—Continued			
India	610, 249	55, 986	666, 235
Jamaica		3	3
Malta		154	154
New Zealand	249, 432	2, 300	251, 732
Nigeria		2	2
Pakistan		83, 680	83, 680
Sierra Leone		1	1
Southern Rhodesia		1	1
Trinidad and Tobago	3		3
Union of South Africa	93, 370		93, 370
Burma		15, 823	15, 823
China-Taiwan (Formosa)	1, 230, 449	1, 800, 554	3, 031, 003
Czechoslovakia	8, 477	183, 453	191, 930
Denmark		246, 236	246, 236
Egypt	1, 700	3, 750	5, 450
Ethiopia-Eritrea	1, 253	3, 186	4, 439
Finland	1, 489	2, 036	3, 525
French Union	2, 637, 123	3, 482, 859	6, 119, 982
France	2, 620, 992	3, 419, 565	6, 040, 557
Algeria	15, 945	107	16, 052
French Equatorial Africa	118		118
French Morocco	68	272	340
Indochina		62, 772	62, 772
Tunisia		142	142
Germany		3, 668, 642	3, 668, 642
East Germany		8, 377	8, 377
Federal Republic		3, 660, 265	3, 660, 265
Greece	78, 992	1, 545, 604	1, 634, 596
Hungary		2, 359	2, 359
Iceland	99	28, 459	28, 558
Iran	8, 144	73, 216	81, 360
Iraq		2, 257	2, 257
Ireland	308	18, 346	18, 654
Israel		161, 183	161, 183
Italy	310, 166	2, 357, 459	2, 667, 625
Japan and possessions	4, 122	2, 527, 023	2, 531, 145
Japan		2, 313, 533	2, 313, 533
Ryukyu Islands	4, 048	213, 477	217, 525
Miscellaneous	74	13	87

[1] Credit.

War period July 1, 1940 to June 30, 1945
Postwar period July 1, 1945 to Dec. 31, 1953
War and postwar period July 1, 1940 to Dec. 31, 1953

TABLE V.—*Foreign grants by country*—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Foreign country	War period	Postwar period	War and postwar periods
Jordan		5, 984	5, 984
Korea		882, 385	882, 385
Lebanon		4, 728	4, 728
Liberia	236	3, 249	3, 485
Libya		3, 259	3, 259
Nepal		493	493
Netherlands Union	118, 314	998, 858	1, 117, 172
Netherlands	114, 690	897, 602	1, 012, 292
Indonesia	3, 625	101, 256	104, 881
Norway	37, 096	216, 884	253, 980
Palestine		175	175
Philippines	52, 515	718, 794	771, 309
Poland	22, 225	364, 978	387, 203
Portugal	1	11, 578	11, 579
Saudi Arabia	5, 489	3, 139	8, 628
Spain	1, 759	1, 453	3, 212
Sweden	766	87, 135	87, 901
Switzerland		1, 803	1, 803
Syria		498	498
Thailand		16, 591	16, 591
Trieste		46, 726	46, 726
Turkey	90, 041	316, 788	406, 829
U. S. S. R.	10, 776, 177	465, 434	11, 241, 611
Yugoslavia	33, 078	595, 612	628, 690
Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands:			
Caroline Islands	90	725	815
Mariana Islands	1, 595	3, 514	5, 109
Marshall Islands	241	206	447
International organizations:			
European Payments Union		238, 084	238, 084
Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration		15, 740	15, 740
Intergovernmental Committee on Refugees	2, 018	3, 650	5, 668
International Refugee Organization		237, 116	237, 116
Organization of American States		2, 439	2, 439
United Nations		124, 329	124, 329
United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund		97, 231	97, 231
UNRRA	51, 220	273, 505	324, 725
Unspecified areas: Europe	435, 369	7, 656, 466	8, 091, 835
British Zone	123, 855	98, 125	221, 980
United States Zone	221, 511	38, 103	259, 614
Balkans	90, 003	1	90, 004
Other		7, 520, 236	7, 520, 236
Miscellaneous overlapping programs	1, 257, 087	1, 684, 807	2, 941, 894

TABLE VI.—*Foreign loans and other credits United States agency and program*

Period July 1, 1940, to Dec. 31, 1953

[In thousands of dollars]

United States agency and program	Net authorizations	Unutilized	Repayments	Outstanding
Total	15, 630, 399	614, 697	3, 112, 043	11, 903, 659
Agriculture Department (occupied areas commodity programs)	214, 353		214, 353	
Commerce Department: Maritime Administration (merchant ships)	229, 001		229, 001	
Defense Department: Army:				
Natural-fibers revolving funds	54, 043		54, 043	
Surplus property	20, 000			20, 000
Export-Import Bank:				
For own account	5, 068, 746	518, 084	1, 711, 500	2, 839, 162
For Foreign Operations Administration:				
Asia and Pacific	16, 500	73		16, 427
Europe	1, 305, 258	685	167	1, 304, 406
Indian loan	189, 656			189, 656
Spanish loan	62, 476	19, 490		42, 986
For Office of Defense Mobilization	43, 842	35, 951	29	7, 863
Grants converted into credits	1, 000, 000			1, 000, 000
Foreign Operations Administration (basic materials)	16, 610	12, 950		3, 660
General Services Administration:				
Deficiency materials:				
For own account	9, 480	2, 572	2, 003	4, 905
For FOA	131, 638	24, 893	14, 488	92, 257
Surplus property	16, 479		5, 370	11, 109
Reconstruction Finance Corporation:				
Loans	487, 260		434, 409	52, 851
Occupied areas—commodity programs	14, 760		14, 760	
Surplus property	1, 965		1, 965	
State Department:				
Institute of Inter-American Affairs	249		241	8
U. N. Headquarters loan	65, 000		3, 500	61, 500
Treasury Department:				
British loan	3, 750, 000		135, 687	3, 614, 313
Grants converted into credits	1, 256, 266		79, 698	1,,176, 568
Lend-lease current credits	127, 999		91, 710	36, 289
Lend-lease silver	291, 401		186	291, 215
Philippine funding	37, 498		10, 500	26, 998
Surplus property	1, 219, 920		225, 305	994, 615

TABLE VII.—*Foreign loans and other credits by foreign country*

Period July 1, 1940, to December 31, 1953

[In thousands of dollars]

Foreign country	Net authorizations	Unutilized	Repayments	Outstanding
Total	15, 630, 399	614, 697	3, 112, 043	11, 903, 659
American Republics	1, 742, 023	297, 771	552, 965	890, 589
Argentina	102, 065	1, 612	503	99, 950
Bolivia	43, 115	3, 400	6, 983	32, 732
Brazil	724, 467	174, 390	119, 406	430, 671
Chile	144, 836	3, 822	59, 556	81, 458
Colombia	83, 374	5, 067	47, 187	31, 121
Costa Rica	7, 260		1, 153	6, 107
Cuba	68, 169		56, 169	12, 000
Dominican Republic	3, 284		3, 284	
Ecuador	31, 301	8, 402	6, 197	16, 703
El Salvador	1, 476		1, 030	446
Haiti	24, 891	11, 516	6, 959	6, 416
Honduras	1, 118		1, 118	
Mexico	279, 469	76, 311	93, 626	109, 532
Nicaragua	5, 250		4, 635	615
Panama	6, 488		2, 800	3, 687
Paraguay	6, 200		4, 694	1, 506
Peru	29, 897	8, 382	3, 122	18, 393
Uruguay	19, 338		5, 778	12, 862
Venezuela	19, 434	988	9, 657	8, 788
Unspecified	140, 592	3, 881	119, 109	17, 602
Afghanistan	22, 500	2, 173		20, 327
Austria	30, 893	2, 628	15, 815	12, 450
Bahrein	17, 048		17, 048	
Belgium-Luxembourg	239, 528	2	74, 728	164, 798
Belgium	234, 978	2	73, 728	161, 248
Luxembourg	3, 000			3, 000
Belgian Congo	1, 550		1, 000	550
British Commonwealth	6, 011, 044	101, 578	752, 577	5, 156, 889
United Kingdom	5, 216, 709	6, 692	568, 604	4, 641, 413
Australia	22, 423	4, 100	2, 904	15, 419
British East Africa	2, 394	112	82	2, 200
British Guiana	130	2		128
British Honduras	482		482	
Canada	196, 305	8, 640	169, 989	17, 676
India	365, 767		4, 607	361, 160
Jamaica	20, 933		2, 084	18, 850
New Zealand	4, 333		917	3, 415
Nigeria	700	300		400
Northern Rhodesia	36, 400	29, 091		7, 309
Pakistan	15, 136		136	15, 000
Southern Rhodesia	14, 348	35	1, 605	12, 708
Union of South Africa	114, 985	52, 607	1, 166	61, 212

TABLE VII.—*Foreign loans and other credits by foreign country*—Continued

Period July 1, 1940, to December 31, 1953

[In thousands of dollars]

Foreign country	Net authorizations	Unutilized	Repayments	Outstanding
Burma	$5,043		$1,978	$3,065
China	347,858		191,735	156,123
Czechoslovakia	30,377		25,507	4,870
Denmark	54,341		3,833	50,508
Egypt	17,934		11,409	6,525
Ethiopia-Eritrea	7,757		3,335	4,422
Finland	152,313		44,433	107,881
French Union	2,496,750	$14,356	417,557	2,064,837
France	2,461,979	4,472	412,510	2,044,996
Algeria	680			680
French Equatorial Africa	14,201	9,833	201	4,167
French Morocco	18,389	51	4,846	13,493
New Caledonia	1,501			1,501
Germany	1,345,583	1,786	140,898	1,202,894
Greece	116,190	1,930	28,813	85,447
Hungary	15,917		2,768	13,149
Iceland	6,249		622	5,627
Iran	34,846		10,609	24,237
Iraq	889		889	
Ireland	128,200			128,200
Israel	134,998	2,951	11,101	120,945
Italy	$456,101	$3,908	$152,270	$299,915
Japan	440,337	60,000	335,538	44,800
Korea	27,428	2,500	3,978	20,950
Latvia	11		11	
Lebanon	1,550		1,550	
Liberia	29,806	4,848	4,343	21,313
Netherlands Union	652,992	56,100	153,763	443,128
Netherlands	472,077		147,542	324,535
Indonesia	180,915	56,100	6,221	118,594
Norway	142,129	2,407	32,031	107,691
Philippines	141,887	17,445	38,587	85,855
Poland	81,268		9,528	71,739
Portugal and Angola	57,618	15,298	1,634	40,691
Saudi Arabia	31,826		7,900	23,926
Spain	100,122	24,932	14,727	60,463
Sweden	28,318		7,278	21,039
Thailand	7,255		4,877	2,379
Turkey	130,078	2,090	31,254	96,734
U. S. S. R	222,493			222,493
Yugoslavia	55,900		639	55,261
United Nations headquarters	65,000		3,500	61,500

Mr. Speaker, I am indebted to Mr. Hermann Ficker, analyst in International Finance and Trade, Economics Division, of the Library of Congress, who has rendered invaluable assistance in this matter.

The Superpatriot

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 15, 1954

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include herewith an article by Dr. Charles W. Mayo, which appeared in the current issue of the New Leader. Dr. Mayo is the world-renowned surgeon of Rochester, Minn. A Republican, he made a brilliant exposure of Communist germ-warfare charges at the United Nations.

His warning of the totalitarian threat in the United States is another brilliant exposé.

THE SUPERPATRIOT: MENACE TO AMERICAN FREEDOM

(By Dr. Charles W. Mayo)

In the postwar period the warning that we run the risk of investigating ourselves to death has been sounded many times by many persons; yet, today the problem confronts us as powerfully as ever. Each era in our history has presented its peculiar problems that required special solutions. We have seen our freedoms threatened before and eventually have acted wisely in the presence of danger. Our power to act is strengthened by the knowledge of our freedom.

It is not unsual, or unprecedented, for a nation to be threatened as the United States is today, on two sides, both from within and from without.

Among the perils from within are those which might cause us to lose our freedoms in an overzealous approach to danger in the United States from Communists in government and in our educational system. Of course, we know that Soviet communism undoubtedly is the greatest danger that we or any other free nation face from without.

The agencies of the Federal Government have demonstrated that they are able to cope with the Communist menace from within. Their abilities to do so are being strengthened. The free world, seeking collective security through the United Nations, presents the most formidable bulwark against aggression in the history of mankind.

What of the superpatriots who threaten our freedom? The answer to this problem rests, I think, with the American people, who, when they are in possession of the facts, have the greatest power of any people—the power to act as individuals.

My work is in the field of science. I am shocked and alarmed when other scientists are in effect put on trial by groups which do not have the power to try them, and the scientists are not the only ones who have their loyalty questioned. The arms of the investigators have the strength to reach into each American home and expose each skeleton in each closet.

The scientist who, in 1942, looked on Russian as an ally and entertained a Russian in his home apparently might just as well forget about working for the Government, no matter what his views are today.

If he did present himself to the probers, he would need the patience and tolerance of a superhuman, and let him answer the charges. Let him finally win clearance. Is it all over? One of America's most brilliant physicists found out recently that it is not.

Of great help to the superpatriot is a technique that is becoming increasingly popular in America—the second guess. In 1945 we were a victorious nation. In a seeming flash we found ourselves confronted with a menace greater than the Fascist hordes. Frustrated and bewildered, many of our citizens, however well-meaning, set out to attempt to fix the blame.

Second guessing is a great game. It brings to those who practice it an Olympian feeling of never being wrong. That is because the making of vital decisions is not their concern.

Second guessing, to the extent that it is practiced today, is a frightening thing. It means that a man who honestly and with no malice in his heart made a wrong decision must bear the scar for life, and too often his family are cosufferers.

The drumbeat of the second guesser is growing louder in our Nation. In the minds of many Red-hunters, the hasty, irrational decision of a college student suddenly becomes of vital importance to the security of the Nation when the student reaches full maturity.

However, let us put aside the personal feelings of the men who are put to the inquisitor's test. Purely, selfishly let us consider what freedom means in scientific research, what it means to the success of all endeavors.

Scientific preeminence and freedom of thought and inquiry are inseparable. Nowhere has this been more graphically demonstrated than in the United States. If we need reinforcement of this fact, we have only to consider what happened to the art of medicine during Nazi rule in Germany.

On the brighter side of this attack by the superpatriots on basic freedom is a growing awareness in the minds of many Americans that we have this problem. Before we can find a cure for this strange twist in our Nation's history, we must look for the cause. Most Americans hold the charitable view that persons who make mistakes in good faith are entitled to a second chance; that persons are not judged guilty without a fair trial; that there is a difference between disloyalty and apparent disloyalty.

It is not too far-fetched to say that a form of calm hysteria holds many Americans in its grip. This hysteria manifests itself in many ways. Fear and frustration are very much in the picture. Uncertainty and a feeling of helplessness go hand in hand with frustration. These assuredly are uncertain times. The threat of global suicide is ever present.

Because of supersecret measures necessary to preserve our security, we must place faith in our leaders, but it must not be a blind faith. It is possible that the American people have never been more bewildered and at the root of bewilderment is fear that breeds on lack of knowledge.

We, as Americans, must now of all times realize that we must be tolerant of the necessity to temper our ideas of what we can and cannot do. It is possible that we may and do become bewildered by the intricacy of the problems that face our Nation and its leaders.

Basic to our way of life is the concept that our people have a right to know. The corollary is that, armed with the facts, we can reach proper decisions. There is real danger in underestimating the intelligence of our citizenry and in tempting the imagination of people with just part of a story. There is danger in Government officials deciding what people are entitled to know about their affairs.

There are evidences that our present administration is mindful of this shortcoming. I believe there is further need for a thorough reevaluation of the Government's public information program in the fields of atomic research and defense. We also need to know more about the Reds in Government issue—not from the lips of congressional investigators, who keep an eye on their constituents, but from the agencies that should be getting the first crack at infiltrating Communists.

Besides steps to give the American people more information, consideration should be given to a program of reeducation in the meaning of freedom. As Thomas Jefferson once suggested, let us put forth a good idea—freedom—to replace a bad one—unfair attacks on our citizens in a scatter-gun attempt to root out Communists in Government. Jefferson added, "Punishment is no solution for bad ideas."

A full appreciation of the meaning of freedom would include an understanding that our way of life is not without its risks. United States defense officials often complain that we give the Soviet Union considerable useful military data by printing this material in magazines and newspapers available to all Americans. Members of Congress are given secret military information that in the Soviet Union would be available to only a select few within the Kremlin. These are but a few of the examples of the risks of being a people at liberty.

We would have it no other way. Foremost in gaining a full appreciation of freedom is the knowledge that right is on our side—that if we do not sacrifice our freedoms and thus destroy ourselves from within, our message to the peoples of the world who sway between communism and liberty will become stronger.

The rash of Red-hunting going on in the United States today and its repercussions are having serious effects abroad, particularly in the rest of the free world.

By its very nature, a totalitarian state stultifies the minds of its citizens. Time is with us, because if we support and reaffirm our basic beliefs, our strength will grow. The totalitarian-controlled masses can be pushed only to a certain point before lack of freedom of thought and inquiry will take its toll in decay or revolution for freedom. This is a lesson of history we should not forget in these days when we wish for time so desperately.

Freedom is made up of many intangibles. It has a rare flavor that can easily be lost. Freedom's cornerstone is the right to an opinion, the right to disagree. Too often, we tend to forget that from disagreements have sprung many of our most noteworthy achievements in science, the arts and political life. We Americans thrive on the unaccepted, the untried, the new, the unorthodox. We are a curious people, and therein lies a great potential strength.

World public opinion, weighted on the side of freedom, is a weapon to be reckoned with.

(This article is adapted from an address by Dr. Mayo at the Minnesota congressional dinner.)

Israel and the Arab States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

April 29, 1954

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to place before the Congress a series of resolutions unanimously adopted on February 16, 1954, by the National Conference of the American Christian Palestine Committee.

The resolutions committee consisted of the following: Dr. Samuel Guy Inman, chairman; Prof. James Luther Adams; Rev. Karl Baehr; Dr. John W. Bradbury; Harry W. Flannery; Dr. Daniel A. Poling; Rev. Dr. Jesse W. Stitt; Dr. Carl Hermann Voss; Prof. Albert N. Williams.

The resolutions are as follows:

PREAMBLE

Our interest in the Near East—in Israel and the Arab states—is aroused by the needs of its people, by its prospects for development, and by the importance of the area in defending and strengthening the free world.

Impelled by our faith in democracy and our religious principles to "see visions and dream dreams" of a Near East area becoming once again a center of creative civilizations, we look forward to a new flowering of the genius of the Hebraic and Arabic peoples and the cultural enrichment of the world community.

We believe it is imperative to reaffirm our friendship for Israelis and Arabs alike. We support Israel in her struggle to attain cultural freedom for dispossessed and persecuted Jews. We hail Israel's advances in founding a democratic society and in reclaiming a neglected land. We are eager likewise to see the completion of such land reform measures as decreed by Naguib in Egypt, by Shishekly in Syria, and by the Shah of Iran. We commend those measures in the Arab world which have been taken to reclaim land and provide more health and educational opportunities to the neglected and victimized masses of Arab people.

The Near East is emerging from its ancient patterns and seems destined to secure a greater measure of the good life for all the peoples in the Mediterranean. Therefore nothing is more urgent than peace as a condition of progress. To continue the existing conflict obstructs all efforts to raise living standards and nourish democratic growth. Only immediate, honest negotiation between Israel and the Arab states will provide the opportunity of terminating this conflict.

We applaud the constructive efforts of the United States Government to aid all the peoples of the Near East.

Sensitive to the urgent needs of two refugee peoples in the area, Arab and Jewish alike, Congress has made generous grants under three successive Mutual Security Acts to both of these refugee groups in the hopes of alleviating their plight and aiding in their resettlement. These funds were voted on the recognized fact that Arab and Jewish refugees were similar in number and that both needed and deserved help.

The United States Congress has also recognized the need for technical assistance in this underdeveloped region. Our experts have helped local populations deal with problems of health, sanitation, administration, road construction, water and soil conservation, and farming techniques. Both Israel and several of the Arab States have benefited from these programs, with the Arab areas receiving the larger share of the funds appropriated.

We support the principle announced by President Dwight D. Eisenhower of sympathetic and impartial friendship for the peoples of the Near East.

We urge, however, that this Nation stand steadfast upon those fundamental principles that have thrust our country into world leadership. We feel that our national interests can be served only through firm support of those principles of self-determination and national sovereignty which both Jew and Arab have been seeking in this region for more than a generation.

We support our Government in its efforts to persuade the Arab States to accept Israel as a free and sovereign nation within the Near East context, and we commend Secretary of State John Foster Dulles for forthrightly supporting direct negotiations between Israel and Jordan.

We applaud the efforts of our Government to seek, in cooperation with the United Nations, a program for the regional development of water resources in the Near East.

Effective cooperation in the use of the waters of the Jordan, Litani, and Yarmuk Rivers can vastly increase the amount of land under intensive cultivation and can produce the electric current necessary to operate factories, light cities, and mechanize farms. These improvements will aid both the refugees and the underprivileged masses of Jewish and Arab people in the region. Where a regional approach to the development of the water is not feasible, we believe in the development of such resources within each country.

We applaud the sacrificial efforts on the part of the Jewish communities of America to provide both gifts and capital funds for Israel, the greatest rescue and refugee resettlement venture of history.

The Jewish people throughout the world have provided immediate relief for the 750,000 Israel newcomers (350,000 of them from the Arab and Moslem lands of the Near East and Africa) and are helping to settle them on farms and in factories with a reasonable standard of living for all Jews and Arabs alike.

We urge that the vast oil and land wealth of the Arab world be similarly used to help bring new opportunity to their brothers in the Arab refugee camps.

We applaud Israel's acts of friendship and good faith:

1. In releasing Arab blocked bank accounts of former Palestinian Arabs despite the failure of the Arab States, notably Iraq, to release the blocked accounts of their former Jewish residents;
2. In offering to pay for Arab lands abandoned in Israel as a part of a peace settlement, taking into account the lands and property abandoned by Jews in Arab lands;
3. In offering Jordan the use of a free port in the newly constructed Kishon River harbor in Haifa Bay;
4. In accepting as citizens some 28,000 Arabs who have illegally returned to Israel since the hostilities of 1948;
5. In voting for the admission of the Arab State of Libya into the United Nations;
6. In offering to redraw the Israel-Jordan boundary lines in the major trouble areas, so that farm homes might be reunited with farmlands, and so that the constant human pressures to break across artificial and arbitrary boundaries will not continue to be the cause of daily depredations from both sides.

We regret that these acts of friendship have either been rejected or have failed to elicit from the Arab nations a desire to negotiate an overall settlement.

We applaud Israel for seeking to establish a democratic society with full civil, religious, cultural, and political freedom for all its citizens.

It is a cause for great satisfaction that eight Arabs are members of the Knesset (the Israel Parliament), that there is universal education, universal franchise, and equal wages for equal work, despite the present conflict between Israel and the Arab States. Since the surrounding Arab nations have not yet recognized Israel as a nation and continue to threaten her very existence by encouraging infiltration for acts of violence and sabotage, Israel must continue military control and require military passes for Arabs and Jews alike in a number of vulnerable areas. These security measures cannot be relieved in the absence of peace.

We applaud Zionists and the friends of Zionism throughout the world who have long sought to provide a homeland so that Jews who felt the sting of discrimination and the lash of persecution might live in freedom and dignity.

It was always the hope of the Zionists to achieve their goal in cooperation with the local Arab peoples. Prior to the Arab war against Israel, Arabs were not displaced by the colonizing efforts of these idealistic Jewish pioneers, but were benefited in many ways through creative Zionism.

We are confident that the people of the United States will keep in mind the high principles and constructive record of Zionism over the past three-quarters of a century.

We deplore repeated statements of Arab leaders that they will never negotiate a settlement with Israel, but seek only to destroy it.

We are shocked by the reported statement, as transmitted through the Associated Press, of King Saud, of Saudi Arabia, that "Israel, to the Arab world, is like a cancer to the human body and the only way of remedy is to uproot it just like a cancer. We Arabs total about 50 million. Why don't we sacrifice 10 million of our number to live in pride and self-respect?" This is a direct challenge to the spiritual foundations of the United Nations.

Likewise, we cannot countenance irresponsible statements of the few but articulate Israelis who speak of expanding Israel's borders to the Jordan River or to its ancient boundaries, including the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan, which statements have been definitely repudiated by the Israeli Government.

We deplore the propaganda machinations of the Communists in the Near East. Like their Nazi predecessors, the Communists portray Israel as an agent of British and American expansion; because they recognize that the stability, trade, and mutual help flowing from an Israel-Arab peace would forever doom Russian imperialist designs on this strategic and oil-rich area.

We deplore the fact that the Arab Nations went to war against Israel to overthrow the United Nations partition resolution of 1947.

This resolution offered freedom and self-determination to both Jews and Arabs in Palestine. But the rejection of the partition resolution by the Arab States and their aggression against Israel prevented the implementation of the specific terms of the United Nations resolution—internationalization of Jerusalem and the economic union between Israel and the proposed Arab State. Likewise, United Nations resolutions looking to the rehabilitation and resettlement of the Arab refugees have been made inoperative by the refusal of the Arab States to acknowledge their major responsibility for the creation and solution of this problem.

Under the United Nations Armistice Agreements Israel's territory is larger than the partition resolution envisaged. It should be recalled, however, that most of the area originally assigned to the proposed Arab State was annexed by the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan.

We point out that the Arab Nations stand alone in their refusal to accept and recognize the establishment of Israel as a sovereign state.

We deplore the continuing conflict on the borders between the Arab States and Israel.

This pattern of Arab forays into Israel has caused the death and wounding of some 423 Israelis during the past 3 years and led to the tragic reprisal raid on Kibya by the Israelis, where 53 Arab villagers lost their lives.

We recognize the validity of the United Nations censure of Israel in this specific case. We regret, however, that no strong measures were outlined at that time to deal with future infiltration and boundary line inequities; and by the fact that the resolution of censure did not call upon the parties to meet and negotiate.

We deplore all moves to grant arms to Near East states until peace between the Arab Nations and Israel is concluded. Regional stability cannot be achieved by placing arms in the hands of fearful, angry, or frustrated rulers. The premature supply of arms tends to promote new conflicts, bringing death and destruction to both Israelis and Arabs, and endangers the defenses of the entire region.

In view of the fact that these concerns lead us to the belief that the future of the free world hangs in the balance in the Near East, we—

Recommend that our Government continue to help both Israel and the Arab States by contributing to the relief and resettlement of each group's refugee population, and by granting increased economic and technical assistance.

Recommend that our Government continue to encourage regional development of the area's water resources so that all peoples may be the benefactors.

Recommend that our Government continue to support, as it did in the Fifth General Assembly, the appointment of a commission with authority limited to the supervision of the holy places only, leaving all political concerns in Jerusalem to the respective Governments of Israel and Jordan.

Recommend that our Government protest to the United Nations Security Council the illegal stoppage by Egypt of Israel-bound ships in the Suez Canal and the Gulf of Elat.

Recommend that our Government, in cooperation with the United Nations, continue to work for the most equitable solution of the Arab refugee problem by resettling these men, women, and children on the potentially plantiful lands of the several Arab nations.

In Arab lands, the refugees would be integrated into a society with which they have kinship of religion and ethnic origin and within economies which will enable them to make substantial contributions toward their development. The Arab refugees thus can constitute a tremendous potential asset to the Arab States—to Syria and Iraq especially, which have large areas of uncultivated lands and which need manpower.

We urge that our Government support all efforts to have the Arab States negotiate directly with Israel, for in this way only can peace be brought to the Holy Land, the sanctuary wherein have been nourished the historic hopes of mankind for brotherhood.

Are We Buying Security?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 10, 1954

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an editorial that appeared in the Washington Daily News entitled "Slaphappy Security":

SLAPHAPPY SECURITY

The United States has spent $7,700,000,000 since October 1949 to arm our allies, the President told Congress.

Which is a sizable sum of money.

Six of these billions went to Europe, which is the approximate amount which will be collected in income taxes this year in the three big States of Pennsylvania, Ohio, and Texas. What did this money buy?

On that score the report to Congress is less than satisfying. Indeed, in some respects it seems to be deliberately deceptive.

For example, the report declares the North Atlantic Treaty Organization "has reduced the gap between Soviet Russia's offensive strength and the West's defensive and retaliatory capacity." Yes, but the gap which remains between the 175 divisions Russia has and the 30 divisions which the West has available now reflects little change in the basic situation.

Lord Ismay, secretary-general of NATO, reported last December the West's strength was not sufficient to keep the Soviet Union from overrunning Europe in an allout war, and that is the point.

The report to Congress also makes much of the fact that the monthly rate of military shipments to the French Union forces fighting the Communists in Indochina in 1953 was 50 percent higher than in 1952. But the report is silent on the much more pertinent fact that the French are trying to make a deal with the Reds right now.

What will happen to the arms we are sending to Indochina if the French sell us out? Indeed, what will happen to NATO if the Communists get representation in the governments of France and Italy, as many observers predict they will?

These questions are not raised through any intention of urging that the United States revert to isolationism. They are raised because it is dangerous to ignore them.

If the people who write the reports which the President sends to Congress misrepresent the actual facts, what dependence can be placed on the military structure which is based upon such a false conception of the situation?

This doubletalk in which the bureaucrats are indulging will not fool the Russians. But if it creates a false sense of security at home it will invite disaster.

When we know there are more Communists in France and Italy than there were 4 years ago, it ought to be apparent to everyone in our Government that the money we are spending abroad isn't buying what it was supposed to buy.

It is time for a new look at this whole defense problem. To that end, let us have honest reporting of the cold, unvarnished facts so that it will be possible to make an intelligent appraisal of the situation.

Preservation of Academic Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 27, 1954

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, a vital part of the free world fight against communism is the preservation of academic freedom. It is a vital duty of American academic institutions to further, by all means possible, the resistance of institutions and scholars to Communist doctrine. The small groups of European scholars who have been driven from Europe by totalitarianism can help to nourish among those still imprisoned behind the Iron Curtain a great degree of intellectual resistance.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by Dr. Roman Smal-Stocki of Marquette University, which will be of interest to all Members of the Senate.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FIGHT FOR ACADEMIC FREEDOM IN THE SOVIET UNION AND BEHIND THE IRON CURTAIN

(By Roman Smal-Stocki, Ph. D., director of Slavic Institute, Marquette University)

The fight for academic freedom in the Soviet Union conducted since 1920–22 by us, emigré scholars of the non-Russian nations, has entered a new phase. Our fight has a rather long history.

First, after 1922, we had to retreat from our mother countries, which were forced into the Soviet Union by Russian Communist aggression. We had to take refuge in Poland, Czechoslovakia, Austria, Bulgaria, Germany, and France, continuing there, as figures in the public eye and as professors in the universities, our fight against the Russian Communist dictatorship over liberal arts and sciences, and mobilizing all the moral forces of central and western Europe for the defense of academic freedom in the Soviet Union. Academic freedom is synonymous for us with personal and national freedom because freedom is a general idea.

The second phase began after World War II. Poland, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, Hungary, Bulgaria, East Germany, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, suffered the same fate previously undergone in the years 1920–22 by Ukraine, Byeloruthenia, Georgia, Armenia, Azerbaijan, North Caucasus, the Cossack, Tatarian, and Turkestan peoples. All academic freedom was suppressed in these countries also. Together with the DP professors of these new victim countries of Russian communism who refused to capitulate before Stalin, we again had to retreat to the west, and finally reached the last line of defense, the United States of America. In the still free remainder of Europe, these academic and national freedoms are at present in mortal danger, and their final fate completely depends on the real force commanded by the Atlantic nations.

Some of us émigré scholars had the good luck to be integrated into the American universities as professors and to join the American Association of University Professors. We all deeply feel that we are in the United States confronted with a task and mission indissolubly merged with the whole ideological war of the still-free world. We must here continue our fight for academic freedom for all the nations behind the Iron Curtain and in the Soviet Union, including also the Russian.

"Why?" we are often asked by our American isolationist or neutral colleagues, and they represent 80 percent of the professors. Here is our answer:

(a) We feel a moral obligation to the memory of all the thousands of colleagues of all nations of the Soviet Union who were murdered by the Russian Communist dictatorship in the previous decades because of their defense of academic and national freedom;

(b) We feel a moral obligation toward all colleagues of all nations in the Soviet Union and behind the Iron Curtain presently imprisoned and persecuted for their defense of free thought and research;

(c) We must convince our American colleagues that the united public opinion of the free world and the U. N. could, by courageous acts of condemnation, if not bring real relief for the scholars, at least surely stimulate the will and spirit of all academic institutions, staff and youth, to continue their effective intellectual opposition against the Russian Communist dictatorship and give them the assurance of not being isolated in their resistance, open or secret, but backed by the whole free world;

(d) We must convince our American colleagues that the American moral leadership of the free world depends in the first line from their decision whether or not they will take over the leadership in our struggle for academic freedom against the Russian Communist dictatorship. In previous years a rather large group of American university professors from leading eastern universities established in this regard a rather sad record.

In May 1953, I presented, with my distinguished colleague, Bela Kovrig, former rector of the Hungarian Francis Joseph University, a resolution at the meeting of the Marquette University chapter of the American Association of University Professors. After long discussions, the resolution was adopted on October 23, 1953, and was submitted to the executive council of our organization in Washington, D. C. We included in the resolution also Russia proper, despite the fact that the destruction of academic freedom, the integral part of national freedom, is the old method of Russian imperialism to keep the non-Russian nations in Muscovite slavery. And I am sorry to say that many chauvinistic Russian exiles even today regard this measure as an absolute necessity to keep indivisible the prison of the non-Russian nations, the Soviet Empire.

Here is the text of the resolution which is only a part of our original resolution:

"RESOLUTIONS OF THE MARQUETTE UNIVERSITY CHAPTER OF THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITY PROFESSORS, OCTOBER 23, 1953

"Whereas the civilized nations of the world are in full accord that academic freedom presents the indispensable condition of all creative efforts which tend to increase knowledge and rationality within culture; and

"Whereas academic freedom is the common inalienable right of all those who participate in the service of truth and in the spreading of the social value of enlightenment; and

"Whereas academic freedom like every freedom is indivisible; and

"Whereas in the Soviet Union and in the captive countries academic freedom is suppressed to the detriment of scholarship, students, the respective national cultures and the common interest of humanity: Be it

"*Resolved*, That—

"1. The Marquette University Chapter of the American Association of University Professors condemns the Russian Communist Government's denial of academic freedom to the academies, universities, and students in the Soviet Union;

"2. The chapter condemns the Communist dictatorship's denial of academic freedom to the academies, universities, and students of Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, East Germany, Hungary, Poland, Rumania, and Yugoslavia;

"3. The chapter expresses deep distress over the tragic plight of such traditional centers of learning as Cracow, Prague, Leipzig, and Budapest;

"4. The chapter extends a pledge of solidarity to fellow scholars and students of all Union and Autonomous Republics of the Soviet Union and of the captive countries; and

"5. The chapter urges the executive council of the American Association of University Professors to request the Government of the United States to take steps to make representations to the proper national and international authorities concerning these violations of academic freedom."

Thus the fight of the former European university professors for academic freedom in their old countries entered into a new phase, now in a common front with American university professors. It is now up to our American colleagues to take over the leadership in this fight which defends also the basic principle of the American academic world, also endangered by subversive Russian communism.

The tremendous importance of our ideological fight for academic freedom against the Russian Communist dictatorship surely cannot be overlooked or neglected by free Western and American institutions, whether public or private. Our fight led to the creation of such glorious traditions as the Free Ukrainian University in Prague, the Ukrainian Scientific Institutes in the capitals of Europe, and the Promethean Learned Congress of the exiled scholars of the non-Russian nations in Warsaw in the year 1936. Through these institutional media we intensified and persisted in the struggle against Stalin's cultural and linguistic policy that could only mean death to the cultural being of the non-Russian nations in the U. S. S. R.

Indifference to this struggle for academic freedom can only serve the interests of those perpetrating what amounts to cultural and national genocide. An impassioned understanding and a constructive will to implement this present fight for academic freedom would reinforce the most decisive weapon in the ideological war against Russian communism. We seek this understanding and will on the part of our public and private agencies in the combined interests of the security of our Nation and of ultimate truth itself.

Upper Colorado River Storage Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1954

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs reported to the House, H. R. 4449, a bill providing for the construction of the Echo Park Dam and other participating projects within the upper Colorado River storage project, on Tuesday, the 18th of May.

The committee approved this project by a vote of 13 to 12, without considering serious evaporation calculation errors admitted by the the Bureau of Reclamation. Before the committee took final action on this bill, I endeavored to insert in the record the Bureau's admission that it erred in estimating the evaporation loss from a high dam at Glen Canyon, Ariz.

The committee, however, refused to take official cognizance of this crucial evidence of error, which throws an entirely new light on the Echo Park Dam controversy. This is typical of the high-handed manner in which this vast billion-dollar project has been approached. The committee has heard a tremendous amount of testimony to try to prove Echo Park Dam essential to the project. But it has received very little evidence to demonstrate the economic, agricultural, and engineering feasibility of other storage dams and participating projects. The committee's refusal to consider the important evidence of error indicates how frightened and frantic Echo Park proponents are, and that they are willing to support any and all projects in their desperation.

The evaporation error at Glen Canyon, which is a key feature of the Upper Colorado River storage project, casts considerable doubt on the need for Echo Park if a high dam can be built at Glen Canyon instead of the lower one contained in the bill. In view of the admission of error as to Glen Canyon, it is quite possible that other serious planning errors have been made on other parts of the project.

In a public release dated May 14, 1954, the Department of the Interior announced that a recalculation of the upper Colorado River data was to be made, including in that release the contents of the letter from the Under Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Ralph Tudor, to the chairman of the Subcommittee of Irrigation and Reclamation of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

I wish to include that release as a part of my remarks.

ORDERS RECALCULATION ON UPPER COLORADO EVAPORATION DATA

Under Secretary of the Interior Ralph A. Tudor today advised a congressional subcommittee that a recalculation of the evaporation factors on all reservoirs proposed in the upper Colorado River project has been ordered.

In a letter to Congressman William H. Harrison, chairman of the House subcommittee, Under Secretary Tudor declared that data supplied by the Bureau of Reclamation on evaporation losses from a high Glen Canyon dam had to be corrected. The Bureau's figures were used in testimony before the subcommittee in January and in a subsequent letter.

Under Secretary Tudor's letter follows:

May 13, 1954.

Hon. William H. Harrison,
Chairman, Irrigation Subcommittee, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, United States House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

My Dear Mr. Harrison: On January 18, 1954, I appeared before your subcommittee and testified on behalf of the upper Colorado River project. A part of that testimony was a recommendation that the Echo Park and Split Mountain Dams be included in the project. These two dams have been opposed by persons and organizations interested in conservation. This Department recommended construction of the dams rather than other possible alternates for various reasons including lesser evaporation losses.

On March 9 I advised you by letter of certain errors that had been made by me in my testimony, and I particularly advised you that if a high dam should be built at Glen Canyon in lieu of dams at Echo Park and Split Mountain the increased losses for evaporation will amount to 70,000 acre-feet per year.

I have this week been advised by the Bureau of Reclamation that the figures which they supplied me for both my original testimony and my letter of March 9 for evaporation from a high Glen Canyon Dam were in error to the extent of an additional 45,000 acre-feet. Thus, it appears that the greater evaporation losses from a high Glen Canyon Dam built in lieu of Echo Park and Split Mountain would be in the order of 25,000 acre-feet per year.

This brings up the possibility of substituting a high Glen Canyon Dam for the Echo Park and Split Mountain Dams. I have reviewed this matter at length with the Commission of Reclamation and with the Assistant Secretary for Water and Power and for reasons which were given in my testimony and by other witnesses before your subcommittee we do not consider such a substitute justifiable.

You may note that my statement submitted to your subcommittee read as follows:

"Should the Glen Canyon Reservoir water surface be raised to provide this additional storage, it would present serious difficulty of protecting the Rainbow Bridge National Monument. This monument is unique and has no counterpart. Furthermore, the additional storage in this lower elevation area of high evaporation would more than offset the savings of evaporation by elimination of Echo Park. The plan would further concentrate storage in the lower end of the basin and fail to provide the needed river control in the upper section. The system power output would be reduced by an estimated 285,000 kilowatts if this plan is adopted."

I am aware that this error in the evaporation calculations for the high Glen Canyon Dam Reservoir may cast doubt as to the reliability of the calculations for other reservoirs. However, my inquiry indicates that the possibility of this is, indeed, remote. Nonetheless, instructions have been issued to have a new check made and this is now being done.

I regret that this information was not brought to the attention of the subcommittee at an earlier date. As an explanation but not as an excuse, these new Bureau of Reclamation figures only came to the attention of the Commissioner of Reclamation and the Secretary of the Department within the past week.

Sincerely yours,

Ralph A. Tudor,
Under Secretary.

Asia Leaders Fear the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 10, 1954

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, herewith is an article by Mr. William L. Ryan written in Geneva, Switzerland, under date of May 24 and the writer points out that there is a mistrust of any alliance that might possibly be made with the United States and other Asiatic countries:

ASIA LEADERS FEAR ANY ACTION WILL PLUNGE THEM INTO WAR—THEY DO NOT BELIEVE UNITED STATES HAS AGGRESSIVE DESIGNS, BUT STILL MISTRUST ALLIANCE

(By William L. Ryan)

Geneva, May 24.—There is not the slightest indication at the Geneva conference that the Communists will accept anything but surrender of the West in Asia.

Apparently they are sure communism is on a victorious march, with the decisive battle for Vietnam all but behind them. The Russians are calling the tune here, even preparing the speeches of the Communist Viet Minh representatives in the Russian language.

After a month of talk there seems no prospect of anything but obstruction and deadlock. The Russians exude confidence that they hold the trump cards.

Communism is relying heavily on a drive to turn Asian nationalism and Asian fears into potent weapons against the West in a long-term struggle for domination of a continent.

The United States has been losing battles in this propaganda war, though it has not yet, by any means, lost the war. Asian distrust of the West, after a century of colonial domination, is being twisted and turned against the United States in a political-psychological offensive designed to win cheap victories.

The Communists are not concerned with masses now. This war is for the intellectuals, the educated layer of Asians from whose ranks come the raw materials for government and leadership.

In those ranks America has been losing friends. They are not going over to the Communist side, but in frustration are retiring into a neutral shell. And that serves the Communist cause.

For one who has just returned from Asia there is an atmosphere almost of fantasy here in Geneva. Talk of united action in Asia seems removed from reality.

HOPES DIM FOR ALLIANCE

At the moment, prospects seem dim for any Southeast Asia defense system under United States inspiration or protection. That may yet change as the Communist breath gets hotter on Southeast Asian necks. If so, the United States hopes to have the framework of an alliance which those nations can join if they choose.

But in an extensive tour of that vast, underdeveloped, poverty-ridden area I found that, with few exceptions, Asian leaders cling to the view that any involvement in a bloc—however defensive it may be—will make Asia the cockpit for world war III.

With the understanding they would not be quoted by name, Asian leaders spoke frankly of their fears and frustrations in trying to build new nations in an area whose unplumbed riches and geographical position make it a tempting target for Red expansion.

"Those who want to be friends of the United States are falling silent now," an elderly pro-American statesman told me sadly. "It is becoming just as politically unwise in this part of the world to take the side of the United States as it is for you in the States to take the part of Red China."

ASIAN LEADERS SEE THREAT

Asian leaders are alive to the internal Communist threat and have been fighting it consistently. They fear communism. But, first of all, they fear a new general war.

Because of this, however mistakenly, they fear the United States. They do not believe Americans have any aggressive designs on them. But they have a dread that actions of the United States in a head-on clash with the Soviet Union might plunge Asia into the most dreadful of all wars.

They insist they have won substantial victories over their domestic Communists and can keep them in check, short of invasion from China.

But many of these anti-Communist leaders themselves help Communist propaganda along. Anticolonialism is the cement holding these new nations together. Many a leader is not adverse to transferring the former fear of Britain, France, or Holland over to the United States. Several frankly admitted this to me.

Certainly the two largest nations, India and Indonesia, would have to be counted out of a southeast Asian alliance as matters stand now. And Burma likely would cast a cautious look northward. That leaves Pakistan, Thailand, and Malaya, short of a defense line, pushed all the way back to the Pacific island chain.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the Record.

Addr
sy
gr
th

IN T

M
unar
the
deliv
Sena
MAR
gres
of tl
tion
ever
T
was
as f
T

(Ad

It
able
T
hav
defe
tage
N
idea
prin
esta
N
cen
N
the
nes
pre
kin
Y
of
me
ena
I
a d
ure
ha
for
T
in
est

wa
do
sp

all
sh
ge
we

in
bl
fr

up
th

Appendix

Address by Hon. Edward Martin, of Pennsylvania, Before 63d Continental Congress of National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GEORGE W. MALONE

OF NEVADA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, May 28, 1954

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an address delivered by the distinguished senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Martin] before the 63d Continental Congress of the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, in Constitution Hall, Washington, D. C., Thursday evening, April 22, 1954.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Defense of Freedom Today and Tomorrow

(Address of United States Senator Edward Martin, of Pennsylvania)

It is a rare privilege to address this honorable and outstanding American organization.

The Daughters of the American Revolution have always been steadfast and militant in defense of the United States and our heritage of liberty and independence.

No organization defends and supports the ideals of freedom with deeper loyalty to the principles upon which our Republic was established.

No organization fights harder for 100 percent Americanism.

No organization appreciates more sincerely the fundamental principle that the greatness of our country is based on the most precious gift bestowed by God upon mankind—freedom of the individual.

Yes, my fellow Americans, our birthright of freedom was not conferred by government. It was not granted by legislative enactment.

It was held by the Founding Fathers to be a divine blessing—a sacred trust to be treasured, guarded, and defended with all we have and all we are—with our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor.

Upon that foundation the United States, in less than 200 years, has become the greatest and most powerful Nation in all history.

Upon that foundation a savage wilderness was transformed into a bright land of freedom, with the highest material, cultural, and spiritual attainments in all the world.

We can point with the greatest pride to all that has been achieved in a comparatively short span of years. But we must never forget that we did not reach the proud position we ocupy without struggle and sacrifice.

It is ours today because heroes and patriots in every generation were willing to shed their blood and give their lives in defense of freedom.

The troubled times in which we live call upon everyone of us to take up the cause they so nobly served. The dangers we face today call for renewed dedication to our country and our flag. They call for deeper devotion to the ideals of liberty and independence, for new strength and courage in defense of freedom.

America faces a desperate challenge.

It is a challenge hurled by evil forces that would destroy the principle of individual freedom.

The voice of the demagogue is loud in the land. The brazen tongues of self-seeking politicians still proclaim the false and deceptive promise of prosperity and security without effort and without sacrifice.

The advocates of a planned and controlled society—call it socialism, collectivism, communism, or by any other name—are still among us. They are still offering their fantastic hope of a more abundant life if we will but give up our individual freedom.

Their one objective is to undermine our system of free government and to replace it with the same socialistic pattern that has led other great nations to destruction.

The danger is real. It must have our careful attention when we consider the defense of American freedom.

Unfortunately, we have amongst us so many misguided persons who do not fully apppreciate the real meaning of Americanism.

They do not seem to realize that our system of free government places upon each citizen an equal share of responsibility for our growth and progress.

They do not seem to understand that the progress of our country has always depended on the principle that each American must bear his share of the burden of supporting and defending our country.

That principle was so well set forth by George Washington when he said, and I quote:

"Every citizen who enjoys the protection of a free government owes not only a portion of his property but even of his personal service to the defense of it."

The Founding Fathers were men of keen perception and far-sighted vision. They knew from the record of history that under self-rule the people might destroy their government by robbing their own treasury.

They feared that political demagogues would undertake projects that seemed good for the individual with no regard for the ability of the people to pay the cost.

The vastly increased cost of goverment at all levels gives some indication of how far we have gone in that direction.

I do not want to burden you with too many figures, but I feel that this great and powerful organization should have all the facts.

Twenty-five years ago the total cost of all local government in the United States was about \$5½ billion a year. It has now more than doubled. At that time local government had outstanding bonds of about \$12 billion. That debt has now increased to \$22 billion.

Twenty-five years ago the cost of operating State government in all the 48 States was about \$2 billion a year. It has now increased to the enormous sum of \$12 billion. At that time the 48 States owed about \$2 billion, which in 25 years has been expanded to nearly \$10 billion.

The total cost of the Federal Government was less than \$3 billion 25 years ago and in 1953 it was close to \$75 billion, which, I hope, can be greatly decreased in the next fiscal year.

Twenty-five years ago the national debt was about \$16½ billion. Now it has just about reached the statutory limit, the staggering sum of \$275 billion.

Twenty-five years ago there were 500,000 employees on the Federal payroll. Today there are 2,347,000, a decrease of 200,000 from the high figure of a year ago. The total number of all Government employees, Federal, State, and local, is now more than 8 million, while 25 years ago it was about 3 million.

The salaries of the Federal employees is now equal to the wages of all the workers in the steel industry of America and twice that of all the railroads.

I bring these figures to your attention because the solvency of our country has an important bearing on the defense of our freedom.

They are a solemn warning that financial irresponsibility is the first step to disaster for a Nation just as it is for an individual.

They should make us stop and reflect upon the grim truth that in a bankrupt nation there is no freedom, no justice—only hunger, poverty, dictatorship, and slavery.

What is the reason for the enormous cost of government?

It is because we are shirking our individual responsibility.

We have permitted the expenditure of vast sums of money for undertakings by government which are properly the business of private enterprise.

We have permitted large expenditures for sectional and regional advantage which have been detrimental to other parts of the country.

We have seen the development of a powerful central government because the States have surrendered many of their functions and responsibilities in exchange for the so-called Federal aid.

The same process is taking place at the lower levels of government. Local responsibility is being destroyed by the shifting of purely local functions to the State level.

Our people seem to forget that every tax dollar spent by government comes from the earnings of the worker and that government has nothing to give except that which it first takes from the people themselves.

Are the American people so attracted by gaudy promises and glowing pictures of a care-free future, that they are willing to close their eyes to the most terrible waste and extravagance our country has ever known?

Are the American people so indifferent to the real facts that they are willing be fooled?

Can America be awakened to the danger?

Can the fighting spirit of American people be aroused to save America from the socialistic system that has brought other great nations to destruction?

Unless we learn and apply that lesson of history, American freedom will be wiped out.

If America is to be preserved as the greatest nation in history, our people must stop leaning on the Government and stand once more on their own feet as our forefathers did.

I am confident that the loyal and patriotic Daughters of the American Revolution will be in the front line of the battle to save American freedom.

We must restore a sense of individual integrity and responsibility.

We must think more about our duties as citizens than our rights and privileges.

We must drive out corruption at all levels of government.

We must rid ourselves of racketeers and profiteers who demand something for nothing.

We must clamp down on law evaders and law violators.

We must crush the poisonous influence of communism and every other subversive element that is undermining loyalty to America.

We must resist the efforts of those who would replace our free Republic with the planned economy of the welfare state.

We must safeguard the national economy against abuses by big business, big labor, and big government.

We must strengthen the moral and spiritual vitality of our people.

We must depend more upon ourselves and less upon the Government.

We must practice honesty, self-reliance, thrift, tolerance, and above all, faith in God.

As soldiers we are taught that we must have an estimate of the situation and a plan of action before we go into battle.

First we learn all we can about the enemy and his possible action, also complete information about our own troops. I believe I have given you an accurate estimate of the situation.

In this conflict we know that our enemies abroad are the godless, treacherous, aggressor nations. We know that our enemies here at home are traitors who conspire to tear down the American flag and to overthrow this Government by force, if necessary. In addition, we have the careless and selfish American. He is not a well-trained soldier.

We know we must be prepared. We must be equipped and we must be trained.

I humbly submit for your consideration the following training program as a basis for our plan of action.

First, we must strengthen the influence of the family and the home. There are few juvenile delinquents in good families. The morale is high. They possess a high degree of integrity.

Second, our schools must be presided over by men and women imbued with the highest ideals of this Republic. Their job is a sacred trust. They should teach the young to be self-reliant, tolerant, and unselfish. They should teach the glories of the American way of life and what it has accomplished.

Third, we need militant and tolerant churches. We should all be generous in support of our churches, cathedrals, and synagogues. They should teach the dignity and the freedom of the individual. They should provide for the Boy Scouts, Girl Scouts, the YMCA, the YWCA, the youth organizations of every faith and all the other great groups that stand for Americanism at its best.

My fellow Americans, one of our most important duties in defense of American freedom is to mold the minds of youth so as to build men and women of character, principle, and integrity.

We should teach our boys and girls to be grateful for the strength and loyalty of the men who, in the name of liberty, created this powerful Nation. It was the first time in history that a government had as its prime purpose the preservation of the God-given right of freedom of the individual. Our Government was consecrated in the blood and tears of stalwart men and women for that purpose.

Our rich soil and our great endowment of natural resources were important in the development of the America we enjoy, but the strongest factor was the iron spirit in the hearts and minds of the men and women who founded, created, and developed the United States.

Let us work and fight to preserve the heritage they have so gloriously given us.

Have We Been Wrong in Indochina?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 28, 1954

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by the Honorable ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL, of Kansas, before the annual meeting of the Ohio State Bar Association, Youngstown, Ohio, May 21, 1954:

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, I remember some years ago when I was in the active practice of law in my home State of Kansas attending similar meetings of the State bar association, I never could refrain from wondering—silently of course—why a pleasant evening of friendly association with fellow practitioners of the law and their ladies had to be spoiled by being forced to listen to the speaker of the evening. I thought then, and on numerous occasions since, that society has a big debt to settle with whoever first insisted that a banquet's afterpiece must be a speech. I suppose the originator looked upon it as a sort of penance that the guests must pay for an enjoyable evening.

Nevertheless, being mortal, I must confess that I am rather proud of having been asked to speak before this annual meeting of the Ohio State Bar Association. It brings me into association with some of the most distinguished legal minds in the Nation.

I cannot help remembering that an illustrious Chief Justice of the United States was a member of this bar; that his late beloved and distinguished son, whom it was my good fortune to count as a personal friend, was an active practitioner and member of this bar; and that today my good friends, the able senior Senator from this State, JOHN BRICKER, and Congressman FRANK BOW, are among its leading lights.

When your distinguished president, Mr. C. Kenneth Clark, wrote me of this annual meeting, I had an inner apprehension about accepting the nomination as a speaker. It may seem strange to you that a politician would ever be reluctant about any opportunity to talk—about anything.

The first problem was time. In common with my 95 colleagues in the Senate, I am on a perpetual merry-go-round of duties large and small which in my case take, on an average, of 15 hours a day, 6 days a week. I reserve Sunday for three things—a little more sleep, church, and several hours of quiet reflective thinking about current and future problems.

The second question was what could I say to men so peculiarily equipped as are members of this or any other State bar association. Of all the professions, lawyers perhaps have the greatest opportunity to know the facts of life. Even our jurists, who are frequently portrayed as sitting in ivory-domed cubicles, deal daily with the ebb and flow of man's affairs—the things which affect and alter the tide of events.

I could, of course, discuss the latest facets of the Interstate Commerce Act and whether trucking regulations issued thereunder are consonant with the act; but as I look around me I see many men who are infinitely better equipped to do so. I might present a discourse on the antitrust statutes on the point of whether the Supreme Court can sustain a lower court decision in the booking of theatrical acts without materially narrowing the application of the Sherman Act; but again prudence commands that I hold my tongue among my betters.

I mention these things merely to emphasize that even a politician sometimes thinks beforehand about what he is going to talk about.

And, of course, I could make a rip-snorting political speech, boasting of the record of my party, damning the opposition, wrapping myself in the flag, and present a series of Monday-morning quarterbacking declarations designed to make me look like the wisest man since Solon or Solomon.

There is a time and a place for everything. I think this is a place to talk facts—plain, unvarnished, nonpolitical facts. I think this is a time to reason together, to examine the conditions and circumstances that surround us.

Tom Paine, rallying a despondent, bewildered band of patriots who saw only defeat ahead of them in their valiant try for freedom, said that was a time to try men's souls.

This too is a moment in history that is fine for pessimists. The world seems upside down. Everywhere there is an air of confusion and crisis. We are living in a time when it is only too easy to feel down in the mouth and walk around muttering lugubriously to ourselves and to each other. The hour is a good one for the Cassandras. It is a good one for the purveyors of doom and gloom, for the Jeremiahs who stress the dark side of everything, for the hand-wringers and the defeatists. The times are again ideal for all those who talk fatalistically about not being able to stop the wave of the future, once the Nazi wave, and now the Red wave.

We become bitter in our criticisms, we become strident in our views, we shout when we should be quiet, we bluster when we should be calm, we threaten when we should be firm. All too often, we are the angry man who has lost his sense of proportion, who sees everything in black and white instead of shades of gray.

Let us agree first on one premise. The day is gone when the United States can or will live alone in the world. The great oceans which were our moats can be traversed in hours by planes, and in minutes by guided missiles. Chicago, Detroit, you here in Youngstown, are scarcely 5 hours away from Soviet Russia's nearest Arctic base by planes capable of carrying the atomic bomb. At least that is what we are told.

Moreover, whether we like it or not, every facet of our domestic economy is affected by what goes on in the world about us. The return to a peacetime economy in a nation geared to war and the furnishing of munitions and economic aid to its allies, is a difficult and uneasy task, as events of the last year have proved. The market prices of our grains and fibers, the rate of steel mill production, the activity of our factories—all are quickly and directly affected by the tide of events in other lands. Russian intransigence in Germany, Red China's demeanor in a Geneva conference, the changing events in Indochina, daily affect our own economy.

It must be clear, therefore, that the problem which transcends all others in our lives is the international problem, the difficulties between East and West.

I was impressed recently when I read the observations of a distinguished Peruvian political refugee, Dr. Hoya de la Torre. He was the leader of a revolutionary party in Peru. For 5 years he had time to think while he had asylum in the Colombian Embassy in Lima. In his view, the essence of the conflict between East and West lies in two

E

differing conceptions of freedom. To Asia, with its fatalistic religions and social and political traditions, freedom is hardly known. To the West, freedom is all important. The history of the West is its continuing struggle to win and maintain freedom. Consequently, justice usually means bread without freedom to the East, and may sometimes mean freedom without bread to the West. That is why, he believes, communism has a stronger appeal in Asia than in the West. Marxism, as a political doctrine, is inconceivable without the suppression of liberty. This cannot long succeed anywhere in the West. Its success in the East will depend on how long bread means more than freedom.

Let us consider one facet of this conflict between East and West, the Indochina situation. It is, at the moment, the most critical, the most dangerous, and the most complex of the lot. It is a boiling caldron which could involve us in war. It is no secret, I suppose, that only a few weeks ago we were, indeed, very near to a repetition of our Korean adventure.

Indochina is a faraway land, a land of fabled temples and plodding oxen. It is also a land of steaming jungles, dirty rice paddies, rubber plantations and tin mines. It has a population of 30 million people, divided into three distinct political states, with more than a dozen different religions and many distinct racial groups. It is a country of great topopraphical contrasts, from hot tropical rice paddies to mountainous savage jungle, through much of which few men have passed. In the strange amalgam of its contrasting population, is the distinct stratum of 3 million Chinese who live as a class apart, well interlarded into the economic life, but socially aloof. As a producer of rice, rubber, tea, coal, coffee, pepper, teakwood and jute for export, the country is potentially a great world trader with much of the world's needs in these commodities. There is abject poverty in the crowded river deltas of the Mektong and Red Rivers, but potentially the country could support many times its population if it had a better economy and improved transportation. Its public health and educational levels are dismally low, which is no tribute to its 100 years of colonial exploitation.

We gain nothing by censuring France—the times are too grave for that—but there can be little doubt that Indochina has been the worst administered colonial area in all Asia.

Vietnam, largest and most important of the 3 Indochina States, consists of 3 provinces. Cochin China is in the north, Annam in the center along the east coast, and Tonking is in the north.

Vietnam, has about 22 million of the 30 million people in all Indochina and most of its people are Annamese. They come from an old migration which had its start in Western China but have been established in their present locale since 1190 B. C., some 3,000 years ago. While the majority inhabit the low coastal areas with their rich rice growing areas, there are also numerous aboriginal tribes, who live in the high mountain chain which runs the length of the peninsula. These tribes recognize no law but their own, and this includes the French, the Vietnam, or the Viet Minh. The jungle in which they live is so dense a machinegun burst will not penetrate 30 yards from the narrow infrequent trails that traverse it. For the most part, they have no concern with the war, and want only to be left alone.

Tonkin, the northernmost of the three provinces of Vietnam, includes both rich river delta and mountains. It has good deposits of fine anthracite coal, copper, manganese, iron, and tungsten.

The other two states of Indochina are Cambodia and Laos. Cambodia, which lies in the southwest corner of the peninsula, is the ancient kingdom of the Khmers. Cambodia's people are mostly of Thai origin, and theirs is a closely integrated community; proud, rich in all the necessities of life, with a glorious cultural heritage of art, music, and literature. Its magnificent sixth century temple at Angkor was 1 of the 7 wonders of the ancient world. The people are mostly Buddhists, a state religion whose loyal subjects are both devout and disciplined in its powerful hierarchy. There is also a tribal minority known as the Isaraks, whose religious faith strongly resembles Brahmanism. Laos is the least developed of the three Associated States. In fact, it is probably 1 of only 2 nations in the whole world which does not have 1 mile of railroad. While it has teak, gold, and tin which have been exploited to some degree, little has been done to facilitate getting its products out into world commerce profitably. Its people are Buddhists, predominantly of Thai origin.

It is significant, I think, that some months ago when a number of nervous communiques were issued by the French about a forthcoming Communist invasion of Laos, the Laotians were the least concerned, and even today show less interest in the war next door than we do.

Why this lesson in the geography, economics, and social and religious life of Indochina? Simply because it is essential that we have some understanding of basic facts before we, or our Government, make decisions which would involve us in undertakings which may be unwise, imprudent, and even wrong.

The war in Indochina is nearly 8 years old. I have sought to learn something about it. I must tell you in all honesty that it is difficult for me to support the belief that the conflict between the French-supported Vietnam and the rebel Viet Minh is, in fact, a war between the forces of freedom on one hand and the forces of communism on the other hand. The war had its genesis in a sincere attempt by nationalists to shake off the French colonial yoke. It was spurred, of course, by Japan's potent slogan of Asia for the Asiatics, which has become a rallying cry for all Asia. It was given added fuel by Gandhi's nationalistic movement in India and Holland's relinquishment of the East Indies. Nationalism, throw the white man out, get rid of colonial exploiters, is a raging fire today through all Asia.

It is true that the leader of the Indochinese rebel forces is Communist trained. But the United States has had a group of military advisers helping the French-led forces. It is true that the rebel forces have been getting military supplies from Red China, and possibly from the Soviets. But the United States has supplied more than a billion in war material. The principal difference is, that the Red Chinese are getting paid in rice, tungsten, and other commodities, and we are giving our supplies away.

Our press and radio in recent weeks have pulled no punches in describing the Viet Minh as the Communist forces. But as little as 3 months ago, not even the French so identified them. In fact, up to very recently, dispatches from Saigon discreetly and consistently called them the Communist-led Viet Minh, but never the Communist forces, or the Communist Viet Minh. It is clear that the Vietnamese themselves have little heart for the war; that the French have difficulty in recruiting them; that arms, munitions, and men go over to the rebel side each day in large numbers and amount. It is interesting to ask ourselves at what point did this war, which the record shows to have been a war for freedom and independence, a war against imperialism, at what point did it suddenly become a war of Communist aggression?

The basis of reasoning lies in distinguishing fact from fancy, truth from untruth. In examining the Indochina situation, we harm only ourselves if we refuse to look at the facts.

It is a fact that more than two-thirds of the world's population goes to bed hungry every night. It is a fact that most of that two-thirds live in Asia. It is a fact that communism breeds on poverty and want. But to conclude from these facts that all Asia will fall under Communist control is to commit a folly of reasoning which places us on a false premise right from the start.

Asia is in revolution—revolution against colonialism. The spirit which animated the American Revolution, and the French Revolution in the 18th century, and Bolivar's great cause in South America in the 19th century, has taken firm root in Asia in this century. What we in America believe is the inalienable right of all men to walk as equals with dignity in the world community is sweeping Asia today.

Are we in America to say nay to this? Yet consider the position that we have been put in. Throughout Asia, and even in many parts of Europe, we are now regarded as the protectors and defenders of colonialism. We, who fought the first revolution for the rights of man, are censured everywhere as defending greed and exploitation of native populations. Is it any wonder that independence movements are driven into the lap of the Kremlin? We help the cause of world communism by failure to stand solidly for the cause of world democracy. In the minds of a great many Asiatics, Europeans, and those in the Arab States, America does not quite know what it is for, and only faintly what it is against.

We are a freedom-inspired Nation, devoted to the tenets of democracy, but remember that Communist China makes the same claim. And the Chinese shrewdly point out that we are the defenders of the white man's policy of exploitation, an argument which the natives find easy to believe in the light of the facts. When we send, or even threaten to send, our troops and treasure halfway around the world in apparent defense of colonialism, it's no help to us that the Asiatic knows no more about us than we do about him. And the eventual penalty to us is infinitely more than the loss of troops and treasure.

I turn now from a recital of these facts to some consideration of where we are, and where we are going. I have formed some opinions about the wisdom of our course so far and of our policies. I believe that these judgments are based on facts—on the facts I have recited and many more.

Able men, students of world political and social movements, believe that communism thrives best wherever poverty and despair and exploitation of the mass of the people exist. The masters of the Kremlin believe it too. Where are these areas today?

Obviously most of Asia, the African colonies, and the Arab States in the Middle East are fertile breeding grounds for communism.

And why not? Consider the living standards of the people. Men, women, and even children, work from dawn to dark without making enough to ward off the pangs of perpetual hunger. The average life expectancy is less than 30 years. Infant mortality is shocking; a sizable percentage of those who live become blind or partially blind through disease.

What do you think runs through the mind of a Chinese woman, a child strapped to her bosom and a heavy sack of coal on her back, as all day long she climbs up and down a ship's ladder refueling the ship from a coaling dock in Shanghai or Hong Kong?

What do you think are the thoughts of an Egyptian fellahin, walking patiently behind the same kind of a plow his forefathers used in biblical times, all day long for 30

E

cents a day and a ration of old camel meat once a week?

What motivates the men and women who when the nights get cold in the winter months throw themselves into the swirling waters of the Whangpoo?

Isn't it clear that people like this haven't anything to lose; that they believe that any change must be for the better? You may say: But their lot won't be better under communism. Of course not; but the Communists are clever enough to promise that it will be better; that communism is striving to help them.

Has the Western World ever even promised them anything? Isn't it easy to see how communism becomes a kind of religion for millions of such miserable, despairing creatures who have nothing to lose but their chains in embracing a new creed?

Does the Western World thwart communism by sitting idly by while all this goes on? Can we, in the kind of world we now live in, afford in our own self-interest to remain silent, to allow the fuse to reach the gunpowder? There was a time immediately after the end of World War II when we had the influence and the power to insist that the first steps be taken to correct these evils. We did it in the case of India and the Dutch East Indies. We didn't do it in the case of Indochina. We didn't do it with respect to the African colonies. And we can be sure that however the Indochinese situation is settled, the next tinder box will be North Africa or the Middle East. Wherever these weaknesses exist, there the Communists will probe and pour oil on the fire.

France bears the major share of the blame for the present Indochina crisis. France turned deaf ears to suggestions made both by the British and ourselves. This was an affair, she said, she could handle herself. She wanted neither advice nor help. As the fire grew and she lost the flower of her officer corps in the jungles, she wanted help, but always on her own terms.

France assumed, correctly I fear, that with proved Communist leadership in charge of the rebels, we could be frightened into the affair. Our own policy of drift and wait and see over the last 5 years made inevitable the position we have finally found ourselves in—a position in which we have poured out munitions and technical help to put down a rebellion against a colonial power.

Then, as the situation worsened, we began to threaten and bluster. We warned of massive retaliation if the Red Chinese or the Soviet Russians came into the conflict; some of the top military figures indicated that the only solution was an all-out military effort; we let the impression get around that if necessary we would go it alone at France's side.

All this went on before there was consultation with allies, and much worse, without any apparent intent to consult the Congress. When our hand was called; when we were bluntly asked to fulfill implied promises and belligerent statements, an urgent effort got under way to condition the mind of the American people to the inevitability of intervention in the Indochinese war. A number of trial balloons were sent up, but they didn't float very high.

In part, they were knocked down by the cold reception most Members of Congress gave the idea of sending our fighting men into the Indochina conflict. Most of us felt that the Congress must not be by-passed; that if the Nation were going to war the Congress must first declare war. We wanted no repetition of the Korean adventure.

In part, the campaign for public approval of intervention was stymied by the sharp antagonism of the newspaper editors of America, who were then meeting in Washington. Editor after editor, even those who supported strongly the international policies of the former administrations and who are themselves strongly interventionist in world affairs, sharply criticized any proposal of the Executive sending American troops into Indochina.

The story one hears in Washington is that when our Secretary of State arrived in London prior to Geneva, he had administration approval for our intervention in Indochina, provided Britain would go along. Churchill, the story goes, refused, at least until after Geneva proved fruitless. In France, Mr. Dulles was met with sharp insistence on fulfillment of a promise to send a powerful armada of American planes. The tide of American opinion and the British opposition put Mr. Dulles in the position where he had to back down on all-out help to the French.

Of course, this turn of events pleased Soviet Russia. It put the Kremlin in a commanding position at the subsequent Geneva Conference; it strengthened the spirit of Red China and of the Communist-led Viet Minh forces. It has been said a diplomatic loss of face for the United States has resulted.

The question is—Was all this necessary? Should our Government make unilateral promises about intervention in a war without considering Congress, and without considering the American people—who I believe are overwhelmingly opposed to getting into the Indochina war?

Do not misunderstand me. This is not the time for recrimination, personal attacks on our leaders, or hand-wringing. I do not want to be, as I said earlier, a Monday-morning quarterback. Hindsight can make a genius of the least of us.

My own view is that although we recognized the rebel movement in Indochina in its early stages for what it was—a truly nationalist attempt to throw off the yoke of a colonial power—we lost our whole sense of perspective when it became clear that the revolution was being exploited by Moscow, and when Communist-trained leaders took over its direction.

In our desire to bolster the European community as a barrier to Russian imperialist expansion, we were reluctant to take a strong stand with France. Instead of counseling moderation, instead of insisting, as we did in the case of Britain with respect to India, that France take firm and definite action to free the Associated States of Indochina, we fell into the trap of aiding a colonial power to maintain her sovereignty over her possessions.

Obviously, we do not want to be a party to helping the Indochinese peoples exchange their French yoke for a Communist yoke. We are fearful that a peace now, or even an armistice which divides the country between the rebel and the French-led forces, means eventual control of the whole country by the Communist-dominated party.

Yet, that is the kind of a peace the free world faces today. The French want an end of the war—at almost any terms. The French people want an end to the bloodletting and the tragedy and cost of war. No government which espouses a continuation of the war will last long in France.

There are men high in our Government councils who advocate all-out military aid in Indochina. They are able men, sincere in their belief that the policy of massive retaliation is America's best insurance of freedom. They are the men who advocated this country going it alone if necessary; they are the men who said that we must take unilateral action if our allies refused to join us in an attempt to destroy the rebel movement. They will, I fear, in the weeks ahead, continue to advocate that we cannot sit idly by while Indochina is taken over by Communist-led forces. They will argue that this is the first step to Communist domination or control of all of southeast Asia.

I, for one, do not agree with them. I think the facts are all against them. There is no evidence that the Governments of India, Pakistan, Burma, or Indonesia—all next door neighbors to Indochina and all non-Communists in nature—are unduly concerned that the Kremlin will take over all southeast Asia.

I am further fortified in my belief against unilateral action, or even allied military action, by the views held not alone by Britain, but by our good neighbor, Canada. If indeed, our future in the kind of a world we live in depends upon firm allies, then we should remember that the British Commonwealth's stake in southeast Asia is far greater than our own—Australia, New Zealand, and Ceylon lie athwart the path of this feared sweep of communism. Yet they counsel patience, prudence, and perseverance in a course of moderation.

The key is to find a means of guaranteeing the States of Indochina freedom from foreign overlordship, to get the French out and at the same time, save France's face.

What is our role in this situation? We are the leaders of the free world, engaged in a desperate struggle with world communism to maintain that leadership. We cannot play that role if our counsel is imprudent, hasty, ill-advised, and motivated by hysteria and emergency.

We could, for example, begin to espouse freedom for Indochina instead of a war of extermination. Nor must we stop with Indochina. We must stand firmly for eventual freedom for all colonial areas, for they are tomorrow's tinderboxes where American arms and American soldiers will be expected to put out the Communist-inspired fire. We have both experience and a record to point to in this field. Our action in freeing the Philippines was one that brought us the respect and admiration of all Asia. It kept the Philippine people as our stalwart allies throughout the dark days of World War II. We passed an independence act, guaranteeing freedom after a period of trial and help by us, and we fulfilled that promise to the letter.

Unfortunately, we are not in the position to do this alone in the case of Indochina. But there is the possibility that it could be done through the United Nations. There is even a better possibility that through the joint efforts of India, the Philippines, Great Britain, Australia, and ourselves, France could be induced to join in becoming joint guarantors with these powers of prompt freedom for the three States of Indochina.

Such a guaranty of complete independence with its own government in eventual charge may be the most effective weapon against eventual Communist control of Indochina. The facts indicate that the overwhelming mass of the Indochinese want freedom and an end of imperialist exploitation from any course, whether democratic or Communist.

While it will be argued, and is undoubtedly true, that an end of the war will now leave the Communist-led forces in a dominating position to eventually take over the entire country, there is equally good reason to believe that their hold may be tenuous and temporary. So long as there is no political vacuum for Communists to step into, the forces of freedom and democracy in Indochina have an equally good chance to become the controlling influence.

This much is clear. The Indochinese affair is not going to be settled by war. Remember—our military intervention in Indochina may not be the kind of limited war some contend; it may well be the trigger which sets off the third world war—the holocaust which will destroy modern civilization. In any event, democracy and freedom are not going to be brought to the Indochinese people by bullets and napalm—and certainly not by a war of extinction which ranges against us millions of people who believe they are fighting for their own freedom. Only a political settlement can cope with the affair as it stands today. A guaranty of freedom backed by nations in whom the people of Indochina have faith and confidence is the best hope for them—and for us.

Is the Wilderness Area Doomed?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROY W. WIER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 28, 1954

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter from O. L. Kaupanger, secretary, Minnesota Emergency Conservation Committee, Minneapolis, Minn.

The letter is as follows:

IS THE WILDERNESS AREA DOOMED?

MINNESOTA EMERGENCY
CONSERVATION COMMITTEE,
Minneapolis, Minn., May 24, 1954.

The struggle to preserve the lakeland wilderness area in the Superior National Forest has been a long and bitter fight. It has been a 45-year battle against deforestation, big dams, roads, and airplanes, but it is our opinion that the biggest fight is about to be fought. It is not strictly a new fight, it has been looming for years, but has not always been discernible to the naked eye.

This threat is mining.

The threat is very real and the mining interests, through State and Federal legislation enacted since 1930, have obtained a strong foothold, too strong, many of us believe, to be stopped.

The latest convincing evidence of the seriousness of the threatened exploitation was vividly brought out at the public hearing held last week in Duluth to discuss State Land Exchange Commission proposals for exchanging State trust fund lands for Federal lands in State and national forest areas. The proposed exchange affects several parcels totaling 9,500 acres of Federal land located in both George Washington and the Finland State forests and a total of 8,500 acres of State land in Superior National Forest. The State lands offered in exchange represent only a small part of the State holdings in the so-called roadless area of the forest, consisting of a few scattered plots in the region.

In response to queries by the Emergency Committee as to why certain State-owned lands in the roadless area, the Gabbro holdings, had been withdrawn from the original exchange proposal, Commissioner Chester S. Wilson, who conducted the hearing, said that the Gabbro lands had some known mineral deposits, including nickel, and had therefore been withheld. Adjacent to these State holdings are several privately owned tracts of substantial size.

"Why should the Gabbro lands be withdrawn," retorted the secretary of the Emergency Committee, "when it is a fact that not only does the State retain the mineral rights on the lands offered, but also the mineral rights on lands obtained from the Federal Government in all such land exchanges?" Mr. Wilson responded by saying that Federal control of the land surface rights would present too many problems for mining operations.

So, there you have it. Mining in the roadless area is in the offing, actually acknowledged by the State land exchange commission at a public hearing.

The acknowledgment did not surprise the emergency committee. A brief look-see at the enabling legislation passed by Congress and the State legislature since 1930 should convince even the skeptic that mining has been a strong possibility always.

In 1930, the Shipstead-Nolan Act was passed by Congress. The act bans all exploitation except mining for 300 feet from shorelines on all Federal lands abutting lakes and streams in the Shipstead-Nolan area.

In 1933, the State legislature enacted legislation giving like protection on all State-owned lands abutting lakes and streams in the area. Mining is also excepted in the State act.

In 1938, the State constitution was amended to permit the State to exchange lands with the Federal Government. The legislature enacted enabling legislation to permit such exchanges in 1939, amending the law in 1941. The arguments advanced for the constitutional amendment were to help improve reforestation through consolidation of lands to facilitate planting, fire protection, cutting practice, and so on.

However, even though more than two-thirds of the Minnesota citizens approved such exchanges, only one exchange has been made, namely, the Nerstrand Woods involvement, which was not a forestry urge, but rather a last ditch effort to save the woods for the State.

In the early 1940's, the State legislature responded to frantic demands for legislation to hurry up taconite development. The State solons went all out even to the point of giving the mining interests the right of eminent domain. Under the terms of this right, the mining companies can acquire private land in the State for mining, including rights-of-way, necessary water development, harbors—in fact, everything needed to promote such exploitation. They can also literally force the State to long-time lease them all State lands needed for such development, as witness the Erie Mining Co. railroad right-of-way—a 65-mile project—now under construction.

Wildcatting laws have been liberalized to help step up the fevered mining development. In fact, it is not too much out of line to say that the mining industry has been given lock, stock, and barrel.

There have been a few setbacks, such as the Division of Lands and Minerals withdrawing its bill in the last session which sought to eliminate the limit of State land that could be acquired by mining companies for mining operations. The emergency committee spotted this one and helped force its being withdrawn.

It is our opinion that under the right of eminent domain practically every acre of privately owned land and State land in the Superior National Forest can be ultimately acquired or controlled under the guise of mineral operations. Even though the mining development does not materialize in the process, the new owners of land will have acquired some very desirable real estate. With Congress having approved the St. Lawrence Waterway, the new harbor at Beaver Bay looks like a very good investment whether taconite is or is not a success. The island in this harbor, its acquisition, was one of the main arguments used to convince the legislature that the right of eminent domain should be granted to mining companies.

There are many who seek to laugh off the mining threat in the Superior National Forest. They insist that no one knows definitely whether or not there are any minerals to be found in the region. Why, then, the mining rider in the Shipstead-Nolan Act; in the State act?

Why only 1 land exchange in 16 years? Why withdraw the Gabbro lands in the latest exchange proposal?

We do not profess to know definitely what is the mineral potential in Minnesota's forest region, but we would like to point out that in 1923 the mining industry was paying taxes on 1 billion tons of high-grade ore in the ground. They are still paying taxes on 1 billion tons—more than 30 years later. In the meantime, over 2 billions of tons have been mined and shipped to the steel mills.

The Federal Government does not reserve mineral rights on the lands it acquires in Minnesota. A private owner could very easily see fit to offer and give Uncle Sam his land holdings in northern Minnesota—in the roadless area—with the proviso that he be permitted to use the land during his lifetime. Meanwhile he retains the mineral rights and escapes all taxes. You may argue that Minnesota taxes minerals, that is iron ore, in the ground, but the facts are the State is helpless, having no vehicle for finding out where and how much these deposits are for taxing purposes, generally speaking. The history of iron ore in Minnesota bears this out.

To all State and Federal officialdom who tend to minimize the mining threat, and some now are so doing, permit us to remind them that under the Shipstead-Nolan Act, mining is permitted—it is the only interest given such right-of-way. This act is the fundamental law of the region so far as development is concerned.

If the Superior National Forest is to be exploited, let's not kid ourselves. Let it be openly understood by the citizens of the State and Nation. The methods now employed are disgusting and could well result in ruthless private exploitation, the very thing the citizens have been trying for almost 50 years to block.

The few and far-between small plots of land offered by the State in the latest exchange proposal are rather a puny gesture in attempting to bring about realization of the purposes which were the intent of the constitutional amendment approved by the voters in 1938.

We think it is time for some plain speaking and vigorous action.

O. L. KAUPANGER,
Secretary.

Joseph Carnella, Commander, Department of Illinois, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 28, 1954

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I have watched with interest the career of Joseph Carnella, of Edwardsville, Ill., as an active participant in the affairs of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States. Through his industry and application to his work on behalf of veterans, Mr. Carnella has risen from position to position within the VFW until, at the present time, he is department commander for the State of Illinois.

In his year as head of the Veterans of Foreign Wars in Illinois, he established an enviable record. He indicated great ability and leadership and brought honor and dignity to the VFW by his enlightened thinking and handling of affairs for that organization in the State of Illinois.

Observation of his work as department commander has caused veterans not only in the State of Illinois but throughout the country to urge Mr. Carnella to seek a post in the national organization. Yielding to these pleas, Joe Carnella has announced he will seek the office of national junior vice commander in chief at the Philadelphia encampment August 1 to 6, 1954. The VFW would add honor to its already great and distinguished name by the selection of Joe Carnella as national junior vice commander in chief. His great energy and ability would be a definite asset to the national organization.

Under leave to do so, I include herewith the text of a speech delivered by the Illinois department commander, Joseph Carnella, at the Henry Honack Post No. 1583, in which he announced his candidacy for the office of national junior vice commander in chief:

My comrades, I am here tonight in answer to a call. Let me say at the outset that I want to take this opportunity to thank each and every member of my staff, the district staffs, post staffs, and all the comrades, not only for the excellent job that you all have done in suport of my administration, but also for taking time out from your busy schedule, VFW and domestic, to come here to attend this night in my honor.

This night has a highly significant tenor, which I am sure is uppermost in my mind as well as yours.

Let it be clearly understood that I have never sought an elective office. I believe that the office should seek the man, not the man seek the office.

I am extremely happy to know that, at long last, you here in Illinois have become aware of the fact that we need experience, integrity and ability in the comrades that hold elective office in the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

I said that I came here tonight in answer to a call.

The call which has been spontaneous and without the slightest urging on my part. It has come not only from the many districts, county councils, and posts within the department of Illinois, but also from VFW leaders, and mind you, I said leaders, in many States who believe as you do.

While this movement has been taking form, and realizing the magnitude of the job you are asking me to fill, I have been taking stock of myself.

The question is: Am I qualified?

Briefly here, I sumbit to you my record.

Since 1944 I have been a post commander, county council commander, district commander, and department junior and senior vice commander, and I am now serving you as your department commander. And never during this period have I ever held an appointive office. I have always preferred to leave my record to the judgment of the membership.

You here know the record I have behind me.

When I became post commander, my post had a membership of 62 paid-up members and $200 in all funds.

When my term of office expired, the membership was well over 400 and we had actually built an outstanding post home.

I organized the Madison County Council and was commander of it for 2 years. The membership there, at the time of my election was 2,300 and when I left, it was over 4,000. And this county council owns a drum and bugle corps, junior class.

I served 2 years as ninth district commander and was named the outstanding district commander for both years. The membership at the start of my first year was about 6,000. At the end of my second year it had reached nearly 11,000.

Then I was elected department junior vice commander, and I am extremely happy to report to you that from that day on, the annual membership loss was halted, and we started on the way up.

Illinois today is leading every membership race. We won the Kaiser automobile, we are leading in percentage of continuous members, we have the largest numerical increase of any State in the United States, and we also have the largest number of solid new posts.

I am proud of the honor of being named "commander of the month" by the national headquarters every month since the membership drive started, more than 6 months, and this honor is the direct result of your efforts.

That's an honor that I will cherish as long as I live since no other department commander has ever been accorded such an honor in the past.

And what are the other records of my administration and I wish to emphasize that they are records.

Illinois is doing an excellent job in community service. Your community service program increased in the number and stature of projects to an achievement never before equaled in the history of the department. And the judges of the community service competition were some of the outstanding public officials of Illinois.

Your statewide activities have been greatly expanded. Particularly in the fields of athletics, both senior and junior class.

The Lincoln Day pilgrimage was the biggest in cooperation and attendance ever held. Our civil defense program is being copied by other departments.

They tell me, to my amazement, that I am the first department commander that has taken the time to visit all the Veterans' Administration and State hospitals during my term of office. And my comrades have told me that I have lived up to the title bestowed upon me at the department encampment in East St. Louis last June, that is field commander, because I have visited 222 posts throughout the State, officially or otherwise.

I have attended all district meetings at least once, and I have attended nearly all the county council meetings that I have been notified of.

The voice of the Veterans of Foreign Wars in Illinois is repeated by the news media and in the legislative halls and the State capitol more than it has ever been.

And I might say, our voice has been heard in the press in some places outside of Illinois.

Now, therefore, let me say that the decision that I am about to announce is solely predicted on the fact that I have dedicated my life to the service of our great organization.

Permit me to say also that I have no ax to grind with anyone.

As a consequence of my record and the other facts enumerated above, I have decided to answer your call and I do hereby announce that I am an active candidate for the office of national junior vice commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.

The First Memorial Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. C. W. (RUNT) BISHOP

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 28, 1954

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Speaker, the first Memorial Day celebration was born in the 25th Congressional District of Illinois in the city of Carbondale, with Gen. John A. Logan as the first speaker. We of the great State of Illinois consider the 30th of May to be one of our most important national holidays. President Delyte W. Morris, of Southern Illinois University, at Carbondale, describes the origin of this great day in the following sketch:

THE FIRST MEMORIAL DAY

The practice of decorating the graves of ancestors is almost as old as that of formal burials.

However, the practice of setting aside a specific day to be known as Memorial Day or, as it was once more popularly called, Decoration Day, is of relatively recent origin. In fact, the first record of which we have knowledge where there was an organized community movement to carry out such a program occurred in Carbondale, Ill., on the last Sunday in April 1866.

"It is significant that leadership in establishing a national memorial day should have originated in Carbondale, Ill.," says President D. W. Morris, of Southern Illinois University. "Many of these same leaders in 1874 brought about establishment of what is now SIU, a university which today is training potential military leaders in Southern's Air Force ROTC and training students for community leadership wherever they may establish their own homes."

There is good evidence that the nationwide movement to designate a particular day as a memorial or decoration day began with the first services held at the cemetery on the south side of Main Street and a few blocks east of the railway tracks in Carbondale.

One Sunday morning in early April 1866, three returned Union soldiers, Russell Winchester, Ambrose Crowell, and Jonathan F. Wiseman, veterans of the Civil War, were awaiting the time for church services to begin at Crab Orchard Christian Church, located about 1 mile south and 3 miles southwest of Carbondale. They were sitting on the steps of the little church. A woman, whose name is not recorded, came with her children and paused to visit the grave of the husband and father, a former soldier. They had gathered some wild flowers on their way to the church. These were placed on the grave they had paused to visit. The three returned soldiers were deeply impressed by the action of the mother and children.

When the little family group had passed into the church Ambrose Crowell, one of the group sitting on the steps, proposed that they similarly decorate the graves of two other comrades buried there. In cooperation with the minister and other members of the church they did so. Afterwards they fell to discussing the desirability of doing the same at the cemetery in Cardondale, where about 20 veterans of the Civil War were buried. Deciding that such should be done, they contacted Col. E. J. Ingersoll, a prominent and public spirited citizen of Carbondale and found him much interested. Others to whom the proposition was explained likewise endorsed it. Tentative plans for the observance of such a day were accordingly formed. News that the services were being planned, rapidly spread over the town and surrounding country.

A meeting was held at the Methodist Church in Carbondale and more definite plans for the day was formulated. It was decided to have it be an all day affair. Colonel Ingersoll was chosen marshal of the day and a program was arranged with Gen. John A. Logan, then a resident of Carbondale, as the principal speaker. Arrangements were made to have a barbecue. Farmers agreed to donate hogs and sheep for the occasion. This was evidently done since a notation on the flyleaf of James Green's Bible records this fact, "Hogs furnished by Dillinger's boys, bread by John Borgher." Another entry evidently not a part of the planned program occurs on the same Bible flyleaf saying, "One fight Brannon and Russell."

On the morning of the last Sunday in April 1866, that is April 29, the people began to assemble and Carbondale is reported to have had the largest crowd the town had ever known. The men who had served in the armed services during the Civil War were assembled somewhere uptown, where they were joined by General Logan. They were formed into ranks under the command of Colonel Ingersoll and marched to the cemetery. There were 219 veterans in this line of march. Arriving at the cemetery, prayer was offered by the Reverend J. W. Lane, then pastor of the Methodist-Episcopal Church in Carbondale. Col. D. H. Brush, a veteran and a prominent citizen of the town, was presented and made a short talk on the purpose of the occasion. Colonel Ingersoll then presented Gen. John A. Logan, who made the principal address of the day.

Logan, then 40 years old, was perhaps the most noted military hero of southern Illinois. He was nearing the height of his influence in State and National affairs and was widely known as a fluent and forceful speaker. No copy of his talk on that day is known to exist, but the meager existing records, as well as the oral accounts passed on by those that were present, indicate it as one of Logan's supreme efforts. Only one quotation from the speech has been found recorded. It was on the flyleaf of the Bible, mentioned above as belonging to James Green, who was caretaker of the cemetery and a cousin of Logan. This sentence can be imagined as the climax of the speech and as having been impressively delivered. It was, "Every man's life belongs to his country and no man has a right to refuse it when his country calls for it."

Following Logan's address and the benediction, the assembled people departed. Memorial Day had been inaugurated. It had been an impressive occasion and many persons, then youngsters, recounted through their remaining years the events of the day. Probably there is no one living today who was present on that day 84 years ago. The last known participants were Elizabeth White (later Mrs. A. C. Elliott), Melissa Hayes (later Mrs. George Bowyer), and Elvira Hill (who later became Mrs. Ammon) were among those who served as flower girls. Thus, the first Decoration Day in Carbondale and perhaps the first such organized service in the United States became history.

Those who launched the movement and the members of the GAR who sponsored it in its earlier years are gone. Memorial Day remains an American institution.

Eighteen sixty-seven saw another observance of the day in Carbondale. Documentary references to the second observance are meager. It is recorded that the speaker on that occasion was a man named Oglesby. It is not known whether this Oglesby was R. J. Oglesby, then Governor of the State. In 1867, Logan, who had been in Washington as Representative at Large for the State of Illinois, to which office he had been elected in November 1866, was in Carbondale, arriving here on April 13. He was ill and remained here much of the summer. A year or so later, while living in Washington, he wrote to his cousin, James Green, previously mentioned as caretaker of Woodlawn Cemetery, stating that he was going to ask the GAR, of which he was then commander in chief, to sponsor memorial services over the Nation and that he would set May 30, as the date on which the ceremony was to be observed. This was, as he explained to Green, to take full advantage of the blooming season of most flowers. Accordingly Logan issued his now famous general order No. 11 on May 5, 1868, establishing Memorial Day and asking for its continuance on May 30.

In compliance with this order another observance of the day was held in Carbondale on May 30, 1868. At 3 o'clock on that date the church bells rang and people gathered at the various churches while some 150 soldiers gathered at Hindman's corner. They were commanded by Capt. Frank H. Riggs. Their line of march passed the churches where large numbers of citizens joined them. Proceeding to the cemetery they were addressed by Rev. Clark Braden, pastor of the Christian Church and later president or principal of Southern Illinois College that was located where Lincoln School now stands.

Reverend Braden was an eloquent man and from all accounts made a most effective speech. The soldiers then proceeded under the leadership of Captain Riggs to strew flowers on the graves of their departed comrades. The graves of veterans had been previously designated by small flags. As they came to each grave Captain Riggs paused and read aloud the name of the buried comrade and the inscription on his marker. At the one unknown grave he proclaimed, "Here rests a stranger—all that we know is that he gave his life for his country."

These ceremonies were followed by the address of Capt. Isaac Clements that drew praise for its eloquency, pathos, and beauty of language.

Rev. Andrew Luce, pastor of the Presbyterian Church, then claimed the attention of the assembly for a few minutes. He remarked that the God of Battles, who carried the country safely through 4 years of bloodshed, still guarded and protected all. He then offered a prayer, invoking the blessings of God upon the country and its defenders. The procession reformed and marched to the public square, where they broke ranks and returned to their homes. Thus ended the third observance of the day in Carbondale.

On April 12, 1869, Logan, who had again been chosen to head the Grand Army of the Republic, issued General Order 21, calling upon all posts to properly observe Memorial Day on May 30. The exact process of its observance was not prescribed. The press, the Congress of the United States, and all who had so freely helped in previous observances were thanked. Since May 30 occurred on Sunday, it was stated that the observance of the day might be made on Saturday, May 29, if such was desirable.

The New Era of Tuesday, May 25, 1869, carries an item saying: "At home. General Logan arrived home on last Saturday, May 22, much improved in health. Thousands of true hearts welcome the gallant Logan to his native hills."

According to previous arrangements, the fourth observance of Memorial Day, that name now taking precedence over that of Decoration Day, was observed for the fourth time in Carbondale. The services had been arranged for Saturday, May 29, as General Order No. 21 had indicated that they might, but rain forced postponement to Sunday, May 30. Even then the weather threatened to prevent their being held. In the afternoon the sun came out and people began to gather. Hurried preparations were made and the program was carried out as nearly as possible.

Soldiers met at the depot. They were formed in columns under the command of Col. E. J. Ingersoll, joined there by General Logan, and marched to the cemetery. The Glee Club sang an ode, "Decoration Day"; after this came a prayer by Chaplain Cole, of the old 31st Illinois. Following this the ceremony of decorating the graves of fellow comrades was carried out. Twenty-seven graves, names given, were then decorated. After these ceremonies Logan was presented and addressed the crowd gathered for a memorial service at Woodlawn Cemetery. When Logan had finished a closing hymn was sung and the benediction was invoked by Rev. J. W. (W. J.) Grant, pastor of the Methodist Episcopal Church. The people then departed for their homes. The fourth Memorial or Decoration Day services had been held in Carbondale.

In the years since April 1866 the custom has become widely established. Today, with some slight variance in dates, memorial services have become nationwide, but few persons have known of its origin.

"Bennington" Heroism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WINSTON L. PROUTY

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 28, 1954

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. Speaker, all of America received with profound shock the news reports of the tragedy aboard the aircraft carrier *Bennington*. The carrier named for a historic battle of the Revolution won by Green Mountain farmers has a special place in the hearts of us Vermonters, and we find the courage of the carrier crew reminiscent of the spirit of the patriots at Bennington so many years ago.

How appropriate at this time to ask ourselves anew:

How much will a man endure for an ideal?

How long will he lie side by side with death and not know fear?

These questions were answered in 1777 when a raggle-taggle band of Vermont farmers led by Gen. John Stark defeated the British troops fighting to capture supplies at Bennington, Vt. Facing almost certain disaster, the Vermont woodsmen, ill-equipped for battle, gave America a victory which made possible the triumph for independence at Saratoga. Every schoolboy knows the word "Bennington" as a symbol of courage and faith in the higher aspirations of mankind.

How much will a man endure for an ideal?

How long will he lie side by side with death and not know fear?

Only yesterday these questions were answered for us again as explosions and fire aboard the aircraft carrier *Bennington* wrenched life from nearly 100 men and inflicted injury on many more. From the first explosion until the last man left the ship, the men of the *Bennington* fought through smoke, flames, and red-hot steel to rescue their comrades.

Man's love for man was never more nobly demonstrated when crew members groped their way through deadly fumes, across passages choked with twisted steel, to find the wounded. Lieutenant Gage, an officer of the *Bennington*, reporting for the rescue parties, said: "We were able to get to all of the men. After we had taken out all we could find, we checked to see that nobody had been overlooked."

Bennington, a name ennobled by the courage of Vermonters during the Revolution, was given a new luster by the officers and men of the carrier *Bennington*.

Vermont holds out its heart to the families of those who lost their lives in yesterday's fateful accident, and most especially to the family of Lt. Cyron M. Barber, of Bennington.

How much will a man endure for an ideal?

How long will he lie side by side with death and not know fear?

The Bennington men of 1777 and 1954 knew the answers to these questions, and all who pass by the tall gray stone shaft in Bennington will be aware of the double meaning which the battle monument there shall forever possess.

California Water Aims Imperil Reclamation, Arizonian Declares

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD A. PATTEN
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 25, 1954

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an article from the Wyoming State Tribune at Cheyenne, quoting Dave Brinegar, executive secretary, Central Arizona Project Association, Goodrich Building, Phoenix, Ariz., and pointing out that reclamation's present poverty throughout 17 western reclamation States stems from California's ruthless attack on all reclamation—through attacking Arizona's central project and the upper basin storage project. In addition, an excerpt from Bruce Gustin's column in the Denver Post, pointing out the dangers California poses to other States in the Colorado River Basin:

[From the Wyoming State Tribune of April 8, 1954]

CALIFORNIA WATER AIMS IMPERIL RECLAMATION, ARIZONIAN DECLARES

PHOENIX, ARIZ.—Reclamation's golden river of profits to the American people is drying up because of the attitude of southern California foes of water projects, according to David F. Brinegar, executive secretary of the Central Arizona project association.

Brinegar pointed to a recent statement by Reclamation Commissioner W. A. Dexheimer in which Dexheimer said that the reclamation program "is drying up despite the urgent need for more water and power" in the 17 reclamation States—Arizona, California, Colorado, Idaho, Kansas, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Mexico, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Oregon, South Dakota, Texas, Utah, Washington, and Wyoming.

Dexheimer was quoted as saying: "The need for reclamation in Western States continues unabated. It takes years to plan and build a modern multipurpose irrigation project. We should be starting today those works which are to serve 5 or even 10 years hence."

To this, Brinegar added:

"As far back as 1946, southern California interests, desirous of kicking reclamation completely out of the California picture and of frustrating Arizona, Colorado, Utah, New Mexico, Wyoming, and Nevada in their use of their share of the Colorado River, began an attack on reclamation in general and on the central Arizona project in particular.

"This attack, unparalleled in the history of western reclamation for its ruthlessness, spread falsehoods about Arizona, the central Arizona project, and the reclamation program from one end of the United States to the other.

"I have clippings in my files from papers from coast to coast, each a direct copy without change of language of the southern California smear on Arizona and on reclamation, trustingly printed by well-meaning editors who had no way of knowing the facts of the case.

"As a result, many reclamationists themselves were confused. They actually began believing that reclamation was faulty, and that Arizona was trying to raid the United States Treasury, despite the fact basic principles of reclamation were unchanged and Arizona's project was and still is sounder economically than even the great Central Valley project in California.

"The central Arizona project association has tried in every way possible to awaken the reclamation States to the peril of the ruthless southern California attack.

"Commissioner Dexheimer's words are all too true.

"It is time the Western reclamation States quit apologizing for reclamation, quit falling for the southern California sucker line—a line designed to make suckers out of all the other States and a megapolis of the city of Los Angeles—and begin standing together for a dynamic reclamation program.

"A dynamic reclamation program, as conceived by the original designers of western reclamation and as furthered by the National Reclamation association and most of the State reclamation associations, will help keep America strongly and conservatively prosperous."

[From the Denver Post of May 12, 1954]

THAT'S THAT, SAYS BRUCE GUSTIN

Former Congressman CARROLL, of Denver, in opening his campaign for the Democratic senatorial nomination, said that "if we can't solve our (water) problems, California will solve them for us. California will get our water." That is a view which is shared widely. But how could such a thing be accomplished?

Under the Colorado River compact, the upper basin States, of which Colorado is one, were given "in perpetuity" 7,500,000 acre-feet of the water of that stream annually. "In perpetuity" means forever. The upper basin States were pledged to deliver to the lower basin States, of which California is one, a total of 75 million acre-feet in each 10-year period. That is an average of 7,500,000 acre-feet a year. This compact was signed by all the Colorado River States and was ratified by Congress.

In authorizing the Hoover Dam which California wanted, Congress specified that the project should not be started unless and until the Colorado River compact had been signed and California had enacted a self-limitation law restricting her use of Colorado River water to 4,400,000 acre-feet a year. Unless the United States Supreme Court allows California to repeal this self-limitation law, and knocks out the "in perpetuity" phrase of the compact, California can't grab Colorado's share of Colorado River water. That the Nation's Highest Court would do such things is inconceivable.

One of the main purposes of the Colorado River compact was to protect for the upper basin States their fair share of water from that stream until they were ready to use it. To make doubly sure of this, Congress made mandatory a definite limit on California's use of Colorado River water.

And this headline is from the Salt Lake Tribune, Monday, May 10, 1954: "California speeds opposition to Colorado storage bill."

Proposed Transfer of Army Procurement Agency From New York to Philadelphia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT C. BONNER
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 28, 1954

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I have been interested in the battle that has been raging between the delegations from New York and Philadelphia over the proposed transfer of the Army procurement establishment from New York to Philadelphia. The transfer means the expenditure of a great sum of money, the disruption of the homes of 1,200 families and the removal of a purchasing office from the center of the textile industry.

The important matter that is involved has not been brought to the attention of Congress. In 1945 the Secretaries of the Army and Navy placed their procurement agencies together in one building in New York as a physical move toward necessary integration. The war experience had shown that the two Departments were consistently buying against each other and that taxpayers were losing millions of dollars through the inefficiencies that resulted.

In the spring of 1951 the so-called Bonner committee visited the purchasing offices in New York and found that while they were together in the same building, they were working in a very ununited way or as they termed it on a "collaborative" basis. As a result of our hearings in 1951 and again in 1952 and the work of the Hébert committee, the Department of Defense established a joint clothing, textile, and apparel agency in New York. This was intended as a further move toward integration. It should be recalled that the Department of Defense, through the Munitions Board, had been working for several years to establish a single procurement agency for these materials, but after years of wrangling, a joint agency was established. This agency never really got started and, of course, accomplished very little. I have been reliably advised that the agency failed to standardize on specifications for clothing items which our committee found were badly needed. We had found that each service had its bakers' caps, aprons, underwear, socks, and so forth, and that great savings could have been made in standardizing on specifications as well as standardizing in procurement.

Last year the armed services were successful in getting the Senate Appropriation Committee to declare that the Joint Procurement Agency had been unsuccessful and funds were denied for its further existence. The move now under foot will be a complete undoing of the work toward integration that has been underway since 1945.

I want to call your attention, Mr. Speaker, to some of the stakes that are involved in the procurement and distribution of clothing in the military service. On February 5, 1954, the Honorable Harold Pearson, Deputy Under Secretary of the Army, and one of the most enlightened and fearless officials that we ever met in the Department of Defense, testified before the House Subcommittee on Appropriations with respect to the fiscal year 1955 program of the Army. On page 207 of the hearings Mr. Pearson indicated that they had the objective in the Army of reducing the $1,045,000,000 clothing inventory of the Army to $200 million. Mr. Pearson then stated, and I quote:

> Now I puzzled a great deal how I could illustrate the physical effect of an $845

million reduction in inventory. It is just a number when it gets up that high. But it still has physical dimensions. Finally, we stumbled upon an idea, and have brought along for discussion here an aerial photograph of the Richmond, Va., depot.

This is the largest branch depot in the Army, and the Army's second largest depot, the only larger one being a general depot at Columbus. It has some 30-odd immense warehouse and shed buildings in the area containing over 5 million square feet, and housed at June 1 of this year $473 million worth of merchandise. In other words, we are talking about accomplishing in one line of merchandise in the Army inventory—and this is a fully coordinated Army picture—an inventory liquidation almost twice as great as the total contents of this jammed-to-the-rafters Richmond, Va., depot. This is just one line of merchandise that we are talking about.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, the surplus clothing in the Army alone would fill two depots of 60 or more warehouses containing over 10 million square feet of space. I might remind you that such space is worth $8 or $10 a foot and that it takes hundreds of people to supervise and manage such a depot system. It should be borne in mind that Mr. Pearson was speaking only about one class of items in one of the three departments.

Further in his testimony Mr. Pearson stated, and I quote:

> I have expressed for the past 2 years the consistent belief that the Army, with good supply management and timely disposal of surplus stocks, could mothball 20 of its existing 73 depots.

He states further, and I quote:

> We have built $300 million worth of depots in the United States during the 3 years of Korean action. Improved supply management could close every one we have built.

Mr. Speaker, this is only a partial picture of the inefficiencies in the supply systems of the Department of Defense. Many people have investigated and reported upon this situation for years. When we consider that two-thirds of all the tax dollars are going into the support of the Department of Defense and we have such waste and ineffectiveness as is here indicated by a responsible official, the time has certainly come when we should take definite action.

The testimony of Mr. Pearson and others shows that the services do not know what they have on hand before they go into the market separately to buy more. Unneeded supplies are bought and added to existing surpluses. Items are not standardized so several kinds are bought when one would do. The depot systems are not large enough to hold all the material so hundreds of millions of dollars worth of new unneeded depots are built to store material which later is declared surplus and sold for 5 or 6 cents on the dollar.

I have noted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 25 that Senators LEHMAN and KENNEDY have proposed an amendment to forbid the use of any money for the transfer of the Army Procurement Agency from New York to Philadelphia. Since the House has failed to act on this matter, I have under consideration the introduction of a House concurrent resolution which would prevent the transfer of the Army Procurement Agency until the Hoover Commission has had an opportunity to study thoroughly the sorry procurement, specifications, standards, cataloging, warehousing and distribution of clothing in the military services. Mr. Speaker, the matter is of such importance that I hope and expect that every Member of this body will support such a resolution.

I want to add two encouraging notes, Mr. Speaker. First, the Army and Marine Corps are, as a result of the work of the Harden subcommittee, studying to see if they should close their clothing manufacturing plants at Philadelphia. Reports are due in early August and this is another reason for not moving the Army Procurement Office. The second encouraging point is that Harold Pearson became the Assistant Director of the Budget on May 1 where he can exercise his talents and courage to great advantage.

Testimony Regarding the George-Barden Appropriations for Vocational Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JEFFREY P. HILLELSON

OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 28, 1954

Mr. HILLELSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following testimony given by me before the Appropriations Subcommittee on Health, Education, and Welfare concerning the George-Barden appropriations for vocational education:

> Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I appreciate the opportunity to appear here today in order to give the facts concerning my State of Missouri in relation to appropriations that are necessary for the continued work of vocational education. Following are some of the facts which I should like to call to your attention:
>
> 1. The 2-year drought has reduced the income of people in rural Missouri and for this reason it is difficult for them to pay additional school taxes.
>
> 2. Because the Governor vetoed a supplementary appropriation of $9½ million for the schools, State funds to operate school programs are already critically short. If Federal funds are curtailed, this will make the general school situation even worse.
>
> 3. The program of reorganization of school districts, leading to larger school service areas and hence better school facilities for all the children, is continuing in the State at a rapid rate. About the first demand which a reorganized district makes on the State Department of Education is for the allocation of State and Federal funds for vocational programs. In an effort to comply with these requests, reimbursements to local schools have been progressively reduced over the years, resulting in the reduction of teachers' salaries and the loss of vocational teachers.
>
> 4. Each year finds a larger number of youth in our public schools and one of their chief interests, and that of their parents, is in vocational education through which they can prepare to earn a living when they enter the world of work.
>
> 5. Many business and industrial establishments are calling on the schools to expand their programs of adult education. In order to meet this need and those explained above, we shall need more George-Barden funds, not less.
>
> During the postwar years vocational education has been neglected in a way, in favor of expenditures for defense and foreign aid. While the George-Barden Act of 1946 authorizes an expenditure of over $29 million for vocation education Congress has always appropriated less, leaving the schools short by several million dollars.
>
> I hope that the committee will see fit to recommend appropriations for the full amount this year.

Statement by Alfred Iddles Before Joint Committee on Atomic Energy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HOMER FERGUSON

OF MICHIGAN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, May 28, 1954

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by Mr. Alfred Iddles, president of Babcock and Wilcox Co., relative to the design and fabrication of nuclear power equipment. This is one of the statements presented to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy relative to S. 3323 and H. R. 8862. This is another important discussion on the peaceful uses of atomic power, and I believe this statement deserves the attention of the Senate.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY ALFRED IDDLES ON S. 3323 AND H. R. 8862

> Mr. Chairman and members of the joint committee, my name is Alfred Iddles. I am president of the Babcock & Wilcox Co., manufacturers of steam generating units and auxiliary equipment, heat exchangers, tubular products, refractories, and process equipment.
>
> I will confine my comments on H. R. 8862 to those sections which are particularly relevant to a company engaged in the design and fabrication of nuclear power equipment. Babcock & Wilcox has entered this new field because we are convinced that nuclear fuels will be widely used for the production of electric power in the not-too-distant future and because much of the required equipment is of the type which we have the experience to engineer and build.
>
> As you know, Babcock & Wilcox has long been a contractor in the AEC's program. We have handled projects ranging from work on the Brookhaven reactor to fabrication of equipment for the nuclear-powered submarines. We have been associated with the Dow-Detroit project since its inception and are cooperating also with other industrial participation program groups, including notably the Nuclear Power Group and Newport News Shipbuilding & Dry Dock Co. We are now authorized by the Commission to operate as a separate unit of the industrial participation program with emphasis on problems related to design and fabrication of equipment. From this background I submit the following remarks for your consideration.

An important prerequisite for the development of any new industry is fair and just patent protection, with ample opportunity for those who make worthwhile inventions to profit by their inventions. Two of the most valid objections to the Atomic Energy Act of 1946 are that it revokes the right to patent inventions "useful solely in the production of fissionable material" and that it provides for compulsory licensing of patents covering inventions which "utilize or are essential in the utilization of fissionable material or atomic energy." The joint committee has gone a long way toward restoring the rights of the American inventor in the field of atomic energy by now sponsoring the removal of these restrictions from the act. It is to be expected that this change will lead to a corresponding modification in the patent clauses used in research and development contracts issued by the Commission and its prime contractors. We hope that the final result will be a minimizing of the present substantial differences between the patent clauses in Commission research and development contracts and those in general research and development contracts for the armed services as set forth in Armed Services Procurement Regulations, section IX.

The only suggestion we have for revision of H. R. 8862 with regard to patents is that section 152 on the nonenforcement of patents in the research and development field should be deleted as inconsistent with the United States patent laws, or at least limited to research and development carried on with Government funds.

The objective of H. R. 8862 "to encourage widespread participation by private enterprise and others in the development and utilization of atomic energy for peaceful purposes" can only be attained if the basis of participation is made sufficiently attractive for investment of private capital. The provisions for the private ownership of licensed production and utilization facilities are undoubtedly helpful in this respect. The proposed arrangements for the licensing of production and utilization facilities are subject to such stringent and complete control by the Commission as to design, construction, and operation, however, that we seriously question whether the private power industry would be sufficiently attracted or able to finance such plants at normal investment rates. I refer specifically to the retention of ownership and control of prices of all special material by the Commission, the power of the Commission to modify the applicable rules and regulations at any time, and the power of the Commission to retake possession of the special material for any alleged violation of the license, whether or not a willful violation, without the user having an opportunity to correct the situation. All of these items contribute to an uncertain franchise situation and the possibility that an important segment of the user's power generating facilities may be rendered inoperative for an indefinite period.

Another point which might well be reconsidered is the requirement that not more than 5 percent of the stock of a license applicant be alien owned or controlled (sec. 103). This appears to be an impracticable method of handling the problem of alien control. Also, the statement in section 54 prohibiting the distribution of special material except on terms that no applicant will be enabled to construct an atomic weapon needs clarification and amplification to avoid the possibility of an interpretation which could nullify any nuclear-power program.

B. & W. wishes to go on record with a strong endorsement of (1) the establishment of an Inspection Division and a Review Board, (2) the provision in section 33 that the Commission may conduct research for others, (3) the requirement that the Commission permit the widest use of special material and atomic energy for research and development and for medical therapy (sec. 105), (4) the requirement that reactor operators be licensed (sec. 106), and (5) sections 145 (b) and (c), which restrict the Commission's power to control information and provide for periodic review of restricted data.

Summarizing B. & W.'s position, we believe that H. R. 8862 will materially hasten the development of a nuclear-power industry, provided that the licensing arrangements can be changed to handle more realistically the problems current in the power field. We believe this can be done with ample safeguards for the common defense and national security.

Of Rights and Sensibilities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 25, 1954

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Constitution of the United States makes every effort to protect not only the rights but the sensibilities of every American citizen.

As a former President of the United States pointed out not too long ago, side by side, the Constitution of the United States and the Constitution of Soviet Russia express noble sentiments for life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. An examination of the operation of both documents shows that life in the United States is happier and freer than life in the Soviet Union. The method used to carry out the terms of the document, it appears to me, makes the difference.

While it may be true that men make organizations, both men and organizations need guides, compasses, or documents to stay on course. The way to go, to proceed, is as vital for safe and lasting success in carrying out a mission, be it on land, in the air, or on the sea, as is the way to act in government to promote the public interest. This seems so fundamental as to make even the mention of it appear naive. Every kid on any city block knows that to play outside the rules invites trouble. History is replete with the story of rulers and governments that have operated, to their dismay, outside the simple rule of promoting the general welfare by recognizing the need of people to live free from the whip across the back or the whiplash across the mind and into the heart.

The Congress is to hear in joint session Emperor Haille Selassie who embodies the idea that life is an echo, it all comes back, the good and the bad. Where is that dictator, that bad man whose boy sprayed Ethiopians from his turret as they ran in fear for cover? He likened them to animals, like game, fun to shoot down. Where is that son? Who knows Haille Selassie is back, vindication to me, at any rate, that in the book of judgment which rests in heaven and not on the table of any political commissar, that the way, that method counts.

Under unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, as a possible contribution to proper procedures in government to promote the general welfare and to hold back the whip and to keep our people from being unnecessarily scarred in heart or mind, I should like below to cite the nine objections he makes as well as the preface he writes in his book recently published called I Protest, by G. Bromley Oxnam:

I

I protest against the use of the House floor to defame. It is at once ungentlemanly and un-American to abuse the privilege of immunity by broadcasting a falsehood from the House of Representatives. There is no congressional immunity from the Biblical injunction, "Thou shalt not bear false witness."

II

I protest against procedures that are, in effect, the rule of men and not the rule of law; procedures subject to the prejudices, passions, and political ambitions of committeemen; procedures designed less to elicit information than to entrap; procedures that cease to be investigation and become inquisition and intimidation.

III

I protest against the inexcusable incompetency that has characterized too many members of the research staff of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, an incompetency that has both duped and embarrassed members of the committee.

IV

I protest against the release of unverified and unevaluated material from the so-called files of this committee on official letterhead and signed by an official clerk, a practice particularly reprehensible since the committee refuses to vouch for the accuracy of the material and insists it does not represent an opinion or a conclusion of the committee. The alleged inclusion of a disclaimer, disavowing responsibility or accuracy, is no justification for the release of falsehood because to release it is in effect to validate it.

V

I protest against the un-American assumption that underlies many utterances of the committeemen, namely, that accusation constitutes conviction. The uncorroborated identification of a citizen as a Communist by an unknown informer is not proof, and the publication of the names of persons thus identified is a vicious and un-American practice.

VI

I protest against the "big bully" spirit and the bad manners of some committeemen who lecture and berate a witness, and who through insinuation misrepresent the views and activities of the witness as well as secure headlines for themselves in the press. A witness is forced to listen to the homilies of the ignoramus, the misrepresentation of the unscrupulous, and the browbeating of the bully. I protest against such degrading and un-American procedures.

VII

I protest against the apparent determination of the committee to save face rather than to face facts. I protest against its unwillingness to clean up its files and to revise its procedures so as to eliminate its abuses. Neither ignorance nor inertia can longer be tolerated. Congressmen, who have introduced bills designed to bring investigating committee procedures into harmony with American tradition, deserve the support of the public whose patience is well-nigh exhausted.

VIII

I protest against the failure of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, after spending hundreds of thousands of dollars of tax funds, to propose sound legislation to end the Communist menace or to suggest constructive proposals to remove the causes that produce communism or creative measures to make us impregnable to Communist infiltration.

IX

I protest against the constant use of the phrase "It is cited" without informing the public that most citations are not conclusions reached after careful research and confirmed by responsible bodies, but in the case of this committee and of many State committees are often the result of incompetent study, the collection of unverified rumor and staff listing. The use of the phrase "It is cited" is a device designed to discredit. It is sheer duplicity and is subject to the severest condemnation.

PREFACE

The informer is infiltrating American life at the national, State, and local level. He invades the privacy of the home, reports on classroom discussion and library accessions, and summons his colleagues to challenge the sanctity of the church. He is a man of the shadows, born of fear and contributing to it. He speaks in whispers. Justice William O. Douglas describes him as "nameless and faceless." He is not subpenaed, answers no rollcall, dares not face the man he accuses. He is as un-American as the Nazi gauleiter or the Russian commissar. But he is here. He strikes at the heart of American freedom. He is a creature of the police state, an alien, and malignant growth. Those who employ him or sustain him insist there is no fear upon the American campus; no fear in the Government service; no fear in the motion picture, the television, or radio industry; no fear in the church; in fact, no fear at all except as it is conjured up by the liberals, who are alleged to be unaware of the Communist threat to freedom.

This denial of the presence of fear is as false as the presence of fear is a fact. The whisper has entered American life for the first time. A people unafraid, heretofore ready to speak its mind boldly, a proud people is becoming a silent people. The American is holding his tongue. If this were due to more serious thought, it would be well. But it is due to fear. Communism can never be answered by fearful people who stand silent. And strangely enough this fear results in large measure from the un-American activities of elected representatives of the American people who have been charged with investigating subversive activities. It arises from the activities of wide-ranging private agencies, vigilante in spirit, of mixed motives, but pursuing methods of the police state that run the gamut from wiretapping to the maintenance of the dossier.

Industrialists, who stupidly subsidized Hitler and secretly assumed that he was their man, were the first to learn that free enterprise dies at the hand of the dictator, and the sophisticated who laughed and called Hitler a buffoon were among the first to behold him as the beast and to be shut up in Buchenwald. The reactionary coalition of isolationists, purblind industrialists, and alien-minded prelates may profit by the lessons of Hitler Germany. Whether this coalition is capable of learning is yet to be decided, but there can be no doubt among those who would preserve our freedom that to appease such tendencies will bring the train of tyranny that appeasement brings whenever we compromise with the tyrant mind, right or left. The threat must be met head on, wisely, fearlessly, successfully.

There is a rightful and necessary place for congressional investigation. It is necessary for Congress to investigate in order that it may have information upon which to base sound legislation. It may be necessary to investigate the agencies chartered by the Congress to be certain that the terms of reference are carried out faithfully and in the interests of the common good. Investigation has at times resulted in information of great value to the Nation. It has an educational value, and in some cases the exposure made by investigators has been significant. It is not the propriety of congressional investigation that is the concern of this book.

The Communist Party is a conspiracy. Conspirators ought to be discovered, tried in due process and, if found guilty, punished. That is taken for granted.

This book is concerned with procedures that repudiate American tradition and practice, procedures that involve the informer, that riddle our life with distrust, and set American against American, that tend to label sound reform as subversive, that make no distinction between progress and revolution, procedures carried on by staffs too largely composed of ex-Communists and often incompetent, or by politicians some of whom appear prone to capitalize upon hysteria for political advantage.

The American must protest. He must do more. He must throttle this threat to freedom. He must preserve the free society.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I think it is only fair to the Congress to say that these nine points of order raised by the author are being attended to. For do not our courts insist on strict proof and proper pleading in order to guarantee the citizen equal justice under the law? And do not our people elect Members to the Congress periodically to guarantee that the laws are kept as flexible as life and the conditions of man require? It is indeed questionable whether our citizens intentionally demand less protection, less protection from the Congress than they do from the courts to the end that justice prevails in equal measure for all.

Needed: A Roberts' Rules for Congressional Investigations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1954

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, one of the most frequently discussed aspects of the McCarthy-Army hearings has been the rules and regulations, or absence thereof, in the investigation. Scores of correspondents have written letters asking for the ground rules governing such hearings. They have cited points of order which turn into something else, points of information which are not information seeking, and a general lack of protection for witnesses on all sides which is not in keeping with the traditional pattern of American trial procedure.

Somewhere along the line a code of committee procedure ought to be produced. While the Democrats were in control of the Senate during the past two decades, no action was ever taken to provide such direction. During the past year and a half, the Republican leadership has proposed such a code to the committees of the Senate, without any effort, however, to compel adherence to its provisions. At this moment, there is a goodly supply of bills setting up regulations for Senate committees in the hands of the Rules Committee.

Traditionally, the Senate has been reluctant to fix the terms under which its committees may function. But the present situation obviously calls for some rules which will expedite and clarify Senate investigations—and House investigations as well. Uniformity of judicial and quasi-judicial activities has always served as a guaranty of equal justice under law. It should be applied by Congress no less than by the courts.

The St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN

OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 28, 1954

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, all over the Nation there is increasing recognition of the tremendous value of the passage of the St. Lawrence seaway law.

The Midwest, in particular, being the area most directly affected by the increase in Great Lakes deepwater traffic, has been especially interested.

I send to the desk the text of several of recent Wisconsin editorials on this issue, several of which, I am pleased to say, commend the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY]. I ask unanimous consent that the text of these editorials be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Evansville Review of May 13, 1954]

COMMENDATIONS FOR SENATOR WILEY

An unusual action took place in the Senate last Friday, with leaders of both major parties reading into the RECORD praise for Wisconsin's fine Senator, ALEX WILEY, on the successful completion of his long fight for the Wiley bill—the bill to create the St. Lawrence seaway.

For decades, this legislation, which can be of great value to this and other Midwestern States, has been hung up in the Nation's Capital. Through his years in Washington, Senator WILEY has tenaciously worked for the seaway bill. Year after year he has brought in additional votes for the seaway, until now, the matter is finally passed.

Senate Republican leader KNOWLAND spoke out in praise of WILEY's work on the bill. So did Republican Senators DIRKSEN, POTTER, FERGUSON, AIKEN, SMITH, BUTLER, BEALL, and COOPER. Democrats, including KEFAUVER, HUMPHREY, DOUGLAS, and LEHMAN, joined in paying tribute to the Wisconsin Senator's leadership.

Several of those who spoke in praise of WILEY did not favor the seaway bill—but they admired the persistence, hard work, and grasp of the problems involved shown by WILEY over the years. The seaway bill, which will open up ocean shipping to the Great Lakes, is one of the important pieces of legislation acted on in recent years. It is with pride that this editor notes that it is largely the work of an outstanding man sent to Washington by the voters of this State that has brought this idea to fruition.

WILEY has worked long and hard for his State. This one bill alone would constitute a distinguished career. Fortunately for Wisconsin and the Nation it is just one of a long series of important matters on which our Senator has shown wisdom and willingness to work hard and long for causes he feels would benefit his State and the Nation.

[From the Hillsboro Sentry-Enterprise of May 13, 1954]

THE EDITOR SPEAKS: GIVE THE SENATOR A HAND

United States Senator ALEXANDER WILEY is entitled to commendation and praise from every resident of the Midwest for his work in making possible legislation that authorizes the joint United States-Canadian construction of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Seaway.

For years Midwestern people have dreamed of the time when ocean liners might dock at such inland ports as Detroit, Milwaukee, Duluth, Superior, Chicago. But the route up the St. Lawrence River and from one to another of the Great Lakes had to be deepened, and new canals and new locks constructed.

Every time legislation was offered to make the improvement possible the industrial East, seaport cities, and the railways fought against it. However, Senator WILEY was not one to give up easily and he offered legislation time and again to have the seaway construction authorized. Success came last week, Friday, when the Wiley bill passed the Senate.

The victory is a tribute to the tenacity and hard work of Senator WILEY. His efforts have made possible a construction that may speed the industrial growth of the Midwest and may also add materially to the welfare of agriculture which is dependent upon shipping facilities, that may allow farm products to compete in world markets. This achievement of the Senator (like his fight against oleomargarine) is typical of his dedication to the welfare of Wisconsin. He is deserving of a big hand, as an expression of the appreciation and continued support of the electors of this State.

[From the La Crosse Tribune of May 11, 1954]

WILEY PRAISED FOR SEAWAY FIGHT

In one of the most unusual actions, Members of the United States Senate in turn paid high tribute last week to Senator WILEY for his leadership in behalf of the St. Lawrence seaway.

The tributes flowed to the Wisconsin Senator ahead of the vote by which the Senate approved the measure. He was lauded by Republicans and Democrats alike as the principal author and sponsor of the legislation—and by some who had opposed the measure.

Senator WILEY has reason to take great pride of accomplishment in his long and tedious efforts in behalf of the seaway.

To have been eulogized by Senators on the ground who witnessed Senator WILEY's work and found it commendable, is quite in contrast to segments of the Republican Party in his own State which have snubbed him for this identical effort.

In full accord with all that was said, we present here a rundown of the laudatory expressions by his colleagues in Senator WILEY's behalf:

Senator DIRKSEN, Republican, of Illinois: "I would say that his has been perhaps the greatest effort toward getting the bill passed. We of the Midwest owe a great debt to Senator WILEY. I am sure the citizens of his State are grateful.

"So I pay tribute to the man who has so consistently sat upon and hatched the ideal that has at last come into fruition. I pay tribute to the persistence, vigor, and great vision with which Senator WILEY has pursued this great cause."

Senator STENNIS, Democrat, of Mississippi: "I feel that his work made the difference between abandoning the bill and continuing with it," said STENNIS. "I salute and congratulate him on his fine achievement, which I know will prove to be most worthwhile for a great many people, even beyond his own State."

Senator POTTER, Republican, of Michigan: "Senator WILEY performed a momentous task which the people of the great Midwest will cherish for many years to come."

Senator THYE, Republican, of Minnesota: "I have the greatest praise for Senator WILEY for successfully piloting the bill through his Foreign Relations Committee. When I first came to Washington as Governor of Minnesota to lobby for the seaway I found WILEY working vigorously to accomplish its development."

Senator AIKEN, Republican, of Vermont: "I confess great pleasure in having cosponsored the seaway bill under the able, sincere, and enthusiastic leadership of Senator WILEY. I believe the legislation is a great work for our country as a whole.

"I think that this event will be one of the great milestones in the history of the economy and the security of the United States. It will benefit all parts of the Nation, even those which were apprehensive of the results. We should feel, as the officials of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers feel, that in the long run this project will result in more business for everybody."

Senator KNOWLAND, Republican, of California: "Senator WILEY worked diligently on this measure despite many obstacles thrown in its path. It was a heartbreaking job."

Senator SMITH, Republican, of New Jersey: "ALEX WILEY, my pal on the Foreign Relations Committee, has worked strenuously for this legislation.

"At one time the bill was sent back to the committee in order that further figures might be furnished. We almost broke up our intimate friendship at that time. In the long run ALEX realized that I had been working for the legislation. I think I have been of some help in getting it through."

Senator LEHMAN, Democrat, of New York: "Without Senator WILEY's interest, determination, and continued agitation the bill never would have been passed."

Senator HUMPHREY, Democrat, of Minnesota: "There is today no Member of the Senate who deserves to feel a sense of accomplishment and fulfillment of purpose more than Senator WILEY. As a member of a party that is temporarily in a minority here, I welcome his leadership and his cooperation and genuine fellowship. It is a joy to me to be present as he presents his symbol of victory on the floor of the Senate."

Senator BUTLER, Republican, of Maryland: "I fought the seaway, but I congratulate Senator WILEY as a worthy adversary. I hope the seaway will do for the country what its sponsors predict it will."

Senator KEFAUVER, Democrat, of Tennessee: "Senator WILEY has exercised a great deal of statesmanship in bringing together the Senators and interests of various sections of the country to accomplish final passage of the (seaway) legislation."

Senator BEALL, Republican, of Maryland: "I pay tribute to Senator WILEY for his generalship and handling of parliamentary matters in getting the bill passed."

Senator COOPER, Republican, of Kentucky: "It was Senator WILEY's continued insistence and his fine and convincing arguments which removed any doubt I may have had about this bill."

[From the West Bend News of May 11, 1954]

AS I WAS SAYING

(By Ben West)

Passage of the St. Lawrence River seaway legislation after many years of struggle by its proponents is certain to be a boost for the economy of our State. The day when we will see major ocean vessels calling at Milwaukee is not now far off, and the result is sure to be a good one for the entire State. Almost everbody with any acquaintance with the facts in the long struggle to win approval of the seaway has tossed verbal bouquets to Wisconsin's senior Senator, ALEXANDER WILEY, who did a fine job of engineering the successful campaign, according to Washington observers.

[From the Phillips Bee of May 13, 1954]

TO OUR ADVANTAGE

Good news came this week for all of the Great Lakes and northern States of our Nation with the announcement that approval had been given by both the House of Representatives and the Senate for the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway.

For 30 years the project of deepening the waters so that oceangoing vessels might navigate any part of the Great Lakes has been suggested, but it was not until this past week that final approval was given. Much credit for the project can go to Wisconsin's Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, who has worked toward the seaway ever since he has been serving in the Senate.

The project, which now becomes a joint one of Canada and the United States, would have been constructed by Canada alone had not our approval been given. Joint sponsorship now gives American and Canadian shipping equal advantages.

That the seaway will be a decided asset to northern Wisconsin is recognized, for ocean-plying ships will be able to dock at such harbors as Duluth, Ashland, and Superior, on Lake Superior, and Milwaukee on Lake Michigan. Such docking will enable products to be transported more cheaply to the Midwest, and will allow Midwest products to be carried at lower costs to the East. Costs of unloading and shipment by rail or truck will be eliminated in many cases.

Under such an arrangement all of the northern States will benefit, for direct boat shipments east and west will be made possible. Such will, without question, mean greater local movement of rail and truck transportation to and from the ports where the big boats will dock. That will mean that there will be more freight being handled on the local roads and railroads, and will as a result bring greater prosperity to this area.

As a defense method, also, the deeper seaway will be a protection to our Nation and to Canada if attack ever comes. The seaway will serve as a supplement to the existing forms of transportation, and will be ready for full usage should other means fail.

It is not that the seaway is a certainty for next year, or the year following, for it may take 10 years before the main channel is available and harbors put in shape for reception of the larger ships. The approval which has been given is just the first step to get the project under way and to prepare for extended development. Results of the action in Washington, D. C., will come slowly.

Remarks of Hon. Edward Martin, of Pennsylvania, Before National Rivers and Harbors Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, May 28, 1954

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the remarks which I delivered before the National Rivers and Harbors Congress at Washington, D. C., on Tuesday morning, May 25, 1954.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is an honor to appear before this historic and important organization.

Through the years your association has contributed outstanding patriotic service to our Nation.

You have had a large part in building the economic strength of the United States. You have worked hard to give America the great benefits that come from navigation improvements in our rivers and harbors.

The expansion of transportation in the United States is a most fascinating and interesting subject.

It traces our national progress from the earliest pioneer days and outlines the magnificent achievements that made us the greatest nation of all history.

First and foremost in attributing the success of the American Republic, I would place our system of government, based on God's greatest gift to mankind, freedom of the individual.

Second, I would place the sturdy courage and faith of our people—the American character based upon hard work, thrift, tolerance, love of liberty, and love of God.

These priceless endowments are the foundation stones upon which American initiative, energy, and know-how, combined with transportation, created the vast empire of industrial and agricultural production that twice in a third of a century saved the world from dictatorship.

From the days of the earliest settlements along the Atlantic seaboard waterway transportation has been one of the most important factors in the development of commercial activity.

In those days, as today, water provided the lowest cost roadway for the movement of goods and persons.

In the early days river transportation had its romantic side. The Mississippi steamboat was celebrated in song and story. The races on the Mississippi were given enduring fame by the Currier and Ives prints of that period which still attract the keenest of interest. The men on the boats took great personal risks in order to defeat their competitors. Speed was the main thought of the steamboat captains on the Mississippi.

Today tonnage is the objective. Twenty major and 80 smaller barge lines operate on the so-called Mississippi system. They carry bulk cargoes such as coal, steel, chemicals, and petroleum. Conservative estimates place the total freight carried on the Mississippi River system and the Gulf Intercoastal Canal in 1953 at 158 million tons.

I wonder how many of our citizens realize that every city in the United States of over 100,000 population is located on a major stream? Sixty of our largest cities are located on navigable water. Thirty-six cities in the United States have a population of over 300,000 and of these only four are not on navigable waterways.

I think those figures are most impressive. They reflect the importance of water transportation in the economic life of our country and its tremendous influence on industrial growth and prosperity.

In my own home State of Pennsylvania we are fully conscious of the importance of our great waterways.

We are fortunate in having within the boundaries of our Commonwealth three great ports which give access to the sealanes of the world.

The great port of Philadelphia is the highly developed center of oceanborne commerce serving one of the greatest concentrations of industry in the world. More than 8,000 manufacturing plants are located along the Delaware River.

In southwestern Pennsylvania the Monongahela and the Allegheny Rivers join to form the mighty Ohio, giving access to the Mississippi waterways and the Gulf of Mexico. These vital waterways carry millions of tons of freight traffic to and from the great diversified industries that line their banks in the Pittsburgh area. There is more tonnage on the Monongahela River alone than through the Panama Canal and it is increasing every year.

The splendid harbor at Erie is one of the busy ports of the Great Lakes.

Let us consider briefly the present situation on the Delaware River where waterfront industrial expansion of unprecedented proportions is now underway.

Five years ago, in 1948, 10 percent of the Nation's foreign commerce was handled by the Delaware River ports. In 1953, 5 years later, the tonnage on the Delaware had increased to 12½ percent. During 1953 nearly 1½ million tons per day of vessel cargo was moved over the docks which line the Delaware River, more than double the 1938 volume.

The new Fairless plant of the United States Steel Corp. alone now requires about 4 million tons of iron ore a year. It is estimated that the plant will use 13 million tons in 1960.

In the first 4 months of 1953 waterborne shipments of iron ore to the port of Philadelphia totaled 208,794 tons. In the same period this year the total had reached 819,355 tons, an increase of 400 percent in 1 year.

Commercial, maritime, and civic leaders of Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Delaware are fighting for badly needed harbor and channel improvements that will enable the Delaware River to reach its full usefulness.

I am hopeful that the present session of Congress will recognize this vital need and will provide the necessary funds as an investment that will advance the prosperity and well-being of the whole Nation.

I have made special mention of the Delaware River because I believe it is typical of the many river and harbor improvements that should be undertaken because they mean so much to the welfare, safety, and progress of the United States.

Obsolete locks and dams, some of them crumbling into danger of collapse, should have immediate attention. It would be a substantial economy to replace them with modern facilities.

There are 53 locks on the Ohio River. They do a tremendous job. At times the river is so crowded that tows must wait for more than 48 hours to clear a lock.

I don't want to burden you with figures but I feel there are certain facts that should be of great interest.

An ordinary towboat, pushing 9,000 tons of petroleum products from Houston, Tex., to Pittsburgh, Pa., is doing a job that would require 830 tank cars of 8,500-gallon capacity, or 1,300 tank trucks of 500-gallon capacity. By rail it would require 16 trains of 50 cars each. If transported by truck it would cover 50 miles of road space.

A coal barge can carry 1,000 to 3,000 tons, the equivalent of 20 to 60 rail cars, and a tugboat can handle as many as 16 barges, which means 320 to 960 rail carloads.

This traffic is constantly increasing. The Army engineer's records show that in 1944 the waterways over which petroleum products and coal are transported carried about 20 billion ton-miles. In 1947 the traffic had increased to about 23½ billion ton-miles and in 1953 to over 33 billion ton-miles.

The improvement of our rivers and harbors has been a Federal responsibility for well over a century.

As early as 1824 Congress recognized this principle in the passage of an act to improve the navigation of the Ohio and Mississippi River. In the same year Congress authorized the construction of harbors on the Great Lakes. Work on the Erie Harbor was begun in 1824. Improvements at Lorain, Ohio, Cleveland, Buffalo, and Chicago followed within a few years.

The natural waterways in America have been a success, but there have been some notable examples of financial failure in State government construction and operation of canal systems.

The great example was the most dismal failure of the publicly owned canal system of Pennsylvania. That system started in operation about 1824. The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania offered its direct obligations in bonds to finance the construction of these canals. The total construction cost was about thirty-three and one-half million. The maintenance and repairs amounted to about twenty-four and one-half million; interest on the loans amounted to forty-three and one-half million, which made a total investment for the State of over one hundred and one million. The State collected in tolls about thirty-two and one-half million, and sold the canals for $11,281,000, or a financial loss to the State of almost $60 million. That was an enormous amount of money at that time.

America has more men of know-how in operation of business than any other country in the world, but somehow we have never gotten those people interested in government. Government operation of business has been a terrible failure.

The use of our natural resources to promote industry, closely supervised by Government, has been successful.

In his 1953 report, the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, estimated the total cost to complete all authorized river and harbor projects presently deemed necessary in the interest of commerce and navigation at about $2,232,000,000.

How much can we afford? The answer to that question is of the highest importance, considering the present state of our national finances and the size of our national debt.

It must be weighed with extreme care, recognizing that neglect of our ports and waterways is both costly and dangerous.

Perhaps some of the funds now going abroad to buy unwilling or questionable friendships might be diverted to more profitable purposes if applied to river and harbor improvements.

We need a steady stream of strategic ores and other raw materials that are vital to national defense.

We need more ships flying the American flag. We need better, deeper, and wider ports, modern inland waterway facilities, and river channels of sufficient depth to accommodate the largest vessels for economical operation.

To maintain our rightful place of leadership in the free world and to sustain our God-given liberties we must have great production.

Our water resources, our deposits of rich minerals, and our productive soil, if intelligently handled by a hard-working, honest, clean, and God-loving people, will attain that objective.

Is It Too Little, Too Late?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 28, 1954

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial appeared in the

Memphis Commercial Appeal of May 26, 1954:

IS IT TOO LITTLE, TOO LATE?

If, as Secretary of State Dulles has publicly said, the recent Red shipment of arms to Guatemala might be part of a Communist plot to seize the Panama Canal, nothing which will provide it with adequate protection should be left undone.

That means not only the taking of military and internal security precautions within the Canal Zone proper, but doing whatever may be necessary elsewhere in Central America.

The State Department admits that canal seizure is a possible rather than a known Red objective, but that doesn't make the possibility less reasonable and certainly the situation is not one permitting of chance taking.

Because of the Red arms shipment, the balance of military strength in Central America is now in Guatemala's favor. Secretary Dulles admits that, for he says "a government in which Communist influence is very strong has come into a position to dominate militarily the Central American area."

Despite that ominous fact, the administration seems yet unwilling to look a fact in the face and do the necessary. Secretary Dulles describes current airlifted military assistance to Honduras and Nicaragua as only a drop in the bucket compared with what Guatemala has obtained from Soviet sources. The Soviet shipment of arms, believed to have been made in Czechoslovakia's Skoda works, is worth about $10 million, according to the State Department's estimate. American equipment aid, it says, is valued at about $60,000 for each of Guatemala's neighbors. More aid will be sent, according to Mr. Dulles. It should be in such quantity and of such quality as to completely negate the importance of the Red shipment to Guatemala.

Collective action with other members of the Rio Pact is anticipated by Mr. Dulles should hostilities break out in the area. Quick action is possible, he says, since consultations among the 20 active pact signatories could be called instantaneously in the event of an emergency.

It would seem that there has been ample cause and ample time already in which to call a consultative meeting. To prevent a hostilities emergency is the very purpose of the Rio Pact. There is little of positive policy or action in waiting until an emergency already exists. If Guatemala can continue to maintain superiority in military strength it will take more than consultation to stop her once she gets going.

To the "policy of neglect" which apparently replaced Cordell Hull's "good neighbor" program for Latin America we now seem to be adding the completely disastrous formula of too little, too late.

Wheat: A Policy Challenge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN

OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 28, 1954

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "Wheat: A Policy Challenge," delivered by Dr. O. B. Jesness, head of the department of agricultural economics, University of Minnesota, before the Millers National Federation, in Chicago, Ill., on May 18, 1954.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Butter has captured the headlines in recent months as the problem child in the farm price-support family. This is due to the factor of time and also because butter is a commodity which the consumer buys directly while wheat comes to him only after having been milled into flour or more often in these modern times as bread or other bakery goods, in the price of which wheat plays a relatively minor role. True, butter is more perishable and will lose quality much more speedily. The stocks which have accumulated in the endeavor to make price supports on dairy products effective, hence, are exerting immediate pressure for remedial action.

However, the wheat problem actually is one of much greater magnitude and one which will be more difficult to solve. This is true whether one looks at it from the standpoint of the public money involved or in terms of physical quantities on hand. Wheat ties up the largest single segment of the Commodity Credit Corporation's funds employed in price supports. Wheat stocks on July 1 may be 875 million bushels, most of it in Government hands or under Government loans. That amount is nearly 200 million bushels more than the customary domestic use for food, seed, and feed in an entire year. While corn carryover on July 1 may be somewhat greater than that of wheat, our corn production and requirements outrun those of wheat by roughly 3 or 4 to 1.

Why does wheat find itself in this predicament? For one thing wheat is such an important part of the human diet and such an important source of income for farmers that governments the world over for a considerable period of time have developed programs of one sort or another dealing with this commodity. For instance, one student of the world wheat problem wrote in 1939, "I should have liked to have been able to mention here a single country in which the government does not interfere with wheat, but I have failed to find one."[1] When World War I broke out in 1914, the world was not too well prepared in terms of food supply. The Allies looked to the United States for wheat to help meet their requirements. Some of us remember well the slogan of World War I days: Wheat will win the war. Wheatless days and other measures to conserve supply were instituted and urgent appeals were made to farmers to expand production. When controls were lifted in 1919 the wheat market soared. However, it took a beating when the market broke in 1920.

Wheat occupied the spotlight in various farm programs advanced during the 1920's. Thus wheat was important in the minds of the backers of the McNary-Haugen and similar plans. When the break in the stock market in October 1929 introduced us to the very severe depression period of the 1930's, wheat again was a leader in the farm price drop. Wheat and cotton were the major concerns of the stabilization efforts of the Federal Farm Board. Efforts to improve wheat prices likewise played a prominent role in the program of its successor, the Agricultural Adjustment Administration.

The depression brought increased emphasis on economic nationalism the world over. Financial and monetary problems played a significant part in limiting trade. Our exports of wheat under these circumstances fell to very low levels. World supplies in relationship to the effective demand were more than adequate during the 1930's. In fact, it is not going too far to say that wheat production was overexpanded prior to World War II. The outbreak of the Second World War found the nations much better fortified with respect to food than they had been a quarter of a century earlier. Our price support program had led to the accumulation of sizable stocks for which the outbreak of war did not create an immediate demand. The rapid increase in employment and activity in the United States associated with war stimulated demand for meats and dairy products, not for wheat, for food purposes. However, to help meet the enlarged demand for livestock and livestock products, considerable wheat was diverted from the stocks on hand to livestock feeding. The extension of the war to the Pacific with its disruption of our supply of natural rubber led to feverish efforts to expand the synthetic product. Wheat provided an important raw material for making industrial alcohol for this and other purposes. In the emergency of war, costs become secondary so that wheat could be employed for this purpose even though under more normal conditions there are more economical sources of industrial alcohol.

The adoption of the lend-lease program for the war period and the European aid program which followed helped step up decidedly our exports of wheat as part of our contribution to the winning of the war and of restoring economic activity in wartorn Europe after the war. Much of the stimulus to wheat acreage came toward the end of the war and more particularly in the early postwar years. Thus our wheat acreage totaled 63 million in 1941, went down to 53 million in 1942, increased slightly to 56 million in 1943, and then jumped to 66 million in 1944, to 69 million in 1945, to 78 million in 1947, and to 84 million in 1949. Here we find an important key to the problem which faces us today.

Prior to 1944 the United States had produced only one crop as large as a billion bushels, namely in 1915 during World War I. However, from 1944 to 1953 the crop fell below that figure only in 1 year, in 1951, with a total of 980 million bushels that year.

The wheat exports of the United States from 1935 to 1944 exceeded 100 million bushels only in 1937 and 1938. For the rest of this period they ranged from 4 million to 49 million bushels. From 1945 through 1952 they ranged from 320 million to 470 million with the exception of 1949, the only year when they were below 300 million.

The United States supplied only 10 percent of the world's exports of wheat during 1934–38. In 1951–52, this country provided 45 percent of the total. In 1952–53 we fell back to 33 percent, Canada resuming the leadership she had in 1934–38.

Industrial uses of wheat which are generally very minor totalled 108 million bushels in 1943 and feed uses his 511 million bushels that year. This illustrates what can happen in wartimes when comparative costs become secondary.

These figures tell the story. We were troubled with wheat surpluses before the war, then output was expanded to meet the unusual export needs of the late war years and early postwar years. There were warnings of impending trouble in 1949 and early 1950, but the Korean outbreak postponed the day of reckoning. The sharp drop in exports in 1952–53, compared with the years immediately preceding, was one of the signs. The large buildup in stocks in the hands of the Commodity Credit Corporation represents a backing up of supply for which no market is available at existing price schedules. Under the law these accumulations required a vote by wheat growers on the adoption of a marketing quota for the 1954 crop.

It would be well that we keep in mind some features of wheat production and consumption in this connection. Acreage is expanded more readily than it is contracted. This is a characteristic of farming. Demand for wheat for food consumption is relatively inelastic; that is, only a moderate increase in consumption follows a decided drop in price. Moreover, wheat consumption per capita in this country has experienced a gradual decline over a long period of time. There is an important physical factor in food demand. The capacity of the human stomach is limited. In a well-fed population if more of one food is eaten, the chances are that less will be consumed of something else. Consumption of starchy foods, such as wheat and potatoes, has declined with increased per capita consumption of some animal products and certain fruits and vegetables. In spite of the growth in population the domestic requirements for wheat for food purposes have remained practically unchanged over a long period of years. Present prospects are that this trend may continue for some time into the future. Because of this, expanding population promises no early solution to the wheat dilemma.

---

[1] Paul de Hevesy, World Wheat Planning and Economic Planning in General, p. 125.

A review of the wheat picture such as that just presented appears to lead us to the inevitable conclusion that our capacity to produce wheat is greater than the prospective market. One would have to be a trade optimist of a high order to anticipate a foreign market for wheat from the United States of 300 million bushels or more which is necessary if we are to continue to produce at the rate of a billion bushels or so a year. Some seem to believe that a bad season could change the picture drastically. Parts of the country, especially some areas in the Southwest, have been plagued by drought. The 1954 crop will fall well below those of recent years. However, present estimates suggest that even so the crop will be sufficient to provide our requirements without any inroads on the carryovers we will have on July 1. In short, it would take a series of unusually bad years before our wheat stocks would be whittled down to normal by such a process.

Some of the expansion in wheat production came in the Central States through shifting cropland from other purposes to wheat. However, a major share of it came from plowing up grasslands in the Southwest for growing hard winter wheat. Rainfall is the critical factor in crop production in that region. When moisture is adequate in amount and well distributed seasonally, a good crop is harvested. On the other hand, it does not take too extended a period of drought to produce conditions remindful of the Dust Bowl days of the 1930's. Such a situation in past months has focused attention on the question whether good land use does not require the return of substantial amounts of land in the Southwest to grass. The old Indian's observation when he saw the white man turning the prairie under with his plow, "wrong side up," comes back to the minds of many.

The marketing quota accepted by vote of wheat growers is in effect this year. It will be recalled that Congress softened the cut by raising the limit by several million acres. With usual yields the acreage permitted in 1954 appears too large for the available market, especially when one recognizes the incentive under this program for seeking higher yields in an endeavor to offset acre cuts. Indications are that if this method of controlling output is to remain the reliance, the restriction in terms of acres may need to cut appreciably deeper. Moreover, if the program is continued in substantially its present form, decided limitations must be established on the rights to use the diverted acres, otherwise we are going to create a whole succession of surpluses calling for production controls.

However, there are grounds for questioning the suitability of this method of curtailing output. Were the oversupply a temporary condition it would make good sense to hold acres out of use temporarily. However, in the case of wheat a longer-run adjustment appears in order. Were all wheat of one class and quality and all growers similarly situated, a cut which is uniform across the board might be somewhat appropriate. But wheat falls into distinct classes, not all of which are in surplus. Some wheat farmers have followed permanent farm practices and have held down or reduced their acres of wheat while others have been expanding. A uniform cut ignores this factor and tends to benefit those who have contributed the most of the overexpansion. For a more permanent readjustment in wheat output a different approach is needed.

Debate today centers largely around the question of whether to continue 90 percent supports on wheat or to accept the 75 to 90 percent range specified by the act of 1949. Argument also rages over whether we should support wheat under the old parity formula or adopt the revised formula more in line with recent price relationships. The outcome of this debate will have a bearing on the issue, but whatever the decision it does not promise to solve the problem.

The current debate in the main seems to assume that the question is one over levels of supports. While the need for controls is given lipservice, it is not apparent that the problems or consequences are being weighed very carefully. The assumption also appears to be that all the Government is doing is to establish the level of the market and to take care of the surplus, leaving the market to its normal operations otherwise. This view is not shared by the trade generally. They apparently see encroachments which are not so apparent to those on the outside. Nor is sufficient attention being given to the effectiveness of pegged prices in drawing out the particular class, grades, and qualities desired. After all, wheat is produced for use, not for storage and an effective market should indicate through prices both the quantities and prices desired. An arbitrarily supported price does not perform this function.

Continued use of 90-percent supports on the old and higher parity calculation will maintain greater incentives to continue high production and thereby add to the costs of supports. It also will increase the problems of export sales. Lowering supports to 75 percent of the revised parity formula will moderate these problems somewhat but will not automatically bring things into line. It is popular to argue that when prices fall farmers expand output in an endeavor to maintain incomes. It may be noted that those who advance this argument are unable to present any convincing proof of its validity. It may sound very plausible. The point which commonly is overlooked, however, is that most farmers cannot go very far in increasing output without adding to their cash outlays and this is the very thing which they seek to avoid during a period of unsatisfactory prices. The facts are that farmers do not cut production in response to lowered prices unless better-paying alternatives are available. A reduced price on wheat very likely will induce many farmers in the Central States to shift to other crops because they have such alternatives. In areas of specialized wheat production such alternatives are not generally available. In some of these areas it probably is true that wheat will show a return even at materially lower prices and under such circumstances the natural expectation is that overexpanded production will continue.

The food demand for wheat is highly inelastic. Those who favor continuing high price supports often place considerable reliance in the argument that there is no merit in lowering wheat prices to stimulate domestic demand in food uses. Granting the truth of this argument, it still remains mainly a negative approach. It provides no real justification for maintaining a commodity at price levels which induce continuing output in excess of available outlets. There are other aspects of domestic demand, however, besides that for food. A lowered price will move in the direction of making wheat available in larger quantities for animal-feeding purposes. An expansion in this use could have considerable significance in a region such as the Pacific Northwest which under existing programs relies heavily on shipped-in animal feed supplies from other regions. A lowered price also will move in the direction of pricing our exports closer to the level with those from other competitors. This should ease the problem of export sales.

Mention should be made in this connection of the proposal which has gained considerable support, namely that a two-price system be employed in disposing of wheat in export. We have in fact a program of such a nature in the international wheat agreement. Some ardent supporters of a two-price system for encouraging exports attempt to gloss over some of the very serious problems involved. For one thing sale abroad at prices below those maintained in domestic markets becomes a form of dumping as that term is defined in international trade. Countries generally have measures to counteract dumping on their markets. They are led to apply these curbs in response to demands from their domestic producers who regard such imports as an unfair invasion of their markets. Americans should not be too surprised at this reaction because we have treated some subsidized products from other nations in the same way. Moreover, an operation of this sort may get us into difficulties with nations competing with us for available markets. In addition any program of maintaining prices above world levels here at home or any program of subsidized exports inevitably leads us to set up additional barriers to trade which over time will limit rather than expand our export opportunities. International trade is an essential part of effective international cooperation and the United States cannot afford to continue to be blind to the international implications of some of the domestic programs which we are employing.

There are those, of course, who say that wheat is such an essential and important food that the stocks we have accumulated and the amounts we stand ready to produce should be distributed to needy people in the world. This is an operation which is much easier to talk about in general terms than it is to work out in actual practice. Those who think this provides an easy solution ought to do some serious thinking over how we are to administer such a program to give assurance not only to ourselves but to other wheat suppliers that we are not encroaching upon existing markets in these efforts.

If a Government price program is not the solution to the wheat situation, what then? Let us go back to the expansion in acreage which we reviewed earlier. If we have an excess capacity to produce wheat, the answer does not lie in holding parts of farms clear across the board in idleness but in taking entire units out of production. This applies particularly to some parts of the Southwest where a good deal of the new acreage was brought in by plowing up grass lands. It might be argued that those farmers who plowed up the grass lands and who gained thereby ought now to be required to return them to grass. Some of the States may have authority under their conservation measures to move in this direction. However, we need a program which is national in scope and the Federal Government does not possess the power under existing law to force people to make this step. Under the circumstances should we not be giving serious consideration to trying to find a program to encourage and induce the return of considerable araeas to grass? Such a program probably will cost the public some money to provide the incentives. As an offset the public might do well to remember that the land was plowed up at a time when there was need for the increased output and that such action at that time was in public interest.

Fortunately much of the wheat land involved does not lie within the fence lines of farms as we usually think of them. The adjustment can be made, consequently, without being upsetting to established farms or to families living on the farms. The policy challenge presented by wheat, consequently, appears to be one involving a combination of some moderation in price supports with a positive program to bring about effective adjustment in our capacity to produce wheat. This is the challenge which deserves a careful study and best thought of all of us.

Statement by Paul W. McQuillen Before Joint Committee on Atomic Energy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER FERGUSON

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 28, 1954

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix to the RECORD the statement made by Mr. Paul W. McQuillen, chairman of the legal committee for the Dow Chemical-Detroit Edison and Associates Atomic Power Development project. The statement was offered in testimony on S. 3323 and H. R. 8862.

I believe it covers a subject of great importance, and that it will be of interest to Members of the Senate and to the readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY PAUL W. MCQUILLEN ON S. 3323 AND H. R. 8862

My name is Paul W. McQuillen. I am appearing as chairman of the legal committee for the Dow Chemical-Detroit Edison and Associates Atomic Power Development Project. I am a member of the firm of Sullivan & Cromwell, general counsel for the Detroit Edison Co.

The members of this group seek to use atomic energy in private industry, for public good. It is with that objective, therefore, that we comment on the bill before you. The other important aspects of the bill, international arrangements and military applications, are outside of our province—except that we realize the need for any private industry to operate in harmony with national policies in those fields.

Strong encouragement to private efforts is given by several provisions of the bill: notably, chapter 14, allowing normal patent rights except for weapons and research; section 67, allowing prospectors to benefit from discoveries of source materials; section 33, allowing the Commission to conduct research for others; and, most essential, the provisions of chapters 5 and 10 making it legally possible for private industry to build, own, and operate atomic energy plants.

The lifeblood of the industry, however, the special material without which it would be a dead shell, is kept in the ownership of the United States, under section 52. There are many provisions for licenses, to produce or obtain or utilize special material (under chs. 5 and 6 and 10), but their enjoyment is subject to such broad Commission discretion (under chs. 10 and 17) that it may not be possible to finance either the plant or fuel inventory required for operation.

The seriousness of these impediments to private business is exposed by the statements of Mr. Cisler and other leaders of the endeavor to establish this new industry. I will refer to specific provisions of the bill which give rise to special concern.

The first important group are those continuing the Government monopoly of materials from which atomic energy can be produced.

Section 2 (g) provides that it is essential to the common defense and security that title to all special material be in the United States. Section 52 provides that all special material shall belong to the United States and be administered by the Commission. That absolute title is fortified by section 41 prohibiting production without license, section 53 prohibiting possession or transfer without license, and section 56 prohibiting use without license.

Section 2 seems intended to declare the reasons why the statute is a proper exercise of constitutional powers. We submit, however, that the congressional power to dispose of property of the United States may be exercised by prescribing terms and conditions upon which the property may be used after it has been sold, as validly and effectively as can be done by retaining title. There also would still remain, to support the regulations, the war power and the power over activities affecting commerce.

There is a vast difference in legal concepts between title to property, however encumbered, restricted and regulated, and the mere possession, under license, of property belonging to another. The business and financial communities are accustomed to dealing with ownership of property as a basis for investment or as security for borrowed money, and legal rights and procedures have been developed for dealing with such property rights. On the other hand the values of franchise rights are not recognized, either for banking or ratemaking purposes.

It is suggested that the bill be amended to provide that the Commission may sell special materials in such amounts, for such purposes, and upon such terms and conditions as it may establish by regulations as appropriate for the purposes of the permitted types of use, to protect public health and safety and to provide for common defense and security.

In this connection, attention is called to the provisions of sections 52 and 171, requiring the United States to acquire any special material privately produced (presumably in a breeder reactor of the type sought by this project), and to pay just compensation therefor, to be determined by the Commission; to the provisions of section 54 to the effect that the Commission shall determine and charge a fair price for any special material furnished by it to any licensee; and to section 107 providing that the Commission may determine the prices for the use of any special material and the compensation to be paid for any produced. These would make the United States the sole buyer of special material (without market price), would tend to accumulate a stockpile without limit, and would make all private operators dependent upon subsidies fixed and prices charged by the Commission, without check by the influence of outside business.

It is suggested that licensees be permitted to buy and sell special materials among themselves, subject, perhaps to a prior right of refusal upon the part of the Commission and subject always, of course, to the paramount right of requisition under the war powers in common with all other private property. That right of requisition makes unnecessary the interim retention of title by the United States.

The second and even more important group of related provisions which present unusual difficulties for any private industry, are the licenses on which it would have to rest. I exclude from this category operators' licenses under section 108 and ones for medical therapy, under section 105. There are nine others, however, which almost any enterprise would need:

1. A license for research and development under section 105;
2. A construction permit under section 185;
3. A license to build or acquire a production facility under sections 44 and 101 (which presumably would suffice as a license to own under sec. 42);
4. A license for the type of business desired under section 103;
5. A license to possess or transfer special material under section 53;
6. A license to utilize special material under section 56;
7. A license to distribute byproduct material under section 71.
8. Possibly a license to receive or transfer source material under sections 62 and 68; and
9. Most likely, in due course, an amended or modified license under section 187 to permit any improvement in the facility or its operation.

There does not seem to be any standard for the granting or denial of licenses or for the terms and conditions to be imposed, nor any requirement of uniformity of basic terms for all licenses, although that may be expected to result.

The complexity of the license requirements may make their administration a real burden and operate as a deterrent to the industry. Conspicuously, section 185 apparently requires that construction of a facility be completed (and thus that it be financed) under a mere construction permit, without any assurance of any license to own or operate the facility.

It is suggested that, if possible, all the licensing provisions be collected and simplified, and that statutory standards governing their issuance be set forth in definite terms, providing for common defense and security and the protection of public health and safety. It should be possible for an applicant to obtain a single license covering all aspects of its intended atomic energy business.

The maximum term for any license is limited to 25 years under section 103, although a utility is obliged to continue its service indefinitely and must do its financing on a long-term basis. The 30-year franchises and the indeterminate permits which are not uncommon for electric companies are protected in fact by the public need for continuance of service and the practical assurance of renewal on reasonable terms which has come from long experience. Those factors are not yet evident for this new industry.

Perhaps the most serious aspects of the license provisions are those contained in sections 186 and 187. Those sections, in substance, empower the Commission to amend, revise, or revoke and annul any license, for almost any reason. There is no guide set forth for the exercise of administrative discretion, except that section 186 clearly indicates that a license may be revoked for a purely technical and inadvertent variation in construction or specifications or conflict with any regulation, including any future regulation. Section 187 includes a mandate that upon revocation, the Commission shall immediately retake possession of all special material held by the licensee, i. e., the entire fuel supply of a plant on which consumers are then dependent.

The licensing provisions, taken together, are such that it is most unlikely that any substantial installation could be possibly financed under those conditions.

It is suggested that any license be made revocable only for willful violation of a condition set forth in the license, after notice and opportunity for correction of the violation and upon conditions designed to safeguard any public interest dependent upon continued operation of the facility in question. In this connection, it is further suggested that section 106 be limited to any violation related to the licensed facility, and that sanctions in that section be enforced by the regular officials through the courts rather than by the Commission.

It is further suggested that conditions of revocation and consequent Commission action should, in any case, make appropriate and adequate provision for continuance of any public service then being rendered. Electric service is inevitably essential for community services vital to the protection of public health and safety. In the event that a national emergency demands the recapture of special material, it is further suggested that there should then be an automatic high priority accorded for the things necessary to replace the utility plant under conditions when those things also would be in short supply.

Suspension of a license and recapture of special material under section 109 because of war or national emergency provides for just compensation to be paid. Presumably consequential damages are intended, but it might be well to make that explicit.

The two foregoing subjects—licenses and special materials—pose the chief problems, from our point of view. There are some other points, however, to which we wish to call attention.

Sections 42 (a), (b), and 44 seem to imply that anyone licensed by the Commission under the act may be the owner of production facilities, but in section 42 that is expressed as an exception to the opening provision that the Commission (as agent) shall be the exclusive owner of all facilities other than those specified. This might leave open the question of whether the Commission shall be deemed to have some sort of ownership, although not exclusive, even in production facilities constructed by a licensee. We think that it is desirable to clarify what we believe to be the implication of those two sections, so that there will not be any doubt that a licensee may be the exclusive owner of production facilities.

The ownership of byproduct material is also left somewhat in doubt. Section 71 speaks only in terms of licenses to use and to distribute byproduct materials. It seems to contemplate that the Commission will be the source of such materials. It is suggested that this section be expanded to make clear that licensees shall own any byproduct materials they produce. The definition of byproduct material in section 11 (d) might also be expanded to exclude expressly any form of energy produced; and a section be added to chapter 8 to provide expressly that licensees may use or sell any form of energy they produce themselves.

Also related to the subject of ownership, although dealing directly with licenses, is section 184, which says that no right to utilize or produce special material shall be disposed of in any manner, either voluntarily or involuntarily, unless the Commission shall give its consent in writing. This raises financing difficulties, most acutely in connection with any mortgage bond financing, and, in fact, under after-acquired property clauses in existing utility mortgages, which habitually cover all the fixed property and franchises of an operating utility. Presumably, the essential terms of a proposed financing would be outlined in the process of application for a license, and would be directly or indirectly approved by the Atomic Energy Commission through the grant of the license. Here, again, however, it seems preferable to provide specifically for transfers by operation of law and for the recognition and enforcement of liens for indebtedness, leaving the transferee subject, of course, to the regulations governing the type of operation in question.

Section 107 provides, among other things, that the Commission may assign the amounts of special material available for use by each licensed facility. We assume that this will be done in the first instance when the license for the facility is granted, and that the amount may not be reduced to take away any of the fuel being used in the facility, but it seems desirable to clarify this point.

Section 54 provides that special material shall be distributed on such terms that no weapon may be made. This drops the language of the old law, which also forbade distribution in an amount sufficient to construct a weapon. This change evidently is intended to permit a licensee to have the large quantity of material needed for a big generating station, but subject to license terms and any supervision appropriate to safeguard against any production of weapons.

Section 104 proposes to add the words "or users" to the list of entities to which energy from Government facilities may be sold. That seems to be an unnecessary and unwise extension of the functions of the Atomic Energy Commission.

Section 2 (e) provides that any operation of facilities under the act will be in interstate commerce. That is evidently intended to mean "for the purposes of this act", and it seems advisable to say so, to avoid any possible implication that it is meant to apply to any other statute.

I have now covered, I believe, the principal features of the bill which we think would still hamper the activity of private industry. We have tried to make our comments as brief as possible so as not to impose on your indulgence. If I have been too cryptic and have not made our points clear, we would be glad to supplement this presentation; or if the committee or its staff would care to see a more concrete expression of our thoughts in the form of an actual draft of amended provisions for any part, we would be very glad to assist in that way if we can.

While my statement has concerned chiefly with the things that trouble us, we do not want to leave the impression that we see only that side of the matter. We are most appreciative of the many improvements proposed, including those that do not directly concern us.

Will New Indochina Plan Work Better Than the Old?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 28, 1954

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial appeared in the Memphis Press-Scimitar of May 26, 1954:

Will New Indochina Plan Work Better Than the Old?

Gen. Paul Ely, Chief of the French General Staff, has returned to Paris after a flying visit to the Indochina front, and is said to have reported that Hanoi and the Red River Delta can be saved if France quickly will send 20,000 fighting men plus modern equipment there.

That is somewhat less optimistic than the plan advanced less than a year ago by Gen. Henri Navarre, the French commander in Indochina, which was expected to bring the war as a whole to a successful conclusion within 18 months or so.

That plan also called for an additional 20,000 French fighting men, and an increase in current expenditures of $285 million a year. We put up the money, in fact $100 million more than the original sum requested. But the French, as usual, didn't come through with the troops.

So our National Security Council, which endorsed the Navarre plan on the advice of our military experts, should take a long look before it goes overboard on the Ely plan.

General Navarre himself now says that if the war is won it must be internationalized. That is one way of saying that foreign troops must join in the fighting. To be even more explicit, the general probably has in mind another American police action. We cannot be too critical of General Navarre for indulging in such hopes, considering the way the politicians in Paris have let him down. But that dream, too, is unrealistic.

When French law forbids sending French conscripts to Indochina, France isn't in a good position to call upon American manpower. The Foreign Legion, made up mostly of Germans, is the hard core of the French expeditionary force, which has less than the halfhearted support of the native population. Most of the natives participating in the war are fighting on the other side because the people are not satisfied with the French plans for their independence.

The prospect for a settlement of this war at the Geneva conference may represent a forlorn hope, but it seems to be the remaining alternative to a succession of bigger and more devastating Dien Bien Phus. The British and the Dutch read the handwriting on the wall and reached understandings with their Asian empires soon after World War II. The French seem to have waited too long.

"Shock Treatment Diplomacy in Indochina," by Vera Micheles Dean

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRAZIER REAMS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 28, 1954

Mr. REAMS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

THE SOCIAL RELATIONS GROUP OF
THE FIRST UNITARIAN CHURCH,
Toledo, Ohio, May 20, 1954.

Hon. FRAZIER REAMS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. REAMS: At the last regular meeting of our group, Sunday, May 9, the present situation in Indochina was thoroughly studied from information supplied by press and periodicals.

Among those articles read and discussed was one entitled "Shock Treatment Diplomacy in Indochina," by Vera Micheles Dean, in the Foreign Policy Bulletin for May 1, 1954. From this article the following quotation is taken:

"If the State Department could be encouraged to see that this country's traditional anticolonial policy is still the best policy in Asia, many problems that now seem insoluble might yield to treatment without resort to diplomacy by shock. First, we would begin to recognize the futility of calling on democratic nations to defend the free world in a country which is not free. The British in World War II failed to persuade an unfree India to join enthusiastically in the struggle against totalitarianism, although they had troops on Indian soil. Their experience could be of value today to the United States and France. Second, the French, who are now psychologically confused by struggle in which they suffer grave losses of young officers without any hope of ultimate victory for France, would be able to look forward to a time, once the war is over, when they could withdraw with dignity and even with the kind of mutual respect that the British now enjoy in the case of India. Third, independence for Vietnam would make it possible for the United States to enlist the cooperation of India and Indonesia, which oppose communism but contend that in southeast Asia the safeguard against communism is national independence. And finally, and most important for the long haul, even a zero-hour dissociation of France from colonialism in Asia could do far more than hydrogen bombs to weaken the anticolonial propaganda of Moscow and Peiping which has proved so valuable to Ho Chi Minh."

Our conviction has grown from this and from other writings similarly phrased, and with like concepts and emphasis, that it is our obligation to express our opinions to those who have the difficult job of guiding the United States at this time.

Therefore we wish to (1) protest any further United States involvement in the Indochina war; (2) to oppose sending United States troops of any kind to Indochina, and (3) to urge a cease-fire and referral of the whole question to a reconvened session of the United Nations Assembly.

We are sure that American leaders wish to learn the views of the citizens, and we are therefore grateful to you in advance for the attention you will give these matters.

Sincerely yours,

George Paps, President; Mrs. Irene Sturn, Vice President; Mrs. Helen J. Williams; Thelma Dorr; Aline C. Ulrich; Blanche V. McGregor; L. G. Williams; Helen Zachrich; Walter Jachrich, Sr.; O. T. Achburn; Herbert M. Emery, Jr.; Elizabeth Rudolph; Florence C. Curtis.

Welcome to Haile Selassie—A Real Ally of Ours

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 28, 1954

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial appearing in the Memphis Press-Scimitar:

WELCOME TO HAILE SELASSIE—A REAL ALLY OF OURS

Americans have more than casual interest in welcoming Emperor Haile Selassie of Ethiopia, who comes for an extended tour of the United States, Canada, and Mexico.

For a quarter of a century Haile Selassie has been running a country which, without benefit of a gilt-edged state department, always has preserved an admirable stance in international affairs. The first victim of totalitarian aggression, in 1935, Ethiopia has never forgotten the experience. Nor has it differentiated between Fascist or Communist threats—it fights them as they come.

The frail, 62-year-old Lion of Judah is hardly misnamed. He sent troops—and good ones—to Korea as willingly and courageously as he dispatched musketeers to battle Mussolini's air force 15 years earlier.

Haile Selassie's long record of friendship and affinity for America is unblemished by any spurious neutralism in the cold war or convenient sham in the United Nations. In contrast to many another nation with wearisome outstretched palm, Ethiopia assuredly deserves the most generous outlays of our foreign aid. We have a feeling this is one place it will not be poorly invested.

Incidentally, Ethiopia's biggest export is coffee and the traveling Emperor has been called the world's most exalted coffee salesman. If there's anything he can do toward lowering the price of coffee in this country, his visit should be doubly rewarding for both sides.

The Washington Pilgrimage, 1954

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 28, 1954

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, the Washington Pilgrimage convened recently, on May 1. Its purpose is to emphasize our national religious heritage. Devoted men and women of all faiths journey to the Nation's Capital once each year, for this purpose. I had the privilege of meeting with this group in the Old Supreme Court room, in the Capitol, along with Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, of Massachusetts. We met with three distinguished religious leaders to whom awards were given. These were Mrs. Harper Sibley, of Rochester, N. Y., who received the award Church Woman of the Year; Mr. R. G. LeTourneau, of Longview, Tex., who was designated as Lay Churchman of the Year; and Dr. Edward L. R. Elson, minister of the National Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., named Clergy Churchman of the Year.

Plans are now underway by the Washington Pilgrimage so that men and women of all faiths traveling to Washington, D. C., may have guidance in the interpretation of our national shrines and monuments. They will be given a hearty welcome and presented with information of inspirational character which they can take back with them to their respective communities. It is not enough that visitors be told how high is the Washington Monument or at what cost the Lincoln Memorial was built. Something of the true significance of these memorials needs to be recaptured, to meet the spiritual needs of the men and women, the boys and girls, of our own generation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the address delivered by Dr. Robert H. Bahmer, Assistant Archivist of the National Archives, in his welcome to the Washington Pilgrimage, on Sunday afternoon, May 2.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WASHINGTON PILGRIMAGE AND THE NATIONAL ARCHIVES

(Address of welcome by Dr. Robert H. Bahmer, Assistant Archivist of the National Archives, delivered on Sunday afternoon, May 2, 1954)

On behalf of the Archivist of the United States and his staff, it is my privilege to welcome you to the National Archives on the occasion of the fourth annual Washington pilgrimage. We are proud indeed that your group again has chosen the National Archives Building as a meeting place "where the memories of our country's greatest moments can be recaptured."

We all know, I am sure, that "this country was founded by men of spiritual vision and deep understanding." As President Eisenhower said of the Founding Fathers in his published letter of April 30, 1953, to Dr. Dudley:

"They [saw] themselves serving at once God and their country, and this vision expressed itself in a way inspiring as it is clear, in the great documents of our heritage."

Your annual pilgrimages have been called "missions to the people of America." Their purpose is to emphasize our religious heritage as a part of the national heritage which we all share. It is entirely fitting, therefore, that you should come to this building which, to quote one of the inscriptions carved on its walls, "holds in trust the records of our national life and symbolizes our faith in the permanency of our national institutions."

Enshrined here for all to see, study, and revere are the three basic charters of American freedom—the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution of the United States, and the Bill of Rights—documents which, in the language of the Declaration, were drawn up by men strengthened by "a firm reliance on the protection of divine providence." Here, too, are the official records of the Continental Congress and the Constitutional Convention, whose deliberations were from the beginning opened with prayer for divine guidance—a practice followed to this day by both branches of our National Legislature. And here are also preserved countless thousands of official documents attesting the moral and spiritual force of the American people. As Dr. Grover remarked to the members of the 1953 pilgrimage:

"From these records we may learn of the courageous men and women who ministered to the religious life of the American frontier; of the devoted missionaries who carried Christian civilization to strange and distant lands or sought to educate and help the American Indian; of the heroic chaplains who served God and country in time of war; * * * of the humanitarian movements, so frequently inspired by religious conviction, which ameliorated the lot of the slaves, bettered the working conditions of women and children, and removed many injustices from the American scene."

These records are the archives of the United States—the documentary heritage of the American people. They are not mere historical heirlooms preserved simply because they are old or because they have sentimental value. They are kept, rather, as the living, meaningful record of the achievements of the American people in emplementing the ideals which gave birth to this Nation. They are precious because they reflect our faith as a people—a religious faith, if you will, in the principles of freedom and justice which inspired the Founding Fathers.

In his American Commonwealth, published in 1910, Lord James Bryce said:

"The more democratic republics become, the more the masses grow conscious of their own power, the more do they need to live, not only by patriotism, but by reverence and self-control, and the more essential to their well-being are those sources whence reverence and self-control flow."

It is a recognition of the great need of our time for developing a deeper understanding and appreciation of these basic sources of self-control and reverence that motivates your pilgrimages. It is the recognition of this need that brings you to Washington where, in the words of your president, Mr. David C. Cook, you seek "to catch the spirit of what has made America truly great." We of the National Archives, not merely welcome you as visitors. We share with you your faith in the aims and purposes that motivate the pilgrimage. We sincerely hope that the 1954 pilgrimage will be even more fruitful than those of previous years, and we extend to you our most cordial invitation to visit us again in the years to come.

Retirement of Tom S. Elrod

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 28, 1954

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, one of the fine newspapermen of Indiana has just retired, after 51 years of association with the Indianapolis News. He is Mr. Tom S. Elrod, who for 22 of those 51 years wrote a fine editorial-page column called Hoosier Homespun.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a copy of the feature story about Mr. Elrod's retirement and a copy of the last Hoosier Homespun which he prepared.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOOSIER HOMESPUN—T. S. E. IS END OF COLUMN AND OF NEWSPAPER CAREER

While other hands are developing journalistic calluses with the first editions of the News next Monday, Tom S. Elrod will be catching an extra wink or two or perhaps tarrying a bit longer over breakfast coffee.

Associate editor of the News, Elrod today announced his retirement, effective at the end of the week, after an active association with this newspaper of nearly 51 years.

He became the Columbus correspondent of the News June 1, 1903. On March 18, 1918, he accepted an invitation to become a full-time member of the staff, since, as the late Richard Smith, managing editor, expressed it, "he was covering the whole southern half of the State anyway."

If Elrod is inclined to philosophize a bit over his coffee next Monday morning, there will be a rich and long career in newspapering and writing, on which to reflect.

Son of a country doctor in Hartsville, Elrod didn't wait long to get down to the business of newspapering.

By the time he was 14, he was both a news vendor and a publisher. He delivered the News and, with two chums, published a 3-by-4-inch newspaper, the Midget.

The Midget ran the news of the day, some advertisements and occasionally a plug for itself. Such as:

"When you feel tired
  And have the blues,
Just buy a Midget
  And read the news."

As a high-school boy in Columbus, where the Elrod family had moved, he edited the school paper and also helped the Columbus Republican report the Spanish-American War.

The Republican got its war news in boilerplate form from Indianapolis, but this wasn't fresh enough to suit the fresh high-school reporter. He suggested to City Editor Kent Cooper, later to become chief of the Associated Press, that the Republican ask for a daily skeletonized telegram on the war.

Cooper complied and from these young Elrod wrote the war dispatches. It was as close as he came to fulfilling an ambition to be a war correspondent

Elrod came to the News as an editorial writer. As such he declined to inhabit an ivory tower, wherein dwell some less energetic editorialists.

"I've always considered myself a reporter," Elrod explained. "And I always figured a man was working every minute he was awake."

When he editorialized in 1918 that it was disrespectful of the Nation's war dead to hold a 500-mile race on Memorial Day, the Speedway agreed he had something there. The race was postponed a day that year.

In 1948, when former Gov. Henry F. Schricker appointed Arthur Campbell superintendent of State police, Elrod recalled that the law required a superintendent to have 5 years' police or comparable military experience.

Campbell didn't have it. Schricker withdrew the appointment.

On January 5, 1932, Elrod started the editorial page contributors' column Hoosier Homespun. Here Elrod gave a platform to Hoosier writers and poets, who, he estimates, have seen at least 28,000 of their poems in print since the column began.

Invariably the last item in the column has been signed "T. S. E." That stands for Thomas Sloan Elrod.

Hoosier Homespun will continue.

In retirement, amidst some fishing and perhaps some mushroom hunting, Elrod plans to turn his typewriter toward the magazine field again, in which he was once a frequent contributor. His writings have appeared in the Saturday Evening Post, Ladies Home Journal, Good Housekeeping, Scribner's, Country Gentleman, and others.

The News hopes, of course, that he'll spare a word or two for us now and then.

HOOSIER HOMESPUN

EASTER

"Easter is a holy day,
  Shot through with joy and gladness,
So let's begin our lives anew
  And leave behind our sadness."
    —*Charlotte Brunker Kinney.*

THE DOGWOOD LEGEND

There is a legend that at the time of the Crucifixion the dogwood tree attained the height of the oak and other forest giants. According to this ancient story, so strong was the wood that it was chosen for the timber from which the Cross was made. To be used for such a cruel purpose greatly distressed the tree.

Jesus, sensing this, smiled upon the dogwood and in His gentle pity for sorrow said to it: "Because of your regret and pity for My suffering, I make this promise: Never again shall the dogwood tree grow large enough to be used for a cross. Henceforth it shall be slender and twisted, and its blossoms shall be in the form of a cross—two long and two short petals—and in the center of the flower will be an image of a crown of thorns. On the outer edge of each petal there shall be nailprints, brown with rust and stained with blood. All who see it will remember that I was crucified on a dogwood tree. And in remembrance this tree shall not be multilated or destroyed but cherished as a reminder of My death upon a cross."

LUCILLE AGNIEL CALMES.

RESURRECTION

"Distinct, upon Golgotha's hill,
  The outline of three crosses, grim,
Is vivid in our memory still
  As in the center we see Him
Who, as atonement for us all,
  Was put to death in mortal shame,
That each who hears the Spirit's call
  May seek redemption through His name.
How great the love on man bestowed,
  Who in transgression wandered far;
How kind of Him to bear our load,
  For which we all His debtors are.
And, as on Resurrection Morn,
  The tomb no longer Him could hold,
His followers today, reborn,
  Extol His name with joy untold."
    —*H. S. W.*

EBEN STEBBIN SAYS

Those persons who dress in their new finery and attend church on Easter are reminded that all of the churches also have services on 51 other Sundays of the year.

EASTER PRAYER

Father, gracious loving Father,
  Hopefully we lift our eyes,
For we, too, have heard Him whisper,
  "Be with Me in Paradise."
Humbly at Thy feet we're kneeling,
  Contrite souls pierced by the thorn
Of remorse, as we remember
  All the anguish that was borne
By Thy Son, our Lord and Saviour,
  On the Cross that awful day,
That our sins and our transgressions
  By His blood be washed away.
Lift us, Father, to Thy bosom,
  Cleanse us with the holy flame
Of Thy mercy, Thy forgiveness—
  This we ask in His dear name.
    —*Mae Hart Brenner.*

WINCHESTER.

NOT OUR REDBUD TREE

Among Hoosiers there are old-timers who still call the redbuds "Judas trees." As there is an Easter legend connected with the dogwood, so is there another having to do with the redbuds that add so much beauty to the Indiana landscape about this time of year. The tradition is that Judas, contrite for having betrayed Christ, hanged himself from the limb of a redbud tree and thereafter it became known as a Judas tree. Various trees with similar characteristics belong to the genus Cercis. The one from which the Judas legend stemmed, however, is known as Cercis siliquarstrum and is an Eurasian species not found in this country. Our native redbud is Cercis canadensis, as honorable as it is beautiful, and never should the name of Judas be associated with it.

T. Y. K.

THANKS FOR THE MEMORY

With this issue of Hoosier Homespun, its conductor since the column was started January 5, 1932, retires from active newspaper work. No words could adequately express his feeling of gratitude for those loyal contributors who have made Homespun possible more than 22 years. First and last there have been thousands of them, some so devoted that they have been in the column almost from the first. To these and all the others the retiring conductor expresses his most sincere thanks. Homespun will continue, with a new pilot at the wheel. Contributions will still be welcome. Which leaves nothing more to be said except to wish one and all a joyous Eastertide. The best of luck, wherever you be, is the last "last line" from

T. S. E.

Researches Into New Uses for Surplus Goods

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 28, 1954

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], who is not able to be present at this time, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article under the heading "Farm Scientists," published in the Wall Street Journal, May 26, 1954, dealing with researches into new uses for surplus goods.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AGRICULTURE DEPARTMENT RESEARCHERS SEEK NEW USES FOR SURPLUS GOODS—THEY WORK ON WATERPROOFED COTTON, PLASTIC-WRAPPED HOT DOGS, A RICE POLISH—"DEHYDRO-FROZEN" PIMENTOES

(By Lester Tanzer)

WASHINGTON.—Uncle Sam's farm scientists, in laboratories across the country, are busily brewing you a batch of new eating and living habits.

They're aiming, in the coming months and years, to have you munching on plastic-coated hot dogs, drinking milk that comes from a frozen concentrate, and making your furniture sparkle with a polish turned out of rice.

If their successes in the laboratory can be matched by commercial producers you'l also be wearing flame-proof, bacteria-proof, maybe even waterproof elastic cotton, or using it for drapes; eating apple pie made with fruit that wasn't simply dehydrated or frozen but "dehydro-frozen"; and drinking orange juice made from a powdered concentrate that can be stored on grocery shelves.

A field army of 1,200 Federal researchers, at work in Philadelphia, New Orleans, Peoria, and Albany, Calif., is aiming to bring these new uses of old familiar products into your home. Together with top officials, who are based here, they make up one of the Agriculture Department's lesser known branches—the Utilization Research Service. Their aim: To find new markets for farm wares.

BOON TO SOME INDUSTRIES

Not only do consumers and farmers benefit from the bureau's work. As a result of their studies, new industries may pop up or old ones may find sudden opportunities for expansion. The aid the Utilization Research Service folk furnished in producing frozen orange juice right after World War II, for example, proved a boon to canmakers as well as to glut-plagued orange growers.

Their experiments to find new uses for corn cobs—as abrasives, polishing agents, fillers for plastics, cattle feeds, or in explosives—led to scores of new factories in the Midwest that deal strictly with the corn byproduct. The work the farm scientists did on bagasse—what's left over when you take the sugar out of sugar cane—led to new sources for Celotex wallboard and could open up a new newsprint source, the Federal scientists say.

The Government's farm labs were approved by Congress in 1938 when surpluses of farm goods were large. By the time the laboratories were constructed and work fully under way, World War II came along and promptly ate up most of the excess agricultural produce. Now, with farm surpluses at record levels, the utilization research people are getting special attention again.

NO ILLUSIONS

The rural scientists have no illusions about solving the farm surplus problem single-handed. It will take more than test tubes, bunsen burners, and an $8 million annual budget to cope with a problem as big the $6.3 billion surplus mountain that now confronts Agriculture Secretary Ezra Taft Benson and his Federal farmhands, they readily admit.

Besides, the farm researchers face plenty of headaches trying to find new markets. First of all, it sometimes takes years to perfect a new use for an old product. Then, they've got to convince commercial firms there's a market for a new item and that it can be produced profitably.

For example, industry prefers raw materials that are uniform in quality and regularly available at relatively stable prices. In this respect, farm goods often can't compete with mineral products. For example, ethyl alcohol, once produced almost exclusively from grains, is now made primarily from natural gas by chemical means.

Also, a private producer has no patent protection for the products developed by Uncle Sam's researchers. The Secretary of Agriculture takes out patents on inventions by the Utilization Research Service, and licenses to market the products are issued to any private firm that wants to apply.

CHIPPING AT THE SURPLUSES

Nevertheless, the agricultural scientists are plugging away, even if only to take a chip out of the growing surpluses. Here are some of the new items the Utilization Research people have come up with or are putting the finishing touches on:

The Bureau is now going frozen concentrated orange juice one better with a concentrated powder. Like the product you buy now at the grocery store, the new product turns into juice merely with the addition of water. But unlike the current item, it can be kept on the kitchen shelf, leaving room in your refrigerator or home freezer for the myriad other new frozen products being put on the market almost daily.

Right now a commercial plant is being built by Orange Crystals, Inc., at Plant City, Fla., 22 miles east of Tampa, to turn out the powder. If the new product "takes," it will probably be followed by powdered tomato, lemon, apple, prune, and grape juices—all of which have been perfected by the farm scientists. The researchers see great prospects for exporting the powder to Western Europe, where demand for fruit and vegetable juices is big. Poor refrigerating facilities there have prevented the frozen juices from taking hold.

AIDING THE DAIRYMAN

The research bureau thinks a new frozen milk concentrate they're working on may do for the dairyman what frozen juice did for the orangegrowers. Agriculture Chief Benson has been saying all along the way to get rid of the surplus butter, cheese, and dry milk is to boost drinking of whole milk before it ever is turned into dairy products. The scientists say give the Nation's housewives milk in a concentrated form and milk drinking will jump.

They think the little woman's milk buying is kept to a minimum now because milk cartons are relatively heavy and take up considerably more space in a shopping basket and in the refrigerator than a concentrate would. Home deliveries are not available in all areas, and where it is it costs more than milk bought at the store.

A powdered skim milk is already sold commercially. But no frozen whole milk concentrate in liquid form that can be stored over long periods without losing its taste has been successfully marketed, the Federal experts assert. The products previously tried developed a boiled taste or jelled in storage, some dissatisfied consumers complained. Using a vacuum-baking process that requires less heat than past drying methods, the California lab has eliminated the cooked flavor; it's now trying to wipe out the jelling tendencies.

Also in the final stages: Dehydro-frozen fruits and vegetables. In this process, the fruit or vegetable is partially dried and then preserved indefinitely by freezing; it can be reconstituted quickly by dipping in water. The farm researchers claim the new product has the same flavor and is as easily prepared for the dinner table as the conventional or frozen item.

APPLES AND APRICOTS

During the past few months, gobs of dehydro-frozen pimentos have been produced for use in cheese spreads. And large experimental packs of dehydro-frozen apples and apricots are currently being evaluated by bakers and jam makers. Says Utilization Research Boss Guido E. Hilbert: "This development now seems to be in the flowering stage."

The Agriculture scientists are trying to employ freezing techniques to make better dehydrated potato dice and granules than are now on the market. (Just add milk or water, and mash.)

They're also attempting to find the most economical way to freeze and preserve bakery goods. Bakers claim the last half of a loaf of bread is eaten more slowly than the first half; if bakery goods would remain fresh for 3 to 5 days, consumption would be boosted considerably, they argue.

It's common knowledge that under freezing conditions bakery goods can be kept fresh for a long time. So the farm researchers are experimenting to find out the best ways of freezing, how various wrapping materials affect frozen bread, and the effect of low temperatures on pie fillings and cake toppings.

Another new food product the Federal scientists are trying to sell commercial firms is one they call rice curls, an item that looks like elbow macaroni and is used just like potato chips as a party snack. Up until now, rice hasn't given Mr. Benson much surplus trouble. But with rice exports declining sharply of late and production up this year, Federal price proppers predict rice will begin piling up in Uncle Sam's warehouses by 1955. The new-use folk are also readying another rice product: A polishing wax made from the oil pressed out of rice bran.

COTTON POSER

Surplus cotton poses a big problem for the utilization research workers; synthetic fibers have made a big dent in the market for cotton. So the researchers are coming up with this answer: Give cotton some of the qualities of a synthetic. By adding chemicals, the scientists claim they make cotton fiber or fabric more heat resistant and bacteria resistant than the natural product. This gives longer life to cotton products to be used outdoors, such as seedbed covers, or even army sandbags. One kind of such treated cotton, now being made commercially, is regaining some of the ground it lost to nylon in the home and in the commercial ironing-board-cover field, experts here report.

Actually, the experimenters say they can tailor make hundreds of new types of treated cotton to suit demand. Examples: Better flame-proof cotton fabric will soon be offered industry; the flame-proof chemical is now being produced commercially on a pilot-plant scale. The New Orleans Utilization Research Branch is also trying to come up with a fully waterproof cloth, involving only one simple chemical operation. Such a waterproof cotton would thus be easier to make and more economical for use in raincoats than present water-resistant cottons, they say.

Cottonseed oil is another big item on Uncle Sam's surplus list and the New Orleans researchers are proceeding along three lines to meet the problem. For one thing, they're showing some of the country's big meat packing firms a colorless plastic made out of the oil that can be used instead of the regular meat binding to cover frankfurters. Although the plastic is tasteless, it's edible and does a better job of preserving meat than other frank coatings, the farm scientists claim. The plastic can also be used to wrap vegetables, which can then be cooked simply by dumping the whole works in a pot.

FATS AND OILS

Along with soybean and other vegetable oils and animal fats, cottonseed oil is coming in for new industrial uses. Production of fats and oils has gone up by 50 percent since World War II but consumption has increased only 11 percent; the switch from fat-laden soaps to detergents, which are fat-free, is chiefly responsible for the resulting surplus, say the experts.

Nutritionists believe diet-conscious citizens are eating about as much fats as they're likely to eat. So the farm scientists are looking for other ways to use vegetable oils and packinghouse trimmings. Used as plasticizers—elements that lend flexibility to usually brittle plastics—these fats and oils are already finding their way into such items as vinyl raincoats, garden hose, and other rubber tubing, tile floor covering, and upholstery.

Now the researchers are testing still other new uses. For example, the Peoria lab has just started experimenting with thermal cracking of soybean oil, a process similar to the one used on petroleum to separate elements in the oil through application of heat. The scientists think they can make chemicals by cracking the soybean oil that can be used in synthetic fibers, as lubricants and as a jet fuel.

ANIMAL FEED OUTLET

Still, the utilization research staff figures the biggest potential outlets for fats and oils are in animal feeds. The researchers have taken out of the fats and oils harmful elements that prevented widespread use in the past; about 250 million pounds a year are going into feed now. With continued improvements, the researchers predict the total will soon double.

The corn and wheat now sold for animal feed lack certain proteins, a key element in feeds. So the Peoria lab crew is trying to make protein-rich corn and wheat feed by an old process—fermentation. What the scientists do, basically, is take corn or wheat and let a micro-organism, like some kind of bacteria, grow on it. The micro-organism produces a mold that is practically concentrated protein.

The farm technicians also expect to add another chapter to the bagasse story. Celotex wallboard is made from raw bagasse. But scientists have broken down this raw material in the labs into a fiber and pith and found various uses for these components ranging from feed to bags to fine paper. But until recently they've been unable to sell the idea of separating fiber from pith to commercial firms.

Now the Department has arranged with United States Sugar Corp. to set up a pilot plant in Florida to break down the raw bagasse. The Government will split expenses with United States Sugar. The fibre and pith will be offered paper mills.

Both industry and farm researchers are looking for new uses for other farm byproducts, too. The idea is that if you can find a market for previously worthless residues, the farmer can afford to sell the regular product cheaper, thus boosting consumption. So the scientists have come up with things like livestock feed made out of leafy vegetable tops, abrasives out of rice hulls, polishing agents out of grain elevator and soybean "dust" and fine paper out of wheat straw.

Hungry Horse Dam Slows Flathead Flood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEE METCALF
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 28, 1954

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, the following news item which appeared in the Hungry Horse News, published at Columbia Falls, Mont., speaks for itself. It eloquently presents the case for immediate action by the International Joint Commission in settling the differences between this Nation and Canada with respect to the Libby Dam so that downstream areas on the Kootenai River may have the same protection that the Hungry Horse Dam has given to the downstream areas of the Flathead River:

HUNGRY HORSE DAM SLOWS FLATHEAD FLOOD

Northwestern Montana this week had a firsthand lesson in flood control.

On one hand there was the unharnessed Kootenai River destroying property in Libby and threatening the city of Bonners Ferry, Idaho, with its 1,800 residents.

On the other, a mass of 3 million cubic yards of concrete was effectively blocking one-third the flow of the Flathead River.

ONE-THIRD DOWN

Hungry Horse Dam was holding back all of the Flathead River's inflow from the South Fork of 34,305 cubic feet per second except for 430 cubic feet early Thursday. The Flathead River without the South Fork at Columbia Falls was flowing at 61,000 cubic feet per second, and stood at 15 feet—one foot over flood stage. Sixteen feet is where trouble starts.

The river continued to rise during the morning and then during the afternoon stood steady at 15.5 feet, with the flow at 69,000 cubic feet per second.

Result is that Hungry Horse Dam Thursday prevented a repetition of the May 22, 1948, flood when the flood stage was topped by more than 5 feet. There was considerable damage in the Flathead, and major destruction downstream. The May 22, 1948, flow was 110,000 cubic feet per second. May 20, 1954, without the dam would have seen virtually the same total.

The Government recorder on the Flathead's Middle Fork at West Glacier Thursday noon stood at 13 feet compared to 12.4 peak during the 1948 flood. The Flathead's North Fork Thursday noon was 9 inches more than the 1948 flood.

NO RAIN

Observer Ray Hall at the airport pointed out another factor that saved the Flathead from destruction. In 1948 there was rainfall of 1.68 inches in 24 hours to speed melting of heavy snow cover. May 1954, so far at the airport, has had but 0.09 of an inch precipitation.

With the flood peak expected to be past, Hungry Horse is to resume power generation next week, commented Dick Wood, Kalispell, Bonneville Power Administration Montana manager.

Water storage has increased from 1,629,000 acre-feet 2 weeks ago to 2,069,750 acre-feet, and is expected to reach capacity of 3,500,000 acre-feet late in June. The reservoir went up four feet in 24 hours.

Most extensive report of local flood damage comes from Hungry Horse where the Flathead's North and Middle Forks flow uncontrolled just before joining the now placid, green water South Fork.

CAMP DAMAGED

Twenty houses and cabins in the Assembly of God statewide camp were being moved through the night Wednesday and Thursday. The raging river had torn 25 to 35 feet of bank away, and choice riverview land that early this week had buildings, was already swept downstream.

Cotton House Movers were on the job pulling cabins and houses off foundations to safety. At work were a half dozen Assembly of God ministers, led by Rev. Charles Jackson, Great Falls, Mont. superintendent for the church, and Rev. Leo B. Hinton, Hungry Horse. There was also Rev. Leon Mitchell, Ronan; Rev. John Johnston, Conrad; Rev. Dennis Finch, Shelby; Rev. O. W. Klingsheim, Kalispell, and a number of laymen, all saving houses.

First evacuation near Columbia Falls was Mr. and Mrs. Gurn Fowler, who moved out from their home near the Red Bridge Thursday morning.

Wednesday evening Fowler took out an old sow, nine young sows, and nine 4-week-old pigs by pickup. In 1948, Fowler had to move his pigs by boat.

The 67-year-old carpenter was concerned that the river would wipe out his home, and "I'm getting too old to start a new place." Hungry Horse Dam meant, a lot to Fowler. His house is safe unless the river gets 2 feet higher. Without the dam, it would be up nearly 5 feet.

Using Sense With Surpluses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER JOHNSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 28, 1954

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert in the RECORD an editorial from the May 27, 1954, issue of the Courier-Wedge, Durand, Wis., in support of my bill H. R. 8600, which calls for an increase in the use of dairy products by the various branches of the armed services.

As I stated on the House floor, when I introduced H. R. 8600, adoption of the bill would provide for a program to reduce our dairy surpluses and also give the members of the armed services a better diet. I commend the attention of my colleagues to the Courier-Wedge editoral which reads as follows:

USING SENSE WITH SURPLUSES

The most sensible way to dispose of the current diary surplus in the United States is to encourage people to eat and drink more milk products. So, Wisconsin farmers should be interested in a bill introduced lately by 9th District Congressman LESTER JOHNSON of Black River Falls. It would raise the daily allowance of milk products for the Armed Forces and swallow up at least 1,800,000,000 pounds of milk a year.

The legislation sought by JOHNSON would increase the daily allowance of fresh milk for Navy personnel from a half pint to a quart. It would raise the evaporated milk ration from 4 ounces to a pint and would boost the powdered milk ration from 1 to 4 ounces. More cheese, too, would be available—a full ounce instead of a half ounce. The Johnson bill directs the President to make like amounts of dairy products available to members of the other armed services—the Army, Air Force, and Marines.

Since JOHNSON wrote the provisions of his act, other Members of Congress have grasped the same idea. Congressman COOLEY, of North Carolina, ranking Democrat on the House Agriculture Committee, has written a companion bill. Congressman ANDRESEN of Minnesota, a Republican, has prepared a bill similar in many respects to the one already issued by JOHNSON.

Men who served in World War II can recall vividly how their tongues hung out like blacksmiths' aprons for a good glass of milk. Conditions in many military camps today are not much better. Milk is served only once or twice a day. Of course, a soldier always can run to the post exchange and buy milk. But, personal incomes are not lush enough to permit spending for a drink considered more desirable than muddy java boiled with vengeance.

As Congressman JOHNSON pointed out in speaking for his bill: "The amount of dairy products available to our soldiers, sailors, and marines is tragically low. There is absolutely no sense in fretting about so-called surpluses of butter and milk when much of it could be used to provide an adequate diet for the men who defend this country."

Last year, the armed services consumed the equivalent of 2,600,000,000 pounds of whole milk from domestic production. Out of this total, the services used 900 million pounds of fluid milk and cream, 103 million pounds of condensed and evaporated milk, 14 million pounds of dried whole milk, 10 million pounds of dried skim milk, 98 million pounds of ice cream, and 42 million pounds of butter.

That sounds like a lot. But, when it is broken down to the individual, it gets really sparse. The provisions of the bill by Congressman JOHNSON prove again that America is not faced with a problem of overproduction, but a problem of underconsumption.

Farmers might well write to Congress to ask for support of the bill by JOHNSON. Top member of the Armed Services Committee is Congressman DEWEY SHORT. He should be counseled that the Wisconsin dairy farmer not only wants to sell his product, but believes in wise use of dairy surpluses for the health of the American serviceman.

Farm Question Linked With Prosperity and World Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 28, 1954

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a very interesting letter pertaining to agriculture and its importance to the Nation's prosperity, progress, and peace.

The writer is E. B. Gebhart, a farmer and a constituent, who resides on Rural Route 2, Mohnton, Pa.:

MOHNTON, PA., *May 12, 1954.*

Congressman GEORGE M. RHODES,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: I have never before written to a President or Congressman, but I am moved to do so now because Congress is in the process of giving consideration to the agricultural program that Secretary Benson is proposing in behalf of the administration.

The objective of the Secretary's program is to bring about a reduction in the production of food and fiber that are now in oversupply in relation to the needs for domestic use and export trade.

I am opposed to this program in so much that it is an entirely negative approach to the problems involved and is completely oblivious of the tremendous opportunities inherent in its solution if approached with a positive and Christian concept.

To take any action by whatever means to bring about a reduction of food and fiber at a time when there are 1,272,000,000 people in the world that are hungry and cold most of the days of their lives is sacreligious to say the least. It is more than that. It is hypocrisy of the grossest sort to pretend to the world that our lives and purposes are motivated by the spirit of the brotherhood of all men, and then callously ignore the hungry and cold in lands not blessed as we are by vast acreages of fertile level soil and wonderful climate that makes possible such prodigious production of food and fiber.

Should we dry-off one-quarter of a cow's udder because she gives more milk than we can use when our neighbors' children hunger for milk? Of course not. If we did we would be inviting the inevitable consequences. We would be goading our neighbor to the use of force and violence to obtain for his hungry children that which we cannot ourselves use, but are denying his children out of plain selfishness, or because we can see no profit in it.

Christ admonished men long ago against acting like dogs in a manger who cannot themselves eat hay, and will not let the cattle eat it either. Furthermore there is more profit in it than we may see at first glance if we are not too self-centered, shortsighted and just plain stupid to see beyond our noses.

In the final analysis the Christian philosophy is the total answer to all the world's problems. No small part of that philosophy is that of receiving by giving. If our religious convictions do not extend themselves to such vital matters, then they are no convictions at all. Then we had better be honest with ourselves and admit that they are only empty gestures and proceed to wallow and sink amidst the wreckage of human misery that has characterized so much of man's history to date.

The sages of the ages tell us that our problems are opportunities in disguise, if only we are wise enough to recognize and honest enough to acknowledge them as such.

Yours, indeed, is the destiny to be one of the men upon whose foresight, sincerity, and fortitude all humanity is depending to grasp this opportunity to prove to the world that our motives are born of a desire for peace, prosperity, security, and good will for all nations and people everywhere.

ENCOURAGE FULL PRODUCTION

There are two aspects to this proposition. First is showing the whole world that we are motivated by other than purely selfish or ulterior interests. Second, prove to them in the most effective manner possible the tremendous capacity for production that our free society releases and engenders as compared to any and all other economic systems.

How could this be done? By encouraging full and total production of agricultural commodities by means of guaranteed support of prices at 90 percent of parity. This will indirectly keep industry busy supplying the demands created by a sustained farm purchasing power. In turn it would sustain the buying power of the other segments of the economy, and would result in a stabilizing influence upon the whole.

What about the surpluses this creates? Store a reasonable amount of such commodities as can be successfully stored against future lean years. Sell all that can be sold at world prices. Trade them for raw materials or such manufactured goods that will not interfere with our home industries.

Finally, give through the established channels of the organization known as CARE all such surplus commodities that cannot be successfully stored, sold, or traded.

Contemplate for a moment what an impact this would make on the other nations, including Russia and her satellites. The knowledge that we enjoy a standard of living and freedom of action that is out of this world by comparison with any other form of government and resulting in such an abundance that we can take care of the most destitute of other nations with the overflow from our groaning tables. This would be the most powerful and irresistible missionary force to be released since Christ's ministry on earth.

Mr. Congressman, the times, the world situation, and our enormous capacity for food production (while millions are hungry) renders this as the greatest opportunity in all history for projecting the Christian philosophy into all the corners of this distressed world.

This opportunity is so pregnant with possibilities for the emancipation of all mankind from the shackles of fear, ignorance, selfishness, and greed that it is beyond a quick and easy comprehension of its full significance.

The fact that we are very strong in a military way, yet gentle and willing to share our providential blessing of having inherited vast acreages of fertile land and good climate will not go unnoticed in the world for long.

After all, what I am proposing is sharing only the troublesome surplus commodities with the most destitute of other lands. If we will pursue this course wholeheartedly it will become a very potent force in helping to solve some of the most difficult international problems. As we share our providential blessings we shall be enriched from the same source.

This program also assures the domestic consumer a plentiful supply of food at something less than parity. (Parity is what he should pay for it to maintain a balanced economy.) Oh sure, he pays a small amount of it in taxes, but look what he gets in return:

1. Steady employment at high wages.

2. A plentiful supply of food every year at reasonable prices, not gluts of potatoes at $1 a bushel 1 year which ruins many of the farmers that produced them, and then the following year the other extreme of a short supply with the resultant prohibitive price of $6 a bushel if available and no choice as to quality.

3. Business stability resulting in a renewed confidence in this country's future prosperity, thus encouraging people to raise families, build homes, start businesses, etc. That means still more jobs for still more people ad infinitum. Thus will follow high national income, high Federal revenues, a balanced Federal budget, Federal debt retirement during the lifetime of the people who created that debt, not allowing that debt to drag on to eventually be inherited by generations yet unborn.

4. They would get in return for their tax dollars the best possible prospects for a preservation of our way of life, for lasting peace, and for what may well be man's last chance to bring to fulfillment Isaiah's prophecy that "each man shall sit under his own vine and fig tree and none shall make him afraid."

TO DO OR NOT TO DO

By now I can hear the critics say that these are the visions of an impractical dreamer. They can conjure up many reasons why it could not be done or the tragic consequences that would result if tried.

My answer to them is that what men can imagine men can do. This has been demonstrated so forcefully that one would think that by now hesitancy and doubt could no longer be such a formidable obstruction to progress in an age when the most fantastic scientific dreams of yesterday are the reality of today.

Furthermore, by now we should have learned that if we but have the courage to begin, to make an honest effort, and faithfully pursue the objective we have in mind, the knowledge necessary for success will be made manifest to us. In short, to make a start, and to persevere once we have, is the essence of success.

What I am proposing is, indeed, a bold new adventure. It introduces a new, positive, dynamic, and far more powerful factor into the sphere or concept of international relations as opposed to the apprehensive, suspicious, envious, fear-ridden, and entirely negative approach which has characterized the intercourse of nations in most of their history.

The next criticism will be that what I am proposing would make wards of the backward and less fortunate peoples of the world, and bankrupting our natural and economic resources in the process, resulting in breaking down or lowering our standard of living until we are as bad off as they are. Nothing could be further from the truth, as I will try to show.

In the simplest terms, what we have done is this: By giving individual initiative as much freedom of action as possible, we have brought about a condition whereby we are the masters rather than the victims of the elements and forces of nature. We know how to harness them and use them for our enrichment of living. I propose that we share our surpluses with those less fortunate than ourselves, while, at the same time, we help them in every way possible to help themselves; in other words, share until they can bring their standards of living up to ours, not ours down to theirs. We have the know-how and resources to do it; all we now need is the foresight and wisdom to recognize this as the most auspicious moment in all history and then the courage to embrace it as such.

THE PRESIDENT'S STATEMENT

President Eisenhower made the statement not very long ago that the peril to our way of life and to world peace was so real and so near that no sacrifice was too great for us to make for the purpose of building up our defenses against the encroachment of the Communist dictatorship. With this I heartily agree so far as it goes, but it doesn't go far enough. This is simply meeting a threat to our way of life with a still more powerful threat of reprisal. In the light of all this, is it not a little silly to say that we should not go at least as far in trying to remove the inequalities that are the causing factors mainly of these threats to our security and perhaps to that of the whole human race?

We are sitting on a veritable powder keg so long as we do not extend full and unstinted efforts to help other less blessed nations to raise their standards on a level with ours. In short, if no sacrifice is too great to build up our military defenses (the objective of which is to prevent a conflict which could easily result in the annihilation of all humanity), then by the same token no sacrifice is too great to make if it would lessen the need and probability of eventually having to use them.

A CHRISTIAN PHILOSOPHY

That which I shared I have. That which I kept I lost. This is a direct challenge to this Nation, and especially to the men who have assumed the responsibility of leadership on the pretense that their motives spring from a full and unreserved belief in the basic principles of Christianity, which is the brotherhood of all men everywhere.

So much for the Christian and international aspect of the farm-surplus problem. So let us delve into the domestic aspects of my proposal for a solid 90 percent of parity support for agriculture.

I will start on the assumption that the severest criticism for such a program would be, that it is inflationary and therefore unsound, as well as being unfair to consumers and taxpayers. Well let's just try to remember that farmers are consumers and taxpayers, too, and pretty important ones.

But let us explore this gruesome monster called inflation. Now I am not a professor of economics and thank God it isn't necessary to be one. All that is needed is good, solid logic and a strong desire to find the truth. The facts are self-evident to all that are not too prejudiced to explore them.

First, true inflation is caused by 1 of 2 things or both. One is printing-press money, and the other is unsound expansion of the credit structure. All other so-called inflation or deflation are just symptoms of other economic ailments, either underproduction or underconsumption or vice versa.

So-called inflation results only when our farms and factories are unable to produce all the things that our people need, want, and can pay for, thus a shortage exists, causing prices to rise. This in plain language is just underproduction. Now I ask you, is this our trouble? Certainly not, it is the exact opposite, that of overproduction, or more truthfully underconsumption of almost everything from food to automobiles.

The only time that this country, with its tremendous productive capacity, is in danger of this kind of inflation is when our production is switched to the making of implements of war instead of the things that people need and want, thus creating shortages, and the resultant high prices. This is not true inflation (although the symptoms are the same). It is only underproduction of the things people need or want.

Now I ask you, is there any indication that our farms and factories cannot supply the needs and wants of our people during peacetime, and especially in this age of technological and scientific know how? There is no such indication. The evidence strongly indicates that we are able to produce all that we need, want, and can pay for, and with some to spare.

The monster that strikes fear into the hearts of those who are old enough to remember or intelligent enough to comprehend it is that insidious creeping paralysis called deflation. This is a condition whereby the people whose hands produced the goods, and need them, are denied the right of using them, although the shelves are loaded and the warehouses bulging with the fruits of their work.

This condition is not like the weather which man does not cause and has very little power to change or control. This condition was brought about in times past by faint-hearted persons in high office who did not have the courage and foresight to act promptly and with resolution to avoid it, or their actions were deliberately designed to bring it about in the belief and with a blind hope that somehow and eventually it would be good for us individually and as a nation.

I lived through about 10 years of that kind of benevolence, and its benefit to my family, myself, and most other people completely escaped me.

By now I can hear the critics scream and weep "creeping socialism." Well, if they can refrain from weeping long enough to read the following, I will pose them a problem on which they can engage their faculties to greater advantage.

FREE ENTERPRISE BEST

Our system of free enterprise is far and away the best, most practical way of life yet devised by mortal man. But it isn't perfect yet, and my sole purpose and objective is to help preserve it by helping to correct its faults, and thus promote its development so that it may serve us better.

To correct faults one must first recognize them. The worst fault with our free enterprise economy is that it functions in such a manner that it serves our purposes almost to perfection when we are at war. Perhaps half of our industrial capacity is devoted to the production of things that are of no use to us in our everyday living. Under these circumstances everybody is prosperous and enjoys a higher standard of living as a whole, than when we return to peace and engage all our energies to the production of goods for our immediate everyday needs and wants.

This is crazy and paradoxical, but this is a fact nevertheless. If we don't take steps to counteract this fault we will have socialism, or something a thousand times worse. With half the world already under Communist domination, we have no time to waste.

Now what can we do to correct this tendency toward a continuous cycle of boom and bust? Well the best criterion from which to begin is past performance, and this makes it comparatively simple. It is an indisputable fact that agriculture is the base of our whole domestic economic structure. No major depression has ever occurred while the buying power of the farmer was maintained by prices at or near parity. It is also true that every depression worthy of the name has occurred when the prices of agricultural products were permitted to drop much below parity. Mr. Benson apparently has forgotten that the farm is industry's biggest cash repeat customer. Cicero once said "Those that were hurt remember." It has also been said that those who cannot remember the past are condemned to repeat it.

These bitter lessons of our economic history Mr. Benson is either unaware of, or prefers to ignore. If Congress allows itself to be stampeded into adopting his ridiculous program history will shortly repeat itself. What could be more ridiculous than the need for higher supports on a shorter supply? When supplies are shorter, prices will rise by themselves without supports. This part of his program is an absolute farce and an illusion intended to lull us farmers into a feeling of security. But one need not be endowed with occult powers to perceive that in the final analysis this is nothing more or less than the law of supply and demand dressed up in the language of wishful thinking.

SUPPLY AND DEMAND

What's wrong with letting the law of supply and demand operate freely? If my presumption that Mr. Benson would ask this question at this point is correct, then it answers a more important question than it asks. I gather from Mr. Benson's remarks that these are his true convictions. Then why not be frank about it and save the taxpayers a lot of money? We don't need a farm program at all, if we want to let the law of supply and demand operate freely; it will do just that in the absence of any program. Our history also testifies to the tragic consequences it produced—although Mr. Benson does not seem to remember it.

For Mr. Benson seriously to pretend that this part of his plan has any merit and is deserving of consideration is a reflection on the credulity of every Member of Congress and every farmer with enough sense to know how to mark a ballot.

I have read the President's Economic Report to Congress and find much of his recommendations are aimed at coping with the effects of a depression after it takes place, such as increased unemployment payments, plans for large public-work programs, etc. This does not give a true ring of conviction to his reassurances that we face nothing more serious than a mild readjustment.

But then to top it off in the light of all this he advocates Mr. Benson's farm program aimed at below parity prices and a consequent weakening of the farmers purchasing power.

If the producers of farm surpluses warrant such drastic and unfair treatment, then why not force labor (workers) to accept reduced wages because there are a surplus of workers? Why not penalize the workers for creating a surplus of the many lines of manufactured goods they produced? Instead it is proposed that legislation be designed to protect them against the consequences. (This is as it should be.) Also why not propose legislation aimed at bringing about a reduction below parity prices of the surplus manufactured goods which is causing this unemployment? This would be consistent with the proposed treatment of farmers.

Why are the President and Secretary Benson so inconsistent in the treatment of these two groups of workers? Why treat the workers who produce the blessings that grace your tables like a stepchild? Could the answer to these questions possibly be contained in a statement Mr. Benson is quoted as having made to the Washington columnist, Holmes Alexander in an interview last fall. It was printed in his column On the Political Front, as follows: "You know we (farmers) make up only 15 percent of the population." What was the inference of that statement? Was it that as a voting force we are not very strong, especially as compared to the 85 percent of nonfarm consumers? Could the fact that farmers do not indulge in organized strikes or slow down tactics have led Mr. Benson to assume that it is safe to consider us as intellectually inferior? Credence is given to this assumption by the statement he made to dairy farmers last year at the convention of the American Dairy Association where he scolded us for inefficiency in the production of food.

AN ODD SOLUTION

He contended then that by increasing efficiency we would in large part solve our surplus and price problems. This indeed is a new and novel solution. It is fortunate indeed that we have at least one man in the Department of Agriculture who knows something about such matters. That man is Undersecretary of Agriculture, True D. Morse. He knows that in order to increase efficiency we must raise more bushels per acre, more milk per cow, more eggs per hen, etc. The next step is to increase the number of acres, cows, hens, etc. per man. Right, Mr. Morse?

Benson's plan would be accomplished by piling on the fertilizer in ever increasing amounts, heavier and more constant cropping of soil depleting cash crops, in order to sustain survival and solvency, resulting in shorter rotations, and less soil holding and soil building crops. Thus will be destroyed most of the progress we made in the way of soil conservation, erosion and flood control in recent years.

How this will help our surplus and price problems escapes me completely. However, the fact is that he challenged them (farmers) with that gem of wisdom last year. He underestimates the farmers' intelligence. Although he has cast a shadow of inferiority upon us in everything that he has said and done, it is nevertheless a reflection on his own wisdom when he presumes that farmers will not resist all attempts at lowering their income. How will they do this? Exactly as in the past. They will expand their production to the extent necessary to make up for what they lose in price.

Mr. Benson and all like-minded people have a perfect right to contend otherwise, but it is only fair that I should warn him that in doing so he is burdened to reckon with the events of our recent history. He also keeps harping on the theme of consumer protest to fixed-price supports, but there are very few of such protests that are not engendered and promoted by his own speeches and statements ever since last summer. I know, for I have followed his comments to the press and the public very closely.

Furthermore, instead of working for better understanding and relations between producers and consumers he has tried to arouse consumer protest to put pressure on Congress to adopt his shortsighted and spiteful program. If he has the farmers' interests at heart, this is indeed a strange way to show it.

By now I am guilty of many sins, not the least of which is oversimplification and bias. Be that as it may, I want to add that I know there is no perfect solution to any problem, and that when we solve one problem we create new ones. This is the very essence of our nature and existence. We cannot escape it, so to pursue any line of reasoning too far leads us into the swamps of confusion and indecision. And if we hesitate to act until we shall be apprised of the perfect solution, it will be too late to solve anything.

LAW OF LIFE

However, of all the things that we can learn from the whole history of mankind, the most important and essential lesson it teaches is that nothing is more certain than change.

It is the unrelenting law of progress. Therefore, it is wishful thinking and a dangerous folly to presume that we can at this late date turn back the hands on the clock of history to an era in our not too distant past that we all hold dear in nostalgic reverie. A time that was simple where ours today is complex. It was indeed a time of independence as compared to our time of interdependence. We have reached a stage in the development of our economic order where the circumstances are almost a direct opposite from that which we revere and would like to go back to. This is a most basic and fundamental change. It is of the most profound significance in the search for a solution to our economic problems. This cannot be overemphasized, as it is the crux if not the cause of all our economic problems. And unless or until we make it so much a part of our thinking that we are ever conscious of it, we cannot hope to find our bearings, without which it is impossible to chart our course for the future.

What puzzles me is that the President seems to recognize this very real and important fact in acknowledging the need for social legislation for workers and recommends strengthening it and enlarging its scope, but at the same time he recommends legislation aimed at weakening the farmers' security (Mr. Benson's involved contentions to the contrary notwithstanding).

What makes him think that farmers today are not just as interdependent as factory workers? What makes him think that the doctor and dentist don't charge farmers just as much as he does his city cousins? That also goes for insurance, electricity, telephone, and all other services as well. The farmer is just as much a victim of this made era of mass production as is his city cousin.

The President seemed to think that farmers were entitled to not 90 percent but 100 percent of parity when he spoke to them at the Minnesota plowing contests, and I presume he still does. But when? After thousands of family-sized farmers go bankrupt the large corporation farmers will then reap his promise.

If we are going to save what is good of our way of life, or free enterprise, we had better not dally away precious time trying to decide whether we will modify it so that it will function in a manner that makes available to those who work with their hands the full fruit of their labor, or whether we will sit on our hands until the consequences of not doing so are upon us. I am close to the grassroots and the rumblings suggest that it is later than we think.

Our social security, unemployment insurance, minimum wage laws, collective bargaining are all steps in the right direction.

Change and progress are as inevitable as sunshine and rain. Our economy cannot stand still. Like the river that winds its way to the sea, you can't block it without causing a flood. If we are like an unwise and uncompromising father, we shall eventually lose all, the good with the bad. If we are wise enough change can be made through sound programs designed to fill the needs and wants of all of our citizens.

It is my prayer and fervent hope that God sustain you and our President and bless your efforts with crowning success.

Respectfully yours,

E. H. Gebhart.

There Is No Easy Road to Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 28, 1954

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, this is the time of the year when many are called upon to deliver memorial orations. Unfortunately much of what is said during this period is too often only oratory; too many of the speeches are filled with the tired phrases that may once have been meaningful, but have become shopworn and shoddy through constant repetition.

The custom of rededicating ourselves as we honor the memory of the dead is based upon an idea, and those called upon to speak on these occasions should express ideas, rather than empty words.

A classic example of a memorial address which is more concerned with an idea than in fancy words—but which at the same time is well expressed—was that delivered on May 23 at the annual American Legion memorial service conducted at Memorial Park Cemetery, St. Louis. It was delivered by Col. John J. Griffin, vice president, United Bank & Trust Co., St. Louis.

I commend it to Members' attention, for it contains some timely and pertinent remarks particularly applicable to those of us charged with charting the character and course of this Nation's efforts to achieve peace.

Our Dead

(Address of Col. John J. Griffin, vice president, United Bank & Trust Co., St. Louis, Mo.)

As we met today, we do so with a full realization that any place on the face of the globe where there is an American citizen, sometime every hour and every minute around the clock, people are standing with bowed heads, a prayer welling up from their hearts to Almighty God in gratitude that liberty and freedom have not disappeared from the face of the earth. As they commune with the Heavenly Father, they do so with a knowledge the only reason liberty and freedom have not died is, our glorious sons have been willing to make any and all sacrifices, even unto the supreme one, in order that we might enjoy these blessings.

We are not here for the purpose of attempting to add glory to those who have died in order that we might live, their glory is inscribed upon the pages of history with their life's blood in a more glorious manner than any words of mine could ever describe. But we are gathered here for the purpose of paying tribute to their valiant sacrifice with the hope Almighty God will give to us the grace to obtain inspiration from those who are gone, in order that we might renew in our hearts a desire to reenkindle the fires of patriotism in the hearts of our people. We trust that the warmth of its glow may spread throughout the world and bring solace and comfort to those who today are manacled with the irons of slavery. In so doing, we also hope that we may reenkindle the dead embers of brotherly love in the hearts of men throughout the world so that the ice of fear may be melted and the germs of hatred destroyed; that men may again learn to live in peace and harmony with their fellow men. We pray that from the reenkindling of these fires of brotherly love, there may come forth a beacon light that will lead the world to centuries of peace and security so that the ambitions of men seeking world dominion may be overcome before they reach the point where it might again be necessary that we send forth from our shores the flower of our manhood to squelch their unholy desires.

It is, I am afraid, becoming just a matter of custom for us, who are living, to honor the sacrifices of those who are dead because, in so doing, we are enabled to bury the guilt we should feel in their immortal presence.

If we are not going to add each year to the list of those we honor, then we must unite as this Nation has never been united before for the purpose of preventing wars. They can be prevented just as surely as they are provoked. If we do not prevent war, then we must share in the guilt of the dead.

If we came here today merely for the purpose of consecrating war and its evils, then let us understand that for every man whom war has raised to the utmost degree of patriotic fervor, inspired to deeds of sacrifice, courage and love, there are many others in whom it has brought forth, with all their evil consequences, brutality, callousness, and greed.

Let us hope those who are steeped in the dregs of hatred, brutality, and greed might have their hearts touched this Memorial Day to the point where they may learn to live charitably together in peace, for, surely, men could find it as easy to live together in peace as they do to die together in war. But let us not forget that the roots of conflict flourish in the faults and failures of those who apparently seek peace, just as surely as they take shape from the greed and disease of aggressors.

Today America is in the fortunate position of having the moral strength, and, with it, the power and ability to marshal its forces against aggression, in whatever form it may appear. Therefore, we cannot feign innocence through our indifference or neglect of the struggles that bring on wars. Certainly, we have had two examples before us, that we cannot and shall not ever forget, which have proven to us conclusively, or, at least, should have proven, that noninvolvement in peace will bring, just as surely as we are standing here today, certain involvement in war. If we fail to take advantage of our position today and marshal our forces of strength, power, and conscience fearlessly and righteously in the defense of human dignity and freedom wherever they may be threatened, this force and power that we have will become a mockery and we will have unmistakably fallen into the trap that breeds new wars.

If the United States at any time ever falters in the leadership that is ours today, by failure to make difficult decisions or by resorting to half-way measures, we will be guilty of defaulting to the forces that breed new wars.

With the position of world leadership this country holds today both morally and financially, let us pray that we shall never be guilty of stooping to expediency or running the dangers of halfway measures that would result in our proving false to those who are looking to us for the leadership that will bring order out of chaos, thereby obtaining peace and security in place of war and destruction.

Let us not listen too intently to or be misled by those who cry "Peace at any price." To do so would mean the placing of this country at the mercy of any aggressor who, by playing on public opinion, puts himself in a position to decimate our forces at will. Again, we cannot continue along in a hit-or-miss policy of attempting to hurdle from crisis to crisis instead of boldly meeting the issue. We cannot improvise with expedients without courting destruction. We cannot drug the Nation into an illusion of security by seeking inoffensive solutions. If we are going to avoid weakening our position in world affairs, then we must adopt a long-range policy and not attempt to meet the issue by fixing principles to the changes of each day. We must remember that not only do we have the security of this Nation at stake, but in our hands also lies the future of the entire world and the destiny of humanity.

If we are to assume the tremendous responsibility that rests upon us today, then let us do so with a firm resolution to adopt a long-range policy governing political, economic, and military matters. Out of that policy must come a positive resolve that, regardless of the cost, we are going to keep and maintain inviolate the trust that is ours in the righteous use of the powers we hold today, fully determined that it will not wax warm one day and cold the next. We must not be lulled into the position in which we found ourselves at Pearl Harbor. To keep peace in the world is to guarantee to generations yet unborn that liberty and freedom will not die on the face of the globe, so they, too, might enjoy the blessings we so freely enjoy today. We must beware of false leaders, those who would lull us back into the days of unpreparedness. We must keep the fires of liberty burning bright. In order to do that, let us, on this Memorial Day, say to those who died in order that we might live, we are determined to live so that their deaths will not have been a mockery. We shall make and keep this Nation so strong that even those who look upon us with an eye of greed from distant places shall not have the temerity to again engage us in another World War.

I like to feel that today throughout the world in every spot on the globe where our sons have baptized the soil with their blood, they have thereby consecrated it to the principles of freedom and liberty that are ours. I feel, too, that today as they rest in the soil from which they came, with the blue canopy of heaven spreading its fathomless depths above them, their spirits are hovering over, above, and about every gathering such as this one here today. If they could pierce the Great Divide, where time blends with eternity, their message to you and me would be that it is a sacred and a holy thing for one to die in the defense of one's country, but that it is just as sacred and holy for one to live for one's country. Let us close our eyes for a moment, raise our hearts and minds to Almighty God in a prayer that He renew within us the inspiration we should obtain from this day, and that is the strength, the power, and the faith to so live that our lives will prove us worthy sons of America in order that they who died that we might live will not have died in vain.

To you who have died we pledge that every day shall be Memorial Day to us; that your memory is engraved upon the fleshy portals of our hearts, and will so remain as long as the blood of freemen courses through our veins.

In the Cold and the Rain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 26, 1954

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit below an editorial appearing in the Evening Star, Washington, D. C., of May 26, 1954. Billy Graham conducted a great meeting on the Capitol steps which we recall vividly, and this editorial indicates the enthusiastic reception he has received in England. The editorial is as follows:

IN THE COLD AND THE RAIN

An overflow crowd of some 120,000 Britons turned out in the rain and the cold for Billy Graham's final outdoor revival meeting in England's Wembley Stadium. Earlier on the same day—it was last Saturday—he preached to 70,000 at White City Stadium, also in the rain and the cold.

This amazing turnout of some 200,000 Britons capped a 12-week revival campaign during which the evangelist spoke directly to an estimated 1,750,000 people. Countless others listened to his talks by direct wire relay all over the British Isles.

Little wonder that the Archbishop of Canterbury led a distinguished assemblage of Britain's clergy into Wembley Stadium for the final rally. For this was something new in British experience. What was the secret of the success of the Graham crusade—a crusade which was launched in the face of a skeptical and often openly hostile press? What did he have to offer which brought out Britons in such numbers that less than a third of them would have packed all of Britain's cathedrals combined?

The evangelist attributed his success to the "spiritual hunger" in the heart of the average Englishman. "The Spirit of God," he said, "is moving across Great Britain as perhaps at no time in the last century." But if this is the explanation, why is it that the British clergy, relatively speaking, have had so little success in reaching their own people?

Last month Mr. Graham spoke to 1,200 British clergymen, many of who were seeking advice as to how they might improve their own techniques. Too often, Mr. Graham told them, preachers prepare their sermons for other preachers. "Tell the story simply," he advised. "Don't be afraid to repeat yourself. Say it over and over, because many have never heard the Word. Preach to the sinners—the Christians know their way. This is a time when people, assailed by doubts, are saying 'maybe' and 'if' and 'I suppose.' The world yearns for a voice of commanding authority, and you must say to those who come to listen to you that this book is it—that this the way."

There may be those who will detect, or who will think they detect, certain ominous undertones in this counsel. If the masses of people really are waiting for a voice of "commanding authority" which admits of no doubts or uncertainties, the final result will not necessarily be one which most of us would knowingly seek. But for the time being at least the efficacy of the Graham technique cannot be disputed. What other preacher of the Word could draw 200,000 people out into the open on a cold, rainy day?

Why I'm Proud To Be a Part of Our American Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 28, 1954

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I have just had an opportunity to read an essay by one of our young Minnesota citizens, Miss Andrea Twedt, a student of South St. Paul High School. Miss Twedt's essay was a winner in a recent contest sponsored in our State. The subject of her essay is Why I'm Proud To Be a Part of Our American Democracy.

I ask unanimous consent to have the essay printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the essay was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHY I'M PROUD TO BE A PART OF OUR AMERICAN DEMOCRACY

(By Andrea Twedt)

Why, hello, Mr. Malenkov. Fancy meeting you here. Oh, I see. You're here on a special visit and the reception committee hasn't arrived yet. My, that certainly seems odd. You say your plane arrived 2 hours early, and you and your 3 bodyguards are just trying to kill a little time? Well, by all means, hop in and I'll show you some of the sights.

I suppose you've seen all you want to see of the airport. Fine. In that case, we'll go somewhere else. I might as well turn on the radio and give you a taste of some of our American music. Oh, wait a minute. The news is just coming on. Imagine that. My favorite news announcer saying that about the President. Mightn't he be liquidated? Why, certainly not. Everyone in this country has that freedom. We call it freedom of speech.

Yes, there really are many beautiful automobiles on the streets. Our standard of living is high, and we constantly strive to keep it that way.

What is that boy shouting about? He's shouting the headlines of the daily newspaper. I think it's something about one of our Congressmen being accused of treason. Are we allowed to read such material? Why, Mr. Malenkov, that's another of our great freedoms; freedom of the press. Do you see that magazine stand over there? Well, those magazines are full of articles and opinions about the way our country is being run. We are allowed to read any of them.

On your left is the Army recruiting office. Yes, I'll admit that we do draft men for the Armed Forces. However, I think you'll find that the reason for it is that we have to be prepared to defend ourselves against certain aggressive nations. Mr. Malenkov, aren't you feeling well? Your face seems to be a bit flushed.

What are those men doing with those signs? Why, they are pickets. They belong to a union that is striking. You think the police should put a stop to it? I should hope not. That is one of the ways in which the worker is assured fair wages.

If you do not mind, I will stop at this next mailbox. I have to mail a letter. Did you say censored? Absolutely not. Not in the United States of America.

Yes, these houses are lovely, aren't they? You will see many just as nice before you leave, I am sure. Of course, we do not all live in houses like those you just saw, but even the cheaper houses are getting to be more modern every day, with all our labor-saving devices.

This is one of our finest high schools. We are proud of our school system.

We are now in city park. Why is that crowd of people gathered there? Senator Smith is giving a speech. As I recall, he is trying to encourage people to vote. You see, we go to the polls tomorrow to elect a new governor. Many people do not realize what a wonderful privilege it is to be able to vote for whom they want.

Have you noticed our many churches? My neighbor goes to the one we just passed. The church I attend is a few blocks from here. What? You think it extremely stupid to have so many churches? I am afraid I can not agree with you, my friend. To us, freedom of religion is a very precious possession.

To your left is our new playground. This city has an extensive youth program, as do many of our cities.

You say you have never seen so many wires? Well, it seems that no one in this country is without a telephone these days. We do not mind seeing the wires everywhere. To us, they represent another of our wonderful inventions.

My, it is almost time for you to be getting back to the airport to meet the reception committee. I am really sorry you will not have time to see some of our farms. No, these are privately owned farms. We have no collective farms here.

Here we are, back at the airport. It has certainly been a pleasure to show you a little of this country. I think you can see now why I am proud to be a part of our American democracy.

Power, Little Glory Mark Secretary Job

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 14, 1954

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to secretaries everywhere, by inserting in the RECORD a fine editorial from the Florida Times Union. No one knows better than I, and than we Members of Congress, just how deeply indebted an employer is to a good secretary. This country is deeply indebted to them for their loyal and good work for which they get little recognition. The editorial is as follows:

POWER, LITTLE GLORY MARK SECRETARY JOB

This is the day to shine for Jacksonville secretaries—an occasion that comes rarely for this well-deserving, seldom-acclaimed group. With their employers they will attend a boss-secretary luncheon to be held today in celebration of National Secretaries Week, now underway.

But while the secretary's usual lot doesn't involve much glory, its opportunities often compensate for the other lacks. It is no accident that a great many of the Nation's executives got their start handling the shorthand pad and typewriter for a business boss.

The secretary's job is a traditional opening wedge into executive ranks. Serving as the boss' right arm, the intelligent secretary has the unequaled advantage of learning a successful executive's techniques and methods at first hand. Then, too, the good will and assistance of the top man are the frequent reward of resourcefulness and excellence in secretarial work. A good, dependable secretary is valued by the executive probably more than any other buisenss asset with the exception of his own ability.

And if the Nation's high-placed planners have their way, the secretary's position will take on even more importance in the years to come. The Nation's shortage of skilled manpower, they say, demands that top men delegate more of their routine work to subordinates for execution in order to leave their time free for the more creative functions that only they can perform. With most of these, of course, the immediate subordinate is the secretary—the one who knows most about what should be done and how to do it.

The secretary's job may at times be maddening and frustrating, but there's nothing like it for those who choose it.

Where Are We Going?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 28, 1954

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include, herewith, an editorial from the current issue of the Reading (Pa.) New Era:

These are times that truly try men's souls. Indochina is falling to the Communists. The free world takes a licking from the Reds at Geneva. Plans for a European Army split at the seams. Germany sees itself left at the altar by the West and takes another look at working out terms with Russia. United States and England fight over Asian defense pact.

And in the midst of it all, America flounders around without a clear cut foreign policy, with a reduced standing army, with curtailed defense program, and with a domestic economy pock-marked with unemployment.

We can ask the awfully important question, where in the world are we going? Are we drifting into a situation where, stripped of our allies, shorn of our world prestige, we are forced to resort to the armed fortress concept of isolationism advocated by Herbert Hoover and his ilk? Are we so uncompromisingly dictating the fortunes of other countries that we refuse to recognize their interests, too, and thus substitute unilateral action for cooperation among allies?

Just this week, U. S. News & World Report published a frightening story of Communist intrigue, torture and secret police in Guatemala—that's not so very far south of our own border. It contains the nerve-wracking moral that "It can happen here."

And on top of everything, the administration demonstrates paramount concern about cutting the defense budget, reducing our Armed Forces, and justifying 4 million unemployed as normal. No wonder the Communists believe that time is on their side.

What we need is a bold, new program in foreign affairs—a policy that recognizes the legitimate aims and aspirations of colonial territories for the freedom we espouse; a policy based on our desire to do what is morally right, not merely what is considered economically profitable.

And at home the time for bargain counter defense is a long way off. Unles the attitude is changed in Washington, our own security and safety may be a sham.

Another War So Soon?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1954

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, an interesting article by Brig. Gen. Bonner Fellers, United States Army, retired, has just come to my attention. It appeared in the magazine Task Force of May 1954 and General Fellers' article deals with the possibility of another war in Indochina. I commend it to the membership.

ANOTHER WAR SO SOON?

(By Brig. Gen. Bonner Fellers, U. S. Army, retired)

By the time Task Force No. 1 reaches the reader, Dien Bien Phu is almost certain to have fallen. Rebel forces will probably be shifting to the perimeter about Hanoi for the siege of that key French stronghold. And the United States will have moved even closer to a shooting war.

We shall pray that Geneva will not be a Munich and that war can be avoided. Nevertheless, signs in the Far East are ominous. Our leaders have indicated the possible shape of events to come.

Speaking at West Point recently, Admiral Radford stressed that it was inconceivable that we should permit the Communists to win in Indochina. Our Vice President, addressing newspaper editors in Washington, indicated that we might have to send ground forces if the French were to lose. Since the probability of a French victory is remote, the Radford-Nixon observations have great meaning.

Indochina has been likened unto the end domino of a domino set standing on end, close together. If the first domino falls, the others in turn go down. Likewise, it is argued, if Indochina falls, neighboring powers will also fall in quick succession—Thailand, Burma, India, Pakistan, Indonesia, Philippines, and Australia.

Let us suppose that the United States Forces intervene, that the Reds are decisively defeated and Indochina is liberated. Would the corollary to the domino story follow? Will a liberated Indochina save Thailand, Burma, India, Pakistan, Indonesia, the Philippines, and Australia?

It is Communist technique to attack from within; then from neighboring satellites or from Russia herself, munitions and volunteers are fed to the rebels. Thus it appears that the security of Indochina would not necessarily guarantee Communist inactivity among neighboring peoples.

Nor could a victory in Indochina be considered as a telling lesson to the Communists not to start trouble elsewhere. Intervention in Korea failed to discourage Communist war in Indochina. Likewise, intervention in Indochina will not prevent Communist activities nearby. Does the United States, or would SEATO, were it formed, have the forces to intervene successively in the several countries south of Red China and Tibet?

Intervention in Indochina might entice Red China to send Peoples Volunteer forces on precisely the same scale as in Korea. Even if cooperative, SEATO ground forces would be enormously outnumbered. In addition, the Red Chinest Air Force, which is the fourth largest in the world, is a menacing threat. This Air Force has airbase facilities within bombing distance of Indochina.

There will be little help from Chiang Kai-shek, because he cannot threaten the mainland until the Red Chinese Air Force is neutralized. And only the United States could effect this neutralization. Syngman Rhee's forces, for the most part, are pinned down on the 38th parallel. He could not deplete this command for operations in Indochina.

With a third of our Armed Forces pinned down in Europe and another third backing Syngman Rhee in Korea, we might find Red China's intervention something difficult to handle.

But does the solution lie in southeast Asia when our real enemy is the Kremlin? Why not therefore create overwhelming American air supremacy as a war deterrent, or instrument of massive retaliation, against the Soviet Union? With this deterrent in being and ready to strike, we should withdraw American diplomatic recognition to Russia. This would give the greatest possible encouragement to the enslaved Soviet peoples. At the same time we should assist the anti-Communist underground in a vast educational program to convince the Soviet people that we will never again recognize the Kremlin dictatorship.

The recent cracks in Russia's MVD, the desertion of key Russian agents in Japan, Australia, and Europe, together with reliable reports from inside Russia, disclose that since Stalin's death the Kremlin grip on the Soviet nation is anything but firm.

Let us therefore avoid panic over immediate conditions in Indochina. Rather let us take steps to confine the Kremlin's attention to its own internal turbulence. Then there would be real hope that the Soviet people and the Red army itself could overthrow the Kremlin. Without further American bloodshed, world peace could follow.

Salute to Armenians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1954

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 36th anniversary of the independence of the Armenian Republic.

The irony of the occasion is that the independence of this brave people was tragically short-lived. On December 2, 1920, slightly more than 2½ years later, Armenia by force of arms became a subject of Soviet Russia, which it remains to this day.

This independence day cannot be celebrated in Armenia, on pain of death. Only secretly and in their hearts can these people recall the freedom they won in battle in 1918 and lost so swiftly. But those or Armenian ancestry in this country and elsewhere in the free world honor the day and the freedom and independence they covet for the land of their origins.

I welcome the privilege of joining in a salute to this brave people. I share the hope that freedom and independence may one day be restored to them. And I offer this reminder that for Americans, too, freedom, to be preserved, must be guarded with eternal vigilance.

Independent Banking Defended

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1954

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article which was written by Mr. Ben DuBois, secretary of the Independent Bankers Association. It appeared in the May 11, 1954, issue of the Minneapolis Star.

INDEPENDENT BANKING DEFENDED

To the EDITOR:

My friend, Arthur Upgren, had an article in the May 3 Star in which he derided independent banking as an outmoded system and urged that banking be modernized by permitting branch banking.

Dr. Upgren is an eminent economist. He sists in his ivory tower at Dartmouth and freely comments on most everything. He is an expert on all things; but a fellow who covers the whole waterfront must do it hurriedly and there can be bad spots in his observations.

I do not know how thoroughly conversant Arthur is with country banking. He has had banking experience. Some years back he was the chief crystal-ball gazer at the Federal Reserve bank of Minneapolis. I would assume that he came into contact more with the big bankers than with the little bankers; perhaps got the point of view of those big bankers who would like to expand their institutions by going far afield and absorbing country banks.

Upgren seems to believe that all communities which in years past had a bank could be supplied with banking service if branch banking were permitted. He indicates that the cost of operating a branch could be absorbed by the parent institution; but there will be no branch in any community where the branch isn't self-sustaining, and many of the 400 bankless communities—and 400 is his figure—wouldn't be supplied with a banking service if branch banking were permitted.

About 35 years ago Minnesota had too many banks and the State suffered severely from an overbanking condition. Branch banking could also be overdone.

As Arthur says, and this is a fact, it costs more to operate banks now than it did in the past. While a branch can operate under the capital of the parent organization, it must be staffed, and if it is to render service it must have a competent loaning officer.

Upgren says, "So we need to recognize that the small unit bank is just too large a form of business enterprise to pay its way. It needs executive, managerial talent which is too costly for a $2 million bank." The $2 million banks in Minnesota are profitable institutions and can pay the salaries which bring capable management. There are many banks with assets of a million that are doing very well. There are banks with assets of half a million that are serving their communities in an admirable way and at the same time making profits.

Is it not better for a small community to have a bank which is owned and operated by the people of the community? It hardly seems wise to have the financial affairs of a community operated by persons who live elsewhere. They have no interest, whatsoever, in the welfare of the community, but only in the profit they can exact from the community.

Distant landlordism in banking is un-American. Recently the National Federation of Independent Business polled its very large membership to ascertain its views on independent banking. Seventy-five percent of the replies indicated a marked preference for independent banking, 20 percent agreeable to branch banking, and 5 percent of no opinion.

Those who advocate branch banking start by proposing a rather innocuous bill confining branches to the city of the parent bank or the county in which the parent bank is located. The history of most States shows that once the prohibitions against branch banking are broken down, progressive steps are taken to widen the breach.

We have a dangerous situation in Minnesota where the large bank holding companies, operating under a corporate device which evades the prohibitions against branch banking, now have banks in many of the county-seat towns. This arrangement is, in fact, a form of branch banking.

Open the door to branch banking and watch these holding companies expand into the smaller cities and villages through the merger route. They would reduce the independent bank which they acquire to a branch of a nearby holding company subsidiary. These holding companies could blanket the State with their banking offices even if the law confined branch banking to comtiguous counties.

Would we want the financial affairs of the State operated by the head offices of these two gigantic banking institutions? With financial monopoly goes political power.

The people of Minnesota, in spite of Arthur Upgren's advice (he doesn't live here any more) had better go slowly in instituting a change that could easily be destructive to a system of banking that has served the people well.

Ben DuBois,
Secretary, Independent Bankers Association, Sauk Centre, Minn.

Presentation and Dedication of the Gen. John A. Logan Memorial—Address of Former Congressman Maurice H. Thatcher

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 26, 1954

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, under leave hetofore granted me, I am including as a part of these remarks the address made by former Congressman Maurice H. Thatcher, of Kentucky, on the occasion of the formal presentation and dedication of the memorial to General John A. Logan Memorial at the Arlington Memorial Amphitheater on Tuesday, May 18, 1954. The memorial—an appropriately inscribed marble tablet in the enclosed structure of the amphitheater—was placed there by the Ladies of the Grand Army of the Republic, to memorialize General Logan, because of his famous order issued May 5, 1868, when he was commander in chief of the Grand Army of the Republic, that designated May 30 of each year as Memorial Day. The tablet was designed by Mrs. Margaret Hopkins Worrell, past national president of the Ladies of the Grand Army of the Republic, who gave her time and labors unstintingly to the task of bringing about the placement and dedication of the memorial tablet, which was erected pursuant to the act of Congress of June 19, 1926.

The inscription on the tablet follows:

> To commemorate the designation of May 30 in each year as Memorial Day by General Order No. 11, issued May 5, 1868, by the commander in chief of the Grand Army of the Republic, Gen. John A. Logan, this tablet is placed by the Ladies of the Grand Army of the Republic.

On May 18, 1954, the formal ceremony of unveiling and dedication took place at the amphitheater. A formal program was observed. Robert F. Sutphins was master of ceremonies. After presentation of the colors by the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the invocation was pronounced by the Reverend James H. Miers, D. D., of the Fourth Presbyterian Church of Washington; followed by the unveiling by Mrs. Mabel S. Taylor, national president of the Ladies of the Grand Army of the Republic; with formal acceptance by Maj. Gen. John H. Stokes, Jr., commanding general of the Military District of Washington, D. C. The response was delivered by Dr. H. Paul Caemmerer, secretary, Commission of Fine Arts. Thereupon the formal address of the occasion was given by the Honorable Maurice H. Thatcher, former Congressman from Kentucky. The United States Marine Band Orchestra, under the direction of Lt. Col. William F. Santellmann, furnished a program of patriotic musical selections. Benediction was pronounced by Rev. Dr. Miers; and with the retiring of the colors by the Veterans of Foreign Wars the event was concluded by the singing of The Battle Hymn of the Republic.

Mr. Thatcher's address was of a highly patriotic character. It is now set forth. Recently, it may be noted, he received at the hands of the Daughters of the American Revolution, District of Columbia, its citation and certificate of award for outstanding patriotic service.

ADDRESS OF HON. MAURICE H. THATCHER AT THE PRESENTATION OF THE GENERAL JOHN A. LOGAN MEMORIAL, ARLINGTON MEMORIAL AMPHITHEATER, MAY 18, 1954

First, I must thank the Ladies of the Grand Army of the Republic for the very kind invitation to appear on this most patriotic and inspirational program. To Mrs. Margaret Hopkins Worrell, past national president of the Ladies of the Grand Army of the Republic, my thanks and assurances of appreciation are especially due. Moreover, she merits the gratitude of all for having designed this historic tablet, and for her successful efforts to bring about its dedication.

The members of the Grand Army of the Republic, as soldiers of the Constitution and the flag, performed a service in the preservation of the Union, so great that no words can ever be chosen or uttered that can adequately describe the value of their deeds or the great debt our Nation owes them. The Civil War, in the course of events, seemed necessary to unite our people and to obliterate the great scourge of slavery. Many of us of the border States had close relatives in both the northern and southern armies; and all of us who now live in this united country are proud of the soldiers of the contending hosts. Both sides could not win, but I believe that all patriotic Americans are one in the judgment that in the evolution of human affairs the final result was best for all our people and for the cause of freedom throughout the world.

In a free country each may make his contribution to the discussion of public problems. It is well that the contribution be made in good spirit and temper. Excessive party spirit has the effect of beclouding the public issues, and preventing the best solutions. In a land of freedom, I appear as a free man. My opinions are my own and to no one am I responsible for their utterance. Liberty is our great heritage, and for the preservation of that heritage I would always contend. I must needs speak briefly and content myself with some general observations.

I believe that one of the most grievous sins of which we, as a people, are guilty is that of complacency. It is hard for us to believe that our institutions are in any danger. We note what is going on in the world at large, but we content ourselves by saying, "It can never happen here; it never has happened here; therefore it cannot happen here." Doubtless this was the reaction of the countries which have been swept behind the Iron Curtain in recent years, although they certainly had a background of tragic experience which should have precluded such an outlook. The so-called free world was inclined thus to view matters when China was being overrun by the agrarian reformers. Yet today that great country is in the firm and vicious grip of communism just as are the Soviet states and their satellites. The so-called free world also regarded, in the same light, at the outset the Korean situation, and a contained war was fought and fought without decisive termination. There were those who thought that when that war was actually undertaken it should have been fought to a finish, with all the free nations contributing to that result. But it was not so fought, and the Red power there utilized was freed to play a similar role in Indochina; and we see how grim the situation in that beleaguered land is today. If communism takes over Indochina, then Burma, Siam, and Malaya will fall beneath the onward course of the hammer and sickle; then India and free Europe. This is the present outlook. The question is whether the free nations have gone so far in their policies of appeasement and in their hopes for peaceful solutions that the mighty engulfing tides of Red power can now be stayed short of universal war.

Thus by force when necessary, and by infiltration always following the termination of World War II, one after another country has passed into the insatiable maw of bloody communism; and the end is not yet. We have given our billions of money and our untold treasures of our best blood to make the world free; and the overall condition is worse than when that great conflict began. We have been bled white; we have fought the battles of others, who jockeyed us into the belief or position that we have been fighting only for ourselves. Chiefly through our unparalleled efforts and sacrifices nazism was cast down and communism preserved and strengthened to become the greatest menace to liberty the world has ever known. Thus we were most tragically deceived. The lesson taught—and we must heed it if we are to survive—is that neither one nor the other is to be trusted.

The common enemy has had the initiative from the start, and yet holds it. We saved Russia from extinction at the hands of the invading forces, and even as we did this, the Soviet tyrants were planning every move against the free nations of the world, ourselves included. How long can we tolerate such a state of affairs? How long can we undertake to place our trust in the promises and pledges of those who never keep a promise or a pledge given either in war or peace? It must be obvious that continued appeasement paves the way for war. This, in no wise, is a jingoistic statement, but a calm appraisal in the light of repetitious history. The Kremlin masters are dedicated to the proposition that the entire earth must come under the yoke of communism, and that all and every means, however frightful, must be employed by them and their satellites to bring this about. The torch, the dagger, the overthrow of free governments by intrigue and violence; these are all in line with their avowed policy and practices.

Every act or gesture of good will on the part of liberty-loving lands has been repaid with insolence and betrayal. The courtesies of diplomatic policies and practices on the part of free nations have brought the most flagrant violations of sovereignty perpetrated by the authorities of communism. Wherever these evil forces are received through diplomatic recognition, the resulting embassies and consulates immediately become the nests of spies, and protected citadels of espionage, using their vantage points to bring about the overthrow of the friendly governments to which they are accredited. Indeed, how much longer can the free nations tolerate such conditions? How much longer, in safety, can we tolerate them?

The great Civil War struggle marked the most vital event of our national history, subsequent to the founding of the Nation. Now, following our participation in two great world wars, unmatched in all the world's experience as to numbers engaged, and the costs involved, we are yet struggling to achieve a just and lasting peace. Thus far our efforts have been unavailing. An ally in the second struggle, that was saved from destruction chiefly through our aid and cooperation, instead of being grateful for what ourselves and others allied with us did to save it, has turned against us and all these allies, and has sought the overthrow of their ways of live, and their governments. In all history there is nothing of ingratitude and infamy to match the situation thus presented.

In Lincoln's immortal Gettysburg address, he described the state of affairs then obtaining in words as follows:

"Fourscore and seven years ago our fathers brought forth on this continent a new Nation, conceived in liberty, and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal.

"Now we are engaged in a great Civil War, testing whether that Nation, or any nation so conceived and so dedicated, can long endure. * * *

"It is rather for us the living to be dedicated to the unfinished work which they who fought here have thus far so nobly advanced. It is rather for us to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us—that from these honored dead we take increased devotion to that cause for which they gave the last full measure of devotion; that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain; that this Nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom; and that government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth."

This is the age of propaganda, rather than the atomic age, for ideologies have always controlled the world, and must always control it. Never before in the world's history has propaganda—with the multiple agencies of communication now obtaining—played so important a part in the affairs of the human race, as at present. Man's thought must always remain superior to his mechanical progress. However, to the extent that the moral sense has not kept pace with human invention, the latter becomes a Frankenstein for the destruction of the race.

I am certainly a believer in selective immigration laws. We should welcome all legitimate immigrants who come into our midst and strive to become good American citizens, with unfaltering loyalty to our flag and Constitution; but those who come with fingers crossed, who take their oaths of allegiance with mental reservations and evasions, we do not want. Such as these are loyal only to alien governments and alien philosophies, in all ways antagonistic to our own. A well-executed selective immigration law will tend to keep them out. If, however, some of this type should enter, and acts of treason are committed by them, they should not be coddled nor their crimes condoned. The laws they have violated should be rigorously—though of course, fairly—enforced.

What has been thus said is also applicable—perhaps with greater force—to all those of American birth who conspire to destroy our liberties.

Since the fateful sixties the sons and grandsons of the men in gray have joined with the sons and grandsons of the men in blue in a common patriotism and valor to fight the battles of freedom on land and sea in many parts of the world. They have fought side by side and earned a common glory. The geographical terms of North and South, East and West a long time ago ceased to hold a sectional meaning in the minds of patriotic Americans.

As Lincoln urged at Gettysburg, a reconsecration and a rededication to the common tasks of patriotism, so we of this day and generation, in the presence of another great crisis in our history—and in that of the world—must reconsecrate and rededicate ourselves anew to the great concepts which the Immortal Emancipator set forth in his imperishable address.

In this grave situation, good Americans may differ on methods which should be employed to rid this soil of freedom from the fatal touch of communism. I am one of those who believe that the Communist Party should be outlawed. A number of bills providing for such action are pending in the present Congress, and it is to be hoped that effective legislation will be evolved.

Our Government is striving in great patience to achieve a just and honorable peace; but has been, and is being, repeatedly thwarted and rebuffed; meanwhile the enemy of freedom is building up its military might in key regions and engaging in ruthless and aggressive warfare to establish enslavement of the world. With the devil's malignancy and cunning, it has been tremendously successful in its efforts; and this largely because of policies of appeasement practiced by the freedom-loving nations.

The main purpose of the Grand Army of the Republic and the qualifications of its members, as formerly declared, are as follows:

"To maintain true allegiance to the United States of America, based on a paramount respect for, and fidelity to, its Constitution and laws, to discountenance whatever tends to weaken loyalty, incite to insurrection, treason, or rebellion, or in any manner impairs the efficiency and permanency of free institutions, and to encourage the spread of universal liberty, equal rights, and justice to all men."

No better enunciation of the duties and ideals of an American citizen can well be stated than is here set forth. If all those who stand beneath the American flag should live and act in the spirit of these declarations, what strength and unity may be ours.

At this juncture I would pay tribute to Gen. John A. Logan, who was a soldier and a great American. One of the finest things he ever did was to establish, by formal direction—while commander in chief of the Grand Army of the Republic—Memorial Day.

In conclusion, I would say that, almost to a man the soldiers of the contending hosts of the Civil War have gone to fame's eternal camping ground, but their lives and deeds shall be cherished by our people so long as this great Republic may endure. The heroes of that mighty conflict have cast their shadows across the world.

The Forgotten Tragedy of Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 28, 1954

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I should like to include an article describing the tragic condition of Poland under Communist domination, written by the well-known lecturer and writer, Bishop Fulton J. Sheen, which appeared in a late 1953 issue of the Washington Daily News.

The article is just as pertinent now as it was then and serves as a grim reminder of the moral obligation we still have to aid the native people of Poland and the other Communist-persecuted countries to regain their God-given freedom.

The article follows:

BISHOP SHEEN WRITES: THE FORGOTTEN TRAGEDY OF POLAND

The principal reading of the vast majority of people is the daily newspaper. This means that their thinking is to a great degree standardized, that their knowledge of the world is derived principally from one source, and that what has happened is of little importance, for nothing is as old as yesterday's newspaper. But the past is not a dead past, but a living past. As our memory influences our present actions and our future decisions, so what has transpired in our political world determines to a great extent what will happen in the future. Among the past events, perhaps no one of recent years so much summarizes our problems as the forgotten tragedy of Poland.

I remember some years ago writing these lines for a radio broadcast: "Poland has been crucified between two thieves." By the two thieves were meant the Nazis and the Soviets. The American people in those days believed that the Soviets were sincere, despite Lenin's dictum that "we must use every lie, deceit, and cunning in order to establish world revolution." I received a telegram from one of my censors that I could not make that statement over the air because it would be offensive to the Soviets. I sent back a wire saying: "How would it be if we call Russia the good thief?" But the censor did not think it a bit funny.

The fact was and still is that Poland has been crucified between two thieves. Eighty-five percent of its homes were destroyed first by the Nazis, and 1 million were made homeless. Then came the Soviets to give permanence to ruin and add new links to the chains of slavery. It was because of Poland that World War II began. Though journalists today speak of Russia and the third world war, a more just appraisal would be "Poland or the third world war." Poland is the cameo of the world situation, the knot of political Europe, the key to whether we will have justice or force in the world for the next hundred years.

The uniqueness of Poland is derived not from the fact that the Soviets have raped Poland and taken it into their imperialistic harem, but because at the end of World War II Europe concurred in the crime. What disappeared was the Poland for which England and France took up arms, the Poland which was at the heart of the Atlantic Charter to which Stalin subscribed. The Atlantic Charter promised that every people and every nation would be allowed to choose the government it saw fit; Poland was denied this, first by the invasion of the Soviets and then by the concurrence of Europe in the murder of Poland.

The United Nations never seems to see the inconsistency of the Soviets stirring up trouble through Africa and Asia and South America by inciting nationalism, while at the same time denying it to Poland and the other countries behind the Iron Curtain. Russia had no right over Poland—that is elementary international ethics. For Europe to give juridical sanction to what was taken by force, was to agree in the robbery.

Just suppose that the whole emphasis of the free world in the United Nations was changed. Suppose that instead of organizing political forces against the enemy Russia, it changed the emphasis and reopened the question of Poland. The stress would then be not on resisting an evil, but on defending a right. No nation is strong when it opposes another nation because it steals; but every nation is strong when it affirms that honesty shall be the policy in all international relations. There is more vigor in uniting for the rights of Poland than in uniting against the imperialism of Russia.

If free nations take not the position of loving the good, then the hope of Poland must be beyond all hopes of politics. Then there must be combined in our hearts a faithfulness to the duty of restoring Poland, along with the enormous inequality of the task. Our hopes then must be likened to the flowers and trees that shed their verdure in the long winters, only to be reborn in another spring. One hundred years ago one of the heroes of Poland, Mickiewicz, wrote: "Poland, you will be taken out of the tomb, because you are believing, loving, and full of hope." If the nations fail, then Poland must trust in the Christ who wept over the tomb of Lazarus, and who weeps now over Poland. Poland will then find its glory assured in Him who says: "I am the Resurrection and the Life."

FULTON J. SHEEN.

Army Morale

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1954

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, Col. John N. Gage, United States Army, retired, who resides at 4032 Ellis Avenue, Chicago, in the Second District of Illinois, has written a letter to the Chicago Daily News which the editors of that newspaper thought worthy of publication in the edition of May 7, 1954. I think, Mr. Speaker, that the timeliness of Colonel Gage's observations and his distinguished standing as a true representative of the spirit of military service, will make his contribution of general interest to the Members of this body. The letter follows:

SEES ARMY MORALE BEING KICKED AROUND

Politics have no place in the armed services, where they are viewed both with alarm and distrustful disgust. When officer or enlisted man gains favor through political channels the circumstances soon become known throughout the unit to which he is assigned.

If he can withstand the derision and jibes of comrades and finally disclaims all illicit political influence he may be accepted, but otherwise he takes on the odor and color of his sponsor and becomes a rolling stone that no one wants.

Morale in the Army is being kicked around at a time when we need it.

JOHN N. GAGE,
Colonel, United States Army, Retired, Chicago.

Address of Lt. Comdr. W. E. Fuller at Red Rock Day Ceremonies in Lynn, Mass., Commemorating Those Who Have Died At Sea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1954

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following address of Lt. Comdr. W. E. Fuller, the commanding officer, United States Naval Reserve Training Center, Lynn, Mass., delivered by Commander Fuller at the Red Rock Day ceremonies in Lynn, Mass., commemorating those who have died at sea on May 23, 1954.

The address follows:

Mayor Frawley, distinguished guests, fellow veterans, Americans all, I am indeed honored to be the principal speaker at this memorial service which brings all of us together today for a common purpose.

It is a special honor to have been the one selected to put into words the thoughts and feelings each one of us has on this occasion. I am particularly pleased to participate in your colorful ceremony because I believe that no American should ever let pass an opportunity to pay tribute to those comrades of ours who have given their lives that we could have the rights and privileges that we enjoy in America today.

In the United States of America we are deeply aware that man counts more as an individual than in any other country on the face of the earth. In a totalitarian society the dominant and almost exclusive emphasis is on the power of the state. The liberty of the individual is the missing element. Individual rights and privileges are wholly subordinated to group control.

Liberty brings with it rights and privileges. Democracy then could be defined as a scheme of living under which those precious gifts are shared among the greatest number of people. That was the goal of those early patriots and statesmen who conceived and wrote the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution and the Bill of Rights.

Rights and privileges are ideas that have been branded in the minds and hearts of every American. Although the most precious gifts, they are no concrete objects that can be stored in a safe deposit box or hidden in a sugar bowl to be removed at will for counting and admiring—the way a miser fondles his treasure—and then returned for safekeeping.

Rights and privileges must forever be present and in the open and available to everyone. They must not be taken for granted but must be protected. And the only way they can be protected is for us to face up to our duties and responsibilities as citizens.

All government receives its authority from God through the people, or, as Jefferson put it, "through the consent of the governed." Therefore, the responsibility of government resides in the citizen; it came from him and should be directed against him. It is his job to see that it does.

To my mind, the greatest address ever delivered at any memorial service was the one Abraham Lincoln delivered on the hallowed ground of the Gettysburg National Cemetery ninety-odd years ago. And, for me, the most vital part—the very heart—of that moving message was the line "that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain."

For those who gathered to honor the hero dead of the War Between the States that was a note of warning. For those of us who have gathered here today and the countless thousands in every village and hamlet across the country who will celebrate memorial services in the week to come it still rings clear as a note of warning—a warning for all of us, no matter what our station in life, to discharge our duties and responsibilities as American citizens to the fullest of our abilities.

Where does duty and responsibility begin? It begins in the home, at the mother's knee, when youngsters are first told about the heritage that is theirs as Americans. To help parents tell this story in a manner that children will understand and enjoy there are on the market today all kinds of beautifully illustrated books that relate in most colorful and attractive fashion the stirring history of our country from the landing of the Pilgrims on Plymouth Rock through the Revolutionary War up to the present. Parents should take the time and make the effort to see to it that their children have such books when they first begin to read.

Working hand in hand with the parents are the teachers in our schools. And the making of better citizens who carry out their obligations to their country is not an exclusive concern of any special group of teachers, such as civic or history teachers, but the individual concern of all teachers and parent-teacher organizations. Our system of education was never intended to carry the implication that some teachers are to be charged with the obligation of working at the task of making better citizens, while other teachers escape the responsibility for teaching good citizenship.

Backing up home and school training as a vital force for militant citizenship is the religious influence. And, no matter what the religion, if you are faithful to God and to your church, you cannot fail to be loyal to your Government and to your fellow man.

In addition to teaching our children a love of our country and their duties and responsibilities toward it, the parent, the teacher, and the religious leader together have the responsibility of counseling them against un-American propaganda and instilling in them an abhorrence of communism.

In our schools great emphasis should be placed on the celebration of national holidays such as Washington's Birthday, Lincoln's Birthday, Patriot's Day, Memorial Day, Independence Day, Columbus Day, Armistice Day, and others. The reasons why these particular days are marked for celebration should be as familiar to American schoolchildren as their own names.

After formal schooling ends and our young men and women begin to take their places in society they should take an active interest in the affairs of their community, station, and Nation. They should fight citizen apathy and the all-too-common attitude "Let George do it," wherever they find it.

Always remember it's your Government—either you run it or it runs you. This is one country where you still have a free choice. When you feel that things are in a bad way and you don't like the kind of leadership you are getting in public affairs, tell your elected officials about it. They are acutely sensitive to public opinion. When things are right and decent, however, it is to your credit and you can stick your chest out.

And, finally, we come to the subject of organizations. As we know, the Communists make great use of organizations. They give them all kinds of high-sounding and patriotic names in an attempt to dupe Americans into membership. They meet regularly under strict regulations but their one goal is to take from each of us all the precious gifts of freedom that we possess.

Against them, however, we have in this country a great fortress of American ideas and ideals in our veterans' organizations. In your Americanism programs—sneered at, of course, by bogus liberals and phony intellectuals—you have made and are making an invaluable contribution to the health and strength of America. By carrying out such programs and by sponsoring ceremonies such as this you are facing up to your duties and responsibilities as real citizens.

Democracy is a living thing. But it must be kept alive and nourished. We must live it every minute of our lives. Our democracy will not be destroyed in Moscow; nor will it be saved by legislation in Washington. It will be perpetuated or destroyed by the manner in which each and every one of us lives it in our own community.

An American crisis, past or present, brings us here today. For those we honor, there is no more crisis. But for us, I submit, that now more than ever before, we will be blind if we do not see that the very survival of a free America depends on the way we continue to meet our duties and responsibilities.

Thank you.

Attitudes on Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. RALPH W. GWINN

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 26, 1954

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, in my remarks which appeared in the Congressional Record of April 7, 1954, I made reference to the satisfaction that must have been Earl Browder's at the Communist infiltration of the Democratic Party. I also described the nonchalant manner in which the warnings of the Honorable Martin Dies, former chairman of the House Un-American Activities Committee, were treated by former President Roosevelt.

It is ironic that these same and related subjects should be discussed by the same Earl Browder in a recent letter to the editor of the New York Times. When the 79th Congress adopted a rule to make the Un-American Activities Committee a permanent committee the resolution was adopted on a rollcall by a vote of 208 to 186. Only 70 of the 342 Democratic Members voted for the resolution. One hundred and thirty-eight Republican Members supported the resolution thus making the Un-American Activities Committee a permanent committee of the House. Mr. Browder shows us now why so many Democrats voted as they did. Were it not for these 138 Republican votes when our party was the minority party there would have probably been no investigation of Alger Hiss. If there still be any doubts as to the extent of the Communist influence during the two decades of the New and Fair Deals, the following excerpts from Browder's letter should dispel them:

[From the New York Times of April 29, 1954]

ATTITUDES ON COMMUNISM—FORMER PARTY HEAD RECALLS CLIMATE OF OPINION IN 1930's

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

The case of Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer epitomizes the problem of a whole nation obsessed with a feeling of guilt arising from past association with Communists at home and abroad. I know nothing about Dr. Oppenheimer as a person except what I read in the papers, but I know a great deal about the conditions which swept many thousands of similar persons into association with the Communists during the 1930's and up to 1945. During that period I was leader of the American Communists, described as a "dictator" by the man who supplanted me. This is the ninth year since I was kicked out, and I have long ceased to be a Communist. But for the period when Dr. Oppenheimer and his type flocked around the party certainly I know more than almost anyone else about it.

DOMINANT TREND

In order to understand that period one must realize that its climate of public opinion was utterly different from that of the present. There was very little to put Dr. Oppenheimer and his kind on notice that there was anything particularly reprehensible about association with Communists whatever one might think about their doctrines. In fact, a rather free association with Communists in public life was taken for granted by the dominant trend of public opinion. There was, of course, an active minority which strenuously fought against this dominant trend, but its fate is illustrated in the person of its most illustrious spokesman, Martin Dies, who was literally laughed out of Congress and into oblivion when he tried to expose the subversive associations of Screen Actress Shirley Temple.

In those days Communists exerted a powerful and persuasive influence in the labor movement; they were invited into the American Federation of Labor and later into the Congress of Industrial Organizations. At election times their support was sought by candidates and factions in both major parties. They played a serious role, unchallenged, in the League of American Writers. Communists were asked to speak in universities, not despite but because they were Communists. For example, I was twice an invited guest speaker at the Institute of Public Affairs of the University of Virginia, and during the nineteen thirties spoke in at least thirty other universities.

FULL COLLABORATION

In the American League for Peace and Democracy, spokesmen for about 5,000,000 organized people, mostly church and labor, including ministers, Government officials, church leaders, scientists, doctors, lawyers, and judges, collaborated freely with the Communists. My speeches were reproduced in college textbooks on public speaking, and in college reading texts on public issues.

* * * * *

In politics, of course, the main weight of Communist influence was thrown behind Roosevelt and the Democratic Party, for historical reasons not germane to the immediate issue.

* * * * *

EARL BROWDER.

YONKERS, N. Y., *April 19, 1954.*

Presidential Power and Aggression Abroad: A Constitutional Dilemma

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL

OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 28, 1954

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to place into the Record an article from the American Bar Association Journal for May of 1954. This article, by Messrs. William W. Schwarzer and Robert R. Wood, of the California bar, deals with a vital issue of our day, and that is the Presidential power to meet potential or actual aggression under the defense commitments of this Nation.

I am advised by Mr. Wood that this material is a summarization of a more extensive document developed as a thesis at the Harvard Law School. I believe that the authors of this treatise have demonstrated a clear acquaintance with this as a developing problem. It is also my opinion that this study can be read with great profit by those Members who may not have occasion to read the bar journal, and I commend it as well to any who have an interest in a careful analysis of an existing problem. I think profit can be had from this careful and independent study.

PRESIDENTIAL POWER AND AGGRESSION ABROAD: A CONSTITUTIONAL DILEMMA

(By William W. Schwarzer and Robert R. Wood)

(Although the constitutional power to declare war is vested in Congress, congressional declarations have had surprisingly little to do in the past with committing our Armed Forces to actions that look and sound very much like war. The President is the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, and most of the hostilities we have engaged in have actually begun before any formal action of the legislative branch.)

If Russian troops should suddenly invade Norway, the universal question would be: What will America do? All members of NATO, including Norway, have received the solemn pledge of the United States that an attack on one would be regarded as an attack on all. Each member of NATO vowed to assist the nation attacked by taking forthwith such action as it deemed necessary, including the use of armed force, to restore and maintain the security of the North Atlantic area.

What action does American governmental machinery permit in such an event? Normally the President is the one to decide what military measures are necessary. Suppose he decides that the safety of America depends upon immediate military action to prevent strategic Norwegian bases from falling into Russian hands. Suppose he decides that the safety of America depends on instant massive retaliation. Still, crisis or not, he must consider a further problem: What does the Constitution authorize the President to do under the circumstances? Oddly enough, this vital question of constitutional law is fraught with such doubt and difficulty that the foremost legal authorities reach opposite conclusions.

This problem—the constitutional power of the President to send troops into action abroad—may confront us anywhere, anytime in our troubled world. It has arisen in the past, as in the Boxer Rebellion of 1900, but was not seriously debated until after President Truman had sent our troops to fight the North Koreans. The issue of the debate, of course, was whether the President should have waited to let Congress vote on what measures were to be taken against the North Koreans, who meanwhile were sweeping southward.

The great constitutional question stems from the division of the war power by the Founding Fathers between Congress and the President. The framers of the Constitution, with the hated prerogatives of George III in mind, did not want the new Republic's Chief Executive to possess the grave power of choosing between war and peace. Congress, instead, would declare war and the President was made Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy to act as the Nation's first general and admiral. Thomas Jefferson thought that "we have already given * * * one effectual check to the dog of war, by transferring the power of letting him loose * * * from those who are to spend to those who are to pay."

Originally the framers had given Congress the power to make war. But even in 1787, war could come too fast for Congress to act to defend the Nation, and a change was made to give Congress the power to declare war in order to remove any doubts that the President could make war in defense of the Nation. In the 23d of the Federalist papers, Alexander Hamilton justified this change by maintaining that the circumstances that endangered the safety of nations were infinite and no constitutional shackles could wisely be imposed on the President's power of defense; that it was impossible to foresee the extent and variety of means that would be necessary to insure adequate defense in the future. Hamilton's authoritative interpretation of the Constitution demonstrates the great foresight and statesmanship of our Founding Fathers.

But the Founding Fathers could not foresee supersonic aircraft and hydrogen bombs which today raise the momentous constitutional question: When is American resistance to aggression abroad war which Congress must declare and when is it defense which the President may undertake? An attack on Hawaii clearly permits the President to plunge the Nation into all-out mobilization and to commit its Armed Forces to action. But what about an attack on Canada, or on Cuba, or on Indochina or on Norway? Are these, too, the ramparts of our defense?

An attack on any of these nations would confront the United States with a national emergency but the degree of its seriousness would vary with each case. Who is to decide the question of degree, the question whether the emergency is serious enough to justify presidential action? The United States Supreme Court in the Steel Seizure case held that the President may not enlarge his powers at the expense of Congress by simply deciding that a national emergency exists. When President Polk seemed to do just that by dispatching American troops into Mexico, Abraham Lincoln scoffed:

"If today he should choose to say he thinks it necessary to invade Canada to prevent the British from invading us, how could you stop him? You may say to him, 'I see no probability of the British invading us,' but he will say to you, 'Be silent; I see it, if you don't.' "

It may be significant that when Lincoln later assumed the awful responsibility of defending the Nation, he thought it necessary to assume unprecedented—even dictatorial—powers for the first 3 months following the fall of Fort Sumter.

In deciding what to do in the event of an attack on a country such as Norway, the President must examine with deep insight this Nation's history and its principles of government. It is our thesis that these will provide constitutional means for taking military action when sudden swift aggression makes it imperative.

A survey of American wars shows surprisingly, that congressional declarations of war have had little or nothing to do with committing this Nation's Armed Forces. Only the War of 1812 followed congressional debate culminating in a declaration of war. In every other instance Congress followed presidential leadership by declaring war or supporting undeclared war such as the naval war against France in 1798, the Barbary wars in 1801 and 1815, the Mexican hostilities from 1914 to 1916, and the Korean war. Although a declaration of war has a major legal significance in our relations with enemy nations and as a basis for emergency legislation, it has had little to do with "letting loose the dog of war."

Over a hundred times the President has sent American forces abroad into action too limited to be called war. In Latin-America, the Philippines, Japan, China, Russia, and other countries these forces have been used to guard American lives and property. At times the President has acted similarly to enforce international obligations or to protect the intangible interests of the United States. The occupation of Haiti, the assumption of control over the Canal Zone, President Monroe's declaration of the Western Hemisphere's territorial integrity, the destroyers-for-bases deal—all were examples of how Presidents have unilaterally committed American military force in the interest of national security as they saw it.

It is also relevant here that the Constitution makes the President the Chief Executive, the chief enforcement officer of the Nation's laws. This presidential function affects our problem in two ways. In the first place we have since the end of World War II built a formidable network of collective security treaties covering most of the free world. The outstanding example is the North Atlantic Treaty in which the signatory powers "agree that an armed attack against one or more of them in Europe or North America shall be considered an attack against them all." While the Senate in ratifying this treaty did not intend to relinquish the congressional power to declare war—even if it could have done so—this treaty certainly imposes a legal obligation on the President in the event of an armed attack on a member nation. Being the law of the land, it would require him to enforce it by such action as the Constitution authorizes. Secondly there exists today something in the nature of an international common law by which aggressive war is made illegal. Over a period of centuries the collective morality of the peoples of the world has crystallized into such legal forms as the Kellogg-Briand Pact outlawing war and the recent trials of war criminals. There is increasing recognition today of a civilized nation's duty to act as a citizen policeman in defending society against aggressive war. This principle has found expression in the charter and the conduct of the United Nations.

The President's role cannot, of course, be conclusively defined by international law and the course of history. Neither the development of international morality nor the assumption of international obligations can alter the distribution of power in American Government. Neither the jetplane, the atom bomb nor the peril of friends abroad is capable of amending our Constitution. Yet the essential truth remains that the Constitution was not drafted as a statute to deal with the problems of Hamilton's and Jefferson's day but as an enduring charter of government.

The system of government bequeathed to us is, like all democratic institutions, a compromise. The Founding Fathers divided the power to conduct our foreign affairs, in peace as in war, between Congress and the President. Since that day, the demands of responsible democratic government have had to be adjusted to the moment's needs for prompt and resolute action. The accumulated experience of history has therefore put a gloss on the constitutional framework. Unilateral presidential action within certain spheres has become a part of constitutional government. Even in the legislative branch power and responsibility have crystallized in committees and chairmen.

What would a President confronted with a sudden attack on a friendly nation abroad, face when he turns to Congress for authority to take action? Even if a majority were willing to follow his leadership and accept his judgment based on information and experience not immediately available to Congress, there would undoubtedly be an intelligent and powerful minority that should and would be heard. The probable debate between representatives from rural and interior constituencies and those from areas more responsive to events abroad might cost strategic days and hours.

Against the delays of congressional debate must be weighed the organization, the skill, and the information of the executive branch which make it peculiarly qualified to act when quick action is needed. But presidential power to act depends on the existence of a sufficiently grave emergency and, as we have seen, it is not within his power to determine that such an emergency exists.

Yet it is clear that the President, sworn to defend the Nation and the Constitution, cannot refuse to act when national security is threatened. An attack on New York would raise no question respecting his constitutional powers. An attack on Canada or Cuba would raise very little question. An attack on a European ally would have this in common with an attack on or near this country—it would impose on the President the same duty to exercise his best judgment on the matter of the defense of this country. The President, after all, is elected as much for his ability to exercise his judgment and make decisions for the Nation as for his ability to carry out the mandate of Congress. If his judgment dictates that the safety of the country is threatened and that quick action is needed to eventually save American lives, it is his duty to take appropriate action immediately whether the attack is against American Territory or not.

Many times in our early history, the President or his executive officers have had to act in the best interests of the Nation when there was no time to go to Congress for authority. The ultimate legality of their conduct depended on eventual congressional approval but this did not diminish their duty to act when circumstances demanded action. Jefferson's purchase of the Louisiana Territory is an example. A firm believer in a weak executive, he nevertheless felt that it was his duty to secure to the American people the immeasurable benefits accruing from the purchase regardless of his doubts respecting his power to act. Congress subsequently approved his action and history vindicated his judgment. There are other occasions on which executive officers have had to act promptly to spend money, distribute supplies or suspend habeas corpus and ask congressional approval only afterward.

When the President's duty to act in the defense of the best interests of the country as they appear to him is viewed in the light of the historic development of his office and of the international obligations which the Nation has assumed, some of the doubts surrounding his power to resist aggression abroad disappear. If imperious circumstances demand action, it is not the President's duty to refuse to act while awaiting specific authority from Congress. Aware of the electorate's confidence in his judgment, he must proceed to exercise it in the realization that Congress must eventually be asked to supply the authority which he may lack at the time he takes the action he considers imperative. Faced with an attack on Norway, for example, the President may well conclude, especially in view of the Senate's recognition of Norway's strategic importance by the North Atlantic Treaty, that immediate military intervention is imperative. An attack on other countries with whom we may have different ties or none at all may equally lead him to determine that immediate intervention by our Armed Forces is needed, and he must then act accordingly and submit his decision to Congress as soon as time permits. Congress retains the ultimate power to overrule the President's decision by withholding funds or by refusing to declare war. Admittedly it would not be easy for Congress to extricate the country from a war in progress but this risk is outweighed by the dangers of inaction in time of peril. And even if Congress should fail to back a President's decision, he will have been no more delinquent in the performance of his constitutional duty than if he had permitted the Nation to be thrown into mortal peril by refusing to take action.

Not Enough Water

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MYRON V. GEORGE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 28, 1954

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following editorial from the Winfield (Kans.) Courier of May 24, 1954, entitled "Not Enough Water."

NOT ENOUGH WATER

Before the United States runs short of oil or coal there may develop a more acute shortage. Our water supplies, as a Nation, may be found deficient in the next few years.

Cecil Hathaway, special assistant to the chief of the Army engineers, made that plain at Kansas City recently when he spoke at a forum of hydraulic engineers held in connection with the dedication of the $6 million plant of Fairbanks-Morse. Rapid depletion of our water resources was described by Hathaway as one of the most serious problems faced by this country.

The hydraulic engineer declared that water use in the United States has quadrupled in the past half century. It now exceeds the natural supply on a long time natural basis, he asserted.

There is no such thing as an inexhaustible supply of underground water, leading authorities now agree. It was once believed that the underground beds could be pumped indefinitely with no fear of depletion. The engineers know better now.

In west Texas, in Arizona, and in other areas supplies of subsurface water have been depleted. In one instance the water level was lowered to such degree that only large firms can afford to go deep enough to get it. Small farmers and ranchers now must depend on surface water and in some areas in recent years that has been deficient.

The current drought has lowered the water level in this area. Many wells and ponds failed, so more strain was thrown on the Winfield wells.

Underground water comes from rainfall or melting snow. When that is short in time of drought the underground water sources are decreased. If, at the same time, demands for water increase there can be only one result—the water level underground is lowered and sufficient pumping would in time deplete the supply.

There are ways of combating the shortage of water. General terracing would slow up the runoff in wet weather and permit more moisture to sink into the soil, thus helping to keep up the underground water level. Another plan is to build more dams to hold the runoff in flood periods, thus making more water available in times of drought. If water demands continue to increase as in the past 50 years, something will have to be done soon to relieve the shortage that is bound to develop.

Monsignor Travers' Jubilee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. BEAMER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 28, 1954

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Anderson (Ind.) Herald under date of Sunday, May 23, 1954.

The Right Reverend Monsignor Thomas J. Travers celebrated the 50th anniversary of his ordination in the Catholic priesthood on that date. The many friends of this respected clergyman joined in giving recognition to him on this particular Sunday.

MONSIGNOR TRAVERS' JUBILEE

May 23, 1954, is a bid day for Anderson and particular for this community's substantial Roman Catholic population; for this is the golden jubilee of the Right Reverend Monsignor Thomas J. Travers—the 50th anniversary of his ordination in the Catholic priesthood.

Fifty years in any endeavor calls for more than passing attention; and when those 50 years have been devoted to the kind of service the Catholic priesthood entails, an occasion like today's becomes one of notable significance indeed.

To grasp the importance of this day for our Roman Catholic friends and neighbors, it is necessary perhaps to understand that to Catholics the priesthood is a vocation in the strictest, most literal sense of the word: a summoning, a calling, manifested according to Catholic tradition by the pious desires of the heart, by innocence of life, by the sincere love of Christ and by zeal for the glory of God and the salvation of souls.

It is necessary to understand also that Catholic tradition places upon the shoulders of every priest a series of responsibilities bestowed by our Saviour Himself upon the Apostles and delegated and bequeathed by them from one generation to the next through 2,000 years of Christendom.

"As the Father hath sent Me," we read in the Gospels that Jesus directed His apostles, "I also send you. Go ye therefore; teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you, and behold I am with you all days, even to the consummation of the world."

As we pursue the origin of these Catholic traditions, we find the apostles singling out the most pious of their followers as assistants and successors. "And they chose Stephen, a man full of faith and of the Holy Ghost," we read in the Acts of the Apostles, "and Philip, and Prochorus, and Nicanor, and Timon, and Parmenas, and Nicolas, a proselyte of Antioch. These they set before the apostles, and they praying, imposed hands upon them."

We read also in the Acts that as St. Paul and St. Barnabas carried the message of Christendom to new corners of the earth, they appointed priests to tend the faithful. "And when they had ordained priests in every church, and had prayed with fasting, they commended them to the Lord."

So it is that every priest, according to the traditions of catholicism, occupies not an extraordinary impeccability or personal infallibility, but rather a divinely ordained office. So it is also that as every young man assumes the priesthood—as Monsignor Travers assumed it 50 yers ago today—he hears the solemn and ancient words of the order of ordination—"Receive the power to offer sacrifice in the church for the living and the dead, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost."

Monsignor Travers came to Anderson more than a third of a century ago. When he assumed direction of St. Mary's parish, he was a young man of 37. Behind him were 18 years of service in Logansport, Fairmount and Portland.

In 1935, he was appointed dean of the Munice Deanery and elevated to the rank of domestic prelate with the title of monsignor. Shortly afterward, with the creation of the Diocese of Lafayette, Monsignor Travers became the diocese's first vicar general. Finally 8 years ago, the monsignor was created a protonotary apostolic—the highest rank of prelacy conferred upon priests outside the See of Rome itself.

These distinctions that have come to Monsignor Travers in his half century of dedication testify to the piety and the wholeness with which he has submerged himself in his work.

But there is yet another distinction to do him honor—a distinction not to be measured in terms of ecclesiastical titles or privileges. That distinction, simply put, is the friendship and the affection of this community—a friendship and affection that go far beyond Anderson's Roman Catholic parishes to involve every man, woman and child privileged to have come within the orbit of the monsignor's career in Anderson.

Now friendship, to be sure, is not a scarce commodity in a community like Anderson. Nor, for that matter, is the kind of intellectual attainment that has characterized Monsignor Travers' existence.

What is it then that sets Monsignor Travers apart from his fellows? What is it that makes him so widely esteemed? We think the answer is his understanding—and to an even greater extent, his wisdom.

Wisdom has become a rarity in this day and age in which we attach perhaps undue import to what dazzles us rather than to what confounds and teaches us. Wisdom is the by-product of a lifetime of knowing and loving humankind. A man who has devoted himself to a half century in the priesthood has seen more of humankind than most of us can imagine. And in the case of Monsignor Travers, we think he has done more than see: he has shared, and he has understood.

And the fruit of that sharing and that understanding has been the gift of wisdom—a gift heaped upon too few in this troubled world, a gift that has made Monsignor Travers a personage whom Anderson will remember and love so long as a single one of his contemporaries lives.

It is then the prayerful hope this day of every Andersonian that Monsignor Travers will count many more anniversaries and that he will see and know many more years of service to his flock, his faith, and his God.

Wanton Carelessness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 28, 1954

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to include an article from the New York Herald Tribune of May 27, 1954, by Walter Lippmann entitled "Wanton Carelessness":

TODAY AND TOMORROW

(By Walter Lippmann)

WANTON CARELESSNESS

About 2 months ago, on March 5, the House voted to do something that almost no one voting, except some member of the Appropriations Committee, can have known about when he did it. The House cut $6 million out of the $15 million asked for by the administration in its approved budget. This cut, if the Senate allows it to stand, will, in Senator Fulbright's words, "virtually destroy" the Smith-Mundt program and will seriously cripple the Fulbright program. These two programs finance the two-way exchange of students, specialists, and leaders between the United States and over 70 foreign countries.

It would be flattering to describe this action of the House as a case of penny-wise and pound-foolish. But as a matter of fact the House was not wise about anything—even about pennies. The cut was not discussed in the hearings of the House committee. It was not discussed in the report of the House committee. It was not discussed on the floor of the House. It was put forward by the committee and it went through the House unexplained, unexamined, and unnoticed.

That $6-million cut will just about complete the wrecking operation which McCarthy began—the destruction and the discredit of our whole effort to earn the good will of other peoples by getting them to know us, not through the propaganda of our adversaries and of those who don't like us but through their own eyes. In the whole vast and complicated budget there is probably no other place where the refusal of so small a sum of money can do anything like such widespread damage to the interests of this country.

The Hickenlooper committee, which made a thorough and constructive investigation of our overseas information program, concluded that "in comparative rating of the various mediums" the exchange program is among "the most effective." Chairman Judd's committee, after making its studies in southeast Asia and the Pacific, came back last January with a conclusion that the program should be expanded. Its contraction, said the Judd committee, "would be a serious setback to our prestige and influence." This was also the opinion of Vice President Nixon after his tour around the world, and it may be said that it is the consensus of American and foreign officials and of newspapermen who have had any reason to observe our overseas information services.

For those who have not had time to look into the matter, it may be useful to explain why so little money can matter so much. We have been so used to enormous figures that we can be startled, even bewildered, by being told that something which is so very inexpensive is also so very important. Everything we have to do, be it in defense or in supporting agricultural prices or in taking care of the veterans, runs into very big money. We may well suppose that many a Congressman, had he been asked, which he wasn't, if $6 million could be cut from an appropriation administered by the State Department, would have answered offhand that $6 million can be cut from any appropriation for any agency, and a mighty good thing it would be.

This is a case which is an exception to that rule. Among the various activities of the Government it comes nearer than any other to proving the song that "the best things in life are free." Fifteen million dollars a year is small change for the Atomic Energy Commission or the Air Force, and not much money for a Texas millionaire. Yet these $15 million a year will do the following: enable 418 leaders in Government and industry and social work and technology to come to the United States and to meet and consult with Americans doing the same kind of work; enable 47 specialists to take 4 to 6 months' training courses here in all sorts of subjects from traffic control to the management of schools and the editing of newspapers; enable 389 professors and research workers to come here for 1 academic year, 421 foreign teachers to spend 6 months observing our schools, 1,407 foreign students to study in the United States and 368 foreign students to go on studying in schools supported by Americans abroad such as the American University in Beirut.

On the reverse side these same $15 million will enable 48 American specialists to go on lecture tours abroad; 345 American professors and research workers, 266 American teachers, and 806 American students to study or teach abroad.

Altogether, on the two-way exchanges 4,515 men and women will take part in the program during the 12 months which begin in July. Since 1948 over 15,000 like them, students, professors, journalists, teachers, and leaders of government, industry, and labor have been exchanged.

Why do the coming and the going of some 4,000 persons a year matter so much? The answer is that seeing is believing. When people have seen a foreign country for themselves, they have something in their minds which resists prejudice and misrepresentation. The purpose of an iron curtain is to prevent just that kind of direct personal contact across frontiers which dissolves the effect of propaganda and indoctrination.

Now if the direct contact is made by men and women who are drawn from the educated class, when they bear witness the effects are multiplied and spread far beyond themselves. One professor in a university in Ruritania, who has seen for himself that in a university town in Wisconsin Americans do not carry atomic bombs in their pockets, or think of McCarthy as the Nazis thought of Hitler, or an American who has seen for himself what family life is like in provincial Ruritania are antibodies in the infected blood stream of our tormented civilization.

On any true estimate of the future of the enormous masses of mankind who are awakening and are emerging from bondage and from ancient darkness, and from foreign and native domination, we must presume that the educated class can be, and will be, certain to decide their direction. From these elite will come the politicians, the civil servants, the military commanders, and the industrial managers of these new countries. What these key people know, and what they believe about themselves and about the rest of the world, is the inwardness of the whole vast movement of historical forces.

China was lost to Chiang Kai-shek when the preponderance of the educated class turned away from him. The odds have been strongly against the French, as they would be against us, in Indochina when the Vietnamese elite did not rally to them. The reason that India and Pakistan and Burma and Ceylon are free countries, are not engulfed in the totalitarian tide, is that the elite in all of them understand free institutions and, having understood, possess personally in their own minds and spirit the universal principles of freedom.

As long as we do not become alienated from the educated class, allowing differences of policy to become irreconcilable, it will always be possible to come to a new order of relations between Asia and the West. If that alienation is allowed to happen—as some of our stupidest Philistines do their best to make happen—armies and weapons and pacts and money will be of no avail.

Reds Violate Korean Truce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 28, 1954

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, recent reports indicate the strong possibility that the Free World Allies in Korea are furnishing the Communists with vital military information while getting little or none in return.

While the Allies, including the United States, are trying to live up to the terms of the Korean Armistice, the Communists on the Neutral Nations Supervisory Commission are not allowing investigation of 40 United States charges of armistice violations.

Is it possible that the reason for the Communist violation of the terms of the truce is that they are building up their troop and air strength in North Korea? The answer seems obvious. In the words of an editorial in the East St. Louis (Ill.) Journal:

> Until the Communists in North Korea * * * are ready to play the game of military inspection honestly, it is foolish to continue to provide vital information to the Commission.

I include in the Record the full editorial from the East St. Louis Journal of May 23, 1954:

REDS VIOLATE TRUCE

Today in Korea the United Nations is acting in good faith by living up to the terms of the armistice while the Communists violate the truce continually.

The American Eighth Army recently said as much in providing the Neutral Nations Supervisory Commission with daily reports of the amount of equipment and the number of troops in Korea.

Compare this with the Communist behavior. The two neutral nations on the Commission—Sweden and Switzerland—recently have charged that the Communist members of the group—Czechoslovakia and Poland—are blocking inspections in North Korea.

This means that the Communist members of the Commission are blocking the investigation of 40 American charges of specific armistice violations—troops and air buildup in North Korea.

Thus the truce-inspection system is working south of the 38th parallel, but not in North Korea.

Why then should the Allies report that 47,321 troops have been pulled out of South Korea since the truce was signed 9 months ago? Or, why should the Reds know that the United Nations has 400 fewer combat planes and 500 fewer tanks in South Korea today?

Why should the Allies give the neutral commission any military information—information that goes directly to the North Koreans and Chinese Communists by way of the Czechs and Poles?

Until the Communists in North Korea and on the Neutral Nations Commission are ready to play the game of military inspection honestly, it is foolish to continue to provide vital information to the Commission.

Award to Hon. Lindsay C. Warren as the Outstanding American of the Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT C. BONNER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 28, 1954

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the Record, I include an address delivered by the Honorable Graham A. Barden before the Dialectic and Philanthropic Societies on May 10, 1954, at Chapel Hill, N. C., this being the annual joint meeting and banquet of these two historic societies at which time they presented a joint award to the Honorable Lindsay C. Warren as the outstanding American of the year. These two historic societies were founded on the campus of the University of North Carolina in 1795. Mr. Warren, being unable to attend the banquet, Mr. Barden was selected to accept the award for him and the following is his address of acceptance:

I want each of you to know how much I appreciate the honor of being selected to accept this fine and much deserved award given to a great American and my personal friend, the Honorable Lindsay C. Warren.

I join you in your accurate and just appraisal of him as being one who has rendered signal service to his university, State, and Nation. They are all a part of our hard-won heritage from our fathers, and never has there been a time when they needed more our devotion and our constant vigilance to protect them in their full flower.

Knowing Mr. George W. Combs, of the Baltimore Sun, as not only one of the finest newspapermen in the United States but as one who knew Lindsay Warren intimately, I asked him for a brief statement giving his appraisal, and he said:

"As an active member of the congressional press galleries for almost 40 years, I have observed many Members of the House and Senate and officials of the Government in action. I have seen many come and go, but Lindsay C. Warren, who retired as Comptroller General on April 30, stands out as the most forthright, able and fearless official in my memory.

"He left a record of accomplishments as Comptroller General his successor will find difficult to meet in guarding expenditures of public funds. During his 13½ years, he recovered almost a billion dollars which had been spent improperly.

"Mr. Warren is a living example of courage, ability, and fairness to his fellow man. For approximately 30 years he gave to his State and the Nation invaluable service. The American people owe him an enormous debt of gratitude. Many Members of Congress, and public officials, have remarked that 'It's unfortunate there are not more Lindsay Warrens in the Government'."

Count Tolstoi once said, "The vocation of every man and woman is to serve other people." You have chosen for your award a man whose whole life has exemplified this principle.

I was recently told of a letter written to Mr. Warren by one of his key officials, which complimented him on the progress made in the Federal Government's accounting system and which wound up with this very potent statement: "But most of all, you will be remembered as the embodiment of everything that a public servant should be."

So, I would like for a few minutes to discuss the attributes of the ideal public servant, with special emphasis on integrity.

Government has grown at all levels. We are living in a world of big government, and the bigger it gets the more important it is for us to see to it that those elected or appointed to public office possess the requisite qualifications of ability and integrity.

Integrity is a good word. It means something. Without it we as individuals are lost and without it our Nation is lost.

As far back as the Prophet Samuel, when he could no longer serve he stood before his God and his people and gave an accounting of his stewardship. This he could well do for his record of service to God and man had been one of integrity.

Let me quote from the records of a Senate Subcommittee on Ethics in Government a statement made by Mr. Warren himself:

"For a long time I thought that no code of ethics or morals would insure a high standard of conduct of the Government's business. I have felt that moral integrity is something innate, the result of a person's conscience, upbringing, and education, and not something controlled by regulations, no matter how rigid. It has been said that a state to prosper must be built on foundations of a moral character, and that this character is the principal element of its strength and the only guaranty of its permanent and prosperity."

And later, stated in plain direct Lindsay Warren language:

"I still think, though, that it would greatly help to bring to bear a little old-fashioned, common honesty, decency, and fair dealing."

It is well that we should still have in Government those who believe as Jefferson in the practice "of placing the interest of our fellow citizens in the hands of honest men with understanding sufficient for their stations."

It has been a great experience to serve in the United States Congress for 20 years. I have seen men come and go. The House of Representatives is a fair but exacting judge of its Members. I have seen men grow. I have seen them dwindle. I do not know of any way on earth a Member could shrink faster than for his associates in the House to decide that he is short in integrity.

Men in public life today, and especially Members of Congress, are constantly under pressure, both good and bad. If you vote, those who disagree ascribe everything but good reasons for so voting.

Integrity and conscientious convictions are in the fight of their lives for survival.

Personally I have been attacked by newspaper editors, slanted news reporters, and subsidized commentators on both radio and television. I have never even attempted to answer a single one even though at times my contempt for their apparent willful and unjust attacks has been almost beyond my control. However, in more calm moments, I have decided that probably that is a part of the price we must pay for a part of our freedoms, freedom of the press and freedom of speech. My sincere hope is that the trend will turn and instead of accepting statements in print or heard over radio or television as being true, that they will be accepted only for their real value and that the people will make search for the real truth.

I sometimes think we could well afford to repeat the words and probably follow the inferred example contained in a statement made by a Member of the House about Mr. Warren—"In debate he demonstrated courage without daring, expressed his convictions without abuse, and supported his arguments with irrefutable facts and convincing logic."

Truth and integrity are powerful weapons whether on offense or defense, and the more used in government, the stronger our Government will be and the longer our democracy will last.

At the present time, and in fact it is too often the case, men in high places in Government plant seeds of distrust and lack of respect for our own Government.

The famous, or should I say now infamous, investigation going on in Washington, is in my opinion a perfect illustration of how a matter of that kind should not be done. The integrity of those on both sides has been seriously questioned. I, together with many other Americans, would like less featuring of personalities, publicity, etc., and more emphasizing of the absolute necessity of integrity in government, whether the question involved is communism or anything else that has bearing on the proper functioning of our Government. Certainly the evidence before us now seems to suggest that probably the wrong man is trying to do probably the right thing in the wrong way.

But the Government belongs to the American people. I have faith in their ability to detect and correct the weak spots in their Government. Certainly we have the greatest Government on earth and the finest system of government. Certainly, the weak spots in Congress exist and probably to some degree will continue to exist. But the American people will never be unmindful of the fact even if there are weak spots in Congress—it is the only wall of protection existing between them and a dictatorship.

I have used the recipient of your award only as an example to enumerate a few of the attributes of the ideal public servant. I could not sum up these attributes as displayed in him any better than was done by my good friend and your Representative from right here in Chapel Hill, the Honorable Carl Durham, in his statement on Mr. Warren's retirement. Here is what Mr. Durham said:

"Fortunately for us here in America, we have produced leaders who have gone far beyond the call of duty in securing for us the many privileges we enjoy today.

"Lindsay Warren can be counted among that group. While he served here on Capitol Hill in the Congress, he always put the basic rights for personal freedom above all else. Selfish people, desirous of personal power, promote ambitious schemes of personal preferment. You always found Lindsay Warren fighting this type of schemes at all levels in his daily life, in his congressional life, and later as Comptroller General of the United States.

"I do not like to think of his leaving our Government. I asked my self seriously, Can we afford to lose him? Our national life here on Capitol Hill will not be the same for me. Our Nation has gained much by his advice and his counsel, and our native State of North Carolina has profited by his presence here on the national level."

I would like to close my remarks by reading President Eisenhower's letter of March 31 to Mr. Warren:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, March 31, 1954.

The Honorable Lindsay Warren,
Comptroller General of the United States, Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Warren: It is with a great deal of regret that I agreed to the request in your letter to retire on April 30, 1954, as Comptroller General of the United States. It is unfortunate from every viewpoint that you are unable to complete your full term after 13½ years of outsanding service in that important position. Not only has your service been long, it has also embraced the period of tremendous responsibility in Government incident to the conduct of the Second World War, the postwar military and foreign-aid programs, and the Korean conflict. However, I can certainly understand that it would be inadvisable to continue in this very demanding office against the advice of your doctors.

You have left a lasting mark on Government in the great program of the General Accounting Office and can take deep pride in so vast a contribution to better, more efficient governmental operation. I appreciate the fine cooperation you have given this administration. Please accept my warm good wishes for a fully satisfying and happy retirement.

Sincerely,

Dwight D. Eisenhower.

Thus the President joins in recognizing Lindsay Warren as an outstanding example of the highest type of public servant. I know that all of you here will join in welcoming back to North Carolina for good one of her most distinguished sons, of whose accomplishments we can all be proud, knowing that he is one of our own.

The Sooner the Better

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 28, 1954

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, there has been considerable discussion recently about the need for the prompt adoption of adequate rules for congressional investigating committees. Many Members have made concrete suggestions, and others have given serious consideration to present deficiencies in committee procedures. Recent developments have emphasized the desirability of prompt action to improve these procedures. The prestige of Congress itself is at stake.

Among those who have proposed a thorough reorganization of our investigating procedures is the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Hendrickson]. As he pointed out in an eloquent speech on the floor of the Senate May 11, there is only one successful answer to "an ever-increasing knot of confusion." "That answer," he continued, "is to reform our ways; to consolidate our committees and protect the rights of all by appropriate, sound, thoughtful legislation."

Senator Prescott Bush is another distinguished Republican who recognizes the urgency of adopting an adequate code of fair procedures. I should like to include at this point an editorial from the Washington Evening Star of May 27, which discusses the specific proposals which Senator Bush has made:

THE SOONER THE BETTER

Republican Senator Bush, of Connecticut, has made a good and timely appeal for early adoption of a code of fair procedures to govern the operations of congressional investigating committees. As far as essentials are concerned, his proposal—similar to others that have been advanced periodically through the past several years—is by no means new, but it has become more pertinent than ever as a result of the inquisitorial excesses that have led to the unpleasant spectacle (to put it mildly) of the McCarthy-Army hearings.

Although addressed directly to the Senate, Mr. Bush's 23-point reform program is equally applicable to the House. Its objective is to reconcile "the right of the Congress to gather facts with the right to fair treatment of individuals called before investigating committees." The abuses in this field—in which Senator McCarthy certainly has not been the sole sinner—have been many and frequent, and they will continue as long as the legislative branch of our Government fails, as Mr. Bush has said, to lay down firm and specific rules designed to protect its own honor and dignity, together with "the basic liberties of our citizens and our national security," against investigative methods that do violence to our American tradition by exceeding the bounds of justice and fair play.

The new rules proposed by Mr. Bush would not, in and of themselves, serve as fool-proof guaranties against the kind of excesses that have occurred in numerous congressional inquiries. But they would go far toward reducing those excesses to a minimum. They would do so—assuming a firm resolve to enforce them in both Houses—by circumscribing the powers of committee chairmen; by governing the release of testimony taken in executive sessions; by placing special controls on the issuance of subpoenas; by requiring a majority vote for the authorization of certain procedures; and by establishing such other checks and balances as specific regulations to let all witnesses have the advice of counsel and to safeguard them from being compelled—if they object—to testify under conditions exposing them to a vast television audience.

In calling for bipartisan action along this line, Mr. Bush has emphasized that he has drawn heavily on recommendations drafted by the Republican policy committee and that Senator Knowland, the majority leader, has pledged full support for such a program. However, because of the legislative logjam, Mr. Knowland has voiced the view that the issue cannot be dealt with until the next Congress, and Mr. Bush may therefore have asked for the impossible in urging that the job be done now. Nevertheless, regardless of that, his proposal is altogether sound and to the point, and the sooner something like it is adopted, the better off the Nation will be.

Businessmen for Farm Parity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 28, 1954

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, on four occasions in the past 2 months, I have introduced resolutions showing that the businessmen in Montana farm communities share the farmers' interest in our agricultural programs.

To date, I have introduced petitions signed by 1,081 merchants in 17 Montana towns who favor the maintenance of farm price supports at at least 90 percent of parity.

Today I received 4 more such petitions signed by 247 businessmen. This brings to 1,328 the total signatures on such resolutions from 21 Montana towns.

The resolutions I received today follow:

PARITY FOR THE FARMERS

Being as the State of Montana is a majority agricultural State, the undersigned businessmen of Lewiston feel that it is most imperative that we work side by side with those attempting to maintain a farm program which will enrich and develop the agricultural activities wherever they are a major industry or source of livelihood.

In view of the above conclusions, we, the following businessmen of Lewiston resolve that we go on record opposing any effort on the part of any Congressman, the Department of Agriculture, or any agency for attempting to disrupt the stabilization program, affecting all farm commodities.

We further resolve that Congress not only maintain 90 percent of parity, but shall try to establish 100 percent of parity for all farm commodities. We do not favor any tendency toward flexibility of price supports, but urge Congress to maintain a production control program, which is necessary in order to have stabilized price support.

We further resolve to condemn any form of prosperity based on war and bloodshed, but favor genuinely sane and sound economic program, particularly for the producer, which shall be based on industry, security, and individual initiative.

We further urge all business groups in other cities of this State as well as those of other agricultural States to go on record favoring similar resolutions.

LEWISTOWN BUSINESSMEN

B. M. Brown, Scshiedt Jewelry; Harry the Nifty Tailor; J. N. Sutton, E. H. Rogers Jewelry; Ruzek the Tailor; T. F. Toomey; William H. Apple, Apple's Bootery; Mrs. Paul Cooper; L. R. Sisson; Orie C. Goodpaster; Barney Schutz; E. F. Carnell; Albert Davenport, secretary, Fergus County Credit Union; Otto Neumann, Neumann Nash Motors; Victor H. Fuhs, M. C. Steel Building and Supply; D. A. Morrison, Morrison & Sons; C. W. Radar, manager, Fergus Electric Co-Op., Inc.; R. E. Merry, Merry Motor Co.; E. N. J. Anderson; W. A. Brantz; G. H. Isaacson; Charles E. Marshall, attorney at law; Mary E. Boward, Boward Floral; Donald E. Pfau; R. A. Green; Ed Diekman, Hines Motor Supply Co.; Leon Jacobs, Jacobs' Store; James A. Wier, Wier Furniture Co.; C. L. Kreuger, Marshall Wells Store; Mel Gore, Modern Shoe Repair; W. K. Wicks, Lewiston Pharmacy; R. S. While, Central Meat Market; Oscar F. Bechtel, Montana Hardware; Clayton C. Williams; Forest Retz, Creel Funeral Home; A. L. d'Autremont, the Fad; R. M. Plovanic, National Market; Tobie E. Liedes, manager, V. & R.; G. O. Behimer, Flinders & Behimer; T. M. Bourke, Bourke Motors and Implement Co.; S. M. Shull, Shull Tire Shop; A. C. McKnight, plumbing shop; Ed Duffner, Bob & Ed's Second-Hand Shop; B. Z. Stewart, Sawyer Store; Hill Top Dairy; Woody's Service; H. W. Sereday, Hank's 76 Service Station; Rudolph Lehmann, Service Station; Russell Brandt, Brandt Motel; H. C. Nelson, Dash Inn; Mrs. Bernice Baker, Lou's Motor Court.

Mrs. Bertha Clark, B. & B. Motel; Cecil L. Field, Fields Cleaners; Wayne Swingley, Wayne's 66 Service; E. W. Geyer, G. & H. Auto Sales; Mrs. C. E. Jolliff, Lewistown Radiator Works; Gene Johnson, Eddy's Bakery; E. H. Cheatham, B. & H. Grocery; Frank B. Smith, Smith Drive Inn; Mrs. Wesley

Ramsey, Dairy Queen; Forest Noel, Central Montana Stockyards; Earl R. Cline, Lewistown Veterinary Service; J. P. Songer, Lewistown Electric Supply; Leo J. Vogl, Vogl Construction Co.; Wallace H. Harper, attorney at law; George R. Fries, Fries Mobile Service Station; E. G. Parrish, Parrish Motors; Howard Biggerstaff, motor pool; George Smokoff, Mecca Barber Shop; Nate Mame, Nate's Sport Shop; Fred Taylor, Lewistown osteopath; Donald McDonald, Dahl Shoe Shop; Fred L. Bourke, real estate; J. A. Wilson, Central Montgomery Product Credit Association; R. J. Sullivan, Montgomery Ward; Q. M. Ulsaker, attorney; C. W. Buntin, attorney; Tom Dowen, auto dealer; Florence Bowles, jeweler; Harold Erickson, real estate; Don B. DeYoe, auto dealer; L. E. Hoyden, Roy's Tire Shop; Walter Scheid, Scheid's Electric Shop; L. M. Gilbert, Gilbert Motor Co.; R. H. Baird, Alumatic windows and doors; F. J. Bucher; I. L. Parrott, car dealer; H. M. Parrott, car dealer; Mrs. Al Madsen, Madsen Sheet Metal.

E. W. Beedie, Ned's Fifth Avenue Conoco; F. E. Cramer; G. E. Yost, Yost Blacksmith Shop; Neal D. Smith, service station; J. L. Zacker, Lewistown Machine & Metal Works; Charles Bersuch, Charlie's Body Works; John L. Kemp, Kemp's Repair Shop; E. Arnold Johnson; R. L. Kramlich, Kramlich Lumber Mill; Wm. H. Biggs, Broadway Body Shop; W. E. Landru, Farmers Insurance Group; L. E. Olson, Iowa Mutual Insurance Co.; Jack Ruckman, Jack's Body Shop; J. C. Stephens, insurance agent; Charles Follmer, Home Plate; Coachcraft Body Shop, C. O. Woods; Radio Supply, J. W. Osler; Jack & Jill Shop, William V. Schneider; O. Kelly, Central Music Supply; Ted B. Manuel, dry cleaner; H. A. Davenport, Farmers Union Insurance; Choe R. Noel, car dealer; Robert G. Daniels, Lewistown Motor; W. A. Elliott, Lewistown Motor, Inc.; J. O. Compton, C. & H. Market; R. A. Edwards, Golden Montana Co.; Jack D. Palmer, Firestone Dealer Store; Frank Maruska, manager, Farmers Union Oil Co.; C. P. Horning, Parrish-Horning Implement Co.; J. W. Wilson, Montana Hudson; Carl C. Rahn, Rahn's Food Center; Ralph Isaacson, Ike's Conoco Service; Charles Cerovski Cement Products; Jack W. Cook, motel and carpenter; Walter Wilhelm, Walt's Grocery; M. H. Schmidt, hotel manager; Earl N. Otto, Otto Machinery Co.; Bert Spencer, Cowan Spencer Implement Co.; Mildred Osburnsen, Osburnsen Implement Co.; Clifford Button, Pacific Hide & Fur Co.; E. L. Thompson, Thompson's Service; Joe F. Brown, laundry and cabins; C. F. Higgens, Higg's Market; Oscar Kippenhan, Montana Roofing; Alex Fah, insurance agent; Henry C. Darrah, auto salesman; I. D. Martin, Retail Farm Supply; John Valach, contractor; Hall A. Smith, custom trucking; J. W. Gretencort, Lewistown Brick & Tile; Central Machinery Co.; George Kuchan, Coca-Cola distributor; Clyde Fredrickson, Fredrickson Implement Co.; Lewistown Propane Co.; Warnisher's; C. A. McDonald, Montana Lumber & Hardware Co.; Jack Ragenovich, metal dealer; E. K. Howland, Lewistown Chick Hatchery; Ernest Hruska, manager FUGTA.

GERALDINE BUSINESSMEN

Paul Entorf, manager, Equity Cooperative Association; Frank Joyce, Frank P. Joyce Co., oils and fuels; Russell Atchison, manager, Geraldine Grain Co.; L. H. Palmer, Geraldine Grain Co.; Roscoe Anderson, manager, Greely Elevator Co.; William L. Reeser; D. S. Mann, Ted's Chevrolet Co.; R. J. Slowey, Slowey's Store; Roy Hays, New Club Cafe; W. R. Reeves, Rusty's Bar; R. Cartwright, Carty's Barber Shop; H. J. Preshinger, Geraldine Meat Co.; George Verrill, manager, Geraldine Cooperative Associaion; Hilda Stoos, The Spot Cafe; W. W. Webb, proprietor, the Geraldine Review; Elmer E. Preuninger, hardware; Clifford A. Scribner, Cliff's Bar; V. H. Quigley, president, First National Bank; Ned B. Bronson, Bronson Garage; J. F. Copp, Geraldine Motor Co.; Wm. Gemmell, manager, Missouri River Lumber Co.; Homer Scribner, contractor; Joe B. Alley, Alley Implement Co.; Carl Johnson, Geraldine Monument Works.

ROBERTS BUSINESSMEN

K. T. Heinselman, Fox Store; Alfred Hiekkila, Roberts Elevator Store; Eugene Stein, Roberts Implement Co.; Elmer C. Kloster, New Deal Bar; Emil R. Frier, Roberts Cafe; V. C. Forster, Roberts Barbershop; Henry Winters, Winters Repair Shop; William Wilson, Roberts Garage; P. E. Howland, general store.

RED LODGE BUSINESSMEN

Walter Bloom, Bloom & Co.; Gus B. Foltz, the Foltz Co.; Peter J. Kucher, Red Lodge Drug; Richard Romersa, Model Drug Co.; R. S. Pfeifer, Coast to Coast Store; Bob Gutche, blacksmith; Robert S. Colness, manager, Sawyers Stores, Inc.;. L. Monahan, Skauge Implement Co.; Pete Micheletto, Micheletto Jewelry; Don Short, Red Lodge Cleaners; Don Stevens, Stevens Implement Co.; Al Siolin, gas dealer; Art Paulson, Arts Standard Service; H. A. Olcott, Olcott Implement Co.; Frank Secora, Red Lodge Tractor Co.; A. D. Whitcomb, oil company; N. Gearhart, Simmons Ready to Wear; Mario Marchello, Marchello Hardware; Norman B. Gardner, repairs; Vienna Kortes, Kortes Store; Chester Hagen, Hagen's Plumbing; John Macmellon, dry goods store; Busy Bee Cafe; H. C. Obert, Mountain View Station; Mike D. Dimich, beverages; John R. Graham, Mountain Chevrolet Co.; Niel A. Stacey, D. D. D.; A. Richardson, barber; Vera Orler, Orler Confectionery; E. G. Hamilton, Bud's Fixit Shop; Red Lodge Cafe; C. W. Waters, Waters' Men's Store; Alice Cobetto, City Bakery; Harvey F. Schrouder, Harv's Sporting Goods; J. H. McDonough, McDonough Motor, Inc.; Mount Maurice Station; Carl Tysel, REA manager; M. W. Buening, Buening Electric; Louis Contratte, Paul's Shoe Shop; E. Levin, Hoffman's; A. P. Marchello, M. & M. Market; Emma Sugg, Quality Grocery; Frank Danichek, Anderson Conoco Station; Mrs. E. Rakkala, Southern Hotel; B. I. Egenes, Flashes Studio; J. Castagne, Montana Meat Market; P. C. Rediske, Felix Sport Shop; Harry Jones; Roy's Shoe Shop; T. J. Cormier, upholsterer; Marino's Artcraft Gift; J. J. Gerondale, Carbon County Creamery; D. W. Columbus, city mayor; Alice Fairchild, Fairchild Cleaners; Chet Moran, City Dairy; George Dimich, Thompson Yards; Cleo-Marg Gift Salon; Ray Gebo, Gebo Grocery; Mike Harschlip, Red Lodge Trading Post; C. W. Vaughn, Vaughn Drug; Margaret Meeks, Wigwam Cafe; Leslie Kline, Kline Insurance Agency; Thereasa Berta, grocery; P. M. Gibbons, grocery; Roy E. Donelson, lumber products and sawmill; George Johnson, Johnsons Greenhouse; F. V. Swenson, groceries.

A Communist Arms Depot in Central America?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 28, 1954

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newspaper article by Arthur Krock:

IN THE NATION

(By Arthur Krock)

A COMMUNIST ARMS DEPOT IN CENTRAL AMERICA?

WASHINGTON, May 26.—Information coming here from Central America through diplomatic channels is that Guatemala's neighbors to the south see a much greater potential of danger than an increase in Guatemala's military power in the army supply to that country from an Iron Curtain port. What is chiefly troubling these nations is the thought that, through secret jungle paths, the hard core of Communists in their countries could be supplied from the large shipment with machine guns for the purpose of effecting the internal social disorder in non-Communist states that is a cardinal foreign policy of the world Bolshevist movement.

Such hidden arms, produced during a general strike or a hotly contested election in Honduras, El Salvador, Nicaragua, Costa Rica, or Panama, could be effectively employed by the Communists toward the objective of civil war. And, while the private advices reaching here are that civil war could be subdued in any of these nations by the power which local armed forces can provide, the effects would be to create new areas of bitterness and desolation and to distract the Americas in some degree from concentration on world Bolshevist threats elsewhere.

According to these advices, Guatemala's neighbors to the south fully recognize that the arms shipment adds to the military advantage over them already possessed by that country, and in this respect presents a sufficient cause for anxiety. Also it has been verified, to the satisfaction of these neighbors, that Guatemala has been assembling troops at the border of Honduras, where the political situation has a special appeal to the promoters of world bolshevism. But, since a border incident plainly provoked by Guatemala would instantly bring into play the Pan American collective security compact, and this fact is well known in Guatemala City, a border incident does not figure importantly in Central American speculations at this time.

COSTA RICA'S EXPERIENCE

But the possible distribution through the jungles of clusters of machine guns to places known to Communists and simple to conceal from the authorities is high among the speculations. Without foreign armament supply, and only with locally acquired weapons that included revolvers and machetes, Costa Ricans fought a civil war in 1948 in which a general strike, of typical Communist nature, was a prominent factor. This strike, imputed by its generators to an infringement of political rights by the party in power, brought on skirmishes in which several were killed and many injured. The fact that the arms shipment for Guatemala from the Iron Curtain port arrived at a time when strikes exist and others are threatened in the neighboring areas has evoked vivid memories of the incidents of 1948, and visions of what their repetition would be if Communists were armed with machine guns.

The nations principally concerned with Guatemala are, however, in a quandary what to do about it, and not the least uncertain as to the next collective move is the United States. The President of Costa Rica, as announced, is pondering a conference of the Foreign Ministers of the nations to the south of Guatemala ("the only direction," said one diplomat today, "in which arms leaving Guatemala will go"). That conference could lead to the employment of the hemispheric collective security measures on the initiative of other Latin-American republics. And the United States could not effectively take this initiative, at this juncture anyhow, for reasons very familiar to persons even slightly acquainted with the unifying effect in Latin America of a charge that the "Colossus of the North" is subverting the sovereignty of its member nations.

A CRITICISM

It was in grateful recognition of this historic fact that Foreign Minister Toriello of Guatemala instantly countered this Government's exposure of the arms shipment from Czechoslovakia to his country by remarking that, after all, Guatemala is not a colony of the United States. On the same basis the administration is being criticized by some, here and abroad, for taking the lead in that exposure. It would have been a simple diplomatic maneuver by the United States, say these critics, to arrange for the revelation to come from a Latin American country, and that would have spiked in advance the inevitable comment made by Señor Toriello.

Be that as it may, and whether or not in the circumstances the comment will have the usual effect, the initiative has now passed to Guatemala's neighbors. What major part the United States, openly or behind the scenes, will henceforth play in the developing hemispheric drama has not been decided. Or the decision, if it has been made, does not appear to be known to the other Pan American nations. Today's announcement that United States bombers are going to Nicaragua on a good-will mission is merely a maneuver reminiscent of the 1910 muscular diplomacy celebrated by Richard Harding Davis.

Among some diplomats here who represent nations outside this hemisphere there is a disposition to attribute the activity of the United States with respect to the arms shipment to strategy designed to increase popular support for intervention in southeast Asia. But Guatemala's neighbors accept our concern at its face value.

Armenian Independence Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 28, 1954

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, on every May 28 Armenians who today live outside of their fatherland in democratic countries celebrate the independence of Armenia, which was established in 1918.

On March 3, 1918, Soviet Russia signed the treaty of peace with Germany and Turkey at Brest-Litovsk, and ceded to Turkey not only the provinces of Turkish Armenia occupied by the Russian forces but also the region of Kars and Ardahan in Russian Armenia.

Turkey, taking full advantage of the absence of the Russian Army, began its invasion of the Caucasus with larger forces. Since more than 200,000 Armenians had already been taken into central Russia during the war to fight against the Germans, the Armenians were able to raise only a small army and yet fought valiantly against the Turkish Army. Their heroic stand at last rewarded them with decisive victories. Thus, the Independent Republic of Armenia was established on May 28, 1918.

A democratic government was established in Armenia with a parliament and executive cabinet. During this crucial period, Armenia was constantly and generously helped by the United States which sent food, clothing, medical supplies, and had several benevolent missions operating in Armenia.

The legislative, executive, and judicial organs were established and were soon functioning smoothly and efficiently. Over 1,500 schools and colleges were opened throughout the land. Housing and irrigation projects were effected. Hospitals, churches, theaters were built.

On August 10, 1920, at Sevres, France, a treaty was signed by the Western Allies, the envoys of the Republic of Armenia and Turkey. This treaty, which has since been known as the Sevres Treaty, meant the official recognition of the Republic of Armenia by the Allies and Turkey and provided that the settlement of the Armeno-Turkish boundaries be left up to President Woodrow Wilson. President Wilson delimited the Armenian boundaries on November 22, 1920.

But all hopes of freedom were smashed when the Red army invaded Armenia and subdued the young republic on December 2, 1920. A heroic stand was made after the occupation in the month of February 1921. Under overwhelming military odds the republic fell and has since been under the Soviet yoke as one of the so-called 16 independent republics that form the present Soviet Union.

Armenia is today once more under Soviet oppression. The people of Armenia are forbidden with the threat of death to celebrate the anniversary of their national independence day, May 28. However, the Armenians of Diaspora continue to celebrate this historic day every year, confident that the United States will emerge victorious out of the present world struggle for freedom, and that this victory will enable Armenia to regain her independence and see the realization of her just claims.

Communism in Latin America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 28, 1954

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following articles from the New York Herald Tribune:

[From the New York Herald Tribune of May 25, 1954]

COMMUNISM IN LATIN AMERICA—GUATEMALA: AN OBJECT LESSON IN THE HOWS, WHYS, AND WHEREFORES OF MOSCOW'S PENETRATION

(This is the second in a series of five articles by A. T. Steele, who has just returned from an extended tour of South America.)

(By A. T. Steele)

As an object lesson in the hows and whys of Communist penetration in Latin America, the Republic of Guatemala (population 2,800,000) is unsurpassed.

Here is an almost classic example of Communist infiltration in an almost classic Central American setting.

Ten years ago, Guatemala was suffering from an oppressive military dictatorship of a kind familiar to Latin Americans. Most of the wealth of the country was concentrated in the hands of a small oligarchy of landowners and merchants whose outlook had changed little since Spanish colonial times. Two percent of the people, it was claimed, owned 70 percent of the land. The gap between the rulers and the ruled was tremendous, and the middle class was small and unimportant. The majority of the people were Indians—poor, illiterate, looked down upon by the whites and mestizos.

DICTATORSHIP ENDED

This dictatorship (of Gen. Jorge Ubico) was brought to an abrupt end in 1944. The people of the country got their first taste of freedom and democracy and liked it. In due course a rather fuzzy leftist, Juan Jose Aravelo, was elected president. Meanwhile, a group of young radicals, mostly ex-students still in their twenties were clandestinely organizing a Communist Party in order to exploit the revolution to their ends.

As the 1950 elections approached, it looked like Maj. Francisco Arana, a moderate, was the man most likely to succeed Aravelo. This was more than the extremists could stomach. Arana was waylaid and murdered, and the history of Guatemala was thus profoundly affected. Capt. Jacobo Arbenz, an army officer of distinctly leftist leanings, was elected president. The Communists, who had helped campaign for him, came into the open for the first time immediately after Arbenz's inauguration in 1951.

Guatemala's history since then has been a story of steadily growing Communist influence. Today Communists dominate organized labor and are making a strenuous bid for the support of the rural population (mostly Indian) through active participation in the land reform program.

REDS INFILTRATE

The Reds have also infiltrated deeply into Guatemala's social service system, the educational system and the propaganda services. They do not, however, control the government. They owe their success in large part to such influence as they may have with President Arbenz and other government leaders.

For the present, President Arbenz holds the key to the Guatemala political situation through his authority over the army. If there has been any Red infiltration of the army, it has not gone very deep, according to most observers.

Guatemalans, trying to convince others that the Communist threat is being greatly exaggerated, point to the fact that there are not Communists in the Cabinet and only four in the Guatemalan Congress. What they overlook is the influence exerted by the Communists through their participation in the high councils of the National Democratic Front, the ruling political coalition.

NUMBER DEBATABLE

Indeed, Guatemalan Communists exert an influence far out of proportion to their numbers. What those numbers are is debatable.

Almost certainly there are no more than 3,000 dues-paying Communists in the country, and the number may be considerably fewer. But they are hard workers and they know exactly what they want, which is more than can be said for the other parties.

For political reasons, the Communists find it more convenient to call themselves the Guatemalan Labor Party rather than the Communist Party. Nobody is fooled. The organizational setup and the membership are strictly Communist.

The Communists are accomplishing in Guatemala what they would like to be accomplishing in other Latin American countries. They have achieved membership in a popular front; they have spawned a variety of other front organizations; they carry considerable influence in the Government, without the necessity of making themselves too conspicuous; they have a growing mass following among workers and peasants; they are steering the official press and radio into increasingly anti-United States lines. In short, just what the Red doctors ordered.

LINES OF COMMUNICATION

The sprawling Communist organism in Latin America has not one head but many. But all channels of leadership lead eventually to Moscow and other capitals of eastern Europe. There are many lines of contact. The Guatemalan setup provides a good illustration of how they work. For example, 6 of the 11 members of the political committee (Politbureau) of the Guatemalan Labor (Communist) Party have visited Moscow on 1 pretext or another in recent years. Presumably this represents direct liaison between a local Communist Party and the Russian Communist Party on matters of high policy.

But much more frequent—and more open—are the relations between the Guatemalan Communists and the World Federation of Trade Unions (WFTU), which appears to be one of the main channels of contact between international communism and regional communism in Latin America.

In addition there are the various world "front" organizations, each with its headquarters in Eastern Europe and each with its subsidiaries in all countries where the creation of such subsidiaries is not prevented by law. Among these Communist-dominated bodies are the World Peace Council, the World Federation of Democratic Youth, the International Students Union and the International Women's Democratic Federation.

DEVELOP FOLLOWING

Through annual congresses and a steady flow of propaganda material, the Communists find these agencies immensely useful in developing a worldwide following of fellow travelers and dupes.

The system provides a convenient device too for push-button propaganda on an international scale. Any appeal or protest from the world headquarters of any of these organizations, be it in Moscow, Prague, Bucharest, or Vienna, evokes instantaneous echoes from the dutiful satellite organizations.

A training school in Eastern Europe provides courses in Spanish for Latin Americans wishing to make communism a career. For Communists in the field, the Cominform Journal (For a Lasting Peace, for a Peoples Democracy) is indispensable reading. It is the bible for the initiated. In its dull columns may be found round-the-world guidance on the latest convolutions of the party line.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of May 26, 1954]

COMMUNISM IN LATIN AMERICA—LIKE THE CHINESE IN THEIR BUILDUP YEARS LATINS BOAST THAT THEIR REDS ARE DIFFERENT

(This is the third in a series of five articles by A. T. Steele, who has just returned from an extended tour of South America.)

(By A. T. Steele)

"Our Communists are different," Latin Americans sometimes tell you. They point to the high percentage of dreamy intellectuals (even poets) among Latin American Reds. They cannot believe that such people are of the same ilk as, say, those rough fellows around the Kremlin. They think we North Americans have a highly exaggerated view of the Communist danger in their part of the world.

All this has a painfully familiar ring to anyone who (like this correspondent) was in China during the buildup years of the Communist revolution in that country. There, too, while they were still a minority, the Communists charmed many non-Communists with their friendly ways, their "democratic" behavior and their apparent desire to cooperate with other "democratic" parties on an "equal" basis. There, too, there were many who thought the Chinese Communists were "different." Once in power, however, the Chinese Reds showed themselves capable of a ruthlessness that many of their misguided followers had deemed inconceivable.

THE YENAN WAY

Yet the Chinese pattern of revolution, with its emphasis on agrarian reform, is much admired by Latin American Communists and their friends. It is viewed as a formula adaptable in many particulars to this hemisphere. The Yenan way, they call it. To learn about the Yenan way many Latin American Reds have read the works of Mao Tze-tung. These and other Chinese Communist writings are on sale in all cities where they are not proscribed. A few Latin Americans have made the long pilgrimage to Peiping (via Moscow) to see Mao's teachings in practice.

It is true there are a few poets among Communist leaders in Latin America, but there are also teachers, labor organizers, office clerks, and tought guys in the best Moscow tradition.

Perhaps the best known Communist in Latin America is the Brazilian, Luiz Carlos Prestes. This veteran organizer and agitator played an important part in building up the Brazilian Communist Party to formidable proportions and helped direct the infiltration of Brazil's government departments, labor unions, universities, newspapers and, to some extent, the army.

CURTAILED BUT NOT HALTED

Prestes' activities were curtailed but not halted by the outlawing of the party in 1947. Today he operates from hideouts that have been variously reported as being in a dozen different places. And despite a shakeup of the Brazilian party's leadership, Prestes retains much of his old prestige.

No Who's Who of Latin American Reds would be complete without mention of Mexico's Vincente Lombardo Toledano. Once a powerful political figure, Lombardo has lost some ground in recent years. As a candidate in the presidential election of 1952 he received fewer than 75,000 votes. But he still has considerable following and influence in left-wing labor circles throughout Central America through his Latin American Labor Federation, an offshoot of the WFTU.

Lombardo played adviser to the inexperienced leaders of the Guatemalan revolution during its early years and was one of the architects of the pro-Communist orientation that the revolution has taken. There is some doubt whether he is himself a Communist Party member, but the question is of academic interest only. His policies are usually right on or alongside the Moscow line.

The most recent claimants to Red notoriety in this hemisphere are Dr. Cheddi Jagan, the deposed Chief Minister of the British Guiana Government, and his Chicago-born wife, Janet. These two, with the help of a dozen or so other Communists and extremists, succeeded, first, in achieving, then in bungling an election victory in the British colony. Dr. Jagan, dentist son of an East Indian mule driver on a British Guiana sugar plantation, got his training at Northwestern University, Chicago. Janet Jagan—blonde, thinnish, bespectacled—is generally credited with being the organizational brains behind the politically dominant Peoples Progressive Party.

S. Gangadeen, a leftist, who was associated with the Jagans up to the time of the fateful election in British Guiana, recently wrote a devastating analysis of his former colleagues. He gives the Jagans rough handling, describing Jagan as a man who "knows literally nothing except what he has half-learned from Communist literature and association with Communists." Jagan, he asserts, is "loyal only to his vain-glorious ambitions and Communist ideology."

SEES HAND OVERPLAYED

As for Janet Jagan, Gangadeen finds her "a good organizer and energetic executive," also "an appealing speaker whose utterances and style reflects both her sincerity and her ignorance." He sums her up as "potentially a high intellect whose development has been warped and stunted by too early an acquaintance with Communist ideology. Gangadeen holds that the Communists in British Guiana threw away their big chance by stupidly overplaying their hand. The Jagans, who are still popular, have now fallen back on passive resistance.

In an earlier paragraph we said something about Latin American Communists who are also poets. Pablo Neruda, Chile's leading Communist, is one of them. Neruda's ability as a writer of verse is generally acknowledged, though some of his efforts are spoiled by their propaganda content. His latest product is a 200-line tribute to Guatemala.

The Cuban Communists also boast of a poet, Nicolas Guillen, among their leaders. And in Guatemala, the party chief, Jose Manuel Fortuny, once won a poetry competition. But Fortuny's career has also included employment in an American-owned business house, in the British Legation and in various Guatemalan radio stations. Today he is a full-time Communist.

The Spirit of the Founding Fathers and American Youth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL CUNNINGHAM
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 28, 1954

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I am extending my remarks to include the story of the fourth annual Washington pilgrimage which has just been concluded. The pilgrimage, from all reports, was a great success. During the pilgrimage Dr. William Kerstetter, president, Simpson College, Indianola, Iowa, gave an address at Washington's Tomb entitled "The Spirit of the Founding Fathers and American Youth." I believe the readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will find it of great interest. Dr. Kerstetter is a new constituent of mine and we of the Fifth Congressional District of Iowa welcome him as president to one of our great schools.

THE SPIRIT OF THE FOUNDING FATHERS AND AMERICAN YOUTH

(By Dr. William E. Kerstetter)

We are gathered here at what is perhaps the most solemn point of our pilgrimage so far—at the burial place of the Father of our Country. We all remember his majestic stature, his moral grandeur, his deep spiritual faith. He is a great person. But we think of him today as more than a person—as a symbol. We think of him as the symbol of a spirit which pervaded the Founding Fathers, a spirit symbolized in American thought not so much by this tomb which is his resting place but by his kneeling in the snow in prayer at Valley Forge during a supreme crisis in his life and the life of a Nation. This spirit sprang up out of an insight into the nature of man. And it is this insight and this spirit which, above all else, we must, in school and college, in the churches, as parents and companions, instill into the minds of all Americans but especially the young men and women of America today. We all need it, but I say "young people especially" because they are more able to grasp it in their formative years and they hold the future in their hands. And I would suggest to you that no other level of insight, no other justification or foundation of democracy is sufficient to cause democracy to flourish and prosper than this insight and this spirit which enlightened and inspired the Founding Fathers. I can think of almost nothing which it is more important that our young people profoundly share.

What is this sobering and inspiring insight into the nature of man which was the root of the liberating spirit of the Founding Fathers? This insight is made up of two parts. Not all the Founding Fathers equally emphasized or, in fact, in every case acknowledged both parts, but taken together it is these two insights which were the inspiration for the development of our democratic way of life. It was nurtured by the Bible, Christian thought, the free churches of England and America, by Lilburne and John Locke, above all by his Second Treatise on Civil Government, by Tom Paine and Thomas Jefferson. It saturated the thinking of the Founding Fathers.

One of these insights was of man's immeasurable capacity for sin, the temptation to tyranny, to mutual exploitation, to magnification of self-interest, to brutality. This knowledge about man appears in the opening pages of the Bible, runs through to its very end, and saturates western philosophy and theology through the centuries, coming to a new vigor and a new enthusiasm even in our own generation, doubtless stimulated greatly in the minds of contemporary thinkers by the shocking brutalities of two World Wars and other wars that have followed. It is startling to realize, when one says that men act like beasts, that this is an insult—an insult to the animals—for the animals do not begin to scratch the surface of the cruelty and sinfulness in its varied forms to which the human spirit gives expression. We men gather together the great geuniuses of our time and assign them the terrible task of devising the most destructive instruments possible, the ones that will most speedily destroy the largest section of the human race in a single operation. Animals have neither dreams nor nightmares about such horrible conduct. But men consciously and deliberately devise it. This is the saddening aspect of the nature of man, and this was the insight of our Founding Fathers.

On the other hand, they also believed in the moral possibilities, the great spiritual potentialities, the infinite worth and dignity of each human soul as a child of God. And, therefore, they said, "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights." They are endowed by their Creator, not by man or by the state, but by God alone. By virtue of their being human, created as spiritual beings in God's image as free spirits, with moral responsibilities to choose good or evil, "they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

When one believes in man as tempted and yielding to sin yet infinitely precious, certain things happen. He is marked by humility. He will never stand up in the temple, as the Pharisee did, and thank God he is not as other men are. Rather, like the publican, he will say: "God be merciful to me, a sinner." Yet he will live with faith and hope and enthusiasm for human living, with self-respect and respect for others because he will remember that for such persons Christ did not disdain to die. He will be marked by ever-increasing compassion. Whether men are black or brown or red or yellow or white, marked by riches or poverty, wisdom or ignorance, cleanliness or filthiness, he will remember that behind these outward facts is a human spirit, a human soul, created in God's image, often suffering, always infinitely precious, and meriting our compassion. So Albert Schweitzer reminds us that no one can ever be so busy at such an important task as to be justified in ignoring a human being in need. But above all—and this is the main point at this moment—this insight into man will inspire devotion to democracy, the free way of life, and is its only adequate foundation.

Because men are sinful, capable of inexpressible brutality and exploitation, it follows that the most dangerous thing to which a man may submit, or a nation may surrender, is the unlimited authorization of power vested in a single person or a small group of people permanently to rule over the community, because that individual and those members of that group, like all human beings, are sinners. Consequently, the best protection that a community of men and women have against the sinful inclinations of them all to the temptations of tyranny, suppression, destructive smearing, is the distribution of power, the spreading of responsibility and privilege to participate in establishing the laws and authorizing some to rule, and recalling them and altering the laws if they are evil and unjust. Because men are sinful, taken in negative terms, democracy is implied as a means by which the many individuals may at least protect themselves against the sinfulness of each other by distributing the power broadly among them all.

On the other hand, because man is of infinite worth as a child of God and possesses certain inalienable God-given rights, like liberty and the pursuit of happiness, he therefore by his very nature possesses a methaphysical and eternal moral right to participate with all other human beings equally in determining the nature of the community, the character of the laws, the personalities of those who shall rule over him at his discretion. In this connection, it is not surprising that Thomas Jefferson was digging down deep into the heart of the matter when he one time asked: "Can the liberties of a nation long endure when it is forgotten that these liberties are the gifts of God?"

What I am trying to suggest to you then, is this: That the most fundamental factor in the inspiration and development of democracy in America, the inspiration of the Founding Fathers, and the indispensable insight for the future is this insight into the sinful and infinitely precious nature of man under the judgment and the love of God. If our young people, and indeed our older people, are to have the solid foundations, the replenishing reservoirs of inspiration and power, essential to the survival and prospering of democracy in America, and indeed throughout the world, they must, in their minds and hearts, their spirits and emotions, recapture and ponder recurrently this vision of man as sinner and as infinitely precious under the judgment and the grace of God.

May this insight into the nature of man and its consequent implications for democracy and the spirit of freedom, which inspired the souls of our Founding Fathers, take deep root in the minds and spirits of all Americans, and above all, of this coming generation of young men and women to whose hands must soon be passed the light which is the light of liberty and of life that is life indeed.

And Still Another Russian Bomber

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 19, 1954

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I respectfully call the attention of my colleagues in this Congress to an article in yesterday's Washington Post and Times Herald by the Alsop brothers, which describes still another Russian jet bomber. This is not the TU-39, comparable to our own B-52, flown over Moscow during the May Day air show. It is the TU-37, comparable to our own B-47 twin-engine jet, to which the groups of our Strategic Air Command are slowly being converted. So far as I know, the information given by the Alsops is the first information published on this Russian bomber.

I do not know where the Alsops got their information. I do know that much, if not most, of our information about Russian strength and Russian aircraft has reached the people of the United States through other than official sources. That does not mean it is any the less correct. Usually a belated official statement confirms what the American people, thanks to the service of the American press, has already known for some time. I do not doubt the information now revealed about the TU-37, that 9 of these bombers have been observed flying in formation together, or that they are coming off the Russian assembly line at the rate of 30 per month.

Nor do I doubt that once again we have made another foolishly optimistic miscalculation about Russian technology, Russian production, and Russian intentions. As usual we have been neglecting research and development while the Russians have forged ahead. This body has just recently approved a cut of over $21 million in Air Force research funds for fiscal year 1955. The Russians have once again achieved a time jump, which gives them the advantage of calling the turns. And if they call for war, our disadvantage in meeting aggression will be even greater than our current disadvantage in trying to keep the peace.

Mr. Speaker, with unanimous consent of my colleagues I wish to insert in the RECORD this latest evidence of Russian Air Force buildup—and American complacency. The article referred to follows:

THE SOVIETS CATCH UP

(By Joseph and Stewart Alsop)

The Soviet heavy bomber program is now approximately 2 years ahead of the schedule forecast for it by the American military intelligence analysis.

Because of this unforeseen success, the air-atomic striking power of the Soviet Union, now being reinforced with hydrogen bombs, may soon be fairly close to catching up with America's air-atomic striking power.

An American lead can no doubt be maintained. But 2 years are perhaps allowed, before this country is as gravely threatened by the Soviet strategic air army, as the Soviet Union is now threatened by our Strategic Air Command.

This short run prospect, combined with the somewhat longer run but no less bleak prospects in the field of intercontinental guided missiles, can be expected to have far-reaching effects on American and free world planning and policy.

The world knows one—but only one—of the facts that form the basis of the foregoing new assessment. In the May Day air show at Moscow, the Red air force somewhat ostentatiously exhibited a new four-engined jet bomber. This plane, called the Tupolev-39, is comparable to our own B-52.

The plane shown was undoubtedly a prototype, but the prototype is thought to have passed the flight test stage. Thus the Tupolev-39 is probably ready to be ordered into full production.

Building this new four-engined jet would have to be regarded as a major and fairly chilling Soviet achievement, even if there were not more of the same.

The real danger signal, however, was not the appearance of the Tupolev-39, which has already been described, but the discovery of the Tupolev-37, which has not been revealed until now.

The Tupolev-37 is also a jet-engined strategic bomber, similar in size to our B-47. Its very large air intakes have caused some argument among the analysts. The point disputed is whether this is actually a two-engined jet, like the B-47, or whether it has two sets of two engines each, coupled together so that each set can be served by a single air intake.

Moreover, nine of these new aircraft have been observed flying in formation together. For this and other reasons, the Tupolev-37 is supposed to be in full production already. Pentagon analysts now give an official estimate that the current output is approximately 30 planes per month.

Our B-47 production rate is of course higher than this; and a good many groups in the strategic air commend have already exchanged the obsolescent B-50's and B-29's for the new twin-engined jet.

But with the Tupolev-37 coming off the line at the rate of 30 per month, the Soviet strategic air army should have something like 720 of these bombers in service at the end of 2 years. By the end of 2 years, the Kremlin will also possess a sufficient stock of atomic and hydrogen bombs. With the new jets plus an adequate stock of weapons of total destruction, Soviet air striking power will become truly decisive.

That does not mean, of course, that all the Soviet Union's strategic air problems are now going to be magically solved. The Tupolev-37's, and perhaps the Tupolev-39's as well, will need refueling to reach American targets, just as the B-47's will need refueling to reach Soviet targets. Refueling has not been practiced by the Russian airmen as long or as intensively as by our airmen.

On the other hand, the unexpected appearance of these planes means that we have made another foolishly optimistic miscalculation. It is very much like the miscalculation that was shown up by the Soviet atomic tests in September 1949. And, in a sense, the results are almost as grave.

With the growth of the stocks of atomic and hydrogen bombs on both sides of the world contest, the power to deliver the weapons of total destruction becomes even more vital than the weapons themselves.

The time jump which the Soviets have achieved is especially significant because of the languid and loitering approach to the gigantic problem of America's air defense. Two years have now passed since the Lincoln project first rendered its famous report, outlining an effective American air defense for the atomic age. Nearly a year has passed since the Bull Report, by the committee that was supposed to lay down the Eisenhower administration's final policy in this matter.

More money is being spent on air defense—spending is probably at the rate of $5 billion a year by now—but the truly essential things have not been done and are not now being done. There is no promise yet of really adequate warning systems or really adequate interception systems for a really adequate command system.

The state of the work on warning systems is illustrative of the state of the whole problem. The earliest possible warning is of course the key to effective air defense. For budgetary and other reasons, however, the administration decided last summer to start by trying to establish an intermediate warning line, the so-called McGill line, crossing Canada at the 57th parallel.

Pernickety negotiations for the establishment of this intermediate warning line have been carried on with the Canadians for many months. There have been difficulties about sending in American personnel to man the radar equipment, about whether the equipment should be made in America or Canada, and so on. The joint Canadian-American establishment of the McGill line has been agreed upon in principle, but the McGill line is not yet being built.

By the same token, Project Corrode was belatedly set up to test the very advanced special equipment advocated by the Lincoln scientists for a much more advanced warning line, somewhere about the 73d parallel. This project has now been brilliantly successful. But until very recently, at least, nothing had been said to the Canadians about extending the warning system to this advanced line.

In this same fashion, the great value of early warning is that it gives you more than one opportunity to knock out the attacker. One fighter plane or rocket may have no more than a 15-percent chance of making a kill. But if the attacker has to run the gauntlet of 5 interceptions by fighters or rockets, his chance of being knocked down will be 75 percent.

Yet no serious effort is being made to fill in behind the McGill line with a net of fighter and rocket bases. Once again, the question has not even been raised with the Canadians, unless this happened very recently. By the same token, a unified continental defense command is plainly needed. But this has neither been mentioned to the Canadians, nor even agreed upon between our own competing services.

In view of all these facts, the question now has to be asked whether the air defense opportunity has not been altogether missed. Two years ago, an all-out effort might have given us an air defense that would save two-thirds or three-quarters of our cities from destruction. With the new Soviet jet bombers already in the air, time may now be lacking to do this vital job.

Add that another feature of the Moscow airshow was the exhibition of an important new night fighter. Add further that the Soviets have been going all out to improve their air defenses since the end of the second war. It can then be seen why the appearance of the Soviet bomber has caused very deep concern.

The Menace of Comic Books

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 28, 1954

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by T. E. Murphy, which recently appeared in the Reader's Digest, which gives an excellent picture of the menace existing today to our juveniles in the form of comic books—many, many of them being depraved pictorial materials of the lowest order.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOR THE KIDDIES TO READ

(By T. E. Murphy)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—T. E. Murphy, columnist and editorial writer for the Hartford (Conn.) Courant, initiated Hartford's crusade against crime comics by writing a column entitled "Design for Murder." His newspaper followed this up with a series of amplifying news stories, while Murphy kept pounding away at the subject in editorials. Hartford's success in getting the worst crime comics off the newsstands is a tribute to the initiative and persistence of this writer and his newspaper.)

It began last December, when a neighbor's child left a couple of comic books at our house. I picked them up casually and began riffling through the pages. I could not have been more startled if I had stepped accidentally on a pair of king cobras. The comic books were loaded with the most depraved pictorial material I had ever seen. "Surely these are not sold in my town," I said unbelievingly. "To our children?"

They were. At the corner drugstore I found counterparts of those two crime comics, and dozens more that contained an equal amount of sewage. I said to the druggist, "Do you know the kind of filth you are selling to the children?" He gestured unhappily. "I don't have time to read them," he said.

That was my first lesson in apathy.

The second was when I spoke to other parents. They shrugged the matter off. Violence, they said, is normal in children. Not until they had seen with their own eyes that it is not violence but abnormality, perversion, and decay that these so-called comics purvey did they begin to awaken. And when they awakened, we succeeded, together, in driving the filthiest of these books off the stands of our city and surrounding towns.

It is not enough to talk about these books. People have to be shown. So, in order to brief myself for my newspaper writing, I have waded through hundreds of comics in recent weeks.

I feel as though I have been trudging through a sewer. Here is a terrible twilight zone between sanity and madness, an area peopled by monsters, grave robbers, human-flesh eaters. Here everything that the human mind has come to venerate and respect through the years of civilization is spat upon and trampled. Here ordinary murder is mild—mix it with sex, mayhem, adultery, patricide, matricide, necrophilia, vampirism. Only in the tamest volumes is a character permitted to die by knife or gun. This is the literary offal we have been permitting a few conscienceless publishers to pour into the minds of our children—for profit.

Here are some sample, run-of-the-mill plots:

Lucy is 10 years old and in the fourth grade. Her parents are not good to her and she would prefer to live with her aunt in a nicer house. Her chance comes when her mother, Mrs. Johnson, starts to elope with a lover. When the two are confronted by Mr. Johnson as they emerge from the house, bags packed, Lucy, watching from a second-story window, picks off her daddy with a .32. The lover runs, whereupon Lucy places the gun in her fainting mommy's hand. Mommy and her lover are later seen in the electric chair. Then, in the finale of Patricide Pays, Lucy is seen smiling and winking because she now lives with her aunt in the nicer house.

That one was available for tiny tots on the newsstands in our town until our recent cleanup—and may be on your newsstand now.

In the same book are also the following stories: (1) A father beats his daughter to death, thinking it is her lover. (2) A man is hypnotized into whipping another to death with tire chains. (The hypnotist is a wronged husband.) (3) A man hires a professional killer to knock off his wife's lover. (A reconciliation brings death to the husband.)

Thus youngsters can obtain four different kinds of intrafamily murder in one 10-cent volume.

Consider then the case of Bloody Mary, also formerly on our stands. Mary chokes her foster mother with a rope, puts the finger on her foster father so that he is sent to the gallows for a crime he did not commit. Later she stabs a psychiatrist and burns his records to conceal her peccadilloes.

In another gem entitled "I Killed Mary" (the name Mary is popular with the purveyors of this literary dung), an inferior boy named Bobby meets a girl named Mary and walks home with her. They stop in a barn because it is raining. There she is shown reclining on the hay. He makes advances to her, but she laughs at the "sissy." Thereupon he picks up an ax and is shown hacking her to death. There is a closeup of the girl's undraped leg as she lies murdered. Later the boy is shown hanging from the rafters of the barn, a suicide.

That book was bought only a few yards from a spot where a 10-year-old girl had been choked to death by a sex pervert just a few days previously.

There were many other detailed recipes for murder on the same newsstand. In one, a detailed drawing showed how to rig a gun on a door so that it would fire on the next person to open the door. Another showed how to follow your wife to the subway platform and force her over the edge by pushing people against her.

One current comic is dedicated frankly "to the kiddies, a revolting yarn reeking with fear." It concerns a wronged husband who makes wife and lover dig their own graves and then kills them. After 10 days the partially decomposed bodies arise—joined together—and pursue the murderer. He fires his gun into the "decaying maggoty flesh," but it "didn't stop—it came groping toward him." The description ends at this point and a witch says, "I wish I could tell you in detail just what Sharon and her lover did to Larry, but how revolting can one get?" We wonder.

One cannot emphasize too strongly the role in these comics of cannibalism—the most deeply rooted of all human taboos. When we cannot be appalled at cannibalism, spelled out to the last bloody detail, what can shock us? Is the day-in, day-out delineation of this subject fit for small children?

Here in a 10-cent book is a dining-room table on which lies a half-eaten human carcass. Here is a half-draped woman—breasts and legs emphasized as usual—and leaning over her is a crone with a cleaver saying she can hardly wait for the nice, soft white flesh. Here is a cover showing a monster telephoning for room service and asking that a bellboy be sent up. Not food, he emphasizes, but a boy—he's hungry.

The prize goes to a crime comic called The Feast of the Ghouls. This concerns a man who, while he neither eats nor drinks during the day, grows fatter and more porcine all the time as the result of his nocturnal activity. Periodically the police are dismayed to find human bodies partially eaten as though by a wild animal. A tidy picture of the corpses in sexes and age groups is shown.

Finally the man invites his niece and his secretary to attend an international gourmets' meeting in Italy. When they arrive they find a table surrounded by fat, hungry-looking men, but nothing on the board. When asked about food, the uncle announces that the niece and the secretary are to be the meal.

Do these rather mild samplings surprise you? The odds are that some of these very books are available to your children. If you are shocked, then you have taken the first step in overcoming the moral apathy that grips us. The second is to pass on your feelings to the man who sells these poisonous tidbits. Suppose he sold poisoned candy to your children. What would you do?

Fortunately, sunlight is a great killer of the enemies of man. Your newsstand can be cleansed by letting in purifying light—by reporting precisely what that stand contains. Go to your pastor, go to your PTA, go to your service organization, go to your newspaper, and demand that this situation be given the sunlight treatment—with these understandings: (1) That many comic books are good (some are educational, others downright funny); (2) that this is not a prudish campaign against cops and robbers, cowboys and Indians (such interests are normal interests of childhood, whereas adultery, necrophilia and cannibalism are not).

When the Hartford Courant decided to let in the sunlight, we jumped in with all the power at our disposal. To start off, we did an almost unprecedented thing for a conservative newspaper—we lowered the masthead of the paper and across the top of page 1, on the biggest circulation day, Sunday, exploded "Depravity for Children, 10 Cents a Copy." With the hard-hitting article which followed was a photomontage showing the covers of the worst of the crime comics.

The effect was immediate and dramatic. Wholesale newsdealers sent notices to retailers to return all books they considered bad. We kept the crusade going with other news stories and editorials. And, in the days that followed, the Courant was able to print headlines like these, referring encouragingly to our surrounding area: "Board of Education, Others, Join Fight on Comics; Haddam Stores Stop Sale of Horror Comic Books; VFW in 30 Towns Backs Fight on Comics Menace; Simsbury KC Cleans Up Comics in Seven Towns; New Britain Comics Drive Begins."

Individuals and groups of individuals had merely been awaiting responsible leadership. And, paradoxically, the happiest men of all have been the newsstand operators. Uniformly their reaction has been: "Good. We're victims of a system. We don't like the dirty books, but how can we check on everything we sell?" In the past, the contest had been going to the makers of these filthy books by default.

Any community can clean up the crime-comic situation if a few responsible people will set themselves to the task. To rail against comic books in general serves no useful purpose. You have to do something about the filthy books in particular. Your hometown newspaper can do the job if you will pitch in and help.

Give the people the specifications, as we have done in Hartford, and the people react, as they always do, on the side of good.

The Importance of the European Defense Community to the Free World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS S. GORDON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 28, 1954

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., United States representative to the United Nations, that appeared in the Department of State Bulletin, May 17, 1954, issue.

I concur in his statements that the formation of a European Defense Community is of the utmost importance to stop the Soviet plans of aggression and of dividing the countries so as to undermine the collective and individual security of the free world.

THE IMPORTANCE OF THE EUROPEAN DEFENSE COMMUNITY TO THE FREE WORLD

(By Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., United States representative to the United Nations)

To me any Franco-American meeting is always something special—something stimulating, interesting, and valuable.

To Americans who think in terms of the arts, of culture, and of graceful living, France is eternally fascinating.

To Americans who think in terms of history, of statesmanship, of strategy, France is eternally important.

Both nations have such strong common interests that it is odd to read in the papers, as we have lately, of those who get discouraged about the situation. To those of us who have known France for a long time it is never possible to get pessimistic, and it is in that spirit, as one who has known France for a long time and who does not get pessimistic, that I speak to you today.

My own associations and memories go back to school days before the First World War. As a boy I played in the Champs Elysees. I saw the annual wreath-laying ceremony at the base of the statue of Strasbourg in the Place de la Concorde and, inescapably, absorbed some of the spirit which that moving event symbolized. I can remember well the strength and vigor of France. In fact, there are events which occurred then which are more vivid to me than many things which happened last week. In particular, I remember the mobilization in 1914 when the drums beat in every French village, when the farmers brought their horses into the central market place to turn them over to the Army and to be branded. It was a drumbeat which marked the beginning of 4 years of heroic fighting by the armies of France—fighting which was in the interests of all free peoples and which was of such bloody intensity that it left its tragic imprint for generations.

So much has been said and written about the fall of France in 1940 that the remarkable resurgence of France and the heroic accomplishments of French resistance after that tragic date are sometimes overlooked.

E

It so happens that I was in the vicinity of Bir Hacheim in the Libyan desert when General Koenig and the Free French made their heroic stand on the southern end of the British minefield against General Rommel's attempt to come around that important flank in the spring of 1942.

Later I was side by side with the French Expeditionary Corps in Italy where it made such a valiant record of vigorous offense.

In the summer of 1944 occurred the landing in southern France, and I went ashore with the troops of the Ninth Colonial Infantry Division which, I believe, was the first French division in the southern France operation to set foot on the soil of France. The French troops liberated Toulon and Marseilles and, with their American comrades in arms, advanced up the valley of the Rhone—and the hospitable welcome which was extended to us Americans by the people of France at that time was something which will always live in our memories. It was intensely memorable and intensely touching.

That hospitable welcome was something unique in my experience. So also was the strength of the French resistance movement. It was so well organized all through that part of France that German forces were in many large areas denied the use of the roads. The French resistance movement was a powerful ally to the armies which were liberating southern France.

Later these French forces grew. They grew into the army detachment of the Alps under the command of General Doyen, which held the Franco-Italian border.

There was also the army detachment of the Atlantic under the command of General de Larminat, which contained the German forces in the Atlantic pockets and eventually destroyed them.

Then there was the First French Army commanded by that great Frenchman, Marshal de Lattre—who was later to become my great friend—which went from the beaches of southern France through the Vosges Mountains and into the heart of southern Germany and Austria. That magnificent army never failed to achieve its objective and carried out every instruction which was given to it in a splendid manner. And, of course, if those French troops had not been there, we here in the United States would have had to supply them ourselves. On their shoulder patch were the arms of the city of Colmar and the words, "Rhin-Danube," and it was in that historic city that Marshal de Lattre decorated me with the Legion d'Honneur and Croix de Guerre with palm, the insignia of which I am wearing here today and which, for the whole of my life, are an honor of unique significance and meaning to me.

HEROISM AT DIEN BIEN PHU

And now the world admires the heroism of French fightingmen at Dien Bien Phu who stand squarely in the tradition of their older brothers at Bir Hacheim and at Colmar and of the French regular army. May God preserve them in safety.

Those days in World War II were very grim and very difficult even when compared with out present state of uneasy peace. Because, even though our present state is distracting and disorderly and often causes us worries and brings sad losses every day in Indochina, it is nonetheless true that a state of honorable peace, however imperfect and even though punctuated with bloody actions like those which took place in Korea and are now taking place in Indochina, is better than all-out worldwide war.

In 1944 and 1945, on the other hand, when we were engaged in an all-out war, the United States commander, General Devers, gave orders to the French under his command and Marshal de Lattre in turn gave orders to a large number of American troops, and in both cases these orders involved loss of life. Yet, in spite of this stark reality, our relations were successful. I often think that, if the Americans and the French could get along as well together as they did in 1944 and 1945, when our relationships involved the actual loss of so much human life, that there could be no valid reason for despairing of solving today's problems, difficult and complicated though they are.

The French record since the end of World War II is as remarkable as its record in its struggle for liberation. We must never forget that we owe primarily to Frenchmen credit for the political initiative, vision, and statesmanship which have gone into the creation of such novel and original political and economic concepts as the European Coal and Steel Community, the European Defense Community, and the European Political Community.

Yet, in the face of this record in war and peace, there are those in both countries who allow themselves to become unduly distressed by the utterances of individual political figures in both countries who do not speak for their own country at all. What a lack of sound judgment it is to allow ourselves to be impressed by these unrepresentative and raucous voices. To do so serves only the Communists—which, of course, is why they call so much attention to them.

It is from this background, beginning in boyhood, going all through my life, and including the terrible days of war, that I am speaking today. It is a background of close association with France under difficult conditions. It is animated by the affection one feels for men and women with whom one has been thrown in good weather and in foul, particularly at those times when the going was rough. There is something special and precious about the affection one feels for persons whose sufferings one knows and whose courage one observes and admires. With friends so close, failure to be frank would be wrong. It is in that spirit that I speak today—and on matters which affect both our countries with equal closeness.

It is in that spirit that I admit at the outset how very difficult are the issues which France confronts and how natural and proper it is for France to be deliberate, to take her time, and to hear all sides of the question.

The problem of Indochina is agonizing. We not only salute the brave Frenchmen who have fallen there; we thoroughly understand the vast importance of Indochina not only to France but to the whole free world. The American people recognize that the French Union forces are fighting a modern Thermopylae—holding off the barbarian hordes who seek to impress free people into tyranny. The United States is determined—working in conjunction with France, with Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia, and with other free nations concerned—to help prevent the spread of the Soviet and Chinese Communist system to southeast Asia.

In Europe the momentous decision concerning the establishment of a common defense community is approaching its culmination. The European Defense Community was proposed by the Government of France. I well remember being in Paris in November 1950 and having Marshal de Lattre outline to me the broad ideas which later became the underlying concepts of the European Defense Community.

This proposal won and continues to hold wide support in the United States and elsewhere.

UNITED STATES-UNITED KINGDOM SUPPORT FOR DEFENSE COMMUNITY

Indeed, within the last week both the United States and the United Kingdom Governments have given the most specific evidence of that support, in the form of solemn assurances from both Governments that they will continue to maintain in Europe such armed strength as may be necessary and appropriate to contribute their fair shares of the forces needed for the joint defense of the North Atlantic area while a threat to that area exists. The two Governments have further reaffirmed their undertaking to regard any action from whatever quarter which threatens the integrity or the unity of the European Defense Community as a threat to their own security.

You have just seen President Eisenhower's personal statement along this line. Thus, those in Europe who have hesitated to support the concept of the European Defense Community because of lack of confidence in American and British support of the European Defense Community should have any last lingering doubts resolved.

Let me review for a moment what the European Defense Community promises, and what might be some of the effects of failure to put it into effective operation.

It is a plan which makes it possible for Germany to contribute to its own defense and to that of Europe in a European rather than in a German national framework.

It offers the prospect of a stable and effective European military system which would permit a practicable defense of central Europe, toward which the United States and other non-European powers could make appreciable contributions.

It thus holds out the hope of providing for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and the broader Atlantic Community a foundation of strength on the continent of Europe.

It is a step toward a state of affairs which would bring France and Germany into a system which would at long last make them partners rather than rivals and in which, therefore, France would no longer need to fear an adversarial relationship with Germany. This in itself is a development of vast significance—in fact it is one the significance of which could literally be measured in terms of centuries.

People distinguished for their logic and their realism can, we hope, see that Germans must participate in the defense of Germany; that, indeed, it would be unjust to France if German nonparticipation caused France to carry an undue part of the load of combat in the tragic event of any future war. The European Defense Community thus represents the best way of bringing about a German defense contribution which is actually indispensable.

The European Defense Community is a military system, the control of which rests in the hands of all its members.

Its establishment would provide effective means to curb, not to incite, military adventures on the part of any of its members if, as appears unlikely, the will for such adventures were somehow to develop.

On the other hand, a failure to establish the European Defense Community would be regarded by the Soviet Union as a victory of epic proportions for her diplomacy and propaganda. Mr. Molotov's refusal at Berlin to take even the slightest step leading to a relaxation of tensions in Europe leaves us no room for doubt that, if the European Defense Community were to fail, the Soviet Union would immediately press forward in every way to achieve its other objectives.

These objectives would certainly include the isolation of each nation of the free world from the other.

After this had been accomplished the Soviet Union would use its subversive tactics against each nation separately having, of course, as the final goal the destruction of all that nation's freedom.

The effectuation of the European Defense Community therefore would be a great step toward defeating the primary Soviet objectives of dividing the countries from each other and of thus undermining the collective and individual security of the free world.

The issues which France confronts today are very difficult and no one who studies them can fail to appreciate their magnitude. But they are the kind of issues which a power wielding real influence in world affairs must meet. And western security efforts cannot possibly be successful if France does not do so. The important role that France is playing in international affairs today is because in her noble history she has met great issues and her friends not only wish and hope—they are confident—that she will continue to do so. The presence and influence of France are essential to the formulation and support of the kind of world for which we are striving.

We are now all traveling together along the road of closer association and cooperation between European countries, which the foresight of French leaders opened up 4 or 5 years ago. We must continue on this road if Soviet aggression is to be prevented and if a strong Europe is to be built. For all these great goals France is indispensable.

I have discussed the signficance of the European Defense Community to France, to Europe, to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, and to Soviet expansionism.

CLOSE UNITED STATES-FRENCH RELATIONSHIP

Let me in closing ask you to look at it from the standpoint of the United States relationship with Europe seen in the light of history.

In our history the importance of France has been manifested many times. It was first shown when France helped us get our independence. Then in this century we Americans have shown by our actions—by the solemn fact that thousands of our young men are buried in France in joint defense of French soil—how important France is to us.

In World War I and World War II, we arrived in Europe after the trouble began. Now we are there already. We have six divisions in Europe. We are there of our own free will—because our French friends wanted us to be there and also because we believed it was in the interest of our own security for us to be there. We want to stay there, and, if conditions are such as to give us a modicum of faith in the future, I believe we will stay there as long as we are needed. And we would do so, I think, for the good and sufficient reason that we are convinced that, if the United States had been in Europe in 1914 and 1939 and if the warlords of those eras had known for sure that we would intervene, then neither the Kaiser nor Hitler would have ever begun their aggressions.

Therefore we feel that the presence of the United States in Europe now is a deterrent to any would-be dictator or warlord.

We point out the following utterly salient and basic fact—that with us in the picture any potential German numerical superiority will be completely balanced.

But, of course, we can only be there as part of a total European defense so intelligently organized that it would in the tragic event of war have a reasonable chance of success.

The question of creating a European defense community is, therefore, a question of the largest moment for all of us. While we naturally understand the emotions which it evokes we regard it as utterly vital to the future of free peoples. We see no acceptable alternative. For these reasons we welcome the decision of the French Government to hold the ratification debate in the immediate future.

I say all this both as a friend of France and as a man with 13 years of service in the United States Senate behind him who took an active part in 1951 in the Senate debate on the sending of the six United States divisions to Europe. These are opinions based on long experience and offered in friendship.

They are offered in the unquestioning faith that our two countries, which have meant so much to each other throughout history, will continue onward together, animated by that belief in the rights of man which has always bound them together.

Report More Munitions Latin America Bound

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 28, 1954

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Herald Tribune of May 22, 1954:

REPORT MORE MUNITIONS LATIN AMERICA BOUND

(By James E. Warner)

WASHINGTON, May 21.—The United States Government has information that other arms-laden ships from behind the Iron Curtain may be on the way to Central America, Representative PATRICK J. HILLINGS, Republican, of California, said tonight.

The State and Defense Departments had no comment on the report, but it is known that this Government is pressing both in this hemisphere and in Europe inquiries into the case of the British-chartered Swedish ship *Alfhem*, which discharged 1,900 tons, or an estimated $10 million worth, of suspected small arms from Stettin, in Red-dominated Poland, at Puertos Barrios, in Guatemala.

"With reports of Russian submarines off the Central American coast, and these reports of additional munitions-carrying freighters en route there," Representative HILLINGS said, "it is imperative that we deny the use of the Panama Canal to any suspicious vessels. It is obvious from recent developments that the Kremlin is stepping up its drive to establish a beachhead on this continent."

While official silence prevailed over what steps, if any, are being taken to prevent a recurrence of the *Alfhem* arms landing, it became obvious that agencies of the United States Government are keeping a sharp eye on such suspect shipping.

A ship was searched in Puerto Rico within the last few days on suspicion of carrying arms, Representative HILLINGS reported. None was found. It was known also to this Government that the itinerary of the *Alfhem*, originally with Dakar as the port of destination, was changed three times while she was at sea.

These developments accompanied a joint announcement by the Departments of State and Defense of the signing yesterday of a bilateral military assistance agreement between the United States and Honduras.

TENTH AGREEMENT

It is the 10th such agreement signed by the United States with Latin American Republics within the framework, both of the Rio de Janeiro Treaty of 1947, and the United Nations Charter. Such treaties previously were signed with Ecuador, Peru, Cuba, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Uruguay, the Dominican Republic and Nicaragua. They result from the continuous planning of the Inter-American Defense Board which sits here.

The two departments, in announcing the signing of the Honduran treaty at a time when attempted Communist penetration of the Western Hemisphere is very much to the fore, said such treaties illustrate the spirit of cooperation prevailing among the American Republics which makes it possible for them to concentrate, through self-help and mutual aid, upon increasing their ability to contribute to the collective defense of the Western Hemisphere.

Best information available to this Government regarding the *Alfhem* cargo is that it contained $10 million worth of small arms and light fieldpieces. The total annual budget of Guatemala is $60 million, so that both the size and the secrecy surrounding the shipment are matters of grave concern to this Government. Originally the shipment showed on the ship's manifest as optical glass and laboratory supplies.

One informed source noted that a Guatemalan diplomat had conceded there were 400 tons of arms in the ship, unloaded under heavy guard under the supervision of the Guatemalan Minister of War, and that 1,900 tons of optical glass and laboratory equipment would supply all the laboratories and equip every Guatemalan with glasses of very thick lenses indeed.

Original sailing orders of the *Alfhem* would have put her in Dakar. Two days out of that north African port the ship was ordered to Curaçao, Dutch West Indies. Two days out of this Caribbean port the ship was ordered to Puerto Cortez, in Honduras. But long before reaching that port the ship was ordered to its final destination, Puerto Barrios, Guatemala.

All these facts were known to the United States Government, it was learned tonight, before it announced arrival of the arms shipment, a development which both the State Department and President Eisenhower have described as serious and grave.

The Superior Virtues of the Common Man

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 28, 1954

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I should like to include an excellent editorial entitled "The Common People?" which appeared in the April 24, 1954, issue of the Framingham (Mass.) News.

This brief but pointed essay very strikingly reminds us that the great heart and soul of America is the united character and courage of the average everyday individual American.

The article follows:

THE COMMON PEOPLE?

Designating a major portion of the Nation's population, the expression, the common people, applies to the millions humble and nameless, who live to serve. They are no strangers to toil, or the burdens which accompany modest circumstances.

Actually, in no sense of the word are they common people except, perhaps, to the extent they are numerous. In all other relationships they are, in fact, superior.

Certainly they are not common in the sense they are inferior as citizens of any community. They are the bone and sinew of society, the bulwark of the Nation. As fighting men in time of war they have never been equaled for bravery and endurance. As neighbors they are understanding and helpful. Whatever the call may be they are found trustworthy.

But they are the constant prey of the uplifters and the do-gooders. Politicians are ever promising to do something about the masses. Once it was said the Lord must love the common people because He made so many of them. In any mixture, human or otherwise, the froth always rises to the top. America will endure because of the strength of the so-called common people, American citizenship at its best.

Remarks on the Supreme Court Decrees Outlawing Racial Segregation, by Hugh G. Grant, Former Member of the State Department in Washington and United States Minister to Albania and Thailand

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. DAVIS
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 28, 1954

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, May 27, Hon. Hugh G. Grant, of Augusta, Ga., delivered a timely and forceful address to the Kiwanis Club of Crawfordville, Ga. Mr. Grant's address deserves more than casual notice. He formerly served in the State Department in Washington, and as United States Minister to Albania and to Thailand.

The subject of this address was the decision of the United States Supreme Court on the segregation question, handed down on May 17.

Mr. Grant's remarks show that he, as do others who understand and respect constitutional government, recognizes this so-called decision to be what it actually is—not the decision of a court performing its duty to decide cases according to the Constitution and laws, but a high-handed and brazen attempt by a group of would-be reformers to palm off on the country something which is not a legal decision at all, but a pronouncement of their own personal philosophy. They have the temerity to proclaim this personal philosophy as the law of the land in the face of an unbroken line of decisions to the contrary. They hurdled this obstacle by saying in effect, What matters it that the law is against us? The law is what we say it is. We herewith change it."

Mr. Speaker, no man or group of men has the right to overthrow our laws by edict. Such action will mean the end of constitutional government, and should not be countenanced or tolerated.

Under unanimous consent previously obtained, I attach Mr. Grant's address herewith as a part of these remarks:

Mr. President, Chairman Portwood, fellow Kiwanians, distinguished guests, it is a privilege and an honor for me to speak to you this evening on a subject which is of the greatest concern to you and to me, to all of the people of Georgia, and to all of the people of the entire South. I shall discuss the Supreme Court decision of May 17, 1954, declaring segregation in the public schools unconstitutional, and the Court's subsequent decision of May 24, 1954, which in effect also outlaws segregation in State-controlled colleges and universities, public-controlled recreational facilities, and low-rent housing projects.

It is especially fitting that I should discuss this grave issue here in Crawfordville, since this was the home of one of the outstanding statesmen of this Nation and a stalwart champion of States rights, the validity of which has been challenged today by the highest Court of the Nation. I refer to your late distinguished son, Alexander H. Stephens, Georgia Congressman and Governor, United States Senator-elect, and Vice President of the Southern Confederacy.

For background purposes, I shall outline the legal aspects of the Supreme Court decisions against racial segregation. Following the defeat of the Confederacy in the War Between the States, there prevailed in the Congress of the United States a spirit of vengeance against the prostrate South and out of this spirit there emerged the 14th amendment to the Constitution. Radical Republican politicians, led by Thaddeus Stevens in the House and Charles Sumner in the Senate, planned to pass legislation under this amendment which would subordinate the State governments to the Federal Government in Washington and place the Republican Party in control of the Nation.

The proposed amendment was first submitted to the States for ratification in June 1866. Thereupon every one of the former Confederate States except Tennessee rejected it. The 14th amendment was therefore defeated since the approval of three-fourths of the States is required for ratification. The vengeful Republican political leaders were not to be denied, however. They adopted ruthless measures of reprisal. The South was placed under rigid military occupation and rule, the white people were disfranchised and the ballot placed in the hands of the former Negro slaves under the direction of avaricious northern carpetbaggers. Under this regime, in 1868, the 14th amendment was resubmitted to the States for ratification. The South was helpless. With the Negroes and carpetbaggers controlling the State legislatures and the United States Army controlling the voting booths the 14th amendment was ratified. As Charles Wallace Collins points out in his noteworthy book, Whither Solid South, the ratification of the 14th amendment in 1868 "was unlawful and in violation of the Constitution."

And yet this 14th amendment to the Constitution forms the legal basis for the Supreme Court decision declaring segregation of the races in the public schools unconstitutional—86 years after the fraudulent ratification of the amendment.

What happened between 1868 and 1954? According to compilation of various Court decisions, outlined to the Senate by Senator DANIEL, of Texas, a few days ago, the Supreme Court, in declaring segregation in the public schools unconstitutional, set aside at least 5 previous Supreme Court decisions, at least 59 State court decisions and at least 13 Federal court decisions which upheld the principle of the legality of separation of the races. The "separate but equal" doctrine in racial relationships was definitely established by the Supreme Court 58 years ago, in 1896, in the case of *Plessy* v. *Ferguson* involving transportation facilities in the State of Louisiana. Since that ruling the Supreme Court has applied the "separate but equal" doctrine in 6 cases relating to public education.

Pursuant to the doctrine of "separate but equal" facilities, the southern States, despite the burden imposed upon them by low-tax-paying Negro citizens, have made tremendous efforts in recent years to improve Negro education. It is significant that the South today spends more than 3 percent of its budget for schools as compared with 2.5 percent for the rest of the Nation. In Georgia, for instance, during 1953–54 the school budget totaled $102 million, of which $99 million was State-appropriated funds. In South Carolina, where the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People initiated one of its cases for integration of the races in the public schools, the State since 1951 has allocated $62 million for Negro-school buildings compared with only $31 million for white-school buildings.

But the Supreme Court, on May 17, 1954, by unanimous decision, threw to the four winds all legal precedents covering nearly 80 years and completely ignored what the States, requiring segregation in the public schools, have accomplished toward providing adequate educational facilities for their Negro populations. Furthermore, the Court in effect established a new national policy of racial integration largely on the basis of certain social concepts, which may be seriously challenged, rather than on the basis of the Constitution and the law. As one well-known correspondent for the New York Times reported from Washington: "The Court's opinion read more like an expert paper on sociology than a Supreme Court opinion." This appraisal hits the nail right on the head. Obviously, the theories of certain so-called social scientists and educational experts, submitted to the Supreme Court by the appellants, loomed large in the Court's ruling. I believe this technique is without precedent in the long history of the United States Supreme Court, which was established under the Constitution to decide litigation on the basis of law.

The plain fact is that in this decree, outlawing segregation in the public schools, the Supreme Court adopted the role of a crusading organization for certain social theories in the field of human relationships. The Court invaded the field of national legislation and it wiped out every vestige of States rights, nullifying not only State laws dealing with the local affairs of the people, but also abrogating certain vital sections of several State constitutions.

My friends, I pose the question: Is this democracy; or is this fascism; or is this communism? I suggest you look up Webster's definition of tyranny and then reflect seriously on what you find. As R. L. M. Parks, editor of the Augusta (Ga.) Chronicle, one of the oldest daily newspapers in the United States, declared editorially on May 20: "If the Supreme Court—on the question of segregation—can nullify the State constitutions, abrogating the rights of the States (reserved to them specifically in both the Article of Confederation and the ratification of the Constitution of the United States), then the Court can further destroy the foundations of representative government in future decisions dealing with matters other than integrating the races in the schools."

There is a strong belief in certain responsible circles in this country, based on documentary evidence compiled by congressional committees investigating subversive activities, that the Communists have played an important role in the campaign for the elimination of segregation in the United States as a part of their subtle technique to weaken this Nation by fomenting internal strife among the American people.

In this connection the assertion is being made today in some quarters that the Supreme Court decree against segregation in the United States has strengthened our position with our allies around the world. This is pure nonsense, in my judgment. On the contrary, we have probably weakened our international position by giving the impression abroad that we are not able to stand on our own feet and carry on our own domestic affairs as we see fit. For instance what right has India, which for a thousand years or more has practiced the most rigid caste system in the world, to comment upon the manner in which we handle our own racial problem? And of all people who should make favorable comment on the Supreme Court decision, the British are the very last, since they have never practiced racial equality in their numerous colonial ventures. Nevertheless, British newspapers were filled with eulogizing editorials of the Court decree.

In these segregation cases the Supreme Court also assumed the role as an arm of the executive branch of the Federal Government since the Court followed the advice of President Eisenhower's Attorney General, Mr. Herbert Brownell. Invited as a "friend of the Court," the Attorney General warned the Court against upholding legislation by the Congress under the 14th amendment in the field of civil rights because of the long line of precedents. Brownell told the Court that it had the judicial power itself to outlaw segregation in the public schools of the States. And that is just what the Supreme Court did in its startling decision declaring public-school segregation unconstitutional. It followed the advice of the Attorney General. Incidentally, it may be pointed out here that it was Attorney General Brownell who made a secret flight to California shortly before the final Court hearings in December of the segregation cases. The purpose of Brownell's flight, the news of which leaked out, was to consult with Governor Earl Warren in regard to possible appointment to the Supreme Court. Warren, whose judicial experience is limited, was subsequently named Chief Justice by President Eisenhower upon the recommendation of Brownell. And it was the new Chief Justice, Mr. Warren, who last week read the opinion of the Supreme Court outlawing public-school segregation.

How many States of the Union are directly affected in this sweeping decree of the Supreme Court? Although only four States, in addition to the District of Columbia, namely, South Carolina, Virginia, Delaware, and Kansas, were involved in the segregation cases brought before the Court by the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, a total of 21 States are affected. Seventeen States have laws requiring segregation in the public schools. These States are Texas, Oklahoma, Arkansas, Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama, Florida, Georgia, South Carolina, North Carolina, Virginia, Tennessee, Kentucky, Missouri, West Virgina, Delaware, and Maryland. The four States having local option on segregation are Arizona, New Mexico, Wyoming, and Kansas. The total population of the States involved is approximatey one-third of the Nation's population, or about 53 million. It is the Deep South, therefore, with its heavy population of white people of Anglo-Saxon stock and large Negro population, which is most seriously affected.

The Supreme Court action against segregation was not a sudden thing. The decrees marked the culmination af a long and powerful propaganda campaign carried on by certain minority elements in the country. Instigating and leading the campaign was the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People which was organized back in 1909. Its headquarters are in New York City, and its leaders, for the most part, are colored men, many of whom are more white than Negro. Walter White, executive secretary of the association over a long period of years, is of this type. These men and their kind are desirous of mixing and mingling freely with members of the white race on the basis of complete social equality, involving every phase of life in the United States. Being denied these privileges through segregation, they have gone into the courts to demand them through Federal coercion. In my judment, these colored leaders are not true representatives of the great mass of pure-blooded American Negroes. In recent years the association has become a powerful political organization, aided very materially by influential members of the white race, including a considerable number of so-called intellectual liberals who have had little or no contract with the pure-blooded Negro.

Another group aiding the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People in its campaign against segregation are white political leaders, representing both the Democratic and Republican Parties in certain northern and eastern States where the Negro holds the balance of political power. In this connection, it is of interest to note that Attorney General Brownell, who has figured so prominently in prosecuting the cases against segregation, made a most significant statement as chairman of the Republican National Committee in a 1944 post-election analysis. Brownell said that "a shift of 303,414 votes in 15 States would have enabled Gov. Thomas E. Dewey to capture 175 additional electoral votes and to win the Presidency with an 8 electoral vote margin." Henry Lee Moone, prominent official of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People and author of the book, Balance of Power—The Negro Vote, points out that "in at least 8 of the 15 States listed by Brownell the Negro vote exceeds the number needed to shift in order to place them in the Republican column."

Is it possible that Attorney General Brownell, close friend and political associate of Gov. Tom Dewey, active participant in the cases against segregation in the public schools as a "friend of the Court" and supporter of Republican Governor Warren for the Chief Justiceship, may be looking ahead at the political possibilities for the Republican Party in 1956?

It is significant that the present Republican administration has been very active in the general campaign to end segregation. In his state of the Union message to Congress last January, President Eisenhower declared that "segregation in the Armed Forces is on the way out." Subsequently in a speech to the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, Mr. Eisenhower pledged that he would do his utmost to bring about racial equality wherever Federal authority extended. The President also told the Negroes that "by and large the mass of Americans want to be decent, good and just, and don't want to make a difference based on the inconsequential facts of color or race." The day following the Supreme Court decree outlawing public school segregation Mr. Eisenhower told the District of Columbia Commissioners that he hoped the National Capital would be a model for other areas that have change-over problems because of the Supreme Court ruling.

Another factor in the campaign for the end of segregation is the acceptance by many people of the theory that racial segregation conflicts with the Christian concept of the "Brotherhood of Man." In my judgment, this theory is a fallacy. Race is a fact—God-made and not man-made. Its recognition is inescapable. No Supreme Court decree or any other edict can eradicate the sharp distinctions between the white and Negro races. The white man has attained his high place in civilization as the result of thousands of years of constant struggle. The American Negro, only a few centuries removed from the primitive, savage state, has developed no civilization of his own. What he has accomplished was acquired through copying the white man's custons and skills here in the United States. He has made splendid progress. One needs only look about him to see the ever-increasing signs of Negro prosperity—expanding individual incomes, ownerships of homes and automobiles, new modern housing facilities and appliances, greatly increased farm ownership, 50 percent increase in industrial workers, increase in life expectancy—are only a few of the gains for the American Negroes. And this has been accomplished under the system of racial segregation. I believe that the American Negro will achieve greater progress if he is allowed to develop along the lines of his own special racial characteristics, many of which are admirable and unique. There is a distinct advantage in the opportunity for members of a race to compete with their own kind. Integration of the races in public schools and in recreational activities, as ordered in the Supreme Court decrees, will destroy this wholesome competitive spirit and at the same time accentuate the emotions of racial inferiority and superiority. This would be true, especially where large numbers of both races are thrown together.

Some years ago while I was a member of the Alabama State Department of Education, I had several interesting contacts with the late Dr. Robert R. Moton, president of Tuskegee Institute for Negroes and successor to the founder of the institute, Booker T. Washington. I recall vividly one particular conversation. Dr. Moton, a fine looking pure-blooded Negro, told me that he took pride in the fact that he was a member of the Negro race, that his ambition was to make a contribution toward the development of his race here in America and that he believed sincerely that the best way to achieve this objective was through segregation, which would enable the Negro to develop his own talents.

My friends, in the time allotted to me for the discussion of the recent Supreme Court decisions it is not possible to cover the entire subject since there are many angles and wide ramifications. Let me emphasize one point, however. If these Court decrees become effective after the further Court hearings next October for their implementation, the people of this Nation will witness the beginning of a revolutionary movement that will produce immediate chaos, strife, and possible bloodshed, and, ultimately, mongrelization.

Make no mistake about it, we are faced with a crisis, the like of which has not existed since the War Between the States. We are rather easy-going, unsuspicious people here in the South and as the result we have been unmindful of the evil forces at work against us. The agitators for the end of racial segregation, highly organized and well financed, have been boring both from within and without for a considerable period of time. They now have the full backing of the highest judicial body in the Nation and the executive department of the Federal Government. They are also supported by certain powerful newspapers, magazines, press associations, and radio facilities. The Negro agitators of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People are boastful and defiant. They held a meeting in the heart of the South, Atlanta, last Saturday. One of the most prominent members boasted that they were meeting in the backyard of Gov. Herman Talmadge, of Georgia, who had dared to speak out courageously against the Supreme Court action.

The great propaganda campaign against segregation has been stepped up since the Court rulings. News and radio reports have been slanted in some instances to make it appear the South will take this thing lying down. To the fainthearted the obstacles may seem insurmountable, but no war is lost until the last battle is fought.

If you believe as I do, that no group of men, not even the Supreme Court, has the legal, moral, or any other right to overthrow, by edict, the long-established social customs of a people who comprise approximately one-third of this Nation's population—then the time has come to stand up and be counted.

Immediate steps should be taken to organize citizens at the grass-roots level—here in Taliaferro County, in every county in Georgia, in every county in every southern State. Petitions and resolutions should be drawn up on a countrywide basis for the signatures of citizens who pledge their active support in the campaign against integration of the races. The county organization should cooperate actively with the appropriate State officials in formulating plans to resist the Supreme Court decrees.

I would like to emphasize my belief that the plan to integrate the races can be prevented only on a statewide basis and not through local, informal agreements between members of the two races. There must be unity of purpose and a unified plan of action for the whole State. No piecemeal methods will suffice.

With a view to encouraging unified action throughout the several States involved in the Supreme Court rulings, county organizations should contact the appropriate State officials, as well as members of their congressional delegation in Washington, pledging support to an active campaign to embrace all of the affected States.

In conclusion, I suggest that your splendid county of Taliaferro, the home of that great champion of States rights, Alexander H. Stephens, would be a fitting community to launch a southwide grassroots movement. I am confident that the frail little man, with the giant mentality, were he here today, would be in the front ranks in this battle for the rights of the people to carry on their local affairs without Federal interference.

The Traditionally High Morale of Our Armed Forces Must Be Maintained

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 28, 1954

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I should like to include a very pertinent and timely editorial entitled "A Serious Drop in Reenlistments," which appeared in the April 28, 1954, issue of the Worcester (Mass.) Evening Gazette.

The essay outlines the difficulty our various military services are having in obtaining the reenlistment of trained service people and pointedly reminds us that our national security depends upon finding ways and means to make military service more attractive to prevent an even deeper decline in the alarmingly low morale of our Armed Forces.

The article follows:

A SERIOUS DROP IN REENLISTMENTS

What has happened to the great appeal of the wild blue yonder?

Young men used to clamor for admission to the "hot hat" branch of the military service. They were needed and they did a great job as America organised the world's greatest air force.

Today the need for a United States Air Force second to none is vital. When you come right down to it, the survival of the free world depends upon it. We are trying to build one now that will be capable of hitting enemy bombers before they leave their bases.

But Air Force reenlistments are down—from 66 to 33 percent. The reason, according to Air Force Secretary Talbott, is dissatisfaction over pay, which is said to be below the standards of commerce and industry.

The nature of modern military aviation is such that there is a greater need than ever for career men in the Air Force. It takes a full 4-year enlistment before a man becomes an effective operator of the intricate bombsight in new jet bombers. More than 4 years are needed to produce trained B-47 combat pilots and crews. If they fail to reenlist, the replacement cost is highly expensive.

The same problem also plagues the Army and Navy. But in view of the importance of the air arm in the first 24 hours of world war III, the administration would do well to start with the Air Force in a serious study of ways to boost the badly sagging morale of the Armed Forces.

More or Less Bang for a Buck

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENDERSON L. LANHAM

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 28, 1954

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, with leave to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am including an editorial which appeared in the Wall Street Journal for Friday, May 28, entitled "More or Less Bang for a Buck."

I heartily agree with this editorial which reinforces the position that I and other southern Congressmen and Senators have taken in opposition to the administration's proposal to set aside certain portions of purchases for our defense program to be channeled into distressed labor areas. The argument of this editorial is unanswerable and the fact that only $163,000, of such contracts have been awarded is further proof of the unworkability of the program and the handicap it places upon defense procurement officials.

The editorial follows:

MORE OR LESS BANG FOR A BUCK

The administration has two announced policies about defense spending. One is the New Look which was set to give the taxpayers, as one of the administration phrasemakers had it, "more bang for a buck." The other policy is to funnel into distressed labor areas preferential contracts at something higher than the lowest competitive bid.

The administration decided on the latter policy last November when there was talk about a recession. Figures released by the Defense Department for the 1954 first quarter indicate that the preferential idea hasn't worked too well so far. For one thing, it takes time to get the word out to all procurement officers. For another, there seems to be some resistance by the military services to the program. In any case, only $163,000 in preferential contracts were awarded to so-called distressed areas while the same areas won some $34 million in contracts on competitive bids during the period.

The preferential program works like this: For areas where there is a labor surplus—where there is 6 percent or more of the labor force unemployed—as much as one-third of a procurement order can be set aside. But firms in distressed areas that want a crack at these preferential contracts must first bid on the other two-thirds. After these are awarded to low bidders, the procurement officers may then award the balance to the low bidder in the distressed areas, provided his bid is not more than 20 percent above the competitive price.

Let's see how this theory would work at its worst: One-third of all Defense Department buying would cost 20 percent more than the other two-thirds. Average it out, and the overall cost is hiked roughly 7 percent. During the first quarter of 1954 the Defense Department let contracts totaling $4 billion. Seven percent of $4 billion amounts to $280 million. Either the Defense Department would have had to spend $280 million more on these goods or it would have had to buy $280 million less of them. In any case the $280 million is lost one way or another. Considerable bang can be bought for 280 million bucks.

We think the preferential program is wrong for a number of reasons. There is no argument we know of that can make it right to penalize the Defense Department in its buying in order to aid any section of the country over another section. It would be more honest for the administration to ask the Congress for outright handouts for all businesses and all laborers in distressed areas. Another reason preferential contracts are wrong is that the ultimate cost to all taxpayers will go higher as the system is more successful. And is the Defense Department to figure into its budgets for the next fiscal year the possibility that one-third of its contracts might go 20 percent higher than the other two-thirds?

We see no way for the services to escape this unless the Nation is to get not more bang for the buck but less bang because there aren't enough bucks.

The American Merchant Marine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARK W. THOMPSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 28, 1954

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this Nation has long since learned that a strong merchant marine is essential to our Armed Forces in time of war. We are too prone to forget that we should keep this part of our national defense strong and active in time of peace. Our security in the world will be immeasurably strengthened if we maintain a close relationship with other nations through well-balanced trade and commerce.

I have just read a prize-winning essay on the subject of our merchant marine. It was written by a constituent of mine, Leonard J. Becker, Jr., a student in Ball High School in Galveston, Tex. The essay won first prize in the local Propeller Club annual contest and when it was entered in the national contest, it was also adjudged the winner.

The thoughs expressed are particularly timely now as the Congress weighs the subject of reciprocal trade and its many ramifications. It is, therefore, my pleasure to insert the essay in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD where it may be studied by Members of Congress and the general public:

THE AMERICAN MERCHANT MARINE: LIFELINE OF INDUSTRY

The sea is the universal highway of the globe and a source of great political strength and of immense wealth. It is the parade ground of nations whereon the wealth, the skill, the hopes and dreams of mankind pass and repass. Since the dawn of history new ideas, new cultures, colonizations, industrial progress have flourished and have spread themselves to the extent that they were seaborne. Even in this air age, we look today to our two oceans as our main avenues of trade and our first bulwarks of defense.

Merchant shipping is without doubt the oldest of the great industries in America for it was in ships that the first colonists came to this country, and ever since, maritime commerce has been an important element in our national economy. When the *Virginia*, a small but important ship was launched from the shores of Jamestown, the settlers did not realize that from this meager beginning would arise a merchant fleet powerful enough to distribute the manufactured goods of the world's greatest industrial nation and to sustain freedom for the peaceloving peoples of the world by helping to win two World Wars and reconstruct war-torn Europe and Asia.

Yearly United States industry breaks past records of production by turning out more, better, and newer articles. However, this manfacturing record depends on the merchant fleet to bring in the raw materials and to transport the finished products to both foreign and domestic markets. Our industries need imports of raw materials and the only safe, efficient, and dependable way to secure these materials is by ships of the American merchant marine. For example, they keep our factories supplied with tin to preserve foods, copper to carry electrical currents, chrome for our autos, and tungsten for industrial machinery. Then we like sugar with our coffee, both of which we import in almost 100 percent quantities. Rubber in cushioning and aluminum in cooking help make our everyday life easier. For the treatment of cancer and tumors we use cobalt which comes to us from beyond our borders. Burlap and hemp are important factors in transportation services, and silk and Irish linens are necessary to the clothing industries. Thus the American merchant marine by its role as carrier of imports plays an indispensable part in keeping American factories open and operating at full capacity.

On the other hand the American merchant marine transports tons of finished products. Thousands of new autos and trucks take to the road in foreign countries each year because our ships have put them there. About 30 percent of our farm machinery output is sold abroad; American textiles find an outlet in foreign clothing markets, and our farm products help feed hungry people all over the world. Thus our merchant marine is the transporter and distributor of the products of the American industries.

In every port and city of the free world, United States manufactured goods can be found. Besides adding revenue to industry, our foreign markets help to dispose of the surplus manufactured goods which American industries mass produce, thereby lowering the unit cost of production. Low prices mean much to the competing businesses as well as to the consumer.

Jobs and employment are always plentiful when we have a favorable balance of trade and for that reason many citizens depend for their paychecks on regular shipments of raw materials and quick delivery of manufactured goods. Shipping provides 300,000 jobs in machinery manufacturing; the trade and service enterprises make 305,000 jobs available; transportation companies require 225,000 employees while chemical plants need 100,000 workers. These are only a few of the many jobs made possible because we are a maritime Nation with its own merchant service.

Those in industry know that the foreign commerce of the United States could never have reached its tremendous importance without ships owned and operated by the American merchant marine. They further realize that merchant shipping has been used by all powerful nations as an instrument of national policy. Also, our merchant vessels are vital to our high standard of living because our way of life is dependent on two-way trade for which we must have a strong and efficient merchant fleet.

There are several advantages of shipping in our own vessels. First of all, the seamen are paid wages in American dollars and this means they receive the high wages in proportion to our high cost of living. Second, they spend their money in this country, thus returning the business to American merchants whereas seamen of foreign-flag ships are paid in foreign ports and likewise spend their money there. Third, our ships are regulated by very strict maritime laws, such as yearly inspection in drydock thus preventing mishaps at sea and a loss to our merchants. A person almost never hears of an American ship losing its propeller at sea.

Then too, ships flying Old Glory insure continued delivery of our goods, both imports and exports. This is vital to industry for delay or stoppage in delivery of goods can cause depression in industry. Our American steamship lines make freight agreements with our industries to provide regular freight service regardless of whether or not the ship is fully loaded.

American vessels in trade constantly improve the service given to importers and exporters for our boats are by far the best manned and our port facilities unmatched. Because the competition is keen, all cargo and service lines strive to please and accommodate our merchants.

The American merchant marine is truly the "lifeline of industry." It brings together our factories and the raw materials of the world; it is the link between the producer and the consumer; it is the lifeline through which flows the finished product to both foreign and domestic markets; and finally, in the event of war, by transporting men and materials wherever needed for defense, the American merchant marine can instantly become the lifeline of the Nation itself.

We Can Cut Spending—Proof of the Pudding

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1954

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, our Secretary of the Treasury, George M. Humphrey, has announced that the administration plans to cut expenditures by more than $5 billion during the coming fiscal year beginning July 1, above and beyond the $7 billion cut during the present year. Mr. Humphrey's announcement is all the more remarkable in view of the serious military complications created by the war in Indochina and the belief that heavy defense spending would throw plans for further savings completely out of gear.

Nevertheless, the Secretary's authority to speak is unquestioned and his views carry even more weight because he is a member of the National Security Council and is therefore a party to all defense-spending plans and commitments. As the "key economy" in the Western World, Mr. Humphrey observed, our soundness will determine the strength of the "whole free world."

In the last year of Mr. Truman's administration, our deficit was almost $9½ billion. The budget prepared by Mr. Truman for the incoming Eisenhower administration proposed another estimated deficit of some ten billions. President Eisenhower and his Cabinet chopped away at the figures and in the first full year of the present National Government the deficits has come down to less than 4 billions for the fiscal year 1954 ending this June. The folks in the Democratic Party who said it could not be done know now that it could be done and that it has been done. On this topic, if on no other, they are literally speechless.

St. Louis Flood Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 28, 1954

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to authorize the construction of certain public works on the Mississippi River for the protection of St. Louis, Mo., at an estimated cost of $112,880,000.

This bill is substantially similar to one introduced in the Senate yesterday by the senior Senator from Missouri, the Honorable THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR., and to a companion measure being introduced in the House by my colleague who represents the district adjoining mine in St. Louis, Congressman FRANK KARSTEN. We are all deeply interested in this project and anxious to see it carried through at the earliest possible moment.

I am hopeful that the necessary administrative work in connection with the necessary clearances of this project can be completed in time for us to try to get this bill considered as part of the omnibus flood control authorization measure now being drafted in the House Committee on Public Works. To that end, I am writing to the Chief of Engineers and to the Secretary of the Army urging their prompt action on the favorable report submitted by the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors. That is a necessary preliminary to obtaining consideration of the project by the House committee.

I am also going to write to the Governor of Missouri and urge prompt action on the part of the State agencies in acting on the report when it is submitted to them. If all of these preliminaries can be accomplished quickly, there is a chance we can get it considered this year. I am certainly going to strive for that.

The project as contemplated by the Army engineers provides for construction of levees, floodwalls, pumping facilities, and related works for Reach 3, Maline Creek to Franklin Avenue, and the Chain of Rocks Waterworks, and Reach 4, Poplar Street to the vicinity of Chippewa Street. It is intended to afford protection against a peak stage of 52 feet on the Market Street gage. There will be some local expenditures necessary in connection with the project, of course, with the Federal Government, however, underwriting the cost by more than $112 million.

E

Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks I include some of the communications I have received from interests in St. Louis endorsing this project and urging its approval:

SMITH-SCHARFF PAPER CO.,
St. Louis, Mo., May 14, 1954.
Congresswoman LEONOR SULLIVAN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MADAM: You no doubt are aware of the dire need of flood protection the city of St. Louis needs in the years to come and now that the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors has approved the St. Louis flood protection plan, we urge that you see that the project is included in the current omnibus bill and work for its early authorization.

Thanking you, I remain
Sincerely yours,
SMITH-SCHARFF PAPER CO.,
IRA HOPKINS, *General Manager.*

PECK'S PRODUCTS CO.,
St. Louis, Mo., May 14, 1954.
Congresswoman LEONOR SULLIVAN,
House Office Buiding,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN SULLIVAN: May I call to your attention that recently the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors has approved the St. Louis flood protection plan.

This protection is vital for all St. Louis. As you know, a river stage over 48 feet will seriously cripple St. Louis industry. At 52 feet of river, and it can happen as shown by the Corp of Engineers estimates, the Kansas City disastrous flood would be minor in comparison.

I urge you to do your utmost to include this appropriation in the current omnibus bill and help us receive early authorization.

It will take a long time to build this protection and the earlier work can start, the quicker all of us here in St. Louis can feel safe from the almost annual floods.

Your cooperation and help will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,
PECK'S PRODUCTS CO.,
A. G. PECK

HERMANN OAK LEATHER CO.,
ST. LOUIS, MO., May 14, 1954.
Congresswoman LEONOR SULLIVAN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN SULLIVAN: We are writing you in reference to the St. Louis flood protection plan which has been approved by the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors. We would like to see the project included in the current omnibus bill now before Congress.

The importance of an appropriation for this protection to the citizens and industry of St. Louis is unparalleled. Damage to property from a flood would be extremely high and the unhealthy condition created would be even worse for our people.

Sincerely yours,
HERMANN OAK LEATHER CO.,
CHAS. E. KASSEBAUM,
Vice President.

ST. LOUIS, MO., *May 14, 1954.*
Congressman LEONOR SULLIVAN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Please help us keep the Mississippi River out of our plant by doing what you can to have the St. Louis flood protection plan included in the current omnibus bill.

Thank you.
S. C. TRACY,
Vice President and Treasurer, Nooter Corp.

ST. LOUIS, MO., *May 14, 1954.*
Congresswoman LENOR SULLIVAN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Your careful and prompt attention to the $120 million St. Louis flood protection plan in clearing an appropriation in current omnibus bill is not only of extreme importance to our company, but for our employees as well. At approximate 42-foot flood stage our employees lost in excess of 5,100 man-hours and our company incalculable revenues. Over a period of years our Federal, State, and city government should recover more than present outlay recommended by board of engineers through elimination of the terrible waste and financial losses caused by floods here in St. Louis.

AARON FERER & SONS.

GAINES HARDWOOD LUMBER CO.,
St. Louis, Mo., May 18, 1954.
Hon. LEONOR SULLIVAN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE SULLIVAN: I respectfully refer to the most gratifying news recently released of the approval, by the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, of the St. Louis flood protection plan estimated to cost $120 million. Those of us who have been valiantly fighting for this protection during the past 5 years are tremendously encouraged by having cleared the most important hurdle.

The St. Louis Flood Control Association has, since its inception 7 years ago, devoted untiring effort to obtain this protection for St. Louis, which is the only major city in the Missouri-Mississippi Valley that has absolutely no flood protection of any kind.

We have had four disastrous floods during the years 1943, 1944, 1947, and 1951, and each flood was invariably higher than the previous one, the highest being in 1951 of approximately 40.3 feet on the St. Louis gage.

The Corps of Engineers inform us that they have never had, since 1844, a considerable volume of water pass St. Louis and that if we ever do attain that 1844 volume, it could reach a stage of 47 feet or more. The consequences of such a disaster would be unbelievable. It would be a national catastrophe.

I respectfully urge that you do everything within your power to include this project, in whole or in part, in the current omnibus bill. It would be one of the greatest things that ever happened to the city of St. Louis. I know that you are aware of the urgency of this protection.

Thank you very much for your favorable consideration.

Yours truly,
HARRY D. GAINES,
President, Gaines Hardwood Lumber Co.

M. A. BELL CO.,
St. Louis, Mo., May 18, 1954.
Congresswoman LEONOR SULLIVAN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MADAM: It has been called to my attention that the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors has approved the $120 million St. Louis flood-protection plan.

This project can be included in the current omnibus bill for authorization and appropriation at the present session of Congress. We are anxious that you support this project for the flood control in St. Louis.

No doubt you are aware of the amount of damage the Mississippi River causes at flood-time. Inasmuch as we are located two blocks from the banks of the river, we are more aware of the danger at the time of high water. Not only is damage done to buildings and property, but many men are kept idle, merchandise destroyed, plants shut down, which makes for loss of sales to the plants located along the river in St. Louis. One only needs to experience the hazards of the flood and until he has such an experience he never will be able to realize the amount of damage caused.

It is our urgent hope that you will support this project.

Yours very truly,
M. A. BELL CO.,
E. C. LENZI, *Auditor.*

MONSANTO CHEMICAL CO.,
St. Louis, Mo., May 19, 1954.
Hon. LEONOR SULLIVAN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MRS. SULLIVAN: On April 29, 1954, the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors approved a flood-protection plan for the city of St. Louis. It is my understanding that this project is now ready to be submitted to the Appropriations Committee for inclusion in the current omnibus bill to be presented to the present session of Congress.

I am sure you realize the urgency of getting this project under way. Not only will it afford protection for the city's water supply, but it will provide protection for the vital industries along the riverfront and will provide insurance against periodic unemployment of those persons employed by those industries.

I join with many others in urging you to see that this project is included in the current omnibus bill and to work for its early authorization by the Congress.

Very truly yours,
F. E. WISELY,
Design Manager, Engineering Department.

UNIVERSITY CITY, MO., *May 20, 1954.*
Mrs. LEONOR SULLIVAN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN: In the past few years St. Louis has had serious experience in the matter of floods. I know it is unnecessary to tell you that the many levees and other work in the Missouri and Mississippi Valley areas only tend to increase the flood hazards for our city.

Recently the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors approved the $120 million St. Louis flood-protection plan, and it is the ardent hope and wish of all of us who are aware of the conditions that could come to us in the event of a repetition of the 1844 flood that the project as approved by the Board of Engineers can be included in the current omnibus bill for authorization and appropriation at the present session of Congress.

The protection which is proposed, I feel quite sure, is the minimum and is urgently needed in view of property loss, business loss, to say nothing of the possible effect upon health and other conditions, if a maximum flood should occur—and it can.

May I urge upon you to do all that you possibly can in the interest of having this project included in the current omnibus bill and your full support toward its early authorization in the Congress.

With assurances of deep appreciation,
Sincerely yours,
ALFRED HIRSH.

CRUNDEN MARTIN MANUFACTURING CO.,
St. Louis, Mo., May 21, 1954.
Congresswoman LEONOR SULLIVAN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN: The Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors have now approved the $120 million St. Louis flood-protection plan and we owe a lot to the St. Louis Flood Control Association for what they have done in bringing this important protection to St. Louis.

It is now up to you to help us by including this project in the current omnibus bill for authorization and appropriation in the present session of Congress. We need it badly in St. Louis and I hope that you will do your part in helping us having it included.

Sincerely yours,

Crunden Martin Manufacturing Co.,
Arthur S. Kendall, *President*.

Monsanto Chemical Co.,
St. Louis, Mo., May 24, 1954.

Hon. Leonor Sullivan,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mrs. Sullivan: The current flood protection plan for the city of St. Louis, as approved by the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, will provide many benefits for the city and for the many vital industrial plants and their employees, who have in the past been affected by floods. The St. Louis plant of the Monsanto Chemical Co. is one of the largest plants so affected, since its employees number in excess of 2,000 persons.

I am informed that prompt action by the Congress will allow this project to be started soon. Since urgency of this flood-protection system is without question, I urge you to lend your full support to it, and to work for its early authorization by the Congress.

Very truly yours,

Chas H. Sommer,
Vice President.

A Shot in the Arm for the New York Naval Shipyard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1954

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, on several occasions, fighting for their very bread and butter and the very bread and butter of their colleagues, representatives of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers have called on this office to help give the New York Naval Shipyard a good shot in the arm with adequate work assignments now going to private shipyards to the detriment of the New York shipyard and its professionally trained personnel. Here follows, under unanimous consent, the story of the situation as presented by Mr. Joseph Perry, chairman of the brotherhood:

International Brotherhood of
Electrical Workers,
Local Union No. 664,
New York, N. Y.

Hon. Alfred D. Sieminski,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Sir: For a considerable number of years this shipyard has maintained a fairly uniform work force on the basis of having major work assignments for the conversion and modernization of aircraft carriers, together with many relatively shorter work assignments consisting of voyage repairs, maintenance, and alterations to naval vessels ranging from the tugboats to aircraft carriers and battleships. At present, due to the Navy Department's policy of assignment of a larger portion of naval work to private shipyards, the New York naval shipyard has suffered from sharp reductions in workload with corresponding reductions in manpower. In the last few months these reductions in manpower have resulted in rather frequent layoffs among various trades. The workload scheduled for the shipyard for the next several months is so low that the employees generally anticipate much more serious reductions in force. This has, of course, adversely affected the morale of shipyard employees.

Although the shipyard has begun the construction of the aircraft carrier, CVA 60, there is the need of further work assignments at the present time. This need exists because the CVA 60, at the present time, can only be worked on by the so-called "hull" trades which fabricate and erect the shell of the ship and compartmentation within the vessel. The so-called outfitting trades which include machinists, pipefitters, and electricians, etc., cannot begin any appreciable amount of work until the shell, compartmentation and decking have been further completed. It is expected that the peak of manpower workload for the outfitting trades, on the CVA 60, will not be reached until June 1955.

At the present time, merely a token force from each of the outfitting trades can be employed aboard the incomplete vessel. The number of employees in these outfitting trades assigned to work on the CVA 60 will increase at a very slow rate until November 1954, when the rate of increase will become much greater. A corresponding decline will be affected with hull trades.

The workload on the CVA 14, the only other major work assignment in this shipyard, is decreasing at present with a corresponding reduction in the work force assigned to that vessel. The rate at which the working force on the CVA 14 is being reduced is more rapid than the increase on the CVA 60. Consequently, all of the manpower released from the CVA 14 cannot be absorbed on the CVA 60. The scheduled commissioning date for the CVA 14 is September 11, 1954. After commissioning, only a very small number of men will be required to complete minor items of work. This small number will in turn be gradually reduced until October 1954 when the CVA 14 will be completed.

Repairs to miscellaneous vessels, which in previous years were a significant factor in the New York Naval Shipyard's workload, are virtually nonexistent at the present time. Approximately 75 men or less of all trades are employed in this kind of work at the present time. Additional repair work is scheduled for the latter part of 1954. However, that work will be available too late in the year to avoid anticipated layoffs resulting from lack of work.

A broad analysis of the workload and manpower picture for the New York Naval Shipyard is offered here.

It is noted that the New York Naval Shipyard has, at present, approximately 17,500 employees. The analysis for the next 6 months offered below is based on shop 51, the electric shop, which employs approximately 700 people, at the present time. The electric shop, one of the oufitting shops, in recent months has been the predominantly leading shop in reducing its work force. Usually the other outfitting shops follow the same pattern. The workload chart for May, June, and July 1954 is fairly level and will probably require no layoff. In August 1954, the workload chart takes a very sharp dip which indicates a layoff of 100 men in shop 51 alone. In September, the workload remains low. However, in October 1954, the electric shop will probably be compelled to recruit additional electricians. In November 1954 the workload increases at a more rapid rate with an anticipated increase in work force until June 1955 when it is estimated approximately 1,400 employees will be required by shop 51 alone.

A review of the decrease in workload, with a corresponding decrease in manpower requiring additional layoffs of approximately 100 men in August 1954 and a subsequent increase in the month of October 1954 and continuing through June 1955, invites a review of the cost of laying off Government employees and reemploying the same or other individuals shortly thereafter. In this connection the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, on page 76 of their Report No. 2102, ordered printed on July 4, published an analysis of the cost of a typical agency's reduction in force. That report shows that the cost to the Government of laying off 1 employee in a reduction-in-force procedure varies from $425 to $97 per position, or an average of approximately $260 per position. The anticipated layoff of 100 employees of shop 51 alone, therefore, would cost the Government approximately $26,000 in nonproductive effort. This estimated Government cost omits the hidden cost to the Government which results from the reduction in morale of the employees directly affected by reduction in force, as well as the remaining morale of the employees whose morale is also adveresly affected. At approximately $20 per day, the average pay of an electrician, the Government could obtain 1,300 man-days of productive labor with no total increase in expenditure if work could be found for these 100 men instead of laying them off. The other side of the picture is the anticipated reemployment of the same number of employees beginning in October 1954 and the anticipated need for hundreds more of the same craft. No estimate is available to us at this time as to the average cost of employing the additional help needed. Such cost would include the recruitment process, interviews, medical examination, indoctrination, issuance of safety equipment, training or retraining in procedures and methods currently employed on naval vessels, etc. It is conservative to estimate this cost at, roughly, the equivalent of the cost of laying off an employee. Consequently, avoiding any layoff of the anticipated 100 men should make available to the Federal Government at least an additional 2,600 man-days of productive work in lieu of the cost of reemploying the same number of people. As it is recognized that insecurity of employment with any employer adversely affects the manpower marked for additional recruitment, it can be anticipated that the cost of the scheduled further recruitment of electricians for employment in the New York Naval Shipyard will become increasingly expensive. No estimate of this increased cost is attempted.

Several proposals are offered to resolve the problem created by the lack of work in the period from August through October 1954. They are as follows:

(a) The CVA 20, U. S. S. *Bennington*, is scheduled to have canted deck installed in the New York Naval Shipyard beginning November 15, 1954. That work assignment will be available too late to avoid a reduction in force as a result of the critically low level of work at this shipyard. Instead, the CVA 20 will require the reemployment of approximately the same number of people laid off in August 1954. If the Navy Department were to reschedule the CVA 20 to be available in New York in July 1954, it is estimated no reductions will be required in this typical shop.

(b) Two vessels of the CVA 42 class are scheduled to have canted decks installed, but they have not been assigned (to best of our knowledge) to specific shipyards. If one of these vessels could be available to the New York Naval Shipyard in June 1954, the problem of finding work to maintain the current work force would be resolved.

(c) The CVA 40, the U. S. S. *Tarawa*, is expected to arrive at the New York Naval Shipyard for an availability in September 1954. Whatever work is to be done on that vessel could be better utilized to alleviate the manpower workload situation if the vessel were to arrive in August 1954.

(d) If the budget permits expenditures for class 27C conversions and one such vessel could be assigned to this shipyard in June or July 1954, or as soon as possible, the workload difficulties would be solved for the next 18 months. The following vessels (to the best of our knowledge) are due for class 27C conversions: CVA 13, U. S. S. *Franklin;* CVA 16, U. S. S. *Lexington;* CVA 17, U. S. S. *Bunker Hill;* CVA 21, U. S. S. *Boxer;* CVA 32, U. S. S. *Leyte;* CVA 37, U. S. S. *Princeton;* CVA 40, U. S. S. *Tarawa;* CVA 45, U. S. S. *Valley Forge;* CVA 47, U. S. S. *Philippine Sea.*

(e) In addition to class 27C conversions, the above listed vessels do not have canted decks. This is a separate job not part of class 27C conversion. Obviously, the installation of a canted deck on any of these vessels would be significant contribution to the workload at the New York Naval Shipyard.

The U. S. S. *Missouri* is scheduled for an inactivation (mothball job). If this would be assigned to the New York Naval Shipyard at an early date it could solve the workload dip.

It is requested that sufficient work be sent to the shipyard within the next 3 months so that the present work force can be maintained without causing hardship among the men by laying them off for short periods when the same and more manpower will be needed shortly thereafter. From a management standpoint it would be more efficient to retain the same people on board instead of attempting to recruit even the same number at a later date, when some of the more efficient people will have been able to find employment elsewhere and may refuse to return to the shipyard.

It must be reemphasized that in the above analysis the electric shop has been used as a typical example of anticipated workload and manpower needs within the next 6 months. The assignment of vessels to the New York Naval Shipyard will, of course, have a corresponding effect on the workload and manpower for other shops.

WORK COMMITTEE,
JOSEPH PERRY,
Chairman.

Missionary Warns Here About Reds in Guatemala

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 28, 1954

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Times of May 24, 1954:

MISSIONARY WARNS HERE ABOUT REDS IN GUATEMALA

Our political leaders and diplomats must be vigilant because of the rise of communism in Guatemala, the Reverend Sebastian Buccellato declared here yesterday. The Franciscan missionary was expelled from Guatemala in February.

He was the principal speaker at a communion breakfast of the Archbishop John Hughes Council 481, Knights of Columbus, at the Granada Hotel, Brooklyn. Members of the council attended a mass at Our Lady of Guadalupe Roman Catholic Church, 73d Street and 15th Avenue, Brooklyn, prior to the breakfast. The celebrant was Msgr. Joseph A. McCormack.

Daniel George, grand knight of the council, presented a chalice to Father Buccellato at the breakfast to replace one in a mass kit that he said had been confiscated by the police in Guatemala.

The Indispensable Condition in Connection With United States Intervention in the Indochina War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON

OF COLORADO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, May 28, 1954

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, the Wall Street Journal in its issue of May 27, 1954, pointed out that there are other very vital conditions in addition to the conditions laid down by Secretary Dulles upon which we would intervene in the Indochina war. Among these are well defined and spelled out political and military objectives and a strong probability that they can be achieved.

The article asks these pertinent questions, to which the administration must have the answers before committing American soldiers in the Indochina crusade: How many American divisions would be needed? What is the political objective? How do we assure Indochina freedom from communism, and how do we assure their independence? If we cannot make such assurances, why the intervention?

I ask unanimous consent to have the article, which is entitled "The Indispensable Condition," printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE INDISPENSABLE CONDITION

Secretary of State Dulles the other day listed the conditions, already unofficially reported, on which the United States would consider intervention in the Indochina war.

The conditions are: That other nations which have an important stake in the area go in with us; that the United Nations gives moral sanction to the action; that it is understood that the purpose is not defense of colonialism but of liberty and independence and freedom; and that Congress approves the action.

These are all very well as far as they go; certainly they are the very least the administration could require before entering a war of this sort.

But there is a further and more basic condition which we are not confident that Washington has or can firmly set. That is that there must be clearly defined military and political objectives for any American intervention and a strong probability that they can be achieved.

The lack of such objectives and assurances has long been an American deficiency. This country went into World War II with little thought of anything beyond crushing the Axis; the result was the aggrandizement of the Soviet colossus and our present difficulties. This country went into Korea intending to stop the Communist aggression but in the middle of the war went beyond that and tried, unsuccessfully, to wrest all Korea from communism.

If we were to go into Indochina in the same casual way, the results could well be calamitous.

The military situation of the French Union forces is deteriorating badly, after 4 years of heavy American material and financial aid and repeated promises of victory. The political situation in Vietnam is so bad that it is questionable whether even a total independence treaty from France would any longer muster sufficient anti-Communist sentiment to turn the tide.

Some administration officials appear to realize that if the United States intervened it would have to do so with ground troops and not merely air and naval units. There is hope, of course, of substantial contributions from other nations, but this seems a forlorn hope.

Troop contributions from the Philippines and Thailand could be expected, but that is about all from Asia; South Korea, despite its offers, needs its troops for its own defense, and Nationalist China probably would not be asked to participate. Britain has few, if any, soldiers to spare, and it would be unrealistic to expect France to do much more than it is doing, even though it has not sent any draftees to Indochina.

How many American divisions would be needed? And where would they come from? The bulk of our ground troops are still in Korea, and they are a long way from being sent out of there. Evidently a much larger Army than our present large one would be required to make more than token intervention.

And if that larger Army could be raised soon enough to accomplish anything, what would it be expected to accomplish? The Communist Viet Minh already occupies large and important sections of Viet Nam. Would our forces be expected to crush them or merely stop them where they are?

Given the present military and political situation in Viet Nam, what are the chances of doing either? What do we do when the Chinese Communists match, as they probably will, our intervention with their own? How many more troops, and what action against China itself? Is Indochina worth a full war with Communist China and perhaps with the Soviet Union?

Assuming—and it is a dubious assumption—the Communists can be stopped in Indochina itself, what is the political objective? We will be in partial or complete control of an area largely populated by fervent Nationalists with long and bitter memories of white colonialism; many of them are sympathetic to the Viet Minh. How do we assure their independence and freedom from communism? And if we cannot assure that, what is the point of intervention?

Without satisfactory answers to these questions, without realizable military and political objectives clearly formulated in advance, we will be floundering in a war whose end we cannot see. We will not know how much or how little to do, where or when to stop. The danger is that we will not stop until it is too late to stop at all.

Question of the Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 26, 1954

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, aside to Mr. Malenkov and company, what do you have in your kind of "freedom" to match Mr. Young against Mr. White for New York Central?

Rogation Sunday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 28, 1954

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record the text of a sermon by the Very Reverend Francis B. Sayre, Jr., delivered in the Washington Cathedral on last Sunday, May 23, 1954.

There being no objection, the sermon was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

"In the world ye shall have tribulations; but be of good cheer; I have overcome the world." (John 16: 13.)

I

Nearly 1,500 years ago, in the Kingdom of Burgandy, nestled in the Alps along the banks of the River Rhone, the mountaineers were terrified by a series of eruptions from volcanoes in the region of Anverque. A good deal of damage was done; but the worst of it was the panic that spread from village to village. The people feared a new and greater calamity. It was at this time, in the year 485, that Mamertus, Bishop of the Burgandian city of Vienne, set aside the 3 days before Ascension Day as a time of special prayer against catastrophe. He led his mountaineers in processional litany beneath the fiery peaks, beseeching God's protection and strength.

People did not forget those days. Long after the volcanoes were forgotten, the church still kept those days of prayer, and called them "rogation days" or "days of asking." To this moment they are appointed in our prayer book as "days of solemn supplication," and today is called Rogation Sunday. Only, happily, they soon lost their sombre associations. Since it came in the spring, Rogation Day became the prayer of farmers for their crops. As they planted, they asked God for a good harvest. And, like the ancient Jews, of the Bible, they sowed a seed for God, offering of their corp a tithe to Him. Thus it comes about that after all these centuries we too will plant a tree at this service to signify our prayer to Him, who in the day of trouble is our strength, and in time of prosperity is the author of our good.

II

Such is the long history of the little ceremoney that we shall repeat today. Expressive not only of the farmer's prayer but also of the church's deepest experience of God across these ages. It's all summed up in a motto I once saw over the door of a hospital: "Man tends, God mends." When we plant the seeds of any good and faithful thing, God will bring forth the fruit in His season. Here and there in this world of tribulation and fearfulness and misunderstanding—are hid the means of His overcoming it. If it is sown in faith, the tree will grow. And since we are not farmers, we may think of our tree as the sign of peace and healing and truth, which God also means to lift up in the world.

That this thing is no dream, but does indeed recur in the rich experience of the church, is illustrated, curiously enough, by the forthcoming visit this week of Haile Selassie, Lion of Judah, Emperor of Ethiopia. In him is seen God's handiwork in history.

Long, long ago was a tiny seed planted. The Bible itself, in the Book of Acts, records how Philip, one of the disciples, was on his way to Gasa, in the southern desert. "And he arose and went: and behold, a man of Ethiopia * * * of great authority under Candace queen of the Ethiopians, who had charge of all her treasure, had come to Jerusalem for to worship; was returning and sitting in his chariot." Philip stopped, talked with the man about the scriptures, about Jesus. And when they came to water, the Ethiopian stopped and asked to be baptized there. Philip's hand upon that man's head was the little seed whence sprang the third great branch of Christendom, known as the Coptic Christian Church, and native still to Ethiopia. It is as head of this church that Haile Selassie, "defender of the faith," comes next Friday to visit this cathedral.

How has God made that seed to grow. In dark Africa to raise up a people whose faith has known how to defend its freedom, and whose leader is today one of the great men of peace in the world, one of the most respected upon his continent. We will welcome him as Christian welcomes Christian, in the name of our common Lord and of His Saving Son; and who knows but that the prayers we say together: men of differing race and divergent practice—may not yet be the surest means of building a peace and understanding in the world. A sturdy tree raised up by faith, in the jungle of doubt and suspicion.

III

"Be ye doers of the word, and not hearers only," is the challenge of the epistle for today. Every Christian knows that prayer which does not issue in good works, is vain. The seed that God would have us plant in the world must be a growing seed, active and alive. God will conquer not by hope alone, but by dint of the tangible service that we offer Him. We have to dig in order to plant.

This is why the several churches of America at this time have called upon their members to give active support to the extension of Christian work around the world. Our own Episcopal Church in particular has invited us all to be builders for Christ, giving of our interest and substance that many seeds may be planted which God may then nourish and bring to fruit. As Philip baptized the Ethiopian, so others are ready to be sent to carry the glad news of God's providence to places which for lack of that Gospel are now sore points of disturbance and uncertainty.

I saw at the end of the war the twisted wreckage of what was once our cathedral church in Manila. Artillery and bombs had reduced it to rubble, with only a few blackened girders projecting toward the sky. Yet, atop that tragic wreckage still remained the Cross of Christ. Tipped and scorched; war had shaken it, but could not knock it down.

Now to give substance once more to that cross—to rebuild the church beneath it, together with the hospital and theological seminary alongside it—is to renew a light without which the Far East must be dark indeed. A seed planted in Manila will blossom quietly all over the Orient. The only other growing thing that I can see there is communism. But in the long run Christ will conquer, if we but let Him use us in His service. We are His hands, the instruments of His will; He has no other in the world. "In the world ye shall have tribulation, but be of good cheer; I have overcome the world."

Are there any still who think that Christian missions are naught but the means of meddling with the affairs of others—nothing but the imposition of our prudish prejudices as we dress the happy natives in unbecoming Mother Hubbards? Do these seeds of which I speak really grow?

Well, many years ago someone went to Japan and baptized a Japanese. A tiny germ was sown. It survived with difficulty, yet bit by bit, imperceptibly, it grew. Until, in our time, there was little Miss Takahashi—a nurse in St. Luke's Hospital, Tokyo, dressed not in a Mother Hubbard but the spotless white of a Nightingale. There in the name of Christ she served God—and, what was far more rare in Japan—her fellow men. War came. The Japanese Army invaded brutally the neighboring lands. Beside the armies went Miss Takahashi, Christian. She ministered to the civilian victims of her countrymen's aggression—still serving God—and man. When at last the Japanese were driven defeated into the hills of northern Luzon, they took with them the little nurse, whose sacrifice they so little understood, but whose ministration they so badly needed. There in the hills she tended the wounded, starved refugees. She met suffering wherever she found it, still in the name of her God. Finally American troops captured the Christian nurse and her sick soldiers, and threw them all into prison. It was there I first met Miss Takahashi. She was nursing still, in the prison, giving of herself for the sake of Christ. She asked if I would celebrate communion in the prison chapel. "There are Christians here," she said, "Japanese and Filipino and Americans, too." As we met in that service, victor and vanquished, white and yellow and brown, I knew that Christ had indeed conquered the world. In the little Japanese nurse the seed of long ago had grown into a great tree.

IV

It is seeds like this which we are asked to plant today. Not only in the far corners of the earth, but here at home, too; in colleges where teaching is so much of man, so little of God; in cities where hundreds of new homes are being built and there is need among them for a house of God; among prisoners and Indians and young people.

If, in response to our church's call, we but plant the seeds in our diocese, in our Nation, and in the world, then we know that God will make them grow.

As we go out to sow on this Rogation Day, let us pray for the harvest.

Jubilee in Bayonne, N. J.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1954

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent of the House, I deem it a marked privilege to cite in the Record at this time a glowing tribute to a most distinguished servant of God as it appeared in the Jersey Journal of Wednesday, May 19, 1954. Congratulations to you, Msgr. Michael J. Mulligan, in your half century as a priest:

JUBILEE IN BAYONNE

Tonight ends a 4-day celebration in honor of the services of Msgr. Michael J. Mulligan in his half century as a priest. For 35 of those years he has been pastor of St. Henry's in Bayonne.

The observance of this jubilee year, however, has spread far beyond the limits of the parish, for nearly everyone in Bayonne knows the monsignor. Everyone who knows anything of the Visiting Nurse Service there, knows he got it started. Everyone who takes an interest in the cultural life of the city knows that he founded the Opera Guild and is forever promoting music and dramatics as compensation for the shallower pastimes of the day.

Everyone who knows anything about Bayonne knews he always has been in the forefront of any movement for a better Bayonne. Typical is this sidelight: Last week he had as luncheon guests a number of newspapermen who were gathering the preliminary stories on his jubilee. Did he talk about himself and the celebration? Yes, when he had to. But very much on his mind was what Bayonne and all those families will do if a major oil refinery is moved. Plunging into Bayonne's problems and helping where he can has made him a most useful citizen to all of Bayonne.

India Fears United States as Unknown, Treats Reds as Known Quantity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 28, 1954

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a few significant paragraphs from an article by William L. Ryan on the subject India Fears United States as Unknown, Treats Reds as Known Quantity, which was published in the Washington Evening Star of May 27.

There being no objection, the excerpts from the article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INDIA FEARS UNITED STATES AS UNKNOWN, TREATS REDS AS KNOWN QUANTITY

(By William L. Ryan)

GENEVA, May 27.—"The devil I know," said an Indian leader, "is worse than the devil I don't know."

He was trying to explain why anti-American sentiment is rising in India, why Indians profess not to fear any threat of communism from abroad.

"America is capitalist," he said. "Indians relate capitalism to imperialism, and imperialism to colonialism. Colonialism is the devil we know."

This came from an Indian leader who is pro-American, and thus is testimony to the strength of Moscow-Peiping propaganda in Asia. Communist efforts have been concentrated upon identifying the United States with colonialism and imperialism.

The Communist Party in India professes to give all-out support to the foreign policy of Prime Minister Nehru and his Congress Party, itself carrying on a grim struggle with the domestic Communists.

NEHRU MORE CHILLY TO UNITED STATES

The Red objective seems to be to drive Mr. Nehru into toeing the Communist Chinese line. Mr. Nehru does not appear willing to be lured all the way, but apparently he is becoming openly more and more anti-American. He declined an interview, but his supporters say he has these reasons:

1. United States military aid to Pakistan. Nothing has so stirred anti-American sentiment. One Indian leader told me this amounted to arming "India's enemy," since there has been no solution to the Indian-Pakistani dispute over Kashmir State.

2. Suggestions in Washington that the war in Indochina might be internationalized. Indian leaders picture the Indochina war as purely one against colonialism. Some of them were so much in the dark about it they had to be briefed by the British before the Colombo Conference last month.

3. Attempts to bring about a southeast Asia alliance. Indian leaders say this is an invitation for Asia to provide the arena for world war III.

4. Statements by Americans about the use of atomic weapons and the prospect of massive retaliation. Indian leaders portray such statements as heralding a futile attempt to blast communism out of existence rather than trying to outflank communism with better ideas and ideals.

5. Failure to appreciate India's special position. This is the crux of the matter. Indian leaders apparently consider themselves misused by American misunderstanding, and think that they are required to walk an international tightrope because of their geographical position.

What America Means to Me

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 28, 1954

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, a short time ago, Betty Hurst, of Hobbs, N. Mex., wrote a winning essay on the subject, What America Means to Me. Her essay was published as part of an editorial in the Hobbs Daily News-Sun, of my State; and I ask unanimous consent that the editorial and essay be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial and essay were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A SCHOOLGIRL'S OPINION

Last Tuesday morning representatives of the Hobbs Woman's Civic Club and the American Legion Auxiliary here presented awards to 19 school children for essays on the subject What America Means to Me. The papers were written last Armistice day and each was composed without previous preparation immediately after the announcement was made in schools.

The winning essay was written by Betty Hurst, a senior in Hobbs High School. Here is what she wrote:

"The Liberty Bell: Made of the iron will of every man, woman, and child that gave their lives for our freedoms; it rings out the words today of liberty, justice, and freedom heard around the world.

"The Statue of Liberty: She stands high and lifted up, not as a ruler, not as a queen, but as a mountain of strength, opening her arms to the poor refugee, to the weary soldier coming home and to the many friends and allies of our country.

"Our flag: Its glorious colors wave heavenward proclaiming the red for blood shed on battlefields, the white for the purity of God, who gave us this country and the blue for the heavens which envelop the whole world.

"To see an open church door, it in itself cries out: 'There is freedom here.'

"From the smallest symbol to the largest symbol, America shouts: 'Freedom to all.'

"Many things have been written, many things are being written and many things will be written on what America means to me, but only by our lives can we really show what America means to each of us."

Betty's essay shows great depth of perception that is rarely found in a high school student. Her words are an inspiration and should be cherished by all who love this country of ours.

Invitation to Anarchy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 28, 1954

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a thought-provoking and very interesting editorial entitled "Invitation to Anarchy," which appeared in the New York Times of May 28, 1954.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INVITATION TO ANARCHY

On the 22d day of the hearings, yesterday Senator MCCARTHY returned to the theme which has guided many of his actions in the past and which he has already propounded before the committee. He would have all Federal employees, in uniform or out, irrespective of oath of office or departmental regulations, or Presidential directives, or the law of the land, report to him any information they think they have about criminal or Communist activity within the Government.

Even taking at face value Senator MCCARTHY's professed desire to expose communism, corruption, and subversion, the basic fallacy in his position is that he views himself as at one and the same time an administrative, an investigating, a law-enforcing, a legislative, and a judicial officer. By virtue of his position, Mr. MCCARTHY is by rights an investigator whose inquiries should be properly related to the area of legislative recommendations. He was not elected to be an administrator nor a police officer nor a judge. Those functions belong to other divisions of the Government, and when Mr. MCCARTHY insists on encroaching upon them he is attempting to undermine the structure of our Federal system.

Every malcontent, every disgrunteled officeholder or officeseeker, every official nursing a grudge, every political sycophant is invited by Mr. MCCARTHY to disregard the whole fabric of law and order that holds this or any government together, and to spy, to inform, to pass even the most secret data to a chairman of a committee who has proved himself only too willing to use such information to suit his own poliitcal purposes.

When on May 5 Mr. Jenkins and Senator MUNDT condoned Mr. MCCARTHY's refused to reveal the name of the young Army officer who had violated the law by giving him a fake letter containing classified information they could not have understood the implications of that action. When Senator MCCLELLAN suggested that Mr. MCCARTHY may have been guilty of a crime in receiving this document he was only calling to the attention of the Department of Justice a possibility that we trust will be thoroughly explored before many more weeks have passed. When Mr. MCCLELLAN observed yesterday that "I don't know of any oath any man ever took that * * * required him to commit a crime," he was putting in the proper light Senator MCCARTHY's inference that such informants were somehow above the law. Senator SYMINGTON, former Secretary of the Air Force, was pointing to the obvious when he said: "I would hate to think that all the people in the Air Force or the Army or the Navy who may have some grudge against their superior officer, or who may feel that their wisdom was superior to that of their superior officer, including the Commander in Chief, were being coaxed to giveaway secrets * * * regardless of the law of the land."

No loyal American wants crime or corruption or subversion or communism within his Government, or anywhere else in his country for that matter. But there are police agencies, there are law-enforcing agencies, there are administrative and judicial procedures that must be respected if we are to have an orderly and meaningful Government. Congressional investigating committees have great usefulness, and many of them have been exceedingly useful in helping to improve the law and the administration of the law.

Civil Defense Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. GLENN BEALL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 28, 1954

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, all of us are concerned with the civil-defense program, and when we think of civil defense we generally picture the problem faced by our cities and large metropolitan areas.

Rarely, if ever, do we give any thought to the problems of our farmers and others in rural areas. There is a group in Maryland, however, which is concerned with farm civil defense, and it is headed by Mr. Siegfried Goetze, of Monrovia.

The Baltimore Sunpapers have also demonstrated an interest in the civil-defense problems of the farmer, and recently Mr. Raymond Thompson, of the Baltimore Evening Sun, wrote a series of three articles on this subject.

These newspaper articles were very competent appraisals of the situation, and I should like to have a condensation of them, prepared by Mr. Thompson, printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the condensation was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[Condensed from the Baltimore Evening Sun of April 12, 1954]

United States Farm Output Termed Dependent on Civil Defense of City Facilities

(The first of three articles on farm civil defense)

(By Raymond Thompson)

Washington, April 12.—Even the cow has a stake in civil defense.

On the farm, she depends on power-operated wells for water to quench her thirst, on electrically driven machines to milk her, and on "three squares" daily to keep up her health and production. But she'd be virtually helpless if an enemy attack blasted electric-generating equipment, hydraulic dams, power lines, and food-supply highways.

Her owner could no longer operate milk coolers or separators. The water pump would stop working. Refrigeration facilities would be cut off. The electric switch would not bring light.

This would be so even if the bombs were dropped on a city a couple of miles—or 100 miles—away.

Few people have ever given this serious thought.

Civil defense experts, in the past, have concentrated their interest on the largest metropolitan centers—that's where the enemy is likely to strike first. Lately, working closely with the Department of Agriculture, they have begun analyzing what could happen in farm areas should atomic or bacteriological war occur.

Communications would be knocked out. Labor shortages would threaten the economy. Transportation tieups would be paralyzing. Fuel supplies would be cut off. Crops and animals might be infected with disease. Markets would be closed off.

Protecting the farm against such attacks could be a major factor in the defense of the Nation in the event of another war, since no element is more vital to our economy than food. Potential enemies know this and would consider farmlands high on the list of priority targets.

What can the farmer do to protect himself, his farmland, crops, and animals? How can he get vital machinery parts, supplies, and fuel? How will he get his perishables to market? What can he do in case of power breakdown?

With any attack on cities, thousands of evacuees would stream into farm areas seeking food, shelter, clothing, and medical care. How many people can be handled by a particular farm district. What is required for them? How many volunteers could be mustered?

The individual farmer can solve some of these problems and attain some of these goals on his own initiative. But to solve the major problems, group action is necessary.

[Condensed from the Baltimore Evening Sun of April 13, 1954]

New Market Plan To Be Used as Pattern for Rural Civil Defense Preparations

(The second of three articles on farm civil defense)

(By Raymond Thompson)

New Market, Md., April 13.—Farmers of this Frederick County community are developing a farm emergency civil defense program which will soon become a pattern for other farm areas in the Nation.

Their unswerving determination, in the face of complacency on the part of county and some civil defense officials, to set up a preparedness program, has led the Federal Civil Defense Administration to select the New Market district as the first model farm emergency community in the United States.

"The question of civil defense is a life-or-death problem for Mr. Farmer," according to Col. William A. Brewer, Director of the FCDA's office of tactical operations. "The problems are complex and knotty, and they vary from community to community.

"That's what makes it so difficult to give farmers a specific set of answers. For that reason, we are simply drawing up a basic guide and pattern and we will leave the question of preparing for emergency up to the individual community.

"The New Market group," he continued, "showed an aggressive spirit long before we knew of their activities and they already have come up with some very good answers."

The program began here in 1948 at the instigation of Siegfried Goetz, a Monrovia farmer. Fully aware of what might happen in event of enemy attack, Mr. Goetze, a member of the New Market Grange No. 362, suggested to that farm group that a committee be appointed to investigate the scope of dangers confronting farmers in an emergency and to provide answers to the vital problems.

Appointed to that committee were Walter E. Burall, chairman; Bruce E. Crum, vice chairman; Lucian K. Falconer, treasurer; Mr. Goetze, secretary; L. H. Crickenberger, civil defense director for the district; Samuel S. Hollingsworth, welfare services; the Reverend Leon P. F. Vauthier, spiritual services; C. W. Kent, rescue services; Kenneth B. McGolerick, information; William F. Smith, warden services; William J. Wilcom, fire services; and Jesse M. Burall, transportation.

[Condensed from the Baltimore Evening Sun of April 14, 1954]

Frederick County Farm Area Being Used as National Civil Defense Pattern

(The last of three articles on farm civil defense)

(By Raymond Thompson)

New Market, Md., April 14, 1954.—In any civil defense program, first consideration is given to saving the lives of humans, but farmers in this Frederick County community are also developing plans to protect their 5,865 head of dairy animals, hogs, sheep, and horses.

They have a dairy industry valued at $25 million annually which must be safeguarded in event of war and they want to be prepared to cope with every aspect of al all-out war—direct or indirect atom bombing, radiation, bacteriological warfare, and sabotage.

To help find the answers to the problems confronting farmers in event of attack, the Federal Civil Defense Administration has requested farmers here to make a comprehensive civil defense rural analysis to include such items as human population, land use, highways and highway repair equipment, animal census, tractor and truck inventory, gasoline and diesel fuel storage capacity, fire-fighting equipment, electric-power sources and available lodgings for evacuees.

It will take several months to complete the survey, but some of the work already is finished.

The farmers know, for example, that a normal 30-day supply of feed for the livestock will be available in event of emergency, but that farmers in the district may have to accept a variation of feed formula because of a shortage of obtainable ingredients. First reports of the petroleum inventory indicate only a week's supply of gasoline, oil, kerosene, and grease will be on hand.

The district, the farmers have learned, is well situated from the standpoint of power resources, but they admit the problem of communications is the toughest they have had to encounter. They currently are meeting with respresentatives of the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. to work out a solution.

To solve some of the problems created by lack of supplies, the New Market group is working on a plan to obtain surplus military equipment for distribution to rural groups for use in emergencies. Two bills have been introduced into Congress for that purpose—H. R. 506 and S. 3074—both of which ask that the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950 be amended to "authorize the disposal of certain Federal surplus property to State and local units of the United States Civil Defense Corps and Farm Emergency Civil Defense Corps."

The 13th District of New Jersey Goes Down the Line in Support of the 1955 Budget for the Heart Institute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 28, 1954

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, it affords me great pleasure to cite at this time, under unanimous consent, the full support of the 13th Congressional District of New Jersey for the 1955 budget required by the United States Public

Health Service to carry on its war to wipe out heart disease which each year kills 1 out of every 2 Americans. A very fine wire soliciting our support in this grim battle follows:

NEW YORK, N. Y., *May 27, 1954.*

Hon. ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Strongly urge your support of $29,888,000 budget for the Heart Institute of the United States Public Health Service in fiscal 1955 as recommended by the National Heart Committee. We consider this figure as critically needed minimum it includes $6 million for badly needed research facilities to carry forward the research efforts which have already produced great advances. Heart disease kills 1 out of every 2 Americans. Won't you let us know that you will support these additional funds to fight our No. 1 internal enemy?

MRS. WENDELL WILLKIE,
ANNA M. ROSENBERG,
EMERSON FOOTE,
Cochairman, the National Heart Committee.

L'Union St. Jean Baptiste d'Amerique, Eighteenth General Session, Springfield, Mass.—Cardinal Leger's Visit to Western Massachusetts' Assumption College Confers Honorary Degree Upon Cardinal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 28, 1954

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, L'Union St. Jean Baptiste d'Amerique is one of the finest Franco-American organizations in the Nation. It was born 55 years ago, in 1899, in Holyoke, Mass., by a group of people interested in organizing an association for the mutual benefit of persons of French descent. This original small band of people, headed by Edouard Cadieux, of Holyoke, saw the need of a society that would not only bring together Franco-Americans dedicated to the perpetuation and practice of French culture but also assist the members by the establishment of a fraternal and insurance program. How well those pioneers planned and how effective are the purposes of the society is attested by the growth that it has experienced. From the official chartering in 1900 it has continued to expand, until today it embraces more than 80,000 youth and adult members in 315 councils spread throughout New England, New York, Michigan, and Illinois.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that all of us can take pride in this great society. I am convinced that we can obtain much from the spirit that nourishes it. That spirit is found in the programs to which the St. Jean Baptiste organization is dedicated. For this fraternal group operates an insurance program, scholarship-aid project, and an old-age assistance system that emphasizes mutual helpfulness. And it combines the latter with a burning zealousness of French culture and tradition.

Mr. Speaker, the 18th General Congress of L'Union St. Jean Baptiste has just finished its deliberations. It was one of the most successful conferences in the society's history. I am proud that it was held in Springfield, Mass., for it gave the people of that locality an opportunity to see and hear one of the world's most distinguished ctizens, His Eminence, Paul-Emile Cardinal Léger, archbishop of Montreal. The proceedings of the convention from May 22 to May 26 were highlighted by Assumption College of Worcester, Mass., in conferring an honorary degree upon Cardinal Leger.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD Assumption College's citation of Cardinal Léger, and an editorial from the Springfield (Mass.) Daily News.

The citation and editorial follows:

CITATION OF HONORARY DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF HUMANE LETTERS GIVEN BY ASSUMPTION COLLEGE, MAY 23, TO HIS EMINENCE PAUL-EMILE CARDINAL LÉGER, ARCHBISHOP OF MONTREAL

Asumption College is honored by being accorded the privelege of offering its honorary doctorate to a Prince of the Church. In doing so, we mean to express all our love for the church, our loyalty to the cause of French Catholic culture, our admiration for French Canada, and, particularly, to pay homage to Cardinal Léger personally.

The church has made him a prince. And the significance of today's ceermony may be expressed in these words: "Sincere humility moves Assumption to see with the eyes of the church, to love with the heart of the church, to feel in harmony with the church. We recognize here, one who is a leader among the shepherds of the church; we love one who, in all of French Canada, is closest to the heart of the Holy Father; we are thrilled in contact with a man who recalls the joys and sadnesses of the universal church. May we be allowed to include ourselves in this life of the church, and to express our obedience and our respect toward the entire hierarchy, our faith in the successors of the Apostles, and our boundless confidence in the Pope."

French culture is beautiful because it is Catholic, and especially inasmuch as it is Catholic. Among all the cardinals of both America, Cardinal Léger is the most authentic representative of French culture. He knows it, he loves it, he is its product and this he proclaims. Assumption, by its history and its plans for the future, has the vocation of spreading this culture in the United States. It is therefore natural that we should insist upon thus calling public attention to the link between our college and the person of His Eminence.

Here also, is for us, an added occasion to voice our admiration for Canada, which is continuing and enriching the Catholic part of French culture. This we cannot do better than in honoring respectfully its leader. Let this be an occasion to strengthen our ties with Canada, whence most of our families have come; Canada, which has preserved the faith for these families by providing them their first priests in their new country.

But, above all, our intention is to pay homage to the person of Cardinal Leger, and to his tireless energy. Is it any wonder, your eminence, that His Holiness Pius XII should have raised you to so high an honor, when on recalls your extensive and varied apostolate, and the deep influence which it has exerted. This apostolate began in Canada, and by way of Paris and Rome, it reached the Far East before returning, rich in experience, to your beloved country, Canada.

Raised in a profoundly Christian family in Valleyfield, Quebec, you were soon attracted to the high mission of the priesthood; imbued with a faith and culture which has left its beautiful stamp on the history of your country, you have been a glorious witness to the vitality of that French-Canadian race which has done so much for church and country. You are among those who leave their mark wherever they go. Whether at the seminary of St. Therese or at the grand seminary of Montreal, the call of souls to whose needs one gives even himself has found in yours a powerful response. Soon the field of your apostolate broadens; you are called to the heart of Paris, to the seminary of philosophy, later to the seminary of theology, finally to the post of assistant to the master of novices; and in all those offices, you show yourself a leader of souls, a prudent counselor, ever concerned with the single-eyed purpose of preparing souls for God. What wonder then that you were called to Japan, certainly a country to which you never dreamed of being sent. Thus, from 1933 to 1939, Fukuoka, Japan, saw you laboring with zeal for a people who would soon appreciate the tact, the resourcefulness, and the adaptability of an apostle who could be all things to all men. Doubtless those years were not the least of your apostolate in beauty and fruitfulness.

But soon Canada would reclaim its rights upon you. For one year you would teach philosophy at the Montreal Seminary, whereupon your merit as well as your learning would lead to your appointment as vicar-general of the Valleyfield Diocese, doubtless a more direct preparation for the office that would soon be yours. Divine providence provides for everything, as you know by experience. And the last step in such a fruitful career brought you to Rome, that you might even more deeply be penetrated with the Catholic spirit that so characterizes the Holy City. From your 3 years as rector of the Canadian College, you brought back an ardent affection for the Vicar of Christ, a passionate love for the church, and a zeal and devotion worthy of our first apostles.

You had, then, eminence, every right to become a prince of the church; and Pius XII, who chooses men wisely, was not long in recognizing your preeminence in apostolic gifts. In 1950, you were given one of the most glorious posts in Canada, a position requiring all your wisdom and tact. The Montreal Archdiocese can glory in having a leader with the heart of an apostle, broad, open to all good causes, capable of any undertaking, for you possess the faith that moves mountains, and the charity that unites the minds and hearts of men.

It is therefore fitting, Father President, that Assumption College confer upon His Eminence Paul-Emile Cardinal Leger, the title of doctor of humane letters, honoris causa.

[From the Springfield (Mass.) Daily News of May 24, 1954]

CARDINAL LEGER'S VISIT

It is a rare privilege for Springfield to welcome a cardinal of the Roman Catholic Church.

Most Rev. John McCloskey, archbishop of New York, came here to consecrate Springfield's first bishop but that was 5 years before the archbishop was proclaimed this country's first prince of the church. James Cardinal Gibbons, the beloved archbishop of Baltimore, did visit here in 1886, soon after he had been raised to the cardinalate.

The Italians who came to Springfield at the end of the 19th century were overjoyed when they were visited by Most Rev. Sebastian Martinelli, a native of Tuscany, Italy. He was created cardinal 2 years later.

Perhaps the most tumultuous welcome ever given to a Catholic cardinal was afforded Desire Cardinal Mercier, the heroic leader of the Belgians who visited the city soon after World War I during which his intrepidity had won international honor and acclaim.

William Cardinal O'Connell, of Boston, attended the consecration in 1921 of Most Rev. Thomas M. O'Leary, and Francis Cardinal Spellman, of New York, was present at the obsequies for the same prelate here. Thomas Cardinal Tien, of China, was a recent guest of the diocese and of Springfield.

The cardinal who was our guest yesterday was warmly welcomed not only by the sons and daughters of New France who brought their culture and their many talents to New England, but also by grateful Catholics of all racial heritages who know that sons of French Canada were among the first Catholic missionaries to New England, and their bishops were the first to make episcopal visitations to this region.

Paul-Emile Cardinal Leger, the 50-year-old cardinal-archbishop of Montreal, was in Springfield to honor the national congress of L'Union St. Jean Baptiste D'Amerique. Host to this 18th national convention in St. Joseph's Church, founded more than 80 years ago by Rev. Louis Gagnier, himself a native of the Province of Quebec.

The cardinal brought his special message to this society and to their Canadian-American families, to whom the cardinal represents the great French-speaking community of Quebec.

However, the cardinal's words here yesterday reflected his universality gained by study, experience, and belief. He was born in Canada, was ordained there, studied canon law in Paris, taught in the seminary at Issy, France, and went to Japan in 1933 where he founded in 1938 the Seminary of Fukuoka.

After serving as vicar general of a Canadian diocese during World War II, he was named rector of the Canadian College at Rome in 1947. There, in 1950, he was consecrated and returned to Canada as archbishop of Montreal. Less than 3 years later, he was created a cardinal of the Church, and became the second youngest member of that august body.

Springfield will long remember the visit of the eminent French-Canadian cardinal, as it does the visits of the Italian, Belgian, American, and Chinese prelates who preceded him. They were reared in different cultures, spoke different tongues, came from different lands, but they all were highly honored for their labors in the same great cause.

The American Industrialist's State of Mind

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE MEADER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 28, 1954

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, as my colleagues are well aware, one of my primary interests in my public service has been the expansion of the free enterprise system through the encouragement of private capital investment in overseas areas.

It is my belief that in our intellectual combat with the Communist philosophy of a state-owned, state-directed economy we should not hesitate on every occasion to crusade for our principles of free individual choice and free economy based upon private ownership of the processes of production and distribution.

Mr. Speaker, my attention has been drawn to an address by the president of the National Association of Manufacturers in Paris last week advancing the philosophy of a dynamic expanding private enterprise economy. I was particularly impressed with three passages of Mr. McClellan's remarks to the American Club in Paris. They are:

> Above everything else, we must have sound investment of venture capital. Every American businessman knows that our economy cannot remain dynamic without new investment any more than a human body can retain life without constant nourishment to make new blood.
>
> When I say investment I mean both domestic and foreign investment. On this subject I'm happy to have the honor of telling our European friends that businessmen at home have only praise for the President's liberal foreign economic policy which embraces private investment abroad. They recognize that building up international trade and foreign investment promote an expanding and prosperous economy—and uphold the principle of free enterprise at home.
>
> * * * * *
>
> But, as business in America can grow and develop only in the proper atmosphere, so must foreign governments, of their own volition, create a favorable climate for the investment of funds from abroad. American venture capital must have the protection of political stability and it must have guaranties against property nationalization and the assurance of monetary convertibility.

Mr. Speaker, under leave heretofore granted, I include the text of Mr. McClellan's address at this point in my remarks:

THE AMERICAN INDUSTRIALIST'S STATE OF MIND

(Address by H. C. McClellan, president, National Association of Manufacturers)

Since my election as the 1954 president of the National Association of Manufacturers of America last December 4 I have traveled many thousands of miles in the United States, having crossed the Nation eight times since January 1. I have talked with businessmen and industrialists in many cities—from Seattle, Wash., to Miami, Fla. Wherever I have gone, without exception, the No. 1 question asked me, the primary subject for discussion, has concerned our economic situation and the business prospects for the future. I, therefore, assume that the Americans in Paris are interested in the same subject.

No one can deny that a change has been taking place in the American business world. Everybody has been talking about it, wanting to know what the change is and what it means.

Some prophets of gloom and doom have called it the beginning of a depression and have predicated a dire future indeed. But most of the calamity callers have a selfish purpose and do not properly reflect the situation. It should be remembered, I believe, that in America this is an election year. It should also be remembered that since 1941 we in the States have been operating in a war economy, a defense economy or a state of constant emergency. But now, at long last, we are in a state of transition; we are moving toward a more normal situation.

I for one welcome that transition as the only means by which we can avoid an ultimate depression, and I know that this view is supported by the majority of American industrialists.

To begin with, the Eisenhower administration is making substantial progress in the reestablishment of sound policies in the fiscal affairs of our Government. Among the administration's achievements to date are these:

1. Overall Government spending has been sharply reduced.
2. The American taxpayer's burden has already been eased a great deal, and further tax reductions in prospect will undoubtedly exceed any tax reduction previously made in American history.
3. We are moving toward a balanced budget which American industry holds to be the very core of fiscal integrity.
4. Inflation has been greatly curbed if not completely halted.

All of this has been accomplished without impairing the national security or the security of our friends abroad.

And, finally, Mr. Eisenhower has proven himself to be the President for all of us in America, not solely for the members of his own political party.

The overall health of the American economy is as sound, robust, and lively as that of a young boy bursting out of his clothes at the seams. He may sometimes get cramps from eating too many green apples but the prognosis is generally favorable for a long, active life.

True, the unemotional graphs show a recent dip in general business and in employment. It would be pointless of me to try to receive you on that score. But you know as well as I that some fluctuation is to be expected in the transition of a dynamic, free economy from wartime to peacetime conditions.

As a matter of fact, the present decline in manufacturing employment is slight when compared with the 28-percent drop from the wartime peak in November 1943 to the low point in February 1946, which was absorbed without the calamity many had predicted. Nor does it equal the 12-percent drop of only 5 years ago.

One important factor in the present situation in this: During the rather long steel strike of 1952 a backlog of orders built up and in the rush to meet them after the steelworkers went back to work factories raised employment to a pitch that could not be permanently sustained.

It's the old story of the river building up behind a logjam. Dynamiting produces a mighty rush of water until the river is restored to its normal level. So, in American business, the flood stage is over and business and employment seek a more normal level.

The transition is moving well, although the critics of American business would not have you believe it. They wanted the President to intervene, to make an offhand diagnosis and prescribe shock treatment. Fortunately, President Eisenhower did not see the need for departing from the policy set forth in his economic report in which he stated: "The best service that the Government can render to our economy, besides helping to maintain stability and insuring a floor of protection for the population, is therefore to create an environment in which men are eager to make new jobs, to acquire new tools of production, to improve or scrap old ones, design new products, and develop new markets, increase efficiency all around, and thus be able and willing to pay higher wages, and provide better working conditions."

To that we say, amen. Business asks no greater blessing than elbow room in which to work out its own destiny.

This much can be said of America's pattern in government, that the old roadblocks are gone. Removed forever, we hope, are such obstacles as unsound money produced by excessive Government spending, excessive taxation and unbalanced budgets, which were dangerously draining away our venture capital.

The ruts of omission and decay have been filled in, and a new, paved econmic highway stretches out before us like a bright silver ribbon.

Whither leads the highway? Gentlemen, it leads wherever we choose to go. I don't know what life has taught you, but I feel that what I have learned can be summed up in one phrase—to make progress is to grow.

The manner in which we grow has many variations, but in general I find that statement all embracing. To make progress is to grow. And, gentlemen, business thrives on growth.

In America the growth is by leaps and bounds. Recent reports show our population is increasing at the rate of 7,000 a day. Projections indicate a population of 175 million by 1960, 189 million or more by 1970, and 198 to 221 million by 1975.

Can we look ahead 21 years and say definitely what the world of the future holds for us? Probably no more accurately than the citizen of 1933 could look ahead and forecast the H-bomb and more TV sets than bathtubs in Boston in 1954. No, we can't forecast the future that closely.

But we do know this: In the year 1975 some 200 million Americans will need more of everything—more homes, more schools and churches, more hospitals and playgrounds, more trains and buses, or whatever vehicles of transportation the citizens of 1975 will be using.

And as they grow up, theyr'e going to need more jobs, and the need for all these added commodities will make the additional jobs, because increasing demand creates the need for production and greater production multiplies the man-hours of work.

We have a total labor force of 67 million in America now. It has been estimated we shall have a work force of 89 million by 1975. Our present output in goods and services has been estimated at 359 billion. In 1975 it could be worth 700 billion at today's prices or almost double our current output.

Such an outpouring of production staggers the imagination. It is a splendid dream but a dream that will become reality only if we continue to enjoy a free, dynamic, expanding economy—and only then if we keep our vigorous inventiveness, our will to work, and our capacity to better our earthly lot.

In the light of the overall potentials for the America of the future as I have portrayed them, what is the state of mind of the American industrialist? How is he measuring up to the challenge ahead? What is he thinking and doing?

In America today a period of renewed, keen competition is developing. Business experts are working out new sales techniques and promotion campaigns. New products are invading the market in ever-increasing numbers. Costs are being brought under better control. All of industry is up on its toes and sparring for an opening. On every side new aggressive enterprises move out to woo the markets in a competitive spirit reminiscent of the old days.

But even though we have a new, competitive instinct today, even though we have better techniques and more persuasive promotion campaigns, even though we have new products, sharper cost figuring, and more energetic approaches to the consumer, we still shall have to improve our methods, we still shall have to redouble, yes, even treble, our efforts as we try to achieve our distant goals.

Above everything else, we must have sound investment of venture capital. Every American businessman knows that our economy cannot remain dynamic without new investment any more than a human body can retain life without constant nourishment to make new blood.

When I say investment I mean both domestic and foreign investment. On this subject I'm happy to have the honor of telling our European friends that businessmen at home have only praise for the President's liberal foreign economic policy which embraces private investment abroad. They recognize that building up international trade and foreign investment promote an expanding and prosperous economy—and uphold the principle of free enterprise at home.

Foreign investment by America can and will expand. In fact a recent study by McGraw-Hill International Co. gives a few significant figures on American imports and exports, and on foreign investment. Our imports and exports at this time are as nearly in balance at about $16½ billion as those of a creditor nation can be. And, the survey points out, we have tapped only a very small portion of the great potential market into which we will ultimately be selling and which we must continue to build. In the long run, our goal abroad depends on the acceptance of a way of life based on free enterprise.

There can and will be investments, yes. The McGraw-Hill survey extends the picture of American business in 1975 which I previously sketched for you. It forecasts that, if we double our national income by that time, as anticipated, we shall be able to invest abroad more than $15 billion a year. That figure, gentlemen, is more than the total of our foreign investments in the last 13 years, and in the future we would be investing that sum each and every year.

But, as business in America can grow and develop only in the proper atmosphere, so must foreign governments, of their own volition, create a favorable climate for the investment of funds from abroad. American venture capital must have the protection of political stablity and it must have guaranties against property nationalization and the assurance of monetary convertibility.

Aside from Government responsibilities, I believe that, in every country, the industrialists themselves have a very special responsibility. Even under the most favorable conditions, the essence of business management and the dynamic, life-giving element is the manager. On him, on his quality and performance, depends the success of any enterprise.

On the quality and performance of managers collectively depend the soundness of a nation's economy, its standard of living, the strength of its social beliefs, its cohesion, and its very chances of survival. Management is not merely the creature of the economy. In a sense, it is the creator of the economy as well. And only to the extent to which it masters economic circumstances and fashions them to its needs, and to its profit by conscious-directed action, does it truly merit the title of management.

American industrialists are recognizing that we live in an age of tremendous technological change which accents and underscores the need for enlightened management. This new technology has already burst upon us, not merely with a flood of gadgets and machines, but also with entirely new principles of production. It is an intellectual, even a philosophical, concept, and this, of course, gives it its impact, its importance, and its penetrating power.

We in industrial management must clearly realize that our capacity to manage successfully rests on our understanding of the tools of the new technology and on our ability to run them to good advantage.

What are the demands that this new technology makes on management and on its vision, knowledge, skill, and competence?

First, I believe, it requires that management learn to understand fully what is involved, recognizing and accepting the fact that we have passed the midpoint of the 20th century, matching both progress and change with competence and vision.

Second, the new principles of production demand that management create new markets by deliberate, systematic work.

Third, the new technology requires a tremendous increase in the number of trained and educated people in business, an increase of almost astronomical proportions. Whereas in the past we have attempted to multiply first man's physical strength and then his skill, the new method adds a new dimension. It calls for augmenting man's control over his economic environment by multiplying his mind power. Management has a tremendous responsibility not only to find people of the proper ability, but also to give them the vision they need, and to convey to them the knowlege, the skill and the understanding they require.

Enlightened mangement recognizes today that in dealing with the members of any industrial family it is good business to give primary attention to human relations policy as the best means of obtaining understanding and cooperation. Only those men and women whose minds and hearts as well as their skilled hands have been enlisted can be expected to exercise to best advantage their own judgment, knowledge and skill. This requires that every employee should feel a sense of opportunity as well as responsibility in his work.

I have always believed that the employer has two personal obligations in his plant. First, to see that his company is profitable—and I realize that men go into business only because they think they can make a profit. Second, to see that the employees find in their daily jobs a sense of satisfaction. I don't know which comes first because they are both a part of the same.

I can't accept the viewpoint of some that these two things are at cross purposes. Rather, the one contributes importantly to the other. If the reason for establishing a business is to make a profit, then it is logical that every policy, every decision, every act should work toward that end and should enhance the profit of the enterprise. But every individual on the management team, from the front-line foreman to the president and back again should understand and accept the fact that the single most-needed requirement is—to learn the secret of dealing with our employees in order to properly enlist their cooperation toward the profit objective.

It is difficult for me to discuss my personal philosophy with respect to the complete integration of sound human relations and profitability in terms which will not be misinterpreted. Either I run the risk of being labeled a Pollyanna at the one extreme or a Mr. Moneybags at the other. When talking in terms of job satisfaction for the individual, I mean to be neither—but rather a practical, hard-headed businessman and at the same time a human individual who realizes that the people who work with me in my plant are men just like myself, men who have a gnawing hunger for satisfaction of their spirit, men, who like me, are working for a sense of accomplishment in their work, a feeling of worthwhileness, people who want the admiration and respect of others.

Good human relations is much more than a mere social responsibility. It is good business. Good human relations policy tends to increase cooperation, improve efficiency, and pays its biggest reward in larger profits for the enterprise.

Another demand which the new technology makes is that management shall learn to stabilize employment. Let me emphasize that I am not referring to the guaranteed annual wage which some of our union leaders are talking about at home. It's as futile to attempt to guarantee the future as it is to insure immortality. Such an attempt can end only in bitter disillusionment, and in the process of attempting it we would only hobble our economy. Industry itself must act to stabilize sales and production.

In America, a great deal has already been accomplished in that direction. Many of the sales peaks have been leveled out and the valleys filled in. New products and whole markets have been developed, sales have been balanced, and customers educated to buy in the off seasons. In many cases the production curve has been smoothed out by stockpiling raw materials, by building inventories, or by subcontracting work during seasonal peaks. Thus, by stabilizing sales and production, management has been stabilizing work and wages.

This need for long-range decisions logically means that manager development becomes more vital than ever. There must be manager development that consists not merely in picking out a few crown princes to replace today's top managers. On the frontline of supervision where the employee meets the foreman the company's personnel policies undergo the acid test. Management has a big job to do in respect to its supervisors. They must be carefully selected and trained for leadership. They must know that they have the confidence of management, and they must be able to get on with the employees they supervise, for they are the frontline of operating management every hour, every minute of the day.

Taken together, these factors combine to form what is certainly an art and what could be called the science of management. Obviously, the more we apply the principles and concepts learned over the first half of this century to the actual job of running our business enterprises the better we shall manage.

But the new technology also makes heightened demands on the social responsibility of management. It requires in particular that we manage in such a way as to root our decisions and the actions of the enterprise we are responsible for in the principles of liberty, not the principles of compulsion; the principles of reason, not the principles of force; the principles of true leadership, not the principles of arbitrary command or fear.

Management and the business enterprise should be rooted in the deep belief that however complex society and its social relationships may become, the natural right of the individual as a person, including his right to acquire and hold property, are of a different order of priority than the rights of society.

Perhaps you are surprised that a hardheaded businessman, like myself, defines management in terms of morality at all. Perhaps—and I trust not—you may say to yourself that these are things one is expected to say in a speech but that they can be forgotten when one returns to his daily work.

Let me therefore repeat to you that during recent months I have traveled many thousands of miles in my country and have visited with the heads of companies throughout the Nation. I have done my best—not only to reflect my own thinking but also to reflect the state of mind of the thousands of American industrialists whom I represent.

Our state of mind, as American industrialists, is truly one which defines management in terms of morality and public responsibility. We believe that it is the moral values, the moral foundations that are hardheaded and practical. Leadership on any other basis misleads—and ultimately ruins.

I would be the last person to pretend that we in the United States know all the answers. I am only too well aware of the tremendous problems which are present in our industrial economy, many of which we have yet to tackle. I know that we Americans have made many, many mistakes and undoubtedly will make more.

But there is one thing we have learned in the past 50 years of growth and development: Management, because of its responsibility for leadership, must be moral in its fundamental principles.

I see about me in Western Europe, which is the cradle of modern industry, a new stirring under the scars and ruin left by war and oppression. A new young generation of managers seems to be emerging, eager to do new things, and determined to prove wrong those gloomy prophets who predict Europe's downfall.

During the past year, I've had the privilege of discussing industrial problems with many business leaders in Western Europe. I've been tremendously impressed by their competence, imagination, resourcefulness, courage, and industry. I have found those with whom I have talked forward looking and eager to find and accept new ideas in exchange for helpful suggestions of their own.

Next week here in Paris will be conducted an international conference of industrialists from all over Western Europe and America. One hundred and sixty industrial leaders from the United States have made the voyage across the Atlantic to attend this conference devoted to discussion of economic and social conditions for the development of free enterprise.

Under that broad title, special attention will be paid during the conference to such basic problems as: Human relations within the enterprise, raising of standards of living and stability of employment, private enterprise and government, and broadening of markets by the progressive removal of obstacles and the correlative possibility of investments overseas.

The basic purposes of the conference are to improve understanding and to discuss with each other the best means of dealing with the problems which confront industry everywhere. Through understanding can come new strength to the manager and the workers of the free world, and understanding based on mutual interest, mutual respect, and continuing cooperation.

The American industrialist's state of mind is: The past is dead. We can do nothing about it but learn from it. Let us turn our faces to the morning sunlight and build for the future.

New Jersey Federation of Post Office Clerks Chalk It Up

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 28, 1954

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent is listed a letter from the secretary of the New Jersey Federation of Post Office Clerks which appears to chalk up a demerit for the Post Office Department. It follows:

NEW JERSEY FEDERATION
OF POST OFFICE CLERKS,
Jersey City, N. J., May 26, 1954.

Hon. ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Since you are a member of the House Appropriations Committee and on the Subcommittee for Treasury and Post Office, I believe that the following information concerning the action of the Post Office Department in the past few months, would be vital in your deliberations.

We believe, that the Post Office Department has in the past few months, misued appropriated funds in the following manner:

1. The use of the Postal Bulletin on March 11 and May 4.

These bulletins carried the controversial issue of the Fry report.

The United States Official Postal Guide states the purpose of the Postal Bulletin as being to publish "current orders, instructions, and information relating to the postal service—philatelic, airmail, money order, parcel post, and so forth—together with changes in the Official Postal Guide, Part I and Part II."

2. The use of private teletype line, leased by the Post Office Department, to transmit a speech made by the Postmaster General attacking bills that would give the employees wage increases.

We believe this is in direct violation of title 18, United States Code Annotated, section 1913, of which the following paragraphs are the important parts concerning this situation. I quote:

"No part of the money appropriated by any enactment of Congress shall, in the absence of express authorization by Congress, be used directly or indirectly to pay for any personal services, advertisement, telegram, telephone, letter, printed or written matter, or other device, intended or designed to influence in any manner a Member of Congress, to favor or oppose, by vote or otherwise, any legislation or appropriation by Congress, whether before or after the introduction of any bill or resolution proposing such legislation or appropriations. * * *

"Whoever, being an officer or employee of the United States, or of any department or agency thereof, violates or attempts to violate this section, shall be fined not more than $500 or imprisoned not more than 1 year, or both; and, after notice and hearing by superior officers vested with the power of removing him, shall be removed from office or employment."

We hope that you will give this your full consideration and take such action that will protect the postal employees from further occurrences of this type. Also that such action may in some way give relief to the overburdened taxpayers of these United States.

I remain,
Respectfully yours,
AUGUST J. CACIOPPO,
Secretary.

New Jersey Firemen, Police, and Medics Object to Social Security Inclusion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1954

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, cited below are several New Jersey wires which object to the inclusion of firemen, police, and medical personnel being included in social-security operations:

UNION CITY, N. J., *May 23, 1954.*

Hon. ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

The New Jersey State Firemen's Mutual Benevolent Association is still on record for complete exclusion from social security.

Capt. GEORGE STEELE,
State Secretary.

Jersey City, N. J., *May 21, 1954.*

Hon. Alfred D. Sieminski,
House of Representatives:

As State delegate of Jersey City police, PBA, local No. 5, I am requesting your support of H. R. 7199 as it was introduced. Our local unanimously opposes any amendments that would include members of organized police and fire pension funds within the scope of social security.

Hugh Nolan.

Jersey City, N. J., *May 21, 1954.*

Hon. Alfred Sieminski,
House Office Building:

This association, the Hudson County Boulevard Police Patrolmen's Benevolent Association, Local 17, earnestly requests your support of H. R. 7199 as it was introduced and that you oppose any amendments that would include members of organized police and fire pension funds within the scope of social security.

Thomas McDonough,
President.
William Johnson,
Delegate.
John Levis, *Secretary.*

Jersey City, N. J., *May 21, 1954.*

Hon. Alfred Sieminski,
House Office Building:

Medical Society of New Jersey and component medical societies are opposed to inclusion of medical profession under social security. Please urge reconsideration of this legislation by House Ways and Means Committee. Grateful for your aid in past and hope for your help in this matter.

Joseph P. Donnelly, M. D.,
Legislative Representative,
Hudson County Medical Society.

Trenton, N. J., *May 20, 1954.*

Hon. Alfred D. Sieminski,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

The Medical Society of New Jersey strongly reaffirms its opposition to the inclusion of the medical profession under social security and urges that the House Ways and Means Committee reconsider the question.

C. Byron Blaisdell, M. D.,
Chairman, Subcommittee of Legislation.

Elizabeth, N. J., *May 22, 1954.*

Hon. Alfred Sieminski,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

On April 14, 1954, the Union County Medical Society at its annual meeting went on record opposing social security for doctors. on May 18, 1954, the Medical Society of New Jersey went on record in favor of Union County resolution opposing social security. As a sponsor of said resolution and as a doctor, I am strongly opposed to compulsory legislation which is, in this case, discriminatory, therefore, unconstitutional. And may I further state, that social security is not an insurance or a trust fund. It is merely a further step toward confiscatory taxation which spells Marxism-communism.

Louis S. Wegryn, M. D.,
Constitutional Democrat.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. The money derived from such sales shall be paid into the Treasury and accounted for in his annual report to Congress, and no sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

Code of Laws of the United States

Title 44, Section 181. Congressional Record; arrangement, style, contents, and indexes.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the Congressional Record, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the Congressional Record semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

Title 44, Section 182b. Same; illustrations, maps, diagrams.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the Record without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the Congressional Record the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily Record as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided,* That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the Record with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the official reporters of the Congressional Record, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the Record shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the Record issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the Record for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the Record of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the Record shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the Record style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the Record.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the Congressional Record any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix, but this rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the Congressional Record.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the Congressional Record Appendix the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed.

10. *Official reporters.*—The official reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the Congressional Record by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this restriction shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. The Public Printer or the official reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the Congressional Record which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Illustrations.*—Pursuant to section 182b, title 44, United States Code (as shown above), requests for authority to insert an illustration in the Record should be submitted to the Joint Committee on Printing through the chairman of the Committee on Printing of the respective House in which the speech desired to be illustrated may be delivered. Illustrations shall not exceed in size a page of the Record and shall be linecuts only. Copy for illustrations must be furnished to the Public Printer not later than 12:30 o'clock p. m. of the day preceding publication.

13. *Corrections.*—The permanent Record is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

Com
B.
de

H

IN T

Mi
on S
Pers
dent
com
uati
dem
mes
the
cau
futu
high
tha
App
T
was
as f
Abd
s
o
n
S
I
son
You
me
T
exa
har
me
thi
ins

Appendix

Commencement Address by Hon. Wilton B. Persons at Staunton Military Academy

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRY M. GOLDWATER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 1, 1954

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, on Sunday last, May 30, Hon. Wilton B. Persons, Deputy Assistant to the President of the United States, delivered the commencement day address to the graduating class of Staunton Military Academy, at Staunton, Va. Because the message is if such great importance to the young men of this country, and because it shows such confidence in the future on the part of one in such a high position, I ask unanimous consent that the address may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE WILTON B. PERSONS, DEPUTY ASSISTANT TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES, TO THE GRADUATING CLASS, STAUNTON MILITARY ACADEMY, STAUNTON, VA., MAY 30, 1954

I am very glad to be here. But I do have some misgivings about being your speaker. You see, I remember too well my own commencement.

That was 42 years ago. Then I was doing exactly what you are doing now. I could hardly wait for the end of the commencement exercises. I wanted to get busy doing things that really amounted to something instead of listening to a long-winded speech.

But since then I've had over a third of a century of living and moving around in the Armed Forces. I've seen how people live all over the world. That has given me a constantly increasing interest in the youth of America and in your meaning to the future.

So, despite my misgivings, I have come anyway. Maybe, since I helped to welcome this class of 1954 to Staunton 4 years ago, you might be indulgent with me as an old friend.

But it's really good to be back. I'm proud that you asked me to come.

There are many things about Staunton that dig deep inside of you. You'll know better what I mean by that after you leave here and then come back as I have. There's something true and fine about Staunton—something everlastingly good. Mostly, I think, that is because everything done here has one clear purpose: It is to build good, strong, God-fearing character in men like yourselves—men who, before long, will have the job of running this great country of ours. As wise old Aristotle said many centuries ago, "The fate of empires depends on the education of youth." Staunton is, in my opinion, doing a splendid job of providing that education.

You men are just about to spread your wings. You're going to sail out of here to all kinds of romance, excitement, and challenge in the outer world. Most of you will head for college. Some of you will want a civilian job, and decide later about college and the Armed Forces. Some of you will go right into military service to get it behind you in a hurry, or to get an early start on an excellent career.

And that leads me to say a word about the real meaning of military service.

So often military service is described as unpleasant and unnecessary work that someone in an office thinks up for us to do. Actually, military service—in our country—is an opportunity. It is an opportunity to prepare ahead of time to defend our freedom. We do it that way instead of waiting until danger is right at hand, and then, when it's too late, trying to defend ourselves and get prepared at the same time.

Now let's talk about some of the things you'll run into after you leave here. Maybe—I hope so, anyway—I can give you a helpful idea or two to take along with you.

Let's take first things first.

What kind of a world is waiting for you?

Well, I'll be perfectly frank. Judging from the way things are happening around this old globe, you're not going to be bored for the lack of something to think about.

There's a powder keg sizzling in Indochina.

Korea is still a smoldering stick of dynamite.

Trieste, over by Yugoslavia and Italy, is like a coiled rattlesnake, ready to strike anyone who gets too close.

Every week or so, things around Israel and Jordan go off like a string of firecrackers.

We keep reading about communism in Central America. Then we hear about neutralism in India. Then we read about alleged indecision and weakness in France. And someone talks about the mighty military power of Russia. If that isn't enough, we can read about subversion and depression, and other gloom and doom, here at home in the United States.

All of this is in addition to talk about the H-bomb, guided missiles, rockets, and supersonic aircraft. And, if people who are so afraid of tomorrow don't get gloomy enough from that, they can always crank up on something like juvenile delinquency.

Well, if we didn't have better sense, I guess we'd think that the best thing about tomorrow is that it hasn't come yet.

But don't let it buffalo you. Tomorrows have always looked that way to gloomy people in every generation, in every age.

You know, what most people have the most of is conceit. About every one of us thinks that his own problem is more important and harder to solve than anyone else's in the world. You and I can sit around with just a headache and think we are far worse off than someone next door with a couple of broken legs.

Most of us do the same thing in the way we look at the world. Just because we have to take a few chances with our lives—just because maybe we even have to fight a little—because we have to pay a few taxes to save freedoms others died to give us, some of us think that no one before had it so tough.

Just because we have to have a little backbone—because we have to work our brains and hitch our belts a little to plan our lives past the next day or two—some of us think we are the most imposed upon people in all world history.

Just because we have to work a little for what we need and want—because we don't have someone to feed and clothe us at public expense—some of us think that the world is mighty unfair.

Now, I've been at Staunton before. I know that none of you men believe things like this. If you did, you wouldn't be graduating from this school. But you're going to be surprised, when you leave here, by how many do approach the problems of life like that.

You'll be surprised, later on, by how many think that someone owes them a living—by how many will trade off their freedom for a piece of economic security. You'll be surprised by the number who have forgotten that freedom is earned, not inherited, and that each generation has to do its own fighting for what it believes in—sometimes with intelligence and moral courage—sometimes with planes and ships, and tanks and guns. You'll be surprised by how many forget that such things as courage and faith, and conviction and character, are what really make you a man and make life worth living.

It is attitudes like these that you'll have to help straighten out in your own way, in your own time. Someone with a lot of sense said that the past is the prologue to the future—that from the past we sort of grow up to tomorrow. So if you and I can just understand the things that have troubled and inspired people before us—people who, after all, were just like we are—then we can do a better job with our own lives.

Let's look back, then, for just a minute. Let's see if it can give us a steadier hand on the tiller of our own lives.

Do you remember the stories about the early explorers—about Columbus, for instance? Remember how the fainthearted, the "it can't be done" kind of people, said the world was flat? They said that sailors would said right off the edge of the world and fall into perdition. They said that the ocean was filled with monsters that would devour people who tried to do what Columbus wanted to do.

Well, Columbus had a dream, an ideal, a purpose. He had a conviction, mixed together with raw courage and an iron will. In other words, he really believed in what he wanted to do. He wasn't about to let anything keep him from going after it. He had the backbone, the fortitude, the complete lack of fear, to go through with it.

He proved that to the courageous goes the battle of life. That is still true today, 450 years later. Each one of you men leaving this fine school has the world right there in your own two hands. All you have to do is to use your courage, use your determination, use your strength, and keep a tight hold on what is good and right as you go along. Everything is possible to you, if you but want badly enough to do it.

About a hundred years after Columbus broke through the ocean barrier, some fellows with more courage than gumption came here to Virginia. They happened to drop anchor down here at a place that they named after King James. Jamestown, they called it. What was the challenge these fellows had, three and a half centuries ago? When their ships sailed away, leaving them on this strange, unknown, scary continent, what was their future? Was it as hard as yours and mine, or was it harder? Was it as tough as what you'll have to buck up against when you get on your own?

Well, all they faced in 1607 was the terrifying unknown. The only thing they could be sure of was that they had themselves. They had their own courage and their own determination. They had their own hands and their own faith in God. That's all these men of early Virginia had. But what did they have to deal with: Savages, starvation, and disease; homesickness and terrible drudgery; bitter weather and heartbreaking failure year after year; danger all the time; discomfort all the time; hard work all the time. But yet, there was challenge before them, too, all the time. There was the knowledge that they were doing for themselves, on their own. They were doing what they wanted to do instead of what someone else wanted them to do.

This, my friends, is the sort of stock you come from. This is the same kind of stock your Pilgrim Fathers brought up to Plymouth and Salem and Boston.

It is the same kind of stock that carried the flag westward into wilderness peopled by savage Indians and roamed by wild beasts.

It is stock like Washington, Jefferson, Benjamin Franklin—like Daniel Boone—like Andy Jackson, Robert E. Lee, Abraham Lincoln—like Custer, Teddy Roosevelt, Admiral Dewey.

Great Americans like these thought the future was an opportunity, not something to worry about or something to be afraid of. They are the kind of people who gave us what we have today in our country. But let's be frank about it, they didn't really give it to us. They slashed and ground and hammered and slugged it out. They drew on sheer courage, fighting ability, and endurance. No; they didn't give us America; they won it for us. So now we've come along. We're just in time to take our own turn in the batter's box.

Our forefathers have put us in the major leagues in the nations of the world. Now they've tossed us the bat. They've shown us the rules of the game. It's our inning. It's up to us now whether we strike out or knock one over the outfield fence.

Yes, we'll have to play the game ourselves. Those oldtimers like Washington and Robert E. Lee and Teddy Roosevelt just couldn't hand everything to us on a silver platter. Even so, they did pass on to us far more than did the fathers of any other nation in history.

As a matter of fact, it is something to be thankful for that those who have gone before couldn't make it too easy for your generation and mine. This business of working hard, of whipping trouble, of gritting your teeth and climbing up and over a tough hill—these are the things as you go along in life that make pleasure really worth while. And remember that only the game fish swims upstream. No one ever got hurt by starting at the bottom of a ladder that is worthwhile climbing.

It is hard work—it is having some idea of what is right and wrong and doing what is right—that more than anything else will determine your future happiness, your success, and the meaning of your life. And there will still be a lot of time left for fun.

The thought of good work habits and stick-to-it-iveness leads me to say a few words about discipline—a word much used but much more abused.

Discipline is not the imposition of one's will on another just because one can get away with it. Discipline develops a man so that he can take his proper place among his fellowmen. When we are young and inexperienced, discipline must of necessity be imposed upon us. But as soon as we learn to have mastery over ourselves, it becomes self-discpiline. Then an imposed discipline is no longer necessary; you impose it on yourself. This is the entirely good result of the kind of discipline you have had here at Staunton and at home.

When you finally attain self-discipline, by mastering some great decision that will come your way, you will know suddenly, with the finest feeling you ever had, that your life is henceforth entirely yours—your own life to mold and control and develop. Thereafter, you will have a gift but few ever have, the gift of self-control, self-mastery—personal discipline.

And that's a great advantage you have as you leave here. You have that training, that inner steel, that solid discipline, already in your grasp. It is already part of your being. So, even now you are miles ahead of most of your own age group. Very few have had this strong influence which will shape your whole life.

Well, I guess all this has sounded mighty serious. We have talked about discipline. We have talked about troubles in the world. We have talked about gloomy people in the United States. We have talked about the need to work hard, to be good, to do your best.

Now, for just a minute, let's talk about something else.

You know, I would give my right arm to be your age—to have your opportunity—to know what you know, to be prepared like you are prepared. I'd like to have a future awaiting me, with such a stupendous, stimulating challenge, as you have awaiting you.

Earlier I said that, in this life, the battle goes to the courageous.

I repeat that, I'll tell you why it's true. It's true in our country because we are free. I said a few minutes ago that you can do anything you want to do, if you want to do it badly enough. Do you realize how boundless your opportunities really are?

Do you realize that every year we have over 2 million more Americans? There are over 7,000 more Americans every day. By 1960 our population will have grown by an amount equal to the total population of Canada.

Can you picture what this means to you? It means an awful lot in terms of national prosperity, opportunities for good jobs, promotions, interesting and stimulating things to do.

Here's an example.

In 7 more years, each day we'll have to feed 15 million more Americans than we feed today. Think what this will do to our agriculture surpluses. Think of the opportunities it means for farmers all over America, for people who make tractors, for everyone in and around farming.

Imagine what all these new people mean to young folks who want to sell refrigerators, radios, new houses. Think of the opportunities this means in engineering, law, medicine, business. Think of the new teachers who will be needed.

And I have not mentioned the opportunities opened by entirely new discoveries. In only the past 10 years, these have been no less than amazing.

Take plastics, for instance. This industry did not exist a few years ago. Now it is tremendous. It gives good jobs to thousands of peoples. What about the development of the atom for peaceful uses—the helicopter, penicillin, television. All types of new processes and inventions have opened completely new opportunities for young men like yourselves.

So, with things changing so fast, I can't see everything that tomorrow holds in store. No one can. But I can tell you this. Your future will be as exciting, it will be as fascinating, it will be as challenging to your ability and strength, as anything that has happened ever before in our country's great history. It is the kind of future and the kind of opportunity that, like I said, I'd give my right arm to enjoy with you.

But I can't. So let me say this to each of you: As you sail out into this great opportunity that is our America, you have my warmest wishes for your success and for your complete happiness.

May you have a world, my good friends, that, under God, will live in enduring peace.

The Veterans' Employment Service Should Be Maintained

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1954

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, the general need for economy in the operation of our huge governmental machinery is clearly understood and appreciated by all of us. With the Federal revenues facing further reductions, and in view of the downward readjustments currently being affected in our national economy, there is strong pressure for reduction of the cost and complexity of the Federal Government.

We must, however, avoid being enticed into any practice of false economy. Fires are sometimes controlled and extinguished by the building of still more fires as we have frequently observed in the forestlands of our western States. We have a serious responsibility of appropriating the Federal moneys so that every dollar will be spent in the most effective manner.

The Veterans' Employment Service within the Department of Labor's United States Employment Service provides extremely valuable assistance for a crucial segment of our veteran population. It should be noted that this service has been made available to those who are urgently in need of this type of aid. The regularly employed veteran who is well satisfied with his job has no need to depend upon the facilities of the Veterans' Employment Service.

It is no guarded secret that as we continue the downward trend in defense expenditures, foreign aid, and other governmental programs, we are experiencing serious unemployment among our labor force. We do not always realize how much the extent of Government spending at home and abroad influences conditions in our national economy. As the number of jobs decrease, and the number of unemployed increases, the competition for existing employment becomes increasingly severe. Our veterans are caught in the middle of this acute struggle. It is readily apparent, then, that the services of the Veterans' Employment Service are more desperately needed than ever before. Since the fall of 1952 there has been a general increase in the number of veterans registered in the various State Employment Offices. A very sudden rise took place in February 1954. From an average below 300,000 for the months of September through December in 1952, an explosive jump to nearly 800,000 was recorded in February of this year.

Perhaps a brief review of the activities of the Veterans' Employment Service will clarify the manner in which this branch of the Department of Labor provides significant aid for the unemployed veteran. It is the responsibility of this Service and its representatives in all the States and Territories to exercise functional supervision of the assistance provided veterans through the local offices of the State employment security agencies. There is greater assurance resulting then that the veteran will receive effective job counseling and employment placement service. The Veterans' Employment Services evaluates the programs and services offered veterans in the 1,800 local employment offices by analyzing statistical and narrative reports and by visiting local offices. Another vital function is the promoting of interest on the part of employers to employ veterans. This is accomplished by initiating and participating in informational, educational, and public relations activities designed to develop more job opportunities and to stimulate the employment of veterans, and particularly disabled veterans.

There would, in fact, be more than adequate justification at this time for increasing our appropriations for this activity rather than decreasing it. I am urging that we make available the same amount of money we provided the previous year.

The Bureau of the Budget very recently recommended a 33-percent reduction in the funds to be allocated the Veterans' Employment Service. The original request for $1,047,000 was reduced by the Bureau to $700,000. Such action would result in the necessity to cut the now current staff of 152 positions to 112 positions, leaving only 1 professional and 1 clerical position in each of the 48 States, Alaska, Hawaii, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico, and 8 positions in the headquarters office in Washington. In the State of California, for example, only 1 man would be available for protecting the rights of veterans with employment problems in the 104 offices of the State employment service. California's needs in the previous year required a staff of 5 professional and 2 clerical assistants in the Veterans' Employment Service.

Perhaps in some quarters the question may arise: "Why expend any funds at all for the Veterans' Employment Service?" For the moment, we may overlook the most basic reason that underlies any consideration accorded veterans by the Federal Government. Since colonial times, we have heard mentioned frequently the debt of gratitude that our Nation owes its servicemen. While all of them have made the usual sacrifices with which we are familiar, others have made still greater ones and were prepared to make the supreme one when and if the proper occasion had arrived.

There are other reasons, however, that prompt our Government's action. Congress established the precedent back in World War I when funds were appropriated to increase the facilities of the employment service, which at that time was a unit in the United States Department of Labor. The funds were provided in order to open offices whose primary purpose was to expedite job placement of returning servicemen.

It is generally recognized that a period of military service places an indivdual at a disadvantage in the labor market. Having served in the Armed Forces, the veteran has obviously lost an equivalent period of time in his regular occupation. As a result he may fail to qualify for promotion, or he may be shelved in favor of another individual who failed to perform a similar service for his country. Still another veteran may find at the completion of his tour of duty that he now exceeds the normal entrance age for apprenticeships or on-job training.

Also, while there are specialized vocations and military skills gained while in service, there are frequent occasions when veterans are unable to utilize or apply them in civilian occupations. Another very important reason underlying congressional acceptance of responsibility for assisting veterans to reestablish themselves in the labor force is the prevalence of service-connected disabilities.

Throughout the history of our country, Congress has consistently viewed the veteran and his problems in an understanding manner. Not only was special legislation enacted after each major war, but in recent years, particularly since World War II, even greater recognition was made of the veteran. Congress exhibited a very keen interest in the plight of the discharged service personnel by approving legislation which embodied privileges never known or exercised previously by servicemen. Through the Veterans' Administration personal loans of money to veterans have been and are being guaranteed, broad educational privileges extended, medical and hospital benefits provided for service as well as nonservice connected disabilities, and other benefits were made and many still are available. In fact, the Veterans' Administration ranks among the leading branches of our Federal Government with respect to the size of its operating budget.

How then, in view of the long record of previous and the current legislation enacted by Congress with regard to veterans, could we support the emasculation of an important service wherein a small investment guarantees such rich returns?

The Bryson Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN R. DAVIS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1954

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include herewith, at the request of Mrs. H. C. Head of 114 N. Orchard Street, Madison, Wis., a petition signed by residents of my congressional district in support of the Bryson bill, H. R. 1227:

To Our Senators and Representatives in Congress:

We, the undersigned, respectfully petition you to protect us in our rights as parents and as purchasers by passing legislation to prohibit alcoholic beverage advertising over the radio and television and in our magazines and newspapers. Our television sets are being rendered worse than useless to us by alcoholic beverage advertising, and our children are being led to believe that alcohol is harmless and to glorify crime by means of such advertising.

A. Olson, Jane K. Purcell, Mrs. Stanley Butler, Mrs. Chas. Teasdale, Mrs. John Werner, Mrs. Martha Lunde, Mrs. A. Koerth, Mrs. H. L. Bartholomew, Mrs. Elsie Abraham, Mrs. Carrie Hogen, Mrs. K. E. Brost, Mrs. R. E. Krause, Mrs. Geo. Peterson, Mrs. Fred Pinch, Loran B. Cockrell, Margaret C. Cockrell, A. W. McClurkin, Ruth M. Johnson, Margaret I. Knowles, Charlotte R. Wood, Mrs. Cameron, Mrs. W. W. Sylvester, Mrs. L. R. Geisler, C. S. Hean, Dean G. Ball, Mrs. B. H. Paul, R. G. Jennings, Mrs. R. Jennings, Francis Niederer, Mrs. Paul E. Hoppe, Mrs. W. H. Miller, Warren H. Miller, Benson H. Paul, Roy W. Zimmer, Mrs. C. Rosen, Mrs. R. L. Blodgett, Mrs. W. M. Ketchum, Mrs. A. E. Berggren, Mrs. E. J. Kallevang, Mrs. Robert M. Roden, Mrs. A. T. Lenz, Mrs. John D. Ong, Mrs. Glenn Koehler, Mrs. Ray W. Clarke, H. W. Ruhde, M. A. Pearson, Lucy Pearson, Mrs. H. W. Ruhde, Mrs. M. E. McCaffrey, Mrs. S. C. Welsh, Alma L. Bridgman, Ada Martin, Mrs. F. Zantow, Laura S. Stark, Bertha Frautschi, Betty Albertus, Mr. and Mrs. T. C. McConnell, Leroy R. Geisler.

Freedom for Ukrainians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT W. CRETELLA

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1954

Mr. CRETELLA. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to include a statement from the Ukrainian-American State Political Relief Organizations, Inc., State of Connecticut, which is affiliated with the Ukrainian Congress Committee.

This statement makes us more keenly aware of the cold, cruel, tyrannical designs of Soviet totalitarianism. Despite the iron-fisted treatment of the peoples of the Ukraine, they have continued to display their intense will for freedom and democracy and will emerge above the shadow of godless communism.

The statement follows:

To analyze the sovereignty of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic in the field of state and international law it would primarily be necessary to recognize the foundational structure and purpose of the Communist state.

Truthfully, in its full interpretation, the word "national" is interchangeable, somewhat as are the individual nations within the Soviet orbit.

Rightly, the national sovereignty of the Soviet Ukraine can be clarified only in the various theses of Communist politics. The Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic was created in name only so that she could become a puppet to the International Communist Party, an organization directed to produce world revolution.

In its entirety, as in the whole of the U. S. S. R., Ukraine is dictatorially controlled by the Communist Party and used as a proving ground for Communist development.

The social structure of the Communist manifesto proposes the destruction of personal, national, and sovereign independency. Communist comradeship replaces family ties with nonclassification, nonnational, and nonsovereign fellowship.

The national question and all freedom-fighting national movements within the U. S. S. R. are scrupulously benefited by the Communist Party. For tactical reasons, these movements are respected by the Soviets.

The Soviet Government clarified the national problem in a declaration dated November 8, 1917, as follows: "Equality and sovereignty to all nations and each one of the member Republics retains the right to freely withdraw from the Union."

Thirty years of Russian tyranny followed. All non-Russian nationals and their attempts for independence were quelled. The significance of the aforementioned declaration could be seen immediately.

Stalin's national politics have materialized national in form, Socialist in content.

The Communist's Party's treatment of national aspirations have been brutally violated and uprooted. Recognizing the national spirit is only one of the tactic moves. These movements are used only to fulfill the Communist desire for world revolution.

The Soviet Ukraine has been the puppet of Moscow since the collapse of the Ukrainian National Republic. Her statehood was used to inspire the 8 million Ukrainians in Poland, 1 million in Rumania, and others in Czechoslovakia toward actual national independence and toward a free democratic Ukraine, simultaneously furthering her own aims westward.

The Ukrainian people have tread their own path and continuously aim for the rebuilding of the Ukrainian National Republic and complete independency from Moscow. This movement has been carried on through the years by the Freedom for Ukraine Committee headed by Professor Eframov.

After many years of attempted Russification, Moscow could no longer tolerate the Ukrainian movement or coordinate her own plans. She began to assault Ukraine with relentless liquidation. Her greatest success was the "manufactured famine" of 1932–33, when over 7 million Ukrainians died. The intelligentsia was inhumanly treated and deported to Siberia. Ukrainian heritage and cultural background was destroyed, yet no tyrannical treatment could destroy the urge for freedom.

The Ukrainian movement, like a Phoenix, is continuously reborn. This national aspiration for freedom forces Moscow to recognized Ukrainian armed resistance marking still another period of life in the U. S. S. R.

These developments precipitated certain amendments to the Soviet constitution and in 1944 the non-Russian states with the USSR were granted the right to enter into direct relations with foreign states, and to conclude agreements and exchange representatives. Soviet Ukraine soon thereafter, was represented in the United Nations. Her sovereignty was recognized by all members of the United Nations as only sovereign nations can become members. Soviet Ukraine under the guise of an independent state was accepted, but disappointingly continued working in united mind and spirit with the Soviets.

Disregarding the tactics of Moscow, and the actual status of Soviet Ukraine which has international rights, the Soviet Ukraine is utilizing these rights and obligations which have been granted her representation at the United Nations in regard to international matters.

After many years of Communist destructive practice in Ukraine a clear mental picture of Moscow's tactics can be viewed. At this time we wish to bringt to the attention this time we wish to bring to the attention whose lips have been sealed, that none of us believe the promises of Moscow or the Soviet peace parleys.

Neither we, nor our descendents can never forget the Russian tyrann, which has burdened the Ukrainian people. We Ukrainians have affirmed Communist tactics. Russia, in whatever form she may be will continue to practice Communist ideas and tactics upon befriended nations. After brutal conquest of the nations she will destroy them spiritually and physically.

For these reasons we believe that Ukraine should become a free democratic republic. In accomplishing this great purpose the Ukrainian people need moral support for we know that we are not alone in this fight against imperialistic Moscow.

In granting the Ukrainians national diplomatic recognition, the United States helps in the purpose of Freedom for Ukraine and enriches her own moral strength in the eyes of all occupied peoples and nations.

Beria who controlled the whole spying apparatus in the entire U. S. S. R., knew and evaluated the untiring efforts of nationalistic strength among the Ukrainian people and he knew that these movements were for the urgency of self-government. In this struggle for power he made an alliance with them.

It would be inconsiderate of the United States to ignore the insurgent action of the Ukrainian people and not morally support her cause for freedom. American diplomatic missions should be established in the Soviet Ukraine and Soviet Byelorussia.

The acceptance of the Smith resolution shall put Moscow to shame and also it will force Moscow to respect her own constitutional law and will teach her to be courteous at international parleys.

In the advances of defense for the Ukrainian nation and her complete freedom we Americans of Ukrainian descent ask, in the frame of our peace policy for full freedom for these occupied nations.

Steps should be taken out at the United Nations for such. Under her supervision, a referendum should be carried out in Soviet Ukraine and Soviet Byelorussia, the result of which will grant the possibility for these countries to become free and liberate the tentacles of the U. S. S. R. and thereby separate itself from Soviet Union.

Very sincerely yours,
THE UKRAINIAN-AMERICAN STATE POLITICAL AND RELIEF ORGANIZATION, INC., OF STATE OF CONNECTICUT,
DR. WASYL NEBELUK,
President of Organization.

Armenian Independence: A Casualty of Big Power Disinterest and American Isolation After World War I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN LESINSKI, JR.
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 1, 1954

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the 28th of May was the 36th anniversary of the founding of the independent Republic of Armenia. Its independence was indeed brief—it was over, in fact, before the rest of the world got around to taking the first necessary steps to help the infant nation survive.

Armenia is today a "slave" republic in the vast Soviet prison system. The Soviets conquered and occupied Armenia late in 1920 in exactly the same way they later came to occupy Poland, Rumania, Hungary, Latvia, Estonia, Lithuania and the rest of today's Soviet Russian Empire.

Occupation and suppression has been nothing new to the Armenians. They have been the victims of almost every wave of conquest since the beginnings of history. Present-day Armenians have known only about 2 years of national freedom during their entire lives—from 1918 to 1920.

Isolationism in the United States immediately after World War I was an important factor in Armenia's tragic loss of liberty. It was not, of course, the only factor. Soviet expansionism even then was on the march. It took advantage of the big power disinterest of those days—the vacuum in the Near East—to move in on and destroy the young new republic.

The tragedy of this diaster was even more deplorable because the United States, through President Woodrow Wilson, had exercised tremendous influence originally in pointing the way to Armenian independence. This was the goal of one of Wilson's 14 points.

So great was the prestige of Woodrow Wilson that both Turkey and Armenia joined in requesting him to arbitrate and delineate their boundaries after the new republic was established. But Wilson had already lost his plan for assuring a free and independent Armenia—he lost it because Republicans were in control of the Senate of the United States at that time—and isolationism was in control in that party.

The United States had committed itself to assume a mandate over a newly established Armenia. But the Senate rejected this commitment, just as it rejected our commitment to join the League of Nations. The isolationists were in control.

Without this guaranty of American protection, the young nation was unable to withstand the combined assaults from both Soviet Russia and Turkey and finally succumbed to invasion and occupation.

The United States had been generous in extending relief to the Armenians under the American Relief Administration headed by Herbert Hoover, but with isolationist Republicans in control in the Senate no attention was paid to Wilson's plea:

> Have you thought of the sufferings of the Armenians? You poured out your money to help succor the Armenians after they suffered; now set your strength so that they shall never suffer again.

The proposal to join other Allied Powers in sending troops to Armenia when Turkey prepared to launch its attack on the new nation was pigeonholed in a Senate subcommittee headed by Senator Warren G. Harding, who was too busy at that time running for President to act on this matter.

After Harding became President, he made several pious protests about the treatment of Armenia but effectively prevented any action.

ARE WE RETURNING TO A DISASTROUS POLICY OF ISOLATION?

I cite these historical facts today, Mr. Speaker, not in partisan recrimination over something that happened a generation ago, when isolationism was dominant in the Republican Party, but to call attention to the fact that other nations will fall if isolationism should come back into style in the United States.

We have always been proud of the fact that the United States covets no territory of other nations. We came out of World War I without selfish aggrandizement, and we came out of World War II in the same noble tradition.

But the grabbing of territory, the annexation of peoples, the suppression of national liberty and sovereignty did occur in both instances on the part of other countries.

After World War I we turned our backs to this tragic and cruel spectacle. Are we turning our backs today? Are we getting tired of our worldwide responsibilities on behalf of freedom? Are we toying with the idea of again retreating to our own domestic sphere as a means of saving money?

There have been some disturbing signs of this trend in the past year. We must stand united against isolation.

We have many bitter lessons before us of the folly of isolation, including the loss to freedom of Armenia only 2 years after its emergence as an independent nation. As we observe Armenian Independence Day on May 28, we should again rededicate ourselves to the goal of freedom for all people, as the means of assuring our own freedom and of world peace.

The Sugar Quota

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1954

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following House Concurrent Resolution 17 of the House of Representatives, State of Representatives, State of Louisiana, which resolution was concurred in by the Senate of the State of Louisiana, regarding the importance of the sugar quota to the State of Louisiana. The resolution is as follows:

Whereas the Congress of the United States will be considering major farm legislation in 1954, which may result in changes in the existing Sugar Act as it relates to quota allocations for the domestic cane area; and

Whereas, of the total domestic allocation, the domestic cane area receives only 11 percent of the total allotted 4,444,000 short tons which is 3½ times less than the allocation to the beet area and less than half that allotted to Puerto Rico or Hawaii; and

Whereas our quota of 500,000 short tons was only 6.1 percent of the 1953 estimate of the consumption in the United Senate; and

Whereas we produced 604,000 tons in 1952 and 635,000 tons in 1953; and

Whereas marketing quotas were imposed on 1953 marketings at a time when the sugar had already been produced and, in the case of Florida, after most of the sugar had been marketed; and

Whereas, even though acreage for 1954 has been restricted, we could conceivably find ourselves in a more serious position at the time we market the 1954 crop; and

Whereas we have produced more than 20 percent, or more than 100,000 tons, above our quota for the past few years; and

Whereas we have been relieved of the seriousness of this situation by the fact that the deficit in the beet area during these 2 years was considerably more than our total excess production; and

Whereas such a chance situation cannot be relied on for the future; and

Whereas domestic consumers' sugar needs can and should be met in greater part by domestic producers; and

Whereas, as our population increases, allowances for increased domestic production should be specific and earmarked; and

Whereas there is a real need for specific legislation that adequately insures fair and equitable distribution to various producer segments, both domestic and foreign; and

Whereas there are two sources for relief in this situation; namely, (1) from allocations to countries trading with the United States and covered in the Sugar Act, and (2) population increase dedication: Therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Louisiana (the Senate concurring), That the Legislature of the State of Louisiana favors and urges immediate upward revision of the domestic sugarcane quota as provided for in the 1948 Sugar Act, as amended, that would more adequately reflect production of recent years and at the same time would be in keeping with present production levels; be it further

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Louisiana (the Senate concurring), That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, the House of Representatives and the Senate of the United States Congress, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the Secretary of State.

Czechoslovak Uprisings Against Soviet Tyranny

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. BYRNE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1954

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor and privilege to rise today before this House and salute the brave and fearless people of Czechoslovakia who, 1 year ago today, rose up against their Soviet tyrants in revolt. The ramifications of their actions are well known. Uprisings and riots surged through Eastern Europe, culminating on June 17 in the revolt of the workers in East Berlin.

The Communist rulers, in a typically totalitarian move, had virtually wiped out the life's savings of the Czechoslovakian people. This had the additional result of raising prices to almost twice their previous level. In protest of this, workers at factories in Pilsen, Kladno, Ostrava, Handlova, and other cities left their jobs and stormed through the cities, burning official papers and buildings, and destroying plant machinery. They were not quieted until, a week later, the Communists ordered the army into action.

Need I stress the importance of these facts. The unrest brewing behind the Iron Curtain was suspected. But nowhere was it thought that it would rise to such great proportions. Newspapers throughout the world screamed with black headlines; radio and television commentators could talk of little else. It was a psychological and political defeat for Soviet Russia.

We can and, in all honesty, we must pay tribute to our Czechoslovak friends. It is because of their courageous actions, done with full knowledge of the likelihood of Russian reprisals against them, that similar revolts followed. Hope was reborn in the hearts of millions subjugated by the Red masters. The people of the free world were awakened to the plight of their brethren behind the Iron Curtain; we were made conscious of the tremendous spirit and fortitude of these people, so much so that it is very vivid in our minds today.

We join today with our friends in Czechoslovakia, in the true spirit of freedom and democracy, in praying that the yoke of tyranny, dictatorship, and atheism may soon be lifted from their shoulders, and that they may in the very near future breathe again the air of a free Czechoslovakia.

Foreign-Ship Mortgages

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1954

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, in the first session of the present Congress identical bills were introduced, S. 2407 and H. R. 6276, designed to relieve the very complex and cumbersome conditions which now surround foreign-ship mortgages and which are hampering our foreign trade and commerce. Briefly, these bills would, with certain modifications, apply to foreign-ship mortgages held in this country provisions enacted into law by the Ship Mortgage Act of 1920, as amended—title 46, United States Code, pages 951–954. Forty-first United States Statutes at Large, page 1003.

Prior to the 1920 act mortgages on ships afforded the mortgagee a very imperfect security for the reason that all maritime liens, even though arising subsequent to the recording of the mortgage, took precedence over the mortgage. Such maritime liens might be sufficient in amount to wipe out the mortgage altogether, leaving the mortgagee nothing. The Ship Mortgage Act of 1920 met this problem with respect to vessels of domestic registry by allowing the mortgagee, upon fulfilling certain requirements, to give his mortgage the status of a preferred mortgage. Such a preferred mortgage takes precedence over maritime liens arising subsequent to the recording and endorsement of the mortgage, with certain exceptions such as liens for wages and for damages from tort. Under the 1920 law preferred mortgages could be foreclosed by admiralty suits in rem in the district courts of the United States.

The purpose of H. R. 6276 and S. 2407 is to extend similar protection to citizens of the United States who are holders of foreign-ship mortgages. The bills would so amend the 1920 act that the term "preferred mortgage" would include "any mortgage, hypothecation, or similar charge created as security upon any documented foreign vessel—other than a towboat, barge, scow, lighter, car float, canal boat, or tank vessel, of less than 300 gross tons"—if such mortgage or similar instrument has been duly executed and registered in accordance with the laws of the foreign nation involved. It is further provided, however, that a preferred mortgage lien in the case of a foreign vessel shall be subordinate to maritime liens for repairs, supplies, towage, use of drydock or marine railway, or other necessaries.

This protection to foreign-ship mortgagees is a matter of considerable importance to the west coast and to other areas directly concerned with foreign commerce. I am advised that the proposed amendment is supported by the American Bar Association and the Maritime Law Association, as well as other interested groups.

In order to remove the uncertainties and inequities which now afflict foreign-ship mortgages and thereby obstruct our interest in foreign commerce, I urge the Congress to consider and act upon this matter as quickly as possible.

Irish Unity and Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM T. GRANAHAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 28, 1954

Mr. GRANAHAN. Mr. Speaker, Mr. John J. Reilly, a prominent businessman and respected citizen of Philadelphia, speaking recently at exercises in Philadelphia commemorating the Easter Week Rising of 1916 which established the framework of the present Irish Republic, delivered a brilliant address that contained information of deep interest to all who would see justice accorded to a nation that has given so much to us in the fine quality of citizens that have come from her shores, and fitting into American life, have contributed so much to the building and preservation of our beloved land. Mr. Reilly has performed a great service to the cause of Irish unity and independence, similar to services he has rendered many times in the past, and which has made him a national figure among those who have befriended the Irish in their aspirations to complete nationhood.

The address follows:

ADDRESS BY JOHN J. REILLY, NATIONAL VICE PRESIDENT, AMERICAN LEAGUE FOR AN UNDIVIDED IRELAND, MADE AT ANNUAL EXERCISES IN PHILADELPHIA COMMEMORATING THE PROCLAMATION OF THE IRISH REPUBLIC AND THE 1916 EASTER WEEK RISING

Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, it is an honor and a great pleasure to have the privilege of addressing you on this most auspicious occasion commemorating the Easter Rising of 1916 and the proclamation of the Irish Republic. In the Irish heart and mind, Easter Week has the same significance, the same reverence, the same grateful remembrance as does July Fourth our Independence Day, in the hears of all true Americans.

Many of our fellow citizens are not aware of the fact that complete independence was not achieved as a result of this rebellion or of the later Black and Tan War. Now that a Parliament sits in Dublin and an Ambassador from Ireland is officially received in Washington, may have the misunderstanding that Ireland has brought here centuries old struggle for liberty to a glorious climax. Such is not the case. The sordid story of Britain's cruel treatment of Ireland's aspirations to full nationhood persists throughout history to the present day. The Rising of 1916 was quickly suppressed and the patriot leaders were heartlessly executed in a manner that horrified the civilized world. As recently as a few short months ago, the British Government refused a request to surrender the mortal remains of Sir Roger Casement for reinterment in the soil of the land he loved and for which he gave his life.

There are few who know that in the general elections held in Ireland in 1918, under British supervision, more than 80 percent of the people of all Ireland voted for a completely free and independent republic. In 1919 the elected representatives met in Dublin, reaffirmed the proclamation of the Republic, and proceeded to organize their own government. How did the British view this action of the Irish people? We must remember that, with her allies, Britain had just victoriously concluded a titanic war (World War I) which was waged with the avowed high purposes of ending all wars—to save the world for democracy—for self-determination of small nations. As a result of this last objective, we viewed the rebirth of Poland, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslovakia, Hungary, Finland, Latvia, Lithuania, Albania, and other small nations that had been subject to the Axis powers and Russia. But Ireland was regarded as a British possession and her efforts to attempt a bloodless revolution and the establishment of her own government was answered with the mailed fist of Britain's armed power. Her late allies looked on in consternation as she poured her Black and Tan forces into the Emerald Isle and for 2 years waged a savage war against a comparatively defenseless people. With the knowledge that over 300,000 Irish volunteers had helped Britain achieve her victory in 1918, outraged public opinion throughout the world finally prevailed, and Prime Minister Lloyd George called for a truce. How grudgingly this concession was made became quite evident in the manner in which the conferences were conducted and prolonged. The agreement that was finally made is referred to as the Shot Gun Treaty in that it was made clear to the Irish delegates that if they did not accept the British terms there would be an immediate resumption of terrible warfare. As a result of these terms, not only Ireland, but the ancient province of Ulster was partitioned, ostensibly to protect the rights of a minority but actually that Britain should maintain a strategic bridgehead in Ireland. This partition of Ireland has resulted in a deep resentment by the Irish of this continued occupation of part of their country by British troops. Within the boundaries are many of Ireland's most sacred shrines, both national and religious. One-third of the citizens in the area are nationalists and passionately desire reunion with their fellow Irishmen. The Government that Britain has set up would have the world believe they have established rights and historic rights to remain in Ireland as British subjects. This attitude has led to much confusion. At this point I would like to quote from a speech made at Faneuil Hall, Boston, in October 1902, by that superb orator the late Bourke Cochrane, one of the outstanding Members of Congress of his day. Here is what he said:

"I think it is no exaggeration to say that the one defense English rule has in Ireland is not in its arms, not its soldiers, not its ships that ride the sea and turn the mouths of their gaping guns toward the Irish coast. It is not the ingenuity of lawyers that frame statutes to support English power; but it is the extraordinary capacity for misrepresentation which has enabled English statesmen to shroud this whole Irish question in mystery, so that the judgment of the world is puzzled to decide upon its right and upon its truth."

Just as this statement embraced the situation of all Ireland in 1902, so does it describe the campaign of misrepresentation of today, that Ulster or that portion that is still British occupied, was always loyal to Britain and that the Tories have an unquestioned right to remain in Ireland as British citizens under a British Government. There is a story told of an Irishman who died and ascended the path to the pearly gates, seeking admission to the kingdom of heaven. As he stood before St. Peter, that good man thumbed the record, sadly shook his head and said: "I am afraid you just don't qualify, your record is not good, you may not enter." Pat looked knowingly at the saint and throwing back his head he gave an imitation of a cock crowing. St. Peter frowned and then said: "All right, you may go in, but you Irish make me sick—always digging into old sores." At the risk of being placed in the same category as this Irishman, I am going to take about 5 minutes to review the history of Ulster, to explain how this sentiment was born and nurtured—and from whence came the ancestors of these Irish who prefer British rule. British historians do not tell of the ancient Irish kings who ruled Ulster, of St. Patrick's landing in Antrim, and of the schools and monasteries that he and his successors erected in Ulster. Nor do they tell of the great saints and scholars who flourished in Ulster during Ireland's golden age, when she was the repository of Christian civilization while the barbarian hordes of Northern Europe overran the continent. We hear nothing of the proud O'Neills and O'Donnells who were the last Irish princes to bow to the English conqueror—and Ulster was the last Irish province to fall to Britain's military might. In the early days, and for many generations subsequent to the occupation of Ireland, English soldiery was able to occupy only small sectors that became known as the English Pale. Many of these families in succeeding generations assimilated a love for the land that gave them birth, acquired a love for liberty and justice, and became more Irish than the Irish themselves.

When Henry VIII withdrew from the Church of Rome, part of his program was to confiscate the estates of Irish lords unless they followed his leadership. With the ascendance of Elizabeth I to the throne of England, this same type of campaign was pursued most vigorously. The cost of the Irish wars mounted and Elizabeth, seeking money to defray the cost, asked loans from Englishmen, pledging them Irish estates in payment at the conclusion of the wars. This became known as the Plantation. In 1649, Oliver Cromwell with a large army that was followed by a horde of hungry adventurers, invaded Ireland in 1650 the Plantation was complete. Practically all Ireland was Catholic at the time and as no Catholic was allowed to own land, all were dispossessed. In 1692 a law was adopted prohibiting any Catholic from being a member of Parliament. In 1694 it was decreed that the Irish Parliament could not consider any legislation unless approved by the British Privy Council. In the following century there were men in Parliament, British though they were, like Molyneaux and Lucas, who protested against these oppressive measures. It was to this Parliament that Benjamin Franklin appealed for aid during the war that established our independence. Here he received the heartening assurances of support that produced many of the valiant and outstanding soldiers of our Revolutionary Army. It is significant to note that this Parliament governed all Ireland and there was no thought of a separate government for Ulster. The Revolt of 1803 was led by Robert Emmett and Wolfe Tone, both men of the North, not of Catholic faith nor of ancient Irish stock. These are names that shall ever be revered and cherished by the children of the Gael. Following the Act of Union there grew up political organizations whose membership was comprised mostly of the descendants of those who followed Cromwell. They were fostered and protected by the British rulers and from this group we have the Unionists of today.

This brief sketch very definitely exposes the falsity and absurdity of the present day attempts to influence public opinion that the Unionists of northeastern Ireland have any established or historical claim to privileges they have been accorded in a partitioned Ireland by the empire that planted the original colony with just this object in view. In promoting and fostering the political organizations I have mentioned, they have through prejudice and fear erected a barrier that has prevented the assimilation of the progeny of the early colonists. Basing her argument on the 3-century occupation, Britain is forcing this partition on Ireland in defiance of the declared opposition of more than 80 percent of the Irish people. Certainly her attitude on other world situations of a comparable nature, are far from consistent. The Arabs in Israel, though they occupied the land for over a thousand years, accepted Israeli citizenship or displacement. The nationals of those countries that formerly ruled the nations carved out of World War I, the Germans in Alsace Lorraine when it was returned to France, were accorded no special consideration. Many of these peoples mentioned became displaced persons and received no compensation for the homes and lands they and their forefathers had occupied for generations. While Ireland claims the right to this territory occupied by Britain, no such proposals or views are entertained by the Irish Government with relation to the Tories in northeastern Ireland. They have assured them of every right of free citizens—freedom of speech, freedom of religion, freedom to pursue their way of life within the framework of a united Ireland. They have even changed their ancient flag of green to include an orange stripe, united by a white stripe, to indicate the freedom and equality of all citizens. Their sincerity is attested by the manner in which former British subjects in the Irish Republic has accepted their changed status and have become useful and interested citizens. However, these offers have been rejected—rejected on the basis of the fears and prjudices fostered by Britain—rejected in view of the fact that Britain has urged them to do so with the promise of moral, financial, and military assistance and by the fulfillment of that promise.

How then is Ireland to regain her occupied territory? By discussion—and with whom? With Britain? Britain refuses to discuss the matter, maintaining it is a subject for the Irish to settle. Yet she has twice in one generation interfered to the extent that she has created this abominable situation—in 1920 by her Government of Ireland Act, which established partition, and again in 1949 by her Ireland Act with which she proposes to perpetuate partition. With the Unionists? Strengthened in their stand by British aid, they defiantly refuse, in their own parlance, to give an inch. By force of arms? God forbid there should be any more bloodshed in Ireland. Centuries of rebellions and countless martyrs have caused the soil of Ireland to be saturated with blood, shed in the cause of a free and independent Ireland. It is indeed a difficult decision for the people of Ireland to make—for it is their responsibility to make—and theirs alone. Meanwhile Irish spokesmen have appealed to the citizens of our great and powerful Republic to place our moral weight behind their cause. Representative John E. Fogarty, of Rhode Island, has introduced in the Congress, House Resolution 19, which would declare it "to be the sense of Congress that the Republic of Ireland consists of her 32 counties unless by a free plebiscite of the people of all Ireland, a majority declare to the contrary." The adoption of this resolution would give no assurance that this would become an accomplished fact. It would, however, produce a significant reaction throughout the world and bring to bear on British statesmen the weight of worldwide public opinion to change her course with relation to her untenable position of supporting minority rule in northeastern Ireland while denouncing it elsewhere in the world. It would also clarify our position by indicating that we abhor oppression, be the guilty friend or foe.

Let us hope and pray and work to see in our day the realization of the objective of the countless martyrs who have died in defence of Ireland's rights, and the vision of Ireland's first President, Padraic Pearse—an Ireland free from sea to sea.

The Upper Colorado River Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DOUGLAS R. STRINGFELLOW

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1954

Mr. STRINGFELLOW. Mr. Speaker, recently copies of an article by Raymond Moley in Newsweek magazine was distributed to all Members of Congress by those who are selfishly opposing authorization of Echo Park Dam and other phases of the upper Colorado River project. Because this article contained so many innuendos, half truths, and complete misstatements, I would like to call to your attention a copy of a letter from Mr. George D. Clyde, Utah commissioner of interstate streams, answering Mr. Moley's article in Newsweek. I also include in the Record an article by Mr. Clyde entitled "It's Time To Call a Spade a Spade," which gives a true and complete picture of the upper Colorado River project:

May 27, 1954.

Mr. Raymond Moley,
Care of Newsweek, New York, N. Y.

Dear Mr. Moley: I read with interest your discussion on the Colorado River project in recent issues of Newsweek. For many years I have read your statements and I had developed a rather high regard for your judgment and sane, sound approach to the problems discussed. However, in connection with the Colorado River, I think you are entirely wrong and have not taken the time or the interest to critically examine the record and take a fair, straightforward look at both sides of this picture.

There's too much involved in this project to pass it by lightly. When you stop to think of the renewable resources of the Colorado River which will go on in perpetuity, you can't help but draw conclusions that those who establish rights to these waters now will have those rights in perpetuity. It represents literally billions of dollars over the years and millions of dollars annually in terms of power and consumptive use of water. The fact that water runs downhill is simple evidence of the interest parties located on the lower reaches of that stream have in opposing the development of the water resources in the upper basin.

Thirty-two years ago this question was before the public. It was a question of major importance. It was a question which involved joint action and such joint action was obtained through and by the Colorado River compact which was signed ultimately by all States in the basin and the United States. The compact divided the waters of the river. Now, after 32 years, when the lower reaches of the river have been put under control by means of the Hoover Dam, the Parker Dam, and the Davis Dam and when the upper basin States, after more than 25 years of investigation, have developed, in cooperation with the United States, a feasible project which will permit the upper States to put to use their share of the waters of the Colorado River, we find opposition raising its ugly head in the name of national parks and monuments, infeasibility, deterioration of water quality, shortage of water supply, and all of the other devices known to man which will prevent the development of the upper river, knowing full well that such prevention means the entire river resource goes to the lower basin States and Mexico, and the upper basin States, who depend upon this source of supply as the last remaining water source, will be forever relegated to a limited economic status because the rights to the waters which fall within their boundaries were taken away from them through the simple device of prevention of development in the upper basin.

It is recognized that such development must have financial assistance from the Federal Government in the form of a loan but this principal is not new in the United States. The United States has grown great because the Federal Government was willing and able to develop its rivers and harbors, to subsidize its railroad and air transportation, and now is spending literally billions on flood control, none of which costs are ever returned to the Federal Treasury and yet when States like the upper basin States, in order to develop their God-given resources, asked for Federal financial assistance to be repaid with interest for all facilities except irrigation, the opposition who want that water for their own use, charge infeasibility and lack of investigations, raid on the public Treasury and you have lent yourself and your great name to that group.

In your article in Newsweek of May 10, 1954, you repeat charges that have been made by dozens of irresponsible people since this question of the development of the upper Colorado River was raised. There was not a single new idea in the entire article. The thing that surprised me was that a man of your stature would lend himself to the mouthings of irresponsibles. You refer to General Grant III. I listened to his testimony before the House Committee in January of this year and upon cross examination, he couldn't qualify as a man informed sufficiently to pass judgment on the questions of evaporation from these reservoirs and he couldn't produce the men whom he claimed he got his information from. Seems to me you're making a pretty bold charge when you say in effect that the engineers in the Bureau of Reclamation are incompetent and not qualified or haven't made sufficient investigations to get the answers.

The whole question is that apparently they haven't come up with the answers the opposition would like, in order that they might take all the water of the Colorado River, of which 90 percent comes from the upper basin, and therefore, they want to continue to investigate until some somebody comes up with an answer to their liking. In the meantime, rights are being established to the waters of the Colorado in spite of the compact. Fundamentally, the rights to the use of water for consumptive and power purposes are based upon use and the upper basin States cannot expect forever to retain their right under the compact to the waters of the Colorado River unless they put these waters to use.

Your comments on the bookkeeping are interesting. Here again you refused to accept fundamental principles of analysis and you seemed to forget that under the proposal, as outlined in the Colorado River storage project and based upon power rates which are accepted by the utilities as well as public power officials, these power plants will fully repay all the costs of construction, including interest for the power features and irrigation features, without interest over and above that portion which will be charged to the irrigation water users directly all within a period of 50 years and there will remain at the end of that time plants in full operation, and after the operation and maintenance costs and replacement costs are taken from the revenues, there will still remain, to pour into the Public Treasury, $15 to $20 million a year based on the current power rates. This, Mr. Moley, is not a cost. This does not tap the taxpayers' pockets. This is an investment in the future of this country to say nothing of the cash return which will come after all of these resources are developed, in addition to the additional taxes, both income and general, which will result from an expanded economy. You forget all of these things.

I realize the danger of crossing swords with a man of your ability but I must speak my mind. The attached statement expresses my feelings in this matter. I am passing it on to you because I believe you are a reasonable man and want to know the facts in the case.

Your sincerely,

George D. Clyde,

Commissioner of Interstate Streams.

It's Time To Call a Spade a Spade

(By George D. Clyde, commissioner of interstate streams for Utah)

These United States did not become great by waiting for certainty—yet Raymond Moley and others of his kind writing in Newsweek and other national papers, cry "Let's wait." After more than 80 years of investigation by the United States Bureau of Reclamation, the most outstanding engineering organization in the world, those who know nothing about the facts of life in an arid region cry "Let's wait for more investigations."

The opponents of the Colorado River storage project and its participating projects are using the Echo Park Dam as a front behind which is a carefully conceived plan to prevent the development of the Upper Colorado River Basin in order that that great water and power resource may automatically go down to the lower basin.

It makes no difference how the project is defeated, whether it be the result of claims of invasion of a national monument, lack of water to satisfy the rights of California and provide consumptive uses in the upper basin, impairment of quality of water by upstream consumptive uses, economic infeasibility, or reduced power output at Hoover, Parker, and Davis Dams as a result of the consumptive use of water in the upper basin, the result is the same. The water and power goes downstream to the lower users.

Literally billions of dollars in economic wealth over hundreds of years are involved. Once the water and power are put to use and an economy builded upon them, no power in the land will ever take away the right to continued use of that water and power. Continued delay in putting that water and power to use in the upper basin is tantamount to granting a right by use to the lower users. The Colorado River Compact won't be worth the paper that it is written on if the upper basin States are prevented from putting the water allocated to them by that compact to beneficial use.

The attack on the Colorado River storage project by Raymond Moley in Newsweek of May 10 and May 17, 1954, is a classic example of misrepresentation and half truths. His article is certainly in the class of the Private Schine debacle to which he refers. Every point discussed by Mr. Moley has been refuted by facts, yet he ignores these, and pleads for more delay, more investigations, and now he wants the Hoover Commission to decide the issue. He knows that every day's delay means more water and power put to use in the lower basin and another nail driven in the coffin of the upper basin States.

In spite of the volumes written in opposition to the Colorado River storage project, the facts are well established relative to the basic features necessary for basinwide development. The details of specific participating projects in the ultimate phase of construction remain to be determined. These facts simply stated are as follows:

1. Full utilization of the Colorado River for consumptive use and power purposes requires complete regulation by storage of water during wet years to supply the developed uses during the dry years.

2. The Colorado River compact requires the upper basin States to deliver at Lee's Ferry 75 million acre-feet of water during each consecutive 10-year period. This commitment cannot be met without complete regulation of the river above Lee's Ferry if the upper basin States are to be allowed to use consumptively their share of the Colorado River. Mr. Moley refuses to recognize this fundamental controlling factor.

3. Because of topography, the waters of the Colorado River in the upper basin must be used by exchange. For example, no water out of Echo Park and Glen Canyon will be used for irrigation of lands in the upper basin. Water from these reservoirs however, will be used in the lower basin in place of waters belonging to the users in the lower basin which the users in the upper basin divert for their use. Use of irrigation water by exchange is a well-established practice but requires basinwide and long-range planning for optimum use of the resource.

4. The resources involved in the Colorado River project are water, soil, power, industrial raw materials, and people. Joining water and soil creates an agricultural resource. Falling water is a power resource. Water and power are basic to industrial development. All of these resources put to use create job opportunities and national wealth. Therefore, the Colorado River storage project will not cost the taxpayer a dime. Its construction is a national investment. There is no subsidy. Power is a resource belonging to the people and Utah has an interest in the power on the Colorado, the same as New York has an interest in the land and water within its boundaries. The use of power revenues from public sources to develop other public resources as in investment in the future.

5. The generation of power is an essential feature of the Colorado River storage project. Power-generation studies on the Colorado by competent engineers backed by years of experience show conclusively that power can be generated at the storage dams, if interconnected and built in the proper sequence, at a cost less than by any other means, and that the same storage dams will provide the necessary storage for the regulation of the river. The revenues from the power plants will pay the cost of the power facilities with interest and well within 50 years. There certainly is no subsidy in this and no cost to the taxpayers.

6. The participating projects of the Colorado River storage project will provide water for municipal purposes. Costs of water for municipal purposes will be repaid with interest in a 50 year period. There is no subsidy or cost to the taxpayers here.

7. Participating Projects of the Colorado River Storage Project will provide water for irrigation purposes. This is a consumptive use. Due to rough topography and long conveyance from points of origin to points of use, the costs of supplying irrigation water to lands both within and without the Colorado River Basin are greater than the users of irrigation water can pay. Historically, the United States has recognized that the development of irrigated lands is a good public investment. For this reason, Federal funds since 1902 have been provided interest free to build reclamation projects. Furthermore, it is recognized that there are many indirect benefits that accure to those living in the vicinity of or on an irrigation project. These indirect benefits should be paid for. In an irrigated region, the users of power are essentially the same people as the users of water. The use of power revenues from plants which are a part of the basinwide project, therefore, provides an equitable method of collecting for the indirect benefits. In the absence of power revenues, an ad valorem tax is often levied to accomplish the same purpose. It is proposed in the Colorado River Storage project to assess the irrigation farmers according to their ability to pay and to pay the balance of the costs allocated to irrigation with power revenues and/or an ad valorem tax levied against the indirect beneficiaries. Thus, there is no irrigation subsidy and when the widespread benefits are considered, no cost to the taxpayer. In fact, it is estimated that the entire cost of the initial phase of the Colorado River storage project and its participating projects will be paid back in 50 years and thereafter for all time, there will be a net income after operation and maintenance and replacement costs have been paid, of from 15 to 20 million dollars. In addition, the broadened tax base and Federal income taxes will add greatly to the public income and the creation of new wealth will improve the economy of the entire United States.

In spite of the facts just enumerated, Raymond Moley proposes that all development in the upper Colorado River Basin be held up pending the report of the Hoover Commission on Reorganization of the executive departments. This is a delaying tactic pure and simple because the Colorado River storage project, or any other project, has no direct relation to the reorganization of the executive departments of the Federal Government.

Mr. Moley, like a broken record, repeats the charge that the engineering investigations are faulty and unreliable. The record is clear on this count. Studies and investigations are valid and complete as far as they were carried and for the purposes for which they were made. They have been carried far enough to prove conclusively the validity of the initial phase of the proposal. The planned reports, preliminary to contracts for construction, will give more detail.

Mr. Moley raises the question of invasion of a national monument and cities the testimony of General Grant III. The facts relating to the Dinosaur National Monument set forth an expansion of the area of the monument from 80 acres to 209,000 acres in 1938, with a specific reservation in the Presidential proclamation providing for the development of the water and power resources within the monument. Failure to live up to this reservation would be an act of bad faith on the part of the Federal Government.

Contrary to Mr. Moley's statement, there are no alternative dam sites that could replace the Echo Park Dam. General Grant III admitted under cross examination at the House hearings in January 1954 that his experience in the engineering field did not especially qualify him to judge the validity of Bureau of Reclamation's position relative to Echo Park but that he secured the advice of his friends relative to the matter.

Mr. Moley's statement relative to the payout is to say the least, confusing. The plan proposed is simple. All revenues from power go into the Public Treasury. Out of these monies the cost of operation, maintenance, replacement, and interest on power facilities is first paid. The capital cost of power facilities is retired out of these funds and will be fully liquidated well within 50 years. The facilities for providing municipal water will be paid with interest from revenues from municipalities. These facilities will be paid for within 50 years. The costs allocated to irrigation within the ability of the irrigation-water users to pay will be paid within 50 years plus a 10-year development period. The balance of the irrigation costs will be paid from power revenues and also within a period of 50 years. This repayment plan is specific, valid, and the required power rates to meet it well within the cost of power from any other source. This is quite a different picture than that presented by Mr. Moley of an immense deficit. Instead, after 50 years, there will be a net revenue of from fifteen to twenty million dollars. Mr. Moley raises the question of a power market. This is prima facie evidence that he has not bothered to get the facts. At the same hearings at which General Grant III appeared, nine public-utility power companies from the upper Colorado Basin States appeared and agreed to purchase all the power to be developed at the proposed powerplants as fast as it became available.

The most revealing question raised by Mr. Moley, however, is the one expressing fear that if the upper basin States used the water to which they are entitled by the Colorado River compact that it might interfere with the rights established and/or claimed by California. It would appear that Mr. Moley figures that California's right is paramount even though the compact divides the water equally. Mr. Moley apparently would have California's and Mexico's rights satisfied first and if there is anything left, the upper basin States can use it.

The upper basin States are willing to abide by the Colorado River compact. They believe, however, that they should be given the same opportunity to develop and use their share of the waters of the Colorado as the lower basin was when the Hoover Dam, the Davis Dam, the Parker Dam, and the All-American Canal were built to control the river and provide the means, both power and water, necessary to develop their resources.

It's time to call a spade a spade, Mr. Moley, and quit trying to cover up the real issue with dinosaurs and fears of water shortage and salt in the lower basin when the nut of the controversy is that water runs downhill, that power and water are urgently needed in the lower basin and that regardless of the means of defeating the Colorado River storage project, the result is the same. The lower basin and Mexico get all the water and the power from the Colorado even though 90 percent of the water originates in the upper basin.

Defeat of the upper Colorado River storage project by the Congress is tantamount to giving away the resources of the upper Colorado River basin States to the States of the lower Colorado River basin and Mexico.

Indochina: France's Position

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 1, 1954

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on May 20, 1954, the distinguished Minister Plenipotentiary of the Republic of France to the United States, Mr. Roger Seydoux, delivered an address before the World Affairs Council of Philadelphia relative to the situation in Indochina. In view of the fact that excerpts from this address have been published in the daily press, I think it would be well for Senators to have the opportunity to study the entire text of the address delivered by Mr. Seydoux. I therefore ask unanimous consent to have the address printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INDOCHINA: FRANCE'S POSITION

(Address on Indochina delivered by M. Roger Seydoux, Minister Plenipotentiary at the French Embassy in Washington, before the World Affairs Council of Philadelphia, May 20, 1954)

The French Ambassador, M. Henri Bonnet, has asked me to express to you his very sincere regrets for not being able to be with you today. But the recent developments of the situation in Indochina require his presence in Washington.

He entrusted me to convey to you his warmest regards and thanks for your kind invitation. His gratitude goes especially to the sponsors of this meeting, particularly to the World Affairs Council and to the Foreign Traders Association, which are both reputed nationwide organizations, and also to the chairman of this meeting, Mr. Edgar Scott, who is Parisian born and who, like so many distinguished citizens of this historic city, has close links with my country.

You will not be surprised if I devote this address to Indochina. No problem, at the present time, is more important for all of us, because it symbolizes the resistance of the free world to Communist aggression.

As you know, Indochina is a territory located in the southeastern part of Asia, bordered on the north by China, on the west by Burma and Thailand and on the east by the Pacific Ocean.

Strategically, Indochina has often been defined as the key to southeast Asia.

Just a glance at the map confirms this. Should Indochina fall into Communist hands, Singapore, Malaya would be instantly threatened as they were in 1941, when the Japanese held Indochina. The smaller states of Thailand and Burma would be outflanked, and the road to India would be open again. Hence, the loss of Indochina would probably bring in its wake the eventual loss of all of free Southeast Asia.

Southeast Asia represents by itself an area three times as large as Korea; it is one of the richest regions of the globe, producing 90 percent of the world's natural rubber and 60 percent of its tin.

It is, furthermore—and this is a point of vital importance—the only region in Asia with an important food surplus. It has justly been called the rice bowl of Asia. Were it to fall into hostile hands, both India's and Indochina's hungry millions would be at the mercy of the conquerors, or totally dependent upon Western—mainly American—relief. This vast area is inhabited by nearly 200 million people who are now neutral or anti-Communist and who would, in the case of a Communist victory in Indochina and its neighboring states, be thrown in with the nearly half billion Chinese and North Koreans who are already enslaved behind the Iron Curtain of communism in Asia.

The defense of Indochina, key to such a vast area, is, therefore, of major concern to all the freedom-loving people of the world.

You may know that, historically speaking, Indochina is a zone of transition between the Chinese and Indian cultures. On the one hand, we have the Vietnamese who represent four-fifths of the total population and who have been marked by Chinese influence in the fields of language, culture, and religion.

Vietnam, formerly the Empire of Annam, was long a Chinese dependency, but centuries ago, Vietnam threw off the Chinese yoke and, since then, it has held its great northern neighbor in distrust—a distrust that had been well justified in recent years.

On the other hand, we find the smaller states of Cambodia and Laos, who are related, on the ethnic and religious planes, to the Buddhist populations of neighboring Thailand and Burma.

It was only in the 1860's that France, wishing to protect the already sizable Christian population which was then persecuted in Indochina, sent her sailors and soldiers to Indochina, and that French protectorates were established to guide the native states toward modern development, as was done by Britain, the United States, and other powers in other parts of the world. France's record of achievement in Indochina in the economic, cultural, and social fields stands second to none in Asia. The creation of a vast network of hospitals and dispensaries and of the world-famous Pasteur Institutes for bacteriological research—which soon put Indochina's health record at the forefront of all southeast Asian countries—also dates back to this period. As early as 1927, the Pasteur Institutes of Indochina were able to export 30 million individual vaccination units to the surrounding countries stricken by one of the worst cholera epidemics of the century. The French-created Hanoi University, with its full-fledged medical, engineering, law, and liberal arts departments, soon began to turn out an elite of trained native leaders. In the 1930's, 48 out of the 80 posts of chief surgeon in Indochina were held by native doctors, and it is a fact of sad pride to us that all of the Communist Viet Minh leaders have received their education in French-created, tuition-free schools and institutions of higher learning and that even today the Viet Minh use the French language for their military radio communication network.

True, while all was not rosy—for nothing in this world is perfect—it may be safely asserted that France's record in Indochina will lie heavily on the credit side in the balance book of history.

What are the historical origins of the present conflict?

We must go back to the Second World War and to the Japanese occupation. A few months after the occupation of France by the Germans, Indochina was in turn occupied by the Japanese armies.

After the Japanese capitulation in 1945, the situation was as follows: The representatives of French authority were in jail; bands in which Nationalists and Communists mingled had been armed by the Japanese and were creating a climate of disorder and insecurity; a Chinese Nationalist army was occupying the northern part of the country, while the British were holding the south.

It was not until the beginning of 1946 that the French authorities regained a foothold in Indochina. At that moment France found herself faced not only with the armed bands mentioned above, but also with a political authority led, even then, by Ho Chi Minh, a Vietnamese intellectual trained in the 1920's in Marxist schools in France and Russia but who, in spite of his Moscow training and dependence, was careful to appear as the champion of nationalism.

The French Government attempted, during this first period ,to negotiate with Ho Chi Minh, and concluded a modus vivendi with him.

This agreement was brutally violated by the Viet Minh who, in the night of December 19, 1946, massacred a large number of French civilians in Hanoi. Since then, war has been raging in Indochina.

What kind of a war is the Indochinese war?

It is a very different kind of war from the one waged in Korea.

First of all, as I already told you, Indochina is three times and a half the size of Korea (286,000 square miles, as against 83,000).

In Korea, there was a set front—in Indochina, the enemy is everywhere. The peasant working in the nearby ricefields may transform himself by night into a sniper. Behind the front lines of the Korean front, the United Nations troops could have a certain feeling of security. In Indochina, this feeling of security does not exist anywhere; the war goes on, not over a restricted zone as in Korea, but over a territory twice as large as Korea.

The climate and terrain are vastly different from that of Korea. The open hills and valleys of Korea permitted effective air observation and attacks, while the deep jungles of Indochina and the water-covered ricefields offer many favorable opportunities for Communist ambushes which are hard to detect and even harder to attack from the air. Thus, Indochina, with its hot and wet tropical climate, its tropical diseases and poisonous snakes, is much more like what you Americans called the "Green Hell of Guadalcanal," where your heroic marines faced the same odds, with one difference, however: Whereas the American struggle in the jungles of the central Pacific and Burma lasted only about a year, and the Korean war lasted 3 years, France's lone struggle in the far bigger expanses of Indochina has now been going on for a full 8 years. Longer than any other war of the 20th century.

The effectives engaged on both sides are considerable.

On the Vietminh side, there is an army of 300,000 battle-seasoned and heavily armed regular and regional troops, well officered by Vietnamese graduates of Red Chinese military academies and inspired with that fanaticism peculiar to Communist forces all over the world.

One must add to this figure an additional 200,000 local guerillas and militias, ready to enter into action at the bidding of the Communist Vietminh command, and countless thousands of helpless civilian coolies and laborers, who are forced—often at gunpoint—to carry the ammunitions and supplies of the enemy over hundreds of miles of jungle paths. It is obvious that such easily hidden columns of carriers are entirely invisible from the air, and render Vietminh supply lines nearly invulnerable to the type of air action which was so important in Korea.

The enemy's main force, carefully kept in reserve for only the biggest battles, is well equipped with the most modern implements of warfare, abundantly provided with Czechoslovakian recoilless cannons, Soviet Molotova trucks, and Red Chinese copies of American automatic weapons and artillery, which enable them to make immediate use of any foreign material captured.

On the anti-Communist side there are the French Union forces, numbering 240,000 men, 80,000 of whom are from France and form the hard core of our paratroopers, airmen, and sailors; the others come from France's overseas territories and from the Foreign Legion and also include Vietnamese volunteers; the national armies of the Associated States of Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia, numbering at present about 200,000 men, with an expected increase to about 300,000 men by the end of 1954; these armies have their own cadres of officers and noncommissioned officers and their own chiefs of staff.

Our losses have been heavy, reaching about 80,000 for metropolitan France alone, of which more than 17,000 were killed—a figure which was established before Dien Bien Phu. Considering that France's population is four times smaller than that of the United States, our losses have been twice as high as American losses in Korea.

It is needless at the present time to point to the heroic sacrifice of the defenders of the fallen fortress at Dien Bien Phu. Fighting against overwhelming odds—with thousands of their wounded and dead lying in the rain-soaked trenches and underground shelters—their deeds will stand as a glorious page in the long history of fidelity and devotion to the cause of freedom "beyond the call of duty." The fight for Dien Bien Phu, however, has once again made crucially clear that this type of war is particularly costly in young and able leaders, such as General de Castries and the many officers and highly trained unit commanders who were lost with him. All in all, we lose each year the equivalent of an entire graduating class from St. Cyr. The average life expectancy of a junior officer fighting in Indochina is 87 combat days.

To these purely French casualties should be added the equally heavy casualties of the Vietnamese, north Africans, and Legionnaires, amounting to an overall figure of more than 100,000 men.

It has been said, and justly so, that Indochina is first and foremost a political problem. In some American quarters—and among American legislators—voices are heard to the effect that the Vietnamese people would fight with greater enthusiasm and eagerness if they were sure that they were fighting for their independence rather than to preserve so-called colonial privileges for France. The question having been raised, I think that this is as good an occasion as any to set the record straight.

First, let me tell you that, if such a question can still be raised, it is because the French Army has, for 8 years, held the line against the Red tide. That is perhaps the reason why it has been said that the war in Indochina is a French war. I can think of nothing more unfair. France would like nothing better than to bring the French Expeditionary Corps back home. If she does not do so it is—as Vice President Nixon said recently—because pulling out the French forces would mean a Communist victory within a month.

In fact, the French forces are fighting precisely to protect the independence of the people of Indochina. This independence is already a reality. The three states already have the prerogatives of sovereign states. They have their own government, their own diplomacy, their own army. They are recognized by 34 states and have their own Ambassadors in Washington. Their full independence has been granted by France as a result of treaties that have already been signed or are to be signed by Laos, Cambodia, and Vietnam.

May I quote the first paragraph of the Treaty of Independence between France and Vietnam: "France recognizes Vietnam as a fully independent and sovereign state, invested with the jurisdiction recognized by international law."

In a different treaty, Vietnam affirms its will to associate itself freely within the French Union, in which it assumes the same rights and duties as France herself.

It has been said, especially in this country, that the French Union framework is still a stigma of colonialism and that the independence of Vietnam would be fulfilled only when all links were severed with the French Union. May I point out that, in such a case, the Indochinese problem would no longer be the sole responsibility of France and that all free nations would have to contribute to the defense of Indochina in proportion to their human and material resources.

What is the present situation in Indochina?

There is a war front and a diplomatic front.

On the war front, now covered by the monsoon rains which hamper our air force and the movement of our motorized and armored units, Generals Navarre and Cogny are now marshalling their troops against what appears to be an all-out attempt by the Viet Minh Communists to strengthen their diplomatic hand at Geneva by a general offensive against the vital Red River Delta. The bulk of the enemy's forces, which had been delayed for several weeks by the stand of General de Castries' men at Dienbienphu, is now free to attack the Delta. There can be no doubt of the fact that the enemy has received sizable amounts of Chinese aid and that it was the last-minute influx of this Chinese aid, now diverted from North Korea, which made possible the concentration of heavy weapons of all kinds upon the embattled defenders of Dienbienphu.

On the diplomatic front, there is a conference going on in Geneva in order to promote a peaceful settlement in Asia.

What is the position of my Government?

The French Government is doing its utmost to reach an agreement on honorable terms, just as an armistice was concluded in Korea. This agreement would involve first of all a military cease-fire in Indochina under international guaranty. In due time, this military cease-fire would be followed by a political settlement which would be implemented by free elections under international control.

If we should, unfortunately, fail to reach such an agreement in Geneva and if the war has to be carried on, one thing is sure: France will not go on fighting alone. This means that the war would have to be internationalized and that the free nations will have to join in the fight, not only with planes and ships, but also with troops.

Rest assured that after 8 years of such a war of attrition, France will not continue to be the foot soldier of the free world in southeast Asia.

Of course, nobody in France or in the free world wants an extension of the war in Indochina. What we all want is peace. But we must realize that no peace that we could accept will be conceded by the Communists if they are not convinced that the free world—of which the leaders are the United States, the United Kingdom, and France—is determined to stand united in face of the increased Communist threat and, if necessary, to fight in order to attain such a peace.

We fully realize that we are asking of our allies, and particularly of our American friends, a grave commitment which has to be carefully weighed. However, they must understand that, in the meantime, the officers and men of the French Union and of Vietnam are fighting and dying every day, to hold the gate of southeast Asia against the Communist avalanche.

This is the time for decision. The more we delay a united action, the more difficult will be the task of the high command in

Indochina, the hardest will be the task of our negotiators in Geneva.

This grave decision is the responsibility of every citizen in all the free countries and on this decision depends, not only the fate of millions of people in Asia, but also, to a great extent, the fate of the Western World.

Address by Gen. Carlos P. Romulo on Receiving Degree of Doctor of Laws From Rockhurst College, Kansas City, Mo.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 1, 1954

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, on May 17 last, Rockhurst College in Kansas City, Mo., conferred the degree of doctor of laws on Gen. Carlos P. Romulo, the special and personal envoy of the President of the Philippines to the United States. It is the 19th honorary degree he has received from an American institution of learning.

Former President Truman, in delivering the introductory remarks before General Romulo's address, said:

> I am here because I am a great admirer of General Romulo, a patriot and a world statesman who has earned our respect and our regard.

As his topic, General Romulo chose Winning the Uncommitted in Asia. No subject concerns us more deeply today. General Romulo's observations on that occasion are worthy of sober attention. I ask unanimous consent to insert excerpts from General Romulo's remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WINNING THE UNCOMMITTED IN ASIA

(By Gen. Carlos P. Romulo)

There is some talk today about the possibility that the United States may be "alienating its allies." In a strict sense, the word "allies" would refer only to those countries in Europe, in the Americas, and in the Pacific that are linked to the United States by treaties of mutual defense and security.

The charge, if true, would be serious. It cannot be said too often that as the leader of the free-world coalition the United States needs all the allies it now has or will have in the future in order to combat effectively the threat of Communist expansion and domination. No one can doubt that everything will be done to preserve and strengthen this coalition.

There is a related problem that is deserving of at least equal attention. This is the problem of keeping or winning the friendship of the non-Communist countries that are not technically allies of the United States, more specifically, the uncommitted peoples of Asia and Africa.

For many years I have discussed this problem with American friends both in and out of the Government and before audiences throughout the country. I have done this because I feel that the citizen of a country, which is America's only proven friend and ally in southeast Asia, may perhaps be in a position to offer some suggestions concerning this vital problem of United States foreign policy.

The problem of winning friends for America in Asia and Africa is difficult but not insuperable. Though it should not be underestimated, it has frequently been exaggerated.

The main sources of the difficulty are well known and generally understood.

There is, first, the dual character of the present conflict. The western countries generally view the conflict as one between the free institutions under which they live and the totalitarian system represented by the Communist states. But as far as the Asian and African peoples generally are concerned, the conflict which more deeply engrosses them is that between the right of self-determination and independence and the vestige of colonial imperialism.

Confronted with this duel nature of the conflict, the United States finds itself in a dilemma. The dilemma is sharpened by the opposing pressures exerted by American ideals and by the practical recognition of political necessity. The idealism springs from America's own revolutionary traditions and from its record of liberating the Philippines and recognizing its independence. On the other hand, what may appear to some as an ineluctable political necessity has inclined the United States to moderate its sympathy for the aspirations of the peoples of Asia and Africa so as not to alienate its Western allies, including the colonial powers among them, and consequently weaken the free world coalition against communism.

What makes the American dilemma specially dangerous, of course, is that communism has come forward to pretend that it is the only true champion of the subject peoples and the redoubtable foe of western imperialism. Unfortunately, there are many ears in Asia and Africa that are willing or eager to listen to Communist propaganda.

But if there are such ready listeners, it is not because they fear the new Communist imperialism less but because they scorn the old imperialism, which they have known for centuries, more.

Anybody who has read with care the May 2 communique of the South Asian Prime Ministers Conference in Kandy, Ceylon, would agree with this estimate of the situation. While I cannot myself agree with all the statements contained in the communique, I consider it to be, on the whole, a sober and statesmanlike declaration which accurately reflects the thinking and outlook of what has been referred to as the uncommitted peoples of Asia. It is a statement which, in particular, should commend itself to the closest attention of the makers of United States policy towards Asia.

The document speaks for itself, and it is not for me to make a defense of the views set forth therein. But when I say that it is a significant document which commands attention and respect, I refer both to the substance of it and to the manner in which the various conclusions and recommendations were reached.

As to substance, the document should go a long way toward dispelling the notion, unfortunately current in the United States, that the countries represented in the conference (India, Pakistan, Indonesia, Burma, and Ceylon) are antiwestern and therefore, by that token, sympathetic toward communism. The communique makes it clear that these countries are strongly against imperialism, both old style and new. It also shows that they are profoundly concerned with the maintenance of peace in this hydrogen age—an anxiety which is natural and universal, quite regardless of any existing political or ideological differences which divide the world.

As to the manner in which the various conclusions and recommendations in the communique was reached, enough is known of the proceedings of the conference to indicate that no one of the five leaders present was able to dominate the conference or to dictate its decisions. As was to be expected, they all agreed that the continued existence of colonialism was a "violation of human rights and a threat to the peace of the world." But as regards the question of whether or not communism should be mentioned as a threat to the preservation of the "freedoms inherent in the democratic system," it is known that while India and Indonesia were inclined to avoid such a reference to communism, Pakistan, Burma, and Ceylon were insistent that the reference should be made, and their point of view prevailed.

Does this represent a gain for the anti-Communist forces in Asia? I believe it does, despite the fact that the statement brackets together Communist and anti-Communist intervention as the object of "their unshakable determination to resist." In countries some of which are suspected of "coddling" or of being soft toward communism, it must be considered a gain to witness a clear affirmation that the menace of Communist intervention is a reality which must be resisted with determination.

The communique clearly disproves two extreme views that are held by many about south Asia, namely, the view that the peoples of the region may safely be allowed to play with Communist fire like children because in the end they will find they have nowhere to go except run for succor to the West, or the view that the region is already lost psychologically, if not militarily, to communism, and therefore should be written off by the free world as a total loss.

The makers of American policy toward Asia will note, I hope with immense relief and satisfaction, that such cavalier conclusions about the region are dangerous oversimplifications which must be distrusted. In fact, they should be rejected on the strength of the evidence presented by this communique of an abiding faith in democracy and democratic institutions and a resolute determination to preserve in their respective countries the freedoms inherent in the democratic system.

In the spring of 1950, a conference of representatives of Australia, Ceylon, India, Indonesia, Pakistan, the Philippines, and Thailand met in Baguio, our mountain capital, on the invitation of the Philippine Government. After considering various measures to insure more positive cooperation among the seven states represented, the conference adopted this historic principle: "That in the consideration of the special problems of south and southeast Asia the point of view of the peoples of this area be prominently kept in mind, by any conference dealing with such problems, so that better understanding and cordial relations may subsist between the countries in the region and other countries of the world."

The Baguio Conference, which I had the privilege of organizing and the honor to preside, passed virtually unnoticed in American press. Official Washington underestimated its importance. Both gave it the same silent treatment which they had given to the proposal which the Philippine Government had made 1 year before, in 1949, that the United States assume leadership in the organization of an alliance which would guarantee the security of southeast Asia in the same way that NATO had guaranteed the security of Western Europe.

What does this bit of history about two Asian conferences indicate? I believe it shows that in south and southeast Asia there continues to be a strong preference for the principles and institutions of freedom and democracy as well as an enormous reservoir of good will toward the United States. It shows that there is no reason for cynicism or despair in tackling the problem of what to do about the uncommitted peoples of Asia.

This faith in democracy and this reservoir of good will cannot be maintained by a mere show of military power. It has become clear that military power as such does not necessarily impress Asians and that, indeed, it would impress them in a negative way.

What appears more likely to impress the Asian peoples is a readiness to keep in mind the point of view of the peoples of this area. This means, basically, the desire to maintain their independence, to assist others in achieving independence, and to preserve peace in the region and throughout the world.

When this is borne in mind, the current crisis in Indochina falls into place in proper perspective. For the Indochina problem presents not only a test of American military policy, but a far more serious test, as far as the Asian peoples are concerned, of the American faith in freedom and democracy.

Utah's Point of View of Colorado River Storage Project and Its Participating Projects

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DOUGLAS R. STRINGFELLOW

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1954

Mr. STRINGFELLOW. Mr. Speaker, there has been a great deal of misunderstanding and a large volume of erroneous impressions created by self-styled conservationists and other misguided persons regarding authorization of the upper Colorado River project. I realize most Members of Congress have little time for reading voluminous material, and, therefore, I am sure my colleagues will be especially interested in the following 25 concise points which sum up Utah's point of view on the Colorado River storage project and its participating projects. This nutshell digest will answer almost every inquiry which may be directed to your office regarding this great reclamation project:

UTAH'S POINT OF VIEW OF COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT AND ITS PARTICIPATING PROJECTS

(By George D. Clyde)

1. The Colorado River is the last remaining water resource of the upper basin States (Utah, Colorado, Wyoming, New Mexico).

2. More than 90 percent of the water in the Colorado River system originates in the four upper basin States.

3. The waters of the Colorado River system were divided by compact in 1922 between the groups of States in the upper and lower basins.

4. In 1949 the States of the upper basin by compact divided their share of the waters of the Colorado River among the respective States.

5. In 1928 the Boulder Canyon Project Act was passed and subsequent to that time, the Hoover Dam and powerplants, the Davis Dam and powerplants, the Parker Dam and powerplants and the All-American Canal have been built. These powerplants are making power out of water that belongs to the lower basin under the compact but are also making power out of water that belongs to the upper basin States under the compact because there are no facilities yet built in the upper basin which will permit the consumptive use of the upper basin's share of the water of the Colorado River.

6. Since 1922, practically no development has taken place in the upper Colorado River Basin. During the same period, California has been able to fully develop her full share of the Colorado River water.

7. Since about 1932, $500,000 annually from power revenues has been available for conducting investigations in the upper basin. These investigations have been conducted by the United States Bureau of Reclamation in cooperation with the respective States.

8. In 1946, a proposal was made by the Bureau called, the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, a basin-wide proposal, which, if carried out, would provide the facilities necessary for the Upper Basin States to use their share of the Colorado River water.

9. It took 8 years to get this report approved by the Secretary, the Budget Bureau, and the President.

10. This proposal is unique but complicated and must be carried out as a single basin-wide project.

11. This project must and does provide for (a) complete regulation of the river at Lees Ferry, (b) power revenues, and (c) water for consumptive use by direct diversion both within and without the Colorado River Basin or by exchange.

12. The initial phase of the basin-wide project involves 2 storage reservoirs, dams, and powerplants (Echo Park and Glen Canyon) and 11 participating projects of which 2 are in Utah (central Utah and Emery County).

13. The Echo Park Dam is the keystone of the project because it makes possible adequate storage for river regulation in conjunction with Glen Canyon, it puts the main power producing plants within reach of the upper basin power market, it provides flexibility necessary to firm up subsequent powerplants in the upper basin, Echo Park, in conjunction with Glen Canyon, provides storage and power at lowest cost and least loss of water by evaporation.

14. The proposed Colorado River storage project and its participating projects (initial phase) will cost about $1 billion over a period of 25 to 30 years that it will take to construct it.

15. The costs of the power features will be repaid with interest in less than 50 years. The cost of the municipal features will be paid back with interest in 50 years. The cost of the irrigation features allocated to the water users will be paid back in 50 years plus a 10-year development period without interest. The balance of the cost allocated to irrigation will be paid back from power revenues—all within 50 years.

16. The opposition is attacking the project by striking first at the Echo Park Dam which happens to be in an expanded national monument. They declare this is an invasion of the national park and monument principle, in spite of the fact that F. D. Roosevelt, when he signed the proclamation expanding the monument, made specific reservations permitting the development of the water, power, and grazing resources within the monument.

17. The opposition is claiming economic infeasibility in spite of the fact that it won't cost the taxpayer a dime, and after being fully repaid the Government will have an annual net income from power of from 15 to 20 millions per year.

18. The opposition is claiming incompetence on the part of the Bureau engineers. They say they don't know what they are talking about and additional years of investigation should be made before approving the project.

19. The opposition is now claiming that there is not enough water in the river for both the upper and lower basins and the lower basin should have its water first and no development should be permitted in the upper basin because it might interfere with the lower basin's rights. Failure to develop the upper basin automatically gives all the undeveloped water of the river to the lower basin.

20. The opposition is now claiming that the reduced power output at Hoover, Parker, and Davis Dams while the upper basin is filling its reservoirs with water belonging to the upper basin, will cost California $187 million worth of power.

21. The opposition is now claiming that if storage reservoirs are built in the upper basin, their operation may interfere with lower basin uses.

22. The opposition is now claiming that the consumptive use of the upper basin's share of the Colorado will deteriorate the quality of water available to the lower basin. They forget that when Mexico raised the question of quality of water in the hearings on the Mexican Treaty, the opposition objected to being responsible for the quality of water delivered to Mexico.

23. Delay is tantamount to defeat of the Colorado River storage project.

24. Unless the upper basin States can put their share of the Colorado River to beneficial consumptive use, the Colorado River compact will not protect them indefinitely in their rights.

25. The Colorado River storage project and its participating projects is a valid, feasible, and urgently needed project. It will take 25 to 30 years to complete the initial phases and 75 to 100 years to complete the ultimate phases. It will provide for the full and complete utilization of the water and power resources of the Colorado River. It is self-liquidating and water, being a recurring resource, will yield net revenues to the public in perpetuity. For Utah it means a hundred years of steady, consistent growth. It means opportunity for our people.

Problems and Needs of the American Shipping and Shipbuilding Industries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 1, 1954

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, the distinguished Senate majority leader [Mr. KNOWLAND] delivered an inspiring address to the members of the Propeller Club of the United States, port of Washington, D. C., on Saturday evening at the annual Maritime Day dinner in the grand ballroom of the Mayflower Hotel.

In its references to the problems and needs of the American shipping and shipbuilding industries, the address was most heartening to all present in that it revealed a thorough understanding and appreciation of the issues involved, and of the legislative assistance required.

The able Senator likewise was both powerful and persuasive in his presentation of the decisions facing the country with respect to Communist aggression in southeast Asia.

The address was broadcast, but it is deserving of the widest possible attention, for which reason I ask unanimous consent that it be published in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Address Made by Hon. William F. Knowland, Majority Leader, United States Senate, on Maritime Day, May 22, 1954, at Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C.

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, Members of Congress, and the very able Representative from Missouri, Mrs. Sullivan, I am very happy to have the pleasure of being here with you tonight. President Eisenhower has designated May 22 as National Maritime Day commemorating the departure on May 22, 1819, of the *Savannah* on the first transoceanic voyage ever made by a steamship. Now one thing which all of us who are interested in the national defense of the Nation and in the problems that may confront this country in the months and the years ahead have a deep concern about is the growing obsolescence of our merchant marine. More than 80 percent of our cargo and passenger ships was built during World War II.

Today there is not a single cargo or passenger ship being built for private ownership in any American shipyard. Unless a planned program of ship construction or replacement is begun now, America will soon find itself with an obsolescent merchant marine, and I submit that this could be as disadvantageous to our national defense as being caught with an obsolescent Navy or an obsolescent Air Force and, consequently, every person who is not only interested in the merchant marine itself but is interested in the national defense of this country must recognize that it is in fact the fourth arm of defense of our Nation along with the Air Force, the Navy, and the Army.

Now, since 1945, other than tanker construction for bulk petroleum products, there has been built in the United States for private account and postwar design only 3 oceangoing passenger steamships and 2 dry-cargo vessels. Foreign passenger and cargo vessels have been built in considerable numbers, and we are being outbuilt and outclassed on the high seas. This situation must not be allowed to continue. If we become totally dependent on foreign shipping, or, I might add, on rubber or on tin, the time will come when we will pay through the nose. We need a merchant marine that will be second to none, manned by crews whose loyalties are to America and to America alone.

Now no man is wise enough to know just what challenges may face this objective of ours in the days and the weeks and the months directly ahead of us. We do know there is a tremendous challenge to the free world now going on in Indochina. The fall of Dien Bien Pu was a great defeat for the forces of the free world. It was not the first defeat that the free world has suffered from time to time in our history. The Alamo was a great defeat for the Texans and yet it aroused the people of that great State, later an independent country, and finally a State of the Union, to the dangers that confronted them from the dictatorship of Santa Ana. The defeats at Corregidor, the defeats at Dunkerque brought home to the free world the dangers confronting them at that time, and it may well be that what went on at Dien Bien Pu, will arouse the people of the world to the fact that there is a relentless force loose in the world determined that their way of life and ours shall not continue side by side.

If you search the time in the history of our country when it was important for men of good will to stand together this is the time. If there was ever a time in the history of the Nation when it was important for those of us who sit on both sides of the aisle in the House and in the Senate to stand together against a common danger this is the time. Now there has been from time to time loose discussion and accusations which should not have to be made. In my 9 years in the Senate of the United States I have found my colleagues on the Democratic side of the aisle equally as patriotic, equally as devoted to the welfare of the Nation in the defense of our Republic as anybody sitting on our Republican side of the aisle. And in full truth the fact remains that the only group that can be charged as being the party of treason is the Communist Party. Now no American industry and no American union should have to tolerate Communist members or fellow travelers on the high seas or on the waterfront or in the interior of our Nation.

I think that every citizen, whether they live on the waterfronts of our land or in the interior, must be concerned with the fact that in 1939 our American ships carried only 21.8 percent of our foreign trade; in 1946 it happened to be about 65.3 percent. It is now about 29.4 percent. Our objective should be to carry 50 percent of the Nation's overseas commerce. Some years ago I happened to have introduced in the Senate of the United States an amendment providing in our foreign aid program that 50 percent of the cargoes should be carried in American bottoms. I think that this is extremely important. I do not believe that we should sell American shipping or American industry short. I think the shipping industry itself found a realization that in the earning of dollar credits it is important that foreign bottoms be permitted to earn dollars in the carrying of cargoes but there is a practical rule of reason in that regard and it seems to me that if we share the cargoes to the extent of 50 percent we are making a contribution to the whole economy and at the same time we are not undermining the economy of a great industry which is essential to the defense of this Nation.

Now a sound maritime industry requires an adequate shipbuilding industry and certainly every Member of Congress and every citizen of this Republic and every person interested in the maritime industry should be cognizant of that fact. You cannot dissipate the trained mechanics of the gulf, on the Atlantic coast or on the Pacific and then expect overnight to build up the shipbuilding industry for this country in time of war. We have some major problems, not all of them so easy of solution, but certainly the Members of the Congress of the United States and the Senate and the House of Representatives, and the public generally, must recognize that the maritime industry and shipbuilding are in fact partners.

I want to talk to you tonight, however, about the great challenge which I think faces a free world even as we are meeting here this evening. The road to appeasement is not the road to peace. Certainly at the time of the original Munich the free world should have learned that appeasement of a potential aggressor is not the road to peace but, in fact, is only a surrender on the installment plan. Those of us who remember Mr. Chamberlain and Mr. Daladier coming back from Munich remember how they pulled a slip of paper out of their pocket at the airport and said to the newspaper correspondents, "This means peace in our time." We know that it represented no such thing. It only made inevitable World War II.

I get no comfort out of the Geneva Conference which has been held to date. It seems to me that the spokesman of the Soviet Union, of Communist China, and of the Communist forces of Viet Nam have made very clear their position in regard to conditions in the Far East. Chou En-lai, the Premier of China, and the Minister of Foreign Affairs made a very clear statement in his opening speeches at the Geneva Conference. Every American member of the Government and of Congress, man, woman, and child, should understand precisely what he said, and he spelled it out in great detail. He said to this Nation you can have peace in the Pacific if you will abandon your mutual-security pact with Japan, if you will repudiate the mutual-security pact with Korea, if you will give up your great airbase at Okinawa, if you will repudiate your security pact with the Philippines and remove your air and naval bases from those areas of the world. Yes; under those conditions you can have peace in the Pacific, and then, he said, that will mean Asia for the Asians.

Well, of course, when you interpret that into Communist language, what he meant was that under those conditions they could have Asia for the Communists. He was laying down conditions that a victorious power would lay down to a defeated nation and that was the alternative he was presenting to the Government and to the people of the United States. Now that may not be thoroughly understood up to the present time but as certainly as we sit here tonight that is the condition, that is the basis upon which he is willing to give peace in the Pacific. Now what in the long course or the short course of history would that mean? That is, merely carrying out the policy of that apostle of Communism Lenin, who 30 years ago said that the road to Paris is through Peking. Now what would he mean by that very succinct statement? He meant that if international communism could control China they stood a good chance of controlling all of Asia with her billion one-hundred million people and her vast strategic resources and if international communism once gained control of the manpower and resources of Asia they could ultimately turn with overwhelming power against the West and neither Paris nor Madrid nor Rome nor London could stand up against that overwhelming mass of power.

Now this is the issue which the American people must face up to in the not too distant future in my opinion. There are some who say perhaps we can postpone a decision in this regard. But I call your attention to the fact that the then President of the United States, President Truman, announced in 1949 that the Soviet Union had had their first atomic explosion and in the intervening years they have been building up their stockpiles and their means of delivering the weapon. Does anyone in this country or the other countries of the world have the naive point of view that when they have accomplished their objective of building up their stockpile and their means of delivery that they will be any less ruthless, any less arrogant than they are to date? To the contrary, they are more apt to say to some of the governments with which we are associated or perhaps those who are maintaining a degree of neutrality they are most apt to say to them when they build up their stockpile and their means of delivering it. "Unless you agree that your bases will not be used by the American naval or American air forces we will level a devastating attack upon your cities and governments that are even unstable today."

Will they be any more able and stable to stand up against that type of ruthless, ungodly Communist tyranny in the future?

Now I think that the time has come when the free people of the world must determine whether or not they are really interested in a system of collective security. Certainly this Nation of ours of 160 million people is not in a position to carry the entire burdens of the world and yet we can no more return to isolation than an adult can return to childhood regardless of how pleasant the recollection might be.

I believe that with all the assistance we have given not for them alone but because we felt it was in our own vital interest to give them aid, we have a right to say to our friends in Europe, in America, and in Asia, in the event the chips are down: "What are you prepared to do?" Certainly the people of the United States have a right to ask that question. No nation has a right to claim the benefits of a collective-security system unless they are prepared to furnish the quota of power that may be necessary to maintain international law and order. No nation has a right to claim a blank check on the United States of America in the event they are subject to attack if they themselves are not prepared to contribute the forces of resistance to international aggression, but I have a deep conviction that if the free world at this critical period stands aside and permits nation after nation to pass into the Communist orbit, first, Vietnam, then Laos, then Cambodia, then Thailand, and Burma, and Malaya, it will only be a question of time before Pakistan and India pass and ultimately this Nation would be an isolated island of forgotten men in a totalitarian world.

That is in our national interest; it is in the national interest of maintaining a free world of freemen, and I have a deep conviction that if we as American citizens will use the same courage and the same common sense that motivated the men who sat in Philadelphia and, under what I believe was Divine inspiration, gave us first our Declaration of Independence and later our Constitution of the United States. There are none of our great domestic problems that cannot be solved and there is no foreign foe we need ever fear.

Heading for War and Revolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRY M. GOLDWATER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 1, 1954

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an editorial entitled "Heading for War and Revolution," written by William R. Mathews and published in the Arizona Daily Star of May 30, 1954.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

HEADING FOR WAR AND REVOLUTION

(By William R. Mathews)

When in the middle of April I returned from a 10-day trip behind the Iron Curtain that took me as far as Moscow and Leningrad, I came home optimistic. In Europe we have definitely established a balance of power that forecasts peace rather than war.

Since getting home I have become more alarmed by the belligerency of American thinking, and the unwarranted assumption in high Government circles that if we intervene with military efforts in Indochina we can win a military victory from which will come political victory—the saving of the rest of Asia from communism.

In my opinion, we have started down the traditional road to a world war. Within 6 months we will be directly involved in Indochina. Within a year we will be at war with China. If these hostilities last 2 years, before the end of the third year, we will probably be at war with the Soviet Union. This war will end in a stalemate of exhaustion and will be followed in this country by a violent revolution and the eclipse of freedom here and throughout most of the world.

The drift toward this development is alarming and is increasing in momentum. It is the same old story: We must help to save the freedom of other people. We first offer economic help, next munitions, and next technical assistance. When these measures fail to bring victory we step up our military help.

The President can, without technically violating his word, order our fleet to unleash our naval airpower against the Communist forces in Indochina. Along with this he will probably announce he is sending military advisors to help raise and train a Vietnam army.

As these efforts fail to bring results, the anger of the American people will grow. We will start pounding strategic points in China by air and impose a military blockade with our naval forces. We may go as far as to step up Chiang Kai-shek's invasion of the mainland.

As these events generate more tension, old Syngman Rhee will be glad to come through and start a march to the north in Korea.

All of these measures will probably fail, and we will become more and more angry. Very reluctantly the President will ask for authority to land ground forces in Indochina to protect the interests of the free world. He may even go so far as to land troops at some strategic points in China.

Though loath to do so, Congress will probably acquiesce. By the time these measures fail to bring results, the whole world, including the Soviet Union, will develop a bad case of jitters.

The chances are, judging from what I have seen of Soviet policy, that the Russians will not enter a war with China at first. They will, of course, send munitions and military instructors. If the Soviet Union enters, it will come from the slipping of some cog in Europe or the Middle East.

The cry is already heard here at home, "We have to settle accounts sometime, so let's do it now and get it over with." These words can become a popular slogan that we can use to justify the opening of an atomic war.

It will end as a stalemate of mutual exhaustion. Amid such exhaustion, revolutionary forces develop rapidly. There will be enough soreheads and weary people in our own country who will, as some are doing already, begin to look for a strong man, a man on horseback, to take care of all our problems by a brilliant stroke of genius.

Our history shows that we can get very rough with one another, as well as with other people in the world. We will probably go through a revolution as violent and prolonged as the British, French, or the Russians.

I believe we are headed in that direction at this moment, and all of it can come to pass within the next 5 years.

Rather than continue to plunge recklessly ahead, surely the time has come to make a sober reappraisal of our objectives and our strength. Our policies in Europe are proving effective and should be continued. We Americans can, by the economical use of our sea and air power, indefinitely maintain the line of the Aleutians, the 38th parallel in Korea, Japan, Formosa, Okinawa, and the Philippines. We can break up any invasion from the Asiatic mainland with comparative ease.

We should bear in mind that the Asiatic continent is a gigantic poorhouse. If trying to save it means wrecking ourselves as well as the world, we can better afford to lose it. If France cannot hold Indochina with the help we are giving, our policy should be stay out. If the British and their dominions, Australia, New Zealand, and Canada, will not muster the strength to protect their interests, it will be futile for us to attempt to do it.

From what I have seen during various visits to the Orient, I am convinced that the loss of Indochina will not mean the loss of Thailand in the near future. The British will continue to have trouble in Malaya and later on in Hong Kong, no matter what happens in Indochina. I believe that if we would encourage the growth of India into a third force, her influence would have a wholesome effect on Thailand, Burma, and Indonesia.

We cannot save people from communism, when they show no positive interest in wanting to be saved.

It is time to recognize that there are limits to our strength and the scope of the acceptance of our ideals and morality. We must stop this drift toward a world war, and the almost certain revolution that would follow it, by reconstructing one basis that will win the united support of the people of our country.

We will best serve ourselves and all of our friends by consciously limiting our objectives to positions we can and will support, instead of plunging blindly ahead into what will grow into another world war and the eclipse of freedom at home and abroad.

The McCarran-Walter Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 1, 1954

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, on May 11, Mr. Walter Van Kirk, executive director of the department of international justice and goodwill, National Council of the Churches of Christ, delivered an address on the McCarran-Walter Act before the 81st annual forum of the national conference of social work.

Mr. Van Kirk is an eminent figure in the lay area of the church world. He is a recognized scholar and a leader in the realm of ideas. He delivered on this occasion a speech of such trenchant quality on the subject of the McCarran-Walter Act, and its relationship to foreign policy, that it should and will, I believe, attract the attention of thinking men and women all over the country. What Mr. Van Kirk says concerning the conflict between what we proclaim in the councils of the world and what our Congress proclaims in the McCarran-Walter Act should give us all reason for reflection and concern.

I hope that this eloquent and thoughtful address will be read by every Member of Congress. I only wish it could be read by every American citizen. I ask unanimous consent that this speech be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

THE IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT OF 1952 (MCCARRAN-WALTER ACT): WHAT IT MEANS IN TERMS OF OUR FOREIGN POLICY

(Address by Walter Van Kirk)

American foreign policy is compounded of many ingredients. One of those ingredients is the voice of the President. To the President, under our Constitution, there is delegated the responsibility of giving executive direction to our foreign affairs. What he says, therefore, determines, in large part, the pattern of our relations with other nations. Then there is the voice of the Secretary of State, and the policies initiated by him, in collaboration with the President. Then there is the Congress of the United States. The Senate can give or withhold its ratification of treaties. But both Houses of Congress, in the enactment of legislation, can be and often are powerful factors in the determination of foreign policy. Any act of Congress that shapes, in part, our relations with other peoples is of enormous consequence to the peace and security of the United States. Such a piece of legislation is the McCarran-Walter Immigration and Nationality Act. The consequences of this act, in respect to American foreign policy, must be taken into account in evaluating the role and assessing the influence of the United States in the search for a just and durable peace.

Any act of Congress that gives offense to large segments of the free peoples of the world adversely affects American foreign policy. This is what the McCarran-Walter Act does. The disparity between American foreign policy as defined by the White House and our immigration and nationality legislation as defined by Congress is brought sharply into focus by Communist aggression in Asia and the efforts of the United States to resist and repel that aggression. It is one of the primary aims of our foreign policy to prevent the imposition on Asia of the political system of Communist Russia and its Chinese Community ally. Failure to achieve this aim would be, in the words of Secretary of State Dulles "a grave threat to the whole free community." To meet the threat posed by communism in Asia, the United States has asserted itself with vigor and determination. It bore aloft the flag of freedom in Korea. In that war-torn land there sleep thousands of American soldier dead. Incident to the Korean war our Nation launched a program of military preparedness that has cost the American people many billions of dollars. Additional appropriations have been forthcoming for military and economic assistance to certain Asian countries—all for the purpose of stopping the spread of Communism in Asia and thereby giving effect to one of the declared aims of American foreign policy.

More recently, Secretary of State Dulles, in an effort to meet the threat posed by communism in Asia, made a fervent plea for united action. It may be assumed that what is meant by "united action" is cooperation by the free peoples of Asia with the free peoples of the Western World. Whether or not such "united action" will be achieved cannot at this moment be foreseen. It is clear, however, that the peace and security of the United States will be influenced, for weal or for woe, by the extent to which there can be achieved an identity of policies and procedures as between the freedom loving peoples of Asia and the Western World.

It is precisely at this point where the McCarran-Walter Act runs afoul American foreign policy. The plain truth is that this act discriminates against Asiatics. This is true despite the fact that under this legislation Asiatics, albeit in small numbers, have been made eligible for United States citizenship. This was indeed a step forward by Congress. In other respects, however, as far as Asia is concerned, the Congress took a backward step. This backward step was taken when the Congress set up a racially conceived "Iron Curtain" known as the "Asia-Pacific Triangle." This triangle includes, among others, the people of Afghanistan, Burma, China, Indonesia, Japan, Korea, India, and the Pacific islands. Let it not be forgotten that in this area there lives half the population of the world. These people are peculiarly sensitive to the encroachments of what they describe as "American imperialism." They are in revolt against the second-class status imposed upon them by those who exult in the doctrine of white supremacy.

Whether intended or not, the effect of the McCarran-Walter Act is to create in the mind of Asia the impression that the United States regards Asiatics as an inferior people. And since we deem them to be an inferior people only small token quotas of 100 or slightly more are arbitrarily assigned to each of these Asian countries. Nor is that all. Any prospective immigrant born outside the Asia-Pacific triangle who is attributable by as much as one-half his ancestry to peoples within the Triangle, is chargeable to these small token quotas. That is to say, a person born in England of an English father and a Japanese mother is charged, not to the large British quota, but to the much smaller Japanese quota. As pointed out by President Truman when he vetoed this legislation: "It is only with respect to persons of Oriental ancestry that this invidious discrimination applies. All other persons are charged to the country of their birth. But persons with Asian ancestry are charged to the countries of Asia, wherever they may have been born, or however long their ancestors have made their homes outside the land of their origin. 'These provisions,' said President Truman, 'are without justification.'" A powerful argument indeed, yet the Congress passed this legislation over the President's veto.

What does all this add up to? It adds up to this: Whereas President Eisenhower and the State Department are doing everything within their power to enlist the friendship and goodwill of the free people of Asia, the Congress, in the enactment of the McCarran-Walter Act, has done and is doing precisely the opposite of this. The President and the State Department look upon Asiatics as our equals when these people are asked to stand by our side for the preservation of freedom. The Congress, on the contrary, looks upon Asiatics as inferior to ourselves. If this conflict of policy is not apparent to the American people you can be sure it is apparent to the people of Asia. And to the Communists whose propagandists, day in and day out, tell the people of Asia that they are being discriminated against and insulted by the people and the Congress of the United States.

I labor this point respecting Asiatics for the simple reason that the United States is desperately in need of their friendship and goodwill, to say nothing of their raw materials which are an important factor in our stockpile of strategic materials. We of the United States comprise only 6 percent of the world's population, whereas, as previously indicated, the people in the Asia-Pacific triangle total 50 percent of the world's population. It is not good manners nor good diplomacy, nor wise statesmanship, for the 6 percent to hold in contempt the 50 percent. It is also important to recall again and yet again, that a new day has dawned for the people of Asia. They are no longer expendable. They deem themselves to be deserving of the respect of the West. Many of these Asiatic people have achieved national independence. Others of their number are moving in that direction. Their friendship cannot be bought with American dollars, nor rendered certain by American oratory. It is time the Congress of the United States woke up to this fact. It is time our lawmakers on Capitol Hill brought our immigration legislation respecting Asiatics into harmony with a foreign policy which presupposes the dignity and worth of Asia's millions.

It is not suggested that Asiatics be permitted to emigrate to the United States without limitation as to numbers. There are good and sufficient reasons for the Congress placing an annual limit on the number of these and all other immigrants permitted to enter the United States. We simply could not absorb the millions of persons who would come to our shores, were the doors of entry thrown wide open. But such restrictions as to numbers as may be required should be achieved without discriminations predicated upon national origins or racial heritage. Eligibility should be related to personal character, individual worth, and commitment to the ideals of freedom and democracy cherished by the American people. It is the position of many of our American voluntary agencies, including the churches, that once a ceiling on numbers has been fixed, consideration should be given to establishing a system of immigration priorities which would facilitate family reunion, provide skills needed in our country, and offer asylum to the persecuted victims of totalitarian regimes. Were this done Asiatics would not feel that they are discriminated against regardless of how few of their number were permitted to enter the United States in any given year.

There is another point at which American immigration policy is in conflict with American foreign policy. I refer here to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, and to the efforts initiated by our Government under this treaty to further the cause of European unity which unity is deemed by us to be an indispensable factor in preserving not only the peace of Europe but our own peace as well. One would suppose that these Europeans who are regarded by us as comrades in the common endeavor to establish the conditions of peace in Europe, and to withstand the pressures of Communist infiltration and aggression, would be accorded by our Congress a status of equality in its immigration legislation. Unhappily, this is not the case.

Turkey and Greece, for example, have been brought within the framework of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. Both of these nations are important factors in the security arrangements to which the United States is a party. Turkey is also a vital connecting link between the West and the Near East. To keep Turkey and Greece within the orbit of the free world is one of the cardinal aims of American foreign policy. Yet in our immigration laws we arbitrarily assign to each of these nations a quota so small as to suggest that their people by contrast with the people of those European countries to which much larger quotas are assigned, are of an inferior order of human beings. The voice of American foreign policy as set forth by the Executive, says to the Greeks and the Turks "You are good enough to fight with us for the preservation of freedom," whereas the voice of the American Congress, as set forth in the McCarran-Walter Act, says to these same people: "You are less deserving than other people to live with us in the enjoyment of freedom." In pursuance of this specious reasoning the Congress assigns an annual quota in excess of 65,000 to Great Britain whose people do not want and have no pressing need to emigrate, whereas to Turkey there is assigned an annual quota of 225, and to Greece an annual quota of 308. What has been said in this connection, respecting Greece and Turkey, could also be said respecting Italy to which country there is assigned an annual quota of 5,645, despite the urgent need for Italian migration.

We have here a lesson in the arithmetic of legislative madness. What these figures add up to is confusion, not comradeship; cleavage, not concord. On the one hand we seek to establish a partnership with the Greeks, the Turks, and the Italians, among others, to contain communism, while with the other hand we enact an immigration law that can and probably will destroy the moral and cultural foundations of that partnership.

Elsewhere among the nations associated with us in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization there is much resentment and irritation occasioned by yet other provisions of the McCarran-Walter Act. The screening process of seamen on ships coming into American ports is a case in point. Fresh in our minds is the experience of the French sailors on board the *Liberte* who were refused permission to go ashore last Christmas. Senator LEHMAN, of New York, has commented on the growing anti-American feeling in Norway occasioned by the stern treatment accorded the seamen of that country, an ally of ours in the cold war. One Norwegian official is quoted as saying: "You may as well close down your American Information Service in Norway as long as this goes on, since they will be fighting a losing battle for the good will of my people." Seven nations, according to Newsweek, including Great Britain and France, have filed strong protests, claiming violation of the traditional rights of seamen to land in foreign ports. Says the Manchester Guardian, one of the most highly respected newspapers of Great Britain: "Nothing has done more to spread distrust of American intentions and to mock all American fine words than the impertinences inflicted on foreigners under the [McCarran-Walter] act."

And then we wonder why we are losing friends in Europe and Asia. At a time when the President and the Secretary of State are striving to create a mutual security system in Europe which will have the effect of bridging some of the chasms by which Europeans in times past have been divided, the Congress superimposes upon that continent its own lines of division between those Europeans deemed by our lawmakers to possess cultural refinements denied other Europeans. At a time when the President and the Secretary of State are striving to build a bridge of understanding and good will with which to to span the chasm between Asiatics and Americans and thereby tear down the wall of partition between East and West, the McCarran-Walter Act causes to be drawn upon the Asian world a vast triangle of racial prejudice and discrimination.

It is devoutly to be hoped that the American people, before it is too late, will recognize that such leadership as is theirs among the nations derives not from guns and bayonets and bombs, but from their historic witness in support of the rights and freedoms of mortals. There was a time when our Declaration of Independence and our Bill of Rights were the inspiration of millions. The downtrodden and oppressed of every land had looked toward our Statue of Liberty as the symbol of their hopes and aspirations. Subject and dependent peoples had looked to the United States as the champion and defender of political self-determination and independence. Always and everywhere our country had been equated with human rights and fundamental freedoms. Pilgrims in flight from tyranny had seen in the United States a haven of emancipation. Today, our economic and military strength is acknowledged by nations large and small. But industrial assembly lines with their shining gadgets and hydrogen bombs with their mushroom clouds of radioactive poison will not suffice to save us once we have forfeited the confidence of peoples near and far in our moral integrity.

Let it be said again that any act of Congress that gives offense to the free people of the world adversely affects American foreign policy. That policy, as affirmed by our President and our Congress, is projected in the spirit of and in conformity with the aims and objectives of the United Nations. As a member of the United Nations we are committed to the principles set forth in the charter of this organization. When we adhered to the Charter of the U. N. we reaffirmed our faith "in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person, in the equal rights of men and women and of nations large and small." Under the charter we pledged ourselves "to promote and encourage respect for human rights and for fundamental freedom for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion." We did more than this. We signed the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. While this declaration is without legal status, and imposes upon the United States no legal obligations, it is our moral duty to behave in a manner consistent with the spirit of this historic declaration. The first of the 30 articles of this declaration states that "All human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights. They are endowed with reason and conscience and should act toward one another in a spirit of brotherhood."

The McCarran-Walter Act is not consistent with the spirit of the United Nations Charter, to which we solemnly and in good faith adhered, nor with the principles of human dignity affirmed by us in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. This act reflects a mood of racial bias which is utterly alien to our heritage as a free people, and to that concept of human worth which provides incentive for creative endeavor in the search for world community.. We cannot, as a nation, talk out of both sides of our mouth, and expect to be taken seriously, when the chips are down on issues related to human rights and fundamental freedoms. The UN is an institution which aims to bring peoples of diverse cultural and racial backgrounds into reconciliation each with the other. The McCarran-Walter Act is a law that impairs this high purpose and, in this respect, it debases our moral stature among those nations of the world whose friendship we seek and must have if we are to endure as a free people.

At a time when the President and the Secretary of State are seeking to consolidate the forces of freedom around the world, the Congress, in such legislation as the McCarran-Walter Act, disrupts the forces of freedom. At a time when the Voice of America broadcasts the gospel of human dignity to the enslaved millions behind the Iron Curtain, the Congress, in its immigration legislation, arbitrarily divides the peoples of the earth on the basis of nationality and race. At a time when the White House and the State Department encourage the captive peoples of Soviet tyranny to break the chains of their bondage and flee to those lands where freedom thrives and hope inspires, the Congress all but closes the doors of entry to our own land of freedom.

It is this working at cross purposes by the White House and the State Department on the one hand, and the Congress on the other hand, that bedevils our foreign policy and renders futile our search for a just and durable peace. Senator McCarran is of the opinion that the act that bears his name is "tough on Communists." The very reverse is true. The people of the United States do not practice "toughness" in relation to the Communists when the Congress enacts legislation that is discriminatory in character and that divides the peoples of the earth by iron curtains of race and nationality. The people of the United States can practice "toughness" toward the Communists by walking in the paths of justice, freedom, and fair play, and by preserving for future generations the ideals of human worth and dignity that have enriched our American tradition.

It may be possible to contain communism by guns and bombs and threats of massive retaliation. But communism can be conquered only by ideas that transcend in spiritual import the ideas of the Kremlin. Such ideas are not the racist views reflected in certain provisions of the McCarran-Walter Act, but the ideas that exalt the worth of the individual and the oneness of humanity. So it was that President Eisenhower, in his state of the Union message, in 1953, requested the Congress to review the McCarran-Walter Act and to enact a statute that will at one and the same time guard our national interest and be faithful to our basic ideas of freedom and fairness to all.

Finally, any act of Congress that is conceived in fear, compromises American foreign policy. Such a piece of legislation is the McCarran-Walter Act. It was conceived in fear. Insofar as is humanly possible subversives—and by subversives is meant not only Communists, but Nazi and Fascist subversives, must be prevented from coming to our shores. We love our land and the American way of life is treasured by us and for its preservation we are prepared both to live and to die. But when fear, unreasoned fear of communism dictates a law that is so obviously unfair to our many friends and allies who, no less than we ourselves, are determined to resist communism to the death, the impact of American leadership on the rest of the world is gravely weakened. The provisions of the McCarran-Walter Act respecting the granting of entry visas, and the procedures respecting deportation were written by a Congress with the jitters. And when to this hysteria there is added the confusion and panic engendered by congressional investigative committees, the result is one of unmitigated tragedy both for ourselves and for the free peoples of the earth. We who encourage others to be brave as they face the perils of communism act as though we were scared to death. We who call upon others to close their ranks in defense of freedom run hither and yon like frightened children, utterly bereft of that unity of purpose and endeavor by which national greatness is achieved. There is found here the explanation of why it is that the United States is coming to be regarded as a nation of psychopaths. There can be no authoritative definition of American foreign policy until this Government is purged of the political upstarts who go about our land shouting their alarms, setting neighbor against neighbor, and paralyzing that moral initiative and creative endeavor by which, in times past, America achieved for itself a place of honor among the nations.

Connecticut Churches

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PRESCOTT BUSH

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 1, 1954

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an address by the Reverend Roy M. Houghton, doctor of divinity, of New Haven, Conn., delivered by him before the Washington pilgrimage, in the Nation's Capital, during the last week of May. Dr. Houghton is an outstanding religious leader in the State of Connecticut, and a man of unusual experience and scholarship. I take great pleasure in making this unanimous-consent request.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Connecticut Churches

(By Rev. Roy M. Houghton, D. D., New Haven, Conn.)

The little square building with a cupola in the center of early Connecticut towns housed the mother of American democracy. The church was there. The edifice was not the church. That sacred name was reserved for the faithful body of believers. The building was the meetinghouse where both religious and civic meetings were held. Both were sacred in the minds of the Founding Fathers.

The town meeting was created by the church. Each church was independent of all others; called its own minister, and decided who should be members. Attendance upon public worship was a duty enforced by law. Children today are compelled by law to attend school. The pioneers deemed it essential to the public good that both parents and children should attend church. That meant, in some cases, long and perilous journies on foot or by horseback through the wilderness infested by Indians and wild beast, and over rough roads. They endured the hardship and danger because it was a high and holy privilege to attend services of public worship. The first item in a petition for setting off a new town was the complaint that they lived so far from the meetinghouse. A tax was levied on citizens for the support of the church. That law was continued until 1818. Other denominations, especially the Episcopalian, were coming into the towns. They rightfully objected to paying taxes to support the Congregational Church.

Connecticut churches took the lead in the march of democracy. That was because of their leaders, chief of whom was Rev. Thomas Hooker. He became pastor of the church in Newtown, Mass., in 1633. He desired greater freedom than he found in the Bay Colony. With his invalid wife on a litter, and with most of his congregation driving 160 cattle before them, they made the historic journey through wilderness, arriving at what is now Hartford in June 1636. There he remained as pastor until his death. There he laid foundations for the American form of government. He preached a famous sermon in 1638 in which he proclaimed government by the people:

"The foundations of authority are laid in the free consent of the people. The choice of public magistrates belongs unto the people, by God's own allowance. The people have the right to set the bounds and limitations of the power and place of those who are called."

Hooker preached government of, by, for the people 225 years before Lincoln's Gettysburg Address. That sermon issued in the fundamental orders, which furnished a pattern for the Constitution of the United States.

The spirit of liberty spread to other towns. Opinions differed. Many hot and sharp debates took place in church councils, town meetings, and general courts. The principles of democracy in church and State were hammered out on the anvil of free speech. Some wanted the right to vote limited to church members, as it was in New Haven Colony. Hooker's ideas prevailed. John Fiske wrote:

"The Government of the United States today is in lineal descent more nearly related to that of Connecticut then to that of any of the other Thirteen Colonies. The constitution of Connecticut marked the beginning of American democracy, of which Thomas Hooker deserves more than any other to be called the father."

The free public school is another child of the church. Democracy is sustained by education. The schoolhouse stood next to the meetinghouse. As early as 1650 provision was made by law for a schoolmaster in each town of 50 or more families, and for a grammar school suitable for preparing students for college. The generous bequest of Governor Hopkins made possible the Hopkins Grammar School in New Haven and Hartford.

The churches must have an educated clergy. Harvard was founded to train young men for the ministry. Connecticut needed such a school. Ten of the pastors founded Yale. Her presidents for 200 years were ordained ministers. Rev. Abraham Pierson, the first president, died after 7 years in service. There was no one to take his place. Rev. Samuel Andrew, pastor of the Milford Church, was asked to serve as rector pro tempore. He served in that capacity for 12 years, while carrying on the work of his church. Part of that time he housed the senior class in his own home and taught them there. Two other colleges were founded: Trinity in 1823 and Wesleyan in 1831, to share with Yale the work of higher education.

Men and women of character trained in Connecticut churches and educated in her Christian colleges were leaders in shaping the course of public education in the Nation. Henry Braynard, of Hartford, after improving the school systems in Connecticut and Rhode Island became the first United States Commissioner of Education. Daniel Coit Gilman, of Norwich, first president of Johns Hopkins University, was one of the most notable of a long line of college presidents born and educated in Connecticut. Emma Willard, a native of Berlin, and Catherine Beacher, of Litchfield, were pioneers in education for women.

Connecticut towns grew in population. The little square meetinghouses were no longer adequate. They were succeeded by large buildings, rectangular in shape, with bell tower and steeple. Some, like those in Guilford and Milford, had 2 galleries and 3 tiers of windows, with a high pulpit reached by winding stairs. Connecticut meetinghouses as we know them, with graceful spire and beauty of design, came in sometime after the Revolution. Increased prosperity together with an inate love of beauty demanded architectural quality and elegance in the meetinghouse. Two skilled architects, David Hoadly and Ithiel Town, adorned the village greens and the hilltops of Connecticut with meetinghouses of surpassing beauty. The many white steeples pointing heavenward is one of the best loved features of the landscape. Eighty or more of these charming meetinghouses still stand in Connecticut towns and cities. Each can tell of one or more sons and daughters who have made notable contributions to freedom and democracy; such are the Trumbulls, of Lebanon; the Beachers, of Litchfield; Gen. David Humphreys, of Derby; Nathan Hale, of Coventry, and many, many more.

The early settlers loved God, and they loved God's good earth. Next to their hunger for God was their hunger for land. They migrated westward. They carried good seed for the soil in their covered wagons. In their minds and hearts they carried the good seed of freedom. The church, the town, the school, were seeds of culture which took deep root in the new settlements, and brought forth an abundunt harvest of self-respecting, God-fearing, liberty-loving, truth-seeking individuals who have made this Nation great.

A notable leader of this migration was Manassa Cutler, born in Kilingly, educated at Yale, Chaplain in Washington's Army. After the war he organized the Ohio Company and migrated to that vast territory out of which was carved the States of Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Wisconsin, and Michigan. He was the author of the famous ordinance governing the Northwest Territory, by which slavery was forever prohibited in those great States; religious and civil liberty was guaranteed; and the fundamental law established that, "religion, morality, and knowledge, being necessary to the welfare of mankind, schools and the means of education shall forever be encouraged."

Constitutional authority was thus given for maintaining schools from the lowest grades to the university. All of the States later admitted to the Union have similar laws. Each State constitution begins with thanksgiving to Almighty God for the blessings of freedom.

No one would be so foolish as to say that this dynamic religion which created our American democracy and fostered free schools, free press, freedom of religion, and free enterprise was found only in Connecticut. Churches and church-supported schools and colleges from other New England States sent pioneers of freedom into the new territory. From Yale went the Dakota Band and the Illinois Band; from Andover, Mass., went the Iowa Band; groups of young ministers with a purpose in their hearts; each would found a church and the group would found a college. Hence a chain of more than 100 Christian colleges across the continent, and churches to leven the land with Christian ideals.

From our public schools in all the States today, we hear the multitude of children singing of "patriot dreams," and "heroes proved in liberating strife", and of "pilgrim feet"—

> "Whose stern impressioned stress—
> A thoroughfare for freedom beat
> Across the wilderness!"

The churches must keep them singing those songs of freedom—which springs from the fountainhead of faith in Almighty God.

"America is great because America is good; if America ever ceases to be good; she will cease to be great."

Farmers Not the Only Group Receiving Subsidies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 1, 1954

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, much is heard about the cost of the farm price-support program. Not nearly so much is heard about Government subsidies to other occupational groups.

But these subsidies exist, and they are costly. An example was pointed out recently in the Farm and Ranch Topics column, written for the Tyler (Tex.) Morning Telegraph by Bob Murdock, director, East Texas Agricultural Council. I ask unanimous consent that the item referred to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GRAVY TRAIN?

If there's anybody around who thinks the American farmer is riding a Government-subsidized gravy train, I'd like to call attention to an article from the Wall Street Journal of May 19.

A page 4 story says that the Federal Government and the United States (steamship) Lines Co. have compromised their dispute over how much the company should pay for the superliner *United States*, which the Government built at a total cost of $76,800,000.

Originally, the company was to pay Uncle Sam $32.9 million. But somebody in Eisenhower's administration thought the Government ought to get a little more money for the ship. As bargaining leverage, Uncle Sam held up $8.6 million in current operating subsidy payments.

So, the company finally complainingly agreed to up the ante by 4 million bucks—to $36.9 million. After that piece of hard bargaining, Uncle Sam (that's us) lost only a little less than $40 million on the deal.

Of course, that was only on cost of the ship. The article didn't say how much annual subsidy we are paying the company to run the luxury liner to Europe and back.

Reckon they'd give a taxpayer a cutrate ride? After all, we're stockholders in the ship, you know—remember that 40 million bucks we have in the purchase price.

Indochina

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 1, 1954

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, so that the people may know, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the Record an article on Indochina appearing in the Wall Street Journal of May 28, written by Herbert Elliston. For many years Mr. Elliston was editor of the Washington Post.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Morale Problem: By Ignoring It in Indochina, United States Lets Reds Exploit Nationalist Fervor

(By Herbert Elliston)

"The other day I visited a small farmer near Saigon.

"Through my interpreter I asked him to tell me what he thought of Americans coming to Indochina. He said:

"'White men help white men. You give guns to help the French kill my people. We want to be rid of foreigners and the Viet Minh * * * was slowly putting out the French.'

"I said, 'Don't you know there is a white man behind the Viet Minh? Don't you know that Ho Chi Minh takes Russian orders?'

"He said, 'In Saigon I have seen Americans and I have seen Frenchmen. I have never heard of any white men being with the Viet Minh.'"

This is one of the best pieces of reporting to come out of the war in Indochina which I have just reread. It appeared several years ago in the Chicago Daily News under the byline of Fred Sparks. From the rustic he spoke to, you could have got a much better idea of what was ahead than from all the interviews with Generals Navarre, Cogny, De Castries, et al.

In the vignette above you get the reason that Indochina is as soft as putty. I used precisely that phrase about Indochina a year ago. I had no firsthand knowledge, was not under the bed of any higher up, but relied solely on circumstances. Long ago I discovered that possession of the inside dope generally goes with a flight from reality. For instance, in 1948 James Forrestal thought an Arab jihad would sweep the Jews in Palestine into the Mediterranean. Morale seems to be ignored in this mechanistic age.

By ignoring the common man we have allowed the Soviet bloc to become the patrons of nationalism in Indochina. Our dilemma, to be sure, seemed extreme. At the start of the cold war, which laid upon us the necessity of protecting the Ruhr and Europe generally, we were squeamish lest we appear to act rough to the French about Indochina.

The French, who call the conflict there the dirty war, have for years wanted to be bailed out. Yet till late 1950 or thereabouts we refused to give them any guidance one way or the other. Suddenly our military filled the vacuum and took over our diplomacy. The war "dragged out under pressure of American strategists," as the author of the new book on France, Death of the Fourth Republic, puts it. The pressure continues.

All the time we have been pretending that we are zealously pronationalist. But our concern is formal, perfunctory. This was exemplified wryly when Dien Bien Phu was taken. The President rushed a salute on the fall of the Tonkinese fortress to France, to President Coty. When no similar message to Bao Dai was forthcoming, a reporter on the New York Herald Tribune reminded the staff at the White House that after all Dien Bien Phu is in Vietnam, and that we had recognized Bao Dai as Chief of State of Vietnam through the accreditation of his Ambassador to Washington. The point hastily dawned on the White House, and a salute went out to Bao Dai 3 hours later. He is still in Paris.

Nothing could better illustrate the attitude of the man with the hoe than this White House story. It is pointed up by Graham Greene's diary appearing in the current issue of Commonweal. Greene reports two battalions of Vietnamese who, left by the French to officer themselves, went over right away to the Viet Minh.

I know you will read that what turned the scales at Dein Bien Phu was the edge in armor which the Chinese Communists supplied. What eyewash. Senator Mike Mansfield said that when he was in Indochina there was a 10-to-1 preponderance of material in favor of the French. The preponderance is now said to be higher; at least Howard K. Smith reported on CBS that the ratio was 20-to-1.

In other words, all the reports about the overwhelming aid from Communist China are simply a coverup for incompetence and wishful thinking and our inability to see the people for the country. I dare say that what Viet Minh used against Dien Bien Phu would have been regarded as pop-gunnery in the war in Europe.

Leave it to the Asians. Till the peasant changes his mind (and moreover till the U. N. steps in) and, like the Czechs in 1938, asks us for action, I would apply the famous phrase by Bismarck to the Balkans—that the whole of the peninsula is not worth the bones of one dead Pomeranian grenadier.

The Democratic and Cooperative Traditions of Scandinavia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 1, 1954

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, some of the warmest ties between the American people and foreign peoples exist with our good friends in the northern tier of countries in Europe. We of the United States and our friends of Scandinavia share a great tradition of love of freedom, industry, thrift, and a desire for cooperation.

I send to the desk two recent clippings from the Milwaukee Journal expressive of the continuation of this tradition. One is an editorial entitled "More Northland Harmony," from the May 26 issue. The other is a reprint, in part, of a North American Newspaper Alliance story on how courageous little Finland has maintained herself free in spite of the avarice and power of the Russian bear.

I hope these clippings, along with other fine evidences of Scandinavia's devotion to liberty and cooperation, will continue to inspire people everywhere. I ask unanimous consent that both of these items be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial and excerpts from the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

How the Finns Stay Free—In Shadow of U. S. S. R., the Little Nation Keeps Independence by Strict Self-Discipline and Individualism

Who are these Finns—the people who can run a thriving democracy in the shadow of the Russian bear?

At a time when an angry diplomat's misplaced adjective can cause a clash between nations thousands of miles apart, how does Finland manage to keep calm relations with her great eastern neighbor, without surrendering to communism?

The Finns' secret lies in a word which, in the Finnish view, is little understood in many foreign capitals. The word is discipline.

Russia is never mentioned among Finns in conversation—although the Russians are a threat just across a border line. Ask the Finns why: They'll tell you that even the most humble here is acutely aware of his national responsibility.

A Soviet plane recently crashed on Finnish soil. The pilot bailed out and reached a village. But not a word was said or printed about it until pilot and plane, incidentally one of Russia's latest models, was shipped back to the Soviet Union.

A whole village knew about it. But they kept the secret—not because of fear or censorship, but because of the high sense of national duty.

The same applies to the Finnish press. However critical a newspaper may be of the government in power, it will never print anything which may embarrass the administration in its dealings with the Soviet Union.

This sternly, almost strangely, individualistic pride is built into a Finn from childhood. Children no more than 3 years old are sent out with a pair of skis to play in the park. No adult accompanies them, and the children would never disobey and play in the street instead.

* * * * *

On the playground the young Finn shows a remarkable doggedness to master the sport. No father or teacher would dare inflict as much punishment as the children take voluntarily, falling time and again on the icy ground without shedding a tear.

Finnish children seldom play in groups: The Finn from an early age is a confirmed individualist. Sports requiring teamwork do not flourish in this nation.

Above all, a natural sense of democracy springs up among the people. The highest official can walk freely on the streets without an attendant. Nobody gapes; those who recognize the government officer generally look the other way.

* * * * *

It is a nation which, by right, should not be here with its 3,500,000 people. Long ago it should have been swallowed up by its more powerful neighbors, whether from east or from west. Being neither of one nor of the other, Finland has jealously preserved her nationhood, her language, and above all, her independence.

Should the Finns ever disappear, it would be only because they value their independence more than their lives.

More Northland Harmony

Norway, Denmark, and Sweden, along with neighboring Finland and more distant Iceland, will soon take two more steps toward neighborly cooperation.

As the result of an agreement worked out at a conference in Copenhagen, citizens of Norway, Sweden, Denmark and Finland after June 1 will be permitted to accept employment in any of the four countries. Moreover, after a 3-month stay, they will no longer have to apply for a work and residence permit.

In the second agreement, effective July 1, citizens of Norway, Sweden, Denmark, and Iceland will come under a mutual health insurance system. The agreement provides that people of the four countries, permanently or temporarily residing in any of the others, will be accorded the same health insurance benefits as those enjoyed by the country's own citizens. The insurance system covers medical treatment, hospitalization, and other sick benefits.

It is heartening, in this period of tightened immigration and border restrictions, to find even a small part of this troubled world moving in the other direction.

The American Merchant Marine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 1, 1954

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, those of us—and I am happy to say their number is growing—who have an appreciation of the value of the American merchant marine, know that its function of transporting the Nation's commerce in peacetime is quite as important as its part in the military logistics phase of war.

It is most desirable that this duel availability be recognized and kept in mind during the next 2 months, when proposals of vital significance to the future of the American shipping and its shipbuilding counterpart will come before the Congress for consideration.

To this end I ask unanimous consent that there be published in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from this month's issue of Marine News entitled "Which Shall It Be, America, United States or Foreign Bottoms?" written by Francis T. Greene, executive vice president of the American Merchant Marine Institute, Inc. The article deals with a matter of basic national policy which now, so to speak, is hanging in the balance, with positive action by the Congress urgently required to assure the survival of both the American merchant marine and the American shipbuilding industry.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHICH SHALL IT BE, AMERICA, UNITED STATES OR FOREIGN BOTTOMS?

(By Francis T. Greene, executive vice president, American Merchant Marine Institute, Inc.)

The commercial importance of the American-flag fleet is by no means realized by the American public as a whole. Indeed, it was this very lack of realization that produced the acute commercial shipping crisis preceding our entry into World War I. It was this lack of understanding that produced the almost complete deterioration of private American shipping following that war. It is this lack of realization of the commercial importance of American shipping which, despite history, again threatens the business and Government support that our shipping must have if it is to survive foreign competition—foreign competition based on low foreign wages.

It is this same lack of understanding which has just produced the short-sighted majority recommendation of the so-called Randall Commission "that the statutory provisions requiring the use of United States vessels for shipments financed by loans or grants of the United States Government or its agencies be repealed, and that other means of support be provided by direct means"—presumably at the cost of the American taxpayer as a substitute for the American shipping activity which has carried the aid that the United States has so generously donated to the rest of the free world.

The American businessman should remember what has happened to him in the past and what will happen to him in the future, should he and our Government ever permit the American operating fleet again to lapse into disuse and decay. It is up to all of us in shipping and shipbuilding to help carry this message to those who either have not thought the problem through or have no acquaintance with their need to keep American ships sailing the seven seas.

The Randall Commission recommends "that the determination of the active merchant fleet requirements of the United States * * * take account of the availability of foreign vessels * * *." To me it is inconceivable that the majority of the Randall Commission could have shut its eyes to the crisis to American business created during the period 1914 to 1917 when the foreign nations upon whose ships we then depended withdrew their ships almost completely from peacetime trade with the United States. Freight then piled up in all the American ports for lack of ships to carry it to such an extent that by 1915 the congestion in American ports on both coasts made it necessary to establish railroad embargoes that reached far into the interior. At the same time ocean freight rates, controlled almost exclusively by the foreign owners of foreign-flag ships, skyrocketed so high as to price the American businessman out of the world commercial markets even had he been able to get any ships in which to carry his products. From 1910 to 1915 the freight charges on cotton from New York to Liverpool went up 700 percent. Freight charges on wheat from the United States to Europe quadrupled. Freight rates on rubber from southeast Asia to our Pacific Coast jumped from $20 to $127.50 per ton.

There was, in this period prior to America's entry into World War I, grave danger that American economic life would be disrupted and that our commercial export trade, which represents in so many cases the margin of profit for the American businessman, would be utterly destroyed. The result was a widespread public clamor for Government intervention and a Government shipbuilding program. This took time. As usual, although this program was not too little, it was too late.

Every American businessman should read the recent testimony of Mr. Donald G. Ward, director of transportation of the Mathieson Chemical Corp., before a Senate investigating committee. Speaking on behalf of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, he thus summarized the major disruptions of American commerce which have resulted from our shortsighted dependence on foreign-flag shipping:

"History offers excellent guideposts for the future. Therefore, I should like to recall some of our experience of the past. Such experience has shown that in the event of any international disturbance, not necessarily one involving the United States directly, foreign-flag shipping on which American exporters and importers might rely will be withdrawn to be placed in other service considered more essential by the country whose flag it flies, or just more lucrative service.

"Boer War: I cite as an example the Boer War, fought by the British in South Africa at the turn of the century. That may seem to be going back a long way for an example, but it proves a point. In that war, which did not involve us, the withdrawal of British ships from normal trade to supply British troops in South Africa, and the increase in British-controlled rates, imposed a heavy burden upon our foreign trade.

"World War I: When World War I began we were not then involved, but since the principal combatants were also the leading maritime nations, they naturally requisitioned or interned most of their ships. Foreign-flag ships were withdrawn from our ports—some to do essential work for their own countries, and some to switch to other operations made lucrative because of the withdrawal of a sizable amount of shipping from the normal channels of trade. Cargo piled up on our wharves and in our warehouses, and railroad cars could not be unloaded. Rail congestion at eastern seaports extended back as far as Chicago, and rail embargoes had to be declared. Because of this congestion, people in the East did without some of the essentials of life, and relatively little foreign trade moved when it was greatly in demand.

"British coal strike: Moving on, a famous example of the dubious policy of depending on foreign tonnage to serve our foreign trade is the British coal strike in 1926. The ships that were carrying our commerce were withdrawn at a time when the crops of the United States were ready to move. They were needed to bring coal to the mother country. This is an example of foreign-flag ships being assigned to more essential service in the interest of the country whose flag they fly.

"World War II: We come to the next serious disruption of our shipping services—World War II. This time, cargo was not piled high on our docks. Warehouse and railroad yards were not congested. We had had the stimulating effects of the Merchant Marine Acts of 1928 and 1936. We had started on a program of building an American-flag merchant marine. Commendable as that was, it was not the answer to why there was no congestion on our docks, in our warehouses, or in railroad yards. The real answer was that only that traffic was allowed to move that could be accommodated in the relatively small number of available ships. The same thing happened then that had happened in 1914. Foreign-flag tonnage disappeared from our ports, except to carry lend-lease cargo home. Little shipping was left, and that was American-flag shipping. And there wasn't nearly enough of that."

Relying upon foreign flag shipping is like relying upon the loan of your neighbor's car. When you need it most he will also need it. You will either walk or stay at home.

In the face of this history, at least 5, and probably 8, members of the Randall Commission dissented from the reliance which the majority urged America to place upon the foreign flag shipping. I would call to your attention this minority viewpoint which alone coincides with the lessons of experience:

"It is not disputed that the United States should have an adequate merchant marine for the national defense and to develop and maintain its foreign and domestic commerce. It is the conviction that the report of the Commission dealing with this important matter is not only inadequate to accomplish these objectives, but if its provisions were implemented, our merchant marine would be weakened.

"The history of our maritime industry from the first World War to the present confirms the fact that this industry has been inadequate to meet the needs for the development of our foreign trade and for the defense of our Nation during times when we were at war.

"In the determination of the requirements for a United States merchant fleet, which no responsible governmental agency has as yet done, we should not put substantial reliance on the merchant ships of our allies. Our experience over the past 4 or 5 decades confirms this conclusion. Whatever agency within our Government is charged with the task of determining the size of our merchant marine, it should set as its goal the establishment and maintenance of a merchant marine and a shipbuilding industry that is reasonably self-sufficient. Although the cost required to accomplish this should be kept to a minimum, economy should not be a major consideration, for what might seen economical initially would in the long run prove most costly. To have such a merchant marine requires experienced shipbuilders to construct the ships and to keep them in repair, and seasoned men to man the ships in active service. These cannot be had by relying upon our allies.

"At the outbreak of two world world wars, the United States has been caught short of sufficient ship bottoms to meet its requirement. Our allies did not and could not supply the necessary ships—most of them were bottled up by an effective enemy blockade."

There is a more subtile, but equally important, advantage to the American businessman of maintaining his merchant marine during time of peace and international quiet than in time of war. This advantage lies in the effect of American shipping upon worldwide shipping rates which must be paid by American importers and exporters regardless of whether the cargoes move in foreign or American bottoms.

Almost all American berth operators are members of international conferences created to establish an orderly and reliable rate structure upon which importers and exporters may depend in making forward commitments. What would happen to the rates charged to the American businessman if there were no American lines seated at the conference table to fight for freight rates fair to American products in competition with the products of foreign countries whose national flag lines are also seated at the same conference table? The representative of the chamber of commerce was asked, during a recent Senate investigation, this self-same question, and I quote his answer:

"I think it would have an entirely and definitely disastrous effect on our foreign commerce. * * * I believe that American ships do have a beneficial effect and that they are a counterweight on the side of the American exporter and importer in the making of ocean freight rates. * * * We cannot sell in the foreign trade unless we have freight rates which are comparable and competitive with producers of like material in foreign countries throughout the world. If we do not have American lines represented in the conferences, protecting American business and at the same time, of course, protecting their own trades, we may find ourselves out of foreign trade completely."

Mr. Ward went on to say that if we did not have American representation in international marine conferences to protect freight rates to and from America versus those of our foreign competing nations, our businessmen would be, and I quote, "completely at their mercy, and I am afraid their mercy would not be good for us."

In similar vein, Mr. Harry J. Carroll, director of traffic of the Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co., stated that in the rubber business there was a great deal of foreign competition, particularly British and Italian. This American businessman, with so wide a traffic experience, concluded:

"If we do not have the American merchant marine to protect our interest, we become at the mercy of our foreign friends, and the rates can go any place and the service can go any place."

It seems to me that one of the principal difficulties facing the American merchant marine under today's almost peacetime conditions is that of its public relations—the unfulfilled need of bringing home to the American businessman and the American taxpayer just how important an American-flag shipping industry, financed by American capital and controlled by American businessmen, is to their well-being. The manufacturer or shipper, from the interior of our country, seldom, if ever, sees the ships that carry his products abroad. He very seldom even stops to think of these unseen ships which alone make possible his export trade even though he knows full well that the 10 or 15 percent of his total production that is sold abroad means the difference between profit or loss. Our problem is how to reach and tell these simple facts of life to the millions upon millions of American citizens who produce or sell the goods which compose the foreign commerce of the United States, which amounts annually to about 200 million cargo tons with a value of over $25 billion per annum. The whole American public could be reached if our industry could afford the annual appropriations for institutional advertising and other forms of public relations, such as that of the Association of American Railroads which runs somewhere between two million to four million dollars per year, or even that of the American Trucking Association which is substantially in excess of half a million dollars a year. Yet, we have a message to bring to the American people of even greater importance to them and of far more economic complexity than the messages of other forms of transportation. However, the American shipping industry, faced with a worldwide shipping slump and using far more red than black ink at the foot of its 1953 profit-and-loss statements, obviously can afford no such sums. It is therefore dependent, almost wholly, upon messengers, such as ourselves, who know and appreciate our need for our own ships in the recurrent times of shipping shortages and international crises, to tell these facts up and down the highways and byways of American business and community life. We must rely in large measure upon ourselves to bring home to the American people the self-evident truism, disregarded by the enemies of the American merchant marine and its foreign competitors, but thus stated by George Washington as long ago as 1790:

"I recommend it to your serious reflections how far and in what mode it may be expedient to guard against embarrassments from these contingencies by such encouragements to our own navigation as will render our commerce and agriculture less dependent on foreign bottoms, which may fail us in the very moments most interesting to both these great objects"—the price of transporting American products to their proper markets abroad.

It is the aim of the magna carta of American-flag shipping, the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, to develop an American merchant marine capable of carrying at least 50 percent of American foreign commerce cargoes. Achievement of this aim would represent a safeguard of strategic commercial importance to the American businessman through assuring him of the everyready availability of ships and shipping, and a constant protection against the skyrocketing of ocean freight rates dominated solely by his foreign competitors. The achievement of this aim lies in large measure in our hands, since only through us, and thousands of others like us, can the salesmanship job be done which must be done in order to bring home our message to the American shipper, businessman, and taxpayer.

Buffalo and the St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDMUND P. RADWAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1954

Mr. RADWAN. Mr. Speaker, although Buffalo has long opposed the St. Lawrence seaway, I pointed out in my remarks before this body that earlier this year we accepted the St. Lawrence seaway as inevitable. This, however, does not mean that we in the great western New York area should view the seaway with pessimism. There is every reason for optimism, and I want to set forth a few of those reasons.

At the present time three-fourths of Buffalo's waterborne tonnage is confined to two products—grain and steel. In our planning for the future we must take every step to keep what we have, that is preserve our present trade and industry in grain as well as steel, while promoting new tonnage. There is no doubt in my mind that our milling industry will stay in Buffalo and, rather than lose any part of it, Buffalo should expect some gain in activity. However, the greatest opportunity and gain will come in steel. At the present time the Buffalo area is the sixth largest steel center in the country. We are the largest steel center among those in close proximity to Labrador ore. It is this Labrador ore that will come down the St. Lawrence seaway—and this was one of the principal reasons for passage of the seaway bill—and we are the closest and largest steel center to it. All finished steel products are almost always shipped out of the Buffalo area by rail. This means more business for the railroads and not less. Buffalo's steel industry is certain to reach great heights once the seaway will be in operation.

What about other trade? Buffalo is the eighth largest manufacturing center in the country, with a highly diversified area. Ocean freighters leaving Buffalo will be able to carry generators made at Westinghouse, big castings made at the Buffalo Forge Co., as well as hydraulic presses manufactured at Lake Erie Manufacturing Co., to Europe, South America, and other parts of the world. There are other manufactured products by other companies but I have only singled out those that come to my mind at the moment. The possibilities for our export trade from our diversified industries are enormous.

At the present time Buffalo and Detroit are the two largest trading points with Canada. Since the population across the border in our area is going to increase rapidly because of the St. Lawrence seaway, our trade with Canada in the Buffalo area should be increased by leaps and bounds. As we export our products to Europe, we will be importing many of the products of mid-Europe, because Buffalo's background is such that products from European countries will find a very ready and interesting market in Buffalo for its population of recent European background.

The construction of the St. Lawrence seaway itself will make for a lot of work on both sides of the border. This means more in dollar payrolls, much of which will be spent in the Buffalo area and contributing to our prosperity. While we now know that ships like the *Queen Elizabeth*, the *Queen Mary*, and the S. S. *United States* will not be able to come through to Buffalo, nevertheless, smaller passenger ships that now cross the Atlantic will be able to go from Buffalo to Europe and return. This is a long-range view, but the possibilities are there and should not be ignored when promotional plans are being made. Buffalo could become an important port of entry and passenger terminal.

I will conclude with the statement that we are strategically and favorably located. We are within a 500-mile radius of 50 percent of the population of America, and within that 500-mile radius we have 70 percent of the Canadian population which, as I stated before, is going to increase very rapidly with the St. Lawrence seaway. We are losing nothing and we have everything to gain—so let us go Buffalo.

Dedication of Memorial Schools at Uxbridge, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1954

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement:

Speaking at the dedication of the memorial schools at Uxbridge yesterday, Congressman PHILIP J. PHILBIN, of Clinton, lauded the completion of the projects as an evidence of superlative civic cooperation which can well serve as an example.

PHILBIN's remarks follow in part:

"I am proud to congratulate the able committee which brought these beautiful new buildings to fulfillment as well as all the citizens of your town who will so immeasurably benefit from them in the future.

"It required the vision and sound judgment of real leadership to inaugurate and complete these most desirable improvements, and all the people of Uxbridge can derive a sense of deep satisfaction that they will be devoted to the public good, the public betterment, and the constructive promotion of education in your community."

Touching upon Memorial Day and current problems, the Clinton Congressman referred to the "great sacrifices upon which American liberties are based."

"On this day dedicated to the memory of those who defended the Nation with their blood and their lives and all those who fought to preserve freedom," he said, "it is appropriate that we should pause to evaluate their unforgettable contributions."

"Our liberties were won through struggle, sacrifices, and loyalty, and it is only by these means that they can be defended and secured," he said.

"In a true spirit of resolution all Americans should recognize today that the best way of preserving what the gallant heroes of the past fought and died to secure is for this generation to be vigilant and unyielding in our determination to protect and perpetuate the basic spiritual values of our way of life."

"It will require a united America, the wholehearted contribution of every race, creed, and class to ward off the deadly attacks against our democracy," he said. "If we devote ourselves to these great tasks with the same indomitable spirit that animated those we honor today, we need have no fear about the future of the Nation, because it will not only endure, but it will grow in the blessed ways of freedom, prosperity, happiness, and peace, and it will prevail against the diabolical enemies which seek to destroy us."

That Benson Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON CANFIELD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 28, 1954

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit an editorial appearing in the New York Times of Thursday, May 27:

THAT BENSON PROGRAM

Typical of the attacks on Secretary Benson's farm policies, and more important than most of the others, was this comment by former President Truman: "The so-called Benson farm program, designed further to reduce farm prices and farm incomes should be tossed out the nearest window * * *."

What are the facts about farm prices under the "Benson program" and under the program of his predecessor, Mr. Truman's Secretary of Agriculture?

Noting that the 1953–54 recession has represented a departure from most such episodes in that it has not been featured by declining prices, Professor Slichter of Harvard pointed out in a recent address: "In 1949 the principal cause of the decrease in the wholesale price index was the fall in the prices of farm products * * * . In the present recession there has been little movement of farm prices as a whole."

The fact of the matter is that under Mr. Truman we saw two inflationary booms in farm prices collapse before our eyes. From an index level of 196 in June 1948, farm prices slid almost without interruption throughout the ensuing 18 months, and by the end of 1949 stood at 154.9, a loss of roughly 41 points, or 21 percent. Then we had the Korean boom, during which the farm price index again went through the roof, to hit 203.8 in March 1951. But again on this occasion the sequel was the same. Once the effects of that shot of inflation had worn off, a fresh decline set in.

For the benefit of those who have been under the illusion that declining farm prices have had something to do with the Eisenhower victory of November 1952, or with the Benson farm program, these facts cannot be too strongly emphasized: Farm prices started down in March 1951, and fell almost continuously for the last 2 years of the Truman administration. At the end of 1952 they had fallen 19 points, or 16 percent, in the recently revised wholesale price index of the Bureau of Labor Statistics. The index declined about another 5 points under the Eisenhower administration, but toward the end of 1953 had reversed its course, and by April 1954, had regained that additional lost ground, and stood at 99.8, as against 99.2 when Mr. Truman stepped out of office.

These figures are, we think, worth pasting in one's hat against the next time one hears anyone induling in loose talk about the Benson program and declining farm prices.

Memorial Day Services, Revere Post, No. 940, Department of Massachusetts, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, on May 31, 1954, at the Old Rumney Burial Ground, Revere, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1954

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following address I delivered at Memorial Day services held on May 31, 1954, at the Old Rumney Burial Ground on Butler Street, Revere, Mass., sponsored by Revere Post, No. 940, Department of Massachusetts, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.

The address follows:

Every boy thrills to the sight of a uniform and something jumps inside of him when he hears the martial music of a military band.

So it was with all of us when we were very young as we watched the annual Memorial Day parade.

It is a pleasant time of the year for every boy, with release from school not far off and a glorious summer of play ahead.

For most of us the days of our carefree boyhood are gone as we face up to the need for maturity in ourselves and for the Nation.

Memorial Day is considered a time for looking backward; for seeing in our mind's eye the faces of friends and relatives who have departed from this worldly scene, remembering their smiles and their voices, their love and understanding for us, remembering our loss.

There is a momentary tightening of our hearts and a tear falls on the flowers we place on their graves.

Then, as we look about us, we see that we are not alone.

The city of the dead is bright with little flags and fragrant with floral offerings and many people come and go on the same reverent mission.

And suddenly we remember something else: The brave men who served us all throughout our history.

As the years passed and we grew up, we came to realize this deeper significance of the price that some must pay so that the rest of us may continue to live in freedom.

Memorial Day is no longer a brief pause in the 365-day cycle of the year to recall the people once close to us whose mortal remains have turned to dust.

It has a national meaning, an everlasting meaning, as long as there is life on our troubled planet.

The spirit of those who died is transferred to us with high faith and courage to maintain what they have won against the dangers which threaten us.

Up through these blades of grass that soften the mask of death to the miracle of nature's re-creation at work, reminding us that we must live up to the best within us while we may so that the children who look up to us in pride and confidence will not say someday we failed them.

From Gettysburg to Heartbreak Hill to some rendesvous this year or next that may test our faith in freedom, the pilgrimage that is America goes on.

Courage is not the exclusive responsibility of our Armed Forces and is not confined to combat.

Day in and day out, unwavering and determined to outlast the enemy, no matter how long it may take, this is the invincible kind of courage that is a must for every American.

The Communists know that we are a people of great material power.

They calculate, however, that we are lacking in patience and tenacity. Their long-range strategy is planned to take advantage of our impetuous nature. They believe we wake up to danger when it is too late, rush in to get it over with in a hurry, and can be talked into a compromise because we are overanxious to get back to business as usual.

They aim to wear us down.

If we emulate the stamina of those American patriots we remember this day, steady in our purpose and patient in our vigilance, then we shall wear down communism and win peace with freedom.

We must set our sights on a long struggle fought with many secret weapons.

Too many people think that when there is no shooting there is no war.

This is the trap the Communists have set for us, and too many people have fallen into it.

The Communists wage war all the time and in many different ways.

It is a total operation against all of our defenses.

They know that they can destroy a country from within as well as by military assault by weakening its currency, by spreading fear and distrust, by industrial paralysis, by the lies of propaganda that always fool some people, and by using every political, social, psychological, and economic irritation they can think up.

These, among others, are the secret weapons.

These are the ones we must learn to see and to recognize when they are being used against us so that we can adopt effective countermeasures.

Communism is a new and deadly form of fanaticism.

As Nicolai Lenin, who brought communism to despotic power in Russia, said: "We must train men and women who will devote to the revolution not merely their spare evenings but the whole of their lives."

That will give you some idea concerning the determination of those who would enslave the whole world because they will be satisfied with nothing less.

We must use every weapon short of war, not simply to fence in but to defeat this conspiracy against freedom.

It is time we started using our own secret weapons against the weaknesses within the Communist empire.

And the one above all which they do not possess is affirmative belief in God and the dignity of man, meaning all men and including those in Communist captivity.

That spiritual strength is in evidence on Memorial Day.

But that is not enough.

We must employ it 365 days of every year not only in strengthening our free institutions within the United States but in communicating this strength to all oppressed peoples as a weapon to use in overcoming the menace of communism.

Reverence for the dead has little meaning if it is confined to one brief ceremonial each year and then is forgotten for another year.

Unless we keep before us the memory of their unselfish lives and try to be as worthy of responsibility now as they were in their time, we shall be in danger of betraying ourselves.

The heroes we honor today have done their work. They sleep in eternal peace.

We are the living.

And, while there is life in us, we cannot afford to be half asleep or, if we do become indifferent, we open the doors to Communist slavery which is a living death without peace.

Once we were little boys who thrilled to the sight of soldiers in the Memorial Day parade, not understanding its real and serious meaning, just as there are youngsters who are enjoying freedom from school and wishing that they could be brave and adventurous like the soldiers and the veterans in uniform that they see on this Memorial Day.

But we are grown up.

We know that soldiering is not a game of make-believe.

Too many of our comrades have gone to their flag-decorated graves long, long before their time.

Their friends and relatives bear the silent grief that does not show.

War is too cruel for us to forget its cost.

But worse than war is for us to be careless of the truths for which these gallant men and women sacrificed their lives.

It would be nothing less than treason if we should lose the victory that they won, if we fail the trust that they reposed in us.

On Memorial Day we pay homage to those who died for our country, to win its independence, to unite it, to defend it from aggression.

Over 1 million Americans have given up their lives that we might enjoy freedom.

This price, this highest cost, should make us think and never forget.

In the constant war that is being waged against us by communism, all of us have a duty to defend our national security, soldiers in citizen clothes as well as those in uniform, to defeat the invisible enemy who is trying to confuse, divide, and weaken us.

This is one of the major battlegrounds today and perhaps for many years to come.

Where we must fight with the weapons of intelligence, will power, spiritual faith—each and every one of us sharing the responsibilities so that freedom will triumph, so that these brave men we honor today will not have died in vain.

That is our prayer and our promise on Memorial Day 1954.

Mississippi River Between Missouri River and Minneapolis, Minn., Damage to Levee and Drainage Districts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SID SIMPSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1954

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the proposed report by the Chief of Engineers herewith inserted, and the communication to the Chief's office from General Robinson, pertain to damage to levee and drainage districts on the Mississippi River between the Missouri River and Minneapolis, Minn. The approval of the Governor of Illinois is required in each instance involving damage to levee and drainage districts lying within our State. I am glad to inform the House that Governor Stratton forwarded the Illinois approval to the Chief of Engineers April 20, 1954.

There are at least 6 Illinois districts involved. Everyone interested should note that the Sny District is recognized in an entirely different manner than the 6 districts as outlined in table No. 1—there is a separate authorization for the Sny District. It is so recognized by the Public Works Committee, the House of Representatives, and the United States Engineers.

Mr. Speaker, as soon as I can get the authorization drawn in legal form, I will introduce such authorizations for the six districts in the 20th Illinois Congressional District. This will be introduced as outlined in the proposed report of the Chief of Engineers and in the amounts outlined in table No. 1. They are, of course, subject to final approval and agreement with the involved districts and Chief of Engineers as well as the public works committee.

This proposed report definitely shows the need for construction start of the Sny project. It has been authorized by Congress. Some construction funds of \$2½ million appropriated only to be stopped by the Korean conflict. The Sny district now has the right to expect action which has already been delayed much too long.

The matters referred to follow:

To: The Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army.

THE BOARD OF ENGINEERS FOR
RIVERS AND HARBORS,
Washington, D. C., February 26, 1954.

Subject: Mississippi River between Missouri River and Minneapolis, Minn., damage to levee and drainage districts

1. Local interests were informed of the recommendations of the reporting officers and were afforded an opportunity to present additional information to the Board. The Board received several communications regarding the particular conditions pertaining to some of the drainage districts. In general they called attention to additional siltation and seepage damages and stated that they desire retention of the authority for provision of remedial works or land acquisitions as contained in the River and Harbor Act of 1945 and prefer annual payments rather than a lump-sum settlement because of possible future inflation, investment difficulties, and legal restrictions. At a meeting of the Board, representatives of the Drury Drainage District stated informally that, while they agreed with the present report, construction of the work recommended in the interim report on flood control, printed as House Document No. 281, 83d Congress, 2d session, is necessary to restore the district to the condition existent prior to the canalization project. In addition the Meredosia Levee and Drainage District protested the method of calculation of the amounts for depreciation of the existing pumping plant and for its enlargement, and the Des Moines County Drainage District No. 7 requested more definite assurances that remedial work necessary to control siltation would be performed.

2. The Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors has carefully considered the recommendations of the district and division engineers and additional information submitted by local interests. The Board concurs in general with the views of the reporting officers as to the nature and amounts of damages to levee and drainage districts caused by the navigation pools within this reach of the Mississippi River. It notes that further work contemplated in a pending re-

port will provide adequate discharge capacity for the diversion channels. At other drainage outlets, justified remedial action may be accomplished under existing authority. A capitalization rate of 2.75 percent which is approximately the current yield of the United States bonds which are legal investments for the drainage districts, is appropriate for the purposes of this report. The extensive studies made, using long-term data, indicate that little additional refinement may be expected with further study. The Board notes that provision of suitable remedial works and necessary land acquisitions are contained in the present report and that the authority in the River and Harbor Act of 1945 is now no longer required. The recommended lump-sum payments are reasonable for the amounts of damages involved and are administratively preferable to annual payments. After giving further consideration to letters from the Meredosia Levee and Drainage District and the Des Moines County Drainage District No. 7, the Board is of the opinion that no modification of the recommendations of the reporting officers is required. The Board concludes that the proposed settlements are reasonable and just.

3. Accordingly, the Board recommends that the lump-sum amounts set forth in the report of the district engineer totaling $2,475,941 be considered as representing the damages to the districts caused by the operation of navigation pools Nos. 14, 16, 17, 18, 20, 21, 22, 24, 25, and 26; and that authority for provision of remedial works or land acquisitions, as contained in the River and Harbor Act approved March 2, 1945, be terminated upon authorization and provision for payment of the amounts reported herein, except for the Sny Island Levee Drainage District, which will be studied further after the authorized flood-control project is completed. The Board further recommends that, in the event funds are appropriated by Congress for the purpose of paying the damages herein reported, or any part thereof, the Chief of Engineers, or such officer or officers as he may designate, be authorized to make such payments to the drainage or levee districts, except in the case of Kings Lake Drainage District, where payments will be made directly to landowners for flowage easements or fee title to lands in the district, upon presentation of such evidence, certificates, receipts, releases, and assurance as he may consider reasonable and necessary, in full settlement for all damages heretofore or hereafter sustained by these districts from the execution of the navigation project.

B. L. Robinson,
Major General, Chairman
(For the Board).

Department of the Army,
Office of the Chief of Engineers,
Washington, D. C.

To: The Secretary of the Army.

Subject: Mississippi River between Missouri River and Minneapolis, Minn., damage to levee and drainage districts.

1. I submit for transmission to Congress my report with accompanying papers on damages to levee and drainage districts along Mississippi River between Missouri River and Minneapolis, Minn., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved August 26, 1937, and the River and Harbor Act approved March 2, 1945. This report covers damages to levee and drainage districts affected by pools 14 to 26 only. A report on seepage damages to districts adjacent to pools 3 to 11 was transmitted to Congress on March 18, 1946, and printed in House Document No. 515, 79th Congress, 2d session.

2. The upper Mississippi River between Minneapolis, Minn., and the mouth of the Missouri River, a distance of about 660 miles, has been improved by the United States to provide a channel 9 feet deep and of adequate width for navigation by the construction of a system of 26 locks and dams of low heads, supplemented by channel dredging. The establishment of the navigation pools has resulted in damage by seepage and backwater to a number of drainage and levee districts bordering the river. The existing project includes provision for acquisition of low-lying land in seven drainage districts, in lieu of payment of the capitalized cost of maintaining their drainage status, and for annual payments to certain other districts to reimburse them for any increased cost of operation and maintenance due to the operation of the navigation pools over a period of not less than 5 years until such time as the average increase in annual costs can be determined. The actual cost of acquisition of the low-lying lands in 6 of the districts has been $935,221, and a court judgment of $22,519.60 plus 4 percent interest from August 8, 1938, was affirmed by the United States Supreme Court on June 5, 1950, for the remaining district. Annual payments totaling $508,619 without depreciation have been made to 15 districts for their increased costs during the period from 1936 through 1951. Lump-sum payments made by the United States under authority of the act of August 26, 1937, include $19,380 for a new pumping unit and addition to the pumping plant building in Union Township Drainage District in 1939, and $24,955 for construction of a ditch in 1940 to remove a portion of seepage by gravity in Des Moines County Drainage District No. 7.

3. The drainage districts under consideration comprise about 250,000 acres of a total of 410,000 acres of agricultural land protected from high waters of the Mississippi River by 450 miles of levees. The drainage is controlled by levees, interior drainage facilities, and by pumping to remove excess water. Costs of maintenance of the drainage and levee districts are affected by meteorological conditions which vary from year to year, by variation in stages of the Mississippi River caused by the levees and by local improvements, and by the navigation project. Prior to completion of the locks and dams, gravity drainage was possible when river stages were lower than the elevation of the water in the suction bays at the pumping plants of the drainage districts. The backwater effect of the pools has in some cases increased the siltation at the mouths of diversions and drainage outlets with the resultant reduction in discharge capacities.

4. Local interests desire annual appraisal and restitution of damages and rectification of unsatisfactory drainage conditions resulting from operation of the navigation pools. The officials of some districts believe that the study of extra costs should be continued for a longer and more normal period and that the war years should be excluded in the determination of the average annual increased costs. They are of the opinion that wherever additional pumping is necessitated by operation of the navigation pools, that the United States should share in the cost of replacement of such pumping equipment, and that interim annual disbursements made to drainage districts should include an allowance for depreciation. As an alternative, they suggest that the United States reimburse them in an amount equal to the cost of equipment necessary to pump the increased quantity of water to be removed from the district as a result of operation of the navigation project. They further contend that the United States should participate in the costs of remedial works such as new or rehabilitated ditches so as to restore the districts to their prenavigation project condition. They object to lump-sum payments for damages to the drainage districts because under existing drainage laws, especially in Illinois, a single landowner in a drainage district might demand and require the use of funds on hand before regular or special assessments are made.

5. Remedial works or land acquisitions as the Chief of Engineers deems advisable were authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved March 2, 1945, in addition to or in lieu of the payments, remedial works, or land acquisitions recommended in Rivers and Harbors Committee Document No. 34, 75th Congress, 1st session, and authorized in the River and Harbor Act approved August 26, 1937. No remedial works have been provided or land acquisitions undertaken by the Government under this authority. In a few cases the drainage districts have undertaken remedial works at their own expense, and in one case a district has acquired a tract of lowland in lieu of maintaining lower water levels over the entire district to provide drainage for this tract. Inasmuch as the act of March 1945 authorizes remedial works or land acquisitions, as the Chief of Engineers deems advisable, but does not appear to authorize reimbursement of drainage or levee districts therefor, no reimbursements have been made under this act for remedial works or land acquisition already undertaken. The backwater effect of the pools results in increased silting in the outfalls of the drainage outlets and varies according to the location of the channel with respect to the pool. In three of these drainage outlets excessive silting has occurred and the capacities of these channels have been restored by the Federal Government as the silting was attributable in an important degree to the 9-foot channel project. These channels are Johnson Creek, discharging below lock and dam No. 13; Hawkeye-Dolbee diversion channel, discharging into pool No. 18; and Yellow Spring Creek, discharging below lock and dam No. 18. The pending interim report on flood control Mississippi River, Guttenberg, Iowa, to Hamburg Bay, Ill., contemplates the enlargement of main river levees as well as flank levees along diversion channels. The flank levees will be built to furnish sufficient channel capacity, based upon the existence of the navigation pools in the river, to provide adequately for siltation of drainage outlets serving the various drainage and levee districts.

6. The district engineer's investigation reveals that for medium and low flows, river stages under operation of the navigation project are higher than would obtain under open river conditions. Under usual pool operations, the water surface elevation is held at the authorized level if the flow is less than that which would produce such a level under open river conditions. He finds that damages suffered by the drainage districts consist principally of additional pumping costs necessitated by higher river stages caused by the navigation pools. The additional pumping includes pumping during periods when gravity drainage would have been available if the pools had not blocked the gravity drains, pumping against an increased head caused by the higher pool stages, and pumping an increased amount of seepage caused by sustained river levels due to pool operation. Most of the pumping plants have inadequate pumping capacity to remove the increased seepage caused by the navigation pools during the summer months when excessive rainfall occurs. The district engineer has estimated the average amounts of future drainage to be pumped from increased seepage, blocked gravity flow, and against an additional head. Based on December 1951 prices, he has estimated the cost of pumping the estimated future average annual increased seepage and blocked gravity drainage against the estimated future average annual lift. These costs include allowances for labor, fuel, power, lubricants, repairs, and supplies, and total $49,030 annually, as shown in table 1. The estimated future annual cost of handling the normal pump-

age against increased heads, totaling $1,703, includes only the cost of fuel or power as the other costs are not appreciably affected. The motors, engines, and pumps in the pumping plants depreciate more rapidly under the increased use resulting from operation of the navigation pools. The future accelerated rate of depreciation is chargeable to the operation of the navigation pools and totals $6,821 annually for the several districts involved. The estimated future average annual increased costs have been capitalized at an interest rate of 2.75 percent. The total lump-sum amount for 15 districts is $2,092,872. The annual payments made under the provisions of the River and Harbor Act of 1937 do not include a depreciation factor. The depreciation allowances through 1948 total $70,520 for 14 districts. The costs of necessary remedial works consisting of additional pumping facilities, reimbursement for ditch work, and acquisition of lands or flowage easements for 16 districts total $312,549. The total lump-sum payments for damages, remedial work, and land acquisition or flowage easements for the 17 districts are $2,475,941.

TABLE 1.—*Summary of damages to drainage districts due to the operation of Mississippi River navigation pools*

Pool No.	Drainage district	Cost of pumping increased seepage and blocked drainage (1)	Cost of pumping normal runoff against increased lift (2)	United States share of annual depreciation (3)	Total annual cost, (1)+(2)+(3) (4)	Total annual cost capitalized at 2¾ percent (5)	Lump-sum share of depreciation (6)	Remedial works (additional pumping facilities, etc.) (7)	Grand total, (5)+(6)+(7) (8)
14	Meredosia	$7,956	$125	$1,037	$9,118	$331,564	$4,209	[1] $19,007	$354,840
16-17	Drury	1,112	41	170	1,323	48,109	2,170	19,646	69,925
17	Muscatine-Louisa No. 13	5,676	161	711	6,548	238,109	17,513	11,704	267,326
17-18	Bay Island [2]	5,785	191	805	6,781	246,582	2,460	21,318	270,360
18	Louisa-Des Moines No. 4	4,909	327	955	6,191	225,127	8,021	12,122	245,270
18-19	Des Moines County No. 7	9,150	0	1,296	10,446	379,855	14,794	[3] 57,770	452,419
18	Henderson No. 3	868	0	120	988	35,927	2,986	5,016	43,929
20	Hunt	904	211	180	1,295	47,091	3,530	8,360	58,981
20-21	Lima Lake	1,211	157	233	1,601	58,218	2,088	[3] 19,125	79,431
21	Union Township	2,051	50	243	2,344	85,236	3,267	6,955	95,458
21	Indian Grave	3,557	245	522	4,324	157,236	3,762	9,196	170,194
21-22	Fabius River	1,208	60	154	1,422	51,709	3,360	10,450	65,519
21-22	South Quincy	2,371	42	90	2,503	91,018	740	5,016	96,774
22	Marion	0	23	0	23	836	0	0	836
22	South River	2,272	70	305	2,647	96,255	1,560	3,344	101,159
25	Elsberry	0	0	0	0	0	0	23,520	23,520
25	Kings Lake	0	0	0	0	0	0	[4] 80,000	80,000
	Total	49,030	1,703	6,821	57,554	2,092,872	70,520	312,549	2,475,941

[1] Includes $1,451 for low-lying land acquired by district.

[2] Also includes subdistrict No. 1 of Drainage Union No. 1.

[3] Includes reimbursement for ditch work.

[4] Acquisition of flowage easements and/or fee title to all lands in district—payment directly to landowners.

The district engineer states that pursuant to the authority contained in the River and Harbor Act of 1945, a number of drainage districts have requested that new ditches be constructed to provide drainage to areas which remain too wet to cultivate until well in the summer season. These requests have not been granted for the reason that the cost of construction of the ditch would be greater than the value of the land benefited. It could not be conclusively shown that the proposed ditch would lower ground water over the entire area. Surface drainage would be improved which would result in benefits to the district. Most districts are averse to having the United States acquire these low areas as an alternate to building ditches, as this would reduce the area assessed for drainage purposes and require a larger assessment on the remainder of the district. The district engineer further states that the additional ditches for the Sny Island Levee Drainage District, recommended in Rivers and Harbors Committee Document No. 34, 75th Congress, are not considered feasible until the capacity of the Sny channel is enlarged. Further study of the need for remedial works will be made after completion of the flood-control project authorized in the Flood Control Act of 1946, which provides for diversion of the principal tributary streams and the construction of additional pumping plants. The district engineer concludes that since the average annual increased pumping quantities have been determined on the basis of mean daily flows from long-term river records, runoff from mean monthly precipitation records, and seepage estimates based on studies for the individual districts, further study would only result in minor refinements in his estimates. He also concludes that the need for additional remedial works has not been demonstrated and that further study of this phase of the problem appears unnecessary.

7. The district engineer recommends that the lump-sum amounts reported herein as set forth in table 1, totaling $2,475,941, be considered as representing the capitalized cost of rectification of damages to the districts caused by the operation of navigation pools Nos. 14, 16, 17, 18, 20, 21, 22, 24, 25, and 26; that authority for provision of remedial works or land acquisitions as contained in the River and Harbor Act, approved March 2, 1945, be terminated upon authorization and provision for payment of the amounts proposed herein; except in the case of the Sny Island Levee Drainage District, where further study of the need for remedial works to drain low areas shall be made after the authorized flood-control project is completed. The district engineer further recommends that, in the event funds are appropriated by Congress for the purpose of paying the damages herein reported, or any part thereof, the Chief of Engineers, or such officer or officers as he may designate, be authorized to make such payments to the drainage or levee districts, except in the case of Kings Lake Drainage District where payments will be made directly to landowners for flowage easements or fee title to lands in the district, upon presentation of such evidence, certificates, receipts, releases, and assurances as he may consider reasonable and necessary. The division engineer concurs.

8. The Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors concur in general with the views of the reporting officers as to the nature and amounts of damages to levee and drainage districts caused by the navigation pools within this reach of the Mississippi River. It notes that further work contemplated in a pending report will provide adequate discharge capacity for the diversion channels. At other drainage outlets, justified remedial action may be accomplished under existing authority. It considers a capitalization rate of 2.75 percent to be appropriate for the purposes of this report. The Board recommends that the lump-sum amounts set forth in table 1 herein totaling $2,475,941 be considered as representing the damages to the levee and drainage districts caused by the operation of the navigation pools Nos. 14, 16, 17, 18, 20, 21, 22, 24, 25, and 26; and that authority for provision of remedial works or land acquisitions, as contained in the River and Harbor Act, approved March 2, 1945, be terminated upon authorization and provision for payment of the amounts reported herein, except for the Sny Island Levee Drainage District which will be studied further after the authorized flood-control project is completed. The Board further recommends that if payments are made to the levee and drainage districts, or directly to landowners in the Kings Lake Drainage District, such payments be made in full settlement for all damages heretofore or hereafter sustained by reason of the execution of the navigation project.

9. After due consideration of these reports, I concur in the views and recommendations of the Board. The amounts contained in the Board's report represent the capitalized cost of damages to the 17 districts bordering the Mississippi River caused by the operation of the navigation project. The extensive studies, which have utilized long-term river and rainfall records, indicate that further study would not yield material refinement.

10. I, therefore, recommend that the lump-sum amounts set forth in table 1 herein totaling $2,475,941 be considered as representing the damages to these districts caused by the operation of navigation pools Nos. 14, 16, 17, 18, 20, 21, 22, 24, 25, and 26; and that authority for provision of remedial works or land acquisitions, as contained in the River and Harbor Act approved March 2, 1945, be terminated upon authorization and provision for payment of the amounts reported herein, except for the Sny Island Levee Drainage District which will be studied further after the authorized flood-control project is completed. I further recommend that, in the event funds are appropriated by Congress for the purpose of paying the dam- the Chief of Engineers, or such officer or offi- ages herein reported, or any part thereof, cers as he may designate, be authorized to make such payments to the drainage or levee districts, except in the case of Kings Lake Drainage District where payments will be made directly to landowners for flowage easements or fee title to lands in the district, upon presentation of such evidence, certificates, receipts, releases, and assurances as he may consider reasonable and necessary, in full settlement for all damages heretofore or hereafter sustained by these districts from the execution of the navigation project.

S. D. STURGIS, Jr.,
Major General, Chief of Engineers.

Library of Congress Performs Great Service for Members of Congress as Well as Public

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1954

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I did not know that the effort would be made to reduce the appropriation for the Library of Congress, particularly the Legislative Reference Service of the Library, when the legislative appropriation bill was before the House recently. It was a shock to me to learn that this important service had received a smaller appropriation.

I do not know of any help that a Member of Congress receives in Washington that is more valuable to him than the help that he receives from the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress. It is the only place that an individual Member of Congress can receive this important assistance.

In view of the fact that each committee is pretty well staffed, I think the Legislative Reference Service should emphasize its help to individual members.

The Legislative Reference Service has specialists in the various fields of interest to Congress and these specialists provide special work for individual Members as well as committees. It is my belief that each Member of Congress should have an administrative assistant and an economist. At the same time, I would not recommend any reduction in the Legislative Reference Service as it will always be needed.

The New York Times for May 31, 1954, has an interesting editorial on this subject. It is as follows:

THE NATIONAL LIBRARY

The Library of Congress has had a long history from its conception in the late 18th century until today. It is clear that the Library has been developing along the lines of a national library when 710,000 people used it last year, in addition to Members of Congress themselves. In one appropriation bill after another the budget of the Library has been increased to afford added services to the public at large. Huge collections of manuscripts, orientalia, music, and incunabula of little direct use to the Members of Congress have been purchased and added over the years with the approval of Congress. For these collections research workers in many parts of the United States have been grateful.

On the basis of the inferred interest of succeeding Congresses in the work of the Library, its collections have been enlarged to the point where in most cases they are the best in the country. If the Library's budget is cut, as the House of Representatives proposes, to eliminate some of the services necessary to make this material available to the public and to Congress it would seem to be a wasteful move to have hoarded treasures in one place and then by lack of adequate service prohibit their use to the people who depend on them. Rather than being an institution subject to the caprices of Congress the Library should be considered more definitely the national library of the people whom it has served so well since the beginning. With this in view, the cut made by the House should be restored, and definite steps should be taken to formalize the Library as the national Library of the United States so that its place in this country may never again be doubted.

Mortgage-Burning Ceremony, William P. Connery, Jr., Post, No. 6, of the American Legion, Lynn, Mass., May 31, 1954

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1954

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following address I delivered in connection with the mortgage-burning ceremonies held at post home, William P. Connery, Jr., Post, No. 6, of the American Legion, Lynn, Mass., on May 31, 1954.

The address follows:

The order of the day is, "Congratulations to William P. Connery, Jr., Post for Operation Independence. Mission accomplished."

It takes time to work off a serious financial obligation. In this case it was a group effort reminiscent of the way you helped one another when you were in military service.

You have proved that teamwork and sound morale can product results.

And everybody shares your pride and your happiness that this beautiful post home is now in the clear.

As the bankers would say, "Your financial credit is excellent."

Individuals and organizations, however, must convince others that they have the most important credit rating, known as character, the ability to back up one's word, to see the job through.

It is no exaggeration to say that the American Legion ranks higher in public confidence and esteem than at any time in its history.

During the twenties and thirties the Legion fought persistently and against great odds to awaken the Nation to the need for military preparedness. Subsequent events verified the Legion's position.

The Americanization program and the drive to tighten our internal defenses against the dangers of subversion have since proved to the people of the United States that the Legion, as guardian of our liberties, has been and is on the right track.

Your policies, your leadership, and your actions have been dedicated unreservedly to what is best for our Nation as the protector and the champion of human freedoms.

The menace of communism is drawing ever closer.

We can no longer count on the safety of distance or time.

At this very moment we stand in desperate need of a clear and positive foreign policy that will effectively halt the spread of communism before it washes up on our shores.

The credit of the United States, as the one last hope of the free world, is low. In the eyes of friends and enemies confusion and indecision make a mockery of our material power and our moral courage.

This is election year, and no one wants to mention unpleasant realities, a human and understandable weakness, although it does not help in meeting the problem of national security.

That a calculated risk must be taken now to avoid a possible disaster later on.

On Memorial Day it is customary to speak of sacrifices made by Americans in the past, where we draw the line between the living and the dead, where we mourn for those who have gone without thinking of the new responsibilities which we must shoulder with the same fortitude that we honor in those who have passed away.

Offhand there seems to be little connection between this mortgage-burning ceremony and Memorial Day.

In this critical hour of freedom's peril there is a meaning which we must not forget.

One duty done leads to another.

One danger over prepares us to meet others ahead.

As Memorial Day tells us of the continuity in American life, of the high patriotism that must never die, even though men come and go, so this ceremony celebrating victory over a financial problem reminds us that the Legion's larger program must go on. The material can only be the handmaiden to the spiritual. On this Memorial Day members of the Legion, in company with all American citizens, gather strength from the past in order to meet the problems that challenge us not in some distant future but now.

All the power and resources of the United States will not save us if we lack the will to make clear and intelligent decisions before it is too late.

Right now our moral credit is hanging in the balance.

We shall never "burn the mortgage" that communism is extending over the world, as it increases its demands from day to day, until we abandon the policy of surrender by the installment plan.

Only a positive and courageous foreign policy, based upon our capabilities and those of our allies whom we should lead instead of following, will emancipate the world from the Communist liability.

So that we can liberate ourselves from fear, and insecurity, and the very real and present danger of foreclosure by tyranny.

The William P. Connery, Jr., Post, with the great energies that are released by independence, will become a rallying point for that resurgent Americanism that will insist upon more vigorous measures to combat communism at home and abroad.

We celebrate one happy mortgage burning tonight.

Another, and far more difficult one to reach, is one we must begin liquidating step by step.

With purpose, intelligence, and courage I am sure that we can make a world where the "chattel mortgage" of communism will cease to have any hold over human beings.

Where'd the Brains Go?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1954

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Reading (Pa.) New Era:

WHERE'D THE BRAINS GO?

All sorts of ruses and alibis have been concocted either to ignore or to mitigate the Republican recession now blighting the economic scene.

But the one big question that remains unanswered is what happened to the business administration that supposedly would end creeping socialism, cut governmental expenses, balance the budget, halt inflation, and keep everybody prosperous and happy—all in one neatly tied package.

President Eisenhower said he was bringing the best brains of big business into his Cabinet. Secretary of the Interior McKay, we believe it was, said bluntly that business was now in the saddle in Washington. In fact, many businessmen themselves said that their boys would have to produce or bring eternal damnation upon the profession.

Yet, we are in a recession. The best financial brains created the disastrous hard-money policy and later were forced to return to Truman fiscal policies—the very policies they condemned when Democrats were in charge.

Then, the best corporation brains trotted out the New Look in defense and cut expenditures, helping to bring on more trouble. Now they are revising this program, thus conceding the correctness of Truman policies in this arena also.

Unemployment is running high, with few signs of immediate recovery—another tribute to the big-business brains.

Even Business Week magazine took a crack at Republican blundering, implying that the big-business brains aren't doing such a hot job.

We hope something happens to pull us out of the rut. What we need in Washington, however, is fewer efficiency men from Detroit's automotive empire and more leaders who understand the needs and problems of the working people.

Chronic Unemployment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1954

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following analysis of the department of research, American Federation of Labor, on the subject of the serious increase of unemployment during the past 6 months:

UNEMPLOYMENT

Unemployment has risen sharply during the past 6 months. According to the census estimate, the number of unemployed workers has increased from a low of 1,301,000 in October 1953 to 3,725,000 for March. A sluggish response to the seasonal trend brought unemployment to 3,465,000 in April.

The census, however, defines unemployment narrowly. It counts a large number of workers as employed despite the fact that the wage earners in these additional categories are neither working nor earning pay. In order to determine economic unemployment, these additional groups should be counted as unemployed. This includes workers who have been laid off but expect their jobs to reopen within 30 days; those hoping to enter new employment or business within 30 days; and those not working or receiving compensation because their outdoor work has been curtailed by bad weather.

In April 1954 there were 462,000 workers in these 3 categories. Adding these workers to the estimated unemployment as defined by the census, in April 1954 unemployment stood at 3,927,000.

In addition, account should be taken of wage earners who are at a given time without jobs because they are moving from one place to another, one job to another, or one occupation to another. Some workers in this group are incorrectly counted as employed, while others escape the census count altogether. It is our conservative estimate that in April 1954 this "floating" unemployment, with other miscellaneous categories not included in the unemployment count by the census, was approximately 510,000. A complete count of economic unemployment representing all workers totally unemployed in April therefore equals 4,437,000, or 6.9 percent of the civilian labor force.

In order to arrive at a proper measure of the economic impact of unemployment, partial unemployment should also be taken into account. On the basis of official data, we estimate that the total number of workers involuntarily on part time in April 1954 was 2,710,000. The time lost due to partial unemployment is equivalent to a loss of more than 1 million full-time jobs. When this aggregate loss of employment is taken into account, it is found that in April 1954 economic unemployment represented a level of close to 5.5 million.

The following table shows how economic unemployment was distributed in April 1954:

Unemployment as defined by the census	3, 465, 000
Laid off, and not on job	216, 000
Expecting employment, but not working	188, 000
Unemployed because of bad weather	58, 000
Floating and miscellaneous unemployment	510, 000
Totally unemployed	4, 437, 000
Full-time equivalent of partial unemployment	1, 000, 000
Total	5, 437, 000

This figure of 5,437,000 unemployed, representing 8.5 percent of the civilian labor force, provides an accurate measure of the economic impact of unemployment on the American economy in April 1954.

INDUSTRIES

While there are no statistics classifying the unemployed by the last job which they have held, employment data of the Bureau of Labor Statistics provide an accurate indication of the industries which have been hardest hit.

These figures show that the sharpest declines in employment have been concentrated in the following four industrial groups:

Industry	Employment (in thousands)		Percent change April 1953 to April 1954
	April 1954	April 1953	
Mining	747	845	−11.6
Manufacturing	15, 965	17, 309	−7.8
Federal Government	2, 168	2, 326	−6.8
Transportation	4, 006	4, 197	−4.6

These four industrial groups account for most of the decline in nonfarm employment of almost 1,500,000 during the past year. Among other groups, service industries, State, and local governments, public utilities, finance, insurance, and trade have either shown small increases in employment over the past year or only slight declines.

The decline in mining largely reflects conditions in the bituminous coalfields, although anthracite mining has been a depressed industry for many years.

The drop in Federal Government employment is the result of a scheduled decline in some defense activities together with the budget cutting and economy drives of the present administration. The drop in transportation employment is mainly due to a sharp decline in railroad jobs.

While the employment declines in these three industrial groups are substantial, by far the largest loss of jobs has been concentrated in manufacturing. The accompanying chart makes it possible to examine more closely the nature of this decline. It shows the percent decline in employment of production workers in each major manufacturing industry from the peak month in 1953 to April 1954. The figures have been adjusted for seasonal variation so that changes in employment caused by purely seasonal influences have been eliminated from the calculation.

The number of production workers in manufacturing declined over 1,400,000 from the peak month of June, a drop of over 10 percent. For individual industries, the decline is larger.

The sharpest drop (33.2 percent) was reported in the ordnance industry which, of course, has been hardest hit by the decline in defense spending. Other industries for which declines of over 12 percent were recorded are electrical machinery, primary metals industries, furniture, fabricated metal products, transportation equipment, and rubber. The industries which have been least affected by the general decline are food, paper, and printing and publishing.

In the key construction industry, employment in April 1954 totaled 2,512,000, an increase of 0.1 percent from the previous year. However, data showing employment by locality make it clear that this stability in construction conceals a number of increases and declines in different parts of the country.

The most substantial declines from March 1953 to March 1954 were recorded in a number of areas in the Far West (Albuquerque, Boise, Casper, Salt Lake City, Tacoma, San Francisco, Los Angeles, and San Diego). A number of other localities also experienced substantial drops, including Washington, D. C., Richmond, Va., Chattanooga, Tenn., and Topeka, Kans.

On the other hand, increases during the past year were recorded generally in most of the New England and southern sections of the country. Increases also took place in New York City, other industrial centers in New York State, cities in Connecticut and Maine, Baltimore, Atlanta, Knoxville, Little Rock, and Tulsa. In a number of areas, including Chicago, Boston, and Denver, there was little change in construction employment.

Detailed information on local construction employment is lacking for cities in the States of Indiana, Michigan, Missouri, New Jersey, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and Wisconsin.

LOCALITIES

Distribution of unemployment by locality is reflected in the statistics provided by the Labor Department's Bureau of Employment Security for the unemployment insurance program. Every 2 months, the Nation's major labor market areas are classified into four categories according to the severity of unemployment. Those areas where unemployment constitutes 6 or more percent of the total labor force are classified as group IV.

During the past year, the number of labor-market areas classified as group IV has been steadily increasing. The most recent report indicates that 35 major areas are included in this category, compared to only 17 a year ago. In addition, there are 58 smaller areas classified as localities with "substantial labor surplus," as compared with 18 a year ago.

Areas with the highest unemployment rates are those where unemployment has become chronic over the last 10 years largely because of the area's dependence on one industry for the bulk of its employment. In most cases, these areas are coal or textile communities in which the generally depressed market conditions for these commodities have forced factory shutdowns and substantial cutbacks in employment.

The hard-hit textile cities are concentrated in the New England area and include Lawrence, Lowell, and New Bedford, Mass. The coal towns are concentrated in Pennsylvania and include Johnstown, Scranton, and the Wilkes-Barre-Hazelton area.

Cities with important metal fabricating and machinery plants which have been hard hit are Detroit, Battle Creek, and Muskegon, Mich.; South Bend and Terre Haute, Ind.; Toledo, Ohio; Kenosha and Racine, Wis.; and the Davenport, Iowa, Quad-Cities area. The reduced demand for iron ore is reflected in the classification of the Duluth, Minn.-Superior, Wis., labor market area as group IV. The lack of shipbuilding on the west coast is reflected in the Tacoma classification in this group. Other centers of unemployment are Portland, Oreg.; Chattanooga, Tenn.; San Antonio, Tex.; and Albuquerque, N. Mex.

Air Superiority: Why Don't We Have It?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1954

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, as the war in Indochina gets hotter, interest in the state of our airpower grows keener. The Department of Defense has not officially been plugging for more airpower—but it has permitted Air Force officers to make some strong statements about what we need, and what we do not have. On Armed Forces Day General Twining, speaking at Amarillo, Tex., acknowledged the superiority of the Russian Air Force—though the Secretary of Defense has never retracted his statement made last year that the Russians had only defensive airpower, implying that we need not be afraid of the big, bad bear. On Armed Forces Day, in Los Angeles, Lt. Gen. Bryant L. Boatner, who is General Twining's deputy for materiel, also contradicted the Secretary of Defense.

General Boatner said flatly that the heavy jet bomber revealed by the Russians on the occasion of their May Day parade is of such a size and has such characteristics as to indicate that it is capable of carrying any known weapon between the Asian and North American Continents. Then he added:

> The number of new swept wing jet fighters and light bombers indicates that the Russians are putting effort into all phases of airpower. I might add that past performance have indicated that the Russians don't put new aircraft into their May Day parade until they are well along in production.

Mr. Speaker, I do not imagine Secretary Wilson liked that, and I wonder if Mr. Dulles liked it. But personally, I am glad that General Boatner said it. It needs to be said. If we are to avoid the pitfalls of complacency and apathy, we have to face the facts.

General Boatner spoke on Air Superiority: Essential for Peace, Vital in War. He listed the three major components in air superiority as, first, superior weapons; second, highly trained people; and third, effective tactics. General Boatner stated that the picture is brighter, so far as tactics are concerned, than in respect to men and weapons. He gave full credit to General LeMay, of SAC; General Chidlaw, of ADC; and General Weyland, of TAC, for what they are doing to strengthen the Air Force. The personnel situation is not bright, as even Secretary Talbott has been repeating, though last year he went along with Secretary Wilson's ordered personnel cuts. And if the materiel situation is not bright, no one should know better than the Air Force Deputy Chief of Staff, Materiel. One wonders if Secretary Wilson knows it, too.

General Boatner said:

> I did not come out here to give you false assurances, to tell you to quit worrying, that we in the Armed Forces have everything under control. But there is a sound approach to the solution to our problem of security in the world. That approach calls for facing the situation soberly and realistically, with neither panic nor indifference.

That approach, I submit, has not been the consistent approach of the Secretary of Defense and his assistants. Need we ask further why the Russians have an air force superior to ours?

Mr. Speaker, under permission of my colleagues, I extend my remarks and insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following address:

> On behalf of all the men and women in the Armed Forces, I would like to express deep gratitude for the magnificent tribute that you pay us here today. The saying, "We do not live by bread alone," is especially true in armed services. Demonstrations of public support and appreciation such as this meeting provide a very necessary psychological income which cannot be passed over the pay table.
>
> I would like to join with you in expressing admiration for the members of the land and sea services. One cannot be associated with them as we in the Air Force have without an appreciation of the job that is being done by our soldiers, sailors, and marines. I have a notion that on Armed Forces Day most of you are thinking of a particular soldier, sailor, marine, or airman—a brother, a son, or close friend of whom you are very proud. I would like to join with you in paying tribute to him.
>
> Armed Forces Day also offers an opportunity to focus attention on some of the vital issues and problems which face both the armed services and the public today. It is with that purpose that I stand before you now.
>
> There is no doubt that in this lively community you are keenly aware of the grave threats to peace and security in the world. Headlines and commentators speak of little else. I did not come out here to give you any false assurances—to tell you to quit worrying—that we in the Armed Forces have everything under control. Nor is it my intention to stir up everybody by dwelling upon the horrors of hydrogen warfare. Somewhere between these two poles of apathy and hysteria, there is a sound approach to the solution to our problem of security in the world. That approach calls for facing the situation soberly and realistically, with neither panic nor indifference.
>
> The other day, I heard a man of considerable wisdom list what he considered the three major problems facing the people of this country. They were: (1) A hydrogen-atomic world war, (2) an economic collapse, or serious depression, and (3) a psychological breakdown of our society caused by worrying about the first two. Whether or not these are the three most serious matters facing us, I had to agree that they are very formidable ones.
>
> Obviously, I do not have final solutions to these problems. I do have a suggestion about how to approach the matter of the hydrogen-atomic world war. And, I submit that even a partial solution to that one would take some of the pressure off the other two. I believe that we can prevent such a war by making the stakes so high that no potential enemy will find it a profitable course of action. If he is aware that he would surely face immediate and effective retaliation, he is not likely, short of an act of madness, to precipitate such a situation.
>
> Here, I think it is important to point out that the deterrent effect of retaliation depends not so much on the size of the weapon used, as it does on the assurance of delivery. It should be made clear that your Air Force is not wedded to any particular size or type of weapon. It can and would choose from a whole spectrum of weapons those best suited to accomplish any given task. These would vary all the way from a shaped piece of steel the size of my finger up to the multi-mega-ton bomb. We do not propose to use a trip hammer to drive tacks; nor, if I may mix a metaphor, would we send a boy to do a man's job.
>
> In the final analysis, when both sides have the so-called superweapon, I submit that superior airpower is really the effective deterrent to world war.
>
> Now there are those who do not subscribe to the deterrent theory of airpower. But even they must face the absolute necessity for superiority in the air in the event of war. For it is axiomatic in modern unlimited warfare that the air force which gains air superiority eventually drives the other side from the air and exerts control over all that lies beneath. It is unthinkable to any of us that enemy aircraft should roam over this country at will raining destruction and terror upon our populace. The same holds true for any battlefield upon which our surface forces might be engaged. Without air superiority both are very possible.
>
> It is mainly about the nature of air superiority and the ingredients that go into its achievement that I wish to talk to you here today.
>
> As to its nature, it should be understood that air superiority is much like the air in which it operates, that is, it is very fluid. You cannot establish and hold strong points or lines in the air as you can on the ground. To have air superiority you have to be able to meet and defeat the enemy at any altitude, over any point on this globe, day or night, good weather or bad.
>
> There are many things which are necessary in the achievement of air superiority—not the least of which is the will to achieve it. Now there is no doubt in my mind as to our capability, but we must avoid the pitfalls of complacency and apathy. To anyone with such tendencies, I recommend reading the account of the flyover of the recent May Day parade in Moscow. On display was a large jet bomber similar to our B-52. Its size and characteristics indicate that it is capable of carrying any known weapon between the Asian and North American Continents. The number of new swept-wing jet fighters and light bombers indicate that the Russians are putting effort into all phases of airpower. I might add that past performances have indicated that the Russians don't put new aircraft into their May Day parades until they are well along in production.
>
> The three major components in air superiority are: (1) Superior weapons, (2) highly trained people, and (3) effective tactics.
>
> When I speak of weapons I am referring to the aircraft and its armament and all the supporting ground equipment that is required to make it work. The United States must have in sufficient numbers air weapons capable of outperforming and outfighting

any possessed by a potential enemy. Right here, I want to say that they have to be armed, manned, and ready to go at the instant a signal is given. The fine new plane on a drawing board will contribute little to air superiority when and if "the balloon goes up."

To bring a new weapon system into being takes years of design, test, and production effort. One of the most difficult problems in this area is deciding when and what to mass produce. We don't want to go into production on unproven, untested, possibly ineffective weapons and aircraft. Yet we must produce in quantity at some time in order to have operational planes and equipment in our combat units.

More of this development and production effort is carried on in the greater Los Angeles area than in any other part of the free world. The Air Force has billions of dollars in development and production contracts here. Just as a matter of interest, I was told before I came out here that we have on order or being ordered more than $3 billion worth of airframes from the plants in this area. There can be no doubt that the people of Los Angeles will play a major role in shaping the future of airpower.

Whether or not we stay ahead in the technology of airpower depends to a very large extent on the scientists and engineers that are your neighbors. They simply must stay ahead in this technological race in which we are involved. It might be better not to run at all than to come in second in this particular race. And I might say that the pace is quickening.

As a community, you will have to advance with them, and this advance is not without its problems and troublesome aspects. As jet engines become more powerful they also become noisier. For several years to come, this situation is going to get worse before it gets better. It won't get better until we reach the point where the hot gases traveling through the tailpipe of a jet engine go so fast that their vibrations are pitched so high as to be inaudible to the human ear—something like the silent dog whistle.

The phenomenon known as the sonic boom which caused so much excitement out here when it was first heard a few years ago will probably become as commonplace as the train whistle. This particular noise, which is sort of like a clap of thunder, is caused when the aircraft goes through the speed of sound and compressibility at that point. Already our new airplanes are traveling it and above the speed of sound as a matter of routine. And the slighest change of attitude, nose up or down, can cause this noise. It's a thing that we are going to have to get used to and live with in the modern world of supersonic flight.

The day is not too far away when many of the aircraft speeding overhead will not be occupied by human pilots. They will be guided only by electronic beams or memory devices. This brings problems of its own.

As important as the new weapons are, and as difficult as the associated problems are, I think there is another component of air superiority which is even more critical at this point. That is the second major ingredient that I listed for you—highly trained people to operate and maintain our planes and missiles.

The 137-wing Air Force calls for something under a million people in uniform. These are not people that you can hire right off the street. Some of the skills take years to acquire. The first few years of an airman's career are largely spent in training. About the time he really begins to pay off he is eligible for his first discharge. At that time, unless he has found a satisfying career, he leaves the service, and we must recruit a new untrained man to replace him.

This coming year, we will lose something like 180 thousand airmen through termination of enlistments. When you figure that we have approximately 14 thousand dollars invested in the training of each one of these men, the loss in dollar value alone is staggering. When you consider how much it lowers our experience level, it is cause for alarm. The Air Force figures it costs over a quarter of a million dollars and 6 years' of effort to train a B-47 pilot, like the ones that you have out at March Field. When one of these fellows resigns, you have lost a great deal more than the money value represented.

There has been a lot of talk recently about reenlistments, bonuses, pay raises, fringe benefits, and so forth. I am afraid that hasn't been taken too seriously. After all, these are rather abstract terms and arguments which aren't too meaningful in our daily life. Let me bring it down to a case history.

Recently I read an account of a struggle of a young man who is greatly honored in your community. A few years ago, as a young jet fighter pilot, he was transferred along with his wife and 3 children to a base in the northeastern part of the United States. Because he had 3 children he was unable to rent an apartment or a house. He and his family spent several weeks living in 1 room and eating in restaurants. Finally he had to borrow money to make a down payment on a small house in a neighboring town. When he was transferred again a short time later, he had to sell the place, and he lost several hundred dollars.

Now there are times when situations force a man to make a choice between staying in the service and caring for his family. If this young man hadn't shown extraordinary devotion to the cause of airpower, he wouldn't have been in Korea; he wouldn't have shot down more MIG's than any other man alive.

We who have the responsibility for running the armed services have a big job to do in making service life as attractive and rewarding as possible. But we are strictly limited in what we can do. Your support is absolutely essential in this matter. The solution does not lie alone in passing laws or making appropriations; at least as important is whether or not you welcome these people into your communities—whether or not you think and say they are doing an important and worthwhile job.

The third ingredient in air superiority is effective tactics. New weapon systems require new and improved means of exploitation. Tactics are essentially the methods of getting "the most out of what you've got." Today's bombers and fighters with their electronic sighting and control systems present tactical problems and opportunities never before met. Techniques of jamming, withdrawing, feinting, and surprise are all parts of the maneuvers that go on day and night, miles above the earth. Modern air tacticians peer at tiny blips of light on radar scopes and call the signals for battles hundreds of miles away.

On this matter of tactics, which is uniquely our problem in the military, I can offer a considerably brighter picture. With men like Gen. Curt LeMay of SAC, Ben Chidlaw of Air Defense Command and Opie Wyeland of TAC working constantly to improve our position we have good reason for confidence. They and their staffs possess great professional competence in aerial warfare. Given effective weapons and good people, we can achieve the air superiority which is essential for peace and vital in war.

I have not tried to cover the roles of the other armed services or of our allies in the overall security program. I am sure you are as aware as I that they play extremely important parts in the defense of the free world. I have tried to make really only one major point: Not only must we have airpower—we must have superior airpower.

To some of you I may have painted a pretty dark picture here today, but talk of possible war is never a very cheerful matter. I do not want to leave you with the impression that I am pessimistic about the future. As I have said, I am not one of those who believes that a third world war is inevitable. If we remain strong, if we achieve and maintain air superiority, I believe there is still a good chance that the great differences in the world can be settled without an atomic war. I have little patience with the cynics who have relegated us to such a destruction. I commend to your attention the words of the late Secretary Stimson who said, "The greatest sin I know is cynicism." On this Armed Forces Day let us hold steadfastly to our hope for peace as we continue to build our power for peace.

How Reds Use Terror Near United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1954

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following article from the U. S. News & World Report of May 28, 1954:

How Reds Use Terror Near United States—In Guatemala, Beatings, Near Drownings, Spies, Graft

(The stark terror of Soviet secret-police tactics—sudden arrest, torture, banishment for the opponents of communism—now is uncovered operating close to United States shores. In Guatemala, those who resist the pro-Communist rulers run the risk of being maimed, even crippled for life, if they fall afoul of the secret agents. It can happen, and does. The story is now in the open. Clark H. Galloway, inter-American editor for U. S. News & World Report, followed the trail of two torture victims from Guatemala to their refuge in Mexico. Here, in their own words, is the story of what happened to them.)

Mexico City.—The police brutality commonplace east of the Iron Curtain has now been imported to Guatemala to try to stifle opposition to the pro-Communist rulers of that American Republic.

Strange disappearances have occurred. Men prominent in the life of Guatemala have suddenly dropped from sight or been hustled off the streets by squads of secret police. Arrests often are unexplained—even to the victims—and now and then an outspoken critic of President Jacobo Arbenz shows up in another country, beaten and broken in health by his treatment at the hands of secret police.

There is conclusive evidence now that these things are happening in a country that is drawing closer and closer to links with the Soviet Union. It comes on top of a chain of events that has aroused grave concern inside the United States.

Guatemala, alone among the American Republics, opposed a recently adopted anti-Communist declaration. Guatemalans circulate constantly between their home country and the Soviet World. They are blamed for a political strike that has virtually paralyzed the economy of neighboring Honduras. The United States has charged formally that the Guatemalan Government is receiving arms shipments from Communist Poland.

There is evidence of other Soviet arms being smuggled into the country.

Rounding out the pattern of a Soviet-style regime is the torture and terrorism being applied to the Government's opponents. Two victims of the Guatemalan secret police—Guillermo Dávila Córdova, a lawyer, and Horacio de Córdoba Monzón, a journalist—recently turned up in Mexico. They had been arrested without explanation, tortured to the point of broken health, then banished from their homeland.

U. S. News & World Report located both men in their place of exile in Mexico City and obtained from them the full account of their arrest and agonizing experiences in the torture chambers of Guatemala.

Here, in his own words, Mr. de Córdoba Monzón tells what befell him:

"Question. Mr. de Córdoba Monzón, when and where were you arrested?

"Answer. I was arrested by eight secret policemen in front of the Capitol Theater in Guatemala City at about 6:30 p. m. on January 23. I was just starting to enter my automobile. Inside the automobile were three more policemen, pointing revolvers at my wife and 8-year-old daughter, who were sitting in the front seat.

"Question. Why did they arrest you?

"Answer. I immediately demanded that, as the constitution requires, the policemen identify themselves and show me a legal warrant. But they did not answer me. They dragged me along in the direction of Civil Guard headquarters. They never told me the reason for my arrest.

"Question. Where did they take you?

"Answer. To a solitary cell in the Civil Guard headquarters.

"Question. What happened there?

"Answer. As soon as I reached the cell, a policeman ordered me to go to the toilet, although I didn't need to. I found out later that was just a preparation for torture.

"Question. Did you see other prisoners?

"Answer. Yes, as I went down the corridor, various people called to me softly from their cells. I was able to identify an army officer named Oliva, who was accused of having explosives in his home; Roberto Castillo, proprietor of radio station CIROS; Roberto Vizcaino, director of Radio Continental; Rubén Dairo Villatoro, of the anti-Communist Union of Free Workers; Dr. Jorge Palacios, and some others whose names I don't remember. This took place at about 7:45 p. m.

"Question. What happened next?

"Answer. A policeman, with his face masked, ordered me to turn my face to the wall. Two masked men took my arms, while another blindfolded me. Then they tied my hands and took me down a winding stairway to a damp place. A noise like that of water falling into a trough or tank reminded me of stories of other Guatemalans who had been tortured.

"Question. Then what did they do to you?

"Answer. When I was close to that trough, they unbound my hands and started to undress me. I objected, and received a hard blow on my back with a rubber hose and a blow on my mouth. They bound me once more and began to push my head into the water. They were starting to drown me, little by little. It was horrible agony. When I became insensible they pulled me out.

"When I had recovered a little, they beat me with a rubber hose. Afterward two men dragged me to another place. There a voice, which I recognized as that of Rogelio Cruz Wer, director of the civil guard, questioned me.

"Question. What kind of questions did he ask you?

"Answer. Questions like these: 'Why do you attack communism?' 'Who pays you for doing it?' 'Don't you know that communism is going to rule the world?' 'Are you a fool in the service of the Gringos?' 'How much money does the American Ambassador give you?'

"Question. What did you answer?

"Answer. I was silent. Then I received a blow full in the face and I fell to the floor. Two men grabbed me, and a voice said: 'I'm going to give you a pen so you can sign this declaration to those who want to overthrow us. If you sign it, you go free.'

"Question. Did you sign the document?

"Answer. No. I said: 'I'll not sign anything.' Immediately I received a rain of blows.

"Question. What did they do to you then?

"Answer. The next thing, they stretched me on the floor and started striking me on the bottoms of my feet. They kept on beating me for a long time, causing such pain that I almost lost consciousness.

"Finally I heard Cruz Wer say: 'Jaime, you question him.' Immediately they released their hold on me. I couldn't stand up, but they forced me to do it by beating me some more. Then a new voice said: 'It will be better if you decide to sign the declaration, or we'll kill you like a dog. Nobody, not even the Gringos, can prevail against us Communists. If you die, nobody will pay any attention.'

"When I again refused to sign, I received a blow on my right ear that knocked me down. The fellow who had been questioning me said: 'We're not getting anywhere this way, and we're going to kill him.' Cruz Wer then questioned me some more, and finally said: 'Get on with this fellow.'

"Question. Where did they take you next?

"Answer. They took me to a big box into which they put salt and water and ordered me to walk through this liquid. My feet had become enormous from the beatings, and I suffered unbearable pain from the salt in the lacerations in my feet.

"When they finally decided this was useless, they took me to another place and told me to stand up. When I tried to sit on the floor because of the pain in my feet, I received light blows to the groin, as if to warn me that I'd better stand up.

"Eventually they let me lie down, and I began to wonder if they were torturing someone else, and I could hear cries and questions and threats. One of my torturers said: 'This — is listening.' The next thing, they seized my head. They put tubes into my ears and forced in a liquid that burned intensely. After that I couldn't hear anything, perhaps for hours.

"When I finally began to regain my hearing, somebody said: 'We've done a lot to him. If this ——— dies here, we'll get the devil for it. Go and dress him and bring him with the others.' So they untied my hands.

"Question. So your tortures finally were over?

"Answer. They were going to put my clothes on me, when one of them said: 'Let's put him in the water again.' So they did it, for nearly 2 minutes. When they saw that I was starting to get water in my lungs, they took me out of the trough and turned an electric fan on my back and threw water on me.

"When I started to shiver, one of them said: 'Don't be a brute; that will give him pneumonia.' The other answered: 'Let him die; that's why we are paid.'

"I couldn't dress myself, as I couldn't move my left side. So a policeman dressed me. They took me downstairs, where there were several other prisoners. They threw me into a jeep, and tossed a canvas over me, and we started the long trip to Mexico.

"Question. What other prisoners were with you?

"Answer. When we reached Talismán, on the border, I found that they were Guillermo Dávila Córdova, the lawyer; Gabriel Fernández, the industrialist; Dr. Palacios; and Mr. Villatoro. I don't know who all the others were who had been in prison with me, but according to the newspapers several were expelled to Honduras and El Salvador.

"Question. When you were tortured, did they question you about a revolutionary plot against the Government, in which the United States was alleged to have been involved?

"Answer. Not at all, although publicly later the Government accused me of having been involved in a plot.

"Question. Did you have any part in the plot that the Government said existed?

"Answer. No. I consider the plot to have been the invention of the Government.

"Question. Is the Government afraid of revolutionary plots?

"Answer. Yes. The men in the Government have a persecution complex.

"Question. When you were in prison, did anybody try to arrange for your release?

"Answer. Yes; my wife appealed to the courts for a writ of habeas corpus, but she could get no information from the police as to my whereabouts. Furthermore, the police did not return the personal effects they had taken from me, including a gold watch, $184 in cash, a gold ring, a fountain pen, and my identification documents. They robbed me of all of it. And they denied that I was a prisoner, although my wife, along with about 500 other persons, had seen me arrested.

"Question. After reaching the Mexican border, where did you go?

"Answer. We went to Tapachula, a short distance away. I was in bed there for 25 days. I was helped by some charitable people who brought me a doctor and paid for my medicines. My roommate, Dr. Palacios, attended me constantly. Thanks to his care and to the help of friendly Guatemalans and Mexicans, I saved my feet, which had been at the point of becoming gangrenous.

"Question. Do you still have scars from your tortures?

"Answer. Yes. There are permanent scars on my feet and my back. My right ear is very bad. My lungs are delicate as the result of the near drownings. My legs are shaky, and I suffer severe coughing spells. However, my lack of money keeps me from getting proper nourishment and medical attention.

"Question. Do you have a job here in Mexico City?

"Answer. No.

"Question. Why not?

"Answer. I had thought the Mexicans, in accordance with treaties of asylum, would immediately give me documents permitting me to work. But it has not worked out that way. I have been trying to obtain necessary documents, but the officials won't give me permission to work.

"Question. How extensive is Communist influence in Guatemala?

"Answer. Guatemalan communism is international communism. There is the major center for new ramifications of communism in America. From there, foreign and Guatemalan agents of communism are going out to all countries. It is certain that every Guatemalan diplomatic minister and consul is an agent. Furthermore, the organizations formed in Mexico, Chile, and other countries under the name 'Friends of Guatemala' are centers of Communist agitation, and soon they will go into full action.

"Question. About how many Communists are there in Guatemala?

"Answer. I couldn't answer that question satisfactorily, but I can assure you that almost all the public officials take advantage of Communist ideology to use their official positions for graft. The Communist bosses from abroad operate secretly. The native Communist leaders number about 30, located in Congress and in the unions. Others are fellow travelers.

"Question. It is said that Colonel Arbenz is not himself a Communist, but is under the influence of Communists. Is this true?

"Answer. The truth is that he is a puppet who performs according to the will of the Communists. They prefer to have it that way, instead of holding the reins of power.

"Question. How about the army?

"Answer. The Army is dominated by Communist officers and it supports the government unconditionally as long as it is paid so juicily for that attitude. Through the rank and file there is a large espionage system that has sown distrust and maintains unconditional support of the Communist regime of Arbenz. The Guatemalan Army is mercenary and immoral.

"Question. How many of the army officers are Communists?

"Answer. Aside from those whose instruction has been rushed along recently, I don't believe there are many ideological Communists. But there are a great number of fellow travelers and of men devoted to communism because it has given them all kinds of advantages and immunities.

"Question. Is there any possibility of an Army revolt if Arbenz continues to support communism?

"Answer. If the Army has not rebelled against the Communists, it is because nobody has offered to pay more.

"Question. Does the Arbenz government have the support of the majority of the people?

"Answer. No. The Government supports itself on a base of terror.

"Question. Then how did Colonel Arbenz get elected?

"Answer. He reached office through compulsions applied to the illiterates, whom they made to vote several time in different places. The legal victory was won by Miguel Ydígoras Fuentes, an opposition candidate.

"Question. What is the remedy for the situation in Guatemala?

"Answer. When there are rats, you have to kill them. I am convinced that we are face to face with a criminal organisation which holds on to power and that, to exterminate it, there is just one route—gunpowder.

"Question. Taking into account the prejudice throughout Latin America against intervention, what can and should the United States Government do?

"Answer. I am convinced that nothing effective can come out of conferences of the American nations. With respect to just what the United States can do, I believe that Nation has the duty of pulling out the evil by its roots.

"The Guatemalan people are not asking for an armed effort from any country. But they hope their leaders will be equipped in some effective way so they can equip the people with war materials to accomplish the expulsion of those who have been guilty of treason by permitting foreign Communists to control the Government—a practical intervention by Russia in Guatemala. I believe categorically that it is necessary to have a machine gun in order to take action against the arms brought from Russia. Someone has to give this help."

When torturing Mr. Dávila Córdova, the secret police used different techniques from those applied to Mr. de Córdoba Monzón. But their brutality was apparent throughout, and their purpose was the same.

Here is Mr. Dávila Córdova's account of what they did to him, along with his appraisal, as a lawyer, of the Guatemalan situation:

"Question. Mr. Dávilla Córdova, what happened to you in Guatemala City on January 22 of this year?

"Answer. In the afternoon, after I closed my office for the day and was about to get into my car, I was assaulted by 10 policemen. They forced me violently into their car, handcuffed me and blindfolded me. Then they took me to the central headquarters of the civil guard.

"Question What happened there?

"Answer. They took all my personal effects, and I was thrown into a subterranean cell. I remained there, bound on the floor and unable to move, for 5 days. During those 5 days I was subjected to terrible tortures.

"Question. What kind of tortures?

"Answer. They applied electric shocks to my body. The applied a steel band to my head which caused such pressure on my brain that I lost consciousness.

"Question. Where were these things done?

"Answer. These tortures were applied every 3 or 4 hours in a special room at the top of the civil-guard headquarters, where they took me from my cell.

"Question. What happened at the end of those 5 days?

"Answer. When I was in a half-dead condition, I was taken to the Mexican frontier in a strongly guarded automobile of the civil guard and at the frontier they threw me out of Guatemalan territory.

"Question. Could you identify the men who tortured you?

"Answer. No; because throughout my time in prison I was tightly blindfolded and kept in handcuffs, and those things were not taken off until a few minutes before we reached the Mexican border.

"Question. Were others arrested and tortured?

"Answer. When they finally took off the blindfold, I saw that five other prisoners had come with me and that they bore on their bodies horrible marks of the tortures they had undergone. On one of these men, Horacio de Córdoba Monzó, the injuries were so bad that he could not walk, because his feet were completely useless.

"Question. Where did you go after reaching the Mexican border?

"Answer. Once we reached the Mexican frontier, we succeeeded in dragging ourselves to Talismán, where the Mexican immigration station is located. We presented ourselves there, begging for asylum. They made a record of the case of each one of us, and then told us we should go to Tapachula, a larger town near by, to await the decision of the Mexican Government.

"Question. How long were you in Tapachula?

"Answer. We spent about a month in Tapachula, while the injuries resulting from the tortures healed.

"Question. Were you molested there, too?

"Answer. We were the objects of hostile demonstrations organized by Communist elements, in agreement with the consul of Guatemala stationed there. That evil man, following instructions from his Government, threatened us constantly, with the complicity of the head of the immigration office. Several times he tried to have us kidnaped and thrown back across the border so we would be shot.

"Question. What finally happened to you?

"Answer. After repeated requests we were informed that we would be permitted to come to Mexico City on February 23. Since then, we have been trying to get them to document us as political exiles, so that we can find work with which to make a living.

"Question. How many Guatemalans came to Mexico City with you?

"Answer. All of those who arrived at the frontier with me came to Mexico City. And so far we have been having a great deal of trouble trying to get documentation as political exiles.

"Question. Why is that?

"Answer. It appears that the hand of the Gautemalan Government is making itself felt, even here. According to what they told us in the immigration office here, the chief, in spite of the records of our case made in Talisman, is slowing up action, trying to get other evidence about us through the Secretariat of Foreign Relations. [Mr. Dávila Córdova now has given up his attempts to obtain documentation and has left Mexico.]

"Question. Is the present Government of Gautemala a democracy?

"Answer. It is not a democracy or anything resembling one. It is practically a Communist dictatorship. That is to say, it is a dictatorship exercised by elements ruling the state, just as in Russia and in the countries that now find themselves back of the Iron Curtain.

"Question. Is the Government of Guatemala honest?

"Answer. In that government there is no such thing as honesty. All of the head men are devoting themselves to self-enrichment by looting the public treasury. It's being done to such a degree that some of them—whom I can name—in 3 years have amassed fortunes of millions of dollars.

"Question. How about President Arbenz?

"Answer. He has deposited large sums of money in banks in Switzerland, while the people are confronted by misery and are burdened with taxes and contributions. A large part of the public treasury also is being used for Communist propaganda in neighboring countries of Central America.

"Question. Are there many secret police in Guatemala?

"Answer. In Guatemala there has been organized a varitable secret police in imitation of the Russian Cheka, with foreign instructors—Czechs, Poles, and Red Spaniards from Mexico.

"Question. What is the job of those secret police?

"Answer. They watch closely every person whom they consider unfavorable to the regime. They investigate everything that he does.

"Question. Did the secret police watch you?

"Answer. I was watched closely by them for more than 2 years. My office constantly was surrounded by secret-police agents, and many times people were interrogated after leaving my office.

"Question. Are life and property safe in Guatemala?

"Answer. At present, there is neither security of life nor the guaranty of one's right to private property. In order to avoid attempts against one's life, a person has to avoid going out at night. The agrarian reform law and the special laws relating to urban property, enacted recently by the government, make it possible to seize the property of any individual or company without any responsibility.

"Question. Does justice exist there now?

"Answer. Speaking as a lawyer, I can say that justice has practically disappeared from Guatemala. The judicial power, although it is supposed to be politically independent, has been placed in the hands of ad hoc elements holding office at the will of the Government, which on its part acts according to the wishes of a Communist-dominated Congress. Thus, every action of justice is ineffective and negative, obeying the will of the Communist element.

"Question. How strong is the Guatemalan Communist Party, which calls itself the Guatemalan Labor Party?

"Answer. I don't know how many members that party has, but I am sure that its leaders are not more than 30 or 40 Communists. The rest are Indians, peasants, and laborers—people who are not very intelligent. They are the victims of exploitation by the Communist leaders. They support the present Government, which in turn patronizes them. They lack public sympathy, and in general the people of Guatemala are hostile to them.

"Question. Do you think President Arbenz is a Communist?

"Answer. He is certainly a Communist. If he is not indoctrinated, he is under the influence of a group of native Communists and fellow travelers who have been indoctrinated in Mexico and in countries back of the Iron Curtain, who obey direct instructions from Moscow, transmitted by direct agents and through the Soviet Embassy in Mexico. Continually, the Communists Victor Manuel Gutiérrez, José Manuel Fortuny, and Leonardo Castillo Flores go back of the Iron Curtain to receive orders. They are financed by funds from the Guatemalan Government.

"Question. How about President Arbenz' wife?

"Answer. Señora María Vilanova de Arbenz is a Communist. By means of various collaborators in her service, she has charge of indoctrination in the hospitals, social-service centers, charitable institutions, and schools.

"Question. Does the Arbenz regime have the support of the majority of the people?

"Answer. In my opinion, it does not. Quite to the contrary, the public, and especially the intelligent people, are hostile. This hostility remains latent and does not let its full extent become apparent, because of the fear which the secret police have instilled in the people. Nobody feels safe under their constant threat.

"Question. If most of the people are against him, how did Colonel Arbenz get elected?

"Answer. He won the Presidency through the fraudulent maneuvers of his predecessor, President Juan José Arévalo. Furthermore, the people blame Arbenz as the principal planner of the assassination of his rival for the Presidency, Col. Francisco Javier Arana, then chief of the armed forces, a very popular person. Arévalo needed Arbenz to continue carrying out the Communist program that Moscow had entrusted to him.

"Question. Why don't the people throw out the Communists?

"Answer. The anti-Communist people of Guatemala, who constitute the majority, cannot overthrow that pro-Communist government because they lack every kind of resources that they would need in order to do it. The government of Arbenz is carefully keeping them from acquiring anything that would be dangerous.

"Question. It has been said that Guatemala is a Soviet beachhead in the Americas. Is that true?

"Answer. I not only believe it, I am certain that Guatemala is a Soviet beachhead, with the mission of implanting and propagating communism in the American Hemisphere. A proof of that is the attitude of the Arbenz government, which always pays attention to and sympathizes with Russian moves, in full cordiality toward the Soviets. Furthermore, there is its economic, social, and political orientation, which is contrary to American practices and every democratic concept.

"Question. What should the United States do about the situation in Guatemala?

"Answer. In my judgment, which is the judgment of the majority of Guatemalans, as a necessity for its own defense, the United States should lend its cooperation to our people, by worthy and honorable means, in a real and effective manner. It should supply every kind of resource so as to enable the Guatemalans to overthrow and drive out the Soviet communism which, unfortunately for the country, has taken possession of the government."

Problems of the Coal Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. ROBESON, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1954

Mr. ROBESON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following editorials from the Charleston Daily Mail, Charleston, W. Va., dated March 15, 1954, entitled "Pretty Soon No Market at All"; from Kanawha Commerce, Charleston, W. Va., of April 1954, entitled "Coal Industry Problems Are Complex"; and from the Charleston Gazette dated May 1, 1954, entitled "Coal Industry Must Try Self-Help Before Appealing to Government":

[From the Charleston (W. Va.) Daily Mail of March 15, 1954]

PRETTY SOON NO MARKET AT ALL

Like most West Virginians who recognize our stake in the coal industry we are concerned over the importation of residual oil from Venezuela. It is unlikely that Venezuelan oil is the major problem of the coal business or that a complete prohibition would rescue it from the doldrums. But in the present state of the industry, any relief might help a lot, and we can understand why industry and union alike would grasp at small comforts.

But as they do, we could wish that they would display a little higher regard for consistency. If it is a good thing for the United States to prohibit the importation of Venezuelan oil, there is nothing wrong with the Belgians erecting a barrier against the importation of American coal. That is what the Belgians have done, and the coal industry is protesting vigorously.

That is the trouble with these attempts to secure an immediate economic advantage by legislating what the market would not allow. It is not necessary to revive the ancient argument over free versus restricted trade to point out that it is, alas, a game that 2 or 4 or 20 can play.

You cut off my market, and in turn I'll cut off yours by sundown tomorrow. It doesn't take much of this to wreck the market completely.

[From Kanawha Commerce, Charleston, W. Va., of April 1954]

COAL INDUSTRY PROBLEMS ARE COMPLEX

Everyone knows that the coal industry is presently in bad shape. In West Virginia, the first State in the Union in production, this is a serious problem which cannot be minimized from any angle.

But we confess our inability to join the emotional excitement over residual imports as the devil in the woodshed. This is a fine cliché, especially in a political year, but the troubles of the coal industry can't be so simply defined.

Last year's residual-oil imports were reported as 128 million barrels or the fuel equivalent of 30 million tons of coal. But that's still only slightly more than 7 percent of the national coal production. In West Virginia, which produces about one-fourth of the national tonnage, the fuel equivalent would be about 7.5 million tons.

Now, we don't mean to make light of 30 million tons of coal on the national scene, or 7.5 million tons in West Virginia's production. Every little bit helps. But there's no help in exaggeration. If all fuel tonnage were recaptured by coal in shutting out residual oil (assuming that it would be), it is doubtful whether the industry or public, as a whole, would be aware of it unless they were told.

No, most of the problems of the coal industry are far older, bigger, and more complex than residual oil. They include the historic existence of production facilities far beyond the normal market requirements, the completely competitive nature of the producing companies, the pricing of coal out of many fuel markets as the result of higher and higher wage scales (about 60 percent of coal costs) and higher and higher transportation costs, with the resultant pressure for more and more mechanization to replace the high-cost factor of human labor.

These and other lesser problems make up the dilemma of the coal industry. They may be new to those whose business careers go back only 20 years. But those whose span of experience is longer recognize all these troubles as familiar ones. They have not shown up for most of the past two decades because, since 1938, this Nation has been under defense and war economies, with abnormal coal requirements. The current move toward normal markets brings them to light once more, and even more quickly, because there has been, during the past 8 years, such a noticeable shift by industrial users from coal to lower cost fuels.

All authorities agree that the long range outlook for the coal industry is good. But the outlook for employment in coal production is not so good. That eventuality might as well be faced. It is doubtful whether West Virginia will ever again see as many persons employed in the actual coal production process as formerly. Mechanization to the nth degree is here or on its way and has been forced, perhaps much sooner than otherwise would have been the case, by high production costs, particularly labor.

What we must now do in West Virginia is bend our efforts toward absorbing this loss of coal production employment in new industry which will process this coal at or near the point of production, thus eliminating also the heavy transportation costs. Such a program is not an easy one. But it is the prime solution. And it will require a cooperative and favorable attitude of labor, government, and finance if it is to succeed.

Nothing is to be gained by name calling or blame calling now. The situation calls for hard thinking and hard work.

[From the Charleston (W. Va.) Gazette of May 1, 1954]

COAL INDUSTRY MUST TRY SELF-HELP BEFORE APPEALING TO GOVERNMENT

For too long we have been sitting around and only bewailing our sick coal industry. Finally the leaders in the coal business have decided to do something about it and there is much to indicate that they can succeed.

The great coal industry was built by pioneers who asked help from no one but met and overcame difficulties by employment of their own energy and intelligence. The same spirit could get it out of its present difficulties. To throw itself on the Government now would prove weakening. That should be only a last, desperate, and final resort.

The taxpayers are burdened with subsidies that could have been avoided or handled more intelligently. The tendency now is to run to Uncle Sam for help whenever an industry meets difficult conditions. The taxpayer pays the bill and the industry affected is seldom benefited in the end.

The governors of the coal-producing States have set up a permanent fuels conference. Because of the caliber of the men concerned there is every indication that the executive committee named will prove active and resourceful. The only fear is that there will be too much preventable delay.

There is no way to know what the plans of the committee may be but we hope it will first try to bail the coal business out of its trouble without running to the Government to bear the burden. If John L. Lewis, chief of the United Mine Workers, is appealing to the Government for subsidies for the coal business that will be giving up without trying.

All can agree with Lewis when he says that the international situation "makes it mandatory that the American coal industry be kept strong and efficient in order to meet the fuel and energy needs of our Nation and of our allies." Lewis could well join with the fuels conferees in trying to work the business out of its difficulties. That could be done without clashing.

Some of the finest business brains in the country are identified with the coal industry. It at least must try to work out a solution for its difficulties before it appeals to the Government.

There are other things the matter with the coal industry besides the competition of residual oil.

People's Press Conference Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1954

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include introductory statements made by me on May 30 when my colleague, Hon. GEORGE H. BENDER, and I appeared on a television program on station WEWS, Cleveland, sponsored by the Cleveland League of Women Voters, entitled "People's Press Conference Program," during which program members of the league asked questions relating to congressional budgetary reforms.

The statements follow:

It is certainly refreshing to see that responsible citizen groups of the country such as the League of Women Voters are taking an active interest in the financial affairs of our country. It is particularly gratifying that women everywhere are taking increasing interest in public affairs today. Women's interest is responsible for the increasing number of women who are Members of the House and Senate. And I feel that there will be more women Members in future Congresses. Good government is merely good housekeeping, especially in financial affairs. A housewife will exceed the budget to preserve the life of a family member; likewise a nation may, in time of crisis, be required to exceed its budget to protect and maintain its own survival.

Any consideration of the national budget must take into full account the kind of world we live in and that aggressive communism is on the march and indeed is threatening everything we Americans hold to be as dear as life itself. Money has no value or meaning unless it is accompanied by individual liberty and human freedom. The fundamental issue before our Nation today is whether or not we will retain the individual liberties and basic human freedoms upon which our Nation was founded.

The trend today is dangerously mindful of events which took place in Moscow just before the Bolsheviks seized total power in 1918. The landed gentry and financial aristocracy in Moscow were only interested in preserving their own physical comforts and privileged way of life. You and I know the results. The Bolsheviks liquidated the landed gentry and the financial aristocracy, seized total power and set upon a course calculated to enslave all mankind. It is the threat of these same Bolsheviks which causes the crisis our Nation faces today.

By and large, the defense posture of the United States is now predicated on a predetermined budget made up by Mr. Dodge which takes into account only the fact that the Republican administration committed itself to cut so many billions of dollars from the national budget. In my opinion, the only way our defense budget should be determined is upon a cold calculation of what is required to defend the long-range security interests of the United States.

Once we have determined what must be done to preserve our Nation and to aid those of our allies who are willing to stand up against the international Communist conspiracy, only then will we be in a position to put before the American people an honest budget—a budget which assures them that our way of life will be adequately protected.

I look upon the United States as one family—I believe no expense is too great to preserve that family. I also believe in the proportionate share of the cost in accordance with the means of each member of that family to pay in order to fully protect and preserve that grand family.

The administration has not done this—it is seeking to put the major burden on the little man while at the same time decreasing the responsibility of those who can best afford the expenditures necessary to adequately defend the Nation.

Too Little and Too Late?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. BARRETT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1954

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, Mayor Joseph S. Clark, Jr., who has made an extensive study of the housing situation in the United States, along with mayors of 17 other American cities, has stated that he believes "the housing program recommended to the Congress may well be too little and too late" and that now is the time for decisive action in providing slum-clearances measures and housing needs to meet our growing population. The enclosed article from the June 1954 issue of Democratic Digest gives a few examples and reasons for Mayor Clerk's conclusions:

TOO LITTLE AND TOO LATE—THE HOUSING PROGRAM THAT PLEASES NO ONE

"The Eisenhower housing program," comments one Washington observer, "makes Senator Taft look like a Socialist."

"Five years ago," this observer adds, "Taft was for 135,000 public-housing units a year. Eisenhower comes up with only 35,000 units. Senator Taft used to say we needed at least a million and a half new houses a year. The Eisenhower crowd is settling for only a million. I neved thought I'd see Eisenhower that far to the right of Taft."

There are a great many people around the country who are worried about the Eisenhower housing program. Mayors are worried about how they are to rid their cities of slums without Federal help. Home builders are worried that the Eisenhower administration is content to let the rate of construction fall below the levels of recent years, which would mean a serious slump in the building industry. Southerners and westerners, far from the great lending centers of the East, are worried that the Eisenhower program will bring on higher interest rates and a tighter money market. Veterans' organizations are also worried about higher interest charges, and about the dilution of the traditional preference veterans have received in getting Government help for their housing.

The Republicans in Congress seem worried on a different count. They appear to be afraid that President Eisenhower has become a raving Socialist because of his proposal for continuing the low-rent public housing program. The fact that it is far smaller than the 50,000-unit minimum set in 1949 by Senator Taft doesn't seem to faze them. Nor do many of them seem aware that Senator Taft said, in January 1946, that "public housing is not socialistic by any stretch of the imagination."

Other Republicans, recalling that the President refused to raise his voice in protest in 1953 when Congress killed his public housing program, took a more cynical view. "You know how it is when you're in the White House. You've got to look like you're pushing public housing. But Ike won't really fight for this one."

One of the leading Republicans in the House went so far as to observe that "the public housing program is a racket. It is absolutely resulting in dirty, filthy places for people to live in."

Thus, when the housing program reached Congress it was up to the Democrats to lead the fight for the President's program. When the roll was called, House Democrats supported the President 2 to 1, while the House Republicans voted 3 to 1 against their own President.

But it wasn't only the defeat of public housing that was causing concern among the housing experts. There were other worrisome aspects of the Eisenhower program, among which were disquieting signs that the mortgage bankers had played a dominant role in shaping the Eisenhower housing policies. There were many who recalled that one of the President's intimates is Aksel Nielsen, a Colorado mortgage banker (and former president of the Mortgage Bankers Association), whose ranch Eisenhower visited just after the Republican convention in 1952, and again during his extended 1953 summer vacation. They recalled also that Nielsen had been given a prominent position on the President's Housing Advisory Commission which developed the Eisenhower program.

Those who follow the housing field closely identify the mortgage bankers and other lenders with two main ideas: High interest rates (which mean greater income for them, but higher costs to the home buyer); and an "economy of scarcity" in the housing field.

But the statistics show that keeping the volume of new housing at a peak level, far from being an evil, is a must if we are ever to catch up with the backlog of substandard housing and keep up with our growing year-to-year new housing needs. Families living in comfortable homes may not be aware of the shocking facts revealed by the housing census of 1950:

A total of 15 million homes were classified as substandard.

Over 2 million urban homes are so dilapidated as to require replacement.

An additional 5 million urban homes lack proper plumbing or running water.

Two million farm homes have serious deficiencies, another million and a half are substandard.

Even if we were to try to replace or rehabilitate the substandard houses at the rate of a half million a year, it would take 30 years to complete the national job, 20 years to take care of the nonfarm homes.

Coupling the backlog of substandard housing with the year-to-year requirements, one professor of city planning from the University of Pennsylvania sets the minimum requirement for new housing at between 2 and 2.4 million new homes every year.

The National Association of Home Builders believes that 1,400,000 must be built each year. Next to these figures, the administration goal of only 1 million units seems pitifully inadequate.

About the most effective way of controlling the amount of new housing is to control the amount of housing credit available. In recent years, the mere existence of Fannie May (the colloquial name for the Federal National Mortgage Association, the Government's agency for buying up the slower-moving mortgages) has eased the money market considerably. There are many who believe that Fannie May has been largely responsible for the housing boom of the last few years. Now the Eisenhower administration proposes to liquidate Fannie May and pave the way for turning over this mortgage-buying facility to the mortgage bankers and other lenders. Under the procedure proposed by the Eisenhower administration, it appears that the money lenders will end up with the stock ownership of the new Fannie May, but the home buyer will have footed most or all of the bill.

But the most worrisome thing about this arrangement, many believe, is that the new Fannie May will end up in the hands of those who want to throttle down the rate of new home building. It also gives the money lenders enormous power to control interest rates. What this boils down to is less housing at higher cost.

On top of this, the Eisenhower administration seems willing, if not eager, to help boost interest rates. In the past, interest charges for housing involving Government help have been kept low partly because of rigid limits specified by Congress, and partly by the determination of the Democratic administration to keep these charges at a minimum. The Eisenhower administration had only been in office a few months, however, when interest rates on veterans loans were raised from 4 to 4½ percent.

This year, the administration wanted to go even further. It sought to wrest from Congress much of its traditional control over interest rates, and asked for a blank check to raise interest rates an additional 1 percent—with the possibility of further increases in the future. To a veteran planning the purpose of a $10,000 home, this would add $1,325—roughly the cost of an added bedroom—to the total cost.

Over and above these high-interest rate policies, there was an even more basic objection to the Republican-housing program. Like the Republican tax bill, there seemed to be little in it for the 4 families out of 5 with incomes of less than $6,000 a year. The only provisions for the lowest income families—low-rent public housing—were killed outright by the House. And most of the liberalizations of FHA mortgage insurance would benefit only those with moderately high incomes. The family with a $4,000 income is caught in the middle. Its income is too high for low-rent public housing, even if it were available, and too low to meet the monthly housing cost for the average FHA house or apartment.

There is, of course, the experimental program for building $7,600 houses ($8,600 in high-cost areas) with a 100 percent Government loan guaranty and a 40-year payment period.

Democrats point out that these houses cannot possibly be a solution for the truly low-income families. The monthly cost of purchasing and maintaining these homes will be between $67 and $75—which would call for a yearly income of between $4,000 and $4,500, far out of range for the families displaced by slum clearance, to whom these houses are limited.

Some experts have pointed out that the biggest loophole in this low-cost housing scheme is the high interest and service charges planned by the administration. Although the 40-year payment period sounds like a benefit to the low-income family, what it actually does is to drag out these high charges over a longer period of time, so that in order to buy one of these $7,600 houses, a family will have to pay $10,675—far more than the cost of the house itself—in interest and service charges.

While supporting the President's public housing program, House Democrats hammered away at other parts of the program they found wanting. Texas' Wright Patman successfully led a move to eliminate the administration's blank check authority to raise interest rates.

North Carolina's Congressman Charles Deane added an amendment continuing aid for farm housing, which the Eisenhower administration had sought to end.

Alabama's Congressman Albert Rains sought to continue Fannie Mae in its present form, and to prevent its control by the mortgage bankers.

And New Jersey's Hugh Addonizio pointed out that the administration proposes to kill the one section in the present law designed to give special attention to housing problems of minority groups.

Mayor Joseph S. Clark, Jr., of Philadelphia, who had been active in studying the housing situation along with other major-city mayors, summed up America's housing problem, and the program put forward by the Eisenhower administration to meet it:

"We mayors look around us," he said, "and see the housing in our cities aging and deteriorating, while at the same time our population grows and our housing needs increase. This is the time for decisive action. I believe that the housing program recommended to the Congress may well be too little and too late."

Memorial Day 1954

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS B. HELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1954

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, Memorial Day 1954 has come and gone, but the real meaning of this day will not be forgotten so soon. The noted columnist Walter Winchell has written a masterful essay on the meaning of this annual observance at the present time. I am happy to insert it into the Record and call the attention of my colleagues to this excellent article which was published in the New York Daily Mirror on May 28, 1954. It reads as follows:

A Day To Remember

(By Walter Winchell)

This is a world of intense anxieties and profound tensions. Consequently, paying homage to the supreme fortitude and bright glory represented by Memorial Day seems almost an ironic absurdity. When some nations have the unlimited capacity to destroy and the uncontrollable ambition to conquer—solemn tributes to those who volunteered the last full measure of devotion for peace—suggest a taunt rather than a hope. Nevertheless, this enduring reverence for our honored warriors is one of the Nation's most compelling attributes. This national salute has an inspiring musical quality—like the sound of muffled drumbeats. The fearful vision of a world in ruins is mercifully superseded by the towering faith and valor of Americans whose sacrifices have been shaped in the image of a great democracy.

The meanings of our memorial are subtle and manifest as well as personal and national. They are represented by a country's vast natural resources and potential power. A lavishly endowed nation washed by oceans and warmed by faith. They are exemplified by the grandeur of our historical accomplishments—the vigor and vision of pioneers. They are illustrated by constitutional privileges, wheat-laden fields, or Broadway's glittering canyon. They are personified by the serene dignity of children reciting the pledge of allegiance. They are everlastingly symbolized by extraordinary deeds of little known Americans. It is a day to remember that freedom has never been gained without sacrifice nor preserved without courage.

This is a time to rededicate ourselves to the knowledge that this nation represents a true miracle. It was fused by the common determination for liberty and united by the invincible partnership of hope and valor. Many Americans endured incredible hardships while being sustained by idealism. The aspirations of the Mayflower compact, the challenging concepts of the Declaration of Independence, the brilliance of the Bill of Rights—encompass a proud tradition motivated by respect for human dignity.

The tyrants arrive and depart—and return again. There are times when it seems easier to succumb to cynicism than cling to hope. However, there is firmer logic and security in constantly renewing our pledge to the aspirations of those who served as a national shield—and strive to measure our devotion by the extent of their allegiance. Every schoolchild knows of the immense contributions by the minute men. Of equal importance and validity is being aware of what they relinquished. Some were wealthy who surrendered material abundance for the burdens of arduous duties. Many exchanged personal security for bitter peril. They traded the serenity of farms for the pitiless torture of battlefields. They sacrificed almost everything for a hope. But they never surrendered their conscience.

This is a time to remember that progress rarely flourishes in the sun. It survives and surmounts recurring storms. Our pioneers subdued a wilderness and carved a civilization while men of little faith contended it could not endure. The War of Independence lacked the unanimous support of colonists. The Constitution motivated a turbulent public controversy. There are compromises in the Declaration of Independence. And there are many in the world today who deride the Ten Commandments.

Progress has been achieved, despite the fearful and the vicious. And despite natural catastrophes and widespread indifference. Occasionally, advances are the result of gradual education. More often it is the consequence of a bitter victory. Tragically, the milestones of decency are tombstones of gallant fighters.

Peace is a word which exists in all languages. Peace, unfortunately, is presently almost nonexistent in every nation. If the future is the lengthened shadow of the past—then past agonies have ominous echoes. It seems almost a thousand years ago that this Nation was engaged in a tortuous struggle with the Axis. In retrospect, Hitler and Mussolini almost take on the aspects of fictional characters. About 13 years have passed since the fateful Pearl Harbor attack—without 24 hours of global peace. China, Greece, Malaya, and Korea have been ravaged by war. Today it is Indochina. A former ally is now our foremost enemy. Some of our foes have become friends we cannot trust. Communism has gained a beachhead in this hemisphere. The strongest allies are having difficulty maintaining friendship. Diplomacy has become an interminable battle of propagandists. Nations have forgotten that there cannot be justice without respect, progress without friendship, and amity without unity.

There are, of course, still appeasers among us who foolishly propose to rescue liberty by offering concessions to its foes. Their quest for peace means surrender to threats. And there are men of despair who limit the capacity for human cooperation, since their minds are bounded by ancient tribual frontiers. Obviously, our warriors failed to gain the ultimate triumph: universal peace. But the measure of their victory is the enduring strength of our liberty.

The titanic monuments tyrants erect to themselves inevitably survive their tyranny. But a democracy's most impressive monuments are carved in flesh and blood. The freedom in the heart of a child is more permanent than all of Stalin's statues.

This is a time for Washington to remember that the fury of its political conflict is not as meaningful as the thunder of the international crisis. Radio-active dust is mightier than political mud. And far more terrifying. This is the age of the hydrogen bomb with its seemingly irresistible power. Its overwhelming destructive force is beyond the power of words or the calculations of statistics. Words do not breathe and statistics do not bleed. Russia has enslaved one-fourth of the world and one-third of its population. What this means in terms of terror and plunder, what this means in terms of men, women, and children—cannot be conveyed by a television camera or solved by the most astute cross-examination.

The final cries of American fighting men have always been protests against tyranny. Weapons become obsolete and maps are changed. But the principles involved remain constant: The issue between freedom and despotism was as clear at Bunker Hill as it was in Korea. Courage is now as essential to national survival as it was at Valley Forge. The faith of America is beyond the ravages of time. It is the source of our national legacy and the mainspring of our national life. It goes from one generation to another and from heart to heart. Freedom cannot be measured in days or years. The spirit has no calendar and the soul cannot tell time. The fight against Benedict Arnolds continues. Sacrifices of Yankee Doodlers in the 18th century made possible privileges Americans defended in the 20th. The road from Concord extends into every Main Street. This is a day to remember America's torch-bearers who light the way and warm our hearts.

Turkey's Prime Minister Adnan Menderes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 1, 1954

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a release by the Turkish Embassy concerning the Prime Minister of Turkey, who is visiting in Washington this week. All of us are extremely happy about the great progress that is being made by our good friends, the people of Turkey. Not only have they made great progress in a material way, but they have also developed one of the soundest and most stable democratic systems of government in the world today. We can take pleasure in the success of our friends and in the knowledge that we have been of some help to them in recent years.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TURKEY'S PRIME MINISTER ADNAN MENDERES

On May 2, 1954, 93 percent of the eligible voters in Turkey went to the polls to reelect the Democratic Party for another term of 4 years and to give a vote of confidence to Adnan Menderes, the Prime Minister of Turkey, who will be visiting Washington, D. C., from June 1 to 4.

The number of votes cast was 9,095,617, an imposing figure for Turkey's 23 million people. The Democrats won 503, the People's Republican Party—main opposition—31, and the small Nation Party won only 5 seats.

Celal Bayar was elected President of the Republic by unanimous vote of the Democratic majority on May 14, 1954. Adnan Menderes, Premier since 1950, was appointed to form the new government.

The new government, as announced in Ankara on May 17, 1954, and headed by Adnan Menderes, is made up of the following ministers:

Deputy Premier and Minister of State: Fatin Rustu Zorlu, Ambassador and formerly Turkey's permanent delegate to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

Minister of State: Mukerrem Sarol, head of the Democratic Party organization in Istanbul.

Minister of State: Osman Kapani, formerly Turkish delegate to the European Council.

Justice: Osman Sevki Cicekdag (as before).

National Defense: Ethem Menderes (formerly Interior).

Interior: Dr. Namik Gedik (member of Parliament since 1950).

Foreign Affairs: Prof. Fuat Koprulu (as before).

Finance: Hasan Polatkan (as before).

Education: Celal Yardimci (formerly Minister of State).

Public Works: Kemal Zeytinoglu (as before).

Economy and Commerce: Sitki Yircali (formerly Industrial Development).

Health and Social Welfare: Dr. Behcet Uz (onetime mayor of Izmir and Minister of Health).

Customs and Monopolies: Emin Kalafat (as before).

Agriculture: Nedim Okmen (as before).

Communications: Muammer Cavusoglu (Under Secretary of the Ministry of Public Works).

Labor: Hayrettin Erkmen (as before).

Industrial Development: Fethi Celikbas (formerly Economy and Commerce).

Turkish elections in general, and the reinstatement of the Democratic Party received wide acclaim in Turkey and abroad. The American press, with usual alertness on what is going on in the world, gave wide coverage to Turkey's elections and indicated its conviction, that with this election Turkey had come of age as one of the leading democracies of the world.

Alongside with the larger metropolitan newspapers, small-town dailies, addressing themselves to the small communities, commented most favorably on the outcome of the Turkish elections. So far this office has received no less than 250 editorials from all over the United States.

The pro-West and pro-American Democratic Party of Bayar and Menderes was formed in 1945; together with Fuat Koprulu, Foreign Minister, and Refik Koraltan, President of the Turkish National Assembly, they are considered to be the founding fathers of democracy in Turkey. Opposing the strongly entrenched People's Republican Party in the elections of 1946, the Democrats became a small minority in the Turkish National Assembly. Four years later they won by a landslide, repeating this performance in a more decided manner on May 2 of this year.

The character of this victory is such that it leaves no doubt in anybody's mind that the majority of the Turkish people are behind Bayar and Menderes.

Premier Menderes comes from a rich farming district. The son of a wealthy cotton farmer, he has never given up farming. He was educated in the American College of Izmir, and graduated from the Law School of the University of Ankara. Premier Menderes works hard and long, and with tireless energy. Blending East-West courteousness, he has a charming personality, is extremely polite and considerate; he attracts new recruits daily to his program of Turkey for the Best. In this we may consider him to be closest to Ataturk's dream of a highly advanced, prosperous, and peaceful Turkey, serving the rest of humanity at the same time.

Menderes was born in 1899 at Aydin, near Izmir. His close touch with the people nearest to the soil no doubt instilled in him the full meaning of Ataturk's slogan: "The real masters of Turkey are its farmers." In point of fact, the Turkish farmer is better off today than at any other time in history, producing more, selling more, and buying more. A private enterpriser himself, Menderes has given utmost encouragement to industry and mining. The following figures may give an idea of the progress Turkey has made in the last 4 years:

Turkey became world's fourth wheat-grower. Production of cereals is 165 percent above the 1949 level. Production of coal has increased 41 percent; steel, 60 percent; cotton, 165 percent; chrome-ore production, 265 percent; iron ore, 285 percent; and manganese, 2,165 percent.

Adnan Menderes is the father of 3 children, 2 sons and a daughter. The eldest son is of college age. The Premier is Turkey's No. 1 public speaker. Nearly all of his speeches are off-the-cuff.

Menderes joined the Turkish national liberation movement at the close of World War I. As an early adherent to Kemal Ataturk's successful rebellion against injustice to Turkey, he is closely linked with the liberation of Izmir from military occupation. The mutual devotion between Menderes and President Bayar dates back to the days when the two men fought shoulder to shoulder to liberate their homeland.

Today they are working together to achieve the high goals and ideals set by Ataturk 32 years ago.

Deputy Prime Minister Fatin Zorlu who is accompanying Adnan Menderes, is a young career diplomat of outstanding ability. As Ambassador and permanent delegate to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, he has shown a high degree of initiative and spirit of cooperation with his colleagues on this world organization to maintain peace. Deputy Prime Minister Zorlu has 1 child, a daughter of 16 studying in Paris.

Coming to Washington with the Prime Minister's party will be Edhem Menderes, Minister of National Defense. Although no relation of the Prime Minister, Edhem Menderes was also born in Izmir in 1899, the same year as Premier Menderes. Formerly a lawyer, he is now an outstanding member of the Democratic Party,

Mr. Orhan Eralp and Mr. Melih Esenbel, members of the party, are no strangers to Washington, having served at the Turkish Embassy in Washington in the capacity of first secretary and counselor, respectively.

The Hydrogen Bomb and Civil Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1954

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, the development of the hydrogen bomb by the Soviet Union has had a tremendous impact on American military policy. During the years immediately following World War II the superiority of the Soviet Union in land forces was offset by the possession of the atomic bomb by the United States. The subsequent development of atomic and hydrogen weapons by both nations, however, has changed this condition entirely. The United States is now confronted with a potential enemy who possesses both the hydrogen bomb and superior land forces.

As a result of this development, the United States policy of deterring Soviet aggression by threatening to retaliate with atomic weapons must now provide for the possibility of Soviet counterretaliation. If the threat of Soviet counterretaliation offsets our threat of atomic-hydrogen retaliation in the first instance, then the free world is left at the mercy of the huge Communist land forces. Our task is to prove to the Soviet Union that we have the capacity and the determination to carry out the policy of "instant massive retaliation" in case of aggression. Only by doing this can we hope to deter the Soviet Union from committing aggression. Unless we are prepared to cope with the destruction of a possible hydrogen attack, we are openly inviting such an attack.

Demonstrating our preparedness to suffer the consequences of using the hydrogen bomb is not an easy task. Films, still pictures, and other data on the 1952 hydrogen bomb, recently made public by Atomic Energy Commission Chairman Lewis Strauss, reveal the appalling nature of this weapon. The destructive effect is tremendous—complete destruction over an area of 33 square miles, severe to moderate damage over 154 square miles, and light to unknown damage for 314 square miles. The fire and blast effects may be known to the Atomic Energy Commission and other authorities, but to the layman they are incalculable. The same is true with regard to radiation effects. It is significant that the Japanese fishing crew which suffered from radioactive ashes from the hydrogen explosion on March 1 of this year were 80 miles outside the designated danger zone. From this and other considerations it is clear that the destructive effects of the 1954 hydrogen bomb are even greater than those of the 1952 bomb. All the factors mentioned above with respect to the effects of the 1952 explosion should be increased when dealing in terms of the present bomb.

The realities of the hydrogen bomb, it seems to me, should be applied to all aspects of the United States defense program. Thus far it appears that we have applied the hydrogen bomb only to our offensive strategy—what we can do to the enemy—and have not applied these hydrogen-bomb data to our defensive strategy—what the enemy can do to us both before and after our offensive actions are launched. The principal defensive programs, continental air defenses and civil defense, have not been adequately coordinated with each other or with our offensive programs, on which our military strategy is primarily based.

The major weaknesses inherent in this lack of coordination are that, first, as mentioned above, our strategy of deterring aggression by demonstrating strength must be based on defensive strength as well as offensive strength; and, second, the strength of our civil-defense program is primarily dependent upon awareness of military plans and capabilities. In this former respect, it is axiomatic that the military, in order to have an understanding of our defensive strength, must be fully acquainted with our civil-defense program.

Regarding the second major weakness, there are several outstanding operational problems not always fully understood. First of all, if civil-defense authorities are to be able to plan for and put into operation a civil-defense program of any effectiveness at all, they must first know what they are to defend against. They must have access to the very best estimates of enemy capabilities and intentions. On the implementing level—and this includes the bulk of all civil-defense operations—measures taken to counteract enemy actions must be designed in view of specific needs. This means that civil-defense policy and tactics, as well as personnel training programs and equipment, must be based on a complete understanding of the weapons likely to be employed by the enemy, including the hydrogen bomb. This naturally requires the publication and dissemination of as much hydrogen bomb data as possible, consistent, of course, with security considerations.

Another important operational problem is that of coordinating military and civil-defense activities in time of emergency. At the present time there are two entirely different systems. Civil-defense agencies will receive from the military a warning of an impending attack, but from that point on civil-defense communications and control are separate from those of the military dealing with defensive military measures. The net result under this system, should an attack occur, would be to have two separate organized forces carrying on large-scale programs at the same time and, in many cases, in the same geographical areas. The resulting confusion would paralyze our community facilities and reduce the effectiveness of both the military and civilian programs.

An important factor contributing to this lack of integration is the present distribution of civil-defense functions between the Federal Government and the States. Under the terms of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950—approved January 12, 1951—the Federal Government carries on functions largely of an educational nature. Under the guidance of the Federal Civil Defense Administration, the States operates their own individual civil-defense programs. In many cases State programs are linked together by interstate mutual-aid compacts, negotiated with the consent of the Federal Government, but these compacts and the individual State programs have not produced an adequately coordinated national program.

The other major arm of our defensive program, the continental air defense system, is also beset with problems of a fundamental nature. Studies conducted during the past several years have produced a program which is expected to develop an effective radar warning and interceptor system by 1960. The dilemma here, however, is that by that date the chief threat to our cities will probably be guided missiles rather than piloted bombers. In the meantime, however, the program is not fully coordinated with the civil-defense program.

These conditions clearly indicate a need for greater integration within the civil defense and continental air-defense programs. They also point to the advisability of bringing these two programs together in a single system directly tied in with the rest of our military effort. What is more, this action must be taken immediately. Whatever shortcomings there are in our continental air-defense plans and whatever weaknesses are inherent in our civil-defense program should be fully understood at the highest military-policy levels. Every effort should be exerted to establish the best possible program at the present time, while planning also for that time in the future when radically different measures will be required.

To implement these recommendations will require fundamental changes in our Defense Establishment, bringing about much greater Federal authority in the case of civil defense. Therefore, I am at this time introducing a joint resolution providing for these basic changes. According to the provisions of this resolution the desired integration of civil defense and other aspects of our defense program will be achieved through a

Cabinet-level Department of Civil Defense, the Secretary of which will be a member of the National Security Council.

Creation of this Department of Civil Defense will enable the Federal Government to exert positive leadership in developing a realistic civil-defense program thoroughly integrated with our continental-defense system. In this manner a basic requirement of our broad military strategy will be met. The possibility of deterring Soviet aggression will be increased to the extent that we demonstrate our ability to minimize the disaster that could be caused by a Soviet hydrogen bomb attack on our cities. In view of our primary emphasis on deterring Soviet aggression, rather than destroying the Soviet Union, the provisions of this resolution should be given the utmost consideration.

Dredging of the Merrimack River

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1954

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following excellent article supporting my proposal for the dredging of the Merrimack River from Lawrence to the sea, which appeared in the Haverhill (Mass.) Gazette, Wednesday, May 26, 1954:

For a Navigable Merrimack

When we read of Representative Lane's bill calling for dredging of the Merrimack River from Lawrence to the sea, certain words of Longfellow came to mind, words used by the poet in introducing his memorable rhyme on Paul Revere's ride.

"Hardly a man is now alive," he wrote, "who remembers that famous day and year." And we might say that hardly a man is now alive who remembers when dredging the Merrimack was an important and perennial issue from Lowell to the sea.

Whether the project is practical in terms of the investment, we don't know, but it fascinates us. And we must recognize that certain of Lane's arguments are persuasive.

A river to be used by seaborne commerce obviously would be of economic benefit to the Merrimack Valley.

If the Federal Government is in the mood to help industrial communities that are not keeping pace with industrial development generally, money spent on the river probably would be more wisely used than money diverted to Lawrence by favorable terms on Government contracts.

Large precedents for such a relatively small project, as Lane notes, were established in such developments as TVA and in the proposed St. Lawrence seaway. He can plausibly argue that what is sauce for the Middle West's dinosaur is sauce also for the Massachusetts mouse. He can note too that Massachusetts has contributed to these regional development projects vastly more than this commonwealth ever has received from comparable programs.

He could also note that the development of the Merrimack River by Federal funds makes more sense than the development of a New England hydroelectric power authority, that was a favorite scheme of the Democrats when they ran affairs in Washington.

The potential value of the project should be carefully determined. It appears to be great, one, as Lane says, that would stimulate industrial growth for the Merrimack Valley. After the value has been determined, then the ratio of costs to benefits must be measured. If the cost is relatively small in terms of benefits, the project should be pushed.

Certainly, if value is revealed, the project is one to be carried out largely with Federal funds; for, assuming its value, it falls within the category of useful projects beyond the financial reach of the immediately benefitted region.

It is easily conceivable that Lane—especially because this is the year for national elections—has started something that we will be hearing much about. But even if nothing comes of it, we got some nostalgic pleasure merely by reading one report of his efforts to revive a once prominent issue.

The Boys' Towns of Italy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1954

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I should like to pay tribute to the Boys' Town of Italy on this 10th anniversary year. It was on Christmas eve, 1944, that an Irish priest, Monsignor Carroll-Abbing started a national organization to look after the army of homeless youngsters who slept on the sidewalks of Italy. Given a home and a chance in life, hundreds of Italy's youngsters have been trained in the priciples of democracy and of honest living. In 1945, the Irish monsignor turned to the American people for aid in his great campaign and the result was a complete justification of his belief in the brotherhood of nations and universal compassion for the suffering children of the world. In recognition of this story of 10 years of faith, I insert the following messages in the Appendix of the Record.

On the evening of May 15, 1954, benefit occasion for the Boys' Towns of Italy held by the Boys' Towns Committee of Union County, N. J., Chairman Arthur Venneri expressed the greeting:

We are, tonight, living proof that it is better to give than to receive. We are enjoying the full and wholesale glow resulting from the accomplishments of so many of us in behalf of many more young children overseas. We are happy in our hearts because we have recognized that ours is akin to the job of a parent. Once we have accomplished the responsibility for the spiritual, physical, and material growth of a child, we cannot be satisfied until our job is done. The little victims of world strife, the recipients of your bounty, are the deserving children in our charge.

It is gratifying that none of you here tonight feels that your job has been completed and that you are still behind the wheel of humanity in this good work. For that, on this 10th anniversary of Boys' Towns of Italy, God will bless you, and you, yourself, will receive the benefits that any great accomplishment brings.

It would, indeed, be remiss on our part if we did not take the opportunity to publicly thank Msgr. John Patrick Carroll-Abbing, who is honoring this occasion by his presence here tonight, for his tireless efforts in the great and noble work to which his life is dedicated.

I salute you, each and every one here present, and also you, our many friends of Boys' Towns of Italy who could not join us tonight, for your contribution in time, effort, and money, and I join with the speakers on this anniversary night in the hope that we shall continue until our mission has been completed.

Following is the inspiring message of Monsignor Carroll-Abbing to the many friends of the Boys' Towns of Italy:

This is the 10th anniversary year of Boys' Towns of Italy. Ten years have gone by since 1944 when we passed through the devastated streets of Naples, Palermo, Leghorn, Reggio, Calabria, Bari, Potenza, Pescara, and Rome and saw the children, without a father and without a mother, homeless and vagabond, wandering in the wake of an army. The lost children of the world, the innocent victims of the war, wandered the countryside alone, seeking food and more than food—the warmth of human affection.

Ten years have gone by and we can look back on the record of Boys' Towns of Italy and be glad. Rejoice at the tens of thousands of children who in the immediate postwar period were clothed and fed and given medical care; at the hundreds of orphanages that were helped; at the beautiful boys' towns that have been built, giving a home and a new chance in life to the children made destitute by the war; at the more than 25 splendid children's day centers that have been erected or are under construction in southern Italy to give care and loving assistance to the underprivileged youngsters of the Mezzogiorno.

Thousands of children who suffered so terribly in the war have grown to happy manhood and given instruction, a trade, and moral training, thanks to the wonderful men and women in America who made a sacrifice of time, energy, and money to help these little ones across the seas. Let us thank God, you and I, for having been given this great and inestimable privilege of helping His little ones.

Let us work together in the future, friends of boys' towns in Union County, as we have done in the past, to bring a smile and a new hope to more and more unhappy children. God bless you and all those dear to you.

Editorial Comment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JEFFREY P. HILLELSON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1954

Mr. HILLELSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following editorial from the Monday, May 10, 1954, edition of the Kansas City Times, Kansas City, Mo.:

Grandview Tackles Its Needs

The little city of Grandview in southwest Jackson County is troubled with growing pains. The conversion of the Grandview airport into a major Air Force base has created something of an economic boom in that area. It also has created problems the like of which Grandview has not had to face before.

Foremost among these is the need of convenient living quarters for the families of military and civilian personnel assigned to the base. Some of the married officers and enlisted men have had to drive as much as 40 miles to and from the Grandview headquarters of the Central Air Defense force each day. Other men have yet to find decent family quarters at rent they can afford.

Aware of this and related problems, a Grandview Chamber of Commerce committee is studying the idea of building a municipal sewer system. Septic tank facilities are not adequate for the multifamily housing units required, nor for the school at Grandview. A tentative plan for financing a sewer system is to try to obtain a $500,000 grant from the Federal Government under the Defense Housing and Community Facilities Act. An additional $325,000 would be obtained by a proposed bond issue.

Grandview is striving to work out its problems of growth as best it can. The effort does credit to the citizens and leaders of that community.

The Dock Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1954

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the New York Times of May 28, 1954, shows the importance of continuing our efforts to clean up the New York waterfront:

THE DOCK VOTE

The portwide election to determine what union should represent the longshoremen in collective bargaining with the New York Shipping Association was disappointingly inconclusive. But the old, and now independent, International Longshoremen's Association has a lead of 319 votes. The National Labor Relations Board has hundreds of challenged ballots to dispose of, and the result will not be known for some time.

Whether or not the final count leaves the old and discredited ILA in control, it is apparent that the newly organized American Federation of Labor ILA marked up a major achievement in the short time it had to recruit membership. The AFL–ILA received 7,568 votes in the voided election of last December, against the old ILA's 9,060, while more than 4,000 votes were challenged and never counted. In this week's election the AFL–ILA received 8,191 votes, the old ILA 9,110, while 1,792 ballots are in dispute.

Old loyalties linger, and it was not to be expected, perhaps, in view of this fact and various resentments, logical or not, that a condition of years' standing could be altered overnight. Whatever the outcome on the challenged ballots the long-term result must be the same: this port and its attendant vices must be cleaned up. All reputable elements in the community are dedicated to that purpose, and one setback—unpleasant as any one setback may be—is only an incident in the long haul. We knew this job wouldn't be easy.

On this same date, May 28, 1954, the following editorial appeared in the Brooklyn Eagle on this same subject. I am pleased to commend it to the attention of our colleagues:

INDICATIONS OF ILA'S VICTORY BAD NEWS FOR PORT OF NEW YORK

While the results are not final, the election to determine a collective-bargaining agent for the waterfront gives the gangster-ridden International Longshoremen's Association a 319-vote majority over the rival American Federation of Labor union. We view this development as bad news for Brooklyn and the port of New York as a whole.

But hope for a reversal of the status quo should not be abandoned since there are 1,797 challenged ballots which will be the subject of a searching investigation by the National Labor Relations Board before the vote receives official certification. Nevertheless, as matters stand now, it would appear that the community must prepare for the grim possibility it will have to deal with the same group that has threatened the very life of its vast shipping interests upon which so many depend for their livelihood.

The ILA's margin, narrow as it is, suggests that longshoremen have absorbed very little of the true significance of recent events which found the ILA not willing to tolerate corrupt practices but having a major responsibility for the disruption of normal business activity with the resultant loss of jobs and millions of dollars.

A close look at the ILA shatters any illusions about its intrinsic value in the field of decent unionism. Yielding to official and public pressure, the AFL belatedly expelled it from the parent union when pleas to clean house were ignored. Investigations produced such alarming facts that a bill was enacted by Congress for bistate control. The method had many disadvantages but it was conceded there was no other means of approach if the port were to be saved.

At the moment the ILA is in receivership and this legal checkrein will prevail until the union can produce the $50,000 fine that was levied by the courts as a consequence of a 4-week wildcat strike in defiance of the Federal Government.

An entirely new phase of the ILA's checkered history developed when evidence was secured that one of its powerful bosses, tough Tony Anastasia, formidable figure on the Brooklyn docks, had solicited war chest contributions from locals dedicated to Harry Bridges, who over the years has been accused of having Communist affiliations. This in itself foretold grave trouble for the future since it placed the Anastasia forces under direct obligations to an element that could cripple the harbor in time of serious emergency.

In the event the ILA establishes its superior position on the basis of the election there is no choice but to accept the fact. But acceptance does not mean defeat nor any continuation of the past practices of paying tribute to hoodlums as a means of staying in business. The duly constituted authorities, bistate, local, and Federal, and the shippers will have a renewed obligation to work together and vigorously prosecute any and all manifestations of illegal acts. None must be hidden. There can be no resumption of the reign of terror which has plagued us for so long. The challenge must be met with vigor and courage.

Investigation of Registry of Vessels

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1954

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following very interesting article which appeared in the editorial column of the Boston Post recently:

INVESTIGATION NEEDED

Men who derive their living from seaborne commerce have noticed a curious change in the past 2 years in the registry of vessels, many owned by American shipping firms. Once vessels owned by Americans were registered in great numbers in Panama, but now, in great numbers, these vessels have been shifted to the Liberian flag.

Of course, the principal reason for having such vessels operated under foreign flags is to avoid the excessive cost of the high pay scales of American seamen. But it was possible under both Panamanian and Liberian registries to hire cheap foreign crews. Then, why the shift to the Liberian flag?

The answer is to be found in the fact that the Panamanian Government prohibited any ship under the flag of Panama to trade with Communist nations. The Liberians have no such scruples. Therefore, in high indignation, American owners shifted to Liberian registry to trade with Communists.

Cases of the following kind are all too frequent, as reported from a west coast port, where a huge, new tanker, with an Italian crew, under the Liberian flag and with a mortgage certificate held by an American university, arrived to compete with American-flag shipping. There should be an investigation of this and there should be legislation to make it economically possible for American-owned shipping under the American flag to compete for world trade.

Elks Anniversary at Newburyport, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1954

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

Speaking at Newburyport at the Elks 50th anniversary jubilee, yesterday, Congressman PHILIP J. PHILBIN denounced the roadblocks which the Soviet has thrown up against peace and deplored the developments at the Geneva Conference as significant of lamentable noncooperation by the free nations.

"It is clear that the Soviet and its puppets are dominating the Conference" said PHILBIN, "and that our allies are not standing with us on the current issues before the world."

"It may well be," said the Congressman, "that timely, effective action by the United Nations and the free allies, working together could have prevented alarming developments in Indochina." In view of the way this situation has worked out, he said, "The American people would strongly oppose sending American boys to remote parts of the world where the security of this Nation was not involved in order to pull somebody else's chestnuts out of the firse. Unless we can secure sincere cooperation from our allies and from the United Nations, it will be necessary to make a complete revaluation of American foreign policy, and that is what the people have a right to expect."

"Communism has played a large part in developing these unfortunate situations in Korea and Indochina," he said. "Unfortunately Communists have been able to capitalize upon the abuses and injustices of certain European colonial and imperialistic systems with which this country is not in sympathy and should certainly not attempt to justify or defend."

"While world tension will continue indefinitely," he said, "I do not believe there will be a war. Even the Soviet realizes that another war might cripple civilization for a century and that their own country would be the greatest sufferer in the event of atomic and hydrogen attack."

"Peace is what we seek and peace is what the world wants," he said. "It must be based upon justice. It could never possibly be achieved by surrendering any part of our great American birthright. It could never rest upon appeasement of those who aim to destroy freedom."

"The fight against communism here and abroad must go on," said the Congressman, "but we must recognize that in all circumstances the rights of American citizens upon which our precious freedom depends must be zealously safeguarded."

Congressman PHILBIN highly lauded the Elks as an organization performing invaluable work. "If the spirit of brotherhood, charity, and patriotism so well exemplified and so actively practiced by the Elks could play a larger part in our lives, the Nation and the world would be better. Your work for charity alone," he said, "entitles you to universal gratitude and I am sure you have it."

The Local Service Air Lines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 28, 1954

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very important address by Hon. Josh Lee, a member of the Civil Aeronautics Board, dealing with the great importance, nationally and from a defense standpoint, of the feeder air line system of the Nation. This is one of the most thoroughgoing studies and explanations of the importance of this vast new area of expansion in the domestic air line industry I have ever read, and I call the address to the attention of Members of the Senate. The distinguished member of the Civil Aeronautics Board who made the address is a former Member of this body from the State of Oklahoma.

I am advised by the Public Printer that the cost of printing the address is estimated to be $233.75. However, Mr. Lee's address is so illuminating, dealing as it does with the importance to the national defense and to the stability of the domestic air line industry, as well as to the handling of mail, of the feeder air routes, and it is so well documented and carefully analytical at this important stage of aviation development, that I ask unanimous consent, notwithstanding the cost, that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, airport executives, and guests, upon your invitation and by approval of the Civil Aeronautics Board I am here to speak to you on the problem of saving the local service airlines. We believe this, in part, is your problem too. We are not unmindful, however, of the possibility that each one of you may have a more immediate and more pressing problem in trying to make revenues cover expenses at your particular airport. As a teen-age boy I grew up on a ranch. One day I was run over by a gentleman cow. He knocked my front teeth and my sense both out. I later had my teeth put back. Then I started teaching school—in order to make enough money to get an education. Schoolteachers' salaries then were about as low as they are now. But I finally saved up $12.50 with which to get a 4 year's education. I went over to the University of Oklahoma and found two other boys whose resources were as limited as mine. We rented a shack and set up bachelor quarters in order to hold down expenses. We lived on ox tail soup and beef tongue in order to make both ends meet. So when the question of making both ends meet arises I am in a position to be very sympathetic. It is my hope that you too, because of your similar experience in trying to make revenues cover expenses, will be sympathetic and help these 14 vigorous young airlines get off of subsidy. I am convinced that if you help them now they in turn will more than compensate you later.

THE LOCAL AIRLINE EXPERIMENT

When the Board first launched its local air service program 10 years ago, it did so with a long-range plan in mind. It did so knowing full well that these local airlines would require subsidy for a number of years to come. We made no effort to determine the exact length of time during which subsidy would be required. We decided that it would be sufficient proof that the experiment was succeeeding if the carriers could show a steady gain in revenues over expenses. This they did continually from 1947 to 1952. In 1947 the cost to the Government for each plane-mile of operation was 70.63 cents. In 1948 it was 64.27 cents. In 1949 it was 56.53 cents. In 1950 it was 52.05 cents and in 1951 it was 48.91. Then the next year, 1952, it jumped back up to 51.71 cents per plane-mile. That isn't all. This unfavorable trend continued through 1953 when it climbed to 53.40 cents a plane-mile. In short, the mail pay required of the Government for every plane-mile of local service operation jumped from a low of 48.91 cents a plane-mile in 1951 to 53.40 cents a plane-mile in 1953, an increase of 4.49 cents a plane-mile in 2 years.

Naturally we knew when we launched the local air service experiment that when we increased the number of route miles to be operated we would have to increase the total amount of mail pay accordingly. This we have done from year to year as the route systems have gradually been spread over 14 areas of the United States. We did not expect the total amount of mail pay to be reduced as long as we were still granting substantial new route mileage to be served but we did expect a gradual decrease in the mail pay required for each plane-mile of operation. In other words, as long as the per unit cost to the Government was decreasing we felt justified in continuing the experiment.

But in 1952 the favorable trend toward less dependence upon the Government for each plane-mile of operation suddenly changed. We immediately began to examine the reports. We discovered that it was an increase in costs rather than a decrease in revenues which caused this reversal of a favorable trend. The expense column had not merely leveled off as would be expected at some point, but had turned sharply upward. The revenues, however, had continued their rate of increase. For example, the nonmail revenues in 1947 amounted to 24.66 cents per plane-mile. In 1948 they were 27.69 cents. In 1949 they were 31.99 cents. In 1950 they were 33.74 cents. The carriers continued to drum up business, and in 1951 the commercial revenues for each plane-mile of operation were 46.17 cents. In 1952, the year that the unfavorable trend appeared, the commercial revenues were 50.93 cents a plane-mile, and in 1953 they climbed on up to 55.13 cents a plane-mile. In short, the commercial revenues showed a constant and steady gain every year from 1947 through 1953. This made it clear that the entire cause of the unfavorable trend was increased costs rather than decreased revenues.

The costs of the local service airlines increased during the 2 years 1952 and 1953 by a total of $6,135,000. After making an adjustment for the increase in the volume of operation for the years of 1952 and 1953, our calculations show that the rising costs in those 2 years not only absorbed $3,469,000 of the increased revenues but required an additional mail payment of $2,666,000, making a total of $6,135,000. This means that after excluding the increase in expenses due to the increase in the volume of operations, there was an increase in costs of over $6 million in 1953 over 1951. Remember, this does not include the increase in costs due to the additional plane-miles operated. This $6 million represents an increase in the cost of operating the local service airlines for 1952 and 1953. I do not believe that the Government can or will continue to provide mail pay increases merely to meet increasing costs. As long as the two columns, that is, the cost column and the revenue column, can be made to show a favorable trend, I, as one member of the Board, feel justified in supporting the local service experiment. But when the dollars run out through the cost column faster than the carrier can bring them in through the revenue column, then I must admit that my enthusiasm suffers a sinking spell.

When it was determined that the unfavorable trend was due entirely to rising costs, it appeared to the Board that the first logical step was to plug the leaks so that when the carriers by extra effort should develop more traffic, they would have something to show for it. There were those who said the remedy lay in getting more bodies on the planes. I favor increasing the traffic too, but it seems so discouraging to work your head off developing more traffic only to discover at the end of the quarter that the increase in traffic has been absorbed by an increase in costs. Of course, some people may be willing to console themselves like the farmer who fattened some hogs for market. When he sold them and figured up his accounts, he found that he had just come out even. "Well," he said with a shrug of his shoulders, "I had the use of the hogs." While we had the fun of running the airlines, it cost us $6,135,000 more than it did in 1951 for the same volume of operation.

No, if we are to take first things first, we must get these costs under control as the first order of business. I once heard of a test which was applied to all candidates for a feeble-minded institution. The prospective candidate was placed in a water-tight basement where a stream of water was running in through an open spigot and where there was a pump. If he tried to pump the water out before he turned off the spigot he was granted admission to the feeble-minded institution without any further question as to his eligibility.

The carriers' individual efforts proved to be ineffective in coping with the situation created by the rising costs, so last December the Board wrote a letter to the president of the local airlines contemplating concerted action by them. We recommended three separate and distinct steps for reducing and holding down costs. They were as follows:

First, wages and salaries: Half the cost of running a local airline is the payment of wages and salaries. Naturally the officials and employees of a local airline should have the incentive of being able to look forward to pay boosts but when those airlines are fighting for their lives in an effort to reduce and hold down subsidy payments, the pay boosts should bear more relation to the increase of revenues over costs than to the scale of pay boosts agreed upon by the self-sufficient trunklines. It is becoming increasingly more apparent that unless everybody concerned with the welfare of the local airline is willing to accord them a sort of "favored nation" status until they get over the hump, they are not going to make the grade.

Second, materials, repairs, and overhauls: These items, coupled with the fuel and oil supplies, account for approximately 20 percent of the cost of running a local airline. Again realizing the ineffectiveness of the carriers' individual efforts in attacking these costs, the Board has offered to protect them from antitrust laws if they will form a corporation to bargain collectively for these materials and services. The carriers have been working on that proposal since last December. It is believed that substantial savings can be effectuated on these items by such an approach.

Third, landing fees and ground rentals: These fees and charges account for slightly over 10 percent of the cost of running a local service airline. It was suggested by the Board that it would be desirable for the carriers themselves to agree upon and recomment a formula of landing fees and airport charges which would take into consideration the subsidized status of the local airlines as well as the expensive nature of the short-haul operations required of them.

On April 30, 1954, the Conference of Local Airlines approved a formula for landing fees which is as follows:

"It is recommended that all local service airlines in negotiating contracts and renewals of existing contracts with cities and/or airport authorities, covering landing fees, and joint terminal services charges, utilize the following formula:

"1. The landing fee at an airport serving the intermediate and smaller cities be no greater than a fee equal to 2 percent of the gross generated passenger revenues on the local carrier's system originating at that airport.

"2. The landing fee at an airport serving major terminal cities be no greater than 8 cents per 1,000 pounds of the certificated gross weight of the aircraft.

"3. The allocation of the cost of joint terminal services used by two or more airlines be prorated among the airlines on the basis of—

"(a) 10 percent equally.

"(b) 45 percent in accordance with the ratio the number of each carrier's passenger schedules in and out of said airport bears to the total number of schedules in and out of said airport by all carriers. Each schedule operated with 4-engine aircraft shall be counted as 3 schedules, each schedule operated with Convair- or Martin-type aircraft shall be counted as 2 schedules, and each schedule operated by DC-3 aircraft shall be counted as 1 schedule.

"(c) 45 percent in accordance with the ratio the number of each carrier's passengers enplaning and deplaning at said airport bears to the total number of passengers enplaning and deplaning at said airport by all carriers."

The local airlines provided us with data pertaining to landing fees at 331 airports, or 82½ percent of the 401 now being served by them. Subject to such modifications as may be necessary to adjust it to differing circumstances, this formula seems to be a fair and reasonable device by which the airport authorities can help the local airlines reduce their dependence upon the Government. There would be an annual saving at these 331 airports on landing fees alone of $385,000. This is exclusive of any savings on airport service charges.

It is more difficult to devise a rental charge formula for space in the terminal buildings because circumstances differ so widely at the different airports. Therefore, the carriers made no specific recommendation with respect to a formula for rental space charges, although some individual carriers did suggest $1 per square foot as a standard charge for rental space. The carriers have provided us with data on this subject from 224 airports, or 55.9 percent of the airports served by them. Twenty-eight of these charge $1 or less per square foot for space in the terminal buildings.

On the basis of the airport rentals and the analysis of them by the Board's staff and also in consideration of the unfavorable trend in airmail subsidies, a formula suggests itself which might be useful for examination and consideration by the airport managements and the airline executives. It is, of course, suggested with such caveats as may be necessary to make it properly applicable under the varying circumstances at the different airports. It is as follows:

(a) $1 per square foot for all airports served exclusively by local airlines, and

(b) $1.25 per square foot for all airports served by 1 trunkline, $1.50 for those served by 2 trunklines, $1.75 for those served by 3 trunklines, and so on, with an additional 25 cents per square foot for each additional trunkline up to and not exceeding at any airport a maximum rate of $3 per square foot.

The acceptance by the airport managers of these proposed formulas with such modifications as may be necessary and desirable would be a substantial contribution toward insuring the continuation of these airlines. If all 3 of the formulas, that is, the landing-fee formula, service-charge formula, and the rental-space formula, were applied at all of the airports served by the local airlines, the immediate savings should be substantial, since 82½ percent of the landing-fee formula alone would save $385,000 per year. But even more important than the immediate savings would be the ultimate and recurring savings achieved by holding down costs which may, in the absence of any uniform standard, start a rising spiral of chain reactions and spread over the industry.

The total increase for airport charges since 1950 is $2,388,604. Of this amount $1,022,319 is due to the inauguration of service at new airports since 1950, but $1,366,285, or 57.2 percent of this increase is due to rising costs. In other words, within 3 years, excluding service at new stations, airport charges have increased $1,366,285. This represents an increase of almost 20 percent a year. Therefore, the greatest benefits from the establishment of a uniform standard of charges will be its effect in holding down future charges.

UNIFORMITY OF TREATMENT

A study of fees and charges levied at 82½ percent of the airports served by the local airlines convinced me that as a general rule the charges are not unreasonable and in a number of cases are rather liberal. Therefore, I do not come before you urging that the fees and charges now being paid by the local airlines are unreasonable but I come rather requesting favored treatment for these 14 local airlines. From the reports given me by the presidents of the local airlines concerning the fair and understanding attitude of the airport managers, we are counting on you to cooperate with the Government in granting favored treatment to the local airlines. My purpose in coming to this convention is to help in the establishment of a scale of fees and charges which are low enough to be helpful and uniform enough to be fair.

The facts show that as a general rule the charges to the local carriers are higher in those airports which are also served by trunks. This, of course, is only natural because the airport managers do not like to be charged with discrimination, so in the absence of any formula which makes allowance for ability to pay, they charge the local carriers the same as the trunks. Furthermore, it appears from a study of this question that many airport authorities would grant the local service carriers lower rates if they were sure that other airports were making the same concessions. Therefore, it is our hope that these uniform standards of fees and charges will make it easier for the airport authorities to justify our request of favored treatment.

It is true that these standards are very liberal to the local carriers. But if this effort is to result in any actual benefits then we must effectuate substantial savings. Some of you may remember the story of the passenger on a pullman who was being dusted off by the porter. The passenger put his hand deep down in his pocket and said, "Porter, what is the standard tip?" The porter replied, "One dollar, suh, Yes suh." The passenger handed him a dollar. The porter bowed low and said, "Thank you, suh. You is de fust one who ever has come up to de standard." I hope we have a better percentage of those who come up to the standard than was enjoyed by the porter.

WHY SHOULD THE LOCAL AIRLINES RECEIVE FAVORED TREATMENT?

First, because they are at an economic disadvantange because of (1) the type of equipment which they must use with little hope of improvement in the offing, (2) the temporary nature of their certificates which handicaps them in financing and contracting, and (3) the type of service they must perform. It is necessary for them to make more landings and takeoffs than the trunks. Their average length of hop is shorter than the trunks. Last year the local airlines made a landing for every 74 revenue miles flown whereas the trunks made a landing for every 234 revenue miles. The local airlines had only 3½ revenue passengers for each takeoff while the trunks had 13.2. The advantage is even greater when translated into dollars. Last year for each takeoff the 10 largest trunks received $469 of revenue whereas the local carriers received only $41.

Second, we are asking favored treatment for the local airlines in assessing fees and charges because they are highly subsidized. It has been said that the small communities are really the ones benefiting most by the subsidized carriers and that they (the small communities), therefore, should pay the subsidy. While there is some truth in this statement it does not represent the whole truth. A survey of the facts with respect to fees and charges showed me that the smallest communities are so happy to have the service that as a rule, their charges are little more than token charges. Several are making no charges at all and 154 of the smallest airports are charging less than $1 per landing. On the other hand, 8 of the largest airports are charging $5 or over per landing and 10 more of the largest airports are charging between $4 and $5.

WHO, THEN, IS SUBSIDIZED?

It is my judgment that every community and every passenger served by the local carrier is subsidized. The large communities cannot say that they are not benefited by having all of these local carriers connect them by air with the smaller communities in their trade territories. Every air journey must have an airport at each end. There is just as much subsidy involved, therefore, in one end of the journey as the other. A large trade center is benefited by having its customers brought in in the morning and taken back in the evening just as much if not more than the small communities which provide those customers.

Last year the local airlines carried almost $24 million worth of traffic in and out of the big trade centers of the United States. Furthermore, a part of this was traffic exchanged with the trunks. The local carriers delivered to the trunk carriers 309,398 passengers and received from the trunks for transportation to their final destination 456,000 passengers. This means that in 1 year 766,210 passengers either began or completed their journey on the local airlines. These 766,000 passengers, it should be remembered, are only those passengers exchanged with the trunks and do not represent the larger volume of traffic carried exclusively by the local service carriers. The trunks received for their share of this exchange traffic $15,025,375. It is safe to say that a part of these passengers would not have traveled by air and another part would not have traveled at all except for the local carriers who made it possible for them to complete their entire journey by air. Therefore, the large communities have just as much at stake in the welfare of the local airlines as the small communities.

A PENNYWISE POLICY

There are indications of growing impatience with the local airline subsidy. I favor the reduction of subsidy too but am unwilling to concede that the absorption of the local airlines by the trunklines would in the long run result in any beneficial economies to the Government. On the contrary, I fear that much we have achieved during the past 10 years in developing a broad base for the air transportation industry would be sacrificed if we should transfer the communities now being served by the local carriers to the trunks for service. It would undo the achievements of the past 10 years in the field of local air service.

One of the major issues confronting the Board in establishing the first local service operation was the selection of a proper carrier. In that first case Western Air Lines was an applicant for feeder routes but its application was rejected in favor of an independent local carrier. In deciding this fundamental policy question the Board stated: [1]

"The type of service we here visualize involves an entirely new type of service gaged to meet the needs of smaller communities and relatively short hauls. In view of the limited traffic potentialities of the points on the new system, an unusual effort will be required to develop the maximum traffic. Greater effort and the exercise of managerial ingenuity may be expected from an independent local operator whose continuation in the air transportation business will be dependent upon the successful development of traffic on the routes and the operation of the service on an adequate and economical basis."

This basic policy announced in the Rocky Mountain case—namely, that feeder routes should be operated by independent local service carriers—was followed by the Board in 11 separate major proceedings involving the establishment of new local route systems throughout the entire United States.

There is a good solid reason for the Board's policy of establishing and maintaining a distinction between the two types of service. The Board has considered it so important that it has reinterated this policy on numerous occasions. The wisdom of the Board in giving local airlines a different type of certificate and in keeping them entirely separate and distinct from the trunklines has been proven by the development of local traffic. A comparison with the trunks in the early stages of their development is worthwhile at this point. In 1939, the first year under the Civil Aeronautics Act, the Big Four trunklines had the cream of the traffic routes. They had long-haul operations between the largest cities. They were not limited by restrictions. They hauled that year a total of 1,025,281 passengers. Now compare this record with the local carriers for 1953 which would be roughly comparable to the same stage of development as the Big Four had reached in 1939. During 1953 the local airlines carried a total of 1,925,087 passengers. The 14 local airlines operated over lean traffic routes with artificial restrictions which required short-haul operations. Yet they developed almost 2 million passengers where the Big Four developed slightly over 1 million in their early stages of development. It should also be remembered that it was not until the last 3 years that the trunk carriers were able to exist without subsidy.

The question might be asked, how then did the local airlines develop so many passengers where no passengers were thought to exist. The answer is, because of the oneness of purpose which the local carriers have. By virtue of their certificates the local carriers must depend upon short-haul traffic generated at the intermediate stations as well as at the terminals. The Board in laying out their route systems had this in mind. The trunks on the other hand, are free to develop the profitable long-haul business. Service to Duluth, Minn., and Pine Bluff, Ark. are good cases in point. During the last year of trunkline service to Duluth the trunk carried 4,552 passengers. A local airline was substituted for the trunkline and the first full year of operation the local airline carried 9,693 passengers. At Pine Bluff, Ark., for the last 9 months of operation by a trunk there were 357 passengers and for the first 9 months of operation by a local carrier there were 1,228 passengers.

There is a fundamental distinction between the trunk carriers and the local carriers. This distinction is important because it gives the two types of carriers different objectives. The primary objective of the trunk is to develop long-haul business. The primary objective of the local carrier is to develop local business.

If the local carriers were to be absorbed by the trunks for the immediate expediency of terminating the subsidy, the air traffic at the small and intermediate communities would dry up because the trunks would provide them with the minimum service required under law. Since the long-haul operations are the most profitable, good business practices would require the trunks to emphasize this type of service to the neglect of the short-haul business. The local service carriers, however, by their certificates, are not permitted to engage in a long-haul competitive service with the trunks. They know that if they succeed at all it will be by developing the inter-city traffic at the intermediate stations. It is this oneness of purpose directed to the development of local traffic that has built up a $24 million business where none existed before. The same reason that causes the local carriers to develop more local traffic than the trunks is the reason that caused the hare to outrun the hound. The hare was running for his life and the hound for his lunch. The difference is one of incentive. This difference in incentive must be maintained. If the trunks should take over the local airlines, then the primary incentive to develop local traffic would be gone and local traffic would begin to wither away. After a short time the trunks would be able to show by the traffic figures that they were losing money at the smallest stations. They would then request permission to suspend service at those stations, and one after another many small communities would be dropped and thus the well springs of new traffic would be dried up at the source. Why, you ask is such a policy being considered. The answer is, because it costs the Government 4½ cents more for each plane-mile of operation than it did in 1951.

THEN ARE THE LOCAL AIRLINES WORTH SAVING?

On the record of their achievement, I believe they are. Here are the facts. Last year the Government paid $23,105,935 in mail pay to the local carriers. That was the total bill for carrying the mail. The total bill paid for rural free delivery for the same period was $192,430,434. The people who pay this bill do so willingly because they believe the service is worth the money. You could not take away rural fre delivery in this country on the grounds that it cost $192 million.

Now let us see what we get for the $23 million we pay the 14 local airlines. Last year they carried 316 million letters. At 6 cents each that equals $18,968,769. If these letters had borne 8-cent stamps instead of 6-cent stamps, the revenue would have paid the entire mail bill of the local airlines with $2,185,756 left over with which to pay the Post Office Department for the handling charges. While a part of this mail was carried on part of its journey by other carriers, nevertheless, the fact remains that the mail carried by these 14 local carriers brought in almost $19 million. In addition, they carried 20 million pounds of cargo and 1,925,087 passengers.

Furthermore, these 14 vigorous young carriers constitute a backlog of national defense. Following World War II the question was often asked in Government circles, "How can the United States best preserve the great backlog of airlift made available by the surplus aircraft?" To place all of these planes in mothballs did not answer that question, but the Civil Aeronautics Board did. We answered it by establishing this secondary system of independent air carriers. We believed that by its establishment more planes could be kept in the air, more pilots and mechanics kept trained, more miles of navigation aids kept in operation, and more landing fields kept in use for fewer dollars than by any other method available. Time has proven the wisdom of that decision. For example, today as a result of the local airline operations over 10,000 miles of airways have been established. Approximately 125 "H" facilities have been installed, a total of 121 domestic airports have been enlarged, 107 airports have been provided with night lighting facilities, and 213 airports which otherwise would be growing up in weeds are in active service.

Furthermore, 6,000 people are employed by the local airline industry. Approximately 1,000 of these are pilots, over 1,000 are mechanics, and almost 1,000 others are technical personnel. These 14 airlines operate a total of 160 aircraft which are available on a moment's notice, in case of a national emergency. What would it cost the Government to maintain on a purely military basis this reserve of trained personnel, this pool of operating aircraft, along with all of the other transportation facilities involved in the daily operation of this young industry?

Imagination and vision are needed in the air-transportation business. We are fortunate, you and I, to have a part in the development of the aviation industry. I say we are fortunate. But is aviation fortunate? When I was first appointed to the Civil Aeronautics Board I attended an aviation meeting where I heard a speaker admonishing the leaders of this dynamic industry to proceed cautiously. He said, "Now, gentlemen, we should keep our feet on the ground." Well, I admit that I was one of the newest members of the aviation industry but for the life of me I couldn't figure how we could fly with our feet on the ground. The "wait and see" philosophy never developed any industry or conquered any new frontiers.

---

[1] Rocky Mountain States Air Service (6 CAB 695 (1946)).

Of all the millions who have flown they are but a handful to those who have not. Air traffic is increasing by leaps and bounds. Last year the domestic airlines carried 184 percent more passengers than they did 3 years before—and the end is not yet. We are aiming at a fast-moving target; we must lead it or we shall surely shoot behind it.

Give us your cooperation in our effort to develop an air transportation system adapted to the future as well as the present needs of commerce, the Postal Service, and the national defense.

Spencer, Mass., Memorial Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 1, 1954

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

At the Spencer Memorial Day exercises Congressman PHILIP J. PHILBIN, of Clinton, hailed the great heroes of the past to whom we owe American liberty, and declared that it is only through complete devotion to the great cause for which they fought and died that we would be able to preserve American institutions against the deadly enemies which surround us in the current day.

Lauding the "incomparable spirit of sacrifice and loyalty which inspired the heroes of every American war," the Clinton Congressman denounced the diabolical forces in the world today which are working feverishly to destroy human freedom.

"This great Nation was built upon the solid rock of patriotism," he said. "It has been preserved by the bloody sacrifices of many generations. In our own day we have witnessed the magnificent devotion of American sons and daughters who gave their all to defend our shores and protect American liberties.

"The Nation can never put too high a value upon these unforgettable contributions to our country, nor should we ever lose sight of the fact that unless we, in our time, keep alive the spirit of patriotic devotion which animated them that our cherished liberties will be in peril," he asserted.

"The sons of American mothers have died in every clime in behalf of freedom, but the world now observes a gigantic and deadly Communist conspiracy which is working ceaselessly to destroy the freedom for which they fought and died. Our task is plain. Our duty is clear. We must soulfully rededicate ourselves today with more fervor and determination than ever before to protect this Nation against its enemies, foreign and domestic, and to make sure that, come what may, we will ever be prepared to defend our American freedom against aggression and infiltration.

"America serves no selfish aims. It seeks no territorial aggrandizement. It desires no dictation over the lives and affairs of other peoples. Our great aim is to preserve our American way of life, our precious liberties for the benefit of ourselves and our posterity, and to help preserve freedom in the world.

"We cherish peace and are pledged to strive for peace provided it is based upon justice. We recognize that no real lasting peace can ever be based upon the surrender of any part of our American birthright or the appeasement of the deadly enemies trying to destroy us.

"Above all, let us have no fear about the future, because under God this Nation will, as in the past, rise up with unity and loyalty to protect its basic way of life against all those who threaten it. Confident in our high purpose and in the righteousness of our ideals, mindful of our blessed heritage and the great debt we owe to those we so proudly honor today, let us courageously grapple with current-day problems. If we serve with the same zeal that inspired them, there can be no doubt that we will preserve our glorious destiny and we will succeed in securing just peace and freedom in the world."

The Inquirer at 125 Years

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 1, 1954

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, this is the 125th anniversary of the erection of one of the great institutions in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. During these perilous times, when all of our freedoms are under attack, the mere existence of a medium of enlightened thought and expression offers a guaranty that those things we cherish most are being protected. I join with other thousands of people in the United States in wishing the Philadelphia Inquirer and its progressive editor, Walter Annenberg, a happy birthday.

A statement by Walter H. Annenberg, editor and publisher of the Inquirer, follows:

THE INQUIRER AT 125 YEARS

On Tuesday, June 1, 1954, the Inquirer marks the 125th year of its eventful career.

We stand at this milestone proud of our historic past, but we are not content to rest on this alone. We stand vigorous and mature—a maturity which expresses itself by being involved and related with the total scene in which we live.

For the Inquirer is not an isolated enterprise, separate and apart from the life around it. It is, in fact, an organ of communication through which all other interests in our community, our country, and, in the larger view, the world, can be more closely related to each other and thus achieve a more meaningful present.

The story of the Inquirer has been told too often to require extensive repetition here—its birth in Bank Alley in 1829; its early struggles for survival; its reportorial accomplishments in the Mexican and Civil Wars; its advocacy of Abraham Lincoln for President; its growth under the control of Jesper Harding and his son, William W. Harding; its progress under the leadership of James Elverson and, later, his son, Col. James Elverson, Jr.; and its great expansion under my father, M. L. Annenberg (1936-42) and the present ownership.

Throughout its history this newspaper has endeavored to be a helpful and dependable factor in the lives of the people it has served.

It has built up a reputation for integrity in its news columns, force and constructive effort on its editorial page, sparkle and originality in its color and other feature sections.

It has sponsored innumerable campaigns for the political, social, and economic betterment of the residents of this area and has resolutely carried them through to concrete results.

It has fought for justice and a fuller and more prosperous life with fairness, not favoritism, as its standard.

The reward of this policy of honesty, forthrightness, and awareness of the needs of the people has been acceptance on the part of its readers, a widespread circulation and a large advertising content.

The Inquirer, however, does not propose to sit back in satisfied contemplation of past successes. A newspaper is a living entity and, like an individual or a nation, must look forward.

We live in a time of great changes at home and abroad, a time of crisis, of danger. This newspaper pledges its continuing help in the strengthening of our own democracy as a guide and hope for other nations, free or slave; to the upbuilding of defensive arms for America's protection against aggression, and to an unceasing crusade for the kind of peaceful and stable world in which all peoples may find true security.

But a newspaper, like a social-minded individual, must continue to be aware of its basic responsibility to its immediate community. Our age is witnessing a resurgence of industrial and cultural life throughout the Delaware Valley. The city of Benjamin Franklin—the Shrine of Independence—which saw the birth of the Nation, is now experiencing an economic rebirth, promising added well-being to millions of Americans.

When the Inquirer coined the phrase, "Delaware Valley, U. S. A.," it undertook an obligation to see that the dream of Delaware Valley, United States of America, would be realized.

In this spirit the Inquirer looks to the future with faith in the high destiny of the United States; the revitalization of this city of homes and the development of Delaware Valley, United States of America, not only in material prosperity and opportunity for workers, but as an example to the Nation of a community where brotherly love and spiritual values find day-to-day expression.

So it is with a sense of dignity and responsibility we stand at this century-and-a-quarter mark resolved, obligated and dedicated to go on working, with all our strength and resources, for the attainment of the lofty goals toward which our beloved country and our historic city strive.

Postal Pay Increases

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN LESINSKI, JR.
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 1, 1954

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, it seems that not only I, as a Member of Congress representing the 16th Congressional District of Michigan, supports a decent salary increase for postal employees, but likewise the Council of the City of Dearborn has also gone on record.

The following is the resolution adopted by the council which also recognizes the fact that our Postal Department is deteriorating rapidly and that the salary question in this area is acute:

From the Detroit Area Postal Organizations Council, box 44, Detroit 31, requesting support in its effort to secure an increase in wages for post office employees.

By Councilman Vezzosi supported by Councilman Broomhall.

"Whereas post office employees have not had a raise in wages in the last 3 years; and

"Whereas such a failure on the part of our national Government has produced conditions which could result in the deterioration of postal service; and

"Whereas the council desires that a situation conducive to maximum efficiency prevail:

"*Resolved*, That Congress, prior to its adjournment for the summer, be and it is hereby respectfully requested to grant the postal workers a living wage through enactment of appropriate legislation;

Resolved further, That the city clerk be and he is hereby directed to transmit a true copy of this resolution to Senators HOMER FERGUSON and CHARLES POTTER and Congressman JOHN LESINSKI."

The resolution was unanimously adopted.

Junior Union and League of Rumanian Societies of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1954

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an address I made to the Junior Union and League of Rumanian Societies of America at their 13 annual Junior Union convention at St. Mary's Rumanian Orthodox Church Hall, Cleveland, Ohio, May 30:

> It is a real pleasure for me to have the opportunity to meet with you and to be able to say a few words before your 13th annual junior convention now being held in Cleveland. It has been my privilege to know about the Rumanian nation and the Rumanian people for a great many years. Long before I even entertained the idea of running for Congress, I knew a great deal about the Rumanian cause. My father, lately deceased, prided himself on his knowledge of, and understanding of, the rich culture and traditions of the Rumanian people, and I am proud to say that he made certain that I acquired a goodly part of his warm understanding and appreciation of your cause. With that background, you will perhaps better understand my keen interest in your affairs and my desire to do everything I possibly can to assist you in furthering the objectives of the Junior Union and League of Rumanian Societies of America.
>
> The world of our day is confronted with the greatest threat in history to the survival of western civilization. This threat is posed by the international Communist conspiracy nurtured in, headquartered in, and directed from Moscow. There is no doubt that the primary and overriding objective of the international Communist conspiracy is to enslave all the nations and peoples of the world and to make them abject slaves of Moscow. While this is the primary and overriding objective, the means by which the conspirators seek to attain that objective are many, devious, and, indeed, diabolical.
>
> For the international Communist conspiracy to win control of the world, it must first stamp out the leadership elements of all those positive forces which oppose it. The madmen of the Kremlin recognize this fact and are busily engaged in destroying all the leadership elements of the opposition forces everywhere in the world. The nations taken captive by the Moscovites following World War II know very well the means by which the madmen of the Kremlin are trying to develop a robot man who will be devoid of all the sentiments, moral norms, inspirations, and disciplines which form the very foundation of our western civilization.
>
> Let us take the case of Rumania—one of the once-free nations now held captive by Moscow. Just what are the agents of the Kremlin doing in Rumania today? They are doing many evil and destructive things, but in my opinion here are the things they are trying to do in order to destroy the very concept of a Rumanian nation.
>
> To begin with, the ruling clique in Rumania today are no more Rumanian than Dictator Malenkov. They have no appreciation of or respect for the Rumanian people and the glorious part those people have played in the building of the civilization which you and I so cherish today. They are stooges of the madmen of the Kremlin. They do not respect the will of the Rumanian people.
>
> Secondly, these stooges of the Kremlin are carrying out programs calculated to destroy the very religious and cultural foundations of the Rumanian nation. In doing this, they penetrate and control all things related to scholastics, artistry, science, social and cultural education. In doing this they seek to stamp out all those great values the Rumanian people have built up over the course of centuries. They have failed in this evil work but the effort continues.
>
> Thirdly, the stooges of the Kremlin are trying to replace everything that is Rumanian with the up-side-down doctrine and philosophy of Russian communism. This atheistic doctrine teaches that there is no God, that there is no moral law, that brotherly love is only for the weak and the misguided, and that the only values in life are those which relate to material things. Underlying all this evil propaganda, however, is the requirement that the Rumanian people look to a new type of deity, who sits upon a blood-bathed throne in Moscow.
>
> There are many other things the Communist stooges in Rumania are doing and trying to do, but these things I have cited, I believe are particularly pertinent to the purposes and objectives which you have been considering during your convention in Cleveland. You have set as your task the noble undertaking of keeping alive all those things which distinguish the Rumanian people down through history as well as in the contemporary world in which we live. These are the things that every man, regardless of his national origin or heritage, takes a natural pride in. These are the things that form the foundation of real patriotism—the kind of patriotism which springs from love of God and love of country. In my judgment, you are engaged in a task which is essential to the survival of our civilization.
>
> I firmly believe that your efforts will reap a great reward and will bring everlasting benefit not only to the United States of America, but to the suffering people in Rumania. The day will surely come, just as certain as day follows night, when the despots of the Kremlin will be turned back and there will follow a great resurgence of all those historic values upon which nationhood is predicated. When that day comes, you must be well prepared as good loyal Americans, to do your full part in a world in which all nations will enjoy the right of national sovereignty within the framework of a world organization dedicated to peace and prosperity for all. I wish you every success in your deliberations and assure you again of my desire to do everything I possibly can to assist you in the very important work in which you are engaged.

Loans or Grants

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. VORYS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1954

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to place in the RECORD a statement I filed today in the foreign-operations hearings in the House Committee on Foreign Affairs.

We are about to close our hearings. I had hoped that FOA or some other executive agency would support the President's announced policy on loans rather than grants for economic aid. Since this has not been done, I wish to do so.

This problem was given careful consideration by the Randall Commission, of which I had the privilege of being a member. The report of the Commission to the President and to the Congress included the following recommendations:

The Commission recommends that economic aid on a grant basis should be terminated as soon as possible.

In cases where our security is importantly involved, the Commission believes that moderate grants-in-aid may serve the national interest of the United States.

The Commission recommends further that where support is needed to maintain military forces to conduct military operations connected with our own security beyond the economic capacity of a country to sustain grants should be made, not loans. In other cases where substantial economic aid is necessary in the interest of the United States but cannot be obtained from private or international sources loans should be made, not grants.

The President endorsed these recommendations of the Randall Commission in his message to the Congress on foreign economic policy of the United States on March 30 of this year. The words of the President are as follows:

> I subscribe, therefore, to the principle that economic aid on a grant basis should be terminated as soon as possible, consistent with our national interest. In cases where support is needed to establish and equip military forces of other governments in the interest of our mutual defense, and where this is beyond the economic capacity of another country, our aid should be in the form of grants. As recognized by the Commission, there may be some cases in which modest amounts of grant aid to underdeveloped countries will importantly serve the interest of security. I further agree that in other situations where the interest of the United States requires that dollars not otherwise available to a country should be provided, such support to the maximum extent appropriate should be in the form of loans rather than grants.

This statement of policy which seems to be clear and simple apparently has been ignored by the various officials who have presented the fiscal year 1955 foreign operations program to us.

The working draft bill does not contain any provisions implementing the policy stated by the President which I have just read. The draft bill authorizes the provision of aid on either a grant basis or a loan basis as has been the case in previous years, but no directives whatever that loans should be made under any defined conditions. The matter is left entirely to the discretion of the administrator of the program. Experience has shown us that when a country can have a grant or a loan, it always chooses a grant, and when a foreign aid administrator has both grant and loan authority, he always chooses grants. The witnesses tell us that none of the projects they wish to underwrite are sound enough for bankable loans but are sound enough for American grants. I question such judgment. In this country our Government has loaned billions of dollars to citizens on projects that were sound but not bankable, and the loans have been repaid. During the depression thousands of homes, farms, and businesses were saved in this way.

The opponents of loans for foreign aid include some strange bedfellows. Those who oppose all aid and those who want nothing but gifts join in saying that aid loans are substantially gifts anyway, and cause bad feelings. Experience shows that both groups are wrong in these arguments.

This committee, through provisions or amendments I have offered, has required a whole series of loans in aid bills. All of them were opposed by the executive branch. None of the loans were ever turned down by the other countries involved. None of these loans have been defaulted. None of them have caused hard feelings. Here is the record:

Loans required under ECA, MSA, and India wheat loan

Original ECA Act (Public Law 472, 80th Cong.)	$1,000,000,000
India Emergency Food Act of 1951 (Public Law 48, 82d Cong.)	190,000,000
Mutual Security Act of 1951 (Public Law 165, 82d Cong.) (10 percent of ECA assistance)	335,547,000
Total	1,525,547,000

Collections on these loans as of December 31, 1953

Principal, European ECA	$167,000
Interest, European ECA	42,755,000
Interest, Indian wheat	7,027,000
Total	49,949,000

As a matter of fact, since World War II, the United States has extended to foreign nations credits of $11,504,000,000. During this same postwar period the United States has collected from foreign nations $2,667,844,000 as repayment of principal and $1,059,375,000 in interest, a total of $3,727,219,000.

When former President Herbert Hoover appeared before our committee in 1947 he urged that we should never make outright gifts of our aid, but should always require an obligation from the receiver. He first suggested the counterpart device, which I put in on the House floor in 1947 over administration opposition, and which has been extremely useful ever since. As to loans, he pointed out that even though they might not be bankable loans, there were two great phychological differences between loans and grants: First, a person asking for a loan tries to make his proposition as good as possible, but someone asking for a grant tries to make his condition look as bad as possible, so he will not be asked to repay; second, a person asking for a loan knows that he might have to repay it and, therefore, asks for as little as possible, whereas someone asking for a grant asks for as much as possible.

In any case, we have found since World War II that loans do not make enemies, and grants do not necessarily make friends.

A loan with "the silly dollar sign" is the capitalistic way to express a collective obligation. A nation such as ours, with constantly diminishing natural resources, should make loans, not gifts, from these resources wherever this is possible. We do not need to be repaid next year, or the year after. We can wait for a number of years, when we will be importing an increasing amount of scarce materials. We can defer payment on our loans, if necessary, to make other loans more "bankable," as many individuals and companies did here in our country during the depression—and were finally repaid. But a nation with 6 percent of the world's resources, half the production, and double the debt of the rest of the world, should be making more loans, and fewer gifts.

I have made a rough estimate that at least $127 millions of the illustrative projects presented in the authorization requests are for capital items, such as railway equipment, power dams, irrigation systems, and so forth, that could be self-liquidating projects for bankable loans. In the present state of our budget, most of the amount authorized will be financed by adding to our national debt. Some of it could go into the national debt of other countries.

I suggest we bear the President's message in mind as we mark up this bill.

Much Ado About Nothing?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1954

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, Bill Shakespeare had a phrase to cover most everything, and now that the McCarthy-Army hearings have reached another impasse, the title of his comedy "Much Ado About Nothing," seems to be growing more and more appropriate. The Nation has discovered after weeks of testimony, cross-examination, crimination, and recrimination that the Army did not like to have its domain invaded by Congressmen, Senators, or anybody else, and that Senator McCarthy and his staff tried to get Pvt. David Schine an easy job in the Army. If either of these revelations is of earth-shaking consequence, it has cost the Nation a good deal of time, energy, and wasted money to discover them. As a matter of fact, both of these tremendous trifles were certainly well known long before the cameras were focused on the caucus room.

Meanwhile, Mr. Malenkov, Mr. Chou en-lai, et al. have been pursuing their mad way all through southeast Asia. They are enjoying the spectacle hugely, and it is a three-ring circus without the clowns. While we are fiddling with the dials, they are strengthening their resources. Is it too much to ask when we are getting back to work?

Our Supreme Court

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1954

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, in the following editorial from the Gary (Ind.) Post-Tribune, attention is called to the fact that more extended debate and discussion should be given the proposed constitutional amendment fixing the size of the Supreme Court at 9 members and requiring all Federal judges to retire at the age of 65.

The editorial reveals the fact that our State legislatures should have more basic information pro and con as to the merits and demerits of this proposed constitutional amendment:

Don't Be Hasty

After a minimum of debate, the Senate has passed a proposed constitutional amendment fixing the size of the Supreme Court at 9 members and requiring all Federal judges to retire at age 65.

The proposal should get more thorough consideration in the House. Action by the States, if the proposal is submitted to them, will be guided considerably by what has been said about it in Congress. There ought to be more than perfunctory debate on any amendment affecting the Nation's Federal judiciary.

The Supreme Court now is made up of nine members, by act of Congress. Perhaps nine is the magic number and never ought to be changed. But it is possible that, with the work of the Court steadily increasing, there will be a need in the future for more judges. A constitutional limitation might be a severe handicap.

There were only 6 judges on the first Court in 1789, and 7 from 1807 to 1837. The number has been 9 since then, except for the period 1866–72 when there were 7.

The reason for fixing the number in the Constitution would be to prevent any President from packing the Court as Franklin D. Roosevelt attempted to do. That attempt was rejected, and it is reasonable to believe any such attempt in the future would be turned back.

As for the mandatory retirement provision, not many United States judges now remain on the bench after they are 75. But some have, and particularly in the Supreme Court some have served with great distinction after they reached that age. Is an age limitation essential?

The Senate gave no thorough consideration to the proposed amendment. The Judiciary Committee heard only 10 witnesses, all favorable and none in opposition, and approved the measure after a day's discussion. When it was considered on the Senate floor, only 9 Senators were present at one point, and there were only 2 principal speeches in discussion of it.

Perhaps we should fix the size of the Court in the Constitution. Maybe judges should retire automatically at 75. But the decision should not be made in offhand fashion. If we can take several months to ponder the Bricker amendment, we can find a little more time to consider this proposal. The House should provide the forum.

Seventy-fifth Memorial Day Observance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. STERLING COLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1954

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by me at the Memorial Day ceremonies at the Soldiers' Home at Bath, N. Y., on May 31, 1954:

Manager Hanley, Commander Aulls, veterans, friends, and neighbors, after 20 years of public service as Member of the House of Representatives from this congressional district and as a resident of this community for the greater part of my life, I consider it a mark of distinction to be invited as the speaker on this occasion which carries such added significance. My acceptance of the invitation, made quite some time ago and at a time when unforeseen circumstances and my congressional responsibilities cast some doubt upon my schedule, nevertheless was made without hesitation for I welcome the opportunity on any occasion to return to the land of my fathers, to the scenes of my childhood, to the meadows and hills of the Conhocton Valley and to the friends and neighbors and loved ones—especially on this of all days in the year, Memorial Day when it's lilac time in old Steuben.

Ordinarily a gathering such as this would have been a reverent observance of the customary Memorial Day when we pay tribute to the memory of our Nation's heroes and the defenders of our Nation's honor. Today, however, our meeting has an added significance; the commemoration of the 75th anniversary of the establishment of this reservation as a home, a haven, and a hospital for the "boys in blue" whose service on the field of battle preserved our glorious Union and struck the shackles of slavery from the limbs of the Negro. Inspired and financed by the grateful residents of New York State, it was opened for use by those veterans in December 1878, but a few years after termination of that lamentable conflict and 9 years after Gen. John A. Logan, Commander of the Grand Army of the Republic and one of its greatest heroes, designated May 30 as Decoration Day.

In some respects Memorial Day means much more to us than the Fourth of July, Thanksgiving, or the birthdays of great men of the past whom we honor from time to time. It commemorates and reconsecrates in our hearts the sacrifices of our grandfathers and our great-grandfathers who fought through 4 long, bloody years of civil conflict. They died that our country as a united Nation of freemen might endure. But Memorial Day is also a day of homage to the more than 500,000 other Americans—men and women of all religions, all racial origins, all colors, and all creeds—who have made the supreme sacrifice by surrender of their lives on the battlements of liberty in order that their fellow men all over the world might live in peace and freedom. The sun never sets on the white crosses that mark their graves scattered over the 5 continents—the islands and the 7 seas of the world. To me, Memorial Day is also one of reverent respectfulness and honor to the memory of those whom each of us may hold dear.

Across the length and breadth of our land—Alaska, Puerto Rico, Hawaii, the Virgin Islands, and wherever the Stars and Stripes greet the morning sun—Americans are gathered just as we have today, not in a spirit of glorification of the victory of the North over the Scuth, nor of rejoicing over the pyrrhic victories of World War I and World War II, but rather to lay a symbolic rose on the collective grave of more than a million brave men and women who have died in all of our wars since 1861, of whom nearly half were the boys who wore the blue and the gray; and, in placing that rose, to collectively rededicate ourselves, reconsecrate our hearts and requicken our minds to the solemn purpose for which they died. Irrespective of the color of the uniform they wore, the Yankess or the men of Dixie, they fought for principles in which they believed, rightly or wrongly. Whether it was Bull Run or Antietam, Gettysburg or Atlanta, the blood they gave welded the unbreakable bond that now binds together the 48 States of our Union—insoluble, inseparable, invincible. Their sons and grandsons in even greater numbers gave their lives for a much broader cause—that the peoples of all countries over the entire world might have an opportunity to live out their lives in peace and freedom.

Here the mantle of green that surrounds us today provides a lovely blanket for the resting place of over 6,000 veterans of all America's wars. Would that it were within my poor power to pay a tribute fitting to their memory. As that great champion of liberty, love, tolerance, understanding, and human dignity said on that memorable occasion at Gettysburg—if I may be permitted to modernize by paraphrase Abraham Lincoln's noble and unforgettable words—"It is rather for us, the living, to be dedicated to the unfinished work which they so nobly advanced * * * that we highly resolve that they shall not have died in vain * * * that this Nation, and other nations of the world shall have a new birth of freedom * * * and that governments of the people, by the people, and for the people, shall not perish from this earth."

Have we kept faith with those who died in '61–'65? Is our country united? Is there. no religious bigotry, no racial animosity, no social or economic jealousy and hatred? Are we a nation worthy of their heritage?

Further, are we doing our best to justify the sacrifices of the half million who died in World Wars I and II? Are we making not only their native land but the entire world a better place in which to live?

As I stand here this afternoon I wonder what my predecessor of three-quarters of a century ago said when he talked, perhaps from this very spot, to a group gathered at the first Memorial Day service in this institution. Basically, I presume his thoughts were similar to mine and that his audience shared the aspirations and the fears that you do. He was speaking a little more than a decade after the most tragic and bloody Civil War. Our country was intent on healing its wounds; trying to forget its animosities; eager to repair the devastation that 4 years of conflict and 6 years of misdirected reconstruction had caused. My predecessor, I am sure, in those troubled times counseled against emotional excesses; against feelings of revenge, against intolerance, racial, and regional hatreds, and religious bigotry.

Today, only a little less than a decade after our country has emerged from the most cataclysmic of all wars of all history, I think I can do no better than to emphasize that same theme. Racial discrimination, sectional animosities, and religious intolerance have no place in our country, in our State, in our community, or in this very institution. To permit them or any part of any of them is to undermine and destroy the structure which our forefathers and our Nation's heroes have so nobly built.

To the extent that we, any of us, collectively or individually, whether we hold positions of importance and power, or positions of lesser authority, whether in our homes, our communities, institutions such as this, our factories, or any other place where human beings gather, to the extent that we allow sectarian prejudices, racial bias, or provincial preferences to enter into our attitude toward another person or persons, to the same extent are we guilty of failure to our Nation's heroic dead whose lives have been sacrificed in order that the great principle that all men are created free and equal in the eyes of a universal God might endure. Those are fundamental principles in human relationships whether we live in the horse-and-buggy days, the jet-airplane days, or those of the atomic and hydrogen bomb. They are eternal and fundamental.

As we look about our world today I am sure you see with me a striking resemblance and similarly of conditions and cleavages, jealousies, and hatreds, a variety of contesting and competing isms and geographic disunities to those conditions and cleavages and competing animosities that pervaded our country in 1861. At that time the country was torn apart on the twin issues of slavery and disunion. The sage of Springfield had warned that a house divided against itself could not stand.

Today the world is similarly divided into two camps, both of which are becoming armed with increasing rapidity and terrifying destructiveness. Half of Europe and most of Asia has either fallen under the vicious and insidious spell of communism or is dominated politically and militarily by Communist Soviet Russia. The Kremlin today exercises some measure of control over a fifth of the world's land surface, and influences, controls, or exploits nearly a billion people who live behind an Iron Curtain which effectively isolates them from intercourse with free nations. The victims of Sovietism are told that non-Communist countries are militaristic, imperialistic, and predatory; that capitalism is weak and decadent; that workers in those countries are barbaric and economic slaves. Our country is denounced as a warmonger, as imperialistic, and ready to drop the hydrogen bomb on innocent women and children.

Day after day, Soviet propaganda poisons the air of Europe and Asia—even some areas of the Western Hemisphere, notably Central and South America—with vicious, contemptuous lies concerning us. Vicious Vishinsky and company re-echo these propaganda falsehoods from the platforms of the United Nations and in the press of the world. Malenkov, Molotov, and Malek, the 3 musketeers of mystery, malice, and malevolence mouth their honeyed words of peace, freedom, and equality while their hands reach out to sweep within their cavernous maw further millions of innocent victims.

What reason do we have to believe—other than our faith in the power of prayer—that a world divided against itself can successfully stand unshaken or for any greater length of time than a house or a nation so divided? Not for a moment would I minimize the power of prayer nor the consecrated purpose of all of our public officials to avoid an outbreak of open warfare which inevitably can bring nothing but death, destruction, and doom to all belligerents. Yet with all our consecrated purposes and in addition to all our impassioned prayers we must nevertheless—with full realization that we are dealing with a band of evil people who are not so consecrated nor so devout—expend our energies, our resources, our manpower, and our talents in a concentrated effort to build our military strength to match any possible development and to maintain that strength unabated so long as the need continues.

Were it not for our possession of the atomic bomb and the hydrogen bomb and our determination to use them if necessary, there is no doubt that the Soviets would have long since over-run Europe or at least overthrown democratic governments and established Red puppet dictatorships in Western Germany, Greece, Finland, Italy, Austria, and perhaps even France. With the largest standing Army in the world—well armed, well equipped, and well disciplined—nothing could stop them from taking Europe tomorrow except our possession of those terrible weapons. Undoubtedly our present lead in atomic armaments and our determination to use them in defense of free people and in retaliation against unprovoked aggression or a threat to our own liberties is the only real deterrent at this moment to a third world war.

Where does this lead us? Obviously the answer does not lie in bigger and bigger bombs, in colder or hotter propaganda, in sharper epithets or continued false accusations.

No one person or group of persons has the answer to this imponderable question—certainly I do not. I doubt if any of you have. But collectively we can provide the answer for most certainly there is one. Perhaps as we endeavor to pierce the curtain of the future our vision can be extended by our knowledge of the past. Perhaps by the counsel of that outstanding leader of our Nation's history who as a tower of strength and vision rose above the strife and stress of conflict of his time like some tall cliff that midway leaves the storm—Abraham Lincoln—perhaps through his wise counsel we can find some marks to guide us along our rough and uncertain path to the future. "With malice toward none; with charity for all; with firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right. * * *

"What constitutes the bulwark of our own liberty and independence? It is not our frowning battlements, or bristling seacoasts, our army and navy. These are not our reliance against tyranny. All of those may be turned against us without making us weaker for the struggle. Our reliance is in the love of liberty which God has planted in us. Our defense is in the spirit which prized liberty as the heritage of all men, in all lands everywhere. Destroy this spirit and you have planted the seeds of despotism at your own doors. * * *

"As a nation of freemen, we must live through all time or die by suicide. * * *

"Fondly do we hope, fervently do we pray, that this mighty scourge of war may speedily pass away."

It is for us the living to be dedicated to the unfinished work which our heroes have no nobly advanced; that we highly resolve that they shall not have died in vain; that this Nation and other nations of the world shall have a new birth of freedom and that governments of the people, by the people, and for the people, wherever they may be located, whatever their race or religion, shall not perish from this earth.

Let us, the living, solemnly vow to keep faith with our immortal heroes.

The Americans: A British Appraisal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. T. MILLET HAND

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1954

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, a favorite European sport is to criticize the supergenerous policy of America. The more we do, the less credit we get. The higher our motives, the more likely we will be accused of selfishness.

A refreshing contrast is provided in a recent article in the Manchester Guardian reprinted in the Washington Post and Times Herald on May 13, 1954. They rightly point out that Americans and the American Congress are getting a little tired of the prevailing attitude, and I believe the article is worthy of the attention of our membership. The article follows:

There is a story of the American Senator who had been dozing before a rollcall vote, and when his name was called he stood up and shouted in a clear voice, "Not guilty." Perhaps some of the Senators have a good deal on their consciences: they certainly should have. But may they (and their constituents) not have legitimate ground for feeling that all America's hard work in the interest of the outside world earns her little or no appreciation?

May they not ask themselves whether it is really worth trying to help foreigners thousands of miles away when all they get in return is a hearty kicking? One wonders—especially when one sees figures such as the News Chronicle provided in last week's Gallup poll. They show that 40 percent of the people answering in Britain disapproved of the role now being played by the United States in world affairs, 37 percent approved, and 23 percent were uncertain. * * *

If one thinks in broad terms of the role played by the United States in world affairs since the war three things stand out.

First, the United States has done more than any other country to guarantee peace in the world. Secondly, America remains the foremost country in the world, whose ideal, in the words of its own Constitution, is to "promote the general welfare and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity." Thirdly, the United States has done more than any country in the world to help others and secure their health, prosperity, and welfare.

Proof of the first point lies in American help which saved Greece from falling to rebellion, in the swift reaction to the Berlin blockade and the saving of that city from being strangled by Communist pressure, in the guaranty given through the North Atlantic Treaty to Western Europe and the backing of that guaranty with the troops and aircraft now stationed in Europe, and in the American resistance to aggression in Korea.

The list is dull through familiarity. But is it not sometimes forgotten? And do we not sometimes too easily assume that because the United States did these things she was bound to do them anyway? The assumption is false. It would have been easy for all the Kennicotts to retire to their gopher prairies, as they did after the First World War, and there forget about all the torments and troubles in the distant continents of Europe and Asia. Or it would have been easy for America to take the MacArthur line, and "go it alone." But she did neither of these things. She has sought conscientiously—if at times rather impatiently—to do her duty in the world and to stand by her friends and allies.

If they forget it they will do so at their own peril. There is a real risk that the apathy, ingratitude, and unthinking criticism of other countries will turn Americans inwards again upon themselves. They are disillusioned because so often the presence of American troops in Germany and France and other foreign places is treated as if it were solely a policy of American self-interest.

They are disillusioned because the Americans in Korea were left to fight almost the whole war on behalf of the United Nations, unsupported by other members. (It will be hard for any American administration again to intervene on behalf of others, as President Eisenhower has discovered over Indochina.)

They are disillusioned because the world seems to think that the Marshall plan and point 4 were merely designed to give America control of new markets. (As a result there is strong resistance now to any further programs of foreign aid, however urgent the need.) They are disillusioned because they set out after the war to help the world to its feet, and yet nobody seems to like them.

One day they may take the critics at their word and go home, back to America and back to isolation. That would be a catastrophic day for western Europe and many other places where liberty still matters. Let us hope it does not come; and let us be careful not to hasten its arrival. There are many valid grounds for criticizing American policy and American methods. There are valid grounds, too, for alarm over the apparent tarnishing of America's own ideals. But the broad soundness, honesty of purpose, and worth of the role America has been playing in world affairs ought not to be in doubt.

Editorial Comment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JEFFREY P. HILLELSON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1954

Mr. HILLELSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wednesday, May 19, 1954, edition of the Kansas City Star, Kansas City, Mo.:

HUGE PROBLEM FOR SCHOOLS

The continuing high level birthrate in the United States poses a staggering problem for the Nation's schools. As Chancellor Franklin D. Murphy of the University of Kansas has pointed out, most citizens have not yet waked up to its full import.

Americans react with both pride and shock when they realize that the annual birthrate of 24.6 per 1,000 persons is almost as high as India's. It is a sign of national health and strength. More babies mean future producers and consumers in a sound, expanding economy.

That growth also will be reflected in the school systems that are ill-prepared to receive it. Within 6 years elementary schools will have an increase of 3 million pupils in enrollments, the high schools 2½ million. Those are reasonably precise figures. The babies are here. They are entitled to receive the best education the Nation can provide.

All this will put States, cities, school districts, and the citizens to a supreme test to meet it adequately. It will take real planning and organization to supply the billions of dollars of additional buildings and tens of thousands of additional teachers.

Somehow the building problem will be met. The real crisis will come in teacher supply. Too few students are taking up teaching as a profession and too many are leaving. The accumulated deficit soon will be critical.

The National Education Association reports a 6.45-percent reduction in teachers graduating from college this year over last year. The number should be increasing and rapidly. The increase can be achieved only by making the profession more attractive. Among the needs are better teacher salaries and benefits. The situation also requires concerted action by groups and public bodies to encourage more students to adopt a career of public service.

If a strong effort isn't made soon, the Nation will be in a real crisis.

People Do Read the Congressional Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY W. WIER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1954

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

BOISE, IDAHO, *May 26, 1954.*

Hon. ROY W. WIER,
United States House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE WIER: I am just an average engineering transitman. Just a typical tropical tramp transitman with legal residence now in Oregon.

Since freshman year in college, I have developed into an eccentric bird who enjoys reading the United States CONGRESSIONAL RECORD from cover to cover.

Although I am not one of your constituents, I believe every Member of Congress represents my interests. I wish to extend to you my deepest gratitude for inserting the following article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD: "The Superpatriot: A Menace to American Freedom," by Dr. Charles W. Mayo.

My work in Europe between 1927 and 1938 gave me a grandstand seat to observe how Hitler gained power through the subtle changes of basic German law. As I recall several speeches I heard Hitler make, I sort of got uneasy today. Could it happen here.

When I recall that I was an American engineer in the Soviet as a consultant in the early 1920's, just after leaving school, I have a strong urge to live in the first badger hole out here in the Idaho sagebrush. For, after all, I am just a wee little fellow and not a Dr. Oppenheimer.

However, like Opie, I belonged to the Last Generation. In the early twenties about half or more of us college students read Karl Marx, then swallowed live gold fish to get the taste out of our mouths. I soon returned to my old favorite—Justice John Marshall.

But the gentleman I would like to meet and treat to a 2-inch thick lap steak—a lap steak is one that laps 6 inches over each end of a 14-inch platter—is Editor L. A. Rossman, of Grand Rapids Herald-Review.

To me his editorial A Plan for Poverty, ranks along with What's the Matter with Kansas.

A lot of so-called inefficient American farm boys went down fighting and they took a hell of a lot of efficient enemies down with them.

A British big efficient brass told an American officer that we lost 5,000 in the battle of Chatteau Thierry because we Americans were inefficient and without discipline. This British brass said with efficient troops the loss would have been less than 500. My farmer dad was one of those 5,000 inefficient soldiers. He sort of volunteered for service, even though he thought George Washington knew what he was talking about when he warned "Beware of foreign alliances."

These two articles inserted in the RECORD by you, allow me to reshoot a Polaris and obtain a true bearing again in this sea of confusion.

Therefore, I reckon as long as we have a few old-fashioned Americans in Congress and editorializing like Mr. L. A. Rossman, I will keep throwing tangents and angles and stay out of badger holes for a while at least.

God bless you.

JAMES H. HOWARD.

The Workmen's Circle Hails Supreme Court Decision Against Segregation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ISIDORE DOLLINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1954

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Speaker, the Workmen's Circle, which recently met in convention at Atlantic City, issued an inspiring statement in which it hailed the Supreme Court decision against segregation in public education as a mortal blow to the enemies of democracy.

I am including the statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that all Members of Congress may have the opportunity to read it:

MAY 18, 1954.

The Workmen's Circle hails the Supreme Court decision against segregation in public education as a mortal blow to the enemies of democracy: racial intolerance and its twin, Communist intrigue. Both have been nourishing upon the indecision of the courts to rule in the past. From now on, Communist propagandists will not be able, whether at home or abroad, to build their hopes on the discriminatory practices of some States in the field of public education. Neither will racial bigots find solace in the decision. It is obvious from the ruling that the moral defenses of the United States have been strengthened; that our prestige abroad will rise; that our friends and allies who have voiced disappointment with us with regard to certain discriminatory practices in the United States will find that Americans who are dedicated to saving the free world from totalitarian encroachments abroad are also concerned with combating with positive force totalitarian concepts at home.

As we of the Workmen's Circle, now in our 54th year of existence, gather in convention, news of the decision reached us. We have, through the years, both through our branches and through the Jewish Labor Committee, labored to achieve the kind of decision as was rendered by the United States Supreme Court.

There is still a long road to brotherhood ahead. The decision of the Supreme Court will serve not only as an inspiration to forge ahead but be, as it should for all who cherish democracy and freedom, a beacon of hope and a source of encouragement.

A War To Stay Out Of

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1954

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of May 30, 1954:

A WAR TO STAY OUT OF—II

On May 5—nearly 4 weeks ago—the Post-Dispatch printed an editorial on the international situation with particular reference to Indochina. The plight of the French in their jungle colony was already critical, although Dien Bien Phu had not then fallen. We called the editorial A War To Stay Out Of.

The passage of time has only reinforced our opinion. The war in Indochina is still largely a colonial civil war, although it has been heavily infiltrated by the Communists. The war continues to be a war to stay out of.

Yet the danger of involvement not only continues; in one sense, at least, it grows the greater as the military situation deteriorates and white civilians in Hanoi are threatened with possible brutalities. What the next several weeks may bring cannot be anticipated. The American people need to prepare themselves for almost any possible development.

The first clue appears likely at Geneva. At any rate, that is where the possibilities of a cease-fire are now being reviewed. The Communists have their ideas and the French have theirs. Whether a meeting of the minds can be arranged only time will tell.

Meanwhile Communist Viet Minh military forces are proceeding with their troop movements designed to crush the French Vietnam defense of the vital Red River Delta—the immediate rebel objective after the fall of Dien Bien Phu. From Paris comes the news that France has ordered 80,000 draftees called to the tricolor 5 months early in order to replace at home regular troops which are to be sent to Indochina.

If there is a meeting of the East and West minds at Geneva and an honorable agreement is reached—one which provides for a a cease-fire on terms that represent a give and take—then that will be all to the good. The hostilities can be ended and the truce can be internationally supervised much as the peace in Korea is being supervised.

If a fair peace can be arranged then the following best step is to establish a means for keeping the peace in southeast Asia. Any alliance for that purpose ought to be primarily Asian, but it will need to include the United States. Emphatically it should have U. N. endorsement. The participation of India will be essential if the alliance is to have fullest respect in Asia.

Such an alliance would have as its chief purpose the guaranteeing of the peace. It would function in the Southeast Pacific much as NATO functions in the North Atlantic section of the world. It would serve as notice to the Communists that any naked aggression would be resisted by united action with force of arms, just as the attack across the 38th parallel was resisted in Korea by the U. N. members, including the United States and, let us not forget, with the approval of India and the Philippines.

If a fair peace cannot be worked out at Geneva then presumably the Indochinese war will go on to its military termination. So long as it continues where it is and on its present basis, there is no question, in our opinion, that it remains a war to stay out of. The United States must be eternally vigilant that it is not drawn into an Asiatic war which would drain off our resources and thus most seriously endanger our capacity to fulfill our tremendous obligations to freedom in Europe.

To say this is not to say that this country can do nothing about helping southeast Asia resist Communist infiltrations. There is much that we can do and much that we should do. Economic aid and technical assistance should be employed in every effective way possible.

Instead of cutting back this help to Asiatic countries, we should be extending it. We should remember that high-sounding statements of political ideals are well and good in their place, but that they get scant attention when men, women, and children are hungry.

Our overseas-aid programs have not been perfect, but they have their creditable achievement. That the Marshall plan helped stop the spread of communism in Europe is not open to question. Technical assistance has made us friends here and there among the great masses of population from the Pacific Ocean, across southern Asia, to the mediterranean. It has its values that no amounts of arms, necessary as arms may be, can in themselves provide.

A diplomatic move that would tend to bring East and West closer together would be for the U. N. to grant the Chinese Communist government's desire for admission to the U. N. This is a move the United States could support without in any way blessing the Peiping regime and for which this country might get in return concessions from China of much value to us.

All the while the United States should work to create a truly Asian defensive alliance of U. N. members—all the while that it redoubles its economic and technical help—this country should be increasing the effectiveness of its defense forces. Our Government in Washington must be careful to avoid dangerous tax cuts and equally dangerous curtailments in the defense program.

The Military Establishment should not be allowed to grow topheavy, yet it must be strong enough in this uncertain world to meet an emergency should one arise. The means must be found to encourage reenlistments, now seriously in decline. The Reserve and Guard units also must be improved through the development of better training programs. For in the event of an outbreak the Reserve forces would be urgently needed in the armed services.

Finally every encouragement must be given to scientific research which leads to the development and production of new weapons. Here in the vast and intricate electronic field it would be only rankest folly to fall behind.

In short then the war in Indochina is a war to stay out of.

The United States should do all it can to help work out a structure for peace in southeast Asia, but we must recognize that the southeast Asians have their destiny largely in their own hands.

We can help in many ways, and one way that is primary is to keep our defense strong enough that it will in itself be a deterrent to war.

Question of the Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1954

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, short report on Indochina: Every public official of the Vietnam Government—except 1—together with wives and children left Indochina for Paris or Geneva in 2 weeks' time. Any further questions?

Foreign Trade Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1954

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein copy of communication addressed to the President of the United States by the secretary of the Greater Lawrence Textile Council, United Textile Workers of America, AFL, of Lawrence, Mass., Mr. George F. Driscoll, concerning our foreign trade policy:

MAY 25, 1954.

President DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER,
White House, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There are approximately 20,000 less textile jobs in the textile community of Lawrence, Mass., than there were just a few years ago. The greater portion of this loss of employment represents textile mills which have liquidated.

Naturally this occasions a good deal of speculation and inquiry relative to the causes and the effects of this overwhelming situation, as well as a searching for a solution of the attendant unemployment problems.

In this atmosphere it has become popular to blame our foreign trade policy for our empty textile mills. Proponents of the theory quote statistics which indicate increased importation of competitive goods. They point out that such goods come from foreign countries whose industries pay wages as low as 7 percent of United States levels (9.4 cents in India).

Whether or not we agree with these contentions will not be of help to the myriad thousands of unemployed textile workers. We believe that the time has come that a thorough investigation be made to determine whether foreign competition is destroying our textile industry.

We are aware of the Randall Commission on Foreign Economic Policy report submitted to the President and to Congress on January 23, 1954. We noted that the American Tariff League believes that congressional opposition to the report casts doubt that many of its recommendations will command the attention of Congress and that the New York Wall Street Journal commented editorially on January 25, 1954, that the "Randall report * * * is so riddled with dissent that its interest may prove to be chiefly academic."

The conclusion seems to be that the Randall report will play but a small part in the shaping of future trade policy.

Furthermore, the Commission on Foreign Economic Policy is more or less concerned with the broad, overall questions of policy, whereas we must endeavor to persuade someone in responsible position that the textile industry (if it is true that foreign competition is causing injury) cannot afford to wait for the determination of broad, overall policy.

We, therefore, specifically suggest that the executive branch of the Government, either through the Tariff Commission or the United States Department of Commerce, conduct a survey to determine the effect of foreign competition in the light of our foreign-trade policy upon our domestic textile industry.

Such a survey, because it would involve a single industry, should be able to easily avoid the dissent which cripples the effectiveness of the Randall report. It ought to be able to cut sharply through the current welter of confusing statistics, conflicting opinions, and varied analysis which renders a decisive conclusion impossible.

After all, if, because of our trade arrangements, our jobs are being lost to 39-cent British wage rates or to 13-cent Japanese wage rates, we have a right to expect that such an intolerable situation be immediately remedied.

Respectfully yours,
GEORGE F. DRISCOLL, *Secretary,*
Greater Lawrence Textile Council,
United Textile Workers of America, AFL.

Keepers of the Faith

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 1954

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following editorial which appeared in the Newark (N. J.) Sunday News on May 30:

KEEPERS OF THE FAITH

Remembrance of things past has value only as we relate them to the present and seek to discover in them lessons for the future. Today we are calling to remembrance the deeds of those who have given their lives for our country and in the cause of peace. Can we truly observe Memorial Day without reflecting upon our own immediate part in our Nation's defense and in the maintenance of peace?

In his Memorial Day proclamation, President Eisenhower said, "We should keep faith with our heroic dead." This brings to remembrance the undying injunction by Abraham Lincoln at Gettysburg, "that from these honored dead we take increased devotion to that cause for which they gave the last full measure of devotion; that we highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain."

We live in a time of continuous crisis. The half century through which we have just passed has been disrupted by two great wars to defend the rights of freemen against mounting aggression. A third war, minor in area of direct conflict, but equally important in defense of freedom, was fought in Korea. Still the world has not overcome the menace. Like the monster Hydra, it sprouts more heads when one is cut off.

Indochina may seem to many to be far away, but it is no farther than Korea. The seriousness of the situation there as it affects the United States was stressed by Adm. Robert B. Carney in New York the other day. The Chief of Naval Operations analyzed the factors involved in the cold war between communism and the free world, and the perils. He declared:

"The threats to our security that have confronted us in the past were trivial compared to the threat that faces this country today. This is neither alarmist nor jingoist talk; nor is it a prediction that the holocaust will come tomorrow. It's merely the belief of an American citizen who is convinced that tomorrow can come far sooner than may be realized or sooner than we're ready to face up to."

Here is something to reflect upon today. It will help us to steel ourselves for whatever may come from the Geneva Conference and the grave discussions between the Washington Government and our allies.

We are the keepers of the faith for which our loved ones have died. President Eisenhower has recommended observance of today as a day of prayer. We need to pray for peace and the triumph of right. We need also to pray for ourselves that we may be true to the faith handed down by those who have gone before.

Facts on Postage Rate Increase Speak for Themselves

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1954

Mr. HAGEN of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, let us get down to the facts on the proposal to increase postage rates. We hear a lot of propaganda about the need to erase the post-office deficit and the need to put the post office on a businesslike basis, but the facts on the need to maintain the Post Office Department as a service organization speak for themselves.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include the following editorial from the March 1954 issue of the Chain Store Age, Orange, Conn., written by its editor in chief, Godfrey M. Lebhar.

It follows:

SHOULD POSTAGE RATES BE RAISED?

(By Godfrey M. Lebhar, editor in chief, Chain Store Age)

Congress now has under consideration a bill which, among other changes, would raise first-class postage rates from 3 cents to 4 cents for the first ounce on all nonlocal mail. The expected result would be to increase postal revenue by $240 million. Of that sum, $160 million would come from the proposed increase in first-class rates, less than $20 million from a second-class increase, and the balance from other increases.

The objective, of course, is to cut the perennial so-called post office deficit which, in the next fiscal year, will amount to an estimated $329 million. The expected additional revenue would reduce this deficit to less than $100 million.

Businessmen who have not acquainted themselves with the facts about our post office operation may be inclined to accept this proposed addition to their own operating costs without much question. After all, they may figure, if we favor a balanced budget for the Government as a whole, how can we object to a step designed to wipe out, or at least reduce, a deficit in one department?

FACTS SPEAK FOR THEMSELVES

Before you come to any such self-sacrificing conclusion, however, here are some facts to consider:

1. The so-called Post Office deficit is really a deficit only on the assumption that this vital branch of Government service, unlike any other, should be self-sustaining. The Department of Agriculture costs us annually some $2,800,000,000, the Department of Commerce, $1,200,000,000; the Department of the Interior, $600 million; the Department of Labor, $300 million. In none of these cases do we refer to the cost as a deficit.

Compared with these figures, in fiscal 1952 the Post Office's total operating cost was $2,700,000,000, but of that sum more than $2 billion was covered by postal revenue, and more than $100 million of the remainder represented the cost of carrying governmental mail, franked mail, free mail for the blind, airmail subsidies, etc. The balance, some $600 million, is referred to as a "deficit" but actually it represents the net cost of operating one of our most vital governmental services.

2. The net cost of running the Post Office is paid by the taxpayers at large rather than by so-called users of the mails. But isn't that the way it should be? The phrase "users of the mails" is misleading because it is applied only to mail senders. The recipients of mail are just as dependent upon the services rendered by the Post Office as the senders. Why shouldn't they share its cost? The senders of mail now pay not only 80 percent of the cost of operating the Post Office, but, as taxpayers, their share of the so-called deficit as well. Why should they be asked to foot it all?

3. First-class postage is the one class which concededly pays for itself. Why should we have to pay more for it?

OPINION SHOULD BE WEIGHED

The Postmaster General recently answered: "It is the only class of mail which can help make a substantial reduction in the deficit without inflicting any particular hardship on the individual."

That statement should not be too readily accepted. Who knows how much of a hardship the proposed increase would involve? To the extent that it would reduce the use of the mails, it might do business far more harm than anybody can measure. To stimulate business, the President is contemplating reducing personal taxes. To discourage the use of the mails by raising postage rates would have just the opposite effect.

Because business will pay the major part of the proposed increase, if the pending bill is passed, the real nature of the supposed deficit should be more generally understood. The impact of the proposed increase in second-class rates would, of course, affect Chain Store Age in common with other publishers, but that is a different matter. Our only purpose here is to direct attention to that feature of the bill which will raise operating costs for business in general.

Antisegregation Decision Reaches Colleges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1954

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, the Supreme Court's landmark decision outlawing segregation in State schools and in the District of Columbia will be placed in effect with varying speed in the areas affected. Some of the Southerns States where poll tax restrictions have been lifted voluntarily by State legislatures are expected to take action fairly quickly to carry out the decision. Others whose patterns of racial discrimination have been fanned by political fanaticism as recently as the current primary elections will resist the decision more violently. In the long run, what happens will be determined by the experience of those States which lead the way.

In the colleges the acceptance of Negro students on a footing of complete equality should move more rapidly. Some of the "all white" southern colleges have admitted Negro graduate or professional students, during recent years. Some 75,000 young Negro men and women presently enrolled in 108 all-Negro colleges, with approximately 580,000 white students in 580 colleges. The record shows that in those State colleges where Negroes have been admitted, despite frequent predictions of dire consequences, the first drop of blood is yet to be shed.

In this period of world turmoil, one of the principal arguments of the Communists in their attack on America has been the charge of racial discrimination. It has been far more effective than we sometimes imagine. The Supreme Court decision will deal the charge a long-awaited knockout blow. This ruling will go down in our history as a significant event of President Eisenhower's administration.

"Under God" Would Help Combat Pagan Influences

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1954

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, a timely article from the facile pen of Shirley Munroe Mullen which appeared in the Malden (Mass.) Press of May 13, 1954. This article is not only timely by reason of the pending proposal to add "Under God" to the pledge of allegiance to the flag, but it is also a most interesting story about the writing of the pledge in its original form by James B. Upham, of Malden, a city in my own congressional district:

"UNDER GOD" WOULD HELP COMBAT PAGAN INFLUENCES

(By Shirley Munroe Mullen)

A relative of James Bailey Upham, author of the pledge of allegiance to the flag, today declared that he was sure the proposed addition of the words "under God" to the 62-year-old pledge would meet with the original author's complete approval.

Warren Upham, 285 Clifton Street, cousin of the nationally famous pledge author, pointed out that James Upham was not only an intensely patriotic man but a devout and religious American also.

Senator HOMER FERGUSON, of Michigan, has asked the Members of the United States Congress to vote for the pledge to henceforth read: "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands. One nation, under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."

This would not be the first time words had been added to the original work of James B. Upham. In 1923 and again in 1924, the first and second flag congresses made improvements on the first draft which had contained 23 words.

The story of this writing of that pledge is a familiar one to Maldenites. Yet it can be told again, for the stirring salute which has passed from the lips of millions of loyal Americans constitutes one of Malden's most important contributions to the Nation's heritage.

AUTHOR

James Upham was the eldest son of Rev. James Upham, D. D., and Cynthia Bailey Upham. He was born in New Hampton, N. H., December 27, 1854, and was educated in the New Hampton Literary Institute of Fairfax, Vt.

He later went to Detroit where he was employed by E. B. Smith & Co., booksellers and publishers. In 1876 he married Mary Hartshorn and in 1880 he came to this city and purchased a home on Lincoln street. He was active in civic affairs, where he was made a deacon in the First Baptist Church in 1888, was a member of the Converse Lodge of Masons and a Knight Templar.

It was while he was in the employ of Perry Mason & Co., of Boston, which published the Youth's Companion, the first national magazine for American youth, that James Upham penned his famous pledge.

In 1888 he instituted a campaign to have the American flag flying over every schoolhouse. In order to further this plan, he gave as premiums, many flags to youngsters who sold subscriptions to the magazines. He spent a great deal of his time and money in arranging for the distribution of hundreds of flags to schools all over the country.

PLEDGE

Later he started a move to make Columbus Day a national holiday—an ambition which was realized in 1892, 400 years after the birth of Columbus. Since he desired schools to hold some form of commemorating exercises on that day, he decided to write a short recital of loyalty which could be addressed to the flag on that occasion, following flag raising ceremonies.

He spent a great deal of time in formulating the pledge. He discussed it with his brother, Artemus B. Upham, over the breakfast cup of coffee in his Malden home. Then he submitted it to the editors of the Youth's Companion for criticism and suggestions.

It was finally published September 8, 1892, and read: "I pledge allegiance to my Flag, and to the Republic for which it stands. One nation, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all!"

Thousands of young voices repeated those words the following month. At that time, the right hand was held against the forehead with the palm downward until the words "to my Flag" when the right hand was fully extended toward Old Glory. Upham himself decided that that was the proper delivery for his pledge. This was later changed during World War II when the extended hand and military salute were considered to be too similar to the gestures employed by the Nazi and Fascist organizations.

CLAIMS

James B. Upham lived until 1905, leaving in addition to his wife, a daughter, Mrs. Bertha Cynthia Proctor, and a son, Henry Putnam Upham. He reaped little personal glory for his contribution to his country. The pledge, when it was printed, did not carry his name, and 4 years after he had written it, a Kansas schoolboy, Frank E. Bellamy, submitted the pledge as his own in a school contest. Since it was not well known in that area of the country, it caused quite a stir until the original pledge cleared up the matter.

Years after his death, a fellow worker in the Youth's Companion named Francis Bellamy, claimed authorship of the pledge. In 1917, Malden Librarian Herbert Fison received data from the editor of the magazine which stated decisively that Upham was the true author. Despite this for years Bellamy's descendants pursued the claim and his name is used in connection with the pledge at times even today.

The first change in the "salute" was made in 1923 when the words "my Flag" were changed to "the Flag of the United States." A year later it was changed to read, "the Flag of the United States of America."

Post mortem honors which came to Upham included a plaque placed on his grave at Forestdale by the city of Malden in 1942, and the Phineas Upham House which was dedicated to his honor in 1952. His relatives and descendants formed the Upham Family Society in order to continue his patriotic endeavors.

BELIEF IN GOD

Today some of the leading statesmen in the country are urging the new addition to the pledge. They include Gov. Christian A. Herter, and Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL who was instrumental in achieving national recognition of the Malden author in 1935.

Warren Upham has several reasons for the belief that his cousin would be wholeheartedly in agreement with the addition. "Religion is deeply rooted in the Upham family," he points out. "My grandfather, Hervey Upham, and James' father, Willard Upham, set out years ago as missionaries to the Cherokee Nation. They went to live among the Cherokees in a region which is now Oklahoma and they translated a good part of the New Testament into the Cherokee language."

Mr. Upham recalls clearly as a child, he heard his famous cousin recite his pledge to him. "He would be in favor of anything which would strengthen the pledge," he declared. "I feel that the reason the words, 'under God' were not included in the original draft was because it was written during a period when devoutness was taken for granted. Now that pagan philosophies have been introduced by the Soviet Union, there is a necessity for reaffirming belief in God.

A New Departure in American Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1954

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, I have just read the Honorable KATHARINE ST. GEORGE's trenchant remarks with reference to House Concurrent Resolution 219, which I introduced last March 22, and her favorable comments with respect to the principles embodied in the so-called Private Enterprise Plan For Korea which I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Appendix of March 5, 1954.

I take this opportunity to call the attention of my colleagues here in the House, and in the Senate, to the possibilities and potentialities inherent in two basic ideas or principles set forth in the Private Enterprise Plan For Korea.

I refer to the idea, first, of a reconstruction finance corporation, similar in purpose and general design, to our own structure of the same name. This RFC would be adequately financed by congressional appropriations, and set up under the laws and American-supervised control of those of our allies who would welcome such a lending organization, and who would be entitled to it by reason of their proven loyalty and devotion to the cause of world freedom.

The second idea endowed with interesting potentialities, is that of inducing some of our outstanding and most efficient American corporations to sponsor the construction and operation of counterpart factories in those countries qualified for the establishment of reconstruction finance corporations. Under this plan, each American parent corporation would receive a 25-percent permanent share of the equity stock in its new allied corporation, and provisions would be made to guarantee that the balance of 75 percent of such equity stock would ultimately be sold to the native men and management of these new corporations.

I am reliably informed that over the past decade we have granted to our friends and allies all over the world, about 60 billions of dollars in various forms of relief, arms, aid, reconstruction, and so forth. The worthy purpose of these vast expenditures of our precious natural resources and wealth, were to build up a formidable and united association of free nations which would combat the growing menace of communism.

I will not digress at this point to state my convictions as to how successful this venture has been. Each citizen can judge for himself in this respect. But, there is a growing conviction in our country that the time has come to take a new look—another look, if you please—to determine whether we can afford to continue such vast outlays. There is an urgent need to weigh the benefits we have received, in exchange for our 60 billion dollars. It is at this important juncture in our own, and in world affairs, that I submit this new and comparatively modest departure in American foreign policy. I mean, of course, the ideas I have just outlined for a series of Reconstruction Finance Corporations to be inaugurated within the realms of the stanchest allies.

Let me name several of those nations that I personally consider to be our most loyal allies. In these countries, the inauguration of this so-called private enterprise, or RFC plan, would, in my opinion, be welcome; and would prove particularly effective. First, of course, is our outstanding, fighting ally, the Republic of Korea. Then there are Formosa, the Philippine Republic, Greece, Turkey, Pakistan, and several of our South American neighbors. I am sure we will all agree that the courage, loyalty, and fighting spirit of each and every one of these allies, is beyond question of doubt.

To put it bluntly, the countries I have named are good risks, because they will stick with us through thick and thin. Now in seeking, as we must, to conserve our resources, of manpower and of minerals and metals, would it not be wise to build up the industrial power of these several nations, as swiftly as we can? And should we not concentrate the expenditure of our precious dollars upon those in whom we can surely trust, rather than upon those who will probably be among the missing when the chips are down?

In all of these nations I have named are rich and valuable natural resources waiting to be developed. But, of far greater importance, there are brave, hardy, and intelligent people, eager to be taught the world-famous American know-how. Those freedom-loving people are eager to grasp the golden opportunity of raising their standards of living to the hitherto undreamed of heights which the application of that famous American know-how will positively guarantee.

This being the case, you may ask why not encourage private capital to undertake the vital task of building up the industrial power of these vital bastions of freedom? Why do we have to appropriate Government funds for this purpose?

My answer is threefold: First, because the primary consideration involved here is strategic rather than commercial. Second, because for this same reason the risk for private capital is too great to induce the investment of its savings. Third, because time is the essence of our world problem today. The expanding menace of communism does not allow the passage of time necessary for the normal development and growth of industry under a system of private investment.

I want to point out that it has been the rapid industrialization of Russia under communism that has led, and is leading, a number of undeveloped nations to accept communism and its risk of regimentation and government ownership. They accept this risk because they see no other way to accomplish swift industrialization.

Now, let me pose the question: Is not this private enterprise plan, with its Reconstruction Finance Corporation idea, the means and method through which the United States can offer our stanch Allies a rapid realization of industrialization that they need? And can we not, at the same time, offer them more than has ever been accomplished in Russia? We can, at the same time, avoid the Red terror and the appalling sacrifices suffered by the unfortunate Russian people.

I say we can. Furthermore, we can simultaneously establish "Little Americas" within all these nations where the principles of the private-enterprise plan may be applied. Now, what do I mean by "Little Americas"? I mean to say that the application of American know-how and American capital in underdeveloped regions can immeasurably raise the standards of living of all the people within them. I contend that this can be accomplished under a system of freedom and private enterprise and with great gain to us, both spiritually and materially.

What is it that the false prophets of Moscow promise to their people and to the people of their satellites? They promise them that communism will enable them, within a generation, to match the industrial power and wealth of America. That, indeed, has become the great world dream. All peoples everywhere have heard fabulous tales of the power and wealth of America, and of the freedom from oppression and from want that exists in these United States. And because they dream dreams of achieving these benefits for themselves, they are discontented with their hard lot in life, and are thus fertile fields for the false promises of communism.

Obviously we Americans cannot raise the living standards of all the people in the world, but we can raise the standards of living in those nations I have named and of a number of other nations in South America which are eligible for application of the private enterprise plan. And let me emphasize this fact, we can accomplish all this for a fraction of the $60 billion we have wasted throughout the world, and for which we seem to have reaped nothing but a harvest of hatred and ill will.

What I propose is no "giveaway" program. In the case of Korea, we are morally obligated to reconstruct, in that tragic land, the devastation wrought by our own incredibly stupid foreign policies. Now that job is going to be an expensive one and we cannot, in all probability, expect any repayment from the Korean people other than in the form of their loyalty and good will.

But, I submit, Korea is the exception to the rule, for I have not the slightest doubt that in a country of rich resources such as Turkey, a $2 billion Turkish Reconstruction Finance Corporation would, within 2 or 3 decades, return to this Government not only its original investment, but a handsome profit besides. And that, I am positive, is the way the Turkish people, or any other self-respecting, independent people, would want it to be.

Now what about our American corporations that would design, build, and operate counterpart enterprises in foreign lands, and would teach the local folks our American methods of manufacture? Have they not everything to gain and nothing to lose? Would the parent corporations fear the competition of their progeny? Well, I do not know whether you can compete with yourself, but I do know that competition is the life-blood of capitalism. I also know that an expanded production of goods means an expanded volume of trade between nations.

So, while our American corporations would be disseminating their knowledge and the good will that goes with it, they would, at the same time, be earning a profit commensurate with the services rendered. And again, I say, this is the way it should be.

Mr. Speaker, the time has come for the United States to cease practicing the preachings of communism. Stripped down to its bare fundamentals, Marxism is just the ageless old phony of "something for nothing," and that is exactly what America—supposedly the citadel of capitalism, has been practicing. We have given away $60 billion and, I repeat, we seem to have reaped a harvest of hatred and ill will. Now, if that is not "something for nothing" then what is?

So, Mr. Speaker, before concluding my remarks, with an enumeration of the advantages to the United States, inherent in the application of this Reconstruction Finance Corporation idea, to our stanchest allies, I say this: Let it be, henceforth, the sense of Congress and of the American people that we will neither sustain bankrupt socialist economies, with our hard-earned tax dollars, nor go bankrupt ourselves by giving away billions for nothing. Let us, rather, regain our own self-respect and the respect of the world by recalling and practicing this great Christian doctrine from St. Luke, chapter 10, 7th verse: "For the laborer is worthy of his hire."

And now, here is my enumeration of the advantages to the United States that are inherent in the private enterprise plan.

First. We will open the doors of economic opportunity to our faithful friends among the society of nations.

Second. We will liquidate the further failures of a foreign policy based upon the operation of an international poorhouse supported by American tax-dollar gifts.

Third. We will create pools of potential military might in areas where there is now nothing but military weakness.

Fourth. We will forge, on the anvil of international cooperation, those enduring friendships that can only be founded upon mutual trust, and proven performance.

Fifth. We will substitute the sound strategic principles of concentration for our present unsound strategy of waste and dispersion.

Sixth. In this program, the money we spend, will be money we lend, and the sums so spent will eventually return in kind.

Seventh. In this way we shall vindicate the superior value and the soundness of our system of private property, private enterprise, and personal freedoms.

Farmers' Lot Not a Happy One, Sometimes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1954

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, city dwellers like to contemplate the joys of rural living, free from the tensions and strain of the competitive arenas, the shops and factories, the noise and turmoil of daily striving. Many a city family looks forward to the day of moving to the little farmhouse where they anticipate the pleasure of raising a few chickens and the rest of the magazine ad version of farm life.

A survey made by the United States Department of Agriculture through the Wooster (Ohio) Agriculture Experiment Station has just checked 150 farm couples under the age of 30. All is not peace and light, according to these young folks. The financial problem of purchasing equipment and livestock necessary to get started these days is a recurrent headache. Some 20 percent of the wives questioned up and said that they just do not like life on a farm, nohow. Lack of modern conveniences, absence of vacations, long work hours, inadequate emergency medical facilities, scarcity of nursery schools and kindergartens are among the difficulties stressed by these young women.

If they are having troubles, you can be sure that 20 percent of their husbands must ofen be envious of the excitement and gadding about of their city brothers. There ought to be a moral to this—be happy where you are. It is not really green on the other side of the hill—that is only envy.

Is Failure To Increase National Debt Causing Farmers and Government To Pay More in Interest Charges?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1954

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, when the question of increasing the national debt from $275 billion to $290 billion came before the House in 1953, I voted against it although it passed the House of Representatives and the bill is now in the Senate. The reason I voted against it was because at that time there was almost $9 billion in cash idle and unused in the commercial banks. I did not see any reason to permit this money to remain idle and borrow more money at the then high rate of interest. Therefore, I felt justified in opposing the increase until these idle funds were used. Now they have been substantially used and if it is necessary to raise the national debt it should be raised.

It is at least bordering on intellectual dishonesty for Members of Congress to vote appropriations in excess of the national debt limit and then refuse to increase the national debt limit to take care of the appropriations so voted. The administration is giving as an excuse for paying higher interest rates and also for filling up the portfolios of local banks to the extent that these banks are discouraged from making local loans, the fact that the Congress will not increase the national debt limit and it is forced upon them.

There is a difference in individuals, corporations, and States and cities being in debt and the Federal Government. It is highly desirable that the former pay their debts as rapidly as possible, but everyone who has studied the question knows that there is no likelihood of any decrease in our national debt. It is used as a vehicle to provide an adequate money supply. If we were to make a substantial payment on our national debt, it would be very deflationary. If we were to pay it off in a short period of time, it would cause a serious deflation. Our capitalistic system, which we all believe in and think it is the best system in the world, is based on debt. No debt, no money. If all debts were paid, we would not have enough money to do business and would be reduced to barter.

In an expanding economy in our country, it is necessary that our gross national product be increased 3 to 4 percent a year, in order to maintain reasonable prosperity. If we fail to increase our gross national product we will be unable to properly take care of the million new workers coming on the job every year and the million workers who are displaced by technological development. If we fail to increase the national debt limit and thereby fail to increase our gross national product, our country will soon find itself going backward instead of forward.

The best way to increase our gross national product is through debts created by local people and then paid off and go into debt again. The trend is now to permit the banks that have the privilege of creating or manufacturing the money to use it to buy Government riskless securities, thereby failing to encourage them to seek and make local loans.

In the June 1954 American Bankers Association magazine, Banking, there is an interesting article entitled "News for Country Banks." It discloses why it was necessary for the Treasury to sell certain loans to the banks in order to keep within the debt limit. It is as follows:

NEWS FOR COUNTRY BANKERS

(By Mary B. Leach)

CCC INTEREST RATE LOWERED

Despite warnings by members of the agricultural commission of the American Bankers Association that a reduction in the interest rate allowed banks for making Commodity Credit Corporation loans would tend to discourage them from originating and keeping these loans, the CCC last month reduced the banks' share of the loan rate to 1¾ percent. The overall rate was set at 2¼ percent, which includes a service charge of one-half of 1 percent.

The CCC loan rate paid by the farmers remained unchanged at 3 percent from 1941 to 1951. The interest allowance made by the CCC to banks during this 10-year period was 1½ percent. For the 1952 crop, CCC officials decided to increase the interest allowance to the banks to 2 percent by increasing the rate to the farmers from 3 percent to 3½ percent. While ABA representatives had been asking for this increase of allowance to banks, they did not seek it at the cost of raising the rate to the farmers. Rather, they felt that a division of 2 percent to the banks of the interest rate of 3 percent paid by the farmers would have been entirely fair.

In the fall of 1953, when the United States Treasury got close to the debt limit, a plan was evolved to offer certificates of interest to banks secured by commodity pools owned by the CCC. The rate on these certificates was 2½ percent, later 2¼ percent, and still later 2⅛ percent. But banks which originated the loans at the farm level got an interest allowance of 2½ percent, plus one-half of 1 percent for service charge, or a total rate of 3 percent out of the 4 percent rate paid by the farmers on 1953 crops. This increase has now been rescinded.

Commenting on the recent reduction to 1¾ percent, Jesse W. Tapp, executive vice president of the Bank of America N. T. & S. A., San Francisco, and chairman of the ABA Agricultural Commission, said that "the 1953 rate arrangement had served as a great impetus to the country banks not only to originate the CCC loans but to hold them, so that it became unnecessary for the Treasury to use its funds in the making of these price support loans."

Our Drinking Water

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1954

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, if we assume that fluoridation of our drinking water will prevent decay of our teeth, does it follow that citizens should be deprived of their right to drink unadulterated water if that be their desire?

If the advocates of fluoridation are to have their way, are others who think or who can prove that certain types of food are more nutritious than others, that certain types of clothing are more healthful than other kinds of clothing; that those who can show that certain types of houses are more beneficial to health than other types, follow in the footsteps of the advocates of fluoridation and, by law, force all of the people to either wear what a certain group can show is beneficial to the human race, to live in the kind of a home that is most healthful?

In brief, just how far are we to be forced to accept what might be callled "standardization" of our daily lives?

That some are vigorously opposed to fluoridation is evident by the statement carried in a letter from the Dickinson County Anti-Floridation Council of Iron Mountain, Mich., under date of May 27, and which reads as follows:

DICKINSON COUNTY
ANTI-FLUORIDATION COUNCIL,
Iron Mountain, Mich., May 27, 1954.

Hon. CLARE E. HOFFMAN,
Chairman, House Committee on Government Operations, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Your letter of May 20, 1954, has been received and contents noted.

In reply you ask for evidence as to the Communist influence in the United States Public Health Service and here is the outside appearance of it:

1. The utter brutality of the United States Public Health Service in practically demanding that all communities fluoridate, a polite name for poisoning their public water supplies.

2. This is a must, otherwise the Chief Surgeon General will withhold all Federal funds and aid to any State or local health units that do not subscribe to the infallible pronouncements of the United States Public Health Service.

3. The denial of the right to vote by local communities by agents of the United States Public Health Service operating through local health departments, is a Communist influence.

4. The slow mass poisoning of the entire population of the United States is the main objective of communism.

5. The bulldozing, browbeating, and pressure attempts on all citizens who oppose this poisoning of our public water supply is other evidence.

6. Consult the United States Public Health Service payroll for the names of the Russian-

born and Iron Curtain doctors and dentists and other employees.

7. There is unlimited power conferred on the United States Public Health Service under the bill H. R. 7397.

8. Enclosed find brief analysis of the bill H. R. 7397, which we understand was passed by the House April 28 without any amendments. No wonder we folks back home wonder why Congress gives the bureaucrats more and more power, especially with our health. These so-called doctors in the Public Health Service are nothing, in the public opinion, but a bunch of bureaucrats seeking vast political powers and which they do not hesitate to use.

9. The people of this Nation are entitled to protection by Congress against the encroachments of their rights as guaranteed to them under the United States and State constitutions against all bureaucrats.

10. For instance, here in Michigan, to illustrate the pressure from the United States Public Health Service, a Dr. Jay, professor of dentistry at Ann Arbor, Mich., and chief propaganda agent of the profluoridation group, is against the people voting on fluoridation and so stated at a public meeting in the Iron Mountain City Hall in the presence of at least 30 people on September 26, 1952.

11. At this same meeting, Dr. Wertheimer, of the Michigan State Board of Health, was designated by Dr. Jay as his fighting man, when the writer spoke against fluoridation without the people having permission to vote on the question.

12. When we questioned the Michigan State Board of Health what was meant by the statement that "Dr. Wertheimer was their fighting man," there was no answer.

13. In Des Moines, Iowa, a Dr. Abraham Gelperin, Russian born, and former United States Public Health Service employee, became their health officer. He forced fluoridation on the people of that city, not by popular vote, but through a five-man city commission.

14. There are more Dr. Gelperins scattered throughout the local and State health boards under the direction of the United States Public Health Service.

15. See the payroll of the United States Public Health Service for more infiltration of Iron Curtain employees and so-called doctors and dentists, who came over in the last Roosevelt emigration deluge.

16. Evidence of subversive action by the Communist influence in the United States Public Health Service is the concentrated effort to fluoridate all United States military establishments and all areas furnishing either raw materials or manufactured for the national defense.

17. Further evidence is the secretiveness with which fluoridation is sneaked in wherever possible without the vote of the people.

18. The vicious attempts to keep the people from voting on socialized medicine and against a Federal health dictatorship is characteristic of communism.

19. We object to the use of Federal funds to poison the water supplies throughout the United States and the use of said funds to promote the sales of poisonous sodium fluoride.

20. Once the damage to public health is done, there is no cure.

21. Enclosed find articles on Grand Rapids, Mich., showing the deplorable mental situation there.

22. The expenditures of the United States tax funds by the United States Public Health Service for propaganda advertising the makers of sodium fluoride poison and dispensing machinery should be prohibited.

23. The outrageous dictatorship of public health by the United States Public Health Service at Washington, D. C., should be looked into.

24. The United States Public Health Service does not want to know anything about the dangerous poison sodium fluoride or its effects upon the health of the people. They do not even know the rudiments of chemistry as pertains to sodium fluoride; still they advocate the use of it. Why? Because some Communists in the service advocate it.

25. Taken all in all, their propaganda methods are typical of Iron Curtain tactics, and all their profluoridation actions undermine public health.

Thanking you for your courtesy in this matter, we remain,

Respectfully yours,
DICKINSON COUNTY ANTI-FLUORIDATION COUNCIL,
W. A. HENZE, *Chairman.*

Mr. Speaker, for myself, in my judgment, if we are to have freedom here in America, people should be permitted to eat, drink, wear, and live where they may wish—in the type of home they wish—so long as the practice of their desires does not injuriously affect others.

Just because I have no objections to you putting whatever chemical you may desire in your drinking water, does not, in my judgment, give you a right to put whatever you may choose in my drinking water.

Why not let each individual decide for himself what he will do and how he will live; yes, and how he will think, if he does not harm the rest of us?

So far as I have been able to learn, decay of the teeth is neither contagious nor infectious, not unless one swaps teeth.

Petition Evaluated

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. L. BARTLETT

DELEGATE FROM ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1954

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the effort being made to suggest that Alaska statehood should be deferred until another referendum is held, I desire to offer an editorial which appeared in the Fairbanks (Alaska) News-Miner for May 25:

ANTISTATEHOOD PETITION

Alice Stuart, a resident of this city, is back in Washington carrying a petition bearing some 1,000 names that alleges to request Congress to delay action on statehood until a referendum has been held in Alaska.

Now, Miss Stuart has a perfect right to go back to Washington and express her opinions. This is a free country.

But, frankly, we think she is using unfair tactics, because many of the names on that petition were gathered under false pretenses. We know, because several staff members of the News-Miner signed her petition, and we are for statehood, not against it.

Miss Stuart came into our office one day and asked us to sign a petition asking for a referendum on statehood. She said nothing about delaying statehood until the referendum was held. She gave us to understand that we were merely requesting an election in which Alaska voters could express their convictions. We are certain the vote would be overwhelmingly prostatehood, so we signed her petition. We have received calls from a number of other people in this city who also complain that they signed the petition under the same deceptive conditions.

Everyone has the right to express opinions in this country. But taking a petition back to Washington and using it to block statehood when many people who signed it are for statehood isn't quite cricket, in our opinion.

International Educational Exchange Activities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. D. R. (BILLY) MATTHEWS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1954

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I am very hopeful that the $6 million cut in the Fulbright exchange program, which has meant so much, I think, in our endeavor to combat communism by permitting a two-way exchange of students, specialists, and leaders between the United States and over 70 foreign countries, will be restored. The fight against communism is not only one of materiel, but even more, is a fight for the minds of men. Ideas translated into action can bring us either peace or war. Because the Fulbright program, I believe, has done so much in giving to the world our democratic ideal of peace and good will, I hope this program can be continued without any impairment.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am including the following statement by Dr. John S. Allen, acting president of the University of Florida, which is in my congressional district:

UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA,
Gainesville, March 16, 1954.

The Honorable D. R. MATTHEWS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MATTHEWS: We are gravely concerned over the drastic cuts in the Government's international educational exchange activities which we understand are proposed in a 1955 appropriation bill now being considered by the House and Senate Appropriation Committees. We believe these programs benefit the university and the State of Florida directly, and constitute the most sensible plan yet put forward for ultimate reduction of world tensions and achievement of a stable peace. Therefore, we are writing to you, Representative SIKES and Senator HOLLAND to give you information on the subject which we hope will be helpful to you in considering it.

We are specifically concerned about the following effects which would result if the proposed bill were to pass:

1. Elimination of the entire State Department program for bringing foreign leaders, specialists, teachers, and students to the United States: At the university in the past 3 years we have received over 450 outstanding people in these categories from 55 countries through the State Department and the Foreign Operations Administration. They have included cabinet ministers, research directors, college presidents, journalists, school principals, scientists, teachers, and other leaders or potential leaders of their countries. In agriculture alone we have had 104 leaders from 31 countries since June 1, 1953. These visitors have stayed on the campus and in the State for periods of a few days to 2 years and returned to their homelands. Through these people the reputation of the State and the university has spread throughout the world, and we are now getting more and more outstanding students to whom the

university has been recommended by these visitors. Our students and others in the State who have met the visitors have profited from the experience and are better able to fulfill their role as citizens of one of the leading countries of the world.

2. Elimination of the funds for exchange programs with Latin America, including those set up by the Buenos Aires Convention. You are well aware of the strong ties with Latin America in Florida and the university. At a time when the Nation as a whole is seeking the cooperation of the other American republics it would seem more appropriate to increase mutually beneficial programs than to eliminate them.

3. Elimination of funds for completion of the programs of foreign leaders and specialists brought to the United States in 1954, but whose programs run into the 1955 fiscal year: This would work an undue hardship on those who would thus be summarily sent home. For example, we at the university have a Greek post-doctoral student, Dr. George Mourkides, on a State Department grant. He has done outstanding research in soils in the 6 months he has been here, as a result of which he has been invited to read a paper at a national scientific meeting, and has published one paper and expects to publish another. Because of his outstanding work he would normally be given another year in which to round out his experience, especially in laboratory practice, in order to be of maximum usefulness when he returns to his position as a professor in the leading agricultural college of Greece. Under the proposed cut he would have to go home with only half of his objective accomplished.

4. Elimination of the United States specialist programs abroad and reduction of the number of Fulbright grants: We feel that the members of our staff who have obtained appointments in one of these programs not only have performed important services abroad, but through the experience are more effective in teaching Florida students and conducting research of value to the State.

5. Elimination of funds to provide the personnel at home and abroad who have been arranging the exchanges between nations and helping to assure their success: In a number of cases these people have been helpful to us directly in arranging for outstanding foreign students to come to the campus, for example, in the case of the group of 25 leaders in rural education here last year from Turkey.

We are concerned in these matters because they affect us directly now; but we are more concerned because we believe the ultimate benefits of exchange programs will be great. Through direct contact with the participants we can see the kinds of benefits that they derive and the kinds of relationships with Americans that are established. Both are of high quality. We believe that the tremendous gains in technical knowledge and personal relationships through exchange programs offer the soundest basis for eventual reduction of world tensions. The sums being spent on the programs now by the United States Government are minor compared to the potential returns.

The elimination of these Government-sponsored programs for international educational exchange will tend to discredit the United States and its protestations of goodwill for other countries throughout the world and thus provide grist for the propaganda mills of our opponents in the world ideological struggle. The United States budget for international exchange is reputed to be minute compared to that of the Soviet Union, and we believe this should be a time for expansion of our Government's activities in this field, rather than for retrenchment.

We urge you to give your careful attention to the matter and to call it to the attention of your colleagues. We will be happy to provide further information if it would be helpful. We appreciate your interest.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN S. ALLEN,
Vice President, University of Florida.

The Geneva Conference and War: Failure of Conference Demotes the Cause of Peace With the Communists—An Analysis by Vicente Villamin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 1, 1954

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, the Geneva Conference on Asian Problems, instead of advancing the cause of peace with the Communists, seems to have demoted it. The free countries, led by the United States, went there with the sincere desire to reach honorable and fair agreements with the Communists. But from the beginning of the conference the Communists, by their speeches and actions, have shown that they would have nothing but what they proposed, and what they proposed is certainly unacceptable to the free world. Mr. Speaker, I wish to make as a part of my remarks an analytical and illuminating article by Mr. Vicente Villamin, distinguished Filipino writer, lawyer, and economist, who is attending the Geneva Conference.

Mr. Villamin's article follows:

THE GENEVA CONFERENCE AND WAR

(By Vicente Villamin)

GENEVA, SWITZERLAND, May 28.—After 30 days of the Geneva Conference, the Korean question is in a deadlock. It can be broken only if the Communist delegates—Molotov, Chou En-lai, and Nam Il—become reasonable. There are no signs that they are going to be. In fact, they are becoming more and more unreasonable. They see no merit in others. They do not mean to agree to anything proposed by others. And they do not trust the United Nations, although they want Communist China and North Korea to become members of that organization.

The Communists came to the conference for a definite purpose. That purpose was made plain by their actions and utterances. It is to let the world know that they are in North Korea to stay and from there spread their dominion. They know that their suggested solution to the Korean question will not be accepted by the non-Communist members of the conference, but they proposed it notwithstanding so they could say that others would not cooperate with them. That is their standard procedure.

They are going to make North Korea the staging ground for their planned conquest of South Korea and their illicit flirtations with Japan. These objectives are crystal clear. They follow their logic and ambition.

North Korea is going to be Chinese in control and population in a few years. Of the 8 million North Koreans there after the war in 1945, there are only some 4 million left today. The undesirable ones were driven into South Korea, the able-bodied were sent to labor camps in Manchuria and Siberia, and many died from war and starvation. Chinese workers and farmers are taking their places. In a few years more there will be but a few North Koreans left. Then the unification of Korea would be a myth.

The Communists will make Japan realize that Korea is the same old "sword" poised at her heart, and this time it is more dangerous. To the Japanese people, who are not keen on Japan's rearmament, the Communists will offer trade arrangements and mutual nonaggression pacts and convince them to stay virtually disarmed.

The idea of the Communists is to keep Japan from being an effective ally of the United States and to entice her to join the China-Russia combine. If that should materialize, as Secretary of State Dulles once said, it would give the United States "a hard going" in the Pacific.

In the present posture of affairs, how would the Communists conquer South Korea without possibly bringing the United Nations to her aid and thus facilitate her conquest?

One way they could do it is for President Syngman Rhee, of South Korea, to resume the war, now temporarily suspended by the armistice, as the result of his disappointment at the failure of the Geneva Conference to solve the problem of the unification of Korea. He had threatened to do that heretofore. He was desperate. He saw no hope otherwise.

If he makes that plunge, the war-weary world might consider his country an "aggressor," although he would just be terminating the armistice. The 16 United Nations countries which cooperated with South Korea in the war might not be disposed to give their cooperation this time for that general reason. However, the United States has a mutual defense treaty with her and thus may be obliged to come to her aid if the action is imposed by its terms.

Fighting alone, South Korea would hardly have any chance to resist successfully the overwhelming numerical superiority of the enemy. Her conquest would be a rational certainty. Then all Korea would be Communist-dominated.

Should that unfortunate event come to pass, the Communists would be in a stronger position to persuade Japan to be on cooperative terms with them.

To reconquer South Korea would be unthinkable. Korea will have to be entered in the ledger of history as another loss of the free world to the Communists.

The deadlock in the conference on Korea is to the advantage of the Communists. Adjournment of the conference without some positive action on Korea is welcome to them. They would hope it would drive President Rhee to take the path of war, for that would be their opportunity to take South Korea.

It is up to the non-Communist members of the conference to loosen the deadlock enough to produce some honorable modus vivendi between the Communists and the South Koreans. This task is admittedly difficult because it might require giving concessions to the Communists. Giving concessions to them after taking their position in the conference upon the premise of untruthful assertions and impossible demands would be an act of appeasement that the Communists know so well how to exploit to their benefit.

In seeking for some solution, even a temporary one, let it not be forgotten that the Communists are not men of iron. They have a greater problem of satisfying their people than the non-Communists. They have more misery and poverty and more dissatisfaction and disloyalty to deal with. Although they present a solid front externally, they are in a state of arrested disintegration internally. Thus they should not be permitted to negotiate for some modus vivendi as if they are doing so from a position of strength.

The Communists feel that they have the upperhand in the negotiations on Indochina. They might use that not only to fortify themselves in those negotiations but also to buttress their position on the Korean question. They have no right to earn compound interest on a theory that is inadmissible, using a Russian favorite expression of dissent.

It must be remembered that there are at least three Communist elements involved in the Korean question that are mutually repellent and are potentially destructive of Communist solidarity: First, it is the North Koreans against the Chinese; second, it is the Chinese against the Russians; and, third, it is the Russians against the Chinese. Each of them have vital and well-founded reasons to dislike and distrust each other.

Going over these three points in general terms, the following may be stated: First, with their country being depopulated and occupied by Chinese, why should not the North Koreans resent the Red-Chinafication of their country? Second, with their nationalism aroused and their ability to run their own affairs shown to their satisfaction, why should not the Chinese resent and reject the supervisory and irritating powers that Russia exercises over their Government through so-called advisers? And third, with China getting stronger industrially and extending herself to what she calls northwest administrative area, which includes the minerally rich semiautonomous state of Sinkiang, why should not Russia look with misgivings at China's activities in that vast area which represents one-third of all China where she is establishing her influence and control?

These conflicts of interests among the Communists do not appear at the conference because they are not relevant to the matters at issue. But they are more basically divisive among them than the diversity of views on Korea and Indochina might be among the non-Communists. It is therefore tactically unjustified to give the Communists undue credit for their touted solidarity, which started from expediency and is headed to inevitable disintegration.

Reverting to Korea, the key to the situation there may be in the hands of President Rhee. Firstly, he will have to be satisfied that his delegation to the conference and the other delegations friendly to his country, led by the United States, have done their best to secure the unification of Korea, but they were stymied by the supreme impossibility of dealing with the Communists on a reasonable and rational basis. Secondly, he will have to fortify himself with an invulnerable patience, however excruciating it might be, and do nothing that might justify the Communists to engage in what they would call a defensive war. And thirdly, he will have to trust the United States as a true friend and advise with her on matters of international import.

South Korea's United Nations allies are not deserting her by any means. Her cause is bound to appeal to more United Nations countries which have witnessed the indefensible attitude of the Communists at the conference. After all, some 36 of them, besides the 16 that sent military contingents to Korea, voted for the Security Council resolutions of June 25 and 27, 1950, the latter authorizing forcible action in defense of South Korea from the North Korean armed aggression. They will and should realise that, after voting for those resolutions, it is their obligation of honor, as well as an act of enlightened self-interest, to make good their votes the way the heroic 16 countries made good theirs.

If the conference is unable to achieve a formal ending of the war in Korea and agree on a plan for the Korean unification, it must not adjourn without some agreed definition of how North and South Korea will carry on in the meantime, as well as of the status of the foreign armies which took part in the war. Otherwise, the Korean peninsula will be in a state of ferment bordering on active warfare. It is imperative that the people have peace so they can work and live. Wars today begin "informally" without ultimatum; they may end as "informally" without treaties of peace. The people simply need peace, and they will have it, if necessary, without benefit of conferences, diplomats, and paper paraphernalia.

The participants in this conference must prove themselves that they came to try and achieve peaceful settlement of pending problems, and not as harbingers of hate and unreason and promoters of war.

In the days not long ago wars were not as destructive as they are now and will be. Wars today between countries possessed of modern weapons make for wholesale destruction of all participants. This fact does not seem to impress those in the conference who have shown such unreasonableness and irreconcilability to come to some agreement and a degree of reconciliation that they do not seem to care if a war of universal annihilation ensues from the failure of the conference. They are the modern apocalyptic figures that come out from the monolithic countries to let mankind know whether it is to survive or not.

The Communists must not act as though they are people from another planet. They belong to the same world to which the non-Communists belong. There should be some common platform of mutual interest and honorable coexistence where Communists and non-Communists could stand. Let this conference find or build that platform before it adjourns.

Wisconsin Delegation Commended for Support of St. Lawrence Seaway Legislation by City of Milwaukee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 13, 1954

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting at this point the following copy of a resolution approved by the Common Council of the City of Milwaukee commending the entire Wisconsin delegation of Representatives in the House, Republicans and Democrats, for their work in support of the St. Lawrence seaway:

Resolved by the Common Council of the City of Milwaukee, That we hereby officially commend Representatives ZABLOCKI, KERSTEN, SMITH, DAVIS, LAIRD, JOHNSON, WITHROW, BYRNES, VAN PELT, and O'KONSKI, the Representatives in Congress from the State of Wisconsin, for their leadership and unfailing support of St. Lawrence seaway legislation and for their important contribution to the final passage of S. 2150 by the Congress; and hereby commend the Wisconsin Members of the House of Representatives for their devotion to this great cause and for having for many long years unfailingly maintained Wisconsin's leadership and identity with this great project so vital to the national defense and the economic security of this Nation and our great and friendly neighbor, Canada.

Amendment of Sugar Act of 1948

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TIMOTHY P. SHEEHAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1954

Mr. SHEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 9394, which I have introduced today, is for the purpose of producing a measure of protection for the sugar consumers within the United States and a level of supply consistent with requirements.

Out of our population of 160 million people in the United States, 140 million are urban or city residents. Most of the city people are willing to go along and help protect the basic farm products, yet when the average American housewife, who represents the consuming public, is paying too high a price for protecting any farm commodity, something must be done to give proper consideration to the housewife and to the consuming public. When Government officials, through legislative or executive policies, cause the American consumer to pay a higher price for commodities than other people, the American consumer is entitled to have some consideration in the matter.

It is important to note the increasing tonnage of cane sugar and beet sugar being used in various forms by the American consumer. According to official Department of Agriculture figures the quantity of sugar distributed to meet consumer requirements during the past 4 calendar years was as follows:

Calendar year	Total distribution (short tons, raw value)	Per capita (pounds, refined)
1950	8,279,000	102.0
1951	7,737,000	93.7
1952	8,104,000	96.5
1953	8,482,000	98.3

During the year 1954 the American consumer, including all types—household, industrial, and institutional—will require a cane and beet sugar supply well in excess of 8,400,000 short tons, raw value.

Of that substantial volume of this basic food commodity, it is generally estimated that about half is purchased for use in homes, while the other half is consumed in the form of processed food products, such as bread and other bakery products, canned foods, chocolate products, jams and jellies, frozen foods, confectionery, ice cream, soft drinks, and other products containing sugar. Therefore, it should be kept in mind that the existing controls on this basic commodity have far-reaching effects on our population and on many food-processing businesses throughout the country.

With the annual per capita consumption of sugar at about 100 pounds the legislation which governs supply, and therefore cost of sugar, must be given the most serious consideration, as every increase of 1 cent per pound means an added cost of about $160 million to the American people. Likewise, when we consider that raw sugar is purchased by other countries throughout the world at a cost average 2 to 2½ cents per pound lower than that paid by refiners in this country, we must recognize that American consumers, in effect, are subsidizing sugar producers and consumers in other countries at a rate of about $420 million each year. A difference of 2½ cents per pound is equivalent to $50 per short ton of sugar. Using the present level of annual United States use of 8,400,000 tons, this results in an annual cost of $420 million in excess of sugar price on the world market.

The legislative development of the sugar program under the Sugar Act of 1948, and its principal predecessors—the Sugar Act of 1937 and the Jones-Costigan Act of 1934—has been woefully lacking in the attention given to it by the consumer generally. Even a most cursory examination of the record of the hearings on those bills shows an almost complete absence to any attention of their legislative development on the part of the sugar consumers and sugar users through participation in those hearings. It is most fortunate that, under those circumstances, in our system of government, the members of congressional committees considering the legislation, the Congress, and the executive branch of the Government were able to and did embody in the legislation that philosophy which recognizes the importance of consumer interest. However, significant developments in the last few years make it appear necessary to modify existing sugar legislation so that the importance of the consumer and his interest is restated in its true perspective.

That question arises because of an apparent tendency to consider that legislation as of primary application only to sugar producers and sugar processors and of the continued efforts of such producers and processors to claim the primary benefits intended to come from such legislation as theirs, and theirs alone. On several occasions, and with increasing frequency, sugar producers and processors in appearing before congressional committees, and more often in appearances before the Secretary of Agriculture and his staff at the annual hearings held for the determination of United States consumption estimates, have indicated a serious disregard for the sugar consumers, when it comes to the matter of sugar cost, and in support of their position usually cite section 201 of the current Sugar Act of 1948. Sugar producers and processors have seemed to take the position that section 201 of the Sugar Act requires the Secretary of Agriculture to establish a consumption estimate, and therefore the permitted supply, for the ensuing year significantly below probable requirements in order that such supply depressing action will result in an inflationary pressure on the price of sugar. On numerous occasions these interests have endeavored to impress on the Secretary that such action was required as a mandate to him from Congress under the terms of the Sugar Act.

Briefly, the general purpose of the Sugar Act of 1948 is stated to be "to protect the welfare of consumers and of those engaged in the domestic sugar industry by providing such supply as will be consumed at prices which will not be excessive to consumers and which will fairly and equitably maintain and protect the welfare of the domestic sugar industry."

Under section 201 of the 1948 Sugar Act, as it now reads, the Secretary of Agriculture, when determining the annual consumption estimate, takes into consideration six factors. It provides that in making this determination of annual requirements it shall use as a basis the quantity of direct-consumption sugar distributed during the 12-month period ending October 31 next preceding the calendar year for which the determination is being made, and shall make allowances for deficiency or surplus in inventories, for changes in population, and for changes in demand conditions. In addition to the previously referred-to basis and allowances, the Secretary shall take into consideration the relationship between prices at wholesale for refined sugar, that would result from such determination, and the general cost of living in the United States as compared with the relationship between prices at wholesale for refined sugar and the general cost of living in the United States obtaining during 1947 prior to the termination of price control of sugar as indicated by the Consumers' Price Index.

Section 201 of the Sugar Act effectively places the determination of the Nation's supply of sugar and the price of it in the hands of one man—the Secretary of Agriculture. And despite the numerous criteria set out in that section as the factors which he "shall use," and "shall make allowances for," and "shall take into consideration," it is abundantly clear that in making such determination a high degree of speculative uncertainty naturally exists, and that such uncertainty can readily result in serious error. As previously pointed out, action which results in an increase of 1-cent per pound in the cost of sugar to the American consumer involves a potential total increase in our annual cost of upward of $160 million.

It is because of these uncertainties and their inherent dangers that this bill is introduced. As conceived it is neither the desire nor purpose to change the fundamental objectives or goals of the 1948 Sugar Act. The objectives of this bill are limited specifically to revision of the existing section 201 which outlines the criteria used by the Secretary of Agriculture in setting an annual estimate of consumer requirements.

First, this bill eliminates from consideration by the Secretary of Agriculture, when determining the annual quota, that provision having to do with the general cost of living index obtained during 1947. Substituted in its place is the single provision that the annual quota so established shall not result in average prices for sugar in excess of those which will reflect to producers prices—including payments under title III of the Sugar Act—for sugar beets and sugar cane equal to not less than 75 percent nor more than 90 percent of the parity price therefor as determined under section 301 (a) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended. This principle, it seems to me, would be in agreement with President Eisenhower's farm program of a flexible parity policy.

Further, and supplementing the parity clause, this bill provides that in no event shall such determination be less than the annual average of the quantity of direct-consumption sugar distributed in the continental United States as indicated by the official statistics of the Department of Agriculture, during the 2 years ending October 31 next preceding the calendar year for which the determination is being made.

With respect to the parity provision here recommended it should be stated that for the year 1952 the estimated average price per ton received by farmers for both sugar beets and sugar cane, according to official statistics published by the Department of Agriculture, in table 6 of Sugar Reports No. 21, reached 92 percent of parity. Likewise, the same source estimated average sugar beet parity for 1953 at 100 percent and for sugar cane 98.5 percent. In consideration of the average parity supports for our other important agricultural commodities, it would appear that sugar is being accorded special treatment at the expense of United States consumers.

The concept of restraining the Secretary of Agriculture from setting an annual estimate below average usage during the 2 preceding years, as here proposed, is not new to sugar legislation. It reestablishes in this sugar-control legislation a previously existing guarantee by Congress that the American consumer shall have the fully supply of sugar he needs, and which guarantee was eliminated when the Sugar Act of 1948 was enacted in favor of means for price control of sugar through supply manipulation. In the Sugar Act of 1934, and again in 1937, basis was provided for safeguarding the historical quantities of sugar required by consumers in a specified period; the former being on a representative-year basis, and the latter on a per capita consumption basis. Therefore, from the standpoint of consumer-users of sugar, and in view of the necessity of strengthening the criteria to be considered by the Secretary of Agriculture when establishing the annual quota, it would appear advisable to add this provision. Legislation of this type will go a long way in eliminating many of the uncertainties and inherent dangers to consumer interest which exist in the control of sugar under the Sugar Act as now written and which were not experienced when that safeguard was in prior acts.

In order that United States sugar consumers may receive the fairest of treatment and protection under our sugar legislation, H. R. 9394 should merit the most serious study and consideration.

Split Allegiances and TVA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS G. ABERNETHY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1954

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Post and Times-Herald of May 28, 1954:

SPLIT ALLEGIANCES AND TVA—CLAPP WARNS ON CHAIRMANSHIP

NORRIS, TENN., May 27.—The national economy can be seriously damaged by a weakening of the Tennessee Valley Authority, Gordon R. Clapp warned yesterday.

And the quickest way to cripple the world-renowned river-valley development, he added, "is for the President to appoint a man of split allegiances" to the agency's board chairmanship.

Clapp, whose 8 years as head of TVA ended last Tuesday, said "It is difficult to see how a TVA man can take his oath of office and at the same time be committed to bring it in line with a new philosophy."

If such a man is appointed by the President, he warned, "this could tear the TVA Board apart with a majority of two—the incumbents—adhering to the purposes of TVA as written in the Valley Authority Act."

FORCED DISAGREEMENT

This would mean he added, that the two incumbents—Raymond Patey and Harry Curtis—"would be forced to disagree publicly with their Chairman."

Only the confusion and disharmony could result, he said—to the detriment of the agency and thus to the national economy as a whole. Clapp spelled out his idea of TVA's impact upon the Nation in these terms:

The agency's yardstick has served to lower electric power rates throughout the Nation.

TVA's idea of abundant use of electricity so stimulated the Nation's demand for power that the private utilities have been forced away from their old theory of scarce power at high rates.

Equally important, he emphasized, TVA has taught the Nation and the world how to weld together in most productive fashion a region's natural resources.

Clapp explored the dangers of a crippled TVA in an exclusive interview with the Nashville Tennessean and the New York Times.

He emphasized that he sees no immediate crisis for the vast multifunction agency created to harness a river's potentially destructive forces to the uses of man. Even if the President delays naming a new TVA Board Chairman, he said, this need produce no crisis.

Both Patey and Curtis, he added, are completely able to carry on its work and assure administrative continuity. In previous years he recalled TVA has gone for periods of as much as 2 years with only two Board members.

Neither, Clapp said, does he subscribe to the theory of the indispensable man. He said he is certain there are many men in sympathy with TVA principles who are qualified to carry out the responsibilities with which he was charged prior to last Tuesday when his term expired.

However, Clapp expressed grave concern over whether Eisenhower will be able to select a man who is sympathetic to these standards—as set out in the TVA Act—and at the same time meet the President's own ideas about TVA's function.

The President said last week during his press conference he is searching for a man who is in agreement with him on the proper role and function of TVA.

"I hope that in filling the vacancy President Eisenhower will recognize the philosophy of government expressed in the AVA development as written in the TVA Act," Clapp said.

CHALLENGES PRESIDENT

He said the act specifies that its Board members must profess a belief in the wisdom and feasibility of the TVA Act. Clapp challenged the President directly in these words:

"If the objectives and puoposes of TVA are not in harmony with the President's genearl philosophy of Government, TVA should not be changed by indirection thorugh the appointment of a new Chairman but by amendment of the law."

Clapp said it is completely conceivable that a new chairman, in good conscience, could take the required oath of office and still aid in its weakening by failing to press vigorously for needed expansions.

"This could defeat the purpose of TVA by direct effort or by nonfeasance—by standing still while TVA's avowed enemies continue their efforts to vigorously assail it and work their wills," he declared.

CREEPING SOCIALISM

Clapp said "it was difficult for TVA to reconcile the epithet of 'creeping socialism' which came over the White House with the President's warm espousal of TVA's engineering plan for regional development of the river Jordan in the Middle East."

This engineering plan, he said, was developed by TVA at the request of the United Nations and shortly thereafter the President sent Eric Johnson, the President's special ambassador, to the Jordan Basin with the plan.

Clapp said he would remind the President that TVA was not constructed in the usual idea some countries have believed of American progress: "One day you have a vacant lot, the next day a skyscraper."

"TVA is nothing more than a culmination of American conservation thinking which began about the turn of the century," he reminded. "The issue," he said, "was debated publicly for 15 years before the first TVA dam was begun." "The system," he continued "was years in the building."

"It has stood for 21 years under constant examination and reexamination by Congress and other public agencies," he added.

"And now," Clapp concluded, "the President appears to be inviting candidates to head this agency who have split allegiances to conflicting philosophy about it."

President Eisenhower Hails Workmen's Circle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1954

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, President Dwight D. Eisenhower today extended warm greetings to the 54th anniversary convention of the Workingmen's Circle which opened this afternoon at the Hotel President in Atlantic City. In a letter to the world's largest Jewish labor fraternal order, President Eisenhower wrote:

> Since 1900, your organization has promoted and strengthened our democratic ideals by helping immigrants adjust to their new American environment, and that through sickness and death benefits, relief of unemployed, health services, schools and summer camps, the Workmen's Circle has advanced the well-being of its members. I also understand that, while supporting and encouraging adherence to our American heritage, you have also promoted Jewish education and helped to preserve Jewish culture.
>
> My congratulations go to the members of the Workmen's Circle, with my best wishes for continued effective service in the years ahead.

Small-Business Loans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1954

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, because of the expressed interest of a number of Members of the House, I am pleased to have obtained from the Small Business Administration and to present for the RECORD a summary of the lending activities of the SBA, created by nonpartisan action during the last session of the Congress.

The Small Business Act of 1953 declared the purposes of the Small Business Administration to be: first, to aid small firms in procuring Government contracts; second, to give technical and managerial assistance to small business; and, third, to provide financial assistance to small concerns to finance plant construction or expansion, buy equipment or facilities, supply working capital, and to provide capital to meet emergency conditions caused by catastrophe.

The small-business loan service has been the principal function of the agency receiving public attention since its creation. Figures on loans, applications, loans processed and loans approved are a good indication of the service being rendered by the Small Business Administration.

Through May 20, last, the regional offices of SBA have received 1,794 loan applications requesting a total of $109,576,206. The regional offices have forwarded 1,025 applications to the Washington office, the total amount having been requested in these applications being $63,456,059. The Washington office has acted upon 861 applications—involving $54,372,719—leaving 164 pending action in the Washington office.

As to the disposition of these applications I am advised that a total of 342 loans have been approved as of May 20 for the total amount of $20,050,260. Of these, 120 were direct loans, amounting to $6,441,360; and 222 were bank participation loans—totaling $13,608,900. The Small Business Administration has declined 519 applications involving requests totaling $30,624,860, and 172 applications requesting loans totaling $9,937,535 have been withdrawn by small business loan applicants. Total disbursements trough May 27, 1954 represent 60 loans involving $3,193,735.55 for both direct and bank participating loans.

First Anniversary of the Czech and Slovak Uprisings Against Communist and Soviet Tyranny in Czechoslovakia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1954

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the Record, I wish to insert the following material pertaining to the first anniversary of the Czech and Slovak uprisings against Communist and Soviet tyranny in Czechoslovakia:

Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C., May 27, 1954.

Dr. Stefan Osusky,
Chairman, Steering Committee,
Council of Free Czechoslovakia,
New York, N. Y.

Dear Mr. Osusky: I have your letter of May 24 requesting that a message be sent on the first anniversary of the Czech and Slovak uprisings against Communist and Soviet tyranny.

It is my understanding that these uprisings were sparked by a monetary reform of the Czech Communist Government which virtually confiscated all savings and sharply lowered wages and salaries. The resultant revolts occurred in Pilsen, Kladno, Ostrava, Handlova, Bratislava, Povazska, Bystrice, Dubnica, and Krompachy. However, the Czech and Slovak patriots who dared to express their resentment against Communist tyranny were cruelly repressed by the police and army.

As one who has lived behind the Iron Curtain and has visited such places as Praha, Bratislava, and Kosice even while they were under Red control, I rejoice that these demonstrations a year ago proved conclusively that the spirit of freedom and independence lingers on among the Czech and Slovak peoples. I trust that these expressions of mine and my colleagues may be communicated behind the Iron Curtain so that the Czechs and Slovaks will realize they are not forgotten and will know that we in America are determined that we will see the day of liberation which we pray will not be far away. We will rejoice when the day arrives when not only the Czech and Slovak people but all peoples now behind the Iron Curtain will again enjoy the right to free self-determination of the type and form of government under which they wish to live.

I am inserting a copy of your letter and accompanying memorandum of May 20, together with a copy of this reply, in the Congressional Record on June 1, 1954.

With kind regards, I remain,

Sincerely yours,

Alvin M. Bentley,
Member of Congress.

Council of Free Czechoslovakia,
New York, N. Y., May 20, 1954.

The Honorable John W. Bentley,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Congressman Bentley: At the beginning of June falls the first anniversary of the uprising of the Czech and Slovak workers against their Communist masters and the Soviet-dictated tyranny. The riots in Pilsen, Kladno, Ostrava, Handlova, and elsewhere in Czechoslovakia was the signal which led the workers in East Germany on June 17 to rise against their oppressors.

I am enclosing a short memorandum of the Council of Free Czechoslovakia containing some data on the anti-Communist riots and strikes in Czechoslovakia, in the hope that you will see your way to send us a message to be broadcast by radio free Europe to Czechoslovakia and that you will find the occasion appropriate to speak of those sad and yet important events in Congress and to publish your remarks in the Congressional Record.

Our brethren behind the Iron Curtain expect words of encouragement from the American people, in their struggle to be free again. They need to know that the free world has not forgotten them.

Sincerely yours,

Dr. Stefan Osusky,
Chairman, Steering Committee.

Memorandum Concerning the Anti-Communist Riots in Czechoslovakia in June 1953

Ever since 1948, when the Soviet-sponsored coup took place in Czechoslovakia and Communists seized the Government, civil liberties are dwindling there and the control over the unhappy people by the all-powerful police and the Communist Party is tightening. In May of 1953 the oppression reached its climax, when the puppet government decreed a drastic monetary reform with the purpose of tying the Czechoslovak crown to the Russian ruble and obliging every one to exchange money at a rate of five to fifty crowns for one "new" crown. The exchange was on a sliding scale, but its result was that savings were virtually wiped out and wages and salaries decreased.

This new lowering of the standard of living was the last drop in the cup of their sufferings. The resentment was such that in Pilsen and other industrial regions workers revolted against the Communist Party and the government-controlled trade unions. At some places the uprising centered in the trade unions themselves. The events were so serious and so well-known all over Czechoslovakia that even the Communist press had to publish accounts of them.

On Jnne 1 workers from the great Skoda factory—which is now called the Lenin Works, of course—stormed the Pilsen City Hall and Court Building, pillaged the archives, trambled on the Red flag and pictures of Stalin and Gottwald and hoisted an American flag over the building. Similar demonstrations took place at Kladno, Ostrava, and Handlova, and unrest and strikes were reported to have occurred at many other places in Czechoslovakia. Czech steel workers are showing at the same time to the Communist regime their unwillingness to reconcile with the loss of freedom. The Communist police were able to supress the riots and strikes. Many Czech and Slovak patriots paid dearly for their courage and defiance. Hundreds were arrested and at least six were executed. The fate of the arrested is not known.

The hoisted United States flag was the fruit of the heritage of the warm relations between the American and Czech and Slovak peoples. These happy and friendly relations started as early as the 17th and 18th centuries, when the first Czech refugees, fleeing the religious persecution and headed by the Moravian Brethren found haven in America, and continued up to the time when the United States so generously accepted, after 1948, thousands of our people who were driven from their fatherland by communism. That hoisted American flag also was the expression of gratitude to the American Army which in 1945 liberated Pilsen and the rest of western Bohemia, and, to the UNRRA aid, which helped Czechoslovakia so much in the postwar years. But it was also the symbol of the faith of our people in the United States, the symbol of their hope and the trust in the American democracy.

We must not fail them in their hope and faith.

Council of Free Czechoslovakia.

Today's Alternatives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DEWEY SHORT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1954

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, Adm. Robert B. Carney, USN, Chief of Naval Operations, delivered an important address to the Nation Security Industrial Association in New York, on May 27, 1954.

Admiral Carney's address Today's Alternatives describes the dangers under which we live, and asks us to evaluate our course in the future. It is appropriate that this speech was delivered to the members of the National Security Industrial Association, which organization is supported by over 600 companies, large and small, employing more than one-third of the Nation's manufacturing laboring force. The members of this association contribute the time and talent of highly skilled personnel to assist the Department of Defense with expert advice.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include this vital address by Admiral Carney with the hope that every Member of Congress will take the time to read it and ponder well its message:

TODAY'S ALTERNATIVES

(An address by Adm. Robert B. Carney, USN)

Our country was founded on principles of individual liberty and equality with an emphasis on the dignity of an honorable peace. Nevertheless, we frequently have fought to consolidate this principle.

Our forebears believed that in America there could be a peaceful and democratic country that would enhance the dignity of the human being. Those beliefs were set forth in the greatest document ever written—the Constitution and its Bill of Rights. We went to war to put this idea across. Our new Republic in its beginnings lived up to the nobility of its self-originated charter but we had to fight in the early decade of this century to make it stick. We believed that in this new world, others should have the same God-given opportunity as ourselves, so, the Monroe Doctrine was born and, on occasion, we fought to make it stick. The Federal Government believed in the destiny of a United States that was indivisible. Although powerful differences of opinion on this particular subject led to a bitter War Between the States, today, all of our States are welded together under one flag with a greater solidarity than ever.

Three times within my generation, the United States determined that it was willing to cast its lot in the fight against aggression and went to war in support of our beliefs. It may appear to be an anomaly, but our love for peace has never been so great that we were not willing to fight for the preservation of those principles and relationships which are the only justifiable foundations for peace.

The threats to our security which have confronted us in the past were trivial compared to the threat that faces the country today. This is neither alarmist nor jingoist talk; nor is it a prediction that the holocaust will come tomorrow. This is merely the belief of an American citizen who is convinced that tomorrow can come far sooner than may be realized.

The forceful and violent reactions of our history which I have pointed up were in effect the decisions of our country respecting the alternatives facing us throughout our past decades and centuries. We are confronted with alternatives today and once more we must make up our minds as to which of those alternatives we wish to adopt.

There is a decided and very subtle difference between the kind of wars we have fought in the past and the kind of struggle we are engaged in today. In our history we have seen the situation as peace or war; we have seen the white of peace and the black of war. But in between the black and white of the spectrum, there is a vast zone of gray. It is neither in the black area nor the white area, and it is in that vast gray zone that the Soviet Union prefers to call the turn. They know that we, and particularly the United States, are not accustomed to this kind of struggle; they know we don't like it.

Nor do they think of war entirely in the conventional sense of sky battles, sea battles, and land battles. The military aspects are only a part, in many instances, a small part, of their plan. The Soviet Union is at war against the mind of man. Although their military capabilities counsel us to remain alert and strong, their primary strength lies not in that military realm but in their diplomatic deceit and subtleties—their spread of intranational and international distrust and suspicion; their spread of fear, and of social and economic disunity—this is the kind of war the Kremlin knows. They create contradictory situations and conditions to confuse and confound their adversaries and they always advance during that confusion. They operate on a sort of tidal theory: that anything like international relations by its changing nature cannot be completely planned and will inevitably have its ups and downs. The trick is to ride with the tide, swim on the floodtide and lose as little as possible when the tide ebbs.

Let me briefly review the recent history of Soviet-inspired communism.

In Germany, for instance, they have taken large amounts of manufactured products as reparations; they have absorbed a large portion of the German industry which was located in the Soviet zone; they have exploited and drained German resources in violation of the Potsdam agreement; they have instituted a totalitarian system of police control which suppresses basic human rights and legal processes, and indulges in arbitrary seizures, arrests, and forced labor—all of these things, of course, are contrary to solemn agreements the Soviet Union made with her World War II allies.

In the Soviet zone of Austria, the pattern has been very much the same. Time precludes my documenting their continuing violations of such agreements as those made at Yalta and Potsdam as they gained political and economic control of Poland, Hungary, Bulgaria, Rumania, Czechoslovakia, North Korea, and China.

But now we have learned something of the pattern of Soviet aggression, the actions they take, the tools they use. Military occupation, false promises, false propaganda, subversion, police control, brainwashing, the dissolving of churches, of national cultures, forced confessions, and the ultimate opportunity to be reconstituted as a thoroughbred Communist—all these devices are familiar to us today. And I do not need to underline the advantage of the liar in a diplomatic agreement.

There is one postwar diplomatic agreement of the Soviet Union that has been so far reaching and stands out as such a classic that I should like to mention it today. Incidentally, it was not made with the United States. I refer to the treaty of Friendship and Alliances signed in Moscow on August 14, 1945. There, the Russian leaders pledged their respect for the sovereignty of the Chinese Nationalists; they promised noninterference in Chinese internal affairs; they agreed not to participate in any alliances nor to take part in any coalition directed against the Nationalist Government of the Republic of China. Mr. Molotov signed that treaty. On the same date Mr. Molotov also signed a note relating to the treaty in which the Government of the U. S. S. R. agreed to render moral support to Nationalist China and to aid in military supplies and other material resources. And such support and aid was to be entirely given to the Nationalist Government. The solemn treaty was to remain in force for a term of 30 years.

There were still 29 years to run on that 30-year treaty signed by Mr. Molotov when the Russian leaders showed the world what they meant by good faith and how they honored a treaty. They had brought aid to the Nationalist Government by removing much of Manchuria's industry and equipment to Russian territory. And by the time the Nationalist Government forces were finally permitted to occupy the area in 1946, they found themselves facing Chinese Communist forces organized, disciplined and mysteriously equipped with former Japanese weapons.

For 9 years, there has been an unbroken series of agreements that the Communists have never kept.

There is no reason whatsoever to assume any change of heart or good will on the part of the Communists. Today, in Indochina, it is floodtide. The Communists are swimming strong, not winded by any means, and it is wholly unrealistic to expect them to stop reaching forward under these circumstances.

We are dedicated to the belief that all nations interested in the maintenance of their freedom must band together and make their appropriate contributions both moral and physical in resistance to this threat.

When the time comes that all the free people realize that we are in a fight to the finish against those who would destroy the dearest birthright of the human race—a man's control of his own mind—I think we will all admit the necessity of fighting harder for what we believe in than the Communists fight for what they want. The ultimate goals of this war cannot be measured alone in square miles of land, in sunken fleets, or decimated armies. This is a war to determine whether man will be free or whether he is to be enslaved by puppet sovereignties; and the first objective of the campaign is the capture of his mind.

It is interesting to note that in no case have we ever enslaved anybody as a result of our victorious efforts. We can point with great justified pride to the fulfillment of our promise to the Filipinos. We can point to our efforts to assist the Japanese in rehabilitating themselves. We can point to the fact that we have helped the Germans on two occasions; that, whereas we fought with the utmost vigor and determination in defense of our beliefs that we as a Nation have never harbored a grudge against our former adversaries nor have we endeavored to acquire sovereignty of additional territory nor the enslavement of the people and their minds.

In 1950 when the Communist crossed into South Korea, our people took the instant and courageous decision that this aggression must be stopped somewhere and this was a good place to stop it. The outcome of that struggle cannot be regarded with complete satisfaction by the allies but the fact remains that we chose the decision to fight them rather than to submit to Communist expansion.

Dressed in different garb, those same alternatives are upon us today, but today, they are graver than they have ever been before. If the free world loses Indochina, can any thinking person convince himself that this is the last step? It should be as obvious as the pages of history that it is only a matter of time until the rest of southeast Asia will be blanketed behind the curtain. With its millions of people and with its vast resources, Indochina would immeasurably strengthen the warmaking potential of the Communist world.

There are some alternative courses of action available to those of us being constantly badgered, assaulted, and insulted, but the alternatives are not for the United States alone. They confront the entire community of freedom-loving nations—European and Asiatic. The United States cannot make the decision alone. If effective resistance—politically and/or militarily—is to be organized in any part of the world, it can only be done with the wholehearted consent of the populations involved. These are political matters for governments to decide, but the alternatives should be just as apparent to the man in the street as to his servants in Washington.

The possibilities or alternatives open to the Soviet strategists and their Chinese Communist partners are infinite as long as they can radiate out from their centralized position. They can continue to exert pressures into southeast Asia with its 150 million people and vast resources. They could move against south Asia's impoverished millions. They can move against the Middle East. And I emphasize again—they can move in the economic, political, cultural, and military spheres depending on their own choice. The combinations and permutations of their future courses of action are limited only by their composite imaginations and diabolical schemes. No one can say for sure what they will do; whether they will act rationally or irrationally; whether, with the hope and possibility of surprise, they will miscalculate or underestimate our own countermeasures and retaliatory capabilities. Their record would seem to indicate, however, that despite their own mental perversities, they, themselves, are somewhat devoid of kamikazi tendencies.

What alternatives are there for us?

For every additional gain of territory and population by communism, there is a corresponding subtraction from the total strength of the free world. That is elementary arithmetic. There are just so many people in the world and so many resources. The balance between us is a fine one today. With each additional gain accruing to the Soviet-controlled world and the corresponding subtraction from the free world, the balance becomes more and more heavily weighted against us. Carried to its final conclusion throughout the world, there can be no other conclusion than that we would ultimately be in a position far inferior to the coalition dedicated to our destruction.

In actuality, the problem is not one of coming up with a succession of minor strategies to cope with brush fires. The real and fundamental problem is to develop a strategy which is a true long-range counter to the centralized overall strategy which is directing the moves in the campaigns for Communist expansion.

Getting down to brass tacks, the simple alternatives are these: To do nothing; to rush around plugging the dike or to take measures to lower the pressure against the dikes. In the past, our people have had the courage to take a firm stand at the critical moment. We took such a stand in 1950 in Korea. We have come to one crossroad after another as we travel along the highways of our destiny and as surely as I stand here, we are approaching another. Perhaps I should say we are approaching a fork in the road. One of the forks is a smooth highway but it doesn't go very far and it ends in oblivion; the other road goes through rough country and is beset by obstacles, but at least it goes on and on. The choice could be a fateful one from which there could be no turning back, because we are close to the fork and traveling at high speed and I do not believe that much time will be vouchsafed us. I repeat now, and I will repeat again and again, that our adversary have never shown good faith—never. He has shown no deviation from his purpose and the evidence of his purpose is represented in the enslavement of Poland, the eastern sections of Germany and Austria, Rumania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Albania, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, China, and North Korea, his persistent and continuing attempts by one means or another to take over every nation in the world. He is constantly expanding, constantly bringing new multitudes, new resources into his orbit. Until today, some 800 million people are doing his bidding; his steady buildup of his armed forces, his increasing efforts in the maritime field—all are indications of his cold and calculated intentions. How can we believe that a settlement of our present trouble will end the troubles? How can we close our eyes to the inevitable arithmetic, that everything added to his resources is something subtracted from ours? How can we possibly blind ourselves to the ultimate end of that arithmetical process which will finally leave us in a position from which there is no possibility of recovering?

It is not for me, a military servant of this country, to say what the national choice will be, but as an American citizen whose entire time and energies are absorbed in contemplation of the problem of our security, it is not inappropriate for me to evaluate the danger. It would be a willfully blind man indeed who failed to see and admit that the danger is imminent and is increasing swiftly.

Today's alternatives are grave indeed but their gravity may well be dwarfed by those which will confront us in a few years hence if our country fails to choose properly today.

Do we want to turn into the smooth dead end or take the rougher road that offers us a good destination if we have the guts and strength to negotiate it?

President Grover Cleveland's Description of Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1954

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, the following paragraphs were called to my attention the other day:

> Communism is a hateful thing, and a menace to peace and organized government. But the communism of combined wealth and capital, the outgrowth of overweening cupidity and selfishness, which insidiously undermines the justice and integrity of free institutions, is not less dangerous than the communism of oppressed poverty and toil which, exasperated by injustice and discontent, attacks with wild disorder the citadel of rule.
>
> He mocks the people who proposes that the Government shall protect the rich and that they in turn will care for the laboring poor. Any intermediary between the people and their Government, or the least delegation of the care and protection the Government owes to the humblest citizens in the land, makes the boast of free institutions a glittering delusion and the pretended boon of American citizenship a shameless imposition.

I wonder how many readers of those words were able to identify them as excerpts from President Grover Cleveland's fourth annual message to the Congress delivered on December 3, 1888. Not only is President Cleveland's description of communism still accurate today but also his comments on the "trickle down" theory are also still valid.

Does Our Social Security System Make Sense?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1954

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD the following article from the June 1954 issue of Commentary:

DOES OUR SOCIAL SECURITY SYSTEM MAKE SENSE?—INSURANCE, RELIEF, OR WHAT?

(By Dillard Stokes)

The true nature of social security in our country is almost unknown to the taxpayers who maintain and rely on it. After 20 years, "social security" is in the language, but these words connote its purpose and assumed benefits rather than the vast politicoeconomic complex depended upon to realize them. The aims of social security are admirable. Most of the results evident to date are good. So, by association, these virtues are imputed to the system itself.

Both Democrats and Republicans extol this sacred cow for the milk it gives, but they do not audit its feed bill or mention the possibility of its going dry. Politicians in both parties trade on colossal outlays for today and munificent promises for tomorrow. Can the promises possibly be honored? What will they really cost? And who, really, is going to pay for them in the long run? These very relevant political considerations languish for want of attention. But they do not die; they only bide their time.

The sole changes seriously being proposed today in social security are for the extension of its coverage to more people—usually in blocks of several millions—and for the raising of payments to all beneficiaries, either forthrightly or by easing the curbs now in force. That is the substance of the Eisenhower program now before Congress. It was the substance of the program recommended by Presidents Truman and Roosevelt. These programs open the tap a little more—but the situation actually requires a thorough examination of the design and efficiency of the whole system of waterworks.

What faces us here is a lapse of the political process. Since the founding of the Republic, policy on great matters has been hammered out through conflicts of interest. Hard-money pressure opposed soft-credit pressure. High-tariff pressure opposed cheap-goods pressure. Each faction was a check on every other; its own interest acted as a test of the policy that prevailed, or of the compromise that was reached by balancing the pressures (the latter being the most frequent solution). This process does not function when only one side of an issue finds partisans and attracts general support, as is the case with social security today. The only issues taken to the people are which party, and which candidate, can promise most to most people most plausibly.

This is not because politicians are rascals but because they are politicians. It is their normal and proper response to much pressure on one side, and little or none on the other. Here on one side is the interest of 6 million beneficiaries, and of 63 million others who hope to join them. This interest is taken up by the liberal wings of both political parties, prodded by powerful lobbies like those of the AFL, the CIO, the ADA, social workers, fraternal groups, and others. These greatly outnumber and outlobby the normally conservative professional, industrial, and financial interests, many of whom are restrained in their opposition by their hope of finding in social security a solution of employer-pension and disability problems.

Hence there was no steam behind the recent proposal of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States to change over to a pay-as-you-go, universal coverage pension plan. It was lost amid the attacks upon the defenses of the social-security idea on an ideological level. There was little discussion of the merits and faults, as such, of the proposed change.

It is the burden of this article that the unanimity is very superficial and that social security presents real issues on which neither present nor prospective beneficiaries would be all of one mind did they know the facts. Until these are clear the political process cannot function.

A realistic survey of OASI—the Federal old-age and survivors' insurance plan, the programs called social security—must reckon with three propositions. First: the sheer size of OASI, which is the biggest permanent enterprise this Government ever has undertaken, or is ever likely to undertake. Second: the public illusions about social security, which are clustered in such a semblance of order as to form a complete yet largely mythical system. Third: the bankruptcy of design and policy, both social and financial, that handicaps the actual system, whose function, method, and economic nature have not been clarified. The myth about social security veils shortcomings, but they are these, and they must be remedied before social security can do its job and merits its reputation.

The factor of size might be taken for granted, but it would be better to put it into perspective first. Since its establishment in 1935, social security has collected taxes from 106,800,000 persons. What other enterprise, public or private, ever attracted or compelled the participation of so many Americans? Not the Armed Forces: there are only about 20 million veterans. Not the income tax: fewer than 60 million returns are made a year. Not even making a living: the 1954 labor force amount to somewhere around 62½ million.

Out of a population of 161 million, about 6 million people get OASI benefits, one for each 10½ workers. Here are the OASI high- and low-cost forecasts for the year 2000, just 46 years away:

	Low cost	High cost
United States population [1]	248	216
Working force [1]	96	84
OASI beneficiaries [1]	21	25.8
As percent of population	8½	12
OASI reserve fund [1]	$128,000	(2)
Annual OASI cost [1]	$16,421	$16,437
Per productive worker	$171	$195
Productive workers per each OASI beneficiary	4.54	3.25

[1] In millions.

[2] Exhausted.

Besides old-age pensions to be paid in the future, OASI promises workers in covered jobs protection in the nature of life insurance. After only 15 years of operation, this insurance amounts to nearly $300 billion. All life insurance of all kinds written by all the private insurance companies in the United States adds up to only $276 billion.

Private insurance is backed up by assets—mostly reserves required by law—of about $76 billion. Social-security insurance is backed by a reserve fund now hovering around $20 billion. After 46 years this fund will either have grown to $128 billion, or to a lesser total—or else it will have all been spent by 1997. The 1953 report of the social-security trustees envisioned all three possibilities, there being no way to tell which will come to pass. As far as the expert can see, any one of the three is as likely as any other.

One does not have to be an expert to see that colossal sums of money are involved. Next to these items of $300 billion and $128 billion, let us place others drawn from the American economy. The national debt is less than $275 billion. The total assets of all American corporations are $181 billion. The total of all bank deposits is $189 billion.

An enterprise as big as social security, which is going to get still bigger, is sure to be a dominant factor henceforth in the American economy, as dominant as steel output, foreign trade, consumer credit, and the value of the whole wheat crop all put together.

Most American families are insured by social security against the death or retirement in old age of their breadwinners. Workers pay premiums on this insurance through taxes withheld from their wages, and the employers pay equal taxes for their workers' benefit. Workers in covered employment thereby acquire the right to a monthly income for themselves and their families when they retire at 65, or a monthly income for their wives, children, aged parents, etc., in case of death before retirement. The payments vary with the worker's earnings, and thus with the premium paid. These OASI benefits do not depend on a means test, as relief does, for they are not charity or relief. The workers pay substantially for what they will get, and they, or their survivors, will get substantially what they pay for. The benefits are paid out of a reserve fund built up for the purpose from premiums paid by prospective beneficiaries. Premiums now being paid by tens of millions of workers are building up the reserve fund to pay their benefits when they become entitled to them.

A familiar picture, is it not? Consider it well. It corresponds to the notion of social security held by a hundred million Americans. They take it for granted, they take it for fact—and they are dead wrong. For every statement in the foregoing paragraph is demonstrably false.

As a matter of fact, social security does not provide insurance. The contributions are not premiums, they are just taxes. The workers acquire no rights, nor do their survivors. Payments to retired workers, or to surviving families—if and when paid—have little relation to the worker's earnings or to what he paid in to OASI. There is a means test for many, and there is an earnings test for everyone. Most of the money now being paid out by social security is relief: the people getting it did not pay for it, and millions do not get what they did pay for. The benefits do not come out of any reserve fund. The trust account maintained under that name is neither a fund nor a reserve.

Insurance is a word known to nearly everybody. And so is the substance of Webster's definition, that it is a contract whereby for a stipulated consideration, called a premium, one party undertakes to indemnify or guarantee another against loss by a certain specified contingency or peril, called a risk, the contract being set forth in a document called a policy. (New International Dictionary, second edition.)

The social-security program is referred to in the law as old-age and survivors' insurance. Its revenue comes from taxes imposed by the Federal Insurance Contributions Act. The Government has published over 60 million booklets, leaflets, press releases, and other educational material, all chock-full of words like insurance, premium, policy, etc. (Here is a sample statement, from a booklet put out in 1952 (2 million copies printed): "Your account number on your social-security card identifies your old-age and survivors' insurance account. Your card is the symbol of your insurance policy under the Federal social-security law.") This nomenclature has been taken up by the newspapers, magazines, and public speakers.

For this reason, the American people cannot be blamed for supposing they are buying insurance with the taxes they pay OASI, and that the other party—the Government—"undertakes to indemnify or guarantee" them against loss of income due to old age and death, according to the published tables and formulas. Hardly can it be called quibbling over words to point out here that the taxes are not buying them insurance or anything else. For under social security the company—that is, the Government—is bound to no obligations whatever. It can raise the premiums or the benefits, or reduce them, or cut them out, or change the conditions upon which benefits are paid, or do anything else it likes, and the policyholder—that is, the taxpayer, the worker—has no remedy. The courts say that what he pays in is an income tax, and if he gets anything back it is a gratuity.

There are sinister stories about the fine print in insurance policies, but surely no private company was ever able to change the fine print at will, or to default on the policy and keep the premiums.

Many will say that such a default would violate the moral if not the legal rights of the victims, and surely Congress never would do anything so shocking. Ah, but Congress has done so.

The Social Security Act of 1935 provided that a worker would get back not less than what he put into the system. The act provided lump-sum refunds to those who reached 65 without qualifying for pensions, to the estates of those who died before reaching 65, and to the estates of those who began drawing pensions but died before receiving an amount equal to the value of their contributions. Under this law, refunds were made to 178,583 workers and 318,665 estates. The same right to get back their money belonged to the other 33 million people who paid social-security taxes during this period but did not die or retire. Whether their rights were moral, legal, or both, Congress wiped them out by the act of 1939. As a result, up to the end of 1952, a total of 6,400,000 persons died without receiving pensions, lump-sum payments, refunds, or anything else. Yet they, and their employers, had paid in $725 million.

The act of 1935 assured the original 33 million OASI taxpayers permanent coverage by 1941. Most of these taxpayers had but 2 years to go when Congress passed the 1939 amendments and moved the date forward to the end of 1946.

During the 1940's the courts declared social-security rights to belong to upward of a million persons over whom there was dispute by reason of the nature of their employment. Regulations to cover them were drafted but never took effect because in 1948 Congress took the rights away.

Having bought, paid for, and qualified for their social-security incomes—as they were led to think—many persons retired to live on them and on what they could earn through noncovered work. These persons opened little shops, set up as repairmen, part-time bookkeepers, dressmakers, or the like. In fine, these old people made plans for their old age on the basis of social security and its assurances. What they did was perfectly legal—until 1950, when Congress extended OASI coverage to the self-employed, and put a limit on their earnings. As a result, many were stripped of their OASI incomes—23,208 individuals suffered these cuts by the end of 1951. In some cases they were called on to pay back substantial sums. And to rub salt in the wound, these people were required by law to pay OASI taxes on their earnings so they would have social security in their old age.

These are instances of rights taken away by specific act. However, OASI rights can vanish simply by the passage of time. There are 25 million persons who paid some taxes to OASI between 1937 and 1951, but at the end of the latter year were uninsured. Some never paid over a period long enough to acquire protection. Many others were insured at some time but lost that status, as well as what they paid in. Another 41 million persons are currently insured, but may lose that status and find themselves, like the first 25 million, deprived of their right to benefits if they are out of a job too long or work too long at jobs not under social security. There are 25 million who now have permanent insurance. They keep their rights regardless of where or whether they work (unless Congress takes them away). These permanently insured persons, however, are liable to a diminution of their benefits if they stop paying OASI taxes; the longer they have no covered earnings, the less the average monthly wage credited to them.

On this average is based the retired worker's primary benefit. His monthly payment is 55 percent of the first $100 of the average, plus 15 percent of the next $200. Secondary benefits are fractions of the primary. The spouse and children of a retired worker each may get a monthly payment of half the primary. The surviving spouse and parents of a deceased worker may each get a monthly payment of three-fourths of the primary. Each surviving child may get between a half and three-fourths. The maximum payable on any worker's account is 80 percent of his average monthly wage, but not more than $168.75.

What is the relationship of these benefits to what was paid in? This year a $100-a-month worker pays $4 a month—$2 himself, $2 through his employer—for a monthly primary benefit of $55. A $300-a-month worker pays $12 a month for a benefit of $85. That is 200 percent more premium for only 55 percent more insurance. A self-employed person, for the same insurance, pays 25 percent less premium than one who works for somebody else. This isn't all; about 10 percent of the 6 million persons newly covered by the 1950 amendments were able to buy, by paying premiums for 6 quarters, the same coverage others had paid premiums on for 14 years. (An OASI booklet in 1951 gave the example of a $20-a-week housekeeper who can get $41 a month for life when she has paid OASI taxes for 3 years. For $93.60 she gets an annuity worth about $4,000.)

Whether social security is administering a relief program is a matter of fact, not of words.[1] As distinguished from bought and paid-for benefits widely supposed to come from social security, relief is aid given by a public agency to needy persons who have not paid for it. Payments based on a substantial consideration are not relief just because somebody calls them that. A gratuity is no less relief because it is called something else, or because of a token consideration that, in fact, does not pay for it.

---

[1] The reference, of course, is to OASI alone, not to old-age assistance, aid to dependent children, aid to the needy blind, or aid to the permanently and totally disabled. These Federal programs, though handled by social security, are setup by Congress as relief, and paid for as such out of separate funds appropriated out of the general funds of the Treasury. In the year ending June 30, 1954, they cost the Federal Treasury $1,340,000,000, or about $2 per month per taxpayer.

A social security report shows $15 billion in annuities will be paid present old-age beneficiaries, their spouses and children. The actual cost of these annuities is not less than $9 or $10 billion, yet these beneficiaries paid only $711,480,000 for them. We disregard the "insurance" protection enjoyed by the primary beneficiaries for periods up to 13 years, the value of which was several times the $711 million they paid in; here we treat the sum of $711 million as though it were paid for the annuities alone.) These people, then, are going to draw over $14 billion more than they paid in. These $14 billion were clearly not paid for: what does this sum go for then, if not old-age relief? The point is not made to blame the old people's getting the aid. Many of them need it, and a wise economy will give it to them. But these considerations do not justify pretending the $14 billion came out of a "reserve fund" built up by the beneficiaries. Nor do they justify camouflaging the fact that the money really comes out of "premiums" currently being paid in by workers who are led to believe that their money is being saved up for their benefit.

Granted that this $14 billion ought to be paid out and that, like all wise relief, it promotes the general welfare. Under our theory of government, funds for this purpose ought to come—and otherwise do come—out of the general funds raised by taxes levied according to ability to pay. The fiction that these OASI payments are something other than relief conceals what is going on. That is, this charge for the general welfare is being exacted from one class of taxpayers, the wage earners. And the whole burden falls on the poorest of these, for OASI taxes only the first $3,600 of annual earnings.

Public relief and private charity have long been denied to those having other means of subsistence, but social security is generally believed to eliminate this supposedly humiliating condition. As an OASI booklet put it: "This is an insurance program. Participants may qualify for benefits without regard to their financial resources, such as savings, property, or other insurance." Quite so. A millionaire can draw the same OASI income for himself and his family that a janitor can. Neither must pass a means test. But if the janitor's means include $76 a month paid him for mowing lawns, he will lose his social-security payments for that month. So will his wife and children. The payments to 340,508 persons were cut off, under this regulation at the end of 1952.

Also, widowers, surviving parents, and, in some cases children, must prove actual dependency on the primary beneficiary. In view of all this, the assertion that social security does not now use a means test rests on some pretty refined hairsplitting.

There is on the books of the Treasury an OASI trust account of nearly $20 billions which will increase by more than $2 billion this year. The account is part of the public debt, and draws interest at about 2¼ percent. How then can one say there is no social-security reserve fund?

Suppose there were no account, and from year to year OASI paid its costs out of appropriations voted for the purpose. If a year came when outgo was more than the appropriation, what could be done? There are four answers: (1) a portion of the Social Security benefits for that year would not be paid; (2) the Government would borrow the necessary funds and make them available to Social Security; (3) Congress would raise taxes to get the money; or (4) the funds would be diverted from some other use by cutting the budget of some other agency.

The same four courses—and no others—would be open to meet an OASI deficit under the reserve fund as it is now constituted.

There is no money in this reserve fund, either as cash, or as a credit like a bank deposit on which checks could be drawn. There are vast evidences of Federal debt, but these are not "bonds" in a familiar or negotiable form. This is not to say that the reserve is worthless—it is as good as the credit of the United States—but it does not exist as a "fund" ready and available when needed. When OASI calls on it the Treasury must find the money, if it is able and Congress is willing. To make good on the reserve fund would require the same operations as to meet a deficit. As an economic fact there is no reserve fund (as the term has been used and understood up to now.)

Private insurance companies have put many billions of their reserves (but seldom over 20 percent of the total) into Government bonds. But they are not on the same footing as OASI, which invests in nothing else. First, the reason for drawing on the Reserves. Private companies get most of their revenue from premiums. A sharp drop in these would reduce their liabilities. But a drop in OASI revenue would mean no such relief from liability. On the contrary, the same factors that caused the loss probably would bring more claims for benefits. When OASI runs into a deficit it probably will not be due to revenue loss at all, but to increased demands. Second, if the private companies met their needs wholly out of their Government bonds, whether these were sold, pledged, or cashed in, there would be no resultant rise in Government paper held by the public, or in taxes, and no reduction of Federal spending. One or more of these would be sure to follow an OASI deficit, with considerable impact on the Nation's whole economy.

The foregoing passages have touched on some but by no means all of the popular illusions about social security. Most of these probably grew out of confused policy and lack of basic principles. Both these confusions and lacks are in the Social Security Act itself. The blame belongs to Congress, not the administrators. They err in emphasizing insurance, premiums, rights, and so forth, but even here they can plead that the terms came from Congress and they just make the most of them.

The conditions of eligibility common to all social security benefits are (1) filing application; (2) adequate covered employment of the primary worker; (3) absence of other OASI benefits of equal or greater value; and (4) that the beneficiary not earn over $75 a month in covered employment.

The first requirement calls for no comment, except that it is hard to see why it was written into the very law. The second is certainly natural and reasonable: it goes to the foundation of eligibility. The third belongs in a relief or charity program: what is it doing, therefore, in an insurance system? (If one is able to claim two or more benefits it can only be because he, or somebody else, bought and paid for them. So why should he not have them? The answer is that OASI simply is not an insurance system except in name.) The fourth condition is the daily instrument of many discriminations.

Besides these there are a host of conditions whch vary from one class of beneficiaries to another and out of which it is impossible to make any logical pattern. Some are so whimsical and arbitrary that whether a person gets, or keeps, current payment status might as well depend on drawing numbers out of a hat. The inevitable result is more discriminations; some favor the rich over the poor, others the poor over the rich. Each touches only a handful of people, but those affected are wholly affected. And handfuls add up.

Consider the covered-earnings requirement: a wage earner (as well as his wife and children) loses his OASI payment for any month in which he makes over $75. But the limit for a self-employed person is not $75 a month but $900 a year. He can make over $75 in 11 months out of 12 without losing a dime of OASI benefit.[3] Those who find employment outside OASI coverage, as in public agencies, tax-exempt institutions, and the like, are freed from this condition altogether. So are 25,000 beneficiaries in foreign countries. Raising the limit will not erase this flaw; the discriminations will still be there.

To survey all the ifs and maybes that harass any one category of secondary beneficiaries would take another article as long as this one. But let us look at 1 or 2 of them in practice.

Age: A retired worker must be 65 to be paid. What about his wife? She, too, must be 65 years old, no matter how long they have been married, no matter whether she ever has worked, or is able to work now. The fact is that most husbands are older than their wives; the average is nearly 4 years. And that tells why in 1952, 1,440,000 persons over 65 had a right to OASI benefits but were not drawing them. It goes far, too, to explain why the average retirement is not 65, but over 68.

The OASI rule, however, is different if the wife under 65 has a child under 18. In that case she and the child can each draw a benefit equal to half that of the retired husband. No widow, however needy, can draw a benefit until she is 65, unless she has a child. If she has, she collects, no matter how well off she is. Yet all these husbands paid taxes to OASI at the same rate for—as they thought—the same security for their wives.

Dependency: This is not a condition for payment of benefits to a child, or to a wife or widow over 65, or to the mother of a child under 18, whatever her age. But the husband or widower of a woman worker must establish his actual dependency. What is more, in his case it is not enough that the wife be permanently insured under OASI. She must, in addition, have worked during half of the 3 years just before her death or retirement. Moreover, the husband's dependency must exist at the time of the retirement or death. If a husband suffers a breakdown or loses his job the week after the wife retires or dies, there is no OASI protection for him, no matter how much his wife paid in premiums. In such a case, a retired woman might be able to qualify her husband by going back to work. But, if she died, social security would simply keep what she has paid in and leave the widower to shift for himself.

The point advanced here is not that any of these rules are wrong in and of themselves, but that they are a hodgepodge, and follow no rationale. The earnings of some are limited, of others not; some must be 65, others not; some must be actual dependents of the primary, others not. The rights of the beneficiaries depend on time, chance, and statutory caprice to a degree that would provoke just criticism of a charity program and is intolerable in a system of insurance the worker buys and pays for.

The chaos just indicated came about with the shift, in 1939, from paid-for pensions to gratuities, without acknowledgement of the fact either by Congress or by the advocates and apologists of social security. The same act of 1939 not only modified the social policy being carried out, but altered the economic nature of the system without the necessary corresponding alteration of its governing principles. From this arises the public illusion that social security is guided by concepts that in fact were long ago abandoned. No others having been adopted in their stead, the system today has no basic controlling economic principle.

---

[3] The self-employed beneficiary can earn $81 a month for 11 months in a row, and still be within the $900 annual maximum.

Because the picture in the public mind is that of the original system set up in 1935, otherwise sensible people are heard debating whether OASI shall be put on a pay-as-you-go basis—which is about the same as arguing whether we shall have rain yesterday. OASI already is on that basis.

The 1935 act did contemplate a reserve adequate to meet the probable liability. Within 4 years the political process broke down. Under overwhelming pressures to give more, Congress in 1939 greatly increased the benefits without doing anything to amass reserves to pay them. On the contrary, Congress kept down the accumulation originally provided for, by holding OASI taxes at 2 percent (half from the worker, half from the employer) until 1950. New increases in benefits, both in number and amount, were voted in 1950 and 1952 without corresponding provision for reserves. More are scheduled to be voted this year.

The result is that today the dollar amount of the OASI reserve fund is not quite enough to pay benefits due to those already on the rolls. There is nothing—not a dime—to pay the benefits that will become due to the 25 million permanently insured persons whose taxes built up the greater part of the present fund. Nor is there any money on hand to pay the benefits that will become due to most of the 41 million persons currently insured, or the 10 million to whom the Eisenhower administration proposes to extend coverage. From this, it does not follow that any of these benefits will go unpaid if and when they are due. But it implacably does follow that, if they are paid, the money will come from taxes yet to be collected, on wages yet to be earned, the wages of children still in school, of children yet unborn. What more does it take to make social security today a pay-as-you-go system?

Social security began with economic and social foundations that inspired reasonable faith in its commitments. Those foundations having been abandoned, tremendous commitments have been and continue to be added pursuant to social policies not declared, or even formulated, and pursuant to no economic theory. There is danger of these uncontrolled commitments mounting to a total of billions beyond the capacity of even this country to honor.

This calls for a survey of social security from the ground up. First the facts, to cull the untruths and make the half-truths whole. Then the social philosophy, to resolve whether current practice actually is carrying out the generally accepted purpose. And finally the economic basis, to assure accomplishment of what is undertaken.

The plight of the needy aged did not grow out of the last depression, but arose during the course of a century and a half at about the same rate as the United States grew away from the land. The new urban and industrial economy produced every year an increasing number of old people upon whom no realist could impose the pioneer tradition of providing for one's own wants, one's own family, and one's own old age. The depression did bring an era of climax. To those who had made no provision for their own old age were added millions who had, but had now lost their means, or their employment, or both. Beyond immediate relief for all, there was great pressure for a permanent program. Much of this opinion was based on the assumption that under modern conditions most people cannot provide for their own future, a premise manifestly too broad, since millions no better off than the others could and did, can and do. The most that is sure is that some cannot and many do not, and they make up the problem of the needy aged.

Congress in 1935 did not go along with this unsound assumption; it did, however, undertake to enforce old-age saving by all, the thrifty as well as the unthrifty. (For the needy who remained, a relief program, old-age assistance, as set up, which was supposed to diminish and disappear as social security matures).[8] The essential social policy of the original plan called for the beneficiaries getting, not charity, but only what they paid for. In fact, there was a guaranty that every worker, or his heirs, would get his money back. With a relatively modest reserve maximum of $46 billion, the plan was very near to being soundly self-maintaining. Except for those who were on relief, and who thus were outside the social-security system, nobody was going to support anybody else.

We have seen that since 1939 this no longer is so, and a basic question arises: Does the United States wish to continue a system under which every 3¼ (or perhaps 4½) productive workers will be required by law to maintain 1 OASI beneficiary—a stranger to them—in addition to their own families? A system that makes from 21 to 26 million persons pensioners of the Federal Government? Leaving social security as it is now would amount to an affirmative answer. If the answer is "No," some of the present promises of OASI benefits will have to be withdrawn, and a statement of social purpose drafted on realistic lines. Indeed, must be done in any case. For the ideal this cannot be made fact until it is clear what the ideal is, and this requires more than a passion for giving more to more people.

Does the Nation wish to support all old people? All old people who retire? All old people without other means? And, in each of these cases, their dependents? Actual or nominal? With or without regard to their means? Does the Nation desire to support all widows and orphans? Or only needy ones? Or none at all?

Shall the support be at a flat rate? By some equally arbitrary formula? Or based on previous earnings? Even continuing the present social-security plan requires answers to these questions if the present mare's nest of whimsical conditions is to be cleaned up.

Shall the needy be given relief, and others brought into a system in which they pay for what they get, and get what they pay for? In that case, shall the plan be voluntary or compulsory and universal?

These qeustions are not raised frivolously. The answers established by Congress in 1935 are no longer valid, for they were abandoned in 1939. The answers that took their place and not valid, for they express no policy and form only a permanent program of whimsical giveaways. They were not the product of the normal American governmental process but the response of Congress to the pressures of one bloc of interests. Because of the fiction that social security could give a great deal to everybody at little or no cost to anybody, no adverse interest was evident. So none was spoken for either by the Democrats or the Republicans. Social security has drifted too long without a course; it is time to chart one and see that it is followed.

Once the purpose and policy of social security are established, they require an economic structure. Here there is room only to notice the courses available if social security is kept more or less in its present form: (1) The reserve structure could be restored. (2) As many participants as possible could be brought into a reserve system, with those who could not (that is, all the present and many potential beneficiaries) shifted to another, where the Government frankly paid the cost. (3) The present system could be placed on a pay-as-you-go basis, with the reserve theory altogether abandoned.

The first course would require the Government to add to the reserves a new bond, and OASI taxes would have to be raised to a rate that would maintain the reserve at an adequate level. The bond would have to be about $125 billion, which would establish the public debt at $400 billion. This amount ought not to horrify anybody who is not horrified right now. It would not be a new debt, but merely posting the books to show a debt Congress already has assumed. At least $125 billion, plus its interest, must be collected in taxes to honor the commitments already made under the social-security program. The only way to cut the total is to cut OASI payments, or to pay them to fewer people than is promised at present. In short, to withdraw some of these commitments.

Under the second course, if future beneficiaries paid their own way, the Government might get off for not much more than the $22 billion committed to those now on the rolls. The saving would be a mirage as far as the whole economy is concerned, for social security must withdraw from it, in taxes of some kind, whatever is going to be paid out. But the people who paid the taxes would get the benefits and vice versa.

Both the foregoing solutions share one serious weakness: the reserves would be built up in dollars, to pay benefits at fixed dollar rates. But let prices go on up, and the benefits would have to go up with them, and against that event the new adequate reserve will no more be adequate than the present one.

The third course accepts the cost of social security as a year-to-year charge on the economy and proposes to meet it from year to year. It is free of the vice of collecting more in any one year than is needed, as a reserve plan does, including the fictitious one now in effect, which takes an excess of more than $2 billion a year, yet otherwise is a true pay-as-you-go operation. It is open to the criticism that—if benefits continue on the present basis—payments will be much larger a few years from now, with a consequent steep rise in cost. That is true. But the same is true, and perhaps more so, of all reserve plans. In the years to come, if the reserve is not drawn on, it will be because OASI taxes are high enough to carry the cost. If the reserves are drawn upon, the money will have to be raised, as has been noted, just as though there were no reserves. In fine, no matter which scheme is adopted, the present social-security program is being handed down to our posterity with the memo: "We promise. You pay."

There are too many of these memos on file for children now growing up and for their children who come after them. Unless the processes of Government are used by this generation to bring OASI into line with reality, they are sure to be used by the next generation to repudiate its burdens. There is no necessity to ordain such an outcome. The Americans of this day, of this decade, once having faced the facts, can resolve their purposes, and build a social security that is equitable, adequate, and economically viable.

A Young Senator Commended

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES R. HOWELL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 12, 1954

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, it is rare that a newspaper in my State goes out of its way to comment on the work being done by a young United States Senator from another State.

---

[8] OAA, however, is still here. The Federal cost rose from $244 million in 1937 to $917 million in 1954.

Therefore I think that it is fitting that the following editorial comments about a former colleague in this House appearing in the Daily Home News, of New Brunswick, N. J., on May 5, 1954, be included in the RECORD:

SENATOR KENNEDY DOING A GOOD JOB

Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY, Massachusetts Democratt, has been persistently pressing the administration for more light on the Indochina situation. But he has been doing this in the rational, temperate manner which is so characteristic of him.

Anyone who will take the trouble to examine KENNEDY'S public utterances, either since he has been a Senator or while he was a useful Member of the House, will find that he has an engaging talent for avoiding the inflammatory and recklessly accusatory statement.

KENNEDY acts and talks as if it were quite proper to have two political parties in this country, while so many of his colleagues behave as if they really were convinced one would be better.

He manages to develop and hold strong views on all the major issues, without ever seeming to imply that no other views but his are proper.

To put it simply, he is the kind of lawmaker many men pretend to be but are not.

Memorial Day Address by Hon. John W. McCormack, of Massachusetts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1954

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include a radio speech I made on May 30, over station WORL, Boston, Mass.:

Ladies and gentlemen of the radio audience, today, May 30, is one of the most important days in the calendar of each year, Memorial Day.

It is a day set aside for us to pause in our year's busy life to honor in an appropriate manner the heroes who served our country in time of war and who have passed on to their great reward.

Throughout our country today and tomorrow in thousands of cemeteries memorial and patriotic exercises will be conducted by veterans' organizations.

Memorial Day is not only a day of commemoration, but it is a day of dedication.

As we recall the glories of our country, its great past, the present challenge, and predict its future; as we honor the memory of our heroes of yesterday, we should dedicate ourselves to preserve and to strengthen and to make American a great Nation for democracy and for peace.

Many centuries ago, before the birth of Christ, a great nation, the Roman Empire, existed. In those days, from a worldly angle, the proudest boast anyone could make was, "I am a Roman citizen."

Since the existence of our country, and to you and I of this day and age, the proudest boast anyone can make from a worldly angle is "I am an American citizen."

For this means we are citizens of a Nation of freemen and freewomen, with a government of laws under God.

Inheriting our country, as we have, from past generations of Americans, it is our duty and responsibility to preserve it for ourselves and for our descendants for countless generations to come.

As we read history, we find its pages filled with dictators of all types who have come and gone.

For history records, and we know by actual experience, that the time-long struggle has been that of liberty against tyranny.

For we well know through history and by experience that "where law ceases, tyranny begins."

And we well know that ours is a government of law under God.

Of all types of dictatorships that have come across the known history of man to date, none have been more vicious than nazism, of which Hitler was the symbol, and of communism, of which Lenin and Stalin were the symbols.

For nazism and communism, in substance, are the same vicious, inhuman types of dictatorships, with their anti-God origin, bent on conquering the world and of enslaving all peoples, and it is only a few years ago that we defeated the first devil—Hitler and nazism.

On this May 30 we are faced with the menace of the second devil—communism.

With our faith retained and intensified, with our confidence strong as well as our courage, with firm and courageous leadership, we can face the future confident of success. No matter what the conditions may be, we cannot afford to lose our faith, our courage, and our confidence.

For faith and courage and confidence, particularly faith, are the sustaining influences between victory and defeat.

In a democracy like our country, public opinion is the greatest force that exists in formulating for good or harm our policies and the actions. Under trying conditions like we are undergoing, it is vitally important that we think clearly, objectively, and rationally, not hastily and emotionally; not as we would like to think or consistent with our hopes, but as our sound judgment and commonsense tells us we should think in the best interests of our country.

In considering communism, we must realize we are dealing with its leaders and members who are world killers, determined to destroy all governments and conquer all peoples who do not agree with or submit to this vicious movement, for we are dealing with a force that acts upon power and force, and fears only greater power and force.

I have repeatedly said in and out of the National House of Representatives that the only thing the Communists respect is what they fear, and that is strength and power greater than they possess.

This means military strength so powerful to deter by instilling fear of the consequences into the minds of the leaders of atheistic communism, or in case of war to defeat them.

This does not mean having a strong military organization; it means having the strongest possible.

The Democratic Party stands for such military strength on land, on sea, and in the air.

Last year, you will remember, President Truman recommended appropriations to build up our Air Force strength to 143 air wing groups by latter 1955. The Republicans opposed this and said 120 air wing groups were enough and reduced close to $6 billion in the budget.

With President Eisenhower leading the fight, the Republicans won last year. It was a bad mistake. This year, 1 year later, President Eisenhower and the Republicans admit they made a mistake last year and now are in favor of building our Air Force to 137 air wing groups, but by latter 1957.

They erred last year. Let us hope it will not be harmful.

And if the Republicans erred last year in connection with our Air Force, President Eisenhower and the present Republican administration could err this year in their proposed reduction in our Army and our Navy.

"To err is human" is an old saying, but it can be dangerous where the future of our country may be involved.

As between strength and weakness; as between security and insecurity; as between liberty and slavery we should not think in terms of dollars and of tax reductions.

For one thing the Communists understand is the language of strength and of action.

If I understand the American people, it is that they will make any sacrifices necessary in the national interest of our country.

As between dollars and liberty, they prefer liberty.

I have called to your attention the great fight the Democrats made last year for a stronger Air Force, which fight was made for the best interests of our country and for your best interests. We fought for an Air Force that could not only attack an enemy but one which could give to our people and to our cities the best defense and protection possible. Unfortunately, the Republican policy is weak in relation to defense against attack by air.

The Democratic Party in Congres is fighting for stronger protection. We shall continue to do so.

During the next fiscal year the Republicans will reduce our naval strength. This should not be done. This is the reason why hundreds of employees of the Boston Naval Shipyard, as well as thousands of others in naval shipyards throughout the country, will lose their jobs in the months that lie ahead.

This reduction in our Navy is not for the best interest of our country.

In connection with the coming reduction in our Navy and United States Marine Corps, let me give you some interesting figures showing just what is proposed by the present Republican administration. The latest report on the size of our Armed Forces is of March 1954. It shows that the United States Navy at that time had 757,000 officers and enlisted men. It is proposed by the present administration to reduce the Navy by June of 1955, about 1 year hence, to 689,000 officers and enlisted men, and in June of 1956 to 670,000 officers and enlisted men. As of March 1954 the size of the United States Marine Corps was 232,000 officers and enlisted men. The goal for June 1955 is 215,000 officers and enlisted men, and for June 1956, 207,000 officers and enlisted men.

Let us see what President Eisenhower and the Republicans intend to do in relation to our Army and its reduction at a time when we should be considering increasing it, if anything. The size of our Army as of June 1954 was 1,445,000 officers and enlisted men. It is proposed to reduce the Army by June 1955 to 1,173,000 officers and enlisted men, and by June 1956 to 1 million officers and enlisted men.

The size of the United States Air Force as of June 1954 was 926,000 officers and enlisted men. By June 1955 the goal is 970,000, and the same number by June 1956. So we find that as a result of the Republicans admitting they made a mistake last year, the Air Force goes up, but the Army and Navy go down. If President Eisenhower and the Republicans made a mistake last year in the case of our Air Force, it is only reasonable to assume they could make a mistake this year in reducing our Army and our Navy. In any event, in the eyes of the Communists this is evidence of weakness and not strength. At this particular time, with the world the way it is, it is too great a calculated risk to take in order to save dollars.

So, on this memorable day of this year, 1954, let us keep our faith and our courage, and make today in the minds of each and every one of us not only a day of commemoration, but a day of dedication; and that each and every one of us will make our contribution to a preserved and a stronger America, and to the hope of mankind—a future world of peace.

Racial Integration in the Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1954

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the momentous decision of the Supreme Court on May 17, 1954, declaring the "separate but equal" doctrine as violative of the 14th amendment represents a landmark of historic proportions in American history. The struggle of minority groups for equal opportunity has been moved forward a long stride by this decision.

Since the decision itself contains reasoning which we in the Congress might well read with care in considering legislative measures with respect to encouraging equality of opportunity for all, at all levels, under unanimous consent I include it in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES—NOS. 1, 2, 4, AND 10, OCTOBER TERM, 1953

1. *Oliver Brown, et al., Appellants,* v *Board of Education of Topeka, Shawnee County, Kansas, et al.* On appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Kansas.

2. *Harry Briggs, Jr., et al., Appellants,* v. *R. W. Elliott, et al.* On appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of South Carolina.

* * * * *

4. *Dorothy E. Davis, et al., appellants,* v. *County School Board of Prince Edward County, Virginia, et al.* On appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia.

* * * * *

10. *Francis B. Gebhart, et al., petitioners,* v. *Ethel Louise Belton et al.* On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of Delaware.

(May 17, 1954.)

Mr. Chief Justice Warren delivered the opinion of the Court.

"These cases come to us from the States of Kansas, South Carolina, Virginia, and Delaware. They are premised on different facts and different local conditions, but a common legal question justifies their consideration together in this consolidated opinion.[1]

"In each of the cases, minors of the Negro race, through their legal representatives, seek the aid of the courts in obtaining admission to the public schools of their community on a nonsegregated basis. In each instance, they had been denied admission to schools attended by white children under laws requiring or permitting segregation according to race. This segregation was alleged to deprive the plaintiffs of the equal protection of the laws under the 14th amendment. In each of the cases other than the Delaware case, a three-judge Federal district court denied relief to the plaintiffs on the so-called separate but equal doctrine announced by this court in *Plessy* v. *Ferguson* (163 U. S. 537). Under that doctrine, equality of treatment is accorded when the races are provided substantially equal facilities, even though these facilities be separate. In the Delaware case, the Supreme Court of Delaware adhered to that doctrine, but ordered that the plaintiffs be admitted to the white schools because of their superiority to the Negro schools.

"The plaintiffs contend that segregated public schools are not equal and cannot be made equal, and that hence they are deprived of the equal protection of the laws. Because of the obvious importance of the question presented, the Court took jurisdiction.[2] Argument was heard in the 1952 term, and reargument was heard this term on certain questions propounded by the Court.[3]

"Reargument was largely devoted to the circumstances surrounding the adoption of the 14th amendment in 1868. It covered exhaustively consideration of the amendment in Congress, ratification by the States, then existing practices in racial segregation, and the views of proponents and opponents of the amendment. This discussion and our own investigation convince us that, although these sources cast some light, it is not enough to resolve the problem with which we are faced. At best, they are inconclusive. The most avid proponents of the postwar amendments undoubtedly intended them to remove all legal distinctions among all persons born or naturalized in the United States. Their opponents, just as certainly, were antagonistic to both the letter and the spirit of the amendments and wished them to have the most limited effect. What others in Congress and the State legislatures had in mind cannot be determined with any degree of certainty.

"An additional reason for the inconclusive nature of the amendment's history, with respect to segregated schools, is the status of public education at that time.[4] In the South, the movement toward free common schools, supported by general taxation, had not yet taken hold. Education of white children was largely in the hands of private groups. Education of Negroes was almost nonexistent, and practically all of the race were illiterate. In fact, any education of Negroes was forbidden by law in some States. Today, in contrast, many Negroes have achieved outstanding success in the arts and sciences as well as in the business and professional world. It is true that public education had already advanced further in the North, but the effect of the Amendment on Northern States was generally ignored in the congressional debates. Even in the North, the conditions of public education did not approximate those existing today. The curriculum was usually rudimentary; ungraded schools were common in rural areas; the school term was but 3 months a year in many States; and compulsory school attendance was virtually unknown. As a consequence, it is not surprising that there should be so little in the history of the 14th amendment relating to its intended effect on public education.

"In the first cases in this court construing the 14th amendment, decided shortly after its adoption, the court interpreted it as proscribing all State-imposed discriminations against the Negro race.[5] The doctrine of 'separate but equal' did not make its appearance in this court until 1896 in the case of *Plessy* v. *Ferguson, supra*, involving not education but transportation.[6] American courts have since labored with the doctrine for over half a century. In this court, there have been 6 cases involving the 'separate but equal' doctrine in the field of public education.[7] In *Cumming* v. *County Board of Education* (175 U. S. 528), and *Gong Lum* v. *Rice* (275 U. S. 78), the validity of the doctrine itself was not challenged.[8] In more recent cases, all on the graduate school level, inequality was found in that specific benefits enjoyed by white students were denied to Negro students of the same educational qualifications. (*Missouri ex rel. Gaines* v. *Canada* (305 U. S. 337); *Sipuel* v. *Oklahoma* (332 U. S. 631); *Sweatt* v. *Painter* (339 U. S. 629); *McLaurin* v. *Oklahoma State Regents* (339 U. S. 637).) In none of these cases was it necessary to reexamine the doctrine to grant relief to the Negro plaintiff. And in *Sweatt* v. *Painter, supra*, the Court expressly reserved decision on the question whether *Plessy* v. *Ferguson* should be held inapplicable to public education.

"In the instant cases, that question is directly presented. Here, unlike *Sweatt* v. *Painter*, there are findings below that the Negro and white schools involved have been equalized, or are being equalized, with respect to buildings, curricula, qualifications and salaries of teachers, and other tangible factors.[9] Our decision, therefore, cannot turn on merely a comparison of these tangible factors in the Negro and white schools involved in each of the cases. We must look instead to the effect of segregation itself on public education.

"In approaching this problem, we cannot turn the clock back to 1868 when the amendment was adopted, or even to 1896 when *Plessy* v. *Ferguson* was written. We must consider public education in the light of its full development and its present place in American life throughout the Nation. Only in this way can it be determined if segregation in public schools deprives these plaintiffs of the equal protection of the laws.

"Today, education is perhaps the most important function of State and local governments. Compulsory school attendance laws and the great expenditures for education both demonstrate our recognition of the importance of education to our democratic society. It is required in the performance of our most basic public responsibilities, even service in the Armed Forces. It is the very foundation of good citizenship. Today it is a principal instrument in awakening the child to cultural values, in preparing him for later professional training, and in helping him to adjust normally to his environment. In these days, it is doubtful that any child may reasonably be expected to succeed in life if he is denied the opportunity of an education. Such an opportunity, where the State has undertaken to provide it, is a right which must be made available to all on equal terms.

"We come then to the question presented: Does segregation of children in public schools solely on the basis of race, even though the physical facilities and other tangible factors may be equal, deprive the children of the minority group of equal educational opportunities? We believe that it does.

"In *Sweatt* v. *Painter, supra*, in finding that a segregated law school for Negroes could not provide them equal educational opportunities, this Court relied in large part on "those qualities which are incapable of objective measurement but which make for greatness in a law school." In *McLaurin* v. *Oklahoma State Regents, supra*, the Court, in requiring that a Negro admitted to a white graduate school be treated like all other students, again resorted to intangible considerations: "* * * his ability to study, to engage in discussions and exchange views with other students, and, in general, to learn his profession." Such considerations apply with added force to children in grade and high

---

Footnotes at end of speech.

Footnotes at end of speech.

Footnotes at end of speech.

schools. To separate them from others of similar age and qualifications solely because of their race generates a feeling of inferiority as to their status in the community that may affect their hearts and minds in a way unlikely ever to be undone. The effect of this separation on their educational opportunities was well stated by a finding in the Kansas case by a court which nevertheless felt compelled to rule against the Negro plaintiffs:

"'Segregation of white and colored children in public schools has a detrimental effect upon the colored children. The impact is greater when it has the sanction of the law; for the policy of separating the races is usually interpreted as denoting the inferiority of the Negro group. A sense of inferiority affects the motivation of a child to learn. Segregation with the sanction of law, therefore, has a tendency to retard the educational and mental development of Negro children and to deprive them of some of the benefits they would receive in a racially integrated school system.'[10]

"Whatever may have been the extent of psychological knowledge at the time of *Plessy* v. *Ferguson*, this finding is amply supported by modern authority.[11] Any language in *Plessy* v. *Ferguson* contrary to this finding is rejected.

"We conclude that in the field of public education the doctrine of 'separate but equal' has no place. Separate educational facilities are inherently unequal. Therefore, we hold that the plaintiffs and others similarly situated for whom the actions have been brought are, by reason of the segregation complained of, deprived of the equal protection of the laws guaranteed by the 14th amendment. This disposition makes unnecessary any discussion whether such segregation also violates the due-process clause of the 14th amendment.[12]

"Because these are class actions, because of the wide applicability of this decision, and because of the great variety of local conditions, the formulation of decrees in these cases presents problems of considerable complexity. On reargument, the consideration of appropriate relief was necessarily subordinated to the primary question—the constitutionality of segregation in public education. We have now announced that such segregation is a denial of the equal protection of the laws. In order that we may have the full assistance of the parties in formulating decrees, the cases will be restored to the docket, and the parties are requested to present further argument on questions 4 and 5 previously propounded by the Court for the reargument this term.[13] The Attorney General of the United States is again invited to participate. The attorneys general of the States requiring or permitting segregation in public education will also be permitted to appear as amici curiae upon request to do so by September 15, 1954, and submission of briefs by October 1, 1954."[14]

It is so ordered.

---

[1] In the Kansas case, *Brown* v. *Board of Education*, the plaintiffs are Negro children of elementary school age residing in Topeka. They brought this action in the United States District Court for the District of Kansas to enjoin enforcement of a Kansas statute which permits, but does not require, cities of more than 15,000 population to maintain separate school facilities for Negro and white students. (Kans. Gen. Stat., sec. 72-1724 (1949).) Pursuant to that authority, the Topeka Board of Education elected to establish segregated elementary schools. Other public schools in the community, however, are operated on a nonsegregated basis. The three-judge district court, convened under title 28, United States Code secs. 2281 and 2284, found that segregation in public education has a detrimental effect upon Negro children, but denied relief on the ground that the Negro and white schools were substantially equal with respect to buildings, transportation, curricula, and educational qualifications of teachers (98 F. Supp. 797). The case is here on direct appeal under title 28 United States Code sec. 1253.

In the South Carolina case, *Briggs* v. *Elliott*, the plaintiffs are Negro children of both elementary and high school age residing in Clarendon County. They brought this action in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of South Carolina to enjoin enforcement of provisions in the State constitution and statutory code which require the segregation of Negroes and whites in public schools. (S. C. Const., art. XI, sec. 7; S. C Code, sec. 5377 (1942).) The three-judge district court, convened under title 28 United States Code secs. 2281 and 2284, denied the requested relief. The court found that the Negro schools were inferior to the white schools and ordered the defendants to begin immediately to equalize the facilities. But the court sustained the validity of the contested provisions and denied the plaintiffs admission to the white schools during the equalization program (98 F. Supp. 529). This Court vacated the district court's judgment and remanded the case for the purpose of obtaining the court's views on a report filed by the defendants concerning the progress made in the equalization program (342 U. S. 350). On remand, the district court found that substantial equality had been achieved except for buildings and that the defendants were proceeding to rectify this inequality as well (103 F. Supp. 920). The case is again here on direct appeal under title 28, United States Code, sec. 1253.

In the Virginia case, *Davis* v. *County School Board*, the plaintiffs are Negro children of high school age residing in Prince Edward County. They brought this action in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia to enjoin enforcement of provisions in the State constitution and statutory code which require the segregation of Negroes and whites in public schools. (Va. Const., sec. 140; Va. Code, sec. 22–221 (1950).) The three-judge district court, convened under title 28, United States Code, sections 2281 and 2284, denied the requested relief. The court found the Negro school inferior in physical plant, curricula, and transportation, and ordered the defendants forthwith to provide substantially equal curricula and transportation and to "proceed with all reasonable diligence and dispatch to remove" the inequality in physical plant. But, as in the South Carolina case, the court sustained the validity of the contested provisions and denied the plaintiffs admission to the white schools during the equalization program (103 F. Supp. 337). The case is here on direct appeal under title 28, United States Code, section 1253.

In the Delaware case, *Gebhart* v. *Belton*, the plaintiffs are Negro children of both elementary and high school age residing in New Castle County. They brought this action in the Delaware Court of Chancery to enjoin enforcement of provisions in the State constitution and statutory code which require the segregation of Negroes and whites in public schools. (Del. Const., art X, sec. 2; Del. Rev. Code, sec. 2631 (1935).) The chancellor gave judgment for the plaintiffs and ordered their immediate admission to schools previously attended only by white children, on the ground that the Negro schools were inferior with respect to teacher training, pupil-teacher ratio, extracurricular activities, physical plant, and time and distance involved in travel (87 A. 2d 862). The chancellor also found that segregation itself results in an inferior education for Negro children (see note 10, infra), but did not rest his decision on that ground (id., at 865). The chancellor's decree was affirmed by the Supreme Court of Delaware, which intimated, however, that the defendants might be able to obtain a modification of the decree after equalization of the Negro and white schools had been accomplished (91 A. 2d 137, 152). The defendants, contending only that the Delaware courts had erred in ordering the immediate admission of the Negro plaintiffs to the white schools, applied to this court for certiorari. The writ was granted (344 U. S. 891). The plaintiffs, who were successful below, did not submit a cross-petition.

[2] 344 U. S. 1, 141, 891.

[3] 345 U. S. 972. The Attorney General of the United States participated both terms as amicus curiae.

[4] For a general study of the development of public education prior to the amendment, see Butts and Cremin, A History of Education in American Culture (1953), pts. I, II; Cubberley, Public Education in the United States (1934 ed.), ch. II–XII. School practices current at the time of the adoption of the 14th amendment are described in Butts and Crimen, supra, at 269–275; Cubberley, supra, at 288–339, 408–431; Knight, Public Education in the South (1922), ch. VIII, IX. See also H. Ex. Doc. No. 315, 41st Cong., 2d sess. (1871). Although the demand for free public schools followed substantially the same pattern in both the North and the South, the development in the South did not begin to gain momentum until about 1850, some 20 years after that in the North. The reasons for the somewhat slower development in the South (e. g., the rural character of the South and the different regional attitudes toward State assistance) are well explained in Cubberley, supra, at 408–423. In the country as a whole, but particularly in the South, the war virtually stopped all progress in public education (Id., at 427–428). The low status of Negro education in all sections of the country, both before and immediately after the war, is described in Beale, A History of Freedom of Teaching in American Schools (1941), 112–132, 175–195. Compulsory school attendance laws were not generally adopted until after the ratification of the 14th amendment, and it was not until 1918 that such laws were in force in all the States. Cubberley, supra, at 563–565.

[5] *Slaughter-House Cases* (16 Wall. 36, 67–72 (1873)); *Strauder* v. *West Virginia* (100 U. S. 303, 307–308 (1879)):

"It ordains that no State shall deprive any person of life, liberty, or property without due process of law, or deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws. What is this but declaring that the law in the States shall be the same for the black as for the white; that all persons, whether colored or white, shall stand equal before the laws of the States, and, in regard to the colored race, for whose protection the amendment was primarily designed, that no discrimination shall be made against them by law because of their color? The words of the amendment, it is true, are prohibitory, but they contain a necessary implication of a positive immunity, or right, most valuable to the colored race—the right to exemption from unfriendly legislation against them distinctly as colored—exemption from legal discriminations, implying inferiority in civil society, lessening the security of their enjoyment of the rights which others enjoy, and discriminations which are steps toward reducing them to the condition of a subject race." (See also *Virginia* v. *Rives* (100 U. S. 313, 318 (1879)); *Ex parte Virginia* (100 U. S. 339, 344–345 (1879)).)

[6] The doctrine apparently originated in *Roberts* v. *City of Boston* (59 Mass. 198, 206 (1849)), upholding school segregation against attack as being violative of a State constitutional guaranty of equality. Segregation in Boston public schools was eliminated in 1855. (Mass. Acts 1855, c. 256.) But elsewhere in the North segregation in pub-

lic education has persisted until recent years. It is apparent that such segregation has long been a nationwide problem, not merely one of sectional concern.

[7] See also *Berea College* v. *Kentucky* (211 U. S. 45 (1908)).

[8] In the Cumming case, Negro taxpayers sought an injunction requiring the defendant school board to discontinue the operation of a high school for white children until the board resumed operation of a high school for Negro children. Similarly, in the Gong Lum case, the plaintiff, a child of Chinese descent, contended only that State authorities had misapplied the doctrine by classifying him with Negro children and requiring him to attend a Negro school.

[9] In the Kansas case, the court below found substantial equality as to all such factors (98 F. Supp. 797, 798). In the South Carolina case, the court below found that the defendants were proceeding "promptly and in good faith to comply with the court's decree" (103 F. Supp. 920, 921). In the Virginia case, the court below noted that the equalization program was already "afoot and progressing" (103 F. Supp. 337, 341); since then, we have been advised, in the Virginia attorney general's brief on reargument, that the program has now been completed. In the Delaware case, the court below similarly noted that the State's equalization program was well under way (91 A. (2d) 137, 149).

[10] A similar finding was made in the Delaware case: "I conclude from the testimony that in our Delaware society State-imposed segregation in education itself results in the Negro children, as a class, receiving educational opportunities which are substantially inferior to those available to white children otherwise similarly situated" (87 R. (2d) 862, 865).

[11] K. B. Clark, Effect of Prejudice and Discrimination on Personality Development (Midcentury White House Conference on Children and Youth, 1950); Witmer and Kotinsky, Personality in the Making (1952), c. VI; Deutscher and Chein, the Psychological Effects of Enforced Segregation: A Survey of Social Science Opinion, 26 J. Psychol. 259 (1948); Chein, What Are the Psychological Effects of Segregation Under Conditions of Equal Facilities? 3 Int. J. Opinion and Attitude Res. 229 (1949); Brameld, Educational Costs, in Discrimination and National Welfare (McIver, ed., 1949), 44–48; Frazier, the Negro in the United States (1949), 674–681. And see generally Myrdal, An American Dilemma (1944).

[12] See *Bolling* v. *Sharp, infra*, concerning the due process clause of the fifth amendment.

[13] "4. Assuming it is decided that segregation in public schools violates the 14th amendment.

"(a) Would a decree necessarily follow providing that, within the limits set by normal geographic school districting, Negro children should forthwith be admitted to schools of their choice, or

"(b) May this Court, in the exercise of its equity powers, permit an effective gradual adjustment to be brought about from existing segregated systems to a system not based on color distinctions?

"5. On the assumption on which questions 4 (a) and (b) are based, and assuming further that this Court will exercise its equity powers to the end described in question 4 (b),

"(a) Should this Court formulate detailed decrees in these cases;

"(b) If so, what specific issues should the decrees reach;

"(c) Should this Court appoint a special master to hear evidence with a view to recommending specific terms for such decrees;

"(d) Should this Court remand to the courts of first instance with directions to frame decrees in these cases, and if so, what general directions should the decrees of this Court include and what procedures should the courts of first instance follow in arriving at the specific terms of more detailed decrees?"

[14] See rule 42, Revised Rules of this Court (effective July 1, 1954).

Making Money in the Stock Market

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1954

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Boston Post of May 25, 1954:

MAKING MONEY IN THE STOCK MARKET

(By Washington Waters)

There are several extraordinary elements working at this particular time, any of which could constitute a major influence not only on the economy in general, but directly on the stock market. Some are so unusual as to merit being called unique, because they have never occurred before.

One of these is the possibility of the partial elimination, and to a considerable extent, perhaps the complete elimination of double taxation of dividends on common stocks. The Senate Finance Committee is expected to decide next week just what provision concerning dividends is to be put into the next tax law. What the Senate committee votes is very likely to be enacted into law.

If the Senate Finance Committee votes as it is now expected to do, there may well be some results which will be equally unexpected and unpleasant to the strongest supporters of the administration's easy money financial policy.

The elimination, even in part, of double taxation on common stocks is bound to enhance them as media of investments. People will certainly buy stocks because they will thereby achieve, to the extent at least that the income tax on them has been paid by the corporations in which they represent interests, tax-free investments. But since there is a rather considerable discrepancy between the yields on common stocks and that on municipal bonds, which are also Federal tax exempt, the prices of municipals are sure to drop, because people will sell them to buy stocks.

The holders of municipal bonds are primarily banks, insurance companies, trustees, and large investors, all of whom constitute the strongest supporters of the administration. When municipal bonds go down, such investors become unhappy. Their unhappiness is not likely to be alleviated by the fact that when municipals go down, so will other high grade bonds, including governments.

When bonds go down, however money rates go up, and it must be borne in mind that easy money rates have been perhaps the strongest bullish influence on the stock market for the past 8 months.

How embarrassing for the administration if the amelioration of the double tax on dividends should result in a drop in bond prices, and a rise in money rates, which, in turn, should result in poorer business, which should cause stocks, in their turn, to drop. It would be like getting your neck caught in your own mousetrap

Since the middle of March the average prices of municipals have shown distinct weakness for the first time in almost a year.

Outstanding Jesuit Editor Protests Pending Swindle of American Indians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1954

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, a communication which follows came to me from the Reverend Francis J. Corley, S. J., of St. Louis, an outstanding Jesuit editor whose magazine Social Order discusses and explores many of the most pressing social problems facing us today as a people and as a society.

I sincerely hope that the Members will read Father Corley's eloquent letter about a problem which will not face many of us in our own congressional districts, but certainly faces us in our hearts and in our consciences as representatives of the American people.

The letter is as follows:

INSTITUTE OF SOCIAL ORDER,
St. Louis, Mo., May 20, 1954.

MRS. JOHN B. SULLIVAN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN SULLIVAN: It has just come to my attention that three of the so-called Indian termination bills passed the Senate last week and that they may shortly be taken up by the House.

These bills and about a dozen others like them will conclude present agreements between the Federal Government and various groups of Indians in the United States and, I believe, in Alaska. The consensus of Indian opinion, as expressed in hearings before a combined committee of the two Houses of Congress and in many local meetings, is overwhelmingly opposed to termination of Federal supervision of Indian affairs at this time.

Many white Americans vigorously concur in this opinion.

Most of us who oppose this abrupt, secretive action on the part of the present Congress believe that eventually—and as quickly as is feasible—the American Indian should be given complete private-citizen status. In principle, consequently, we agree with the idea of termination.

But for several extremely grave reasons we oppose the present hasty action.

1. It has been undertaken against the will and the judgment of all Indian leaders whose opinion I have heard.

2. There has been almost no long-range preparation of the Indian for private-citizen status.

3. The Indian's relative inexperience with business affairs is rendered more serious by fairly recent developments in the fields of petroleum and uranium resources. If many Indians cannot be trusted to know the value of a saddle, he can hardly be expected to handle extremely valuable mineral rights with sagacity.

4. The Indian's present cultural position is not entirely a matter of his own responsibility. We, as a people, are gravely responsible for his position, too. The purchase of Manhattan Island is typical of our business dealings with the Indians. Moreover, what he is today is as much the product of our wardship as of his own action. Congressional moves at this time to terminate his relationship to the Federal Government would almost be tantamount to setting him up for a swindle.

5. The unilateral abrogation of Federal relations with the various Indian tribes and

groups may be a legally defensible action. I do not know. But legal or not, it would be a shameful dereliction of duty which we would not dare to perpetrate upon the people of any other group. Indeed, similar irresponsibility toward any other ethnic group in the United States would stir up a hornet's nest of protest.

What is needed at present, I submit, is vigorous action by sufficient Members of both Houses to stop the present movement of bills through the legislative process. Then action should be initiated to outline an intelligent program of action leading to orderly termination of the Indian-Federal Government relations. The termination cannot be consummated quickly; it will take time and painstaking effort to prepare the Indians. Clearly there must be a gradual relinquishment into his hands of increasing important responsibilities so that he can develop the social and economic skills which full private-citizen status will demand of him. Tribal wardship, if it is continued in the future as it has been maintained in the past, will only prolong the present situation. It must be intelligently, but gradually, modified with a view to ultimate terminations.

May I express the hope, Congresswoman SULLIVAN, that you will interest yourself in the threat to our American Indians and protect them from injustices for which we, as a people, would be gravely responsible?

Faithfully yours,

FRANCIS J. CORLEY, S. J.

Address by Charles H. Silver at Ground-Breaking Ceremonies for the New Simon Baruch Junior High School

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1954

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the address of my good friend Charles H. Silver at the ground-breaking ceremonies for the new Simon Baruch Junior High School, No. 104, in the Borough of Manhattan, city of New York.

Mr. Silver, as a member of the board of education, has devoted much of his time and energy to furthering the cause of education among the young people of the city of New York. He is president of the Beth Israel Hospital of New York and is well-known throughout the city for his great humanitarianism and benevolence to the indigent and needy.

I am indeed proud to number him among my cherished and valuable friends.

Also included is Mr. Silver's introduction of the Honorable Bernard M. Baruch, to whom, I am sure, the Members of this body need no introduction.

The address follows:

I count it a great privilege to preside at the ceremonies marking the breaking of ground for the new junior high school, No. 104, which is to be known as the Simon Baruch Junior High School. I know of no one who is more deserving of the honor of having a school named after him than Dr. Baruch who did so much during his lifetime for the city where he lived and rose to such great heights as a humanitarian and public benefactor.

This building which is soon to rise here represents a fitting and permanent memorial to him. He was not only a distinguished practicing physician here for many years, but he was also a great crusader, a kindly philanthropist, a real patriot and a fine human being. His devotion to the people of this city during his generation lives after him, for we of the present generation are now reaping the benefits of his wisdom, planning and practical understanding of the needs of the people.

The construction of this building which is about to get underway marks the beginning, I am very happy to say, of a school-construction program for the lower east side, It is incidentally, a section of our great city which has for me a very sentimental meaning for I played as a boy on the streets of the east side and I absorbed in my youth, at first hand, an appreciation of the meaning of our way of life and an understanding of the precepts of real democracy.

When I was first appointed as a member of the board of education in May 1952, my attention was called to the fact that there had been no new school construction in the area south of 23d Street during the past 3 decades. I was advised that there was no need for new buildings because there were 22 buildings in the area, some of which were not fully utilized. I learned, however, that a great many of these structures wer old and that many of them were not suitable for modern classroom instruction. I was astonished to learn that out of 70 buildings under my jurisdiction as a member of the board, 67 were over 50 years old and 18 were more than 75 years old.

With this data in our hands, we proceeded with our drive for new schools. And I want to say to you now that, while there is still a great need for the bulk of new school buildings for the outlying areas of the city where large housing projects have created a serious shortage of school sittings, we have been able to get a proportionate share of the new construction work assigned in the area lower Manhattan.

The school which is getting under way is merely the beginning of a long-range program to modernize the buildings already available in this section. The board of education has placed under construction several other buildings in this vicinity, namely, the new Public School 34 and the addition to Public School 15 in Manhattan. The new Public School 19 will soon be placed under construction as well as the new Junior High School 167, just north of here, and also the modernization of Stuyvesant High School.

It is my earnest hope, and I feel confident that it will be realized, that in the next few years we will modernize or completely replace the schools that are more than 75 years old.

I should like to say to you now that when I was appointed to the board of education and began to study the school needs of this section, I received the sympathetic and wholehearted cooperation of Robert F. Wagner, who was then the president of the Borough of Manhattan. Mr. Wagner was keenly interested in school problems of our city, and he worked very closely with us. He has continued this interest since his election as mayor of the city of New York, and he is deserving of the thanks of the people of this area for his splendid assistance to us.

We are living in a time of confusion and uncertainty. We have a solemn obligation to our children to guide and prepare them to meet the staggering problems which face them in the days ahead. One of the essential requirements of our children is the best possible school facilities. Having recognized this, we have embarked on the program to which I have referred, thanks to the determined campaign by community leaders, parents' associations, and local school boards. They are entitled to a full measure of credit from our citizens.

I regret to note that there has been much irresponsible talk of juvenile delinquency and subversion among the members of our teaching staff. I certainly hold no brief for subversives, either among teachers or any other agency of our government. Nor do I condone any laxness that might be practiced in the handling of juvenile delinquents.

Yet I am compelled to point out at this time that we have nearly 1 million school children, and that the very great bulk of this vast army of pupils are a credit to their parents, to the school, and to the community. We must not forget that the leaders in the cultural, civic, and business life of our city are the graduates of our schools in the years gone by.

Unfortunately, some delinquency arises, and we are obligated to do our utmost to wipe it out completely.

The other day, that great American, Bernard M. Baruch, in a lecture delivered in the College of the City of New York, quoted his father after whom the new school has been named, as saying that there is no such thing as incurable disease; it is merely our lack of knowledge to treat it. The same thought, I believe, applies to juvenile delinquency—it is up to us school officials, parents, Government agencies, social workers, and others to dissect this problem thoroughly so we may finally reach the goal to which we aspire, namely, the eventual elimination of juvenile delinquency. It can be done and I am sure it will be done.

As for subversion in our public schools, I would remind those who cast aspersions on our public-school system that, out of nearly 38,000 teachers, less than one quarter of 1 percent were charged with being out and out Communists or associated with Communist fronts. It is utterly unfair to condemn one of the finest teaching staffs in the world for the malfeasance of a scattered few among the teachers.

I am optimistic regarding the future of our school system, I have great faith in our administrators, our teachers, our pupils, and our parents. They have always been right and so they shall be, for there is instilled in their hearts and minds faith in the American way of life, and if we cling to that faith we are bound to come out the victors against the forces of tyranny and oppression which are seeking to extinguish the light of freedom. Thank you.

BERNARD M. BARUCH

Our next speaker is one whom we are proud to have with us this evening and I am sure that he has a feeling of pride in being here. He is a distinguished American who is known throughout the world as an advisor of Presidents and is one of the greatest public figures of our time. I know how happy and exalted he must feel to realize that he is present at the naming of a junior high school for his great father who did so much for his fellowmen. I shall not presume to tell you of his achievements in public life for I am certain that it is known to the great bulk of our people in this country, but I should like to quote a news paragraph from the New York Times that sums up in a few words the character of the man. I quote:

"Mr. Baruch was present at a memorial service for one of his school teachers, Miss Blake, in Public School No. 10. He was 10 years old when he was in Miss Blake's class. At this service Mr. Baruch held up a book which he treasures as a kind of a Bible. Miss Blake had given it to him. The book was inscribed: 'To Bernard Baruch for gentlemanly deportment and general excellence.'"

Ladies and gentlemen, it is my very high privilege to present to you the son of Dr. Simon Baruch, who is himself a graduate of one of our city's great colleges in the class of 1889, Mr. Bernard M. Baruch.

Prejudices Are Seen in All Races

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS G. ABERNETHY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1954

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Dorothy Thompson:

PREJUDICES ARE SEEN IN ALL RACES—IF WE INTEGRATE SCHOOLS TO MEET COMMUNIST CRITICISM, IT IS ASKED, WHY NOT ABOLISH PRIVATE ENTERPRISE ALSO?

There are many aspects of the Supreme Court ruling against segregated schools that ought to be considered, but one argument that leaves me cold is that it is a triumphant answer to Communist and Afro-Asian charges against the United States.

If we make our policies to meet Communist criticisms we should abolish private enterprise, representative government, private schools, independent courts, and every other institution of our society. Nor will full social equality for Negroes suit the Communists, who advocated (until, apparently, their Russian bosses told them to pipe down) establishing a separate all-Negro state in the South, from which the whites would be moved.

If we want to frame our domestic policies to suit the Africans and Asiatics, we should throw open the gates of Afro-Asian immigration and abandon the undemocratic notion that ours is a predominantly white and Western civilization.

This is a far cry from the Supreme Court decision but not from some of the arguments being advanced for it.

The white nations suffer from a bad conscience which does not afflict the colored world.

We seem to think that the white races alone have prejudices and that only they have established colonial systems ruled by dominant racial castes. What nonsense. Racial antipathies and affinities appear to be endemic in mankind.

The yellow races think the whites ugly, that their bodies exude an unpleasant odor, that their hairiness is beastly, and that white faces are actually mottled, and marred by unesthetically protuberant features.

The colored risings against white settlers in Africa are largely attributable to the fact that the settlers are of a distinguishably different race.

Where a colored minority live among whites they adopt the prejudices of the whites.

The Soviet Union has, officially, no racial prejudices. But the governing elite is almost entirely composed of white Slavs. A distinctly Mongoloid woman from Moscow was insulted when I remarked that she must come from the Soviet East, since she had no Slavic features.

Mongol troops from Siberia created dismay among pro-Russian East Europeans when they entered as liberators. But they were equally feared and disliked in Western Russia.

The caste system of India was originally, I have read, based on race. Indo-Aryan conquerors created the caste system to keep down the lesser breeds. Now we see a sort of race prejudice in reverse. Mr. Nehru was quoted as denying that he had prejudices against whites. "We always had white servants."

American Jews, though in the forefront of the fight for minority rights, oppose intermarriage with Gentiles.

So it is with the world.

I am opposed to American intervention in the wars and revolutions of Asia, because I am opposed to Asian intervention in our affairs.

Races and cultures are different, and there is a limit to success in mixing them up.

Equal but separate may not work well within a nation. But nothing else is likely to work peaceably between nations and civilizations.

Arms in Guatemala—Three Points of View: Intervention, Enforcement of Sanctions, the Monroe Doctrine—The Exercise of Caution and More Than Scare Talk and Smooth Words Required

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1954

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, the recent disclosures of Soviet espionage throughout the world and overt acts endeavoring to establish Communist beachheads in the Western Hemisphere—Guatemala, in Central America—has demonstrated again and anew the Communists' international conspiracy for world conquest and domination.

The initial reaction of all Americans has been one of indignation and yet, we realize, that indignation must be tempered with prudent and effective action. What is the proper course? That is the question every American is pondering at the present time.

Recently in the press 3 points of view with regard to this critical situation have been set forth in 3 distinguished newspapers of our Nation. I believe the three points of view are worthy of consideration and, under unanimous consent, include them with my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD. One editorial entitled "United States Warning Still Says 'No Trespassing' " is from the May 26 issue of the Nashville Banner; another entitled "Guatemala: Caution Is Needed" is from the May 28 issue of the Nashville Tennessean; and a third entitled "Arms in Guatemala" is from the May 29 issue of the Christian Science Monitor.

The three editorials are as follows:

[From the Nashville Banner of May 26, 1954]

UNITED STATES WARNING STILL SAYS "NO TRESPASSING"

The United States was small (only 10 million people)—and young (only 34 years under the Constitution)—when its fifth President propounded the Monroe Doctrine. It was a warning to the world that this hemisphere was not to be encroached upon; that, "as a principle in which the interests of the United States are involved, the American continents, by the free and independent condition which they have assumed and maintain, are henceforth not to be considered as subjects for further colonization by any European powers."

It was exactly as large and as old when President Monroe denounced the Russian ukase forbidding citizens of other nations from navigating and fishing within 100 miles of the northwest coast of North America. The American reply was candid and final. It declared, "the American continents are no longer subjects for any new colonial establishments."

Those men formulating that policy were Americans of initiative, of courage, and of vision. Under the Monroe Doctrine, the Americas have withstood exploitive encroachment. They are strong and they are free.

The precedent—even if there were no more than the Monroe Doctrine to justify it—would sustain America's position prohibiting such developments as a military enterprise under Soviet auspices to establish in Central America a Communist beachhead; or conversely an enterprise of Soviet infiltration to establish a military beachhead. There are, however, supplemental and corollary policies to sustain that position; far from unilateral in that they embody agreements with the majority of powers in this hemisphere.

Secretary Dulles is right in his conclusion that the purpose of arms shipped from the Soviet orbit to Guatemala could be to build up a Communist bastion near the Panama Canal. Nor is it an overstatement of the case to assume that the Red intent is to use Guatemala as a basing point of Communist penetration north and south.

A stronger United States is no less today a Nation of initiative, courage, and vision than when, as a New World guardian, it drew the line of "no trespass."

To enforce that prohibition beyond all possibility of misunderstanding is imperative. The threat is here, and it can't be met with talk.

[From the Nashville Tennessean of May 28, 1954]

GUATEMALA: CAUTION IS NEEDED

The growth of communism south of the border has not passed unnoticed by American observers, but the sudden threat of an armed communism so close to home does come as something of a shock.

Guatemala is, of course, a small nation and as such, pushes little water in the ebbing and flowing tides of international politics. Yet, comparatively speaking, it is one of the larger countries of Central America and according to Mr. John Foster Dulles, the Secretary of State, it has a military force 3 to 4 times as large as that of any of its neighbors.

In view of this, Guatemala's proximity to the strategic Panama Canal lends a seriousness to a situation that some believe to be the makings of another of the violent political conflicts for which our Latin neighbors are so famous.

There is also some doubt as to the extent of the Communists' power in Guatemala, and an able correspondent, Mr. Edwin A. Lahey, raises the point that the "incipient distrust" of Yankee exploitation, by most Guatemalans may be credited with much of the blame for the worsening relations between their nation and the United States.

But the heart of the Guatemalan argument, Mr. Lahey points out, is that the United States refused to sell arms to the present Guatemalan Government, while selling arms to Central American nations whose governments are urging Guatemalan exiles to attack and oust the present government. Furthermore, the Guatemalan Government officials note with some sarcasm, the United States sells arms to Soviet neighbors, and why shouldn't a Soviet ally sell arms to a neighbor of the United States.

While the merit of this argument is certainly debatable there is no doubt that the situation demands the utmost in tact and careful diplomacy on the part of Mr. Dulles.

For as Guatemalans harbor a distrust of Americans based on a background of the economic exploitation during the early years of this century, so do the citizens of other Central and South American nations.

It should be noted also, that Russia already has made propaganda capital out of the goodwill visit of three United States bombers to Guatemala's neighbor, Nicaragua, and any future United States action will be considered suspect unless clearly demonstrated to be otherwise.

And in view of the economic hold the United Fruit Co.—an American firm—has in Guatemala, there is no reason to believe the Communists, whether Guatemalan or Russian, will not, whenever possible, attempt to define any United States action as an attempt to protect that company in the style of the imperialist.

A wise Secretary of State should make it clear that the United States has one primary interest in the Caribbean—the security of the Panama Canal. And to that end, it will use military force if necessary.

A wise Secretary of State should assert also, and in no uncertain terms, that he does not view with any pleasure the appearance of an armed communism in a Central American nation, and that he will work as effectively as possible with peaceful weapons against the success of such a movement.

But the Secretary of State should not allow this Nation to be placed in the position where it must take unilateral action in a conflict with Guatemala. The administration has at hand treaties for hemisphere defense which can be invoked in the event of an outbreak of hostilities.

This is a prime opportunity for Mr. Dulles to demonstrate to the world that the United States can work against communism without resorting to arms. It is a prime opportuity for Mr. Dulles to demonstrate that the United States is not an imperialist nation. And this a prime opportunity for Mr. Dulles to demonstrate the scope of Soviet, Communist imperialism. It is hoped that he takes advantage of it.

[From the Christian Science Monitor of May 29, 1954]

ARMS IN GUATEMALA

The Western Hemisphere faces a first-rate diplomatic problem in what to do about Communist infiltration in the Government of Guatemala. The problem roughly divides itself into three parts.

First, there is the question of how the United States shall continue to deal with a situation which presents no major threat but is nevertheless troublesome and potentially dangerous. The affair continues to build up with discovery of a falsely listed cargo of machine guns.

Second is the question of what action, if any, the Organization of American States should take about recent receipt of a shipment of 1,900 tons of arms from Soviet-controlled Czechoslovakia. This amounts to a 100-car trainload of guns and ammunition for a country the size of Louisiana, and makes Guatemala much the most heavily armed nation between Mexico and the Panama Canal.

Third, there is the question whether Guatemalans themselves can yet awake to the perils in Communist influence in time to prevent their government from being used as an instrument to do serious damage to themselves as well as others.

Guatemala is in the throes of a far-reaching land reform, such as other Latin-American countries have needed from time to time. That program involves seizure, if not confiscation, of lands of the United Fruit Co., and Guatemalans have attributed North American interventionism to mere concern over a company investment.

Much more is involved than that. Spanish Republicans accepted Communist help in the civil war of the 1930's, and found it a dagger at their backs. Czechoslovakia began by electing 114 Communists in its 300-member assembly, and ended 2 years later as an iron-ringed police state under Russian orders. Such are the dangers of inviting Communist imperialism.

Latin Americans—in Brazil, Peru, and elsewhere—have had their brushes with communism. But they tend to be less disturbed about it than North Americans. There may be some virtue in this, but it is also something of an uncalculated risk.

To dissuade Latins from taking so casual an attitude about a vast and sinister international intrigue something more than scare talk is required. Alarms such as Secretary of State Dulles has sounded are to a degree necessary. But some other actions also would give North American appeals more impact.

One of these would be a greater concern over suppression of human liberties when those come from reactionary juntas and dictatorships in Latin America. Another would be helpful consultation in working out social problems such as communism exploits. Another—and the Latin countries themselves have a good deal to do with this—is the encouragement of capital investment from the United States.

More can be done than at present in technical assistance, economic aid, and acceptance of imports to help South and Central American countries improve the lot of their people. But while every effort is made to lift the stigma of dollar diplomacy, a certain amount of perceptiveness also is needed on the part of Latin Americans to recognize when their safety is affected by a new kind of Eastern Hemisphere ambitions.

Senate Committee Restores Not Eisenhower Program But Bigger, Better Democratic Public Housing Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM T. GRANAHAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1954

Mr. GRANAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased by the action of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency in voting to restore the public housing provisions of the Housing Act of 1949 in the housing legislation recently passed by the House. The House killed off all new public housing, rejecting the President's request for authorization to build 35,000 units a year for 4 years.

Many of the news stories commenting on the Senate committee's action carried headlines to the effect that the Senate committee restored the Eisenhower public housing goals. But that is not what happened.

Instead of limiting new public housing to only 35,000 units a year, as the President had requested, the Senate committee has restored the language of the Housing Act of 1949 so that the President can have authority to start up to 200,000 units a year.

What he does with that authority is, of course, up to him. He will have the final say, if the bill as amended by the Senate committee becomes law. He could then settle, if he wished, on only the tiny, inadequate program he has proposed of 35,000 units a year or he can go ahead with a large-scale attack on slums of the size and magnitude we need, and authorize the start of at least 135,000 units a year as contemplated in the 1949 act.

This is the type of program envisioned by the Democratic Congress in 1949 when the Housing Act was passed. It is still the kind of program most Democratic Members believe is necessary.

I sincerely hope this amendment becomes law—that is, restores the previous law which was crippled by Republican changes in recent years—and that the President uses the authority effectively.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Printing and binding for Congress, when recommended to be done by the Committee on Printing of either House, shall be so recommended in a report containing an approximate estimate of the cost thereof, together with a statement from the Public Printer of estimated approximate cost of work previously ordered by Congress within the fiscal year (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 145, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on Printing, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized book dealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by book dealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. The money derived from such sales shall be paid into the Treasury and accounted for in his annual report to Congress, and no sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

Addr
Br
BA

HO

IN T

M
dent
from
liver
on th
Unit
be
Reco
Th
was
as fo
Ex

(Add
Fo
Lo
It
jour
the
ideas
here
dres
purp
Th
was
Cons
ever,
mine
most
bodi
men
grow
that
lead
gent
agai
seek
Pr
vised
exec
tutio
to h
ciple
a Hi
supr
com
dist
W
ship
Ame
the
infir
duc
at E
We
tati
gene
rial
prec
tom
and
cha
rule
as

Appendix

Address Delivered by Hon. John W. Bricker, of Ohio, at Forest Lawn Journalism Awards Dinner

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 2, 1954

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, the distinguished senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. Bricker] recently delivered a stirring address in Los Angeles on the subject of the Constitution of the United States. I ask that the address be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Executive Leadership and the American Constitution

(Address by Hon. John W. Bricker at the Forest Lawn journalism awards dinner, Los Angeles, Calif., May 18, 1954)

It is a real pleasure to be here at the sixth journalism awards banquet. Recognition of the crucial importance of communicating ideas effectively accounts for your presence here tonight. It is a distinct honor to address a meeting inspired by such a vital purpose.

The power of ideas effectively expressed was never better demonstrated than in the Constitution of the United States. However, the Constitution can also be undermined by powerful ideas. Of these, the most dangerous is that the Constitution embodies the leadership principle of government. That dangerous idea is likely to grow in popularity during the emergencies that seem to lie ahead. Opponents of the leadership principle must wage an intelligent, energetic, and articulate campaign against it. It is that problem that I am seeking to illuminate here this evening.

President Eisenhower was recently advised by his immediate predecessor to wield executive powers not found in the Constitution. In effect, Mr. Truman recommended to his successor the same leadership principle that produced a Mussolini in Italy and a Hitler in Germany. This plea for executive supremacy was hailed by a host of left-wing commentators. And yet, few Americans were disturbed by its alarming implications.

Why is it that a blueprint for dictatorship often fails to excite loyal and patriotic Americans? The answer, I think, is that the threat of dictatorship in America seems infinitely remote. The word "dictator" produces a mental picture of the gas-chamber at Buchenwald or the salt mines of Siberia. We simply cannot envision those manifestations of tyranny in America. What is not generally understood is that every dictatorial regime is shaped to some extent by the preexisting political order, by national customs and traditions, by the nation's social and educational institutions, and by the character of its citizens. Accordingly, the rule of an American leader would be benign as compared with that of Hitler or Stalin. He might even respect the technical constitutional provisions relating to tenure of office and elections. Most likely, it would be a dictatorship of the majority that followed the outward form of the Constitution but destroyed its inner meaning. The heart and soul of our Constitution is represented in provisions designed to protect the rights of States and individuals in the minority.

Ever since the formation of our Republic, radicals of every political coloration have worked incessantly to concentrate all political power at one point. That point is the White House. No pressure on President Eisenhower is greater. No pressure has been more courageously resisted by him than that which seeks to make him the American Fuhrer. To help him resist that pressure is the solemn duty of every loyal American.

The two great structural principles of the Federal Constitution are States' rights and separation of powers. No regimentation is possible within the framework of that structure. And so, all authoritarians, whatever their political label, have recognized as their first task the consolidation of all political authority. Their plans for regimentation, whether communistic, socialistic, or paternalistic in design, require a leader who can rule without congressional or State interference.

Unfortunately, those of radical persuasion have not had to fight alone for the leadership principle. Frequently they receive aid and comfort from hybrid conservatives who are willing to enlarge Executive power to achieve an end close to their hearts or pocketbooks. Alexander Hamilton first revealed the political blindness of hybrid conservatives. To secure special privileges for his class, Hamilton espoused the leadership principle of government and even opposed the Bill of Rights on the ground that it might hamstring the Federal Government. Hamilton failed to see that a consolidated nation ruled by a strong leader, preferably a king, would ultimately destroy not only the aristocratic privileges he was seeking to protect but the elementary rights of every man. America was saved from Hamilton's shortsightedness by the wisdom of Jefferson and others who sensed that freedom and a unitary state were incompatible.

The American press today has too many Hamiltons in its ranks. A significant part of the press seems to believe that the first amendment is entitled to more zealous protection than other constitutional provisions. Defenders of a free press can make no greater error. Whenever the 10th amendment, for example, is circumvented, the protection accorded by the 1st amendment is also weakened. Freedom is indivisible. A newspaper that condones assaults on property rights or one that encourages centralization of political power in the President is slowly committing suicide.

To justly the Presidential exercise of undelegated powers, Mr. Truman pointed in his statement of May 8 to the conclusion of John Adams that the greatest protection against unlimited power lay in an Executive protected against legislative encroachment. Here is John Adams' idea in his own words:

"The legislative power is naturally and necessarily sovereign and supreme over the Executive; and, therefore * * * the latter must be made an essential branch of the former, even with a negative, or it will not be able to defend itself." (John Adams, Works IV, p. 579.)

It must be remembered, too, that at first Congress did appear to be the strongest of the three Federal branches. The President was Commander in Chief, but there was virtually no Army to command. Although he was the Nation's chief organ in foreign affairs, America was virtually isolated from the rest of the world in time and distance and by choice. The power accruing to the President as leader of a national political party had not come into being. And, finally, John Adams and his contemporaries could not foresee the usurpation of power by the Presidents of recent years.

Today, and as far as we can see into the future, two facts are certain. First, Congress cannot assume the role of dictator. If America is ever ruled by a dictator, that man will be the President of the United States. The fact that he was elected or reelected would merely establish the form as a dictatorship of the majority.

The "threat of legislative dictatorship" cited by Mr. Truman is utterly absurd. Congress has no guns at its command. It must depend on the President to execute its legislative will. It has no centralized direction or control. Most of its business must necessarily be transacted in public. And finally, Congress has no informational or propaganda agencies under its control. For similar reasons, judicial dictatorship is impossible. No comparable restrictions hobble the executive branch.

I do not mean to imply, of course, that the Congress cannot legislate unwisely. Congressional legislation may even be unjust in certain cases. However, even gross abuse of legislative power by the Congress would still fall a tremendous distance short of dictatorship. Legislative dictatorship is possible only under a parliamentary and cabinet system. The threat of dictatorship in America will be that of a man on horseback and not the 531 men on a horse conjured up by opponents of the Congress.

To sugar-coat his plea for executive supremacy, Mr. Truman cited the opinion of "that shrewd observer, Alexis de Tocqueville" that the presidential office is too weak. The French writer also pointed out the danger of what he called "democratic despotism" by an all-powerful Federal government. In view of the steady accretion of power by the President since 1840, I am confident that de Tocqueville would not think the office too weak today. However that may be, we find this poisonous pill planted by Mr. Truman underneath the historical sugar-coating:

"As the President came to be elected by the whole people, he became responsible to the whole people. Our whole people looked to him for leadership and not confined within the limits of a written document. Every hope and every fear of his fellow citizens, almost every aspect of their welfare and activity, falls within the scope of his concern—indeed, within the scope of his duty."

It is, indeed, refreshing to have a candid admission from the leading exponent of the so-called welfare states that it is not authorized by the Constitution, and, strangely enough, I found the true significance of that paternalistic state spelled out by "that shrewd observer, Alexis de Tocqueville." Here is how De Tocqueville, referring to the probable courses of despotism in America, described the welfare state:

"Above this race of men stands an immense and tutelary power, which * * * is absolute, minute, regular, provident, and mild. It would be like the authority of a parent if, like that authority, its object was to prepare men for manhood, but it seeks, on the contrary, to keep them in perpetual childhood; it is well content that the people should rejoice, provided that they think of nothing but rejoicing. For their happiness such a government willingly labors, but it chooses to be the sole agent and the only arbiter of their necessities, facilitates their pleasures, manages their principal concerns, directs their industry, regulates the descent of property, and subdivides their inheritances; what remains, but to spare them all the care of thinking and all the trouble of living?" (De Tocqueville, Democracy in America, II, Bradley, ed., 1948, p. 318.)

As you here in Los Angeles well know, UNESCO would gladly relieve you and your children of the care of thinking about the United Nations and other international problems. I congratulate the people of Los Angeles for refusing to permit their children to be spoon fed with UNESCO progaganda.

According to the leftwing press on the eastern seabord, the Los Angeles School Board has terrorized all friends of the United Nations. Fortunately, however, there are also responsible newspapers in the East. From them, I learn that most parents and teachers in Los Angeles have merely decided that instruction about the U. N. should be presented factually and with all points of view open for discussion. That is much more in accord with academic freedom than uncritical acceptance of the packaged thought of an international propaganda organ.

Do not think for a moment that this UNESCO controversy in Los Angeles does not have nationwide implications, or that those implications are confined to the educational field. The great first-amendment freedoms of speech and of the press are directly involved. For example, if UNESCO is accepted in the public school system as the one true prophet in international affairs, why not in the press as well? Already, there are several United Nations treaties that would compel American newspapers to print a United Nations version of the truth. And if the United Nations has the power to establish what is true and what is false, that same power cannot long be denied the President of the United States.

Those who endorse the leadership principle never fail to throw in a few words about his duty to lead public opinion. And, of course, it is true that that is a highly necessary and proper function within certain limits. The President alone has access to certain information which he must evaluate and bring to the people's attention. However, those who would have the President move in the direction of thought control seldom cite his responsibility to act in accordance with the grassroots thinking of the people. Since most of you are interested in the communication of ideas, remember always that no official body, no matter how august, and no individual, however high his office, has any right to tell you what to say or write. In stating the truth as you see it, you are responsible only to God and your conscience.

The basic issue concerning UNESCO propaganda is not whether it is good or bad, radical or conservative, wise or foolish, nationalist or internationalist. The principle involved is that no governmental organization, national or international, has any right to compel acceptance of its idea of truth. I refer you to the conversation recorded in the 18th chapter and 37th verse of the Gospel of St. John:

"Pilate therefore said unto Him, 'Art Thou a king then?'

"Jesus answered, '* * * To this end was I born, and for this cause came I into the world, that I should bear witness unto the truth. Everyone that is of the truth heareth my voice.'

"Pilate saith unto Him, 'What is truth?' "

Christ made no answer. The answer Christ denied us is one that every dictator in the history of the world has been determined to supply—always, of course, citing his obligation to lead public opinion.

The doctrine of inherent Presidential powers has not yet won general approval in the courts or with the people. If that time ever comes, dictatorship in America will be legalized. It is true, of course, that some of the President's constitutional powers are vaguely defined and that others rest on necessary implication. The doctrine of inherent and undelegated powers has no constitutional foundation. Mr. Truman described those powers as "powers which no President can pass on to his successor. They go only to him who can take and use them."

The Supreme Court in the Steel seizure case prevented one such taking of power from being passed on to President Eisenhower. Unfortunately not all Executive usurpations of power are judicially reviewable. The unconstitutional intervention in Korea falls into that category. Thank God President Eisenhower has declined to use the Korean precedent established by his predecessor to send American boys to the jungles of Indochina without the approval of Congress.

As you know, I have been working for more than 3 years for a constitutional amendment that will prevent the sovereignty and the Constitution of the United States from being undermined by treaty or by executive agreement. The amendment would invalidate any treaty or executive agreement in conflict with the Constitution. It would prevent any treaty or executive agreement from making the United States a minor province in some world or regional government. It would keep the God-given and inalienable rights of the American people in the spiritual realm and beyond the power of any government, national or internationl. My amendment would tell the United Nations to keep its nose out of our purely domestic affairs. Although the amendment was defeated by a narrow margin in the Senate earlier this year, the fight has only just begun.

Percentagewise, the mail I have received against the amendment was negligible. However, the number of letters was large enough to represent a fair sampling of the basis of opposition. I was shocked to discover that over 75 percent of the mail in opposition had nothing whatever to do with issues germane to the amendment. These opponents argued: "we must trust President Eisenhower", "do not create disunity in the Republican Party"; "we live in dangerous times." All these objections, you will note, imply that strong leadership is of greater importance than a government of laws.

On the text of my amendment, the administration's main objection has been the section that would prohibit the President from making domestic law by executive agreement. The Founding Fathers never intended the President to initiate legislation. I will never agree to any compromise that breaches that cardinal principle.

What troubles the President most about my amendment, I think, is his feeling that he is obligated to pass on intact all the powers of the executive office that he inherited. Rigid adherence to any such principle would simply mean that each new President would become the trustee of all powers usurped by his predecessors. For example, the Supreme Court in the Pink case held that an executive agreement between President Roosevelt and Communist Russia became the supreme law of the land. The agreement was held to override the laws of New York and property rights otherwise protected by the fifth amendment. The President's paramount obligation is to protect the liberties of the American people even if he must relinquish some of the prerogatives of his office. For example, the 1952 platform of the Republican Party promised to restore the States to their traditional place in the Federal system. That promise cannot be fulfilled unless both the President and the Congress surrender many powers acquired during the last two decades.

The leadership principle has also been fostered by Presidents who have sought by pressure to stifle any exercise of independent judgment by Members of Congress. The President is a constitutional partner in the legislative process. He is given power to recommend legislation and to veto bills. It is entirely proper for him to work for the passage of legislation that he considers in the country's best interest. Unquestionably, the line separating proper persuasion and undue pressure is vague and shifting. But such a line does exist. It must be respected. As Lincoln warned:

"My political education strongly inclines me against a very free use of any of these [indirect] means by the Executive to control the legislation of the country. As a rule, I think it better that Congress should originate and perfect its measures without external bias."

In this connection, a special tribute is due President Eisenhower. In spite of the clamor from the left that the President crack the whip on Congress and its committees, the White House and the Congress are working together effectively and harmoniously. No longer does honest difference of opinion lead to political excommunication.

Advocates of the leadership principle never fail to warp the meaning of the separation-of-powers doctrine. They contend that the Constitution guarantees conflict between the legislative and executive branches. Although some friction is unavoidable, nothing in the Constitution prevents the Congress and the President from working together as friendly and equal partners. To do this, however, it must be recognized that no clean-cut separation of legislative and executive functions is ever possible. The powers of Congress and those of the President cannot be sealed off in watertight compartments. They overlap to a considerable degree. The Founding Fathers intended them to be exercised in a spirit of cooperation rather than in hostile competition.

This cooperative design does not satisfy those who want a leader with a big "L." And so, they contend that the President must be "master in his own house"; that Congress should not affect "promotions and transfers" in the executive branch, or that Congress must not "influence * * * the decisions of the executive branch." Congress can and must influence decisions of the executive branch. It has the power to establish rules for the promotion and transfer of Federal employees. The Constitution itself repudiates any notion that the President and Congress are separated by some impassable barrier. Article 1, section 8, clause 18, provides: "(Congress shall have power) to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper to carry into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof."

There is another way to prove the absurdity of the claim that Congress must be rigidly excluded from the executive domain and the President from the legislative. As in the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, Congress has on numerous occasions delegated some of its legislative power to the President. Mr. Truman was an unusually eager recipient of legislative authority. Contrary to his recent utterances, he expressed no fear of legislative power "oozing" into the executive branch.

Successful opposition to the growth of the leadership principle will require both hard work and great ingenuity. Particularly in times of stress, the simplicity of a leader in action has a powerful appeal. During such times the benefits of a complex government are less obvious. It must not be forgotten, however, that liberty can only be protected by a complicated governmental structure, whereas the tyrant's machine is usually a model of simplicity.

At first glance you might think it harder to sell such abstractions as States' rights and separated and delegated powers than the simple picture of a strong leader taking care of his beloved subjects. Do not despair. The odds are with you. You have at your disposal in your own constitutional law and history the accumulated political wisdom of the ages. You have but to use it to keep liberty the hallmark of America.

Farmers Fear a Benson Bust

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1954

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, it is glorious springtime in our wide agricultural countryside. The crops have been and are being planted. Our farmers keep the faith. They plant the good seed for all of us. Nature cooperating, there will be abundant harvests come summer and autumn. There will be food, enough and to spare, for all of us.

It will not surprise you, if you have been keeping in close touch with those who feed us, to hear that they are worried—more worried than for a generation past. They are worried, not about the usual farm troubles of drought and insects and labor supply but about prices and agricultural activities, both administrative and legislative, in Washington.

As requested, our farmers provided the amazing production which helped win the war. Even if our production did not write the peace as some anticipated, at least it kept Western Europe and many people elsewhere from starving. Our farmers are now worried about matters right here at home.

They have watched, with a growing foreboding of worse yet to come, as the prices of what they have to sell have dropped down and down, almost month by month. Meanwhile their costs, the prices of those items they must purchase with which to operate have declined very little. If you like high-sounding phrases you may refer to this situation as a cost-price squeeze. If you are the farmer involved you will be wondering more than a little whether the "Benson Bust" ends in bankruptcy for you as an individual, as well as for your friends and neighbors.

The United States Department of Agriculture measures farm prices with what they call the parity ratio. When it stands at 100, prices of the things which the farmer has to sell will buy just as much of the things he must purchase as they would during a base period. During the years 1910–19 that ratio averaged approximately 105—a favorable period for many farmers. During the 1920's it averaged only 90. We might say that the mad 1920's were a period during which the farmers were disadvantaged by 10 percent as compared with our economy in general. Then we all got it in the neck. But during the 1930's the farmer really had rough going—the ratio averaged about 78 percent. The 1940's as we all recall, were a period of general prosperity with the parity ratio standing at an average of about 105. Now the ratio has dipped to approximately the 90 of the 1920's.

Instead of the farmer having the mighty forces of his government at his side aiding him in his distress the administration, as now constituted, seems determined to whittle away such support as is now provided. As an example of what I mean, price supports on dairy products, as some of you are very acutely aware, were lowered as of April 1 by the administrative decision of the Secretary of Agriculture, operating within the existing law, to be sure, from a previous support level of 90 percent to a present level of 75 percent. Moreover, the administration proposals as to farm legislation would make present fixed price supports on the basic commodities flexible, that is, permit them to be dropped below the 90 percent of parity level when production is favorable.

It seems to me unnecessary and inequitable that a sliding scale should be substituted for the fixed supports which have made such a real contribution to progress and stability at a high economic level. Fixed supports over the past 10 years or more have been an important part of our productive and responsive agricultural system which has assured ample supplies at fair prices to consumers here and to our friends abroad. They have helped to stabilize the income of producers of basic commodities and thus have assisted in stabilizing the entire economy. They are sound when used with marketing quotas—CCC losses on the 6 basic commodities over the past 20 years have been very low.

Moreover, substituting flexible for rigid supports at 90 percent of parity would cure few if any of the present admittedly serious problems of agriculture.

(a) Basic commodities are highly inelastic with respect to both supply and demand. Flexible supports would merely result in lower prices to producers; reductions in supply of increases in consumption would be negligible.

(b) Flexible price supports at this time would not avoid marketing quotas and acreage allotments.

(c) Flexible price supports at this time would not expand the export market for United States products significantly in the face of the present world supply situation and large accumulated reserves, as of wheat in Canada.

Is it any wonder that the farmers are worried, when the very man and Department which, under our system, is supposed to protect them, suggests "flexing" them below 90 percent? No wonder they have had bad dreams and fear a "Benson bust" will slide them into the depression of the 1930's, a disaster which no mature farmer, awake or asleep, has been able to forget.

Free Trade and Unemployment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 2, 1954

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, an interesting, provocative, and scholarly address on the detrimental effect of lower tariffs and free-trade proposals was recently given by Harry B. Purcell, industrial relations manager of the Torrington Co., Torrington, Conn.

The speech was fully reported in the Torrington Register of May 26, and I wish to include that account of Mr. Purcell's remarks in the RECORD.

As a supplement to the content of Mr. Purcell's speech I include also the results of an employment survey of Torrington which demonstrates the decline in employment, largely attributable to the unfavorable competitive position of many domestic industries with respect to low-cost imports.

The matters follow:

[From the Torrington (Conn.) Register of May 26, 1954]

FREE TRADE HOAX ON WORKERS, H. B. PURCELL TELLS BANKING GROUP

Speaking last night before more than 70 members of group 4, Savings Banks Association of Connecticut, at the Coon Club in Norfolk, Harry B. Purcell, industrial relations manager of the Torrington Co., denounced "free trade" as "a subtle form of economic quackery."

"As far as America in 1954 is concerned," said Mr. Purcell, "no more absurd phrase was ever coined. For if there is any freedom in present international trade conditions, it is only the free ride the other countries of the world are getting while American business and American workers pick up the tab."

Mr. Purcell exhibited numerous products manufactured in Torrington along with identical products imported from England, France, Italy, Germany, and Switzerland, and quoted the cost and selling prices to show "how impossible it is for American industries to compete successfully with the flood of imported goods made by labor paid as low as one-half to one-tenth the rates of American labor."

Statistics on layoffs and reduced working hours in Torrington industry were also presented by Mr. Purcell as evidence of the effect our unfair tariff policies are having and will continue to have on local employment.

Mr. Purcell urged those present, and all "whose concern for America transcends the affection they hold for those countries which lie beyond our borders," to use their influence with their representatives in Washington for obtaining "a sound tariff policy, which means a policy that will maintain duties, so designed as to equalize selling costs on the American market between all home products and their foreign counterparts or substitutes."

Mr. Purcell spoke in part as follows:

"The first mistake many people make as they approach this problem is in not seeming to understand that the proponents of 'free trade' have a powerful weapon in their knack of semantics. Somehow, we have never been able to match the skill of, say, a Winston Churchill for turning out such clever self-serving slogans as, for example: 'Blood, Sweat and Tears'; 'There'll Always Be An England'; 'Iron Curtain'; or 'Trade Not Aid.'

"But we had better recognize the fact that such 'catch phrases' cannot be substituted for the cold hard realities of our position today.

"Another common and serious mistake made by the students of this subject is in thinking of tariff in 1954 as involving nothing more than the simple economics it did, for example, 50 or 60 years ago."

GOVERNMENT INTERVENTION

"It used to be that the principals in international trade transactions were individuals or corporations. To be sure, governments levied duties, either for revenue or to protect their own peoples from foreign competition, but that was the extent of governmental interference in those days.

"Today, however, those same governments have turned trade from a purely economic matter, into a political instrument. They now use it to shape internal affairs of a country, and to influence the policy of friendly countries, or as a club over the heads of unfriendly ones.

"Today, international trade is inseparable from international diplomacy. Even the military now includes it in its strategy as we did, in our restrictions on Japanese trade prior to Pearl Harbor, and as we are using it today in our awkward about face regarding stopping trade with Communist countries. Traders are not just traders any longer—but rather are agents, or makers, of national policy. As a result, a great deal of adjusting of focus must be done if the present trade situation is to be seen in its true perspective."

CAMOUFLAGE

"The third major mistake people make in considering this question is in not recognizing the many ways in which governments abroad engage in trade under a camouflage. Embargoes, cartelism, licensing of imports, import quotas, and the manipulating and rigging of the value of currency in particular, are nothing more or less than disguised tariff.

"Or consider England's practice of subsidizing certain of her exports. It works this way:

"If one of our steel companies was to ship a load of steel to England, the British tariffs and restrictions against that steel, if indeed they let it in at all, would force the price of that steel up to about double what the quotation otherwise would be.

"That makes it impossible for the American steel company to compete in England against British steel.

"On the other hand, when the same American company competes with British steel in a neutral market, the American steel price is too high because the British steel is subsidized. The British people, through taxation, pay an extra price for their domestic steel products so that Merrie Old England can expend her export trade. Thus they keep our cheaper steel out of England while, at the same time they undersell us in other countries."

FRENCH ANGLE

"Or take this lesson in French:

"Suppose France arbitrarily fixes the price of the franc at so many to the dollar. In America, however, the franc's value is only one-half of that amount. If a French importer sets out to buy dollars in the American market, to pay for goods bought here, he must ante up twice as much as his exchange in Paris says he should. The other side of the coin is no less counterfeit. Suppose the Frenchman sends goods to America in payment for those things he bought in New York, he gets credit here for only half as many francs as he had to lay out. The effect is to double the price of American goods in France. By arbitrarily rigging the money price and keeping the American goods out, France levies an additional, but nicely disguised tariff.

"As a final point let's examine the theory that holds, quote 'If we let England (or the other countries) build up her export trade here she will have more dollars with which to buy American-made goods.'

"There is no question about the fact that she will have more dollars. But neither is there any question about the fact that the American people will have fewer dollars. Because anyone who thinks that England, or any other nation, is not going to spend those good stable Yankee dollars in those markets of the world where they can get the most in return, has an inexcusable ignorance of how speedy they are with a 'buck,' or is indulging in the purest kind of fantasy."

FOREIGN RESTRICTIONS

"I mentioned the prevalence of trade restrictions abroad. By October of 1953, some 60 countries of a total of 80 required an import license in order for anyone to ship goods to those countries. Fifty-five required an exchange permit. In a number of these countries, however, an import license automatically carries the right to an exchange permit. We in this country have not adopted such methods of restrictions.

"Requirements such as these, of course, override all other controls. The power to issue import licenses is the power to control imports. Even import quotas become meaningless. Tariff reductions may be completely nullified. What has the external appearance of a fair-trade policy may be, and as a rule is, quite unfair.

"Thus we find ourselves in the rather absurd position after 20 years of shrewd Yankee horsetrading of hearing our high tariff bemoaned by countries that have captured three-fourths of our bargaining shirt while they are still comfortably clothed in theirs.

"We have been outmaneuvered by the diplomats who have no business in the game, anyway. The Department of State knows nothing about the realities of production and competition and is incompetent, therefore, as an administrator of tariff. Its vision is not inward toward the farms and other industries of our country; it is outward, or should be, toward relations with other countries."

MAJOR CONTROVERSY

"Now the great debate will go on, and it will, in my opinion, develop into the hottest controversy of our generation. But while reasonable men will differ as to its causes and effects, there can be no disputing of the fact that in the past 20 years the protection of our existing tariff has been reduced 75 percent.

"Neither can it be denied that the wage differential as between this country and others is at the core of our present predicament.

"The discussion about the necessity of admitting more goods, or how high or low we might stand in the regard of other countries, cannot hide this fundamental truth; namely, that many American industries cannot pay existing wage scales and compete successfully with the flood of imported goods made by labor paid as low as one-half to one-tenth the rates of American labor.

"Obviously, mass-production methods, combined with technical skills, have been the lifesavers for many United States industries. But such superior productivity and know-how is not always enjoyed by our producers. Moreover, we have no monopoly on modern equipment today, thanks to an unprecedented outpouring of American talent, machinery, and money to the rehabilitation programs around the world since World War II. And the foreign firms have all the advantage from the standpoint of costs."

PROTECTION NECESSARY

"How ironic, that our economic life should now be threatened by the creature of our own handicraft. For now, fully 25 percent of American workingmen and women are employed in industries which are vulnerable to foreign competition. The increase in imports cannot be talked away. The real problem here is protection for American business and the American worker. And mere hemstitching of our tariff procedures is not the solution. We must never forget that the primary market for the things we produce and manufacture is right here at home. Those who advocate 'free trade' seem to have overlooked this fact."

INDUSTRIAL COMMITTEE

"To appreciate the scope of this problem and the concern it is causing, I will merely point out that in the spring of 1953 a Nationwide Committee of Industry, Agriculture and Labor on Import—Export Policy, was organized in this country. It is an organization of industries which have banded together to seek protection against unfair foreign competition.

"It is made up of groups ranging from the manufacturing areas of New England to the wineries and fishing grounds of the west coast; and from the cattle and wool-growing areas and mines of the West to the fruit and vegetable farms of Florida.

"I might mention that the industries associated with this national organization include: Aluminum; building materials; clocks; printing; bicycle; cattle; chemical; coal; ceramic carpet; dairy; fishing; hat; textile; wool; rubber footwear; and many others.

"There gentlemen, in part at least, is what a wholly fantastic world prosperity crusade is being allowed to do to our American way of life."

PUBLIC ACTION NECESSARY

"If enough people in this country can be prompted to timely action, it may not yet be too late to procure for the United States a sound tariff policy, which means, a policy that will maintain duties, so designed, as to equalize selling costs on the American market between all home products and their foreign counterparts or substitutes.

"Unless this be done, we shall be undersold in all our markets by foreign competitors. Even the 'free traders' admit this. Indeed, they expect it, and more. 'Let the marginal American industries be sacrificed' they say, 'if it will benefit world economy.' What unbounded generosity some people are capable of, when it comes to offering up money and lives that are not theirs, and therefore, not theirs to give. Should they be allowed to inflict their ignoble experiment upon American employers and employees, inescapably, vast areas of our country would be returned to the wilderness.

"I further suggest, gentlemen, that this fight for a fairer tariff policy is not industry's exclusive responsibility. It is the responsibility of every individual and organization whose concern for America transcends the affection he holds for those countries which lie beyond our borders.

"On that basis, therefore, this is your fight, as well as on the basis of the degree to which the welfare of your banking institutions is dependent upon the welfare of your respective communities.

"I earnestly urge you to use your great personal influence with your Representatives in Washington requesting their immediate and appropriate action.

"I would also respectfully urge your association to adopt a formal and appropriately worded resolution for forwarding to the United States Tariff Commission; our United States Senators and Representatives; and to President Eisenhower.

"At least two State legislatures, Massachusetts and Pennsylvania, have already adopted such resolutions. The same has been done by numerous industrial, labor, and civic organizations who have already learned from bitter experience that there is nothing 'free' for America in the fallacious theory called 'free trade.'

"Even in its partial realization the cost to Americans has been staggering.

"Our 'friends' from across the seas now offer us a Trojan horse in their 'free (horse) trading' which potentially, contains the power to achieve what the several wars could not accomplish; namely, the insidious yet mortal weakening of the American economy.

"Such an impious bargain would not only cost us true freedom, as only Americans know it, but would, of necessity, signal the end of our ability to act as the mainstay of the free world.

"Our most astute economists must be wretchedly incapable of computing the total price of 'free trade.'"

Employment survey, May 25, 1954

Company	Present employment	Estimated average hours currently being worked
Progressive Manufacturing Co	110	100 percent at 32 hours.
Turner & Seymour	390	50 percent at 32 hours.
Fitzgerald Manufacturing Co	256	100 percent at 32 hours.
Bendey Manufacturing Co	123	100 percent at 40 hours.
Union Hardware Co	600	100 percent at 32 hours.
Hayden Manufacturing Co	459	100 percent at 40 hours.
Torrington Manufacturing Co	1,030	Overall average 41 hours.
American Brass Co	1,152	Overall average 40 hours.
The Torrington Co	3,071	70 percent at 35 hours.
Total	7,191	

Since the survey on March 10:

1. Eight out of the nine companies have suffered continued drop in employment. The current total employment figure for Torrington of 7,191 indicates a drop of 30.4 percent in employment from the peak periods, and a drop of 709 or 9 percent from the March 10 total. (Turner & Seymour is the only plant to increase in total employment since March—added 15 employees. However, they have added an additional 10 percent of their work force to the 32-hour workweek so that their total hours of work per week has not actually increased.)

2. Five of the nine plants have further decreased their average hours of work. The average workweek is now 37.04 hours. This represents a total decrease of work hours per week of 20,282 since March 10, 1954, and based on the current total employment figure this would add an additional 548 to the lay-off list, again decreasing the actual total of current employment to 6,643.

3. Four of the nine plants have suffered decreases in both the total employment and the average hours of work.

In relation to bankers, businessmen, and men in the financial world what does it mean? Where the employment figure indicates a drop of 30 percent from the peak, the corresponding decrease in earnings for the community as a whole conservatively estimated would approximate 41 or 42 percent. In addition, as take-home pay diminishes, the amount of money in circulation decreases at an increasing rate. People become more security conscious and savings tend to acquire a much greater degree of importance than normally in relation to luxuries and semi-necessities. (Bankers are familiar with the multiplier effect of money in circulation where a dollar represents not only that nominal amount, but an undetermined multiple as that dollar is spent and re-spent for purchases of goods and services.)

Thus the concern of the businessman is not merely the single grand total of decreased wages in the community, but rather the resultant multiple decline in business activity.

Bryson Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 2, 1954

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include in the RECORD a petition signed by constituents of my district in support of H. R. 1227 which would place certain restrictions on the advertisement of alcoholic beverages.

The petition follows:

To Our Congressman:

We, the undersigned citizens of Virginia, in view of the appalling toll or murder on our highways called to our attention by the President, and of the recent frightening disclosures of the Senate hearing on juvenile delinquency, urgently beg you to remove unfair inducement to drivers to drink and the dangerous influence of sales talk for alcoholic beverages being channeled into our very homes over the air to the eyes and ears of our children by voting for and passing the Bryson bill (H. R. 1227):

Mrs. Geo. Hawkins, Arlington; Mary E. Potts, Alexandria; Betty Moreland, Eleanor Harrison, Lucille Thompson, Anna May Jones, Mrs. Pearl Jones, Vienna; Mary W. Cox, Alexandria; Anne C. Houghton, Arlington; Lucy G. Buckman, Alexandria; Elois Rogers, Edward A. Houghton, Arlington; W. Herbert Brown, Doris E. Brown, Fairfax.

H. R. 9242, the Military Public Works Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1954

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, the military public works bill, H. R. 9242, represents a direct contribution to the national defense in a way which is not generally recognized. The three prerequisites for a sound and efficient military force, men, materiel and bases, must be in balance or waste and inefficiency result. It is not always easily demonstrated that adequate base facilities are necessary to house and train the men and to store and maintain the materiel if they are to be properly utilized.

The Army portion of H. R. 9242 passed unanimously by the House on May 26 is a well conceived balanced program of construction designed to meet the most glaring deficiencies in Army facilities. The main portion of the $270 million authorized for the Army is found in three types of facilities: permanent barracks to house 41,000 men and permanent quarters for 1,350 bachelor officers; $85 million for continued expansion of adequate antiaircraft protection of our cities using the famous Nike guided missile; and another special port for the shipment of ammunition overseas.

The Members of the House know that American soldiers have been living in temporary barracks built 12 years ago for World War II. These buildings are not the sort the Army should have. It is the duty of the Government to give our fighting men decent and comfortable living quarters.

It should not be necessary for me to have to emphasize the importance of the other two segments of this bill which I have mentioned. In these times a dollar spent for modern antiaircraft defense may well save thousands by preventing a successful sneak attack on centers of population and industry. The Army plan to have special port facilities for ammunition is made necessary by the danger which such shipments represent when handled through commercial port facilities.

Mr. Speaker, the cost of the construction authorized the Army under H. R. 9242 is only a small fraction of the funds which this country has spent and will spend on national defense. I doubt if there is any other equivalent dollar expenditure more worthwhile.

Increasing Term of Office of Members of the House of Representatives to 4 Years

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1954

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, I introduced House Joint Resolution 539 on June 1, 1954, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States with respect to the term of office of Members of the House of Representatives.

A large number of persons, including myself, have given a great deal of serious thought to the proposal that the term of the Members of the House of Representatives be increased to 4 years. There are several valid reasons which have prompted my action.

Under the present law a Member of the House serving his first 2 years is forced to spend a disproportionate amount of time and effort learning the intricate procedures and requirements of his office. Yet he must also begin to plan for his reelection campaign almost immediately upon assuming his new duties. The quality of the service which a Member is able to render his country and his constituency is seriously jeopardized. While the position taken by our early statesmen when debating the length of the term of office was perhaps more logical at that time than it is today, so many significant changes have occurred that the original decision has become progressively less defensible.

The intervening years have greatly altered the conditions under which a Member must meet the obligations of his trust. In recent years, a general tendency toward longer annual sessions is to be noted. More conflicts result in his time schedule as he endeavors to correlate the legislative timetable with the need for traveling in his district, making necessary appearances and inspection tours, and campaigning for reelection. With our vastly improved transportation and communication media, the Congressman finds he must devote more personal time and attention to a greater number of visitors, phone calls, and messages received from his constituents. The increase in the legislative load has made far more serious inroads on his time and energy than was the case during the early Congresses. The House of the 1st Congress in both of its sessions proposed only 142 bills of which 118 became law. In the second session, alone, of the 82d Congress, 3,183 bills were introduced, while 612 became law.

Although a 4-year term will not of itself reduce the legislative burden upon the Congressman, freedom from constant campaigning will permit him to spend more time studying the problems involved in legislation. Every new Member must also train a new administrative and clerical staff. Several months are ordinarily required for both the Member and his staff to attain the requisite proficiency for efficient operations.

The need for frequent campaigning required by the present biennial elections does not provide adequate time or opportunity for the lawmaker to demonstrate his competence to the electors in his district. In many States the problem becomes even more severe because of the provision for both winter and spring primary elections.

The heavy financial burden imposed by the need for frequent campaigns is a source of deep concern for many Members of the House. In recent years, some of them have made public statements in this respect, while others no doubt have felt the serious inconvenience but chosen to remain inarticulate. A 4-year term is likely to encourage promising young candidates of limited financial resources to compete in a congressional election.

The 4-year Member is not likely to lose contact with his constituency as the protagonists of the conventional 2-year term proclaim. Present-day systems of rapid and efficient communication insure a far more accurate determination of the local pulse and temperature than was dreamed possible in 1787. No one would claim that the Members of the upper Chamber of our Congress are a dictatorial lot, out of contact with the people, even though their term is 6 years. We have now had a century and a half of experience with a democratic government, and with this heritage, there need be no fear of a tyrannical legislature predicated upon the change from a 2-year to a 4-year term.

One of the motivating factors that no doubt influenced the provision of our present 2-year term of office was the long Parliaments of 17th century England. The delegates to the Constitutional Convention were aware of these long sessions, and of the fact that the voters were finally no longer represented. It would hardly appear, however, that a 4-year term established and limited by law would precipitate a similar tyrannical legislature. Among the American State governments, there is a growing sentiment for lengthening of the terms of the legislators. The Book of the States, 1954–55, reported that the legislatures in a quarter of the States in 1952–53 considered measures to lengthen legislative terms so as to increase the amount of time the legislature might devote to public business, to reduce the time consumed in running for reelection and to retain experienced legislators longer. In Canada, Great Britain, and throughout much of Western Europe parliamentary members are retained at least 4 years in office.

We have had numerous proposals for the reorganization of Congress. Some have been the result of formally organized committees, while still other plans were less formally determined. Although their objectives have been varied, they generally strive to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of our legislative machinery. Of particular interest in this respect is the recommendation which many of these plans have made for 4-year terms for the members of the House of Representatives.

The committee on political parties of the American Political Science Association recently expressed its belief that the present term is so short that a freshman member is involved in a campaign for renomination before he knows his job or has had much opportunity to prove his worth to his constituents or his party.

Social Security Versus Railroad Retirement Tax Rates and Monthly Benefits Under Comparison of Proposed 1954 Social Security Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL CUNNINGHAM

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 2, 1954

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a table which is explanatory of tax rates and monthly benefits under the Railroad Retirement Act and also under the proposed 1954 Social Security Act. It is interesting to note that railroad workers pay more taxes into their retirement fund than those who are under social security though their benefits are in many instances less. The following table was prepared by Walt Sands, research director, National Railroad Pension Forum, Inc.:

Social-security versus railroad-retirement tax rates and monthly benefits-comparison under 1954 social security proposed increases

	Social security			Railroad retirement
	Present	Proposed		
Tax rate (percent)	2.00	2.00		6.25
	On $300 earnings per month	On $350 earnings per month		On $300 earnings per month
Cost:				
Per month	$6.00	$7.00		$18.75
Per year	[1] 72.00	[2] 84.00		225.00
		To those now retired	To those who retire in the future	
Maximum retirement benefits possible to 1 worker and his spouse:				
Old age	[3] $85.00	[4] $98.50	[5] $108.50	$165.00
Spouse	[6] 42.50	[7] 49.25	[8] 54.25	40.00
Total	[6] 127.50	[9] 147.75	[10] 162.75	205.00
Maximum survivor benefits possible to 1 worker's family	168.90	200.00	200.00	168.90
Minimum annuity	[11] 25.00	[12] 30.00	30.00	[illegible]

NOTE.—By comparison to social security tax payments:

[1] Rail workers now pay 3.125 times (2.125 percent) or 2⅛ more.

[2] Rail workers will pay 2.678 times (1.678 percent) or 1⅔ more.

NOTE.—By comparison to social security benefits:

[3] Rail workers now receive 1.948 times (0.948 percent) or less than twice as much.

[4] Rail workers will receive 1.681 times (0.681 percent) or ⅔ more.

[5] Rail workers will receive 1.526 times (0.526 percent) or ½ more.

[6] Rail workers and their spouses now receive 1.612 (0.612 percent) or ⅝ as much.

[7] Rail workers' spouses will receive 0.812 times (0.812 percent) or ⅘ less.

[8] Rail workers' spouses will receive 0.737 times (0.737 percent) or ¾ less.

[9] Rail workers will receive 1.309 times (0.309 percent) or less than ⅓ more.

[10] Rail workers will receive 1.263 times (0.263 percent) or ¼ more.

[11] Rail workers now receive 0.100 times (1.00 percent) or 100 percent less.

[12] Rail workers will receive 0.833 times (0.833 percent) or ⅚ less.

Source: Exhibit prepared by Walt Sands, Research Director National Railroad Pension Forum, Inc., Chicago 43, Ill.

Radio Address of Thomas Dixon, Commander, United American Veterans, May 18, 1954

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. USHER L. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 2, 1954

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I desire to present the address of Thomas Dixon, commander, United American Veterans, delivered May 18, 1954, over WPIK:

Patriotic Americans, whenever serious and hazardous situations arise in our national and international relationships, I feel it my duty, as national commander of the United American Veterans, to state the issues and to make clear what we Americans ought to do.

War-fiendish Russia and Red China have multiplied their danger to us. Now we have two potential battlefronts instead of one, as in Mr. Truman's day. Two separate areas of danger, whereas we could have wiped out the entire Communist battlefront and silenced his battle cry if we had followed the military wisdom of General MacArthur and General Van Fleet and Gen. Mark Clark.

They spoke out strong and clear. They advised action where action was indicated.

That would have settled the fighting over Korea. That would have united North and South Korea into a nationalist unit of free and democratic people. It would have dealt a positive stop-order to the inroads that communism was making. But they carried on their satanic plan while we watched them with our eyes wide open.

What did we do about it? We just sat on our hands doing nothing, or whispered silly twaddle about appeasement and understanding.

Is that the way to deal with a rattlesnake?

When will our State Department become realistic? Mr. Acheson's close friend, Mr. Dulles, is bouncing around the world with the same vast amount of personal publicity as he did under the Truman administration.

Can he really be so oblivious to the actual world situation? Why has Indochina been allowed to grow to its present problem? Why didn't the United Nations silence Russia and Red China in Korea 2 or 3 years ago? What was Dulles thinking about then?

Generals MacArthur and Van Fleet and Mark Clark knew the situation. Their expert opinions should have been followed. Perhaps it was too much to expect that Mr. Truman would take competent military counsel, because of his close association with Mr. Acheson and Mr. Hiss and the rest of that mess in his own department.

But it was clearly the belief of the American people that President Eisenhower would take a survey of the State Department, clear its tracks, and get running on schedule.

Also, the American people had every expectation that President Eisenhower had the gumption to act on the worldwide expansion of communism, with diplomatic words and also with every military action that was indicated.

The Korean truce last July was an ineffectual way to handle a dire situation. Mr. Dulles should have known that. Certainly President Eisenhower does know that Communists are persuaded only by mighty force. Before the Korean truce was signed, which was a highlight of stupidity on our part, President Eisenhower publicly stated, and I quote: "Should the Communists infringe on any part of the truce agreement, the armies of the United Nations would renew the battle at once, and not only in North Korea but against the Communist regime in China."

How about that?

There is proof aplenty that the Communists in North Korea have violated that truce right along, and are now violating it.

Because of these continuing blunders and weaknesses in the State Department, there is a growing feeling that it would be better for Mr. Dulles to retire permanently to his fishing lodge in Canada, and for the President to take over the international problems.

Why shouldn't the President be the soldier he was trained to be, and to assume his full Presidential authority in dealing with foreign powers, be they friendly or belligerent?

Korea is the only area in which the United States and the Soviet Union have engaged in direct conflict. Korea is the only part of the Far East in which, under agreements arising out of World War II, the United States and the Soviet Union were deeply interrelated.

In Korea the United States suffered more than 130,000 casualties. Meanwhile, the Republic of Korea suffered more than 2 million casualties while fighting with us in the same cause, and, indeed, under the American military command.

Why should the United Nations be timid in confronting Red China? Why not finish the cold war? Why not finish definitely what we undertook to do?

The Security Council resolution of June 27, 1950, called for "such assistance as may be necessary * * * to restore international peace and security in the area." On October 7, 1950, the General Assembly of the United Nations adopted a resolution which left no doubt whatsoever that its intent was the immediate reunification of Korea by armed forces. This resolution recommended that "all appropriate steps be taken to insure conditions of stability throughout Korea."

Yet, in July 1953, we finally signed a truce which left 1 million Chinese Red aggressors right there in North Korea.

Was that truce fair to the Korean people and Government? Obviously, it was not. Two million of their people were war casualties. Ten million were driven from their homes; their land lies in ruins; their nation remains divided, with a far more dangerous Red enemy on their northern border than they ever had before.

The Communist aggressors never intended that the outcome should be fair to the nations on our side. The Communist war was designed to weaken us physically and morally.

It certainly did weaken Truman and Acheson and Dulles. But, thank God, it didn't weaken Generals MacArthur, Van Fleet, and Clark, and the whole American fighting force.

That truce signed at Panmunjom offered no solution. It was a stalling device. The Communists have violated every clause. They have actually increased their military forces.

We could have, and ought to have, won a military victory in Korea.

Where does President Eisenhower stand on that statement?

Why walk off from an unfinished job?

What would Secretary Dulles have us do in Indochina? How far would we get when he would again soften up and want to rally around the conference or banquet table with his buddies?

There should be no more halfway measures for the United States. Had we settled the Korea situation as it should have been settled the Reds would have had no stomach for another such defeat in Indochina.

It is definite in our mind that Dulles can't do the job. It remains to be proved whether President Eisenhower can do it.

What do you think?

If the job is beyond their reach, our best recourse is to cut out the global steeplechase and take care of our own barnyard duties at home.

I still recommend that Congress should consider our withdrawal from the United Nations. The pros and cons of this matter should be brought up for thorough discussion. Every reason favorable to each side of the controversy should be searched out in the light of today's problems.

There is before Congress House Resolution 105, which was introduced by an outstanding American citizen, Congressman BURDICK, of North Dakota. This bill calls for our withdrawal from the United Nations.

If we can't keep the United Nations free from the breeding of more Communists, then our place in it is a waste of time.

I thank you.

United States Trade Policy Controversy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. SMITH

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 28, 1954

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include the following article from the Christian Science Monitor:

UNITED STATES TRADE POLICY CONTROVERSY

(By Joseph C. Harsch)

WASHINGTON.—On March 30 of this year President Eisenhower sent an eloquent and urgent message to the Congress on foreign trade policy.

In that message he urged the Congress to be both realistic and bold.

He said that by increasing the flow of trade between the United States and its allies we enhance our own military security by strengthening our friends abroad.

He said the program he was recommending represented a minimum which he considered to be essential.

He said:

"Unless we are prepared to adopt the policies I have recommended to expand export and import trade and increase the flow of our capital into foreign investments our friends abroad may be discouraged in their effort to reestablish a free market for their currencies. If we fail in our trade policy, we may fail in all. Our domestic employment, our standard of living, our security, and the solidarity of the free world—all are involved."

At the same time the President made this firm public commitment to a broad program for expanded American trade with its friends and allies abroad the President's advisers were saying privately that these words were not idle or perfunctory; that the President meant every one of them; that he believed deeply in the vital importance of expanding American trade; that he felt as deeply about the urgency of securing his trade program as he did about the urgency of halting the Bricker amendment.

On May 20 of this year, less than 2 months after the President had launched his trade program into the Congress with such overtones of urgency and commitment, the White House released a letter to Charles H. Percy, president of the Bell & Howell Co., of Chicago, and chairman of a business group pledged to support the President's program, in which the President said, "A simple 1-year extension [of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act] will, of course, be required."

Thus in the brief span of less than 2 months President Eisenhower sustained a bitter disappointment and disillusionment.

What happened between those dates can be reported.

The President's foreign-trade proposals became the most controversial feature of his legislative program.

The machinery of Congress refused to accommodate itself to such a controversial matter in a session which was overshadowed by the McCarthy-Army hearings and the onrushing election campaign.

The White House accepted the conclusion of the congressional leaders that it would be impossible to handle the trade program this year even though the President had said that "unless we are prepared to adopt the policies I have recommended to expand export and import trade * * * we may fail in all."

It also can be reported that the conclusions finally accepted by the White House on May 20 had been anticipated by the Embassies of friendly and allied governments even before the President had sent his message to Congress on March 30, and that the anticipation by them of what happened in May is an important feature of the background of the troubles which have evolved in the western alliance.

During the year 1952 the Allies had come to the conclusion that outright American aid should, and of necessity would, come to an end. But the dollar gap would remain unless something new were put in the place of "aid." Out of this evolved the concept of "trade, not aid" which President Eisenhower supported during his election campaign and which his lieutenants promised to the Allied governments as the future economic cement of the alliance.

During the year 1953 the Allied governments began to plan their economic future on a basis of "trade, not aid." But by December they were hesitating because of growing doubts that the new administration in Washington would be able to deliver the program. In January of this year, they already were making emergency provisions for a possible nonfulfillment of the promise. In February they felt that their doubts had been confirmed by the nonunanimity of the Randall Commission report.

It is merely a fact that since February the alliance has grown weaker and less able to meet the strain of the Indochina crisis which suddenly was imposed upon it in April.

No one ever has stated the importance of the trade program to the whole Eisenhower legislative program more eloquently than did the President himself when he said that "if we fail in our trade program we may fail in all." The White House still hopes the program can be achieved in the year 1955; still believes that "for our security we require that our Allies become economically strong."

But while Washington defers the achievement of this objective for another year, Moscow dangles Communist trade before the eyes of the Allies, and they are tempted to accept the risks of such trade out of what they regard increasingly as their necessity. They would vastly prefer trade with the United States. They may be forced to accept trade with Moscow and its dependencies as the alternative.

Foreign Trade and the City of Milwaukee: An Interim Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 1, 1954

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, in the belief that it will prove of great interest to the members of this House, I wish to commend to their attention the following interim report on a study conducted by the Library of Congress to determine the effect of foreign trade on the city of Milwaukee and its environs.

The tentative findings outlined in the interim report suggest that foreign trade—and particularly foreign exports—play an important role in the industrial life of Milwaukee.

These findings are subject to further adjustment and revision since the study has not been completed to date. There is still additional material which must be gathered, and further replies which are still expected from the industrialists in the Milwaukee area, before a more complete evaluation of the impact of foreign trade on my city will be possible. Nevertheless, the interim report, furnished at my request, is both valuable and informative.

I should like to mention at this point that this particular study was initiated at my request in March of this year by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress. Dr. Howard S. Pijuet, senior specialist in international trade at the Legislative Reference Service, was placed in charge of this project. Assisted by Mr. Harold T. Lamar, of the Library of Congress staff, and with the help of the facilities of my office, Dr. Piquet proceeded with the preparation of a questionnaire which was sent to selected manufacturing firms in the Milwaukee area.

The questionnaire is described in the interim report. It was mailed to the executives of approximately 250 manufacturing firms in the Milwaukee area, representative of all types of industries in that vicinity, and employing upwards of 80 percent of the total number of workers in manufacturing.

Prior to the preparation of the interim report, replies were received from 150 firms, employing over 100,000 workers. Since that date, May 19, 1954, 11 additional replies were received from firms employing a total of 7,000 workers. This splendid response and cooperation on the part of the industrialists in the Milwaukee area has been indeed heartening. Their continued assistance in this project will be of tremendous help in making possible a comprehensive evaluation of the impact of foreign trade on our city.

Under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am at this point inserting the interim report on foreign trade and the city of Milwaukee:

INTERIM REPORT ON THE SURVEY FOREIGN TRADE AND THE CITY OF MILWAUKEE

This is an interim report on the study which is being made on foreign trade and the city of Milwaukee. This interim report is only a first-run analysis of the replies thus far received (May 19, 1954) to the questionnaires sent out to selected manufacturing firms in the Milwaukee area.

There are inherent difficulties in analyzing the impact of foreign trade on a particular region, especially a political subdivision. Three such difficulties are prominent in this particular study: (1) The city of Milwaukee is not a homogenous economic area; (2) companies manufacturing in Milwaukee have related operations in other parts of the country that have a bearing on their Milwaukee operations; and (3) some firms have an interest in both exports and the impact of competitive imports. At this point, the effects that such considerations might have on the final analysis of the impact of foreign trade on the city of Milwaukee are not clear.

The letter that was sent to a selected list of firms in the Milwaukee area, explaining the study being made, asked the firms' cooperation in answering the following questions:

1. What are the principal products produced by your company?

2. What was your annual output of these principal products in 1953 (in value and in units of quantity, if possible)?

3. With which of your products do you regard imports as competitive? Which imports?

4. Which of your products do you sell for export abroad (in value and in units of quantity, if possible)?

5. Are any of the materials used by you imported from abroad? If you do not have this information will you please furnish us with a list of materials that go into your products?

6. What is your total average employment?

7. We shall appreciate any comment you may care to make regarding the significance of (a) exports and (b) imports to: (i) Your own company; (ii) the industry of which your company is a part; (iii) the city of Milwaukee.

As of May 19, 1954, 150 firms had replied to the letters which were sent out requesting information. These firms employ over 100,000 workers or about two-thirds of the total number of workers in manufacturing in the Milwaukee area. The replies that have been received fall into five broad catagories.

(1) Firms which replied that imports are competitive with their products and which have no interest in exports (15 firms—6,200 workers).

(2) Firms which replied that imports are competitive, and which also expressed interest in exports (41 firms—52,000 workers).

(3) Firms exporting their products and which expressed the belief that imports are not competitive (37 firms—35,000 workers).

(4) Firms not interested in exports and which do not regard imports as competitive with their products (48 firms—12,000 workers).[1]

1. Firms which replied that imports are competitive with their products and which have no interest in exports.

Of the firms which replied to date, 15 fall into this category. These firms employ some 6,200 workers. At this juncture the competitive impact of imports is difficult to ascertain. While some firms replied that imports are competitive with all their products, other firms named only 1 or 2 instances where imports are competitive. Still other firms feel no competition from imports themselves, but expressed the belief that some of their customers were being harmed by import competition.

2. Firms which replied that imports are competitive, and which also expressed interest in exports.

This category includes 41 firms employing approximately 52,000 workers. Some firms reported import competition with regard to certain products, while, at the same time, expressing great interest in exports. Other firms are concerned with import competition and still others feel that competition in export markets is becoming increasingly noticeable. Other firms did not appear to be too concerned about import competition but feel that existing trade barriers abroad make it more difficult to maintain export markets than previously. Until further facts are developed it is impossible to tell where the balance of interests lies, as between import competition and exports. Although some firms give the amount of their products that is exported, it is not yet possible, in most cases, to measure the quantitative impact of competitive imports.

---

[1] Nine firms were written which replied that they no longer manufacture, or which have gone out of business.

3. Firms exporting their products and which expressed the belief that imports are not competitive.

There are 37 firms employing 35,000 workers which replied that they export but were not concerned with import competition. For some firms, export sales account for as high as 50 percent of their total sales, annually; however, in a few cases export sales are not too significant.

4. Firms not interested in exports and which do not consider imports competitive.

There are some 48 firms employing approximately 12,000 workers which apparently have little or no interest in either exports or competitive imports. Many of these 48 firms are the very small companies which would not normally be concerned with foreign trade. There are three firms employing over 1,000 workers which expressed a negative interest in either competitive imports or exports.

SUMMARY

Of the replies received to date (May 19, 1954) the firms employing the greatest number of workers (52,000) feel that they have a dual interest in foreign trade. These 41 firms are different in many respects. Some of them, although exporters, appear to be greatly concerned with competitive imports. On the other hand, some of these firms export to a greater extent than firms which also export but have no fear for competitive imports.

The group of firms employing the next largest number of employees (35,000) are the firms exporting. Most of these firms expressed a real interest in exports.

The firms expressing concern over competitive imports (15 firms employing 6,200 workers) does not as yet constitute a true picture of the manufacturers in Milwaukee which compete in the domestic market with imported products. While three of the larger firms (employing over 1,000) are concerned with import competition on a very limited number of products, other firms which export have competition from import on all the products they produce.

As to the 48 firms employing 12,000 which expressed a negative interest in both exports and imports, it is clear in most cases that they are companies producing products sold entirely for the domestic market and which are not imported. However, a few of the larger firms do produce commodities consumed by companies exporting and/or competing with imports, and therefore, when further facts are brought to light, it will probably develop that these firms which appear uninterested may well have a substantial interest in either competitive imports or exports or both.

An Unselfish Life of Devotion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 2, 1954

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, some people as they travel life's highway gain recognition of their fellow man in the fields of art, politics, letters, and public service, generally. There are others who with no hope or ambition to gain the favor of other people or to perpetuate themselves in the memory of man, but motivated only by the teaching of the Master himself to serve mankind unselfishly and devote their lives to their family and to God.

Such a case in point is the beautiful, unselfish life of devotion being currently lived by Mrs. Luther Maples. Notwithstanding her devotion to her husband and her two splendid children, she finds time like the man "who lives by the side of the road" to be a friend to mankind. For a quarter of a century, to my personal knowledge, this beautiful character has given unselfishly of her time to brightening the road of life of the veterans of this country. Mrs. Maples, because of her retiring, modest, and unassuming character, would be possibly the last person in the world to seek public recognition for her contribution to these heroes of our great country. Such extended unselfish contribution, particularly to disabled veterans, however, could not go unpublicized. Therefore, as one who has admired and appreciated this truly great character for many years, I submit for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following tribute which appeared in the Gulfport-Biloxi Daily Herald a few days ago, not only as a tribute to her, but as a tribute to others throughout the country who likewise recognize the duty which we owe those who have fought the country's battles. The article follows:

TWENTY-FIVE-YEAR SERVICE RECOGNIZED FOR MRS. LUTHER W. MAPLES

(By Jimmie Bell)

A Mississippi city woman, who is described by coworkers as "soft-spoken, lovable, and unassuming," is quietly working the greatest miracle known to medical science—the miracle called occupational therapy, in which a patient may, completely on his own, regain the feeling of usefulness simply by being useful.

She is Mrs. Luther Maples, and she has been teaching the veterans at Gulfport's VA Hospital the art of usefulness 5 months every year for the past 25 years. Her record has grown to the point that she now works with close to 65 patients each year.

The returns from the annual sales of poppies, which the public wears as a tribute to the men who offered their lives in service to the United States are largely due to the efforts of Mrs. Maples and her crew of workers at the Gulfport medical facility.

For her 25 years' service, the supervisor of the poppy-making project was honored with a surprise party Friday afternoon in the recreation annex of the VA hospital. It was to be a very simple occasion, Carl Fridlund, chief of special services, confided; the regular meeting of the VA volunteer service was to be a report by Mrs. Maples on how many poppies the men had made.

But suddenly, her coworkers, including the hospital manager, officials, aides, and general personnel turned the business meeting into a tribute to Mrs. Maples and they brought out an iced cake with an appropriate arrangement of candles, one for each year of service.

The story gets even better as it goes on:

When the tributes had been paid and the kind words completed, Mrs. Maples' report still outshone the festive portion of the gathering—for she told the group that her veterans had turned out no less than 177,100 poppies since January.

They had been shipped to Jackson earlier this month and distributed to auxiliary units and Legion posts of the State for sale May 29.

Mrs. Maples calls it "one of the very best years in the history of poppy making, and a record that would not be possible without the cooperation of the general personnel of the hospital. They have been splendid."

Dr. W. K. Freeman, hospital manager, presented Mrs. Maples a Veterans' Administration certificate in recognition of outstanding service. Dr. Freeman called it a rare personal privilege. He said he felt "this is the first time in the history of the Veterans' Administration a volunteer worker has devoted such service over so long a period of time."

What Mrs. Maples does for the men who work in this project is an accomplishment with many benefits to many persons. One of them is the fact that the veterans are paid so much per poppy, enabling them to earn money for themselves, thanks to a fund handled by the State department of the American Legion.

Another is that all proceeds from the sales are used to help the families of needy veterans. Therefore, the work the veterans at Gulfport perform in the annual project is of great importance to men, women, and children throughout Mississippi.

Mrs. Maples is the wife of Judge Luther Maples, Harrison County court. She became interested in volunteering her time and services to the hospital in 1929 at the request of Mrs. C. S. Everetts, head of the State auxiliary.

She has continued year after year in service to the hospital because, she related, "of the joy of seeing the therapy of this program in action with medical care and treatment in restoring men to health." And the fact, she says, "that there is further joy in seeing men happy in the realization that, although disabled and hospitalized, they can still work and earn money."

Mrs. Maples says, "There is no estimating the value of poppy making." Several workers are blind and many in wheelchairs, but there are no handicaps so far as Mrs. Maples is concerned.

Thus guiding the war veterans back to good health, Mrs. Maples works with devotion, interest, and special attention for each patient as he first takes a tapered spool, fastens the petals, then curves the wire, and entirely by touch completes a poppy. One of her blind patients can turn out 1,000 poppies "in just a few days," Mrs. Maples relates.

No matter how badly handicapped a patient may be, Mrs. Maples finds a way for him to make poppies if he wishes to do so. Her men have manufactured a total of 4,375,000 poppies at Gulfport in the quarter century of her service.

"They take great pride in their work," Dr. Freeman reported, "and feel a great sense of accomplishment in working toward the annual distribution and sales."

Mrs. Maples has her idea about the annual poppy day as well: "I wish the Legion posts and the auxiliary units could see our men working. They would, I am sure, order poppies as they have never ordered them before."

Neither the workers who distribute them nor the public who buys them can quite know the feeling of pride Mrs. Luther Maples experiences when a good report is turned in and she can share the news with the men who made her good work possible.

Tariff Compromise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. SMITH

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 28, 1954

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following editorial from the St. Louis Globe-Democrat:

Tariff Compromise

It is disappointing that pressure against the reciprocal trade policy has mounted so high in Congress. President Eisenhower now feels his best strategy is to fight for a year's extension instead of the 3 years he originally asked. No doubt this is a realistic compromise. One-third of a loaf is better than none.

Obviously the White House has sounded out prospects of its tariff reduction program in Congress and found the outlook dim. Mr. Eisenhower and his administration are dedicated to continuation of reciprocal trade pacts, as the only way to expand our own and world trade. Without increased foreign markets, our own economy is endangered and prosperity peaks will be scaled down.

There is no economic mystery about this. As we ease off on military spending and other aid abroad, the American production plant will be left with capacities our own needs will not support. Continued prosperity demands foreign markets, and we will not have enough of them when our mutual assistance program slims down. This is as simple a fact as the law of supply and demand.

But certain industries and groups, seeking to protect their own domestic markets, refuse to accept this elemental reality. They learned nothing from the trade debauch caused by the Hawley-Smoot Act, which walled out foreign commerce after World War I, and paved the way for the 1929 depression. They have organized powerfully and flooded the mails with tariff publicity. The free trade groups have also organized, but confront a richly endowed high-tariff campaign, plus the traditional tariff policy of the GOP Old Guard.

Enemies of freer trade and essential world markets have balked the administration's plan for a 3-year extension with provision for new gradual cuts in duties. They must not be permitted to defeat at least a year's extension. That would be not only economic isolationism, hampering to foreign policy; it would ultimately prove prosperity's blind defeat.

Fluoridation of Drinking Water

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY W. WIER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 2, 1954

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the Record, I include a copy of the testimony of Frederick B. Exner, M. D., before the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on H. R. 2341, a bill to prohibit the fluoridation of public drinking water:

Artificial Fluoridation of Public Water Supplies

I am Frederick B. Exner, M. D. (Minnesota, 1927), FACR (Fellow of the American College of Radiology). I am something of a jack-of-all-trades. My father was professor of chemistry at Carleton College, Northfield, Minn., for many years, and I practically grew up in a chemistry laboratory.

I was graduated from Carleton (B. A. 1921), with two majors, mathematics and chemistry. I took post-graduate work there in organic chemistry in the summer of 1923.

I taught chemistry and physics at Faribault, Minn., from 1921 to 1923.

While in medical school, I took an extra summer quarter, and took elective work in pathology and physical chemistry; and also did some special work on statistical studies of growth with Richard Scammon, one of the pioneers in biometrics.

From 1930 to 1933, I took post-graduate work (combined with teaching) in radiology and pathology, at the University of Minnesota. Since that time I have engaged in the private practice of radiology, including dental X-ray, mostly in Seattle.

While at Minnesota, I did pioneer work (1931–33) on mass X-ray case-finding of tuberculosis. My latest paper on the subject was published in July 1952. I was twice president of the local Antituberculosis League (Christmas seals), was for more than 10 years a consultant to the State department of health, and have been on the medical advisory committee of the State department of vocational rehabilitation. I include these facts because it has been maliciously stated that I am opposed to everything aimed toward the public good.

I am a member of the house of delegates of Washington State Medical Association, have been 4 times president of the State radiological society, 6 times secretary of the Association of American Physicians and Surgeons, am councilor for Washington for the American College of Radiology, and a member of its commission on legislation and public policy. I am a member of the faculty of our medical school (medical ethics and economics).

I speak here strictly as an individual, expressing my own opinions. The medical school particularly, wants it expressly understood that it has no official opinions on the subject of fluoridation.

I've been asked to tell you why you should not put fluoride in your water supply. Nor should you add anything that will degrade its purity.

In the first place, it is morally wrong. Willful adulteration of public water supplies is a crime, and you are morally guilty of that crime when you vote to put fluoride in the city water.

No place is habitable without drinking water. The inhabitants of a modern city depend on a common supply, and each has equal stake in its purity. Each has a right to get water from his tap, not medicine, or soup.

You may add anything you like to your water. Your neighbors may do the same. But neither can abrogate the other's right to have water in the tap.

What is more, right to determine what shall be done to one's own body is probably the most fundamental of those personal rights our Constitution was designed to protect. Such rights cannot be denied except when their exercise presents a clear and present danger to the equally important rights of others. This may conceivably occur where there is communicable disease, but tooth decay is not contagious.

But morals are no longer fashionable; the law is whatever the courts say, and the Constitution has been reinterpreted to give Federal bureaucrats police power within the States. So perhaps I should give you additional reasons—hard-boiled, cold-blooded, practical, selfish reasons, based on the primitive instinct of self-preservation.

But let's clear up an important point that the fluoridizers have done their best to confuse. They try to tell you that chlorination and fluoridation of water are alike, and equally justifiable.

This simply is not true, and they know it, as I shall prove shortly. So let's get clear what the difference is and why one is right and the other wrong.

Pure water is hard to come by, and in some places the only feasible supply is pretty bad. Now, some impurities are merely disagreeable, but typhoid germs are deadly. In times past they killed people by the thousands. The germs can be destroyed, however, by putting in the water tiny amounts of chlorine which are believed to be harmless. In any case, it is less to be feared than typhoid germs. Moreover, it can be removed from the water by a few moments' boiling (something, by the way, that you can't do to fluoride).

The purpose of adding chlorine, then, is to destroy more harmful impurities already present in the water. The purpose of fluoride, on the other hand, is to act on, and alter, the body of the person who drinks the water.

You have been promised that artificially fluoridated water will so change your children's bodies that their teeth will be less apt to decay. You have also been promised that it cannot harm either them or you. Both promises are false, as we shall see, but let's take one thing at a time.

The drive to fluoridate your water comes from a small group in the United States Public Health Service. In the past 15 years they have spent thousands of hours that should have been spent on their jobs, and several million dollars of tax money, on a long-range propaganda campaign aimed at putting fluoride in the water of every city, including yours, which does not already have too much naturally.

On October 17, 1950, F. J. Maier, of the PHS, addressed the southwest section of the American Water Works Association. His remarks have been reprinted with tax money and are distributed free on request by the Public Health Service. (I advise that you get one and read it carefully.)

I now quote: "Some of the most important contributions to the improvement of public health have been made through the application of procedures designed to remove from drinking water substances injurious to health. Conversely, the discovery of the role of optimum amounts of fluorides in water has led to the concept that the treatment of drinking water might include the addition of specific substances to prevent disease."

Here is proof enough that the Public Health people do know the difference between chlorination and fluoridation, and that their attempts to confuse you are deliberate; that they are aware that fluoridation introduces a new principle of public-health function; and that they plan to extend its application as soon as the precedent has been established.

Here are grounds for deep concern. These are no ordinary busybodies. They are high Government officials, with tremendous arbitrary power over your life and mine. And if this new principle becomes established, their present powers will be increased beyond measure.

Once you accept the idea of adding drugs to the water, what do you add next? Where do you draw the line? Who decides? How do you make the decision stick? My friends, such powers cannot safely be entrusted to anyone. The time to call a screeching halt is now.

Now, why would people want to put poison in their water? The answer is that they wouldn't—and don't. Almost every time the voters have been asked, they have answered an emphatic "no."

Almost without exception, where water is artificially fluoridated it has been done by the city council without the people's consent, and often without notice. And when it injures children's teeth—as it certainly will—there will be no recourse for children or parents. The city cannot be held liable unless there was negligence.

Now, aldermen as a class are not evil men, intent on doing their neighbors in. The councils were "had." They were duped by experts, people they trusted. Some were experts at humbug (or their stooges). Others were respectable experts on other things who had themselves been fooled.

Now, few people know much about fluorine, but most who do have been tricked into thinking that the effects of fluoride, both good and bad, depend on how much is in the water.

The most ordinary common sense will tell you that this simply can't be true. It might be if the fluoride worked on the teeth by contact, but it doesn't. When you want it to do that, you use it 20,000 times as strong and are careful not to swallow any. (Even then, it is not too effective.)

Fluoride that you drink must be taken into the blood and carried to the tooth buds, and the tooth bud has no way of knowing how much water accompanied the fluoride to the stomach.

Even experts know, when they stop to think, that if you put 1 grain of fluoride in 1 barrel of water, and 3 grains in another, 3 glasses from the first barrel will carry the same amount of fluoride as one from the second. But experts, like other folks, don't always stop to think.

And even an expert should know that different children drink different amounts of water—not just little differences, tremendous differences. One child will drink many times as much water as another, and get manyfold the dose of fluoride.

Now, Hitler taught that if you keep repeating a lie that is big enough, people will soon believe it in preference to truth.

The public healthers used Hitler's method to put over two honeys: (a) That the effect of fluoride depends on its concentration in the water; and (b) that one part per million is magic—that it will reduce tooth decay by 65 percent (whatever that means), and can harm no one.

And you can chalk one up for Mr. Hitler. His method worked like a dream. They wrote over a hundred pseudoscientific articles, and made hundreds of speeches, endlessly repeating these two lies—till I think they almost believed them. At first they were limited to quoting each other, but soon they could quote any number of people who, of course, were merely quoting them.

Now, fluoride may eventually be proved useful as a drug, in controlled dosage. When put in the water, however, it is and will always be just plain poison. There, dosage cannot be controlled because it is tied to water consumption which is wholly unrelated to need for the drug. If some children happen to get a correct amount, others must get far too much or far too little.

And fluorides are poisonous. The United States Dispensatory says, "Flourides are violent poisons to all living tissue." Sodium fluoride is commonly used to poison rats and roaches. Cryolite, a much less deadly fluoride, is used as insecticide on fruit trees.

Now, no one believes that with only one part of flourine in each million parts of water, anyone can drink enough to kill him dead on the spot. But that doesn't mean, either, that it can't hurt you. And, when added to what you get from other sources, it frequently just makes the difference between safety and disaster.

Many jobs involve exposure to fluoride, and if it is job where you work hard, sweat a lot, and drink a lot, the added fluoride in your drinking water can kill you—slowly but surely.

The Government sets rigid requirements for removal of spray residues from fruit. It requires the grower to spend hard-earned cash to protect you from tiny traces of fluoride. And all the time, another branch of the same Government is spending millions of tax dollars (your money and his), to put a far more deadly form of the same poison in your drinking water.

Now, opinions differ as to what traces of fluoride can do, but all agree that they do damage teeth, and that the damage is serious. It can be far worse than the worst-neglected decay. So let's not get sidetracked on fruitless arguments about what happens to other parts of the body. After all, the alleged purpose is to protect the teeth.

H. Trendley Dean, archpriest of fluoridation, has said, "It is obvious that whatever effect the waters with relatively high fluoride content (over 2.0 p. p. m. of F) have on dental caries is largely one of academic interest, the resultant permanent disfigurement of many of the users far outweighs any advantage that might accrue from the standpoint of partial control of dental caries."

But the same holds true at any other fluoride level, since tooth damage depends on the dose of fluoride, not the concentration. We know it is true at 0.2 p. p. m. (a mere one-fifth of the amount they want to put in your water) because that is the amount in the only water supply on the island of Tristan da Cunha, in the South Atlantic.

Yet 60 percent of the young people had teeth disfigured by fluoride, and damage was obvious enough to be revealed by the first smile. (And any who thinks that is unimportant should have such teeth.)

Moreover, 2 percent of the people old enough to have permanent teeth had them not just disfigured, but actually deformed, by fluoride.

Now the public healthers know all this, and get around it by saying that the damage was done by food, not by water. Of course, the only honest answer is that it was the combination—but they don't go in much for honest answers.

By official definition, if your teeth were damaged where the water contains more than one part per million of fluoride, the water caused it, but if there was less than one part of fluoride in each million parts of water, the fluoride in the water has nothing to do with it. But, of course, your teeth don't know that.

Back in the 1930's, 1.0 p. p. m. was selected as the minimum threshold of endemic dental fluorosis in the hope that it would not damage the teeth of more than about 10 percent of children. The public healthers agreed that damage to less than 10 percent of children was not objectionable and had no public health significance. And, by the way, questionable damage did not count. It had to be unmistakable.

The Public Health Service has since learned that it made a bum guess, and that far more than 10 percent will show up injured. It has, therefore done two things while continuing to chant the old lies between times.

After years of preaching that the amount you drink isn't really important, it now suggests that where climate leads to heavy water consumption, less fluoride should be put in the water.

And, secondly, the definition of objectionable fluorosis has been scaled upward. Fluoride is no longer objectionable unless 15 to 20 percent of children are damaged. And this is the thin ice between the health officers and perjury when they testify under oath that fluorides in the amount of one part per million will not cause objectionable fluorisis.

Those who now control the Public Health Service think nothing of sacrificing up to 20 percent of our children if by so doing they can increase their already tremendous power. My friends, as I said before, the time to call a halt is now. Don't let them put fluoride in your water supply. I thank you.

F. B. EXNER, M. D.,
Fellow of the American College of Radiology.[1]
SEATTLE, WASH.

New Look at Red China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. PILLION
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 2, 1954

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to insert the following editorial which appeared in the Buffalo Evening News on May 24, 1954. The editorial refers to House Resolution 548, which has for its purpose the initiation of a United States policy for the divorcement of China from the Soviet objective of world communism:

NEW LOOK AT RED CHINA

Chou En-lai observed what he considered Red China's arrival in the international big time at Geneva with a vituperative opening speech demanding that all foreign forces get out of Asia. What it is assumed he meant was that all Americans, British, and French in that part of the world should pack and go home. Not Russians. He carefully refrained from any mention of Soviet armed troops which occupy the ports of Dairen and Port Arthur at a tip of Manchuria across the Yellow Sea from Korea.

At the Yalta Conference in 1945 the Allies yielded—among many things—to the Soviet Union's demands for independence of Outer Mongolia, internationalization of Dairen, and the leasing of Port Arthur as a Russian naval base. The forces of the U. S. S. R. still are there.

Representative JOHN R. PILLION, of Buffalo, called these facts to the attention of Congress in an address on the House floor last week in introducing a resolution calling upon the United States delegations to the United Nations and the Geneva Conference to ask collective action against "these violations of the Soviet Union of the territorial integrity and sovereignty of China and other Asiatic peoples."

He predicted that "it is inevitable that (the present rulers of China), failing to dissociate China from Soviet policy, will be replaced by more farsighted Chinese leaders from within or without China." Eventually, he said they will be replaced by leaders who will regain China the territory, sovereignty, and sphere of economy lost to the Soviet Union. As grounds for his belief, Mr. PILLION asked, "Where are the former leaders of Czechoslovakia, Poland, East Germany, Hungary, Romania, and Bulgaria who delivered these peoples to Soviet slavery? Is there any ground to believe that the fate of the Chinese leaders would be less inglorious?"

The Buffalo Congressman declared that China is a Kremlin dupe being bled white in aggressive adventures which react to the profit of Soviet Russia and will eventually lead to one supreme Communist dictatorship—that of Moscow.

He pointed to "the progressive shift of the Soviet population and industry eastward" and added that the movement has slowly but surely absorbed the territories and monopolized the economy in an ever-narrowing circle around China. These pressures have robbed China of her natural areas of expansion and economic development.

"The Soviet policy of world totalitarian dictatorship by Moscow remains unalterable. China is both a pawn and an obstruction to this purpose," Mr. PILLION said. It is China's embroilment with the free nations that serves ideally the double purpose of weakening both China and the free world so that the Soviet can extend its rule at minimum cost over both China and the free nations, he declared.

---

[1] Lecturer on medical ethics, economics, and public relations, University of Washington School of Medicine; coucilor for State of Washington, and member of commission on legislation and public policy, of American College of Radiology; former secretary, Association of American Physicians and Surgeons; member of House of Delegates of Washington State Medical Association; past president of Washington State Radiological Society; past president of King County Antituberculosis League; past president King County Medical Service Bureau, etc.

The pillion resolution also asks that the people of the United States reaffirm their traditional friendship with the people of China and declare that they will view sympathetically any measures the Chinese people take to regain territories lost by virtue of Russian violations of their sovereignty—and regard, presumably, any attempt to get rid of their present leaders in the same light. It is most certainly no mistake for this country to consider possible support for China in any affort she may wish to make to free herself from dependence upon the Soviet, in the opinion of Mr. PILLION.

There can be no doubt whatever that China lost some of her richest territories, sovereignty over parts of her land and even property through aggression by the Soviet Union—aggression and seizure no less to be identified and condemned than that accomplished by a shooting war.

Federal Housing Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. AYRES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 2, 1954

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, the recent disclosures of certain irregularities that have occurred in the past in connection with the Federal Housing Administration are creating alarm in the building and home improvement industries. I have been familiar with the program since 1936. Unless one has been close to the operation of FHA it is practically impossible to understand all of the ramifications. It has been an important factor in the national economy and it would be a very serious matter if it were to be discontinued or so regulated as to become inoperative.

The title I plan has offered a sound program of consumer lending and has been serving the hitherto largely unserved millions of Americans who have needed repair and improvements to their property. There is a serious housing shortage in our country today. There are literally millions of homes that need improving and repair. The title I program offers a simple and sound method of financing through which conscientious lenders, home improvement dealers, manufacturers and consumers have mutually benefited.

Even though there is a vast backlog of savings accounts, the American habit of installment buying is a vigorous stimulant to business. There is every indication that a large proportion of repair and home modernization will continue to be financed through the extension of credit.

The FHA title I program has made it possible for a number of banks who previously were not able to extend home improvement credit to do so, especially commercial banks and Federal savings and loan associations. These organizations were not allowed by law to make loans on FHA terms prior to the advent of the FHA title I plan. Many States passed special enabling legislation to permit this kind of lending if insured under the title I program.

Many banks have found FHA insured paper attractive as it is a very liquid asset highly approved by bank examiners and the Federal Reserve Bank. It has afforded them a way of increasing their business and broadening their service. It has attracted many new customers to their banks. From the observations I have made it has been well demonstrated that where reasonable credit judgment is exercised, the financial institution is virtually insured against 100 percent loss even though the present program provides for insurance of only 10 percent of the outstanding balances of accounts financed on the title I program.

Many of the present complaints with the FHA title I program are occasioned by the fact that good faith on the part of certain dealers and borrowers was not exercised and the failure of certain lending institutions to do a real policing job with respect to dealer malpractices.

In my opinion, there are sufficient regulations in force to properly police the title I program, however, one of the major problems has been on the part of certain lending institutions who failed to properly administer the rules and regulations and use due caution in the purchasing of paper, particularly in thoroughly investigating and properly appraising the integrity of the retail vendor. I know, as do so many others, the manner in which some customers have been abused in the past and I am fully aware that some unscrupulous companies have permitted the padding of transactions with the customer paying an excess of list prices and the retail company dividing this "pack" with salesmen obtaining it. Unquestionably, many of these transactions were financed by lending institutions carrying FHA title I loan insurance, thus in a very intangible way FHA might be termed responsible. In the past on various occasions, at an opportune time, I have pointed out to various bankers the hazards and fallacies of purchasing paper from unethical dealers with little or no tangible assets and background of a shady character. Many of these warnings went unheeded with an unfavorable result to the bank and the customer. In spite of the vast amount of unfavorable publicity in connection with the title I program, it is my opinion that the abuses of the program are in a major part of a nature that can be easily corrected and small in proportion to the overall activity of title I. A recent survey of the banks in the large cities indicated very strongly that the abuses of the program were small in proportion to the activity generated in the area surveyed.

Some dealers have obtained completion certificates prior to the completion of a job and then have failed to complete the job to the customer's satisfaction and went ahead and discounted the deal with a lending institution. In view of the fact that the customer had signed a completion certificate, the lending institution forced the customer to pay in spite of the fact that the job was not completed, using the argument that the customer had participated in perpetrating "fraud" on the bank by certifying that the job was completed when it was not. Some dealers have represented to an unsuspecting customer that his installation of an improvement was to be used as a "model home" and that the customer would receive a commission on all jobs sold as a result of the use of his home as a "model home." Such commissions never materialized and the customer was forced to pay by the lending institution without the benefit of the commissions which he was led to believe he would receive in connection with his purchase. Everything possible should be done to correct such abuses as these.

Many banks years ago realized that they could not follow in the footsteps of certain lending organizations who were purchasing questionable FHA paper and limited their operations to good dealers and sound borrowers. They thought that any long-range thinking must be based on sound principles rather than temporary advahtages and have done their best to avoid fly-by-night operators. FHA itself, in my opinion, has done a conscientious and admirable job. While I do not have the figures available, it is my understanding from reliable sources that it has produced millions of dollars in profit for the Government. FHA itself only enforces such restrictions and promulgates such regulations as it must to administer properly the law under which it operates. Early in 1953, at the suggestion of the Commissioner, a title I advisory committee was made up of representative principal bankers from San Francisco, Memphis, Detroit, New York, St. Paul, Louisville, and Chicago, was formed to assist in recommending certain regulations to eliminate and minimize irregularities which had come to the attention of various officials. As a result of the recommendations of this advisory committee, the FHA title I Commissioner instituted certain regulations which became effective December 1, 1953. In essence, the new regulations provided:

(A) That a dealer would assume full responsibility for the title I activity of all of his personnel; that ethical and proper selling practices would be followed, and that immediate attention would be given to all complaints involving materials, workmanship, or sales representation. A signed statement to this effect had to be filed with the financial institution discounting his paper along with an application from the dealer which set forth his background and financial condition.

This regulation was made a part of the United States Criminal Code and provided for a fine of not more than $5,000 or imprisonment of not more than 2 years or both.

(B) The dealer's completion certificate was revised to include the following certification:

First, the above work or materials constitute the entire consideration for which this loan is made; second, a copy of the contract or sales agreement has been delivered to the borrower and the above financial institution; third, this contract contains the whole agreement with the borrower; fourth, the borrower has not been given or promised a cash payment or rebate nor has it been represented to the borrower that he will receive a cash bonus or commission on future sales as an inducement for the consummation of this transaction; fifth, the work has been satisfactorily completed or materials delivered; sixth, the above certificate was signed by the borrower after such completion or delivery; seventh, the signatures hereon and on the note are genuine; eighth, all bills for labor or materials have been or will be paid.

If any of the above representations prove incorrect, the undersigned agrees to promptly repurchase the note from the financial institution or from the FHA as the case may be.

(C) The customer-completion certificate was also revised to include the following certifications:

> I (we) certify that I (we) have not been given or promised a cash payment or rebate nor has it been represented to me (us) that I (we) will receive a cash bonus or commission on future sales as an inducement for the consummation of this transaction. I (we) understand that the selection of the dealer and the acceptance of the materials used and the work performed is my (our) responsibility and that neither the FHA nor the financial institution guarantees the material or the workmanship or inspects the work performed.

(D) The bank was required to mail to the borrower or personally deliver to the borrower written notice of approval of the application for credit on a form approved by the Commissioner. Such notice shall be directed to the borrower prior to disbursement of the loan and in no event less than 6 calendar days prior to such disbursement.

There is one further regulation which I would recommend in the interest of better control of the program and that is that a lending institution be limited to its own county and adjacent counties in the purchasing of paper as a bank operating too far from its base cannot properly investigate credit applications as it is not intimately acquainted with the local conditions and neighborhoods and cannot maintain the necessary collection follow-up in areas more than a day's distance away. Should the FHA limit their insurance to 85 or 90 percent of the total loan this requirement would have the effect of putting on the bankers some of the burden of making certain that loans are worthwhile and that an effective collection job is done. This would provide an incentive for a bank to do a conscientious job in handling title I loans.

From a dealers standpoint, the FHA title I program has provided financing in areas where it would not be available to the consumer if FHA was not participating in the financing. Certain areas would be virtually blacked out if it were not for title I as a number of the smaller banks are so situated as to be unable to finance without the title I program. The reserve for losses in individual banks is such that without the FHA program the bank would not find it profitable to handle consumer credit loans. Their reserves are so high that the reserve set up for consumer credit activity would be taxed to a point where the operation would be unprofitable. In my opinion, the title I program in effect takes the resources of one part of the country to develop other parts of the country where financial resources are limited or not made available to consumers in this type of activity.

The title I program has been a stabilizing factor insofar as interest rates are concerned. In areas where title I is not available consumers have been denied the privilege, in many instances, of financing their home improvements on a resonable program at reasonable interest rates. Some banks who do not have the title I plan charge as much as $9 per hundred per year to handle loans for home improvement and limit the period of repayment to as little as 18 months.

It seems to me that the Congress has gone investigation slaphappy. We cannot legislate people into being ethical. We can only pass laws to penalize those who are not.

I cannot speak as an authority on all other phases included in the FHA. I can only speak as such on title I.

Under existing law cases of fraud and misrepresentation can be turned over to the Justice Department for prosecution.

For the sake of the millions of Americans who want and are deserving of a better place in which to live let us hope that the other body in its wisdom will soon have the housing bill as passed by the House of Representatives ready.

National Conference of Americans of Slovak Descent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER M. MUMMA

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 2, 1954

Mr. MUMMA. Mr. Speaker, on May 24 I had the pleasure of attending an informal dinner of the national conference of Americans of Slovak descent at the Washington Hotel, in company with some 25 other Members of the House and 4 or 5 Senators.

This meeting was unusually interesting to me since one of the principal activities of the Slovaks—the Jednota Printery—is in my district. Mr. Philip A. Hrobak is its superintendent and was the principal speaker at the dinner. I am sure the remarks he made will be interesting to all of you, as they describe the Czechoslovak situation as it exists today, even behind the Iron Curtain.

Pursuant to the privilege granted me, I include Mr. Hrobak's talk, as follows:

ADDRESS OF PHILIP A. HROBAK, PRESIDENT OF THE SLOVAK LEAGUE OF AMERICA, DELIVERED AT THE INFORMAL DINNER OF THE NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF AMERICANS OF SLOVAK DESCENT, WASHINGTON HOTEL, MAY 24, 1954

As citizens of the United States of America, we firmly hold to the belief that all nations without exception have the inherent, God-given right to freedom and independence, the right to establish their own political state, and to freely elect a government of their own choice.

On March 14, 1939, after over 10 centuries of alien domination, the Slovak nation exercised its inherent right when its duly elected representatives in the Bratislava Assembly of autonomous Slovakia proclaimed the independence of the land the Slovaks had occupied for 1,500 years and established the Republic of Slovakia. Of course, certain people in America present this historical fact in a false light and attempt to debase and vilify everything connected with it. But the utterly simple historical truth is that the Slovak Assembly unanimously declared the land of the Slovaks an independent republic.

Independent Slovakia, the dream of Slovak generations, did become a reality and was thoroughly enjoyed by the Slovak people, even though it was short lived (1939–45), and it is significant even today that the Slovak Republic was recognized by 27 countries, including France, Great Britain, Japan, and even the Soviet Union. Naturally the enemies of Slovak freedom and independence, the exploiters of the Slovak nation, furiously opposed the independence of Slovakia.

Raving over the circumstances under which the Slovaks gained their independence, the followers of Dr. Edward Benes—the so-called Benes Czechs (Socialists) and Czechoslovaks (Slovak Judases in the pay of the Benes Czechs)—smeared and crucified true Slovak patriots who dared to speak up for what their nation was rightfully entitled to. But no matter what the circumstances under which the nation we are descended from gained its independence, we as Americans declare unequivocally that the Republic of Slovakia should not have been destroyed against the will of the Slovak nation.

By what law of God or man was independent Slovakia destroyed? Its wanton destruction cannot be reconciled with our political beliefs; it was contrary to all Christian and democratic principles; in short, the destruction of Slovakia in 1945 was criminal. And the eternal shame of it all is that Slovakia was destroyed by the victorious United Nations under the guise of liberation.

The present terrible plight of the Slovak nation, like that of the other nations of central Europe which had been "liberated" in 1945, can be traced to the blundering, undemocratic policy pursued and the secret agreements negotiated in the name of expediency by men in democratic governments. We are all, therefore, responsible, more or less, for the Red enslavement of the nations behind the Iron Curtain and the inhumanities suffered by them. Definitely, we should do something about it. Let us at least be honest with ourselves and the rest of the world and admit that it was morally wrong and contrary to every democratic and Christian principle to surrender the Slovak nation and the other nations of central and eastern Europe to the ruthless men of the Kremlin. Then, let us repudiate the treaties and secret agreements by which these nations were enslaved by the U. S. S. R. and immediately proceed in earnest with the task of real liberation of all nations from all tyranny.

The struggle against tyranny is nothing new to the Slovaks. The history of the Slovak nation is a history of thraldom and exploitation. For over 10 centuries the Slovak nation, one of the oldest Christian nations in central Europe, has been but a pawn in the hands of alien rulers. Its freedom, security, economy, and territorial integrity have always been determined by foreigners. The Slovaks have suffered longer under alien domination than any other nation of Europe. No other nation has been so thoroughly misunderstood, misrepresented, degraded, maligned, and vilified, even by the very people who claimed to represent it and protect its national interests, by men who professed to be and were glorified as the very epitome of the democratic way of life.

Many of us believed, as did many Slovaks at home, that the trials and tribulations of the Slovak nation were ended and its national existence safeguarded with the establishment of the Czechoslovak Republic in 1918, which the Slovaks and the Czechs were supposed to govern as equal partners and in which the Czechs were to be masters of their own household and the Slovaks were to enjoy states' rights according to the principle of self-determination. But we were mistaken, badly mistaken. We did not see the job through; Czechoslovakia was not set up as a federation. It soon became evident that the Prague Government, headed by T. G. Masaryk and Dr. Edward Benes, did not regard the Slovaks as equal partners, but only as a colony to be exploited by the Czechs. The Slovaks soon realized that Czechoslovakio simply meant an exchange of rulers; they were rid of the Magyar tyrant, only to be placed under the Czech despot, who also sought to destroy them eventually as a nation. They protested, but in vain. Andrew Hlinka, champion of Slovak freedom, went to Paris to attend the Peace Conference in 1919, but was promptly arrested by the French police, at the instigation of Dr. Edward Benes, and ordered out of France. For this the Prague Government later had Hlinka jailed.

The Slovaks, however, outlived the tyranny of the past and today are determined to outlive the present scourge of Czecho-Communist terror and violence and to continue in their march to complete political freedom and independence. But what after communism? Shall the Slovaks be surrendered to another tyrant? Are they willing to be exploited by another form of Czechoslovakia? Certainly not. The Slovaks want only what rightfully belongs to them—no more, no less. They want the United States of America and the rest of the free world to recognize and respect their inherent right to freedom and independence.

The Slovaks, however—despite the many bitter memories of injustices suffered from ruling groups of neighboring nations, some of which blatantly claimed to be exemplary democracies—are fully aware of the fact that a free Ukraine, a free Poland, Bohemia, Latvia, Estonia, Lithuania, and even a free Russia are also necessary to form a better, free, and more just order in Europe. The Slovaks well know that the struggle for freedom and independence cannot and must not be waged in isolation, that the goal of liberation from Communist tyranny and all foreign domination must be the unified aim of all enslaved nations and of all friends of all the oppressed peoples.

It is a matter of record that the Slovak Nation fought communism, the implacable foe of all free countries, in and out of season. Americans of Slovak descent can proudly stress the fact that their forefathers fought the plague of materialistic communism consistently and resolutely for over a hundred years. Slovak history tells us that Louis Stúr, champion of Slovak freedom, repudiated the godless philosophy of Marx in 1849; at its very first session, in 1905, the political party of Andrew Hlinka, the Slovak Populist Party, did not hesitate to condemn communism; 14 years later, in 1919, Gen. Milan R. Stefánik, Slovak hero of World War I and one of the founders of Czechoslovakia, warned T. G. Masaryk and Dr. Edward Benes to make no compromises with Bolshevism; finally, Dr. Joseph Tiso, the first president of the Slovak Republic, appealed to his people to persevere in its fight against the dread plague of communism even as he was being led to his death on the gallows by order of the Communist-dominated National Front Government of Dr. Edward Benes on April 18, 1947.

And, today, the sons of Slovakia, wherever they might be, are more determined than ever to fight Communist tyranny until it is completely eradicated from the face of the earth. The Slovaks seek the opportunity to play a useful role in the struggle for freedom and, they believe, it is the responsibility of the free democratic world to afford them this opportunity. At the same, however, they wish to make it perfectly clear that they do not intend to surrender their inherent right to freedom and independence under any circumstances. They do not believe the Soviet propaganda that the free democratic world wants the Slovak nation to commit national suicide.

The Slovaks want the free nations of the world to recognize at long last a simple truth which the Slovaks and the Czechs have known for many centuries past, that is, that the Czechs are not and do not desire to be Slovaks, and the Slovaks are not and do not want to be Czechs. The Slovaks recognize and respect the right of the Czech nation to complete freedom and political independence, but they also expect the leaders of the Czech nation to realize that the Slovak nation, too, has the inherent right to freedom and political independence. And in the struggle against communism, the Slovaks want to be united with all free nations and not especially with and only with the Czech nation. They want it clearly understood that they are not fighting communism for the sake of a free or any other kind of Czechoslovakia. They were definitely through with the political monstrosity known as Czechoslovakia in 1939, when the assembly of autonomous Slovakia declared the independence of the Slovak nation. The Slovaks subscribe wholeheartedly to the idea of a federation of Central Europe, or even a federation of the whole of Europe, in which all nations would be equal and none would be dominated and exploited by the others.

The Slovaks do not want anything that they are not rightfully entitled to: they make no claims to Czech history, national traditions and customs, or the material, spiritual, and cultural wealth of the Czech nation; and they do not covet Czech territory. The Slovaks do not want or request the Czechs to represent them in any field of human endeavor, whether cultural, political, or spiritual.

And, of course, the Slovaks do not want to be credited with the criminal acts committed by the Communist-dominated national-front government of Dr. Edward Beneš and Clement Gottwald. The Slovak nation had nothing to do with the criminal expulsion of Germans and Magyars from Czechoslovakia, or the brutal persecution and suppression of religion and of all anti-Communist opposition in that hapless country. For the betrayal of Czechoslovakia—the Czech and Slovak nations—to the Communists and the Soviet Union, the Slovaks give full credit to Dr. Edward Beneš and his Socialist followers, who consistently promoted pro-Soviet policy. Slovak political, cultural, and religious leaders did not betray the Czechs, but the Beneš Czechs betrayed not only the Slovaks, but the entire Czech nation as well.

Today, in America and elsewhere, the Beneš Czechs and their Slovak hirelings—the apostles of Czechoslovak democracy—are organized in various Czech and Czechoslovak organizations, the American Fund for Czechoslovak Refugees, Inc., and the Council of Free Czechoslovakia among them, which profess to be organizations of anti-Communist, democratic exiles, from Czechoslovakia. In fact, however, they are controlled by the Beneš Czechs, the Czech National Socialists, and former members of the Communist-dominated national-front government of Dr. Edward Benes and Clement Gottwald, which collaborated closely with the Soviet Union and outlawed all antisocialistic and anticommunistic parties in Czechoslovakia in 1945.

These "national fronters," who claim they control the employees of Radio Free Europe and the Voice of America, never did and never will represent the political will of the Slovak nation, and therefore have no authority to speak for the Slovaks anywhere. Furthermore they do not represent the antisocialistic and anticommunistic Czechs. They should be recognized for what they really were in their homeland—promoters of the pro-Soviet policy of the Czech Socialists and Communists. And they should be treated accordingly. Under their leadership, the so-called Czechoslovak democracy had practically no trouble at all in converting to a peoples' democracy after World War II.

Americans of Slovak descent consider it their sacred duty to unmask and embarrass all such pseudodemocratic elements and to disarm them completely, because the enemies of Slovak freedom and independence are, in fact, the enemies of the American democratic way of life itself.

Imagine then, if you will, our surprise and consternation when we learned as late as February 26, 1954, that our State Department still considers the Council of Free Czechoslovakia to be an organization of leading anti-Communist political refugees from Czechoslovakia working for the liberation of that country from Communist domination. Rightfully we ask, "What goes on in official Washington?" In our opinion, to defend an indefensible group of foreign politicians, who peddled the Moscow line for years, is today not only inexcusable but highly reprehensible, and more so in the case of a Government official.

We must not be confused by the propagators of the new look of the Soviet Union. Let us remember that such a new look had deceived intelligent statesmen and wary diplomats during the last war. Just 10 years ago today, May 24, 1944, the Honorable Winston Churchill said in the Commons:

"Profound changes have taken place in Soviet Russia. The Trotskyite form of communism has been completely wiped out. The victories of the Russian armies have been attended by a great rise in strength of the Russian state and a remarkable broadening of its views. The religious side of Russian life has had a wonderful rebirth. The discipline and military etiquette of the Russian armies are unsurpassed. There is a new national anthem. The Comintern has been abolished."

The Slovak nation was not deceived by the Soviet chameleon in 1938, or in 1944, and it will not be deceived by it now. The Slovaks are firmly convinced that the world cannot exist in peace half slave and half free; there can be no compromise between the forces of freedom and the forces of slavery.

History has taught us one great lesson: No nation can have a monopoly on freedom and remain free. Freedom is the grandest of all of God's gifts to mankind; freedom is the universal heritage of all the ages. The more we promote and share it, the more abundant and lasting are its fruits. Peace without freedom is unthinkable. If we are truly interested in a permanent and just peace, let us not deny freedom to any nation—not even the Slovak nation.

Our Pledge of Allegiance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. PILLION

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 2, 1954

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to include in the Appendix of the

Record a statement given by me on May 5, 1954, before Subcommittee No. 5, of the House Committee on the Judiciary:

I appear here today in support of any and all bills that would serve to recognize the power and the universality of God in our pledge of allegiance. I am the sponsor of House Joint Resolution 334 which was introduced by me at the request of the membership of the American Legion of the County of Erie in the State of New York. The County of Erie is comprised of the city of Buffalo and its suburban cities and towns. This bill would add the words "under God" after the words "one nation" in the pledge of allegiance.

Our western civilization is a product of the Christian-Judaic conception of the individuality and dignity of every human soul. The liberalism of our constitutional form of government, in turn, is the product and the beacon light of western civilization and its acceptance of one God with universal and supreme spiritual significance.

Since our flag is symbolic of our Nation, its constitutional government and the morality of our people, it is most appropriate that the concept of God be included in the recitations of the pledge of allegiance to our flag.

The inclusion of God in our pledge would acknowledge the dependence of our people, and our Government upon the moral direction and the restraints of religion.

At the same time, this action would serve to deny the atheistic and materialistic concept of communism. It would condemn the absolute and concentrated power of the communistic slave state with its attendant subservience of the individual.

United States Airpower Can Enforce Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WINT SMITH
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 2, 1954

Mr. SMITH of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, in Kansas we take great pride in our native sons who have served their country, but there is none in whom we take greater pride than in Ennis C. Whitehead, lieutenant general, United States Air Force, now retired. As a fellow Kansan, but also as an old and close friend, I share that pride. I was a classmate of Ennis Whitehead at the University of Kansas. In World War I, I went into the Infantry, Whitehead into the air service of the Army. But there was no dividing of the ways between us. We still see eye to eye, especially on the subject of national defense.

Fate tapped Ennis Whitehead for greatness, and placed him on the scene of a turning point in history. In the summer of 1945, he was commander of the Fifth Air Force, with headquarters on Okinawa, in charge of the air offensive against Japan. On the 6th of August 1945 the airplanes of the Fifth Air Force were ordered to keep 50 miles from Hiroshima, while a single B-29 took over. That was the day of the world's first atomic bomb attack.

In the current issue of the Saturday Evening Post, General Whitehead tells the story of that day and what followed. The story is a needlessly tragic one. It is a story of how irretrievable time was wasted, and how a great nation did not rise to the challenge of the atomic-airpower age which it had ushered in.

The only bright spots in the picture are the growth to a state of superb readiness of the Strategic Air Command, and the present—but needlessly delayed—buildup of the Air Force.

Now at last—

Says General Whitehead—

> we appear to be approaching the era which really began at Hiroshima—an era which, if we have the will and the staying power, may well be a long span of American enforced world peace.

Another bright spot is suggested by General Whitehead, but only time can prove if it is more than a blur on the picture. That is the growing conviction that if another Korea should occur, we would respect no Yalu River boundary. Another time, we would be better prepared to attack the sources of enemy airpower.

Mr. Speaker, while the presses were still rolling out General Whitehead's article, there came the announcement from SAC that American bomber units would now make rotational training flights to the Far East as they have been doing this year to North Africa, and as they have been doing several years to Europe. If the enemy moves, we can have American air strength where it is needed to strike back.

We cannot have that strength, however, if we do not build it now. And we cannot have the strength we need, if we spend time and money on building strength of a sort we do not need. What we need—and what President Eisenhower has called for—is Armed Forces balanced in direct relation to the missions they would be called upon to accomplish, not Armed Forces supported by a defense budget cut in three equal segments. General Whitehead's testament to this generation is expressed in one simple sentence:

> I believe that our maximum effort must be concentrated on the creation of atomic-hydrogen-airpower in being.

General Whitehead saw this atomic-airpower age born. His article is a stirring but measured plea that we rise to the challenge of it. Our atomic-strike capability is our greatest weapon for enforcing the peace. It is our only hope for preventing war. I trust my colleagues will take time to read General Whitehead's convincing article which, with their consent, I shall insert in the Record as an extension to my remarks, and a tribute to an old friend. The article follows:

Our Airpower Can Enforce Peace

(By Lt. Gen. Ennis C. Whitehead, U. S. Air Force, retired)

When the atomic bomb came into my life, 24 hours before Hiroshima, I was much too annoyed for any profound reflection upon its future meaning to the world. I was commander of the 5th Air Force on Okinawa at the time, and we were so busy dumping fire bombs and conventional high explosives on the Japanese home islands that we were in no mood to appreciate interruptions. Suddenly, on August 5, 1945, I was ordered to keep all my airplanes at least 50 miles from Hiroshima the following day. Only a B-29 from Tinian named the *Enola Gay*, was to fly over the doomed Japanese city that historic morning. But to me, the first A-bomb drop meant that I had to cancel all regular missions scheduled for the Hiroshima area. This, in turn, made it necessary for us to change some of the bomb loads already aboard waiting aircraft. It was a lot of trouble, and I complained about it.

"These newfangled gadgets," I grumbled, "are certainly raising hell with my operations."

Often in the years which followed I was to wonder whether my preoccupied remark did not, in fact, symbolize our national policy only too accurately. For they were years in which irretrievable time was wasted—the first years of an atomic-airpower age that we had created, but seemed determined to thrust from our minds as too expensive and probably too immoral for our participation.

I had an uncomfortable ringside seat during those wasted years. When Gen. George C. Kenney returned to the United States in December of 1945, I moved up from the 5th Air Force to succeed him as commander of the Far East Air Forces, supporting General MacArthur's occupation of Japan. By April of 1949, when I turned FEAF over to Lt. Gen. George E. Stratemeyer, these forces—which were to fight in the Korean war—were disastrously undermanned, underequipped, and undersupplied. But they were the best we could get under the limitations imposed by an administration which did not understand the potentialities of airpower.

Back in the United States, I was placed in charge of the fighter planes assigned to defending the American Continent against a surprise air attack. I found that no one outside the Air Force was very much interested in the Continental Air Command—a fact reflected in its weakness and inadequacy for the job—until we learned that Russia also had the atomic bomb. This chilling news, followed by the outbreak of the Korean war, led to a frantic effort to rebuild our Armed Forces including our airpower. But then came the political commitments which kept our war planes on the leash throughout the Korean conflict, banning the atomic bomb and halting our air operations at the Yalu River. The lack of decision, or of courage, which produced these commitments prevented our Air Force from playing its true, decisive atomic-age role.

In my best judgment, we can therefore write off the more than 3 years of war in Korea; I do not believe that the loss of life was worth the results, so far as our learning anything new about air strategy and tactics is concerned.

There are two bright spots in the picture, however. One has been the growth and superb state of readiness achieved by the Strategic Air Command under the driving, dedicated leadership of Gen. Curtis E. LeMay. The ability of this force to hit Russia with the atomic bomb—and now the hydrogen bomb—may well be the one factor that has prevented the outbreak of world war III. The other bright spot is the new strategic concept of the present administration which places increased emphasis on airpower and its capability of massive retaliation with nuclear weapons. Now at last we appear to be approaching the era which really began at Hiroshima—an era which, if we have the will and the staying power, may well be a long span of American-enforced world peace.

What factors are involved in maintaining such a Pax Americana? What, for example, might we do about the problem of Communist ambitions in Asia? How safe can we be here at home? And, if our striving for peace should fail, could we win world war III once it started? Answering these questions is a large order, but I should at least like to undertake an appraisal, based upon the study of history and my 34 years' experience in military aviation.

One step of major importance, it seems to me, should be the unshackling of the Far East Air Forces from their knowledge and experience in conventional air warfare. These forces should be redisposed and trained for atomic warfare as soon as possible.

Let's look at the past for a moment. The Far East Air Forces fought two conventional wars in that part of the world. During World War II, with General Kenney as commander for air, they supported General MacArthur's campaigns from the southeast tip of New Guinea to the Philippines and Okinawa. We had good airpower during that war, capped by the decisive atomic bombs which were dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki. The second conventional air war in the Far East was fought in Korea. This was a different story.

When we entered the Korean war, FEAF consisted of 78 World War II bombers, 5 fighter wings of 75 aircraft each, 1 reconnaissance wing and 1 wing of C–54 troop carriers. The fighter and reconnaissance wings had some F–80's, our first operational jets, but most of their planes were also leftovers from World War II. In manpower, FEAF's table of organization called for only 80 percent of peacetime strength, and it was actually 4,500 officers and men short of even that level. Though expansion was pushed with desperate haste after the war began, it is astonishing, in view of the initial weakness, that our air units in Korea were able to roll up as impressive a record as they did. They flew 1 million combat sorties, destroyed more than 1,100 enemy aircraft in air-to-air combat, and accomplished widespread destruction of enemy ground troops, equipment, and supplies.

But our airpower, confined within the Yalu boundary and forbidden the A-bomb, failed to win the Korean war. The enemy did not surrender as did Japan in 1945. There is a lesson for us in these two wars. In the earlier one we walked into the enemy's homeland without having to fire a shot in the final take-over. In the second one we hardly achieved a tie. The lesson is that we must have no more Koreans. We must realine our thinking to atomic warfare and the consequences we face in East Asia, where our future rests primarily on strong airpower and seapower, and certainly not on manpower. The other side has the manpower.

I consider the entire Far East, from the Aleutians to Borneo, as one theater. In that huge area, the American flag flies today over air bases in the Philippines, on Iwo Jima, Guam, Tinian, Saipan, Okinawa, and the Japanese islands. I know them well. These fields came to us at a high price, for once they were strongly fortified enemy bases. The United States has since spent a great deal of money on most of them. They have runways which will take the heaviest bombers. There are enough of these bases, close enough together, so that we can deploy very great strength through them without risking large concentrations of aircraft vulnerable to enemy attack. This complex of airfields would give us extreme flexibility in the concentration or dispersion of all our airpower in the Far East. Our jet interceptors could defend them.

As I see it, all of East Asia, containing half a billion people and a very large proportion of the world's natural resources, could be stabilized by properly disposed American atomic airpower based upon these airdromes. I cannot see how anything but raw, naked power will be effective in meeting the inevitable problem in East Asia. I think it is obvious that we could not pour our necessarily limited ground forces into the bottomless well of the Asian land mass. Therefore I feel that as soon as we can extricate our troops from Korea we must redeploy to our island bases in order to cast the shadow of the atomic bomber over the maximum population of Asia. Only then would we have a real deterrent to further Communist aggression in the Far East.

The Far East Air Forces today are infinitely stronger than they were when the Korean war began. Jet aircraft of the most modern operational types are on hand for interception, reconnaissance, fighter-bomber and night-fighter missions; on the fighter side of the picture, the improvement has been qualitative as well as quantitative. On the bomber side, though we now have five bomb wings instead of two, plus a tactical control group of bombers for long-range reconnaissance, the planes are still primarily World War II types. In other words, FEAF is not yet equipped for atomic-age missions, much less disposed or trained for them.

But let us consider what could be done. For example, the newest model of the B–50 Superfort medium bomber, taking off from Clark Air Base in the Philippines, could reach targets over most of East Asia and return to friendly territory without refueling. FEAF has some of these bombers, which are the latest and last of the propeller-driven planes of their class.

General LeMay's Strategic Air Command, of course, could move to the Far East on short notice from its bases within the continental United States. His B–36 heavy bomber has not only crossed the Pacific nonstop but has demonstrated the feasibility of flying aircraft carriers. Tests have shown it can carry an F–84 jet fighter which can take off from and return to the B–36 while the big bomber is airborne, thus affording either fighter protection or the use of the F–84 to carry tactical atomic bombs to the enemy while the mother ship remains safely out of enemy range. SAC's B–47 Stratojet bomber, now on hand in service quantities running into the hundreds, has flown more than 12,000 miles in a 24-hour period, refueling in flight. The B–52 heavy jet-bomber, with increased performance, is already available in experimental quantities.

Nuclear weapons have been developed to the point that any one of our large new bombers can deliver a punch 20 times greater than all the TNT bomb loads of our entire World War II B–29 fleet. When we contemplate that fact we begin to understand the massiveness of the threat we can impose against any would-be aggressor. If this capability, now possessed by SAC, could also be added to the Far East Air Forces by modernization of FEAF's bomber wings, the deterrent effect of our retaliatory strength would be tremendously enhanced in east Asia. Looking at it from the viewpoint of a Red general in Peiping, atomic bombers on Okinawa are an even more terrible and immediate problem than atomic bombers in Texas.

The truce in Korea, while certainly unsatisfactory to a nation used to winning its wars, was nevertheless an important accomplishment because—in addition to halting the bloodshed—it created a changed political situation. The truce was a tremendous stride toward disentangling ourselves from the stupid limitations with which the present administration was saddled by its predecessor. Now, if the Communists should resume the Korean fighting, we would no longer be hemmed in by the Yalu or limited in our choice of weapons. We would be free to strike at the root of the trouble, against "targets of our choosing," on terms set by our own decisions. Certain knowledge by the Communists of these facts of life seems to me to be the best guaranty that they will not start the shooting in Korea again. And once we were completely disengaged from that unhappy peninsula and redisposed on our island bases, the threat of free-ranging, all-out, air-atomic retaliation could be expanded to deter Communist aggressions anywhere in east Asia.

An American ultimatum to any Far Eastern aggressor whose troops were crossing the borders of an adjoining nation might carry relatively little weight at present. The reluctance of the United States to commit any more ground forces to Far Eastern fighting is well known, and this attitude has a sound military basis as well as an emotional one. But with an American Air Force on the scene capable of instant tactical A-bomb assaults on troop concentrations or strategic obliteration of any chosen target no matter what its size or location, we would be in a position to issue an ultimatum that would be respected.

Although there are now only two major powers in the world, the United States and the U. S. S. R., there is a third major power in prospect. For the Soviets are modernizing the army of Red China. Once the Chinese Communists also have an atomic capability, we face the threat of a two-front war, just as we fought in World War II, with the enemy strength in east Asia potentially more dangerous to us than when Japan was a military power. It is for this reason that I have placed so much stress, at the outset, on the Far Eastern situation. But the task of peace enforcement which has fallen to the United States is a problem that ranges the world, and just as in east Asia, it seems to me that our atomic-strike capability is the No. 1 tool for accomplishing that task in all its aspects, including protection of the American Continent.

Our first line of defense is in the war councils of the Russians at the Kremlin. This is the ideal place to stop world war III before it begins. We can be truly effective there only when we have enough retaliatory strength to convince the Soviet leaders that their war machine would be wiped out in very short order if they start anything.

How much American strength would be enough? There is no precise answer, for war is an art rather than a science. Our lead in nuclear weapons, the growing strength of our NATO alliance, the Soviet need for time to recover from World War II, have in combination proved to be enough thus far in Europe, if not in Asia.

But the Soviet air force is larger than ours, and still expanding. The Soviet supply of atomic and hydrogen bombs certainly is growing. While our stockpile of these weapons may yet be greater than the Communists', it is not necessary for the Soviets to overtake us in this respect. All they need is enough bombs and bombers to crush our power to retaliate, for they know that we will never strike the first blow.

Since we will not start world war III under any conceivable circumstances, our problem is to be able to survive the first blow and still strike back immediately—at the air bases from which their assaults on the American Continent would be mounted, and at every principal center of population and industry in the land of our enemies. One answer to the question of how much strength we would need for this might be to take the estimates of our military leaders and then double them, to avoid Napoleon's fear of "one battalion too few." I might express my own estimate this way: If our retaliatory capability is adequate to destroy the 100 principal targets of the enemy in 1 day of operations and to continue the air offensive until the land of the enemy is laid waste, then I believe we would have enough.

In measuring our own potential effectiveness, we must consider the quality of the Soviet air force. Here we know only part of the answer. We discovered in the Korean war that the United States F–86 Sabrejet was the only operational fighter in the allied world that could cope with the Russian MIG–15. The F–86's were always outnumbered, for production had been cut back in the name of economy to only 10 Sabres a month by the time the Korean war started.

It took a lot of time and expense to get production really rolling again.

The battles over MIG alley in North Korea at least proved the high quality of the F-86 and of our pilot training. But they also proved that we do not dare to underestimate the air capabilities of the Russians. If the high performance of their MIG's was an unpleasant revelation, we must anticipate that they have even more fateful surprises in their long-range-bomber fleet. No Soviet bombers appeared in Korea, so we have no battle experience with them. We do know that the Russians have bombers capable of reaching any target in the United States on one-way missions and are developing aircraft which can make the round trip.

Unfortunately, the prospect of smashed and flaming American cities has led to confused and wishful thinking about the air defense of this country. I refer to the concept that we can create a Maginot Line of the air if only we can build a sufficiently elaborate system of aircraft warning and tracking devices to lead our fighters to the enemy. This line of thought can be dangerous if only because it is superficially so attractive. It is based on experience in the Battle of Britain, but the defense of North America is an entirely different proposition.

It ignores the fact that we could expend our entire military budget and all our precious time on a highly scientific, static type of defense and still not have any guarantee of 100-percent destruction of attacking bombers. The fundamental flaw, however, is that such a defensive system would be so elaborate that it could not be operated beyond the communications network of the United States-Canadian telephone and telegraph systems. It would, therefore, be effective only on a relative close-in basis.

The point is that close-in defense is only the final resort. If our ability to strike back should unhappily prove to be not enough to deter the enemy, we must at least be able to start fighting his bombers as far from the United States as possible. The real key to our safety here at home lies in distant airbases in Alaska, northern Canada, Greenland, Iceland, and England. From these bases, long-range interceptors alerted by vastly simpler, but nonetheless effective, outlying warning systems can meet the attackers at least 2,000 miles from their targets and battle them all the way in. And also from these bases, as well as those in North Africa and Europe, we can mount our most effective strikes against the enemy bombers by smashing their bases. It is much easier to destroy bombers and guided missiles in their nests than to shoot them down in flight.

Another factor not to be overlooked is that the more distant bases we have, the more the enemy must disperse his efforts, for he must attack our bases in the hope of thwarting our retaliation. Every bomber sent against our airfields is one less bomber bound for New York or Chicago.

Of course, we need as much information about the enemy's location as we can get, and, of course, we also need fighters and guided missiles close-in to hit the bombers that get through our outlying defenses. But the danger, as I see it, is that we shall be led by our fears to put too much emphasis on an elaborate defensive system within continental United States, while neglecting the more vital job of strengthening our outlying forces. I have never heard of a nation winning a war by fighting all of it at home. Historically, we need only look at the breaching of the Great Wall of China or the fate of the Maginot Line in World War II to clarify our thinking on this subject.

I think there is considerable agreement among American military men that the modern weapons of mass destruction, delivered by air, are the primary threat to our country. Invasion of this continent, it seems to me, could be achieved only after enemy air attacks had paralyzed our air-strike capability and smashed our war-production capacity. While I have approached the subject from this viewpoint, which admittedly comes more naturally to an air general than to an officer who has spent his military career in the ground or sea forces, I want to make it perfectly plain that I have no intention of minimizing the importance of the Army and Navy to our national security.

Each of these Armed Forces has a vital mission. Our divisions in Europe would face ground fighting coupled with the tactical use of atomic weapons. American installations vital to the atomic offensive and to the air defense of the United States might have to be defended from hostile land forces as well as from air and naval attack—for example, our airbases in North Africa.

There must also be sufficient regular Army forces to take over disaster areas at home in the event that we are hit. This might conceivably prove to be the Army's most important mission. I recall the morning after Pearl Harbor, when I was commander of Luke Field in Arizona. Driving to work that morning, I came to a highway intersection at which I had to make a left turn to reach the airfield—and there I had to wait for 15 minutes until there was a break in the steady eastbound stream of automobiles with California license plates, a panic migration which had swollen to such considerable proportions less than 24 hours after an enemy attack 2,500 miles from Los Angeles. Only the Army, it seems to me, would be adequate to the task of maintaining order—and with it the ability to go on supporting our war effort—in areas struck or threatened by the enemy's bombers.

The Navy, in addition to wielding its own atomic air-striking potential, would be needed to drive hostile submarines and shipping from the sea, and to keep open the sea lanes supplying our overseas bases and bringing up strategic materials from distant lands. We are indeed fortunate that we have a Navy second to none.

But in the long period of world tension which we evidently face, there cannot be enough money for any of the Armed Forces to have everything which they consider desirable. True security cannot be purchased at the price of national economic instability. It therefore becomes a matter of balancing our Armed Forces in direct relation to the missions they would be called upon to accomplish, which is something different from cutting the military budget into three approximately equal segments. Viewed in this light, the soundness of the new American strategic concept becomes apparent.

For our primary mission is to prevent war by making it clear to any potential aggressor that his homeland would be laid waste without delay if he should be foolish enough to start the shooting. This mission is bound up inextricably with the defense of the United States as the free world's main source of strength, and that defense is to be achieved by offensive action first, defensive action second, if war should come. Therefore I believe that our maximum effort must be concentrated on the creation of atomic-hydrogen airpower in being.

Not long ago, in a strange but peculiarly appropriate setting, I had occasion to recall the words of our earliest prophet of modern airpower, Billy Mitchell. Gen. Jimmy Doolittle and I were visiting the great new United States Air Force base at Thule, Greenland. It was 10 o'clock in the morning, but the sky was pitch dark. There is a saying among the airmen that a year at Thule lasts a day and a night, and this was the nighttime half of the year.

We walked into the alert hangar. Without warning to anyone, Col. Richard T. Hernlund, the base commander, strode to the wall and punched a button. Horns and sirens sounded. Pilots and radarmen jumped up from a table at which they had been playing cards, ran out of the ready room and down a flight of stairs to their F-94 Starfire all-weather jet interceptors. Mechanics poured out of another ready room on the hangar-floor level, helped the pilots and radarmen into their bulky G-suits, helmets, and cold-weather clothing, and made electrical connections to the planes so the jet engines could be started. Great doors at each end of the hangar swung up smartly, and a blast of 27° below zero air swept in. Then orange-blue fire flared from the jets' tailpipes, the F-94's rolled briskly from the hangar and started to pick up flying speed even while they were still on the curving taxiways which led to the main runways. Then they were airborne, their wheels tucked in and their noses pointed straight for the stratosphere. Two minutes had elapsed since Colonel Hernlund had pushed that button.

New York was 2,100 nautical miles away in one direction, Moscow 2,400 miles in another. The quick, efficient operation I had just witnessed, I knew, was a preview of what would happen if our outlying radar should tell the story of enemy bombers crossing the polar icecap en route to the cities far to the south of us. General LeMay's men weren't there that day, but they had been and would be again. And I recalled how Billy Mitchell had predicted, away back in the 1920's when he was sacrificing his career to espouse the cause of airpower, that someday we would need bases like this in the far north to defend our homes and families.

Well, I reflected as I walked back to the warm ready room to shake the Arctic chill from my bones, Billy Mitchell would be pleased with what I have seen this day.

Memorial Day Address by Hon. Theodore Francis Green, of Rhode Island

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 2, 1954

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, on Memorial Day it was my privilege to address the veterans and citizens of Coventry, R. I., at the Memorial Day exercises in that town.

I ask unanimous consent to have the address I delivered on that occasion printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Commander Longridge, members of the veterans' organizations, and good citizens of Coventry here assembled to participate in these Memorial Day exercises, it was in May 1868 that the then Commander of the Grand Army of the Republic, Gen. John A. Logan, issued an order designating May 30 as a day of reverence and for the decoration of the graves of those who served with the Grand Army of the Republic. Today, Memorial Day, is a legal holiday in practically every northern State, and in keeping with the spirit of that day we meet here to honor and revere those who bore arms in the defense of our country and who have gone to their just reward.

With us here today are many men who bore arms in the defense of our country in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, and Air Force, and many women who served in uniform with these forces. You servicemen and women know what it is to leave your homes, your friends and families when a call to the colors is issued and when our country needs your services to fight an enemy which would destroy it.

Only a few are living today who fought with the Grand Army and who inspired General Logan's establishment of Memorial Day. However, with us here today are those who served in the Spanish-American War, and World War I, and World War II and in Korea, as well as other places where our Armed Forces were necessary. Through the years, and especially since World War II, armies have been equipped with new weapons of destruction. The old reliable Springfield rifle, the charge such as that of the Rough Riders at San Juan Hill—the trenches and the equipment of World War I, the high-velocity weapons of World War II, are gradually being pushed into the background. In their place we have the tanks, the jets, the guided missiles, and the terrifying atomic and hydrogen bombs. It is believed that other nations have these same weapons, and further that they would not hesitate in the case of an all-out conflict to use them against us.

I do not share the belief that we should divulge to any foreign power any atomic or hydrogen or other bomb secrets we may have. However, I do believe that we should hold conferences with other nations with a view to outlawing the use of these destructive weapons in any future conflict. It may be argued that a treaty on the abandonment of destructive weapons could easily be broken and that these weapons could be used in an attempt to destroy the enemy. So what is the use of such a treaty? Yet poison gas was outlawed in this manner and was not used in the last war, although both sides had it ready to use.

With so much world distrust, controversy, and constant changing of power in the governments of various countries, a definite and sound policy relating to the use of the atomic and hydrogen bombs would be hard to negotiate. Yet it certainly is worthwhile to lend our efforts to that end.

I trust that none of us will live to see the day when a country which is founded on theories and policies and principles directly opposed to those of our United States, will ever be successful in threatening our existence or in retarding our American way of life. And so, in order for us to remain a free country in this world of today where transportation to any part of it is only a matter of hours, we should take pains to be on friendly terms with countries which will come to our assistance if at any time we need them.

In the last analysis, in order to maintain our security and even perhaps our very existence, we should have a strong, active, and well-equipped Army, Air Force, and Navy, ready at all times to defend us in conflict. Unfriendly nations should be made aware of our determined attitude and efforts toward world peace, and warned that the United States will seek all means through the United Nations, and by conferences and agreements, to that end. However, with so many nations distrusting each other, and with so many international conferences ending without policy being defined, this is no time to be talking of reducing our Armed Forces or cutting down appropriations for their maintenance. We should lend our efforts to maintaining a strong, active force, well equipped and ready to defend us at all times. This will serve notice on any would-be aggressor nation that the United States is ready to defend itself if need be.

The young men of today may be the soldiers of tomorrow, and no one knows in what part of the world their services may be needed. Many of those who in the past left your town to serve with our Armed Forces did not return. We today honor them, and all others who went forward with our flag to participate in the great victories of our past history. I trust the United States will not again be the target of any aggressor nation. However, if an aggressor should attack us, I know that the citizens of Coventry and of Rhode Island and of the whole United States will come forward, as they have in the past, to defend our country and defeat our enemy.

Memorial Day is a day of sadness for many of us. This is particularly so today for the families of those officers and men who lost their lives in the recent catastrophe aboard the U. S. S. *Bennington*. This catastrophe was close to us, and I want the families of the men whose lives were lost serving aboard this ship to know that we share their bereavement. Many other members of our families and relatives and friends have served with the colors at different times. This is their day, and the day which we respect and honor. They would expect, I know, that we shoulder the responsibility of doing our best not only to win any war forced upon us, but also to prevent any future war, to be ever vigilant, and to continue our efforts to bring a lasting peace to the world.

Our country, the United States of America, has had forced upon it the leadership of the world. This responsibility has come to it unsought and cannot be avoided. It is imperative that we as citizens live up to that responsibility, and so maintain and spread throughout the world the blessings of our democratic civilization.

AMVET Scholarships

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT
OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 2, 1954

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record a statement prepared by me, together with a copy of a letter, dealing with AMVET scholarships.

There being no objection, the statement and letter were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

For the second time in the 3 years that the AMVETS National Service Foundation has presented scholarships, one of these 4-year, $2,000 grants has been awarded to a young lady from Arkansas. In 1952 Miss Sylvia Vanderslice, daughter of Mrs. Octavia R. Vanderslice, of Fayetteville, won a scholarship. Recently Edgar C. Corry, president of the foundation, announced that Mary H. Fordyce, daughter of Mrs. Downs L. Fordyce, of 1801 Shadowlane, Little Rock, had won one of the 1954 grants.

These memorial scholarships are not ordinary educational awards. They have a specific purpose—a very fine one. These grants are presented only to children of deceased or totally disabled veterans who served in the Armed Forces after September 16, 1940. Given as living memorials to the Americans who died in World War II and Korea, they help the children of these men who sacrificed life or health in battles for their country.

Six scholarships are awarded each year. One winner for each of the six AMVETS districts is chosen on the basis of (1) his ability to succeed in college, as shown by his secondary school record and his grades on a national aptitude examination, and (2) financial need.

These scholarships are one of a number of fine programs the AMVETS National Service Foundation maintains to aid veterans, war widows, and war orphans. The foundation's activities, I believe, show that we did not misplace our trust in 1947 when we made AMVETS the only veterans' organization Congress chartered after World War II.

This year's scholarship winner from my State comes from an old Arkansas pioneering family and is the daughter of a great American patriot. Mary Fordyce's father, the late Col. John R. Fordyce, was a much-decorated bomber pilot, who served his country well and faithfully until he was killed during the north African fighting of World War II.

Colonel Fordyce's willingness to serve and his faith in America is poignantly told by his widow in a letter to Mr. Corry, of the AMVETS National Service Foundation.

Little Rock, Ark., *May 10, 1954.*

Edgar Corry, Jr.,
President, AMVETS, National Service Foundation, Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Corry: The AMVET memorial scholarship which has been designated for my daughter, Mary H. Fordyce, will be a constant reminder to her and to me that Colonel Fordyce did not misplace his love for his country. This is the American way of life that he fought to preserve. In losing his life in serving others, it is wonderful that those he worked with can now do so much for his daughter in his absence.

Before going overseas he wrote a letter to his children saying that as a father he thought he had more reason to serve than a single man. He also said, "It is regrettable that men of evil design can have sufficient power to so disturb the lives of us all. In the belief that the only way to prevent catastrophe in all our lives is to overcome the forces of evil and that it is the duty of all of us to carry the fight, I sail quite determined to do my part."

Because of his military record as a leader and as a bomber pilot (Air Medal and Distinguished Flying Cross) as well as his record of service as an interested citizen of our State, his name has been proposed for the new bomber base that is being built near Little Rock. Many friends and organizations are backing his nomination sent to the Air Force memorialization committee in Washington. Whether or not the name is designated as Fordyce Field, we, his family, will be happy that he is still remembered and is honored.

Please extend to your scholarship committee and to your organization my appreciation not only for the honor to my daughter, but also for your financial assistance. This assures her of 4 years in the college of her choice as with your help I can manage the rest.

Sincerely yours,
Downs L. Fordyce
Mrs. John R. Fordyce, Jr.

Truth Restated

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER
OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 2, 1954

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, the excellence of the address delivered by the distinguished senior Senator from Ohio before the Forest Lawn journalism awards dinner, on the Constitution of the United States, is indicated by an editorial which was published in the Baltimore News-Post of

May 31, 1954, entitled "Truth Restated."

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRUTH RESTATED

Something all Americans should understand and none should forget, was the theme of Senator JOHN W. BRICKER's principal address in Los Angeles.

The Constitution of the United States is not an instrument for the creation of power, he told a distinguished audience at the Forest Lawn journalism awards dinner.

It is, instead, a charter of liberty that limits and controls power.

It must be kept invulnerable against attempts to deny the American people the vital right of self-government.

The principle is incontrovertible. It is the firm base on which the Bricker amendment to the Constitution rests.

Quoting the Declaration of Independence, Senator BRICKER repeated the essential doctrine of the Founding Fathers:

To secure the inalienable rights of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness, "Governments are instituted among men, deriving their just power from the consent of the governed."

When the executive treatymaking power is able to circumvent this doctrine, constitutional guaranties are in fact canceled.

So attested John Foster Dulles before he became Secretary of State, Mr. BRICKER reminded his hearers.

In spite of bitter opposition and misrepresentation, the Senator said, the Bricker amendment remains a burning issue as long as Americans refuse to yield their right of self-government to executive ambition or caprice.

For, he concluded, America's strength and leadership does not lie in weapons or goods, but in the spiritual concepts of liberty and justice that only a free people can uphold.

We are grateful for Senator BRICKER's timely and convincing address.

It is most heartening to Americans who love their country.

Address Delivered by Former President Hoover Before the Government Economy Rally of the Farm City Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 2, 1954

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an address made by the Honorable Herbert Hoover before the Government Economy Rally of the Farm City Conference at Town Hall on May 25, 1954.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am greatly honored to receive this economy award from the Farm City Conference. Especially as I receive it in company with Secretary Humphrey and Senator BYRD.

Those two distinguished public servants are every day in the operating room performing surgery on Federal expenditures in the hope of maintaining national solvency. I am only an old family doctor called in as a medical consultant. My job is to suggest politely to administrative agencies and pressure groups, "You are a little bit heavy in the middle." The Secretary hourly has to say, "We just don't have any money for you." The Senator's favorite prescription is, "Put Santa Claus in the deep freeze."

In the fiscal field we have to contend with two delusions. One is the John Maynard Keynes shell game that no matter how much the public debt may be, it does not matter because we owe it to ourselves. That theory includes the idea that the debt never needs to be paid off. But it ignores the pain resulting when the old and especially the young pay income tax for interest on the debt. Twenty-odd years of deficits and consequent inflation have produced another economic pain which the followers of Lord Keynes did not diagnose. For the purchasing power of money has decreased by one-half.

The idea is that blessed are the young for they shall inherit the national debt.

I might observe generally that creating public debt through deficits is creating a dead horse. Private debt creates live horses.

The other delusion is that the Federal Government should do the homework of the counties and the States. There are two parts to this delusion. One is that the job will be better done if it is a long way off from local control. The other is that when the people in the States pay out money in Federal taxes, they get it all back in benefits. But the benefits idea omits the fact that there is a deducion for the "kitty"—the real name of which is Federal bureaucracy.

While the authorities can carefully watch efficiency and waste in Washington, their influence seems to decrease inversely with distance. For instance, the Brownson subcommittee of the House of Representatives reported that the Federal Government in erecting certain quarters for American staff in Germany, supplied the following glassware at the taxpayers' expense to each 4-bedroom apartment: 12 beer glasses, 12 champagne glasses, 12 cocktail glasses, 12 liqueur glasses, 12 white wine glasses, 12 red wine glasses, 12 sweet wine glasses.

There were also 12 water glasses, but it would seem this item might have been reduced. This happened during a previous administration.

Another method for increasing the national debt and deficits is Federal lending of money and guaranteeing of loans. This flame can warm, but it also can consume.

Members of our Reorganization Commission of 5 years ago urged that there were great dangers when such loans or guaranties were made to anyone except public or Government regulated institutions. We said it would lead to favoritism, waste and corruption. As an example I may mention that Senator BYRD and I once upon a time conducted a campaign to wind up the RFC for just those reasons. We did not immediately succeed, but we illuminated the subject. We showed that loans had been made to 11 distilleries and breweries, 8 theaters, 5 bowling alleys and beauty parlors and 39 hotels. One hotel was named the Bluebeard. Also I should include a loan to one snake farm. The RFC is now in liquidation. But only after huge losses and the exposed corruption was a season's sensation.

I might also cite another example in the housing loan guaranties which are now under investigation for fraud—as ample proof of our rightness of 5 years ago.

I have frequently spoken on the consequences of pressure groups, both citizens and States and municipalities, operating on the Congress for huge spending. Of course, every pressure group and every Government agency wants economy for everybody else. But we three, who are speaking tonight, have difficulty in adding this up to unanimity for less expenditures. Today these pressure group bills before the Congress would aggregate 2 or 3 billions of additions to the present authorizations.

My sympathy often goes out for the humble decimal point. He has a pathetic and hectic life wandering around among regimented ciphers, trying to find some of the old places he used to know when budgets were balanced.

Our Republic is beset by many dangers. But here is one which we can control if we have the will to do it. That is, waste, unnecessary spending and unbalanced budgets and thus continued inflation. That willpower can be provided by the citizens of the country expressing themselves in support of such leaders as Secretary Humphrey and Senator BYRD.

A Tribue to President Truman on His 70th Birthday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY M. JACKSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 2, 1954

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address in honor of former President Truman, on his 70th birthday, delivered by Dr. Henry Steele Commager, in New York City, on Saturday, May 15.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A TRIBUTE TO PRESIDENT TRUMAN ON HIS 70TH BIRTHDAY

(By Henry Steele Commager)

We meet on this festive occasion not in a spirit of partisanship but of unity, for Mr. Truman belongs not alone to the Democratic Party but to the Nation, and Mr. Truman's achievements, which we are here to recall and to celebrate, are chapters in the history of the Nation and of the entire world.

What are those achievements? It is sometimes difficult to render a historical verdict on a man or an institution that is still with us—and Mr. Truman, who is by way of being both man and institution, is an old soldier who has not just faded away, but is very much with us. But the swift rush of events has already supplied us with historical perspective, for now as one great crisis succeeds another with breathtaking speed, the years are as decades, and already we can see the Roosevelt and Truman administrations as part of history.

President Truman came to office as the most terrible of wars drew to its tremendous close, and expected to devote his talents and energies to the beneficent tasks of peace and restoration. His great predecessor had carried the Nation through a decade of crisis and 4 years of war. He had recognized in time the grim danger that confronted free peoples everywhere; he had made this Nation an arsenal of democracy and pledged its power and might to the rescue and liberation of the Old World. This he had achieved, and the salvation of the New World as well. He did not live to see the final triumph of that cause of freedom—that triumph of which he was the chief architect—and he was spared, too, the swift disillusionment that followed. But we know that he whose faltering hand wrote those last shining words, "let us move forward with strong and active faith," that he would have gone on not from the disillusionment but from the triumph. We can say of him, in the great words of Pericles, that "the whole world is the sepulchre of famous men, and their story is not graven only on stone over their native earth, but lives on far away without visible symbol woven into the stuff of other men's lives."

Every war is followed by reaction and every victory by a sense of frustration. After the First World War we retreated into illiberal conservatism on the domestic scene and into isolation from the international. But not every administration must succumb to these forces of reaction and disillusionment. Mr. Truman was catapulted into power at one of the most difficult moments in all history—at a time when the idealism of one world was giving way to the tragedy of a divided world; at a time when the great wartime coalition that had brought victory was falling apart; at a time when the Nation was confronted with problems of almost insuperable difficulty; the occupation and administration of conquered territories, the relief and rehabilitation of our allies and of our quondam enemies as well; the transition from a war to a peace economy and then back to the twilight economy of a cold war; the resistance to assaults on freedom at home and abroad, and to communism wherever it threatened. But under Mr. Truman's affluent leadership there was no retreat into isolation and no abandonment of allies—not even the luxury of talking about them as if they were really our enemies. There was no reaction, no postwar depression or recession or rolling readjustment; there was no paralysis of the power of government; there was no frittering away of civil liberties.

Scarcely had Mr. Truman taken over the Presidential office before he was confronted with a series of convulsive crises. Over a Europe shattered and demoralized by 6 cruel years of war now loomed the shadow of a new aggressor. President Truman rose unhesitatingly to the challenge. For, in the noble words of the same Pericles, he knew "that the secret of happiness was freedom and the secret of freedom a brave heart, and he did not stand aside from the onset of the enemy." The result was one of those great historic acts whose significance will grow with the passing years, for the Truman doctrine, the policy of supporting free peoples who are resisting subjugation everywhere, is one which Mr. Truman's successor has of necessity made his own, and one which must remain one of the cornerstones of our foreign policy.

Not content with declamation, President Truman moved resolutely to the aid of Greece, and saved that ancient land, and with it much of the Middle East, from Communist dominion. A few weeks later and Secretary of State Marshall had outlined what came to be known as the Marshall plan. The opposition to this plan was fierce and implacable, but after a full-dress debate the plan became law, and once again the New World stepped forth to the rescue and liberation of the old. Marshall aid stands, with lend-lease, as one of the great inventions in the realm of social relations; for boldness of conception and generosity of execution it is without parallel in modern politics. With the twin shields of the Truman doctrine and the Marshall aid western Europe started back on the long road to recovery and strength—a recovery not material alone but on morale and faith; a strength not military alone but of heart and spirit.

With these two great steps the United States, under President Truman's inspired leadership, moved confidently into that position which destiny had prepared for her—the position of leader and guardian of the free world. Mr. Truman saw the real nature of the danger from communism, and was not confused. He saw that America must arrest that danger, and was not frightened. He saw that no one nation could do this task alone, and he organized a second grand coalition, as unprecedented in time of peace as its predecessor had been in time of war. History will record that he did not permit himself or his administration to be distracted into sideshows or spectacles, or deluded into thinking that the real enemy was within rather than without. It will record that he did not fail to summon to his aid the best talent of the Nation, and to give that talent full play, and that under his guidance the Nation built up its armed might, organized its industrial strength, developed its scientific resources, and all of this in an atmosphere of freedom. It will record that he constructed the most powerful peacetime coalition in history, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, and then the European Defense Community, and that when he left office these were going concerns.

It will record, too, that under President Truman the armed might of the free nations met aggression in the West and in the East, and halted it. The blockade of Berlin was a deadly threat to the whole balance of power in Europe. Mr. Truman fought back, and the spectacular success of the Berlin airlift was a turning point in modern history, for this display of technical competence, of material power, and above all of willpower, heartened freemen everywhere.

The Communist invasion of South Korea presented a challenge to the United States and to the United Nations which could not be ignored—though there were those who thought that we should ignore it, and who still entertain that folly. Once again President Truman acted with vigor and boldness. He threw American forces into the breach, and the American delegation to the United Nations rallied the free nations to present a united front against aggression. Contrast all this with the sorry spectacle of totalitarian aggressions and victories in the thirties—in Ethiopia, in Manchuria, in Austria, in Czechoslovakia, and at last in Poland. Though aggression was not defeated—the fight still goes on—it was arrested, and freedom was given a breathing space in which to build up its strength.

What a record it is. We are told now by men interested in partisanship but not in truth, that under Democratic leadership—under Franklin D. Roosevelt and Harry Truman—communism has overrun most of the globe, and that for this they are somehow responsible. We are told that the democracies have staggered, in these years, from blunder to blunder, from defeat to defeat. Should it be necessary to recall that under Roosevelt's leadership we did, after all, win the greatest and most arduous of all wars, and that under Truman we inaugurated the United Nations, rehabilitated Europe, reconstructed Japan, stopped aggression in Iran and in Greece, in Germany and in Korea, and built up a powerful community of free nations?

It was not on the world stage alone that Mr. Truman displayed qualities which assure him an honored place in history, but on the domestic as well. What we miss most, now, with the passing months, are the contours of statemanship, that magisterial understanding of the nature and function of government which has characterized all of our major Presidents from Washington and Jefferson to Franklin Roosevelt and Truman. The men who founded this Nation were men with a profound understanding of the nature of government, of its responsibilities and its dangers, of its scope and its limits. They constructed a government which had ample authority to do all those tasks that government must do—to protect the Nation against enemies abroad and at home, to conserve and develop natural resources, to protect the human resources—the resources of a people who make up now a congeries of little States but a single Nation. And at the same time they constructed a government that had clear limits to its authority—one that was restricted in the arena of personal rights and liberties. They saw to it that the government had sovereign power in those realms where it had to operate effectively, and had no power in those realms where it had no right to operate at all—the control of ideas.

President Truman, like his wise and brave predecessor, had a sure grasp of this essential distinction, and a sure instinct of the nature of governmental authority, and of Presidential authority. He did not submit to the fallacious notion that it was statesmanlike to dismantle government, or to withdraw it from those areas where it alone was strong enough to protect the Nation's interest. He recognized that there were many fields where only the National Government could function effectively, above all the field of natural resources, the preservation for future generations of the Nation's resources of oil, natural gas, water power, timber, and soil, which are the possession of no one State and no one generation but of the whole people and the illimitable future. He knew that it was the duty of the President to make the whole Nation, and future generations, his clients.

He knew well the lesson of our history, that the strong Presidents, those who accepted responsibility, were also those who had advanced democracy, who had been instruments of reform, who had brought America to its position of world leadership: Washington, Jefferson, Jackson, Lincoln, the first Roosevelt, Wilson, and Franklin D. Roosevelt. It was along the path marked out by these men that Mr. Truman followed, and as he was not merely a follower but a pioneer, he pushed his explorations into new territory. He knew, too, that if our political system is to function the President must assume and exercise to the full the responsibilities of leadership—leadership of his administration, leadership of his party, leadership of public opinion, leadership, now that we are the strongest of free nations, of the Western World.

He accepted therefore the responsibilities of his great office and fulfilled them. He formulated a legislative policy, disciplined his party, and got results. He attracted men of talents to the Federal service, protected them against contumely and harassments, intimidation and distraction, misrepresentation and character assassination. He did not dismantle the administrative structure, nor undermine the civil service, nor seek to turn over great administrative tasks to local and private organizations incapable of performing them. Nor did he seek to turn back the constitutional clock to a day of laissez-faire or of governmental impotence. He knew that under the Constitution the President was invested with authority to conduct foreign relations, and guarded this high responsibility against congressional assault that would unbalance our constitutional system and render the executive helpless in time of crisis. He took with high seriousness the solemn promise to preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution and did not permit that great charter to suffer harm. He knew that the Bill of Rights was an integral part of the Constitution and did not stand idly by while it was undermined.

In that great oration from which we have already drawn, Pericles reminds us that the Athenian Commonwealth owed all its greatness to men with the fighter's daring, the wise man's understanding of his duty, and the good man's self-discipline in its performance." These are the qualities for which Mr. Truman will be remembered: the fighter's daring, the wise man's sense of duty, the good man's self-discipline. And we can pay him too that final tribute from Pericles that "the love of honor alone is not staled by age, and it is by honor that the end of life is cheered."

Our Debt to the Veterans of Wisconsin and the Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 2, 1954

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, Memorial Day, 1954, has come and gone. It is altogether fitting that our reconsecration to the departed heroes of past conflicts not be confined to but 1 day of the year. It is fitting that we remember them every day of the year, through, in Lincoln's words, caring for him "who shall have borne the battle and for his widow and his orphan."

I was pleased to see in the Monday, May 31, issue of the Milwaukee Journal an extensive article by Mr. Paul M. McMahon, regarding the tending to the needs of the 426,000 veterans of Wisconsin.

We of the Badger State, like our fellow citizens of the other States of the Union, glory in the deeds of gallantry of our heroes. We glory in the more than 50 Badgers who have won our highest military award—the Congressional Medal of Honor. We glory in our fighting 32d Division. We glory in all the units which have fought, from the earliest times in Badger country, like the 7th Regiment, which was mustered into service on September 16, 1861—the "Iron Brigade of the West," which suffered only 14 fewer casualties than the battle losses of the 5th New Hampshire, which lost more men than any other regiment in the Union Army.

I ask unanimous consent that brief excerpts from the article by Paul McMahon be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Many Services Provided in State for Veterans of Our Nation's Wars—About 426,000 Live in Wisconsin—Hospital Care, Education, and Job Training, Loan Guaranties for Homes, Farms, and Businesses Among Things They're Eligible For

(By Paul M. McMahon)

By tradition a grateful Nation paused this weekend to honor its war dead, but her people have made every day Memorial Day for the living veteran. A look at what the State and Nation are doing, and have done, for military veterans in Wisconsin reveals that the living never are forgotten.

Wisconsin has about 426,000 living veterans. At least 123,000 of them reside in Milwaukee County. Close to 75 percent of the veterans served in World War II. Services for all veterans are varied and extensive. Here are some indications:

Close to $68 million in public money are spent annually for veterans in Wisconsin. Almost all of it is Federal money.

The Federal Government operates the third largest veterans' institution in the United States at Wood, Milwaukee County. Wood has 1,661 operating beds in its domiciliary and 1,275 in its hospital. It costs $8,700,000 a year to keep the institution going.

Fifty-three thousand six hundred and thirty loans guaranteed

More than 150,000 veterans have received education and job training in Wisconsin under the GI bills of the last decade. The cost totals $223 million. About 72 percent of this outlay went to the veterans and 28 percent to the schools.

Veterans in Wisconsin hold $1.1 billion in Government life insurance.

The VA regional office here says that it has guaranteed 53,630 home, farm, and business loans in Wisconsin. The amount guaranteed was $187 million. Included are loans for 47,358 homes. Last year alone the VA guaranteed 6,300 home loans in Wisconsin.

The State of Wisconsin maintains the Grand Army Home for Veterans at King where veterans of any war and their wives, widows, or mothers may live. Its capacity is 300 veterans and 200 women.

Service to the veteran has become an undertaking of tremendous scope. It touches, in one aspect or another, a vast number of Americans.

Over 20 million veterans

"The veterans' administration estimates the total number of living veterans of all wars in the United States at 20,731,000," said J. P. Cullen, Milwaukee, regional manager of the veterans' administration here. "These veterans and their dependents are potentially eligible for VA benefits under laws enacted by Congress." Largest segment of the veterans' population in this country is the World War II group, which numbers 15,428,000, according to the VA. Certain significant points regarding the veterans' population have been drawn in a nationwide VA study which Cullen believes can be applied in general to Wisconsin.

"Veterans and their families now make up one-third of the population of the Nation," he said. "By 1955 we expect veterans and their families to make up 40 percent of the population.

Taking care of the veteran has become one of the biggest jobs in the country. In Wisconsin, as in most States, it is approached from both State and Federal levels. Uncle Sam, however, pays by far the larger share of the cost and provides more extensive services.

One of Wisconsin's major contributions to veterans is the Grand Army Home at King, just outside of Waupaca. Bathed in serenity, it's a charming community perched high over pretty Rainbow Lake where veterans can fish at length and with good chances of success.

The institution, originally established 77 years ago by the Grand Army of the Republic as a home for Civil War veterans, later passed into the hands of the State of Wisconsin and eventually became a home for veterans of any war. It includes 109 buildings scattered over 136 well-kept acres. Some of the buildings are as old as the institution but each is maintained in good condition.

Presiding over the 500 "members" and 222 employees is big, genial, kind, Gilman H. Stordock. A former Milwaukean long active in veterans' affairs, Stordock left the Veterans' Administration 5 years ago to become commandant of the Grand Army Home. Although younger than almost any of the members, Stordock takes a fatherly interest in them. He calls all of them, men or women, by their first name. They often can find him in his office shortly after 6 a. m. Stordock's friends claim that he would rather be commandant at King than President of the United States.

Oldest member is 101

"We give complete maintenance for all members, including medical and dental care, prosthesis, all clothing, lodging and meals," Stordock said.

Wives, widows, and mothers of veterans may become members if they qualify in other respects. The oldest member of the home is 101-year-old Mrs. Victoria Pinkert, a remarkably spirited, chubby little woman who lives in the hospital annex. Three of Mrs. Pinkert's eighteen children were World War I veterans.

• • • • •

The home, operated under the jurisdiction of the Wisconsin Department of Veterans' Affairs, requires an annual outlay of about $868,000. However, a total of $162,000 was collected from members in the last fiscal year. An additional $72,399 was received from the Federal Government, which pays $500 a year for each veteran who could qualify for entrance to a Federal veterans' home (less one-half of anything the home might collect from the veteran). The Federal money must be spent for construction.

IMPORTANT FIELD—HOUSING LOANS

Another important aspect of the State's services to veterans is in the housing-loan field. Gordon A. Huseby, director of the Wisconsin Department of Veterans' Affairs at Madison, says that his department has approved 13,146 housing loans for a total of $34,500,000 since the State housing loan law went into effect.

"We're rather proud of this because about 95 percent of our loans are second mortgages," he said. "Our loans are made only to veterans who show need for housing and who have exhausted primary financing from local sources. Housing funds are allocated to the counties according to veteran population."

Milwaukee County is represented by 3,958 loans totaling $10,867,800.

The State also makes grants to needy veterans to cover such emergencies as medical treatment and hospitalization. These grants, which are not repaid, may total close to $90,000 in the fiscal year ending June 30.

Loans for Rehabilitation

A more substantial item is the rehabilitation loan. Such a loan generaly is made to a veteran who has not been able to establish local credit but who shows that he is a reliable risk, Huseby explained. The loans, up to a maximum of $1,000 may be made for purchase of a business, repairing a business property, adding to a veteran's home, educational purposes, buying furniture, or cattle, or farm machinery, or simply to cover accumulated bills beyond the veteran's current ability to pay.

Rehabilitation loans totaling more than $16 million have been made to 24,400 Wisconsin veterans since the law permitting them went into effect in 1946.

Milwaukee County veterans received about $2,111,000 of that amount.

The State of Wisconsin's service to veterans is, of course, overshadowed by the Federal Veterans' Administration. The VA regional office in Milwaukee spends close to $52 million a year. The VA spends another $15,366,000 on the operation of its general hospital and domiciliary at Wood, the tuberculosis hospitals at Madison and Waukesha and the neuropsychiatric hospital at Tomah.

Altogether, the VA employs 3,400 persons in Wisconsin. Its four hosiptals have a total bed capacity of 3,158.

The veterans' center at Wood is exceeded in size, and only slightly, by centers at Los Angeles, Calif., and Dayton, Ohio. Old-time residents of Milwaukee often think of it as "soldiers' home," a name commonly used from the time of its establishment mainly as a home for Union veterans of the Civil War in 1867. Milwaukeeans used to make the spacious grounds one of their favorite picnic spots.

Ninety-three buildings, some modernistic, some generations old, but all clean and neat, are scattered over almost 300 acres of rolling land. It would take $40 million to replace the property at Wood, not including land purchased in the opinion of its manager D. C. Firmin. Actually, the original cost to the Government is placed at only $6,500,000, he said. Wood's hospital capacity of 1,275 beds has an average utilization of 85 percent. In the domiciliary, where the turnover is less frequent, utilization of the 1,661 beds averages 94 percent.

Veterans from World War I dominate the populations of the hospital and the domiciliary. A recent count at the domiciliary showed that 1,329 of the residents were World War I veterans. Only 133 were World War II veterans. The rest served in the Spanish-American War, the Indian wars, or in peacetime.

On the same day, 585 of the hospital patients—more than one-half of the total—were World War I veterans. There was 339 patients who served in World War II and 66 who served in the Korean conflict.

Only a few women veterans are seen at a center like the Wood. The hospital has beds for 18 women and an attractive lounge for patients able to leave their beds. One day recently there were only 3, 2 of them World War I nurses.

The modernly equipped hospital has beds for 840 general medical and surgical cases, 209 tuberculosis and 226 neuropsychiatric. The hospital last year admitted 6,113 patients. The hospital's completely equipped dental service, intended mainly for inpatients, handled an average of almost 2,000 cases a month.

Many types of therapy

About one-half of the hospital patients are treated in one or another phase of physical medicine and rehabilitation, including many who also may be under treatment for other medical or physical ailments. The hospital offers many types of therapy—educational, manual arts, occupational, corrective, physical and blind.

"We try to teach our veterans how to live the best with what they have left to use," explained Joseph Riley, executive assistant in physical medicine and rehabilitation.

Leroy Friestad, 25, of Williams Bay, offers an example. He's a quadriplegic who is ready to leave the hospital after 17 months of treatment. Friestad, a paratrooper in World War II, was paralyzed in an automobile accident.

Learned to typewrite

Friestad lost all use of his legs and his hands. He could use only a few isolated muscles in his arm. He set out to discover how he could use those few muscles to best advantage. Under the careful direction of Miss Nancy Brown, chief occupational therapist, special slings were made in which Friestad's arms could rest and plastic splints were made to cover his hands. He cannot, of course, get around except in a wheel chair.

Although virtually all of the muscles in Friestad's limbs were dead, the muscles of his heart were of steel. Courageously, he set about to make a useful man of himself. Now, almost a year and a half later, he can write, use an electric typewriter, feed and shave himself. To write, Miss Brown places a splint over his hand and inserts a pencil which Friestad can guide with the arm muscles.

When Friestad returns to his Williams Bay home he will set up a little service business working on telephone ordering, mail ordering, typing, etc. How fast can he type?

* * * * *

REDUCE MORTALITY OF TB PATIENTS

Remarkable progress is being made in the reduction of the mortality rate of tuberculosis patients in veterans' hospitals and in the percentage of arrested cases, according to Firmin and the heads of the VA tuberculosis hospitals at Madison and Waukesha. The introduction of miracle drugs permitting new types of surgery have revolutionized treatment of tuberculosis since the end of World War II, they said.

* * * * *

Treatment has been so successful in the last 2 years that some VA officials now doubt that future needs will require as many tuberculosis hospital beds as are presently set up, Firmin said. Those beds could easily be converted to other uses.

Patients from 30 States

The Madison hospital has a capacity of 416 beds, Waukesha 256 and Wood 209 beds for such patients. Many of the patients at Waukesha and Madison are from the Chicago area.

Although Wood also uses 226 beds for neuropsychiatric patients, the major service in this field is carried out in the 1,176 bed hospital at Tomah. This big neuropsychiatric center averages 97 percent of capacity, according to VA statistics.

Tomah has patients from 30 States, although 90 percent of them are from Wisconsin, Minnesota, Iowa, Illinois, or upper Michigan. Dr. Benjamin F. Jackson, manager of the hospital, reports a patient turnover of between 350 and 500 a year. Virtually all the patients are veterans of World War I, World War II, or the Korean conflict. The percentage, roughly, runs 60 percent World War I and 40 percent World War II-Korea.

Both acute and chronic

The peak from World War I is approaching, in Dr. Jackson's opinion. Many of his cases are men who have become chronic over the years. The hospital handles both acute and chronic cases.

A veteran is eligible for admission to a veterans' hospital if he has a service-connected disability. He also may be treated for a non-service-connected disability if he signs a statement that he is unable to pay the cost of treatment in a private hospital.

Entrance to a domiciliary, like Wood's, is open to "a war veteran with a disabling disease or condition not susceptible to improvement within a reasonable time and who has no adequate means of support," Firmin said. Residents are referred to as "members," not "patients."

The members range in age from 28 to 94. The average is 61. They are quartered in 6 buildings and divided into 10 companies.

Every member physically able to do some work is required to put in 5 hours of work on each of 5 days a week. As a result, 7 of the 10 companies do all the housekeeping and maintenance of barracks, proudly reports Domiciliary Officer Victor J. Brulc. Unfortunately, all of the barracks at Wood are old. Each was built some time before 1900, Brulc said. Nevertheless, all are kept in good condition, well painted, polished, and equipped with sprinkling systems.

Members are provided a bed, locker, and chair in rooms containing from 1 to 60 beds. Each barracks has a solarium where the men may read, visit, and relax. An indigent member receives all the services and items needed for his daily living, including 12 packages of cigarettes a month. A member with more than $20 a month income is asked to buy his own comfort items.

The quiet dignity which pervades Wood's domiciliary is especially evident upon the death of a member. No matter how many burials may be scheduled for one day, each funeral is handled separately. Each deceased member lies in state at the Wood mortuary. Flowers, a firing squad, a bugler, and complete funeral service is provided.

"A member may be friendless, may have no other home or relatives—may even have been a bum part of his life—but at Wood the Government buries him like a gėneral," Brulc said.

THEY BRING PROBLEMS TO REGIONAL OFFICE

A hub of all VA service in Wisconsin is the busy regional office at 342 North Water Street. Veterans made 50,000 visits there last year, bringing with them one problem or another. An additional 50,000 visits were made to VA contact offices in Ashland, Eau Claire, Green Bay, La Crosse, Madison, Racine, Superior, and Wausau. VA interviewers also discussed personal problems with 23,000 other veterans at the 4 Wisconsin hospitals.

What were the main points discussed?

Forty-eight thousand compensation cases

Better than 25 percent wanted to talk about their GI insurance. Then came matters pertaining to VA education and job-training programs. Of all the veterans who have returned to civilian life in Wisconsin, 48 percent have taken up some form of training, the VA says; 35,000 have attended the University of Wisconsin alone, with a peak of 13,700 in September 1946. The peak enrollment in the entire Wisconsin program was 55,000 in April 1947. Presently almost 11,000 are participating in the education program.

Also of interest to Wisconsin veterans, as indicated in the interviews, were compensation and pensions. The VA pays compensation for service-connected disability and pensions to veterans physically unable to support themselves.

Wisconsin has 48,000 compensation and pension cases, according to Hugh MacGillis, acting assistant VA regional manager. Sixty percent of the cases are from World War II. The VA will pay more than $33 million on those claims this fiscal year.

Another major problem of veterans which the VA regional office sometimes can solve on the spot is medical and dental care. The office has a complete dental clinic and can treat outpatients for a wide variety of diseases and ailments, physical and mental.

The regional office's medical staff handled 23,500 cases last year and its dental staff took care of 4,200 patients. In addition, the VA arranged for 12,800 medical patients and 19,600 dental patients to be treated by outside private professional men.

Pensions to increase

Despite the volume of cases now being handled by the VA here, Cullen foresees a steady increase in the business of his office. The peak load for the regional office occurred in February 1947 when the office staff rose to 1,800. It's down to 550 now.

The World War I veterans reaching an age when many illnesses strike will be applying for an increasing number of pensions until the peak for this phase of VA service is reached, probably in 1970 or 1975, Cullen said. Later the World War II veterans and the Korean veterans will produce heavy loads.

The Korean veterans will not reach the peak of their education and training program until 1956. After dipping to just under 10,000 education and training cases, an upturn started last month and the total now is close to 11,000. Applications for loan guaranties promise to reach huge totals this year.

The Korean war veterans will produce as big a load as World War I veterans, Cullen said. In fact, he added, they might produce greater work for the VA because more benefits are available now than after World War I.

Service at county level

Service to veterans in Wisconsin extends even to the county level. State laws require that a veterans' service officer and a veterans' service commission be named in each of the 71 counties. The commission sets policy and guides the department of public welfare in granting aid to veterans who apply. The present commission in Milwaukee County consists of Ray Markey, chairman; Christ T. Seraphim, and Frank J. Jazdzewski. The office of the commission and the veterans' service officer is in the county courthouse.

The service officer works with the Veterans' Administration, the Wisconsin Department of Veterans' Affairs, and veterans' organizations in providing various services for veterans. Jack Luban, Milwaukee County veterans' service officer, pointed out that he may even act with power of attorney for a veteran to press a claim. The county board appropriates funds to cover the budget of the service officer and commission. This year's budget is $20,000.

Other outstanding services for veterans are performed by the many organizations and individual persons who offer their time and energy free at the Veterans' Administration institutions. They help feed the crippled, give parties for the blind, entertain the sick and wounded, write letters and perform countless other favors. At Wood they run a day nursery where little children may play while their mother visits with their father.

"We get 100,000 volunteer hours of work a year from these people at Wood alone," Firmin said gratefully. "I don't know what we would do without their help. It shows how much a community will take a place like Wood to its heart."

The Road to Responsibility

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PRESCOTT BUSH

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 2, 1954

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an address entitled "The Road to Responsibility," delivered at Chicago, Ill., on May 25, 1954, by William S. Paley, chairman of the board of the Columbia Broadcasting System. I had the honor to be associated with Mr. Paley in that enterprise for some 21 years, and I have always regarded him as one of the outstanding leaders of American business. I am glad to see from the address that he is running true to form.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

In our turbulent industry today I have no lack of problems to choose for the topic of my talk this morning. Broadcasting gets broader all the time. The problems we have before us are numerous and complex and touch almost every phase of the broadcaster's world: his business and economic preoccupations, the technological developments of the medium; his relationship with Government; his responsibility to the public at large. But you will permit me, I am sure, after acknowledging their very great importance, to put all but one of these categories aside and direct your attention to one significant aspect of our responsibilities to the public at large. And so, I have chosen as my topic: the broadcaster's role and responsibilities in the field of news and public affairs. This problem is neither transitory nor peculiar to any other segment of the industry. On the contrary, the proper exercise of a broadcaster's functions in this field is a responsibility which every broadcaster must face and the problems relating to it are common to each of us.

Another reason I want to discuss news and public affairs is because this part of a broadcaster's operation has long been close to my heart and uppermost in my mind; also because I believe that discussion and exchange of ideas on this topic may well lead to newer and more significant plateaus for every segment of broadcasting.

It is my belief that if we know what we are doing in the world of news and public affairs, we are secure: if we do not know, we are in danger—in danger of encroachments from Government, in danger of criticism, destructive and deserved from other powerful organs of opinion, in danger of criticism from the thinking and leading citizens of our Republic.

Let me say that when I talk about news and public affairs this morning, I mean more than just what we call, in this business, "the hard news." I mean also all the related fields—the opinion broadcasts, the debates, the feature projects, the documentaries, the panel discussions—as well as the direct on-the-spot coverage of news and public events as these occur. So here I am concerned not just with the raw news, the current happenings, but with the ideas, issues, and controversies that concern the public.

At no period in our history has the function of news and public affairs broadcasting been so critical and important to our national life. The movement of world events on both the national and international scenes takes on increasing significance each day in terms of the welfare and security of each citizen.

These events not only affect how he lives, but, in some instances, whether he will live at all. Issues have become extremely complicated giving rise to intense emotion, to a deep longing for answers, and hence demanding greater knowledge and—above all—understanding. It is part of our democratic tradition that facts and exposure to other people's views and opinions have a way of driving out emotional prejudice and of leading the way to answers which are more nearly correct.

These conditions and circumstances provide the broadcaster with an unprecedented opportunity to move ahead in this field of news and public affairs. We have today within our grasp the opportunity to provide an extraordinary public service in a troubled world and, at the same time, to increase our stature and strength as broadcasters. But I must point out that one does not receive positions of public trust and of strength on a silver tray. They must be won by resolution, courage, and performance. In these areas, I think, we still have quite some distance to go.

Let me give you my reason for thinking so. Consider for a moment some of the significant differences between a broadcaster and the publisher of a newspaper, or, more broadly, the difference between what a radio transmitter does and a printing press does. The printing press came into being in a rudimentary, slow-moving society, in an excessively limited world. Even so, it needed several centuries of struggle to become as free as it is today and to be placed at the service of all the people, not just at the service of scholars or priests or governors or public administrators. In the vast present-day diffusion of printing we have undesirable comic books—but we also have great newspapers, an incredible world of magazines, and big books for a quarter. Editors today come from a line of men that have centuries of experience behind them in getting news printed and diffused against the pressures of persons who thought it shouldn't be. The press may not be as free as it likes, but it's plenty free. Through the years it has learned how to keep a manageable degree of freedom against the pressures of readers, advertisers, and powerful critics in Government and other high places.

Now, by contrast, consider broadcasting. Against the centuries of hard-fought experience of the press, what have we? Why, we have about a quarter part of 1 century. Considering this pitiful little span of time, I think we've done rather well. I think it's remarkable that we have been as successful as we have—that we have learned things that have taken other people centuries to get the hang of: the subtleties, traps, and pitfalls that lie in the path of the unwary.

Another thing we had to learn in our beginnings—the hardest possible thing to have to learn fast: We had to learn what our new broadcasting medium was for. Some people thought broadcasting would be for education. Some thought merely that it would replace the phonograph. Some thought it would remake the world, which it hasn't. Some thought it would revolutionize politics, which it has. Some thought it would put newspapers and magazines out of business; instead, it joined them in an intense but friendly—well, sort of friendly—competition to carry the messages of editors and advertisers to greater areas than ever before.

But, of course, broadcasting did not limit itself to any one of these. Instead it became almost all the things that were imagined for it. And when television added broadcast sight to broadcast sound, broadcasting then became, and I am sure will always remain, the broadest means of interchanging, communicating and diffusing ideas, moods, sights, emotions, facts, images (should I say color?)—and also confusion—in the history of man. We now, in this industry, partake of the newspaper, of the magazine, of the stage, the movies, the concert hall, the lecture platform, the museum, the medical center, the university, and the battlefield. To say nothing of the town meeting, the Senate committee room, the whistle stops of political campaigns and the auditoriums for great debate. Indeed, I think we can say, "Name it, and we are of it."

No wonder we are all a little confused. A grant of opportunities has been offered to us of this industry wholly unlike, in range and scope, any grant of opportunities to any other group of modern men. And it happened in a democracy. Which must make us eternally wary of abusing it.

Since by relative time we are newcomers to the field, we are short in tradition and we still have a lot to learn. The old-time newspaper editor, with his centuries of professional experience, was accustomed to letters saying "Dear Sir, you cur." He was accustomed to being horsewhipped by outraged ladies, and shot at, or indeed shot, by those who considered themselves libeled by some small, innocent item. He was also sued frequently; another painful form of the expression of displeasure.

I must say that I have no desire to stir up any additional public violence today. In this industry we should continue, as in the past, merely to shoot one another and not encourage the public to think that this pistol range is open to them, too.

Old-time editors used to take such threats and actions in their stride, as a part of their occupation. I think we broadcasters can afford a certain amount of the same stride in the face of our letter writing, telegraph, and telephone critics. If we are fair and responsible in our decisions, we will gain the approval and the respect of the large majority of the people.

But can we in all fairness and good conscience ask our medium to be as free of threats of boycott, as free of political pressures, as respected as the great newspapers of our country, if we shirk our responsibilities in this field? We claim for ourselves, and quite properly, I believe, the great historical and constitutional rights and privileges which have been maintained by the press of this country. We recognize the plain fact of our power for good or evil through the enormous force of our media.

Yet the question remains whether we enjoy in the public mind the status which is a natural corollary of our rights and privileges. I respectfully submit that we do not, and that we will not until we have shown through clear performance that we have faced up to our opportunities and to our responsibilities.

But it is one thing to resolve to expend greater effort and courage in the field of news and public affairs. It is quite anbther and far more difficult thing to determine how to do it and do it well.

For one thing, we cannot just imitate the press. With all the similarities between the press and broadcasting, there are still powerful differences between us. And so, with all due deference to the press and its long-established traditions, it can only set us on the road. We will have to do our own driving and find our own right way.

I would not be so presumptuous as to say that there is any single right way. Each broadcaster will have to find his own. But I would like to suggest certain steps which might be taken by the broadcaster who finds some truth in my words and who, having not yet done so, wants to build a responsible and respected place for himself in this field.

First, and perhaps most obvious, the operation of news and public affairs in a broadcasting organization should be given great emphasis and attention by top management. Top management should adjust itself to the fact that this area of the broadcaster's operation is at least as important as any of the other areas coming under his jurisdiction and supervision.

Second, a broadcaster must build a strong news organization, not in numbers, which is not in itself controlling, but in quality. Certainly he should choose the man to head his station's news operation or his public-affairs operation, or both, as carefully and as thoughtfully as he would choose the head of his most important departments. Having been selected, this person must be invested with status and the proper authority.

Third, a broadcaster who wants to exercise his responsibilities in this field cannot go into it blindly, if disaster is not to overtake him. For his own protection, as well as for the protection of his listeners, he must work out in advance well-defined and clearly stated general policies that will govern his operations.

I make no pleas for uniformity in the ground rules which each broadcaster establishes in this field. Only one basic tenet must be observed: There must be fairness and balance. No matter what the station owner's personal predilections—and he is bound to have them—there must be fairness and balance among all viewpoints.

Beyond this fundamental principle, each station will doubtless work out its own ground rules in the exercise of its vital functions in the area of news and public affairs. The more different approaches there are, the more searching and experimentation there is, the better off all of us will be, for good new ideas will stimulate the competitive forces in this field as they do in other fields.

Reminding you, then, that ours is only one possible approach to a set of ground rules, I would like to outline the policies in this area which we at CBS have worked out over the years. I do so as an example of the thought processes that a broadcaster must go through in order to determine how to exercise the responsibilities in the area of his activities. Our policies, brefly, are these:

In news programs there is to be no opinion or slanting. The news reporting must be straight and objective.

In news analysis there is to be elucidation, illumination, and explanation of the facts and situations, but without bias or editorialization.

In both news and news analysis, the goal of the news broadcaster or the news analyst must be objectivity. I think we all recognize that human nature is such that no newsman is entirely free from his own personal prejudices, experience, and opinions, and that, accordingly, 100 percent objectivity may not always be possible. But the important factor is that the news broadcaster and the news analyst must have the will and the intent to be objective. That will and that intent, genuinely held and deeply instilled in him, is the best assurance of objectivity. His aim should be to make it possible for the listener to know the facts and to weigh them carefully so that he can better make up his own mind. Our policies also provide that significant viewpoints on important controversial issues are afforded the opportunity of expression—largely through time periods which are allocated free of charge to outside people and organizations representing opposite viewpoints. The programs in these periods take the form of straight talks, debates, and panel discussions.

Opinion broadcasts must be labeled for what they are. In particular, opinion must be separated from news. The listener is entitled to know what he is receiving, news or opinion, and if it be opinion, whose opinion.

In other types of information programs, such as the feature or documentary program, produced by us, the expression of opinion might properly take place. When it does take place, it should be by the decision of management or through the delegation of authority to a member of the staff producing a particular program. Such delegation, however, must be to one who is trained and responsible and in whose integrity and devotion to democratic principles we repose complete confidence.

When opinion is expressed in any type of information program—excluding news and news analysis where opinion is not allowed—opportunity for reply is given to the person with whom issue has been taken, or to a responsible spokesman representing an opposite viewpoint.

An advertiser who sponsors any type of information program produced by us does not thereby purchase, or in any way gain, any rights to control the contents of the program.

Programs presenting news, news analysis, discussion, debates, feature or documentary material, or on-the-spot pickups are under our direct control and supervision and we bear full responsibility for such broadcasts.

I have not as yet touched on the question of editorialization by the broadcaster—that is, opinion which might be expressed by the broadcaster in his own name or in the name of the station or network. The broadcaster has the same right to editorialize and the same right to independent expression as the free press. I am not urging anyone to exercise this right. It is and should be a matter of personal preference. However, I would urge that we fight to preserve this right should it ever be threatened. In this connection, I would like to say that it is not the act of editorialization which puts the bite and the backbone into a news and public affairs operation. It is rather the fact of having a rounded and vital schedule which does the trick; of having a schedule of unbiased news which covers all categories, national, regional, and local; of having a fair and objective analysis of that portion of the news which calls for background and interpretation; of having a schedule of controversy in which the issues of concern to the listeners will get full and responsible airing; of having public feature programs and documentaries which put the spotlight on conditions worthy of the listener's attention.

As has become apparent, the principle of fairness and balance is the cornerstone of our news and public affairs policy, as it should be of any broadcaster. I want to point out, however, that this principle cannot be reduced to a mathematical formula or even to a set of rigid rules which are self-executing and will cover all the possible circumstances. In the free American broadcasting system, fairness and balance must be maintained through the exercise of fair and courageous judgment by the station or the network management. And it must be recognized that there is a difference between men, ideas, and institutions: Some are good and some are bad, and it is up to us to know the difference—to know what will uphold democracy and what will undermine it—and then not to do the latter.

Some people may question the desirability of placing in the hands of the broadcaster this important element of control. To this point I would say that undoubtedly there may be abuses, as there are in other media. But I for one have enough faith in the vitality of the democratic process, in the intelligence of the American people, and in the freshness of the competitive climate to believe that the good will and the determined intent of broadcasters to be fair, coupled with the powerful voice of the people, will provide far better protection against abuse than any other form of control. And let me remind you that those who would take this control away from the broadcaster are the ones who would put it in the hands of Government.

Here, then, are our thoughts and our ground rules, evolved through the years, on how best to exercise our responsibilities in the area of news and public affairs. You may disagree with some of them; you may have or develop better ones from which we at CBS may learn much.

I would like to say, and perhaps you will agree with me, that too often public officials, legislators, and other people in public life look upon the broadcasting organization primarily as an instrument created to serve their own purposes, whatever these may be. They do not sufficiently regard the broadcaster as a free and autonomous institution exercising to the best of his ability an influence and responsibility dedicated to the interests of all the people. The fact is—our own timidity in the vital areas of public information is self-perpetuating; it breeds pressures which in turn breed further timidity. Our excursions, by and large, into the responsible exercise of our functions in the field of news and public affairs are often too spasmodic, too tentative, or too sensitive to permit us to realize our own independence and stature. This must be corrected.

The important thing, whatever the ground rules you set for yourselves, is to consider carefully whether you should not increase your activities and your emphasis in the significant field of news and public affairs. If you do so—if you develop an active, responsible, and eager organization—if you move vigorously into this area, you will, I am convinced, do the country and broadcasting an enormous service.

I have made these suggestions today because I am proud of broadcasting and I want to see the broadcaster seize the extra opportunities which are within his grasp and thereby raise his status among the people he is serving. If he does so, he will be putting himself into the stream of life which brings meaning, satisfaction, and a sense of achievement which cannot be matched by any other kind of reward.

Young Doctors for the Old Dominion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 2, 1954

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the Record an article from the Reader's Digest with respect to locating doctors in the rural areas of Virginia.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Young Doctors for the Old Dominion

(By Lois Mattox Miller)

The private citizens of Virginia, operating at the grassroots level, are showing the rest of the Nation how to deal with the most serious problem of United States medical care, the shortage of doctors in rural areas. Since 1950 more than 50 small towns in the Old Dominion have lured young medical men away from the big cities and proved to them that the round-the-clock life of a country doctor can be more exciting and soul-satisfying than any urban practice.

Now, instead of complaining (like most States) about the doctor shortage, Virginia boasts of a backlog of over 130 general practitioners waiting for a chance to hang out their shingles in the right community. Even more astonishing is the fact that the people of Virginia found the solution entirely on their own, without Government aid or large private funds.

The Virginia plan began to take shape in 1946, when Dr. W. E. Garnett, rural sociologist of the Virginia Polytechnic Institute, decided that the time had come for action. The State's death and disease rates ranked among the Nation's highest. The cause of the trouble seemed obvious: the trend among young doctors was toward the big cities; few were willing to play the old horse-and-buggy role. The reason given seldom varied: "It's no longer possible to practice good medicine without modern facilities."

Dr. Garnett induced the dean of the University of Virginia Medical School, Dr. H. B. Mulholland, to call a meeting of the State's civic, farm, and health groups. Representatives of 37 organizations came to Richmond for the session. Together they formed the Virginia Council on Health and Medical Care, which studied conditions in the rural areas, talked with doctors and medical educators, questioned students in the State's two medical schools. In 4 years they turned up some interesting facts.

First, they found that most of the towns could amply afford to support a doctor in a good practice and, moreover, were ready to do anything within reason to get a doctor.

Next, talking with medical students, the council found a considerable number of young men who would prefer to live and work and raise a family in an attractive small town. But they all made one proviso: They would have to be able to practice the high type of modern medicine for which they had been trained, and they couldn't give rural people up-to-date medical service "out of a little black bag." Perhaps the small clinic was the answer.

In 1950 the Virginia council hired Edgar J. Fisher, Jr., as executive director and imparted to him its plan of action. The council would be a clearinghouse for doctors and the towns needing them and would stand ready to advise and supervise. But it would be the responsibility of each town to snare its doctor and, more important, to make him a happy and permanent part of the community.

What happened in Huddleston is typical. Huddleston has a population of only 225. But in the surrounding countryside some 3,000 persons depend upon the town for services, including medical care. For over 30 years Dr. John Pollard had been kept busy night and day with a practice that was too big for one man. After his death in 1945 there hadn't been a doctor within calling distance.

In 1950 the local grange wrote to the Richmond headquarters of the Virginia council. Soon Edgar Fisher came to Huddleston. He listened to the townsfolk's woes.

"All right," he said, "we've talked a lot about your needs. Now, let's talk about what the doctor needs and what the town is willing to do about it.

"First, he'll want a decent place to live. Probably he'll want to rent; a young man won't be ready to buy or build.

"Next, he'll need a place to work. The nearest hospital is 17 miles away. To diagnose and treat illness today requires a lot more equipment than in the old days; a modern doctor needs the facilities of a modern clinic. That's the kind of medical care you should have."

The people of Huddleston gave much thought to the idea of setting up a local clinic. Finally Fisher was informed that the town was ready to proceed. "Good," he said. "But don't build anything until you find your doctor—he'll have some ideas of his own."

Fisher broadcast a description of the Huddleston situation to the doctors, interns, and senior medical students on his list. Soon several young men came to have a look at Huddleston, and let Huddleston have a look at them. The townsfolk took a particular liking to tall, curly haired Jesse M. Tucker, Jr., who was finishing his internship at Norfolk General Hospital. The Tuckers were expecting their first baby that spring. "Build me that clinic and find us a place to live," Dr. Tucker said, "and I'll move in this summer."

Under Fisher's watchful eye Dr. Tucker and the townspeople drew the plans. The town put up a cinderblock building containing an office, laboratory, examining room, X-ray room and dispensary at a cost of $6,000. Dr. Tucker agreed to provide the equipment, most of which he was able to obtain secondhand. He was given the use of the building free for 1 year; thereafter he was to pay $500 a year rent. He got a 10-year option to buy the clinic at cost.

When it came to finding the Tuckers a place to live, there wasn't a decent house for rent, and the town didn't feel it could finance another building. Not far from the clinic site, however, was an abandoned one-room schoolhouse. A Lynchburg contractor, who had gone to school there as a boy, had bought the old place for sentimental reasons. Hearing about Huddleston's plight, he offered to remodel the building into a 2-bedroom home and rent it to the Tuckers for $70 a month.

Dr. Tucker began practicing in Huddleston the week after he finished his internship and not long after Jesse M. Tucker III was born. Since then he's been working around the clock, seeing an average of 250 patients weekly. Two of his classmates, a husband-and-wife team, have established a practice in nearby Bedford. This year the county is building a hospital with local, State, and Federal funds under the Hill-Burton Act. Says Fisher, "Huddleston touched off a chain reaction in Bedford County."

Actually, the chain reaction is now statewide. Town after town, inspired by examples like Huddleston's, is trying the new approach to getting a doctor.

Many of the new clinics are as small as Huddleston's. Others, like Forest's new Community Health Center, cost $20,000 or more. The scheme varies with local needs. New Hope decided to put the clinic and doctor's residence under one roof. Charlotte Courthouse installed its clinic in the local Red Cross Building. Dinwiddie found space in the County Health Center. In every instance the facilities have been financed by funds raised locally.

In 1951 the town of McGaheysville (population 500) had been seeking a doctor unsuccessfully for 3 years. Then one day Fisher got a call for a doctor from Mill Creek. A glance at the map showed that the two towns were less than 10 miles apart. Why not persuade the two to make one attractive offer for some ambitious doctor?

Fisher arranged a joint meeting in Montevideo Consolidated High School, midway between McGaheysville and Mill Creek. Committee members had only to look out the school window to spot an ideal location for the clinic.

The Montevideo Clinic, Inc., was formed, and plans were drawn for a $25,000 building. Four nearby towns heard of the scheme and offered to participate. The people raised $10,000 and borrowed the rest from a local bank. The handsome building was dedicated last August.

Meanwhile, Montevideo got an unexpected break. Fisher received a letter from Drs. Ashby Woods, 30, and Hugh W. Rule, 29, who had been classmates and were now interning in the same Delaware hospital. They had decided to practice together and would like to locate "somewhere in Virginia west of Skyline Drive, south of Winchester, and north of Lexington." The specifications all but named Montevideo.

Woods and Rule made a trip to Montevideo. They were delighted with the plans for the clinic, and inspired by the spirit of the people behind the venture.

"This is a dream situation," Edgar Fisher says. "The doctors alternate taking night calls, and they can arrange vacations so that one is always on hand. The people of the six towns are really enthusiastic about the whole setup."

Since 1951 the council has placed 58 doctors. This year, with the program really rolling, Fisher expects to come close to doubling that number. But finding and placing a doctor is only part of the job.

"There's as much to keeping a doctor in a small town as there is to getting him there in the first place," says Fisher. "We watch each situation and try to iron out differences until we know the doctor is a happy member of the community."

When the plan had proved sound the council offered to turn over the placement service to the Medical Society of Virginia. The doctors said, "No; this program works because it is the people's program. Let's keep it that way." Instead, the medical society increased its contribution to the council from $500 to $2,000 a year. The council's annual budget of $21,000 comes from 55 State and 178 local organizations and many business concerns.

The American Medical Association has called the program one of the best, if not the best, in the Nation. The late Adm. W. H. P. Blandy, president of the Health Information Foundation, declared: "More and better medical care in rural areas is a 'must' for the entire Nation. The Virginia experience offers many ideas that other States ought to adopt."

Code of Fair Procedure for Investigating Committees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 2, 1954

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record a very excellent editorial with reference to a code of fair procedure for investigating committees.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

A Code for Investigations

Congressional investigating committees have become increasingly important instruments of Government in recent years without firm rules to guide their methods. Procedures unknown in law courts or in legislative proceedings have been used by Senators and Representatives during committee investigations.

When the case of McCarthy versus Army was brought before a committee of the Senate there was a pause for the writing of ground rules. It was necessary because none of the preceding investigations had established rules binding on this case. Neither will procedure adopted for this case hold for future investigations.

The need was so plain that several Senators and Representatives have prepared sets of rules to govern the conduct of committees. Each plan has rested quietly in a congressional pigeonhole.

Action has suddenly moved into sight. Authors of these proposals have gotten together and agreed on a unified version of what is needed. They call it a Code of Conduct for Congressional Committees.

This code would turn toward the accepted practices of law by allowing a person adversely affected by public testimony to force the witness against him to appear for cross-examination. Those called before a committee are to have 24 hours' notice of the subject on which they will be questioned.

These are examples of the many detailed proposals.

Most interesting is the proposal that the Senate and House accept responsibility for what is done by committees through establishment of a new special committee of five to supervise enforcement of the code for investigations.

The five Senators who had submitted investigation codes have been joined by others with similar ideas, and they have taken up some of the suggestions in House proposals for investigation codes.

The consolidated code now is before Congress with the backing of 18 sponsors. That is a large enough group to make careful consideration probable even though Senators are touchy about their independence of action.

When a committee of Congress, or a subcommittee, or a lone member of a committee makes an investigation he is using the power of Congress. For the protection of that power all Members of both Houses have an interest in keeping use of the investigative procedure within the limits of fair play as understood by the public which put the power in their hands.

Comment by the Memphis Press-Scimitar on Antisegregation Decision of the Supreme Court

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 2, 1954

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record a most constructive editorial entitled "It Will Take Time and Patience" from the Memphis Press-Scimitar of May 18, 1954.

To me, the editorial of this great Tennessee newspaper represents the kind of thoughtful and understanding leadership which, in all sections of the country, can make successful the application of the Supreme Court's recent decision for equality of educational opportunity.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

It Will Take Time and Patience

The highest qualities of leadership among both white and Negro Americans will be required to bring about an orderly adjustment to the Supreme Court's ruling against segregation in schools.

It was an unanimous decision in which the two southern justices joined. It is a decision that was not unexpected and will have to be accepted.

Given good will among all Americans a little less than a century ago, the issue of slavery could have been settled by judicial and legislative processes. But lack of understanding and tolerance forced our Nation into a fratricidal war, the scars of which are not yet completely healed.

We have learned from the experience and we do not think that this time there will be conflict among fellow Americans.

By judicial and legislative processes, segregation in the schools has already been ended. It has already, and long since, ended over the larger area of our country north of the Mason-Dixon line and to the west. The High Court's decision presents no problem there for the simple reason that there is no segregation to declare unconstitutional. Children of both races study in the classrooms together, and grownups accept that as natural.

In the South, with its own mores and deeply rooted customs, the ending of segregation will take time.

The Supreme Court took a long time to consider this important question—2 years. Wisely the Court will take time to consider the question how and when to end segregation; the hearings on this question will not begin until fall. The Supreme Court should take plenty of time on this.

The principle has been stated. The rest of the world now knows that the United States has adopted a policy of ending what has been called racial discrimination. Whatever benefit in our world situation comes from this statement of policy has been obtained.

It would not make sense to balance this gain with a loss—the loss of unity at home by hasty and ill-considered measures which would anger and disaffect the Southern States, who have done as well with their problem as Northern States would have done with the same problem, if their particular situations had been reversed.

As for the Southern States, we would do well to ponder the words of a southerner, Ralph McGill, editor of the Atlanta Constitution, who has said:

"An end to segregation will not, of course, force people to associate socially. That will remain, as now, personal choice. But it will bring on change * * *. The problem of the future is how to live with the change."

In Memphis, our school board by wise planning is ready for the end of segregation and anticipates no serious difficulty. President Milton Bowers, Sr., believes the Negroes will continue to use what are now their own school facilities since most of them are located in the center of Negro population areas. "However," Mr. Bowers adds, "we are most certainly going to abide by the law of the land."

No Court decree was issued, and none will be until after briefs are filed next fall, arguments are heard next winter, and courses of action finally decided upon probably not before next spring.

Plenty of time for people of good will of both races to think and work for a solution, if only they can keep the extremists of both races from precipitating trouble, and if only the people of the North, both white and Negro, will have patience while the people of the South, both white and Negro, wrestle with their problem.

It probably won't be as difficult as we now think.

When the armed services ended racial segregation, the expected tensions simply failed to develop. Our Negro fighting men justified their recognition as class A citizens in Korea. No people stood up better under Communist brainwashing, and few did as well. Given time, we in the South will learn to live with the Supreme Court's decision. Our returning servicemen should help this process.

The Supreme Court has decided this principle as a national issue, but the application is in local hands.

And it is something more. It involves the survival of all of us. It is a worldwide issue.

The peoples of Asia are looking over our shoulders. We here know that all of our people, white or Negro, have a greater opportunity than any people anywhere else on earth. But the Communists tell Asians otherwise.

Our allies and potential allies in the Pacific hear of our High Court's decision with eager interest—the Koreans, the Japanese, the Nationalist Chinese, the Indians, Pakistanis, Indochinese, Indonesians, Burmese, Thailanders, many of the Filipinos and Hawaiians—colored people all.

Our preachments on democracy and dignity and equal opportunity of man will ring truer to Asia's fermenting millions when they learn that here in America equality is not graded by complexion.

As we face the difficulties of complying with the Supreme Court's decision, it is comforting to know that it has made things easier for us in the world situation.

Visit of Emperor Haile Selassie I, Emperor of Ethiopia, to the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 2, 1954

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on last Friday the joint meeting of the two Houses of Congress was honored by an address delivered by the Emperor of Ethiopia, Haile Selassie I. When he appeared before that assemblage, he appeared as a man of vision, a man who in his own right has proved himself to be a prophet over the years. His address was not only courageous but statesmanlike.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the Record an editorial entitled "Ethiopia's Emperor Visits United States," published in the Great Falls (Mont.) Tribune of May 30, 1954. The editorial deals with the visit of Ethiopia's Emperor to the United States.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Ethiopia's Emperor Visits United States

Haile Selassie I, Emperor of Ethiopia and Conquering Lion of Judah, is now paying a state visit to President Eisenhower and the Nation.

Most Americans remember Haile Selassie as the African monarch who lost his kingdom to Mussolini's invaders in 1936. But he captured the world's admiration when he led a barefoot army, equipped mainly with spears, curved swords, and rhinoceros shields against the Italian dictator's bombs and mustard gas. He and his kingdom now have survived Mussolini.

Not so many, however, are aware that his distant country on the northeast shoulder of Africa has a history and traditions going back many hundreds of years before the birth of Christianity.

"Ethiopia's own devoutly practiced Christianity was introduced in the fourth century, A. D." says the National Geographic Society. Closely linked with the Egyptian Coptic Church, it follows a rigid and ritualistic form.

Outsiders are fascinated by the strange and colorful ecclesiastical paintings that decorate Ethiopia's curiously shaped churches—square, round, and octagonal—and its medieval temples carved out of solid rock. Through the ages Ethiopia's religion, like its ancient tribal ways of life, has changed little behind geographic walls that shut out the rest of the world. But new influences at last are beginning to penetrate the physical barriers.

These people point proudly to more than 2,000 years of almost unbroken independence. Earlier, between the 16th and 11th centuries B. C., there was a long period when the highlanders, according to inscriptions on Egyptian monuments, came under Egypt's domination.

Then the Ethiopians revolted, to return later as conquerors of Egypt, from which ruling position they were finally driven out by the Assyrians around 660 B. C. The present Emperor traces his lineage back to Menelik I, traditional son of King Solomon and the Queen of Sheba.

Test of Budget Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PRESCOTT BUSH
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, June 2, 1954

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an editorial entitled "Test of Budget Policy," which appeared in the New York Times of May 30.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Test of Budget Policy

The administration, according to Secretary of the Treasury George M. Humphrey, has cut planned expenditures for the coming year an additional $5 billion beyond the $7 billion reduction for the current year.

Mr. Humphrey, who made this announcement in the course of an address before the Farm City Conference, conceded that plans to cut spending further could go completely awry if adverse serious developments should occur in the world, resulting in a revision of our future foreign undertakings.

The administration has been sniped at from two, and sometimes three, sides with respect to its budgetary policies over the past 16 months, but none of these criticisms goes to the heart of the policies of President Eisenhower and his able Secretary of the Treasury. Yet the key to those policies is simple, and the contrast between them and the policies that had been pursued previously since the end of World War II is as the difference between day and night. Some administrations regard a deficit—and particularly recurring deficits—as an unmitigated evil, to be countenanced only under extraordinary conditions when the evidence is overwhelming that the alternative would be worse than the deficit. That is the philosophy of the present administration. Others give lip service to balancing the budget but actually regard deficits as a convenient stimulant to be administered whenever it seems politically advantageous to use them for that purpose. During the Truman administration, no matter how high the national income soared, no genuine and consistent effort was made to bring the budget into balance and keep it there.

Does the public sense the difference between these contrasting attitudes of Government toward the budget? We think it sees it and understands it far better than the politicians have any idea. And if anyone has any doubts on that point he is advised to take a good look at the new American dollar—the dollar that will buy as much today as it did a year ago.

Indochina Lost

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 2, 1954

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following editorial from the Boston Post, May 31, 1954:

Indochina Lost

Face the facts about Indochina—only a miracle of statesmanship will now prevent the partition of Indochina by Red military force.

No coalition of western nations is going to save it. The British are stalling for time. The French are so war-weary and rotten from creeping communism that it wouldn't be surprising if they began to scream and throw tantrums and blame it all on the United States.

The United States hasn't any disposition to intervene with armed force in Indochina. The administration certainly isn't for it, or, at least lacks the spine to come right out and say so. The Congress certainly isn't in the mood to commit troops to a war in Indochina.

So, having felt out all the reactions at Geneva, Molotov is going back to Moscow for a few days to get the answer on how much of Indochina, if any, the Reds will let the western nations keep.

Most of the world's foreign policy is being manufactured in Moscow, anyway—so this is no change in the situation. It is disgraceful that the policymakers of the western nations have permitted this to happen. They might have banded together under NATO and EDC and become so strong that Moscow wouldn't dare stall, procrastinate, and deceive.

We spent enough billions to persuade our anemic allies to smarten up and act like men, but apparently they thought that our sad sack performance in Korea was typical of the employment of American military power when we didn't have Winston Churchill at our elbow to tell us how to do it. So, whatever disposition the United States may have had to take a firm hand in Asia was nullified (1) by the fellow travellers who used to infest the State Department, and (2) by our own military planners' excessive stupidity in fighting the way the Communists wanted us to fight—at times and places of their choosing.

Things are so bad that when some Western European statesman—a glib and unctuous old hand like Churchill, for example—refers to the United States as the most powerful nation on earth, it sounds very much like irony.

Indochina is lost. By force of arms the Reds have taken half for their own, and may very easily grab the rest. It's only a question of time before they move into Burma, Malaya, Thailand and, finally, India. Nehru has done everything to persuade the Reds to move into India except personally carry them like a new bride over the threshold.

Maybe Americans will wake up to the fact that no nation can be the most powerful nation on earth and behave like a hoarse Little Lord Fauntleroy. Bigness and power carries with it obligations, the need for doing something except bluster.

The Roles of Government and the Voluntary Agencies in Immigration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, June 2, 1954

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, Mr. Harry N. Rosenfield, former displaced persons commissioner, and former executive director of the President's Commission on Immigration and Naturalization, delivered on May 17 a very interesting and scholarly discussion of the role of voluntary agencies in the immigration process.

I ask unanimous consent that this speech by Mr. Rosenfield be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Roles of Government and Voluntary Agencies in Immigration

(By Harry N. Rosenfield)

Who Should Do What in Immigration is the subject of these remarks. Just over 4 years ago, I discussed this same general subject, in terms of the role of the voluntary agencies under the Displaced Persons Act, and I said:

"Were I to attempt to make a one sentence address on this subject, I would say that the voluntary agency's role in the DP program is to make that program work. * * * The program would fall flat on its face without the active and vigorous cooperation of the voluntary agencies."

I believe that statement is as true today as it was then, in its application to any special or regular immigration program. The voluntary agencies must not only keep the immigration issue alive until adequate and good laws are passed, but must also see to it that whatever laws are on the books are reasonably, humanely, and effectively administered.

Immigration has completely changed in the past generation. It is no longer a question of haphazard individual movements alone, but largely of planned mass migrations. When we speak of immigration these days, we refer not only to individual adjustments to a new country, but more normally to large-scale resettlement projects. This basic change in the nature and complexion of the problem, should, but frequently does not, carry with it a fundamental reorganization of our thinking as to what needs to be done, and by whom.

In connection with the current immigration problem, which is a question of planned mass resettlement, I submit that there are at least six basic functions that must be performed. (I realize, of course, that others may classify the problem differently, but believe that the essence is in the six functions therein presented.) These functions are as follows:

1. Determination of eligibility for admission as an immigrant.
2. Resettlement and integration.
3. Representation and protection.
4. Aid to government.
5. Public liaison.
6. Leadership.

The two principals in this field, government and voluntary agencies, must together perform all these functions, or the whole job will not be done toward effective adjustment and integration of immigrants in this country and the promotion of genuine Americanization. The voluntary agency should supplement, but never supplant, the role of government in immigration, and vice versa. Therefore, the role of each depends upon the capabilities and willingness of the other to perform within the whole area of needs.

In the United States, in particular, government has been almost exclusively concerned with the first of these above-indicated functions, the determination of eligibility for a visa and for admission into the country. With rare and notable exceptions, such as the DP program, there has been no positive or affirmative governmental attitude toward immigration in recent American history. This is not a mere matter of neglect, but rather of calculated policy.

By contrast, other countries in varying degrees have undertaken responsibility for orientation, reception, care, maintenance, inland transportation, normal amenity services, employment placement, personal counseling, integration and adjustment, and protection of the immigrant against exploitation. Such program responsibility has not been the pattern in the United States, although for a while, and in a few States, State agencies assumed a more affirmative and positive role in immigration activities.

In a position paper adopted by the American Council of Voluntary Agencies for Foreign Service, on January 22, 1954, the problem was stated thus:

"There are certain situations, certain conditions under which governmental action and assistance may be inexpedient, inadvisable, impossible, or even unacceptable."

Whatever the reason, the fact is that if the full task in immigration is to be performed now and in the foreseeable future in the United States, the great body of American voluntary agencies must undertake the following five functions:

1. RESETTLEMENT AND INTEGRATION

Time was when the immigrant was an individual who migrated because he thought he might like it better somewhere else. Today, immigration is part of the age of refugees and overpopulation. With this vital change, the old concept of voluntary agency activity is outmoded. Mere reception and initial care and housing is no longer sufficient. The circumstances demand a continuous social case work approach, based upon adequate financing. The functions to be performed are complex and changing, but at least the following are called for:

(a) Orientation, both prior and subsequent to migration;

(b) Transportation services, before and during embarkation, during the trip, at debarkation, and during inland transportation;

(c) Material and economic assistance, at all stages of immigration and resettlement;

(d) Social and welfare services before, on, and after arrival, including technical immigration advice;

(e) The establishment of basic family resettlement plans, both prior and subsequent to migration, including employment counseling and follow-up; and

(f) Assistance in integration into the new community, including language and vocational training, help with psychological and spiritual adjustment, and assistance in the process of Americanization.

2. REPRESENTATION AND PROTECTION

In general, the migrant is in need of legal and personal protection, both on a national and international level. Therefore, the voluntary agency must assume the following duties:

(a) Acting as general friend and protector against exploitation;

(b) Legal aid to individual immigrants, and personal representation for the sponsor and the prospective immigrant with national and international agencies;

(c) General representation before national and international agencies, in order to develop adequate protective policies in legislation and administration. Examples of this function are the activities of voluntary agencies in advising American authorities as to regulations issued under the DP Act of 1948 and the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, and participation in the development of international conventions for the protection of migrants;

(d) Efforts to assure and expand legal protection to refugees and migrants by national and international agencies; and

(e) Protests against unwarranted, unjustified, unreasonable or illegal actions by Government or international officials.

3. AID TO GOVERNMENT AND TO INTERGOVERNMENTAL AGENCIES

Far more than most people realize, official agencies of government and official international bodies require the general backstopping which voluntary agencies can provide. In particular, such aid by voluntary agencies should include:

(a) Advising and counseling Government and international agencies;

(b) Guidance from the experience of voluntary agencies in devising new and better methods of administration and in developing better and more adequate programs;

(c) Aid in the actual processing under the program. For example, Mr. Frank L. Auerbach, Special Assistant to the Director of the Visa Office of the State Department, just last week sought the cooperation and help of the voluntary agencies in connection with the Refugee Relief Act by making the law known throughout the country and by helping those willing to sponsor refugees with the fulfillment of the law's requirements. Under certain parts of the DP orphan program, voluntary agencies represented almost an arm of the Government.

(d) Auxiliary and supplementary services to international agencies, as experience indicated in connection with UNRRA, IGCR and IRO; and

(e) Public support for the programs and for the necessary appropriations and finances.

4. PUBLIC LIAISON

As the freely chosen instrumentalities of large segments of the American people, voluntary agencies have a particularly important opportunity and responsibility—

(a) To act as molders of public opinion in the encouragement of public understanding of the problems and benefits of the program and of immigration in general;

(b) To act as two-way vehicles of public understanding between official agencies and the public at large.

(c) To develop full and adequate understanding within their own constituencies; and

(d) Cooperate with other voluntary agencies, both national and international.

5. LEADERSHIP

In a very real sense, this role is the most important of all. The leadership, initiative, vigilance, and resourcefulness of voluntary agencies is one of the most effective ways of assuring program success. This leadership responsibility includes, among others, the following:

(a) The pioneering role. Voluntary agencies haven generally been the first to recognize the problem and to point the way for national and international action;

(b) Awakening the conscience of people as to the problem, educating public opinion and winning public support for the necessary governmental and intergovernmental actions. Thus, for example, it is common knowelge that the DP Act was the result of the combined action of major voluntary agencies, and that leadership from American voluntary agencies contributed materially within the NGO Conference to the development of a set of basic principles for the protection of the rights and interests of migrants;

(c) Maintaining a constant alert to make justified criticism of official dereliction, inefficiency, or ineffectiveness, through the moral weight of informed advice and wise proposals for improvements and for new programs and services, and through keeping the American people advised; and

(d) Development and effectuation of humane, adequate, and less restrictive national and international programs for refugees and migrants.

This is my concept of the relationships between government and voluntary agencies in immigration, and of the responsibilities of American private effort. It is not an easy prescription, either for government or for the voluntary agencies. Nor must it be thought that the functions I have outlined are new, for in fact they represent, in one way or another, the basic reasons for the initiation of the immigration aid activities of many religious groups and of civic and social agencies.

Furthermore, it is important to note that the assumption of such responsibilities by one of the partners in this enterprise at any one time does not create a fixed and static rule. There must be give-and-take in the relationship, with changes depending upon circumstances and policies. In the United States it depends very largely on the degree to which the Government will remain the passive partner. I believe, however, that the full range of functions herein outlined is both necessary and feasible. To a considerable extent, it worked in the DP program, where the glimmerings were evident of this expanded concept of the functions necessary to make an immigration program succeed.

I am convinced that one of the major reasons for the success of the DP program was the magnificent and fruitful participation of voluntary agencies. As the DP Commission said in its final report, the DP Story:

"Without the voluntary agencies, there never would have been a displaced-persons program to begin with. Without their continuous and active participation, the program never would have been able to succeed."

Just as the voluntary agencies were "indispensable to the achievement of the purposes of the DP Act," so do I believe that they are indispensable to the achievement of the positive and affirmative purposes of any immigration program, national or international. Like any working partnership, the partners may reassign the duties among themselves, but somehow or other all of the necessary duties and functions must be performed by the partners together. To the extent that Government or international bodies cannot or will not perform any of the necessary functions in such a program, to that extent voluntary agencies have to make a greater contribution.

The people of the United States and their voluntary agencies as representatives of public conscience and public opinion must act as continuing guardians in the protection and improvement of the immigration and naturalization laws of the United States and in the development of necessary and suitable international actions for the protection of migrants and refugees. It is a big responsibility, but our American experience with voluntaryism as a supplement to Government action gives me complete confidence in the fullest performance of their duties by the American voluntary agencies interested in immigration.

Address of His Eminence Paul-Emile Cardinal Leger, National Convention of L'Union Saint-Jean-Baptiste

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 2, 1954

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to present to the Congress the remarks of Cardinal Leger, archbishop of Canada, delivered at the convention of L'Union Saint-Jean-Baptiste D'Amerique held in Springfield, Mass., from May 22 to May 26, 1954. Convention proceedings took place at St. Joseph's parish under the direction of Rev. Albert A. Aubertin, distinguished pastor of that church. Cardinal Leger addressed the delegates at a banquet in the Springfield Municipal Auditorium on Sunday, May 23.

Mr. Speaker, a reading of the cardinal's message points up the magnificent mind of the man who is the spiritual leader of Canadian Catholics. His words clearly demonstrate his great love of his religion, his devotion to French culture, his admiration for our own great Nation, the United States, his penetrating understanding of the terrible problems that face the world. How well the distinguished archbishop of Canada states the fact:

> Man's conduct in his dealings with others and the economic organization of the country must be codified in moral treatises and in systems of economics which will permit a generation of men to use matter without being enslaved by it.

If governments and the leaders of nations would stir their efforts in this direction, the world would once again be on the road of sanity and peace.

Mr. Speaker, I am thankful to Rev. Albert A. Aubertin and J. Henri Goguen, president of St. Jean Baptiste D'Amerique for permission to include Cardinal Leger's address in the Record:

Speech Given by His Eminence Paul Emile Cardinal Leger, Archbishop of Montreal, on the Occasion of the 18th Quadrennial Convention of L'Union St. Jean-Baptiste D'Amérique

The person principally responsible for tonight's impressive manifestation is not with us this evening. Could we not say that this triumph is, as it were, the flower which has grown on the rough branch of his sacrifice? He was the first to tell me of your sentiments; he was the first to manifest his joy when I told him that I would be able to accept your invitation. And then, for several long months, he suffered agony in a Montreal hospital. In His providence, God wanted to purify the joys we experience this evening by means of his long illness. I am sure that no one will object if I recall with emotion the memory of Msgr. Albert Bérubé.

Though I am the guest of the Union St. Jean-Baptiste d'Amérique, this evening, I cannot forget that I am also the guest of the spiritual leader of the diocese of Springfield. The Apostle St. John called the first bishops of Christianity angels. This was the appellation he used in the mysterious book of the Apocalypse when he wrote to the Angel of Ephesus, the Angel of Smyrna, the Angel of Pergamus. If the Apostle St. John came back to this earth, he would probably write to the Angel of Springfield in these terms: "I know thy works and thy labor; thou hast tried them who say they are apostles and are not; thou hast kept my commandments concerning patience, but I have this against thee that I, the Risen Lord, the principle of all things, feel a little weary after having followed thee during the day, and I see that the Angel of Springfield has very large wings and I, the Lord, look beyond to the region where he is able to fly. * * *"

Your Excellency, I am sure you will pardon me this flight into the realm of prophecy. All I wanted to do was to tell all those who are here or listening in at home, that the bishop of Springfield is a man who spares no effort in his apostolic work and whose sole preoccupation is the salvation of souls.

Your presence here with me is also a source of encouragement and reassurance for me. You also have come to tell these members of the Union St.-Jean-Baptiste d'Amérique that the work accomplished by their ancestors has not been in vain and that their present activities are valuable for the Nation to which they belong and for the church whose sons they are.

Gentlemen, age-old and powerful bonds which are stronger than death, to use the words of Holy Scripture, unite these two sections of land whose destinies are as opposed as their names: New France and New England. France passed here before England. The French-sounding names of some of your cities link the land itself to the splendors of the 17th century civilization as golden nails which fasten a precious tapestry to a bare wall: Lac Champlain, Marquette, Lamothe-Cadillac, Vincennes, Bourbonnais, Dubuque, Aubry.

France lost this empire whose frontiers extended to the four seas of the earth, and the little that was left of her spirit and of her heart was placed by one of these strokes of providence at which Bossuet marveled, under the custody of a watchful master, called England. Without knowing it, and perhaps without wanting it, England was to keep New France and lose New England. Amidst the vicissitudes of history and in an atmosphere of liberty two great nations were being formed on the North American Continent. The church took advantage of these new circumstances. Here we see in the folds of the Star-Spangled Banner the red and white furrows of the land in which she sowed; at home the church campaigned for the sacred right of liberty and taught the difficult requirements of loyalty.

This evening I would have liked to treat of a subject which could have had the proportions of your nation and of the church in your country. But one must not expect such an effort from a bishop who is struggling, amidst the concrete realities of a difficult apostolate, to accomplish a ministry which is beyond the capacities of one man. These lines will not be worthy of your archives, and I believe that I will abuse of the good will of the numerous visitors who have traveled the New England roads to come to hear me this evening.

But seeing you here around me this evening, gathered around the church which I represent, I experience a feeling of justifiable pride and the star of hope is shining a little brighter for me. Is it possible that God could have made a mistake when he reserved for us such a long and glorious chapter in the book of the history of this continent? It is this lesson of divine providence upon which I would like to meditate with you so that my passing among you may be the occasion for a spiritual renewal and an invitation to heroism without which nothing great and enduring is ever accomplished here on earth.

All kinds of things have been said concerning the existence of the French culture in America. Historians, economists, poets, optimists, and pessimists have analyzed and judged the situation very differently. It is not my intention to treat of the subject under all its different aspects. These aspects have been studied by remarkable men from here and from Canada. Some no longer believe in the survival of the French language in this country. Others judge the church in the light of this historical fact and talk about language and faith without bringing to their subject the necessary distinctions. Others, finally, propose solutions of the practical order and seek ways of integrating the French element into American life.

Gentlemen, my passage among you will not change in any way a situation of which I realize the complexity without being able to furnish the elements of the solution. My words, however, may perhaps put into the heart of one or of a few of you that sacred flame which gives the courage to save an inheritance which moreover, we never really possess until the moment when we have won it through our own efforts. No one accepts to fight in order to defend or to win a treasure whose value he ignores. The growing generation is losing contact with its source and no longer knows about its origin. Often, it even gets the impression that the requirements of its own survival become obstacles to its integration in the structures of the Nation.

Those who came over the border to settle here brought with them the roots which would nourish their life. They had crossed a bridge over which they were permitted to come back, and the close relations which existed between two French-speaking worlds were the manifestation of genuine life. Can I ever forget, for example, that my grandfather on my mother's side rests in the little cemetery of Crookston, Minn., and that my own mother was born in this land of America? Who is there among us who did not have an uncle from the United States whose visit was one of the highlights of our holidays? But the past is forever gone. French life in America cannot live on its past. It must be concerned with things of the present and find within itself the reasons for its survival or forever perish. What are these reasons and how can they be preserved? These are the thoughts upon which I would like to meditate with you this evening.

It is understood that the answers to the questions I have proposed will be of a strictly spiritual nature and that, on the other hand, the statements I will make will not be, at least in my mind, allusions which are apt to offend other ethnic or religious groups. Moreover, this is not the time for comparison with others but for self-examination. All peoples must ask themselves the questions which the Shakespearean hero, Hamlet, asked himself: "To be or not to be." The explosion of hydrogen or cobalt bombs are shaking all strongholds of civilization to their very foundations, and the destinies of nations are suddenly limited to the frontiers established by iron curtains.

The existence of the French culture in America was the pure and lofty expression of a true civilization and a push for liberty which was daily woven with strands of heroism which always sprang from faith in the spiritual values of Roman Catholicism. To deny this would be to oppose the irrefutable testimony of history. Why did not the founders of New France choose the temporal security which could be found behind the counters of a fur-trading post? It is because they were convinced that their mission was the answer to a call and they would have had a sentiment of culpability if the entire world had not heard their message. They announced to the rivers and forests, to the seas and deserts, the message which explains the world and which opens up the road to eternity. They had a vocation and this vocation was their only fortune and the only reason for their existence.

Champlain, Jolliet, Marquette, Iberville, LaVérendrye were wandering over this continent when, scrutinizing with his eagle eye the mysteries of the history of mankind, Bossuet wrote these words: "Remember that the long succession of particular causes which make and destroy empires depends on the secret commands of providence. From the heavens above, God holds the reins of all kingdom; He holds every heart in His hand; sometimes He checks passions, sometimes He gives them rein, and thus He moves the whole human race. It is in this way that God reigns over nations. Let us no longer speak of chance or luck; or else let us speak of them only as words with which we conceal our ignorance." (Discours sur l'Historie universelle, pt. III, ch. VIII.)

Gentlemen, the passing of those men through these regions which were then a vast wilderness is a living illustration of that great law of history which can be seen in the evident correlation of the accomplishment of the duties of the natural law and that of the supernatural mission of a people. They had not come here to get rich or to rest. They were not attracted by the golden sand of the beaches. The animals of the forest they left to nature hunters; they were not concerned with gold deposits. An unquenchable energy led them to the natural frontiers of their vast country with more rapidity than would present-day airplanes pushed by the force of their jet motors. Though the roads they opened were often tortuous, the goal for which they strived kept, in their wills and hearts, a recitude which seemed to eliminate distances.

There was also a shining light which has not ceased to illumine all the history of these three centuries of French culture in America. The first bishops, from Laval in Quebec to Blanchet in the mountains of Oregon, continued in this land the chapters of history which had been started by Remi of Rheims and Martin of Tours. In Montreal, Maisonneuve laid the foundations of a city where Marguerite Bourgeoys was to develop into a flower whose colors were to be as vivid as those of the rose of Lisieux and on the shores of the St. Lawrence, Madeleine de Verchères was convinced that she was not resisting the mysterious plans of providence when she imitated the virgin of Domrémy. All these things must have seemed very unimportant to the pirates of the high seas, to the adventure seekers, the gold hunters who thirsted for coarse pleasures.

It was Voltaire who was their spokesman when he ridiculed the men who had exchanged the beautiful country of France for a few acres of snow. And even if our present history, like all others, presents certain tragically sad pages where the forgetfulness of some and the refusal of others, obscured in many minds the realization of their religious vocation there have always been, at the time when men had begun to despair, readjustments which brought back harmony in the pursuit of the temporal and earthly goods of the Nation and the requirements of one religious vocation. For three centuries, it was heaven itself which saw to the erection of those high places of prayer which, today, are called Ste-Anne-de-Beaupré, Cap-de-la-Madeleine and St. Joseph's Shrine. A century ago, it was the pastors who transformed their rectories into classical colleges, those fortresses of human and Christian culture and, during the last 50 years, it has been our young people who have gone to the extremities of the world to make our country one of the great missionary countries of the present. Our 20 bishops at work in Asia and Africa, are a striking proof of this and their actual sufferings carry us back to the days of Brebeuf and Jogues: "Non fecit taliter omni nationi."

Civilization is more than the cultural expression of a language. The points of the pyramids of Egypt which emerge from the sandy waves of the desert are a testimony of strength but they are also a sign of death. Humanity would not gain anything by attempting to do the same. However, Plato's Banquet, Aristotle's Metaphysics, St. Thomas Aquinas' Summa and the bells of Chartres are always treasures of throbbing actuality. We believe that the existence of the French culture in America is one of those things which will not die out for it is a sign which is a sort of signpost along the road which humanity follows at a certain point in time and space, to arrive at its destiny. It is because the French culture is not the only one which exists in America that we can say this without fear of hurting anyone's feelings. Other peoples have done as much to make this world a better one. We claim the right, however, to say that the descendants of the French in this land of America, have never ceased working at the mission which God gave them. Claudel was the one who said that a Christian is a man who knows where he is going. Eyes which are set on eternal horizons never close as Sully Prud'homme says so well:

> "Ouverts à quelque immense aurore,
> De l'autre côté des tombeaux,
> Les yeux qu'on ferme voient encore."

True civilization is an explanation of the world and a search for the road which man must follow to meet his Creator. This effort of man to adapt himself to his natural milieu must be accomplished by the conquest of knowledge and by the organization of the social structure in which he lives. The technical discoveries of hidden forces which characterize our age constitute but one of the six elements of true civilization. Man's conduct in his dealings with others and the economic organization of the country must be codified in moral treatises and in systems of economics which will permit a generation of men to use matter without being enslaved by it and to impress into it a trace of the beauty of the all beautiful. When a lack of equilibrium appears, somewhere along the line of human activity, the existence of a civilization is jeopardized and on the gold-panelled walls of the palaces which conceal his base deeds, man can always distinguish the mysterious hand which traces the prophetic words: "Mane, Thecel, Phares."

The human environment produced by our technical knowledge is no longer adjusted to our nature and the gigantic work which man has entrusted to electronic brains has produced in him a weakness of judgment which make him incapable of tracing the path of his own destiny. Man is now dwarfed by the heights of the cities he has built and that is why he seeks to escape them by enclosing himself in basement cafes and nightclubs, by wandering around inside the fences of a concentration camp or by isolating himself from the rest of mankind behind iron curtains. Man has always had the temptation of abandoning his self-perfection to exterior agents of civilization thus attributing to technical discoveries a power which belongs to virtue alone. Christianity is therefore the summit of civilization in the world since it requires of those who practice it a constant effort of integration in the divine plan and a limitless progress along the lines of the most noble instincts that can be found in man—the very definition of true civilization. Alas. How many of our contemporaries no longer understand these words. Moreover the incredulous, in their supreme pride, celebrate their passing triumphs by the profanation of all that is most sacred. Children are corrupted. The marriage bond is broken. The sanctuary of the home is degraded. Lust has been made a divinity. Hatred is accepted. Denial of divinity has become a social system. Man wants to take the place of God.

Where, one day, will this world find the peace, the remedy and salvation which it seeks? Only a love which has learned to understand, a love which sacrifices itself can, by its sacrifice, save and transform and change our world. We have no desire to condemn those who make up wise plans to reform social structures and we offer our support to large organizations whose names always express one intention: that of forming an international community. However, there is something more essential and more urgent to be accomplished: to unite all hearts it is necessary to fill them with the love of God. St. Vincent de Paul did more to create a new world than systems thought up by wise economists; and international conferences would be more efficacious if they were animated by the spirit of a man such as Ozanam.

I am far from thinking, even for an instant, that the French language is necessary for such a reform of conscience and for the education of wills in the love of God. But I must state, however, and you must agree with me, that authentic sanctity does not usually cross the frontiers of a country whose civilization has a determined and particular mode of expression. For the last 50 years, the church has continued to pronounce infallible judgments concerning the lives of men and women of all classes and every condition in her canonizations. Most of them are sons and daughters of Italy, of Spain, and of France. This last country, for the past century especially, has become a land of predilection. France has been gratified by numerous heavenly visits—at Lourdes, La Salette, Paris, Pontmain, and Pellevoisin. Through the intervention of its queen, Heaven has poured forth its gifts in extraordinary and varied abundance into the souls of the humble Curé of Ars, of the shepherd girl of Lourdes, and of the virgin of the cloister of Lisieux.

Gentlemen, besides these facts, we must consider others. Today a large section of humanity is, on the religious level, without home or country. For it, the church is no longer the Father's house; God is no longer our Father; Jesus Christ is no longer our Saviour. Contemporary man no longer has the strength to consider the world in a divine light. He can no longer hear and appreciate the melody in which all the sounds of the earth are harmonized. He tries, however, to restore order and justice but only to attempt to win an earthly happiness which is the very negation of the essential and fundamental relations which must unite him to God and to his fellowmen.

What bitter disillusionment and what bitter irony we feel in the reading of the last pages of the history of humanity. Those who were greeted as precursors, teachers of mankind, and artisans of progress, suddenly appear as being the ones responsible for the crises which afflict us. A gigantic economic organization whose fantastic increase astonishes the world and upsets all traditional conceptions of economics, places immense numbers of people in a condition of life whose abject misery stirs up bloody revolutions and eventually leads millions of human beings to their death because of a systematic organization of hunger and undernourishment. In giant laboratories some men succeeded in harnessing the forces of nature, and then came a day when treason precipitated these same men to the lowest rung of the social ladder to associate them with criminals, while the rest of mankind trembled in fear of the large sums which were ignited in different places and whose burning light produced deserts instead of warming the hearts of men.

Gentlemen, this is precisely the role of Catholicism in all its historic realism and actuality. The church announces the message of salvation to a world which turns its back on the Cross and which turns to the muddy pools of the most abject sensuality. To put order and light into all this confusion, the vicar of Jesus Christ on earth never ceases to cry out his message concerning all the great questions of our day as well as the social problems of the world. He denounces and condemns injustice wherever it may be found. Wherever he discovers good, he acknowledges it and joyfully draws attention to it. He has also declared, often in recent times, that he places his choicest expectations in the young and flourishing church in America. Let us not forget, however, that civilization is actually going through a critical period and that it is always in times of crisis that the wills and hearts of men are put to the test. The brave and the weak separate when humanity comes to such crossroads. It is during such periods that nations must make decisions on which their providential vocation depends.

If we wish to retain the French culture in America, it is because we firmly believe that it has served, not as a symbol, but as the living and historical expression of great fidelity to the tasks of the Kingdom of Heaven, in answer to the call of God. Our acts of fidelity are not rooted in the dry earth of mere temporal and economic preoccupations and that is why they cannot be considered as expressions of a wild and narrow patriotic fanaticism. We firmly believe that if our people preserve the strong discipline of moral law in the sanctuary of the home, if they accumulate the riches of their own culture, if each descendant of French parentage in America is a living example of sobriety, thrift, purity, devotedness, generosity, and charity, then, the French element here will be one of the numerous elements which God uses to make His creative work more perfect and His redemption more efficacious.

Gentlemen, the call comes from God but let us not forget that the answer must be given by each one of us. Our past will be valuable to us only in the measure in which it becomes a stimulus which helps us along the roads of redemption. There are pressing needs in every field of activity. If the descendants of the French in America take hold of the tools which the church places in the hands of those to whom she entrusts the building of the city of God, they can once more make the requirements of their existence as a nation coincide with those of their supernatural vocation. Let us resolutely accept the austerities imposed upon our individual lives by the yoke of the cross by being chaste, sober, and laborious. May our homes be schools of virtue, of courage, of self-control. May our community life be the expression of the love which is in our hearts. When we take a stand in social questions, may our decisions be guided by the teachings of the Holy Father. Thus, we shall take up our place in the divine plan once again.

In Canada, the constitution drawn up by the fathers of confederation permits all citizens to exercise the rights we have just enumerated. If conscience imposes such difficult duties on each individual, the constitution of a country must also oblige other citizens to recognize these obligations as sacred and inalienable rights. It is from ocean to ocean that a Canadian can enjoy the exercise of these rights and it would surely be a sign of ignorance of Canadian history to limit the influence of the French culture to the sole frontiers of the Province of Quebec. In the United States as well, the French element is protected by a Constitution which has made liberty the foundation stone of national life.

In these tragic times, nations must not waste the riches of true civilization which they possess. The church accepts the terrible lessons of history. It can assist at the death of a nation, but the church also knows that the mystery of the cross always precedes the splendors of Easter morning. The technical expression of a civilization will pass and the world which will rise out of the ruins will again be marked by the sign of the cross. Those who will have answered the call of a God who governs the universe will be entrusted with tasks as glorious as those of the discoverers of this continent—our fathers according to the flesh and the fathers of our faith.

Portuguese American War Veterans Memorial Banquet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 2, 1954

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an address I delivered at the Portuguese American War Veterans memorial banquet, dedicating memorial room and plaque honoring seven boys of Portuguese extraction who made the supreme sacrifice while serving our country during World War II. The Memorial Banquet was held on May 29, 1954.

The address follows:

The United States is the one, great, international Nation.

Where all peoples work and live together in mutual respect and in dedication to the principle of human brotherhood.

Where race and creed do not act as walls separating us but serve to enrich our national culture.

From all lands we draw this strength.

Tonight we honor the contributions of your community to the defense of the United States during World War II.

Portugal, a small nation in territory and in population, has given far more than its share to religion and civilization.

Names like Vasco da Gama and Magellan are known to school children all over the world.

As a result Portugal has become famous as a nation of explorers in every field of man's experience.

Her sons and daughters have been high among the world's great navigators, reaching out through uncharted seas, meeting and overcoming dangers to discover new opportunities for the rest of mankind.

From the crows-nests of their frail ships they always looked forward to far horizons, going forward through calm and storm.

They plotted their course by the stars, with faith in God and in themselves.

The crews change.

But the voyage goes on.

Centuries pass.

New dangers threaten our freedom ship.

Pirates attack, trying to capture us so that they may enslave us.

They are beaten off, once in 1918, again in 1945.

Seven young men from the *City of Peabody*, proudly bearing names of Portuguese origin, fought and died to keep us free in the massive battle that ended 9 years ago.

In some oriental countries they believe that a warrior who dies in battle goes straight to paradise.

In the Western World we take a more realistic view of this stern problem.

Our people hate war, but they do not retreat before it when it is forced upon them.

War is hideous, but courage is noble.

And when we must fight to protect freedom against tyranny, we reserve our highest tribute for those who give their lives in defense of our liberties.

Their names are inscribed on the roll of honor, and we perpetuate the memory of their devotion in our hearts.

On earth and in heaven there is no greater glory than that earned by those who live and die for the truths in which they believe.

Some men die bravely, following the wrong leadership in support of evil itself.

We feel sorry that their manhood did not serve a better cause.

The pity is that their courage was not joined with intelligence and the divine spirit that teaches the brotherhood of man to turn upon the aggressors who lead them down the inevitable road to disaster.

We honor tonight men of a different breed.

Those whose physical courage was fortified by moral purpose, fighting not only to preserve our freedoms but for the right of Germans and Japanese, Chinese and Russians, to choose their own form of government and to join with us as partners in peace and progress.

These seven men from your neighborhood did more than offer themselves in our defense, for life cannot be confined to a fortress and can never be regarded as a mere holding operation.

They fought to open the way, even for the enemy once he was shorn of his despotic leadership.

Witness our treatment of Germany and Japan.

They, too, were liberated.

Under the stimulating opportunities of freedom they have made remarkable progress.

So that today we feel close to their peoples and will no doubt join with them to protect what we now share.

Proving how the average man or woman, no matter where he or she lives, will respond when he or she is given a chance to improve themselves in a society where all enjoy equality.

Our Armed Forces conquered Nazi tyranny and Japanese imperialism, and thereby released their captive peoples.

After World War II ended we relaxed.

We thought the danger was over.

We went back to living as we had before, back to the narrow circle of our job, our home, our city, the family car, and television.

Forgetting the rest of the world.

It did not last long.

Another enemy was getting ready, building guns, and tanks, and planes, scheming and scaring and forcing small nations to surrender, filling the air and the press and the mouths of foolish people with propaganda that began to divide and weaken the free world.

Strange names began to appear in the papers—Iran, Yugoslavia, Korea, Formosa, Indochina. Remote places, hard to find on the map, that had little to do with more familiar objects that we could see with our own eyes, like the church on the corner, the school down the street, the police officer nodding and smiling, as friend greets friend near the Paul Revere Trust Co., where folks are going into cash their paychecks.

The May processions are over.

Parents are just about ready to buy that new dress that Barbara will wear at her graduation.

The rains have stopped for a while, we hope.

Everyone is making personal, private plans for the summer vacation—to leave all cares behind and enjoy a couple of weeks of sun and fresh air at the beach or the mountains.

Yes; the United States is the best place in which to live, if we can only keep it that way, making it better as we go along.

Why not?

We, the people, run things here, don't we?

Sure, if the others let us.

What "others"?

Those who fear and hate freedom because free people would never tolerate their lust for power, and so they are working to drive humanity back into slavery and make them mechanical animals to serve the new and cruel aristocracy of communism.

Power is a monster when it grinds people down into hopeless drudgery, completely regimenting their lives, locking them up in fear and despair, coming in between them and God, turning them into faceless caricatures of human beings.

This is the enemy who, day by day, is enslaving more helpless victims whom he will eventually turn against us.

There are no signs of them on our main streets yet.

All is well as far as the eye can see.

But the eye cannot see under ground.

It cannot detect conspiracy.

And the warnings it reads from time to time in our newspapers have the unreal quality of "make believe" and to be put aside and forgotten as easily as the newspaper falls to the floor when we doze off to sleep, to dream of tomorrow, of an increase in pay, of a promotion for the extra work we have done, of how people will envy us when they learn of our success, of that second car the family is talking about, and of all the things, both seen and unseen, that our humankind secretly long for.

Communism does not dream.

In fact, it never sleeps.

Shift by shift, around the clock, it is plotting and working and pressing against the ramparts of freedom and its easygoing defenders.

It is the manmade hurricane of the twentieth century sweeping nations from their moorings out into the violent sea where alternate calm and storm deceive then batter the confused navigators and ships go down because the fearful crews will not secure the hatches and repair the leaks so that the vessel will ride out the storm.

Off again, on again, but relentless in its dedicated purpose to conquer us—that is the Communist enemy at our gates.

But Indochina is so far away.

That is what we think and perhaps want to believe to put off doing the things that must be done.

No one is pleased to see a honeymoon come to an end.

Being human we are inclined to think of our own convenience and contentment first. God knows we desire peace above all else.

But wishing won't make it so.

These seven young men from your community knew, far more than any of us who have come to honor their sacrifice, the final and complete price that must be paid by a few to stop the fanatical tide of tyranny.

Even as some small garrisons today, cut off in their tiny forts in Indochina, wait for the human sea charge of Communist armies that will soon and certainly overwhelm them in a Red and bloody tide.

These seven young men knew that someday we must learn to know and in time. So that we will take the steps to save ourselves through strength from the supreme sacrifice that they were called upon to make.

We are met here on a solemn occasion to dedicate a memorial room and a plaque in their honor.

Our tribute must be as constant as their devotion was complete.

Not for an hour nor a day, but as long as we shall breathe.

The time is too late and the circumstances too dangerous for any American to live for himself alone.

Only by united effort can we survive.

There is no place for the small in spirit, the selfish in purpose, for those who cannot see beyond their noses, because they will not dare to live as freemen should, with high and generous resolve, believing in, and helping one another.

The seven young heroes have gone to their eternal reward.

You and I carry on for them as members of the crew, fighting the storm of communism. Striving to bring the ship that bears humanity's hopes toward the discovery of peace, with justice.

We shall succeed if—if we keep faith with these our heroic dead.

Address by Hon. Oveta Culp Hobby, Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STUYVESANT WAINWRIGHT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1954

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare made a brilliant and thought-provoking speech at the Waldorf-Astoria in New York on Wednesday, May 26, at the annual Republican State committee dinner. I believe that her wise and kindly words of wisdom should be brought to the attention of as many people as possible irregardless of partisan politics.

I am pleased to insert her speech in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

Before I begin my remarks may I pay tribute to the many men from this great State who are serving the Nation in Government.

If I may, I should like to name a few of them. The list is not, by any means, complete, but it illustrates the very important contribution that New York is making to the Nation.

You will join with me, I know, in salute to John Foster Dulles, Herbert Brownell, James Mitchell, Senator Irving M. Ives, and the outstanding Republican Members of Congress from New York, many of whom are with us tonight.

Eighteen months ago a majority of the people of the United States reasserted—the fundamental principle of democracy—a simple fact simply stated by Abraham Lincoln in his first inaugural address.

He said, "This country belongs to the people who inhabit it."

Another great American enunciated another great principle of democracy when he said:

"The public judgment will correct false reasonings and opinions on a full hearing of all parties."

I myself would especially emphasize that part of the sentence which says "all parties."

The name of that great American was Thomas Jefferson. Lincoln and Jefferson were everlastingly right.

This country does belong to the people who inhabit it.

Not to highly placed members of the Government.

Not to the men and women of the Congress.

Not to the managers of business; nor to the managers of labor. Not to the tax collectors. Not to the Democrats alone, nor the Republicans alone.

And not to the 5-percenters—whatever their party. One test of honest, political administration—as the people of New York certainly know—is to root out those who abuse the public trust wherever they are found.

With the firm conviction that the country belongs to the people, a majority of Americans in 1952 reached a very important decision. They decided, as was their right, to change the course their Government was taking and reassert their sovereignty.

The first big step in this historic change took place in the Republican victory of November 1952—a victory that could have been achieved only under the leadership of a great and good American—Dwight D. Eisenhower.

He led his countrymen and women—as he has led them before in a crusade that has established a firm beachhead beside the somewhat muddied waters of the Potomac.

But no crusade ever achieved success within the confines of its first beachhead. No crusade remains a crusade, standing still.

And no one was more aware of this than the President, himself. No one in his entire administration was more eager to get on with the business at hand. At the same time, there was no one who realized more fully the great importance of the second step that had to be taken in the crusade—the buildup of new recruits, of added reserves; the careful buildup of strength that must precede the final break-through to victory.

Only a few hours after the 1952 election beachhead had been won, the President-elect was making and executing the basic plans to bring that needed strength to this crusade.

This country, in the short year that followed, heard those plans. The people began to see and feel their effect.

On January 4, 1954, President Eisenhower spoke to the Nation in advance of his state of the Union message, briefly and modestly outlining the accomplishments of his administration to that time.

Abroad, the end of bloodshed in Korea.

Abroad, the defenses of the free world against Communist aggression strengthened everywhere.

Aboard, a foreign policy tirelessly forged to make it possible for us first to earn and then to hold the initiative in foreign affairs.

At the U. N. a manifestation of our refusal to be pushed or bullied and of our willingness to negotiate from the premise of honesty, frankness, and faith.

At the U. N. a bold and humane plan proposed to all the world to harness the forces of atomic energy to the peaceful service of mankind.

At home, new appropriations for Government spending reduced and taxes on the way down.

At home, the end of the inflationary spiral that had cheapened every dollar we earned and robbed every pension payment our people received.

At home, unnecessary controls on our economy eliminated.

At home, the return of a sense of dignity and integrity in Government.

Yes; in one short year following the inauguration of Dwight D. Eisenhower, the people of American began to recapture the sense of self-government—the feeling that can only come to free people that are setting their own course.

From his delivery of his state of the Union message on January 8 until the present time, the American people have seen the Eisenhower program for national strength and unity and international peace and cooperation presented, item by item, to the Congress.

The state of the Union message included the strongest possible recommendations for legislation:

To continue military assistance abroad, but to reduce foreign economic aid;

To provide for greater mobility of our defense forces with emphasis on air and atomic power;

To authorize the St. Lawrence seaway construction;

To intensify our civil defense facilities;

To deprive of citizenship rights those convicted of participating in the Communist conspiracy;

To revise the tax system so as to remove inequities from the small taxpayer, to encourage small business, and to stimulate the economy.

In quick succession there followed the Eisenhower messages on farm problems, on labor, on social security, health and welfare, the budget message, the message on housing, and the economic message with provisions, among many other things:

To authorize construction of 140,000 public-housing units over the next 4 years;

To help families in low income brackets buy home through long-range, low down-payment loans from the Federal Housing Authority;

To help local communities, by increased loans and grants, to clear slum areas and rehabilitate submarginal neighborhoods;

To extend unemployment insurance to cover 10 million more men and women;

To increase and size and extend the duration of unemployment payments;

To direct Government action toward stabilizing the economy by whatever lawful means any situation may require.

As all of you may easily imagine, we, in the Department, are especially proud of that portion of the Eisenhower program to which it has been our privilege—always under the warm and sympathetic and understanding guidance of the President—to contribute.

I hope you will forgive the pride with which I refer to the establishment of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare as unmistakable evidence of the emphasis placed on the human side of Government by President Eisenhower. I am proud, too, that the President's program includes many legislative proposals covering the efforts of this Department to fulfill its obligation to all the people of the country.

In this gathering, I think it is particularly appropriate to note that the historic actions leading to the establishment of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare originally had been suggested by Republican Presidents. Most of the units that now compose the Department were first founded by Republican Presidents and Republican Congresses.

The Republican Party may rightfully claim credit for establishing the Office of Education in 1867 and the Children's Bureau in 1912. Republicans were also responsible for the first Federal food-and-drug law in 1906 and for starting a program of grants to the States for vocational rehabilitation of disabled civilians in 1920.

The elected officials responsible for these pioneering steps were working squarely in the mainstream of Republican tradition. The Republican Party was founded a century ago to work for human freedom and betterment. Its record in behalf of the well-being and dignity of the American family is one of which we may all be proud.

President Eisenhower did not pay lip-service to the traditions of his party by simply setting up the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and then letting it go at that. He gave real meaning to his historic act by recommending to Congress a series of forward-looking, practical measures designed to enhance the welfare of all the American people.

These recommendations are among the guideposts that I feel are so essential to our future progress.

Each of these measures is important to you as Americans, as parents, and, as the President has pointed out, as heirs to the Republican tradition.

The President has asked Congress to expand and improve the old-age and survivors insurance system, commonly called social security. Congressman DANIEL A. REED, of your own State, who is chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, has introduced a bill to accomplish this aim.

Social security is a very personal thing. For millions, it spells the hope of independence in their later years. It provides other millions with the assurance that, in case of the death of the family breadwinner, money will be coming in to help keep the home intact.

The measure put forward by Congressman REED, with the endorsement of the President, would greatly strengthen and enhance the social-security program. It would increase the amounts of individual benefit payments and would provide coverage for millions of Americans who, until now, have been excluded from participation in the program. To the people of New York State alone, I might mention, Congressman REED's bill would mean that over 700,000 people who are drawing old-age and survivors benefits would receive an additional $50 million in benefits during the coming year.

Another phase of family security—health security—is properly a matter of concern to the Department. One part of this program deals directly with health insurance. Legislation has been proposed to encourage private, voluntary health insurance organizations to extend their coverage to more people and to enable those who already have some protection to obtain more protection against the rising cost of medical care.

The President emphasized the Nation's needs for more medical research, for more hospitals, nursing homes, diagnostic clinics, and more rehabilitation centers. He proposed that Congress simplify and improve the present system of Federal grants to States for their own public health work.

The President, you will recall, also spoke of the Nation's needs in education.

"Youth," he said, "our greatest resource—is being seriously neglected in a vital respect. The Nation as a whole is not preparing teachers or building schools fast enough to keep up with the increase in our population.

"The preparation of teachers as, indeed, the control and direction of public education policy, is a State and local responsibility. However, the Federal Government should stand ready to assist States which demonstrably cannot provide sufficient school buildings. * * *"

Three proposals—for State conferences and, subsequently, a White House Conference on Education; a program of cooperative research on specific national problems; and establishment of a National Advisory Committee—have been recommended to Congress.

The President also urged the Congress to make it possible for State rehabilitation agencies to help greater numbers of handicapped men and women return to a self-supporting way of life—a threefold increase.

I know you will agree with me that these legislative proposals, which touch the hearts and the homes of our country, are inspiring guideposts in our crusade—concerned as they are, with the intimate problems, with the principal purposes, and with the great hopes that fill all our lives.

Any one of these proposals, once enacted into law, would move our people closer to the common goal of a healthy, happy life.

Collectively, they would build up and maintain our most precious national asset—our human resources, the vigor and the vitality of all our people.

These, then are the highlights of the Eisenhower program. Through it all, you will discover, runs this administration's conviction that where the slum, the out-of-date highway, the inadequate school system, the loss of a job, the need for health protection—where any of these penalizes a single one of our citizens, everyone of us is also penalized, set back a step of two on the road to a better life.

This, I repeat, is the Eisenhower program. It is today the same program that won the endorsement of millions of American voters of every political persuasion—Republicans, Democrats, Independents—18 short months ago.

It is the same program that brought faith anew to a Nation on Inauguration Day in January of 1953. And it is the same program that gave us fresh hope when it was put into specific terms in the President's messages to Congress during January and February of this year.

It is the people's program—designed, from start to finish, as President Eisenhower has said, to secure our country against the threats of our time and to do for our people those things they cannot do as well for themselves.

It is a program, once activated, that will attract new and willing recruits to our crusade.

It is a program that today cries out for action—from Republicans, Democrats, and Independents, alike. Until that action comes, it represents—for this administration and for the Republican Party—a debt and a duty of unparalleled magnitude to the people of America—Republicans, Democrats, and Independents who voted for the President.

In the hands of the Republican Party lies the responsibility for this leadership. We cannot discharge our obligations nor fulfill our promises with castles in the sky, castles anchored only to dreams and visions that move backward and forward, keeping time with some political metronome. The President and members of his administration will continue to work unceasingly for the full enactment of this program.

Proud as we justly are of what has thus far been accomplished, we must move on if we are to meet the final challenge that remains before us.

The beachhead is now secure. The buildup is now complete. We have come, after 18 months, to the all-important breakthrough—the time to move out, boldly and confidently, toward the brave and inspiring goals which have been outlined by our President.

There is no major disagreement as to our primary objectives. We all want an America that is free, peaceful, prosperous, united and strong. We want a land of ever-increasing opportunity, of constantly rising living standards, of freedom from want and fear. We want to close as rapidly as possible the great chasm between the ideals we as a nation hold and the realities of our daily existence.

We can do all of these things—and more—if each of us will bear his fair share of the battle.

It is to this supreme task that all of us must devote ourselves in the coming months, here and in other communities and States across the Nation.

All of us working for the Eisenhower administration make up the vanguard of what must become a great thrust forward toward new heights of social, spiritual, and economic well-being. No effort, however small, is unimportant, if it brings us one step closer to the achievement of that goal. No effort, however great, is too much, if it brings us one step closer to the achievement of that goal.

This is the time to strengthen the bright promise of Inauguration Day, 1953, the time to restore the vigor of our support for the administration's policies, and the time to dedicate ourselves anew to the building of a better America, an Amerca that belongs to the people who inhabit it.

In closing, may I read to you the final words of President Eisenhower's 1954 Lincoln Day address, words which I believe all men and women of good will will be better for rethinking.

He said: "To be dedicated to a single purpose—the freedom, strength, prosperity, and peace of America—and to strive with all that's in us to advance the welfare of her citizens—that is the forward way we must seek for America."

Thank you for the privilege of being here.

Italian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 11, 1954

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, by nature, Italians are individualists. Their strongly developed sense of independence is reflected in their approach to Government and to all problems of life.

An Italian will cooperate voluntarily.

He can never be driven.

In honoring Italian Independence Day, we pay tribute to its people.

No nation has had greater experience with various forms of government. From tyranny to anarchy, they have tried and tested all types, and, finally, have chosen responsible representative government—beholden to the people—as the best political instrument for achieving progress with justice.

Individual expression flowered among the Italians.

It resulted in magnificent achievements that, in some fields have never been equalled since.

In art and science, and in every activity where the human mind and spirit work unfettered, the Italians have proved that only under freedom can man go forward.

Independence releases the God-given talents of all the people. In contrast to the authoritarian system which limits vision, expression, and performance. Where richness of the many, is imprisoned by the harsh and narrow dictates of the few.

With the wisdom distilled from long experience, the people of Italy know that, although man comes from dust and returns to dust, during life he is animated by a divine spirit that makes him more than clay.

The spirit that is eternal.

No state can mold him as if he were putty.

Without independence, he is as good as dead.

So long as he breathes he will resist all efforts to reduce him to the role of an obedient and unquestioning slave.

It makes no difference whether brute force, or the more subtle tyranny of brainwashing is applied against him, the spirit in man will triumph over his oppressors.

It was ever so. And will be. Today and tomorrow as well as yesterday.

It is encouraging to note, and never forget, the passionate love of liberty that animates the people of Italy.

Their Independence Day is similar to ours—uniting both nations in a common cause.

With admiration for the superb contributions that Italy has made to civilization, with gratitude toward our fellow-citizens of Italian ancestry for the way in which they have strengthened our own traditions of freedom, and with confidence that the people of Italy will make democracy triumphant in the struggle with communism in their own country, we celebrate Italian Independence Day.

Echo From a Bloody Past

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. R. GROSS
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 2, 1954

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the following is a timely warning from one of the great newspapers of this country, the Omaha Evening World-Herald:

ECHO FROM A BLOODY PAST

Twice within the memory of a generation now living the United States has been drawn into world wars.

In each case the drift toward war was so slow as to be almost imperceptible.

First the American people were persuaded, emotionally, to choose sides. Then the Government in Washington took a series of steps "short of war." Presently, in each instance, there came the overt incident which lit the fuse, and the United States found itself engaged in a grim and bloody conflict.

This well-known history is brought to mind by a New York Times dispatch from Washington.

The Times is regarded by some Washington officials as a national newspaper. It is often used as a medium for floating trial balloons. Whether the present dispatch was inspired in that way has not been revealed, but it has some of the earmarks.

The article related that the Joint Chiefs of Staff in Washington "are now discussing various new contributions to the war in Indochina."

These possible "contributions" include the sending of more American planes to Indochina, the training of native pilots and fighting men by United States officers, and "exploring the possibility of raising an international corps of pilots to enlist with the French or Vietnamese and be financed indirectly by the United States."

Remember the destroyers-for-Britain deal?

Remember "Give us the tools and we will finish the job"?

In each of those cases the people were solemnly assured that the surest way to keep the peace was "to help our friends." Then came the explosion.

Whether your Uncle Sam is following the same road now is known only to those who can read the future. But the scenery has a decidedly familiar look. And the arguments cited in the trial balloon referred to above—if a trial balloon it was—sound about the same as those that were heard in the land 14 years ago and 37 years ago.

In this instance we judge that a majority of the American people have no wish whatever to get mixed up in a war in Indochina. Greatly as they resent the Communist aggression in that theater, they realize that Indochina is in truth an exploited colony of France, and that America will not enhance her prestige or stature by fighting in defense of that obsolete colonialism.

The question, however, is not whether the American people want to fight in Indochina, but rather whether they will be dragged into it by unwise and overeager global diplomacy. Those who have firm convictions would do well to keep a close eye on what is being done in the Pentagon.

People of Asia Will Never Submit to Domination

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 1, 1954

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, on his regular broadcast last night over the Mutual Broadcasting System, Mr. Frank Edwards had as his guest Bishop J. Waskon Pickett, the senior bishop of the Methodist Church in India.

Bishop Pickett is a veteran of 43 years in southeast Asia, who knows Asians—their hopes and aspirations—and who knows their problems.

He has given a succinct and clear-cut picture of the causes of our present difficulties in that area of the world. I commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

In view of the extreme seriousness of the situation in southeast Asia, I have invited to our microphone tonight a gentleman who is well qualified to give you an eye witness account of what has brought about the present state of affairs (in the Far East). He was a close personal friend of Gandhi for 25 years, has played an important part in the creation of the relief committee credited with saving a hundred thousand lives in India and Pakistan. A missionary in southeast Asia for 43 years he has just returned from that area. For a first-hand report we hear now from the senior bishop of the Methodist Church in India, Bishop J. Waskon Pickett:

"At the end of World War II, America was the hero Nation to the people of Asia as they achieved their independence. But we have forfeited much of their former high regard for us. We have made four major blunders: First, we have talked a great deal about America leading the world, whereas those Asian peoples wanted to go forward together with us. They were prepared to accept our counsel as long as we did not boast about it. In order to understand their thinking we must realize that the people of Asia could not see much difference between our boast of world leadership and Hitler's boast of world domination.

"The second blunder was when America began to offer arms and ammunition wherever they thought there was a chance of people accepting it and using it to the ultimate advantage of America. This policy shattered their respect for us as a peace-loving Nation. It was a policy that was in direct conflict with our traditional opposition to war.

"Our third blunder was an outgrowth of the second. I am referring to our military pact with Pakistan which was officially announced a few weeks ago. By furnishing arms and ammunition to Pakistan we have antagonized India and other countries in Asia. It has added fresh fuel to Communist propaganda against us in Burma, India, and Nepal. It has spread alarm and stimulated anti-American feeling throughout southeast Asia. We have made the mistake of arming a nation which India especially fears. History shows that India has been ravaged repeatedly by Moslem armies out of what is now Pakistan.

"When at long last we became concerned about the Communist expansion in Indochina we committed blunder number 4 in the manner in which we proposed to stop that expansion. Our Secretary of State flew to London and then to Paris and publicly presented proposals for a southeast Asia treaty organization—without prior consultation with any Asian country. This infuriated people of friendly nations of southeast Asia whose cooperation was essential if we were to succeed.

"The crisis in Asia has been precipitated because our leaders have failed to realize that the people of Asia are willing to be friends if they can be equals, but they will never again submit to domination."

Eighth Anniversary of the Republic of Italy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES R. HOWELL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1954

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, today we mark the eighth anniversary of the founding of the Republic of Italy. Founded in the aftermath of World War II, with its vast social and economic disorder, the republic has risen like the fabled Phoenix from the ashes.

The years since 1946 have not been easy ones. Internally, the process of orderly government has been seriously hampered by the presence of a strong Communist faction. Despite the frequent attempts of the Communists to sabotage the government, I believe it can be said of the republic that two outstanding characteristics of her post-war development are noteworthy. First the Italian people have decided to remain within the western bloc of democratic nations. Second, the Republic of Italy can be accounted a military and economic asset to the NATO alliance.

In any salute to the Italian Republic it is quite appropriate to mention the great influence exerted on the struggling republic by Americans of Italian descent. Our fellow citizens, during the desperate days following the war, gave generously of food and clothing so needed to maintain the spirit of the Italian people.

Nor should it ever be forgotten that along with the material gifts went constant exhortation to families and friends to return to the democratic ideals of the great Guiseppe Garibaldi. To a very large extent the presence of the Italian Republic in the democratic ranks is due to the efforts of the Italian-Americans. In paying tribute to our young sister republic, let us also pay tribute to the firm democratic ideals of the sons and daughters of Italy whom we are proud to call fellow Americans.

Negotiating From Weakness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 13, 1954

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting at this point in the RECORD an article that appeared in the Wall Street Journal by Mr. William Henry Chamberlin, in which he comments on the present situation that exists at the Geneva Conference:

NEGOTIATING FROM WEAKNESS—THE WEST'S FAILURE SO FAR TO DEVELOP UNITY AND STRENGTH MAY MAKE GENEVA STILL ANOTHER LESSON IN FUTILITY

(By William Henry Chamberlin)

Unless all the signs are deceptive, the Geneva Conference is likely to be remembered in history as a new proof of the futility of trying to negotiate from weakness.

Well-meaning sentimentalists may believe that there is some magic in a conference table, which will soothe or charm away all international differences. But this is not the teaching of experience, especially in dealing with such tough and relentless adversaries as the Soviet or Chinese Communists. International conferences between representatives of opposing governments are likely to produce positive results only if one of two conditions is fulfilled. Either there must be a process of bargaining, of give and take. Or one side must be able to convince the other that a persistence in aggressive courses will bring consequences sufficiently unpleasant to offset the possible gains of aggression.

Both these methods had been discounted before the Geneva meeting got underway. Great Britain and France had no bargaining counters of any consequence themselves. The British Government had already given Mao Tse-tung's regime diplomatic recognition and assurances of a desire to trade, despite many insults and injuries which the Chinese Reds had heaped on British subjects. There was nothing more to offer. French diplomatic recognition is a minor consideration to Peiping, certainly not an inducement to forego the fruits of the heavily increased aid to the Viet Minh Communists.

NO AMERICAN GIFTS

There might have been (no one can say with certainty whether there would have been) some bargaining value in American recognition, support for the membership of the Red Chinese regime in the United Nations and offers of trade and credits. There was some wistful hoping in London and Paris that the United States would bring some such gifts to the Geneva conference table.

But this possibility was ruled out from the beginning by the state of American public opinion. Neither Mr. Dulles nor any other Secretary of State could have survived politically a policy which would have been widely denounced as appeasement. Nor is there any strong probability that Red China could have been bought off from its dreams of political and economic expansion into southeast Asia.

With efforts to placate Red China by American concessions ruled out, there remained another possibility of successful negotiation at Geneva. This would have been to impress the Soviet Union and Communist China with a show of Western unity, strength, and firmness. Mr. Dulles did his best to achieve results along this line. But up to the present time he has been unable to overcome the hesitations and misgivings in London and Paris.

It is not easy to piece together all the exchanges of views that took place between Washington, London, and Paris on the eve of the Geneva meeting, when the political crisis of the impending conference was aggravated by the military crisis of Dien Bien Phu. But perhaps the decisive blow to any hope of impressing the Communist participants in the conference with fear of united action was Prime Minister Churchill's statement in the House of Commons on April 27: "Her Majesty's Government are not prepared to give any undertakings about United Kingdom military action in Indochina in advance of the results of Geneva."

COMMUNIST EXPLOITATION

This very statement probably contributed much to predetermining "the results of Geneva." With no bribes to placate them, and no affirmation of resolute combined action to deter them, there would seem to be no good reason why the rulers of Red China should not exploit a favorable political and military situation and step up aid to the Vietminh forces to whatever degree may be necessary to insure complete victory.

Some Americans, perplexed by statements from high administration sources which have not always been completely consistent and irritated by evidences of weakness and cross-purposes in foreign capitals, may be tempted to ask why we should be concerned about the fate of Indochina and of southeast Asia generally. We never had and do not have imperialist interests in that part of the world.

But the time for such questioning is past. Maybe it would have been wiser for the United States never to have taken the Philippines and never to have tried to play the role of a big power in Asia. But our involvement in that part of the world was determined beyond turning back when we challenged Japan's pretensions to hegemony, crushed Japanese military power—and found ourselves inheriting some difficult and unforeseen burdens as a result of the Communist sweep in China and the increase in Soviet power in the Far East.

We are now bound by treaty to defend many vulnerable spots in Asia which may become targets of Soviet or Chinese Communist imperialism. Among these are South Korea, Japan, the Philippines, Australia, and New Zealand. We have a strong moral obligation to support the Chinese Nationalist Government in Formosa.

THE IMPORTANCE OF SOUTHEAST ASIA

Our ability to fulfill our defense treaties, and the obligation to protect Formosa, which was assumed by the Truman administration after the invasion of South Korea, would be very adversely affected if first Indochina and then other states in southeast Asia would fall under hostile Communist rule. Japan's precarious economic balance might be upset altogether by such a development.

That is why President Eisenhower and Secretary Dulles, despite setbacks and disappointments, have little if any alternative to the course which they are following: Trying somewhere to find and stabilize a political and military line that can be held, by joint action, on the mainland of southeast Asia.

Steel Engraving Best and Safest Method To Print Bonds, Currency, Stamps, etc.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1954

Mr. HAGEN of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, in January of this year the Bureau of Engraving and Printing decided to print $25 savings bonds by the offset-printing method. As Members of the House know, all Government bonds had previously been done by the steel-engraving process which no counterfeit genius could duplicate, although many of them have tried it. On the other hand, offset printing can be duplicated by any boob with a good camera. Any reputable offset printer will vouch for the accuracy of this statement.

The offset printing of Government bonds establishes a dangerous precedent. If followed through to a logical conclusion, I do not see why the Government does not run off all bonds and currency by the offset-printing method. In fairness to the Treasury Department, which has jurisdiction over the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, I want to point out that their answer to this problem is economy. It is a fake and dangerous economy; it opens the door to widespread counterfeiting.

I will have more to say about this issue at a later date, but at this point in my remarks I wish to include a front-page story from the Washington Star, May 11, written by James Waldo Fawcett, an expert on this subject. Mr. Fawcett had many exclusive stories about the Post Office Department which had been contemplating issuing stamps by offset printing, pointing out that the offset printing of stamps would cost the Government more money in the long run than steel engraving.

Following is Mr. Fawcett's story, published in the Washington Evening Star:

THIRTY PLATE PRINTERS OUT AT ENGRAVING BUREAU AS WORK DROPS OFF—DEMAND FOR CURRENCY DOWN 25 PERCENT—MORE CUTS PROBABLE

(By James Waldo Fawcett)

Thirty plate printers in the Bureau of Engraving and Printing were notified yesterday that they will lose their jobs on June 30.

It is understood that 25 others are to be separated before the end of the calendar year. After the planned dismissals take place, the Bureau still will have on its rolls 360 plate printers.

Most of the men involved in this reduction of staff have had about 5 years' service and are between 35 and 50 years of age. All are skilled and experienced craftsmen. None is being dismissed for any fault or failure of his own, it was learned.

Associate Director Henry J. Holtzclaw last night explained that the requirements of the Treasury and of the Federal Reserve System for currency are declining approximately 25 percent, and it is on account of this circumstance that the Bureau is decreasing personnel. He said that 1,200 employees, most of them women, have been dropped from the rolls in recent months.

SOME FIRINGS LAST JULY

No change in policy is responsible for the firing, Mr. Holtzclaw said. As far back as July 10, 1953, it was discovered that the production schedule did not warrant continuing the apprentice program, and 70 apprentices then working on presses printing currency were reassigned to their former jobs and 5 journeymen plate printers were discharged. The apprentices protested their reassignment and the plate printers' union protested the firing of the five plate printers, with repercussions that reached all the way to the White House, but the reduction order was not rescinded. Instead, further cuts were planned and now are to go into effect.

The apprentices, however, believe that they have reason for hope in the fact that last December, when it was announced that Government bonds were to be surface printed and not engraved, they officially were assured that "future vacancies in plate printer positions at the Bureau will be filled by reinstating apprentices." The Plate Printers Union argued that such a procedure would be a discrimination against plate printers, but the Civil Service Commission ruled that the Treasury Department could use its own discretion.

APPRENTICE HIRING UNLIKELY

No apprentices have been engaged to replace journeymen plate printers as yet, but it does not follow inevitably that the apprentice program will not be revived and apprentices used in lieu of some of the 55 plate printers who are being "liquidated." Mr. Holtzclaw's opinion is that is "very unlikely."

Meanwhile, the entire Bureau personnel is nervous. One of the reasons is a proposition made to the Treasury Department by the Thomas DeLaRue firm of London to supply the Bureau with "improved" British-built presses with automatic feeder and delivery devices. The DeLaRue machine would accommodate a plate large enough to print 27 notes of standard currency size at a contact, thus producing 2,400 impressions an hour, as against 800 an hour from the 18-subject plates on the presses now in operation in the Bureau. Priced at $101,000 for the first installation and $85,000 for subsequent machines, the British presses undoubtedly would bring about the firing of additional hundreds of Bureau employees. The DeLaRue company has offered to pay the expenses of a committee of Bureau officials from Washington to London to see its press working, but Mr. Holtzclaw has replied that no consideration can be given to the proposal at this time.

The dismissed plate printers have no employment opportunities in the Washington area and will have to move to other towns if they are to stay in their trade. Their problem is complicated by the fact that the engraving business is "off" everywhere.

Report on UNESCO

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. J. CARNAHAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 2, 1954

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I enclose a report on UNESCO. This report was prepared for the May 2, 3, and 4 meetings in Indianapolis, Ind., of the national executive committee of the American Legion by the American Legion special committee on covenant of human rights and United Nations.

Included in this extension of remarks is section 2 of the report, which deals with UNESCO. A careful study of this factual report will clarify the purposes, aims, and the work of UNESCO:

The special committee on covenant of human rights and United Nations last reported to the national executive committee at the April-May 1953 meeting. Since that time, the committee has held 2 meetings—1 at New York City on December 21, 1953, the other at New York City on April 27, 1954.

SEC. 2. UNESCO: On August 25, 1953, a subcommittee of this committee, consisting of Robert R. Sugarman, William G. McKinley, and the chairman, met with representatives of the State Department and of the United States National Commission for UNESCO, at the offices of the United States Mission to the United Nations, 2 Park Avenue, New York City. A very thorough discussion ensued pertaining to the origin, purposes, and work of UNESCO. Since that meeting, members of the committee have given a very great deal of study to the subject of UNESCO, and have read and studied almost innumerable documents and publications relating thereto, including controversial subject matter emanating from various groups and localities within the United States.

As a result of such study, it is fair to say that UNESCO is little understood by the very great majority of the people of this country. Accordingly, your committee believes it advisable to devote some space in this report to a discussion of UNESCO, what it is, how it is organized, what it costs, what is its membership, and what is the United States representation therein, and what are its purposes, programs, and methods, etc., etc.

UNESCO is 1 of 10 specialized agencies affiliated with, but not directly controlled by, the United Nations. It originated at a conference held in London in 1942, which was attended by the ministers of education of nine allied countries. Its present authority is found in article 55 of the United Nations Charter, which states that the members of the organization shall promote "international cultural and educational cooperation." The quoted phrase was recommended by American consultants who were representatives of business, agriculture, civic, labor, religious, and educational groups. On May 22, 1945, prior to the adoption of the United Nations Charter, the United States Congress unanimously adopted resolutions favoring the creation of a permanent international agency to promote educational and cultural relations. Members of the United States Senate attended a conference in November 1945, as members of a United States delegation. At this conference the Constitution of UNESCO was drawn. Authority for United States membership and participation in UNESCO, and for the establishment of a United States National Commission was approved by joint congressional resolution on July 30, 1946, by a vote of 264 to 41 in the House, and without dissent in the Senate (Public Law 565, 79th Cong., 2d sess.).

UNESCO consists of a General Conference, an Executive Board, and a Secretariat. The General Conference meets at least once each year. Its functions are to determine the policies and main lines of work of the organization, and to make decisions on programs drawn up by the Executive Board.

The Executive Board consists of 18 members, and the United States has been represented continuously thereon.

The Secretariat is a permanent staff appointed by the Director-General, as chief administrative officer, who in turn is appointed by the General Conference on nomination of the Executive Board. Headquarters are in Paris. Some 67 United States nationals work at UNESCO headquarters, and about 35 with UNESCO missions throughout the world, including about half a dozen in New York.

The United States Government has a security clearance with UNESCO's Director-General, regarding the employment of Americans by the international agency. This action parallels the agreement worked out by the United States and the United Nations in this regard.

The current budget of UNESCO is about $8½ million, of which the United States pays about one-third, or $2.8 million. Any United States contribution is authorized and appropriated by the United States Congress, year by year, and is included in the appropriations for the Department of State. In addition, approximately $3 million is allocated for UNESCO use from the United Nations Technical Assistance Program. This is used for technical assistance principally in the field of education.

UNESCO has some 67 member states at this time. The Soviet Union joined UNESCO only within the past 2 weeks or so. Three Communist satellite states, Poland, Hungary, and Czechoslovakia, have resigned from UNESCO—each in substance stating in its letter of resignation to the Director-General that UNESCO "has joined the camp that preaches hatred and war among peoples." Had placed itself at the service of the "American warmongers" and "had raised no protest against the shameful Anglo-American aggression in Korea." They charged UNESCO with being a "tool of the United States policy of aggression" and with having "become a refuge for all that is the negation of culture and science, a refuge of fascist barbarism." They deplored what they termed "the flood of worthless American films, broadcasts, publications, and other materials with gangsterism, worship of force, and glorification of war" imposed, as Poland said, on the culture of the people of the world. It will be noted that membership in the United Nations carries with it the right to membership in UNESCO, and that it is by virtue of such right that Russia has now joined UNESCO, where it appears she has already begun her usual obstructive tactics.

The United States National Commission for UNESCO consists of a group of 100 United States citizens, including 60 representatives of nongovernmental organizations, 10 Federal Government representatives, 15 representing State and local governments, and 15 members at large. This Commission meets twice annually. Its purposes are to advise the Government of the United States in matters relating to UNESCO, to act in consultative capacity with regard to the appointment of United States delegates to the General Conference of UNESCO, to advise with the delegations of the United States to the General Conference of UNESCO, to serve as an agency of liaison with organizations, institutions, and individuals in the United States interested in matters relating to UNESCO, and to promote an understanding of the general objectives of UNESCO with the people of the United States. The chief purposes of UNESCO are as follows:

1. To eliminate illiteracy and encourage fundamental education;
2. To obtain for each person an education conforming to his aptitudes and to the needs of society, including technological training and higher education;
3. To promote through education respect for human rights throughout all nations;
4. To overcome the obstacles to the free flow of persons, ideas, and knowledge between the countries of the world;
5. To promote the progress and utilization of science for mankind;
6. To study the causes of tensions that may lead to war and to fight them through education;
7. To demonstrate world cultural interdependence;
8. To advance through the press, radio, and motion pictures the cause of truth, freedom, and peace;
9. To bring about better understanding among the peoples of the world and to convince them of the necessity of cooperating loyally with one another in the framework of the United Nations;
10. To render clearinghouse and exchange services in all its fields of action, together with services in reconstruction and relief assistance.

The program centers around efforts to raise levels of education; the improvement of health, nutrition, and literacy; assisting in scientific research to improve living conditions; the exchange of students and teachers among nations; and, together with other international agencies, to aid in the development of healthy productive communities and citizens with a sense of self-direction and responsibility.

In carrying out its program UNESCO has evolved a number of methods, including meetings of experts, missions, seminars, pilot projects, the calling of international conferences and the submission of recommendations or international conventions to member States.

UNESCO canont operate in the United States without the aproval of our own National Commission. Its programs of educational and technical asistance, which are designed and fitting for less developed areas, are not conducted in this country. UNESCO supporters, however, believe that we benefit directly from UNESCO operations in three ways:

1. In teaching the inhabitants of the underdeveloped areas modern techniques in science, education, and technology, it helps draw these regions closer to American ideas, standards and trade.

2. It benefits American science, education, and culture by facilitating the exchange of ideas and methods between American and foreign scientists and educators.

3. Any organization which helps to preserve the peace is to the interest of the United States which has the most to lose through war. In addition, however, in encouraging the idea of collective responsibility it increases the chances that we will not have to fight alone if we are again forced to fight against Communist aggression.

As is well known to the National Executive Committee, UNESCO has become involved in local controversies in some areas. There can be no doubt that some overzealous supporters of UNESCO have gone overboard in ascribing benefits to and from UNESCO which cannot be realized in fact. Such may have been the case in Los Angeles where a booklet called the E in UNESCO was attributed to UNESCO itself, when in fact the booklet was a production of the Los Angeles school system itself, and the controversy was local, involving the question of what should and should not be taught in Los Angeles schools pertaining to UNESCO and its programs and work. Similar situations have existed elsewhere. The public misunderstanding of UNESCO may be attributed in large part of the fact that few people, indeed, know what UNESCO is all about. This is not the fault of UNESCO itself, which is not of itself a propaganda organization. While Communist countries have criticized UNESCO as the tool of the United States, on the other hand, individuals and groups in the United States have attacked UNESCO on the basis that it has reflected ideals and philosophics alien to the American tradition. Among the attacks on UNESCO is one to the effect that UNESCO advocates world government. As a matter of fact, the constitution of UNESCO expressly forbids it "from intervening in matters that are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction" of the member states, and the United States National Commission for UNESCO states in substance that such charges have no basis in fact. President Eisenhower's committee to examine into UNESCO concluded, after an examination of a series of publications, Toward World Understanding, that "a careful study of them fails to reveal that this terminology connotes world government in any political sense." UNESCO has been attacked as atheistic, although none of its member nations except Yugoslavia is officially atheistic, and membership on our own national commission includes representatives of the National Council of Churches, the National Catholic Welfare Council, and the Synagogue Council of America. The Vatican has a permanent representative at UNESCO. The Catholic Church, which is hardly atheistic or communistic, has actively fought what it considers unwarranted attacks on UNESCO as atheistic.

A principal charge against UNESCO is that it is subversive; that it is influenced or controlled by Communists, with the intention of undermining through its influence on American education, respect for the capitalistic system and private ownership of property in the minds of American schoolchildren; that it seeks to pervert the American teaching profession, and to destroy the worth and integrity of our public schools.

It may and should be said that the origin of at least a great deal of these charges is the American Flag Committee, and that due to such charges and to certain material issued by that group, and allegedly substantiating them, a small number of patriotic organizations, as well as the National Committee for the Abolition of the United Nations, headed by Gerald L. K. Smith, have taken stands in support of such charges. If true, the charges would certainly warrant the actions and positions taken by such groups.

This reporting committee holds no brief for UNESCO, but it is charged with the duty of reporting facts as it finds them. It reports certain facts in relation to charges of subversion by UNESCO of our public school system and of the minds of our schoolchildren as follows:

The Congressional Record of April 1, 1952, contains a statement by Congressman A. S. J. Carnahan, of Missouri, denouncing one of the supporting charges of the American Flag Committee, on which the positions taken by various other groups heretofore referred to have been based, as a complete fabrication, not to be found in any report, publication, or statement of UNESCO. The Congressman's statement of record further points out that the American Flag Committee has given as a literal quotation from a UNESCO publication consisting in fact of sentences lifted from context, whereby certain sentences from a certain page (56) are followed by phrases from another page (60), then joined to words from another page (58), then followed by more material from another page (59) then by other material from another page (60)—all put together as though it were one direct quote. It is this material on which the national executive committee apparently based its Resolution 33, at its meeting of April 29–May 1, 1953.

This reporting committee has given most careful study to this particular matter, and it finds that the charges of Congressman Carnahan in this respect are correct, this after thorough study of the publications of UNESCO involved. It should be pointed out that UNESCO issues many publications which are available for purchase, but which do not necessarily represent any policy view or program of UNESCO itself, and may be contrary or irrelevant thereto, as, for example, reports of educational seminars in which individual educators participate and express their own views, perhaps different from or even conflicting with views expressed by other educators at the same or like seminars or elsewhere. This reporting committee will continue observation and study of UNESCO as it has done with the Covenants of Human Rights.

It is the view of those who favor UNESCO that—

1. Any organization which by encouraging ideas of cooperation and understanding among the nations of the world, thus helping preserve the peace of the world, is to the interest of the United States.

2. Any organization that contributes to raising living standards throughout the world also contributes to the growth of the democratic way of life, and that in making known to the inhabitants of the underdeveloped areas the modern techniques of science, education, and technology contributes to the growth of democracy throughout the world.

3. UNESCO, in facilitating the exchange of ideas and methods between the United States and foreign scientists and educators, works directly toward increasing the knowledge and competency of our own scientists and educators.

Officials of the United States National Commission have indicated their desire that the American Legion be represented on the United States National Commission for UNESCO, as one of the 60 nongovernmental organizations comprising a part of the United States National Commission. This reporting committee believes that the National Organization should give serious consideration to the informal invitation extended to the American Legion to have representation on the United States National Commission. Other national organizations, such as the United States Chamber of Commerce, have taken an increasing interest in UNESCO for the purpose of knowing what it is and does, and this without any limitation on such organizations to criticize or disagree with any policy or program of UNESCO. Membership of the National Organization of the American Legion on the United States National Commission for UNESCO would in no way limit the right of the American Legion to express its views either for or against UNESCO, but would permit of a much closer observation of the work of UNESCO than is now possible. Such participation should not involve any substantial expense to the national organization.

As in the case of the Covenants of Human Rights, our first report on UNESCO is somewhat lengthy, and yet it is by no means fully exhaustive of the subject matter involved. It would be quite impossible in this report to cover all the study made by this committee and the material which it has examined.

Respectfully submitted.

William G. McKinley,
Paul M. Herbert,
Rev. Gordon L. Kidd,
Jacob Ark,
Mrs. Harold S. Burdett,
Vice Chairman.
Ray Murphy,
Chairman.

Perils of Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT B. WARBURTON
OF DELAWARE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 2, 1954

Mr. WARBURTON. Mr. Speaker, on May 1, I was privileged to receive the letter which I am including in the Appendix of the Congressional Record under permission to revise and extend my remarks.

This letter was written to me by Mrs. Charles H. Benning, who is the wife of the health commissioner of the city of Wilmington, Del. Mrs. Benning, a Russian countess by birth, was married to the Baron von Roenne, who died in prison as a captive of the Bolsheviks. Mrs. Benning is now incurably ill, and I think that this fact deeply underlines the message which she has set forth in this letter to the people of America with regard to communism.

Mrs. Benning's letter follows:

May 1, 1954.

My Fellow Citizens: It might very well be that you have never before received a communication like this, because it is a last message. I was told by my physicians that I would not recover from the illness which has plagued me for the past few years, but I am prepared and not afraid to go.

In these days of my illness I have had time to look back upon my life in this my adopted country, time to look at the present and to contemplate the future which I will not be here to experience.

My life in America has been dedicated to one purpose: to tell my fellow citizens about the perils of communism, fascism, and, in fact, of any "ism."

I tried to point out the danger signals, I lectured and talked and worked, putting my vast experience at the disposal of a people who were naive and lighthearted and easygoing.

I do not know how much of what I told them throughout the years they believed; they knew that I had been of the Russian nobility, they heard that my own relatives had been killed by the Bolsheviks, they listened when I told them that I had been in a Soviet prison; but, then, there was an ocean and this was a vast country and Russia was far, far away.

But I carried on. I felt I had to tell them, had to awaken them before it was too late.

Later I tried to rid them of their complacency about "little men who'll never be a danger." Adolf Hitler, the little corporal, was thousands of miles away and whatever he did to the people of his own country, to the Jews, the Catholics, anyone who dared to oppose him was too remote to notice or to become concerned about.

The blood, the bombs, the tears that followed came as no surprise to me who had seen the handwriting on the wall. What I would like to do now is to remind you, my fellow citizens, how Hitler started; how he chose communism for the issue upon which he rode into power; how he enlisted the aid of those who abhorred communism and who, in many instances, were sincere and truthful men but who without their knowledge were only used as tools to satisfy the lust for power, the determination to become a dictator by this one man, Hitler.

Anyone in his right mind must abhor communism. But anyone who took the trouble to look carefully must, or at least should, have seen that communism was not the only target of this man who wanted to become more powerful than any of his fellow citizens. His targets were communism and those who opposed him; those who dared to stand up and block his path; those he labeled "Communists" and threw them into his prisons.

Communism can be fought successfully if one knows what it is. It is, very simply, an idea. And it can be fought two ways: With a better idea and with better deeds. Erase the causes for unrest of the mind and body, give those who cannot provide it for themselves better education, better health conditions, better housing. Abolish slums—they are the breeding places for communism and other un-American ideas. In other words, give the people a chance to lead happy, healthy, hopeful lives. Give them equal opportunity for equal standards—and the people will have no reason to look for the so-called utopia of communism.

But, you will say, what about the unthinking elements in our midst, those who do not wish us to take the time to create these better conditions?

To you I say—be alert, inform yourself of facts and not assumptions; cling tenaciously to the constitutional truth that a man is innocent until proven guilty, be watchful without being suspicious, and above all, in the execution of your job as a citizen of this great country, see to it that the department of your Government which has been charged with security receives all the support, financial as well as moral, it needs to carry out its monumental job of keeping the country safe.

I pray that I die knowing that this, my adopted homeland which I deeply love, will always be faithful to its principles and that its citizens of whom I have been proud to be one, will continue to practice methods true to the tradition of that democracy which has made the Republic of the United States loved and respected throughout the world.

This is my last message before I pass over into the beyond. Do not disappoint me—do not let your country lose its proud heritage.

Goodbye.

Olga A. Benning
Mrs. Charles H. Benning.

(Formerly Countess Olga A. von Radetzki; by marriage, Baroness Olga von Roenne. The baron died in prison.)

Remarks of the President of the United States at the 41st Annual Convention of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, May 25, 1954

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 30, 1954

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States appeared before the 41st annual convention of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, May 25, 1954. At that time he brought greetings to this meeting and an informal talk to the convention. He laid great stress upon the utilization of our water resources.

The President's speech struck a favorable response in the minds of the delegates and representatives who attended this meeting at the Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C., and the reaction throughout the length and breadth of this country to the President's talk has been uniformly favorable.

Under leave to extend and revise my remarks, I present the remarks of the President of the United States made on this occasion:

Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, first, permit me on behalf of the administration, and I am sure all of Washington to bid you a very warm welcome to this city for your deliberations. We hope that you find your meeting not only profitable but enjoyable.

I have just heard it said that every President in the past 53 years has endorsed the work of this Congress. Here is one case where I certainly intend to set no precedent of a negative sort, and I join in the list of those who have endorsed your work.

Now, if I may impose on a bit of your time before you can make inroads on your luncheon, I should like to tell you of just one or two of the reasons why I feel so strongly in this matter.

I have become convinced that before very long, America will almost unanimously look upon water as its single greatest resource. Everywhere we find evidence of its destructiveness when badly used or when not controlled. We have a very great lack of it in some areas, even down to one project proposed for drinking water—just isn't enough drinking water for three cities in one of our States.

Along with it, of course—when we are conserving and handling water correctly—goes soil conservation. So I won't even take your time to digress into that field, but simply stick to the water end of it.

Now, as an old soldier, I have a horror of piecemeal action. There are among you old soldiers who have attended Fort Leavenworth and have heard of all the lessons they taught us and the criticians of doing things piecemeal. I learned that, and I believe it. So when a project is proposed that seems to me to be unrelated to all of the necessities of a river valley or of a slope in which it is located, I am very cold and unsympathetic. I believe that we have got to go to the Continental Divide and say—from there on down to the sea, studying where each drop of water falls—what we are going to do with it until it reaches the sea. I believe that any lesser survey of our water resources, our water uses, and our water control, is completely piecemeal, and we should reject it.

When we begin to talk about dams, or streams, or soil conservation way upstream, I believe they are two related subjects and should be dealt with together.

Now I know that a body such as this is doing valuable work every day. My anxiety is to have the Government cooperate with you and to be so organized that it can effectively operate and cooperate with you without the necessity of running to half a dozen departments in the executive department. I shall do this, and am doing it.

There is being organized, first, a Cabinet committee on water resources that will be announced to you this evening and tomorrow. It will have on it the Defense Department, the Interior Department, and the Agriculture Department. The heads of those Departments will be the members, and they will coordinate with bodies such as this, with the Hoover Commission, and with Members of Congress, to devise on behalf of the executive department a broad water program that will cover this continent from ocean to ocean and from the Canadian border to Mexico.

Under this Cabinet committee will be organized an operating committee so that the policy determined upon by the Legislature—the National Legislature—and the Cabinet committee can be implemented. This operating committee, in turn, will be able to meet with you and your representatives.

In this way, we hope that not only will the Federal Government be coordinated in this great endeavor, but that the actual activities which you people so deeply study will be coordinated as far as the Federal executive department is concerned. We will then be able to plan to use our water for power, for irrigation, for its control, so that it doesn't flood out our other resources and wash away soil for navigation, for the proper use of our harbors. That will be our task.

There are other individuals in Government that will be members of these committees, when necessary. These will be permanent committees established for this purpose. And certainly we do hope that in this one field the great wisdom and experience that can be brought to us by the professionals in the field, the people who study it, such as you do, by the policymaking groups in the Congress, by our own executing agencies in the executive department and branches, all can be brought together. We hope that all can work to the end that we will make certain that we won't wake up some two decades from now and regret that we did not act intelligently back in 1954 with respect to this greatest of all national resources.

Now in this very crude and informal way, I have tried to tell you why I am interested in your work. If I haven't made you understand it now, I don't know what else to say. So with this brief interlude—for which I thank you, and thank you for the compliment of inviting me before you—I will say goodby. Good luck to each of you.

A Deliberate Approach

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILL E. NEAL

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 2, 1954

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to include the report of a commencement program in my district.

Douglass High School, Huntington, W. Va., where separate and as nearly equal facilities as possible for Negro and white students has been the objective, witnessed a most unusual procedure for its commencement program this year.

The recent Supreme Court decision was discussed by three outstanding personalities and immediately following the speeches the top students of the class asked questions. It was made the occasion for emphasis on patience, understanding, and tolerance as the requisites needed to accomplish an orderly implementation of the Court decision.

The report follows:

DOUGLASS HIGH SCHOOL SENIORS TOLD DECISION IS CHALLENGE

The usual commencement activities were overshadowed when at Douglass High School on Wednesday night a panel of guest speakers discussed the Supreme Court decision banning segregation in public schools. They urged upon a capacity audience calm reasoning, but a determined effort, to make school integration work on the community level.

Honor paid to 43 graduating seniors was all but lost in the cheers that greeted pronouncements on the Supreme Court ruling.

The Douglass program brought about the first public discussion here of the ruling outlawing segregation in public schools, the action was termed variously "the greatest step toward freedom since the Emancipation" and "an eloquent answer to Godless Communism."

The panelists were Dr. Charles Leander Hill, president of Wilberforce University; Charles W. Anderson, Jr., Louisville, Ky., attorney, and James H. Rowland, Beckley, attorney and member of the West Virginia Board of Education.

Mr. Anderson said "the decision poses a challenge to Negroes and it is up to us to make it work."

The attorney declared the ruling is one which brings joy and happiness to millions of liberty-loving people and is a second milestone on the road to freedom. The Emancipation Proclamation was the first, he asserted.

"A separate system cannot possibly be equal," he said, adding "calm reasoning, but determined effort, is needed to implement the Court's decision."

Mr. Anderson said the decision was only the beginning because it affected only children.

"We must see that there also is equality for teachers in salary and position," he added.

The speaker discounted fears that integration wouldn't work and said that the South already has been conditioned for integration by earlier nonsegregation decisions.

He predicted that the program would work smoothly and "10 years from now all fears will be forgotten."

Dr. Hill said the decision was a momentous piece of history and defined integration as the complete participation of all men in the social order.

The Ohio educator said the decision fulfills three centuries of yearning and is an eloquent answer to communism.

He foresaw the abolition of a double standard in education generally. Dr. Hill said the double standard is bad economically and the resultant savings would bring better schools for all.

He added that legality was now on the side of those working to abolish prejudices.

"We will have more money for better schools, more pay for teachers, and a more efficient school system," he declared.

He warned, however, that a difficult road lay ahead and urged the Negro community redouble its activities in changing attitudes.

"The legal block has been lifted and we must now overcome the psychological blockade," he said.

Mr. Rowland said the decision ultimately would give the Negro the opportunity to serve his community fully, and declared:

"America will find how foolish she has been in not allowing the Negro to make a full contribution to society."

He added the ruling was the greatest decision since the Declaration of Independence and the abolition of slavery, and "represents the best thinking in America today."

"We must approach this new day with a new outlook and end the twisted notion of mankind and rearrange thinking so that all will come to believe that there is no superior race," he concluded.

In answer to questions, Mr. Rowland declared that the integration could not come about, despite the Court ruling, unless all in the community were willing to work together to make it possible.

The class was presented by Principal L. H. Glover and acceptance was made by Okey E. Hodge, an assistant superintendent of Cabell County schools. Diplomas were presented by School Board Member H. E. Danford.

Class valedictorian was Coretha France; Phillip Stewart was salutatorian; and Sadie Robinson honorarian. Music was provided by the glee club.

The Flammable-Fabrics Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON CANFIELD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 28, 1954

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the Legislative Daily of the Chamber of

Commerce of the United States on Friday, May 28, reported as follows:

FLAMMABLES

The Federal Trade Commission issued some technical rules to implement the new flammable-fabrics law which becomes effective July 1.

The rules, and the law, are designed to keep off the market highly flammable and dangerous articles of wearing apparel.

FTC Chairman Edward F. Howrey said the rules will carry out the intent of Congress to protect the public but the industry will be able to live with them.

Howrey cautioned the public that the new rules do not mean that all wearing apparel must be fireproof, flameproof, or even fire resistant. He explained that the law merely forbids the sale of fabrics which are especially hazardous.

Under the caption, "Teacher Dies of Burns from Flaming Negligee," the Associated Press carried the following story, datelined Baltimore, May 29:

TEACHER DIES OF BURNS FROM FLAMING NEGLIGEE

BALTIMORE, May 29.—Miss Flora Corey, 52-year-old teacher whose negligee caught fire and engulfed her in flames Thursday, died today at Mercy Hospital.

Police found a freshly lighted cigarette and a lighter in the apartment.

A night watchman, attracted by her screams, found her standing in the doorway of her apartment, her clothing ablaze. He smothered the flames with a coat but the woman suffered second- and third-degree burns over her entire body.

As one of the sponsors of the Flammable Fabrics Act of 1953, which will go into effect next month, I am disturbed no end over current efforts that are being made to weaken the standards set up in the act after years of painstaking study by the National Bureau of Standards in cooperation with industry. And now I learn that a national organization of importers is contending that the effective date of this protective act should be postponed for 1 year because some businessmen have heavy inventories of these goods which will be regarded as highly flammable under the terms of the act.

I firmly believe the new law will save thousands of our American people both young and old, from serious and even fatal injuries if given a chance and I shall continue to resist all efforts to weaken the law or postpone its operation.

Springfield, Mass., Nation's Best Convention City—J. Henri Goguen, President, St. Jean Baptiste Union, Acclaims City

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 28, 1954

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, Springfield, Mass., was host the past week to the 18th national convention of L'Union Saint-Jean-Baptiste D'Amerique. Officers and delegates to the conference were unanimous in asserting that it was the best convention in the society's history. The personal appearance of His Eminence, Cardinal Leger, archbishop of Canada, and His Excellency, Bishop Weldon, of Springfield, both of whom addressed the proceedings, highlighted the gathering.

Mr. Speaker, I am particularly proud of the feeling of the delegates generated toward my home city. It is best expressed by the words of J. Henri Goguen, president of the society, who declared that "Springfield is the Nation's best convention city." This belief was shared by all who came from many States to participate in the conference. They were impressed by the cooperation of church and civic officials, by the warmth of the greeting of Mayor Daniel B. Brunton, by the generosity of the newspapers, the Springfield Daily News and the Springfield Union, and the friendliness of the people of the entire community.

I congratulate President Goguen and his great society on the tremendous success of their national convention.

Under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD an editorial from the Springfield (Mass.) Daily News which was inspired by President Goguen's remarks:

BEST CONVENTION CITY

During the final meeting of the annual congress of L'Union St. Jean Baptiste d'Amerique here Wednesday, Dr. Alfred Pelletier, of Winchendon, arose to praise Springfield as a convention city.

Later, J. Henri Goguen, of Leominster, president of the 60,000-member society, said that, in his opinion, "Springfield is the Nation's best convention city." That is what Joseph D. Price and the convention and visitors bureau committee of the chamber of commerce have been explaining in their publicity program directed to such groups all over the country.

"This was our most outstanding convention; even better than the golden jubilee held at Boston in 1950," Mr. Goguen said. The president said that his belief that Springfield is the best convention city is shared by the 457 delegates who were greatly pleased by the cooperation of civic and church officials and the warm reception of the public.

We agree with Mr. Goguen that Springfield is the best convention city in the country, but in fairness we must point out that L'Union St. Jean Baptiste itself richly deserved the cooperation of Springfield officials and merited the warm reception of the people of Springfield. It brought to our city several distinguished guests, and it was represented here by delegates whose deportment and activities reflected the high purposes of L'Union.

As hosts, we are at our very best when we entertain such guests.

New Frontiers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD H. REES
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 1, 1954

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent granted me by the House, I am including a forthright and interesting address delivered by Dr. James A. McCain, president of the Kansas State College at Emporia, Kans., on the occasion of the graduation of the senior class at Newton High School, Newton, Kans. Dr. McCain is one of the outstanding educators of this country. I am sure Members of Congress will be interested in reading this splendid statement.

NEW FRONTIERS

Certainly, one could hardly blame your generation of American youth for feeling grave concern over the future. You of the graduating class would have some reason to complain, "Aren't we finishing high school at the worst possible time in our history."

At least three temporary conditions would justify such a dim view. The men of the graduating class face the inevitable requirement of 2 or more years' service in the Armed Forces, with an attendant interruption or postponement of plans for higher education or launching a career.

The prospects for the economy appear less attractive than at any time in a decade. Some experts maintain we are in the midst of a recession; others call it a depression.

Most discouraging of all are the conflicts among the nations and the threat of a third world war, in which weapons of frightful destructiveness would be employed.

You 1954 graduates, therefore, might well be persuaded that the prospects before you are by far the most discouraging ever faced by a generation of American youth. It might be worth your while at these exercises, therefore, to speculate on how the future must have appeared to those who graduated from high school in past years and then compare the forecast with subsequent events.

The times must have seemed most inauspicious to those who graduated from high school 50 years ago, in 1904. In that year our Nation was making the adjustment to one of the crucial turning points in our history, the closing of the geographical frontier.

From the founding of our Nation until the beginning of this century there had been ever to the West of us unexplored territory, possessing a variety of natural resources and rich with opportunity for those with the vigor and courage to possess it. The frontier shaped the character of our people and was the major source of the new wealth which made the Nation increasingly prosperous.

But between 1890 and 1900 civilization completed its westward march from the Atlantic to the Pacific, and the last new land was settled.

To the graduating classes of 1904 the end of the geographical frontier must have signaled the end of opportunity. Many of these graduates might fervently have regretted that they had not been born a half a century earlier.

In the light of subsequent developments, how valid was this pessimistic forecast? Actually our Nation enjoyed its greatest period of economic development during the first half of this century. New frontiers arose in science, invention, and industry to multiply the opportunities for youth to lead prosperous, useful, and successful lives. Specifically, the income of the American people doubled twice between 1900 and 1950, and average earnings in the middle of the century were four times greater than at its beginning.

Thus, despite the dim view they might well have taken, the graduates of 1904 faced the happiest prospects of any generation of American youth up to their time.

But surely the future must have appeared even more dismal to the graduates of 1934, just 20 years ago. They completed their high school education in the midst of our most serious depression. They received their diplomas at a time when 15 million able-bodied Americans were unemployed.

For many weeks during that depression season the No. 1 song on the Hit Parade was, Brother, Can You Spare a Dime?

It was estimated there would be 1 job for every 5 college graduates in 1934, and fewer than that for high-school graduates. The future appeared grim, indeed. Yet 4 years later the depression had ended and workers, instead of jobs, were in short supply. Such new industries as television, air conditioning, prefabricated construction, and plastics have become sources of great new wealth and opportunity.

Today, with 62 million workers gainfully employed, this Nation enjoys its highest level of prosperity. Despite the poverty and unemployment which characterized their commencement season, the graduates of 1934 in actuality faced incredibly bright prospects.

What has all this to do with you of the graduating classes of 1954? Despite certain discouraging signs of the times, it can be demonstrated that ahead of you lie unequaled opportunities for success, satisfaction, and service.

Even our most conservative economic forecasters assure us that we haven't yet even approached the levels of prosperity and well-being of which we are capable. This Nation has the natural and human resources and the industrial know-how to continue indefinitely into the future the rate of economic development we have enjoyed in the past. By the end of the century we can be enjoying a standard of living four times as great as today's, with an average income per family in excess of $12,000 per year.

What are the sources of this new wealth? What new frontiers are fraught with such unlimited opportunity for youth? At least four hold incredible promise.

As far as the practicable applications of atomic energy is concerned, we have barely scratched the surface. Yet the power of the atom is now being employed to furnish energy to a large factory, heat to the business district of a city, power to a submarine, and both diagnostic and therapeutic services in the practice of medicine.

Solary energy, the power inherent in the rays of the sun, is another source of new wealth and industry. Former President Conant of Harvard University predicted recently that during the remainder of this century we shall develop more practical application of solary energy than even of atomic energy.

Phenomenal new developments lie ahead in the field of electronics. One recent invention, the transistor, a substitute the size of a pea for a vacuum tube, might well cause a small industrial revolution all of its own.

The increase in the Nation's population will provide new frontiers for American agriculture. We shall have 192 million people to feed in 1975, in contrast with our 160 million today. Sometime in the near future, therefore, we will reach the end of agricultural surpluses, and the law of supply and demand will thereafter work for instead of against the farmer.

The future you face is an incredibly bright one. And yet this promise of science and technology is a potential, not an inevitability. If we are to realize the plenty within our grasp we must plan and work for it.

Therefore, in closing I should like to offer you of the 1954 graduating class three admonitions.

In the first place, make certain you select and prepare for the occupation for which you are best suited. Jobs should be plentiful throughout your lifetime. In fact, we are faced with an indefinite shortage of trained workers. However, as our economy becomes increasingly complex, there will be increasing demands for persons with intensive and specialized training. Thus, your personal welfare and the Nation's strength and security require that you choose both your occupation wisely and prepare for it thoroughly.

Secondly, be ever mindful of the importance of hard work. As one grass roots philosopher recently observed, "I don't know what the secret of success is, but I'm afraid its hard work," and someone has defined genius as, "10 percent inspiration and 90 percent perspiration."

Jobs may be easy for you to find, but the highest levels of success will be reached only by those with the will and capacity to work hard.

Finally, I urge you to practice enlightened citizenship based on a deep understanding of and devotion to our democratic system. The phenomenal progress which has characterized our history is due to the maintenance in this Nation of free institutions. Should we lose this freedom and acquire an authoritarian government in its place, we would have lost the chief wellspring of our strength and vigor.

Amendments to Railroad Retirement Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DeWITT S. HYDE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 2, 1954

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to include in the Appendix of the Record the following statement which I made before the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee regarding amendments to the Railroad Retirement Act:

Mr. Chairman, I would like to add my word in the support of legislation which will reduce the retirement age of railroad workers to 60 years or make it possible for a railroad man to retire at the end of 30 years of service with the railroad. Much of the work done by railroad workers is attended with the risk of life and limb and a good bit of the work is very hard on the workers physically. In addition to these reasons, the modernization of railroad equipment has eliminated many of the jobs on the railroads and has made it possible to do much more work with fewer men. Some of the benefits of this modernization should be passed along to the workers on the railroads. These benefits could take the form of reducing the retirement age or make possible retirement after 30 years' service. The benefit would be twofold; namely, the obvious one of earlier retirement, and, secondly, it would make more jobs available for the younger men.

I urgently request favorable consideration by your committee of legislation before you which will accomplish this result.

In addition, I understand that you also have legislation which will make it possible for the widows of retired railroad workers to receive their pension at the age of 60 instead of 65 as now provided by the law. This is good legislation and should be passed. The wives of many of the retired railroad workers are considerably younger than their husbands and have no means of support other than the income of their husbands. If their husbands die when they are at or near the age 60 there is practically no opportunity for them to earn a living and the result of the present law is that they are either dependent on private or public charity until they reach the age of 65. Actually, I think it would be preferable to make the widow's pension payable immediately upon her husband's death, but if this cannot be done, the age of retirement should at least be reduced to 60. I respectfully request the favorable consideration of your committee on this proposal.

Yazoo Story Best on South in 20 Years

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMIE L. WHITTEN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 2, 1954

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following article from the Jackson (Miss.) Clarion-Ledger:

Yazoo Story Best on South in 20 Years—Fine Story by Man Who Loves and Knows Delta

(By Phil Mullen)

The river—only avenue into the wilderness.

The Yazoo River—creator of the delta, fed to a richness surpassing the Nile Valley—America's most fabled fertile farmland, the last stronghold of King Cotton and the southern plantation.

The Yazoo River—river of death in the Choctaw language.

The Yazoo, written by Frank E. Smith, has just been published by Rinehart, and Mississippi readers will agree with Carl Cramer, who has called it "the best book on the Deep South in 20 years."

Mr. Smith, Member of Congress from Greenwood, has been working on this 47th volume in the Rivers of America series since 1947, but, as he says, "The Yazoo is basically the product of a lifetime of listening to stories about the river and the delta country to which it has given its name."

And there is the charm and the absorbing interest of this new book, which talks much about near neighbors of Madison County and which should be of familiar interest to all Mississippians.

Through all the history, and the economics, and the facts about soil erosion and flood control, there is the leavening humor of old folk tales and political anecdotes; there is the "feel of the river" as a small boy feels it on a summer's day.

Moreover, Mr. Smith says in his introduction, "Our story will not be of that geological mystery, but of the people whose lives were influenced and fashioned by the Yazoo and those who today are attempting to better their way of life by refashioning the Yazoo itself."

Mr. Smith writes like the newspaperman which he says he is, although most of his time, since service in World War II, has been spent upon a most successful political career. He was a State senator, then administrative assistant to Senator Stennis, and then elected as the Delta Congressman when Will Whittington retired.

"He writes like a newspaperman"? Well—he is very easy to read—there is an excitement and glamour to his history, from the days of the Choctaw Nation, to John Law and Louis XIV, and to Greenwood LeFlore and Andrew Jackson—and then the war.

THE WAR

But the Yazoo was no land of the * * *. This was new ground, the frontier, almost up until the "war for southern independence."

And the war came directly to the storied southern plantation. Yazoo—here were fought the naval battles for the "Gibraltar of the South," for it was Grant's highway to the rear of Vicksburg. At the Confederate Naval Yard at Yazoo City, the ironclad, the *Arkansas* was finished and it was taken through the Federal fleets to Vicksburg—only to meet an inglorious end at the hands of the yankee *Essex*.

Mr. Smith's chapter on War on the Plantation and The Woman's War are excellent, telling the reader of the one time when the American civilian population—at least those in the South—actually knew what war is; actually felt the hurt of the conflict.

Mr. SMITH writes sympathetically—rather, he writes understandingly—of the Negroes in The Yazoo. He writes much, too, about the colored people for from the first they greatly outnumbered the whites in Delta. He says, "Down through the years the Negro and the white man in the delta have lived together in greater harmony and mutual respect than perhaps anywhere else in the traditional southern black belt."

And he writes of the immediate post-Civil War era more plainly than do most authors who like to tell of the carpetbaggers and the Klu Klux and black Republicanism. He tells of Yankee soldiers who settled in the Yazoo country, not as carpetbaggers—they were adventurous GI's of the War of '61, reluctant to turn from power and prestige of Army officer rank back to the small-town obscurity.

One of these was Albert Morgan who rose to leadership in the Republican Party and, as a State senator, passed a bill repealing the ban on miscegenetic marriages. It passed with little comment but his marriage to the quadroon, Carrie Highgate, and his leadership of the colored politicians ended in his fleeing from a gun battle. He was given a pension office job in Washington, only to lose that when Cleveland came into power and L. Q. C. Lamar said his case was "too much of an issue in Mississippi" for him to be retained.

According to the acknowledged father of the blues, W. C. Handy, the blues were born in the delta and Mr. Smith tells of that in his chapter, "The Yaller Dawg"—to prove that perhaps the bluest note of them all was and is the lonely wail of a steam engine whistle in the night.

Delta Tall Tales, at least one of them a Bob Burns favorite of later years, take up the chapter on the adventures of Mike and Bob Hooter, bear hunters and fishermen extraordinary. The story of the tough hog that survived a swallowed and exploded stick of dynamite; the old boll weevil who whupped the young weevil because he would not take two rows at a time; the drunken minnow who caught the two-pound perch by biting it; the snipe hunts—all are familiar but well told. But the reader may discover a completely new critter in the winter.

JOHN SHARPE WILLIAMS

The Yazoo devotes a chapter to the last of the planter-statesmen and perhaps more correctly repeats the most quotable anecdotes about John Sharp Williams. Surprising, perhaps, to those who preach States rights sectionalism in Mississippi politics today will be Senator Williams' statement that he "experienced no difficulty in a joint role as citizen of Yazoo County, the State of Mississippi, and the United States, and thought he would have no trouble in the future adding citizenship in the League of Nations to the list."

Famed as a wit, a progressive, and a scourge of the Republicans, John Sharpe Williams also always has been a hero to those Mississippians who think they can drink like a gentleman. For he did. Once, in Senate debate, Tom Heflin observed, "Well, whatever else may be said of me, when I come into the Senate Chamber I always come in with full possession of my faculties."

"What difference does that make?" John Sharpe retorted.

GREAT WHITE CHIEF

More political history is interestingly told in a chapter on James K. Vardaman, who used "white supremacy" to win the votes, setting the pattern of the even more successful Theodore G. Bilbo.

But even the Great White Chief could not win in Mississippi when he opposed the Democratic President Woodrow Wilson.

YOCKINAPATAPHA

Mr. SMITH takes a chapter out to pay tribute to William Faulkner, whose writings mostly have been about the Yockinapatapha River (Yocona) and the Tallahatchie, and those are tributaries of the Yazoo. Mr. Faulkner's speech accepting the Nobel Prize is reproduced in full.

"The Yazoo is a story of high water and cotton," the author says, and his book ends with the description of the flood-retention reservoirs, built with Sardis Dam on the Tallahatchie, Enid Dam on the Yocona, Grenada Dam on the Yalobusha, and Arkabutla Dam on the Coldwater.

Great earthenwork dams built to control flooding on those tributaries and on the Yazoo. "The Mechanized Revolution" in southern agriculture has the last chapter.

In his introduction, Mr. SMITH says, "the river itself, in combination with the cotton culture, was on the verge of destroying the new civilization in its basin through flood and erosion of both land and people. The people have fought back, however, and they are confident now that the Yazoo will never be death to them."

Mr. SMITH, who all agree is the biggest Congressman from Mississippi, loves his vittles, and he cannot resist, also in the introduction, the mention of one of his favorite foods, "Delta catfish in its most delectable form is prepared by rolling large slices of the fish in meal and salt and frying it in hot pork grease. The very ease of preparation is deceptive, for only a true fish artist can know just the right sizzle for the grease and just the right golden tone that announces the finely done fish."

He has written a fine book—the Yazoo—it is his homeland, and even hill-country rednecks can understand his love for it as they read his story.

The Significance of Forestry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS E. GRAHAM

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 2, 1954

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following remarks of Representative L. H. GAVIN before the annual meeting of the Society of American Foresters in the home of Mrs. Gifford Pinchot on May 27, 1954:

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF FORESTRY

(By Hon. LEON H. GAVIN, Representative, 23d District of Pennsylvania)

Mr. Chairman, Mrs. Pinchot, members of the Society of American Foresters, and guests, it is a real privilege to meet with you in the home of the man who took the first great step in America's conservation movement. I understand also that it was in this spacious room that your society was organized. I can imagine that here in quiet meditation or here in conference with trusted advisers many of the policies that guide our conservation efforts today were formulated.

It is not characteristic today for people to dwell long on the events of history—tonight, however, for a brief moment I do want to recall the words of a great American as he paid tribute to Gifford Pinchot. Teddy Roosevelt once said: Gifford Pinchot is the man to whom the Nation owed most for what has been accomplished as regards the preservation of the natural resources of our country.

Naturally I am justly proud that the true American of whom I speak was a fellow Pennsylvanian. Moreover, in addition to being an outstanding forester he was twice governor of our great Commonwealth.

Critics invariably appear in the wake of accomplishments of all who take progressive leadership in any field of endeavor. This is particularly true when the natural resources of our Nation are involved. We are fortunate, however, in knowing that for each individual who would dissipate or dissolve our great national forests which Pinchot helped establish, there are thousands of citizens who now recognize the real value of these public forests. For the selfish few who would unmercifully cut the timber and gouge the soil from the priceless watersheds of our Nation there are now thousands who appreciate the water and soil holding power of a tree and do much to protect it. And, a special tribute should go to the many sportsmen's organizations not only in my own State but everywhere throughout our land for the courageous manner in which they stand up and fight for the well-being of our forests and streams. These groups see not only the great timber values at stake—but the inestimable values of productive lands in which to hunt and fish—and a place where millions of our people can go for relaxation and play.

As a layman in forestry there is little that I can tell you foresters about the technical science of growing and harvesting the forests. I can, however, remind you of some practical aspects of your profession—in the hope that from my remarks you will take new courage in attacking the many problems that face you daily. And that as in the past you will fearlessly and courageously fight for what you believe to be right—when the welfare of the Nation's forests are under consideration or attack.

Years ago as a young man I became concerned about the future of our forests in Pennsylvania. Only a few thousand acres of virgin timber remained in a State that some 35 years before had led the Nation in timber production. Along with others I realize it was important to save a few of these virgin acres in northwestern Pennsylvania for posterity to see. There was a basic purpose in this. Spindly popple or gnarled and twisted hardwoods which now grow on thousands of acres do not stir the imagination of people that better trees can be grown. It takes big, fine trees to do this. Fortunately those who were interested refused to give up—and succeeded in saving several thousand acres in giant hemlocks and stately white pines which plainly show the majesty and grandeur that once reigned in Penn Woods. These forests of the East are tangible, living proof that Pennsylvania is blessed with the soil, water, and climate needed to grow stands of timber, which if wisely managed and properly cut can place the Commonwealth back in the forefront of the leading timber producing States.

Working side by side with these forests of the past is the forest of the present and the future. I refer to the great Allegheny National Forest in my district. Calvin Coolidge, with the uncanny foresight of a wise and frugal New Englander knew what he was doing when in 1923 by proclamation he created this public forest which now serves as a working demonstration of good forestry practices. It would be a gross understatement to say that I was just modestly appreciative of this endeavor of our Federal Government. Along with the millions who use it for recreation, hunting, and fishing and with others who use it as a source of timber for their mills, I am extremely proud of the accomplishments of our Forest Service in this enterprise of conservation and wise use of a natural resource.

In Pennsylvania, like the Nation as a whole, 75 percent of our forests are in private ownership. Here again a great challenge goes out to the private citizen to make the best use of the forests and soils that have been entrusted to his care. In 1949 I had the pleasure of participating in the dedication ceremony of the first tree farm in northern Pennsylvania. I experienced much satisfaction in helping to get this joint effort of the private landowner and the technical foresters off to a good start; one group cannot succeed without the help of the other. Herein lies the challenge for all foresters, whether Federal, State, industry, or private, to work together in guiding and directing the private landowner and timber operator, more particularly the small ones, to better forestry practices. The job of getting better cutting practices onto the lands of the private owner is so tremendous that it will succeed if only the best in the imagination and ability of every forester is brought forth regardless of his affiliations or sources of employment.

If, up to now, I have mentioned my own State of Pennsylvania to the exclusion of others, I ask your indulgence because much of what happened there has happened or is happening elsewhere in our Nation. My concern is no less whether the national forest under consideration is in Florida or in Oregon. My interest in the well-being of our private forest lands is the same in scope whether it be a farm forest in Maine or an industrial holding in California. As technical foresters you cannot discharge your duties if you are blinded by the rays of the sun as you look into the crown of an individual tree while the great panorama which includes rivers and streams, soils and terrain, game and fish, livestock and ranges, recreational areas and people, timber and mills, and the future needs of a growing nation, go unnoticed. There lies your problem and your challenge.

Small mistakes, even if numerous, will not alter the picture too much if your aims are toward the improvement of our forest resource and all its attendant benefits. Great blunders in the management and use of this resource whether by accident or intent can be disastrous in a world where an abundance of these gifts of nature determine the security or even the survival of a people.

Someone has said, "The reason God made man first was because he didn't want any advice." Well, I don't know for sure which came first, the forester or the legislator interested in forestry. I have a suspicion, however, that in our Nation the forester may have been first on the scene. The fact that you foresters are meeting here tonight is some proof of this statement. Regardless, the legislator from his vantage point on the outside can sometimes offer advice to the foresters who labor arduously at the tasks of the moment. And certainly the progress in resource conservation, management, and use of the last 50 years is proof that the two are now working in close association. This is good. In fact, it is essential if the problems and demands of the next 50 years are to be solved and satisfied.

As a member of the Armed Services Committee of the House, it has been my privilege to visit many countries throughout the world. It is soon apparent that wherever forests are found they serve the same general purposes in protecting watersheds, soils, and streamflow and in providing the world's most widely used industrial raw material. It is also apparent that the amount of industrial wood or wood products used by each person is an indicator of the economic development of a country.

Many think of industrial development in the terms of coal, iron, and the lighter alloys of metals. However, in the places where there is little or no wood available to a people you find them also deficient in the products of these other materials. In many parts of the world people have only stones, adobe, brush-and-mud, or the skins of animals with which to build houses. Because wood is scarce or entirely lacking. It is only in the United States that one can travel from coast to coast and see millions of beautiful houses, both large and small, built from wood. In some places a bundle of fagots or sticks is the difference between being cold or comfortable. Here in America a match or cigarette carelessly handled can, on occasion, burn up more wood than is available through an entire century to the people in some lands.

In many countries the incessant use of the ax has made an eroded wasteland out of great watersheds. Floods come and unbelievable suffering and hardship follow. Half-starved animals roam in search of a tuft of grass or a chance seedling to devour. Fish and game are nonexistent and millions of people can't take to the woods for a weekend in the forest.

The problems one sees in forestry around the world are much the same as we might have encountered here in the United States. That some nations failed to solve these problems is shown by barren hillsides and wasted plains—dust bowls so to speak—something which has been experienced in some sections of our country as a result of poor land use. Fortunately, for us here in America we have stopped, or at least slowed, the prolific waste of a great forest heritage. We have been guilty at times of a wanton destruction of our resources for in our haste to build and create material things we have failed to deposit anything in nature's bank in many places. One only has to ride through millions of acres of timberland that have been seriously overcut, repeatedly burned and unregenerated to good trees to see what I mean. And the demands of two global wars have left their mark on our forests.

Wise management and use of our forest resources is a fundamental issue of our time. Economists tell us that by doubling the amount of wood used in the poorer countries, their standards of living could be raised astonishingly. Those who deal with the people and resources of our Nation know that only by maintaining an abundance of timber and other essential resources can the high standard of living to which we are accustomed be continued. The forester who is objective in his thinking and loyal to his fellow man will plant idle acres to trees with the hope in mind that 25 or 50 years hence there will be sufficient trees to meet the needs of an increasing population and an expanding economy. He will not be distracted in his endeavors by the fears of an overabundance of timber or the prediction that the product will be worthless. The managers of our great national forests will continue to handle these areas for the greatest benefits to the largest number of people in the years ahead. No one group or any particular individual can be permitted to dissipate or destroy the benefits of an inheritance which has been years in the building. The private woodland owner will see the advantages of growing successive crops of trees of the kinds and sizes that can best serve the purposes of mankind—whether in the multiple enrichment of human life in the time of peace or in the protection of all those things we hold dear in the time of war. And in it all will be the leavening influence of a group of foresters who know that nature alone can grow a tree—but that they can do a lot to help shorten the time and to grow a better one.

A Secretary of Agriculture once said that Gifford Pinchot more than any other man brought the word "conservation" into the everyday American vocabulary together with the idea of sound management and wise use of our natural resources into our national thinking.

You foresters here tonight and foresters throughout the world have the responsibility of keeping it there—and of enlarging on all efforts of the past toward a sounder management and a wiser use of our forests. The restoration of our soil, water, wildlife, and timber resources to full productivity throughout our Nation should be your constant ambition and goal. Every day we have several more thousand people added to our population. For the long range defense and security of this Nation together with an abundant economy, more acres of woodland must be made and kept productive in each passing day.

And now as your society meets for the 54th year in the home of the man who was America's first and foremost forester—the job ahead is just as big, just as difficult, as when he tackled it. The word "conservation" and the idea of wise use will be maintained and enhanced in the minds and actions of our people—in proportion to the success of your efforts in working with our soil, streams, wildlife, and forests. The profession that Pinchot started in this Nation has grown in stature and importance. It is looked upon with admiration and respect. I am sure that it is in good hands which is a tribute to both your society and to the man who started it.

Memorial Day Address of Joseph F. Burke, Second Junior Vice Commander, DAV

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 2, 1954

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address made by Second Junior Vice Commander Joseph F. Burke, of the Disabled American Veterans, on Memorial Day, at Bayonne, N. J. Commander Burke is an amputee veteran and has decided views upon the treatment of former prisoners of the Korean conflict. The address follows:

Memorial Day is the day on which we lay open the naked scars of our country's losses. It is the day of remembrance on which we pay tribute to those who sacrificed their lives for the ideals and principles which are the bulwark of this Nation. It is the day on which hidden tears are made visible, the tears of mourning relatives and friends, the tears that fall forever steadily within a mother's heart.

Memorial Day is also the day on which we remember those who died in past wars, who died for our present way of life and for the future destiny of our country.

We have a double duty on Memorial Day. We have the duty to give public honor to our Nation's heroic dead, and we have the duty to reflect seriously upon the future of the Nation for which they died.

Our public remembrances of our honored dead are reflected in the parades such as we have here today, in the solemn ceremonies at the graves of our departed comrades, and in the thoughts and remembrance of our personal comrades in arms who no longer visibly walk beside us.

Let me also add my own thought that we honor the dead most when we consider the living for whom they died.

It is from this consideration of the living that I feel the need to speak out on this Memorial Day in protest of our treatment of the veteran of the Korean war.

The Korean war was a major conflict. World Wars I and II were in a sense popular wars if it is ever possible to refer to any major holocaust that expresses man's inhumanity to man as a popular war. The Korean war was not the same kind of popular war. Yet in spite of the apathy of the American people generally, and in spite of the criticisms and misunderstandings that surrounded the Korean war, what war was ever fought for a greater cause? The Korean war attempted to stop the slime of communism from oozing farther over the world's surface.

This was a war that saw 2,300,000 men and women in service for a period of time from the outbreak June 25, 1950, to the cessation of hostilities back in July 1953. It was a war, according to the latest figures, in which 33,237 American soldiers were killed, 103,376 were wounded, and 410 were missing. Perhaps we should also entertain this sobering note on Memorial Day, 1954, that we have not as yet recovered the bodies of 2,600 American GI's known to be buried in Communist-held North Korea. That is why the organization I represent, the Disabled American Veterans, in conjunction with other veterans' organizations which believe in equal rights for equal sacrifice, resent and bitterly struggle against the inequities which exist in benefits for Korean veterans in rehabilitation, readjustment allowances, and insurance. Also, we continue to hold the line of defense against those organizations and forces which are urging the reduction or curtailment of compensations, hospitalization, outpatient treatment, medical benefits, loan guaranties, and education programs which are generally available to all veterans at the present time.

Now we come to a phase of the Korean situation which sets it apart from other wars. Because the problem is a current one, and because we have formulated no policy concerning it, may I emphasize that what I am about to say is the expression and the reflections of my own personal convictions. I must speak now as a private citizen and not as a national junior vice commander of the Disabled American Veterans. What I say now is said on my own responsibility and not on that of my organization. I refer now to the problem of Korean prisoners of war. As a veteran, I have felt deeply about the distrust and suspicion which have been placed upon 3,500 Korean prisoners of war because 23 of their number did not return. I do not disparage the efforts to return the 23 to their hearths and homes, but in the propaganda and efforts surrounding this whole situation, our attempt to give to the world at large an explanation why 23 Americans defected, and our own efforts to get them to return, have cast an air of suspicion over Americans who came back.

Certainly, I don't want to believe that 23 Americans could really prefer communism to democracy and another country to this Nation with its priceless heritages of freedom and liberty. But I can understand the brain washing and force-fed propaganda that led to their defection.

However, too many people in our Nation have jumped to the unwarranted conclusion that because we know that the 3,500 returning prisoners of war were subjected to this same treatment also, that there is a possible cause for doubting the loyalty of these men because of guilt by association. By inference, insinuation, and innuendo, the people of this country are being led to question the loyalty of these returning veterans. I know this to be true, for in traveling in different parts of the country on assignment by the Disabled American Veterans former prisoners of the Korean war have confided this to me.

I am perfectly well aware that in these prisoners of war there might be a source for Communist infiltration. Yet, my position is that if any other victory was scored in Korea, besides our checking the Communist advance upon the free world, it was in the mathematical victory scored when only 23 Americans, 1 British soldier, and a few hundred South Koreans expressed a desire to stay in the Communist camp. Match that record against the thousands of North Koreans and Chinese Communists who held firm against returning to enslavement under their Communist masters. This was a victory for liberty and freedom that never was properly publicized in its true light, mainly because we seemed to accept it as a matter of course. We took no comfort in the fact that only 23 Americans, 2 of whom later changed their mind, expressed a desire to remain in Communist hands.

In connection with those two who changed their minds, I hold no brief for Mr. Dickenson. He was fairly tried by a jury of his peers and found guilty of crimes against his fellow prisoners. Because of that, he is to be punished. No one can object to that course of action. I cannot but regret exceedingly, however, that becaue of the promises of immunity made him, and because of the overrejoicing at his return, we now find ourselves in a situation where no matter what our final decision, we will lose prestige as a Nation. If the review board finds we are bound to keep our promises, the admitted escape from punishment Dickenson will enjoy will anger not only those prisoners of war who suffered at his hands but many here and in other countries throughout the world who would feel he should not go unpunished. On the other hand, if he is not released, there are those who will argue that as a Nation we have broken our word, and as a result, our prestige here and abroad will suffer. In possible similar circumstances in the future, we will not be believed. America's strength throughout the world lies not only in her military strength and economic power; it lies still more on her devotion to fundamental principles of truth and fair dealing.

Now, we come to that part of the prisoners of war episodes where I see no extenuating circumstances whatsoever for those who sit in judgment on our prisoners of war. That is the condemnation of those unfortunate prisoners who after undergoing months of privation, solitary confinement, and brain washing confess to the lie of dropping bacteriological bombs in North Korean and Chinese civilian areas.

Both military and civilian personnel cry for shame at these men. But I say that is easy for us 6,000 miles away from the torturers to cry for shame. It is easy for us 6,000 miles away from the filth and the starvation, and the loneliness of solitary confinement to cry for shame. We have the kind of courage born of geography—the courage that comes when 6,000 miles of plains and mountains and oceans separate us from the enemy. But when we learn that a man of proud courage, a man with an unblemished record, a man like Colonel Schwable, of the Marine Corps, confessed this kind of lie, we should stop and think before we judge. A man does not become a colonel in the Marine Corps easily, and if such a man submits, let not us, who sit at home, arrogantly pass easy judgment on him. What would be do under the circumstances?

By what reasonable yardstick do we measure the ability of any man or men to withstand the techniques of torture, which have been improved along with man-made inventions, to wage war more terribly than at any other period in the history of our world. Regrettable, yes, that these forced confessions of lies released much vicious and injurious propaganda, but, nevertheless, the circumstances under which the confessions were secured should make us regret the confessions but understand those who confessed. We instead find that a court of inquiry which finds Colonel Schwable not guilty is countermanded in effect by military and civilians who feel it was not in the best traditions to give complete exoneration to Colonel Schwable and to return him to a combat command and to a career in which he had previously distinguished himself in outstanding service to his country. How shallow and hypocritical it is for us with our immunity of geography, without firsthand knowledge of this situation, with no understanding of what actually happened to these men, to pass judgment on them. The will for survival is strong in any human being, and in addition to the ordinary human urge for self-preservation, these men had drilled into them the old training axiom "Anyone can die; it takes a good man to stay alive."

What greater example of this same type of treatment is there than that of Josef Cardinal Mindszenty, who wrote a letter prior to his imprisonment by this same type of Communists asking his people to disregard any confession which torture might wring from him. If ever a man there was, who by previous example of fighting nazism as well as communism had given an example of heroic courage and fortitude, that man was Josef Cardinal Mindszenty. He had the spiritual confidence that comes from love of God; the spiritual power of a true man of God; yet, Cardinal Mindszenty confessed under torture. We knew that confession was meaningless because of the letter released before his capture and from the chain of events subsequent to and during his trial. We have since seen too many of these trials by Communists to be led astray now. Yet, without that letter, without the knowledge of events, would we not in a similar situation as regards Josef Cardinal Mindszenty believe wrong of him?

I repeat, it is the courage of geography. The oceans, which have no protective value today in a war, do instill a false security into civilians and give them a safe distance from which to judge men and events.

Could we not have accepted the word of General Dean and the other prisoners of war who were closer to the scene instead of drawing the conclusions that have forever marked these men? Is it fair to point the finger of scorn at men whose culture, whose upbringing was completely foreign to what was thrust upon them?

My words are strong because I feel deeply about this treatment of my fellow veterans. On this Memorial Day, it seems to me we can pay tribute to the generosity of those who died by our own generosity to those who suffered. Instead of bitter judgment, let us be guided by the words of Jesus Christ on the cross when He spoke out and cried, "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do." With that spirit, we can build the greatest of all memorials to our comrades in arms.

Memorial Day Address of Hon. John C. Watts, of Kentucky

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL D. PERKINS

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 2, 1954

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by the Honorable John Watts, of Kentucky, at Georgetown, Ky., on May 30, 1954:

I deem it a great privilege to be permitted to join with the citizens of this fine county in an effort, in a humble way, to pay honor and homage to our dead heroes and those men and women who so gallantly wore the uniform of our country throughout its history and in the defense of our most precious heritages—our freedom and our liberty.

The memory of mankind is short, indeed, and our capacity for thanks and gratitude to those who have done so much for us is very limited. It is altogether fitting and proper that one day each year be set apart to pay tribute to those who made a supreme sacrifice for us and give us who are enjoying the heritage that they bequeathed to us an opportunity to take stock of our actions, recount our many blessings, and examine our behavior and the behavior of our country in order to evaluate whether we are worthy of the trust that has been placed in our hands.

Memorial Day, as we observe it today, was first recognized as a day to remember our Civil War dead and, as history has it, was first originated in Columbus, Miss., in 1866 when a group of Southern women, still wearing mourning for their dead—fathers, sons, husbands, and brothers—assembled at the local graveyard for the purpose of decorating with flowers the graves of those loved ones. In the cemetery in which they were decorating their own dead there were graves marking the last resting place of 40 or more Union soldiers, and with the fine spirit of generosity and feeling of forgiveness seldom if ever equaled, these noble women decorated alike the graves of the blue and grey. From this humble beginning, this day has been set apart to honor all of our war heroes of all of our struggles for liberty, independence, and self-preservation.

From Concord to Lexington, in the War of 1812, at Gettysburg, on San Juan Hill, through the Argonne Forest, on the bloody shores of Iwo Jima, and in the cold and frozen forests of Korea Memorial Day is now universally observed throughout the entire world, as the sun of a single day never sets on the graves of our honored dead, many of whom now rest on foreign soil and in numerous watery graves in the vast oceanic reaches of our world. They rest where they followed the flag of their country, and carried with them the American fighting spirit in behalf of freedom and justice for all of the people of the world.

Any words of praise that we speak here today or anything that we might do on this occasion will be of small import and will be soon forgotten. But the heroic deeds and sacrifices of those we seek to honor must not, shall not, ever be forgotten or in any way diminished irrespective of the passing of countless years. No words of praise; no recitation of sacrifices can add one iota to their greatness. Their record of achievement has already been established; they have made their sacrifice and have erected for themselves a monument of greatness that speaks louder, longer, and more forcefully than any words falling from the lips of any man. This great monument that they have collectively erected to themselves is a democratic, peace-loving, powerful United States of America, dedicated to the principles that all men are created equal, with certain inalienable rights. Our heroes of the Revolutionary War made possible the founding of this country on those principles and each war that followed was fought to preserve and expand those precious rights that we all enjoy and take as a matter of course in our everyday living and thinking.

We can thank them every day of our lives that we can worship God according to the dictates of our own conscience; free to attend the church of our own choosing, being insured of receiving religious instruction according to the word of God without it being colored by the dictates of a Government interested in using religious worship for propaganda purposes. It is to be regretted that this is not true in many countries today where religion is used as a tool of a government.

Their sacrifices make it possible for our children to attend schools, where facts and truth are taught, where our children are allowed to gain all the knowledge there is on any subject and are permitted to evaluate it for themselves and arrive at their own conclusion. Many places in the world today students are taught what the leaders of those countries want them to know and their minds are guided along the channels of thought that best serve their masters.

Our heritage by the secrifice they made permits us to live in a free Nation, where men's rights and privileges are guarded by law, where no man need fear arrest on some fictitious charge and the loss of his life, or be condemned to prison, slavery worse than death without any hope of fair trial by his peers.

To those we seek to honor today, we owe our freedom of the press, and our right to say and think what we wish, our right to vote; our right to criticize the action of our public officials and change them whenever it suits us. We are permitted to exercise these rights without fear of reprisal because we are free people and live in a free country, established and preserved by that legion we memoralize today.

Oh, what a rich and proud heritage they have bequeathed to us. It is this legacy—this legacy of the belief in the individual's rights. America believes in the dignity of man. It is a Nation which stands as the defender of the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Today America symbolizes to the world the hope of all free men. America has become the guardian of the principles and rights by which men wish to live, and for which they will give their only life to preserve.

We must preserve our immortal heritage. We are a Nation of laws; of responsibility and obligations. Today our responsibility is as great as it has ever been at any time in our history; to defend our country from an insidious menace from within as well as from without. Let us not act rashly, however, lest we destroy our principles which we claim to preserve. We must restrict and dispose of those who seek to destroy us, our Government and our democratic way of life. But we must be very careful not to mistake honest, patriotic dissent for disloyalty. This is dangerous.

It must continually be remembered that our country was born in revolution. At no time in our history have all of our people thought alike, although we were all seeking the same objective. Loyal dissent is not only permissible but necessary if we are to remain a strong Nation. It is this very principle of freedom of expression and difference of opinion which formed the basis of our Bill of Rights. It is a travesty upon our heritage that today a lack of conformity should be mistaken for disloyalty. We must not in this hour of our history be ruled by fear and distrust. Our strength lies as it always has in the rights and privileges of individual man; his freedom to express his thoughts; his right to live his life as he wishes insofar as he does not jeopardize the rights of others or the security of our country.

The external menace to our country and the free world is more easily distinguished than is our internal danger. It is a force which if permitted would destroy all of our democratic forms of government and make the world a slave world subservient to the whim of a few. This force does not believe in the dignity and freedom of man, but wants to dominate mankind mentally and physically and make his every thought and service subservient to ideology.

As we need to safeguard individual freedom at home so do we need to unite with the other freedom-loving people of the world and present a united strong front and defense to a common enemy in order that collectively we can save and protect our freedom and the freedom of the world.

On this Memorial Day we should reaffirm our faith and hope in the success of the United Nations; our belief that in the future the differences and grievances which one nation now has against another can and should be settled peaceably at conference tables and not on the battlefield.

In this day of atomic and hydrogen bombs, I say to you that this world cannot endure another war in which these weapons might be used, and who of us can say that despite any agreement that might be made outlawing their use in war that some madman might not, if we have another war, resort to their use. Man by his ingenuity has for the first time discovered a device by the use of which total life on this world can be destroyed. If we should have such a war, there will be no nations left; there will be no victor; there will be only destruction and devastation. We will be fortunate if any of mankind remains to continue the human race. We must do our best to see that such a war does not occur; that is our responsibility to mankind and our dead war heroes. It is our duty to see that they did not make their sacrifice in vain.

It is the duty of each of us and each generation to protect and cherish our heritage and to so conduct our lives and our Nation's affairs that with our passing we will leave behind us a better, stronger, and richer heritage for those who follow us.

Education and Training Benefits for Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 2, 1954

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to extend for 2 additional years the time for a veteran of service on or after June 25, 1950—Korean veterans—to initiate a course of education or training. Today a veteran must initiate his course by August 20, 1954, or 2 years after his discharge, whichever is the later. He must complete it within 7 years after his discharge. The first section of this bill would extend the time for initiating a course to 4 years from the date of discharge, and for the time for completion to 9 years from date of discharge. By this amendment the law is comparable, in this respect, to the provisions of Public Law 346 of the 78th Congress, the Servicemen's Readjustment Act, which provided education and training for the World War II group.

Sections 2 and 3 apply to the service-connected disabled group who take training under Public Law 16 of the 78th Congress or Public Law 894 of the 81st. The service-connected group receives training of such character and of such duration to permit them to regain their civilian aptitudes or to create new aptitudes to enable them to overcome the handicaps caused by their service-incurred disabilities and thus regain employability. As such, there is no initiation date, but there is an overall completion date for World War II veterans, July 25, 1956. Sections 2 and 3 extend this completion date from the present 9 years after termination of World War II to 13 years thereafter. In the case of the Korean veterans the extension is to 13 years after the termination of the basic service period which began June 27, 1950. These two sections cover only those veterans who have been prevented from pursuing their courses by reason of long illness or the two other compelling reasons specified in the bill.

The second category covered by sections 2 and 3 is the group of veterans, number unknown, who, upon discharge from the service, received a discharge of a character rendering the person ineligible for those benefits and who have subsequently followed the discharge review procedure provided under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act, the Legislative Reorganization Act, or otherwise had their discharges corrected by competent authority. In most instances the time within which vocational rehabilitation training may be begun and pursued to completion in World War II cases is past for those men, and thus legislation is needed to permit them now that they have discharges under other than dishonorable conditions to pursue their course.

The third category concerns the group of veterans who have not meet the requirement as to the establishment of a compensable service-connected disability until a date which would not afford sufficient time to complete a course of vocational rehabilitation before the existing terminal date.

Similar extensions are provided in the bill for those Korean veterans who in the future may come within the foregoing categories.

Sections 2 and 3 relate exclusively to the service-connected groups. The only amendment to the bill is for the purpose of correcting a typographical error.

No estimate of cost can be furnished on this measure as indicated in the report of the Veterans' Administration, which follows:

June 2, 1954.

Hon. Edith Nourse Rogers,
Chairman, Committee on Veterans' Affairs, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

Dear Mrs. Rogers: This will refer to your request for a report by the Veterans' Administration on H. R. 9395, 83d Congress, "A bill to amend the laws granting education and training benefits to certain veterans to extend the period during which such benefits may be offered."

The purpose of the bill is (1) to extend the initiation and completion deadline for education and training under the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952 (Public Law 550, 83d Congress), and (2) to grant 4 additional years during which certain disabled veterans of World War II and the Korean service period who, for specific reasons, have been unable to commence or, if having commenced, to continue vocational rehabilitation training under Public Law 16, 78th Congress, as amended and extended.

Section 1 of the bill would amend the pertinent provision of title II of the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act to read as follows:

"Sec. 212. (a) No eligible veteran shall be entitled to initiate a program education or training under this title after August 20, 1954, or after [two] *four* years after his discharge or release from active service, whichever is later.

"(b) * * *.

"Sec. 213. No education or training shall be afforded an eligible veteran under this title beyond [seven] *nine* years after either his discharge or release from active service or the end of the basic service period, whichever is earlier."

The words enclosed in brackets would be deleted from existing law by the enactment of H. R. 9395 and the italicized language inserted in lieu thereof.

Thus the effect of the bill would be to extend the periods for initiating, and for completing, education and training under the act by 2 years each. It is noted, however, that the date August 20, 1954, would remain as the initial delimiting initiation date. It would, under the revised act, however, be applicable to only those very few Korean service veterans who were discharged on or before August 20, 1950. It is, of course, obvious that any persons who were subject to this date could have acquired only a very few days of entitlement to education and training under the act, those with substantial entitlement would presumably have the benefit of the proposed 4 year post-discharge initiation date.

As will be recalled the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952, which provided benefits for veterans of the Korean service period in the same general fields in which comparable benefits had previously been granted to veterans of World War II by the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, received extensive consideration prior to its enactment. Some of the provisions included were novel and were designed to avoid certain difficulties which had become manifest under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act. Other provisions were adopted which were substantially identical with the comparable provisions of the earlier act and confirmatory of the same underlying principles.

One principle thus carried forward to the new act was the concept that measures relating to the specific readjustment needs of veterans in returning to civilian life should be temporary in character. This principle is soundly based upon the purpose of the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act, which, as applied to education and training, was stated in section 102 as "providing vocational readjustment and restoring lost educational opportunities to those servicemen and women whose educational or vocational ambitions have been interrupted or impeded by reason of active service in the Armed Forces during a period of national emergency and for the purpose of aiding such persons in attaining the educational and training status which they might normally have aspired to and obtained had they not served their country."

The temporary character of this type of benefit is obviously a recognition of the fact that readjustment to civilian life should be accomplished by the veterans within a reasonably short time following service, and that the time element is an essential ingredient of the readjustment principle.

Sections 212 and 213 of the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act, however, are more than a reaffirmation of the temporary nature of the readjustment benefit. They designedly adopted the supplementary concept of the 1944 enactment that the foregoing readjustment principle needs to be implemented by a statutory requirement that the veteran must make his educational plans, complete all necessary arrangements, and actually commence the pursuit of his program within a fixed period of time. All of this is implicit in the term "initiate," as interpreted by the Veterans' Administration in connection with the Servicemen's Readjustment Act, and of which the Congress was fully apprised when it selected such term for incorporation in the delimiting date requirements of the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act.

To be consistent with this concept, and with the basic readjustment purpose, the delimiting period for initiating a program cannot be so short as to leave the veteran insufficient time for the deliberation needed for a wise choice of his objective and to make the necessary arrangements for enrolling in the selected educational institution or training establishment. On the other hand, if the prescribed period is unduly lengthened, the readjustment purpose will tend to become obscured, and procrastination encouraged, most probably to the veteran's own detriment.

The instant bill does not appear to be designed to change the aforementioned principle, but would allow a more extensive period than that allowed by existing law during which the veteran could commence his program. It therefore poses the question of whether the 2-year delimiting initiation period of existing law is reasonable and adequate or whether a 4-year period (somewhat comparable to the requirement applicable to the World War II education and training program) should be allowed.

A review of the legislative history of this provision may be helpful. Title II of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as enacted June 22, 1944, provided that a course of education and training must be initiated not later than 2 years after discharge or the termination of World War II, whichever date was the later, and no training could be afforded beyond 7 years after the termination of such war. These 2- and 7-year periods were extended to 4 and 9 years, respectively, on December 28, 1945, by section 5, Public Law 268, 79th Congress. This extension was enacted at a time when the mass demobilization which followed World War II was already beginning to result in the crowding of the educational institutions of the country by the veterans who were seeking to enroll in unprecedented numbers. All efforts for a further extension of, and for exceptions to, these dates have thus far been rejected by the Congress.

The Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act was enacted under circumstances which precluded the likelihood of a repetition of the demobilization of millions of persons within a relatively few months. Further, the educational facilities which had been expanded to accommodate the World War II veterans were becoming available through the constriction of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act program, as it entered its terminal stage. It is significant that all bills, introduced in the 82d Congress to provide a new education and training program for veterans of the Korean service period (as opposed to those which would have merely extended the Servicemen's Readjustment Act program) without exception, proposed 2- and 7-year delimiting periods.

The following extract from the report of the Veterans' Administration to the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs on an earlier bill (H. R. 5040, 82d Congress) is, we believe, indicative of contemporaneous thinking on the subject.

"In apparent recognition of the fact that readjustment to civilian life must be accomplished in a relatively short period of time after discharge or release from active duty, if it is to be effective, all persons would be required to initiate a course under this part within 2 years after such discharge. The terminal date for the program would be established as 7 years after the termination of the basic service period. As previously noted, these periods (2 years and 7 years, respectively) are identical with the periods originally established for part VIII.

"The conditions existing at the present time would not seem to portend a mass release of service personnel, such as occurred at the end of hostilities in World War II, so that the schools and other training establishments should be able to absorb all trainees under this part without the delays such as influenced the extension of the original limitation periods under part VIII from 2 and 7 years to 4 and 9 years, respectively, pursuant to Public Law 268, 79th Congress."

It would seem that the favorable situation envisioned above has not been materially altered by any development since the enactment of the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952. Hence, there is presented the basic question of whether there has been any demonstrated need for a period longer than the 2 years which the Congress so recently determined to be adequate and proper. It is true that the enrollments in certain types of training notably in institutional on-farm training have not reached the anticipated level. However, it would appear that where the interest and demand for on-farm training has been evidenced, such training has been provided and enrollments effected.

Section 2 of the bill is identical except for technical changes not here pertinent to H. R. 7210, 83d Congress, "A bill to extend the time during which vocational rehabilitation training may be afforded under Public Law 16, 78th Congress, as amended and extended, to certain disabled veterans who have been unable to pursue such training because of long illnesses or because of other reasons beyond their control."

It proposes to provide a limited extension of the period during which vocational rehabilitation training may be provided certain classes of those disabled veterans of World War II and of the Korean service period who are basically eligible for the benefit but whose entrance into training was delayed or prevented by reasons beyond their own control. Specifically it proposes to amend both Public Law 16, 78th Congress, as amended, and Public Law 894, 81st Congress, as amended, to provide such training to be extended for 4 additional years in the cases of persons who were unable to pursue vocational rehabilitation training to completion within the prescribed period because of one of the following conditions:

"(a) Such person had not attained, retained, or regained medical feasibility for training because of mental or physical disability;

"(b) Such person had not met the nature of discharge requirements of section 1503 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 (38 U. S. C. 697c) prior to a change, correction, or modification of a discharge or dismissal made pursuant to section 301 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended (38 U. S. C. 693h), or the correction of a military or naval record made pursuant to section 207 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended (5 U. S. C. 191a), or other corrective action by competent authority; or

"(c) Such person had not timely established the existence of compensable disability connected with or aggravated by service."

The Veterans' Administration submitted a report to your committee on H. R. 7210, 83d Congress, under date of April 2, 1954. The views and principles expressed in that report are equally applicable to section 2 of the instant bill and will not be repeated. For your convenience a copy of that report is enclosed herewith (Committee Print No. 230).

Attention is invited, however, to the fact that in the mentioned report on H. R. 7210 question was raised whether the language of the proposed exceptions might possibly be open to an argument that even though the disabling condition ceases to exist at a date when adequate time remained for the pursuit and completion of a suitable course of vocational rehabilitation training, an extension of the existing time limitation should be granted. It was suggested that to guard against such a contention appropriate language be included to bar any extension of the present time limitations in the case of a person having the last 5 years of the basic 9-year period available to commence and pursue training.

Further, it was also pointed out that since a terminal date for pursuing vocational rehabilitation training under the Public Law 894 extension has not been set; and since it is impossible at this time to predict when such a termination date will be set, persons whose eligibility is based upon service subsequent to June 27, 1950, will have staggered amounts of time in which to pursue and complete vocational rehabilitation training. The actual amount of time in any individual case would, of course, depend upon date of discharge. I wish, therefore, to invite special attention to my recommendation that the committee consider amending Public Law 894, 81st Congress, as amended, to provide that training must be completed by the date 9 years after discharge, or 9 years after the end of the basic service period, whichever is the earlier. Appropriate language could be included to assure all persons of 9 years subsequent to the enactment of such amendment in which to pursue and complete training. An amendment along the suggested lines would be consistent with the delimiting requirements of the educational and vocational assistance provision of the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act, which requirements are the subject of section 1 of the current bill.

As an overall matter, it is my view that both section 1 and section 2 of the present bill involve serious questions of policy, which in the last analysis must be resolved by the Congress.

No reliable estimate can be made of the cost which would be attributable to the enactment of this bill. Undoubtedly there would be additional cost for direct benefits in an extension of either the Public Law 550 education and training program or the Public Law 16 vocational rehabilitation training program; since persons who would not otherwise take advantage of these benefit programs could be expected to do so during the extended period. Moreover, there would be some ultimate additional expense in administrative costs resulting from the longer period in which both programs would be operative.

The Veterans' Administration has been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that it recommends against any extension of either the time limitations of title II of the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act or of the vocational rehabilitation training program.

Sincerely yours,

H. V. Higley,
Administrator.

H. R. 9395

A bill to amend the laws granting education and training benefits to certain veterans to extend the period during which such benefits may be offered

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) section 212 (a) of the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952 is amended by striking out "two" and inserting "four" in lieu thereof.

(b) Section 213 of such act is amended by striking out "seven" and inserting "nine" in lieu thereof.

Sec. 2. The proviso in paragraph 1 of part VII of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a) is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following: ", except that '13 years' shall be substituted for '9 years' in the case of any otherwise eligible person who the Administrator determines to have been prevented from entering or, having entered, from completing, training under this part within such 9 years by reason of one of the following conditions:

"(a) Such person had not attained, retained, or regained medical feasibility for training because of mental or physical disability;

"(b) Such person had not met the nature of discharge requirements of section 1503 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 (38 U. S. C. 697c) prior to a change, correction, or modification of a discharge or dismissal made pursuant to section 301 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended (38 U. S. C. 693h), or the correction of a military or naval record made pursuant to section 207 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended (5 U. S. C. 191a), or other corrective action by competent authority; or

"(c) Such person had not timely established the existence of compensable disability connected with or aggravated by service.".

Sec. 3. That the act of December 28, 1950, as amended (38 U. S. C. 701a), is amended by inserting before the period at the end of clause (1) the following: "; except that 'thirteen years' shall be substituted for 'nine years' in the case of any otherwise eligible person whom the Administrator determines to have been prevented from entering or, having entered, from completing, training under this act within such 9 years by reason of one of the following conditions:

"(a) Such person had not attained, retained, or regained medical feasibility for training because of mental or physical disability;

"(b) Such person had not met the nature of discharge requirements of section 1503 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 (38 U. S. C. 697c) prior to a change, correction, or modification of a discharge or dismissal made pursuant to section 301 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended (38 U. S. C. 693h), or the correction of a military or naval record made pursuant to section 207 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended (5 U. S. C. 191a), or other corrective action by competent authority; or

"(c) Such person had not timely established the existence of compensable disability connected with or aggravated by service."

Improve Our Social Security Program

SPEECH

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. BARRETT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1954

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 9366) to amend the Social Security Act and the Internal Revenue Code so as to extend coverage under the old-age and survivors insurance program, increase the benefits payable thereunder, preserve the insurance rights of disabled individuals, and increase the amount of earnings permitted without loss of benefits, and for other purposes.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, most references to "isms" today are in a derogatory or defamatory sense. I believe there is one "ism" that we should all adopt, and that is humanitarianism. What greater act of humanitarianism can there be than taking care of the aged, infirm, and physically handicapped?

Because social security is being considered by the House of Representatives today, the people who elected us as their Representatives in Congress are under the misapprehension that as individual Members of Congress we have before us the opportunity to enact legislation which will eliminate concern about how the aged and needy of today and tomorrow will meet the expenses of the bare necessities of living. Unfortunately, this is not so. We are presented with a measure (H. R. 9366) which was prepared after more than a year of study and months of hearings, but ultimately drafted by the administration and reported by the House Ways and Means Committee. We are given several hours to debate this bill, but have only the choice of voting for or against the bill as presented, but not permitted to offer amendments.

H. R. 9366 does have several desirable features which improve our existing old-age and survivors insurance program, which was originally adopted in 1935 and later had two minor amendments to increase benefits slightly. However, it falls very short of meeting the needs of aged persons who were born too soon to get under the original program. It does not make any provision for persons who are totally disabled before reaching the age of 65. Nor does it provide adequate increases for today's retired aged individuals to meet the increased cost of living since enactment of the original social-security legislation.

One of the commendable features of H. R. 9366 is that it extends old-age and survivors insurance coverage to an additional 10 million persons who work during the course of a year in jobs now excluded from the program. Also it increases the total annual earnings on which benefits would be computed and contributions paid from $3,600 to $4,200. The Democratic administration had proposed that this be increased to $6,000. The new method of computing benefits for persons who retire and for the survivors of those who die in the future results in insignificant increased payments to those beneficiaries of the program. There are several other additions to the social-security program, but these affect very few persons who fall in the average workingman category.

PROPOSED INCREASES NOT ADEQUATE

The average payment to today's social-security beneficiaries is $50 per month—minimum $25, maximum $85. It is hard to believe that the Congress has not before this time, in the face of inflation and increased cost of living, raised this mere pittance to an allowance to permit a decent standard of living for the aged and needy. H. R. 9366, which we are today given the opportunity to accept or reject, provides an average increase in monthly benefits of $6. In other words, the range in primary insurance amounts will now be from $30 to $98.50 per month, as compared with the present range of $25 to $85 per month. This can hardly be considered as corrective legislation. It seems to me to be mere sugar-coating for use as congressional campaign propaganda.

PRESENT AGED NOT INCLUDED

There is one group of our citizens who cannot even look forward to this meager increase in old-age benefits. That group is today's retired aged who, through no fault of their own, are not covered by old age and survivors insurance because the program did not exist during their years of gainful employment. Our social security program discriminates against the very group that has the greatest current need for the protection of OASI. It is only fair that we give equal consideration to today's retired aged by providing minimum benefits to them now. Our social security program also ignores the widows of those now beyond retirement age who do not come under the present system. A majority of these former workers and their widows are entirely dependent on their children for all of their necessities of living, thus spreading poverty into two or several families.

EARNINGS OF BENEFICIARIES TOO LIMITED

The maximum outside income that a beneficiary of OASI under 75 years of age may receive is $1,000. The maximum amount of social security benefits that an individual under 75 may receive is $1,182, making a maximum total income permissible after age 65 of $2,182. Hence, at the age when an individual's earning capacity decreases, even though he may be physically capable and prefer to continue in gainful employment, he is not entitled to receive the benefits toward which he has contributed for a major portion of his life, and on the other hand is prohibited by law from obtaining an income to meet the bare essentials of living. I do not believe there should be any limitation on the outside income of any person who has contributed to the social security fund and is otherwise eligible to receive benefits.

BENEFITS FOR TOTALLY DISABLED

Another striking deficiency in the administration's social-security bill is that it fails to provide benefits for totally disabled workers. If a person covered by OASI is permanently injured in an automobile accident or suffers a heart attack at the age of say 52, even though he or she has contributed to social security, neither the individual nor the family can collect any benefits from the Government until that person reaches the age of 65. The arbitrary retirement age of 65 disregards the human factor that some of us are forced to retire before that time for physical reasons, while other more fortunate men and women can continue to work well beyond any given age. In 1950 I voted in favor of a bill which included social-security benefits for the totally disabled. This bill passed the House of Representatives, but unfortunately it was not approved by the Senate. Today, we are not given the opportunity to reconsider this important part of social-security legislation because of H. R. 9366 being "closed" to amendments and this particular provision was not included in the administration's social-security bill.

Mr. Speaker, the rapid rises in cost of living during and since World War II have distorted the structure of our social-security system. I am personally aware of hundreds of cases in South Philadelphia where the old folks are unable to manage on their meager social-security incomes. We are not achieving a truly protective system of social security under H. R. 9366, as it does not provide for a "security" income. I hope that our colleagues in the Senate will have the opportunity to amend this measure to provide greater benefits now and that when H. R. 9366 is returned to us from conference, we can feel that we have truly acted in the interest of humanitarianism by casting our votes in favor of it.

Addresses Delivered by Hon. Lyndon B. Johnson, of Texas, and Hon. Robert B. Anderson, Deputy Secretary of Defense, on the Occasion of the Presentation of A. Harris Co. Texan Award to Secretary Anderson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. LYLE, JR.

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 2, 1954

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, last Saturday the A. Harris Co. Texan award for 1954 was presented to the Honorable Robert B. Anderson, Deputy Secretary of Defense. The award, given each year by this great merchandising company of Dallas, Tex., is in recognition of an outstanding Texan for uncommon achievement.

The committee chose well this fateful year—and the circumstances of presentation were most impressive.

Two young Texans were the principals—Mr. Anderson, of course, who, at 43, is the youngest man to serve in the high position he now holds—and the Honorable LYNDON B. JOHNSON, who, at 45, is Texas' senior Senator and Democratic leader of the United States Senate—the youngest man ever to be so selected. Each of these men enjoys extraordinary achievement in their personal and public affairs—each is stimulating evidence of the possibilities and opportunities afforded the young of America. Each is dedicated to the preservation and the full development of our good life, our sound Government, and our great country. Each are outstanding Texans—great Americans.

They are warm friends—uncommon young men with a common objective.

The remarks of these leaders, delivered that day in Dallas, Tex., are eloquent reminder, to us and to the world, that we are united in effort and in thought.

You will want to read what they had to say. I insert their remarks in the order of their presentation.

Secretary Anderson spoke extemporaneously before referring to his prepared text. I am not prepared to record that part of his speech. It was a moving and modest tribute to his friends and to his family—to the people and circumstances that had permitted his unparallelled opportunities for service.

The addresses follow:

ADDRESS OF SENATOR LYNDON B. JOHNSON

Secretary Anderson, Mr. Harris, Mr. Kramer, distinguished guests, a little less than a year ago I flew to Amarillo with the President of the United States.

It was a long trip—a trip to inspect the drought-stricken regions of our Panhandle.

BIG ENOUGH FOR ANY JOB

As men will do to pass the time on the way to their destination, we started to talk about our mutual friends. When I mentioned one, the President's eyes lit up.

"That man," he said, "is big enough to handle any job in this country."

"That man" was the great Texan and great human we are honoring tonight—Robert B. Anderson.

ABILITY AND HEART

Frankly, I had a feeling of superiority on that occasion. The President's knowledge was recent. I had known for years that Bob Anderson was big enough to handle any job, anywhere at any time.

In fact, there is only one thing in Texas that is bigger than Bob Anderson's ability. That is Bob Anderson's heart and his understanding of his fellow men.

I can remember back to 1935 when I was State Director of the National Youth Administration. We had to set up a board—a board composed of experienced and able men.

One of the members was Beauford Jester. Another was Bob Anderson—a man who could not be passed up.

A CHANCE TO HELP

Bob was a pretty busy man in those days. There was nothing in it for him—nothing but a chance to do something for helpless kids who were getting the short end of the stick.

That was enough. He attended the meetings. He was one of the hardest working members of that board.

Maybe it was because Bob knew what it meant to get the short end of the stick. Maybe it was because he had come up the hard way—working his way through school; overcoming handicaps that have knocked many another man out of the battle of life.

Whatever it was, it added up to the quality—to the basic character—that makes people say: "Bob Anderson is a big man."

We all have our struggles; we all have our trials. Some of us learn from them and mellow with the passing years. Others are exhausted and the passage of time merely adds to their frustration and bitterness.

A FINE LEADER

Bob is a man who has learned—who has remembered the lessons of a vigorous and fruitful life.

He has been a member of the State legislature.

He has been the chairman of our unemployment commission.

He has been president of the State board of education.

He has been the manager of a large business enterprise.

From each of these positions, he has drawn the experience and the knowledge that makes him one of the finest leaders of our Government.

VARIETY IS NEEDED

It may seem like a long step from the State legislature to Deputy Secretary of Defense. But I will never forget the words of one of our wisest men.

He told me that if a former Secretary of State had run for town constable just once, it would have been a blessing for the free world.

It takes a lawyer to try a lawsuit.

It takes a businessman to run a corporation.

But it takes a man with a wide variety of experience to be a great public servant.

A FORCE FOR UNITY

Bob Anderson is one of the few men in public life today who can unite just about everybody. He can bring them together regardless of party, creed, or background. He can bring them together to work for the country.

Just a few years ago, we were shocked by the spectacle of the Navy investigating the Air Force and the Air Force fighting back. It was a bitter struggle, the kind that did not do our country any good.

It was due solely to the absence of men like Bob Anderson—men who understand human values and who can approach the problems of others with sympathy.

I am mighty proud that he is getting the Texas award in Dallas. But I think it should go one step further. I think he is entitled to the American award for service to his country.

Bob Anderson personifies the kind of unity that America needs. I am very glad that he is in a key spot in our Defense Department.

JUDGMENT AND BALANCE

These are times that call for judgment and balance.

The "cold war"—which has actually been pretty hot—has entered a new stage. It is the military penetration of the Western Hemisphere.

We cannot call it an invasion—it is too small for that. At best, it represents a small beachhead.

A TRIAL AT ARMS

But whatever we want to call it, the implications are clear. There are Communist weapons in the Western Hemisphere. Sooner or later, there will be a trial at arms.

It may be only a clash between guerrillas in the jungles of Central America. It may be a border sniping between 2—or 3—small countries.

Nevertheless, the mere presence of those arms is a matter of grave concern. We cannot afford to have armed and organized Communists virtually in our own back yard.

PART OF A PATTERN

I cannot avoid the feeling that this is no isolated incident. It is hardly a coincidence that Communist arms should arrive in Guatemala shortly after the fall of Dien Bien Phu and right in the middle of the Geneva conference.

This is a piece of a pattern—a pattern designed to keep us off balance in the months ahead. We can expect to see more pieces as the Communists unravel the web they have spun.

THE ONE-TWO PUNCH

Indochina and Guatemala represent a one-two punch. Neither are lethal. But they could be followed by a sharp series of blows that would be staggering.

There are other soft spots in the world.

The middle east is out of the headlines for the moment. But no one can claim that the Communist forces in that area have been vanquished.

South America is relatively quiet. But it is no secret that Communist forces are actively at work in a few countries.

Africa is not front page right now. But there are many who believe that Soviet agents have made some deep penetrations.

PICK AND CHOOSE

Obviously we cannot police the whole world. Our soldiers cannot act as fire brigades rushing to stamp out flames spurting up at isolated corners of the globe.

It would be a fruitless task that would exhaust both our strength and our blood.

We have got to pick and choose. We must select the ground upon which we will stand, and know clearly who will stand with us. We must find "soft spots" in the Communist system where we can go on the offensive without going to war.

These are not easy decisions.

We do not want to abandon any unwilling people to Communist tyranny—nor should we.

We do not want to break up any relations with countries that are our friends and allies—nor should we.

Nevertheless, we have to take a long, cool look at the realities of the present world.

FIND THE STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES

Our foreign policy is a complicated network of alliances, pacts, and understandings that have been put together in the past few years. Some parts of that network have worked well, very well. Some parts have been severely strained. Some may have failed altogether.

We have got to examine that network and determine the strengths and the weaknesses. Perhaps some parts should be propped up. Perhaps others should be abandoned altogether.

It is not a job for a day or for a week. It is a hard, plugging task that will take time—even though we cannot afford too much time.

BIPARTISAN REVIEW; NONPARTISAN SPIRIT

But it must be done. And the first step in doing it must be the promotion of national unity.

What we really need is a bipartisan review in a nonpartisan spirit.

I am not going into any discussion of whether bipartisanship has—or has not—existed in the past. It is fruitless to engage in such arguments when we have much more serious problems before us. Let the record speak for itself.

LET US REASON TOGETHER

Neither am I going to try any complicated definition of bipartisanship.

Let us simply as Americans, recall the Biblical injunction from Isaiah—Come now and let us reason together.

It may be that we will find disagreements that cannot be reconciled. If so, they must be stated with force, candor, and vigor—but not with venom, malice, or sly innuendo.

PEACE AND FREEDOM

Personally, I believe that we would find many more agreements than disputes. However we may feel about the burning issues of the day, practically every American holds one objective in common.

It is peace and freedom for our country.

I have found that when disputes cannot be reconciled, it is usually because men hold to different objectives. But when objectives are the same, mature people can usually find a way to get together.

Peace and freedom for our country is not an abstract objective.

It means an opportunity to plan for the future.

It means security for our children.

It means liberty in thought and in deed for our posterity.

I think most Americans want these things. I also think they want them for their fellow Americans.

Only a selfish, shortsighted minority believes that a small part of America can be free—and the rest slave.

HONEST DISAGREEMENTS

Some men are for the Taft-Hartley Act; some are against it. Some men are for social security; some are against it. Some men are for reciprocal trade; some are against it.

But these are honest disagreements based upon different objectives. When they cannot be reconciled, we have no alternative but to vote the majority—and grant the minority the opportunity to try to change the views of the other side.

A FRONT OF NATIONAL UNITY

As a realist, I recognize the fact that disagreement is possible even where objectives are identical. We can always argue methods and sometimes we are so firmly committed to them that we cannot be shaken.

But even in cases such as these, it is usually possible to narrow the area of disagreement. It is usually possible to broaden the front of national unity.

There will be partisanship in this country so long as it is free. It is a necessary and healthy part of the democratic process.

But partisanship solely for the sake of partisan advantage should stop short where the Nation's security is at stake. To use a well-worn but expressive phrase, it should halt at the water's edge.

NO ALTERNATIVE

In a very real sense, there is no alternative. We cannot permit our Nation to be ripped apart in the face of the greatest threat to freedom in all its history.

Where there are disagreements, they must be stated. I have done so in the past, and I intend to do so in the future. But where there is agreement, the whole Nation should participate in making the policies that will secure our liberty.

A STANDARD OF REASON

I would like to go back for a moment to what is really the theme of my address—Come now and let us reason together.

Those are the words that will save our country.

We are here today to honor a great American who has practiced that philosophy all his life. He has raised a standard of reason and sympathy and understanding around which we all can rally.

I think all of us deep in our hearts would like to pay Bob Anderson an even higher tribute today.

We can do it—all Americans can do it—by uniting in mutual confidence and trust and an unshakable determination that the lamp of freedom shall burn bright upon this earth.

Remarks of Hon. Robert B. Anderson, Deputy Secretary of Defense

I would like to speak briefly on a few of the things which we Americans who champion the cause of freedom within the framework of democracy are wont to turn with mounting interest and attention in these days of long and continued uncertainty.

The first of these concerns the nature of the democratic process. The essence of democracy is that it is government by the many instead of by the few or by the one. It rests on the sweeping assumption that the people themselves are wise enough to understand the issues and conflicts of interest which are bound to be presented to any human community, and good enough to make the concessions and compromises required for their resolution.

Thus, in any community where men are free to speak, to think, to act, to write, and otherwise participate in the making of public policy there is a tremendous amount of pulling and hauling which may lend the color of discord and lack of solidarity to its proceedings. This may or may not in fact be true. We who believe in the democratic proposition, in the ultimate worth and goodness of the individual, know that the function of public debate, in which differences are aired, views are challenged, and truth is relentlessly sought is crucial to the democratic process. But we also know that when blind emotionalism rules, when men rather than ideas become the issue, when self-interest is substituted for national interest in a widening circle of hysteria, hatred, and mistrust, then discord and insolidarity may indeed become the product of the process. No natural law vouchsafes to us the continuation of our democratic system. It will thrive in the measure, and only in the measure, that we show ourselves to be decent enough, wise enough, and responsible enough to deserve the political luxury of a government of the people, by the people, and for the people.

The second point I would make is that we are living in a world of vast physical power. Never before has the intelligence of man placed so much material power at his disposal; never before were his potentialities for good or evil so expansive; and never before loomed so imminent his choice between the two. It is entirely probable that those of us whose life span is included in this instant of cosmic time may see this choice made—may, indeed, each in his own way, share in the making of it. Because of the imminence of this decision ad our responsibility in it, it is of supreme importance that the positions we take and the principles we announce come from a platform of calm assurance and determination. There is a very present need for us to be firm but dispassionate; resolute but understanding; always willing to negotiate but never to appease.

In a world of uncertainty, it behooves us to conduct our affairs with patience and good faith, seeking peaceful solutions to our problems wherever possible, but ever mindful of the fact that for a people who are and wish to remain free, war is not the supreme evil of human experience, nor is peace at any price the supreme objective of human endeavor.

Finally, we should know that the requirements of our times extend to the uttermost reaches of our national life. Our position both with respect to our own affairs and the affairs of the world in which we live must represent a balance of our very best capabilities in every field. It is not enough that we alone have strength amid weakness; it is not enough that we effectively solve our production problems while those of distribution may beg for attention. We must see clearly that we are part and parcel of the free world, that our fortunes are bound up in it, and that the frontier of freedom is common to us all. We must see our own responsibilities for leading the free world community, in patience and understanding, toward the ultimate goal of freedom for all men, everywhere. Whether that goal is achieved in 1 generation or in 20 should not concern us here. The important thing is not so much where we are, but the direction in which we are moving; and if our best efforts produce a world in which the dignity of the individual is somewhat more secure, in which the values of liberty and justice and respect for truth are more firmly rooted in the social consciousness of men, we shall not have failed in our stewardship to those who follow us in the great pageant of human history.

The Atomic Revolution, a Speech by John Jay Hopkins, of the National Security Industrial Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1954

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, on April 28, 1954, an address entitled "The Atomic Revolution" was made before the Economic Club of New York by John J. Hopkins, chairman of the board of trustees of the National Security Industrial Association, and chairman and president of the General Dynamics Corp.

Mr. Hopkins is well qualified to speak on the place of atomic energy in our lives today and in the future, and is a proper spokesman for the National Security Industrial Association, a unique organization serving as a link between American industry and the Defense Department, which seeks to provide for the Defense Establishment an access to America's pool of industrial knowhow. Under unanimous consent, I include this speech in the Appendix of the Record:

The Atomic Revolution

(By John Jay Hopkins)

I am deeply appreciative of the honor I enjoy in addressing so intellectually inquisitive a group—and particularly in company with the distinguished Attorney General of the United States.

I should like to say at once that I have looked forward eagerly to this occasion. Not, of course, with any visions of being amusing or profoundly enlightening but rather with the hope of communicating to you something of my own constantly accelerating enthusiasm for this new and wonderful and revolutionary era which each of us must view as his responsibility and also, perhaps, his good fortune.

My associates and I are vitally interested in the exploration of three worlds: the space world—the world of the earth's atmosphere and beyond; the world of the earth's oceans, their surfaces and their depths; and the atomic world—the world of forces invisible, immense, and basic to the life and growth and continuity of all things.

In presuming to discuss these matters that have been thought privy to mathematicians and poets I do not, of course, appear before you as a scientist or as a philosopher. My approach is purely pragmatic. My group is concerned with designing and producing supersonic fighting planes; intercontinental bombers; large transport planes, for both sea and land; guided missiles; and even vertically rising aircraft. We are occupied with design studies for atomic aircraft; with the world's first important use of atomic power—in the submarines *Nautilus* and *Sea Wolf*; and in constantly reconnoitering the industrial frontiers of atomics and electronics.

BUILDING WITH DREAMS

It is natural, therefore, for me to hold constantly in mind the parallels between the present infancy of atomic energy and the early days of other great inventions and discoveries—particularly aircraft.

In the time of the Wright brothers, just half a century ago, men who talked of aviation and an aviation industry were shrugged off and ridiculed as dreamers.

Yet, I venture to say, that even the wildest dreams of 1904 fall fantastically short of the realities of aviation in 1954. I know—because my associates are now busy engineering and manufacturing many of these very dreams. Dreams on which military and industrial leaders are willing to spend millions, in order that they may come speedily to fruition.

There are other organizations, too, successfully creating dreams. Some of you, I see, are chief executives of them.

We may take comfort in knowing that Jules Verne, the imaginative author of Twenty Thousand Leagues Under the Sea was regarded by scientists and engineers and other practical men of his day as an extreme visionary. Yet today his fictions and fantasies of submarines, supersonic aircraft, and rockets reaching for the moon have become facts.

In the light of the past 50 years of astounding progress in aeronautics, in electronics, and in atomics we can hardly be derided as spinners of dreams if we predict even much more revolutionary developments during the next 50 years.

THE ATOMIC REVOLUTION

The atomic revolution—now transforming our scientific, economic, and political concepts—began as a wartime achievement triggered by a desperate wartime emergency. Yet the terrible first employment of atomic energy as the light—brighter than the sun—which destroyed Hiroshima—should not blind us to the great and enduring good for all mankind already rippling outward from this epic event.

We have learned and are learning—as we have had to do with fire—that the uncontrolled release of atomic energy can be the world's greatest evil. Atomic energy controlled can become the world's greatest material blessing—a major achievement of the spirit of man in the conquest of his material world. This is the dual destiny of the atom.

Yet it must be borne in mind during this current wave of mild hysteria—and during the future recurring atmospheres of apprehension which are bound to encompass us—that the atomic fission missile has no motive, that the thermonuclear device has no brain, and that the theoretical bomb of cobalt will be inert until activated by man.

The atom bomb does not decide its enemy, choose its target, detonate itself. It does what it is directed to do. The thermonuclear device is not in itself a villain—a hell bomb. Bombs are built with human hands. Human passions, not machines, supply the villainy and the hell.

True for today are the words of the great and wise George Meredith:

> "In tragic life, God wot
> No villain need be—
> Passions spin the plot."

What we need to fear, and seek to control, is not the H-bomb but the thought that broods behind the bomb—and the hate, or greed, or fear that trembles on its trigger.

The atom has its greatest potential not in a world of war and hate and evil, but in a world of peace, and of good will. Not as a destroyer of cities and nations but as a builder and savior. Indeed, atomic fission and fusion have given us the knowledge which now forces us to an historic choice between good and evil.

Hopefully, I believe that the world's choice will be made for atomic creation rather than atomic destruction. While atomic clouds and rains of radioactive ashes and atoms for war monopolize the news—the peaceful atomic revolution is being speeded, too, though little publicized.

Because creation is infinitely more difficult than destruction, the curbing of atomic energy to peacetime use has become the great technological and moral challenge of our day. For in order to deserve the creative boons of atomic energy rather than the consequences of its destructive power, we have no alternative but to work vigorously and unremittingly, and instantly, toward the constructive benefits it so clearly offers.

AGAINST THE STATUS QUO

It seems fair to compare the revolutionary impact of atomic energy on our world economy with the discovery of fire, steam, and electricity, and the power sources of coal, oil, wood, and falling water. But the nature of the atomic revolution is infinitely more varied in scope than any mere power revolution. I foresee that the atomic revolution will transform not only power, travel, transport, and communication, with new portable power packs, but will revolutionize also our economics, our social customs, our medicine, our finances, our politics, our agriculture, our biology.

The atom is revolt incarnate against the status quo.

To a physicist, atomic energy is a prime tool for studying the structure of the physical world, and the interrelation of force and matter. To the researcher in biophysics, or chemistry, or medicine, or metallurgy—atomic energy provides priceless precision tools to identify and trace chemical reactions within the constituents of living and inorganic matter. To the military man, atomic energy has given instruments of unimaginable power. To the industrialist it offers a new type of fuel—one with its own peculiar problems, but also one offering competition eventually for existing fuels, and with reserves of energy far surpassing any of those now being employed.

ATOMS AT WORK

Already more than 1,000 firms in the United States and Canada, to say nothing of the rest of the world, are employing the atom in everyday routine operations. This widespread industrial usage, it seems to me, more than anything else, should serve to remove from atomic energy any romantic veil of mystery or of fear.

For example, some 300 companies in North America alone are now using atomic energy in radiation instruments that inspect metal parts of the products they make. A further 250 firms are using atomic thickness gages to measure and control the coating on such things as paper and galvanized iron. In a 6-year period this industry has grown from a sales volume of $2 million to a sales volume of over $20 million.

Today's typical radiography installation may cost a factory about $750. Its predecessor, an industrial X-ray machine, might cost $10,000 or more. The atom thus provides cheap reliable inspection of parts, which means faster, lower-cost production. The result is that more and more industrial firms are adopting these atomic tools.

Atomic tracers provide another growing source of atomic aids for industry. For instance, a speck of radioactive material is dropped into a pipeline when a shipment of gasoline is pumped into the line, followed by a shipment of fuel oil. With a Geiger counter, a workman at the other end of the line can then tell when to stop pumping the pipeline's flow into the gasoline storage tank and switch it over to the fuel-oil tank. Formerly he had to take samples from the pipeline in order to know when one product was being replaced by the other. Considerable intermixing and delay, where the second shipment joined the first, were, of course, inevitable.

Another important application of atomic energy is in the field of preventive maintenance. At least 15 large oil and chemical concerns are already engaged in this activity. For example, a radioactive pellet can be suspended from a string of wire and carried from place to place like a weight on the end of a fishing pole, to be dropped into inaccessible places. A maintenance man can drop such a pellet down a pipe into a valve, put a film on the outside of the valve, and X-ray the critical part with a minimum of difficulty.

Thus, atomic radiation is upsetting the status quo with faster, cheaper, more reliable ways of investigating the wear in pistons; of measuring the thickness of films of rubber, paper, and metals; in the radiography of castings; in the detection of impurities in dyes, paints, crystals, and chemicals. Agricultural research is making studies of great importance on plant growth and soil processes through the use of radioactive stimulants and tracers.

Through the use of radioactive phosphorus, which checks the overproduction of red blood cells in the bone marrow, the lives of sufferers from leukemia have been prolonged. One of our most famous ethical laboratories is offering radioactive iodine in capsule form for the treatment of thyroid disorders without the need of hospitalization or elaborate controls.

And while the largest single employer of isotopic materials is industry, the second largest application is in the field of medicine. Some perspective on our progress in the last few years may be gained from the figures on shipment of radioactive isotopes. In 1946 there were a total of 246 shipments, in 1953 there were 10,676. Other nations, particularly Canada, are also large producers.

So great is the expansion of uses of radioactivity in the field of medicine it is estimated that already the lives of more people have been saved by the atom than were lost in the Hiroshima and Nagasaki explosions.

THE COMPETITIVE ATOM

Now what can we say of atomic power?

Spurred by the constantly rising cost of coal as mines become deeper and veins thinner the British are moving swiftly to place greater and greater emphasis on power from atomic energy. The point at which atomic energy becomes competitive with conventional fuels will be reached far earlier in Britain, and elsewhere, than in the United States. Indeed, British scientists and engineers now conclude that within 15 to 20 years nuclear energy should be able to make a substantial contribution to the electricity supply of Britain at a cost comparable with the cost of coal-generated electricity. In that time it may be possible to set up a reactor system which would generate enough electricity to save 20 million tons of coal a year—the amount by which estimated production will fall short of estimated requirements in the next two decades. Not only would there be a considerable saving in cost but the partial introduction of nuclear power may also make possible a shift of manpower from marginal coal mines to more productive activities. The British, we may well note, are already heating buildings experimentally with atomic energy.

The atom offers great hope for the continent of Europe which clearly faces a power shortage in the foreseeable future. World scientists find the need for energy far outstripping man's ability to produce it from hitherto conventional sources. One expert estimates that in the next 100 years the world will burn up 37 times as much energy as has been produced in the last 2,000 years. These are the compelling reasons why today a 12-nation European pool is building the world's largest atom smasher near Geneva, Switzerland, pooling atomic research for peacetime purposes.

Here, as you know, the Atomic Energy Commission is proceeding with the development of the first nuclear powerplant to produce electrical energy on a commercial scale. The engineering and cost experience in this 60,000-kilowatt project and industry's direct participation in its construction and management phases will show the way for future independent enterprise. In fact, many private concerns have already indicated readiness to build, on a fixed-price basis, smaller-size reactors for military powerplants.

Obviously it was the realization of these great portents of the atom which led the President to make his dramatic proposal to the United Nations last December. The boldness and constructive imagination of that proposal were quite in keeping with the American tradition of readiness to move ahead when our instincts tell us human welfare and conditions of life may be improved. It is obvious that implementing such a proposal involves many delicate and difficult problems, particularly in a world fraught with concerns of international security. We have, however, the assurance of Chairman Strauss, of the Atomic Energy Commission, that no fear for security need dissuade us from the basic purpose which lay behind the President's proposal. Rather, if we consider with care some of the potent technological factors I have reviewed for you, you may share with me the conviction that international exploitation of atomic energy is absolutely inevitable.

A BRIGHTER LAMP

Atomic energy, then, as a revolutionary source for power scores first on the basis of simple economics. Today experts are hesitant to say that nuclear-powered plants will soon produce power below the cost of our most efficient conventionally fueled plants. There are few, however, who will fail to estimate even now that a nuclear-powered plant can be built to produce power at a cost somewhere in the upper one-third of present United States power costs. These estimates, bear in mind, are being made before the first, full-scale powerplant has even been built. How can anyone doubt that American ingenuity will bring nuclear energy into sharp competition with existing sources, when it is already starting out at only twice the current figures?

On a second score, too, the atom must achieve a revolution in our energy sources. This is simply because the potential reserves of energy from fissionable materials are now estimated to be over 20 times that available from existing mineral fuels—coal, oil, and gas. We must bear in mind, first, that the rate of energy used is growing more rapidly, even, than our population rate. We are therefore forced to anticipate those demands which cannot be met by our capital resources in existing fuels. Furthermore, the varied use of coal, oil, and gas, which could not be met by fissionable materials, caution us to conserve them. We cannot ignore the increasing demands of liquid fuel for mobile power, plus coal derivatives and petro-chemicals. Thus, I think, fissionable materials are arriving just in time to substitute a brighter lamp for the candles we now burn at both ends.

Thirdly, there is the portability factor of the atom, or the great concentration of energy contained in fissionable fuels. Given time, in our world economy, low-cost energy will attract capital and seek out its own practical area of development. We can also count on atomic energy doing that in the future—extending the present range of power from coal, oil, and water, with their limits of economical transmission. None of these present fuels, however, has the capacity to vault mountain barriers, jungles, and desert wastelands with the unimpaired energy of the atom.

Let me describe these potentials in another set of terms. The tremendous growth in per capita use of energy in this country of ours is not merely due to the genius of our engineers in lowering the cost of energy. It goes basically to the great increase in the effective recovery of energy, in its portable form, from the days before the industrial revolution to the present atomic revolution. The pound of coal we use today may produce about 1 kilowatt hour of energy. This is roughly 2,000 times the energy equivalents of a pound of muscle power, our prime energy source back in the days of our colonial beginnings. Hence in the whole lifetime of our Nation the portability or concentration of our usable energy has increased by this factor of 2,000.

In comparison with this, what does the atom offer? A pound of the pure, fissionable material, uranium 235, we are told, has the energy value of say, 2½ million pounds of coal. Even if we were to realize only 1 percent of that energy value, the portability of our energy would be increased by a factor of 25,000. Compare that factor of 25,000, and its implications on the range of energy exploitation that lies in the next generation, with the growth that has taken place from a two-thousandfold concentration of energy spread over a period of 200 years.

OUR ATOMIC FUTURE

Progress in the field of atomic propulsion, of course, offers fantastic prospects in the years ahead. The world's first atomic-powered submarines, the revolutionary *Nautilus* and *Sea Wolf* will be able to cruise submerged at speeds in excess of 20 knots. A few pounds of uranium will give them ample fuel to travel thousands of miles underwater at top speed. They will require no breathing tubes to the surface. Thus, neither fuel nor oxygen need limit their stay underwater.

Basically, it is not much of a step from atomic-powered submarines to atomic-powered combat and passenger ships and to nuclear propelled airplanes and trains. These present different problems, but in the light of gains already made they do not look too far off—but rather well within our compass. I venture to say that we will have them—and in the not far distant future. Indeed, I have no hesitancy about picturing for you a world of the near future in which atomic energy heats and powers our factories, lights our cities, cooks our food, cures our ills, and propels our ships, planes, and trains.

And I have hopes that the use of atomic energy in one of its protean forms will yet solve two of civilization's most difficult problems—the economical distillation of sea water for industrial and agricultural use, and the instantaneous disposal of human and industrial wastes.

After the tremendous stimulus our scientists have given us, the next stage ahead is to resolve our engineering choices. This will be done through the efforts of chemists, metallurgists, thermodynamacists, mechanical engineers—plus some imaginative financiers—and, I hope soon, some equally imaginative and persuasive salesmen.

WANTED: A PHILOSOPHY

The atomic age provides us not only with an open sesame to the treasure house of the world's natural wealth—with classic irony, it has presented us also with the key to a Pandora's box of the world's ills and evils. We already have in being a rapidly growing atomic technology. We are beginning, though somewhat faintly, to foresee the economy of this new era. But we lack a vigorous exposition of the philosophy of the atomic age. We require what a great and distinguished churchman has called a Pax Technica—a peace governed by a devoutly ethical responsibility for retaining control over this advance of science which could destroy the world.

Confronted with the dissolution of traditional physical forms, the pulverization of matter, and the need to understand our new world not as a world of things and events, but as a universe of infinite and fluid relations, the danger is that we may lose entirely any sure sense of being in touch with reality. We may, indeed, under a panic urgency to do something—do anything, and so precipitate disaster. I think James Joyce has well characterized our situation with his sardonic comment:

"History is a nightmare from which I am trying to awake."

And so it is—under the hideous threat of a hydrogen bomb in the hands of trigger-happy and frightened men. Yet one does not awaken from a nightmare by continuing to believe in its reality and thus succumbing to it—you awake from a nightmare and its influence by knowing it to be unreal and by overcoming it. Let us not, therefore, be discouraged by the complexities of the current but only apparent transmutation of our physical world, but rather let us be encouraged by the boundless opportunities, the limitless possibilities, the marvelously expanding horizons of this new and still unfolding revolutionary atomic age.

AND COURAGE

In this upset of the status quo, this atomic demolition not only of the world that was but of the world that is, the need for new political leadership, for new management vision, for a new responsibility in retaining control over the advance of nuclear science is as important as, and in direct proportion to, our atomic performance capabilities.

For we have a sober necessity to deter and to defend against atomic destruction. We have a moral compulsion to answer the crying need of all peoples for the peace and fulfillment of atomic creation. We have a desperate need not to underestimate the power and persuasiveness and persistence of evil.

With all our craft and courage, with all our physical and spiritual resources, we have need to defend those things which, born of another revolution, are, above all others, worth defending: Our freedom of worship, our freedom of speech, our rights of assembly, of enterprise, of trial by jury, of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, of government of the people, by the people, and for the people.

Atomic energy taunts us with ideas of new world horizons. The challenge and the opportunity for world leadership are clear—but do we have the wisdom and the initiative and the daring to rise to meet them? And if we do not, we must then ponder the question—who might?

I can think now of no closing comment quite so apt as William Laurence's story of an entry in the Journal of the Goncourt Brothers of April 1869, just 85 years ago. The entry describes a conversation between leading scientists of the day, in which they predicted that in a hundred years "man would know of what the atom is constituted" and "would be able to create life (synthetically) in competition with God."

"We have the feeling," the Goncourt Journal states, "that when this time comes to science, God with His white beard will come down to earth swinging a bunch of keys, and will say to humanity, the way they say at 5 o'clock at the saloon:

"Closing time, gentlemen."

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Printing and binding for Congress, when recommended to be done by the Committee on Printing of either House, shall be so recommended in a report containing an approximate estimate of the cost thereof, together with a statement from the Public Printer of estimated approximate cost of work previously ordered by Congress within the fiscal year (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 145, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on Printing, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. The money derived from such sales shall be paid into the Treasury and accounted for in his annual report to Congress, and no sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

Me

H

IN T

Mr.
reside
highly
in the
ing m
Grave
Gen
ing M
Blair
May
the A
betwe
The
Fort
Penns
lidays
Gen
Mr.
and ge
Americ
County
me by
occasio
can Le
of serv
tributi
It is
on the
form w
State o
E. VAN
Even
to be i
sylvan
ing Ar
presen
sylvan
days o
the Ya
sylvan
strugg
that cl
Ladi
deep
invitat
tribute
It is t
much
humili
add no
men h
In 1
uted t
dom,
preser
here t
and h
home
175 y
soldier
wine,
Rhine,
seas, a
Ther
history

Appendix

Memorial Day Address of Gen. G. B. Erskine, U. S. M. C., Retired

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 3, 1954

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the residents of central Pennsylvania were highly honored on May 30, 1954, to have in their midst one of America's outstanding military leaders in the person of Gen. Graves B. Erskine, U. S. M. C., retired.

General Erskine delivered the following Memorial Day address at the annual Blair County Memorial Day services, held May 30 in the natural amphitheater in the Alto Reste Memorial Park, midway between Hollidaysburg and Altoona, Pa.

The services were sponsored by the Fort Fetter Post, No. 516, Department of Pennsylvania, the American Legion, Hollidaysburg, Pa.

General Erskine's address follows:

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, ladies, and gentlemen, the Fort Fetter Post of the American Legion and the veterans of Blair County have bestowed a great honor upon me by inviting me to speak on this solemn occasion. Being a life member of the American Legion, I am familiar with its tradition of service and its many activities and contributions in support of a strong America.

It is also a great privilege to be included on the same program and share the platform with so distinguished a son of the great State of Pennsylvania as Congressman JAMES E. VAN ZANDT.

Even more, however, it is a distinct honor to be invited here because this area in Pennsylvania has an unbroken history of defending America dating from 1775 down to the present. From the days of the first Pennsylvania Rifle Battalion in 1775 down to the days of the gallant men who fought along the Yalu River in Korea, this part of Pennsylvania has always been represented in the struggle to uphold the freedom and liberty that characterize our democracy.

Ladies and gentlemen: it was also with a deep sense of humility that I accepted the invitation to offer here today a few words of tribute to the fallen men of Blair County. It is the humility of one who realizes how much the living owe the dead. It is the humility of one who knows mere words can add nothing to the everlasting respect these men have achieved through their own deeds.

In 1775 the men of Pennsylvania contributed to the birth of something we call freedom, and today they continue to fight to preserve that freedom. We are assembled here to honor those who understood freedom and have defended it with their lives, at home and around the world during the past 175 years. We honor the gallant citizen soldiers of Pennsylvania who died at Brandywine, Gettysburg, in the Argonne, on the Rhine, at the Pusan perimeter, on the high seas, and in the battles in the air.

There have been long periods in American history when our people could gather on Memorial Day to honor men of past wars and enjoy the peace that these men defended. Peace seemed secure then, and freedom, the cornerstone of our democracy, seemed immune from threat. In other years we have sometimes taken our freedom for granted without too much thought of what it has cost in human life, not only to secure it but also to protect it.

Today we can permit ourselves no such luxury. The freedom men died for is threatened again; the peace for which the whole world has hoped seems more remote than ever. We have come into an age of peril, a time of tension.

The peril and tension will hang over us for a long time. If we are to keep our freedom secure, we will have to do more than meet once a year to honor those who have defended it in the past. Every day we must think the thoughts that are in our minds today. Every day of our lives is made richer and better because we are a free people, and every day we must willingly make the sacrifices necessary to protect our way of life.

To preserve our freedom we must understand and appreciate what it really is. Clearly it is a state of the mind, the soul, the conscience. Let me suggest to you some of the ways our freedom affects our everyday lives.

Freedom is the right to live our life just as we choose, so long as we do not encroach on the rights of others. We may worship God as and where we choose. We may freely choose a profession, a business, a hobby, and a recreation. We may freely choose our colleagues, our customers, our clients, and our companions. We may freely select our leaders and hold them responsible for carrying out our mandates. We have rights but with them we have responsibilities; and it is only by measuring up to our responsibilities that we truly earn and hold our rights.

To anchor these ideas, our forebears wrote a Constitution that fairly bristles with our rights. Our steady adherence to the philosophy of this Constitution, coupled with our creative development of our great natural resources has built in these United States the greatest power and the greatest well-being in the history of mankind. We have built a wonderful country; a country worth living for and worth dying for.

We have built a country rich both in spirit and in treasure. We provide education for all. We are turning out more young men with mechanical and technical training than any other nation in the world. Our productive capacity surpasses that of the rest of the world. Our scientific men lead in their various fields.

Despite 3 wars in 1 generation, we have attained and are now enjoying the highest standard of living ever known.

We stand, girded with our greatest peacetime strength for the protection of the good things in our lives, but we have no designs on a single inch of any other nation's territory. Our only aspiration for any other nation is that it, too, enjoy the full measure of freedom and the spiritual and material benefits which flow from it.

We are strong and we can be confident. This is a time for confidence and not for fear. Why, then, is there tension; why is there a threat to freedom and to peace?

The tension and the threat are not of our making. After VJ-Day we turned all our energies to building peace in a shattered and weary world. But our enemy had no interest in peace. The enemy sought to stampede the frightened, hungry, dazed peoples of Europe and Asia into his expanding empire—an empire built on hopelessness and despair.

Our enemy is clearly defined.

The enemy is militant communism.

In communism we are faced by an implacable and ruthless foe. Its leaders seized power through conspiracy and hold it through terror. They look upon our freedom as a symptom of weakness. They have reduced the unhappy people of their countries into a faceless, sodden mass. To these ruthless leaders, government is not an instrument for insuring life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness for its subjects.

Their system strips the individual of human dignity; it makes him a slave of the state who exists solely for its welfare, not his own.

Lenin, one of the early high priests of communism, predicted that our system, based on the dignity of the individual, and his system based on the theory that the individual is an instrument of the state, could not live together peacefully. He forecast a series of violent collisions between the two.

This theory has put the leaders of communism in continuous, unrelenting hostility toward non-Communist countries. Real cooperation is out of the question. They create the illusion of cooperation only when it seems, for a time, the best means to reach their final goal—the destruction of the non-Communist world.

However, Lenin's followers have learned that the will to freedom does not die in the face of struggle and adversity.

In the spring of 1948 the Communists suddenly blockaded the roads to West Berlin, shutting off supplies to the people of Berlin and to the free nations' garrisons there. Perhaps the Soviets expected us to meekly abandon the outpost and with it the 2 million gallant Berliners who clung to their city—battered and ruined but still free in the midst of the Red Zone.

On June 26, 1948, the allied nations started the airlift to supply West Berlin. When it was over September 30, 1949, we were a quarter of a billion dollars out of pocket. Our Air Force had flown 82 million statute miles delivering, along with the British, almost 2½ million tons of supplies to West Berlin. The Soviets drained some dollars from our Treasury, they tightened tension throughout the world; but they had to yield in the face of the free world's determination and resourcefulness.

On June 25, 1950, the Soviets launched a limited war by sending their North Korean satellite across the 38th parallel. They were convinced that the free world wouldn't strike back. This attack cost us 142,000 casualties and several billion dollars a year. And global tension grew even more taut.

These were individual overt actions. But all the while the Communists have used deceit, subversion, and terrorism. Some examples have recently come to light through the defection of Soviet agents frightened for their lives or fed up with their dirty work.

Last February a Russian secret police captain (Nikolai Khokhlov) came to Frankfurt for the purpose of assassinating a member of a Russian expatriate anti-Soviet organization (Georgi S. Okolovich of NTS). But the captain sidestepped his mission. He surrendered to American intelligence. He had a clever little weapon manufactured to MVD specifications. It was a cigarette case that fired a dum dum bullet smeared with potassium cyanide.

Not long ago Vladimir Petrov, a diplomatic employee of the Soviet Union, asked for political asylum in Australia. Two armed Soviet "diplomatic couriers" were in the process of kidnaping his wife by plane when she was rescued by Australian officers.

With these incidents, tension grew even tighter in the world as free people were reminded that the Soviets include mystery thriller assassination and kidnapping in their repertoire of aggressive tricks.

Revolution everywhere is the Communists' ultimate aim. They have an utterly ruthless, completely unmoral attitude toward the means of bringing it about. With no other standards of morality or decency, they believe that any means is good that will speed the revolution.

That is why President Eisenhower told the Nation "American freedom is threatened so long as the world Communist conspiracy exists in its present scope, power, and hostility."

The threat is real and ever-present. Yet now is a time for confidence, because we—together with the other freedom-loving nations of the world—possess overwhelming spiritual and material power to meet both the shock and the corrosive aggression of communism.

This is a time for confidence but not for complacence.

This is time for confidence, but a confidence that is wary, wise, and watchful.

We can be sure the Soviet Union will continue its aggression. We must be wary, wise, and watchful to determine what form it will take next and we must be resolved to beat it back on every front.

A year ago, writing in the Saturday Evening Post, William Henry Chamberlin pointed out, "the Soviet Government has challenged us to the competition of international civil war. That challenge we shall ignore or fumble at our peril. For the grand design of Lenin and Stalin for the conquest of the world is not conceived along Napoleonic lines of military conquest. It is a design that depends for 90 percent of its success on the revolutionary tactics of subversion, propaganda, and infiltration, with the ground and air forces of the Red army built up to maximum strength to furnish support where and if needed."

This seems to be a fairly accurate estimate of the situation today, despite the constant rattling of bombs and the ferocious chest thumping of the Soviet orators. The Soviets are cautious folk, who don't want to risk fighting a major war for something they believe they can attain by other means.

Of course, we must consider the possibility that the Soviets might start a general war under certain circumstances, and we must act acordingly.

They might, for example, start a general war if they thought the West was weak and divided.

We know the basic weaknesses of the Soviet Union. We know her strengths. Balancing one against the other, it seems probable she will try, for the time being at least, to continue her aggression by pressing politico-economic, psychological-proaganda attacks and local wars.

Or by a combination of these tactics.

The Soviets will try to disrupt the economy of the free world by frightening it into maintaining armaments beyond its capability. They will continue their divisive tactics by trying to win away our allies through economic or trade agreements.

How far can the Soviet Union get with these tactics? Against frightened or unwary men, they have come far.

Since 1939 the Communists have quietly taken over 11 countries.

On February 19, 1948, Czechoslovakia was a democracy. Six days later it was under Red dictatorship. Little blood had been shed. It was all done with talk, threats, smooth, swift, deadly political maneuvering. It was done by a disciplined minority carrying out long prepared plans. In the years since, these freedom-loving people have been held under the Red yoke by purges, silent arrests at night, starvation, stifling of free speech, concentration camps, and all other paraphernalia of the Soviet slave state.

Such maneuvers are used by militant Communists to raise the tension level in the free world community. And yet every Communist orator, and I must say they seem to have good press agents, blames world tension on the United States.

As informed citizens we need not yield to panic in the face of Communist-induced tensions. As membes of a free world community we must not permit Communist maneuvers to come between us and our neighbors.

The free world could avoid tension all right. It could avoid it by a complete abject surrender to Communist aggression. tI could avoid it by joining that enslaved, faceless mass behind the Iron Curtain.

That, of course, we shall not do.

We will never betray ourselves, nor the men who founded freedom in this country, nor the men who insured it with their lives.

So the tension is quite likely to remain in the world for some time to come.

Yet it is a time for confidence, a wary watchful confidence. It is time for confidence because we have traced the whole design of Communist aggression. We know how to recognize it and meet it on every front.

We know we must maintain sufficient military strength to deter possible Soviet military aggression. We know we must be ready to block war by Red satellites. We know we must prevent the Communist from tipping the balance in their favor by swallowing up any more countries on our side of the Iron Curtain. We know we must bolster our allies because freedom lies in collective security.

It is no time to mutter darkly about survival. The men to whom we pay tribute today thought first of the survival of freedom and we must do the same.

We can confidently face and ride out the tension in the world for 1 year or 1 decade or 1 century if we simply practice without cessation, every day, the virtues of calm courage, endurance, steadfast purpose, and willingness to sacrifice for principle—as they were practiced by those whom we morn today.

If we weaken and soften because we feel we can no longer endure the burden of standing to arms; if our consciousness of danger becomes less acute; if we allow ourselves to wander into the byways of discord and confusion, we face catastrophe.

Our purpose to defend our way of life must match and overmatch in hardness, durability, and inflexibility the very hardness, durability and inflexibility of those who seek to destroy it.

If we do this, we will survive, and so will fredom, because freedom in this world has the preponderance of power.

The opportunity is ours today to enrich the meaning of the sacrifices of our gallant war dead.

Let us dedicate ourselves to the cause for which so many of our men and women have given their lives. Let us pray that God may give us the wisdom, the courage, and the determination to do all things that must be done to protect and preserve our country, and help to bring the world to lasting peace.

Chance To Save Hub Port

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 3, 1954

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Chance To Save Hub Port," which appeared in the Springfield (Mass.) News on May 14, 1954.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHANCE TO SAVE HUB PORT

In 1900, the port of Boston ranked fourth in exports, but by 1951 it had fallen to 45th among the ports of the United States.

Once ranked with New York and Philadelphia, Boston must now fight to keep up with Marcus Hook, Portland, Oreg., and Lake Charles. Our port does less business than many of the Great Lakes ports and, of course, handles millions of tond less than such ports as Beaumont, Port Arthur, Houston, New Orleans, and Norfolk.

Partly due to the excellent promotional work of the Port of New York Authority contrasted with Massachusetts' own feeble but expensive efforts, less than one-fifth of New England's own exports are shipped from the port of Boston, about as sad a commentary as could be made about our once-great port.

Despite the fact that State taxpayers have been pouring millions of dollars into the port, it continues to struggle along with less than 20 million tons of traffic a year. However, the situation is even more pathetic than such disheartening statistics would indicate.

About 25 percent of the general cargo vessels which call at Boston use the Army base pier, which provides 30 percent of the berthing piers in Boston. It is the only pier in Boston with shipside warehouse space and double shipside tracks.

It can handle more than 100 railroad cars or trucks; its upper floors have 550,000 square feet of storage space, and it has 7 full-sized covered berths equalled only by the east Boston pier of the Boston and Albany Railroad.

In 1935, there were 35 other covered berths in the Boston port area, but now there are only 22 other than those maintained at the Army pier.

In short, the Army pier is superior to all other facilities in Boston Harbor. That is, it would be if it were not in great danger of collapsing into the channel. The pier was built for the Army in 1918 and was used again by the Army during World War II. It is the only Boston pier suitable for use as a port of embarkation in wartime.

During the years of peace, the Maritime Administration has leased the area for commercial purposes and, by the way, has netted a sizable profit for the Federal Government. However, it has been a poor landlord, and has not turned the profits into improvements or maintenance. In 1935, it put a steel skirt around the pier which had been attacked by marine borers, and that has rusted away. Repairs are desperately needed.

Now, the Commerce Department has told the Maritime Administration to return the neglected pier to the Army which doesn't need it or want it now. Therefore, the badly deteriorated facility will probably be disposed of by the General Services Administration as surplus property.

This would be an unfair blow to the already weak port of Boston. To prevent this catastrophe, Senator Kennedy, together with Senator Saltonstall, has introduced in the Senate a bill authorizing the repair and rehabilitation of the pier, and its lease to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, which would then agree to pay all subsequent maintenance costs.

The details of such an agreement should be subjected to careful study and thought, but we should delay no longer in taking steps to save the Army pier from collapsing into the channel and carrying with it the already clouded hopes to save the port of Boston.

Address by Rt. Rev. Msgr. Maurice S. Sheehy at 16th Annual Solemn Military Memorial Field Mass

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 3, 1954

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record a very impressive address delivered by the Right Reverend Monsignor Maurice S. Sheehy, on the occasion of the 16th annual solemn military memorial field mass, held at the amphitheater, Arlington National Cemetery, on the 23d of May 1954.

Monsignor Sheehy is the head of the department of religious education, Catholic University of America. He performed notable service to the Armed Forces during the late war and holds the rank of admiral in the Chaplain Corps of the United States Naval Reserve. The Monsignor's address is very brief, but is one of the most eloquent tributes ever paid to the men in the Armed Forces who gave their lives for their country.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

"Take courage. I have overcome the world" (John 16: 23).

Once more we assemble in this hallowed ground to pay tribute to our heroic dead. Before the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier, surrounded by the graves of thousands who made forfeit their lives in their country's cause, the pomp and pride of life surrender to the presence of death. Those who are willing to die for a cause survive in the grateful memory of man those who are afraid to live for it. Cardinal Newman once wrote, "Fear not that thy life may have an end, but fear rather that it may never have a beginning."

Something tremendous is about to happen in this amphitheater, something I have no words to describe. Overwhelmed by the fact, my words shall be few indeed. You came to do something, not to listen. What words of mine can compare with the action of the mass? We assemble that its deluge of graces may descend upon all who have served and are serving our beloved country. In a few moments, He who said, "I am the way, the truth, and the life," will come to this altar. Amid uncounted heroes, He, the Lamb of God who offered Himself in sacrifice for others, should feel at home.

To some death is a cruel tyrant. Men of faith recall that death is always the servant of God. Sometime, somewhere, somehow, God will call us to Him. Why are the dead, row upon row, resting in this cemetery? Many died in the high noon of life. All are here because God permitted them not only to die but to come to this sacred resting place. Dying and behold they live. He who took the sting of terror from death will soon be amongst us.

Over 19 centuries ago men were scheming, as they are today, to destroy Christ. He was about 20 miles from Jerusalem when word came to Him that His friend, Lazarus, was dead. Then we read, "Steadfastly He set His face to go to Jerusalem." No doubt His apostles protested. Jesus answered simply, "I go." Then Thomas cried out, "Let us also go that we may die with Him." Past familiar and loved landscapes, Jesus came to the city over which He had wept. At the end of the journey was the hard and bloody wood of the cross.

One thought should console us, above all others, as we glance over these grave-filled valleys today. The victory of the Kingdom of God is certain. Christ said, "Take courage. I have overcome the world." History is nothing more or less than a record of war, of the warfare between the Kingdom of God and the world. Man, because of free will, chooses his destiny. Most of Arlington's dead paid a price for their loyalty. Christ warned His followers, "If any man will be my disciple, let him take up his cross and follow Me." Those American heroes who in dying kept their eyes on the cross of Christ died in a cause that must triumph. "Greater love than this hath no man than that he give his life for his friend."

What, alas, is not certain is that this country is forever wedded to the Kingdom of God. Countries like individuals may change their destiny. Our Nation today is the strongest in the world, not because of its armaments but because it rests upon a noble and holy ideal:

We hold these truths to be self-evident; that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Man stole that ideal from heaven. It has set on fire the homes of freedom-loving peoples throughout the world. It is the guiding star in a dark and tortured age.

There is one question I would ask in the presence of our heroic dead: Is this Nation losing its spiritual dynamism? Are we carrying the torch which they have handed to us?

Certainly our Nation is torn as never before by internal dissention, by pharasaical politicians, by the greedy struggle for power, by those who would compromise with the diabolism of atheistic communism.

Are we too self-centered to pay the price that our form of government may endure? Shall we because of the mirage of a moment of peace betray the heritage for which freemen fought and died? Is our sense of duty toward our land so dead that many consider service in our Armed Forces an evil hour rather than a consecreated privilege?

Christ warned those who sought the Kingdom of God and its justice. "If you were of the world, the world would love what is its own. But because you are not of the world, but I have chosen you out of the world, the world hates you."

Today there is a conspiracy, an evil conspiracy, against those who oppose communism, "Why are you fearful, O ye of little faith?" We who assemble here this morning have come with stout hearts and firm purpose. Christ should feel at home among you and among those who sleep in this cemetery. Would He feel as much at home across the Potomac where some seek only their own good, the triumph of a political party, a trade association, or a labor group? We live in a day when to be alive and to be indifferent to the world crisis may not be synomymous. We must all now be good Americans—and Good Christians—or we betray those whose death we today honor.

During the mass, we draw apart the curtains of time and take our place before the Cross of Calvary. Beyond we see the everlasting hills and hear again His words, "Take courage. I have overcome the world." Every nation which abandons God will perish. May we joint our hearts and minds this day, this hour, this very moment with Jesus as He prays, "Just Father, the world has not known Thee. I have made known Thy name * * * in order that the love with which Thou hast loved me may be in them and I in them."

Take courage. Men and women of faith will help Christ overcome the world.

Supreme Court Ruling on Segregation in the Public Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES O. EASTLAND

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 3, 1954

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record a very timely editorial entitled "Another Error," published in the Hattiesburg (Miss.) American of May 31, 1954, dealing with the Supreme Court ruling on segregation.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Another Error

The Supreme Court made an error in ruling out segregation in public schools.

And now some thoughtless Negro agents of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People are making another error. They met in Jackson Sunday and adopted a program calling for an immediate campaign to end segregation in Mississippi schools.

Obviously these Negroes are unaware of the situation in this State. They are doing the very thing that will produce the worst possible racial relations. They should be denounced by the more intelligent members of their race.

No amount of force will enable the Negroes to attend white schools, even though they might wish to. They ought to realize this and save themselves and others a lot of distress.

The problem shapes up something like this:

The Negroes say they are prepared to go to court to have the segregation decision enforced. What happens when they go to court? The judges, the court officers, the people who will compose the juries are Mississippians. If a criminal charge is filed the Federal district court grand jury will have to consider it. Is any Mississippi citizen, white or black, so stupid as to believe that such a grand jury will return an indictment? If the grand jury were called up before the United States Supreme Court itself and reprimanded the jury foreman would reply about as follows: Your Honors, we will have to indict ourselves, if necessary, because we will continue to refuse to bring in an indictment in this case or any case like it.

Now just what would the Federal courts, the NAACP, and all the other Negroes who fight segregation do about that?

The Situation in Indochina

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY

OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, June 3, 1954

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address I made on May 28 before the Executives' Club in Chicago concerning recent events in Indochina.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The acceleration of recent events in Indochina has brought within the realm of definite possibility within the next few weeks a request to Congress from the President of the United States for military intervention in that area. It is therefore important for all of us—in and out of Congress—to inquire into the nature of that struggle, and the decisions and actions which have brought us to this brink of war.

We must take particular care to base our impending decisions upon the actual facts of the situation; for I think it is not unfair to say that the policies of the Western powers toward Indochina have been notably marked by miscalculations and contradictions; that there has been a steadily widening gap between our conception of events in that area and reality; and that our actions frequently have ben directed toward conditions which no longer existed. Permit me to mention four examples of what I believe to be glaring errors of conception and judgment.

First, the very foundation of American assistance rested upon a miscalculation of the military program of the French Union forces in Indochina. The United States, which is now paying more than 80 percent of the cost of the largely French-directed war, has based such assistance and our diplomatic strategy on the assumption that the so-called Navarre plan would achieve a military victory against the Viet Minh. This plan, bearing the name of the French general in command of the area, called for development of the native armies and continuation of the struggle by the French Union forces to achieve success by 1955. Joint French-American communiques in March and September of last year stated that American support was premised on the success of this plan; and as late as April of this year, Secretary Dulles stated in discussing Geneva that there was "on reason to question the inherent soundness of the Navarre plan" and that "nothing has happened to change the basic estimate of relative military power for 1955." Chairman Radford, of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, stated at the same time that our military and technical assistance was still based upon the "expectation that increased military operation by the French and by the associated states would defeat the Communist military forces."

Not only were these statements in direct contrast to the steady deterioration of the military situation in Indochina; they were also in curious contradiction to the policies of the French in that area as outlined 1 month earlier by Premier Laniel. Recalling previous disagreements over the desirability of negotiation as an alternative to military triumph, M. Laniel told the French Assembly on March 6 that "Today we are unanimous in wishing from now on for a settlement of the conflict by means of negotiation. This is one thing that is settled. There is no need for anyone to argue it further."

The failure of the United States to comprehend the eclipse of the Navarre plan in French councils as well as on Indochinese battlefields was a most serious miscalculation. It can be traced to further miscalculations on the part of both France and the United States: our underestimation of the military power of the Viet Minh; our failure to consider the effect upon their military capabilities of increased assistance from Red China; and our inability to foresee the drastic turn in the military situation which occurred between the Berlin and Geneva Conferences.

A second basic miscalculation was our inability to recognize the nature and significance of the independence movement in Indochina. Certainly we must realize now that the success of the Navarre plan, and any hope of either military victory or a reasonable negotiated peace, rested upon the effectiveness and reliability of the Vietnamese Army and its officer corps; and that in turn depended not only on the quality of French training, but also upon the wholehearted support and devotion which the people of Vietnam would be willing to give to the struggle against the Communists.

Of course, this issue presented the United States with a serious dilemma. On the one hand, the importance of Vietnamese spirit and the traditions of our own policy motivated our desires for a French grant of independence. On the other hand, a strong body of opinion within our Department of State argued that the French would withdraw from the struggle, with disastrous results, if the ties binding Indochina to the French Union were severed. Seeking a rationalization by which to escape from this dilemma while preventing a French withdrawal, the United States, under Democratic as well as Republican administrations, chose to support the myth—and it was no more than a myth—that the associated states of Cambodia, Laos, and Vietnam were genuinely independent.

In May of last year, for example, the Department of State in a letter assured me that "France had granted such a full measure of control over their own affairs that * * * these three countries became sovereign states." This hardly squares with the extensive political control still maintained by the French Republic through its domination of the French Union and the lack of a popular assembly in Vietnam; its diplomatic control, through its coordination of Vietnamese foreign policy and diplomatic missions; its extensive military control over the conduct of war, the distribution of American aid, the retention of French facilities, and even the training of native armies; and extensive economic control, through ownership of the country's basic resources, control of transportation and commerce, and special tax and extraterritorial privileges.

The third fundamental American miscalculation was our misapprehension of the fluidity and instability which characterized Asia and allied attitudes toward its problems. To attempt to unify the non-Communist forces of Asia, Western Europe, and the United States on a single course of action in Indochina and Asia in a concentrated period of time was an impossible task, and failed to distinguish the diplomatic difficulties faced in Asia and those on which we had achieved comparative unity in Europe. In Europe, we have always dealt with established governments reasonably able to maintain domestic order, whose officials were familiar with Communist motives and traditional balances of power. In Europe we were able to establish a system of mutual guaranties to defer the Soviet Union from outright military intervention.

The situation in the Far East is entirely different. Young and struggling governments, with a traditional hatred for the white man who had exploited them for several centuries, held no strong hostility for the Communist movement which was, and still is to some extent, identified in many sections with independence. In Indochina, the cause of the West was blurred by the visual impact of colonial powers fighting native people. No system of military guaranties had been established; neutrality, far more than mutuality, characterized Asiatic opinion; and there was no real political or military counterforce to offset the massive armies and power of the Chinese. The political and economic interests of ourselves and our European allies in the area were not on the same level, although the West is reaping a bitter harvest of decades of mistakes and exploitation in Asia. It was thus a serious mistake to assume that united action would be quickly forthcoming as the result of our belated prompting, and disunity at home and with our most intimate allies was the unfortunate result.

The fourth and final serious miscalculation by the United States was to base our own military strength upon a mistaken analysis by the National Security Council of the future course of events in the world in general, and in Indochina in particular. Last year, the administration cut our Air Force funds by over $5 billion. As a result, instead of possessing 143 wings by 1955—the minimum requested by the Joint Chiefs of Staff in 1951—we will have no more than 137 wings by 1957. This year, the New Look provides for a cut of $5 billion from last year's budget. This slash, to result in a reduction from 20 to 17 divisions this year and to 15 next year, is based upon assumptions which have not stood the test of time: That the United States would not have its overseas commitments increased; that we would continue a withdrawal of our ground forces in various parts of the world, including the Far East; and that our massive retaliatory power, including a great capacity to retaliate, instantly, by means and at places of our own choosing, would give us security at bargain prices.

Events in Indochina and elsewhere today have already knocked the props from under these assumptions; and our reduction of strength for resistance in so-called brushfire wars, while threatening atomic retaliation, has in effect invited expansion by the Communists in areas such as Indochina through those techniques which they deem not sufficiently offensive to induce us to risk the atomic warfare for which we are so ill prepared defensively.

These miscalculations and contradictions upon which our policies have been based for so many years have become more apparent in recent weeks. The resultant confusion, haste, contradictions, reversals, and failures are by now well known to you.

We may hope that the Communists, who would be necessarily concerned about a major war in the Far East the end of which they cannot foresee, will come to terms in Indochina. Present deliberations center about the possibility of a cease fire and partition along the 16th parallel, with Communist recognition of the security of Laos and Cambodia. This might permit the Allies to establish a defensive pact solidifying their determination to repel, by whatever means are necessary, any Communist advances beyond that line.

But the Communists' willingness to accept such an agreement will depend upon their assessment of the limits to which they could force us without facing atomic retaliation. Today they are intransigent. Time is passing in Geneva. Our allies, fearful of the tremendous buildup of Russian and Chinese military power, including the Soviet's hydrogen developments and long-range air force, are indecisive; and the French may soon be faced with the basic decision as to whether to continue the struggle in the absence of a reasonable negotiated settlement, or whether they will surrender or withdraw. Certainly any French decision to maintain the struggle will depend upon assurances of American support. It is thus apparent, as I previously stated, that the administration and Congress may soon be called upon to decide the wisdom of American intervention on behalf of the French Union forces.

The elements of that decision, the ingredients which must balance in order to produce a successful policy, are clear.

First, the United States has insisted that our intervention must be on the basis of united action, and under the auspices of the United Nations. We originally required, as a condition for our participation, the assistance of not only Great Britain and France but also the peoples of Asia, including India, Burma, Ceylon, and Indonesia in addition to the Associated States of Indochina.

It is doubtful that this condition can be wholly met. Even if the support of our western allies, and such island nations as the Philippines and New Zealand is forthcoming, we have no evidence that the heretofore neutral countries of Asia would join us in collective action. We must therefore consider whether this limited support would be sufficient.

Secondly, the United States has insisted upon complete independence for the people of Indochina as a condition of our intervention, in order to win the support of the Vietnamese and the rest of Asia, and in order to assure the justice of our cause. Here, too, the condition we have imposed presents serious difficulties, including the possibilities of French withdrawal once the ties between the French Union and the Associated States are broken. Moreover, it would be difficult to insist upon free elections in a country where—according to those occasional reports seeping through strict censorship—native units have defected to the Communists even at Dien Bien Phu itself, where most government officials and some of their families are in Europe instead of at home, and where Ho Chi Minh—rather than Bao Dai—is the most popular leader in the land because of this identification with the fight against French colonial rule.

Third, intervention by the United States could not be expected in the absence of a willingness by the French to continue the struggle. The present French Government survives by the razor's edge of a two-vote margin. The French people are weary from 8 long years of fighting and the disaster at Dien Bien Phu. We do not know, once the decision faces them, whether they will choose withdrawal or a continuation of the struggle.

Fourth, American intervention is dependent upon the role of the Vietnamese. The lack of popular enthusiasm for the war in that area, the hostility from the natives faced by western soldiers, and the desertion of the Vietnamese soldiers and civilians to Ho Chi Minh—which might well rapidly increase if a partition contrary to their wishes were adopted—these are the factors upon which the quality of this ingredient would be determined.

Fifth, the United States would, of course, only intervene where such intervention was militarily sound. The terrain in Indochina is more complex than Korea and we would not have the support of a friendly population. We would be forced to throw our widely dispersed ground troops into the jungle war where conditions favor the Communists, and it is doubtful that we could possibly achieve decisive results if the Chinese answered our ground troops with so-called volunteer units. Certainly this condition is not one that can be discussed in full today without a comprehensive analysis of the military situation, but we know enough to realize the difficulties which surround this condition, too.

If these five conditions are not met in full, it will be necessary to weigh each of them in balance against the circumstances of the day in order to determine the desirability of the particular type of intervention which may be requested at that time. We would, moreover, be faced with two other decisions:

First, can we or should we localize such a war in Indochina as we did in Korea, or would we be prepared to carry the war to the Chinese mainland and thus risk the invocation of the Sino-Russian Treaty of Friendship and a worldwide nuclear war?

Secondly, we would be required to determine under the circumstances then existent whether all or part of Indochina is absolutely essential to the security of Asia and the free world. President Eisenhower originally stated that Indochina was of transcendent importance under the "falling dominoes" theory. Secretary Dulles has since indicated that the loss of all of southeast Asia might not necessarily follow the loss of Indochina. But, the internal struggles, the neutrality, and the military weaknesses of the other governments of Asia would tend to make them weak reeds on which to lean once Indochina fell.

These are decisions which weigh heavily upon the minds of the administration and Congress, and indeed all citizens. Permit me to conclude, however, by pointing out what may be one encouraging result: namely, the lessons the United States may have learned in Indochina for more effective policies in the future in that and other areas.

1. First of all, I hope we have learned the importance of allies. Those who once urged that we "go it alone" in Korea and elsewhere now insist upon the participation of other nations in any military intervention. We have learned, moreover, that we need more than our traditional European allies. For they are overextended in may areas, beset by domestic problems and struggling to unify European defenses; and the battle against communism in Asia—with its long history of western exploitation—cannot be won without the full support of the nations of that continent.

2. Secondly, I think we now more fully realize the implications of the hydrogen age. The fear of a nuclear war in which no nation would be victor and all nations would be victims has stimulated neutrality and caution throughout the world; and it has radically altered the significance of a military program which relies primarily upon massive retaliatory power. For if the United States can meet aggression only by risking hydrogen warfare, we hand an advantage to the aggressor nation willing to achieve its conquest by methods short of those inducing us to take that risk. In short, we must reverse our air cuts and our New Look military cuts, and place national security ahead of balancing the budget.

3. Third, I trust the United States has learned that it cannot ignore the moral and idealogical principles at the root of today's struggles. Indochina should teach us that in the long run our cause will be stronger if it is clearly just, if we remain true to our traditional policies of helping all oppressed people, even though it may require unpleasant pressures in our relations with colonial powers and friends. We would have better served France itself, and the cause of the whole free world, had we insisted firmly at the beginning upon the complete Vietnamese independence which was essential to rally native and other Asiatic forces.

4. Finally, the United States now has a clearer realization of the burdens of leadership, and the severe and conflicting criticisms which Great Britain and others bore in the past. Today the British feel we moved too fast in seeking action in Indochina; the French feel we moved too slow. Many Asiatics feel we have supported continued French domination of the Associated States by our assistance; others feel we have let down the Vietnamese by not intervening more promptly and directly. Some say we are pushing our allies too hard; some say we are not leading them vigorously enough.

Many Americans understandably respond to this criticism with an attitude of disgust and withdrawal. But unless we choose the road that will inevitably lead us to eventual submission or annihilation, we must recognize that these are our burdens borne by others in the past in the difficult task of welding into a powerful force a loose confederacy of heterogeneous nations, some of whom will find our pace too slow, others too fast.

The United States is the leader of the free world today; but this is not so because our citizens are anxious that we take the lead in military battles; nor because our diplomats are the most expert; nor because our policies are faultless or the most popular. The mantle of leadership has been placed upon our shoulders not by any nation nor by our own Government or citizens but by destiny and circumstance, by the sheer fact of our physical and economic strength, and by our role as the only real counter to the forces of communism in the world today. If events in Indochina have taught us to better fulfill that role, then it is not a wholly dark story after all; and what Washington termed "the sacred fire of liberty" may yet be preserved throughout the world.

The Cases of Val Lorwin and Ted Lamb

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 3, 1954

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record a remarkable analysis by Drew Pearson of the injustices inflicted upon Val Lorwin and Ted Lamb, published in the Washington Post and Times Herald of June 2. This is substantial reason for the inquiry proposed by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. Hennings].

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

THE WASHINGTON MERRY-GO-ROUND

(By Drew Pearson)

LORWIN CASE PROBE PROPOSED

Senator Tom Hennings, of Missouri, is proposing an investigation of the manner in which Val Lorwin, of the State Department, was indicted as a Communist only to have the Justice Department drop the indictment and fire the attorney who brought it. Lorwin was the only man on McCarthy's list of 81 State Department Communists ever indicted.

Since Hennings, a member of the important Judiciary Committee, is also the Senator chiefly responsible for killing the Bricker amendment, he will probably get the investigation, for some other members of the Judiciary Committee, including its chairman, Senator Langer, of North Dakota, also believe that McCarthyist hysteria has gone too far and it's time to probe various unfair, un-American infringements perpetrated under the cloak of preventing communism.

Of the many such, the two most glaring currently are:

1. The Lorwin case, where a Justice Department attorney, William Gallagher, informed a grand jury that two FBI men would testify against Lorwin, when no FBI men

had any evidence. But because of this phony information a man had to live for months under the stigma of an indictment.

2. The Federal Communications Commission's move to yank the Erie, Pa., television station of Ted Lamb, former attorney for the CIO and heavy Democratic backer, on the unsupported ground that Lamb was once a member of the Communist Party.

Indict and run

The Lamb case and the Lorwin case have certain parallels. In each instance the Government moved on political grounds and with practically no evidence. Then it went out to try to find the evidence.

Lorwin was indicted by Brownell last December, shortly after Brownell tried to pin the treason charge on Harry Truman in the Harry Dexter White case. It was a period when the administration seemed to be following a policy of out-McCarthying McCarthy. Prior to that time, not one of McCarthy's long and varying lists of State Department Communists had panned out. So Val Lorwin, formerly with the State Department, now with the University of Chicago, was indicted.

In the case of Ted Lamb, FCC Commissioner John Doerfer, of Wisconsin, McCarthy's best booster on the FCC, was brazen enough to tell him, "Too bad you're not a Republican."

Possibly what he referred to was the fact that Lamb had contributed $5,000 to the Adlai Stevenson campaign and was publicized by the Chicago Daily News as the top Democratic contributor in the Nation. Now a millionaire and a very successful attorney, Lamb helped to organize the United Auto Workers many years ago. Then, seeing the importance of radio-TV, he was one of the first to get into that field. His TV station in Erie is one of the oldest and most profitable in the country, has won countless awards for public service.

Looking for evidence

When the Communist charge was brought against Lamb, the conservative Toledo Blade, though competing against him for a TV station, commented:

"This newspaper, which undoubtedly is as well informed about what goes on in this community as anybody else, has never come across any evidence to support the accusation. * * * We will grant that one had to get up early in the morning to get the better of him [Lamb] in anything. But a Communist? Bunk."

Nevertheless, McCarthy's friend, Commissioner Doerfer, and FCC colleagues took the unusual step of holding up Lamb's TV-radio license on the ground that he was a Communist. And, having taken this drastic action, they then went out to get the evidence. So far they've had great difficulty.

Obviously, they are using the same tactics as in the Lorwin case. Among other things they sent two investigators to Ohio with instructions to dig up anything on Lamb's political activities, any possible marital or income-tax troubles. They also interviewed a former Communist, Emmett Lee Wheaton, Jr., of Lucas County, Ohio, together with a man named Bill Cummings.

It soon developed that it was Cummings who had originated the information that Lamb was a Communist.

"He stated," said ex-Communist Wheaton in his affidavit, "that while he, Bill Cummings was an undercover agent for the FBI he had sent in reports to Mr. McGrath (Howard McGrath, then Attorney General), and in these reports they stated Mr. Lamb was a member of the Communist Party."

One Thousand Dollars for evidence

However, Wheaton, himself an ex-Communist, told the FCC probers that he had no information that Lamb had any Communist connections or had supported the Communist Party. Various efforts were made to jog his memory, without success. Driving home afterward with Bill Cummings, the following highly significant conversation took place during which Wheaton was offered $1,000 to refresh his memory.

"On the way across the high-level bridge," Wheaton swore in his affidavit, "Cummings said to me, 'If you will let your memory remember Lamb's being at the Lincoln House on the platform and pledging to give money to the cause of the Communist Party, it will be worth $1,000 to you and all your expenses paid if this goes to a hearing.'"

It is on such tenuous evidence that men are being indicted today and valuable television properties are being suspended. And it is this sort of unfairness resulting from McCarthyism that Senator Hennings wants to investigate.

Wisconsin Editorials in Commendation of Senator Wiley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. ALEXANDER SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 3, 1954

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I have been glad to note many fine expressions in numerous newspapers throughout the Nation commending the contribution made by our associate, the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Wiley] in spearheading the passage of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway law.

I send to the desk two such editorials from the press of his own State. The first is from the May 21 issue of the Grant County Independent, published in Lancaster, Wis. The second is an editorial from the May 24 issue of Wisconsin Farmer Union News, published in Frederick, Wis.

I ask unanimous consent that both of these editorials be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Grant County Independent of May 21, 1954]

WILEY'S LEADERSHIP SAVES ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY FOR UNITED STATES

Last week President Eisenhower signed the St. Lawrence seaway bill, which after years of bitter controversy now clears a way for the joint development of this great project by the United States and Canada.

Although the project authorized by the new law is distinctly a compromise in size and scope, it is a historic initial step toward ultimately opening the Midwest of the North American Continent to direct oceangoing commerce with the rest of the world. The new law authorizes only a 27-foot channel rather than the 35-foot channel which would be necessary to accommodate most oceanborne traffic, and it does not authorize even that channel beyond the head of Lake Erie. The 21- and 25-foot channels at Detroit will thus continue to limit the traffic that flows to and from our ports on Lake Michigan and Lake Superior, as well as the Michigan ports on Lake Huron.

But the new legislation has broken the logjam of controversy over the St. Lawrence Waterway, and for that reason alone is an important milestone in the economic progress of the country.

Wisconsin can well be proud of the leadership of Senator Alexander Wiley in bringing this legislation to pass. As one after another of his colleagues said as they rose in the Senate the day the conference report on the bill was finally adopted 2 weeks ago, it was the hard work, wise counsel, and determined efforts of Senator Wiley that saved for the United States a voice in the construction and control of the St. Lawrence seaway through the passage of this legislation.

Senator Paul Douglas, of Illinois, was just one of many, but he put it this way: "We of the Midwest owe a great deal to Senator Wiley. I am sure the citizens of his State are grateful."

And indeed we should be.

[From the Wisconsin Farmer Union News of May 24, 1954]

SENATOR WILEY AND THE SEAWAY

The way has finally been cleared for United States participation in the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway in partnership with our northern neighbor, Canada. The bill authorizing the $105 million project has passed both Houses of Congress.

The backers of the seaway foresee vast benefits to the Midwest in improved transportation facilities to industry and agriculture concentrated in the Great Lakes region. Another argument advanced in favor of developing this passageway to the Atlantic has been that of the increased national security this transportation lane can provide in time of war.

One of the stanchest supporters of the seaway has been Senator Wiley, of Wisconsin. It was left for him to shoulder much of the weight of final argument for the bill and to bear the brunt of the opposition's last-ditch attacks. Praise for his successful efforts has come from many quarters—in some cases from where it was least expected.

* * * * *

The seaway bill just passed is not, however, the final answer. Harbors will have to be improved along the Great Lakes and channels deepened from Lake Superior to Lake Erie for oceangoing vessels. Yet, had the measure not been approved, Canada was prepared to go it alone on the project. That United States participation has been assured and that the promise of a greater Great Lakes has been made brighter than ever, is in no small measure due to the senior Senator from Wisconsin, Alexander Wiley.

How To Grow Old Gracefully

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 3, 1954

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, last week the people of West Virginia honored Michael L. Benedum, of Pittsburgh, Pa., who is a native of the State of West Virginia. There was a very fine gathering, at which the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Neely] presided.

Mr. Benedum made a statement which I think should be of interest to most Americans. He said:

> Almost daily someone asks me how I keep going at my age. My formula is to keep busy so that the years go by unnoticed * * * to

despise nothing except selfishness, meanness, and corruption * * * fear nothing except cowardice, disloyalty, and indifference * * * covet nothing that is my neighbor's except his kindness of heart and his gentleness of spirit * * * think many, many times of my friends and, if possible, seldom of my enemies.

Mr. Benedum is 84 years old. His words are commented upon in an editorial published in the Charleston (W. Va.) Gazette of May 26, 1954. I ask unanimous consent to have Mr. Benedum's statement and the editorial printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the statement and editorial were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

One Who Knows Tells How To Grow Old Gracefully

"From my position on the sunset side of the hill, I want to say to you that autumn can be as beautiful as any other season; there are green grass and flowers on the western slope, too.

"They are there if one wishes to see them and is willing to nurture them. They are there for those who approach the sunset unafraid.

"Almost daily someone asks me how I keep going at my age. My formula is to keep busy so that the years go by unnoticed; to despise nothing except selfishness, meanness, and corruption; fear nothing except cowardice, disloyalty, and indifference; covet nothing that is my neighbor's except his kindness of heart and his gentleness of spirit; think many, many times of my friends and, if possible, seldom of my enemies.

"So long as I can work and enjoy the kind words of approval of my associates and the warm handclasp of the younger generation, I see no reason why every day should not be as much of a challenge to a man of 84 as it is to anyone else.

"As I see it, age is not a question of years. It is a state of mind. You are as young as your faith, and today I think I have more faith in my fellowman, in my country, and in my God than I have ever had."

These words were spoken by Michael L. Benedum, a man who grew up in the hills of West Virginia and who traveled the world to discover oil where others either did not think of looking or did not have the faith to think it could be found. He spoke them last Saturday night on the occasion of his being honored as "West Virginia's son of 1954" by the West Virginia Society of the District of Columbia.

As the calendar measures it, Michael Menedum is 84 years old, but he is still active in his business and in making his wealth work for the benefit of his fellow man.

His is the voice of experience, and it substantiates completely the advice brought out in last Sunday's You and Your Health forum on how to grow old gracefully.

Reducing Airmail Subsidies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 3, 1954

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a very fine column by Ray Tucker, which is syndicated to more than 200 newspapers by the McClure Newspaper Syndicate, and which appeared on May 25, 1954, in the North Adams Transcript and the Springfield News, of Massachusetts; the Post-Herald, of Beckley, and the Daily Telegraph, of Bluefield, W. Va., and in the other papers subscribing to the syndicate.

This column discusses in detail the very public-spirited and alert questioning of the Civil Aeronautics Board by the distinguished senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Kilgore].

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Senator Kennedy Probing Airline Gravy Train

Flat charges of dereliction of duty by the Civil Aeronautics Board in handling more than $1 billion of mail payments and subsidies to the international airline carriers have been made before the Senate Appropriations Committee.

In failing to make any audits of these funds or to reduce subsidy allowances in accord with a recent Supreme Court decision, CAB was accused of defying the high tribunal, Congress, the White House, and the Post Office Department. Chairman Chan Gurney's explanation was that Congress had not given him a sufficiently large staff to check on the companies' use or misuse of the $1 billion in defense grants.

His defense did not satisfy his principal critics, Senator John F. Kennedy, of Massachusetts, and Harley M. Kilgore, of West Virginia. Unless they can force Gurney to furnish long-secret data, they will ask that Congress or the Comptroller General investigate CAB's alleged carelessness with the taxpayers' money and favoritism to the politically entrenched airlines.

As the company which receives the major portion of these mail and subsidy grants, Juan T. Trippe's Pan American World Airways and its 61 subsidiaries, which include swanky hotels, golf courses, and country clubs, were the principal Kennedy-Kilgore targets.

Kilgore brought out that CAB had given Pan Am and its subsidiary, American Overseas Airlines, $1,750,000 for payment of Federal income taxes in 1946. Although the taxes amounted to less than CAB's contribution, Pan Am simply pocketed the difference.

When Gurney admitted that CAB had made no attempt to recover this undetermined sum, Kilgore demanded that he start immediate action. Gurney was unable to say whether Pan Am had enjoyed similar tax windfalls in the 1946–53 period, and doubted whether he could verify the suggestion that it had.

Gurney again pleaded lack of personnel for CAB's failure to obey the Supreme Court demand for a fairer and more economical computation of subsidy payments. In that decision, the Court held that the profits and losses of the parent companies' numerous subsidiaries, including the hotels and country clubs, must be offset against each other, and the total subsidy figured on the net loss.

But CAB, besides failing to make any audits of these subsidiaries' finances, failed to follow the Supreme Court's formula in presenting a 1955 budget of $143 million for these grants. The House reduced this figure by $42 million, insisting that CAB base 1955 payments on the Supreme Court's findings. Despite this mandate, which was accompanied by severe criticism, CAB again submitted its original swollen budget to the Senate Appropriations Committee.

Postmaster General Arthur E. Summerfield insists that at least $35 million in unjustified subsidies have been paid out under CAB's apparently illegal and politically inspired generosity. Both Truman and Eisenhower, as well as three congressional committees, have long insisted on greater economy in this field.

Kilgore also ordered Gurney to furnish the expense accounts of Pan American's 10 top officials. Their salaries, fees, and bonuses for 1953 totaled $842,154, but there was no data on their expenses for entertainment and other items, although these deductions help to reduce the amount of their Federal income taxes.

Kilgore made this request after Oswald Ryan, Pan American's friend on CAB, admitted that he had been entertained lavishly by Wilbur Morrison, Pan American's vice president in charge of the South American division. It is Pan American's alleged monopoly of through flights from New York to South America which led to the Government's recent antitrust suit against the Trippe organization.

Two other bits of evidence on huge expense accounts piqued the Kennedy-Kilgore curiosity.

It developed that W. J. McEvoy, Pan American vice president and Washington lobbyist, received only $88,791 in salary for the 1946–51 period, but he drew $61,682 for expenses. J. Carroll Cone, former Democratic national committeeman from Alabama, got $113,500 in salary and $100,453 in expenses. And they do not rank along Pan American's 10 highest-paid executives and entertainers.

When an Atlantic shipping strike threatened to strand Margaret Truman in Europe several years ago, at the former President's request Pan American placed a special airplane at her disposal. McEvoy handled the mission, and is known in aviation circles as "Margaret's baby sitter."

West Coast Electronics Industry Hampered by Distance to Testing Facilities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1954

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, electronics is the fastest growing industry in the United States. Its growth during the last decade has been phenomenal. It is already one of our major industrial fields, with sales value surpassing $5 billion, and it is anticipated that sales of electronic products will quadruple before the end of this decade.

The builders of this industry can also take pride in the fact that electronics is almost entirely a native-nourished United States industry. Unlike other American industries it has depended little on foreign developments and has set the pace for the rest of the world in the growth of applied electronics, and in many areas of research.

This is highly significant. Electronics is not only making our work easier and living more comfortable, but is also a basic factor in making it possible for us to build up a mighty defense machine to protect us and our friends from aggression and thus preserve the free world.

One of the most significant and rapidly growing centers of this vital industry has been developing in the State of California. We have in our State some

150 electronics companies employing more than 50,000 persons producing hundreds of products from adapters to yokes, including aircraft equipment, geiger counters and power supplies.

Much of the credit for nourishing and encouraging this growing industry is due to the West Coast Electronics Manufacturers Association, which is now in its 12th year of productive operation. One of the basic activities of this organization has been to attract the attention of Government procurement officers to the tremendous potentialities and facilities of electronics on the west coast.

The Government has, however, still far to go and much to do in encouraging sufficiently the development of the western facilities. Present delays hamper their vital contributions. Government procurement regulations require prior official testing before electronic parts are purchased. But the testing services are offered only in the East and Midwest although facilities are available on the west coast which could make the necessary tests at little additional costs to the Government and at savings of millions to the producers of electronics. This problem is now before the Department of Defense and I most seriously urge, in the interest of national defense and economy, favorable and speedy action to correct this inequity.

The recent measures shutting down the Signal Corps procurement offices in Los Angeles are regrettable and present another obstacle to the growth of the west coast electronic industry.

But with the aid and under the guidance of the West Coast Electronic Manufacturers Association the industry will continue to flourish as it has in the past decade and will meet its twofold challenge: contribute toward building our national defense and develop products for peacetime use, thus creating new jobs and prosperity for all.

In many ways, this administration seems blind to the fact that California and her sister States of the west coast are important industrial and defense production areas. The west coast was discriminated against when the Air Force heavy press program was curtailed. The electronics testing facilities are another case in point. Failure to build a Forrestal carrier on the west coast is still another. It is about time that the role of the West in all phases of national activity was recognized.

Spanish-American War Memorial Day Program at Altoona, Pa., May 30, 1954

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1954

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to deliver the following address as part of the Memorial Day program sponsored by the Dewey Camp, United Spanish War Veterans, Altoona, Pa., on Sunday, May 30, 1954:

Comrades, ladies, and gentlemen, once again I am honored by the members of Dewey Camp, United Spanish War Veterans, in being invited to participate in this annual Memorial Day observance before this historic relic of the Spanish-American War.

This shell placed here many years ago not only represents a symbol of patriotic devotion on the part of all Spanish-American War Veterans but it is a constant reminder of the part they played in defense of this great Republic at the turn of the century.

The Spanish-American War was not only confined to Cuba and Puerto Rico.

You boys of '98 fought in the Philippines and in China.

Let no man underrate the soldier of the Spanish-American War.

Faced with the perils of yellow fever, and with poor rations and contaminated water, his life was made more difficult by disease-carrying insects that 56 years ago were not under the control of man.

We should keep in mind that medical progress has made stupendous strides in the past 56 years.

Yet you boys of '98 were forced to act as guinea pigs in the desperate attempts made to halt epidemics of every known variety.

The soldier of the Spanish-American period was poorly equipped and fought in heavy clothing in hot weather that sapped the strength of the sturdiest men.

Yet the American spirit of love of freedom was the motivating influence that dominated the lives of the boys of '98, which you so proudly represent in this area.

You volunteers fought for love of country and in the good old American tradition of freedom for all mankind.

On such an occasion as this it is good to refresh our memories and briefly recall the incidents that led to our participation in the Spanish-American War.

It was 9:40 p. m. on February 15, 1898, that the battleship *Maine*, sent to Cuba on a friendly mission, was destroyed in Habana Harbor by an explosion that claimed the lives of 2 officers and 258 men.

"Remember the *Maine*" became the slogan in '98 as President McKinley called for 125,000 volunteers and later for 75,000 additional men.

At that time we had an Army and Navy of only 2,143 officers and 26,040 enlisted men. Yet Spain at that very moment had one of the largest navies in the world and an army of 500,000 with over 192,000 in Cuba alone.

President McKinley's call for volunteers was responded to in typical American fashion, and American manhood to the number of 1 million expressed readiness to defend the Stars and Stripes.

Some 483,000 served, of which nearly 20,000 lost their lives either in action or through disease contracted in the steaming jungles.

Many more thousands suffered permanent disability.

The feat of Admiral Dewey on May 1, 1898, in the bay of Manila, when the Spanish fleet was destroyed is one of the glorious chapters in American history.

It sounded the end of Spanish tyranny and opened the door through which the United States has traveled to become the greatest world power in all history.

While we are paying tribute to the splendid role played by the United States Navy in the Spanish-American War, let us not forget that the valiant foot soldiers and intrepid cavalrymen were fighting in the cruel heat of San Juan and battling with pestilence and disease at Chickamauga.

The Spanish-American fighter has been affectionately termed the "hiker."

He has earned this title by his relentless devotion to duty in not only Cuba and Puerto Rico, but in the Philippines and China.

He left his home and loved ones to fight America's first crusade for the liberation of mankind.

It is interesting to observe that despite poor rations, lack of equipment, and being continually exposed to deadly disease the "hiker" received the monthly sum of $15.60.

You members of the United Spanish-American War Veterans represents a portion of the few thousands that remain from the war of 1898.

Many of your leaders in that war fought gallantly in the war between the North and the South to preserve the unity of this great Nation.

Many of your number served with distinction in World War I and provided leadership that enabled America to repel the forces that threatened the freedom of the peoples of the world.

You have sent your sons and daughters and grandchildren into both world wars and in Korea where they duplicated your record of loyalty and devotion to country.

You men of the Spanish-American War had a great responsibility, which you met in an unflinching manner.

Today, 56 years after your glorious achievements, and despite the fact our Nation has fought two global conflicts, we are still engaged in efforts to rescue humanity from evil forces who would deny freedom and liberty and substitute an alien philosophy for the American way of life.

The American nation owes you a debt of everlasting gratitude for you were pioneers in the fight for liberty and freedom.

I can think of no better way of perpetuating the ideals for which you fought than to maintain a strong national defense.

For it is only by a strong and united America that we can hope to carry on the great principles you fought for in the disease-infested jungles in 1898.

I am confident that we Americans will continue our united efforts in the hope of restoring peace to a confused world by uniting all mankind in a spirit of true brotherhood.

It is only on the basis of justice, love, and understanding that we can ever hope to fashion a lasting peace among all nations.

Mountain Home, Ark., High School

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES W. TRIMBLE

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1954

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, the people of Baxter County, Ark., and all Arkansas for that matter, are proud of the graduating class of the Mountain Home High School who visited Washington this week.

The class with their sponsors, Ike Sharp, Mrs. Buna Linebarger, and Mrs. Rex Yerby, spent 3 days here visiting historic sites in and about the Nation's Capital. On Tuesday they visited Arlington, on Wednesday they visited the Capitol, sat in the hall of the House of Representatives where Congress meets and saw the House in session, visited the Senate, the Library of Congress, and the Supreme Court, where they had luncheon. In the afternoon they took the boat trip to Mount Vernon and visited the home and grounds of our first President. On Thursday they went to the National Airport and witnessed the arrival of Turkish Prime Minister Adnan Menderes, visited the FBI, and the Smithsonian Institution.

All of us are proud of this fine, wholesome group of young Americans. They are a credit to their school and their country.

The members of the class are: Dale Tipton, Janette Pitts, Carl Yates, Wayne Treat, Joyce Sherman, Duane Treat, Anna Mae McCalmont, Mary Porter, Betty Morris, Velma Sue Bradley, Mary Sue Bowling, Ella Faye Hargrave, Rex McGuire, Jim Nelson, Danny Benedict, Johnny Perkins, Jerry Scott, Wanda Morris, Ruby Simpson, Bonnie Gillette, Gary Skiver, Earl Wall, James Rains, Frank Rapin, Roy Burns, Ruth Louise Baker, Russell Langston, Bob Fouts, Duane Pitchford, George Mayfield, Lester Butterfield, George Wicker, Normon Martin, Henry Shearer, Pat Boone, Johnna Lee Summers, Carmen Hattman, Arthaline Quick, Joan Paris, Mary Lou Gilliland, Joan Jordan, Richard Koop, Harley Harris, Bonnie Sinor, Lual Bell Pickens, Homer Bromund, Alice Mae Beane, Onis Gibson, Marilyn Duro, Marlys Dahlen, Reba Tilley, Carol Baer, Don Hubbell, David Owen, Betty Bolding, Shirley Hickman, Mary Marie Reynolds, Linda House Gladney, and Gerald Stevens.

Forest Service Budget Should Not Be Cut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1954

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, few people understand or appreciate the assets which this country has in its national forests. Much less do they realize the extent to which they, as citizens, control these forest values. Proof of this is the small public reaction to the proposed cut of $2,026,700 in appropriations for national forest protection and management. If the general public realized how important these forests are to the national economy, the Members of Congress would have received so many protests as to force reconsideration of this item.

When a Federal enterprise pays for its maintenance and returns a profit it deserves more than casual attention. Its administrators deserve public commendation and support. Last year the national forests had gross receipts of more than $76 million. After covering appropriations for all current operations and capital expenditures, $12 million remained in the Federal Treasury.

These were the largest receipts in the history of the Forest Service, but, shocking as it may be, they were $25 million short of what they might have been. The larger sum might have been realized had the past several years' appropriations to the Forest Service been sufficient to permit more timber sales. Neither last year, nor the year before, did the appropriations provide enough money to permit forest officers to sell all the timber which the national forests are capable of growing. Now, a deeper cut is proposed.

Timber harvested from the national forests during fiscal year 1953 amounted to 5,160 million board feet. This was sold as it stood in the forest, in over 25,000 individual sales. Each transaction made the purchaser responsible for cutting and removing the trees according to Forest Service regulations. The returns to the Government, in terms of stumpage prices, were $70,616,025. Add to this the returns from grazing fees, and special uses, and the national forests show gross receipts of $76,463,746.

This is a record which promises to hold for several years, or until Congress makes more money available for more sales and better care. With stabilization of the lumber market and with small prospect of an increase in appropriations, a drop in income can be expected. Looking backward, however, we can now see how a relatively small addition to the appropriations available for conducting timber sales during the past 1 or 2 fiscal years would have permitted receipts to reach $100 million.

Forest Service estimates of timber growth in the national forests are always conservative, yet, a responsible officer has stated to the Committee on Appropriations that 6,900,000,000 board-feet of national-forest timber are ready and waiting to be harvested. In other words, after last year's record sales, more than 1,700,000,000 board-feet of merchantable timber remained uncut in the national forests. At an average price of $15 a thousand board-feet on the stump, such as prevailed last year, this would have brought nearly $25 million.

Such a loss to the Federal Government represents more than the money that might have been turned into the Treasury. It includes the deterioration of much of the timber that was left unused, and additional losses in the growth of younger and more vigorous trees that remain under the domination of big, overmature, standing trees.

About 13 percent of all of last year's lumber production was cut from national forests. They are located in 42 States and 2 Territories, and cover 181 million acres. Besides being producers of timber, they provide forage for 8 million head of livestock, recreation opportunities for some 33 million people, and are the sources of origin for more than half of the water available to the Western States. For their protection and management during the current fiscal year, the Congress appropriated $30,961,700. About the same appropriation was made for the previous fiscal year. Yet, today, with as much or more land, with timber no less valuable, and with other public uses increasingly in demand, a budget is proposed that would provide only $28,935,000.

Perhaps this reduction of $2,026,700 is thought necessary for the immediate economy. If so, we should know why. We should also know something of the threat that such a cut carries for the future. This kind of saving will hamper the protection program, cut down needed silvicultural improvements, and reduce the maintenance of facilities for public use. It promises to reflect a slowdown in the growth of trees in many parts of the forests. It will definitely speed up the deterioration of many of the trails, shelters, and other improvements on the national forests. In a long-range program such as characterizes forest management, we can almost bank on the probability that future sessions of Congress will be asked to compensate for this cut with larger appropriations. It is plain, therefore, that by approving this relatively small immediate saving, we hazard our investment in a great natural resource, and we stand to lose in annual forest growth. We hazard all of this with no promise of long-time fiscal gains.

What does this reduction of $2,026,700 mean to the State of California? Of the entire system, I find that 20 million acres are in my State. This is about 12 percent of the entire national forest area. Appropriations for the current fiscal year allow $5,431,400 for their protection and management. The budget now under consideration would reduce this to $5,017,900. This cuts away $413,500, with the result that California, with 12 percent of the national forest area must absorb 20 percent of the cut. This, in the region where the sale of last year's forest harvest returned more than $10 million and where nearly 5 million people went for outdoor recreation.

Further inquiry revealed the complete elimination of $288,400 largely devoted to special efforts for the control of forest fires in southern California. Most of this has been applied to the critical watersheds where disastrous fires of last winter were followed by destructive mudflows. You read of the forest fire that threatened the great observatory on Mount Wilson. And a few days later, you read of the rains that fell on the bare, fire-swept mountain slopes to inundate the valley towns and residences in mud and rubble. These losses and the threat of their repetition are so constantly in the minds of the people that the board of supervisors of Los Angeles County have appealed for a more aggressive Federal program of forest protection. I presented it to this Congress, and it is printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for March 4.

The recent fires on Monrovia Mountain and on the slopes of Mount Wilson are reminders of a long series of fire hazards that repeatedly threaten the California watersheds. The aftermath of floods and wasted water is more devastating than the loss of forest growth, but without forest growth more floods are certain to follow. Already, during the present year, communities and individuals have spent more than a hundred thousand dollars to clear their streets, dig out their homes, and make necessary repairs. The situation was so threatening that President Eisenhower declared this part of the State an emergency area. Then, with authority provided in title II of the flood control act, the Department of Agriculture allocated $144,700 for the stricken area. Thus, half as much was spent after the fire and the subsequent flood as was provided to help prevent the catastrophe.

If these funds for accelerating measures for flood prevention are wiped out, as is now proposed, the critical areas in the southern California watersheds will be protected in ways comparable with the protection being given to other watersheds within the national forests. It will be neither better nor worse. Yet recognition has long been given to special local hazards due to climate, topography, soil, resultant vegetation, and the complications inherent to a densly populated area. All this will be ignored. Meanwhile, with each succeeding year the probabilities will get stronger that emergency funds must again be provided to partially restore the destructive effects of other onslaughts. Insofar as that happens, can a present reduction be credited under the head of economy?

The work of the Forest Service in protecting the areas entrusted to it and in developing forest cover on them, causes all to count that agency as a profitable servant. Yet, in contradiction to the parable in the Bible, here is a case where Congress proposes to take away even that which it now has. Such economy is hard to justify.

The situation is one that recalls a recommendation of the President's Materials Policy Commission—more popularly known as the Paley Commission, for its chairman, William S. Paley, who is also chairman of the board of the Columbia Broadcasting System. In Resources for Freedom, the report which the Commission brought out in 1952, annual appropriations to the Forest Service were described as consistently too small to permit adequate protection and management of the national forests. The same could be said for portions of the budget now under consideration. If approved, the Forest Service will be less able than at present to fulfill the Commission's recommendation "that the Federal Government raise the level of silvicultural work on its commercial timberlands at least to the level maintained on intensively managed private lands of comparable value."

I have emphasized the difficulties which the proposed reductions will bring to the State of California. These could be multiplied in one form or another to include every State which holds a national forest. I have attempted to call your attention to the financial losses which must follow this proposed cut in appropriations. I have also indicated some of the cumulative losses which are in store for us. Insofar as the national forests suffer these losses blame will be placed upon the Forest Service. I would remind you, however, that those who look beneath the surface will conclude that the fault is not with the Forest Service but with the administration and with the Congress. If this body persists in continually reducing the available funds, it will increasingly handicap the administrators of the national forests. As that is done their ideals of general usefulness for the national forests, sustained yield, and increased returns will be shoved further and further into the future.

I hope this Congress will consider carefully the present and future values which this country holds in its national forests. If it does so, I doubt if it will approve the proposed cut in appropriations for their protection and management.

The Government in Business—Paint Manufacturing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CECIL M. HARDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1954

Mrs. HARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to direct the attention of the House to a report prepared by the Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee, of which I have the honor to be chairman, on the subject of the Government in Business—Paint Manufacturing. The report was unanimously approved by the full Committee on Government Operations on May 19, 1954, and submitted to the House on May 25, 1954—House Report 1672. Following are the conclusions and recommendations included in the report:

> The Navy alone of all Government agencies considers it necessary to manufacture paint. The Army, the Air Force, Coast Guard, Maritime Commission, and practically every important department or agency use paint to a considerable extent. These agencies buy their needs from industry.
>
> The national industry production of paint is some 200 million gallons, with a value of $1,357,370,000 per year. The industry has tremendous capacity with more than 1,000 manufacturers scattered through every section of the United States.
>
> The Navy's production even in wartime was only 3 percent of the national production. Except for a few items of plastic paints which are not now competitive, all Navy paints are in the competitive field and can be produced commercially.
>
> Prior to May 1953, the Navy was heavily engaged in the manufacture of paint and was producing approximately 150 different types. In fiscal year 1953 the Navy produced 5,456,164 gallons, and its production in 1945 was 16,369,857 gallons. By directive issued by the Secretary of the Navy on May 28, 1953, production of paint was limited to 28 types, and it is expected that total gallonage for the fiscal year 1954 will not exceed 2,901,000 gallons. This is less than 1½ percent of the estimated 200 million gallons of paint annually produced by commercial manufacturers.
>
> The Department of the Navy was well aware of this subcommittee's interest in its paint-manufacturing activities, but whether or not the subcommittee's interests stimulated the Secretary to issue his directive of May 28, 1953, the subcommittee was gratified that this action was taken administratively, but continued its investigation with respect to the remaining 28 types of paint which the Navy continued to manufacture.
>
> The Navy contends that quality, particularly with respect to shipbottom paints, is of extreme importance, affecting the range, fuel consumption, preservation, and total operational effectiveness of the fleet. The subcommittee agrees. The Navy further contends that proper quality control can be achieved effectively and economically only if the Navy manufactures such paints itself. With this the subcommittee does not agree, being convinced that inspection and other supervisory procedures can effectively insure quality paints manufactured by private industry.
>
> In House Report No. 1197, filed February 9, 1954, the Committee on Government Operations concluded that the burden was upon the Government to prove unusual circumstances as justification for engaging in the manufacture of items satisfactorily obtainable from private industries.
>
> After detailed hearings and a careful consideration of the facts, the subcommittee concludes that the Navy should further restrict its paint-manufacturing operations.
>
> The subcommittee recommends that manufacture of all paint items, except the plastics, shipbottom, and antifouling paints, which are covered by patent, should be discontinued as rapidly as is consistent with sound and economical practices and with due concern for maintaining uniformly high quality paint procured from commercial sources, and for relocation of affected personnel.
>
> With respect to plastics, the Navy should endeavor to develop commercial sources in order to insure that requirements can be met and should, at the same time, progressively reduce its manufacture of this type of paint at the earliest date practicable.
>
> The General Accounting Office has been requested to investigate and report to the subcommittee as to the history and development of the plastic paints, the contributions, if any, of the Government through funds, facilities, personnel, or otherwise, and whether or not the patent rights should be exclusively held by private individuals.
>
> The Navy should continue intensive research activities on paints through an integrated program within the Department of Defense and in full cooperation with other interested agencies and the industry. Adequate testing facilities must be available to insure full contract compliance.

Memorial Day, 1954

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1954

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, I was highly honored to have been accorded the privilege of joining the citizenry of Houtzdale, Pa., in their annual observance of Memorial Day, May 31, 1954.

The observance was sponsored by the various veterans' organizations of Houtzdale and was largely attended. During the course of the program I delivered the following address:

> Comrades, ladies, and gentlemen, once again I am honored to have the privilege of joining my fellow veterans and their neighbors in this annual observance of Memorial Day.
>
> You are to be commended for joining other communities in our Nation in paying this annual tribute to the defenders of our flag who made the supreme sacrifice that this Nation might endure.
>
> Memorial Day is a special day for memories—a day for commemorating and dedicating.
>
> Our memories are of those who served this country in time of need.
>
> We commemorate the men who gave their lives in defense of our freedoms.
>
> And we dedicate ourselves to the responsibilities which our honored dead have passed to us.

As a nation we canont fail them.

If we squander the inheritance of freedom which they have left to us, we shall place little value on the supreme sacrifices of those whom we honor here today.

Memorial Day is the only day in the year when our entire Nation mourns its dead.

Memorial Day was intended to be a day of dedication and of memories.

We are assembled here today to recall the brave deeds of our defenders.

From the richness of their loyalty and courage we renew our firm determination to safeguard the freedom principles for which they died.

The services they have rendered to their country, as well as the price they paid, shall always be our highest inspiration.

Our memories of the Nation's heroic dead kindle in our hearts a warm and lively appreciation.

That is as it should be because sincere appreciation is the very essence of love of country.

Real appreciation is the keystone of loyalty, the positive, dynamic types of loyalty which binds men to men and citizens to their country.

These are some of the thoughts we express on Memorial Day.

They are not new thoughts.

For years these thoughts have been instilled deeply within our own convictions.

Today we merely review and reevaluate them because we have made Memorial Day the appropriate occasion for serious and truthful thinking.

But Memorial Day is such a brief period of contemplation.

Three hundred and sixty-four days in the year we rush past the resting places of our honored dead.

We are so hard pressed by our many chores and desires that we have little time for serious thought.

Then on the 365th day the entire Nation remembers.

That is Memorial Day, May 30.

On that day the red, white, and blue emblem of our country—the stars and stripes of the United States—is lowered to half mast between dawn and noon.

The hurrying footsteps and grinding wheels pause beside our departed brothers in arms.

We lay wreaths and flowers upon their resting places.

Then we bow our heads and recite a brief prayer for them and for ourselves.

In solemn gratitude we say, "Thank you, brave ones.

"You who stand close to God—ask the Almighty Father to watch over all of us.

"Ask Him to guide us in our judgments and actions.

"Ask Him to help us help ourselves.

"As a nation we do not want to fail you.

"Nor do we want your sacrifices to have been in vain."

Who were these men whom we honor here today?

They symbolize all the 1,500,000 Americans who have been battle casualties since this Nation first began defending its free way of life 178 years ago.

Therefore what we say here is the message straight from our hearts to all the honored dead of America, wherever they rest.

Again, let me ask, who were these men?

They were the loyal Americans who answered the Nation's call to arms.

They left their schools and shops, their homes and their cities to battle the tyrants of their day.

First it was the kings and kaisers, the dictators, and then the Communists.

Those have been the ruthless foreign aggressors down through the ages.

They have always been identical in principle and method. All have been enemies of freedom.

They have been defeated in the past—defeated by America's unity and strength.

Today we plan and work, hope and pray that we shall always score victories against tyranny.

The men of our Armies, Navies, Marine Corps, Air Force, and Coast Guard are the heroes we honor here.

Were they different from us? No, they were the Protestants and Catholics, the gentiles and Jews, the white men and the black, the native sons and the foreign born.

They were the rich and the poor, the boys and the men.

They came from all walks of life. They represented all the social, economic and educational strata of American citizenship.

The defenders of our country were as diverse as the colors in the flag under which they served.

However, like the combined red, white, and blue of the flag, those men harmonized their differences into the most powerful force on earth.

That is because they fought shoulder to shoulder for just one cause—freedom.

The sun never sets on the mortal remains of our departed comrades.

They have been laid to rest in Asia, Africa, and Europe.

They are in the national cemeteries throughout our homeland.

Yet, regardless of their last resting place, above them flies the Stars and Stripes.

The flag says these are your defenders and mine.

It matters not who they were nor whence they came.

All that is important is that they were loyal Americans.

They upheld the American traditions of freedom.

They were comrades in arms.

Their courage was proved on the field of battle.

Those are the memories and eulogies of this Memorial Day.

We have spoken of dedicating ourselves.

Dedication to what? What must we do?

Abraham Lincoln answered those questions clearly in his Gettysburg address 91 years ago when he said, in effect, "It is for us the living to be dedicated to the unfinished work which they who fought so nobly advanced.

"It is for us to be dedicated to the great task remaining before us, that these dead shall not have died in vain and that government of the people, by the people, and for the people shall not perish from the earth."

Those words spoken by President Lincoln nearly a century ago are true today.

They shall always describe the obligation of the living.

It is our perpetual debt to the warriors who have passed on before us.

We shall keep the fires of freedom burning eternally.

We shall, unless through selfishness and utter blindness, lose sight of the fact that freedom is kept alive only through intense loyalty and eternal vigilance.

There can be no doubt about the threats to freedom today.

And certainly there should be no hesitancy in recognizing them.

Frankly, we are face to face with the most powerful and brutal enemy of mankind.

Eight hundred million people are the victims of communism around the globe today.

The red clouds roll menacingly over half the world.

Survival of freedom in the remaining half depends largely upon our leadership and determination that this time, as before, the tyrants shall be defeated.

Technically we are not at war but weapons have changed.

Today we resist aggression with the so-called cold war.

The cold war against communism can be as effective as military battles of the past.

But a successful cold war requires planning and nerve, loyalty and intense unity of effort.

These requisites are our primary obligation in our defense against communism as a Nation of freemen.

In addition to these requisites we must maintain a strong national defense with an adequate Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps, supported with the most modern and powerful weapons of warfare.

At the same time we must maintain a sound economy or invite national bankruptcy.

However, all those material weapons cannot alone assure freedom.

Our most effective weapon is our ability to see clearly the real and present danger in Communist aggression, and the imperative need for a united American citizenry alined solidly against the ruthless, godless Soviet system, and against all who would compromise with it.

The bloody sacrifices of two world conflicts and in the Korean war have not brought universal peace or everlasting security to our Nation.

We realize that we shall always have to defend ourselves as long as we want freedom and as long as there are dictators challenging us.

Human nature being what it is, we can expect endless conflict between the forces of freedom and slavery.

Therefore we will always have to be on guard, always ready to defend.

That is the task before us—the unfinished work so nobly advanced by the men we honor here today.

Truly Memorial Day is a day of memories, commemoration, and dedication.

This brief Memorial Day program emphasizes the purpose of this national day of reverence by reminding us of the memories of the men to whom we owe a perpetual debt of gratitude.

We commemorate their valor and patriotism in our tributes to them with flowers and prayers.

Finally we dedicate ourselves to the never-ending task of preserving and perpetuating the ideals of our great Republic.

To aid us in our common objective, we beseech Almighty God to help us in our mighty struggle as we fervently pray:

> "Lord God of hosts, be with us yet
> Lest we forget, lest we forget."

The Bryson Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1954

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD a petition concerning the Bryson bill, H. R. 1227. The petition follows:

We, the undersigned, believing that the cause of total abstinence can be served by the reduction of advertising of alcoholic beverages over radio and television urge that our congressional representatives insist on getting a hearing and voting for the Bryson bill, H. R. 1227, which would prohibit the transportation in interstate commerce of alcoholic-beverages advertising in newspapers, periodicals, and its broadcasting over radio and TV. Also to present the petitions to the House and to have a note made of them in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

B. Smith, J. O. Culp, Paul Jones, H. L. White, Frank White, C. O. White, Olun Welloaru. Mrs. Lorene Taylor, Mrs. J. O. Handley, Mrs. Lorna Ham, Mr. Loyd Lanthigs, Mrs. E. E. Becks, Mrs. J. C. Jones, Maude Coete, O. W. Hoert, Neal Denny, Mary Bell Parker, Mrs. Mallory Hammonds, Jr., Mrs. C. R. Parker, Mrs. Dalton Lallope, Dalton Lallope, Miss Wilmer Shilds, Mr. Emmett McElrath, Mr. C. L. Mizzue, Boyd D. Douglas, J. A. Rowell, J. W. Haynes, V. W. Vawter, Chas. V. Vawter, W. W. Thurman, M. C. Franklin, J. D. Boyd, Sycamore, Ala.

Memorial Day 1953—Letter to St. Peter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CECIL M. HARDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 3, 1954

Mr. HARDEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include in the Record a composition written by Mrs. Ruth Cates, president of the Veedersburg, Ind., Auxiliary Unit, No. 288, American Legion. This essay won for Mrs. Cates an award from the Freedom Foundation and I commend its contents, its inspiring message, to the Members of this House. The essay follows:

Memorial Day 1953—Letter to St. Peter

(By Elma Dean in the American Mercury)

"Let them in, Peter, they are very tired;
Give them the couches where the angels sleep.
Let them wake whole again to new dawns fired
With sun not war, and may their peace be deep.

"Remember where the broken bodies lie * * *
And give them things they like. Let them make noise.
God knows how young they were to have to die!
Give swing bands, not gold harps, to these our boys.
Let them love, Peter—they have had no time—
Girls sweet as meadow wind, with flowering hair * * *
They should have trees and bird song, hills to climb—
The taste of summer in a ripened pear.
Tell them how they are missed. Say not to fear;
It's going to be all right with us down here."

The above poem describes the youth of the many thousands that have died that you the reader of this article might live in this great America and have the freedom to do as you please on this Memorial Day of 1953.

We of the American Legion and American Legion Auxiliary wish to pay tribute to our beloved dead and to those that have returned to spend the rest of their lives on hospital beds, suffering from the ravages of war, in the following manner:

To remember first, and always, that "the Fate of America depends on the Faith of America."

The Back to God movement of these two great organizations puts God first in mind and act. We have no room for any power other than our Creator.

Americanism is a way of life—the best way of life ever known. If we stop to recall the struggles of the pioneers of this great Nation, the men who fought for its freedom, and those who wrote the two greatest documents of state ever written by men—the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States—we will not sit idly by while someone in our midst strives to undermine this great heritage of ours.

So in memory of these our dead, we pledge anew: "For God and Country we associate ourselves together, to uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States of America."

Our deepest sympathy goes out to the families of those whose hearts are broken today and our prayers are with you and with our fighting men everywhere.

Mrs. Ruth Cates,
President, Veedersburg American Legion Auxiliary Unit, No. 288.

Gov. Robert B. Meyner at the National Press Club

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. HART
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 3, 1954

(Mr. HART was granted leave to extend his remarks by inserting an address delivered at the National Press Club by the Governor of New Jersey.)

Mr. HART. Mr. Speaker, one of the great forums in America is provided by the National Press Club in Washington. In order to be invited to address its membership and submit to the sharp questioning following his speech, one must be regarded as an outstanding public figure. And there he finds himself facing an audience as discerning and discriminating as may be found anywhere.

Recently, Hon. Robert B. Meyner, Governor of New Jersey, was a guest of the club. He delivered, as usual, a very fine address, and at its conclusion answered with candor and to the apparent satisfaction of his widely informed listeners the numerous questions they propounded.

His address follows:

Mr. Chairman and friends, I understand that my invitation to speak before you came at the suggestion of Arthur Sylvester, of the Newark News, a fact which makes me very happy, since it indicates that I have a certain amount of popularity with at least the Washington bureau of that great newspaper.

Mr. Sylvester's home office has been taking a dim view of me ever since it became necessary for me to tell the State of New Jersey that, if it is to continue to live in the manner to which it is accustomed, more revenues will be needed.

I am sure the Newark News has been most successful in balancing its own budget; but it seems to regard with suspicion and distrust my efforts to follow that same example with regard to the finances of the State.

It may be that there is an implied compliment here; it may be that the Newark News regards me as some kind of magician—a sort of Houdini who can do tricks with mirrors. Let me make blushing acknowledgement of the fact that the Democratic Party is a superb instrument of government; however, it cannot walk on water.

It is a pleasure to be here and it happens to be just 4 months ago today that I took the oath of office as Governor in the city of Trenton. That fine city has a warlike background. Within a stone's throw of my office is the old Hessian barracks, whose inmates celebrated Christmas, 1776, not wisely but too well.

On the following day, at what must have seemed to them the ungodly hour of 8 a. m., the hungry Hessians were attacked by the troops of General Washington, whose victory has had the most remarkable consequences to this very day—among them not only the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness—but even the right of United States Senators to search under our beds for Reds, scarlets, crimsons, vermilions, and even pinks and bleeding hearts.

Trenton, I am glad to say, retains its warlike atmosphere, particularly on Monday mornings, when an overwhelmingly Republican legislature gathers to brood over the fact that a Democrat sits in the Governor's chair. There is never a dull moment in the new battles of Trenton.

As I told the Women's Press Club here in Washington some weeks ago, the legislature is suffering from chagrin because it raised the Governor's pay last year and bought him a new Cadillac on the theory that New Jersey, as usual, would go Republican in November. I hope you will not think me a poor winner if I tell you that I am having immense enjoyment both out of the salary and the car.

Not so many years ago any man who declared himself to be a New Jersey Democrat was suspected as being a stooge for ex-Boss Hague, of Jersey City. I do not need to tell you that those days are gone forever. The Democratic Party of New Jersey has been reorganized and revitalized; otherwise it could not have carried the State by 153,000 only 1 year after it had been carried by General Eisenhower by 369,000, a turnover of more than half a million votes.

The Democratic Party used to be run from the City Hall of Jersey City, mostly in the interest of the county of Hudson. Today the party has been rebuilt in all of the 21 counties of the State, under the influence of outstanding men like Archibald Alexander and Dwight R. G. Palmer, whom some of you know from other days in Washington. It gives me pleasure to tell you that both these men have accepted posts in my Cabinet and are among my most valued advisers.

We Democrats could not have won last year, however, without the support of Republicans and Independents, who came over to us because of their confidence in the new Democratic leadership. However strong may be the organizations of the two major parties, the balance of power in big American elections is held—if I may be guilty of a truism—by the independent votes.

In New Jersey, we expect to attract the independent voters again this year in the races for the United States Senate and the House of Representatives. Today, Democrats hold 6 of the 14 congressional districts; we expect to retain these seats and add others. Today, Republicans hold both of New Jersey's seats in the Senate, with one open for contest. We expect to win this seat by the election of my friend, Congressman Charles R. Howell, who, as former chairman of the Democratic State Committee, had much to do with the renaissance of the party in New Jersey to which I have referred.

Congressman Howell is a liberal by conviction and by performance—and belongs to a party which shares his views. His opponent, ex-Congressman Clifford Case, sees eye-to-eye with Charlie Howell on some issues—in fact, he has been labeled a New Deal-Fair Deal Republican—but, unfortunately for him, he finds himself in bed with conservatives and reactionaries. He is compelled to defend an administration with which he is out of tune. When they choose a Senator next November 2, I think New Jersey voters will prefer the bottle marked "genuine" to the substitute which is being palmed off as "just as good."

If we believe in party responsibility—and that is the only tenable theory on which sound and stable government can be conducted—then the people must identify candidates with the prevailing philosophies of the parties to which they belong. Thomas Jefferson never ran on the ticket of Alexander Hamilton.

I know it is easy for a politician like myself—and I accept that label without apology—to forecast party victory. You here in Washington are properly bored with stereotyped optimism and conventional political baloney. I am thinking, however, in terms of broad political trends, which show that the Democratic Party, in the first half of this century, has forged new methods of government in keeping with the modern aims and aspirations of the people. In this light, the Republican victory of 1952 can be considered merely an interlude.

Much Republican thinking is still geared yearningly to the gaslight and horse-and-buggy days of the 19th century except where, in the broad fields of human welfare and concern for the common man, Republican leadership has felt constrained to adopt proposals originated by the Democratic Party. You can look at Republican platforms of the past 12 years for evidence of this schizophrenia—a longing for the good, old days of James G. Blaine and William McKinley on the one hand, and half-hearted acceptance of Democratic policies on the other.

The Democratic Party long ago said goodby to Grover Cleveland and William Jennings Bryan. It assumed 20th century stature with the new freedom of Woodrow Wilson, and has continued to face modern problems in a modern way through the administrations of Franklin D. Roosevelt and Harry S Truman. If you will let me make a parenthetical remark, I want to express heartfelt thanks to Senator KNOWLAND, the Republican leader, for denying last week that the 2 decades from 1932 to 1952 constituted 20 years of treason. It is very nice to know that.

We Democrats have had a marvelous story to tell the people at every presidential election since 1932—it is one of the greatest political sagas of all time how, from the first 100 days of the first Roosevelt administration, a veritable revolution occurred in the improvement of the standards of living of every man, woman, and child in the country. It was a peaceful revolution—a revolution that was conducted within the framework of the Constitution and with the preservation of our system of democratic capitalism.

It may be that older people—those whose despair in the depression gave way to tope and then to a feeling of triumph—will never tire of the story. But the younger people want something new. They have heard what the Democratic Party accomplished in the first half of the century; but they are more interested in what the party proposes for the second half of the century—their half.

The Democratic Party cannot rest on the old reforms, the old accomplishments, the old successes. It must go on to blaze new paths in the light of its basic creed. The world of 1954 is a far different one from the world of 1932. Our country has made great progress in the protection of civil rights, the organization of labor, development of natural resources, reform of the security markets, raising the purchasing power of the people, and in many other fields. These improvements must be consolidated and nailed down and, in some respects, extended. We must be sure that a long period of reform is not followed by a long period of reaction.

In any program for the future, whether it relate to foreign affairs or domestic policies, the first task is to cleanse the intellectual atmosphere of the United States.

• • • • •

The progressive spirit will be crippled until it again becomes possible for men to espouse worthy causes without fear of being charged with leftism or pinkism. You would have to go back to the time of the alien and sedition laws, I think, to find a comparable situation in this freedom-loving Nation. We must reverse the state of affairs described by Raymond Fosdick, former head of the Rockefeller Foundation, who said:

"If you sign a petition to admit colored people to public housing developments, if you favor fair employment practices or are concerned about civil liberties, if you fight for the protection of the foreign-born, if you oppose religious prejudice and Jim Crowism, if you sanction cultural exchange with foreign countries, if you aline yourself with those who are working for more effective labor unions or more adequate medical care, if you take any point of view which involves the implementation of the Declaration of Independence that all men are created equal, you are apt to be suspected in some circles as a knowing participant in the Communist front, or at the very least a witless dupe of Moscow's hynotic influence."

The United States can and will break out of this mental stockade. We cannot permit the Kremlin to control our thinking and our behavior. We cannot surrender the immense moral and spiritual advantage that we hold over communism. In the end, the struggle between the democratic ideology and the Communist ideology will be settled by the jury of mankind not in terms of H-bombs, but in terms of the enduring and universal values. Napoleon lived by the sword, yet it was he who said: "There are but two powers in the world, the sword and the spirit. In the long run, the sword is always beaten by the spirit."

Let me leave you with that idea.

Memorial Day Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1954

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, May 28, it was my privilege to address the student body of Altoona Senior High School during the annual Memorial Day program.

The address follows:

MEMORIAL DAY ADDRESS BY HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, 20TH DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA, AT THE ALTOONA SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL MEMORIAL DAY PROGRAM, MAY 28, 1954

As a former student of Altoona High School I consider it an honor to have been invited to participate in your annual Memorial Day program.

As I look around this auditorium it is with fond recollections that I recall the Memorial Day observances when I was a student here, and the program centered around the veterans of the Grand Army of the Republic and the Spanish-American War.

Believe it or not, these memories extend back to the years of 1914, 1915, and 1916, just prior to the beginning of World War I.

Leaving high school to enter World War I, and having taken part in World War II and a short period in the Korean war, I return today as one of America's veterans to join with you in this annual tribute to our heroic dead.

Memorial Day is a day when all of us are united in a common purpose.

It is a time to remember and to honor the sacrifices made by all of our war dead on behalf of the cause of freedom.

Memorial Day is the most beautiful and sacred of our patriotic holidays.

It originated as a tribute to our Civil War dead.

It is now the annual occasion for recalling what all our war heroes did in our behalf for the precious liberties we cherish today.

It is fitting that on Memorial Day we resolve to carry on the struggle for freedom to such a degree that we know in our innermost hearts that we are truly keeping faith with those who gave their lives in defense of our country.

We must make sure that they shall not have died in vain.

Each of us must pledge in the words of Abraham Lincoln, "That this Nation under God shall have a new birth of freedom."

Thus through the efforts of all of us will come a new birth of freedom throughout the world.

In the presence of the supreme sacrifices and hallowed memory of our war dead everyone must realize that half-hearted measures today are not enough.

We must determine to be as devoted, selfless, and brave on behalf of our country and the cause of liberty as they themselves were.

Certainly on this Memorial Day, a day of commemoration, we must search our hearts to make certain that we are really keeping faith with those who gave life itself that we might enjoy the freedoms, happiness, and all the spiritual and material blessings we have in such abundance.

Today a great issue faces all of us and all men throughout the world.

It is simply whether or not we shall continue to be free men or whether we shall be slaves in bondage to dictatorship in any form.

This great question burns deeply today in the hearts and minds of men in every part of the world.

Our forefathers have waged an intense struggle for human liberty throughout our Nation's history.

We surely cannot afford to relax our own efforts in that struggle.

The situation which confronts all Americans on Memorial Day this year is explained in a statement issued by the American Heritage Foundation, the organization which directed the Freedom Train tour and is now continuing a program for more active citizenship.

The statement is as follows:

"We are among the heirs of 5 or 6 generations of Americans who have lived since our country came into being.

"Our forefathers lived through trials and perils which we have only read about in history books.

"Those we especially honor on this Memorial Day gave life itself.

"They fought the good fight; they kept the faith.

"From them we have received this wonderful land and its free institutions."

The statement of the American Heritage Foundation continues by asking these timely questions:

"Can we think of it at all except as a sacred trust to be passed on safely to those who come after us?

"For if one generation fails in its duty the chain may be forever broken.

"Shall we let it be said of us that we squandered our inheritance?

"That we were so devoted to our own comforts and conveniences, so lax about the preservation of our liberties, that we passed on a lost and broken country?

"Shall we deserve only bitterness and reproaches from our children and the generations yet to be born?"

Continuing, the statement of the American Heritage Foundation says:

"It was the task of our fathers to conceive the principles of democracy and to lay deeply and solidly the cornerstones of our freedoms.

"It is our task to continue the building upward to keep democracy evolving and growing.

"We must believe in our democratic heritage with a faith not passive, but strong and confident.

"And then we must be willing to work at keeping it.

"For it is written that faith without work is dead."

The preservation of our great American heritage as outlined by the American Heritage Foundation, in my opinion, is a mandate that cannot be ignored.

The American heritage is your heritage to protect.

It is not hard to do. You just decide to do it and then make it a daily task.

But it is a continuing task, an everyday task.

It may seem to each of us, as private individuals, moving in the very small circle of our own daily life, that our efforts are futile in the great worldwide struggle for the extension of individual liberty.

But there is a way for young and old to take positive and constructive action to promote the cause of freedom in our own community and Nation and thereby help to advance the cause of liberty throughout the world.

We can each resolve to live up to the following "Promises of a good citizen," which have been set forth by the American Heritage Foundation.

Each one of these promises of a good citizen should interest you as a high-school student today and the voting citizen of tomorrow.

These promises are as follows:

"1. (a) I will vote at all elections of public officials and issues incumbent upon a good citizen.

"(b) I will inform myself on all candidates and issues and will further use my influence to see that honest and capable men who will uphold our liberties are elected.

"(c) I will accept public office or other stewardship of community service if I can render a real service to my country.

"2. I will readily obey a summons to jury duty or similar obligations of a qualified elector.

"3. (a) I will respect and obey the laws of my community, State, and Nation.

"(b) I will assist public officials and law-enforcement groups in prevention of crime and upholding law and order.

"4. I will pay my taxes understandingly, knowing full well that progress in all fields is not possible without such assessments.

"5. (a) I will respect the flag of the United States and such ideals and principles as are associated with it.

"6. I will strive for peace among nations, but will dutifully respond for military or allied service when and if my country needs my help.

"7. I will support our system of free public education by doing everything in my power to improve the schools of my community and the instructions of higher learning.

"8. I will not shirk my responsibility of leadership and community service to make my community, State, and Nation a better place to live.

"9. I will practice and teach the principles of good citizenship in my home and wherever else I am afforded the opportunity of so doing."

We can do no greater honor to our war dear than to keep faith with their memory and their sacrifices by resolving to observe our duties of a good citizen.

We must not fail to look after the widows and orphans of our veterans and those veterans who are old, ill, and needy.

Then, indeed, we will live up to the obligations which Memorial Day places upon each one of us.

This action on our part will be the greatest possible tribute to those who gave their lives for our country in the cause of freedom.

If we remember that every day should be a memorial day and that "freedom is everybody's job" and live accordingly, then truly we shall keep faith with our honored dead.

H. R. 9366, Social Security Amendments of 1954

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1954

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of interest that I note the action taken by this House on Tuesday, June 1, in passing H. R. 9366, the Social Security Amendments of 1954. While the bill, as approved here, does not quite come up to the level that I had hoped it would, and does not embody all the suggestions and proposals which I outlined in my remarks of April 6, in the Congressional Record, it does indicate, at least to me, a genuine effort by Republicans and Democrats of this House, working together to put through and continue and better a program which has been the brain child of the Democrats, since the time of the first social-security legislation in this country, back in the mid-thirties.

In the Record of April 6, I asked that this House consider, in any legislation of this nature, the merits of a seven-point program which had been submitted on January 13, of this year, by a number of my Democratic colleagues and me, which would act to liberalize the present social-security system and to bring it more closely in line with living conditions as they are in this year of 1954. In all honesty, it is admitted that many of these points were incorporated in the bill as finally passed on June 1. Some of these proposals were watered down, and in their diluted condition, are in this bill H. R. 9366.

Social security, wisely handled and implemented with an anxious eye to the actuarial aspects of the program, can bring to the people of our country, especially to our aged and elder citizens, a new high of decent living and a new measure of contentment and well-being. Old-age assistance in this day and age, is more than a gratuity; it is an absolute necessity.

We have more old folks in this country than at any time in our history, and with the continuing rise in cost of living, they find that what they have will not, in many cases, afford them even the minimum requirements of ordinary living. This bill seeks to take these factors into consideration, providing a firm basis on which recipients of old-age and survivors insurance may provide for their future, and a means by which those receiving old-age assistance may meet their obligations and needs.

This is what the bill, H. R. 9366, as passed by the House will do:

It will extend old-age and survivors coverage to some 10 million persons who are now without basic retirement and survivors' protection. It will continue to provide, through contribution, to the States' funds for old-age-assistance payments to persons still remaining outside the insurance system. It makes available benefits to workers who become permanently and totally disabled, with waiver of premiums. It increases monthly payments of benefits.

The benefits will range in primary insurance amounts from $30 to $98.50 as compared to $25 to $85 under present law. This 20-percent rise, from $25 to $30, is a larger jump than cost-of-living figures would apparently justify.

The 2-percent contribution remains in effect.

The bill permits an employee, or a self-employed person, on social security, to earn up to $1,000 a year without loss in benefits, computed on a yearly basis. I had asked that this figure be put at $1,200 a year.

The bill provides that the present base of $3,600 on which contributions are collected and paid be raised to $4,200. It had been my request that the figure be raised to $4,800.

The social-security bill now goes to the Senate for consideration. It is my hope that wise and early action will be taken in that body on the bill. This will assure to our aged citizens—who in the past have exercised the great efforts that brought about developments here in America which we, in our generation, enjoy—a more complete and adequate protection than they are heirs to at the present time.

Representative George A. Dondero Commended for His Work on St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1954

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, our colleague, George Dondero, of Michigan, who is chairman of the House Committee on Public Works, led the fight for final approval of the St. Lawrence seaway in the House of Representatives. His leadership resulted in overwhelming approval of that great inland waterway project.

Mr. Speaker, at this point in the Record, I will insert a resolution of appreciation approved unanimously by the Oakland County Board of Supervisors on the 19th day of May 1954, at a regular session held in the city of Pontiac, Mich.

Also inserted at this point is a copy of a resolution approved by the common council of tha city of Milwaukee, Wis., which unanimously commended Mr. Dondero for his distinguished leadership and untiring efforts to bring to a successful conclusion the long struggle to insure United States participation in that great seaway project. This resolution was approved by the common council of the city of Milwaukee on May 18, 1954:

The above mentioned follows:

Resolution of Appreciation

"Whereas the United States has long needed a waterway from the Middle West for ocean vessels; and

"Whereas the Congress of the United States has recently passed legislation making it possible for the United States to participate with the Dominion of Canada in the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway; and

"Whereas this legislation has been signed by the President and has become the law of the land; and

"Whereas this action on the part of our Representative has been of inestimable value and benefit as a defense measure and economic boon, not only to the people of this district and State, but to the Nation as well; and

"Whereas during his years in office, Congressman Dondero has always reflected the highest credit upon this district and the people he represents: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the Oakland County Board of Supervisors in regular session this 19th day of May 1954, at the city of Pontiac, Mich., as representatives of the people of Oakland County, express our appreciation and gratefulness to Congressman George A. Dondero for his superior representation and foresight in making the dream of a St. Lawrence seaway a reality."

Floyd Andrews,
Chairman.

I certify that the above resolution was adopted by a vote of the members of the Oakland County Board of Supervisors on the 19th day of May 1954, at a regular session held in the city of Pontiac, Mich.

Lynn D. Allen,
Clerk.

Moved by Kelley, supported by Barnard, the resolution be adopted. Carried.

Resolved by the Common Council of the City of Milwaukee, That we hereby officially commend the Honorable George Dondero, chairman of the Public Works, House of Representatives, for his distinguished leadership and untiring efforts in bringing to a successful conclusion the long struggle to assure United States participation in the St. Lawrence seaway project; and that we hereby express to Representative Dondero the official thanks of the city of Milwaukee for his personal leadership and his long efforts in the interest of this great project so vital to the national defense and the economic security of this Nation.

I hereby certify that the foregoing is a copy of a resolution adopted by the Common Council of the City of Milkaukee on May 18, 1954.

Stanley J. Witkowski,
City Clerk.

Milwaukee, Wis., *May 25, 1954.*

Remarks of Hon. William S. Hill, of Colorado, Before the SBA Regional Director's Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. HILL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 3, 1954

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the Record, I include the remarks I made to the regional directors of the Small Business Administration at their headquarters in Washington, D. C., on June 2, 1954:

As chairman of the House Select Committee on Small Business, I should like to congratulate your Administrator, Mr. Wendell B. Barnes, and you gentlemen—the regional directors of the Small Business Administration, and the Washington administrative staff of SBA—for the generally fine work you are doing.

The work of the Small Business Administration become steadily more important as the volume of military procurement declines, as it has declined in recent months. Your efforts to increase the volume of credit—much of it private credit—to help small firms is bearing fruit.

It is your job to make sure that small business gets its fair share of Government spending. This is an important job because we must preserve small business in order to make sure that we can have full production in case of all-out war. We cannot afford to let small firms go out of business and close their doors and let business concentrate in the hands of large firms.

We have found out in past periods of mobilization that this Nation cannot possibly reach its full industrial might without the production of small concerns. There is no need to cite any statistics on this point to you gentlemen, but it is a point that bears repeating if only because it is so obvious that in a period such as this we can too easily forget the really vital and indispensable role that small business does have in our economy.

The SBA has been very effective in helping small firms get subcontracts and this is an important part of your work. But we must never let ourselves forget that we must also help small firms get a fair share of prime contracts.

Too often I hear complaints from small firms of seemingly needless changes in specifications, with the result that the small proprietor can't get the contract he thought was already his; too often I hear complaints that the military authorities have allowed too short a time for the proprietor of a small firm to prepare his bid.

You, too, have heard of these complaints, and I am happy to note that in many cases you have been effective in getting such abuses corrected, in cases where the complaint had merit.

I for one am very glad that we have a strong, independent agency such as SBA to stand up and fight for the rights of small firms. You must never let yourselves forget that the job you are doing is an important one and yet at the same time you must remember that in this free enterprise economy there are limits beyond which you cannot safely go.

I think your Administrator, Mr. Barnes, understands this distinction, particularly as it applies to your small business financial assistance program. I believe you are oriented in the right direction so long as the major emphasis is directed towards helping small firms help themselves. An important indication that you are properly oriented, that you are on the right track, is the loan figures which you have issued, showing that you are making about twice as many participation loans as direct loans.

In our competitive society it is the businessman who has ambition and drive, who goes out after business, who stands the best chance of making a go of it. That is the way we want it to be, and I am glad that you gentlemen are directing your efforts to helping those who are trying to help themselves.

I am also glad to note that you in the Small Business Administration are directing much of your effort toward helping new firms get started. This is important.

We like this approach you have developed of friendly and sincere cooperation with all of the forward-looking elements in the business community, and we welcome more of it.

I have spoken at some length about the favorable aspects of your activities. Now, if I may, I should like to turn over to the other side of the ledger.

Please bear in mind that the criticism I have to offer is friendly. We on the Select Committee on Small Business are aware of the difficulties you have faced and are facing, and what I have to say now is offered in a friendly spirit.

It is my belief, and the belief of the House Select Committee on Small Business that the SBA lending authority must be decentralized as far as possible. We want to see the lending function handled at the regional office level as far as that can be done.

We have had many complaints over the long period of time between the filling of applications and final disbursal. I want to urge most strongly, therefore, that some method be found to speedup this vital process of your work.

We have found that too frequently directives go forward to regional offices containing standards to be used in evaluating loans, only to find that the Washington office uses other standards.

For instance, in the case of bank participations where the bank had approved the loan, the regional offices were under instructions not to make the same extensive investigation as where there is no bank participation. Yet when the loans were sent on to the Washington office for approval, in many instances they were disapproved because the Washington review officers insisted upon more collateral and security than the participating bank thought necessary.

Our committee recommends that—

Increased effort be made by regional investment groups and insurance companies to extend long-term funds to small business. This means more programs and better public relations on the part of insurance companies and the establishment by State charters of new regional groups.

Increased effort by local banks to adopt lending techniques which are more suitable to the financing needs of small firms.

Greater effort be made by commercial banks of all sizes to participate with the SBA in the extension of intermediate or long-term loans. In many cases this will mean that an effort must be made by SBA to rebuild the goodwill of local banks that might participate in the program. Many of them have already been discouraged from attempting to participate.

Greater concentration on the part of SBA in widening the scope of its financial activities through an increase in its staff.

SBA must reexamine its lending procedures to determine where greater decentralization of authority is possible. Current policy governing collateral requirements also needs to be reexamined.

Regarding the SBA program to make sure that small firms receive a fair share of Government contracts, we have discovered a trend that appears to us to be detrimental to the program—that is, increased emphasis by the military on negotiated procurement as opposed to advertised procurement.

Our committee believes that the joint determination procedures are required most often to protect small-business interests under negotiated procurement.

We hope that SBA will be especially vigilant in this area.

We believe that SBA should try to intensify its efforts to secure subcontracts for small firms.

Of course, we are aware that many of these shortcomings of your agency result from lack of personnel. We are glad to note that the present emphasis is on the hiring of financial specialists and engineers to add to the field staffs.

And now one final word: In the multitude of your activities you must never forget the importance to small business of our present antitrust laws—the Sherman Act, the Clayton Act, the Robinson-Patman Act, and the Federal Trade Commission Act. These laws are the basis for maintaining the competitive and nonmonopolistic economy that small business requires for its survival.

I believe that our basic antitrust laws are sound, and yet I believe—and the House Select Committee on Small Business concurs in this—that it is desirable to take a long, hard look at these laws and determine whether they are really doing the job they were created to do.

Our antitrust laws have been on the books many years and they have been altered by numerous legal decisions. We in Congress need the help of you men who are close to the everyday operations of small businesses and know the problems of the small-business proprietor in evaluating the effectiveness of our antitrust laws.

I feel very close to this agency, the Small Business Administration, because it had its beginning in a bill which I introduced in the House on March 16, 1953.

So if I have scolded you on some matters, please understand it is like a father speaking to his son. I believe you are trying, and I'll do all I can for you on the firing line on Capitol Hill. Thanks for the opportunity of addressing you.

A Tribute to a Great Man: Dan Reed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. MILLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1954

Mr. MILLER of New York. Mr. Speaker, one man who has probably done more than any other Member of Congress to permit congressional consideration of the President's program is the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, the Honorable Daniel A. Reed. Mr. Reed has kept his committee hard at work since the first day of the convening of this second session of the 83d Congress. The result has been that his committee has reported to the Congress the first comprehensive tax revision in 78 years. I refer to the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, H. R. 8300, a bill completely overhauling our tax structure so that the tax burden imposed on our American citizens will be applied fairly and equitably without restraint on initiative and incentive.

A second important bill presented to the House by Mr. Reed's committee is the Excise Tax Reduction Act of 1954 granting almost a billion dollars in tax relief to our American citizens.

Last Tuesday, on June 1, the House debated and passed overwhelmingly the third major piece of legislation which Dan Reed's committee has reported to the House this session. That legislation was, of course, the social-security amendments of 1954, which will assure our citizens a more adequate floor of protection in the years of their retirement and to their survivors.

The Buffalo Evening News, a great newspaper in my district, took appropriate recognition of Mr. Reed's achievements in an editorial in the May 26, 1954, edition. That editorial was entitled "Mr. Reed Can Take a Bow." Indeed, in my estimation, while modest Mr. Reed would decline to take a bow, I think the Members of Congress and the entire Nation can applaud his record of great achievement. Under unanimous consent, I insert the editorial just mentioned in the Record:

Mr. Reed Can Take a Bow

So much has been written and said about congressional sluggishness in dealing with President Eisenhower's comprehensive legislative program that the public has largely lost sight of the few specific accomplishments of far-reaching importance. It is a case of the trees versus the forest, but in reverse. In this case, there has been so much talk of the sparseness of the forest, that the few sturdy trees nurtured to full stature are all but overlooked.

There is particular irony, moreover, in the fact that two of the sturdiest of these trees stand largely as monuments to a man who is often pictured as one of the most stubborn Republican footdraggers with whom this administration has had to contend. He is our Dunkirk neighbor, Chairman Daniel A. Reed, of the House Ways and Means Committe. A bitter-end foe of the administration's tax views last year, and of its freer-trade tariff policies this year, Mr. Reed has nevertheless done a herculean job on two of the most important items in the Eisenhower legislative package—and it's time he got his share of public recognition.

The omnibus tax-revision bill which cleared the House in March and will soon be debated in the Senate was Mr. Reed's baby from the beginning. The President and the Treasury Department have embraced it as one of the central pillars of their economic policy. The President even went to the length of making a nationwide broadcast when it was imperiled by Democratic opposition in the House. Embracing 875 printed pages, it represents a comprehensive revision and codification of the internal-revenue laws, and could stand by itself as the product of a lifetime of work.

Yet in this same session that has moved his tax-revision bill toward final passage, Mr. Reed's committee has now completed another job almost as arduous and comprehensive—an omnibus revision of the Social Security Act. That bill, too, gives the administration satisfaction on virtually every point contained in the President's special message on the subject. It will soon be ready for action in the House, with every expectation that it, too, will get final Senate approval before adjournment.

While Chairman Reed did not personally supervise the drafting of this bill as closely as he did the tax bill, he has done the legislative steering. And, though there has been less open opposition, there has been plenty of stalling to overcome. The Democrats, after all, have made too much political hay out of sociay security for too many years to be anxious to see a Republican Congress and President get credit for a revision bill which extends, liberalizes, and improves the social-security system.

The Reed committee still stands as a major obstacle to the enactment of the liberal foreign-trade policy which the President and his Randall Commission have urgently recommended. That issue has now been laid over for another year, apparently by mutual agreement with the understanding that the existing reciprocal-trade law will be extended. But if there is any administration disappointment over that one bill, it should certainly not obscure the massive job of legislation which the Reed committee has completed in two other fields of equivalent importance—and perhaps even greater complexity. The President learned last year that Dan Reed, as chairman of Ways and Means, can be a formidable foe when he has his back up; he has learned this year that Mr. Reed can also be a powerful legislative lieutenant when they happen to be playing on the same team.

H. R. 8923

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. GRANT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 2, 1954

Mr. GRANT. Mr. Speaker, the bill before us today, H. R. 8923, which bears the name of Congressman Rains, is designed to suspend the operation of the Rivers and Harbors Act of March 2, 1945, to enable a private utility to apply to the Federal Power Commission for a permit to construct five power dams on the Coosa River.

As the upper portion of the Alabama-Coosa River system, which roughly extends from Rome, Ga., to Mobile, Ala., a distance of more than 650 miles, the Coosa River has its headwaters at Rome and is formed by the confluence of the Etowah and Oostanala Rivers, originating in the northwest corner of the State of Georgia. The river flows in a southwesterly direction through Cherokee and Etowah Counties, then southerly until it meets the Tallapoosa River above Montgomery, Ala. Here it becomes the Alabama River, which after a course of several hundred miles flows into the Mobile River for a short and direct route to the Gulf of Mexico. The Alabama River west of Montgomery forms the northern boundary of my congressional district, and at no place in its progress to the gulf is it as much as a county from my district.

According to no less an authority than the book Ten Rivers in America, published by the President's Water Resources Policy Commission in 1950, the Coosa River is one of the most important rivers in this country yet undeveloped. It has a fall comparable to that of the Tennessee River, and at its point of greatest discharge near Montgomery, it equals in capacity of flow that of the Tennessee River.

Extensive study and work have gone into the comprehensive plan which the Corps of Engineers over a long period of time has prepared. In 1934 the Corps of Engineers filed the 308 report, recommending the construction of three multipurpose dams and a flood control dam with a provision for locks. This construction would provide a navigable channel upstream from Mobile, Ala., to Rome, Ga. The act of March 2, 1945, gave definite form and considerable meaning to the 308 report in authorizing the recommended construction.

After persistent efforts for the last 9 years by the Alabama delegation in Congress to obtain the necessary Federal funds to carry out this construction program had been of no avail, in November 1953, the Alabama Power Co. filed an application with the Federal Power Commission for a temporary permit to build five dams within a 10-year period. For the Alabama Power Co., a reliable and progessive private utility, to be granted this permit it will be necessary to enact H. R. 8923 into law.

In expressing their wholehearted approval of this piece of legislation, the people of Alabama are intelligently aware of its various provisions. For example, they know that the power developed is to be used in the section providing the generation and that it will be sold to all consumers at the lowest possible cost; that the basic features for navigation and flood control, under the supervision of the Secretary of the Army, are to be provided; that the first dam must be completed within 5 years of the date of the issuance of the permit and that the other four must be completed within 10 years of the date construction begins on the first one; and that facilities for all types of outdoor recreation will be assured. The people of Alabama have taken into due account the declaration of Maj. Gen. B. L. Robinson, Deputy Chief, Corps of Engineers, that the provisions of this bill are satisfactory to him and they adequately protect the Federal interest.

Being a member of the Committee on Agriculture of the House, which has charge of REA legislation, it has been my pleasure to support legislation that would bring to the farmers of the Nation adequate electric power at a price they could afford to pay. I know what electric power means to the rural people of my section. When these dams are completed, it will enable the affected REA cooperatives to firm up their power and to secure an abundance at a low price.

H. R. 8923 is somewhat unique in that it represents the finest effort toward cooperation between private business and the Federal Government that has been reported to this floor in many years. At no cost to the American taxpayer but by industrial genius, the Coosa River Valley will be able to harvest manifold and far-reaching results. The Alabama Power Co. will spend an approximate $100 million to furnish electric power to bolster an inadequate reserve and to attract new industry to a region in which the Labor Department has already designated "distress areas." During the construction phase of the dams alone, the demand for labor will be a boon to the valley. And following the dams will come steam plants using Alabama coal and contributing much to the revitalizing of an industry in which we now find thousands of unemployed miners. Education in the State of Alabama will appreciably benefit from an estimated $3 million tax per annum on the physical real property of the company. The foregoing are some of the most obvious effects of the development of the Coosa River, but by no means are they to be considered the maximum.

Although the proposed five dams will be constructed in the congressional districts of Congressmen RAINS, ROBERTS, and SELDEN, it is quite evident that the consequences of the project will be happily felt in my district. The residents of the Second Alabama Congressional District have recognized this circumstance and have earnestly urged the Congress' favorable consideration of the bill before you today. I trust that the Congress will join this unanimity of purpose and provide the necessary legislation with the least possible delay.

Tomorrow's Harvest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 29, 1954

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following excellent article from the Boston Sunday Globe, Boston, Mass., of May 30, 1954:

What Nation Gained by Aiding Veterans—We Are Reaping the Harvest in Money, Jobs, Factories. But Tomorrow's Harvest Will Be the Real Gain, the Effect of GI Bill of Rights on Education

(By John Harriman)

War releases new and sometimes strange forces in both the social and economic structure of society.

War can exhaust a nation, leaving it prostrate and open to disintegration. But war can by the same token vitalize a whole people, whether for good or for evil.

War breeds revolution, but it can also father reform. War sometimes impoverishes, but it can also lead to experiments that in the end enrich. And it is one of the paradoxes of history that in the frightfulness of war we have at times discovered that which has contributed heavily to the freedom and betterment of man.

In World War II and Korea we have within the last 15 years seen a measure of destruction and suffering matched seldom, if ever, in history. Yet from that destruction and suffering we have learned much, gained much.

We have gained, for instance, an economy vastly more productive than we have ever had before, and a living standard beyond the dreams of man but a few short years ago. While no one can measure the extent to which we have increased our understanding of natural forces, techniques, and processes. It was war, or the desperate need bred of war, remember, which led us to harnessing the atom.

But one of the most remarkable results of the wars of our generation has been their effect on those who participated in them actually—our fighting men. These men suffered or enjoyed a profound experience. Some lives were wrecked, others deformed. Some men paid with their lives, others with spiritual distortions which it would be impertinent to attempt to analyze. But one and all, the injured and the unscathed alike, returned to the most remarkable veterans' program ever devised, the so-called GI bill of rights.

NATION OF HOMEOWNERS

This program was intended to express the country's gratitude to those who had risked their lives in its defense. But it has in its effect gone far beyond that. Today the veterans' program is changing the social and economic structure of the Nation.

Within the past few years we have become a Nation of homeowners, with all the social and economic advantages that this implies.

Whence this gain? The answer in large part is to be found in our veterans' program, under which 3,305,000 young men bought homes under the liberal terms of Government-backed credit. Another 66,000 veterans used their GI rights to buy farms. Another 212,000 used them to enter business.

This, of course, has resulted in an enormous stimulus to our national economy. New homes create the demand for new furniture, new appliances, new cars, and their erection leads communities to build countless schools and engage in other forms of public works.

EIGHT MILLION STUDENTS

All in all, veterans through exercising their borrowing privileges have poured some $22,800 million into the purchasing stream of our national economy. This has been an incalcuable economic benefit. Not for nothing has the construction industry been called the seed industry, bellwether to prosperous times.

But the gains which the Nation has received from our veterans' program are not only a matter of material wealth, of goods and money. There is another and perhaps even more important gain, a gain marked up within the minds of our young men.

It was the intention of a grateful Nation that returning veterans should be aided to education and vocational training, and a total of over 8,100,000 have taken advantage of this provision of the GI bill of rights. Through Government aid, these millions of young men have attended universities and colleges, or received specialized training in whatever field they elected as their life work.

The effect of this part of our veterans' program has been twofold.

It has given to this generation a degree of education unheard of in any other nation at any time in history, and it has provided both stimulus and support to our whole educational system.

SAVED COLLEGES

Many a university or technical school would have had to close its doors during the recent period of monetary inflation, if it had not been for the flow of funds from veterans in attendance. Others have used such funds to add to staffs, and round out curricula. All have prospered from the general increased interest in technical and higher education.

Here again the gain to the Nation is immeasurable.

A technical age needs trained technicians—men and women specially schooled to its mysteries—while an age in which freedom and democracy stand challenged will depend for its survival upon political function which supposes an electorate educated to understand and to deal with ideas.

Thus, the generation of World War II and Korea has paid its private price, in suffering in mind and body, and sometimes in individual death. But thus, also, this generation has been dealt great advantages. It is a generation coming to fruition under social conditions never before witnessed in history. It is a generation of homeowners, educated in the manner of its own choosing, trained to its political and economic tasks.

A NEW WEALTH

This is so because of the desire of the country to render to its defenders a measure of its gratitude and appreciation. That was the purpose of the veterans' program. But that purpose is now being transcended. We are finding a new wealth in the very act of gratitude. With gentle irony, we are discovering that by the very act of rendering it is we who gain.

To our veterans' program we owe countless homes and all the economic gain that the building of those homes provided.

Of even greater importance, to this program we owe the intellectual stimulus which broadened education and training are bringing to this generation.

Today we are reaping the harvest in money, income, goods, jobs, factories. But tomorrow's harvest will be of even greater importance—the harvest made possible by education. This will be the real gain—the real wealth. Nations are not led to greatness by weath, but by the character and minds of their people—by resourcefulness and the play of ideas.

Ambassador Morgenstierne Warns Communist Expansion Is Fatal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 1, 1954

Mr. HAGEN of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, recently the Ninth District of Minnesota, which I have the honor to represent, had the opportunity to play host to the distinguished Ambassador from Norway, the Honorable Wilhelm Morgenstierne, the dean of all diplomatic representatives in Washington, D. C.

Ambassador Morgenstierne was the principal speaker at Moorhead, Minn., on the occasion of the celebration of Norway's Independence Day.

The Ambassador brought home to us some facts about communism which ought to warn us, if we are not already aware of it, that continued communism expansion and colonization of extensive areas by the Soviet Union will in the end be fatal to all of the free world.

A résumé of the remarks of Ambassador Morgenstierne, as reported in the Moorhead (Minn.) Daily News of May 18, 1954, follows:

ENVOY TERMS EXPANSION FATAL COLONIZATION

Ambassador Wilhelm Morgenstierne declared last night that there has never been a more fatal colonization in the world than what the Communists are now pursuing.

With a complete faith in the United Nations, the Ambassador discussed the situation in the world today. He stated that communism was not related to liberalism, but termed it black reaction.

The envoy spoke last evening at the Concordia Gym under the cosponsorship of the Fargo-Moorhead Open Forum and Concordia College. Joe Cohen was moderator. Morgenstierne spent the rest of his day here at news conferences and a dinner in his honor early last evening at the Gardner Hotel in Fargo.

U. N. AND NATO

Speaking of the United Nations and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, the Ambassador said that NATO was necessary for protection until the U. N. could become strong and until its member nations lived up to its Charter.

Speaking of the veto power, used so often by the Russians, Morgenstierne said that it has "taken time to see what we were up against" in the United Nations.

He asserted that NATO has given the Norwegians a sense of security even though their country borders Russia. He emphasized the point that if they were attacked all the other nations of the treaty would come to his country's aid.

POSTWAR YEARS

Speaking of the postwar years, the Ambassador declared that American aid virtually saved Western Europe. "We will never forget what the United States has done for us and the rest of the free world," he said.

He outlined the history of his country in the postwar years, and said that there was a "tremendous burden on the people," but they all worked together to work out their problems.

With regard to this, he said Norway had no strikes in the immediate years after the war. He said his country could be called a welfare state. A labor government has been in power since the war.

Asked at the press conference what he though about possible intervention of the United States in Indochina, he said that he felt communism should be stopped before it claimed all of southeast Asia, but declined to say anything specific about the United States.

He declared that the Indochina situation was of equal importance in the world with the Korean war.

Secretary of State Dulles and House Concurrent Resolution 58

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 3, 1954

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to submit for the RECORD a penetrating statement prepared by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, professor of Georgetown University and president of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, concerning the pending House Concurrent Resolution 58, which advocates the establishment of American diplomatic representation in the capitals of Ukraine and Byelorussia.

In this illuminating statement, Dr. Dobriansky accepts the criteria of diplomatic recognition as set forth by Secretary of State Dulles in an address before the Overseas Press Club of America, and finds in them a complete logical confirmation of the position represented by House Concurrent Resolution 58. On the basis of this analysis and numerous other testimonies given on this unique resolution, it is plainly evident that the opposition to House Concurrent Resolution 58 by the Kennanist clique in the Department of State is marked by a gross inconsistency of thought and a characteristic lack of imagination in the treatment of facts that conduce to the benefit of our struggle in the cold war.

When final consideration is given to this resolution in this session of Congress, it will be most interesting to observe whether the Secretary of State, in the face of his own stated criteria, will go along with the inconsistent position assumed by this group in the Department or, instead, will recognize and support the rational bases underlying House Concurrent Resolution 58, which are in accord with his own criteria and the many tenets of his position on the liberation of all nations.

The basic point of Dr. Dobriansky's remarks is that we should be consistent in the conduct of our foreign affairs. If we are going to maintain diplomatic relations with one or any of the captive nations in the Communist empire we should establish relations with as many of them as possible. Otherwise we should be consistent and break off relations with those Communist-dominated nations with whom we now maintain diplomatic relations.

Dr. Dobriansky's statement follows:

SECRETARY OF STATE DULLES AND HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 58

(By Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky)

In his address before the Overseas Press Club of America at the end of March, Secretary of State Dulles dwelled on several basic criteria of diplomatic recognition when he advanced his sound and rational justification for the nonrecognition of Red China. These criteria were submitted as forming a basis of general United States policy, and thus can be interpreted as enjoying general applicability in our relations with all nation-states. In view of the untenable position assumed by the vestigial containment crowd in the Department of State toward House Concurrent Resolution 58, which calls for the establishment of American diplomatic missions in Ukraine and Byelorussia, it is highly interesting and most instructive to relate these criteria to the issues bearing on this pending resolution.

The pertinent paragraphs of the Secretary's address read as follows:

"Let me first recall that diplomatic recognition is a voluntary act. One country has no right to demand recognition by another. Generally, it is useful that there should be diplomatic intercourse between those who exercise de facto governmental authority, and it is well established that recognition does not imply moral approval.

"President Monroe, in his famous message to Congress, denounced the expansionist and despotic system of Czarist Russia and its allies. But he said that it would nevertheless be our policy to consider the Government de facto as the legitimate government for us. That has indeed been the general United States policy, and I believe that it is a sound general policy. However, where it does not serve our interests, we are free to vary from it.

"In relation to Communist China, we are forced to take account of the fact that the Chinese Communist regime has been consistently and viciously hostile to the United States."

Extensive testimony submitted in support of House Concurrent Resolution 58 is founded on the very criteria set forth in this passage.[1] Indeed, as was demonstrated in the hearing, the problem dealing with

---

[1] Hearing, Committee on Foreign Affairs, Special Subcommittee on H. Con. Res. 58, U. S. Government Printing Office, Washington, 1953.

Ukraine and Byelorussia is fundamentally dissimilar from and much simpler than that involving Red China. Whereas we do not, and I hope will not, extend de jure recognition to the Red Chinese regime, we have, by virtue of our consent to the admission of the Ukrainian and Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republics into the United Nations, extended such recognition to these nation-states. Evidently in the light of international law itself, the United States already recognizes de jure the nation-states of Ukraine and Byelorussia.[2] The problem, therefore, is merely one of logical consistency in our policy and the full seizure of advantage afforded us by this de jure recognition.

It will be observed, then, that the criteria relevant to the subject matter of House Concurrent Resolution 58 are (1) usefulness of diplomatic intercourse, (2) absence of moral approval and (3) current intensity and power of histility toward the United States. Each of these bears an interesting relationship to the issue of American diplomatic representation in Ukraine and Byelorussia.

With reference to the first point, the usefulness of direct diplomatic intercourse with the governments in Kiev and Minsk, the capital seats of Ukraine and Byelorussia respectively, is naturally to be predicated entirely on the consideration of serving American interests solely. As was amply shown in the hearing, the absolute advantages of such direct diplomatic intercourse could devolve only upon the United States. The enumerated advantages are informational, propagandistic, psychological, and historic in nature, and are related to the chief sources of weakness and the two most restricted areas in the Russian Communist Empire. In meeting the superficial objections of the State Department group, it was clearly emphasized that if it is useful and advantageous to maintain diplomatic posts in Warsaw, Prague, and in other so-called satellite capitals, by reason of strategic position it is even more useful and advantageous for us to establish posts in Kiev and Minsk.

Anyone who has read carefully and with knowledgeability the contents of House Concurrent Resolution 58, which were formulated by the Honorable LAWRENCE H. SMITH, of Wisconsin, cannot but be profoundly impressed by the striking parallels that exist between the de facto governments in Kiev and Minsk and those in Warsaw, Prague, Budapest and elsewhere in the Russian Communist empire. Each exercises de facto governmental authority within the boundaries of its national jurisdiction, but all are basically and essentially subordinate to the will of Moscow. From a realistic and functional viewpoint the separation of these de facto governments on the basis of the satellite concept is pure fiction. Thus to maintain, as the State Department coterie has, that direct diplomatic intercourse would fortify the semblance of national independence in Ukraine and Byelorussia certainly backfires when our posts in Warsaw, Prague and elsewhere behind the Iron Curtain are taken into consideration. One is led to ask, then, whether Poland, Czechoslovakia, and others are to be construed as independent states. The dilemma is obvious.

It can be unequivocally stated that the main reason why the absolute advantages of the proposed course of action are not fully understood is due to the fact that there are many in our Government who possess only a slight acquaintance with the backgrounds and developments of Ukraine and Byelorussia in their strained relations with imperialist Russia. We've witnessed, for instance, the spectacle of a former counselor in the State Department who never even recognized the elementary distinctions between these nations, no less begin to appreciate the centrifugal force represented by Ukraine and Byelorussia within the Soviet Union itself.

Another important reason for this condition is that many Americans are unaware of the presence of Russia first elements in this country who deliberately seek to play down the historic aspirations and the liberation movements of the Ukrainian, Byelorussian and other non-Russian nations in the Soviet Union for fear that overt manifestations of American interest in these captive nations may eventually lead to the final collapse of the Russian empire, now partially in the guise of the Soviet Union. Thus, it is no accident nor wonder to close observers of this shadowy phenomenon that on House Concurrent Resolution 58 an opposition of three of a kind has formed, consisting of Ukrainian Communists, certain anti-Communist Russian emigree groups, and the Kennanist loyalists.[3]

The members of the special subcommittee under the chairmanship of the Honorable FRANCES P. BOLTON were impressed by the stated advantages and usefulness of this diplomatic intercourse with Kiev and Minsk, and unanimously accepted with favor the Smith resolution as submitted. It was evident that they realized also the second relevant criterion advanced by Secretary of State Dulles, namely, that such diplomatic intercourse does not imply moral approval. As in the misnomered satellite countries, governments representative of the will of the people also existed in Ukraine and Byelorussia before Russian expansionism and domination set in to establish national puppet regimes. Consequently, thoughtless statements to the effect that full passage of this resolution might engender the extension of diplomatic intercourse with two more Communist governments imply the consideration of moral approval which, on the basis of Secretary Dulles' second criterion, has no application here. Furthermore, aside from the factor of advantage, whether relative or absolute, in the matter of principle there is no logical quantitative basis of measurement for the number of Communist governments we should or should not deal with.

The third criterion on the current intensity and the power of hostility of a Communist government toward the United States is, in the light of present fact, no more applicable to the Ukrainian and Byelorussian Governments than it is to the Communist governments in Moscow, Warsaw, Prague, and elsewhere in Europe. In view of the fact that all Communist governments in the Red Russian Empire are by tenet and precept hostile to the United States, this criterion can only be relatively applied. Obviously, with an eye to our experiences in Korea and the circumstances now surrounding Indochina, the Secretary rightly gives full application to this criterion in the case of Red China, involving the broader problem of de jure recognition. It follows, therefore, that if in the more limited area of procedural diplomatic intercourse, this criterion is arbitrarily applied to the Ukrainian and Byelorussian Governments, it should, quite logically, be equally applied to the Communist governments in Moscow, Warsaw, Prague, and elsewhere. Consistency and clearness of thought can't have it otherwise, especially where all enjoy our de jure recognition.

The lack of such consistency in policy exposes us to the rude charge of discrimination toward nations, whether large or small. If, as it has often been described, the presence of an American Ambassador in a captive capital is to be viewed as a symbol of freedom and enduring American interest and hope in the eventual restoration of independence and freedom of the nation concerned, then, other things being equal, the maintenance of diplomatic missions in certain captive capitals and not others certainly furnishes credence to this charge. As was pointed out in the hearing, the tremendous psychological impact of this diplomatic step upon the peoples of the Ukrainian and Byelorussian (White Ruthenian) nations would be, in terms of this symbolic aspect, enormously salutary and beneficial to the United States. After all, one of the prime objectives of direct diplomatic intercourse is to weld peoples and nations together in peaceable bonds of friendship and mutual interest, despite the absence of moral approval toward a de facto government. Ukraine, for example, is the largest non-Russian nation behind the European Iron Curtain, and surely bears great strategic and political importance to the United States. For its people, the presence of an American Ambassador in Moscow is as meaningless in these symbolic terms as it is for the Baltic nation and the peoples of the other captive nations.

In conclusion, it is evident that House Concurrent Resolution 58 is completely consistent and in accord with the basic criteria of diplomatic recognition and intercourse as postulated by the Secretary of State himself. This resolution demands consistency in our diplomatic policy toward all nation-states, whether large or small. It was conceived as an implement of an unfolding American policy of liberation of which there is, as yet, no concrete evidence. To merely assert, as some do, that it was a mistake to have recognized Ukraine and Byelorussia in the United Nations and that full passage and execution of this resolution would compound the alleged mistake indicates a complete lack of knowledge and understanding not only of the present factual and logical aspects of this matter but also of the paramount reasons that caused Moscow to press the admission of Ukraine and Byelorussia at the inception of the United Nations organization.

If there was any mistake on this score, it was Stalin's mistake, resulting from his necessary appeasement of the powerful nationalist tendencies and pressures existing in Ukraine and Byelorussia. Indeed, our mistake will lie in a failure to pass and execute this resolution in order to compound Stalin's mistake for our own advantage. If it was a mistake to recognize any Communist representatives in the United Nations, this obviously implies a moral premise that is extraneous to the discussion at hand.

House Concurrent Resolution 58 is now before the full Committee on Foreign Affairs. With the issue of Red China's recognition in the foreground of international affairs, the time is most ripe now to pass this resolution as a counteroffensive to Communist efforts aimed at the placement of Red China in the United Nations. The State Department group succeeded in stalling the committee's consideration of the resolution toward the close of the last session, despite the fact that its representatives were afforded ample opportunity to testify at the hearing held last July. Feeling that their case was adequately presented in previous communications, they chose not to appear. Those in support of the resolution have no fear of any new objections that might be submitted by this group, if the acid test of rational and factual argumentation, as was observed by the Bolton subcommittee, is consistently and openly maintained. We seek only the earliest opportunity for this test, now so conveniently furnished by the Secretary of State's own criteria of evaluation.

---

[2] H. Con. Res. 58 Consistent with International Law, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, April 14, 1954, pp. A2811–A2812.

[3] H. Con. Res. 58, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 29, 1954, pp. A2384–A2386.

Extension of Social Security

SPEECH

OF

HON. VERA BUCHANAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1954

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 9366) to amend the Social Security Act and the Internal Revenue Code so as to extend coverage under the old-age and survivors insurance program, increase the benefits payable thereunder, preserve the insurance rights of disabled individauls, and increase the amount of earnings permitted without loss of benefits, and for other purposes.

Mrs. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I am very happy to support the bill now before us. As some of my colleagues on this side of the aisle have already remarked, we are observing the pleasing spectacle of our Republican friends coming, at long last, to the support of this humanitarian legislation dedicated to the welfare of all the people.

We have heard, increasingly of late, the question as to what has happened to the "great crusade." Now that is a good question, and I think the answer would have to be that it has suffered a fate similar to that of the other catchy slogans and has become just another empty phrase. So in this mood of disenchantment I think it is at least slightly reassuring to see some evidence of what our slogan-loving friends might well call the great conversion.

The original Social Security Act first became law in 1935. The Democratic Party has pointed to it with pride as that great landmark of social legislation recommended to the Congress by the great humanitarian, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, and passed by the Congress under his leadership. It has preserved and strengthened the family life of America. The theory behind this act, when it was passed in 1935, was that it would assure retired workers and their families enough money to live out their lives in comfort and independence. It is a little difficult today for us to realize that such an attempt to bring security into the life of the American worker was met with anguished cries of socialism.

Down through the years it became apparent that the act should be extended to cover more persons who were without basic retirement and survivors' protection and, further, that the benefits were too low. That is why I am so pleased with those provisions of H. R. 9366 which extend old-age and survivors insurance coverage to approximately 10 million persons who are presently excluded from the act. Unfortunately, the increase in benefits provided for in this bill is far too limited in this time of high living costs to meet the original purpose of the act.

There was legislation before the Ways and Means Committee introduced by my colleague, Congressman EBERHARTER, and other Democratic members of the committee, providing a more realistic increase in benefits and if it were possible I would vote for it today in preference to the benefit provisions of the present bill. In view of the legislative situation resulting from the closed rule under which we are operating today there is no possibility of an amendment and hence I am supporting the limited increase in benefits as the best we can obtain at the present time.

This is, then, Mr. Chairman, not the best of all possible bills but an encouraging step forward and a heartening recognition of the need for social security on the part of those who have opposed it most vigorously in the past.

A Challenge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1954

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the hearings which Senator MUNDT is so ably conducting, and which would tax the patience and forbearance of a saint, are said to be for the purpose of determining whether certain statements made by the Army and others made by a member of a Senate investigating committee and by members of its staff are true or false.

The opportunity to determine the accuracy of the testimony of at least two of the witnesses has been afforded by the statement of a member of the committee staff and the Army Secretary.

This is indicated in an editorial from the June 1 issue of the Chicago Tribune which reads as follows:

YOUNG MR. COHN LAYS IT ON THE LINE

> An important difference in quality between Roy Cohn's testimony and that of Secretary Stevens and Mr. Adams is that Mr. Cohn has made it very easy for his opponents to send him to jail for perjury if he isn't telling the truth.
>
> For example, there is Mr. Cohn's version of what took place at the luncheon at Fort Monmouth. "A colonel," said Mr. Cohn, "interrupted Secretary Stevens, told him he was discussing a confidential matter, and ordered him to be quiet." Mr. Cohn said that Mr. Adams then whipped out a notebook, jotted down the officer's name, and said this man would not long remain in the vicinity.
>
> Now this is an incident the truth or falsity of which can be verified by third parties who were present at the luncheon. There is no need to take the word of one interested party against the other. Mr. Cohn, in fact, is staking his liberty and his career on his faith in the honor of the Army officers who were present. Unquestionably, they would serve their immediate interest if, in case they are called to testify, they deny the truth of his story. Mr. Cohn is willing to take that chance.
>
> He followed the same fearless course in his discussion of the treatment of General Lawton. He says General Lawton was disciplined for cooperating with the Senate committee. He says that General Lawton was, in effect, forbidden to go with the committee's investigators to the penitentiary to interview Greenglass, the member of the Rosenberg spy team. General Lawton and perhaps other witnesses can say whether this is true or not. Cohn's sworn testimony is in the record. He has invited prosecution for perjury if he hasn't told the truth.
>
> There was little or nothing comparable to this in the testimony of Mr. Stevens and Mr. Adams.
>
> Evidently, Mr. Cohn isn't worried about the record of the telephone calls he made to Secretary Stevens. He has told to what extent he intervened to get a commission for Schine and has told his reasons for the calls to Schine at camp. He has said flatly that this is the whole story. If he isn't telling the truth, the recorded telephone calls will prove him a perjurer.
>
> There is no doubt that Mr. Cohn is an unusually bright young man, who knows the law of perjury. It seems unlikely that he would stick his neck out as he has done if he weren't telling the truth.

However, it seems to me, a very real issue which should be determined by the committee is that of who was responsible for the promotion and honorable discharge, by Army authorities, of the dentist, who, testifying before the committee, invoked the fifth amendment.

Other than that issue, to me, the only apparently worth-while question is that raised by the gentleman from Wisconsin when, exasperated, he rebuked an Army officer for what appeared to be evasive testimony.

That would seem to be a trivial issue, rather easy of decision.

New England

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 29, 1954

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following editorial from the Boston Herald, Boston, Mass., Monday, May 31, 1954:

BOOSTING NEW ENGLAND

> New England seems to have more than its share of weepers and wailers, but we have our boosters, too, who speak from facts as well as with volume.
>
> Take Irwin L. Moore. He is president of the New England Electric System, the outfit that won the 1953 first award of the New England District of the Advertising Federation of America for advertisements booming New England.
>
> In this year's annual report President Moore says:
>
> "New England's industrial production and growth have been steady and substantial. Important and healthful readjustments continue to take place in New England. Like the rest of the country, we are now in a buyer's market. And it is precisely that kind of market in which New England has always excelled.
>
> "New England excels in the production of quality products, of specialties, of new devices where the emphasis is on value added by manufacture. To our high-grade textile, paper, and leather products we have added automatic machinery, intricately fashioned tools and parts, precision instruments, electric and electronic equipment, and plastics. Textile firms alone have spent an estimated $300 million for modernization in New Eng-

land since the war, and continue to operate at a profit to themselves and the region.

"Any suggestion that New England economy is lagging is disproved my our position among the leaders in such measures of prosperity and stability as individual home ownership, personal savings, life insurance in force, and annual per capita income, in all of which New England ranks above the national average. * * *

"New England Electric System recorded new highs in outputs, sales, and customers during 1953. And we look forward with confidence to further gains in the years to come. * * * New England's record of performance and its outlook for the future continues to be good."

That's the kind of talk—and facts—we like to hear.

Man of Courage: Jefferson Davis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1954

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, today, June 3, 1954, we commemorate the birth of Jefferson Davis, president of the Confederate States of America. Although we agree that the United States are better off united in one Nation, we consider Davis as a symbol not only of the Confederacy but of the responsibilities and virtues of local self-government. We know that Davis was correct when he said the following words which are as important today as when he said them:

> The world has long suffered from the oppressions of government under the pretext of ruling by divine right, and excusing the invasion into private and domestic affairs on the plea of paternal care for the morals and good order of the people.

It took more than a bit of courage for a statesman to utter those words many years ago because it is always difficult to voice an opinion that centralized government should not supplant local responsibilities. It takes similar courage to voice such opinions today. In this little talk on Jefferson Davis it will be my purpose to speak of the courage of this great statesman and not to dwell on any particular philosophy which he voiced.

Davis was born 146 years ago today in a two-room log house in eastern Kentucky. After the family, of modest means, moved about through several Southern States, Jeff was taken under the wing of an older brother in Mississippi, then almost a frontier State. His brother and he were industrious; and their planting activities brought an ever increasing prosperity. Jeff found time to get a scattered, but adequate basic education which was finally climaxed by graduation from West Point. It took a great degree of courage for a young man to attain his educational achievements despite the handicaps which might have made less determined people pursue other courses.

At West Point there was an incident which showed the physical courage of Jeff Davis. He was a member of a class which was studying explosives; and without warning one day a fuse was ignited to the peril of all of those present. It was Jefferson Davis who picked up the ignited explosive and threw it out of the window before it could do damage to others. Everyone else in the room including the teacher, fled for safety. This was an early example of the courage which Davis demonstrated throughout his entire lifetime.

After graduation from West Point, Davis served with distinction in the United States Army in the Black Hawk War and during this time met Miss Sarah Taylor, daughter of his commanding officer, Col. Zachary Taylor. This was occasioned despite the opposition of her father, who for some unknown reason was opposed to the match. It has been said that the reason was that Colonel Taylor did not wish for his daughter to marry a military man; and that this also was the reason for Davis resigning his commission. It seems to me that it took a portion of courage to marry Miss Taylor despite the opposition of her father. There soon occurred the first great tragedy of Davis' life; for the bride died from an attack of malaria a few months after the marriage. Davis then settled down at Briarfield, his extensive plantation in Mississippi and lived there the life of a planter and reclusive scholar for a number of years. In 1843, his first political campaign, he ran for the State Legislature of Missippi and in so doing opposed the chief plank of his party, the proposed repudiation of State bonds. He was defeated for the legislature, but the race is of primary importance to us because it showed his courage in withstanding the political pressures which were upon him. Two years later he was elected to the United States Congress, despite his continued opposition to the repudiation issue of his party. This seems to me to demonstrate a political courage which was a counterpart of his personal, physical courage demonstrated at West Point.

Although Davis opposed the Mexican War, he later saw that it was inevitable; and when this occurred he resigned his position in Congress to become a colonel in the First Mississippi Regiment for active service in the 1848 war. Incidentally, he refused a commission as general in the United States Army on the theory that the United States Army did not have the right to give him this commission in a State organization, the Mississippi Volunteers.

In the Mexican War, Jefferson Davis demonstrated a physical courage which has few parallels in our history. In a crucial battle at Monterey, he led the forces to capture a fort and held it under hours of intensive fire from the enemy. His actions in this are described by his biographer, Landon Knight, in the following words:

> The strong fort redoubled its fire of grape, cannister, and musketry under which the American lines wavered and were about to break. Colonel Davis, seeing the crisis, without waiting for orders, placed himself at the head of the Mississippians and gave the order to charge. With prolonged cheers, his regiment swept forward through a storm of bullets and bursting shell, driving the Mexicans pell-mell back into the stone fort in the rear. In vain the defeated Mexicans sought to barricade the gate; Davis and McClung burst it open and, leading their men into the fort, completed its surrender. Its capture insured victory.

The high point of the service of Jefferson Davis in the Mexican War was reached at Buena Vista. This was where he made his famous stand against overwhelming odds. Under orders from him, his soldiers held their fire until at close range. Then the volley which they released was so great that the enemy fled, and the day was won for the United States forces. All of this took place despite a very severe wound which Davis received in the early part of the encounter. At the end of the battle he fell, unconscious, from his horse. The events at Buena Vista are described by his biographer, Knight, in the following words:

> Thus assailed on two sides by overwhelming numbers, the situation was truly critical; but Colonel Davis, forming the two regiments into the shape of a reentering angle, awaited the assault. They refused to give an inch and met every onslaught with a withering fire, which soon so cumbered the ground with the dead that it was with difficulty the living could move over it. At last, utterly demoralized by the awful carnage, the Mexican lines broke and fled from the field. Buena Vista was won.

After the successful culmination of the Mexican War, Colonel Davis was appointed to the United States Senate, later to become Secretary of War in President Pierce's Cabinet, and still later to serve again in the Senate. During this period of very difficult statesmanship for any southern leader, we find that he strongly urged that the South remain in the Union, though he felt, as an intellectual matter, that secession is constitutional. He expressed it in the following words:

> Remain in the Union, though the right to secede is constitutional; but it is not expedient to use that right. Contend for the rights of the States within the Union and under the old flag.

It took a degree of courage to maintain such a position because it satisfied neither the northern extremists nor the southern extremists. While he was Secretary of War, the war clouds were gathering between the sections of the country. Yet as to this responsibility of Secretary of War, no one could ever criticize his activities in that important leadership for our country. In fact, it has been said that he was, by far, the strongest Secretary of War that our country had ever had in its history down to that time; and he did many things to build up the strength of the United States from a military standpoint. He supervised the building of important forts, bridges, and other military defenses. He gave new impetus to the strengthening of West Point and the caliber of its teaching. He increased the size of the Army and made it more attractive for service personnel by increasing pay; and in many other ways he strengthened the defenses of the United States.

Before actual war broke out, he was serving again in the United States Senate. From this position he resigned when his home State, Mississippi, seceded from the Union. His speech in the Senate on that occasion was a classic. In it he said among other things:

> Senators, we recur to the principles upon which our Government was founded, and when you deny them and when you deny us the right to withdraw from a government which, thus perverted, threatens to be destructive to our rights, we but tread in the paths of our fathers when we proclaim our independence and take the hazard.

Upon resignation from the Senate, he had hoped to command the troops for Mississippi if a war was to follow, but he was drafted as an interim President and finally as a permanent President. The closing sentence of his inaugural speech upon his election and inauguration as a permanent President was as follows:

> With humble gratitude and adoration acknowledging the providence which has so visibly protected the Confederacy during its brief but eventful career, to Thee, O God, I trustingly commit myself and prayerfully invoke Thy blessings on my country and its cause.

In the conduct of affairs of the Confederacy, he had many opportunities to display his courage, and he never failed to do just that. Perhaps the greatest oration of his life was made on the steps of the African Church in Richmond, Va., when most of his hearers were in the depths of despair. He demonstrated clearly his courage in the presence of mounting unpopularity in the closing days of the conflict, doomed to defeat from the very beginning because of overwhelming odds. On that occasion he said:

> Let us then unite our hands and hearts, lock our shields together, and we may well believe that before another summer solstice falls upon us it will be the enemy who will be asking us for conferences and occasions in which to make known our demands.

Davis had not been one of the hot-blooded zealots for secession or for war. He had advised more peaceful measures, but when the responsibility rested upon his shoulders to lead the South, he took the responsibility and did a magnificent job against overwhelming odds. Even in the darkest days he showed courage and devotion to responsibility and duty. His darkest personal days came with his being imprisoned after the end of the war. He was put in irons and later placed under indictment for treason. Some southerners would have welcomed his trial as it would have given Davis a chance to fight through the courts the question of the legality of secession which he and they believed to be implicit in the United States Constitution. But this would have been embarrassing to the North which felt that blood had now decided the question of secession forever, whatever might have been the proper interpretation of the words of the Constitution as it had been drafted. So the Federal Government dismissed the trial and Davis was freed after several years in prison. Dr. J. J. Craven, the surgeon for Fort Monroe, where he was imprisoned, said of Jefferson Davis:

> The Psalms were his favorite portion of the book and he said: "There is sufficient evidence of their divine origin in the fact that only an intelligence which holds the life threads of the entire human family could have uttered in a single cry, every wish, joy, fear, exultation, hope, passion, and sorrow of the human heart."

I understand that in those most trying days he received his greatest comfort from reading the 26th psalm which begins as follows:

> Judge be, O Lord; for I have walked in mine integrity: I have trusted also in the Lord; therefore I shall not slide.
>
> Examine me, O Lord, and prove me; try my reins and my heart. For thy lovingkindness is before mine eyes.

A study of the life of Jefferson Davis shows to everyone that he relied on God in all of his major decisions and that the courage which he so repeatedly demonstrated came from a conviction that he was doing what he should do under the circumstances with which he was confronted. Few men have had more trying responsibilities and I know of no one who has fulfilled them better.

In the closing days of his life Jefferson Davis was idolized by many who would keep alive the friction and discord between the sections of our country, so in his closing years he had a tendency to remain silent in the hope that his voice would not be distorted to create and keep alive unnecessary friction throughout the United States. However, there came an opportunity in these later years to speak an important speech at Mississippi City where he would have an opportunity to speak particularly to the youth of the South. With his words on that occasion I wish to close this talk with the thought in mind that an unusual degree of courage was involved in making the speech which included these words which are particularly applicable to us today:

> The faces I see before me are those of young men: Had I not known this I would not have appeared before you.
>
> Men in whose hands the destinies of the Southland lie: For love of her I break my silence to speak to you a few words of respectful admonition. The past is dead, let it bury its deeds, its hopes, its aspirations; before you lies a future—a future of expanding national glory, before which all the world shall stand amazed. Let me beseech you to lay aside all rancor, all bitter sectional feeling and to make your places in the ranks of those who will bring about the consummation devoutly to be wished—a reunited country.

Loud Talk and a Small Stick

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 2, 1954

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I include in my extension of remarks a timely article, Loud Talk and a Small Stick, written by Marquis Childs, appearing in the Washington Post of June 2, 1954.

The last sentence of this article, "Such recognition must inevitably bring the realization that American strength should be increased rather than reduced," is one that I agree with.

I have repeatedly said in and out of the National House of Representatives, "The only thing the Communists respect is what they fear, and that is strength, military and otherwise, greater than they themselves possess."

LOUD TALK AND A SMALL STICK

(By Marquis Childs)

To one who has been absent from the country for some months, concerned day after day with the ominous drift of world events, America presents at this moment a strange spectacle. The television screens, the newspapers, the radio reflect an intense—one might almost say a willful—preoccupation with the Stevens-McCarthy drama.

If this controversy had been deliberately devised as a piece of escapism to distract the national attention from the perilous turn world events have taken, the net effect of distraction and diversion would hardly have been greater. One suspects that this national farce, with its tragic overtone, has completely obscured the harsh realities of the new phase of the struggle between East and West, between the Communist and the non-Communist halves of the divided world, in which we now find ourselves.

The conspicuous fact of this new phase is a drift toward war, with the controls over policy largely taken out of American hands. What happens in the immediate future is likely to determine how rapid that drift is or, more unlikely, whether it can be checked.

There can apparently be no accommodation between Communist China and the United States. It is the immovable object and the irresistible force. How an explosion can be avoided, in view of the mounting score of hostility and resentment, no one looking objectively at the facts can say.

That explosion may not come over Indochina. The French seem to be ready with British backing, to settle for almost any kind of an armistice. But when another domino goes over, or seems about to go over, the tensions will be renewed and, with the potentials of violence lying all about, it will be impossible to prevent the fatal outburst.

Certain comfortable assumptions have long been taken for granted. One was that the Soviet Union did not want war and that therefore no matter what happened we should not have a war. It may still be true that Moscow wishes to avoid another world war. But even if this is true, there is reason to believe that Moscow's Chinese partner feels differently about the risks of war. All the signs out of Peking are of a fierce, implacable hatred toward the West and in particular toward America. In that hatred is an irrationality which goes far beyond the calculated risks of statecraft.

Some disturbing parallels out of the recent past are bound to occur. In the drift of the thirties leading up to the outbreak of World War II the same persistentt, almost irrational refusal to face up to the facts of life was in evidence again and again. When one looks back at that time, the blindness of the principal actors has a perverse, after-me-the-deluge quality.

The responsibility for world leadership lay almost entirely on Britain. And the culminating folly of the Conservative government in power in England—and it is here that the parallel is most deadly—was in scaling down the British military establishment for reasons of economy and a balanced budget at the very time that far-reaching promises and pledges abroad were being made. While Munich meant the surrender of Czechoslovakia, Britain at the same time pledged the defense of Poland which had a weak, unstable government and an old-fashioned romantic army. The commitments were extended as the means for living up to them were constantly contracted and only a few lonely voices, such as that of Winston Churchill, were heard in protest.

This is precisely what the Eisenhower administration is doing. The Defense Establishment is being scaled back as the promises are extended to the farthest periphery. The words grow louder and angrier as the stick grows smaller, thereby flying in the face of Theodore Roosevelt's sage advice.

All this is perfectly evident to the Communist world. They see that when the chips are down, the threatening words mean very little. So the next time they step farther over the line, and the danger of the ultimate showdown comes near.

The first necessity, if the drift toward war is to be checked, is to recognize the realities of the present situation. Such recognition must inevitably bring the realization that American armed strength should be increased rather than reduced.

In Commemoration of the Birth of the Italian Republic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 2, 1954

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, our understanding of a given situation may very well depend upon our perspective; that is to say, on whether we are looking back on the progress that has been made or whether we are looking ahead toward a particular goal that has been marked out. Our understanding is considerably improved, of course, if we can do both. I have recently had occasion to attempt to take this dual perspective in looking at Italy in order that I might come to a better understanding of Italy in 1954. Since this is an important occasion in Italy the time for commemoration of the birth of the Italian Republic 8 years ago, I would like to share my thoughts with you.

If we go back to the end of World War II, we find that Italy was in a state of political chaos. The failure of a totalitarian experiment had created a political vacuum. The only group ready to step into it was the united front of anti-Fascist parties, namely, Christian Democrats, Socialists, and Communists. These parties, suppressed by Mussolini, had united underground as the Committee of National Liberation. The Communists were well organized and more adequately financed than the others, and so they were in a position to demand and receive a place in the provisional government set up after the war.

Several Cabinets of the new Government formed and fell before December 1945. Italy's economic plight and the issue of whether the country was to remain a monarchy or become a republic contributed to this instability. However, in that month, December 1945, the Christian Democratic leader, Alcide de Gasperi, became Premier and managed to form a relatively stable Government. For a time his Cabinets included representatives of all the active liberation parties.

On June 2, 1946, a referendum settled the issue of monarch or republic in favor of a republic. The citizens of Italy had freely expressed their preference. In this act Italy provided evidence to the world that a country does not have to exchange a one authoritarian creed for another. This series of events in Italy is looked upon by western nations as one of the most significant following World War II. By the end of 1947 the new constitution had been approved and parliamentary elections followed. The constitution drafted by the constituent assembly provided for a Parliament made up of a Chamber of Deputies elected by popular vote for a term of 5 years and a Senate elected in the same way for a term of 6 years; a president to be elected by both houses for a 7-year term and a cabinet responsible to the Parliament.

In 1946 and 1947, the cooperative spirit that had at first animated the coalition government declined sharply at the same time that East-West tensions were growing. The Socialist Party was split on the issue of subservience to the Communist Party. In the 1948 elections a new coalition was formed and the Christion Democrats, right-wing Socialists, Liberals, and Republicans defeated the Communists. The Christian Democratic Party, broadly based, represents many opinions; it moves along the path of compromise. However, it has demonstrated on a number of occasions that it is not afraid to take action against any of its component groups. Alcide de Gasperi, head of the party, a man of political acumen and unquestionable integrity, built up a large personal following in Italy. After the 1953 elections, he was unable to form a new government, and so he resigned as Premier; however, as party secretary he continues to be influential.

The Communist Party in Italy has a rigidly disciplined, conspiratorial leadership. The U. S. S. R. is fully aware of Italy's strategic location and importance. Italy has, therefore, been one of the prime targets of Communist activity. The party, under the direction of Moscow has built up to Italy a very large Communist Party outside the Iron Curtain. Italy's top Communist leaders are shrewd, skillful politicians, as well versed in the techniques of Soviet propaganda as in the tactics of revolution.

However, in 1948 the Communist strikes, riots, and violence thoroughly alarmed the great mass of Italian voters. Prospects of Marshall plan aid brought stirrings of hope to the Italian people. They paid little attention to the Communist croakings about the economic disaster sure to come if Italy broke off trade with the Eastern European countries in favor of trade with the West. As a result of this election, the Christian Democrats had an absolute majority in the chamber and a near majority in the senate to last for 5 and 6 years. Thus firmly established, the De Gasperi government instituted reforms and helped the country greatly on its road to recovery and progress.

Following the close election of 1953, De Gasperi was unable to form a new government that had the support of Parliament, with the result that there have been several Premiers in the interim. Nineteen hundred and fifty four has been called Italy's year of decision. It certainly bids fair to be a year of testing for the moderate democratic regime. The Communists blame the Government for all of Italy's problems and trials, and on the other hand distort to their own advantage whatever the Government accomplishes that is obviously helpful to the people.

However, for the Italians the rapid progress they have made in recent years is convincing evidence of what they believe can be accomplished in the future. In some respects the road which Italy has traveled since its postwar Government was set up has not been unlike those which other European countries have traveled, yet Italy even with her many economic problems has been singularly effective in the struggle to gain a firm economic and political footing.

Our own country has a deep and human interest in Italy. We have consistently supported Italy's integration with Western Europe through membership in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and the European economic, defense, and political communities. As a nation that owes much to its own Italian population and heritage, this country has an abiding concern for Italy. And so it is with a great deal of gratitude and a feeling of sincere friendship that we pause to commemorate this anniversary—the eighth year of the Italian Republic.

Federal Aid to Education in Federally Impacted Areas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DeWITT S. HYDE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1954

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I should like to urge upon the Congress the absolute necessity for the approval by this Congress of the maximum amount of funds possible for Federal aid for school construction in federally impacted areas.

In my own congressional district, which includes the impacted areas of Frederick County and Montgomery County, part of which borders the Nation's Capital, there is an urgent need for Federal financial assistance for school construction. For example, the school population in Montgomery County has increased almost 100 percent in the last 4 years. Most of this can be traced directly to the tremendous growth of government in the last 15 years. An area such as this has practically no tax support from commerce and industry. It is absolutely essential that the Federal

Government in such an area, where the Government itself is the business which has induced the rapid increase in population, bear part of the cost of constructing school facilities to take care of the families brought into the community.

I should also like to call to the attention of Congress the need for an early decision on the matter of payments in lieu of taxes to local governments on Federal property located throughout the States. This is the most realistic basis for help to those communities into which the business of government brings large numbers of people for whom the local government must supply all the necessary services such as schools, streets, roads, drainage, sewers, police and fire protection, and the like.

Trial Against Bourgeois Nationalists in the Communist Party of Slovakia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. BONIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1954

Mr. BONIN. Mr. Speaker, at the request of Joseph A. Mikus, director of the Slovak League Press Bureau, and under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following article concerning the trial against certain nationalists by the Communist Party of Slovakia.

Some of the charges enumerated in the indictment against the defendants are as follows:

TRIAL AGAINST BOURGEOIS NATIONALISTS IN THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF SLOVAKIA—SOME POINTS OF THE ACT OF INDICTMENT

The trial of a group of bourgeois nationalists in Slovakia, headed by Dr. Gustav Husák, former chairman of the board of commissioners for Slovakia, and consisting of Ladislav Novomesky, former commissioner of education; Dr. Daniel Okály, former commissioner of the interior; Dr. Ivan Horvát, former Minister Plenipotentiary of Czechoslovakia in Budapest; and Ladislav Holdos, former chief of the office for church affairs in Slovakia, took place between April 21 and 24 before the criminal senate of the state court in Bratislava. From the act of indictment we reproduce the following points:

While the Czech and Slovak people, after a common struggle for national liberation and after a long struggle for the elimination of the exploiters, were starting to build a new Czechoslovak state, the defendants committed criminal acts, damaging the national and state interests of the Slovak people and directed against the security and unity of the common Czechoslovak state.

The preconditions for liberation of Czechoslovakia was created by the Soviet victory in World War II. The Czech and the Slovak people took power in their state and embarked on the road of a people's democracy and of building socialism, thus creating the possibilities for a new relationship between Czechs and Slovaks in the spirit of equality. Czechoslovakia was renewed as the common state of two equal nations. The Slovaks became masters in their country to the same degree as the Czechs in their national household.

The establishment of the principle of equality between the two nations put an end to the old frictions. The Kosice program of April 1945 and the constitution of 1948 recognized the Slovak national organs, the Slovak national council and the board of commissioners, as the organs of state power on Slovak territory. Slovak representatives participated in the work of Parliament and of the central government, while the Slovak national organs tried, with the help of the Czech working class, to overcome as soon as possible the backwardness of Slovakia with respect to culture, economy, and so forth.

Supported and directed by the western imperialists, the Czech and Slovak bourgeoisie stood against this policy inaugurated by the Czech and Slovak working class, trying to break the unity of the two nations. The defendants, who were renegades from the Slovak working class, assisted the reactionary bourgeoisie in their endeavors.

The ideological background of their treachery consisted in their attempts to solve the national question of the Slovak nation, not in collaboration with the Czech working class, but mainly in cooperation with the Slovak bourgeoisie and accepted eventually their leadership. In this connection they accepted the Slovak fascist puppet state. Later on they successfully penetrated the leadership of the Slovak national uprising and got hold of important positions in the new people's democratic state. They misused their positions in the Slovak national council and in the board of commissioners in a criminal way in order to isolate Slovakia from the Czech working people and from the construction of socialism, thus strengthening in Slovakia the remnants of capitalism and jeopardizing the achievements of the Slovak working class. Their aim was to break up the common Czechoslovak state and to hand over Slovakia to the reactionary bourgeoisie and to the mercy of foreign imperialists.

In this activity, the defendants were directed by Vladimir Clementis, the proven enemy of the Slovak nation and agent of the western imperialists who, in the trial of the antistate conspiratorial center led by Rudolph Slánsky, was unmasked as a member of the leadership of this center. It became apparent from the confession made by Clementis that the defendants formed a group of bourgeois nationalists acting in common understanding.

In the case of Husák, Novomesky, Okály, and Horvát, the development started long ago in the pre-Munich republic, when the Slovak left-wing intellectuals gathered under the leadership of Clementis around the periodical DAV. This group, originating in bourgeois society, posed as an ally of the Communist Party, and some of their members even joined the party; in reality, however, DAV remained an exclusive group outside the party, following its own policy and educating young Slovak intellectuals in the spirit of Slovak bourgeois nationalism.

Clementis, Husák, and Novomesky managed to isolate the young Slovak intelligentsia from the working class and from the Communist Party. Slovak youth was thus isolated from the idea of class struggle and from unity with the Czech working class. This became evident as long ago as 1932 when Clementis, Novomesky, and others took part in the Trencianske Teplice Congress of bourgeois nationalistic youth, agrarian, and other youth groups, and accepted the separatist and autonomist platform of Hlinka's fascism.

Eventually the members of DAV became "admirers of the imperialist agent Benes and his conception, binding Czechoslovakia to the western imperialists. They were not deterred by the fact that Benes refused to recognize the existence of a separate Slovak nation for equality within the Czechoslovak Republic."

After Munich, Clementis joined the camp of western imperialists quite openly. "In the beginning of the war in Europe in 1939 and mainly during the Soviet-Finnish war, he openly expressed an antidemocratic and an anti-Soviet point of view. Husák, Novomesky, Horvát, and Okály at that time became collaborators of the Slovak Fascist state, concentrating their endeavors mainly on the securing of a comfortable life.

Novomesky was a well-paid editor of the periodical Budovatel, published by the Fascist Slovak Grain Co., and became thus a propagator of Fascist ideas in the economic field. The other three collaborated with the Fascist regime in their capacity as lawyers. Novomesky was in close personal and friendly relations with Mach, Karvas, Zatko, and others; Husák mainly with Karvas. A. Mach and I Karvas were members of the Slovak Government during the Second World War.

When, after June 22, 1941, a warrant for arrest was issued against Novomesky, Husák, and others—as they had been members of the Communist Party—Novomesky in a cowardly fashion visited Alexander Mach, the then minister of interior, promising him in an abject manner that he intended to work for the Slovak Fascist regime. After the warrant for arrest issued against Novomesky was revoked, his collaboration with Mach became even closer. He himself has confessed that this fact disorientated the ranks of the Slovak fighters against fascism. The other accused behaved in a similar way.

The treacherous activity of the defendants Husák and Novomesky against the Slovak national uprising was evident from the selection of officers for military leadership and from the hostile attitude of the leadership of the uprising toward the partisan units. Husák and Novomesky supported the endeavors to hand over the military leadership to the reactionary Benes agents Viest, Golian, and others. They put the Slovak revolutionary forces directly to the service of Benes, the agent of western imperialists.

Their purpose was to create the preconditions for preserving the capitalistic order in Slovakia. Horvát has confessed that he agreed with Novomesky to leave all preparations and all decisions regarding the starting signal for the rising of the Slovak revolutionary forces to Golian, Ferjencik, and others, in the knowledge that such a decision was directly opposed to the interests of the U. S. S. R. When the rising began they tried to help the counterrevolutionary forces around the imperialist agents Ursiny, Lettrich, Viest, Golian, and others, in order to neutralize the revolutionary forces of the workers.

These traitors entered the people's democratic state under an obligation to officials of the former Fascist Slovak state and to representatives of the reactionary Slovak bourgeoisie, Lettrich, Ursiny, etc., and through Clementis also to Benes.

CRIMES DIRECTED AGAINST THE FOUNDATIONS OF THE REPUBLIC

As early as 1944 the accused cooperated with Clementis on their subversive activities. The accused Novomesky, Ursiny, and Lieutenant Colonel Vesely at that time, as representatives of the Slovak national council, flew to London where Novomesky concluded with Clementis a treacherous agreement to the effect that they would try to make impossible the creation of a united state of Czechs and Slovaks and that they would not admit the authority of the central government in Slovakia. In 1945 Clementis returned to liberated Czechoslovakia as an agent of the French secret service and as a close collaborator of Benes. Immediately after his return, Clementis renewed his contacts with Husák, Novomesky, and Okály. The demoralized former member of the Spanish brigade, Holdos, commenting on his connections with the bourgeois nationalist group, said, "Owing to my Trotskyist views, I came gradually under the influence of Husák, Novomesky, and their accomplices and began fully to cooperate in the antistate activities of this group."

The accused Okály gave the following evidence about the formation and development of the bourgeois nationalist group, "I was present and took part in many conversations with Husák, in which we discussed not only problems concerning the commissariat of the interior, which at that time was also in charge of security, but also problems concerning the whole state. In those talks, Husák advocated the view that we must under no circumstances allow the Prague government to interfere in Slovak affairs. He emphasized that we must solve all our problems alone, with Slovak authorities, disregarding the attitude of the Prague government. I promised that I would support this."

The final aims of the bourgeois nationalist group were described in the evidence of all the accused. The defendant Okály stated, "The final goal of our hostile endeavors was the creation of such conditions as would enable the bourgeois again to assume power in Slovakia and to resurrect the independent Slovak state."

Holdos, too, gave evidence in this matter: "We endeavored to make Slovakia once again the fifth column of the imperialists so that the Slovak bourgeoisie could regain its lost positions and its power in order to contribute to the disintegration of democratic Czechoslovakia."

In the negotiations concerning the relations between the central government and the Slovak national council, the bourgeois nationalist group tried to enforce such an authority for the Slovak national council and the board of commissioners as would strengthen the position of Slovak bourgeoisie inside of the Slovak executive organs and as would hamper Slovakia's advance toward socialism.

As the struggle concerning the constitution, the accused Holdos stated: "Up to February 1948 we demanded such authority for the Slovak national organs that the implementation of our requests would have been exclusively to the advantage of the reactionaries. After February, we concentrated on obtaining such authority as would make possible an independent policy for Slovakia, disregarding the government. We were fully aware that we were damaging the interests of the state as a whole."

The bourgeois nationalists were well aware of the importance of the state machinery in the light of the bourgeoisie against the workers. Hence, they tried to preserve as long as possible the machinery established by the Fascist Slovak state, particularly the institution of municipal and district notaries, who were the backbone of the bureaucratic machinery of the so-called Slovak state.

AID FOR FASCIST AND TREASONABLE ELEMENTS

The accused, who had obligations toward representatives of Tiso's Fascist state, did everything in their power after the war to aid outstanding representatives of the Fascist state and to protect them against their just punishment. On this, the accused Novomeský said: "After the liberation, I intervened on behalf of the minister of the interior of the Slovak state, Alexander Mach, during the trial of Tiso and his accomplices."

By these activities, which were not confined to outstanding representatives of the Fascist state, but aimed at sabotaging the punishment of traitors and Fascists on the whole territory of Slovakia, the accused deliberately violated the Košice government program and the low of the republic on the punishment of enemies, traitors, and collaborators. By these activities, the accused at the same time strengthened the position of the Fascists and the followers of Hlinka's People's Party in the state and economy.

IN THE SPHERE OF EDUCATION AND CULTURE

The commissariat for education, under the accused Novomeský, became, thanks to him, the hideout of collaborators in science, literature, and education.

ON THE ECONOMIC SECTOR

The hostile and antistate activities of the group of accused bourgeois nationalists were also carried out in the economic field. Their aim was to preserve the economic positions of the Fascists and capitalists, and to disrupt economic construction in the republic and the planned economy. In order to foil the confiscation of land, the accused prevented the implementation, in Slovakia, of the decree of the president of the republic on the confiscation and rapid distribution of agricultural property of traitors and enemies of the Czech and Slovak peoples.

Land reform in Slovakia was, as a result of this, nearly entirely sabotaged. With the active support of the reactionary representatives of the Democratic Party, the accused members of the bourgeois nationalist group sabotaged the supply of basic foodstuffs and consumer goods for the working people. The main key to this activity was the effort to maintain as long as possible in Slovakia the supply system of the Slovak state, which aimed at strengthening the black market and aided speculators and kulaks but did not safeguard supplies for the Slovak workers. (The Slovak state had a free market system.)

NATIONALITY POLICY

In their whole activity, this group of bourgeois nationalists aimed at creating an atmosphere of hostility between the Czech and Slovak nations. Not only their activity in the sphere of state administration and of economy contributed to this end, but also a number of speeches and utterances calculated to engender a feeling of national hatred between the workers of Czech and Slovak nationality.

CRIMES AGAINST THE SECURITY OF THE REPUBLIC

In 1945 the defendant, Horvát, on direct instructions from the prominent member of the leadership of the antistate conspiratory center and imperialist agent Clementis, entered into contact with Manac'h, the former French consul general in Bratislava, who was engaged in creating in Slovakia important bases for the French espionage network. The defendant, Horvát, admitted the following about his espionage connection with Manac'h: "Clementis, who introduced me to Manac'h, told me to render every assistance to Manac'h after his arrival in Bratislava and to pass on to him information about conditions in Slovakia for which he would ask."

Holdos also provided the French espionage service, via Manach, with espionage material after 1945, as well as the cultural attaché of the French consulate, Professor Chollet, and Vice Consul Michelot.

HELP TO AND ORGANIZATION OF ESCAPE ABROAD OF ENEMIES OF THE STATE

After February 1948 the accused bourgeois Nationalists enabled their accomplices, Lettrich, Frastacky, and others, to escape abroad. The defendant Okály said in this matter: "In my office as commissioner for the interior, I failed to investigate to cooperation with the Nazis of certain Zionists who, in Tiso's Fascist state, worked in the Jewish center in Bratislava and, during World War II, engaged in information service work for state security office and the German Gestapo. I also failed to follow up the subversive activity of the Zionist organization (joint) in Bratislava.

On the basis of these facts the defendants Husák, Novomesky, Okály, Horvát, and Holdos are rightly accused on having conspired with members of the conspiratory center of Vladimír Clementis and others in order to attempt the destruction of the independence and constitutional unity of the republic and its people's democratic state system. All defendants violated the duties of their positions with the intention of foiling and harming the execution of a uniform economic plan in order to bring about serious disorders in the operation of the state and the economic apparatus. The defendants Horvát and Holdos conspired with other people, or entered into contact with a foreign power or foreign agents, with the intention of betraying state secrets. Thus all defendants committed: (1) The crime of high treason according to article 78 1–A and C, 2–A and 3–B, of the penal code; (2) the crime of sabotage according to article 85 1–A and B, 2–A, B, and C, and 3–B of the penal code; (3) the defendants Holdos and Horvát committed the crimes of espionage according to article 5 1 and 2–B, C, D, and law No. 231–1948.

Sentence of the state court: Gustav Husák, life imprisonment; Ivan Horvát, 22 years; Daniel Okály, 18 years; Ladislav Holdos, 13 years; and Ladislav Novomesky, 10 years. All lost their civic rights and property.

Speech of Mrs. S. Alexander Brailove, National Chairman, Women's Division, United Jewish Appeal, 1950, 1951, 1952; Now Honorary Chairman, National Vice Chairman, National Women's Division, Einstein College of Medicine of Yeshiva University and Member of Men's Executive Committee; Member of Board of Directors, American Friends of Hebrew University; and Member of the Board of United Service for New Americans

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SIDNEY A. FINE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 2, 1954

Mr. FINE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include herein a speech delivered by Mrs. S. Alexander Brailove, under date of May 26, 1954, at the Concourse Plaza Hotel, Bronx, New York City. The speech follows:

When I told my children that I was going to speak in the Bronx tonight, two of them dutifully wished me well but the third child voiced her feelings with the kind of noise reserved for visiting ball teams to the Yankee Stadium. Her vexation stems from the fact, and you should excuse the expression, that she is a Dodger rooter. It seems that one day, soon after she'd learned to drive a car, she went to Brooklyn on a visit to a friend, and parked in the middle of the street. When she emerged 2 hours later she could hardly see the car for the constabulary. Whatever her appeal was, it worked, and she drove off with only memories of handsome men and fatherly advice. Well, of such stuff are loyalties molded. My other two children are Yankee fans, and I'm not inventing this fiction for votes. I am not running for office.

When I consider that the Bronx houses the world famous Zoological Park, Botanical Gardens and Museum, Fordham Hospital and University, Manhattan College, part of New York University, the world's championship baseball team, an informed voting citizenry, I must bow deeply in admiration. Imagine, all this and now the Albert Einstein College of Medicine of Yeshiva University.

You are indeed to be envied. At this point I think I ought to take the beautiful Bronx Parkway and get back to my subject.

At the outset I want to explain why I, a lone but not lonesome woman, am here tonight on the program among this distinguished group of men, a situation I would have called, quite a few unnumbered years ago, a teen-ager's dream.

The explanation may be implied if I called my thesis A Sentimental Journey, and I would have called it exactly that if it weren't for the fact that some 200 years ago, a mischievous fellow by the name of Laurence Sterne, peeped over my shoulder and stole the phrase for the title of a book. He sought to hide the theft by naming his opus "A Sentimental Journey Through France and Italy." It is too late to sue so I shall content myself by naming my talk here tonight, "A Sentimental Journey to the Albert Einstein College of Medicine." Not unlike Laurence Sterne, I am tenderhearted, for additional reasons, as you shall see. Like Sterne, I am "sentimental," a word defined as "being susceptible to sympathetic emotions." In my case "sentiment" has the added reference to anything that deals with the health and happiness of a people, to anything whose appeal is completely and utterly civilized.

But let us forget Sterne. Truth to tell, I question the attitude of this man who went out of his way to add an "e" to his name.

In explaining my presence here I might have omitted all the foregoing by stating simply that it has been my personal experience to have witnessed at first hand the evolution of my fellow Jews from the immediate aftermath of slaughter and harassment to the formation of the nation State of Israel.

Many of you here, I am sure, have seen what I have seen; some of you may even have been yellow-badged and tattooed victims; all of you I am certain are well aware of the appalling and enthralling history of the Jews in the last 20 years. I think that against this background the formation of the Einstein College of Medicine becomes better understood and more significant.

The ghastly events that involved the Jews have been no strangers to other peoples in the course of recorded history. The Catholics and Protestants have, in turn, felt the grim hand of tyranny, expulsion, and death. If history has a habit of repeating itself, it is only because people forget. Forgive me please if I rapidly review some of the highlights of the Jewish history that began sometime in the thirties, a history which, given the lethargy and the persuasive megalomaniac, may happen to any minority at any time.

In the light of the reason for which we are gathered here tonight, the support and sustenance of our new college of medicine, dare we forget the specters brought up at mention of the phrase "numerus clausus," and how, upon its instigation there followed in cruel succession the screaming lunatic voice on the overseas radio, the Warsaw ghetto with its heroic stand and tragic extermination, the ashes of Dachau and Bergen-Belsen, the pictures of the walking skeletons liberated by the American Army, the concentration camps.

And still in reminiscences, but in a mood of pardonable exhiliration, may I recall how, while the great powers stood idly by, we Jews plunged into the rescue of millions of persons, debased and displaced by a war they never wanted. We fed them; we clothed them; we healed them; we transported them to havens of safety, to our country, to South America, to Canada, Australia, New Zealand, to Israel. We helped to establish the State of Israel, whose inhabitants, even as I speak, are struggling valiantly and austerely to redeem the prophecies of our ancestors, Israel which has been called the "cradle of prophecy," the land that gave birth to the Judaic-Christian system of ethical conduct which is the basis for the laws under which we in America live today.

O we were angry then, but because our anger was touched with reason, and because our hearts were as one against tyranny and outrage, we forged a strong, united, American-Jewish community. And now, out of this strength, attended by the sympathies of all liberty-loving people, has come physical and spiritual sustenance through the building of synagogues, centers, and hospitals. Today this strength finds its finest culmination in the building of the Albert Einstein College of Medicine of Yeshiva University.

Now, in the middle of the 20th century, we are about to celebrate the 300th anniversary of the coming of the Jews to America, and we find ourselves asking these questions. Has America been good to the Jew? Have the Jews been good for America?

The first question, I believe, could be considered rhetorical, for outside of a few instances of ceramic-psychosis, to coin a phrase, or crackpotism, and outside of the misuse of the "numerous clausus" or percentage table, America has been good to the Jews. One need only travel to Morocco, to Germany, as I have, there to see the squalor and degradation of our people, to appreciate just how good America has been to us.

The second question, have the Jews been good for America, is a rhetorical one too, but one I cannot resist answering with a question or two of my own. Have the Jews contributed to America's independence, to her liberties, to her democracy? Have they contributed to the arts, the sciences, to medicine? To building and business? I have but to name the categories, and you can fill in the names, the famous and self-sacrificing names that, working side by side with right-thinking men and women, helped make our country a synonym for individual dignity.

Now in the middle of the twentieth century, the clock having come full turn—out of the strength, imagination, and gratitude of the American Jewish community, some men among us of great vision and heart and trust, wish to present this vitally needed institution to our wonderful country, on this the occasion of our tercentenary.

These men of vision have made it easy for us. just as Ehrlich exposed the idea that chemicals might be a way of combatting pain and disease, as Dr. Wachsman found healing in the earth, as Professor Einstein's formulas confronted us with fantastic vistas.

Inspiring this vision is the philosophy in the Talmud, which counsels us that "the falling of rain is an event greater than the giving of the law, since the law is for Israel only, but rain is for the entire world." The rain is for the entire world. What a beautiful and humane thought. Consider the gardens this rain will nurture can be anybody's garden, anywhere in the world. It will nurture the growth of colored and white, and it shall not turn aside in its descent from above, to ask whether these gardens, these roses, belong to Catholic, Protestant, or Jew, even as the bullets in flight on the battlefield never discriminate between hearts that are white or colored, Catholic, Protestant, or Jewish.

These great men of vision are asking you to give substance to their vision and heart and trust; to the vision that would build a towering edifice of faith in all people; with a heart that would defeat and fend off the frailties of the human body; and in the trust that their vision and heart are the common goals of all good people.

Our past conduct has proved to the world that we can meet the challenge of our enemies. Now we have been challenged by our friends, the friends who gave us a medical center here in the Bronx, a center that will hold 1,500 beds; each department to be headed by nationally and internationally famous figures. Our friends have challenged us with a charter for a medical college, the first to be granted in New York City in 50 years. What it all amounts to is this—these agencies, these wonderful persons have challenged us with the confidence that we can create and sustain an institution for teaching, for research, for healing.

This challenge has a deadline. Applications for admittance are being received and studied, acceptances to depend only upon the quality of the applicant. I must repeat, if I haven't made myself clear, this is one school where a man or woman will not be turned down because of faith or color.

With the first acceptance we are irrevocably committed to open the doors of the medical school in September of 1955. Of the required 10 million, $5 million have already been raised. I say to you we dare not pursue the last 5 millions leisurely or complacently. We dare not make a shambles of the laying of the cornerstone on June 13 of this year. We dare not make a shambles of the lives of those worthy young men and women who wish to dedicate themselves to lives of healing. Like any good captain of a ship, I know you will want to send this ship of mercy off the ways free from leaks or imperfections.

The experiences of My Sentimental Journey tell me that you will give and give generously. You will give out of a sense of pride as people who have never been found wanting in the right cause. You will give out of a sense of self-enrichment as a people who do not have to be told that our fundamental biologic urge, is to serve. You will give out of a sense of enlightened self-interest, knowing what the center and school will mean in terms of community health and reassurance, in terms of inspiration to you and your children. And you will give as true Americans, who know, that when the rain falls, it falls for all.

Development of Coosa River, Ala. and Ga.

SPEECH

OF

HON. LAURIE C. BATTLE

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 2, 1954

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 8923) to provide for the development of the Coosa River, Ala. and Ga.

Mr. BATTLE. Mr. Chairman and Members of the House, I am delighted to have the opportunity to speak for a bill that will not cost the Federal Government any money, so I rise at this time in support of H. R. 8923, introduced by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. Rains].

I have supported this program from the beginning. I introduced a similar bill, H. R. 8929, and other members of the Alabama delegation have done likewise.

It is my firm belief, Mr. Chairman, that there is plenty of room for private and public development of our river systems both in Alabama and in the United States.

To me, this is a good example of a time when private enterprise can and will do a job, and certainly it should be encouraged. Oddly enough, it is a time when the Government cannot or will not do the job.

Mr. Chairman, the development of the Coosa River by the Alabama Power Co. will mean new jobs, new industries, and more taxes for our local, our State and our Federal Governments.

I have always supported the Tennessee Valley Authority. In my opinion, there is no conflict whatsoever with the interest of the people in this great area and the legislation before us today. The Tennessee Valley Authority will continue its great military and economic contributions to Alabama and the Nation. I will continue to support this great development.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, may I say that this is a good bill, with adequate Federal protection for the public's interest. I sincerely urge its passage.

The Honorable Lindsay C. Warren, an Inspiring Example for the Public Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BROOKS HAYS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1954

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, the recent retirement of Hon. Lindsay C. Warren as Comptroller General draws attention to one of the finest careers which our Nation has produced, and many young men, both in the executive and legislative departments of the Government, find in his example a constant inspiration. His service in Washington, totaling almost 30 years, was divided about equally between the Congress and the General Accounting Office, and his record offers a convincing refutation of the cynical view that the rewards of Washington service are too meager to attract men of stature. It is true that many with an ambition to serve in the Federal Government have turned to other vocations, either through insufficient urging from within or because of unusual financial requirements. While it may be anticipated that public appreciation of the role of the civil servant will result in increased monetary rewards, it is unlikely that the disparity between incomes in the Government service and private business will be substantially reduced.

Foremost among the attractions that draw men of ability into the ranks of government must be the satisfaction that goes with human service on a large scale. An occasional betrayal shocks us, but for every act of malfeasance there are thousands of faithful performances, and it is my opinion, Mr. Speaker, that public recognition of this quality in our Nation's life is on the increase. Lindsay Warren's career is monumental, and it has been properly acclaimed as outstanding; but that career's foundation was integrity, and in that sense it is typical of the Capital's legions who continue to find an honorable outlet in their Government's service.

Unemployment Compensation Standards Act of 1954

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AIME J. FORAND

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1954

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of myself and cosponsors, I am introducing today a bill to provide urgently needed amendments to our unemployment compensation laws.

The following Democratic Members of this House join me in sponsoring this bill:

Hon. Hugh J. Addonizio, of New Jersey; Hon. Cleveland M. Bailey, of West Virginia; Hon. William A. Barrett, of Pennsylvania; Hon. John A. Blatnik, of Minnesota; Hon. Edward P. Boland, of Massachusetts; Hon. Richard Bolling, of Missouri; Hon. Vera Buchanan, of Pennsylvania; Hon. Robert C. Byrd, of West Virginia; Hon. James A. Byrne, of Pennsylvania; Hon. A. S. J. Carnahan, of Missouri; Hon. Emanuel Celler, of New York; Hon. Earl Chudoff, of Pennsylvania; Hon. Robert Crosser, of Ohio; Hon. John J. Dempsey, of New Mexico; Hon. John G. Dingell, of Michigan; Hon. Thomas J. Dodd, of Connecticut; Hon. Harold D. Donohue, of Massachusetts; Hon. Herman P. Eberharter, of Pennsylvania; Hon. Michael A. Feighan, of Ohio; Hon. Sidney A. Fine, of New York; Hon. John E. Fogarty, of Rhode Island; Hon. Samuel N. Friedel, of Maryland; Hon. Edward A. Garmatz, of Maryland; Hon. Thomas S. Gordon, of Illinois; Hon. William T. Granahan, of Pennsylvania; Hon. William J. Green, Jr., of Pennsylvania; Hon. Edward J. Hart, of New Jersey; Hon. Wayne L. Hays, of Ohio; Hon. Chet Holifield, of California; Hon. Lester Holtzman, of New York; Hon. Charles R. Howell, of New Jersey; Hon. Lester R. Johnson, of Wisconsin; Hon. Frank M. Karsten, of Missouri; Hon. Elizabeth Kee, of West Virginia; Hon. Augustine B. Kelley, of Pennsylvania; Hon. Edna F. Kelly, of New York; Hon. Eugene J. Keogh, of New York; Hon. Cecil R. King, of California; Hon. Michael J. Kirwan, of Ohio; Hon. Arthur G. Klein, of New York; Hon. Thomas J. Lane, of Massachusetts; Hon. John Lesinski, Jr., of Michigan; Hon. George S. Long, of Louisiana; Hon. Eugene J. McCarthy, of Minnesota; Hon. John W. McCormack, of Massachusetts; Hon. Thaddeus M. Machrowicz, of Michigan; Hon. Peter F. Mack, Jr., of Illinois; Hon. Ray J. Madden, of Indiana; Hon. Don Magnuson, of Washington; Hon. Lee Metcalf, of Montana; Hon. Howard S. Miller, of Kansas; Hon. Robert H. Mollohan, of West Virginia; Hon. Morgan M. Moulder, of Missouri; Hon. Abraham J. Multer, of New York; Hon. George D. O'Brien, of Michigan; Hon. Leo W. O'Brien, of New York; Hon. Thomas J. O'Brien, of Illinois; Hon. Barratt O'Hara, of Illinois; Hon. Thomas P. O'Neill, Jr., of Massachusetts; Hon. Otto E. Passman, of Louisiana; Hon. Carl D. Perkins, of Kentucky; Hon. Gracie Pfost, of Idaho; Hon. Philip J. Philbin, of Massachusetts; Hon. James G. Polk, of Ohio; Hon. Melvin Price, of Illinois; Hon. Louis C. Rabaut, of Michigan; Hon. George M. Rhodes, of Pennsylvania; Hon. Peter W. Rodino, Jr., of New Jersey; Hon. Byron G. Rogers, of Colorado; Hon. John J. Rooney, of New York; Hon. Franklin D. Roosevelt, of New York; Hon. Robert T. Secrest, of Ohio; Hon. John F. Shelley, of California; Hon. Alfred D. Sieminski, of New Jersey; Hon. Brent Spence, of Kentucky; Hon. Harley O. Staggers, of West Virginia; Hon. Mrs. John B. Sullivan, of Missouri; Hon. Roy W. Wier, of Minnesota; Hon. Harrison A. Williams, of New Jersey; Hon. Edwin E. Willis, of Louisiana; Hon. Clement J. Zablocki, of Wisconsin; Hon. George P. Miller, of California.

We are agreed that the unemployment situation in the United States requires that action be taken now to cushion our economy against a trend that threatens to become a serious and prolonged period of unemployment resulting in a severe contraction of buying power, and eventually a curtailment of production.

Several Republicans have informed me that they favor this bill, but are reluctant to join us in sponsoring it, because they want to support an administration measure if one is introduced.

However, they have told me that within a few days they plan to introduce a bill similar to ours because they believe, as we do, that now is the time for action.

Chairman Daniel A. Reed announced on May 27 that the Committee on Ways and Means will hold public hearings on unemployment compensation beginning June 8. It is my hope that the committee will agree to include our bill in the list of bills on which the hearings will be held.

Under leave, already granted me, to extend my remarks, I include herewith, first, a statement on the need for an unemployment compensation standards bill; second, an explanation of what our bill provides; third, the administration's position in favor of amending existing law; fourth, a summary of our bill; and fifth, a copy of our bill.

THE NEED FOR A FEDERAL UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION STANDARDS BILL

The original intent of the supporters of the Social Security Act of 1935 and of State laws enacted in conformity therewith was to provide unemployment compensation payments equal to at least 50 percent of full-time weekly wages, up to a maximum of two-thirds of such wages, as provided in some State workmen's compensation laws enacted many years earlier.

The Federal-State system of unemployment compensation has strengthened and stabilized the national economy. It has promoted and provided for the general welfare by shoring up purchasing power in periods of adjustment, recession, and depression.

Now, however, payments have fallen behind wages and the cost of living. They average only one-third of wages. They are inadequate both in weekly amount and in number of weeks' duration. Employers eager to cut their contribution rates have prevailed on legislatures to hold down benefits, litter State laws with land mines to penalize and disqualify insured workers.

In order to implement the original purpose of the unemployment compensation title of the original Social Security Act of 1935 and the Employment Act of 1946, it is necessary to enact a Federal Unemployment Compensation Standards Act that will prevent unfair competition among States and employers. Such standards would govern minimum and maximum payments, number of weeks duration, and limit the levying of extended waiting periods, outright disqualification, and other requirements and penalties.

An outline of a bill I am introducing today with broad bipartisan support follows:

Federal Unemployment Compensation Standards Bill

The proposed Federal unemployment compensation standards bill would continue the present Federal-State unemployment compensation system. It would, however, correct inadequacies in the present State laws by imposing additional standards which States would have to meet as a condition of employers getting credit against the Federal unemployment tax.

Such Federal standards would be effective July 1, 1955, allowing a sufficient period for all State legislatures to meet and enact necessary amendments to State laws.

For the period from 30 or 60 days after passage to July 1, 1955, however, States would have to pay benefits at levels up to the benefit standards with the Federal Government bearing 100 percent of the cost of such excess benefits.

The proposed bill should have the following provisions:

I. BENEFITS

The maximum primary benefit payable under State laws shall be not less than 66⅔ percent of the State's average weekly wage. Subject to this maximum, each individual's primary benefit shall be not less than 50 percent of his weekly wages. (President Eisenhower and Secretary of Labor Mitchell on February 16, 1954 urged the States to adopt such standards. No State has done so.)

II. DURATION

Benefits shall be payable to all unemployed insured individuals for a period of not less than 39 weeks. (Twenty-two States now have 26 weeks; President Eisenhower and Secretary Mitchell urged the other 26 to do the same; only 1, Michigan, has acted to do so.)

III. DISQUALIFICATIONS

A. An individual who is able to work and available for suitable work may be disqualified only for the following reasons and for periods not in excess of those noted:

(a) Leaving suitable work without good cause (including good personal reasons) for a period not in excess of 4 weeks;

(b) Discharge for misconduct connected with the work—for a period not in excess of 4 weeks;

(c) Refusing suitable work without good cause (including good personal reasons) for a period not in excess of 4 weeks;

(d) For any week in which his unemployment is due to a stoppage of work which exists because of a strike at the unemployed worker's plant, provided that unemployment due to a strike occasioned by the following actions of the employer shall be compensated:

(1) The failure or refusal of the employer to conform to Federal or State laws pertaining to collective bargaining or to wages, hours, or other conditions of work;

(2) The employer's insistence on wages, hours, or other conditions of work less favorable than those prevailing for similar work in the locality.

B. Standards of suitability of work are spelled out in the bill along the lines of the standards contained in section 1603 (a) (5) of the Internal Revenue Code. In addition, the bill sets forth general criteria which would have to be taken into account in determining whether the disqualification for refusing or leaving work should be applied.

IV. COVERAGE

Would be made virtually coextensive with the coverage of the old age and survivors insurance program.

A. Employers who have one or more individuals in their employ at any time during the taxable year will be covered.

B. Service performed for another shall be employment irrespective of whether the common law relationship of master and servant exists.

V. FINANCING

A. States would be permitted to provide for uniform rate reductions to all employers as well as individual experience-rated reductions.

B. Proceeds of the Federal Unemployment Tax Act will be earmarked in a Federal Unemployment account in the Federal Treasury. Such account will be used for (a) paying the Federal and State administrative expenses (including the establishment of a contingency fund) and (b) reinsurance grants to those States who are in financial difficulty because of high rates of unemployment.

(For a description of the current unemployment situation and the need for improved unemployment compensation standards, see Representative Aime J. Forand's speech "Unemployment Situation Requires Action Now," Congressional Record, May 3, 1954, pp. 5582–5585.)

Appendix A

Eisenhower Administration's Position on Unemployment Compensation Benefits and Duration and Supporters of That Position

1. President Eisenhower's Economic Report:

The report says: "Unemployment insurance is a valuable first line of defense against recession. * * * But even as a first defense, the system needs reinforcement."

Among the specific proposals are:

(a) Benefits: "It is suggested that the States raise these dollar maximums so that the payments to the great majority of the beneficiaries may equal at least half their regular earnings."

In order to provide the great majority of the workers benefits equal to at least half their wages, the maximums would have to be increased to a level substantially above 50 percent of the average wage.

(b) Duration: "It is urged, therefore, that all of the States raise the potential duration of unemployment benefits to 26 weeks, and that they make the benefits available to all persons who have had a specified amount of covered employment or earnings."

2. Secretary of Labor Mitchell's letter to State governors dated February 16, 1954:

(a) Benefits: "At its most recent meeting in January the Federal Advisory Council on Employment Security took action supporting the President's recommendations on improving weekly benefits. The Council recommended that in each State, the maximum weekly benefit amount should be equal to at least 60 to 67 percent of the State's average weekly wage."

(b) Duration: "The President has urged that all States provide 26 weeks of benefits uniformly to all eligible claimants, in order to assure that even in a minor business downturn most workers would remain protected by the program until they could find other jobs."

3. Letter of Assistant Secretary of Labor Rocco C. Siciliano to heads of State unemployment compensation agencies dated February 16, 1954:

(a) Benefits: "As also pointed out in the letter to your Governor a recent recommendation of the Federal Advisory Council, in line with the President's Economic Report, suggests as a ceiling on weekly benefits that weekly maximums be equal to 60 to 67 percent of the State's average weekly wage."

(b) Duration: "* * * by providing all eligible workers with 26 weeks of benefits, the effectiveness of the program in relieving unemployment distress and as a counter-recessionary device will be greatly strengthened."

4. Federal Advisory Council recommendation:

(a) Benefits: The Federal Advisory Council, a tripartite, labor-management-public body, recommend that "* * * as expeditiously as possible the maximum weekly benefit in each State be raised to an amount not less than three-fifths to two-thirds of average weekly earnings in covered employment."

This recommendation was adopted after the Council had had presented to it and had rejected a proposal to relate benefits to take-home pay rather than average weekly earnings.

(b) Duration: The Federal Advisory Council had also gone on record on an earlier occasion in favor of a uniform 26 weeks duration for all unemployed workers.

5. National Conference on Labor Legislation:

The 20th National Conference on State Labor Legislation convened by the Federal Government, with governors' delegates from State labor departments and organized labor in 41 States and Territories, unanimously adopted a resolution supporting President Eisenhower's recommendations with respect to unemployment compensation benefit levels and duration. The resolution said: (a) "* * * maximum benefit amounts shall be not less than two-thirds of the average weekly wage in covered employment"; (b) "duration of the period in which benefits shall be payable to eligible unemployed workers shall not be less than 26 weeks."

6. Joint Congressional Committee on the Economic Report.

The Joint Congressional Committee on the Economic Report, composed of both Democrats and Republicans from both Houses of Congress, was unanimously agreed on that part of the committee's report which says:

"We commend the President's suggestion that the States should raise the potential duration of benefits and their dollar maximums on weekly benefits so that payments to the great majority of beneficiaries may be restored to a larger percentage relative to their regular earnings."

But it is now plain that the States will not do what President Eisenhower recommends.

Unemployment is a national problem. National action is needed. The Congress must act now at least to do what President Eisenhower, Secretary Mitchell, the Federal Advisory Council, and the 1954 National Conference on Labor Legislation agree is necessary to strengthen purchasing power and the national economy and to go further in extending benefits to 39 weeks.

The time for action is now, before more ground is lost.

Summary of Federal Unemployment Compensation Standards Bill

The bill's findings of fact and statement of purpose:

To provide for unemployment reinsurance grants to the States, to revise, extend, and improve the unemployment-insurance program, and for other purposes.

The Congress finds that—

(1) The systems of unemployment compensation as now constituted and administered throughout the several States are failing to carry out the purposes and objectives of employment stabilization and security against unemployment which were sought to be achieved by the enactment of the Social Security Act of 1935;

(2) There are substantial categories of workers and employees who, though needful of the benefits afforded by unemployment compensation, are not covered for such benefits;

(3) The amounts of unemployment compensation payable to unemployed persons who are covered are in most cases inadequate to provide the worker and his family with the basic necessities of life;

(4) Many and, in some cases, unreasonable terms and conditions are imposed upon eligibility to receive unemployment compensation, thus depriving many unemployed workers and their families of the benefits of unemployment compensation; and

(5) There are great disparities between the States with respect to the terms and conditions under which workers may become eligible for unemployment compensation as well as with respect to the amount of such compensation and the length of time for which it is paid.

Therefore, it is the purpose of the Congress in order to achieve the goals of employment stabilization and security against unemployment and in order to strengthen the economy and provide for the welfare of the Nation and to extend to certain new categories of workers the benefits of unemployment compensation, to prescribe certain uniform minimum standards with respect to the terms and conditions under which unemployment compensation will be paid as well as to the amounts and the length of time for which such compensation will be payable and to otherwise extend, revise, and improve the unemployment-compensation program.

Section 2 of the bill establishes additional standards which a State law must meet in order to be certified by the Secretary of Labor for the purpose of permitting credit against the Federal tax for employer contributions under the State law. The additional standards cover the following areas: (1) Eligibility and disqualification provisions of State law; (2) the maximum and minimum weekly benefit amounts provided by the State law; and (3) the duration for which benefits are payable under the State law.

1. ELIGIBILITY AND DISQUALIFICATION

Section 2 permits a State to disqualify an individual who has left suitable work or refused to accept suitable work without good cause or who was discharged for misconduct in connection with his work. It would also limit the period for which disqualification may be imposed in the above circumstances to the period of 4 weeks which follow the leaving, refusal, or discharge from work.

Federal provision of standards governing the reasons which may lead to disqualification under a State law is necessary in order to eliminate the recent trend in State disqualification provisions and to assure that disqualifications accomplish the purposes for which intended.

While disqualifications were originally intended to assure that benefits will be paid only to individuals whose unemployment is due to lack of work, employer pressures heightened by tax savings afforded under experience rating have resulted in disqualifications for many other reasons.

Similarly, the form of disqualification has shifted from the postponement of benefits for a limited period during which unemployment can be reasonably attributed to the claimant's own irresponsible action to unreasonably long periods during which continued unemployment can only be attributed to failure to secure suitable work.

In addition to postponing benefits for unreasonable periods, too many States now cancel wage credits—it has the effect of denying all benefits—to an individual who has committed a disqualifying act. It is for this reason that it is necessary to limit the period of disqualification as well as to limit the reasons therefor and preclude outright cancellation of wage credits.

In this area the Federal Advisory Council on Employment Security has recommended a limitation of the period of disqualification and the elimination of statutory provisions for cancellation of wage credits.

In the case of strikes, a State would be permitted to disqualify an individual who is unemployed because of such strike who is participating or who has a direct interest therein for any week in which his unemployment is due to the strike.

It would, however, preclude disqualification in cases where the employer locks out his employees during which period the unemployment is attributable to the employer's rather than the claimant's action as well as unemployment arising from strikes in which the claimant has not participated or in which the claimant has no direct or indirect interest. It also precludes disqualification if a strike is occasioned by reason of the employer's violation of law or his failure to meet prevailing working conditions.

In the case of fraud or willful misrepresentation States would be able to extend the disqualification of an individual from receiving benefits to 12 weeks.

The limitations of disqualification for fraud, which may be based on an administrative determination, to 12 weeks would not interfere with the authority of any State to impose criminal penalties for fraudulent acts.

2. WEEKLY BENEFIT AMOUNT

Section 2 requires that the maximum benefit under the State law be not less than an amount equal to two-thirds of the average weekly wage within such State. It also requires that subject to this maximum every individual receive a benefit equal to at least one-half of the individual's average weekly wage. In no case would an individual receive a benefit in excess of the State maximum.

Thus, if the average weekly wage in covered employment in State X is $66, the State law must provide a maximum weekly benefit of at least $40. An individual whose average weekly wage is less than $66 would be required to receive a weekly benefit of at least 50 percent of his own wage. The individual who earns $50 a week would only receive a weekly benefit of $25 a week. The individual who earns $60 a week would only receive $30 a week. In no case, however, would a State be required to pay anyone more than $40 weekly. Individuals who receive $80 a week would be entitled to the $40 but no individual who earns more would be paid a greater benefit.

The requirement that individuals be entitled to receive at least 50 percent of their average weekly wage as a necessary goal is consistent with the recommendations made by President Eisenhower in his economc report. As pointed out by Secretary of Labor Mitchell in his February 16 letter to the governors of all States, a weekly maximum along the lines recommended in this bill is necessary to accomplish the recommendations of the President. These standards have also been supported by the Federal Advisory Council, the National Conference on State Labor Legislation, as well as by the Joint Congressional Committee on the Economic Report which commended the President for his unemployment compensation recommendations (see appendix A).

In view of the inaction by State legislatures in meeting these goals, it is clear that if they are to be accomplished, congressional action along the lines recommended by this bill is necessary.

3. BENEFIT DURATION

Section 2 of the bill would require that all eligible individuals be entitled to benefits for at least 39 weeks of unemployment. This does not mean that every individual will automatically receive 39 weeks of benefits in a year. The bill requires that the individual be unemployed and that he be able and available for work during each week of unemployment.

With continued unemployment, the need for benefits of sufficient duration for all unemployed individuals is apparent. President Eisenhower also recommended that duration be uniformly extended for all claimants. While his recommendation was limited to duration of 26 weeks, the continuation of heavy unemployment since his recommendation in January and the continued increase in the number of persons exhausting the benefit rights indicate the present need for benefits for a duration of longer than 26 weeks.

Subsection (a) of section 3 of the bill extends the coverage of the Federal Unemployment Tax Act to employers of one or more individuals.

This amendment is consistent with the recommendations made by President Eisenhower. It does not mean that housewives who employ a domestic or a farmer employing one individual from time to time will have to pay unemployment contributions with respect to such individual. The present definition of employment which excludes domestic and agricultural service is not changed in this bill.

Consistent with the extension of coverage to employers of one or more, subsection (b) of section 3 amends the title of the Federal Unemployment Tax Act to eliminate reference to employers of eight or more.

Subsection (c) of section 3 amends the definition of employee to make it consistent with the definition contained in the old-age insurance provisions of the Social Security Act. It eliminates the requirement imposed by the 80th Congress limiting coverage only to individuals who are employed under the usual common-law rules applicable in determining the employer-employee relationship. This requirement was eliminated under the old-age insurance provisions of the Social Security Act in the amendments enacted by the 81st Congress in 1950.

Subsection (d) of section 3 adds definitions of benefit year, base period, high quarter wages and average weekly wage to the account. These definitions are necessary in order to avoid contravention by a State of the amendments proposed in subsection (a).

Section 4 would give additional freedom to the State in determining the methods of reducing employer's taxes under the State law below 2.7 percent. Under present law, if a State wishes to impose a tax lower than 2.7 percent on employers, it may only do so by instituting a system which rates individual employers on the basis of their own experience. A State which desires to levy a uniform rate of less than 2.7 percent on all employers is now unable to do so.

This amendment would permit a State to levy a uniform contribution rate of less than 2.7 percent. It would also permit a State which desires to continue a system of individual employer experience rates to continue to do so. In short, it imposes no new Federal requirement; it relaxes the existing requirements.

Section 5 amends those provisions of the Social Security Act relating to grants to States for administration of State unemployment compensation laws by providing that all collections under the Federal Unemployment Tax Act are earmarked in the Federal Unemployment Account in the unemployment trust fund. This account was established by Congress in 1947.

Section 5 provides that all funds for administration of State laws, including contingency amounts which are to be expended only in the event of unforeseen changes in economic conditions, shall be charged against the Federal unemployment account. Unemployment compensation administrative expenditures of the Department of Labor shall be charged to the Federal unemployment account, instead of being charged against general funds of the Treasury.

Section 6 provides that a State whose accumulated funds for unemployment compensation has reached a precariously low condition will be entitled to a reinsurance grant from the Federal unemployment account. The amount of such grant will be limited to three-fourths of the excess by which compensation payable under such State law exceeds 2 percent of the State taxable payroll. In other words, only where unemployment benefits cannot be financed through a 2 percent contribution rate will the State receive any Federal grant. To the extent that its costs exceed 2 percent, it will still be required to finance one-fourth of the costs out of State funds.

In order, however, to avoid the possibility of a State permitting its fund to reach a precariously low condition in order to receive a Federal grant, the bill requires that as one of the conditions of eligibility that whenever a State's fund drops below 6 percent, it impose a minimum rate of contribution of at least 1.2 percent.

Section 7 changes title IX of the Social Security Act and makes certain technical changes in section 904 in order to achieve consistency with the substantive amendments proposed by the bill.

Section 8 of the bill provides that the above provisions extending coverage and establishing eligibility disqualification and benefit standards which must be met by State laws shall be effective as of July 1, 1955. This would permit the great majority of States to make the necessary statutory changes in their State unemployment compensation laws without the need for special sessions.

Section 9 of this bill provides that prior to July 1, 1955, when the Federal standards requiring higher benefits and longer duration, etc., become effective, a State may enter into an agreement whereby it will pay benefits as if its law included the required standards. The additional cost above those required under State law will be paid for by the Federal Government.

A bill to provide for unemployment reinsurance grants to the States, to revise, extend, and improve the unemployment insurance program, and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc., That the Congress finds that (1) the systems of unemployment compensation as now constituted and administered throughout the several States are failing to carry out the purposes and objectives of employment stabilization and security against unemployment which were sought to be achieved by the enactment of the Social Security Act of 1935; (2) there are substantial categories of workers and employees who, though needful of the benefits afforded by unemployment compensation, are not covered for such benefits; (3) the amounts of unemployment compensation payable to unemployed persons who are covered are, in most cases, inadequate to provide the worker and his family with the basic necessities of life; (4) many, and in some cases, unreasonable terms and conditions are imposed upon eligibility to receive unemployment compensation, thus depriving many unemployed workers and their families of the benefits of unemployment compensation; and (5) there are great disparities between the States with respect to the terms and conditions under which workers may become eligible for unemployment compensation, as well as with respect to the amount of such compensation and the length of time for which it is paid. Therefore it is the purpose of the Congress, in order to achieve the goals of employment stabilization and security against unemployment, and in order to strengthen the economy and provide for the general welfare of the Nation, to extend to certain new categories of workers the benefits of unemployment compensation, to prescribe certain uniform minimum standards with respect to the terms and conditions under which unemployment compensation will be paid, as well as to the amounts and the length of time for which such compensation will be payable, and to otherwise extend, revise, and improve the unemployment compensation program.

SEC. 2. Section 1603 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code is amended by striking out paragraph (5), by redesignating paragraph (6) as paragraph (10), and by adding after paragraph (4) the following new paragraphs:

"(5) Compensation may be denied in such State to any eligible individual only under the following circumstances. Compensation may be denied to such an individual—

"(A) for a period not in excess of 4 weeks immediately following the week in which he (i) left suitable work without good cause, (ii) refused to accept suitable work without good cause, or (iii) was discharged for misconduct in connection with his work; or

"(B) for any week in which he left or lost his employment due to a stoppage of work which exists because of a strike at the place of his employment if such individual participated in or was directly interested in such strike or was a member of a grade or class of workers who were participating or directly interested in such strike unless such strike was occasioned by (i) the failure or refusal of the employer of such individual to conform to Federal or State laws pertaining to collective bargaining, wages, hours, or other conditions of work, or (ii) the failure of the employer of such individual to maintain for his employees wage rates, weekly earnings, hours, and other conditions of work not substantially less favorable than those prevailing for similar work in the locality;

"(C) for the first week of unemployment occurring within the benefit year;

"(D) for a period not in excess of 12 weeks immediately following the week in which he has been found, after an opportunity for a fair hearing, to have obtained, or to have sought to obtain, compensation by fraud, or willful misrepresentation of a material fact;

"(E) for any week in which he is unable to work or is unavailable for suitable work.

In determining whether work is suitable, in the case of any individual, there shall be taken into consideration the degree of risk, if any, involved in such work to the health, safety, and morals of such individual, his physical fitness for the work his prior training and experience, his prior earnings, the length of time, if any, for which he has been unemployed, his prospects for obtaining work at his highest skill, the distance of such work from his residence, his prospects for obtaining local work, and such other factors regarding the acceptance or retention of work as would influence a reasonably prudent person in like or similar circumstances. Work shall not be deemed suitable for any individual if the availability of the work is due directly to a strike, lockout, or other labor dispute at the place where such work is available; or if the wage rate, weekly earnings, hours, or other conditions of the work are substantially less favorable to the individual than those prevailing for similar work in the locality; or if as a condition of holding employment the individual would be required to join a company union or to resign from or refrain from joining any bona fide labor organization.

"(6) The maximum weekly compensation payable under such law shall be an amount equal to at least two-thirds of the average weekly wage earned by employees within such State, such average to be computed by the State agency of such State on July 1, 1955, and on July 1 of each succeeding year on the basis of the wages, including amounts excluded therefrom under section 1607 (b) (1), paid during the last full year for which necessary figures are available.

"(7) The weekly compensation payable to any individual shall be (A) the maximum weekly compensation payable under such law, or (B) an amount (exclusive of any compensation payable with respect to dependents) equal to at least one-half of such individual's average weekly wage as determined by the State agency, whichever is the lesser.

"(8) Compensation shall not be denied to any eligible individual for any week of total unemployment during his benefit year by reason of exhaustion or reduction of benefit rights or cancellation of his wage credit until he has been paid unemployment compensation for not less than 39 weeks during such year.

"(9) In order to be eligible to receive unemployment compensation benefits an individual shall not be required (A) if the State law provides for a qualifying requirement computed as a multiple of the amount of the individual's weekly unemployment compensation benefit, to have been paid, during his base period, more than 30 times the amount of his weekly unemployment compensation benefit; (B) if the State law provides for a qualifying requirement computed as a multiple of such individual's high quarter wages, to have been paid more than 1½ times the amount of his high quarter wages; or (C) if the State law provides for a qualifying requirement based on weeks of employment, to have been employed by an employer for more than 20 weeks in his base period."

SEC. 3. (a) Subsection (a) of section 1607 of the Internal Revenue Code is amended to read, as follows:

"(a) Employer: The term 'employer' means any person who, at any time during the taxable year, has one or more individuals in employment."

(b) The title to subchapter C of chapter (9) of the Internal Revenue Code is amended to read as follows: "Subchapter C: Unemployment Compensation Tax on Employers."

(c) Subsection (i) of section 1607 of the Internal Revenue Code is amended to read, as follows:

"(i) Employee: The term 'employee' means—

"(1) Any officer of a corporation; or

"(2) Any individual who, under the usual common law rules applicable in determining the employer-employee relationship, has the status of an employee; or

"(3) Any individual (other than an individual who is an employee under paragraph (1) or (2) of this subsection) who performs services for remuneration for any person—

"(A) As an agent-driver or commission-driver engaged in distributing meat products, vegetable products, fruit products, bakery products, beverages (other than milk), or laundry or dry-cleaning services, for his principal;

"(B) As a full-time life insurance salesman;

"(C) As a home worker performing work, according to specifications furnished by the person for whom the services are performed, on materials or goods furnished by such person which are required to be returned to such person or a person designated by him, if the performance of such services is subject to licensing requirements under the laws of the State in which such services are performed; or

"(D) As a traveling or city salesman, other than as an agent-driver or commission-driver, engaged upon a full-time basis in the solicitation on behalf of, and the transmission to, his principal (except for sideline sales activities on behalf of some other person) of orders from wholesalers, retailers, contractors, or operators of hotels, restaurants, or other similar establishments for merchandise for resale or supplies for use in their business operations;

if the contract of service contemplates that substantially all of such services are to be performed personally by such individual; except that an individual shall not be included in the term "employee" under the provisions of this paragraph if such individual has a substantial investment in facilities used in connection with the performance of such services (other than in facilities for transportation), or if the services are in the nature of a single transaction not part of a continuing relationship with the person for whom the services are performed."

(d) Section 1607 of the Internal Revenue Code is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(o) Benefit year: The term 'benefit year' means the period prescribed by State law, but not in excess of 52 consecutive weeks, for which an eligible individual may receive weekly unemployment compensation benefits.

"(p) Base period: The term 'base period' means the period prescribed by State law beginning not prior to the first day of the fifth full calendar quarter beginning of the benefit year.

"(q) High-quarter wages: The term 'high-quarter wages' means, in the case of any individual, the amount of wages (as defined by State law) paid to such individual in the calendar quarter of the base period for which his total wages were highest.

"(r) Average weekly wage: The term 'average weekly wage' means, in the case of any individual, the amount of wages (as defined by State law) paid to such individual during the period used for determining his compensation for a week of total unemployment (1) in case the period used is the calendar quarter in which such individual was paid his high-quarter wages, divided by 13; or (2) if some other period is used, divided by the number of weeks, during the period used, in which he performed services in employment (as defined by State law)."

Sec. 4. (a) Section 1601 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code is amended to read as follows:

"(b) Additional credit: In addition to the credit allowed under subsection (a), a taxpayer may credit against the tax imposed by section 1600 for any taxable year (1) an amount equal to the amount, if any, by which 2.7 percent exceeds the amount for which credit is allowed under subsection (a), if the contributions to a pooled fund required to be paid by him with respect to the taxable year are of a uniform rate imposed by State law on all employers, or (2) with respect to the unemployment compensation law of each State certified for the taxable year as provided in section 1602 (or with respect to any provisions thereof so certified), an amount equal to the amount, if any, by which the contributions required to be paid by him with respect to the taxable year were less than the contributions such taxpayer would have been required to pay if throughout the taxable year he had been subject under such State law to the highest rate applied thereunder in the taxable year to any person having individuals in his employ, or to a rate of 2.7 percent, whichever rate is lower."

(b) The first sentence of section 1602 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code is amended by inserting "(2)" after "section 1601 (b)."

UNEMPLOYMENT REINSURANCE

Sec. 5. Sections 301 and 302 of the Social Security Act, as amended, are amended to read as follows:

"FEDERAL UNEMPLOYMENT ACCOUNT

"Sec. 301. (a) There is hereby appropriated to the Federal Unemployment Account in the Unemployment Trust Fund for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1955, and for each fiscal year thereafter, amounts equivalent to 100 percent of the taxes (including interest, penalties, and additions to the taxes) received during such period under the Federal Unemployment Tax Act and covered into the Treasury. There is also authorized to be appropriated to the Federal Unemployment Account such additional sums as may be required to carry out the purposes of this title.

"(b) (1) For the purpose of assisting the States in (A) the administration of their unemployment compensation laws (including administration pursuant to agreements under title IV of the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952), (B) the establishment and maintenance of a system of public employment offices in accordance with the provisions of the act of June 3, 1933 (48 Stat. 113), as amended, and (C) carrying into effect section 602 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 there is hereby authorized to be expended, for payments to the States, from the Federal unemployment account in the unemployment trust fund for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1955, and for each fiscal year thereafter, sums not to exceed the amounts specified by Congress in the appropriation act or acts for the Department of Labor for each such fiscal year.

"(2) In addition to the sums authorized to be expended under paragraph (1) of this subsection for the purpose of assisting the States in the administration of their unemployment compensation laws, there is hereby authorized to be expended from the Federal Unemployment Account for such purpose, as provided in section 302 (a) (2), for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1955, and for each fiscal year thereafter, an amount not in excess of $25 million.

"(c) There is authorized to be expended from the Federal Unemployment Account for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1955, and for each fiscal year thereafter, a sum not to exceed the amounts specified by Congress in the appropriations act or acts for the Department of Labor to be necessary for the administration by the Department of Labor of its functions under (1) the Federal Unemployment Tax Act, (2) this title and titles IX and XII of the Social Security Act, (3) the act of June 6, 1933 (48 Stat. 113), as amended, (4) title IV (except section 602) of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, and (5) title IV of the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952.

"PAYMENT TO STATES

"Sec. 302. (a) (1) The Secretary of Labor (hereafter referred to as the 'Secretary') shall from time to time certify to the Secretary of the Treasury for payment to each State which has an unemployment compensation law approved by the Secretary under the Federal Unemployment Tax Act such amounts as the Secretary determines to be necessary for the proper and efficient administration of such law during the fiscal year for which such payment is made. The Secretary's determination shall be based on (A) the population of the State; (B) an estimate of the number of persons covered by the State law and of the cost of proper and efficient administration of such law; and (C) such other factors as the Secretary finds relevant. The Secretary shall not certify for payment under this subsection in any fiscal year a total amount in excess of the amount specified for such purpose in the appropriation act or acts for the Department of Labor for such fiscal year.

"(2) If the Secretary determines that the amount specified in the appropriation act or acts for the Department of Labor for the purpose of assisting the States in administering their unemployment compensation laws is, because of changes in economic conditions which were unforeseen at the time such amount was specified, less than the amount necessary for the proper and efficient administration of such laws, he is authorized to certify to the Secretary of the Treasury for payment to the States for the administration of their unemployment compensation laws, in addition to the amounts authorized to be certified under paragraph (1), amounts the total of which shall not exceed the amount authorized to be expended by section 301 (b) (2).

"(b) The Secretary of the Treasury shall, upon receiving a certification under subsection (a), pay from the Federal unemployment account in the unemployment trust fund, prior to audit or settlement by the General Accounting Office, in accordance with such certification."

Sec. 6. Title XII of the Social Security Act is amended to read as follows:

"TITLE XII. GRANTS TO STATE UNEMPLOYMENT FUND

"Sec. 1201. (a) (1) Except as provided in paragraph (2) and paragraph (3), a State shall be entitled to a reinsurance grant for any calendar quarter, commencing with the quarter beginning on July 1, 1955, if the balance in such State's unemployment fund on the last day of the preceding quarter is less than the amount of the compensation paid from such fund under the State unemployment compensation law during the 6 months' period ending on such last day.

"(2) A State shall not be entitled to a reinsurance grant for any calendar quarter commencing after the computation date for the first taxable year beginning after December 31, 1956, and prior to the computation date for the first taxable year beginning after December 31, 1961, if with respect to any taxable year beginning after December 31, 1956—

"(A) the balance in the State's unemployment fund on the computation date for such year was less than an amount equal to 6 percent of the most recent annual taxable payroll or less than the amount of the compensation paid from such fund under the State unemployment compensation law during the 2 years immediately preceding such date, whichever amount is greater; and

"(B) the minimum rate of contribution required to be paid into the State fund during such taxable year was less than 1.2 percent.

"(3) A State shall not be entitled to a reinsurance grant for any calendar quarter, commencing after the computation date for the first taxable year beginning after December 31, 1961, if with respect to any year within the five most recently completed taxable years—

"(A) the balance in the State's unemployment fund on the computation date for such year was less than an amount equal to 6 percent of the most recent annual taxable payroll or less than the amount of the compensation paid from such fund under the State unemployment compensation law during the 2 years immediately preceding such date, whichever amount is greater; and

"(B) the minimum rate of contribution required to be paid into the State fund during such taxable year was less than 1.2 percent.

"(4) A reinsurance grant shall be an amount estimated by the Secretary of Labor (hereafter referred to as the 'Secretary') to be equal to three-fourth of the excess of the compensation which will be payable under the provisions of the State unemployment compensation law during the calendar quarter for which such grant is made over

2 percent of the taxable payroll for such quarter.

"(5) As used in this section, the term 'computation date' shall have the same meaning as when used in section 1602 of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended.

"(b) The Secretary is authorized and directed, on application of a State agency, to make findings as to whether the conditions entitled a State to a reinsurance grant provided for in subsection (a) hereof have been met; and if such conditions have been met, the Secretary is directed to certify to the Secretary of the Treasury, from time to time, the amount of such grant, reduced or increased, as the case may be, by any sum by which the Secretary finds that the amounts granted for any prior quarter were greater or less than the amounts to which the State was entitled for such quarter. The application of a State agency shall be made on such forms, and contain such information and data, fiscal and otherwise, concerning the operation and administration of the State law, as the Secretary deems necessary or relevant to the performance of his duties thereunder.

"(c) The Secretary of the Treasury shall, upon receiving a certification under subsection (b), make payment from the Federal Unemployment Account in the Unemployment Trust Fund, prior to audit or settlement by the General Accounting Office, in accordance with such certification.

"(d) All money paid to a State under this title shall be used solely for unemployment-compensation benefits; and any money so paid which is not used for such purposes shall be returned to the Treasury and credited to the Federal unemployment account unless such State is eligible for a reinsurance grant."

SEC. 7. (a) The heading of title IX of the Social Security Act is amended to read as follows: "Title IX: Unemployment Compensation Tax on Employers."

(b) Section 904 (g) of the Social Security Act is hereby repealed.

(c) Clause (2) of the second sentence of section 904 (h) of the Social Security Act is amended to read as follows: "(2) the excess of taxes collected under the Federal Unemployment Tax Act after June 30, 1946, and prior to July 1, 1955, over the unemployment administrative expenditures made after June 30, 1946, and prior to July 1, 1955."

(d) The third sentence of such section 904 (h) is hereby repealed.

SEC. 8. The amendments made by the preceding sections of this act shall be effective as of July 1, 1955.

TEMPORARY SUPPLEMENTATION OF UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION

SEC. 9. (a) When used in this section—

(1) The term "State" includes the District of Columbia, Alaska, and Hawaii.

(2) The term "compensation" means cash benefits payable to individuals with respect to their unemployment, exclusive of any payments with respect to dependents.

(3) The term "State weekly benefit amount" means the amount of compensation to which an individual is entitled (exclusive of any portion thereof payable with respect to dependents) with respect to a week of total unemployment, under the provisions of a State unemployment-compensation law.

(4) The term "adjusted weekly benefit amount" means the sum of (A) the State weekly benefit amount of an individual, and (B) any supplementary compensation payable with respect to a week of total unemployment under an agreement or regulation pursuant to this section.

(5) The term "benefit year" means the period prescribed by State law, but not in excess of 52 consecutive weeks, for which an eligible individual may receive weekly unemployment-compensation benefits.

(6) The term "base period" means the first four of the last five full calendar quarters immediately preceding the beginning of the benefit year.

(7) The term "high quarter wages" means, in the case of any individual, the amount of wages (as defined by State law) paid to such individual in the calendar quarter of the base period for which his total wages were highest.

(8) The term "average weekly wage" means, in the case of any individual, the amount of wages (as defined by State law) paid to such individual during the period used for determining his compensation for a week of total unemployment (A) in case the period used is the calendar quarter in which such individual was paid his high quarter wages, divided by 13, or (B) if some other period is used, divided by the number of weeks, during the period used, in which he performed services in employment (as defined by State law).

(b) The Secretary of Labor (hereafter referred to as the "Secretary") is authorized on behalf of the United States to enter into agreements with any State, or with the unemployment-compensation agency of any State, under which such State agency will make, as agent of the United States, payments of compensation on the basis provided in subsection (c) with respect to unemployment.

(c) Any such agreement shall provide—

(1) That such State agency shall pay every unemployed individual, eligible for compensation under the State unemployment-compensation law or under this section, adjusted weekly-benefit amounts equal to (A) two-thirds of the average weekly wage earned by employees within such State during the last full year for which necessary figures are available, or (B) an amount (exclusive of any compensation payable with respect to dependents) equal to not less than one-half of such individual's average weekly wage as determined by the State unemployment-compensation agency, whichever is the lesser;

(2) that such State agency shall continue to pay adjusted weekly benefit amounts to any eligible individual during his benefit year, notwithstanding the exhaustion of his benefit right under State law, or reduction of his benefit rights or cancellation of his wage credit until he has been paid an amount equal to compensation for 39 weeks of total unemployment within a benefit year; and

(3) that compensation may be denied in such State to any otherwise eligible individual only under the following circumstances. Compensation may be denied to such an individual—

(A) for a period not in excess of 4 weeks immediately following the week in which he (i) left suitable work without good cause, (ii) refused to accept suitable work without good cause, or (iii) was discharged for misconduct in connection with his work; or

(B) for any week in which he left or lost his employment due to a stoppage of work which exists because of a strike at the place of his employment if such individual participated in or was directly interested in such strike or was a member of a grade or class of workers who were participating or directly interested in such strike unless such strike was occasioned by (i) the failure or refusal of the employer of such individual to conform to Federal or State laws pertaining to collective bargaining, wages, hours, or other conditions of work, or (ii) the failure of the employer of such individual to maintain for his employees' wage rates, weekly earnings, hours, and other conditions of work not substantially less favorable than those prevailing for similar work in the locality;

(C) for the first week of unemployment occurring within the benefit year;

(D) for a period not in excess of 12 weeks immediately following the week in which he has been found, after an opportunity for a fair hearing, to have obtained, or to have sought to obtain, compensation by fraud, or willful misrepresentation of a material fact;

(E) for any week in which he is unable to work or is unavailable for work.

In determining whether work is suitable, in the case of any individual, there shall be taken into consideration the degree of risk, if any, involved in such work to the health, safety, and morals of such individual, his physical fitness for the work, his prior training and experience, his prior earnings, the length of time, if any, for which he has been unemployed, his prospects for obtaining work at his highest skill, the distance of such work from his residence, his prospects for obtaining local work, and such other factors regarding the acceptance or retention of work as would influence a reasonably prudent person in like or similar circumstances. Work shall not be deemed suitable for any individual if the availability of the work is due directly to a strike, lockout, or other labor dispute at the place where such work is available; or if the wage rate, weekly earnings, hours, or other conditions of the work are substantially less favorable to the individual than those prevailing for similar work in the locality; or if as a condition of holding employment the individual would be required to join a company union or to resign from or refrain from joining any bona fide labor organization.

(4) That in order to be eligible to receive unemployment compensation benefits an individual shall not be required (A) if the State law provides for a qualifying requirement computed as a multiple of the amount of the individual's weekly unemployment compensation benefit, to have been paid, during his base period, more than 30 times the amount of his weekly unemployment compensation benefit; (B) if the State law provides for a qualifying requirement computed as a multiple of such individual's high quarter wages, to have been paid more than 1½ times the amount of his high quarter wages; or (C) if the State law provides for a qualifying requirement based on weeks of employment, to have been employed by an employer for more than 20 weeks in his base period.

(d) (1) No agreement under this section shall be effective before 60 days after the date of enactment of this act, or after July 1, 1955.

(2) Any agreement under this section shall provide that compensation otherwise payable to any individual under the State's unemployment compensation law will not be denied or reduced for any week by reason of any payment made pursuant to such agreement.

(e) (1) Each State entering into an agreement under this section shall be entitled to be paid by the United States an amount equal to the additional cost to the State of payments of compensation made under and in accordance with such agreement which would not have been incurred by the State except for the agreement.

(2) In making payments pursuant to this subsection, there shall be paid to the State, either in advance or by way of reimbursement, as may be determined by the Secretary, such sum as the Secretary estimates the State will be entitled to receive under this section for each calendar quarter; reduced or increased, as the case may be, by any sum by which the Secretary finds that his estimates for any prior calendar quarter were greater or less than the amounts which should have been paid to the State. The amount of such payments may be determined by such statistical, sampling, or other method as may be agreed upon by the Secretary and the State agency.

(3) The Secretary shall from time to time certify to the Secretary of the Treasury for payment to each State the sums payable to such State under this subsection. The Secretary of the Treasury, prior to audit or set-

tlement by the General Accounting Office, shall make payment, at the time or times fixed by the Secretary, in accordance with such certification from funds appropriated to carry out the purposes of this section.

(4) All money paid to a State under this subsection shall be used solely for the purposes for which it is paid; and any money so paid which is not used for such purposes shall be returned to the Treasury, upon termination of the period for which the agreement is effective.

(5) An agreement under this section may require any officer or employee of the State certifying payments of disbursing funds pursuant to the agreement, or otherwise participating in its performance, to give a surety bond to the United States in such amount as the Secretary may deem necessary, and may provide for the payment of the cost of such bond from funds for carrying out the purposes of this section.

(6) No person designated by the Secretary, or designated pursuant to an agreement under this section, as a certifying officer shall, in the absence of gross negligence or intent to defraud the United States, be liable with respect to the payment of any compensation certified by him under this section.

(7) No disbursing officer shall, in the absence of gross negligence or intent to defraud the United States, be liable with respect to any payment by him under this section if it was based upon a voucher signed by a certifying officer designated as provided in paragraph (6) of this subsection.

(f) (1) Determination of entitlement to supplementary payments of compensation made by a State unemployment compensation agency under an agreement under this section shall be subject to review in the same manner and to the same extent as determinations under the State unemployment compensation law, and only in such manner and to such extent.

(2) For the purpose of payments made to a State under title III of the Social Security Act, as amended by this act, administration by the State agency of such State pursuant to an agreement under this section shall be deemed to be a part of the administration of the State unemployment compensation law.

(g) The agency administering the unemployment compensation law of any State shall furnish to the Secretary such information as the Secretary may find necessary or appropriate in carrying out the provisions of this section, and such information shall be deemed reports required by the Secretary for the purposes of paragraph (6) of subsection (a) of section 303 of the Social Security Act.

(h) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section.

SEC. 10. (a) Section 1603 (c) of the Internal Revenue Code is amended to read as follows:

"(c) Certification: On December 31 of each taxable year the Secretary of Labor shall certify to the secretary of each State whose law he has previously approved, except that he shall not certify any State which, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the State agency, the Secretary of Labor finds has changed its law so that it no longer contains the provisions specified in subsection (a) or has with respect to such taxable year failed to comply substantially with any such provision."

(b) Section 303 (b) of the Social Security Act is amended to read as follows:

"(b) Whenever the Secretary of Labor, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the State agency charged with the administration of the State law, finds that in the administration of the law there is—

"(1) a denial, in a substantial number of cases, of unemployment compensation to individuals entitled thereto under such law; or

"(2) a failure to comply substantially with any provision specified in subsection (a); the Secretary of Labor shall notify such State agency that further payments will not be made to the State until he is satisfied that there is no longer any such denial or failure to comply. Until the Secretary of Labor is so satisfied, he shall make no further certification to the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to such State."

SEC. 11. This act may be cited as the "Unemployment Compensation Standards Act of 1954."

Memorandum Supporting Requested Program for Government Action in the Industry Which Prints, Dyes, and Finishes Silks and Manmade Fibers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON CANFIELD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1954

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following memorandum:

MEMORANDUM SUPPORTING REQUESTED PROGRAM FOR GOVERNMENT ACTION IN THE INDUSTRY WHICH PRINTS, DYES, AND FINISHES SILKS AND MANMADE FIBERS

The attached economic survey[1] demonstrates the need, in our view, for swift and constructive Government action in the public interest as well as in the interest of the industry involved. In this memorandum we shall set forth the reasons which we feel call for such action. A proposed program for such action is set forth as well.

THE INDUSTRY INVOLVED

The industry on behalf of which this memorandum is submitted is essentially a service industry. The industry prints, dyes, and otherwise finishes silk, rayon, nylon, and other synthetic fabrics. It receives from the converter, who in most cases is the owner, gray goods produced by mills. It imparts to those gray goods color, design, and the myriad finishes which in turn give such qualities as shrink resistancy, crease resistancy, and water repellency. Its manifold processes bring about a transformation of the dull gray goods into attractive salable materials.

The finisher is the keystone of the textile industry. He plays an essential role in an essential industry.

This industry appeared on the list of essential activities issued by the War Manpower Commission during World War II.

END USES OF PROCESSED FABRICS

The fabrics processed by this industry are widely used in the manufacture of clothing for men, women, and children, as well as in the manufacture of household accessories, such as furniture coverings, draperies, and bedspreads. The fabrics processed by this industry are an integral and pervasive part of the clothing and home furnishings of the Nation's population. They also include many fabrics essential to our war and defense effort. In an economic mobilization survey made by this association in 1950, it was found that members of the industry processed the following items, among others, during World War II, and thereafter: Asbestos linings, banner cloth, belting, bomb fragmentation cloth, camouflage material, fiberglass panels (Navy), flack jackets, flare cloth, hat cords and bands, knit goods, linings, mosquito and sand fly netting, parachutes (cargo and personnel), parachute shroud lines, printing on plastics, raincoats, ribbons, scarves, shirts, slacks, sleeping bags, stripes and chevrons, tent cloth, threads, ties, tow targets, underwear, uniforms.

THE ASSOCIATION SUBMITTING THIS MEMORANDUM

Silk & Rayon Printers & Dyers Association of America, Inc., is a trade association with members in the eight States of the Union wherein the bulk of this industry is located. It has been in existence for 12 years. It has come to be recognized in the trade, among Government agencies and in the press as the official spokesman of the industry in which its members are engaged.

HISTORICAL AND CURRENT ECONOMIC SITUATION OF THE INDUSTRY

The Knowlton study reveals the depressed and chaotic condition of this industry today and its long history of chaos and depression interrupted by occasional and relatively short-lived periods of reasonable business health. The interplay of numerous factors has served to bring about and continue the characteristically unhealthy state of the industry's being. The Knowlton study discusses these factors in detail. Suffice it to say here that during the past 3 years a combination of adverse factors has served to bring about one of the most aggravated and intensified depressions in the history of the industry. It has been confronted simultaneously with a decline in demand for its services, increased cost for labor and supplies, and decreased prices. There have followed in the wake of these conditions bankruptcies, reorganizations, and liquidations. Some of the oldest and finest names in the business have disappeared from the scence. Price has been given such exalted importance by the industry's customers that quality and standards have been relegated in many instances to a position of minor, if not negligible, importance. In the long run, the consuming public has been the loser.

THE PUBLIC'S STAKE

The qualities and attributes of manmade fibers, as dyed and finished, are a mystery to the average member of the consuming public. The typical buyer of a dress, suit, undergarment, or drape is qualified to judge of appearance, and appearance only. Her selection, therefore, within her accustomed price range, is made on the basis of eye appeal, but in total ignorance of the most elementary questions, such as the washability and color fastness of the item purchased. Informative labeling is the exception rather than the rule.

This situation invites the subordination of emphasis on quality to the establishment of alluringly low prices. The consumer's sense of outrage and disappointment is not awakened until after the purchase is completed, and then it is too late. Under present-day conditions, for the most part, experience by actual use is the only guide available to the consumer in the selection and purchase of items of the nature under discussion.

The consumer is not the only member of the public who suffers as a consequence of the conditions which our program seeks to correct. The industries which supply the subject industry with materials and services, such as paper, dyestuffs, chemicals, and trucking, all are adversely affected by the unstable condition of the printer, dyer, and finisher.

The Government loses tax revenues from an industry whose key and vital position should entitle it to earn and pay taxes on a fair profit, but which is confronted, instead, with increasing losses. Employment in the industry has decreased at least 20 percent since 1951 and the casualty rate among individual firms is such as to invite ultimate domination by monopolistic interests.

---

[1] Hereafter referred to as the Knowlton study.

Protective and regulatory legislation are commonplace in the fields of food and shelter. The Knowlton study points out that as simple and as easily detectable a characteristic as the freshness of eggs is safeguarded by Government sanction. Similarly, the consumer is protected qualitywise by the States in the purchase of mattresses and other forms of upholstery. In short, as the study points out, where the producer is anonymous and where there is insufficient basis for customer appraisal, the State has intervened to establish or sustain quality standards. Such standards are urgently needed here.

SUMMARY STATEMENT

The need for protection to the consuming public, to the thousands of families whose livelihood is derived from employment within the industry, to the industries which manufacture and supply the chemicals, dyestuffs, and other materials used in the finishing operation, and to other segments of the public as well, stands out clearly. The need for protecting the industry itself from monopolistic control invited by the casualty rate in the ranks of individual firms appears with equal clarity. The program which we propose herein would, we submit, respond to and meet all of these needs. It would restore economic health to a vital segment of the national economy which needs Government action to accomplish this result.

PROPOSED PROGRAM

I. Regulatory commission

We propose the enactment of a law creating a regulatory commission for printers, dyers, and finishers of silk and manmade fibers.

A. The Commission would—

1. License the entry of new firms into the industry.
2. Control rates and prices or establish minima.
3. Control credit terms.
4. Establish qualities.
5. Regulate tariffs affecting the industry or recommend changes by any existing regulatory commission in such tariffs.

Comments

A program structured along the lines just described is needed to accomplish the twin objectives of public protection and industrial stabilization outlined above. Firm Government controls are needed to regulate the helter-skelter entry of new or reorganized firms into this industry, their oftentimes flighty and short-lived existence and their unceremonious departure. The demoralized price structure of the industry—which in many instances has sunk below 1932 levels—needs the firming influence either of rate control or at least of fixed minima. The Bituminous Coal Commission Act serves as a precedent and could serve as a model for the drafting of such legislation.

The proposed Commission would serve a valuable function in establishing quality standards. This is a matter of great importance to the industry since the attributes and characteristics of man-made fibers are unknown to the consuming public and are usually unrecognizable by the consuming public at the time of purchase. These attributes are unknown even to many of those who form links in the distributive chain between the mill and the retail outlet. They are certainly unknown to the vast body of retail sales people. There is only one effective way in which the public can be educated to know what to expect and demand in articles manufactured from man-made fabrics. That way is by compulsory labeling. The setting of standards for such qualities as washability, shrinkability, and color fastness and the legal compulsion to specify with regard to them will have the dual effect of educating and protecting the public, on the one hand, whilst stabilizing the price structure in the industry, on the other. Here again no innovation is suggested. The Wool Labeling Act serves as a precedent and can serve as a model for the legislation we propose.

II. Enforcement of trade practice rules by the Federal Trade Commission

The serious condition of the finishing industry is attributable in substantial part to the continuation of practices which are believed to be in direct violation of statutes administered by the Federal Trade Commission. These practices include unjustified price discrimination, sales below cost to the injury of competitors, and other conduct prohibited by the Federal Trade Commission Act, the Robinson-Patman Act, and the Clayton Act.

On December 12, 1941, the Federal Trade Commission issued trade practice rules for this industry, defining many of these illegal practices, with a view to their voluntary elimination by the industry. The currently depressed condition of the industry has revived these practices on a scale which it is believed is so wide-spread that intervention by the Federal Trade Commission is called for. For this purpose, the Federal Trade Commission could render the following valuable assistance in placing the industry on a sound and healthy basis:

1. A letter should be sent by the Commission to every member of the industry, warning that such practices may violate the laws administered by the Federal Trade Commission, and urging finishers guilty of such violations to terminate them.

2. Where evidence of violation is submitted to the Federal Trade Commission, the Commission should seek to induce the alleged violator to terminate his illegal practice voluntarily, and where this is not successful, should institute suitable proceedings to restrain those practices.

III. Sound cost accounting

One of the great weaknesses in the industry is ignorance on the part of many finishers of their true costs of operation. The trade-practice rules urge each member of the industry to learn his costs and to keep appropriate cost records, but this sound advice has been largely ignored, with the result that many finishers operate at a loss through sheer ignorance of the minimum prices they must charge merely to cover their costs. The Federal Trade Commission can render valuable aid and advice to the industry on setting up appropriate cost accounting systems. The association can also aid members of the industry in this respect, with the backing of the Federal Trade Commission.

IV. Improvement of efficiency

As already stated, the industry has been greatly weakened by the entry of numerous small and inefficient units which operate uneconomically, sell their services well below cost, existing only as an interim source of salary to the owners until their creditors force them into bankruptcy or liquidation, after which they reopen elsewhere and resume operations in the same pattern. This vicious cycle can be halted by a judicious program of pooling and consolidating the inefficient and uneconomical units into stronger and more efficient organizations. The problems raised by such a program may require clearace with the Department of Justice, but the leadership by the association in working out the details would seem to be essential, since the weak and inefficient business concerns themselves cannot be relied upon to take the initiative. Some collective action, such as negotiation, is essential before any pooling or merger of a group of business units could be effectuated. It is desirable to have assurances in advance from the Antitrust Division, not only that the contemplated pooling or merger would be consistent with the antitrust laws, but also that the preliminary conferences and negotiations for this purpose would not violate the Federal statutes. An indication that the administration feels that the industry's problems are sufficiently acute to require immediate solution would facilitate working out the program described above.

V. Financial aid

Many of the units of the industry are undercapitalized and poorly equipped. Modernization of equipment and sound capitalization can turn a losing enterprise into a sound business. The Small Business Administration is authorized to make loans and to give financial aid to small businesses to aid and strengthen the national economy. The finishing industry would seem to be a particularly appropriate area for the Small Business Administration program, and every effort should be made to obtain aid from that agency. The financial aid could take the form of long-term loans at reasonable interest rates to concerns whose capital position does not enable them to obtain equivalent aid from commercial banks. Adequate security and other safeguards for the Government's investments could unquestionably be worked out.

VI. Economic surveys

An important element of a sound industry is a constant awareness of its economic problems as they develop under ever changing conditons both within the industry and within the national economy. This requires resources and facilities which the industry does not command. Surveys of the industry can, however, effectively be made from time to time by the Department of Commerce and the Federal Trade Commission. These surveys would serve as a barometer, enabling the industry to take appropriate action to avert or minimize the effects of an economic crisis such as the one which currently threatens the entire industry. These surveys would also furnish valuable guides for governmental action where indicated.

SILK & RAYON PRINTERS &
DYERS ASSOCIATION OF
AMERICA, INC.,
DEAN M. LEWIS, *President.*
JOSEPH F. WILDEBUSH,
Chairman, Economic
Mobilization Committee.
CHARLES A. GRANT,
Executive Secretary.

Of counsel:

DAVID L. BENETAR,
Nordlinger, Riegelman, Benetar &
Charney, General Counsel.
DAVID L. KREEGER,
Kreeger, Ragland & Shapiro,
Washington Representative.

The Bryson Bill, H. R. 1227

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE L. HAYS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1954

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a petition forwarded to me by Mrs. Mabel Waggoner, Carrollton, Ohio:

To Our Representatives in Congress:

We, the undersigned, your constituents, earnestly beg you to give consideration to our constitutional rights as American citizens to be free in our homes of an offensive invasion by those who wish to increase their huge profits from the sales of alcoholic beverages by high-pressure advertising directed through magazines, newspapers, and over radio and television, at our children. We urge you to obtain consideration of and pass the Bryson bill (H. R. 1227).

Mrs. Euna Boyd, Mrs. Gail Eusa, Mrs. Sarah Mathison, Mrs. Sarah Harsh, Mrs. Martha E. Boyd, Mrs. Clara Tinlin, Mrs. Pearl Bebout, Mrs. Mary B. Prohl, Mrs. Blanch Eick, Mrs. Dorothy Whity, Mrs. Ruth A. Claghorn, Mrs. Martha Eick, Mrs. Bertha Boggs, Maude Huddleston, Mrs. Mabel Waggoner.

Carrollton, Ohio.

The Voice From Back of the Yards

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1954

Mr. **KLUCZYNSKI**. Mr. Speaker, the Fifth Congressional District of Illinois includes the Back of the Yards. I was born, reared, and educated here. I know what spirit pervades its people. It is the district I represent.

All through America people are leaving old settlements and spreading into new communities. The old become slums and backward districts. But the proud spirit of our people who built and made up Back of the Yards has again asserted itself in an endeavor to rebuild and stabilize its environment to adjust to the new trends. The people remain loyal to their community. A recent publication very adequately expresses the move. Restated, it is as follows:

The Voice From Back of the Yards

Authors once pointed to Chicago's back of the yards area as a hotbed of juvenile delinquency, bad health, housing problems, and social disorganization. But in the last 15 years the residents, with help from their back of the yards neighborhood council, have transformed the area into a model community.

The voice of the people, which once instigated the Boston tea party and the Emancipation Proclamation, is being heard again—this time in the area bordering the Union Stock Yard & Transit Co. on Chicago's south side. Through its own organization, the back of the yards council, the voice—125,000 strong—is leading a repair and clean-up campaign that has transformed a residential section almost overnight.

Credit for the community success in the back of the yards area belongs to the people themselves, representatives of whom compose the council. They are proving the power of democracy in action and they are setting a model pace that is being copied in cities throughout the United States. Their motto, "We the people will work out our own destiny," and their desire to carry it out, have written a new chapter in the history back of the yards.

Back of the yards is the name given to the specific area bounded by 33d Street on the north, 55th Street on the south, Racine Avenue on the east, and Western Avenue on the west. Within the boundaries lies the livelihood of the 125,000 residents—the industries of the central manufacturing district and the stock years, the shopping centers, churches, and schools.

A spirit of mutual interest pervades the area. The economic life of the community is dependent upon the nearby businesses and industries, and the latter draw the bulk of their working forces from back of the yards. The situation of interdependence has existed for many years, but the feeling of community pride was long in coming.

People who live in the vicinity of the yards represent many foreign nations. They originally were brought to Chicago as labor for the growing meat-packing industry. The Irish came first, early in 1890, and they were followed by the Germans, Poles, Lithuanians, Slovaks, Czechs, Bohemians, Negroes, and Mexicans. Each group established its own church, banded together in its own settlement and spoke its own language. Leftover hatreds based on long-standing antagonisms in Europe bred distrust and suspicion among the groups. Here was a melting pot of discord.

The problems these nationalities faced were made infamous through literature written in the early 1900's by American authors called muckrakers. Attacking social and economic evils of the day, some of the authors pointed to the yards' area as a hotbed of juvenile delinquency, bad health, housing problems, and social disorganization. The literature provided an impetus for investigations and studies by civic leaders and social and welfare workers. But through a world war, an era of prosperity, and a worldwide depression they either dismissed the situation as unsolvable or, once their studies were completed, promptly forgot about the people.

It took the leadership of three men to unite the residents in one effort for the good of all of them. And in 1939 the Back of the Yards' Neighborhood Council was founded by Saul Alinsky, sociologist at the University of Chicago; Bishop Sheil, senior auxiliary bishop of the Catholic Archdiocese of Chicago; and Joseph Meegan, then recreational director of Davis Square Park, a native of the area, and presently executive director of the council.

A priest, Rev. Roman J. Berendt, later a council president, expressed the purpose: "Our people differed in many respects, but there were certain ways in which they were similar. They wanted the same things all people want—dignity, the right to give and take the rights, as well as obligations of citizenship."

Or, as one founder worded it: "The council was formed upon three ideas: First, no one was more interested in the community than the people who lived there. When they talked about problems of children, jobs, and health, they were talking about their children, their health, their housing, and their jobs. The second idea is * * * we believe that our local people have as much intelligence as anyone else and, given the opportunity, will do the job. The third was and is our belief that if anything was to be done for better conditions in our neighborhood it would come, not from others but from us."

The founders sought the cooperation of church and labor leaders, merchants and youths representing social, athletic, and national groups, and invited them to form a council designed to work out their problems. After a year and a half of meetings, the community leaders had ironed out compromises and had decided upon a council program, selected in the fields of labor, housing, health, youth, and recreation, enveloping all of the needs of the community. Today 185 organizations; nearly every one in the area belong to the council. Each group selects a representative to attend the monthly meeting. Once a year the organization holds a community congress to which member groups may send delegates in proportion to their membership. The delegates elect officers for the year and chairmen for their programs.

Operating funds are raised by the council's fair, held every July at 47th Street and Damen Avenue. The organization receives additional help from the Community Chest. Council activities are directed from headquarters at 4600 South Ashland Avenue.

The council has made many achievements in its 15-year existence. It has established an infant welfare center where mothers can obtain advice and help to maintain their children's health. It has lobbied successfully to pioneer the hot lunch program for public and parochial schools. It has developed free recreational playgrounds and recreational facilities for night softball at 47th and Damen Avenue. It has established a credit union where people of the area can borrow at a low rate.

The council has cooperated with local public officials for better housing; and its investigations have uncovered nearly 4,000 housing and health code violations. It has provided free dental inspection and care in the schools; has employed a social worker who speaks several languages and is acquainted with the problems of the community; has been active in promoting good race relations and fighting rumors and propaganda; has dealt with juvenile delinquency through conferences with the youngsters, their parents, clergymen, school principals, truant officers, police district officers, and the council's committee on juvenile delinquency in an effort to strike at the cause of and to solve the problem.

But perhaps the greatest single work the council has promoted is the conservation of the area. It has emphasized how the neighborhood, which was beginning to decay with age and from lack of care, could be saved only through community spirit. It has extolled the advantages of the area and has kept the people from joining the flight to the suburbs.

The council planted the seed of morale in the community. One member stated it this way to make moving look ridiculous to the people:

"We wanted to know if people were moving to the suburbs because—

"(1) They enjoyed the long ride to work in the city, or maybe they liked to pay more for daily transportation.

"(2) Maybe we had too many schools for children. We reminded our people that there are 20 schools—14 parochial and 6 public schools in the community—and that no home in the neighborhood is further than 3 blocks from any school. We asked them if they were moving to the suburbs because they wanted their children to have a long walk to school. Maybe the exercise would be good for the children.

"(3) And then we raised the question that maybe people are moving to the suburbs because there were too many recreational facilities in the neighborhood for children such as public parks, parish social centers, outdoor swimming pools, or public playgrounds—23 in number. Maybe the fact that we have a social center with floodlights for night sports and other activities for children might also be disturbing and they would rather get away from it.

"(4) Then it occurred to us that possibly because our delinquency rate was among the lowest in the city and maybe the parents were worried when there were not too many children becoming delinquent and that was the reason that they wanted to move out to the suburbs.

"(5) We also pointed out that possibly many of them felt that they had gotten so in the habit of making payments for the mortgages on their church, school, and parish property that they just could not feel comfortable in their church which was now debt free."

When the people viewed the problem in those terms, they began to look at their surroundings in a new light. Desire for action replaced apathy.

The next problem was how to finance building and improvements. A finance committee was set up and its members called a meeting of the savings and loan institutions in and around the community. They agreed to cooperate in financing renovations and improvements of old homes and buildings in the community, and new construction.

For rehabilitation and renovation of old homes, the council launched educational programs describing new devices of construction. It recommended new kinds of siding, store fronts, and attractive paint combinations. Above all it encouraged people to help each other and to cooperate in organization of painting and building groups.

The Back of the Yards Council has helped owners of empty stores to convert them legally into apartments or homes that would increase property value for a new source of income either from rent or sale.

Vacant lots, another eyesore in the community, have provided sites for new buildings. When the council took the trouble to check on the lots, it found 570 parcels of vacant land, from inside 25-foot lots to vacant land of 2,000-foot frontage. The council has made investigations to get title and tax searchers to determine costs of every piece of vacant property. It has checked ownership, the amount of delinquent taxes, assessments, and prices.

In addition, the council has contacted next-door neighbors to enlist their interest in purchasing these lots at a very small cost, cleaning them up, and either adding them to their property or building on them. The council also is sponsoring a rehousing program that will provide new homes at reasonable prices for the growing community. It has waged a successful street-and-alley-cleaning campaign, and it provides a free job service for placing residents in nearby industries.

Already, the results of the conservation program are amazingly evident, all because the people have cooperated. There is no law which says anyone or any organization must participate or cooperate. The entire program has been something the people have wanted to do, not something they had to do. Thousands of improvements have been made, and thousands more will come in the future. Those who have not cooperated will be approached politely but firmly by their neighbors who have cooperated.

The Back of the Yards Neighborhood Council is high in its praise of the cooperation it has met at every turn. Religion is a case in point. The area is 95 percent Catholic, but the Protestant and Catholic Churches alike have acted as one in backing council programs. The council has lauded the Union of the Central Manufacturing District for their cooperation. And then, of course, the council cannot praise highly enough the residents themselves, who have made an idea into a reality.

It has been said that the world views Chicago through the lens of the back of the yards. Today's picture presents a proud, democratic, American community whose voice can tell an envious world, "We, the people, have worked out our own destiny."

Big Unions Are Partners in America's Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 24, 1954

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, in all the talk of the evils of monopoly which were once the chief target of labor organizers, there was seldom any concern over the possibility that labor, too, might one day grow big enough to constitute a monopoly. As the power of big business to control the lives of its employees expanded, so, also, has the power of great unions to influence big business. Today the respective mobilization of forces has reached what amounts to a state of fairly equal equilibrium.

The latest demonstration of this development comes from Washington where the funds controled by the United Mine Workers through their welfare arrangements have just been used to obtain control of a second bank. The two banks have resources of some $235 million, making their combined funds second only to the largest bank in the Nation's Capital. This is a remarkable tribute to the growth of this labor organization under its dynamic leader, John L. Lewis, but it also must occasion a considerable amount of eyebrow lifting by those who have always thought of labor organizations exclusively in terms of the poor workingman trying to wring another dollar out of hard-hearted businessmen.

We have reached an advanced stage in our country's industrial society, and it is time we recognized that in this state of affairs there is no longer any reason for prolonged labor-management disputes. Equals sitting down at the conference table ought to be able to iron out any disagreement without resorting to the outworn practices of uneconomic strikes or equally unsound lockouts.

Memorial Day Address by Hon. James M. Mitchell

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD T. MILLER
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 3, 1954

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, on May 31, Hon. James M. Mitchell, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense, made an address in Salisbury, Md., in connection with the Memorial Day ceremonies held in that fine city in my district. Mr. Mitchell's remarks were timely and inspiring and, under leave granted, I am herewith inserting them:

It is a privilege to be asked to offer here today a few words of tribute to those who gave their lives to keep us free. I deeply appreciate the honor. I take pleasure in joining the citizens of Salisbury in this commemoration of Memorial Day.

It is much more than a privilege. It is an inspiration to observe this solemn day of tribute to our fallen comrades, in this historic tidewater country, long recognized as a cradle of American liberty. The full panorama of American history from its beginnings has been unfolded here. Here we find all the symbols of America's greatness.

Even before Salisbury was Handy's Landing on the river, a purposeful breed of men had reached the Eastern Shore. A few of them were pure adventurers. Some of them were drawn by the lure of quick riches in a new, prolific land. But by far the greater number of them were in search of at least one of the fundamental freedoms. For in Maryland a man could worship as he pleased. Some were gentlemen and some were not. But all knew what they wanted and were willing to pay the price for what they sought. And the price was high. That price was endurance in the face of the dangers and the acute hardships of a new land full of unknown, mysterious threats.

So it's little wonder that this hardy breed fostered and nurtured the American philosophy of individual rights and individual freedom. With such a background of intense love of freedom it is little wonder that Maryland produced the author of the Star-Spangled Banner. And it's little wonder you have sent successive generations of young men out to fight bravely, and many to die to preserve our freedom.

For 3 centuries the people of the Eastern Shore have been preoccupied with the almost ever-pressing task of establishing freedom or struggling to preserve it. We know full well that words cannot add to the honors our fallen servicemen have achieved by their own brave deeds. No words can add luster to their glory.

Thomas Jefferson, in one of his many thousands of letters still preserved, wrote, "The world belongs to the living, not the dead." He was contending that one generation should not consciously take action for the specific purpose of binding or placing limitations on the next. In general, his contention doubtless had merit. But in one important sense, we cannot escape being bound by the actions of our generations of heroic dead.

To those to whom we pay our humble tribute at this commemoration we are bound by a great debt. To them we owe the preservation of our freedom, our freedom to disagree, to debate in the search for truth and in the search for a better way of life for all. To them we owe the continuation of a Government which recognizes the dignity of the individual and is shaped to guarantee his rights.

There is need today in the world of free men for the same calm courage, the same endurance and the same unswerving purpose which made possible the inspired deeds of those we honor today. There is that need because for the third time in many of our lives a mighty force has again risen up to strike down freedom.

This newest force is communism. To misconstrue the deadly intent of communism to engulf freedom everywhere as we know it or to underestimate its power would be worse than tragic. Edmund Burke said, "He trespasses against his duty who sleeps upon his watch, as well as he that goes over to the enemy."

Examples of the techniques of the Communist conspiracy are known to all. We all remember the seizure of freedom-loving Czechoslovakia by a small but carefully trained minority. We learned with sorrow of the subsequent purges, silent arrests, concentration camps and the other trappings of the slave state. We all remember the blockade of West Berlin and how we countered this maneuver with our magnificent airlift. We are saddened by the bloody war by a Communist satellite in Korea. We have watched them dodge fulfillment of their agreements such as those to unify Germany and Austria.

As President Eisenhower summed it a year ago, "We all know something of the long record of deliberately planned Communist aggression. There has been, to this moment, no reason to believe that Soviet policy has changed its frequently announced hope and purpose—the destruction of freedom everywhere.

"There is, therefore, no reason for the free nations to alter their course; to hope and work for the best, to arm and be ready for the worst.

"We must see—clearly and steadily—just exactly what is the danger before us. It is more than a military threat."

At times our military, civil, and even our spiritual dangers seem to multiply. Many of us may feel tempted to yield to discouragement, or even fear.

Yielding to fear or discouragement, and giving up our hard-won freedom of speech and freedom of religion as a means of fighting communism would be just as tragic as misjudging communism's ruthless ability or misconstruing its design.

We can dispel discouragement and fear by turning to history. Here we find that human experience is a repetitive as well as a cumulative process. We learn that many of our problems are new, not in essence but in form. We learn that mankind has met and overcome them in other forms in earlier days. The inevitable conclusion is that we can meet and overcome essentially the same problems disguised in modern trappings. To meet them, we must assume the attitude of restrained and wry confidence instead of discouragement and gnawing fear. Our power gives us every right to complete confidence in our ability to emerge from this struggle against communism with our freedom intact.

There is power in our location and the other facts of our geography. We lie between two mighty oceans and below a great polar ice cap. These are by no means insurmountable barriers to attack in these days of intercontinental bombers. But they are still far more protection against invasion than an imaginary line on a map.

Our coastlines provide us with great year-around harbors from which we can go forth to control the seas in time of danger and which promote life-giving commerce in times of peace.

Our geographical location is responsible for a climate that is conducive to the best efforts of our inhabitants. Little of our country is too hot or cold, too dry or wet, for habitation or agricultural use.

Our size is a power factor. When this country was only 13 Colonies along the Atlantic seaboard, Frederick the Great, one of the earlier prophets of doom readily predicted the quick downfall of the new Republic because it was too large for unification. The Star-Spangled Banner was flying from coast to coast not many decades later and the added territory meant only added strengths.

This great spread of land meant for one thing, a wide variety in the basic industry of agriculture. We can produce the widest range of foods and fiber.

So great has been our agricultural development that our productivity is virtually unsurpassed. It has been carefully estimated that 1 American farmer can produce enough food for 6 families. It likewise has been estimated that 1 Russian farm family can produce only enough food for 2 families. This is significant in gaging power.

Our size has brought under one nation huge quantities and a wide variety of natural resources. A great power must have either the essential raw materials to sustain a prosperous peacetime economy and to maintain adequate military forces within its borders, or have access to such materials even in an emergency.

The possession in this country of a wide variety of raw materials, especially minerals including coal, was one of the important reasons for our industrial development.

In this modern and complex world it has become axiomatic that economic strength and military strength are inseparable. The industrial capacity of the United States and the rest of the free world to support our military forces towers over that of the Soviet Union and its satellites.

Given favorable location, climate, adequate size and other favorable geographical features, raw materials from which industry may be developed, the key to a nation's power is its people.

Our democratic institutions, including universal educational opportunities, have helped us produce a highly enlightened, skillful population. This, in turn, has resulted in an increasingly more effective use of our resources and industrial capacity. In the language of the advertising agency, we produce better faster. We have developed the most efficient production methods and the best transportation systems.

We are still turning out mechanically and technically trained men at a higher rate than any other country. Our artists and scholars are among the world's finest. Our scientists lead in their various fields of research and development. So there is no reason to fear that we soon will lose our lead if we maintain and strengthen these democratic institutions.

The power a nation derives from its population is not to be calculated in mere numbers or the state of their well-being, important as are these factors. You must have a look at the type of government they prefer, their religion, their formulas for solving their problems. These formulas may be called ideologies. They are, in a sense, transformers that can step up the strength of a relatively small number of people. And let us keep in mind that although we are a big country, we have only 6 percent of the world's population.

Our country is in one respect, at least, unique. It was, in its beginning a refuge for those who sought freedoms denied them in their homeland. We have welcomed wave upon wave of newcomers generation after generation—from England and France, from Poland and Italy, from most of the countries in Europe. In many of our large cities we have a United Nations in miniature. These newcomers have found America a good place to live. We have found them good citizens, good to have among us. The names of our leaders in Government, in business, in all walks of life, show that America has been made great by people from many lands.

Yet with all this absorption of new stock there has been no change in our original ideology. We still believe that life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness are the unalienable rights of every human. We believe in a competitive enterprise which does not abridge any of these rights.

Communism is a militant ideology that drives its confirmed believers to great sacrifices. Yet it is the indisputable fact of history that the greatest technical advances in modern times have been made in areas where there are competitive economies and freemen. Mechanical production was born in Great Britain and grew up in the United States.

Great as is our strength we do not need to depend upon it alone in the struggle against communism. We have the rest of the free world as our allies. It is part of our own defense to help them with their defenses. We are not, as some so often and so cynically phrase it, trying to buy friends.

Part of our present strength rests in the fact that we are confident without being complacent. In order to organize our strength so that it can be quickly applied against a potential enemy we have created our greatest ground, air and naval forces, short of total mobilization for war. We are continuing to increase the size of the Air Force and we are increasing the efficiency of all arms by the adoption of new and highly effective weapons systems.

Admittedly the Soviet Union and its satellites are resourceful. Their ideology breeds fanaticism. They have great natural resources in raw material and manpower. We must continue our awareness of the danger imposed by their hostility but this awareness should not lead to fear.

They have their weaknesses as well as their strengths. These have been carefully studied by our political and military experts. For example, their transportation system is so bad that many of their resources are not available to their industry. It is estimated that 4 Russian workers are required to equal the production of 1 American worker.

Above all, the Communist leaders in the Kremlin are cautious folk. They will not risk weakening or even losing their power in a global war to attain what they believe they can get through other means.

They might start a general war under a few conceivable circumstances, for example, if they actually believed the West was preparing to strike the first blow.

It seems more probable at this time that they will continue to attack freedom through wars by satellites, subversion, economic, political, and other forms of cold warfare.

All of which means we must expect to live in a world of tension for the foreseeable future, and be prepared to endure it indefinitely. We must strive for peace, but we must remain strong and confident. Consider the problems facing the great Americans of earlier times, Washington, Jefferson, Lincoln. They did not panic in the face of danger. Above all, we will need the one great strength without which all other strengths are futile.

That is spiritual strength.

We must have the willingness to sacrifice, the unity, the calm courage in face of danger, the unswerving purpose exemplified by those we honor here today at Salisbury.

We must be just as unrelenting in our purpose to preserve the freedom for which they fought. If we never grow too weary of the struggle or too soft to continue to stand to arms until the bitter end, eventually we must emerge from the age of peril with our freedom—all of them—stronger than ever before.

Big Difference: No Tweedledum, Tweedledee in Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1954

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, time was when a President described the differences between his political party and the opposition as the difference between tweedledum and tweedledee. Those days are long gone. Today, the gulf between Republican President Eisenhower and Democratic Nominee Stevenson seems to widen daily as the march of events moves forward into the unknown.

But if there is one sure definition of the large differences which now prevail, it comes on the subject of American financial policy. The Democrats believed that inflation was a useful technique. They like it on occasion as a means of "priming the pump," and even if it resulted in a net loss to the American family whose wage increases never quite matched expense rises, it was an exciting economic stunt. President Eisenhower and his administration believe that a deficit is evil, something to be abhorred and eliminated as fast as possible.

"Balancing the budget" is more than a catchy phrase to Republicans. It is a goal which we have set as a sure means of putting our American economy back on a sound keel. Democrats never even tried when they were in office, despite soaring income. As people who recognize the importance of our role as the world's leading nation, we understand that a sound dollar is far more than the key to our own prosperity. It is the rock on which the free world must stand.

Juridical Status of the Continental Shelf—Part I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY

OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 26, 1954

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I should like to include part I of a report by the distinguished authority on international law, Dr. Joseph Walter Bingham, of Stanford University:

JURIDICAL STATUS OF THE CONTINENTAL SHELF—REPORT TO THE EIGHTH CONFERENCE OF THE INTER-AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION IN SÃO PAULO, BRAZIL, MARCH 15–22, 1954—PART I

At the Montevideo conference of this association in November 1951, on behalf of the State bar of California, I presented a paper on the topic Juridical Status of the Continental Shelf. That paper summarized briefly salient facts related to the topic and stated my views concerning the present law, its probable development, and desirable objectives. I have been asked to make an official report to this conference, bringing the record of events up to date and commenting on trends and prospects. I am glad to do this as I wish to offer some suggestions on an area of law and politics covered by the topic which still is characterized by legal confusion and political turmoil. This is the industry of fishing in the sea, a fertile source of acrimonious controversy between peoples and factions since long before the comparative civilization of modern international law. It is high time that the problems of justice in this field be faced resolutely and solved in a spirit and by a method worthy of the unprecedented scientific age in which we are privileged to live.

The juristically noteworthy occurrences of the past 3 years concerning the resources of the bed and subsoil of Continental Shelves can be summarized briefly and need no great elaboration for the purposes of this conference. A matter of verbal usage should be mentioned at the outset in avoidance of misunderstanding. I use the term "Continental Shelf" as I believe it has been used generally in the discussions of this topic during the past decade, to cover not only sea-submerged outer margins of continents, but also (1) similar margins of islands and (2) so-called inner shelves such as those of the Persian Gulf and the North and Bering Seas. For convenience I do not include what some geologists call outer shelves which commonly are called banks, such as those off the Atlantic coasts of North America, although in considering problems of the legal regime of fishing in the sea, it is arguable that fisheries over some of these banks should be classed as coastal fisheries and there may be banks over which coastal States should be given jurisdiction and control for purposes of exploitation of resources of their beds and subsoils in accordance with considerations which have led to the assumption of such legal powers by coastal States over their Continental Shelves, proper and inner.

The list of governmental proclamations, orders, and legislation extending coastal state jurisdiction and control over the resources of the bed and subsoil of the Continental Shelf, over the shelf itself, or over the shelf and its overlying sea and their resources include those of the following countries: Argentina (1946), Mexico (1945 and 1949), Chile (1947), Peru (1947), Nicaragua (1948), Guatemala (1949), Costa Rica (1948 and 1949), United States (1945), Honduras (1950), Ecuador (1951), Panama (1946), El Salvador (1950), Brazil (1950), Iran (1949), Philippines (1949), Saudi Arabia (1949), Bahrain (1949), Abu Dhabi (1949), Ajman (1949), Dubai (1949), Kuwait (1949), Qatar (1949), Ras Al Khaimah (1949), Sharjah (1949), Umm Al Qaiwain (1949), Bahamas (1948), British Honduras (1950), Jamaica (1948), Falkland Islands (1950), Trinidad and Tobago (1942), Pakistan (1950), India, Australia (1953), New Guinea (1953), Israel (1952).

ICELAND'S CLAIMS OF JURISDICTION OVER ITS CONTINENTAL SHELF

In addition to these claims of property rights and jurisdictions in support thereof, there is the Icelandic law of 1948 authorizing the establishment of fishery conservation zones within the limits of Iceland's Continental Shelf. Under this law Iceland has issued regulations for fisheries off its coasts within 4 nautical miles of a base line drawn through "the outermost points of the coasts, islands, and rocks and across the opening of bays." Within these limits Iceland claims jurisdiction to exclude foreign fishers subject, however, to treaty privileges. This involves a claim to territorial waters 4 miles wide and controverts the Anglo-American 3-mile doctrine. In its reply to the request of the International Law Commission of the United Nations for comments of governments on its tentative draft code on the Continental Shelf and related subjects, Iceland justified these jurisdictional claims as follows:

"Investigations in Iceland have quite clearly shown that the country rests on a platform or Continental Shelf whose outlines follow those of the coast itself, whereupon the depths of the real high seas follow. On this platform invaluable fishing banks and spawning grounds are found, upon whose preservation the survival of the Icelandic people depends. The country itself is barren and almost all necessities have to be imported and financed through the export of fisheries products. It can truly be said that the coastal fishing grounds are the conditio sine qua non of the Icelandic people for they make the country habitable. The Icelandic Government considers itself entitled and indeed bound to take all necessary steps on a unilateral basis to preserve these resources and is doing so as shown by the attached documents. It considers that it is unrealistic that foreigners can be prevented from pumping oil from the Continental Shelf but that they cannot in the same manner be prevented from destroying other resources which are based on the same seabed. The Government of Iceland does not maintain that the same rule should necessarily apply in all countries. It feels rather that each case should be studied separately and that the coastal state could, within a reasonable distance from its coasts, determine the necessary measures for the protection of its coastal fisheries in view of economic, geographic, biological, and other relevant considerations."

This statement and indeed the rest of the comments of the Icelandic Government in its reply have a cogent quality which supports some of my suggestions for solution of fishery problems and I shall refer to it when I make my suggestions toward the end of this report.

The focus of interest in the current development of law and politics concerning the Continental Shelf is composed of the deliberations and proposals of the International Law Commission of the United Nations and the comments of governments thereon. During its fifth session, June 1–August 14, 1953, at Geneva, Switzerland, the Commission completed its work on the Continental Shelf draft, and approved 3 draft articles on the basic aspects of international regulation of fisheries and 1 on a zone of control contiguous to a coastal State's territorial sea for prevention and punishment of violations of customs, immigration, fiscal, or sanitary regulations. The width of this contiguous zone is limited to 12 miles measured from the baseline from which the width of the territorial sea is measured.

PROPOSALS OF THE INTERNATIONAL LAW COMMISSION OF THE UNITED NATIONS

Following are the draft articles on the Continental Shelf and on fisheries finally adopted by the Commission for submission to the General Assembly of the United Nations:

"*The Continental Shelf*

"Article 1

"As used in these articles, the term 'Continental Shelf' refers to the seabed and subsoil of the submarine areas contiguous to the coast, but outside the area of the territorial sea, to a depth of 200 meters.

"Article 2

"The coastal State exercises over the Continental Shelf sovereign rights for the purpose of exploring and exploiting its natural resources.

"Article 3

"The rights of the coastal State over the Continental Shelf do not affect the legal status of the superjacent waters as high seas.

"Article 4

"The rights of the coastal State over the Continental Shelf do not affect the legal status of the airspace above the superjacent waters.

"Article 5

"Subject to its right to take reasonable measures for the exploration of the Continental Shelf and the exploitation of its natural resources, the coastal State may not prevent the establishment or maintenance of submarine cables.

"Article 6

"1. The exploration of the Continental Shelf and the exploitation of its natural resources must not result in any unjustifiable interference with navigation, fishing, or fish production.

"2. Subject to the provisions of paragraphs 1 and 5 of this article, the coastal State is entitled to construct and maintain on the Continental Shelf installations necessary for the exploration and exploitation of its natural resources and to establish safety zones at a reasonable distance around such installations and to take in those zones measures necessary for their protection.

"3. Such installations, though under the jurisdiction of the coastal State, do not possess the status of islands. They have no territorial sea of their own and their presence does not affect the delimitation of the territorial sea of the coastal State.

"4. Due notice must be given of any such installations constructed, and due means of warning of the presence of such installations must be maintained.

"5. Neither the installations themselves, nor the said safety zones around them, may be established in narrow channels or on recognized sealanes essential to international navigation.

"Article 7

"1. Where the same Continental Shelf is contiguous to the territories of two or more States whose coasts are opposite to each other, the boundary of the Continental Shelf appertaining to such States is, in the absence of agreement between those States or unless another boundary line is justified by special circumstances, the median line every point of which is equidistance from the baselines from which the width of the territorial sea of each country is measured.

"2. Where the same Continental Shelf is contiguous to the territories of two adjacent states, the boundary of the Continental Shelf appertaining to such States is, in the absence of agreement between those States or unless another boundary line is justified by special circumstances, determined by application of the principle of equidistance from the base lines from which the width of the territorial sea of each of the two countries is measured.

"Article 8

"Any disputes which may arise between States concerning the interpretation or application of these articles should be submitted to arbitration at the request of any of the parties.

"Fisheries

"Article 1

"A state whose nationals are engaged in fishing in any area of the high seas where the nationals of other states are not thus engaged, may regulate and control fishing activities in such areas for the purpose of protecting fisheries against waste or extermination. If the nationals of two or more states are engaged in fishing in any area of the high seas, the states concerned shall prescribe the necessary measures by agreement. If, subsequent to the adoption of such measures, nationals of other states engage in fishing in the area and those states do not accept the measures adopted, the question shall, at the request of one of the interested parties, be referred to the international body envisaged in article 3.

"Article 2

"In any area situated within 100 miles from the territorial sea, the coastal state or states are entitled to take part on an equal footing in any system of regulation, even though their nationals do not carry on fishing in the area.

"Article 3

"States shall be under a duty to accept, as binding upon their nationals, any system of regulation of fisheries in any area of the high seas which an international authority, to be created within the framework of the United Nations, shall prescribe as being essential for the purpose of protecting the fishing resources of that area against waste or extermination. Such international authority shall act at the request of any interested State."

The Commission recommended that the General Assembly adopt by resolution the report and draft articles on the Continental Shelf. Its recommendations concerning the draft articles on fisheries are expressed in the following quotation from its report:

"The Commission believes that the general importance and the recognized urgency of the subject matter of the articles in question warrant their endorsement by a formal act of approval on the part of the General Assembly. Considerable time must elapse before a convention on the lines here proposed can be adopted and widely ratified. In the meantime, it seems advisable that the General Assembly should lend its authority to the principles underlying the articles. In particular, endorsement should be given to the view that, where a number of interested states have agreed on a system of protection of fisheries, any regulations thus agreed upon should not, without good reason, be rendered nugatory by the action or inaction of a single state. The problem underlying the articles is one of general interest and the Commission believes that an authoritative statement of the legal position on the subject, both de lege lata and de lege ferenda, by the General Assembly is indicated as a basis of any future regulations which may be adopted.

"While the articles adopted by the Commission contain the general principles for the protection of fisheries, it is clear that only a detailed convention or conventions can translate these principles into a system of working rules. It is probable that that object may be achieved on a regional basis rather than by way of a general convention. Conventions concluded in the past for the protection of fisheries have been, as a rule, on a regional basis. The International Convention for the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries of February 6, 1949, which establishes an International Commission for the North Atlantic Fisheries assisted by panels for subareas and national advisory committees, and the proposed International Convention for the High Sea Fisheries of the North Pacific Ocean, approved in draft by the Tripartite Fisheries Conference at Tokyo on December 14, 1951, provides recent instructive examples of such regulations. Account would also have to be taken of the existence and experience of regional bodies such as the Indo-Pacific Fisheries Council, the General Fisheries Council for the Mediterranean, and the Latin-American Fisheries Council. The matter is of a technical character; as such it is outside the competence of the Commission. A specialized body, such as the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization, would seem to be most suitable for the purpose. Accordingly, the Commission recommends that, concurrently with its approval of the articles on fisheries, the General Assembly should enter into consultation with FAO with a view to investigating the matter and preparing drafts of a convention or conventions on the subject in conformity with the general principles embodied in the articles."

Concerning the draft article on the contiguous zone, the Commission recommended as follows:

"As the Commission has not yet adopted draft articles on the territorial sea, it recommends the General Assembly to take no action with regard to the article on the contiguous zone, since the present report is already published (art. 23, par. 1 (a) of the Commission's statute)."

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE INTERNATIONAL LAW COMMISSION'S FINAL AND EARLIER DRAFTS ON THE CONTINENTAL SHELF

It will be noted that the final draft on the Continental Shelf differs from the tentative conclusions of the earlier draft in three important particulars.

1. The revised first article gives the term "Continental Shelf" a more stable effect. Instead of the phrase "to a depth of 200 meters," the tentative draft had the phrase "where the depth of the superjacent waters admits of the exploitation of the natural resources of the sea bed and subsoil." This would have caused the spatial extent of a coastal State's jurisdiction to vary with the technological practicability of exploitation, local and temporal.

In its comments on the first article, the Commission gives the following modifying recommendation:

"Similarly, while adhering in general to the geographical description and characteristics of the Continental Shelf, the Commission envisages the possibility and the desirability of reasonable modifications, in proper cases, of the test thus adopted. Thus, although the depth of 200 meters as a limit of the Continental Shelf must be regarded as the general rule, it is a rule which is subject to equitable modifications in special cases in which submerged areas, of a depth less than 200 meters, situated in considerable proximity to the coast are separated by a narrow channel deeper than 200 meters from the part of the Continental Shelf adjacent to the coast. Such shallow areas must, in these cases, be considered as contiguous to that part of the shelf. It would be for the State relying on this exception to the general rule to establish its claim to an equitable modification of the rule. In case of dispute, it must be a matter for arbitral determination whether a shallow submarine area falls within the rule as here formulated. Some such modification of the general rule is necessary in order to meet the objection that the mechanical reliance on the geological notion of the Continental Shelf may result in an inequality of treatment of some States as compared with others."

2. The second article of the tentative draft provided that a Continental Shelf, as defined in the draft, should be "subject to the exercise by the coastal state of control and jurisdiction for the purpose of exploring it and exploiting its natural resources." This seemed to adopt the idea of the Truman proclamation of 1945, which claimed only as exclusive, incorporeal property interest in the resources of the Continental Shelf and coastal state jurisdiction confined to the protection and exploitation of this property interest. The probable effect of the final draft of this article is like the territorial jurisdiction (annexation) proclaimed by the Orders in Council of the United Kingdom covering continental shelves of its American island possessions and British Honduras, modified, however, by following articles of the draft and dubiously by the retained phrase "for the purpose of exploring and exploiting its natural resources."

The strongly prevalent opinion of governments in favor of the United Kingdom method of annexation instead of the method of the Truman proclamation is evidenced by the declarations of the governments of Latin America, of Pakistan, and of the Persian Gulf sheikdoms. Now the Outer Continental Shelf bill, passed by the Congress of the United States last year, in effect has substituted annexation of shelves for the technically more limited jurisdiction of the Truman proclamation and incidentally has extinguished any possible doubt of the present validity of the Truman proclamation itself in the law of the United States. Indeed, by section 9 of the earlier 1953 Submerged Lands Act, Congress had confirmed the claim of jurisdiction of the Truman proclamation.

An interesting interpretative comment of the Commission's report on the phrase "natural resources" in article 2, is the following paragraph:

"The Commission decided, after considerable discussion, to retain the term 'natural resources' as distinguished from the more limited term 'mineral recources.' In its previous draft the Commission only considered mineral resources, and certain members proposed adhering to that course. The Commission, however, came to the conclusion that the products of sedentary fisheries, in particular to the extent that they were natural resources permanently attached to the bed of the sea, should not be outside the scope of the regime adopted and that this aim could be achieved by using the term 'natural resources.' It is clearly understood, however, that the rights in question do not cover so-called bottom-fish and other fish which, although living in the sea, occasionally have their habitat at the bottom of the sea, or are bred there. Nor do these rights cover objects such as wrecked ships and their cargoes (including bullion) lying on the seabed or covered by the sand of the subsoil."

3. The third important change made by the final draft concerns the adjustment of claims between two or more States to portions of the same Continental Shelf. Article 7 of the tentative draft left this adjustment to agreement between claimants and put them under an obligation to arbitrate if they failed to agree. In response to the official criticism of most governments which commented on this article in their replies to the Commission's request, article 7 of the final draft defines rules for determination of shelf boundaries between neighboring States.

Juridical Status of the Continental Shelf—Part II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 26, 1954

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I should like to include part II of a report by the distinguished authority on international law, Dr. Joseph Walter Bingham, of Stanford University:

REPORT TO THE EIGHTH CONFERENCE OF THE INTER-AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION IN SÃO PAULO, BRAZIL, MARCH 15–22, 1954—PART II

CONTINENTAL SHELF PROPOSALS OF THE INTERNATIONAL LAW COMMISSION AND PRESENT INTERNATIONAL LAW

If the report of the Commission on the Continental Shelf is approved by the General Assembly, with or without amendments, a very probable occurrence, this phase of the great debate over seaward jurisdictions of coastal States supporting their important offshore interests in this remarkable age of revolutionary change and scientific progress, will have reached a definitive stage. Then, at least, it would seem that one should be able to say with assurance that the minimum popular ideas embodied in the Commission's draft on the Continental Shelf reflect established and recognized international law before they are approved by formal treaties between all states or even most states.

I realize that this statement is open to vigorous challenge unless it is interpreted carefully. Therefore, I propose to digress for a few moments from the theme of this report to offer a brief explanation. I mean by law in the sense of my statement what the ancient Roman jurists meant by jus—not lex or regula or fas, but the action of official government on concrete cases in its relation to causal factors. In this sense judicial law is what the judges determine in their court conduct and orders and judgments, and international law similarly consists in concurrent state practice, and nothing else. I offer this premise without full substantiation as an introduction to criticism of certain traditional methods of argument in our field of international law which tend to confusion and are the main barrier to acceptance of my dictum that the Continental Shelf doctrine, in the limited degree to which it has been approved by the International Law Commission, is now part of our international law.

I challenge anyone to offer evidence that the basic ideas of the Commission's Continental Shelf draft will be opposed by any government or that any government interested in continental shelves will not go as far in asserting or supporting coastal state control as the draft goes. If the available evidence supports the opinion that the Commission's draft reflects a prevailing general concordance of will of governments on its basic concessions of coastal state jurisdiction, then why is it not a safe prediction that future (as well as recent) concurrent State action will accord with these basic draft ideas? Therefore, why have we not already established international law to that effect? Why should it be required that formal international legislation through multilateral treaties endorse the draft before it can be said that its provisions reflect current governmental practice (law)?

The law of the sea, including that part of it called "freedom of the sea" and its various particular qualifications in war and peace, especially the law of territorial seas, has grown out of unilateral assertions of right and vigorous counter unilateral assertions of wrong through the centuries, grown through diplomacy and concessions and acquiescence or inertia in the presence of claims, grown very much through such common-law processes, and the growth has been only sporadically aided by multilateral treaties.

There has been expressed recently by some jurists a strange idea that no government today should assert unilaterally an international claim such as the Truman proclamations or the Continetal Shelf declarations of the United Kingdom or those of Latin American States, without the support of established law or previous formal general concordance of other governments. The implication is that even when the problem is an entirely novel one as is that of the Continental Shelf today, such unilateral action involves a departure from established international law and therefore tends to anarchy. The argument is surprising in this scientific age in several particulars. (1) It runs quite contrary to the common practice of governments throughout past ages, especially their practice with respect to the continually occurring and continually changing problems of the law and politics of the sea in peace and in war. (2) It supports doctrinaire, stagnating use of the popular political slogan "freedom of the seas," as though that freedom existed categorically in established law except as modified by formally recognized infringements and as though further inroads on it could be established legitimately only by formal international legislation. (3) It thus fortifies the opposition of strong naval states and their satellites and the political-pressure groups influencing their policies against the cogent demands of smaller states for better justice in protection of their offshore interests and the economic welfare of their peoples. In short, it entrenches formidably the status quo of the strong hand.

Let me give you an example of this type of argument which has been used against extension by a coastal state of its control of sea fisheries beyond the 3-mile limit of Anglo-American propaganda. The argument runs as follows: International law (concurrent state practice) supports a coastal State's claim of jurisdiction over its territorial seas and fishing therein up to a limit of 3 miles beyond the coast, but no further. Therefore, a coastal state which extends its jurisdiction beyond the 3-mile limit violates international law and the freedom of the seas. Of course this conclusion is a logical nonsequitur substituting specious propaganda and a slogan for the truth of State practice (international law). The truth includes the premise of the argument, but it includes also the facts that on fishery jurisdiction beyond a 3-mile limit there is an irreconcilable conflict of state practice, no sufficient concurrent practice and therefore no established law. International law in this sense does not condemn or approve coastal State fishery jurisdiction beyond the 3-mile limit either within or without territorial waters. Furthermore, freedom of the seas without limits never has existed in fact or in law. Governmental restrictions on sea uses always have existed in peace and in war and they have varied greatly from time to time. On the high seas as in domestic territory, freedom has been much more restricted in war than in peace; but even in recent modern peace times the need of controls of uses of the sea and its bed and subsoil has grown. Coastal state jurisdiction over territorial seas has been asserted and has gained recognition through similar processes of unilateral contentions and because of similar economic and social and political pressures as those which are producing the solution of our Continental Shelf problems today.

Never should a legal problem such as that of the Continental Shelf be labeled prejudicially as one of preservation or restriction of freedom of the seas. It should be considered pragmatically and without partisan prejudice by international jurists as a new social development in the politics of the sea arising out of the economic and national pressures of the times. Pernicious governmental controls are undesirable, but harmful anarchy also is undesirable.

PROBLEMS OF JURISDICTION AND CONSERVATION CONTROLS OVER SEA FISHERIES UNDER INTERNATIONAL LAW

This brings me to the final part of this report—It concerns the problems of sea fishing and its legal controls in the interest of conservation of sea resources and of justice between the competing interests of peoples and of economic factions. I propose to abbreviate my remarks by omitting argument and confining myself to a summary statement of verifiable facts (including the opposing classes of interests involved), and of suggestions for a viable solution of the legal problems of justice and conservation which concern not only opposing partisans, but the world community.

1. There is no general concurrent state practice on the extent of a coastal state's jurisdiction over sea fisheries. There is general agreement that a state has jurisdiction and proprietorship of fisheries within its territorial seas, but there is no agreement on the extent of territorial seas for fishery purposes and no agreement on fishery jurisdiction beyond territorial seas. For territorial seas, widths have been claimed ranging from 3 miles to 20 miles. Some Latin-American states now have asserted territorial jurisdiction over the sea to the edge of the Continental Shelf, and some have claimed an additional undefined jurisdiction over an extra territorial range of sea for 200 miles from the shores of their possessions for protection of their interests. There is no agreement on methods of measurement or base lines for measurement of the width of territorial seas. In effect there is no settled general international law limiting the width of territorial seas or denying coastal state jurisdiction over fisheries beyond territorial seas.

2. In this unprecedented scientific age of intense exploitation of the natural resources of the world and of bitter economic and political competitions for their use, the interest of peoples in peace and orderly good government urgently demands legal controls of sea fishing and peaceful just settlement of opposing claims—opposing claims of participants of different nationalities in the exploitation of important fisheries, of the people of a coastal State and exploiters of offshore fisheries from other States, and of the world community with its public concern for conservation of the resources of the sea and of exploiters who are concerned with profits only and whose wasteful or destructive operations threaten ruination of fishery resources. There is no present hopeful prospect of efficient global control by international administrative agencies.

In its report and its draft articles on fisheries quoted in this paper, the International Law Commission recognizes the need of effective legal provisions for conservation and the special interest of coastal States in conservation of fisheries within 100 miles of their territorial seas, "even though their nationals do not carry on fishing in the area." This special interest is based on the fact that fisheries in a territorial sea may be injured seriously by foreigners' overfishing or abusive methods outside territorial limits. The conservation plan of the Commission includes regulations agreed on by all States whose nationals participate in a high seas fishery and by coastal States within 100 miles of the fishery, each State undertaking to enforce the regulations against its nationals. In case of lack of agreement on regulations by these States article 3 suggests that an international authority to be created within the framework of the United Nations be given power to issue regulations which it may deem essential to protect fishery resources of the area against waste or extermination. Action by this authority is to be taken at the request of any interested State and adherents to the draft articles assume the duty to accept the prescribed regulations as binding on their nationals.

This plan has a specious appearance of simplicity and of free cooperation of representatives of all interests for the mutual protection thereof, but it does not meet clearly the difficulties of opposing interests and it is not likely that it will be accepted by many States. The objection of nations to the dictation of an United Nations legislative or administrative authority,. even for a beneficial end, is too strong in the present state of international opinion and suspicions to permit of hope of success for this plan. I am quite sure that the United States will not adopt it. In paragraph 104 of its report the Commission in effect casts doubt on its draft as anything more than a general framework of principles which may be translated into detailed regional agreements covering particular fisheries modeled on such conventions as those of February 6, 1949, covering the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries, the approved Tokio treaty draft of December 14, 1951, covering the high seas fisheries of the North Pacific Ocean, and Canadian-American treaties for cooperative conservation of North Pacific coastal salmon and halibut fisheries. These treaties provide for international commissions with limited regulatory powers, appointed, however, under the authority of the parties to the treaties. The Commissions are not independent international authorities within the framework of the United Nations.

The possibilities of great contributions to human welfare and to the cause of good government by the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations and its Commissions and cooperating specialized agencies such as the Food and Agriculture Organization should not be depreciated. In the investigation and study of facts concerning sea fisheries, Commissions under the authority of the United Nations already are doing useful work, and valuable advice for the solving of the complicated legal problems of sea fisheries may come from the Council and its Commissions and cooperating agencies. Nevertheless a proposal to give any organization of this nature independent lawmaking or compulsory administrative powers of global scope over such important national economic interests as those in fisheries, has no chance of approval by States in the near

International agreements on a regional basis are a promising method for solution of conflicts of interests in particular fisheries and for promotion of conservation when the exploiters are of only a few nationalities and a mutuality of interest in an agreed settlement is recognized, but such agreements always are subject to the weakness that an exploiter whose state of nationality is not a party to the agreement may destroy its effectiveness. This has happened to whaling conventions. The early Pacific Sealing Convention and the North Sea Fisheries Convention were circumvented similarly by nationals of a party engaging in exploitation against convention regulations by employment of a ship registered under the flag of a nonsignatory state and officered by nationals of the flag state. The Commission's draft articles make no adequate provision against this sort of possibility.

A further objection to the draft articles is that although they recognize the special interest of a coastal state in extraterritorial coastal fisheries, they do not define the relative interests of the nationals of a coastal state against the opposing interests of foreign fishers nor provide a certain method of solving this important problem. It is to be noted also that conservation involves preventing overfishing as well as wasteful and destructive fishing and thus often would necessitate apportioning in some way a limited seasonal catch among exploiters of various nationalities. If conservation of the territorial fisheries of a coastal state is a prior interest in an extraterritorial fishery area, how is this priority to be measured and enforced? If this interest is to have no priority over those of foreign exploiters of the area, how is it to be equated with these foreign interests in seasons when the resources of the fishery are not sufficient to satisfy all consistently with conservation requirements?

Juridical Status of the Continental Shelf—Part III

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1954

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I should like to include part III of a report by the distinguished authority on international law, Dr. Joseph Walter Bingham, of Stanford University:

REPORT TO THE EIGHTH CONFERENCE OF THE INTER-AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION IN SAO PAULO, BRAZIL, MARCH 15–22, 1954—PART III

SUGGESTIONS FOR PROGRESSIVE SOLUTIONS OF PROBLEMS OF JURISDICTION AND CONTROL OVER SEA FISHING UNDER INTERNATIONAL LAW

Almost all the sharp controversies over sea fisheries that have arisen in modern times have involved this primary problem of conflict between exploiters from a coastal state and foreign invaders when the fishery was not ample to satisfy all exploiters. All the regional agreements mentioned as models in the Commission's report were devised to adjust such conflicts on a temporary or a permanent basis. The Tokyo North Pacific Fisheries Convention provides only a temporary armistice. It revives, extends, and formulizes the prewar informal temporary Japanese-American agreement that Japan would keep her nationals from invading American coastal salmon fisheries outside American territorial waters. It is not probable that the Japanese will refrain from resuming their invasion of Bristol Bay after the period of the Tokyo Convention and as soon as their international political situation permits. Exploitation of all available fisheries is too important to Japan's economy to justify abstention from those valuable ones of Alaska. Japan never has abandoned its claim of right to exploit these fisheries outside territorial waters against American claims of rights of exclusion.

It is of first importance then that the development of the international law of sea fisheries should solve this primary conflict, and I have mustered sufficient temerity to offer some suggestions for progress. My first and pervasive suggestion is that in seeking a solution we abandon all slogans, all political propaganda that the freedom of the seas is substantially threatened or that the venerable doctrine raises a barrier or even a presumption against a pragmatic decision in favor of coastal state jurisdiction beyond its territorial seas, which may have been rigidly limited by considerations other than those of fishery controls. As for all problems of the new international law of this unprecedented scientific age, the approach to this fishery problem should not be the traditional formulistic one, but a pragmatic and truly scientific one of factual determination of causes and consequences and of balancing of interests in the spirit of fair play and justice with the purposes of good government and of furthering the welfare of peoples.

In our legal balancing, of course, human welfare should outweigh the commercial profits of particular interests, however powerful their political influences or the governments which respond and support them. On the other hand, large, efficient, modernly equipped exploiters are an important factor in our world economy and the public interest in their services should be given due weight.

This leads to an observation that these fishery problems of law differ from region to region with economic, biologic, sociological, and political factors. Each fishery presents a separate concrete legal problem to be solved pragmatically and not avoided through sterile, dogmatic, traditional abstract formulas and political slogans.

We can start with what should be regarded as a simple case in which the balance of justice seems clear: the case of Icelandic fisheries as set forth in the excerpt from the Icelandic reply to the International Law Commission's request for comments which was quoted in the earlier part of my remarks. At stake is the economic survival of a people with limited available resources and possibilities. Invasion of these resources by foreign exploiters threatens a continued national existence on an economic scale satisfactory in our modern world. Why should any competent court on any ground of traditional abstractions, however important they may seem to reasoning on more complicated cases, decide against the Icelandic claim? Indeed the entire thesis of the Icelandic reply seems commonsense.

The case of the people of northern Norway involved in *United Kingdom* v. *Norway* adjudicated by the International Court of Justice in 1951 is similar. Probably in a similar category would fall the cases of Portugal and Spain and of many another small state and of many a people isolated from modern industrial development. Similar considerations are relevant to the case of Alaskan coastal fisheries. On the other hand the importance to national interests and to world economy of expert, well-equipped, roving fishing off foreign coasts has a juridical weight which in some cases cannot be overbalanced by arguments available to the opposing coastal state.

In my pevious talks and writings and professional advice on this topic I have offered the following suggestions: The jurisdiction of a State over its coastal fisheries should be limited to protection of the full productivity of its exclusive fisheries within its territorial seas, properly extended and limited by international law for fishery purposes. Beyond the scope of this protective jurisdiction fisheries outside territorial seas should be open to use by all. In pursuance of this idea different species of fish in each separate region might be classed as traditional coastal fish proper or high seas fish according as they fell among the sort of Continental Shelf fish traditionally exploited by the population of a coastal State or among those typically caught in commercial quantities in the deep high seas—such, for instance, as tuna. I now add an outline for a methodical development, case by case, through diplomatic and judicial processes toward a pacific and fair settlement of these troublesome problems. Always settlement by regional agreements between the interested parties should be the preferred method; but a sound framework for juridical adjustment is the best basis for encouragement of such agreements.

The basic principles which I propose for guidance in the development of this law are the following:

1. A coastal state should be conceded exclusive use and control of fisheries within its territorial seas as determined for this purpose, or, if the extent of its present territorial seas have not been determined for this purpose, then within an area of coastal sea so determined.

2. The determination of the area of exclusive fishery jurisdiction of a coastal State should not be guided by mechanical global rules, but by careful regional study of all persuasive factors, geologic, biologic, economic, political, and historical bearing on the problem of a pragmatic, fair, just solution of the particular concrete case. Rules should be based on a thorough survey of all decisions of particular cases within the scope of the rule. The reverse process leads to undesirable law.

3. For the protection of current use of its territorial fisheries up to their maximum capacity and for the prevention of damage to them, including depletion of their productive capacity—but for no other fishery purpose—a coastal state should be conceded jurisdiction over extraterritorial areas of sea fisheries.

4. Damage to a fishery, including depletion through over fishing, should be an international legal wrong for which any interested state should have a cause of action before any competent tribunal.

The report of the International Law Commission on its draft articles on fisheries approves this idea of legal wrong in the following passage.

"The Commission, in adopting the articles, was influenced by the view that the prohibition of abuse of rights is supported by judicial and other authority and is germane to the situation covered by the articles. A state which arbitrarily and without good reason, in rigid reliance upon the principle of the freedom of the seas, declines to play its part in measures reasonably necessary for the preservation of valuable, or often essential, resources from waste and exploitation, abuses a right conferred upon it by international law. The prohibition of abuse of rights, insofar as it constitutes a general principle of law recognized by civilized states, provides to a considerable extent a satisfactory legal basis for the general rule as formulated in article 3. To that extent it may be held that that article is not altogether in the nature of a drastic departure from the principles of international law. In fact, the Commission deems it desirable that, pending the general acceptance of the system proposed in article 3, enlightened states should consider themselves bound, even if by way of a mere imperfect legal obligation, to act on the view that it may be contrary to the very principle of the freedom of the seas to encourage or permit action which amounts to an abuse of a right and which is apt to destroy the natural resources whose preservation and common use have been one of the main objects of the doctrine of the freedom of the sea. This is so although the Commission is of the opinion that the articles adopted fall generally within the category of development of international law."

My suggestions thus far cover the extent of the jurisdiction of coastal states over foreign exploiters, in cases where coastal state priority is deemed currently just. The adjustment of uses between foreign exploiters is a more difficult problem. If fishing is unrestricted the results may be those of an overcrowded fishery—gradual ruination and abandonment as catches become too small for economic profit. The experiences of the North Sea fisheries and of the American and Canadian Pacific salmon and halibut fisheries are examples. They are instructive illustrations of the need for conservation measures. But conservation measures mean restrictions on freedom of sea fishing. They mean also apportioning a supply insufficient for all comers. How could this apportionment be made? The supply could be divided equally or proportionately between all applicants, or it could be awarded to prior comers up to the limit of the total catch allowed for the season. Or it could be awarded by some scheme of priority based on continued past use of the fishery by particular exploiters and their predecessors or by certain nationalities. Any system of administrative supervision requires checking and policing and perhaps registration of ships. Adoption of the basis of apportionment which would admit all comers and apportion the total permitted catch among them seems inpracticable. Administration and policing would be difficult and a large number of exploiters would tend to make individual portions too small for profit. Therefore some applicants must be excluded from participation each season if the fishery is a popular one.

These considerations account for the intense hostility of Americans against admission of Japanese (or Europeans) to the Alaskan salmon fisheries, even under American conservation controls. Admission of foreigners on a basis of equality would diminish the amount of American participation in the seasonal catch.

I do not purpose an attempt to solve this difficult problem of apportionment in this report. I do not like a priori solutions, especially in legal matters where the economic and social prejudices and the cultural traditions of peoples play a potent natural and often a justifiable part in a viable solution. I suggest that when agreements cannot be negotiated or do not solve urgent problems, judicial methods are available if peoples are willing and the capacities of our profession, and particularly of international tribunals, are sufficient for constructive nonformulistic, nondoctrinaire, case-by-case lawmaking to meet the needs of our shrunken industrial world in this continuously changing, unprecedented scientific age of rapid technological progress.

The International Court of Justice could be used to determine controversies between states over rights in a particular fishery and their exact limits, and to adjudicate all matters affecting relative rights of use and of jurisdiction to regulate. If the Court will assume the function of deciding such cases with the constructive, pragmatic intelligence and interested ability which it demonstrated in the case of *United Kingdom* v. *Norway* and if our diplomats will be permitted to pursue their conciliatory functions with a similar spirit and wisdom, there will be little need of global legislative prescriptions for a start on a satisfactory course of progress.

As an instructive historical model for salutary desirable lawmaking in the traditional spirit of great judges of the common law—I suggest for study the case by case development through the past century in the State and Federal courts of California of the basic features of our novel water law. The legal problems which our judges had to solve were very similar indeed to those of sea fisheries, in the competitive claims to use of public natural resources which they concerned, in conflict of interests and political influences and regional variation of conditions, in demand for fresh, flexible and pragmatic juridical thought and novel decisions. Our judges fashioned the law to the social pressures and economic needs of the growth of the new western settlements which gave it birth and their solutions of conflicting claims of riparians and appropriators and of appropriator against appropriator may suggest analogous solutions of conflicts between coastal state exploiters and foreigners and between foreign exploiters of different nationalities.

The International Law Commission has inserted in its tentative draft articles on territorial seas a phrase limiting a coastal state's exclusive proprietary fishery rights to 3 miles seaward from its base line for measuring the width of its territorial seas, although those seas have a wider range for other purposes. It provides that a coastal state may regulate the use of fisheries within its territorial seas beyond this 3-mile limit for purposes of conservation, but that it must admit foreign fishers to this extra area on an equal basis with its nationals. This provision, whch seems strangely out of place since the Commission has drafted a code on fisheries, reflects the persistent historic policy of England, of the Netherlands, of Germany, of Japan, and of the United States—of the old naval powers—favoring their roving fishers against the interests of smaller coastal states such as Iceland, Portugal, and Norway. It runs contrary to the interests of almost all other coastal states and to the judgment in *United Kingdom* v. *Norway*. That it will meet with acceptance from more than 8 or 9 states seems very unlikely. Certainly it would have unsocial effects if it should be applied categorically all over the world.

No doubt this strict limitation of coastal State proprietorship of sea fisheries would be approved by certain world minded, neo-Malthusian inspired economists who are very active in the promotion of projects for global conservation of sea food resources under the authority of international agencies. Indeed these public spirited propagandists would like to abolish nationalistic controls and preferences entirely; but their proposed substitute, common use of all peoples up to the shoreline under international governing authority, will continue to be a visionary hope for many years to come.

I should like to end this report with a tribute of appreciation to all those able, earnest colleagues who have contributed to the great progress which has been accomplished in the past 5 years toward the determination of jurisdiction over the resources of the Continental Shelf and of the waters which cover it; to the members of the International Law Commission for their earnest and intelligent discussions; to Prof. J. P. A. François for his capable reports to the Commission and his patient drafting of the articles agreed on; to the members of this association, of the International Law Association, of the Institut de Droit International and of the International Bar Association who have made possible the interesting debates on the Continental Shelf at their meetings during the past 5 years; to the many learned students and jurists who have made contributions to understanding of the complexities of the topic and to progress in solution of its problems.

Without prejudice to others of this brotherhood, I would mention especially the following: Jonkheer P. R. Feith, of the Netherlands, whose advocacy at the 1948 meeting of the International Law Association in Brussels aroused the interest of its members in this topic and who by his studious and earnest reports stimulated the progress which has been made; Mr. Henry F. Holland, of Texas, who has spent much time and interest on the topic and presented a paper on it at the Montevideo Conference of this Association in 1951; Dr. Eduardo Jiménez de Aréchaga, of Uruguay, who at the same conference presented a paper prepared by three of his students; Prof. Gilbert Gidel, of France, one of the great leaders in this development of law, who organized the discussions at the last conference of the International Bar Association in Madrid; Sir Cecil B. Hurst, of Great Britain; Prof. A. de La Pradelle, of France; Prof. C. H. M. Waldock, of Oxford, the chairman of the present committee of the International Law Association on this topic; Richard Young, of Harvard University, who in his writings has contributed much to clarify the geologic facts and linguistic difficulties associated with the use of the term "Continental Shelf" in legal discussions and who now is working as rapporteur under Professor Waldock as chairman on a further report on the topic for the Edinburgh meeting of the International Law Association next summer; L. C. Green, of University College, London; Dr. M. W. Mouton, of the Netherlands, for his excellent book on the topic published in 1952, which was awarded the Grotius prize of the Institute of International Law; Dr. José Luis de Azcárraga y de Bustamante, of Spain, for his excellent monograph and his earnest scholarly advocacy of the doctrine; William W. Bishop, of the University of Michigan; Prof. H. Lauterpacht, of Cambridge; F. A. Vallat, of Spain.

All these gentlemen and agencies and many others, in an admirable display of collaborative professional enterprise during the past 14 years have contributed to an important development of the international law of sea areas. This development now has arrived at a stage which justifies, in my opinion, a declaration by this association that the ideas embodied in the articles on the Continental Shelf submitted in its last report by the International Law Commission of the United Nations to the General Assembly have become by the official unilateral action of many states and the official opinions of others and the tacit acquiescence of all the rest, a part of the international common law of our modern world. Of course, the certain definition of details and the controversies over further extensions of the extraterritorial jurisdiction of coastal states and the troublesome problems of the extent of territorial seas and contiguous zones remain to be further debated before a similar general agreement will bring a similarly settled positive law on these matters.

Whether we should approve or disapprove a statement that the doctrine of the Continental Shelf as embodied in the report of the International Law Commission now has become a doctrine of settled international law is really a question of semantics and not of law. Logically the answer depends on what we mean by law. In view of the clear evidence that certainly from now on State practice in our modern world will not controvert the main principles of the articles on the Continental Shelf contained in the report of the International Law Commission, this semantic question is academic. What we should do is to recognize by our resolution that state practice has, does, and will endorse the doctrine of the Continental Shelf as far as it is embodied in the International Law Commission's draft. The language in which we do this is a minor matter.

JOSEPH WALTER BINGHAM.
STANFORD UNIVERSITY, CALIFORNIA.

Public Laws 359–364, Inclusive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 3, 1954

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent, I am extending my remarks to include my report to my constituents in the Second District of Illinois on the new laws enacted by this Congress, as follows:

TWENTY-FIFTH REPORT ON LEGISLATION OF THE 83D CONGRESS

DEAR FRIEND: Up to May 26, 1954, a total of 365 bills passed by House and Senate of the 83d Congress (288 in the 1st session, 77 in the 2d session) had been signed by the President, thus becoming the laws of the land. On May 27 the President signed 6 other bills, on May 28, 7 more, and another on May 29.

Continuing from where we left off:

PUBLIC LAW 359

H. R. 6896, claims of war prisoners

This extends from April 9, 1953, to August 1, 1954, the time in which prisoners of war in World War II may present their claims for compensation at the rate of $1.50 a day for the period of enemy detention. Those eligible and who have not already applied may obtain forms for filing claims by writing the War Claims Commission, Washington, D. C.

The War Claims Commission, which will go out of existence at the end of March of 1955, was created by an act of the 81st Congress for which I cast your vote. Some 119,000 claims were filed by American prisoners of war, 74,000 by Philippine prisoners of war. It is estimated 16,000 American, 78,000 Filipino eligibles have not filed up to date. They (including certain survivors) should act promptly. The average individual payment to American war prisoners has been $549, to Filipinos $248. The money comes, not from American taxpayers, but from the sale of German and Japanese properties by the Alien Property Custodian.

The first chairman of the War Claims Commission was our late beloved neighbor from the Second District, Daniel F. Cleary. He literally worked himself to death in the accomplishment of one of the outstanding public services of our country. He now sleeps in Arlington Cemetery, a hero in war and in peace resting in the soil dedicated to American devotion and American heroism. The War Claims Commission, the bulk of its work accomplished before his passing is Dan Cleary's monument.

PUBLIC LAW 360

H. R. 6251, Shoshone Cavern National Monument

Here is an illustration of how Federal and municipal governments can cooperate to solve a problem in the public interest. In 1909 the United States set aside 210 acres for the establishment of the Shoshone Cavern National Monument. Being inaccessible, nothing further was done. Now the city of Cody, Wyo., is willing to take over. It will develop the area as a public park and construct an access road from the Cody-Yellowstone Highway. Public Law 360 authorizes the transfer of the land to Cody exclusively for that purpose. It adds up to the public getting the recreational and scenic delights originally intended, and the Federal Government saved the expense of upkeep.

PUBLIC LAW 361

H. R. 6549, Jefferson National Expansion Memorial

You will find interest in the authorization of a Jefferson National Expansion Memorial at St. Louis, Mo., but I suggest caution against immediate expectancy. Public Law 361 provides that the authorization of an appropriation is effective only when the Federal budget has been balanced.

The plan envisions a commanding riverfront memorial to commemorate the Louisiana Purchase of March 9, 1804, by President Thomas Jefferson. This purchase, as every schoolboy knows, marked the opening of the great western domain. In 1934 the Federal Government put $6,750,000, the city of St. Louis $2,250,000, into the development of the Old St. Louis area as an historic site. Litigation, World War II, then Korea held up further progress. Now it is the unbalanced budget.

Public Law 361, looking ahead to the glad day when Federal income will tab with Federal outgo, authorizes at that time an appropriation of $5 million for the completion of the memorial conditioned on St. Louis or other non-Federal sources matching each $3 with an additional $1.

PUBLIC LAW 362

H. R. 6988, University of Wyoming

In 1944 the United States granted 24 acres of land in the Shoshone Reclamation project to the University of Wyoming for exclusive use as an agricultural experiment station. Public Law 362 permits its exchange for a larger tract made necessary by the expansion of the university's farm experimental and research work. Part of the 24 acres traded will afford sites for new buildings for the Northwest Community College at Powell. Everyone benefits from the swap.

PUBLIC LAW 363

H. R. 8377, Columbia River Basin

This increases by $16 million the authorization for flood control and water power development in the Columbia River Basin in order to clear the way for an appropriation to continue the work now in progress on Dalles Dam in Oregon. Actually Public Law 363 is expected to save the Federal Government an anticipated revenue of $12 million from sale of hydroelectric power which otherwise would be lost by a year's delay in construction.

The comprehensive program of the Corps of Army Engineers for the Columbia River Basin (draining 259,000 square miles on the Pacific slope) finally will reach an estimated $2 billion. Authorizations, however, are made as the work progresses and as of date totaled $267 million, of which $233 million had been appropriated. That left a balance of $34 million available for current appropriations, insufficient to continue the work now in progress. Public Law 363 made possible the orderly and uninterrupted continuance of the program necessary to the economic development of the great Northwest. Otherwise, the completion of Dalles Dam (with anticipated annual intake of $12 million) would have been delayed 1 year.

PUBLIC LAW 364

H. R. 8097, District of Columbia Public Works Act of 1954

Public Law 364 provides for the financing of a comprehensive public-works program which, among other items, includes (a) $35 million in new schools, (b) $46 million in a sewage system replacing an ancient and dangerous system, part of which is 99 years old, (c) $14 million for modernized hospitals, (d) $9 milion for homes for the aged and for children and other welfare facilities, (e) $8 million for penal institutions, and (f) $16 million for expansion of facilities for recreation, sanitation, libraries, and public safety.

Article 1, section 8, clause 7 of our Constitution gives to the Congress the exclusive jurisdiction over 10 square miles (the District of Columbia) and all useful buildings thereon. Times have changed. The District of Columbia has become one large city with 52 percent of its 10 square miles tax exempt.

Public Law 364 increases by $9 million the annual contribution of the Federal Government. Taxation on real estate is fixed at a minimum of 2.20 percent on assessed value. Tax on accommodations to transients is increased from 2 to 3 percent, meaning that you and other visitors to Washington annually will chip in about $200,000 more to Washington's upkeep.

Public Law 364 also imposes a sales tax on groceries and on meals costing from 50 cents to $1.25, which is expected to yield $5 million a year. You will find my reasons for opposing this tax on pages 3453 and 3454 of the Congressional Record of March 22, 1954. I argued that the public works program should be carried forward, but the burden should not be placed on the worker's basket of groceries and the citizen trying to make both ends meet by budgeting on 50-cent dinners.

I voted to recommit the bill for the elimination of this unfair sales tax. This motion defeated, I voted for the final passage of the bill because of (a) the urgent need of the public works contemplated and (b) the prudency of undertaking needed public works at this time as some offset to growing unemployment.

Cordially and sincerely,

Barratt O'Hara,
Member of Congress.

The Paper Curtain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 3, 1954

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I wish to include an editorial entitled "The Paper Curtain" which appeared in the Ukrainian Bulletin of May 15, and also an article appearing in the same issue entitled "Irish and the Ukrainians":

The Paper Curtain

On April 2, 1954, Representative Michael A. Feighan, of Ohio, stated in the House:

"On February 16, 1954, I inserted in the Congressional Record, page A1236, a transcript of the Georgetown University Forum which had taken place on Sunday, November 15, 1953. I was amazed when I had a telephone call several days later from the Reverend Daniel E. Power, program director of the forum, telling me of a complaint he had received regarding the forum program. There is a person called Mr. Sergius Yakobson, who holds the title of Chief, Slavic and East European Division of the Library of Congress, who made a serious allegation challenging the integrity of Georgetown University and the forum it sponsors."

The said Mr. Yakobson had charged: "I watched the television program on What is Russia? on the Georgetown University Forum; however, there was no reference to me, to the Legislative Reference Service, or to the Library. It must have been interpolated later for one reason or another."

And the said Mr. Yakobson, whose brother is a former cultural attaché of the Soviet Mission in Prague and presently on the Harvard faculty, charged even more—unfortunately for him.

THE FIGHTING PROFESSOR

Unfortunately, because of the presence in our country of Dr. Roman Smal-Stocki, astute DP Ukrainian scholar now on the faculty of Marquette University and who is a champion of the democratic ideal. He wrote in his monumental study, the Nationality Problem of the Soviet Union, "We greeted the Statue of Liberty with enthusiasm * * * Later there came the first chilling breezes * * * behind the Statue of Liberty (were) some old friends from Europe."

Mr. Yakobson proved to be one such old friend.

For he also charged that, contrary to statements made on the forum:

1. He was not responsible for Communism in Action (H. Doc. No. 754, and Russia First-tinged official study of the problem of the non-Russian nations of the Soviet Union submitted by the Library of Congress to the Congress);
2. He had not minimized the non-Russian nations in his report, Tensions Within the Soviet Union;
3. He had not insulted the Ukrainian Church by use of the word "sect";
4. Suchasna Ukraina, Ukrainian newspaper published in Munich, had praised his Tensions.

Professor Smal-Stocki, in an exhaustive memo to Ernest S. Griffith, Director of the Legislative Reference Service, made intellectual mincemeat of these assertions.

PIERCING THE PAPER CURTAIN

Before proceeding to the fighting professor's analysis, the matter of the integrity of Georgetown University is in order. This was neatly cleared up by Reverend Power:

"Dr. Yakobson, reputedly a competent scholar, either did not read the entire text or read parts of it hurriedly. On page A1236 it is clearly stated 'radio' forum. Had Dr. Yakobson scanned the entire insertion with the same eagerness he manifested in imputing motives for alleged interpolation, he, as a sound scholar, would not have confused the television forum, which he says he saw, and the radio forum, part of the transcript of which he could not possibly have read."

Dr. Smal-Stocki was not less incisive in his memo, read into the Congressional Record by Congressman Feighan. In persuing it, one is not surprised at the fact that the invitation which had been extended to the same Dr. Yakobson to appear on the Georgetown University Forum in question, was declined by him with the announcement that Dr. Smal-Stocki would also participate.

The DP professor wrote that it was an incontrovertible fact that Dr. Yakobson, then Library consultant, had reviewed Communism in Action in its entirety. Hence Dr. Yakobson could not dodge responsibility for its objectivity and truthfulness. Dr. Smal-Stocki continued:

"But in spite of his rejection for any responsibility for the misinformation given to the Congress—and this rejection is in reality an avowal about the quality of that information—the former consultant of the Library attempts to minimize the basic importance of the quotation from Corliss Lamont's book by stating that 'Corliss Lamont's book is quoted once.' But the whole chapter Nationalities is based on Corliss Lamont's book. * * * Thus the tragic fact is on record that the Library of Congress, with the approval of its consultant, Dr. Yakobson, presented to the Congress the crucial problem of the Soviet Union, the fight of the non-Russian nations against the Russian communism dictatorship, on the basis of pro-Communist books, silencing in bibliographical references the whole anti-Communist literature on that subject."

A SECT IS A SECT IS A SECT

Pressing the point, Dr. Smal-Stocki wrote: "Mr. Sergius Yakobson, an employee of the Library of Congress, as a scholar, used a similar method of silencing the anti-Communist publications from 1946–50 in the compilations of the bibliography of articles in the American Historical Review * * * and in the bibliography of Five Hundred Books About Russia, published by the Library of Congress. This term 'Russia' includes here the whole Soviet Union, but the bibliography which influenced all university libraries lists only three books on the peoples of Russia. Any objective bibliography about the Soviet Union where academic freedom does not exist should in addition include the free voice of the scholars who have been emigres since 1920 and have created a whole literature about all aspects of the non-Russian nations and the Russian regime itself."

As for Dr. Yakobson's assertion that he had not minimized the non-Russian nations in his Tensions, the Marquette professor conclusively rebutted such by a statistical analysis and, more important, by pointing to the false connotations created by the presentation of the non-Russian nations as minorities (they outnumber the ethnic Russians). He added:

"These minorities as a tension problem in the Soviet Union were put in the report in fourth place, behind the Soviet Youth and Soviet Intelligentsia chapter, thus creating the impression (so dear to official propaganda) that the Russian Communist regime has already formed a Soviet people with a Soviet youth, Soviet intelligentsia, and Soviet scholars. But that the problem of the non-Russian nations is the paramount tension in the Soviet Union is clearly shown by the Beria case, the present celebrations of the 300th anniversary of the alliance of Ukraine and Muscovy, by all the ideological troubles of the Russian Communists with history, literature, philology of all non-Russian nations * * * and finally by the history of the last 30 years. And Russian cultural imperialism, the reason for the tension, is also not sufficiently elaborated."

Although it must have pained Dr. Smal-Stocki, he, as had Dr. Yakobson, consulted Webster's for the meaning of the word "sect." He found: "especially, an organized body of dissenters from an established or older form of faith," precisely the sense in which Dr. Yakobson had employed the word.

Lastly, with regard to the newspaper, Suchasna Ukraina, Dr. Yakobson had simply quoted out of context.

BLUNTING OUR WEAPON

Hence we see once again the old imperialist great Russia line still being peddled. Here again in effect is the denial of the rightful aspirations to independence of the enslaved nations of the U. S. S. R. through a paper curtain in these United States.

Concealed from Americans is the tremendous centrifugal force represented by the non-Russian nations of the U. S. S. R. Is it not the height of irony that we should tolerate and even finance those instruments working toward the deprivation of our most formidable weapon against Russian communism imperialism?

Irish and Ukrainians

Mention of the Ukrainians was made by Representative Michael A. Feighan, of Ohio, in his St. Patrick's Day radio address. The Irish are a people who have always been determined "to rise again in dignity and honor to national sovereignty."

Read into the Congressional Record on March 5, 1954, part of Congressman Feighan's address read:

"Just as the Irish are identified by their devotion to Christianity so are they known for their willingness to die for the cause of liberty and human freedom. There is scarce a spot on earth where the struggle for liberty has taken place in which some Irishmen have not played a noble part. * * *

"The Irish hold no monopoly on being persecuted as a race or as a nation. * * *

"The uprooted sons and daughters of Poland, thrown to the four winds by this new tyranny, look to their patron saint—St. Casimir—just as the Irish have always looked to their patron saint, St. Patrick. So do the sons and daughters of Hungary look to St. Stephen. In the same manner do the Lithuanians look to blessed Cunegurda; the Byelorussians look to St. Andrew, the apostle; the Slovaks and the Ukrainians look to the brother saints Cyril and Methodius; the Armenians look to St. Gregory Eliminator; the Georgians look to the apostle St. Nino; the Rumanians look to the apostle St. Nicetas; the Latvians and Estonians look to Bishop Albert. * * *

"Indeed, all the enslaved nations have their patron saints to give them strength in their hour of martyrdom."

Views of an Airman, First Class

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1954

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I think it is a matter of great interest to all Members to give the views of an airman, first class, in the United States Air Force. Not having his permission to include his name, for obvious, reasons it is being deleted, but his letter to me follows:

MAY 18, 1954.

The Honorable FRANK T. BOW,
Congressman, 16th District, Ohio.

DEAR SIR: Some time ago I wrote to you asking for the 1953 edition of the Yearbook of Agriculture. Before closing I mentioned that if you desired I would give you my personal impressions gained from being in the service of my country. Your most welcome answer, which arrived a few days later, stated that you would be interested in knowing how I felt toward military life.

Ever since I received your letter many thoughts have passed through my mind; no doubt, many of them would have interested you. Due to my failure to record these reflections as they came to me, I will do my best to show you what I have gained from being in the Air Force.

First of all, any given problem is what a person makes of it. He can be either pugnacious toward it or he can try to attack it in a scientific manner. The same principle applies to any individual about to serve his country.

When I enlisted in 1951 I went in the Air Force with this thought in mind. I was determined to make the next 4 years that confronted me a success. I have the impression that if a man cannot make a go of the service, how can he ever expect to be successful in civilian life? I may be wrong, but I live by this simple rule.

After finishing my basic training at Sheppart Field, Tex., I was sent to Bethesda, Md., to attend the Naval Medical School. This school, being one of the longest service schools, lasted 14 months. After graduation I was ordered to Clovis, N. Mex., whereupon I stayed approximately 6 months. I was sent to Hahn, Germany, with the 50th Fighter Bomber Wing in July 1953. My next trip will be back to the United States, where I will be discharged.

Now comes the big question. What has the service done for me? When I finished Kent State University in 1951 I did not feel that I was quite ready to accept a teaching position. It is a sort of uneasiness that we all go through sometime during our lives. I decided that by the time 4 years of military service were over I would be ready to settle down so I enlisted in the Air Force.

These past 3 years have shown me many lessons, the most priceless one being how to get along with people and, secondly how to be thrifty and economical. I have found that if a man tries hard enough he can make good no matter what duty is assigned to him, if he applies himself.

It will be impossible to repay the Air Force for the education it has given me. These past 3 years have been an education in themselves, not only by going to Bethesda, but also by being sent overseas. Many of the men complain about the duty over here, but as yet I have to make a complaint, either verbally or to my parents, when writing home. I feel that being here in Europe is something that would have taken me many years to accomplish in civilian life.

I hope that what has been said will give you a picture of my thoughts toward the military. If you would like to know something specific, which I have not mentioned, please convey your thouhgts to me and I will do my best to answer them for you.

I would like, in the future, to write you my thoughts on the world situation, that is, if you are interested.

In closing I want to thank you very much for your thoughtfulness in sending the Yearbook.

Sincerely.

Jefferson Davis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. SMITH

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 28, 1954

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, today, June 3, is the 146th anniversary of the birthday of Jefferson Davis. Under unanimous consent, I include an address which I delivered 1 year ago today in Statuary Hall at a United Daughters of the Confederacy ceremony honoring the Confederate President:

We do honor today to a great American. Jefferson Davis attained his greatest fame as the President of the Confederate States of America, but his record as a Member of Congress, as a soldier, and as Secretary of War, is one of which any American can be proud. It is most appropriate that the State of Mississippi has chosen to honor its most distinguished son by placing his likeness in Statuary Hall beside that of another great American military hero—Robert E. Lee.

On the 145th anniversary of his birth, it is well to look back at Jefferson Davis' birthplace on a small Kentucky farm. His father, Samuel, had been a captain in the Revolution, but he was a hard-working farmer whose 10 children joined him in the cultivation of his crops in the fields. Jefferson, named after the great President then in office, was the 10th child.

The Davises were not of the landed aristocracy. Jefferson's grandfather, Evan, was a laborer who migrated from Wales. Samuel Davis took his family from one small farm to another in Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, and Mississippi. His son, Joseph, in the best American tradition, prospered as a planter in Mississippi, not through inherited wealth, but through his own energy and efforts.

After attending Transylvania College in Kentucky, where he had four classmates who were later to serve with him in the United States Senate, young Jefferson Davis was appointed and graduated from the United States Military Academy at West Point. Young Lieutenant Davis planned to make the military his chosen career, and his first campaign was in the Black Hawk War, where one of the volunteer militiamen was another young man born in Kentucky about the same time as Davis—Abraham Lincoln.

At Fort Crawford, Lieutenant Davis' commanding officer was Col. Zachary Taylor, one of the ranking officers of the Army, and a proud Virginia Whig. Jefferson Davis immediately fell in love with his daughter—Colonel Taylor did not consider an improvident young officer, without property of his own, a proper match for his daughter. The marriage was forbidden. The young lovers refused to accept the edict, however. Davis resigned from the Army and took Sarah Knox Taylor south as his bride. The happy love story was a brief one with a tragic ending. Young Sarah Davis died 6 weeks after she became a bride, still unreconciled with her family. The deep personal tragedy took many years for Jefferson Davis to outgrow. He lived in seclusion on his brother's plantation, and did not actively enter into the life of the community until nearly 10 years later, shortly before he married young Varina Howell, of Natchez, who was to be an ideal helpmate all through the triumphs and tribulations still ahead.

Jefferson Davis was a member of the House of Representatives when the War with Mexico began. He immediately resigned his seat, returned to Mississippi, and organized an infantry regiment, the 1st Mississippi Rifles, which he was elected to command. The Mississippi regiment led the final assault at Monterrey. Their colonel was at the front of the attack which overwhelmed street barricades and fortified houses. Colonel Davis was about to attack the main body of Mexican troops when their commander asked for terms.

A few weeks later the Mexicans regrouped under the famed Gen. Santa Anna, after American troops had been withdrawn from the northern front. On February 22, Santa Anna, with an army of 20,000 attacked the 5,000 Americans at the village of Buena Vista. The first attack folded up the American regiment on the left, and the entire American force appeared on the verge of collapse when the Mississippi Rifles were ordered to charge. In the face of enemy fire, Davis led his riflemen forward until they formed a line at right angles with an Indiana regiment. Two concerted assaults against the "V" shaped line were mounted by Santa Anna, but the long line of riflemen never gave ground. When the second assault was broken the two American regiments moved out into attack, completing routing the overwhelming enemy force.

Col. Jefferson Davis, who had fought through the battle though wounded in the fighting, was the hero of Buena Vista, second only to Gen. Zachary Taylor, the commanding general. On the field of battle the father and son-in-law had become reconciled.

Appointed to the Senate upon his return to Mississippi, Davis served in that body until Mississippi seceded, except for 4 years in which he was Secretary of War under President Franklin Pierce. The role of Senator Davis in the historic legislative struggles which preceded the War Between the

States is well known. The fact that he was among the moderate leaders of the South is less well known, as is the fact that moderates in the North recognized him for his efforts—at the height of the ill feeling he was given an honorary degree by Bowdoin College, and gave a major speech at Faneuil Hall in Boston.

Other aspects of his service as Senator and Secretary are worthy of our attention. Senator Davis was a leader of the expansionist forces who sought to bring further territory on the North American continent into the United States. He was primarily responsible for the Gadsden Purchase, without which New Mexico and Arizona would probably not have been States today. No man contributed more toward the building of the first transcontinental railroad. Would our country have its present continental scope if those who opposed the expansion of that period had had their way?

Senator Davis was a leader in the fight against the Know-Nothing Party of the period, which proposed to stop further immigration to America. He declared, "I have an utter detestation for the Native American Party and for its sordid character and arrogant assumption." If those who wanted to close the door to America a century ago had had their way, could our country have ever developed to its present greatness?

The cleavage in the Union and the War Between the States came despite the best efforts of moderate leaders, both North and South. Although he had upheld the right of secession, Jefferson Davis had not sought it. When it came, like Robert E. Lee, he gave his first loyalty to his State. Mississippi was proud to offer Jefferson Davis as the President of the Confederacy, the one man who had the confidence of the entire South. Davis accepted this responsibility, too, even though he would have much preferred a military assignment.

There is no time here to review the record of the only President of the Confederate States. There were many mistakes, but any fair student can only marvel that there were not many more in the impossible tasks which confronted the Confederacy. The States had exercised their sovereignty in seceding from the Union—few of the individual State leaders could understand their new responsibility of yielding some of that sovereignty in the interest of the common overall purpose of winning independence. The task of the President of the Confederacy was an impossible one from the beginning.

Today we can all accept without question the knowledge that the outcome was to the best interest of the United States and to the world as a whole. This does not mean, however, that we of the South cannot be proud of the high ideals which motivated our forefathers, or of the courage and honor with which they fought for them.

I am especially grateful for the splendid role which the United Daughters of the Confederacy has played in keeping alive the record of matchless valor and spendid ideals which is that of the Confederate States of America.

No man has a greater cause for bitterness than Jefferson Davis, imprisoned as the symbol of the Confederacy, too proud to ask for a pardon for following a course which he believed to be fully justified in the law and the Constitution. Yet he showed none.

His words of advice at a reunion of the Army of Northern Virginia are most fitting to close this talk, for they seem to me to express a basic goal for the UDC. President Davis said: "In referring therefore to the days of the past and the glorious cause you have served—a cause that was dignified by the honor in which you maintained it—I seek but to revive a memory which should be dear to you and pass on to your children as a memory which teaches the highest lessons of manhood, of truth, and of adherence to duty—duty to your State, duty to your principles, duty to the truth, duty to your buried parents, and duty to your coming children."

Those of us who are sons and daughters of the Confederacy can follow that advice for generations yet to come.

If We Must Fight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. POLK
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 3, 1954

Mr. POLK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include in the RECORD an editorial from the Cincinnati Post of Saturday, May 29, 1954. This editorial expresses so well my own views concerning why the United States should not send American soldiers to fight in Indochina, that I wish to call it to the attention of the House.

The editorial follows:

IF WE MUST FIGHT

The free world faces even graver alternatives in Indochina than those that led to the 1950 decision to fight in Korea, according to Adm. Robert B. Carney, Chief of Naval Operations.

The admiral did not predict that the holocaust would come tomorrow. But he said: "The danger is imminent and it is increasing swiftly."

This speech by the Nation's chief naval officer is being interpreted as a warning that the United States must be prepared for the possibility of joining the fighting in Indochina.

Since the speech was cleared by the Defense and State Departments, apparently the public mind is being conditioned for that possibility. And if that is the intention, we must dissent.

We can accept the admiral's general thesis regarding the gravity of the Communist menace without agreeing that the United States has any business fighting in the jungles of Indochina, when the real enemies are in Moscow and Peiping.

It was not so long ago when military voices in equally high places were telling us that in Korea we were fighting the wrong enemy, in the wrong place, at the wrong time. The enemy we were fighting in Korea was Red China. The implication was that the real enemy was the Soviet Union.

Well, whom would we be fighting in Indochina? Russia? No. Not even Red China. We would be fighting natives of Vietnam. Some Vietnamese, however mistaken they may be, believe they are fighting for their national independence, against France, long their colonial overlord.

Our armed intervention in such a war would be regarded as intervention in behalf of foreign imperialism. We cannot afford to appear in this false light before the millions in Asia who want to be our friends.

That there must be some kind of a showdown with international communism there can be no question. But if that issue must be resolved by fighting we should not dissipate our energies and resources pursuing dupes and puppets in areas of the enemy's choosing.

On any real showdown we must deal with Moscow and Peiping and our strength should be conserved to that end.

Anticommunism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 26, 1954

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, following is the text of an address delivered by the Most Reverend Bernard J. Sheil, auxiliary bishop of Chicago, before an international educational conference of the United Auto Workers, CIO, held in the Civic Opera House, Chicago, April 9, 1954:

I would like to talk about a subject we hear a lot of these days—anticommunism. Note that I said anticommunism. I think it is necessary that we give a little thought to just what form anticommunism should take at this point in America's history. That all decent Americans are against communism, I should think, would go without saying. That we are opposed to communism, both as individuals and as a nation—and why—hardly needs an explanation. I know that I could stand here and tell you what you already know. I could tell you that communism is morally evil because it is militantly, viciously, one might even say diabolically, set against God and man. I could tell you that communism deprives men and women of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. I could detail the bloody history of communism as it operates in every land where it has taken hold. I could repeat the story of Communist treason in the United States. I could outline the well-known attempts of the Communists to infiltrate into our great national institutions. In a word, I could match the oratory so familiar to all of us. Or I could try to. But what purpose would be served in going over all that we know to be so bitterly true? The problem is no longer one of alerting people to the danger of communism. We are all aware of that danger. The problem we are facing is what do we do about it. The unsolved problem, in other words, is what constitutes effective anticommunism. More than that, what kind of anticommunism is moral? What kind of anticommunism is proper in a freedom-loving country like ours? The three go together, in my mind. If anticommunism is immoral, it is not effective. You cannot effectively fight immorality with more immorality. If anticommunism flouts the principles of democracy and freedom, it is not in the long run effective. You cannot effectively fight tyranny with tyranny. And if anticommunism is not effective, it is so much sound and fury, signifying nothing.

It is not enough to say that someone is anti-Communist to win my support. It has been said that patriotism is the scoundrel's last refuge. In this day and age anticommunism is sometimes the scoundrel's first defense. As I remember, one of the noisiest anti-Communists of recent history was a man named Adolf Hitler. He was not wrong because he was anti-Communist. He was wrong because he was immorally anti-Communist; he countered Communist tyranny with a tyranny of his own. And inevitably, Herr Hitler was a dismal failure as an anti-Communist. Half of his own Germany now lives under communism and half of Europe lives in Communist slavery. Would this be true, I wonder, if Hitler had been morally anti-Communist? If Hitler had fought Communist tyranny with democratic freedom, the world we live in, I am persuaded, would be quite different today. And I venture to say there would be less, not more, communism in it than there is.

No Hitler has risen in America, and I must say that I think it is nonsense when foreign reporters and journalists describe us as living in a kind of Hitlerian reign of terror. We are still free, and we will remain free. Let's have no doubts about that. But it seems to me that now, while we are free, is the time to cry out against the phoney anticommunism that mocks our way of life, flouts our traditions and democratic procedures and our sense of fair play, feeds on the meat of suspicion, and grows great on the dissension among Americans which it cynically creates and keeps alive by a mad pursuit of headlines.

How much more of this are we going to tolerate before we remember that we are proud Americans with values of our own? If we throw those values away—and I am referring to our traditions of innocent until proved guilty; I am referring to our concern for means as well as ends; I am referring to our trust in our basic institutions—then we will be left with our anticommunism, but very little else.

An America where the accused is guilty until he is proved innocent, where means don't matter but only ends, an America which has lost faith in the integrity of the Government, the Army, the schools, the churches, the labor unions, press, and, most of all, an America whose citizens have lost faith in each other—such an America would not need to bother about being anti-Communist; it would have nothing to lose.

Such an America would have nothing to recommend it to freedom-loving men—nothing at all, not even the shining image of its victorious junior Senator from Wisconsin.

In my view, we have been victims in the last few years of a kind of shell game. We have been treated like country rubes, to be taken in by a city slicker from Appleton. "Now we see it; now you don't"—the Government is full of Communists; we are all in mortal danger. We hear there are 205—now we hear 81—now the voice says 57 card-carrying Communists in the State Department. We hear that General Marshall is a traitor, a leader of a black conspiracy that dwarfs every other conspiracy in history. This charge is never proved and now, a few years later, in a recent book has been gently explained away as an exaggeration by the carnival man's intellectual shills. Who cares about the good name of the venerable general who has given a lifetime of service to his country? The game must go on. The Army is "soft on communism"; another heroic general is told that he is not fit to wear the uniform. Hubbub, commotion, everybody suspecting everybody else.

Our colleges are called hotbeds of subversion. A headline? Then a Communist is found decoding secret messages (only she doesn't decode messages and she isn't a Communist). Excitement galore there is, but precious few results as Communists, supposed Communists, phantom traitors, and innocent people are alike pursued from headline to headline, from edition to edition.

What kind of a spectacle are we becoming anyway? What has happened to our sense of balance, our sanity—our sense of humor, you might say? If we Americans could stand off in space and look at this foolishness—the mad, merry search for the spotlight that has been going on for the past 2 or 3 years in the name of anticommunism, I think our native sense of humor, our ability to laugh at ourselves, to recognize that we had been taken in, would save us, if nothing else.

Anticommunism is a serious business. It is not a game to be played so publicity mad politicos can build fame for themselves. If someone were to tell me that the masters of the Kremlin inspired this burlesque to distract us from our real dangers and keep us from taking effective anti-Communist measures, I'd have half a mind to believe him. I can't imagine what would please the Kremlin more than to turn America into a frantic, hysteria-ridden place, full of suspicion of an American for an American. If the Kremlin masters wanted to weaken us—and they do—I suppose that they would be delighted to see Americans lose confidence in the integrity of their political leaders, lose confidence in the stability of their Army, suspect clergymen and teachers. I imagine they would delight in seeing us lose faith in our constitutional privileges, in seeing us ape their courtroom procedures, and hound innocent little Government clerks who are blown up to be important spies and saboteurs as long as it is good for a front-page story.

Congressional committees have done good work, are doing good work, and will do more. But when they are cynically used to trap headlines rather than spies, they mock themselves—and they mock us, too.

Aside from the actual undermining of democracy that such procedures entail and the harm done to the individuals involved—and tell me, is there anyone who will deny that General Marshall, to name only one, was truly injured? Or is to be accounted as nothing that an honorable soldier is berated as a traitor to his duty and his country? Aside from such evils as this, there is the fundamental problem that these shenanigans distract us from our real problems, including the problem of communism. They distract us from pursuing a truly effective program of anticommunism.

Are we any safer, for instance, because General Marshall was branded as a traitor? No, we aren't. But we are a little less honorable. We have taken what a devoted public servant gave us and offered him abuse and calumny as our gratitude in his years of retirement. Are we any safer because the line between a liberal or a nonconformist and a Communist or subversive is hopelessly blurred? I doubt it. Are we any safer because nonconformity has been practically identified with treason? I think not. Do we have anything less to fear because people have been bullied by the chairman of an investigating committee and his counsel? I doubt it. Is America a safer place for ourselves and our children because the morale of our State Department has been blitzkrieged? Or because our fine officer corps has been insulted? Or because political controversy has sunk to a new low of name calling? Again, I would say no. Are we any more to be feared by the Communists because of all the hundreds of headlines the Senator from Wisconsin has piled up? I don't believe so.

Just what has been accomplished? I wonder. The large-type charges almost always peter out to a back-page item after they have served their purpose: to gain a headline. But by then, our man on horseback is charging off in another direction—tomorrow is another day, another edition, there is need for another headline.

This kind of ridiculous goings-on is seriously described as anticommunism. If you will pardon a very lowbrow comment, I say "Phooey." America today is faced with a world challenge—military, political, social, religious, the protection of its own institutions from subversion within and aggression from without. It's about time we start taking that challenge seriously and drop the cops-and-robbers game that has been going on.

In my book if a man is truly anti-Communist, he is concerned with meeting the challenge of communism on every level. He is interested first of all, in seeing to it that conditions here and abroad are such that they don't provide a fertile breeding ground for communism. He is interested in such matters as seeing to it that people get enough to eat, have decent homes, are able to raise their children in dignity. His scope is broad. He is interested in measures to share the wealth of have nations with the have-nots. He is interested in breaking down the barriers that separate people—national barriers, religious barriers, class barriers. He is interested in making a better place of his own little corner of the world and of doing all he can to see that others are not in want.

I judge an anti-Communist—the real thing, not the cops-and-robbers version—by how well he does these things. If he happens to be a legislator, I look at his record. I see how he voted on measures, to make freedom a reality and not merely an aspiration in the lives of his own fellow citizens and of the poor of the world. By this standard, a number of famous anti-Communists, I'm sorry to say, simply don't measure up.

Communism is a military problem. I judge an anti-Communist according to his record of supporting military measures taken to hold back the Communist forces. I judge him according to how much he helped the Army do its work and not according to how much harm he did to Army morale—how many generals he has insulted.

On the question of internal subversion, I judge an anti-Communist according to how well he does the very difficult job of seeking out subversives, clearly identifying them and removing them from critical positions. I take it that a genuine anti-Communist is one who despises the court methods of the Communists. I take it he hates the Communist idea that one is guilty until proved innocent. I take it that the genuine anti-Communist is one who above all believes in the democratic procedures and is willing to stand by them, even in the face of great temptations to lose one's temper and to lose one's faith in the methods of freemen.

I judge an anti-Communist by how well he fulfills all these responsibilities in a difficult, delicate job. In a word, on this score I judge an anti-Communist according to how well he succeeds in doing what he is supposed to be doing—not according to how many headlines he makes. I judge him according to how well he clarifies the difference between treason and nonconformity—not according to how well he blurs the distinction. I judge him according to how many innocent people he has helped prove innocent and how many guilty people he has proved guilty.

I do not admire him as an anti-Communist according to how many guilty and innocent both leave his courtroom without his having made clear and convincing just what their status is but only fogging the issues and the reputation of innocent and guilty alike.

As you can see, I take a pretty dim view of some noisy anti-Communists—one in particular, the junior Senator from Wisconsin. I do not take a dim view of them because they are anti-Communists but because they are such pitifully ineffective anti-Communists. I hate to see anti-communism identified with this kind of playing for the grandstand.

Now I want to make clear that what I have said is my personal opinion. I am not speaking for the Catholic Church but only for myself, a citizen. Other Catholics may take a more kindly view of the public career of the junior Senator from Wisconsin and of the effect he is having on the Nation. That certainly is their privilege, as it is my privilege to speak as I have. Other Catholics may agree or disagree with the judgment I have reached. On political matters such as these, a Catholic's statement—even a bishop's—bears no more authority than whatever he can bring to it as a citizen and public figure. I know that there are many in my church who do not agree with me on this. So be it. Time will tell which of us is right.

But although the church takes no position, and will not, on such a matter of public controversy, the church does take a position on lies, calumny, the absence of charity, and calculated deceit. These things are wrong—even if they are mistakenly thought of as means to a good end. They are morally evil, and to call them good or to act as if they were permissible under certain circumstances is itself a monstrous perversion of morality. They are not justified by any cause—least of all by the cause of anticommunism, which should unite rather than divide all of us in these difficult times.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Printing and binding for Congress, when recommended to be done by the Committee on Printing of either House, shall be so recommended in a report containing an approximate estimate of the cost thereof, together with a statement from the Public Printer of estimated approximate cost of work previously ordered by Congress within the fiscal year (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 145, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on Printing, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized book dealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by book dealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. The money derived from such sales shall be paid into the Treasury and accounted for in his annual report to Congress, and no sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided,* That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the RECORD with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the official reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix, but this rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Appendix the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed.

10. *Official reporters.*—The official reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this restriction shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. The Public Printer or the official reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Illustrations.*—Pursuant to section 182b, title 44, United States Code (as shown above), requests for authority to insert an illustration in the RECORD should be submitted to the Joint Committee on Printing through the chairman of the Committee on Printing of the respective House in which the speech desired to be illustrated may be delivered. Illustrations shall not exceed in size a page of the RECORD and shall be linecuts only. Copy for illustrations must be furnished to the Public Printer not later than 12:30 o'clock p. m. of the day preceding publication.

13. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

HI

Ch

Ro

Bil
S. 3

Bil
S
stre
De
S
of
S
gar
S
tiv
co
H
Ca
H
Sp
S
Ga

so

Bu
(S

A
th

R
ti
(S

fis

B
a

C
o

E

W

IN

I
ple
sau
in
sor
Co

V
oth
vir
of
eve

V
tol
hig
mu
sou
peo
wa

I
saf
for
kee
wh

I
pri
the
We
wa
ach

T
wa
as
Lis

N
n

V
the
It
195
the

V
Sta

I
city
1,4
Yo
sific

V
for
in

N
pre
tio
said
awa
195

Appendix

Wausau, Wis., Wins Top United States Safety Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, June 4, 1954

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I am pleased to report that the city of Wausau, Wis., has achieved the top award in the 1953 national safety contest sponsored by the famed National Safety Council.

Wausau has been victorious over 1,475 other municipalities in the Nation by virtue, in part, of its spotless 1953 record of avoiding any auto casualties whatsoever.

We are all familiar with the serious toll taken each year on the Nation's highways. We know that much more must be done throughout America in sound thinking, sound driving, and sound pedestrian traffic if the street and highway toll is to be slashed.

My own State has always had a good safety record, although this year, unfortunately, our largest city—Milwaukee—has not reached the top safety class which it had traditionally occupied.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of an article published in the Wednesday, June 2, issue of the Milwaukee Journal, describing Wausau's achievement.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LIST WAUSAU SAFEST IN UNITED STATES—HAD NO AUTO DEATHS—MILWAUKEE IS SEVENTH IN GROUP OF EIGHT

Wausau, Wis., Wednesday was acclaimed the top city in the country in traffic safety. It won the grand award for all cities in the 1953 national safety contest sponsored by the National Safety Council.

Winner of the top honors among the States was Virginia.

* * * * *

WON OVER 1,475 CITIES

In winning the distinction as the first city for traffic safety, Wausau triumphed over 1,475 other municipalities, ranging from New York, the biggest, to scores in the 5,000 classification.

Wausau not only won the grand award for all cities but also was champion of those in the population class of 25,000 to 50,000.

Norman Damon, Washington, D. C., vice president of the Automotive Safety foundation and chairman of the board of judges, said Wednesday that Wausau won the grand award because of its outstanding record in 1953.

HAD NO FATALITIES

Not only did the Marathon County city of 30,414 go through 1953 without a traffic death, but it rated at or near the top in many other activities that were major factors in selecting the grand champion.

Damon said Wausau rated first in safety activities, accident facts reporting, traffic engineering and in public information on safety. It tied for first in its school safety programs and in reporting no traffic deaths. It stood third in safety organization and fourth in law enforcement.

"Wausau had a strong, well coordinated safety program that not only was good on paper but in actual tests," Damon said. "It paid off handsomely in the record of no deaths there last year."

PRESENTATION DATE NEAR

"Presentation of the grand award will be made to the Wausau city administration within a few weeks by one of the top officials of the National Safety Council," Damon said. The ceremony will be in Wausau.

Wausau has had an exceptionally low traffic death record in recent years. In 1952, the safety council reported, only one traffic fatality occurred and only two in 1950.

* * * * *

WISCONSIN GETS NO AWARD

In addition to Wausau and Virginia 14 other States, not including Wisconsin, and 26 other cities won divisional honors.

The contest was scored on the basis of 1,000 points, divided between traffic deaths and traffic safety programs.

AIMED AT TRAFFIC RISKS

WAUSAU, WIS.—Motorist cooperation, plus a sharp pencil and a pad of blue tickets, helped Wausau win the grand award in the national safety contest announced Wednesday.

"Most credit for these honors must go to Wausau's driving public," Police Chief Everett Gleason said. "They kept the city's streets safe by obeying traffic ordinances.

"Strict enforcement made believers of the transgressors, and a long-range program of driver education is paying off."

STARTED WITH BIKES

"We started years ago with the bicycle riders. We licensed all bicycles and gave the riders a course in traffic safety. The violators lost their 'bike' licenses. These boys and girls have now gone through high school, where they received additional training and drivers' courses given to all students.

"Strict enforcement continually applied has been the other side of the coin. We have never conducted any drives. Enforcement has been carried on around the clock, day after day."

HIT DANGEROUS DRIVERS

"Motorists arrested have faced the courts. Officers have learned good judgment in issuing tickets, not enforcing the law to the strict letter but arresting drivers who endangered others by their violations."

The city boasts a large school patrol, women traffic guards, engineering programs with continual experimentation to increase the safe flow of traffic and detailed record keeping to learn the city's traffic danger spots.

Kennedy Hits GOP's Public Power Doings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, June 4, 1954

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Kennedy Hits GOP's Public Power Doings—Development of United States Natural Resources Vital to Entire Economy," which appeared in the Trainman News under date of May 10, 1954.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KENNEDY HITS GOP'S PUBLIC POWER DOINGS—DEVELOPMENT OF UNITED STATES NATURAL RESOURCES VITAL TO ENTIRE ECONOMY, BRT–LA TOLD

CENTRALIA, WASH.—Maintaining that further development of the Nation's public power and natural resources is of the utmost importance to the growth of our entire economy, President W. P. Kennedy lashed out at the national administration and Secretary of Interior McKay in a recent address here for their program which is "doing a great deal to slow up, if not stop completely" expansion along these lines.

He also hit private electric firms which "have declared war against the West, and war against a legitimate function of government, which is to provide public power when private power is not sufficient to serve the public needs."

Hundreds of BRT and LA members and friends from Washington, Oregon, Montana, and British Columbia heard the BRT chieftain urge continued development of our resources to benefit the whole Nation in impressive addresses at a banquet and closed meetings during the recent 2-day convention of Northwest Association of the BRT and LA in Centralia.

Labor and agriculture, and all industry, he declared, have a definite stake in the development of America's power potential.

The country's industrial community, he continued, depends greatly on continued agricultural development.

"The far West is on the threshold of an era of unprecedented agricultural and industrial development," said Mr. Kennedy, adding: "To achieve sound development, billions must be invested in irrigation and flood control and the orderly use of water resources."

"Those billions cannot be obtained, or if obtained, cannot be repaid unless revenue-producing electric plants are incorporated in plans for the big multipurpose dams which are needed."

The 2-day convention, which drew officers, delegates, and members from many lodges throughout the Oregon-Washington territory, was welcomed to the city by Mayor Claude Warren and Grand President Mary Gorman, of the Ladies Auxiliary, replied at opening ceremonies at Elks Temple. BRT Skookum Lodge 916 and LA Centralia Lodge 679 were host and hostess lodges.

Three hundred and fifty attended the joint banquet climaxing the meeting when President Kennedy was principal speaker, and 150 were present at a closed BRT meeting to hear the BRT leader.

He assailed the private power firms for disseminating plenty of "hokum" concerning taxes the Government loses when public power is made available.

"The Government does not pay itself taxes, of course, partly because there's no point in taking money out of one pocket and putting it in another, but the Government does use power profit to pay for irrigation, flood control, and recreational projects. Otherwise, such projects would be a direct charge against the taxpayer, including private power companies," he said.

"The BRT is 100 percent for the free-enterprise system," he asserted, "but when free enterprise is unable to carry through with a job or is disinclined to assume the task, then the Government has an obligation to the people to step into the breach and perform the needed services," President Kennedy declared.

COMMENDS SENATORS

He highly commended Senators Warren G. Magnuson and Henry M. Jackson, both Democrats, for their splendid job in representing the voters of the State of Washington in the United States Senate. He also urged the voters of Oregon to give full support to Richard L. Neuberger, Democratic nominee for United States Senate, and Albert C. Ullman, Democratic aspirant for United States House of Representatives, Second Oregon District.

Roy M. Steele, legislative representative and delegate of Lodge 916, Centralia, was chairman of the meeting and Mrs. Marie F. Sprague of Ladies Auxiliary 679 was secretary. Other executive board officers were Mrs. Loraine Williams, cochairman; Claude H. Wood, treasurer; Mrs. Alice Ramser and Wesley L. Sutton, members. They also comprised the arrangements committee.

Other head table guests at the banquet, in addition to President Kennedy and Grand President Mary Gorman, were R. J. Davidson, field supervisor; Deputy President and Mrs. H. E. Nevala, J. L. Williams, 916 president who was master of ceremonies; Mrs. Margaret W. Donahue, member of LA board of grand trustees; and R. C. O'Grady, BRT board of insurance member.

Jerry Hanson, Milwaukee superintendent; W. J. Macklin, regional director of Railroad Retirement Board; and Mr. Neugent, Railroad Retirement Board district manager, Seattle, attended.

General Chairmen L. A. Borden, Milwaukee Lines West; Paul K. Byers, Northern Pacific; B. E. Kennelly, Spokane, Portland & Seattle Railway; J. J. Corcoran, Southern Pacific (Pacific system); and BRT State representatives G. E. Rutledge (Oregon) and E. W. Mitchell (Washington) also participated in the 2-day meetings and banquet.

NORTHWEST BRT PRAISED

At the closed BRT meeting presided over by J. L. Williams, President Kennedy praised BRT'ers in the Northwest for their help in building the brotherhood into the great organization it is today. He also stressed the seriousness of the unemployment situation today with 25,000 BRT'ers out of work. In many cases, he said, "rails" with 15 years' seniority are jobless.

The ladies auxiliary initiated a number of new members at its meetings. Programs of entertainment were enjoyed and the ladies auxiliary drill team presented exhibitions.

The McCarthy Hearings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 4, 1954

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, the New York Herald Tribune recently published a very interesting editorial entitled "Investigating Itself," in regard to the McCarthy hearings. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Investigating Itself

From the beginning it has been fairly clear what is wrong with the McCarthy hearings. What is wrong is that the committee is investigating itself. A dispute which ought to have been aired before a different body was left in the hands of those who had much to lose and could hardly fail to be moved by a strong desire to cover up. Senator McCarthy, as he reminds the public on frequent occasions, is still the chairman of the parent committee, and his relinquishment of the chairmanship of the subcommittee does not deprive him of his basic power.

If there was any doubt about the deficiencies of this arrangement, it was removed on Wednesday when the subcommittee voted, along straight party lines, to drop the charges against two of the principals, Mr. Hensel and Mr. Carr. This means curtailing the hearings. It means that something less than the whole truth will be exposed. Two previous efforts along the same lines were sparked by Senator Dirksen; one failed to secure an abrupt end to the hearings but the other succeeded in getting a week's interruption. Wednesday's successful maneuver crops the total picture as definitively and as harmfully as was the case with the famous picture taken at McGuire Airfield.

Senator McCarthy made charges against Mr. Hensel of an extreme and damaging nature. He failed by his desperate means to divert or discredit the hearings. Now those charges are allowed to stand, not retracted and not shown up for the hollow thing they gave every evidence of being from the start. In the same way Mr. Carr made charges against the Army. It is true he did not choose to repeat them under oath, yet he should certainly have been questioned upon his part in the case. One of the major purposes of the hearings—to call to account those who have been getting away with reckless and unproven charges—has been in substantial part defeated.

The cynicism of the whole procedure was indicated by Senator Dworshak, when he refused to break down his motion into two separate votes upon the Carr and the Hensel issue. "You must have some balance or compensating feature," he said. Thus two opposing figures have been lopped off. Why doesn't Senator Dworshak next propose that Mr. McCarthy and Mr. Stevens get the same treatment, leaving Messrs. Cohn and Adams to fight it out and resign? This is precisely what Senator Dirksen proposed in the first place.

The Senate does not dignify itself by these maneuvers, and the Republican majority of the subcommittee puts itself in a definitely unfavorable light. The public wanted thoroughness and impartiality. It is getting the uncontrolled ramblings permitted by Senator Mundt and the inescapable bias of a committee that is a judge of its own case.

Public Laws 365 to 371, Inclusive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1954

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent, I am extending my remarks to include my report on Public Laws 365 to 371, inclusive, to my constituents in the Second District of Illinois, as follows:

Report No. 26 on Legislation of the 83d Congress

Dear Friend: Here are the new laws recently enacted at this session:

PUBLIC LAW 365

S. 2305, legislation for the District of Columbia

This adopts for the District of Columbia automobile financial responsibility legislation similar to that now in force in 43 States, including Illinois. Another instance in which the Congress serves in the capacity of a State legislature for the 10 square miles that comprise the District of Columbia.

PUBLIC LAW 366

S. 2120, toll bridge at Portsmouth, N. H.

In 1940 the Maine-New Hampshire Interstate Bridge Authority opened a toll bridge across the Piscataqua River at Portsmouth, N. H., the cost to be amortized within 45 years. The bridge now needs reconstruction and repairs. Public Law 366 gives the required authority of Congress. The cost of reconstruction is to be deemed a part of the original cost, period of amortization to remain unchanged.

PUBLIC LAW 367

H. R. 1433, equity to retired Naval personnel

Under this measure 111 retired enlisted men and warrant officers of the Navy (who were temporarily commissioned during the war) will receive a total of $206,819 in retirement pay from November of 1946 to the date of their restoration to enlisted or warrant officer status. It is the final windup in equity and good conscience of the mess occasioned by an unintended application of decision B–61122 of the Comptroller General of October 28, 1946. Previous legislation (Public Law 709, 80th Cong.) gave relief to most of the personnel affected including all from Army and Air Force. Public Law 367 merely applies retroactive features of the act of 1948 to bring the final 111 (all Naval) under coverage.

PUBLIC LAW 368

H. R. 2274, Civil Air Patrol

A law of the 80th Congress authorized the Air Force to furnish surplus or obsolete equipment to the Civil Air Patrol. Then came a law of the 81st Congress regulating the disposal of surplus property so that CAP was practically elbowed out. Public Law 368 of the 83d Congress sets everything right, authorizes issuance of supplies and equipment by the Air Force as needed and provides for expense of CAP personnel in time of war emergency. It enables the Department of Air Force to give a strengthened and deserved support to an Air Force auxiliary that frequently has proved itself.

Present membership of Civil Air Patrol is about 29,000 individuals over 18 (pilots, observers, radio operators) and about 49,000 cadets between 15 and 18 undergoing training in aviation education. Senior members of CAP privately own 5,700 aircraft, maintain 11,000 licensed radio stations. I was glad to cast your vote for CAP.

PUBLIC LAW 369

H. R. 5862: Canal Zone Corrosion Laboratory

The Canal Zone Corrosion Laboratory is used for long-range corrosion testing of metals and materials. Previously the Panama Canal Company has carried the expense of operation. Public Law 369 grants necessary authority for the transfer of the laboratory to the Navy. This clears the way for operation under Navy jurisdiction with the Navy, the Army and the Canal Company each contributing $15,000 annually for maintenance.

PUBLIC LAW 370

H. R. 7329: Cooking for the Army

This repeals section 1174 of the Revised Statutes, an antiquated law [enacted in 1877] charging the Surgeon General with responsibility over Army menus and requiring Army doctors to supervise the cooking for enlisted men. While the Medical Corps has the overall responsibility for health, doctors ceased many years ago to superintend the actual cooking. Since the establishment of cooks' and bakers' schools in 1905 the Quartermaster General has exercised the responsibility for food service supervision. Public Law 370, by repealing a law to which no one paid the slightest attention, makes it all legal. Deadwood laws that have ceased to be enforced discourage the proper respect for law.

PUBLIC LAW 371

H. R. 7328, aeronautics research construction program for 1955

Public Law 371 is important. It passed the House by voice, no vote being cast in opposition, and without debate other than explanatory remarks (pp. 2572–2574 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 4, 1954) which you may wish to read if especially interested in aeronautics research, also House Committee Report No. 1206 and Senate Report No. 1283.

Purpose of Public Law 371 is to assure the continued supremacy of the United States in the air by authorizing the construction of additional aeronautic-research facilities by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics at a total cost not to exceed $5 million. These include (a) additional equipment at the Langley (high-speed, hydrodynamic) Laboratory at Hampton, Va., (b) alterations to supersonic tunnels at the Ames Laboratory at Moffett Field, Calif., and (c) alterations at supersonic tunnel, air drier for propulsion systems, air heater for altitude tests chambers, and rocket engine research facility at Lewis Flight Propulsion Laboratory at Cleveland, Ohio.

Someone has said that what we now are engaged in is a world race of scientists. This emphasizes the vital importance to our national defense of scientific research, especially in air application. Illustration of the tremendous progress American scientists have made possible: Flight of Major Yeager in December of 1953 at 1,600 miles an hour, a speed 2½ greater than that of sound.

For 39 years the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics has carried the responsibility for intensive study and research in this field. Today it operates 3 research centers, where some 7,000 scientists and supporting personnel are working round the clock to keep the United States always ahead in the world race of scientists.

PUBLIC LAW 372

Senate Joint Resolution 69, Ford's Theater

Public Law 372 looks toward the day when Ford's Theater in Washington will be reconstructed exactly as it appeared that fatal April 14 of 1865 when the Great Emancipator was felled by an assassin's bullet. It directs the Secretary of the Interior to prepare an estimate of the cost of reconstructing the stage, boxes, and scenic setting, also for making provision for housing the famous Oldroyd collection of relics. When the estimate of cost is furnished the Congress at some future date it then will be decided whether the project for this Lincoln memorial should be carried through.

PUBLIC LAW 373

H. R. 3598, merger of dam power projects

This authorizes the consolidation of the Parker Dam power project and the Davis Dam project and future operation as a single project to be known as the Parker-Davis project, Arizona-California-Nevada. Reason, economy in operation and administration. Thus the merger seems sensible to me. Parker Dam is midway between Hoover Dam and the city of Yuma. Davis Dam is located about 80 miles upstream (lower Colorado River) from Parker Dam.

Cordially and sincerely,

BARRATT O'HARA,
Member of Congress.

Need for Full Employment at Boston Naval Shipyard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 26, 1954

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following resolution adopted by the Massachusetts Senate:

Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to reconsider any proposed curtailment of employment or work at the Boston Naval Shipyard

Whereas the Boston Naval Shipyard draws its employees from every part of the Commonwealth, more particularly within a radius of 50 miles from Boston; and

Whereas each community therein is in part affected by the financial stability of these employees; and

Whereas it is proposed to lay off 800 men in the first quarter of the fiscal year with further layoffs during said year, which will affect 154 trades and occupations and result in many professional and technical men and skilled mechanics seeking work in other States; and

Whereas nine ships scheduled to be sent to Boston for repairs have been diverted to other shipyards; and

Whereas there is a 25-percent reduction in the appropriation for the Boston Naval Shipyard and any further cutback in work would increase unemployment in this area to an untenable degree: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Massachusetts Senate respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to take such action as may be necessary to compel the Department of Defense to maintain the present standard of employment and work at the Boston Naval Shipyard; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be transmitted forthwith by the State secretary to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of the Congress, to each Member thereof from this Commonwealth, to the Secretary of Defense, to the Secretary of the Navy, and to the Secretary of Labor.

Adopted: Senate, May 27, 1954.

IRVING N. HAYDEN,
Clerk.

A true copy. Attest:

EDWARD J. CRONIN,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

Prohibition in Sheep's Clothing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, June 4, 1954

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Prohibition in Sheep's Clothing," from the Oregon Journal of May 11, 1954.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROHIBITION IN SHEEP'S CLOTHING

One of the greatest burdens borne by legislators is the constant and sometimes powerful pressure brought to bear upon them by special-interest groups.

Such pressure by antiliquor forces has resulted in the scheduling of hearings later this month on the Bryson bill by the United States House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

This bill would prohibit all forms of alcoholic beverage advertising in every type of advertising media. So broad is its scope, the mere posting of a letter seeking an order for a case of beer would subject the writer to possible fine and imprisonment.

Proposals of this nature are not new. They have resulted in hearings no fewer than four times by the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce since 1947. None has been favorably reported, but the effort to return the country to some form of prohibition continues, and now that effort finds itself focused in the House.

In view of the impending hearings, the experience of Oregon in voting in 1950 upon an initiated measure having similar intent should be of particular interest to Congress.

That measure did not forbid advertising completely, but would have prohibited sale of alcoholic beverages "promotively" advertised. The word "promotively" was defined in such a way as to achieve a form of prohibition by indirection—exactly the purpose of the present Bryson bill.

Oregon citizens rejected the proposal by 378,732 votes to 113,524, a margin of more than 3 to 1. Particularly significant was the fact that proponents carried only 9 out of more than 2,000 voting precincts.

Refusal to countenance prohibition obtained through devious means could hardly have been more positive.

The Bryson bill deserves similar treatment from the House committee, which will show real courage in resisting the political pressure brought upon it. Let prohibition be voted upon, if at all, on its own merits—not under the guise of a ban on something else.

Dairy Month Observance in Texas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, June 4, 1954

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, Texas is joining with other States in observing June as Dairy Month. All during this month, a statewide dairy products promotion campaign is being carried on in Texas with the backing of thousands of dairy farmers, processors, manufacturers, food retailers, grocers, restaurants, drug stores, and allied industries.

June has been officially proclaimed as Dairy Month in Texas by Gov. Allan Shivers. I ask unanimous consent that the text of Governor Shiver's proclamation be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the proclamation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM BY ALLAN SHIVERS,
GOVERNOR OF TEXAS

AUSTIN, TEX.

Greetings:

The dairy industry of Texas is one of our greatest resources. Its very nature directly relates the welfare of the industry with the welfare of the general public.

The observance of Dairy Month is of great interest to all of us. Milk, butter, cheese, ice cream, mellorine—these dairy products are essential to the health of everyone.

Some 500,000 Texans earn their livelihood from the production, processing, distribution, and sale of dairy products with a resultant contribution of $900 million annually to the commerce of Texas.

Therefore, I, as Governor of the State of Texas, hereby designate June as Dairy Month in Texas.

In official recognition whereof I hereby affix my signature this 17th day of May 1954.

ALLAN SHIVERS,
Governor of Texas.

How McKay Tried To Stop Seattle Power Statement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, June 4, 1954

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "How McKay Tried To Stop Seattle Power Statement," which was published in the Wenatchee Daily World of April 11, 1954.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW MCKAY TRIED TO STOP SEATTLE POWER STATEMENT

Because of the political implications involved, a representative of Secretary of the Interior Douglas McKay tried last week to prevent the Seattle Chamber of Commerce from announcing its new policy advocating that Federal multiple-purpose dams on the Columbia be sold, the Daily World learned today from unimpeachable sources here.

McKay's representative was said to be Raymond Davis, Assistant to the Secretary.

This paper was advised that Davis hurriedly flew to Seattle by plane when the Department learned of the proposed announcement of a power-policy statement by the chamber, which in effect also advocates that the Federal Government get out of the power business.

Davis met with the power committee of the chamber to discuss the report, saying he was in Seattle for the express purpose of preventing hasty action by the group. He recommended that the chamber not put out any policy statement at this time, saying that the power situation was explosive. It was suggested the resolution be delayed until after next fall's election.

Davis is reported to have told Seattle chamber officials that the resolution was a hot potato and that the Department was already in trouble over power policies in the Pacific Northwest.

Reliable sources told the World that Davis agreed with the chamber that all power resources in the Northwest should be owned and operated privately.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized book dealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by book dealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Frank Brodie is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Printing and binding for Congress, when recommended to be done by the Committee on Printing of either House, shall be so recommended in a report containing an approximate estimate of the cost thereof, together with a statement from the Public Printer of estimated approximate cost of work previously ordered by Congress within the fiscal year (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 145, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on Printing, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

DISTRIBUTION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

To the Vice President and each Senator 100 copies; to the Secretary and Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, each, 25 copies; to the Secretary, for official use, not to exceed 35 copies; to the Sergeant at Arms, for use on the floor of the Senate, not to exceed 50 copies; to each Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress, 68 copies; to the Clerk, Sergeant at Arms, and Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives, each, 25 copies; to the Clerk, for official use, not to exceed 50 copies; and to the Doorkeeper, for use on the floor of the House of Representatives, not to exceed 75 copies; to the Vice President and each Senator, Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress there shall also be furnished (and shall not be transferable), 3 copies of the daily RECORD, of which 1 shall be delivered at his residence, 1 at his office, and 1 at the Capitol.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. The money derived from such sales shall be paid into the Treasury and accounted for in his annual report to Congress, and no sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRICE OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

The Public Printer is authorized to furnish to subscribers the daily RECORD at $1.50 per month, payable in advance.

Remit by money order payable to Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C.

PRINTING DOCUMENTS AND REPORTS

Documents and reports of committees with the evidence and papers submitted therewith, or any part thereof ordered printed by Congress, may be reprinted by the Public Printer on order of any Member of Congress or Delegate, on prepayment of the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 162, p. 1940).

SENATORS WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Vice President, Richard Nixon

Aiken, George D., *Vt*	Carroll Arms.
Anderson, Clinton P., *N. Mex.*	6 Wesley Circle.
Barrett, Frank A., *Wyo*	The Woodner
Beall, J. Glenn, *Md*	
Bennett, Wallace F., *Utah*	
Bowring, Mrs. Eva., *Nebr*	
Bricker, John W., *Ohio*	The Mayflower.
Bridges, Styles, *N. H*	The Dorchester.
Burke, Thomas A., *Ohio*	
Bush, Prescott, *Conn*	
Butler, Hugh, *Nebr*	3065 Chestnut St.
Butler, John Marshall, *Md*	
Byrd, Harry Flood, *Va*	The Shoreham.
Capehart, Homer E., *Ind*	The Westchester.
Carlson, Frank, *Kans*	Sheraton Park
Case, Francis, *S. Dak*	4545 Conn. Ave.
Chavez, Dennis, *N. Mex*	3327 Cleveland Ave.
Clements, Earle C., *Ky*	2800 Woodley Rd.
Cooper, John S., *Ky*	
Cordon, Guy, *Oreg*	
Daniel, Price, *Tex*	
Dirksen, Everett M., *Ill*	
Douglas, Paul H., *Ill*	
Duff, James H., *Pa*	
Dworshak, Henry C., *Idaho*	
Eastland, James O., *Miss*	5101 Macomb St.
Ellender, Allen J., *La*	
Ferguson, Homer, *Mich*	The Westchester.
Flanders, Ralph E., *Vt*	
Frear, J. Allen, Jr., *Del*	
Fulbright, J. William, *Ark*	2527 Belmont Rd.
George, Walter F., *Ga*	The Mayflower.
Gillette, Guy M., *Iowa*	
Goldwater, Barry M., *Ariz*	
Gore, Albert, *Tenn*	
Green, Theodore Francis, *R. I.*	University Club.
Hayden, Carl, *Ariz*	
Hendrickson, Robert C., *N. J.*	
Hennings, Thomas C., Jr., *Mo.*	
Hickenlooper, Bourke B., *Iowa.*	5511 Cedar Parkway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Hill, Lister, *Ala*	
Holland, Spessard L., *Fla*	Sheraton Park
Humphrey, Hubert H., *Minn.*	
Hunt, Lester C., *Wyo*	
Ives, Irving M., *N. Y*	
Jackson, Henry M., *Wash*	
Jenner, William E., *Ind*	
Johnson, Edwin C., *Colo*	Carroll Arms.
Johnson, Lyndon B., *Tex*	
Johnston, Olin D., *S. C*	
Kefauver, Estes, *Tenn*	4848 Upton St.
Kennedy, John F., *Mass*	
Kerr, Robert S., *Okla*	
Kilgore, Harley M., *W. Va*	3834 Macomb St.
Knowland, William F., *Calif.*	
Kuchel, Thomas H., *Calif*	
Langer, William, *N. Dak*	The Roosevelt.
Lehman, Herbert H., *N. Y*	Sheraton Park
Lennon, Alton A., *N. C*	
Long, Russell B., *La*	
McCarran, Pat, *Nev*	4711 Blagden Ave.
McCarthy, Joseph R., *Wis*	
McClellan, John L., *Ark*	
Magnuson, Warren G., *Wash.*	The Shoreham.
Malone, George W., *Nev*	The Mayflower
Mansfield, Mike, *Mont*	
Martin, Edward, *Pa*	
Maybank, Burnet R., *S. C*	4730 Quebec St.
Millikin, Eugene D., *Colo*	
Monroney, A. S. Mike, *Okla.*	
Morse, Wayne, *Oreg*	5020 Lowell St.
Mundt, Karl E., *S. Dak*	The Capitol Towers.
Murray, James E., *Mont*	The Shoreham.
Neely, Matthew M., *W. Va*	
Pastore, John O., *R. I*	
Payne, Frederick G., *Maine*	
Potter, Charles E., *Mich*	
Purtell, William A., *Conn*	
Robertson, A. Willis, *Va*	
Russell, Richard B., *Ga*	
Saltonstall, Leverett, *Mass*	2320 Tracy Pl.
Schoeppel, Andrew F., *Kans.*	
Smathers, George A., *Fla*	
Smith, H. Alexander, *N. J*	Sheraton Park
Smith, Margaret Chase, *Maine.*	
Sparkman, John J., *Ala*	4920 Upton St.
Stennis, John C., *Miss*	
Symington, Stuart, *Mo*	
Thye, Edward J., *Minn*	
Upton, Robert W., *N. H*	
Watkins, Arthur V., *Utah*	
Welker, Herman, *Idaho*	4823 Tilden St.
Wiley, Alexander, *Wis*	2122 Mass. Ave.
Williams, John J., *Del*	
Young, Milton R., *N. Dak*	Quebec House So.

OFFICERS OF THE SENATE

Secretary—J. Mark Trice.
Chief Clerk—Emery L. Frazier.
Sergeant at Arms—Forest A. Harness.
Secretary for the Majority—William T. Reed.
Secretary for the Minority—Felton M. Johnston.
Chaplain—Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

Messrs. Aiken (chairman), Young, Thye, Hickenlooper, Mundt, Williams, Schoeppel, Welker, Ellender, Johnston of South Carolina, Holland, Anderson, Eastland, Clements, and Humphrey.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Bridges (chairman), Ferguson, Cordon, Saltonstall, Young, Knowland, Thye, McCarthy, Mundt, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Dworshak, Dirksen, Hayden, Russell, McCarran, Chavez, Maybank, Ellender, Hill, Kilgore, McClellan, Robertson, and Magnuson.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Saltonstall (chairman), Bridges, Flanders, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Hendrickson, Case, Duff, Cooper, Russell, Byrd, Johnson of Texas, Kefauver, Hunt, Stennis, and Symington.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Capehart (chairman), Bricker, Ives, Bennett, Bush, Beall, Payne, Goldwater, Maybank, Fulbright, Robertson, Sparkman, Frear, Douglas, and Lehman.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. Case (chairman), Barrett, Beall, Payne, Morse, Neely, Gore, Mansfield, ———.

Committee on Finance

Messrs. Millikin (chairman), Butler of Nebraska, Martin, Williams, Flanders, Malone, Carlson, Bennett, George, Byrd, Johnson of Colorado, Kerr, Frear, Long, and Smathers.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Messrs. Wiley (chairman), Smith of New Jersey, Hickenlooper, Langer, Ferguson, Knowland, Aiken, Capehart, George, Green, Fulbright, Sparkman, Gillette, Humphrey, and Mansfield.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. McCarthy (chairman), Mundt, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Dworshak, Dirksen, Butler of Maryland, Potter, McClellan, Jackson, Kennedy, Symington, Burke, ———.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Butler of Nebraska (chairman), Millikin, Cordon, Malone, Watkins, Dworshak, Kuchel, Barrett, Murray, Anderson, Long, Clements, Jackson, Daniel, and Lennon.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

Messrs. Bricker (chairman), Schoeppel, Butler of Maryland, Potter, Duff, Purtell, Payne, Mrs. Bowring, Messrs. Johnson of Colorado, Magnuson, Johnson of Texas, Hunt, Pastore, Monroney, and Smathers.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Langer (chairman), Wiley, Jenner, Watkins, Hendrickson, Dirksen, Welker, Butler of Maryland, McCarran, Kilgore, Eastland, Kefauver, Johnston of South Carolina, Hennings, and McClellan.

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

Messrs. Smith of New Jersey (chairman), Ives, Purtell, Goldwater, Cooper, Upton, Mrs. Bowring, Messrs. Murray, Hill, Neely, Douglas, Lehman, and Kennedy.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Carlson (chairman), Duff, Jenner, Cooper, Purtell, Upton, Mrs. Bowring, Messrs. Johnston of South Carolina, Neely, Pastore, Monroney, Daniel, and Lennon.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. Martin (chairman), Case, Bush, Kuchel, Beall, Upton, Morse, Chavez, Holland, Stennis, Kerr, Gore, and Burke.

Committee on Rules and Administration

Messrs. Jenner (chairman), Carlson, Potter, Barrett, McCarthy, Hayden, Green, Gillette, and Hennings.

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Mr. Chief Justice Warren, of California, Hotel Sheraton-Park, Washington, D. C.
Mr. Justice Black, of Alabama, 619 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Mr. Justice Reed, of Kentucky, the Mayflower.
Mr. Justice Frankfurter, of Massachusetts, 3018 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Douglas, of Washington, 3701 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Jackson, of New York, McLean, Va.
Mr. Justice Burton, of Ohio, the Dodge.
Mr. Justice Clark, of Texas, 2101 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Minton, of Indiana, the Methodist Building.

OFFICERS OF THE SUPREME COURT

Clerk—Harold B. Willey, 3214 N. Wakefield St., Arlington, Va.
Deputy Clerk—Reginald C. Dilli, 1329 Hemlock St.
Deputy Clerk—Hugh W. Barr, 4701 Connecticut Ave.
Marshal—T. Perry Lippitt, 4916 Flint Dr., Westgate, Md.
Reporter—Walter Wyatt, 1702 Kalmia Rd.
Librarian—Helen Newman, 126 3d St. SE.

UNITED STATES JUDICIAL CIRCUITS
JUSTICES ASSIGNED
TERRITORY EMBRACED

District of Columbia: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. District of Columbia.

First judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Frankfurter. Maine, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Puerto Rico.

Second judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Jackson. Vermont, Connecticut, New York.

Third judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Burton. Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Delaware, Virgin Islands.

Fourth judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina.

Fifth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Black. Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Texas, Canal Zone.

Sixth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Reed. Ohio; Michigan, Kentucky, Tennessee.

Seventh judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Minton. Indiana, Illinois, Wisconsin.

Eighth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, Iowa, Nebraska, Missouri, Arkansas.

Ninth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Douglas. Washington, Oregon, Montana, Idaho, California, Nevada, Arizona, Alaska, Hawaii.

Tenth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Colorado, Wyoming, Utah, Kansas, Oklahoma, New Mexico.

Appendix

Memorial Day Address by H. Stewart Potter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER M. MUMMA

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 7, 1954

Mr. MUMMA. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following Memorial Day address delivered by H. Stewart Potter, of Arlington, Va., at Millersburg, Pa., on Monday, May 31, 1954:

Commander Klinger, honored guests, ladies and gentlemen, you have signally honored me by extending me an invitation that permits my participation in these Memorial Day exercises held annually under auspices of Steever R. Day Post of the American Legion.

I am happy to come back to Pennsylvania and in this way join you in paying tribute to the veterans—dead and living—of all wars.

My first recollection of Millersburg is when, as a small boy, my parents brought the family over to Crows Ferry to visit Uncle Lee and Aunt Ellen McConnell, my uncle having operated the steam ferry for many years. Another uncle and aunt, the Lincoln Potters, resided here for many years prior to their deaths. Of course, during a 10-year residence in Halifax, I became very familiar with your progressive town.

Years ago, as a boy over in Newport, I was filled with pride on each Memorial Day when I was given the opportunity to gather fresh flowers to decorate the graves of the brave men who had served in the wars of the United States. Each grave had its American flag and its profusion of flowers. Then there was always an impressive parade with the members of the Grand Army of the Republic leading, and then a Memorial Day address followed. Sometimes I wished for shorter speeches. Today, some 50 years later, I shall not forget. My message will be brief.

The custom of observing Memorial Day, which had its beginning at Boalsburg, Centre County, in this State, 90 years ago, was the outgrowth of that stirring period known as the Civil War, and the desire of the American people for a day of tribute to their heroic dead. All over the land our grandmothers and grandfathers on both sides of the Mason-Dixon line united in paying tribute to their dead.

In so doing, they removed their hats, dropped a spray of flowers on some soldier's grave, lifted their heads to the stirring notes of the Star-Spangled Banner, and, at the same time, in their hearts they resolved that this Nation shall never again be torn asunder; that we shall never again allow internal discord or partisan dissention to break the solid front of all Americans.

This action on the part of our forebears took place here in Millersburg as well as in the most remote country churchyard throughout our Nation.

Spurred on by such a determined resolve, America embarked upon a course, backed by this unconquerable spirit of national unity, that transformed this Republic into a mighty and respected Nation among the people of the world. Yes, in a short span of years, became the leader of the world.

While our youth have responded to their country's call on each occasion, and our industries have hummed with activity, as they sought to produce the needs of an adequate national defense, we found in 1939 with the war clouds forming again and threatening our peace and security, we were in truth, a house divided against itself.

We lacked the spirit of our heroic dead who knew no "ism" but true Americanism, who saluted no flag but the Stars and Stripes, and to whom preservation and advancement of American ideals was a birthright and a solemn duty to one's country.

These honored dead whose memory we revere today believed in a true Americanism and were willing to fight and die for it; an Americanism that keeps strict faith with every word in the Bill of Rights and every line in the Constitution.

Yes, a kind of Americanism that gives you and me the right to express our own opinions, to approve or disapprove, to commend or criticize as we see fit.

That same Americanism that gives us the legal right to meet under the same roof as coworkers in the ranks of labor, as farmers in our local granges, as businessmen in our local chambers of commerce, as brothers in the various fraternal organizations.

That same Americanism which leaves our newspapers free to print anything not in conflict with the laws of libel or decency and which recognizes that a free press must be available to all, and if we deny it to those with whom we disagree today it may be likewise denied us tomorrow.

Memorial Day is a day of sadness and grief as we take a moment to reflect and to realize that thousands and thousands of Americans, the flower of this generation and past generations made the supreme sacrifice for the defense of their country's freedom. Yet this is a day of fond and blessed memories for we know that our departed heroes sacrificed much for us, and they would, if alive, want us to carry on their noble tradition.

Through the heroic efforts of those who lie here, and in the other cemeteries of this area, we are now able to live in a free and democratic country. We are free because we are not afraid to speak our thoughts. Our assemblies are not held by stealth under cover of night.

We are not afraid of fine literature and art, and music; we do not destroy such things, we encourage them. Truth can never be destroyed, nor can the ideas of great minds. Those in power do not use our schools to spread propaganda for personal gain. Our press is not silent. Our churches are great in number and ever increasing. Without the love of God there can be no freedom. Yet there are those in this world who threaten our way of life. We must be alert not only for our own cause but also in honor of those who made this freedom possible.

Other nations, holding dear the same values as we, have also sacrificed, and are now sacrificing the best of their manhood in their fight against aggression. An unnecessary tragedy—for how much better the world would be if we still had with us the strength, the courage, and the determination of our departed youth and the wisdom of our fallen elders. How much better the world would be if all nations had the same intense desire for human freedom and liberty as we.

Due to the aggression of communism, we and other freedom-loving nations are faced with the necessity of spending billions for weapons of destruction, yet there are so many in the world sick in body and mind, without funds for medical attention and medicines. Billions for arms but not enough food to feed the world's starving millions. How many people died of heart ailments, cancer, and other diseases who might have been with us today if more money for medical research was available. This is a sad commentary on the history of our human civilization. Yet until such time as the enemies of freedom are prepared to lay down their arms and meet with us in good faith for the purpose of preserving honorable peace and freedom for all mankind we will continue to be faced with the problem of neglecting our sick, our hungry, our homeless. To do otherwise, our presence here today would be but mere mockery.

We must remember that the goal of communism is world domination. If world domination were not the goal of Communists, there would not have been a war in Korea. The dead and living dead of Korea would not be a reality. The peoples of South Africa would have had the opportunity to settle their differences amicably. Europe and the Near East would not now be sitting on a powder keg, which should remind us to keep our powder dry.

Would that we here today might dedicate ourselves to strive, by more than mere wishful thinking, toward ending the causes of war.

Memorial Day is a day of prayer and reflection—prayer for those who are suffering from the wounds they received in battle; reflection for the noble principles for which they gave their all, and upon the manner in which we cherish and safeguard those principles. Memorial Day symbolizes the spirit of the American people—the will of a great, free, and enlightened Nation to pay tribute to the honored dead.

Today, from countless flagpoles, Old Glory flutters at half mast as a moving reminder, that busy though we are, we still realize that it is appropriate to pause and remember the sacrifices of the heroes in whose honor we assemble here.

Memorial Day is dedicated to the tens of thousands of Americans, young and old, who have given their lives in military conquest to present our way of life. Memorial Day is the day of living tribute to those honored dead.

The intent of what we say here shall extend far beyond the horizon.

Our tributes to the heroic American war dead reach around the earth.

Our thoughts, our prayers, and our words of gratitude shall travel swiftly with the light of day.

The sound of our voices is directed into many lands. For it is said truly that the sun never sets upon the American war dead. Let us remember that more than 150,000 American war dead have been laid to rest in foreign lands. Thousands of others have been lost beneath the waters of many oceans far from our shores.

Our war dead are buried in Asia, Europe, and in Africa, as well as in cemeteries here at home.

Yes; it is true that the sun of a single day never sets upon the graves of our honored dead because the sun shines perpetually upon some area of hallowed American ground. This assertion is proved by history and the maps of the world.

The light of the sun races across the face of the continent at great speed, 1,000 miles per hour. When it is midnight in the United States the sun is shining at high noon in Korea and the Philippines.

There is always a new dawn creeping silently over some farway ocean or jungle, over strange hills and cities. And there, in the pale light of each new day, the American Stars and Stripes is stirring at halfmast, and beneath it are thousands of white markers inscribed with the names of our departed men.

If we could visit one of these cemeteries in the far corners of the earth and walk slowly between the white markers we would see that some are of the Christian cross, and others the Star of David, the emblem of the Gentile and the Jew. Then we look at the flag overhead. We watch its brilliant red and white stripes curving with the shifting breeze, its folds gently to the north, then the east, then south, then west. The flag seems to speak.

At least we sense an answer coming from that proud and beautiful emblem that marks the last resting place of our hero dead. The flag seems to say that speculations about these men as to race and creed are of little important. It matters not who they were, whether they were rich or poor, college graduates or uneducated. It makes little difference whether they rest under cross or star. All your questions are in the past. They deal with trivial distinctions which only the living consider important.

As we stand looking at the flag and the graves we see it all very clearly. Death is the great equalizer, only in life do we judge a man by his money or social standing. Only in life do we question his race or creed.

Then we get a final answer. The flag tells us clearly all the men who rest in soldier graves were your defenders and mine.

On occasions such as this we are prone to spend too much time and too many words eulogizing the dead and making eloquent speeches about the cause for which they fought. In a sense we glorify war. Whereas the only fitting tribute that can be paid our soldier dead, wounded, and alive, is to strive with all our hearts, with might and main, to put an end to the causes which require their sacrifices so that they will not have died in vain. Most certainly were our noble dead permitted to speak they would cry out for some solution to our problems more logical and more sane than fruitless war.

We can pay no greater tribute to the martyrs of our Nation on this Memorial Day nor can we make a greater contribution to the welfare of our country than resolve that we will truly evaluate the manifold blessings bestowed upon us by citizenship in this great Republic.

Let us carry aloft the torch of freedom; and, in so doing, let us march as a united people asking God to place us in His infinite care and continue to shower us with His choice blessings of peace and happiness.

From grateful hearts let us pour forth our prayers of thanksgiving for the American way of life and beseech God to preserve our great Republic for the countless unborn millions to follow us.

In the same breath let us in prayerful attitude ask divine providence to restore peace and tranquillity to the nations of the world, that in so doing we may again look upon civilization as being rescued from the onslaughts of those who would destroy it.

With such an objective and faith in the future let us say from the depths of our hearts, thank God I am an American.

May Almighty God hear our prayers for a lasting peace on this Memorial Day, 1954, and may He fill our hearts with a deep and abiding love for our country. May He impress upon us each day our duty as a citizen, and of our need for eternal vigilance in preserving, protecting, and defending this great Republic for which we owe an undying debt of gratitude to God for the priceless heritage of liberty, freedom, and equality.

Despite the efforts made to formulate a just and lasting peace, the goal has not been reached, because the hearts of mankind have not yet been attuned to the spirit of universal love, which is essential if the family of nations expect to dwell in harmony with each other.

History is replete with the experiences of nation after nation, who sought power and glory through conquest and subjugation. It is written on the memories of mankind, that the nation that forgot God and refused to recognize the human dignity of every creature created by Him, traveled the road to ruin and destruction.

Yet, how short is the memory of man? Regardless of the lessons from history of the utter destruction of ancient empires, our minds were refreshed during the present 20th century by the fate that befell modern dictators, who have trod the same path to destruction that counterparts traversed in the distant past.

The scene which surrounds us today is the evidence of the cost of war. Here in this cemetery lie buried a number whose lives have been given to their country in the past. Who can estimate the worth of these lives? What these men might have meant to the world had they lived? What their loss means in the unrecorded sorrow of their parents, wives, sweethearts, and children? The great treasure of any country is not in its steel mills or its rolling prairies or its public buildings, but its young people. And here we commemorate those lives, who for the most part were sacrificed before the story they could have told could be unfolded, or their contribution made to the family of the Nation which gave them birth.

All too ready, because these dead cannot speak to us, we accept the fruit of their sacrifice in an unthinking way. We have many privileges in this country. We exercise these privileges every day of our lives. But that we have them is due to the fact that in the past Americans have been willing to lay down their lives for us. Privilege is always preceded by sacrifice. Theirs has been the sacrifice. Ours now are the privileges.

We do right when we honor them, with our flowers, our parades, with everything which can be provided, at this most beautiful season of the year, to remind ourselves of our indebtedness. We must also honor them by making a lasting peace.

Would that we here today might dedicate ourselves to strive, by more than mere wishful thinking, to do something toward ending the causes of war.

May I close with this poem:

"God bless America,
  Land that I love;
Stand beside her and guide her
  Through the night with a light from above,
From the mountains to the prairies,
  To the oceans white with foam,
God bless America,
  My home, sweet home."

I thank you.

The Federal-State Rehabilitation Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 29, 1954

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, the Federal-State vocational rehabilitation program has its origin in the Vocational Rehabilitation Act of 1920. The Barden-La Follette amendment of 1943 markedly broadened the scope of the services.

Through Federal-State cooperation for the purpose of making handicapped persons employable, rehabilitation agencies now offer a number of services which directly benefit the individuals who receive them, and indirectly benefit the Nation as a whole. These services include medical and psychological diagnosis, hospitalization and surgery, the furnishing of training supplies and placement equipment, and counseling through the rehabilitation process. The Federal-State cooperative effort now gives some aid to about 200,000 disabled persons annually and restores earning power to about 65,000 persons each year.

This program must be maintained and strengthened. The Federal Government is annually spending huge sums for public assistance—rather than rehabilitation—of handicapped persons. Unless more is done to rehabilitate such individuals, expenditures for public assistance to persons classified as totally and permanently disabled may soon reach $300 million or $400 million annually—estimate obtained from the National Rehabilitation Association. The Federal appropriation for rehabilitation for the 1953–54 fiscal year was only $23 million.

The values of rehabilitation in increasing the available manpower and production and in reducing dependency, are well known. Accomplishment of these objectives is a national concern. Increase of Federal assistance for rehabilitation would be good business for the Federal Government.

S. 2759, pending in the 83d Congress, would replace the Vocational Rehabilitation Act with a new program. It provides for three types of Federal grants to the States, namely, a fund for the basic rehabilitation program called rehabilitation services, a fund for improvement and extension projects, and a third fund for special projects.

The present rehabilitation program is financed under Public Law 113 of the 78th Congress, which provides that the Federal Government shall reimburse the States for 100 percent of expenditures for necessary administration, guidance, and placement, and 50 percent of expenditures for case service. S. 2759 would discard this method of financing the basic program and substitute for it allotments based upon population, weighted by per capita income, and a Federal share based upon relative per capita income of the States.

The Federal-State rehabilitation program has been operating on a national average of about 2 Federal dollars to 1 State dollar. The proposed legislation, S. 2759, is aimed at an eventual 50–50 sharing of the cost by the Federal and State Governments.

Certain provisions of the bill would ease the transfer from one system of financing to another, particularly during 1955 and 1956. Nevertheless, establishment of the proposed system of financing would create for many of the States serious difficulties in immediately securing enough State funds to replace the Federal funds lost. Some of these States would be unable to replace the lost Federal funds, so there would actually be less rehabilitation service in these States during 1955 and 1956 than before, under this legislation.

The broad aim of S. 2759 to expand rehabilitation services will not be soon achieved unless there is a reduction in hardships from changing methods of financing.

One way of reducing such hardships is proposed in S. 3039, which would provide Federal allotments to the States for the basic rehabilitation program in two parts, as follows:

First. An amount equal to 100 percent of the administration, guidance, and placement expenditures for 1953 and 50 percent case service expenditures for the same year. If a State should in future utilize less State money than in 1953 it would receive proportionately less Federal assistance.

Second. Federal funds available in excess of the amount needed for the purpose stated above would be allotted on a population basis to States expending more for rehabilitation than in 1953. The Federal share of the additional expenditure would be 50 percent in all the States.

This plan would maintain rehabilitation programs in the States at their present levels, while encouraging their expansion on a 50–50 basis.

Other alternatives to S. 2759 have been proposed. Copies of several alternatives in typescript form have been prepared and distributed by the National Rehabilitation Association. They merit careful study.

Since first, the California Legislature has already approved the budget for vocational rehabilitation for the year 1954–55, and second, there will be no opportunity for the legislature to appropriate additional amounts to compensate for the loss of Federal funds under the financing formula contained in S. 2759, enactment of this bill as originally introduced would be a serious temporary, if not permanent, injury to the vocational-rehabilitation program in California.

At the least, S. 2759 should be amended to provide for a continuance of Federal payments to the States for the fiscal year 1955 equal to the contribution of the Federal Government in 1953. This would give the States a breathing space to make adjustments to the different financing provisions of S. 2759. Under no circumstances should we permit pennywise cuts to reduce the size and scope of the rehabilitation program.

Trends in Labor Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 7, 1954

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include an informative address entitled "Trends in Labor Relations," made by Whitley P. McCoy, Director of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, before the seventh annual conference on labor at the Barbizon-Plaza Hotel, New York City, on May 7, 1954.

The address follows:

TRENDS IN LABOR RELATIONS

The accidental transition of my subject title is not serious, of course. I doubt if any of you are here specifically because I was to speak on friends in labor relations or would have stayed away had you known I was to speak on trends in labor relations. As a matter of fact, with the opening given me by the inadvertent title change, I was sorely tempted to throw both friends and trends out the window and discourse on the subject of semantics. However, I have resisted that temptation.

It has become quite popular to attack many of the activities of the Federal Government as "meddling." In fact, criticism of overparticipation by Federal agencies in the lives of our citizens comes not only from outside the bureaucracy, but also from within, for it is the position of the administration that the executive agencies should, where possible, withdraw from activities which could best be handled outside the Federal structure, perhaps by the States, but preferably by private groups. I, personally, have always felt that government intervention and participation should be minimal and, as a matter of policy, I have applied that principle to the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service.

In recents months I have publicly spoken of my desire to reduce the Service's caseload, insofar as possible and expedient. I hope to accomplish this primarily by resolving questions of Federal versus State jurisdiction in favor of the latter, where feasible and practical. I have also pointed out that the Service has eschewed a formal preventive mediation program in favor of an informal, natural one.

I do believe, however, that the charge of governmental meddling has been somewhat overdone. For example, even the Federal postal system comes under periodic attack by a small group of well-intentioned people, although its place in the American scheme of things is apparently secure. It is clear that there are areas in which the Federal Government's participation is desirable, practical, and necessary.

Usually, the criticism of government meddling is confined to those agencies whose function is of a quasi-judicial nature; such agencies are almost constantly under attack. Generally, there is a considerable sincerity in these attacks, although too often they are made by the losers of governmental decisions. But regardless of the motive of the critics, it must be admitted that big government can be a dangerous thing in a democracy and the reduction of big government to necessary government is an important goal.

The Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, being exclusively a service agency, has, I am glad to say, seldom come under attack as a meddler. To begin with, it is a very small unit of the Federal Government. Its staff includes only about 225 mediators, thinly spread over the entire Nation. Secondly, it is not a decision-making agency. It has the sole purpose of assisting the parties in a labor-management dispute to come to agreement, and it operates without compulsion. It has no interest in the rights and wrongs of disputes. Moreover, if a formal charge of any type is later filed by one party against the other, the Service's mediator cannot be called upon to testify, even in court, as to either opinion or fact. Finally, it is the tradition of the Service, confirmed by 40 years of practice, that the basic responsibility for the settlement of disputes lies with the parties, and that the Service will not participate only at the point of impasse.

Nevertheless, we are not entirely free of criticism, which is as it should be, and we have undertaken to examine the two main areas in which we are sometimes accused of meddling. The first of these concerns jurisdiction; the second, preventive mediation.

As to jurisdiction, it has been said that the Service accepts many cases which more properly should be mediated by State and local agencies. In this regard, I submit that with the small staff of mediators available, the Service's job is more one of limiting its jurisdiction than of maintaining or increasing it. Therefore, it has been my constant position that in doubtful cases, our jurisdictional authority should be denied, particularly where a State or local mediation agency is available, unless special factors are present which seem to make our participation desirable in the public interest.

It has been my policy to encourage existing State agencies, and to urge States which do not have a mediation service to establish such a facility in order to assume part of the mediation burden, at least for those cases which are properly the responsibility of the States. And, far from meddling, we are quite anxious for the State and local services to accept many of the cases which we have had to accept by default. Almost like the multiplier principle in economics, the very success of mediation as a technique in settling labor-management disputes has brought about need for more mediation services.

Now, there may be those who consider that any mediation action by the Federal Government constitutes meddling. To that small minority, I would address these questions: Would disputants now using the Federal Service be expected to request mediation assistance of the State and local governments? What service would be available to disputants in the many States which have no mediation facilities whatever? And in the States which do provide a mediation service, are the physical and financial resources available for the undertaking of the tremendous job which would fall to them? Could they become involved in disputes of a national character? And if they did, might they not be impinging upon the rights of other States? Would not the charge of meddling now leveled at the Federal Service then be directed toward the State agencies? If meddling it be, is a meddle by a State agency more savory than a meddle by the Federal Government?

These questions are basic to the proposition of total withdrawal of Federal mediation facilities. It is my considered opinion that it is neither feasible nor proper to remove the Federal Government from the function of mediation. Such action would be as faulty and indefensible as a Federal withdrawal from mail delivery. And just as likely, I think.

As to the question of preventive mediation, I will say that in all the mediation process, no function is so belabored or so misunderstood as this one. Preventive activity is implicit in a definition of mediation. There is nothing particularly new about it; it has been practiced in one form or another almost from the beginning of time. As with other matters dealing in human relations, it has undergone experimentation, and even now an exact definition of it is difficult. Our mediators are instructed that preventive mediation is any activity performed by them that pertains to the avoidance of industrial strife and promotes recognition and acceptance of responsibilities by labor and management.

I realize that it is possible for persons outside the Service to read many things into that general framework. For example, the dispute notice section of the Labor Management Relations Act has been cited as the initiation of preventive activity. That section requires parties to send notice to Federal and State mediation agencies of the intention to ask changes in an existing contract. The receipt of such a notice by the Service often requires an inquiry of the parties to determine whether we have jurisdiction in the matter and/or to determine need for mediation. This can hardly be called preventive activity. Preventive mediation may be many things, but no realistic definition of it considers that strike prevention should begin at the time of a strike—or even at the time of contract negotiations. To charge off an administrative procedure to preventive mediation is to miss the point of preventive activity. Prevention is a never-ending, year-around activity. I have said in the past that preventive mediation must be placed in its proper perspective. The Service's experiments with it have led to the conclusion that a formal preventive program is less successful than an activity which grows naturally out of the techniques used by the mediator in his day-to-day dispute assignments. For maximum effectiveness, preventive work must be informal and natural. It may take as simple a form as mere mediator participation in conferences, meetings, and classes as an invited guest, or an occasional luncheon or phone conversation with labor and management principals. It may be somewhat more complicated, as in acceptance of invitations from companies and unions to assist in the development of a plan for the handling of a contract, a grievance, or other matters. It may be in the writing of a thought-provoking article. It is, in short, any activity which will enhance good labor-management relations. I believe that this type of activity is in keeping with a mediation service, and I cannot believe that it is meddling in the slightest degree. If there are imperfections in it, these must be charged to individual errors in judgment and not to principle.

Whether it be in terms of jurisdiction, preventive mediation, or any other activity, it is not my desire that the Service should grow beyond the bounds of need. As I have said, the charge of meddling by the Service is not often made, but I will be sensitive to such charges because of my own views on big government. At the same time, I consider that the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service performs a function which is useful, helpful, and necessary to the public interest and to labor-management relations in this country. It is my hope and intention that it will continue to meet the obligation placed upon it in law and spirit by the Congress of the United States.

Dairy Surplus Drops

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 7, 1954

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the Appendix of the Record a summary of dairy price support purchases and uses in May 1954:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE SUMMARIZES DAIRY PRICE SUPPORT PURCHASES AND USES IN MAY

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT
OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, June 4, 1954.

The most significant development in the dairy price support operation during the month of May was the sale of 403.5 million pounds of nonfat dry milk for mixed poultry and livestock feed use, the United States Department of Agriculture reported today in summarizing dairy product purchases and uses during May. While this sale has more than halved nonfat dry milk stocks during the month, the remaining stocks plus current purchases will amply supply anticipated outlets for human feeding.

Purchases during May 1954 amounted to 44,320,838 pounds of butter, 21,854,138 pounds of cheddar cheese, and 75,642,757 pounds of nonfat dry milk. In May 1953, purchases amounted to 42,255,757 pounds of butter, 35,104,647 pounds of cheese, and 74,272,345 pounds of nonfat dry milk.

May distribution totaled 20,997,672 pounds of butter, 11,455,909 pounds of cheese, and 421,108,376 pounds of nonfat dry milk. Excluding dry milk feed sales, remaining distribution was mainly for domestic school lunches, and domestic and foreign welfare feeding—16,555,735 pounds of butter, 6,536,404 pounds of cheese, and 17,249,040 pounds of nonfat dry milk. In addition, 4 million pounds of butter were scheduled for conversion into butter oil for the United Nations and 60,000 pounds of butter were sold commercially under the foreign liquid milk-recombining operation. Nonfat dry milk sales for commercial export amounted to 277,555 pounds and commercial sales of cheese were 4,919,505 pounds.

Following are purchases and uses through May under the 1952-53, 1953-54, and 1954-55 dair-support programs and estimated quantities on hand May 31, 1954:

[In pounds]

	Butter	Cheddar cheese	Nonfat dry milk solids
Purchases:			
1952-53 (Apr. 1, 1952-Mar. 31, 1953)	143, 348, 182	75, 236, 130	210, 410, 087
1953-54 (Apr. 1, 1953-Mar. 31, 1954)	380, 198, 987	454, 253, 349	665, 929, 094
1954-55 (Apr. 1, 1954-May 31, 1954)	59, 147, 116	31, 672, 192	117, 236, 771
Total	582, 694, 285	561, 161, 671	993, 575, 952
Uses:			
Commercial sales	9, 760, 334	106, 858, 071	64, 970
Animal and mixed feed sales			405, 196, 136
Sec. 32 outlets	95, 818, 425	28, 832, 525	20, 999, 548
Section 416 donations	59, 957, 560	30, 843, 300	112, 666, 082
Noncommercial export sales		465, 000	203, 696, 760
U. S. Army sales	23, 099, 894		6, 830, 765
Other [1]	6, 038, 410		357, 555
Total	194, 674, 623	166, 998, 896	749, 811, 816
Estimated supplies: As of May 31, 1954	388, 019, 662	394, 162, 775	243, 764, 136

[1] Other uses include butter salvage sale, cocoa butter substitute sales, butter sales to the Veterans' Administration, conversion of butter into butter oil for U. N., donations for research, liquid milk recombing program, and commercial export sales.

This Is Our Answer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 7, 1954

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the Record, I submit the following editorial from the June 4 edition of the Collins (Miss.) News-Commercial, of which the able and outstanding humorist and publisher, Jimmy Arrington, is the editor.

The fact that the leadership of the South is temperate in its reaction to the misguided opinion of the Supreme Court on school segregation should not be mistaken for lack of determination to see that the children of both races are to receive equal but separate opportunities for education in our public schools.

The editorial follows:

THIS IS OUR ANSWER

Covington County's answer to the recent ruling of the United States Supreme Court banning segregation in the public schools, may be found in the fact that bids will be received on June 18 for the construction of an auditorium and gymnasium for the Carver Central Colored School in Collins.

When the auditorium and gymnasium are added to the present school plant, Carver School will have one of the most modern school buildings in the State.

We are positive that segregation can be maintained in the public-school system of Covington County and at the same time not be violative of the recent ruling of the Supreme Court.

This will be possible because Covington County over the past years has made determined efforts to provide adequate educational opportunities for the colored students.

It will be noted that we use the term "adequate" rather than "equal," because in some instances the facilites of the colored schools in this county are "superior" to some of the white schools.

Our county has three outstanding colored high schools: Lincoln, Hopewell, and Carver Central.

With the providing of adequate transportation routes, there will not be a single colored child in Covington County without access to a modern school.

If the Negro leadership of Covington County will be satisfied with educational equality as ordered by the Supreme Court, then Covington County will gladly provide it for their children.

Hower, if this leadership lends an attentive ear to wild-eyed agitators and demand social equality, then they will not only fail to get that, but they will be doing their own race a great injustice.

The News-Commercial over the years has worked diligently in bringing to our colored citizens a better standard of living; better schools and justice before the law.

We have never been guilty of inciting racial ill will through the publishing of inflamatory matter.

By the same token, we have never advocated nor do we now advocate the abolition of segregation of the races.

We know that in Covington County the two races can live and work side by side, peacefully and happy, under a system of segregation.

Therefore, every Covington Countian should take pride that our answer to the ruling of the Supreme Court is not open defiance of the mandate of the Court; not plans to abolish our public schools; not foolish threats of political reprisals; not predictions of racial violence, but on the contrary, our answer is the continuing of a program to give adequate educational facilities to the colored schoolchildren of this county.

Offshore Procurement of Ships

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 29, 1954

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, that the essential shipbuilding industry of the United States is approaching a desperate condition owing to a dearth of construction work is becoming more evident day by day. Orders are very slow, work in progress is tailing off, employment is declining, and some yards have already closed while others face that prospect in the near future. It is a serious problem and one for genuine national concern in view of the security importance of our shipyards. Consequently, I think it must be agreed that any policy or practice of our Government which serves to aggravate these difficulties should be challenged and reexamined.

For several years, under the offshore procurement program, it has been the practice of our Government to place contracts for ship construction, particularly of smaller craft, with European shipyards of the NATO countries. It is reported that in the fiscal years 1952 and 1953 the United States Government expended or contracted for the expenditure of $237 million for such offshore procurement of small vessels to be built in Europe. This has been a part of the much larger general program of offshore procurement under which the United States has been purchasing military equipment abroad for delivery to its allies.

Now, I recognize the importance of this procurement program in promoting desirable trade relations with friendly foreign nations, in building up the military potential and self-sufficiency of the NATO countries, in strengthening their economies as vital segments of the free world, and frequently as a measure of economy in obtaining the necessary defense facilities at lowest cost.

It is also important to bear in mind, however, that there are other important considerations to be taken into account in determining how far to go with this kind of program. We must be concerned with how our own economy and security are affected. In fact, the directive issued by the Department of Defense in 1951 setting forth its offshore procurement policy specifically provided that the items be selected for European procurement should not result in "serious adverse effects upon the United States economy, employment, or industrial mobilization base" or interpose "any threat to the security interests of the United States."

Let us see, then, what these provisions signify when applied to our own domestic shipbuilding industry. We find, in the first place, that it is our declared national policy as stated in the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 and again in the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946 to foster the development and maintenance of a strong merchant marine and shipbuilding industry at all times as an essential arm of our national defense and security. Why this is so is altogether clear from our experiences in both World Wars I and II when we were desperately in need of ships and shipbuilding and could not turn to others to furnish them. Never must we allow our atttention to be diverted from this basic security need for a vigorous shipbuilding industry in our own country.

The 1951 directive of the Department of Defense also stated that the offshore procurement program must not seriously injure the domestic economy. What about that as applied to shipbuilding? Over the past months shipyard activities and employment have declined sharply and are continuing to do so. The order books of the domestic shipyards, both large and small, are virtually bare and propects of immediate improvement are poor. Some of our shipyards have already shut down for lack of work and others will have to do so before long unless conditions change.

In contrast with the situation in this country, foreign shipbuilding, with its comparative cost advantages, is generally active and in some areas is booming. Circumstances being what they are, it would seem to be perfectly evident that, so far as ship construction is concerned, the need for stimulation now is not in these foreign countries but in our own. It seems very clear, also, that to continue offshore ship procurement with the expenditure of United States funds under existing conditions runs directly contrary to the terms of the directive which the Department of Defense laid down in 1951 to guide its program.

A few weeks ago there were indications that the Department of Defense, in connection with the Navy Department's offshore ship-procurement program, was about to let additional contracts with various foreign shipyards in the total amount of approximately $52 million. Representatives of the Department were about to leave for Europe to undertake final negotiations and the signing of the contracts.

Fortunately, through the timely intervention of certain interested Members of Congress and protesting American shipyards, and with the cooperation of the Secretary of Defense, these plans have now been modified. About half of the amount which had previously been earmarked for expenditure in the busy foreign shipyards will instead be used in this country to provide some urgently needed work for our own shipyards. It is intended that contracts amounting to $27,500,000 will be let soon on a negotiated basis for building 8 to 10 minesweepers of the medium class. This is a type of work which has usually been performed by our smaller shipyards, now so greatly in need of business to keep their operations going.

This is surely a step in the right direction, and it may be hoped that from now on more vigilant attention will be given to our own essential shipyards in awarding construction contracts. In the present situation, with our own domestic shipyards in dire need of work, the placing of contracts with foreign shipyards is unjustified and is, as I have said, actually contrary to the directive issued by the Department of Defense itself to govern the administration of the offshore procurement program.

What It Means To Be an American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 7, 1954

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, Dale Dingeman Bajema, a student in the Benson Polytechnic High School in Portland, Oreg., in my congressional district, has written the winning essay for the largest American Legion unit in Portland entitled "What It Means To Be an American." His essay seems to me to be worthy of a nationwide audience and I include it as part of these remarks:

WHAT IT MEANS TO ME TO BE AN AMERICAN

(By Dale Dingeman Bajema, student at Benson Polytechnic High School)

I am an American. I don't ask for security—only opportunity. I don't want the state as my nursemaid; only the opportunity to take a chance—to succeed or fail by my own ability and ambition.

I want the challenge of matching my skills and judgment against the world conditions to better my standards—the calculated risks of the ladder of success to the routine existence of the perfect state. Only then can I realize that I am capable; that I am strong enough to live without support of someone else.

I don't want to be a man looked after by the state. What pride and respect could I have for myself? For my existence I want obligations to no one, much less the state. It is my heritage as an American to be self-supporting. Would the New England colonists or the westward moving pioneers have expected Government care? They had pride that they could build a country with their own hands. Why should I now look to the state to hand me life? I want to dream, to build, and obtain my desires as a man independent of socialistic and communistic principles.

I want that certain dignity which comes when one's neighbors look at him with respect, not the pity as if he were a state case. A person cannot help but be humbled, and his ambition and abilities dulled by having all his needs looked atfer by the state. I don't want a guaranteed existence, but the opportunity to create for myself, and say proudly, "This I have done."

(Judge: Mr. Arthur Crookham, editorial staff, Oregon Journal.)

Assumption by Federal District Courts of Jurisdiction in Cases Involving Condemned Killers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. DAWSON
OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 7, 1954

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced two pieces of legislation—a private and a public bill. Both are an outgrowth of an increasing tendency on the part of Federal district courts throughout the Nation to assume jurisdiction in cases involving condemned killers. In order that the Members will be familiar with the problem, I cite a specific case in Utah for which one of the measures, the private bill, seeks monetary relief.

Verne Alfred Braasch and Melvin LeRoy Sullivan were tried and convicted to death for the brutal holdup slaying of a gas-station attendant in Beaver, Utah, on October 22, 1949. The original execution date was February 16, 1950.

The execution was stayed when the defendants appealed to the Utah Supreme Court. Utah's highest court affirmed the conviction and subsequently considered three additional appeals for extraordinary writs and reviews, all of which were denied after careful study.

In addition, the two have twice petitioned the United States Supreme Court, and in each instance these petitions have been denied, the most recent one being October 19, 1953.

One could reasonably expect that these men had run their full legal course. Such is not the case, however.

Despite refusal of the United States Supreme Court to review the State's highest court decisions on the matter, the Federal district court assumed jurisdiction over the case on February 21, 1952, after the defendants filed for a writ of habeas corpus in his court. The district judge has retained jurisdiction of the case since that time and recently requested the filing of additional briefs by both the State and the defendants.

Certainly it is not my intention by these measures to cut down the legal remedies available to our citizens, including convicted killers such as Braasch and Sullivan. But I do believe that where such extended delays in the carrying out of sentences occurs that the Federal Government should bear the cost of maintaining the prisoners. If the Federal district court is going to assume the obligation of a court of last resort after all other remedies have been exhausted, then the concomitant expense of maintaining the defendants should be assumed at the same time.

We Can Sell That Dairy Surplus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CECIL M. HARDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 7, 1954

Mrs. HARDEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to call the Members' attention to an article appearing in the current issue of the Country Gentleman. I think it is of particular interest to those of us from agricultural districts. The article follows:

WE CAN SELL THAT DAIRY SURPLUS

The dairy industry must face up to the fact that it has an emergency on its hands. Its present situation is a threat to the income of the 2 million farmers who sell milk and to the solvency of the farm price-support program.

There are only two ways to get out of it—produce less or sell more milk. The policy that has been followed, of depending on the Government to take the excess production, has reached the limit of public tolerance.

Put simply, a use must be found for better than 6 billion pounds more milk, if present production is maintained, at the same time the market is absorbing some of the accumulated dairy stocks in Government hands. Those stocks—butter, cheese, and dried milk—recently amounted to the equivalent of 8 billion pounds of whole milk. At that point the Government had $310 million tied up in them.

A part of these stocks is now being disposed of at heavy losses to avoid spoilage. Flush milk production is expected to bring an increased flow of dairy products into Government storage, with the probability of more fire sales later on.

This heedless process can't go on indefinitely. It is undermining the whole dairy price structure, and CCC stabilization funds won't stand such continued losses.

You can see why that leaves only two alternatives—produce less or sell more milk. Both may have to be applied, but Country Gentleman believes that dairy farmers and their leaders have the ability and the incentive to make the second a success and to put their business on a secure basis. Fortunately, they will have the aid of perhaps the best food merchandising expert in America, Clarence Francis, chairman of General Foods Corp., who is serving as consultant to the President and the USDA in the disposal of surplus farm crops.

It is a merchandising job that is called for, the most challenging one in America today. There is a big enough potential market to absorb all the production and more. It includes the whole 161 million American people, a majority of whom are not drinking enough milk for their own good. What is carelessly termed a dairy surplus—only 6½ percent of our total production—isn't really a surplus at all. It's just undersold milk.

You realize how true this is when you read in the article We're Learning How To Sell More Milk, on page 20 of this issue, that half the adult population seldom or never drinks milk. This is borne out by recent studies in Iowa, one of the most favored States in wealth and education. These showed that where 4 out of 10 younger persons needed to drink more milk, 8 out of 10 older people were not consuming enough milk for good health.

Those figures tell one important reason for the undersold milk supply. The dairy industry has let people think of milk only as something good for children. The far larger number of adults, who need to drink milk all their lives to keep their health and vigor, have been neglected. That a bigger market can be built for milk, when its real values are brought home to people, is demonstrated in the article mentioned.

This combined advertising and educational program, carried on by the American Dairy Association in cooperation with local dairy interests, is one of numerous signs that the dairy industry is going after the opportunity to expand the use of milk and dairy products.

But just creating more of an appetite for milk isn't enough. It needs to be backed up by methods that will make milk easily and widely available. As W. E. Winn, president of the Pure Milk Association, which supplies the big Chicago market, said: "I would like to see a lot more effort in the field of merchandising, getting more milk-vending machines in schools, offices, apartment buildings and factories; more mechanical vendors of large containers of milk and ice cream, and more milk dispensers in restaurants. These outlets offer unlimited possibilities for more sales."

All of which goes to show how much is yet to be done before the limits of the milk market are reached. It makes you realize, too, that until recently how poor a merchandising job has been done with this $3 billion a year product.

Another thing that needs consideration is the increased cost spread between the dairy farmer and the consumer, and how it may be reduced. In many markets dairymen are receiving a cent a quart less while the consumer is paying 5 to 7 cents a quart more than in 1945. What makes this fact doubly important is that if people were using as much milk as they did in 1945 there wouldn't be any surplus now.

That consumers will take more milk when they can get it at savings has been proved by the Lawson Milk Co., which operates more than 100 milk stores in Akron, Cleveland, and Canton, Ohio. They buy milk direct from farmers, advertise extensively, and sell it in gallon jugs at their stores considerably below the doorstep-delivery rate. You can see the advantage of that gallon jug. It puts more milk in the family refrigerator, and the more milk there is around the house the more will be consumed. Any surplus milk the Lawsons have they use to make ice cream, candy, and bread, which they also sell at their stores.

The test of this cost-cutting system is that milk consumption per person in Akron is nearly one-third above the national average. Those are Akron Health Department figures.

Such examples as cited here simply suggest how many ways there are to expand the use of milk. And if more milk is consumed as milk there will be less going into those troublesome surplus products. You'll hear of other plans and methods being tried or considered over the country. Every dairy producer ought to study them carefully and give his support to those that will help his business.

The opportunity exists to build a bigger market. It is time to turn it to account and give milk the place it deserves—as a satisfying drink, a necessary food, and a mainstay of a healthy America.

Pope Pius X Canonized

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 7, 1954

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include an editorial entitled "Pope Pius X Canonized," appearing in the Washington Star, Washington, D. C., June 4, 1954:

Pope Pius X Canonized

In a sense, a worldwide audience attended the ceremonies wherein Pope Pius XII proclaimed the canonization of Pope Pius X. The solemn rites were watched by thousands assembled at St. Peter's in Rome. They were reported by all the latter-day facilities of communication. Not to Catholics only but to Christians of every other school and many non-Christian people of good will the drama was compelling in its power and beauty.

Pius X was a postman's son. He was born poor in 1835 and he died poor in 1914. But there was no poverty of mind or heart in him. He loved his church and labored for it prodigiously. It is an understatement to say that he earned the papal crown "the hard way." His election represented a compromise, yet possibly for that very reason was a tribute to his talents, his noble character, and his beneficent personality. Devoted to the masses in daily practice, not simply in philosophic theory, he received their devotion, in turn, and likewise was immensely popular in the Vatican. Many changes occurred in the organization and administration of the church in his time. Pius X was a great executive officer and he taught his patterns of procedure to Catholicism at large with notably constructive results.

One of the earliest critics of secular opportunism, he sponsored a crusade against modernism in economics and politics in relation to religion which became controversial itself and to still some extent remains a matter of debate. But the world now goes further in approving his resistance to the evils of godless materialism than it was ready to go in 1907. It has been educated to a better appreciation of the views of Pius X than was feasible in his lifetime. The canonization of "the saint that providence presents to our era" is a vindication of him. World War I claimed him as one of its earliest casualties. The world of 1954 pays him homage as a prophet against further disasters.

Edgar Poe, Jr., Honored

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 7, 1954

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the Record, I submit below an editorial from the June 6 edition of the Jackson Daily News of Jackson, Miss., honoring one of the page boys of this House, Edgar Poe, Jr.

We are all familiar with and profit by our association with Mr. Edgar Poe, Sr., the Washington correspondent of the New Orleans Times-Picayune, one of the most delightful character it has ever been my pleasure to know. Ed, Jr., is truly "a chip off of the old block."

Because of the interest that we all have in this splendid group who make up the page boys of this body and in order to give proper recognition to this splendid young man, this editorial is submitted:

Edgar Poe, Jr., Honored

Edgar Poe, Jr., son of a former Jackson newspaperman, now serving as Washington correspondent of the New Orleans Times-Picayune, was signally honored the other day for notable journalistic achievement in connection with his work among the 90 page boys who serve the House and Senate.

These youngsters on Capitol Hill attend a school provided by Congress and young Poe is one of the most popular and efficient of their number. This year's class will be graduated on June 14. The boys have a newspaper of their own known as the Capitol Courier and this former Jackson lad is its editor. Last week he was made a member of the National High School Honor Society. Members of that organization are selected for character, scholarship, and leadership.

Edgar Poe, Jr., was morn in New Orleans in 1936. He finished the sixth grade in the public schools in Jackson, Miss., and then entered the Dolly Madison School in nearby Virginia, where he finished the eighth grade. His high-school courses have been at Washington and Lee High School and the page school.

Address of Gov. Theodore R. McKeldin, Governor of Maryland, at the Commencement Exercises, Steed College of Technology, Johnson City, Tenn., May 24, 1954

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. B. CARROLL REECE

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 2, 1954

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, on May 24, 1954, Gov. Theodore R. McKeldin, of Maryland, delivered the commencement address at Steed College of Technology, Johnson City, Tenn., a business college which is rendering a great service to the people.

The address by Maryland's great governor attracted wide attention. It is such a splendid address and analyzes the problems of the day so well, I have requested permission to have it inserted in the Record, so that it might be more widely available for reading by Americans everywhere.

The address follows:

In Pericles' eulogy of the Athenian war dead, which many people regard as the greatest oration ever delivered, the high point was touched when the speaker described Athens as the school of all Greece. More than 2,000 years later we know that Athens was, in fact, more than the school of Greece; to an astonishingly large extent it was the school of the whole world. In fact, we are still learning from it.

It is our habit to attribute this to the great philosophers that Athens gave the world. But the city was already the school of Greece when Pericles spoke, and at that time Socrates was a not-too-successful sculptor turned soldier; Plato was less than 2 years old; and Aristotle was not to be born for almost 50 years. It is true that the philosophers added the crowning touch to "the glory that was Greece" but Athens was a great school before they appeared.

To find the explanation you must go back almost 150 years before Pericles, to Solon, the great lawgiver, who decreed that every Athenian, whether of high or low degree, must teach his son a trade. He was permitted also to leave him a fortune, if he had one, but he must teach him a trade.

This established at the very basis of Athenian culture a profound respect for the dignity of labor. You might be the son of a very eminent man, you might possess wealth and numbers of influential friends, you might aspire to the highest offices in the State, or you might devote your mature years to the study of philosophy; but first of all, you had to learn to do something with your hands.

A hundred and fifty years of this resulted in what many wise man have called the most completely civilized society the world has ever seen. It was not a society of technicians; it was a city in which what snobs refer to as the common herd delighted in the plays of Sophocles and could appreciate the beauty of the Parthenon, both of which are now regarded as the highest of highbrow art. Respect for honest labor had much to do with making Athens intellectually great.

More than 200 years have passed since Pericles spoke, but human nature has not changed. The time since the adoption of the Constitution of the United States is only a little longer than the time from Solon to Pericles; and if our country has grown great it is because we, too, have held that the most important question to be asked about a man is not how much does he have, or whose son is he, but what can he do?

We have no law requiring every man to teach his son a trade, but we do have a strong public opinion holding that a man is not a first-class citizen unless he is capable of making his own living by some form of labor, mental or physical. We have abandoned the old idea that education consists entirely of being able to read Latin and Greek. We have realized that the ability to work to some useful purpose is the foundation of cultural development.

This has become plainer and plainer as modern science has complicated the operations of the crafts and industry. As long as the horse was the largest unit of motive power, a teamster needed to know horses, but not much else. He might be very successful teamster without even being able to read and write. But think of a modern truckdriver going out on the highway without being able to read the road signs. He would be in trouble before he had gone a mile, and he would be lucky not to kill himself and somebody else.

A man with the power of 200 horses under his hands, and with the weight of many tons behind him must be educated in many ways. His brain must be alert and his judgment must be swift and sure, both of which are qualities developed by education. A dimwit simply cannot be allowed to operate one of those huge machines on the public highways. He would be a security risk in the most literal sense—a risk to his own life and that of everyone he met.

What is true of truckdrivers is doubly true of the men who operate the complicated mechanism of our industrial system. The Apostle Paul, you remember, was a tentmaker. Later he became a saint and a profound philosopher, but he began by cutting and sawing tent-cloth. It is probable that his hands developed a strength and skill surpassing that of a modern maker of tents; but a tentmaker of our time has to possess knowledge that did not exist in the world of Saint Paul. He must know how to control and operate power-driven machines, he must be able to read and follow complicated directions, he must know how to adjust himself to the factory system.

All of which means that the wide gulf that once existed between classical education and manual training has grown narrower and narrower until now it is impossible to draw a hard-and-fast line between them.

Consider, if you please, the wonderful achievement that some call the triumph and some the tragedy of modern civilization, the making of the atomic bomb. The theory of the thing was purely intellectual, involving mathematical calculations so difficult that most of us cannot even imagine what they were about, much less how to make them. The intellectual work, or the bulk of it, had been performed years before the outbreak of the Second World War, but there was no bomb, nor any immediate prospect of one.

The actual construction of the thing was only partly mental labor, and largely mechanical. True, some of the mechanics were also very great scientists, thinkers of the first order of importance; yet they had hands skillful enough to operate precision instruments of extreme delicacy, and without those hands their thinking could never have borne fruit.

So the term "vocational education" has become less and less precise as our industrial civilization has grown more and more complicated, until today all education is to some extent vocational, and the learning of any craft is to some extent education. Offhand one might be inclined to say that no two operations could be more utterly different than setting a turret lathe and translating a line of Homer. Yet in both cases one must know the material that is to be worked, have a clear concept of what the end project is to be like, and be aware of what the difficulties are and how to overcome them.

Most important of all, each worker, if he is to be highly successful, must be dedicated to the purpose of producing something that is exactly right. Sloppy work means a defective product, whether it is a line of verse or a bearing with a tolerance of one ten-thousand of an inch.

It is this last factor that I would urge upon your attention today. You have had in your classrooms, I know, persistent and consistent emphasis on the fact that it is not enough to do the thing, that the only success is in doing it right. That is the basis of all education, vocational, classical, professional, or any other. When it comes to that point, it is all alike; and what your hands do, whether it is writing a play or assembling an internal combustion engine, will reflect the way your brain works. If your thinking is direct, accurate, and precise, your work will be swift and efficient, and it makes no difference at all what that work is.

Obviously, then, anything that improves the quality of a man's thinking will improve the quality of his work. The converse is also true—as a man improves the quality of his work he is pretty sure to improve the quality of his thinking—but for the moment let us consider the first proposition, the desirability of improving one's thinking as a means of improving one's work.

Once again let us go back to school to Athens. Solon required every citizen's son to learn a trade. It was not necessary to require him to take an interest in the city's affairs, for that was the very heart of Greek life. Remember that in ancient Greece the city, the polis, was the entire nation and interest in the affairs of the polis was interest in political affairs.

If Solon were dictator of the United States today he would have to reverse his orders. Most Americans know how to do something to make a living, but vast numbers take little or no interest in political affairs. If he were living today, Solon would command every American to teach his son, not a trade, but how to act as a citizen, for it is in that department that we are falling short.

It is that advice I urge upon you. You are people who have accepted the old lawgiver's counsel. You have understood the honor and dignity of the craft; but let me remind you that men who are craftsmen and nothing else have never created a great civilization. That work requires men who are craftsmen and also competent citizens.

We have recently had a vivid illustration of this very point. The man who made the atom bomb was certainly a fine workman; you might put up a pretty good argument that he was the finest workman of his generation. But in his youth he made the error that no Athenian of Solon's time could possibly have made—he devoted all his time and attention to his work, giving none to public affairs. As a result, he was deceived into assuming a tolerant attitude toward the greatest political heresy of our time; and in later years that error rose to embarrass him and his country.

I plead with you not to make that mistake and I emphasize the truth that this man's original mistake was not in becoming involved with Communists—that involvement was a result of the original mistake, which was to be indifferent to the conduct of public affairs. The man who is indifferent to public affairs in a democracy lays himself wide open to deception, and deception may lead him into monstrous error.

On the other hand, do not fail to learn the supreme lesson that Athens teaches—that when you have a society in which all men, or nearly all, are at the same time skillful workmen and citizens alert to what is going on in public affairs, you may have a brilliant civilization, perhaps the most brilliant that it is possible to create. In this institution you students have acquired half of the necessary equipment; you have trained your minds and your hands to discharge the duties of private life adequately. But it is not enough; there remains another realm, that of public affairs, and no school can teach you how to conduct yourself there. You must learn for yourself.

But the respect for accuracy, for fact not fancy, that you have learned here has equipped you to learn all that is necessary for a citizen to know. The one other requisite is diligence. But with that, it is possible for you to make a contribution to our country that will raise it a little further toward true greatness and enduring power.

Two Sick Industries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 7, 1954

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in my extension of remarks, I include a timely suggestion to Dr. Arthur L. Burns in an editorial in the New York Times of June 7, 1954, entitled "Two Sick Industries."

There is no question but what the textile and coal industries are in a depressed condition, and are entitled to every consideration possible to bring relief to the workers and their families and to business and management.

The editorial follows:

TWO SICK INDUSTRIES

We hope that when Dr. Arthur F. Burns, the chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, holds his first general press conference tomorrow, he will indicate that the administration is giving thought to the depressed state of the coal and textile industries. Each week brings fresh reports of shut mines and mills, widening unemployment and erosion of labor standards.

Workers in the Botany Mills at Passaic, N. J., long a pattern setter in the woolen and worsted field, will have their pay cut 9¼ cents an hour under an arbitrator's decision, effective today. Other northern mills are pressing for similar cuts as an alternative to bankruptcy. The textile unions have sought to cooperate in increasing the efficiency of the industry and the productivity of its workers. But the industry has been losing ground in the face of competition from imported fabrics, synthetics, and nonunion producers in the South.

The coal industry has been running downhill so long that we tend to take its woes for granted. Now, for the first time since the thirties, there are signs that the mine operators are sufficiently concerned to jettison their sectional feuds and work together with the Government in measures intended to restore economic health to the vast areas of West Virginia, Pennsylvania, Illinois, and 15 other States that are dependent on coal for the livelihood of their people.

It is clear that no general upturn in the economy will automatically restore the prosperity of the mines or the textile mills. The sooner the administration gets together with management and labor in these industries to seek answers to their basic problems, the sooner remedial programs can get underway.

American Troops to Indochina?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. THYE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 7, 1954

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, in a Memorial Day address in Minnesota, I discussed the hazards which the United States would face if we should undertake to send troops to Indochina at this time, both in sacrifice of American youth and the standing of this country in the minds of the Asiatic people whose strong aspirations for national independence must be recognized.

I ask unanimous consent that this address, delivered at Memorial Day services at Bemidji, Minn., on May 30, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY UNITED STATES SENATOR EDWARD J. THYE, OF MINNESOTA, AT MEMORIAL DAY SERVICES, BEMIDJI, MINN., SUNDAY, MAY 30, 1954

DEDICATED TO PEACE

Memorial Day has long been a day set apart from all other patriotic days, for it is a day not only of gratitude and appreciation of those who have given much in the service of our country, but also a day of dedication for all, old and young, who are privileged to share the blessings of our common American heritage.

This day, as we know it, had its origin soon after the Civil War under the leadership of the Grand Army of the Republic. Today there is but one left in the whole land—our own Albert Woolson, of Minnesota—of that gallant band of the boys in blue whose appearance each Memorial Day helped to make that day, at least in the minds of those who were the boys and girls of yesterday, the most touching and typically American of the special days on the calendar. From earliest childhood one remembers the gathering of the old soldiers, the march under the warm spring sun, the cemetery where colorful flowers and the bright Stars and Stripes were placed at the headstones of the dead. Later the veterans of the Spanish-American War and of World War I and World War II took the places of the old soldiers who participated for so manys years in the exercises.

The new Memorial Day is different, in many ways, with a new group of veterans, not yet old, in the places of honor. But it is not different in purpose. Those who have gone linger on in grateful memory. All over this land there are community gatherings like this at this hour all with the common purpose of paying tribute to the highest attributes of patriotic duty and renewing both our faith in the America we love and our purpose to keep strong those ideals of unity, of justice, and of peace which those we here honor sought to preserve.

This is a day dedicated to thoughts of peace among the nations and as such it is a true American day, for one distinguishing mark of our great Republic is the desire of its people to remain at peace with other nations and to prevent the horrors of war in this atomic age. It is true that peace-loving men and women cannot look upon the present world scene without some sense of disillusionment, but we must not forget that the things which have made America great came through struggle and sacrifice, and we cannot keep them or strengthen them by easy or cheap means. And let us not forget that while the United States, perhaps more than any other great nation in all history, is dedicated to peace there are some things we consider even more sacred, and they are freedom and justice and honor.

These ideals and, in fact, the very security of this country, are challenged today by an alien philosophy that is the exact opposite of American principles of freedom and by a dictator government which is bent upon spreading that ideology throughout the world and bringing all others under their domination. I need not recount to you what we have done in this cold war to build the military and economic strength needed for our own security, to bring the nations of the free world together in collective measures against the forces of communism, to assist less-favored nations in bettering the lot of their people, and to seek understanding with our friends and allies and the people of that vast, awakening continent of Asia.

When these forces of communism sought to overrun the independent Republic of Korea, we did not hesitate to answer that threat in the only way it could be answered and understood—by force of arms—and we know the costly sacrifice of American lives which were made because of that threat to freedom and security. Earlier we had assisted Greece in fighting off the Communist guerrillas, and we made a clear and winning answer to the Soviet attempt to blockade Berlin. We have also furnished much in supplies, material, and technical know-how to Indochina where a fierce struggle has been going on for control of a rich and strategic area.

Indochina, grave problem

Indochina at this time presents the most serious problem in the entire world picture. It is so serious, in fact, that there are those who believe we should intervene with American troops to bolster the French and Vietnam forces against the Communist rebels who have enjoyed the active support of Red China and Soviet Russia.

It is my considered judgment that it would be a grave mistake to send American forces into Indochina, and thus involve us directly in that war. It would be costly in the extreme, not only in the sacrifice of American blood and treasure, but likewise in the destruction of the very things we have always fought for—freedom and independence. And it would completely undermine what little understanding now exists in the minds of the people of Asia and the Far East as to what our true objectives are.

I do not underestimate the danger to Indochina, or the effect on that entire area if Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos, which make up the Associated States of Indochina, should eventually fall into Communist hands. I have always supported what we have tried to do there, but I am convinced that we must draw the line on sending American boys into the fight.

When we fought in Korea we were fighting side by side with the people of a nation which had been freed. When we sent help to Greece, we assisted a country independent and united under popular rulers. When we resisted the Soviet blockade of Berlin we aided people who were struggling for freedom.

The situation in Indochina is quite different, for there we would not be understood as aiding with our troops an independent nation in a fight for freedom. We would be accused—and I regret to say with some justification—of rescuing the French colonial power. In the light of the national aspirations of every Asiatic nation I do not see how we can take such action without great damage to our position in the whole struggle of the free world against the slave world.

France has not yet given true independence to the states of Indochina. It has not made those states ready for independence through trained leadership or self-reliant industrial development. It will require much time to train adequate native military forces, even if true independence is now granted—as we granted independence to the Philippines in accordance with our promise. When I traveled in the Far East last fall in making a survey of our foreign operations program I talked to many people in the countries visited. I came back with the clear impression that a key to the fight against communism in these areas is a vital and phychological factor involving the national aspirations of these people and their desire for independence. I believe that the will to resist Communist domination will depend as much upon this factor, and their understanding of the purposes and objectives of the free nations, as it will upon either military power or economic assistance.

Think what it would mean, solely from our own standpoint, if we started pouring American manpower into the Indochina civil war. It would be an endless sacrifice because of the vast manpower reservoir existing along the northern border in Red China from which there would be a continuous infiltration into the war area. Our supply lines would be so long there would be a constant drain on our resources. Such an involvement could be self-destructive, while Soviet Russia meanwhile would be building up her industrial power without a similar military drain of men and supplies.

Far East security pact

The only acceptable alternative which is apparent is collective security in the far-Pacific, while we continue to give such material aid as we can in Indochina. We must strengthen our friends in the Far East, including Chiang Kai-shek on Formosa and Syngman Rhee in Korea, encourage Japan to industrial strength as part of this association, and bring the Philippines, Malaya, Thailand, Indonesia, Australia, and New Zealand, as well as our western allies, into a Pacific security pact. There are vast resources in India and Pakistan that could be allied in the fight for freedom, and I believe that one day China will see the folly of continuing as a tool of the Soviet.

Such an alliance of independent and sovereign nations, on a basis of equality, seems to me to be the objective toward which we must now work.

We face a most difficult task and we know there is no sure road ahead, but we must not be discouraged either by the complexities of the situation or setbacks that will develop. Let us show a determination, a singleness of purpose, a skill in diplomacy, and a united spirit that will exceed those of the vast forces arrayed against us in the struggle for freedom and security.

You cannot have order in a nation or peace in a world in which fundamental rights, opportunity and justice are denied to great masses of people, or where honor and respect are lacking. There are, in fact, three essential conditions of order in a nation: There must be a rule of justice and fair play; there must be permanent institutions controlling its application; and the means and temptation to use private force must be carefully limited and controlled. And these, likewise, are the essential foundations of international order and world peace.

Maybe Stalin Was Right

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRY M. GOLDWATER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 7, 1954

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Maybe Stalin Was Right," published in the Indianapolis Star of May 4, 1954. I commend the reading of the editorial to all my colleagues, for it is written by Mr. Eugene C. Pulliam, publisher of that newspaper, who has one of the best grasps of the foreign situation possessed by any man in America, and in the editorial he expresses the feelings of many Americans.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAYBE STALIN WAS RIGHT

Maybe Stalin was right, after all. He always said that the capitalist nations were soft, decadent, confused, and plagued with inner contradictions. Because of this, he said, they would be ripe for picking by a confident and ruthless Communist conspiracy.

Nothing that happened in his lifetime proved him wrong. By preying on the enmities, divisions, and wars of the capitalist nations in Europe, and on the pathetic ignorance of communism of the Roosevelt and Truman administrations, he won control of half of Europe and all of China.

And look at us today. After making agreement after agreement with the Kremlin in the past 10 years and seeing them all broken, we are still trying again at Geneva. As always before, our allies are putting every sort of pressure on us to give in "just a little" to get another agreement. Now, when our Secretary of State tries to call a halt to this continued retreat, our allies have walked out on us. The British are holding cozy talks with Molotov at which he seeks to get them to act as mediator between communism and American policy toward Red China. Mediator. No wonder the Red Russian and Red Chinese delegates at Geneva gloat and swagger and act as victors over an enemy groveling on his knees.

No wonder Dulles came home. He twice tried to purchase Allied unity at the price of appeasement and both times he failed.

Now there is no unity among the Allies. They have walked out on us at the critical moment. And so it is time for the agonizing reappraisal of American foreign policy of which Dulles has spoken.

WHY DIDN'T WE LISTEN?

That reappraisal would not have been so agonizing if our State Department had heeded Senator Bob Taft's last major speech made just after he had been struck down by the cancer that killed him 3 months later. Speaking of the Korean Conference, Taft said, "We should do our best, and if we fail, then let England and our other allies know we are withdrawing from all further peace negotiations in Korea. * * * I believe we might as well abandon any idea of working with the United Nations in the east, and reserve to ourselves a completely free hand."

We should have done it then. We must do it now before our timid allies drag us down with them again in appeasement and in ignoble bargaining with criminals and liars.

MUNICH ALL OVER AGAIN

Today we see Eden in the role of Chamberlain, Bidault in the role of Daladier pleading for peace at any price with Molotov in Hitler's role and Mao in Mussolini's. It's Munich all over again. But there is a difference. The United States Government is there, too.

It's time to get out. What are we doing in this conference with tyrants and torturers and betrayers? They have publicly proclaimed their intention to destroy us and the institutions and freedoms we love. What are we doing trying to make another agreement with people whose word is given only to be broken, who have violated every treaty and agreement they have made with us in the past 10 years?

No wonder they think we are stupid, confused, and afraid. We have acted that way in conference after conference. Every time our Allies say, "It means world war III," we back away, and give in, and lose a few more countries to the Communist slave empire.

It is time to show both our Allies and the Communists what America is really like. It is time to act in the spirit of these ringing words spoken in June 1952 by General Eisenhower: "If we are deserving of our heritage of freedom, there is no more reason to fear 190 million backward people living on the Eurasian continent, surrounded by a flock of captive and recalcitrant states, than there is to fear pollywogs swimming down a muddy creek."

It's time to go it alone. Our Allies have forced it on us by walking out. Our enemies fear us only if we are free from the restraining hand of those who still want to do business with aggressors.

We should make our independent position clear as quickly as we can. The best way to do that is to break off diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union and all the captive states immediately. This will put the world on notice that from now on appeasement is out. We will make no more deals with those who seek our destruction. We will also get rid of a few hundred Soviet spies and saboteurs operating here under diplomatic passport.

Congress should hold up all action on the foreign aid bill. Nothing should be appropriated until a new policy is worked out. That policy should base all American aid on the principle of giving only to those who are ready to fight and die for freedom. Countries like Turkey, Greece, South Korea, and Nationalist China should have first priority. We should stand henceforth equally against Communist aggression by the Soviets and against colonial oppression by European nations.

From now on American policy should be made in America—not in London, not in Paris, not in Moscow.

Aid to Indochina Opposed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 7, 1954

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record, a letter published in the New York Times of June 2, and written by William R. Mathews, editor and publisher of the Arizona Daily Star.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Aid to Indochina Opposed—Danger That Present Measures Will Lead to World War Is Feared

To the Editor of the New York Times:

When in the middle of April I returned from a 10-day trip behind the Iron Curtain that took me as far as Moscow and Leningrad I came home optimistic. In Europe we have definitely established a balance of power that forecasts peace rather than war.

Since getting home I have become more and more alarmed by the belligerency of American opinion and the unwarranted assumption in high Government circles that if we intervene with military efforts in Indochina we can win a military victory from which will come a political victory: the saving of the rest of Asia from communism.

In my opinion we have started down the traditional road to a world war because, in proposing to stop communism we will expand our efforts into the same unlimited and unattainable objectives that took us into two world wars. The same old signs mark the way. First there is economic help, which we justify on moral grounds; next comes munitions aid, and then technical assistance and military advisers.

PLAN OF ACTION

We are at that point today. As these measures fail, we will send military teams—not to fight, of course, but to train the natives to fight. As this plan fails we will resort to air strikes from our carriers. When our confidence in airpower does not bring the expected results the cry will go up to start hitting the source of Indochinese strength—China—by air and by blockading now by sea.

As these plans miscarry our anger will mount. We will reluctantly consent to the sending of troops from America. As the war drags on without decision and we find ourselves bogged down in another stalemate our anger will grow into blind fury, and we will give the go-ahead signal to President Rhee and Chiang Kai-shek with the hope we can "bleed" China to submission, or start a counterrevolution there.

The chances are, judging from what I have seen of Soviet policy, that the Russians will not enter a war with China at first. They will, of course, send munitions. If the Soviet Union enters, it will come from the slipping of some cog in Europe or the Middle East.

The cry is already heard here at home, "We have to settle accounts sometime, so let's do it now and get it over with." These words can become a popular slogan. The fat will be in the fire, and once more we will be fighting a war to end wars, a war to free the enslaved, etc.

We drifted into two wars. And that is what we are doing today. We are mistakenly assuming that if we win a military victory in Indochina a political victory will follow automatically. That is a woeful illusion, as most reporters who have been there can confirm.

It is one thing to win a political victory over an enormous hostile population, and another thing to win it with a sympathetic native population. To take for granted that we can convert the Indochinese to our side overlooks the fact that their hatred is founded not only on opposition to the French but to all white men.

SEA AND AIR POWER

Surely the time has come to make a sober reappraisal of our objective and our strength. We Americans can by an economical use of our military power maintain the line of the Aleutians, the 38th parallel in Korea, Japan, Okinawa, Formosa, and the Philippines indefinitely. We can break up any invasion from the Asiatic mainland with our seapower and airpower.

So many of us have absurd ideas about Asia. As a continent, it is a gigantic poorhouse. We can afford to lose it, if trying to save it means wrecking ourselves as well as the world. If France cannot hold Indochina with the help we are giving, our policy should be "stay out." If the British and their dominions, Australia and New Zealand, will not muster the strength to protect their interests, it will be futile for us to attempt to do it.

From what I have seen during various visits to the Orient, I am convinced that the loss of Indochina will not mean the loss of Thailand in the near future. The British will continue to have trouble in Malay and later on in Hong Kong, no matter what happens in Indochina. I also believe that India, Indonesia, and Burma will have much more respect for us when they see that they must face their own salvation alone. We cannot save people from communism when they do not want to be saved.

Now that we have reestablished a balance of power in Europe and are maintaining a precarious one in the Middle East, for us to risk getting bogged down on the continent of Asia would, within the next few years, wipe out the notable gains we have made.

It is time to recognize that there are limits to our strength and the scope of our ideals and morality. We will best serve the people of the United States and all our friends abroad by consciously limiting our objectives instead of continuing to plunge blindly ahead into what will be another world war and the eclipse of freedom at home and abroad.

William R. Mathews.

Tucson, Ariz., *May 22, 1954.*

Report on Texas' First Soil Conservation District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 7, 1954

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the May issue of the Soil and Water magazine, published by the Association of Texas Soil Conservation District Supervisors, contains an article briefly outlining the work during the last 14 years of the first soil conservation district established in Texas.

The article so effectively emphasizes the vital importance of the work of the soil conservation districts that it is worthy of the attention of all the Members of Congress. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the article from Soil and Water magazine be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A few short years ago, on June 29, 1940, the first soil conservation district board of supervisors in Texas was sworn in in the old courthouse in historic Nacogdoches.

We thought it would be interesting to see what has happened in the Nacogdoches-Rusk soil conservation district in the intervening years. Has the district made a dent on conservation there? What does the evidence show?

After a hurried survey of the district, we can report the dent is both visible and permanent.

The chairman of the board now is the same chairman who stood up and took his oath of office back in 1940, and his name is Belton Latimer, of Garrison. The chairman is the same, but the land is not the same land.

Nacogdoches and Henderson are surrounded by some of the prettiest pastures on earth, wrought out of sedge-grass hills and weedy valleys by the magic of know-how and cooperation. This isn't to say that far too much of the land still isn't in that helpless state nature throws over an area when cultivated land has been cropped to death and abandoned, but the evidences of a district at work are here to be seen by anybody for whom a pretty pasture is one of the most beautiful sights on earth.

Not only is it evident in the pastures, but also in the timberland. The care and cultivation of pine trees, through planting seedlings, selective cutting, etc., are clearly evident. There is a demonstration plot of about 10 acres just outside Nacagdoches, on land that once was an airport, which will fairly take your breath. Nine years ago the city enlisted the aid of Boy Scouts in a reforestation project, and pine seedlings were put out in neat rows. Now, 9 years later, a magnificent stand of pines is growing there, some of it now ready for cutting.

By selective cutting, that 9 acres will be producing pulpwood from now on, and what has happened there is happening on many privately owned acres not only in the Nacogdoches area but throughout the pine timber area of east Texas.

But it is the pasture improvement which catches the eye. On a quick trip through the district, piloted by Area Conservationist E. D. Bolton and Work Unit Conservationist Claude Compton, we saw pastures that looked like golf courses, despite the drought, but they were not show places, they were profit-making pastures for some of the more than 100 dairies which have sprung up in this district in the last 5 or 6 years. Others belonged to beef cattle raisers, and the cold facts of the matter are that an east Texas pasture, when improved, will simply grow a lot more beef than a west Texas pasture, just as west Texas farmland, when it gets moisture, will beat east Texas farmland when it comes to economical production of cotton or grain.

Through the use of fertilizer (fertilizer firms now sell fertilizer distributed on your land) and particularly crimson clover, east Texas sandy land is responding in an unbelievable fashion, and the spread of the work is contagious. It sort of goes by areas. One farmer will improve his pasture, a neighbor will follow suit, other neighbors will follow him, and before long the whole area is improved, resulting in such a place as the Central Heights community near Nacogdoches, dotted with dairies and rolling hills of green pastures.

Take the White family at New Hope community. Three families, Preston White, Phillip White, and their father, R. P. White, are supporting themselves on 105 acres of improved land, with every foot of their land in green pastures.

But it didn't happen over night. There is no magic formula. What the Whites did was set out to make their land more fertile, and they worked untold hours hauling chicken litter from surrounding chicken farms and spreading it on their land. They began in 1945, fertilizing and planting, first Austrian winter peas, then vetch, then white dutch clover, then crimson clover, then mustang oats, et cetera.

You have to see their place to understand how three families can live well off that little land, but once you've seen it, you believe it.

The White place is cited only as an example of what's taking place in the Nacogdoches-Rusk district. The area is dotted with such examples, and the improved pastures in one community alone would be justification enough for the district program.

The goal of a completely conserved Nacogdoches-Rusk district is still a long way off, sedge grass fields can be found alongside clover fields, but anybody can see the area is on the right track and has made incredible progress since the board of supervisors was sworn in a few short years ago. Texas' first soil conservation district will stand inspection.

It Isn't Fair To Judge Men by Labels

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 7, 1954

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial entitled "It Isn't Fair To Judge Men by Labels," which appeared in the June 2, 1954, issue of the Messenger, of Owensboro, Ky.

The editorial is as follows:

IT ISN'T FAIR TO JUDGE MEN BY LABELS

Most of us are pretty well aware today that we too often substitute label pinning for hard thinking about issues and men. Perhaps, however, we are not sufficiently conscious of how frequently we employ one particular label—"leftist."

In its original European context, the "left" comprised that portion of a legislative chamber covering those political parties which espoused principles grading from moderate socialism to the extremes of Communist radicalism. The "right" embraced parties ranging in principle from liberal capitalism to the extreme state of capitalism called fascism.

As the Europeans used the term "leftist," it appeared to be largely a descriptive designation, and a pretty general one at that. Certainly it was not intended to be a term of scornful reproach, since in European politics it is just as respectable to be a Socialist as to be, say, a liberal capitalist.

As drawn into the American political terminology, though, the word "leftist" came to have a different connotation. It was meant to describe pure Socialists and Communists. Liberal Democrats and liberal Republicans were felt to be in the moderate center, with some other minor groups on the border between center and left.

More than this, the word in America was many times used as a derisive epithet. Since by definition a "leftist" espoused another form of government, he was to that extent un-American.

But since the advent of the New Deal and the Fair Deal and the growth of the great Russian Communist menace to global proportions, we in America have steadily expanded the territory taken in by the term "leftist."

Today it is often applied loosely to all liberals of either major party. And often, indeed, it is attached even to moderate conservatives who feel themselves quite devoted to capitalist democracy but choose to differ from more confirmed conservatives at some points. Even the late Senator Taft earned the epithet when he put his name to a public housing bill in 1949 and earlier.

So a word which one time had a very specific meaning for America at least has today become a sort of catchall epithet that may be hurled at anyone who is not either an extreme or a confirmed conservative. It is a tar-brush word, and we are daubing it around pretty carelessly in these times.

If we are going to label so many Americans leftists, then it would seem perfectly fair to dub the rest of our classifiable citizenry as rightists.

As it stands, the impression is abroad that there are good Americans and then there are leftists, who unhappily seem to be a larger and larger share of the politically mature population.

Of course it isn't really like that. And we either ought to stop slapping the tar about or daub a comparable heel on everybody.

Urgent Need for More Trained Medical Social Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 7, 1954

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, each day we are more aware of the fact that the health of our people is a first line of defense of the Nation. And that the men and women trained to fight disease and disabling accidents are truly defenders of the people when they serve the people's needs.

My own city of St. Louis has an excellent record of caring what happens to its sick people. It also has an unusually fine record of training young men and women for service in the medical and health professions. These young people are from not only St. Louis and the State of Missouri but from other States and some foreign countries. St. Louis University and Washington University, with their allied hospitals and clinics, are distinguished centers for medical and health training.

The people of St. Louis, as well as the doctors and professors, have helped to make St. Louis a progressive medical center. Almost 50 years ago—in 1910—a small group of women volunteers who helped manage the affairs of St. Louis Children's Hospital organized one of the first hospital social service departments in the country.

These women of St. Louis and the doctors at Children's Hospital realized that sick children need more than medicine and surgery. The kind of place the child went home to from the hospital, whether he had proper braces or other appliances, transportation to and from the hospital were some of the many things they saw as necessary to the child's recovery also. With money from their own purses and those of their friends, they established a social service department to help their young patients and their families.

Social service departments are not unusual in hospitals today, due in no small part to the pioneering in St. Louis. In this field, as in many others, St. Louis still leads the way.

That is one reason I am especially pleased to have a letter calling attention to the medical social work training facilities in St. Louis. Medical social workers are specially trained to work with doctors and nurses in hospitals, clinics, and other health services. This is one of the health professions which is not so well known but which needs many more trained persons.

I should like to take this opportunity to urge both young men and women to investigated further the training opportunities for this and other health professions at St. Louis University and Washington University in St. Louis. Miss Lewis' letter, which follows, gives more details about where such information can be secured.

Medical social work is not for the young man or woman who wants to get rich quick or who will not—or cannot—take time for specialized training. But it is the kind of career that puts young men and women into the ranks of the defenders of the people's health.

The above-mentioned letter follows:

WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY CLINICS
AND ALLIED HOSPITALS,
SOCIAL SERVICE DEPARTMENT,
St. Louis, Mo., June 1, 1954.

Representative LEONOR K. SULLIVAN,
House of Representatives,
United States Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MRS. SULLIVAN: Like all citizens of St. Louis, I am sure you are proud of the medical facilities of our city. I feel certain, too, that you are equally proud of the excellent opportunities St. Louis offers for professional training in the medical and health fields. I am writing to ask your help in making these facts better known to young men and women who plan training for medical and health service careers.

We are unusually fortunate in having two important teaching centers in St. Louis—Washington University and St. Louis University. Both offer students a wide choice of specialized professional training. For training in medical social work, my own profession, these two universities rank with the best in the country. .

Those of us who received our medical social work training in St. Louis are especially eager that young people choosing a career consider the opportunities that St. Louis offers for professional training in our field.

The George Warren Brown School of Social Work at Washington University and the school of social work at St. Louis University gives students the best possible combination of classroom instruction and actual work experience in the great teaching hospitals associated with the universities. The hospitals in St. Louis have pioneered in medical social work for almost 50 years.

Medical social work is an unusually attractive profession for the person who likes the medical atmosphere and who wants to help sick people return to health and normal life.

Many social workers today are valued members of the modern medical team in hospitals, clinics, and health agencies. We are trained particularly to work with doctors, nurses, and numerous medical specialists. It is our job to help patients handle social and economic problems that often complicate illness or retard recovery.

But the hard facts are that there are more medical social work jobs available than there are trained persons to fill them. One reason for this is that there are no short cuts for medical social work training. Two years of specialized postgraduate study after graduation from college are necessary.

The National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis, which, of course, is most interested in the care of polio victims, considers the shortage of medical social workers so serious that it has taken steps to help relieve the shortage. The Foundation has made a grant to the American Association of Medical Social Workers to help recruit at least 3,500 newly trained medical social workers by 1957.

Our two schools of social work in St. Louis can and should train a much larger number of medical social workers in the next few years. We have the know-how and we have the hospital facilities. We must do everything possible to keep pace with the growing health needs of the country.

I hope that many college students—and their parents—will explore further the possibilities of medical social work training in St. Louis. For more detailed information they should write to:

Benjamin E. Youngdahl, dean, the George Warren Brown School of Social Work, Washington University, St. Louis 5, Mo.

Rev. Aloysius H. Scheller, S.J., dean, School of Social Service, St. Louis University, 221 North Grand Boulevard, St. Louis 3, Mo.

American Association of Medical Social Workers, 1834 K Street NW., Washington 6, D. C.

As a medical social worker, I appreciate very much your interest and cooperation in making these facts known to young people who want to train for a career that is more than a job.

Sincerely yours,

MARY M. LEWIS
Miss Mary M. Lewis,
Director, Social Service Department, Washington University Clinics and Allied Hospitals; Chairman, St. Louis Chapter, American Association of Medical Social Workers.

Address by Adlai Stevenson at Columbia University Bicentennial Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 7, 1954

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, on Saturday, June 5, former Gov. Adlai Stevenson, of Illinois, delivered an address at Columbia University on the Nation's moral crisis. I ask unanimous consent to have the address printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEXT OF ADLAI STEVENSON'S ADDRESS AT COLUMBIA ON NATION'S MORAL CRISIS

Dr. Russell, Mrs. Roosevelt, President Kirk, ladies, and gentlemen, here at Columbia our country celebrates an institution that has had continuous existence and tradition for 200 years, an existence that goes back before there was a United States.

In recent days you have heard far wiser men than I enlarge upon this theme and I would be presumptuous indeed to lecture this distinguished audience about the nature of the university let alone the nature of Columbia. In fact, I am presumptuous to be here at all I am afraid.

One of the most curious and persistent myths of democratic society is that political figures have anything important or interesting to say, especially when they are are out of office.

I was instructed to speak here about a half dozen different things and finally I was told to say whatever I pleased, and my desultory remarks could perhaps be very crudely entitled "Hooray for America" and "Look Out, America."

IRRATIONAL ABUSE OF AMERICA

I am a great believer in national humility, modesty, self-examination, and self-criticism, and I have preached these virtues vigorously, although, of course, I haven't practiced them. Of late I have been disturbed, as I am sure many of you have, by what seems to me to be the course at home and abroad of irrational criticism, abuse and mistrust of America, its conduct, its motives, and its people.

I don't mean just the voices that have been raised, we thank God, in protest against our current deficiencies, against the attacks on academic freedom, the pressure for conformity, our failures abroad or the present wretched manifestations in Washington of our national neurosis.

Nor do I mean the wholesome and the continuous debate and self-examination that should and it must go on among us and among allies; the candid controversy that makes for good neighbors and for good friends. Rather, I am talking of the malice, distemper, and the new fashion of being cynical, sarcastic, skeptical, deprecating about America or fellow Americans in large groups, and therefore about America.

WHAT THE VOICES ARE SAYING

There are rising voices here and abroad that forget that although America occasionally gags on a gnat, it also has some talent for swallowing tigers whole; voices that tell us that our national energy is spent, that our old values have decayed, that it is futile to try to restore them.

There are voices that say that at best we are as Rome; that once our bridges, our skyscrapers, our factories, and our weapons fall before the iron law of decay no trace will be left—great issues, no great cause to mark our past in universal history.

And there are voices that seem to say that we are as Carthage, that our vital principle is commerce, just commerce; our ethics, our politics, our imaginative faculties, they say, are all bent and twisted to serve our sovereign—commerce.

Other voices cry havoc, fear that America is not equal to the task; that communism is the way to the future—is irresistible, just as fascism was for them not so long ago.

Even novelists and poets seem to have been infected. Humanism passes as realism. The very excitement in a time of change and testing is suspect.

Now, some of this talk may reflect a wholesome attitude abroad and a wholesome attitude here of self-criticism, if in a slightly fevered form. Some of it may even mark the reaction to the easy and the groundless optimism of the 19th century.

I don't know, but I do know that if we doubt ourselves we will persuade no one. If we doubt our mission in the world we will do nothing to advance it. And if we are craven before the slanders that fill our ears we will secede from each other. But to view our present and our future with such sickly anxiety is to ignore the lessons and the achievements of our past.

GENERATIONS OF ACHIEVEMENT

For the plain truth is that we here in America have written the greatest success story in human history. The plain truth is that on the record of performance we here in America have in a few years made socialism obsolete, shown that communism is nothing but a noisome stagnant pool of reaction.

And it wasn't merely in 1776, when King's College was a stripling, that America left its footprints on eternity. For in our lifetime, we, the seventh generation of free and independent Americans, have given a tidal force to the forward roll of what was set in motion by the first generation.

If we but lift our heads for a moment above this storm of criticism, of abuse, doubt, and "un-American activities," and survey the past 50 years, I think you will say with me "Hooray for America."

The first and most obvious thing we have to cheer about is our material progress. The miracle of American mass production is commonplace. And under our capitalist system we have increased our wealth to an extent almost unimaginable 50 years ago, at the turn of the century.

Now this increase in our wealth has of course greatly changed our country. The change for the sake of change—as I've tried with a notable lack of success to point out to my countrymen—isn't worthy of applause. What matters is not that we have changed but how we have changed.

Our national income is distributed far more equitably than it was at the turn of the century. As late as 1935–36 there were only about a million American families and unattached individuals, as they commonly say, with income of $5,000 or more, and 17 million with incomes of less than $1,000. Fifteen years later, in 1950, these proportions were just about reversed, and even after allowing for inflation, the change is still dramatic.

It is not in terms of money and products that we can see most clearly the change that America has undergone. Rather it is in the attitude of the people and in the role of the Government. For we have succeeded not only in making our society prosperous but in keeping it fluid.

And, while this was easy enough in the days of the frontier, it seemed all but an idle dream by 1900. The frontier was closed; the homestead land was gone; women and children labored in dingy sweatshops, and robber barons plundered at will. Miners in company towns, and immigrants compressed into filthy tenements were fast becoming a miserable proletariat.

KEYS TO A GREAT TRANSITION

How could the roads of opportunity be kept open? How, short of revolution, could we adjust modern capitalism to democratic ends? To many it seemed hopeless. Yet see what happened—the gap between rich and poor has been greatly narrowed without revolution, without socialism, and without robbing A to give to B—although there may be some dissent to that downtown.

Our wealth has been mightily increased and better distributed. The rising tide has lifted all the boats.

How has this transformation been accomplished? By increasing productivity and by putting government to the service of the people. Woodrow Wilson, Theodore Roosevelt, Robert LaFollette, and so on, led a revolt of the American conscience, followed by the reforms under Franklin Roosevelt. They've altered the face of America.

The child-labor laws, wage-and-hour laws, the antitrust acts, banking legislation, rural electrification, soil conservation, social security, unemployment compensation, the graduated income tax, inheritance taxes—it may be too much to say that all this and more amounts to a bloodless revolution, but it certainly amounts to a transformation of our economic and social life.

Now why was all this done? Why did America adopt the concept of man's responsibility for his fellow man? Our decision that the well-being of the least of us is the responsibility of all of us was, of course, not merely an economic and a political decision; it was, at bottom, a moral decision. And it was not, as some are now saying in the Nation's capital, all a sinister conspiracy of the great philanthropic foundations.

It rested upon the conviction that it's the duty of the Government to keep open to all the people the avenues of opportunity that stretched so broad and so far before us in the days of our frontier. It rested upon the conviction that the Government must safeguard the people against catastrophe not of their making.

FACING CHALLENGES OF OUR ERA

But this great decision has brought us face to face with vexing problems which have engaged your attention, as I understand it, during this past week—the problems of the conflict between freedom and security, between the individual and his social safeguards.

It seems to me there is something gallant about man's fight to become the master rather than the slave of nature; but there is something rather tragic about his struggle to keep himself free from the impositions of his own social creations.

Now it would be fatuous to claim that we are anywhere near solving this conflict, in my judgment, as it would be fatuous to say that because our material well-being increases year by year all must be well with America. It isn't.

Too many of our people still dwell in wretched slums or on wornout land. Once again our topsoil, our national skin, is blowing away out on the plains. Our schools and hospitals are overcrowded; so are our mental institutions and our prisons. Too many of our cities are wasting away from neglect. And how can we boast of our high estate when more than 1 of every 10 citizens still do not enjoy fully equal opportunities?

Nonetheless, our progress has been astonishing—more Americans are living better than ever before. The middle class, whose disappearance Marx so confidently predicted, has expanded as never before in the history of any other nation. And while the Communist conspirators fulminate about the cruel capitalists, the lackeys of Wall Street, and the downtrodden masses, we have created a free society that promotes the general welfare of all far better, far more successfully than it has ever been promoted by any other system or social organization.

Briefly, I think America's record is terrific—if I may borrow a word from my junior son. And it is my view that its performance abroad is even more spectacular.

Since the turn of the century we have successively and emphatically renounced, first imperialism, then isolation, and finally our historical neutrality. We have transformed our foreign policy as completely as our domestic policy. Twice America has decisively tipped the scales for freedom in a mighty global exertion.

Instead of isolation, our policy is total involvement; instead of noncooperation we have been the prime mover in the United Nations; instead of neutrality we have organized the greatest defensive coalition in history. And in Korea we fought and bled almost alone for the United Nations and for collective security.

But this isn't all. In the process America has fathered three unprecedented ideas: Lend-lease for Hitler's intended victims in war, the Marshall plan for Stalin's intended victims in peace, and point 4 to help undeveloped areas. And to pay for it all Americans have borne a tax load. I mean a collected-tax load that it without counterpart save in Britain, and that few beyond our borders appreciate.

LIFTING OTHERS AND OURSELVES

And what have we asked in return? Why have we done all this? Some will say self-interest, and there is truth in that because communism follows the geography of human misery. Some will say magnanimity, and there is truth in that, too. For it would have been easy to go home, as we did after the first war, or go it alone, as some of our people have proposed.

Call it what you will; the point is to help others help themselves, to help make independence and democracy work, to share the burdens of the less fortunate, to raise the tide a little all around the world, lifting all of the boats with it, just as we have done here at home. It was bold and imaginative. It was wise and responsible. It was good for them and it was good for us. As Edmund Burke said: "Magnanimity is not seldom the truest wisdom."

Now, I have touched lightly, I know, on a vast subject, and, while I emphatically approve and loudly cheer America's purposes abroad, past and present, I don't mean to imply for a moment that I approve any more than all of you do all of our foreign policies, past or present, especially present.

My purpose has been just to suggest the main outlines of a success story in which we can all take pride. As we look back to 1900 and look around us today, the infinite evidence of our creative impulses and of our vast achievements ought to be heralded, not mocked.

We have heard the "least of these." We have enlarged our vision, opened our heart, and we have disciplined our strength. We have turned it into a servant of justice—justice not alone for ourselves but justice for the worldwide commonwealth of free men and of free institutions.

Here, indeed, is a case where mankind has a right to knowledge and to the use thereof—the knowledge of what America has done, how America has spread out the decision-making process within its many parts.

It is the knowledge of how we have committed 160 million people to vast social projects, not by coercion but by persuasion and consent and by a balancing of the rights of the one with the needs of the many.

I say it is a grand and glorious story. On the basis of the record, we have outperformed any rival proposals of communism or of fascism; and America has nobly accepted her responsibility and proudly met her time for greatness in a troubled age.

FEAR THAT IMPERILS FUTURE

Why, then, all this abuse and criticism? Why, then, have we of late grown afraid of ourselves? Why have we of late acted as though the whole of this Nation is a security risk? Why do you suppose we have given in to the bleatings of those who insist that it is dangerous for a man to have an idea? Why do we talk of saving ourselves by committing suicide—in the land of Jefferson?

So, having said, "Three cheers for America; you've done a great job of work," we have to add, "But look out, America, your work has just begun; though you've nobly grasped the present, you could meanly lose the future."

What's the matter with us, anyhow? [Laughter.] The usual diagnosis is ignorance and fear. Ignorance leads many to confuse ends with means, to act as though material progress were an end in itself rather than a means to great and noble ends. This, I suggest, is the peril of our hard-headed, pragmatic attitude that has helped us so much to achieve our vast social and economic transformation; for if we ever succumb to materialism, the meaning will go out of America.

And ignorance begets fear—the most subversive force of all. If America ever loses confidence in herself, she will retain the confidence of no one, and she will lose her chance to be free, because the fearful are never free.

But I wonder if all of these alarming concerns are not America's surface symptoms of something even deeper; of a moral and human crisis in the Western world which might even be compared to the 4th, 5th and 6th century crisis when the Roman Empire was transformed into feudalism and primitive Christianity, early Christianity, into the structure of the Catholic Church, or the crisis a thousand years later when the feudal world exploded and the individual emerged with new relationships to God, nature, to society.

I sometimes rather wonder if that sentence sounds as wise at Columbia as it did on the farm when I wrote it.

And now in our time in spite of our devotion to the ideas of religious and secular humanism, I wonder if we are in danger of falling into a spirit of materialism in which the aim of life is a never-ending increase of material comfort, and the result a moral and religious vacuum.

Is this leading, as lack of faith always must, to a deep sense of insecurity and a deterioration of reason? And I wonder, too, if today mass manipulation is not a greater danger than economic exploitation; if we are not in greater danger of becoming robots than slaves.

HUMANISM VERSUS PAGANISM

Since man cannot live by bread alone, is not the underlying crisis whether he is going to be inspired and motivated again by the ideas of the humanistic tradition western culture, or whether he falls for the new pagan religions, the worship of the state and a leader, as millions of believers in the Fascist and Soviet systems have already done.

That we are not invulnerable, that there is a moral and a human vacuum within us, is I think, demonstrated by many symptoms, of which McCarthyism, which has succeeded in frightening so many, is only one.

But it is even more certain that there are millions who see or at least who dimly sense the danger, and who want to make life in its truly human meaning the main business of living; who want to express the humanistic tradition of reason and of human solidarity—who want to understand the truth and not be drawn into the mass manipulative influence of sentimentality and rationalization.

I venture to say that there are in the world many with a deep, intense longing for a vision of a better life not in a material, but in a spiritual sense; for love, for human solidarity. There is a hunger to hear a word of truth, a longing for an ideal, a readiness for sacrifice. Churchill's famous speech at the beginning of the war is an illustration and so is the totalitarians' appeal to emotional forces rather than to material interests.

But the conventional appeal seems to be so often to the better life in material terms. I wonder if people are not eager to hear about the better life in human terms.

And I think that deep down the ideas of independence, of individuality, of free initiative, represent the strongest appeals to Americans who want to think for themselves, who don't want to be creatures of mass suggestion, who don't want to be automatons.

The question is, I suppose, whether the human and rational emotions can be aroused instead of the animal and irrational to which the totalitarians appeal. But fill the moral vacuum, the rational vacuum, we must; reconvert a population soaked in the spirit of materialism to the spirit of humanism we must, or bit by bit we too will take on the visage of our enemy, the neo-heathens.

THE ANSWER WITHIN US

I have said to you that in my judgment America has accomplished miracles at home and abroad, but that despite all of this wisdom, this exertion, this goodness the horror of our time in history is that things are worse than ever before. There is no peace, we are beseiged, we are rattled. Perhaps we are even passing through one of the great crises of history when man must make another mighty choice.

Beset by all of these doubts and difficulties in which direction then do we look?

We look to ourselves—and we are not ashamed. We are proud of what freedom has wrought—the freedom to experiment, to inquire, to change, to invent. And we shall have to look exactly in the same directions to solve our problems now—to individual Americans, to their institutions, to their churches, to their governments, to their multifarious associations—and to all the free participants in the free life of a free people.

And we look, finally, to the free university whose function is the search for truth and its communication to succeeding generations. Only as that function is performed steadfastly, conscientiously, and without interference does a university keep faith with the great humanist tradition of which it is a part.

For the university is the archive of the Western mind, it's the keeper of the Western culture, and the foundation of Western culture is freedom. Men may be borne free; they cannot be born wise; and it is the duty of the university to make the free wise. The university is the guardian of our heritage, the teacher of our teachers. It's the dwelling place of the free mind.

More than 100 years ago William Ellery Channing defined the free mind this way:

"I call that mind free which jealously guards its intellectual rights and powers, which calls no man master, which does not content itself with a passive or hereditary faith, which opens itself to light whencesoever it may come, and which receives new truth as an angel from heaven."

I wonder, my friends, how many of us fulfill Channing's definition. And I wonder if that could be part of our trouble today?

Thank you.

Mixed Business Picture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 7, 1954

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial entitled "Mixed Business Picture," which appeared in the May 21, 1954, issue of the News-Democrat, of Russellville, Ky.

The editorial is as follows:

MIXED BUSINESS PICTURE

Do you ever really sit down and analyze the state of business as a whole—not just here in Logan County? Try it sometime. Just jot down all the little things you glean from the pages of metropolitan dailies, and see what kind of a word picture you can put together.

From this corner we would say that the business picture is a mixed one. There is good news about jobs, building activity, stock prices, and corporate earnings. In some segments of the economy, for example steel productions, coal mining, textiles, retail trade, and agriculture, there is nothing to cheer about.

April witnessed the first decrease in unemployment since October. The number of jobless decreased 260,000 during the month as compared with March, and the total number of employed increased 500,000 during the month.

The construction industry—all segments of it—is really booming.

The remarkable bull market in stocks continues. Two weeks ago the stock market average was the highest in 24 years—since April of 1930. The behavior of the stock market is the most impressive evidence of confidence in the future.

In the first quarter over 600 of the country's largest corporations had net earnings only a fraction of 1 percent less than the same quarter last year. Their volume was down and gross profits before taxes were down. Net earnings were substantially unchanged as a result of the elimination of the excess-profits tax.

Retail trade is below last year. Steel production is still 70 percent of capacity. Car loadings are 11 percent below last year. The coal industry is suffering from a huge increase in demand. The worst drag on business activity is the farm situation.

All in all it appears the business decline did not stop in April, but the rate of decline slowed. Restrained optimism seems to prevail generally in business circles.

Notwithstanding a 17-percent decline in farm prices during the last 3 years, the consumer's food cost is only a shade below the alltime high. No wonder the average consumer thinks farmers are rolling in prosperity. He mistakenly measures farm prices by what he pays at the grocery and often the metropolitan press makes a valiant contribution to his inaccurate appraisal of the facts.

A spokesman for the National Grange asserts the food prices to consumers would be higher if supplies were balanced with demand. He further states that the average consumer would save little if price supports were completely eliminated. Underscoring this fact and presenting some concrete evidence of the amazing proportion of the consumer's food dollar the farmer does not get, consider the following:

A 15-cent loaf of bread would still cost 12.6 cents if farmers gave away wheat.

A $3.50 shirt would still cost $3.20 if farmers gave away cotton.

A 15-cent box of corn flakes would still cost 12.6 ments if farmers gave away corn.

A 23-cent package of cigarettes would still cost 20.9 cents if farmers gave away tobacco.

A 25-cent quart of milk would still cost 13 cents if farmers gave away milk.

And, by the way, the Government's decision to reduce support prices from 90 percent to 75 percent of parity has not curbed milk production, which is at an alltime high—and the decrease in butter prices of 10 cents a pound has increased consumption very little, if any.

What does the future hold? You may know. We do not.

A Problem in Business and Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 7, 1954

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith an article entitled "A Problem in Business and Industry." It has to do with the problem of drinking. It is also known as the Yale Plan for Business and Industry and it is written by Ralph M. Henderson, LL.B., industrial consultant, Yale Center of Alcohol Studies, and Selden D. Bacon, Ph. D., professor of sociology, Yale University director, Yale Center of Alcohol Studies, New Haven, Conn.

It will be noted as a frontispiece to this important article is a letter from the Honorable Charles E. Wilson, former director, Office of Defense Mobilization of the United States dated July 3, 1951:

A PROBLEM IN BUSINESS AND INDUSTRY

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
OFFICE OF DEFENSE MOBILIZATION,
Washington, D. C., July 3, 1951.

DR. A. WHITNEY GRISWOLD,
President, Yale University,
New Haven, Conn.

DEAR DR. GRISWOLD: My attention has been called to the recently projected program of the Yale Center of Alcohol Studies which has received endorsement from officials within the Federal Security Agency and the United States Department of Labor.

As Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization, I would like to take this opportunity to commend Yale University for its leadership in this field. I feel that the principles involved are sound and that the objectives as they affect the Nation's mobilization deserve very careful consideration.

I appreciate your representatives calling this program to our attention.

Sincerely,

CHARLES E. WILSON.

PROBLEM DRINKING: THE YALE PLAN FOR BUSINESS AND INDUSTRY

(By Ralph M. Henderson, LL. B., industrial consultant, Yale Center of Alcohol Studies; Selden D. Bacon, Ph. D., professor of sociology, Yale University; director, Yale Center of Alcohol Studies, New Haven, Conn.)

THE HIDDEN PROBLEM

There has been a marked increase in the interest accorded alcoholism during the past decade in the United States, an interest which has been reflected in business and industrial circles. The reflection in industry has not been too bright. In fact, there has been suspicion of the validity of the claims made and a certain amount of antagonism toward recognizing even the possibility that such a problem exists. Since no problem will be solved unless it is recognized, it is essential to view the barriers of irritation and mistrust commonly met in introducing the problem.

The first barrier is that of traditional conceptions of alcoholism, conceptions as common to the total community as to business and industry. The belief has long held sway that alcoholics are weak-willed, morally disgraceful, and disgusting characters.

The second barrier concerns a popular belief about the sort of person involved. He is usually perceived as a Skid Row bum or as a neurotic genius or Lost Weekender.

The third barrier relates to the large area of drinking alcoholic beverages and associated attitudes. Two of these attitudes might be expressed as follows: Anybody bothering me about such a problem is a bluenosed, teetotaling reformer; and, nobody's going to criticize my drinking.

The fourth barrier is the belief that there are no problems in this or that company—a quite natural conclusion in view of the first three conceptions and one which, most pleasantly, is reinforced by the absence of any company records indicating the existence of such conditions.

Finally, even if there should be grudging acquiescence in the remote possibility that there is such a problem, objections to any action rise fast and furiously: (1) Labor would consider any program as offensive paternalistic meddling. (2) Recognition of the problem would be bad for public relations. (3) The program would call for extraordinary and expensive techniques and personnel, would result in pampering "drunks," would eliminate the only practical way of handling the few cases that do arise—firing them. (4) In any event, why should business and industry have to shoulder the stigma and the cost of meeting a problem which pertains to them less than to almost any other group? In fact, it is possible to achieve rather magnificent heights of elocution in manifesting interest in a great humanitarian problem and at the same time proving that it does not exist and that nothing can be done about it anyway.

The simply proven fact that the barriers are imaginary does not reduce their strength. Traditional beliefs are stronger than objective proofs. However, the barriers can be weakened and finally overcome. This is possible because, first, the results of the problem, whether it is admitted or not, are continuing, painful and expensive; and second, because it has been shown that something practical and effective can be done. The fallacious aspects of the barriers are worth labeling since an increasing number of persons within business and industry are becoming more aware of the problem and sometimes face these objections when they try to instigate interest or action.

The view that alcoholism is to be explained by moral weakness can no longer be held seriously as the only or even as an important factor in explaining alcoholism. Actually, this term is used to describe the effects of a condition rather than its causes. When put to the test of causality, it fails. No matter what the definitions of strong and weak moral character, it will be found that both appear among drinkers who did not become alcoholics as well as among drinkers who did become alcoholics. The same applies to recovered alcoholics and to abstainers. Ordinarily the term weak or immoral character is used to cast blame on those we dislike; it cannot logically explain alcoholism.

THE HIDDEN MAN

Increasing knowledge about the alcoholic population has been gained with the emergence of Alcoholics Anonymous and specialized clinics for the treatment of alcoholism. It has become apparent that the psychotic or deeply neurotic alcoholic and "skid row" type are but segments of the total alcoholic population, segments forming less than half, perhaps only a quarter of the total. In business or industry they form but a tiny fraction of those with a chronic drinking problem. The following facts emerged from a study[1] of over 2,000 consecutive made patients who visited 9 outpatient clinics for alcoholism in different parts of the country.

1. More than 80 percent were under 50 years of age; 1 out of 4 was under 35.
2. Over half were married and living with their wives.
3. Three out of four were living in an established household.
4. Nine out of ten had lived in their present town for at least 2 years.
5. Seven out of ten had held jobs involving skills or special responsibilities.
6. Nearly 60 percent were known to have held steady employment on 1 job for at least 3 years, 25 percent for at least 10 years.

There were neurotics and "skid row" types among these 2,000 men, but it is clear that they form a minority. The majority of alcoholics do not display the neurotic or "skid row" traits commonly associated with the label alcoholism. Rather, they may be seen to form a cross section of the male population between the ages of 30 and 55, appearing in business and industry just as does the rest of that population.

The alcoholic in business and industry differs from the rest of the alcoholic population primarily in the extent of the damage accrued and in terms of his progress in this slowly developing condition. He might be termed an incipient or early-stage alcoholic. He may be the laborer in the yard, the skilled worker in the shop, the clerk, the salesman, or the executive. He is likely to be married and living with his family, to have a history of steady employment in positions requiring skill and responsibility, and is usually found to be a fairly well integrated member of his community.

Among industrial employees, problem drinking ordinary appears after a 10- or 12-year period of development, usually between the ages of 35 and 45. At these ages men of real promise are often reaching a period of peak productivity. When they work and are not experiencing the aftereffects of their last drinking bout, they are capable, responsible workers.

In the past these people generally have been the unrecognized alcoholics. At home they have been hidden by family and friends. In industry and business they have been hidden by fellow workers, by foremen, by union stewards, and by management itself.[2] Even after their condition has eventually reached such magnitude that their continuing relationships have become intolerable for the employer, friends, and even the family, the true nature of their difficulty has seldom been understood, often concealed and rarely entered on company records. These men and women are actually sick people, suffering from a serious, progressive disorder.

THE HIDDEN COST

Conservative statistical studies reveal that there are nearly 4 million alcoholics in the United States.[3] From these statistics, along with analysis of age characteristics and behavior patterns of samples of administrative and plant personnel, it can be calculated that there are at least 1,650,000 problem drinkers in business and industry.

The alcoholic in industry loses an average of 22 working days annually from the acute effects of alcohol alone—over 36 million working days each year. In addition, he loses each year 2 days more than nonalcoholics because of various other ailments. His accident rate is twice that of the abstainer or ordinary drinker. His life span is reduced approximately 12 years in comparison with that of the nonalcoholic.[4]

The economic costs to business and industry arising from problem drinking among employees reach staggering figures. It has been authoritatively calculated that these run well over a billion dollars annually. Direct costs are related to man hours lost through absenteeism; to the disciplinary time dealt out to alcoholics; to costs of hospitalization and disability payments to known alcoholics; and to costs of replacement of the trained worker or executive dismissed at the peak of his productive period.[5]

Indirect costs cannot even be estimated but are of such magnitude that they cannot be ignored. The loss from inefficiency among workers suffering from hangover; increased scrap and waste; the slow-down in production when an alcoholic is part of a team; the effect on morale of workers associated with alcoholics on the job—these and similar hidden but still very real costs must be taken into account in considering the total loss to industry.

THE "HALF-MAN"

Of the problems which accrue to industry from problem drinking, which one is the most harmful: absenteeism, accidents, labor turnover, loss of highly skilled men, waste of materials, breakdown of teamwork operations, insult or irritation to the consumer, executive error, related sickness, deteriorating plant morale?

The answer would appear to be that in one sense it is none of these, in another it it all of them. The answer here must be tentative and uncertain, not in the terms usual to discussions of industrial problems, for there is a lack of solid evidence. But it appears that the core of the problem in this field is to be found in what might be

---

Footnotes at end of speech.

Footnotes at end of speech.

called the half-man. It is in this aspect of the problem drinker that the observant industrialist or businessman can see not only all the problems suggested but, perhaps more importantly, the reason why the problems are ordinarily not seen at all and why little or nothing has been done though much could be gained from doing even a little.

When an individual in a plant is found to be drunk, he is taken off his job. Whether openly or secretively, whether temporarily or permanently does not matter too much. The loss is clear, unambiguous, measurable. It is probably an infrequent occurrence.

When a worker is absent from the job, is injured, gets into fights, quits, is obviously inefficient, noticeably and chronically disturbs other workers, the loss is clear, unambiguous, measurable, and not long tolerated. When an employee or executive is not up to the intellectual or physical requirements of his job, is accident prone, is emotionally unbalanced, the consequent loss may take longer to locate, assess, and correct, but it can be done and plants develop formal or informal means for the doing.

But the half-man is a different phenomenon. This half-man may be a salesman, a supervisor, a member of the board of directors, a company physician, a janitor, a die-setter, a fitter, an accountant, an inspector or one doing any of the 80,000 jobs listed in a recent dictionary of occupations. On a particular morning he is on location: he shows no manifest signs of sickness or injury. Chemical analysis would show no or very little alcohol in his body. Certainly he is not drunk, obstreperous, an obvious accident hazard or an obvious anything else. He responds to ordinary stimuli. If asked, will say that he does not feel up to par. He goes through certain motions, fewer than usual, which are part of his job routine. This man has been working 5 to 10 years for the company, knows his job, has proved that he can be a good worker, perhaps at times has shown that he can be a superior worker. He has friends, status, and know-how on his job. That is one-half. The other half? For practical purposes the man is not there at all. He is accomplishing nothing. From an objective, industrial viewpoint it would be far better if both halves had stayed at home; if he should do something, it will not be done well. It might be even dangerous. This man has learned how to disguise or mask the condition known as hangover.

Many drinkers who are not alcoholics may have experienced hangover. Perhaps they have on occasion gone to the office or shop in this condition. They differ from the alcoholic in several ways. They do not, for example, show the guilt and remorse of the alcoholic, whose feelings do not pertain to just this episode, as in the case of the drinker who had too much, but relate to his overall perception of his whole personality. He did not just make a mistake or foolishly drink too much; no, the alcoholic feels this experience as just one sample of something much bigger, something he can't effectively explain or control, something to be feared far more than an isolated indiscretion. Another difference: the problem drinker, through repetition of the experience, has learned to cover up, to tough it out on the job. He cannot afford too much absenteeism. Further, many of these men differ from the occasionally overindulging drinker in the third way: they know how to relieve the pain of the hangover quickly and easily and have to fight the almost overwhelming impulse to seek that relief—a few quick drinks. Rationally they know that this will make the situation even worse and surely prolong the suffering, but the known promise of immediate relief, when the individual is at such a low point physically, socially, and emotionally, presents a horrible dilemma. In the same situation many—if not almost all—nonalcoholics would view any drink with something akin to horror.

The half-man is neither the whole man drunk and obvious, nor the whole man sober and useful. He is the half-man, at least useless, often a liability, occasionally a positive danger. His condition may be recognized for what it is by another sober, observant alcoholic, but if recognized at all by others will be mislabeled or at least misunderstood. Even those who may think "George is hung over" cannot appreciate the alcoholic's hangover, which is quantitatively and qualitatively so much more painful and threatening than any experience of their own. In most instances George himself cannot understand the how or the why of his repeated experiences even though he may build series of defensive rationalizations if pressed to explain.

The day which George has spent as a half-man at the plant or office or on the road on his job will in most cases never appear on the record under the headings of absenteeism, accident, excessive waste, significant error, sickness, low output, or anything else. Very few people at the plant will ever know or care that this was "one of George's days." And if the day, not George, is remembered because of a dramatic incident involving George, this very incident is likely to have a profound effect on the hangover so that all manifest traces disappear as if by magic. Such events truly have an immediate sobering effect, although for the alcoholic it is equally true that they may, after several hours, lead to renewed drinking. If an accident involving injury or death is the dramatic event, very few diagnosticians would be able to reach an opinion which took account of "problem drinking and its effects." Nobody knows that George is a problem drinker, and there is nothing on his breath or in his behavior, nothing that could be detected even by chemical test, that would lead to this conclusion.

But George is not likely to be involved often in dramatic incidents. If George's job is desk work, he is quite likely to sit at his desk with correspondence, accounts, layouts, writing pad, order book, or whatever it may be, in approximately the usual order. Probably George will not make any drastic mistakes in his work. The probability rests chiefly on the fact that he will not do any work. Thoughts—thoughts related to his work, that is—will be rather vague and invariably depressing. The aspirin bottle, cigarette package, water cooler, men's room, window, picture on the calendar, other people, and the clock may get more attention than usual. Or George may seem to be in deep contemplation, lost in thought. That he is lost, insofar as business is concerned, is true enough.

If George is on the floor, working a lathe, he may show considerable physical activity. Trained by routine—and George is potentially an efficient worker—his torso, arms, and legs go through the familiar motions. But only half of George is there; his ability to discriminate between different pieces of material, his accuracy in noting the refined tolerance measure, his flexibility in physical balance and timing, all those abilities beyond dull routine exertions did not come along to the plant. The water cooler, window, clock, and so on, press forward in their function of distraction. Good old Charlie, the fellow at the next machine, may help out. George and Charlie have worked together for some time now, jointly dislike one of the inspectors, have common opinions on the union and on the company. Charlie won't squawk; he will not complain to the supervisor and get George (and his wife and kids) in trouble. Furthermore, Charlie and George occasionally have drinks together, and Charlie is not going to hear about any nonsense on that level: "Who do they think they are." Perhaps Charlie and George are aware that the supervisor and the foreman are thinking very similar thoughts: "George isn't very good today, but he's usually one of the best, one I can depend on. If I jump on George, it'll upset the whole section. Charlie will cover for him today." George's output is down and his waste pile is up. Of course, Charlie's output is down a bit too. But this does not appear on the record, and all concerned, including George, say nothing about it. Why not? Because it would upset personal relations, job efficiency and morale; because it means extra work, worry, perhaps hearings; because the company, and the community too, are not presently willing or able to do anything positive and constructive. All they can do is fire George, fine him, bawl him out, or take any like action which will usually make George worse, not better. It is perfectly understandable why George is not only a half-man as a worker but a half-man or an unrecognized sort of man insofar as management is concerned. He is not only a half-man; he is a hidden half-man.

To appreciate the extent of the half-man condition and to understand further its relative invisibility, it should be specified that George is not a half-man every day or even on the majority of his working days. If George is paid on Friday, he may well be full of alcohol Saturday and Sunday, perhaps absent from work on Monday. He is a half-man Tuesday and part of Wednesday. Thursday he may be up to his usual competence. Such Tuesday-Wednesday phases may appear 10 or 20 times a year; they may or may not follow a regular pattern; there may be different degrees of intensity in the various incidents. It is important to note there is always a period of George as a whole man, a longer period than 2 days, which follows and tends to cover up or even erase the memory of each half-man episode.

Many companies, in addition to confusing problem drinking with full-blown alcoholic psychosis or with skid-row types, also confuse drinking with problem drinking and problem drinking with drunkenness. True, all alcoholics get drunk, but not all people who get drunk are alcoholics. One not infrequent misconception runs as follows: "Alcoholism and problem drinking are most frequent among those who drink the most" (only partly true); "everybody knows" (the usual introduction to an unprovable statement) "that miners and workers in heavy industry and members of certain nationality-origin groups and longshoremen and lumberjacks drink a lot. However, our company is made up primarily of service workers, salesmen, office help, quasi professionals and the like, and we have almost none of the heavy drinker categories. Therefore, we have very, very few half-men. We probably have no significant problem at all." Perhaps this statement would come from few who are actually in such companies; perhaps it would come from outsiders.

There may or may not be more or fewer problem drinkers in companies of this nature. There are good reasons, based on related evidence, for believing that there may be more of some types, fewer of other types.. There is no evidence at all to suggest that any company because of the nature of the work or because of company policy is free from problem drinkers. Whether more or less, it is clearly true that existence of the problem is more serious for the company which is largely engaged in public service, public relations, and quasi professional work.

The half-man or—often quite important in work of this sort—the half-woman is not only a nonproducer for the company, he or she is an almost certain liability. Service to the public, good relations with the public, all the characteristics associated with being good with people, are perhaps intangible but they form one of the major assets of such companies. This asset is not protected in a vault, or made concrete by a figure in a stockholder's report, or protected by a patent. It is put in the hands of each and every employee who deals with the public, whether over a counter, across a wire, by correspondence, by interview, by home visit or other means. The salesman, equipment repairman, complaint adjuster, receptionist, home or office consultant, or person performing a direct intermediary service for two or more consumers—such workers carry that asset around in full public or consumer or potential consumer view. Energy, interest in other people, imagination, keen discrimination, intelligence, judgment, adherence to a rather high level of courtesy are all requirements for the successful and secure maintenance of that asset. By definition the half-man or half-woman has lost just those capabilities. But, also by definition, they have learned consciously or unconsciously to disguise the loss, to avoid above all else operations which will necessitate bringing such abilities into manifest action.

Fatigue has a similary dangerous function, and most companies carefully guard against its impact on employees in this sort of work. As the person's job is characterized by increasing amounts of this sort of responsibility, greater pains are taken to protect against the dangers of fatigue. The tired, harried executive is increasingly less effective. Compared to the half-man executive, however, he is hardly a danger at all. The half-man in positions calling for relations with the public is a far greater liability than George on the factory floor or George in the office, whose jobs do not carry this function.

Occasionally there is a job which calls for both keen physical reaction and continuing relations with the public, as the commercial air pilot, the bus driver. Some such jobs even carry specific limitations on the use of alcoholic beverages. Regulations may well eliminate the danger of slight drunkenness; they do not, however, eliminate the half-man.

This description of the core of the business-industrial loss through problem drinking would not be complete unless mention were made of another type of "half-person," almost always a woman. Several companies have indicated this to be their chief loss from problem drinking or alcoholism. This woman employee is neither an alcoholic nor problem drinker; she may be an abstainer. However, her husband or brother or father or other resident in the home is an alcoholic. When he is on a binge or in hangover, this woman employee—especially if she has very old or very young dependents at home—may be all too similar to the half-person described earlier, similar insofar as company functions and dangers to the company are concerned. Her case is similar also in that alcoholism or problem drinking will never appear on the record as the major or minor cause of her absence, her leaving in the middle of the working day, her anxiety, her distractibility, her mistakes, her inept public relations. There is a potential madman in her home. "But he is not a real madman, nobody can do anything about it, nobody must ever know." Information, sympathy, understanding, advice and plans on what to do, relief from stigma, awareness of community resources, all these would increase the effectiveness of this half-worker as much as would a program for an employee who himself or herself was the problem case.

The core of the problem, then, is not the count of the manifest symptoms, is not the count of those afflicted. The core of the problem is made up of two major items: one, the ignorance about the problem and distaste for knowledge about it on the part of all concerned, owners, managers, all levels of workers, and the public; and two, the very nature of the condition, which easily allows hiding, false labels, and disguised manifestation in any and every sort of problem already equipped with a different label.

Yet this half-man with his hidden problem—and there may be 2 million in business and industry—does not present an insoluble situation. There are heartening signs that corrective action will be taken: (1) In any company it is actually a small number of individuals from whom a large proportion of problems stems. (2) there is a means available for discovering this number; (3) there is a means for distinguishing those who can be rehabilitated by practical, tested methods; (4) there is a means for catching cases in earlier and earlier stages, leading to prevention; (5) the means are not esoteric, expensive, or incompatible with company policies or procedures, and they are available; and (6) the high rate of employment and expanding production, with consequent pinch on man-power resources, makes it ever more likely that industry and business will increasingly take advantage of means to meet all and any problems in the manpower field. They can ill afford to wait.

THE YALE PLAN

The Yale Center of Alcohol Studies has, in the last few years, developed a constructive approach to the problem drinkers in industry. The purposes of the plan include discovery of the nature, extent, and cost of the problem; the development of means to determine what proportion of those affected can be helped economically; provision of means for such rehabilitation; and the development of increasingly effective methods for discovering cases in earlier stages and at the time of employment. A most important step in realizing these purposes is a program of education to change existing attitudes toward alcoholism and the problem drinker in the environment where he works. When management, supervisors, and the workers themselves develop a more sympathetic understanding of the plight of the problem drinker, then the biggest hurdle has been cleared. The problem drinker—the hidden half-man on the production line—will come forward if he knows that he will receive sympathetic understanding and that his case will be given consideration as a medical disorder.

The Yale plan is not pointed at drinking itself; individuals naturally resist the attempt to interfere with their personal drinking prerogatives. Paternalism or infringement on the personal rights of the individual under the guise of help will only arouse suspicion and distrust. The treatment of a problem drinker does not involve controversial entanglement in any of the wet or dry philosophies and arguments; nor is it effective to resort to preaching, exhortation, or the use of scare methods in reaching a satisfactory solution to the individual's problem. The plan should not become a device for gathering evidence to be used in disciplinary action within an industry. It should be kept on a level above the reach of ridicule of any kind.

For a clearer understanding of problem drinking, it has been suggested that the problem drinker in industry be defined as the employee whose work is materially reduced in efficiency and dependability because of excessive drinking; he is the employee whose drinking excesses are more or less repetitive; he is the employee whose drinking is recognizably affecting his health or personal relations. This is the man who is costing his employer money. This is the man who in many instances can be helped.

The plan is a flexible program which may be used in whole or in part, depending on the existing policies of the company toward problem drinking, and the size and type of the industry. It is designed to achieve maximum utilization of individual plant facilities. The major steps in the institution of the Yale plan are as follows:

I. The first step in the establishment of the program is to develop understanding of the problem among those in management. They should be acquainted with the nature of alcoholism as a health problem, its extent as it affects industry, and the approved methods of treatment. If the plan is to succeed, it should have the approval and encouragement of top management. Management should view alcoholism as an illness and a plant health problem.

Material on alcoholism, especially developed for management, is available from the Yale Center of Alcohol Studies. This material should be distributed to those at the highest management level, accompanied by a letter from someone in authority recommending careful reading and consideration.

When sufficient time has passed, it might be advisable to convene a meeting of key personnel openly to consider and discuss the problem.

II. Responsibility for the direction of the program, while a matter of company policy, is usually assigned to one of the existing departments of the plant or office. Because problem drinking is primarily a health matter, this responsibility has most frequently been placed with the medical department. In a number of instances, however, where this has not been feasible, responsibility has been given to the personnel or employee relations divisions.

III. The next step is to lodge responsibility for carrying out the program. Management may select any person they consider suitably qualified to supervise the operation of a program within their organization. The individual chosen should have administrative ability and experience in employee counseling, and should be adept at presenting ideas. Above all, the program supervisor should look upon the alcoholic as a sick person and should have understanding of his problem. Such a supervisor or other key personnel, once chosen for this responsibility, may attend one of the specialized sessions of the Yale School of Alcohol Studies, where he will gain insight into the problems of alcoholism as they affect the particular industry. A person so chosen and trained should readily handle the details of the program or his company or corporation and supervise its operation under policies determined by the appropriate department.

IV. The program supervisor should set about to mobilize the existing plant facilities that lend themselves readily to furtherance of the program. In a concern of 1,500 or more employees, facilities useful for such a program will be available, such as a medical department, a social-work staff, an industrial-nursing staff, welfare services, a plant counselor, a legal department, a credit union, a recreational supervisor, union representatives, or others. Through the coordination of available plant assets the program may be quickly put into operation without any material addition to the staff.

Where treatment and rehabilitation facilities are lacking within a particular plant, companies may take the opportunity to create such facilities under their own supervision or assume the leadership in establishing them in their communities. It is advisable to evaluate the agencies in the community which are equipped to render services in this field. In the area of diagnosis and treatment, satisfactory working arrangements should be established with physicians, psychiatrists, and psychologists specializing in alcoholic cases. Arrangements should be made also with reputable clinics and hospitals that admit alcoholics. Community welfare and social groups should be enlisted. The aid and guidance of the courts and clergy should be sought. Alcoholics Anonymous is a major community asset in the rehabilitation of problem drinkers. As the program advances it may well prove advisable to encourage development of an AA group within the plant itself.

V. As the program, especially rehabilitation service, is developed, a new conception of the nature and extent of the problem will emerge. At that time the program supervisor can aid in developing a constructive plant policy concerning severance, discipline, retirement, job placement, treatment, and rehabilitation.

VI. A most important feature of the plan is counseling and referral. These services should be established for the problem drinker as early as possible. In the early phases of the program the supervisor (with the assistance of the medical and personnel department) will most likely be able to handle this responsibility. As the caseload increases—and it will as the program proves its worth—a trained counselor may be required.

The duties of the counselor are threefold, namely, to identify the alcoholic employee who is becoming a problem to himself and to the company; to interpret to him the nature of his problem and the possibility of recovery from the condition; and to refer him to the proper means by which he can be restored to normal working capacity.

If the alcoholic is to be helped he must be viewed realistically. It must be recognized that he cannot be expected to correct his condition himself. He needs help. The key to successful counseling is to provide the alcoholic with support and help without necessarily making him aware of his actual dependence, and in a sympathetic, noncritical, nonmoralistic manner to aid him in developing a genuine desire to stop drinking and to bring about a deep conviction that a method is available to him.

VII. Supervisors and administrative personnel have a leading role to play in all phases of this program and will contribute a great deal to the success of the plan through their improved understanding of the problem of the alcoholic in industry. An educational program for these personnel should be established within the plant and should emphasize the vital part each is to play. It is not suggested that the supervisor assume the role of a practiced counselor. Rather, because of his closeness to the employee and his knowledge of his habits and temperament, he should act as liasion between the employee and the responsible division within the plant.

Short lectures, motion pictures, and selected reading material can be used for this purpose.

VIII. Once key personnel have been indoctrinated, personnel can be shown the differences between drinking, drunkenness, and alcoholism. Leaflets, pay envelope stuffers, posters, and brief articles in company publications can be used profitably to introduce ideas of prevention of alocohol addiction and to bring about acceptance of treatment by those already suffering from the illness. Such materials have been especially prepared for industry. Already tested for their effectiveness, they can be easily incorporated into a consistent information program for any company or corporation. It should be carefully noted that to be effective such informational programs must be geared to an existing rehabilitation service, must be timed in accordance with a recognized program, and must avoid sensationalism and controversy. As isolated projects such efforts are not usually helpful.

IX. A survey should be made by the program supervisor to ascertain the extent of the problem within the plant. This can be done through techniques developed at the Yale center which avoid direct questioning or interference with personnel. Initial estimates will probably be on the conservative side since the "hidden man" will not come forward until assured of the plan's honesty and efficacy. The Allis-Chalmers Co., for example, carried only 70 problem drinkers on its program at first; today it carries some 300. The effectiveness of the program must be continuously investigated if its results are to be ascertained.

A TESTED PROGRAM

The cost of the plan is well within the reach of any concern, whether of 100 or 10,000 employees. The cost will vary according to the existence and utilization of plant facilities. If the program is handled largely within the plant through existing agencies, the cost will be small. It will be larger to the extent that cases are referred outside the plant. The cost will of course vary directly with the scope and intensity of the program undertaken by management. A cost analysis can be made for those contemplating a program.

Several large industrial concerns, in cooperation with local and civic authorities, have applied the ideas developed at the center and the results have been decidedly encouraging. All of those reporting have seen a marked reduction in absenteeism due to alcoholism. Another result has been a definite increase in the efficiency of the recovered alcoholics and a considerable decrease in their accident rate. These reports indicate satisfactory recovery rates varying from 40 to 80 percent of the cases treated. In general, these companies seem to agree that a minimum of 50 percent of those accepting help were sufficiently recovered and that their drinking, if continued at all, was curtailed to such an extent that it did not interfere with their job situation or normal living. The increasing ability to identify early symptoms and to discriminate between those more susceptible and those less susceptible to rehabilitation are valuable increments to the direct savings of rehabilitation. Another noticeable gain stems from the worker's new-found ability to use the information and services allowed by the program to relieve the problem of the alcoholic family member, a major source of difficulty for women employees.

The most far-reaching advantage of the Yale plan is that with proper education and treatment the individual worker need not let his drinking get out of hand, need never reach the advanced stages of alcohol addiction. "An ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure" is an adage that truly applies to the problems of alcoholism in industry.

An important feature of the Yale plan for industry is that it is continuously undergoing revision. Companies conducting programs are requested to communicate their experiences to the center in order that new techniques of treatment and education resulting from such experiences may be incorporated in the plan. Research on therapeutic procedures, on definitions of success in treatment, on early case finding, and on such matters as record forms, in-service information programs, and cost analysis is a continuing function of the center, which invites cooperation in such work by companies active in meeting the problems of alcoholism and problem drinking in industry.

---

[1] Straus, R., and Bacon, S. D. Alcoholism and Social Stability. A study of occupational integration in 2,023 male clinic patients. New Haven; Hillhouse Press; 1951. Also in: Quart. J. Stud. Alc. 12: 231–260, 1951.

[2] Page, R. C., Thorpe, J. J., and Caldwell, D. W. The problem drinker in industry. Quart. J. Stud. Alc. 13: 370–396, 1952.

[3] (a) Jellinek, E. M., and Keller, M. Rates of alcoholism in the United States of America, 1940–48. Quart. J. Stud. Alc. 13: 49–59, 1952. (b) Jellinek, E. M. The estimate of the number of alcoholics in the U. S. A. for 1949 in the light of the sixth revision of the International Lists of Causes of Death. Quart. J. Stud. Alc. 13: 215–218, 1952.

[4] Jellinek, E. M. What shall we do about alcoholism? Vital Speeches 13: 252–253, 1947.

[5] Landis, B. Y. Some Economic Aspects of Alcoholic Problems. New Haven; Hillhouse Press; 1945. Revised in: McCarthy, R. G., and Douglass, E. M. Alcohol and Social Responsibility—A New Educational Approach; ch. 4, footnote 10. New York; Thomas Y. Crowell Co.; and New Haven; Yale Plan Clinic; 1949.

[6] Bacon, S. D. Alcoholism and industry. Civitan magazine, March 1951.

World Government or One World Philosophy Exploded

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1954

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, dreamy visionaries have been advocating a one world philosophy covered by a world government without any consideration of the realities of the present world conditions.

William Henry Chamberlin, writing in the Wall Street Journal, calls the turn on this approach to world affairs. I call his article to the attention of all Members of this House:

Little Worlds Divided—The Partition of Ethnic Groups as Political Solutions Is a Grim Reversal of One World Aspirations

(By William Henry Chamberlin)

The still fluid conference at Geneva may lead to a military collapse and forced evacuation of the French troops from Indochina. It may lead to an extension of the war and the involvement of countries which are not now involved in the hostilities. Apparently the most that is expected, in the event that an agreement is reached, is a partion of the country along some line that has not yet been drawn.

Should any such arrangement be worked out, it would be one more example of an act of unnatural partition, accepted as preferable to a continuation or extension of war. Dreamy visionaries during the last war foresaw the coming of a one world situation, with internationalization under the United Nations as the political wonder drug for every difficult situation.

How grimly different the reality has been. The world is split more sharply than it has ever been in the past by the Iron Curtain which every Communist state automatically lowers around its frontiers. The Soviet Union itself has become far less accessible to foreign visitors. Tourist liners no longer disembark passengers at Shanghai; the beauties of the old Chinese capital, Peiping, are as shut off from foreign view (a few handpicked delegations of foreign Communists and dupes excepted) as they were in the days of Marco Polo.

NATURAL UNITS VIVISECTED

More than that, countries which are natural units have been vivisected. The judgment which King Solomon pronounced in order to learn which of 2 claimants of a child was the genuine mother has been executed on 1 of Europe's great capitals, Berlin, and on the historic city, sacred to 3 religions, Jerusalem.

It is only a stone's throw from a free-enterprise society in West Berlin to a Communist society in East Berlin. It is almost impossible to pass through the barbedwire barriers which separate New Jerusalem, the capital of the State of Israel, from Old Jerusalem, won by the Arab Legion during the war and held by the State of Jordan.

Korea is another example of a country backed into two parts along an arbitrary line of demarcation created by a parallel of latitude. Trieste and the Saar are symbols of postwar disputes for which no agreed solution has yet been found.

Much the most serious of these surgical operations on the living bodies of peoples is the division of Germany. There is no historic, ethnic, economic, or other justification for the present frontier between the Western Zone and the Soviet Zone in Germany. It is a demarcation line traced on a map and based on a guess, and an inaccurate guess, as to where the allied and Soviet armies would meet at the end of the war. One of the many Santa Claus acts of the United States Government was the withdrawal of American troops to this line of demarcation, in spite of the fact that the Soviet Government had already clearly violated its promises to assure free, unfettered elections in Poland.

The people in the Soviet Zone of Germany were no more inclined toward communism before the war than the people in the German Federal Republic. Now, as the spontaneous revolt last June showed, they are probably still more actively anti-Communist in their feelings, because they can contrast the squalor, drabness, and general poverty of Soviet Communist rule with the booming prosperity across the zonal border. However, they are helpless so long as picked Communist special police units are supported by large, well-equipped Soviet-occupation forces.

GERMAN DEADLOCK

The Berlin Conference, held early this year, showed no way out of the deadlock which has existed for years, with the Western powers insisting on free elections as the basis of German unification and the Soviet Government holding out for voting along lines familiar behind the Iron Curtain. An explosive element in the German situation is furnished by some 9 million Germans and peoples of German stock, driven from their homes in the German provinces east of the present German-Polish frontier, in the Sudetenland area of Czechoslovakia and elsewhere.

These refugees have their own political party. They have their newspapers, their meetings, their organizations. Some of them by this time have become more or less resigned to living in West Germany. But many look forward eargerly to some miracle that will bring them back to their homes in East Prussia, Silesia and the Sudetenland.

In Korea, as in Germany, partition was not the result of any separatist feeling on the two sides of the 38th parallel. It was imposed as a provisional solution after the war. The attempt of the North Koreans, with Soviet and Chinese support, to conquer the whole country was defeated; but General MacArthur's march to the Yalu, northern boundary of Korea, also ended in defeat.

The division of the city of Jerusalem is the most dramatic expression of the failure of all dreams of Jewish-Arab coexistence in Palestine. And, as the frequent reports of killings and reprisals show, the whole eastern border of Israel with Jordan and Syria is an inflamed trouble spot. One reason is that in some cases the border, which is a military demarcation line, cuts off Arabs on the Jordan side of the boundary from their former land on the Israel side. There has not been enough mutual trust and good will to permit a reasonable straightening out of the pockets in this more or less accidental border.

NO JUSTIFICATION

Not one of the acts of partition, of which Indochina may be the latest example, is justified in terms of morals, politics or economics. All create much hardship and suffering. They have been grudgingly accepted because the alternative, at the present time, seems to be something worse, new outbreaks of war. Their permanence is doubted.

This frequent resort to carving up of historic national units is a realistic commentary on the "brave new world" which some shallow optimists imagined as emerging from the late war.

Declaration of the National Conference of Americans of Slovak Descent, May 24–25, 1954, Washington, D. C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. BONIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 7, 1954

Mr. BONIN. Mr. Speaker, on May 24 and 25 the Slovak League of America, a cultural and civic federation of Americans of Slovak descent, held a national conference at the Hotel Hamilton in our Nation's Capital.

The convention assembled set forth the following declaration of principles which were submitted to me for insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by Dr. Joseph A. Mikus, director of the Slovak League Press Bureau:

DECLARATION OF THE NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF AMERICANS OF SLOVAK DESCENT, MAY 24–25, 1954, WASHINGTON, D. C.

We, the participants of the National Conference of Americans of Slovak Descent, sponsored by the Slovak League of America at Washington, D. C., May 24–25, 1954, do solemnly and unanimously declare:

1. We rededicate ourselves to the preservation of our American democracy—the principles upon which our United States of America was founded and which made it the greatest democratic country in the world.

2. Our primary interest is the welfare and security of the United States of America.

3. We condemn all forms of tyranny, every form of totalitarian political system. We recognize the Godless philosophy of materialistic communism as the dread evil and conspiracy against free humanity that it is, as a political system which threatens mankind with utter enslavement. We have fought consistently and resolutely against it in and out of season and, today, are more determined than ever to persevere in our fight against it with all possible means at our command until the plague of communism is completely wiped off the face of the earth.

4. We cannot subscribe to the policy that doing business with the Soviet Union and its satellites is in the best interests of the welfare and security of the United States and the free world.

5. The Council of Free Czechoslovakia does not express the political will of the Slovak nation or the will of the Slovaks in exile. The Slovaks members (Czech Slovaks) of the council are individuals who either did not get a mandate from the Slovak nation, or betrayed it by collaborating with Communists and the Soviet Union.

We strongly recommend that all official, semiofficial and private American institutions desiring any information on problems affecting the Slovak nation, consult with the Slovak League of America, an American institution which since 1907 has been advancing the cause of freedom and national rights of the Slovak nation.

Another organization worthy of consultation in the matter of the problems of the Slovak nation is the Slovak National Council Abroad, whose leadership and membership represents the majority of the Slovak exiles.

6. We heartily commend all efforts on the part of our Government, its agencies and congressional committees to ferret out, unmask, and prosecute all subversive elements, specifically all Communists and fellow-travelers, which propagate class hatreds, economic strife, chaos, and anarchy. All persons and organizations, who wittingly or unwittingly give aid and comfort to the conspiracy of communism, should be thoroughly investigated by the proper organs of our Government.

7. We approve the idea of a United Nations organization which shall promote and preserve peace and prosperity in all countries of the world, as far as is humanly possible. The UNO at the present time is not really an organization of United Nations, but an organization of governments, several of which definitely are not representative of the political will and the national interests of the nations they claim to represent.

8. We subscribe wholeheartedly to the principle that all nations have the right to determine by their own free choice the state or form of political organization under which they wish to live. The principle of self-determination—the fundamental principle of American policy in Europe since the administration of President Woodrow Wilson—must apply without reservations even to the Slovak nation from which we are descended.

9. We endores the principle that the Government of the United States shall refuse to recognize any government imposed upon any nation by the force of an alien power and urge that this principle be made operative even in the case of the Slovak nation, which is in fact dominated today by the Czecho-Communist regime of Prague in violation of the fundamental principles of the Charter of the United Nations Organization and the fundamental principle of American policy of self-determination.

10. The independent Slovak Republic, established by the duly elected representatives of the Slovak nation on March 14, 1939, should not have been destroyed by the victorious allied nations without consulting the will of the Slovak nation. We, therefore, respectfully request the President of the United States and the Congress to instruct our delegate to the United Nations Organization to request an investigation by the UNO of the destruction of the Slovak republic.

11. We, furthermore, respectfully petition the President of the United States and the Congress to voice a strong protest against the violation of human right in Slovakia, the brutal persecution of Slovak religious, cultural and political leaders by the Czecho-Communist regime of Prague.

12. As Christians and adherents of the democratic way of life, we resolutely oppose the domination and exploitation of any nation by any other nation or political state. The Slovak nation did not want to be dominated by the Magyars prior to 1918 and, today, does not want to be ruled by the Czech nation. We firmly believe that the national existence and the welfare of the Slovak nation can best be safeguarded by the Slovaks themseleves in their own Slovak republic.

13. We seek no special favors or grants for the nation we are descended from. We only plead for the recognition of and respect for its inherent and fundamental rights, because it cannot voice itself freely today. These rights are predicated on the elementary democratic and Christian principle that all peoples, wherever they may be found and

however few their numbers, are morally entitled to speak in the council of nations, there to defend the rights of their nation to survival and self-fulfillment.

14. The Czechs and their Slovak hirelings (Czech Slovaks), now organized in various Czech and Czechoslovak organizations, do not represent the political will of the Slovak nation, and, therefore, have no authority to speak for the Slovaks anywhere. One such organization, the Council of Free Czechoslovakia, purports to be an organization of anti-Communist, democratic exiles from Czechoslovakia, but is, in fact, an organization controlled by Czechs who were members of the Communist-dominated National Front government of Dr. Edward Benes and Clement Gottwald, which collaborated closely with the Soivet Union and outlawed all antisocialistic and anticommunistic parties in Czechoslovakia. The leading members of this council should be recognized for what they really were in their homeland: promoters of socialism and the pro-Soviet policy of the Czech Socialists and Communists.

Utilize Percy Jones

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1954

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, it is now more than 8 months since the splendid Percy Jones Army Hospital property at Battle Creek, Mich., in my district, was deactivated as an Army hospital.

During that time this facility with a replacement value of more than $35 million, has remained idle and unused, with serious economic loss to the community and waste to the Government and taxpayers.

A proposal, originating within the armed services, to utilize it as headquarters for the Armed Services Medical Procurement Agency, now located in a top priority atomic target area, in Brooklyn, N. Y., was turned down on the flimsiest of excuses, after many weeks of futile conferences and discussions.

Next Monday a special House Armed Services Subcommittee, of which I am chairman, begins hearings on the Defense Department policies relating to utilization of hospital properties and to this strange decision relative to the Armed Services Medical Procurement Agency.

Meanwhile, under leave to extend and revise my remarks, I include an editorial from the Battle Creek (Mich.) Record and Lakeview News, which forcefully and accurately reflects the views of my fellow townsmen with respect to the present status of the Percy Jones Hospital and the lack of any sound Defense Department policy for utilization of this valuable property. This editorial, appearing in the June 3 issue of the newspaper, was written by its editor, Mr. Charles Reisner. The editorial follows:

BEAR DOWN, PAUL

Last week we had occasion to walk past Percy Jones and it was depressing to see that wonderful plant completely idle. Everyone who passes must feel the same way although all of us would rather see it standing idle than have it being used to care for freshly wounded boys from a battlefield. We all know, however, that our Government is spending millions of dollars for rent for housing the many departments and bureaus in congested cities throughout the country and we are certain that some use can be found for this building, which will save the taxpayers' money. It now stands as a monument to governmental inefficiency and an economic blight to this community.

As taxpayers and residents of this city we have a double obligation to protest the nonuse of Percy Jones and we can, at least, lend our support to Representative PAUL SHAFER who has been carrying the ball on this situation with little support. Now as chairman of the Special House Committee on hospitals, PAUL is in an ideal spot to find out, among other things, why the Medical Procurement Agency was not moved here when all the heads of the various services involved approved the move both from the standpoint of safety and economy.

It should be kept in mind that Mr. SHAFER started in motion the chain of events that lead to Percy Jones being considered as the logical headquarters for the Medical Procurement Agency. He started this when he learned that the Fifth Army was considering moving its headquarters from Chicago to Fort Sheridan. He said immediately, and we heard him say it, "why shouldn't they use Fort Custer instead?" He then started action which brought an investigation concerning that possibility. Although Battle Creek was ruled out as not desirable for the Fifth Army as a result it was learned that neither was Fort Sheridan. While this investigation was going on the Defense Department came up with the idea that Percy Jones would be the ideal spot for the Medical Procurement Agency. This was their own idea, which was investigated thoroughly by every branch of the service and approved by all the heads of such services including the head of the agency who would have had to live here.

What happened when the final decision was made? The weak excuse was given that it would be a violation of the Geneva Agreement and that the Defense Department had no authority to make such a move. This is just too silly for any intelligent person to believe.

It so happens that we lived for 7 years in Brooklyn and we know where the present headquarters of the medical agencies are located. They could not be in a worse spot in the entire country. One well placed bomb aimed at the Brooklyn Bridge and the other nearby bridges would bottle up that section of the city so that nothing could move. Moreover the agency is located in a slum area of the worst kind. From the standpoint of safety to the entire Nation the present location is the worst possible and we believe when the facts are revealed it will be found to be bad from an economy angle as well.

We expect the real reason is that the people who work in the agency just did not want to move to Battle Creek, or lose their jobs. Knowing the typical New Yorker as we do, he is so provincial that the prospect of moving out of that rabbit warren is so terrifying to him that he cannot imagine anything worse. Actually it would be doing those people a great favor to get them out as they would soon realise. But since when has the Defense Department become so considerate that personal wishes have any bearing on questions that involve national safety? If Battle Creek is the best place to have this agency then why not have it here? We think that when all the facts are brought out that the logic of the situation will force that agency to be moved here or if not, then some other use will be found for Percy Jones. Paul, concentrate on this job, and do not worry about reelection.

Dominion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED MARSHALL

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 7, 1954

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include the following comments from the Christian Science Monitor in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Miss Kendall has long been interested in United States development of the Antarctic region.

The above-mentioned follows:

DOMINION

To the CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR:

There is a way that any seeming consternation, any apparent sense of defeat, attributed to the United States during the Geneva talks or afterward may well be refuted by the people and the leadership of this Nation.

A leader such as the United States does not back up against a wall and whimper. Nor does a young and virile nation accept as a way of life a future consisting of plans to crawl under desks and/or evacuate cities. No. Already there are indications that the Nation which has become a world leader is of leadership stature.

The country is taking note of the needs of an ill and despondent world. In a commonsense and humanitarian sort of way there is attention being paid to future world needs; in other words, true progress is still the watchword and little or no sense of defeat needs to be felt by any country in small diplomatic forays when fundamental rightness is being upheld by that country.

Bases for fundamental rightness are in the Bible. Definite orders appear there. "Have * * * dominion over all the earth * * * and subdue it" (Genesis 1: 26 and 28). This means just what it says—over all the earth. It does not mean over men and nations, but over the earth, the planet, the resources to be developed for the good of all.

Today one-tenth of the land surface of the earth is not utilized for the good of mankind. This is the Antarctic Continent. The absurdity of such status quo is more and more being realized in the United States and not only scientists but civic and patriotic leaders are beginning to think about this along commonsense lines. There is such thinking in the Congress in connection with measures introduced, in various societies as reflected in their resolutions, and in scientific circles.

United States participation in the International Geophysical Year in 1957–58 may mean not only that certain important questions regarding cosmic rays, auroras, magnetic storms, and other meteorological problems will be solved, but that in the field of glacialogy there may be some advances. Today there may be sitting in some kindergarten class a youngster who later will have a sensible and logical plan for clearing off the ice cap now hindering Antarctic development. The ideas for this advanced thus far, some of them in connection with studies of arid areas of the world, are called ridiculous and insane; but as both fission and fusion energies emerge for practical use the idea of fixing up Antarctica as a part of the inhabitated world would surely become feasible. Thus, "having dominion" and "subduing" the earth are terms having very different meaning in the intentions of a farsighted Nation such as the United States from the mere subjugation of men or nations.

As a nation puts aside the old for the new, that nation cannot be embarrassed or annoyed by trifling diplomatic dickerings. That nation does really step forward with vision and commonsense toward a future freely progressive with horizons symbolized by Antarctica and distant planets and embodied in spiritual advancement and attainment.

Miss Elizabeth A. Kendall.

Chevy Chase, Md.

"There Must Be No American Intervention Here," Says French Army Captain in Indochina

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1954

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, there is considerable agitation in high circles for American intervention in Indochina on the flimsy pretext that we are obliged to stop communism there. Nothing could be more tragic to our Nation and the free world.

Mr. Keyes Beech, writer for the Chicago Daily News Service, in a dispatch from Hanoi June 4, relates a conversation with five French officers who are on duty there. The article in question follows:

French Fed Up, Hanoi Visitor Finds

(By Keyes Beech)

Hanoi, June 4.—I sat around a luncheon table with five French officers the other day and learned why the French won't win this war.

They don't believe in it. Moreover, they're fed up with it.

All of them were back in Indochina for their second tour of duty—27 months—except for one. He was back for his third tour.

Three were captains and two were majors. All were in their middle or late 30's, much older on the average than American officers of similar rank, because promotions don't come easy in the French Army. All were married, with wives and children back in France.

"There must be no American intervention here," said a curly-haired captain. "For then the Chinese will come in and that means we would be here forever."

"If the Vietnamese would fight the way the Viet Minh (Communists) do we would win the war tomorrow," said a mustached major, adding by way of explanation: "I command a Vietnamese light battalion. It is very light indeed."

"The Vietnamese lack the mystique—the moral spirit," observed the curly-haired captain. "Between them and their Government there is a great gulf. They have Bao Dai (Vietnam chief of state regarded by many Vietnamese as a French puppet)."

"The Viet Minh, on the other hand, have Ho Chi Minh. Ho may be a Communist but he's an honest man."

"But couldn't something be done to persuade the Vietnamese to fight?" I put in.

"At one time, perhaps yes," replied the captain. "But now it is too late. Too many mistakes have been made."

Those are the words you hear most often from the French here when you discuss the war:

"It is too late."

"For us," said the captain, "there are only two ways home to France and our families. One is by the *Aeromanche* (French aircraft carrier). The other is by telegram."

Need Federal Aid Now for Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 7, 1954

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include herewith an editorial entitled "Need Federal Aid Now for Schools," which appeared in the June 1, 1954, issue of the Park City Daily News, of Bowling Green, Ky.

This editorial very ably sets forth the immediate necessity for legislation authorizing the Federal Government to make allotments to the several States to aid in their school-building construction programs. The need for this assistance becomes more urgent each year in my home State of Kentucky. The records of the United States Office of Education show that of the 5,013 school plants in my State 3,004 are 1-room schools, and that only 122 of the 5,013 were rated as satisfactory in 1950 by United States standards. Eighty percent of our school plants have no central heat and only 5 percent had water on the grounds. As pointed out by the Park City Daily News, it is better to move fast and err on the side of spending too much, than to delay and deprive America's young people of an opportunity that, for them, may never come again in quite the same way.

The editorial follows:

Need Federal Aid Now for Schools

A Government survey shows that in the school year just closing there was a deficit of nearly 350,000 classrooms. The likelihood is the situation will get worse as the children of World War II marriages stream through the school doors.

Currently before the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee is a proposal authorizing Federal aid to the States for new school construction. If this measure were to be approved by Congress, and implemented by direct appropriations, a healthy start could be made toward licking this problem.

However, Secretary Oveta Culp Hobby, of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, has asked that action be delayed. She wants to wait until planned White House and State conferences on the situation can be held, so a more accurate gage can be put on the ability of local communities to meet construction needs.

There would seem not the slight reason to doubt Mrs. Hobby's good faith in this matter. Her request for a postponement does not make her an enemy of new school construction, as some of her critics seem to suggest.

But, assuming the best of motives, the effect of a postponement by Congress on Federal aid would be to increase the classroom deficit through the 1954-55 season, with damaging results upon the educational opportunities of hundreds of thousands of youngsters.

There is always a certain lag between the voting of appropriations and the start of authorized projects, and obviously school buildings cannot be thrown up overnight like tents. If Federal action is put off until the 1955 session of Congress, the prospects are that the benefits of any aid will not be felt in the form of new schoolrooms until some time in 1956—possibly even later.

In and around Congress are some pretty ingenious bill drafters. If one of these cannot come up with a Federal-aid formula flexible enough to accommodate to later information on local community resources, then the craft of lawmaking is sagging badly.

The Senate and House ought to approve now some such flexible plan, and initial appropriations should be voted. Cramped quarters can produce cramped minds. Delay may put an ineradicable scar upon our youth.

It is better to move fast and err on the side of spending too much, than to delay and deprive America's young people of an opportunity that, for them, may never come again in quite the same way.

Trees Grow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRIS ELLSWORTH

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 7, 1954

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, the eyes of the professional foresters of the United States are turned this year toward the Pacific Northwest. For the first time in its 79-year history, the American Forestry Association will hold its annual meeting in that area. The gathering will be in Portland, Oreg., September 6 to 9. The forest economy of the Douglas-fir region is not only important to professional foresters, it is of vital concern to the whole country since more than one-half of the wood products used in the United States comes from the Northwest.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include an article written by Mr. W. D. Hagenstein and published in the magazine American Forests for April, under the title "Trees Grow." Mr. Hagenstein is a forester who knows his country and its history. In the following article he explains in careful detail why full crop development based upon full crop utilization has become the guidepost in Douglas-fir region forestry today:

Trees Grow

Acre for acre the Douglas-fir region is the greatest forest in the world. It is a compact 26-million acre forest extending from British Columbia to California and from the summit of the Cascades to the Pacific shore. Its fertile forest soils and mild maritime climate favor its excellent timber species.

The region, long heralded as America's last forest frontier, has been contributing substantially to America's wood products needs for a half-century. Its first tree was commercially harvested as recently as 1827. Despite America's heavy demand on its forests, more than half the region is occupied by trees of currently usable size.

The Douglas-fir region is unique in the United States in that all three segments of its forest industry are substantial—lumber, pulp and paper, and plywood. The development by single companies or between companies in the same community of facilities which offer a market place for every kind of log has furnished landowners the best possible incentive for growing trees. Full crop development based upon full crop utilization is the guidepost in Douglas-fir forestry today.

Unfortunately the latest complete data on the total forest resource of the region are those which were recapped as part of the nationwide forest reappraisal in 1945. They show a total stand of merchantable trees 15 inches and larger of 439 billion board feet. Old-growth timber then occupied 9.3 million acres, young growing timber 8.2 million acres, seedlings and saplings 3.0 million acres, poorly stocked and nonstocked burns and harvested areas consisted of 3.3 million acres and there were 2.1 million acres of recently harvested lands, unexamined for their condition.

The ownership and merchantable trees in 1945 showed 41.3 percent in national forests, 10 percent on the Oregon and California revested railroad lands, 1.3 percent in other Federal holdings, and 7 percent in State, county, and municipal holdings. All private owners were credited with 40.4 percent.

Because these data were mostly bookkeeping of earlier field data, some as antiquated as 12 years, it has been the contention of many foresters that they were badly out of date. The United States Forest Survey has reinventoried some counties in the region in the last few years. The subsequent reports have shown an almost universal increase in the volume of usable timber. In these recent surveys the minimum size of sawtimber was reduced from 15 to 11 inches, new volume tables which give an approximate 10 percent across the board increase because of better utilization now in general practice were used, and planimetric measurement of aerial photographs for determination of forest-type areas has recorded more commercial land than previously thought to exist.

A striking example of the increased timber volume between the original survey of 1933 and the most recent inventory is that for the five southwestern Oregon counties. They were estimated to have 128 billion feet of timber in 1933. Between 1933 and 1948, 15.2 billion feet were harvested, which would project a volume by bookkeeping of 112.7 billion. The survey reported 152.5 billion feet in 1948.

Another example of this is in the eight counties of southwestern Washington. The original survey volume in 1933 was estimated at 116.3 billion feet. Between 1933 and the recent survey 39 billion feet were harvested which would project a volume by bookkeeping of 77.3 billion. The latest surveys completed between 1949 and 1952 credited these counties with 121.7 billion feet.

Some of the increases in timber volume are due to the passing of some considerable acreage of trees into the 11-inch size class. Some are due to the changed standards cited. Most of them, however, are due to our Nation's dynamic economy which impelled rapid changes in technology and allowed us to tally as useful for the first time timber which had been standing in the region's forests for several centuries.

A straight-line expansion of these data shows a present timber supply in the Douglas-fir region of over 600 billion board feet. The vastness of this footage can only be appreciated when it is recalled that 1 billion feet of timber will provide lumber for 111,500 homes for average size.

Historically the Douglas-fir industry began with lumber. After a century and a quarter lumber is still the region's principal product. Wood pulp production began early but has increased to front rank importance in the last 20 years. Plywood has grown similarly during that period. In 1952 the region had 993 sawmills, 72 plywood plants, 26 pulp mills, 203 shingle mills, and 10 board mills. There were also another 1,100 miscellaneous wood-using plants.

In 1925 nearly 90 percent of the region's logs were used for lumber, only 3 percent for pulp, and less than 1 percent for plywood. Shingles and miscellaneous uses accounted for 7 percent. A quarter of a century later lumber required 71 percent, wood pulp more than 16 percent, plywood nearly 10 percent, and shingles and miscellaneous uses less than 3 percent. However, lest this be construed as supplanting of lumber use by the others, it should be noted that nearly 90 percent used for lumber in 1925 was a log use of 8.2 billion feet, while in 1950 the slightly more than 70 percent lumber use was nearly 8.8 billion.

While accurate regional economic data are not available for the forest industries in earlier years, State data indicate the trends in employment, payrolls, and value of products. In 1921 Washington employed 47,000 people in her forest industries. Their wages were $60 million and the value of their products $165 million. In 1952 there were 74,000 people directly employed by the industry, their wages were more than $318 million, and the value of their products $814 million. An even greater trend has occurred in Oregon as indicated by the 21,875 persons employed in 1921 with wages of $27 million and products worth $70,500,000. In 1952 there were more than 92,000 workers in the industry in Oregon, their wages were $400 million, and the value of their products a billion dollars.

A quarter of a century ago when logging was completed there was more sound wood left per acre in the Douglas-fir region than ever grew on most other softwood acres in the world. This was the circumstance of cheap timber, the engineering problems of removing 300 to 500 tons of wood from slopes often as steep as 150 percent, the urge to put an end once and for all to ad valorem taxes which were eating up stumpage values and the risk of fire which was ever present. With that kind of utilization in the woods and a refuse burner as standard equipment at every sawmill and plywood plant is it any wonder that there was little forestry being practiced in the Douglas-fir region?

The changes which have taken place since the dark days of those adverse conditions are no less dramatic. With rising stumpage values the forest industries looked everywhere for additional sources of raw material, but principally at their own lands and plants. The pulp and paper segment of the industry is now getting the equivalent of more than three-quarters of a billion board feet of logs annually from sawmill and plywood leftovers. Relogging, which means principally gathering up the leftovers, mostly slash and cull trees and snags, is providing the industry with about a billion feet of logs annually. They are used for all major products.

You have all heard of the great Tillamook fire of 1933 which killed some 12 billion feet of timber. After 20 years there are more than a hundred operators logging in the burn and their salvage will not be completed for another 10 or 15 years. Because the cruises of the area were so conservative in 1933—a year of no markets and rock bottom stumpage values—it is said that the total recovery of salvage wood from this burn will exceed that which was estimated to have been killed by the original fire. Of course, this is arithmetically absurd as some of the timber certainly deteriorated, but what it shows is that with changing economics, changing technology makes useful more and lower grades of material.

Diversification of manufacture has developed faster in the Douglas-fir region than probably any other part of the world in a period of fewer than 15 years. Longview, Wash., undoubtedly furnishes a greater variety of wood products than any other community in the world. Far example, Longview has more than a dozen sawmills, including the 2 largest in the world, numerous planning mills, 2 plywood plants, 3 pulp mills, 1 paperboard plant, several shingle mills, a hardboard plant, a wood-treating plant, a bark products plant, a prestolog plant, and a factory which uses small clear pieces of leftovers from a planing mill for inexpensive knock-down furniture and a variety of woodenware. While I have singled out the community of Longview, let me be quick to point out that there are other centers of integrated utilization in our region—Bellingham, Everett, Seattle, Tacoma, Shelton-McCleary, Port Angeles, and Hoquiam-Aberdeen in Washington. In Oregon such centers exist at St. Helens, Portland, Springfield-Eugene, and others are developing on Coos Bay, Roseburg, Medford-Ashland-Grants Pass and Lebanon-Sweet Home. Sometimes the integration is effected within one company, although more commonly it is between companies in the same community.

The Douglas-fir region forged ahead rapidly in forest utilization to meet current human needs. Forest management was slower in starting, because its results generally serve future human needs. However, these two handmaidens of forestry now are sprinting ahead at a break-neck pace in the Douglas-fir region.

As in all other forest regions the first application of forestry consisted of protection against fire. Organized protection has been required by State law for nearly half a century, but was largely developed through the initiative of private landowners. However, it has only been generally effective for the last 20 years. It was the ineffectiveness of forest protection which had more to do with the origin in the State of Washington in 1940 of the keep green program followed a year later in the same State by the establishment of the Nation's first tree farm.

Because forests in the Douglas fir region develop best as even-aged stands, the accepted method of harvesting mature timber with the object of regeneration is clearcutting. Fortunately, this system lends itself to the engineering requirements of logging under Northwest conditions.

In the early days logging was done almost entirely by railroad. Today there are no more than 20 private railroad systems in the region. The truck has replaced the railroad and has been one of the means of helping the region do a better forestry job. The truck is useful not only for harvesting but provides motorized fire protection and has allowed operators to do away with one of their costly headaches—the logging camp. Only a handful, as compared with former years, of Douglas fir region loggers now live in camp. Most of them live in small communities adjacent to our forests and commute each day in company buses or drive their own cars. This has improved the quality of men available for this highly mechanized industry which needs men of better than average mental and physical agility.

Under railroad logging methods clearcutting was accomplished by logging contiguous areas, one setting after another on the basis that logging must be completed on each spur before the untreated bridge piling and ties rotted out. Truck logging has given much greater flexibility in setting up harvesting schedules on the basis of priority so that overmature stands can be liquidated while bypassing younger stands which are allowed to grow.

For the past 20 years a modification of clearcutting termed "staggered settings" has been common practice. Under it a watershed is logged in three or more rounds of cutting by taking a setting here, skipping a setting, taking a setting, and so on. By cutting this way green timber is left against which to burn slash, thus minimizing the risk of fire getting away. It also provides a much more adequate supply of seed for each harvest. The system has two striking disadvantages. It requires a much greater capital investment in roads earlier in the history of the development of a property. It also exposes so much more cutting edge, the hazard of windfall is increased. However, the latter is minimized by the fact that the road system is in place and salvage of a few trees which blow down along the margins can be accomplished without great additional cost.

All private lands are required to practice a kind of forestry which results in minimum acceptable regeneration because the Oregon and Washington Forest Conservation Acts require the leaving of seed-bearing timber for natural regeneration, or planting or seeding if the owner chooses not to reserve the required seed sources. These acts, coupled with the very complete forest protection requirements of the State laws and the additional forestry practiced by the owners of more than 4¼ million acres of certified tree farms are resulting in continuing improvement in the level of forest management being practiced in the woods.

The most conclusive demonstration the region has ever had that its cutting practices assure regeneration is the evidence of the recent forest survey data. The comparison of nonstocked forest land, county by county, indicates what has happened.

Of the 5 Oregon and 8 Washington counties resurveyed by the end of 1952, according to the original survey, there was a total of 1,763,000 acres of lands which had been harvested or burned over which were nonstocked in 1933. By the current inventory these nonstocked lands had been reduced to 713,000 acres, or a reduction of 59 percent in an average of 18 years. Of this more than a million additional acres now supporting young timber, less than 10 percent has been artificially reforested. The rest was principally the result of adequate forest protection which allowed Nature to function.

As indicated previously, cutting practices are designed primarily to obtain natural regeneration. However, in the last 15 years the industry has been engaged in a widescale planting program which is primarily one of rehabilitation of areas which years following cutting were still nonstocked. A hundred thousand acres have been planted since 1941.

Local taxation in the Douglas-fir region can be summed up very quickly. It is still an unsystematic jangle of improper timber valuation, ill-fitting formulas and uncorrelated assessments for the most part. It's a real problem to private foresters, a major share of whose timber growing costs are the taxes needed for the support of local government.

To attempt to start a systematic procedure for the assessing of values under the ad valorem system the Industrial Forestry Association employed a nationally known timber valuation engineer and forester, the late Julian E. Rothery, to make a study in 1951. This was published in a concise copyrighted volume entitled "A Study of Forest Taxation in the Pacific Northwest."

Shortly thereafter the Washington State Tax Commission, drawing heavily upon the Rothery recommendations, prepared a timber and forest land assessment manual which for the first time in the Douglas-fir region attempted to base assessed valuations on a realistic differentiation between "retail" and "wholesale" timber prices. Oregon is still struggling with this problem. Only last month an interim legislative tax study committee was considering the matter.

The Douglas-fir region's advances in wood utilization have been phenomenal. From north to south the refuse burners at sawmills have been progressively disappearing or their fires drawn. As pulp mills have demanded more chips and hard and softboard plants developed, more and more of the leftovers from sawmill and plywood operations have been going into high-grade products. The region formerly used a lot of wood for domestic fuel, but since the present generation of housewives prefers pushbutton cooking and it has cheap hydroelectric power from its bountiful rivers, wood is in little demand as domestic fuel today. However, most substantial wood-using plants burn sawdust, bark, and other unsalable leftovers for steam to generate their own power.

But the area still needs to do a more complete job of using what its forests have or are capable of growing. It must get more use out of that still large quantity of material which it is forced to dispose of each day as a nuisance. Freight rates play a part in this as there is an economic radius beyond which chips cannot be shipped. Another reason for lack of as complete use as the region would like is insufficient kraft mill capacity and other fiber outlets for the tremendous pile of slabs, edgings, trim, clippings, cores, bark, sawdust and shavings which an industry processing 200,000 tons of wood a day develops.

Another utilization problem is how to sell the tremendous tonnage of low-grade products which are manufactured from defective wood from overmature trees. No. 4 Common lumber and sheathing-type plywood are being manufactured from these conky logs in increasing quantities. The difference in price between them and the next higher grade is such as to create a brisk demand for them.

The outstanding merchandising job which has been done on low-grade lumber since the end of World War II is without parallel in the history of the industry. It's that, coupled with the installation of more kraft capacity which furnished a market for chips, which has effectively extended the old-growth timber supplies. How important this is during creation of the series of timber age classes necessary for progressive and continuous yield.

The Douglas-fir region is not resting upon its laurels in utilization, though they be many, for as stated its goal is full crop utilization which it is convinced is the greatest incentive for full crop development the second time around.

Memorial Address by William H. McIntyre, St. Laurent Cemetery, June 6, 1954

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL B. DAGUE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 7, 1954

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, I have just learned that my good friend and fellow Legionnaire, Mr. William H. McIntyre, of Metropolitan Post, No. 385, of New York City, was designated by National Commander Arthur Connell to deliver the memorial address commemorating the 10th anniversary of the landing of American troops in Normandy in World War II. The exercises were held yesterday at the St. Laurent Cemetery, Omaha Beach, in France; and knowing somewhat of Mr. McIntyre's ability I am sure that he ably represented the American Legion at this important ceremony.

Incidentally, I might point out that Mr. McIntyre in his capacity as a member of the Graves Registration Committee of the Legion has met every train and ship upon which our overseas dead have been returned to the east coast via the city of New York, and his present assignment will take him to all the principal cemeteries in Belgium, Holland, France, and Italy. A condensation of his remarks delivered at St. Laurent follows:

MEMORIAL TALK COMMEMORATING 10TH ANNIVERSARY OF LANDING OF TROOPS IN NORMANDY, ST. LAURENT CEMETERY, FRANCE, JUNE 6, 1954

Once again we are observing a day of remembrance, and it brings us a sobering thought. For death, despite its awful finality, has not yet destroyed the ability of our people to remember and to love.

The spirit of those interred here still lives, and in a way that humbles the undertakings of most men. Had they not been willing to give up life itself, we would have a very different world today, and chances are, that we would not have an America at all.

It is but the simplest debt we pay when we take time to remember gratefully the services which our soldiers of the past have rendered. So the ceremonies of today have a very deep significance.

They did not die to be honored with tears, flags, and flowers, they died so that the future would be better than the past. The future is in our hands, America belongs always to the living generation. Our hero dead have done their part, but the task they have discharged so faithfully is not yet finished. Freedom is never safe. We are still in a world where liberty must be defended.

Those who made the supreme sacrifice, stand in the unbroken line of patriots who have dared to die that freedom might live.

The silent thousands who gave their lives, won a mighty victory. Our debt to these dead can be discharged by deeds, by building a secure and prosperous Nation in a world which never again will turn to war.

Not all of us have been privileged to wear the uniform of our country in the time of war. However, let us, the living, dedicate ourselves to the support of the truths for which so many died.

May God in His wisdom help us.

WILLIAM M. MCINTYRE,
Metropolitan Post, 385,
New York City, American Legion.

Appropriations for Vocational Rehabilitation Fact Sheet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 7, 1954

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, the current appropriation for vocational rehabilitation in the States is $23 million. Between 60,000 and 65,000 persons are being rehabilitated annually.

When the 1954 appropriation bill was in conference, restrictive language was added as follows:

> *Provided further,* That the amount apportioned to a State for fiscal year 1955 shall not exceed $1 for each $0.75 contributed by the State for the same purpose.

The item was not in either House or Senate bill. It was not mentioned in the conference report. It was not explained at time of passage.

The administration has made clear its displeasure with the restrictive language. Legislation proposed by the President would repeal it and expand rehabilitation services. He has stated that he will ask Congress for a total of $28 million for vocational rehabilitation in 1955 if the legislation is passed. In putting $19,175,000 in the regular budget for vocational rehabilitation, he made it clear that this was the maximum amount that could be spent under the restriction and that this was the reason so small a sum was listed.

The House Committee has reported $21 million for vocational rehabilitation in the States for 1955. This is $2 million less than the 1954 appropriation. The restrictive language referred to in paragraph 2 is not repeated in the 1955 bill but is effective for 1955 in the absence of specific repeal.

Since legislatures in 35 States have not met this year, they have had no opportunity to replace lost Federal funds with State funds. It is estimated that the $2 million cut would result in 7,000 fewer rehabilitations in 1955. Ironically, if the restrictive language is not repealed in the appropriation act, or elsewhere, not even this amount of Federal funds could be used. $19 million would probably be the maximum.

Amendments will be offered on the floor: First, to increase the amount to be appropriated to $23 million, the amount available for 1954; and, second, to repeal the restrictive language.

Whether or not the House is allowed to vote on the amendment to repeal the restrictive language, it is extremely important that $23 million be appropriated by the House. Then, if the repeal is initiated by the Senate in the appropriation bill or is accomplished by the passage of new legislation to be reported by both House and Senate committee this week, the appropriation will be available to maintain the program at the 1954 level.

Will you please participate actively in efforts to prevent the proposed reduction in rehabilitation services to the handicapped? Ask for time when the amendments are considered by the House. Call upon the National Rehabilitation Association, or the rehabilitation people in your own State for additional information.

Unity for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MORGAN M. MOULDER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 7, 1954

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and article which I received from Alfred Held, Route 2, Pilot Grove, Mo., a veteran of the Korean war:

PILOT GROVE, *January 18, 1954.*

DEAR MR. MOULDER: I have been back from Korea only a short while. I think something constructive should be done to keep peace. The amount of money spent for wars, even small ones like Korea, is so great that if it were spent for the betterment of mankind instead of destruction, the standard of living all over the world could be raised.

I have written sort of an article to give you an idea of what I think should be done. I know you are busy, but I hope you will take time to read it. Maybe if you agree with it, you could have it published in some magazine.

You don't need to answer this as I know you haven't that much time. I feel that we should let our Representatives know once in a while what we want done so I'm sending my two bits worth.

Sincerely,

ALFRED HELD.

UNITY FOR PEACE

In the beginning of time there was no government. Then primitive man found he had to make certain rules or regulations in order to maintain peace within his family. Later, small groups, in order to protect themselves, formed into tribes, with the strongest and wisest being the leaders.

Down through the ages, as the need arose, these simple forms of government grew. Government today is almost beyond comparison with that of primitive man. Yet, it is the same, in that the laws regulations are man-made, and being man-made are fallible. Even though these laws are imperfect, they are the best way known today to maintain peace among men. As the Atomic Age draws the countries of the world closer together, the need for one strong world organization of free nations becomes more and more evident.

Two attempts at world government organizations have been made so far. The League of Nations was doomed to failure almost as quickly as it was formed. The United Nations government will fail because it has not got power to enforce its laws, and because it has different forms of government in conflict with each other, such as, communism and the United States. The failure of these governments can be understood if compared with the failure of our first Federal Government, the Articles of Confederation. A government, in order to be successful, has to have a source of revenue, and a system of currency among those governed. It has to have power, or an army, to enforce its laws. And last, it has to have restrictions to keep it from becoming too powerful.

A representative type of government, in which the wisest and best men are chosen to represent the State or country from which they come, has proven to be the best. Our Federal and State governments are proof of this. Communism, dictatorships, etc., are not on a comparative basis with a free peoples', representatives type of government. Because this type is best, it is time the countries of the world, that have this type of government, united as our Sates did in 1787—"in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity."

OZARK AL.

Social Security

SPEECH

OF

HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1954

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 9366) to amend the Social Security Act and the Internal Revenue Code so as to extend coverage under the old-age and survivors insurance program, increase the benefits payable thereunder, preserve the insurance rights of disabled individuals, and increase the amount of earnings permitted without loss of benefits, and for other purposes.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, social security has become a fixed policy of the Government, and is closely woven into the economic welfare of millions of our citizens. Having become a great industrial nation, with over 60 million people employed, we find that a number of people cannot save enough during the earning period of their lives to provide the necessities of life, when their ability to do a day's work has passed, because of their age.

The purpose of social security is to provide, through small payments by the workers and a like small payment by their employers, a social security insurance fund which over a span of years will provide a small retirement fund for such workers, and certain of their dependents, which will help to partially provide the necessities of life when their earning period is over.

This bill, H. R. 9366, before us, will increase the benefits for those who are eligible. After many months of careful study by the Ways and Means Committee, reviewing the whole social security structure, the committee feels that their recommendations contained in this bill are justifiable and within the limits of the social security fund to sustain. For this reason, I heartily approve of this section of the bill.

The committee has also seen fit to eliminate those in the medical profession in the bill. This, in my judgment, is a wise move.

I am concerned and doubt the wisdom of the inclusion of self-employed farmers under social security. I think it would be a wiser decision to have given the farmers an opportunity to come under the social-security provisions of this bill by their own volition, making their own decision, as to whether or not they desire to do so, rather than under the present provisions of the bill.

Inasmuch as we cannot amend the legislation before us, and inasmuch as the Senate, under its rules, can amend the legislation, I am supporting the bill before us with the hope that the Senate will give serious consideration to amending the bill when it reaches that body, making it optional to self-employed farmers whether or not they desire to come under the provisions of this legislation.

I am also hopeful that the same consideration will be given to certain other professional groups, including such groups as lawyers, dentists, and so forth. I feel that such groups should be allowed to make their own decision as to whether or not they want to avail themselves of the social-security provisions of this bill. I hope, and believe, the Senate will give more thorough consideration to these groups referred to along the line I have suggested, as I believe such changes would substantially improve the legislation.

Harold G. Hoffman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 7, 1954

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, we have learned of the recent sudden death of Mr. Harold G. Hoffman, a former Member of the House of Representatives from the State of New Jersey. Mr. Hoffman, following his service of 4 years in the House of Representatives, went on to become an outstanding Governor of the State of New Jersey. During his lifetime, Harold Hoffman became one of the most colorful and well-known figures in New Jersey's political history. Our State, and the Nation, mourns his untimely passing.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Harold G. Hoffman," which appeared in the Perth Amboy Evening News of June 5, 1954:

HAROLD G. HOFFMAN

The whole of the Raritan Bay area, where he began and carried on his colorful career in public life, is deeply grieved over the death of Harold G. Hoffman, former governor, and one of the most popular figures in the history of New Jersey. Death came yesterday from a heart attack.

In his 58 years, Harold Hoffman achieved a record of public service that perhaps no other man in the State can match in a comparable number of years. In politics, he was a successful candidate in 15 our of 16 campaigns, and held appointive public offices for more than 20 years.

With characteristic courage and vigor, he fought for sound principles to better government, responding to his own judgment and conscience, rather than to political dictates or public clamor. He was always clearly frank in his opinions, to a fault at times, but he was never evasive, even though he found himself often on the unpopular side of an issue.

The great love and respect with which Harold Hoffman was held is shown in the many tributes being paid him today by people in all walks of life, including his political foes.

In his busy life he always found time to maintain his fraternal and social contacts. One of the outstanding public speakers of our time, he probably made more platform appearances and speeches at social functions than any man in public life in America in a like span of years. He had been characteristically loyal to his friends and they were loyal to him. And as most people will agree, Harold Hoffman had as many friends in the Democratic Party as he had in his own Republican ranks.

Harold Hoffman was educated in the South Amboy public schools and when only 12 years of age became a newspaper correspondent. Upon being graduated from high school, he served as sports editor of the Perth Amboy Evening News, then worked at the duPont laboratory in Parlin, and 2 days after the declaration of war in 1917 he enlisted as a private with Company H, Third New Jersey Infantry.

He went overseas with the AEF and was successively made a sergeant, second lieutenant, first lieutenant and captain. His last promotion came to him on the battlefield when he commanded headquarters company of the 114th Infantry in the Meuse-Argonne sector. In the regimental citation, his commander said of him: "Captain Hoffman served under my command in the stubborn engagements north of Verdun during the closing days of the war. His efficiency and his courage, on the march and in battle, was an inspiration to his men."

Upon his return from military service, Harold Hoffman became treasurer of the South Amboy Trust Co. and in the same year was elected as South Amboy's city treasurer. In 1923 and 1924 he was elected to the State legislature; in the following year he was elected mayor of his home city, and during the same year served as secretary to the president of the State senate.

In 1926 and again in 1928 he was elected to the House of Representatives, serving in Congress 4 years before his recall to New Jersey to become commissioner of motor vehicles. In 1934, in a spectacular campaign, he defeated three opponents for the Republican nomination for governor and in November was elected as the State's chief executive. For the past 15 years he had served as director of the State employment security division.

Harold Hoffman's life, while a busy one, with its ups and downs, and with the many controveries into which he was thrown, was a full one. Smiling, fighting for those things which he considered to be right and fair, giving generously of his time and worldly goods to help his friends, Harold Hoffman and his career in public life have made a deep impress on our State's history.

Progress Made by Rural Electrification Administration Under the Eisenhower Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HUGH BUTLER

OF NEBRASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 7, 1954

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement concerning the progress made by the rural electrification under the present administration.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Republicans have always been and are today strong supporters of rural electrification.

Looking at the record itself, during the present Republican administration, the Rural Electrification Administration made 349 loans totaling $181,118,100. This was in the 12-month period from May 1953, when a Republican, Ancher Nelsen, was appointed by President Eisenhower to head the REA, to April 1954.

Contrast this with the preceding year under the Truman administration. From May 1952 to April 1953 the REA made 315 loans which totaled $157,612,091. The first year of Republican REA administration saw an increase in the number of loans by 34 over the peak year of Democratic administration loans, and these 34 loans amounted to about $25 million.

What is of particular interest to Nebraskans is the record of REA loans to this State. In the past year, Nebraska received the largest amount of money from REA for electric development of any State in the Union. This amounted to $16,918,000 in 14 loans to rural-electrification cooperatives. This was more than 8 percent of all money loaned during the first full year of Ancher Nelsen's administration. Wisconsin was second, with about $2 million less in loans than Nebraska received from May 1953 through April 1954. REA regulations forbid any single State from receiving more than 10 percent of the total amount available for loans. It can be seen that Nebraska came very close to this limit, and no other State topped it.

Belying recent Democratic charges, Administrator Nelsen has recommended, and President Eisenhower has approved, retention of the 2 percent interest rate on loans. In October 1953, Mr. Nelsen gave these reasons for not increasing the rate: "Approximately 91 percent of the Nation's farms are electrified. The remaining 9 percent, for the most part, are unusually difficult to reach from the standpoint of loan feasibility. Any increase in the interest rate would make the task even more difficult."

The REA Administrator added:

"Over the 18-year life of the program the interest collected from REA borrowers has been sufficient to cover the interest paid by the Treasury on long-term borrowings, and there has thus been no loss to the Government."

This position was endorsed by President Eisenhower in February when he announced the Republican administration was going to recommend that no change be made in the REA interest rate.

The Republican 80th Congress (1947–48) had a record of accomplishment in the field of rural electrification surpassed by no Democratic Congress before or since. That Congress provided $800 million for rural electrification loans to extend electricity to nearly a million farm homes. This sum was nearly twice as much as any previous Congress provided, and only $275 million less than the total amount provided for REA in the whole period prior to the 80th Congress.

During the 80th Congress President Truman's budget requests for rural electrification amounted to $725 million. The 80th Congress increased this sum to $800 million.

In the light of this record, recent Democratic charges of Republican opposition and obstruction to the rural electrification program cannot be considered other than deliberately false and misleading.

The fact is that the Republicans have vigorously supported funds for REA. On the other hand Republicans have opposed unnecessary expenditure of taxpayers' money to construct transmission lines where adequate facilities were available.

Commenting on the loan totals, Administrator Nelsen declared in a press statement May 6: "I have never thought the success of a Federal program should be measured in terms of how much money is dispensed. But I do think our record to date shows that we are meeting the loan needs in the electric and telephone programs. We are constantly simplifying our loan procedures in both programs so that we can give loan applicants faster service and operate the agency at less cost."

In a February 1954 speech at Jefferson City, Mo., Mr. Nelsen said, "Let's put these charges [against us] in proper perspective and look at them for a moment. * * * We intend to meet every valid loan need where soundness and feasibility can be established. Also, we are going to keep at the task of expediting the processing of loan applications."

Mr. Nelsen further emphasized this point in an address at Miami, Fla., on January 12, 1954, when he said, "There is not, as has been alleged in some quarters, any understanding, secret or otherwise, to limit the program or slow down the rate of lending. We intend to meet every valid loan need. Also, we are going to keep at the task of expediting the processing of loan applications. * * * We in REA accept the decision of Congress as establishing the blueprint for our lending program. The only limiting factors are the merit of the individual applications and the complexities of the problems presented by them."

On September 18, 1952, during the Presidential election campaign, General Eisenhower emphasized his support of REA in a speech at Omaha, Nebr. He said:

"The Republican Party favors a sound program of rural-electrification and rural-telephone service. The Republican 80th Congress made available for REA loans $800 million—the largest amount ever made available by any Congress. We regard REA as an investment in agriculture's future."

PLATFORM

Eisenhower's support of the REA program underscores the 1952 Republican platform, which states:

"We support the principle of bona fide farmer-owned, farmer-operated cooperatives and urge the further development of rural electrification and communication, with federally assisted production of power and facilities for distribution when these are not adequately available through private enterprise at fair rates."

A United States Military Operation in Indochina Would Be Foolhardy—Communist Aggression Is More Political Than Military

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1954

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend me remarks, I am including a recent editorial from the Wall Street Journal. It refers to an observation made by Secretary of Defense Wilson, after a recent trip abroad to the effect that the problem of halting Communist aggression in Asia is more political than military.

Mr. Speaker, it is high time that more policymakers in our Government awake to that fact. There is too much stress upon the military and too much reliance on British policies. The editorial follows:

NEW LOOK AT INDOCHINA

Secretary of Defense Wilson, returning from his extensive tour of the Far East, has now observed that the problem of halting Communist aggression in Asia is more political than military.

One of the parts of this problem, he said, is a lack of recognition among Asian peoples that Communist aggression is involved in the Indochina crisis.

It strikes us that if Secretary Wilson can just explain this to some of our more aggressive interventionists, many of whom seem to be within his own Department, the discussion of what to do about Indochina can proceed with a lot more clarity.

Most of that discussion thus far has treated Indochina as if it were strictly a military problem to be solved by studying the terrain, adding up Viet Minh divisions against allied divisions, or by calculating the relative power of airplanes against jungle ground troops. This would give us the answer as to whether we should or should not go to war in Indochina.

The basic assumption in all of this is that Indochina is very much like Korea. That is, we could settle it if we would just put in enough arms and men. The debate has not been so much about whether we could solve the problem of Indochina as about whether it was worth the military effort.

But the West's difficulties in Indochina, as in all Asia, do not stem from military weakness as such. Even the French strength, taxed as it is, would have been able to hold the rebel Viet Minh at bay if the people of Vietnam had been resolute against the rebels. The difficulty has been that a large number of the Vietnamese have been persuaded that the Communists are their deliverers from colonialism. To the Vietnamese this war has appeared more as an uprising than as an invasion.

True, this is an illusion. Nevertheless, it is the way it has appeared. Unlike Korea, there has been no demand from the inhabitants that we come in to save them, and there is a very grave question whether, if we do intervene, we will appear as saviors of Vietnam or saviors of a foreign overlordship.

This being so, we face something much worse than military battles if we intervene in Indochina. It is quite likely that if the United States Army intervened in strength it could soundly trounce the Vietminh battle forces; militarily, they are not so formidable as Tojo and Hitler. It does not at all follow that we could trounce the Vietminh as a political force.

Suppose we won the battles and beat the Vietminh Army and even beat back any Chinese Armies. What would we have won with our tremendous victory? The support of the Vietnamese? The trust of southeast Asia? Could we then come home?

The questions answer themselves. The best the most ardent interventionist can say is that we would have demonstrated our toughness and deprived the Communist Empire of more terrain. No one can argue that we would have solved anything. And no one can really count the cost of it.

When Secretary Wilson says that Indochina is more a political than a military problem he is not giving a cheerful report, for neither he nor anyone else now has the solution to political problem. But it is well that he has, after personal inspection, challenged the assumption that Indochina is something we can settle with an army.

Any military operation entails risks. But to launch a military operation that cannot win, even if it is successful, is just plain foolhardy.

Dr. C. E. Carlton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MORGAN M. MOULDER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 7, 1954

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article appearing in the Reveille and Central Missouri Leader, Camdenton, Mo.:

DR. C. E. CARLTON STARTS 54TH YEAR OF PRACTICE—STOUTLAND PHYSICIAN COMPLETES 53 YEARS OF COUNTY PRACTICE

Dr. C. E. Carlton has finished his 53 years of practicing medicine in the town of Stoutland, Mo., and surrounding communities both in Laclede County and Camden County, and sometimes Pulaski County. On April 20, 1901, he came from medical college and settled here and has been all these 53 years a good doctor, a civic leader, and a Christian gentleman. Many, many years he has been a deacon and a trustee of the Baptist Church here.

Dr. Carlton had that indefinable something all great men have in common, an unassuming manner, dignity, genuineness, kindliness, honesty, and intelligence. He was and is always ready to give advice and help to all who need help. In his busy life serving others, he always depended on supernatural power. Like Jesus, his great passion was to help in the healing of both body and soul. Many times he found patients where the need of the soul was even greater than the need of the body. He feels that true religion and medicine should go hand in hand as mutual forces.

High-Tariff Crowd Set for Congressional Blitz

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TIMOTHY P. SHEEHAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 7, 1954

Mr. SHEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as our trade and tariff problem is one of the more important pieces of legislation yet to be acted upon by this session of Congress, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues some thoughts on the subject as set forth by the Midwest's well-known financial editor of the Chicago Sun-Times Robert P. Vanderpoel, in his column of June 2, 1954.

The article is as follows:

HIGH-TARIFF CROWD SET FOR CONGRESSIONAL BLITZ

(By Robert P. Vanderpoel)

A wise man once said: "The honor of a country depends more upon removing its faults than of boasting of its qualities."

I recalled that quotation today as I noted two bills that have been introduced in Congress dealing with tariffs and trade.

There is much to boast of in the United State but boasting neither makes friends nor develops character. I suspect we have been guilty of too much boasting and not enough soul-searching, because the truth is that we have many faults too and we have not done nearly enough toward removing them.

One of our great faults has been our trade policies. These have been based too much on ignorance, selfishness, and just plain insanity. We have pushed exports. We have restrained imports. As a result, we have created such a lack of balance in the economies of nations as to do very serious harm to ourselves and other countries.

Gradually, much too slowly, we have become aware of this fault. We have tried to take steps to remove it. But always selfish, greedy pressure groups, playing upon ignorance, have worked efficiently in the other direction.

Economists, with a unanimity not found in all their views, have pointed the way. They have had support from forward-thinking businessmen, labor leaders, farm leaders, and statesmen. President Eisenhower, recognizing the problem, appointed the Randall Commission to study it and make a report to him and the Nation. The Commission's report was conservative but clear and decisive as to the direction in which we should move, a direction of freer trade, of facilitating greater imports into this country, bringing wealth to our shores, reducing the need of grants and loans.

CONGRESS HAS DONE NOTHING

Yet, what do we find? The record is clear. Congress, dominated by protectionist lobbies and a few reactionary politicians steeped in the traditions of an age that is gone, has done nothing about the President's recommendations. Defeated, Mr. Eisenhower indicated a willingness to delay forward action until the next Congress and accept merely a 1-year renewal of the Reciprocal Trade Act.

But even this is not enough. Under the sponsorship of the American Tariff League, representing industries desiring to mulct the American people under the protection of high tariff laws, two of the most reactionary trade bills in more than a generation have been introduced in Congress.

According to a statement by Charles P. Taft, brother of the late Senator Taft, and president of the Committee for a National Trade Policy, these bills would double the tariff 1 year hence on 41 percent in dollar value of all imports that pay a duty now. They would result in substantially increased tariffs on another 30 percent of the imports that now pay some duty. Further, Taft is convinced that if these bills are passed, nations throughout the world would abrogate their bilateral trade agreements with the United States and that we would start the procession back to the Smoot-Hawley rates of 1930, 300 percent higher than the present average tariffs.

AN ASSAULT UPON TRADE

In Taft's words, "This can only be described as a well-planned assault upon the foreign trade of the United States, skillfully concealed in words that actually increase tariffs and quotas without even saying so."

This, he said, would be the first effect of the bills, "but the second objective of their sponsors and supporters is just as destructive." They would take away from the President of the United States and "remove entirely from the consideration of anybody the demands of the national interest" and place in the hands of the high-tariff group, the high-price-to-American consumers group, the power over the Nation's trade policies.

"This," declares Taft, "is indeed a protectionist's dream, with most elements of the free-enterprise system out the window."

I would say that it isn't a dream at all. It is a nightmare, a terrible vision of reaction of selfish greed, of ignorance, a betrayal of national interest. Certainly, these bills would make the search for peace just that much more difficult.

PEACE DEPENDS ON HEALTHY TRADE

"I am convinced that world peace depends, to a great extent, upon whether or not we succeed in establishing a healthy world trade among all nations." (Charles B. Shuman, president, Illinois Agricultural Association.)

"If our country were to grow coffee in hothouses instead of importing it, everybody would qualify this as lunacy. But it differs only in degree, not in principle, from other protectionist schemes." (Philip Cortney, president, Coty, Inc.)

Case No. 10

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 12, 1954

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, here is a case in which a physicist has been denied a visa to visit the United States under the provisions of the McCarran-Walter Act. I quote in full a letter, as printed in the New York Times, written by three professors of physics of Princeton University:

QUESTIONING DIRAC BAN—DENIAL OF VISA TO PHYSICIST SEEN AS LOSS TO AMERICAN SCIENCE

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

The New York Times of May 26 contained a report that P. A. M. Dirac, professor at Cambridge University, England, had been refused a visa under State Department regulation 212A. The undersigned individuals, American physicists, believe this action is exceedingly unfortunate for science and for our country.

Professor Dirac is among the most original living physicists. His decisive contributions to the development of the quantum theory were properly recognized by the award of a Nobel prize for physics in 1933. We have in the past benefited greatly from Dirac's periodic visits to Princeton. A number of us remember his stays at the Institute for Advanced Study in the years 1934–35, 1946–47, 1947–48, and 1949.

In 1930–31 and 1946–47 Princeton University was especially fortunate to have Professor Dirac as visiting lecturer of theoretical physics. His presence in the past has always been a source of inspiration to us in our own scientific work. His exclusion from this country would represent a distinct loss to American science.

We do not pretend to be experts in the law which governs the issuance of visas. However, if this is what the McCarran Act means in practice, it seems to us a form of organized cultural suicide. We are very strongly aware of the advantages to this country of Professor Dirac's proposed visit. We are aware of no disadvantage. We also know that his case is only a particularly obvious example of a general policy which operates to this country's detriment.

It appears to us that, as it operates at present, our national policy with respect to visas for temporary visitors is basically unsound.

WALKER BLEAKNEY,
JOHN ARCHIBALD WHEELER,
MILTON G. WHITE,
Professors of Physics,
Princeton University.

PRINCETON, N. J., *May 29, 1954.*

The American Legion, Aldenville Post, No. 337, Dedication of New Home June 6, 1954

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 29, 1954

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, yesterday marked a milestone in the history of Aldenville Post, No. 337. It was D-day—dedication day—for this comparatively young American Legion organization. Although this post is only 8 years old, it has realized an ambition that few other such organizations have in so short a time. The building of Post 337's new home was sparked by a spirit among its members that defied obstacles. This same spirit succeeded in constructing a building that is a real credit to this great organization. I am proud to have been invited to participate in the dedicatory exercises and I congratulate the committee for the very fine program it arranged both for the afternoon and evening sessions.

Mr. Speaker, I think it significant that this dedication was held on the anniversary of another D-day. Ten years ago, June 6, 1944, in the early dawn the Allied forces struck the continent of Europe with the greatest invasion force in history. It constituted one of the mightiest military maneuvers of all time and it succeeded because of the spirit and determination of the leaders and men who joined in this triumph. On the beachheads of Omaha and Utah on the shores of Normandy, 10 years ago, stories of unbelievable heroism and sacrifice were written by the men who swam, crashed, waded, and parachuted to a successful invasion of a hitherto impregnable enemy position.

Mr. Speaker, many of the members of the Aldenville Post took part in this historic event. And on their day of dedication, in keeping with the preamble of the constitution of the American Legion, the memories and incidents of association in World War II were preserved and recalled as the post opened its new home. In constructing this building, Post 337 continues to adhere to the Legion motto, "For God and Country." For these new facilities offer greater opportunities to this organization to continue its great work not only in providing for its own members but in helping to build a better community.

Under unanimous consent, I include with my remarks a brief history of Aldenville Post, No. 337, and its auxiliary:

ALDENVILLE POST, NO. 337, INC., AMERICAN LEGION: A BRIEF POST HISTORY

Soon after the surrender of the Japanese ending World War II, a group of veterans from Aldenville met and discussed the need of an American Legion post in Aldenville.

On November 18, 1945, the first organization meeting was held at the Aldenville Quoit Club with Philippe Brault acting as chairman.

The post received its temporary charter on December 22, 1945 and then settled down to the business of electing its first slate of officers. The date was set for January 6, 1946 and thus Aldenville Post 337 had its first commander and full staff of officers. The first big problem to confront the new post was the recruiting of members. At this time many of the young men were returning from their tours of duty in various parts of the world and were being urged to join the ranks of their buddies and dads in the newly formed American Legion post. March 2, 1946 saw Aldenville Post 337 hold its first installation of officers, at which time Henry J. Boisvere, a veteran of World War I and a long time Legionnaire, took over the leadership of the post.

The members of the post immediately recognized the need of quarters of its own and with this in mind filed application for its incorporation papers and received these on May 27, 1946.

The post was granted its permanent charter on August 27, 1946, and then began the big push in acquiring its own quarters. After considering a few prospective locations, the banner day finally arrived. On October 3, 1946, we were very fortunate in acquiring the old isolation hospital on Worthington Street. This building was built sometime in 1915 and had been used for the treatment of those suffering from tuberculosis and other communicable diseases. At that time it was known for its spacious lawns, flower beds, and general beauty. In later years it was used as a residence, by the WPA for its projects, a headquarters for Westover field engineers, and in World War II as a ground observer post under civil defense. From this point the building was abandoned and practically in ruins when deeded to the post. Immediately after taking possession of the building, plans were made to demolish the south wing and start a complete remodeling program. This was done only after many months of hard work and the donation of many hours of labor by many of the members. On August 29, 1947, our quarters were finally ready to be occupied. Success was not an easy goal to attain but we finally struggled through and on February 17, 1952, we held a mortgage burning ceremony and once again we were clear and set to forge ahead.

In August 1952, we suffered two staggering blows. Our post quarters was struck by 2 fires that almost destroyed the entire efforts of 6 years. This prompted the action that is climaxed by this day. In a fine sense of cooperation the members joined together and immediately started plans for rebuilding and expansion. Within a few weeks we had the salvageable portion of our building renovated. In September 1953 the post launched a building program that had been contemplated for many years. The first phase being the erection of a suitable pavilion and general development of our grove. The post was now ready to undertake the major and most important part of its development and expansion program. On October 31, 1953, a ground breaking ceremony was held which signified the beginning of construction on the new addition of our quarters. Today, June 6, 1954, we are proud to welcome all our friends to join us in the dedication of our new structure.

Since our organization we have been active in many civic and Legion programs. We have always sponsored boys to Boys' State and also participated in the Chicopee Pee Wee League. Each year a parade and Halloween Party is held for the children of our community and at Christmas time we also hold a party and sponsor a visit from Santa for our children. Participation in Momorial Day services in our city is always one of our major annual programs and we have assisted in the dedication of honor rolls and memorials to our service men. Each year a prize is awarded to the boy and girl graduating from St. Joan of Arc School with the highest average in United States history and we have also donated classroom flags to this same school. Among our many other programs are participation in Chicopee's Cribbage League, the organization of a drum corps, cooperation and support of Aldenville's Scouting Family, active parts in our department and national conventions and also taking active part in the affairs of the American Legion county council in our district. We have published a post newspaper and held many social activities for the entertainment of our members and friends in the community.

Thus is a brief resume of our activities since our beginning some 8 short years ago. We sincerely hope that the future may multiply these tenfold and we may continue serving for God and country for many years to come.

Brief History of American Legion Auxiliary, Unit 337

A group of Aldenville women who were interested in the formation of an auxiliary unit to American Legion Post 337 took the necessary steps in 1947, and their dreams were realized when the organizational meeting took place on Monday evening, September 29, 1947. Under the guidance of Mrs. Jennie Miller, who was then the director of Hampden County Council, American Legion Auxiliary, the unit was organized, and members soon after nominated and elected their first slate of officers.

The first officers of Unit 337, serving for the year 1947–48, were as follows: President, Mrs. Alma Covington; senior vice president, Mrs. J. Irene Boisvere; junior vice president, Mrs. Phyllis Laramee; secretary, Miss Naomi Chartier; treasurer, Mrs. Margaret Hildreth; chaplain, Mrs. Aldina Breault; historian, Mrs. Rhea Roberts, now deceased, who put in countless hours in various activities of the auxiliary; sergeant at arms, Mrs. Rita Paquette; executive committee, Mrs. Lillian Garrow, Mrs. Claire Fleury, and Mrs. Mildred Desmarais.

The meetings held on the first and third Mondays of the month have always proved very interesting, and with the cooperation of the members, the task of officers has been lessened, bringing about a well-rounded program of activities.

A membership campaign was begun at the outset of the first meeting, and when the charter was closed on January 2, 1948, the unit boasted a total of 101 senior and 14 junior members.

Mrs. Covington, who headed the local Auxiliary in 1947–48 and 1948–49, was succeeded by the following presidents: Mrs. J. Irene Boisvere, who served in 1949–50; Miss Naomi Chartier, who headed the group for two terms, in 1950–51 and 1951–52; Mrs. Florida B. Swann, the leader of 1952–53; and Mrs. Theresa Rivet, the current head of the auxiliary.

Each year, as the unit has expanded and gained experience, more and more time was given to the various activities related to the ideals of the American Legion Auxiliary. Long interested in the varied programs of child welfare, rehabilitation, community service, etc., unit members offered assistance wherever it was needed.

Among the main projects conducted year after year by the unit are the donation of a Thanksgiving basket to some needy family of this community, and the collection of toys and clothing for the less fortunate at Christmastime. The veterans are not forgotten, for a dance is sponsored annually at Leeds Hospital, where unit members help serve refreshments and act as hostesses.

To further the rehabilitation work for the welfare of the disabled World War veterans, the unit has always met its quota of gifts for the Christmas gift shop, for which it has received many citations. Countless hours have been given by a group of members who served as orchid ladies at Leeds Hospital, for which they were commended.

The sponsoring of poppy-poster contests, between the students of St. Joan of Arc and Aldenville schools, in the months of April and May, have proved of prime interest in the community, and attractive prizes are awarded the young winners. The contest is climaxed with the sale of poppies throughout the community, and proceeds are used to further the child-welfare and rehabilitation work of the unit.

Other projects of the unit have been to assist its post at the annual Halloween rag-shag parades as well as Christmas parties for all children of Legion and auxiliary members, and children of this community. Appreciating the post for their help, members sponsor an annual birthday party in celebration of the birthday of the American Legion in March.

In order to perpetuate the memory of the local auxiliary, the unit has recently donated a sum of money to purchase a pew for the new St. Rose de Lima Church. A donation toward the purchase of gifts for the St. Joan of Arc school graduates has been made annually.

A special chair was donated recently for children confined to Monson State Hospital, for the use of those afflicted with cerebral palsy.

In the 7 years since its formation, the unit has progressed rapidly, and as it grows older the program will be expanded. This year of 1954 has been a banner one in membership and the unit now boasts 154 members, exceeding the quota by 35 members.

Keeping up the good work of the unit is the goal of all officers and members, who have in mind the many citations received year after year for membership, child welfare, and rehabilitation.

Stop, Look, Listen: The Communist Conspiracy Is at Work in the United States of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 26, 1954

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, Freedom Club News for May 1954 has just reached my desk. It contains a transcript of a radio broadcast by Mr. George Sokolsky over the ABC network on March 14. It is so timely and important that I am inserting it at this point in the Record. Mr. Sokolsky, in his remarkable broadcast, is speaking the sentiments of millions of loyal, patriotic Americans:

The Caracas Conference, at which America won a victory, is unnoted. The tax bill is forgotten in the shuffle. What is happening in China? What is happening in Indochina? In Turkey? In Greece? All we hear is: Liar. Blackmail. Deceit. Falsehood.

Big headlines over nothing fill the newspapers. Radio commentators fill the air with vigorous, almost sweaty, reading of the exciting items about Joe McCarthy, Roy Cohn, Secretary Stevens, John Adams. David Schine is called out of line to a press conference as though he were a movie star, rather than a soldier undergoing basic training.

The fifth-amendment Communist dentist, Major Peress, must be having a wonderful laugh. He has split the Republican Party right down the middle; he has started a clamor and a yakity-yak all over the country which prevents the Congress from doing its proper work; he has taken the mind and thought of our people off the recession and danger of depression, and got every household arguing as to who is telling the truth—McCarthy, Cohn, Stevens, or Adams. And how important is it all?

I have read, as you have, the releases of both sides. I know there was horsetrading between the McCarthy committee and the Department of the Army. Why this Major Peress case should be so important to the Army, I do not know. After all, Secretary Stevens is a fine, upright American of breeding and education. And McCarthy is sincere in his fight on those whom Vice President Nixon has called rats.

Why should this case of an open Communist who was a dentist in the Army be so important? Why should it get all parties into such a jam, and disturb the entire Nation?

We must take it that Peress is not the real issue, that, without knowing it, McCarthy has somehow hit a raw nerve somewhere, and that pressures have been brought upon Stevens either to soften him by holding out considerations for the hostage, David Schine, or by smearing Roy Cohn, who is a brilliant investigator and lawyer, so that McCarthy's committee will lose his services and be slowed up.

Actually, the Fort Monmouth investigation was slowed up by yanking David Shine into the Army, thus neutralizing his investigation of this area of infiltration. Schine had done the original work on this, and could not complete the job, or even his memoranda, before he was sent to Fort Dix.

I should like to review what happens to men who fight Communists:

MARTIN DIES took a moribund committee of Congress and made it an active investigation committee—the House Committee on Un-American Activities. He was hounded until he actually gave up public life. He is now back in Congress.

Robert Stripling was the chief investigator for the House Committee on Un-American Activities. Though suitable officer material, he was inducted into the Army and kept there as a "yardbird" picking up cigarette butts and doing similar work. No advantage was taken of his special abilities.

J. Parnell Thomas, another chairman of this committee, was indicted and sent to jail on an issue which, if investigated, would have been found not to be unusual in Congress. His career was wrecked.

Dr. J. B. Matthews, the most effective battler against communism in the United States, was knocked down over an article which he wrote for a monthly magazine. The American Mercury, prior to his joining the McCarthy committee. He has never been given an opportunity to defend himself.

David Schine, investigator for the McCarthy committee, graduate of Harvard, president of a large hotel company, brilliant investigator, was grabbed suddenly, put into the Army, made an object of ridicule, and notoriety, with perhaps his career ruined.

Now they are after Roy Cohn, one of the best investigators in the country. As assistant United States attorney in New York, he worked on most of the big cases which sent Communists to prison, including the Rosenberg case. His record of achievement is astonishing for one only 27 years of age. So they are now trying to destroy him.

When Senator McCARRAN was investigating Communists, an effort was made to smash his reputation; but that strong personality somehow managed to survive.

Attorney General Herbert Brownell, devoted to anticommunism, entered the lists and was silenced. Scott McLeod was cleansing the State Department of Communists, but has been divested of control over personnel, which is the heart of the job.

I could go on and on, listing men who have been destroyed because they dared to serve their country against a competent, unscrupulous, all-pervading enemy.

I should like to ask this question: Do you believe the Communists could be so powerful if they were not protected by a force inside our Government, that has been inside our Government through three administrations—the Roosevelt, Truman, and Eisenhower administrations?

Look at what is happening to Senator McCARTHY.

He is trying to discover who it is in our Government that possesses so much power to protect the Communists. Little by little, he gathers a fact here and there. It is slow, unpleasant, even unpalatable work. He is abused to his face by fifth-amendment Communists. If he answers back in kind, he is accused of being unfair. If an insulting, shrieking Communist exasperates him—as they exasperated Judge Harold Medina or Judge Irving Kaufman—and he loses his temper, he is accused of kicking witnesses in the shins. Pressure is brought on his colleagues to quarrel with him as to methods; but nothing said about the methods of the Communists.

Maybe in the end JOE McCARTHY will be silenced, as MARTIN DIES was silenced, as the great educator, William A. Wirt was silenced, humiliated, and driven to his death by the Communists and their allies.

This is a time for us to pause. The state of the world, the perils of our country, our own lives are at stake. The men involved in the present fracas are unimportant. Most of them will sooner or later disappear from our memories. But the struggle between Marxism and the Judaic-Christian civilization will continue—must continue—if we are not to be conquered by default. This is the issue, not whether McCARTHY or Stevens is right, or even whether the Republican Party or the Democratic Party is in office. I suppose most of us prefer the sensational to the fundamental. It makes life so much easier.

Yet that is how we lose sight of the main target. And that is what the Communists want us to do. They want us to forget about them, to quarrel among ourselves, to hate each other, to bargain and trick and horsetrade over careers until the country is in a turmoil. It is under such circumstances that they have always triumphed.

Country after country has fallen to the Communists without a shot being fired. And it is always that they create so much confusion that one does not know what to think. Thus men concentrate on the wrong issues; they fight over nothing; society becomes disordered; the will to resist is weakened. The beasts come in and take over.

Always they find, weak, spineless men who witlessly become their pawns. While such men in Poland, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Germany, and even France and Italy, have their day of glory with their names and faces in the newspapers, when the Communists triumph is complete, they step on their faces and obliterate their names. Some of our public officials who think there is some momentary advantage in dealing with Satan, might look at the record and take caution. No good has ever come out of hell.

The madness of the past fortnight has been another Communist triumph. It has given this hell-brood another advantage in our country. They are skillful in their lies, and our people seem to be so easily taken in. Everybody enters this row to get his name in the newspapers. Even Tito had a comment on it. I wonder why. I wonder why.

Who wants us to lose this battle against communism?

The Communists have long attacked the integrity of the FBI. They hate the FBI. Senator FULBRIGHT is not a Communist, but suddenly he gives comfort to the Communists by attacking the FBI, without providing proof of anything.

Sanity dictates that a halt be called to all this personal quarreling, and that this Nation return to its normal business. Nobody gains from all this shouting and cursing—no one, that is, but the Kremlin. The David Shine argument is sheer nonsense. He has had no special privileges. Rather, he has become a pawn in a fight among politicians. The real culprits are the Communists, not those who fight them.

Mr. Speaker, Freedom Club News, published in Los Angeles, is under the direction of a group of very distinguished Americans the advisory committee is composed of the following named persons:

Erle Cocke, Jr., past commander American Legion; Bing Crosby, motion picture star; Cecil B. deMille, motion picture director; Dr. James W. Fifield, Jr., clergyman; Adm. M. K. Fleming, United States Navy retired; Adm. Leslie E. Gehres, United States Navy, retired; Dr. Edgar Goodspeed, Bible scholar and author; Rupert Hughes, author; Fulton Lewis, Jr., radio commentator, columnist; Clarence Manion, attorney, author, lecturer; Felix Morley, author; Dr. Norman Vincent Peale, clergyman; Dr. Roscoe Pound, dean emeritus, Harvard Law School; Eddie Rickenbacker, president, Eastern Air Lines; James P. Selvage, public Relations Counsel; George Sokolsky, radio commentator, columnist

---

Proposed Indochina Air Strike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 7, 1954

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "United States Twice Proposed Indochina Air Strike Blocked by British 'No'." The article was written by Chalmers M. Roberts and was published in the Washington Post and Times Herald of this morning.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BLOCKED BY BRITISH "NO"—UNITED STATES TWICE PROPOSED INDOCHINA AIR STRIKE

(By Chalmers M. Roberts)

The United States twice during April proposed using American Navy carrier planes and Air Force planes based in the Philippines to intervene in the Indochina war provided Congress and our allies agreed. But the British would not agree, and the plans fell through.

The Eisenhower administration even set a tentative date for an air strike to aid the then besieged fortress of Dien Bien Phu. The date was April 28, 2 days after the opening of the Geneva Conference.

President Eisenhower was prepared to go to Congress Monday, April 26, to ask for passage of a joint resolution to permit American intervention.

Secretary of State John Foster Dulles and Adm. Arthur W. Radford, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, first broached the idea at a secret meeting April 3 of the bipartisan leaders of Congress.

In neither instance was the use of American ground troops contemplated.

The President himself did not discuss the proposed intervention with either the bipartisan congressional leaders or the ambassadors of allied nations, leaving that to Dulles and Radford.

NOT BACKED BY JOINT CHIEFS

Radford told the congressional leaders on April 3 that the proposal did not have the backing of the other members of the Joint Chiefs.

It was these intervention proposals which divided the Anglo-American alliance, a division which continues to this day on what to do about the Indochina crisis.

With a major Communist assault by Viet Minh forces expected shortly on French Union forces in the Red River Delta of Indochina and with peace negotiations making little progress at Geneva, the allies soon may once more be faced with the problem of whether to act militarily to hold back Communist aggression. This is the reason that the following chronology is of more than mere historical interest.

The chronology is based both on the scanty public record and on private information gathered by this reporter in London, Paris, at the Geneva Conference and in Washington from American and Allied officials.

This is the sequence of events thus far:

Saturday, March 20: Gen. Paul Ely, French Chief of Staff, who last week was made commander in Indochina, arrived in Washington with reports on the Indochina war which gravely alarmed American officials. He conferred during several days with President Eisenhower, Dulles, Radford, and other officials. The sum of his message was that French Union forces could not win in Indochina without American military intervention. The American response indicated a willingness to act.

Monday, March 29: Dulles, in his Overseas Writers speech in New York, called for united action though it might involve serious risks. He said Communist China was backing aggression in Indochina with the goal of controlling all of southeast Asia and that the United States felt that "that possibility should not be passively accepted but should be met by united action."

MEETING WITH HILL LEADERS

Saturday, April 3: Dulles and Radford met in secret session at the State Department with eight congressional leaders representing both parties and with the then Undersecretary of Defense Roger Kyes and the then Navy Secretary Robert B. Anderson. Congressional leaders present were Senators Knowland, Millikin, Lyndon Johnson of Texas, Russell, and Clements, and Representatives Martin, McCormack, and Priest.

Dulles said the President had asked him to call the meeting. He said he felt that it was indispensable at this juncture that the leaders of Congress feel as the administration did on the Indochina crisis.

Radford said the administration was concerned with the rapidly deteriorating situation.

Dulles said that the President wanted him to take up with the congressional leaders action by Congress, but action short of a declaration of war or the use of ground troops. Dulles said that if Congress would permit the President to use air and naval power, then a way could be found to prevent broadening of the conflict. He said it was felt that the necessary air and naval power was already in the area and that Congress should shoulder its responsibility in the crisis.

Radford suggested that if Congress passed a joint resolution giving the President general power to act, it would be possible to make a single air strike to relieve the embattled fortress of Dien Bien Phu, then under siege for 3 weeks. Radford explained the urgency by saying that he was not even certain, because of the 13-hour time difference between Washington and Indochina, whether the fortress was still holding out at that very moment.

FOLLOWUP CONTEMPLATED

Radford spoke of using the approximately 200 planes on two 27,000-ton United States Navy carriers, the *Essex* and the *Boxer*, then in the South China Sea, Radford said that land-based United States Air Force planes in the Philippines would join in such a strike.

Radford was asked whether such action would be war. He replied that we would be in the war. He was asked whether, if the strike did not succeed in relieving the fortress, we would follow up. He replied "yes." He was asked whether land forces would then also have to be used. He did not give a definite answer.

Radford was asked whether he was speaking for the Joint Chiefs of Staff. He said "no." He was asked what was the division in the Joint Chiefs. He replied that the other members did not agree with him on the idea of the air strike.

Dulles was asked why he didn't go to the United Nations. He replied that it would take too long, that this was an immediate problem. Dulles was asked whether he had lined up the British or any other allies for a joint venture under the united action doctrine. He said he had not. The congressional leaders suggested that he should line up the allies before Congress take any action. The meeting broke up on this note.

Sunday, April 4, through Friday, April 9: Dulles consulted with diplomatic representatives in Washington of Britain, France, Australia, New Zealand, the Philippines, Thailand, and the three associated states of Indochina, Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia.

During these talkes there evolved on Dulles' part a proposal for positive military action along the lines discussed the previous Saturday with the congressional leaders and including planes from aircraft carriers to be supplied by Britain, France, and Australia. There also was discussed a statement or declaration of intent designed to explain to the world what action was being taken and why, and warning the Chinese Communists not to intervene.

The British reaction was negative. The other nations indicated they would go along with the plan provided everyone, especially the United Kingdom, joined in.

Dulles offered to go to London, if necessary, to make clear the urgency of the situation and the need for action. British Prime Minister Winston Churchill asked that Dulles fly over and a London-Paris trip was then arranged.

Saturday, April 10: Dulles left by air for London and Paris on what he called a "mission of peace through strength" and to pool allied strength "to create the conditions needed to assure that that conference (the coming Geneva Conference) will not lead to a loss of freedom to southeast Asia but will preserve that freedom in peace and justice."

Monday and Tuesday, April 12 and 13: Dulles conferred with Churchill and Foreign Secretary Anthony Eden in London. The British urged caution and flatly opposed any military action at this time, saying that the monsoons soon would bring the fighting to a halt, perhaps in 2 weeks. Dulles dropped the idea of immediate military intervention and took up the idea of creating a southeast Asia defense alliance somewhat similar to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization in Europe.

Dulles felt he had won agreement to begin at once creating this united front in southeast Asia with the idea that this would lead to united action if necessary to save Indochina though not specifically to save Dien Bien Phu. Dulles agreed to soften the wording of the proposed communique at Churchill's insistence.

Tuesday, April 13: An Anglo-American communique said that the two nations were ready to take part in examining the possibilities of a southeast Asia defense pact. Eden, in announcing the communique in the House of Commons, said that the two nations must await the reaction of the other interested countries before determining what steps we take next. He insisted that he had committed Britain to no specific action but only to examine the possibility of such action.

Dulles understood that a working group would be set up in Washington in a few days to begin drafting the pact. Dulles had argued that the Geneve Conference would be more apt to succeed if there were some strong alternative to a failure to get what the West wanted by negotiation. No ultimatum to Red China was intended, however, Dulles felt that the critical situation in Indochina in fact activated the pact.

Wednesday, April 14: Dulles flew from London to Paris where he discussed the proposed pact with French Premier Joseph Laniel and Foreign Minister Georges Bidault. A Franco-American communique closely followed the language of the London communique. The French understood that work on drafting the pact would begin at once.

Friday, April 16: Vice President Nixon told newspaper editors in Washington (his identity became known the next day) that the effect of the loss of Dien Bien Phu would be almost catastrophic. He said if the French withdrew, Indochina would be Communist-dominated within a month and that the United States, as a leader in the free world, could not afford further retreat in Asia. Nixon said that it was hoped that the United States would not have to send troops to Indochina but if the United States could not avoid it the administration must face up to the situation and dispatch forces.

Sunday, April 18: British Ambassador Sir Roger Makins told Dulles that he could not attend a meeting called by the United States for the following day to begin work on the southeast Asia pact. Sir Roger had been told by the State Department late the previous week about the meeting. At the time he had not received a report on the Dulles visit to London and hence he asked London for instructions. London referred him to the report of the Dulles-Churchill-Eden conference, by then received at the British Embassy here, Sir Roger thereupon told Dulles that his government was not prepared to take part in such discussions because of the possible repercussions on south Asian opinion of an announcement that such discussions were being held. Sir Roger said that he could only discuss the other topic scheduled for the Geneva conference, that is Korea. The Monday meeting was thereupon turned into a discussion of Korea.

Dulles felt that the British had switched their position on going ahead with the southeast Asia pact. There is some question whether Sir Roger specifically told Dulles that Eden had forgotten about the coming Colombo conference, due to open the following week, at Colombo, Ceylon. Dulles, at any rate, felt that the British switch was due to objections from Indian Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru, who was to meet at Colombo with the Prime Ministers of Pakistan, Ceylon, Burma, and Indonesia.

Monday, April 19: Dulles, after seeing the President at Augusta, Ga., told reporters it was unlikely that American troops would be sent to Indochina.

Tuesday, April 20: Dulles briefed bipartisan congressional leaders on his London-Paris trip and on his plans for Geneva, saying that American intervention in Indochina was not imminent or under active consideration at present. At the meeting were Senators Knowland, Millikin, Ferguson, Saltonstall, Wiley, Bridges, Hickenlooper, Lyndon Johnson, Clements, Russell, Green, and Fulbright and Representatives Chiperfield, Arends, Fulton, and Brooks Hays.

Later that day, Dulles left by air for Paris and Geneva. The Paris stop was to attend a NATO meeting and to consult with Eden and Bidault on Geneva.

Friday, April 23: Bidault told Dulles that Gen. Henri Navarre, then French commander in Indochina, had just cabled that he would not be responsible for the fate of French Union forces in Indochina if Dien Bien Phu fell. Bidault, therefore, asked whether the United States was prepared to take military action to prevent fall of the fortress.

Saturday, April 24: Radford arrived in Paris. Dulles and Radford told Eden that the French were asking for military help. An Allied air strike at the Vietminh positions surrounding the fort was discussed.

The discussion involved use of the same two United States Navy carriers and Philippine-based Air Force planes that had been considered on April 3. The carriers had been in the South China Sea since nearly March, the Navy said, for training. The nearest point from the Gulf of Tonkin to Dien Bien Phu was about 240 miles distant.

Bidault said that General Navarre had agreed that a strike by about 500 American planes would be sufficient to save the fort.

Dulles said that if the Allies agreed the President would go to Congress on Monday, April 26, and ask for a joint resolution authorizing such action and that this would permit a strike on Wednesday, April 28, assuming that Congress had acted in time.

The State Department had prepared a declaration on intentions—an outgrowth of the early April meetings in Washington—to be signed on Monday or Tuesday by ambassadors of the nations allied with the United States—Britain, France, Australia, New Zealand, the Philippines, Thailand, Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia. The declaration spoke in general terms of the danger of Communist aggression and the Allied recognition of the necessity of repulsing that aggression by military means.

However, there were no British or Australian aircraft carriers close enough or available to join in the strike on the proposed day and the only French carrier was already fully occupied.

Eden told Dulles and Radford that this was a most serious proposal, amounting to war, and that he wanted to hear it from the French themselves. Eden and Dulles then conferred with Bidault, who confirmed the plea for aid.

Eden said he personally opposed such a move and that he felt that ground troops would be called for within 48 hours after an air strike as had been the case at the beginning of the Korean war.

Eden added, however, he would not want to give a final British judgment and that he, therefore, would go to London at once and confer with the British Cabinet.

At the end of the day, Eden flew to London. Dulles then told Bidault that (1) the proposed strike was beyond the President's constitutional powers without action by Congress, and (2) that no action could be taken except under the "united action" doctrine previously discussed but delayed by British unwillingness to act at once. Dulles also said that there was doubt in the minds of American military leaders that a single strike would, at this late date, save Dien Bien Phu. Dulles then flew off to Geneva.

Sunday, April 25: The British Cabinet met in extraordinary Sunday session and decided against participating in the "united action" air strike. The British Chiefs of Staff unanimously agreed that it would not be sufficient to save Dien Bien Phu.

Eden stopped in Paris Sunday evening en route to Geneva and told Bidault at Orly Airfield of the negative Cabinet decision. Dulles was told by Eden late that night in Geneva. At this time Eden told Dulles that Britain had decided to wait and see what sort of settlement the French could get from the Communists at the Geneva Conference before taking any action.

Monday, April 26: Radford arrived in London from Paris to talk with Churchill and the British Chiefs of Staff.

On the same day, the Geneva Conference opened.

Also on Monday, Undersecretary of State Walter Bedell Smith in Washington discussed Indochina in a conference with Senators H. Alexander Smith, Hickenlooper, Langer, Fulbright, Gillette, and Mansfield and Representatives Chiperfield, Arends, Fulton, and Brooks Hays. Undersecretary Smith raised the question of unilateral American military action in Indochina but the Members of Congress strongly opposed such a course.

Tuesday, April 27: Churchill announced to a cheering House of Commons that the British Government was "not prepared to give any undertaking about United Kingdom military action in Indochina in advance of the results of Geneva."

Churchill went on to say that "we have not entered into any new political or military commitments" but he did not explain the background of his statements.

Thursday, April 29: President Eisenhower told his press conference that the United States was trying to steer a course between the unattainable and the unacceptable in the Indochina crisis. He repeated a statement of sometime earlier that the United States would not get into a war except through constitutional processes which involved the declaration of war by Congress.

Wednesday, May 5: Dulles returned to Washington from Geneva and reported on the conference to Senators Knowland, Ferguson, Millikin, Saltonstall, Wiley, H. Alexander Smith, Bridges, Lyndon Johnson, Clements, George, Russell, and Green, and Representatives Martin, Halleck, Chiperfield, Vorys, Judd, Short, Arends, Rayburn, McCormack, Gordon, Lanham, and Vinson. Dulles indicated that the United States had virtually abandoned all hope of effective "united action" in Vietnam and that he was now seeking a collective security system designed to seal off and protect Laos and Cambodia, the other Indochinese States.

Friday, May 7: Dien Bien Phu fell to the Communists.

Wednesday, May 19: President Eisenhower told his press conference that it might be possible to create a collective security system in southeast Asia without the British and that the United States might possibly work out something with Australia, New Zealand and some Asian nations.

Thursday, May 20: New Zealand External Affairs Minister T. Clifton Webb, asked by reporters about the possibilities of a pact without Britain, said that "I can't conceive of a satisfactory alliance being made that would not include Britain" and that he felt "that any form of security pact for southeast Asia that it may be necessary to form will in fact include Britain."

Thursday, May 27: Adm. Richard B. Carney, Chief of Naval Operations and a member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff said in a New York speech that the United States is "approaching the fork in the road," that the "choice could be a fateful one" and that however grave are "today's alternatives" their "gravity may well be dwarfed by those which will confront us in a few years if our country fails to choose properly now." He said the question was: "Do we want to turn into the smooth dead-end or take the rougher road that offers us a good destination if we have got the guts and strength to manage it?"

Wednesday, June 2: President Eisenhower told his press conference that he had not, by any manner of means, reached any decision to ask Congress for authority to act in southeast Asia.

Thursday, June 3: Five-power military talks between high ranking officers of the United States, Britain, France, Australia, and New Zealand opened in Washington. Admiral Carney was the United States representative. The talks, due to last a week, were military and not political in nature and were designed to explore military problems which might arise from a southeast Asia defense pact, among others.

Thursday, June 3: Gen. James A. Van Fleet, who had been sent to the Far East in May as a special envoy by President Eisenhower, gave what one Senator termed "a very alarming" report to the combined Senate Foreign Relations and Armed Forces Committees.

Friday, June 4: Dulles told the Senate Foreign Relations Committee that the situation in Indochina is "grave but by no means hopeless" and that it is "fraught with danger not only to the immediate area but to the security of the United States and its Allies in the Pacific area." When Senator Fulbright observed that recent witnesses before the committee had urged a go-it-alone policy, Dulles replied that he would not want to make an answer which conceded that Britain had a veto on what we might want to do and that a situation might arise when the United States would have to act without the British.

Saturday, June 5: Senate Majority Leader Knowland in an interview said that the free world has reached the "jumping-off place" and if it does not force some kind of showdown with the Communists in Indochina within the next 30 days all Asia may fall to the Communists. He added that the United States ought to face up to the fact that it may have to fight in Indochina.

Monday, June 7: Admiral Radford and General Van Fleet have an appointment with President Eisenhower at 10:30 this morning.

Battle of the Honorable Raymond S. McKeough Ends in $4 Million Recovery for People of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1954

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am extending my remarks to include the full text of the statement of the Honorable Lindsay C. Warren in reference to the $4 million settlement with the United States Lines. Members of this body who served in the 74th, 75th, 76th, and 77th Congresses with the Honorable Raymond S. McKeough, later a member of the Maritime Commission, especially will be pleased by Mr. Warren's high praise of Mr. McKeough, whose long and courageous battle with other members of the Maritime Commission has received the satisfying vindication of a recovery of $4 million for the people of the United States. The statement of Mr. Warren follows:

Lindsay C. Warren, former Comptroller General, on being contacted with reference to the settlement with the United States Lines, made the following statement:

"During the week immediately preceding my retirement as Comptroller General representatives of the Department of Justice consulted with me on a proposed settlement with the United States Lines with respect to the superliner steamship *United States.* I approved the proposed settlement in a letter to the Attorney General dated April 30, 1954, my last day in office, as being in the best interest of the United States. I have just been advised that the settlement has been agreed to by all parties.

"Two years ago I rendered a decision to the then Secretary of Commerce, Charles Sawyer, pointing out numerous misinterpretations and misapplications of the law underlying the contract which had been executed between the former Maritime Commission and the United States Lines. I advised Mr. Sawyer that the contract was illegal and that the steamship *United States* should not be turned over to the company until a new agreement fixing a proper price was worked out. Mr. Sawyer chose to act in direct contradiction to that decision.

"This settlement should stand forever as a stern warning to administrative officials of the Government who choose to substitute their own views for the mandates of the Congress. No man in this country is above the law. I refer particularly to Mr. Sawyer and to the members of the former Martime Commission—with the outstanding exception of Mr. Raymond McKeough, who not only voted against the subsidy in this case but continued thereafter to voice his vigorous dissent.

"I wish to pay tribute to the courage and integrity displayed during the course of this controversy by former President Truman and his naval aide, Admiral Dennison, the congressional committee headed by Porter Hardy, Jr., former Attorney General McGranery, Attorney General Brownell, and Maritime Administrator Rothschild. Particularly do I wish to express my admiration for Assistant Attorney General Warren Burger. He is a lawyer of the highest ability and character. His thorough grasp of the issues has greatly facilitated the settlement of this case.

"I feel sure that this settlement will dispel any doubts there may have been with respect to the powers of the General Accounting Office to review the administrative actions of the executive branch. This is especially gratifying to me, coming as it does at the time of my retirement as Comptroller General.

"May 18, 1954."

Question of the Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1954

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, news item: Pennsylvania Railroad installs 13th president in its 107 years of successful operation. President's father was Pennsy baggagemaster for 25 years. New president went to work on railroad after finishing high school.

Quaere: Can capitalism be so bad when when it gives a man this kind of chance?

What's the Economic Picture Today?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1954

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, some people enjoy the idea of rushing frantically into every situation with either legislation or executive action. The moment a difficulty arises anywhere they want to pass a bill or issue an order. Fortunately for the Nation, the legislative and executive branches of our Government are not so easily stampeded into precipitate action.

A few months ago, labor leaders were mobilizing for marches on Congress, for special legislative sessions. They were reviving old anti-Republican slogans and preparing to lay the blame on their traditional target, the GOP. A strange silence has suddenly fallen upon the "gloommongers." They have discovered national employment dropping, construction contracts rising, farm prices lifting, metal markets strengthening, and the whole picture one of new confidence in the prospects for future developments.

With the construction of large new units by automobile manufacturers, air-conditioning companies, and other major industries, there can be little doubt that the country is betting on a good year of business activity all around.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Printing and binding for Congress, when recommended to be done by the Committee on Printing of either House, shall be so recommended in a report containing an approximate estimate of the cost thereof, together with a statement from the Public Printer of estimated approximate cost of work previously ordered by Congress within the fiscal year (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 145, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on Printing, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

DISTRIBUTION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

To the Vice President and each Senator 100 copies; to the Secretary and Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, each, 25 copies; to the Secretary, for official use, not to exceed 35 copies; to the Sergeant at Arms, for use on the floor of the Senate, not to exceed 50 copies; to each Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress, 68 copies; to the Clerk, Sergeant at Arms, and Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives, each, 25 copies; to the Clerk, for official use, not to exceed 50 copies; and to the Doorkeeper, for use on the floor of the House of Representatives, not to exceed 75 copies; to the Vice President and each Senator, Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress there shall also be furnished (and shall not be transferable), 3 copies of the daily Record, of which 1 shall be delivered at his residence, 1 at his office, and 1 at the Capitol.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the Record.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized book dealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by book dealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the Congressional Record, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the Congressional Record is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Frank Brodie is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the Record at $1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. The money derived from such sales shall be paid into the Treasury and accounted for in his annual report to Congress, and no sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRICE OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

The Public Printer is authorized to furnish to subscribers the daily Record at $1.50 per month, payable in advance.

Remit by money order payable to Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C.

PRINTING DOCUMENTS AND REPORTS

Documents and reports of committees with the evidence and papers submitted therewith, or any part thereof ordered printed by Congress, may be reprinted by the Public Printer on order of any Member of Congress or Delegate, on prepayment of the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 162, p. 1940).

Appendix

A New Day for the Wool Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, June 8, 1954

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, a few days ago the Chamber of Commerce, of Waynesburg, Pa., held a wool festival, at which 15,000 persons assembled. At the festival there were fine floats depicting the wool industry in southwestern Pennsylvania. A very interesting address was delivered by Mr. F. W. ImMasche, of the Department of Agriculture, and I ask unanimous consent to have his address printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A NEW DAY FOR THE WOOL INDUSTRY

(Address by F. W. ImMasche, Livestock and Dairy Division, Commodity Stabilization Service, U. S. Department of Agriculture, at the Pennsylvania State Wool Festival, Waynesburg, Pa., May 22, 1954)

It is a high honor and a real pleasure to take part here today in your Pennsylvania State Wool Festival. This is one of our American ways of recognizing and encouraging projects beneficial to the general welfare.

The Waynesburg Chamber of Commerce, its officers and committees, and everyone who helped put on this festival are to be complimented.

The parade, the floats, the window displays, the exhibits which include world champion wool, are something to be proud of.

You can be assured that I am going to tell them down in Washington how well you do things here in Greene County. You folks gathering here bears ample testimony to your community spirit and deep interest in having a sound and prosperous domestic wool industry.

I have always been impressed with this area as I have driven through it on my way home to Kansas. Your rolling pastures and woods are beautiful. Your farms are well kept. And your girls—I am sure of one thing, selection of your queen for 1954 must have posed a most difficult decision, because all your young ladies—the princesses as well as the queen—are most charming.

If you will pardon a personal reference, I have some Pennsylvania blood in my veins. My mother's people moved to Washington County from Northumberland County in 1784. The family records show that hostile Indians made occasional raids; wolves, bears, panthers and wildcats were very numerous. Common salt was luxury and was carried over the mountains on pack horses. The spinning wheel and hand loom furnished the principal part of their clothing.

It is completely unnecessary for me to praise the wool you produce. The high quality of your Delaine merino wool—its fineness, its length of staple, and its freedom from black fibers—speaks for itself wherever fine wool is needed for the manufacture of beautiful fabrics. The continued improvement in your sheep which has made this superb wool possible as well as producing blocky lambs for meat is a credit to yourselves and the leaders of the industry. I want to pay special tribute to two men who, I understand, have made great contributions. One is Lloyd Engle—"Dad" as he is known to you—who worked with you for many years here in Greene County as county agent. The other is Dr. William Henning, of your State university, under whose leadership the sheep industry in Pennsylvania has made great strides both in the quality of breeding stock and in the preparation of wool for market.

I always feel at home when I'm talking to livestock people. Livestock people, no matter where they are, seem to have something in common—a something that makes us all pretty much alike. We always can agree upon the good qualities of an animal; always can complain about high costs and low prices; and always are interested in comparing one area with another.

I made some comparisons myself on my way up here. I couldn't help but compare your area with ranches in the far West. Here you have your sheep under fence, all close at hand the year around. I know of ranches in the West where the sheep are moved 200 to 300 miles for year-round grazing, utilizing the high mountain ranges in the summer and the open desert in the winter.

But the West has one feature you don't have—and I rather think that you have missed something. I refer, of course, to that picturesque character of fable and song, the sheepherder. Some sheepherders are talkative; some are not. Some look forward to a gay old time when they go to town; some are confirmed hermits.

One of the most interesting people I have ever known is a chap named Archer B. Gilfillan, who first studied for the ministry, and then decided to become a sheepherder. He used his experiences on the range to write the book to which he gave the one-word title "Sheep." I'd like to quote one little passage from that book, a passage in which he compares the sheepherder's job with the task that faced a minister of the Gospel. Here is what he says:

"The herder can tell his black sheep at a glance, which is something no pastor can do. Besides all this, the herder's black sheep will average only about 1 to the 100. Where is the pastor who can boast a score like that? Lastly, when the whole flock shows a tendency to go wrong, as it frequently does, the herder doesn't tearfully beg it to go right, and get in another herder to work over it a week or two. No, he addresses his flock in short, concise phrases. He alludes in passing to certain interesting facts about their ancestry, touches briefly on the present state of their morals, winds up with a reference to their hoped-for destination, and then sets the dog on them. The pastor has certain inhibitions of speech; the herder has none unless he is tonguetied, and few of them are. But, after all, the herder and the pastor speak much the same language, only differently arranged."

Whether we talk about the West or the East, we can be sure of one thing: Sheep and wool always have been most important to the economy of this Nation.

Here are just a few brief facts from the pages of American history. Our American colonists soon learned what was essential to living in a new land. Cattle were highly important because of their ability to furnish milk, meat, and draft power. But a year's wear on English woolens, plus the cost of their replacement soon made the settlers demand flocks of their own.

The colonies restricted the exportation of sheep in order to increase wool production. In some colonies, sheep were exempted from taxation and given preference in grazing. In Connecticut, all male citizens over 13 years were required to work 1 day a year to clear more land for sheep. The slaughter of lambs was restricted in some colonies. It was also provided that no sheep under 4 years old were to be killed.

When the westward trend to the Ohio River Valley got underway after the Revolution, the new settlers, of course, took sheep with them. One of the trails used in reaching the New West led through this region. Seeing how ideal it is for sheep production, settlers in the region now comprising Greene, Washington, Fayette and Somerset Counties in Pennsylvania, and the area that is now the West Virginia Panhandle, developed a dominant sheep culture. That explains, in part, why we are in Waynesboro today.

Sheep, of course, followed the frontier on westward across the continent. History shows that few indeed were the military expeditions leading to the settlement of this country which did not have their quota of sheep with the advance party or train. No important step has taken place in the building of our Nation without the contribution from sheep or their masters.

Domestic wool production is still—in 1954—vitally imprtant to us. Here is why I say that:

First, we produce less than a third of our domestic requirements.

Second, the foreign wool on which we must rely has to be shipped over sealanes 5,000 to 8,000 miles—from Australia and other Southern Hemisphere countries.

You can see what that means. The supply lines in time of war will be exposed to enemy action. Wool is a critical material and we must have a strong domestic wool industry for our national defense.

Recognizing this, President Eisenhower last July asked the Department of Agriculture to make a study of the wool situation.

Secretary Benson reported to the President that, along with research and other programs to increase the efficiency of the industry and improve its products, some form of price assistance is needed to enable our woolgrowers to compete with wool imported from the low-cost areas of the world.

Price support through loans at 90 percent of parity has not been effective in maintaining, let alone stimulating, domestic wool production. Sheep numbers have declined sharply in recent years and are near a record low. Under our present program, domestic wool has accumulated in the hands of the Government, while imports have supplied an increasing share of our requirements.

With the advice of woolgrowers, President Eisenhower has recommended special legislation for wool. His recommendation provides for an incentive price to encourage larger production of wool. At the same time, the Government would be taken out of the wool business. Wool would move into consumption in competition with other fibers. And all this would be done without ncreasing the tariff or otherwise affecting our relations in the Southern Hemisphere. Here are the main features:

An incentive price for wool aimed at encouraging a yearly production of 300 million pounds of shorn wool would be announced by the Secretary of Agriculture. Today we are producing about 230 million pounds. At the end of the year, woolgrowers would receive a payment to supplement the returns they receive from wool sold in the open market and thereby bring the average price for all growers up to the incentive level.

For example, if the incentive price is 60 cents and the United States average price for the year turns out to be 50 cents, 20 percent more is needed to bring growers' returns up to the 60-cent level. In that case, the payment to each grower will be 20 percent of the amount he received for wool sold during the year. Your account of sale will serve as a basis for the payments. Payments on a percentage basis will encourage growers to obtain the best price possible. This is a program that will really mean something to you who are producing high-quality wool.

Funds to pay for the program will be taken from the tariff collected on wool. In this way, the protective tariff will be worked "double action." The present level of protection will be continued and the duties will be used to compensate wool growers for the higher tariff they should have to protect them from imports.

The proposed legislation known as the National Wool Act has already been passed by the United States Senate. It now is being considered by the House of Representatives. With early enactment, this incentive payment plan could be applied on wool marketed this year. In the meantime, price support through loans is available to you.

In closing I wish to leave this thought with you wool growers. You are growing a product which is essential and critical to our Nation and we need larger production. The situation is different than in the case of cotton and wheat where we have surpluses. Your Government is fully aware of this and is recommending a program which will promote the development of a sound and prosperous domestic wool industry. It has been a pleasure to be with you and indeed a high honor. I thank you.

Courage of Texas Youth Stricken by Polio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 8, 1954

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, some people spend a great deal of time worrying about American youth. I am not included among them. I believe our boys and girls face the future with courage and confidence—that they are preparing themselves well for the positions of leadership they will be called upon to fill.

Daily they show themselves capable of outstanding accomplishments. I submit as a case in point the story of Jerry Williams, of Tyler, Tex., who recently was graduated from Tyler High School in the face of difficulties that would have downed many adults.

The story of Jerry Williams is told in a special dispatch to the Dallas Times Herald. I ask unanimous consent that the article from the Times Herald be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Tyler, Tex., June 4.—For one 19-year-old Tyler high school graduating senior in particular participating in commencement exercises this week marked a special triumph over personal handicap.

Spunky Jerry Williams pushed himself across the stage in a wheelchair to get his diploma and climax a 3-year fight against polio.

Williams, son of Mr. and Mrs. Stafford Williams, beamed as he rolled across the stage to get his certificate from School Board Member M. M. Haws. Jerry could have received his diploma in special ceremonies in a school office, but he chose to join his more than 300 fellow graduates and get his just like the rest.

Graduation ended a year's stay at Tyler High. Jerry's other schooling, since he was stricken with polio in 1950, had been at an exceptional children's class in Ramey Elementary School. There he did high school work among a group of children in grade-school level.

Tyler Businessman Woody Tunnell "adopted" Williams for the advanced class of Glenwood Methodist Church, and the class provided taxicab transportation for the youth to and from high school and gave him a typewriter.

Tyler Junior College has awarded the paralyzed youngster a scholarship so he can continue his education, and the Glenwood Sunday School class will continue to provide him transportation and other needs when he begins college work.

This past year students at Tyler High solved Jerry's big problem of getting from one floor to the other in the high-school building, which has no elevators. Fellow students took turns on a voluntary, nonassignment basis, carrying Williams up and down stairs in his wheelchair between classes.

The Miracle of the Hydrogen Bomb

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 8, 1954

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an editorial from the Memphis Press-Scimitar in which the editor, Mr. Edward J. Meeman, gives an excellent and thoughtful discussion on the miracle of the hydrogen bomb. He gives us hope in that the challenge is not too great for this great people to outlaw war completely if we are to survive and to develop our spiritual progress as we have our scientific progress.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

WHAT WE MUST DO ABOUT THE BOMB: IT'S A MIRACLE—IT WILL TAKE ANOTHER MIRACLE TO CONTROL IT

(By Edward J. Meeman, editor, Memphis Press-Scimitar)

The explosion of the hydrogen bomb in the Pacific astonished the world.

It shouldn't have astonished us. It was only the to-be-expected climax of a development that had continued for decades—man's mastery of the material world.

The explosion frightened the world. It frightened us because we didn't see how we could control this power to control the world * * * and the power to control, we saw, is also the power to destroy.

Why did we feel helpless?

Because the amazing, constantly accelerated growth of man's knowledge and mastery of the material world has gone on without a corresponding growth of the knowledge and mastery of himself—his mind and soul.

Had we chosen to progress equally and with equal speed along these two parallel lines, the explosion would have been greeted only with awe, wonder and delight—without a thought of fear of the future.

Before the age of natural science man didn't think he could know the secrets of, and attain dominion over, nature. When he lost the superstitious fear and sense of helplessness before nature, and applied pure reason, the process of control of the outward world began moving step by step until the climax in the Pacific.

But the man who accomplished this miracle—inconceivable before the time of Roger Bacon—is little different mentally, emotionally and spiritually from the man who wielded sticks and stones and a gun which would kill only one man at a time.

We simply neglected the other parallel line of progress—spiritual progress—although the road of it was as wide open as the road of material progress proved to be once we had curiosity and interest enough to enter upon it.

Now we are confronted with the need to make in one great leap the mental and spiritual progress which we should have been making all the while we were making this amazing material progress.

We can't?

We can. We can do it because we must, and we can always do what we have to do.

Why do we have to make this sudden leap, this great profound change—each of us in ourselves, and all of us together?

We have to do it in order to live, and the desire to live is stronger in mankind than the desire to commit suicide.

Obviously, the current situation gives no assurance of survival, but promises death to our country, to our civilization, to our freedom.

What is our situation?

Face up to it.

The United States has the hydrogen bomb. Communist Russia has the bomb.

Most of the rest of the world stands by, wishfully thinking that it can be neutral and watch the collision of the giants, if it should occur, from the sidelines.

What is our hope?

That the bomb is so awful that the other side will not use it, and we feel sure we won't start anything.

A slender hope.

How can we build a real hope that we can live with the bomb?

By building a preponderant power in the world which will protect freedom and enforce peace.

We can do this by uniting the nations that have freedom and want peace in a great union of the free. This would be, not a loose league like the United Nations, but a permanent, unbreakable federation like the United States, which has brought secure peace, prosperity, and freedom to a wide area because it is composed of states, which though widely differing, are firmly united.

Such a great union of the free, from the instant of its formation, would be so strong that no nations outside would dare attack, and there would be no danger it would attack those outside, because it would be nonaggressive. But its greatness would be a magnet that would attract the outsiders, one by one, into it.

Natural science could not have achieved its marvelous results, culminating in the hydrogen bomb, if scientists had been encumbered with prejudice. They asked only: What are we trying to do? What's the next step? How shall we do it? They never asked whether they liked one substance better than another—only which one would work with which. They never dared to be afraid; they did what they had to do.

So we come to the great leap.

We can't survive without a great union of the free.

And we can't form this necessary union without giving up our prejudices. We can't form it without sacrificing our small immediate self-interest to our larger, long-range self-interest.

This requires us to make the jump upward from the dark cellar of prejudice and fear to the heaven-lit towers where every action is inspired by reason and love.

To live with the final awesome product of the technological system, we have to face all the facts about man and technology, and man's needs in a technological world. Man is the master of the machine and the process, not an automaton attached to the process. He is not the fascinated victim of speed; his automobile becomes a conveyance, not an instrument of mayhem and murder. He does not produce unneeded things with his great mass-production machines which clutter life and belittle man, but only things which add to man's dignity. He does not fear that the machines will overproduce and bring him depression in a world in which many are in want. He recognizes what he should have recognized in the beginning of our age—that if we are to have a profit system, all must share in the profits, directly, rather than only through wages, and so he makes the capitalist system a system of universal profit sharing. He sells stocks to all, for if we are to have a private-property system, all must own private property.

The American candidly admits that our high standard of living is due to no superiority of Americans over other peoples. It is due to these causes (1) our personal freedom guaranteed by a great Constitution, (2) our Federal system which has brought peace, stability, and free trade over a wide area, (3) our productive technological system, itself the result of freedom, free inquiry, and experiment. So if we want other people to understand us, and like us, and join with us for peace, we have to extend these three blessings to other peoples, who racially are as capable of living up to them and benefiting from them as we are.

Other nations have to face the facts—that America has no cause of its own, like Communist Russia, but only the cause of peace and freedom—their cause.

We Americans have prejudice and self-interest to give up, too. There is no room for race prejudice in the world of the atom bomb. The brown Filipino has as much a place in the Great Union of the free as the white American. We need a freer trade with the free world. We cannot refrain from bringing up the standard of living of other nations for fear it might mean some temporary drop in our own. It need not, but if it did, it would be small price for the survival of our way of life—a way of life that can continue in the world only if it is extended to others. America is like a ship in river. When we come to the locks we need be willing to take a drop to a lower level so that we may safely continue our progress in a wider stream. Such a drop need not occur, but unless we are unselfish and brave enough to be willing to take it, we are not likely to avoid disaster.

Who says this challenge is too great for this great people? Who says we are not brave enough to do what we have to do?

We have already proved what we can do. Our pampered boys went to Korea and endured unendurable hardships, performed feats of the grandest courage.

The people back home, too, would have endured any sacrifice, any hardship, had they been called upon to win a war rather than reach a stalemate.

But, they say, "people will not sacrifice in peacetime."

Here comes that need for pure reason which we are to employ from now on, that utter facing of all the facts.

It is not peacetime. We are engaged in a war, which however cold it may be, is a war of survival, a war in which every thought, every act of every one of us, every day, is determining whether government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall perish from the earth—and whether the people so governed shall perish from the earth, whether the giant cities their enterprise has built shall be traps of doom.

We shall never have peace again until we build peace.

We face but two alternatives—destruction or construction.

Do we want to die—or live?

If we want to live, then let us now make the great leap—make at once the spiritual progress we might have made in all these years of material progress—the progress we can and must make now.

We can now become men whose every thought and act is governed by reason and love.

Such men can form now, a Great Union of the Free, in which the explosion in the Pacific will become the symbol not of man's death but his dominion and triumph.

The hydrogen bomb is a miracle. We must, we can, control it with another, better miracle.

Increase in Armament Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 8, 1954

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Cornerstone of Defense," published in the Wednesday, June 2, issue of the Wall Street Journal.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CORNERSTONE OF DEFENSE

Recently the news stories out of Washington have contained a number of those hints and inspired speculations which are frequently harbingers of a new policy. This time the talk is about the need for a vastly increased armament program.

Pentagon officers have quietly passed the word that they are reexamining military money needs in view of increasing world tensions. Elsewhere officials let it be known that they are drafting blueprints for a complex system of rationing, allocations and price controls whose only political justification would be a huge inflationary jump in the budget. Commentators closely attuned to the mood of the more impetuous planners speak dolefully of how unprepared we are to face our enemies.

What this actually portends, we do not know. But it suggests there is strong pressure in Washington to overthrow the administration's budget plans, embark on another multibillion dollar spending spree and return to the philosophy of inflation-be-hanged.

And the argument for all of this, of course, is the magic word, defense. We must be strong—therefore, we must get more guns, ships, planes, and soldiers. Who but the penurious would count the cost of defense?

But it seems to us that Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey, who no more than anyone else would sacrifice security to economy, has offered a necessary reminder that strength for defense is not wholly a matter of guns. The worth of our defense, he said this week, must be measured not by its cost but by its wisdom.

"If our economy should be weak and faltering * * * we would not suffer alone. Our allies would also suffer; the strength of the whole free world would be threatened. To maintain this vital strength of our Nation we must have economical and efficient operations of our Government. * * * The cornerstone of our whole program is our firm belief that a sound economy is an absolute prerequisite to a strong defense over any extended period. It is the balance needed for maximum development of both that we must maintain."

The United States has had only a brief experience with inflation; and with the pains over, it is easy to forget them. Yet the memory of history is that great nations have fallen not alone from conquest but from the onslaught of unchecked inflation. Even now we have an expected deficit for next year of $3 billion. To add more billions to it with no more than a few weeks frightened thought certainly does not commend itself to wisdom.

Whenever we are threatened, the temptation to react by just spending more money for guns is an easy one. It helps assuage fear. But what is really to be feared as threatening our existence is not today but tomorrow; not Indochina but world war III.

And we are not protecting ourselves against tomorrow if what we do today crumbles the economic cornerstone upon which our defense must rest when that day comes.

Attlee's Journey to Red China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1954

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, it is the fashion in some quarters to feel that any criticism that is leveled at our country, especially from Great Britain, should be received with meekness and accepted almost gratefully. On the other hand we are supposed never to criticize, or if we do, it is taken up by the British press as an insult and properly resented.

I am very glad to see that Mr. David Lawrence has seen fit to point out the gratuitous slap in the face dealt to us by the high command of the British Labor Party in visiting Red China at this time.

Let us take note of the fact that Messrs. Attlee and his followers value the friendship of the U. S. S. R. and their satellites more than that of the United States.

Mr. Lawrence says:

ATTLEE'S JOURNEY TO RED CHINA—BLUNT ANNOUNCEMENT MADE OF TRIP BY LABOR PARTY LEADERS—BRITISH DON'T REALIZE HOW DEEPLY AMERICANS WILL RESENT IT

(By David Lawrence)

LONDON, June 7.—How readily the relations between Great Britain and the United States can be subjected to acute irritation when all the facts are not put in perspective is well illustrated by the blunt announcement that eight members of the British Labor Party in Parliament, headed by former Prime Minister Attlee, have decided to go for a visit to Red China this summer.

If some of the minority leaders in Congress had suddenly decided during the summer of 1940, after Britain had been bombed, to go on a visit to Adolf Hitler, it can easily be imagined what the reaction inside Great Britain would have been. Furthermore, if today some of the Democratic Party leaders had decided to visit the Kremlin without having consulted the United States Department of State in advance and if the announcement had said that the purpose was to discuss public policies with the Moscow government. The British press would properly have hailed it as an unwarranted interference with the prerogatives of the American Chief Executive. There would be even more criticism than there was a few months ago when Senator McCARTHY undertook to persuade Greek shipowners to carry out the spirit of the American embargo on trade with Red China.

But while the announcement of Mr. Attlee's proposed visit has been adversely commented upon in some of the British newspapers, and while the Foreign Office has denied that it was consulted or that it approved of the mission, the fact remains that the British people as a whole are not at all exercised about the episode and few persons really know how deeply the Attlee mission can wound the sensibilities of the American people.

Why, it may be asked, is there such indifference? The answer is that the sacrifices made by the American people—the 140,000 casualties in Korea—are not now and never have been impressed upon the British people by most of the newspapers here. There is a sort of "it's all in the day's work" attitude in Britain which seems to say, "well, we have had many killed in little wars for the last 100 years." This is but another way of brushing off the Korean War itself, which seems never to have been convincingly presented in Britain as a war for an ideal—the repelling of aggression 8,000 miles away from home primarily by the forces of a country with no colonies in the Far East and with no commercial interests to defend. There is no other logical explanation for the tendency in the British Parliament to forget so soon that Red China was declared an aggressor by formal resolution of the United Nations in February 1951 and that she has done nothing since to atone for her sins before the world. Americans cannot understand the British willingness to take the blood-covered hand of the Red China government.

But it would be a mistake to say that the British Government, and particularly its Foreign Office, is unaware of the American attitude. Had the Attlee mission come before the Cabinet for permission, which apparently it does not need to obtain, the answer would have been, "not at this time."

Also there are plenty of members of Parliament who say privately that the Attlee mission is a grave mistake and they hope America will understand it is not a policy of the British Government or of the majority in Parliament. For after all, Mr. Attlee and his associates—among them the fiery Aneurin Bevan—do not represent Britain, but only themselves.

Clement Attlee himself has a deep prejudice on the matter of American policy in the Far East. He thinks the United States should have abandoned Formosa to the Reds. Mr. Bevan believes America caused the aggression by the North Koreans and the Red Chinese. Both men are mature enough to know the comfort that the Communists will derive from their journey. Mr. Attlee defends his course in an interview published in the London News Chronicle:

"Our politicians are too ignorant of the China of today. We want to make an honest report about the changes taking place in this vast country whose civilization is thousands of years old. We want, if we can, to see how we can make friends in this great community and to gain the good will of its leaders. I cannot see how anything but good can come of such a visit."

There is something naive about a man of the experience of Mr. Attlee who believes that he will be able to get an honest look at anything behind the Iron Curtain or that the hand of friendship should be extended to a government which holds in prison many American citizens captured in the Korean War and never returned as the armistice agreement required.

Prime Minister Churchill, moreover, has just told the House of Commons that the Government of Red China has snubbed for 4 years a British offer to exchange ambassadors.

It is, therefore, the function of a group of minority members of the national legislature to conduct the foreign policy of the British Government and decide for themselves whether or not it is opportune to start their own conversations with Chou En-lai, the foreign minister of Red China, who cannot but feel he is dealing with the British Labor Party and possibly with the men who will head up the next British Government? The American people may confidently expect that all this will be clarified before long. For never in the heyday of his assertion of congressional powers in inquiring into international policy has even a certain Wisconsin Senator ever suggested that he or his associates go abroad to deal directly with a foreign government, especially when his own government, as well as the United Nations, are still in a technical state of war with that aggressor government.

The Contribution of the Townsend Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 29, 1954

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I should like to include my speech delivered at the 14th national convention of the Townsend Clubs held at Santa Cruz., Calif., June 7. The speech follows:

Mr. Chairman and friends, almost 21 years ago, a simple, straightforward letter appeared in the columns of the Long Beach Press-Telegram which began very sincerely: "If the human race is not to retrogress, two facts of essential importance must be recognized; the stimulus to individual effort must be maintained by the certainty of adequate monetary reward.

"If business is good at all times, we need not worry about the reward of individual effort; and if money is plentiful we need have no fears that business will become bad."

This straightforward statement and the elaboration of a plan which followed in the remainder of the letter were destined to catapult its author to a position of national prominence. This author was Dr. Francis E. Townsend, and the plan was the Townsend plan.

Very briefly, let us trace the events which led up to this momentous proposal.

The great wave of prosperity which flooded over the United States in the 1920's came to an abrupt halt in 1929, with such suddenness that a great portion of our people found themselves depressed under a huge weight of unfinished financial ventures. The big depression was on. The brakes had been applied to all business, and it had stopped. The economy was nearly paralyzed. Panic took the place of prosperity.

With this panic and depression came almost unbelievable suffering to large segments of our population. Particularly pathetic were the cases of those of our fellow citizens who had reached the latter years of their lives. As Dr. Townsend has said: "The most soul-wracking (medical cases) were those old men and women suddenly reduced to absolute begging penury from comparative affluence. They were lost—gamely and hopelessly groping for something to cling to, some tangible enemy against whom they might prove their courage by a valiant fight for themselves and for their dear ones. They had had their savings in the banks, or in the building and loan, or in stocks and bonds. They were gone. There was no one to fight. Even their natural anger was thwarted by being denied an outlet."

As a result of these conditions, this large group of people who had given the young and vigorous years of their lives to making the United States the greatest Nation on the face of the earth abruptly found themselves lost in a sea of hopelessness and despair. Then, like a light from out of the darkness, this kindly doctor kindled the spark with this letter which started a flood tide of hope which surged across our Nation. I feel sure that those famous words of the poem Invictus must have been ringing in the hearts of all these people: "Out of the darkness that covers me, black is the pit from pole to pole, I thank whatever gods may be for my unconquerable soul."

From very humble beginnings, the Townsend cause has become one of the most controversial issues in the political history of our Nation. Before the appearance of the Townsend Clubs on our national scene, old-age pensions in America were limited to Supreme Court justices and their widows, policemen, firemen, war veterans, and other such organized groups. Most people of retirement age were simply left "out in the cold."

There was no serious attempt on the part of the Federal Government to enact a social security law until the Townsend plan caught the imagination of the American people. In 1936, 3 years after the Townsend wave had begun swelling toward Washington, Congress acted to alleviate some of the uncertainty and insecurity of old age by passing the Social Security Act. I am one of the first persons to state publicly that it is my opinion that the Social Security Act was not and is not a perfect piece of legislation. It has been amended several times in recent years culminating in the passage just last week in the House of Representatives of new amendments which extend the coverages of social security to an additional 1 million persons in the United States by 1960.

It is of deep interest to note that there has been a decided trend toward the adoption of a universal old-age security program. Those of you who through the years have been fighting for a more adequate program should be encouraged by the trend in recent events which show that informed public opinion increasingly supports amendments to social security as to make its coverage universal and improve it in some other ways. Still it remains incomplete, inadequate, and in many respects inconsistent and unfair.

President Eisenhower should be complimented for his recommendations for the extension of social security and increase of benefits, but we must also keep in mind that the coverage still fails to take within its protective shield all those who are entitled to be covered, and the benefits, even increased by the recommendations of the President, are insufficient to maintain the elderly people of America in decency and health according to American standards.

I do not feel that it is necessary to discuss with you, our senior citizens, the various provisions of the Social Security Act and/or its relationship to the Townsend plan. In all probability, you are familiar with such considerations.

There is one final point, however, which I would like to make. We as Americans should never lose sight of the indisputable fact that the Townsend plan and its effect on the first passage of the Socieal Security Act in 1936 have proven to be an effective weapon in our never ending fight against the insidious disease of international communism. This has been accomplished by showing that our great system of free enterprise under law surpasses any other form of society and its genuine regard for the individual. Many times men have given up their freedom and liberty in the hope of obtaining security, but instead they reaped insecurity, chaos, and war. Thank God here in America we have a plan to meet the challenge of insecurity in old age with wisdom, compassion, and mutual respect for our fellow citizens without encroaching on human dignity or our fundamental rights and liberties guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States.

We have come a long way since those dark days of 1933, but we still have a long way to go. I feel sure, in my own heart, that with the continued assistance of Dr. Townsend and others of like mind, we will yet arrive at our cherished goal. I was one of the first signers of Dr. Townsend's petitions. I am proud of my long friendly association with this great American, Dr. Francis E. Townsend.

Social Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1954

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial from the Reading Times of June 3, 1954:

SOCIAL SECURITY

When the members of the high school classes that will get diplomas all over the country this month were 1 year old, their mothers and fathers were haunted by fear. Millions of men and women were unemployed in that great depression and though Federal programs like the Works Progress Administration and the Public Works Administration gave scant bread and butter to many jobless men, the men themselves no less than their Government in Washington recognized these devices as temporary and experimental. Thus, the fear remained—fear of what would happen when the Government stopped plowing money into made jobs, fear of poverty in old age.

The United States first permanent program to allay the fears not only arising from joblessness but also from the insecurities of old age was enacted into law in 1935. It was called the Social Security Act and provided for old-age and survivors insurance and the three public assistance functions now locally administered through the Department of Public Assistance. Later, old-age and survivors insurance was divorced from unemployment compensation and the assistance functions. Accordingly, the social security law now pertains only to old-age and survivors insurance.

The law was amended, to increase benefits, in 1950. On Tuesday the House of Representatives, acting on recommendations made by President Eisenhower early this year, approved further liberalization of the act and there was every reason to believe that the Senate also would approve.

The amendments will make 9,500,000 more persons eligible for social-security benefits, including farmers, farmworkers, State and local government workers, self-employed professionals (except physicians), additional domestic workers, and ministers.

The 6 million present beneficiaries will get bigger monthly benefit checks and the employees under the program, as well as employers, will pay more tax to support the program. In addition, retired pensioners will be allowed to earn more money on outside jobs without losing their benefits.

In the years immediately succeeding the passage of the law in 1935, there was much talk, among its opponents, of the possibility of repealing it. They argued that it destroyed initiative to assure a superannuated worker of a bare livelihood rather than have him save his money through his productive years—though they did not say how a man with a family and making, say, $2,500 a year, could save enough to keep body and soul together between the time he was 65 and the time he was gathered to his fathers.

Gradually, the talk of repeal subsided, but conservative forces in the Congress continued to criticize the law and the law's basic philosophy. These forces blocked liberalizing amendments session after session. Actually, the only liberalizing amendments of any importance that were ever made to the 1935 law came in 1950, through an unusual set of circumstances.

That the politicians have come to understand that it would be political suicide to do less than is now being done is plain from the vote in the House on Tuesday—355 to 8. Thus, the cry of "socialization" comes to naught in the end and conservative joins liberal in improving the act. Which is just as well, perhaps, because if the Social Security Act is "socialization," what is it if you don't help aging Americans help themselves?

Good Advice From Walter Lippmann

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1954

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I recommend to the House the thoughtful reading of an extremely interesting article which appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald of June 8, 1954. The administration should give serious consideration to the detailed advice particularly with reference to rescinding the cuts and reductions in our military power. It is apparent that the free world has lost its position in the balance of power and thus is faced with some very serious and dangerous problems.

The article follows:

TODAY AND TOMORROW

(By Walter Lippmann)

THE BEST OF A BAD JOB

The military position in northern Indochina is critical and within a week or so decisive battles could begin. The stakes may well be the capital city of Hanoi, the port of Haiphong, the Red River Delta with its thousands of villages, and even the security of the French Expeditionary Corps. The situation has become critical because on the one hand the Viet Minh have increased their forces; they have brought in large elements of the divisions from Dien Bien Phu. On the other hand, the French forces have grown weaker through defection and through the growing unreliability of their native levies.

The determining factor is not guns, tanks, trucks, and airplanes. In these, the French have, in large part from us, far more than Ho Chi Minh has received from the Chinese. The determining factor is that the French do not have popular support, and a civil war cannot be won without popular support. The Bao Dai government has made 2 draft calls and only 10 percent of the men called have joined the army. When they do join, they cannot be relied upon to fight a battle.

The position of the French is a cause for great anxiety. For they are an army fighting a losing war in an unfriendly country. The real military question may well be whether the beset and harried French expeditionary forces can be regrouped and drawn back to a security position from which an orderly evacuation can be arranged.

The answer to this question ought, at least, in theory, to be found at Geneva. It may not be easy to find it there. The answer could be found if a cease-fire could be arranged now, that is to say, before the military position, which is deteriorating, becomes still worse. But that, of course, is precisely the reason why we must expect the Communists to be very stiff—to ask in a negotiation for some considerable part, perhaps not all, of what they have a good prospect of winning by force of arms. There are reasons for thinking that the crucial point in a negotiation is the capital city of Hanoi—the administrative, cultural, and commercial center of northern Indochina, and an important commercial outlet of southern China.

The French still hold Hanoi. But the Viet Minh are deployed where it looks possible that they may be able to cut the connections of Hanoi with the port of Haiphong, and then to surround it as they did Dien Bien Phu. Will Ho Chi Minh be prepared to negotiate an armistice which leaves Hanoi in the hands of the French? And can the French agree to an armistice which surrenders Hanoi to Ho Chi Minh? This is a cruel issue. Are the French in a position where they cannot hold Hanoi without massive intervention by the United States and yet cannot give it up unless it is taken from them in battle?

In northern Indochina the French have a bear by the tail. Their problem, which is our problem and a world problem, is how to let go in the north without letting go also of Cochin-China, Cambodia, and Laos. On the strategical map, which does not include the political attitude of the people, there is no reason why a partition—say, at the 16th parallel—should mean the fall of southern Indochina. The connections between northern and southern Indochina are not overland but by sea and by air. Northern Indochina can be invaded by Chinese armies marching on foot. But the Chinese armies cannot invade southern Indochina, much less Malaya, except, as the Japanese did, by sea.

The weakness of southern Indochina is that the Bao Dai government has no genuine popular support and, therefore, once Ho Chi Minh is seated in the capital city of Hanoi, he will probably be generally regarded as the national leader of the whole of Vietnam. The French in Indochina are trying, as the saying goes in the East, to carve a wood that is rotten.

There is no use pretending that the prospect is good. The best that can be made of this very bad job is almost certainly to partition the country with a chance, not a good chance but not a hopeless one, of keeping southern Indochina more or less neutralized and outside the military orbit of revolutionary China.

Even at this late date, and after all the mistakes that have been made by everybody, this ought still to be an attainable objective. If it is attainable, it will be because there is a united front of the powers to back it up. But that as Mr. Dulles has found, is easier said than done, and the situation is now so critical that it is time to stop pulling the wool over our own eyes. It is time to realize that a principal, almost certainly the principal, obstacle to the united front is right here in Washington.

The obstacle is in the fact that the interventionists, led by Admiral Radford, have an unlimited objective—namely, the overthrow of the Red Chinese regime. For this objective Secretary Dulles can never hope to organize a united front in Europe and in Asia, and there is not even a united front among the Chiefs of Staff, and with Congress and with American public opinion. It is because of Admiral Radford's well-known views on the necessity of a general war with China that every military proposal he sponsors disunites the front that Secretary Dulles has been trying to organize.

The whole western position is undermined because Admiral Radford's objectives go so far beyond the stabilization and guaranteeing of some kind of armistice in Southeast Asia. The West is divided by his objectives and is unable to agree on any practical and effective measures in the emergency because the West cannot be united behind Admiral Radford. There is no use talking about a united front if he is to be the military leader of it. He cannot lead a coalition because he wants to go places where nobody in Europe, no great power in Asia and mighty few Americans are willing to go along with him.

What we need is to clarify and limit our objectives. They are now in the utmost confusion and inflation because there are a dozen semiofficial versions of them. Because of these confusing statements, we are giving the world the impression that we do not want to negotiate at all in the Far East, that our people do not want to fight, but that there is a faction within the administration and in Congress which is trying to entangle us in a general war. That is a disastrous impression for the prestige of a great power, and our prestige is—to put it mildly—not what it ought to be.

Talking less recklessly will not make the bad situation better. It will, however, help to keep it from becoming less bad than it will become if the tall talk goes on. The Western World is faced with the problem of how to redress the balance of power, which though far from upset, is not in the balance that it was, because the war in Indochina is being lost.

We should act to redress the balance and, in my view, the wisest way to do that is to raise the level of our own military power—to rescind the cuts and the reductions and to increase the expenditures, especially for research and the development of new weapons. An increase of 10 percent in the military appropriations will have a more salutary effect on the balance of power and on the prestige of this country than a whole collection of speeches and press conferences by admirals, Senators, and administration spokesmen.

That surely is a wiser and more effective way to redressing the balance than to commit our forces in a region where no man—not Admiral Radford or anyone else—can limit the commitment once it is made. As a matter of fact, the commitment of American forces on the mainland in that part of the world would unbalance further the present balance of power. For the United States would be committed for a serious part of its total forces and the Soviet Union would still be entirely uncommitted. That would not be a healthy position in Europe, in the Middle East, or in Japan.

The Hells Canyon Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GRACIE PFOST

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1954

Mrs. PFOST. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following letter from Mr. G. H. R. Taylor, a member of the board of directors of the National Hells Canyon Association, and an article from the Idaho Farm Journal of April 29, 1954:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *May 24, 1954.*

Hon. GRACIE PFOST,
Member of Congress,
Old House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MRS. PFOST: As you know, much of the argument, pro and con, about the proposed Federal high dam at Hells Canyon versus the proposed three dams of the Idaho Power Co., has in southern Idaho been based upon the effects of the high dam upon present and future water rights above Hells Canyon site.

Farmers and the general public along the Snake River have been subject to a colossal, misleading propaganda effort by the Idaho Power Co. to discredit the proposed Hells Canyon project.

The company has been telling the public again and again that the water rights of irrigators, present and future, would be endangered if the Federal Government were to construct the high dam, that the cost of construction would be prohibitive, and that there would not be enough water to fill Hells Canyon reservoir in dry years by virtue of future upstream depletion of Snake River for irrigation.

Testimony in the hearings by four eminent hydrologists including Lynn Crandall, upper Snake River watermaster, hace effectively laid the old ghost of not enough water for both Hells Canyon and future upstream irrigation. But the Idaho Power Co.'s public relations mill still grinds out the same shopworn contentions, and in addition continues to tell the public that it is the greatest protector of the farmers' headgates since Rameses I of Egypt. It is with this latter point that I should like to deal in this letter.

In one of its series of advertisements promoting its case (some $44,000 was spent on advertising by Idaho Power for promotion of its proposal in 1953 was reported to the Oregon Public Utilities Commission), the company declared: "Idaho Power Co.'s plan fully protects irrigation rights, present and future." The advertisement, which has been carried in newspapers all over Idaho and eastern Oregon cited a proviso protecting irrigation rights written into the water permit filings in the office of the Idaho State reclamation engineer.

T. E. Roach, president of Idaho Power Co., on July 8, 1953, before the Federal Power Commission Examiner William J. Costello in the hearing on application of the company for license to build three small dams in Hells Canyon, said: "Currently, all of our State permits in the State of Idaho carry in them specific provision which preserves for irrigation not only now, but for all times in the future, a prior claim on the water, with the claim for hydroelectric energy being second to that of the irrigator or farmer."

A letter written to Gov. Len. C. Jordan by A. C. Inman, vice president and secretary of the Idaho Power Co., dated March 14, 1952, reads: "Idaho Power Co. fully recognizes the primary importance in southern Idaho of the use of water for reclamation and irrigation purposes, and over more than 35 years of its experience has cooperated fully with water users of the Snake River Valley."

The clause which the company declares appears in all water permit applications "for the Hells Canyon area projects" was part of the letter referred to written by Mr. Inman and just cited. Its date was interestingly coincidental with the hearings held by the House Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation on the Hells Canyon bill (H. R. 5743) about a week later.

Governor Jordan, employing the customary alacrity with which he follows the suggestions of the power company, sent a letter dated March 23, 1952, to Mark Kulp, State reclamation engineer, which stated:

"I am attaching hereto a letter from Idaho Power Co. which should become a part of the Oxbrow license permit. This letter is not only a clear exposition of the Idaho Power Co.'s attitude toward upriver consumptive use of water for irrigation, but it contains an amendatory statement to the Oxbow permit."

It is to be noted that this waiver, therefore, applies only to the Oxbow permit.

It is also to be observed that Governor Jordan did not take the normal precaution to protect the interests of upstream irrigators by seeking and obtaining an opinion from his attorney general that this waiver was legally binding, that it conformed with State law, and that it actually would be a safeguard against future conflict between the interest of Idaho Power and the interests of reclamation in the use of Snake River waters.

Let us examine the testimony under oath by President Roach in the Federal Power Commission hearings, that "all of our State permits in the State of Idaho" carry provisions which preserve the rights of irrigators for all time. This simply is not true. Permit No. 20,223 covering the Bliss power installation of the company carries no such waiver. Permit No. 19,864 for the Low Malad power project and generating plant carries no such waiver.

But the most interesting feature is the company's position in the C. J. Strike matter, permit No. 21,716.

Application to the FPC for preliminary permit to investigate Strike site was made by the company July 17, 1950. License was issued by the Commission on February 6, 1951, after negotiations were abruptly halted on January 11, 1951, over a proposal by the Department of the Interior directed to the Federal Power Commission and dated December 18, 1950.

In this letter just referred to, the Secretary proposed that the company's license be made subordinate to certain future upstream irrigation developments. The company commented as follows in its response to the Commission:

"We cannot agree with the arguments contained in the Secretary's letter of December 18, and respectfully urge that such stipulations do not come within the bounds contemplated or permitted either under the Federal Power Act or the Constitution of the United States. Essentially, the Department's proposal is one which would in effect, if not in intent, deprive the licensee of its property by taking such property from the given public use for which it was constructed, as contemplated and authorized under the Federal Power Act, for another public use."

The company was actually telling the FPC that, contrary to the provisions of the Federal Power Act which do not give title to licensee on any licensed project and holds the power of recapture to the Federal Government after the 50 years license period has elapsed, that C. J. Strike was company property in fee simple.

The company was also informing the FPC that if it allowed a certain stipulation establishing priority of irrigation over power on Snake River (which State water law already does), that FPC might be losing its jurisdiction.

But the FPC did not accede to the company's suggestion. The license order provided that "* * * should the project works be damaged or the power output of the project reduced by subsequent upstream diversion of the waters of Snake River by the United States * * * then the United States shall have the option, in full settlement of any and all claims by the licensee, of paying such damages as the licensee shall then be entitled to receive as a matter of law, or of acquiring the licensee's project in the manner provided by the act."

But the effect of such condemnation when conflict arises between uses of water on Snake River simply adds to the financial burden of irrigators paying off project costs.

Consult any farmer on the Minidoka project who has been there several years. When the Bureau of Reclamation built American Falls Reservoir, it was necessary to condemn a power filing of Idaho Power Co. at its American Falls plant. The condemnation costs amounted to $960,000, which according to reclamation law was included as an additional cost of the Minidoka project, and $750,000 of which the farmers are still repaying to the Federal Treasury. In addition, the company received valuable storage space for many thousands of acre-feet in American Falls Reservoir, and by virtue of firm-up in streamflow provided by the reservoir, has produced without any financial reimbursement to the Government thousands of additional kilowatt-hours of electric energy every year for years for all its downstream plants.

Certainly under law the company is entitled to reimbursement for any damages incurred by its installations by diversion of water upstream for irrigation, but its consistency in posing as a selfless friend of the farmer when such conflicts arise is misleading and dishonest. Like any other monopoly that has property for sale under any circumstances, it will take all the traffic will bear, regardless of its effect upon the community. The Idaho Power Co.'s pious words smell of hypocrisy.

The waiver written into some of its water filings, but not all, carries little meaning. The waiver merely says that under State law power users of Idaho waters are secondary in priority to irrigation uses. Therefore, if the Government or a water-users association condemn a portion of the company's rights on a power project, the company would go to the courts to obtain what it regards as just compensation. It is not giving anything away. The sole purpose of the waiver is propaganda.

But even on the far fetched assumption that the waiver had any legal relevance, or a voluntary abdication of company power rights, it is easy to see that the company is not taking a chance at its key plant at Bliss where no such waiver exists. Bliss filing of 12,000 cubic feet per second controls the river from King Hill gaging station to Hells Canyon. This is the point at which the Snake regains its full flow from underground sources after it has been almost depleted at Milner Dam.

We cannot imagine any irrigation project above Bliss affecting the return flow of the river there which could escape condemnation charges in acquiring irrigation rights. And should any new irrigation project below Bliss reduce the power output of the company's Strike or Swan Falls projects, the Federal Government or water users association would be forced to condemn all, or part of the company's filings at those two plants. These additional costs, as adjudicated, would then be passed on to the settlers on the new tract, just as took place on the Minidoka project.

It is time for the irrigators and other citizens interested in expansion of reclamation along Snake River to penetrate behind the smoke screen of Idaho Power propaganda and weigh it against Idaho Power's real position on this matter, as well as its historical record. Certainly neither can give the public any confidence that the general public interest will be regarded as superior to the Idaho Power Co.'s corporate interest. To relinquish any further sites on the river to this corporation, is to place future irrigation which is more and more dependent upon aid from power revenues from multiple-purpose projects, either on or off the immediate project, into great danger, and can very well bring it to a complete halt in southern Idaho.

Sincerely yours,
G. H. R. TAYLOR,
Board of Directors,
National Hells Canyon Association.

[From the Idaho Farm Journal of April 29, 1954]

Hells Canyon Water Rights Scare Is Phony Propaganda

Analysis of expert testimony at the Federal Power Commission hearings on Hells Canyon area power development has strengthened the conclusions of previous studies that the high storage dam is no threat to either present or future water rights in southern Idaho.

Testimony of three Government engineers and one independent hydrologist, recognized as leading authorities in their field, showed that operation of the Hells Canyon power plant would not conflict with Idaho's future irrigation development. Essence of the testimony was that there is plenty of water in the Snake basin for both future irrigation and for Hells Canyon Dam.

Lynn Crandall, Snake River water master, who submitted an engineering report to the Commission and testified in great detail on possible future upstream depletion of Snake River waters, summarized the engineering facts on water rights when he told the Idaho Farm Bureau Institute, a few days after the hearing:

LYNN CRANDALL GIVES FACTS

"The average depletion from future irrigation during the 50-year period (which power revenues will repay the Federal Government for the dam) will be about 13 percent of the average annual runoff, so this is not a controlling matter in the Hells Canyon development and its effect will be less than the cyclic changes in runoff between wet and dry years."

He added that "it is possible that the best overall long-time solution would have been to let the Government build its high dam under an arrangement whereby the Idaho Power Co. would get a firm long-time contract to purchase at wholesale rates say 60 percent of the output at the site."

ELEVEN MILLION ONE HUNDRED FIFTY THOUSAND ACRE-FEET AFTER 50 YEARS

Crandall told the FPC hearing examiner that even after all possible irrigation development in the Snake River plain during the next 50 years, annual flow of the river into Hells Canyon would average approximately 11,150,000 acre-feet. The average annual runoff of the river at Hells Canyon from 1919 to 1952 was 12,800,000 acre-feet.

In his report, Crandall explained that the effect of future irrigation, construction of additional reservoirs and ground-water pumping will be to level out the streamflow.

"As a result the streamflow at Hells Canyon will generally be depleted more than the average in wet years and less than the average in dry years," Crandall reported.

He pointed out that Idaho Power Co. owns storage rights requiring the discharge of about 155,000 acre-feet annually over Milner Dam for downstream use by the power company. Except for the company's water rights, he said, it was quite likely that future years will see the flow of the upper Snake controlled so as to practically eliminate spills past Milner Dam.

Crandall, who has been studying Snake River flow characteristics since 1910, has occupied the position of district engineer for the United States Geological Survey and Snake River watermaster since 1930.

NO DEPLETION AFTER 40 YEARS

Milton Sachs, formerly with the United States Bureau of Reclamation in Boise and now chief hydrologist with Bonneville Power Administration, gave the FPC examiner 19 detailed engineering exhibits dealing with Snake River runoff, area rainfall, and effects of irrigation on streamflow.

Sachs told the examiner that there was no evidence that 40 years of irrigation in southern Idaho had depleted the Snake River flow. One of his exhibits showed that for the 10-year period, 1912–21, the average runoff at Weiser per inch of precipitation was 976,000 acre-feet. In the last 10 years, 1943–52, the average was 974,000 acre-feet per inch of precipitation.

"We can only forecast the future to the extent of what we know and understand of the past," Sachs said. "Therefore, it occurs to me that it is very logical that since during the past 40 years we had 1,800,000 acre-feet of irrigation development upstream from Hells Canyon and couldn't find any significant depletion to affect the runoff at Weiser, therefore, with a similar development for the next 40 or 50 years, depletion from this additional acreage would also be as insignificant as far as the total streamflow at Oxbow is concerned."

SACHS' REPORT SUMMARIZED

He summarized his conclusions on the relationship of future irrigation to the Hells Canyon project as follows:

"(a) Future irrigation developments, whether 734,000 or 1,196,000 acres, will have very little effect on water resources for the generation of power in the Hells Canyon reach of the Snake during the 50-year payout period:

"(b) In the event of recurrence of weather which resulted in the low flows of 1928–37, the runoff at Oxbow will closely approximate the streamflow observed and recorded during that period;

"(c) A dependable water supply will exist at Oxbow, adequate for the development of power resources in the Hells Canyon reach of the Snake River."

Sachs also presented at the hearing details of studies on the use of cloud seeding to increase the water supply of the Snake River plain.

"Evidence is accumulating that such departures from normal occur as a result of cloud seeding that it cannot be overlooked in any appraisal of future water resources," Sachs said. He said that a committee of engineers with Dr. Schaefer, General Electric's research laboratory scientist, as consultant studied the effects of a cloud-seeding program in the Pend Oreille River, Flathead, and Clarkfork River Basins and concluded results of the tests warranted further studies.

"Any increase in runoff resulting from cloud-seeding operations in the Snake Basin would tend to improve the low-water flows," Sachs testified.

MORE IRRIGATION, MORE WATER DOWNSTREAM

Additional support for the theory that more irrigation in Idaho will increase the water supply available for power production during dry years was supplied in the testimony of Raymond A. Hill, a civil engineer in private practice as a consultant. Hill is a member of the engineering firm of Leeds, Hill & Jewett, of Pasadena, Calif., specializing in water-supply surveys.

"The expansion of irrigation uses above King Hill by storage and diversion of surface waters will tend to increase the supply of water available for the generation of power at the plants further west during years of deficient runoff," Hill testified. "The depletion which will be caused by increased consumptive use of water will be limited to those years in which there is an excess beyond the quantity reasonably usable for power generation."

In testimony that followed, J. R. Riter, Chief of the Hydrology Branch, Project Planning Division, United States Bureau of Reclamation, said he agreed generally with Hill's conclusion that "irrigation development east of King Hill would have little or no depletionary effect on Snake River streamflows in dry years."

ENOUGH TO FILL HELLS CANYON TWICE

Riter raised the possiblity of discharging upper Snake flood waters into southern Idaho laval beds as a means of creating underground reservoirs. He emphasized that if any of the things he discussed take place—further irrigation or recharge of the underground reservoirs or all in combination—the net effect would be "to make the streamflow below King Hill more constant and stable."

In summary, the testimony of Crandall, Hill, and Riter showed that the addition of 630,000 acres of new irrigated land and added supplemental water for 150,000 acres of presently irrigated land will have no effect upon the ability of the reservoir at Hells Canyon to fill even during the lowest period of recorded streamflow.

The hearings confirmed the basic engineering fact that even with all possible upstream irrigation use and even during the driest year on record, enough water will pass through Hells Canyon to fill its reservoir nearly twice.

Memorial Day, 1954

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EVA BOWRING

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 8, 1954

Mrs. BOWRING. Mr. President, I I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Memorial Day, 1954," which appeared in the Omaha World-Herald, Sunday May 30.

The editorial represents the thinking of a very substantial number of American people. In fact, it might be said all good Americans will share the hope expressed in this editorial that the young men of America may not again be required to sacrifice their lives in futile battle in the far corners of the earth.

As to the editorial opinion that we are seeking ideals that cannot be attained, there will undoubtedly be differences of opinion. I, for one, reserve the right to differ on the latter point, depending upon the course which is taken by succeeding world developments.

The editorial is provocative and for that reason I think it should be brought to the attention and consideration of Members of the Senate.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEMORIAL DAY, 1954

Today America will bow its head in gratitude for the sacrifices and bravery of those who have gone this way before.

Sermons will be given. Memorial services will be held. Prayers will be offered. Perhaps some speaker will read the majestic lines carved on the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier:

"Here rests in honored glory an American soldier known but to God." "In honored glory." A beautiful phrase.

Those whose loved ones have joined the army of eternity may feel sure in their hearts that it is a true one.

But the young men who left their bodies at Chateau Thierry, and Iwo, and Seoul—what would they think if they could hear the words of homage?

Alfred Noyes, the British laureate, wrote a sardonic poem at the end of World War I, as he watched the nations spiral toward World War II. He called it a Victory Dance.

> "God, how those dead men grin by the wall,
> Watching the fun of the Victory Ball."

What would those shadows think now, after watching World War II fade into Korea, and Korea into Indochina?

But enough of such sorrowful thoughts. As Abraham Lincoln said, "It is for us, the living."

For us to accept humbly the sacrifices that have been made for us; for us to try to learn the lessons that the past has taught and build a nobler society on the ashes of those who now dwell in honored glory.

And what lesson does the past teach? What truths can we moderns learn from it that may help to end the dreadful sequence of war, war, war?

For a fragment of an answer—only a fragment, but one not without significance—we turn to another writing from the past.

More than a century ago the essayist, Sydney Smith, wrote to Lady Grey, the wife of the British Prime Minister:

"For God's sake, do not drag me into another war. I am worn down and worn out with crusading and defending Europe, and protecting mankind. I must think a little of myself. I am sorry for the Spaniards—I am sorry for the Greeks—I deplore the fate of the Jews; the people of the Sandwich Islands are groaning under the most detestable tyranny; Baghdad is oppressed; I do not like the present state of the Delta; Tibet is not comfortable. Am I to fight all these people? The world is bursting with sin and sorrow. Am I to be champion of the Decalogue, and to be eternally raising fleets and armies to make all men good and happy? We have just done saving Europe, and I am afraid that the consequence will be that we shall cut each other's throats. No war, dear Lady Grey. No eloquence, but apathy, selfishness, common sense, arithmetic. I beseech you, secure Lord Grey's swords and pistols, as the housekeeper did Don Quixote's armor."

"The more things change, the more they remain the same."

The sword and pistol of Lord Grey's time have given way to the A- and H-bombs.

Yet in the midst of change, one peril remains immutable: the driving urge in the hearts of good people to remake others in their own image.

Their ways are not our ways, their god is not our God, their features have a strange look to our eyes, therefore sound the tocsin. Let the bugles blow. Force the unbelievers to conform, or drive them from the face of the earth.

That is not, of course, the only cause of war. But it is a major one. Those who try to trace the origins of the modern conflicts which so densely have filled America's military cemeteries with white crosses, will find tangled in the roots the same intolerance, the same insatible desire to reform, that Sydney Smith noted in 19th century England.

America is a grand country. Its spiritual climate is the kindliest, the most benign to the individual, ever known on earth.

It should be the devout prayer of all on this Memorial Day that today's young men be allowed to live in their own land, and to glory in its freedoms, and that they not be sent abroad, as so many of their fathers and brothers were, to end their days in miserable foxholes, while waging a crusade for ideals that cannot be attained.

The Situation in Indochina

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 8, 1954

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, in order that the people of the Nation may know the facts regarding the situation in Indochina, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD excerpts from the Kiplinger letter of June 5. In it Mr. Kiplinger points out how close we are to war in the jungles of Indochina. Today the press reports indicate that almost all the natives are lined up with, or at least are sympathetic to, the rebel forces in opposing the hated French forces. Are we about to enter a war against the natives, and on the side of their enemy?

There being no objection, the excerpts from the letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Inquiries are pouring in to Washington on the war in Indochina, and the possibility of our getting directly involved in shooting there. Few weeks ago there was an attitude of skepticism or outright disbelief. This still persists, but in lesser degree, and is being replaced by fear that the United States is secretly taking on commitments which may lead to war.

That is true. We are making commitments more or less secretly. They do involve the risk of war, and the only question is how much risk. On this we can only say again what we have said to you in past weeks, that the outcome is as if balanced on a knife edge, could go either way. There is still hope, but the developments this week point more to a war than to peaceful adjustment, and more to the chance of United States intervention.

Dulles says he expects no war, but he's got to talk that way, for it's his job to make peace, and war is regarded as a last resort, after diplomacy has failed. Dulles thinks that by forming an alliance, and by presenting the Reds with a show of force, we can persudae them to desist from war. But even with this he thinks the risks are great. He doesn't say "50-50," but some of his friends say that's not far wrong as an indication of what he privately thinks. Some of those same friends, men of high rank, think that on the chances of war he is underestimating.

There's a sort of conspiracy of silence among the top officials. They don't speak out freely, lest they interfere with delicate diplomacy. Yet in their talks with key Members of Congress (talks still going on), they explain with some degree of candor, and then enjoin further secrecy. This is why Members of Congress cannot speak out about the prospects, even though they admit they are "much disturbed" by a "grave situation."

Consequence is that the public is not informed and is not aware. We've seen many such conspiracies of silence here in the past 30 years, but this seems to us to be one of the worst. Public should be forewarned.

As things stand now, the President will go to Congress soon, perhaps in 4 weeks, perhaps in 6 weeks, and state the facts as they are. He may ask approval of a treaty of alliance against Reds in southeast Asia, if the treaty is ready by that time. Or if the treaty is not quite ready, he will explain and ask for powers of some sort—powers to "implement." Precise nature of what he will ask has not been determined as of now. Neither has the time, but the quiet talk is of "not later than mid-July."

Continued Support for Vocational Education Urged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1954

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, I am placing in the RECORD two editorials relating to the vocational agriculture program operated under the Smith-Hughes and George-Barden Acts. These articles are especially appropriate, since the House will consider appropriations this week for this program. The editorial entitled "For What It's Worth," appeared in the magazine Better Farming Methods, April 1954, and the editorial entitled "In Summing Up," appeared in the County Agent and Vo-Ag Teacher Magazine, May 1954:

[From Better Farming Methods of April 1954]

FOR WHAT IT'S WORTH

(By Herbert L. Schaller, Editor)

A THREAT TO PUBLIC SCHOOLS

It is "money time" again as far as agricultural leaders are concerned. The budget has been given to Congress, and the period of adjustment is now at hand.

Once again vocational education as a while is down for a cut in funds. On the other side of the educational fence, extension has been recommended for a big increase.

With research and education receiving such a play in the minds of the people today, it is not conceivable that vocational education should receive a cut in funds in the face of extensive increases for education elsewhere.

The action as proposed in the current Federal budget is to increase funds for an educational program outside our public school system, while decreasing funds for education within our public schools.

Many agricultural leaders are frank to state that if this cut is sustained in the face of increased emphasis on education throughout government, then it is only a matter of time until all Federal aid to agricultural education is ended.

I am in no way intimating that the Extension Service is not entitled to or should not get an increase in funds. Its service has been of tremendous value. It no doubt can do much more with increased financial support.

Extension and vocational agriculture each has a place in the field of educating farm people. Each has some jobs they can do better than the other, but neither can do the job alone.

This serves to point up a condition that could become acutely serious. It is a problem that is of concern to all agricultural leaders.

During the 82d Congress, Charles A. Quattlebaum, education research analyst, made a comprehensive report on Federal education activities for the Committee on Education and Labor.

In this report he lists approximately 275 separate Federal educational programs under 200 divisions of the Federal Government. Most of them are entirely outside the public school system as we know it.

Included in the report, also, are many new Federal educational activities being proposed by many private, industrial, professional, and worker organizations.

For instance, the American Federation of Labor has recommended for years the creation of a labor extension service. It has wanted Federal funds to help eradicate adult illiteracy. It has wanted funds to promote the health and welfare of every child in the United States.

This is not to deny the right of labor to have its extension service. But it does help to point up the fact that more and more demands are being made on the Federal Government for aid to education, much of it outside the public school system.

It is unlikely that an unsubsidized program of agricultural education can exist in the schools in competition with a heavily subsidized program outside the schools. The net effect would be to transfer agricultural education out of the public school system.

What may happen here in agriculture is only the beginning of what could happen to other subjects in public school education.

The problem is this. There is a danger to our entire system of public school education when the Federal Government emphasizes and increases aid to out-of-school programs while deemphasizing the same type of program carried on in our public schools.

Vocational education should not be considered for a cut when out-of-school educational agencies are getting a large increase. Under these circumstances, it has a right to expect and to receive the full amount of funds allotted it by Congress under the George-Barden Act.

The entire field of agriculture has a stake in this problem. The answer is not withdrawal of all Federal funds for vocational education.

The answer is not more and more Federal aid for vocational education, vocational agriculture, or for general public school education.

The answer is not increased emphasis on out-of-school education and less on public school programs.

The answer lies in the intelligent promotion of both programs together, so that each may complement the other to obtain the maximum benefits for the entire field of agriculture.

The strongest educational program, regardless of its origin, will be the one that continues to receive increasing support from its local and State governments.

In conclusion, let me leave this one question with you. Do we want our schools to become minor agencies of education as the Federal Government builds up competitors to them in nearly every useful kind of education?

There is no room for jealousy or envy between agricultural groups on this question. It is a problem that concerns every leader—vocational, agriculture, and extension.

[From County Agent and Vo-Ag Teacher of May 1954]

IN SUMMING UP

DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: These are days when the vocational agriculture instructor finds himself at the crossroads again. A year ago he weathered the storm. But the issue of whether funds should be made available for vocational education in 1955 is up again.

At this time, two big questions come into everyone's mind. How can the teacher do an effective job of teaching with this constant threat hanging over him? With his valuable college education, why does he stay on in vocational agriculture?

He always has a stock answer. He'd assure you that it isn't blind faith in a deep-seated principle that keeps him coming back—he had always wanted to help raise farming standards, vocational agriculture has a tremendous future, and he likes kids.

The real issues in this big debate, he insists, are human lives, jobs, prosperous farms, and, above all, national security. It's not the shaving of a million dollars from an overall national budget that runs into the billions.

He has all the facts stored in his mind. He knows that such a cut, though just a drop in the bucket as far as the overall budget is concerned, would virtually destroy the Future Farmers of America. He knows that it would wipe out the vocational agriculture program in at least 25 percent of the communities of the Nation. He knows that the hardest hit States would be the poorer ones—where, even with the most courageous efforts in recent years, State and local budgets still lack the necessary capital to tackle the job alone.

The instructor is certain that Mr. Taxpayer does not wish to see small communities experience economical and social setbacks for the sake of saving only about 8⅓ cents a month. It is in these communities that the true greatness of vocational agriculture is reflected. It is here that vocational agriculture departments stand as the centers of all rural activity. The teacher has been known to fill in for the local minister. He's pitched in and driven school buses during a crisis, and performed many other tasks.

The term "teacher" doesn't exactly fit the man. He's more than that. His interests in a boy don't fade at 4 o'clock. That's when his work really begins, with supervised farming projects, young farmer meetings, adult classes, FFA advisory work, and a host of other activities. Let's call him a big brother to these kids. He's always around.

Many vo-ag teachers will agree that education is the responsibility of the States and local communities. But, they remind us, while other educational systems have been with us for centuries, vocational education did not come into existence until as late as 1918. It must be given a chance to grow.

He's thankful for the Federal dollar that got the program rolling—and which has been responsible for the tremendous growth in responsibility from State and local governments, especially in recent years. But Federal funds, he pleads, should not be cut off just when the other two sources of support are really coming into their own. He cites the battle slogan of one of vocational education's best supporters—Congressman BARDEN, of North Carolina:

"It hurts a dog's tail just as much to cut off 1 inch as it does to cut off 8 inches."

Two of the Nation's top vocational agriculture leaders—Mr. A. D. Anderson, supervisor of agricultural education in South Carolina, and Mr. C. B. Davenport, a vo-ag teacher at Mount Holly, N. J., for more than 30 years—are well qualified to discuss this subject. Their articles are enclosed with this letter.

To all of us who work with vocational agriculture, the issue is national security—

not dollars. To us, it's ironical that most charity drives net far more money than vocational education does. This vital work is not charity. The cost is infinitesimal compared to the benefits realized. Our authors speak from experience. Their articles demand careful consideration before any action is taken on this issue. We are confident you will not substitute expediency for national honor.

Respectfully yours,
Gordon T. Berg,
Editor.

Are Inconsistencies Plaguing the Administration's Promises for Greater Inter-American Economic Cooperation?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM C. LANTAFF

OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 8, 1954

Mr. LANTAFF. Mr. Speaker, with Communist infiltration of Latin America posing a serious threat to the Western Hemisphere it is imperative that the administration take prompt and positive action to obtain greater inter-American economic cooperation. The fact that the United States has not as yet formulated any consistent economic policy with regard to the nations of Latin America is of vital concern to the Western Hemisphere. I should like to insert in the Record an extremely timely editorial on this subject which appeared in the Spanish-American newspaper, the Americas Daily, of Miami, Fla., on June 2, 1954:

DULLES VERSUS HUMPHREY IN THE BATTLE FOR FORMULATION OF A LATIN AMERICAN POLICY

Concern and mistrust are the keynotes of reaction in Latin America to the fact that the United States has still not formulated any consistent economic policy with regard to those nations.

Secretary of State John Foster Dulles told delegates from the Latin nations at the recent Caracas conference that the United States would undertake to implement consistent plans for economic collaboration with the Latin American Republics, which along with the United States, make up the Organization of American States.

According to a report published by the authoritative New York Times which has not been denied, on January 28 this year the National Advisory Council in an executive session imposed restrictions on the operations of the Export-Import Bank, an institution which could go far to promote economic development of the hemisphere's lesser developed nations if it had a well thought-out-loan policy toward the Latin American republics.

The National Advisory Council is headed by Secretary of the Treasury George Humphrey. By their action Mr. Humphrey's counseling agency showed that there are some internal inconsistencies plaguing the Eisenhower administration, for this action is certainly not in harmony with the solemn promises for greater inter-American economic cooperation pledged by Mr. Dulles at Caracas.

It is noteworthy that American businessmen support the stand of the Latin American countries in the sense that bank lending policies should be liberalized and not curtailed. They feel the way they do because they are fully cognizant that the bank's operations have always come out on the earning side. By December 31, of last year the bank showed earnings of $324,100,000 after interest due the Government had been discounted. Furthermore, American businessmen realize that terms of bank loans require imports of American-manufactured materials for carrying out projects made possible by a bank credit. United States merchants stand to benefit as a result every time a loan is made.

Policy makers in the United States would do well to coordinate their efforts in order to avoid exposing themselves to hemispheric opinion as being at cross purposes with one another as far as inter-American economic programs are concerned. The hemispheric economic conference to take place at Rio de Janeiro in November is not far off, and the United States must be prepared to offer practical proposals at the inter-American conclave for preservation of hemispheric solidarity.

The operations of the Export-Import Bank are one of the mediums through which the United States can cooperate with its other American sister republics in an economic sense. These activities of the bank aren't charity; they're conducted in a businesslike manner and the case history of Latin American nations with obligations toward the bank is unspotted by sorry failures.

Reducing Airmail Subsidies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE

OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, June 8, 1954

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record my exchange of correspondence with the Postmaster General concerning the amount of excess earnings of airmail contractors which could be applied under the offset principle of the Supreme Court decisions of February 1, 1954, in Summerfield against Civil Aeronautics Board, to reduce airline subsidy claims.

I note that in his letter of June 5 to me, Postmaster General Summerfield upholds the statement of Congressman Gary and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Kennedy] to the effect that the protests under the offset principle do total exactly $35,034,000.

Furthermore, Mr. President, the Postmaster General notes in his letter that subsequent to the period referred to in the statements of Congressman Gary the Senator from Massachusetts additional exhibits and other legal documents have come forward pointing to an additional $15,764,000 which could be used to reduce airline subsidy claims.

That brings the total of disputed amounts to $50,798,000, and I might note for the record, Mr. President, that these figures more than substantiate the suggestion of the distinguished junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Kennedy] that the airmail subsidy appropriations requested by the Civil Aeronautics Board could well be reduced by $50 million.

Mr. President, the letters which I desire to have printed in the Record are a copy of the letter of May 24, 1954, from me to Postmaster General Summerfield, and the letter of June 5, 1954, from Postmaster General Summerfield to me, together with a tabulation attached to the letter.

There being no objection, the letters and tabulation were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

United States Senate,
Committee on Appropriations,
May 24, 1954.

The Honorable Arthur H. Summerfield,
Postmaster General of the United States, Washington, D. C.

Dear General Summerfield: On page 2408 of the Congressional Record of March 3, 1954, appears a statement by Congressman Gary, who, as you know, occupies the same position in the House that I do in the Senate, namely, ranking minority member of the Treasury-Post Office Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee.

At our hearings on the Civil Aeronautics Board's request for appropriation for airmail subsidies Congressman Gary's statement has been called into question by representatives of the Air Transport Association and the Civil Aeronautics Board. I would appreciate knowing from you whether the statement by Congressman Gary is correct, especially his itemization of various briefs, exceptions, and other legal documents filed by you totaling approximately $35,034,000.

If the Congressman's statement is not correct, could you furnish me with the total figure of excess earnings of the airlines which, in the opinion expressed in your legal documents in the cases mentioned by the Congressman, could be applied under the offset principle of the Supreme Court to reduce airline subsidy claims.

It would also be appreciated if you could give us an idea concerning excess earnings to which the offset principle might be applicable to subsidy claims in periods subsequent to those covered in the documents mentioned by Congressman Gary.

Finally, it would be greatly appreciated if you could furnish me with a list of the airmail payments claimed by carriers, or proposed by CAB or its examiners, in the cases referred to by the Congressman, to which you have taken exception.

It would be appreciated if your reply could be received prior to consideration of the appropriation bill, H. R. 8067, in the markup session of our subcommittee.

With best personal wishes, I remain,
Sincerely yours,
H. M. Kilgore.

Office of the Postmaster General,
Washington, D. C., June 5, 1954.

Hon. Harley M. Kilgore,
United States Senate.

Dear Senator Kilgore: My staff informs me that the figure of $35,034,000 does represent the totalization of claims previously asserted by the Department in those various proceedings before the Civil Aeronautics Board referred to in your letter of inquiry of May 24, 1954.

I am also informed that additional claims as to excess earnings have been or are being asserted by the Department in those same proceedings for other rate periods after more complete and detailed data are made available for analyses and presentation. These claims involve the past calendar year of 1953 in the case of Pan American World Airways and Trans-World Airlines, and the rate period commencing December 16, 1950, for Delta Air Lines, as successor in interest to Chicago & Southern Air Lines. Our assertions and the related airmail pay claims of the carriers, in accordance with your request, are set forth on the basis of presently available information in the attachment to this letter of reply.

Sincerely yours,
Arthur E. Summerfield,
Postmaster General.

	Total mail day claimed by carrier or proposed in dockets (see footnotes)	Assertion by Post Office Department as referred in your letter	Additional assertions by Post Office Department on offset principle
Delta—Latin American operation rate periods:			
Nov. 1, 1946, through Dec. 15, 1950	[1] $3,662,000	[2] $654,000	[3] $200,000
Dec. 16, 1950, through Dec. 15, 1951	[4] 1,855,000		[5] 938,000
(The above 2 periods relate to Chicago & Southern and are involved in the Supreme Court case.)			
May 1, 1953, through Apr. 30, 1954	[6] 792,000		[7] 954,000
Western (Supreme Court case) rate period: May 1, 1944, through Dec. 31, 1948	[8] 3,917,361	[2] 350,000	
Pan American—Atlantic rate period:			
Jan. 1, 1946, through Dec. 31, 1952	[9] 71,089,000	5,015,000	
Jan. 1, 1953, through Dec. 31, 1953	[9] 15,915,000		[10] 1,800,000
TWA—International rate periods:			
Feb. 5, 1946, through Dec. 31, 1952	[9] 54,698,000	12,158,000	
Jan. 1, 1953, through Dec. 31, 1953	[9] 8,507,000		[11] 11,872,000
United—Hawaiian operation rate period: Apr. 30, 1947, through Aug. 7, 1952	[12] 14,595,503	15,857,000	
Braniff—Latin American operations rate periods:			
June 4, 1948, through Dec. 31, 1953	[13] 11; 867,000	1,000,000	
Jan. 1, 1954, through Dec. 31, 1954	[14] 2,671,000		
Total	189,568,864	35,034,000	15,764,000

---

[1] CAB Order E-5793, Oct. 18, 1951, CAB Docket No. 2564; reviewed by Supreme Court.

[2] May be increased by tax benefits. In the case of Western, the Supreme Court decision referred to a profit of approximately $350,000; Post Office's brief referred to a profit of $447,000.

[3] Additional assertion due to $200,000 error in previous computations prepared by CAB rate staff.

[4] CAB Statement of Tentative Findings and Conclusions, Order E-5385, May 18, 1951, CAB Docket No. 2564; later affirmed by CAB Order E-5793, see note 1 above.

[5] Computed from carrier's domestic operation, reported net profit for the year 1951, CAB's recurrent reports; and carrier's domestic investment as recognized by Board in its order No. E-5869, Nov. 15, 1951, Docket No. 5144, for Chicago & Southern, domestic operations.

[6] CAB Statement of Provisional Findings and Conclusions, E-7738, Sept. 21, 1953, CAB Docket No. 6610, Delta, Latin American operations.

[7] Postmaster General's Answer to Board's Order E-7738 of Sept. 21, 1953, CAB Docket No. 6610, see note 6 above.

[8] CAB Order E-5782, Oct. 12, 1951, CAB Docket No. 2870 et al.; reviewed by Supreme Court.

[9] Initial decision of examiner, Mar. 26, 1954, on the consolidated Transatlantic Final Mail Rate Case, CAB Docket No. 1706, et al.

[10] The above figure computed from CAB's rate staff figures of excess profit of $864,000 for Pan American's Pacific division for 1953, but increased for tax benefits; and without recognition of reported losses on Pan American's Alaska and Latin American divisions totaling a net of $237,000 for the same year 1953.

[11] The above figure computed from CAB's rate staff figure of TWA's, domestic division, excess profit of $5,700,000 for year 1953 but increased for tax benefits.

[12] CAB Docket No. 2913—United's claim, exhibit No. U (United)-3, p. 6, subject to subsequent modifications.

[13] Braniff's reported break-even need, Latin American operation, for period June 4, 1948, through June 30, 1953, without additional claim for last half of 1953 and without further claims for return on investment and related tax allowances for the whole rate period of June 4, 1948, through Dec. 31, 1953.

[14] CAB Statement of Provisional Findings and Conclusions, Order No. E-8354, May 19, 1954, CAB Docket No. 2886. Braniff's Latin American operation.

The Superficial Aspect

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1954

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include herewith an article by Gerald W. Johnson in the current issue of the New Republic:

THE SUPERFICIAL ASPECT

The myth of the Abominable Snowman supposed to inhabit the extreme altitudes of Government in Washington is fading, as such myths always fade after 1½ years of a new administration. Eighteen months ago political Alpinists were full of wild tales of tracks 28 inches long left by a creature nobody would venture to name definitely, but whose initials were supposed to be H. S. T. and whose habits were unspeakable. But now that the climbers have scaled the summit of political power, interest in this shaggy, hypothetical denizen of the neve has subsided. It's cold up there, too cold and too slippery to encourage a hue and cry after Pithecanthropus.

So H. S. T. has shrunk almost to the dimensions of an ordinary mortal wearing shoes and eating with a knife and fork. It is probable that he would be quite down to common size except for one of his ways of amusing himself. From time to time, even as the Consul Nero cast the head of Hasdrubal into the camp of Hannibal, H. S. T. hurls a dead cat in the midst of the administration, making it necessary to revive the legends of his fearsomeness.

One of the most interesting of these is the story that he has set up as the Bashaw, not to say the Sultan of the Democratic Party, and the candidate to whom he throws the kerchief will be the acknowledged favorite of 1956. It is improbable, but its superficial aspect suggests that this tale may contain a modicum of truth. There is not much doubt that in the case of H. S. T. distance lends enchantment to the view, and by 1956 at a distance of 4 years, he may take on very seductive hues indeed.

Already it is apparent that he did a remarkable job in containing communism from 1945 to 1953. We had no idea how remarkable it was until someone else tried it and communism promptly began to leak out all over Asia. Somewhat more slowly we are realizing that it took pretty smart work to hold together the coalition of democracies. After awhile we shall understand that this unimpressive citizen of Missouri had to make a larger number of momentous decisions than President Washington had to make.

Oh, yes; he did wallop a music critic, and he did call a commentator an s. o. b., and he did have a distressing affection for clowns, and he did refuse to regard any man as a Communist until it was proved that he was a Communist, which rarely happened. But all that is beginning to seem not much more important than Theodore Roosevelt's Ananias Club, and reformed spelling, and removal of "in God we trust" from the coins; while the atom bomb, the Truman doctrine, the Marshall plan, Korea, and NATO increase in stature with passing time, and point 4 begins to seem colossal.

H. S. T. is plainly assembling what it takes to constitute an elder statesman. Like Madison and Jackson his size was not accurately measured while he remained in the White House because, as with them, the decor of the little palace never harmonized with his complexion. The Israelites lusted after the fleshpots of Egypt no more ardently than Americans lust after a President who looks the part, and we cannot be reformed even by getting one. Within the memory of living men we have had two, William McKinley and Warren G. Harding, and our experience with them should have subdued the fiercest libido, but it has not done so. Because H. S. T. looked out of place on Pennsylvania Avenue we assumed that he was out of place, and if facts point the other way, so much the worse for the facts.

In the environment of a small Missouri town, however, he begins to look a bit like Andrew Jackson in the Hermitage. As his successors become more and more entangled in messes of various kinds it is likely that he will seem less and less like a monster of fearful mien and more and more like a workman who had an appallingly difficult job and got away with it in highly competent fashion. The myth of the Abominable Snowman has already faded. The myth of the well-meaning but bungling fathead is fading. The conception of H. S. T. as a smart cookie is already seeping into public opinion.

So if I were a candidate for the Democratic nomination, while I would not rely on snatching the kerchief, I would walk as delicately as Agag in the neighborhood of Independence. For times change, and being polite to H. S. T. is no longer suicidal in an aspiring politician.

The Bryson Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES RAPER JONAS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1954

Mr. JONAS of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, and at the request of Miss Clara R. Smyre, of Lincolnton, N. C., I include a petition signed by residents of my district in support of the Bryson bill, H. R. 1227:

TO OUR CONGRESSMAN:

We, the undersigned, citizens of North Carolina, in view of the appalling toll or murder on our highways called to our attention by the President, and of the recent frightening disclosures of the Senate hearing on juvenile delinquency, urgently beg you to remove unfair inducement to drivers to drink and the dangerous influence of sales talk for alcoholic beverages being channeled into our very homes over the air to the eyes and ears of our children by voting for and passing the Bryson bill, H. R. 1227.

Marvin S. Sneed, Clara R. Smyre, Mrs. C. S. Digh, Mrs. Charlie Heavner, Mrs. Roy Williams, Mrs. Hazel Pitts, Mrs. H. J. Marley, Mrs. Dora Robinson, Mrs. Hillard Hartsoe, Mr. and Mrs. Carl Plonk, Mrs. Ola H. Heafner, Mr. and Mrs. M. E. Modlin, Mr. and Mrs. A. B. Senter, Mrs. John Murphy, Mrs. R. G. Carter, Mrs. John Hoffman, Mr. and Mrs. W. G. Bynum, Mr. and Mrs. D. W. B. Coon, Mrs. Rosa Lee Lynn, Mr. and Mrs. E. T. Ballard, Jr., Mr. and Mrs. Stowe Wehunt, Mr. and Mrs E. H. Baxter, Mrs. Mildred Hicks, Mrs. C. R. Harrison, Rev. and Mrs. W. E. Baulding.

Code for Investigators

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 8, 1954

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, many Members of both the House and the Senate are seriously interested in improving the rules under which our investigating committees operate. This question has become increasingly urgent in recent weeks. Because of the general interest in this topic, I am submitting the following editorial, from the Newark (N. J.) Evening News of June 7, 1954:

CODE FOR INVESTIGATORS

Evidence of the growing concern in Congress over legislative investigative practices is the submission of recommendations by two groups of Senators—one Republican, the other Democratic—of proposed codes to govern these inquiries.

Expressions of concern, both in and out of Congress, are evoked by opposition to methods made familiar by the McCarthy subcommittee of the Government Operations Committee. But they apply also to procedures of the Jenner committee in the Senate and the Velde Committee on Un-American Activities of the House. Early in the year New Jersey's Representative Frelinghuysen sensibly proposed consolidation of all these investigatory excursions in a new Senate-House committee.

The code proposals were called to President Eisenhower's attention at his news conference, with the suggestion he might like to make the idea of an enforcible code a part of his legislative program. His response was that this was a "very deep and grave responsibility of the legislators themselves." It is encouraging that Members of the Senate are recognizing this fact.

There are similarities in the codes put forward by Senator Prescott Bush, of Connecticut, with the support of 4 other Republicans and by Senator Kefauver, of Tennessee, with the sponsorship of 17 other Democrats. The latter formulation is the more comprehensive. It includes a provision for setting up a committee under chairmanship of the Vice President to police observance of the code. It would provide that an accused be accorded the right to appear and testify in his own defense, or to file a sworn statement; to have the adverse witness recalled for cross-examination, to be represented by counsel, and to obtain the subpenaing of witnesses or evidence in his own behalf.

A major aim of the Kefauver group's proposal would be to ban the practice frequently referred to as "smearing" a person by making public uncorroborated statements by unidentified informants to which the accused has not been given opportunity to enter defense.

There can be no question of the need for Congress-prescribed regulations governing the investigatory committees. What is often overlooked is the fact that the purpose of these inquiries is to gather information on which legislation can be based. These committees are not law-enforcing or prosecuting agencies.

But if there is congressional reform of the practices of investigating committees, the corollary problem of proper cooperation between the legislative and executive departments also requires consideration. The hearings in the Army-McCarthy dispute have spotlighted this and likewise have produced some suggestions for remedy.

Senator Mundt's comments last Thursday deserve study. Acknowledging that the executive branch is as eager as the Congress to eliminate security risks, he expressed belief in the possibility of finding a workable formula for joint effort for the common good.

The Rights We Seek To Save

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 8, 1954

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following article from the Wall Street Journal of Tuesday, June 1, 1954:

THE RIGHTS WE SEEK TO SAVE

We doubt if there are many people about who will question that communism in the United States is a serious problem for those whose responsibility is the Nation's security. The internal Communist movement was recognized by the Congress as a clear and present danger to that security when it enacted the Internal Security Act of 1950.

The difficulty arises when the Congress tries to make security secure, or when the officers charged with maintaining security go about doing it. It is not an easy task for the one or the other.

Proof that it is not easy lies in the suggestions Attorney General Brownell has made from time to time to tighten the net about communism. He has asked that wiretapping be legalized for admission as evidence. He has asked that a law be passed which would compel witnesses invoking the fifth amendment to testify if granted immunity from prosecution in connection with anything testified about.

It was not lack of appreciation of the tasks before Mr. Brownell but awareness of the dangers we thought inherent in these proposals that convinced us they were wrong. These suggestions may make the job a bit easier for the Justice Department, but they would whittle away rights and privileges of the citizens all the same.

Mr. Brownell has recently proposed two other laws to knit loopholes he finds in the 1950 Internal Security Act.

One of these deals directly with the problem of security of private facilities—such as powerplants or producers of supplies required by defense plants—and would empower the President to issue regulations to bar individuals from employment where there is reasonable ground to believe that they may engage in sabotage, espionage, or other subversive activities. Such regulations may issue when the President finds that the Nation's security is endangered "by reason of actual or threatened war, or invasion, or insurrection, or subversive activity, or of disturbance or threatened disturbance of the international relations" of the country.

The later reason would seems a rather sweeping one; and we trust that the Congress will spell out specifically what it means. But in any case, the proposal has much merit. A Communist at the switches of a great city's powerplant could do great damage at an opportune time.

Under Mr. Brownell's other proposal any organization—including a private business or a union—may be destroyed if the Subversive Activities Control Board determines that such organization is Communist infiltrated.

Four guides are created under the measure for determining whether an organization is Communist infiltrated. These include the extent to which persons who are active in its management, direction or supervision, whether holding office or not are also active in the world Communist movement; the extent to which funds, resources or personnell are used to further world communism; the extent to which policies of the organization do not deviate from the policies of any world Communist organization, and the extent to which the firm or union or group is in position to impair mobilization of manpower or use of economic resources in connection with defense or security.

This new yardstick to measure Communist activity is an extension of the purposes of the 1950 act which defined Communist-action and Communist-front organizations and required registration with the Attorney General of any group which the SACB said fit the pattern. A Communist-action organization is there defined as one established by the Communist dictatorship of a foreign country in which is vested the direction and control of the world Communist movement. A Communist-front organization is one created and maintained to promote the ends of Communist-action groups. The general idea was to expose fronts and action groups and to cut off sources of funds received from unsuspecting contributors. There is, of course, recourse to the courts for any accused and there are ways for fronts to clear themselves and get off the hook.

Mr. Brownell's new and more sweeping bill also provides recourse to the courts and attempts to set up some safeguards for members and stockholders in case an organization is ordered liquidated. The SACB is required to take into consideration and to preserve the legitimate rights and interests of such people; but only to the extent the Board determines is consistent with the purposes of the act. These powers are obviously too broad and raise the question whether the Board could not seize the property as well as liquidate the business or union if it decided some morning that such action was consistent with the purposes of the law.

In our view all this sort of language is far too vague and creates a catchall for Communists which quite possibly could injure many innocent people. It is a drastic departure from the purposes of the 1950 law which set out to throw light on action groups and fronts and thus to limit their effectiveness. But the 1950 act did not try to destroy them as this one does.

As we see it, the trouble with Mr. Brownell's bill is that he here seeks not to expose organizations or to punish people for what they have done, but to punish people for what they may be in a position to do.

Certainly the Daily Worker—and perhaps many other publications—could fall into the net. And even though the courts finally ruled against the SACB and the Attorney General those who have had to go to the judges to protect their rights to private property, freedom of speech or publication would have been put in unwarranted jeopardy.

Freedom of speech, thought, and press—including that for the Daily Worker—were specifically acknowledged in the Internal Security Act of 1950 which Mr. Brownell's bill seeks to strengthen. That law says:

"Nothing in this act shall be construed to authorize, require, or establish military or civilian censorship or in any way limit or infringe upon freedom of the press or of speech as guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States and no regulation shall be promulgated hereunder having that effect."

Mr. Brownell's bill contains no safeguard. Indeed, it would have been most difficult to make reference to the Bill of Rights and then attempt to do what this measure suggests.

We recognize the trying task the Attorney General and his law officers face in combatting the secret and sinister Communist intrigue. But it is not the part of wisdom ourselves to chip away at the very rights we seek to save from that menace.

Time Turns Backward in Its Flight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. TUCK

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1954

Mr. TUCK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting in the Record an excellent editorial appearing in the Halifax Gazette, a newspaper published at South Boston, Va., of Thursday, June 3, 1954, relating to the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States with regard to the subject of segregation of our children in the public schools.

This newspaper is now and has been for many years published in my home county of Halifax. The high standards it has maintained are such that it enjoys the respect of the people in the field in which it circulates. The editor of this publication, Mr. Lynn Shelton, is an able and fearless journalist. He has earned wide recognition and acclaim. Mr. Shelton is a native of Southside Virginia and understands the problems of the people in that section.

The editorial is as follows:

TIME TURNS BACKWARD IN ITS FLIGHT

We have delayed comment until now on the Supreme Court ban of segregation in the public schools in order to gain perspective and to express our sentiments as dispassionately as possible. This situation in which the Southern States find themselves will require as much of that as southerners can command, for calm tempers and sweet reason must prevail lest we revert to the intemperateness and blood letting of the Reconstruction Days.

Words still fail us to express our contempt for the usurpation of the rights of the States to govern their schools and to otherwise regulate and safeguard a way of life. That the Supreme Court has reversed itself and placed a new construction and interpretation on the Constitution of the United States is reprehensible to us. The 14th amendment to the Constitution has stood almost unchallenged for over 80 years as meaning no more than it said until the nine robed gentlemen sought to grab history by the tail, and with a sudden jerk, set civilization on a backward course. And that Southern civilization is turning backward there is not the slightest doubt in our mind.

The record of the progress of Negroes in the South speaks for itself. It was only shortly over three centuries ago that they were taken from savagery and brought to this country. Through a sorry spectacle of slavery they were finally emancipated and were given the rights as citizens to vote, attend the public schools, and in short, make as much of themselves as it was their capacity as individuals and as a race to do so. It has been one of the shining pages of southern history that so much social progress has been made by the two races working together in peace and in harmony. Lynching has all but disappeared from the South. Ku Klux Klanism is all but a thing of the past. The southern Negro lives in peace and in prosperity. He has the right to seek the highest levels of attainment possible anywhere in this broad land of ours, and it is a source of southern pride, shared by both races, that so many Negroes from Dixie have reflected these opportunities in their own personal advancement.

But now comes the almighty force of Federal dictates to tell both the southern Negro and whites that they must integrate and amalgamate whether they like it or not. They cannot wait on the slow wheels of evolution to turn. The wheels must mesh and revolve fast, ready be the races or no.

It augurs no good. In the South where the races are so nearly matched in numbers, and in several States where Negroes are in the majority, the transformation the Supreme Court has in mind cannot and will not be made without time and lots of it. Perhaps a generation ahead mixed schools and integrated attendance at other public places will be accomplished without the nudges of Federal bayonets. But if one is to properly gage the southern mind and temperament today, he must not mistake what it is and what it means. Southerners, many of them, think less of what some men may define the law of the land to mean than what a way of life means to them.

What we have said we say in the fondest kind of spirit and admiration of our Negro citizens, the great body of whom are as resentful of this intrusion into local and States rights as we are. What we point up is that race relations can be improved only by the slow grinding of the wheels of progress. On that score southern history speaks for itself. To enforce social laws is to retard and set back progress and to lose much of what has been gained. Ironically, perhaps, the race that the Supreme Court appears to be so concerned over and has gained the most, stands now to lose the most.

It is a day of dark despair and mourning. Stygian darkness obscures the morn of tomorrow in a land that once was happy and glad to face the future. Time turns backward in its flight.

H. R. 9430

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 28, 1954

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I wish at this time to add my name to the roll of those Members who joined with our able and forward-looking colleague, Aime J. Forand, of Rhode Island, in introducing H. R. 9430. This bill, to provide for unemployment reinsurance grants to the States and to revise, extend and improve the unemployment insurance program, has been introduced to meet a pressing need in revitalizing this established program so that it can continue to fill its place in our antidepression program.

Careful analysts of our social and economic structure have come to agree that this program is a most worthwhile built-in stabilizer in our kit of tools to meet periods of slack in our great free economic system. The virtue of this program is its very anticyclical and automatic operation. When the level of operation is high and employment rolls are full, a balance is diverted into this fund for unemployment relief. When, on the contrary as things are now and the level of operation slacks off, then this reserve purchasing power returns to the economy in the form of sustaining purchasing power until the slack can be taken up in the employment situation.

However, with the passage of time and changes in the economic scene and in the general price level, it is now necessary to make certain adjustments in this program and I am happy to join in this effort to see these necessary changes adopted by the Congress.

Jefferson Davis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. D. R. (BILLY) MATTHEWS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1954

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, June 1, at 9:45 p. m., radio station WWDC extended its facilities to the United Daughters of the Confederacy for the presentation of a special program in tribute to the memory of Jefferson Davis. The program was under the direction of Mrs. Maude Howell Smith, division chairman of radio for the United Daughters of the Confederacy. Mrs. Smith presented Congressman James C. Davis, who represents the Fifth Congressional District of Georgia in the House of Representatives, who paid tribute to the distinguished American in whose memory the program was broadcast.

In presenting Congressman Davis, Mrs. Smith called attention to the fact that he is the grandson of two Confederate veterans, and is himself a veteran of World War I.

Congressman Davis spoke as follows:

It is indeed an honor and privilege to speak to you today on the life, character, and work of a man who stands as one of the immortals of all time, Jefferson Davis. When we hear his name, many of us think of a man who was the first and only President of the Confederate States of America. True, as President of the Confederacy, Jefferson Davis experienced his finest hour, but this great southerner, this great American, occupies a broader view on the horizon of American history. Jefferson Davis exemplified in his life and character fundamental Americanism. He was consecrated to constitutional liberty. He believed in the Constitution. Jefferson Davis believed that the truths as laid down by the Founding Fathers in the Constitution were fixed, and not subject to later interpretations and variations based on political, social, or economic expediencies. He was one of the greatest exponents of States rights in American history. To Jefferson Davis, the Constitution was not a complicated document. Those powers not enumerated and given explicitly to the Federal Government were reserved to the States and to the people. The Constitution was as simple as that, he said.

Today the things he loved and cherished are again being assaulted. Renewed attacks on the sovereignty of the States is abroad in the land. The Constitution is being given a new meaning never contemplated in the wildest dreams of our forefathers.

For a few minutes, let us examine some of the highlights in the life of Jefferson

Davis, a life that has all the grandeur and tragedy of a Shakespearean drama.

Mr. Davis was born on June 3, 1808, in what is now Todd County, Ky. He and Lincoln first saw the light of day in the same State. His father was a native Georgian and a Revolutionary War hero. At the age of 16, Mr. Davis entered Transylvania College and from there he went to West Point, graduating in 1828. In all of his schooling, his brilliant mind, his logic and gentle manner impressed all with whom he came in contact. After graduation from West Point, Jefferson Davis took part in the Black Hawk Indian War. In 1835 he resigned his commission and having married the daughter of Zachary Taylor, later President of the United States, he settled on a plantation near Vicksburg, Miss. Here he lived until 1845 when his neighbors and friends sent him to Washington as a Member of the House of Representatives. He had been in Congress only a year when he answered the call of his country again. The drums of war were beating in far-off Mexico and his friends in Mississippi, having elected him colonel of Mississippi Volunteers, he resigned his seat in Congress and hurried to join his regiment, which, never doubting the acceptance of its colonel, had started to Mexico without him. Colonel Davis caught up with his regiment at New Orleans and proceeded on to Mexico.

In Mexico, Colonel Davis displayed conspicuous gallantry. His military genius and courage contributed greatly to the splendid victories at Monterey and Buena Vista. At the battle of Buena Vista he received a severe wound, the effects of which he felt until his dying day. For more than 40 years he carried this wound inflicted in defense of the liberties of his people, and yet there were those who called him traitor as he lay in his coffin.

Returning to his beloved Mississippi in 1847, the governor of that State appointed him to fill out an unexpired term in the United States Senate. Mr. Davis accepted and in 1848 was unanimously chosen by the legislature as Senator. In the Senate his great powers of leadership won for him the chairmanship of the Committee on Military Affairs. Upon the election of Franklin Pierce as President, Jefferson Davis was offered the post of Secretary of War, and resigning his Senate seat he accepted.

Jefferson Davis contributed greatly to the stability of Franklin Pierce's administration. Under his direction as a cabinet member, surveys were made for a transcontinental railroad, sea coast fortifications were strengthened, infantry tactics were improved, and iron was substituted for wood in armaments.

Upon the conclusion of President Pierce's term, Mississippi returned Mr. Davis to the Senate and again he became the recognized Democratic leader. At a time when northern abolitionists were fanning the fires of sectional hatred, Jefferson Davis remained calm and collected. He urged a course of moderation. He believed the differences between North and South could be settled by a just application of the simple remedy that lay within the Constitution itself, the application of the doctrine of States rights.

But his eloquence was lost in the passion of the times, and when he was formally notified that Mississippi had left the Union, he resigned from the Senate. His farewell to that body is a striking example of the character of the man: "Whatever offense," he said, "I have given which has not been redressed or for which satisfaction has not been demanded, I have, Senators, in this hour of our parting to offer you my apology for any pain which in the heat of the discussion I have inflicted. I go hence unincumbered by the remembrance of any injury received and having discharged the duty of making the only reparation in my power for any injury offered.

"Mr. President and Senators, having made the announcement which the occasion seemed to me to require, it only remains for me to bid you a final adieu."

Mississippi wanted Mr. Davis to command her troops and upon his arrival from Washington he was commissioned major general. But a higher and nobler duty awaited him and, against his wishes, his people persuaded him to accept the presidency of the newly organized Confederate States of America.

Jefferson Davis by sheer force of character created a government where none existed, organized and put armies in the field, conducted the innumerable civil functions of government, and stood a rampart of strength and courage to his people. In every place, under every condition, he proved himself the president. His messages, state papers, and public utterances were models of statesmanship and scholarly diction.

He demanded honesty and integrity and no one has ever accused his administration or any phase of his public life with corruption and graft.

The dead and mangled, the suffering and horror of Antietam, Gettysburg, Chancellorsville, the Wilderness, and Spottsylvania Court House wrung his heart out. The hunger and privation of his people saddened and burdened him. But steadfast he clung to the helm of the confederacy and, like a captain who goes down with his ship, he went down with his government and his people.

Shortly after the surrender of General Lee on April 9, 1865, Jefferson Davis was captured by Federal troops and imprisoned at Fortress Monroe, Va. Here his imprisonment marks a dark chapter in American history. Shackled like a common felon, he was confined to a dungeon and denied the right of habeas corpus.

Sick, scorned, slandered, and vilified, he remained at Fortress Monroe 2 years until he was released on bail. Mr. Davis was never brought to trial as the radicals of the North knew they could never convict him.

After his release from prison, the broken and weary president traveled in Canada and England where he was received with great honor.

Returning to his Southland he devoted the rest of his life to writing and lecturing. Death came to him in New Orleans on December 6, 1889, and he was buried in that city. In 1893 he was reinterred with great honor in Hollywood Cemetery, Richmond, Va. There he sleeps today in the city he did so much to bring eternal fame.

The United States sorely needs men of the caliber of Jefferson Davis today. His steadfast devotion to principle, his veneration of the constitutional process of government, and his unswerving loyalty to God and man are fundamentals upon which America can seek a new dedication.

"Under God"

SPEECH

OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 7, 1954

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, this measure is more than one of passing importance. It goes to the very fundamentals of life and creation. It recognizes that all things which we have in the way of life, liberty, constitutional government, and rights of man are held by us under the divine benediction of the Almighty. There is a hope and a hereafter in these two words and they, of course, should be included in the pledge of allegiance to Old Glory.

I have worked for the day when our pledge of allegiance would be thus modified. I have wondered why the Senate committee which deliberated on this matter at first vacillated and finally acted in approving the change. I am now anxious that this measure be finally passed.

Free nations today battle for their very existence in many parts of the world. Communism with its siren voice of false appeal is heard round the world and many peoples and many nations fall prey to these false headlights on the shores of time. One thing separates free peoples of the Western World from the rabid Communist, and this one thing is a belief in God. In adding this one phrase to our pledge of allegiance to our flag, we in effect declare openly that we denounce the pagan doctrine of communism and declare "under God" in favor of free government and a free world.

Some Senatorial Reputations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDGAR A. JONAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1954

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, much has been said in the past concerning the possible effects of television upon the conduct of the Nation's affairs. It has been said that a good television personality will become the greatest asset of those who seek the suffrage of the people; the greatest asset, too, of those in Government who wish to gain public approval for their policies and their actions in connection therewith.

In support of the ideas I have just now set forth, Mr. Speaker, I, under unanimous consent, insert in the RECORD an editorial published on Monday, June 7, 1954, in the Chicago Tribune, and entitled "Some Senatorial Reputations":

The temptation to discuss the merits of the McCarthy-Stevens controversy should be resisted until all the evidence is in, but it is not too early to comment on what the hearings have done to and for some senatorial reputations.

Senator MUNDT has unquestionably gained the most. Those who were acquainted with him have always respected him for his character and abilities, but to the country as a whole he was little known. Now he is acknowledged by millions to be a man of much personal charm, sincere, thoughtful, urbane, friendly, and genuinely gifted as a parliamentarian. If Mr. MUNDT came from a big and politically doubtful State he could expect to go very far on the reputation he has made in these hearings. As it is, it is scarcely an exaggeration to say that he has put South Dakota on the political map.

In the course of the radio and television show, Mr. MCCARTHY has managed on more than one occasion to irritate his friends while confounding his enemies. It wasn't easy, but he did it. We have never supposed that he was likely to get a presidential nomination and now we believe it is more unlikely than ever. Delegates to national conventions do not nominate sluggers like Mr. MCCARTHY. Citizens down east who have found it difficult to sleep of nights for fear that the junior Senator from Wisconsin would land in the White House need worry no longer.

Mr. Dirksen early in the hearing distressed his friends with his unction but has happily changed his manner, and all for the better. Mr. Dirksen is really a very bright boy. He is always in danger of being a shade too bright for his own good but, by and large, the people of Illinois have not been disappointed in his behavior.

Young Mr. Potter is no ball of fire, certainly, and he could have used a little more seasoning before he broke into the big leagues, but in his favor it may be said that he hasn't done anything to distress his friends.

The Democrats have done themselves and their party some harm with their pettifogging partisanship. Of the three, Mr. McClellan has shown himself to be the most able and he has the most attractive TV personality.

Mr. Symington has more than his share of vanity and is in love with the sound of his voice, as is Mr. Jackson, the Boy Scout. The millions who have viewed or heard the proceedings must harbor the gravest doubts of Mr. Symington's honesty, sincerity, and good faith in view of Friday's disclosures of his monitored telephone conversations with Secretary of the Army Stevens. He is seriously compromised. A fair view is that he ought to be listed among the instigators and principals, rather than to be pretending that he can sit in disinterested judgment.

None of the three Democrats, we should say, has advanced his political fortunes, at least as far as national politics are concerned, through his participation in the McCarthy proceedings. Maybe there is one TV viewer somewhere who thinks the Democrats have approached this hearing with open minds, but there can't be two observers so naive.

The American State of Mind

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1954

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, appended is the address by Morehead Patterson, distinguished chairman of the board of the American Machine & Foundry Co., delivered at the second annual banquet of the American Society of Tool Engineers, Commodore Hotel, New York City, on April 6, 1954:

Mr. Toastmaster, honored guests, members of the American Society of Tool Engineers, ladies, and gentlemen, this evening I should like to discuss with you one of the most controversial subjects of our time. It is a subject of dismay in France, concern in England, bewilderment in Canada, and even disagreement here at home. The subject, ladies and gentlemen, is the American State of Mind.

It is a subject of importance not only because of the past but especially of the future. I believe this country is on fire. I believe we are poised on the edg of a rich, fruitful, stimulating, exciting, rewarding, and dynamic era. No one person, indeed, no single group of persons, can accurately analyze this intangible. Each of us, however, can view certain phenomena and draw certain future conclusions.

I suppose everyone of you at this banquet tonight has heard the word "recession" at least once today. Some of the most respected men in America have prophesied danger ahead. A variety of ills has been diagnosed in our economy, a variety of cures has been prescribed. But the patient is not sick. He is bursting with energy.

The use of the word "recession" to describe the American state of mind, or the American state of being, stems, I think, from misapprehensions and misunderstandings, or, more bluntly, from an astonishing reluctance to recognize facts. So in the few minutes we have together this evening I shall attempt to analyze 1 or 2 small areas of the American state of mind and try to explode some of the myths that surround them.

It is believed by many Americans, as well as many Europeans and even Indians—that we in the United States are a vulgar lot. English school masters view our comic strips with horror. French intellectuals cringe at what they call the banalite of our motion pictures. In Italy, we are told, even the truck drivers sing grand opera. I think you will agree that it is an often expressed view that while we are sensational on the assembly line, we are really a little gauche in the drawing room.

Now the plain facts available on this area of the American state of mind, tell a completely opposite story. We Americans are actually living in an environment of extraordinary cultural abundance.

You are aware of course, that we have over 200 symphony orchestras in the United States? Two hundred. You know that the Bell Telephone Company in the New York-New Jersey area has a full scale symphony orchestra made up of employees that plays an annual concert in Carnegie Hall? Doubtless you have observed that physicians, and lawyers, and tool engineers traditionally virile are no longer considered sissy if they play in string quartets. You know also that we spend over $90 million a year for tickets to the legitimate theater and grand opera? That is more than we spend for tickets to baseball games. Perhaps you will be as astonished, as I was, to learn that our museums have increased during the past quarter century from 600 to 2,500. There are 3 times as many concerts given in the United States as in all the other countries of the world combined.

It seems difficult, then, to entertain a low opinion of American culture. It is, however, a good example of the misapprehension that exists both here and abroad about this, the American state of mind.

Life magazine is a popular publication and yet each week it presents articles on science, editorials on current politics, samples of modern poetry, and beautiful color reproductions of art masterpieces to 5½ million people. Culture, in America, is not something exclusively for the elite. Surely it is indicative that anybody who has 25 cents, and the inclination, can buy a fair reproduction of an impressionist masterpiece in Woolworth's. We are ceasing to think of it as a noble abstraction and beginning to take it for granted. To me, at least, this proves that we are not money maniacs, and that our powers of organization and tool design are transferable to other things besides material goods.

You can see, then, from this rather detailed example, what I mean by misapprehensions concerning the American state of mind in its cultural area. There are many other areas, and many other apprehensions, but we cannot go into all of them this evening, or indeed, in a thousand evenings.

As lieutenants of business you are, of course, concerned with the economic aspect of the American state of mind. During the past 15 years, the American state of mind has been stirring and shifting and changing in more areas than culture alone. Fenton Turck, the well-known New York consulting engineer, has enumerated a few of these changes under the very apt title of "The Great American Explosion." Mr. Turck believes that we have exploded in a flood of new ideas, new tastes, and new standards. We are emerging (he states) into a fresh and exciting age. An age already indelibly marked by changed attitudes, changed customs and changed goals.

I should like to repeat to you a few of the extraordinary statistics which Mr. Turck so rightly considers significant:

Americans increased their annual use of electric energy more between 1940 and 1950 than in the entire previous time since electric power was first installed in the United States. In the same 10 years 141 million people moved either from farms to industrial centers, or from one house to another. We are indeed a restless and a changing people. Forty-five percent more Americans graduated from college in 1948 than in 1940, and more Bibles were purchased between 1941 and 1951 than in the previous 40 years. Yes, we are better educated and more concerned with spiritual things than we realize. Today, for the first time in history more consumers (54 percent) own their own homes than pay rent. The picture of the average American as a highway-happy worshipper of a shiny new automobile is sadly out of date. In 1950, 96 percent more constant dollars spent for books than 10 years before. We spend $44 per person per year on education, more than any country in the world. Today, classical music accounts for 40 percent of all record sales in the country. Think of it. Two thousand towns, two thousand, now provide serious music regularly for their populations.

These extraordinary changes are happening now, and they will continue to happen. That is why I believe this country is on fire. It is alive with expanded opportunities for those who recognize the new signposts and have the courage to follow them. And yet, we continue to labor under misapprehensions even in the economic area of the American state of mind, the area concerned with business.

Let me give you an example of what I consider a misapprehension involving the economics area.

At the beginning of the war, a certain prominent company was asked a question by the Government. "How much," the Government representative asked, "can you increase your production for the war effort?"

Now this company did an annual gross volume of $120 million. So, after some lengthy conferences, its officers told the Government that they could increase this annual production figure by 50 percent. "Gentlemen," replied the Government representative "50 percent won't do. We must have 1,200 percent."

The executives of this company thought he was crazy. But during the 5 years of war they performed miracles. Today, instead of producing $120 million a year, they produce $120 million worth of goods a month.

Now why do you suppose these very capable and experienced executives failed to see their own potential. After all they were running it. They knew it, and the people in it. Could it be, that they did not know themselves? Criticism by hindsight is easy, but in view of their performance now, it is difficult to explain their limited outlook at the beginning of the war. The plain fact is that probably each of us here would have reacted as they did, with incredulity. We are not kids any more. And it is dangerous to underestimate us.

The American state of mind is mature. It has grown up. I for one have faith in it. In fact I think it is the most exciting thing in the world today, so let us not underestimate it. That is the road to depression. Instead, let us try, if we can, to anticipate its next move.

Until recently, a Florida vacation traditionally has been two things. It has been in the winter, and it has been expensive. Five years ago, a Florida building contractor decided that tradition was changing, and that he would anticipate the American state of mind. He gambled $5 million on a housing project that included 650 modern Spanish villas, a shopping center, a country club, and a golf course. He did not raise his rates in the winter, nor did he reduce them in the summer. Instead he tailored his prices to the middle-income vacationer. Today, his project is doing a roaring business all year around. He evaluated and anticipated the American state of mind shrewdly, and it paid off handsomely.

At AMF, we are trying very hard to anticipate and to evaluate correctly, the American state of mind. For most of our 50 years, we stuck to our role of designer and maker of machines for the tobacco, apparel, and baking industries.

In the days when Sir Walter Raleigh first took tobacco to England, cigarette smoking was unheard of. Even in the good old "roll-your-own" era the habit was not exactly widespread. With the invention of a rapid automatic cigarette-making machine, cigarettes became not a luxury but a necessity. There are many examples like this, but they all prove the same point. Necessity is not, the mother of invention, invention is the mother of necessity. That is the real secret of American strength in all fields.

There is scarcely any limit to the capacity of man to consume goods. The need for more output per man-hour is virtually unlimited, except perhaps, for power and materials. Our present resources of power will not last forever, and it is this need, and potential shortage of power, that brings me—inevitably—to the atom.

We at AMF are not strangers to atomic energy research. We have taken part in the design and production of atomic energy equipment since the beginning of the AEC program.

We were engaged to develop, design and build, special process machinery for the AEC Savannah River plant, a work which we began in late 1950 and will complete this year. At its peak, this project employed some 400 of our technical personnel, many of whom had prior atomic energy experience at Argonne, Brookhaven, and Oak Ridge National Laboratories.

I am particularly proud and happy to tell you that the Atomic Energy Commission announced today their acceptance of AMF's proposal to undertake a study program on industrial reactor development. Along with 11 groups composed of such prominent American corporations as the General Electric Co., the Dow Chemical Co., the Detroit Edison Co., and the Monsanto Chemical Co. (to name only a few), the American Machine & Foundry Co. has contracted with the Commission to participate in a study of reactors and reactor equipment related to industrial atomic energy applications. We expect to bear the direct cost of this study which will run to at least a hundred thousand dollars a year.

We at AMF believe in the atom's peacetime future and we are engaged in a broad program of engineering development. For instance, we are designing a research reactor on a building block principle, a nuclear mechano set if you will, to make such reactors flexible and versatile and able to satisfy a wide variety of requirements. We believe, you see, that nuclear reactors and nuclear package powerplants are in the immediate future of the "American state of mind." The quicker, therefore, that they are standardized, the quicker their industrial use will become general.

Nuclear package powerplants are needed in many remote areas of the world. Think of what electric energy could do for ore-rich countries, where there are no waterfalls, no supplies of coal, oil, or even wood. Nuclear package plants can compete with conventional plants in these areas today. There is no question in my mind that nuclear powerplants will compete commercially with conventional powerplants anywhere in the near future.

Now as you know, there is a by-product of atomic power which is already of great practical value to humanity. These are the radioisotopes, and they have many uses. Radio sodium, injected into the blood-stream is of vital use to doctors studying the treatment of circulatory deficiencies. A radioactive isotope of iodine is, in wide use in the diagnosis and analysis of thyroid-gland diseases. Isotopes are used in many ways in agriculture, to show, for instance, how much fertilizer is actually taken up by a plant. Tiny invisible amounts of radio-active materials can be used to run control checks on the chemical composition of huge batches of molten steel, or to measure and control the thickness of tissue-thin plastic films. They can be used to determine the rate of flow of liquids through long pipelines. Petroleum scientists use radio-carbon to study the fundamental and very complex processes which take place in the big cracking units where gasoline is produced.

In addition to applications that we can foresee today we are convinced that the number which will emerge in the future is practically without limit. I do not know, whether an American housewife will ever run her washing machine with an atomic battery. However AMF wants to be there with the tools to make the washing machine and also the battery when the time comes.

Yes, we want to be prepared. That is why we are exploring industrial atomic energy to the fullest, so that we may accurately evaluate and anticipate, the American state of mind.

Atomic energy is a slave which, if we have the wisdom, we can control and command.

I believe that there lies before us a golden age of progress and prosperity. We hold it in our hands to win a crowning victory for human progress throughout the world. We will be prepared for this if we study and comprehend that fabulous thing—the American state of mind.

Low Tariff on Woolens Crippling Mills In New England

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1954

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by James F. Leonard, being the first of a series published in the Boston Post on New Enland tariff problems:

LOW TARIFF ON WOOLENS CRIPPLING MILLS IN NEW ENGLAND

(By James F. Leonard)

(This is the first of two articles on the tariff problems of the depressed wool textile industry. It tells some of the problems wool merchants and wool product manufacturers are experiencing under the present tariff structure.)

A competitor much tougher than the southern mill operator has appeared on the scene to plague further the hard-pressed New England woolen mill owner.

This competitor has Government sanction—in fact Government solicitation in the form of reciprocal trade and Government aid in the form of a very low tariff—to compete for American textile business with a product manufactured by workers who make from a low of 14 cents to a high of 43 cents an hour in contrast to $1.56 paid to our mill workers.

Last year production of apparel fabrics containing 25 percent or more wool dipped to its lowest since the depression years of the early 1930's.

At the same time imports of woolen yard goods reached a new 30-year high. More than 30 million yards of imported woolen goods reached the American market from Great Britain, France, Italy, and Japan.

Even with duty paid, the imported woolen goods sell for less than a similar product manufactured in this country.

"The only way we can meet this competition," says Harry F. Blake, president of Blake & Co., Boston wool firm, "is for a speedy readjustment of the tariff rate."

Under the Reciprocal Trade Act there is a provision for raising the tariff rate on any class of fabric in which imports exceed 5 percent of the annual domestic production in the 3 preceding years.

It is called the peril point. When the point has been reached, the tariff rate may be raised from 25 percent to 45 percent.

"There's just one hitch," says Edward Wilkinson, executive vice president of the National Association of Wool Manufacturers, "the machinery for this procedure is so cumbersome it would take a couple of years to get the measure through."

The Textile Workers Union of America, CIO, which has joined the manufacturers and the wool merchants in the fight for a readjusted tariff on wool imports, reports that 180 mills have been liquidated or closed down permanently and 70,000 jobs have been lost since 1946.

Meanwhile imports have risen from 4,160,000 yards in 1946 to 30 million yards in 1953.

"Irreparable damage is being done the industry because of the present low tariff," says Hugh Munro of the firm of Munro, Kinkaid, Mottla, Inc., an old Boston wool firm, "but we can't seem to get the relief we need."

MOSTLY FROM BRITAIN

The majority of imported wool products come here from Great Britain, where the average textile workers' wage is 42 cents an hour. In 1952 Great Britain exported 70 percent of wool products to the United States.

Italy, where the worker gets 30 cents an hour, supplied 9 percent; France, where the wage is 43 cents an hour, supplied 3 percent.

Japan, where textile workers receive but 14 cents an hour, offers worsted yarn for about $4.10 a pound, duty paid, $.85 to $1 cheaper than comparable American yarn.

Resolutions Congratulating the Town of Saugus, Mass., on Its 325th Year as a Settled Community

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1954

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolutions introduced in the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts by Representatives Belden G. Bly, Jr., of Saugus, and Fred A. Hutchinson, of Lynn, on petition of John J. Bucchiere and his associate members of the Saugus Board of Selectmen congratulating the town of Saugus on its 325th year as a settled community:

Resolutions Congratulating the Town of Saugus on Its 325th Year as a Settled Community

Whereas when the Puritans who founded the Massachusetts Bay Coloney landed in Salem Harbor on the ship *Arbella* in 1629, several of their number explored along the beautiful north shore until they found the rolling meadows bordering upon the meandering river which the Pentucket Indians who inhabited this area called the Saugus, meaning in their language "long and extended"; and

Whereas as former residents of the fens country of old England, they were fascinated by this area of boundless marshes bordering the crystal-clear waters of the river teeming with edible fish, and the countless coveys of wild birds who feasted along its banks, and they determined there to make their homes in the land they christened "Newe England"; and

Whereas the tiny settlement they built along the riverbank became one of the founding towns of the Bay Colony, and for the first 8 years between 1629 and 1637, it encompassed all of the area now constituting the great industrial city of Lynn and the charming residential towns of Swampscott, Nahant, Lynnfield, Saugus, Reading, and Wakefield; and

Whereas in tribute to their second pastor, the Reverend Samuel Whiting, who had been a curate at St. Margaret's Church in King's Lynn, England, the citizens of Saugus petitioned the great and general court on November 15, 1637, to change their name in his honor, and the legislature voting, "Saugus is called Lin," the ancient Indian name of the settlement was retained only in the river until February 17, 1815, when the legislature set off the west parish of Lynn under the corporate name of Saugus; and

Whereas with the formation of the first general court in 1634, Saugus, under its original name, was 1 of the 8 founding towns to form 1 of the first legislative assemblies on the North American continent, and had 3 of its citizens, Capt. Nathaniel Turner, Edward Tomlins, and Thomas Willis numbered among the 24 original members of the house of representatives from the founding communities of Boston, Charlestown, Roxbury, Dorchester, Cambridge, Watertown, Salem, and Saugus, as part of the first elected government of this great Commonwealth; and

Whereas in 1646 that part of the town of Lynn which is now Saugus became the "cradle of American industry," with the foundation of the first successful ironworks on the American continent, thereby founding our great industrial system, which birthplace of free enterprise is now being restored as a national shrine by the First Iron Works Association and the American Iron and Steel Institute; and

Whereas 1 of the founders of the first ironworks, sent to London to organize the company of underwriters for the ironworks in Saugus, the Honorable Robert Bridges, was 1 of 2 citizens of Saugus to be significantly honored by election as speaker of the house of representatives, the second being the Honorable Frederick Bancroft Willis; and

Whereas Saugus, the second largest town in Essex County, with more than 19,000 God-fearing, well-governed, law-abiding, and patriotic citizens of the Commonwealth, has also been a pioneer in the field of education, giving to Harvard University one of its most illustrious presidents in Cornelius Conway Felton, being the site of the first female seminary in America, and in keeping with its pioneering traditions is now engaged in the monumental task of erecting for the enrichment of its youth a new and beautiful senior high school plant fronting on our scenic Newburyport Turnpike; and

Whereas Saugus pays grateful tribute to its debt to its heroic founders of Puritan days, despite the fact that it is now a community of many races and creeds, all living happily and harmoniously in the American tradition, and all taking pride in the fact that there has never been a war on the North American continent, commencing with the colonial expedition against the Pequots in 1636 in which Saugus sent a company of 21 men, in which the men and boys of Saugus have not willingly fought for their homes, their liberties, and the ideals of the American way of life, even at the cost of life itself; and

Whereas Saugus will fittingly pay tribute in this year of 1954 to its 325 years of life as a settled community, first of the Bay Colony, and then of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, for whom its sturdy farmers and their sons fought so valiantly on the retreat from Concord and Lexington, at Bunker Hill, at Saratoga, and in the final victory at Yorktown; and

Whereas this 325th anniversary program of the patriotic citizens of Saugus is being arranged by the board of selectmen, Town Manager Walter E. Lawrence, and other officials and citizens as an inspiration to youth in these days when a godless and materialistic philosophy seeks to undermine all that Saugus has stood for over the centuries, and as a guide post to indicate the increasingly great role to be played in our Commonwealth by this Essex County town with its memories of the past and its eyes focused upon an even greater future: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the great and general court extends its congratulations and felicitations to the town of Saugus upon this auspicious occasion, together with its sincere best wishes for its continued growth and prosperity; and be it further

Resolved, That in recognition of the fact that Saugus was 1 of the 8 founding towns of the Massachusetts Bay Colony which in 1634 joined to form one of the first legislative assemblies in America, thereby making possible representative government in Massachusetts, this general court authorizes the appointment of a committee of 8, of whom 5 shall be designated by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and 3 by the President of the Senate, to officially extend the congratulations of the Commonwealth at a civic celebration to be conducted by the citizens of Saugus in this 325th anniversary year of their settlement; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state be instructed to send a suitably inscribed copy of these joint resolutions to the town of Saugus to be preserved in its archives for the benefit of posterity.

These resolutions were unanimously passed by both branches of the legislature, and to note the subsequent action thereunder I also include with these remarks the following story from the Wakefield Daily Item, a newspaper serving the town of Saugus:

Saugus Will Note 325th Anniversary

Membership of a joint committee to extend the congratulations of the general court to the town of Saugus this fall at a celebration marking its 325th anniversary as a settled community has been announced by President Richard I. Forbush, of the State senate, and Speaker Charles Gibbons, of the house of representatives.

Although resolutions congratulating towns and cities on their anniversaries are relatively common in the legislature, the unanimous action of both branches of the general court in this instance was unique in that it authorized the appointment of a committee of eight to deliver the congratulations of the Commonwealth in person.

This, in the language of the resolutions introduced jointly by Representatives Belden G. Bly, Jr., of Saugus, and Fred A. Hutchinson, of Lynn, who represent that town on Beacon Hill, was prompted by the fact that "Saugus was one of the eight founding towns of the Massachusetts Bay Colony which in 1634 joined together to form one of the first representative assemblies in America, thereby making possible representative government in Massachusetts."

The resolutions called for the appointment of five members of the house of representatives and three senators on the committee of eight.

House Speaker Charles Gibbons, of Stoneham paid Saugus the unusual compliment of naming himself to the committee from that body.

Speaker Gibbons represents Wakefield as part of his legislative district. The town of Wakefield, formerly South Reading, was in 1629, when Saugus was founded under its present name, a part of the area occupied by the Puritans. Saugus in its founding years included all of what is now the city of Lynn and the towns of Swampscott, Nahant, Lynnfield, Reading, Wakefield, and Saugus.

Serving with the speaker as members of the house delegation will be Representatives Bly and Hutchinson, Joseph F. Walsh, of Lynn, and John E. Murphy, of Peabody.

Chairman of the committee from the senate is Senator Philip A. Graham, of Hamilton, a Swampscott native, whose district includes Saugus and Lynnfield. His two associates will be Senator Charles V. Hogan, of Lynn, and Senator Robert Campbell, of Medford, home town of Town Manager Walter E. Lawrence, of Saugus.

Prior to the Saugus civic celebration of its 325th anniversary this fall, the First Iron Works Association will dedicate its colonial reproduction of the "Cradle of American Industry" in the colonial iron works on the banks of the Saugus River in that town.

Leaders of the Nation's iron and steel industry will be among the several hundred invited guests.

Arrangements for the Saugus celebration are being made by Town Manager Lawrence and the board of selectmen, whose chairman, John J. Bucchiere, sponsored the resolutions authorizing the legislative committees announced today on Beacon Hill.

The town of Saugus is one of the communities within my congressional district, and I shall take pleasure in acquainting my colleagues later on with further happenings in connection with this noteworthy anniversary.

Disorderly Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1954

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Walter Lippmann's column Today and Tomorrow, in the June 3, 1954, issue of the New York Herald Tribune, speaks volumes. I commend it to the attention of our colleagues.

Disorderly Government

The President is in serious trouble as he faces a mounting disorder in the Government and in his party. This is not solely or mainly because he must deal with so many problems for which there is no good solution and must make so many decisions where all the choices are painful. We live in a time of troubles and the President is at the center of all the big storms. The grave question, which is being put more and more insistently, has to do with his ability to cope with these problems—with whether he is losing his authority, his power, and his control over the process of governing.

He does not have the support of his party in Congress. He does not have effective control over the conduct of foreign affairs, not in matters of policy or even in matters of personnel. His prerogatives as the Chief Executive are challenged by Senator McCarthy, who is supported by Senator Mundt and others, in what is in plain and sober truth an act of open rebellion against constituted authority. And within the executive branch itself there is a pernicious demoralization due to intimidation and muddle—of which the Oppenheimer case, though the latest, is not the beginning nor will it be the end.

A common characteristic of the sensational episodes is that none of them should have been or needed to have been allowed to happen. The President, if he had a few competent advisers in the art of governing, had only to act promptly, firmly, and lucidly according to the elementary and traditional practice of constitutional government.

Take, for example, the ordeal of Secretary Stevens. The Army was being subjected to improper pressure by McCarthy, Cohn, and Carr on behalf of Schine.

Why did Mr. Stevens or his superior, Secretary Wilson, and his superior, the President, not tell Senator McCarthy to stop the pressure? When Mr. Stevens did finally decide to fight back, why was any doubt allowed to exist that he was acting under the authority of Secretary Wilson and the President? Only a year ago in the message of April 30, 1953, on the reorganization of the Defense Department, the President described the chain of command. "The three civilian Secretaries * * * are responsible" to the Secretary of Defense. "No function in any part of the Department of Defense, or in any of its component agencies, should be performed independently of the direction, authority, and control of the Secretary of Defense. The Secretary is the accountable civilian head of the Department of Defense, and under the law, my principal assistant in all matters relating to the Department."

What then was the point of allowing McCarthy to muddle up the hearings and to call Stevens a liar with all the hullabaloo about whether Stevens had or had not had orders from higher up? Either Stevens should have been removed when he quarrelled with McCarthy, or he should have been supported explicitly by the Secretary of Defense and by the President, and not treated as if perhaps he was somebody else's Secretary of the Army.

The Oppenheimer case raises issues of a very far-reaching kind which we shall all be discussing for a long time to come. But this much can be said at once since that which was easily foreseeable when it started has now in fact come to pass. The case was one which a wise, a just, and a good government would never have brought unless it was certain to be ended by a conclusive verdict. The one intolerable result is the result we have got, a divided, confused, contradictory verdict that raises enormous issues and settles none of them. Yet from the outset this was the probable, it seemed to me at the time the almost unavoidable, outcome. For the allegations were so vaguely defined, the issues were so carelessly posed, that they invited an indecisive result.

The Oppenheimer case is a product of stupidity in the administration of the loyalty and security program. Unless there was evidence—which there was not—of perjury or espionage which would have made Dr. Oppenheimer liable to criminal prosecution, the question of whether to use him or not to use him as an adviser was not one of legal right. It was one within the President's administrative discretion. It was not a question therefore which could be answered wisely or decently by a board because it was not a question which could be answered by a quasi-trial.

If the President did not want Dr. Oppenheimer to be an adviser, he should have told him so, and that would have been that. The President did not have to order a trial to decide whether to chop off Dr. Oppenheimer's head in order that the President would no longer need to have him as an adviser. There must have been a dozen ways of terminating his services if that was what the administration wanted to do. But all the decent ways of doing it required the exercise of the Executive power, instead of the tiresome and demoralizing process of avoiding decisions, of evading responsibility, and of finding someone—usually a board—to which to pass the buck.

From the Far West

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1954

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, from a former Member of this body, John T. Wood, 817 Sherman Avenue, Coeur d'Alene, Idaho, comes Washington Impressions of June 7, 1954, which reads as follows:

Time marches on. Day by day our internationalists in government are trying to get us into world war III, that great world catastrophe which will no doubt wreck civilization as we know it. All other problems—bread and butter, income tax, wages and hours, your bridge score, your latest stock market gains or losses, the Ike-McCarthy issue, the result of this fall's elections; all pale into comparative insignificance with that of whether or not we are to be sold to the god of war a third time.

Stalin did a better job for his side than F. D. R. did for us during the last war. Malenkov is still doing a better job for the commies than Dulles is doing for this country. The true winners of World War II are still winning; we are still losing.

We shall probably continue thus until we renounce the insane idea the United States is a great world leader, divinely appointed, to force the whole world into an unworkable ideal of collective security under the reign of world law, through that thoroughly discredited, and enemy dominated bastard organization—the United Nations.

Step by step the disunity of the United Nations, and the unwillingness of our supposed allies to go along with us in the execution of these delusions of grandeur—a la Dulles and company—are becoming more and more apparent daily.

We are embarking on a trek over a waterless desert with leaky water containers which will not hold water. We are not taking the most elemental precautions against ultimate disaster. We have too much to lose in such an insane venture, led by the same type of irresponsibles who got us into World Wars I and II, and the police action in Korea.

In the coming war we shall be opposed by 800 million so far unbeaten Communists; another 400 million so-called neutralists in India, who are much more disposed to go along with the Communists than with us; and still another 400 million colored peoples in Asia and Africa, who have been sold a bill of goods by the Communists that Asia should be for the Asiatics and Africa for the Africans.

These 400 million coloreds have been commie-taught, or otherwise, to hate the white man, and white colonial rule. Our internationalists in our Government have been defending colonial rule in Indochina, Iran, Egypt, Morocco, and central Africa through the United Nations, and otherwise. Indeed, the United Nations was set up in the first place to defend the vested interests of the victor nations against those of the vanquished at the close of World War II, and most of its decisions have not been such as to endear the United States to the colored nations.

Our supposed European allies are no more dependable than were those whom Britain hired to do her fighting in our Revolutionary War, who lost the war for the British. We have paid the national debts of most of these European peoples, at the expense of increasing our own to nearly $300 billion, and the end is not yet.

Now that we have set them up in business, and have about reached the end of our financial rope, they are unwilling to go along any further with our internationalists in their mad delusions of grandeur. They have served notice upon us since the Korean debacle and the silly Geneva conference they want no more of it. Perhaps they are wiser than we.

So, from here on we go it alone; if and when we go. And the colored world, used by Russia, may yet prove to be the deciding factor in the coming war which has been projected for us by the internationalists. And perhaps the world's biggest guess from here on may be: Where will the colored world go from here on, and with whom will they join forces?

Americans. Stop, look, and listen. We cannot hitch our wagon to the star of the internationalists. For that star is sterile and barren and cannot support life. Their bungling lost us World Wars I and II and the Korean police action. How can you assume they might conduct world war III any better? They are steadily building up sentiment to treasonably force us into a world government. How can you assume they can be intelligent in conducting our affairs within that body, when they have just about wrecked our own? You might as well expect that Judas Iscariot might have founded the Christian religion.

No. This wagon of ours has too much in it. We must never hitch it to that kind of a star. That wagon carries the attainment of individual freedom, under God and our Constitution. It carries the results of the genius of the American people toward self-government, which was triumphant until we listened to the siren's song of the internationalists during World War I and since. It is still not too late to save the rest of the world. But to do it we must first save America as the world's greatest object lesson of how a free people shall become a happy people in contrast to the despair of those under any form of totalitarian rule. Only by the reestablishment of America as a free constitutional, representative republic, may the world be saved from the horror of a second Dark Ages.

House Bill 8834

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 7, 1954

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I have received so many requests for information concerning a bill which I introduced in the House recently—H. R. 8834—that I desire to make a brief explanation of the provisions of this bill for the benefit of the membership of the House.

H. R. 8834 provides for the payment of compensation to reinstated or restored persons in the Federal classified civil service when the grounds are that the removal or suspension was "unjustified or unwarranted" either as a result of the determination of the merits of the case or because of procedural error. Such pay shall cover the period during which such persons were removed or suspended and for which no compensation was received. The pay shall be at the rate at the time of such suspension or removal.

Requires that any person who is reduced in compensation under the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944, who, after answering the reasons advanced for such reduction or after an appeal to the Civil Service Commission as provided under such act, is restored to his former rate of compensation on the ground that such reduction was unjustified or unwarranted, either as a result of the determination of the merits of the case or because of procedural error, shall be paid an amount equal to the difference between (a) the amount of compensation he would have received during the period his rate of compensation was reduced if such reduction had not been made, and (b) the amount of compensation he actually received during such period. Effective as of April 1, 1951, amending United States Code, volume 5, section 652.

Fiction Titles on Anticommunism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. McCARTHY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1954

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Wilson Library Bulletin:

Fiction Titles on Anticommunism—A Selected List of the Past 15 Years

(Compiled by Antoinette Ciolli)

Borden, Mary (Lady Spears), Catspaw (English title: For the Record) (Longmans, 1950): Purports to be the confession of a disillusioned Communist spy, who had served as secretary to the popular prince of a small European state, which was eventually taken over by the Communists. The unsuspecting prince was used at a catspaw by the Communists, and when it became evident that he had been taken in, he committed suicide. (Book Review Digest.)

Dortort, David, Post of Honor (McGraw, 1949): We are introduced to young Max Gerard in 1934: agitation-propaganda director of the Brownsville branch, Young Communist League of America. Max Gerard believed passionately in the Communist ideal, brotherhood as an end. But he began to have his doubts about Communist means when he saw Young Communist leader Barney Price deliberately provoke a police attack on a peaceful picket line * * * From that first split we follow Max through the stages of his disillusionment—job in Harlem, Spanish civil war, United States Army after Pearl Harbor—to the point where he casts aside all ideologies and arrays himself on the other side of power, whatever that power is. On the people's side. (Book Review Digest.)

Dos Passos, John, Adventures of a Young Man (Harcourt, 1939): This is a novel written out of a mood of disillusionment * * * Glenn Spotswood is a very earnest, idealistic youngster, conditioned to championship of the underdog by a vaguely liberal father who lost his professorship at Columbia because of his opposition to our entry into the world war. He was seduced by Das Kapital at a tender age, and soon after college enrolled as a member of the Communist Party. His story is one of progressive disillusion and frustration in the revolutionary movement, to which, in its objectives, he remains faithful to his death. (Book Review Digest.)

Fischer, Bertha Mark (Mrs. Louis Fischer), The Nazarovs (Harper, 1948): Story of 50 years in the lives of the Nazarovs, a Russian textile manufacturing family, from the end of the reign of Alexander III to the middle of World War II. Although some of the family became loyal Communists, their former bourgeois background prevented them from keeping high positions in the Soviet Union. * * * Since the history of a betrayed idea is it real subject and since the fates of most of her characters are predictable long in advance, the aliveness of Mrs. Fischer's story is a real achievement. * * * Mrs. Fischer grinds a heavy ax in this militantly anti-Stalinist story, but it is one that is deadly sharp. (Book Review Digest.)

Gibbs, Willa, Tender Men (Farrar, Straus, 1948): Dakota farm boy cuts home ties to become a newspaperman. When he is down to his last dollar a Communist organizer picks him as usable material. Psychoanalyzed, schooled in Marxism and his trade, he becomes a valuable asset. Under severe stress he fails to follow directions and is sentenced to death. Exposé of Communist methods and strategy, individual equality, but complete subjection of national and personal rights. (Book Review Digest.)

Hazlitt, Henry, The Great Idea (Appleton, 1951): Stalenin's son, Peter, sheltered from babyhood on a remote Bermudian isle, returns to Moscow, capital of Wonworld, to face a rigorously regimented life. * * * Stalenin's death places Peter in power, but opposed by ambitious No. 1. Deputy Bolshekov, and aided in his search for a restoration of humanitarian government by No. 2, the American, Adams. Peter and Adams engage in endless economic discussion, but do take time out to activate reforms by restoring free enterprise. For this they are forced to flee westward, where the form Freeworld in America. (Kirkus quoted in Book Review Digest.)

Koestler, Arthur, Age of Longing (Macmillan, 1951): Set in Paris, the story opens on Bastille Day, 195– and closes the following February, with the air-raid sirens announcing the last judgment—or maybe just another air-raid exercise. [It] assembles a group of characters who exemplify a variety of viewpoints, and whose talk and conduct dramatize the author's ideas. (Book Review Digest.)

The young writer "sees through communism" and hankers for the utopia he has intellectually rejected. (Book Review Digest.)

Koestler, Arthur, Darkness at Noon (Macmillian, 1941): A novel of the Moscow trials. * * *

Brilliant as this book is as a novel, and a piece of prison literature, it is probably the most valuable as an interpretation of the Moscow "confessions" by someone with an inner knowledge of totalitarian methods. (Fiction Catalog, 1942–46 Supplement.)

Orwell, George, Animal Farm (Harcourt, 1946): A political satire, written in the guise of an allegory. The animals on a certain farm, rise, overthrow their drunken master, and take over the running of the farm themselves. The pigs, being more intelligent, are the leaders. Gradually the utopian state passes and dictatorship seeps in; the situation is no better than it was before.

It has the double meaning, the sharp edge, and the lucidity of Swift; it also has a clever hostility if one applies the analogy to Soviet Russia. (Book Review Digest.)

Orwell, George, Nineteen Eighty-Four (Harcourt, 1949): A satirical novel about a future time when people living in a collectivist society are persuaded by thought police into thinking that ignorance is strength and war is peace. The chief character is an average man, Winston Smith, whose work in the ministry of truth consists of falsifying records when state policy changes. "The novel depicts his heroic search for an underground movement in revolt against the state. It also tells of the sad course of his attempt to escape the frustrated conception of sex and to carry on a love affair that bears some resemblance to romance, some relation to physical joy." (Saturday Review of Literature quoted in Book Review Digest.)

Singer, Israel Joshua, East of Eden (originally published as Chaver Nachman) (Knopf, 1939): A story of Jewish life in Poland and Russia from just before the World War through the Bolshevik revolution. The story centers around poor and idealistic Nachman, a Socialist who longed to go to Russia, that land east of Eden, and was bitterly disillusioned with what he found there. (Fiction Catalog, 1941.)

Sothern, Margaret, Death Solves Nothing (Sheed, 1938): Sophia, the heroine, is a German-Polish woman of aristocratic birth, reduced to direct poverty by the Nazi regime. In France she meets a Russian Communist spy, with whom she falls in love. After a period happiness, bitterness and doubt again assail Sophia, and the book ends with her violent death. (Book Review Digest.)

Sperber, Manes, Burned Bramble (Doubleday, 1951): Novel about the Communist Party in Europe in the 1930's. The book centers around the figure of Soennecke, an old-time colleague of Rosa Luxembourg, the leader of the German Communist Party, and his two chief lieutenants, Vasso and Doino, young central European Communists, as pure in intent as Soennecke, but already incipient deviationists, beset with desperate doubts about the Soviet leaders and the naked expediency of the party line. These three make the nucleus and it is through their activities that you come to know the many other figures whom Mr. Sperber weaves into the labyrinth of the underground Communist network. (New York Herald Tribune Book Review quoted in Book Review Digest).

Sperber, Manes, the Abyss (Doubleday, 1952): Second in a trilogy of novels dealing with Communists and ex-Communists in Europe during the 1930's and 1940's. The chief character in this installment is Doino Faber, a Yugoslav who escapes the fate of his friends and finds refuge for a time in France. (Book Review Digest.)

Trilling, Lionel, Middle of the Journey (Viking, 1947): A novel of ideas, the scene of which is a Connecticut farming district in the late 1930's. The chief protagonist is John Laskell who goes there to recover from an almost fatal illness, and to be near his friends, the Crooms, who are summer residents. Although he is not a devout Communist, Laskell is instrumental in saving an ex-Communist friend from possible violence. That fact and the pitiful death of the young daughter of one of the natives provides the little action of the novel. (Book Review Digest.)

Wylie, Ida Alexa Ross, Furious Young Man (Little, 1936): Fired by youthful zeal and faith in the principles of communism, Tor Wyatt went to Russia, where he married a loyal Soviet worker. Disillusionment followed when he saw communism in action—his hoped-for Utopia was brutal and autocratic, his Russian wife deserted him, and he returned to conservative England and an English sweetheart. Melodramatic and tinged with propaganda. (Booklist quoted in Fiction Catalog, 1941.)

Annual Banquet, Ward 1, Lynn Woods Civic Association, Lynn, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1954

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following, which is part of the address I delivered at the annual banquet of ward 1, Lynn Woods Civic Association, Lynn, Mass., on Monday, June 7, 1954, at Briarcliff Lodge:

The neighborhood in which a person grows up or spends many years of his life rates high in his affections.

The fact that its people are well known to him, that its familiar places are a comforting sight, gives him a feeling of friendship, loyalty, and security.

Here is the school he went to.

There is the church he attends.

Next to his family and his home, the neighborhood is very close to him, almost like a larger family to which he belongs.

It is not just a street or a block.

When someone in Lynn inquires about a person, you begin by saying: "Joe Johnson? Sure I know him. He lives in ward 1."

That is the main point of identification. Incidental details follow.

Wards were originally intended as political subdivisions of a city.

They also have a social meaning, like those groupings in a big city, for instance, that are known as the Ward 14 Social and Athletic Club or the Ladies' Charitable Aid Society of Ward 20.

Ever notice how clannish some wards can be?

A newcomer has to serve an apprenticeship—prove himself before he is admitted to full membership. After that, if he wants to run for public office or begins to keep company with a girl with an eye to matrimony or starts up in a business or profession, the ward gives him confidence and support that he would receive nowhere else.

In all the patterns of life, from family to religion, to political party, fraternal membership, and one's relationship to an occupation or a profession, none has the balanced community interest that is typified by a good neighborhood.

Ward 1 is a section of neat and attractive middle-class homes that has taken on a new look with all the residential building that has taken place since the end of World War II.

It is representative of a significant development in American life during recent years.

High or low the dream of every citizen is to own a home of his own with a lawn around it for beauty and privacy, and with neighbors who have also improved their position in life.

People once lived in the center of cities, in crowded tenements where there was little light or air, and no elbow room for children to develop in a safe and healthy environment.

The automobile has changed all that.

People don't have to live within walking distance of their work.

Greater conveniences have enabled the humblest citizen to work and save and plan for a home instead of a tenement.

This is what we mean by opportunity and progress.

And, in the process, a change comes over people.

With a chance to realize their dreams, their morale improves, and they acquire a greater sense of responsibility.

The man who owns his home has a real stake in the life of his community and its problems.

The tax-rate is no longer a remote subject for others to solve.

He does not take city services for granted.

The school is much more to him now than an institution that contacts him once a month through the medium of report cards regarding the educational welfare of his children.

He suddenly finds himself taking a real and vital interest in all matters that affect his neighborhood.

At the start it is prompted by the immediate recognition that the progress or decline of his neighborhood is tied in with profit or loss.

But the roots of real living go much deeper than that.

Happier home life, happier children, and encouraging signs that those around us—across the street, down the avenue, and up the hill, are sharing in the progress of your ward, build self-respect and pride in the life around us.

In the world of today, where there is so much suspicion, envy, and turmoil, the extension of neighborliness in action that we witness here could accomplish far more to solve problems than all the postures and intrigues and forced compromises that keep the world in fear and confusion.

The Ward 1 Civic Association is an example of people working together for a common purpose voluntarily.

Doing it on your own initiative and because you have learned to have confidence in one another.

This is true community spirit.

It cannot be regimented.

It cannot be left to Government.

Only as people do things for themselves and for their neighborhood, whether it be the ward, the city, the State, the Nation, or the world community and through the medium of public opinion, can we ever make genuine progress that is fair to all concerned.

The Ward 1 Civic Association is proof that it can be done.

I congratulate you on your enterprise.

Your neighborhood is a finer place in which to live because you have made it so.

Intemperance Opposed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1954

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, from the people in my home town comes another petition in support of legislation prohibiting the advertising of alcoholic beverages and its transportation in interstate commerce.

It reads as follows:

Inasmuch as our Nation faces a world of dangers in which it becomes imperatively necessary to conserve our youth and to achieve a high degree of fitness, we, the members of the Women's Christian Temperance Union and friends of the churches of Michigan, earnestly beseech you to support the Bryson bill, H. R. 1227, and the Langer bill, S. 3294, to prohibit in interstate commerce the transportation of alcoholic-beverages advertising in newspapers, periodicals, etc., and its broadcasting over the radio and television:

Lucy Hicks, Hilda Woonders, Jessie Gorlock, Myrtle P. Kremer, Leah Weston, Zelma Harris, Grace Teusink, Lucille Ingalsbee, Ted Hicks, Ernest Harris, Henry Teusink, Ben Woonders, Jean Alcott, Milan J. Levett, Pauline Peterson, Ruth Terry, Mina S. Tracy, Etta C. Lemon, Florence Cook, Mrs. Amy Glaze, Lewis Huntley, Emily S. Wise, Azella Welsh, Dora Warner, Cleo Stukel, Harriet Moore, Nellie B. Hope, W. J. Moore, William B. Plummer, Evelyn Gillette, Myra Tripp, Marguerite Hale, James O. Leech, Clara H. Brainard, Thelma M. Meyer, Jo Mihelheim, Joyce Magers, Betty J. Levett, Grace A. Campbell, Doris Adams, Helen Whisler, Allegan, Mich.; Blanche Kenbeck, Kalamazoo, Mich.; Lois Plummes, Mahlan J. Henrich, Harold E. Terry, Edward E. Peterson, Gael E. Marvin, Ona L. Terry, Frank J. Terry, Peggy Leech, Helen Kilburn, June Zuerback, Allegan, Mich.

Let's Protect American Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1954

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Speaker, foreign imports have struck again, and the consequences are closed plants and greater unemployment. Last week, the Charleston, W. Va., plant of the Libby-Owens-Ford Glass Co. announced the closing of a production furnace and an experimental furnace, a move which will cost 240 men their jobs. Two other units closed less than a year ago, affecting about 260 employees, and these have not been put back into production. The competition of cheap foreign labor in the plate-glass industry has, therefore, cost 500 skilled and highly paid craftsmen the means of earning a livelihood. This is an American industry, Mr. Speaker, and these are American workmen. They are Americans who pay taxes and who give their sons and daughters to protect America on the fields of battle.

The Libby-Owens-Ford plant is the largest plate-glass factory in the world. The plant normally employs approximately 1,800 workers, and the latest cutback has reduced the force to 1,300.

Officials of the company and representatives of labor are in agreement that the rapid increase in imports of European window glass, made under low-wage conditions, has been the direct cause of the work loss. Wages at the Charleston plant average six times as much per hour as those paid to European employees for the same type of work, and almost identical types of machines are used. The disastrous increase in imports can readily be seen by comparing figures for 1948 with those of 1953. In 1948 about 1 million square feet of plate glass was imported. In 1953 the United States imported 100 million square feet of glass—an increase of 100 times the amount imported 5 years earlier. The 1953 figure represents 1,020,000 man-hours of work in modern window-glass factories.

The bad effects of glutting window-glass markets are not confined to my district in West Virginia. The American Window Glass plant at Jeannette, Pa., has recently closed, and 800 employees have been laid off. Likewise, reductions have been made at the Pittsburgh Plate

Glass plant, and the Libby-Owens-Ford plant at Shreveport, La., is operating only 2 out of 4 furnaces.

Mr. Speaker, American industries cannot stand against the competition of slave labor in foreign countries without reasonable protection. Since coming to Congress, many of us have clamored for and demanded this protection from the administration. Our voices have been raised in vain and have fallen upon heedless ears. In following the admonition that we are our brother's keeper, the administration thinks only of our brothers abroad but is thoughtless of our brothers at home. The storm warnings are continuing to grow on the economic horizon, as more and more men and women are thrown out of work and are added to relief rolls.

A few days ago, I introduced a bill designed to restore to Congress the final responsibility for any adjustments made in tariffs. The aim of my bill would be to establish imports on a fair competitive basis by avoiding import injury to domestic producers. The final authority in tariff modification would be shifted from the executive to the legislative branch. I believe this change is imperative, because the tariff would no longer be used as an instrument of diplomacy even to the detriment of American industries and the people who work in them. While the executive branch would no longer have the final word in a tariff adjustment, the bill nevertheless provides that the Department of State might, if it so desired, send to Congress a statement seting forth its views on any tariff adjustment order. The National Security Council would likewise be given a voice in the determination of cases, to the extent of having a representative sit with the Tariff Commission during hearings.

The bill also provides for an import quota on residual fuel oil. This provision would be a protection to the coal industry.

The overall objective of this bill is to assure the largest volume of imports that may be absorbed by this country without causing import injury to American industries. It would provide the machinery by which our tariffs may be reasonably and fairly adjusted so as to protect the American people first. It would offer some help to the coal industry, the glass industry, the pottery industry, and the many other industries whose enterprising initiative has given the American people the highest standard of living in the world and whose ingenuity has made America the hope of all humankind.

Congress Should Probe Poultry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 7, 1954

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I herewith include an article entitled "Congress Should Probe Poultry," written by Hilton E. Hanna for the May issue of the Butcher Workman. In this article Mr. Hanna focuses attention on a problem of sanitation in the meat industry. The article follows:

CONGRESS SHOULD PROBE POULTRY

(By Hilton E. Hanna)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The following article by our feature writer, Hilton E. Hanna, focuses attention on a problem that has too long been ignored. Time for action in this situation is already overdue. It ought to be pointed out, however, that nothing in this article or in others that might follow on the subject, is intended to cast reflection or damage the reputation of the poultry industry, which has literally mushroomed into a mammoth industry practically overnight and in a sense may still be experiencing "growing pains." Despite this fact, it is the sincere hope of the Butcher Workman, that the American people and their elected representatives will so "rise to the occasion" that the practices described here may be promptly and completely eliminated, not only from the operations of companies in which they have been reported, but whereever they might exist, and that such conditions never again be permitted on any scale or in any area of the industry. When such action has been taken, then chicken—back, the breast and all the rest—will once more be the bird we have always loved. P. E. G.)

Approximately 50 years ago, 1906 to be exact, Upton Sinclair aroused an indifferent Nation to the incredible lack of sanitation, sickening economic conditions, and the sea of human misery that surrounded the meatpacking industry of that period. Sinclair vividly described those conditions in his long famous book, The Jungle.

Today, conditions in certain areas of the poultry industry cry out to high heavens for another Sinclair to paint forceful word pictures and focus attention on the appalling new jungle which as sprung up in the poultry industry. This "jungle business" in the poultry industry seems to flourish in cases where the rotten products can be most easily "passed off" without detection. In other words the purveyors of this filthy trade make their "big haul" on the unsuspecting consumer in instances where the chickens are cut up and sold in packages of breasts, wings, drum sticks, or some other particular parts of the bird and featured as ready for frying or stewing.

The story of this modern jungle is neither the easiest nor the most pleasant for the Butcher Workman to relate. It is difficult to handle, first of all because of the welfare of our members, 30,000 of whom are earning their livelihood in the poultry industry. Equally important, it is a difficult story to handle because of the welfare of those employers in the industry who take pride in the reputation of their business and do everything in their power to make sure that the products they handle are every bit as sanitary and wholesome as those of the great meatpacking industry of today. In spite of these considerations, the general welfare of the consuming public—which means all of us—demands that the story be told.

At the present time it is estimated that approximately 300,000 workers are employed in the poultry industry in the United States. In plants where the workers are organized, their contracts provide for sanitary and other decent working conditions. This pride in production and cooperative policing of working conditions has developed to such a point that in a number of areas of the country, processed poultry products carry both the seal of our International Union, the Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen of North America, and the brand name or trademark of the company employing our members. This system of labeling serves as a double guaranty of highest quality products. It is double assurance that both the union and the companies stand 100 percent behind the products they produce.

On the other hand, recent attempts to organize in certain areas of the poultry industry reveal the existence of some truly putrid, filthy, inhuman, and almost unbelievable conditions. Affidavits in our possession point out that in instance after instance, employees are forced to work day in and day out under sickening conditions, handling and preparing diseased birds which move along in trade and eventually wind up on the tables of unsuspecting customers.

Get the story firsthand from some of the poultry workers themselves. Listen to this account from affidavit No. 1:

"My job was to pull feathers, and those who were on this job with me and I were the first ones to handle the chickens after they had passed through the scalding process and roughing machine. When the chickens reached me, most of the feathers were off the bodies and I could see the skin of the birds very clearly.

"It is quite often that thousands of chickens would pass on the line with sores on their bodies. Thousands of them would have large swellings as large as a chicken egg on their bodies. These swellings were filled with a yellowish pus, and the odor was very strong. Others would have red spots all over their bodies that looked like smallpox."

Affidavit No. 2 reads in part as follows:

"I have seen thousands of chickens that I have worked on that had large sores on their bodies. Some of the sores had hard scabs on them and some of them would be open. I have, when I had time, cut these sores off. These sores would range in size from a dime to the size of a half dollar. I have also seen chickens with red spots all over their bodies. We did not know what caused these red spots but we would remark to each other that they had smallpox or measles."

Here is another worker's sworn statement:

"When I was killing chickens I have cut the throats of many chickens that were already dead and stiff. These dead chickens would at times have part of their heads mashed off. The first time I saw these kind of chickens come along, I did not cut their throats, but (my) supervisors came and told me to cut their throats and let them go through with the good ones. I obeyed them from then on until I changed jobs.

"When on the killing job, I would also kill chickens that would be sick and have long, thick, and stringy pus coming from their mouths and nostrils.

"When clipping gizzards I would see large growths on the entrails that looked like a mass of jelly. These chicken entrails would smell awfully bad, and at times would make me sick at the stomach. The entrails would have small pimples on them that looked similar to measles. The gizzards would be full of worms and would get all over my hands, and they would also have some kind of hard growths on them. The livers would be almost green at times.

"These diseased livers and gizzards would be taken to the stuffing table and put in a sack and placed back in the chickens."

Affidavit No. 4 gives this picture:

"When packing there would be hundreds of chickens per day come into the packing room that would be bruised, have sores on them, and the chest cavity would be covered with pus. Sometimes the skins of chickens would be so covered with sores (sores that would have openings with a hard gristly ring around them, others that would have scabs over the sores, and others with red pimples that looked like measles and chicken pox) that I would have to take the entire skin off. Some of these sores could be cut off. After taking the skin off or cutting the sores off, I would pack them in boxes and see them loaded on trucks to be taken to market. Others that would have different parts that had turned green would have the green parts cut off and the rest of the carcas would be packed and loaded out for market."

FEDERAL INSPECTION NEEDED

This threat to the Nation's health and welfare exists primarily because there is no Federal law compelling inspection of poultry products which move in interstate commerce. Consequently, in the main, only the laws of the jungle prevail in the preparation of poultry products for market.

Contrast poultry with meat and you get the picture. It is estimated that approximately 80 percent of the Nation's meat supply is prepared under compulsory Federal inspection and most of the rest is subject to State or local inspection laws. On the other hand, none of the Nation's poultry is sold under compulsory Federal inspection and relatively few States have any compulsory poultry inspection. For example, even the great State of Illinois, home of our International headquarters, has no compulsory poultry inspection.

There is, however, a Federal poultry inspection and grading program, but it is purely voluntary and covers less than 20 percent of the Nation's commercial poultry supply. This voluntary program is invited and accepted by those poultry houses and establishments that take pride in being able to advertise and offer their products to the public as "U. S. Government inspected" or "Government graded." These producers, and others whose contracts with their organized employees provide for sanitary conditions, and other operators who cater to a limited trade or invite their customers to watch their birds being dressed, are the major exceptions to the jungle laws that prevail in the industry.

Time and again the affidavits that call attention to the complete lack of sanitation and utterly filthy conditions that exist in certain areas of the poultry industry, point to the fact that no inspectors, Federal, State, or local, are ever seen around the plants.

Another worker makes a sworn statement:

"My job was cleaning up and during the last 4 months my job was cutting off feet. This job required that I handle and cut the feet off every third chicken. During my tenure of employment I have never seen the Federal, county, or State inspector in the plant. I have seen thousands of chickens with large sores, broken wings, discolored spots, and some were green and slimy. These chickens were then sent into the packing room for shipment. I have never seen a chicken that was discarded as unfit for human consumption. All chickens regardless of their condition were sent to the packing room."

Affidavit No. 6 says this:

"My job was to take the galls off the livers. I also had to handle the hearts. I have handled thousands of livers with big ugly sores, hearts that were enlarged to twice their normal size, and hearts that were covered with pus. Sometimes these sores would break open and an odor was so bad that I could hardly stand it. I would put the livers and hearts into a trough, diseased ones and all. They were then washed by a machine and sent to the packing room where they were prepared for shipment. I was instructed to put every one, including the diseased part, into the trough which I did. I have never see an inspector in the plant."

The description of conditions above reported was furnished our union by poultry plant employees who have recently entered our ranks and who seek through the Amalgamated the benefits of collected bargaining. Our union will always insist upon contracts that provide at least minimum standards of health and sanitation in production as well as improved conditions of employment for the workers.

ISSUE BIGGER THAN JUST A CONTRACT

By their affidavits these newly organized workers show an unwillingness to act as silent partners in abuses of the American public. They themselves have taken the first important step to remedy the situation. They have called on our international union to help save their health, their lives, and their consciences.

We have responded and entered the picture in all good faith, as their chosen representatives. As the record of our organization shows, we are never unmindful of the welfare of our employers. At the same time, no representative of the Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen would or could afford to accept a contract unless such an agreement specifically provided for sanitary conditions of production and other improved conditions of employment, as well as higher wages.

Putting it bluntly and briefly, the workers have acted—they have started the ball rolling. Our union in turn has gone to bat and is doing everything in its power to help clean up the mess. Now it seems that it is time for Mr. and Mrs. John Q. Public to swing into action, not only with an aroused conscience and moral indignation, but also with a positive demand for action and result by Congress, the State legislatures, city and county lawmakers, public-health officers, and other interested citizens and officials.

It is true that the passing and enforcement of adequate food-inspection laws to protect the American people from diseased poultry, foul chicken, and such matters, may not appeal to the fancy or capture the imagination of either the general public or the lawmakers in the same manner as spectacular congressional hearings, pock-marked windshields, or somber speculation about involvement in another shooting war. But it strikes us that this poultry jungle which has been described for us is a perfectly natural field, fertile with possibilties for a super on-the-scene congressional investigation, fully equipped with TV, radio, and newsreel pickups.

Paraphrasing a well-known quotation, we would say that now is the time for all good men—lawmakers and crusaders included—to come to the aid of their country. And if the old adage still holds good that the way to a man's heart is through his stomach, then the gentleman or gentlelady who first promotes the investigation here suggested and follows it up with positive and effective action, will not only win the undying praise of his countrymen, but will have earned the everlasting support of his constituents.

CHALLENGE TO THE INDUSTRY

We pointed out at the beginning that this story is neither the easiest nor the most pleasant for the Butcher Workman to publish. We are fully aware that there are limitless possibilities for distortion, misunderstanding, and even condemnation of the entire poultry industry because of the situation described in these pages.

In spite of the adverse possibilities referred to here, we have complete faith and confidence in the basic judgment of the American people. They can be counted on to act with sanity when all the facts are known. The history of the country proves that. For example, there is hardly a major industry of the Nation which has not had its "black sheep" or "dark days" sometime through the years, but playing ostrich by sticking one's head in the sand has never solved any problem. Problems are solved by frankly facing facts and acting on them in an honest, intelligent, and determined manner.

It might be worth pointing out here that as a result of public reaction to the countless tales of grease joints or eating places, the catering industry has developed a healthy trend of closer inspection of food and equipment, and more rigid health requirements for its personnel. It has brought in the development toward more plain-view or see-it-done kitchens.

We again call attention to the fact that 30,000 of the employees in the poultry industry are organized workers. The contracts of these workers, with health and sanitary working condition clauses, are assurances that the products they handle are produced under sanitary conditions. In many sections of the country, in the absence of adequate Federal or State law, these contracts of the organized workers are the only guaranty that consumers have that they are getting food fit for human consumption when they purchase poultry products. This means that in such cases, our Amalgamated members and their employers are the guardians of the health and welfare of the consumers.

On the other hand, we are forced to call attention to the fact that there are still approximately 270,000 or 9 times as many unorganized as organized workers in the poultry industry. The unorganized are wage earners without contracts and therefore without effective voice in saying anything about the sanitation and working conditions in their places of employment. Wherever this is the case and where no adequate State inspection law exists and where the processors choose not to invite Federal inspection, the consuming public is completely at the mercy of plant operators, many of whom may prove to be unscrupulous.

ORGANIZING DRIVE GOES FORWARD

We have carried our drive for union organization of poultry workers right into the heart of tough antiunion territory with excellent results thus far. Last fall the employees of the Denison Poultry & Egg Co. and the Eastex Poultry Co., both of Center, Tex., voted in an NLRB election to have the Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen represent them as bargaining agent.

For fully 6 months representatives of our union tried by every legal means possible to negotiate contracts for better wages and conditions of employment for the workers, including such conditions of health and sanitation for the employees as would insure that the workers would not be compelled to touch or expose themselves to unwholesome or diseased products. But when all negotiating efforts failed and no sign of reasonable agreement was in sight, the workers went out on strike. It was their means of last resort.

INSPECTION LAWS IN ACTION

Eastex Poultry Co. is listed by the United States Department of Agriculture on its January 1954 list as a plant operating under the voluntary Federal sanitation program by contract with the Agricultural Marketing Service.

Denison Poultry Co. is not so listed by Uncle Sam.

Affidavits in our possession concerning the operations of Eastex Poultry raise some serious questions about the thoroughness and effectiveness of the present Federal poultry inspection program.

The products of Denison Poultry and other Texas poultry processors have moved in commerce to some States under circumstances of doubtful legality. A few States, like California, have rigid poultry inspection laws which provide that out-of-State poultry need not be reinspected if it originates in States whose inspection laws are as strict as their own.

Texas has no poultry inspection law at all. But nevertheless to enable Texas-produced poultry to reach out-of-State markets, the Texas Commissioner of Agriculture went ahead on his own and appointed inspectors to whom he gave authority to certify as to sanitation and grade of poultry produced in

Texas without the guidance of any published tests or standards.

The legality of these unwarranted appointments and so-called inspection procedures is under severe challenge initiated by Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen of North America Local 103. As we go to press, on the union's motion the District Court of Travis County has issued an order restraining and enjoining the Commissioner of Agriculture of the State of Texas from appointing any poultry inspectors or taking any action relative to poultry inspection anywhere in the State of Texas other than adherence to the standards and tests required by the United States Department of Agriculture.

Further developments in this case will be reported in future issues of the Butcher Workman.

THREAT TO HEALTH OF ALL

The situation gets worse the more you think of it. It gets to be really tragic when you realize that in this air age, poultry from unorganized and uninspected plants can be flown from one end of the country to another in simply a matter of hours. Or if we consider only the refrigerated trucks, poultry processed and packed in one place can be hundreds of miles away, possibly across the borders of several States, in an overnight period. This means that distance from the unorganized and uninspected plants is no longer a protection.

This situation is a direct threat, both to the consuming public and to those workers and employers who are cooperating in every way possible to produce quality products. If only from the standpoint of its own material welfare, therefore, it would seem that the poultry industry itself should be leading the cleanup campaign, both for effective inspection laws adequately enforced and for a well-organized, self-policing campaign.

Even though another Upton Sinclair comes along to fully dramatize the surroundings of another "jungle," the Amalgamated Meat Cutters will continue its usual course. We will go on organizing the unorganized and servicing our members, cooperating with those fair-minded and decent employers, and appealing to the American people, the Congress of the United States and to the various State legislatures for action in cleaning up and straightening out any unhealthy situations we may encounter, whether in poultry or any other industry or enterprise.

Disposal of Government Surplus Food

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1954

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Speaker, in January of this year, I contacted Mr. Marshall P. Driggs, Chief, Direct Distribution Branch, Food Distribution Division, Agricultural Marketing Service, and requested that adequate amounts of food from Government surplus stocks be provided for distribution to the unemployed people in West Virginia. The response to my request was encouraging and immediate. Many carloads of surplus food have subsequently been channeled into that area and have brought relief to thousands of families. The distribution is continuing through the cooperation on the State level of the West Virginia Department of public assistance, the United Mine Workers of America, and the Salvation Army.

There has been some misunderstanding as to whether there is any regulation in the law which limits the quantity of surplus foods that may be made available to eligible recipients. In order to clarify this question, I have contacted the United States Department of Agriculture and have received a reply which answers the question as follows:

> There is nothing in the law which limits the quantity of surplus foods that may be made available to eligible recipients. They can be distributed in any quantity which can be utilized in its entirety and not be wasted.

In order that other Members of Congress may have the benefit of this information, I am including a letter from Mr. George A. Dice, Acting Deputy Administrator, United States Department of Agriculture.

Mr. Speaker, 136,500 people in West Virginia are receiving surplus food. While I am grateful to the Federal Government for the cooperation rendered by the Department of Agriculture in supplying hungry families with food, I must say, nevertheless, that the Federal Government continues to do nothing to offset growing unemployment and to provide the coal industry, the glass industry, the pottery industry, and other American industries with the protection which they so vitally need against the importation of cheap foreign goods which are continuing to glut the markets thus depriving our fellow Americans of the right to work and earn their daily bread.

The letter referred to follows:

JUNE 3, 1954.

Hon. ROBERT C. BYRD,
House of Representatives.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: On several occasions you have directed inquiries to Mr. M. P. Driggs, of this service, concerning the distribution of surplus commodities to needy families and persons in West Virginia. Just recently, you asked Mr. Driggs for additional information about the continued availability of surplus commodities.

Surplus commodities are acquired by the Department under the provisions of section 32 of the act of August 24, 1935, as amended. They may be made available to nonprofit school-lunch programs, charitable institutions, needy Indians, and families and persons determined to be in need by appropriate State and local agencies. In West Virginia, the State department of public welfare is administratively responsible for the distribution of surplus commodities. The foods presently available are butter, cheese, nonfat dry milk solids, canned beef and gravy, dry beans, shortening and, in some instances, potatoes. There is nothing in the law which limits the quantity of surplus foods that may be made available to eligible recipients. They can be distributed in any quantity which can be utilized in its entirety and not be wasted. Thus, if a State distributing agency is requested for permission to increase the quantity of a particular surplus commodity because of need, the distributing agency has authority to grant the request as long as the supply is sufficient for this purpose. We are attaching a guide for distribution to needy persons which State distributing agencies use as a base. As indicated, it is elastic in its application.

Twenty-six counties in West Virginia at the present time are distributing surplus commodities to needy families and persons. The total number of participants under the program is 136,500. The counties include Barbour, Boone, Braxton, Cabell, Clay, Fayette, Greenbrier, Harrison, Kanawha, Lincoln, Logan, Marion, Mason, Mercer, Mingo, Monongalia, McDowell, Nicholas, Ohio, Preston, Putnam, Raleigh, Randolph, Taylor, Wood, and Wyoming.

As was indicated to you, the Department, upon request, will continue to make surplus commodities available to West Virginia consistent with the needs of the State.

Sincerely yours,

————— —————,
Acting Deputy Administrator.

Thousands of Yugoslav Patriots—Soviet Slaves in Siberia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES J. KERSTEN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 2, 1954

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, between the time the Russian troops first entered Yugoslavia and the final liquidation of the forces of General Mihailovich, I am informed that thousands—perhaps 50,000—troops of Mihailovich's were brutally deported from their homeland into Siberia where they now languish. These Yugoslav patriots fought on the side of freedom during the war and because of that they are now living under subhuman conditions of Soviet slave camps. The United States should present this matter to the United Nations and demand the freedom of these individuals. Recently I received a letter from an authoritative person describing this situation. I will not disclose the name of my informant because of relatives and friends of his who are presently living under the Communist regime in Yugoslavia. It seems that it is as necessary to protect people believing in liberty whether in Tito's Communist state or in the Communist states under Moscow's rule. The letter is as follows:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN KERSTEN: May you raise your voice in favor of many thousands of Yugoslav patriots who were forcibly deported to the Soviet concentration camps as a result of a devilish Communist policy to destroy everybody and everything that is on the side of God and the free world.

With this letter I would like to draw your attention and the attention of the Congress of the United States to those who up to now are forgotten by the free world, only because they do not have their own country, government, or a party interested in their destiny, that can make known their fate and ask for their release from Soviety slavery.

You certainly remember the heroic struggle of Gen. Drazha Mihailovich and his troops on the side of the United States and western allies in the World War II. It happened that his troops and Chetniks, who at that time were fighting against the German Army of occupation directly supporting in this way our then Soviet ally and its troops in their mission for the liberation of the northwestern part of Yugoslavia. They were rewarded by the Soviets with deportation and enslavement into Siberia. It is not necessary to say that these camps are places of horror, misery, and death. These Yugoslav patriots were sent there in order to destroy them, because they were on the side of God and the free world.

THOUSANDS DEPORTED BY THE COMMUNIST TITO

Thirty-five thousand of civilians, patriots, in Belgrade alone, when Tito's partisans entered Belgrade were liberated—killed outside of town or delivered to the Soviets for a reeducation in the Soviet schools (camps) by the Soviet specialists. The victims were packed into the railway wagons built for cattle and sent in them to the Soviet paradise.

Additional thousands of General Mihailovich's troops who resisted the Communist regime in the woods for many months more, even after the Communist regime was established in Yugoslavia, were captured, owing to the lack of ammunition and food. Many of them were killed in the last battles, but many of them were also captured and sent to Soviet camps. It suited both Stalin and Tito to annihilate these stubborn patriots who were Christians and freedom-loving people.

Apart from those above mentioned, numerous others had the same destiny. All those who remained in Yugoslavia had to be liquidated. Siberia, which is very far away from Yugoslavia, and into which the "damned westerners" and "war mongers" could not have an insight, was the best place for them. There many of these "criminals" after being physically tortured, had to die.

THE PROOF OF THEIR PRESENT SLAVERY EXISTS

It is a well-known fact in Yugoslavia that many thousands of these troops of General Mihailovich's and the civilian population were deported. But nobody dares to talk about or mention it. The Communist secret police, Tito's UDBA, would take care of such enemies of the people. The patriots captured by the Tito partisans or UDBA were loaded into trains and deported. Thousands upon thousands of families know that the missing members of their families were not killed in battle against the partisans, nor were they executed by the UDBA, they were not found in Tito's prisons or camps. The government never gave an account of them to their families.

It has happened that some of these unfortunates have escaped from the trains during the transportation across Rumania and the western part of Russia and confirmed the already known fact of their deportation.

Some Italians who were POW's in Russia, and who were recently released, confirmed the existence of these deportees. They have seen not only the former soldiers of General Mihailovich but also Yugoslav civilians in different Soviet camps. The exact number of them is unknown because they are dispersed into numerous camps. There is no doubt that these patriots could not be mistaken for the pro-comminformists, who escaped Tito's land after the split between Tito and Stalin. The proof concerning the deportation of Mihailovich's men originated much earlier than the split between Tito and Stalin. The procomminformists were treated as friends by the Soviets when they were banished by Tito. Recently almost all of these procomminformists were returned by the Soviets into Yugoslavia to serve the Soviet interests there. They were returned to Yugoslavia immediately after relations between Moscow and Tito were reestablished.

WHO WILL TAKE CARE OF THE DESTINY OF THESE ANTI-COMMUNIST YUGOSLAVS?

The free world and free humanity only can do this because the deportees have lost their country to a Communist regime. They are stateless. Tito's government will never act in their behalf? Tito will never forget these reactionaries and criminals who fought against him. If they would return, they would be additional trouble to the other troubles which he already has with the tremendous majority of Yugoslav population. They could do nothing else but strengthen the already existing resistance to Tito's communism, and, moreover, their release would reveal the truths unpleasant to Tito and provoke reaction against him with the United States public. So the Yugoslav Government keeps quiet about the whole situation. The Soviets, on the other hand, need the slaves.

The free world, in which the United States holds a leading position, should ask that these enslaved Yugoslav patriots be released and given a chance to come to parts of the world free of any kind of communism.

It is not necessary to emphasize the tremendous moral effect on the population of satellite nations and Yugoslavia particularly if a step for their liberation is undertaken. The United Nations and the Red Cross should feel obliged to make efforts in their behalf because it is their duty to do so and the very reason why these organizations exist.

It is for these reasons that each of us gives to these organizations our moral and material support.

I will be very happy, as the thousands upon thousands of families will be, if you, dear Congressman KERSTEN, will raise your voice in the Congress in behalf of these unfortunates, forgotten by the free world. I sincerely think that their hope is this great country and its institutions.

Who else can do something for them if not the freedom-loving people of the United States?

Very sincerely yours,

—— ——.

(Name omitted because of fear that the relatives and friends of the writer of this letter could be persecuted by the Communist regime in Yugoslavia.)

A Deserved Tribute to Dan Reed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NOAH M. MASON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1954

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, the June 3 issue of the Olean Times-Herald carried an editorial entitled "Soon Will Be Law," commenting on the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, H. R. 8300.

When you talk about that great piece of legislation, which passed the House recently, you naturally have to talk about DAN REED; so the editorial does that in most favorable terms. No man will be more responsible for the development and enactment into law of H. R. 8300 than the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, Mr. REED. He made the original motion that started the preliminary work necessary to the writing of a comprehensive Internal Revenue Code back in 1952. It was his integrity, perseverance, and outstanding ability that permitted the House on March 18 to vote overwhelmingly in favor of the passage of H. R. 8300.

I insert the editorial from the Olean Times in the RECORD at this point:

SOON WILL BE LAW

One by one, points of difference between House and Senate in regard to the monumental Internal Revenue Code bill of 1954 are being ironed out; and there is every likelihood that the measure will be on the desk of President Eisenhower for signature before many weeks have passed.

The bill, which originated in the House Ways and Means Committee, of which Representative DANIEL A. REED, of Dunkirk, is chairman, and which bears his name, represents the first comprehensive revision of the internal revenue statutes since before the turn of the century and the advent of the Federal income tax.

The bill provides a complete rearrangement of the code provisions in order to place them in more logical sequence; it insures the deletion of obsolete material, and it expresses the internal revenue laws in a more understandable manner.

The new code contains many changes, the purpose of which is to remove inequities, end harassment of the taxpayer, and eliminate tax barriers to further expansion of production and employment.

As Chairman REED has expressed it, "we have sought to create tax laws which will be conducive to the dynamic development of our national economy."

As far as the Federal Treasury is concerned, the Reed bill will reduce annual receipts by around $1,400,000,000, $800 million of which will be left in the pockets of individual taxpayers while $600 million will be eased from the tax burden of American business.

However, the bill also contains a provision extending the 52 percent corporate rate for 1 year; and this will produce an estimated $1,200,000,000 in additional revenues for the next fiscal year.

The bill contains many provisions that are important to the growth and survival of small business; and literally millions of individuals will benefit directly from its stipulations.

Chairman REED enumerates some of the benefits that will accrue as follows:

"A broader definition of dependents; permitting children to earn over $600 a year without loss of the exemption for their parent; a greatly liberalized medical deduction; more equitable rules for the taxation of pensions and annuities; eased requirements for the filing of returns; tax incentives to encourage invention; deduction of soil conservation expenses by farmers; fairer treatment of homeowners where they sell their homes; liberalized deductions for contributions to schools, churches, and hospitals; deductions for the child care expenses of working mothers, and broadened deductions for the transportation expenses of employees.

"The tremendous scope of this bill," Chairman REED observes, "has been obscured by public discussion of 2 or 3 provisions.

"Each of its hundreds of pages covers overdue changes in the tax laws; and well over 50 loopholes in the present law have been closed.

"This bill constitutes the cornerstone of the present Govarnment's tax legislative program. It is a tax revision rather than a tax reduction measure.

"We have made tremendous strides in the last 17 months in restoring fiscal order to what had previously been fiscal chaos.

"We have not fully attained our objectives of reduced Federal expenditures, reduced Federal taxes, and a balanced Federal budget.

"But bearing in mind that the effects of 20 years cannot be changed in 20 days or 20 months, I believe that we can be proud of our record of achievement."

This Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (H. R. 8300) will be duly enacted, as stated, at the present session of Congress.

It will take its place as one of the greatest milestones in American fiscal history; and it would seem to be inevitable that when it has been sealed and signed the name of Representative DANIEL A. REED will have taken its place among the immortals of congressional annals.

Polish Liberation and American Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES J. KERSTEN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1954

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I wish to include herewith remarks that I made to the rally for Polish Constitution Day, Sunday afternoon, May 2, 1954, at Chicago, Ill.:

POLISH LIBERATION AND AMERICAN SECURITY

(Address of Congressman CHARLES J. KERSTEN, of Wisconsin, at Humboldt Park, Sunday, May 2, 1954, at rally for Polish Constitution Day)

This is the greatest celebration of the Polish traditional National Day in the world. There are more people of Polish descent living in Chicago than in any other city in the world, outside of Poland. Only Warsaw has more Poles, and certainly in Warsaw there is silence today. Millions all over Poland commemorate the May Constitution secretly, painfully, and hopefully in churches and in the cellars in fear of the Communist police.

This is so because Poland lost her independence as a result of the Communist aggression. We must keep this fact in mind, we free Americans, whatever we do and whatever we say with regard to the country of your forefathers. It is a tragic reality that Poland, a traditional friend of America, lost her freedom to America's enemies. We know that Poles in Poland as well as over the world were always tied to this land and to our people by participating in the American Revolution—in our war of liberation and independence—and by the military cemeteries of every American war attesting the thousands of American boys of Polish ancestry who have given their lives for American freedom.

The constitution we commemorate today was proclaimed in Warsaw in 1791, just a few years after we Americans had written our own Constitution. The nearness of those two dates, as we know, had very great consequences. The same spirit and the same ideals which animated our forefathers were in the hearts of the Poles. The highest sovereignty resting in the people; freedom of religion, humanitarianism, tolerance; separation of three powers—legislative, executive, and judicial; strong but responsible-to-the-people government. These are the ideals which we find both in the American and in the Polish Constitution.

It was not strange that it was so. Freedom has been always the greatest treasure of the people and it was in order to secure this freedom that we took arms in 1776 as well as it was in order to secure that freedom the Poles started their great work of reforms, crowned by the constitution of 1791.

The community of the spirit of freedom between Americans and Poles continues today. It is because Poles want to be free they did not surrender to the Communist rule and it is because we want to be faithful to our own American tradition and to the ideals of the Founding Fathers that we want them to be free. In the final analysis, the liberation of Poland is bound up with the security of the United States. The freedom of each is necessary to the ultimate fate of the other.

All men are created free and all men are created equal and all men have the right to pursue their happiness—these ever-living principles, as written in our Declaration of Independence, were not understood as applying only to the Americans. As did our forefathers, so we want them to apply to all human beings.

The policy of liberation which we initiated and which we will not renounce is not a new concept. It is the basic political philosophy as contained in our Declaration of Independence. Announcing it we only follow our American tradition and our American ideals. Indeed, it is the surest expression of what we call the American way of living.

But the policy of liberation also has another meaning no less important and of the greatest practical significance. In the world of today, of which one-third has fallen under the Soviet slavery, America became the bulwark and citadel of the free world. Regardless of wheher we like it or not, and it is only understandable that many of us do not like it, we have the largest part of the burden of responsibility for the future of the whole human race. What would happen to the world if we were not strong, if we are not wise and not honest or if we compromise with the principle of human freedom? What would happen if we make agreements and have dealings with the Communists that endorse the captivity of the enslaved nations. The gates to the Soviet conquest of the world lead through the United States and our enemies know it very well. This is why communism concentrates its attacks, its campaign of hatred and its calumnies on this country.

In this situation America needs allies, not satellites; faithful, trusted and understanding allies. We cannot defend the whole world alone. For this even we, strong as we are, are too weak. The Soviet Union knows this and this is the origin of their efforts to split the free world, to confuse all of us and to undermine the confidence of the free nations in each other. We Americans know it too, and this is why we cannot cease our efforts to secure allies and to make the free world understand that only by standing together can we preserve our freedom and break the mortal embrace with which communism wants to strangle us, and in our seeking of allies against the Communists let us never forget that those hundreds of millions who now suffer under Red rule are potentially the greatest anti-Communist force in the world, and they are also close to the tyrants who are feverishly preparing to attack us.

The policy of liberation, and only the policy of liberation can maintain and strengthen the ties of confidence and friendship between the enslaved nations and ourselves. If we abandon those millions of people behind the Iron Curtain, if we do not counteract the Communist indoctrination and pressure exercised upon them, we take a great risk indeed that they will turn away from us. This we cannot afford to do.

It was in this spirit and in this understanding that I proposed several bills and several resolutions to the Congress of the United States, of which I am sure you are aware. It was in this spirit that I proposed the resolution to declare the unfortunate and erroneous Yalta Agreement null and void, never should have been entered into, and denounced the betrayal of Poland at the end of the war by the allies. It was in this spirit that I, along ago—1948, proposed to the Congress of the United States the withdrawal of recognition from the so-called Polish Government in Warsaw. These people are not a government—they are agents of the Kremlin installed in their offices by mere physical force and terror. It was in this spirit that I proposed to the Congress of the United States the expulsion of the Polish delegation from the United Nations. This delegation does not represent the Polish people; it represents Soviet interests. Again, it was in this spirit that I proposed, and the Congress adopted and enacted into law, and appropriated money which is still unused and available, the provisions to form from Polish and other Iron Curtain countries, escapees and exiles, free Polish and other national military units in their own national uniforms and under their own free flags, to be attached to the military forces in Western Europe. It is also in this spirit that we will open hearings in Chicago tomorrow to show the criminal take-over of Poland by the Communists and the ruthless persecution of a Christian people. Let the youth of Poland know that there is one thing which has no price for us and for which we will not accept a compromise—that is, their freedom and ours.

My dear fellow Americans, looking at this magnificent demonstration of today, seeing your faces and reading in your hearts, I know that you burn with a desire to help the country of your forefathers, Poland, to regain her independence. As a Member of the Congress of the United States, I tell you that this desire of yours and your work for this purpose is a great contribution to our America. Continue your work and do not stop your efforts and sacrifices. The independence of Poland as well as the independence of all countries under the Communist slavery is in the direct interests of the United States. It is the best security that we will be able to preserve our own freedom.

Last August, Malenkov announced the Soviet hydrogen bomb. Will the Communists, in their own good time, use it upon American cities if they can? Their abandonment of morals as shown by their sadistic murders, from Katyn to Korea, their complete disregard for their own people shows that they will use the hydrogen bomb upon us, if and when they can.

The policy of massive retaliation to Soviet bombing of America is not of itself enough. Such a policy accepts the not remote possibility of many destroyed American cities. Furthermore, if the Soviets attack us, they know in advance that we will counterattack and, therefore, they will be prepared for weeks, even months ahead. The greatest warning that we could have would be only a matter of hours.

The policy of liberation—and I do not mean by that a war of liberation against the military forces under Communist control as George Kennan would attempt to twist it into—is the only policy which can cope with the Communist determination ultimately to destroy us. A policy of liberation is the only true policy for permanent peace and to make impossible, in fact paralyze, the Communist ability to conduct all-out aggressive war against us. Many of the military forces now under Red control can be enlisted to our side. Such a policy is also capable of bringing about the disarmament, the disarmament by the enslaved peoples of the ruthless Communist clique that controls them, and who now seeks to attain a position of power in order to initiate atomic war.

A policy of liberation is not interfering in the affairs of foreign nations. A policy of liberation is taking steps in the true American tradition to stop the present Communist interference in the affairs of the enslaved nations, in order that the enslaved nations cannot be molded into instruments of aggression against us. Instead of dealing with the criminal gangsters who now enslave the captive nations, our appeal must be to the suffering millions whose only hope for freedom lies in their liberation.

Since this is so—since all of us gathered today as sons of this blessed free land of America, since all of us want America to be great and to be free and since all of us are ready not only to live but to die if necessary for this country, for its future, and for its security, I finish by saying that it is here our prayer that the day will not be long delayed when the Christian nation of Poland will live in freedom under its own great constitution.

The Menace of Lewd and Lurid Literature

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 7, 1954

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I herewith include an article by Mark Kinsey, director of Americanism, Veterans of Foreign Wars, entitled "The Menace of Lewd and Lurid Literature," which appeared in the June 1954 issue of the VFW magazine, the official magazine of the Veterans of Foreign Wars:

THE MENACE OF LEWD AND LURID LITERATURE

(By Mark Kinsey)

Newsstands in practically every city display and sell lurid literature glorifying violence, crime, sex, perversion, liquor, and dope.

Because obscenity in print is poison for adolescent minds, and breeds juvenile delinquency, Congress has taken note of the situation.

The Gathings committee of the United States House of Representatives has condemned the presence of downright dirty comic magazines and pocket-size booklets on the market. The public in general has been asked to help stamp out this growing evil.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars has stoutly condemned this nationwide disgrace also. At its 54th national encampment, the VFW adopted this resolution:

"RESOLUTION 261. A RESOLUTION TO ELIMINATE OBSCENE LITERATURE

"A congressional committee has disclosed nationwide dissemination of lewd, indecent, obscene comics, magazines, and pocket-sized books glorifying crime and the criminal, engendering disrespect for law and order, glamorizing bloodshed, violence, sex, perversion, polygamy, and narcotic addiction. The VFW urges that all VFW posts help eliminate such literature in every community."

Charles Dougherty, chairman of the VFW national Americanism committee and chief justice of the Cook County (Ill.) criminal court, is giving dynamic leadership to this campaign against objectionable literature. Judge Dougherty says this:

"I believe our organization should implement this resolution (No. 261) by a united effort on the part of all of the State departments to minimize the effect of this type of literature.

"As the chief justice of the criminal court of Cook County, I am disturbed by the increasing number of teen-aged defendants who are brought before me each day, to be arraigned on all types of felony indictments.

"I am well aware of the fact that—from a legal standpoint—little can be accomplished in abating these publications. But I believe that if all post commanders could be made aware of this growing evil, and a sincere effort made by all of us to educate the public generally on the prevalence of this type of literature, much good could be accomplished.

"If the chairmen of VFW Americanism committees in the various States will urge their post commanders to alert the law-enforcement officers to this menace in their respective communities, much good can be accomplished. We should invite the parent-teachers and other civic-minded groups to help us combat this condition. We should also ask our ministers, priests, and rabbis to give their influence to this campaign.

"I don't mean to imply that all of the juvenile delinquency is chargeable to this source. But from my own investigation of cases appearing before me, I know that it is one of the contributing factors."

Those who profit from the sale of obscene literature will point to freedom of the press as one of our cherished constitutional guaranties. However, the first amendment was never intended as a license to corrupt the morals of young citizens, nor to encourage crime, delinquency, or degeneracy. The elimination of indecent literature protects, rather than violates, the spirit of the Constitution.

What to do? Survey local conditions. If you find obviously objectionable literature on sale at drug stores or newsstands, seek to arouse public opinion against the situation. Get school officials, parents, and church leaders to express themselves publicly. Use the press and radio in your drive to wipe out this dangerous filth. Let those who sell obscene literature feel the lash of public indignation. Make those who profit from the sale of erotic books and magazines understand other phases of their business operations will suffer if they continue to antagonize their customers. No newsstand owner, located in corner drug stores or elsewhere, will try to sell objectionable publications to juveniles if he is in danger of losing the patronage of irate parents.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Printing and binding for Congress, when recommended to be done by the Committee on Printing of either House, shall be so recommended in a report containing an approximate estimate of the cost thereof, together with a statement from the Public Printer of estimated approximate cost of work previously ordered by Congress within the fiscal year (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 145, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on Printing, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

PRINTING DOCUMENTS AND REPORTS

Documents and reports of committees with the evidence and papers submitted therewith, or any part thereof ordered printed by Congress, may be reprinted by the Public Printer on order of any Member of Congress or Delegate, on prepayment of the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 162, p. 1940).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

DISTRIBUTION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

To the Vice President and each Senator 100 copies; to the Secretary and Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, each, 25 copies; to the Secretary, for official use, not to exceed 50 copies; to the Sergeant at Arms, for use on the floor of the Senate, not to exceed 50 copies; to each Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress, 60 copies; to the Clerk, Sergeant at Arms, and Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives, each, 25 copies; to the Clerk, for official use, not to exceed 50 copies; and to the Doorkeeper; for use on the floor of the House of Representatives, not to exceed 75 copies; to the Vice President and each Senator, Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress there shall also be furnished (and shall not be transferable), 3 copies of the daily RECORD, of which 1 shall be delivered at his residence, 1 at his office, and 1 at the Capitol.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized book dealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by book dealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Frank Brodie is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. The money derived from such sales shall be paid into the Treasury and accounted for in his annual report to Congress, and no sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRICE OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

The Public Printer is authorized to furnish to subscribers the daily RECORD at $1.50 per month, payable in advance.

Remit by money order payable to Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C.

Appendix

The State-Federal Program for Vocational Rehabilitation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 9, 1954

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting a statement of interest to all who believe in and support rehabilitation legislation:

THE STATE-FEDERAL PROGRAM FOR VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

As a public program, vocational rehabilitation for the disabled was established shortly after the close of World War I. While the need for such a program had been recognized earlier, it took the war to focus wide public attention on the problems of disability. Demands for a civilian program were exercised as soon as the needs of disabled soldiers had been considered. Among the voluntary organizations that took an active part in advocating rehabilitation was the Red Cross Institute for Crippled and Disabled Men, which was founded in New York City in 1917 to conduct research and demonstrations in rehabilitation work. Early in 1918 this organization became active in promoting State legislation.

Twelve States passed rehabilitation laws before enactment of the Federal statute, although only six State programs actually were functioning when the first Federal law was passed. In 1918—1 month before the Federal soldier rehabilitation law was passed—Massachusetts became the first State in the Union to adopt a vocational rehabilitation law. On June 2, 1920, the President signed the Smith-Fess bill, and the Vocational Rehabilitation Act (Public Law 236, 66th Cong.) became law. Federal legislation in this field had been passed with bipartisan support, and had been supported by the National Association of Manufacturers, the American Federation of Labor, and numerous other organizations representing social welfare, medicine, education, and State government.

The first Federal legislation for the vocational rehabilitation of civilians provided for grants to the States for a 4-year period (subsequently extended), based on relative population, with a 50-percent matching requirements; the grants to be used for services to the disabled consisting of training, guidance, placement, and prosthetic appliances.

During the fiscal year 1921, Federal and State expenditures on the program totaled slightly less than $285,000. The following year's expenditures exceeded $736,000 and expenditures on the program have never been below the $1 million mark since 1923. Federal and State expenditures during the past fiscal year, by way of contrast with the early years of the program, amounted to $34.6 million.

Federal responsibilities for vocational rehabilitation initially were vested in the Federal Board for Vocational Education. Subsequently the Federal agency for vocational rehabilitation became a part of the United States Office of Education. Since 1943 the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation has been a separate agency. State agencies for vocational rehabilitation, since the inception of the State-Federal program, have been divisions of the State boards for vocational education. (Today, in 36 of the States, separate agencies provide rehabilitation services to the blind. Most of these agencies are elements of State agencies for public welfare.)

In the period between 1930 and 1932, amendments to the Vocational Rehabilitation Act further extended the program and authorized annual appropriations for Federal grants to the States totaling $1 million. With the adoption of title V of the Social Security Act of 1935, the vocational rehabilitation program became permanent. Continuing annual appropriations of nearly $2 million were authorized and these were increased in 1939 to $3.5 million annually.

The Barden-La Follette Act of 1943 is the basic law under which the program operates at the present time. This legislation provides for the full administrative costs of the program and expenses for vocational guidance and placement being borne by the Federal Government. It also makes specific provision for the physical restoration of the disabled through medical services. The costs of medical examinations and services, training, living expenses during rehabilitation, necessary travel, and occupational tools and licenses are shared by the State and Federal Governments on a 50–50 basis.

During the first 23 years of the program's operations, 210,000 disabled men and women were rehabilitated for useful work. However, during this period, vocational rehabilitation agencies had to train around the disabilities of those who were served. Physical restoration to overcome or reduce disabilities was not provided.

Since the services of the program were expanded in 1943, well over a half million Americans have been provided with substantial services under the program and restored to useful employment.

OPERATION OF THE PROGRAM TODAY

The services which are provided under the public program for vocational rehabilitation are geared to the specific needs of the individual, with due regard to the nature of his disability, his interests and aptitudes, and his goals for a career.

In this program no disabled individual is considered rehabilitated until he has been placed in suitable employment after being provided with substantial rehabilitation services. In most cases the criterion is successful accomplishment in paid employment, verified by personal followup. In some cases it is the ability to perform the important work of making a home.

There are nine services in all: (1) Medical diagnostic services to learn the nature and degree of disability and to help determine eligibility for services, the need for additional medical services, and the individual's work capacities; (2) individual counsel and guidance, including psychological testing, to help select the right job objective; (3) medical, surgical, psychiatric, and hospital services to remove or reduce the disability; (4) artificial limbs and other prosthetic appliances to increase work ability; (5) training, including occupational training and adjustment training for the blind; (6) maintenance and transportation during treatment or training; (7) tools, equipment, or licenses, if these are necessary to give the individual a fair start; (8) placement in a job commensurate with the individual's highest physical and mental capacities; (9) followup to insure that the rehabilitated man or woman is successful and that both he and the employer are satisfied.

The payment from public funds for services other than diagnosis, counseling, training, placement, and followup is conditioned upon the economic circumstances of the disabled individual.

The services of vocational rehabilitation are available to men and women of working age who have disabilities that are handicaps for employment. Federal responsibilities for the program are discharged by the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. These responsibilities consist of disbursing grants-in-aid to State agencies, and supporting the efforts of these agencies with leadership and technical assistance which can be provided most economically on a national basis.

The program is operated in every State and Territory except the Virgin Islands. General agencies for vocational rehabilitation are components of State boards of education. In 35 of the States and in Hawaii, separate agencies provide rehabilitation services for the blind. In the District of Columbia, services are provided by an element of the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation.

Each public agency for vocational rehabilitation operates its program in accordance with an approved State plan that meets the provisions of Federal law. These plans are developed by the State agencies with the cooperation of the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation. The evaluation, improvement, and approval of these plans constitute a continuing Federal responsibility. To ensure the best possible service to the disabled and the most efficient utilization of Federal funds, the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation staff works closely with State agencies in keeping State plans abreast of current needs.

In order to insure that rehabilitation services are provided in conformity with approved State plans, and that the Federal portion of the funds is being spent properly, the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation conducts periodic reviews of the operation of all State rehabilitation agencies. In the course of these reviews individual case records are studied, methods of administration are reviewed, and agency staffs benefit from evaluation of services to disabled individuals. These reviews reveal trends within the program, the manner in which State and Federal policies are applied, and the needs and accomplishments of the State agencies.

For the third successive year, the State-Federal program for the vocational rehabilitation of disabled civilians prepared more than 60,000 substantially handicapped Americans for work and placed them in useful occupations. The vast majority of these men and women are now completely self-supporting.

The return of last year's group of disabled individuals to productive work brings to more than a half million the number of disabled civilians rehabilitated since 1943. It brings to 738,000 the total number of rehabilitations during the 33 years in which vocational rehabilitation services have been available to Americans as a service of their State and Federal Governments.

Nearly 1 out of every 5 disabled persons rehabilitated during the fiscal year ending

June 30 was receiving public assistance at the time services were begun, or at some time during the course of rehabilitation. To maintain these disabled recipients of public assistance on relief for just 1 year would cost an estimated $8.7 million. But the cost of their rehabilitation was only about $6.4 million. This expenditure is less than three-fourths what it would cost to maintain these disabled people at public expense for only 1 year.

Since many of these individuals undoubtedly would have needed public assistance over an extended period of time, the savings made possible by their rehabilitation—which is generally a one-time expenditure—are cumulative. Disabled people who are receiving public assistance year after year consume taxes, whereas rehabilitated people who are working pay taxes every year of their working lives.

Although 11,355 of the 61,308 disabled individuals rehabilitated during the year were recipients of public assistance, many more would have become public charges if they had not been rehabilitated into gainful employment before the effects of disability and enforced idleness had exhausted their resources. There is no way to measure the dollar savings from preventing public dependency by restoring disabled people to self-support before they become completely impoverished by their inability to earn.

Regardless of whether or not the disabled people who are served by vocational rehabilitation repay in one way or another the cost of the services made available to them, our society—under the American tradition of a fair chance to all—has an obligation to restore to them the capacity and opportunity for self-support. However, the economic facts of rehabilitation—as illustrated by the achievements of the program during the past year—give strong support to the proposition that vocational rehabilitation is an investment in human welfare that is wholly self-liquidating. As an investment, it pays high returns in dollars as well as in social betterment.

Following are some of the highlights of vocational rehabilitation in the United States during 1953.

The Federal income-tax payments which will be made by the disabled men and women rehabilitated during 1953 are estimated at $10 million a year. Thus the $30 million in Federal income taxes that these rehabilitated workers are expected to pay in the next 3 years exceeds the entire 1953 Federal investment in the rehabilitation program by more than 30 percent.

The cost of operating the program for the year was $564 per person rehabilitated. This is substantially less than the estimated $700 which would be the cost of maintaining a disabled individual on relief for just 12 months.

The combined annual earnings of the disabled men and women rehabilitated during the year were estimated at $17 million when they became clients of the program. After their rehabilitation, their combined earnings were estimated at $114 million a year.

An estimated 100 million man-hours a year have been added to the Nation's productive effort by this group of disabled men and women. Many of them have acquired new skills which are in short supply and which are vitally important to the Nation's preparedness effort. More than 9,000 went into the skilled trades, and about 5,500 more became farmers or agricultural workers. An estimated 3,000 entered professional fields in which shortages exist, such as education, medicine, and engineering.

PROPOSALS FOR THE FUTURE

Each year an estimated 250,000 persons disabled by disease, accidents, or congenital conditions come to need vocational rehabilitation in order to work. Only about 60,000 disabled persons are rehabilitated each year under the present State-Federal program. It is easy to understand, therefore, why there are some 2 million disabled persons in the United States today who need vocational rehabilitation services. Disease, and particularly chronic disease, is the cause of about 88 percent of all disabling conditions. Accidents account for about 10 percent of the total problem of disability. The other 2 percent results from congenital conditions.

The majority of the disabled who can be rehabilitated are within the age limits 14 to 64; a small portion, about one-twentieth, are 65 years of age or older. About one-tenth, roughly 200,000, are currently confined to various types of institutions—tuberculosis sanatoria, mental hospitals, and chronic disease hospitals. Restoration of this group to gainful work would help to reduce hospital and institutional loads.

It is apparent from the foregoing that the present public program for vocational rehabilitation falls far short of meeting the Nation's needs in relation to the annual number of disabled persons who come to require vocational rehabilitation in order to work. This is why the President, in his health message, recommended a progressive expansion of our rehabilitation program over the next 5 years. In that message, the President said:

"There are no statistics to portray the full depth and meaning in human terms of the rehabilitation program, but clearly it is a program that builds a better America."

He suggested that we establish goals to increase the number of rehabilitants far above the present 60,000 per year. As a 1955 goal he recommended 70,000 rehabilitants; for 1956, 100,000; and progressively upward until we reach by 1959 the goal of 200,000 rehabilitated persons in the course of the year. This scheduled progression takes into consideration the time required to expand facilities and to increase the supply of trained personnel. It also gives the States an opportunity to plan for their part of the additional financial support needed.

If the program were to be merely continued at its present level during the next 5 years, we could anticipate rehabilitating in that period about 300,000 persons. The expanded program would rehabilitate an additional 360,000 persons at an estimated additional cost of $209 million. The additional cost to the States and Federal Government would be offset several times by the resulting savings in public assistance costs and the revenues from income taxes of the persons restored to jobs.

Some of the administration's proposals in this field, embodied in an amendment to the Hospital Survey and Construction Act, already have been passed by the House of Representatives. Prospective changes in the law embodied in this amendment have an important bearing upon vocational rehabilitation. The amendment would provide for Federal financial assistance in the establishment of public and nonprofit rehabilitation facilities for serving the severely disabled. An objective of this amendment is to promote the development of comprehensive rehabilitation centers which, at the present time, are far too few in number even to begin to meet the Nation's needs.

Other proposed legislation would authorize Federal funds to be spent for personnel training to help relieve acute shortages of professional personnel in rehabilitation; research and demonstration to improve rehabilitation techniques and disseminate knowledge of such developments; and expansion of special facilities by the States such as speech and hearing clinics and others for which needs are urgent.

The administration recognizes the rights and prerogatives of the States in meeting the problems of their citizens, and the responsibilities of the Federal Government in cooperating in the common effort. It is our aim to increase State and local responsibility in vocational rehabilitation, to reduce Federal controls, and to provide more flexibility in the administration of the program. These aims are covered in specific legislative proposals.

Vocational rehabilitation to the individual is a means for regaining or achieving self-sufficiency and independence. To the States and to the Federal Government, it is a field in which long-standing cooperative effort is paying huge returns in social and economic gain.

INTERNATIONAL CONTRIBUTIONS IN THE FIELD OF VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION

The spirit of international interaction has also extended itself into an interest and concern for the rehabilitation of the handicapped. This is not only true today, when constantly we are reminded of the common international language of rehabilitation through the increasing interest of governments and international organizations. It has been true down through the ages. Looking through the literature on rehabilitation we never fail to find evidences of the international interchange of ideas and information on the various aspects of vocational rehabilitation. For research purposes in the field of prosthetics, for instance, we can go back to 2830 B. C. and find a bas-relief carving believed to be the earliest illustration of the use of a crutch, or to the 5th Egyptian Dynasty (2750–2625 B. C.) to find the most ancient splints. These ancient prostheses discovered in the 20th century nevertheless are indications of the universality of disability and the efforts from the earliest days to overcome it.

As in other fields of endeavor, much of the growth and development of rehabilitation in the United States can be traced to the influence of the rehabilitation movement in other countries. As early as the nineties, many of the large charity organizations in this country had established special bureaus for the handicapped, and drew on the experience of European countries in developing their programs. Many of the State Workmen's Compensation Commissions owe development of their vocational rehabilitation features to studies of the German system as far back as 1911. Likewise it was during the First World War, as a result of observing the early experiments of the European nations in retraining and returning disabled soldiers to useful employment, that studies of these systems were made by the United States and utilized in the framing of the first Federal legislation—which was passed in 1918 as the Smith-Sears Act for the vocational rehabilitation and return to civil employment of disabled persons discharged from the military and naval forces of the United States. This was followed by enactment of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act for civilians in 1920, with further reliance on study of the progressive developments abroad.

Since the early beginnings in the international exchange of information on the rehabilitation front, the United States can point with gratitude to many specific areas of the rehabilitation process where international contributions have played a vital role in the development and refinement of our rehabilitation process. To mention only a few:

Our program for rehabilitation of the tuberculous which provides for introduction of rehabilitation measures, particularly counseling, guidance, development of the rehabilitation plan, and training during the early stages of treatment, was inspired by the English colonies for the tuberculous which successfully demonstrated feasibility of starting rehabilitation as early as medically possible.

To Italy and Germany, we owe the cineplastic procedure in amputation surgery which was introduced in the United States by Dr. Henry Kessler. The widespread and growing use of this technique in the United States particularly in the Army and Navy has done much toward facilitating the rehabilitation of amputees. As recently as 1951 it was reported by Commander Canty, Medical Corps, United States Navy, an outstanding authority in this field, that cineplastic prostheses available were essentially the same as those developed by Sauerbruch and his associates in Germany 35 years ago. With these cineplastic prostheses as a base, current United States research in cineplastic prostheses is now directed toward improvements of certain cosmetic, functional, and mechanical features. Of course, Germany has long been a leader in the prosthetics field and the contributions of England and other countries have also been noteworthy.

Dr. Howard Rusk, director of the Institute of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation, New York, and international leader in rehabilitation has brought back to the United States information on many of the recent developments and techniques from virtually all areas of the globe.

From England, for example, the developments in training and retraining the disabled, the remarkably good experiences with Remploy, Ltd., which provides employment in factories for many thousands of severely disabled men and women; the Roffey Park Rehabilitation Center, which has done so much toward rehabilitation of white-collar employees suffering neurosis or mild mental illnesses; the inspiring reports of the Spinal Injuries Center at Stoke Manderville, headed by Dr. Guttman, where paraplegics are vocationally trained and from which they are graduated into employment, all have had their influence on United States rehabilitation activities.

Although we have been fortunate in being able to adapt and utilize many of the excellent rehabilitation procedures and techniques from other countries, there are still others which we hope eventually can be put into effect here. Most unique among the services in Finland, reported by Dr. Rusk, is the Sheltered Colony at Suitia Manor, about 20 miles from Helsinki, where about 63 brain-injured veterans are permanently employed at farming, gardening, metalwork, and woodworking. Wages are paid to these disabled employees according to the normal union scales and the colony is practically self-supporting. In addition to providing for the permanent residents, provision is also made for training brain-injured individuals who leave the colony when their period of training is over. Experience at the colony indicates that the seizures of the large proportion who are epileptic are reduced by the controlled-work program and the security the colony affords. Experience of this center would be of great value to the United States toward developing rehabilitation programs, particularly for persons with epilepsy.

Another particularly impressive Finnish development is its program for the mentally ill. In one 1,200-bed state mental hospital visited by Dr. Rusk and a group of international rehabilitation experts, more than 75 percent of the patients, even in the disturbed wards, were busily engaged in work-therapy programs that included shoemaking, machine operation, and handwork of all types. To quote Dr. Rusk: "Certainly there is no State mental institution in the United States that can boast of such an activity program."

Little has been said of the techniques and procedures we have "borrowed" from abroad in rehabilitation of the blind. However, the United States public and voluntary organizations have excellent relations, established far in the past and strengthened throughout the years. The United States and Canada work closely together in development of their programs for increasing employment opportunities for the blind. We have just recently been exploring again the possibilities of developing training facilities and securing employment opportunities in this country for blind physiotherapists, having seen England's successful pioneering work in this field. Recent discussions with the Royal National Institute for the Blind as to how many of the same obstacles we face have been overcome in the English system give hope that progress in the United States can be made in opening the field of physical therapy to blind persons who can qualify for training.

The student braille library operated by the Royal National Institute for the Blind is another program we would like to see developed in the United States.

No discussion of international cooperation would be complete without fully recognizing the influence of the international organizations concerned with the welfare of the disabled. Noteworthy among these is the International Society for the Welfare of Cripples, founded in 1922. This is a federation of nongovernmental national organizations engaged in programs for the welfare of the disabled. Through its secretariat in New York it serves as a clearing house for information concerning the physically disabled of the world, assists in the establishment of national organizations for the handicapped, promotes scholarships, fellowships and international exchanges of rehabilitation specialists. It provides consultation services to the United Nations Rehabilitation Unit, the World Health Organization and other official international bodies and arranges international conferences such as the one to be held in The Hague this summer.

The United Nations Rehabilitation Unit established in 1951 has already demonstrated its significance for millions of the world's disabled. It has developed recommendations on a coordinated comprehensive program of rehabilitation; through the United Nations Technical Assistance Administration it participates in the social welfare scholarship and fellowshp program; and provides for selecting and supervising the activities of rehabilitation in technicians who provide consultative services to countries interested in developing their services for the disabled.

As rehabilitation to be effective for the individual disabled person must mean an integration of services, rehabilitation on the community, national, and international level also requires coordination of programs and services. It is gratifying that the United Nations and the specialized agencies have recognized this, for increased integration will eventually mean more services for more people in more nations.

The United States is happy to have the opportunity of international sharing of our rehabilitation experience. This, of course, is constantly being done through exchange of publications, interchange visits of experts, and the strong relationships of voluntary and public agencies over the years referred to above. A significant development, strengthened in recent years through the inauguration of the technical assistance programs of point 4 and the United Nations, is the United States participation in the training programs of these organizations for leaders and technicians in the field of rehabilitation. During 1953 the Federal Office of Vocational Rehabilitation planned the programs for 37 such persons from all areas of the world. We have just about equaled the same number for 1954, and judging by the growing interest of the countries, we estimate a considerable increase in 1955 in applications for training. We have participated in these two training programs since their inception, and in addition have planned programs of training over the years, for individuals referred by the Department of State, Department of Defense, and the many voluntary agencies, such as Rockefeller and Kellogg Foundations.

There are many different national approaches. No country can claim to have developed an ideal service yet. By continuing the exchange of views, hearing results of new experiments, developing new techniques, increasing international professional cooperation, and stimulating interest in overcoming the problems of disablement, the physically handicapped in their own particular countries and throughout the world will be benefited.

Is a McCarthy Critic Seeing the Light?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 9, 1954

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, from the Washington Star, which has had thousands of words of condemnation of the gentleman from Wisconsin, comes an editorial which reads as follows:

Those Monitored Calls

It is hard to understand why anyone on the Army side of the dispute with Senator McCarthy thought that the transcriptions of the monitored telephone calls would help the Army's case. For actually, if it be thought that the Army once had a case, it has collapsed in the face of these telephone conversations.

This does not mean that Senator McCarthy is in the clear. He has much to answer for, including especially his shameful abuse of General Zwicker and his appeal to the executive employees to convert themselves into a host of informers. Neither does it mean that the questions of veracity have been resolved. The conflicts in the direct testimony—the conflicts in which one side said one thing, in which the other side said the opposite, and in which some one obviously was not telling the true—remain to be cleared up it if is possible to do so.

The formal accusation from the Army in this hearing, however, is of a different nature. The claim is that Senator McCarthy, his committee counsel, Roy Cohn, and staff director Francis Carr exerted improper pressure on Secretary of the Army Stevens and Army counselor Adams in behalf of Pvt. David Schine. (The complaint against Mr. Carr has been dropped.)

The Army claim is destroyed by the phone conversations. On March 8, 1954, the day before the Army filed its charges, Secretary Stevens called Senator Symington. Some of the things said by the Missouri Senator in that conversation have been used effectively against him by Senator McCarthy. But this is what Secretary Stevens said "I personally think that anything in that line (in the nature of the Army charges) would prove to be very much exaggerated. That would be my opinion. In other words, I think there has been some talk around that has been very much exaggerated."

On November 7, 1953, 3 days before Private Schine reported to Fort Dix, Secretary Stevens told Senator McCarthy with reference to the Schine matter: "You never have done or said anything that spurred me on in this situation at all, other than to take a friendly interest."

The Army's first complaint of improper pressure was dated July 8, 1953. On September 28 Mr. Stevens told Mr. Cohn: "The way you have played ball with me has been 100 percent." The record also discloses that on October 21 of that year Secretary Stevens phoned Schine to tell him that he had discussed his case with Defense Secretary Wilson; that they could not see any appropriate way for him to avoid basic training, but that when basic training was over "I personally would like to arrange it in such a way that you would come into this Army or Military Establishment in such a way that you would use the knowledge and ability you have in certain fields."

This is a record which certainly reflects an extraordinary readiness on the part of the Secretary of Army to please Mr. Schine. It is not a record, however, which reflects pressure, improper or otherwise, in any significant degree.

"The Value of Self-Communion," by Dr. W. T. Tutt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 9, 1954

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the other day, Saturday, June 5, 1954, I heard a very interesting discourse over the radio by Dr. W. A. Tutt, which impressed me. I requested a copy of Dr. Tutt's remarks and am extending them below.

I consider these remarks include a valuable lesson for our times, not only for Members of Congress but for all citizens:

The Value of Self-Communion

You, perhaps, have overheard members of your family, lost in reverie (or daydreaming), talking to themselves. You, no doubt, have asked, What did you say? They responded quickly, "Nothing, I was just talking to myself."

I know of no conservation so vital and so important as self-communion. What an individual says to himself will greatly affect his conduct daily as he moves among his fellowmen. Only a few persons, if any, have turned out as others have planned. We are products of our own thinking and planning. The Big Book says "As a man thinketh in his heart, so is he." The currents of thought that run through our minds will either purify our lives or fill them with corruption. Thoughts are index of character; people do like they do because they think like they do. You can't lift a person or a people above their thinking.

When George Washington was a boy in school, his teacher asked him one day, What are you going to be, George? He replied, that I must first of all make a man out of myself; if I fail in that I cannot succeed in anything else. * * * Note: I must do it. Not my mother, nor my father, nor my teacher, nor my preacher, but I must do it * * * History shows that with God's help he was a man. * * * Each of us is not one, but two (myself and me); these two go on from day to day counseling together and planning together; there is no way to escape this inner conservation, there is no way for a person to separate himself from himself.

I wonder if you have ever read the lines of Edward A. Guest, entitled "Myself and Me":

> "I have got to live with myself and so,
> I want to be fit for myself to know;
> I want to be able as the days go by,
> Always to look myself straight in the eye;
> I don't want to stand with the setting sun,
> And hate myself for the things I have done.
> "I can never hide myself from me,
> I see what others may never see;
> I know what others may never know,
> I never can fool myself and so,
> Whatever happens, I want to be,
> Self respecting and conscious free."

There is a right and a wrong way to talk to yourself. Perhaps you have heard some people say, willy nilly, its nobody's business. They release their moral brakes and start in the wrong direction; down they go to disgrace and shame. Why not say to yourself that you just cannot afford to do certain things; your mother has confidence in you, and your father is hoping you will reward his efforts by turning out to be a son of which he should be proud. Therefore, say to yourself, "I just cannot disappoint my parents and my friends; I have got to be the right kind of citizen, nothing short of that will please me."

You have read about Hannibal, that renowned Carthaginian and lion of war who ascended the Alpine heights, who went beyond its icy peaks and laid waste the Roman empire because he knew how to talk to himself. "Let there be no Alps," he said. The men and women whose names shine in sacred and profane history knew how to talk to themselves. One can overcome any obstacle, surmount any difficulty, and accomplish any end if he only knows how to talk to himself about it. There are temptations and opportunities on every hand to go in the wrong direction that would mar our lives and ruin our character. To deal with these forces of evil calls for courage, convictions, and willpower. The community in which the individual lives furnishes the basis that generates the material for commentation. Great movements have been started by men and women who knew how to talk to themselves about existing conditions that needed to be set right in said communities. The community's obligation to society is to produce the right kind of men and women; and it is the duty of every boy and girl in the community to work to that end, that the standard of righteousness might be obtained.

I once heard of a very prominent woman who was struck blind at the height of her powers. She said, "I'm in a bunker all right, but watch me use my niblick and get out of it." She knew how to talk to herself. There is no obstacle, no difficulty however hard they may appear, that cannot be overcome, if only one knew how to talk to himself or herself about them. Ask men who have built great institutions, and led large organizations, they will tell you how it was done. It took hard work, willpower, and determination, that stood over against doubts, discouragements, and fear. The right kind of life can be built, and has been built, because people knew how to talk to themselves.

If you would associate the cost with the act of a deed, you would say to yourself, "If I do this I may be arrested, and have my freedom taken away from me, and maybe my life." You cannot associate the cost with the crime and then commit the crime. Talk things over to yourself before you act, and the action will beyond a reasonable doubt be right.

> "With knowledge so vast,
> And with judgment so strong;
> No man with half of them,
> Ever went wrong.
>
> "With passions so patient,
> And fancies so bright;
> No man with half of them,
> Ever went quite right."

You, I am sure, have heard about two men who lived in or near the ancient city of Jericho. One was a blind beggar, the other a rich tax collector. This blind man heard a passing throng and asked what it meant. After he was told, he cried for help. Some tried to discourage him, but he said to himself, this is my chance and kept on crying. Because he knew how to talk to himself he received the needed blessing; and the rich man was rewarded because he knew how to talk to himself.

Arthur Colton makes one see in his Mr. Smedley's Guest the results of the man who talked wrongly to himself. Sitting one night by his fireside he falls asleep, and dreams he has a visitor, who strangely does all of the things he himself had once dreamed that he would do. He spends an enchanting evening with this guest, and when the guest is about to leave he asks, "Who are you anyway?" The guest replies, "I am the man you might have been."

> "Life is a sheet of paper white,
> Whereupon each one of us may write,
> His word or two, and then comes night;
> Greatly begin, though you have time,
> But for a line, be that sublime,
> Not failure, but low aim is crime."

Hollywood, Fla., Civic, Business, and Industrial Survey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DWIGHT L. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 9, 1954

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the bureau of economic and business research of the University of Miami, under the direction of Dr. Reinhold P. Wolff, has just recently completed an economic survey of the city of Hollywood, Fla., which is one of the outstanding and growing cities of the Nation. The growth of this city and area has attracted national attention and is of such general interest that the committee on civic, business, and industrial survey thought it warranted inclusion in the Congressional Record.

I am therefore including in my remarks the results of a civic, business, and industrial survey of the city of Hollywood, Fla.:

Hollywood, Fla., Civic, Business, and Industrial Survey

Hollywood, Fla., a city of 25,000 today, may expect a population of over 70,000 by 1970 and nearly 100,000 after 1975. The land area of Hollywood comprises 15.7 square miles. Of this, roughly 60 percent is developed, the rest is raw land.

TOURIST INDUSTRY

It may be estimated that Hollywood accounts for roughly 7 percent of the total tourist population of the so-called "Gold Coast area.

INDUSTRY

There are many conditions that are favorable to small plants. Outstanding is the availability of a labor force of considerable quantity and quality. There is, also, an ample supply of housing, a good community atmosphere, a first rate transportation system, and a favorable location to markets.

RETAIL TRADE

At present the retail trade is at nearly $33 million annually or about $1,300 per capita of the residential population. It can be expected that the present retail sales volume will nearly double by 1965 and triple at the ultimate stage of development.

RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT

The powerful forces that drive toward the residential development of high-lying land in the orbit of Greater Miami are a challenge to the city of Hollywood. As the commuter distance of Greater Miami broadens, larger and larger segments of the population will find Hollywood not too far a place to choose as their residence. Service by two railroads and the limited-access State road No. 9 will shorten the time distance of commuting.

A great advantage in the development of Hollywood as a residential city is contained in the financial soundness of its municipal system. Despite the homestead exemption of the Florida State law for real properties under $5,000, the full taxable valuations have shown almost constant and satisfactory increases. This and the economy of the public household has made it possible to reduce the total millage from 32 mills in 1934, to only 16 mills in 1953.

PARKING

The parking problem is susceptible to considerable improvement at the present time. It is recommended that a survey of parking spaces be undertaken to determine the areas which would best lend themselves to off-street parking.

ZONING

There should be adequate consideration for well-located shopping centers, churches, schools, and similar facilities in close vicinity to residential areas. Business string zoning along the thoroughfares should be discouraged and concentrated business districts should be encouraged. Parks and beach facilities and recreational resources both for resident and nonresident population should be provided at the scale of the expected population rather than in accordance with the present population size.

LONG-RANGE PLANNING

We recommend a procedure of planning in which various projects are attacked in the order of their importance. The institution of a permanent planning department as part of the municipal setup is highly desirable. This should not prevent the city from employing outside experts on individual projects that require such technical assistance.

CONCLUSIONS

The land surplus offers wide opportunities for developing profitable tourist trade on a year-around basis, expansion of residential development, enlarging the downtown shopping facilities, establishing small-scale industries, and attracting distributing facilities.

The most important task is the planning of traffic and parking, the improvement of zoning, the creation of park and other recreational facilities, and the institution of long-range municipal planning.

The Bryson Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PRINCE H. PRESTON, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 9, 1954

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a letter addressed to me and signed by the Cobbtown Methodist Official Board relative to H. R. 1227. It is a pleasure to comply with their request by placing their letter in the Congressional Record.

The letter follows:

Cobbtown, Ga., *June 2, 1954.*

The Honorable Prince H. Preston,
House of Representatives Office
Building, Washington, D. C.

Dear Congressman Preston: The Official Board of Cobbtown Methodist Church is keenly interested in the increasing number of accidents, criminal acts, and broken homes due to alcohol, and we feel that it is our Christian duty to oppose the sale of intoxicants. We helped defeat the liquor interests in a county option bill, but we realize that much more needs to be done on a national scale. We are therefore appealing to you as our Congressman to vote for the Bryson bill, H. R. 1227, and we request that you place this letter in the Congressional Record in order for others to see that some of your constituents have expressed an interest in the elimination of harmful liquor advertising.

Sincerely,

Cobbtown Methodist Official Board,
Rufus Moxley.
Luch C. Evans.
Alene W. Moxley.
Margaret K. Collins.
Chas. L. Coleman.
C. D. Coleman.
Rev. Carroll Tinsley.

Wool Mills Braced for New Blows

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1954

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, I append hereto, under leave to extend my remarks, the second of two articles on the tariff problems of New England written for the Boston Post by James F. Leonard:

Wool Mills Braced for New Blows

(This is the second of two articles on the tariff problems of the depressed wool textile industry. Low tariff on imported wool products has resulted in cheap-labor textiles flooding the United States markets with resultant unemployment and liquidation of New England mills.)

(By James F. Leonard)

The sick and staggering wool textile industry is being measured for what could be a knockout blow by a Federal Government committee intent of further lowering an already dangerously low wool-products tariff.

Back in 1946 a Government group succeeded in having the tariff rate cut 50 percent. It opened the gates for a flow of $192,173,000 worth of cheap-labor wool products from Great Britain, Italy, France, Japan, and Germany to the American market to date.

Unable to compete with goods produced by textile workers who average only between 14 cents and 43 cents an hour compared to $1.56 an hour paid to the textile worker here, 92 New England mills were either liquidated or closed entirely.

At present there are about 40,000 unemployed woolen and worsted mill workers walking the streets of New England mill cities and towns.

Between January 1, 1949, and May 1, 1954, in Massachusetts alone 35 mills have been closed; 19 have been closed in Rhode Island, 11 in Maine, 11 more in New Hampshire, 8 in Vermont, and 8 in Connecticut.

In that same period wool products imports have increased from 8,917,000 yards to a record high of 24,275,479 yards.

Despite this alarming situation striking deep at the heard of New England's economy, the Federal Commission on Economic Policy has urged a 3-year extension to the reciprocal trade agreements program with a 5-percent tariff reduction in each of the 3 years.

"What we need is a higher tariff, a protective tariff to safeguard the jobs of our mill workers, not lower tariff and further competition from the low-pay industries of Europe and Asia," comments Harry J. Blake, president of Blake & Co., and former president of the Boston Chamber of Commerce.

Hugh Munro of Munro, Kincaid, Mottla, Inc., one of Boston's foremost wool merchants, declared, "Any lowering of the tariff would hurt like the devil. It would be a terrible blow to the industry."

Mr. Blake, Mr. Munro, and John Sheldon, another prominent Boston wool merchant, have been spearheading a fight against the proposed tariff reduction. So far, though, despite aid from Mayor Hynes, Governor Herter, and the entire congressional delegation from New England, it has not been a winning battle.

ITALIAN COMPETITION

The impact of $45,892,000 of wool product imports on the New England mill owner is best illustrated by a Connecticut worsted mill operator who cut his profit margin razor thin and placed a plain worsted sharkskin on the market for $4.65 a yard.

"I found I was in competition with an Italian sharkskin, made of finer yarn, for the same price even with the duty paid," he said. The textile worker in Italy receives but 30 cents an hour.

Added to the complications of the financially troubled domestic wool textile man is the fact that this country produces only about one-third of the wool needed for the finished product. Two-thirds of the wool used in the textile industry must be imported.

There is a tariff on the imported raw wool amounting to 25 percent on most grades. It is, in effect, "just another tax passed on to the American consumer," say Boston wool merchants.

"It's another impediment to recovery of the textile industry from its present depressed state," Mr. Blake explains. "America is the only country in the world with a tariff on raw wool imports. If the raw wool tariff was lowered and the tariff on finished products was raised, we could compete on equal footing with the more cheaply produced foreign products."

This is the crux of a situation which has seen woolen and worsted mill employment drop from 166,947 in 1947—the year the tariff on wool product imports was lowered to 25 percent—to a figure of slightly more than 90,000 employed in the industry today.

"We're being undersold in our own market by foreign mills and unless we can compete on an equal basis with them through readjustment of tariff rates the domestic woolen business is in a precarious position," says Edward Wilkinson, executive vice president of the National Association of Wool Manufacturers.

Back From a Troubled Area

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. HALEY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 9, 1954

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to include in the Record a very pertinent editorial which appeared in the Lakeland (Fla.) Ledger on Sunday, June 6, 1954, reviewing Gen. James A. Van Fleet's recent fact-finding mission to the Far East.

We all know General Van Fleet as one of the greatest soldier leaders of our times. Fellow Floridians, as all Americans everywhere, can be justly proud of the tremendous job he has done and is doing for our country. His extensive knowledge of the Far East area can be invaluable to us in these troubled times, and it would be well for all of us to heed his warning and advice.

The editorial follows:

BACK FROM A TROUBLED AREA

Back in Polk County, Friday, for a little while, General Van Fleet has just returned from a distant area now generally referred to as the world's big trouble spot.

Much concerned about what is happening out yonder in that Asiatic area, the people of Polk County would like to have been along with the General during the few weeks that had intervened since he took flight from Polk as a special Ambassador.

For the people of Polk, like their fellow Americans throughout the remainder of the Nation, have an extremely uneasy feeling about developments in the Far East and they want to know as much as possible about what's going on.

Lacking firsthand knowledge, they give serious study to the views expressed by such men of reliability as General Van Fleet.

What does he think about the situation now?

He is not brimming full of optimism, by any means.

Like many other people in America, he does not think it is necessary to send United States land forces into Indochina. Navy and Air Force aid perhaps, but not land forces. But he is emphatic in his assertion that the threat to the free world is becoming more serious yonder in the Asiatic realm. He expressed that view in Washington as he made an official report during a stopover en route back to Polk County.

Now, as often during recent months, General Van Fleet stresses that manpower of the nations in the Asiatic portion of the world that are friendly to the United States should be equipped and trained to fight.

Thereby is spotlighted again the choice between sending American material resources or American manpower.

We may eventually have to send both. But until such an eventuality becomes an imperative reality, the people of America would much prefer to send material resources—if American participation in the Indochina trouble becomes completely unavoidable.

It should give the American people a feeling of satisfaction that the stalwart Jim Van Fleet is one of the Nation's principal observers in the troubled area.

A Historic Letter to General Washington From the General Court of Massachusetts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1954

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, Hon. Charles Gibbons, speaker of the Massachusetts House of Representatives and a constituent of mine, recently read to the house of representatives a release from his office containing an old letter from the general court to General Washington, and the statement with the letter was incorporated in the journal of the house. In view of the nationwide historical value of the letter, I am including it herewith under leave to extend my remarks. The credit for bringing this interesting letter to light and to the attention of Speaker Gibbons should go to Paul A. Haley, of the Lynn Daily Evening Item, who also is a constituent of mine. The release follows:

Guidance of an all-wise Supreme Ruler of the Universe led the Thirteen Original Colonies to select George Washington as the commander in chief of their armies in the Revolutionary War, according to a letter sent to the victorious general at the conclusion of the struggle by the Massachusetts Legislature.

Text of the long-forgotten expression of thanks to General Washington by both branches of the great and general court was released today by Speaker Charles Gibbons, of the house of representatives.

It was found in an old copy of the Acts and Resolves of the Legislature for 1782 and 1783 and is not believed to have been previously published.

The letter was adopted by unanimous vote of both the house of representatives and senate and is signed by Samuel Adams, president of the senate, and Tristram Dalton, then speaker of the house.

It follows:

COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACUSETTS,
Boston, July 10, 1783.

To His Excellency General WASHINGTON.

SIR: The Senate and House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts in general court assembled take this opportunity of congratulating you on the happy return of peace. Your Excellency, we are assured, will join with us in the warmest expressions of gratitude to the Supreme Ruler of the Universe, under whose influence and direction the struggles of a virtuous and free people have terminated in a Revolution which excites the Admiration of the World.

Guided by His all-wise Providence, your country early fixed her eyes upon you; And confiding in those eminent qualities which you possessed, appointed you to the Command of her Armies.

The Wisdom of your Conduct in the discharge of that important Trust, has given a compleat Sanction to the Appointment, and crown'd the most enlightened Expectations. In every Stage of the arduous Conflict, what trying scenes have you not passed through! What Hardships have you not endured! What Dangers have you not encountered?

May Heaven reward you for your unremitted Exertions! May you long live, beloved by a Grateful Country and partaking largely in the enjoyment of those inestimitable Blessings, which you have been so eminently successful in securing for us!

While Patriots shall not cease to Applaud that sacred Attainment which you have consistenly manifested of the Rights of Citizens—too often violated by Men in Arms, your Military Virtues and Achievements will be deeply recorded in the Breasts of your Countrymen and their Posterity, and make the brightest pages in the History of Mankind.

We are with every Sentiment of Respect and Esteem, In the Name and behalf of the General Court, your Excellency's.

Most obedient and very humble servants,

S. ADAMS,
President of the Senate.
TRISTRAM DALTON,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Is Congress Attempting To Take Over Executive Functions?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1954

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, recently much has been said and written about the efforts of Congress to interfere with the executive branch of the Government.

In reality, the shoe seems to be on the other foot. Legislation is the business of the Congress. Execution of that legislation is the business of the executive branch. The President is authorized and directed by the Constitution to keep the Congress advised as to the state of the Union. But, nowhere in that document, is there a statement which either directly or indirectly suggests that he should dictate legislation.

Nevertheless, today, seldom does an important controversial bill come before the House that the House leadership, which ordinarily each Monday sees the President as to the pending legislative program, does not advise the House, as to the President's wishes. Sometimes stating "this is an administrative measure. I have been authorized to advise the Congress that the passage of this legislation is the administration's wish."

What an uproar there would be if the House passed a resolution suggesting to the President the name of its choice for a Cabinet position; dictated the terms of some statement which the President was to make to another nation, or suggested what he should include in a message to the people or to the Congress.

Sure, the executive and the legislative departments are independent but coordinate departments of the Government and neither should seek to usurp the functions of the other.

Illustrating the thought just expressed is an editorial from the Chicago Tribune of June 3, 1954, which reads as follows:

THEY SEEM TO SUSTAIN CONGRESS

The effort of President Eisenhower to restrict the Senate committee's investigation of communism in the Army has resulted in some erroneous statements being made about the historic relationship of the legislative and executive departments under the American system of government. The following quotations from the writings of authorities should contribute to better understanding:

"The weakening of the legislative arm leads to encroachment by the executive upon the legislative and judicial functions, and inevitably that encroachment is upon individual liberty. If we examine the fate of wrecked republics over the world we shall find first a weakening of the legislative arm." (Herbert Hoover, The Challenge to Liberty, 1934.)

"The most eminent Senators would have received as a personal affront a private message from the White House expressing a desire that they should adopt any course in the discharge of their legislative duties that they did not approve. If they visited the White House, it was to give, not to receive, advice. Any little company or coterie who had undertaken to arrange public policies with the President and to report to their associates what the President thought would have rapidly come to grief." (Senator George F. Hoar, Autobiography, 1903.)

"The executive department of a republic like ours should be subordinate to the legislative department. The President should obey and enforce the laws, leaving to the people the duty of correcting any errors committed by their Representatives in Congress. (John Sherman, Recollections of 40 Years in the House, Senate, and Cabinet, 1895.)

"The President's wishes conveyed in a message have not necessarily any more effect, on Congress than an article in a prominent newspaper * * * and, in fact, the suggestions which he makes, year after year, are usually neglected, even when his party has a majority in both Houses, or when the subject lies outside party lines." (James Bryce, The American Commonwealth, 1908.)

"I have never felt that it was my duty to attempt to coerce Senators or Representatives or to take reprisals. The people sent them to Washington. I felt I had discharged my duty when I had done the best I could with them. In this way I avoided almost entirely a personal opposition, which I think was of more value to the country than to attempt to prevail through arousing personal fear." (Calvin Coolidge, Autobiography, 1929.)

"Congress does not domineer over the President himself, but it makes the Secretaries its humble servants. Not that it would hesitate upon occasion to deal directly with the Chief Magistrate himself; but it has few calls to do so, because our latter day Presidents live by proxy; they are executives in theory, but the Secretaries are executives in fact." (Woodrow Wilson, Congressional Government, 1885.)

The Tax Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BURR P. HARRISON
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 9, 1954

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix, I include an article by Peter Edson which appeared in the Washington Daily News on June 2, as follows:

There doesn't seem to be such a thing as an average taxpayer. So, when it comes to figuring how much a taxpayer of modest income will benefit from the Republican administration's new tax bill, which has passed the House and is all ready to be reported to the Senate, the subject becomes a bit confusing.

There will be an estimated 47 million individual income-tax returns filed this year. The total benefits from the removal of inequities in next year's taxes, if the pending tax reform bill is passed, is estimated at $690 million.

It does not follow that the average taxpayer will have his taxes cut by an average $15. Over half aren't going to get any relief at all.

Deductions and credits to reduce double taxation on dividends received by individuals offer an excellent illustration. Next year it is proposed that there will be no tax on the first $50 of income from dividends. For dividends of over $50, a 5-percent credit will be allowed. This supposedly will reduce taxes collected on all dividends received by $240 million.

The trouble is, there are only 6 to 8 million Americans who own stocks and receive dividends. This is one-sixth to one-eighth of the 47 million income-tax payers. These stockholders will therefore benefit only $30 to $40 apiece, on the average.

The only other group of comparable size who will benefit are those who have medical expenses in excess of 3 percent of their adjusted gross income. Present law allows deductions for those having medical expenses in excess of 5 percent.

This is supposed to benefit an estimated 8 million. The total amount the change will cut income tax collections next year is estimated at $80 million. So the average taxpayer having medical expenses of over 3 percent of his adjusted gross income next year is going to benefit by $10.

Another inequity to be removed will permit unmarried taxpayers—single people or widows and widowers who support dependents—to split their income for income tax purposes, the same as married couples now do. This is supposed to benefit about 1 million unmarried heads of families for a total of $50 million. The average benefit in tax reduction will be about $50.

It also is proposed to allow working parents a credit of $600 for baby-sitting and child care expenses. Only $500,000 are expected to benefit from this, though it will cut tax collections $40 million. The average tax benefit for each working parent affected will be $80.

In an effort to put all retired workers on the same tax basis as those receiving tax-free United States social-security benefits, the new tax bill would exclude from Federal income taxation the first $1,200 from pensions, annuities, rents, interest, and dividends received by retired persons over 65. Tax experts estimate this will benefit about 1 million. It would reduce collections by an estimated $125 million. The average benefit for each of these taxpayers of 65 and over would thus be $125 a year.

What this all adds up to is a pretty selective reduction of income taxes for people in special circumstances. It is in no way comparable to a flat increase of $100 in personal exemption for everybody. This would cost the Government an estimated $2,400,000,000 next year and benefit the average of 47 million taxpayers by $50 apiece.

Making Self-Government Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES A. HALEY
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 9, 1954

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, for the continuation of our democratic form of government, our self-government, we must attract to public office young men of capacity and integrity, young men with sincerity of purpose and dedication to our American ideals. I, as many Americans, am seriously concerned over the disinterest that young men today are showing for public office.

Recently our distinguished and esteemed senior Senator from Florida, the Honorable Spessard L. Holland, spoke before the graduating class at his alma mater, Emory University of Atlanta, Ga. Senator Holland's remarks on the responsibilities of citizenship and our need for sincere and intelligent young men in public service were a challenge to those graduates.

I include an editorial tribute to Senator Holland's timely speech, which appeared in the June 6, 1954, edition of the Lakeland Ledger. The editorial follows:

MAKING SELF-GOVERNMENT WORK

Forty-two years ago Polk County's United States Senator Spessard Holland was graduated from Emory University in Georgia.

Yesterday he stood before that institution's graduating class and said among other things:

"I know there is a tendency on the part of many good citizens to feel that there is something unwholesome or unclean about political life. Such a feeling is not just a reflection upon our public officials. Much more significant, it is an indication of a lack of confidence in the soundness of our system which, if it justifies its existence, must produce sound leadership through selection by the votes of free people, who indispensably must have the intelligence, courage, and patriotism to make self-government work. I do not believe there is any greater need which our Government feels today than to put an end to this unwillingness on the part of many good citizens, who are highly trained, to seek and accept public office because they regard politics as unclean."

In proof of his implied contention that good men can go into politics and continue to be good men, Holland was able to cite Georgia's own two Senators—George and Russell, whose prestige as men of ability and integrity is not exceeded by any other men in Congress.

In its entirety, the message delivered there in a nostalgically familiar setting yesterday by Holland was an appeal to a new crop of graduates to keep their eyes lifted up to the highest level of citizenship in order that our American system of self-government may be best sustained.

No more pertinent exhortation could fall upon the ears of this Nation's graduates of the class of 1954.

What Can We Do if the Natives Won't Fight?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 9, 1954

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am convinced our Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles, is doing his best to prevent this Nation from being dragged into the war in Indochina. However, there are obviously men in high positions in this country who are apparently determined to send American military forces into that distant colonial war on the side of the French.

These interventionists could not do better than to ponder the following article by Mr. Ludwell Denny, Scripps-Howard foreign editor, which appears in the Washington Daily News on June 9, 1954:

WILSON AND NAVARRE AGREE ON LOW VIETNAMESE MORALE—WHAT CAN WE DO IF THE NATIVES WON'T FIGHT?

(By Ludwell Denny)

The Vietnam people will not defend themselves against the Red aggressor. This is the clincher used here by opponents of American military intervention in Indochina.

The low morale of the native population has just been confirmed by two high authorities, one French and the other American.

Gen. Henri-Eugene Navarre, retiring French commander in chief in Indochina, in a farewell interview with the press, said a national spirit of self-defense is lacking there. This cannot be dismissed as an alibi. For, as he pointed out, the Vietnam Government is unable to draft soldiers. In its last desperate attempt to do so it could not catch more than 1 draftee in 10.

WILSON AGREES

Defense Secretary Wilson, in returning here from his inspection trip, used different words to say the same thing. He emphasized that the Indochina problem is not essentially military but political.

Of course, there is nothing new about this. Since that war began almost 8 years ago, this has been the overriding fact.

It explains why the French, who are good officers, and why their Foreign Legion, which is one of the best fighting forces in the world, have not been able to defeat the Reds. The population has been more hostile to the defenders than to the aggressors. Under such conditions a victorious defense is impossible, and always has been.

EVADED THE ISSUE

But the French could not admit this and carry on. So they have evaded that decisive issue, with disastrous results. And now many advocates of American intervention are doing likewise. French-American evasions have taken the following forms:

The myth that the Reds could be licked if the French had more dollars and supplies. On the basis of that phony argument the United States taxpayer has been financing that French colonial war without any control over expenditures, and without exacting any reforms to convert it into a clear struggle for independence.

Actually there never has been a time when the French were not better armed than the enemy, with more modern weapons and planes. Until recently the amount of supplies obtained by the Reds from China was relatively small, according to both French and American experts.

The myth that more native troops could bring victory. Actually the defenders always have outnumbered the aggressors. But the native troops are inferior, and the French have been unwilling to give native generals high command for fear the troops would go over to the enemy—as many have done. The assumption here is that American training could produce an effective Vietnam army, comparable to the excellent South Korean army, evades the fact that the Vietnamese lack the Koreans' spirit of self-defense.

The idea that a French treaty granting full freedom—long promised but still withheld—could create a native spirit of self-defense quickly. Like the Koreans who continue to hate their former Japanese rulers long after liberation, the Vietnamese will go on distrusting the French and betraying them to the Reds for a long time.

The absurdity that the Vietnam Government of the playboy Bao Dai, loafing on the French Riviera, can be built into a fighting ally like South Korea under the genuine patriot President Rhee.

There is no patriot party with Vietnamese support on which to build.

To Use the Land and Save the Soil

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURR P. HARRISON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 9, 1954

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix, I include an essay on the importance of soil conservation by Miss Betty King Biggs, of Front Royal Elementary School, Front Royal, Va. This essay won the top award in the annual contest sponsored by the Lord Fairfax Soil Conservation District, which conducts an outstanding program in the field of soil-conservation education.

The essay follows:

To use the land and save the soil is a most important lesson that man has not fully appreciated. All through his history on the good earth he has left more destruction than conservation and we are told that nowhere has the destruction of productive soil and the bounties of nature been so rapid as in our own country. In much less than 200 years over 100 million acres of once good land have been virtually ruined for further cultivation.

We have at last come to land's end and demands increase from year to year on our remaining productive land. We have left now 460 million acres of land suitable for cultivation. This is not quite 3 acres to each of our 160 million people today. And 90 percent of this is subject to soil erosion where soil-conservation measures are not used.

Most certainly we are living at a time when the conservation of soil and natural resources is of vital importance to everybody. A great many people are doing a lot about it in many ways. But there is so much to be done. So much destruction continues to our fields, forests, streams, harbors, and our wildlife. This does not have to be. Conservation farming produces more at less cost and in less time. Everybody benefits from the good things of life. Progress must be our watchword. Our whole existence is very largely tied to productive soil—good health and good living from good soil. The Mississippi River alone carries 40 acres of topsoil downstream every minute when at flood stage, creating havoc along the way. Soil and water are so important to all life and progress we must do what has to be done to use and conserve both. Every little watershed must show thoughtful attention.

Our own Lord Fairfax Soil Conservation District includes the counties of Frederick, Clarke, Warren, and Shenandoah. It is one of the 27 soil conservation district in Virginia and one of America's 2,750 districts organized and supervised by the farmers in their districts where they farm. This is great progress along the conservation way that increases day by day. In our Lord Fairfax district over 1,000 farmers have developed their farm plans for conservation farming. As in other districts they have the assistance of their Soil Conservation Service technicians and all who can make a contribution in any way to the conservation program of the district. This may well include everybody in all walks of life.

The following is from the annual report of the supervisors of our district. Each year some 10,000 illustrated copies are given to the schools and others of the district. We use them in our classrooms and take them home along with a lot of other conservation literature made available each year. Progress is so important, and this is from the recent progress report of our district, To Use the Land and Save the Soil, the basic heritage from one generation to another.

"Tailored to fit the potentialities of the individual farm and the farm economy is the basic 11-point soil conservation program of the district—evolved through the development of some 1,000 soil conservation farm plans throughout the district. Fitting land capabilities of the individual farm and designated watersheds of the district. The following soil-conservation measures are integral parts of the basic soil conservation farm plans for production and protection—preservation and improvements:

"1. Conservation crop rotation built around good sods of grasses and legumes. Planned 37,200 acres.

"2. Conservation crop rotations in a pattern of alternate contour strips, conserving topsoil and rainfall on sloping fields. Planned 17,100 acres.

"3. Contour tillage: Farming operations on the level. Planned 23,100 acres. Rows up and down do not fit a field that's round.

"4. Grassed waterways in natural draws: Drainage and diversions, all carrying surplus rainfall safely. Grassed waterways 1,070 acres, drainage 1,360 acres.

"5. Productive meadows and pastures of grasses and legumes, water, and shade in a good land-use pattern. Planned 90,100 acres.

"6. Conservation cover crops on orchards and cropland. Planned 19,100 acres.

"7. Correct use of lime and fertilizers, manures and crop residues, all fitting the soils and crops. See your land capability map of your farm. Planned for 93,200 acres.

"8. Farm ponds: Storage of surplus rainfall on the farm. Planned 690. Stocked with fish 540; 5,100 farm ponds are required in good land-use patterns. Water for livestock and wildlife, fire protection, irrigation, recreation. An acre pond holds 1 million gallons of rainfall on the farm.

"9. Vegetate galls and gullies, cuts, and fills with grasses and legumes, shrubs, and trees. Many potential wildlife habitats.

"10. Woodland protection and management for sustained yields of woodland products; protect from fire and grazing. Leave ample den trees for wildlife. Planned 36,100 acres.

> "'I think that I shall never see
> A poem lovely as a tree.'

"11. Wildlife: Its survival and abundance. Vegetate field and woodland borders and other areas for food and cover. Planned 610 acres.

"We believe with those who say: Youth molds its future as it helps to save the soil by which we live; good health and good living from good soil.

"Will future generations say of us: Knowledge comes but wisdom lingers in saving the soil as we use the land."

The oldest living things in the world are trees. Living monuments of thrift and conservation. Pupils of our schools in Lord Fairfax Soil Conservation district have planted 150,000 seedling tulip poplar and pine in the last 3 years. Planted along with bicolor and sericea wildlife habitats—on land not good for other farming purposes. Our interest grows as we see our trees grow and beautify idle areas about the farm.

Democratic Leader United States Senator Lyndon B. Johnson Praised in Full-Page Editorial of Great Texas Newspaper

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 9, 1954

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the San Antonio Express-San Antonio News, for Sunday May 30, 1954, carried a full-page editorial concerning the Democratic leader in the United States Senate, the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson. In addition to the statements on the page, it contained a complimentary cartoon showing the Senator to be a great, tall Texan and deservedly popular with the masses of the people. It also shows a large picture of the Senator. This is a great endorsement—every word of it deserved—coming from one of the greatest newspapers in Texas and the entire Gulf Southwest. The editorial and accompanying statements are as follows:

Johnson Merits Full Support—Express, News Favor Senator for Reelection

Senator Lyndon B. Johnson has attained one of the most outstanding records of achievement for a freshman term in the annals of the United States Senate.

Senator Johnson's public life and record, as outlined in detail on this page today, undoubtedly have won him the trust and support of the vast majority of his fellow Texans. He has ably and honorably represented this State through two decades of public service in ashington.

While San Antonio News and San Antonio Express may not agree with Senator Johnson on every point of public policy, it certainly considers his official record and general political philosophy to be in close harmony with the best interests of this State and the Nation. These newspapers wholeheartedly endorse the senior Senator's campaign for Democratic nomination and for reelection.

Senator Johnson's position as third-ranking Democrat on the Armed Services and the Interstate and Foreign Commerce committees is a decisive influence on important Texas, and San Antonio area, relations with the Federal Government.

Even more constructively influential is Senator Johnson's role as Senate Democratic minority leader, with the prospect of his attaining the majority leadership should his party regain congressional control.

Lyndon Johnson's Senate leadership has won bipartisan acclaim, and its continuation is vital to the success of the Eisenhower administration in overcoming deepening crises at home and abroad.

Senator Johnson is universally conceded to be one of the hardest working public servants in the National Capital. And his heavy national and party responsibilities have not lessened his close attention to Texas interests and opinions.

Texas can take profound pride in the maturing statesmanship of its senior Senator. This State should reward his splendid service with a record vote of confidence in the coming primaries and general election.

No one is better able to judge Lyndon B. Johnson's stature as a statesman than his colleagues on the Senate floor. Here is what they think of him:

Senator Russell, Democrat, of Georgia: "I did not believe that any man could have achieved as much harmony within the Democratic Party and contributed as much to the operations of the Senate as a whole."

The late Senator Taft, Republican, of Ohio: "I do not see how any majority and minority leaders could cooperate better than we have done, and it is due very largely to your thoughtfulness and understanding."

Senator Gore, Democrat, of Tennessee: "His proven ability as a leader in the United States Senate makes him needed by every one of the 48 United States."

Senator Green, Democrat, of Rhode Island: "Admirable qualities of leadership."

Senator Mansfield, Democrat, of Montana: "He certainly has indicated to us a great wisdom, a wide field of knowledge, and a good deal of understanding."

Senator Knowland, Republican, of California: "The distinguished minority leader has been cooperative and has put his country ahead of any narrow partisanship."

Senator Hill, Democrat, of Alabama: "Time and again on this floor during this session we have seen our leader demonstrate his exceptional ability, his courage, and, most of all, his devotion to our country and its welfare."

Senator Wiley, Republican, of Wisconsin: "He is always courteous; he is always friendly."

Senator McCarran, Democrat, of Nevada: "He has rendered valiant service to America."

Senator Johnston, Democrat, of South Carolina: "The Senator from Texas has been truly a great Democrat, and at the same time he has been able to cooperate in the Senate with the Republican Members."

Senator Johnson, Democrat, of Colorado: "I can thing of nothing better than that we might have a continuation of the leadership of Lyndon Johnson."

Senator Smathers, Democrat, of Florida: "His attention to legislative duties has aroused the admiration of the country."

Senator Symington, Democrat, of Missouri: "No Senator ever contributed more to efficient management and operation of the administrative branch."

Senator Pastore, Democrat, of Rhode Island: "In Lyndon Johnson there is not one intolerant, not one bigoted, and not one partial bone."

Senator Douglas, Democrat, of Illinois: "The party owes a great debt to the Senator from Texas."

HIS LIFE: TEXAS' SENIOR SENATOR RISES TO KEY POWER

Lyndon Baines Johnson, 45, senior Senator from Texas, today is second in political influence only to President Dwight D. Eisenhower.

His pivotal position in the United States Senate, as floor leader of the Democratic Party minority, makes him a decisive factor, both in domestic and foreign policy.

Profoundly respected by the Republican majority as well as by his Democratic colleagues, Lyndon Johnson is as typically Texan as a man can be.

Six feet 3 inches tall, weighing 204 pounds, he is deceptively mild for one of strong convictions, apparently easygoing but one of the National Capital's hardest workers. In his southwestern drawl, he says what he thinks and means what he says.

Senator Johnson was born on a modest farm near Stonewall, Tex., and he has not strayed far from his origin. He and his wife, the former Lady Bird Taylor, whom he married in 1934, and their two daughters, Lynda Bird, 9, and Lucy Baines, 6, have their home on the LBJ ranch on the Pedernales River near Johnson City, north of San Antonio.

After finishing his public school education, Johnson worked his way through Southwest Texas State Teachers College at San Marcos, receiving a bachelor of science degree in 1930. He attended law school at Georgetown University in Washington, D. C.

After teaching school for a while, he went to Washington in 1931 as secretary to former Congressman Richard Kleberg, manager of the famed King ranch. He resigned in 1935 and returned to Texas as State director of the National Youth Administration, youngest man in the country ever to hold a comparable position.

Johnson entered politics actively in 1937, winning election to the national House of Representatives with a whirlwind campaign in the 10th Congressional District. Following that special election, he was reelected for five successive terms.

At that time, Johnson was a strong supporter of the Roosevelt administration, though political maturity was later to swing him to the middle-road course of constructive conservatism. He learned the congressional ropes from House Speaker Sam Rayburn, of Texas, who showed him how a party leader operates on the Hill.

Johnson made a bid for a Senate seat in a special election in 1941, but lost and remained in the House. In 1948, Johnson opposed former Gov. Coke Stevenson for Democratic nomination to the Senate post vacated by W. Lee O'Daniel, and the likes of that campaign may never be seen again.

Johnson beat Stevenson by only 87 votes out of nearly a million cast. Stevenson failed in his court contest of the election, and Johnson then beat Republican Jack Porter, of Houston, in the general election after another hot campaign.

In the House, Johnson had made a good record as an exceptionally effective member of the Naval Affairs Committee. And he was the first House Member to take leave for active duty. He served in the Navy after Pearl Harbor and was decorated with the Silver Star by Gen. Douglas MacArthur for gallantry under fire.

Johnson maintained his interest in national defense in the Senate. He fathered the special Senate Preparedness Subcommittee and served as its chairman. Independent Senator Morse, of Oregon, has said of that work:

"The Johnson subcommittee in its 43 unanimous reports—there was not a single one of its reports which involved a partisan vote—saved the taxpayers of the United States, on the record, at least between $2 billion and $3 billion, and there are those who say we saved much more."

Johnson's subcommittee is generally credited with saving the country more than a billion dollars during the Korean war. He is third ranking Democrat on the Senate Armed Services Committee—of tremendous importance to the San Antonio area—and the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, one of the most important in the upper Chamber. He also served for a brief period on the Joint Congressional Atomic Energy Committee.

Johnson was elected unanimously in January 1953, to his present position as Senate Democratic leader. That heavy responsibility includes serving as chairman of the Senate Democratic conference, the Senate Democratic policy committee, and the Senate Democratic steering committee.

Johnson is the youngest floor leader in Senate history, and, both Republicans and Democrats agree, one of the ablest. Seasoned politicos shook their heads and said Johnson was taking over "a receivership in bankruptcy." But he quickly turned the Democratic minority into a loyal and constructive opposition.

Johnson worked to put fresh, vigorous young men on key committees. He was able to tell the people of Texas last year:

"We have supported the (Eisenhower) administration when we thought it was right. We have opposed the administration when we thought it was wrong. But in no case did we oppose merely to obstruct."

Johnson did not join the pro-Eisenhower Democrats during the 1952 presidential campaign, but during the first year of the Eisenhower administration the President received more support from the Johnson-led Democrats than he did from the members of his own Republican Party.

In Texas, Johnson has managed to retain the respect of both the Rayburn-Truman-Stevenson Democrats and the Eisenhower Democrats and Republicans. He has received the personal congratulations of the President.

Johnson last fall covered virtually all Texas, reporting to the people and getting first-hand information on their problems. Though the pressure of urgent duties will prevent him from undertaking an extensive campaign this year, the odds are overwhelmingly in his favor for reelection.

HIS RECORD: MINORITY LEADER STEERS A MIDDLE-ROAD COURSE

Senator Lyndon B. Johnson reached a new peak of personal popularity during his marathon of 200 speeches over this State last fall in a report to the people that left no doubt where the Democratic Senate minority leader stands on today's vital issues.

Senator JOHNSON's public record is an open book in which all Texas can take pride. It is a record of constructive conservatism, and it is one of fine balance among his duties to State, party, and Nation. His attitude toward the Eisenhower administration is this:

"I never hesitated to oppose a Democratic administration when I thought it was wrong. I shall not hesitate to support a Republican administration when I think it is right. The American people are more concerned with the fortunes of the next generation than they are with the fortunes of the next election."

Though Senator JOHNSON in recent weeks has directed a somewhat more aggressive opposition on the eve of congressional campaigning, he can be fully trusted to cooperate with the Eisenhower administration on sound foreign and domestic policies.

Senator JOHNSON, the first Senator in history to lead his party during his freshman term, has accomplished the near miracle of taking firm legislative stands while consolidating a badly split minority opposition. He is the only Texan ever to hold the position of Democratic floor leader.

San Antonio News does not agree with every stand that Senator JOHNSON has taken, just as it does not rubber stamp every item in President Eisenhower's program. But it is in general accord with the broad political philosophy of both.

A nonpartisan survey shows that Senator JOHNSON's voting record in support of the Eisenhower administration has been better than the record of the average Republican Congressman. Yet he has been able to work amicably with the northern liberal and southern conservative wings of the Democratic Party.

Here is a running glance at his stalwart record:

Senator JOHNSON coauthored legislation returning the oil-rich offshore lands to Texas. He brought that measure to the floor when it was almost lost in a committee pigeonhole.

He has been a leading advocate of water conservation to solve Texas' growing shortage problem, and he has acted promptly in drought and flood-control emergencies.

Senator JOHNSON repeatedly has fought successfully to prevent passage of the Fair Employment Practices Commission bill in a form that would violate States' rights.

He has been a consistent supporter of the Taft-Hartley Act, and has helped block undesirable amendments to the law, such as those to pull its antistrike teeth and to tack on an FEPC provision.

In 1952, Senator JOHNSON opposed a grant of authority to President Truman to seize steel mills during a strike that hampered prosecution of the Korean war. He voted for a resolution urging the President to use Taft-Hartley Act powers to end the strike.

Senator JOHNSON voted for the McCarran-Walter omnibus immigration bill, and voted to override President Truman's veto of that measure.

He successfully fought a drive in Congress to lower oil depletion allowances for Federal income tax purposes, a measure that would have hit Texas hard. He also voted for capital gains treatment of profits from sale of cattle used for breeding and dairy purposes, against raising the capital gains maximum tax rate, and against prevention of family partnerships for income tax purposes.

Senator JOHNSON has favored State over Federal control of natural gas resources, strong Communist-control measures, and economy in the national administration. He opposed increasing the national debt ceiling.

Senator JOHNSON has worked for superior airpower and well-rounded national defense. He favors international cooperation, but with closer supervision of foreign aid and more congressional control over treatymaking. He opposed both the St. Lawrence seaway and statehood for Alaska and Hawaii.

Senator JOHNSON is a firm advocate of soil conservation, rural electrification and parity-price supports. He favors continuation of the Federal welfare program. He supports the United Nations, but stand squarely against admission of Red China.

A champion of military and industrial defense preparedness, Senator JOHNSON pushed wartime strategic-materials stockpiling, development of synthetic rubber and tin smelting at Texas City, the latter a valuable industry that he is now struggling to save.

All in all, Senator JOHNSON represents the majority will of Texas with a rare degree of accuracy. This is his job, and he is doing it admirably.

Breakfast in New York—Dinner in Honolulu

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON

DELEGATE FROM HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 9, 1954

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following item from the Washington Daily News of July 9, 1954:

BREAKFAST IN NEW YORK—DINNER IN HONOLULU

(By Inez Robb)

HONOLULU, June 9.—Ours is the only Government that ever had a chance to incorporate a piece of paradise as a State and hesitated.

This is a land where every schoolgirl wears orchids in her hair and the office boy sports one in his lapel. In this clime even those Harry Truman shirts look good. Can anyone ask for more?

There is scant literature about the life and times of a lady beachcomber, but since arriving here and sighting Waikiki, I am seriously considering the possibilities.

I did not exactly arrive here by rocket, but in a plane that will do until a rocket comes along. It was a United Air Lines DC-7 that chased the sun one-fifth of the way around the globe.

THE SUN WON

It was a photo finish, with the sun nosing out the DC-7 in the stretch. But even if the plane came in second, it flew so high, wide, and handsome that I had breakfast in New York and dinner—the same day—in Honolulu.

Breakfast was a mite early in New York, a few minutes before 6 a. m., when I am not ordinarily at my best or brightest. But with pluck and luck, I made the 7 a. m. takeoff.

Seventeen hours and one minute later, or slightly after 6 p. m., Honolulu time, Capt. Gus Sommermeyer, general manager of flight operations for United, set the plane down without so much as a ripple.

I will grant you that it was then midnight in New York and I was beginning to feel it.

Then it was announced that the flight had clobbered all previous New York to Honolulu flight records by 3 hours and 15 minutes.

This perked me up considerably. But when the door of the plane was thrown open and we intrepid travelers were given a Hawaiian welcome, I felt like Ponce de Leon quaffing from the fountain of eternal youth.

LEIS TO THE EYEBROWS

I love flowers more than most anything in the world and within 3 minutes flat, I resembled the principal of a high-class gangster funeral. When the orchid leis got up to my pompadour, I was thoughtfully provided with a seeing-eye guide by the reception committee.

And still the leis kept piling up. It is an old Hawaiian custom not only to toss a lei around the neck of the new arrival but also to kiss him on the cheek.

I'm no fool. The minute I caught on to the local usage, I started dishing out floral wreaths and the old, customary buss to every handsome man at the airport. A girl can meet a lot of interesting men in this way in a really short space of time.

As I can determine, every day is Sadie Hawkins Day in Hawaii.

And now, if you'll excuse me, I am going out to have my new grass skirt shortened and distribute the rest of these flowers. Wow. How long has this been going on?

Surpluses Can Be Managed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. THYE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 9, 1954

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, our abundant agricultural production, although it has presented us with a difficult economic problem of bringing surpluses into manageable proportions, is one of the most powerful weapons for peace ever given a nation. We know that communism has no greater ally than hunger, and that democracy and freedom, on the other hand, have no greater ally than a well-nourished people. If we use our surpluses wisely, they will be a blessing to our country and to other nations.

Having introduced in the Senate a bill to provide for the transfer of portions of surplus agricultural commodities to voluntary agencies, for distribution in friendly nations, I discussed the use of our surplus food and fiber in an address I gave on June 5 at the Morrison County Dairy Day program at Little Falls, Minn. I ask unanimous consent that the prepared text of this address be printed in the appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SURPLUSES CAN BE MANAGED

(Address by United States Senator EDWARD J. THYE, Republican, of Minnesota, at Morrison County Dairy Day, Little Falls, Minn., Saturday, June 5, 1954)

How to deal with our agricultural surplus situation is our most important domestic problem. Its solution involves not only the prosperity of our farmers, but sooner or later the continued prosperity of the city laborer and industry. And it affects to a profound extent our foreign relations and whether or not we will have real friends among the free nations of the world.

With all our know-how in industry, in commerce, and in distribution—to say nothing of the demonstrated capacity of American agriculture to produce an abundance to meet our needs in war or in peace—we must demonstrate our ability to handle these surpluses. Only when we have proved that ability can we afford to take steps toward settling the question of price supports or deciding what our farm price supports should be.

These surpluses need not be regarded as a curse, as some seem to think. They could well be one of our greatest blessings if only we have the good sense to use them as a blessing. We must always have sufficient plantings of food and fiber to meet our needs. It is inevitable that in some years, when all factors are favorable, including such an uncertain one as the weather, there will be surpluses. We must not allow the proportionately small surpluses of our Nation's farm economy to bring poverty to our farmers.

We must meet the surplus problem, not only by temporary acreage controls to help bring them into manageable proportions, but by a long-range program of larger use of the commodities in Government warehouses to improve the nutritional standards of the American people, to provide for increased distribution in welfare programs considering the needs of certain low-income groups, and to enlarge the benefits of the school-lunch program.

The dairy producer has one of the greatest foods that could be offered on the market. Fluid milk contains not only the natural milk sugars but contains the calcium that is so essential in one's diet. Children must have it for their health and well-being. Adults should have it because of the calcium that this food product contains. The surpluses in dairy products would vanish if we undertook a real selling program in this country of this highly nutritive food.

USE OF PRIVATE AGENCIES

In addition, there are three foreign channels for use of surpluses in farm production in this country; namely, (1) normal commercial export markets, (2) sale of surpluses outside of these channels with acceptance of local currency for reinvestment in the purchasing countries, and (3) distribution of surpluses largely through church relief organizations, refugee organizations, CARE, CROP, and other similar organizations.

While administration bills pending in Congress provide for methods of using these commodities for foreign-aid purposes, for sale or barter (including barter for strategic materials) to develop new or expanded markets, and for donation to the school-lunch and relief programs at home, provision was not made for such distribution by nonprofit voluntary organizations. I have introduced a bill to provide this third channel which I think holds much promise for effective distribution where it is most needed and where it will build good will. Voluntary agencies are equipped to do this job and they are ready to do it on a basis that would give a maximum of benefit to persons who really need this help.

In many years we will have unused surpluses on our hands after we have exhausted all disposals under normal commercial means, and have met our domestic needs, and we will need to use our remaining surpluses to distribute to the needy people of our allies and friends. By this means wastage of these surpluses can be avoided, good will can be created, and profitable new markets for the future can be opened up.

Even a cursory examination into the nature of farming in our Nation will reveal the inevitability of surpluses in some years regardless of the kind of price support or farm program we may have. The nature of the farm business makes a continued full output from our farmers essential. Also, the rapid improvement of our knowledge, methods, and machinery insures a continued rapid increase in our productivity per man, per acre, and per head of livestock.

Because of our own and world needs, our agricultural machine has been geared to a high level of productivity. It is most difficult, if not impossible, to reverse the upward movement of increased productivity of American farms at the present state of our development. Acreage controls, diversion of land to planting of legumes for soil building, and other means will help maintain a balance, but basically we must anticipate that surpluses will occur. I do not know of any farm economist who would predict where the increased productivity of our American farms will level off, especially with research paying such good returns and with expanded research and extension being advocated by nearly everyone.

In our acreage-control efforts during the last two decades we have never reduced our total crop acreage any—but merely shifted it from one surplus producing crop to others. We are trying to avoid that by encouraging shifts to soil building rather than marketable crops. Nevertheless, the high fixed-cost nature of the farm business and the uncertainties and hazards of farming make the effort for full production not only logical but necessary.

WEAPON FOR WORLD PEACE

Stated in very simple terms we have two facts to consider. Over one-half of the world's population is living on the edge of starvation and suffering from malnutrition diseases. And, yet, we are piling up in Government storage billions of dollars' worth of surplus foods and fibers which are feeding and clothing no one.

These surpluses could well be the most powerful weapon of peace ever given to a nation. Let us use them to help feed hungry people, to help them gain strength so they can themselves become more productive. Let us use them as a far more potent destroyer of communism than is the hydrogen bomb, for communism has no greater ally than hunger and democracy and freedom have no greater ally than a well-nourished people.

I believe that a serviceable use of some of our current and future unmarketable surpluses is highly important as a means of avoiding the spread of an aggressive communism. If these surpluses are allowed to waste, or are dumped onto the world markets to break normal markets, great discredit and ill will to us will be the result. On the other hand, if these surpluses are used to relieve hunger, to increase productivity and trade, and to establish new future demands without interfering with normal private trade, we can reap rich harvests of goodwill, of reduced costs of checking aggression, and of increased profitable future trade with friendly nations.

We must realize that the great continued abundance of our food and fiber—the even full flow from our farms of the means of high standards of living—is one of the greatest factors in our Nation's greatness and of its leadership in the world. Let us not for once look upon it as a curse, but as one of the greatest blessings sent to a troubled, hungry world.

Texas Research Foundation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 9, 1954

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, a brochure was published recently on the story of the first 10 years of the Texas Research Foundation, of Renner, Tex.

This review lists briefly some of the principal accomplishments of the foundation during the past decade. Implicit in those accomplishments is a bright promise of what the organization will do in the future.

I ask unanimous consent that this review of the Texas Research Foundation's first 10 years of work be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the review was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Texas Research Foundation celebrated the 10th anniversary of its founding on February 8 with a luncheon in the Texas room of the Baker Hotel.

"The foundation in one decade has grown from an idea to a powerful force in agriculture of the Southwest," Dr. C. L. Lundell, director of the foundation, stated in his address.

Dr. Lundell said that the foundation was created in answer to one of the greatest needs that has ever confronted our economy—a declining agriculture which threatened the future stability of the entire region. It was reflected in one-fourth bale per acre cotton, 11-bushel-per-acre wheat, and 15-bushel-per-acre corn, and in soils which were being steadily mined of all their virgin fertility.

In 1943 Dr. Lundell, on leave from the University of Michigan for wartime service with the Foreign Economic Administration, and Dr. Umphrey Lee, president of Southern Methodist University, began a series of conferences about an approach to this problem, and in December of that same year Dr. Lundell joined the staff at Southern Methodist University to initiate an agricultural project.

At its meeting of January 21, 1944, the executive committee of Southern Methodist University took action to start a program to stem the tide of agricultural deterioration.

Dr. Lundell presented the proposal to the executive committee, and Mr. Karl Hoblitzelle, a member of the committee, endorsed the plan wholeheartedly, stating that he would give it his backing.

The executive committee took action, and on motion made by Mr. Eugene McElvaney and seconded by Mr. W. B. Hamilton, the committee authorized the establishment of an institute of technology and plant industry and approved a budget of $43,941.80 as proposed by Dr. C. L. Lundell for immediate outlay for the purchase of plant and improvements and an annual operating budget of $15,000.

On February 8, 1944, the recommendation of Dr. Lee to establish a division of the University to be known as the Institute of Technology and Plant Industry was authorized by the board of trustees of SMU.

At considerable sacrifice to itself, Southern Methodist University carried on the program for 2½ years, Dr. Lundell stated, "putting more than $200,000 into the work at Renner. During this early period of development, the first private support was received, a gift of $5,000 from Mr. G. B. Dealey, and $1,000 from Mr. John Alford of Henderson."

It soon became evident that if the program was to be established on a firm basis to carry out the research job needed in the State, steps should be taken to obtain considerably more financial backing than the resources of Southern Methodist University could supply. Through the initiative of Mr. Karl Hoblitzelle, who offered $250,000 for expanding research facilities at Renner, with the understanding that the community would underwrite operating expenses, the board of trustees of Southern Methodist University on June 24, 1946, authorized the transfer of the facilities and land of the Institute at Renner to a new corporation to be known as Texas Research Foundation.

Since July 1, 1946, Texas Research Foundation has functioned as an independent, nonprofit research and educational institution operated wholly by funds contributed by businessmen, farmers, and ranchers, and maintains the only privately supported agricultural experiment station in the United States. Today its plant is valued at approximately $1,500,000 and it has an annual budget of some $350,000. More than 1,350 corporations and individuals, who recognize the constructive role of the Foundation, provide financial support.

All the way it has been a pioneering venture—a flexible growing program in which businessmen, farmers and ranchers have gotten together to work out mutually threatening problems. It has been described as a paramount example of how the free enterprise system operates to protect, sustain, and extend itself in providing greater security for more people.

Dr. Lundell described the program of Texas Research Foundation as an integrated attack on the basic problems facing agriculture in the Southwest.

It has for its long-term objective the realization of the productive potential of every acre through the development of sound land-use systems and efficient production practices adapted to individual farms and ranches. Its approach is through fundamental research, seeking improvement of our soils, plants, and livestock.

"Our philosophy," Dr. Lundell said, "is that the problems of agriculture basically are local and can best be worked out at the community level. In other words, under our free-enterprise system, the solution of the agricultural problems and a more efficient farming industry must be the direct responsibility of the farmers and ranchers themselves, working through organizations such as we have here."

In agriculture the foundation operates in three main areas: (1) Fundamental research; (2) development of farming systems with combinations of practices which will rebuild the soils and increase crop yields; and (3) pasture and range improvement to restore productivity of the grasslands.

Another important objective of the program of the foundation is to encourage integrated industrial development in rural communities, recognizing that marketing and utilization of farm products are inseparable from sound agricultural development.

Dr. Lundell briefly reviewed some of the basic accomplishments of the foundation in its first 10 years:

1. In 1944 it initiated a corn-breeding program which has produced TRF-3 and other hybrids to be released in the next few years. TRF-3 is already recognized as a top white hybrid corn in 85 percent of the corn-growing area of Texas.

2. It initiated a project to develop new sources of vegetable oils and protein. Three new oil seed crops already have been developed at Renner. These are sesame, now in commercial production, and new varieties and hybrids of soybeans and sunflowers which are ready for field testing.

3. In an intensive research program to find economical means for rebuilding soil fertility and to maintain fertility at high levels, a grass-legume program has been developed which has resulted in the adoption in the Southwest of the idea of all-season pastures. This program represents two phases—cool-season and warm-season pastures. Although there is much research still to be done on grasses and legumes for the production of all-season pastures, the basic philosophy has already been accepted.

The grass program has the double emphasis of strengthening the livestock program of the region and of improving soils. Major emphasis is being given to the improvement of various native and introduced grasses for inclusion in the rotation cycle with cash crops on tillable lands.

"The acceptance and wide usage of our grassland farming practices with both warm and cool season pastures indicates that within a very few years grass marketed through livestock well may be our most important cash crop in this area," Dr. Lundell reported.

4. It has been demonstrated that a combination of good farming practices—grass-legume sod in rotation, adequate fertilization, insect control, proper tillage, and the planting of the best varieties of adapted crops—pays off handsomely in increased per-acre yield. In field tests, yields of wheat have been increased from an average of 11 to 38 bushels, cotton from one-fourth to 1½ bales, and grain sorghum from 1,800 to 4,200 pounds per acre.

5. The foundation has introduced a new concept of the role of agricultural experiment stations in our economic life. The foundation starts with a basic research problem and carries it through all the intermediary stages from laboratory to greenhouse to field plots to outlying farm demonstrations, and finally to testing on an operating farm unit. Thus the principles developed from research are being tested under actual farming conditions to determine their value in the agricultural economy of Texas.

6. Texas Research Foundation as an implement of the free-enterprise system has served as a stimulus to tax-supported organizations working in the field of agricultural research. It is providing the same impetus to agricultural research that private enterprise has so long supplied in the field of medical and industrial research.

7. In addition to operating the only independent agricultural experiment station in the country, the Foundation is carrying on a program of research in the more fundamental aspects of the botainical sciences, and in agro-industrial research. Continuously it is looking for new outlets for farm products and for the development of more processing of products in the communities where they are grown.

8. In the broad field of industrial research it has made specific and immeasurable contributions in petroleum chemistry, radiochemistry, uranium ore processing, development of synthetic lubricants, and other fluids and in the chemurgic evaluation of new raw materials.

9. The Foundation makes getting the research which it develops quickly into use on the farm an integral part of its job. Not only does it hold field days and demonstrations on its 850-acre site at Renner, but through its agricultural relations division provides assistance to farmers and ranchers in developing a complete soil-conservation and improvement program. These farms in turn serve as community demonstrations of applied research and in the use of sound farming and ranching practices. It carries on an active program for the dissemination of its research results through newspaper, radio, and television publicity, and through the distribution of printed literature. It also reaches thousands of interested individuals each year who come to the Foundation to study its work in progress.

10. Through the administration of the Hoblitzelle Awards, it has served to stimulate scientific research; and promote the adoption of sound farming and ranching practices, statewide as well as nationally.

Time for a Showdown

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SPESSARD L. HOLLAND

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 9, 1954

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an editorial entitled "Time for a Showdown," relating to the commodity price support structure, and published in the New York Times of June 9, 1954.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

TIME FOR A SHOWDOWN

The House Agriculture Committee, now considering an omnibus farm bill, has challenged the central thesis of the whole farm program proposed by the administration. It did this yesterday when it voted to continue through 1955 the high, rigid price supports (90 percent of parity) on the so-called basic commodities. It is this system of rigid price supports, originally adopted purely as a temporary wartime measure, that has been predominantly responsible for the huge and costly accumulation of farm commodities in the hands of the Government.

The action of the House committee is in no sense a surprise development. Clifford R. Hope, the committee's chairman, issued a statement a little over a week ago in which he said that "a large majority" of that body "still favors a high level of price supports." It was another House Agriculture Committee, headed by this same Representative, that was responsible for wrecking the only previous effort by his own party to rid the country of the incubus of continuing crop surpluses, with all their unfortunate repercussions. That was in 1948 when the Republicans produced the basically sound and farsighted Aiken bill in the Senate. The most important single provision of the Aiken bill was one calling for flexible price supports. Then, as now, however, Mr. Hope's committee adopted what its chairman referred to euphemistically as a "compromise" measure; and then, as now, by a "compromise," it meant putting off the effective date which the law had provided for abandoning rigid price supports.

This time, however, Mr. Hope and other Members of Congress who refused to accept the fact that the Nation has returned to a free price system may find the going somewhat rougher than it was in 1948 under an administration with a definite leaning in the direction of a regimented economy. The President told his press conference a week ago that he would not compromise on the essential principles of his farm program. On top of this, Secretary of Agriculture Benson is now reported to have declared that he would recommend a Presidential veto of any bill including high, fixed price supports. Their position is logically impregnable. It deserves the Nation's unstinted applause and support.

Report by Hon. Herbert H. Lehman to the People of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 9, 1954

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record the text of a radio report which I made to the people of New York State on the evening of Sunday, June 6, 1954.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

This is Senator Herbert H. Lehman reporting to you from the Capitol in Washington.

I wish I had a cheerful report for you. I wish I could recite a list of what has been constructively accomplished in the past month since I made my last radio report over this station. I wish I could say that all is well along the Potomac, and that we are moving forward in strength, security, and prosperity, at home and abroad. But I cannot.

The truth is that events and developments of the past month in Washington have not been encouraging. They do not lift up the heart. They do not inspire hope and confidence for the immediate future.

The main theme of the past month in Washington has been largely turmoil, sensation, conflict, and confusion.

I need not tell you that the center of the stage has been occupied by the unfortunate McCarthy hearings. I say "unfortunate" not because the holding of the hearings is unfortunate, but because the content of those hearings has been so distressing.

They have been distressing because they have disclosed a shocking picture—even a frightening picture—of what has been going on, behind the scenes of a congressional investigating committee for the past 2 years.

We have seen how a congressional committee could use and abuse great powers, for mean and unworthy purposes. In the case of the McCarthy committee those powers have been used to dominate and intimidate the executive branches of Government.

It is clear that these powers were exercised, in the name of a congressional committee, by one man, the committee chairman, Senator McCarthy. The other members of that committee apparently had very little influence on the course of the committee's activities. Senator McCarthy did not permit them to know what was going on, what was being done, and what material was being collected in the files of the committee.

The committee counsel, Mr. Roy Cohn, ostensibly a civil servant, an employee of the committee, seems to have exercised far more power than any Senator on that committee, with the exception of Senator McCarthy himself.

We have seen, during recent days, the incredible spectacle of committee members seeking vainly to obtain material from the files of their own committee, being required to subpena those files, and being defied by the chairman of that committee.

The counsel of the committee, Mr. Cohn, has had free access to all the so-called confidential material in the committee files, but members of the committee, Members of the United States Senate, representing the sovereign States of the United States, were denied such access.

We have heard Senator McCarthy issue a broadside invitation to all Government employees to violate the laws, to confide in him the innermost secrets of the United States, to break all security regulations, to make Senator McCarthy the supreme arbiter and judge of the loyalty of all Government officials and employees.

Who selected Senator McCarthy for this supreme responsibility? The answer to that question is: Senator McCarthy himself.

Of course, the people of Wisconsin elected him to the Senate, and that is their responsibility. But under the Constitution the Senate is the judge of the qualifications of its own Members. And the Senate, itself, elects members to committees, and elects the chairman of committees. So the Senate has a responsibility, a very heavy one.

In my judgment the Senate must soon proceed to take action in regard to Senator McCarthy.

It must decide whether Senator McCarthy is properly discharging his responsibilities as chairman of the Government Operations Committee and as a member of that committee.

It must decide whether he is properly using the funds supplied by the Senate, and by the taxpayers, for the operations of his committee.

The Senate must decide whether Senator McCarthy is conducting himself properly as a Member of the Senate, and whether his open invitation to Government employees to violate the laws and security of the United States is consistent with the written and unwritten rules of deportment governing the conduct of Members of the Senate.

I am not prepared today to pass final judgment or even to recommend what measures should be taken. Today I say only that the Senate has a primary responsibility which cannot be denied or evaded. At a proper time, that responsibility must be assumed and discharged.

About 10 days ago I, and 18 other Senators, and 6 Members of the House of Representatives, joined in introducing a proposed code of fair procedure for congressional investigating committees. Two of the six Members of the House who joined in introducing that proposal are from the New York area, Representative Emanuel Celler and Representative Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., both Democrats.

But this is not a partisan matter. I must say that Representative Keating, of Rochester, and Representative Javits, of New York City, both Republicans, among others, have also introduced proposals pointing in the same general direction as ours.

I think our proposal, of which the prime sponsor is Senator Kefauver, of Tennessee, is the best that has been introduced. It provides a machinery for enforcement of the rules. None of the other pending proposals on this subject contains an effective enforcement provision.

Our proposal sets down uniform rules to guide the conduct of investigating committees, and to protect the rights of witnesses appearing before those committees.

The investigative power of congressional committees is carefully safeguarded, under our proposed rules. The rights and liberties of the American people are also safeguarded. It is a strange paradox that the Bill of Rights in our Constitution serves to protect the liberties of the American people against abuse by the executive branch of the Government, but there are few protections against abuse by the legislative branch.

We now propose to supply that protection, by our code of fair procedure.

Senator Knowland, the majority leader of the Senate, has announced that he does not favor taking up this or any other fair play proposal at this session of Congress. He does not think the Senate will have the time this session to consider and debate this code of committee procedure.

I say that this is a matter of paramount importance. Nothing is more important than the protection of the rights and liberties of the American people. I hope the citizens of this State and of every other State will demand that hearings be held immediately on the proposals for a code of fair committee procedure.

If you agree with me, write to Senator Knowland, the majority leader, write to Senator Jenner, chairman of the Rules Committee; and write to your own Senators and Representatives in Congress.

Yes, my friends the McCarthy inquiry has occupied the center of the stage in Washington during the past month. It has almost crowded to one side other matters of vital national and worldwide importance.

The situation in Indochina and in southeast Asia has not improved. Far from it. The administration has not developed a coherent and consistent policy to deal with that situation. Indochina is in acute danger of being lost to the Communists. I do not blame the administration for that. I do not pretend, myself, to know any magic formula for saving Indochina. I do not believe that sending troops to Indochina, under present conditions, at this time, is the answer.

President Eisenhower and Secretary of State Dulles have said this, too. But they have also said different things at different times. On April 8, President Eisenhower said that we cannot afford to lose Indochina. On May 11, Secretary Dulles said that we can afford to lose Indochina.

One thing for which I do blame the administration is for its failure to provide a consistent leadership for the American people and for the free world. The American people have been told one thing on Monday and quite a different thing on Tuesday.

Admiral Carney, the Chief of Naval Operations, said only the other day that we must prepare for the worst, while the Secretary of Defense has assured the Congress that it is safe to cut appropriations for the Army and Navy.

Whom are we to believe? In what direction are we going? What is our defense policy? What is our policy toward Indochina and southeast Asia?

What is our policy toward India? Are we determined to help India save itself from communism, or will we be so intent on defending colonialism in southeast Asia that we will forget India, and lose India, and all of Asia?

These are among the questions which the administration must answer. These are the problems to which our Government should be directing the attention of the American people.

These questions are not being answered. The American people are not being given the guidance which the situation calls for. In the last analysis, the American people must decide the foreign policy of the United States. But the Government must supply the leadership. The people must be told the facts, all the facts, even if it hurts—even if it hurts the administration.

The survival not only of the United States but of mankind is involved. The unity of the free world, so firmly knit together by Presidents Roosevelt and Truman is in danger of breaking up, disastrously and fatally.

The administration has the awful responsibility for the preservation of free-world unity, of freedom, and of mankind. I pray for them inspired guidance. I demand of them unflinching frankness in telling the people what must be done to save ourselves, and the world, from unutterable disaster.

Of course, my friends, there are scores and even hundreds of less dramatic problems confronting the Congress. The legislative schedule is heavy with vital matters. But the progress being made is slow and uncertain. Much of the legislation being submitted for final consideration is either inadequate to meet the public need or directly contrary to the public interest, in my judgment, at least.

I do not have time today to report on the many matters which should and do concern you as citizens. I can only urge you to follow as carefully as you can, through all the means of public communication, what is going on in Washington. It affects you, your livelihood, your security, your health, your welfare, and the future of this whole country of ours.

Keep us, in Washington, informed as to your views, your anxieties, your problems. Give support to those causes you feel are right. Stand fast for the cause of freedom.

If we in Washington know that we have behind us an alert and informed citizenry, we will find a way—the right way—to solve the heavy problems of this troubled age.

Monetary Policy's New Look

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PRESCOTT BUSH
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, June 8, 1954

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by E. Sherman Adams, deputy manager in charge of the department of monetary policy, American Bankers' Association, before the Richmond Chapter of the American Institute of Banking, at Richmond, Va., on Friday, May 7, 1954.

I have been informed by the Public Printer that the manuscript will make approximately 2½ pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at a cost of $212.50.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MONETARY POLICY'S NEW LOOK

(Address of E. Sherman Adams)

Since 1950, monetary policy has been acquiring a New Look. Events have already demonstrated that this remodelment has far-reaching implications for banking and for our whole economy. It is important for bankers to appraise carefully the emergent new role of motetary management.

Varying interpretations vie for acceptance. Some hail the renascence of monetary policy as the dawn of a new era of economic stability. Others say that monetary policy has shot its last bolt. Some profess to see a conspiracy to ruin the country with "hard money." In between are views of varied hues—the official Federal Reserve pronouncements, the Republican "party line," those who feel that the monetary policy has been too timid, and those who feel it has been too bold. Clearly, it is still a free country.

One would be rash indeed to try to delineate exact truth in this field. Nevertheless, we can at least avoid unbalanced views. We should also be able to distinguish areas of general agreement and reach certain conclusions regarding some of the points at issue.

THE ACCORD AND AFTER

From the outbreak of the Korean war until the spring of 1953, the Federal Reserve sought to prevent excessive credit expansion in order to combat the threat of inflation. What conclusions can we draw regarding this period?

It is generally agreed that at least through 1952, Federal Reserve policy was well conceived and well executed. The Federal Reserve-Treasury accord of 1951 was surely a landmark in monetary history. The abandonment of the par pegs for Government bonds paved the way for the rehabilitation of monetary policy as an economic stabilizer.

During 1950–52, credit tightened moderately and interest rates were generally firm. Official support in the Government securities market was greatly reduced. Member banks were forced to borrow rather heavily from the Reserve banks to obtain the additional reserves they required.

There is widespread agreement that during this period, monetary management made an important contribution to the stability of our economy. It goes without saying that it was not the only stabilizing factor, but it was one of them. Many would go so far as to say that stability would probably not have been attained during this period if the support-at-par program had not been abandoned.

THE CREDIT SQUEEZE

The story since 1952 is less unanimous. There is considerable agreement, nevertheless, on a number of major points.

One of these is that economic conditions early in 1953 justified some stepping up of the Federal's restrictive credit policy. Our economy was booming and getting boomier. Business inventories were increasing at an unsustainable rate. Demands for credit were abnormal. A policy of greater restraint appeared to be warranted.

It is generally conceded that for a short time last spring credit did get too tight. The Federal Reserve has explained this partly in terms of underestimating the expectations of investors. What happened was that some investors and borrowers got the impression that the Federal Reserve and the Treasury might follow really get-tough credit and debt-management policies. Fear of a financial crisis created a temporary credit squeeze.

It should be noted that this squeeze never came even close to being an old-fashioned panic. It consisted largely of a temporarily demoralized bond market. The general public was unaffected. There were no bank runs, no hoarding, no financial failures, no spiral of credit liquidation. On the contrary, the credit mechanism continued to process a record volume of loans and investments, and the Nation's 15,000 banks continued to serve the credit requirements of their customers very much as usual.

EFFECTS OF CREDIT RESTRAINT

Was the net effect of the credit restraint program of early 1953 beneficial or harmful to the economy?

Opinions naturally differ as to precisely what effects this program had. There is considerable agreement, nevertheless, that it probably helped to moderate the boom and thereby contributed to the long-run stability of the economy. If the boom had gone further, the inevitable readjustment would probably have been more severe.

Federal Reserve officials have had the commendable candor to admit that for a time last spring credit became tighter than they intended. Unfortunately, some people have the impression that this was a serious blunder. There is no evidence that this short-lived stringency had any lasting ill effects. In fact, a case could easily be made that this kind of shock treatment, even though unintended, was just the right prescription to prevent another wave of inflation.

Indeed, it seems clear that monetary policy served as more than simply a deterrent to renewed inflation. The evidence suggests that it actually caused some shifting of capital investment from 1953 into 1954. This was particularly apparent in the case of housing and industrial construction. Monetary policy thereby helped not only to temper the boom but also to cushion the readjustment.

From an economic standpoint, therefore, the restraint program appears to have been, on balance, definitely a success.

THE HARD-MONEY CHARGE

There is a different standpoint, however, from which some believe that this program may have been unfortunate. The tightening of credit in 1953 was sufficiently spectacular to encourage some opponents of the administration to try to make hard money a major political issue. The monetary authorities were accused of raising interest rates and making money scarce in order to serve the interests of bankers and other lenders.

Ridiculous as these charges seem to bankers, they are widely regarded as being politically effective. In fact, they are still being made in spite of the fact that interest rates have been declining precipitously for almost a year.

Some people wonder whether the Federal Reserve and the Treasury may have become overly sensitive to these attacks. It has been suggested that this may partly explain why the Federal Reserve has moved so actively in the direction of easy money and why the Treasury has not undertaken any long-term financing since the issuance of the 3¼'s.

In short, it is argued that the credit restraint program was unfortunate because it led to attacks which may tempt the Federal Reserve and the administration to lean too far in the opposite direction.

IS MONETARY POLICY DOOMED?

A few observers have gone so far as to say that the Reserve Board and the administration were forced to abandon their sound money policies in 1953 when it became evident that the political results might be serious. It is even contended that after the experience of last year, no political party will assume the risks involved in permitting interest rates to rise. This would mean that general monetary policy would never again be used to combat inflation.

This viewpoint is surely extreme. If the monetary authorities are defunct, they show no signs of having heard the news. One might perhaps contend that the authorities might have been forced to abandon their sound money policies if the inflation had continued, but that is entirely in the realm of speculation.

Some confusion on this point may arise from the fact that the Federal Reserve did engage in some open-market operations as early as May, which was before the boom had passed its peak. Those operations were undertaken, however, because the market was becoming demoralized. They did not constitute a reversal of the policy of preventing excessive credit expansion. It is certainly clear that the easy money policy of the past year has been an exercise in monetary flexibility, not a retreat from it.

The fact of the matter is that the timing of the reversal of monetary policy from restraint to ease was amazingly good. Seldom, if ever, have the monetary authorities acted so promptly to ease credit while business was still so close to the peak. This performance admittedly may have contained some element of luck, but it nevertheless deserves special citation.

As for the future, it seems naively cynical to assume that no efforts will ever again be made to restrain credit expansion. Such an assumption is reminiscent of the premature obituaries of monetary policy that were being bandied about only a few years ago when Government bonds were being pegged. Reports of its demise, as of Mark Twain's, proved to be exaggerated.

NEED FOR UNDERSTANDING

There may be a real danger here, nevertheless, that should not be ignored. It is not a new discovery, to be sure, that sound monetary management requires courage, but perhaps it takes more courage to be courageous today than it used to. The Federal Government has now assumed considerable responsibility for the Nation's economic health. As a result, despite the greater degree of independence achieved by the Federal Reserve since 1950, monetary policy can no longer be considered as an isolated operation. It has become a matter of direct concern to the Government and is now regarded as a component part of its broad economic program.

Moreover, the events of the past year do suggest that political opposition to a program of credit restraint may be more potent than formerly.

These considerations emphasize the need for more widespread understanding and support of monetary management. This is a matter that presents a challenge both to the monetary authorities and also to bankers.

THE ADVENT OF EASE

Over the past year, the credit situation has been completely reversed. Stringency has been replaced by ease throughout the entire credit market.

This has been reflected in the spectacular rise in bond prices and decline in interest rates. Long-term Government bonds have advanced more than 10 points from their lows of last spring. Yields on 90-day Treasury bills, which approached 2½ percent a year ago, have been averaging less than 1 percent.

During most of this period, the Federal Reserve System has actively promoted monetary ease. There is almost universal agreement that this policy has been in the right direction. Monetary flexibility obviously must be a two-way proposition. Policy should flex in the direction of restraint when inflation threatens and in the direction of relaxation when there is some slack in the economy.

The Treasury has followed a somewhat comparable policy with respect to its debt management operations. It has done some lengthening of the bank-held debt but has refrained from offering really long-term securities which might compete with other borrowers for investment money.

NATURAL OR MANAGED?

To what extent has the decline in interest rates been caused by natural supply and demand factors and to what extent by Federal Reserve and Treasury policies? This question is obviously one of considerable practicable significance from the standpoint of bankers and other investors.

Some confusion on this point seems to have arisen as a result of the emphasis which the Federal Reserve authorities have placed on the increased freedom that has been achieved in the money market over the past few years. At times, they seem to go a long way in the direction of disavowing responsibility for the level of interest rates. At the same time, they describe their policy as being one of active ease. Some bankers have difficulty in reconciling these ideas.

Part of the answer may be that the Reserve authorities take pride in having contributed to the much greater degree of freedom that now exists in the money market. As they have repeatedly pointed out, the market today is a far cry from the rigidly pegged market of only a few years ago. This has been a major accomplishment and one for which the Reserve authorities deserve a great deal of credit.

On the other hand, admiration for the virtues of a free money market can be overdone. After all, central banks are instituted among men because modern monetary systems require some degree of management.

Moreover, it is generally recognized that the money market is not and cannot be completely free by any means. This is abundantly clear if one stops to review the extent to which the market has been affected by the actions and the statements of the Federal Reserve and the Treasury over the past year and a half. After all, the Reserve System is the key factor on the supply side of the credit picture; and the Treasury is a major factor on the demand side. Neither agency can possibly avoid influencing money market conditions.

It is obvious, for example, that the Federal's open market operations are bound to affect the reserve positions of the member banks and thereby influence short term interest rates. It is equally apparent that longer term rates will be affected indirectly.

INVESTORS CARRY THE BALL

Yet, the money market does today enjoy a notable degree of freedom. The Federal Reserve now operates only in very short-term securities in order to affect prices and yields as little as possible. Its basic approach is to supply a suitable quantity of bank reserves, not to determine the level or pattern of interest rates.

Moreover, while Government security yields are admittedly sensitive to changes in the reserve position of the banking system, this relationship is by no mean constant and fixed. This is true even in the case of short-term yields. The relationship between bank reserve positions and long-term rates is even more variable.

It would not be realistic, therefore, to regard the monetary authorities as being solely responsible for the extent to which interest rates have declined over the past year. The Reserve System has eased the reserve positions of the banks, to be sure, and has given its blessing to lower interest rates. On the other hand, security prices and yields are established by tranactions among investors; and the willingness of investors to buy securities at progressively higher prices and lower yields bears no precise relationship to the actions of the Reserve System.

In short, the Federal has been pointing the direction for interest rates to go; but it has been the investors who have actually been running with the ball. The Federal has not forced investors to run as far as they have.

It is true that the monetary authorities could have tempered the decline in rates if they had so desired. The answer seems to be that both the Federal Reserve and the Treasury have been understandably reluctant to make any moves that might even possibly have accelerated the downturn in business.

WHAT CAN EASY MONEY DO?

What can be expected from an easy money policy? Does it simply remove impediments to the flow of credit? Or is it, in addition, a positive stimulant to the use of credit?

The phrase "easy money" refers primarily to the degree of ease with which borrowers can obtain credit. It is mostly a matter of the availability of credit, not its cost. Availability and cost are closely related, to be sure, but they are not the same thing. Generally, when credit becomes more easily available, interest rates tend to decline. In the case of most types of credit, lower rates have little or no effect upon the demand for credit. Availability, however, may have considerable influence upon the volume of borrowing.

The chief objective of an easy money policy, surely, is to make certain that credit is adequately available. This is largely a matter of eliminating pressures that might make lenders cautious and might inhibit lending and investment policies. It means seeing to it that the banks are amply supplied with reserves and giving them confidence that they will have no difficulty in obtaining additional reserves if they need them. It is largely a negative matter of avoiding a restrictive policy which might discourage the extension of credit. It also insures against a shortage of credit which might aggravate a recession.

An easy money policy cannot be expected to reverse a decline in business activity. It cannot do much more than remove pressures that might otherwise be deflationary.

EASE SHOULD NOT BE OVERDONE

Once credit is amply available at reasonable rates, therefore, there may be little point in making it still cheaper. Just because money should be easy, it does not follow that the looser it becomes the better.

In fact, it is highly important that credit should not be permitted to become excessively easy. This is just as clearly a responsibility of the monetary authorities as it is to prevent credit from becoming too tight.

One of the chief dangers of supereasy credit is its tenacious tendency to perpetuate itself. For illustration one has only to look at the entire decade of the 1940's. The overcheap money that had developed during the big depression sure did stay for dinner and with most unfortunate consequences. It should also be noted that excessive ease during the 1930's stimulated an expansion in the money supply which subsequently proved to be inflationary.

It is obvious, of course, that cheap money tends to undermine the earning capacity of banks and other financial institutions. Also, it may encourage people to use credit for purposes which are economically unsound.

At the present time a supereasy money policy would represent in essence an attempt to inflate our way to full employment. What we should strive for is healthy, balanced growth, not repeated doses of inflation. The adoption of a policy of continuous inflation would be a serious threat to our economy.

Some people do exist, of course, who have a built-in propensity to exaggerate the harmful effects of easy money and to underrate its benefits. That is no excuse for going overboard in the other direction of ignoring the validity and importance of the points mentioned above.

HOW FAR IS DOWN?

What criteria should be employed to determine how far a policy of monetary relaxation should be carried? Ease, yes; but how fast and how far? When does "easy" become "sloppy"?

We should not seek to find a magic formula to answer these questions. There can be no single guide for monetary policy at any time. What is needed is broad appraisal of the whole economic situation.

Yet, one cannot escape paying more attention to certain yardsticks than to others. Which are the most important?

Last year there was considerable discussion of the idea that the money supply should expand at an annual rate equal to the average annual growth rate of the economy—somewhere around 3 percent per year. This concept is not entirely devoid of merit when applied to a period of full employment. At other times, however, it has little application—or none. Under present-day conditions, there appears to be no definite guideposts to monetary policy other than assuring an ample availability of credit and the avoidance of excessive ease.

ARE WE GOING TOO FAR?

Has credit been easing too rapidly over the past year? How much further, if at all, should cheapening be permitted to go?

We do not have very accurate methods of measuring the availability of credit. Nevertheless, there is widespread agreement among competent observers that credit has now become amply available throughout all the major segments of the credit market. A Federal Reserve spokesman recently declared that the persuasiveness of ease today is unprecedented.

In view of this and in view of the collapse of open-market rates, it is not surprising that many bankers feel that easy money has already been carried far enough, at least under present circumstances.

On this point there seem to be some misgivings with respect to the policy of the Federal. One reason may be the extent to which some Federal Reserve spokesmen seem at times to disclaim responsibility for money rates. Also certain monetary officials apparently feel that easy credit can be a more powerful spur to business than most bankers believe. Recently, for example, one Board member spoke of easy money as a stimulus that can give impetus to the economy by promoting credit expansion. Most bankers would use a different emphasis.

The Reserve authorities have stated frankly that their policy had been to err on the side of ease. They have admittedly picked the right direction for erring, if err they must; but bankers may perhaps be pardoned for wishing they did not have to err quite so vigorously. Also, some bankers find it hard to understand why the authorities should not backtrack a bit if they find they have gone too far. Moreover, some question the desirability of compounding such an error by successive reductions in the discount rate.

On the other hand, the Reserve System has not created a plethora of funds. It has not piled up large quantities of excess reserves. Also, the Reserve authorities must certainly be cognizant of the dangers of overabundant money. They are inevitably concerned with the health of financial institutions. They know it is important that money should receive a living wage. They cannot abdicate all responsibility for the level of interest rates.

So, the Federal Reserve may have erred in the direction of ease, and may continue to do so; but it can assuredly be counted upon not to go to a ridiculous extreme.

It would not be at all surprising to see in the not-too-distant future another reduction in member bank reserve requirements. If the Reserve authorities exercise care, however, they should be able to accomplish this without further depressing short-term interest rates.

EXPLANATIONS HELP

With respect to these problems, and some others as well, it would be most desirable to have more illumination from official sources. At times, when official statements have been misconstrued by the market, some people have criticized the monetary authorities for "talking too much." A more sensible conclusion would seem to be that spokesmen might be more careful to guard against such misinterpretations. The misunderstandings of investors can best be dispelled by clear explanations, not by silence.

In this connection, we are indebted to the Reserve authorities in recent months for a number of statements which have been unusually informative. There has also been the early publication of the Board's annual report, together with the full minutes of the deliberations of the open-market committee.

The monetary developments of the past year and a half have nevertheless raised more questions than have been fully answered. All who are concerned with the credit market would benefit from further clarification of these problems.

SOMETHING OLD, SOMETHING NEW

So there we have monetary policy, post-accord style. Essentially, of course, it is the same old-fashioned monetary medicine. Nevertheless, some important new ingredients have been added which may have improved its effectiveness.

The doctors, by and large, have shown considerable skill. They may have used a little too much medicine at times; but after all, they are relearning a complicated art under radically changed conditions after a long period of disuse.

In addition, they do seem to have learned some lessons from the past. For one thing, they are not as rough as their predecessors were—in 1920, for example. Also, they seem to be considerably more interested in having the patient back on his feet as rapidly as possible.

In general, both the doctors and the patient are to be congratulated. It is to be hoped, surely, that they will continue to work closely together over the years ahead. That, of course, will require good doctoring; but it will also depend upon whether the patient realizes that monetary medicine is good for him.

Social Security Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES A. BYRNE
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 1, 1954

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I want to say that I am glad to be a Member of the 83d Congress, which has just passed by a very large majority the amended Social Security Act. For many years we Democrats have worked and voted for social legislation of this type. It makes us proud to see that our efforts have not gone unnoticed, particularly by our colleagues on the Republican side of the aisle. The bill which we have just passed is basically Democratic legislation. It has proved itself so well that even our Republican friends find it necessary to extend and enlarge it.

This legislation adds an estimated 10 million persons to the social-security rolls. Besides extending coverage to large new groups, the bill will provide for increased benefit payments, larger annual contributions by employers and employees, and a more liberal income for persons already under the program.

For the first time, farm owners and workers will be included, as well as many State and municipal employees, clergymen, and professional people such as dentists, lawyers, architects, and engineers. Schoolteachers, for example, would have the option of joining the social-security system, if they carry a vote to do so by a two-thirds majority. Social-security coverage would not prevent them from receiving benefits from their State or local retirement systems.

For the worker who has already retired, this bill raises the minimum monthly payments of social security from $25 to $30 and increases the maximum monthly payments from $85 to $98.50. These benefits would become effective 2 months after the bill becomes law and would affect approximately 6 million persons. Workers not yet retired may expect to receive up to $108.50 per month.

While the maximum annual wage on which benefits and taxes are based has been raised from $3,600 to $4,200, it was felt that a more equitable salary floor would have been $4,800. This proposal was defeated in committee.

There is a provision in this bill for retired persons receiving social security who accept employment to supplement their income from the social-security pension. At the present time, these persons lose their social-security benefits each month that they earn $75 or more. Under this bill, maximum earned income is placed on an annual basis, and this amount is fixed at $1,000. My colleagues and I hoped that the maximum income earned by a person receiving social security would be set at at least $1,200. However, we were unsuccessful in our efforts.

The Social Security Act which has passed the House admittedly has its defects. On the other hand, I am convinced that it will provide more benefits than ever before to many more people. It will be a welcome boon to many of my constituents. Let me note here that the original Social Security Act of 1936 has been amended five times. This is an indication that Congress has kept up with the times and has shown itself willing to correct inequities as they appear. I feel sure that should experience prove that this bill is inadequate, measures will be taken to adjust it to make adequate provision for all our people.

Real Wages in the Soviet Union, 1928–52

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, June 9, 1954

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, Columbia University, of New York City, has issued a press release and a summary of an article entitled "Real Wages in the Soviet Union, 1928–52," written by Dr. Abram Bergson, a member of the Columbia faculty. The article will appear in the May issue of the Review of Economics and Statistics—Harvard University Press.

Dr. Bergson is an eminent authority on Russian affairs, especially its economic aspects. I ask unanimous consent that the news release and the summary of the article referred to be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the release and summary were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Soviet Government's recent highly publicized price cuts for consumers' goods have in effect only been restoring the Russian worker's real wage to the low level of 1928.

This is the principal finding of a study that has been in progress at Columbia University for over 4 years. The study, by far the most detailed and exhaustive to date on Russian real wages, is being made by Mrs. Janet Chapman, a consultant of the Rand Corp., of Santa Monica, Calif. It is part of a project being directed by Prof. Abram Bergson, of Columbia's Russian Institute, on behalf of the Rand Corp. Part of the results of the study are being made public for the first time in an article titled "Real Wages in the Soviet Union, 1928–52." It will appear in the May issue of the Review of Economics and Statistics (Harvard University Press).

The study shows that, after a series of much heralded 5-year plans, the average worker is earning many more rubles than he did in 1928—over 10 times as many. But the rise in the cost of living up to the December 1947 monetary reform far outstripped the worker's money income. The series of annual price cuts instituted since the monetary reform have only partly offset the previous inflation. In sharp contrast to Soviet claims, real wages as late as 1952 were still below the level of 1928, which marked the introduction of the first 5-year plan.

The 5-year plans witnessed major changes in the patterns of workers' consumption. Thus, as the prices of meats, fats, and the like skyrocketed, the worker was able to buy much less of these goods than before and had to subsist relatively more on bread and potatoes. The government also supplied increased quantities of "cultural and sport goods," reading matter, and the like at relatively low prices.

These changes in the things going into the worker's market basket inevitably complicate measurements of the cost of living and real wages. In order to test the effect of the changes in the worker's market basket, the Columbia study makes two alternative calculations of the cost of living and real wages, one in terms of a 1928 market basket and one in terms of a 1937 market basket. According to the calculation in terms of the

1928 market basket, real wages in 1952 were only two-thirds of the 1928 level. In terms of the 1937 market basket, real wages in 1952 were nine-tenths of the 1928 level.

Although it is impossible to rely on one measure, to the exclusion of the other, the article points out that many of the changes in the worker's consumption patterns under the 5-year plans were artificial and not in accord with the worker's wants. For this and other reasons the 1937 market basket probably gives a relatively biased picture of the change in real wages.

The Columbia project, which has made extensive use of Soviet official price and wage data checked by foreign visitors' reports, has focused primarily on the period up to 1952. Tentative calculations indicate, however, that the cuts of 1953 and 1954 reduced the official prices of consumers' goods by some 15 percent. But this and further gains due to a few percent increase in money wages and reduced compulsory bond subscriptions have been partially offset by the growing deficiencies of goods offered at the reduced official prices in state shops, the resulting high prices in the free collective farm markets where peasants sell their surpluses, and planned increases in deposits in savings banks.

For your information, a summary of the article, Real Wages in the Soviet Union, 1928–52, is attached.

SUMMARY OF ARTICLE "REAL WAGES IN THE SOVIET UNION, 1928–52"

The Russian worker's real wage in 1952 was lower than it was 25 years earlier.

After a series of much-heralded 5-year plans, the average worker was earning many more rubles than he did in 1928—over 10 times as many. But the rise in prices has far outstripped the worker's money income. While the Government has made a series of price cuts since the monetary reform of December 1947, they have been only a partial offset to the previous inflation. In sharp contrast to glowing Soviet propaganda claims, the Russian worker was able to buy less in 1952 than he could in 1928 when the 5-year plans started.

The amount of the reduction in real wages depends on the things going into the market basket in terms of which real wages are measured. In terms of a 1928 market basket, the reduction was as much as 37 percent.

These are the principal findings of a study that has been in progress at Columbia University for over 4 years. The study, by far the most detailed and exhaustive to date on Russian real wages, is being made by Mrs. Janet G. Chapman. It is part of a project being directed by Prof. Abram Bergson of Columbia's Russian Institute on behalf of the Rand Corp., of Santa Monica, Calif. Part of the results of the study are being made public for the first time in an article titled "Real Wages in the Soviet Union, 1928–52." It will appear in the May issue of the Review of Economics and Statistics (Harvard University Press).

The study presents two alternative measures of the cost of living, and on this basis two alternative measures of real wages. In one case, the changes in the retail prices of different consumers' goods are weighted by the percentage share of each product in a typical worker's market basket in 1928. In the other case the weights are based on a typical worker's market basket in 1937.

Because of the large changes in the structure of retail prices and in the pattern of worker's consumption under the 5-year plans, the different measures differ significantly. Thus, as the prices of meats, fats, and the like skyrocketed, the worker was able to buy much less of these goods than before and had to subsist relatively more on bread and potatoes. The government also supplied increased quantities of "cultural and sport goods," reading matter and the like at relatively low prices. Compared with the typical market basket of 1928, that for 1937 gives less weight to the things that rose most in price, and vice versa. Hence, from the standpoint of the 1937 market basket, the cost of living rose less and real wages fell less than from the standpoint of the 1928 market basket.

Although it is impossible to rely on one measure, to the exclusion of the other, the article points out that many of the changes in consumption patterns under the 5-year plans were quite artificial, and not in accord with the worker's wants. For this and other reasons, the 1937 market basket probably gives a relatively biased picture of the change in real wages.

Under the first two 5-year plans (1928–37), real wages declined according to both measures. The decline was 43 percent in terms of the 1928 market basket and 19 percent in terms of the 1937 market basket. As a result of the enormous agricultural losses in the collectivization drive, there was an even greater decline under the first 5-year plan alone, but this was partly offset by a limited recovery under the second.

There was a further decline from 1937 to 1948, so that in the latter year real wages were 60 percent below 1928 in terms of the 1928 market basket and 44 percent below 1928 in terms of the 1937 market basket. This change from 1937 reflects the wartime losses and a partial postwar recovery.

Between 1948 and 1952 there was a striking increase in real wages. But a quarter of a century after the inauguration of the first 5-year plan real wages were still lower than in 1928. In terms of the 1937 market basket real wages in 1952 were but 90 percent of the 1928 level. In terms of the 1928 market basket real wages were but 63 percent of the 1928 level.

The study takes as a point of departure Soviet official figures on average money wages, but these refer mainly to prewar years. In view of the postwar secrecy of the Government on this matter, the postwar figures had to be estimated partly from indirect evidence, particularly from scattered releases on individual industries and social security taxes. The postwar estimates are believed to be consistent with the prewar figures but may be somewhat on the high side.

In support of their claims on rising real wages, the Russians before the war often cited only the official figures on money wages. The Soviet Government, since 1929, has systematically withheld overall measures of the cost of living which are needed to translate the money wage figures into real terms. Interestingly, the government is now secretive even on money wages, which since the war apparently have been maintained at a relatively stable level.

The major part of the Columbia study is concerned with the compilation of measures of the cost of living. While the Soviet Government withholds overall measures of the cost of living, it publishes from time to time price handbooks, mainly for purposes of trade administration, and price decrees, giving the price quotations in effect for individual consumers' goods. The cost of living measures were compiled from an exhaustive study of this official information, as checked and supplemented on the basis of numerous reports of foreign visitors to the U. S. S. R.

In all, 94 consumers' items bought by the Russian worker were priced for the period 1928–37. For later years 149 items were priced. These represent 90 percent or more of the purchases of goods and services by Soviet worker families. In order to ascertain comparability of the products whose prices are compared, a detailed study was made of information in Soviet trade handbooks and other sources on commodity specifications and grading practices. The indices, originally computed on the basis of Moscow prices, are adjusted so as to represent changes in the cost of living of urban workers in the entire U. S. S. R.

The main results of the study are summarized below:

[Index, 1928=100]

	1928	1937	1948	1952
Money wages, gross	100	405	961	1,039
Gross real wages:				
(*a*) Based on cost-of-living index using 1928 market basket	100	58	45	73
(*b*) Based on cost-of-living index using 1937 market basket	100	82	62	103
Net real wages, after taxes and bond purchases:				
(*a*) Based on cost-of-living index using 1928 market basket	100	57	40	63
(*b*) Based on cost-of-living index using 1937 market basket	100	81	56	90

The gross money wage figures are average annual earnings of workers and employees outside agriculture. The study measures both gross real wages and net real wages. The latter allow for direct taxes and also for purchases of Government bonds, which are now largely compulsory in the U. S. S. R., and for practical purposes differ little from taxes. Only net real wages measure the goods that the worker's money wage can buy.

The study is limited to real wages of workers and employees outside agriculture. For the population as a whole Soviet figures on the output of consumer goods suggest that per capita consumption may not have suffered any sizable decline over the period studied. Possibly there was even a limited increase. This appears possible despite the decline in real wages and despite a probable decline also in the real income of the peasants in view of the great movement which took place during this period from the farms to the cities, where the standard of living was relatively higher. Also, many city women are now working who did not do so before, and this has meant that family real income for the working class fell less drastically than real wages.

The article concludes that the Soviet worker has never been as well off in terms of real wages as he was in 1928, and according to one calculation he is still far worse off. Nevertheless, the Soviet Government's ability to provide a steady and appreciable increase in real wages over the last few years albeit from a very low level, during the cold war, is a matter of real domestic and international significance. The indications are that the present Soviet rulers are attempting to continue this trend. But unless they are able to overcome their longstanding difficulties in agriculture, they will still hardly be able to go far beyond the low standard of the eve of the first 5-year plan.

Are We Embarked on the Road to Peace or the Road to War?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DOUGLAS R. STRINGFELLOW

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 9, 1954

Mr. STRINGFELLOW. Mr. Speaker, our country today is plagued my many vexing problems in the field of foreign affairs. We have numerous divergent opinions as to what course we should pursue in southeast Asia, and especially on what action we should take in regard to Red China. I am sure that at the present time, a majority of the Members of Congress are opposed to admitting Red China to membership in the United Nations, but there are many prominent Americans who believe as do the British, that China cannot long be ignored as a world power, even though we abhor and shun her present form of government.

This matter was recently called very vividly to the attention of the American public by a gentleman who I am sure is known and respected by most Members of Congress, Mr. Marriner S. Eccles, former Chairman, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System. In a speech on May 3, 1954, before the National Association of University Presidents, Mr. Eccles said in part:

Are We Embarked on the Road to Peace or the Road to War?

(By Marriner S. Eccles)

In any realistic appraisal of the world today we are bound to ask ourselves, "Are we embarked on the road to peace or the road to war?" We should have learned from the logic of events that wars never solved any of the world's problems but only accentuated them. Today we must recognize that the world generally is divided into two divergent political systems—the democratic and the communistic. Any idea that there could emerge a victor in a war between these two systems is totally unrealistic in the light of today's completely destructive weapons.

Democracy, after winning World War II, lost its opportunity to enforce the conditions of peace without risk of war. We are therefore forced by the relentless logic of events to accept the unpalatable fact that Russia and her satellites are copowers with the democratic world.

We should know by now that the forces of communism cannot be contained by isloated military efforts around the world and the cost in blood and treasure in attempting to do so is formidable, endless, and futile. It would be far less costly and more successful to use our knowledge and substance to create economic and political conditions in the backward countries of the world which the Communists cannot exploit.

It is equally important that we discontinue our blessing and backing of the reactionary governments that lack the confidence and support of their people, such as Chiang Kai-shek, Syngman Rhee, the French colonial government of Indochina. We must not repeat the costly and futile mistakes of Korea by a military intervention in Indochina.

Having recognized Russia and all her satellites as well as Tito, Perón, and Franco, it would seem that the time has passed when the communistic regime of China should have been recognized by us as the ruling power which it is. Great Britain and most of the other countries of the free world have done so long ago.

Nothing is solved by our denial of the fact that the Communist government is the Government of China. In fact our attitude toward China only serves to weld the Communist world more closely together. Realism instead of political expediency is sorely needed. A solution of the involved problems of Korea and Indochina, which so directly affect Red China and the free world now being discussed at the Geneva Conference, will not be hastened by Mr. Dulles' refusal to either speak to or look at Mr. Chou En-lai, Red China's Premier, as recently reported by the United Press.

We must recognize sooner or later that economic necessity is more powerful than any other force in ultimately determining the course of history. We are therefore going to find ourselves increasingly isolated from our natural political alliances if we do not accept the fact that the nations of the free world must trade with those of the Communist world, Mr. McCarthy notwithstanding. Japan, for example, cannot long survive as a free nation without such trade.

Although at this time it is unfortunately still necessary for the free world to maintain a defense effort sufficient to deter war, it is however even more important that we recognize the wisdom and the value of the principles of compromise. Essentially the human race has no wish to blow itself to bits for with all of its diversity it has far more in its heart that unites it than divides it.

Legion's Second Look at UNESCO

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 9, 1954

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, the quotation which follows is from the magazine America of June 5, 1954:

Legion's Second Look at UNESCO

Last year the national executive committee of the American Legion passed a resolution roundly condemning the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO). Enemies of the agency rejoiced. The authority of the Legion was invoked in school-board meetings throughout the land. The fanaticism of its ideological bedfellows seems to have caused the Legion misgivings. A special committee began a comprehensive study of UNESCO, resulting in a report presented to the national executive committee at its meeting May 2-4 in Indianapolis. The committee, headed by Ray Murphy, past national commander, carefully examined the charges that UNESCO reflects ideals and philosophies alien to the American tradition and that it is atheistic and subversive. It found them all false. To the charge of atheism, for example, the committee replied that the Vatican has a permanent representative at UNESCO. "The Catholic Church, which is hardly atheistic or communistic, has actively fought what it considers unwarranted attacks on UNESCO as atheistic." Blame for the fact that "a small number of patriotic organizations" oppose UNESCO is laid at the door of the American Flag Committee, whose anti-UNESCO material the committee found to be a "complete fabrication." It was on this material that the national executive committee apparently based its resolution No. 33 last year. The thoroughness of this factual report encourages us to hope that the Legion will adopt the committee's recommendation to accept membership on the United States National Commission for UNESCO. That would indeed be an amende honorable.

I believe today that there is growing understanding of the purpose and work of UNESCO. Much of the credit for this important development should go to that very able member of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Carnahan].

The resolution discussed above, among other things, describes one of the many contributions Representative Carnahan has made to a better understanding of this important agency.

No Place for Needless Tinkering

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DOUGLAS R. STRINGFELLOW

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 9, 1954

Mr. STRINGFELLOW. Mr. Speaker, a very interesting and thought provoking editorial appeared in the Deseret News and Salt Lake Telegram of May 31, 1954, dealing with proposed amendments to the Constitution of the United States. I believe the observations contained in this editorial are well worth considering before the House takes any action on the proposed amendment to limit the number of Supreme Court Justices and to prescribe retirement ages and other criteria governing the operation of this great appellate body. It is especially significant to note that this editorial was printed directly under the motto of the Deseret News and Salt Lake Telegram which reads:

> We stand for the Constitution of the United States, with its three departments of government, each fully independent in its own field.

The editorial follows:

No Place for Needless Tinkering

It is a thing to marvel over that the same Constitution of the United States which was drawn up to govern the affairs of a struggling collection of 18th century settlements strung along a thousand miles of seaboard now governs, and adequately, the affairs of the world's greatest industrial nation in the fastest-paced age mankind has seen.

That it does is because its makers were wise enough to outline only broad basic principles of government—principles good for all time. They left the details of administration to be worked out as needed by each succeeding generation.

This Constitution has been amended only 11 times in 163 years of incredible change—and 2 of the changes canceled themselves out.

One would think that with a history like that men would consider changing it further only for the most fundamental reasons, and then only with the utmost care. One would think men would think carefully before cluttering it up with minutiae that may be good for this generation but may or may not be good for the next.

The Senate had the good sense to kill 1 needless amendment proposal on 18-year-old voting. But another proposed amendment regarding organization and operations of the Supreme Court went sailing through the Senate by a 3-to-1 majority, and it did so virtually without advance notice to the public, with less than 4 hours of debate, with only 10 witnesses (all favorable) being called, and with relatively few Senators even present on the floor.

And what would be accomplished that is important enough to change the basic law that has served so adequately?

Well, the amendment would deprive Congress the right it now has to deprive the Supreme Court of its appellate powers.

It would fix 75 as a compulsory age limit for retirement of Supreme Court Justices.

And it would fix the number of Justices at nine.

There may be justification for the first change. The language of the Constitution gives the Supreme Court appellate jurisdiction "* * * with such exceptions, and under such regulations as the Congress shall make."

Only once, in 1868, has this power been used. Still, it may be argued that the "except" clause has no longer any practical effectiveness and might well be stricken in the interest of simplicity.

As for the others, not much good can be said. It borders on the ridiculous in this day when life expectancy and usefulness are steadily increasing to nail down in the supreme law of the land an arbitrary limit to service. Somehow the Nation has managed to get along all these years without such shackles, and thereby obtained the benefits of the distinguished latter years of such men as Oliver Wendell Holmes who was 91 when he left the bench, Roger Taney who was 87, Louis Brandeis who was 83 and John Marshall who was 80. Perhaps the Court ought to consider some house rules to be sure the more elderly Justices carry a proper load. But surely the Constitution of the United States, the classic expression of broad fundamentals of statecraft, is not the place to rule that reaching a certain age ends a man's usefulness.

Those who would forever fix the number of Justices at 9 makes much of the fact that in 1866 Congress reduced the number to 6 in order to prevent President Johnson from making certain appointments. Also the fact that in 1937 President Roosevelt tried—but, note this, failed—to pack the Court by increasing the number. But what is not pointed out is that the number of Justices has been changed many other times, for reasons thought good and proper at the time, and may well need to be changed again. Congress fixed the original number at 6. Subsequently it was changed to 5 in 1801, 7 in 1802, 9 in 1837, 10 in 1861, 7 in 1866, and 9 in 1869. Who is to say that as legal problems multiply in this technological age—consider the legal implications of cloud-seeding as just one example—that more Justices might not be needed in the future to handle the Court's load?

What seems to be reflected in this attempt at constitutional rigidity is a decay of confidence in the future. Article III establishing the Supreme Court and defining its powers is among the shortest and least specific of all sections of the Constitution. It was left that way deliberately, in order that the Court could grow with the country. And it did grow. There is not a word in the Constitution, for example, about the Supreme Court's power to review and overrule acts of Congress. That right was established by the Court itself in the historic *Marbury v. Madison* decision that laid the basis for the growth in power and stature of our court system to become the world's greatest judiciary.

In avoiding enshackling details the founders of the Constitution showed inspired wisdom. Moreover they showed abiding faith in the future of government and in the integrity and wisdom of the men who would administer it. There is nothing in this day to indicate their faith was misplaced; nothing to indicate our generation shouldn't have equal faith.

There is something belittling and timid about the proposed Supreme Court amendment. It does no credit to those who support it.

Dr. Scholl Honored

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. S. J. CRUMPACKER, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 9, 1954

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to honor a Hoosier farm boy whose name has become a byword, not only in homes all over the United States, but also everywhere in the world, outside of the Iron Curtain.

The man I am referring to was born on a small farm near La Porte, Ind., 1 of 13 children. His life story is one that we, in Indiana, are particularly proud of. It is an example to every struggling boy and girl, because it typifies the fact that in this great Nation of ours, a man can truly rise "from rags to riches."

Sixty years ago he seemed like any other Hoosier barefoot farm boy, struggling behind an old hand plow. He was hot, tired, and footsore. Night after night he would turn in for dinner, aware of the fact that not only he, but most of the people he knew, felt the same way. Night after night he saw his parents and their friends try to find relief by removing their shoes for more comfortable slippers.

He realized that a tired foot means a weary body, with its accompanying loss of efficiency. And so he decided to devote his life to foot comfort. He left the farm to serve as a shoemaker so that he might learn something of shoe construction, and at the same time earn enough to put himself through medical school. It was his belief that the care of the feet should be an exact science, and he was determined to prepare himself for the role of foot doctor to the world. In the last 50 years he has brought more foot comfort to the world than anyone.

Therefore, I would like to pay tribute to this Indiana farm boy who has become one of the great pioneers in manufacturing—I refer to Dr. William M. Scholl, M. D. It is particularly appropriate that we honor Dr. Scholl, because this month is the 50th anniversary of the formation of the Dr. Scholl Co. It is a tribute to the foresight and imagination of Dr. Scholl, that the public today reaps the benefit of healthier feet.

Dr. Scholl is responsible to a great degree for the introduction of the large variety of shoe lasts and sizes found in today's shoe stores. His efforts turned the hit-and-miss method of fitting shoes into a scientific procedure; he equipped shoe salesmen with tools to perform their work, such as the pedograph to detect deficiencies. He went further and instructed these same salesmen on the whys and wherefores of fitting shoes properly, with a text on "practicpedics," a term he applied to the new science.

The response to his effort was an overwhelming that from a two-room cubby hole he has been forced to expand to the 10 manufacturing plants in the United States and 6 foreign countries, and 424 exclusive retail stores scattered throughout 57 countries. He produces more than a thousand separate items. His payroll covers more than 6,000 workers. Surely this is in the best tradition of the growth of American business.

It is an interesting sidelight that although his firm has been a part of the American scene for half a century, many people do not associate a living person with the Scholl Manufacturing Co., Inc. However, no mere trade name—Dr. Scholl is the active head of his company. He still assumes personal responsibility for every phase of its activities and continues his project of originating new ways of alleviating foot discomforts. He holds more than 200 patents in his own name.

Global demand has resulted in Dr. Scholl's becoming foot missionary to the world. While aiding the cause of aching feet, he has become a good-will emissary in the many countries he has visited.

For his good work, I am sure we all join in wishing him and his company a hearty and happy 50th anniversary. The story of the success of this farm boy is a monument to American opportunity, courage, ingenuity, and industry.

Vocational Rehabilitation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 7, 1954

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, later this week when we meet in Committee of the Whole to consider amendments to H. R. 9447, I shall rise to urge a more substantial appropriation for vocational rehabilitation for the handicapped than is provided in the bill as it comes from the committee.

An adequate program for vocational rehabilitation is not only humanitarian but it is good business. It restores to happy, productive living fellow citizens who would otherwise be a burden to themselves and the community.

The program of vocational rehabilitation was born during World War I. Paraplegics represent the problem well. As a result of World War I there were 400 paraplegics. One-third died before they reached the United States; one-third lasted a maximum of 3 months after their return; of the third third, 90 percent died during the first year after they had been stricken.

During World War II about 2,500 survived, thanks to antibiotics. They were strong men who had given the best of their bodies to their country. We owed to them all the assistance we could give to make the best of the remainder of their lives.

Because of the dynamic rehabilitation program established in veterans' hospitals, 1,763 of the original 2,500 are living in their own homes and driving their own automobiles. Eighty percent are either in school or on a job.

It is estimated that there are today 2 million persons unemployed, because of disability, who could be made employable through vocational rehabilitation. The origins of these disabilities are: congenital, employment accidents, other accidents, and disease. Public-assistance programs and charitable funds are both inadequate and expensive—expensive in terms of the taxpayers' dollar, and in terms of the waste of human material. Helping the disabled to obtain employment not only reduces State and Federal costs but provides sources of taxation for State and Federal Governments.

Dr. Howard Rusk, director of the Institute of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation, New York, testified that at Bellevue Hospital in 1953 there were 147 patients with broken backs, 38 with broken necks—completely paralyzed, many of whom came from the Miners' Welfare Union; others from the State vocational rehabilitation program. Dr. Rusk testified that of the 147 with broken backs, 80 percent are now at work. Of the 38 with broken necks 50 percent are either in school or at work.

The investment in rehabilitation returns $10 for every $1 expended.

However, the program of rehabilitation is but the third phase: the training from bed to job. The first phase obviously is prevention; the second, medical and surgical care. For each of these steps there is need for specially trained doctors and research facilities. We need young doctors in this field trained and scattered about the country to head programs and hospitals which are begging for them, doctors and trained personnel who within a year could get 50,000 individuals out of hospitals and back into life. It is not a question, my colleagues, of whether we can afford it. Can we afford not to appropriate every dollar asked, for an investment in our fellow countrymen.

Uranium and Its Relationship to the Upper Colorado River Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DOUGLAS R. STRINGFELLOW

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 9, 1954

Mr. STRINGFELLOW. Mr. Speaker, I am sure my colleagues, as well as most of the citizens of our country, are vitally interested in our Nation's atomic-energy program. Certainly we in Utah have a big stake in this program because the Utah-Colorado plateau is the largest producing area of uranium in the United States. The Beehive State is following this development very carefully because our expansion and growth is very closely related to mineral production.

Anyone familiar with mining operations knows that a great deal of water and power are required to extract and process ores for commercial use. The fact that eastern Utah and western Colorado is the location for most of our domestic sources of uranium urgently needed to continue our atomic-energy program, is one more major argument for approval of the upper Colorado River project. The construction of the proposed dams and reservoirs contemplated under H. R. 4449, will insure that our atomic-energy program is not jeopardized. It is sincerely hoped that the Rules Committee will soon clear this legislation for floor action.

I would like to call to the attention of all Members of Congress, the following article from Deseret News and Salt Lake Telegram, of May 31, 1954, which deals with the uranium rush in Utah:

URANIUM: THE RUSH GETS BIGGER—STOCKS NOT NECESSARILY PROFITABLE—FIVE HUNDRED AND FIFTY MINES PRODUCE URANIUM ORE

Everyone's talking about uranium, but few realize the true situation. Here are some of the facts about the West's new glamor industry.

Uranium fever, diagnosed as an acute urge to get rich quick, hit epidemic proportions last week.

The most obvious symptom was a fantastic boom in speculative uranium issues. Brokers in San Francisco, Salt Lake City, and other cities reported a stock-buying spree by people from all walks of life. New companies popped up nearly every day, and uranium stock buying and selling at times took on appearances of a bingo game at a carnival.

"It's crazy," said one broker. "These people don't even know what they are buying. Some of them are going to get burned."

But the fuss and fury of stock speculation doesn't give a true picture of the uranium industry. In the Western States, uranium is big business and getting bigger. Activity is at an all time high, with an influx of prospectors and miners. There are boom towns and bonanzas as well as heartbreak in this glamor industry.

THESE ARE THE TRENDS

The surge of interest that has kept brokers "using a club to beat off people trying to get rid of their money" has obscured these recent trends in the uranium industry:

1. More and more big companies—with big money—are moving into uranium. By and large, they're companies that have already made their mark in copper, oil, gold, lead, or zinc.

2. For all its frenzy and excitement, the uranium industry is beginning to settle down. Prospecting and production are going along at record levels.

3. Exploration, once centered along the Colorado-Utah border and into Arizona and New Mexico, now is expanding to other Western States.

4. Modern mining methods are replacing the wheelbarrow era in the production of uranium ore.

SPECULATIVE ISSUES

Uranium company shares being offered now are mostly speculative issues—with the emphasis on the word "speculative," brokers say.

Most of the companies issuing stock have mining claims and some have even started production. But this doesn't mean that all companies are as interested in production as they are in selling stock. Some of them are in no position to make a qualified search for uranium, nor do they have potentially valuable claims.

ARE COMPANIES SUPERVISED?

Most of the uranium securities are not registered with the Securities and Exchange Commission because the amount of money being raised is usually less than $300,000. The SEC is notified of a pending offer, however, so that shares can be offered through the mails.

In Utah, companies must be licensed by the Utah State Securities Commission, Milton H. Love, chairman of the commission, says his unit checks on the credit and background of backers of the prospective company, and makes sure that the company has land available for exploration.

WHO SHOULD SPECULATE?

"Don't buy unknown stocks unless you can afford to lose the money you invest," one broker said.

Obviously, some people will make money. Others won't. The issues are speculative.

If a person is determined to buy uranium stock, he should find out about the backers of the company, the company's holdings, and the number of shares issued. Sometimes, so many shares are issued that stockholders don't have a fair chance to get a return on their money.

WHAT ABOUT PRODUCTION?

A Salt Lake City businessman in New York City recently was asked, "When do you think uranium really will be discovered?"

When the Salt Laker tried to explain that ore was being mined in quantity, the New Yorker commented, "Yes; I know that some of the people have found a little ore, but there's nothing very big out there."

The fact are these:

Ore is being produced from 550 properties in the Colorado Plateau area, according to the Atomic Energy Commission.

There are eight processing mills in the Western States, all operating at capacity.

The United States now probably ranks second in the free world in uranium ore production. (The Belgian Congo is first.) Production in the United States chiefly is centered in the Colorado Plateau, a 130,000 square mile area along the Colorado-Utah border.

Total uranium production figures, of course, are secret. But to date, the Atomic Energy Commission has paid out more than $3,275,000 in initial production bonuses—that is, bonuses for the first 10,000 pounds of ore produced from new mines. This is in addition to payments for the ore. One indication of stepped-up activity is that more than half of these bonuses have been paid in the past year.

WHAT THIS MEANS TO UTAH

The uranium boom has given the economy of Utah (and other uranium-producing States) a shot in the arm.

It has provided employment for several thousand persons and put a lot of money into circulation.

Construction of uranium roads has opened up vast new areas to tourist travel.

Some towns in the uranium areas—Moab and Monticello, for example—have boomed. Business has jumped, but there have been problems, too. Housing facilities have been taxed as have utilities.

Just as any new industry benefits an area, uranium production has aided Utah's economy.

THE BIG BOYS MOVE IN

Almost as significant as the uranium scramble itself is the nature of the outfits that are jumping on the bandwagon—the increasing role played by a group of big companies.

Homestake Mining Co., largest gold producer in North America, recently acquired properties near Moab. Floyd Odlum, of Atlas Corp., is interested in uranium. Anaconda Copper Co. is firmly entrenched with a mill and holdings near Grant's Pass in New Mexico. United States Vanadium Co. and Vanadium Corp. of America were uranium pioneers and producers. National Lead Co., Vitro Manufacturing Co., the Santa Fe Railroad, New Jersey Zinc Co., among others, all have uranium interests.

These larger companies are providing stability to an industry long regarded as a "freak" in business. Too, they furnish capital needed to develop promising properties.

However, the nature of the uranium country—rugged and isolated—assures a vital place in exploration and production for the individual prospector and the small company.

WHAT ABOUT THE FUTURE?

Uranium apparently will be a much sought after mineral for years to come.

Recently AEC extended its system of bonus payments for initial production until 1957, and its guaranteed minimum price for ore until 1962.

Peacetime uses of atomic power may increase the demand for uranium.

With these facts in mind, experts generally think the uranium industry has an unlimited future. Exploration and production will increase, they believe.

Utah has a bright new industry.

But that doesn't mean that uranium stocks are anything but highly speculative.

Timothy J. Murphy, Junior Vice Commander in Chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Appeals for Korean Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 9, 1954

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article from the National Tribune-Stars and Stripes, Thursday, June 10, 1954:

VFW Junior Vice Commander Tells About Conditions Found on Trip to Investigate War-Torn Areas

Returned from a special mission to Korea, Timothy J. Murphy, junior vice commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, appealed to all his comrades in the VFW to lend their fullest support to the American-Korean foundation drive to relieve the misery of the war-ravaged people of Korea.

"We should do this in the name of humanity and to help the brave allies of our own Armed Forces in Korea," said Murphy at his Dorchester, Mass., home. "Helping these people is the best way to insure the United States against the propaganda of underground Communists who are trying to exploit the misery that exists.

"Our GI's in Korea have given us splendid examples of what we can do on the home front to help save the people of that country from utter chaos and tragedy."

Leaders of other veterans' organizations also participated in the mission, sponsored by the American-Korean foundation for the purpose of permitting their first-hand observation of that country's desperate needs. To President Syngman Rhee they tendered President Eisenhower's flag as General of the Army, also a testimonial scroll on behalf of United States veterans. Rhee told them, Murphy said, that "with a little assistance from the United States, our devastated country can be restored to normal."

NO PROVISION FOR WOUNDED

"During our first evening in Korea," Murphy said, "we were guests of the veterans' association. There we learned that no provisions have been made to assist disabled Korean veterans. Even those who have lost their arms and legs are unable to obtain artificial limbs or vocational guidance to speed their rehabilitation. There are no hospitals to provide care or treatment for men who were wounded in the fighting against North Korea and the Chinese Reds.

"We agreed with the conclusion that these disabled and neglected veterans need the kind of help that will make them immune to Communist propaganda.

"The Korean veterans with whom we met questioned us as to procedures in forming an organization like our own. They recognise the need of organized action by veterans themselves in the effort to obtain proper care for their disabled comrades. Swift rehabilitation of disabled Korean veterans is urgently needed and much of the money collected by the American-Korean Foundation would be used for this purpose.

"We were privileged to inspect various installations, including an orphanage being built by GI's. Gen. Maxwell Taylor briefed us on the activities of the Eighth Army and conditions generally in Korea. Describing the program which the Armed Forces have undertaken, he pointed out that much of the construction machinery required in Korea during the war is now being used to build schools, hospitals, orphanages, bridges, etc. He said GI's serving in that theater have contributed more than $25 million to Korean reconstruction and relief, each outfit having underwritten a specific project."

MADE COMPLETE INSPECTION

"By plane and helicopter we were taken close to the buffer zone where, as guests of Generals Taylor and Bradley—the last-named of the 40th Division—we reviewed the troops. President Rhee was in the party that witnessed the final review of the 40th, which is being retired."

"At Inchon, the group inspected the Star of the Sea orphanage, a project that is being vigorously supported by the Department of Washington VFW. There, Sister Philomena, who is in charge, told them of the pathetic plight of countless thousands of orphans and of other children of parents who lack food and shelter. Murphy said seeing the 438 children who are housed in the Star of the Sea orphanage was a soul-stirring experience, one I shall never forget.

"Everything I saw convinced me that most Koreans are living in absolute misery," he said. "Japan left this country drained of its resources prior to the war with North Korea, and the war itself destroyed nearly all that was left. There are no sewerage installations, no plumbing, no water. Most of the people's homes have been destroyed. As many as 10 or 12 persons are today huddled in shacks half the size of a one-car garage.

"Any change would be an improvement for our Korean allies. They are courageous and anxious to help themselves, if we will come to their rescue in this crisis."

Nevada Fortunate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DOUGLAS R. STRINGFELLOW

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 9, 1954

Mr. STRINGFELLOW. Mr. Speaker, it is an infrequent occasion when a citizen writes to his local newspaper editor to sing the praises of his own Congressman. But an even more unusual occurrence is when a person writes to a newspaper editor commenting favorably on a Congressman from a neighboring State. Such an event recently occured in Utah when two of our fine citizens wrote to the Salt Lake Tribune and praised Representative Clifton Young, Republican of Nevada, for his statesmanlike support of legislation authorizing construction of the upper Colorado River project.

I would like to include in the Record the following letter which appeared in the Salt Lake Tribune on May 30, 1954. It is indeed a fitting tribute to an outstanding legislator, a good American, and a true friend of reclamation—Congressman "Cliff" Young:

Nevada Fortunate

Editor, Tribune:

We watched with great interest the final outcome of the action in the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs on the administration's proposed $1 billion upper Colorado project including the controversial Echo Park Dam and the $281 million central Utah project.

We are deeply grateful that Representative Clifton Young, of Nevada, so ably supported the upper Colorado States in their just rights and we are sure that Utah will long remember and appreciate his stand in upholding what was right and just regarding the division of the water in the Colorado River.

We feel Nevada is fortunate in having such a fine Representative. The United States Government has great need of men and women who stand on what is right for all.

Mr. Young did a fine piece of work when he made it possible for States outside the site of the dams to purchase power.

Helen Gubler,
Ella H. Perkins.

National Emblem of the United States of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 9, 1954

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following excellent editorial from the current issue of the National Tribune-Stars and Stripes:

We Hail the Flag

One hundred seventy-seven years ago on June 14 the Continental Congress adopted the Stars and Stripes as the national emblem of the United States of America. It was accepted by the people of this then infant Republic as a symbol of the principles of Americanism and of the effort then launched by our forefathers to secure on this continent a government, the goals of which must be personal freedom, liberty of thought and conscience and a mode of living that spelled absolute justice for all who deserved it. On next Monday, this country will observe Flag Day on the anniversary of the Flag's adoption, a day that should be dedicated to a universal display of the emblem as a reminder to ourselves and to all people of the values that unite us as Americans.

We are glad to aline our thoughts with those of a great patriotic national veterans' organization, the American Legion, which has been carrying on an intensive campaign for the showing of Old Glory all over the country on June 14—a clean, bright and sparkling reminder of the glory that has attached itself to American progress and to which these war veterans have given the slogan, "New Glory for Old Glory." We think it a little unfortunate that some thoughtless individuals have sought to glean perverted humor from an agreement between 25,000 dry cleaners and the Legion's 31,000 post and auxiliary units to clean without charge any soiled ensign which will be flown on Flag Day, but this is an aggravated instance of the need for reeducation of our citizens in the symbolisms that have meant so much during our progress as a nation. Physical cleanliness is conducive to moral conversion, so we gain some satisfaction from a thoughtless play on words and hope that, in addition to encouraging an actual flying of the flag on June 14, some greater consideration will be devoted to the morality of the occasion. There has been entirely too much disregard for our established institutions in wide areas of the world; it would be well to know better the many involvements of unconcern as we gather in awe before the massed colors next week and pledge our allegiance to the flag and to the Republic for which it stands.

Down through the years since June 1777, this country has enlarged physically. It has progressed from a small confederation of States to a vast Union spreading from ocean to ocean and beyond the seas. With its physical expansion has come increased power, development of resources, a growth of national and international influence, all without the stifling of ideas with their helpfulness. The flag itself has changed only as new luster has been added to the stars that number the States which compose the National Government. But with those changes has come a willingness to accept all of the blessings of a free people while there has been a growing disregard of the bases upon which our freedoms are won. As some have fought to preserve our priceless ideals, others have sought to deprecate them and far too many take issue with the most loyal among us who toil to prevent their dissolution.

At no time to our knowledge have those in authority in our country, or any among the mass of us who make up the citizenry, sought to prevent the development of ideas and yet there is heard constantly a wail of dismay from idealistic intellectuals who blame a condition of fear for an intelligent resistance to a breakdown of the fundamental reasoning that has permitted the expansion of our country and has contributed to its safety. Actually there is no suppression of the individual, nor is there any threat to his freedom, but there must always be an awareness of inimical influences which are proposed to alter our ideals through a disguised plea for political change that would prove suicidal. We have in our midst a strong element of misguided liberals who would dissolve the Union by the acceptance instead of a world alinement, one that would replace the Stars and Stripes with the blue spiderweb of an international government, a threat so real that there is indeed a need today to revitalize our educational programs lest our younger and coming generations not know of the significance of free government as symbolized by the American flag. To the end that our children and our children's children may know and appreciate the splendor that is characterized by Old Glory, there must be carried into the schoolrooms of the country an intensive campaign for the study of American history by those who believe in it with the enthusiasm required to plant in the minds of students a desire to preserve our form of government. No progress nor any degree of progression can justify the replacement of Americanism with one-worldism.

Without any attempt here to do other than to draw a contrast, we would remind that for the past 178 years this country of ours has done well in following the precepts of its founders. It grew and prospered as an entirely independent people. It has settled its own internal quarrels without assistance up to the present hour. Its strength and promise have permitted it to settle three world conflicts in which it participated against its will but which it fought in its desire to free others from oppression and to defend its own shores against desecration. When, however, it permitted itself to become involved in foreign diplomatic entanglements, its influence has waned in proportion to the extent it has freely given of its power. We believe we voice the thinking of most of the war veterans of the Nation, and particularly those who have mobilized for the good of our people into the major organizations of veterans, when we suggest that the occasion of marking Flag Day is one on which we might well reassess the values of sacrificing for others who seem incapable of protecting themselves or who are demonstrating an unwillingness to do so. We face hazardous times in a world that has too little regard for the principles symbolized by the American flag and we would do well to think more generally in terms of harboring our resources for our own preservation.

A little more self-thought is in order in these days of world turmoil. As we watch Old Glory waving from the flagpoles all over the land, we should consider how fortunate we are to have the protection of that flag, how lucky we are to have been born and to have lived under it as Americans. As it is the symbol of America, so it is that which suggests our homes, our churches, and schools, the enterprise and the progress that is the United States. It represents the heritage that is ours and the debt of gratitude we owe to our forebears to keep it unsullied. Its heart beats to the tramping of soldier feet from Valley Forge through Heartbreak Ridge. It is a promise that those who have kept it from defeat must never be forgotten by their neighbor beneficiaries. It is the emblem of freedom, of protection, justice, honor, sacrifice, and opportunity to free men. As it has fought oppression, intolerance, and injustice with wisdom and with honesty and understanding, it must still resist those evils and it must keep this country free from the taint of both totalitarian aggression and the fiction of international betterment.

It is our belief that the flag of our country can be kept morally clean just as it can be cleansed of the soil which comes from constant usage. As we display it this Flag Day, we must remember that all America is bound within its folds.

The Plight of the Soft Coal Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 9, 1954

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, the plight of the soft coal industry, not only in my home State of West Virginia but in the other States producing coal, is such as to compel me to severely criticize the present practice of the Tennessee Valley Authority, through its Purchasing Division, in the purchase of coal to operate its several steam plants in the area.

Awards on bids taken recently have gone almost exclusively to the operators of nonunion mines in total disregard to providing wage rates. This has forced the closing of many standard mines, causing loss of profits to the operators and jobs to the miners.

In this connection, I desire to include a letter from the Southern Appalachian Coal Operators' Association, addressed to the Honorable Estes Kefauver, of Tennessee. The letter follows:

May 5, 1954.

Senator Estes Kefauver,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Kefauver: Southern Appalachian Coal Operators' Association, representing its member firms and speaking, I think, for the established coal producers in this area, would like to direct your attention to a situation that is severely undermining the wage structure of the coal-mining industry in Tennessee. I refer to the present coal-purchasing policies of the Tennessee Valley Authority which are directly responsible for some of the reduction of the miners' wages by as much as $10 a day in some instances, and as a result of which no coal operator who pays the union wage scale can compete with the substandard wage producer. Is it any wonder then that the coal industry in the valley is in the worst condition in its history at a time when it could be expected to be, and as TVA officials repeatedly predicted it would be, in the strongest position of any segment of the coal industry in the Nation.

As an example of the practice referred to, on the latest invitation to bid for coal to be furnished to the Kingston steam plant on long-term contracts a majority of the tonnage was awarded to firms not paying the union wage scale, and if their usual practice is followed, the Authority, having used these substandard producers as a lever to further depress the price of coal produced in the Tennessee Valley, will insure their further cooperation by not penalizing them when they fail to deliver on their contracts (even though the contract incorporates stringent provisions in this regard). You can readily see that, though some of the tonnage awarded is never actually delivered, the damage will already have been done; when union wage scale producer X see that he has again failed to meet the nonunion price to TVA he reluctantly decides to close down his mine, and the fact that the low bidder doesn't deliver on this contract doesn't give the miners their jobs back. The so-called robber barons of the last century were not guilty of a more cynical waste of a great natural resource.

While the coal business, like any other, has its ups and downs, and is at present in a very low period nationally, this is something entirely new in purchasing policies. This situation has been repeated so many times during the past year that a catastrophic condition has resulted. Private utilities in the Southeast which are also large buyers of coal have been forced by this TVA policy to abandon their practice of paying enough to enable the mineowners to pay the union miners' wage, and they are now following the Government agency's lead in buying coal from producers who are able to reduce wages 40 to 50 percent.

In calling this matter to your attention, we do not claim that these purchasing policies are illegal. In fact from a short-range standpoint it may be smart business to so depress the price of a product which the Authority must purchase in large quantities. But what of the lofty aims of TVA to rehabilitate the valley? And, incidentally, how do TVA officials square this practice with their conspicuously liberal wage policies on their own jobs? To pinpoint the first of these two questions, perhaps there should be recalled to their minds the first sentence of the first paragraph of the act creating the Tennessee Valley Authority. I quote:

"For the purpose of maintaining and operating the properties now owned by the United States in the vicinity of Muscle Shoals, Ala., in the interest of the national defense and for agricultural and industrial development, and to improve navigation in the Tennessee River and to control the destructive flood waters in the Tennessee River and Mississippi River Basins there is hereby created a body corporate by the name of the 'Tennessee Valley Authority'."

If forcing mine wage scales down from $19 a day to $9 a day, and the union producers out of business and miners out of jobs, is promoting the industrial development, then the declared purpose of the TVA Act in this instance is being effectively carried out. But, if it is not, then those lofty aims and ideals are being perverted by sharp practices and are being sold for what will undoubtedly prove to be a mess of pottage when TVA coal requirements have increased by several million tons per year and they have either no reliable suppliers left in the area, or a reenactment of Federal control by the Congress establishing a floor on coal prices at a considerably higher level than TVA is now paying, or both.

By reason of this policy of a Government agency, and by reason of this alone, the large coal producers of Tennessee are now faced with the alternative of either closing down their mines permanently or drastically reducing wages, and if this policy is to be sanctioned by the Congress we believe that we are entitled to be advised of that fact.

Yours very truly,

C. R. GRIFFITH,
President.

Ira Harold Ames

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 1, 1954

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include a column from the Brooklyn Eagle of Tuesday, May 18, 1954.

Ira Harold Ames, about whom this column is written, is the son of my old friend, Dr. Lawrence Ames, and is a constituent of whom I am very proud. This young man has just graduated with the highest honors from Brooklyn Poly Prep, one of the finest preparatory schools in the city of New York, and has been admitted to Princeton University in the class to commence in September 1954. Princeton University is indeed fortunate in having among its students a young man like Ira Harold Ames. All of us who know Ira know that he will prove to be a great credit to that famed institution of learning, Princeton.

The article follows:

JIMMY MURPHY'S COLUMN

EMULATING NAMESAKE

Possessing the last name of one of the greatest right-handed pitchers that ever toed a big league rubber, Ira Harold Ames, orthodox heaver of Poly Prep, has played a major part in the Blue and Gray winning the Ivy Preparatory League championship for the third successive season. Ira tossed 6 of the 9 straight triumphs that the team so ably coached by the veteran Herb Bohnet turned in. It was the first time in the history of the colorful loop that a team finished the diamond campaign with a clean slate.

The namesake whom Ira is emulating is Red Ames, formerly of the Giants, away back when grandfather was a boy.

A HEADY CHUCKER

Being a close student of the game and a good observer, Ira has improved his twirling by copying the styles of various major leaguers, particularly Carl Erskine. He has a fine assortment of twisters, a fast ball that is alive, good control, and a change of pace that keeps the batters off stride.

He pitches with his thinking cap as well as his arm and is quick to discover defects in the style of the hitters. Like his namesake of yesteryear, Ames is as cool as the proverbial cucumber under fire.

WINS COVETED TROPHY

Ira's ability has not gone without recognition at Poly Prep. He has won the Froeb Cup, one of the most cherished prizes the Dyker Heights seat of secondary education has to offer. Donated for the past 28 years by Augustus Froeb, who was one of the outstanding all-around athletes of Poly Prep around 1902 when he graduated, the prize goes to the member of the graduating class who has best represented the school ideals in character and varied achievement.

The presentation was made by J. Wesley Cunningham, assistant headmaster and head of the mathematics department, who retires at the end of the current school year after 43 years on the faculty. Mr. Cunningham called attention to the fact that the names on the base of the trophy are those of some of the most illustrious graduates of the Blue and Gray institution.

The winner a year ago was Pete Holmes, football, basketball, and track star, who is now a freshman and an honor student at Colgate University.

JAMES FORMER WINNER

Among the other former winners of the trophy were Jack James, Jr., all-scholastic football player, who carried on to earn All-America recognition at Princeton. He was killed a couple of years ago in a New Jersey railroad wreck. Fred Tuttle, current football coach of Poly, who starred on the grid and track for the school as well as at Williams College, was another who earned the coveted award.

In addition to baseball, Ames was a mainstay with the swimming team. He is a member of Cum Laude, and sports editor of the Polyglot, the school yearbook. He will enter Princeton University in the fall to major in engineering.

DAD OLD ATHLETE

The boy's dad, Dr. Lawrence Ames, is a former basketball star, who helped give the Jewish Community House of Bensonhurst its first court championship.

Soon after becoming a physician he took care of the New Utrecht football players in the days of Coaches Dave Sehres and Abe Warchaizer. Abe is now track mentor at Erasmus Hall. He was also the Midwood doctor.

A SEVERE LOSS

It is with deep regret that we learned of the approaching retirement of John Wesley Cunningham. He is one of the finest educators in the country and a real credit to his profession. The borough can ill afford to lose such a man and his departure is going to be felt.

John has been a good and faithful servant in the educational field. He has been square in his dealings with his fellow man which built up a popularity that is hard to equal.

Let's all join in in wishing him the best of everything as he disappears from the classroom. A little meditation for continued good health won't do any harm.

John, we are going to miss a sincere friend when you go.

Baccalaureate Address by S. Orestes Bond

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY

OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 8, 1954

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I have requested permission to insert my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD for the express purpose of paying tribute to one of America's outstanding educators, Dr. S. Orestes Bond, president emeritus of Salem College, Salem, W. Va.

This Seven Day Baptist institution, nestled in the beautiful hills of my State, is truly a citadel of learning. Its history and growth closely parallels the life of Dr. Bond, who for nearly a half century has been the guiding light that has dedicated this seat of higher learning to the service of mankind—including the thousands of young men and young women who have been privileged to enter its portals and absorb the teaching of this truly great man.

On May 30, 1954, at the 66th commencement, Dr. Bond delivered the baccalaureate sermon, and was introduced by the Honorable Jennings Randolph, former Member of Congress, who lauded Dr. Bond's services as president of this college for a period of 32 years.

Dr. Bond's address follows:

STRONGER THAN THE SPLIT ATOM

(Baccalaureate address by S. Orestes Bond, president emeritus, Salem College, May 30, 1954)

"And God said, Let us make man, and let them have dominion" (Genesis 1: 26).

All of ancient Gaul is not the only thing divided into three parts for discussion and study.

Since this is a religious service, perhaps we should seek a Biblical reason which might justify our division of the subject tonight. Seven has always seemed, in the minds of most people, to be the charmed Biblical number. Almighty God Himself gave the idea of its importance when He established the creation week of 7 days—6 days for work and 1 for rest; but certainly we cannot use 7 classifications in the brief hour allotted for this service. Many numbers have come in for special emphasis in the scriptures, and among these, 3 stands out as one especially emphasized.

When David had sinned before God, trying to determine his strength by numbering the fighting men of Israel rather than by his trust in the power of the God of Israel, God sent the prophet Gad to him with a message. The message said, "I offer thee 3 things, choose thee 1 of them that I may do it unto thee." The 3 things offered were: and I quote, "Three years of famine, 3 months of flight being destroyed before your enemies, or 3 days the sword of the Lord, even the pestilence in the land and the angel of the Lord destroying throughout all the coast of Israel." That was a difficult trio from which to choose a punishment. David thought carefully and long and chose the latter saying, "I am in a great strait, let me now fall into the hands of the Lord for great are His mercies, but let me not fall into the hands of man." Christ's inner circle of disciples numbered 3—Peter, James, and John. Saint Paul's cardinal Christian virtues as emphasized in First Corinthians, verse 13: 13, were 3: "And now abideth faith, hope, and love, these three, but the greatest of these is love." And finally one other reference which in itself should be enough to sanctify the word "three" as a sacred number. The three manifestations of God Himself were, and are, God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost. It can truly be said that we live in many worlds, but for our purpose tonight, we have classified our human experiences under three heads.

We live in a world of things. Or, if you prefer to use the scientists' expression, we may say that we live in a world of matter. Matter is defined by Webster as "the substance of material things." God Himself emphasized the importance of things. He spent 5 whole days of creation week in creating things. He spent a considerable part of the sixth day in creating things. When the sixth day of that week was far spent, the Scripture says that God looked on His creation "and God saw that it was good and God said let us make man in our image after our likeness and let them have dominion; so God created man, and God blessed them and said unto them, 'Be fruitful and multiply and replenish the earth and subdue it and have dominion over every living thing that moveth upon the earth.'" At the close of the sixth day, the Bible tells us that God saw everything that he had made and behold it was very good. Of all of God's creation the special blessing pronounced by Him was given to man alone. It is also evident that this planet was created for man. It was not made for the rocks and the metals which hold up the mighty peaks of our mountain ranges. They have no appreciation for the glorious dawn which ushers in the day or for the brilliant sunset which closes the doors of the night. The trees are never conscious of their own beauty and stateliness. The higher forms of animal life are alike unconscious of their marvelous surroundings except, perhaps, that they follow instinct alone in their search for food and in their flight from danger. The faithful dog and the family horse seem to be almost human in their demonstrations of affection for their masters. However, they are only following their instincts of association with man. They never have one thought for the kind providence that provides their meat and their corn.

Neither was this planet created for angels. God could have left off many of the intricacies of His creation had it been intended for them. The laws of transportation need not have been included. If man has interpreted aright, angels received their transportation facilities as original equipment, if I may borrow the expression from automobile salesmen. Since food would be of no concern to them, the laws of crop growing, preparations for processings, and preservation could also have been omitted. Innumerable other things could be listed that would have been superfluous in a world for angels. This planet was made for man. I doubt not that everything made on this planet by the hand of God is useful to man. If the human race does not destroy itself from the earth by some of its inventions now made, or to be made, man will probably go on indefinitely discovering new things and new uses for old things. With all the innumerable things in the world, our scientists had discovered even before I went to college that it was rather a simple world after all. I was taught that there were in the whole world only about 92 distinct elements. I checked with our college scientist a few days ago and found that we have been able in the last half century to identify a few more separate elements, making now a grand total of 103 that are each different from all the others. Try to imagine how an infinite God could make a world and all the millions of things that challenge our interest with only 103 elements. Any sensible man who would think of this marvel could scarcely doubt the existence of a God who created such a complex world from such simplicity. But we live in three worlds. Perhaps an illustration will clarify this statement. A judge found himself facing a prisoner who had been proven guilty of three crimes. The minimum sentence for each of the crimes was 5 years in the Federal penitentiary. The judge looked at the prisoner and realized that he might be expected to die before being released from prison. Finally the judge said, "I cannot lessen the penalty for any one of the crimes, but I can legally do this: I can permit you to serve them concurrently."

Now let us examine a little more carefully the world of things. We study history and learn something of the primitive nature of tools, houses, and factories in pioneer days. It seems to us that we are the only generation that has attempted to take seriously God's world of things. We now make more adaptive uses of things in a year than other generations made in a century. Even one of our own graduates of a very few months ago made a little gadget for use in a chemical laboratory that will do the work of eight chemists. Incidentally, his salary was quickly raised to five figures. But please do not mention this to our financial representative. To enumerate just a few of the adaptations of things and the principles written into them by the hand of God during creation's week, we might mention communication. The voice, with all the power that man could put behind it, was limited to a mile, more or less. This interesting story comes down to us from about 125 years ago. Two early settlers in the Lost Creek community lived approximately 2 miles apart. They arranged a signal to be used as an invitation to Sunday dinner. The one who had success first in hunting would go to the top of a very high hill on upper Lost Creek and fire three blank shots. That meant that the other family was invited to come over to dinner that day. There was no way to carry the human voice across the miles except to send the one who owned the voice. Now the human voice is carried from house to house, from community to community, from State to State, and from nation to nation in the twinkle of an eye.

The lines, dots, and dashes, a sort of new alphabet, came but 110 years ago. This invention doubtless led to the telephone which invention was announced but a single year before I was announced. Then, in turn, came wireless communication, the radio, the moving picture, at first silent then the talkie, the television and all the rest. These came in the next half or three-quarters of a century. Today we can hear the jargon of many tongues, peoples, and nations without moving from the easy chair at our fireside.

Again we might look a moment at the transformation of this world through the facilities of transportation. The earliest historical records limit speed and distance in travel to the strength of a man's legs and heartbeat. Later it was speeded up by the use of the strength and endurance of the horse. People are still trying to improve this speed but it is not for utility purposes but for amusement; for there are still those who enjoy a good horse race. It was probably as late as 1843 that a Baltimore & Ohio Railroad engine raced 15 miles with an old gray horse hitched to a buggy. The engine won by a small margin. It still wins at a 100 miles or more per hour.

There have been other contenders for speed and load carrying. The automobile, with its variations in trucks, in trailer, and what have you, is an important invention for moving things and people about the world. However, the final accomplishment of transportation speeds to date is the airplane and its variations culminating in the jetplane which travels faster than sound. Just last week the papers announced that 1,600 miles per hour had been made. All these improvements together with a million more that might be mentioned have been made by man's manipulation of God's creation of things.

The Heavenly Father must have watched with real concern the slow growth of man's use of things. It seems to us who live today surrounded by gadgets for doing almost every kind of manual and mental work, that past generations made little use of things. The three worlds under discussion tonight are not wholly separate. In fact, the second world uses almost constantly the world of mind or of thought. Matter can exist without mind but it is doubtful if mind on this planet can exist without matter. Inanimate things have no trace of mind or mental processes. Animate things in the higher classes of the animal kingdom have certain instincts which may be used by men to develop in animal life the simplest of mental processes. The animal could not do it alone, but may, through the guidance and efforts of man, make at least a little progress toward that which we label as mind.

The mental worlds is man's interpreter. Through it he classifies his knowledge secured through the other two worlds. Never in history has new knowledge multiplied so rapidly as during the last half century. Never have the facilities for planting this new knowledge in human minds, improved so rapidly. The whole field of visual education and laboratory education is a recent development. Figuratively speaking, it is already the automobile of the mind and pushing rapidly to the status of the airplane. I taught a child in my first school to read a little in spite of my clumsy methods. Now with the facilities of modern schools, she would learn 10 times as much in one-tenth of the time.

The progress of this planet has not moved forward on men's backs but in men's minds. The importance of growth and development here becomes more and more evident with each passing year. Long ago this fact was quite clear to the world's great philosophers and teachers but only recently has the "hoi polloi" recognized it in any large sense. How could Watt look at the water and then at the fire and conceive the power that would serve our factories and move our commerce? It was through the mind. How did Franklin, stung by the electricity at the end of a wet kite string, envision the power that was so soon to light our homes and streets and turn the wheels in so many of our factories. It was his active and highly imaginative mind that led to his suggestions for others and still others who would experiment and follow out their varied mental imaginations through their minds. How did Thomas A. Edison surpass all world records in giving the world useful inventions for the benefits of the human race? Someone has figured out what his inventions have added to the world of values. It is no longer millions; it is billions. These billions represent his contribution to American convenience, to American wealth, and to American comfort.

The mental world is a God world just as the matter world is a God world. Make no mistake about its importance to man. Use it, cultivate it, preserve it, else we defeat the purposes of the Creator who looked upon all his creation and pronounced it good.

There is a third world in which we live. It transcends the second world as far as the second surpasses the first. Matter in higher and lower forms waited through those long days of creation week for the mind of man which would change it and give variety and usefulness to its myriad forms. The first world had no power of its own to change its status. There were no controls over which it presided. The second world had great power to change things but it was as likely to destroy as to build up. Perhaps I should say more likely to destroy. The same kind of mental processes can save a life or destroy one. The bank vault time clock was made by the same careful mental activities as were used to make the burglar tools to rob it. The same power wrapped up in splitting the atom may be used through the minds of other men to destroy the race. The controls of life are not primarily in the second world. The controls of man are largely in the third world. There is a spiritual world and men live in it whether they choose or not. They may emphasize any one of these worlds or they may neglect any one. Man was made for the spirit world as fishes were made for the sea, as birds were made for the air.

The Lord created man for his own pleasure as the prophet cried out in the 149th psalm, "For the Lord taketh pleasure in his people."

In the eighth chapter of Romans Paul declares that "as many as are led by the spirit of God they are the sons of God." Keep in mind that Paul was speaking of people living right here on this earth. "The Spirit beareth witness with our spirit that we are the children of God and joint heirs with Christ." It would seem from sacred Scripture that immediately after creation God talked with men much as men talked with each other. Genesis tells us that God walked in the garden in the cool of the day and said, "Adam where art thou?" Then followed a long conversation about man's first sin, and its results on the race that was to follow. "Enoch walked with God and was not because God took him." This seems to imply conversation. And again in the sixth chapter of Genesis we read, "God saw that the wickedness of man was great in the earth, and that every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually. And it represented the Lord that he had made man on the earth, and it grieved him at his heart. And the Lord said, I will destroy man whom I have created from the face of the earth." Following immediately after this statement God seemed to look at Noah and the scripture says that "Noah found grace in the eyes of the Lord." It further says that, "Noah was a just man and perfect in his generation and Noah walked with God." At later periods God spoke to the children of men through prophet and seer, kind and wise man, as well as by His oracles. And finally He bridged the gap between himself and men by sending His own Son into the world to live and to teach as the Son of God and the Son of man. Jesus, when the time of his departure from the earth in human form was at hand, promised that the Father would send the Holy Ghost who would live in the hearts of men. Jesus said, "He shall teach you all things and bring all things to your remembrance whatsoever I have said unto you."

We may thus be assured that from creation's day to this moment the eternal Father God has never severed the communication line that reaches from himself to His faithful children on this planet. The controls of life are not in the secular but in the spiritual. When men can no more hear the voice of God from within, they cannot hear it from without.

The supreme power in the world is not steam, not TNT, not the atom, or the adaptation of hydrogen, or any other substance. The supreme power is in the spiritual world, provided and measured out to the children of men by God himself.

Moses lived to be 120 years old but it was said of him that "his eye was not dim nor his natural force abated." It was his great spiritual power that supported his body, mind, and soul during those 40 years in the wilderness leading that rebellious group that was as unstable as the waves of the Red Sea before the hand of God divided it.

Samson, the strong man, is an example of one who fell into sin and lost his strength and his eyes. David, the lad, the man, and the king is one of the finest illustrations of spiritual power in the Bible. When he, as a youth, cared for his father's flocks, a lion and a bear came to steal the lambs from the flock. He slew them with his short sword. Later, when his older brothers were serving in Saul's army against the Philistines, the father Jesse sent David, the youngest, to carry some loaves to them. He arrived just in time to hear Goliath, the mighty giant of the Philistines, shout out his challenge to the armies of Saul. David listened carefully for one of his brothers or for some other valiant soldier to accept the challenge. All were fearful. Then David offered to go against the giant. He was taken to the great Saul, the king and leader of the armies of the Lord. Saul was probably 7 feet tall and truly a mighty man. David offered to go and fight the Philistine but Saul said, "thou art not able to go against this Philistine to fight with him; thou are but a youth, and he a man of war from his youth. And David replied, the Lord that delivered me out of the paw of the lion and out of the paw of the bear, He will deliver me out of the hand of this Philistine. And Saul said unto David, "Go and the Lord be with thee." Goliath, the Philistine, had challenged the armies of the Lord for 40 days. The remainder of that story, the sling, the pebbles chosen from the brook, and the conversation between the two is familiar history to all. The one thing that we might miss in this story is that David's strength was a spiritual strength and with the exception of a few brief periods it remained a spiritual strength to the end of his days.

There is indeed no time to tell of the power Moses received on the mountain when he was tending the sheep of Jethro, his father-in-law. A voice, God's voice, called to him saying. "Put off thy shoes from off thy feet for the place whereon thou standest is holy ground." Gideon, hidden away in a secluded place threshing grain, heard the voice of God calling him to deliver Israel from the Midianites, the Amalekites, and other groups who had assembled an army of 100,000 soldiers, Gideon brought together 32,000 of the fighting men of Israel and God said, it is too many and he permitted 22,000 to go home. God said it's still too many. It was reduced again at the brook to 300 and God gave the victory to Gideon and his 300. Gideon's strength was of God. These men and 10,000 more that might be named from the Bible and secular history utilized the power that can only be secured from this third world of spirit. Washington, on his knees in the snow at Valley Forge found it. Abraham Lincoln found it as he prayed with Henry Ward Beecher after traveling from the city of Washington to New York City with no other errand than to seek the prayers of that great preacher who dared to auction off a slave girl in the pulpit of his church and set her free. It was a spiritual power that fortified both Washington and Lincoln during those dark days in American history.

There probably has not been a 50-year period in the last 500 years when the people of all nations in the world have been so frightened and felt so helpless in their defense of families and possessions as they feel now. People everywhere seem to be looking to the world of things to protect them: bigger guns, bigger cannons, bigger bombs, bigger airplanes, bigger submarines, bigger battleships, and bigger armies to handle these bigger weapons. I would like, however, to be just and fair to the Christian ministry and to a relatively small group of our truly great leaders of thought coming from all walks of life. Thus, I acknowledge that the last few years, and particularly the last few months, have brought to all of us by radio and daily papers, statements of hope and assurance that we might find the true source of our strength. Certainly our defense of the freedoms we have known in the past and to which we still cling, and the ingredients which have been fused with freedom to make up what we have been pleased to call the American way of life is first and always a moral and a spiritual defense. This way of life came to America in the hearts of those who steered the Mayflower to Plymouth Rock in New England. It came in the hearts of William Penn and his Quaker brethren to Philadelphia. It came in the hearts and lives of John and Charles Wesley to Georgia. Others and others and others from abroad came with ideals human and divine. Later America itself developed these ideals and defended them with its primitive weapons until they could grow into the warp and woof of this Nation. Now this way of life has become the envy of the world.

We want to share it, every part of it that is good. But it is not likely that our defense of it is largely in our military buildup. This defense will come through the power of God or it will not come at all. The prophet Zachariah brought a message from an angel of God to Zerubbabel, the leader of the first band of Jews that returned to Canaan from the Babylonian captivity. The message said, "Not by might nor by power but by my spirit saith the Lord of hosts." This message was certainly for the purpose of centering the mind of Zerubbabel on his only hope of defense since he had but a handful of people with him. The wise man of Proverbs wrote, "Righteousness exalteth a nation but sin is a reproach to any people."

Can this generation make these truths live again in the hearts, minds, and lives of our leaders in America? Many wise men in recent years have been willing to tell the American public by word of mouth and by the printed page that the center of our defense must be in the spiritual realm rather than in the realms of mind only or in things only.

A man whose name you would recognize and who is now a multimillionaire found himself, at the age of 30, in the midst of a big business. The business had gone awry. He could not pay his help; he could not pay his creditors; he was far more than broke financially. He sat down to think through the problem that he himself had created. He called upon God and tried to explain why he had not been a giver to good causes. He enumerated what he had given. It was so small that he was greatly humiliated. He spoke to the Father God and said, "I have tried to be honest with myself; I have been honest with my fellowmen but I can no longer pay my just debts. If you will help me to pay these debts, I promise to pay to your work while I am paying the debts, 10 percent of every dollar I can make. When the debts are paid, I promise to pay a larger percent of every dollar I make." He not only made the money to pay his debts, but he rapidly became very wealthy. He then increased his proportionate giving. He now gives 90 percent of all that he makes and lives on the other 10 percent and still the money continues to pile up. He spends sums in traveling about the world and telling the story of the spiritual power of the God of Heaven as he works with men in their business activities.

I am glad to make reference to some of our statesmen who seem to have found the key to the solution of America's problems. President Eisenhower is an outstanding example of a soldier and now a statesman who puts his trust chiefly, I believe, in God. Could he and the Members of Congress see that if the sums now spent on building up physical defenses with which to frighten our possible enemies could be matched and invested in our spiritual defenses, the God of Heaven would certainly fight for us. The sword of the spirit would pierce the hearts of those, who, for personal ambition or for private gain, try to use and abuse America. Mr. President of Salem College, this Nation is still in the hands of Almighty God. This college is in His hands and the defense of both are in His keeping. Forget not the source of your strength.

To this graduating class of 1954 let me say that in the first world you are the direct heirs of the richest values in things that have ever existed. No doubt you will leave it richer still.

In the second world you have had the accumulation of the wisest conclusions of the thinkers throughout all time. You have had the best interpreters this college could assemble to guide you in your studies. Your mental heritage is as rich as your matter heritage.

If you appreciate the values to which you are heirs in these two worlds you should be prepared to evaluate your status and your supreme opportunities in this third world of the spirit. Remember that the same God who breathed into the first man this breath of life from which he became a living soul, expects you to make a worthy contribution to the spiritual accumulation of your generation.

"The earth is the Lord's and the fullness thereof; the world and they that dwell therein. This is the generation of them that seek Him. Lift up your heads, O ye gates; even lift them up ye everlasting doors; and the King of Glory shall come in. Who is this King of Glory? The Lord of Hosts, He is the King of Glory."

Yankee Enterprise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 9, 1954

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following interesting article that appeared in the May edition of the New Englander, published by the New England Council:

The First Hundred Years

The National Association of Cotton Manufacturers, the Nation's oldest trade organization, started on its second century this month with a modern point of view and the courage of youth.

William F. Sullivan, president of the association, which numbers in its membership a great majority of Yankee cotton and synthetic fiber mills, said at the centennial celebration:

"Today is not to be devoted to contemplating the past nor attempting to fathom the future.

"Today is an occasion upon which we should repledge and rededicate ourselves to those enduring principles upon which we are founded—search for knowledge and free exchange of ideas in a spirit of mutual trust and confidence.

"The centennial has been held to switch New England thinking from the mills that are gone to the mills that are here."

And to give New Englanders something to thing about in this respect, Sullivan quotes some of the great assets the Yankees have in their cotton and man-made fiber textile industry. Such things as:

There are 125 cotton and synthetic-fiber mills located in New England.

New England-made fabrics are worn by men, women, and children throughout the country, and are used in homes in all sections of the Nation.

Industries through the United States use cloth made in New England specifically for industrial purposes.

These mills turn out more than 1¼ billion yards of goods annually.

More than half the Nation's looms weaving fine cotton goods are in New England mills.

Almost one-quarter of the Nation's looms producing the newer manmade fibers are in New England mills.

The New England cotton and synthetic-fiber mills employ 65,000 men and women.

They have an annual payroll of almost $200 million, which supports thousands of families and helps support thousands of New England business enterprises, large and small.

Since the end of World War II these New England mills have spent $185 million on modernizing plants and equipment—that's more per employee than other industries and it's 18 percent more per worker annually than the national cotton and synthetic textile-mill average.

These mills also make other great contributions to the region's economy. They spend many millions of dollars with other New England industries for services and supplies, for power and for textile machinery, itself a substantial factor in the region's economy. And local, State, and Federal tax payments add even more millions.

All of this is money spent in New England.

Seabury Stanton, president of the Hathaway Manufacturing Co., of New Bedford, and chairman of the association's centennial committee, echoed the firm determination of most New England millmen when he says:

"We have no sympathy for the defeatists who say that our industry should cease operating and leave New England.

"We are not minimizing the difficulties ahead, but we believe that since these difficulties are manmade they can be overcome by men."

More Power to the Northwest Through Teamwork

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALT HORAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 9, 1954

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the Record I am pleased to include the following speech recently delivered in Spokane, Wash., by Henry J. Kaiser:

More Power to the Northwest Through Teamwork

Our gathering together today symbolizes a drama of tremendous teamwork.

The corporation's directors and management men—and, I am sure, all the Kaiser aluminum men and women who dwell and work among you—would want to join me in expressing our deep appreciation for this magnificent civic luncheon and especially for what it means in terms of our working together through the years—aspiring together—daring together—and achieving together.

"Together we build" is the slogan among the people of our "family of industries," and I feel it expresses the spirit of our mutual teamwork with the friendly people of Spokane and the great Pacific Northwest.

The busy days of our directors and associates in Spokane have been packed with inspiring experiences and renewed insights into how much there is for all of us to "build together" in the Northwest.

TODAY'S FILLED WITH MORE CHALLENGING OPPORTUNITIES

Here, in the city of my first home in the West, I have been asked whether today there is less opportunity—less challenge—less to fire the imagination and spirit of enterprise—than when I first came to Spokane just 48 years ago.

* * * * *

I must answer that today's opportunities and the challenges for the future in the Northwest are far greater than those of the past.

* * * * *

It has only been during the last decade or two out of the century since the Washington territory was founded, that the Northwest has started making fast and dramatic changes in the structure of its economy.

For the first 80 years or more the Northwest was preoccupied with and overwhelmingly dependent upon exploiting its basic natural resources and exporting its raw materials.

Yet even a region of rich resources cannot always be content to live off its natural wealth, rather than off its ideas. Nearly half our national wealth has come from ideas which a half century ago were not known or not applied to the production of "more things for more people."

Today we witness only the beginnings. We are only at the threshold of greater developments that can be achieved.

It is people who build a region great and strong, and although from 1940 to 1950, the Northwest increased the priceless asset of population by almost one-third, still the people come. And still the markets grow.

* * * * *

QUESTIONS IN THIS YEAR OF CRITICAL DECISIONS

However, it is my duty to caution that 1954 will be known as a year of critical decisions in the history of the Pacific Northwest.

Developments as fabulous as the modern day upsurges of California and the Gulf Coast and Texas will not just drop in our laps in the Northwest. This region has vigorous competition from many other areas; it has immediately pressing problems, as well as untouched opportunities.

Will our leaders and the people put forth the united teamwork required to make good on the Northwest's long-range growth potentialities?

How will the Northwest obtain the highly productive investment of billions of dollars of capital that it justifies?

Are there any keys to the Northwest's future?

Is there any single asset of the region that can be capitalized upon to a greater extent here than anywhere else in the country if not the world?

The first key I have emphasized is people—their teamwork, faith, and courage, their willingness to engage in the real American risk taking, competitive kind of private initiative, their relish for building together.

POWER IS TREMENDOUSLY SIGNIFICANT KEY TO NORTHWEST'S FUTURE

The tremendously significant physical asset that sets the Northwest apart is its gigantic potentiality of hydroelectric power.

I have been profoundly impressed by studies proving that an industrial civilization and a people's standard of living rise in direct relation to the development of sources of energy and power.

* * * * *

We already have witnessed the amazing progress that low-cost hydroelectric power has brought to the Northwest, but before I speak of the crisis over power that we are face to face with, let us think back a bit.

Most of us will recall, when we were building the Bonneville and Grand Coulee Dams, the gloomy warnings that the power which these stupendous dams would generate could not be used for a hundred years.

Why, I used to be almost ashamed to go into Portland, because of the unmerciful ridicule I had to take about the building of these so-called fantastic "white elephants."

Bonneville at first was provided with only 2 generators out of its capacity of 10, and Coulee Dam only one-third of its potential, on the theory that not until the distant future would it be necessary to consider putting in the rest.

Then came World War II, and I hate to think what a setback to the then-losing Allied war struggle it would have been had the Nation not had the abundant power of the Pacific Northwest to draw upon for the great industries of the light metals, minerals, wood products, and chemicals. The Nation still has a great stake in the development of much more Northwest low-cost power for the long years ahead during which, it seems, we must wage the winning struggle against international Communist imperialism.

POWER PROPELS REGION INTO NEW INDUSTRIAL AGE

Since the close of the war, nothing could have been proved more wrong than the forecasts that the Northwest would have power to burn and that aluminum would be running out of our ears.

Again, think how fortunate it was that the Nation—faced with the Korean war and Communist aggression—could call upon the Northwest power and electroprocess industries, and a Northwest growing stronger year by year.

The Pacific Northwest has been literally power-propelled by the "white gold" of energy from falling waters into a new age of aluminum, electronics, atomic sciences, plastics, and the many applications of modern chemistry.

The aluminum industry and all the wealth of electrochemical plants, as well as the Hanford, Wash., atomic plant, which holds promise of products for peace as well as defense—are dependent upon large quantities of low-cost power. Likewise abundant power can bring about much larger utilization of undeveloped mineral resources.

The electroprocessing industries, which can only be built where there is ample, low-cost power or fuel, are basic or "seed" industries. They, in turn, start a chain reaction of creating other plants, new businesses, and more jobs. Take aluminum.

NORTHWEST ALUMINUM MAKES GREAT GAINS

Are not you thrilled and proud of the way that northwestern enterprisers have gone ahead in aluminum manufacturing?

I certainly am thrilled that this year the number of manufacturing firms engaged in the production and fabrication of aluminum in the 4 Northwest States has grown to a total of 511. That is an increase in the last 3 years of 26 percent. In the State of Washington alone, there are 296 plants manufacturing aluminum products. They make a wide range of products—building, industrial, farm, transportation, and household products. In addition, a host of businesses in aluminum are flourishing.

I am confident that we haven't even begun to see the hundreds of northwestern manufacturers and businessmen who will capitalize upon the bright opportunities in aluminum.

We are backing up this confidence with money and action. The directors and management of Kaiser Aluminum are happy to make the significant announcement that the corporation is investing another $1,500,000 here at the Trentwood mill. We are adding two new rolling mills and are further expanding and diversifying the production of aluminum-mill products for fabricators.

One new Trentwood mill will roll out sheets of aluminum at 3,000 feet per minute to go into a myriad of products—such as food containers for bakery products (pies and pastries), frozen foods, and heat-and-serve meals; interesting architectural and building uses, and consumer products.

A new Trentwood embossing mill will increase production of embossed sheet for architectural paneling, corrugated roofing, refrigerators, food freezers, automobiles, and other uses.

MORE JOBS, MORE PRODUCTS COMING IN ALUMINUM

This latest expansion program exemplifies how Kaiser Aluminum has soundly invested millions of dollars throughout the last 8 years in constantly building up its tremendous investment in Washington. Our expansion investments in the State have now been raised to a total of approximately $25 million.

During our directors' trips to the Trentwood plant yesterday and the Mead reduction works this morning, we saw and heard many things that could well make the people of Spokane and the Northwest proud and also hopeful for aluminum's future here.

* * * * *

It is indeed imagination stirring to glimpse what the scientists are developing in the Trentwood research laboratories.

The present accepted forecasts are that American demands for aluminum by 1960 will be nearly 2½ times the 1950 level. Yet just one out of the several major new uses of aluminum that our research men are working on here could result in an aluminum expansion tremendously in excess of these forecasts. Why? Just one of the major and promising new uses of aluminum alone could more than double or triple the forecasted demand for aluminum.

The Washington State Industry Utilization Committee has pointed out that the aluminum industry in this State alone employed 43,587 persons in 1953 in primary production and fabrication.

The estimated annual payroll amounts to $195,600,000. Millions of dollars more are paid by the industry for local supplies, transportation, and other services.

All these contributions reach such magnitude that it may certainly be said that unwanted hydroelectric power was converted into a new basic industry—aluminum—to add to agriculture, lumber, and wood products, mining, and fishing.

The State's report went on to project the anticipated market growth and to predict that the Washington aluminum industry by 1960 will be employing 107,750 persons. That's not counting the jobs and enormous payrolls in Oregon and elsewhere in the region.

It is true that the next half dozen years could—demandwise and opportunitywise—more than double the number of jobs in aluminum production and fabrication industries.

However, I think I should say to you that as things stand at this time the startling truth is that there is not the prospect of enough Northwest power being made available by 1960 to begin to make possible this big increase in jobs. It is a shocking thought that we are not prepared.

NORTHWEST IS FACING ACUTE POWER SHORTAGE

The expected shortage of hydro-electric power threatens not only to cut short the aluminum industry. It threatens to curtail other basic industries dependent upon low-cost power. In turn, it jeopardizes all the train of new manufacturing, new businesses and livelihoods for thousands upon thousands of more people that the seed industries stimulate.

Bluntly, thenew and unique pattern of industrialization which the Northwest has only recently entered is already threatened with being seriously curtailed.

TODAY, THE NORTHWEST IS FACING A PERIOD OF ACUTE POWER SHORTAGE AFTER 1960

With Bonneville and Coulee being utilized to capacity, the Northwest's normal demands for electrical energy are increasing faster than the supply—and faster than the completion of McNary, the Dalles, Chief Joseph, and smaller dams can meet.

It is imperative not merely to get more dams started promptly to take care of ordinary load growth after 1960, but to provide—just as soon as possible—a large additional amount of job-producing power to attract new electro-processing industries and expand existing ones.

Our studies bear out the startling finding that the Northwest, at its present rate of growth, will need an additional half million kilowatts of electric power—the equivalent of a new Bonneville Dam every year.

Yet for the fourth straight year, no appropriations are provided for a major new power project in the Northwest. It takes 5 to 8 years to build major power-producing dams after financing and engineering are done. So we are already late. That's what makes this a critical year for decisions and actions.

UNTHINKABLE SHORTAGE AMIDST UNPARALLELED POTENTIALITIES

Already, because of the scarcity of firm power and the lack of any assurance that sufficiently large blocks of firm low-cost energy for industrial use are anywhere in sight, industries which would be naturals for the Northwest are locating or expanding elsewhere.

* * * * *

The picture beyond 1960 becomes rapidly worse and cannot be improved unless dams are started now.

Isn't it downright unthinkable that this region, the richest in undeveloped but useable hydropower potentialities, should go hungry for electrical energy?

POWER CRISIS IS ACTUALLY AN OPPORTUNITY AND CHALLENGE

I have stated a problem, but everyone who knows my philosophy will understand my conviction that problems are only opportunities in work clothes. The Northwest's immediate problem of getting new major multipurpose dams under way with all possible speed is both a challenge and an opportunity.

The opportunities are breathtaking. The Northwest possesses more than 37 percent of the Nation's hydroelectric resources. Think of it, the Northwest's hydro potential amounts to more than 35 million kilowatts. What a national asset. Yet so far only about one-fifth of this vast resource has been or is being developed.

It is in the Nation's interest that power development be pushed forward in the Northwest. The power from falling water is an inexhaustible resource, unlike other natural resources that are depleted.

It will have an ever-greater market, multiplying its benefits manyfold beyond the cost in more enterprises and a higher standard of living. It will greatly augment our national defense and strengthen the national economy.

ONLY UNITED TEAMWORK CAN WIN

So what are we waiting for?

If there is one thing crystal clear and essential to Northwest power development, it is that the people must be united in the all-out efforts. Only by united teamwork can we hope to find a solution fast enough.

The northwesterners' disputes among themselves have been all too publicized throughout the United States. Bickering will kill anything. Bickering most assuredly can kill power projects. The controversies over whether development of water resources shall be done through public or private means have occupied a major amount of time.

President Eisenhower has proposed a partnership program for practical realization of power development by a wise combination of prudent public investment and courageous private enterprise. This objective can be achieved only through wholesome public and private cooperation at the grassroots level.

It will be essential for private funds to be invested heavily, and under present and foreseeable circumstances, full power development of the magnitude required to provide needed power in advance will not be accomplished without the Federal Government also carrying out its part of the partnership.

This is far more than a Northwest regional problem. The Government has an overriding interest in the development of these natural resources. The development of resources in any region helps the entire country.

In this case, the development of power is a bulwark and necessity for national defense. Consequently it is to the interest of all the country that these vast natural resources in the Northwest be developed.

The Congress will not authorize and appropriate funds for such a program unless the people of the Northwest are united in desires and unless the Congress is convinced the proposals are prudent and in the best interest of the United States. The problem of unity and teamwork is in the hands of the people of the Northwest.

There are signs that greater understanding and unity will come, but it cannot come too soon. The people cannot see their destiny thwarted; they need more kilowatts, not more controversies. More job-producing industries, not partisan politics just for politics' sake. More power for one and all, for big and little industries, for homes and farms and businesses.

A recognition in the Northwest that national defense is an important feature of developing its resources will do much toward accelerating action.

The transcendant objectives necessitate, moreover, close cooperation between the States and prompt, fair, and equitable agreement between the United States and our neighbor, Canada.

THE NATION HAS A GREAT STAKE IN FATEFUL DECISIONS

Today, unlike in World War II, the Northwest has no readily available supply of "power on demand" for national defense in event of emergency.

The goal should be the maximum development of the natural power resources of the Northwest. Of course, the Northwest can be the principal and immediate beneficiary of the development of these resources. But the whole Nation's interest transcends the regional interest. The entire country has a tremendous stake in development of these resources.

It was heartening that our Government within the last month announced the decision to seek construction of the great Libby Dam on the Kootenai River in Montana. We can surely agree with Secretary of Interior Douglas McKay's declaration that this calls for all groups interested in the prosperity and economic stability of the Pacific Northwest to unite in support of this project.

I would add that it calls for all concerned with our national defense to push for speedy action, and specifically for the International Joint Commission to expedite the reaching of necessary agreements between the United States and Canada.

The fact that "no other proposed single dam site on the Columbia River system will provide for the huge quantity of salable power at the site and downstream as Libby" is, in itself, a spur to united action.

Libby Dam will store more than 5 million acre-feet of water—about the same as Grand Coulee. It will provide more than a million kilowatts of firm power in the Pacific Northwest. This firm power will be generated at Libby and at downstream plants now existing and under construction. That's enough power to supply a population of a million people in cities like Seattle, Spokane, and Portland.

As additional downstream plants are constructed on the Columbia River, the water stored in Libby Reservoir will provide still more firm power.

The time has come to ask some pointed questions and get definite answers—and results.

When do we get going full speed ahead on Libby Dam?

When will the interest of national defense be recognized in carrying out imperative development of power?

When—instead of just talking—will we all team up and do something?

Out of teamwork and united action, here is the kind of program that reasonable men of vision can accomplish; here are 5 points that I believe we can agree should be done:

1. Develop a power program that is adequate to the needs of the national defense and the economy.
2. Obtain immediate starts on some of the large Government-programed dams.
3. Stimulate major partnership plans by encouraging private utilities and partnerships to the maximum practical extent to construct multipurpose dams, with adequate Federal underwriting of nonpower features such as flood control, navigation, etc.
4. Assure adequate Federal appropriations to complete on schedule the dams now under construction.
5. Be sure that the overall program will provide job-producing power, the low-cost and ample power that is essential to developing basic industries and creating more jobs.

In conclusion, the Northwest is at the crossroads of converting its traditional raw materials economy into a balanced and diversified economy of its own—of building its own kind of new industrial age around power—and still retaining and enriching its own enjoyable way of life.

Paramount in realizing 'our dreams, I have placed, first, the people in united teamwork; second, the Northwest's inexhaustible resource of power; and, third, the national interest and advantage in developing the Northwest.

In this year for vision and action the great Pacific Northwest may well call upon her citizens in these words of a poet:

> "Bring me men to match my mountains,
>   Bring me men to match my plains,
> Men with empires in their purpose,
>   And new eras in their brains."
>
> —*Sam Walter Foss, The Coming American.*

Foreign Operations Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 9, 1954

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following is the statement I was privileged to make before the House Committee on Foreign Affairs regarding the draft of the mutual security bill:

Chairman Chiperfield. The committee will come to order.

Mr. Multer, we are happy to have you here. I see you have a statement. Will you proceed in any way you care to?

STATEMENT OF ABRAHAM J. MULTER, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF NEW YORK

Mr. Multer. Mr. Chairman and distinguished members of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, I appreciate the opportunity to appear before you and to state my views with reference to the very important foreign aid bill that your committee is now considering.

I am aware of the fact that you have conducted many and long hearings on this very important problem, and that much information has been given to you in executive session by high and respected members of the executive departments.

I wish to address myself briefly to that part of the proposed bill which will deal with economic aid to that area of the world which is commonly referred to as the Middle East.

At the outset, I ask you to believe me when I earnestly say to you that in addressing myself to this subject I do not do so from any partisan interest in any particular country in the Middle East. I do so primarily as an American citizen profoundly concerned with the peace of the world. I know that this committee agrees that conflict in any part of the world threatens the peace of our own country. It is because I sincerely believe with you in that concept that I presume to come before you and offer my comments on the subject.

Long before I came to Congress, I had been urging, publicly and privately, that the solution of the problems in the Middle East could be accomplished only by outside aid to the peoples of that area, giving them the technological know-how and the wherewithal with which to improve their standards of living and their general economic welfare.

One of the first speeches that I made in the Congress after coming here in 1947, was addressed to that subject. You will remember that that was before the establishment of the State of Israel.

I urged then, as I have continued to urge ever since, that peace in that area can be assured only if the economic conditions of all of the peoples of the area were improved. When I use the words "peoples of the area," I never limit it to Jews or to Christians or to Moslems. I specifically, at all times, pointed out that "peoples" of that area include all the people, the Arabs of the Moslem faith and the Arabs of the Christian faith, as well as the Jews. I pointed out that there could never be peace in that area if only the Jews prospered there. It is essential that all of the surrounding Arabs be taught how they too could prosper, and be given the implements with which to attain such prosperity.

The need for such a broad, all-inclusive program has increased since the establishment of the State of Israel.

Military aid, however, will not accomplish that important goal.

It cannot be denied by any military authority worthy of such designation, that if Soviet Russia should decide to march upon the Middle East, she could conquer every country within that area almost overnight. Every military expert must concede that, if we sent into the Middle East every dollar of military aid that heretofore has been allocated to that entire area, together with that allocated to India, Turkey, and Greece, sending none of it into India, Turkey, or Greece, and I do not advocate that, but if we sent all of it into the Arab countries and Israel, it could not stem an onslaught by Soviet Russia for more than a few hours.

It should, therefore, be evident that any military aid sent into any of the Arab countries could be used only by such Arab countries, either for fighting with one another or for fighting with Israel. Either alternative must be condemned.

If the pretense is made that such aid must be sent into these countries to be used solely for their internal security, then I venture the opinion that we cannot be sure that, even so, it will be properly used. We have no way of being certain that such aid to an Arab country will be used only by a government friendly disposed to us and our democratic ideals. We cannot be sure that such aid, under the pretense of being used for internal security, will not be seized by forces within such countries inimicable to the United States of America, who would turn such aid against us.

In view of all of this, my suggestion is that appropriate safeguards be written into any foreign aid bill that this committee reports, which will prohibit any military aid going to any of the Middle East states which has not entered into a peace treaty with each and every other of the Middle East states and given satisfactory assurance that it will engage in no acts of aggression at any future time.

I earnestly urge that this committee give serious consideration to this proposal.

Chairman Chiperfield. Thank you, Mr. Multer, for a very constructive statement.

Mr. Morano.

Mr. Morano. Mr. Multer, why do you call this a foreign-aid bill, when it has specifically been called mutual security?

Mr. Multer. Possibly I have taken the colloquial description, but I would prefer that rather than the legislatively correct description.

Mr. Morano. The reason I ask you that, I moved to call it a foreign-aid bill this morning, and I didn't get anywhere with it.

Chairman Chiperfield. That is no criticism of you, Mr. Multer. It was only that we had that point raised this morning.

Mr. Multer. I hope I have offended no one by using a designation other than its technically correct one.

Mr. Bentley. In the third paragraph on page 1 you say you are going to speak about economic aid and then your suggestion goes to military aid. Is that correct?

Mr. Multer. Yes. I don't want to be put in the position of saying that I am opposed to aid to any of these countries. My affirmative program is like that of this committee, that there must be aid. Then, of course, you break it down into whether it will be economic aid or military aid.

I don't take the position that there should be no military aid. I take the position there should be no military aid except where we have satisfactory assurances that that military aid will not be used for purposes that we and the United Nations condemn.

Now, I would like to express the need for economic aid and to urge all the economic aid possible without any military aid, because I don't think military aid in itself accomplishes the end. So far as our defense is concerned, our national security is concerned, we must also give military aid to our friends and allies abroad.

Mrs. Bolton. You know, when we have a tripartite agreement in the Near East, any money that goes to any of those countries is under agreement and neither we nor anyone else, the British, the French, the Arab States, or Israel, could really have anything more defined, more clearly and distinctly said.

Mr. Multer. I am quite in agreement with you that under the tripartite agreements we have those covenants and commitments. I don't think that with reference to the Middle East, they go far enough. I sincerely believe that if there are no peace treaties between the Arab States, vis-a-vis themselves, and between the Arab States and the State of Israel, no military aid should go into that part of the country, either to Israel or to any of the Arab States.

Mrs. Bolton. You are so convinced, then, that it is of no interest to us to strengthen our foreign defenses there and bring them into a more closely interwoven possibility of defense.

Mr. Multer. I believe that is of paramount importance and of paramount interest to us and all the peace-loving peoples of the world. But, I say before you can get to that point of taking this area, whether it is just an Arab State or the Arab States alone, or together with Israel, and strengthening them as against the Communist world, strengthening them so they can withstand aggression from without, we must first be sure that they are not going to fight among themselves.

Mrs. Bolton. That is a very interesting angle of it. I am very much interested in it because I would feel reluctant to have the nations of the world wait until the intransigents of both sides were converted to peaceful mind, with the thought that we used that very strong northern pressure. As you probably realize, within the last 2 or 3 months, the Soviet has moved into the Near East, as she has not before, and it would seem as though we would have to really consolidate a little bit with such countries as Turkey, Greece, and Pakistan, and with some of the other countries.

Mr. Multer. There is no doubt in my mind when we are dealing with Turkey, Greece, and Pakistan, we do not have that conflict between them so that we can strengthen them as against our common enemy. But, I would state my same views would apply if Greece and Turkey were fighting each other, or threatening to fight with each other, or Pakistan was threatening to fight Turkey and Greece, or Greece and Turkey against Pakistan.

Then, I would say the principle applies there, too. We dare not go in anywhere and give arms that we hope will be used against communism which only helps stir up strife among the recipients of our aid.

Mrs. Bolton. We are taking a big chance with Yugoslavia and we are taking chances in other places. In other places we don't have a tripartite agreement which holds the status quo.

Mr. Multer. At the same time, I think you will agree with me that we wouldn't have sent a dollar of aid into Yugoslavia if we weren't reasonably certain that Yugoslavia would not turn upon one of her neighbors.

Mrs. Bolton. But, we have said many times here that we are not reasonably certain; that we are taking a tremendous chance. We have said that in this committee over and over again. We haven't the remotest idea what Yugoslavia will do in a pinch. We are taking the gamble that she won't.

Mr. Multer. At least we do have the commitment from Yugoslavia, do we not?

Mrs. Bolton. We have commitments from the other states, too, in the tripartite agreement.

I am very glad to have your point of view very much, Mr. Multer.

Mr. Multer. Let me put it this way. With the agreement upon the part of Yugoslavia that she will not attack any of our friendly allies——

Mrs. Bolton. We don't have that.

Mr. Multer. Don't we have that with Yugoslavia?

Mrs. Bolton. She has gone in with Turkey and Greece and she says she is all right with us, but how about Italy? There is a constant war going on, there, you see; it is not as clear as we would like to have it. Or, with other countries.

Mr. Multer. We are not getting the threats from the other parts of the world that we get from the Middle East. Regardless of which side they come from, whether the Israeli strike back to keep the marauder from coming into their borders, or it is the other way around. You don't have the constant activity in other parts of the world.

Mrs. Bolton. We don't at the moment, I am very glad to have your point of view. Thank you very much.

Chairman Chiperfield. Are there further questions?

Mr. Javits. I would like to ask a question.

Chairman Chiperfield. Mr. Javits——

Mr. Javits. I wasn't here, Mr. Multer, when you made your direct presentation, but it seems to me that one of the points of difference between what we face in Yugoslavia and what we face in Iraq is the fact that Iraq is in a state of war with a country in the Near East, to wit, Israel. Would you care to make a comment on that?

Mr. Multer. That is one of the precise things I had in mind in discussing the matter with Mrs. Bolton a moment ago. At least outwardly there is peace between all of our allies that we are helping, outside of the Middle East area. In the Middle East area, we have an armed truce which is being constantly violated by one side or the other. Who initiates the violation is immaterial. The violations are occurring daily. We have constant threats emanating from some of the Arab States that they are just waiting for the opportune moment to step in and take what they claim is theirs, despite the United Nations decrees and edicts to the contrary.

Mrs. Bolton. With what forces are they going to take them? I didn't know they had any real forces with which they could take anything.

Mr. Multer. You are referring now to the Arab States not having any forces?

Mrs. Bolton. Yes.

Mr. Multer. I did not know they claimed not to have any forces, but they are certainly using arms and whether they recognize the bearers of the arms as their own armed soldiers, or not, the fact of the matter is that the Arabs are constantly moving in and out of the Israel borders.

Mrs. Bolton. Yes; I think that is happening on both sides.

Mr. Multer. That is what I say, no matter who initiates it, is immaterial to this discussion. The fact of the matter is, the constant scrapping is going on and they are using arms. It has gone beyond the point of just threats. There have been no threats out of the State of Israel, but there have been threats, open, public statements out of the Arab States that they will move in. They implemented those threats at least to the extent of the armed incursions for which they then say they are not responsible. If these sovereign states are going to deny responsibility for these armed acts of invasion which occur daily, how can we possibly consider giving them more arms? The least we should get is the commitment in writing from them that this is going to stop, that they are not going to use these arms and this military aid for warfare among themselves. We are giving it to them to stand off a common enemy. We ought to at least have the very firm commitment that there will be no more threats and there will be no more of this armed incursion, to use the milder term.

Mr. Javits. My collegaue knows, as in every committee, we'll be discussing this when we are to mark up the bill. I think we are interested in this point of view and in the facts, and I think it is a fact that Iraq and the other Arab States have organized armies. Otherwise, we would not be contemplating aid to equip forces; we must be convinced that there are forces in being.

Mr. Multer. There is no doubt the manpower is there.

Mr. Javits. The Iraquis actually have an organized army. There is no use in our negating the fact.

The important thing I would like to understand is my colleague's argument so we have it of record: Do I understand, then, that adding the responsibilities upon us in the three-power declaration, which gives us a special interest in seeing that there is no aggression or renewal of active hostilities, plus the climate of the area, the statements made, the border incidents, plus what we gain through furnishing more supplies in terms of anti-Communist defense, that on balance you plead as one of our colleagues that we do not get any net gain—on the contrary we get losses and, therefore, we shouldn't do it.

Mr. Multer. I think that is a fair summary of my position. I think we should prefer at this time to gamble every dollar that we allocate to that area, in economic aid which will reach the people even though they remain unarmed, as against using any part of this for military aid to that area, to any of the people in that area. Particularly, because the military experts have told us that all the military aid we are sending there cannot withstand an onslaught from Soviet Russia if she should move in on that area of the world.

So, instead of sending in materiel that may perhaps be captured by the Russians and used against us, let us concentrate on giving the people the economic assistance they need. I think that is a better gamble than sending military aid in there, with the status of that area, what it is today.

Mr. Javits. Thank you, Mr. Multer.

Mr. Smith. Following up that argument, Mr. Multer, then would you you say that by the same reasoning we ought not to send anything to Europe? I don't think I have heard a military man yet say that so far as the defense of Europe is concerned that the Russians couldn't move from East Berlin to the seacoast in 4 or 5 weeks.

Mr. Multer. I think the situation there is slightly different unless you have information which you have received in executive session which is contrary to much of the information I have with reference to Europe.

For instance, in Spain. I advocated military aid to Spain at a time when it was very unpopular to do so. I advocated the military aid be in such a way that we, the United States, would go in and build the basis, provided we could have control of such bases of operation. And, I think all of Europe is a base of operations for us.

Now, if you were going to say this military aid we were sending into the Middle East must be used to establish bases for us, the United States, and we will be in control of that military aid and those defense bases that we build there, I'd say let's do it. But, the situation, I think, is different. When you are going to go in and arm people who are constantly scrapping among themselves, the chances of their finally using it against the common enemy are not so good.

Mr. Smith. I can only say to you in response to that statement, this, that we were in the area last fall, and our military people who were there seemed to think that we had to do this very thing. I think we are up against that very practical problem, where the military feels that we must have the bases, and I have assumed, at least, that the bases were going to be used for our defense, or part of our defense system.

Now, it may be that you have other information which would lead you to conclude that we would get a different result.

Mr. Multer. I have been in the area twice, but I have not been there recently.

If the military aid that would be allocated under the bill that you have before you, or any bill that has heretofore been enacted is going to be used to establish our bases in this area, I would not raise any objections against it, but if it is to arm the people in the area, either in the Arab States or in Israel, then I say until they have made commitments, satisfactory commitments, that they will not war upon each other, until they have entered into treaties of peace one with the other and given us assurance that the arms will not be used against each other but only against the common enemy, we should not send in that kind of military aid. Building up bases is another story. I go along with you there. Just as we are doing it in Europe. All of this is a calculated risk, but I think there is less danger of losing where we are going in and building bases that are going to be made available to us.

I didn't think such was the situation in the Middle East. For instance, when they are attempting to drive the British out of the Middle East where we know that the British forces that are there today are not there to fight the Arabs, or to fight the Israelis, that they are there to fight the common enemy if there should be an attack, yet there is an attempt to move them out of there.

Now, are we going to move the British out of there and move in ourselves and take over the bases, or are we going to go along with those Arabs who say none of us should be in there?

Mr. Smith. Our military people are saying that the British should remain there and if not the British then ourselves, because they consider it very vital insofar as the whole Middle Eastern defense area is concerned.

Mr. Multer. You see, Mr. Smith, I draw the distinction between sending in military aid which will be in bases under our control and just sending in military supplies which will be entirely under the control of belligerent sovereign states.

Mr. Bentley. Mr. Multer, if we terminate military aid, as you suggest, for the time being in your statement, do you think there is a possibility that they might be coming in from other sources?

Mr. Multer. If that possibility exists, the sooner we find it out, the better. If there is a possibility—the only other source would be from a Communist source, and if they will turn from us now when we don't give them military aid and take military aid from the Communist source now——

Mr. Bentley. You are speaking of any of the middle eastern states?

Mr. Multer. Any of the Middle East; yes. Any part of the that area, if they should turn on us because we wouldn't give them military aid and take it from a Communist source, we better stop all aid, including economic aid. If they do that, then they are not friends of ours and we can't rely on them. I think that is one very simple way of testing it.

Chairman Chiperfield. Thank you very much, Mr. Multer. I believe that is all the questions. We appreciate your coming before us.

Mr. Multer. Thank you again, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, for the opportunity to be here.

Chairman Chiperfield. We will proceed in executive session.

Vocational Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 7, 1954

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend and revise my remarks, I set forth specifically some of the telegrams and letters which I have received from people in Louisiana supporting the increase in the appropriation for vocational education. They are as follows:

Ruston, La., *June 3, 1954.*

Hon. Overton Brooks,
United States Congressman,
House Chamber, Washington, D. C.:

The Louisiana Agricultural Teachers Association, representing 251 teachers of vocational agriculture in Louisiana, assembled today in Ruston, La., passed a resolution requesting your support and interest in securing the full $29 million authorized in the George-Barden act of Congress for vocational education. We will appreciate anything you can do to amend the proposal on the House floor to secure the badly needed additional funds for our State.

C. Ulmer,
President, Louisiana Agricultural Teachers Association.
Zachary, La.

Ruston, La., *June 3, 1954.*

Hon. Overton Brooks,
United States Congressman,
House Chamber, Washington, D. C.:

The Louisiana Association of Future Farmers of America, representing more than 9,000 members, assembled today in Ruston, La., passed a resolution requesting your support to work in the interest of securing the full $29 million authorized in the George-Barden act of Congress for vocational education. We will appreciate anything that you can do to amend the proposal on the House floor to secure the badly needed additional funds for our State.

Billy Pesnell,
President, Louisiana Association of Future Farmers of America.
Ruston, La.

St. Joseph, La., *June 4, 1954.*

Hon. Overton Brooks,
House of Representatives, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Vocational education funds are very important in providing adequate training of girls and boys in public schools. Urge you to support bill providing for maximum amount.

Louisiana Association of Future Homemakers of America,
Judith Clower, *President.*

Lake Charles, La., *June 4, 1954.*

Hon. Overton Brooks,
Member of Congress,
House of Representatives:

More than 1,500 vocational teachers in Louisiana request your vigorous support for full $29.3 million vocational fund as authorized by George Barden.

Rex H. Smelser,
President, Louisiana Vocational Association.

Lafayette, La., *June 4, 1954.*

Hon. Overton Brooks,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

The Louisiana Home Economics Association urge unlimited support to vocational educational bill.

Marie Louise Comeaux,
President, Louisiana Home Economics Association.

Natchitoches, La., *June 5, 1954.*

Congressman Overton Brooks,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Urge your support of the vocational education appropriation bill and the amendment.

Cecile Melacon,
President, Central District, Future Homemakers of America.

Union Parish Trade School,
Farmerville, La., June 5, 1954.

Hon. Overton Brooks,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Congressman: I would appreciate it very much if you would use your influence and vote toward securing the full $29.3 million that vocational education needs to do an adequate job of training the hands and minds of the youth and adults of this area.

I feel that there is no better investment our Government can make than money used to train the greatest asset we have—our citizens.

If you feel that this program is worthwhile, it would be appreciated if you would support it.

Sincerely yours,
W. C. Wilhite, Jr.,
Director.

BIENVILLE TRADES SCHOOL,
Ringgold, La., May 25, 1954.

Hon. OVERTON BROOKS,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BROOKS: You may recall that on April 1, 1954, I wrote you concerning the George-Barden funds for vocational education. The A. F. of L. and the CIO have gone on record requesting that the full $29.3 million be appropriated under this act.

I asked you on April 1 if you would take a definite stand for or against this bill. It is my understanding that the office of education officials appeared before the House subcommittee on May 13, 1954.

Your reply of April 13, 1954, assured me that you would give this close consideration when it reached the House floor. I believe that it will reach the floor around June 1 and I trust that you have by now decided that you will or will not support this bill.

Would you please advise me as to what your stand is?

Sincerely yours,
WILLIAM H. ARMSTRONG,
Director.

Address by Nelson A. Rockefeller, Under Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, at the 90th Commencement, Gallaudet College, Washington, D. C., June 5, 1954

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HOMER THORNBERRY

OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 8, 1954

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, last Saturday, June 5, Gallaudet College, the world's only college for the deaf, observed its 90th commencement exercises.

Those of us who have had the privilege to be associated with the program of this great college are very proud of its splendid contribution to the education of the deaf. We have been and are concerned over the lack of physical facilities on its campus and are hopeful that soon the Congress will provide the funds which will help to make it a first-class college and allow all qualified applicants to obtain a college education.

At the commencement exercises Saturday, it was my privilege to listen to the inspiring address delivered by the Honorable Nelson A. Rockefeller, Under Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. I believe it is interesting to note here that his address, while delivered orally by Mr. Rockefeller, was translated into sign language while he spoke.

Mr. Rockefeller's tribute to the college and his advice and counsel to the graduates was both timely and well chosen. Because I believe every Member of Congress will find it extremely interesting, I respectfully include Mr. Rockefeller's address in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It follows:

I am very happy to return once again to this inspiring campus, which is making such an outstanding contribution to America and the world.

Gallaudet is dedicated to the advancement of the individual. The same noble cause is the mission of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. We are proud indeed that the interest of the Federal Government in Gallaudet College is expressed through the Department.

Since taking up my present duties, I have learned much of Gallaudet's history and tradition. This is a story well known to many of you. It is a rich and fascinating tale, however, to those who do not know it.

We are all in the debt of that modest but resolute young man of 20, Edward Miner Gallaudet, who came to Washington in 1857 to found a college. The steadfast purpose of Amos Kendall—and his wisdom in the ways of Washington—were well joined with Gallaudet's vision and determination.

Together they finally interested Congress and the President in a college for the deaf. The country was then at war—torn in the greatest struggle that has yet embroiled us. No matter. Lincoln took time to think of plowshares as well as swords.

Founding this college was another great act of emancipation.

It is noteworthy, also, to recall that Gallaudet College was the outcome of political efforts by Kendall—a Jacksonian Democrat—and the party of President Lincoln. From that beginning, as Edward Gallaudet has recorded, "Men of both the great parties have always appeared to befriend the college."

Building by building, Gallaudet has grown in the 90 years since its founding. It has grown, too, in purpose and capacity. Today it trains scientists as well as teachers and sends forth architects and accountants, cartographers, and librarians.

Nor has Gallaudet neglected the international obligations that rest upon every institution of learning. In some countries, as you know, the talents of deaf young men and women are not so widely recognized. This is one reason Gallaudet has welcomed students from around the world.

Although Gallaudet has grown through the years, it has never been able to catch up with its expanding needs—not to mention its advancing goals. To be sure, its task—like that of any college—is virtually unbounded.

Be that as it may, today the disparity between Gallaudet's needs and Gallaudet's resources is far too great. In recent years especially—when many other humanitarian ventures were being forwarded—the needs of this unique institution were somehow ignored or overlooked.

Let me assure you, however, that you have many stanch friends, who are all working together to help build up Gallaudet.

Your president, Dr. Elstad, is outstanding and your board of directors is extremely able. We of the present administration have been proud to help as have, of course, the many Members of Congress who take a deep interest in the progress of the college.

Your alumni have been very loyal. And as the general public has come to know more about Gallaudet and its splendid work, philanthropy, too, has aided you.

It is that sort of cooperation—for an unselfish end—by Government and private citizens that is so essentially American—and so superbly democratic.

In the last few days, as you all know, your friends have made wonderful progress.

This week the Senate passed, and soon President Eisenhower will sign, the bill granting Gallaudet a new charter and consolidating its basic legislation.

The time for all to recognize that Kendall Green is primarily the seat of a national college has been long overdue. That is why this bill names this entire establishment Gallaudet College.

The new charter, as you know, establishes—for the first time—an unequivocal relationship between the college and the Government. It also gives to your board of directors the powers and privileges normally enjoyed by the trustees of a public or private college.

This week also the appropriations committee of the House of Representatives reported out a bill which included funds for the construction of a new library and classroom building.

With Federal support joined to the gifts of your alumni, and through the generosity of the Meyer Foundation, Gallaudet will—if the Congress agrees—gain its first major new building in 37 years.

Surely its centennial—only a decade away—will find Gallaudet a much stronger and sounder institution. To help bring this about, we bespeak you to continue your efforts to enlist the interest of the public at large.

My own experiences with Gallaudet and the Kendall School have made a deep and lasting impression. I have gained a warm and friendly feeling for this dedicated faculty and their eager students.

This convinces me that—as the American people learn more about Gallaudet and its unique educational mission—they will support it with their traditional warmhearted generosity.

Now I should like to speak specifically to the class of 1954.

Throughout the land, in this springtime of hope and opportunity, many schools are holding graduation exercises. Among the schools which are sending the youth of the new generation out into the world, Gallaudet College on this occasion holds inspirational meaning for all of us.

Here is a reminder that worldly affairs are shaped by the qualities of the human spirit, by the courage to dare and to do, by the will to struggle and to win over obstacles, by love and understanding for others, by aspiration for freedom and for a better life, by faith in human capacity to achieve an age of peace.

Life essentially is struggle against obstacles. Gallaudet College is an expression of that impulse to struggle against obstacles which has lifted mankind out of the darkness of savagery into the light of civilization, science, cooperative effort among people and among nations.

The light of the future shines here in the courage and hope, in the determination to overcome obstacles, which the youth of this school have shown in their quest for knowledge.

What you have learned here of the arts and the sciences, of history and philosophy, will be useful in meeting the problems of life. But greater than any of these is the essential truth of life, the knowledge that progress is spun out of the intangibles of the human spirit.

That essential knowledge surely is implanted deeply in the hearts and in the minds of each of you who have risen above obstacles by the strength of your will and your faith, by your courage and determination to achieve in spite of handicaps.

The courage to dare and to do, to experiment, to seek the truth and live by the truth, is the great unseen force in human affairs; by this mighty force mankind learned the secret of fire and the secret of the atom.

And now, with courage and endurance, we seek to move on to a wider world order of peace and security, to more health and educational facilities for the millions, to more goods and services for all through the use of mechanical power, to a society of freedom and opportunity for the individual.

Who doubts that these goals will be achieved?

In the long record of human achievement, from the primitive struggle of the cave to the strivings of a Beethoven or a Lincoln, the main line of progress is clearly shown. Out of the endless cycles of time and tide, there emerges a great design which justifies unbounded faith in human capacity to overcome the hazards and the obstacles of the times.

So long as courage fortifies the will as strongly as it does here at Gallaudet College, there is no reason to despair for the future nor to doubt that we shall find a way out of our troubles and the solutions to the conflict which divides East and West.

One truth we hold, however, to be fundamental in this conflict—courage and faith, love and understanding, are qualities best nurtured in an environment of freedom for the individual. The impulse to experiment with the unknown in search for the truth is not called forth by compulsion. Nor does love for one's fellowmen thrive on fear and terror.

No, the qualities of mind and heart which have shaped human destiny toward democracy and Christianity, toward the cooperative spirit of the United Nations, are those which are nourished by liberty and opportunity to develop as God gave one talents and will to develop.

Your generation is privileged to take a larger part in the unprecedented tasks of shaping human destiny toward peace, cooperation among nations, the advance of science and technology for the improving of living standards on a world scale, the growth of an international order which will give the enormous productive potentials of the nations—electricity, atomic energy and all other aspects of modern technology—fuller outlet in providing a better life for people everywhere.

In the United Nations, in the inter-American system of cooperation, in a widening variety of public and private enterprises, the pattern of an international order of development for peaceful ends is emerging. What has already been accomplished but points the way to achievements in a still larger design of international amity.

Here is opportunity for achievement calling for the highest qualities of the human spirit, for daring innovations, sympathy and understanding for others, the will to persevere in face of obstacles, faith in human capacity to learn and experience and to use reason, and stout belief in man's capacity to continue the quest for truth in his long climb up the slopes of progress.

Much of the responsibility for leadership now rests upon America. That is why I say your generation has historic tasks ahead of it. Take up these tasks with courage and good will, to understand and work with other peoples of the world toward common goals.

In that spirit will a new age of peace and order be achieved.

Correction of Remarks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 7, 1954

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to insert in the Record the following statement by me which appeared in the Record of June 7, page A4224 of the Appendix. I am most anxious to do this since a typographical error completely changed the meaning of my remarks. Many people have called it to my attention, and I feel it is important to make the correction. The statement is as follows:

Mr. Speaker, some people enjoy the idea of rushing frantically into every situation with either legislation or executive action. The moment a difficulty arises anywhere they want to pass a bill or issue an order. Fortunately for the Nation, the legislative and executive branches of our Government are not so easily stampeded into precipitate action.

A few months ago, labor leaders were mobilizing for marches on Congress, for special legislative sessions. They were reviving old anti-Republican slogans and preparing to lay the blame on their traditional target, the GOP. A strange silence has suddenly fallen upon the "gloommongers." They have discovered national unemployment dropping, construction contracts rising, farm prices lifting, metal markets strengthening, and the whole picture one of new confidence in the prospects for future developments.

With the construction of large new units by automobile manufacturers, air-conditioning companies, and other major industries, there can be little doubt that the country is betting on a good year of business activity all around.

It's Time Our River Went To Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALT HORAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 9, 1954

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the Record, I am pleased to include an editorial from the Wenatchee Daily World. I was born on the banks of this great river and have watched its growth. There is, as the editorial points out, much yet to do in order that wasted energy and wasted benefits be put to use.

The editorial follows:

IT'S TIME OUR RIVER WENT TO WORK

Once again in north-central Washington, as happens each spring, our streams are rising, floods are in the making, and millions of tons of water will pour down from our mountainsides into our streams and out to sea in a mad orgy of lost and wasted waterpower.

Not only is the huge potential power that lies latent in these tons of water lost and wasted, but in those uncontrolled floodwaters lies a destructive force that rips out roads, devastates farmlands, disrupts railroad services, destroys homes, and even takes human life.

And yet, we could use every bit of this power if we just had it harnessed.

It's time we put it to work without further delay.

Anyone who stands along the shores of the Columbia, or any other stream of this area during the next few weeks and watches this uncontrolled floodwater rolling unchecked past our cities and towns cannot help but feel a tinge of sadness that such waste is permitted.

For uncounted centuries it has gone on.

But its day of unchained licentiousness is nearing an end.

Engineers, utility districts, reclamation planners, flood-control engineers, all have been eyeing this economic waste for years and it won't be long until something is done about it.

Then will come dams, until the mighty Columbia will be a succession of lakes and pools, each impounding its share of the waters and feeding them downstream in a controlled and orderly manner, after extracting the last ounce of power as it passes through the hydroelectric turbines on the way down.

When that time comes, the force and fury that now rages uncontrolled will be tamed and put to work, turning washing machines in countless homes, powering industrial plants, irrigating what is now wasteland.

The plans for all this are already clearly mapped by our engineers and planners.

The carrying out of these plans takes time, but each year the goal is brought a little closer. The taming of the Columbia is near at hand, and it is about time.

The rip-roaring, slap-bang days when the river did as she pleased may have been all right for her as an untamed youth, but they have lasted long enough.

It's time she grew up, settled down, and went to work.

The Bryson Bill, H. R. 1227

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE L. HAYS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1954

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include four petitions forwarded to me by Mrs. L. Bower, president of the Women's Christian Temperance Union of Harrison County, Ohio.

The petitions follow:

To our Representatives in Congress:

We, the undersigned, your constituents, earnestly beg you to give consideration to our constitutional rights as American citizens to be free in our homes of an offensive invasion by those who wish to increase their huge profits from the sales of alcoholic beverages by high-pressure advertising directed through magazines, newspapers, and over radio and television, at our children. We urge you to obtain consideration of and pass the Bryson bill (H. R. 1227).

Mamie Host, Elizabeth Dick, Blanche Bower, Ola Crawford, Elizabeth Roth, Hazel Edie, Emma Edie, Mary Bontrager, H. L. Brown, F. D. Strausbaugh, Myron Ramsey, Blanche Price, Mary F. Hilligas, C. G. Hilligas, Leota B. Host, Bowerston, Ohio; Hattie H. Hunt, Uhrichsville, Ohio; G. A. Bower, Bowerston, Ohio; H. B. Hunt, Uhrichsville, Ohio; W. R. Swinehart, E. G. Bishop, Ania Miller, Ella Mull, Bowerstown, Ohio.

To Our Representatives in Congress:

We, the undersigned, your constituents, earnestly beg you to give consideration to our constitutional rights as American citizens to be free in our homes of an offensive invasion by those who wish to increase their huge profits from the sales of alcoholic beverages by high-pressure advertising directed through magazines, newspapers, and over radio and television, at our children. We urge you to obtain consideration of and pass the Bryson bill (H. R. 1227).

Mrs. Blanche McGill, Mrs. Hazel Baldwin, Mrs. W. E. Heavlin, Mrs. W. W. Ralph, Mrs. Ernest E. Ross, Dennison, Ohio; Mrs. Maxine Price, Uhrichsville, Ohio; Grace Carmack, Mary Agnes Ritchey, Pauline H. Reed, Rev. Walter W. Ralph, Mrs. Frances Raush, Joseph K. Ritchey, Rudy Wenger, Emil Redevun, Birney Carmack, Clara Wenger, Paul C. Wenger, Marian E. Wenger, Anna Butler, Mrs. Harry Patterson, Delmer McGill, Mrs. Delmer McGill, George McGill, Dennison, Ohio.

To our Representatives in Congress:

We, the undersigned, your constituents, earnestly beg you to give consideration to our constitutional rights as American citizens to be free in our homes of an offensive invasion by those who wish to increase their huge profits from the sales of alcoholic beverages by high-pressure advertising directed through magazines, newspapers, and over radio and television, at our children. We urge you to obtain consideration of and pass the Bryson bill (H. R. 1227).

Margaret B. Wright, Gladys G. Wilson, Twyla Thompson, Melissa Stewart, Olive Salmon, Eva Thompson, Lydia Bargar, Pearl Arbaugh, Vivien L. Reid, Gentea Harriman, Jewett, Ohio; May M. Crawford, Bowerston, Ohio; Doris Zimmerman, Alice Arbaugh, Jewett, Ohio; Anna L. Bower, Priscilla Millhorn, H. C. Millhorn, W. B. Masters, W. E. Masters, Margaret Thomas, William J. Ronada, H. H. Scott, Jr., Bowerston, Ohio.

To Our Representatives in Congress:

We, the undersigned, your constituents, earnestly beg you to give consideration to our constitutional rights as American citizens to be free in our homes of an offensive invasion by those who wish to increase their huge profits from the sales of alcoholic beverages by high-pressure advertising directed through magazines, newspapers, and over radio and television at our children. We urge you to obtain consideration of and pass the Bryson bill (H. R. 1227):

Mary Palmer, Dennison, Ohio; Mrs. Vesla Grimes, Mrs. Margaret Gibson, Bowerston, Ohio; Katherine Chaney, Dennison, Ohio; Ivy M. Unger, Guadenhutten, Ohio; Margaret Grimes, Dennison, Ohio; Laura Host, Bowerston, Ohio; Hattie Wright, R. B. Dallas, Mrs. R. J. Chaney, Mary Warner, Emerson T. Warner, Calvin Unger, William L. Chaney, Dennison, Ohio; Howard Caldwell, Mrs. Betty Caldwell, Bowerston, Ohio; J. J. Wagner, Philadelphia, Pa.; Alma Custer, Jessie Wilson, Walt Wilson, Bowerston, Ohio; Mary M. Stauffer, Leesville, Ohio.

Amending the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag of the United States

SPEECH

OF

HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 7, 1954

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, on May 5, 1954, I appeared before a subcommittee of the House Judiciary Committee in support of House Joint Resolution 479, amending the joint resolution of June 22, 1942, with respect to the pledge of allegiance to the flag. I pointed out that this year our country celebrated the 145th anniversary of the birth of Abraham Lincoln. President Lincoln recognized that only under God could this Nation win a new birth of freedom. I would like to quote the last sentence from President Lincoln's Gettysburg Address:

> It is rather for us to be dedicated to the great task remaining before us—that from these honored dead we take increased devotion to that cause for which they gave the last full measure of devotion—that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain—that this Nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom—and that government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth.

The State of Wisconsin and 46 other States recognize in the preambles of their constitutions the authority of Almighty God.

I can only say that the importance of favorable action of the House on House Joint Resolution 243, which is the resolution now before us similar to the one introduced by me and other Members, cannot be overemphasized.

Statement by James E. Folsom, Governor-Nominate of Alabama, Before the Task Force on Water Resources and Power Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, Chattanooga, Tenn., June 1, 1954

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT RAINS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1954

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Speaker, recently Governor-nominate James E. Folsom appeared before the Task Force on Water Resources and Power, Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, at Chattanooga, and presented his views, and those of a great majority of the citizens of the State of Alabama, on TVA. I commend the reading of his statement to Members of Congress and all people interested in TVA:

> Gentlemen of the task force, as a former Governor and presently as Governor-nominate of the State of Alabama, I am personally familiar with the great accomplishments of the Tennessee Valley Authority and I am here to urge you to leave the TVA alone—to let it continue to perform capably and without Washington interference under the TVA Act.
>
> I know how the people of Alabama and the whole valley region feel about TVA. They are for it. And they have long known me as a strong and appreciative supporter of TVA. In the recent primary election in our State, I carried every county in Alabama served by the TVA. So they think nearly as much of me as I do of the valley people and the TVA.
>
> Under my approaching administration, there will not be any need for the people of my State to have to look to the Governor of Tennessee to carry the full burden of appearing wherever the cause of the TVA is being discussed and debated. I shall be there with him to represent the people of the Tennessee Valley section of Alabama and Tennessee—and, in fact, to speak for all of the people of our State. In other words, I shall be on hand, just as I am here today, to help fight the battles of TVA.
>
> We in Alabama are for TVA because it has not only reduced the cost of electricity—a basic commodity today in the lives of nearly all American citizens—but because of many, many other contributions it has made in the total resource development of the Tennessee Valley region.
>
> There is a lot of loose talk about the TVA not paying taxes. The TVA has been making payments in lieu of taxes to the State and to the counties and municipalities concerned, ever since it first began operating. The official report just released by the Tennessee Valley Authority shows that the State of Alabama and the affected counties will have received in the current fiscal year a total of $650,095 in the form of in-lieu tax payments. While we do not yet have the figures covering payments in lieu of taxes to the municipalities, I can tell you that they will be sizable—in the neighborhood of a half million dollars. So, as an answer to those who say that TVA does not pay taxes, let me remind you that in excess of a million dollars a year is being paid by the Authority in lieu of taxes in my own State of Alabama. This is considerably more than private power company operations ever produced in the same area.
>
> The people of my State are strong for the TVA because of its major contributions made to the agricultural industry of our State and region—in fact, to the entire Nation, through the development of new high-analysis nitrate and phosphate fertilizers that made possible a gradual but steady switch from soil-depleting row crops to cover crops and others connected with dairying and cattle-raising. So successful has been the TVA method of teaching by demonstrations that now 15 north Alabama counties have increased the use of fertilizer 245 percent—from 102,500 tons in 1935 to 354,000 tons by 1951—contrasted with a 147 percent gain in fertilizer use in the rest of the State during the same period.
>
> Just what the TVA-recommended methods have meant in the 15 valley counties of Alabama was clearly shown in a special study conducted in 1953 showing comparisons with 52 nonvalley counties. Between 1939 and 1949 net farm income increased 172 percent, compared with 137 percent in the nonvalley area of the State. Cotton yields in the valley went up from 227 pounds per acre (1930–34) to 320 pounds in the period 1946–51, compared with an increase from 173 to 260 pounds in the rest of the State. Corn production increased from 14.7 bushels per acre to 24.7 bushels per acre in the valley, and from 11.1 bushels to 16.8 bushels per acre outside the valley area. Under TVA-suggested practices, forage changed considerably in the valley—16 percent of the hay coming from alfalfa in 1949 as compared with 1 percent in 1934, while the alfalfa increase in the rest of the State ran from only 1 to 3 percent. (See p. 41, 1953 Annual Report of TVA.)
>
> In a sense, I am here today as a representative of one-half of the TVA partnership. As you know, the ownership and management of the distribution systems in the Tennessee Valley are in the hands of the local people and their elected representatives. It is accurate to say that in no other region of the country do the ultimate consumers of electric power have greater control of their power distribution systems than in the area served by TVA.
>
> The Federal half of the partnership is, of course, the generation and transmission of power. The local half is made up of the 148 publicly owned distribution systems, of which 97 are municipally owned. At the end of fiscal 1953 the assets of these 148 systems totaled nearly $400,000,000, which is approximately the same amount of money invested in TVA power generating facilities serving the needs of the valley people, as contrasted with atomic energy defense needs. So, both in terms of job-sharing and cost-sharing, the TVA electric system is truly a partnership between the Federal Government and local interests, a partnership policy which surely should square with the publicly announced aims and objectives of the national administration in this area of activity.
>
> Nor has this arrangement been imposed from above on the people of the valley. In every case the people themselves voted to get rid of the private power companies and

their local electric service and turn to the TVA as a source of low-cost electricity.

Gentlemen, I submit that the people of the valley are upholding their end of the partnership, and it is up to you and Congress, it seems to me, to make sure the Federal Government meets its end. In brief, this means that TVA must be operated and maintained at maximum efficiency, as promised by the President when a candidate.

Permit me to say just a few more words on the people's contribution to the effectiveness of the partnership. We have used the opportunities presented us by the efficient development of our natural resources to increase our own economic welfare and thereby to make a larger contribution to the support of the Nation as a whole. Twenty years ago, gentlemen, we paid into the Federal Treasury only a little more than 3 percent of all Federal income taxes collected in the country. Today that figure is over 6 percent. It should be a source of gratification to you and the administration that the Tennessee Valley, under the stimulus of the TVA development, is bearing a fairer share of the general costs of Government than it did 20 years ago.

Moreover, because we made use of the wonderful opportunity to build electricity into our lives, so to speak, we stimulated the tremendous expansion of the TVA system. And although it may be immodest to say so, we believe our unprecedented use of electricity and the consequent expansion of the TVA system made possible a convenient, ready-made source of electricity for the Government to develop the atomic bomb. We do not want any special credit for this, but we believe it is a factor to be kept in mind by Congress and by your Commission in considering the Nation's obligation to TVA and the Tennessee Valley.

I believe it is also fair to say that the TVA and its power consumers have proved to be great friends of the private power companies surrounding the TVA area. TVA has shown them how to make money. It is significant that some of the lowest private power rates in the country are charged by the private systems operating in States and areas adjoining TVA. Unquestionably, this is due to the example of the TVA yardstick. Coupled with the reduction of rates in private-power territory surrounding TVA has been an above-normal increase in common stock earnings. Common stock earnings of private power companies, nationwide, have doubled since TVA began power operations; but common stock earnings of the private power companies in the 8 States surrounding TVA have increased 5 times. As I say, TVA has shown private power companies how to make money. There is much to be said for the formula of high use and low cost.

Gentlemen, permit me to conclude my testimony by pointing out that there are many other benefits that have come to the valley region as a result of the TVA program, including an ever-growing use of the Tennessee River for freight transportation by barge line at great savings to shippers and consumers. As a result of this, numerous new industries have started up and old ones expanded. The vast benefits accruing from flood-control measures that have harnessed a once-wild river for the benefit of mankind are not to be overlooked. Then there's the great advance in the public health through the elimination of mosquitoes causing malaria that formerly attacked at least 30 percent of valley residents each year, taking them out of the ranks of workers and causing great economic losses to themselves and to our whole area.

Nor do we in Alabama overlook the major defense contribution our industries were able to make in World War II because of river transportation, making it possible to build seagoing vessels inland and send them to deep water to carry out their appointed tasks. The chemical plants produced many tons of chemicals needed in munitions of war.

Gentlemen of the Task Force, we ask that you recommend to the administration in Washington that the TVA be allowed to carry on on the basis of its proven record and program of regional development through the wise use of water, land and forests for the good of our people—and to the everlasting credit and benefit of the whole Nation.

H. R. 9447

SPEECH

OF

HON. DeWITT S. HYDE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1954

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 9447) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, I commend the committee for its fine work on this entire bill, but particularly I commend the members of the committee on its appropriation for aid to federally impacted areas. I note that the committee appropriated $70 million for school construction, which was $4 million less than the request, but it is comforting to note that in its report, the committee said:

> If the Department's guess proves to have been better than the committee's a supplemental appropriation will be in order any time before July 1, 1955.

I take this to mean that, at least by inference, if the Department finds that it needs the extra $4 million, the committee will not hesitate to make the appropriation.

I should also like to take this opportunity to suggest to the committee a careful study of the possibility of some different formula for distributing the money appropriated for Federal aid to impacted areas. As I understand it, the present formula is largely based on the number of children whose parents work in Federal installations within the jurisdiction of the district, county, city, or other area receiving the money. Such a formula does not adequately take care of the problem of areas such as those in Maryland and Virginia, adjacent to the District of Columbia in which live thousands of Government employees who work within the District of Columbia. As a matter of fact, most of the impact in such areas is caused by the expansion of Government employment in a jurisdiction—District of Columbia—outside of the areas receiving the money. A different formula is vitally important to such areas because the only business or industry except the usual service businesses is the "business" of Government. Taxation for schools and other services in such areas is at the present time obtained solely from real property, and that real property is almost entirely composed of residences.

The committee's careful consideration of this problem is respectfully and urgently requested.

Bryson Bill, H. R. 1227

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE L. HAYS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 9, 1954

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a petition forwarded to me by Pearl Walker, of Salem, Ohio:

To Our Representatives in Congress:

We, the undersigned, your constituents earnestly beg you to give consideration to our constitutional rights as American citizens to be free in our homes of an offensive invasion by those who wish to increase their huge profits from the sales of alcoholic beverages by high-pressure advertising directed through magazines, newspapers, and over radio and television, at our children. We urge you to obtain consideration of and pass the Bryson bill (H. R. 1227).

Milford Landmert, Mae Montgomery, Clara Stewart, Mrs. Ray Pearce, Mrs. Dolores Dickey, Mrs. Nora Fitzpatrick, Mr. R. D. Johnston, Mrs. R. D. Johnston, Jerome Eagleton, Bertha Eagleton, Mrs. Scott Warner, Salem, Ohio; Laura M. Bartges, Beloit, Ohio; Margaret Wank, Columbiana, Ohio; Ruth Ingram, E. F. Ackelson, L. C. Woeshey, Shirley Holloway, Alice Greenawalt, Mrs. Anna Lutos, Mrs. Beulah Harveth, Mrs. Clyde Oman, Salem, Ohio; Mrs. Leon Breckenridge, Beloit, Ohio; Mrs. Sam Paxson, Salem, Ohio; Stella Pelhicain, Ellsworth, Ohio; Peggy Thomas, Canfield, Ohio; Rilda Fowler, Salen, Ohio; Mrs. Hennon, Smith Corner; Mrs. Scheiber, Leetonia, Ohio; Hasel Tanner, Columbiana, Ohio; Mrs. H. J. Barnes, Berlen Center, Ohio; Mrs. Jabob Maurer, Mrs. Voletta Bohmer, Salem, Ohio; Mrs. Florie Delmont, Berlen Center, Ohio; Mrs. Geo. Goodman, Mrs. Carson Maysle, Salem, Ohio; Mrs. Myrtle Paterson, Berlen Center, Ohio.

Mrs. M. D. Waithman, Mrs. Louie Ramsey, Mrs. N. Berninger, Salem, Ohio; Mrs. Marian Barnes, Mr. Richard Barnes, Berlin Center, Ohio; M. K. Rickman, Mrs. Jean Adams, Mrs. Barbara Knopp, Mrs. John Kesseg, John Kesseg, Julius J. Phillips, William J. Jury, John J. Demes, Jr., Shirley Steinmetz, Salem, Ohio; David E. Barth, Carol Barth, Poland, Ohio; Margaret Clingerman, Ray Tanner, Columbiana, Ohio; Norbert Berninger, Sam Paxson, Rev. Clarence W. Hahn, Salem, Ohio; Florie Delmont, Berlin Center, Ohio; M. D. Waithman, Salem, Ohio; Lester H. Scheiben, Leetonia, Ohio; Emery Barnes, Berlin Center, Ohio; George Goodman, Columbiana, Ohio; Carson Marple, Chas. Greenawalt, Steve Hanuth, Cylde Owen, Sharman Steinmetz, Salem, Ohio; Harold Barnes, Berlin Center, Ohio.

PRICE OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

The Public Printer is authorized to furnish to subscribers the daily RECORD at $1.50 per month, payable in advance.

Remit by money order payable to Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C.

4

ly

on
r-

S

an-
in-
by

ents
to
citi-
sive
heir
bev-
cted
ra-
urge
the

Clara
lores
. D.
rome
Scott
rtges,
iana,
L. C.
wait,
Mrs.
reck-
xson,
orth,
Rilda
Smith
Hazel
arnes,
aurer,
Mrs.
Mrs.
Salem,
enter,

msey,
Marian
Cen-
Jean
John
hillips,
Shirley
Barth,
inger-
Ohio;
Rev.
e Del-
hman,
etonio,
Ohio;
Carson
anuth,
Salem,
hio.

ECORD
to fur-
at $1.50

uperin-
rinting

Appendix

World Questions Must Be Answered

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 8, 1954

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including a remarkable address by Hon. Charles Malik, Ambassador of Lebanon, at the 155th annual commencement of Georgetown University on June 7. Ambassador Malik has had a distinguished career in the diplomatic service of his country and is presently a valued member of the United Nations Organization. On many occasions his voice has spoken to the world on questions that must be solved by the people of the world sooner or later.

Mr. Speaker, the address by Dr. Malik should be read by every Member of Congress because it presents to all of us a responsibility and a challenge.

THE ULTIMATE QUESTIONS

In the world situation today there are some ultimate questions which it is well worth our while to ponder. I propose to examine some of these questions largely as they spring from and bear upon the great question of decision. For nothing is more obvious, it seems to me, than that history is decisively in the making today, and yet the quality of decision is largely absent. There is an ominous drift; people appear overwhelmed; and the clear, decisive, destiny-laden, summoning voice is not heard. It is as though the complexity and multiplicity of present issues is too much for the mind of man. But if one thing is certain, it is that where people refuse to decide, events will decide for them. And if personal decision is both difficult and risky, it is not at all certain that to allow events to decide impersonally, although relatively easy, is not itself a decision involving the greatest risks.

Those who claim, whoever they be and wherever they are, that their internal conditions are a veritable paradise while the outside world is all evil, and those who feign that they can effectively shut their eyes to what goes on abroad concentrating upon their internal problems alone, do greatly err if they imagine either that they can escape responsibility for the general mess of the world or that they can live through a possible world crisis unscathed. While it is always essentially true, as Father Zosima in the Brothers Karamazov affirmed, that "everyone is really responsible to all men for all and everything," yet through the hardness of our heart we often fail to see that, and it takes an actual or impending disaster to cause the scales to fall from our eyes so as to realize, in all humility, our inalienable moral solidarity with all mankind.

There are the prophets of doom. There are the apostles of progress, the incurable optimists. There are the pacifists and appeasers. There are the cynics who do not care what comes or what goes, who therefore just float. There are those who preach that one dramatic stroke, perhaps of a radical and violent nature, will once and for all solve all problems. There are those who blame everything on communism, or imperialism, or colonialism. There are those who believe that the raising of the standard of living through science and technology is the answer. There are the believers in education—that if only people knew how to read and write, if only they achieved a certain degree of intellectual culture, all would be well. And there are, of course, the nationalists, whose analysis of the world is that it is made up of 60 or 80 nations, and that the millennium would be upon us if each one of these units enjoyed what they ambiguously call freedom and independence. The babel of tongues with respect to what is the matter and what is the remedy could not be more striking.

Nothing, therefore, is more worth while than to try to elicit some order in this widespread confusion and disorder. Understanding and vision precede action, and we may safely lay it down as one of the preliminary matters which constitute the trouble of the world today that this formula has been largely inverted. In the name of what is called trial and error, people rush to action without adequate antecedent reflection. The greatest need is for the elaboration of a grounded, truthful, fundamental, responsible theory which will illumine, guide, and justify the men of action. When you leave people in the dark as to the reasons for what you are proposing to do, when you fail to answer the thousand and one questions that they are mutely asking in their hearts—and you ought to be discerning and loving enough to guess these questions—then they may rightly conclude that perhaps you do not know these reasons yourself and that, therefore, your guiding philosophy is nothing deeper than that of trial and error. But such a philosophy will never move the hearts, it will never induce respect, it will leave in its wake a terrible disenchantment, a futility that rends the soul, a disgust that can easily turn to rebellion. Just as there are ultimate questions which it is our duty to seek, so there must be ultimate reasons which it behooves us to understand.

II

People talk of a settlement of the cold war. They bandy about such phrases as "peaceful coexistence" and "peaceful competition." Now a real settlement implies the restoration of a balance that has been disturbed. Both in Europe and in Asia there was a sort of balance of political forces that no longer obtains. Nothing is more obvious than that to reestablish this balance, and therefore to help bring about a real settlement, first, China must be effectively independent, second, Eastern Europe must be effectively independent so as to enable the complex unity of the European spirit to be restored, and third, Japan and Germany must once again play a balancing part in their respective regions. "Peaceful coexistence" when the political balance is already considerably tipped on one side is of course nonsense. As to "peaceful competition," I ask: how can one compete fairly, and therefore peacefully, when the field where competition is permitted to take place is all on one side, all in one's home and one's back yard, and never on the other?

It follows that the three fundamental conditions for any real settlement are, first, a freer movement, on the basis of just regulations, of goods, ideas, and men between the two worlds; second, a fundamental change in the theory and practice of communism, and third, adequate assurance of security, equality and respect given the great Russian people whose creative genius in humane and spiritual matters is truly astounding. So long as Marx, with his irrational and atheistic doctrine of matter, man, society, and history, is the effective prophet of powerful states, and so long as the Marxist technique of revolution is the weapon of powerful parties, peace, in any sense of the term, especially in the sense of "peace of mind," is impossible. Everything should be done to convince the Russian people that neither their freedom, nor their happiness and greatness, nor their place in the world, nor their destiny, really depends upon Karl Marx and his followers.

There are two things worse than war: to surrender on the fundamental issues, and to put off a showdown until a less favorable moment. And if you bequeath this moment to your children, then it is entirely possible that they will not have much wherewith to bless your memory.

III

The Asian revolution is much talked about. This great upsurge in Asia is no doubt inspired partly by the original American revolution. The terms "freedom" and "independence" are basically American. The influence of this country in facilitating and hastening the independence of India, Pakistan, Indonesia, and other Asian and middle eastern nations is well known, and many an eastern nationalist today in arguing with Americans appeals to the precept and example of Washington and Jefferson. Diverse cultures have every natural right to be, in freedom, the maximum that can possibly be.

Although this revolution is an abiding fact, to which people have not yet fully adjusted, still from the point of view of peace its course has been complicated by three factors. First, the social and economic aspect of the revolution, which from many points of view is its most important aspect, is completely dependent upon industry, and since for a long time to come, at least until the consummation of some sort of world decision with respect to communism, there will only be three world centers of industry, namely, Russia, Europe, and North America, the Asian revolution, to succeed at all, must come to some understanding with one or the other of these three centers. It is naive to suppose that this understanding, with whichever center, is possible except—in part at least—as a function of the cold war.

Secondly, there are some who develop the concept of "neutrality" or "a third force" which will either remain aloof from or else mediate the world conflict. It can be shown that in a magically contracted world this concept is without objective validity. In a radical war of cultures, the useful, wherever and whatever it be, will certainly be utilized, and the useless will be tolerated only so long and so far as its uselessness is useful. There is no escape in this modern world from the law that to be is to act, to decide, to play a part.

Thirdly, there is a real danger that the Asian revolution might turn into a massive racial and cultural reaction. But this in its turn will inevitably induce a counter-reaction on the part of the West. Such ultimate vicious circles can only be broken through the effective development of a concrete universal message, a genuine meaning, a real fullness of life, based not upon arbitrary willfulness, but upon the very nature of things, that is, upon the being of man in all his mysterious depths. Asian racialism is no answer to the sin of western racial exclusivism. What is needed is an honest concrete idea which transcends—not sentimentally, but in truth—race, language, and culture, and which, by austerely including and preserving all in its loving bosom, makes costly demands upon all. An idea of such magnitude, absolutely required by the historic moment, will entail, among other things, humility in fellowship, rising above false self-sufficiency, free interchange of goods and ideas, and a voluntary acceptance of some international juridical order.

The Asian revolution, then, demands from the West understanding, respect, and equality. Equality and respect are fairly clear. But understanding means the unsentimental recognition of the possible pitfalls of this revolution and the wise determination to help it not to fall into them.

IV

War and peace constitute an ultimate question today requiring decision; so does the Asian revolution; and there is a third question of equal ultimacy. It is the rise and revolt of the masses all over the world. By the term "the masses" I do not refer to particular classes or peoples; for insofar as certain sections of mankind have been repressed, oppressed, denied light and freedom and being, whether this denial came about from outside or from the falsity of their own systems, it is right for them to bestir themselves and become human. The phrase "the rise and revolt of the masses" means that in one mode of the existence of all of us we constitute a mass, more or less unreasoning and primitive, a mass in which the individual ceases to be able to think and judge for himself. Only insofar as this reduction of individual responsibility overtakes large classes or distinct peoples may we say that such classes and peoples have really become masses.

What has happened is that for various reasons, both spiritual and material, this massive, unreasoning, turbulent mentality is becoming more and more frequent, more and more dominant, more and more overwhelming, more and more decisive, not only in this or that country, but all over the world, and not only with such and such individuals, but in the life of each one of us.

The result is the increasing prominence of the primitive and backward, the instinctive and dark, the unformed and ill-formed, the massive and quantitative, the irrational, the potential, the material, the underdeveloped and undeveloped. The forces of darkness have literally erupted into the light demanding to be recognized. Witness how people love to be anonymous, to travel unknown, incognito, to just let go every restraint, every sense of responsibility. The one moral characteristic of this age is the general breakdown of standards, the determination of the norms of truth and goodness by the tastes and whims of the masses.

When one is given day and night to the problems of the formless and undeveloped, whether in his own life or in society, it is exceedingly difficult for one to keep his gaze upon the perfect and complete. One gets overwhelmed oneself. There is no greater tribulation than to try to retain the vision of the perfect, in all its reality and power, while you are moved by the clamor and need of the imperfect. This is the peculiar snare of the devil for our times.

The masses must be loved and saved. They can only be saved if powerful, actual standards of excellence are set up before them. Nothing is more important today than to know that absolute standards exist and to demonstrate their existence in theory and in life; to instill the sense of individual, personal responsibility so as to save man from falling into massive unreason and irresponsibility; and to inculcate the fear of God so that men might live in the certain presence of a hidden judge. Men are swept off their feet by massive mass movements, but what is supremely needed is to convince them of the irreplaceable importance of personal character, of the value of a single individual redeeming, by the depth of his own being, a whole age. The tremendous assertion "for their sakes I sanctify myself" applies today to every man who, while loving the world and aspiring to help it, yet knows and sets his heart upon another real world of perfection which will save him, in the process of his trying to save this world, from losing his own soul.

The seductiveness of material things stands in the way of people becoming decisive and therefore really facing up to the ultimate questions. Civilizations have fallen when soft and silken things have so bewitched the mind that it could see nothing else worth seeking and enjoying.

It is true there are organized systems of tyranny and falsehood enslaving the mind. But an equally great enslavement is the worship of the soft and silken, of comfort and security. The man who interprets his life as consisting in the quest of more and more comforts, more and more pleasure, more and more years of the same sort of sensuous excitement, is not superior to the man whose mind is warped by false doctrine.

A life of comfort and security cannot understand, much less respond to, the ultimate questions, including the question of its own vacuity. Slothful and afraid, it will buy mere existence at any price. It cannot make up its mind, it cannot take worthy chances, it cannot break away with meaningless, not even with harmful, habits. Such a life is incapable of believing with all its heart, of standing up for and defending the supreme values of its own civilization, in a word, of becoming heroic. On the contrary, it will always find an excuse, it will always refuse to expose itself. Soft and easy living can never produce heroes of the spirit, and yet the present world situation requires, above military and material security, above economic abundance, above political wisdom, the rise of a new breed of men with the highest heroic stature.

This is the test of decisiveness and of the deleterious effect of the soft and silken; supposing you were told—and I believe it to be true—that you must count on parting with at least half of your possessions and you must expect besides plenty of suffering and hardship before you can really master the crisis, would you accept to pay that price? I fear there be many who would much rather bury their heads in the sand.

Whatever may be the material need of other parts of the world, certainly one of the greatest needs of the West is for the virtue of poverty to be once again preached and practiced. And while it is perfectly true that the West in general, and the United States in particular, can teach Asia and Africa how to produce and multiply material wealth and therewith how to satisfy their appalling material needs, I assure you that if that is all you are going to mean to this humanity on the march, they will profit from and thank you for your teaching, but they will not on that account either love you or stick by you in your moment of need. The grounds of love and community are all spiritual, and he alone is rich in spirit who knows how to be free from all material things. Again and again the poor have been called blessed, and we may be sure that God can only appear in our midst as one of the poor. It is difficult to compress a total problematic in one nutshell, but I am nearly persuaded that if only the West practiced voluntary poverty, all would be well with the world.

There is a movement proper to matter: it seduces. There is a movement proper to the masses: they overwhelm. Both movements blind the reason, so that we can no longer either see the truth or act in accordance with its requirements. But the situation is so critical that freedom from both movements is absolutely necessary if right vision and courageous action are to be properly wedded to each other.

I will then sum up what I honestly see.

There is a universal revolution against all that has been held sacred and true for thousands of years. The more deeply you go into this revolution, the more you become convinced that it admits of no possible compromise.

The essence of this revolution, whatever form it takes, is to hate the authentic freedom of the spirit, to reject any ultimacy to the individual human person, to subvert the traditional norms of truth and conduct, to split up the total man into sensations and dreams, to reduce reason to conditioned reflexes manipulated in the interests of some arbitrary philosophy enthroned and backed by force, to spurn any objective truth, to deify matter and material security, and to deny the existence of God.

Where this revolution prevails, people like Aristotle, Paul, Augustine, Dante, Pascal, and Kant find themselves utter strangers. Since, however, without such people and what they saw and were Western history has no meaning, the call is for the defense of the soul of the West.

But such a defense will be hollow and half-hearted if it does not spring from absolute faith in this soul. Thus the real crisis is the crisis of faith. In fact if faith had been vigorous, the revolution probably would not have arisen.

What avails most so far as vision and decision are concerned is prayer, contemplation, adoration, the peace of nothingness, the love of God.

If the fantastic development of modern weapons should in due course have the effect of neutralizing physical war as the final means of settlement, then the struggle must move entirely onto the economic, political, intellectual, and spiritual planes. On these planes I am not at all sure that the West is yet adequately prepared.

The real West is hardly known in the East. What is known is only the commercial, technological, and political West. But there can be no greater pity, no more ultimate question, than if the truth and light and spirit and freedom and love and vision which constitute the essence of the West should remain hidden under a bushel.

Western civilization, if it is to survive, must stand for what is genuinely and concretely universal in its heritage. This can only mean in the order of nature the moral law and in the order of God the Christian message in its concrete plenitude.

Without God and without the law of nature the West cannot save itself, let along the whole world.

Even after the truest and clearest vision is revealed and the most courageous decision taken, there is no certainty that all will be well. Let no man therefore set his heart only upon outside things. What if the mess is inherent to the world. What if it could only be patched up a little here and a little there, but never quite eradicated. He will always be disappointed who puts all his eggs in the basket of the world.

Therefore we must have independent access all the time to another independent realm in which there is complete victory, a realm not dependent upon our subjective feeling and imagination, nor upon the manipulation of our body, but one that is real, objective, in itself, given, full of truth and life. May it not be the case that the only sense in which all will be well with the world is for this independent realm to remain integral and whole even if the whole world went to pieces?

Beyond war and peace, beyond economics and politics, beyond the atom and its potentialities for good or for evil, beyond the question of whether Western civilization can be saved, beyond even any immediate personal suffering or sorrow or profound secret unhappiness or even sin, beyond all this towers the supreme question whether we really know and are comforted by what Christ meant, both in itself and in history, when He said: "These things I have spoken unto you, that in me ye might have peace. In the world ye shall have tribulation: but be of good cheer; I have overcome the world."

The Illicit Narcotic Traffic in the Far East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1954

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, Federal Narcotic Commissioner Harry J. Anslinger in his capacity as United States representative on the United Nations Commission on Narcotic Drugs delivered the following address to the Commission's ninth session recently held at United Nations headquarters, New York City.

Commissioner Anslinger's address is very interesting and should receive the attention it merits from persons in every walk of life.

The address follows:

THE ILLICIT NARCOTIC TRAFFIC IN THE FAR EAST

(Remarks of the Honorable Harry J. Anslinger, United States representative on the United Nations Commission on Narcotic Drugs, ninth session, April 19 to May 14, 1954)

Last year I told this Commission that the United States is a target of Communist China to be supplied with a flood of foreign-exchange-earning, health and morale-devastating heroin. For several years I have presented documented facts which established that narcotic trafficking from the Chinese mainland is an insidious, calculated scheme of the Chinese Communist regime to obtain operating funds and at the same time spread the debauchery of narcotic addiction among the free nations.

On April 5 of this year in San Francisco, Calif., after several months of intensive undercover investigation, we made important inroads on this traffic when we arrested eight prominent Chinese and indicted Judah Isaac Ezra, of Hong Kong, who collaborated in supplying heroin from Communist China to outlets on our west coast. Pure heroin seized in the raids or purchased as evidence by our agents during the investigation amounted to 6 pounds.

Merchant seamen who frequented Ezra's establishment obtained heroin from Ezra and smuggled it into the United States for the illicit market. In most instances the heroin was brought into the country concealed on the persons of seamen. Ornately carved camphorwood chests with specially built compartments were also used for the smuggling operations.

One of the dealers arrested in San Francisco operated a florist shop and made his deliveries of heroin disguised as boxes of flowers. Other dealers made deliveries to undercover agents in the usual manner in such places as Chinese restaurants and meeting places for seamen. Arrangements for sales of heroin were often negotiated over elaborate Chinese dinners. Chinese social clubs were frequently the meeting places to arrange for sale and delivery of the narcotics. One such social club is known to authorities as a gathering place for Communist Chinese and Chinese alien smugglers.

The importance of this coup can be gaged by the fact that in the diluted form in which it reaches the addict, this operation would have represented over a million addict doses of this deadliest of drugs. It offers additional dramatic proof that we are not here dealing with a petty adversary but rather with a formidable and far-reaching plot to gain foreign exchange and at the same time to demoralize the people of the free world.

Spreading narcotic addiction and obtaining funds for political purposes through the sale of heroin and opium is not just the policy of one man in the Communist regime. It is the policy of the entire Communist regime in mainland China.

The now well-known Communist, Po I Po, had become an important official among the Communists in China by 1938, and was one of the principal exponents of the sale and distribution of heroin for funds and for political purposes. At that time the distribution of heroin was carried on from an area controlled by the Communists in Shensi Province, at which place the sale of heroin was part of an agent's underground assignment. The agent received instruction in such activity along with other political propaganda. Po became minister of finance of the Communist regime in October 1949, in which position he was able to expand international narcotic traffic from Communist China to heretofore unimagined proportions. When he was relieved as minister of finance in 1953, Jung Tzu Ho became minister of finance.

After visiting Moscow for several months, Po returned to Peiping to attend a meeting of the central committee of the party. Before the meeting of this committee, Jung had held a conference and perfected an improved plan for the export and sale of opium and heroin in conjunction with Yeh Li Chuang, minister of trade, and Fang Jung Ho, chief of special trade. The latter term signifies narcotics. According to the report of Jung, during the year Communist China exported opium, morphine (large quantities of morphine base were shipped out because of the shortage of chemicals), and heroin with a value of US$60 million amounting to over 800 tons. Jung stated that the shipments were 20 percent short of the goal.

The innovation in the present arrangement over the former operation of the Communist regime in narcotic traffic is that the foreign ministry has overall control over the entire program, and directs the export and further distribution of the heroin and opium through the National Trading Co., which maintains headquarters in Peiping.

At the time the Communist regime was promoting illicit narcotic traffic in the interior of China in the area controlled by the Communists in 1938, Chen Kwan Yuan, alias Chen Kun Yuen, alias Chen San Yuan, was busily engaged in Tientsin smuggling narcotics off Taku Bar as circumstances permitted. He was still in Tientsin in 1951 when the now well-known "Lions Globe" brand of heroin began to reach Japan in large quantities. Since that time he has become one of the most powerful representatives of the Communists in the narcotic traffic outside Communist China, and has built his fortune on narcotics through and under the cover of his far-flung Tin Shing Trading Co., moving heroin out of Communist China to all parts of the world in exchange for tires, rubber goods, trucks, and other strategic material. He has all the brass and front of a gangster and relies principally on bribery and buying protective information to smooth the smuggling of from 5 to 50 pounds of heroin at one time. Crew members of various kinds of ships have been used for this operation in addition to individual Chinese couriers. One of these is a relative of Tse Oi Chan, alias Mrs. Wu, the international female smuggler of narcotics who was arrested in 1953 and who, while awaiting trial, is now living in grand style through a portion of the profits of Chen Kwan Yuan who arranged for her movements from one country to another. The coconspirator of Mrs. Wu, the infamous Li Sui Po, alias Lee Sau Fung, who has also been arrested, was in the organization of Chen Kwan Yuan.

There are two principal groups exporting and distributing heroin and opium for the Communist regime in China in addition to the group which deals almost exclusively in heroin and opium from Yunan Province. All of these are under the direction of the National Trading Co. One of these groups exports directly from the north China ports of Tientsin (Taku) and Tsingtao, and in this way avoids the jurisdiction and control of the more powerful group in south China. In this northern group is Hsieh Chun Mu who went to Peiping in 1952 where he has become a powerful political agent continuing his narcotic trafficking through Communist representatives with whom he has been associated for many years.

The group in south China functions as the Trade Bureau of South China, a department of the Communist regime in China. The Trade Bureau operates powerful trading companies as fronts and has the greatest concentration of stocks of heroin and opium in all of China stored at Canton and Chungsan, Shek-ki, for export to affiliated trading companies in free countries. Members of the Communist regime undertake the management of these trading companies and other enterprises, including banks, which these companies control.

Eighty percent of the heroin from Communist China flows from Canton to these trading companies. The South China group and their affiliates control this flow of heroin to the free countries by means of more trading companies and representatives in these free countries from whom payment for the heroin is received. Some of these representatives have become rich and powerful and are able to negotiate directly with the Communist regime as well as with major distributors who control the traffic in other free countries. The close connection between these trading companies and the overall Communist control may best be illustrated by their method of either pooling or borrowing stocks of heroin from whichever company or representative available in order to make delivery of large consignments. In this respect the dealers in this dirty business operate as legitimate enterprises in that each knows where additional stocks of heroin may be obtained as necessary.

The fanatical Communist narcotic traffickers have resorted to the extreme measure of cutting off the ears of those small-time sellers who dared reveal the identity of the supplying group. Another method has been to take them into a Communist organization whereby they are sealed off and thereby silenced.

The golden web of the conspirators protecting them in their palatial surroundings has been spun through the funds ultimately obtained from the very persons destroyed by the product—the very persons who pay in money and blood to "Chase the Dragon" or "Shoot AA Guns", terms which are now heard throughout the Orient with reference to the use of heroin.

From the beginning the Communist purveyors of heroin have realized the dual purpose of its sale since they have forbidden members of their own organization to use the drug. This was true in 1938 and it is true today. Communist traffickers in the drug on the wholesale level talk of the dual purpose of sale, and also of the fact that users lose their effectiveness. Like remarks are heard from coolies on the streets.

The close relationship between the heroin and the opium and political agents extends all the way to the top. In Chungjin, a city in the suburbs of Peiping, a factory for the manufacture of heroin is located. Here also is the training center for Communist China's political agents. The same pattern involving Communist agents and the sale of heroin was followed in the cities of Rashin and Wonsan, North Korea.

One of the principal methods of distribution to the ultimate consumer continued to be through use of brothels operated by Chinese Communists or supplied by Chinese Communists who funneled the profits of the traffic to powerful traders and representatives in the organization in the principal cities. These traders and representatives were also aided by Chinese who ostensibly were traders, but who were actually operating on behalf of the Communist regime in China and could supply any amount of heroin. They negotiate directly with Communist bosses on the Chinese mainland for large supplies of opium. In the offices of these traders, which bear little resemblance to offices of legitimate commercial companies, the clerical force is composed of stooges and lookouts. One such company is the Aaron Trading Co. which operates with a headquarters office and a branch office, and which has a direct connection into Communist China for quantities of heroin and opium. This company, operated by two Chinese, endeavored to establish connections directly into New York City, and proposed using letters of credit concealing final destination.

Li Chin Sui, who heads a Chinese export-import company, is one of the most active traffickers in the Far East, operating under the direction of the gigantic combine. Li Chin Sui, a Chinese, was forced out of Japan by investigating agents of the enforcement division of the narcotic section, Ministry of Welfare, after he had accumulated a fortune trafficking in Communist heroin in the Yokohama-Tokyo area. Li's company channels strategic material to Canton and takes charge of the movement of opium and heroin under the direction of the South China Trade Bureau and representatives affiliated therewith.

Powerful Chinese closely associated both commercially and socially with top-notch Communist agents have accumulated fortunes of tremendous magnitude even by western standards through feeding gold and strategic materials into Communist China in return for heroin and opium. The extent of this operation becomes clear when it is realized to be a cold fact that 200 tons of opium from Communist China are required annually to carry on the established business of these Chinese traffickers and their associates. Most of this opium is from Kwangtung, Kweichow, Szechwan, and Kwangsi Provinces. In addition to this known 200 tons of opium tremendous quantities of finished heroin with a high degree of purity, heroin pills, and morphine base from which heroin is later refined, are channeled by these same traffickers to their Communist representatives in other countries. Large amounts are shipped on consignment and need not be paid for until they are distributed to representatives through trading companies or couriers by the political activity committee members who collect the money or acquire strategic materials according to a prearranged plan.

The Communist regime has decided that the system of consignment will be eliminated as far as possible since some of the profits have been embezzled. A large portion of the profits will continue to be used as a special fund for various organizations under the control of the Communist bosses in the area where the heroin is sold, but there is a strict requirement that a set portion of the profits must be returned to the Finance Ministry of the Communist regime in China. It has likewise been decided that the system of trade cooperatives and agents transporting and selling the heroin must be more efficient and close-knit to avoid detection and to provide more funds for the organization. Special attention is being given to improving the technique of the Communist bosses in control of the smugglers who are to take more care in the use of bribes to permit the smooth flow of drugs. The same procedure applies to entry and exit papers to facilitate the movements of the operators. The equivalent of more than US$1,000 is often used in such an operation.

Traffic in heroin and opium has been found to be so lucrative and otherwise effective by the Communist regime in China that they have taken great pains to improve the cultivation of the opium poppy. Not only does the opium come from beyond the Great Wall in the provinces of Chahar, Jehol, and Suiyuan, but also from Tsinghai, Sinkiang, Shensi, Kansu, and Ningsia Provinces. Yunnan Province also produces immense quantities of opium under the direct control of the head of the secret police. In this area 500 tons of opium were shipped out in 1950 at the same time as 500 tons were being offered for sale in Canton. Opium caravans from Yunnan Province numbering approximately 200 men are moving at the rate of 2 or 3 a week. Recently morphine base has been moved out in large quantities by air, a continuation of the traffic over the past several years. A seizure of 418 pounds of opium from Yunnan was made from an air cargo in November 1953. Other seizures of Yunnanese opium were made in April, 1,700 pounds, and in June, 3,250 pounds.

Forty tons of Yunnanese opium were offered for sale through agents of the Communist regime in China in June 1953. It was stated that the morphine content would be 9 percent; that the opium would be packed in 1-kilogram packages wrapped in cellophane; and that 50 pieces in a tin container would be boxed and covered with jute cloth stitched with string. This shipment was offered at US$2 million.

In Szechuan Province the governor controls the opium production and also operates a factory with a capacity of 150 kilograms. Heroin factories were established in Kwangsi Province and in Yunnan Province. In Kwangtung Province the opium poppy planting is about three times what it was in 1951. In Yunnan and Kweichow Provinces the Communist authorities have issued special instructions to increase the production of opium. Because the authorities have not shared the huge profits with the growers, they have not obtained as much opium as was expected. The yield must be sold to the Communist cooperatives who with their agents openly sell the opium at prices ranging from US$35 per pound in large quantities to more than US$100 per pound in quantities of a few pounds. Heroin is from six to ten times this price. These prices are in line with quotations by the Bank of China offering opium at US$72 per pound and heroin at US$500 per pound.

JAPAN

Through international liaison, the enforcement division of the narcotic section, Ministry of Welfare, Japan, was able to effect the arrest of the notorious international narcotic smuggler from Shanghai, Li Sui Po, alias Lee Sau Fung, during the past year. Brilliant undercover work and surveillance preceded the arrest of this trafficker in possession of 500 grams of heroin. He is now under trial and is held on a ¥10 million (US$25,000) bond, the highest of record for narcotic traffickers in Japan. The authorities also have under arrest Li's coconspirator, Tze Oi Chan, alias Mrs. Wu, formerly of Shanghai.

Approximately 12 kilograms of heroin, 50 percent more than for any like period since the end of World War II, were seized from the unending flow of heroin to Japan from Communist China. In view of the state of enforcement in Japan, officials do not consider the seizures to be more than 1 percent of the total smuggled into Japan from Communist China. This means that a huge amount of Communist heroin is being sold in Japan in a 12-month period. One member of the Communist organization stated that 120 pounds of heroin entered Japan in Niigata Prefecture, arriving from Communist China through the North Korean port of Wonsan. The explanation for the manner of payment for such a quantity, about US$300,000, was that no money or goods are paid until the heroin is distributed to the Communist bosses in the various cities. Strategic goods are preferred to money.

Chinese Communist bosses in control of the traffic, assuming the role of import-export merchants and businessmen, relied principally on their tremendous capital to facilitate the smuggling and distribution of heroin.

For the Communists, the traffic in heroin in Japan was highly profitable and successful, but it was at the same time a grim, deadly serious project. It was here that traffickers who dared reveal the identity of the suppliers had their ears severed from their heads. This method proved effective in closing avenues of information concerning factories producing heroin, accurate estimates of areas devoted to poppy cultivation, and the extent of the activities of the opium buying and selling cooperatives in the interior of China. Even former employees dared not talk.

Heroin poured into the country through the ports of Yokohama, Kobe, Kure, Sasebo, and smaller ports along the Japan Sea as well as through the airports. With this very real weapon, Chinese Communist collaborators acting as representatives of the Communist regime in China posed a threat to the health and safety of the nation. The Japanese press has begun to cry out against this dirty business of the Communist regime in China.

As late as February 1954 the Japanese authorities were seeking 30 kilograms of heroin and 3,000 revolvers reported to have been landed in Kyushu from Communist China during the first part of the month.

SOUTH KOREA

South Korea is the target of tremendous quantities of heroin from North Korea. The trading companies in North Korea, as in China, controlled by the Communist regime insist that at least one-fourth of all goods leaving North Korea for South Korea must be either heroin or opium. The smugglers, usually agents operating both for information and monetary gain, have for the most part used the same route into South Korea since 1947. They obtain heroin in Kaesong and at small villages along the coast of North Korea, opposite Kanghwa Island, and enter South Korea at Inchon. Some have proceeded overland directly to Seoul and thence to Taegu and Pusan.

There is extensive cultivation of the opium poppy in the areas around Pyongyong in the west and Wonsan on the east coast. There is also considerable cultivation in the northeasternmost province of North Korea. Some of the opium is shipped to a factory in Communist China at Chungjin near Peiping, but most of the opium is processed at a factory in Pyongyong. As much as 5 tons of heroin have been stored at this factory.

Heroin is purchased in North Korea from the Communist trading companies in exchange for commodities most needed by the Communist regime. One of these commodities is rubber shoes, which on one occasion were used in the amount of 3,000 pairs to obtain 2,000 grams of heroin and 1,500 grams of opium. The opium in this case came from Communist China. The heroin was the coarse, granular, off-white type which has been sold into international traffic in North Korea since 1948. The heroin was originally in the familiar heavy tin cans with slip-over tops soldered and waxed to protect the contents. Communist trading stores in North Korea have trafficked in heroin in this kind of container since 1949 in wholesale quantities. The containers appear to have been hammered out of corrugated metal.

The 2,000 grams of heroin and the 1,500 grams of opium were seized early in January 1954. The heroin had been placed aboard a 23-foot boat about an hour before departure from Heichampo, a small town with 5 or 6 docks capable of accommodating 17 to 18 small ships at one time on the coast of North Korea between Kaesong and Kanghwa Island. The smuggler was so confident of the contraband and so accustomed to smuggling that he did not bother to examine the contents of the packages which proved to be 85.2 percent heroin. The value of the rubber shoes traded for the opium and heroin was US$1,200.

The smuggler stated that the Communist regime issues instructions to the trading companies in regard to the narcotics which are the property of the Government. Most of the smugglers average two trips monthly from North Korea to South Korea with narcotics. Young girls working as maids or prostitutes receive the narcotics on many occasions. At other times the narcotics are turned over to wholesale syndicates, some of which are made up of businessmen.

A police official in the National Police Headquarters, Republic of Korea, stated that from April 1, 1952, to March 31, 1953, 2,400 Communists from North Korea, most of them posing as refugees, were arrested in South Korea. These Communists had received 6 months' training in Communist ideology, learning names of associates, names of contacts, answers to police in case of arrest, etc., at a political training school in northwest Korea.

Using the expression of this official, these Communist agents carried gold in one hand and heroin in the other. The gold was for traveling and living expenses; the heroin was for political activity, for mental purposes. Young girls from 18 to 23 years of age had come down into South Korea from North Korea as Communist agents. Some of these became housemaids at appropriate homes of politicians, others became prostitutes, not in the true sense of the word for a living, but in order to accomplish their political purposes. When the Communists arrived with heroin they knew in advance where to deliver it.

On May 10, 1953, heroin of the same quality, texture, and physical appearance, in the amount of 851 grams and in the same kind of containers mentioned above, was seized as it was being smuggled into South Korea. The detail of similarity in the containers extended even to the wax paper sack fitted into a brown sack of a peculiar texture and fastened at the top with paper clips of an unusual variety.

On May 19, 1953, heroin in the amount of 22 grams was seized from a known Communist agent from North Korea.

Some of the narcotics sold by the Communist trading companies in North Korea is morphine base which is usually delivered to guerrillas in the mountains in southwest South Korea. On October 31, 1953, a crude, clandestine plant, utilized for processing this morphine into heroin at the rate of 250 grams daily, was seized.

In September 1953 a seizure was made of 15.8 pounds of opium and 135 grams of 90 percent heroin which had been brought in from North Korea. The opium was in glass jars and was in the odd-shaped balls which are characteristic of opium grown and collected in North Korea. The cultivators sell it in this form and it is usually cut through with a knife to prevent concealment of rocks for increased weight.

One distributor of heroin in wholesole lots in Seoul was a North Korean who spoke perfect Chinese and who operated a brothel over his flourishing trading store. To enter the brothel it was necessary to pass through the trading company. The heroin was sold by the prostitutes on the premises as well as directly by the operator of the business. It was established that this smuggler and wholesaler knew the heroin was manufactured in Pyongyong and was brought in through Kanghwa Island to Seoul, Taegu, and Pusan. He had several customers on an every-other-day basis at the rate of United States $10 for one-half gram of heroin.

The heroin is sold at prices which the traffic will bear, which vary from US$2 per 0.03 gram to about one-half that price when it is supplied to lepers, thieves, pickpockets, and the prostitutes in the "ditch" at Pusan.

HONG KONG

While movements of heroin through Hong Kong, because of its geographical location, continued despite efforts of local police who acted vigorously, there has been a noticeable trend toward bypassing this area whenever possible with shipments to other free countries. Enforcement officials and the courts have taken a positive attitude to thwart the traffickers. On February 26, 1954, in the Victoria District Court, Judge J. Reynolds, in sentencing a defendant for possession and sale of 12 grams of heroin, said, "I regard this offense of possession and sale of narcotics as one of the most serious offenses to come before me, and you are sentenced to 2 years and 6 months on each charge."

CONCLUSION

The threefold increase in some areas in the land devoted to the cultivation of the opium poppy in Communist China, the establishment of new heroin factories in Communist China, the continuation and expansion of a 20-year plan to finance political activities and spread addiction among free peoples through the sale of heroin and opium by the Communist regime in China, and the extension of the same pattern of narcotic activity to areas coming under the jurisdiction of Communist China has mushroomed the narcotic menace from Communist China into a multiheaded dragon threatening to mutilate and destroy whole segments of populations from whom the danger of addiction through ready availability of drugs had been removed during the past 40 years by the uncompromising work of the narcotic enforcement authorities in the free countries of the world.

Until this Communist traffic in narcotics is dried up, the agents of this menace wherever found must be apprehended and dealt with surely and severely as a means of bringing under control this unbridled monster.

Aid to India

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1954

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement:

STATEMENT BY REPRESENTATIVE EMANUEL CELLER, SUBMITTED TO COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, JUNE 8, 1954, IN SUPPORT OF UNITED STATES ASSISTANCE TO INDIA

It is proposed for the fiscal year 1955, the United States grant India $104.5 million, of which $85 million be in the form of development assistance and $19.5 million in the form of technical cooperation. In addressing myself to this proposal and in support thereof, I say if we cannot afford more, most assuredly we cannot afford less.

I spent a little time in India some 6 months ago. India bears a gruesome burden, hunger. India, at the beginning of both her independence and industrialization must maintain and sustain two and a half times the population of the United States in a country one-half our size. Enormous and intricate problems face India; first, the increase in agricultural output to feed her hungry, which means more arable land, more water, less disease that incapacitates, greater technical skills for the agricultural worker. For greater industrial output, there is the lack of investment capital, the lack of trained personnel, the lack of steel and the like. There is the huge illiteracy problem to wrestle with; there is unemployment in the cities and disease in the villages. But there is also an India alive with men and women of searching, sensitive minds. There is also an India that embraced democracy, that struggled through to proud independence; an India willing to take upon herself the responsibilites and challenges of these problems through a government responsive to the people and representative of them; in short, to take them on in the free way of life.

The people of Asia have their eyes upon India and upon Communist China. Which pattern shall impress itself upon the mind of men? That of democracy, of the free way of life with its trials and errors, its fluid give and take and compromise, its divided political pressures? Or that of the totalitarian state with its rigidities, the iron whip, the coerced direction? Which will succeed in giving man the fuller measures of food, employment, education, health? There are many in India, particularly among the young in the colleges, among the unemployed in the cities who watch the race.

We who know the answer, who are so sure of the answer because we have the fruits of freedom which have placed us in the position to help others through to self-help cannot avert our eyes from the struggle of freedom anywhere.

I have seen some of the results of the economic and technical assistance we have granted India heretofore. You have the facts and the figures before you, but I have before me the memory of an Indian and his wife standing in front of their new one-room house, proud and loving of their tiny vegetable garden planted around the tiny ground of their home, the very first such garden they have seen, the very first of its kind in India. This is the work of their own hands through United States aid.

Fertilizers and steel are mighty good friends of independence.

I have talked with many in India. I have seen many of their villages, their community projects and their training schools, particularly the work done with and for refugees. I returned from India with the conviction that such aid as we give India is not a one-way stream. What flows back is a knowledge of India and Indians, enriching our understanding not only of one another, but of the interplay of cultures and arts, of her influences upon us and ours upon her. The aid is a bridgeway of learning both for us and for India. India has endured for centuries and has ancient wisdoms and patience and tolerance upon which we ourselves can profitably draw and our aid to her cannot ever be that of some beneficence arrogantly insisting that she receive our bounty. It is because we have not understand the fierceness of the anticolonialism of the East, nor her surge for independence, nor her pride in it for those who have achieved it, nor her cultural heritage of centuries that we have blundered in practical operation of our foreign affairs in Asia. If we can understand and let India know we understand that in the act of giving we are receiving as well we shall have made a giant stride forward in strengthening our now necessary ties in the East.

In the many quiet talks I had with Indian leaders, I learned how, internally, the Indian Government insistently and effectively attacks the problem of Communist subversion. I make this point because there are those who oppose aid to India on the false premise that India is pro-Communist.

To deny our differences with the Indian Government would, of course, be absurd. Where there are freedom and independence, differences do arise. We have our differences with Great Britain, France, Italy. Just so do we have them with India. The differences are sharper, and, perhaps, more crucial. But aid is not an instrument for the carving out of a country's mind. Let it suffice that India is free and that that freedom is worth nourishing and strengthening.

We can neither save India from herself nor buy her for us with some millions of dollars. We couldn't if we would and we wouldn't if we could. We can only express our gratitude for the abundance which is ours and for the freedom many have died to give us by trying in whatever measures we can that others, too, grow in abundance and in freedom.

Toward a Greater America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 10, 1954

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, water—America's greatest resource—will continue to rule progress in the United States. What we do today will determine whether we will continue to experience our phenomenal growth and maintain our standard of living, the highest in the world.

The United States may run out of water before it runs short of oil or coal. There is a rapid depletion of our water resources and the President, when he appointed the new Cabinet-level group to study the situation, recognized that it is a serious problem that is facing the country.

The use of water in the United States has quadrupled in the past half century.

There is no such thing as an inexhaustable supply of underground water. It comes nearer to be inexhaustable in the sand hill area of Nebraska, where it is estimated there are some 600-million acre-feet of water stored in the sand hills.

Many engineers and farmers find that where they depend upon an underground supply of water for irrigation purposes, that the underground beds of water cannot be pumped indefinitely because the water supply and level go much lower after pumping. In some instances, the water level gets so low that only the very large companies, who are willing to spend some $50,000 to $75,000 for a well, can afford to develop new irrigation pumping projects.

WHAT CAN WE DO?

One might ask, "What can we do to preserve the water supply of the United States?" Proper soil conservation methods, such as soil terracing and slowing up the runoff in wet weather would permit more moisture to sink into the soil. The building of dams to hold any runoff floodwater will make more water available during drought. The greatest waste this country has, when it comes to water, is from not using the water that constantly flows to the ocean from the several water divides in this country.

I am reminded of what Daniel Webster once said in opposing western railroad development:

> I will never vote one cent from the Public Treasury to place the Pacific Ocean 1 inch nearer to Boston than it is. What do we want with this vast worthless area—this region of savages and wild beasts, of shifting sands and whirlwinds of dust, of cactus and prairie dogs? To what use could we ever hope to put these great deserts and those endless mountain ranges?

To what use, Mr. Webster? To the building of bustling cities; to the development of fertile acres; to the homes of 35 million Americans, who supply nearly half of the entire Nation's demands of choice protective vegetables and truck crops; to the development of a $40 billion yearly retail sales averaging $1,139 for every man, woman, and child—retail sales for the Nation during the same year averaged $1,023 per capita—and to the development of a new outlet for the products manufactured in the East.

These are just a very few of the innumerable benefits the Nation has received in the development of the West. It is interesting to note that practically all of this development has occurred during the past 50 years—since the inception of reclamation.

LAND OF WEALTH

Mr. Webster, even with his great foresight, had failed to realize the potentialities of the West and its tremendous wealth of land, minerals, and forests. He failed to reconcile the needs of our mushrooming population to the possibilities of the West.

One of the leading examples of the wealth found in the West is its immense untapped mineral resources. Latest mineral findings include vast amounts of uranium—unknown a few years ago in the United States. Recent studies indicate we have a bountiful reserve of uranium to meet our needs for the years ahead when we reap the benefits of the atomic age.

Despite these vast mineral resources, the dearest treasure of all the West is water. Water—the Nation's greatest replenishable natural resource—must be conserved and developed at an accelerating pace. It has been aptly said that water is worth what it costs. The individual who is thirsty will pay handsomely to quench his thirst.

Reclamation in the West and supplemental irrigation throughout the rest of the country must work as allies in the economic growth of the Nation. Any other course means forfeiture of a part of our national tradition, stagnation of development, and decreasing standards of living.

VALUE OF WATER

One cannot make a true objective study of irrigation and reclamation in the West without first having a thorough understanding of the importance of water. The availability or lack of water has been the determining factor as to whether areas continue to grow in population.

Remembering the Dust Bowl years of the thirties, one thinks of the mass migration from the Middle West to the Garden State made fertile by irrigation. The increased purchasing power of the Central Valley project in California provides an excellent case study of the influence of resource development. This project alone is estimated to provide a new yearly market for a million pairs of shoes made in the New England States and of thousands of home appliances made in Ohio, Michigan, Illinois, Connecticut, New Jersey, New York, and Pennsylvania.

This new outlet would never be except for the reclamation and irrigation development of this area.

In Colorado a comparison was made between two similar counties—one irrigated, the other dry. For every 1,000 acres of irrigated land, 33 persons are supported, while the comparable dry-land area supports only 3.9 persons. The ratio of the number of inhabitants per 1,000 acres in irrigated farms has remained constant since 1930, but in the comparison area it has declined 42 percent. Since 1920 the population of the dry-land area has decreased about 25 percent, while the population of the irrigated area has increased about 13 percent.

This one county added $10½ million to our gross national product in 1939, $18 million in 1944, and $29 million in 1949.

That is what water has done for one irrigated county in Colorado. Not too far distant from that Colorado county is a prosperous city. It experienced a phenomenal growth, like many of our cities, immediately following World War II. It is an attractive city and the people have a tremendous amount of civic pride, and justly so. Many industries have examined it as a possible new location.

GROWTH STALEMATED

However, growth has been stalemated. No longer can the ambitious Chamber of Commerce seek new industries. Why? Because there is not a sufficient supply of water available. Seems strange, does it not? A community in the heart of the Rockies, where many rivers originate, being stymied by a lack of water. There are towns and communities under the upper Colorado River project that will no longer grow unless they can get an ample supply of water and power. Truly, water is the lifeblood of not only crops, but of communities.

The same is true in California. The citizens of Colinga are paying what amounts to $2,000 per acre-foot for their water. The normal cost of water to the average city is $3.50 per acre-foot. Yes, much importance is placed on water in the West.

At the present time there is more than 25 million acres of land in the West now under cultivation. Possibly 20 million acres which are susceptible to development remain to be supplied with irrigation water. Of the 25 million acres under irrigation, only 7 million were constructed by the Federal Government—the remaining 18 million by local interests without any financial assistance from the Federal Government.

Total Federal investment in irrigation and reclamation projects is $1.9 billion. It should not be forgotten, however, that local citizens have been active partners—paying partners—in each of the projects. Before work is started on a Federal irrigation project, a repayment contract must be negotiated. This contract is based on the cost of all reimbursable features of a project. Nonreimbursables such as flood control, navigation, fish and wildlife protection, recreation, and pollution abatement, are considered beneficial to the whole Nation.

SPECIAL DIVIDEND

The Federal Government is reaping a special dividend on the investment it has made in Federal reclamation and irrigation projects. Combined returns from individual and corporate tax revenues are estimated at $1.1 billion on 15 typical areas. Total Federal cost for these projects through June 30, 1952 was $264 million. Thus far, Federal taxes collected have exceeded the Federal investment in irrigation features in these projects by 450 percent.

These revenues are in addition to the obligation voluntarily assumed by direct users of water to repay to the Government the total cost of irrigation. Other dividends which cannot be counted in monetary figures include homes and opportunities for our mushrooming population.

It is a firm principle of the Eisenhower administration that the responsibility—and the cost—of resource development should be borne to the greatest possible extent by those who receive the benefits.

In my own State of Nebraska, we find one of the oldest irrigation districts in the United States. It was started about 50 years ago. The North Platte Valley of Mitchell, Scottsbluff, Gering, and Bayard would be a parched land with few inhabitants today if water was not being used to raise tremendous crops. This irrigation area has repaid to the United States several times over the cost of the projects through new taxes, new industries, and the production of crops and fibers so badly needed by this country and the world.

I have pointed out, and the record confirms it, that irrigation and reclamation and the incidental power costs are repaid to the Federal Government.

On the other hand, many billions of dollars are spent for flood control, harbors and docks, and agriculture conservation payments. These are direct outlays from the public Treasury. The Corps of Engineers, on water conservation and control projects has spent $7,245,017,000, or nearly four times the total spent on irrigation and reclamation during the past 50 years.

No one quarrels over the benefits received from these projects. Most of the money spent on flood control is used to protect the soil. All of the agriculture conservation payments go for that purpose. Measures are taken to protect the land so that more crops might be raised. Most of the crops protected are corn and cotton—crops the Government has billions of dollars worth in storage.

Many of my colleagues in the East and the consuming parts of the country complain that money should not be spent for new irrigation districts. The story is that we now have too many crops. I will shortly point out that most of the crops raised under irrigation has not to date contributed to the surplus now on hand.

If we are to accept the theory that no new projects should be developed because we have surplus crops, then my colleagues in the East should resist moneys spent for flood-control and soil-conservation purposes. These moneys protect the soil so that more new crops can be produced. They ought also to oppose spending money on research so that more and better crops can be produced.

I can say to you, my colleagues, that this country can well become a have-not country and join more than half of the rest of the world and become hungry. Our new crop lands are limited. Our population grows rapidly. It takes 10 or 12 years to develop an irrigation project.

I am sure you realize that wars have been fought and won and even started because of the abundance or the lack of food. A hungry person does not want your prayers nor your arguments. He wants food in his stomach. If we are thinking of future generations, as we should, we would give our hearty support to this new irrigated area that can be developed to meet the needs of future generations.

How much does irrigation and reclamation add to our present surplus crops? Very little is the correct answer.

Irrigated lands in the Western States produce virtually all of the Nation's apricots, almonds, walnuts, dates, lemons, figs, prunes, and olives. They supply about 95 percent of the grapes; 90 percent of the lettuce; 85 percent of the sweet cherries; 75 percent of the avacados, pears, and cantaloupes; 65 percent of the asparagus; 50 percent of the peaches; and more than 50 percent of the commercial truck crops.

Four Federal irrigation projects in the Southwest produce over 97 percent of United States grown dates; 45 percent of winter and 42 percent of spring lettuce; 85 percent of the spring carrots; and sizable portions of the Nation's supply of other choice vegetables and truck crops.

There are very few, if any, surplus crops caused by irrigation in the Western States.

If this Congress is to continue being the custodian of the future resources of America, we must not neglect building toward a greater America which means more food, more resources, and more industry. It is in this way that we can be a dynamic, growing America, a strong resource Nation able to meet the many, many demands of an expanding population and indeed a hungry world.

Better Unemployment Compensation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM T. GRANAHAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 10, 1954

Mr. GRANAHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including the statement which I have submitted to the House Ways and Means Committee on behalf of pending bills to amend the unemployment compensation law and in support of the principles contained in the Forand bill, H. R. 9430, of which I am a cosponsor, and to which I hope that the committee and my colleagues in the House will give favorable consideration.

The statement follows:

TESTIMONY BY CONGRESSMAN WILLIAM T. GRANAHAN, OF PENNSYLVANIA, BEFORE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS, ON PENDING BILLS TO AMEND THE UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION LAW

BETTER UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I want to join in urging the approval of this committee of the principles contained in the Forand bill, H. R. 9430, of which I am a cosponsor, to increase unemployment compensation benefits approximately 50 percent and extend the period of benefits to a maximum of 39 weeks.

In addition, I earnestly support other bills before you which would extend unemployment compensation to Federal, State, and local Government employees. In Philadelphia, we are particularly aware of the desperate plight of many of the men who have been dismissed from the Navy Yard and from other Federal installations at a time of high unemployment generally, who have had serious difficulty in finding other work, and who have been ineligible for unemployment compensation.

Many of these people were recruited into Government work on the basis of patriotic appeal at a time of labor scarcity. They were told they were needed to help their country's defense effort. Jobs were plentiful in those days, and the decision to take Government employment was, as I said, motivated largely by patriotism.

It is ironic and unfortunate that the Government thereupon dispensed with their services and threw them into the labor market at the worst possible time, when competition for available jobs has been severe. But unlike other wage earners who lost their jobs in this period, these Government employees were nót eligible for unemployment compensation and had not even the compensation checks to fall back on when their jobs came to an end. They were just cast adrift as you would throw out a worn-out pair of shoes.

Therefore, I strongly urge that you take into consideration the valued service these workers have performed and cover them into the program at this time. It is a step which is long overdue, but one which we had some excuse for not having taken earlier while the Government's activities and payrolls were expanding rather than contracting as they are now. Beginning more than a year ago when the new administration began its wholesale firing of Government workers and its elimination of whole agencies and functions of Government, it should have acted promptly to meet the moral obligation to our Government employees to provide this kind of economic protection.

I venture to say that unless we take that step promptly, and include Government employees under unemployment compensation, it will seriously undermine any future attempt the Government might have to make in time of emergency to talk people into leaving other jobs and taking Government jobs. We have seen too often the spectacle of conscientious Government workers abused and condemned for doing their work well; we have seen the sense of security go out of Government career service; we are seeing now that they almost alone among American wage earners do not even have this minimum protection of unemployment compensation.

As to the Forand bill to liberalize the existing unemployment-compensation law, it would mean in Pennsylvania an increase in the maximum benefits from the present $30 a week to about $44 on the basis of present statistics on average weekly wages. In other words, with an average weekly wage of $66.08 in Pennsylvania (the figure cited by Secretary of Labor Mitchell earlier this year in his report to the States on this matter), a worker would be eligible to receive a weekly compensation check of as much as one-half his regular pay up to a maximum of two-thirds of the State average wage, in this case up to two-thirds of $66.08.

He would have to have been earning $68 a week or more to be eligible for the top maximum. On anything less than $88, he would collect one-half of his regular pay as unemployment compensation.

This formula is the same one recommended by the study commission set up by the administration, and in turn recommended by the President in an appeal to the States to adopt this formula. None of the States did so. In Pennsylvania the maximum is still only $30 a week.

I don't know exactly how many Pennsylvanians have exhausted their 26 weeks of benefits without finding suitable employment, but I am sure the number is substantial, since Pennsylvania is second only to New York in the number of unemployed, and our total started to go up precipitately around October and November—from 88,900 in October to 112,400 in November, and so on, until it has reached a level of, I believe, about a half-million. The October figure was doubled by December; that's how fast the increase was. These are just workers covered by unemployment compensation, not Government workers or others not covered.

And these are other statistics we in Pennsylvania have been experiencing:

Industrial activity in April declined for the 10th consecutive month; for the first 4 months of this year, industrial activity was down 13 percent from the same period a year ago; carloadings, depressed by the low level of production in coal and steel, were the smallest since 1939; anthracite production is the lowest in this century; and so on.

All of this indicates to me, and I hope to you, that we must act promptly to protect our workers and our economy against a sharp further drop in purchasing power by providing more adequate unemployment-compensation benefits. Extending the period of benefits of 39 weeks merely recognizes the desperateness of the difficulties of skilled workers in a period of general recession in finding suitable employment. In a State like mine, and in móst industrialized areas, when employment is off it is off for just about all businesses and not for a selected unfortunate few.

So I urge that you approve the bill which 81 of us in the House have joined in sponsoring, which would carry out these worthwhile improvements.

Under this bill, the increased benefits and wider coverage would go into effect almost immediately, at Federal Government expense, if the States do not act on their own. The States would then have until July 1955 to change their laws to conform to the newer standards. It is necessary that the Federal Government take the initiative on this right now, since no State, as I said, has so far acted on President Eisenhower's appeal directed to the States to bring their systems up to date in this fashion. We must lead the way, and then they will follow. Apparently they won't act on their own.

Putting the Bite on Us

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 10, 1954

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the cautious Wall Street Journal remarked recently:

> Tariff boosts, not cuts, might be Congress' response to Ike's freer trade urgings.
>
> If joblessness continues to rise, then a few tariff hikes are possible.

The following editorial from the June 9, 1954, issue of the Altoona (Pa.) Tribune discusses the subject and is timely reading.

The editorial follows:

PUTTING THE BITE ON US

We in Altoona have reason to know that the condition of business throughout most of the Nation has been a cause of much concern in the last 6 months.

The basic reasons for this situation appear to be vague, although the end of the Korean war, with a consequent drop in war production, is regarded as a major cause, at least.

No one has attempted to figure out just how much our foreign policies in recent years have had to do with the overall economic picture in America. But, there are many who say it is a vital factor, having its effect upon business in Altoona, as well as in most other parts of the Nation.

What factors of foreign policy?

Well, some of the most important are those relating to tariffs, to exports and imports, of course.

Even the cautious Wall Street Journal remarked recently, "Tariff boosts, not cuts, might be Congress' response to Ike's 'freer trade' urgings. If joblessness continues to rise, then a few tariff hikes are possible."

Now, few things seem to interest the American people less than a discussion of tariffs.

But the problem reaches into every industrial city of America.

Since the men behind the scenes in Washington for years have been pushing the most extensive program of internationalism in American history, the complex problems relating to sensible foreign relations, on the economic, cultural, and military fronts, have become so inextricably confused that many of our leading men seem to be totally unable to see that their duty in Washington is not the complete economic rehabilitation of every country in the world, but reasonable relations which result in benefit to the United States of America.

In brief—and in these days of popular internationalism in New York and Washington, it sounds like basest slander to state a constitutional fact—the American people do not send their representatives to Washington to be philanthropists for other nations.

IMPORTS MAKE JOBLESS

Yet a recent survey purports to show that at least 300,000 American workingmen and women are out of jobs because of import competition. And, it is said, unemployment due to the increasing number of imports into this country is increasing.

Lower labor costs abroad are making imported merchandise available in many instances to American shoppers at prices far under those of similar merchandise made in this country.

Recently, Iowa's Representative JENSEN told a House hearing that American dollars paid for most of the cost of drilling thousands of deep wells in India for irrigation, but 90 percent of the equipment used was bought in Europe.

Mr. JENSEN charged that specifications for the pipe used called for 11 threads to the inch, so American manufacturers could not even compete.

The United States standard for pipe threads, he said, is nine threads to the inch. Eleven threads are the European standard.

Mr. JENSEN also charged that the United States Reclamation Bureau bought more than half its powerhouse equipment in Europe last year. He cited a typical item of $182,000 paid to Brown Boveri Corp., Switzerland, for four circuit breakers installed at Bismarck, N. Dak. American bids for the same kind of equipment were nearly twice as high.

But if the Government does not support the American system, if it does not support the high standard of living of the American worker, can we expect such a standard to survive for long, in the face of such international competition, plus our endless handouts, our military costs, and the ceaseless efforts of Europe's Reds and radicals to involve us in one global war after the other?

Thinking in terms of the American people, we sometimes suspect, ends at the District of Columbia boundaries, and gives way to thinking in terms of foreign lands and foreign peoples.

Unemployment Compensation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 10, 1954

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, while Government agencies squabble among themselves over the extent of unemployment—with conservatives estimates putting the total at about 3½ million—9 leading Senators and 81

Members of the House, all Democrats, have joined in introducing a bill to overhaul the unemployment-compensation program, increase benefits by about 50 percent, and extend the period of coverage to 39 weeks.

I was happy to join in cosponsoring this important legislation. Westmoreland County has been hard hit by unemployment. Recent figures from the Department of Labor showed that Pennsylvania had more covered unemployment than all six New England States, plus Montana, Idaho, Wyoming, Colorado, New Mexico, Arizona, Utah, and Nevada combined—more than any State except New York. The total of New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania was equivalent to from one-fourth to one-third of all the covered unemployment in the Nation.

And another set of statistics issued by the Department of Labor showed that more than 250,000 workers in the country, as of March, had been unemployed for more than 26 weeks and had thus used up all their unemployment compensation.

The bill I have joined in sponsoring—H. R. 9430, known as the Douglas-Kennedy-Humphrey-Forand bill — would mean an increase in the maximum benefits under unemployment compensation in Pennsylvania, for instance, from the present $30 a week to $44. It would be based on a formula recommended by President Eisenhower which be directed to the individual States—and which they ignored. Not one of the States has put into effect the higher benefits the President had recommended.

Under those circumstances, the Democrats in the House and Senate waited for the President to come forward with proposed Federal legislation to take care of this pressing problem, but months went by and no administration bill was forthcoming. Consequently, we introduced our own bill to carry out these features of what we assume are the Eisenhower program, even though he has not put up much fight for it in Congress.

An interesting aspect of this situation is that at the same time he was futilely calling upon the States to increase their unemployment compensation benefits, the President's own Budget Bureau was cutting the funds for the Department of Labor in the administration both of unemployment compensation of the United States Employment Service.

The Budget Bureau cut the Labor Department's appropriation requests for the costs of administering unemployment compensation and the employment service by nearly $1 million below the level of 1953. Now the House Appropriations Committee has come along and cut it another $110,000. The amazing thing about this is that when the demands upon these services are rising, they have to fire staff members and cut down on their operations.

A tipoff to the reasoning which went into this upside-down decision lies in the fact that the Eisenhower budget, prepared beginning last July, was based on expectations of "a high level of employment, a high level of prosperity," in the words of Secretary of Labor James P. Mitchell. Thus, it would seem, the steady alarming increase in unemployment has caught the executive department by surprise, and it has not revised its budget estimate to conform to the present facts.

This has been true not only in connection with unemployment compensation and the employment service, but apparently in regard to practically all programs of government. Therefore, unless there is a quick, decisive upturn in economic activity in the country, and people go back to jobs which folded up over the past months, most of the budget estimates on which the whole Eisenhower program is based will blow sky-high, and our fiscal position will be chaotic.

Editorial Comment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JEFFREY P. HILLELSON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 10, 1954

Mr. HILLELSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Sunday, June 6, 1954, edition of the Nevada Daily Mail, Nevada, Mo.:

CONGRESS DOES SOME WORK

A number of Republican leaders have been telling us that despite all the furor over the Army-McCarthy hearings, the Congress was getting its work done. The evidence now seems to indicate that, at least so far as appropriations are concerned, this is quite correct.

Appropriations measures are supposed to be enacted by June 30, since the Government's new fiscal year begins July 1. But seldom in the last 6 years has Congress come anywhere near meeting that deadline. Once things dragged on until September 6, and twice it failed to clean up appropriations action until the very end of October.

This time the House is a whole month ahead of last year's not very impressive schedule, and the Senate seems to be doing better, too.

The House has passed 7 of the 11 money measures called for, and in the aggregate they represent five-sixths of the funds sought by President Eisenhower. The Senate has disposed of 2 of the 7 approved in the House, and has another ready for early consideration. Hearings on three more are incomplete.

If this pace could be maintained, we might see all appropriations voted by the June 30 deadline. The sticker appears to be foreign aid. Neither House can do anything on the money side until Congress approves the basic authorization for aid expenditures, and this has not been done.

Though it is too early to say what the Senate will do on this score, the House has chopped almost $3 billion off the President's requests in acting on 7 bills. About half the cut came in the military budget.

So much has been said, not only in recent months but in the last few years, about the irresponsibility and neglect of elemental lawmaking duties in Congress that it seems only fair to recognize the improvement shown in 1954 in this vital appropriations field.

Congress obviously is not at a standstill while the great inquiry grinds on. Earnest men are hard at work in the grubbiest area of lawmaking there is—marking up the money bills.

They deserve to be encouraged for their responsible effort. And one may perhaps be forgiven for hoping that their example will be contagious on Capitol Hill.

A Bill To Amend Public Law 280

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 10, 1954

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced a bill which would amend Public Law 280 to require full consultation with the Indian tribes before any legislation is enacted by a State legislature providing for an extension of the jurisdiction of the State in civil and criminal matters.

This bill was introduced in accordance with the recommendation of the President in a statement that he issued when he approved H. R. 1063 as Public Law 280.

A second provision of the bill is that final approval by the Federal Government is required before any State legislation, extending civil and criminal jurisdiction, becomes effective.

These requirements would not, however, be applicable with respect to the areas of Indian country in States, such as the five named in Public Law 280 and those named in prior statutes conferring jurisdiction on particular States, as to which jurisdiction over the matters described in that measure has been specifically placed in the State by act of Congress.

This bill would establish orderly procedure for bringing the areas of Indian country in additional States within the operation of the jurisdictional provisions added to the United States Code by Public Law 280.

In any State where such an extension of State jurisdiction was contemplated the first step would be for the Governor to consult fully with the Indians concerned to ascertain their wishes and desires in the matter and to report the results of such consultation to the Secretary of the Interior.

The second step would be a notification by the Governor to the Secretary that the State had enacted affirmative legislation for the exercise of jurisdiction over the matters described in Public Law 280 within the areas of Indian country in the State.

It would then become the duty of the Secretary to find and determine whether the proposed extension of jurisdiction would be in the best interests of the Indians concerned and whether the other conditions established by the bill had been fulfilled. If the finding and determination was in the affirmative, a public notice to that effect would be published in the Federal Register. Upon the 90th day after the publication of the notice the jurisdiction of the State would be extended, by force of the terms of the bill itself, to the matters described in Public Law 280 within the areas of the Indian country listed in the notice.

The adoption of this bill, calling for thorough Indian, State, and Federal consideration of each proposal for extending State jurisdiction over additional areas of Indian country, would offer a practical and equitable way of accomplishing the objectives underlying the enactment of Public Law 280.

Public Law 280 recognized that the constitutions or laws of certain States, other than California, Minnesota, Nebraska, Oregon, and Wisconsin, as named in the law, contain a disclaimer of jurisdiction over the matters described in that measure.

This bill which I have introduced follows those sections of Public Law 280 which recognize these disclaimers of jurisdiction, and places those States which have such disclaimers of jurisdiction in the same position as those States which do not have such disclaimers of jurisdiction.

Public Law 280 excepted the areas of Indian country comprising the Red Lake reservation in Minnesota, the Warm Springs reservation in Oregon, and the Menominee reservation in Wisconsin from the jurisdiction specifically placed in those States. Consequently, if the Congress later concluded that it would be in the best interests of the Indians concerned to provide for an extension of the jurisdiction of any one of these States to the excepted area, it would be necessary for Congress to enact a separate bill for that purpose.

There is included in this bill, therefore, an amendment to Public Law 280, making applicable to these three reservations the same procedures as are provided by this bill for the areas of Indian country where jurisdiction has not been specifically placed in the State by act of Congress. This provision would avoid any necessity for Congress at some later time to enact a separate bill or bills for an extension of State jurisdiction to one or more of these three reservations with respect to such matters.

It is felt that the procedures embodied in the proposed bill would materially aid in accomplishing the purposes of Public Law 280 by clarifying language and by providing the safeguards recommended in the President's statement.

Postal Junk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ERNEST WHARTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 10, 1954

Mr. WHARTON. Mr. Speaker, many of my constituents express amazement that our post offices are being used for the dissemination of advertising and other printed material to boxholders at nominal expense, this especially in view of the huge deficits of that Department for some time past. There is general sentiment that this service, if it could be called such, should adequately pay its own way. I submit herewith an editorial from the Albany Times Union under date of June 4 which I am sure expresses the true sentiments of the majority in my district:

POSTAL JUNK

Our mailbox at home and probably yours, too, is filled these days with an assortment of junk not even suitable for papering a room reserved for particularly obnoxious weekend guests.

This stuff is what used to be called throwaways because that literally was what it was; circulars tossed into doorways by a youngster who thereby earned a few pennies an hour.

Now, under revised postal regulations, it is carried by the postman. It is the kind of stuff that carries no name. It reads: Resident of such and such number on such and such a street, and it announces a miraculous cure for warts and things like that. It is an additional burden for the postman and generally an annoyance to the recipient.

Promoters who use this method to blanket a neighborhood get by at so little cost that it amounts to almost free delivery. Postmaster General Summerfield professes concern about a deficit. Well, here is one expense he could ask Congress to stop at once.

India Curbs Missionaries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 10, 1954

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Christian Science Monitor of May 18, 1954:

POLITICAL MEDDLING CHARGED—INDIA CURBS MISSIONARIES

(By Gordon Graham)

CALCUTTA.—The whole pattern of Christian mission work in India, built by generations of missionaries from overseas, is today in danger of severe curtailment.

This has been brought about in the short period of 1 year by the political activities of a minority of European and American missionaries who have allowed their zeal for the progress of their flocks to make them not only pastors but political advocates.

In the remote hills of Assam, for example, a group of American Baptists who have been working among the Naga hillmen for 80 years have become identified with the Nagas' unacceptable demand for independence from New Delhi.

Similarly, in Madhya Pradesh, central India, the state government has formed a committee to inquire into the allegedly unfair methods of conversion employed by missionaries in aboriginal areas.

The result is that missionaries wishing to come to India are very often refused visas, while missionaries returning to the west may not be permitted reentry. This trend is the reverse of events from 1947 to 1952 when the number of non-Indian Christian missionaries in India increased from 2,271 to 4,683. The Government of India has not revealed the current figure, but the presumption is that it is either on the decline or static.

(Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru said May 18 his Government's objections to foreign missionaries are based solely on political grounds, not religious, according to the Associated Press. During a foreign affairs debate in Parliament, he said Christianity is one of the oldest religions in India and foreign missionaries had done excellent work here, especially in education and social welfare.)

MONEY LURE SEEN

Behind the opposition to foreign mission work is the hard core of Hindu conservative thought, which notes with alarm that thousands of Indians, mainly Harijans (formerly untouchables), and remote, underprivileged tribes are adopting the Christian faith. This proselytization, the Hindus challenge, is not genuine. In the words of B. D. Khaitan, of Calcutta, "our people are poor and they fall a victim to the allurements of money, and this is how hundreds of thousands of our brethren have been compelled to accept Christianity."

In Parliament recently Miss Maniben Patel, daughter of the late Sardar Vallabhai Patel, made similar accusations claiming that missionaries concentrate on poor, illiterate people and small children.

In the hands of Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru and Home Minister Kailas Nath Katju, who are responsible for the Government of India's official policy, the extreme Hindu attitude is tempered. India is a secular state and there is no opposition to Christianity, the Government makes clear, but it would prefer, it implies, that Christianity should be propagated by Indians.

NUMERICAL STRESS

The 100 mission organizations in India, many of which are administered by Indians although they include missionaries from overseas, rest their case squarely on the Indian Constitution, which states: "All persons are equally entitled to freedom of conscience and the right to profess, practice, and propagate religion."

They draw particular attention to the use of the word "persons," which shows that these rights are not confined to Indian citizens.

The pity of the situation is that those missionaries who concentrate on numerical proselytization and may use questionable means to achieve this are a very small minority. But this minority is undermining the acknowledged achievements of the others who give education, medical aid, and social service without aiming at conversion beyond the voluntary response of those who may admire the Christian example.

The emergent trend is that Christianity in India, like most other things, is becoming subject to a policy of national self-sufficiency, and those Christian organizations which are most deeply Indianized have the best chance of growth. This gives a head start to the Roman Catholic Church, which appointed the first Indian cardinal last year.

Statement of Position on Pending Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 10, 1954

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as I am called out of Washington and will not have an opportunity to vote on the Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare bill, H. R. 9447, I would like to state for the record that I am unreservedly in favor of this legislation, have asked to be paired in favor of it, and would support it with my vote if it were possible for me to be present.

I have also been informed that a bill to extend for 1 year the present reciprocal trade agreements will probably be voted upon Friday of this week. I supported this legislation when it was before the House in a prior session, and, if it were possible for me to be present, I would again support it on final passage.

Food Prices and Living Costs in Relation to Unemployment Compensation Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 10, 1954

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the statement I submitted this morning to the House Committee on Ways and Means on the need for revision of the unemployment compensation laws to provide more adequate benefits, particularly in this time of very high living costs. The statement is as follows:

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, while the official notice from the committee does not list the Forand bill, H. R. 9430, of which I am a cosponsor, among those bills presently being considered in these hearings, I would like to plead with the committee to take it up and discuss it and act upon it. I think the subject matter of that bill is one of the most urgent matters facing the Congress today.

I don't know how many members of the committee saw the latest report from the Department of Labor on employment conditions of the Nation's major production and employment centers. It was a rather frightening report.

Sixteen major areas in the country were shifted from group III (moderate labor surplus) to group IV (substantial or very substantial labor surplus). I'd like to mention those labor areas. Leading the list alphabetically is the Albany-Schenectady-Troy, N. Y. area. Others include: Aurora, Ill., Buffalo, N. Y., Erie, Pa., Evansville, Ind., Fall River, Mass., Fort Wayne, Ind., Jackson, Miss., Joliet, Ill., Knoxville, Tenn., Peoria, Ill., Philadelphia, Pa., Pittsburgh, Pa., Reading, Pa., St. Louis, Mo., Utica-Rome, N. Y.

These 16 new surplus labor areas—areas of substantial labor surplus—are among 51 major areas of the country with anywhere from 6 to 12 percent or more unemployment. Every member of this committee, I believe, is aware from his own observation of the extent of unemployment in his State. Most of you, I think, have surplus labor areas in or close to your districts. Not a single major labor market area in the country has today a labor shortage.

This situation has been getting progressively worse since last fall. Although we have been reassured that business is going to pick up eventually, or soon, or sometime, the fact is that there has been no sudden upswing that any of us have been able to find in our own districts. In Missouri, for instance, unemployment has more than doubled since October and is about 2½ times what it was a year ago. And apparently it is still going up. More than half of the State's unemployment is concentrated in St. Louis—at least that part of the unemployment covered by unemployment compensation. Between April and May of this year, the total rose by more than 10 percent in St. Louis. I'm afraid many more people will be on the unemployment rolls in the coming months—perhaps not for as long a period as many workers currently on the unemployment compensation rolls have been out of jobs, but long enough, I fear, to experience the shock of going from a good paying job to an income of $20 or $25 or $30 a week on unemployment compensation. In my own State of Missouri the maximum benefit is $25 a week.

Now, gentlemen, if the purpose of unemployment compensation is to help sustain purchasing power in periods of temporary layoff or recession—periods such as the one we are now going through—I would appreciate if someone would let our unemployed know how they are to live on $25 a week. The cost of living in St. Louit, as in most cities in the country, is 15 or 16 percent higher than it was 4 years ago. You all know what has happened to the price of coffee—the consumer's price index, which is usually on the conservative side, listed it for April at an average of $1.13½ a pound; actually canned coffee is running around $1.35. Frankfurters were 56 cents a pound, veal cutlets $1.10, pork chops 88 cents, milk averaged 22½ cents a quart, peanut butter 49 cents a pound, eggs 55½ cents a dozen. These were average in our cities in April. Rents as we know have been going up everywhere, transportation costs go up steadily. The few things that come down in price seasonally are counterbalanced by those that go up steadily. When butter went down because of lower support prices, the average price to the consumer was still 70 cents a pound, according to the CPI.

All I am trying to get across to you gentlemen in listing these figures is the fact that the cost of living is at or very near record levels. People out of jobs must still pay the rent or the mortgage. When it comes to food, it is worthwhile, I think, to keep in mind that very few of our grocery stores in this country operate a credit business. That went out of style and became economically burdensome for the small neighborhood store in the face of severe price competition by the chains. You can't go into the grocery store—unless it might be one you have been patronizing for a number of years and is independely owned and is owner-managed, where the owner knows you—and buy a lot of groceries and charge it. The family out of work doesn't eat if it is out of cash.

So in this situation with millions of unemployed, an unemployment compensation system which works effectively has got to provide a temporary income sufficient to enable them to meet the barest minimum necessities. Twenty-five dollars a week will not do that.

Under the Forand bill, H. R. 9430, the maximum compensation benefits in a State like Missouri will be about $40 a week, basing it on the same formula President Eisenhower and Secretary of Labor Mitchell have recommended be adopted by the States. None of the States has acted to put these higher standards into effect. Many of them are unable to act this year. The Forand bill would make it possible to put these higher standards into effect immediately and then give the States a full year in which to amend their own laws and raise their standards to the recommended levels.

In addition to increasing benefits, the Forand bill also extends their duration. In Missouri, we have something like 48,000 or more unemployed subject to the unemployment compensation program. Of course, there are additional thousands unemployed not covered by the present law. In Missouri nearly 4,000 workers went off the unemployment rolls in April after exhausting their benefits. In March it was 3,000—that is 7,000 in 2 months' time. That is happening all over the country—something like 157,000 claimants had exhausted their benefits in April and another 150,000 did so in March.

That is why our bill urges an extension of the period of coverage to 39 weeks instead of the present variable periods in the different States. When we urge longer coverage, it is not because we are resigned to having people going 39 weeks without finding suitable employment. I am distressed that it takes so long. No doubt there are a few on the rolls taking an easy way out, collecting unemployment compensation and avoiding work.

But I know that is not true of the overwhelming majority of people who are jobless today and forced by necessity to try to live on unemployment compensation. They are the ones I am concerned about. They are the people the Forand bill is intended to help. I urge you to take it up and approve it and report it out for House action.

American Legion To Convene in Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELIZABETH KEE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 10, 1954

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I should like to include a recent issue of my newspaper column, Keenotes, on the subject of the American Legion convention, which will be held in the Nation's Capital from August 30 to September 2, 1954:

KEENOTES

(By Representative Elizabeth Kee)

The American Legion is coming to Washington. In its 36 years of annual meetings, it has been in every section of the country and now at long last it comes to its Capital, whose place in the world the members of the Legion have done so much to secure and protect.

The convention will be held August 30 to September 2. I am writing this note so far ahead of convention time so that my voice might be added to those who urge Legionnaires and their families to attend this year. The registration committee of the convention is anxious to have registrations as soon as possible in order to facilitate housing, entrance to places of interest, and proper planning for the needs of the huge numbers who will no doubt be in attendance. It is estimated that this will be the largest convention ever held by the Legion.

Washington is looking forward to these visitors. A great bond exists between the American Legion and this city. Our Nation's Capital embodies the tangible evidence of the bravery and sacrifice of the men who have fought for its preservation. Beside the important meetings, transaction of business and plans for the future, those who attend the convention will see the sacred shrines of their country. They will follow the path of history which saw this beautiful city rise from the mud flats along the Potomac River in little more than a century and a half. They will be serious in the realization that so many peoples of the world are looking to this place for leadership. They will feel the eyes of the Nation's leaders, past and present, on them as they march down the "avenue of parades." They will visit the Capitol and the Supreme Court, stand beside the marble figure of Chief Justice Marshall and with him look down the Mall to the white shaft of the Washington Monument and to the classic Lincoln Memorial. They will stand in respectful attention at the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier in Arlington. They will visit the White House, and perhaps take a boat ride down the river to Mount Vernon. If time permits, they will visit other places of interest, the Smithsonian Institute, the Congressional Library, the art galleries, the FBI, the mint, and many others. There will be much to do and see, but perhaps above all that they do and see, there will enter into their hearts the strengthened realization that whatever they might have suffered or sacrificed in their participation in war, here in Washington is the symbolic evidence that it was not in vain. They can take with them, when they leave, the knowledge that the American people are eternally grateful to them.

Principle Into Practice Is Now the Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 10, 1954

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following article from the Nashville Tennessean:

Principle Into Practice Is Now the Problem

Historic though it is, the school-segregation decision handed down yesterday by the United States Supreme Court could not be called unexpected.

And because it could not, it should be viewed in the perspective of the long sweep of time.

It is not going to bring an overnight revolution. It is, in the years ahead, going to bring some changes or at least accelerate some already underway.

But the South is and has been for years a land of change. Its people—of both races—have learned to live with change.

They can learn to live with this one. Given a reasonable amount of time and understanding, they will.

As a matter of principle, the status of segregation in the public schools is no longer in doubt. Unanimously, the Nation's highest tribunal has ruled that it violates the United States Constitution's guarantee that every citizen shall have equal protection under the laws.

The problem to be faced, therefore, is how to reconcile practice with this principle. No one who knows the problem can say that its solution will come easily. The prejudices of generations cannot be swept away with one stroke of the legal brush. To pretend that they could would be to court consequences potentially more damaging and unsettling than any attending the problem as it now stands.

THE LAW OF THE LAND

The existence of extralegal difficulties, however, cannot become a permanent excuse for disregarding the legal principle.

The principle has been unequivocally enunciated as the law of the land. To flout it would not only bring discredit to a great section but would merely delay what have now become inevitable decisions.

In facing up to it, the people need to call on the best that is in themselves. They also look for guidance in implementing the principle to the same Supreme Court which has pronounced it.

And such guidance, it is reassuring to note, seems certain to come in one form or another.

For while the Court has stated flatly that "in the field of education the doctrine of separate but equal has no place," it has with sympathetic wisdom called for further arguments on how and when to translate principle into practice.

That the Court faced squarely up to the issue and ruled as it did should not come as too great a surprise.

For more than 15 years now, it has been enunciating new points of law in gradually breaking down the barriers of segregation in public educational institutions. The "separate but equal" doctrine itself, as handed down in the celebrated *Plessy* v. *Ferguson* case of 1896, had already been successfully attacked as it related to institutions of higher learning.

It has seemed inevitable, therefore, that the Court would ultimately rule against segregation in all public schools. The question was when, and it has now been answered.

NO IMMEDIATE INTEGRATION

For several reasons, however, this does not mean that integration is going to replace segregation in a day, a year, or even a decade.

In the first place, the Court itself has delayed implementing its ruling by scheduling new arguments for this fall on the mechanics of putting it into effect.

That in itself provides not only additional time in which to seek a workable solution but a highly appropriate forum for consideration of the problem in the kind of calm atmosphere it demands. By recognizing the practical considerations as well as the legal ones that are involved, the Supreme Court can do itself great credit and the people of the South, both white and Negro, a profound service.

Even when the Court's decrees are handed down in their final form, however, much will remain before even the legal barriers, much less the practical ones, are broken down.

Mr. Harry Ashmore, editor of the Little Rock Gazette, explains this in detail in his just-published summary of the exhaustive survey conducted under the auspices of the Ford Foundation, the Negro and the Schools. He writes:

"The distinction made here between legal and de facto segregation is essential to any consideration of the future of biracial education in the United States. The limit of Supreme Court action is the setting of a new legal precedent; even if segregation in the public schools were flatly declared unconstitutional, integration would be ordered only in the 5 school districts cited in the 5 specific cases.

"No change would necessarily occur in the other 11,173 districts where segregation has been legal and usually practiced until and unless individual suits were brought against each administrative unit. This in itself guarantees a rather lengthy transition period.

"As long ago as 1938 the Court began enunciating the new points of law which led to the admission of Negroes to the graduate schools of southern universities, yet 15 years later the admission standards of 5 State universities in the South still remain inviolate and the number of Negro students on the desegregated campuses still may be counted in the hundreds."

EXTRALEGAL FORCES AT WORK

Finally, there is the fact that even when the legal bars are finally overcome certain social forces now working against integration will still be at work.

In cities, for example, the pattern of residential segregation is almost sure to result in educational segregation, just as it already has in many communities outside the South. In borderline sections and in the rural areas, there is reason to believe that a system of free choice would in many instances produce all-white and all-Negro schools, as also has frequently been the case outside the South.

For all this, there are apt in time to be some profound changes in the system of biracial education, particularly in those areas where the Negro population is small and getting smaller and where the expense of maintaining separate schools is growing and excessively burdensome.

It remains, therefore, for the South to use the time left to it in preparing for the adjustments that seem likely.

How shall this be done?

That is what must now be determined. Already, however, one thing is certain:

It will not be done by inflammatory statements, threats of violence, or rash proposals to abolish the public schools and substitute for them subterfuge systems which would at best delay the day of decision and at worst imperil the education of thousands of children.

IT MUST BE GRADUAL

Generally speaking, it will be done by profiting all that is possible from the experience of States which have long been without legal segregation in their schools and then, in an atmosphere of cooperation and reality, adapt that experience to the peculiar situation of the South.

The Negroes, there is reason to believe, are no more anxious for a complete upheaval than are the whites of the South.

A revealing indication of their attitude came earlier this year from the man who has led their fight in the courts, Chief Counsel Thurgood Marshall of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.

Promising his race's complete cooperation with the Supreme Court's decision, he stated that it would take at least 4 to 5 years to bring about integration and that in areas of extremely dense Negro population, a ruling that we are legally right would have little effect for 30 years.

"It must be gradual," he counseled, "and it must be done through cooperation at the local level."

ACROSS THE COMMUNITY TABLE

This emphasis on cooperation at the local level is well put. For no matter how broad the problem and its many ramifications may look today, it will in the end come down to each community, each school district for attention and action.

"It is here," Mr. Ashmore writes, "that the South will have to determine the future of its educational system. Wise leadership at the upper levels can help, and emotional excursions by the leaders of either race can do great harm. But in the end the new pattern will have to be hammered out across the table in thousands of scattered school districts, and they will have to be shaped to accommodate not only the needs but the prejudices of whites and Negroes to whom these daily problems are not abstractions but the essence of their daily lives."

It is in this way that the South has met and overcome other problems rooted in a departed past.

It is in this way, and in no other, that the people of the South will solve this problem that now arises.

And in so doing, they will be paying new honor to the principles of democracy they so readily profess but, on occasion, so reluctantly practice.

Agricultural Research

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER JOHNSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 10, 1954

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter and program which I have received from R. K. Froker, dean and director of the College of Agriculture of the University of Wisconsin at Madison, Wis., which is being sent to people in our State. As a Congressman who is vitally interested in agriculture, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to what Wisconsin is doing in agricultural research, and I wish to commend Dean Froker and the College of Agriculture for the excellent job they are doing in informing the farmers of Wisconsin of the new research developments in the field of agriculture.

Dean Froker's letter reads as follows:

THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN,
COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE,
Madison.

DEAR FRIEND: You've probably already heard something about this year's Farmers' Field Days at the university, but I want to take this opportunity to invite you to attend and to interest other farmers in the event. The dates are June 15 and 16.

Our staff has an interesting program lined up to show our visitors, and we think we'll have something to interest and benefit every farmer who comes.

The main field attraction will be grassland farming. All the major makes of forage harvesters and other harvesting machinery will be operating in a hayfield, and agronomists will be on hand at test plots to talk about such subjects as seeding and grazing.

The big features in the buildings of the Electric Research Farm, site of this year's field day, are the pushbutton devices that take a lot of the hard work out of choretime. There will be exhibits and demonstrations of new research developments in many fields—livestock, poultry, horticulture, insect control, dairy, economics, etc. And, naturally, there will be a program for the ladies in the afternoon of both days. The attached folder lists some of the things we plan to show this year.

The Electric Research Farm is just too small to handle our expected crowd adequately. To try to even things up, we're asking farmers from areas west of Madison to attend on June 15, and those from east to attend on June 16.

Refreshments and hot lunches can be purchased at the farm. The farm, by the way, is located near the junction of routes 12 and 18 with the belt-line highway routes 12, 13, 14, and 18 bypassing Madison. There's a map on the attached folder.

Because you're on our annual report mailing list, I know you take an interest in agricultural research. At the field day, you can see some results of this research at first hand. We don't send this letter to every farmer in the State, so I'd appreciate it greatly if you would tell others about the field days and help us show our research to as many farmers as possible. I'll be looking forward to seeing you there.

Sincerely,

RUDOLPH K. FROKER,
Dean and Director.

HERE'S WHAT YOU'LL SEE AT FIELD DAY

ON THE FIELD TOUR

How the electric farm was planned, strip grazing for dairy cows, pasture renovation, pasture fertilization, farm planning, erosion control, soil maps, corn fertilization, hay harvest machine display, horizontal silos, Minnesota power fencepost driver, identification of grasses and legumes.

AT THE WOMEN'S PROGRAM

Get the most from the equipment dollar, how do you clean carpets? is the food you serve safe? color in the home, all-day tours through farm home kitchen and workroom.

IN THE EXHIBIT AREA

Hay-drying machinery, brucellosis (results with strain 19 and M vaccines), internal parasites of cattle, bloat, leptospirosis, pasture for meat production, poor roughage is costly, chicks like feeds with fat, turkey forage research results, respiratory diseases of poultry, breeding for egg quality, improved strawberries, garden insect and disease control, chemicals prevent sprouting of stored vegetables, woody landscape plants, summer care of roses, disease control in tobacco seedbeds, fertilizer injury in tobacco seedbeds, what kind of nonfat powder makes the best milk, economic problems facing dairymen and what can be done about them.

IN THE FARM BUILDINGS

Automatic barn ventilation, proper barn lighting, silo unloader, automatic feed mixing, easier feed hauling, electric cow trainers, automatic barn cleaner, automatic manure stacker, mow hay drying, modern farm shop, room and water heater in milkhouse, automatic hog waterer, automatic poultry waterers, automatic poultry feeders, heat lamps for brooding pigs and chicks, pushbutton fly control in the barn.

Machinery demonstrations in hayfields start at 2 each afternoon. All major makes will be shown actually cutting grass and putting it into the horizontal silos.

National Association of Insurance Commissioners Takes Action Designed To Crack Down on Companies Using Gimmicks and Misrepresentation in Selling Accident and Health Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 7, 1954

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, it is highly gratifying to learn that the National Association of Insurance Commissioners recognizes that there is justification in the complaint that has been made against certain insurance companies with respect to unfair gimmicks contained in some accident and health policies and unfair practices with reference to claims under such policies.

This statement is based upon a news article appearing in the Washington Daily News, issue of Thursday, June 10, 1954. It reads as follows:

INSURANCE GROUP VOTES SHARP ATTACK ON GIMMICKS

(By Lowell Bridwell)

DETROIT, June 10.—The National Association of Insurance Commissioners has taken strong action designed to crack down on companies using gimmicks and misrepresentation in selling accident and health insurance.

The NAIC accident and health committee pushed aside stiff opposition in acting to answer public clamor for stronger control, and forestall the threat of Federal regulation of insurance companies.

The committee unanimously voted a three-pronged attack on health insurance gimmicks by recommending laws, among them one that would vigorously regulate advertising. The NIAC has no power to force any of the 48 member States to act on its recommendations, but it carries considerable weight in almost all States.

The NAIC also indicated it would actively participate in a strong move by some of the biggest and most reputable companies writing accident and health insurance to police their own business. These companies and 7 trade organizations 6 weeks ago formed a joint committee to tackle the problem of how to curb practices that hurt their business.

PASS RESOLUTIONS

The NAIC committee passed 3 resolutions, 1 of which recommends that laws be passed to require insurance companies to:

Include a prominent statement in any advertising whether accident and health policies can be cancelled and renewal refused solely on the basis of a company decision. And the terms of cancellation and renewal also must be printed prominently on the first page of any policy.

Any advertising outlining the benefits of an accident and health insurance policy also must contain the limitations of the policy.

Anyone buying a policy may return it within a certain length of time and get back the money paid if he discovers in reading the policy that he has been misled or deceived by advertising or by an agent.

Another resolution urged that all States adopt a law which would set a time limit (3 years) on any company claim that a person filing for benefits is not entitled to them because of some illness or disease he had before he bought the policy. This already is a law in most States.

The third resolution strongly urged each State to pass a law which, in effect, would allow any State to regulate an insurance company selling policies there, regardless of what State the company claimed as its home.

The measures were fought primarily by companies selling mail-order insurance.

Several commissioners, including Donald Knowlton, NAIC vice president and New Hampshire commissioner said "gimmicks" in accident and health insurance have been brought into sharp focus by a series of articles in the Scripps-Howard newspapers showing that thousands of people bought policies under which they thought they were fully protected, but later found they weren't.

ACTION REVERSED

The strong action by the committee was a reversal of NAIC action of the first 2 days of its convention here. In previous days, NAIC committees had either failed to take strong action on problems confronting the commissioners, or, in some cases, failed to even discuss the problems.

A committee dealing with the financial solvency of insurance companies met and promptly adjourned without discussion of any problems. Normally, it would be expected this committee would have serious discussions on the cases of three Texas insurance companies which have gone broke within the last year and left thousands of policyholders without protection. The committee chairman was Garland A. Smith who also is insurance commissioner of Texas.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House has conducted an investigation of the inadequacy in general of the coverage provided by the average health policy. The Washington Daily News, as well as the Scripps-Howard newspapers, have been exceedingly helpful in this investigation by the committee by writing and publishing a series of articles on the subject. These articles were widely read and resulted in bringing to the attention of the committee a tremendous fund of information submitted by individuals who alleged improper and deceptive treatment as a result of gimmicks in the so-called health policies that did not come to their attention until after a claim had arisen.

The newspaper Labor, of Washington, D. C., also published a series of articles of the same character. These articles likewise produced a great number of complaints that were placed at the disposal of the committee.

The House committee conducted extensive hearings on the basis of the complaints that were presented to it. In the course of the hearings representatives of the National Association of Insurance Commissioners were heard. They expressed an interest in having the conditions remedied. Evidently the action taken by the commissioners in the annual convention in Detroit to which the above article relates, is the direct result of the desire previously expressed to the committee to be helpful in this important matter. The action of the commissioners is timely and it is appreciated.

The Tung Oil Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 10, 1954

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, southeastern tung-oil producers are confronted with serious difficulty in obtaining adequate price supports for their product. Something of the importance of the industry to America is pointed out in the following article from Nation's Business.

New Markets Spur Tung Oil Output

(By Ann Moreton and Evelyn R. Griffith)

A multi-million-dollar tung-oil industry has developed in the past 20 years in a strip of high, rolling land 100 miles inland from the Gulf of Mexico.

From the 154,000 acres of trees in this area came 42 million of the 50 million pounds of tung oil that this country used in 1953. The rest came from Argentina—oriental sources now being closed to us. At an average price of 28 cents a pound, the oil paid the farmers more than $11,750,000. United States production for this crop year is estimated by the Department of Agriculture at 24 million pounds, or half as much as last year due to three unprecedented freezes.

Nearly everybody uses tung oil in some way every day. Your toothpaste tube, automobile foot brake, linoleum, and furniture all have this oil in their finish, as does the insulation in your telephone. The ink on this page probably contains American grown tung.

The known unique characteristic of tung oil are its quick-drying quality and resistance to acids and alcohols. It is used for water-proofing and insulation. When it was first imported to the United States after the Civil War it was used only as a quick-drying agent for varnishes and lacquers. Today it has hundreds of uses and new ones are constantly being discovered, some of them in the medical world.

Paints containing tung oil are used for underwater surfaces such as swimming pools, locks, dams, piers, boats, bathtubs, and fishing rods. Tung's hard, durable waterproof properties make it valuable to industry for use in linoleum, oilcloth, wallboard, artificial leather, paper bags, cartons, and cans.

Lithographic printing took a step forward when tung was used in printing on metal containers, bottle caps, advertising plates, and metal signs requiring perfect cohesion. Tung-oil varnishes make a protective film for labels on metal.

In the electrical industry insulating varnishes made with tung oil are used for treating coils, coating fibrous materials for insulating wire and metallic surfaces. A strategic material during World War II, tung oil was used in military communications equipment.

The tung tree is native to China, where Marco Polo gave a circumstantial account of its harvesting in the 13th century, but it did not reach this country until 1906, when Consul General L. S. Wilcox, stationed in Hankow, shipped some seed to the Plant Introduction Garden at Chico, Calif. These were propagated and sent to various sections for trial. The trees proved temperamental. Although not tropical in nature, they require at least 40 inches of rainfall annually and cool winter temperatures for proper dormancy. They thrive on lean land with proper fertilization, providing the soil has high moisture-holding capacity, good drainage, and a degree of acidity.

California did not meet these requirements. It was too dry. The Middle Western States were too cold; southern Florida too hot.

The Gulf Coast States were just right. A cemetery caretaker near Tallahassee planted five trees. One survived, and the first gallon of American tung oil taken from it was exhibited at a paint manufacturers' convention in 1913. By 1928 one commercial orchard was operating in Florida, and the State had the country's first crushing mill. Seed from the pioneer Florida orchard started the first tung orchard in Mississippi, a State which in 1952 produced 60 percent of this country's tung crop. Of this, some 40 percent came from Pearl River County.

This 828-square-mile county's 41,000 acres of bearing orchards in 1952 produced 17 million pounds of oil, valued at $4,500,000. The three banks in the county show an increase of more than $6 million in deposits since 1930, which is an indication of the economic outgrowth of tung and related industries. Legumes growing between the tung rows not only fertilize the trees but supplement pastures; consequently, today the county has 30,000 head of beef cattle and 150 grade A dairies. The annual livestock show in Picayune is a direct result of this practice.

Pearl River County uses more fertilizer than 14 surrounding counties combined. The farm income has doubled since 1939, and land values rose up to $20 per acre prior to the general rise all over the South.

In Poplarville, the county seat, nearly every home has a few trees planted in the yard or along the fence rows which they call their taxpayer and use for that purpose. Groves range from these fence-row crops to 6,000 acres.

Meanwhile, Florida's 3 million bearing trees brought the State more money than the entire output of sweetpotatoes last year. Figures show that the tung crop was valued at more than the market price paid for the State's pecan crop and half as much as was paid for all honey produced.

Louisiana, with 35,000 acres planted to tung, is in second place.

Alabama, Georgia, and Texas are relatively small tung producers. Alabama's 3,000 acres of tung are centered mostly around Mobile, and Georgia has nearly 1,000 acres planted with a few groves as far east as Savannah, while Texas has 1,000 acres, all east of Houston. One tung farmer near Beaumont says, "I planted tung because I made up my mind to have my own old-age pension."

This old-age security appeal has made tung one of the unique agricultural products in the South because it has not been traditionally planted by father and son as rice, sugarcane and cotton have been. Businessmen from Michigan, Illinois, Pennsylvania, Washington, and New York have bought tung farms as investments and more than 200 of them have moved into the tung belt in the past 10 years. Today the American Tung News and Tung World, magazines published by the American Tung Oil Association and the Tung Oil Council, respectively, go to people in 32 States and 8 foreign countries. Cut-over pinelands and worn-out cottonfields offer another 1 million acres of potential tung land in the South.

A farmer can start a tung orchard with very little cash. Tung fits well into farm operations because it requires relatively little labor at times when other crops need attention. The tree is relatively free from attack by insects and diseases and companion crops for the market can be grown between the rows for the first 3 years, improving soil fertility and providing a substantial income to help keep the tung investment low.

The money-making row crops successfully grown include strawberries, peppers, corn, peanuts, sweetpotatoes, field peas, beans, and melons.

4–H Club boys and girls are learning the actual money value of tung by participating in annual nursery and acreage contests sponsored by the American Tung Oil Association and supervised by the assistant county agent.

One 12-year-old, Tyrone Jones, near Lumberton, Miss., spent $2.50 for 33 pounds of tung nuts and used $2 worth of fertilizer to plant one-tenth of an acre in the 1952 nursery contest. The next year he used his nursery trees to enter the 1-acre contest and won a $50 prize—a nice return on his investment.

An acre will produce from 1 to 2 tons of globe shaped nuts which tourists sometimes mistake for chestnuts—an error which sometimes leads to hospitalization.

Inside the hull are five white kernels from which the oil is extracted. The trees begin to produce when 3 years old and continue satisfactorily for 25 to 30 years. A ton of nuts will average 280 pounds of oil, although the Isabel variety has produced 1,000 pounds of salable oil per acre for the past 3 years.

This variety is one of those developed in a tung experimental program which, according to Dr. William H. Chandler, assistant dean of the College of Agriculture at the University of California, "has accomplished more in 10 years' research in the United States than any other similar group."

The search for better varieties is centered in the Tung Experiment Station laboratories at Bogalusa, La., Cairo, Ga., and Gainesville, Fla.

Bogalusa is also working on mechanical picking and harvesting machinery. Today the nuts are hand-picked, a chore requiring 10 man-hours per ton of fruit.

One crushing mill also is experimenting with a new solvent process to extract the oil from the nuts. The 14 crushing mills in the area have previously done this by pressure alone.

Other researchers see far broader horizons for this comparative newcomer to the American agricultural scene.

"The heart of marketing a product depends on the analysis of the product," according to Dr. A. F. Freeman of the Southern Agricultural Research Laboratory in New Orleans, 1 of 4 such laboratories in the United States. Here five people work full time on tung. They set up the standards for domestic oils and are advancing scientific information on tung to extend beyond protective coatings. Dr. A. M. Altschul, head of the Oilseed Division says: "We have a two-fold approach in our research. First, what can we do in a general way to use oils and second, how can we take advantage of any special qualities of tung?"

The important thing to come out of tung research in the past 50 years is Dr. W. G. Bickford's discovery of the architecture of the eleostearic molecule in the alpha (liquid) and beta (solid) forms. Tung is the only source of eleostearic acid in the United States. This acid is responsible for the quick drying quality of tung oil. Following routine, when this test was completed the properties of the components were submitted to the Chemical and Biological Coordination Center in Washington, D. C., which in turn forwarded this information to its 100 members. At least 10 of these members, corporations and laboratories, have requested samples for tests in the use of tung oil for cancer control, weed control, fungicides, and even snail control.

Another outstanding accomplishment of the Southern Regional Laboratory in New Orleans was the compiling of a 4-volume Tung Abstract Bibliography which required translating 7 languages, using 3,000 references and covering 75 years of information. This was judged the best published document in the field of agriculture and natural science in 1951–52 and was awarded the Oberly Memorial Award of the American Library Association for 1953. For the first time the American tung grower now has access to all printed material on tung.

This laboratory also is engaged in research for the use of residues from agricultural products such as peanut shells, rice hulls, cotton burs, and tung mealcake and hulls. Fifty to sixty thousand tons of tung hulls must be disposed of annually. So far fertilizer and cattle feed are the only uses.

Some pioneer tung growers believe that in a few years a good part of the tung fruit will be harvested green and processed for purposes not now known.

The use of American-grown tung in the medical field started in 1951 in Gulfport, Miss. Though it was thought to be toxic 5 years ago, Dr. M. M. Snelling, fellow of the American College of Surgeons, is using tung oil in the treatment of external cancer with amazing results. He says, "Healthy tissues grow 50 percent faster than with any other treatment." It is his opinion that this indicates a new approach to cancer research. Outstanding results are also being obtained by Dr. Snelling from the use of tung on burns, external ulcers, dermatitis, and athlete's foot. The University of Tennessee, Tulane University Medical School, Cornell Division of Bellevue Hospital, and Emory University participated in establishing the nontoxicity of tung oil.

Lamont Rowlands, sometimes called the father of the tung industry in Mississippi, sums up the future of tung, saying, "We have only touched the hem of the garment in the possibilities of the use of tung oil. Its future is great and those who worked in its development will look back upon the pioneering days and thank God that they helped establish this industry which is bringing a blessing to our country."

Commencement Address to the Graduates of the Woodstown, N. J., High School, Wednesday, June 9, 1954, by Hon. Charles A. Wolverton, of New Jersey

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 7, 1954

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to address the graduating class of the Woodstown High School, Salem County, N. J., on the occasion of the 69th commencement exercises of that splendid high school that has had such a long and outstanding record of achievement in educational circles in southern New Jersey.

I include extracts from the address that I delivered on the above occasion to the graduates of the class of 1954 on Wednesday evening, June 9, 1954, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, members of the graduating class, and their friends, tonight we meet under circumstances that are inspiring and encouraging.

INSPIRING

What could be more inspiring, what could more surely stir the imagination, what could more certainly create a feeling of assurance as to the future welfare and permanency of our Nation than to behold such a splendid group of young women and young men as compose this graduating class—intelligent, sincere, and earnest minded, hopeful and courageous—facing the future with an intense and earnest desire to succeed, each with a full realization and understanding of our national ideals and purposes, and each imbued with a desire to play their part in life wholeheartedly and courageously?

SUCCESS

Tonight marks the closing of one chapter and the opening of another in the life of each graduate. They are each standing on the threshold of life. They are each facing the future. There is a glow and a beauty about it, that beckons each of them onward. Across the horizon of each life can be seen in letters of gold, shining with an attractive brilliancy, that magic word, success.

There is no word in all the English language that has so thrilled, inspired, and encouraged. To attain it men have been willing to sacrifice and suffer, challenge perils, and endure hardships. It is the keynote of ambition.

NO COUNTRY WHERE YOU CAN SO READILY RISE

There is no country in all the world where able and energetic young men and young women can so readily rise as this. All kinds of excuses are given by those who have not succeeded. Very often they say they have never had a chance. This is all nonsense. No boy or girl in this great country, today, can truthfully say they do not have a chance. Some, it is true, may have better chances to start with than others, but everyone has a chance, and many who have started with the poorest chances have outstripped and far surpassed the more fortunate ones. Remember, as Emerson has said, "No one can cheat you out of success but yourself."

PUBLIC-SCHOOL SYSTEM

In view of the fact that this graduating class is the product of the public-school system, it is appropriate to emphasize the importance of our public-school system. There is no agency in all the world that tends so surely to promote success in the individual life and at the same time make certain and secure our national stability as the public-school system of America.

The public school is America's most precious jewel. It is the heart and soul of our national life and existence. Aside from the church there is no more necessary institution to insure the safety and permanency of our Nation and promote the general welfare.

The first and last line of defense of American democracy against our foes without and our foes within will always be the public school, guarded and protected by that grand army of self-sacrificing and devoted body of teachers who are constantly instilling knowledge, wisdom, and ideals into the minds of the children of our land.

We cannot give too much attention to the public-school system of our country. It is the greatest factor in education in all the world. It should claim not only our most serious consideration, but also command the utmost of our endeavors to promote its efficiency and usefulness.

NECESSITY FOR EDUCATION

The necessity for every young man and young woman to obtain the highest possible education is becoming more and more apparent. The requirements of this present age are greater than ever before, and with each succeeding year will become even greater. There are more trained men and women today than yesterday, and there will be more tomorrow than today. The time has been when just a general knowledge was sufficient to carry one through life and give an opportunity for a fair measure of success in any pursuit or vocation. But today the demand is for the individual with special knowledge, and not to be so prepared is to be greatly handicapped and to decrease the opportunity to accomplish much. Therefore, my young friends, strive to obtain all the education and vocational equipment possible. You will need it.

OPPORTUNITY FOR WOMEN

The presence of these young ladies in this graduating class prompts me to emphasize the fact that every avenue of activity in life is now open to them, and there has never been a time in all the history of the world when women had such marvelous opportunities of service as in this present age.

It has only been a comparatively few years ago when it was thought that women did not need any special or advanced education. But these later years have witnessed an awakening, an emancipation of womankind, a breaking of the bonds of custom and prejudice, and her elevation to a place where she can face and grasp equal opportunities. We have learned that women can really be educated without spoiling them.

As a result of the increased educational facilities now open to women, they are qualified and are now filling with distinction and honor positions of great responsibility in every field of activity. What finer or more deserved recognition of woman's ability to render worthwhile and important service than the presence of one at the present time in the Cabinet of the President of the United States—Mrs. Oveta Culp Hobby, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare—and the quality of service she is rendering in that high Cabinet position is not only a credit to womanhood but a complete justification of the President's judgment in having selected her for that important office. Or, if you do not aspire to a place in a President's Cabinet, you may prefer to serve alongside of the 2 women who now hold membership in the Senate or the 10 who serve in the House of Representatives.

While I have sought to emphasize the advantages and in fact the necessity of education in promoting the welfare of the individual and the strength of our national life, yet there can be nothing accomplished that is worthwhile, either individually or as a nation, no matter how great the degree of intelligence, unless there be an underlying foundation of good character.

PREEMINENCE DUE TO NATIONAL CHARACTER

We stand preeminent among the nations of the world because we have here in America the highest type of national character that has yet existed. Whether we retain this position in the future depends upon the individual citizen. The whole cannot be any greater than its parts. The parts are the individuals who compose our citizenship and as these parts are good or bad in the aggregate so will be the Nation. Public virtue cannot exist except as it is founded upon private virtue. The fundamental factor must always be the character of the individual citizen. Therefore, the future welfare of this Nation and the influence it will exert among the nations of the world depends upon each individual citizen, upon you, and upon these graduates who will be the citizens of tomorrow.

The strength of this Nation does not lie merely in the beauty of its structure and form of government. Beauty has no permanency in itself. I never go into the city of Washington but that I am impressed with the beauty of its buildings, especially one whose high dome can be seen long before you reach the city. Once you have entered the city and walked up its broad avenues and approached this building, you are impressed with the plain beauty of its architecture. Within its portals you are awed by the magnificence of the scene. Highly polished marble, a striking scheme of coloring, immense pillars of onyx rising to a great height in support of the dome. You are impressed with the beauty of the scene. But what sustains all this beauty? Down beneath the beauty of the superstructure of the Congressional Library lies the strong broad foundation stones that make possible its permanency and without which the beauty could not exist for a single moment. Thus, beneath the beauty of our national superstructure there is the foundation of national character. Without it our Nation cannot exist, any more than the nations of yesterday that have flourished for a time and then crumbled into ruins.

Greece conquered the world and sat down to enjoy herself and was rudely awakened by Rome thundering at her gates, realizing too late she had lost her power.

Rome gained the victory and united all the so-called civilized world under her banners, then she, too, sat down to enjoy herself and Rome was startled by the barbarians of the north sweeping through her domain.

The power of Greece was not her armies, but the strength of Spartan manhood. When manhood was lost by the destruction of the forces of character Rome found the Greeks an easy prey.

Rome believed that her power was in her well-organized, well-trained alert army. But the morale of that army broke down when character weakened and proud Rome was no match for the barbarian hordes.

The power of Greece was gone before Rome thundered at her gates. That is why she fell. The power of Rome was gone before the invasion of the barbarians or the barbarians would have been driven back.

With the high ideals that have been built into the foundation of our Republic we are safe so long as these ideals prevail and strength of character remains, but if we lose those ideals and character weakens, the structure will crumble as did Greece and Rome.

No nation has ever fallen that was not first conquered from within. America of tomorrow will be what these and other graduates of today—who are citizens of tomorrow—make of it. Intelligence without character will never sustain nor make stable our structure of government. Intelligence with character will, however, give strength and permanency.

OUR NEED TODAY

We need today the same type of character that was needed in the men who with Washington laid the foundations of this Nation. We need the same type of character that was needed in the men who with Lincoln struggled to maintain our national unity.

We need leaders of the type that are willing to put principle above personal ambition or selfish interest. Leaders who will stand foursquare against all wrong and uphold principles which they know to be right.

But we need more than leaders. In this land where every individual holds sovereign power the leaders will be no more and no less than the masses demand. We are the rulers. All have a part and a responsibilty. The responsibility cannot be shifted, it may be neglected, but it rests upon the shoulders of each individual just the same.

We need men and women who will take the duties, responsibilities, privileges, and opportunities of poplar government seriously. We, the people, are the Republic. It is for us to say what America's future will be.

YOUTH DETERMINES FUTURE NATIONAL CHARACTER

It is to the youth of our land that we look to determine what our future national character is to become and quite rightly, too. The youth of today is the citizen of tomorrow; and never forget that our future national character is to be derived not from the rich alone, or the poor alone, not from the city alone, or the country alone, but from every single individual in our Nation, from the highest to the lowest, from every grade of society, from the palatial residence to the tiny cottage. Surely, then, it is incumbent upon us to provide such means as shall exalt our youth.

REALIZE SOMETHING IS EXPECTED OF YOU

The greatest inspiration and incentive to the accomplishment of things in this life is to realize that something is expected of you. Not of somebody else, but of you. The men and the women who have achieved the greatest success in life have been those who have appreciated this truth and have sought to govern their lives accordingly. When an individual realizes that something is expected of him, in most cases, he will seek to measure up to the particular thing that is expected of him. Therefore, as an underlying principle, have this thought firmly implanted in your mind. Make it a part of yourself and seek each day to fulfill it. At the beginning of the day stop long enough to give expression to these words, "Something is expected of me" and at the close of the day these words, "What have I accomplished?"

PURPOSE: TO ACCOMPLISH SOMETHING

Realizing that something is expected of you, then "purpose" in your heart that you will accomplish something. Without a fixed purpose nothing much can be accomplished. An individual without a purpose is like a ship without a rudder. It can never get anywhere. But, a young man or a young woman with a purpose in life has something definite in mind and therefore reaches something definite. How foolish we would consider the captain who left harbor without a definite purpose as to where he was going. Until he did so, he would be nothing more than a drifter upon the sea.

I regret to say that too many young men and women are nothing more than drifters. They drift into this or that pursuit, not because of any particular liking or particular adaptability for it, but solely and entirely because it gives an opportunity for a job. When they tire of that they drift out and drift into something else, and so on, drifting, drifting, drifting through life, and never accomplishing anything worthwhile. But the individual who starts out on the sea of life with a definite purpose to accomplish something, steering a straight and steady course with that object in mind, accomplishes something because they purposed.

CREATE AN IDEAL, PURPOSE TO ATTAIN IT

Create an ideal and purpose to attain it. In this connection, I would like to relate a circumstances that made an everlasting impression upon me. It comes to my mind tonight because of the similarity of the occasion on which it took place. I was a student at the University of Pennsylvania at the time the incident occurred. On University Day the student body was gathered together in the Academy of Music and filled it from pit to dome. The speaker was the President of the United States, William McKinley. I shall never forget as he stood before that great assemblage with a quiet dignity that made his words seem majestically impressive. He raised his hand and with a supreme silence pervading the whole place, he spoke these words, that burned themselves into my memory, never to be forgotten, he said, "Young men, have an ideal in life, keep it ever before you, keep it burning bright, sacrifice to attain it."

Could I leave with you any finer message this evening, anything more worthwhile as you stand upon the threshold of wider activity? I think not. And, if you forget all else, remember these words of his, "Have an ideal, keep it ever before you, keep it burning bright, sacrifice to attain it."

I have sought to emphasize upon you as graduates: First, the importance of a continuance of your education; second, the realization that something is expected of you; third, the importance of having a clearly defined purpose to achieve; fourth, the value of an ideal in life.

I extend to you, the graduating class, the congratulations and best wishes which you merit, and the sincere hope that a large measure of success will be yours in the days to come, yet never forget that the education you receive is but a trust, of which you are steward, and that the responsibility is upon you and each of us to do our part to make America's future what it should be.

Vocational Rehabilitation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 7, 1954

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend and revise my remarks, I set forth specifically some of the telegrams and letters which I have received from people of Louisiana supporting the increase in the appropriation for vocational rehabilitation. They are as follows:

BATON ROUGE, LA.,
June 4, 1954.

Hon. OVERTON BROOKS,
Member of Congress, House Office Building:

I understand that the appropriation for vocational rehabilitation may be presented on the House floor on Tuesday in the amount of $21 million. I also understand the restrictive language of the current year appropriation will be incorporated in the appropriation for fiscal 1955, limiting the States to $4 Federal funds for $3 of State funds. It is my further understanding that amendments will be introduced on the floor of the House to increase the appropriation to its present level, $23 million, and to remove the restrictions of the 4-to-3 matching. Your support of these amendments will be needed to help us maintain the rehabilitation program in Louisiana. Any help you can give us will be appreciated.

Shelby M. Jackson,
State Superintendent of Education.

Shreveport, La., *January 4, 1954.*
Congressman Overton Brooks,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Brooks: I am a railroad man, 35 years as conductor on the KCS road and being in your constituency I know that you are always interested in those of us who live here.

I have never written to you before nor have I ever asked you to help me but your reputation is so strong to help all of the people here in your district that I do not hesitate to write you.

I am very interested in a program which I am certain that you are familiar with its merit, that is the vocational-rehabilitation program, which helps those people to become employed with their handicaps. I know that the budget for the National Government will have to be cut this coming year, but I hope that the amount that this program budgeted will not be cut, because I have seen several of my friends on the railroad helped through this program and I would hate to see us economize unwisely. Is it economizing when we put these people who could earn money with a little help on relief?

I know of your interest in the welfare of the people and that is the reason I am asking you for your consideration of the support of this program.

I would like to hear from you concerning this.

Yours very truly,
W. C. Beth.

Shreveport, La., *January 8, 1954.*
Hon. Overton Brooks,
Congressman, State of Louisiana,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Brooks: I tried to call you during the holidays but was unsuccessful. It is my understanding that some legislation will be introduced to cut the funds available for rehabilitation of handicapped persons. This to me is a very worthwhile project, and I hope that you will do what you can to see that they have an adequate budget. I am teaching practical nursing under the auspices of the Caddo Parish school board, and we have had several students from the rehabilitation center. We think that these students will become self-supporting, useful citizens. Rehabilitation has aided these students during the time they were attending school.

Thanking you in advance and with best wishes for a Happy New Year, I am,

Yours truly,
Uma S. Collins.

Fair Park High School,
Shreveport, La., January 8, 1954.
Hon. Overton Brooks,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Sir: It has been called to my attention that a bill will be introduced in the present Congress to reduce the ratio of the Federal to the State appropriation for the rehabilitation of handicapped children.

In our present enrollment we have 25 children who will, in the next 4 years, be in need of assistance toward their educational training. In the past, the appropriation has been sufficient to meet the needs of this rehabilitation program. To lower the Federal appropriation would be a serious threat toward the successful continuation of this work.

I am as anxious as any other citizen to see the unnecessary expenses of our Government reduced. I know of no other joint Federal and State contribution which does more toward making self-supporting citizens than this particular project. To reduce the appropriation, I believe, will jeopardize the entire program and will prevent many handicapped children from receiving such training as will make them self-supporting. It seems wiser to provide the necessary money now so as to eliminate future welfare subjects.

If the bill to reduce the appropriation to the rehabilitation program is introduced in Congress, I should appreciate your vote against the bill and your support in defeating it. I thank you for considering this bill from the point of view as I have given.

Very truly yours,
E. L. Alberson.

Belcher High School,
Belcher, La., January 6, 1954.
Mr. Overton Brooks,
Member of Congress, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

Dear Congressman Brooks: In the 5 years that I have been principal at the Belcher High School I have worked with the State department of education's program of vocational rehabilitation for physically disabled high-school students. In our small school we have but few who qualify, but I can assure you that the results of the program merit the highest of praise. Worthy, deserving, but underprivileged boys and girls have received medical treatment and college educations. These boys and girls, in years to come, otherwise would have been unable to care for themselves or their families, and would have been of no help to society. As it is, most of them, now or later, will stand high among our leading citizens.

Please do all you can in support of this program of boys and girls who only need the opportunity to become real assets to their generation.

Thanks very much for your time and consideration.

Yours truly,
Powell A. Layton,
Principal, Belcher High School.

Norton Business College,
Shreveport, La., December 31, 1953.
Hon. Overton Brooks,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Sir: There has been some discussion that the Federal Government may cut funds for all agencies. This may be good in some cases; however, I would like to express my opinion concerning the vocational rehabilitation program, which is a sound investment for we taxpayers.

These handicapped people who are trained, pay back in Federal income taxes many times more than is spent on them. In many cases they are taken off the welfare rolls and become taxpaying citizens.

Due to accidents and diseases, disability is increasing faster than rehabilitation. With our improved medical techniques, people who formerly would have died now live out a life of disablement. Many of them cannot return to their former jobs; then the rehabilitation counselor uses all of his resources in counseling and guiding them toward training to help select and attain the right job objective. With our increase in population and complex way of living, there is a greater need for rehabilitation than ever before.

For a number of years I have watched the vocational rehabilitation program grow, and it gives me a great deal of pleasure to see these people become self-reliant and to take their rightful place in society. I am thinking of the polio victim as a watch repairman, the arrested TB as a barber, and many other cases I could quote. The man with one leg as a bookkeeper or the young lady on crutches as a secretary; these are people in our midst who have been given an opportunity and have made the best of it.

I am aware of your feelings toward the betterment of society and the welfare of the individual, and I feel sure you will give the bill concerned with vocational rehabilitation your sincere attention and support.

Our family sends to your family best wishes and happiness for the coming year.

Very cordially yours,
Mrs. J. W. Norton.
Wesley Norton.
L. W. Norton.

State of Louisiana,
Department of Public Welfare,
Baton Rouge, La., June 4, 1954.
Hon. Overton Brooks,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Brooks: We have just been advised that the House Appropriations Committee recommended only $21 million for vocational rehabilitation for the next year, and also recommended retention of the restrictive language which limits Federal participation to $1 of Federal funds for each 75 cents of State funds expended.

We are muchly concerned about these recommendations. They would result in fewer people being provided rehabilitation services than during the present year. We urge that the vocational rehabilitation appropriation be increased rather than reduced. The expansion of rehabilitation services is one way to reduce the need for tax funds for public assistance. The proposed reduction is not at all in keeping with the administration's stated objectives of a greatly expanded rehabilitation program.

We have been advised that Mr. Fogarty is planning to introduce floor amendments when the bill is considered on Tuesday, June 8, to raise the appropriation to $23 million, the same as for this year, and to remove the restrictive language. We sincerely hope that you will assist in any way possible in securing passage of these amendments.

We are sure that you are as interested in this matter as we are, and we will appreciate any effort you can make to increase the appropriation and remove the restrictive language.

Sincerely yours,
Edward P. Dameron,
Commissioner of Public Welfare.

Mayor Wilbur W. Shackelford

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE L. HAYS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1954

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, this week the city of Bellaire in my district lost its mayor, a young man in his thirties, who suffered a heart attack. He had only been mayor for a short time and in that time had impressed the citizens of his city of both political parties. He was especially interested in recreational facilities for young people and they will sorely miss his efforts toward building a better city in which they could grow to be good American citizens. Although Mayor Shackelford and I were members of different political parties and I had known him for a much shorter time than his many close associates, I had come to have a profound admiration and respect for him. His untimely death is a great personal loss to his fine family and a public loss to the city of Bellaire and to Belmont County.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to include with my remarks the following editorial from the Times-Leader, an outstanding newspaper in eastern Ohio:

MAYOR SHACKELFORD

The Times-Leader joins with the entire Ohio Valley in extending its sympathies to the family of the late Mayor Wilbur W. Shackelford, whose untimely death has taken from the city of Bellaire one of its finest citizens.

Mayor Shackelford had served as the city's chief executive only a little more than 6 months, but in that short space of time he had won the admiration and respect of all for the capable, fair, and just manner in which he was directing the city's business.

Especially interested in children, Mayor Shackelford had taken a leading part in attempting to improve the recreational facilities for the youngsters, and with his passing the children have lost a very good friend.

Had Mayor Shackelford been able to complete his 2-year term as head of the Bellaire municipal government, we do not doubt but what his record would have been one of the best in that city's history. His attention to duty, his consuming interest in the city's business, his great desire to make Bellaire the best city in the Nation and his example of leadership in progressing toward that goal stamped him as one of the most selfless of public servants. His death is a severe blow not only to his family and his thousands of friends but to his city and the entire Ohio Valley.

Mayor Shackelford had given much to his family and to his community, and had yet much more to give when his life was cut so short. We have great need today for men of his caliber, and can ill afford to lose those few we do have.

Depression in the Coal Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELIZABETH KEE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 10, 1954

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I should like to include the following telegram which I sent today to the Honorable DANIEL A. REED, chairman of the Ways and Means Committee of the United States House of Representatives:

JUNE 10, 1954.

Hon. DANIEL A. REED,
Chairman, Ways and Means Committee,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

The coal industry is the hardest hit of all major American industries.

The mining districts of this Nation have been hard hit by an unprecedented depression in the coal industry, and there is serious suffering and need in the coal areas throughout the United States. Especially is this true in my own district of southern West Virginia.

Last year 161 Members of the House of Representatives—after public hearings were held by your committee—insisted on the revision of the Reciprocal Trade Act. By a majority vote in the House, the Reciprocal Trade Act was extended for 1 year, in order that an investigation and study could be made. This investigation did not even permit the coal industry an opportunity to present its side of the case which was amply substantiated by facts when presented before your committee. Consequently the study, which is known as the Randall Commission report, completely ignored the increasingly serious situation existing in the coal fields of the United States of America.

A year ago today the lack of coal production—as a direct result of the importation of foreign residual fuel oil—caused a very serious economic condition—unemployment and its natural resulting uncertainty and misery—in the coal fields. They facts were at that time that the production of coal in the United States during 1953 was considerably less than that produced in 1952. This decrease in production of coal resulted in the loss of $155 million in revenues for coal-producing companies—a less of $79 million in coal-mine wages. In addition, the railroads lost $88 million in revenues; railroad workers lost $44 million in wages.

Today the situation is much worse—it is critical—due to the increased importation of foreign residual fuel oil. For example, records of the coal industry clearly show that the production of coal so far in 1954 has dropped over 18 percent as compared to the corresponding period of 1953. With present conditions continuing—that is, the continued increased importation of this foreign residual fuel oil—what the situation will be a year from today—how much more our coal industry can deteriorate and yet remain alive—no one knows.

Therefore, in order to eliminate additional suffering and unnecessary misery, I plead with you and the distinguished members of your committee to please hold immediate public hearings on your bill, H. R. 9474, in order that the coal industry may have an opportunity to present the facts as they are today before your committee, the Congress, and the American people. This is a serious matter of utmost urgency.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, for our own security and national defense, it is extremely important to remember that unless there is a sound mining industry in being there can be no major expansion of industrial production when, and if, another crisis comes such as in 1941 and again in 1950.

ELIZABETH KEE,
Member of Congress.

Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and Related Independent Agencies Appropriation Bill, 1955

SPEECH

OF

HON. CLARENCE CANNON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 9, 1954

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 9447) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, there is no proposal in this entire bill in which the advantages to be secured are so great in proportion to the cost as in this item. No bread cast upon the waters—no dollars invested by the Government—will come back to us with greater returns on the investment.

Lack of educational facilities constitutes one of our most pressing domestic problems. Our schools are everywhere inadequate. Classrooms are overcrowded. Instructors are underpaid. Our best teachers, no longer able to meet the increasing costs of living on stationary incomes, are leaving the profession for other employment.

An increase in funds for vocational education is especially needed. A comparatively small number of our high-school graduates—particularly in the rural areas—have opportunity to attend college. They must begin earning a livelihood in their rural communities or must leave home and endeavor, with their limited qualification, to find a place in the economic machinery of the city. Too little is being done to prepare them for that alternative.

But in local schools, where vocational training is offered in agriculture, home economics, and the trades and specialized industries, these young people are being taught to be farmers, homemakers, artisans, and other lucrative and useful occupations, and good citizenship is inevitably inculcated along with their technical education.

Our schools are fully alert to this need. But funds are lacking. Even the amounts provided under our last bill are inadequate. The demand for these courses is prompting schools, which have not heretofore carried them, to branch out to meet the need—thereby increasing the number of schools between which the appropriation must be divided. At the same time those schools already carrying vocational courses are pressed with the necessity of expanding their classes and the field of instruction and should have an increase instead of a decrease in Federal support.

There is no more imperative need for Federal cooperation. It is an investment in youth which will pay vast dividends. It will multiply the productive capacity of the Nation. We won both World Wars through superior production. Increased Federal appropriations for vocational education will stabilize production and will back up our first line of defense. It is not only a local need, it is a national need. I trust the amendment will be agreed to.

Alabama Can Take Pride in Coosa Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARMISTEAD I. SELDEN, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 10, 1954

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, recently the House of Representatives passed a measure that will allow the Alabama Power Co. to further develop the Coosa River. The passage of this legislation has been hailed by the newspapers of Alabama not only as a significant step in the development of Alabama's waterways but also as a pioneering step for private interest in the development of the waterways of this country.

Illustrating the favorable editorial comment this legislation has received in my State is the following editorial from the Tuscaloosa News of Friday, June 4, 1954:

ALABAMA CAN TAKE PRIDE IN COOSA PLAN

The House of Representatives has approved the bill that will allow the Alabama Power Co. to further develop the Coosa River. This is a significant milestone in the proposal which is, in reality, a pioneering step for private interest in the development of waterways in this country.

We do not anticipate that this measure will have any difficulty in passing the Senate. And while development of the Coosa is removed from the west Alabama area, the overall importance of this project for the State cannot be overlooked.

And while our primary interest in this area, as far as waterways are concerned, revolves around the development of the Warrior-Tombigbee system, we should consider that development of any kind on the waterways of [illegible] State is of interest because Alabama is unusually fortunate in having over 2,100 miles of river channels.

Congressman ARMISTEAD SELDEN appeared before the House Committee on Public Works in support of the bill for the Coosa development and presented some interesting facts on the history of this river and efforts to make it navigable and also to install hydroelectric power facilities.

In part, this is what Congressman SELDEN told the House group:

"For more than a century, efforts have been made to develop the Coosa River. As early as 1823 the Tennessee General Assembly took up the matter of a canal to connect Mobile Bay with the Tennessee River via the Coosa, and called upon Georgia and Alabama to cooperate. The Alabama General Assembly answered Tennessee by approving the Coosa route on May 20, 1823. A few months later Alabama approved the chartering of the Coosa Navigation Co. to improve and develop the Coosa River.

"Since that time, countless efforts have been made to develop the potentialities of this waterway. As early as 1872 the Federal Government instituted the first improvement program on the Coosa. The plans called for development of navigation on this river from Rome, Ga., to Gadsden, Ala., by the building of 31 low-lift locks and dams. However, only locks 1, 2, 3, and 4 were built on the upper end of the rapids below Rome. In 1890 the Government abandoned its program due to lack of funds.

"Later the Alabama Power Co. obtained permission from the Federal Government to build three dams on the Coosa River. The first of these was Lay Dam which is located between Chilton and Coosa Counties. This dam was authorized by an act of Congress in 1907 but construction was not completed until 1914. In 1921 the Federal Power Commission granted a license for construction of Mitchell Dam which is also between Chilton and Coosa Counties. Two years later this dam was ready for use. The third of the three dams is Jordan Dam, located north of Wetumpka in Elmore County. This dam was licensed by the FPC in 1923 and completed in 1926. These dams, the only ones on the Coosa River at the present time, have been operated as a source of electric power by the Alabama Power Co. since their construction. * * *

"In the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1945, Congress vetoed authority for the further development of the Coosa exclusively in the United States Corps of Engineers. As a result, the Federal Power Commission was deprived of the authority to issue the license that the Alabama Power Co. must obtain in order for them to construct additional dams on the Coosa Waterway.

Although the members of the Alabama delegation in Congress have worked relentlessly in an effort to secure an appropriation so that the Corps of Engineers might begin construction on locks and dams for the Coosa, none has been forthcoming. This has been due primarily to the tremendous cost involved. I am sure most of you will agree that prospects for future appropriations by the Federal Government are none too bright."

Congressman SELDEN sees in the development of the Coosa by the Alabama Power Co., these benefits: (1) It will provide additional, needed electric power at no cost to the taxpayers; (2) it will spur economic development in the Coosa Valley; (3) it will provide additional income, through taxes, to all levels of government; (4) it will increase recreational facilities; and (5) it will enhance the possibility of obtaining Federal funds for addition of navigational facilities.

The construction of five dams at a cost of some $100 million, which will include provisions for navigation facilities, by private enterprise is a new concept for development of waterways in this country. We can be proud that this development in coming in Alabama, will be constructed under the direction of Alabamians and will be financed, at least in part, by funds from this State.

Freedom Should Remain Among Us

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JEFFREY P. HILLELSON
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 10, 1954

Mr. HILLELSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article, entitled "Freedom Should Remain Among Us," written by Dr. George S. Reuter, Jr., of Holden, Mo.:

FREEDOM SHOULD REMAIN AMONG US

(By Dr. George S. Reuter, Jr.)

"Freedom" is probably the third most important word in the world. The other two are "life" and "salvation." These three words must remain united if the best in life is to be achieved. From the beginning of time, these three words have remained in some form. All civilizations have recognized their importance.

There are six phases of freedom that each citizen should be aware of. They are: a free mind, a free school, a free economy, a free value system, a free election, and a free immigration system. Probably, the theologian is correct in devoting time to a free religion, but this is really a part of a free mind.

A free mind should be considered first. Unless the people of the world achieve this, then the other phases are in danger of failing. From the Bible, we find the expression of the idea that the thoughts of men are extremely important. Some great thinkers need only a quiet place, but their words often mislead the general public.

From the idea of "sitting on the right and left," as expressed in the Bible, much freedom has been taken from mankind. Now it is often considered correct if an issue is to the "right," and wrong if an issue is to the "left." The writers of the Scriptures never intended this development. A free mind would refuse this sort of thinking per se.

It is undesirable to have a climate anywhere in a democracy where pressure groups attempt to reign. A free mind will recognize that thinking is more important than random movement. Man is to think for himself and not for others.

Fair criticism is desirable, and unfair criticism is always expected. It is more important to be right than popular for a season. The free mind will work toward the long range of events.

A free mind attempts to be objective with all people, but loyalty is necessary. This idea is common in Congress where 1 of the 2 United States Senators from a single State may be a liberal and the other a conservative, yet both are respected because they have arrived at their philosophy by exploring their free minds.

So many fine citizens fail to detect the "beginning of the end," as far as freedom is concerned in a school system. Some librarian might assume she is "all-knowing" and "all-powerful" and censor the books recommended by faculty members. This is not her duty, and she is bringing about the destruction of the concept of a free mind. There are many records in the histories of the various States where county and State textbook commissions attempted the same thing and failed even though many of the members were qualified educators. As the courts would say, the duty of the librarian is ministerial. She has been given the duty by all faculty members to carry out their requests.

A free school exists because our Nation permits a free mind and further guarantees free public education for all. There are still enemies of this concept, but they will never succeed if the American people are kept informed.

George Washington dreamed of a national university. Thomas Jefferson blazed the trail for the separation of church and State. Jefferson succeeded far beyond what he desired. He was opposed only to denominational teaching in the public schools, and not to the teaching of religion. Mr. Justice Reed has noted this.

A godless school is not a free school. If it were, then the Communists could make an important contribution to education. Children with a knowledge of the Bible should develop into better citizens from the standpoint of ethics and morals.

Dr. Hutchins is correct in insisting that the free school should have the best possible information to present to the students. This would result in exposing the students to all philosophies. The best way to teach democracy is to understand the defects of the other systems. Democracy can best be taught by making it a part of Christianity, and to make Christianity a way of life.

A free economy might be termed "a free enterprise system." Certainly this system is the traditional one in the United States. Laissez faire capitalism is the classical concept of our system and the one held by most businessman today.

The aim of this system is national wealth. Any individual gain would be secondary. The free market provides the heart of the program. While the classical theory failed in 1929, and there were unemployment, overproduction, and a depression, the system remained. The system was revised according to democratic methods. China fell to communism because her government was corrupt. Our free economy saved itself, because the American people realized the situation.

The decline of individual enterprise, the separation of ownership and control of production, the decline of individual initiative, and the perversion of the free markets were recognized by America. The struggle to create a revised system is still going ahead with much progress already attained.

A value system is an interdependent set of rules that are consistent and mutually adjusted. A free value system is such a system in a democracy. The latter system should give the group a common orientation. This should supply the basis of individual action and of unified, collective action. There may be disagreement concerning the plan of attack, but agreement as to the goal.

A free value system should enable the individual to know what to expect of others as well as how to conduct himself. He should have the love of Jesus and the faith of Job, but be forthright like Senator George Graham Vest in his Eulogy.

A free value system should set the sense of right and wrong, fair and foul, desirable and undesirable, moral and immoral. This would retire from public service the politicians and retain the statesmen. Politics, like religion, must be kept on a high level at all times.

A free election is demanded by the American people, and dishonest elections are now fairly rare. Thomas Jefferson was defeated by John Adams and Andrew Jackson lost to John Q. Adams. There was no fraud noted, hence Jefferson and Jackson waited 4 years and took the issues to the people and won. The American way is to abide by the vote of the electorate. The majority today may be the minority tomorrow, hence worthy defeated candidates may win in the long run of events. Joseph C. O'Mahoney is a classic example.

By supporting the United Nations this Nation is concerned with attaining peaceful world understanding. This concept can be promoted at home through a free immigration system. Our future citizens should come from all sections of the world. Such ideas have come from such leaders as Senator LEHMAN, of New York and Henry Ford, II.

While it may not be possible to attain a free immigration for many years, yet a freer immigration system is possible. Both major parties have recognized this fact as essential if our Nation is to continue to lead the free world.

The Bible teaches the dignity of man. The United States and the United Nations have ascribed to this doctrine. The people of the world, particularly in Asia and Africa, are interested in such realities. If all nations are of "one blood" then our immigration system needs revision.

Freedom is so precious that it should remain among us. Mankind expect continued progress in all the phases. Let's do our part.

Puerto Ricans in New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS B. HELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 10, 1954

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, we often hear it said that it takes a great many people to make America what it is—a land of freedom and opportunity, a land of hard-working and God-fearing men and women who have converted this country from a wilderness into a land of plenty. Here the cultures and civilizations and the religious beliefs of many peoples commingle and together they contribute to the development of the American way of life. Here, too, people of various national origins and backgrounds live together in peaceful and neighborly relationship, each group contributing to the best of its ability toward the general welfare of the community.

In the city of New York we have people who come from various nationality groups and profess different religious faiths, but we all live as good neighbors and work toward common goals of brotherhood, better understanding, human dignity, and respect for one another. We seek to make our community a better place in which to live, happier for ourselves and our children, and more tolerant of each other despite the differences in origin or creed or viewpoint.

Among the groups which have arrived in New York in large numbers in recent years are the American citizens of Puerto Rican origin, who now number between 400,000 and 500,000. Like all newcomers to our shores in the past, they are confronted with many serious and difficult problems, such as finding adequate housing, obtaining suitable employment, overcoming the language barrier, and their general assimilation into the community. It is primarily a problem of adjustment faced by so many other immigrant groups which preceded the Puerto Ricans and, as has been true in the past, they serve as a convenient scapegoat for local frustrations and incidents of one sort or another.

In an interim report of the Mayor's Committee on Puerto Rican Affairs in New York City, submitted on November 16, 1953, it is stated as follows:

> Need for special coordinated effort (to help the Puerto Rican newcomers) arose from the fact that since the end of the war in 1945 there was a steadily increasing migration from Puerto Rico to the mainland, with almost all the migrants settling in New York City. Here, during the years just after the war, this migration was added to all the economic and social problems, worries, and concerns which are part of any postwar period.
>
> The new arrivals were forced to take the poorest jobs, while social and economic forces herded them into the worst slum areas. There followed, inevitably and ruthlessly, all of the insecurity, hardship, suffering and the social fears, tensions, and conflicts which are the result of poverty and slum life. As had happened again and again when waves of immigration and migration hit New York, all too often the new arrivals were looked on either with indifference or with open hostility.

Mr. Speaker, a little over a year ago, in the spring of 1953, I had the great pleasure of visiting the island of Puerto Rico, where I met many of its leaders and had the opportunity to observe the people performing their daily tasks in the fields and in the factories. I was most pleased with the progress and the achievements in Puerto Rico, but even more so, I was proud of the friendly and close relationship between the United States and Puerto Rico over the past half century.

Our relationship with Puerto Rico began in 1898 when the island was formally ceded to the United States under the Treaty of Paris of that year. In 1900, Congress passed the first organic act reestablishing civil rule in the island and granting to its people the right to protection by the United States, including free trade, tariff protection, and financial assistance. In 1917, Congress passed the second organic act granting United States citizenship to the people of Puerto Rico. As a result of the latter act, many Puerto Ricans have come to our shores and have become our neighbors.

In New York they have established fine civic organizations, they conduct their cultural activities, they participate in the economic and political life of the community, and they set up their family and home life just as the rest of us do. In short, they are contributing their share toward the continued growth of our city, its cosmopolitan way of life, and the development of its democratic spirit. Those of us who have had the opportunity to come into closer contact with the Puerto Ricans and to observe them in their daily life, as I have, find them to be fine and upright citizens, peace-loving and loyal people, deeply religious in their spiritual makeup, and firm believers in the American democratic way of life.

As newcomers, they deserve a helping hand. Every effort should be exerted to integrate them and assimilate them into our institutions and our mode of life. Above all, we must eliminate every manifestation of prejudice and discrimination toward them, particularly in their desperate housing situation and in employment. There must be greater mutual understanding since they are part of the fabric of America. Our problems are their problems, too. With greater understanding and mutual cooperation we stand a better chance to solve these problems.

Like millions of other Americans, our citizens of Puerto Rican descent are vitally interested in civil rights, equality of opportunity for all in employment and education, decent housing and the elimination of firetraps and slum areas, maintenance of a higher standard of living and the proper standards of health. In my efforts in Congress I have consistently supported legislation to attain these goals, and I shall continue my efforts in that direction also in the future. This is essential to the welfare and progress of our society.

Mr. Speaker, I feel certain that in time we shall successfully solve the problems troubling our citizens from Puerto Rico who now reside in New York, just as we solved similar problems troubling other migrant groups. Patience, tolerance, and understanding will go a long way.

Federal Deposit Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1954

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, Mr. J. J. Smith, national vice president of the American Federation of Government Employees, has presented to me an article by James J. Girvan, manager, REX Federal Credit Union, Philadelphia, entitled "Federal Deposit Insurance Supported," and at his request I include it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It follows:

FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE SUPPORTED

(By James J. Girvan, manager, REX Federal Credit Union, Philadelphia)

This article will endeavor to explain to you the position taken by those persons throughout the Nation who favor a system of insurance to protect the members of insolvent Federal credit unions from loss.

It is apparent from the many letters appearing in the Credit Union Bridge and other credit-union publications that this proposed Federal credit union insurance system is the most misrepresented and most misunderstood proposal ever to come before the credit unions of the United States of America.

For example, we have been told that the cost of insuring the shares of credit-union members against loss, from whatever cause, would be prohibitive.

We have heard it said that credit unions should not be forced to join the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.

We have been told that the Federal Government, if it controlled the Insurance Corporation, would suspend the charter of any member credit union that did not meet the insurance requirements.

Another favorite argument used against a system of insured shares is that losses have been so small throughout the Nation that actually insurance protection is unnecessary.

A CUNA national committee, dealing with the subject of a system of insurance, stated in 1952 that losses in Federal credit unions for the 16 years prior to 1951 were only one-sixth of 1 percent of the average share balance. This committee stated further that all Federal credit union losses for the 17 years of operations amounted to only one-third of 1 percent.

Percentages confuse me so I shall ask you to remain with me while I discuss the story behind the percentages.

I shall begin, therefore, by telling you that the people who are seeking a system of insured savings, for credit unions desiring such protection, are not interested in becoming a part of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. In fact, we are opposed to this type of protection.

Contrariwise, we are a group of officers of Federal credit unions who are seeking a plan of insurance to protect the savings of members of Federal credit unions. The proposed insurance corporation would be under the control of its member credit unions.

More important, however, is the fact that this proposed corporation would be voluntary. No credit union would be forced to join.

This proposed insurance system would be under the control of a board of directors, part of which would be elected from among the men active in the Federal credit union system; part of the board would be appointed by the President of the United States.

We realize that credit unions chartered under State law could not join this insurance system unless certain changes were made in the law governing the operation of these State groups. Likewise, we recognize the impossibility of these State-chartered groups ever getting together to form such a system of protection that would be national in scope.

If a State decided to amend its law to permit its credit unions to join a Federal insurance system, then, these credit unions would be given proportionate representation on the board of directors.

It is logical to expect that an insurance corporation serving Federal credit unions should, therefore, be a part of the Bureau of Federal Credit Unions. The Director of the Bureau would be the Director of the insurance corporation. Examinations would continue as they are today; there would not be two examinations a year.

The primary reason for combining the two agencies would be to reduce the cost of operations. For example, it is expected that within a very short period of time it would be possible to combine into one package the cost of Federal supervision; the cost of examination, and the cost of insurance.

The combined cost of these three items, if both agencies were merged, should not exceed 10 cents per year per $100 of assets above the amount you are now paying for supervision and examination.

A loan of some $25 million would be necessary to get the corporation started. This loan, however, should not present a very great problem.

The rate of interest on such a loan should not exceed the rate being paid for funds by the Government. We should not compare the present money market with financial conditions in 1933 when the Bankers Corp. was formed. That would be unrealistic and unwise.

The cost to the member credit unions for this insurance protection should not exceed 15 cents per year per $100 of assets. As our experience grew this figure, naturally, would be reduced.

Again this would be a voluntary system of insurance—no credit union would be forced to join. In addition, the cost of participation in the corporation would not necessarily affect your dividend.

I shall now endeavor to answer some of the arguments used against such a system of protection for credit union members.

It has been said that Federal control would give to the Government the right to liquidate or to suspend the charter of a credit union that did not conform to regulations.

This argument proves only one thing: that those who use it are not really familiar with the Federal Credit Union Act. The Bureau of Federal Credit Unions now enjoys that privilege.

Why do we need insurance protection is another question that credit union directors and committee members are asking. In fact, your own board of directors may be asking the same question as you read this article.

Unfortunately, credit union membership losses are published only in newspapers; credit union publications never mention that the members of a certain credit union lost X number of dollars.

To answer this question clearly one must remember that to date there are no figures available regarding losses in State-chartered credit unions. In fact, the only figures published so far are those concerning the losses in liquidated Federal credit unions. The States, generally speaking, are hot interested in credit unions.

Thirty-six thousand Federal credit union members have lost an average of $3.16 each in liquidated credit unions.

If you will go through your own records and get your average savings per member; then, look at your largest savings account. This will give you an idea of how easy it is for a member to lose a large amount of money, even though the average loss per member may be only $3.16.

In addition to liquidations, Federal credit unions are faced with the infamous "scaledown of shareholdings." A "scaledown" is where the membership of an insolvent Federal credit union is given one of two options; it may vote to liquidate and take an even greater loss because of the cost of liquidation procedure, or it may vote to accept a reduction (scaledown) of shares to their true value.

As an illustration, if a member of an insolvent credit union had $1,000 in his savings account and the members had to accept a 62 percent of scaledown of shares, this member's passbook would then be changed to read "$380." He would have taken a loss of $620.

The Bureau of Federal Credit Unions has not released the figures on losses to members involved in scaledowns. In addition, the highest personal loss in these cases is not shown. Again, go through your accounts and see how much your largest shareholder would lose in a 62-percent scaledown.

In Baltimore, the members of an insolvent Federal credit union lost 62 cents on the dollar. In Pittsburgh, the members lost 52 cents on the dollar. In another Pennsylvania credit union, the loss exceeded 25 cents on the dollar. There are other losses too numerous to mention.

In the Philadelphia case, 105 members will lose $33,000. One member will lose $1,700; one will lose $1,600; another will lose $900. Despite these astounding figures, the average loss per member will be recorded at only $23.

These figures will prove what happens when you discuss "averages" instead of realities.

If this question of insured savings is to be settled realistically, it must be put direct to the membership of every credit union. This question is too big for a board of directors to take upon its own shoulders. For example, the turnover on boards is sometimes very high so that a person voting on the board today might very well be off it tomorrow. On the other hand, the members are the real owners of the business and, more important, the membership is permanent—the directors are not.

In conclusion, I ask only that you study the record carefully; that you not be blinded by confusing percentages.

If you are from an industrial credit union you should consider the impact of an economic recession or depression upon your members. Would they be able to repay their loans? Would other members want their savings to meet living expenses while they are unemployed. What if your industry closed entirely?

We are told that there were no credit union losses during the last depression. This is absolutely correct. Generally speaking, there were no industrial credit unions in operation during the last depression.

Guaranteed Growth in Annual Salaries and Wages Can Be Assured More Than 164,000 Employees in 138 Firms in the New Jersey Tariff Group by Proper Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 9, 1954

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the question is, Can the 2½ billion people on this earth trade for mutual profit especially when more than 50 percent of them, residing in 15 of the poorest countries of the world, earn less than 9 percent of the world's total income? While experts toss the ball around from production, to distribution, to consumption, then to finance, it might be well to list a few notes to keep the flywheel going for more jobs at higher pay with greater profits in growing markets.

Once 400,000 American Indians slaughtered each other for hunting grounds. Today 165 million Americans get along where half a million Indians could not. And Americans are growing at the rate of 2½ million people a year. In 21 years we will number over two hundred million. That is growth.

The question is, Can the cash budget match the human budget? Can people, payrolls, and profits keep pace with each other? If not, then Americans might well become the Indians of the 21st century. In trade, how much lift do we give? to ourselves and to others?

Under unanimous consent, cited below is a situation on the 138 firms in the New Jersey tariff group:

NEW JERSEY TARIFF GROUP

The following list of companies, and two manufacturing associations, representing many different industries, all conduct manufacturing operations in New Jersey. They all have a definite tariff interest in varying degrees. In each case, the continuity of their operations and the maintenance of full employment for their workers directly depend upon adequate and reasonable tariffs.

The 138 firms and the two associations whose company membership totals approximately 600, as of this date employ 164,000 people in our State.

These same firms pay total annual salaries and wages of $711 million.

The purpose of these statistics is to demonstrate the economic importance of the very large segment of New Jersey industry that is affected by the tariff problem. It should be noted that these figures are not complete, but are being added to continually.

Attached hereto is the list of cooperating companies and associations:

COOPERATING COMPANIES, NEW JERSEY TARIFF GROUP

A. & M. Karagheusian, Inc.; Advance Solvents & Chemical Corp.; Air Reduction Co., Inc.; Airex Corp., Alliance Color & Chemical Co.; Allied Chemical & Dye Corp.; Aluminum Co. of America; American Cyanamid Co.; American Dyewod Co.; American Oil & Supply Co.; Arnold, Hoffman & Co.; Arrow Woven Label Co.; Art Tube Co.; Atlantic Manufacturing Co.

J. T. Baker Chemical Co.; Beattie Manufacturing Co.; Becton, Dickinson & Co.; Benzol Products Co.; Berkeley Chemical Corp.; Richard Best Pencil Co., Inc.; Botany Mills, Inc.; Bright Star Battery.

California Spray-Chemical Corp.; Catalin Corp. of America; Celanese Corp. of America; Childhood Interests, Inc.; Ciba Co., Inc.; Commercial Solvents Corp.; Conmar Products; Cowles Chemical Co.; Crescent Insulated Wire & Cable Co.; Crown Chemical Co.

Diamond Alkali Organic Chemicals Division, Inc.; Dillon-Beck Manufacturing Co.; Joseph Dixon Crucible Co.; Dolphin Jute Mills; Doremus Chemical Works; Dow Chemical Works; Dow Chemical Co.; E. I. du Pont de Nemours; Dye Specialities Corp.

Enjay Co., Inc.

The Fish Net & Twine Co.; Fisher Scientific Co.; Food Machinery & Chemical Corp.; Forstmann Woolen Co.

Gamma Chemical Corp.; General Aniline & Film Corp.; General Cable Corp.; General Pencil Co.; Gibraltar Corrugated Paper Co., Inc.; Givaudan Corp.; B. F. Goodrich Chemical Co.; Gould Woven Label Co.

The Harshaw Chemical Co.; the Hamersley Manufacturing Co.; Hercules Powder Co.; Heyden Chemical Corp.; Highstown Rug Co.; Samuel Hird & Sons; Hoffman-La Roche, Inc.; R. M. Hollingshead Corp.; Hooker Electrochemical Co.; Horsman Dolls, Inc.

Interchemical Corp.

Kimble Glass Co.; the Kirchhof Patent Co., Inc.; Koppers Co., Inc.; Kuehne Chemical Co.

Lenox, Inc.; Linen Thread Co., Inc.; the Lionel Corp.

Mallinckrodt Chemical Works; the Manhattan Shirt Co.; Margon Corp.; A. Maschmeijer, Jr., Inc.; Mathieson Chemical Corp.; A. H. Mathieu & Co.; Otto B. May, Inc.; Maywood Chemical Works; Merck & Co., Inc.; Metal & Thermit Corp.; Metalsalts Corp.; Paul L. Miller, Inc.; Monsanto Chemical Co.; F. G. Montabert Co.; Montrose Chemical Co.; Mutual Chemical Co. of America.

National Distillers Products Corp. (U. S. Industrial Chemicals); National Oil & Supply Co.; National Products Refining Co.; National Starch Products Co.; National Woven Label Co.; New Jersey Zinc Co.; New York Quinine & Chemical Works, Inc.; Nixon Nitration Works; Nopco Chemical Co.

Okonite Co.; Ottol Oil Co.

Patent Chemicals, Inc.; Peerless Color Co., Inc.; Peerless Tube Co.; S. B. Penick & Co.; Pfister Chemical Works; Pharma Chemical Corp.; Philadelphia Quartz Co.; Phelps Dodge Copper Products Corp.

Raybestos-Manhattan, Inc.; Reichhold Chemicals, Inc.; Reilly Tar & Chemical Corp.; John A. Roebling's Sons Corp.; Royce Chemical Co.

Scammel China Co.; Schering Corp.; Seydel Chemical Co.; Schiffli Lace & Embroidery Manufacturers of New Jersey; Sherwin-Williams Co.; Silk & Rayon Printers & Dyers Association of America.

Stangl Pottery; Stauffer Chemical Co.; Stein-Tobler Embroidery Co.

Thiokol Corp.; Thomas Manufacturing Co.; Todd Shipyards Corp.; J. S. Turner White Metal Co.; Joseph Turner & Co.; Triangle Conduit & Cable Co., Inc.; Trubek Laboratories, Inc.

Union Carbide & Carbon Co. (Bakelite Co.); Union Woven Label Co.; U. S. Plastic Products Corp.; U. S. Rubber Co.

Van Ameringen-Haebler, Inc.; Verona Chemical Co.; Vervaet Woven Label Co., Inc.

Warner Woven Label Co., Inc.; Westinghouse Electric Corp.; Wilson Organic Chemicals, Inc.; L. J. Wing Manufacturing Co.; Witco Chemical Co.; Jacques Wolf & Co.; Wollen Chemical & Supply Co.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized book dealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by book dealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Printing and binding for Congress, when recommended to be done by the Committee on Printing of either House, shall be so recommended in a report containing an approximate estimate of the cost thereof, together with a statement from the Public Printer of estimated approximate cost of work previously ordered by Congress within the fiscal year (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 145, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on Printing, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

DISTRIBUTION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

To the Vice President and each Senator 100 copies; to the Secretary and Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, each, 25 copies; to the Secretary, for official use, not to exceed 35 copies; to the Sergeant at Arms, for use on the floor of the Senate, not to exceed 50 copies; to each Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress, 68 copies; to the Clerk, Sergeant at Arms, and Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives, each, 25 copies; to the Clerk, for official use, not to exceed 50 copies; and to the Doorkeeper, for use on the floor of the House of Representatives, not to exceed 75 copies; to the Vice President and each Senator, Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress there shall also be furnished (and shall not be transferable), 3 copies of the daily RECORD, of which 1 shall be delivered at his residence, 1 at his office, and 1 at the Capitol.

PRICE OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

The Public Printer is authorized to furnish to subscribers the daily RECORD at $1.50 per month, payable in advance.

Remit by money order payable to Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C.

PRINTING DOCUMENTS AND REPORTS

Documents and reports of committees with the evidence and papers submitted therewith, or any part thereof ordered printed by Congress, may be reprinted by the Public Printer on order of any Member of Congress or Delegate, on prepayment of the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 162, p. 1940).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

or Fed-
on Post

TIONS

private
oduced

Wlady-
he Ju-

f Rev.
tee on

George
iciary.

Maria
he Ju-

Mrs.
mittee

tions
desk

ution
ation
nbled
pro-
spe-
For-

the
t its
uling
ment
s; to

etts:
oth,
chu-
I. R.
and

Comm
Ba
M

IN T

M
una
the
add
Ari
ate
Co
fou
sho
An
at
lea

WA
as

Appendix

Commencement Day Address by Hon. Barry M. Goldwater, of Arizona, at Mount Vernon Junior College

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN WELKER

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 11, 1954

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very fine address delivered by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] to the graduates and alumni of Mount Vernon Junior College on May 29, 1954. This is a profound and wonderful address, which should touch the heart of every young American. I commend the junior Senator from Arizona, and I urge my colleagues to read the address.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Many flattering invitations to speak before groups have come to me, but I have never in my life been so honored and at the same time so flattered as to have been asked to be with you on this day when members of previous classes and the graduating class of this old and distinguished school gather together to honor their alma mater.

The feelings I have expressed are doubled because it marks my wife's 25th reunion and also calls to my attention the fact that I have a daughter in school here now, and another coming through the grades, who in time will share your fond memories of this school. Believe me, it is not an easy matter to address your wife's 25th reunion, because I find that such reference to figures denoting years are not easily accepted by women, whether it be the 1st or the 50th. Therefore, I proceed with due caution and proper respect.

I cannot help mentioning at this point, though, the situation I found myself in this very time last year when it fell my happy lot to be called upon to speak before the graduating body of my alma mater on the occasion of my 25th class reunion. I am compelled to mention this because of a rather obvious comparison that I must make between the two groups, last year's and this year's. My classmates, assembled, bore obvious indications of advancing age—larger waistlines, receding and even disappearing hairlines, complaints about the steps having been steepened, and on ad infinitum with the complaints attendant to the aging of men. But here today, as I look at this attractive audience representing, as you do, women of ages from graduation today to graduation 50 years ago, the comparison with my class becomes most alarming, and I am compelled to remind the younger women, who receive their diplomas tomorrow, that they need just glance around the room to see that they have only placed their feet upon the first rung of the ladder of loveliness.

So now, instead of being afraid of what to say on my wife's 25th reunion, I gain superb strength from the obvious indication that with the arrival of the 50th reunion of her class, beauty will mark her steps to even a more marked degree than they are now graced with. As we have started on the note of beauty, let us continue thusly for a short while. This time of year has always been my favorite, and for that matter, I suspect that spring is the looked-forward-to time of the year by everybody. Spring in Arizona brings flowers to the gardens of my State. The desert becomes a vivid and wonderful picture etched with brilliant color. To the forests comes a new greenness, and their floors of needles, moistened by the melted snows, spring to the step. Our streams run with new water from the mountains, and our canyons are brightened again by the warm suns of the Arizona springtime.

Washington, too, is at its finest at this season. The flowers are out. The dogwood trees are in bloom. The leaves are back on the trees bringing color again to their majesty.

Yes; spring here in our Capital is as wonderful, almost, as spring in Arizona. But, I find another reason to exult at this time of year, for, with all the wonders of nature returning to Washington, come the schoolchildren. Thousands of these young people pour into the Capital every day now. They come by bus and by train, and daily I see them as they walk through our Capitol Building. I see them as they look reverently at the inspiring momentos of our country's history, as they verify the stories and facts told them by the history books of their schools. It is a deep emotional experience for me to watch them, for I see no fear in their faces. I see only brightness and confidence.

It inspired me because these are the children of my generation. The children of a generation that has seen three wars—that has lived through two depressions—but, I suggest, a generation that has witnessed and contributed to the greatest technological and economic advances in the history of the world. However, I suspect that we are a generation which, while living through trying times and times of fine achievement, has not advanced in its moral and spiritual strength.

Some place during the life of my generation, the pursuit of material things became more powerful than the pursuit of the basic strengths of this country, and with this change, fear crept into our lives, and is now reflected in too many of our eyes and hearts. Our eyes were once bright and clear—as much so as the eyes we see in the Capitol—the eyes of the young people of today. You and I have a great challenge, therefore, a challenge to keep this bright light of hope and confidence in those young eyes. In accepting this challenge, we can also learn again to wipe the feeling of fear from our hearts and the drab, dull look of fear from our eyes.

Here is what you and I have to do—just learn a great and wonderful song all over again, and then sing it so loudly that the sirens who now sing beckoningly from the black rocks of communism that line the shores of this sea through which we are sailing will not be heard by these children, nor by the others who travel through life on the ship of constitutional freedom. Remember when Orpheus did that to prevent his sailors from following the disastrous change of course those sirens of Greek mythology had been able to sell to other sailors and other skippers. Remember he sang in a loud and clear voice a song so entrancingly true that his sailors listened but to him, and their ship sailed steadily on where others had foundered.

Now we hear the same sirens' voices singing in their dulcet tones the songs of the isms, the songs that other nations have listened to only to find themselves impinged on those hard rocks of national destruction from which there is no relief or no return. So let's learn again that great song of our freedoms that our generation has overlooked in its conflicts with wars and depressions and material things. It's a simple song, and some of you will wonder why I even bother with a recital of its words and score. You might well say that you know it as well as I do, and I would not argue that point. But, what we must remember is that in the history of nations, there has always come a time when someone suggests that we must change our basic thinking. It has always happened, and it has always ruined. That is what the sirens are singing. "Oh, you have a great country and a great freedom, but you have been so successful in this approach by the means your forefathers used, just think of what you could do if we changed a little note here or a word there." It sounds good—listens well—but the proof of its failure is so evident around us in this world that it should convince us that it is only through the adherence to these basic philosophies of ours—this basic song of ours—that we will continue to be the great free people that God intended us to be. So we must be simple in our approach, because any approach to a gift of God has always been that way. We must be basic because the laws of human nature have not been changed, and what governed the thinking of our forefathers I suggest now governs those in our land whose roots of freedom have traveled far and deep.

What are these basic strengths? They lie in our moral, governmental, and economic approach to a free life. Let's look at the first. When people first came to our shores they did not come seeking wealth, because they left wealth behind them. They did not come seeking education, because they left great halls of learning behind them in Europe. They came because they saw in this land a chance to achieve the freedom they had never been able to achieve in a Europe fraught with class distinctions and hatreds. Here on our soil, they joined together in little settlements and larger towns, and they lived together in the spirit of the Bible. That men should do unto others as they would have them do unto them. Men became in truth their brothers' keepers. Those who had, shared with those who had not, and through this feeling of responsibility to each other and this kindred interest in freedom, there developed in this land a dignity in man that he had never before enjoyed throughout the long history of his search for it. Man and woman grew into great stature, because they had confidence in themselves, born of that dignity. So was instilled into the scene of freedom that first and most necessary basic strength—the moral strength.

Then, as these communities grew and as the idea of freedom spread, it became evident that we would have to sever our ties with England. A war started. At first, it was just another war against—against representation without taxation—against England. We weren't fighting for something, and there we learned a great lesson—that people progress being for, not being against. But, sometime, someplace, during the days of that conflict, it dawned upon men that there was something they were fighting for, and that it was freedom. But not a freedom won by arms or maintained by arms, but a freedom born of God and given to all men as free children of God. When that realization came, then the firm roots of freedom grew into the hearts of men and women in America.

It was that thought, never before acknowledged by man, that Thomas Jefferson put down on the parchment of our Declaration of Independence. He wrote, "We hold these truths to be self-evident * * * that all men are created equal, and that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights * * * life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." Those words, "endowed by our Creator," are the basic words of our philosophy of freedom. Those are the great and ringing words of our song—not to be sung only on Sundays in church, but to be carried in the hearts of all of us every moment of our lives. That declaration is the chord to which the song keeps coming back for new strength and new truth. It is the chord of the song we must sing to these children and to ourselves, because the dark song of the sirens of the "isms" never refer to God, and in that alone, they should be recognized as false and devilish songs.

Now that we had established the source of our freedom, our governmental strength emerged. Men went on to write our Constitution, which separated the judicial from the legislative, and the legislative from the executive, each one from the other, and protected these separations with articles that carried meaning into our forefathers' efforts to write a real and workable protection to our freedoms.

Another source of basic greatness now came into being. It is called the free enterprise system, and on it we erected the economic dominance of this country. It simply means what it implies—that freedom of the markets—freedom of men to work where and for whom they desire—freedom to be rewarded by profit for venture well pursued and well managed—the complete freedom of the operations of the law of supply and demand—and the freedom of people to develop the natural resources of the country, shall be the stars to which this strength is hitched. These are simple statements, you say—true—but I say them to remind you that if these words are not true, then why is not Russia the great economic entity of the world. Russia with her untold natural resources. But Russia, with her dominance of not only the souls of her people and the lives of her people and the business of her people, is a midget compared with what a free people has been able to do. So, our third strength—our economic system, built on freedom, adds its rich chords to the song of a free people. Seven percent of the world's people with 44 percent of the world's goods.

This, then, is our song. The song maybe our generation has not rehearsed enough to sing with proper gusto, but the song that we were taught at the knees of our mothers and our fathers, and a song that we can again sing with all the richness and clarity that Orpheus put into his song when, by singing it, he guided his sailors away from that which would have destroyed them. A song which, if we teach it to our children and sing it again and again to them, will keep the fear from their eyes, and keep confidence and pride and dignity constantly in their hearts.

Yes, you might say he is right, but what can I, as one American, do about these many things that have come to mean distrust and fear to me? I can only answer you in the simplest of words—it is better to light one candle than to complain about the darkness.

United States Needs Not Less Politics but Better Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 11, 1954

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, a recent address before members of the Texas Chamber of Commerce Managers Association, delivered by Dr. Stuart A. MacCorkle, government professor at the University of Texas, presented thoughts of particular value to public officials.

This Nation's great need, Dr. MacCorkle declared, is for greater and better informed interest in government at the local level. I may add that Dr. MacCorkle practices what he preaches, having served as a member of the city council in Austin, Tex.

I ask unanimous consent that a report of Dr. MacCorkle's address, as published in the Austin American, be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Galveston, June 8.—What this country needs is not less politics but better politics, especially in local government, Dr. Stuart A. MacCorkle, of the University of Texas, declared here Tuesday.

Dr. MacCorkle, government professor and director of the university's institute of public affairs; addressed the Texas Chamber of Commerce Managers Association at its annual convention.

"Nothing is so important to America's welfare today as a strong and wholesome local government," Dr. MacCorkle said. "Too few of us realize that if we are more successful in meeting our local problems the national ones will come pretty near taking care of themselves.

"Government centralization is the curse of the world. This has proved to be true in Europe, in Russia, and in the Near East.

"If we do not want it to develop further in this country, then we must have a program which will meet local problems at the local level," Dr. MacCorkle warned. "Small and weak units of local government cannot do the job."

To keep government from getting beyond the control of its citizens, Dr. MacCorkle urged individuals to "take an unselfish hand in its operation, not just once every 2 or 4 years but week by week and day by day.

"We will not get the kind of local government you and I desire if we continue to criticize and unjustly condemn our public officials," the former Austin city councilman asserted. "We must learn to work with these officials rather than against them.

"It is easy to criticize and condemn local government," Dr. MacCorkle continued. "It is something else to improve it. Too few of us are ready to make the sacrifice in time and money to correct the ills and faults we are so skillful in pointing out to our friends.

"There is little wrong with our local government that capable, honest, and strong leadership at the local level would not correct," he declared. "We, the people, have done little to create, encourage, and keep alive local leadership so essential to our very existence."

Dr. MacCorkle suggested five things which chamber of commerce managers might do for local government:

Assist in recruiting competent people in government.

Urge chamber of commerce members to make available to local government from time to time the services of their accountants, engineers, statisticians, and others with technical skills.

Attend meetings of city councils, school boards, commissioners' courts, and other local government units. "Too frequently those represented at these gatherings are only those with selfish interests."

Help local officials by constructive criticism and expressions of praise for jobs well done. "Too often the public official only hears criticism. He seldom receives a word of commendation."

Work to see that those who are able contribute both time and money to citizen movements in behalf of improved city charters, planning studies, research on various administrative problems and the like.

Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare, and Related Independent Agencies Appropriation Bill, 1955

SPEECH

OF

HON. WILL E. NEAL

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 10, 1954

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 9447) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955.

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Chairman, it would seem to me that Federal funds allocated to the States to encourage hospital construction should be delegated to a single administrative agency.

From the debate today, it would appear that the committee is withholding 10 million from this specific appropriation in anticipation that unused funds previously appropriated for Hill-Burton disposition would be transferred to the hospital construction grants. This clearly prevents the planning and execution of a definite hospital construction program and encourages uncoordinated effort.

Since the Hill-Burton program, already set up, should be able to handle the distribution of all hospital construction, it stands to reason that it would be much simpler and more successfully allocated if this appropriation were made to that agency.

This program must be carefully supervised to insure that local cooperating agencies seeking Federal aids can thoroughly justify expenditures for hospitals in suitable areas where beds may be fully utilized and adequate medical and nursing staff can be made available. Otherwise, these funds will not be economically spent.

In an overall study of hospital and domiciliary care, more consideration should be given to facilities for the care of aged people who, for reasons beyond their control, are compelled to spend their last days in hovels or at the mercy of neighborhood assistance.

Many slightly ill persons occupying hospital beds today could receive adequate treatment for their needs at home and thus avoid over-crowding of facilities to the extent that acutely ill persons are often turned away or compelled to await their turn. This is not good. It prevents the really needy from securing proper hospitalization and creates an over emphasis on the shortage of hospital beds.

These are conditions deserving thorough investigation by the Division of Health, Education, and Welfare, which is responsible for the proper allocation of Federal funds intended to meet the hospital needs of localities desiring to participate.

They Kept the Faith

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CECIL M. HARDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 11, 1954

Mrs. HARDEN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I wish to call attention of the Members of the House to an inspiring Memorial Day sermon delivered by the pastor of the National Presbyterian Church of Washington, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson.

The sermon follows:

THEY KEPT THE FAITH

(Memorial Day sermon by the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D. D., Litt. D., LL. D., pastor of the National Presbyterian Church, Washington, Sunday, May 30, 1954

"These all, having obtained a good report through faith, received not the promise: God having provided some better thing for us, that they without us should not be made perfect"—Hebrews 11: 39–40.

I

Some time ago a singularly unusual event occurred in a church. The parents of an American youth, Edward Gomez, asked that the ceremony be accomplished in their parish church. There, on behalf of their son, they received the posthumous decoration, the Congressional Medal of Honor.

Edward Gomez had been a private in the Marine Corps. One September day in Korea his machinegun squad was under heavy fire from three automatic weapons. Gomez lobbed a grenade and fired from the hip with his carbine. As the squad moved into heavier fire, it wavered and Gomez yelled, "If Third Section Marine guns can't take this molehill—nobody can." The line straightened, and as the men reached the crest, Gomez kept the enemy off with rifle fire while the crew set up the machinegun. Suddenly, a grenade landed nearby. Shouting a warning to others, he grabbed the grenade and fell on it, his body absorbing the shock of it. For this action, his parents received on his behalf the Nation's highest honor.

The mother of this American boy found among his personal effects a letter written in premonition—a testament to the courage and faith of American youth.

"I am not sorry I died," he wrote "because I died fighting for my country. * * * I am very proud to have done what little I have done to keep my honor free. Be proud of me Mom, because even though I'm scared now, I know what I'm doing is worth it. Tell Dad, I died like the man he wanted me to be. * * * The kids—remind them of me once in awhile. And never forget, kids, fight only for what you believe in; that's what I'm fighting for."

That is a testament to remember today, "Fight only for what you believe in."

And so today and tomorrow as men and women and youth make their way to the silent, green-tented camps of the Nation's war dead for a moment of caressing sacred recollection, we hear these words, "fight only for what you believe in."

In this city, symbol of national life, and in this church, symbol of piety and refined patriotism, as we trace God's movement in history, and here recover the faith of our fathers, we must on a day like this be moved to deeper spiritual dedication. We are heirs of a great legacy, and we are proud of what our spiritual ancestors have achieved, but every generation must vouchsafe its own faith and its own freedom.

The first Christians were Jewish converts. They had a great heritage. They believed, as we their spiritual successors believe, in a covenanting God. To them, as is true with us, true religion and noble patriotism are inseparable. In the spiritual succession of the glorious company of the apostles and prophets about whom we sing in the Te Deum, our founders covenanted with God—not as a racial or tribal deity, but with God who, while being the God of all men, becomes in a special sense the God of all those who seek to know and to do His bidding—so that the slogan on our humblest coin, "In God we trust" has been and is now the sum of motivation and purpose.

The 11th chapter of the book of Hebrews is the heroes' song of the ancients—the national honor roll of men of faith. The writer concludes that the Christian community becomes the spiritual completion of ancient Judaism. These all died in faith—that the new dispensation and the new covenant with a Savior and a Messiah would some day be fulfilled.

These all, having obtained a good report through faith, received not the promise: God having provided some better thing for us, that they without us should not be made perfect.

There are few more pertinent words for us on this national Memorial Sunday than these. For while we have always insisted upon the separation of the institutions of religion from the institutions of Government, religion has never been disassociated from national life—and can never be divorced from it if we are to fulfill our nature and purpose among the nations. In the instruments of government and through our leaders we have always asserted that we are a covenant Nation, deriving our very life and being from God. Indeed it is impossible to have a republican form of life without a great nucleus of God-believing, God-worshipping, Christ-inspired men and women.

The tenets of our democratic faith are religious concepts. The only reason a man has any rights or should be treated with dignity is because he is a son of God by creation. The freedom which we cherish is not something we have achieved: it is the gift of God to man at his creation. And while nations through instruments of government can testify to man's freedom and formulate the philosophy of freedom, no power on earth can "give" him freedom, and no power on earth can permanently withhold freedom. Freedom is God's gift to man as part of his nature. Freedom is part of man's createdness, and if man, in his sin, departs from his pristine purity, God has provided through Christ for his restoration. It follows then that individual man—whom we believe God has invested with supreme worth, can be trusted with his own destiny—and can be led and inspired to put the common good above his own selfish concerns, and that he finds his highest happiness in sacrificial service. Man being thus created free, must in freedom worship his God, be renewed by His Spirit, and undergirded by His strength. And all the other freedoms—to speak, to write, to assemble, to hold property—are all derived from the freedom God breathed into man at creation and which our fathers expressed in our national documents. God is the source, so we assert, of all our rights. Therefore, the highest role the Nation can play is to reflect God's righteousness in national policies and to promote His glory in all relationships.

Where did all this arise? Clearly this platform of freedom emerges out of the Judeo-Christian heritage; more specifically it comes out of the Protestant Reformation. Our kind of church policy and theology synchronizes with our philosophy of government, so that democracy as we know it is very much the logical consummation in political terms of our dominant religious faith. And if we allow religion to languish we begin to disintegrate.

America did not become great and strong simply because of the presence of vast natural resources secured against all enemies by wide ocean frontiers and friendly neighbors. Other nations have had richer resources and have possessed them for longer periods of time. The American succeeded because of his spirit—the spirit of freemen—derived from his religious faith.

In some, this faith was intimate and personal; in others, a less conscious Christian experience, but nevertheless an attitude of life derived from the climate and culture produced principally by evangelical Christianity.

The men whom we remember today whose mortal remains rest below white crosses around the world, on battlefields where Americans have fought, may not all have formulated the expression I have just uttered. They may not have been theologians or political philosophers, though some of them surely were that—but they had an instinctive appreciation and love for this heritage and they literally kept the faith for us. They are giving us our opportunity in our day.

"These all died in faith—God having provided some better thing that they without us should not be made perfect."

II

And now there stalks across the world a new and militant faith. This faith has evangelistic passion and crusading vitality. There is in it the smell of factory smoke, sweaty bodies and a craving for bread and a place in the sun. Its youth in a dozen nations parade through the streets singing:

> "It's the final conflict,
> Let each man take his place.
> The international party
> Shall be the human race.
> We are changing the world,
> We are changing the world."

We do not like its evangelism. We reject its materialistic dialectic. We repudiate its atheism. We loathe the way it attempts to refashion man. But to say that Christianity and Western democracy are not challenged by it would be consummate folly. To the discerning mind, the sweeping events and the collision of forces in our age make explicit God's judgment upon us in the historical process.

Make no mistake about it. Communism is more than economics, more than sociology, more than Russian nationalism on the warpath. Although rejecting God in the historical sense of that term, communism evokes the total loyalty of its adherents to forces which are beyond the individual and which are believed to be purposefully and inexorably at work in the universe. It is fanatically evangelistic in its quest for converts, and it crusades to extend its domain by fair means and foul, for its morality aserts that anything is moral which furthers its purposes.

The personal pilgrimage of the new religion's founder is enlightening. Karl Marx, who fashioned its ideology, was first a Jew, then a Lutheran, and finally an atheist. He absorbed his concept of social justice from the Hebrew prophets, extending the idea to a belief that violent social change is inevitable. He acquired from Christianity the conception of a day of judgment, when the sins of society are condemned and made public and when heaven on earth is to become the reward of the oppressed of the world. He drew from atheism his belief that man and man alone would bring about the great day of judgment—through the revolution of the proletariat—and that on the final day the judgment throne would be occupied by man rather than God.

To the three great religions of the world of Semitic origin—Christianity, Judaism, and Islam—we must now add a fourth: communism. Only in the context of a world religion, competing for men's allegiance, can the issues of this epoch be understood. Communism makes its appeal as salvation, as a saving faith. The salvation which it offers is not "pie in the sky by and by," but salvation in the world here and now.

Some in our day have been accustomed to thinking of communism as a Christian heresy, and that somehow or other this heresy might become orthodox. This is a sad error. Communism stands in juxtaposition to our faith. It is not a Christian heresy, but a New World religion, contending with Christianity for men's allegiance.

There are spiritual issues at stake in the world crisis which strike at the very heart of our existence. It is time for us to know what we believe, why we believe it, and why we must resist that which would destroy us and destroy as well the faith that has made us what we are. Our faith and the way of life produced by our faith are in mortal peril.

The heroes of this faith whom we honor this weekend have left for us an unfinished task.

The only way to fight a false religion is with a true religion; and that true religion cannot be a soft, easygoing, sentimental, Sunday-go-to-meeting religion.

We see what strong faith will do in this world. The most moving address at our general assembly in Detroit was by Chaplain Harold Voelkel, who, before World War II and between World War II and the Korean action, was a missionary in Korea. When the Korean invasion took place he was already in Korea and was promptly ordered to active duty as one of our chaplains. Because he knew the language, and the people and their church he was the most useful chaplain in that struggle. The story is one of the great heroic spiritual episodes of our age.

Throughout the Panmunjom talks, one of the most controversial issues had to do with prisoner exchange. The Communists feared letting individuals decide their own destiny. Throughout these months a great Christian revival was taking place in the prison compounds. Christians from the north, who had been impressed into Communist armies, were reasserting their faith. Through chaplains and laymen, thousands were being converted; Bible institutes behind barbed wire were training evangelists; the Scriptures were being distributed and memorized; and gospel songs were being sung everywhere.

To be sure, the Communists with the prisons, meanwhile, were strongarming and murdering Christian POW's whenever they could—10 now, 12 another time, 16 another night—and so on. Then, in Compound 85, the Christians drew up a petition they had in mind for sometime and signed it in their own blood. [At this point Dr. Elson held up one of these petitions.] Here is one of them which comes from Chaplain Voelkel, who was kind enough to say that a letter I had written him in 1942 had prompted him to enter the chaplaincy. This petition states that these Christian POW's would rather die than return to North Korea.

The petitions were given to Chaplain Voelkel, who delivered them to proper authorities. The effect was electric. Within a few days in every North Korean compound, the Christians, in the name of Christ, wrote blood petitions, asking for death rather than exchange to the Communists. Afterward others signed petitions, but it was the Christians who took the initiative in this historic movement.

Let Chaplain Voelkel tell you in his words the subsequent action:

"After submitting the petitions, the Christians maintained their agitation against exchange north and for the right to remain in South Korea through urgent representations to the International Red Cross, and by displays of large anti-Communist banners and protests against a forced return.

"Ultimately the United Nations officially approved the plan devised and first set in motion by the Christiahs, that of no forced repatriation. Each individual prisoner was to be permitted to decide for himself whether he would or would not return to the Communist area.

"Soon the screening was conducted, decently and in order. If slanted at all, the questions were slanted favorably to the Reds. Here they are:

"'1. Do you wish to be repatriated?

"'2. Will you resist repatriation unto death?

"'3. Do you realize that your refusal to be repatriated will result in suffering for your family?

"'4. Do you know that when prisoners are exchanged those returning north will leave immediately whereas those who choose not to go will remain in South Korea for a long time?

"'5. Do you know that if you do not return north the United Nations cannot be responsible for your financial support?

"'6. Having understood all the above are you still absolutely determined not to return north?

"'7. In view of your opposition to repatriation, in case you are forcibly repatriated what will you do?'

"Sixty thousand men decided against a return to communism and thereby gave the West its mightiest propaganda weapon against the Reds. Men who had lived under the Reds, fought for them and knew them, repudiated them."

Where else do you see virile resistance to Communist tyranny? From men, a year ago last June 18, in East Germany attacking armored vehicles with stones and faith, in men like our Dr. John Hayes who joined me here in the ministry of this parish for several years before returning to China to do what he could only to be imprisoned by the Reds—brain-washed, threatened five times with execution—but never broken. Why? Because of this faith—a greater, more daring, more authentic, revolutionary faith—faith in God through Jesus Christ.

The men whose memories we honor and who have "kept the faith" for us have given us a glorious opportunity—and those who have confronted the new militant and blasphemous communism have shown us the way.

The only way to meet a false religion is with a true one. The only way to meet a strong, furtive, dark force is by a stronger, militant force of light. Mere anticommunism is not enough. Men cannot live by negations. To absolutize the negation of anticommunism and measure all loyalties by what one is against and who he is allied with in fighting communism is perilous. And to substitute an absolutized negative for a positive faith in a sovereign God and a providentially directed nation is destructive. Never. Never. Never.

The answer to falsehood is truth; the answer to negativism is affirmation. The call to you and to me is clear. The most important thing for us today is to set over against communism vital Christian lives and a more vital, more Christian society. A half-hearted faith and a tepid church can never deal effectively with the dynamism set against us. Only by becoming a great spiritual bastion and by exalting Jesus Christ in personal testimony and public action can we triumph.

We must not fail those who kept the faith for us. Emerson sang out the summons—

> "For He that worketh high and wise—
> Nor pauseth in His plan,
> Will tear the sun out of the skies
> E're freedom out of man * * *
> For what avail the plow or sail
> On land or life, if freedom fail."

A Golden Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 11, 1954

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial entitled "A Golden Anniversary," which appeared in the June 3, 1954, issue of the Breckinridge News of Hardinsburg, Ky.

The editorial is as follows:

A GOLDEN ANNIVERSARY

Fifty years ago on June 6 a group of medical men and laymen met in Atlantic City to form the National Tuberculosis Association. Their purpose was to do something about a very real enemy—tuberculosis—which was then killing 188 people out of every 100,000 and infecting an unknown number. This meeting was unique because it marked the first time the lay public had joined forces with the medical profession to fight a disease.

The Kentucky Tuberculosis Association, its parent organization and local affiliates are celebrating the anniversary in a practical and sober mood. The anniversary is being observed by looking to the future of tuberculosis control rather than by pointing with pride to past accomplishments. The theme of their golden anniversary year is The Challenge of the Future in TB Control.

Five decades have passed since the NTA was founded. Great progress has been made. Today, TB can be cured. It can be prevented. But TB has not been defeated. Complete eradication of the disease is being postponed by the apathy resulting from the recognization that TB is no longer the major killer it was 50 years ago. The rapidly declining death rate has been followed by a reduction in control programs. Plans for expanding hospital facilities have been delayed or set aside, funds for X-ray programs to find new cases have been substantially cut, trained public health personnel have been shifted to other responsibilities.

Even though new drugs and surgery allow faster cures and X-ray makes it possible to detect TB before there are outward symptons, more cases are being found today than ever before. The TB death rate is down but the case rate is up. It is reliably estimated that more than 1 of every 4 Kentuckians is inffected with TB. Some 6,800 have the disease in its active stage and about 2,500 new cases are discovered each year.

Now, with modern detection and treatment methods it is quite possible to completely eradicate TB. The first step is to find every case. That requires the active support of voluntary and public agencies by all Kentuckians. It is up to you.

What Success Means to Me

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEO E. ALLEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 11, 1954

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to state I take great pride in the accomplishment of a student constituent who won a Thom McAn success award, sponsored by the Thom McAn Stores and the Scholastic Roto. He is Richard Gordon, of 509 Locust Street, Sterling, Ill.

To qualify for the principal awards, a boy must be elected by his class and must then write an essay of not more than 300 words on the subject What Success Means to Me. A prominent board of judges stated that all the essays submitted from across the country were of such high caliber that selecting winners was difficult and that the final rating was especially trying. For this reason all honors are due Richard Gordon, of my congressional district, for being among the top winners. His essay, which follows, is a work to be proud of and he deserves encouragement. The essay sets forth a way of life promoting the development of reverent, patriotic, and disciplined citizens so necessary for the preservation of our religious, social, and economic institutions. Great credit is due not only to Richard Gordon, but to those responsible for his home training and to the Sisters of Newman High School of Sterling, Ill., who find in his accomplishment a reflection of their untiring efforts.

The essay follows:

WHAT SUCCESS MEANS TO ME

(By Richard Gordon, Newman High School, Sterling, Ill.)

To achieve the greatest fame or to make the most money is not my interpretation of success, but rather, to live the best kind of life in the sight of God, or do the most by way of service to God, our country, and fellow man. Therefore, I expect to spend a lifetime to accomplish my aim.

Napoleon made himself master of all Europe, but he failed to master himself. A Christian life implies self-denial and self-control. No great end in life is gained without an active and watchful resistance. This repressive vigilance is self-denial. A good oarsman, a good musician, a good scholar, or a champion prizefighter all includé self-denial in their determination to succeed.

It takes more than self-denial to build character, and now I refer to self-discipline, which is not self-destruction, but rather a taming of the lower nature for the sake of the higher. A sculptor does not destroy the marble when he chisels it to produce the image.

The quality of persistence to plot patiently along in the face of adversity, a respect for the convictions and practices of others, kindness towards the afflicted which becomes compassion, are all necessary requisites in my pattern for success. A truly compassionate and kind person manages to find time to help others.

In furthering my education to learn not only how to make a living, but how to live, in cultivating my natural talents to benefit others as well as myself, in setting a good example to those about me, I expect to achieve my aim. This will not be easy, because it involves hard work, determination, and perseverance.

When I experience the joy of success, I will have experienced the joy of Easter Sunday, which could never be without, first, a Good Friday.

Guess Who Foots Our Big Tax Bill?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 11, 1954

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial entitled "Guess Who Foots Our Big Tax Bill?" which appeared in the June 5, 1954, issue of the Messenger, of Madisonville, Ky.

The editorial is as follows:

GUESS WHO FOOTS OUR BIG TAX BILL?

As everybody has been told a thousand times before, though some may have forgotten, our present Federal income tax rates run up to 91 percent, which is dangerously close to taking it all. A lot of people think that maybe the 91-percent figure isn't too high, but these are the people who are fooled into believing that the rich are obliged to bear the heavy end of the expense of running the vast Federal establishment.

A new slant on just who really pays the Federal income tax is given by economist Henry Hazlitt, and a lot of people will get something of a shock when they learn that the average citizen is the fellow who foots most of the bill. Hazlitt states it in this fashion:

The workers of this country are being cruelly deceived when they are led to think that the rich are paying most of the taxes because of confiscatory rates. Of the $31 billion that the personal income tax yields, only about $1 billion comes from the rates above 50 percent. Only $3 billion or one-tenth, comes from the rates above 30 percent.

In fact, if there were no tax progression at all, and the income tax never rose higher than the 20-percent rate that now applies only to the net-income-tax brackets below $2,000, the total maximum revenue loss would amount to less than $5,400,000,000.

Mr. Hazlitt makes an interesting suggestion. He thinks that if income tax were cut to a maximum of 50 percent the tax would within a few years yield more revenue from net incomes above $18,000, not less. He describes what he considers the greatest danger of confiscatory tax rates in these words:

The worst harm is that they discourage the most productive people from producing and earning what they would otherwise produce and earn. They deprive the Nation of this production and of the new enterprises that would otherwise be launched.

Down in Louisiana, we note, this idea of providing tax incentive as a stimulus to production is being applied to the growing of timber. The ideas of Economist Hazlitt on how taxation can, if excessive, cripple production and jobs by removing incentive are not new. They were expressed in far simpler fashion many, many years ago as follows:

Killing the goose that lays the golden egg.

So Far, So Good

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 11, 1954

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial entitled "So Far, So Good," which appeared in the June 3, 1954, issue of the Union County Advocate, of Morganfield, Ky.

The editorial is as follows:

SO FAR, SO GOOD

On April 1, substantial reductions took place in the retail excise taxes. An officer of an association of retailers which represents some 7,000 stores, chains, and independents among them, hailed this as an important forward step to "unloosen the shackles that have so long acted as a brake on the sale of the affected categories of merchandise." And in addition to the stimulating influence the reductions will have upon production and distribution, he added, "They also constitute a lessening of the inequities that have so long been part of our excise tax laws, and so represent the American tradition of equal treatment to all citizens and all segments of the economy. They also represent the first step toward the complete and desirable elimination of all wartime imposed excises which have proved a heavy burden to the sale of many types of consumer goods."

The excise taxes have often been referred to as luxury taxes. Actually, in a country with our accepted living standards, many of the goods are in universal use by people in all income brackets and are considered necessities—good examples being cosmetics and leather goods. And this is true also of services subject to excise taxation, such as railroads and other transportation, and the telephone and telegraph.

More important, the key to good times in this country in consumption—the volume of goods which people go into stores and other retail outlets and buy. Anything which abnormally burdens and reduces consumption is bad for all. And there can be no question but that the excise taxes have been such a burden.

The hope is that, in time, these war-imposed taxes can and will be eliminated entirely, not just reduced. But unless such tax cuts are accompanied by drastic cuts in the cost of government, they will be a prelude to more debt and inflation rather than sound prosperity.

Agriculture in the 16th Ohio District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK T. BOW
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 11, 1954

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, on May 26, under leave to extend my remarks, I included in the RECORD a statement which I had presented to the House Committee on Agriculture, dealing with the farm support program as it effects the dairy industry in my district.

Since that time a number of my colleagues have expressed to me their surprise at the extent of the dairy industry in the 16th Ohio District and of agriculture in general, as they had considered mine to be a basically industrial district.

While it is true that the 16th Ohio District has the Nation's largest concentration of electric furnace steel, of drop steel forgings, of tapered roller bearings and of safes, and is also the clay center of the world, it is equally true that my district is a leading agricultural area.

To substantiate this, I wish to include in the RECORD a series of statistics which have been released by the Rural Economics Department of Ohio State University. These statistics show very clearly the magnitude of agriculture in the three counties of my 16th Ohio District:

AGRICULTURAL STATISTICS

[Source: Rural Economics Department, Ohio State University]

County	Cash receipts [1] from 1952 farm sales	Total cash receipts [1]	
		Per farm	Per acre
Stark	$18,332,800	$4,744	$71.7
Wayne	23,652,100	7,238	74.7
Tuscarawas	10,348,200	4,154	39.9
Average Ohio	12,000,000	5,494	82.2

[1] This is total sales. To get net income, production expense must be deducted.

Rank of receipts from sales of major enterprises

	First		Second		Third		Fourth		Fifth	
	Type	Percent	Type	Percent	Type	Percent	Type	Percent	Type	Percent
Stark	Dairy	41	Truck	16	Poultry	13	Hogs	7	Wheat	5
Wayne	do	46	Poultry	19	Hogs	10	Wheat	7	Cattle	5
Tuscarawas	do	51	do	12	do	11	Greenhouses and nurseries.	5	Wheat	4

Ohio cash receipts from sale of farm products, 1952

	Amount	Percent		Amount	Percent		Amount	Percent
Dairy	$314,000,000	29	Soybeans	57,000,000	5	Hay	10,000,000	1
Hogs	206,000,000	19	Greenhouse	48,000,000	4	Tobacco	10,000,000	1
Poultry	132,000,000	12	Truck crops	28,000,000	3	Other	22,000,000	1
Wheat	76,000,000	7	Sheep	16,000,000	2			
Cattle	75,000,000	7	Fruit	21,000,000	1	Total	1,090,000,000	100
Corn	72,000,000	7	Potatoes	11,000,000	1			

United States farm census, 1950 (for year 1949)

	Stark	Wayne	Tuscarawas
Number of farms	3,887	3,288	2,520
Percent of land in farms	70	90	74
Land owned by operators, acres	203,212	231,442	222,106
Land rented from others, acres	60,380	100,313	44,591
Land in farms, acres	256,882	318,373	262,090
Average size farms, acres	66	97	104
Value, land and buildings per farm	$11,707	$16,398	$9,310
Percent of tenancy	10	18	9
Telephones, farms	2,881	2,023	1,001
Electricity, farms	3,707	2,750	2,287
Tractors, farms	2,667	2,184	1,287
Feed bought	$1,937,034	$3,156,668	$1,430,968
Gasoline bought	652,000	778,000	597,000
Value of livestock	$5,478,479	$7,911,679	$3,935,155
Number of cattle	33,365	47,332	27,289
Number of milk cows	17,092	24,060	13,543
Value of livestock—Continued			
Number of hogs	23,437	41,318	17,832
Number of sheep	12,213	10,771	6,642
Number of chickens	260,798	371,079	134,593
Number of horses	2,641	3,551	3,033
Value of dairy products sold	$3,819,468	$5,384,909	$2,547,745
Value of eggs sold	$895,857	$1,729,068	$436,834
Value of cattle, hogs, sheep sold	$2,084,775	$4,085,945	$1,593,167
Value of corn produced	$2,305,334	$3,790,745	$1,429,247
Value of wheat produced	$1,502,055	$2,472,609	$805,359
Value of oats produced	$767,590	$859,272	$236,831
Value of alfalfa and clover hay	$1,220,000	$1,571,000	$1,002,000
Value of potatoes	$198,590	$877,051	$267,401
Value of vegetables sold	$1,326,907	$82,258	$112,932
Value of fruit sold	$189,262	$223,525	$85,829
Value of greenhouses and nurseries	$609,216	$205,712	$319,107

Crops, 1952, and livestock, Jan. 1, 1953

[Source: Federal-State Crop Reporting Service]

[These figures tend to be larger than census figures]

	Stark	Wayne	Tuscarawas
Corn, acres	35,100	53,100	23,900
Yield, bushels per acre	49	57	52
Production, bushels	1,727,000	3,037,000	1,238,000
Wheat, acres	29,800	45,500	18,800
Yield, bushels per acre	26	27	25
Production, bushels	787,000	1,206,000	466,000
Oats, acres	28,500	31,300	9,600
Yield, bushels per acre	39	39	35
Production, bushels	1,103,000	1,230,000	339,000
Hay, acres	41,000	51,600	33,300
Yield, tons per acre	1.7	1.6	1.5
Production, tons	69,700	82,600	48,300
All cattle	38,800	55,000	30,700
Milk cows	20,900	28,400	16,000
Hogs	22,100	39,000	14,500
Sheep	3,600	9,400	7,800
Chickens	340,000	484,000	188,000

1953 crops and livestock as of Jan. 1, 1954

[Source: Federal State Crop Reporting Service]

CORN

	Acres	Bushels per acre	Bushels
Wayne	57, 200	53. 1	3, 037, 000
Stark	37, 300	46. 6	1, 738, 000
Tuscarawas	24, 600	51. 4	1, 264, 000

WHEAT

	Acres	Bushels per acre	Bushels
Wayne	46, 200	30. 0	1, 386, 000
Stark	30, 800	29. 6	912, 000
Tuscarawas	20, 500	27. 4	562, 000

OATS

	Acres	Bushels per acre	Bushels
Wayne	26, 700	42. 5	1, 135, 000
Stark	28, 300	43. 4	1, 228, 000
Tuscarawas	10, 300	35. 5	366, 000

SOYBEANS

	Acres	Bushels per acre	Bushels
Wayne	800	21. 4	17, 100
Stark	100	21. 0	2, 100
Tuscarawas	500	17. 2	8, 600

ALL HAY

	Acres	Tons per acre	Tons
Wayne	51, 700	1. 75	90, 500
Stark	41, 500	1. 70	70, 600
Tuscarawas	33, 600	1. 60	53, 800

LIVESTOCK

	Cattle	Milk cows	Hogs	Sheep	Chickens
Wayne	59, 900	33, 000	30, 300	11, 800	585, 000
Stark	41, 400	22, 100	18, 200	2, 600	392, 000
Tuscarawas	34, 000	17, 400	10, 200	6, 700	200, 000

The Bryson Bill, H. R. 1227

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE L. HAYS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1954

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include three petitions forwarded to me by my constituents:

WARNOCK, OHIO, *May 16, 1954.*

Hon. WAYNE HAYS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HAYS: We, the undersigned, are strongly opposed to the advertising of alcoholic beverages over the radio and television and through newspaper and magazine. This subtle propaganda has a tremendous influence upon youth in their formative years. The alcoholic-beverage interests have no moral right to thus nullify the training of the Christian home. We are glad to hear that you will fight for us. We pray that the vast majority of Congressmen will feel as you do and will enact the Bryson bill, H. R. 1227, into law.

Mrs. Charles Strahl, Warnock; Mrs. Delora Clark, Canton; Mrs. Elva Harris, Warnock; Mrs. James Stitt, James Stitt, St. Clairsville; Mrs. Richard C. Sutton, Mr. George R. Taylor, Mr. Robert M. Taylor, Mrs. Robert M. Taylor, Mrs. George R. Taylor, H. J. Taylor, Mrs. A. S. Popovich, Charles Winzenreid, Mrs. Charles Winzenreid, Mrs. Wm. Winzenreid, Wm. Winzenreid, Bellaire.

WARNOCK, OHIO, *May 16, 1954.*

Hon. WAYNE HAYS,
House office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HAYS: We, the undersigned, are strongly opposed to the advertising of alcoholic beverages over the radio and television and through newspaper and magazine. This subtle propaganda has a tremendous influence upon youth in their formative years. The alcoholic beverage interests have no moral right to thus nullify the training of the Christian home. We are glad to hear that you will fight for us. We pray that the vast majority of Congressmen will feel as you do and will enact the Bryson bill, H. R. 1227, into law.

Albert P. Fulton, Mrs. J. M. Fulton, Mrs. Charles Fulton, Mrs. Maxine Brocklehurst, Eleanor, Josephine Kosilier, Bertha Neff, Mrs. Wilbur Porter, Mrs. Elva Harris, Mrs. Albert Fulton, Irene Duvall, Darla Parish Dena Favol, A. B. Phillips, Mrs. Mary J. Coen, David W. Brocklehurst.

BELLAIRE, OHIO, *May 16, 1954.*

Hon. WAYNE HAYS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HAYS: We, the undersigned, deplore the advertising of alcoholic beverages over radio and television and through newspaper and magazine. The alcoholic beverage interest have no moral right to invade the sanctity of the home and seek to nullify the training Christian parents are seeking to give their children. We pray that Congress will put an end to this advertising by enacting into law the Bryson bill, H. R. 1227. We are happy to learn you are with us in this fight.

Richard Howell, Arch D. Brown, Chester W. Kocher, Mary E. Brown, Betty Howell, Alice Howell, Frazier Taylor, Ira Harlan, Emma Young, Laura Decker, Martha L. Taylor, Bellaire; Alma Montgomery, Jacobsburg; Boyd Phillips, Bellaire.

The Monetary Costs to the U. S. A. of World War I, World War II, and the Korean War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1954

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, on May 27, I inserted in the RECORD a statement of the money the United States had given to European and other countries in World War I, World War II, and the Korean action.

I am inserting at this point in the RECORD, in order to complete the story, the monetary costs to the United States in those same wars. I believe this information will round out the total picture as to the cost of war since 1917.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I want to acknowledge the help I received from Mr. Herman Ficker, analyst in international finance and trade, Economics Division, Library of Congress. He has worked on the figures submitted herein and I feel they are accurate:

THE MONETARY COSTS TO THE U. S. A. OF WORLD WAR I, WORLD WAR II, AND THE KOREAN ACTION

Estimates made concerning the cost of a war must vary because of different definitions, periods of time involved in the estimates, calculations of military expenditures alone, or by the addition of accruing costs, such as interest on war debts, pensions, insurances, and care of veterans and dependents.

Even if only military and continuing costs are taken into account, the cost of a specific war cannot be definitely determined until more than a century after the end of hostilities. For example, it was not until the fiscal year 1947 that the last pensioner entitled to assistance as the result of the War of 1812 disappeared from the United States budget.

Historians dealing with military matters often give estimates as to the cost of wars. Newspapers often compare military costs of certain campaigns. Various organizations dealing with war relief work, refugees and rehabilitation give estimates of the expenditures in specific wars. Considerations that will affect a final estimate for the wars engaged in by the United States since 1917 concern substantially the intangibles of future pensions and other compensations.

In this paper the estimates for the World Wars and Korean action are based on the total expenditures for national defense during the period of hostilities, the interest computed on the war debts incurred, as well as the accruing costs for veterans and dependents. These estimates are not final and the accruing costs and interest totals should be regarded as preliminary.

There is wide divergence of opinion as to what programs in the budget are allocable by programs for war. The totals given in this report are based primarily on the annual reports of the Secretary of the Treasury, of the Veterans' Administration, and the reports on receipts and expenditures of the Department of the Treasury.

Costs of World War I

National defense expenditures for fiscal years 1917–21	$25,298,000,000
Computed interest on war debt until Mar. 31, 1954	20,198,709,000
Veterans pensions, compensations, readjustments and other programs allocable by war, as of Mar. 31, 1954	21,096,257,000
Total	66,592,966,000

Costs of World War II

National defense expenditures for fiscal years 1941–47	$356,121,000,000
Computed interest on war debt until Mar. 31, 1954	54,461,009,000
Veterans pensions, compensations, readjustments, and other programs allocable by war, as of Mar. 31, 1954	39,096,257,000
Total	449,678,266,000

Costs of Korean action

National defense expenditures for fiscal years 1951–53	$111,135,000,000
Computed interest on war debt until Mar. 31, 1954	21,997,090,000
Veterans' pensions, compensations, readjustments, and other programs allocable by war as of Mar. 31, 1954	17,746,443,000
Total	150,878,533,000

Gross tabulation of monetary cost of World War I, World War II, and Korean action, period 1917–Mar. 31, 1954

World War I	$66,592,966,000
World War II	449,678,266,000
Korean action	150,878,533,000
Total	677,149,765,000

A comparison is often made of the supposed cost per day of hostilities. The figures given here should in no wise be considered comparative, since they are expressed in terms of the dollar value of the time. A theoretical expression of costs in terms of a variable 1929, a 1939, and a current value dollar would not convey a realistic interpretation.

The total expenditures for World War I and World War II and the Korean action are taken from the annual reports of the Secretary of the Treasury and comprise the actual expenditures for Army, Navy, and Air Force. No attempt is made to equate the expenditures on the basis of a constant currency unit.

(NOTE.—The totals used are for actual days of hostility only and vary from the totals used to express the actual expenditures for war purposes given previously.)

World War I

Cost from Apr. 1917–Apr. 1919	$21,850,000,000
Actual days of hostilities (Apr. 6, 1917–Nov. 11, 1918) ....days	585
Average cost per day	$37,350,000

World War II

Cost from July 1, 1940–Sept. 14, 1945	$297,745,000,000
Actual days of hostilities (Dec. 7, 1941–Sept. 14, 1945 ....days	1,347
Average cost per day	$221,043,000

Korean action

Cost from June 25, 1950–July 1, 1953	$99,698,000,000
Actual days of hostilities (July 1, 1950–July 1, 1953) ....days	1,095
Average cost per day	$91,048,400

Another comparison of the cost of war may be obtained by correlating the cost of each war with the national income figure for the years of hostility. Such figures are:

1918	$58,300,000,000
1938	67,375,000,000
1941–45 (average)	154,730,000,000
1946	178,204,000,000
1950	240,632,000,000
1953	307,700,000,000

The monetary cost of war may also be expressed in terms of estimated national wealth. According to the National Bureau of Economic Research and the National Industrial Conference Board, such national wealth comprises the value of all land, buildings, productive assets, public utilities, inventories of goods, gold and silver bullion, military equipment, net foreign assets and reproducible tangible assets. Excluded is all mineral wealth under the ground.

[In billions of dollars]

1916	214.9
1920	354.2
1932	298.9
1940	401.2
1944	499.1
1946	624.5
1948	800.0

The enormous increase in the national debt has been occasioned largely by the expenditures for national defense except for some $15 billion for general relief and recovery purposes during the depression years and some large-scale loans for post-war foreign aid. The national debt figures corresponding to the years of hostilities are given in the following table:

Mar. 31, 1917	$1,282,044,346.28
Nov. 30, 1918	19,438,375,000.00
Mar. 5, 1933	20,936,058,784.71
June 30, 1940	42,376,495,928.00
Dec. 6, 1941	55,219,519,744.71
Aug. 31, 1945	263,000,710,435.17
July 1, 1950	255,226,431,180.85
July 1, 1953	266,071,061,638.57
Mar. 31, 1954	267,899,007,507.34

The Bryson Bill, H. R. 1227

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE L. HAYS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1954

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include 10 petitions forwarded to me by my constituents:

To Our Representatives in Congress:

We, undersigned, your constituents, earnestly beg you to give consideration to our constitutional rights as American citizens to be free in our homes of an offensive invasion by those who wish to increase their huge profits from the sales of alcoholic beverages by high-pressure advertising directed through magazines, newspapers, and over radio and television at our children. We urge you to obtain consideration of and pass the Bryson bill, H. R. 1227.

Ruth Hazel Meiser, Mae Montgomery, Elizabeth Fouts, Bessie Godward, Ella Sangell, Faye Diehl, Mae Ward, Mrs. Ella D. Campbell, Mrs. R. A. Groner, Mrs. J. S. Crawford, Florence Vincent, Grace Allmon, Mrs. D. C. Wright, Mrs. Robert Entrikih, Irma Hutcheson, Cora Daugherty, Mildred Tate, Edna Stouffer, Rachel McConnell, Salem, Ohio; Lilly B. Justice, Canfield, Ohio; Nina B. Jones, Ora A. Vincent, Mrs. George J. Gunn, Mrs. I. H. Cooke, Mrs. B. M. Maxson, S. E. Walker, Erma Coppes, Salem, Ohio.

To Our Representatives in Congress:

We, the undersigned, your constituents, earnestly beg you to give consideration to our constitutional rights as American citizens to be free in our homes of an offensive invasion by those who wish to increase their huge profits from the sales of alcoholic beverages by high-pressure advertising directed through magazines, newspapers, and over radio and television at our children. We urge you to obtain consideration of and pass the Bryson bill, H. R. 1227.

J. O. Hogedorn, Mrs. Ross Hinchliffe, Mrs. Alfred Stratton, John Ketterer, Mrs. Harry Milhoan, Mrs. Helen Milhoan, Mrs. Florence Zimmerman, Mr. W. H. Zimmerman, Mrs. Ross Helman, Mrs. E. E. Bonsall, Mrs. J. O. Hagedorn, Mrs. Edward Bruderly, Mrs. Catherine Westfall, Harvey D. Bates, M. F. Stratton, Mrs. Earl Burcan, Howard Gillett, Ernest E. Stookesberry, Mrs. G. A. Dressel, Geo. A. Dressel, Mrs. Howard Moulin, Mrs. Mabel A. Cowan, Mrs. Christina West, Mrs. Walter Dickey, Mrs. Wm. Lantz, Mrs. Clarence Bady, Mrs. Ernest Hoobler, Mrs. John Schuck, Mrs. Alma Piller, Mrs. C. D. Griffith, C. D. Griffith, E. E. Hoobler, C. W. Kaminsky, Mrs. C. W. Kaminsky, Salem, Ohio.

To Our Representatives in Congress:

We, the undersigned, your constitutents, earnestly beg you to give consideration to our constitutional rights as American citizens to be free in our homes of an offensive invasion by those who wish to increase their huge profits from the sales of alcoholic beverages by high-pressure advertising directed through magazines, newspapers, and over radio and television at our children. We urge you to obtain consideration of and pass the Bryson bill, H. R. 1227.

Mrs. R. A. Ohl, Mrs. Nellie Rhodes, Mrs. Calista Dodge, Mrs. Willis Hole, Olive R. Whiney, Cora M. Smith, Hester L. Moss, Mrs. Cecil Baxter, Leonia A. Rummel, Margaret Goodballet, Mrs. N. C. Simpson, Ella Beeson, Maude Reitzell, Mrs. F. A. Rinehart, Mrs. E. J. Walton, Mrs. Jennie F. Harris, Mrs. Howard Rumsey, Salem, Ohio.

To Our Representatives in Congress:

We, the undersigned, your constituents, earnestly beg you to give consideration to our constitutional rights as American citizens to be free in our homes of an offensive invasion by those who wish to increase their huge profits from the sales of alcoholic beverages by high-pressure advertising directed through magazines, newspapers, and over radio and television at our children. We urge you to obtain consideration of and pass the Bryson bill, H. R. 1227.

E. S. Vincent, M. E. Steiner, E. W. Early, Claire Early, Alden Gross, Jr., Alice Gross, Robert L. Keller, Alberta J. Keller, J. Floyd Stamp, Ruth A. Stamp; D. F. Ashead, Mrs. D. F. Ashead, H. R. Schaefer, Ellen Tetlow, John H. Williams, Ralph X. Walton, William McCrae, Edna Fennema, Dorothy Haught, Salem, Ohio; A. T. McCandless, Margaret McCandless, Windham, Ohio; John P. Olloman, Salem, Ohio.

To Our Representatives in Congress:

We, the undersigned, your constituents, earnestly beg you to give consideration to our constitutional rights as American citizens to be free in our homes of an offensive invasion by those who wish to increase their huge profits from the sales of alcoholic beverages by high-pressure advertising directed through magazines, newspapers, and over radio and television at our children. We urge you to obtain consideration of and pass the Bryson bill, H. R. 1227.

Martha B. Milliken, Garfield, Ohio; Mrs. Alice Krauss, Mrs. G. M. Barnes, Mrs. Ethel Messenger, Mrs. George Glenn, Mrs. Harry G. Gardner, Mr. and Mrs. Edgar Herr, Mr. and Mrs. Sylvester Jackson, John McCluggage, Mrs. John Auerbrecht, Mrs. Mary M. Strickler, Mrs. Susan Ridgeway, C. E. Nachsmuth, Dessie Scullion, Mrs. Daisy Williams, Mrs. Hazel Parker, Mrs. Carl Lippcott, Salem, Ohio; Ray I. Wallace, Lisbon, Ohio; Elizabeth R. Tolson, Elmer Tolson, Salem, Ohio; Mrs. Helen B. Wallace, Lisbon, Ohio; Mrs. Walter B. Christensen, Walter B. Christensen, Salem, Ohio.

To Our Representatives in Congress:

We, the undersigned, your constituents, earnestly beg you to give consideration to our constitutional rights as American citizens to be free in our homes of an offensive invasion by those who wish to increase their huge profits from the sales of alcoholic beverages by high-pressure advertising directed through magazines, newspapers, and over radio and television at our children. We urge you to obtain consideration of and pass the Bryson bill, H. R. 1227.

Miss Estelle M. Mayerhöfer, Mary Older, Mrs. Eugene Hively, Mrs. Norman Suggett, Mrs. Harold Winn, Harold B. Winn, Mrs. Ernest Ashley, Mrs. George H. Bell, Mrs. M. E. Thomas, Mrs. C. C. Ressler, Mrs. Bertha Hoopes, Salem, Ohio; Mrs. Mary Hoenicks, Massillon, Ohio; Mrs. Bernice Burkle, Martha E. Park, Salem, Ohio; Mrs. W. L. Yengling, Damascus, Ohio; A. I. Suliot, Mrs. Helen Carroll, John H. Fithian, H. E. Myers, Mary Allen Burcaw, Mrs. Harold Tolen, Salem, Ohio; Mrs. Russell Wilson, Russell Wilson, Berlin Center, Ohio.

To Our Representatives in Congress:

We, the undersigned, your constituents, earnestly beg you to give consideration to our constitutional rights as American citizens to be free in our homes of an offensive invasion by those who wish to increase their huge profits from the sales of alcoholic beverages by high-pressure advertising directed through magazines, newspapers, and over radio and television at our children. We urge you to obtain consideration of and pass the Bryson bill, H. R. 1227.

Mrs. Wayne Wilson, Mrs. Harmon Handwork, Harmon Handwork, Lisbon, Ohio; Mrs. H. C. Snyder, Mrs. Daniel Halloway, Mrs. B. C. Tepsic, Mr. and Mrs. E. F. Breit, Mrs. LaRue Vincent, Betty Mason Holmeister, Mrs. Raymond Stiver, Mrs. Robert Dunn, Ora Montgomery, Walter Hofmeister; A. Laten Catlee, Salem, Ohio; W. E. Harlow, Stow, Ohio; Harold Babb, Salem, Ohio; Betsy McClay, Canton, Ohio; Minnie Rhea Carter, David T. Mair, Lee B. Vincent, Anna P. Cook, Bessie M. Cook, Salem, Ohio.

To Our Representative in Congress:

We, the undersigned, your constituents, earnestly beg you to give consideration to our constitutional rights as American citizens to be free in our homes of an offensive invasion by those who wish to increase their huge profits from the sales of alcoholic beverages by high-pressure advertising directed through magazines, newspapers, and over radio and television at our children. We urge you to obtain consideration of and pass the Bryson bill, H. R. 1227.

Mrs. Neva Bowman, Arla N. Bowman, Naomi Walter, Shirley Grunder, Paris, Ohio; Mrs. Velma Willett, Clyde Willett, Minerva, Ohio; Mrs. Janet Clapper, Robert Clapper, Paris, Ohio; Mrs. Irma Farkas, Herman Smith, Mrs. Ruth Kimbel, Donald Kimbel, Mrs. Gertrude Wingert, Earl Wingert, Jessie Snook, Rev. C. L. Chess, Mrs. Mary Frank, Loy Haynam, Minerva, Ohio; Verna Clapper, Paris, Ohio; Faye Pearson, Lylis Farnsworth, David Farnsworth, Mrs. Margaret Chess, Minerva, Ohio.

To Our Representatives in Congress:

We, the undersigned, your constituents, earnestly beg you to give consideration to our constitutional rights as American citizens to be free in our homes of an offensive invasion by those who wish to increase their huge profits from the sales of alcoholic beverages by high-pressure advertising directed through magazines, newspapers, and over radio and television at our children. We urge you to obtain consideration of and pass the Bryson bill, H. R. 1227.

Mrs. Clio Freed, Salem, Ohio; Miss Mabel C. Ward, Massillon, Ohio; Elmer Rufer, Mary Herbert, Gladys McCluggage, Salem, Ohio; Grace Beck, Bertus Roby, Alliance, Ohio; L. L. McCluggage, R. I. Ingram, Mrs. Marie Rich, Mrs. Vera Wiggers, Mrs. Chas. Garrigus, Mrs. Vern Rich, Mrs. Constance Everett, Mrs. Minnie Smith, Mrs. Pearl M. Mitchell, Laura Coulson, Martha Conkle, Leela Guy, W. H. Matthews, Arllis R. Hole, H. M. Combs, H. A. Gross, L. Goodballet, Roy W. Harris, Alfred H. Stratton, E. F. Naragon, Salem, Ohio.

BELLAIRE, OHIO, *May 9, 1954.*

We, the undersigned, deploring the advertising of alcoholic beverages on radio and television where it can be heard and seen by our children, and in magazines and daily and Sunday papers where it can be read by our youth, do earnestly urge you to support and pass the Bryson bill, H. R. 1227.

C. C. Mackey, Mrs. Jas. DuBois, Bernadine Wiggins, Betty Jane Cochrane, Mildred Spirk, Frank Spirk, Martha I. Mackey, Ann Wiggins, Bellaire, Ohio; Vernice McClain, Shadyside, Ohio; Mrs. Willard McKelvey, C. T. Shipman, A. Charles White, Lee Kay Martin, Bellaire, Ohio; Herman F. Brown, Wm. Edgar Johnson, Mrs. Herman Brown, Fred Broon, Shadyside, Ohio; J. Harry Johnson, Mrs. J. Harry Johnson, Mrs. Nelle Langley, Bellaire, Ohio.

Mrs. Walter R. Lewis, Shadyside, Ohio; Mrs. Alma Mayhew, Mrs. Hewetson Ault, Wilma Snively, Bellaire, Ohio, Jeannette B. Johnson, Mary B. Boyd, A. C. Warren, Shadyside, Ohio; T. W. McKelvey, Anna Shipman, Hewetson Ault, Jr., Bellaire, Ohio; W. R. McKelvey, Shadyside, Ohio; H. H. Ault, Hazel Ault, R. C. Sutton, John Morris, Bellaire, Ohio; Lawrence List, Shadyside, Ohio; Marlene Mackey, Mrs. A. Chas. White, Bellaire, Ohio.

State Department Dilemma: House Concurrent Resolution 58 Should Be Approved

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1954

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an article by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, of Georgetown University, in support of House Concurrent Resolution 58. This is a challenging statement on our diplomatic relations and deserves the attention of every Member of this House:

THE DILEMMA OF THE STATE DEPARTMENT—ON DIPLOMATIC RELATIONS

One of the most interesting and fundamentally important developments in Washington is the thorny logical dilemma which the Department of State has created for itself by it fragmentary and inconsistent determinations on the subject of American diplomatic relations with Communist governments. Three closely related phenomena have contributed to what is essentially a pressing problem of effective political diplomacy that the Department, in its charaacteristic trained incapacity, has been unable to cope with: They are the solid popular opposition to the recognition of Red China; the challenging House Concurrent Resolution 58, which calls for the extension of diplomatic relations with Ukraine and Byelorussia; and Senate Resolution 247, proposing the complete severance of diplomatic relations with all Communist governments.

It would surely be a grave error of understanding to associate the existing dilemma of the Department to any seeming contradiction between House Concurrent Resolution 58 and either of the other two proposals. On the contrary, the dilemma arises exclusively from the Department's own inconsistency of thought and action which so often in the past has produced macaronic situations that without specific accounting are ultimately written off at incalculable cost to the Nation. In fact, the dilemma is related to an internal inconsistency of principles and criteria underlying judgments and decisions on the nature and direction of diplomatic relations and certainly not to any apparent or superficial irreconcilability between these propcsals.

If rules of sound reasoning are observed in a critical analysis of this subject, the dilemma becomes strikingly evident and the common, essential character of the thrue proposals falls into full relief. It is assumed here that only rational argumentation will guide congressional decision on this important matter, and thus assist in rectifying the illogical course pursued by the Department of State. Authoritative opinion delivered by the Department or any other source is scarcely valid when it engenders an internal contradiction that cannot be explained away by ostensibly qualifying factors of empirical evidence. If the dilemma is objectively recognized, a rational judgment on the issue of diplomatic relations then becomes possible. In the spirit of all three proposals it will also be possible to cast our diplomacy into an effective weapon of political and psychological warfare which the contemporary scene clearly necessitates, but which could hardly be fashioned by those delicately bred in modes of thought and behavior that fall far short of the demands of the current situation. Congress, therefore, can and should exercise a responsibility in this regard. And the existing dilemma affords an excellent and appropriate occasion for such constructive action.

NONRECOGNITION OF RED CHINA

Viewing all three proposals in terms of their respective premises or criteria of thought, it is logically sound for one to advocate the nonrecognition of Red China and simultaneously support House Concurrent Resolution 58 or Senate Resolution 247. First of all, the nonrecognition proposal is obviously motivated by the common intent of employing diplomacy as a necessary and flexible political weapon against communism. In reference to the House resolution, the Red China issue dwells on entirely different premises of thought. The House resolution is girded to an existing legal framework, whereas the nonrecognition proposal rests on the motive of excluding Red China from this framework. Regarding the Senate resolution, this motive is really generalized in the proposal to withdraw all forms of recognition from Russian Communist-dominated governments. On net balance, the three ideas are by no means mutually exclusive, but rather tend to supplement each other once their individual contexts of thought are grasped. It is in the area of their contextual differences that the dilemma confronting the State Department is found.

Most likely, if it was not for the fact that an aroused public sentiment and the vigorous opposition in Congress, led by the Honorable WALTER H. JUDD, and others, emerged with spontaneous report over the Red China issue, the Department of State would have been greatly inclined to extend diplomatic recognition to the Chinese Communist regime. The accuracy of this statement may well be measured by the fundamental criteria of diplomatic recognition recently set forth by the Secretary of State himself. Referring to the Red China matter, Mr. Dulles plainly stated in an address to the Overseas Press Club of America that (1) "Generally, it is useful that there should be diplomatic intercourse between those who exercise de facto governmental authority * * *"; (2) that "it is well established that recognition does not imply moral approval"; and (3) that "in relation to Communist China, we are forced to take account of the fact that the Chinese Communist regime has been consistently and viciously hostile to the United States." It is evident from this presentation of the Department's view that the third criterion alone, one of current intensity and power of hostility toward the United States, predicates our present withholding of recognition toward Red China.

These criteria must be borne in mind when consideration is given to the other two proposals. Mr. Dulles advanced them as the foundation of our general policy on diplomatic relations, and consequently they enjoy the status of general principles applicable to all instances. The dilemmatic position of the State Department is in part attributable to this fact. As concerns the proposal on Red China, which is preeminently derived from sources of moral disapproval, the Department obviously lends its present support to it not on the basis of any moral premise, but rather one of political expediency represented in self-legitimating terms of consistent and vicious hostility on the part of Red China. This determining criterion can be interpreted only in relative terms for it is a basic truth that all Russian Communist-dominated governments are "consistently and viciously hostile to the United States." Thus, on this relativist basis of judgment, it would follow that any substantial alleviation of military pressure and aggression in Asia would justify, in the light of the Department's position, the diplomatic recognition of Red China.

This possibility in the future has already been accommodated in the Department's guarded statements on the issue. Terms, such as "at present," "at this time," "currently" and the like are employed as levers of qualification. It may be axiomatic in the standard techniques of rote diplomacy always to keep the door somewhat ajar, but as cumulative experience with the Communists well shows, somehow their feet, not ours, seem always to be situated on the threshold of political initiative and effect. The time may come when the proponents of nonrecognition shall have to intensify their efforts to thwart this potential tendency in the Department's position toward the diplomatic recognition of the Peiping regime. Leaning on the first criterion of usefulness, it should not be difficult to establish from the primary angles of intelligence and symbolic value the far greater utility of maintaining diplomatic intercourse with the Nationalist Chinese Government. From the overall viewpoint of political diplomacy, as distinguished from antiquated rote diplomacy, the nonrecognition proposal serves as a major weapon against Russian-centered communism.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 58

The State Department is perfectly consistent in its attitude toward Red China. Not only does it refuse to establish an embassy in Peiping, but it opposes also the seating of Chinese Communist representatives in the United Nations. To permit either would incur de jure recognitin which the Red Chinese government so desperately seeks. Moreover, its position is internally consistent with the criteria or operational principles governing diplomatic recognition as declared by the Secretary of State. Now, however, when it comes to the second proposal, namely House Concurrent Resolution 58, we discover a glaring inconsistency which precipitates the dilemma now confronting the Department. The existence of this dilemma invites serious consideration of Senate Resolution 247 even without the postulation of any premise of moral disapproval. If this matter is thought through clearly without intrusion of unessential argumentation, this conclusion is the inevitable logical outcome.

In the final analysis, penetrating to the very core of the entire issue on diplomatic relations, what are the determining factors of advantage justifying the existence of such relations? Ultimately, there are two general factors. One is the establishment of friendly and peaceful relationships with the peoples involved for productive cultural and commercial intercourse. In the present context of affairs this primary objective is largely marred by the hostile propaganda and activities of the Communist governments in the Soviet Russian Empire. In a real sense this objective has been converted into one of symbolizing to the tyrannized peoples the hope of eventual liberation and freedom. This is what I referred to above as the symbolic value of current diplomatic relations.

The second general and ultimate factor, which, today, perhaps takes precedence over the one mentioned, is intelligence. Embassies in foreign countries are important listening posts and sources of intelligence reports that enable us to keep abreast of developments and events in these countries for purposes of accurate information and calculation of policy. In considering this and the other objective, it goes without saying that the conduct of our foreign affairs should be rationally ordered and consistent with international law itself.

If these, then, are the basic considerations founding diplomatic relations, the opposition of the State Department to the passage of House Concurrent Resolution 58 should be very carefully examined. For several outstanding reasons its stand is both inconsistent and questionable. First, the resolution, as formulated by the Honorable LAWRENCE H. SMITH, is securely based on our de jure recognition of the states of Ukraine and Byelorussia. In contrast to Red China, these two nations receive our de jure recognition by virtue of their legal presence in the United Nations. Thus the question here is not one of recognition but rather an extension of diplomatic relations in the form of establishing American missions in the capitals of Ukrainian Kiev and Byelorussian Minsk. With the element of consistency in mind you may well ponder the question, in the full light of the aforementioned considerations, as to why this extension had not consistently succeeded the act of recognition.

Second, upon careful analysis one finds that the Smith resolution is completely in accord with the very criteria on diplomatic relations expounded by the Secretary of State.[1] Each of the three general principles enumerated above is thoroughly reflected in the resolution. Concerning the principle of utility in dealing with de facto governmental authorities, the cases of Ukraine and and Byelorussia—the two largest non-Russian republics in the European sector of the Soviet Union—are exemplary, and supported by precedent and general opinion in international law, their respective governments enjoy de facto status in substantially the same manner as do the Russian-controlled Communist Governments of Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and others.[2] The nominal distinction of Soviet Union, which we disregard in the case of the Baltic States, is of no consequence. The second and third criteria, respectively relating to the absence of any moral approval and to consistent and vicious hostility, are also suitably satisfied by these two cases. In short, could it be that a divergence of thought exists between the Secretary of State, who has clearly expressed himself as to the bases of diplomatic relations, and the group responsible for the untenable, negative opinion on House Concurrent Resolution 58? An answer to this question should be sought.

Now, turning to the two major objectives of diplomatic relations, no reasonable person can deny that they are of momentous import when related to a concrete situation that is both quantitatively and qualitatively outstanding from the vantage point of American interest. The combined population of Ukraine and Byelorussia exceeds 50 million people. Ukraine itself is the largest non-Russian nation behind the European Iron Curtain. Strategically, each country is situated in a most advantageous position, the capital of Byelorussia being in close proximity to the entire Baltic area and that of Ukraine in the very shadows of the Balkan region, areas which are at considerable distance from Moscow. The group in the State Department may be blind to such elements, but if we are engaged in long-range planning, we might well take heed of the necessity, as Hanson W. Baldwin strongly points out, for "a psychological and political offensive in the Ukraine and satellite states * * *."[3] Politically, these two national states are the most troublesome to Moscow, while, economically, Ukraine is one of the most valuable to the colonial Russian power.

These few essential facts are adequate enough to explain why Ukraine and Byelorussia are the two most prohibited republics in the Soviet Union to foreign visitors. However, by the very nature of this case, we have the opportunity of penetration to the peoples involved. Thus in the light of the given facts, is it not equally important for us to symbolize the force of freedom in the native capitals of these large national states as we see fit to do in Warsaw and the capitals of even considerably smaller nations in Eastern Europe? Taking our second general objective, is it not even more important for us to establish intelligence centers in these highly restricted and strategic areas than, perhaps, anywhere else in Eastern Europe? In the framework of the analysis presented here, the answers to these fundamental questions are obvious. These are the questions that should be pressed by the members of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs when the representatives of the Department appear to justify their negative stand.

It is at this point that the dilemma of the State Department crystallizes itself. In its statement on the resolution the Department committed other inconsistencies contributing to its present dilemma. For example, its primary argument is that an extension of diplomatic relations with Ukraine and Byelorussia would lend to the fiction of their national independence. The logical retort to this raises the question as to

---

Footnotes at end of speech.

whether the maintenance of diplomatic relations with Poland, Czechoslovakia, and others certifies to their independence. As was demonstrated at the hearing on the resolution, the other arguments are secondary in character and just as inconsistent and irrelevant as this one.[4]

If our diplomacy is to be conducted with functional and political significance, then in the legal scope of this case the basic objectives of symbolic value and creative intelligence activity must be advanced toward realization. If, despite the sound legalities of the case and the substantiating criteria of the Secretary of State, the Department still sees no value in realizing these paramount objectives in Ukraine and Byelorussia, then, from the viewpoint of these essential objectives, how can it possibly justify the continued maintenance of diplomatic representatives in Russian Moscow, Polish Warsaw, and elsewhere behind the Iron Curtain? Surely we do not venture to symbolize freedom for some nations and not for others. And certainly expanded intelligence, particularly in these two areas, is not something we can afford to ignore in these times. If it is arbitrarily maintained that these factors bear no value in the tense areas of Ukraine and Byelorussia, then, quite rationally, it is most difficult to believe or imagine that they carry any weight of advantageous significance in Russia, Poland, or anywhere else behind the Iron Curtain. Aside from any moral premises, a negative stand by the Department on House Concurrent Resolution 58 would furnish adequate justification for the withdrawal of all American diplomatic missions now behind the Iron Curtain.

SENATE RESOLUTION 247

It should be clear now as to how the Department of State stumbled into a dilemma really of its own making. The logical relationships between the three outstanding proposals should also be manifestly clear by now. It is clear that one can logically support at the same time the nonrecognition proposal and either of the other two. Now it should be equally evident that, depending on the Department's resolution of its dilemma, there is a close logical relationship between the House and Senate resolutions. The two resolutions are not mutually exclusive in the proper order of time. If the Department persists in its negative stand on the House resolution, which, let it be emphasized, accepts and firmly rests on the determining premises and criteria of our present conduct of diplomatic relations, as well as being in full accord with international law, then its action invites serious consideration of the Senate resolution, supported by the pragmatic fact that there is no value, either symbolic or of intelligence worth, in the continuance of diplomatic relations with Russian-dominated Communist governments.

In premisal contrast to House Concurrent Resolution 58, Senate Resolution 247, sponsored by Senators JENNER and MCCARRAN who propose the complete severance of diplomatic relations with all Russian-dominated Communist governments, is formulated on the basis of moral disapproval. Its first clause begins with, "Whereas it is morally wrong for the Government of the United States to maintain diplomatic relations with the band of Kremlin international outlaws." This obviously is in disagreement with the second criterion stated by the Secretary of State above. Moreover, if carefully analyzed, the resolution is thoroughly consistent internally by indicating the logical outcome of such action. Because of the general nature in the application of de jure recognition, the necessary consequence of severance in relations is either the expulsion of the Iron Curtain representatives from the United Nations and other international councils or our formal withdrawal from these bodies. Legally, a permanent boycott of sessions marked by the presence of these representatives would not do where we still would maintain membership. Therefore, the second part of the resolution plainly recommends "that the Government of the United States should convoke an international conference of the free nations of the world."

The anvil of logical decision on this whole complex of diplomatic relations is obviously House Concurrent Resolution 58. The full burden of proof on the practical and tangible efficacy of our diplomatic relations with the Iron Curtain governments rests squarely on the shoulders of the State Department. For those considering these matters there are no other logical alternatives of action but these. First, if we are content to follow rote diplomacy in an adaptational drift with events and circumstances that accounts for the existent labyrinth of inconsistency and confusion, then the easiest and unthinking course is to let things be, with no support given to any of the three proposals. Second, if we are intent upon utilizing diplomacy as an effective instrument in the current mortal struggle, not merely one of words but of symbolic freedom value and strategic intelligence, then, conforming with the declared criteria of diplomatic relations and the rulings of international law, we have no logical choice but to support House Concurrent Resolution 58. And, third, if it cannot be established to our mental satisfaction that the maintenance and legally justified extension of diplomatic relations with Iron Curtain governments are productive of symbolic value and strategic intelligence, as, indeed, a negation of House Concurrent Resolution 58 unquestionably implies, then we are totally free to support Senate Resolution 247.

House Concurrent Resolution 58 poses the dilemma to the State Department, and challenges also the effectuality of our diplomacy. Although it establishes itself primarily on legal and accepted procedural grounds, it is vested with the aims of moral and psychological effect and the means of strategic intelligence activity. The denial of the possible realization of these aims and means is undoubtedly a black reflection on the functional utility and worth of our present diplomatic missions behind the Iron Curtain. Reason would dictate that these important elements must first be settled before we impute exclusive moral considerations to the problem of diplomatic relations. It will be interesting to observe to what extent reason will be employed in the settlement of this issue.

LEV E. DOBRIANSKY,
Georgetown University.

Footnotes at end of speech.

---

[1] Secretary of State Dulles and H. Con. Res. 58, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, June 3, 1954, pp. A4158–A4159.

[2] H. Con. Res. 58, Consistent with International Law, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, April 14, 1954, pp. A2811–A2812.

[3] War or Peace: Some Basic Issues, New York Times magazine, April 18, 1954.

[4] Special subcommittee on H. Con. Res. 58, U. S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C., 1953.

Let's Quit Kidding

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 11, 1954

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call attention to an editorial in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of Wednesday, June 9, 1954, entitled "Let's Quit Kidding." The editorial emphasizes the rise in unemployment.

This situation has been getting progressively worse since last fall. Although we have been reassured that business is going to pick up eventually, or soon, or sometime, the fact is that there has been no sudden upswing that any of us have been able to find in our own districts. In Missouri, for instance, unemployment has more than doubled since October and is about two and a half times what it was a year ago. And apparently it is still going up. More than half of the State's unemployment is concentrated in St. Louis—at least that part of the unemployment covered by unemployment compensation.

The editorial is as follows:

LET'S QUIT KIDDING

The time has come to quit kidding ourselves about unemployment. Ever since January, the administration has accompanied each monthly report on the jobs situation with cheerful words about a confidently expected upturn. Each month, the upturn has failed to take place.

Now it is time for the administration and everybody else to quit kidding themselves. It is time to look the facts square in the face. Here are some of the facts:

1. Total unemployment of 3,305,000 in May, as just reported by the Commerce and Labor Departments, was the highest May total since World War II.

2. Employment in factories, mines and transportation continued to fall in May as it has done every month since the present decline set in last November.

3. When the number of unemployed is added to the number of persons working a curtailed workweek, the volume of total or partial unemployment reaches the dangerous ratio of 7.4 percent of the labor force.

Nobody can cite these figures with any satisfaction. All too plainly, they suggest that, unless the United States blunders into an Asian war this summer, we are in for more unemployment before the predicted upturn takes place.

As Secretary of Labor Mitchell has previously forecast, between 750,000 and 1 million young persons this month are leaving school and entering the labor force. A great many of them are not finding jobs. It is mathematically certain, then, that June unemployment is already substantially heavier than May unemployment, and will be so reported a month hence.

Is it not time that we started facing the facts, unpleasant as they may be, instead of continually telling each other that things are sure to get better pretty soon?

The fact is that although total unemployment fell in May by 160,000, this was a far less than normal decline for this time of year. (In 1953, for example, the May decline in unemployment was 276,000.)

The fact is that the slight improvement reported for May was largely due to a seasonal rise in farm jobs, and that nonfarm employment continued to decline by 230,000.

The fact is that in addition to 3,305,000 persons without work, the Government reports 1½ million persons in full-time jobs who are working a curtailed work-week, and 900,000 persons in part-time jobs who would like to have full-time jobs. All these people are drawing curtailed incomes which spell depleted purchasing power for the future.

Dr. Arthur F. Burns, President Eisenhower's chief economic adviser, said last week that the administration did not view the present level of unemployment as a situation to be accepted indefinitely. This implication that action will be taken if the present level persists is good news. Dr.

Burns, however, told a press conference Tuesday that economic indicators suggest "an early upturn" and this implies that he believes there will be no need for Government action.

But many Americans, including all who are looking for work or taking home a shorter paycheck, will want to know how long the present situation has to last before something will be done to correct it.

Dr. Burns evidently has no plans for any new legislative requests at the present session of Congress. When that session ends in July it will be 5 months until Congress meets again. Is Dr. Burns quite sure that the economic situation is going to take care of itself until then?

The counry must hope that Dr. Burns and the President's other advisers know what they are doing when they gamble that the economy can recover without further Government action. But it cannot be forgotten that these same advisers last January were predicting that unemployment would level off at 2½ million, whereas it went above 3.3 million in March and has stayed there.

Distress in American Industry and Employment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELIZABETH KEE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 11, 1954

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, a very serious thing is happening on the floor of the House of Representatives this very day.

On June 8, 1954—Tuesday of this very week—H. R. 9474, a bill to simply extend the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements for a further period of 1 year from June 12, 1954, was introduced in the House of Representatives. Yesterday morning, Thursday, June 10, the second day, the proper committee met in executive session and, without benefit of public hearings, voted favorably to report this bill to the floor of the House. A little later yesterday—the same day—the House Rules Committee favorably voted this same bill with a closed rule, which leaves us no opportunity to offer an amendment to restrict the importation of foreign residual fuel oil. This last-minute, hurry-up measure to continue for another year trade policies which are destroying the soundness of many American industries in a time of general nationwide economic recession is a stab in the back for millions of our own distressed American citizens. I cannot support it. I must express my deepest sorrow over what we are being asked to do here today.

I am not—I repeat that I am not—against foreign trade. The issue here today is not whether we favor or oppose foreign trade. The issue is whether or not, in connection with our foreign-trade program, we are going to correct situations which have gotten out of hand and which now border on the tragic.

In a period of general prosperity, of a plenitude of jobs and high income, the harm which comes to particular industries from low-wage foreign competition—even the most unfair kind of competition—hurts painfully in some cases, but is not insufferable. Some industries get into trouble and perhaps are even forced out of customary markets and so must turn to other markets or other products to survive and prosper. If they go under, as many have, their workers can still turn elsewhere for jobs.

But consider, Mr. Speaker, what is happening in our economy today. Sixteen new major industrial areas of the country have just been added to the list of distressed communities, making a total of 51 in that unfortunate category. Workers in those areas who lose their jobs have nowhere to go for gainful and productive employment. They are forced—through no fault of their own—on unemployment compensation or on relief, for recession or serious depression is general in those communities, with at least 6 percent of the working force unemployed, and in many cases more than 12 percent. The list of really distressed areas is now so large that the Labor Department has had to divide it into two sections—A and B. Group IV–A consists of those with more than 6 percent unemployed. Group IV–B consists of those with 12 percent or more.

In West Virginia's distressed centers, Bluefield, Charleston, Clarksburg, Fairmont, Huntington, Parkersburg, and Wheeling are in the IV–A category; Beckley, Logan, Morgantown, Point Pleasant, the Ronceverte-White Sulphur Springs area, Welch, and Williamson are in IV–B. Think of that, Mr. Speaker. Virtually every one of our business centers in the State with at least 6 percent unemployment, and 7 of them with unemployment of 12 percent or more. During the month of April there were 120,000 West Virginia citizens dependent upon surplus foods in order to keep body and soul together. Without this food, actual starvation would already have prevailed.

In reporting on the recent addition of Logan to this list, the Labor Department submitted this information:

> Logan (added to group IV list in April). Continued heavy layoffs in bituminous coal mining, return to area of former outmigrants virtually doubled unemployment in first few months of this year. Little likelihood of increase in local employment in foreseeable future although some mine operators hope to add a few workers.

These conditions are general, Mr. Speaker, in many parts of West Virginia. They are alarming. They do not in any way reflect the optimism expressed earlier this week by the chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers whose advice seems to be: "Let's wait a while and things might get better."

Now what does all this have to do, Mr. Speaker, with the issue presently before the House? The issue is the so-called reciprocal trade agreements bill. The law which this bill would continue unchanged for another year has been on the books since 1935. During most of that period, it has not presented a really basic problem, although some industries have had serious difficulties from it. But we were in an expanding American economy and there were opportunities for jobs and opportunities for profitable investment. There were many complaints about it, but not widespread distress.

What is the situation today? Thousands of coal miners are in destitution because of the unrestricted importation of residual fuel oil to replace coal as a boiler fuel. Thousands of glass and pottery workers and other skilled artisans are out of work because of the unrestricted imports of cheap competing products produced at low or starvation wages. They can not turn to other jobs because there are not other jobs.

Last year I understood that through an agreement between the majority leadership of the Congress and the White House we were promised an opportunity this year to vote on these fundamental issues. That opportunity is now denied. Now we are again promised that perhaps next year we can get the opportunity to take up these issues we have raised of the unrestricted imports of cheap materials at a time of unemployment and distress in the United States.

I think we should face up to these issues now. I thought we had a pledge last year that we could at least debate and vote on these issues in this session. The pledge may or may not have been sincere—but it is now being repudiated.

The time has come when the Congress must assert its right to legislate—especially on matters which so directly affect so many of our constituents. It is most difficult to explain to distressed and unemployed citizens the niceties of parliamentary procedure in the House. They elect Representatives to represent them on the issues, and they expect us to do so. I am certainly trying my best to do so.

But in this situation, the Republican leadership of the House has decreed that we must take this bill as it is—take it or leave it—with no opportunity to offer any amendments. When we explain this situation to some of our people, they are incredulous. They ask: "Is that democracy? That sounds like some totalitarian parliament." They ask, and properly so, "Where is your voice? Why do not you do something about it?"

Unfortunately, no matter how much or how little we like it, we are powerless to amend this bill in any way under the procedure laid down by the Republican leadership.

I not only protest that decision, but I must vote against it. Otherwise, I do not see how I could face the miners, the railroad workers, and other unemployed in West Virginia, many of whom have used up entirely their unemployment-compensation benefits and are now so destitute they are eligible for surplus Government food. If it were not for those few items of free food—inadequate as they are for a full and nourishing diet—many of our citizens would have practically nothing to eat and would be dependent on the overextended, overtaxed private charities for existence.

Mr. Speaker, my decision on this issue is not a political one. I am not voting this way because I think it might be an expedient vote. This is much too serious for that. We are too deep in an economic maelstrom for that. We have suffering, hardship, distress in parts of West Virginia such as we did not know even during the depression of the early thirties.

Our people desperately need work. Our people desperately want work. Our industries desperately need orders.

Instead, however, the Congress is saying to us that we must tolerate for yet another year this unrestricted flow of residual fuel oil coming into this country to rob our miners of needed worktime and payroll time, and nothing will be done or can be done this year on that or any of the other problems intensified by the import problem. I ask you, is that fair?

If we could see any effective and affirmative action being taken to stimulate and revive the American economy, there might be a reason for hope despite this setback on this import issue. But we see no interest. We see no concern. We see no action.

And in my district, as well as elsewhere in West Virginia, and in more and more business centers of the Nation, we see distress growing worse, hardship increasing, bitterness, even hopelessness among some. Has the American Government lost its spirit of humanity?

I think we should—here today—live up to our responsibility and restrict the importation of this foreign, residual fuel oil in order to permit our coal industry and domestic oil companies to compete on a fair basis for our domestic markets. Such competition is healthy, fair, and it is good for our economy. This unfair competition which this bill permits to continue unchecked, is intolerable. Let us take action now before it is too late.

Do We Believe in Democracy?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 11, 1954

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial written by one of my constituents and printed in the Chistian Century of June 2, 1954, which I recommend to the thoughtful reading by my colleagues.

The editorial follows:

DO WE BELIEVE IN DEMOCRACY?

Absured as the question is, it has to be asked. We spend billions mobilizing force to head off the real and growing threat of Communist imperialism, but we are strangely penurious in our efforts to mobilize the mighty convictions by which democratic societies live. Everybody knows that newsstands and bookstores in India and other lands which are currently the object of Communist attentions overflow with Communist books, pamphlets, and papers. Everybody knows their publication is subsidized, so that anybody with a few cents can obtain the classics of communism in his own language. Everybody should know the effect of his kind of campaign. The book stalls, newsstands and bulletin boards of China preached Marxism in the twenties and thirties; China fell a victim of Communist expansion in the forties. The relationship between the two was more than a coincidence. Yet with this lesson and others, we are slow in spreading the classics of democracy. This is one reason we should be grateful to the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization. Out of the meager budget of UNESCO $1,000 has been assigned to the International Federation of Philosophical Societies for the publication of the Classics of Democracy and Tolerance. The first project will be the translation and distribution in German of Locke's Treatise on Government and his Letters on Toleration. The first has not been available in German since the beginning of nazism; the second has never been translated into German. The series will provide bilingual editions for school and college use. Greek and Italian as well as German editions—all requested by these countries—will be issued. This kind of activity deserves help and should be extended. It offers an example which the United States Information Agency should follow, or which a foundation could use to advantage. Why not make available in Asian as well as European languages inexpensive editions of Hamilton and Madison's Federalist, John Stuart Mill's Liberty, De Toqueville's Democracy in America, or Bryce's American Commonwealth? Surely they are more essential than the translation into a dozen languages of books by ex-Communists. Why not write your Congressman or United States Information Agency urging dissemination of the classics of democracy?

All-Out Atomic War Must Be Avoided—Atomic Energy Commissioner Murray Makes a Brilliant Proposal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 11, 1954

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, in a world which seems at least partially infected with spiritual bankruptcy, there shines forth a brilliant and creative proposal which offers some chance of saving the world from suicide.

Speaking at commencement exercises at Catholic University, Washington, D. C., on June 8, 1954, Atomic Energy Commissioner Thomas E. Murray made the following bold and imaginative suggestion:

> Let the peoples of the world, especially their leaders, witness a special atomic demonstration—witness modern war in a capsule—in the explosion of a large-scale hydrogen bomb.

In making this suggestion, Mr. Speaker, Commissioner Murray continues his brilliant career as one of the Nation's outstanding public servants. An outstanding businessman and engineer before assuming the heavy and challenging responsibility as a member of the Atomic Energy Commission, Mr. Murray has brought to the AEC a brilliant mind, a social conscience, and a zeal for utilizing atomic energy for the betterment of mankind as well as for military security. Mr. Murray has made great contributions to the Nation's welfare, particularly in the relationships between industry and government in the atomic-energy field.

Therefore, it is not surprising that Commissioner Murray has again come forth with a bold and imaginative proposal. This Nation should not rely upon vague and hopeful proposals that the terrific destructiveness of atomic-hydrogen bombs will deter wars. Commissioner Murray has made a concrete proposal, which I call to the attention of my colleagues in this body.

I include in the RECORD Commissioner Murray's commencement address at Catholic University:

THOUGH THE HEAVENS FALL

(Remarks by Thomas E. Murray, Commissioner, U. S. Atomic Energy Commission)

When the first man fell from grace because of an act of prideful disobedience, his whole relationship with nature changed. The Garden of Eden, wherein all things had been instantly subservient to man's purposes, became a wilderness. Dark untamed forces resisted the will of man and even threatened his very life. Over the millenia the gradual development of human arts and sciences has restored to man some small part of his original dominance over his earthly environment.

Then, on what seems yesterday, a gigantic stride was made. Man stumbled upon atomic energy. This scientific discovery has resulted in the greatest alteration in man's relations with nature since the spiritual upheaval of the Garden of Eden. This is sober fact. Man now has at his disposal what someone has dramatically, though perhaps presumptuously, called nature's last secret. Possessed of this secret, man has succeeded in making weapons of mass destruction powerful enough to reverse history and to reduce the world to the primitive conditions of the time of Cain and Abel.

Our hope at the moment is that human reason will find some way of securing mankind against the abuse of this new destructive power. The devising of effective methods of international control is a primary task for statesmen and scientists.

But I wish to emphasize today the fact that statesmen and scientists cannot and will not succeed in their task unless the peoples of the world themselves come to realize that a fundamental change has occurred in man's relations to nature. This fact has placed before mankind a unique challenge. The challenge demands an immense response, a tremendous collective effort, a marshaling of all man's spiritual and moral and even physical energies. This response and this effort will not be forthcoming unless you and I and millions like us in all the nations of the world come to understand the crucial nature and the dizzying magnitude of the challenge.

Nowhere in the world today do I see sufficient evidence of this necessary understanding. Nowhere do I see the beginnings of an adequate response to the challenge. Tradition and habit and inertia combine to make our international thinking much less bold than the nearness and the size of the new threat that looms over us. A gigantic race for armaments, unprecedented in history, is going on. It will not do to think of it in the old-fashioned framework of a threat of war. It would be a mistake to think that it may possibly be solved by convential diplomatic negotiations. Rather, we have to force our imaginations to face our situation after the fashion of men who face a great catastrophe of nature.

If this world were threatened with an invasion of beings from another planet, we would have little trouble in agreeing even with the Soviets on a plan for joint defense.

If a universal plague swept down upon the earth, the differences between capitalist and Communist would not stand in the way of a pooling of information and a union of effort to stave off the menace. Why then are the prospects so dim for finding some measure of common ground with the Kremlin? The matter at hand is hardly less urgent. Rational means must be found to avert the danger of universal destruction by the fire—the blast—the radiation and the atmospheric contamination—all resulting from nuclear explosions. Natural catastrophes—earthquakes, floods, plagues—cannot be prevented by human industry. But man should be able to prevent catastrophes of which he alone is the cause. If men throughout the world today are not setting their brains and hands more strongly to the work of preventing the human catastrophe of atomic war, the reason is a simple one: men do not yet understand or appreciate their own danger.

This common appreciation of a common danger is the necessary condition of any fruitful negotiations between the Western World and the U. S. S. R. Behind the chronic intransigeance there has recently been some slight suggestion that the Soviet mind is at last beginning to catch a glimpse of the common peril that lurks in man's possession of the ultimate weapons of universal destruction. In our own country, in consequence of the unscheduled and unexpected publicity given to the hydrogen bomb tests, more and more men are realizing that every possible effort must be employed with all possible vigor to avert the coming of an all-out atomic war. Perhaps the time is at hand when the thought of total destruction should make men see national sovereignty in a new light. It should induce them to consent to those limitations of this treasured right which are essential for effective international control of atomic weapons. For years America has shown its willingness in this respect. The world again looks to the Soviet Union. Will its response to the hydrogen threat be as negative, as disappointing, as alarming, as was its earlier response to the A-bomb threat? I think not. I pray not.

We look, therefore, to the Kremlin. But we Americans must also examine ourselves—examine our own state of mind. Suppose the Kremlin does conclude that it is to its own interest to recede somewhat from its past obduracy; would our problem be therefore ended? By no means. There would still remain the problem of educating our own people to the mentality, to the attitudes, to the habits of thought required in this atomic age. In our efforts toward peace, we are still thinking in terms of power, in terms of our assumed superiority of force. At best we are thinking in terms of collective security, which is at bottom a power concept. We shall undoubtedly have to go on thinking in these realistic terms for some time. God knows how long. Nonetheless, we must begin to think in terms of a higher realism—the realism of reason—the realism of law—international law, stated in agreements on the control and use of atomic power.

These agreements must have their safeguard and sanction in force, for every law must have behind it a power which will insure its enforcement. But we cannot go on indefinitely putting our highest trust in power or in a sheer balance of power. Our highest national responsibility is somehow to bring the new and awesome power we now possess under the reign of law. In order that this responsibility may be fulfilled, there is need of a long process of education—education of statesmen and scientists, indeed, but also the education of the people, the training of the public mind.

The first necessary step in this process of education—a step that has not yet been taken firmly enough—must be to impress upon the public mind the immediacy and the proportions of the threat that exists today and that will increase as each day passes. I am not speaking of a course of propaganda that will scare the public out of its wits. I put little trust in sheer fright; I put no trust at all in men who are out of their wits. I am speaking of understanding the thing that confronts us. I am proposing that we gather up all our wits. I am proposing that we bring the collective power of human reason to bear on our own fears and on the fears of other peoples. We should likewise bring this mighty power of reason to bear on the dreadful force that inspires our fear and theirs, in order that we may subject this fearsome force to the reign of law.

I think that our traditional national sense of responsibility for furthering the reign of law in the world needs new impetus if it is to be kept abreast of the colossal and continuing increase in our weapons power. In April 1816, Stephen Decatur gave his famous toast to the United States: "Our country. In her intercourse with foreign nations may she always be in the right; but our country, right or wrong." But in the world of today there can be no place for a United States—or for any other country—which acts wrongly; because today a country in the wrong will have in its service the power of atomic weapons. Therefore, in pain of fearful retribution, our policy today can only be that of Abraham Lincoln: "Firmness in the right, as God gives us to see the right."

We Catholics must assume our proper share of the responsibility. We have led the field in pointing out the threat of international communism. Even among those who do not share our religious faith there are many who are frank to admit that the Catholic Church is the strongest international bulwark against the appeals of communism. But our task is not yet done. We still must join in the further lengthy task of alerting the world to the need of sacrificing some of its conventional habits of political and emotional conduct. In this sacrifice of outworn habits we can only hope that the Russian people will join us.

The same genius of this Nation must now be harnessed to the unprecedented job of keeping under rational control the forces of the atom, and of bringing these forces to serve the constructive purposes of mankind. God the Creator of all things brought these natural forces into being in order that they might serve and not destroy the human race. If in this hour of opportunity we fail in our task of making these forces obey the purposes of their Creator and ours, there may be no further work for us to do on earth.

We Catholics understand the necessity and therefore the justification for our present effort at rapidly building up our atomic weapons potential. But the problem of the use of these weapons is much more complex than the problem of their possession.

New looks and new styles in military affairs may come and go. But there can be no new look in what concerns moral principles. The vast ever-increasing destructive atomic power in our stockpiles should not be used save in defense of our vital interests—in defense of that most vital interest of ours which is the cause of justice. National conscience demands that even in our defense of ourselves and of the order of justice, only as much of this force should be used as is necessary. An ungoverned, wanton use of force is as immoral in the atomic age as it ever was.

I think that this kind of caution may be particularly in order for us for a reason that may sound strange at first. We believe in the reality of Satan. We think that Satan must be the patron of atheistic communism. We might, therefore, be tempted to think that any means of destroying this greatest of all historical menaces would find favor with God. Some men have even indulged in the thought of preventive war. This, I have insisted on other occasions, and I again insist, is nothing but spiritual bankruptcy. It cannot be said too often that every person in the Soviet Union is a human being, compounded of mortal body and immortal soul. Each is dear to God its Creator as we too, men and women of the Western World, are dear to Him. If all-out atomic war is to come, it must come only as the last of all last possible resorts. And in the course of its waging, we shall have to remember that the outlaw nature of the enemy does not justify outlaw methods of warfare.

I have another suggestion which I think is valid in our present emergency. Science has shown us that a disease can be prevented by vaccination. Infecting people with the germ of a disease, enables the human system to develop antibodies which will destroy the disease if it should later strike. Cannot a lesson be learned from this scientific technique which will teach us something about the way to prevent that recurrent disease of mankind which is war—a disease that today would be more virulent and fatal than ever? This is my suggestion: Let the peoples of the world, especially their leaders, witness a special atomic demonstration—witness modern war in a capsule—in an explosion of a large scale hydrogen bomb. Let them thus experience in a way that will leave them undamaged, save in their illusions, what modern war really means in all its horror, in all its shocking destructiveness. I feel sure that such a special demonstration could be arranged without damage to security. It would make the political leaders and the peoples of the world realize what the word, "war," means in terms of the 1954 models of atomic weapons. God alone knows what atomic war will mean in a comparatively few years if some sane solutions to the atomic arms race are not soon found. If the present meaning of the word "war" were universally realized, there would rise in the world a reasoned horror of war, and a rational opposition to all policies that might lead to all-out atomic war. This horror and opposition might make even the leaders of a totalitarian dictatorship so unpopular that they would eventually be displaced.

It seems to me that we cannot rely merely on a vaguely hopeful assumption that the terrific destructiveness of hydrogen bombs will deter nations from their use. The new meaning of war should be demonstrated. General Sherman's remarks "War is Hell" is no longer a figure of speech. It can now be taken almost literally. If this fact were ever universally grasped, the search for peace would take on a new and needed sense of urgency.

Even the Russians must now realize that man's relations with nature have been radically altered. They must realize, too, that this fact must inevitably make a change in the relations between nations. Even now they may be wondering if this new, apparently limitless force demands any adjustment of their dogmatic belief that destiny is on their side. America must quickly capitalize on this turn of affairs—on this possibility of a birth of receptivity in Moscow—in order to avoid a likely doomsday caused by man's disagrement with man.

As Christians we must hope that there can be sowed in the Kremlin's mind even some small measure of skepticism as to the value of the barren earth which the victors in a future war might ultimately inherit. If this can be done there may well develop in the Soviet that minimum of willingness to compromise which is essential to real negotiations looking to disarmament and to the control of atomic weapons by international agreements and laws.

After the awesome tests in the Pacific, man can no longer plead that he knows not what the experts do. All of us, educators and students, Government officials and voters, priests and people now have a firsthand, personal responsibility in this ultimate matter of atomic weapons policy. Our recent experiences in the Pacific have brought the problem of this responsibility into the light for all to see and ponder and, I would add, to pray over.

The words, "Thy will be done" must also take on new meaning in this age of peril. You have heard the reply of St. Francis to the question put to him while hoeing in his garden—he was asked "If an angel appeared to tell you, Francis, that tonight you are to die, what would you do?" "Keep on hoeing the garden," he replied. Similarly, today we have no alternative but that of keeping on doing, that is, we must go on strengthening our defense with the best weapons we can devise. At the same time, it is all important that we should vigorously strengthen our resolution to find peaceful solutions to the issues that seem so insoluble now. God alone knows what is going to happen. All we can do is to try our very best to realize in fact the prayer we make, "Thy will be done." His will is peace, not war.

And so we must not forget the urgency inherent in our present situation, created by the radical alteration of man's relation to the forces of nature. The response to the emergency is not that of fear, unless it be a holy fear, not a slavish fear. We are not frightened by the forces we have discovered and unleashed. They are in a sense our own creation; we are their master. They cannot destroy us against our will. Nevertheless, we must stand in fear, not of these blind forces, but of our own blindness and apathy, our own failure to rise to the heights of the emergency that confronts us. This holy fear will make us pray more earnestly, "Thy will is peace; Thy will be done; we will do it."

The emergency is also an opportunity. The power we now hold in our hands is not evil in itself. On the contrary, the energies of nature are of God's creation. They are good, and it is good for us to have unlocked the secret of their use. Everything now depends on the way in which we use them. We can use these new energies to lead us forward, not indeed into some new Garden of Eden, but at least into a more tranquil, human, prosperous, ordered world. Or we can use them to drive us backward into the primeval chaos. It is for us to choose.

The responsibility for the choice rests upon all of us. Ours is a government by consent of the governed; in that sense, therefore, the makers of atomic policy are not only a small group of men in Washington. We, the people, are policymakers, too. We shall not consent to any policy that is not in accord with the norms of justice; for we know that peace can only be the work of justice. "Let justice be done, though the heavens fall." Moreover, we will not be content with any policy that does not strongly tend toward the establishment of the reign of law over the possible brutalities of sheer power. In order that there may be peace, we must presently have power, as much power as we can recruit from nature's atomic storehouse. We trust our power, but we do not put our ultimate trust in it. Our ultimate trust is in the forces that alone in the end can control power—the spiritual and moral forces of reason, justice, and law.

Finally, I think the United States might well unveil the new face of war—war's New Look in this atomic age. This would help us in America, and help all the peoples of the earth, to realize more fully our common situation, and our common responsibilities. If this display were made, I think the peoples of the world and their leaders would cry out with a great voice: We reject war. We choose peace. We refuse methods of violence as the way out of our conflicts of ideas and interests. We choose the methods of argument and agreement—arguments honestly made and agreements slowly reached. We choose the methods of reason, not of wreckage. Lest the heavens fall, let justice be done.

Halifax County and the Supreme Court Decision

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. TUCK

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 11, 1954

Mr. TUCK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an editorial appearing in the Halifax Record-Advertiser, published at Halifax, Va., under date of June 10, 1954, which editorial sets forth the situation which prevails in Southside Virginia in respect to the recent decision of the Supreme Court of the United States.

The Halifax Record-Advertiser was established in January 1869, less than 4 years after the close of the War Between the States, by the late Maj. Henry Archer Edmondson, of the Confederate States Army of America, who during his long and useful life was one of the leading citizens of that county. For many years Major Edmondson represented that section of Virginia in the State senate. The paper which he founded occupies an unusually high place in the confidence and esteem of the people of Halifax County. The editor of this paper, Mr. Spurgeon Compton, is a brilliant young man who in his chosen profession of journalism is making valuable contributions to the culture and education of his subscribers.

Mr. Speaker, the senseless and reckless decision of the Supreme Court on this subject, intended as a scourge upon the people of the South and which would reflect unfavorably upon the legal erudition and commonsense of a second-class justice of the peace, so stunned and shocked the responsible elements of both races that they are just beginning to ponder and consider the awful consequences.

The editorial referred to above is as follows:

HALIFAX COUNTY AND THE SUPREME COURT DECISION

The recent Supreme Court decision outlawing segregation in the public schools has been taken with surprising calmness in Halifax County. Radicals who expected an immediate and perhaps violent reaction to the decision have apparently been disappointed. At the same time, anyone who believes that integrated schools in Halifax County will become a reality at any time in the foreseeable future, are doomed to even greater disappointment.

The spontaneous turnout of around 300 citizens at a meeting of the board of supervisors on Monday leaves no doubt of the fact that the future of the public schools is uppermost in the minds of county citizens. With no public announcement of a meeting before the supervisors, these citizens, many of them farmers busy with their crops, packed the courthouse to show their interest and determination to maintain separate schools for the two races. Many of them were in favor of a resolution asking a special session of the general assembly to enact legislation that would abolish public education as a last resort against integrated schools. Others would have let it be known that they would refuse to pay school taxes to support a school system whose policies the majority of voters would have no voice in shaping.

They accepted a much milder resolution; but let no one mistake their determination. Since the Supreme Court decision, we have talked to hundreds of citizens in Halifax County, and we have yet to find a single one who believes that mixed schools will function in Halifax County during this generation.

State and local leaders have urged that the decision of the Court be greeted with calmness. There has been a general calmness in this county; but this calmness must not be mistaken for the calmness of acceptance. It is rather the calmness of stunned disbelief—a calmness that precipitate action on the part of any group seeking immediate integration of the schools could stir into violence.

We hope and trust that there will be no violence; at the same time we believe that State leaders should know the true temper and determination of our citizens, so that they may plan accordingly. These leaders have the benefit of the best thinking in the State, and we hope that they can find some solution to a problem, the seriousness of which cannot be overemphasized. If abandonment of the public school system as presently constituted is the only way to avoid bloodshed, then we feel that the public schools should be abandoned.

In passing its decision, the Supreme Court usurped legislative powers; but neither a court nor duly empowered legislative body can legislate the morals, customs, and traditions of an entire people.

Phenomenal Progress in Operation of Refugee Relief Act—Forty-eight Individuals Admitted Since August

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN LESINSKI, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 11, 1954

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the newspapers yesterday carried a report declaring that the Refugee Relief Act is beginning to make progress. Naturally, this article caught my eye, since we had earlier been informed that between the time of the passage of the act last August and until a month or so ago, only nine persons had been admitted to the United States under it.

So the information that the act is now beginning to make progress was a welcome piece of information. After all, since we had provided for the admission outside quotas of 209,000 refugees—186,000 of whom were to be refugees from Iron Curtain communism—over a period of 3 years, admission of only 9 in nearly a year was indeed a dismal result.

But what is the truth about this phenomenal progress? We find in reading the news account that the great progress the headline spoke of refers to the total admission since last August of 48 persons—27 Italians, 3 Greeks, and 18 orphans. Apparently very few, if any, of these 48, are Iron Curtain refugees.

While we appreciate the fact that these 48 were fortunate enough to get through the paper curtain of redtape that the State Department has erected around this program, the results, as I said, are dismal.

The report said "there is evidence" of a quickening tempo of the program—that a single ship docking sometime this month may bring in as many refugees under the program as have been admitted since the program began 9 months ago. A 100-percent increase in admissions is impressive—until we remember that we are talking about doubling the total from 48 to only 96.

So we will still have less than 100 refugees coming in during 10 or 11 months under a program which was supposed to allow 209,000 to get in, in 3 years.

The State Department has defended its snail's pace on this matter by declaring the problems of security and clearance were so difficult it is impossible to act quickly. It seems to me that in 10 months, it could find more than 96 qualified persons to permit to come to this country. When it comes to filling the quota of 4,000 orphans, I wonder what kind of security check we have to run on very young children that only 18 could be admitted in 9 months.

Mr. Speaker, any child in good health and with good mentality can be brought up to be a good American, I believe, if we give him half a chance. The opportunities open to a child in this country are so great in comparison with anything these poor orphan kids have known in their short lifetimes that I do not believe we have to fear them as refugees to our country. Elaborate security checks on homeless or stateless or refugee orphans—particularly youngsters of ages most suitable for adoption—seem to be the height of bureaucratic absurdity.

If the tempo of operations under the Refugee Relief Act is really increasing—fine. But a possible increase in admissions from 48 to a total of 96 persons after 10 months makes the boast of phenomenal progress an empty one. The whole thing has been a cruel hoax.

The article follows:

[From the Washington Post of June 10, 1954]

Ike's Refugee Relief Program Beginning to Make Progress

(By Warren Rogers, Jr.)

President Eisenhower's refugee relief program, dogged by security and red tape delays, shows signs of pushing through these barriers toward its goal of providing a haven for 214,000 "homeless, persecuted, and less fortunate."

From the time Eisenhower signed the bill into law last August 7 until May 13, only nine persons had been admitted to the United States under the program.

But now the total admitted is 48, and there is evidence of a quickening tempo. On one ship arriving at New York this month, for instance, as many refugees are expected as have been admitted since the program began 9 months ago.

Representative Javits, Republican-Liberal, of New York, told the House in March that the admission rate verged on a "national scandal."

However, administrators of the program argued it was bound to be a slow starter because personnel had to be hired, a security system installed and other ground work laid before entries began moving at a rapid rate.

The Refugee Relief Act authorizes admission of 214,000 persons over and above regular immigration quotas for a 3-year period ending December 31, 1956.

The 48 refugees admitted to date include 27 Italians, 3 Greeks, and 18 orphans—11 from Germany, 3 from Greece, 2 from Italy, 1 from Japan and 1 stateless.

The act provides for admission of 209,000 refugees. An additional 5,000 persons already in this country may be given permission to settle here permanently.

Of the 209,000 aliens to get visas, 186,000 may be refugees or escapees from Communist-dominated countries in Europe and Asia. Four thousand may be orphans adopted by American families. Up to 19,000 may be additional Italians, Greeks and Dutch with close relatives already in the United States.

The Republican REA Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL T. CURTIS
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 1, 1954

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, the program of rural electrification is a program that is widely supported throughout the United States. It is a program that means a great deal to the farmers of America. It not only contributes very materially to the standard of living, but it is an important factor in production on our modern farms.

The present administration and the 83d Congress have an enviable record in strengthening and improving the REA program and in extending electricity to those rural areas not now being reached.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to call attention to some of the detailed accomplishments in the field of rural electrification.

MORE CONSUMERS GET SERVICE

Loans approved by this Administration during its first year will bring service to 180,500 consumers which is an increase of 37,300 over the year before.

MORE LOANS APPROVED

The present REA has made more electric loans and loaned more funds in its first year than the Truman administration did during the preceding 12 months.

	Loans	
	Number	Amount
This administration's 1st year (May 1, 1953, to May 1, 1954)	340	$181, 118, 100
Former administration (May 1, 1952, to May 1, 1953)	315	157, 612, 001

APPLICATIONS HANDLED FASTER

This administration has given borrowers better service and reduced paper work on loan applications. This is shown in the large reduction of the backlog of applications inherited by this administration:

Backlog when this administration took office	$220, 288, 416
Applications on hand Mar. 28, 1954	130, 599, 000
Reduction	89, 689, 416

HALF OF APPLICATIONS NEED MORE DATA

More than half of the electric loan applications now on file with REA cannot be acted upon by REA until more data of some kind or other is provided by the applicants.

For example, 22 applications or 12.6 percent of the total have feasibility problems and solutions to these problems must be worked out with the help of data from the applicant before REA can take action. Seventy-five applications or 42.9 percent of the total require information about power supply, rates, purpose of construction, financial statement and similar factors before REA can act.

This leaves 78 applications which are in various stages of active processing at the present time. Here is a tabulation summarizing status of all electric applications on hand.

Status of application	Applications		Amount	Percent
	Number	Percent		
Feasibility problem	22	12. 6	$35, 338, 000	27.1
More information	75	42. 9	39, 713, 800	30.4
In process	78	44. 6	55, 547, 200	42.5
Total on hand	175	------	130, 599, 000	------

TREND OF APPLICATIONS DOWN

The trend of applications for electric loans from REA has been sharply downward since 1949, the peak postwar year.

The following table shows the dollar amount of applications received for electric loans since the 1949 peak:

Fiscal year:	*Total of applications received*
1949	$455, 548, 785
1950	335, 397, 810
1951	201, 814, 000
1952	150, 936, 950
1953	[1] 220, 671, 686
1954 (through May 28)	[2] 143, 656, 068

[1] The trend of applications was briefly reversed during November and December of 1952.

[2] This is through May 28—about 1 month before end of the fiscal year.

TREND OF LOANS APPROVED ALSO DOWN

The electric loan program hit its peak in 1949 and for several years thereafter dropped substantially as the postwar construction program leveled off. Today over 91 percent of farms are electrified and applications now call for less funds for new connections and more for boosting system capacity.

Here is the record of loans approved in each fiscal year since 1947:

Fiscal year:	*Amount loaned electric borrowers*
1947	$253, 217, 000
1948	319, 110, 000
1949	449, 317, 700
1950	376, 199, 000
1951	221, 815, 000
1952	165, 758, 731
1953	164, 972, 662
1954	165, 000, 000

HOUSE PROVIDES $193 MILLION PROGRAM

The electric loan program recommended by the House Appropriations Committee and approved by the House provides $193 million for the 1955 fiscal year. Present estimates, based on applications received together with program experience, indicate loans needs will be about $150 million.

On the basis of the House action there thus would be a margin between funds authorized and funds estimated to be needed of more than $40 million.

Here is a breakdown of loan funds proposed for fiscal year 1955:

Electric loans

[In millions]

	1953	1954	1955	
			House	Senate
New authorization	50	135	100	135
Contingency	50	45	35	35
Carryover	117	30	50	50
Rescissions	28	12	8	8
Total	245	222	193	228

ADDITIONAL HALF BILLION ALREADY AVAILABLE

Borrowers presently have available to them about $438 million in unadvanced funds. These are loans which have already been approved—money in the bank—and which borrowers can draw down at any time they properly requisition the money.

Since 1949 advance of funds by REA also has declined:

Fiscal year:	*Amount advanced Electric borrowers*
1949	$321,266,868
1950	286,658,652
1951	268,130,658
1952	227,574,029
1953	207,633,936
1954 (estimated)	185,000,000

This reflects the declining construction program of electric borrowers as they near completion of the distribution plant required for initial connection of all consumers in their service areas.

Here is a table showing the amount of unadvanced loan funds available, by States, as of April 30, 1954:

United States	$438,882,753
Alabama	10,494,075
Arizona	4,372,625
Arkansas	20,262,747
California	6,058,403
Colorado	10,964,340
Connecticut	------------
Delaware	732,954
Florida	7,044,313
Georgia	16,215,147
Idaho	1,477,842
Illinois	7,665,322
Indiana	6,663,297
Iowa	17,183,793
Kansas	5,871,434
Kentucky	31,683,566
Louisiana	5,113,369
Maine	491,295
Maryland	4,084,896
Massachusetts	0
Michigan	14,148,925
Minnesota	15,247,458
Mississippi	16,627,146
Missouri	19,404,832
Montana	7,563,249
Nebraska	14,855,064
Nevada	26,739
New Hampshire	2,001,200
New Jersey	197,862
New Mexico	11,202,400
New York	401,607
North Carolina	17,215,720
North Dakota	7,518,124
Ohio	11,910,668
Oklahoma	12,559,961
Oregon	4,470,923
Pennsylvania	5,978,488
Rhode Island	0
South Carolina	11,354,238
South Dakota	9,208,911
Tennessee	12,047,138
Texas	26,241,186
Utah	1,101,421
Vermont	683,521
Virginia	10,177,484
Washington	5,402,965
West Virginia	129,642
Wisconsin	$23,001,244
Wyoming	6,359,233
Alaska	12,088,085
Virgin Islands	1,874
Puerto Rico	3,376,000

POWER SUPPLY PROGRAM PUSHED

The Administration has worked sympathetically with its borrowers in solving power-supply problems. This is reflected in two items: (a) The percentage of loans made for generation and transmission facilities equals the long-time level; (b) applications now on hand amount to $70,540,000. This represents a reduction of nearly $27 million in the backlog of generation and transmission loan applications since June 30, 1953.

TELEPHONE LOAN PROGRAM AT NEW HIGH

This Administration, as of June 4, 1954, has approved $63,635,000 this fiscal year. The full year total is expected to reach $74 million. This is nearly twice the $41 million program the year before. This year will be by far the biggest in the history of the telephone program. At the beginning of this fiscal year the cumulative total of loans made since the telephone program amendment was enacted in 1949 amounted to only $118 million.

TELEPHONE CONSTRUCTION SPEEDED UP

This year the Administration is advancing to borrowers about $30 million in contrast with $23,864,802 advanced during the previous year. Advances represent actual construction since loan funds are advanced to borrowers only as needed to pay for construction.

ADMINISTRATIVE COST CUT

While setting new records for providing service on loans to electric and telephone borrowers, this Administration has cut administrative costs by 10 percent. This has been accomplished in two ways: First, administrative processes have been streamlined, making possible savings and manpower. Second, borrowers have been permitted to handle for themselves many of the program responsibilities not affecting loan security.

H. R. 9430

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS E. MORGAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 11, 1954

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish at this time to add my name to the list of sponsors who joined with my able colleague AIME J. FORAND, of Rhode Island, in introducing H. R. 9430. This is a bill which provides for unemployment reinsurance grants to the States and also provides for the revision, extension, and improvement of the unemployment insurance program. I feel that there is a great need for legislation of this kind. Because of the changes that have occurred in our economic situation since the enactment of the original unemployment legislation, some adjustment is necessary. H. R. 9430 is a very worthwhile bill and while I understand that it was introduced too late to be considered by the Ways and Means Committee when hearings were held on the unemployment compensation problem, I hope that the committee will report out a bill which will embody the provisions of H. R. 9430.

Massive Stagnation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 11, 1954

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, from time to time, I have called attention to the confusion created in America by the curious and conflicting utterances from persons who may be properly labeled as administration spokesmen, consisting in large part of slogans and catch phrases, in the field of military and foreign policy.

I have been most sharply critical of the tough-guy nature of many of these statements when they were backed up by a constant and continuous gnawing away at our vital military strength, the result of the administration malady known as budgetitis.

In addition to domestic confusion, there are other and equally grave consequences to such antics as we have observed during the past 17 months, and particularly during the past 6 months. One of these consequences is the loss of allies, and the present critical state of Anglo-American relations is a clear but tragic case in point.

Another is the impression made upon the enemy, who is apt to interpret our actions as pure "bluff." The record is rather clear on that in recent weeks, when both Russia and Red China have repeatedly called our bluff.

The Washington Post and Times Herald for June 11 carries an interesting and timely discussion of the perils of administration antics, which I include as a part of my remarks.

I should like to invite the particular attention of my colleagues to the last paragraph of this editorial, and emphasize that one of these days the Russians might think we are bluffing when we are not. As the editorial writer says "that is the way big wars start."

The above-mentioned editorial follows:

MASSIVE STAGNATION

A Western diplomat recently asked a Russian contemporary about the Soviet view of the tough-sounding speech by Admiral Carney. "Oh," replied the Russian, "we don't take it seriously. We know that when the Americans talk that way they are bluffing." Here is, indeed, the epitaph to the sorry confusion of administration policy on Indochina. What we have witnessed has been a progression from massive retaliation to massive stagnation, if not massive disintegration.

There is now ample evidence for everyone that the United States does not intend to intervene in Indochina short of overt Chinese Communist military action. The decision may be right, though perhaps for the wrong reason. The military situation has deteriorated too far, the political troubles have been too long unremedied, the relations with our allies have been too frayed, to permit the prompt and effective stand that in other circumstances ought to be made. Yet for all the responsibility that attaches to the French for unrealistic military estimates and inept handling of independence, and to the British for shying away from new risks, a major share of the blame for this pathetic predicament falls upon the United States.

Lay aside the years of American military aid to the French in Indochina without conditions or supervision, or even a common understanding. In January Secretary Dulles started talking of massive retaliation. But he was not alone. Official after official repeated the line that Indochina simply could not be allowed to fall. Mr. Dulles hinted at an ultimatum to Red China as a sort of advance placarding of the southeast Asian alliance he sought to put together.

In view of the congressional restraints on Mr. Dulles, real negotiation by the United States at Geneva was impossible. The result of the tough talk was to make negotiation virtually impossible for our allies as well. For the bold front suddenly collapsed. When the French, led on by the muscle-flexing, expected the United States to intervene at the 11th hour with a joint air strike at Dien Bien Phu, they were disappointed. The collapse stiffened the hand of the Viet Minh and their Communist mentors. Why should they be reasonable about a cease-fire in Indochina when there was manifestly nothing to stop them?

In point of fact, American political pronouncements had far outrun American military preparations. The strike at Dien Bien Phu, which was proposed seriously, apparently did not even have the support of the majority of the Joint Chiefs of Staff—an incredible background for a politicomilitary adventure. The split among American policymakers has been advertised to the world; and the false hopes and anxious alarums have all been in vain. As Walter Lippman observes, "no government can hope to lead others in a grand alliance if within itself it is so irreconcilably divided."

Let us hope that there now will be a moratorium on tough talk and on the idea that words are equivalent to action. No American can take any satisfaction in the humiliation of his country and the plight of Indochina; the situation is difficult enough to warrant charitable restraint. The effort to take the matter to the United Nations, to build an effective alliance, to bring in other Asian nations and to define a stand is sound long-range policy. It does not have to follow that the remainder of southeast Asia will fall if Vietnam goes.

But never was the need to talk softly and carry a big stick more amply demonstrated. If the administration is not worried about the Russian reaction to brave words, it most certainly ought to be. For one of these days the Russians are likely to think we are bluffing when we are not. That is the way big wars start.

Indochina

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MORGAN M. MOULDER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 11, 1954

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from School and Community, official publication of the Missouri State Teachers Association:

COLUMBIA, MO., *May 17, 1954.*

Congressman MORGAN M. MOULDER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MOULDER: I believe that I am not alone in being very much disturbed about the French Indochina situation.

We who must get our news about situations such as the one in Indochina through the newspapers frequently wonder just what is going on.

As I understand it, the struggle in Indochina has been going on for 7 or 8 years. It isn't something that started in the last 2 or 3 years. The fall of the fort at Dien Bien Phu is only one in a series of steps of progress made by the Communists.

We parents who happen to have sons stationed in Japan where they can be thrown into the Indochina meat grinder would like to have some information about the overall importance of this affair to our Nation.

Frankly, I will need to be convinced of the necessity of sending ground troops into the Indochina theater.

I will be glad to hear from you receiving any information that you may have regarding the above situation.

Sincerly yours,

INKS FRANKLIN,
Editor.

Lt. Gen. Ernest O. Thompson Has Earned Title of "Mr. Oil Conservation"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 11, 1954

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, no man in the world has done more for the cause of conservation of our petroleum resources than Lt. Gen. Ernest O. Thompson, chairman of the Texas Railroad Commission. He has truly earned the right to be called Mr. Oil Conservation.

The Dallas Morning News recently published an article by Richard M. Morehead, a member of the news bureau in Austin, which outlined briefly the service-crammed career of General Thompson. I ask unanimous consent that this article, which is of general interest and significance, be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Lt. Gen. Ernest O. Thompson, the dean of elective State officials, has a pleasant political prospect this year.

June 4 marked the 22d anniversary of Thompson's tenure on the Texas Railroad Commission. He stepped into the job during the trying days of the east Texas oil boom and has earned the respect of the petroleum world.

W. Alton Jones, chairman of the board for the American Petroleum Institute, described the Texan as "the greatest living authority in the world on conservation." The occasion was 3 years ago when Thompson was awarded the API gold medal for distinguished achievement.

Now Thompson is seeking the Democratic nomination for another 6 years on the commission. He is unopposed. That is the way public officials prefer to run for office.

So the commissioner, now serving his fourth term as chairman, will spend the summer with such tasks as autographing copies of Three Stars for the Colonel, a biography of Thompson written by James A. Clark of Houston. Random House, Inc., is publishing the book, which will go on sale first June 18 at Amarillo, the general's hometown.

Gov. Ross Sterling brought Thompson to Austin in 1932 to serve on the commission, when the late Pat M. Neff resigned to become president of Baylor University.

Thompson already had won wide attention as mayor of Amarillo. He battled there for lower utility rates and won, dramatizing his campaign with such measures as removal of the telephones from hotels which Thompson owned.

The east Texas oilfield was in chaos, with crude selling for 10 cents a barrel, the market flooded, and oil being wasted.

Thompson considers the handling of east Texas a masterpiece of conservation. Its crude now sells for $2.85 a barrel.

When the field first was developed, its ultimate recovery was estimated at a billion barrels—the greatest in the world.

East Texas already has produced more than 3 billion barrels. Its expected recovery now is 6 billion barrels—counting the oil already produced.

Thompson's career on the commission largely spans the whole era of oil conservation. The regulatory system which the Texas Railroad Commission has developed now is widely copied by other States and nations.

The general looks upon the following as landmarks of conservation during his term on the Commission:

1. Passage of a market demand law, declaring that oil and gas production in excess of market demand is wasteful and illegal.

2. Realization that reservoir pressure must be preserved. East Texas operators who expected the field to be produced under the old wasteful "gusher" technique still have pumps connected to some wells, unused 20 years later.

3. Realization that oil wells can efficiently drain 20 to 80-acre tracts. No longer is a field a forest of expensive derricks and pumps.

4. Adoption of a "discovery allowable" rule which gives Texas operators a bonus for finding more oil.

5. Creation of the Interstate Oil Compact Commission. Thompson helped to organize the agency and served as its chairman three times. This effectively helped the States to preempt the field of petroleum regulation and avoid Federal control, Thompson believes.

"Nobody wants Federal control now," he observed.

A lieutenant general commanding the Texas National Guard, Thompson has actively urged maintaining adequate oil reserves in the United States for defense. The Nation's reserves now total about 28 billion barrels, half of it in Texas.

A single field in Arabia has the same quantity of oil—28 billion barrels—according to the engineers. Around the Persian Gulf lie an estimated 100 billion barrels of crude.

General Thompson does not view this as a menace to Texas' oil industry. He views it as a blessing which can bring better living to the hungry hordes of China and India. Mechanized farming and other benefits of the Machine Age can do wonders for Asia's backward civilization, Thompson said.

Two things are necessary to maintain a healthy United States oil industry, according to Thompson. These are the preservation of a tax depletion allowance to encourage exploration for oil and gas and limiting imports to a quantity which will supplement and not supplant domestic production. This still would mean that Americans will use more foreign oil in the future.

For the present, Thompson is trying to get petroleum importers to reduce shipments from abroad. He has written to the heads of all importing firms, advising them that foreign oil is hurting the domestic producer.

"National security of the United States depends upon a virile prosperous domestic oil producing industry," the general wrote.

Memorial Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MILTON R. YOUNG

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 11, 1954

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article on Memorial Day, published in the column entitled "Chaff and Chatter," written by Miss Ruth Fairbanks, which appeared in North Dakota's largest daily newspaper, the Fargo Forum, on May 30, Memorial Day. In her article Miss Fairbanks offers a fresh treatment to a subject about which many words have been written and spoken. In my opinion, it brings back to us the true purpose of Memorial Day, at which time we pay homage to our honored war dead.

It is only fitting and proper that all Americans keep in mind the tremendous sacrifices which were made by these valiant heroes. The memory of their gallantry and devotion to duty should create in each of us an earnest desire to maintain and perpetuate the true spirit and heritage of our beloved country.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHAFF AND CHATTER

(By Ruth Fairbanks)

Memorial Day has grown nearer to us these passing years with war following war and leaving little time for peaceful, quiet reverence to those whose lives are lost in battle.

The memory of those we honor today has become such a young memory.

Along with the heroes who rose out of the pages of our history books and the stories we heard from our elders there now marches a long line of men and boys we knew * * *

The boy who used to bring the groceries, the banker's son and the son of the preacher, the bricklayer and the storekeeper.

Heroes of the Battle of the Bulge, of Korea! Men who fell in Italy, in Germany, in North Africa! Many countries with strange names hard to pronounce!

The unknown soldier came home to rest at the close of World War I. It was a gesture to keep alive the memory and to honor all men who served our country in that war.

The sentry on guard and the wreath laid on the tomb in the Nation's capital continue today with deepened significance as the truth dawns that this first World War was by no means the last.

We have seen the sons and daughters of these World War I men and women become members of the Armed Forces.

We have come to know the Unknown Soldier. He is no stranger to us any more. When we honor him or the other heroes of war we pay homage to those we miss from our own circles of friends and family.

We know the things for which he fought and gave his life for they are the same for which the boys from home fought and died.

We know him as the boy from home who never wanted to be a hero. Happiness and a chance in life. Those were the things he asked for.

We know him as a lad who believed in principles of decency and justice, of honorable freedom and loyalty to his country and his Government whether that country was his birthplace or not.

We know him as a blend of many family backgrounds of many countries and many customs.

There will come a day when these heroes we know will be like legendary figures to your children's children, marching in Memorial Day parades. From books in school and stories at home they will learn of these wars and they will seem as far away as do those other wars to us.

It was that way once with us, too, remember?

There was nothing so very real as we marched in a parade, feeling a little awkward waving a small flag. And it was like being in a play or pageant. A visit to the cemetery, laying wreaths and flowers were moments in which we felt sad. But war as such had not touched our lives and so it seemed far away * * * as far away as Paul Revere's ride, as the Blue and the Gray.

Today in many ways we will pay honor to the heroes of war and at the same time we honor a way of life that we have somehow come to feel is greatly to be desired and fought for.

Straight Talk From Mr. McKay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR V. WATKINS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 11, 1954

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, on June 5, 1954, Secretary of the Interior Douglas McKay delivered an address in Salt Lake City, commenting on western progress. Both leading dailies in our State had editorial comment.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Straight Talk From Mr. McKay," appearing in the Deseret News, of Salt Lake City, Utah, on June 7, 1954.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STRAIGHT TALK FROM MR. MCKAY

The absence of political double-talk was the most notable thing about the address delivered by Secretary of Interior Douglas R. McKay in Salt Lake City Saturday. Considering the fact that he was addressing one of those $100-a-plate party rallies, he spoke remarkably straight from the shoulder and specifically in reporting on the policies and accomplishments of his department, particularly in relation to problems of the West.

An impressive and reassuring report, it was, too.

In the early weeks of his administration, President Eisenhower spelled out his basic water and power policy. It was to give the most vigorous and resourceful leadership from the Federal Government in planning and promoting reclamation projects. But never, he emphasized from the start, would Federal bureaucracy be allowed to encroach on State, community, and private responsibilities or prerogatives in this field. What the administration sought was a working partnership between all levels for the most effective possible use of water resources.

In his talk here, Secretary McKay made it plain the administration has not retreated from that goal. That philosophy has been at the root of the administration's refusal to push ahead on a high Federal dam at Hells Canyon in Idaho over the objection of private and local interests. It has also been the key to the administration's stanch support of the upper Colorado River storage project. The appointment by President Eisenhower last week of a Cabinet Committee on Water Resources Policy, including the Secretaries of Agriculture, Interior, and Defense, is a further progress in this direction.

Political opponents have attempted, chiefly on the basis of the Hells Canyon stand, to persuade the country that the Republican administration intends an end to big, multiple-purpose reclamation projects. Nowhere is the falsity of that idea more clearly exposed than in the administration's position on the Colorado River project. Here, if ever, because of the severe criticism and the political risks, was a place to retreat from Federal participation in such projects.

But although every word he has said on the subject has brought hot coals of criticism on his head, Secretary McKay backed up not a bit.

"We are determined to press for congressional approval of this gigantic undertaking which has the vigorous support of the President and top priority on the 'must' list of the Department of the Interior," he said.

The contrast between that forthright stand and the hedging and crawfishing of the former Secretary of Interior cannot fail to be refreshing to citizens of the mountain west.

Another refreshing contrast was that between his attitude and that of his predecessor toward the problem of Utah's unsurveyed school lands, a solution for which this newspaper has been strongly urging in recent months.

"The administration is fully aware of its responsibility to the State and is determined to play fair in protecting its rights in the development of its mineral resources," he declared.

But more than a mere declaration of policy, he outlined specific plans of his Department to spend the big share of an additional $500,000 next year to survey some 50 townships in Utah, making some 130,000 acres of school land available to the State. His Department had already given full support to the legislation passed a few weeks ago to allow the State of Utah to replace the Federal Government as lessor of a piece of school lands on completion of the survey.

There was one matter in which Secretary of Interior McKay disappointed his audience of Utahans. This was his failure to hold out any substantial hope for improvement in the condition of the lead-zinc industry. He declared his conviction that "a prosperous mining industry is essential to the economic strength and continued growth of the West." But he said nothing constructive about the real, immediate problem. He said nothing, for example, to indicate that the recent study report issued by the Tariff Commission will result in tariff relief to save a lead-zinc industry that is, and for several years has been, far from prosperous.

With that one exception (and in fairness it should be emphasized that any action the President plans to take probably is not ready for discussion yet), Secretary McKay, himself a westerner, showed a keen awareness of and sympathy toward the problems of this area. His atttiude and his forthright discussion of policies for meeting the problems did him and the administration he represents significant credit.

Merchant Marine Ailing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FREDERICK G. PAYNE

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 11, 1954

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an article by Hanson W. Baldwin entitled "Merchant Marine Ailing," published in the New York Times of June 10, 1954.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Merchant Marine Ailing—By End of This Year No Dry-Cargo Ship Will Be Building in United States Yard

(By Hanson W. Baldwin)

The President this week asked Congress for funds to aid our ailing merchant marine.

The request was small—for $82,600,000 for new merchant ship construction. Even if this request is approved by Congress, many months must elapse before contracts have been let, and when 5 Mariner class vessels, still building, are delivered later this year, the last of an order for 35, not a single oceangoing dry-cargo merchant vessel will be under construction in any American shipyard.

Thus the merchant marine, usually the poor cousin of the armed services in periods between wars, is again lapsing into somewhat the same depressed state that characterized it prior to World Wars I and II. The New Look military policies have paid, at best, lip service to the merchant marine even though those policies, which envisage an eventual reduction of our naval amphibious forces, put a greater degree of responsibility on merchant ships as troop carriers.

KEY ELEMENT IN DEFENSE

Merchant shipping always has been for the United States a key element of sound national defense and always will be so long as sea power forms one of the first lines of defense. This is more true today than it was prior to World War II, despite the increased capabilities of the plane.

For the United States is now far more dependent on foreign sources than it was a decade or two ago. Uranium, oil, manganese, columbium and scores of other minerals and products must be transported across the seas to the United States if our war economy is to be maintained.

This must be done, in time of war, in the face of a formidable Russian submarine threat, which is not perhaps as serious as it has been painted but which is none the less real.

Moreover, the plane has not proved that it can carry bulk cargoes economically in peace or war in competition with ships. About 95 percent of all supplies to Korea were transported in ship's bottoms. The Secretary of the Navy, Charles S. Thomas, said recently that 5 tons of supplies accompanied each man we sent to Korea and 64 pounds of supplies each day were necessary to sustain each man after his arrival.

"From 1950 to 1953," Mr. Thomas added, "The Military Sea Transportation Service (operated by the Navy) hauled more than 5 million passengers, 22 million tons of petroleum products and 52 million tons of dry cargo in support of the Korean military operations."

It is true that some experts are advocating the expansion of our cargo- and air-passenger fleets. These men believe that combinations of atomic weapons, mines, and submarines sever us from our overseas sources of raw materials in time of war if our carrying capacity were limited primarily to ship's bottoms.

TRANSPORT COSTS STRESSED

They assert that air transport costs already are competing with rail costs and that in time they may be able to compete with shipping costs. Such a vision, however, is for the future, if indeed it ever is realized. Today it is probably beyond the capability of any major nation to supply itself with all the bulk cargoes it needs by transoceanic air transport.

Even if other aspects of the operation were feasible, the problem of supplying fuel for the great numbers of cargo aircraft necessary would seem to be dependent, at least in part, upon tankers.

In view of these facts and the importance of the merchant marine to national security the state of our commercial shipping today is not reassuring, particularly as regards future trends. Shipbuilders are principally dependent, at the moment, upon the Navy, which hopes to be able to carry out a $1 billion program of warship construction, conversion, and modernization annually.

LAG IN CONSTRUCTION FUNDS

There were no appropriations for construction of new merchant ships in the current fiscal year's budget; next year, the appropriation will be only $82,600,000, if Congress approves the President's recent request. These figures contrast with merchant ship construction funds that reached $322 million in 1951.

The present merchant fleet is large in size, 3,348 vessels, 1,259 of them privately owned. But about half of all of these are classified as poor, from the point of view of speed and cargo capacity, and all of them are getting old fast. Within 9 years 80 percent should be replaced. Very few of these ships can make 18 knots, a desirable speed in the age of snorkel submarines.

The high cost of constructing and operating United States merchant ships is the major economic reason for the merchant marine's between-wars decline. Unions afloat and ashore are responsible for much of the increased costs and also for some of the uncertain discipline that periodically has marred United States merchant ship operation.

There is no doubt, however, that the merchant marine is an essential element of our security policies as they are now envisaged. Congress should consider it in that light.

Laurels for a Traffic Manager

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 11, 1954

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, with so little being done generally throughout the country on behalf of the merchant marine, I think it appropriate that recognition be accorded to one citizen who has given outstanding evidence of his interest in this field.

Mr. Otis E. Shaw, of the A. H. Bull & Co., steamship operators, has just been chosen president of the Baltimore Traffic Club, as well as vice president of the Propeller Club, Port of Baltimore. Mr. Shaw formerly was president of the Washington Traffic Club.

I ask unanimous consent that an article from the Baltimore Sun of June 10, 1954, outlining Mr. Shaw's many accomplishments and activities in the shipping field, be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Laurels for a Traffic Manager

(By Helen Delich)

A most unusual honor has been bestowed upon one of the most modest—if not the most modest—of men in Baltimore steamship circles.

The man is Otis E. Shaw, traffic manager for A. H. Bull & Co.

The honor is that of being elected president of the Baltimore Traffic Club after having served as president of the Washington Traffic Club.

And to add to the honors of this southern-drawling gentleman, the Propeller Club, Port of Baltimore, has just elected him its vice president, lining him up for the top position there after he finishes with his chief executive duties in the Traffic Club.

The one bit of unhappiness that accompanies these honors is that all the extracurricular work means that his pet game of golf is simply a memory.

What spare time he has now is devoted to gardening around his Ruxton home.

BASHFUL AND UNASSUMING

Such honors were not accorded to Odie, as he is known generally, without due recognition of his ability.

The shyness of this short, slender, curly-haired man would make the stranger meeting him think he is nothing more than an ordinary clerk.

But those who have worked or associated with him know better.

They know that quiet Odie is able to accomplish almost anything in the traffic world. They know that he knows rates, schedules and cargoes as well as anyone anywhere.

And they know that his mannerisms go a long way in the traffic world to attract business to his line, the only American-flag company operating regularly to Puerto Rico from the North Atlantic coast, just as it has for 80 years.

Odie Shaw is a great booster of the port of Baltimore.

In fact, he does his utmost to move everything he can from the Pittsburgh and Chicago centers, as well as other midwestern points, through Baltimore on his company's ships. He maintains that the overall costs here are less.

But he does note that the general cargo facilities here are not adequate, although the potential is great.

And he should know, for the Bull Line's trade is principally general cargo to Puerto Rico.

There are several subsidiaries of A. H. Bull & Co., but all the ships are known as belonging simply to the Bull Line.

The Bull Steamship Co. operates the coastwise ships bearing fertilizer materials from the Gulf to the Mathieson Chemical and Baugh Chemical companies.

FAST WEEKLY SERVICE

The Bull Insular Line operates a fast, direct weekly service from Baltimore to ports in Puerto Rico.

C–2 vessels, capable of 17–18 knots, are used and reefer space, in addition to space for 12 passengers, is available.

Similar service also is maintained from other North and South Atlantic ports.

Like all domestic concerns, A. H. Bull & Co. suffered a serious loss in ships that were used by the Government during the war, and it has never reestablished its coastwise, general-cargo service.

But this American-flag line still is the dominant factor in the Puerto Rico service, and Odie Shaw does his share in obtaining as much cargo as possible, as he has for the 24 years he's been with the Bull Line.

It is expected that he will perform the same excellent job with the Traffic Club, whose principal purpose is to create fellowship among the members and present a complete and thorough discussion of transportation problems from an educational viewpoint.

A Good Friend Speaks to the West

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR V. WATKINS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 11, 1954

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an editorial entitled "A Good Friend Speaks to the West," appearing in the Salt Lake Tribune of June 8, 1954.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

A Good Friend Speaks to the West

Utah and the rest of the intermountain West were given striking evidence over the weekend that the area's problems are in the hands of an administration which understands them and which will do its best to see that they are solved.

The occasion was the visit of Secretary of the Interior Douglas R. McKay to Salt Lake City during which he addressed Republicans attending the party's centennial dinner. But though Mr. McKay spoke at a political gathering, his words had a weight not customarily associated with political speeches. This was so because Mr. McKay discussed matters in which all Utahans, regardless of party affiliation, are intensely interested.

At the present, this area is most concerned with the development of the upper Colorado River Basin, and, more particularly, in the Echo Park project, which is being opposed by a strange combination of armchair conservationists and California interests which covert water belonging to others. Mr. McKay emphasized the strength of the opposition and declared that the administration will need vigorous support of all the people of the area. We think it safe to say that such support will be practically unanimous.

It was also good to have Mr. McKay destroy the silly contention that he was tricked into supporting Colorado River development. Quite the contrary, said the Secretary; he gave his endorsement with his eyes open for the simple reason that he considers it a good project. That is a plain answer to those who try to make out that the Colorado project has to be sold by subterfuge.

Mr. McKay's forthright statement of policy on the development of water resources is much appreciated here, too. On the upper Colorado, he said the attempt is being made to get "the best use of every drop of water available." This policy will be applied to all projects to meet both local requirements and the needs of the Nation as a whole. Which will not only mean the end of interdepartmental squabbling over who is going to build the dams, but also a correlation of all the complex factors involved in any reclamation undertaking.

Mr. McKay certainly set at rest any fears that the administration is only paying lip service to the principle of water resources development. At the same time, the Secretary discussed several other subjects of particular interest to the West. He described recent progress in improving educational and medical facilities for the Navaho Indians, and he gave assurance that the administration is working on a long-range policy to keep the mining industry strong. He did not spell this out, nor could he be expected to at this time, since the policy has not yet been completely formulated and other departments than his own are involved.

Secretary McKay made an excellent impression. He spoke as a westerner to western people. Moreover, he demonstrated a remarkable understanding of the area's particular needs and a firm determination to help solve its problems. The Tribune is very happy—indeed, all of us must be—to have had him visit the State.

Importance of the American Shipbuilding and Ship Repair Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 11, 1954

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, an editorial in the Baltimore Sun of Wednesday, June 9, points out a fact that should be kept in mind, particularly by Members of the Congress, with regard to the maintenance of America's vital shipbuilding facilities.

Noting the recent award to the Bethlehem-Sparrows Point shipyard of contracts for construction of two Navy ammunition ships, the Sun editorial rightly declares that such isolated aid will not solve the problem at Sparrows Point—in fact, at any other shipyard.

The editorial calls for the adoption of an overall maritime policy, emphasizing that the awardings of Navy contracts are not a substitute, even though they keep some shipyards open for a while longer.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial from the Baltimore Sun be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Navy Ship Awards and Maritime Policy

Bethlehem's shipyard at Sparrows Point no longer faces a shutdown in October. Receipt of the award for the construction of two Navy ammunition ships assures that the shipyard will be in operation for some time. The award does not, however, solve the problem at Sparrows Point.

The shipyards in this country are facing hard times. Contracts for new ships have dwindled almost to the vanishing point. There have been sharp curtailments in shipyard operations and drastic reductions in shipyard employment. Occasional awards of Navy contracts cannot keep the shipyards in widespread operation.

In the recent report issued by the Maritime Administration and the Office of the Under Secretary of Commerce for Transportation the view was expressed that the shipyards should be maintained at a peacetime level of 36,000 employees. With this nucleus they could readily be expanded to the necessary size in the event of emergency.

Construction annually of 60 oceangoing ships would maintain the shipyards at the proper peacetime level, the report continued. In addition, this building program would assure the country of a modern, basic merchant fleet.

Approval of the program would necessitate Federal subsidies. If there is to be such a program it should be part of an overall maritime policy, not an isolated affair. Congress is considering the adoption of such a policy. The awarding of Navy ship contracts are not a substitute, even though they keep some shipyards open for a while longer.

What Is American Policy in Indochinese Crisis?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 11, 1954

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I wish to commend to the attention of the membership of this body an editorial which appeared recently in the Milwaukee Journal.

The editorial is entitled "What Is American Policy in Indochinese Crisis?" This is the question which many of our people have been asking for some time. They have been told by administration spokesmen that Indochina is important to the cause of the free world; that the free world cannot afford to lose that area; that something will have to be done to forestall Communist conquest of the Associated States.

The fact remains, as the editorial points out, that statements of this nature are no substitute for a policy. Our people want to know what is our Nation's policy with respect to the crisis in Indochina. I believe that they are entitled to an answer. It is my hope that the administration will make up its mind on this issue, and give us an answer soon.

The editorial follows:

What Is American Policy in Indochinese Crisis?

The most distressing thing about the crisis in Indochina is the obvious lack of any American policy for dealing with it.

There has been no lack of top level statements. But statements are no substitute for policy—and there is no policy. And the things our leaders have said are frequently in conflict.

The American people hear Senator Knowland, GOP Senate leader, proclaim that the free world has reached a jumping-off place, that all of Asia will fall to communism if a showdown is not forced on the Communists within 30 days. This comes right after Secretary of State Dulles has said that the situation is not hopeless, and that while no concrete action has been taken to prevent Indochina's fall, such things as foreign aid and allied treaties might prevent disaster.

Admiral Carney, Chief of Naval Operations, declares that the United States cannot afford the loss of Indochina. It must be prevented at all costs, he says, for if it isn't, the free world will eventually be "far inferior to the coalition that's dedicated to our destruction." Admiral Radford, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, is reported to believe that only active American military intervention can save Indochina and that it must be saved. General Ridgway, Army Chief of Staff, is said to think that Indochina is a political as well as a military problem. He contends that the idea that coolies with rifles and a bag of rice can be defeated by the Navy, airpower and atom bombs is ridiculous.

Vice President NIXON has said numerous things, varying from pleas for some kind of intervention to assurances that no American boys will fight in Indochina.

Senator WILEY, chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, wisely said a few days ago that the Nation must soon decide one way or the other about Indochina. The sacrifices which intervention would entail, whatever the form and extent of such intervention, must be weighed against the cost if Asia goes Communist.

It is decisions such as these that the National Security Council and the Eisenhower administration should be making. But when Council members and administration leaders talk as though they were in the Tower of Babel—each insisting he is speaking only for himself and disagreeing with others and sometimes with himself—it is evident no decisions are being made.

Leaders who complain that the American people do not understand the seriousness of the Indochina situation have themselves to blame. The people can't make up their minds when confronted by confused and uncertain leadership. Until there is a policy on Indochina and southeast Asia, there can be no public assessment or support for that policy.

Communist Infiltration in Guatemala

SPEECH

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 11, 1954

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, as material additional to the remarks which I made today on this subject in the House, I append the following:

A significant element related to the infiltration of communism into the affairs of the Republic of Guatemala has been overlooked. It is the interest in Guatemala which the Communist Party spokesman in the United States, the Daily Worker is displaying.

When and how did the Daily Worker come to have an abiding interest in Guatemala which the past few months this organ of the Communist Party—I say organ because it does not merit the designation of newspaper—has so prominently displayed? Let us place the Daily Worker into the context of that phase of the international Communist conspiracy which is at work in our own backyard.

From November 5, 1953, to January 12, 1954, José Manuel Fortuny was on a trip to Moscow.

Between October 1, 1953, to November 29, 1953, Victor Manuel Gutierrez traveled to Moscow and back to Guatemala.

These two top Guatemalan Communist leaders apparently worked out with international Communist strategists a policy decision. That decision would seem to have been for the entire propaganda apparatus of international communism to come to the active support of Guatemalan Communists, and to extend the danger of Communist penetration in that country and in the Western Hemisphere.

Pravda enunciated the new policy in an article published in its January 14 issue.

The Cominform Journal, published in Bucharest, echoed Pravda in its issue of February 5, 1954.

World Front organizations, apparently ordered to express their solidarity with Guatemalan communism, came to life. In the Western Hemisphere so-called Societies of Friends of Guatemala were created.

And the Daily Worker apparently received the party line, and without deviation has followed it to this day as straight as an arrow.

One of the first targets, as the Daily Worker opened its campaign early in February, was the executive council of the American Federation of Labor, which was accused of teaming up with Wall Street in a plot against Guatemala.

Almost simultaneously with its attack against the A. F. of L., John Pittman, a Daily Worker editorial writer, wrote about the second national congress of the Communist-dominated Guatemalan General Labor Confederation held at Guatemala City. He reported that Lombardo Toledano, head of the Latin American Labor Confederation; Giuseppi di Vittorio, of the Italian Labor Confederation; and Luis Saillant, of the World Federation of Trade Unions, were present.

As a matter of fact it does not appear to be true that all these heads of Communist-labor fronts were present. But certainly Pittman outlined accurately the nature of the Communist-labor front from the top to the Guatemalan unit of it. And if all these Communist labor leaders were not present physically, certainly they were there in spirit.

During February and March the Daily Worker followed through with basic indoctrination of its readers with international communism's line and rationalization on Guatemala.

On March 5 a display advertisement appeared in the Daily Worker announcing a rally on "The Guatemala Crisis" for March 12 at Manhattan Plaza. This rally was sponsored by a provisional committee on Latin-American affairs and followed the pattern which had gotten under way in other American republics.

During the first part of April the Daily Worker published a series of six articles by its correspondent who had been sent to Guatemala. This correspondent wrote about such themes as these: First, the National Peace Committee, an offshoot of the Communist World front, the Berlin Peace Council; second, the place of Communists in Guatemala, and particularly of Fortuny, who Magil described as "one of the founding fathers of the Guatemalan Republic"; third, critical comment on United States labor unions, the United Fruit Co., and the Department of State.

On May 31 the Daily Worker carried an article from Tribuna Popular, of Guatemala City, described by the Daily Worker as the organ of the Guatemalan Workers—Communist—Party. This article attempted to justify the surreptitious shipment of arms from behind the Iron Curtain to Guatemala.

These are some of the surface facts which are alarming enough. They indicate the close liaison which has been established between the Communist press in the United States and the Communist press in Guatemala and the international design of communism. Since communism is essentially subversive and hidden in its attack we have reason to raise many questions and to search for the answers.

Are there secret channels through which members of the Communist apparatus in this country operate with their co-workers in Guatemala and in other parts of Latin America?

Are there agents—some Latin Americans and others of American nationality—who maintain contacts in the interests of international communism?

And are those agents of United States nationality working against the foreign policy and the vital interests of the United States?

The time has come to seek the answers to these significant questions.

Keep Your Mouth Shut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 9, 1954

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, recently we were told that Federal employees should not peddle to Members of Congress information which some executive officer had classified as secret.

Recognizing the fact that information, which if given general circulation would be injurious to the public, should not be peddled or broadcast, we should not forget the fact that usually this secret information is available to clerks, stenographers, and others, and that at times reporting only to a superior officer who fails or refuses to act may result in irrevocable injury to the Nation.

Certainly, in the first place a Federal employee or a citizen aware of a dangerous practice or situation should first report to those charged with the enforcement of the law, the protection of the country, but when those charged with responsibility for law enforcement, with acting for the security of the Nation or its people, neglect or fail to act promptly and vigorously, the individual should not fail to go farther and, if necessary, call to the attention of the public a dangerous situation.

After the Civil War, many a scandal was uncovered, a remedy applied, because of information furnished by individual Federal employees.

More recently, Teapot Dome gives an example, as do the cases of Hiss and White where public officers refused to take cognizance of most deplorable situations. Only because Federal employees "leaked" to Members of Congress did justice catch up with certain individuals.

An example of what happened to an Army officer who did not keep his mouth shut is given in an editorial from the Chicago Tribune of yesterday, June 10, which reads as follows:

He Didn't Get To Be a General

Col. Otis K. Sadtler, chief of the military branch of the Army Signal Corps at the time of Pearl Harbor, died in retirement the other day. He was a colonel in 1941, he was a colonel at the end of the war in 1945, and he was still a colonel when he died. Thousands of officers were promoted during the war from the rank they held at the start of hostilities, but not Colonel Sadtler. Hundreds, if not thousands, of colonels became generals; not Colonel Sadtler.

And when the failure of this officer to advance is examined, the reason seems peculiar. For Colonel Sadtler, in the events leading up to the Japanese surprise attack upon Pearl Harbor, distinguished himself by his devotion and energy. He tried to prevent a surprise, but his warnings and advice went unheeded.

The Army Pearl Harbor Board, which investigated the disaster and reported its conclusions in 1944, complimented Colonel Sadtler for his "interest and aggressiveness in attempting to have something done" on the basis of Japanese cryptographic messages, which were intercepted and decoded after the United States broke the Japanese secret code. He was, the Board stated, deeply impressed with the significance of the information thus obtained, unbeknownst to the enemy, "which pointed only to war, and to war almost immediately."

Colonel Sadtler testified to the receipt of the Japanese East Wind Rain message, inserted in a radio broadcast from Tokyo, which had been arranged as a signal to Japanese diplomats overseas that war was coming. He went to the Chief of the Army War Plan, Gen. L. T. Gerow, with a suggestion that American overseas commands be alerted, but was informed that they had been adequately warned. He went next to Col. Walter Bedell Smith, then secretary to the General Staff, but Smith said he "did not want to discuss the matter further."

The report of the Army Board placed a part of the responsibility for Japanese success on Gerow. It was highly critical of Smith. The report of the minority in the congressional investigation of Pearl Harbor in 1946 listed Gerow among those guilty of "failure to perform the responsibilities indispensably essential to the defense of Pearl Harbor." Testimony in the investigations disclosed that the night before the Japanese attack, when there was still time to warn Pearl Harbor, the first 13 of the 14 part final Japanese message breaking off relations with the United States was delivered to Smith, with word that it should go to General Marshall, the Chief of Staff, at once. The Army Board called Smith's failure to act "unfortunate."

Gerow, during the course of the war, was promoted from brigadier general to lieutenant general and placed in command of an army in Europe. Smith was promoted to the rank of lieutenant general, became Chief of Staff to General Eisenhower in Europe, later was made Ambassador to Moscow, still later Chief of the Central Intelligence Agency, and now is Under Secretary of State. General Marshall, who muffed the last minute message needed to alert Pearl Harbor, rose to the Secretaryships of State and Defense.

The contrast to Colonel Sadtler, who tried to carry out his duties, is striking. The fumblers all hit the glory road. The colonel never went ahead. His zeal in trying to head off Pearl Harbor was not appreciated by the powerful patrons of the others.

Toward a Greater America—Are We Prepared To Meet the Demands of Our Mushrooming Population?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 11, 1954

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, what manner of person is he who would place his future in barren waste to be made fertile by the strength of his back and the sweat of his brow? Whatever manner he might be, we know there are many who are willing, yes, even anxious, to mortgage their future for 50 years in order to move onto a new Federal irrigation project.

They should not be objects of charity from the Federal Government and neither do they seek charity. They want only what America offers to all—opportunity.

An opportunity to help build a greater America. These young people, who are willing to make an investment in this future project, should be regarded as a sound economic asset which has kept America strong. It should be remembered that future earning power is present capital and so regarded in all financial markets.

Irrigation projects have a continuing record of developing new wealth. The true national value of irrigation, however, is measured best in terms other than monetary.

WESTERN GROWTH

For instance, the phenomenal increase in the population of the 17 Western States over the past 50 years clearly indicates the economic maturing of that vast area comprising three-fifths of the area of the United States.

Expressed in terms of percentage increase between 1940 and 1950, the 17 Western States gained 25.8 percent, the 11 Mountain and Pacific States 40.9 percent, and the 3 Pacific States 48.8 percent. Compare this to the 14.5 percent population increase of the United States.

The East is crowded—only the West offers the opportunities for our expanding population. The rapid rate of western growth has resulted in a major shift in the location of the population of the United States. Since 1900, the percentage of all of the people of the United States living in the 17 Western States has increased from 14.7 percent to 22.6 percent in 1950.

In raising its percentage of population, the 17 western States have more than tripled their population. The growth is even more phenomenal in the three Pacific States where most of the reclamation and irrigation projects are located. In 1900 there were about 2½ million people living in California, Oregon, and Washington—the 1950 census shows nearly 14½ million.

POPULATION DOUBLES

Since 1900, the population of the United States has just about doubled. Many of us have watched this entire growth. Since 1950 our population has grown over 11½ million with 3.4 million new births in 1953—far beyond the highest predictions of a few years ago.

Many of us have watched this entire growth. We have seen the inventions of many wonders. As a child, living on a farm in Nebraska, I won't forget the look of amazement on my father's face when I told him I saw a "horseless carriage"—he found it difficult to believe. Yet, before he died he saw the wonders of television which enabled him to see thousands of miles, witnessing various events, remaining in his own living room.

Just as many found it difficult to believe that we could have self-propelled carriages, that man would fly, or that man could project his voice and image thousands of miles; they also found it unbelievable that our population would surpass 160 million quickly eating itself out of food and fiber. People who predicted a population of 150 million for the United States were considered fanatics in yesteryears. Now, people are telling of 250 to 300 million people living in this land of yours and mine.

Present crop production finds us growing enough for approximately 20 million more people, or until about 1970. After that we will be at the mercy of the weather and foreign markets. We will be a nation of have nots rather than of plenty. Unless, of course, we anticipate our needs and prepare to meet them. As it now stands, the United States has assumed the responsibility of feeding the rest of the world—a world which finds half the people hungry. Will we be able to meet the obligations we have assumed to our own people, let alone the rest of the world?

Irrigation and reclamation projects do not spring up overnight. There is a 10-year construction and development period. So, for all intents and purposes, we must consider the needs of our mushrooming population and the saturation point of our food supply at 1960 rather than 1970. This is only 6 years away.

With population constantly increasing, the strain on our natural resources grows more acute. Only by pursuing a balanced program for reclamation of land by water shortages can we meet the responsibilities to preserve and extend national prosperity. We can no longer afford to think in terms of the relatively simple, single-purpose projects. Water has become too precious. We must be sure that we make the fullest use of all that is available.

PRESIDENTIAL NOTICE

The sound development of our water resources is a key part of the great task which lies ahead of supplying our people's needs. President Eisenhower, in realizing the importance of continued water development, has ordered creation of a Cabinet-level Committee on Water Resources to form a national water policy. In announcing the program, the President said he hopes to coordinate Federal activities in the water-resources field with the activities of such organizations as the Rivers and Harbors Congress.

Surveys conducted throughout the Western States show 392 million acre-feet of stream runoff annually, but only about one-fifth of it has been developed and put to use. In other words, our greatest waste of any one of our natural resources has been the failure to take full advantage of our vast water supply.

The constantly increasing population requires a proportionate increase of food supply. Since there are no considerable acres of raw land to be brought under cultivation in the United States, except by drainage or irrigation, it leaves us the only alternative—drainage and irrigation.

The average layman, when thinking of irrigation, thinks of it in conjunction with Government-owned farm surpluses. However, it must be pointed out that crops produced on western irrigation projects are supplemental to rather than competitive with crops produced in other sections which have contributed to our present surpluses. These areas produce winter truck crops of which we never have adequate amounts for a completely satisfactory national diet.

Like the effects of a pebble tossed into a still pond, irrigation brings new wealth not only to the immediate vicinity but also affects our whole Nation. Irrigation and reclamation has been one of the major factors in building the West.

WHAT TO DO

There are several things we must do with our tremendous wealth of natural resources. Above all, we must remain within the essence of good resource planning and always make sure that we do not rob Peter to pay Paul. If there was ever a subject in these great United States on which emotions can be aroused at the slightest provocation, it is just what constitutes the wise use of the natural resources of our country.

We must remember that the land and our resources belong to the people. Not just those living today, but those who will come long after we have departed. We cannot and should not be so selfish as to dissipate them unwisely today, but rather we should follow the example of the great conservationist and great President, Theodore Roosevelt, who had the foresight to lay down the basic policy of conservation in the first Reclamation Act which he steered through Congress and signed into law in 1902.

He realized the need for and established the necessary legislation to insure that those living today were the custodians of our Nation's wealth for those who will live tomorrow. The Federal Government has followed the policy of relinquishing control of the public domain in direct proportion to the needs of its expanding population. Fifty years ago about half of our Nation's land area was public domain. Today, about a quarter of it remains on the Federal land rolls. By the same token our Nation's population has more than doubled.

Irrigation and reclamation is a basic natural resource. Too often people feel that irrigation and reclamation are entirely regional in scope. Mention the words and people immediately think of the West. I cannot overemphasize its importance to the whole Nation.

> Just as the continued prosperity of the West depends on the wise use of its natural resources, this prosperity is of crucial importance to the entire Nation which depends upon the West as one of its most vital productive areas—

To use the words of the Secretary of the Interior, the Honorable Douglas McKay.

The importance of the West as a market for the products of the East, while at the same time serving a major source of supply, is best determined by the sample study of waybills conducted by the Interstate Commerce Commission.

In 1951, the Commission found over 1½ million cars were shipped into the 17 Western States from the 31 Eastern States while during that same period about 2¼ million cars were loaded in the 17 Western States for shipment to the 31 Eastern States.

Internal shipments—those originating in the 17 Western States and shipped to others of the 17 State group or within the States themselves—produced an additional whopping load of 4½ million carloads aggregating 186½ million tons.

POWER PRODUCTION

While we have discussed the food needs of our expanding population, another important aspect arises in discussing irrigation and reclamation. This is power—electrical energy to light our cities and propel our industrial machines.

It is estimated that by 1959 the United States will be faced with a critical power shortage. Every kilowatt of electrical energy developed will be needed.

While hydroelectric power is developed as incidental to the irrigation and reclamation features of a Federal project, each year its importance has become more pronounced. In some instances in the past, it has been permitted to dominate the primary function of irrigation. However, power revenues from large multipurpose projects help to pay back to the Federal Government, not only the cost of storage works, but also to help reimburse the cost of irrigation works.

The introduction of electrical energy to rural areas, made possible in many areas only by Federal irrigation projects, has opened a virgin market for many home appliances and other electrical appliances which otherwise might never have been sold. Much of the electrical energy being used by Rural Electrification Association Cooperatives is produced by the Federal Government.

These Federal hydroelectric developments produce about 30½ billion kilowatt hours of low-cost power each year. Despite this tremendous output, there is still a shortage of power. Steam generating plans are springing up all over the Nation to supplement this power.

Falling water is one source of generating electricity without depleting some exhaustible resource such as coal, oil or gas. Water used for the generation of power can be used over and over again; nothing is ever taken from it.

The Problem of Communist Domination of a Few Labor Unions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES R. HOWELL

OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 1, 1954

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, on May 17, 1954, I introduced a bill designed to bring about a more effective enforcement of the non-Communist affidavit provisions of the Labor Management Relations Act.

My bill, H. R. 9158, provides the National Labor Relations Board with the power to declare that a non-Communist affidavit signed by a labor-union officer does not satisfy the requirements of compliance with the law under the following three conditions:

First. If an official of a labor union refuses to testify under oath whether he signed the non-Communist affidavit.

Second. If a labor-union official refuses to testify whether his signature under the non-Communist oath attested to a true statement of fact.

Third. If the union official has been convicted of perjury in executing the affidavit.

Therefore I am proposing simply to strengthen the hand of the NLRB in dealing with those few labor unions which are controlled by Communist officials. My bill in no way interferes with free trade unionism. It is designed to protect the national security of the United States by ridding certain unions of Communist officials.

It is well known that almost all labor-union officials are completely loyal to the United States. The free American labor unions have done a magnificent job of cleaning out Communists from the great unions of this Nation.

There remain a few entrenched Communist officials in certain unions who pose a threat to the national security, and under existing law, the NLRB is powerless to deal with the gross abuse of the non-Communist affidavit. The NLRB should be given the added power to declare under certain conditions there has not been compliance with the National Labor Relations Act and thus be able to withdraw its recognition of such a union as a bargaining agent.

Under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD the following editorial on this subject which appeared in the newspaper, Hudson Dispatch, Union City, N. J., on May 21, 1954:

HOWELL WOULD RID UNIONS OF REDS

Democratic Representative CHARLES R. HOWELL, Fourth New Jersey District, who is seeking the seat in United States Senate being vacated by Senator ROBERT C. HENDRICKSON, Republican, is a long-time foe of communism. He has now come up with a plan to rid unions of Red leadership.

Mr. HOWELL has introduced a bill in House of Representatives that would give National Labor Relations Board the power to ignore unions which keep Communist officers in leadership positions.

If the measure becomes law, a union with such leadership would have to throw the Reds out within 30 days on order of NLRB. The peremptory order would be made possible simply by the failure of the union officers to comply with the anti-Communist provision of the Labor Act, which requires affidavits of loyalty from union officers. The Howell bill would empower the NLRB to declare a non-Communist affidavit signed by a union officer as unsatisfactory if that official refused to testify under oath that he had signed the affidavit, whether it was a true statement of fact, or if perjury were committed in executing the affidavit.

The bill would not give the NLRB power to conduct large-scale investigations into the validity of the affidavits, Mr. Howell explained. This is a Department of Justice function. But he added:

"Where an obvious abuse of the affidevit clause exists, however, the NLRB should be permitted to act. If a union officer refuses to say whether he signed the affidavit, or to affirm its validity, or his being convicted for perjury in connection with his signature of the oath, it seems clear the NLRB needs the power to declare there has not been compliance with the act, and thus withdraw its recognition of the union as a bargaining agent."

Since Mr. Howell has long been known as a friend of union labor and is being backed by many unions, both AFL and CIO, his bill is not aimed at the great majority of unions, which are thoroughly American. However, he wants to make sure that the small minority of unions that persits in maintaining Communist leadership through subterfuge, or otherwise, can no longer get away with flouting Taft-Hartley Act.

The bill looks like a good one that Congress should enact at this session.

Mr. Speaker, my bill, H. R. 9158, has met with general approval in my State of New Jersey. However, there has been at least one public and violent attack on my measure designed to rid labor unions of Red officials. I include at this point in my remarks a newspaper account of this attack upon my bill which appeared in the Trentonian, of Trenton, N. J., on May 19, 1954:

Howell's Anti-Red Bill Is Scored by UE Local

A bill introduced in Congress this week by Congressman Charles R. Howell designed to close loopholes in dealing with Communist officials in unions was scored yesterday by officials of Local 409, United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers of America, UE.

William Bonafide, legislative chairman, and Anthony Lizzano, president, termed the measure as "McCarthyite antilabor legislation. It smacks of the kind of rule set up by the trade unions when the late Adolf Hitler came to power."

The union, an independent, was expelled from the CIO several years ago for alleged Communist activities.

Congressman Howell, who has one of the best prolabor records in Congress, said last night that he is preparing an answer to the criticism.

Mr. Speaker, anyone who takes the trouble to study my proposal will see that such attacks upon it are completely unjustified. My bill was not a hastily drawn proposal, but the result of long study of the problem of Communist control of certain labor unions. It is designed to aid labor unions and not hamper them. If passed by Congress, my bill will give the rank and file of those few unions under Communist leadership the incentive to replace officials who are not working in the interests of the United States of America.

I include in the Record at this point a newspaper account of my reply to those who have criticized this bill. It appeared in the Trentonian, Trenton, N. J., on May 20, 1954:

Howell Defends Anti-Red Union Bill

Washington, May 19.—Congressman Charles R. Howell declared today that his recently introduced bill designed to weed out Communist union officials in no way will interfere with the rights of free labor unions. Howell replied to criticism yesterday of Local 409, United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers of America (UE), that the bill was against the tradition of free American trade unionism.

EXPELLED FROM CIO

The union, an independent, was expelled several years ago from the CIO because of alleged Communist activity by its leaders. It was the only labor organization that has protested to Howell about the bill, the Congressman explained.

"The one and only purpose of my bill is to eliminate Communist officers from control of certain labor unions," Howell declared. "It is a carefully prepared measure which will in no way interfere with the rights of free labor unions.

"The only individuals who have anything to fear are union officials who refuse to testify if the non-Communist oath is a true statement of fact or union officers who have been convicted of perjury in executing the affidavit.

"These are the groups and the only groups affected by the measure. It was sponsored in the upper House by Senators Hubert H. Humphrey and Paul H. Douglas, and is the result of careful study of more than 2 years by a Senate Labor Committee headed by Humphrey.

"My bill is designed to protect the national security of the United States by strengthening the hand of the National Labor Relations Board in dealing with Communist domination of certain unions.

"I fail to understand the grounds for any objections to this bill," the Pennington Congressman declared.

Mr. Speaker, I believe my bill is a reasonable one and is in the best interests of the United States. I urge my colleagues to join with me in supporting H. R. 9158.

Report on Guatemala

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PATRICK J. HILLINGS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 10, 1954

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial which appeared in the New York Daily News on June 8, 1954.

The editorial follows:

Report on Guatemala

The most constructive remarks we've seen in several weeks about Guatemala appeared in Frank Holeman's Sunday News interview with Representative Patrick Hillings, Republican, of California.

Congressman Hillings is just back from a secret 9-day trip to Guatemala and some of its neighbor nations. He is convinced that the little republic's present leaders are taking orders from the Kremlin, that their next Central American target is Honduras, and that United States arms shipments to Nicaragua and Honduras have had a good moral effect and ought to be stepped up.

Mr. Hillings also advises that if, as seems likely, the Organization of American States takes up this case, it should do more than just talk. He wants it to consider seriously a policy of swat-Guat, with widespread refusals to buy its coffee or sell it fuel. We imagine, too, that the Congressman is pleased by the news, printed since this interview, that United States Navy ships are standing off Honduras and Guatemala and searching vessels bound for the latter.

Winding up his discussion of what the United States should do to ruin the Red plotting in the Panama Canal neighborhood, Hillings says we should rejigger our foreign aid programs so as to funnel into Latin America a lot more than the present puny 1.3 percent of the billions our leaders insist on spending in efforts to buy friendship abroad.

All this makes eminent sense to us. We hope the administration and Congress will act along these lines promptly, or let the Nation know any reasons they may have for not so acting. That's a dangerous and nasty fire down there, and the sooner it is put out the better.

Moving Along in Aviation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 13, 1954

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, travelers using the airplanes are constantly impressed with the remarkable progress being made in airport development, new types of planes, and the increasing speed of air transportation. Uncle Sam has a real stake in this business, on the basis of our annual direct subsidy of some $80 million over and above the $58 million we paid to domestic and international airlines for flying the mail.

Our Government has just received the Air Coordinating Committee report on aviation, and President Eisenhower has adopted it. Under the report, the subsidy is regarded as a temporary item and Government assistance is to be withdrawn regularly and quickly. The existence of much uneconomic competition and duplication of aviation services and facilities, particularly in the area of international flight service is recommended strongly, and this seems to suggest the combining of some lines even in our domestic service where operations are proceeding at a loss or at very low margins.

We are just on the brink of the real air age, and the expansion of airports, development of private aviation, and the kind of tremendous advances which came to the automobile industry once everyone began to think of owning a car are right ahead. Our Government is more than an observer in this field. It has a huge investment and a vital interest, from both the military and civilian viewpoints, in the growth of aviation.

Colorado River Storage Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 11, 1954

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, various representatives of the Department of the Interior and the Bureau of Reclamation have been traveling throughout the region of the upper Colorado River praising the glories of the upper Colorado River project.

Speaking in an area where water is of vital importance, these overzealous individuals are drumming up approval for unsound water development projects in order to make a showing to these Western States.

The very nature of these Government agencies is such that a constant program of construction is necessary to keep the organizations together—typical of Government bureaus that promote projects to keep themselves in business.

One of the outstanding modern-day writers has pointed out the defects in the present system, and in one of the present projects in an article which appeared in a recent edition of Newsweek magazine. The article of Mr. Raymond Moley follows:

IRRIGATION: HYDROPOWER'S EXPENSIVE PARTNER

(By Raymond Moley)

With the full support of the President, Secretary McKay's Interior Department has shown that cooperation rather than conflict will be the keynote in the relations between the Government and private power companies. The withdrawal of the Department's opposition to the private development of Hells Canyon has encouraged not only private enterprise but economy-minded people of all sorts.

But those people are wondering whether the victory for economy on the Snake will not be more than balanced by defeat on the Colorado. For the President and the Interior Department have presented to Congress two immense projects which together will cost, for construction alone, two and a half times the estimate for Truman's abandoned Hells Canyon project. They are the upper Colorado storage and irrigation proposal and the Fryingpan-Arkansas transmountain diversion plan. The following discussion relates to the former. I shall consider the latter at another time.

HOOVER BYPASSED

The urgency with which the administration has asked that these be authorized has been a shock and a disappointment to the new Hoover Commission task force on public works and reclamation headed by Adm. Ben Moreell. Most, if not all, of that group of distinguished students of the subject, feel that the proposal for the development of the upper Colorado should have been reviewed by them before its submission to Congress: The administration's action, according to some of the members, has cut the ground from under efforts for a new look at reclamation policy.

The first great achievement of Theodore Roosevelt's administration was the Reclamation Act of 1902. That act directed that the land benefited by Federal irrigation should, so far as possible, pay the cost thereof without interest.

Since then, the cost of putting water on arid land has increased enormously, not only because of inflationary prices and wages, but because projects have become more and more remote from natural water supply. Some of them require long channels, tunnels, and water lifts. The construction cost of some of the older projects was $100 an acre. On some of the new ones, the cost will run to $1,000 an acre. Congress progressively relaxed the conditions of repayment. In the 1902 act the period of repayment was 10 years; in 1914 it was extended to 20; in 1926, to 40; and in 1939 a "development" period of 10 years was added, making the real repayment period 50 years. Since 1946, individual projects have been given even more generous terms, some of them running to 76 years or "the life of the project."

But even with these liberal terms there has been a quite general failure to live up to the contracts. Hence, there have been renegotiations, some of which will extend repayment without interest for hundreds of years.

There has also been a rehabilitation program—an additional subsidy.

PAY TIME EXTENDED

Extensions of time have meant immense subsidies which have become larger because deficit financing has made it necessary for the Government to borrow to pay interest on these investments. An easy way to illustrate that is to consider the E bonds of the Second World War. In 10 years the outlay by the Government grows one-third. Then consider how it will grow in 20, and 30, and 40, and 50, and maybe more years. The investor's dollar and the Government debt will be more than $4 in 50 years.

This dim account relates for the most part to experience with projects undertaken in the earlier years of reclamation—projects with more justification than those undertaken recently or now proposed.

Not long after the original reclamation act in 1902, irrigation acquired a junior partner—the hydroelectric plants incidental to dams and reservoirs. By the time F. D. R. took office the junior became the overshadowing partner. Expenditures mounted. Total appropriations for reclamation during the first 44 years were $1,250,000,000. In the 7 years after 1946 they were $1,700,000,000. And that does not include appropriations for the Army engineers.

Efforts to increase subsidies for irrigation projects have eagerly turned to the money from the sale of the hydropower. It has become a main support of the partnership.

BOOKKEEPING GIMMICKS

In seeking economic justification for hydro-irrigation projects the Interior Department has persistently attempted to have Congress adopt a bookkeeping gimmick called a "benefit-cost ratio." Thus, 2:1 means that the benefits are twice the cost. The trick is to fatten the benefits with intangible and indirect items. Three years ago this practice was denounced by an engineers joint council, a group of distinguished engineers representing the five big professional societies. The law, the judgment of engineers and of accountants refuse to recognize any justification except repayment in dollars. Any other method would be subject to unlimited abuse.

It is therefore passing strange that in justifying the upper Colorado project, Budget Director Dodge, who, I am sure, would have tolerated no such nonsense in private banking, approved benefits other than repayment in dollars. In answer to a blunt letter from Congressman JOHN P. SAYLOR, of Pennsylvania, a sturdy critic of this project, Dodge used the term "economic evaluation" three times without explaining what he meant. This vague term can mean only one thing, the benefit-cost ratio.

A masterpiece of ingenuity was created by the Solicitor of the Interior Department in 1944. Under the law, the rates charged for power should be large enough (a) to pay operation and maintenance expenses and to liquidate the capital and depreciation cost and (b) to cover an additional amount known as the "interest component" to pay to the Treasury interest on the money advanced for construction. The Solicitor held that the "interest component" need not be repaid to the Treasury but could be applied to pay off that part of the capital cost of irrigation which was not paid by the irrigators. Thus, the power users would pay the irrigation subsidy while the taxpayers of the Nation would pay the interest on the power investment. In fact, the taxpayer would pick up two tabs: (a) the interest on the power investment and (b) the interest on the irrigation investment.

Despite every effort by the Interior Department, this scheme was not adopted as policy by Congress.

COLLBRAN FORMULA

And so the Department went to work again and came up with a new formula for an irrigation subsidy. This is known as the Collbran formula because it was embodied in legislation in 1952 authorizing a small project at Collbran, Colo. However, the House committee report declared this should not be regarded as a precedent.

Under the Collbran formula the "interest component" of the power revenues would be applied, as was intended by the law, to pay the Treasury interest on the diminishing power investment. Meanwhile, all repayment on the interest-free irrigation costs, except the fraction paid by the irrigators, would be suspended for the years during which the power investment would be liquidated. Since revenues and costs would be the same, the out-of-pocket cost to the taxpayers of the Nation would be the same at the end of 50 or 60 years under either the 1944 Solicitor's opinion or under the 1952 Collbran formula.

According to an officer of the Interior Department, the thing that would make this "palatable" would be the promise that after the power investment is paid off with interest the proceeds from the sale of power should be used to pay the unpaid part of the irrigation investment. But with this sweetening in the pot there are also the bitter dregs of accumulated interest on the unpaid irrigation debt.

The map which appears on page 84 shows the location of the various units of the upper Colorado project. The Glen Canyon Dam is the only unit in the plan that would have economic feasibility standing alone. For it would rank with Hoover Dam in economic and engineering soundness and productivity.

The Echo Park hydroelectric dam and reservoir would, according to the United States Park Service, irreparably impair one of the most gorgeous natural wonders in America—the canyon in Dinosaur National Monument. Tremendous opposition to the invasion of a national recreational area has come from lovers of wildlife and friends of our national parks. Only once since Yellowstone was established 82 years ago has a park been thus invaded, and specific legislation by Congress would seem to forbid it.

The 12 participating projects are run-of-the-mill irrigation and storage affairs. One, Central Utah, would open the way to further plans in that State. A 13th, very expensive one—Shiprock in New Mexico—was deferred by the President.

This plan, it should be noted, is only the initial phase of a much greater series of projects in the upper Colorado Basin. This part alone will cost $1 billion for construction. The ultimate would be an enlarged series costing for construction $4 billion more. Under the plans for repayment advanced for this, the final cost with interest subsidy would be a sum impossible to estimate now, but no doubt running to several times $5 billion.

Congressman Saylor pointed out in the hearings that only once in 50 years has the Bureau of Reclamation stayed within its estimates and that final costs over all have been twice the estimates.

TREMENDOUS SUBSIDY

A formal document entitled, "Views of the State of California," submitted by the State engineer of California with the collaboration of the Colorado River board of that State, shows by an analysis of the Interior Department's figures that not more than an average of 15 percent of the irrigation costs would be repaid by the irrigators and that for the largest project the return would be only 12 percent. Considering the long period of something like 50 years during which the repayment of 85 percent of the irrigation costs would be postponed (with interest accumulating), the power projects would never be able to pay them off as planned by the Department.

The California report also makes the point that even if we assume that high power rates could be maintained for 75 or 100 years in order to pay for irrigation costs, any legislative authorization for such a doubtful repayment would in effect constitute an advance obligation to pay for projects of unknown costs and engineering soundness laid out in the master plan. It occurs to me that this binding of the future to maintain high hydroelectric rates is to assume that there will never be competition with power produced from the vast deposits of coal, gas, and oil shale known to be in the region or from some new form of energy.

In Congressman Saylor's statement in the Congressional Record which accompanied his insertion of the letter from Budget Director Dodge he offered some amazing figures. He stated that the construction costs alone of the participating irrigation projects would range from $200 to nearly $800 an acre and would average $545 per acre benefited. The Federal subsidy, which the Budget Director admitted in his letter would be two-thirds of the construction cost, would average $365 for every acre benefited. That would mean about $50,000 for the average farm. That would be two and a half times the average value of fully developed irrigated land in the region.

But this sum, huge as it is, is only the initial cost of the subsidy. The accumulated interest subsidy at the end of the overall period of repayment would amount to about $1 billion, or more than $2,700 an acre. That would be about $370,000 per farm.

MORE LOSSES

The story of the ultimate cost cannot end with these estimates and calculations. For they are based upon the certainty of things working out as the planners have planned. If the history of 52 years of reclamation can throw any light upon the future, these incredible figures may prove to be optimism rampant. The real costs will no doubt be immeasurably greater.

Another loss is to be anticipated. Congressman Saylor has addressed a letter to the Secretary of the Interior asking for an estimate of the effect of the diversion of water upstream upon the flow and consequent production of power by Hoover, Davis, and Parker Dams down the river.

Whenever you discuss these subsidies with an advocate of irrigation you are confronted with the assertion that "by 1975 we shall need a lot more food for a lot more mouths to feed." This is a highly debatable subject. There are reliable opinions that we shall then be raising a lot more food on land already under cultivation without need for new irrigation projects. Congress may find it in the national interest to measure the cost of this vast subsidy for irrigation against a more modest subsidy for soil conservation in nonarid regions. There are also those who ask why we need to provide subsidies for new cultivation and at the same time subsidies for food surpluses which we are already producing.

Too Late Now for Guatemala?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PATRICK J. HILLINGS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 10, 1954

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, the action of the Communist government in Guatemala this week in suspending civil rights and in organizing a "people's army," indicates that the Kremlin foothold in the Western Hemisphere is being strengthened. Last week, as a member of the Committee on Communist Aggression, I visited Mexico and several countries in Central America, including Guatemala. I am presently preparing a preliminary report to my committee on the situation existing in this area. I found that the Communist government of Guatemala has already encouraged Red agitators to infiltrate neighboring countries to stimulate Marxist activity. It appears that the Republic of Honduras is next on the list of Communist targets. Other nations of Central America face similar Communist agitation.

It is imperative that we recognize the danger to the free world which now exists in America's own backyard. It is important that our Government take positive and courageous action to meet this threat to our freedom in the Western Hemisphere. I suggest that the Congress reappraise the foreign aid program now under consideration. The present proposals call for the spending of $3.5 billion in foreign aid during the next fiscal year. Only $44 million of this amount, which is 1.3 percent, will be earmarked for all of Latin America.

We cannot buy friends with dollars, but proper use of military and economic assistance to the countries of Latin America could help those countries strengthen their national defense programs and assist them in increasing the standard of living for their people in an effort to discourage Communist activity.

In addition, it is important that we respond quickly to the request of our Latin American neighbors for military equipment in the face of the Communist threat. Our response to requests from Honduras and Nicaragua has helped to strengthen the anti-Communist bloc in Latin America and has encouraged resistance to the Reds.

If a conference of Latin American nations is called, serious consideration should be given to the imposition of economic sanctions against the Red leadership of Guatemala. If the United States and our friends in Latin America stop the purchase of Guatemalan coffee and boycott the shipment of fuels and other essential commodities to Guatemala, the Communist government there would be in serious difficulty.

I also found in the course of my study of Central America, that the Communists have infiltrated labor unions and teacher organizations in a number of Latin American countries. It is my hope that labor leaders in this country will consider inviting anti-Communist labor leaders in Latin America to the United States in order to show them the manner in which the Reds have been driven from active leadership in most of our American labor unions. A similar exchange among teachers of the United States and Latin America could also be helpful.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope that the people of the United States awaken to the danger which exists in the Western Hemisphere today. Failure to recognize the danger and to take action to prevent its spread will mean that the day will come when the Red menace could reach the very border of our country.

Mr. Speaker, I include as part of my remarks, an editorial from the San Diego Union. The editorial follows:

Too Late Now for Guatemala?

The clock may have struck 12 in Guatemala yesterday. The hour when anti-Communists within that country might strike back peaceably has been passing rapidly. With the suspension of constitutional guaranties that time may have elapsed.

Supported with Moscow weapons and dictatorial orders, the Communist-dominated government in Guatemala now may enforce any oppression it chooses upon the people.

The Reds long have dominated the press and radio in Guatemala. Raul Leiva, press secretary for President Arbenz, is a Communist. The director general of radio broadcasting, Carlos Alvarado Jerez, also is a Red.

But until constitutional guarantees were suspended yesterday, the opposition to the Communists still dared to speak out—mildly, perhaps, but as a voice of resistance.

The pattern of Red encroachment in Guatemala is typical of communism. Because of its proximity to our own borders, it deserves militant scrutiny.

The Reds have made no pretense of capturing the masses. Their numbers are estimated at 2,500 in a country of 3 million. The Communists have been able to entrench themselves in key organs of state power and in the leadership of labor and peasant organizations not as the result of a widespread popular revolutionary movement, but through a well-managed conspiracy. Unwittingly, they have been helped by non-Communists and ineffectually opposed by the anti-Reds.

With few exceptions, Guatemalans have not elected the Communists to the positions of power nor explicitly endorsed the Red objectives.

Jose Manuel Fortuny, recently deposed Guatemalan Communist Party leader, has proclaimed publicly the steps being followed. While the Reds tighten their grip on government, they are creating economic havoc by confiscating land and discouraging foreign investment. As conditions become worse, in typical Communist fashion inflation will increase. The Reds then will seek to convert the masses, offering the pretense of a solution.

The United States and other nations can seek to prevent the spread of communism to other nearby countries. But with the strong hold the Reds now have in Guatemala, it appears there is little hope unless revolt strikes from within. The hour for that is passing fast.

Radio Station KGNC, Amarillo, Tex.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WALTER ROGERS

OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 11, 1954

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, May 31, 1954, Mr. Wes Izzard, one of the outstanding news commentators of the Nation, treated the very important subject of segregation in a news commentary over radio station KGNC at Amarillo, Tex. It occurred to me that this excellent treatment of this most important issue should be made available to all who have access to the Congressional Record:

Radio Station KGNC, the News and Globe-Times Station, Amarillo, Tex.—The Commentary of Wes Izzard, Monday, May 31, 1954

There seems to be nothing new under the sun, even in the field of American social reform. About 3 weeks ago the Supreme Court of the United States rendered a unanimous decision that segregation of the races in American schools is unconstitutional. The ruling came after years of argument and deliberation over several specific cases.

None of this is new. Over a hundred years ago the same issue arose in the State of Massachusetts. A Negro girl sued to be admitted to a school for whites. She was represented by fiery Yankee lawyer and later United States Senator, Charles Sumner. The case was carried to the Massachusetts Supreme Court. It lost.

Although this was before the War Between the States, the issue was fought bitterly. The fact that thousands of Negroes were held as slaves in the South didn't seem to phase the contenders in this New England battle for the right of one little Negro girl to attend a white school.

The case is described in a new volume just issued by the University of North Carolina Press—a book hailed by critics both North and South as the most dispassionate, informative and objective work yet compiled on the subject. Its title is "The Negro and the Schools." Its author is Harry S. Ashmore, a newspaper editor who compiled and presented the findings of more than 40 scholars engaged in the research project. Mr. Ashmore lives in Little Rock, Ark. This volume, by the way, is recommended for anyone who wants to dig deep into the background and statistics of this school segregation problem—The Negro and the Schools, by Harry S. Ashmore; published by the University of North Carolina Press in Chapel Hill. The price is $2.75.

Mr. Ashmore launches his first chapter with a discussion of the Massachusetts case which came to a head in 1849. He writes:

"The lawyer of record in the first school segregation case was Charles Sumner himself—the brillian, contentious Yankee who was to be enshrined in the North as the era's most militant crusader for Negro rights and reviled in the South as an arch-villain of reconstruction. Sumner appeared on behalf of a Negro girl who had been barred from a white school under a local ordinance providing for separate education of the races. There was no 14th amendment for the Court to interpret, but Sumner's arguments in *Roberts* v. *City of Boston* were not substantially different from those that were to be heard in State and Federal courts a hundred years later.

"The bill of rights of the Massachusetts constitution, he contended, forbade any legal distinctions based on race when it proclaimed all citizens to be born equal. The operation of segregated public schools, Sumner argued, 'tends to deepen and to perpetuate the odious distinction of caste, founded in a deep-rooted prejudice in public opinion.' And finally he sought to show that the separate schools of Boston were not in fact equal, pointing out that his client had to walk 2,100 feet to attend her classes, while a white school was only 800 feet from her door.

"The Massachusetts Supreme Court held against Sumner and handed down a decision that also was to have its echoes a century later. Chief Justice Shaw found that segregation of the races did not in itself constitute discrimination, and held that when the Boston school committee provided substantially equal schools for Negroes it had reasonably exercised local powers not specifically denied it by higher authority. And Chief Justice Shaw dismissed Sumner's central thesis with the opinion that any caste distinction aggravated by segregated schools, 'if it exists, is not created by law and probably cannot be changed by law'."

On May 18—just 2 weeks ago—another United States Senator, this one from Texas, pointed out to his colleagues and the Nation the fact that segregation in public schools did not begin in the South, as a result of slavery and the bitterness of reconstruction, but in Massachusetts, in the days of Abolitionist Charles Sumner. He was Price Daniel, whose remarks have been lauded even by those who have no qualms over the decision of the Supreme Court. Senator Daniel repeated the substance of his speech briefly in an NBC radio debate on the program, American Forum of the Air, at which time his opponent was the redoubtable Senator Paul Douglas, of Illinois. Also, we understand, he was on still another network program—on television—just yesterday, speaking on the same subject.

Since the Court's decision has resulted in a great deal of apprehension throughout most of the South, and in downright rebellion among a small group of southern public men; and since many Texans feel strongly on the subject, one way or another, what the junior Senator from our State has to say about it should be significant. In fact, we judge that Price Daniel represents a large segment of opinion in Texas—probably the majority—on this issue. Senator Daniel began his speech in the Senate by saying this:

"The unprecedented decisions by the Supreme Court that separate but equal schools violate the 14th amendment call for the best that is in all of us to assure the continuation of our public systems and our progress in good relations among the races in the 17 affected States. There are those who feel that the decisions have sounded the death knell to the public-school systems in certain areas of the country, and others who believe that they will supplant recent southern progress in race relationships with intolerance and violence. * * * This should not be so. No matter how much some of us may disagree with the reasoning and result of the Court's decisions, we must look to the future with patience, wisdom, and sound judgment to live under the law as it has now been written and at the same time preserve our public-school systems and maintain peace, order, and harmony. * * *"

The Texas Senator then launched into a thorough and scholarly analysis of the case, in which he cited many legal decisions. He contends that the decision is contrary to, and really overrules at least 5 former Supreme Court decisions, and about 59 State court decisions, saying that separate but equal schools are all right.

In fact, Senator Daniel has printed in the Congressional Record an exhaustive analysis, in chart form, of all these decisions. * * * It was a scholarly piece of work. His colleagues in the Senate are beginning to learn that when Price Daniel gets up to make a major speech, they will hear something that is carefully prepared, soberly thought out, and exhaustively documented. That's the sort of speech he made on the tidelands last year, for which he earned the applause even of his arch foe, Senator Douglas. This business of separate but equal facilities has cropped up frequently in the controversy. Those who have fought so long and so hard for an end to segregation contend that "separate but equal" facilities are unsatisfactory for two reasons: First, they assume that the Negro is inferior although entitled to equal educational facilities; and second, separate facilities are economically wasteful and place too heavy a burden on States and communities.

About the first point, Senator Daniel said this in his Senate speech:

"I know of no one who has ever defended the doctrine of separate and equal schools because of prejudice or a desire to discriminate against either the white or the colored race, or because of hatred, or a feeling of superiority. I have not lived among people who had that feeling. That has not been my feeling. The only defense and justification for the doctrine have been that in certain localities it has been impossible to maintain peace, order, and harmony among the people, and to have support for the public-school system by the taxpayers, when people are forced to mingle together against the will of the majority of each race."

It is a police power of the State which has been held to be constitutional in the past. It is the same proposition as we find in Northern States, when there had to be segregation at swimming pools, because there were some persons of each race who do not get along with each other. There are some in each race who have prejudices.

Not too long ago in the District of Columbia, swimming pools had to be closed because of fights which occurred when there was commingling of the races. The same thing was true in Detroit, Chicago, St. Louis, and New York.

"It is unfortunate that there are any prejudices left; that there is even one person in the white race or of the Negro race who would still cause trouble when commingling in public places, but we might just as well face the facts. There has been trouble in the past. I hope we may not have it in the future.

"When I began my remarks, I said it was not my purpose to criticize the opinion of the Supreme Court, to flout it, or to do anything else with respect to it, but simply to hope that we can look forward to living under the opinion in a way which will enable us to preserve our public school system, as well as peace, harmony, and order in the various communities which are affected. I make these remarks today simply to place in the Record as to the good faith of the States in the past, to show where they got the doctrine, and how they have applied it in good faith; and also to show that the new decisions by the Supreme Court have overruled many previous court decisions. I mainly wish to show that the States have acted in absolute good faith in believing that they were obeying the Constitution and the opinions of the Supreme Court in providing separate but equal school systems in the respective States."

Now let's talk a moment about the second point brought up by those who have been battling for an end to segregation—that the "separate but equal" doctrine is wasteful and works a financial hardship on States and communities.

There was a brief statement in a weekly news magazine last week that "even some west Texas communities" in which only a few Negroes live welcomed the Supreme Court decision because of the financial burden of attempting to provide "separate but equal" facilities. We have made some inquiries but haven't found any of these. Perhaps there are some. However, there are, perhaps, communities in which an end to segregation would solve some financial problems—as well as other physical problems brought about by the necessity of maintaining "separate but equal" schools. The outstanding example of such communities, of course, is Washington, D. C.—our National Capital.

In Mr. Ashmore's book The Negro and the Schools, this description of the Washington problem is given:

"The maintenance of the dual system in a city where residential segregation is rapidly breaking down causes an increasing number of children to travel long distances to school. In the interracial neighborhoods the districting of elementary schools has become meaningless, for if there is only one school, one group or the other has to go outside the neighborhood for its schooling. The inconvenience has cut both ways. For example, the new River Terrace Elementary School was originally intended for whites, but by the time it was completed there was a greater need for Negro classrooms in the mixed neighborhood in which it is located, with the result that white children now have to cross a major highway to attend the inferior Benning School. The problem of travel is most severe for Negroes at the high school level, who have to travel as far as six miles to reach one of the three Negro institutions.

"The continuing effort to superimpose a rigidly segregated school system upon a rapidly shifting residential pattern has made crises, financial and otherwise, the norm in the Washington school system. The direct dollar and cents cost of maintaing segregation was estimated in 1952 by the then Commissioner F. Joseph Donohue as between $7 and $8 million annually—more than one-fourth of the entire school budget.

"There has also been a high cost in terms of communitywide frustration and tension. The effort to preserve the uncertain balance between the white and Negro divisions has often involved transferring facilities from the use by one race to the other. This might work if affected neighborhoods changed character quickly and became all white or all Negro. The fact is that they do not, and a neighborhood usually changes character gradually until it reaches the point that the white school is not wholly empty but half-empty. Negro and white parents are then placed in competition for the most convenient school facilities for their children and bitter racial controversy is a frequent result."

Getting back to Senator DANIEL: He brought out a vital point in answer to a question on the American Forum of the Air program on NBC a week ago—a point that was discussed briefly right here in Amarillo at the Methodist Conference last week. Let's see first what Senator DANIEL had to say. A member of the forum audience, a man named Hollender, asked this question:

"When we find Negroes in the North who are given a free choice of whether to go to segregated schools or mixed schools, they almost invariably go to mixed schools, except where the schools are neighborhood schools and the neighborhoods happen to be predominantly Negro. The question I wanted to ask you about is this: If there is a free choice, if the Negroes in the South could feel free to choose mixed schools or segregated schools without any hint of intimidation or any of the subtle ways in which they have been made to feel that they must stay by themselves, whether you think that they would not, under those circumstances, without the intimidation, choose to go to mixed schools?"

That's a pretty long and confused question. It is based on that old, old misconception the superliberals up North have had for so long, that the Southern Negro is intimidated and cowed into accepting the lot of an inferior citizen. We'll have more to say about that later. But first, here's Senator DANIEL's reply:

"Not at all, Mr. Hollender. I feel perfectly safe in saying that if given a free choice the Negro children and their parents would choose that they attend the separate schools instead of the mixed schools.

"Now we have proof of that. In Texas, we have a fine university for Negroes—Texas Southern University. I handled a law suit against a Negro who wanted admission into the University of Texas law school. He won out. He obtained entrance, but only about 6 or 7 of the students from the Negro law school went into the University of Texas. Thirty-some-odd remained at the separate Negro school. And you will find even among Negro citizens of the North, a majority with college degrees, instead of going to the mixed schools, came into separate schools and obtained their degrees."

The same sort of reply to a similar question was made here in Amarillo last Thursday by the president of Huston-Tillotson College in Austin, a Methodist Negro institution, Dr. M. S. Davage. Dr. Davage was asked whether, in his opinion, the High Court ruling would mean the end of the all-Negro college in Texas and the South. He replied he thought the larger and better-supported Negro colleges would survive. Even today, he pointed out, there are students in Huston-Tillotson—many of them athletes—from States in which Negroes are taken for granted in the schools and colleges. They are there from California, Illinois, Kansas—even New York.

"These young people," said Dr. Davage, "could have gone to mixed colleges in their own States. They chose to come to Huston-Tillotson."

The fact is that the majority of brilliant Negro college graduates have degrees from all-Negro colleges in the South.

All of which leads us to something else—to a now-famous editorial published in a Negro newspaper in Newark, N. J., 2 or 3 years ago, and republished widely since then throughout the South. The editor who wrote it is named Davis Lee, one of the outstanding Negro newspapermen in the Nation. When Congressman ROGERS was here last week we got to talking about the Davis Lee editorial, and he said he thought he had a copy of it in his files. He called his secretary in Washington, Dee Dodson, and asked him to have a copy made and airmailed to us. Mr. Dodson did just that, and threw in a good deal of other material, besides—photostats of newspaper editorials on the Supreme Court decision, excerpts from remarks printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. We wish we had time to bring you all of it, but it would take all night; and Mr. Eisenhower is going to need these radio facilities in about 30 minutes for his speech on the anniversary of Columbia Univerisity * * * incidentially, we suggest you keep tuned in and listen to it. It is our understanding that he is going to hit pretty hard at Senator MCCARTHY, without calling him by name * * *. But getting back to the Davis Lee editorial. The copy we have here is from a reprint of the editorial in the Elberton, Ga., Star. Originally, remember, it come out in the Newark, N. J., Telegram, published by and for Negroes. Here are some of the statements pertinent to the present situation, although written a couple of years before the High Court ruling was made:

"The efforts being made by certain paid agitators and pressure groups to have segregated schools in the South declared unconstitutional may cause southern Negroes to lose a lot more than they will gain.

"The trouble with this Government, as with similar ones, is that the initiators don't count the overall cost to the race. The present effort is designed to destroy the whole pattern of segregation, and to establish an integrated social order in which there will be no distinction made in this country on the basis of race, religion, or color or nationality.

"That is a laudable objective, but human nature just has not changed that much, and the achievement of such an objective could cause repercussions that might set the Negro back 50 years.

"Integration in the schools in the North and East is not a howling success. A Negro can attend most of the schools up here and get an education, but few of the States that educate him will hire him as a teacher. The State of Connecticut doesn't have 25 Negro teachers.

"Recently I visited Albany, the capital of New York State, and learned that the city only employs three Negro teachers. Our own city, Newark, with Negroes constituting 20 percent of the population, employs 2,200 teachers, but only 70 of them are Negroes, and we don't have 1 Negro principalship.

"Nowhere in these integrated States do Negroes get anywhere near proportionate representation. Every device is employed to keep qualified Negroes from being assigned. Recently a reputable New York labor union made a report on the employment of Negro teachers in New York City and charged that a systematic scheme has been adopted to exclude Negroes as teachers.

"This is not true in the South. The State of Georgia employs 7,313 Negro teachers and paid them close to $15 million in salaries last year. North Carolina paid its Negro teachers over $22 million last year. Florida is another State that ranks at the top on teacher pay.

"If these States, that are now pouring millions of dollars annually into Negro pockets, which provides our people with money that enables them to enjoy the dignity of man, to enjoy prestige and respectability, to buy homes and the necessities of life, are forced to abandon the segregated school, 75 percent of the Negro teachers in the South will lose their jobs. Not only that, but approximately 20,000 Negro principals will lose their jobs as well.

"Can the southern Negro afford to take this sort of economic licking for the privilege of sending his kids to a mixed school? I don't think so. * * *

"Another angle of this forced change is this: Under integration the States will not be permitted to maintain separate cafeterias and operate separate school buses—it will be integration all the way, which will necessitate scrapping or repealing State laws unless all Negro and white school children are permitted to violate present laws, and this is not likely.

"This present movement to end segregation in the schools is merely the beginning of a well-laid plan to completely end segregation in everything in the South. If this happens, the Negro will be thrown into direct competition with the white race, and our business institutions will crumble.

"No place in the world do Negroes own and control as much as do those in the South. Atlanta is without question the Negro capital of the world. It is the center of Negro culture, education, business, and finance. And both Negroes and whites live, work, and operate business without either being conscious of the other's race. * * *

"During the past 2 years I have spent more time in the South than I have in my office, and I have interviewed thousands of Negroes in all walks of life and I have found very few who favor mixed schools. They want their own schools, but equal facilities. * * *

"Despite all of the hullaballoo about the liberal East and North, no Negro has been made head of a State college or university. Down South the woods are full of Negro college and university presidents. Down in Texas a Negro college president of a State school gets $15,000 a year.

"What Negroes need to refresh their memories on is the fact that just a few years ago we were raising Cain because colored kids in the South were being taught by white teachers. We wanted them taught by Negroes. As Negroes qualified, Negro teachers replaced white teachers until now Negro teachers have completely taken over.

"Not too long ago Negroes went into court and demanded equal facilities in our schools. The courts ruled that they were right. All the Southern States embarked upon a schoolbuilding program never heard of before in the history of our Nation. And this effort to give Negroes equal school facilities is an honest one.

"Now after these States have spent millions, as they were requested to do, a group goes back into courts declaring that the Negro is not now satisfied with equal facilities, that the separate but equal law is unconstitutional, that nothing less than integration will do. That doesn't seem fair to me.

"I have never contended that the South is a utopia, but I do contend that it offers the Negro his greatest opportunity. Last week as I looked at the Negro schools in St. Petersburg and Tampa, Fla., I felt proud of my race. Nowhere in the world do they have more beautiful schools than do the Negroes in Florida, Georgia, North and South Carolina, and the building program is not yet complete."

Well, that's a good part of the famous Davis Lee editorial from the Newark (N. J.) Telegram. It wil be quoted loudly and widely in the months ahead—and probably it should be.

Nevertheless, segregation has been outlawed by the highest Court in the land. The Court wisely postponed the problem of carrying its edit into effect until at least next fall. The complexities and adjustments will be tremendous.

There are some things that will bear watching. An organized drive is under way—and has been for years—for a Federal FEPC, a Fair Employment Practices Act. This could be rushed through during the excitement of working out the nonsegregation decree. Unlike the school ruling, which simply forbids segregation as unconstitutional, the FEPC would force employers to hire individuals they might not want to hire, on the grounds that discrimination because of race, creed, or color is illegal. This is on its way.

On the other side, efforts of Georgia and perhaps South Carolina to circumvent the school ruling by abolishing public schools could do a tremendous harm to the Nation. By subsidizing private and church schools, this practice—inaugurated to circumvent what those States consider one evil, would weaken another Constitutional bulwark—that providing for separation of church and state.

It is a tremendous problem. We must approach it soberly and with a will to work it out as peaceably and harmoniously as we can. As the junior Senator from Texas told his fellow Senators:

"We must look to the future with patience, wisdom, and sound judgment to live under the law as it has been written and at the same time preserve our public school systems and maintain peace, order, and harmony."

Uncle Sam Shows Atoms for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 7, 1954

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, when President Eisenhower offered to organize an international effort to develop atomic energy for peaceful purposes, there was a loud silence from the Soviet Union. Fortunately, the rest of the world is far more interested in peace and prosperity than the Communists.

With or without Russia, our Government has decided to show the world. Our Public Information Service is planning a series of atomic shows this summer to demonstrate what we are doing to utilize this new power for peace. In South America and in Europe, the Atomic Energy Commission and those American industries which have been working under its direction will demonstrate a model of an atomic powerplant and show how cities may be illuminated, how ships may be propelled, and how medicine may be furthered through the use of atomic byproducts.

The demonstrations will undoubtedly command prime attention wherever they are shown. High on the list will be the Brazilian world fair this summer, an exhibition in Rome, and another in Berlin. Even the title is suggestive of things to come, "The Hope of the Future." Here is a potential influence for world peace which must not fail.

Statehood for Alaska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 10, 1954

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a proposal for the subdivision of the Territory of Alaska from a valued constituent, Orvis H. Saxby, who resides in Stoneham, Mass. Mr. Saxby is a prominent member of the bar and a devoted student of government. Accompanying the proposal as furnished me is a carefully drawn sketch map which, unfortunately, cannot be reproduced in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The proposal follows:

STATEHOOD FOR ALASKA: A PROPOSAL FOR THE SUBDIVISION OF THE TERRITORY OF ALASKA

Granting statehood to an area the size of the Territory of Alaska is most impractical and unfair both to the people of Alaska and to the other States of the Union. The Territory of Alaska should long ago have been subdivided into smaller political areas, each of which might someday develop into a potential new State.

Alaska embraces 586,400 square miles, which is more than twice the size of Texas (267,339 square miles), and 3½ times that of California (158,693 square miles). It is larger in area than many independent foreign nations.

The population of Alaska (1950), 128,640 (of which 33,000 are native Eskimos and Indians), would only make one fair-sized city in most States and is only one-sixtieth that of Texas (7,711,194) and one-eightieth that of California (10,586,223). The burden upon this small population, which will be assumed, if statehood is granted, to administer and police such a vast area, would be untenable and might result in utter disaster for the new State.

Nearly 90 percent of the population and all but 1 or 2 of the larger towns and cities of the Territory are to be found south of the 65th parallel of latitude and east of the 150th meridian. The area thus enclosed (including Kodiak Island) might well form a State of reasonable size which could survive and properly administer itself without undue burden upon its citizens.

The entire area of the present Territory of Alaska, which lies north of the 65th parallel of latitude, could well be organized into a new Territory, as could the area lying west of the 150th meridian and south of the 65th parallel of latitude, including the Aleutian Archipelago. These Territories should remain under the jurisdiction and administration of the Federal Government for many years to come. Should the development and growth of either of the two proposed new Territories some day warrant, another State of reasonable size for efficient self-government will be available for admission.

ORVIS H. SAXBY, LL. D.

Maintenance of America's Vital Shipbuilding Facilities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER

OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, June 11, 1954

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, I ask uhanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of a letter sent by the Industrial Union of Marine and Shipbuilding Workers of America to the President of the United States on June 2, 1954, asking that he "bend every effort to avert the collapse of the American shipbuilding and ship-repair industry."

Both as citizens and as workers in the Nation's shipyards, President John J. Grogan, of the Industrial Union, and all the members of his organization, have a deep interest in the well-being of the shipbuilding industry and a realistic approach to the correction of current difficulties in that field.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INDUSTRIAL UUION OF MARINE AND
SHIPBUILDING WORKERS OF AMERICA,
Camden, N. J., June 2, 1954.

The PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We are writing to request you to bend every effort of your administration to avert the collapse of the American shipbuilding and ship repair industry.

About 2 months ago the Maritime Administration requested a supplementary appropriation of approximately $110 million for construction differential subsidy for two vessels for the Moore-McCormac Lines, 2 vessels for the Grace Lines, and 4 experimental conversions of Liberty ships in the reserve fleet. This request was referred to the Bureau of the Budget, where it still remains. If the Bureau of the Budget or administration approval is not given in the very near future, Congress will have adjourned by the time such approval is obtained, and no shipbuilding appropriation will have been made for either this year or next. Even if the Bureau of the Budget were to approve this request for supplemental appropriations and the request were to be sent up to Congress immediately, there is very little time left during which the Congress can act on the request.

We trust that you will remember that action on a request for appropriations for construction differential subsidy for the 2 vessels for the Moore-McCormac Lines and the 2 vessels for the Grace Lines was not taken at the 1st session of the 83d Congress. This action was tabled until the next session of the Congress. The second session is now almost over and because of the delay by the Bureau of the Budget, it seems as if no action will be taken by the second session.

We, therefore, urge you immediately to instruct the Bureau of the Budget to pass upon the rquest for this supplemental appropriation, and to send it to Congress.

Further, at present there are the following bills before the Congress of the United States, which, if passed in time, might alleviate the emergency situation of this industry.

S. 3458, passed by the Senate on May 24 to permit long-term charter of privately built tankers by the Navy. This bill is presently before the House of Representatives, Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, and, if passed by the House, can take effect immediately.

H. R. 9252, to provide a national defense reserve of tankers by permitting 10-year-old tanker trade-in. This bill was passed by the Senate at the 1st session of the 83d Congress, and is presently before the House merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee.

H. R. 9253, to provide for a program of merchant ship construction of 60 vessels per year. This bill is presently before the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee and could be introduced into the Senate very quickly.

The emergency program for the repair of vessels in the laid-up fleet—hearings on this have taken place before Senator BUTLER's subcommittee on water transportation, and the bill could go before the House of Representatives.

If new contract work is not obtained by the shipbuilding and ship repair industry immediately, we will face almost total collapse of the industry.

As you doubtless know, unless drastic action is taken by this session of the Congress relative to the merchant marine, only two private merchant vesels will remain to be constructed in private shipyards of this country by the beginning of 1955. Not a single private merchant ship will be left on the ways to shipyards after that time. Our present merchant fleet is inadequate for national defense because it is becoming obsolete en bloc. We are decimating the American shipbuilding and ship repair industry to a point where it will not be able to expand to meet the full needs of war.

By July the Sparrows Point shipyard of the Bethlehem Steel Co., the yard which built the most merchant tonnage of any yard in 1953, will be ready to close. Most of the small yards will be shut except those which are lucky enough to have some Navy work. From the beginning of 1953 to the beginning of 1954, the backlog of shipbuilding work has declined by close to 50 percent.

The rapid expansion required for the shipyard forces in America during the Second World War and the cost of the facilities it was necessary to construct, cost us well over one-half billion dollars in facilities, wasted manpower and training programs. In addition to this, the cost of building a fleet which would not be usable in peacetime is difficult to measure—but we would venture to say that close to $5 billion worth of unusable merchant ships were constructed because of the emergency and the fact that ships had to be built quickly by mass production methods, with no time to construct a fleet which could be usable in peace as well as in war.

If Congress and the administration were to allow an adequate ship construction program at the same time as allowing the preservation and repair of the reserve fleet, in time we would be able to scrap the obsolete Liberty ships in the reserve fleet, and have a reserve fleet capable of meeting any emergency.

We trust you will give this matter your immediate consideration.

Respectfully yours,

JOHN J. GROGAN, *President*.

Bad for the United States of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 11, 1954

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include herewith an editorial from the Reading Eagle of June 10, 1954. The same day, another editorial appeared in the Reading Times which reflects a siimlar point of view on the important incident involving several midshipmen whose commissions were withheld as possible security risks. I believe that both of these editorials which I insert today, reflect the thinking of many American citizens who were shocked by the action of the naval authorities on the eve of the graduation from the United States Naval Academy:

BAD FOR THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

The incident of the three midshipmen, Harold Pollack, Paul Shimek, Jr., and Peter Yadlowsky, whose commissions have been withheld for "security" reasons after the three men graduated from the United States Naval Academy, looks like one of those ridculous things that are likely to result from sweeping directives and ill-conceived laws.

We use the Yadlowsky case as an extreme example. Here the loyalty of a young man was questioned because, 17 years ago, when Peter was a mere child, his father had caused an insurance policy to be issued in the boy's name by an organization known as International Workers Order.

At that time IWO was not being dignified by Government scrutiny. Since then, however, it was placed on the Attorney General's subversive list. Also since then, the policy has been canceled by the father, an immigrant from Austria, who, so far as anyone knows to the contrary, is loyal to the United States of America. Yet, because of something that was done for or with the boy, and over which he had no control, this Naval Academy graduate, whose record is good, must be smeared and investigated.

Technically, the action that has been taken in three cases is justified by an Executive order, issued by President Eisenhower in April 1953, which requires investigations prior to the granting of officer commissions. But from a practical standpoint it seems that the cause of doubt is very weak indeed. Moreover, one wonders why all the facts could not have been quietly ascertained during the years that the three boys spent in our Naval Academy.

It is possible to sympathize with the elder Yadlowsky, who now grieves because it is by his action, innocently taken many years ago, that his boy has been placed under a cloud. But as citizens of the United States upon whom official injustice and inanity reflect, all of us need some sympathy.

We may be confident that the investigations will be expeditious and fair in each case. As for young Yadlowsky, whose plight we are highlighting, it is probable that he will come through with a clean slate and that his father also will be adjudged blameless for entering into what was merely a business arrangement when his son was a small child. However, it also seems that out of all this should come a better method of investigating individuals than has thus far been evolved.

We assert the right and duty of our officials to institute regulations and procedures that will safeguard our country against subversives. But we also believe that there should be a time limit on even subversion and that a way must be found clearly to absolve those who, in former years, have entered into un-American alliances which they later sincerely renounced. Most of all, we think it is wrong and foolish to hold budding citizens answerable for the actions of their parents, whether those actions were sins or merely errors.

To believe that there are many Americans who, at some time in their lives, were either members of the Communist Party or sympathetic to the cause of communism imposes no strain on the imagination. But to hold that, having recanted, they should be forever damned violates religious dogma and simple commonsense. Beyond that—to appraise the loyalty of one person by the action of another is both immoral and asinine.

We find it difficult to sympathize with or to trust those who took refuge in the fifth amendment to refuse to answer the questions of a duly authorized Senate committee. However, we believe that most Americans can view with tolerance and understanding those who have frankly confessed past association with subversive groups and who later revised their thinking.

In the case of the three midshipmen, it is on the record that none of them claimed immunity from questioning. Each of them had signed loyalty forms and in no case has any of their answers to questionnaires caused them to become suspects.

Whether or not it was so intended, the order that withheld the commissions from graduates Pollack, Shimek, and Yadlowsky is likely to make all security regulations look ridiculous. That would be bad for the Nation.

Conversely, our Nation will be the gainer if, from the case of these three Naval Academy graduates, we learn the necessity of vamping our laws and directives into a pattern that fits with simple justice and basic common sense.

American Way Finds Voice Abroad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 7, 1954

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, our American capitalistic system has been remarkably silent in its own cause in Europe on too many occasions. As a result, there are many countries which have developed the notion that our economic strength is due to our wealth. Because of our resources, our rich soil, and our great size, so runs the argument, we have achieved a living standard unequalled overseas.

The erroneous reasoning behind this proposition is clear to us, no matter how obscure the Communists try to make it. Other lands have resources equal, if not superior, to our own. At the International Labor Conference, an American employer delegate finally told the truth to a European audience. He told it without boastfulness, but simply as a matter of plain, down-to-earth fact. Our success in developing the American economy is due to, first, our competitive system; second, the determination of American business to give the people the most that can be furnished for their money; and third, the recognition that working people of all walks of life are the best customers we can have.

Our spokesman, William L. McGrath, president of the Williamson Heater Co., of Cincinnati, Ohio, did a job for the American way of life. What we need are more folks like him to prove the point that capitalism is the greatest producer ever devised by the mind of man. Given the chance, this way of life will put more of the good things in the hands of more people than any other system. We have proved it here. It can work just as well everywhere.

Relief for the Fishing Industry in Massachusetts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 7, 1954

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter addressed by me to the President of the United States:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., June 10, 1954.

PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: May I direct your attention to the fact that Massachusetts leads the Nation in the production of fresh and frozen, packaged groundfish fillets. In our ports, regardless of this fact, however, one finds no healthy increase in landings, fewer fishermen and vessels, and a lack of incentive to replace antiquated vessels. This great industry is beginning to wither away. Foreign nations with lower living standards appear to be taking over the United States market and are rapidly building plants and new vessels with various subsidies not available to our own' fishing industry. This industry is vital to Massachusetts and must be protected.

In view of the recent Tariff Commission report to the President, I have been officially requested by the Department of Natural Resources of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts to seek your assistance in obtaining relief for the fishing industry in Massachusetts under the escape clause of the Reciprocal Trade Act. It is my understanding the President of the United States very soon either accepts or rejects the Tariff Commission's report.

For your information regarding this important consideration, may I bring to your attention the fact that in 1939 imported groundfish fillets were received from only three foreign countries and amounted to less than 10 million pounds. With the present duty being no deterrent, however, imports now during this year are coming in from 14 countries and the importations of groundfish fillets have reached a record high of almost 108 million pounds. The Massachusetts fishing industry cannot survive this competition.

Because of this situation and the necessity for immediate action, I respectfully request you to authorize relief to the fishing industry of Massachusetts under the escape clause of the Reciprocal Trade Act.

With cordial regards and all best wishes, I remain

Very sincerely yours,
EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
Member of Congress.

Graduation Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DEWEY SHORT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 9, 1954

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following address delivered by me before the graduates of the senior course and junior course, Marine Corps Educational Center, Marine Corps Schools, at Quantico, Va., on June 4, 1954:

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS OF LT. GEN. CLIFTON B. CATES, USMC, COMMANDANT, MARINE CORPS SCHOOLS, QUANTICO, VA.

Congressman SHORT, members of the graduating classes, fellow marines, ladies, and gentlemen, first, let me welcome the visitors to the Marine Corps schools. We are very pleased to have the friends and loved ones of the members of these classes present. Prior to introducing our guest speaker, I would like to extend my heartiest congratulations to the members of these classes and to wish each and everyone the very best of everything on their new assignments. I would also like to express my sincere appreciation to the wives of the members of these classes for the valuable contribution they have made to our post activities. These graduating classes are composed of officers from all of the services—Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force—and, I am pleased to say, officers from our allies—England, Korea, Brazil, Denmark, Nationalist China, Venezuela, Indonesia, and Greece.

Our guest speaker, Congressman SHORT, is a man that I am proud to claim as a friend. He is a true friend not only of the Marine Corps, but of all the services. His life's record reads like a real story book. He was born in the Ozark district of Missouri and, being an old country boy from Tennessee myself, I can assure you he speaks our language. After attending public schools at Galena, he attended Marionville College, Baker University, Boston University, and Harvard University. While at Boston University he was awarded the Frank D. Howard fellowship and studied for 3 years in Berlin, Heidelberg, and at Oxford University. He is recognized as one of the best educated Members of Congress. At one time he was a Methodist minister and also a college professor. He was elected to Congress in 1928, and has served continuously since then, with the exception of a period of 4 years when evidently the Democrats were too strong for him.

Congressman SHORT has served on many committees in Congress, and is at the present time the chairman of the Armed Services Committee of the House. As a committee member, he has visited every section of the globe and there are few in Congress who can equal his knowledge of world conditions. He has always been an advocate of a strong America and the need for keeping the nation alert to the menace of communism. He has taken an active interest in national defense. In fact, he has become an authority on it. He has consistently displayed very keen judgment and has been able to predict with uncanny accuracy many important events. He is noted for his eloquence, and even the Democrats sit up and take notice when he rises to speak.

I have always been a firm believer that officers on active duty should not participate in politics, but after carefully reading the voting record of our guest speaker, I will admit that I concur in practically all of his stands on national defense.

I know of no man who has more friends than our guest speaker today. He is a man who has the courage of his convictions, but always fair and square, and it is a great honor to present to you the Honorable DEWEY SHORT, from the seventh district of Missouri.

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE DEWEY SHORT, OF MISSOURI

General Cates, General Pollock, distinguished graduates of the senior and junior amphibious warfare schools, ladies, and gentlemen; before I start, let me just say a few words about my good friend, Cliff Cates. I always think of him as a marine's marine. I'm not going to embarrass him by reciting his accomplishments—but in the years ahead, when marines gather to discuss the "Old Corps," Cliff Cates will be remembered, not only as a former commandant, but as an outstanding platoon leader, a brilliant regimental commander, an extremely effective division commander; and finally, but most important, as a man—a man who lives, breathes, eats, drinks, and, I imagine, dreams about the Marine Corps.

The Nation, sir, has been fortunate to have had your services. And as I look at all of these future commandants and generals who are graduating from the senior and junior amphibious warfare schools, I can offer them no better advice than to emulate their commanding general, Clifton B. Cates.

I greatly appreciate the honor you have bestowed upon me by asking me to address this class, so indicative of the real accomplishments of interservice, yes, even international, cooperation.

This kind of teamwork, now known as unification, is nothing new for our armed services, for it operated quite successfully throughout World War II. And as I gaze upon the outstanding men who make up this graduating class and see each service represented, as well as officers from friendly nations, then I cannot refrain from expressing my confidence in this type of unification—this type of teamwork, this type of cooperation—which augurs well for our national security.

The duty of developing new phases of amphibious warfare is appropriately that of the Marine Corps, but World War II taught us, as did Korea, that amphibious operations are an important part of service doctrine for each of the services. Yes; even the Air Force must be proficient in amphibious operations beyond that of combat support, for we have not yet reached the ultimate in logistics which permits us the luxury of supplying all fuel, armament, and equipment by air.

These are confusing days—not just because of the complex, unsettled international situation, which apparently is to become an inherent part of the 20th century—but also because there are some people who feel that we have developed weapons which nullify all known concepts of warfare.

Of course, we are in an era of changing military doctrines, but our military policy as an extension of diplomacy has not, and will not, change merely because of the advent of new weapons. It is unfortunate, but true, that while our military policy remains stable—as a means of effecting a result—nevertheless, our foreign policy has faltered and stumbled over the past two decades, from nonintervention to partisan neutrality; from war to misguided cooperation; from appeasement to anger; from containment to massive retaliation—but I am naive enough to hope that this Nation will one day unanimously support a firm, fixed, foreign policy which will be our unswerving national policy—notwithstanding the vacillations and fleeting diversions that ofttimes tempt not only ourselves but our allies.

Your responsibility as military men is to implement whatever foreign policy may be the fashion of the day. This is not an easy task, particularly in the atmosphere of a feast-or-famine type of military preparedness. In the past we mobilized when the situation called for drastic action—and costs were disregarded; we demobilized even more rapidly when the fire was out—and again costs were disregarded. But the thought of future fires always managed to escape us—until suddenly another conflagration sounded the alarm.

Thus, our military policy of preparedness has, until recently, vacillated, just as has our foreign policy. I am confident that we are now in an era of predetermined preparedness and that our military program will become reasonably well stabilized.

Some variation in personnel strengths can be expected, but our overall mobilization base, our ability to expand efficiently and quickly, and our capacity to fulfill our international commitments, based upon actual forces in being—properly equipped—is now a reality. The difficult problem will be that of maintaining those forces in being, for, with a ray of sunshine in the international clouds, the Nation will again be tempted with the bait of temporary good will. I don't know why it is that a kind word from a nation controlled by deceitful habitual criminals can bring about a clamoring for wholesale reductions in our Armed Forces—but it does. Perhaps by now we have all learned our lesson the hard way.

Coupled with our past performance in the feast or famine theory of preparedness, and our previous attempts to establish a weathervane type of foreign policy—subject to typhoons, doldrums, cyclones, and short-lived blue skies—is the awful specter of nuclear power. It adds more confusion to an already bewildering situation, for it carries with it the threat of extinction, the fear of aggression, the power of retaliation, the faint hope of world understanding, and the incorrect conclusion by some that it replaces a major portion of our Armed Forces.

Warfare, since the beginning of time, has involved personal combat. New weapons can increase casualties, disrupt supply routes, destroy depots, decimate cities, and force industrial production underground. But the ultimate challenge remains the same. No man controls, in the true sense of the word, any area over which he does not have physical supremacy. The attainment of that physical supremacy may require changes in methods, but, after all is said and done, it is the man who personally confronts his enemy—who looks him straight in the face—who decides the final outcome.

Everyone today is attempting to become a major prophet with respect to nuclear power and the effect of the hydrogen and atom bombs upon our Armed Forces. There are some who feel that the day of a large Army, Navy, and Marine Corps is a thing of the past. There are others who feel that the development of nuclear power increases the importance of the individual soldier, sailor, or marine. There are some who feel that only a strategic air arm equipped with the means of massive retaliation is necessary in this day of the splitting atom. There are a few who would bury their heads in the sand like the ostrich and try to deceive themselves into thinking that by denying the presence of the power of utter destruction it will go away—like a bad dream.

Fortunately, we have military leaders and civilian leaders in this country who, in my opinion, have approached this subject from a logical, sensible manner. They look upon the hydrogen bomb and the atom bomb as weapons for which there are countermeasures; and for which better countermeasures must be developed. I like to think that I belong to this group.

There are some, I am sure, who look upon conventional weapons as a thing of the past. These are the same type of persons who, undoubtedly, would have abolished the Navy following the development of the submarine and the torpedo. These are probably the same type of people who would have abolished divisions and corps because of the advent of airplanes and aerial bombs and armored tanks.

Certainly the development of any new weapon, be it a guided missile, a rocket, or any other type of weapon with an atomic warhead, necessitates new tactical doctrines. And such tactics are being studied and improved upon, daily. I am sure that this graduating class has spent considerable time in studying the effects such new weapons will have upon amphibious operations—and have also studied the best known methods of coping with those weapons.

Now, my approach to this subject is not new or drastic or original. I can see four possibilities and, perhaps hopefully, a fifth remote possibility.

First, I can appreciate the conceivability of all-out nuclear warfare;

Second, I can see the likelihood of unrestricted atomic warfare without the use of the hydrogen bomb;

Third, I can visualize a war limited to the use of atomic weapons only for tactical purposes;

Fourth, I can see the possibility of a series of so-called small wars without the use of any type of nuclear power.

And finally, the fifth remote possibility, is the wonderful, although admittedly faint hope, that the very existence of the power to destroy ourselves will bring about world understanding and everlasting peace.

Let's examine some of these possibilities. Will there be a further need for an Army, Navy, and Marine Corps now that we have hydrogen bombs as weapons of devastation, and atom bombs capable of being used as tactical weapons? Is there any future in being a soldier,. sailor, or marine under the theory of massive retaliation, with emphasis placed upon a strategic air force? Well, my answers to those questions are simple—there will be a need for an Army, a Navy, and a Marine Corps so long as there are enemies of America who resort to armed force in an attempt to impose their will upon us. There will be a need for these three services just so long as natural law requires a man to be physically present on a piece of real estate in order to deny that piece of real estate to another individual who has the same ambition.

The man with the rifle has not become obsolete. Nor is he even obsolescent. As a matter of fact, it is quite possible that as the result of our newest developments in nuclear power, the man with the rifle is today more important than ever before.

I am asked time and again why it is necessary to maintain a Navy, Marine Corps, and an Army, now that we have perfected the most horrible weapon ever devised by man—the hydrogen bomb. But just to ask the question, supplies the answer. Is it not possible that a weapon so horrible, so utterly fantastic, and so devastating will never be used in warfare? Will any nation expose itself to possible extinction, knowing that one plane can, today, in one flight, shower upon any enemy more destructive power than all of the planes, on both sides, were able to deliver in all of World War II?

During World War II we knew that our enemies possessed tremendous quantities of highly poisonous gases, particularly nerve gases. The city of London undoubtedly was susceptible, on numerous occasions, to desolating gas attacks. Large areas of France could have been denied to Allied armies if various forms of persistent gas had been used. Even the landing beaches on the coast of France could have been inaccessible to us had these gases been used. In the Pacific, many islands, won by sheer courage unequaled in history, could have been rendered useless, at least for long periods of time, had gas been used. But gas was not used, and one reason it was not used was because of the fear of retaliation. The capability possessed by the enemy was also possessed by the Allied Nations.

Buzz bombs, jet aircraft, napalm, and many other types of new and highly destructive weapons were developed and used but never did we or the enemy resort to the one weapon which could have brought mass annihilation to literally hundreds of thousands of persons, had it been used by either side. We are faced with the same problem. We possess a weapon that makes every other form of destruction look insignificant in comparison. We have good reason to believe it is also possessed by the Soviet Union. Would either side be the first to use such a weapon since its destructive powers are so well known? True, we used atom bombs in Japan, but I doubt very much whether those who developed that now out-dated weapon had anticipated its full destructive effect. And now that we possess a device fantastically more devastating than the bomb that was dropped on Hiroshima, I am of the opinion that we would not initiate the use of such a weapon, but we would use it unsparingly in retaliation.

For the same reasons, I am of the opinion that unlimited use of the atom bomb would not be resorted to by either aggressor or defender, except in retaliation. After all, the difference between an atom bomb and a hydrogen bomb is merely one of degree.

If this premise is correct, and if neither side resorts to fissionable material for unrestricted use in warfare, then we find ourselves confronted with the necessity of improving what we now rather naively consider to be "conventional weapons." Had we sat back at the outbreak of World War II and decided not to enlarge our forces because of the fear of the use of gas, that war might have had a different ending. Instead, we developed gases of our own, and at the same time expanded our forces and developed new weapons. To me that is the only reasonable course that we can pursue today. We must improve our conventional weapons; we must also be ready to retaliate with the weapon of utter destruction if it is used against us. At the same time, we must be prepared for the limited use of atomic weapons—in actual combat operations.

But for the moment, let's follow another premise. Let's assume that both sides will resort to hydrogen and atom bombs in the event of another armed conflict. If that does happen, then the need for compact, highly skilled, superbly trained, self-contained units becomes even more important. Large masses of troops become a thing of the past. Concentrations of ships carrying troops and landing forces become choice targets. There remains, however, the necessity for maintaining and transporting well trained troops who can operate in relatively small groups to carry out the assignments which will still require physical contact. If our forces cannot operate in large units—then neither can the enemy's. At the same time we must continue to develop and improve upon our defensive weapons—for we must never let our assumptions of nonuse detract in any way from our knowledge that nuclear power may be used—in every possible manner—especially by an enemy who seeks to destroy us with one all-out effort—either in a surprise move of aggression, or as a last resort.

Or let's look at the situation on the basis of another premise. Let's assume that both sides will use nuclear power in the event of all-out war, but both sides avoid all-out war. Korea was an example of something short of all-out war. Indochina is another. How many more there will be, no one knows. How many will involve us, no one knows. And as much as the American people wish to avoid future armed conflict with any nation, wishing won't make it so. So we must be prepared for that possibility.

Thus, as I see the future, in any event there must be an Army, a Navy, a Marine Corps, and an Air Force. Insofar as the Marine Corps is concerned, it must not be a large second army, but a 3-division, 3-airwing compact organization, skillfully trained. Marines must be more than masters of amphibious warfare; they must be equipped with weapons that are mobile, relatively light, and capable of concentration. It must be a Marine Corps with its own air support—air support furnished by pilots who know the problems of the ground troops. These pilots must be well indoctrinated in the theory of close air support. And as the pilots must know the problems of the ground troops, so must the ground troops have confidence in the pilots—for it is that type of confidence that really provides the closest of close air support.

Likewise, there must be a Navy, for so long as water covers 70 percent of the earth's surface, the sea lanes, be they above or below the water, remain vital—yes, indispensable—sources of transportation.The nation that controls the sea will always remain predominant.

And certainly, no new weapon will replace the Army, for in the Army lies the power of ultimate victory.

But all three of these services must have freedom of movement and therein lies the importance of tactical air superiority. And, there must always be the capability of destroying productive capacity, transportation facilities, and civilian will to continue to fight—therein lies the power of a strategic air force. So, obviously, there must be an Air Force.

I am not trying to be all things to all men, for I sincerely believe that each of the four separate military services are mutually dependent; and likewise, each, within itself, must be reasonably independent.

The National Security Act recognizes that each of the four services has a special mission. I do not believe we could successfully wage war without the existence of each of the four services.

And if the day should ever come when these four services are merged into one—if the doctrine of a single Chief of Staff or a single commandant or a single chief of operations—should ever infiltrate into our military system—then we shall be endangering the security of our Nation far more than if we had abolished any one of the four services. No man, regardless of his capacity, could possibly assume the responsibility of preparing plans and directing, under the President, all of our Armed Forces. Such a person would have to have a military background. That background—of necessity—would have to be Army, or Navy, or Air Force, or Marine Corps. To ask that individual to forget his years of 1-service environment; to ask him to forget his prejudices—whatever they might be; to ask him to be an outstanding authority on the importance of sea power, and the significance of a strategic air force, and the art of land warfare, and the necessity for continually improving the methods of amphibious warfare—is to ask for the impossible.

Perhaps one day in the future some effort may be made to bring about this merger, but it will be disguised in the clothes of more efficient unification. Watch for it, be ever vigilant, for such a move carries with it the invitation to disaster.

It may be proposed as an economy measure, and great cries of eliminating duplication will be heard. This is the most insidious type of approach, for it has pocketbook appeal, but in protecting the pocketbook the trousers may disappear. Bear in mind, always, that there is a difference between unnecessary duplication and healthy competition. Never sacrifice the immeasurable, intangible value of esprit de corps, for whatever paltry, tangible savings might result from the adoption of a single uniform.

And, so long as there is an exchange of information, the efforts expended in research, development, and experimentation, on the same subject, by different services, are not wasted. There must be supervision, correlation, and progress analysis by the Department of Defense, but each service must be permitted to carry on its own development, for in that manner we produce not just a weapon, or a device, but the best weapon and the best device.

There is no future for the nation that comes in second in a war, and the wars of this century have proved, beyond doubt, that the nation with second-best equipment, second-best research, or second-best production, does not dictate the peace terms.

I am happy to see the proof of an excellent example of interservice exchange of information here today. I congratulate each and every one of you, for each of you will go back to his own service, or his own nation, with a better understanding and a fuller appreciation of the importance and the necessity for the Marine Corps' primary mission.

I wish you all good luck in your next assignment.

Threat of Atomic Grab

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE M. RHODES
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 11, 1954

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the Congress should give greater attention to the important question of control of atomic energy. There seems to be a strong desire on the part of the Eisenhower administration to give away this great atom power program to private monopolists, and to deny the people of America the benefits from the $14 billion investment they have made with their taxpayments. It is most alarming that this important question gets very little attention in the Congress. There is so little publicity on this matter that the public is unaware of the big grab which appears to be shaping up. To permit this program to fall into the hands of special private interests will not only result in denying the American people the benefits of this great development, but it will also be a threat to traditional American freedom.

Mr. Speaker, the Nation owes a deep debt of gratitude to those who are calling public attention to this question. In a recent issue of Labor, the official publication of the railroad labor organizations, an article by Senator John F. Kennedy, of Massachusetts, was published which deals with this important subject. I include herewith the contents of that story and his timely warning:

Warns Against Atomic Grab by Monopolies

A hot fight is ahead in Congress over a bill of such importance that it staggers the imagination. The Senate-House Atomic Energy Committee is holding hearings on this bill. It would, among other things, allow private interests to get atomic patents.

This week, the Atomic Energy Commission, which handles the atom power program, urged the Senate-House committee to approve the patent part of the bill.

On the other hand, Senator John F. Kennedy, Democrat, of Massachusetts, pleaded that the committee put into the bill patent provisions insuring that the public, and not private monopolists, will get the benefits from the American people's tremendous investment in atom developments.

PUBLIC PAID $14 BILLION

As was testified earlier by Jerry Voorhis, former Congressman from California, and now executive director of the Cooperative League of the United States of America, "the people provided $14 billion of public funds to discover and develop atomic power. Ownership of that power vests in the American people.

"This new and potentially decisive resource," Voorhis told the committee, "must be used to reduce monopolies, not to increase them."

Both Voorhis and Kennedy pointed out that the original Atomic Energy Act, still on the books, provides that all atomic patents belong to the Federal Government, and all patented processes can be used—free—by any private corporation which takes part in the atom power program.

COULD BLOCK PROGRESS

In contrast, the bill before the committee would enable Power Trust companies and other big business interests to get atom patent monopolies. They could use patents, not to promote development of atom power, but to block such development.

As the famous O'Mahoney monopoly investigation back in the 1930's revealed, big corporations often get patents and put them on the shelf, to keep new discoveries from interfering with old vested interests.

Kennedy told the Senate-House committees that free and rapid development of atomic power is especially important to the New England States, which have the highest electric rates in the country because they are in the grip of the private Power Trust.

"For example," he said, "the highest residential rate in the United States, for 250 kilowatt hours, is $9.51—in Boston and nearby Massachusetts cities. Contrast this with the lowest rate—$3.50—in Tacoma, Wash.," which has public-owned power.

STAKES ARE HIGH

Low-cost atomic power can rescue New England from its present plight, Kennedy said, but that won't happen if atom power gets tied up in private patent monopolies.

To keep atom power development free, Kennedy urged the Senate-House committee to put into the bill a requirement that, when private interests get atom patents, they must let anyone else use the patented processes, upon payment of "reasonable license fees."

"Participation of private industry in the atomic power program," Kennedy declared, "must not cause the public to lose control of this development. Extremely high stakes are involved."

EDWARD R. MURROW REPORTS ON ATOMIC ENERGY FIGHT

Mr. Speaker, I also wish to include herewith remarks that were made by Mr. Edward R. Murrow, prominent news commentator, who discussed this important question in his radio report over CBS radio network on June 7, 1954. His remarks follow herewith:

Washington is watching an interesting struggle over a revision of powers within the Atomic Energy Commission. It is proposed to give the Chairman greater authority than other members by assuring him sole administrative control. The bill amending the atomic law would name the Chairman "the principal officer" of the Commission. The Commission would continue to make the policy, but the issue is one-man rule as against commission-rule in administering it. Chairman Louis L. Straws and Joseph Campbell favor the change; Eugene Zuckert, Henry Smyth, and Thomas E. Murray oppose it. Such an issue naturally attracts attention, for the public usually is reluctant to concentrate a great deal of power in one man. And it would be a great deal of power if the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission were made the "principal officer." When the Commission finishes its present expansion program, it will have a gross capital investment and equipment of $8 billion. This is more than Dupont, General Motors, and United States Steel put together. Running it single-handed would mean a lot of power, and that can be said without any reflections on the capabilities and character of Chairman Straws. But more interesting—and surely more significant—is another issue raised by the Commission in its report to Congress. This has to do with the development of atomic energy for peaceful purposes. The Commission recommends that private industry take this over from the Government. This is what the report says: "Obtaining full participation of the Nation's electrical energy producers and equipment manufacturers in the development and production of nuclear power is, in our judgment, the best way of securing the maximum return on the public investment in this phase of our atomic energy program."

Previously in the report the commission had said, in effect, that we are a society of private enterprise and should remain so. Nuclear power, it said, "should be produced and distributed by the private and public power systems and not by the Commission." And that, it argued, would let nuclear power "confirm and strengthen, rather than change, our way of life." But what the Commission proposes may itself be a change in our way of life. It is not easy to find a name for the kind of society it would produce. Obviously it wouldn't be socialism, for though the people put up the money for atomic development and now own the process and the plant, the profits under socialism (if there are profits) would go directly or indirectly to the people. But just because something isn't socialism it isn't automatically free or private enterprise. In free enterprise the capital is put up by private persons—at a risk—and that is what entitled them to the profits they make. Obviously it wouldn't be free or private enterprise to collect the equivalent of $75 from every person in the United States for nuclear development, which is what the Government has done. This is public money and the discovery and the indstry now belong to the public. Of course, if private industry buys its way in, and the public is reimbursed for its capital outlay, that could end up as private enterprise. But the AEC doesn't suggest this should happen. And nothing is being said about it so far in Congress. It just isn't explained how the public property is to become private property. I should mention that giving public property to private persons, or selling it at nominal cost, is not necessarily reprehensible. It was worthily done by Abraham Lincoln in the Homestead Act, for example. But it is not the same to give away a whole range of new knowledge and a vast equipment that have cost the public an outlay of $12 billion. This is not said to object to atomic energy for peaceful purposes becoming a function of private enterprise. Most Americans will agree that this is a valid objective. But one is entitled to know just how this public property is to become private property. And we may need a new name for the kind of society we might become.

As I said, it isn't socialism, but it also isn't pure private enterprise. If one assumes that neither the administration nor Congress wants to arrange simply a gigantic handout of the public property, what do they have in mind? It is not a mixed economy, even though the proposal is that the Government stop making nuclear energy for peaceful purposes and go on making it for defense. For it is not characteristic of a mixed economy to turn over publicly financed and operated functions to private persons. Another name for the proposal may be subsidy. Letting private industry benefit from the nearly four billions it cost simply to develop nuclear energy and use part of the public's plant and equipment, would be one of the most sensational subsidies of all time. Must we learn to call our form of society in the atomic era "subsidized free enterprise"? One should hope not. It sounds like double-talk. To quote again from the AEC report, the aim is: "Securing the maximum return on the public investment." But the maximum return to whom? Is it to the public which put up the capital? Or is it to private corporations? These questions are worth thinking about.

Some Basic Agricultural Facts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NOAH M. MASON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 11, 1954

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, the farm problem is the most important domestic problem confronting the administration and the Congress today. It has many ramifications, and no easy solution. For months the House Committee on Agriculture has been holding hearings on this problem. Last summer the committee toured the country to get first-hand information from the farmers themselves on how best to deal with it. The farm problem directly affects all city dwellers as well as all farmers; therefore, a sound solution is of national importance.

Farming is big business. American farmers have a total investment of $141 billion. That is not chicken feed. Last year our farmers spent $24 billion putting in, cultivating, and harvesting their crops. The average investment per worker in industry is $12,000; the average investment per farm worker is $18,000.

In 1953 the average yearly cash income of the American farmer was $850, while the average yearly income of the industrial worker was $1,850.

Since 1945 the cost of handling farm products after they leave the farm—packaging, milling, transporting, canning, retailing, and so forth—has increased 83 percent. The farmer's share of the consumer's dollar has actually decreased during that time.

For example, take a loaf of bread, a basic item of food. In 1947 the average selling price of a loaf of bread was 13 cents, out of which the farmer received 2½ cents as his share. In 1952 the average selling price of a loaf of bread was 16 cents, out of which the farmer received 2⅓ cents.

To have a healthy economy the purchasing power of both farmer and industrial worker must be maintained. Government statistics show that factory wages have gone up more than the cost of food; that for 1 hour of work the factory worker can buy more agricultural commodities today than at any time during the past 40 years. That is not true of the farmer's purchasing power in connection with the things he has to buy. It takes more bushels of wheat or corn today to buy a tractor, a piece of farm machinery, an auto, than it did 20 years ago.

The farm problem is a national problem affecting all the people. Without question it is the number one domestic problem.

IMPORTS AND EXPORTS OF FARM PRODUCTS

Mr. Speaker, according to a report of the United States Tariff Commission, we imported, in 1952, $5 billion worth of agricultural products and exported $4 billion worth of agricultural products—a $1 billion balance of trade in favor of the farmers of foreign countries. Of course, coffee, tea, bananas, and crude rubber are included in this overall picture of agricultural imports, but we also imported immense quantities of sugar, wool, oils and fats, tobacco, wheat, feeds and fodders, hides and skins, all of which compete in our markets with the products of our own farms.

How can we support farm prices when we import huge quantities of farm products that compete with our own? We try to hold up farm prices by Government supports—at the taxpayers' expense—and at the same time we actually depress farm prices by permitting heavy imports. Does this make sense? Should not our tariff policy and our farm subsidy program go hand in hand, in the same direction, rather than pulling in opposite directions as they do now?

REESTABLISHING A SOUND HEALTHY AGRICULTURE

Mr. Speaker, President Eisenhower's Administration is making an earnest effort to reverse the socialistic trend of the past 20 years. This effort was reflected especially in the President's farm message. That message emphasized the fact that it is much easier to start subsidies than to end subsidies.

Trying to taper off the farm subsidy habit is analogous to trying to taper off a patient's dope habit. To try to correct problems of supply and demand through price supports or other legislative devices is the same as trying to ease a patient through a period of severe pain and shock by the use of opiates.

The Eisenhower-Benson farm program as outlined in the President's message is a program for a gradual transition from a fixed 90 percent support to a flexible 75 to 90 percent support; from a program depending upon opiates or dope in the form of subsidies and price supports to a sound and healthy free economy.

POLITICALLY SAFE BUT ECONOMICALLY UNSOUND

Mr. Speaker, the Wallace-Hopkins agricultural program was one that produced high prices through an "economy of scarcity," a program based upon curtailed production. It was politically safe but economically unsound. The Truman-Brannan agricultural program was one that produced high prices, encouraged overproduction, and resulted in tremendous surpluses—at present over $7 billion of taxpayers' money tied up in these surpluses. What are we to do with these immense surpluses? This program was also politically safe but economically unsound. It won reelection for President Truman in 1948 when he made his whistle-stop invasion of the normally Republican farm counties of the Middle West.

The Eisenhower-Benson agricultural program of flexible supports, raised or lowered to offset scarcity or abundance, is not politically safe but it is economically sound. It is a feasible method or approach to the elimination of rigid parity supports and the establishment of a sound, safe agricultural program based upon supply and demand.

The program outlined in President Eisenhower's farm message proposes a gradual changeover from a politically safe but economically unsound farm program inaugurated under the New Deal, to a sound, safe, and healthy farm program, tailored to fit the needs of our modern-day agricultural conditions.

RUSSIA AND TURKEY COMPARED

Mr. Speaker, an excellent example of the difference in results as between government control of agriculture and private ownership and control of agriculture is the recent happenings in Russia and Turkey.

Russia is a vast agricultural country. She formerly produced farm surpluses to sell on the world markets. Great quantities of Russian wheat were exported in bygone years. Today Russia cannot and does not produce enough food for her own people. Why the change?

Turkey, on the other hand, has doubled her grain production in the last 3 years; her cattle have increased from 55 million head to 62 million head during the same time; and her cotton production has increased 60 percent. Why the difference?

Turkey and Russia are neighbors. Turkey borders Russia on the south. Both Turkey and Russia has modernized their farming methods, installing tractors, modern machinery, hydroelectric dams, water systems, and so forth. Why then has Turkey achieved what Russia would like to achieve—namely, an abundance of food supplies?

Turkey today has a democratic form of government and encourages private initiative, private ownership, and operation of her farms. Russia has a dictatorship with government ownership of all forms of productive property, including the farms. That is the difference.

Under the Wallace-Hopkins farm program for America, and under the Brannan-Truman farm program, our American farmers were to be regimented, supervised, with Government acreage allotment, marketing controls, crop controls, and subsidies as the order of the day. Is that what our American farmers want? Do they want to become Russianized?

THE TWO-PRICE FARM PLAN

Mr. Speaker, prospects for a two-price farm plan are becoming brighter. Both the Secretary of Agriculture, Ezra Benson, and the chairman of the House Agricultural Committee, CLIFFORD HOPE, favor a two-price system on wheat and cotton, two American farm crops, part of which must be sold upon the world market. They advocate flexible supports upon those crops that do not enter world markets, such as corn. The claim is made that this combination farm program will increase the overall income of the American farmer, and such a program would do away with the need for acreage and marketing restrictions—two things repugnant to our American farmers.

Government price-support programs have priced American farm products out of world markets. Germany used to buy more than half her raw cotton from the United States. Now she buys less than 20 percent of her raw cotton from us, because she can buy raw cotton 5 cents per pound cheaper from other countries.

Mr. Speaker, the two-price farm program, now proposed as a necessary part of an overall farm program, is nothing more or less than the old McNary-Haugen plan. It proposes to provide the American market price for all the wheat and cotton needed for home consumption—about 90 percent of the crop—and the world price for the surplus wheat and cotton.

The McNary-Haugen farm plan was passed by Congress back in 1926, but vetoed by President Coolidge. It has never been given a tryout.

America consumes about 90 percent of all our industrial and agricultural production. The 10-percent surplus production is the factor that gluts the market and brings about low prices. Under the McNary-Haugen plan the American farmer would receive the American market price for 90 percent of his crop, and the world market price for his surplus crop.

The beauty of the McNary-Haugen farm plan is that it costs the American taxpayer nothing, but it does guarantee to the American farmer the American market price for 90 percent of his crop.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, the Eisenhower-Benson farm program is a sound, sensible farm program, based upon our American system of free enterprise. It proposes a gradual changeover from the present unsatisfactory and unsound program to a sound, self-adjusting program that will prove satisfactory and beneficial to American agriculture. The new administration's farm program should be adopted and given a fair trial.

Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare Departments Appropriations Bill for 1955

SPEECH

OF

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1954

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 9447) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, there is, perhaps, no legislation that more deeply affects the lives of the great majority of our citizens than this annual appropriation bill for the Labor Department, the Health, Education, and Welfare Department, and related agencies.

The regulations we enact to promote Christian working conditions for our people and the measure we approve for the protection of their health are certainly matters of vital importance to our national welfare; that is why I have felt formally compelled, in these 8 years of my membership in the House, to take a keen and personal interest in this bill.

I realize full well that able members of the committee, who have worked and studied through long days and nights in preparing this bill, will discuss it in detail during the general debate. However, I would feel lax in my duty if I did not at least outline my own earnest convictions.

To try to measure the health and happiness of human beings in terms of dollars and cents is a most difficult, if not impossible, endeavor. We are all, I am sure, agreed on the necessity for practicing economy in Government expenditures to preserve our financial stability. However, I think we are further agreed that questionable economy at the expense of lowered national standards of working conditions and health protection is most unwise and impractical.

In my decided opinion, cuts in several items of this bill, as recommended by the committee and the Bureau of the Budget, are indeed examples of penny wisdom against pound foolishness.

Mr. Chairman, I earnestly hope, therefore, that no crippling reductions will be adopted today, for instance, in the appropriations for the full and continuing operation of the Hill-Burton hospital construction program, the Wage and Hour Division, the Food and Drug Administration, the Bureau of Employment Security, the vocational and rehabilitation program, and the National Institutes of Health and Medical Research. These are emphatically services that have proved their worth to the American people.

The Hill-Burton hospital construction program was originally approved, in 1946, by unanimous vote in both Houses as a bipartisan bill; it should be continued as such. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare has testified that there is still a shortage of over 600,000 hospital beds in this country at the present time, and that we need to construct about 36,000 beds a year to keep up with the increase in our population. I have not heard a single word yet to justify a reduction of one nickel in the amount that has been recommended by the administration, namely, $75 million, which is only about one-half of the amount authorized in the basic law. The Hill-Burton Hospital Construction Act is one of the most beneficial and humanitarian measures ever adopted by the Congress, and I trust the administration figure will be approved, with more if possible.

The Wage and Hour Division of the Department of Labor enforces the minimum wage and child labor laws that are now on our statute books. Having adopted these laws, and I have heard no voice urging their repeal, then certainly we have the moral obligation to provide sufficient money for their reasonable enforcement. Protecting our children from the abuse of unscrupulous employers and insuring our working people are paid their proper wages are sound national investments. Let us take no unwise step that will prevent this important agency from carrying out its congressional instructions by the laws we have already adopted.

Last year, we passed a law giving the Food and Drug Administration increased authority to inspect food factories. May I ask what good that law is if sufficient money is not available to the Administration to carry it out. Let us realize that any severe reduction in this regard simply means that the American taxpayers will get less protection against poisonous foods, dangerous drugs and cosmetics, and against the fraudulent sale of worthless, if not hurtful, remedies for serious diseases.

With respect to proposed reduction in employment security funds, outside of several injustices connected with it, may I simply say it is almost incredible to suggest such a cut when we have a mounting problem with regard to unemployment in multiple areas of the country. The practical wisdom of any such action at this time is certainly open to serious question.

Also, rather than any reduction in vocational and rehabilitation funds, it is my contention that, if anything, they could well be increased. My personal observation of the vocational education program in my own State has convinced me that this program merits substantial Federal support. Vocational education is rapidly becoming more and more important, and its need is becoming more and more intensified because of our changing pattern of occupational employment. The States need encouragement in this field. I think all of us well appreciate the importance of vocational education to our national defense program. The authorities tell us it appears we will always need a stand-by supply of skilled workers. The various States, of course, should assume their fair share of responsibility, but the problem admittedly has a national aspect and impact we cannot afford to overlook.

I understand that an attempt to increase the appropriation for vocational rehabilitation and to remove the restrictive language in the present law requiring individual States to put up at least 75 cents for each Federal dollar will be made, and I intend to support these proposals.

The United States is currently rehabilitating about 65,000 people each year, but there are about 250,000 capable of being rehabilitated. It has been testified by responsible officials and experts, year after year, that in this program, for every dollar that is appropriated in Federal funds, the Federal Government receives $10 back; that is certainly excellent economy. There is, then, no reason in the world why we should not maintain and expand this program that actually is materially profitable as well as being a concrete demonstration of the Christian character of our Nation. It is an investment in youth which will pay back vast dividends and multiply the productive capacity of the Nation. There is no more important part of this bill than that relating to our Public Health Service, which includes our several institutes on health. Our economic loss resulting from crippling diseases runs into untold billions of dollars. Medical experts tell us the cause and cure of such dreadful afflictions among others as cancer, multiple sclerosis, muscular dystrophy, cerebral palsy, arthritis, rheumatism, heart disease, and even blindness can be eventually found. With adequate facilities for continuing study and research they are confident of success. It is my own heartfelt conviction that Federal expenditures, for continuing medical research and health protection pay for themselves a million times over—in the reduction of human suffering and in direct economic returns to individuals and the Nation as a whole. Even at a time when I well realize we must examine all Federal appropriations with critical scrutiny I do not hesitate to ask you, in Christian charity and wisdom, to not only maintain the present program but provide for its expansion.

There are other features of this bill that time does not permit me to dwell upon.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, may I may say this. At a time when we are generously granting billions of dollars to aid our foreign allies, is it wise to neglect our own citizens? At a time when we are telling the world of our better way of life, as opposed to Communist slavery, is it intelligent patriotism to dangerously reduce so many public services whose contributions to national progress have been so universally acknowledged? At a time when we are engaged in a life-and-death struggle with the curse of communism, is it practical to disrupt the morale of our own people? I submit it is not. Let us not, in this hour of national destiny, abandon and retreat from the civilized progress we have steadily maintained since the good Lord blessed us with an independent existence.

Greater Aircraft Carrier Potential

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY J. LATHAM
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 11, 1954

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, on June 8 the Navy pulled the wraps off a new, small, and simpler carrier-based jet plane which will carry an atom bomb. It is the Douglas A4D Skyhawk.

This is a startling and encouraging reversal of the trend toward larger, more complicated, and more expensive planes.

The significance and importance of this development becomes apparent, even to the nonmilitary eye, upon casual analysis:

First. It roughly doubles the capacity and effectiveness of America's most potent fighting unit, the aircraft carrier. This new plane with less than half of the weight and size of the conventional jet, will make it possible for each carrier to mother many more planes, keep a goodly portion of them in the air continually, and each plane can carry an atom bomb.

Second. It will make possible the use of additional conventional carriers by eliminating the necessity for strengthening the underpinning of the flight decks required for the heavier planes.

Third. Being smaller, the new plane will be much more difficult to detect visually or by radar, and less easy to hit by enemy fire.

Fourth. It will save money. The cost of large new complicated combat planes is staggering. The new plane will cost less than half as much, can be produced much faster, and will require less strategic materials.

We need large planes for a variety of uses, of course. But there is no virtue, necessarily, in mere bigness.

The Navy and the Douglas Aircraft Co. are to be congratulated for producing this new and promising atom-attack plane.

I set forth below the following story which appeared in the New York Times on June 8, 1954:

NAVY UNVEILS LIGHT JET TO CARRY SMALL ATOMIC BOMB

(By Gladwin Hill)

LOS ANGELES, June 7.—A new Navy jet attack bomber that reverses the trend toward ever bigger and more complicated military planes was shown for the first time today at the Douglas Aircraft Co.'s El Segundo plant.

The craft, a single-seater dubbed the A4D *Skyhawk*, was designed to carry the later-model small atomic bombs. It has a wingspread of only about 30 feet and a length of about 40 feet. Exact specifications were not officially disclosed.

The ship is only about half the size of existing service planes performing comparable functions, weighing less than 15,000 pounds against their normal weight of around 30,000 pounds.

Powered by a Wright J-65 Sapphire engine, it is designed for speeds in the neighborhood of 600 miles an hour—less than the speed of sound.

The *Skyhawk* is intended to operate from carriers and small landing fields. It is so small that designers did not consider it necessary to give it the folding wings common in current carrier-based planes. The craft will take up less than half as much space on carriers, Douglas engineers said, as its folding-wing counterparts.

Another advantage cited in the small size was that the plane would offer less than half as much area for enemy radar and missiles. Also it can be produced much more rapidly and less expensively than comparable craft. The first test flights of the plane will not take place for another week or two, at Edwards Air Force Base near here, but the company is so confident of the design it is understood to have already tooled up for quantity production, at an outlay of several million dollars.

The small-scale design marks a culmination of several years' agitation among aeronautical engineers against "gadgetry," an all-inclusive term for overelaboration in warplanes. This tendency, which grew out of the hasty output of World War II, had evoked complaints from Korean war pilots and threatened to push the cost and complexity of warplane manufacture and maintenance beyond practical limits.

Edward H. Heinemann, Douglas' chief engineer, explained today that the conventional-looking Skyhawk, instead of being based on existing models was designed from scratch with economies in size and weight, consistent with performance, the prime considerations.

Dual mechanisms, the second one for safety, were excluded, on the ground that the pilot seldom could be sure the auxiliary mechanism was functioning and could be relied on.

Typical of structural economies throughout the plane were the reduction in weight of the pilot's ejection seat from the 70-pound equipment in the current F4D fighter to 30 pounds, and combination of four friend-or-foe identification electronic equipment boxes weighing 160 pounds into a single unit of only 105 pounds.

Rock Creek Park Et Al.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 11, 1954

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me by unanimous consent of the House to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article which expresses the views of my constituent, Michael Nadel, entitled "Rock Creek Park Et Al.," published in the May 1954 issue of the New York State Conservation Council, Inc., Bulletin:

ROCK CREEK PARK ET AL.

(By Michael Nadel)

Strains and stresses from the Nation's Capital send tremors in all directions. There are values in and around the Capital, however, that seldom get a mention in the news. These are in the Capital parks, a part of the national park system, administered by the National Park Service.

They are the admiration and the concern of our citizens the country over, for whom they have a special meaning; world tourists and temporary residents identify them with the quality of our democracy. But now an eruption is threatened that would destroy their essential meaning to every citizen and world visitor.

We spent a brief weekend with Howard Zahniser, executive secretary of the Wilderness Society and editor of the Living Wilderness, on a round of these lovely parks.

Rock Creek Park runs like a deep and expanding skein through the heart of the Capital. It is a natural area, visited by wild birds on their migrations and by humans in their travails, the scene of plant studies and the seat of local wildlife. At several points Rock Creek flows over and across the roadways as though hardly tamed, established a seeming independence of human engineering. Automobilists bow to the challenge and cross the shallow flooded fords with mild excitement over the color of their simulated daring. For this appearance of wildness is in the nature of the place. The park is a living link with the realness of the Nation that lies out and beyond the magnificent corporate structures of the world capital.

The roadbuilders, ever economy-minded, have cast a greedy eye upon this emerald jewel. They propose to cut an expressway through Rock Creek Park, apparently under the theory that one enters the park in absence of mind, and must depart through it in celerity. To stop and marvel at a barrel owl in a tree, as Zahannie did upon a time, would seem like an incomprehensible frivolity.

We believe that arterial progress can be made in a way that serves the eye pleasantly and that gets somewhere efficiently, in alternative places, without destroying environment that is arterial to the spirit.

OTHER AREAS THREATENED

As we drove along the Potomac through the Capital Theodore Roosevelt Island lay but a stone's throw away. It has been preserved in a natural state, with dense woods, 3½ miles of trail, and "one of the few unspoiled marshes in the Washington region." It is accessible only by ferry.

This island, described by Herman Hagedorn, executive director of the Theodore Roosevelt Association, as "an island of solitude where men may find lost values and perspectives amid the tumult of national politics and international controversy," is now being considered by bridge builders as the possible foundation for the abutment of a high-level bridge. The island, purchased with the pennies of school children, would lose its character as a completely insular memorial, and its wholeness would be destroyed.

C. & O. CANAL

We partook of the hospitality of the Washington Biologists Field Club at their famed Plummers Island in the Potomac—an oasis of fauna and flora disturbed only by the distinguished biologist members who have studied the area chronologically over a period of 50 years, with possibly unmatched completeness of record. In the unpretentious old clubhouse our coat was put away in a locker once occupied by Gifford Pinchot.

After the traditional fare of shad and shad roe, prepared over an open fire, four of us by prearrangement left Cactus Rock, peak of the island, crossed a narrow channel by rowboat to the mainland, manned by rope and pulley, and set foot upon the towpath of the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal. The other three included Howard Zahniser; William O. Douglas, Associate Justice, Supreme Court of the United States; and Richard Griffith, of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service.

From where we entered, near a footbridge and ancient lockhouse, the canal was intimate and sensitively rural. Corot would like to have painted the delicate juncture of arbor and embankment, the going-away, grassy-bordered path above the slow stream, the shallow bloom on the water under the intermittent sunshine, the clearness of it where concealed springs pushed away the insistent algae, leaving a foil of seeming coolness to the humid air.

With varying character the canal moves unhurriedly from its well in the National Capital, undergoing many environmental transformations on its way to Cumberland, a hundred and eighty-five miles distant. Sometimes, through woodland latticework, can be seen an elbow of the Potomac as it makes an arc far below. Green glades and young woods stretch everywhere, and trees like sentinels of history lean over the path.

Serenity is implicit in all that surrounds. From time to time one encounters an elder of the human race, taking his obedient stroll along this path, immersed in an inner completeness, and carrying a knotted stick, emblematic of the brotherhood of quiet strollers everywhere. Young lads, barely on the lip of their teens, tarry over the embankment, with their fishing poles. The quite old and the quite young find a common link in this special world, and the continuity between them is established.

Families find inexpensive recreation along the fringes and on the nearby trails, many of them accessible by footbridge from unobtrusive feeder roads. Other activities include canoeing and boating on the canal; bird observation (if desired, under the guidance of a park naturalist, who can point out the pileated woodpecker, wood duck, black vulture, or warbler, according to the habitat); plant study, scheduled mule-drawn barge trips, accompanied by a National Capital Parks historian or naturalist who interprets the history and natural features of the canal; picnicking, hiking.

All of this, with its keys to the freedom of the spirit, is slated for destruction—if the roadbuilders have their way. For their plan is to replace the canal with a highway, emasculating it of the values which exist by virtue of its associative elements. Although plans were put on the drafting board long before the development of modern speedways and traffic lanes which now stretch everywhere from the Capital, the roadbuilders cannot resist dragging them out to fill in their criss-cross pattern of cluttering concrete.

A NATIONAL ISSUE

Everywhere meaningful areas of human experience are in retreat before the builders; they are being extinguished one by one. Where our children tented only yesterday rise new horizontal or vertical masses. The bovine pastures in the magnificent natural park of the Old Soldiers' Home are appropriated for structures which could more suitably, and as conveniently, face the park from the outside. Developments arise everywhere which quarrel with the land. Open valleys disappear in view; the rich earth is overlaid with "contractor's topsoil"; and the songbird is jazzed in the machine's roar.

It is not that we would obstruct progress, as represented by building. But we cannot permit the builders to wreck our dwindling birthright, under the plausible but false guise of economy, when practical alternatives exist which are available to them.

The threats to the natural areas in and around the Capital must not be shugged off. They are symptomatic of the threats to our entire national park system. And precisely because, in the National Capital, they are symbolic of our democratic culture, they must not be assailed. The issue is a national one.

The citizens of Washington cannot vote. But we can. Opposition to the threatened despoliation of capital park areas such as Rock Creek Park, Theodore Roosevelt Island, and the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal should be communicated to one's Congressman. Also to Hon. SID SIMPSON, chairman of the District of Columbia Committee of the House of Representatives and to Hon. FRANCIS CASE, chairman of the Senate Committee for the District of Columbia.

Where's That Cruel Recession?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CECIL M. HARDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 11, 1954

Mrs. HARDEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to make a few comments regarding what Mr. Harry Truman recently described as "this cruel recession" in America. Mr. Speaker, for many months—indeed, from the day Dwight Eisenhower entered the White House—we have heard loud and anguished cries from the minority party about the economic situation in this country, particularly the unemployment situation. Mr. Truman describes it as "this cruel recession" and it has been similarly described by many other purveyors of gloom in Mr. Truman's party.

Mr. Speaker, no Member of this Congress appreciated any more than I do the very serious situation faced by men and women who are, through no fault of their own, unable to find work. My heart goes out to these people and their families. I try to help them. But, I submit that the unemployment situation today is not as disastrous as our friends across the aisle would have us believe.

In my own district reside approximately 8 percent of Indiana's population. However, in my district reside only about 4 percent of Indiana's total unemployed. And the total number of unemployed in Indiana today is just about what it was in 1949. I do not recall Mr. Truman, who was President of this country at that time, admitting he had any "cruel recession" on his hands. He referred, instead, to the "great prosperity" which then was apparently abundant in the land.

The Indianapolis News, one of our great midwestern newspapers, graphically portrayed the falsity of Mr. Truman's claims in an editorial published June 8 of this year. I insert this editorial in the Record at this point:

WHERE'S THAT CRUEL RECESSION?

As the 1954 general elections draw nearer smart Democratic leaders surely are testing issues to replace the one that has failed them so miserably—namely, the "cruel depression," a dead horse which former President Truman again flayed in a recent speech.

In the first place, Mr. Truman's "cruel recession" never has reached the level of unemployment which prevailed in 1946, 1947, 1949, and 1950. During those years of Fair Deal prosperity Mr. Truman would have been properly shocked had he heard political opponents talking about a "cruel recession."

Unemployment this year has averaged around 3.8 percent. For people out of work that indeed amounts to a "cruel recession." But in 1946 unemployment stood at 4.3 percent. In 1947 it was 4.2 percent. In 1948 it was down to 3.5 percent. In 1949 it rose to 4.4 percent. And in 1950, before the Korean bloodletting started, it stood at 7.3 percent.

Moreover, present indications are that the peak of unemployment has passed. The Indiana Unemployment Security Division announceed last week that unemployment-insurance claims had dropped 4,600 the previous week. Employment in the State was at the highest point since the first week of last January, which arrived on the heels of the most prosperous year in this Nation's history. Improved employment conditions were reported in nearly all areas of the State, with South Bend as a particularly lamentable exception.

And in Washington the Commerce and Labor Department reported yesterday that national unemployment dropped by 160,000 in May.

If we really were in the grips of a cruel depression, among the first to suffer in the job market would be this year's crop of college graduates, particularly those lacking technical training. But, as is noted below, Indiana University graduates have a wide choice of job offers and the pay is even better than last year.

Successful political strategists, whatever their party, must be realists. Therefore, since Mr. Truman and other welfare staters have failed to talk this rich and dynamic Nation into a cruel recession we may expect to hear less and less talk about that subject from Eisenhower administration opponents as next November draws nearer.

Mr. Speaker, as the News so graphically points out, unemployment in America today is not as great a problem as it was in 1946, 1947, 1949, or 1950. All of these years, I submit, were years in which the Democratic Party standard bearer occupied the White House.

If we wish to go back a little deeper into our history, I am sure the figures will prove that the employment situation today is far better than it was in any peacetime year of Democratic control. We are proving, Mr. Speaker, that the Republican Party, under the inspiring leadership of President Dwight D. Eisenhower, can achieve prosperity without war.

I believe the American people will remember this fact when the polls are opened this November.

He Deserves a Hand

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 11, 1954

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the people of the Fifth Congressional District of California, located in the city of San Francisco, have accorded my friend and colleague, Congressman John F. Shelley, a signal honor by nominating him on both the Democratic and Republican tickets in his congressional district.

"Jack," as his friends call him, was also honored by the Republican Party's decision not to place a candidate on the ballot to oppose him.

I praise the good judgment of the Republicans and the Democrats of California's Fifth Congressional District in their undivided support of an efficient and beloved public servant.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the Appendix of the Congressional Record an editorial which appeared the day before the primary election in the San Francisco Call-Bulletin:

HE DESERVES A HAND

It's a tribute to the effective representation which Congressman John F. Shelley has given San Francisco as a Member of the House that he's running this year without any opposition in the Fifth District. As a Member of Congress and, before that, as a member of the State senate, Shelley has demonstrated distinguished legislative competence and an energetic willingness and readiness to go to bat for anything which benefited his native city, and against anything which adversely affected its welfare. San Francisco is fortunate to have such a Representative in Washington, and his constituents owe him an expression of appreciation for the good job he's been doing in the National Capital. The best way to make that appreciation known will be to give him a big complimentary vote in the Tuesday election. He deserves it.

Peter Yadlowsky, Midshipman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 11, 1954

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the Record, I wish to include herewith an editorial from the Reading Times of June 10, 1954. On the same day, the other Reading newspaper, the Reading Eagle, also editorialized on the same subject referred to in the Times. It pertains to the midshipmen whose commissions were withheld by the Naval Academy. I am quite sure, as these editorials infer, that this incident reflects an unwise policy which does not help in making America more strong and secure.

The editorial follows:

MIDSHIPMAN YADLOWSKY

There is something odd and somehow disturbing about the case of Peter Yadlowsky, midshipman.

The young man and his father, Andrew, were in the news the other day. It seems that Peter, having satisfactorily completed the 4-year course at the United States Naval Academy at Annapolis, was duly graduated, but the Academy withheld his commission as a naval ensign.

Why? The Navy isn't saying very much except that security checks on Peter Yadlowsky and two of his classmates have not been finally resolved and the commissions will not be granted until they are.

Peter's father has an idea, though. He thinks the commission is being withheld from his son because he, Andrew Yadlowsky, had bought an insurance policy on his son from the International Workers Order, one of the organizations on the Attorney General's subversive list. That was 17 years ago. The father says he never was a member of the International Workers Order and dropped the insurance when the Government began its check on his son.

It is proper and necessary that the Government check carefully on the loyalty of the young men it admits to and graduates from its Naval and Military Academies. To have anyone of dubious loyalty or anyone who, though completely loyal, may still be a security risk in the officer corps of the United States military would be unthinkable. But it seems to us to be unfair to Midshipman Yadlowsky to permit him to get to the point of graduation then withold his commission because a security check had not been completed. Why wasn't it completed—and long ago? In fairness to a midshipman and in the interest of the national security, why aren't such checks completed, and the candidates cleared or rejected, before they even enter the Academy?

If it is argued that close security checks have been ordered only recently, under stricter procedures, and that there was not sufficient time to complete Yadlowsky's and the other 2, then we ask, How is it that there was time to complete security checks on the other 848 members of the class, but not these 3? And suppose the rules were tightened recently? That should have no effect whatever; the Government, the Navy, and the Academy should have been conducting the closest kind of check these many years, regardless of recent orders and procedures. Communism has been around for a long time, and if the authorities at the Academy and in the Navy Department have not, on their own, been scrutinizing candidates, then there has been a dereliction of duty.

If when the checks finally have been completed and Midshipman Yadlowsky's connection with communism is found to be no more direct than the fact that his father, himself no Communist, once bought an insurance policy—17 years ago—from an organization now listed as subversive, the Government will be on slippery ground if it refuses a commission to the midshipman.

It seems to us that even membership in an organization that has been branded as Communist dominated is not necessarily damning. How about the old United Electrical Workers of the CIO? Jim Carey, secretary-treasurer of the CIO, was a member of that union for many years, and Jim is about the most stout-hearted anti-Communist we know. But instead of getting out of UE, Jim stayed in and waged a relentless battle to wrest his union from the Commies. He never did, and finally the CIO gave it and other Red-led internationals the heave-ho. But because Jim Carey was a member of the old UE, could he be branded a Communist? The idea is preposterous.

The Communist threat, of course, is from within as well as from the outside, and we must constantly be on guard against it. But we must exercise great care in the way we go about it so that some day some of us won't find ourselves in hot water with the investigators because our great-great-grandfathers were revolutionaries—American revolutionaries.

Question of the Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 7, 1954

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, have you placed your order for color TV yet? Sets will be out this autumn.

Quaere: How many citizens of the Soviet Union have even seen TV? How many are likely to see it in this generation? Any wonder Russia keeps its doors locked?

Iowa's First National Monument

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY O. TALLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 28, 1954

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article written by Florence L. Clark, of McGregor, Iowa, which appeared in the Chicago Sunday Tribune on May 16, 1954:

MOUNDS AREA OF IOWA IS A HISTORIC SITE

(By Florence L. Clark)

MCGREGOR, IOWA.—To the many who are planning to make the well-known national parks in the West their vacation objective this year, visits en route to smaller national-park areas may add variety and informative interest to the trip.

One of the newest and most accessible of these parks, just off a popular Federal highway to Yellowstone park, is Effigy Mounds National monument in northeastern Iowa.

After crossing the Mississippi River on U. S. 18 from Prairie du Chien, Wis., the new park is reached by a drive of only a few minutes north beside the great river.

The 1,200 acre monument of secluded valleys and high rugged bluffs preserves some of the last traces of prehistoric Indians.

First settlers in the United States and Canada found mounds so numerous over much of the country that a legend grew that a mysterious race, "the mound builders," once had peopled the region. It is now known "the lost race" were ancestors of the modern Indians.

Effigy mounds are distinct from the commonly seen round and linear mounds. Built in the shape of animals, birds, and fish, they are found only in a limited area in Wisconsin and along the Mississippi bluffs in northeast Iowa and southeast Minnesota.

The monument, fringing the Mississippi bluffs for several miles, is divided by the Yellow River and its untamed valley, often spoken of as "the wildest spot in Iowa."

Outstanding among the many effigies is a procession of 10 bear mounds known as the "Marching Bears" and "Big Bear" mound, 70 feet across the shoulders and 137 feet long, the largest effigy known.

Archeologists believe that the Indians erected burial mounds in the shape of animals, birds, and fish because they were the burial places of important persons.

A walk past the mounds along the ridges gives the visitor fine views of the Mississippi River, islands, and hills, said by world travelers to be among the finest inland water scenes. A far-reaching view is from Fire Point, so named because excavation of some of the mounds have indicated cremation burials. In the distance to the south from Fire Point is the junction of the Wisconsin River with the Mississippi, scene of the discovery of the father of waters by Joliet and Marquette.

Effigy Mounds Monument also features the white man's early history in this area. On Yellow River is the spot where Jefferson Davis, later president of the Confederacy but then a young lieutenant fresh from West Point, built and ran the first sawmill in the northwest, while he was at Fort Crawford courting his wife-to-be, Commander Zachary Taylor's beautiful daughter, Knox.

An abandoned steamboat landing at the base of one of the bluffs once was a popular place for the old wood-burning boats to tie up to take on wood.

The visitor more interested in natural beauty will find wild flower gardens in the valleys on the monument and the hills covered with oaks, maples, hickory, and walnut trees, and carpets of ferns and mosses.

Spring is a particularly good time for nature lovers to visit the monument to see the wild flowers and birds. Bird watchers have found the monument lands an ideal observation center.

Headquarters of Effigy Mounds National Monument is at the base of the bluffs beside Highway 13. From there guides lead visitors up an easy trail to the mounds.

Should visitors decide to spend more than a few hours at the monument, there are good hotels, motels, and restaurants in nearby towns.

Mr. Speaker, I also include a brief report entitled "History of the Development of Effigy Mounds National Monument, Iowa," prepared by Dr. Conrad L. Wirth, Director of the National Park Service, Department of the Interior, Washington, D. C., on May 26, 1954, as follows:

HISTORY OF THE DEVELOPMENT OF EFFIGY MOUNDS NATIONAL MONUMENT, IOWA

Effigy Mounds National Monument, Iowa, was established by Presidential proclamation on October 25, 1949. Yet the history of the development of this area for national park or monument purposes goes back much earlier than this date.

As early as 1918, a bill was introduced in Congress to establish a national park, to be known as the Mississippi Valley National Park, near Prairie du Chien, Wis., and McGregor, Iowa. The land to be included in this park had an area of about 1,650 acres and included a strip of the left bank of the Mississippi River, stretching from McGregor, Iowa, to a point directly opposite the mouth of the Wisconsin River. This bill was not passed by Congress.

On June 16, 1930, the President signed a bill which directed the National Park Service to make an official inspection of the upper Mississippi River area and to report to Congress on the desirability of the area as a national park. This survey was made for the Service by Mr. Roger W. Toll and he recommended that while a national park along the upper Mississippi Valley did not seem desirable, a national monument to preserve and protect certain of the unique Indian mounds in this area would be of great interest and benefit to the Nation.

The Iowa Conservation Commission, especially Dr. Charles R. Keyes, State archeologist, and Dr. L. H. Pammel, chairman of the commission, was active in backing the idea of a national monument to protect these Indian antiquities, especially those in the vicinity of McGregor, Iowa.

In 1941, the Advisory Board on National Parks, Historic Sites, Buildings, and Monuments declared the proposed Effigy Mounds National Monument to be of national scientific importance. In the same year, by an act of the 49th General Assembly, the State of Iowa authorized conveyance of 1,000 acres of land to the Federal Government for the establishment of a national monument protecting the Effigy Mounds near McGregor, Iowa.

The war years intervened, and it was not until early in 1949 that title to the land could be fully cleared and actual transfer to Federal ownership take place. Although the total area of the monument still lacked 204 acres which the State of Iowa had indicated its willingness to transfer when authority had been enacted by the State Legislature, President Truman signed the proclamation establishing Effigy Mounds National Monument on October 25, 1949. The donation of the remaining 204 acres was accepted by the Federal Government on November 10, 1952.

Throughout the entire period during which this project took shape and was established, Congressman TALLE assisted its progress in many ways, materially aiding the enactment of legislation in the State and in Congress. Since the Effigy Mounds National Monument has become a reality, he has followed its further development with keenest interest.

Along with Drs. Keyes and Pammel, other conservation-minded Iowans, including Mr. Ellison Orr, Mrs. Addison Parker, and Mr. V. W. Flickinger, were most active and helpful in obtaining the establishment of this monument—Iowa's first national monument.

Mr. Speaker, it was a labor of love to promote the establishment of this historic and unique monument. There is nothing like it anywhere. It must be seen to be appreciated. Scenic northeast Iowa is rich in American Indian tradition and lore. Small wonder that increasing numbers of tourists from far and near are eager to see and are fascinated by Iowa's first national monument.

Bar Mitzvah

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 11, 1954

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, every religion has its devotional rituals and customs. One of the many beliefs and practices of the Jewish people is the custom of formally recognizing that time in a boy's life when he passes from childhood to manhood. It is a formal recognition by his family, his relatives, and his friends, that he has passed the status of being a child with a child's irresponsibility for careless actions and that he has entered the status of maturity when he must assume the responsibility of manhood for his daily actions, his respect for the obligations to his religion, his Nation, his family, his relatives, and his friends.

This custom of the Jews is called bar mitzvah. It is a time of tears and laughter, of prayer and soberness, and finally of feasting and happiness. The boy who is the principal in this age-old but ever new custom is given the recognition due a new adult among his elders. In turn he publicly acknowledges his new status and pledges his dedication to the age-old spiritual and filial principles and obligations of the people of Israel.

On the 15th of May, Fred Babbitt, a boy of 13 years, the son of Irving and Fae Babbitt, very dear friends of mine, celebrated the custom of bar mitzvah with his family, relatives, and friends. At the appointed time he stood before the congregation and made the following pledge, which, because of its significance, Mr. Speaker, I insert in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

Elohenu Velohe Avosenu, our God and God of our fathers. In the great tradition of our faith, it has been my privilege this day to take my place alongside my elders in Israel as a bar mitzvah. I stand in Thy presence, and give thanks unto Thee for all my blessings. I am grateful for the rich tradition of Jewish piety which I have received as a heritage from my family, from my great-grandparents and my grandmother of blessed memory, from my great-grandmother who now in her 97th year has lived to enjoy the news of my bar mitzvah, and from my grandparents who are here to share this wonderful day.

I am grateful for the love and the guidance of my beloved mother and father, who have provided not only for my physical well-being, but for my religious inspiration as well, and the affection of my sister. I am grateful for the privilege of living in this land of freedom, where I may now carry on the age-old traditions of our faith in security and peace.

In this spirit of thanksgiving, then, I turn my steps toward the future and pray that I may justify all these blessings, and reward the love of my dear ones by growing into the kind of American and Jew of whom they can be proud. Standing on the threshold of that future I pronounce the benediction with which our people have greeted every great event in life, and in my own name and the name of all my dear ones, proclaim:

Blessed art Thou, O Lord our God, Ruler of the Universe, who hast kept us alive and preserved us and enabled us to reach this glorious season. Amen.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Printing and binding for Congress, when recommended to be done by the Committee on Printing of either House, shall be so recommended in a report containing an approximate estimate of the cost thereof, together with a statement from the Public Printer of estimated approximate cost of work previously ordered by Congress within the fiscal year (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 145, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on Printing, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Frank Brodie is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

DISTRIBUTION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

To the Vice President and each Senator 100 copies; to the Secretary and Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, each, 25 copies; to the Secretary, for official use, not to exceed 35 copies; to the Sergeant at Arms, for use on the floor of the Senate, not to exceed 50 copies; to each Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress, 68 copies; to the Clerk, Sergeant at Arms, and Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives, each, 25 copies; to the Clerk, for official use, not to exceed 50 copies; and to the Doorkeeper, for use on the floor of the House of Representatives, not to exceed 75 copies; to the Vice President and each Senator, Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress there shall also be furnished (and shall not be transferable), 3 copies of the daily RECORD, of which 1 shall be delivered at his residence, 1 at his office, and 1 at the Capitol.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized book dealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by book dealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

PRICE OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

The Public Printer is authorized to furnish to subscribers the daily RECORD at $1.50 per month, payable in advance.

Remit by money order payable to Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C.

PRINTING DOCUMENTS AND REPORTS

Documents and reports of committees with the evidence and papers submitted therewith, or any part thereof ordered printed by Congress, may be reprinted by the Public Printer on order of any Member of Congress or Delegate, on prepayment of the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 162, p. 1940).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. The money derived from such sales shall be paid into the Treasury and accounted for in his annual report to Congress, and no sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

C

IN TH

Mr
unan
the A
dated
from
of th
Th
was c
as fo

The I
S

DEA
your
quest
May
ment
C. R
Appa
As
pract
in it
throu
Unde
awar
bidd
awar
Mr
in it
those
garda
cont
ard v
of a
a cle
do f
and
TVA
char
work
cont
simi
spec
and
does
rate
pres
its
its p
unic
ern
Wal
its
has
inas
pres
coa
abi
uni
tra
fro
pre
div
T
TV
un

Appendix

Coal Procurement by the TVA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT GORE
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 14, 1954

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter, dated June 1, which I have received from Mr. John Oliver, General Manager of the TVA.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY,
Knoxville, Tenn., June 1, 1954.
The Honorable ALBERT M. GORE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR GORE: This is in response to your referral of May 7, in which you requested our comments on the letter dated May 5, 1954, relating to TVA's coal procurement practices which you received from Mr. C. R. Griffith, president of the Southern Appalachian Coal Operators' Association.

As you know TVA buys its coal, as well as practically all the other materials required in its construction and operating programs, through the competitive bidding process. Under the competitive bidding system, awards are made to the lowest responsible bidders. TVA's coal contracts have been awarded on that basis.

Mr. Griffith states that TVA is inconsistent in its treatment of its own employees and those employed by the coal producers as regards wages. Without conceding that TVA's contract terms have contributed to substandard wages or working conditions in the mines of any of the producers of its coal, there is a clear legal difference as to what TVA can do for its own employees in those respects and what it can do for the miners. The TVA Act requires that the laborers and mechanics employed by TVA in construction work as well as those so employed by its contractors be paid at prevailing rates for similar work in the vicinity. The TVA Act specifically authorizes TVA to fix the wages and salaries of its other employees and TVA does so generally on the basis of prevailing rates. However, TVA has no authority to prescribe wage rates which the producers of its coal shall pay the miners or to restrict its purchases of coal to that produced from union mines. Purchases of coal by the Government, including TVA, are subject to the Walsh-Healey Act, and TVA so stipulates in its contracts. However, at present the act has no practical effect on the miners' wages inasmuch as the Secretary of Labor has never prescribed a minimum wage thereunder for coal production. Notwithstanding TVA's inability to make any distinction between union and nonunion mines in awarding contracts, the information we have received from our contractors indicates that TVA's present receipts of coal are fairly evenly divided between union and nonunion mines.

The statement in Mr. Griffith's letter that TVA follows a practice of making awards to unreliable bidders offering low prices and then excusing them when they fail to deliver is not supported by the facts. Out of the hundreds of coal contracts it has awarded, TVA has terminated not more than half a dozen because of the failure of the contractor to deliver. In most of these few cases it was definitely to TVA's advantage to cancel the contract because the current market price of coal at the time of cancellation was below the contract price and TVA could save money by buying the coal elsewhere. Clearly, TVA was in no position to claim damages for breach of contract in such cases when it had suffered no damages. In the 1 or 2 instances in which TVA had paid a higher price for replacement coal, it has collected damages from the defaulting contractor, and we have no intention of departing from that course. During the first quarter of this year, the coal producers with term contracts delivered over 97 percent of their scheduled tonnage. The contractor furthest in arrears happened to be a long-established, union-operated mine. If Mr. Griffith will specify the instances in which he thinks TVA has been discriminatory in the enforcement of its contracts or has otherwise acted unfairly, we shall be glad to give you all of the facts regarding each transaction.

The difficulties of the coal producers and resulting unemployment and reduction of wages among the miners are not confined to the area of TVA's operations or even to the southern Appalachian region but are nationwide. The decreasing demand for coal has created keen competition for the remaining market, and the inevitable result has been a substantial decrease in price. It is simply the law of supply and demand in operation. Undoubtedly many producers have endeavored to meet competition for this lower-priced market by cutting wages and terminating union contracts, but this is not confined to any particular group of producers.

The decrease in the demand for coal is graphically demonstrated by the figures on bituminous coal production in the United States since 1947. From a peak of approximately 630 million tons in that year, production dropped to an estimated 450 million in 1953. Preliminary figures for 1954 show the production rate is still declining. These production figures, of course, represent the demand for the product. It is obvious that a decrease of almost 200 million tons in the demand for coal inevitably results in intense competition for the remaining market; and the competition is accentuated by improved production methods in many of the mines. Since the use of coal for electric-power generation has been rising rapidly during this same period, the decline in the demand for other uses has been even greater than the foregoing figures indicate.

Mr. Griffith is in error when he says that it is TVA's procurement policy that is driving the large producers of Tennessee to close or drastically to reduce their wages. The truth of the matter is that the mines of these producers were developed and operated primarily to supply markets such as the railroads, residential heating, and exports that are now rapidly vanishing. Having lost most of the former markets which have generally called for a high quality product with extensive preparation and for which a relatively high price could be charged, they have turned to a market which is substantially different and for which they probably cannot compete without radical changes in mining and marketing methods. The steam plants, particularly those of recent design such as TVA's, can use a lower quality coal which involves little if any preparation at the mine. Certainly it is uneconomic for TVA or any utility to purchase the high-quality prepared product which many of these mines have produced in the past and pay the high price that the producers must charge if they are to make a profit. The producers must recognize that in TVA they have a new and different kind of market and if they want to compete for it, they must alter their mining methods or develop new sources so that coal can be produced in substantial volume on a low-cost basis.

You will be interested to know that notwithstanding Mr. Griffith's complaint the trend in coal production in Tennessee is extremely favorable today as compared with production in the United States as a whole. From a peak of 6,480,000 tons in 1948 production in Tennessee dropped to a low of 4,170,000 tons in 1949. However, it has been climbing back up steadily and in 1953 reached an estimated 5,660,000 tons. Preliminary figures for the first quarter of 1954 indicate that the rate is still going up or at least holding its own, and it is one of the few areas in which that has occurred. The increasing share of Tennessee producers in TVA's coal business is shown by our receipts for the first quarter in each of 1953 and 1954 as follows:

1953 (first quarter):	
Receipts from Tennessee mines	635,300
Receipts from all sources	1,874,294
1954 (first quarter):	
Receipts from Tennessee mines	1,291,202
Receipts from all sources	3,120,215

Much of this Tennessee coal is coming from new sources where cheaper mining methods that give large-volume low-cost production have been adopted. Some of the producers are new in the area, having come from other areas to take advantage of the proximity of the vast new TVA market. There is no reason, of course, why other producers in Tennessee may not share in this business if they want to and are willing to utilize mines and mining methods designed for the new and large steam coal market rather than for an era and markets that apparently are gone.

The necessity of new sources and changes in mining methods on the part of the producers in Tennessee and other areas of the southern Appalachian mining region, if they are to compete successfully for this new market, is emphasized by the following Bureau of Mines figures showing the productivity rate of mine labor in various areas in 1952 (figures show tons of production per man per day): United States average, 7.47; Alabama, 5.53; east Kentucky, 5.89; west Kentucky, 15.19; Tennessee, 5.04; Virginia, 6.20; southern Illinois, 11.51. Since the cost of mine labor is such a substantial part of coal production costs, it is obviously impossible for mines in Tennessee which have had an average production rate of 5 tons per day per man to compete with those in west Kentucky with a production rate of 15 tons per day per man even where the Tennessee coal has a substantial advantage in freight rate.

We hope for the sake of our mutual interests that the coal producers whom Mr. Griffith represents, as well as all the other producers in Tennessee, will recognize and accept the opportunity that this new TVA market affords and adjust their operations accordingly. As a business-like producer of electric power we feel that we are obligated to buy our fuel as economically as possible. A substantial supply of coal at competitive prices within short shipping distance of some of our larger steam plants is advantageous to TVA in that respect. We are also truly interested in the further industrial development of the Tennessee Valley region. The expansion of coal production in Tennessee and adjoining areas on an economical basis to supply this new market would be of immense benefit, we feel, to the economy of the region.

We hope this letter answers all the questions you have arising out of Mr. Griffith's complaint. If there are others, please let me know. We have sent a similar letter to Senator Kefauver.

Sincerely yours,

Tennessee Valley Authority,
John Oliver, *General Manager.*

Commencement Day Address by Hon. A. Willis Robertson, of Virginia, at University of Virginia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN C. STENNIS
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 14, 1954

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, the University of Virginia was planned and built and started on its long constructive career by Thomas Jefferson in 1819. It has long been at the very forefront of leadership in the educational life of our Nation and in training strong leadership for our free institutions, as well as a bulwark of strength in continuing our concept of individual freedom.

Many national leaders have been trained there, including Woodrow Wilson, who reflected many of the ideals of the university in his educational and public life.

This afternoon commencement exercises at the university are in progress, and our colleague, the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. Robertson], is the commencement speaker. His record of fine statesmanship in the Senate reflects at their best the ideals of his State and of the University of Virginia as it continues its constructive work of training leaders for present day problems. With his usual clarity and fine diction, he has forcefully expressed some of these ideals in a timely and constructive commencement address. It will afford inspiration as well as wise counsel to his hearers. As one who greatly cherishes the honor and privilege of being a University of Virginia alumnus and one who appreciates the high ideals and splendid achievements the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Robertson], I request that his address be printed in the Appendix of the Record for its value to the Members of the Congress and the people of the Nation.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Keystone of the Arch

(Remarks of Hon. A. Willis Robertson, of Virginia, at the commencement exercises at the University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Va., June 14, 1954)

The longer I live the more convincing proof I see of the fact that Thomas Jefferson was our greatest political philosopher. Keen insight as well as the modesty that evidences true greatness were shown in his selection of the three accomplishments for which he asked to be remembered.

Jefferson correctly saw that the high points of his long career of public service were his contributions to physical freedom, through the Declaration of American Independence, to spiritual freedom, through the Virginia statute for religious freedom, and to mental freedom, through establishment of a system of public education in Virginia with this great university as its capstone.

In words which will survive as long as men have the courage to hold aloft the torch of personal liberty, Jefferson proclaimed in the Declaration of Independence a theory which had been evolving ever since Moses brought the Ten Commandments down from Mount Sinai. Ignored or opposed by despotic rulers in every age, this theory remained the foundation of our Christian culture. But it was Thomas Jefferson who said for the first time in a document of state that certain rights with which men are endowed by their Creator are inalienable and that the only legitimate function of a government is to secure those rights.

We are all, Jefferson said, entitled to life, which means freedom of our bodies; liberty, which means freedom of mind and heart from all forms of oppression, and pursuit of happiness which includes freedom to devote our talents to the vocation of our choosing.

In his Virginia statute for religious freedom, the prototype for all subsequent action on the subject, Jefferson gave specific emphasis to that aspect of personal freedom which has to do with the relation between man and his Creator and in his plan for a system of general education he gave added meaning to his personal pledge of "eternal hostility against every form of tyranny over the mind of man."

As a student of the classics Jefferson must have read Cicero's rhetorical question: What greater or better gift can we offer the republic than to teach and instruct our youth?

He made such a contribution as the first head of this university, drawing the plans, helping to raise funds to supplement the meager appropriation of $15,000 originally made by the State, and devoting the latter part of his life to supervising the building program, selecting the first professors and planning courses of study.

In that planning Jefferson made clear that the university was to be based on the illimitable freedom of the human mind to explore and expose every subject susceptible of its contemplation. He stated his belief that the most effectual means of preventing the perversion of power into tyranny are to illuminate as far as possible the minds of the people, and he defined the obligations of those who would study here when he said: "For promoting public happiness, those persons whom nature has endowed with genius and virtue should be rendered, by liberal education, worthy to receive and able to guard the sacred deposit of the rights and liberties of their fellow citizens; and they should be called to that charge without regard to wealth, birth," or other accidental conditions or circumstances."

In other words, Jefferson did not want any graduate to leave this university and later say, as did our famous scientist, Dr. Oppenheimer, "I was not interested in and did not read about economics and politics * * * I was interested in my science; but I had no understanding of the relations of man to his society."

I envy every member of this graduating class who has had the privilege of guidance by an institution which is so truly the lengthened shadow of Thomas Jefferson, and I want to talk to you briefly about the responsibilities implicit in the advantages you have enjoyed.

You will face many challenges but the one which I feel is most important today is the need for a program to prevent another world war. Certainly my generation has done little to ease the task confronting you. According to a recent cartoon entitled "Graduation Gift, 1954" we have presented to the graduate of this year a miniature guided missile symbolizing the devastation inherent in a hydrogen bomb. It was a gift of the power to destroy himself and all civilization along with him.

This is a grave responsibility but one not to be assumed with either cynicism or despair. Through the adoption of Christian principles by the free nations world war III could be averted. Otherwise it is not only possible but probable that such a war will start in the next 3 to 5 years. And there is hope that some day all men and all nations can live together in harmony in a world transformed by the wonders of a peaceful application of atomic energy. This is the same hope that prompted President Eisenhower to issue his now famous call to the United Nations for a worldwide pool of fissionable material and the international exchange of scientific thought. So far, little progress has been made with this proposal because of the uncooperative attitude of Russia and the fears of some that the program would not be limited to peaceful purposes.

If you young men could help to create an atmosphere in which such a plan could function, all civilization would be your debtor.

But history has not treated ideals and hopes with kindness. We entered World War I in 1917 because, as Woodrow Wilson said, "the world must be made safe for democracy," and we fought "for the ultimate peace of the world and for the liberation of its peoples."

But the goal which seemed within our grasp in 1919 eluded us in later years and in 1941 we formally entered another worldwide struggle for the same avowed purpose. The assembly in San Francisco of 50 nations in 1945 to draft a charter for world peace seemed to indicate that we could again realize the boast of Patrick Henry at the end of the Revolutionary War, that "the white wings of peace are spread above our fair land and contentment lies down at every door." But in the years that followed we have seen a new threat arise from a nation which we treated generously as an ally, and which signed the peace covenants of the charter of United Nations.

The Communist movement in Russia which we should have distrusted from the first even though we had no sympathy for the un-Democratic and dictatorial methods of the Russian czars has mushroomed in a relatively few years from an undisciplined mob of revolutionists into the largest and best disciplined military force the modern world has known. For us to assume that the rulers of this vast military force mean us no harm is futile. We know that Lenin, one of the founders of the Soviet system, said: "The existence of the Soviet Republic side by side with imperialist states"—and that means all states that are not Communist—"for a long time is unthinkable. One or the other must triumph in the end and before that end supervenes, a series of frightful collisions between the Soviet Republic and the bourgeois states will be inevitable."

We know that in 1952 Stalin told the Soviet Party Congress: "The inevitability of wars between capitalist countries remains in force." And we have seen the efforts which his government made to encourage such wars and to take advantage of divisions among capitalist nations to promote the cause of communism.

We know also that Malenkov, the present top figure in the Soviet Union, has said that the victory of democracy and socialism throughout the world is inevitable, and any student of Soviet thinking will realize that when Malenkov says democracy and socialism, he means soviet rule.

After the Soviet Union violated pledges made at Yalta and Potsdam, it would have been folly for us to allow the Communists to engulf the remaining parts of Europe and Asia. Our logical course lay in buttressing the free nations of the world so that our combined strength could be used to halt the spread of communism while it was still far from our shores.

So we sponsored a new military alliance to combine and coordinate the defensive strength of 13 free nations. Where there were 14 divisions, when General Eisenhower assumed command of NATO, there are now 50; where there were 15 airfields there are now 120; where there were once only 1,800 obsolete aircraft, there are now thousands of modern jets.

We have given freely of our peacetime supplies as well. While the Communists were making token gestures to the starving and oppressed peoples of the world, we have sent thousands of tons of wheat to India and Pakistan, irrigation pumps and tools and railroad equipment to speed production and distribution of food in Asia—and tools for industrial production in Europe.

In acting as we did, perhaps we have not won the devotion of as many of the free nations as we might have wished. Perhaps also, the economy of Western Europe would have been stronger today had we insisted on an economic union of those countries as a permanent foundation for self-sufficiency. But the fact remains that our economic aid to Western Europe stemmed the tide of communism in the countries there; the peoples of Germany and Japan are deeply grateful for the generous treatment accorded them; a vast industrial potential was saved to the free world; and underdeveloped countries throughout the world have been given more strength and spirit to meet the political and ideological attacks of communism.

Our stand in Korea cost us dearly, but it was a demonstration of our determination to set certain limits beyond which aggressors might go only at the risk of armed conflict. We cannot back down from that determination now, for if we falter the Communists would eventually control over 2 billion people and most of the world's strategic raw materials. If that happened, we would no longer be a great power. We would be little more than a beleaguered garrison, forced to total mobilization, fighting for our very existence.

But setting territorial limits to aggression is not enough to halt the psychological assault of communism—the attack from within. Especially in Asia, a crucial struggle is going on, heightened by the natural antipathy of her peoples toward the former colonial powers. The vast population of India has only recently been freed from a colonial status in which any western government was too easily identified with economic exploitation of the native people. It is understandable, therefore, that the new leaders of that area might feel compelled by popular pressures to make a show of independence which denies us effective assistance in holding back communism.

The problem in Indochina is even more acute. There a faltering French colonialism has enabled the Communists to capitalize on the natural aspirations of the people for an independent government. The vast majority of the people of Indochina are not Communists but are oblivious to the fact that government by the local Communist leaders does not mean national self-determination but only domination by the Kremlin.

We face the difficult task of convincing the Indochinese people that we represent the cause of true liberty and that our sole intention is to help them achieve independence in an orderly manner, as was done by the people of the Philippines. Only then can they be given the will to carry on their own fight against communism. They have ample manpower to do so without our sending American men into those steaming jungles to fight for them.

In the struggle to protect the minds as well as the bodies of men from exploitation, much remains to be done. This is the task for the new leadership which those now coming from our colleges should help to provide. I ask you to do everything in your power to combat tyranny and to establish world peace. But let me caution you not to join the zealots who attempt to defend freedom with the weapons of tyranny. Always respect the right of your fellow men to speak, to argue, to disagree with you if necessary. Never forget that as Oliver Wendell Holmes said: "The best test of truth is in the market place." Let all ideas be heard—contemplated—accepted or rejected. If what you believe is right it will win, and it will withstand the test of time. If an idea is false it will not live. Test its soundness with logic, with reason, with similarity to truths universally accepted but never with force or terror.

An example was set you by a graduate named Woodrow Wilson. While he was still a young man and 22 years before he was elected President of the United States, Wilson made a commencement address at the University of Tennessee in which he explained his ideas about leadership.

He spoke of times in the life of a nation when great influences which we call causes arise and he said that on such occasions, "men of strenuous minds and high ideals" come forward as champions of a political or moral principle, defying public opinion at first but eventually winning it to their side.

"These men who stood alone at the inception of a movement and whose voices then seemed as it were," Wilson said, "the voices of men crying in the wilderness, have in reality been simply the more sensitive organs of society—the parts first awakened to consciousness of a situation."

"Leadership belong not only to the man of action, who is readily recognized by the world," said Wilson, "but also to the leaders of silent thought." He made clear, however his view that thinking on a lofty plane is not enough in itself, because "if you would be a leader of men, you must lead your generation, not the next." He therefore defined the great leader as the "deeply human man, quick to know and to do the things the hour and his nation need."

In asserting his own leadership Wilson insisted at the time of our declaration of war on Germany and throughout the war that we were the sincere friends of the German people and desired nothing so much as the early reestablishment of intimate relations of mutual advantage between us. When the war was over he continued to advocate international cooperation as exemplified in the League of Nations. Wilson convinced our allies of our good will and they supported his plan for world peace. Germany was encouraged to establish a Republic with a Constitution modeled after ours. But Wilson's own country repudiated him by refusing to join the international organization and later we, along with Great Britain and France, imposed harsh trade restrictions that strangeled German democracy in its infancy. Then, when trade wars were bringing on a worldwide depression, the United States sought to isolate itself through passage of the highest tariff in our history which made international cooperation an empty term. Thus the stage was set for another world conflict.

It is my firm conviction that Woodrow Wilson's plan to preserve the peace of the world through a league of nations could have been made to work if we had given it whole-hearted support not only in its security aspects but as a means of reestablishing "relations of mutual advantage" among nations. Realizing the bitter price we had paid for failure to adopt Wilson's plan for world peace we eagerly and enthusiastically embraced the Charter of the United Nations but again we put national sovereignty first and agreed to the Russian proposal for a veto power of members of the Security Council which Russia has since exercised over 50 times in nullifying the effectiveness of United Nations as an instrumentality for the preservation of world peace.

As a result, we were forced to join an independent military alliance, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. But the effectiveness of that organization depends upon the European Defense Community which France refuses to join, partly because she puts national sovereignty first and partly because she is unwilling to extend the hand of friendship to her traditional enemy, Germany. No one recognizes more clearly than President Eisenhower that in the midst of trade wars there can be no genuine peace in the world but this Congress is going to turn down Eisenhower's earnest plea for a restoration of mutually beneficial international trade.

If we would search our hearts to ascertain why our world leadership in behalf of peace has faltered, if indeed it has not failed, it would pay us to remember Wilson's last message to the American people. On that occasion Wilson pointed out that the chief cause of the Russian revolution was the systematic denial to the great body of Russians of the rights and privileges which all normal men desire and must have if they are to be contented and within reach of happiness. He said those who believe in the Capitalist system must ask themselves seriously whether that system has been used for the benefit of their countries and of their fellow man. He suggested that our civilization must be based on sympathy, helpfulness and a willingness to forgo self-interest in order to promote the welfare, happiness and contentment of others and the community as a whole.

"The sum of the whole matter is this," Wilson concluded, "our civilization cannot survive materially unless it be redeemed spiritually. It can be saved only by becoming permeated with the spirit of Christ and being made free and happy by the practices which spring out of that spirit. Only thus can discontent be driven out and all the shadows lifted from the road ahead."

A free world united on those principles would present to the Soviet Union a strong moral as well as physical barrier. But the keystone of the arch of international unity has been rejected by the builders. It is to the building of such an arch that the class of 1954 of Jefferson's and Wilson's school is called; "and who knoweth whether thou art come to the Kingdom for such a time as this."

Baltic Genocide Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. IRVING M. IVES

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 14, 1954

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, 13 years ago this month there was perpetrated one of the most heinous crimes against humanity known to western civilization. I refer to the brutal and infamous treatment of the people of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia at the hands of the Communist invaders.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the Record, a statement I have prepared for this anniversary of Baltic Genocide Day.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Statement by Senator Ives

There have been bitter days in the history of man which leave unforgettable scars on the conscience of humanity. Such a day occurred 13 years ago when thousands upon thousands of innocent people—Latvians, Lithuanians, Estonians—became the victims of Communist brutality. Today we have come to designate that occasion as Baltic Genocide Day. And we observe it for one reason only: in order to vow that the wrongs done on that day will be righted.

Civilized men could not live in good conscience if they were to forget or ignore the injustice Baltic Genocide Day memorializes. But to remember injustice is in itself not enough. It is important only as long as we are determined that its victims will be restored to dignity and self-respect.

This nation is dedicated to insuring freedom under God for men of good will everywhere. We shall never rest as long as that freedom is withheld. In this resolution lies the greatest hope of those Lithuanians, those Latvians, those Estonians who saw their liberty wrested away by ruthless aggressors. That liberty will be restored. It must be restored. There can be no true peace in this world until Baltic enslavement, like all enslavement, shall have been brought to an end.

Upper Colorado River Basin Reclamation Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR V. WATKINS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 14, 1954

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, there is pending before the Senate a bill having to do with the upper Colorado River Basin reclamation program. Much has been written in the press, largely by opponents of the proposed legislation, in opposition to this great project. Some southern California interests have been opposing the project. On Friday, June 11, 1954, there appeared in one of the great newspapers of Utah, the Salt Lake Tribune, an editorial on the subject. It is very well written and to the point, and I believe should be read by all Members of the Senate.

I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial, which is entitled "California Opposition to Upper Basin Plan," printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

California Opposition to Upper Basin Plan

Opposition by California water interests to the upper Colorado River Basin reclamation program—vague and hard to pin down for some time, is now growing more strident and openly hostile.

After letting the Sierra Club carry on the open fight under the banner of "Don't Violate our national parks," various southern California interests are currently attacking the upper basin plans as economically unfeasible and as inimicable to their selfish demands.

Just recently California's Colorado River Board announced opposition to the bills in Congress for setting up reclamation installations in Colorado, Utah, New Mexico, and Wyoming, branding storage plans as too costly and endangering the water supply of California. Previously the California division of water resources joined the river board in protesting that the upper basin project and related works gave "no proper or adequate consideration to the effect on lower basin developments."

However, a main reason cited by the upper basin project advocates, notably for the proposed Glen Canyon and Echo Park storage reservoirs, is to enable the upper basin States to comply with their 1922 compact with the lower basin and still be able to use some of the precious water from this last undeveloped source.

In view of past good relations between California and the other Western States which serve as a market for California products, it is unfortunate that selfish interests in the Golden State are acting to destroy many years of cooperative effort and good will. The economic health of the intermountain West is important to California, and future economic development is tied to the proposed facilities to control and store upper Colorado River water.

The upper basin disgorges into the lower basin about 90 percent of the flow of the entire river system, including more than two-thirds of the water apportioned the upper basin. Naturally some southern California water interests would be happy to have this situation continue.

The Hoover Dam and other downstream storage and irrigation works made possible rapid growth in the lower basin unparalleled in the Nation's history. Is it not fair that the upper basin States be assisted, as California has been assisted, with a reclamation program that would enable them to use a rich potential of natural resources—without taking away a drop of California's allocated water? And is not California interested in halting the siltation of Lake Mead?

In March 1945, former President Herbert Hoover wrote the following to Senator Albert Hawkes, of New Jersey:

"As you know, I had the honor to be chairman of the Colorado River Commission which settled the Colorado River compact in 1922 and other matters relating to the development of the river. And during the following years I had many duties involving these questions. * * * In 1922 there was general agreement that the allocation of 7,500,000 acre-feet per annum to the upper basin would be more than ample to meet its ultimate requirements. * * * It is now realized that the allocation will fall far short of ultimate needs of the upper basin. * * * In 1922 the compact requirement that the upper States never deplete the flow of the river to less than 75 million acre-feet in any 10-year period, was not considered burdensome. Studies now available show that to meet this obligation the upper States will have to provide at least 20 million acre-feet of holdover storage to be used during the low flow periods, comparable to 1931–40, or lacking storage, will have to limit their use to about 64 percent of their allocation, in order to make available the 75 million acre-feet at Lee Ferry."

In other words the Colorado River flow failed to measure up to the estimate from sparse records available at the time of the 1922 compact. However, regulation of the river and its tributaries, as provided in the upper basin program, would facilitate allocation of water from the stream to both the lower and upper basins according to the compact provisions. Some California interests seem to be trying to torpedo this solemn agreement.

As the issues of the river controversy emerge in clear light, the upper basin States should realize the peril that confronts them and present a more united front to the interests that would block future development of this region.

Marland for Vice President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MATTHEW M. NEELY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 14, 1954

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an interesting editorial by Col. C. E. Smith, which appeared in the Fairmont Times on the 5th day of May. It suggests that West Virginia's able, liberal Democratic Governor, William C. Marland, be nominated by his party in 1956 for Vice President of the United States.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Marland for Vice President

From the growing confidence of the Democratic Party that the election of 1956 will mark the retirement of the Republicans from the control of the Government, voices are already being raised in West Virginia for a greater participation on the part of the local democracy in the affairs of the national party.

Our State, it is pointed out, came through the debacle of 1952 with flying colors as not only to attract the favorable attention of the national party leadership but also to raise the question of a fuller recognition of West Virginia in national affairs. Among other things, the question has been asked in Washington and elsewhere if our youthful and able Governor might not be receptive to the nomination for Vice President.

It must be remembered that, in addition to West Virginia's election in 1952, when Mr. Marland won his impressive victory in the face of the Eisenhower landslide, he has been extremely active in his participation in party conclaves throughout the country. From these appearances the word has spread about that he is a forecful speaker, a natural leader, and a man of much personal charm. In these circumstances it is only to be expected that he would be looked upon as a man with a future, but to be prominently mentioned for the vice presidential nomination more than 2 years before the national convention assembles, and when victory is in the air, is unusual and most flattering.

As time passes, the story of West Virginia's victory in 1952 has been an interesting study for the political strategists. The best answer that can be found is that it was an almost normal victory for the Democrats and a stunning defeat for the Republicans.

Today the greatest danger to the Democrats is overconfidence, but the fact that in national political circles West Virginia no longer is looked upon as being a "small State with too few electoral votes" should give greater confidence to the party leadership that bigger and better things are in store, and that the very mention of the name of West Virginia in 1956 may be an inspiration to the democracy of the whole country.

Whitten's Talk Dims Repeal Chances

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK E. SMITH
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 28, 1954

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, Representative JAMIE L. WHITTEN's testimony on the Whitten rider before the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee last week should go a long way toward dispelling some of the confusion about this law which seems to exist.

Under unanimous consent, I include an account from the Washington Daily News of Mr. WHITTEN's testimony:

WHITTEN'S TALK DIMS REPEAL CHANCES

(By John Cramer)

In an impressive display of persuasiveness, Representative JAMIE L. WHITTEN, Democrat, of Mississippi, apparently has talked the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee into opposing repeal of his Whitten rider, with its restrictions on Government personnel actions.

He did it yesterday in a 2-hour appearance at a committee hearing on the Senate-approved Federal employee fringe benefit bill, which, among other things, would repeal the rider.

And his successful eloquence greatly dimmed the once-bright outlook for repeal.

It's possible that other witnesses will outtalk the persuasive Mr. WHITTEN, and change the committee's mind, at additional hearings, scheduled for today and next week.

But at this point, the odds are strongly against it.

Strongest witnesses against the rider at the coming session will be representatives of the big veterans organizations.

Federal employee unions are increasingly lukewarm in their opposition.

And Civil Service Commission, which will speak the administration's case against the rider, had the ground most thoroughly cut out from under it by Mr. WHITTEN's testimony yesterday.

By the time he had finished, every committee member had complimented him on his presentation. Not one member had spoken up against the rider. None had so much as raised a critical question.

And several said frankly that Mr. WHITTEN had changed their minds.

CSC BLAMED

The burden of his argument was that all the faults of the rider actually were Civil Service Commission faults—and none the fault of the rider itself.

The Commission, he charged, has misinterpreted and distorted the rider in every conceivable way.

He said it did this initially getting President Truman to issue an Executive order which went far beyond the actual rider in the restrictions it placed on Government personnel transactions.

And he said it continues, to this day, to use its powers to make the rider as unworkable as possible—while refusing to do the things which would make it work.

LIMITS APPOINTMENTS

In its present form, the rider limits the number of permanent appointments to the level of September 1, 1950; permits only indefinite appointments for former permanent employees who are reinstated in Government; allows employees to be promoted only once a year and no more than one grade at a time, though with power to Civil Service Commission to grant exceptions to both restrictions; and permits agencies to grant permanent promotions only if the number of permanent employees in any grade will not be raised above the level of September 1, 1950.

Mr. WHITTEN contended that these restrictions are far less restrictive than their opponents claim—if only the Commission would attempt to make the rider work.

He said:

The overwhelming majority of his mail from Federal workers in the last few months has been against repeal of the rider.

The rider came into being in the first place only because the Commission failed to adopt emergency regulations to meet the Korean emergency.

While the rider merely limited permanent employees in Government to the September 1, 1950 level, the Commission got President Truman to issue an executive order which had the effect of prohibiting all new permanent appointments. As a result, he claimed Federal agencies now have 265,000 indefinite jobs which could be filled on a permanent basis.

It's only through the rider that re-employment rights are guaranteed to workers who transfer from nondefense to defense agencies.

Although the original rider specified that the postal field service should be exmpted from its provisions, Congress had to "order" the Commission to make this exemption effective.

It's only through the rider that jobs vacated by employees called to military duty get a full guaranty of reemployment. (The Selective Service Act guarantees them the right to return to jobs of like seniority status and pay. The rider provides that the jobs they vacate can be filled only on a temporary basis.)

The present version of the rider contains every single modification requested by the Commission.

The Commission consistently has "ministerpreted" the rider. As an example, Mr. WHITTEN cited a rider clause providing that the employee must serve at least a year before promotion to a higher grade. The Commission, he said revised this, by regulation, to provide that the year's service must be "immediately preceding" promotion. Thereby it worked a hardship on employees with broken service which might have qualified them.

None of the rider's provisions are completely rigid. All have built-in machinery for special cases—machinery, he charged which the Commission has failed to use.

Mr. WHITTEN made much of his claim that the rider "protects employee rights," a statement which many workers will challenge.

He said he would not object to further revision of the legislation to give individual agencies 10 to 15 percent leeway in their ceilings on permanent appointments.

But should Congress repeal the rider this year, he said, he will go back next year and ask that it be tied to individual agency appropriation bills.

Jay County Auto Dealers Pay in Silver Dollars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN V. BEAMER
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 14, 1954

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, the Jay County (Ind.) newspapers recently carried another evidence of the workings of the free enterprise system. A group of automobile dealers in Jay County jointly advertised their contribution to the economy of their community. In an advertisement dated June 9 they proudly point out what they contribute to their county.

They provide:

First. Employment for 126 persons whose dependents number 324, or a total of 450 people who depend on the automobile business for their living. Nearly 60 percent of these people own their own homes, and all are good citizens who live, work and trade in Jay County.

Second. Annual payroll of half-million dollars. The total wages paid by the 12 members of the Jay County Auto Association were $514,024.

Third. Tax dollars for local needs. Annually thousands of dollars in taxes are paid by these dealers on real estate, personal property and inventory, providing funds to build streets and highways, to operate the schools and to provide adequate police and fire protection to the citizens. Every dollar contributes to a better Jay County.

On Saturday, June 12, these 12 automobile dealers paid their employees in silver dollars. Many of these dollars naturally found their way into the various retail channels in that community and thus the part played by that one industry could be identified and recognized by the flow of silver dollars into cash registers. This idea also emphasizes the fact that these dealers do their own promotion and sales work without Government subsidies to aid them. Is this not a further tribute to their industry?

Under unanimous consent, I enclose a news article describing this unusual event from the June 10 issue of the Portland (Ind.) Commercial-Review:

SHADES OF THE OLD WEST—COUNTY AUTO DEALERS TO PAY IN SILVER DOLLARS

Jay County pockets and cash registers will have silver linings this weekend when 12 county auto dealers pay their employees' weekly wages in silver dollars.

These dealers, members of the Jay County Automobile Dealers Association, are paying in silver dollars to call to the attention of citizens and businessmen of the area the important role their firms play in the economic life of the county.

With an annual payroll in excess of a half-million dollars ($514,024) and with a total of 126 persons employed, the 12 business firms are equivalent to a fair-sized manufacturing operation.

Actually, the employees and their families would populate a good-size community. The 450 persons whose livelihood depend on the auto dealers would compose a community larger than Bryan (332), half as big as Geneva (966), and nearly as large as Pennville (596). In addition, this community would be made up of approximately 60 percent home owners, for 75 of the 126 persons employed in Jay County dealerships own their own homes.

In addition to the nearly $10,000 weekly payroll, the auto dealers contribute quite a sum in taxes, which helps maintain roads, streets, schools, fire, and police protection and other county and local functions. And, many thousands of dollars annually are expended with other local firms for services and supplies.

According to Ed Maitlen, president of the Jay County Automobile Dealers Association, the dealers are using this method to call to the people's attention the fact that these firms do account for a large portion of the dollars that flow through local trade channels. "If a new factory came to town," stated Mr. Maitlen, "employing 126 workers with an annual payroll of a half-million dollars and with an investment in plant and equipment of several hundred thousand dollars, everyone would be overjoyed. We're simply taking this means to show that our business operations are equivalent to such a factory."

Mr. Maitlen added, "Actually, many other allied retail businesses in the county could come up with similar figures, such as the implement dealers, the feed dealers, the grocery stores, and others. Too many times, in our search for something bigger and better, we have a tendency to overlook the basic foundation upon which a good, solid community is built * * * the hundreds of small retail and services stores that take care of our everyday needs."

So, when you see or receive as change some of those big silver "cartwheels" this coming Saturday, think of the automobile dealers of Jay County, their employees, and the nearly $10,000 per week they contribute to the economic life of the community.

Members of the Jay County Automobile Dealers Association who are cooperating in this event are H. S. Barkman, Inc., Crown City Chevrolet, and Huggins Auto Sales, all of Dunkirk, and the following Portland auto dealers, Ford Bros. Pontiac, Hardy Chevrolet Sales, Harshman Motor Sales, Heniser Motor Sales, Jay Motor Sales, Maitlen-Theurer Motors, Vernon Schmidt Garage, Sheffer Implement Co., and Wehrly Motor Sales.

Portland and Dunkirk banks have cooperated by ordering the necessary amount in silver dollars.

Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag in the House of Representatives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER HOLTZMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 14, 1954

Mr. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing in the House of Representatives a resolution which would amend the rules of the House to provide that the pledge of allegiance to the flag shall be made by the Members at the beginning of each day's session, immediately after the prayer by the Chaplain.

Our flag has been our inspiration since its adoption in 1777, and to us and to the peoples outside our borders it symbolizes the American way of life.

Each year on Flag Day we honor our national emblem, and once again dedicate ourselves to the ideals it represents. Our young men have fought and died on many fields to uphold the heritage of our flag, and at the moment we are engaged in a bitter fight against communism, both here and abroad. We must not, and will not, accept any foreign ideologies which would be contrary to our fundamental concepts of democracy, and which would dishonor our flag.

Many of our school children start their day with the salute to the flag, and numerous civic and patriotic organizations begin their meetings with the pledge to the flag.

We here in the House are the elected Representatives of the people, and I believe that it would be most fitting for us to start each session with the pledge of allegiance, thus giving public indication of our belief in the flag, and "the Republic for which it stands." For that reason I have introduced this resolution, and I trust that it will be favorably considered by the appropriate committee.

Facing Up to the Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. WATTS

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 14, 1954

Mr. WATTS. Mr. Speaker, the following guest editorial in the Cynthiana Democrat is based on the remarks made by Miss Jo Boswell, daughter of County Judge and Mrs. W. E. Boswell, of Cynthiana, and was given by Miss Boswell as valedictorian at the annual class-day program. It, in my opinion, presents the problems facing the world today as seen through the eyes of American youth who are completing their high-school courses and who, in a few short years, will assume the responsibilities of voters and citizens in this great country of ours. Her thoughts, views, and opinions on the challenge offered to herself and thousands like her constitute a very novel and interesting approach, and I think it one of the most interesting viewpoints from the standpoint of our youth of today that I have ever read. I am sure that it will reaffirm our faith and confidence in the young people of our country. The depth of perception and the willingness to meet the challenge of the future as typified by Miss Boswell's statement are, indeed, reassuring that the future of our country will be safe in the hands of the youth of America.

The editorial follows:

FACING UP TO THE FUTURE

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The following editorial is based upon remarks made by Miss Jo Boswell, valedictorian of the class of 1954, Cynthiana High School, at the class day program, last week. Miss Boswell, at the invitation of the Democrat, has revised her notes for use in our editorial columns.)

As young people of today we look forward not to taking our place in a settled, untroubled world, but a world complex and frightening. However, a world that could aptly be called challenging.

If you were taking a survey and walked up to any average man to ask what sort of a world he would want to live in, no doubt he would describe a perfect world, not unlike the garden of Eden, a Utopia with no cares, problems, and fears. A world where there was no strife and everyone lived in harmony. He would probably, in time, refer to the good old days, when things were different and life was leisurely. After receiving an answer like this, which would not be unusual, I would probably astonish the man by telling him that I like the world as it is today. In fact, I like living in this century. I like the world with its plans, experiments, hopes, and dreams. I like to feel that I am a part of something greater and more wonderful than has ever been known to man. Science, industry, and knowledge are moving forward in steps formerly termed "impossible" and "unbelievable," man has opened new outlets on life that were unheard of a century ago. I know that there are many dangers today, greater and more threatening than ever before. But I think that present day youth does not fear that so much. We have been prepared for it, perhaps better than any other preceding generation and I fully believe that we will be able to cope with this world, with its suspense, drama, and problems.

I also think that the world is not nearly as bad as people would like to believe. Similar instances in history have happened before, and will undoubtedly happen again. In spite of all the seemingly useless strife and arguing, this century is still the broadest, most exciting, and most promising of all. Who would exchange the "good old days," and whatever they represent, for our world today? After careful consideration, I believe none of us would. Because, actually, those days never existed. There has never been a time when man could, with a clean conscience, sit around and let events take their course. It has been done, and affairs have ended up in a muddle. But that is not the case today. We have able men, ready and willing to lead our country, and people who believe in their country and for what it stands. Perhaps this belief is not obvious because it has never been tested, but it is there. If we did not have able leaders and citizens then there would indeed be ample cause for worry.

I hope that the world will always have problems to be patched, solved, or mended. That is what makes life worth living. A worthwhile life is not lived when one sits around dreaming of what should be, or could be, or ought to be, but a wrothwhile life is when one gets out and actually does something about it, to the best of his ability. If all the leaders in government just threw up their hands in despair, you can easily see what would happen. But when people who believe in their government and their leaders work together, a powerful nation is the result Of course there will always be many seemingly insoluble problems, just as there are now. But with a world of such complexity and scope as that in which we are living today we can never be complacent, and our lives will be worth living because each of us, in our own small way, can contribute something good and worthwhile to a troubled world, and I truly think we will.

Our Flag and Our Duty To Defend It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1954

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, on June 14, 1777, Congress enacted a resolution recognizing the red, white, and blue ensign of the American colonies as the official flag of the United States. In the ensuing 177 years a total of 35 stars have been added to the original 13 and we are looking forward to the day when more will appear to herald the admission of other American territories into our union of States.

Old Glory has become steeped in hallowed tradition in those eight score and seventeen years since it was first raised over this land of the free. Many millions of our sons have traveled to the four corners of the globe in defense of our national ensign and the principles for which it stands. American blood has colored the soil of both continents in order that our flag would never be tainted.

Despite these heroic sacrifices, however, our flag today is faced with the most serious threat that has existed in all its history. Spawned in the Kremlin and nurtured in part by some of the very men who have enjoyed the comfort and security of the Stars and Stripes, the plans to supplant our national banner with the hammer and sickle have progressed to a point where it has become necessary for every loyal American to join in unprecedented effort to prevent their fruition.

Many of the traitors in our Government who contributed to the relentless siege of communism against those institutions symbolized by our flag have now been routed from their positions of responsibility; yet those who have thus far escaped the extermination process can still inflict incalculable harm by obstruction of the new American program if not by direct furtherance of the plans designed to implant the Red standard on America's shores. And as the danger from without grows more ominous with each stride of Red boots onto free soil, I think that it is vital on this memorable occasion to inspect every part of that bulwark on which we depend for national security. I therefore take this opportunity to review in brief the one phase of our defense structure over which the shadows of doubt and confusion continue to hover. I speak of our foreign trade policy and its effect on the security of this Nation.

Not so many years ago, when the Soviet influence first began to penetrate our State Department, Red conspirators posing as medicine men for our economic ills, concocted a venomous potion which was fashioned to dilute United States industrial strength. Peddled as reciprocal-trade agreements, the prescription sounded innocent enough and, in fact, might have proved innocuous if properly prescribed. By anesthetizing the populace through soothing propaganda, however, the dose was gradually increased until a large segment of our economic system was affected.

In the course of a score of years, America's vitality has been seriously weakened. Giving full access of our east-coast markets to foreign residual oil has seriously crippled our normally healthy coal industry. Excessive imports of foreign-made products have created wholesale unemployment in our highly important glass industry. Scores of other basic industries are likewise feeling the impact of unfair foreign competition.

Because this Nation has waded so deeply into the sea of intrigue dredged and filled to the brim by conspirators functioning in our own Nation's Capital in collusion with their kin in the Kremlin, some of our most distinguished and most loyal statesmen have resigned themselves to the philosophy that there is no turning back. They hope and pray that by keeping our course steady as we go perhaps over the horizon we shall eventually reach that isle where justice and reward provide a haven for all honest voyagers. A laudable objective, Mr. Speaker, but one that cannot be achieved in this season of dangerous squalls and mounting waves of international dissension. Davey Jones' locker has claimed many a well-meaning and unsuspecting seafarer not alert to dangers en route.

As of this time—Flag Day, 1954—there is heavy unemployment in the coal-mining and glass-manufacturing communities of my State of Pennsylvania. One of the primary reasons for this condition is the foreign-trade policy which was embarked upon in 1934 and indiscreetly pursued for these many years.

I insist that only by altering our course can we hope to revive our industrial strength to the level that will be required to defend our country against further encroachment by the forces of communism. I contend that it is dangerously unwise for Congress to permit the unnecessary deterioration of the coal and glass industries to continue, for I believe that these American industries are vital to the protection of the flag which we honor here today.

Pull Leather, Podners, the Pony Express Rides Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DOUGLAS R. STRINGFELLOW

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 11, 1954

Mr. STRINGFELLOW. Mr. Speaker, we in the West have many historic landmarks and traditions of which we are justifiably proud. One of the most memorable occurrences which helped to link the East and West was the advent of the famous Pony Express. This year in order to reconstruct a little bit of the nostalgia of the Old West an event will occur which I believe worthy to be called to the attention of all Members of Congress. I quote from an announcement from the office of the public relations director, Ogden Junior Chamber of Commerce, Ogden, Utah:

> One of the Nation's most exciting and thrilling eras, the Pony Express, comes to life again June 14 through 16, when riders of the Weber County mounted sheriff's posse, of Ogden, Utah, and riders of the Wyandotte County mounted sheriff's posse, of Kansas City, Kans., reenact a 600-mile mail run under the sponsorship of their respective junior chamber of commerce organizations.
>
> Several months ago, the Odgen Jaycees conceived the idea and hurled a challenge at the Kansas City Jaycees to run against time and each other to Colorado Springs, Colo., site of the National Junior Chamber of Commerce Convention, which convenes in that Colorado city, June 14 to 19.
>
> At high noon, Monday, June 14, beautiful Maurene Parker, Miss Utah, assisted by Gov. J. Bracken Lee, Mayor Raymond S. Wright, his council, Jaycee and senior chamber of commerce officials, will cut the tape to send the first rider thundering on his first lap of a grueling day and night ride—the Kansas City riders will start 2 hours later, due to a difference in time.
>
> Each rider will ride approximately 3 miles at top speed. He then hands a pair of elaborately hand-tooled leather saddle bags to a fellow posse expressman who travels at top speed to the next way station. The Odgen posse will use 43 riders and horses with each pair making 4 to 5 rides during the course of the race.
>
> The saddle bags will contain 49 letters, the same number as carried by the original first Pony Express rider. The letters include one from President Eisenhower and one from each of the governors of the 48 States.
>
> The Railway Express Agency, modern counterpart of the Pony Express, has made its offices in each of the cities along the route available for use as a way station and mail exchange point. The agency has also constructed an elaborate display board at Colorado Springs where the progress of the race will be charted every 4 to 5 hours.
>
> Stamp collectors throughout the Nation have already requested souvenir cachets of the event which are available by writing to the Ogden Junior Chamber of Commerce, box 1363, Ogden, Utah. Collectors are asked to send 10 cents and a 3-cent stamp to cover the cost of handling.
>
> Both posses will be attempting to beat the old Pony Express record of 10.6 miles per hour for an extended run and thus set a new world's record. Riding with the posse to record and verify the event will be representatives of Life magazine, national television shows, and all the leading news services.
>
> To all those persons participating in this Pony Express project we wish good luck and God speed. To our many friends gathered at Colorado Springs, Colo., to participate in the National Junior Chamber of Commerce Convention, June 14 through 19, we send our greetings and sincere wishes for an outstanding meeting and success in the year ahead.

The W. A. Sheaffer Pen Co.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS E. MARTIN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 14, 1954

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, the W. A. Sheaffer Pen Co., which I am proud to say, has its main plant located in my district, has just completed the best year in its long history. Back in 1913, when Mr. Sheaffer founded the company, its products were sold by less than 500 dealers in a mere half dozen States. Today, Sheaffer merchandise is sold in every county in the United States and in all foreign countries outside the Iron Curtain. The company has plants in Canada, our good neighbor to the north, and has other plants as far away as Australia.

The company was one of the first to share its profits with employees; and has paid out more than $12,700,000 in profit sharing since the plan began in 1934.

Sales last year exceeded the $25 million mark, largest in the company's history and the largest domestic volume of all manufacturers in the writing equipment industry.

Mr. Sheaffer's letter of April 23, 1954, to the stockholders takes a crack at the prophets of doom who talk fearfully of recession and business declines and cites reasons why his company plans to face the future with complete confidence. His letter is so informative and illuminating that I include it in the Appendix of the Record:

W. A. Sheaffer Pen Co.,
Fort Madison, Iowa, April 23, 1954.

To Our Shareholders and Employees:

The fiscal year ended February 28, 1954, was a good year for your company. I hope that after seeing this report you will agree it was a year of real progress.

You may be gratified to know that the company's greatest rate of progress was in the second half of the year when the Nation's business, as a whole, seemed to be marking time before advancing to meet economic conditions different from those of the past 10 years.

Net sales last year reached $25,161,532, the largest in our history and the largest domestic volume of all manufacturers in the writing instrument industry. Our net income was $2,252,942, an increase of 16.5 percent over the preceding year. Our overall financial condition is sound and healthy.

During the year the new Snorkel fountain pen backed by the heaviest promotion in the company's 41-year experience, achieved great sales success. That success inspires high hopes for continuing good sales in the coming year.

Your company entered a new field of business a few months ago by establishing its tool and die division. Already, having attracted industrial customers from throughout the Nation, that venture gives indication of being a good investment. It is this investment, incidentally, that is primarily responsible for the increase in our plant and property account.

In the pages that follow you will find more detailed information on those accomplishments and the other activities of the company during the past year. As I complete my first year as president of your company I welcome this opportunity to give credit for the accomplishments of 1953 to those to whom it belongs, the people—all the people—who make up the company.

During my first year in the job, I obtained great reassurance from the realization that it's pretty difficult for a company comprising the kind of people who are your company to go in any direction but forward. To me, the company is those at the bench and the desk; those in our management group; those who make our products and sell them; and certainly you stockholders whose confidence and faith in this company give to all who work for you a personal satisfaction in our work—a determination to achieve greater economic and human satisfactions for all connected with the company.

Reviewing your company's progress in 1953, I cannot help feeling optimistic about the future.

Much has been said these past months about possible recessions, business declines, and leveling off. In my opinion, the prophets of doom who talk so fearfully, merely help to create—through the fears and doubts they instill—the very conditions they fear.

Some say the American economy is due for a setback because there no longer is a war-created backlog of demand, because the dollar is gaining stability, and because we won't be having such huge expenditures for munitions of war. What they are really saying is that our industrial economy isn't dynamic enough or forceful enough or enterprising enough to get along without bloodshed, without pump-priming and without injections of artificial financial stimulants.

The gloom spreaders seem to be singing the economic blues simply because industry, for the first time in many years, is faced with good, old-fashioned competition and the need for hard selling. And they're afraid industry can't take it.

In my book, the kind of conditions they moan about are exactly the kind of conditions that bring out the best in our free enterprise economy. America grew to greatness under such conditions.

Today there are more customers than ever before, wages are higher than ever before, the national income is greater than ever before, people have more money to spend than ever before. Industry is being permitted to operate in a more favorable economic and political climate than in the past 20 years. All this presents to our industrial economy a wonderful and challenging opportunity. I am confident this opportunity won't be muffed.

As far as your own company is concerned, I know our people won't muff their chance—a chance to make more sales records, better products, more efficient methods of production and distribution, and more happiness and prosperity for those upon whom our hopes depend.

In closing, I record, with deepest sorrow and regret, the tragic death of vice president and director Grant F. Olson who was killed in a plane crash in Singapore on March 13 while on a business trip for our company. During the 25 years he was with us, Grant made many invaluable contributions to the progress of this company and the community. His fine leadership and warm friendship have left an indelible mark on the pages of Sheaffer history.

Respectfully yours,
W. A. Sheaffer II,
President.

Flag Day, 1954

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 14, 1954

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, one of the many Flag Day observances sponsored by the Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks was held in Altoona, Pa., Sunday, June 13, 1954, under the auspices of my home lodge, No. 102, BPOE.

It was my privilege to deliver the principal address, which follows:

Address Delivered by Hon. James E. Van Zandt, Member of Congress, 20th District of Pennsylvania, at the Flag Day Celebration Sponsored by Altoona Lodge, No. 102, Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks, Altoona, Pa., Sunday, June 13, 1954

It is with great pride and honor that I join with my brother Elks of Altoona Lodge, No. 102, on this memorable occasion in celebrating the 177th anniversary of the birth of Old Glory.

It is appropriate for the Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks to observe the celebration of Flag Day by urging an awakening of the spirit of good old-fashioned Americanism.

It is likewise fitting and proper for the Elks to take leadership in such patriotic exercises since the Elks is a typical American society whose members believe in Almighty God and loyalty to the stars and stripes.

You will find on the altar of every Elks Lodge the Holy Bible, the Antlers of Elkdom, and the American flag.

Collectively they signify patriotism, love of country, brotherhood, devotion to God, tolerance, and goodwill.

Thus we may be proud of our membership in the Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks.

It was June 14, 1777, that the Continental Congress of the United States proclaimed the stars and stripes the official flag of the new Nation.

On that day the Congress of the United States gave to the world a banner of liberty, a promise of justice and tolerance for all men who would yield it allegiance.

That banner of liberty, the American flag, has waved in greater glory with each succeeding year.

It has been a symbol of hope and promise not only to those who dwell under its protection but to the downtrodden and oppressed in many lands.

Its meaning has grown ever dearer, its significance deeper to those who believe in freedom for all men.

What is this freedom about which we speak?

As youngsters in school we saw the word in history textbooks and heard it from our teachers.

The word became familiar to us but the meaning seemed vague.

Later on we read it in Fourth of July editorials and listened to orators talking about it.

What does freedom really mean?

Freedom means a lot of things.

It means you can live the way you want to live and believe the things you want to believe as long as you do not interfere with the rights of your neighbor.

It means you can be a Democrat or a Republican or belong to no party at all.

It means you can go to church on Sunday morning or stay in bed.

And if you go to church you can attend any one you choose.

It means you can write a letter to the editor of your newspaper about what you think is wrong with the country and he can print it without fear of being thrown into jail.

If you want to belong to an organization you are free to join.

You can stand up before people and express your opinions.

Freedom means the opportunity to create your own future to be president of a multimillion-dollar corporation or to occupy a humble position in life with equal dignity.

And in either job you can have pride in your work and the dignity of honest labor.

You can go to college any college you choose and study any subject you like.

You can be a doctor lawyer merchant or farmer.

Of if you have discovered the secret which eludes the rest of us you can spend most of your time just doing nothing.

Freedom means that you live in a country that is governed by laws that say you are the equal of your fellow man regardless of your religion, political creed, or the color of your skin.

It means you cannot be seized and thrown into jail without trial by jury.

It means that you have a voice in the government and that you and your fellow citizens control both the laws of the land and the men who administer them.

As free men we have all these rights and privileges and many more.

Because we have enjoyed them all our lives they seem ordinary, yes, just commonplace things.

But the rights and privileges we take for granted have been denied to the people in many other countries.

Some of them have enjoyed freedom only to have it snatched from their grasp.

Others have never had it.

Our flag symbolizes freedom purchased with blood and sacrifice and envied by oppressed peoples everywhere.

Old Glory is also a symbol of strength—the strength of brave men and self-sacrificing women.

It has been held high with courage on battlefields all over the world.

Many men have died for it.

Many others have lived for it their whole existence devoted to the preservation of the ideas for which it stands.

What a remarkable thing it is that a piece of brightly colored cloth can mean so much to so many people.

Is there some magic in the pattern or color combination of our flag that has made it so glorious and so enduring?

It could not be the pattern or the color that gives Old Glory its grandeur.

Many of us have seen our flag on the battlefields torn by bullets and faded by the sun.

The pattern was distorted and the color was almost gone but the glory was undimmed.

Our flag is glorious because generations of Americans have endeavored to glorify the principles for which it stands.

When the Continental Congress officially adopted the Stars and Stripes for the United States our Nation was small and weak.

It could not match the European nations in wealth and power.

Its future appeared uncertain.

The Stars and Stripes was a mere upstart flag among the standards of the mighty.

Behind the flag, however, was a new ideal—new and yet as old as the Ten Commandments.

The men who had the courage to raise it by the side of flags of powerful nations were inspired by a vision.

They looked into the future and beheld a land where liberty was triumphant and all men walked as equals.

They saw that land becoming the greatest and most powerful in the world pointing the way toward a better and finer mode of life.

These heroic men with their inspired vision gave the American flag its first touch of glory.

That glory was increased in 1787 when the Constitutional Convention gave to the new Nation a Constitution guaranteeing every citizen the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Our flag thus became more than the symbol of an ideal, a dream, a vision.

It told the world that here was a people with the courage to live by their ideals, a people who had secured for themselves and their descendants the blessings of freedom.

Before many years had passed, however, the struggling young Nation, with its new way of life, was put to the acid test.

A Civil War threatened its very existence.

How our Nation met that test and came forth triumphant we all know.

Out of the strife and chaos of Civil War there emerged a Union even stronger than before because its strength had been tried and proved.

The Stars and Stripes became even more glorious and inspiring.

The years that followed brought still more trials and tribulations to the growing Nation, but from each crisis the United States came forth with its flag flying higher.

And all this time men were working, sacrificing, fighting, and dying to make the Nation great.

Our flag was challenged again in the Spanish-American War.

The call to defend it was answered by thousands of Americans willing to shed their blood to prevent desecration of the emblem they loved.

The gallant dead of the Spanish-American War and the living veterans of that conflict gave their touch of glory to our flag.

Thrice more in a generation—in World War I, World War II, and the Korean war—the finest young men of the Nation offered their lives for our flag.

Added to the sacrifice of the men who fought for Old Glory on the world's battlefields was the sacrifice and devotion of those who did what they could on the home front.

Each of these groups contributed to the glory of the Stars and Stripes.

And so it has been down through the years.

Countless people have had a share in making the American flag what it is today.

Soldiers, statesmen, and plain everyday citizens, even as you and I, have fashioned our flag.

The great and the humble, rich and poor, men and women have had a hand in it.

Therefore, as we observe Flag Day we are paying tribute to the most honored and respected national symbol in the entire world.

It represents to us both an ideal way of life and the heroic efforts of millions of men to make that ideal a living reality.

Thus we are honoring not a bit of cloth of red, white, and blue but the spirit of America.

As we salute our national emblem on the 177th anniversary of its birth, it behooves us to ponder and recall that throughout the history of the world mighty nations have risen and fallen.

Many nations at the peak of their power and prestige became careless, indifferent, and corrupt, which led to their eventual downfall.

While America occupies an enviable position in the family of nations to maintain it we should never forget the lessons of history and the fate of once mighty nations.

Therefore to preserve our country and the American way of life we must be eternally vigilant.

In short, we owe to our Nation and our flag the same ceaseless devotion and patriotic fervor that our forefathers conceived as their solemn obligations.

Yes, a devotion and patriotic fervor which enabled them to bequeath to us a Nation described by Abraham Lincoln as "conceived in liberty, and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal."

Ladies and gentlemen, it is easy to relax as a nation and be lulled to sleep by the idea that our freedom and peace are always secure.

If we adopt such a listless attitude and frame of mind we may awaken one day to find that while we were sleeping our enemies have been busy.

Yes; busy in carrying out their sinister plans to destroy our form of government.

We may find to our dismay that tyranny will have supplanted liberty, and that injustice will reign in its place.

Make no mistake about it, our beloved Nation is facing the most critical period in its history during this hydrogen-atomic age.

While we, as a nation, sincerely pursue the elusive phantom of world peace, we find that the burning desire for tranquillity among the family of nations has, because of the activities of Soviet Russia, become an almost hopeless goal.

Adm. Robert B. Carney, Chief of Naval Operations, confirms that fact when in a recent address he frankly stated that America is rapidly approaching the crossroad of a fight to the finish with Russia.

Admiral Carney, without any resort to high-sounding phrases, points the finger at Russia and identifies her as our relentless foe.

In reviewing his timely remarks, we must realize that we, as a nation, are playing into the hands of Soviet Russia when we accept her plan of fighting fringe engagements all over the world in the mistaken notion that we are containing communism.

The truth, ladies and gentlemen, is that these Kremlin-inspired fringe conflicts are Russia's plan of fighting wars by proxy.

Meanwhile she stands on the sidelines and gleefully watches as the free world yields mile by mile, nation by nation.

Let us not forget that Moscow is calling the signals and piping the tune in freedom's dance of death.

Ladies and gentlemen, the blunt truth is that, as a nation, we have been sacrificing the blood of American youth and our national resources (a) not in resisting Red China as such; (b) North Korea as such; (c) or the Communists of Indochina as such.

The cold fact is that Russia is our arch enemy and the conquests in which we have been involved are fought by stooges for the Soviet Union in furtherance of her conspiracy for world conquest.

Frankly, we as a nation, must face the truth.

We must realize that Russia is the real enemy at our gates.

We must realize that it is pointless to sacrifice American blood and substance in fighting the Kremlin's series of wars by proxy.

There is no doubt that the average American and the citizens of the free world are sick and tired of Russia's role as an enemy of world peace.

We are fed up with her intrigue, her lying, and her insults.

Surely we have had more than enough of Communist infiltration and her design of espionage and sabotage suffered under the guise of friendship, diplomatic relations, and immunity.

We are sick, weary, and disgusted to the breaking point with gestures of negotiation and conference each of which is a new sounding board for Soviet deceit and the frustration of every peaceful design.

Surely we do not have to be convinced, after present and past experiences, that Russia is our potent enemy.

We know this to be an undeniable fact and with such knowledge it is inviting national suicide to adopt a lukewarm attitude with respect to our duties and obligations as liberty-loving Americans.

The issue before us as a nation is clear cut.

Stating it in terms of national emblems, the question is which shall we have, the Star-Spangled Banner of the United States, or the hammer and sickle of Soviet Russia?

There should be no difficulty in selecting the flag which most truthfully represents the desires of all men.

One glance at the Red, White, and Blue, our National Emblem, should be enough to stir the blood of every loyal American citizen into a tightfisted resolve that we are here to remain freemen forever.

Yes; it might be well for us to repeat in 1954 the toast given by the American patriot, Stephen Decatur, 138 years ago, when he declared: "Our country, in her intercourse with foreign nations, may she always be in the right, but our country right or wrong."

What Stephen Decatur said should be the attitude of all red-blooded Americans and especially those of us who enjoy membership in the Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks.

On this Flag Day of 1954 I can think of no better means of rededicating ourselves to an awakening of good old-fashioned Americanism than to say in unison:

"May our country always be right, but, right or wrong, we shall defend forever this Nation and its glorious emblem, the Star and Stripes of America."

Good News for 1954

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 14, 1954

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following extract from a broadcast on May 17, 1954 by

Henry J. Taylor, entitled, "Good News for 1954":

ANNOUNCER. Mr. Taylor, can you bring us up to date on the present state of business?

Mr. TAYLOR. Some place in here the prophets of doom certainly should have something to answer for. Beginning last September with their frightening and persistent talk of depression, depression, depression, the whole country was supposed to be flat on its back by now. Yet, as I have tried to say so often, this country was made for faith, not fear.

PROSPECTS FOR 1954

In fact, a number of persons who follow the realities of the economic situation with a careful eye, see indications that 1954, this year, can be the second most prosperous year in our Nation's history, exceeded only by 1953.

If that trend continues, the prophets of doom will find it difficult to make the public believe that the second best year in history is a depression year.

If that were true, by analogy, you would have to say that Vice President NIXON is a failure in life just because he is not President.

So, it's very important to look at the facts, and not the doom propaganda.

THE FACTS ABOUT EMPLOYMENT

During the all-out war effort in 1945, there were 58 million employed. Was that a depression?

Today there are 60½ million people at work. There were 58½ million employed in 1950, when things were considered booming.

May I repeat, there are 60½ million people employed today. I re-emphasize this because we hear so much about those who are not working, and hear so little about those who are working.

SAVINGS AND SPENDING

The rate of consumer savings in the first quarter of this year was higher than a year ago. In fact, consumer savings are at a record all-time high.

Consumer disposable income has been running higher than last year. So has consumer spending. It simply is not true that folks are hoarding their money, through fear.

Investment expenditures, which are fundamental to the health of our economy, as you know, are being maintained at a high level comparable to 1953.

THE NATIONAL PRODUCT

The total construction expenditures for the first 4 months of this year actually established a record.

The gross national product—that is, the Nation's total output—holds at a rate very near the all-time high level, in spite of the billions and billions less being spent on Government defense spending.

Let me bring this down to an important case. General Motors, as an important example of business conditions, held its annual meeting in Wilmington, Del., last Friday. The first quarterly report for this year should be enormously encouraging to all, because it is very, very significant.

GM'S ANNUAL REPORT

Mr. Harlow H. Curtice, the corporation's president, made an important forecast a way back last January. He repeated this forecast, namely, that General Motors' volume of sales in physical and dollar terms in 1954 should not be far from the high level attained in 1953.

Then he gave the facts for the first quarter, and here they are:

The dollar sales were within 5 percent of last year's all-time record in spite of a 14-percent decline in defense deliveries.

Clearly, the defense cutbacks have certainly not been ruinous, as so widely predicted. As if America had to live on war preparation.

GOOD NEWS FOR US ALL

General Motors' employment set a record first-quarter high.

Net income was up 25 percent from a year ago.

Unit sales of passenger cars also set a record high for any first quarter (705,000 units).

April passenger car sales (287,000 units) established a record for that month as well. This 1954 high record has only been exceeded in 3 other months in the entire 48 years of General Motors history (June 1950; August 1950; June 1953).

Retail deliveries of its passenger cars during the last 30 days were ahead of last year. Deliveries were directly in line with production. General Motors dealers' stocks were reported at this meeting to be normal for this time of year, except in the case of certain GM lines and certain models which are in very short supply, and which the plants are pressing to make up.

Like so many other examples that could be cited, this indicates that the Nation is readjusting from a part-war to a peace economy on a very sound, and orderly basis. And that's good news for everybody. Faith, not fear.

Good night. And God bless our country.

Eisenhower-Dulles Speeches Dismay Geneva Bargainers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 14, 1954

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I include in my extension of remarks a frank and appropriate article written by Crosby S. Noyes appearing in the Washington Star of June 12, 1954:

EISENHOWER-DULLES SPEECHES DISMAY GENEVA BARGAINERS—ALLIES SEE UNITED STATES SHIFT AGAINST INTERVENTION—FEAR TALK HARMS FRANCE, INDOCHINA

(By Crosby S. Noyes)

PARIS, June 12.—If there was ever a time when daily speeches by Secretary of State Dulles were unhelpful, that time is now.

It has nothing to do with the Secretary's qualifications as a speaker, nor with the rightness or wrongness of what he says. It's simply that there are times for talking and times for keeping quiet. And to the extent that the United States has an interest in the present world crisis, a gag for all top public officials is urgently indicated.

In the past few days statements by Mr. Dulles and President Eisenhower have gone far toward destroying the one small reserve of bargaining power that the allies had at Geneva. And in the present French political crisis these same statements have complicated severely the almost impossible struggle for survival of a government heartily devoted to the goals of American foreign policy.

Ironically enough, Mr. Dulles seems to be intent on destroying the very thing which he worked so frantically to create in the last days before the opening of the Geneva Conference—the situation of potential strength in southeast Asia from which the allies could bargain with some hope of success. It can scarcely be denied that the administration deliberately set out to sell the idea to the American public that Indochina was vital to American strategic interests; that the country, together with its allies, should be ready to fight to prevent the area from falling under Communist domination.

POLICY REVERSAL

Today the machine is in reverse. Both the Secretary and the President seem to be saying now that the United States has no intention of intervening in Indochina. And they are saying it more clearly every day.

Admittedly a good part of Mr. Dulles' original plan fell through when the proposal of intervention was cold-shouldered by our major allies. Perhaps, as has been said, there was a certain element of bluff in all that tough talk. Perhaps American intervention in Indochina is in fact impossible militarily, politically, and morally.

Admitting all these things, it is still a mystery why Mr. Dulles and General Eisenhower consider it wise to broadcast them officially. Up to this time there has been exactly one thing that offered some hope of curbing the implacable ambition of Communist negotiators at Geneva. In France there was one thing that gave the government some reason to continue the heartbreaking diplomatic and military struggle. This was the possibility of American intervention.

Once that possibility is gone, the Communists have nothing whatever to worry about. And the French have nothing to look forward to.

Even those Europeans who looked forward with the greatest misgivings to the possibility of American intervention in Indochina admit this disastrous effect on the allied bargaining position. "From now on," says Le Monde, "the most menacing talk may well be taken as pure bluff. The time of greatest danger for world peace will be the day when the bluffing ends and precise intentions are misunderstood in the other camp."

INDOCHINA LOST?

From here the Secretary's speeches can be explained only in one way: The United States is now absolutely convinced that the Geneva talks will lead nowhere and that Indochina is inevitably lost to the Communists. If that is true, then perhaps it is more merciful from everyone's point of view to throw in the sponge now instead of waiting until the last minute.

This explanation, however, does not explain the motive behind the Secretary's effort to unload the blame for the failure onto the allies—an effort which is bitterly resented in Britain—or the latest revival of demands for ratification of EDC complete with the now familiar threats about revising United States foreign policy.

To be sure, Mr. Dulles' theory of diplomacy has never been one of saying the right thing at the right time. Perhaps with some justification he believes in pressure judiciously applied in tender spots as the best way to get things done.

Even by these standards however, this recent remarks appear most unfortunately timed. It seems almost as if the Secretary does not appreciate the effect of his words here in France where EDC lies at the heart of the government crisis and where the charge of subservience to American pressure is one of the strongest weapons of the opposition.

There may be, as the saying goes, some domestic reason of transcendent importance that makes it necessary for the Secretary and the President to keep on unbosoming themselves daily before the American public and before the world. It's important, of course, that the public should be fully and frankly informed whenever possible. But there is such a thing as overdoing it.

Northampton, Mass., 1654–1954: A Great City Pauses To Celebrate Its 300th Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 14, 1954

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, this is tercentenary week for the city of Northampton, Mass. The program officially dedicated to its 300th birthday opened yesterday, June 13, and continues through June 20. During these 8 days, the history of the community will be reviewed in song, speech, and pageant. Mr. Speaker, it is a history that all America can be proud of.

The significance and greatness of a community is not measured by its geographical area and population. They are determined by its accomplishments and the spirit of the people who inhabit the locality. As we review the history of Northampton, the conclusion is irresistible that she, indeed, is a great city. In those things which are the hallmarks of distinction, Northampton has excelled. The success of her sons and daughters, her preeminence in the field of religion and education, her response to the patriotic calls of her country, and the efforts of her leaders in striving to build and maintain a better community—all have combined to make Northampton a good and a great city. Mr. Speaker, these are the characteristics that make for a better America. Because Northampton represents the very best in what a city should be, her people can well take pride in her past and her present, and they can look to the future with confidence.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD a brief history of Northampton and an account of famous names in her 300 years of existence. I am indebted to the tercentenary committee, the Hampshire Gazette, and Sprinfield Daily News for this information. The tercentary committee is composed of Frederick D. Meehan, chairman; William R. Barry, Albert G. Beckmann, Charles A. Brambilla, Maurice J. Carlson, Thomas J. Doyle, Mrs. William E. Dwyer, Albert F. Eyre, Romeo E. Fortier, Charles Gleason, Harry J. Jekanowski, C. Edgar Maynard, Roger S. O'Brien, Mrs. Thomas M. Shepherd, and Lawrence E. Wikander.

BRIEF HISTORY OF NORTHAMPTON

EARLY DAYS

When Northampton, Mass., received its charter as a city in 1654, there were probably not 75,000 Englishmen in the New World, and these were widely scattered. There existed only a long, thin line of settlements, fringing the wild shores of the Atlantic from Maine to New York, and some settlements in Maryland and Virginia. New York and the Jerseys were under the Dutch and the Swedes. William Penn had not yet received the charter which he coveted. Neither Philadelphia nor Baltimore had yet been founded. The Carolinas and Georgia had as yet no charters and no settlers. A feeble Spanish colony was clinging amidst southern fevers to an uncertain life at St. Augustine, Fla. Quite probably, the majority of the settlers at that time had never heard of the Mississippi River.

The founders of Northampton, Mass., were true frontiersmen in their day. The region of which our fair city is the center, is known today as Pioneer Valley.

In these early days the city was called Nonotuck, after a local Indian tribe. The name "Northampton," after Northampton, England, was suggested by John King, then a popular citizen of the town. This recommendation met with general favor, and the name Northampton was legally adopted by the city fathers.

On March 14, 1676, Northampton was raided by 500 Indians from several tribes. They attacked the city in three different places simultaneously, but fortunately were driven away.

Four white men and one girl were killed and six men were wounded. From that time on the city had no further serious raids from Indian attacks, although our close neighbor, Deerfield, suffered tragic losses.

CONTRIBUTION TO NATION'S CONFLICTS

Since the founding of Northampton, its citizens have taken part in many wars. The first real war was known as King William's French and Indian War, followed by Queen Anne's French and Indian War, and King George's French and Indian War, in each of which at least five Northampton men sacrificed their lives. In the Revolutionary War, our city furnished its full quota for men and officers and suffered many casualties. At one time there were some 30 British prisoners confined in the Northampton jail. For the Civil War, Northampton contributed 751 men, 42 of whom were killed; in the Spanish American War, 77 men embarked to Cuba, 28 of whom gave their lives for our country. In World War I, our city furnished 1,053 men; and for World War II, 2,900 men and women responded to the call. The Navy Department selected Smith College, Northampton, Mass., as the site for its WAVES Officer Training School.

CENTER OF EDUCATION AND CULTURE

Today our city is known from coast to coast as an educational center. In the very early days of our town, a law school was established on Prospect Street by Judge Samuel Howe and United States Senator Elijah H. Mills. Among the pupils was included Franklin Pierce, of New Hampshire, who later was elected as the 14th President of the United States. At one time, Alexander Graham Bell taught at the famed Gothic School for the Deaf on Gothic Street. Two famed individuals who once attended this school were Henry Ward Beecher and George Hillard.

Clarke School for the Deaf, founded by John Clarke, a Northampton citizen, has a worldwide reputation due to the fact that it teaches lip reading exclusively. Mrs. Calvin Coolidge, widow of the last President Coolidge, once taught in Clarke School and later was president of its board of trustees.

Smith College for Women, established in 1875, was until recently the largest college for women in the world, and is still one of the most famous. Burnham School and the Northampton School for Girls, preparatory schools for college, attract young women from coast to coast. The public schools have always continued along high education traditions, and this is apparent by the fact that approximately 50 percent of the total school buildings in the city have been constructed within the last 25 years.

Considering the size of the city (27,000), four hospitals supply the needs of the ill; Cooley-Dickinson Hospital (general medical care), Hampshire Sanatorium for the county (tuberculosis), Northampton State Hospital (mental), and the Veterans' Administration hospital facilities.

The Hampshire Gazette, established in 1786, is one of the oldest newspapers in the United States with continuous publication. At the present site of the Draper Hotel, on Main Street, there has always been a tavern or hotel for 158 years. A drugstore has existed for 188 years where Dickinson's Drug Store is now located. E. J. Gare & Son, who recently supplied the silver service to the U. S. S. *Northampton*, the second cruiser to be named in honor of our city, has been doing business continuously for 168 years.

Few cities of its size can boast of more public parks than Northampton. Among the outstanding are the Frank Newell Look Memorial Park, graced with a large swimming pool, wading pool, picnic grounds, a minature diesel-engined train, athletic fields, tennis courts, and other sports facilities, especially for children and youth; and Child's Park, a showplace with flowers, trees, and shrubbery.

Northampton is justly proud of its magnificent library containing over 250,000 volumes and in addition, a large collection of articles of historical interest. In point of size among city libraries, Forbes Library ranks 4th in Massachusetts, and 40th in the 7,000 libraries in the United States.

Of unique interest is the ownership by the city of the Academy of Music, a theater of first-class equipment and beautiful architecture, given to the city by the late Frank Lyman, and one of the few municipally owned theaters in the United States. Since 1890 this unprecedented gift to the city has played an important part in the promotion of legitimate stage performances, as well as moving pictures. Northampton was chosen as one of the cities to receive generous gifts from Andrew Carnegie. He not only built a library for Smith College, but created for the city a commodious building, known as the People's Institute, and serving educational, social, and civic interests.

HOME OF CALVIN COOLIDGE

Many able men and women have played an important part in the growth of the city. Northampton has produced 1 President of the United States, 2 Vice Presidents, 4 members of the Presidential Cabinets, 4 United States Senators, 3 Congressmen, 2 Governors of the Commonwealth, and 9 of our attorneys have been appointed to either the Supreme Court or superior court.

In speaking of famous men, the one to reach the highest office in the land was our own Calvin Coolidge, who after his term of President of the United States had expired, returned to Northampton and here spent the remainder of his days. His widow still resides in Northampton. History also records the lives of such men as Gov. Caleb Strong, 11 times elected Governor of Massachusetts, a record matched by only one other man in the State, John Hancock. Caleb Strong was one of the 55 men of the early days of our country who was a member of the Philadelphia convention which framed the now immortal Declaration of Independence. Gen. Seth Pomeroy, a native of Northampton, Mass., took an active part in four wars and only the ride of Paul Revere eclipses his famed ride from Northampton to Boston to take part in the Battle of Bunker Hill. In the dark days preceding the Revolutionary War, Maj. Joseph Hawley, a power in the legislature in Boston, was the first one to use the phrase, "The Parliament of Great Britain has no right to legislate for us." He stands in history on an equal with Patrick Henry who subscribed to the theory that, "Fight we must finally, unless Britain retreats." In the field of religion, probably no single man has been better known throughout the English-speaking world than Rev. Jonathan Edwards, who preached here for many years.

DISTINGUISHED VISITORS

In the years gone by, Northampton has been visited by many prominent people. In 1824, Gen. Marquis de Lafayette, the famous French patriot, visited Northampton. Nine years later the eminent statesman Henry Clay paid a visit to this town and was entertained with a banquet and reception. In 1847, Daniel Webster argued the now historic Smith Charities case, which provided Northampton with one of the rarest philantropies in American history. Since its conception, this organization has contributed millions of dollars to young people of this community. On July 3, 1851, Jenny Lind, known the world over as the Swedish Nightingale, came to Northampton to give a concert. So impressed was she by the city itself, which was at that time a famous health resort, that about a year later, she returned to spend her honeymoon at the then famed Round Hill Hotel. At that time she christened Northampton, "the Paradise of America." In the early 1900's, President McKinley paid a visit to this city. Among other distinguished persons who have visited our city include Oliver Wendell Holmes, William Lloyd Garrison, Ralph Waldo Emerson, Horace Greeley, Wendell Phillips, and P. T. Barnum.

Northampton is not just a name, nor merely a city. The spirit of New England, where America began, is embodied in Northampton. America is great because it is based on the sound traditions of our city—a government of laws administered by men guided by the ideal of civil and religious liberty, truth, and justice. May Northampton continue to play its role in the Nation's future greatness.

Respectfully submitted.

TERCENTENARY COMMITTEE,
FREDERICK D. MEEHAN,
Chairman.

[From the Springfield (Mass.) Daily News, June 11, 1954]

LITANY OF FAMOUS NAMES IN NORTHAMPTON HISTORY DURING THREE CENTURIES—GOVERNORS, GENERALS, SENATORS, PRESIDENTS LIVED AT 'HAMP—GRAHAM CRACKER AND NATION'S HIGHEST MOUNTAIN NAMED FOR SONS OF CITY NOW MARKING TERCENTENARY

Northampton has many monuments, from the graham cracker to the Nation's highest mountain, and their significance is being recalled as the city celebrates its 300th birthday.

Ever since John Pynchon, of Springfield, purchased Nonotuck from the Indians and conveyed it to the inhabitants of Northampton, great names have been associated with that community.

One of the first was Jonathan Edwards, the great theologian and philosopher, creator of the first great religious revival of modern times, whose dismissal from the Northampton pulpit was one of the most dramatic events in colonial history. His fusion of Calvin logic with mystic communion still invites intensive study, and 3 books have been written about this man in only the last 5 years.

RIDES TO BUNKER HILL

The revolutionary era in Northampton presents Seth Pomeroy, an opponent of Mr. Edwards, a gunsmith, soldier, and an openhearted man. In his 70th year, he wore out three horses racing to Bunker Hill where he fought as a foot soldier. Five days later he became the first brigadier general of the Continental Army and died during the winter of 1776–77 at Peekskill, N. Y.

For many years Northampton's first citizen was Caleb Strong, one of the Founding Fathers of the Nation, who served more terms as Governor of Massachusetts than any other man in the Commonwealth's history. When the States ratified the Constitution he helped to write, Massachusetts elected him to the United States Senate.

FOUNDED NAVAL ACADEMY

In the early 1800's, most of the famous men of the town were associated with schools. In 1823, the noted Round Hill School was founded by Joseph Cogswell and George Bancroft. The latter gained fame as the Secretary of the Navy who founded Annapolis, the Secretary of War who ordered the troops into Mexico, and the Ambassador to Great Britain who completed while in that country his plan for the monumental work which ranks him among the very greatest American historians.

SCHOOL FOR UNITED STATES LEADERS

Charles Edward Forbes, the judge who founded Forbes Library, read law with Elijah Hunt Mills who, with Samuel Howe, founded a law school at Northampton. Among the students was Franklin Pierce, the 14th President of the United States. Mills became a United States Senator, and Howe was named to the Massachusetts Supreme Court.

Margaret Dwight, granddaughter of Jonathan Edwards, founded the Gothic Seminary for Ladies whose name was used by a street (despite nationalistic objections) and its building by St. Michael's School. John Clarke's famous philanthropy, Clarke School for the Deaf, was guided by a dedicated teacher named Alexander Graham Bell.

SMITH FIRST PHILANTHROPIST

Daniel Webster went to Northampton to defend the will of the county's first philanthropist, Oliver Smith, and Rufus Choate represented the aggrieved heirs. On the winning defense team was Charles E. Forbes who later founded Forbes Library; in the jury box was Samuel Williston who gave his fortune to education. Oliver Smith's niece, Sophia Smith, founded Smith College, one of his in-laws, E. H. R. Lyman gave the Academy of Music, and his friend Deacon George Hubbard who helped direct both Smith charities and Smith College, left his fortune to the latter, and convinced Cooley Dickinson to build a hospital in Northampton.

PARADISE OF AMERICA

Many other famous people have gone to Northampton for business, pleasure, politics, or higher purpose, including Rev. (later Cardinal) John Cheverus, General Lafayette, and President McKinley, but Jenny Lind, the Swedish nightingale, went there on her honeymoon and was the town's favorite. She called Northampton the paradise of America, and the town agreed with the thousands who called her the world's greatest singer.

Much less popular in his hometown was Northampton's eccentric but gifted Dr. Sylvester Graham, whose lectures on diet and courtship often had to be held in fortified halls to keep out the angry mobs. At his home on Pleasant Street he developed the flour which bears his name.

COMMUNISM AT FLORENCE

Between the time of the arrival of the first canal boat from New Haven and of the first locomotive from Springfield, big industry, represented by silkworms and mulberry trees, came to Northampton. When the bubble burst, the Northampton Association of Education and Industry bought the silk factory in Florence, and this communistic experiment was visited by such American leaders as William Lloyd Garrison and Wendell Phillips. When the community failed, one of its leaders, Samuel L. Hill, assumed its liabilities, helped develop the village of Florence, was a major contributor to Cosmian Hall, and founded Hill Institute. The community's silk and cutlery industries were revived and are still important businesses in the town.

Associated with the industrial history of the city were such remarkable men as Lucius Dimock, of Leeds, the colorful master mechanic of the American silk industry; Alexander McCallum, who made the finest silk hose ("You just know she wears them"); George A. Burr, whose daughter provided Frank Newhall Look Park; and John L. Otis, the wounded general who became a prominent Florence manufacturer.

MOUNT WHITNEY

Other Northampton men made their marks many miles from their native town. The name of Prof. Josiah Dwight Whitney, Jr., son and namesake of Northampton's banker, was immortalized when members of the California State geological survey expedition sighted the Nation's highest mountain and named it for their chief, Francis A. Cook, commander of the *Brooklyn*, led the attack on the Spanish fleet at Santiago in 1898 * * *.

FHA Loans for Mobile Homes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. S. J. CRUMPACKER, JR.

OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 14, 1954

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include the following editorial from the Elkhart (Ind.) Truth of Monday, June 7, 1954:

FHA LOANS FOR MOBILE HOMES?

Expansion of the mobile homes industry has been tremendous in recent years. No single city realizes it better than Elkhart, with the payrolls and prestige derived from our 13 mobile homes factories.

Yet this industry may actually be on the verge of a great new growth.

Of the utmost importance is the housing bill, sponsored by our own Indiana Senator CAPEHART, which was passed by the Senate last week and now awaits Senate-House conference action.

Significant for Elkhart is a section of this bill which, for the first time, would make FHA loans available to mobile-home buyers.

The lack of such loans in the past has surely discouraged numerous potential buyers. A study of financing made by the Mobile Homes Manufacturers Association in 1953 shows why.

Questionnaires were returned by about 300 banks which make such loans.

The survey indicates the average time for the loan contract runs only 36 to 42 months. On a mobile home costing an average $4,000, that means pretty stiff monthly payments. FHA presumably would allow easier terms.

Yet the survey also tends to indicate that mobile homes buyers have mostly been very good loan risks.

Of 267 banks reporting, 71 percent said they had no mobile homes accounts as much as 60 days or more delinquent.

Fifty-one percent of the banks said their experience in financing mobile homes had been "excellent," 45 percent said it had been "good or satisfactory," and only 4 percent called it "fair."

Seventy-six percent of the banks said they had never found it necessary to repossess a mobile home.

FHA reluctance to finance mobile homes in the past has possibly been based on the thought that mobile homes buyers move about a lot. But the survey indicates that they meet their obligations, whether they move or stay put.

Perhaps this is more understandable when we remember that the 1950 census quotes the average income of a mobile home family at $4,400, or $100 above the national average.

It is very important for Elkhart that this section of the Capehart housing bill should not get lost in the shuffle.

The national interest is also at stake, since any measure which will make it easier for large numbers of people to acquire good housing is helpful to the whole country.

The housing bill is complex, and unless public opinion makes itself felt, there is always a chance that certain sections will be deleted. Why not let your sentiments be known immediately to Senator HOMER CAPEHART, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.?

McCarthyism Feared by All

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY W. WIER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 14, 1954

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include an article from the American Jewish World of June 11, 1954, entitled "McCarthyism Feared by All."

The article is as follows:

MCCARTHYISM FEARED BY ALL

From the interpretation Senator MCCARTHY chose to put on the Senate floor speech of Vermont's Senator FLANDERS, in which the New Englander savagely raked the Wisconsinite over the coals, you might have thought FLANDERS was basing his attack on the contention that McCarthyism is causing foreboding only among American Jews.

MCCARTHY counterattacked by asserting FLANDERS was seeking to arouse religious and racial division among the American people. It was a typical MCCARTHY stratagem.

What FLANDERS said was that McCarthyism not only was arousing concern and alarm among American Jews, but also among American Catholics and American Protestants—in short, among all segments of the public.

It is not Senator FLANDERS who promotes divisiveness in the United States; it is Senator MCCARTHY himself—latest of a species described by President Eisenhower, although not by name, in his Columbia University speech as "demagogs thirsty for personal power and public notice."

It is MCCARTHY who instills suspicion and fear in the public, who foments confusion and chaos, who inspires a new kind of legal philosophy — "guilt by association" — and who, by so doing, encourages neighbor to turn against neighbor, creating situations in which bigotry and bias may flourish.

Certainly no one element in American society is troubled by MCCARTHY and what he stands for; rather, all share the misgivings that his brazenness, arrogance, cynicism, and ruthlessness arouse.

He is no more—but no less—a problem for the Jews of the United States than he is for the Protestants and the Catholics; for the Negro as well as for the white; for the civilian as well as for the military man, the scientist as well as the laborer, the teacher as well as the laboror, the teacher as well as the salesman.

Some critics liken MCCARTHY's tactics to those employed by rulers in totalitarian states. Max Lerner, in a blistering column captioned "I accuse," contends MCCARTHY is seeking to equip his committee with the kind of built-in fuehrer principle which, if he ever gets the power, he would extend to every phase of American life.

Accurate or not, the description spells out what many people in this country have come to believe of MCCARTHY—and you find such people in every social, religious, political, and economic group.

The dawning awareness of where McCarthyism might lead us has evoked a mounting tide of criticism directed at the Wisconsin Senator, and must have had much to do with the fact that Joe Must Go Club sponsors in Wisconsin succeeded in getting the signatures of well over 300,000 voters on recall petitions, even though they fell short of the goal fixed by law.

Though MCCARTHY would have you think otherwise, you cannot limit his foes to any single group or collection of groups. Indeed, you must, on the basis of the evidence, conclude that McCarthyism enjoys the distinction of having stirred deep-seated fears in all areas of the population. That is good, for it presages an early downfall for the Wisconson Senator—an end, as someone once phrased it, devoutly to be desired.

Flag Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN JARMAN

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 14, 1954

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, on this annual Flag Day I am placing in the RECORD a statement by Col. August W. Kopke, of Oklahoma City, a member of the United States Flag Association, which I think will be of general interest. His statement follows:

FLAG DAY

(By Col. August W. Kopke, Oklahoma City, U. S. A., member, United States Flag Association)

One hundred seventy-seven years ago this month, on June 14, a new flag appeared in the blue of the heavens, and the Stars and Stripes became the century plant of human hope in bloom. The gentle breezes with lingering caress kiss the folds of no flag that compares with it in beauty.

Down through the intervening years it has become the emblem of freedom and democracy throughout the world. That piece of red, white, and blue bunting means 5,000 years of struggle upward. It embodies the essence of patriotism. Its history is the history of the American people. Is spirit is the spirit of the American Nation. Emblazoned upon its folds in letters of living light are the names and fames of its heroic dead.

Other flags may mean a glorious past. This flag means a glorious future. It is the flag of tomorrow, Whether we like it or not, the cold hard facts are, world leadership has been conferred on us by the ceaseless march of destiny. Much as we might desire the easier way of lesser responsibility, we are denied that privilege. We cannot turn back the clock, and we can no longer sail by old and easier charts. We have to play a great part in the world in sheer defense of our own self-interest, until the curse of all revolutionary "isms" has been lifted from the brow of mankind.

Rise up, glorious freedom's banner and send out these messengers of thine. Tell the air not a spot ever sullied thy whiteness. Thy red is not the blush of shame, but the flush of joy. The blue an eternal reminder of loyalty and constancy. Tell the dews that wash thee that thou art as pure as they. Say to the night, thy stars lead to the morning. And say to the morning that a brighter dawn will arise with healing on its wings. And then, O glorious flag, bid the sun pour light on all thy folds with double brightness while thou are bearing round and round a troubled world the eternal message of peace, of brotherhood, and democracy.

Let me urge every American to display Old Glory on Flag Day and every day. America has too many flagpoles without flags. Every flagpole in our country should display this banner of freedom daily. If you cannot display the physical emblem, then wear its image in your hearts, and if you do, the heart of America will finally interpret the heart of the world.

JUNE 14, 1954.

Flag Day 1954

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 14, 1954

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, on the occasion of Flag Day it seems appropriate to include in the RECORD two writings, full of meaning, which reflect the splendor that is America.

One, the well-known and beloved Toast to the Flag, is the composition of a personal and valued friend, John J. Daly. The toast is a tribute regularly published throughout the Nation on this day:

A TOAST TO THE FLAG

(By John J. Daly)

Here's to the whole of it—
Here's to the red of it—
There's not a thread of it,
No, nor a shred of it
In all the spread of it
From foot to head,
But heroes bled for it,
Faced steel and led for it,
Precious blood shed for it,
Bathing it red.

Here's to the white of it—
Thrilled by the sight of it,
Who knows the right of it
But feels the might of it
Through day and night?
Womanhood's care for it
Made manhood dare for it;
Purity's pray'r for it
Keeps it so white.

Here's to the blue of it—
Beauteous view of it,
Heavenly hue of it,
Star-spangled dew of it
Constant and true;
Diadems gleam for it,
States stand supreme for it,
Liberty's beam for it
Brightens the blue.

Here's to the whole of it—
Stars, stripes, and pole of it,
Body and soul of it,
O, and the roll of it,
Sun shining through;
Hearts in accord for it
Swear by the sword for it,
Thanking the Lord for it,
Red, white, and blue.

In the publication, You and Your U. S. A., distributed by the Department of Defense, is a series of statements on What America Means to Me. These are the prize selections chosen for honor by the Freedoms Foundation at Valley Forge.

I am proud that one of those chosen for publication was written by an Army sergeant, Charles B. Howard, born in Ansonia, Conn. His letter is a warm, sincere expression of the love Sergeant Howard bears for his country. It follows:

(By Sgt. Charles B. Howard, U. S. Army)

What America Means to Me is to quote a famous saying that is the hope and aim of all mankind, "Love and the pursuit of happiness without fear of redress."

As a Negro and a soldier I have seen the rapid strides that my race has taken both in times of peace and war. The fields of science, culture, and numerous others are mine for the asking. America has offered me far greater opportunities than I could ever expect elsewhere.

America has taken our problem to its heart and is slowly but surely ironing out all the wrinkles that have plagued us for many years.

We, who a few years ago were under the yoke of slavery, today have fully realized that America means freedom: Freedom of thought; freedom of religion; freedom of speech; and last but not least, equality. A chance to live, a chance to enjoy the high standard of living that is of the highest in the world.

Americans who have made such rapid strides in science and aviation such as the breaking of the sound barrier no doubt were greatly thrilled by what they accomplished. Well just think of the joy they experience in crashing the sound barrier and think how we feel about our racial barrier is being slowly disintegrated under our system of democracy.

"What America Means to Me" is more than the hollow words on this paper. The freedom I enjoy is imbedded in my heart with the thankfulness that our country is a reality—a model for others to follow with an ever so firm foundation based on liberty—equality and justice for all. This is what America means to me, and I feel that any service that I can do for my country could never repay it for the chances that are offered to me. This from a very proud and thankful American.

Corsicana, Tex., Provides Example of Civic Cooperation in Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 14, 1954

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the people of the Texas city of Corsicana have a simple and strikingly effective formula for progress. The formula is this: The people all work together for the good of the community.

Bob Stanley, a staff writer for the Dallas Times Herald, recently wrote for his newspaper a story giving specific examples of the value of this formula. I ask unanimous consent that this story of civic cooperation in action be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

NAVARRO COUNTY'S FORMULA FOR PROGRESS—THEY ALL WORK TOGETHER

(By Bob Stanley)

CORSICANA, June 9.—This Navarro County seat, once the boom-town capital of the first commercially successful oil field west of the Mississippi River, today is striking it rich in an entirely new field.

They call it civic cooperation.

What it means is that for the first time in the 106-year history of the north central Texas city, labor leaders, city officials, and chamber of Commerce members are sitting down together to iron out community problems.

And once a course of action has been determined, everybody from Mayor C. C. Sapp on down is rolling up his shirt sleeves to see that it's carried out.

Skilled union labor, some 1,000 strong in this oil and manufacturing center, is being volunteered to reduce the cost of such projects as the Little League Baseball Park, dedicated last week in time for the opening of the local ball season.

The same formula—volunteer labor and financial aid—soon is expected to provide the community with a new park and its first public swimming pool.

On the city government level, 5 different committees of a total of 150 citizens have started surveying the present and future needs of the city departments.

It all started back in March with a communitywide meeting. With Manager R. W. (Dick) Knight's busy chamber of commerce, J. J. Robinson's United Steelworkers of America (CIO), and the pile-driving weight of 6-foot, 4-inch Mayor Sapp, behind it, the effort couldn't help but be a success.

There are some communitywide needs that compelled citizens to band together in search of answers.

One is the city's current fire-insurance penalty of 15 percent. In the 10 years between 1940 and 1950, Corsicana had increased its population from 15,232 to 19,211. But like several city departments, the fire department hadn't kept pace.

Outmoded equipment and an inadequate number of substations, coupled with some big fires like that which destroyed the Texas-Miller Hat Co. building for a $250,000 insurance loss in April 1951 caused the fire rating to drop from "credit" to "penalty."

Then there's the matter of city finances. Back in 1949, when an independent school district with its own tax powers was set up many Corsicanans feared the dual city and school-tax burden might be too heavy. They set a $1.50 maximum on the city government's taxes, which must meet the interest and retirement payments on city bonds, as well pay for general operating expenses.

Of the 1953–54 tax rate of $1.25, City Secretary William M. Elliott pointed out, only 89 cents was available for operation of the city, and 5 cents of this had to go to the city's Carnegie Library.

Mayor Sapp, a mechanical foreman for the Cotton Belt Railroad for 32 years, puts it this way:

"We're like a workingman with a fixed income of say $200 a month. His family and his expenses keep increasing and he has more children. But his income doesn't.

"He may be able to feed his children and care for most of their basic needs, but he hasn't got the money to add any more rooms on the house."

The mayor has a committee of nine key men at work seeking the ways and means to care for the city's needs.

His advisory committee includes 2 labor leaders, 2 bankers, and several businessmen and representative citizens.

And each of the four city commissioners who with the mayor make up Corsicana's governing body has his own advisory committee to study the needs of the department he heads.

All this activity doesn't mean that Corsicana and Navarro County haven't made progress in recent years. They have. But there was a period between the beginning of the depression and the end of World War II when most civic construction was at a standstill. And it's taking a while to catch up.

Most notable of the recent improvements in Corsicana have been the $1,400,000 waterworks program and the $300,000 sewer project financed through bonds. With a new 4,000-acre-foot lake on Chambers Creek, a 4-million-gallon ground-storage tank and two smaller tanks for filtered water, plus some 20 miles of new water mains, Corsicana's water needs seem to be well cared for.

A third bond issue of $675,000 provided 2 new elementary school and 2 gyms for existing schools in a move designed to bring the school system up to date.

The county's most recent bond-financed improvements are the ultramodern $1,600,000 Memorial Hospital, for which the Federal Government paid half the cost, and Navarro Junior College, a 400-student school started with $540,000 in bonds.

Both city and county have also made strides in commercial enterprises. Oil activity, dating back to the first well in 1894, isn't as important as it was in the 1920's when it helped boost the county's population to 60,507 by 1930.

Since then oil income has leveled off at a reliable—if not spectacular—income of $5 million annually from some 1,200,000 barrels produced.

Today the black land and sandy loam soil produce considerably more agriculture income than they yield in oil. Last year, a bumper one for many crops, showed a $15 million farm income.

Greatest growth in recent years has been in manufacturing activity, which adds another $5 million annually to the county pocketbook.

With the prospect of attracting even more industry in the future, city leaders feel it's time to take stock of their government to be sure that inadequate facilities and services won't stand in the way of further expansion.

That's the thinking behind the current cooperative program. No one individual claims credit for initiating the plan, but some point out that Corsicana is following the lead of Navarro County's unincorporated communities in learning how to work together.

County Judge James C. Sewell, whose blindness caused by World War II injuries hasn't hampered his work as Navarro County head, agrees with County Agriculture Agent Tom E. Prater that the community programs of Corbet, Pursley, Chatfield, and several others are the finest thing that's ever happened to the county.

These small communities, most of them without schools since facilities were consolidated, now hold regular community meetings in the old schoolhouses and carry out planned recreation, improvement, and youth programs.

Wherever it started, this kind of community-improvement program through cooperative action is contagious. It's spreading.

As railroading Mayor Sapp says:

"We're trying to make active citizens of everyone—and so far we're mighty pleased with the reaction."

Federal-Indian Relationship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 14, 1954

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, on June 1, I inserted in the Record a communication from the Reverend Francis J. Corley, S. J., of St. Louis, concerning termination of the Indian-Federal Govenrment relations. Many of the Members read this communication in the Record and have written me on the subject. One letter in particular came from the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the Honorable A. L. Miller, of Nebraska, giving the history and background of these activities. I think Congressman Miller's letter will be of great interest to all Members, and therefore I am inserting a copy, which reads as follows:

House of Representatives,
Committee on Interior and
Insular Affairs,
Washington, D. C., June 9, 1954.

Hon. Leonor Sullivan,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

My Dear Mrs. Sullivan: I appreciate your calling to my attention your insert in the Congressional Record of a letter you received from the Reverend Corley of St. Louis. The tenor of Father Corley's letter suggests a sincere interest in the Federal-Indian relationship. With the exception of his reference to "abrupt, secretive action on the part of the present Congress" and one or two other statements, I am inclined to agree with his statement. I should like to point out, with respect to the allegation of "abrupt, secretive action," that Congress, as early as 1865 had appointed special subcommittees for the purpose of developing a comprehensive legislative program aiming at eventually bringing to our Indian citizens the same benefits and responsibilites as are available to our non-Indians. While the history of past legislative efforts cannot always be read purely in congressional enactments, it must be recognized that in the United States, as in Canada, the problem of reconciling the interest of the aboriginals with those of an expanding Republic and commonwealth has been given serious and continuing consideration by the legislative body.

The history of development of the West during the post Civil War period is a continuous recitation of encroachment of the white man on the vast areas in which the Indians roamed. In an attempt to effect agreement as to the co-occupation of these lands by Indian and non-Indian, more than 300 treaties were executed. That Congress in 1946 enacted into law the Indian Claims Commission Act was a recognition on the part of Congress that the Indians had not always been fairly treated. During the 8-year period since the passage of this act, awards totalling many, many millions of dollars to the Indians by the Courts of Claims underscore the willingness of the people to deal equitably with the Indians. Pending claims will undoubtedly result in additional substantial awards to tribes and individuals whose lands were taken without compensation. In this respect, it is fair to observe that the treatment by the United States of its aboriginals has been far more Christian and far more equitable than in almost all other areas of the world. To cite a few examples: British treatment of the Kaffirs and Dutch treatment of the same people in South Africa, the acquisitions of Belgium in the Cameroons and of Belgium and Germany in the African Congo land, the hunting of natives with dogs in Australia and New Zealand and the activities of the conquistadors in Latin America and in Old Mexico.

In 1865 the Senate Committee on Indian Affairs, after an exhaustive study of the Indian situation in the United States and in Canada, recommended the passage of several laws. Highlights of these recommendations included:

1. Extension of criminal jurisdiction over the Indian reservations as far as practicable;

2. Provision for the admission of Indians to the rights of citizenship upon sufficient showing in a District Court in the United States of capacity, intelligence, industry, sobriety, and knowledge of the English language;

3. To not extend beyond the periods fixed by the then treaty stipulations for the payment of annuities due Indians; discountenance of any such stipulations in future treaties; and to provide mainly for industry, schools, and practical stockraising and agriculture; and

4. To surrender as soon as practicable the control of Indian affairs within every State to the State authorities.

Commissioners of the Crown, surveying the Indian situation in Canada, and comparing it to that of the United States in the same year, reached this conclusion:

"The natural apathy of the Indian character, and their inherent desire to wander without restraint, hinder their advancement, while their position as minors, freeing them from all responsibility, leads them to abandon self-reliance and trust to government to help them in all their difficulties * * * but whatever may be the advantages in theory in keeping the Indians as children of nature, shielded from contaminating vices of the whites, we believe that practically the system must be a failure * * * such being, then, the objections to the system of endeavoring to keep the Indians entirely separate from the whites, it remains to look at the question from the other point of view, and see how their interests may be affected by allowing the whites to settle close to them, and by so doing endeavor to make the Indians, by degrees, an integral and useful portion of the population of the country."

Without adopting the reasoning of the Canadian Commissioners, history suggests that they may have arrived at the right destination traveling a slightly different route than that which you or I might have followed. In any case, the Indian program generally has embraced the following:

From 1775 to 1871 represents the so-called treaty period during which time more than 200 reservations were established and some 300 treaties executed. Following 1871 and as late as 1947, additional reservations were created in the United States and Alaska. Beginning in 1887 and continuing to 1934 was the so-called allotment period during which time tracts of land were designated for individual families with restrictions as to sale and use. Following the allotment period there came into being in 1934 the so-called Indian Reorganization Act which provided generally for the granting of charters to Indian tribal corporations for the avowed purpose of permitting greater self-determination and self-management.

In 1924, the Indians of the United States were made citizens and during the past 30-year period, 20 years of which came under operation of the Indian Reorganization Act of 1934, tremendous strides have been made by tribes and individual Indians in the direction of achieving an ability to manage their own affairs.

As early as 1929, several major tribes had attempted to have legislation enacted which would give them almost complete self-determination, at the same time expressing an unwillingness to assume responsibilities of uncontrolled citizenship to accompany the benefits of uncontrolled citizenship, which they declared to be their aim. In 1947, the Acting Commissioner of Indian Affairs, before a Senate subcommittee, listed tribes and bands believed to be eligible for termination of Federal supervision. Bases for this determination were as follows:

1. Degree of acculturation of the affected tribe.
2. Economic position.
3. Attitude of the Indians involved.
4. Attitude of the State and local subdivisions in the area affected.

The matter of withdrawal of Federal supervision between 1947 and 1953 was given additional detailed study with many conferences both in Washington and in the field, including very comprehensive reports on the status of the American Indian tribe rendered during the 82d Congress. In adopting House Concurrent Resolution 108 in July of 1953, the Congress unanimously expressed itself as desiring the earliest practicable termination of Federal supervision of certain named tribes and over the Indians in States specified in the resolution. The Secretary of the Interior was directed to transmit to the Congress not later than January 1, 1954, his recommendations as to legislation which would effect such termination for the Indian groups named in the House Resolution. Upon receipt of the Secretary's recommendations, bills were introduced and hearings commenced in mid-February of this year. These hearings were conducted both in Washington and in the field over a period of 2 months with extensive testimony and statements of several hundred witnesses received.

It is pertinent at this point to note that in several instances the joint subcommittee conducting the hearings reached the tentative conclusion that named tribes were indeed not eligible for termination of Federal supervision at this time. In each instance, the four bases for determination of eligibility were taken into consideration and it is my personal observation that it is necessary to include at least all four points before reaching a legislative determination. The experience of the House and Senate subcommittees in consideration of the terminal legislation for the Menominee Indian Tribe of Wisconsin is a case in point. It is sufficient to say that following the numerous hearings and attended conferences involving Committee Members, Bureau of Indian Affairs representatives, officials of the State of Wisconsin and tribal members, complete agreement was reached as respects the Menominee terminal legislation. To the extent that consent to the tribe was not unanimous as to termination now, provisions were incorporated into the bill which permit sufficient time for the development of detailed plans aimed at assuring safeguarding of tribal assets as of the date of complete withdrawal of Federal supervision. While it is understandable that some individuals are quite apprehensive as to the effect of this withdrawal, it has been indeed heartening to observe that a majority of the tribal representatives are accepting the challenge of assumption of full responsibility after having weighed it carefully against those restrictions under which they must now exist by reason of the simple fact that they are Indians and not non-Indians.

In this legislation, as in all of the terminal bills considered, the attitude of the Indians is heavily weighed; if resistance is based on a conclusion that economically, socially, or culturally the affected individuals are clearly not in a position to assume responsibilities common to non-Indians at this time, our Committee has shown a complete willingness to govern itself accordingly. If, as has been apparent in several instances, resistance has been based solely not on apprehension as to ability but rather on an unwillingness to assume such responsibilities as liability to local property taxes, such factor is then only weighed in light of all other surrounding circumstances. Wherever any possible rights or equities are present as a result of treaties or statutory enactmentfi such rights have been carefully preserved in the Indians for whatever term is involved in the treaty or statute. It follows that "unilateral abrogation" is not involved.

I am enclosing, for the information of your constituent, a copy of House Report No. 1757, the House-Senate conference report on H. R. 2828, the Menominee terminal bill, together with a survey report on the Bureau of Indian Affairs, January 26, 1954, which I believe will help to advise Father Corley more fully of some of the factors involved in the Federal Indian legislation.

Many critics of the congressional program for Indians apparently overlooked the fact that not only individual Indians but tribes have demanded or pleaded for termination of Federal supervision over their property. The same persons may frequently overlook the fact that while in a sense Federal supervision constitutes protection, it also singles out a great group of fine Americans and places them under restrictions and controls which virtually kill all individual initiative or desire for advancement. We in Congress can only know that the 102-year program under the Department of the Interior has not in many respects made available to our Indian citizens those benefits which our modern concept of citizenship responsibility dictates for all citizens. It is my conviction that the 83d Congress has accomplished in its legislative program to date the most beneficial enactments in many years of legislating. To enumerate but three: repeal of the Federal statutes placing restrictions upon the personal property of Indians, long a source of complaint and frustration by the Indians; repeal of the Federal statutes applicable to Indians only with respect to intoxicating liquor—it should be noted that the repeal of the Federal Indian liquor law gives the same local option privileges that have been enjoyed by all other Americans since repeal of the Volstead Act with ratification of the 21st amendment in 1933; and legislation covering civil and criminal jurisdiction in certain States with respect to Indian country within their borders, at the same time making it possible for all other Indian States to assume such jurisdiction in the future. It should be noted (and this fact has frequently been overlooked by critics of the so-called jurisdiction act) that for many years law and order conditions on Indian reservations have ranged from absolute lawlessness in the more extreme cases to a more typical case where individual Indians simply have not had available to them the constitutional protection and due process protection guaranteed to all non-Indians since the very early days of our Republic.

With respect to Indian legislation, it must be recognized that at least a part of the resistance is resistance not to the substance of the legislation but resistance because of apprehension.

On the House Indian Affairs Subcommittee, of the 14 members, we have representation from areas containing more than 250,000 Indians in the United States and Alaska. It is my deep personal conviction, from many years of serving with this committee, that if there is one bulwark against hasty, ill-conceived legislation affecting the American Indian, it lies within the membership of our Indian Affairs Subcommittee. As with all other legislation, we can only act as experience, conscience, and the very best advice obtainable from all sources will dictate that we should act. It should not be forgotten in any discussion of Indian affairs that there are those small groups of individuals who, claiming to represent the interest of the Indians, are in actuality only seeking to keep them in status quo so that they—the self-styled spokesmen for the Indians—can either perpetuate the continuing need for their own services or can continue to enjoy a position of importance or profit to themselves alone; so, too, with several national organizations.

The letter of Father Corley is a refreshing and heartening one. I trust that in going into this matter in some length I have helped demonstrate how sincerely I feel that the present program is the only program which will in the end result in maximum benefit to the citizens involved.

Sincerely yours,

A. L. Miller,
Chairman.

The Federal Unemployment Compensation Standards Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VERA BUCHANAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 14, 1954

Mrs. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following statement submitted by me to the House Ways and Means Committee in support of H. R. 9430, the Federal Unemployment Compensation Standards Act, of which I am a cosponsor:

Statement of Hon. Vera Buchanan Before the House Ways and Means Committee on H. R. 9430, the Federal Unemployment Compensation Standards Act

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I wish to thank you for the opportunity to give my views in support of H. R. 9430 introduced by Congressman Aime J. Forand and known as the Federal Unemployment Compensation Standards Act. This bill, of which I am very happy to be a cosponsor, provides substantial improvements in the Federal-State system of unemployment compensation. It provides maximum primary benefits of at least 50 percent of the full-time weekly wage up to a ceiling of 66⅔ percent of the State's average weekly wage, and increases the duration of benefits to a period of 39 weeks.

Almost 19 eventful years have elapsed since the Social Security Act was passed in 1935. During these years the Federal-State unemployment insurance program has proved its worth under constantly changing economic conditions and has become an accepted institution. It is clear, however, that with the millions of workers who are unemployed today, with the many thousands who are receiving layoff notices each week and with unemployment compensation payments falling far behind wages and the cost of living, there is an immediate and pressing need for an unemployment compensation standards bill.

In the great Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, the maximum weekly benefit presently allowed is $30 and payments run out after 26 weeks. Is it any wonder that many workers are exhausing their benefits before they can find jobs?

With the unemployment situation becoming more serious each month, the need for improving benefits must be met without delay. It is true that there was reported a slight drop in the number of unemployed workers between April and May, but these same figures show that manufacturing employment continued to decline. The Labor Department has just announced that 31 industrial centers have been added to the list of areas of substantial unemployment—those having 6 percent or more of their labor force without jobs. The total of these substantial labor surplus areas has now reached 123. The Department said there were 16 major areas in this latest addition to the list and 4 of the 16 are in Pennsylvania—Pittsburgh, Erie, Philadelphia, and Reading.

In another Labor Department report published in May, we find that the States paid out a record $553 million in unemployment-compensation benefits during the first quarter of this year. This was the largest amount paid to jobless workers in any previous 3-month period, the Department reported, and figures just released by the Office of Business Economics of the Department of Commerce show that personal income in the Nation declined in April for the sixth straight month. Personal income, according to this report, in April, was at an annual rate of $1 billion less than it was in March and $5 billion under that of last October.

In the face of this urgent need to improve unemployment benefits, it is disheartening to note that during the year 1953 only eight States amended the provisions of their unemployment-insurance laws governing the maximum length of benefit payments. It is thus apparent that this cannot be left to the States and that the obligation and the responsibility is here with us.

The statistics I have quoted point implacably to one conclusion—the need for prompt and effective action and that the time for action is now. Each day that we delay such action adds to the workers' fear of unemploy and undermines that security which is so essential to their welfare. It is by such action, and by such action alone, that the Federal-State unemployment-compensation program will be able to meet the challenge of the serious period of recession which we are experiencing today.

Let Us Draw Upon the Strength of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DEWEY SHORT
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 9, 1954

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, under leave heretofore granted, I submit the following address delivered by the Secretary of Agriculture, the Honorable Ezra Taft Benson, before the chamber of commerce, St. Louis, Mo., June 1, 1954.

However one might feel toward Mr. Benson, or whatever one might think of his views, it must be and is generally admitted that Mr. Benson is a fine Christian gentleman, a great American patriot, and a man of unusual courage in conscientiously expounding his views. Because of his long training, experience, and background he certainly knows much about agriculture, and whatever he says deserves the most thoughtful and serious consideration of the American people. His address follows:

Let Us Draw Upon the Strength of America

It is always a pleasure to visit in St. Louis, and it is both a privilege and an honor to be here with you for this meeting.

Perhaps I may be pardoned for regarding St. Louis with particular affection. After all, it was here at the exposition of 1904 that the ice cream cone was invented. Entirely apart from the pleasure that this discovery has given us, both as children and as adults, I am thinking of the dairy surplus we might now have if 50 years ago the ice cream cone had not been invented.

Many of you here today are business or professional people. Many others, including myself, have been farmers for all or much of our lives.

Yet this should not mean—and it does not mean—that our points of view—urban or rural—are fundamentally different. There are other—and more important—characteristics that all of us here share in common. One—we are all consumers. Two—we are all Americans.

As consumers we are interested in providing an economic climate that will result in raising the level of living.

As Americans we are vitally concerned that this choice land shall remain strong and free—and that it shall continue to merit the blessings of a kind providence.

As you know, agriculture has recently been traveling a pretty rough road. Farm income has fallen in 5 out of the past 6 years.

Our agricultural problems have been aggravated by a severe drought in parts of our range area and by an accumulation of surpluses such as this country had never witnessed before.

The national farm programs, which were intended to bolster farm prices and income, obviously have not done their job.

This administration has pledged itself to help agriculture gain a fair share of the national income.

Experience clearly shows that the present price-support program cannot be depended upon to function effectively in helping farmers achieve this goal.

We need a new program.

We need a new program for four basic reasons:

1. Because the present system of price support is resulting in back-breaking surpluses, and they are growing worse all the time.
2. Because the present program deceives farmers with a pledge of support at 90 percent of parity that it does not provide.
3. Because the present program is leading us away from a balanced agricultural economy, instead of toward it.
4. Because the present program taxes the American people for agricultural abundance and then tends to deny them the benefits of abundance.

Here are the facts about our surpluses:

Commodity Credit Corporation today has approximately $6½ billion invested in farm price support operations. Approximately half of this total is accounted for by commodities owned outright by CCC.

Now $6½ billion represents more than one-fifth of the value of all farm marketings for an entire year. Slightly more than half of the 1953 flaxseed crop went under Government loan. In addition, 47 percent of the 1953 wheat crop, 41 percent of the cotton crop, and 29 percent of the peanut crop were placed under price supports.

Early this year, Congress increased the borrowing authority of CCC from $6¾ billion to $8½ billion. If we should continue to accumulate surplus stocks at the same rate during the next year as we have in the last year, a further increase in this borrowing authority will be required.

Today it is costing CCC in excess of $700,000 per day—more than one-quarter of a billion dollars per year—just to store these commodities.

These sobering facts are glossed over by the advocates of rigid supports.

The CCC now owns or has under loan enough wheat to provide the average family in the United States with 1,400 loaves of bread—enough cotton to make 117 shirts or 91 house dresses for each family—enough corn to provide 6 months' suply of pork and pork products—enough butter for a 3 months' supply.

By July 1 our carryover of what is expected to be more than triple what it was in July 1952. By next August, our carryover of cotton is expected to be 3½ times the level of August 1952. By next October, stocks of corn are expected to be double those of 2 years ago.

We shall have enough wheat and cotton on hand to carry us through a full year's domestic use, even if this year's crops were a total failure.

I said that the present program deceives farmers by pledging support at 90 percent of parity, but does not provide it. Here are the facts:

We have made an investment of nearly $2¼ billion to support wheat at 90 percent of parity—but the average market price of wheat is only 82 percent of parity.

We have made an investment of $1.3 billion to support corn at 90 percent of parity—but the average market price of corn is only 80 percent of parity.

The present program helps least those farmers who need help most; and it helps most those who need it least.

In Missouri for example, the 5 largest Government loans on the 1953 cotton crop averaged $153,191, while th eaverage loan to all cotton farmers in the State was only $395. The 5 largest wheat loans averaged $39,668, against a State average of $1,695. The 5 largest corn loans averaged $50,578. The State average was $1,994.

Now it is obvious, in view of these very large loans, that there must have been a tremendous number of very small ones to pull the average down to the levels indicated. And I submit that the difference between the loan level and the free market price is not great enough, where only a few bushels of grain or a few bales of cotton are concerned, to give the small farmer any appreciable degree of financial security.

The present program has contributed to agricultural imbalance by pricing some farm commodities out of their traditional markets. It has discouraged balanced conservation and soil-building practices by maintaining artificial demands for some soil-depleting crops. It has disturbed the normal relationship between feed and livestock prices.

I have said that the present program taxes the American people for abundance only to deny them the full benefits of abundance.

The eating habits of the American people have changed considerably in recent decades. I don't mean that the poundage of food consumed per person has changed significantly, but that the quality of the diet today is much different from what it was 40 or 50 years ago.

Last year, for example, Americans consumed per person 223 pounds more of such foods as meats, eggs, fish, dairy products, fruits, and vegetables than they did in 1909.

Let me repeat that figure—223 pounds more of these foods per person.

They offset this by eating 222 pounds less of grain products and potatoes.

This is a vitally important fact. It indicates the kind of foods American buyers want.

But do we recognize this? On the contrary, the existing price supports, with their emphasis on the basics, are bucking the trend of consumer food preferences.

While the six basic crops, which enjoy 90 percent supports, capture most of the headlines these days, the great bulk of Missouri's farm income is derived from other sources. During 1953, for example, farmers' total cash market receipts were a little over $1 billion. Livestock and livestock products accounted for $705 million of this, while crops returned only $310 million.

Only 14 percent of Missouri's farm income is supplied by the so-called basic commodities.

Actually, the basic crops—wheat, cotton, corn, rice, tobacco, and peanuts—account for only about 23 percent of the Nation's total farm income.

Yet nine-tenths of the $6½ billion committed to price-support operations is tied up in the basic commodities. Approximately 56 percent of the receipts from all farm marketings comes from commodities which are not under price supports of any kind.

During the last 20 years, prices received by farmers for nonsupported commodities have averaged slightly higher in relation to parity than the prices of those which are supported. This would indicate that in the current debate over our future farm program many people are assigning to price supports an importance far out of proportion to the role they actually play.

Although farmers have been led to believe that 90-percent supports created high commodity prices, actually it was unprecedented wartime demands and galloping inflation which held farm prices above 100 percent of parity between 1942 and 1952. When those forces abated, we were not able to hold wheat, corn, and peanuts at 90 percent of parity, even with price supports at that level.

Much of our current trouble with grain surpluses stems directly from the fact that our price-support programs have encouraged farmers to produce cereals as grain rather than as animal feed—or to put it another way, to produce corn and wheat for storage, beyond what Americans need—rather than for meat, eggs, and other livestock products which the American people need and will buy.

The carryover of corn next October 1 is now estimated at 950 million bushels, against 487 million 2 years earlier. Thus, in 2 crop years we are adding 463 million bushels to a carryover which was already more than ample.

At least this much additional corn should have been fed, rather than stored. Had it been fed, it would have resulted in an increase in meat and eggs of around 2 to 3 percent per year.

From a nutritional point of view the American people could easily have used an increase of 2 or 3 percent per year of such foods, and have been better off for it. With more flexibility in prices this probably would have happened.

Larger marketings can mean higher net income and greater stability for producers of livestock and livestock products and better diets for consumers.

The same thing is true over the long pull for producers of grain. Given some flexibility in prices, we can expand our wheat exports. And we need to do so.

We have been pricing ourselves out of world markets. Our exports of wheat outside the International Wheat Agreement during the last 2 years of the pact dropped from 220 million bushels to only 64 million. Meanwhile, Canada's non-quota sales jumped from 105 million bushels to 161 million.

And let's not forget that income from any commodity does not depend on price alone. It is price per unit—minus cost—times the number of units sold.

When excess reserves of grain—whether wheat, corn, or other grains—pile up in storage, because of rigidly supported prices at unrealistic levels, agriculture suffers. Those who buy grain for feed suffer immediately. But over the long run grain producers suffer also. They suffer from restrictions on acreage—from wide fluctuations in income—and from consumer resentment.

On the other hand, a realistic price support program—geared to consumer preferences and present day conditions—will benefit all of agriculture.

As you know, this administration has proposed a different program—a program which places the emphasis where it belongs. It is a program that will be sound for farmers in the short-run and in the long-run. It is a program that will be fair to all our people. It will help keep America strong.

Under the new program, and beginning January 1, 1955, price supports would be flexible, rather than rigid. They would be geared to supply and demand conditions.

Moreover, all price-supported commodities would be placed on a fair and comparable basis by applying to all such commodities the new or modernized parity formula, beginning January 1, 1956. To make sure that the changeover to modernized parity would be gradual, any reduction in the parity price level would be limited to not more than 5 percent per year.

Up to $2½ billion worth of the present excess reserves of such crops as wheat and cotton would be frozen—set aside from the market in order to give the new program a chance to work.

Agricultural Conservation Program funds would be used where needed to aid farmers in making wise adjustments in the use of diverted acres.

A thorough study would be made of the problems of smaller farm operators.

Note how these proposals are designed to correct the four basic defects in the present program which I mentioned earlier.

First, they would place more emphasis on the type of agriculture needed to produce the kind of diets our people want.

Second, variable supports, plus the substitution of modernized parity for the outdated old parity formula, would help move more farm products into wider use both at home and abroad.

The old parity level is completely unrealistic. Under it, parity for wheat is 37 cents a bushel higher than modernized parity. Corn under old parity is 21 cents a bushel higher than under modernized parity. Such artificial price levels cannot be maintained except through regimentation and even more rigid controls.

Third, the $2½ billion set-aside would give farmers a chance to correct unbalanced production patterns without carrying the burden of huge surpluses on their backs.

Meantime, we are taking aggressive steps here at home as well as in world markets to develop new and larger outlets for our farm products.

Fourth, the use of agricultural conservation funds to assist farmers in meeting the problem of diverted acres would encourage sound land use patterns.

And the thorough study of the needs of small farm operators ordered by the President, and already under way, can do much to correct the economic imbalance that is perhaps the most important long-range agricultural problem of all.

This entire program, my friends, is one to help us achieve balanced farming.

Actually, there is nothing new about flexible price supports. They have been a part of our farm program for many years.

Prior to the Second World War, we had flexible supports ranging between 52 and 75 percent of parity. Even today we are supporting more commodities on a flexible basis than under the high, rigid plan.

The record shows that all recent Secretaries of Agriculture have favored flexible supports. Mr. Wallace did and still does. Mr. Wickard did. Mr. Anderson did and still does. Mr. Brannan did through at least a considerable part of his service.

The platforms of both major parties endorsed flexible price supports in 1948. These recommendations were embodied into law in that year and in 1949. All major farm organizations backed the principle then, as did overwhelming majorities of both parties in Congress. Certainly the record of overall support for such a program is impressive enough to justify a fair trial for it now.

There are some who say: Yes, this program is right, but it's poor politics.

There should be no room for narrow partisan prejudices in this question. We are dealing with something that affects the welfare of all farmers—of all business—of all working people—of all consumers.

Let us not judge this question with bias. Let us judge the present program—and the proposed program—on the sole basis of what is best for farmers—for consumers—and for America.

Let me repeat what I have said often elsewhere; Never will I knowingly advocate any program, or policy, which I believe is not in the best interests of farmers and farm people, regardless of political pressure.

My fellow Americans, you have a vital stake in this program to strengthen agriculture. Our farm program is financed with taxpayers' dollars. Its results—good or bad—affect all the American people.

Last year, as you people here in Missouri know so well, we experienced a wide-spread drought which encompassed 18 States. All of us are thankful that this drought has been broken over most of the area.

There was some misunderstanding of the role which the Federal Government played in meeting the drought situation in Missouri. This may have been fostered for partisan reasons.

On this entire question of Federal assistance, I have always believed that Abraham Lincoln stated the case better than it has been set forth since. He said:

"The legitimate object of government is to do for a community of people whatever they need to have done, but cannot do at all, or cannot so well do, in their separate and individual capacities."

Now it not the function of government to provide credit and other assistance to citizens who can obtain such services from private sources on reasonable terms.

During a drought emergency such as we experienced last year, however, I am convinced that the Federal Government was eminentaly right in helping farmers to help themselves.

In Missouri alone we authorized emergency loans totaling $5.8 million in addition to the livestock-feed program which represented an outlay of $13 million. At the same time, the State legislature appropriated $6.5 million to help meet the problem. Nearly one-sixth of the economic disaster loans which we made in the entire United States went to Missouri farmers. So did approximately one-sixth of the feed distributed under the drought-aid program.

We who live today—whether we are on the farm or in the city—have must to learn from the past. The history of this city and this State contains a wealth of inspiration for us in the midtwentieth century.

Here is a city that was built on the basis of the fur trade and its ideal location as a center of water transportation. But though the era of flatboats and steamboats dominating transportation eventually passed, St Louis did not decay. It became a mighty commercial center. It became a great railroad center. It is still the world's largest raw fur market. It is becoming an increasingly important grain market.

The early Missouri farmers were real Americans, and the part of the word "American" that they emphasized consisted of the last four letters—i-c-a-n: I can. When they had few outlets for their goods agricultural societies planned fairs and other means to increase markets. When the times were at their worst an overland trade route was opened to Santa Fe., N. Mex. Missouri became a base of supplies for flour, beef, pork, and other foods that were needed in the growth of the Far West.

Today we are still confronted by this same basic problem of finding adequate and stable markets for farm products. And that is why I say that we have much to learn from the courage, the ingenuity, the perseverance of the early Missouri farmers.

They drew on the strength of America to solve their problems. And that is what we must do today.

Let us do away with fear about the future of American agriculture. The future will be better than the present. It will be immeasurably better than the past. Today American farmers produce per man-hour of labor four-fifths more food and fiber than they did in the years just before World War II.

We have, by no means, come to the end of the road in research. We are rather at the beginning, and the long route of wonderful progress lies ahead of us.

So, too, with our markets. Each year our population grows by some 2.6 million persons. We have that many new mouths to feed, new bodies to clothe, new persons to house and shelter. Many in our present population are still not well fed. They, too, are a market for our agriculture, if only we have the initiative and courage and foresight to seize the high tide of opportunity.

Let us go forward, asking the guidance and blessing of providence, in this great task of strengthening our agriculture and our Nation.

General MacArthur Was Right on Asia—Even His Enemies Now Admit It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1954

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including a rather interesting article by the Alsop brothers in which they now admit that General MacArthur was right in his attitude on Asia when he was supreme commander in that part of the world. The United States and the world are beginning to realize that he was right when he said, "There is no substitute for victory."

The article follows:

Matter of Fact

(By Joseph and Stewart Alsop)

ASIA PERIL UPHOLDS MACARTHUR

One of the things the Indochinese crisis is doing is to vindicate the judgment of Gen. Douglas MacArthur. The free world would not now be menaced with a catastrophe in Asia, if MacArthur had won his fight against the artificial limits on the Korean war.

From the false perspective of Washington in 1950, the arguments against MacArthur's views sounded convincing to many. Speaking personally, one of these reporters only discovered how farsighted General MacArthur had been by going to Asia last year to see things for himself.

MacArthur was right in 3 different ways and on 3 different levels. He was right, first, in proclaiming that there was no substitute for victory.

Adm. Arthur Radford now is being attacked venomously for taking the same stand about the Indochina crisis. But what is the substitute offered in Indochina? Viacheslav Molotov has told the world. The substitute is to be a smashing triumph for the Soviet Empire and unmitigated, disastrous defeat for the West.

MacArthur was right, second, in his view that the Korean war was a crucial test that was necessary to win at all costs and risks. Indochina is the proof.

Because General MacArthur's policy was rejected, the Communists were able to fight our armies to a standstill. The truce then automatically transferred the strategic storm center of Asia from the relatively manageable contest in Korea to the extremely unmanageable contest in Indochina. Because we did not win the first test, we seem to be about to lose the second, and many others after that. The danger in Indochina is the direct result of their failure in Korea.

Third, MacArthur was right in feeling, as he obviously did feel, that the time of the Chinese intervention in Korea was the right time for a showdown in the world struggle between the Soviet and the free halves of the world.

In the simplest terms, the United States already possessed decisive air-atomic striking power, while Soviet air-atomic power was still virtually nil in 1950-51. The Communist enemy then had proven his aggressive intentions. Our one major weapon then had its fullest value. That value already was being impaired by the Soviet air-atomic buildup. Logic demanded a showdown without further delay. Indochina again is the proof.

It is not generally known, but it is the chilling fact that Soviet air-atomic striking power has for the first time begun to influence American policy in the present crisis. The Joint Chiefs of Staff have not beein influenced. That will come no doubt a year or two later. Then the Soviet air-atomic buildup will have gone much further. Then the peril of the United States will be total, which is not yet the case.

But among the opponents of action to save Indochina, certain key planners already have been strongly influenced by the existing Soviet air-atomic threat. If we go into the Indochina war, they have said, it cannot be limited. If it is not limited, the Soviet Union may come into the war. If the Soviet Union comes in, its atom-bomb power may be used. And are we then to risk atom bombs on the United States, they have asked, for the sake of this crisis in Asia?

The question is superficially persuasive, as long as you do not ask the counterquestions. Those are simple. What are we to do when the world power balance has utterly collapsed because of the West's humiliating defeat in Indochina, and when Soviet air-atomic striking power has grown twice or three times as dangerous to us? Are we then to surrender everywhere?

These facts and questions prove another man right, too. In 1951-52, Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer took the lead in advocating an adequate air defense for the United States.

The big-bomber generals of the Air Force regarded Oppenheimer's pleas for expenditure on air defense as being almost as bad as a proposal to spend money on the Navy. They charged that his motive was secret and disloyal hostility to the Strategic Air Command. There is an echo of that shameful episode in the report of the Gordon Gray Board.

But Dr. Oppenheimer's real motive was quite different. He argued that a country with a strong offense and no defense was like a fighter with a glass jaw. He predicted that, despite the power of SAC, American policy would be progressively paralyzed as the danger of Soviet air-atomic attack grew greater and greater. Without prejudice to SAC, he urged an adequate air defense as the only effective protection against this creeping paralysis.

The air defense problem was nonetheless neglected. The American planners, asking their rhetorical question about Soviet atomic bombs, already show the creeping paralysis of policy that Dr. Oppenheimer foresaw. Although this is only a small, first installment of something far uglier, Dr. Oppenheimer has already been proven right in detail.

General MacArthur and Dr. Oppenheimer are an oddly assorted pair. But they now jointly deserve a public apology from all those who opposed them. Or perhaps, instead, their highly placed opponents should now be classed as security risks, because of their "lack of enthusiasm" in situations where their errors have done infinitely more damage than Dr. Oppenheimer's "lack of enthusiasm" for the hydrogen bomb.

What Is Right for America Is Politically Right

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 14, 1954

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, the speech delivered by President Eisenhower on Thursday evening, June 10, 1954, is considered one of his most noteworthy speeches. It was plain that he spoke of what he considered best for the Nation, regardless of its political effect. His sincerity was convincing.

An editorial in the Camden (N. J.) Courier-Post, issue of June 12, 1954, has emphasized in well-chosen words that the President spoke in terms that considered the Nation and its welfare of paramount importance. The title of the editorial, "What Is Right for America Is Politically Right," words used by the President in his address, makes plain the underlying theme that was dominant throughout the entire speech.

The editorial is as follows:

WHAT IS RIGHT FOR AMERICA IS POLITICALLY RIGHT

President Eisenhower's Thursday night speech was primarily an appeal for bipartisan support of his legislative program, important segments of which are endangered by congressional politicking.

It was one of Mr. Eisenhower's best speeches. As always, he left no doubt of his deep sincerity and belief that what he was urging was in the best interests of the Nation. Many who watched and listened must have been convinced, if they had not been before, that he was right in his belief.

Warning that this "age of ceaseless trouble and danger" may continue for another generation or longer, the President said that "in spite of highly publicized distractions" Congress has accomplished considerable and enacted important parts of his program for blocking Communist aggression—as it has.

"But much still remains that is of vital significance to every American citizen," he continued. "Let us, therefore, not rest until these laws are passed. Let us have, in this session of Congress, approval of a program essential to a stronger America."

Mr. Eisenhower has presented an excellent case, one that can hardly be controverted. The rest is up to Congress.

Mr. Eisenhower long ago made it clear that he will never try to dictate to Congress and will do his utmost to avoid infringing on its rights.

Nevertheless he has learned, as most Presidents eventually do, that times come when the Chief Executive must stand up for what he believes is right even if that means a clash with the legislative branch.

He is showing unusual political courage in challenging the congressional farm bloc on the issue of price supports. It is hard to recall the last time a President defied this supposedly powerful bloc as Mr. Eisenhower is doing.

He has thrown down the gage of battle to the farm belt politicos by as good as announcing that he will veto the bill they are trying to force upon him and the country which would continue the present disastrous and scandalous rigid price support system, which "encourages the production of great surpluses" and forces the Government to "spend $30,000 an hour—every hour" just to store them.

The President has said before and he now reiterates that he will not compromise on the essential principle of his farm program, which is a change in the direction of a free price system through the substitution of flexible supports for high, fixed ones.

Mr. Eisenhower is right in saying that only "minority clamor" is behind the fixed support program and that the change to flexible supports will not hurt the farmer but instead "will increase markets for farm products, protect the consumers' food supply, and move food into consumption instead of Government storage. It will gradually dispose of the gigantic farm surpluses and promises our farmers a higher and steadier financial return over the years."

The President has been told, he tells his fellow citizens, "that it would not be good politics to attempt solution of the farm problem during an election year. The sensible think to do, I have been told, over and over, was to close my eyes to the damage the present farm program does to our farmers and the rest of our people—and do this job of correction next year."

But, Mr. Eisenhower movingly says in the high spot of his speech, "In this matter I am completely unmoved by arguments as to what constitutes good or winning politics. And may I remark that, though I have not been in this political business very long, I know that what is right for America is politically right.

"In the proposal to correct the deficiencies in our farm program, the administration's concern is for all farmers, regardless of their politics, and for all America."

There can be no question that on the price-support issue, and in all his actions, President Eisenhower is genuinely trying to do what he thinks is best for all America, despite the McCarthys and the farm blocs and self-seeking, time-serving politicians of all stripes.

He is not a professional politician, but he is far wiser than most of them in realizing that what is right for America is politically right.

His stand on the farm issue is logically and morally unassailable. He merits and undoubtedly has the support of the great majority of Americans on it.

If he is forced to use the veto on it, that will prove to be not bad politics but good politics and he will rate all the higher with the American people for it.

Dixie Gilmer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL ALBERT

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 14, 1954

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep sorrow that I join with my colleagues in paying a small word of tribute to a former colleague from my State. I have known Dixie Gilmer for many years. During all this time we have been close personal friends. Early in his life he lived in my district and has relatives living there at this time.

Dixie Gilmer is one of the most unique and colorful characters in Oklahoma politics. He had a personal following in his own county that always enabled him to run far ahead of his party. He was a man of tremendous courage. He was a fighter. He has been ill for many years. He was ill most of the time during his short period of service in this House. Had it not been for his unrelenting fight, he would have lost his battle with death many years ago. Yet with all his courage and tenacity, Dixie Gilmer was a lovable person who loved his friends.

To his beloved widow and loved ones I extend my deepest sympathy.

The Gallatin Steam Plant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 2, 1954

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, a few years ago Members of Congress from the Tennessee Valley persuaded Congress to install some steam generating plants in the Tennessee Valley Authority, stating that these plants were necessary in order to firm up the power generated by hydro in order to assure a constant supply of electricity to the consumers.

Many people believed that steam plants were not necessary to firm up the hydroplants and that the beginning of such construction would result in the Tennessee Valley Authority going further and further into steam generation plants. The fears of the opponents of the steam plants in the Tennessee Valley are more than justified because in the May issue of the magazine Combustion, devoted to the advancement of steam plant design and operation, appeared an article by C. E. Blee, chief engineer, and H. J. Peterson, head mechanical engineer, of the Tennessee Valley Authority, verifying this position.

This article indicates that today steam generates 39 percent of the total installed capacity of the Tennessee Valley, and at the end of 1956 steam will generate 63 percent of the Tennessee Valley capacity. The description of the Gallatin steam plant follows:

THE GALLATIN STEAM PLANT OF THE TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY [1]

The power system of the Tennessee Valley Authority is undergoing a change from an almost entirely hydro system to one in which steam-electric power will predominate. This is the history of practically all the large, growing utility systems which initially were supplied primarily from hydro sources. There is presumably in each case some combination of hydro and steam which would produce the most economical power supply. What this relationship is depends on the conditions of hydro and steam power supply available in a particular system together with the load characteristics. The question is really academic since, to be realistic, it comes down to a matter of meeting the load demands in a practicable manner. In the case of TVA the impact of unprecedented loads, spearheaded by the requirements of the Atomic Energy Commission and other defense agencies, left no choice but to go ahead with a program of steam plant construction which has developed into an undertaking of sizable proportions.

The chart shows the supply and demand on the TVA power system going back to January 1, 1944. The load is given in terms of hourly peak in kilowatts. For the years up to January 1, 1954, this is the load as experienced. For the future years shown, the expected load demands are based on an analysis of the past and present loads. The AEC load is a very considerable factor in the present load and is reflected in the estimated future load to the extent that it is covered by contracts. The load demands of the municipalities and cooperatives which are supplied wholesale by TVA are showing a sustained heavy rate of growth.

The installed generating capacity on the system in terms of name plate rating was 2,639,000 kilowatts as of January 1, 1949; today, 5 years later, it is 5,689,000 kilowatts; at the end of calendar year 1956, 8 years later, it will be 9,935,000 kilowatts, approaching four times the 1949 capacity. At the start of this present program of steam plant construction in 1949, there was only 437,000 kilowatts of steam-electric generating capacity in the system, amounting to 16 percent of the total installed capacity. Today, the steam amounts to 2,237,000 kilowatts or 39 percent; at the end of 1956, the steam will amount to 6,287,000 kilowatts, representing 63 percent of the system's generating capacity. While the additions of generating capacity in the more recent years have been largely in steam-electric units, hydro possibilities have not been overlooked. During the 5 years from 1949 to date, hydroelectric generating units with a combined capacity of 1,250,000 kilowatts have been added to the system. Hydro will continue to play its part in the development of the system but the available sites remaining will accommodate only relatively small installations and it would be utterly impossible to keep pace with the load demands by building such stations.

DESIGN TRENDS

In the brief period of time covered by this program of steam-plant construction, there has been a remarkable advancement in the art of designing and manufacturing steam-plant equipment. This is reflected in the progressively changing characteristics of the units installed on the TVA system. These units are listed chronologically in table 1. A corollary of this change in the characteristics of the units is that although started less than a year apart, no two stations are duplicates, a fact which has not lessened the heavy design load.

It may be noted from the data given in table 1 that in the approximately 4 years covered by this table, the maximum guaranteed capabilities increased by stages from 125 megawatts to 150 megawatts to 200 megawatts and finally to 250 megawatts at Gallatin. In this same period the throttle temperatures rose from 1,000° F. to 1,050° F. with 1,000° F. and 1,050° F. reheat in the later stages. The throttle pressure kept pace by increasing from 1,450 pounds per square inch gage to 1,080 pounds per square-inch gage, and finally to 2,000 pounds per square-inch gage at Gallatin. The trend of the net plant heat rate, of course, followed the more efficient heat cycles by reducing from 10,086 British thermal units per kilowatt hour at Johnsonville to 9,216 British thermal units per kilowatt-hour at Gallatin, a gain of 8.6 percent.

The above illustrates that the Authority is taking advantage of what might be called the conservative advances in the art of generating steam-elecric power. The above stations will be among the most efficient in the world. Capacitywise the TVA has taken its place as one of the leaders because of the lesser reliability risk involved in increasing capacity. It is true that there are other stations being designed with higher temperatures and much higher pressures, but TVA has preferred to let those units get a trial by performance before accepting their more extreme heat cycles.

SELECTION OF THE GALLATIN UNIT

With its strategic location near the center of the system and with the site features as to topography, foundations, cooling water, coal supply, and transportation being favorable, the Gallatin plant was envisioned as ultimately being a very large capacity generating station and one which would justify large units.

TABLE 1.—*Design trend of TVA steam plants*

Plant	Authorized number of units	Starting date, first unit	NPHR,[1] B. t. u./kw.-hr.	Unit guaranteed capability, mw	Temperature, °F	Pressure, p. s. i. g.
Johnsonville	1-4	Oct. 1951	[2] 10,086	125	1,000	1,450
Widows Creek	1-4	June 1952	9,972	125	1,000	1,450
Johnsonville	5-6	Nov. 1952	10,015	125	1,000	1,450
Shawnee	1-10	Apr. 1953	9,303	150	1,000/1,000	1,800
Kingston	1-4	Feb. 1954	9,271	150	1,000/1,000	1,800
Widows Creek	5-6	May 1954	9,296	125	1,000/1,000	1,800
Kingston	5-9	Sept. 1954	9,191	200	1,050/1,050	1,800
Colbert	1-4	Oct. 1954	9,201	200	1,050/1,050	1,800
John Sevier	1-3	June 1955	9,170	200	1,050/1,050	1,800
Gallatin	1-2	Nov. 1955	9,216	250	1,050/1,050	2,000

[1] Calculated NPHR at maximum guaranteed capability of the turbine and 1½-inches Hg. back pressure, using manufacturer's guaranties.

[2] Actual NPHR for fiscal year 1952 as reported to Federal Power Commission.

Table 1 indicates that the Gallatin plant will have a slightly higher heat rate than will the John Sevier plant with its 200,000 kilowatt units. The difference is due to various factors, such as differences in the coal, difference in manufacturer's guaranteed boiler efficiencies, and, because, while each turbine has the same exhaust annulus area, more steam is exhausted from the larger unit resulting in a slightly higher back pressure. At the design back pressure of 2 inches of mercury this difference is narrowed to 27 British thermal units per kilowatt-hour (0.29 percent). Temperature conditions of the cooling water are such that the units at Gallatin will be operating approximately one-half of the time above 1½ inches of mercury back pressure and one-half of the time below. The selection of the units with a slightly lower efficiency was justified because of the extra 50,000 kilowatts per unit obtained and because of the lower operating expense and building cost per kilowatt of capacity.

LAYOUT AND GENERAL DESIGN FEATURES

The unit system of one boiler per turbine was employed. A high availability factor is expected from the boiler so there was no need of splitting the boiler load in view of the excessive cost for so doing. No cross-connections are to be installed between units. These were installed at the Watts Bar plant but they have never been operated.

As will be noted from the cross section of the plant, figure 3, the operating functions are concentrated on two main levels which are the basement level and the grade level.

Partial outdoor type of construction is employed in that the dust collectors, induced-draft fans, and ductwork are all outside the powerhouse enclosure. A comprehensive study was made to determine the savings of an outdoor type of plant over the partial outdoor type used at Gallatin. The saving indicated was not considered sufficient to overcome the operating objections to an outdoor plant.

---

[1] Presented before the American Power Conference, sponsored by the Illinois Institute of Technology, March 24–26, 1954.

Because of the large gas flow from the Gallatin boilers it was found advisable, because of physical limitations, to use three air preheaters per boiler. A detailed study was made whether or not to use 3 forced- and 3 induced-draft fans per boiler or to use 2 of each together with plenum chambers. It was found that the latter scheme was somewhat cheaper. However, the former scheme of 3 of each fan per unit was finally adopted for the following reasons:

1. Smaller fans. The larger fans would require excessively large handling equipment for maintenance.
2. Ten large isolating dampers are eliminated by the three-fan scheme.
3. One fan lost in a three-fan system means a loss of about 20 percent of unit capacity, whereas with a two-fan system this loss would be about 40 percent.
4. Simpler and smaller duct arrangement.

An interesting feature of the condenser circulating water system is the water passages which run from the pumps at the river's edge to the condensers and out again to the river. These passages are approximately 72 feet below grade and lie in solid rock. There is one 8-foot diameter concrete-lined tunnel to and from each unit and the total length per unit is approximately 1,100 feet. The considerable excavation and backfill involved if these passages had been excavated and backfill involved if these passages had been excavated from the surface instead of tunneled was eliminated at a very appreciable savings in cost.

Another interesting development occurred in the layout of the large units. Heretofore, all turbines in previous plants were placed with their longitudinal axes at right angles to the length of the powerhouse. In the Gallatin plant it was found that the boiler width controlled the spacing of the units even when the turbines were placed end to end. Consequently, the machines are laid out in this manner, which permits a much narrower turbine room. This reduction is 29 feet from the 200-megawatt units at John Sevier to the 250-megawatt units at Gallatin. The savings in building and crane costs are obvious.

PRINCIPAL EQUIPMENT

Turbogenerators

The Gallatin turbines have a guaranteed capability of 250 megawatts operating under initial steam conditions of 2,000 pounds per square inch gage and 1,050° F., reheat to 1,050° F., exhausting to a back pressure of 2½ inches of mercury absolute. They are single-shaft, tandem-compound, triple-flow units.

The generators have a continuous capability of 250 megawatts or 277.8-megavolt-amperes at 0.9 power factor, 30 pounds per square inch gage hydrogen, 24 kilovolts. At 45 pounds per square inch gage hydrogen these generators will have a maximum capability of 287,500 kilovolts or 319,445 kilovolt-amperes at 0.9 power factor. At the time of installation these units will be the largest in the world.

The 250-megawatt rating was chosen after full discussion with the various turbine manufacturers. It was finally decided to install units of this rating, first, because the manufacturers with their design experience on units of 200-megawatt capacity felt no hesitancy in going to this next higher step. Then, too, the obvious advantages of less operating labor and less building space per kilowatt of these larger units carried a great deal of weight. Because of the large installed capacity of the TVA connected system this rating imposed no regulating restrictions. These units are of a smaller proportionate size to the TVA system than the 60-megawatt Watts Bar units were when they were installed in 1942.

The temperature and pressure of these units also was given considerable study. Eleven hundred degrees was rejected because of the limited operating experience with this temperature. The use of ferritic steels is possible with 1,050° F. temperatures while austenitic steels are required for 1,100° F. and above. Pressures above 2,000 pounds per square inch gage were rejected for the lack of operating experience above this figure and because of the small gain obtained at a considerable increase in cost.

Cross-compound units were considered since they have extra capability and better efficiencies in the lower back pressure ranges. However, our studies indicated that this advantage was outweighed by their higher installed cost. Several companies are now offering a close coupled cross-compound unit which compares favorably with a single-shaft unit in installed cost and heat rate for these larger capacities; such units will be studied for any future plants which the Authority may build.

In common with practically all the larger units now being installed in this country the reheat cycle was chosen. The 4½ to 5 percent gain in fuel economy, together with the smaller condensers, feed pumps, etc., required for the reheat cycle makes it very attractive. With fuel costs for the Authority at 18 to 20 cents per million British thermal units the second reheat cycle is not economical and was not considered. There was some question whether to use 1,000° F. or 1,050° F. for the reheat temperature. Analytical studies made on a pervious plant (Colbert) indicated a substantial return on the additional investment required for the 1,050° F. temperature, so it was selected for Gallatin.

The greatest limitation on generator size is the problem of removing the heat generated by current flowing through the conductors. At Gallatin a step forward is being taken in this direction by the application of innercooling to both the stator and the rotor windings. This type of cooling makes possible a much smaller generator for the same output or, conversely, a much larger output for the same generator frame. At Gallatin this is emphasized dramatically by the fact that the generator is 110 inches less in length and 263,000 pounds less in weight than a comparable conventionally cooled generator of equal rating. The savings in building space, crane capacity, and foundations are apparent.

As a measure of progress in generator cooling the Authority has advanced from air cooling at Watts Bar to 0.5 pounds per square inch gage hydrogen conventional cooling at Johnsonville to 30 pounds per square inch gage hydrogen inner cooling at Gallatjn. Liquid cooling with its higher heat removal potentialities will be investigated for future large units which the Authority may install.

Steam generators

The Gallatin steam generators are twin-furnace, controlled-circulation, tangentially fired units similar to those previously purchased for the last 5 units at Kingston and the 3 at John Sevier. However, in order to drive the 250 megawatt turbines the ratings have been stepped up to a continuous flow of 1,650,000 pounds per hour at 2,035 pounds per square inch gage at the superheater outlet, with total steam temperature of 1,053° F. for both superheater and reheater.

Provision is made for a 4-hour peak load of 1,780,000 pounds per hour.

The principal feature of the twin-furnace design is that the entire reheater is installed in one of the furnaces and the finishing-off section of the superheater in the other furnace. This permits control of the temperatures in each furnace separately. Control of exit steam temperatures is by tangential burners, with spraying used for emergency conditions only.

A further reason for selecting the twin-furnace design for a unit having a boiler input of 2,380 million British thermal units per hour, such as at Gallatin, is that the structual supports and the furnace accessibility of a single furnace design become a problem. With separated furnaces it was possible to install a center column between them thereby decreasing greatly the size of the supporting girder and other structural members. Then, too, the retractable soot blowers were reaching lengths where their use was becoming uneconomical.

The many advantages of controlled circulation are outlined by W. H. Armacost [2] in his recent paper on that subject. The paper by Crossan and Ryan [3] confirmed that although they experienced some starting-up difficulties these advantages had been realized at Chesterfield. We also expect some starting-up and operating difficulties with the twin-furnace, controlled-circulation installations but believe they are not insurmountable and are far outweighed by the advantages gained.

The furnaces are of the dry-bottom type principally because we did not want to be limited to low ash-fusion coal. With the huge quantities of coal that the Authority burns on its system it is necessary to be prepared to use any kind of coal that might be available. As an aid in this direction furnace heat release and gas velocities are kept to a minimum and the water-cooled heat absorbing area is high.

Regenerative-type air preheaters are used and the design exit gas temperature is 286° F., including leakage. Lower temperatures were considered but rejected because of the danger of plugging in the preheater. Space is provided in the preheater casing for additional elements to lower this exit gas temperature if it should prove feasible in the future.

Automatic sequential steam soot blowers are used. Air was considered for a previous plant, but was rejected in favor of steam for cost and operating reasons. Electric motor operators are used for the blowers because they are believed to be more reliable than air motors.

Condenser and circulating water system

The site of the plant on the Cumberland River assures an ample supply of cooling water. For this reason, conventional single-pass, divided-water-box condensers will be installed. A pumping station is being built on the river bank with two vertical mixed-flow pumps per unit. Both pumps are necessary to pump enough cooling water to maintain design vacuum in the unit at rated load and at usual summer river temperatures. However, one pump operating alone will pump sufficient water to permit maximum output of the unit at 3 inches of mercury back pressure with maximum river temperature.

Heaters

An economic study indicated that eight feedwaters heaters should be used. Four of these are low-pressure heaters through which 2 condensate pumps (3 provided per unit) pump the water to the deaerator. The boiler feed pumps pump the water from the deaerator storage tank through the three high-pressure heaters to the boiler.

The Authority prefers closed heaters over open heaters because of the simpler pumping and piping arrangement. Because of the large volume involved, consideration was given to splitting the flow through the heaters into two parallel systems. However, the various heater manufacturers gave assurance that they could design the high-pressure heaters to handle the total flow in single heaters in series, so this method was adopted.

---

[2] Armacost, W. H., the Controlled Circulation Boiler, ASME paper No. 53–A–91.

[3] Crossan, T. E., and W. F. Ryan, Controlled Circulation at Chesterfield, ASME paper No. 53–A–96.

Boiler feed pumps

The large flows also prompted consideration of four feed pumps perunit. This was discarded in favor of 3 pumps per unit (1 being a spare) because of the complexity of the controls and piping required for 4 pumps. The feed pumps have hydraulic couplings with scoop control for regulating speed and flow. The economy of the hydraulic couplings was established at Johnsonville. The scoop is regulated by a standard 3-element control (feedwater flow, steam flow, and drum level).

Draft fans

As indicated above 3 induced-draft and 3 forced-draft fans are provided per boiler. They are all direct connected with volume regulation being obtained by means of inlet vanes and louvers. This method of controlling air and gas flow has proved very satisfactory on the 17 large units now operating in 4 plants.

Control room

In an effort to reduce the number of operators required, the Authority has adopted the arrangement of 1 control room for 2 units. It is located on the turbine room level between the units and between the turbines and boilers. All the principal mechanical and electrical control functions (except switching) are centralized in this room.

By the use of miniature instruments where possible, and by grouping only the trend instruments on the front panels, we have been able to keep the control room size small enough so that it may be staffed by 3 operators, including 1 who has supervisory responsibilities and may be called away from the control room in emergencies. These 3 operators in the control room are supplemented in the rest of the plant by 3 assistant operators and 4 auxiliary operators per shift for 2 units.

Piping and valves

The 1050° F. main steam piping is forged and bored and conforms to ASTM Standard A335–P22. This is 2¼ percent chromium and 1 percent molybdenum alloy. The return steam to the boiler is A106–52T, grade B, seamless carbon steel pipe. The reheat steam to the turbine is A155–52T, 2¼ percent chromium, 1 percent molybdenum, class 1 rolled and welded alloy pipe. This latter pipe was chosen because it is cheaper than cupped and drawn or forged and bored.

There are no valves in the main steam piping as the stop valves on the turbine are deemed sufficiently tight. All 1,500-pound valves and those for service at 750° F. and above have welded bonnets. The 14-inch, 1,500-pound and the 14-inch, 2,500-pound valves in the feedwater discharge are venturi-type valves. It was found that the extra pressure drop through these valves was outweighed by their saving in first cost.

Stacks

The 2 boilers at Gallatin are connected to 1 concrete brick-lined stack, the top of which is 500 feet above grade. This relatively high stack was chosen to help dissipate the gases from the boiler. The large concentration of generating capacity combined with the rather high sulfur content of the coals available will result in the emission of a considerable volume of sulfur compounds with the stack gases. It has been found that high stacks are one of the most economical ways to dissipate these gases. However, the Authority has a comprehensive program under way, the objective of which is to eliminate or ameliorate the cause of this nuisance, if practicable.

Electrical characteristics

Each generator is connected solidly to its unit stepup 3-phase transformer which is rated 300 megavolt-amperes, 55 C, FOA, 22.5–161 kilovolts. Three 161-kilovolt lines are connected to a bus section for each generator. Auxiliary power for unit starting and emergency use, and for common station use, is taken from 2 25/33.3-megavolt- amperes OA/FA, 161-kilovolt transformers with double 4.16-kilovolt secondaries. Each of these transformers eventually will be connected selectively to 2 161-kilovolt bus sections. Auxiliary power for normal use of each unit is taken from a 13.5/18-megavolt-amperes OA/FA, 22.5–4.16-kilovolt transformer connected solidly to the unit generator-transformer circuit. Controls for the generators and 161-kilovolt switching are on the main control board in the control building located between the powerhouse and the switchyard.

All major auxiliaries which influence plant output, such as draft fans, feed pumps, circulating water pumps, condensate pumps, and pulverizers are overpowered. Figures on Gallatin are not yet completed, but on a previous plant it was calculated that each generating unit was able to maintain rated output with frequency reduced to 55.2 cycles at 100-percent voltage, or with 56.3 cycles at 83-percent voltage. These figures at Gallatin will be approximately the same.

CONCLUSION

The authors have attempted to describe some of the more important features of the Gallatin steam plant and discuss the reasons for adopting them. Obviously there are many other features which might be included in a paper such as this. Because of the unique characteristics and significance of Gallatin in the powerplant field, it is probable that other papers will be written dealing with, among other things, more of the electrical and operating aspects as well as the layout and structural features of this plant.

Dixie Gilmer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM STEED

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 14, 1954

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, one of the greatest fighters for the public good that Oklahoma has ever produced, Dixie Gilmer, has been taken by death. It is with greatest sorrow that the news of his passing is brought to the House, where he served as a Member of the 81st Congress.

Torn in body by physical ailment for most of his adult life, Dixie Gilmer found not only the courage and strength to remain active in public service but literally defied the normal law of survival by sheer willpower. His frail body contained a brilliant mind that was his strength until the end.

I deem it a high privilege to have held him as a true friend in his lifetime. His devotion to the public welfare in his many offices of public trust was an inspiration to me, and I know to everyone who knew him and his deeds. He contributed much in the making of Oklahoma into a great State.

Perhaps his greatest virtue was his refusal to compromise his principles. Few men could have found the courage that he needed to carry on his public activities through the long years of his personal afflictions. But the issue of good government and his zeal to serve it seemed always to sustain him when men of lesser determination would have given up the struggle.

I join with my colleagues in extending my deepest sympathy to his family. His passing is not their loss alone—the Nation has given up one of its finest servants.

No Room for Compromise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VERA BUCHANAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 14, 1954

Mrs. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include in the RECORD a most timely editorial entitled "No Room for Compromise," from the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette of June 11, 1954:

NO ROOM FOR COMPROMISE

Now that both the Senate and House have passed housing bills, the decision on whether or not the Goverment's program of low-rent public housing is to be continued is up to the conference committee of the two Chambers. But since the House measure provides for no public housing at all and the Senate bill provides only for the President's modest goal of 35,000 units a year, any compromise between the 2 bills would mean a pitiably small public-housing program.

The need for a Government-subsidized, slum-clearance, public-housing program is indicated by recent statistics compiled from releases of both the Federal Housing and Home Finance Agency and the National Association of Home Builders, a private organization. The NAHB said in February that 8 million Americans live in houses "unfit for human habitation." Slum and blighted districts, according to the HHFA, comprise about 20 percent of the Nation's metropolitan residential areas. These same districts, however, house 33 percent of the population, account for 45 percent of the major crimes, 55 percent of the juvenile delinquency, 60 percent of the tuberculosis victims, and 35 percent of the fires. Some 45 percent of expenditures for city services go to slum areas which provide only 6 percent of real-estate tax revenues.

Public housing is not a cure for slum sickness. But it does provide a palliative. Along with other measures it helps the cities to meet some of their most acute problems. Since the number of families living in slum housing is growing despite the building boom of recent years, the need for a governmental program to check the blight is clear. The authorization of 35,000 units a year asked for by President Eisenhower and approved by the Senate is a minimum. The conference committee should send the Senate bill to the House, thus giving it another chance to provide for a housing program that the President considers vital to the public welfare.

Something About Those 50,000 Rounds of Small Arms Fire Reportedly Used for Each Red Killed in Korea

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 9, 1954

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the other day, the papers revealed that it reportedly took 50,000 rounds of small-arms fire for each Red killed in Korea. That statement has tricky implications.

The report should serve at least one purpose. It should intensify training in rifle markmanship for ground forces.

I said that the statement has tricky implications. It is not clear to me whether 50,000 rounds of ammunition were used for every enemy dead or that it took 50,000 shots to kill each Red. The distinction should interest the taxpayer and the trainee.

While we realize that in war waste is inherent, waste in men, money, materials, and machines, there are nevertheless factors in this 50,000 shots for each dead Red report that should help the taxpayer breathe more easily and the soldier to advance or to retreat in combat more confidently perhaps.

Every shot fired in combat is, of course, not intended to kill an enemy soldier. The mission of the ground soldier is to defeat the enemy. This is done with small arms ammunition in several ways, by seizure, occupation, surrender, or death. The efficiency of shots fired can be measured against these factors.

For example, it is known that machinegunners and riflemen often lay down curtains of fire to pin the enemy down or to make him retreat while an objective is taken or a mission accomplished, be it a hill, an airfield, a water source, a supply dump, or a town.

The efficiency of shots fired can also be measured in terms of civilians liberated from enemy control. When allied forces moved above the 38th parallel in Korea to the Yalu in the fall and winter of 1950, over 4 million North Korean civilians streamed south to freedom.

The pin-down technique, while it uses up vast quantities of ammunition, allows troops to gain time to retreat, and it yields terrain inch by inch. During the pin-down, or spray for effect, reinforcements or withdrawals can be in motion. This technique was in play when the marines arrived to buttress the Pusan perimeter. It was also in operation when the Tenth Army Corps withdrew from the beachhead at Hungnam. Much ammunition used, many lives saved.

The efficiency of shots fired thus can be measured in terms of ground held, gained, or voluntarily relinquished, and the same applies as to time, as well as to objectives taken, civilians liberated, prisoners captured, or enemy killed.

The report of the 50,000 rounds to kill a Red has many angles, Mr. Speaker.

Insurance Firms Are Banding Together to Stamp Out Existing Evils

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 14, 1954

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, the desire to clear the gimmicks from accident and health policy is really making headway.

The Scripps-Howard newspapers have performed a very worthwhile service in bringing this intolerable condition to public notice. The work of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House could not have accomplished all that has been done in this respect without the aid of this chain of newspapers. But with the publicity these newspapers have given to the matter it has had the effect of creating interest throughout our entire country. It has resulted in a strong and insistent demand that something be done to eliminate the evils that have been disclosed.

A recent article by Lowell K. Bridwell, a Scripps-Howard staff writer, appearing in the Washington Daily News, issue of June 11, 1954, reads as follows:

INSURANCE FIRMS ARE BANDING TOGETHER TO STAMP OUT EVILS

(By Lowell K. Bridwell)

DETROIT, June 11.—Scores of insurance companies and the 48 State commissioners who have the job of regulating them joined today in an unprecedented attempt to stamp out the "evils" in selling accident and health insurance.

The National Association of Insurance Commissioners, meeting in convention here, has agreed to work closely with a joint committee representing companies in the move.

As one of the first actions, the NAIC today was to elect New Hampshire Insurance Commissioner Donald Knowlton as president of the organization. Mr. Knowlton in his 11 years as commissioner, has built a solid reputation of fair but strong regulation of insurance companies.

Mr. Knowlton earlier this week credited a recent series of articles in The News and other Scripps-Howard newspapers with bringing various "gimmicks" in health and accident insurance policies into sharp public focus.

The companies plainly said they were anxious to police their own business.

Both the NAIC and the companies frankly admitted they were starting the "clean up campaign" in answer to thosuands of complaints by the public and the threat of Federal regulation.

"For the first time," Berkley Cox of the Aetna Life Insurance Co., told the commissioners, "a large segment of the industry has joined together * * * in trying to solve the problem.

"I'm more hopeful now than I've been that we'll find the answers."

Seven trade organizations made up of companies selling accident and health insurance have joined the group. But others, and specifically some of the companies against which most of the complaints have been directed, are not members of these organizations.

The joint committee hopes, however, to turn a spotlight on the relatively few companies using "gimmicks" and misleading advertising by doing an exceptionally good job themselves.

The companies already are considering such things as setting minimum standards for health and accident insurance. Once these are established, the companies accepting them will launch a public relations program to let the public know what it can and should expect in a "good" accident and health policy.

The so-called positive approach to end gimmicks in insurance also will serve another purpose by pinpointing to the commissioners which companies refuse to accept such things as minimum standards and ethical standards of advertising. The commissioner then can act accordingly.

Unemployment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY W. WIER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 14, 1954

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a letter from Mr. William D. Gunn, secretary, Minnesota State Federation of Labor, with a report of the executive council of its unemployment committee on the subject of unemployment.

The letter and report follows:

MINNESOTA STATE FEDERATION OF LABOR,
St. Paul, June 10, 1954.

Hon. ROY WIER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WIER: The subject of unemployment was considered at a recent meeting of the executive council of the Minnesota State Federation of Labor. The council adopted a report of its unemployment committee a copy of which is enclosed.

The council instructed me to call the report and this action to your attention.

Very truly yours,
WILLIAM D. GUNN,
Secretary, Minnesota State
Federation of Labor.

REPORT OF THE UNEMPLOYMENT COMMITTEE

With the unemployment that exists at the present and with the possibility of more unemployment in the future, we feel that local, State, and Federal governing bodies should initiate projects such as:

1. Housing projects to replace our slum areas.
2. Highway improvement and new construction to meet the growing needs and demands of our transportation system.
3. Public schools to meet the ever-increasing school enrollments.
4. Public institutions to meet the ever-increasing needs of our society.
5. Sewer projects to meet the ever-increasing need of sanitary conditions.
6. A reforestation program which will furnish wood products for our country which does not have an oversupply now or in the foreseeable future. Such a program will bring production out of millions of acres of soil which is lying idle now and producing nothing.
7. Increased benefits on social security—enough to supply the necessities of life for older people in their declining years; and lowering the eligibility age to 60 years so that working people will have more to look

forward to than the average of less than 3 years of drawing social security benefits.

8. The completion of the St. Lawrence seaway to the Duluth Harbor to create a water transportation system for the entire upper Midwest, thereby creating an ever-widening circle of jobs and opportunity for the entire area.

9. A program of soil conservation and water conservation.

Signed by the committee: A. P. Eberl, chairman; Charles Bannister, Duluth; Carl Thode, Winona.

Dixie Gilmer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAGE BELCHER

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 14, 1954

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Speaker, the State of Oklahoma is mourning the passing of one of its most colorful citizens and best-known political figures, our former colleague, Dixie Gilmer.

Dixie Gilmer was best known in his hometown of Tulsa, and the two daily newspapers of that city have both printed editorials which will interest the House and all who knew Dixie Gilmer. The editorials follow:

[From the Tulsa World of June 10, 1954]

DIXIE GILMER

A conspicuous record as a public servant ended with the death of Dixie Gilmer, State commissioner of public safety.

The 53-year-old Tulsan, who first entered the field of politics as a page in Congress, was as articulate as he was proficient in legal forensics. His keenly receptive and sensitive mind were assets which kept him in the public view for the last two decades. His tenure as Tulsa County attorney was the longest in local history. Following that, he narrowly missed the Governor's office. He later served a term in Congress.

Mr. Gilmer's laudable zeal and his ability as a prosecutor made him a strong and determined force in law enforcement. His constancy in office was matched by a dauntless spirit which, in recent years, refused to surrender to insuperable physical difficulties. Dixie Gilmer was a credit to Oklahoma.

[From the Tulsa Tribune of June 10, 1954]

THE THIN MAN GOES DOWN

Dixie Gilmer's passing takes from the political stage a performer of consummate skill. He did about as much as anyone in Tulsa's and Oklahoma's history to put into government the personal touch the people loved. He taught many sluggards to hate crime and respect virtue.

He devoted his whole life to public affairs and to fighting against an insidious form of lung ailment. His success was notable in both endeavors, for he lived to be 53 and went from page in the legislature to membership and from page in Congress to a seat in the House. Along the way and afterward he was Tulsa County prosecutor and a top-level contender for the Democratic Party's gubernatorial nomination. He was State safety commissioner when he died.

Considering that most of this was accomplished after he was stricken with a malady that would have shriveled the ambitions of most men, his career was exceptional.

The thin man from Tulsa really was an indomitable character.

Was the Navy Mousetrapped?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 9, 1954

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am studying developments in the case of the midshipman from Jersey City, N. J., who was not commissioned with his class at Annapolis last week. He resides in my district and won a Presidential appointment, having come up through the ranks.

Letters from this office are out to ascertain the facts in the case. Press reports tell a story. Rumors in the district amplify the press releases. The name of Jersey City and a family in Jersey City are involved as well as a boy from Jersey City. In our town, a hurt to one is a hurt to all. The Navy will, I trust, give us the facts.

In our town we are told that the definition of a security risk by the executive branch of the present administration is someone who talks too much. We hope that the Navy did not talk too much when it disclosed this boy's name for that would be condemnation before investigation, which is un-American. We do not recall that the midshipman from Jersey City ever waived his rights as a citizen, even while at Annapolis.

We the people of Jersey City and of the 13th District of New Jersey would dislike for the White House to order the Attorney General to list the Navy as a risk to the civil liberties of the United States because it talked too much. Or are we now in for government by apology?

House Resolution 521

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 14, 1954

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, on April 29 I introduced what is now known as House Resolution 521, the intent of which was to bring an end to peacetime draft and form the basis for a volunteer professional military establishment.

Peacetime draft, the present system of making up the strength of the Armed Forces, is inequitable, expensive, and inefficient. My resolution, Mr. Speaker, directs the Committee on Armed Services to make a full and complete investigation of the pay, allowances and so-called fringe benefits endeavoring to work out a program calculated to attract vounteers to a military career. This investigation would have two principal objectives: First, to provide benefits for military personnel approximately equal to those which could be obtained in civilian life and, second, to attract career personnel into the Armed Forces in numbers sufficient to maintain them on a volunteer basis except in time of war. This procedure would provide our country with professional armed units which would be familiar with up-to-date and modern weapons that are being developed from year to year. In this way, those reaching service age would have the opportunity of selecting a military or civilian career. The program would save money, give adequate defense, and go a long way in preventing economic disruption.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Printing and binding for Congress, when recommended to be done by the Committee on Printing of either House, shall be so recommended in a report containing an approximate estimate of the cost thereof, together with a statement from the Public Printer of estimated approximate cost of work previously ordered by Congress within the fiscal year (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 145, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on Printing, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

DISTRIBUTION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

To the Vice President and each Senator 100 copies; to the Secretary and Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, each, 25 copies; to the Secretary, for official use, not to exceed 25 copies; to the Sergeant at Arms, for use on the floor of the Senate, not to exceed 50 copies; to each Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress, 68 copies; to the Clerk, Sergeant at Arms, and Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives, each, 25 copies; to the Clerk, for official use, not to exceed 50 copies; and to the Doorkeeper, for use on the floor of the House of Representatives, not to exceed 75 copies; to the Vice President and each Senator, Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress there shall also be furnished (and shall not be transferable), 3 copies of the daily RECORD, of which 1 shall be delivered at his residence, 1 at his office, and 1 at the Capitol.

PRICE OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

The Public Printer is authorized to furnish to subscribers the daily RECORD at $1.50 per month, payable in advance.

Remit by money order payable to Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Th

IN

M
mo
the
mit
lor
Ed
sent
port
Kan
Th
toria
Leav
On M
resol
tory.
open
Leav
office
stam
vision
have
State
Gov
exerc
of the
torial
sentin
sistan
ertson
On
to rev
and d
ritoria
unani
printe
The
was or
as foll
SPEECH
OPEN
TENN
MONI
Mr. C
lege to
opening
tennial
It is
sale sho
first pos
The d
neer co
gone be
great St
We, a
nial are
based o
built on
service,
To th
so well,
challeng
to prese
dren a
must no

Appendix

The Kansas Territorial Centennial Stamp

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK CARLSON
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, June 15, 1954

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, this morning Dr. Robert Taft, chairman of the Kansas Territorial Centennial Committee; Dr. Franklin Murphy, chancellor of Kansas University; Representative Ed Rees, and I had the privilege of presenting President Eisenhower with a portfolio containing a block of the new Kansas territorial centennial stamp.

The opening sale of the Kansas Territorial centennial stamp was held at Fort Leavenworth, Kans., on Monday, May 31. On May 30, 1854, Congress approved the resolution creating Kansas as a Territory. It was most appropriate that the opening sale should be held at Fort Leavenworth, as it was the first post office in Kansas. The design of this stamp depicts the pioneer courage and vision of those who have gone before and have laid the foundations of a great State.

Gov. Edward F. Arn presided at the exercises at Fort Leavenworth on the day of the opening sale of the Kansas Territorial centennial stamp. Present representing the Postmaster General was Assistant Postmaster General Albert Robertson.

On that occasion it was my privilege to review briefly the history, growth, and development of our State from Territorial days to the present time. I ask unanimous consent to have that address printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

SPEECH BY HON. FRANK CARLSON, OF KANSAS, OPENING SALE OF KANSAS TERRITORIAL CENTENNIAL STAMP, FORT LEAVENWORTH, KANS., MONDAY, MAY 31, 1954

Mr. Chairman, it is an honor and privilege to participate in the program for the opening sale of the Kansas Territorial centennial stamp.

It is most appropriate that this opening sale should be held at Fort Leavenworth, the first post office in Kansas.

The design of this stamp depicts the pioneer courage and vision of those who have gone before and laid the foundations of a great State.

We, as Kansans, at this Territorial centennial are indebted to them for a heritage not based on power or grandeur, but a heritage built on the Christian principles of humility, service, equality, freedom, and justice.

To those who built and girded our State so well, we, the present generation, have a challenging charge and a solemn obligation to preserve this great heritage for our children and their children. We cannot—we must not falter.

Let's look back 100 years—1854 to 1954. In 1854 our Nation was emerging as a great world power and was attracting the leadership of other nations with its rapid development and its active interest in world affairs, but at the same time, we were suffering from internal problems that resulted in the Civil War.

It was that year that Comdr. Matthew Perry sailed to Tokyo Harbor and impressed the world with our determination to take our place among the nations of the world. It was in October of that year that three United States Ministers to Spain, England, and France met at Ostend, Belgium. Their advice to the American Secretary of State was that the Island of Cuba should be bought if Spain wished to sell, or taken by force if Spain objected.

These three Ministers were proslavery Democrats, interested in getting possession of Cuba as a part of an overall program of expansion of slavery in the United States.

Slavery was a burning issue and factionalism was driving our Nation into two strong camps with divergent views.

On May 30, 1854, the Kansas-Nebraska Act marked a compromise between the forces for and against the extension of slavery. The statesmen of the North had lost their fight and it was a humiliating defeat because in this compromise, the South fully expected Kansas to go in as a slave State and Nebraska as a free State.

The passage of the Kansas-Nebraska bill revoked the measure in the Missouri Compromise for limiting slavery to certain sections of the United States. This bill left every foot of land in the United States fair game for slavery interests, but the proslavery advocates failed to recognize the determination and zeal of the Kansas settlers who opposed slavery.

Our Kansas history is replete with the zealous and heroic efforts in opposition to enforce human servitude, and, after years of suffering and bloodshed, these righteous citizens carved out Kansas—a free State.

It was in 1854 that the Republican Party was born and one of the main planks in this new party's platform was opposition to slavery.

It was that year that Abraham Lincoln joined forces with the Republican Party and stated in a speech at Peoria, Ill.:

"I shall try to show that it is wrong, wrong in its direct effect, letting slavery into Kansas and Nebraska and wrong in its prospective principle, allowing it to spread to every other part of the wide world where men can be found inclined to take it."

It was with this background that the Republican Party continued its fight for the preservation of high ideals.

It was in 1854 that there was a great expansion of business in the United States. This was the period, too, when labor unions began to appear. The farmers were beginning to pay attention to scientific methods of farming and, in general, a new era had begun in the United States.

Now let's look at Kansas on May 30, 1854. Can you visualize a great rectangle of grass where buffalo roamed by the millions, where the only inhabitants were a few missionaries, traders, agents, squatters, and Indians by the thousands?

There was very little land under cultivation. There were no fences. There were few roads, mostly recognized as trails. There were no bridges—there were few fords and in 1 or 2 instances ferries.

This was truly God's country, with an open invitation to settlers to endure the hardships and to fashion a great State. They built log cabins, they established schools, they erected churches, which institutions laid the foundations for a model State, inhabited by people with vision, faith and courage—whose strong convictions have made Kansas outstanding among the States of the Union.

We have portrayed Kansas in 1854—let's look at Kansas in 1954.

If Kansans have a weakness, I believe it is one of modesty in telling the world about the greatness of our State—the quality of its people—the fertility of its soil and its unlimited resources for future development.

Too often we magnify cyclones, droughts, floods, and hard times, which are but temporary blights or hardships that temper and steel our people to greater and more substantial achievements.

I think we might learn something from the Texans—let's brag about our State. We can rightfully do so.

Why not tell the world that Kansas is the Times Square of the United States, where the cross-currents of traffic meet and mingle and pass on—where the West says "Howdy" to the East and where the North shakes hands with the South.

Why not tell the world that Kansas is crossed by more transcontinental highways than any other State and that we hold second place in highway mileage—second only to Texas—with a grand total of 134,000 miles.

We rank fifth in railway mileage and are served by five transcontinental airlines, serving a State which ranks eighth in the Nation in the number of airports.

Why not tell the world that Kansas and wheat are synonymous—that our State grows one-fourth of the winter wheat of the Nation. While we rank 13th in area among the States, we are second in the Nation in the number of total harvested acres. We have more than 48 million acres of farm land and pasture.

Why not tell the world that we rank 10th among the States of the Nation in mineral production. Petroleum is our greatest mineral asset and in this field we rank fifth among the States. Our State is a part of the Hugoton area, which is the greatest gas field in the world and we supply fuel from this field to almost every section of the United States.

Why not tell the world about our great industrial expansion. Kansas leads the United States in the production of flour and in the manufacture of personal and executive aircraft.

We have a great production capacity for chemicals which are used for both war and peace. There are over 3,000 manufacturing concerns within the borders of our State. Industry and agriculture give us a balanced economy.

Why not tell the world about our universities, colleges, primary, and secondary schools—which have placed Kansas among the top States of the Union when it comes to education.

We are proud, too, of our churches, which have played such an important part in the growth and development of our State.

Our hospitals are staffed with men and women who are leaders in their professions and are so recognized in the Nation. The Menninger Foundation, with headquarters in Kansas, is internationally known for its treatment of the mentally ill.

While we are talking about all of the outstanding qualities of our State, we must stress the most important of all—our people. Ninety-seven percent of our Kansans are American born. They are the healthiest people in the world—they are aspiring, energetic, ingenious, intelligent, and resourceful. Pages could be written about individuals who have played an important part in the history of our State, our Nation, and the world.

Time will not permit the calling of this roll, but every Kansan is proud of the fact that a Kansas boy, born of humble parents, reared in a small Kansas community, with a typical Kansas family background, has become the man that the world is looking to for leadership through one of our most trying and difficult periods and who is now President of the United States—Dwight Eisenhower.

I mentioned that our Nation in 1854 was emerging as a great world power—let's look at our Nation in 1954.

In 100 years we have become the most powerful nation in the world. In this position we must assume a new roll—a leadership in the world.

No longer can we depend on oceans for protection—no longer can we live to ourselves. We must prepare ourselves to live in an atomic age. Our people are a peace-loving people, yet we have fought three wars in a generation—wars that solved no problems, but laid the groundwork for what threatens to be the most terrifying and destructive war in our world's history.

The issue in this conflict is whether nations whose people believe in self-government must be overcome and swallowed up by nations who believe an individual is but a slave to the state.

Human slavery and servitude were the burning issues in 1854 in this Nation. In 1954, the issue, internationally, is whether individuals shall live under governments that permit freedom of assemblage, freedom of expression, freedom of the press, and freedom of religion, or be subject to the slavery of a state-controlled and dominated government. Communism is that threat of our freedom.

Its dangers cannot be minimized. We have been prone to feel that communism is an economic and social theory in another hemisphere and that it affects us only indirectly, however, Americans were shocked 2 weeks ago when the Communists established a beachhead in Guatemala in the Western Hemisphere, which is only a few hundred miles from the Panama Canal. This is a threat that must not—cannot be overlooked.

In 1954, nationally, we have some domestic problems that are pressing. One of these problems vital to the people of Kansas is the farm problem. As a result of increased demands and increased production for war, our farmers geared their production into a program that built great surpluses of the basic commodities. These surpluses at the present time are so large they are burdensome, but on the other hand, is it not a blessing that we have surpluses of these food commodities rather than shortages?

It is my sincere hope that many of these surplus commodities may be used to cultivate good will among the people of nations that are less fortunate. Why not a campaign for peace based on food—not bullets?

Another problem that is causing us grave concern is our economic problem. For the past few months we have been shifting from a program of production for war to a program of production for peace. It is only natural that this should result in difficult readjustments in many areas and bring about increased unemployment.

Despite these dislocations of employment, we have over 60 million people employed. We have a gross national production of three hundred and fifty-nine billion and a personal income of two hundred and eighty-three billion.

We have a sound and expanding national economy and 1954 promises to be second only to 1953, which had the highest employment and the greatest gross national production in our Nation's history.

The issue in our economic program is whether we as a nation can have prosperity and peace or must we be in continuous war or preparation for war in order to keep our people employed.

I hope the time will come when we can spend billions of dollars for the construction of homes, hospitals, schools, highways, and improvements that are of real value to our citizens and employ our people for these purposes rather than manufacture munitions for war and destructive purposes.

We are faced with this issue now. President Eisenhower believes we can have peace and prosperity and so do I.

On this occasion—as we commemorate this territorial centennial, we look back on 100 years of progress, growth, and development of this great State.

Today we begin to look forward with vision, courage, and faith to a greater State, in which we have preserved the fundamental principles laid down during the last 100 years. In 2054, we will celebrate another centennial.

The Fair Labor Standards Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES J. KERSTEN

OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 15, 1954

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, today, Representative CHARLES G. OAKMAN, of Michigan, and I have introduced bills intended to clarify certain provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act regarding profit-sharing plans and trusts and the computation of overtime pay for employees covered thereunder.

In 1949 the act was amended and certain items were specifically excluded from the definition of regular rate of pay. Thus, section 7 (d) (3) of the amended act excludes amounts paid pursuant to a bona fide proft-sharing plan or trust meeting the requirements of the Wage and Hour Administrator set forth in appropriate regulations issued by him. Section 7 (d) (4) excludes contributions made to a bona fide employee benefit plan.

In his interpretation of section 7 (d) (4) the Wage and Hour Administrator recognizes that a plan which is qualified for tax purposes under section 165 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code is a bona fide benefit plan—with one reservation—for wage and hour purposes. On the other hand his profit-sharing regulations under section 7 (d) (3) define the term "bona fide profit-sharing trust" in such a way that most trusts are disqualified even though they are qualified for tax purposes. Many such trusts were in existence for a number of years before 1949 and had fully complied with the detailed requirements of section 165 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code as amended in 1942. Clearly it was the intention of Congress that they should be treated as bona fide trusts by the Wage and Hour Administrator.

Without detracting in any way from the validity of the Administrator's interpretation of section 7 (d) (4) of the Fair Labor Standards Act, the proposed bills correct the existing situation caused by the profit-sharing regulations under section 7 (d) (3) by providing that profit-sharing trusts which qualify for tax purposes must be considered bona fide trusts under the Fair Labor Standards Act. The proposed bills leave the Administrator with authority to prescribe regulations for deferred profit-sharing trusts which are not qualified for tax purposes and profit-sharing plans where payment is made directly to the employee without the intervention of a trust.

The effect of the ruling of the Wage and Hour Administrator in requiring that certain amounts paid under profit-sharing plans be considered part of regular compensation of the employee is to discourage companies from entering into profit-sharing plans. Normally, it is a simple matter for an employer to compute the time and one-half he is obliged to pay his employees for overtime work under the Fair Labor Standards Act. However, when amounts paid or credited to an employee—at the end of a year—under a profit-sharing plan must be considered a part of regular pay of an employee, the computation of his overtime pay presents a complex mathematical problem.

Thus, many employers, rather than run the risk of violating the Fair Labor Standards Act, may abandon their intention of inaugurating a profit-sharing plan.

The very fact that Congress has provided certain tax concessions with respect to profit-sharing plans, shows clearly that Congress intended to encourage profit sharing. Furthermore, when Congress specifically exempted payments under bona-fide profit-sharing plans from consideration as regular pay under the Fair Labor Standards Act, it was also intended to encourage profit-sharing by removing impediments to the adoption of profit-sharing plans in industry.

I believe that Congress clearly intended that a profit-sharing plan which qualified for tax concessions under the tax laws would also be considered a bona-fide profit-sharing plan under the Fair Labor Standards Act. Congress surely did not intend to create two standards of qualified profit-sharing plans. The effect of the ruling of the Wage and Hour Administrator is to reestablish the impediment to profit sharing which Congress clearly intended to remove. The purpose of the bills which Mr. OAKMAN and I have introduced today is to clarify the position which Congress intended in the first instance and thereby require the Wage and Hour Administrator to regard any profit-sharing plan which qualifies under section 165 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code to also be qualified under section 7 (d) (3) of the Fair Labor Standards Act as amended.

Facts on the Upper Colorado River Basin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 15, 1954

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, and one who is interested in the sound development of our natural resources, I feel it is my duty to call the attention of my colleagues to House Report No. 1774, which accompanies H. R. 4449, a bill to authorize the construction of the development of the upper Colorado Basin.

This is a big project—one of the few remaining big projects yet undeveloped within the borders of this great country of yours and mine. Unfortunately, there are some who violently oppose this development—just as there were some who violently opposed the construction of a transcontinental railroad, of Hoover Dam, and the Tennessee Valley Authority. It is unfortunate that some feel they must oppose this project, just as it is most unfortunate that we are unable to iron out our differences. However, this criticism tends to make those who favor the project look at it very carefully to insure that the best interests of all are equally fostered and protected.

However, Mr. Speaker, I do feel that the Colorado River storage project should be considered on its merits, just as has been done with other major reclamation projects in the past.

The report on H. R. 4449 was filed by my committee just a few days ago. It sets out, in a few pages, the pertinent physical and financial facts with respect to this project—facts which were developed in the many weeks of public hearings. I believe it is imperative that every Member of this body spend the few minutes required to go over this report so that you may understand the basic facts contributing to the committee's decision to favorably report the bill.

Some of the members of my committee have felt it necessary to summarize the testimony given in opposition to the bill. Besides being made a part of the report, it was widely circulated among the Members of Congress. Therefore, I feel it is my duty to take time to answer the allegations. I will do this in the most concise manner in which I am capable, approaching each allegation categorically.

First, it has been said there is a concealed subsidy. They consider interest on the investment in the irrigation features of the participating projects as a hidden subsidy. The principle of not charging interest on the investment in irrigation features is one of the fundamental concepts underlying the reclamation law as it was signed into law by Theodore Roosevelt in 1902. Call it a subsidy if you choose, but let us face the facts—it is not concealed.

Second, it is alleged that it will put the Government further into the power business than it has heretofore been put by other projects. It is claimed that for Hoover Dam, Grand Coulee Dam, and TVA, power was sold to build the dams. We all know that the power was not sold before the dams were constructed. Only for Hoover Dam did the law read that contracts for power had to be entered into before construction could start. Prior commitment for disposition of power was not required for either Grand Coulee or TVA Dams. I might point out that power contracts at Hoover Dam also provide for the generation of diminishing quantities of power year by year as the consumptive use of water is increased in the upper basin.

The charge that the dams of the projects are to be built to sell power only is simply not true. The real purpose is the conservation of water in order to make possible the utilization of water resources belonging to the upper basin States and at the same time enabling them to meet compact commitments to the lower basin at Lee Ferry.

Third, critics of the project state the authority of the Secretary of Interior to construct transmission lines is too broad under this legislation. His authority is limited by the estimating and planning behind the legislation. Cost estimates as set out in the project report and in the bill are predicated upon construction of certain transmission lines. Testimony before the subcommittee clearly indicates that the intent is to limit the construction of transmission lines by the Secretary to backgone tie-lines interconnecting powerplants and to transmission lines to load centers not already constructed or projected by private utilities.

The fourth assertion that power to be produced by the plants is high cost power immediately involves the question, "What is high cost power?" The estimated cost of 6 mills per kilowatt-hour for hydroelectric power delivered to load centers is far below the price for power produced by any other method available to this area. Steam-produced electric energy in this area is estimated to cost at least seven and three-tenths mills per kilowatt-hour.

As for the fifth charge that we will never be able to use the power which will be developed, there was ample testimony given by officials representing 10 private utilities in the area, surveys made by the Federal Power Commission and the Bureau of Reclamation to the effect that a ready market is or will be available for all the power produced at the 6-mill figure.

As for the sixth allegation that atomic electric power will soon be available at a cost lower than hydroelectric power, I cannot believe that this will be in the near future. I wish I could believe it, it would be a great boon to the power-starved Western States. Due to the huge original investment, it is not believed that atomic electric power will be capable of production within the cost of either steam or hydropower for many years to come, at which time it will compete with the proposed hydropower plants, not existing plants.

The seventh point made in the summary of views would lead one to believe the bill would commit Congress to the development of the whole upper basin. This legislation would commit Congress only to construction of the Glen Canyon and Echo Park storage units and, upon certification by the Secretary as to their economic justification and feasibility, to the construction of the Curecanti storage unit and 11 participating projects.

The plan of complete repayment of all the units which would be authorized is based only upon revenues from those units and not on revenues from units to be constructed in the future. Future units that are mentioned refer only to potential full development of the area. Therefore, the $5 billion figure given by the minority is rather misleading.

The charge that the bill makes drastic changes in existing Federal water policy is just not correct. For example, I point out that there is nothing in existing reclamation law which requires that the irrigation investment be repaid in 40 equal annual installments. The facts are: First, that irrigators are not required to make equal payments; second, that only the amount assigned to the irrigators is repaid; third, that amount is repayable in 40 years only if the irrigators voluntarily choose that type repayment contract; and fourth, that part of irrigation allocation which is assigned for return from power revenues need not be paid during the same period that the irrigators pay.

As many of my colleagues know, Mr. Speaker, under special acts of Congress repayment periods can be any length of time specified therein. In this legislation, the total cost of the participating projects, including that part which is to be returned from net power revenues, must be repaid in 50 years.

The argument that the bill will undercut the Hoover Commission, I feel, is irrelevant to the merits of the Colorado River storage project. The Hoover Commission has no authority to determine what the water policy of the Nation shall be—only Congress has this authority. However, I want to point out that there are no new water policies contemplated under this bill.

My colleagues are quite familiar with the fact that of the three Presidential commissions of recent years that have investigated the water resources of the Nation, not one recommendation pertaining to water policy has been sent to Congress.

The ninth point states that only 20 percent of the lands of the participating projects are class I lands. This is misleading since it has meaning only with respect to the area in question. It has no meaning in a comparison of class I lands of this area with class I lands of some other area. I might remind my colleagues that land is classified to make it possible for technicians to evaluate the project, to set up family size farms under reclamation law, to figure possible returns from lands, and to determine suitability for irrigation after considering other related factors, such as climate, type of crops, and so forth.

As pointed out heretofore, there is no gift of $2,500 per acre from the Nation's taxpayers involved.

Wherever our water resources have been developed—either for irrigation and reclamation or power—it has brought new wealth to the immediate area and resulted in a broader tax base, new markets for the industrial areas, and supplemented our Nation's diet.

A spot study of a few typical irrigation districts constructed by the Federal Government shows that these districts have paid for themselves by four and a half times in new taxes. While the money loaned for irrigation features is interest free, certainly this new wealth, which otherwise would not be realized, contributes much more than any interest charges which might be paid on the irrigation features.

The 10th statement that the bill would delegate excessive authority to the Secretary of the Interior to determine feasibility and construct irrigation projects, the economic and financial feasibility of which have been found by the Budget Bureau to be in serious question, without reserving to the Congress the power of final authorization, is a misrepresentation of the facts. In my opinion the Secretary has not been given excessive authority. In fact, he has been limited in his authority.

Members of my committee well remember my statements of last year when I sought, and received, support to require congressional authorization before any project could be started. Secretary McKay has assured me he will not authorize any projects calling for more than $5 million without congressional approval.

The 11th point brought out in the summary of minority views is best answered by pointing out that the use of the benefit-cost ratio for testing the economic justification of irrigation projects is not new. It is merely to be regarded as an added criteria for testing economic justification.

Those parts of the Colorado River storage project and participating projects which would be authorized by H. R. 4449 meet both tests of economic justification and financial feasibility.

The 12th charge made in the summary singles out the central Utah irrigation project. However, it cannot be considered on a dollars-and-cents basis alone—even though it is feasible and the overall benefit-cost ratio for this project exceeds unity. The statement would lead one to believe that the 12 percent repayment is extremely low—this is more than has been repaid on many other projects. And, again, that is more than the zero quantity paid back by beneficiaries from flood-control works constructed and paid for by the Federal Government in the form of Federal taxes paid in part by the people of Utah and the other upper basin States.

The 13th point has aroused much opposition to the bill. Several organizations have conducted a vicious campaign to kill the project on the grounds that it would break 80 years of conservation policy by invading Dinosaur National Monument in order to build Echo Park Dam. They would lead you to believe that this is the beginning of wholesale attacks on all of our national parks and monuments. I want to emphatically point out that neither the Department, nor the committee consider this a precedent.

Well-documented testimony by reliable witnesses before the subcommittee attest to the fact that there will be no invasion of Dinosaur National Monument in order to build Echo Park Dam. On the contrary, the monument has invaded a natural dam site, and the people of the area consented to the enlargement of the monument only after they were assured that the intent was to provide for further water and power developments in the canyons of the Yampa and Green Rivers. There is a moral commitment to the upper basin which Congress should keep. After all, which is more important—sightseeing or water for irrigation and municipal supply? Growth has been stalemated in some areas because of a lack of water. Very little progress has been made sightseeing. This matter is discussed in the committee's report, which I again suggest each Member take time to read.

The minority summary of views states the recommendations of the Bureau of the Budget for the drastic revision of the bill were largely ignored. The facts are, the draft of the bill by the Bureau of the Budget was substituted for the original bill and considered as a working draft by the subcommittee. It was this draft, with amendments that finally went to the full committee and was favorably reported to the House. In all fairness, I feel I should point out that the Bureau of the Budget made no further recommendations to its own draft during the course of the deliberations of either the subcommittee or the full committee.

The 15th of the numbered charges states: "Pertinent questions have not been answered." Altogether there were 21 days of hearings by the subcommittee, 2 days before the full committee plus a 5-day tour of the upper basin States last fall by several members of the committee. This, of course, does not include the years of studies made by the Department of Interior and the careful examination made by the Bureau of the Budget. All have approved the project.

The answers to the questions can only involve a rehashing and representation of data already submitted to the committee in other forms.

In regards to the 16th point of the summary which says the project is not self-liquidating. What is a self-liquidating project? Under existing law, first enacted 52 years ago, a project is considered as self-liquidating if the revenues equal or exceed the costs, and the costs are defined as not including interest on the investment in irrigation features. Inasmuch as this project is a self-liquidating one under the laws of the land, the objection under item 16 is, therefore, an objection to the present law. If Congress should see fit to change the existing law, then one of those who feel it should, should introduce a bill to amend it, calling for interest to be charged on the irrigation investment.

While we are examining the interest features of the bill, it is well for us to examine what interest payments will be made. The entire cost of power and municipal water features amounting to approximately $632,750,000 will be returned to the Federal Treasury with interest—not only on the capital investment but with the interest accruing during the construction period.

I have previously pointed out the tremendous returns to the Nation in terms of increased wealth, broadened tax base, new farms and homes, and so forth.

The 17th point raised in the summary of the minority views is a résumé of the 16 points outlined in the report. I sincerely hope my colleagues will take the time to read and study the committee report.

Soviet Tyranny

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. D. ROOSEVELT, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 15, 1954

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, today we commemorate, with Americans of Latvian, Estonian, and Lithuanian descent, the tragic deportations of peoples from the Baltic States by the Soviets in 1940.

The seizure of the Baltic Republics marked the first step in the enslavement of nearly a billion people in Europe and Asia—a pattern which unfortunately has become all too familiar: infiltration, the presence of the Red army, sham elections, then virtual or actual incorporation into the Soviet Union.

In our preoccupation to prevent fresh Communist advances, we sometimes forget the fate of these early victims of the Kremlin's aggression. In today's effort to accurately evaluate the potential menace of communism and to gage its toll upon the freedom of the world's peoples, it is fitting that we remember the valiant persecuted people who are victims of the illegal seizure of Latvia, Estonia, and Lithuania in 1940.

Recently the policy of "Sovietization." somewhat relaxed in 1953, has been revived with ruthless vigor. Underground channels have reported another mass deportation within the past year. Attempts are being made to wipe out all trace of the Baltic peoples as national and cultural entities and to completely mechanize the human lives involved. In spite of this, news from the Baltic indicates that the resistance movement is still alive.

The story of the Baltic countries since World War II is a tragic indictment of the forces of communism. Abundant evidence presented to the House Baltic Committee is such that the United States could never be reconciled to Soviet occupation of Latvia, Estonia, and Lithuania.

For the sake of the free as well as the enslaved, we must retell the story of this tragedy as a lesson in how freedom is lost, looking forward to the day when the efforts of the free world will be rewarded with triumph over Communist tryanny. It is for us to bolster the hope of the Baltic peoples until that day.

The Fate of the Baltic Countries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 15, 1954

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, man's devotion to the fundamental principles of liberty and freedom was reinforced by the Baltic States freedom rally held at the New York City Town Hall last Sunday, June 13, commemorating the 13th anniversary of Communist aggression against the Baltic States and the first mass deportation of the peoples of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania.

Representatives of each of the Baltic States contributed to this program of the spirit of national independence which included selections by the Lithuanian Operatic Choir, the New York Estonian Male Choir, and the Latvian Evangelical Lutheran Church Choir of New York. This solemn observance of terrorism and deportation served to emphasize our resolve that the peoples of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia will regain their freedom.

I was deeply appreciative of the opportunity to join in these observances and, under unanimous consent, include my address in the Appendix of the RECORD:

THE FATE OF THE BALTIC COUNTRIES—A CASE OF GENOCIDE

Of all the peoples of Europe those of the 3 Baltic countries have perhaps suffered most during the last 15 years, for no people in Europe have endured so much cruelty and misery as have the unfortunate Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians. All three of these peoples have their origins wrapped in the mist of distant antiquity. They have, however, been living in their fairly well delimited lands, north of Poland and east of the Baltic Sea, for more than 1,000 years. They have each had their distinctive national histories, national cultures, and their hallowed national traditions. Each in its own way has developed its own free, individualistic culture and civilization, patterned upon the accepted western European Christian civilization. And until their annexation by tzarist Russia late in the 18th century they managed to maintain their freedom and safeguard their national cultures and traditions. For more than 100 years they lived under tzarist tyranny, but all three were able to keep alive their national ideal, that of regaining their lost national political independence. And toward the end of the First World War, with the collapse of the tzarist Russian state, they each proclaimed their independence.

INDEPENDENT REPUBLICS

Soon after they asserted their independence, these countries were duly recognized by all the powers, including the Soviet Union. All three were admitted into the newly formed League of Nations and became full-fledged members of the family of nations. All three signed the pact of Paris (the Kellogg-Briand Pact) renouncing war as an instrument of national policy, and they all also signed nonaggression pacts with the Soviet Union. Though small in size and also in terms of population (the combined areas of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania are about 60,000 square miles, with a total population of about 5 million), these countries contributed greatly to the prosperity and peace of northeastern Europe during the interwar years.

Internally there was striking prosperity and constant progress in all three countries during those days of independence and freedom. Each of them had proclaimed itself as an independent republic in which the democratic form of responsible and representative government was given a good start. And the popular governments thus instituted proved efficient and deserving of public support. From the very beginning the leaders in all these countries were fully aware of the heavy responsibilities thrust upon them. To some of these inexperienced national leaders these responsibilities must have seemed difficult to discharge, yet under the circumstances, during the relatively short time allotted to them, they did astonishingly well and discharged their responsibilities most honorably. They succeeded in laying the firm foundation of a vibrant and virile democracy in all three countries. Their governments encouraged and engineered a long series of political, social, and economic and agrarian reforms, and all these reforms marched hand-in-hand with industrial developments. Measures concerning the care of children, the sick, the unemployed, and those affecting the national health and sanitation were advocated and quickly adopted. Great strides were made in public education. All these reforms resulted in higher living standards and better general well-being. In 1940 it was stated that "the best-fed peoples in northeastern Europe were those of Finland and the Baltic countries, and the best-clothed lived in Estonia and Latvia."[1] In short, these three small Baltic countries, in the course of their short-lived national independence, had become model democracies in northeastern Europe.

LOSS OF INDEPENDENCE AND THE BEGINNING OF ENSLAVEMENT AND GENOCIDE

The Baltic countries were among the first casualties of World War II, and the peoples of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania were the first innocent victims of that war. Soon after the outbreak of the war in early September 1939, the government of the Soviet Union began to make demands upon these countries, demands which aimed at undermining their national independence. And these demands were forced upon these helpless countries in the guise of mutual assistance pacts, and the governments of these countries had no choice but to sign these pacts in the fall of 1939. By these pacts the Soviet Union secured certain strategic naval and airbases in these countries, and also the right to station Soviet forces there. These pacts also tied the defenses of these countries to that of the Soviet Union. However loudly Molotov might state, as he did on October 31, 1939, that these pacts "in no way imply the intrusion of the Soviet Union in the internal affairs" of the Baltic countries, that is precisely what these pacts did; and they paved the way for still further intrusion into the national affairs of these countries until finally, less than a year later, in July 1940, all three countries were incorporated into the Soviet Union.

In the spring of 1940 the Soviet Union, under a pretext of the flimsiest nature, moved in and took over these countries completely. The legally constituted governments fled and sought refuge in the West. Under strict Soviet supervision elections were held, and left-wing governments friendly to the Soviet Union were instituted. The electoral program in each case called for an alliance with the Soviet Union, the purge of representatives of the former regimes from all governments posts, and the distribution of all lands to landless peasants. In the course of July 1940 the new governments of these countries voted "unanimously" to unite with the Soviet Union. With this incorporation of these once free republics into the vast Soviet domain, began, one might say, the Iron Age of the Baltic countries.

Even before these farcical elections, unanimous decisions, and forced incorporations took place, large-scale purges, arrests, imprisonments, and mass deportations from these countries into the far-off corners of Asiatic Russia were underway. All this was done on orders from the Kremlin and under the iron discipline of the dreaded Soviet security police. At the time it was impossible to say how many thousands, or tens of thousands, were being uprooted from their homes and driven deep into the desolate and frosty regions of Soviet Union. Only gradually the outside world learned of the immensity of this cruel deed. Then the whole free world was shocked, when apprised of the real objective of Soviet policy in the Baltic countries. That objective seems to have been, from the very beginning, to denationalize, to dehumanize, to destroy the peoples of these countries by purging the populace of all elements who displayed, or were potentially capable of displaying any sign of independent thought or action, and by deporting all such "enemies of the state" to places where certain death is their inescapable lot. This was the Soviet policy of genocide as they practiced it in the Baltic countries. It has often been stated, on the basis of information obtained from those who escaped and also from bits of information received from those exiled to Siberia, that more than 100,000 innocent persons from these countries, men, women, and children, were ejected from their homes soon after these countries were incorporated into the Soviet Union. But this number constituted, unfortunately, only the first installment of deportees; many more hundreds of thousands were to follow. There was, however, a period of intermission of 3 years, occasioned by the Nazi invasion and occupation of these countries in mid-1941.

On June 20, 1941, the Nazis attacked the Soviet Union and in less than a month they succeeded in chasing the Soviet forces out of the Baltic countries. But it was not much of a bargain for these peoples to exchange Soviet tyranny for Nazi dictatorship. They suffered almost as much under the Nazis. For 3 years, from mid-1941 to mid-1944, Nazi Germany occupied the Baltic States, and during that time the people were spared from the Soviet terror and genocide, even though Nazi horrors were almost equally detestable.

In August of 1944 as the fortunes of World War II began to take a favorable turn for the Soviet Union, the Red army marched into the Baltic countries and once more the war-weary and helpless people were caught behind the spreading and tightening iron ring of the Soviet communism. With the Red army came the Soviet commissars, the dreaded CHEGA, the OGPU, the NKVD, or the MVD secret police, followed by Soviet experts and specialists armed with 5-year plans, plans for the liquidation of the farmers and collectivization of all farms. And all of these unwelcome and hated intruders came as emissaries of Moscow, as devout Communist agents of the Kremlin to turn the the Baltic countries into a satrapy of the typrants in the Kremlin.

Today for almost 10 years these dreaded and despised minions of the Kremlin have been at their dehumanizing tasks. They have been forcing upon this peace-loving, independent-minded, industrious and hard-working people an alien philosophy, an alien way of life, one that is abhorent to these people, one that is revolting to the decency of human nature. They are forcing these peoples to forego and denounce all their national ideals and traditions, their Christian creed, their individuality, and accept, without protest, the credo of the Kremlin—

Footnotes at end of speech.

Soviet communism with all its attendant horrors and terrors, including, of course, the atheism preached in all Communist countries. And when the Soviet authorities found that the people seemed reluctant to foregt their ideals, and were unwilling to embrace the new way of life preached to them, stern methods were used. Arrests and imprisonments were carried out by tens of thousands, even by the hundreds of thousands. These were herded into freight cars and sent to prison camps or to forced labor camps, far away from the Baltic region, with the obvious aim of exterminating the Baltic peoples.

This process of genocide is still going on. Several years ago it was conservatively estimated that more than 1 million people, or 20 percent of the population of these countries, had been "sent" away from their homes. Since then genocidal operations have been speeded up. It was reported that old plans called for the liquidation of about 25 percent of the population. Later this figure has been raised to 50 percent or higher.[3] At first it was planned to bar native peoples from the coast and other areas considered strategic, but later they were herded into and confined in certain specified areas only, and their movements are now rigidly controlled. And as these countries are being depopulated and denuded of their native population, peoples from Asiatic regions are brought in and settled there. The Baltic countries are being colonized by the Kazakhs, Uzbeks, Tajiks, and other peoples entirely foreign to these regions, and whose very names bring forth horrors in the minds of the freemen of the west.

This genocide which the Soviet Communists are practicing in the Baltic countries is perhaps worse than anything committed by the perpetrators of Nazi crimes. In the words of two writers in Collier's,[2] "the bland falsehoods of Hitler at Munich pale before the brutal hypocrisy of the Soviet chief delegate to the General Assembly [of the United Nations]," in trying to cover up this most hideous crime. To this day there has been no effective way of denouncing and condemning this genocidal policy of the Soviet Union and putting an end to it. We can only hope that after the genocide pact comes into force, an effective way will be found to enforce it, and thus put a stop to the worst of all crimes, that of genocide.

What hope can we hold out to these brave, free, and courageous, but long-suffering people? When will they again reassert their national independence—throw off the yoke of tyranny?

Would that we could be more encouraging—more reassuring. But I think we can say that we recognize and appreciate their courage and their desire for freedom. We certainly will never rest easy, never forget their justifiable and burning desire for freedom until this yoke of Soviet enslavement and brutality has been lifted. The struggle is long and arduous, but never too long or too arduous to give up hope. Tyranny is like a cancer which must be checked if it is to be prevented from spreading. We look to the day with our friends of freedom in the Baltic States—to the day when they will again emerge as strong, free, prosperous, and happy nations. We know that our friends in the Baltic States will never give up their hope; we know they will be ready when the day arrives to throw off their suppressors.

With courage, with perseverance, with faith in freedom, this day will come—so help us God.

---

[1] J. A. Swettenham, the Tragedy of the Baltic States, p. 69.

[2] Collier's, June 30, 1951, p. 20.

[3] W. Attwood and S. Freidin, June 30, 1951, p. 20.

Address Delivered by Hon. Alexander Wiley, of Wisconsin, at Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Association Dinner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 15, 1954

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, last Thursday night, June 10, it was my privilege to be a guest of honor at a dinner tendered by the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Association in conjunction with the Milwaukee Association of Commerce and the Governor's St. Lawrence Seaway Committee.

At that time, appreciation was expressed to all of us from the Badger State who had been glad to give our efforts to this great cause.

I send to the desk the text of the address which I delivered on that occasion.

Moreover, since the most important task is to look forward rather than backward, I append the text of a Milwaukee Journal editorial of June 11 regarding new waterway possibilities, particularly in connection with the proposed Calumet-Sag project.

I ask unanimous consent that both of these items be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SEAWAY: AMERICA'S NEW FRONTIER

(Address by Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY, of Wisconsin)

It is a great joy and privilege to attend this historic occasion.

Needless to say, I am profoundly grateful for all of the generous expressions tonight.

I want to assure you, however, that far more important than what any single individual did on behalf of the seaway is the fact that a great team was working for the seaway.

TRIBUTE TO THE SEAWAY TEAM

Many of the members of that team are here tonight.

So many, indeed, that it would be difficult if not impossible to try to pay well-deserved tribute to all of them.

Each of them gave of himself selflessly and untiringly.

Through years of setbacks, years of disappointments, years of facing what appeared to be hopeless odds, none of them—none of you ever gave in.

I know that this evening will long live in your and Mrs. Wiley's and my memories.

It will long live not because of all the many thoughtful expressions, but because the occasion tonight is confirmation that right does and will prevail.

You in this audience and we at this table tonight had looked for and dreamed of what might be called V-S Day—victory of the seaway day.

Each of you, wherever you are, did your part.

Some of us were privileged to strive for this goal—on the main "battlefield"—in the Halls of the United States Congress—others at Madison, or in Milwaukee, or in other Wisconsin communities.

It is not a question of which man did the most or did more, but it is the fact that every man did all that he could do, under the given circumstances in which he found himself. Higher praise than that could not be said of any man.

BUILDING FOR THE FUTURE

What triumphed on last May 13 was a great cause, not just a group of individuals.

What triumphed were the forces of right and truth and justice and reason over wrong and falsehood and unfairness and illogic.

It was not just Wisconsin and her neighbors but all America which triumphed when the President of the United States signed Public Law 358.

And it was not just the America of 1954, nor the America of 1960 when deep-draft ships travel 2,200 miles into the heart of the North American Continent, but the America of 1970 and 1980.

We were building for the future in this long seaway fight.

We were building for children yet unborn—for children whose future prosperity we are helping to enhance in this seaway fight. We were building for new industry and new farming in the immense valley of the Great Lakes.

We were building for America's expanding economic frontiers.

THOSE OF LITTLE FAITH

There are those who fear for America's future—who have feared for the future of the railroads, the future of the coal industry, the future of eastern and gulf ports.

They are men (now reduced in numbers) of little faith and little vision.

They are men who could not see further than the noses on their faces and (what they thought to be) the self-interest of their own pocketbooks.

But they are and were wrong—dreadfully wrong. The seaway is not going to hurt them.

It is going to help them, provided they have the intelligence, the imagination, the ingenuity to tap the vast economic markets which the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway is going to build.

I predict that the seaway will revolutionize patterns of American transportation, distribution, manufacturing, agriculture, to a far greater and better degree than the Panama Canal and the Suez Canal have revolutionized world trade and travel, production, and distribution in times past.

Why? Because the United States and Canada are literally God's countries.

Here in the New World we are going to write a saga in the future which will make all our achievements in the past look puny, indeed.

In years to come, we are going to give to men and women—200 million and more of them—luxuries and convenience and necessities which the human mind today can hardly conceive.

This is provided, of course, that we have the peace without which this building cannot go on.

But the seaway is itself going to be a vital weapon for peace by strengthening the United States and Canada—giving it a great inland protected artery. The seaway is going to be a vital element of collective security for the world.

It is going to demonstrate to the Kremlin that we of a constitutional Republic can plan far better than dictators can plan. There may be delays as there have, unfortunately, been, but when we Americans set our minds to it, no dictatorship can match what free men can achieve in conceiving and building great engineering works for man's well-being.

SHOT-IN-ARM FOR MIDWEST

Meanwhile, even on a short-run basis—the seaway is going to be a shot in the arm for the Midwest and the Nation. It involves an immense public works undertaking which will probably take about 70,000 man-years of work.

It will be a short in the arm for the entire Midwest industrial center. Without the seaway, the steel industry, as you know, dependent as it is upon Messabi ore as well as all the industries feeding the steel industry, would have had, gradually, to relocate to the Atlantic coast in order to be in a better competitive position.

The seaway's most direct effect will, of course, be on Midwest shipping, shipbuilding, on warehousing, stevedoring, communications, banking.

And too, the seaway is going to be a great additional bond between the United States and Canada; Canada which already is the biggest supplier of United States raw materials and the biggest customer for American finished products.

But most important of all, the seaway is a great psychological spur.

It is a lift to the morale of men. It demonstrates anew that there is no such thing as an end to the economic horizons of America. People say that the frontier is gone. It isn't gone. There is a whole new frontier on the Great Lakes, and it holds tremendous meaning for America.

CHANNELS MUST BE DEEPENED

To realize that frontier, you and I know that the channels for access to upper lake ports must be deepened.

So far as all of the seaway proponents are concerned, we could infinitely have preferred to have been able to put directly into the seaway law—immediate provision for deepening the channels.

We knew, however, that our chances for getting the law enacted would be aided tremendously if we did not attempt to put into a law whose costs are self-liquidating—a nonself-liquidating provision which can be accomplished through the regular rivers and harbors appropriation bill. For in the latter type of bill, the Federal Government soundly bears the cost of channel development.

By November, 1954, the Corps of Engineers survey of the deepening will have been completed, and it is my hope and expectation that early in the 84th Congress, the green light will have been flashed—authorizing the $100 million or so for the deepening work.

This engineering is absolutely essential for the future of the Great Lakes area, because the tremendous traffic potential simply cannot be handled through existing channels.

Meanwhile, at the other end of the lakes, billions of kilowatt hours of power will be generated yearly by the harnessing of the St. Lawrence. New England and New York industry will be tremendously helped.

We rejoice in that massive outpouring of electric juice. So, too, we know that those of the East, who so long helped us on the navigation phase, which is so vital to the 50 million people in mid-America, rejoice in turn in our good fortune.

Our two regions were the ones most directly involved in the respective phases of this effort, but there isn't one State of the Union which won't feel the constructive impact of it.

Now, my friends, on an occasion such as this, a man's mind tends to become flooded with memories.

I have been privileged to be engaged in this fight longer than any but one Republican in the United States Senate. He, my good friend, Styles Bridges, of New Hampshire, unfortunately has not been numbered in our proseaway ranks.

And so, as I think back to all that has transpired down through these 15 years of my service there are many persons and many events which I would like to recall to you now.

I think back, for example, of the days in the 80th Congress when the then chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, the late Senator Arthur Vandenberg, appointed me as chairman of the Senate subcommittee.

I think back to the unsuccessful floor fight we waged at that time and subsequently.

PRESIDENT EISENHOWER'S GREAT SUPPORT

I recall the many conferences during the present 83d Congress—conferences at the White House, conferences on Capitol Hill.

And in this connection, I want to pay tribute to the Chief Executive of our country, without whose inspired leadership the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway bill would never have been passed.

Dwight D. Eisenhower is a man of forthright honesty. He frankly wanted the facts on the seaway to resolve certain questions in mind. We gave him the facts, and when we had given them to him he promptly made his decision with firmest resolution and gave us the fullest and finest cooperation. His achievement in attaining what no President before him could attain will I am certain be one of the great landmarks of his outstanding tenure of office.

But all the way down the line, all across America, other good men also gave everything they had to this cause.

As I stated at the outset, time does not permit me to pay tribute to all the Wisconsinites whose loyalty to the seaway has never flagged—all the Wisconsinites in labor, in agriculture, in business, in education, in religion, in every field of human endeavor.

They wrote to me down through the years.

They sent the resolutions of their clubs and societies.

They visited with me in Washington and back home.

They sent messages to their friends and acquaintances in other States of the Union asking for support.

They appealed to other Members of the Congress.

They did everything they could do, under the circumstances.

It is a source of deepest pride to me that there is no State of the Union, to my knowledge, whose people at the grassroots did more than did the people of Wisconsin.

I am proud of them. I am proud to serve them.

CONCLUSION

And so, with my heartfelt appreciation to them and to you tonight, I conclude these comments.

May the seaway victory be but the forerunner of greater victories to come.

May right ever prevail over wrong.

May the builders of America's future never be defeated by those who lack faith in our future.

May narrow, selfish, provincial interests always fail before the forces of broad vision and devoted public interest.

May the forces of reason which brought about the seaway victory always triumph over fear and bigotry and self-interest.

I believe that all of this can indeed occur, if we who have triumphed in this cause, give to other causes the same tireless zeal that we have to this one.

Thank you, and good luck to you all.

[From the Milwaukee Journal of June 11, 1954]

NEW WATERWAY POSSIBILITIES

Approval of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway has given impetus to other waterway plans which, if built, would give the United States inland water trade routes from New York City to the gulf coast canals.

Two of the proposals have particular interest and potential value. First and foremost is the Cal-Sag channel project in Illinois. The Calumet-Sag channel is a barge and drainage ditch that runs for 16 miles between Lake Michigan and the Illinois Waterway which connects with the Mississippi.

Eight years ago, in 1946, Congress authorized a construction project to widen the 60-foot canal to 225 feet, deepen parts of it and break a waterway bottleneck. At present the Cal-Sag Canal—because of its narrowness and low bridges (26 highway and 12 railroad spans)—can handle only low barges. By going ahead with Cal-Sag, Congress could open a water link between the Atlantic (through the coming seaway) and the gulf. The industrial potential of the area would be increased by the improved free flow of commerce. Congress, which so far as refused construction funds, has a duty to study the promising possibilities of the project.

In the East another project—first surveyed 20 years ago—is attracting renewed support. A waterway now leads from the St. Lawrence River above Montreal, south through Lake Champlain to Whitehall, N. Y., connecting with a canal running into the Hudson River, leading into New York Harbor.

If this route were widened and deepened in some places, with perhaps a very few changes in channel, the lakes would be opened (after the seaway) to direct shipping into New York City.

The Cal-Sag Canal has been surveyed and authorized. It appears to have more than adequate justification. The Army engineers give it the highest ratings. The practicability of the project from Montreal to New York—while most interesting—needs study. If it is practical and if its benefits would justify costs, it would form an important part in what could be the greatest inland waterway system in the world. The seaway, Cal-Sag and the Montreal-New York Canal would provide a safe, inland, submarine-free trade route that could be invaluable in wartime.

Congress should have a look at the whole proposal. It's intriguing. It might have possibilities that would pay big dividends to our entire economy.

We Need the Houses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SIDNEY R. YATES
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 15, 1954

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following editorial from the Chicago Daily News:

WE NEED THE HOUSES

Enough attention has been centered on the problem of slums and blighted, decaying neighborhoods to convince practically everybody that American cities need rebuilding. The National Housing Conference estimates that 2 million new homes each year are required to give every American good housing. Starts have been running slightly over 1,100,000.

There is a place in this program for public housing. The House and Senate are currently at odds over President Eisenhower's request for funds to build 140,000 publicly financed units in the next 4 years. The case for at least this minimum is good, and the House should concur in the Senate approval.

Opponents of public housing argue that the taxpayers have no obligation to provide shelter for low-income families. This may be conceded without weakening the case for such construction.

The taxpayers have no obligation, either, to provide hospital care for an indigent man with smallpox. Nevertheless, they find it expedient to do so, not only on humane grounds but because it is desirable to protect the community from infection.

Slums are costly. Studies have shown that such property yields only some 6 percent of taxes in metropolitan cities, but produces about half of the fires, crimes, juvenile delinquency, tuberculosis victims, and so on.

Public housing has also proved its ability to bring a sharp appreciation in the value of adjacent property, in contrast to the steady decline under the corrosion of neighboring blight.

The housing bill contains other aids to home building, in the form of guaranteed loans, low interest rates, and a provision for low-downpayments to enable the lowest income groups to finance the purchase of houses.

As the National Housing Conference pointed out, residential construction offers largest single opportunity for the expansion of jobs and employment of capital. Home building has lagged behind in the evolution of modern construction methods, but substantial strides have been made in the technical progress, making for sound investment.

Two million housing starts a year is not an impossible goal for the richest nation in the world. If the Federal Government would cooperate further by leaving in the hands of the taxpayers some of the billions now wasted in futile subsidies at home and abroad, the next decade or two might see the rebuilding of American cities on a scale equal to our resources and our needs.

Return-the-Books Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THURMOND CHATHAM
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 15, 1954

Mr. CHATHAM. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial written by Associate Editor Alfred G. "Pete" Ivey appeared in one of my hometown papers, the Winston-Salem Sentinel, and was later reprinted in the Saturday Review of Literature. I refrain from commenting on the seriousness of Mr. Ivey's proposal, but will certainly not hesitate to attest to its humor and literary merit:

HERE IS ANOTHER WEEK TO ADD TO AN ALREADY LONG, LONG LIST

"Bring back the books" is herewith suggested as a slogan for an annual campaign of 1 week to round up all the books we have borrowed and return them to the lender. It's also the week to get back all the books we have loaned.

Perhaps we already have too many weeks to observe. A Return-the-Books Week could, however, be a real boon to harassed mankind. It would relieve anxiety, lower high blood pressure, patch up broken friendships, cure stomach ulcers, and thus permit book owners to live to a ripe old age.

Anyone who has ever loaned a favorite book and then waited weeks, months, years, and forever for the book to be returned will realize the value of Return-to-Books Week. It will be a time when you can, without offense or apology, ask that your favorite book be returned.

Many booklenders are reluctant to ask for their property. They may have practically forced the book on the borrower. Proud of it, they wanted to share it with their guest or friend. The borrower, unwillingly (but not wishing to be ungrateful), probably mumbled something admiringly about the book and promised to return it as soon as he had read it, probably within a week or two. Since the lender has thrust the book upon the borrower, it's a little awkward to launch a campaign to get it back.

A "bring back the books" drive will solve this problem. Local, State, and National committees could be formed to do the following things:

1. Have the President proclaim Return the Books Week, and be photographed returning a volume he has borrowed. The same with governors and mayors.
2. Encourage every household to take inventory of its bookshelves and return all books to the owners.
3. Send announcement cards to persons who have your books, asking them in a nice way to bring back your books. Name the title and the date it was borrowed. The sting of the request will be minimized because everyone will be doing it. Cards can be formal, or comic, or in between.
4. Appoint a Miss Bring-Back-the Books dressed in some spectacular, preferably abbreviated, attire designed to represent some book.

Nothing but good (and a lot of books) would come, we believe, from such an effort, whether it be on a local, State, National, or international scale.

The Situation in Guatemala

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, June 15, 1954

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, today we behold a world divided not merely by geographical boundaries, but also by antagonistic philosophies. One is based upon man's dignity as a human being; the other, upon atheistic communism. Atheistic communism by its very nature and modus operandi, as inspired by the Kremlin, is dedicated to the suppression and subjugation of the entire free world.

Regrettable as it may be, the international Communist conspiracy, through odious and devious means, has made progress; and in the light of these repugnant successes and their effect on the entire free world, the present tension in regard to the situation in Guatemala must be viewed.

I therefore ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a copy of a newsletter which I sent to my constituents, together with two editorials dealing with the situation in Guatemala.

There being no objection, the newsletter and editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRESSIONAL VIEWPOINT—A WEEKLY NEWSLETTER BY SENATOR JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER, OF MARYLAND

WASHINGTON, June 1, 1954.—Developments of the past 10 days in Guatemala would seem to signal greater activity in the Western Hemisphere by the partisans of atheistic communism. Undoubtedly, Communist infiltration of Central and South America, in conjunction with continued and devious subversion in our country, is but part of a planned program for the complete subjugation of the United States and of all freedom-loving people everywhere. There is much expert testimony to substantiate this point.

Thus, the repugnant pattern of world domination, created by the Bolshevik terrorists immediately following World War I and since, surreptitiously, and often openly, motivated by the Kremlin, moves closer to ultimate attainment, unless the free world, with alacrity and vigor, rather than apathy and indolence, awakens to the true nature and eventual goal of the Red menace.

Let it not be forgotten that international communism has but one, and only one, objective—world domination and subservience—the accomplishment of which has followed a definite plan of several specific phases:

First, the overthrow of the Czarist regime in Russia after World War I for the purpose of obtaining a national base for international operations. Second, in the years prior to World War II, the consolidation of Russia under Communist control. Third, a program of periphery expansion to enable contiguous defense from satellite nations. Fourth, the mastery of Asia by either direct or indirect means; the latter having proved most effective. Fifth, the mastery of Africa with its vast storehouse of natural resources. Sixth, the mastery of Latin America as a prelude to the economic strangulation of the United States. Each phase requires no direct military intervention by Russia; on the contrary, results are obtained through the typical Kremlin-inspired tactics of subversion, infiltration, and propaganda. Only recently, the scope of these tactics has been broadened to include a campaign of negotiated economic ties with the Communist orbit.

The present tenseness in the Guatemalan situation might well be viewed in the light of results thus far achieved through this phased plan of international conspiracy, particularly since World War II: Establishment of Red China, occupation of Tibet by "a people's army of liberation," invasion and division of Korea, support of Ho Chi Minh in Indochina, attempts to aid the insurrectionist Hukbalahps in the Philippines, support of independence for Indonesia, infiltration of Burma, a program to communize Thailand and Malaya, creation of an Iron-Curtain defense through a consolidation of satellite nations, disruption of most Middle East governments, except for Greece and Turkey.

With the knowledge of such a global conspiracy, and the inroads which have already been made in the community of free nations, the extensive reaction of lethargy to situations such as now exist in Guatemala is indeed incredible. If freedom, as a basic dignity and cherished heritage, is to be preserved, this latest threat to the Western Hemisphere must be challenged, perhaps, through a return to the principles of the Monroe Doctrine.

[From the Baltimore News-Post of May 31, 1954]

THESE DAYS

(By George E. Sokolsky)

THE MONROE DOCTRINE

The nullification of the Monroe Doctrine was a response to the demand of Latin American countries which resented the umbrage of a United States protectorate over them. In its stead appeared a series of multilateral agreements which effectively bar protection of the interests of the United States without the two-thirds consent of the Latin American countries.

The Monroe Doctrine formally came into existence in President Monroe's annual message of December 2, 1823, but its origin goes back to Washington's Farewell Address. Its basic principles were fundamental American policy from George Washington to Franklin D. Roosevelt. It is not fundamental American policy today and therefore the State Department and the President are unable to act soundly in the Guatemala affair.

Top points

The primary matters discussed in the Monroe Doctrine are:

1. The American continents are not subject to colonization by any European power;

2. The United States would consider any attempt of the Allied Powers, to extend their system to any part of "this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety."

By "Allied Powers" in 1823 were meant Austria, France, Russia, and Prussia, and by "system" was meant the post-Napoleonic reaction of the Holy Alliance.

3. Existing European colonies were excluded from these provisions.

4. With regard to the Spanish colonies which had declared their independence, the United States "could not view any interposition for the purpose of oppressing them or of controlling in any other manner their destiny, by any European power, in any other light than as the manifestation of an unfriendly disposition toward the United States."

Some apply

I desire to quote a few sentences from the Monroe Doctrine which are applicable to the Guatemalan situation:

"The political system of the allied powers is essentially different in this respect from that of America. This difference proceeds from that which exists in their respective governments; and to the defense of our own, which has been achieved by the loss of so much blood and treasure, and matured by the wisdom of their most enlightened citizens, and under which we have enjoyed unexampled felicity, this whole Nation is devoted.

"We owe it, therefore, to candor and to the amicable relations existing between the United States and those powers to declare that we should consider any attempt on their part to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety."

Were the Monroe Doctrine in effect today, the difference in system between the Marxism-Leninism of the Soviet universal state and the United States would be sufficient cause for the United States to intervene in Guatemala. The physical peril is the destruction of the Panama Canal; the spiritual peril is the spread of the Marxist system.

[From the Wall Street Journal of June 1, 1954]

Repeating History: Soviet Arms Aid to Guatemala Defies Monroe Doctrine—Proclaimed To Thwart 19th Century Russian Aims

(By William Henry Chamberlin)

The heavy shipment of arms from the Soviet bloc to Communist-infiltrated Guatemala is the most serious challenge to the Monroe Doctrine in the present century. And, if one looks up the record, one finds that the Monroe Doctrine was conceived very largely as a challenge and a warning to another Russian Government—that of Tsar Alexander I.

There were two causes of concern about Russian designs in the United States at the time when President Monroe set forth his famous doctrine, in his message to Congress of December 2, 1823. First, Tsar Alexander had proclaimed an iron curtain along the northwestern coast of America, forbidding navigation or fishing within 100 miles of the coast as far south as the 51st parallel (somewhat to the north of the present boundary between the United States and Canada).

At that time all boundary claims in what was then an unsettled wilderness were vague and there was a Russian settlement at Fort Ross, north of San Francisco.

Second, the Russian Government had addressed two notes to the United States, refusing to recognize the independence of the newly established republics in South America and announcing that the policy of the Holy Alliance, in which Tsar Alexander was a moving spirit, was "to crush all revolutionary movements." There was here at least a hint of possible Russian participation in some European intervention in South America.

Basic principles

The Monroe Doctrine, one of the oldest and most universally accepted commitments in American foreign policy, laid down two main principles. The American continents were not to be considered subjects for future colonization by European powers. And any European intervention against independent American states was declared "the manifestation of an unfriendly disposition toward the United States."

There have been occasional diplomatic crises over the application of the Monroe Doctrine. Most serious was the French intervention which placed an Emperor, Maximilian, on the Mexican throne. This coincided with the American Civil War. After the end of the Civil War the firm attitude of the United States was sufficient to insure the withdrawal of the French troops and the fall of Maximilian.

A boundary dispute between British Guiana and Venezuela in 1895–97 and financial claims of Great Britain, Germany, and Italy against Venezuela in 1902–4 produced flurries of excitement; but both these incidents were settled peacefully.

In recent decades the Monroe Doctrine, in line with the nationalist susceptibilities of our neighbors south of the Rio Grande, has been modified and broadened. From a unilateral declaration of purpose by the United States it has become a multilateral obligation of all American states to act together in the event of a threat to the security of the hemisphere.

For the last 10 years Guatemala has been a trouble spot in inter-American relations. A tight oldfashioned Central American personal dictatorship was overthrown and the Communists succeeded in moving in on the somewhat woolly minded reform government which was set up. Since that time, and with growing intensity in recent years, the Guatemalan Government has been harassing American economic interests, such as the United Fruit Co., and refusing to go along with hemispheric measures designed to check Communist subversion.

Military ascendancy

The receipt of arms valued at $10 million from behind the Iron Curtain puts a more serious aspect on what had been regarded in the past as a minor diplomatic headache. Any such export from such a source may be considered strictly political in design. The Central American Republics are poor and economically retarded, and Guatemala has acquired a position of temporary military ascendancy.

The grave view which Washington takes of this development has been reflected in comments of the President and the Secretary of State and in the hasty rushing of much smaller quantities of arms to two of Guatemala's neighbors, Honduras and Nicaragua.

A stockpile of arms from Communist sources in an American country located a few hundred miles from the Panama Canal may be an alarm bell even to Americans who feel that Indochina is a long way from home. The immediate danger is probably not a direct attack by Guatemala on its neighbors. This would be a clear challenge to hemispheric peace and security and could be dealt with, in all probability, by joint action, averting the stigma that would always be attached to single-handed United States action, regardless of the provocation, against a smaller and weaker nation.

The danger is rather that Guatemala might become a kind of Typhoid Mary, spreading germs of communism and anti-Americanism accompanied by arms in the Central American area. This danger may be averted or minimized by close consultation between the United States, Nicaragua, Honduras, and other States which may be affected.

The diversionary design of this shipment of arms, at a time when the issue of extended war or peace in Indochina is becoming acute, is clear. Just how the arms were paid for is not clear. But Moscow may well count on buying more than $10 million worth of trouble for the United States in its own backyard.

Continual undermining

The arms shipment to Guatemala was revealed shortly after Mr. Dulles delivered a speech at Williamsburg in which he expressed his opinion that the struggle between freedom and Communist despotism "cannot be resolved by any agreed partition of humanity between freedom and despotism." The arms shipment seemed to confirm this opinion. For it is only one of many devices by which Communist undermining might be expected to go on even if some kind of division of the world into spheres of interest were formally agreed on.

The American Merchant Marine: Lifeline of Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 15, 1954

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record a prize-winning essay by John K. Sleeman, a 14-year-old student of Belle, W. Va. This essay entitled "The American Merchant Marine: Lifeline of Industry," was entered in a contest sponsored by the Propeller Club, and, I am happy to say, it won for this fine young man a trip to Cuba.

In a letter to me, young Sleeman wrote that he "was trying to arrange to take an older member of the family along because, at 14, I haven't had a chance to learn Spanish yet." I am confident he will enjoy this trip, and it will be a wonderful experience for young Sleeman.

I urge my colleagues to read this essay, a fine tribute to our great American merchant marine, by an outstanding young man from my State of West Virginia.

Incidentally, he comes from a section where the inland waterway and the inland merchant marine played a great part in the settlement and building of the West. In his essay he calls attention to that fact, and shows what waterborne transportation can do. For that reason I think this is a very fine essay, and I urge all my colleagues to read it.

There being no objection, the essay was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The American Merchant Marine: Lifeline of Industry

(By Kay Sleeman, Belle, W. Va.)

The history of the great merchant fleets down through the ages parallels the history of industry, prosperity, enlightenment, leadership, and prestige. The lack of merchant fleets, or neglect of them, has been the undoing of whole civilizations, such as that of ancient Greece.

America, with its thriving industries, its matchless standard of living, and its freedom-loving people, owes its very existence to our merchant fleet, for it was the navigation acts passed by England in the 1600's which irked the colonists and contributed to their eventual revolt against the mother country.

One of the first acts of our 1st Congress was to enact measures to protect and encourage the American merchant marine. Thomas Jefferson, with his auburn hair and stubborn determination, put up a successful argument for development of the shipping he considered essential to American industry and economic balance.

It was our swiftly growing fleet of merchant vessels which gained for this young nation the respect of the world and, by establishing trade between America and the rest of the world, encouraged manufacturing and industry of all kinds.

In time of war, the American merchant marine maintains and protects our industry. Although it is not Government owned or operated—merely Government aided—it is the guardian which first meets the enemy.

"It is our high seas protection against the enemy on the economic front long before our first line of military defense is called into play," declared Congressman Tollefson, from the State of Washington, when he addressed the House of Representatives recently concerning the vital importance of a large merchant marine.

Fleet Adm. Ernest King, of the Navy, in praising the American merchant marine, calls it an important national resource and "a buttress to sound national economy."

The merchant marine which has helped to build and promote our wonderfully successful system of free enterprise is, appropriately enough, a private industry. It is true that the United States Maritime Commission loans money, by subsidy, to private firms building and operating ships in foreign trade. Yet the number of unsubsidized ships numbers five times as many as those now receiving Government aid in cash.

No nation today can equal the United States in either number or tonnage of merchant vessels.

Our modern freight vessels are more efficient than ever before. They cover greater distances in less time, and consume less fuel. They are designed with extra large cargo hatches and double handling gear at each, which makes for speed and ease in handling freight, with fewer "lay days" for vessels, more "pay days" for industry.

We have better-trained personnel, with better living conditions and quarters than at any time in our history.

Our merchant marine on the inland waterways and coastal routes enables us to use more widely and more productively the vast array of America's resources, from northern timber and southern turpentine to eastern coal and western copper.

It enables us to build industry in places inaccessible to other transportation facilities. For instance, the Kanawha Valley, a narrow strip of land and water nestled in the mountains of West Virginia, has in a comparatively short time developed from a sparsely settled agricultural area into one of the industrial centers of the world. Now called the Magic Valley, it owes its progress primarily to the boats that have plied the Kanawha River, carrying to distant markets its coal, oil, chemicals, and glass, and bringing in steel, machinery and other vital materials.

To earlier settlers along the Kanawha, these boats brought food and furniture, books and percales. Salt, the first important product of the valley, started its journey to world markets in boats on the Kanawha. In addition, there were passenger boats which gave these valley dwellers virtually their only opportunity for travel to the outside world, for roads were many times impassable, and in many places nonexistent.

It was still an age of barter in some respects, and it was a happy day for the housewife when the "iron boat" arrived in the springtime. The children joined in the work of carrying down the bank all the scrap metal which had accumulated during the year on the typical small farm—rusty mowing scythes, discarded reapers, barrel hoops, even buggies. Glassware and dishes, and perhaps a handsome cut glass punch bowl for "infares" and special occasions, were received in exchange.

With increasing river traffic, new industries arrived. Older ones prospered. The standard of living rose.

Now, although highways have been built, and truck and railway lines traverse the valley, the great petroleum refineries, chemical plants, coal mines, and power plants depend upon the river boats for the most dependable and efficient transportation at lowest cost. The savings they realize are passed on to the consumer in the form of lower prices. A greater volume of sales is possible when the price can be kept low, and with volume sales comes added incentive for the research which improves products. Thus the consumer benefits in two ways. He gets a better product at less cost.

The story of the Kanawha Valley, multiplied a thousandfold, is that of the Nation. Wherever our merchant ships could penetrate, they have carried with them potentialities for progress, opportunities for development.

To the American merchant marine we can rightfully, gratefully, assign the title "Lifeline of Industry."

Platform Adopted by the 1954 Wisconsin Republican Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 15, 1954

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the strength of the Republican Party of our Nation consists of the strength of its 48 State Republican units and of their combined strength with respect to all America.

The Republican Party of Wisconsin met last week in Milwaukee. It contributed what I believe to be an outstanding statement of grassroots principles on which it invites, and on which I know it will receive, the continued support of the people of my State interested in sound government at Madison and throughout our 71 Badger counties.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the State convention platform be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the platform was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Text of Platform Adopted by 1954 Republican Convention—Planks Cover Many Issues—Labor's Strike Rights, Agricultural Problems Are Considered

Since the birth of the Republican Party at Ripon in 1854, Wisconsin citizens have generally entrusted the government of their State to Republican officials and legislators.

Experienced Republican leadership has always given Wisconsin an honest, efficient government, responsive to the needs, hopes, and desires of the people. Through the century, Wisconsin has earned an enviable reputation for the honesty, economy, and social advances of its government which has become the pattern for legislation and administration in other States and the Federal Government.

Our Republican national administration is demonstrating once again that the Republican Party can provide the same quality of progress and leadership in Washington which Wisconsin citizens now enjoy and have enjoyed for most of the century.

Today the Republican national administration has restored honesty and integrity in Washington and permitted Americans once again to regard their national leadership with respect.

AGRICULTURAL

The Republican Party of Wisconsin believes that the farmer is entitled to a fair price for his product, as the industrial worker is entitled to a fair wage and industry to a fair profit.

Recognizing that in agriculture lies the economic strength of Wisconsin, Republicans will continue to support programs which would encourage and develop this vital segment of the State economy.

The Republican brucellosis-control program is effectively reducing this costly disease. In the last 4 years Republican administrations through legislation have provided $6 million for the aggressive brucellosis program which now is being widely copied by other States. We shall continue this program.

Milk markets goal

We support the principle that the Wisconsin dairy farmer must receive protection from subsidized competition on acreage diverted from the production of corn, wheat, and cotton in other States under the price-support program. We oppose the restrictive local ordinances and unfair Federal milk marketing orders which have closed markets to Wisconsin dairy farmers while forcing consumers in those areas to pay excessive prices for their milk.

We believe that the true solution to the problems of the dairy farmer lies in expanding consumption of dairy products.

Under Republican leadership, therefore, the State government will continue the development of new uses and expanded markets for dairy products.

Recent test merchandising campaigns by the State department of agriculture have stimulated sales of dairy products as much as 300 percent. This success is convincing evidence that such activities should be expanded to create greater markets for Wisconsin dairy products. We therefore pledge that this vital promotional activity will be substantially increased.

The Republican Party will continue its traditional support of soil conservation and erosion control, and will continue to support and encourage rural electrification and farmer-owned, farmer-operated cooperatives.

LABOR

The Republican Party of Wisconsin has developed an impressive reputation for dealing fairly with every segment of society. Outstanding is its record in the field of labor legislation because of the leadership the party has provided.

Most significant among these many acts are those dealing with the rights of workmen who lose their jobs or are disabled in the course of their employment. Wisconsin led the Nation in the enactment of workmen's compensation and unemployment compensation laws, and has consistently maintained the most liberal benefits under these acts of any State in the Union.

The 1953 Republican legislature again improved legislation in this field with the result that Wisconsin today provides greater benefits, for a longer period of time, than any other State.

The Republican Party pledges that it will continue to maintain benefits for the unemployed and the disabled in the front rank of all States.

Right to strike cited

We reaffirm the belief of the Republican Party in the following rights:

FOR THE WORKINGMAN

The right to quit his job at any time.

The right to take part in legal union activity.

The right to remain in his union so long as he pays his dues.

The right to protection against unfair practices by either employer or union officials.

The right of political activity of his own choice and freedom to contribute thereto.

The right to a job without first joining a union.

The right to a secret ballot in any election concerned with his livelihood.

The right to protection from personal financial responsibility in damage cases against his union.

FOR THE LABOR UNIONS

The right to establish union-shop contracts by agreement with management.

The right to strike.

The right to free collective bargaining.

The right to protection from rival unions during the life of the union contracts.

The right to assurance from employers that they will bargain only with certified unions as a protection against unfair labor practices.

INDUSTRY

The Republican Party recognizes the increasing importance of industry in the economic life of the State. During the years of Republican administration, Wisconsin has attained a place among the 10 leading industrial States in the Union.

It will continue to be the purpose of the Republican Party to encourage the development of industry in Wisconsin, to provide a sounder State economy, and to provide greater employment opportunity for the citizens of the State.

We therefore commend the Republican national administration, the Republican Representatives in Congress, and the Republican State administration for their efforts in securing passage of the St. Lawrence seaway legislation. We look forward to substantial economic development in Wisconsin as a result of this successful effort.

We further commend the governor and the legislature for the creation of two important groups active in aiding in the industrial development of the State. The industrial development committee and the natural resources committee already have given evidence that they hold forth great promise in the further development and strengthening of Wisconsin industry and we pledge continued support for these groups.

CONSERVATION

The Republican Party consistently has recognized the importance of sound conservation practices to the economic welfare of the State.

This devotion to the principles of conservation has led Republican administrations to provide programs of pollution control, forest protection, fish and game management, reforestation and watershed improvement which are second to none in America.

Under the forest crop law, the woodworking industries of the State have been provided with resources which promise within relatively few years to make available a continuing supply of raw materials.

Under the Republican Party, every aspect of conservation has receive intelligent treatment. We have recognized the interests of hunters and fishermen, and the needs of our resort areas, yet we have not sacrificed the principles of basic conservation.

Republican administrations will continue, through the activities of the State natural resources committee, the conservation commission and the State legislature, to improve and develop the conservation activities of the State.

STATE FINANCES

Wisconsin Republicans have steadfastly supported the principle that government can be most economically administered on a pay as you go basis, and have resisted all efforts of the minority party to repeal our constitutional prohibition against borrowing by the State.

It shall be our purpose to continue to operate the State government with economy and efficiency, to the end that the cost of governmental operations may be met with current revenues.

We commend our Republican national administration for its efforts to restore solvency in the Federal Government, for acting to halt inflation, stabilize the economy, and eliminate graft, waste, and extravagance in Washington. We commend the Republican Congress and the President for providing the American people with the largest Federal tax reduction in the history of the United States.

We commend the Republican State administrations for reducing State income taxes almost 40 percent during the last 10 years, while taxes in virtually every other State were being increased. We take pride in this remarkable record, and pledge that we shall continue to practice the economy in order that Wisconsin citizens may be spared the burden of unnecessary taxes.

BUILDING PROGRAM

We take pride in the constructive improvements at State institutions which have been provided by the Republican administrations.

During the years of World War II when inflation and an expanding economy produced revenues beyond expectations, the Republican administrations and legislatures wisely laid aside funds for use in the improvement of the State's physical plant.

Legislation was enacted for the orderly replacement of physical facilities as they become obsolete.

Construction at the State university, the State colleges, the mental hospitals, and other public welfare institutions totals $97 million since the close of World War II. The Republican Party takes pride in the wise investment of these surplus funds, and commends the foresight of those Republican officials and legislators who have made possible these magnificent improvements at institutions throughout the State.

We pledge that the Republican Party will continue to maintain the State's physical facilities at a level consistent with the needs of our students and those in need of care and treatment by the State.

PUBLIC WELFARE

The attitude of the Republican Party toward those in our society who must look to the State for help in best expressed in these words of President Eisenhower:

"In all those things which deal with people, be liberal, be human. In all those things which deal with the people's money or their economy, or their form of government, be conservative."

The Republican Party consistently has extended a helping hand to the mentally ill, the aged, the widowed, the underprivileged, and retarded children, the handicapped—to all those who need the aid and good will of their fellow citizens.

During the last decade vast improvements have been made in the quality of care at our State institutions of public welfare. Institutions which were understaffed and ill equipped have been generously provided for to enable the development of sound treatment programs, rather than mere custodial care. Personnel and facilities have been provided which immeasurably brighten the hopes of our victims of mental disease. Under Republicans more than $42 million has been provided for improved construction facilities at public welfare institutions.

We pledge the continuation of these sound and humane programs, in the knowledge that such a course not only serves the cause of humanity and justice but inevitably results in strenthening the State's economy, as well.

EDUCATION

Republican administrations in Wisconsin historically have recognized education as a primary consideration of the State government, since the benefits derived from education are essentially statewide.

This philosophy has encouraged Republican legislators and governors to enact laws under which the State bears a substantial share of local educational costs.

Research by the taxation committee of the legislative council indicates that per capita State assistance in Wisconsin is 50 percent greater than the national average.

It is a significant part of Republican philosophy that a major portion of Wisconsin's aids to local units of government is in the form of shared taxes, rather than direct aids for a specific purpose. As a result, there is less State control of the method by which the funds are expended, permitting greater local control over and responsibilities for governmental operations.

We pledge a continuing study of elementary school problems with the aim of maintaining local control and participation in educational affairs. We further pledge the provision of funds to permit payment of educational aids in full.

This belief in the principle that the best administered government is that which is closest to the people is the basis for our continued opposition to Federal aid to education, and all of the Federal regulations and controls which such aid would impose.

The Republican Party also has recognized its responsibility in the field of higher education by making generous provision for the State university and the State colleges. Appropriations for building alone total more than $50 million in the last 10 years.

It continues to recognize the needs and problems in this field, and in particular the pressing need for increased facilities which rising population will occasion.

We pledge, therefore, a continued program of building at our institutions of higher learning.

We recognize also that higher education is on the threshold of a new and greater expansion to meet the needs of a greatly increased population. We pledge measures to coordinate our institutions of higher learning and to eliminate costly duplication, particularly where parallel, overlapping programs are offered, to the end that opportunity for higher education may be more broadly and more economically available to our youth in the various areas of the State.

We commend the progress of the public library system in Wisconsin over the years and the part it plays in making accessible to our adult citizens the opportunity for continued self-education.

HIGHWAYS

Wisconsin, under Republicans, consistently has maintained the Nation's finest system of farm-to-market roads and, with the exception of relatively few of our older highways, has one of the Nation's outstanding primary highway systems.

We pledge continued development and improvement of our highway system.

We take pride in the action of the 1953 Republican legislature in making provision for the construction of a system of turnpike highways, geared to the most modern traffic and safety needs.

Currently, the State turnpike commission is developing plans for a $200 million turnpike system to serve the entire State.

These fast, new traffic routes connecting with similar turnpikes in the Eastern States will open up vast new possibilities for the development of the State's commercial and recreational industry. In addition, they provide faster, safer transportation for Wisconsin citizens, and relieve other free roads of the burden of heavy truck and tourist traffic.

The Republican Party has acted with great foresight in the past to maintain and develop highways adequate for modern needs, and we pledge that we shall continue to provide a highway system in which every citizen can take pride.

HIGHWAY SAFETY

The shocking toll of highway accidents has aroused in each of us a determination to act decisively to make our highways more safe.

We commend the present local, State and National administrations for their activities in this important field, and pledge our support and cooperation in the development and enactment of a Republican legislative program which will effectively reduce the accident rate.

We commend the legislature and the governor for appointing special committees to prepare far reaching programs for greater highway safety. We recognize that such programs must provide for greater education, better enforcement and more adequate licensing and control of motor vehicle operators.

The Republican Party pledges effective action during the 1955 legislative session to protect our citizens from traffic hazards.

VETERANS

The Republican Party consistently has maintained that those who served their Nation in time of war and are in need, deserve the continuing help and support of their fellow citizens. We have therefore provided programs of rehabilitation which acknowledge the debt of the State to its veteran population, and extend to every veteran in need assistance in time of financial trouble.

During the decade since the establishment of this program the State has made available to veterans of World War II and the Korean war more than $52 million in grants and loans to ease them through periods of readjustment. More than 60,000 veterans have benefited directly from this program, and additional thousands are receiving assistance each year.

We pledge that this responsibility, assumed by the State under laws enacted by Republicans, will continue to have our support in future years.

HUMAN RIGHTS

The Republican Party of Wisconsin, in celebrating its centenial, reaffirms its conviction that intolerance and prejudice have no place in the hearts of men.

We take pride in the establishment by Republicans of the governor's commission on human rights, which has brought to our State new levels of human understanding based on education and persuasion, rather than coercion. We commend the Republican legislature and the governor for increasing the support of this worthy commission.

We further reaffirm our support for the Wisconsin statutes which provide for fair-employment practices, and which recognize the injustice of discrimination in employment because of race, color, creed, national origin, or ancestry.

We commend the State administration and the Republican representatives in Congress for their activities in behalf of Wisconsin's Indian population, and take pride in State legislation which has abolished separate educational facilities for Indian children. We pledge continued efforts to assist the original Americans within our population in the solution of the problems which confront them.

REPRESENTATION IN GOVERNMENT

The Republican party of Wisconsin believes in the principle of equitable reapportionment, and further believes that persuasive arguments exist in behalf of recognition for area as well as population in the apportionment of legislative districts.

CIVIL DEFENSE

Recognizing the importance of activities to protect our population in the event of atomic war, we commend the Republican legislature for its foresight in establishing a Statewide program of civil defense, and pledge continued efforts in this field.

CONCLUSION

The Republican Party of Wisconsin reaffirms its belief in these fundamental principles of Wisconsin government which have had their part in winning for our State, under Republican administrations, an international reputation for honesty and integrity.

1. We reaffirm our support for the State civil service system which guarantees to Wisconsin citizens that their State servants will be appointed because of what they know, not whom they know.
2. We pledge continued support for the corrupt practices legislation which has eliminated corruption in Wisconsin elections and made our system the object of admiration and envy throughout the land.
3. We commend the Republican legislatures for enacting lobbying regulations which are the most stringent of any State in the Union, to the end that improper influence has been virtually eliminated from Wisconsin legislative procedures.
4. We take pride in the fact that secrecy has no place in Wisconsin government, as a matter of public policy, and that evidences of secret meetings so often characteristic of governments elsewhere are the rare exception in our State.
5. We reaffirm our belief that State income tax records should continue to be made available only to any public officer who is legally authorized to utilize the information which they contain.

HONESTY IS CITED

We commend the 1953 legislature, however, for granting to every citizen of Wisconsin the same right of privacy regarding his income and personal finances which has long been enjoyed by residents of every other State in the Union.

Finally, we commend the present State administration for maintaining in Wisconsin equality of government, and a reputation for honesty, integrity, and fair play which every citizen can support with pride and enthusiasm.

This record is in keeping with the enviable reputation for accomplishment and progress developed by the Republican Party of Wisconsin during its first 100 years.

As we enter our second century, we pledge continued vigilance to make certain that the problems of this generation and future generations will be met and solved in the efficient, effective, and economical manner which has become traditional with Republican administration in our State.

Effect of Soil-Saving Practices on Texas Farms

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 15, 1954

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the people of Texas are thinking about water and soil conservation as never before. They are receiving sound information from the progressive newspapers of Texas, and it is certain that great good will result from the general interest in this all-important problem.

Doc Jenkins, farm writer for the Fort Worth Press, recently wrote for that newspaper a thoughtful article on how water reservoirs are affected by soil-conservation practices on farms. Since the information in this article is of general interest, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Do soil conservation measures—like the cover crops, contour-tillage, stock ponds and tall, thick range grasses—rob big reservoirs of water?

Definitely, insists one group, mainly those who are worried about enough water for municipal supplies.

Another group, chiefly supporters of soil conservation's upstream plan to control floods, say no—and just as definitely.

It's a question that has been warming up to the scorching point. It is a fear heightened by the troubled months that cities like Fort Worth and Dallas have been passing through, with dwindling supplies and no rain.

It's the kind of fear that prompts deals with rain-makers and the building of conduits over long and expensive distances.

ISSUE ADDS WORRY

And when you toss into the argument the systems of flood prevention dams that hold back a few acre feet of water each, you have an issue that adds more worry to the talk.

Opponents of the flood prevention dam ideas have already kicked the latter subject around considerably. Month-after-month of less-than-normal rainfall has lent weight to their contention, that you can't have a lot of soil conservation, especially with upstream flood control, and have water in your big reservoir, too.

Meantime, the Government agency that deals entirely with soil conservation and flood prevention has been taking a careful look at its way of doing the job. Near Waco, the United States Soil Conservation Service has been checking the action of water on 2 small watersheds. One of the two watersheds has had complete soil conservation treatment for 10 years. In the other watershed the way of farming has continued the way it was, the way which farming is done on most farms without soil conservation.

RECORDS INTERESTING

The purpose, of course, was a side-by-side checkup on soil conservation in the Blacklands. The records of the study now have become extremely interesting.

For the last 5 years the rainfall in the area has been far below normal. For the preceding 5 years it was normal or above. Five years of good rainfall, followed by 5 years of drouth.

And here's the answer the SCS has come up with, as reported by Howard M. Matson, chief of engineering and planning for this 4-State region:

As far as runoff is concerned, there isn't enough difference between conservation-treated and untreated watersheds to slice with the sharpest edges ever honed.

MATSON CONTENTION

You can't base a water supply on the runoff you get in drought years, Matson insists. You need a supply big enough to carry through drought periods.

In the years 1943 to 1947, which were years of good rainfall, the rain total on the two watersheds near Waco was just over 192 inches. A total of 87 inches was considered effective; that is, it fell in quantity enough and at a time when it could do crops some good.

In the next 5 years the rainfall on the two watersheds was 120 inches, with only 24 inches effective.

Runoff from the untreated watershed in the 5 years of good rains totaled 51.43 inches. From the conservation watershed it was 51.91 inches—.48 inch more.

During the drier years the runoff total was 7.05 inches from the untreated watershed, 4.29 inches from the treated one. This represented less than 14 percent of the runoff of the earlier period from the untreated area, a little over 8 percent of the earlier period's yield from the other.

Matson's way of looking at it is this: Regardless of whether a watershed has conservation, the difference in water yield is extremely small, even during a period of drought.

Matson points out, too, that the entire experimental watershed was under complete conservation treatment. About the best you could expect on a big watershed would be 70 percent, and drought always reduces the effectiveness of a part of the conservation measures.

Then there's this angle to note: periods of low rainfall are not normal. You don't get too many of them.

However, the angle of sediment is something to consider. Sediment is the soil material, mostly topsoil, that is carried from exposed land by water. It is the product of water erosion. It is dumped into streams and lakes where it occupies space that could hold water. It stays. Getting it out of a lake or stream on any scale at all is too costly for a second thought.

INSEPARABLE COMPANIONS

Surface runoff and sediment are inseparable companions, Matson points out. Conservation farming on watersheds reduces the rate of sediment yield, especially in years of higher rainfall when sediment loads would be high.

It would work this way in the case of Benbrook, Grapevine, Garza-Little Elm, and Lavon Reservoirs. If no further conservation work is done on the watersheds of these lakes, sediment will cut the capacity by 91,150 acre-feet in 50 years. But if all needed conservation measures were in effect now, there would be no encroachment on the storage capacity of Benbrook and Grapevine Reservoirs in that time. And an additional 20,156 acre-feet of storage would remain available in the other two lakes.

So the people who are most concerned with the action of water that runs into an impounded supply report you may allay all fears. There is little difference in the total yield under conservation conditions as compared with unprotected watersheds. But of greater importance, they assure you, is the matter of space-stealing sediment. Keep the soil where it belongs—where it is now, they advise. There it is worth an awful lot more.

Chief Justice John Marshall

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 15, 1954

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an editorial from the June issue of the American Bar Association Journal concerning Senate Joint Resolution 149, which would honor the late great Chief Justice John Marshall upon the 200th anniversary of his birth.

In directing the attention of my colleagues to this editorial commentary, I express the sincere hope that Senate Joint Resolution 149, in tribute to the great Chief Justice John Marshall, will receive prompt and favorable consideration.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

John Marshall Month

In the midst of trouble and turmoil, when the world is in the grip of tense anxiety, it is well that we pause occasionally to review the events of the stirring times of our forefathers; for it is too easy to forget the courageous struggles and the inspiring achievements of those who fought the good fight that freed us from unwelcome controls and went on from there to lead us to greatness.

One of these was John Marshall, the great Chief Justice, born in Virginia on September 24, 1755. He was a soldier, diplomat, legislator, author, Cabinet officer, and jurist—the illustrious head of a great Court for 34 years. The memory of no man deserves more reverence from the bar than his.

The 24th of September 1955, will mark the 200th anniversary of his birth. The occasion should be celebrated throughout the Nation, and to this end House Joint Resolution 340 was introduced in the House last January. It was approved by our board of governors at Atlanta, and a note of the pendency of the resolution published in the Journal. It appeared in the April issue, Senate Joint Resolution 149, which is identical with the House resolution, was introduced April 21.

This is the preamble of that resolution:

"Whereas September 24, 1955, will mark the 200th anniversary of the birth of John Marshall, who has been rightly called 'the Great Justice'; and

"Whereas the work of John Marshall in expounding constitutional principles has been one of the most important factors in developing and maintaining the liberties of the people of the United States; and

"Whereas a wider public knowledge and appreciation of the achievements of the great Chief Justice, John Marshall, is highly desirable in order to strengthen the moral, social, and political structure of our Nation, and as a means of helping to preserve and protect the lives, liberties, and property of all our people. * * *"

The resolution sets aside and designates September 1955 as John Marshall Bicentennial Month, requests the President to issue a proclamation, calling upon appropriate agencies and organizations throughout the United States to unite in observing such bicentennial month with suitable activities and ceremonies, and inviting all the people of the United States to join therein.

Recognizing the vast amount of work that lies ahead if this celebration is to be worthy of the great man whose memory is to be honored, the resolution establishes a commission of 19 to supervise and direct the observance of John Marshall Bicentennial Month, to prepare appropriate plans and programs, to receive and coordinate any plans prepared by State and local agencies and by representative civic bodies, and to submit to the Congress at the earliest practicable time a full report of its activities together with a detailed statement of the plans and programs to be used in such celebration.

It is to be hoped that nothing will interfere with the development of the proposed plan promptly and in a manner suitable to the occasion.

Administration Promoting International Tourist Travel as Vital Element of Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 10, 1954

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, appended hereto is the letter of Hon. Clarence Randall, special consultant to the President and Chairman of the Commission on Foreign Economic Policy. In the consideration of the foreign economic policy of the United States it became clear to the Commission that one of the greatest potentials for increase in world trade was tourist travel of residents of the United States abroad. In 1953 this produced revenue of $1,200,000,000 to other countries and over 1 million American traveled abroad. Based upon analyses of our income the potential for such travel is estimated at an additional $1,300,000,000 to produce $2,500,000,000 of revenue to other countries.

International tourist travel is the greatest single "import" of the United States exceeding in value the next greatest import, coffee. Its corollary benefits of education and the cultivation of international good will are very well known. In addition it is little known that the United States itself is the principal tourist attraction in the world having attracted foreign visitors in 1953 who spent over $600,000 here. This travel also has an enormous potential for expansion.

Mr. Randall's letter sets forth in detail the administration's activities in the implementation of its policy to promote international tourist travel. It deserves the consideration of every Member.

It is my belief that the United States needs to establish a United States Travel Commission which will be the official Government agency for coordinating this effort following in this way the practice of the other leading countries of the free world practically all of which have such tourist commissions. It is for this reason that I have introduced House Joint Resolution 350 which is under consideration by the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

The letter follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, June 8, 1954.

The Honorable JACOB K. JAVITS,
United States House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN JAVITS: Following through further with respect to your letter of May 19, 1954, I am happy to give you this summary of steps taken by the executive branch with respect to the encouragement of international travel.

One of the most significant recent developments has been the emphasis which the President placed on the expansion of international travel in his message to the Congress of March 30 on the subject of foreign economic policy. After stressing the cultural, social, and economic advantages to the whole free world of international travel, he stated:

"I shall instruct the appropriate agencies and departments, at home and abroad, to consider how they can facilitate international travel. They will be asked to take action to simplify governmental procedures relating to customs, visas, passports, exchange, or monetary restrictions and other regulations that sometimes harass the traveler."

A bill, H. R. 8352, was introduced by Congressman FRELINGHUYSEN to give effect to the one specific legislative recommendation made by the President in connection with international travel. This bill would increase the duty-free allowance for tourists from $500 to $1,000, exercisable every 6 months.

To implement further his recommendations in this field, the President has recently sent memoranda to the four principal agencies concerned with international travel, namely, the Departments of State, Commerce, Treasury, and Justice, requesting them to take the necessary steps to carry out his recommendations.

As a further follow-up on this section of the President's message I have asked the Departments of Agriculture, and of Health, Education, and Welfare to reexamine the provisions of the plant and animal quarantine laws and the Pure Food and Drug Act, and the administration therefor, to determine whether there are any inequities in the application of these laws to foreign commodities as compared with domestic commodities. It is understood with the staff of each of these departments that these reviews although more general than the tourist problem do cover any aspects of these laws or their enforcement which affect tourists.

Consistent with the President's emphasis on the importance of international travel is the request by the Department of Commerce, now pending before the Congress, for a small amount of money with which to reestablish an office devoted exclusively to the development of tourist travel. If this money is appropriated by the Congress, it will be possible to do considerably more in the way of providing adequate statistics on travel, determining what factors tend to hinder travel, reviewing foreign regulations and procedures with a view to suggesting through diplomatic channels changes in these regulations and procedures which would facilitate travel, and so on.

The Bureau of Customs has instituted various new procedures designed to make it easier for travelers to pass through the United States customs. Examination of travelers' personal luggage, particularly that accompanying the traveler, has been reduced to the minimum consistent with adequate enforcement of our laws. Within the past 2 years steps have also been taken to reduce the formalities involved when a tourist makes a purchase abroad and sends it home separately. An experiment which holds great promise has been underway for some time in conjunction with Canada. This is a procedure whereby travelers leaving certain Canadian points and going directly to the United States are examined before leaving Canada, and are thus not delayed at all upon reaching the United States border. This procedure may be extended to other nearby countries if the necessary cooperation of those countries can be secured. At present officials of the Treasury Department do not think such a system would prove feasible for the more remote countries, for example, Western European or South American countries.

Representatives of this country are actively engaged in discussions with those of other countries, both through individual meetings and through multilateral conferences, to find ways of simplifying border formalities and otherwise to facilitate international travel. We are at the present time, for example, represented at the United Nations Conference on Customs Formalities for the Temporary Importation of Private Vehicles and for Tourism. This conference is seeking to reach agreement on a protocol to the Geneva Conference of 1948 for the purpose of establishing uniform regulations covering automobiles and auto travel and to arrive at international agreement on the regulations covering personal belongings accompanying a tourist. The United States will also shortly send its delegation to the Fifth Inter-American Travel Conference, to be held this year, June 10–20, in Panama. Active consideration is now being given by this Government to a recommendation for placing tourism on the agenda of the forthcoming Inter-American Conference of Ministers of Finance or Economy, to be held at Rio de Janiero.

In addition to discussing the problems of tourist travel with other nations at conferences, this Government is now taking advantage of all opportunities as they arise to impress on other nations the importance we attach to international travel and to urge upon them the appropriate actions to encourage such travel. You are no doubt aware that the President, the Secretary of Commerce, the Under Secretary of Commerce, the Assistant Secretary of Commerce for International Affairs, the Assistant Secretary of State for Economic Affairs, and I all met with the delegation of leading European travel officials, members of the European Travel Commission, which was recently in this country.

The Department of State has established new procedures to insure that the question of international travel will be discussed wherever appropriate with visiting foreign officials, as was done in the case of the recent visit of high-level Spanish officials. Steps are now being taken by the Department of State to see that the basic standing instruction to all our foreign service personnel will take specific account of the emphasis placed on international travel by the President. This will further insure that the subject will be given adequate attention in future discussions with other nations.

One special aspect of our international discussion on the question of international travel pertains to the visa which some nations, including this one, require for entry by nonresidents of the country. The necessity for a visa is often a burden to the traveler, particularly if he intends to visit several countries, each of which requires a visa. The State Department has been successful in securing the mitigation of certain onerous regulations connected with the visa or the outright discontinuance of the visa requirement for American travelers to a number of countries, including all of the countries of Western Europe.

Another way in which this Government can help other countries stimulate tourist travel is through giving these other governments, when they request it, technical advice on travel and tourist accommodations. The Department of Commerce is the agency which provides this technical assistance. With the use of funds of the Foreign Operations Administration the Department of Commerce within the past year has sent two travel technicians abroad, and two persons have been brought to this country from abroad, to study our methods of accommodating tourists, publicity, statistics, and other technical aspects of the field.

No doubt you are aware that the Department of Commerce has recently established a travel advisory board composed of 20 high-level representatives of the travel and tourist industry. This committee was organized too recently to have had any significant impact on the Government as yet, but there is good reason to hope that it will prove very beneficial.

Another step taken by the executive branch which indirectly should assist international travel concerns the President's recommendations for revisions in the tax laws, now embodied in H. R. 8300. This bill would provide certain tax incentives to American corporations for investing overseas. These incentives would tend to make it more attractive for American hotel corporations to build hotels abroad. Lack of hotel facilities or inadequate hotels is, as you know, one of the factors frequently cited as a deterrent to greater travel abroad.

One further area where the efforts of this country, combined with those of other free nations, may have a very marked effect on international travel is that of currency convertibility. At the present time, the inability of travelers to convert foreign currencies readily from one to another is an inconvenience, particularly if they are going to visit two or more countries. One of the basic objectives of this administration as enunciated in the President's message on foreign economic policy is the creation of those conditions in the world which will permit major currencies to become convertible. International travel will be greatly facilitated thereby.

In concluding this, may I mention that the issuance of passports, as an indication of the prospective level of international travel by Americans, is already very high. Whereas in previous years, the rate of 50,000 or more passports issued in 1 month was not attained until April or even May, in preparation for this summer's travel, over 50,000 passports were issued this year in the month of March, and it seems possible that we might reach an all-time peak of over 60,000 passports issued in the month of May. This is a hopeful sign for a very big tourist year.

I agree fully that the promotion of tourist travel is of great significance to this Nation and to all other free nations. I shall be glad to do anything that I can to be of assistance.

Please let me know if I can be of any further service to you.

Sincerely yours,
CLARENCE B. RANDALL,
Special Consultant to the President.

Let's Get Tough About Selling Milk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDWARD J. THYE

OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, June 15, 1954

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, an article in the July issue of the Farm Journal, by Claude W. Gifford, is timely. It calls to the attention of all what is needed to be done in the dairy industries. I have contended that there is overproduction; there is underconsumption. There is an improper distribution of our dairy products. Mr. Gifford's article sheds some light on this question.

Mr. Gifford's is one of the few articles I have seen which endeavors to clarify the problems with which the dairy producer is faced by stating the facts, instead of writing an editorial criticizing the price-support program. There have been too many statements and articles in condemnation of the price-support program, which have not enlightened the general public. It has been most confusing not only to the public in general, but more especially to the consumer. Mr. President, I wish to call the article to the attention of all, and I therefore ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Let's Get Tough About Selling Milk

(By Claude W. Gifford)

It's about time that farmers looked at the "take" the middlemen are drawing out of the milk business.

With milk producers suffering a big drop in income, these milk middlemen are doing better than ever. This includes dairy plant wage earners, home and store deliverymen, and dealers.

This wouldn't be so bad if these middlemen—whose job it is to sell milk—were doing a bang-up job.

The truth is that milk outlets are partially paralyzed from abuses, dealer shenanigans, selfish labor encroachments, horse-and-buggy laws and regulations, and plain deadwood in the distributing business.

It's time that somebody besides farmers listened to advice about cutting costs, culling, and selling and promoting harder. If we had competitive markets everywhere pushing milk sales from the small towns, up through the biggest cities—we'd have no surplus. The excess is only about 5 percent of our milk—1.7 ounces a day per person.

Farmers can do something about this. You can do something. The trouble may be no farther away than your nearest town—and if so that's the place to start.

Farm Journal has become convinced of this after talking with some of the country's milk-market men, Government's specialists, and former bargaining groups.

The milk middlemen's gross take since 1950 has climbed nearly a fifth, in 25 of the country's largest milk markets. Milk prices have dropped 3 percent.

United States Department of Agriculture figures show this startling fact: The biggest increase in middleman incomes came in 1953—right when farmers' milk prices were hitting the skids. Milk companies were enjoying one of their better years.

Dairy-plant wages were never higher. Wholesale milk deliverymen for a company in a well-known eastern city averaged $11,500 a year for a 40-hour week. More than $5 an hour. United States Department of Agriculture figures show that typical New York dairy farm families worked for less than 50 cents an hour labor return last year.

The dairy distributors—whose job it is to sell our milk—are actually selling 14 percent less total milk per person than they did in the depression thirties. And this while consumer incomes are at peak levels, and farmers are producing higher-quality milk.

Middlemen are an essential part of the dairy team, and in some markets they are doing a bangup job, but in others it is another story.

A. L. McWilliams, general manager of Chicago's Pure Milk Association, gets to the core of this problem quickly. "Too much talk and too little action." As a busy director of a farmer bargaining group representing more than half of the farmers selling milk in the Chicago area, he speaks with the conviction and experience that comes from infighting on a turbulent milk market.

"There's only one way to get the job done—that's for farmers to pitch in and do it themselves."

Do what? Dr. Roland W. Bartlett, the University of Illinois crusading milk marketing specialist, answers: "Recognize a 'dead' dairy market, wherever it may be, and do whatever is necessary to liven it up—make it sell farmers' milk."

Just ask yourself these seven questions about your own market. They'll tell you whether the place to start is right in your own backyard.

1. Are your dairies, the ones in your milk market, promoting milk with vigorous advertising in newspapers, over radio, and with signs in stores?

If not, that may be the telltale sign of stagnated competition between milk dealers.

Or perhaps a "deadwood" company has the town "sewed up." Or dealers may be cooperating backstage to soft pedal competitive selling—or to set prices that will keep them all in clover.

Pricing or health regulations may have frozen prices—or may be protecting deadwood distributors by keeping aggressive companies off your market. Local farmers often applaud this, figuring that it protects them from competition, too.

2. Can customers save money enough to amount to anything by carrying milk home from stores in your milk market?

To make "carry-home" attractive, the difference between home delivery and store prices needs to be 2 cents or more a quart, except in little stores in small towns.

If there isn't this difference in your town, middlemen costs are too high. What's worse, people aren't drinking as much of your milk as they would if they could make this much saving by going after their own milk.

A little over a year ago competition dropped store prices in Cleveland from 1 cent below home delivery (in quart containers) down to 5 cents below (in gallon jugs). Milk consumption shot up 8 percent for the year—the biggest increase for any large city in the country. Yet farmers were getting more per hundred for class I fluid milk. They collected a half million dollars more for the year.

In Chicago stores milk can be bought from 4 to 7 cents a quart under single-quart home-delivery prices. In 1930 Chicago stores handled only 6 percent of the milk sold in the city; now it's near 70 percent.

The simple facts are that milk can be sold through stores (in all but smaller towns) at substantially lower costs than when delivered from door to door. If your store prices don't reflect that—

The stores may be charging too much; maybe because they're forced to.

The milk distributors may be dictating store prices in your town.

The milk-wagon delivery union may be pressuring companies to keep store prices high.

Outmoded State price-fixing laws and regulations may have frozen store prices.

In about three-fourths of the Nation's cities and towns, a quart of milk still costs the same, or only a penny less, than for home delivery—regardless of how much you buy at one time.

Why? Why not find out?

3. Can you buy milk at lower prices in half-gallons or gallons? Or can you get discounts for taking more than one single quart container per delivery?

"The important thing is that milk should cost less per quart for quantity sales—no matter what size package is used," states Dr. Leland Spencer, Cornell University's well-known marketing specialist.

That's what happens in Fort Wayne, Ind., where you pay 18 cents for a single quart. If you take 2 quarts per delivery, the price is 16 cents; for 4 to 6 quarts, 15 cents a quart.

In Minneapolis you can get a 2-cent-per-quart discount on deliveries of 2 or more quarts. Why aren't more markets passing along this saving for quantity sales—which would encourage higher milk use?

One Milwaukee dealer reports that 70 percent of his retail route business is in half-gallons. He passes along a 1-cent per quart saving; 2 cents if the customer takes 26 half-gallons a month.

Quarts are going out of the picture in Chicago observes Federal Milk Market Administrator A. W. Colebank. Sixty-seven percent of the milk there is already being sold in gallons or half-gallons—at a good price saving.

Yet May USDA figures show that less than half of the Nation's 132 larger markets were selling milk in half-gallons or gallons at a saving under single-quart prices. Even then, the difference was often only a half-cent a quart. Why?

4. Can you find new products on your market? Lots of variety?—such as flavored milk, skim milk fortified with dry-milk solids, egg nog, new cheeses, and other new products in varying sizes and quantities?

Such variety is a healthy sign—indicating spirited competition and aggressive promotion.

Some distributors are offering a fast-selling milk containing only 2 percent butterfat and 10 percent extra nonfat solids. It's going great guns under such "health" names as Zest, Zim, Champ.

Cream is very poorly merchandised on many markets—being both overpriced and of poor quality.

5. Are milk sales going up in your market? Or are they standing still, maybe slipping?

"Fluid milk sales are terrific in Chicago," reports Carl Deysenroth of the Milk Foundation. In this city of wide-open competition—and high store sales due to much lower prices than home delivery—milk consumption per person went up 4 percent between 1945 and 1949, when it was dropping 10 percent for the Nation.

6. Are there vending machines and milk dispensers on your market?

If not, you're losing one of your best chances to sell more milk (Farm Journal, Something You Can Do To Sell Milk, June 1954).

Two hundred machines installed in Indianapolis and Chicago establishments (where milk was already being sold over the counter) increased total sales 60 percent.

Lester Will, manager of the American Dairy Association, estimates that if we could duplicate the vending-machine sales of coffee and soft drinks we could sell more than 7 billion half-pints yearly of milk and chocolate milk. That's half of our present surplus.

Sales in large schools have shot up phenomenally when vending machines were put in. Why? Simply because students could get uniformly cold milk easily and quickly. If all students could, it's estimated from actual tests that they would drink an average of a half-pint a day—more than tripling their present low intake.

Aside from being good for the kids, this increase is equal to a third of the butter and half the dry milk now in storage.

Many schools don't even have milk, and in many schools—maybe most—it isn't as well refrigerated, nor as high quality, nor as easy to get, as it might be. How about your school?

7. Are labor restrictions and wage scales out of line for your dairy plants or route deliverymen?

If so, they're taking a bigger bite than they're entitled to and adding costs that hold down sales.

Part of the answer in larger cities may be milk subdealers—those independent distributors who own their own trucks and buy their milk wholesale from a dairy. Unlike milk-wagon men on salary, these subdealers hustle up their own customers, set their own prices where they can, and take their own profits. They often handle 50 percent to 100 percent more milk in a day than a union driver.

What if these seven questions show that your market doesn't measure up?

"Go to the source of the trouble and see if it can be corrected. If not, give the matter wide publicity," advises Chicago-wise A. L. McWilliams.

Get your local farm organization on it—or start a milk-bargaining association. Either way, set up a committee with gumption enough to dig up the facts, no matter how hard they may be to get. Then plan some action.

Get active in your local ADA or Dairy Council, if you have one; contribute to dairy promotion, locally and nationally.

"Get your organization to take the lead in doing away with State laws that allow minimum price fixing to the consumer," urges Bartlett. He insists that these laws merely protect inefficient distributors. (You can still protect the price paid to the farmer.)

At one time or another 21 States have fixed minimum consumer prices. Nearly a third of the United States population lives in the 13 States that still do. Bartlett argues that milk control boards relying on these laws have demonstrated that they resist change, force consumers to pay higher prices, slow up sales, and cut down on healthy competition in milk distribution. Here's what's actually happening:

Milk is 92 cents a gallon in Pittsburgh (where the State sets consumer prices), and only 60 cents a gallon in nearby Youngstown, Ohio, where competition sets consumer prices. A difference of 32 cents a gallon. Yet farmers in the Pittsburgh milk shed get only 5 cents a gallon more for milk.

Bartlett cites 17 typical competitive markets where there is no State price fixing. Store prices average 3.1 cents a quart below home delivery price. In 18 other markets, where State milk control boards set consumer prices, milk in stores averages only a half-cent below home delivery.

This boils down to the fact that there is much we can do about our milk market. We can sell all of the milk that we're now producing. The obstacles are artificial and can be overcome. Progressive markets are showing the way. Why not have yours join the parade?

Recent Visit to the Senate by Representatives of the Turkish Republic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 15, 1954

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an editorial entitled "Well-Cut Jibs," which was published in the New Bedford (Mass.) Standard-Times of June 11, 1954. The editorial discusses the recent visit to the Senate by representatives of the Turkish Republic, who were welcomed in a very friendly and appropriate manner by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Capehart].

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Well-Cut Jibs

Representatives of the Turkish Republic, who are visiting the United States, stopped in the United States Senate last week. They were presented to the membership, of course, and generously applauded, as the majority and minority leaders and the chairman of the Foreign Relations Commitee recounted the attributes of a "great and true ally, Turkey."

Had the formal but sincere paeans for the distinguished visitors stopped there, one could have imagined a duplicate ceremony occurring at any of the free world parliaments. But, it is pleasant to report, something else was added. Senator Capehart, from Indiana, arose and added a few words of his own.

After expressing appreciation for the "visit of the distinguished Prime Minister of Turkey and members of his Cabinet," Senator Capehart continued:

"We wish them to know that we believe in them and wish to cooperate with them. In short, Mr. President, we wish to say to them, 'We like the way you comb your hair'."

It is to be hoped the interpreter was up to snuff. If he was, the visitors will have a truly American expression of warmth to carry home with them, one they will encounter nowhere else in their travels, and more genuinely expressive of the way Americans feel than to be found in any formalities.

A Third World War Is Not the Answer to the Three-Prong Communist Threat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 15, 1954

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, before and ever since World War I, certain individuals and groups, apparently lacking faith in our form of government, in the ability, the courage, and the endurance of our people, have been telling us that though we are a peaceful and a powerful Nation, we must travel half way around the world to fight other nations in order to maintain our national existence.

A little sound thinking will tell us, as has been demonstrated time and again in the past, that no one nation can conquer and hold in subjugation all other nations—the rest of the world.

Yet, one-world propaganda has been so effective that without gain, we have fought three world wars and apparently are about to become involved in a fourth.

An address delivered by our Secretary of Defense, Charles E. Wilson, at the University of South Carolina, Columbia, S. C., June 7, 1954, gives the sound and convincing views of a typical American who is deeply concerned not only with the welfare of our people but the security of our Nation.

His address is as follows:

It is a pleasure to be here today to speak to this graduating class and their relatives and friends on this 150th anniversary of the founding of the University of South Carolina.

The great and wise men who founded our Nation early recognized the supreme importance of education in a free society. In 1787 the Congress incorporated the following provision in the Northwest Ordinance: "Religion, morality, and knowledge being necessary to good government and the happiness of mankind, schools and the means of education shall forever be encouraged."

In his farewell address on September 19, 1796, George Washington said, "Promote then, as an object of primary importance, institutions for the general diffusion of knowledge. In proportion, as the structure of a government gives force to public opinion, it is essential that public opinion should be enlightened."

South Carolina has supplied our Nation with many illustrious sons, and many of them have been graduates of this great university. The members of the class of 1954 with the fine beginning they have made in finishing their schoolwork here have the opportunity in their time to add to the prestige of South Carolina and this fine university.

While your formal education here is undoubtedly an excellent start, I am sure you recognize that in truth it is only a start. While education is a fundamental of a free society, education alone cannot be the salvation of democracy, nor does the formal education you have so far received guarantee to each of you a happy and useful life. It is not what might be called "tonnage" of education you have received that will count in the long run, but it is the "quality" and how you apply it in your daily living. You must make it your own, and make sure you understand all you know.

Some years ago I was talking to Dr. Doherty who was then president of Carnegie Institute of Technology. He particularly recognized the importance of this matter I have just mentioned and went to considerable length to tell about what he called the Carnegie plan for instructing students in the liberal arts, including the humanities, as well as the physical sciences. He held that the specific need in educating young people was to develop in them: (1) A feeling of social responsibility; (2) appreciation of social values and relationships; and (3) analytical ability and creative power in dealing with these social values comparable to that developed in the study of the physical and biological sciences.

The continuing welfare of our country depends on making both social and economic progress, and while continuing to stimulate the initiative of the millions in making material progress through greater knowledge and the use of machines and mechanical power, we must also stimulate the young men and women of our country in the areas of human relations. This can and must be done without violating the ethical principles recognized in the Constitution of our country on which our great progress has been based. Certainly it is a sound social and economic objective to help men and women to protect themselves against the individual hazards of life and achieve greater security, but this cannot be done by destroying individual responsibility and depriving millions of their freedom. We must understand the essential difference between being social-minded and socialistic.

From the earliest days in our country men and women have had ardent faith in progress. Our farmers, businessmen, scientists, engineers, and philosophers have placed no limit on what can be achieved in our free society. Unforeseen but probable discoveries were expected any moment that would throw additional millions of people into the lap of human comfort. By such means it was expected that man would raise himself above the limitations of privation and strife. In no area of physical progress and development have the earlier expectations of the 19th century failed to materialize.

The fulfillment has by far outdone the hope, but privation and strife have not vanished from the earth. On the contrary, we look at a world torn by strife and conflicting ideologies that separate men widely and threaten to destroy the progress of centuries. The human privation that has resulted and is still to follow is of frightening dimensions. All the immense advance of scientific knowledge has apparently been powerless to prevent a resurgence of the most savage barbarism, especially during the last 15 years. The heartless disregard of human life and the terror that has been instilled in men's hearts by ruthless dictators remind us of the days of the Pharaohs, the Caesars, and Genghis Kahn.

In spite of our increased knowledge of the physical sciences and the great applications we have made of this knowledge to material things, we have not made corresponding progress in human relations—particularly in international relations. While material efficiency has been increasing for 200 years, and very rapidly during the last 50 years, human capacity for working together has apparently diminished at the very time when increased cooperation and understanding is essential for our very existence. This observation is strikingly evident in the international field. Thereby a critical political and social situation has been created throughout the world.

Our modern systems of transportation and communication have in effect made the world much smaller and made us all much more dependent upon each other. Our modern world teems with stimulants and opportunities, and with our increased knowledge and means of increasing productivity we still have the possibility of banishing privation and strife from the earth. But we must develop much more than the desire of people for physical things alone. We must stick to the ethical principles and moral codes that develop self-respect and self-discipline on the part of individuals and recognition of the individual citizen's basic obligations to others. These same principles must be recognized between nations. Otherwise we will have more and more people and even nations wishing for what they have not earned and angry when they do not get it.

I am always encouraged concerning our Nation when I see groups of its young people like those which are here today. I wish I could assure you with confidence that the trend toward communism had been stopped everywhere and that there was no possibility of general war resulting from the conflict between Russian communism and the free world. While the hope and object of all of us is peace, we must be prepared in a military sense to defend our free society if forced to do so. At the same time, we must achieve military strength without, by our own acts, sacrificing the very rights for which we are prepared to fight.

Communism, militant communism, is a threat to the nations of the free world. It is a threat to their institutions as well as to their sovereignty. It is a particular threat to the United States and to the free institutions that have made our country great.

Militant communism, the Russian type, headed up in Moscow, is a three-pronged threat to the free world.

It is a psychological and propaganda threat, since it attempts to spread communism throughout the world, claiming that the Russian version of communism is a political and social system superior to any other in the world.

It is an economic threat in that the Russian State owns and controls all productive property and advocates and actively attempts to destroy the economic systems of the nations of the free world.

It is a military threat since it builds up great military power, and militant Communists teach and believe in world revolution. They accept war and internal subversion as proper political instruments to use in doing away with all capitalist and free societies.

The United States has been singled out by the leaders of this militant Communist movement because of its leadership, size, industrial capacity, and great accomplishments. The Communist leaders know that our country was founded more than 175 years ago to promote the welfare of all the citizens rather than the aggrandizement of the state or the rulers thereof.

Our political system is based on the religious concept of the sacredness of the individual and his inalienable personal rights. It has given our people personal freedom which has to a great extent fulfilled the hopes and aspirations of generations ever since the dawn of civilization. Our free system is the complete antithesis of Communist dictatorship.

The United States, its institutions, its people, its high standard of living and its great progress in both a social and economic sense refutes the Communist dogma and propaganda. It is living proof that the assumptions on which Communist beliefs rest are false. The Russian Communists seem to hate America and other free nations because of this, and because we continue to prove that freemen can live happily and cooperatively together and develop for themselves an ever-increasing standard of living. Thus the very facts of our way of life continue to discredit and disprove a large part of the philosophy on which their beliefs are based. For these reasons they fear the comparison between their type of society and that of the free nations; hence their coercive policies and the Iron Curtain and their effort to deceive their own people regarding the standard of living, the personal opportunities, and the ethical, social, and economic progress of the peoples of free nations.

Since this form of militant communism is a 3-pronged threat, it must be countered in the 3 areas in which it is threatening the free world. While communism claims to be a new liberal philosophy, in the Russian form particularly, it turns out to be only another form of reactionary philosophy which through centuries has destroyed personal freedom and enslaved the people of the world. Our free American society is really the new liberal philosophy in the world today.

The propaganda threat comes about through attempts by the Communists to prove that their system, based on the teachings of Marx, Engels, Lenin, and others, is a superior system. For some of its advocates communism takes the place of religion. Others become sadistic and ruthless. Part of the danger comes about through the zeal with which they attempt not only to promote their ideas but to force them upon others, using all the means at their disposal, including extreme physical and mental coercion, to accomplish their purposes.

The danger of the propaganda which the Communists preach and apparently believe also lies in the fact that they promise so much in material things to so many who have had little or nothing; whereas, the free world, most of whose people already have a great deal more, promises a gradual improvement for all without loss of personal liberty. In particular, people who have never known what it is to be free and who regularly face hunger and hardship with little or no hope of improving their lot, frequently fall easy victims to the extravagant promises of Communists, only to find later when the promises are not fulfilled that they have gone down a one-way street. They then discover that the yokes the Communists have placed around their necks are so heavy and restricting that it is difficult or impossible for them to elect any other course and regain a measure of personal freedom.

When Marx, in London, wrote Das Kapital, the bible of the Communists, the situation of the people generally throughout Europe was miserable. This was partly due to a long series of wars and conflicts. Marx accurately reported the grim conditions that existed in Europe a century ago. Conditions were terrible, but his diagnosis of the trouble was wrong, and therefore the remedy he prescribed was wrong, also.

His diagnosis and, therefore, his remedy were wrong because when he wrote he had little or no conception of a free society as we know it. What free men have been able to accomplish in the last 100 years he did not have the capacity to even imagine. Therefore, at the time he wrote he did not and could not appraise the relative values of the two philosophies.

Americans know what it is to be free, and I am sure they would be very unhappy and considerably less well off under some form of society based on Marxist philosophy, whether it is communism, fascism, or some other form of statism. With such a clear exemple in recent decades of what this Marxist philosophy when forced on a nation does to its people, and with the facts of what our American system of individual liberty has done for our people, there can be no doubt on this point by anyone who looks at the facts squarely.

Since the dawn of civilization man has had to struggle against nature for food, clothing, and shelter. For centuries in many places over the world men had little choice between working themselves to death or starving because they could not produce or find enough to eat. This is still true in some parts of the world where men are living under primitive conditions. It has only been relieved in nations such as ours where free and productive systems have been established.

When Marx wrote Das Kapital, 100 years ago freedom had so recently emerged from centuries of tryanny that the educators, statesmen, inventors, scientists, and businessmen had not had a chance to dream and plan. Neither did they have the freedom of action we have had in our country. The political systems of many nations were still promoting the dictatorship of the few and restricting the free initiative of the millions.

For 175 years freemen here in America have been fortunate to have had the opportunity to educate themselves, select their own occupations, accumulate capital and invent better ways of doing things. This is why the people in the United States are so much better off than most of the people in the rest of the world. This is why we never had a real famine in our country. This is why our standard of living is many times higher than that of the average of the rest of the world. This is why we were able to serve as the arsenal of democracy and assume the major role in the rehabilitation of our former enemies as well as of our friends.

Such attainments cannot be explained solely on the grounds of greater natural resources in the United States. The answer lies in great part in the simple fact that we have done a superb job of applying our human energies and individual initiative to the improvement of the welfare of all.

Since the threat in this ideological area comes about through a clash of ideas and philosophy, it is important that we counter the Communist propaganda with the facts. We cannot knock out false ideas with bullets; we must counter and destroy them with the truth, with superior ideas and sound philosophy. Mahatma Gandhi is credited with stating very aptly one of the basic concepts underlying the idea of a society composed of freemen. "Individual freedom alone can make a man voluntarily surrender himself completely to the service of society. If it is wrested from him, he becomes an automaton and society is ruined. No society can possibly be built on a denial of individual freedom. It is contrary to the very nature of man, and just as man will not grow horns or a tail, so he will not exist as man if he has no mind of his own. In reality even those who do not believe in the liberty of the individual believe in their own."

The threat in the economic area comes about through the fact that the Communists, when they have the power, advocate and enforce the state ownership of all productive property. The economic theory of the Communists may be summed up in the single phrase "abolition of private property." But when private property is abolished, to an important degree individual freedom and the right of free choice in personal activities and affairs are also done away with. This can be exercised only to a limited extent without the right of private property. The dictators of totalitarian states believe that the mass of the people are too dumb not only to rule themselves but to make personal decisions regarding their occupations, their activities, and their daily lives. Therefore, such dictators attempt to organize the people and force them to produce according to state plans and the will of the dictators. Likewise, they control consumption and prices. Also a Communist state through threat of war can cause other nations to make excessive military expenditures in their efforts to counter the threat to their security, and thus affect the internal economies of such nations.

Communists are hoping for a big financial depression in the free world and are doing everything they can to cause such a depression. They recognize that wars and the aftermath of wars in the past have upset the economies of nations. They believe, and on this point I agree with them, that the boom of the twenties and the bust of the thirties with its hardship and unemployment did more to shake the confidence of many men and women in our country in the principles of a free society than all the propaganda and teachings of the Marxists. So while countering the ideological propaganda of the Communists and keeping a reasonable military posture, we must plan carefully to maintain the stability of the economy of our country.

War and the preparation for war can never be real prosperity, for such military programs absorb materials and the efforts of millions of people that could otherwise be used for raising the standard of living of the people. Nor are tremendous military expenditures necessary to economic stability and the maintenance of reasonably full employment. We have shown in the last year that there is no reason for the people of our country to fear another depression because of any gradual changes in defense production.

The military threat of communism is a very real one since Russia maintained a great deal of its military power, especially its land armies, following World War II. It also went ahead with the production of airplanes, particularly thousands of MIGs. Also, through military coups, completely directed from Moscow, border states were forced into the Communist orbit contrary to the desires of the great majority of the peoples of those countries. Aggression must be stopped. Conversion to communism by the sword must be stopped.

On the other hand, if the free world has the will and the determination to stay free and is willing to make the effort to maintain reasonable military strength, there is reason to believe that the dictator-dominated Communist states may stop their aggression and not precipitate a war which finally they cannot win. While it varies somewhat, the free world actually controls about 75 percent of the world's industrial production as against 25 percent behind the Iron Curtain.

We must counter the military threat by developing and maintaining sufficient military strength to discourage aggression on the part of any dictator-dominated Communist nation. We must understandingly cooperate with the other nations of the free world in stopping aggression. We must have the best possible strategic plans and operate our entire military organization so that we will get the maximum defense per dollar through good planning and maximum utilization of manpower.

A third world war is not the answer to the three-pronged Communist threat. Even a victory in such a war could be purchased only at the cost of such horrible waste and destruction that the course of human progress would be set back many decades. And even after the necessary reconstruction after such a victory in a third world war the free world would still have the problem of what to do with the vanquished and how to establish conditions of peace in the world.

We must continue to be strong in our faith in the free world. We must continue to be strong in an economic sense. And as long as militant communism continues to be a threat to the people of the free world, we must continue to be strong in a military sense. But we cannot depend on arms and arms alone as the basis for peace abroad and freedom at home. While keeping strong in a military sense to deter aggression and insure final victory in case of war, to win a durable peace we must make progress in eliminating the causes of war and put into effect the policies that will contribute to a stable peace.

The peoples of all nations wish to avoid war and see world peace established. At the same time they wish to improve their personal security and standard of living. The United Nations was founded in recognition of these impelling desires. Fully conscious of the moral and spiritual issues involved, political leaders and men of good will throughout the world should cooperate in the effort to identify the sound policies and methods that will have to be adopted to achieve these objectives.

We must take the lead in showing others how to accomplish these ends and assist them in every way we can in their efforts in this direction. Among the policies that must be subscribed to by all nations to bring the world's economic productivity to the highest possible level are freer exchange of technical knowledge and production know-how, freer access to raw materials in a world market including the active development of natural resources throughout the world, freer exchange of goods and services, and the gradual elimination of artificial and political trade barriers. Real progress must also be made in strengthening the economies of all nations and raising their standard of living through a better understanding of the relationships between the production and consumption of goods and services, of exports and imports, of credit and debt, of trade barriers and the money supply. These policies are essential to the establishment of a durable peace.

The challenge to our Nation—and the free world—today is to be strong enough in a spiritual, political, economic, and military sense to prevent war. At the same time we must strive to figure out what it would take to win the peace even after a third disastrous war in the hope that by putting those policies into effect now before such a war the war itself could be averted. To achieve this objective of world peace will require years of great effort, sacrifice, imagination, and understanding. As time goes on you young men and women will have the opportunity to help in establishing a sound basis for world peace. It deserves your continuing effort and interest.

Longhorn Cavern: Top Texas Tourist Attraction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 15, 1954

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, as the vacation season gets underway, I invite the attention of Senators to the wonders of Longhorn Cavern in my State of Texas.

This cavern, third largest in the world, is the subject of a brief article in the May issue of the LCRA News, published for employees of the Lower Colorado River Authority. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LONGHORN CAVERN: A TREAT UNDERGROUND

Texans who want to do some bragging have plenty to talk about after a trip to Longhorn Cavern. Third largest in the world, Texas Longhorn Cavern offers mystery, adventure, folklore, historical romance, and great natural beauty along its 2 miles of subterranean passageways. It's been explored by over a quarter of a million enthusiastic vacationers from all over the country already.

Longhorn Cavern has been somewhat of an enigma to professional and amateur cave-exploring parties. After probing 8 miles into the darkness with no end in sight, some experts believe the cavern may stretch for hundreds of miles beneath the earth's surface.

But it doesn't take a scientific mind to enjoy Longhorn Cavern. Anyone with a taste for adventure in an unusual setting will find it there, dramatically lighted by a modern system of concealed illumination. There is a guided tour leaving the administration building every hour from 10 a. m. to 5 p. m., ready to take visitors from Sam Bass entrance through a whole series of marvelous formations from another age.

Sam Bass entrance has a particular appeal to those who relish tales of the old West. According to local legend the notorious Texas badman used the mouth of the cave as a hideout. Before he died in a furious gunfight with the Texas Rangers, near Marble Falls, Bass reportedly told someone that he had hidden his accumulated loot in the cave. Possibly a $2 million treasure is somewhere in the dark recesses; it has yet to be discovered.

Equally as historically interesting is the 183-foot-long main room of the cavern. Once the Confederate Army used it for making and storing gunpowder. The date, 1864, is still visible on a wall where some Johnny Reb whiled away an anxious moment.

Rusted revolvers, flattened bullets and two human skeletons have also been found in the cavern, giving rise to some speculation about violent gun battles staged there by various outlaws.

Although Longhorn Cavern is not as large, at least in its present state, as Carlsbad Cavern, New Mexico, and Mammoth Cave, Kentucky, it is said to rival both of them in color and variety of formations. The Hall of Diamonds, for example, has walls of crystallized calcite that actually simulate the sparkle of diamonds. Other walls glow richly red with the iron oxide embedded in them. From time to time explorers have found treasure stores of alexandrite, agate, beryl, jade, jasper, onyx, topaz, and other semiprecious stones.

Elaborate stalactites and stalagmites, formed over thousands of years by dripping water, make some of the cavern's most unusual spectacles. There are realistic chandeliers in the Chandelier Room and a giant stone icicle. Other formations take the shape of humans and animals. There is an almost exact likeness of Abraham Lincoln, a huge footprint, and the Queen's Watchdog to guard a striking formation known as "The Queen's Throne."

One of the magical things about Texas Longhorn Cavern is that the visitor will always discover something new and fascinating no matter how many times he returns. Veteran guides, Oscar, Clarence, and Jack Marx, and the cavern's manager, H. H. (Hob) Galloway make the 2-hour tour many times every week and never tire of the wonders of this natural phenomena.

Farm Price Supports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN

OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 15, 1954

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an editorial entitled "Farm Price Supports," appearing in the Rutland (Vt.) Herald of June 14, 1954.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

FARM PRICE SUPPORTS

President Eisenhower's statement that "what is right for America is right politically" is one which has wide application. It was made in connection with a plea for his program of flexible farm price supports, however, and this newspaper believes it has an especially clear meaning in that connection.

The argument for price supports of any kind rests upon the assumption, which this newspaper believes to be a well-founded one, that a prosperous agriculture is essential to the national prosperity. This country of ours cannot be economically healthy with that sixth of its population which produces virtually all our food, and so large a proportion of our other raw materials, in a financially distressed condition.

But the advocates of rigid, high price supports make, we believe, at least two unwarranted assumptions. One of them is that the Government is the only agency which can or should be called on to help, and the other is that support of certain basic commodities really makes as much difference as claimed.

Regarding the first it should, in Vermont at least, be necessary only to note the current attitude and recent experience of a majority of our dairy and poultry farmers. The State's new commissioner of agriculture, Elmer E. Towne, gave voice to these feelings only last week. Self-help, not Government largesse, is the key to the farmer's economic well-being, he stated in suggesting the growing importance of united effort by farmers themselves.

"The problem of selling our increased production is the one big, overwhelming problem confronting us," he said. "If we do this job, our other problems will not be too serious. * * * Lack of coordination of our various farm organizations is a * * * weakness * * * but we have made progress and we must work at this problem hard, all the time, if we are to keep Vermont agriculture prosperous."

Note that, as a dairy farmer himself, Towne kept emphasizing the "we"—farmers, not the Government. He stressed progress made to date by dairy-promotion campaigns, urging even larger financial support by milk producers and quoted approvingly the results of a self-help program in the poultry industry. This promotion program, supported by the industry through the poultry and egg national board, has contributed to the fact that since the board was organized in 1940 the average American family has increased its consumption of eggs by 35 percent, of chicken by 65 percent, and of turkeys by 115 percent.

From such figures as those, as the milk-use statistics following promotion and advertising drives and as other self-help moves like those of the California fruitgrowers (to name an early one), it is amply evident that high, fixed price supports maintained by the Federal Government are by no means the only method of maintaining farm prosperity.

Along that line, too, we note with interest the conclusion reached about Government support programs in England by Clifford Selly, agricultural correspondent of the London Observer. In an article forwarded to this newspaper by W. Arthur Simpson—who is a farmer besides being commissioner of social welfare—Selly has this to say:

"If farmers can but realize that high guaranteed prices unrelated to world levels are against their long-term interests, the way will then be open for the application of a really constructive farming policy.

The review (of farm price policies) technique of lumping all farms together in assessing the profitability of the "national farm" has always been a dangerous oversimplification. There are many British farmers who can stand on their own legs. There are many others who, through no fault of their own, are short of working capital and the means to carry out necessary land improvements. There are others who ought to make way for more energetic and enlightened men.

Instead of chasing as elusive and ephemeral popularity, the government should apply further assistance in the form of direct grants and cheap loans to those farmers who can make best use of them. The taxpayer would then get better value for his money.

That last sentence, we think, contains the meat of what a national farm program should have for its goal: helping to maintain farm prosperity through means which give the taxpayer—who is in the great majority—the most for his money. There is certainly serious reason to doubt if rigid high supports do that, or anything like it.

The second assumption of the high-support advocates which we think unwarranted is that maintaining prices artificially on a few selected basic commodities can achieve the desired end or can, in fact, achieve the goal for which they are established. As Eisenhower pointed out, present supports directly affect only 23 percent of farm cash income. The rest is supposed to stay in line—but does it? Ask any Vermont poultryman or dairyman what the effect on his net cash is of high support prices for western grains, which he has to buy for feed.

Meanwhile the taxpayer has to "shell out" hundreds of millions of dollars a year for continuing to pay high prices for his food. Can he be blamed if, eventually, he rebels? And when he does, can the farmer stand the financial shock of suddenly facing a completely free market? He won't have to if the President's (and Senator Aiken's) flexible support policy is adopted. He will get help, and plenty of it, the first year of a glut over which he personally has no control. He'll know that he will get less the next year and can (if he only will) try to adjust his operations. He and the taxpayer both get a break—which is more than can be said at present.

Address by Gen. Nathan F. Twining at Commencement Exercises at Virginia Military Institute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 15, 1954

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, when the army of northern Virginia marched past Gen. Stonewall Jackson prior to the battle of Chancellorsville, he observed the young officers whom he had trained at Virginia Military Institute, and he proudly remarked to a companion "VMI will be heard from today."

In every war since that time, VMI has been heard from. It is well known, of course, that VMI furnished the Chief of Staff for World War II—Gen. George C. Marshall, a man who will go down in history as one of our truly great soldiers. It is not so well known that during that war every member of one graduating class entered military service immediately upon graduation.

Several years ago, when the personnel officer of one of the large corporations of the Nation told me that he would rather have graduates from Cornell and VMI than graduates of any other two schools, I expressed some surprise that graduates from a school with a total enrollment of less than 1,000 should be included with one of the greatest engineering schools in the Nation. His reply was that the VMI men would do what they were told to do; and he said: "You can teach a man who knows that type of self-discipline." That is the secret of the training that is given at VMI, plus the fact that the great marine hero, Gen. John A. LeJeune, when he was superintendent of VMI said: "At VMI we teach no 'ism' except patriotism." It is no idle boast that VMI is the West Point of the South.

Today VMI is being honored by the presence of the Chief of Staff of the United States Air Force, Gen. Nathan F. Twining, a great soldier, who is a product of our United States Military Academy. As a member of its board of visitors, I am well acquainted with the fine work being done at West Point.

Some years ago Sir Winston Churchill said that it was our possession of the atomic bomb that was preserving an uneasy peace. While General Gruenther was undoubtedly right in saying in Washington, a few weeks ago, that in a war there is no substitute for ground troops, every student of current military developments knows that the Soviets now have such great superiority in that category, that our Air Force is what they really fear. I give thanks for the fact that that essential arm of our defense is headed by so able and fine a man as General Twining. Furthermore, as a resident of Lexington, Va., a former member of the board of visitors at VMI, and a lifelong supporter of that splendid State school, I am happy and proud that General Twining is today addressing the graduating class. I ask unanimous consent that his commencement address be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Remarks by Gen. Nathan F. Twining, Chief of Staff, USAF, Before the Graduates of 1954, Virginia Military Institute, Lexington, Va., Tuesday, June 15, 1954

The name "Virginia Military Institute" has been familiar to me through all my years of military service. It was familiar to my father and to my father's father. It has always been a good name and a highly respected name.

For many years I have looked forward to visiting this famous campus. It is a special privilege and a distinct honor to participate in these ceremonies on the final day of the school year.

For you who are graduates, this is a climax in your life as students. With your relatives and friends, you have been looking forward to this hour for many long months. Yet you have not been waiting for graduation, I am sure. A man does not wait to be graduated from Virginia Military Institute—he works for it. Because you have worked hard for this degree and for these commissions, they will mean far more to you than anything that is written on paper, and more than anything that can be expressed in words.

Here in this school you have acquired a valuable knowledge of many subjects. Most important of all, you have learned a way of life. The manner of living that you have learned and practiced here is the way of order and of discipline. This is not the only way of life that is worthwhile. For some, perhaps, it is not the best way. For many it is not the most desirable way to live or to learn.

An education that is combined with formality, with order, and with discipline is by no means the easiest education to acquire. At times it can become disagreeable, and for some individuals it may be impossible. Most young men who cannot adapt themselves to the well-organized routines of military life did not choose to attend a school such as this one; the few who made a mistake in their choice have long since dropped from your ranks.

You who are here today have proved something that many men, often to their sorrow, fail to prove throughout their entire lives.

You have proved that you can live agreeably in close and constant contact with other men. You have proved that you can compete with other men in both physical and mental skills, endure defeats, and continue to strive for victories. You have proved that you can abide by the wisdom and judgment of your seniors just as willingly as you accept the knowledge they impart to you. Best of all, you have learned to share both pleasures and sorrows with your comrades and to find satisfaction in working with others to achieve a goal.

There is no need to claim that all the disciplines and all the organized and supervised actions you have experienced over the past are necessary, or even desirable for all men. There are, after all, only a few schools in this country that closely resemble Virginia Military Institute. Only a small percentage of our college graduates are trained in the way that you have been trained. Yet the influence of this small percentage is high, even in periods of peace.

In war, our Nation has always depended heavily upon a few men who received early training in discipline and leadership. Their ability and their willingness to assume responsibility in times of crisis have more than justified the small extra investment in their education.

Most of the extra investment in your education has been in human effort, rather than in material resources. Your own energy, combined with the work of your teachers, has developed useful habits and attitudes that will stay with you all of your lives.

Here you have learned to accept continuous responsibility for all your own actions and for many actions of others. Here you have come to understand, through actual experience, the meaning of loyalty and dependability.

True discipline, after all, is little more than a willingness to face unpleasant facts and to do tiresome or unpleasant duties when they need to be done, rather than when we feel like doing them. At this moment in the history of our country, there is a growing need for men whose minds and bodies are trained and disciplined toward seeking the truth, however unpleasant, and toward acting in accordance with the truth.

Today the people of this country and the people of all other countries have some very unpleasant facts to face. We would like to believe that the period of sacrifices is over, but it is not over. We cannot ignore the indications that for some time to come we shall have increasingly burdensome duties to perform.

The principal fact that all of us must bring ourselves to face is just as simple as it is ominous. The simple but ominous fact is that the greatest nations on earth can now cripple or devastate each other from a distance. They are rapidly improving their ability to demolish everything through the air, without waiting for a slow approach on land or sea.

This new development changes the relationship between nations in the same way that, some 500 years ago, the invention of firearms changed the relationships between individuals. At that time gunpowder and projectiles made shields and armor useless and human bodyguards ineffective. For the first time in history, the only guarantee against attack was the ability to shoot back—the certainty of retribution against the offender.

It became possible for one man to take another man's life suddenly, and from a great distance. No longer could a man defend himself by his own physical strength or skill. No longer was a man completely safe when surrounded by friends. No longer was he secure in his own castle, for even the mightiest castle could be reduced to rubble by cannon. High-speed projectiles propelled by gunpowder changed the entire course of history, completed the destruction of the feudal system, and prompted the rise of the more industrial and progressive nations of the West.

In recent years the development of the long-range airplane and the manufacture of increasingly powerful bombs have opened the interior of every nation to attack. Fortified boundaries no longer provide protection, nor do satellites or allies or mountains or seas. Now it is true for nations, as it has been for individuals for the past 500 years, that the only guaranty against attack is the ability to strike back—to strike back so hard that the crime of aggression will bring nothing but defeat.

This is a hard and unpleasant fact, and there are few among us who seem willing to face it. Except for those who have experienced the rigorous necessities of military service, the people of our happy country have long been sheltered from harm and from serious danger. It is extremely difficult for most of us to even think about the realities that now confront us. It will be far more difficult to make the sacrifices and to perform the duties that may be necessary as we build the strength we need to save us from destruction.

New advances in science and weapons—and the two always advance together—will have a tremendous impact on the course of human history. If all goes well, humanity may move forward into a golden age of swift and unrestricted travel and of unlimited industrial power. On the other hand, defeat and destruction could eliminate freedom and throw the surviving members of the human race back into an age of darkness and despair.

No man can now be certain of the future. We only know that, whatever happens, we cannot stand still. The outcome could well be determined by whether the free world or its enemies achieves the greatest mastery of the new forces and weapons that now have become decisive.

The conflict involves minds, as well as bodies; and it demands thought, as well as actions. Yet we must not lose our remaining military advantages. Military weaknesses leading to surrender or defeat would stop all our efforts toward peace and understanding.

Over the past few years our superiority in the newest and most powerful weapons has not been seriously questioned. Our ability to hit back harder than we can be hit has not been challenged.

Now we see the Reds will not permit us to rest on our present superiority in weapons. They are straining every resource to overtake us. Already these all-out enemy efforts have begun to challenge our leadership in long-range jet bombers. These are the bombers that can deliver the most powerful weapons over the greatest distances at the highest altitudes and speeds. The Reds have now begun to build them.

Superiority in new long-range weapons is essential to our side, for it has overbalanced Communist superiority in massed manpower, in massive territory, and in massive quantities of older types of weapons. We must maintain, at all costs, our superiority in super-weapons and our superiority in the ability to deliver them over intercontinental distances. Yet the cost of maintaining that superiority will rise as the enemy's efforts to overtake us become more desperate.

As a result of their leaders' willingness to sacrifice their standard of living for military progress, we may be forced to step up our own progress, through heavier investments and increased effort.

It would be easier, of course, to close our eyes to this uncompromising fact. It seems easier and simpler to concentrate on measuring our strength—our gains and our losses—in terms of battle lines or boundary lines on some small portion of the globe. While these lines may be important, they are by no means the truest measure of strength today. Weapons already in existence can obliterate all battles lines and demolish everything made by man over wide areas beyond them.

In every month that goes by the new weapons that are manufactured could cause millions of casualties and could stop all activity in any zone of battle.

To measure military strength in terms of real estate or manpower or conventional weapons is no longer valid. This is fortunate for us, since the Reds have more of all these things than we have.

Our principal military advantage to offset all these Soviet advantages is our superiority in the most advanced weapons and our superior ability to employ them. Under the circumstances that exist today, it seems futile to maintain that the most powerful weapons would not be used in an ultimate test of strength between the nations that possess them.

All of us must rise to new heights of mental and moral discipline and must face these facts unflinchingly, no matter how disturbing they are. If we direct our thoughts and actions toward preparing against any such test of our strength, we may continue to persuade the Reds not to test us in war. If we fail to do this, the terrible possibility that we are slow to recognize and to guard against may become a terrible reality.

In either case, we as a nation and as a people may be in for some rough going in the years ahead. We are likely to need all the stamina, stability, and stubborn resistance we can muster. We shall certainly need many men who have developed these characteristics as you have developed them here at Virginia Military Institute.

Here at VMI, as at other military colleges, your habits and attitudes have, in part, been molded in traditional ways—inspections and parades, clean rifles, and shiny shoes. All these have a proven value and effectiveness. We all know, however, that rifles, parade-ground maneuvers, and "spit-and-polish" have far less importance in the wars of today than in the wars of history. We all know that most weapons, strategies, and tactics of past wars are now outmoded. We recognize that our survival depends on developing new techniques to counter the huge quantities of manpower, weapons, and territory now marshaled against us.

We know these things too well to be misled or confused by the memories and symbols of history that surround us here. These symbols are inspiring reminders of noble characters and unsurpassed leadership. Yet the enduring tradition of Lee and Jackson and the other great leaders whose memory we honor here is not embodied in the weapons they used or the specific methods they used in fighting their battles. It is embodied in the spirit and courage they displayed, in their dauntless boldness, and in their powers of leadership that inspired men to incredible heights of sacrifice and achievement.

Jackson was a progressive military leader who, at every opportunity, used new weapons, new means of transport, and new tactics. He believed in pressing every advantage while he had the advantage and he never acted too late. He and General Lee recognized the necessity for developing new ways to win battles and wars. They knew that if the old methods prevailed, they were already beaten by the odds against them.

Today, we are faced with a similar situation. The odds against us in geography and manpower are very great. We must develop leadership in military thought, as well as skill in military action. We must have more minds like that of Matthew Maury, the scientist, as well as more indomitable wills like that of Stonewall Jackson.

Today, as in the day of Jackson and of Maury, all types of personal achievement and personal leadership are necessary. In the air, some of the methods of the past are too crude and elementary to be of use.

Gen. A. P. Hill, who was General Jackson's understudy, saved Lee's army at Antietam when he pushed a part of his division 17 miles in a few hours by prodding stragglers onward at the point of his sword. Such desperate measures, however effective on the ground, are out of the question in the air. There a more subtle and a more highly developed kind of leadership is necessary. But the driving will and the spirit are the same. It takes just as much personal leadership to get a squadron of B-47's into the air as it did to move out with a squadron of cavalry.

Today we have in the Air Force young men who led bomber formations hundreds of miles through continuous flak and fighter attack. We have men who without hesitation and with success can lead a squadron of F-86's through half a dozen squadrons of MIG-15's.

This is the same do-or-die spirit that was so successful at Second Manassas and at Chancellorsville. The great leaders who are buried here at Lexington had the daring and progressive spirit that we need today as we search, ever more vigorously, for the military means that will guarantee the survival of our Nation.

Maury's great work was made possible when American warships, cruising unprecedented distances across the Pacific, reported the tides and currents of the sea. Recently, American warplanes, flying at unprecedented distances across the Pacific, reported mysterious tides and currents in the upper air that have yet to be mapped and explained. The challenge to the mind now, as in the past, is just as great as the challenge to action.

As we move out to your final formation on the hill, we will remember the great leaders whose images surround us, whose words instruct us, and whose deeds inspire us. We will remember the young cadets who assembled here for the march to battle at Newmarket. They were ready, without hesitation, to contribute all their skill and energy to their cause.

Surely our cause today is no less noble and no less inspiring. Today, the need for intelligent and forceful action is just as pressing as it has ever been.

You have the training, you have the knowledge, and you have the example. You can be what you determine to be, and you can do what you set your minds and hearts to do. We are counting on you.

Much To Be Thankful For

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 15, 1954

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein a very interesting editorial which appeared in the Daily Evening Item of Lynn, Mass., on Monday, June 14, 1954:

MUCH TO BE THANKFUL FOR

Every now and the it pays to take stock of the kind of life we are living materially in the United States. A lot of comfort can be found in the current economic statistics.

Indeed, we could afford to be a fairly carefree people if they were the only measure of how things are going for us in this world.

The magazine U. S. News has just done another of its competent surveys on our living standards, and it finds the picture astonishingly bright. It draws parallels throughout the survey between 1940 and now.

In 1940 America had somewhat less than 40 million families, while today the total exceeds 48 million.

Then, when the Nation was just emerging from a long depression into the prosperity of the prewar defense era, only 15,200,000 families—well below half—owned their own homes. Today 28,500,000, considerably more than half the country's families, possess their homes.

The automobile long has been a symbol of United States living standards, and in 1940 a bit more than half of our families had one. Yet in 1954 the figure has soared far beyond the 1940 total of 21,200,000 to a present 37 million families—three-fourths—who own cars.

Take a look at such indexes of material well-being as home electricity, running water, inside toilets, tub or shower baths, the telephone.

In 1940, 79 percent of United States homes had electricity, in 1954, 98 percent; the comparable figures on running water are 70 percent and 88 percent; on toilets, 65 percent and 80 percent; on tubs or showers, 61 percent and 78 percent; on telephones, a mere 36 percent and 69 percent.

For all the jokes of our European friends about our "bathtub culture," these are not trivial figures. They are the kind the sociologist pays close heed to in measuring the quality of our housing. When the experts talk of substandard housing, they mean, among other things, houses deficient in some of the items noted above.

Americans, of course, have not been content with these minimum essentials of good housing. They have gone to outfitting their households with all manner of devices and appliances, some of which are obviously labor saving and others of which fall into the luxury category.

Some 42 percent of United States homes had washing machines in 1940, and today the percentage is 72. Use of vacuum cleaners is up from 34 percent to 56. On electric irons, the increase is from 67 percent to 83 percent of all families; on toasters, from 39 percent to 66.

Radio was well established in 1940, with 83 percent of all families owning one or more. In the years since—and the period covers the great impact of TV—usage of radio has gone up to 98 percent.

Meantime, TV, starting from scratch in 1940, has zoomed to a point where already 61 percent of all United States families own a set.

Figures like these don't say anything about our spiritual condition, or our moral standards, or our troubled relations with friends and potential enemies beyond our shores.

But they do make it strikingly plain that in the business of gaining the hard necessities and many of the shiny appurtenances of material life we are well ahead of where we used to be. That's something to be thankful for.

City Consumers Need President's Farm Price Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 10, 1954

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Herald Tribune of June 13, 1954:

WHAT'S HAPPENING IN BUSINESS?—FARM PRODUCTS SURPLUS 6-BILLION TAXPAYER LOAD

(By Donald I. Rogers)

Apparently most Americans are unaware that they own, have bought and paid for, enough wheat to fill every living room in the Nation and that they own enough cotton to stuff every garage so full there'd be no room for the lawnmower. It can be assumed that this information is not generally known, for there was very little protest when the House Agriculture Committee voted last week to buy a great deal more of these and other commodities in behalf of the taxpayers.

By a 21-to-8 margin, the committee voted to ignore the plea of President Eisenhower for a flexible farm price-support program and continue, for another year at least, the support price of 90 percent of parity, which means that the Nation's 54,500,000 nonfarm workers will be called upon to buy and store several billion dollars' worth of additional commodities for the benefit of the 6,100,000 people who work on farms.

These are not commodities that we will use. These are surpluses. They will be stored. Many of them will rot or disintegrate. Some have already been stored 5 years.

SURREPTITIOUSNESS SEEN

There is the suspicion of surreptitiousness about this vote of the House Agriculture Committee, for it is doubtful that the farm Congressmen, even with elections coming up this fall, would have risked the ire of the Nation's consumers and taxpayers had not the Army-McCarthy hearings monopolized so much newspaper space and so much radio-TV air time.

An informed public might not agree that there should be further purchases of farm commodities.

Here's what the American taxpayers own in commodities right now; commodities that were bought by the Commodity Credit Corporation and put in storage:

Commodity	Amount	Value
	Millions	*Thousands*
Wheat.....bushels..	478	$1,254,000
Corn.....do....	433	707,000
Butter.....pounds..	364	244,000
Cottonseed oil.....do....	1,024	184,000
Cheese.....do....	361	145,000
Dried milk.....do....	656	109,000
Wool.....do....	91	61,800
Cotton linters.....do....	614	58,000
All others (including cotton, crude cottonseed oil, cottonseed meal, field seed, i. e., grass, soybeans, barley, beans, flaxseed, grain sorghum, oats, rice, rye, peanuts, linseed oil, olive oil, tung oil, gum turpentine, resins, tobacco, and honey). Value of "All others".....	....	201,000
Total value of stored commodities.....	....	2,965,000

In addition to this, the CCC has made loans on an additional $3,223,000,000 worth of commodities, mostly cotton, wheat, corn, and tobacco, a major portion of which will be owned by the American people before the year is out.

Thus, the taxpayers own but can't use over $6 billion worth of farm products.

The CCC had a net realized loss of $215 million on the surpluses it bought in the period from June 1 last year to April 30 this year. This agency is empowered to lend up to $8,500,000,000, and already has bought over $6,175,000,000 in farm goods.

This is in the face of headlines in Friday's papers: "Huge Wheat Crop Seen"; Canada Expects Wheat Glut"; and "Rise in World Cotton Supply Seen Despite High-Level Use."

There's enough wheat to care for the United States if not a single sheaf is raised this year—and to care for our normal exports, too. The United States will grow about 1 billion bushels.

TWO-MONTH PROP DEAL

Nonfarm Americans who have noticed that the price of potatoes has doubled recently will be interested to know that there has been a 2-month program of price-propping by the Government. This cost the taxpayers $1,300,000. But the surplus has disappeared.

Who said the Nation's farms have been completely mechanized? Farmers still benefit from a horse—a trojan horse in Congress—with which 6 million farmers have won another victory over nearly 55 million consumers.

But farms have been mechanized and improved sufficiently so that the antiquated parity and price-support system can be scrapped. This old legislative device was designed to guaranty food to the industrial workers when the trend away from the farm seemed to imperil it.

It was not intended to guaranty an annual wage to every farm owner at the expense of the consuming public, nor was it conceived with the purpose of supplying a Cadillac with every silo.

Ninety Percent Procrastination

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DOUGLAS R. STRINGFELLOW

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 15, 1954

Mr. STRINGFELLOW. Mr. Speaker, it is not often that I find myself in agreement with the policies of the Washington Post newspaper, but occasionally they do come forward with a meritorious editorial which is worthy of attention. Such an article appeared in the Post's Sunday edition for June 13, 1954. This editorial calls attention to the folly of continuing the present rigid farm price support program, and urges congressional action to support the President's and Secretary Benson's recommendations for flexible supports.

I sincerely hope that we have enough courageous Congressmen who will not place political expediency ahead of principle in this election year so that we might enact effective farm legislation. Any agricultural program should be fair to big and little farmers alike, as well as to our own Nation's consumers and taxpayers. As the President said last week in addressing the Citizens for Eisenhower rally here in Washington:

> I am completely unmoved by the arguments as to what constitutes good or winning politics. * * * I know that what is right for America is politically right.

The Washington Post editorial follows:

NINETY PERCENT PROCRASTINATION

President Eisenhower has reiterated his determination to press ahead with his farm program irrespective of politics, but this will not necessarily influence the attitude of Congress. Although the vote of the House Agriculture Committee to extend 90 percent price supports was anticipated, it nonetheless dealt a blow to the President's flexible support plan. The Senate Agriculture Committee has not yet acted, but present signs are for a vote to extend rigid 90 percent supports for another year. Meanwhile, there is every indication that 1954 will be another boom crop period and that surpluses will continue to pile up virtually across the board.

An unfavorable committee vote would not infallibly mean an unfavorable vote by the full House and Senate on the President's plan for variable supports from 90 down to 75 percent of parity, depending on supply. More and more legislators, judging from reports, are beginning to see the absurdity of subsidized surpluses and general overproduction. Even if Congress should vote to extend 90 percent supports, Secretary Benson has indicated that he would ask the President to veto the bill. It would be difficult for Congress to pass the bill over the President's veto. And if a veto were sustained, the long-deferred Anderson law of 1949, providing flexible supports, would automatically go into effect.

Any proposal to get away from 90 percent supports is politically troublesome, of course, because it seems to imply a drop in farm income. There is a misconception that rigid supports are a great help to the little farmer. Actually they give a windfall to the efficient farmer because they are based on the lowest common denominator; and the hill farmer of Alabama or Arkansas receives relatively little tangible benefit. In any case, it does not make sense to base the price-support system on inefficient production.

Perhaps flexible supports are not the only means or the best means of meeting the problem of overproduction. But procrastination is not an answer, either; and the surpluses are mounting. Congress cannot in conscience merely shrug its shoulders. Flexible supports at least ought to have a try. It is ridiculous to think that all major crops, under widely varying conditions, justify the same price support percentage.

If the administration is wise, however, it will learn something from the opposition to flexible supports. To prosper and meet the genuine needs of the people, the Nation's agriculture must be an efficient agriculture. There must be some means of getting marginal production out of agriculture (and rigid 90 percent supports merely serve to encourage marginal production). There must be some means of retraining displaced farmers in other pursuits. The administration might be in a better position to persuade legislators to its views on price supports if it could show that the necessary readjustments would be carried out, not through the heartless device of bankruptcy, but through a positive human program.

Are We Planning a Shadow Army?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 15, 1954

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, recent events in the Far East seem to indicate that serious discussion and debate is in order before the Congress accepts the drastic cutback in our ground forces.

The Army Chief of Staff, Gen. Matthew Ridgway, has told the House appropriation subcommittee, in his words, "I would not think we can increase combat effectiveness." The Army Chief of Staff was referring here specifically to the 1955 Eisenhower budget for the Army. Let us not hastily cut back our ground forces when we need them, at least as a deterrent, in the tense international situation.

Some well-chosen words of advice on this subject were contained in a recent editorial in the Army Times of April 10, 1954. I include this editorial in the RECORD in the hope that it will aid my colleagues in their consideration of the military appropriation bill:

SHADOW ARMY

After a somewhat ambiguous start, the official "line" explaining America's new strength alinement for defense purposes is becoming more clearcut. Our overwhelming concentration on long-range airpower is not based, it seems, on any threat of "instant retaliation" against an aggressor on our part nor on our capacity to carry it out. Neither are we abandoning conventional means of warfare to put all our reliance on drawing-board doodles and pushbutton gadgets.

Instead, we intend to continue to maintain a well-equipped Army here and abroad; to consult with our allies and aid in building up their own strength; and to bring our air defenses to maximum effectiveness.

Meanwhile, Defense leaders will continue to hope that the Korean war doesn't break out again, that the ROK Army reaches 20-division strength by the middle of this year, that the new Japanese Army is allowed to continue to rebuild and that no further strain is put upon United States troops overseas.

That is what emerged from recent Defense testimony before a Senate Appropriations Subcommittee and it was probably good news for our friends overseas, who have been quaking over some of Secretary Dulles' remarks on "instant retaliation." It was less than comforting, however, for the United States Army to learn that—with a strength reduced by a quarter of a million men—it would have to continue to carry out its present worldwide mission of defending West Europe, Korea, Japan, Okinawa, Alaska, Greenland, the Caribbean and—who can say?—Indochina.

Testifying before the committee, Army Chief of Staff Ridgway was moved, indeed, to reveal that a reduced ceiling of 1,172,700 men had been imposed on the Army. Up to that moment no Defense officials had ever said that ceiling had been placed on any service, because the implication then would be that Defense's New Look was dictated by the desire to save budget money rather than on sober calculation of the threat facing us.

By citing a few hard figures, General Ridgway tried to show the committee how big a handicap the Army faced, under the contemplated strength limits. He said that of the 1,172,700 men the Army expects to have 18 months from now, 315,000 will be in fixed jobs in communications or joint headquarters activities, or as trainers, trainees, patients, transients, or in other spots imposed on the Army by law. This would leave the Army with about 857,700 for combat and support troops. About 188,200 are in support activities, worldwide, leaving the Army with 669,500 troops to fill out the combat field forces.

Since full-strength requirements for the units contemplated for the Army in fiscal year 1955 are 600,000 men, it would leave a mere 500 available for support units in the field, such as signal battalions, bakery units, ordnance shops. The figure is ridiculous on its face, but since these support units must be maintained their strength must come from, and deplete, the only available source: the combat units.

Let's hope the committee members lent careful ears to this point. If not, they are in for a rude awakening in June 1955 when they learn that no more than 2 or 3 Army divisions are at full strength.

Time and the River

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 15, 1954

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Memphis Press-Scimitar of May 28, 1954:

TIME AND THE RIVER

"Time is getting to be a critical factor."

Those were the words of Brig. Gen. John R. Hardin, president of the Mississippi River Commission, before the House Public Works Committee.

General Hardin was talking about lack of authorization for the United States Engineers to do something to keep the Atchafalaya River from capturing the Mississippi River's main channel 200 miles north of New Orleans, and discharging the flow into the gulf by a shorter route.

We hope General Hardin made the urgency plain to this committee with these facts that cannot be misunderstood:

Two years ago the engineers estimated 23 percent of the flow was going through the connecting channel into the Atchafalaya route.

This year 30 percent of the flow is going that way.

Time and the river are running mates, as a rule. Changes take from decades to centuries and there is little rush.

Now it appears we have an exception to the rule.

The diversion channel is developing with exceptional rapidity, and the engineers says a 40 percent flow would be difficult to control, and perhaps impossible.

At the present rate of increase there could be 40 percent flow within 30 months.

We hope the committee, and the House as a whole, will take favorable action to stop this threat to the economy of the entire lower Mississippi River valley before it gets out of control.

Eisenhower Appeal Temperate, Convincing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DOUGLAS R. STRINGFELLOW

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 15, 1954

Mr. STRINGFELLOW. Mr. Speaker, according to a recent editorial in the Salt Lake Tribune, the people of Utah and the country still like Ike. It is very encouraging and heartwarming to me to note that our people are very discerning and alert in selecting leadership—and demanding support of Congress for the President's program.

The respect and dignity which President Eisenhower has brought to the White House has renewed the faith of our American citizens in our constitutional government where the executive, the legislative, and the judicial branches all occupy their proper sphere. We have in Dwight D. Eisenhower a President not only capable of leading, but fully worthy of the high honors which have been accorded to him.

I commend the editors of the Salt Lake Tribune for the following fine article, which appeared in this Utah paper on June 12, 1954:

EISENHOWER APPEAL TEMPERATE, CONVINCING

President Eisenhower's earnest appeal for less political fission and more political fusion should bring favorable response.

If Members of Congress heed the President's call for favorable action on his lagging legislative program and listen to the "I still like Ike" people at home, there surely will be a break in the ominous clouds hanging over major administration recommendations.

The speech, delivered before the Citizens for Eisenhower Congressional Committee and carried over major networks, was characterized by typical temperance and reasonableness of the President. He did not belabor lawmakers who have stalled or sidetracked much of his program; he did not censure them for failure to act. Though he alluded to the highly publicized distractions, he said Congress has been hard at work.

Mr. Eisenhower's temperance was in sharp contrast to some explosive outbursts of his predecessors, who castigated Congress for failing to follow the President's wishes. The appeal was directed to Democrats as well as to Republicans and he stressed that his program had a bipartisan origin. The President is having trouble with a wing of his party which would turn back the clock and with Democrats who are trying to capitalize on every schism and failure of the administration for their own advantage in the coming congressional elections.

Mr. Eisenhower correctly described his program as threefold "to protect our freedoms; to foster a growing, prosperous, peacetime economy, and to fulfill the government's obligations in helping solve the human problems of our citizenry."

The total objective, he said, "is to help assure every willing American to enjoy good health, a good job, a good education, a good home, a good country." He received an enthusiastic ovation when he pledged to keep everlastingly at the job of uprooting subversion wherever it is found and when, discussing the administration's farm program, he declared "I am completely unmoved by arguments as to what constitutes good or winning politics. * * * I know that what is right for America is politically right."

These are sound, statesmanlike observations and they should appeal to all Americans who put their country's welfare above partisan considerations. He spoke with unusual conviction and good sense in discussing the farm program, against which political pressure is particularly strong.

Mr. Eisenhower spoke in a somewhat improved climate for some progress has been made in the last week or so with important parts of his pledge to preserve social gains. Social-security expansion was passed in the House and a public-housing bill in the Senate. Both still face tough sledding but with firm pressure from the White House may yet be enacted.

Mr. Eisenhower is the least political President to occupy the White House in many generations. The recent report of the University of Michigan Survey Research Center corroborated what many observers have already said, that Mr. Eisenhower won the presidential election as a person not a party's standard bearer. Not only this, as summarized in Scientific American, the majority of the voters made up their minds to support him even before the campaign.

Members of Congress, of both political faiths, would do well to remember that Mr. Eisenhower still retains much of the confidence and faith of the American people. His strength remains with the masses and these masses are more interested in political fusion for American's welfare than political fission for the benefit of any politicians.

Lawrence, Mass., Fire Fighters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 15, 1954

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to include herein a portion of my remarks at the annual memorial services and breakfast conducted by the fire fighters of Lawrence, Mass., on Sunday morning, June 13, 1954:

The world could use a lot more fire fighters.

To put the damper on communism, that inflammatory doctrine that would spread through all nations and all peoples, burning out spiritual values from the life of man and leaving him but the shell of his former self.

We checked the forest fire of communism that was sweeping down Korea.

And we are keeping watch there to see that it does not break out again.

There, and in Germany, and all around the large slave empire of Soviet Russia that always threatens to erupt against us if we should ever so weaken ourselves that we are unable to meet fire with fire.

They call themselves "Reds," and for once they speak the truth. Pyromaniacs by instinct, they are determined to destroy what they cannot build. Fires start sometimes by spontaneous combustion, defective wiring, or in various other ways, including fires that are set by mentally twisted persons who derive an insane pleasure from the ghastly spectacle that they engineer.

Human life is cheap to the Communists. In their drive to subjugate the world, they will stop at nothing. Only the knowledge that we possess fire-power to turn against them stops the Russian Communists from unloosing the inferno of a third world war.

As it is, they are using their satellites to apply the torch that starts smaller conflicts, making us run here and there in order to wear down our manpower and our resources.

They are experts in other forms of incendiarism, trying to "burn us up" against our allies, trying to incite other people against us by their propaganda, or getting us to quarrel heatedly among ourselves.

These sparks are not accidental.

The Reds have studied every method of developing friction among people and among nations. They know that the lie is the best way to kindle fears, resentments, and hate.

And so they start hot rumors about a person, a race, a religion, or a nation, knowing that there are always foolish people who, for the excitement of it, will pick up the rumor, add to it, and pass it along not knowing that they are being used as troublemakers by the Communists.

As fire fighters, you understand the open blaze you must contend with, as well as the hidden, smoldering flame that eats away inside the partitions.

The struggle against communism presents us with similar problems.

To combat it in the field, where it engages in overt aggression, we must maintain sufficient force to deter it. This is no time to economize on our Defense Department. We need all the highly mobile apparatus, the engines and pumps and aerial ladders, and trained manpower, to extinguish the Communist flame whenever it licks out at the free world.

At the same time, we must take precautions to fireproof the United States against espionage and subversion.

Each one of us must maintain a "firewatch" to detect intolerance, and nip it in the bud, before it spreads its corrosive influence among us to our own undoing.

All of us must equip ourselves with the facts and the truths to stamp out the embers of prejudice, and ignorance, and hysteria, before they fan into the all-consuming conflagration that would destroy us from within.

Abroad, 24 hours around the clock, our Armed Forces maintain constant and ready watch against the outbreak of "the Red terror."

At home our job is to support these guardians of our liberties by a fire-prevention program that will clean up our mental attics, get rid of any Communists who may be lurking in the cellar, and by making certain that we do not overload our emotional outlets to the point that we short-circuit ourselves.

There is a duty for all of us to perform, with cool efficiency and intelligent courage.

In the same spirit of public service that we honor in those members of the Lawrence Fire Department who have passed on to their eternal reward.

They had a job to do.

And a responsibility to live up to.

We recall with affection and with pride that they were good and brave men, engaged in a hazardous occupation for the protection of Lawrence and its people.

Vigilant and capable in defending our city from the scourge of roaring flames.

As all Americans, like the volunteer fire brigades of old, we must respond to the general alarm that now sounds, calling upon us to put up fire barriers against the spread of communism.

And to oppose it in every way until it is quenched in the smoking ashes of its own ruins.

Batture Newsprint

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 15, 1954

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New Orleans Times-Picayune:

BATTURE NEWSPRINT

Prospects of utilizing southern-grown hardwoods—including millions of cords of cottonwood grown along Mississippi River battures—in making newsprint under a process considered feasible by the United States Department of Commerce represent an economic venture that would be both profitable and unexpectdly useful to the South. The just-issued report on the economic feasibility of using southern hardwoods for newsprint describes experiments indicating hardwoods can be used for this purpose if sufficient quantities are available. Most important, the report points out that in addition to birch, beech, and maple, the problem tree of the South—cottonwood—is not only practical for making newsprint but, as every southerner knows, widely available.

There are some 2.9 billion cubic feet of hardwood stands already available in the South, the report says. Cottonwood—which is easily grown along batture lands on the unprotected sides of levee lines—would produce 4.8 cords per acre per year. Some 2 million acres of land between the levees lying along the river from Cairo, Ill., to Baton Rouge are unsuited for crops other than cottonwood. These lands would annualy procure something like 96 million cords a year when cottonwood trees are mature. This represents 600 million cubic feet annually, since the average 15-year yield is 300 cubic feet per acre.

If this utilization of battures for cultivation of cottonwood trees and their exploitation as a source of newsprint succeeds, the South would gain an unanticipated windfall. For few have been optimistic enough to figure out any other profitable utilization of the land lying along the levees. Realization will depend, however, upon establishment of a newsprint mill along the lower Mississippi River. Businessmen who have noted the $20 million investment of a northern paper company in Maine for a mill that will use hardwoods could profitably look at the windfall in the lower Mississippi's batture backyard.

The Bricker Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NOAH M. MASON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 15, 1954

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, every Republican Member of Congress from Illinois believes in and supports some form of the Bricker amendment. We want to prevent future abuse of the treatymaking power, and we want to outlaw executive agreements as a substitute for constitutional treaties. Senator DIRKSEN, of Illinois, also strongly favors some form of the Bricker amendment. Why then did not the Illinois State Republican platform committee face this issue squarely and take a definite stand?

The Bricker amendment is very much alive. It is far from being dead. It will be adopted by Congress either at this session or the next. It lacked only one vote in the Senate—60 for and 31 against—of the required two-thirds vote necessary for adoption.

Senator DOUGLAS, of Illinois, voted against the Bricker amendment. This means that in the senatorial battle in Illinois this fall between Joe Meek and Senator DOUGLAS, the Bricker amendment will be one of the principal issues. The question will be: "Shall we return Senator DOUGLAS to the United States Senate—a man who voted against the Bricker amendment—or shall we elect Joe Meek who will vote for the Bricker amendment"?

Mr. Speaker, as a part of these remarks I want to extend the following editorial from the June 12, 1954, issue of the Chicago Tribune:

THE STATE PLATFORM

Governor Stratton has proposed for what seems to be to us a wholly specious reason, that the Republican State platform, to be submitted to the party convention in Springfield today, should avoid a position on the Bricker amendment. There has been strong party sentiment in support of the amendment which would prevent abuse and extension of the treaty power.

The Governor argues that the Bricker amendment "is not any longer an issue," because it was voted on once by the Senate. That vote was 60 in favor of the amendment, 31 opposed. Because of the two-thirds majority required in each House on a constitutional amendment, the proposal failed to carry by a single vote.

Mr. Stratton can hardly contend, on the basis of this vote last February, that the Bricker amendment was decisively rejected, for it commanded a very large majority, although just short of what was needed. Nor can he contend that the amendment does not represent good Republican Party doctrine, for 32 Republican Senators voted in favor of it, and only 14 against. Thus the Republicans stood, by more than 2 to 1, in support of the measure. The margin of Democrats favoring the amendment was similar, if not quite so high. Twenty-eight

Democrats voted for the amendment, and 16 against it.

The Bricker amendment, far from being dead, is very much alive. It has enlisted the support of vast numbers of Americans of both parties. Those who sponsor it in Congress are planning to bring it up for consideration again. The voters of Illinois want to know how the Republican Party in the State stands on this vital issue.

Mr. Stratton may feel that, inasmuch as Mr. Eisenhower called for defeat of the Bricker amendment, some requirement of submission to Presidential leadership ought to compel the party in Illinois to remain silent. He overlooks two things. The first is that amending the Constitution is not a proper concern of the President. The decision rests with Congress and the States. A resolution for a constitutional amendment does not come to the President's desk for approval or disapproval. His lobbying against the Bricker amendment was unprecedented in Presidential history.

The second consideration is that every Member of the Senate and House gets to vote on a constitutional amendment. As the Bricker proposal will be up for action again, any Republican representing Illinois in either House will be called upon to declare his position. Why not let the people know now what their position will be?

Joseph Meek, the Republican nominee for Senator in the November election, has declared his support of the Bricker amendment. The Republican Congressmen from Illinois who are seeking reelection can be counted upon to support the amendment What good will be served in planting a suggestion with the people that the Republican State organization is too timid to back them wholeheartedly?

Pussyfooting on this issue may lead to pussyfooting on other issues of comparable importance. An impression of party vacillation, if not of party weakness, will be created. If it has to be done that way, the delegates to the State convention must discharge their duty by amending the platform from the convention floor and contributing any firmness that may be lacking.

Meeting a Challenge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 15, 1954

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by the gentleman from Texas, Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN, before the 55th annual convention of the National Association of Retail Grocers at Washington, D. C., June 13, 1954:

Mr. President, members of the National Association of Retail Grocers, and guests, it's a real pleasure to be here with you today and to have this opportunity to attend the 55th annual NARGUS convention.

There are not many trade associations in the United States that have held 55 annual conventions, and I understand that NARGUS is several years older than this number of conventions indicates.

So I want to offer my congratulations to the members of this fine organization and to its officers and directors, who have contributed so much to its success.

Your able and fine secretary-manager, Mrs. Marie Kiefer, has made a wonderful record in the association field. She is highly regarded by the experts and professionals in the public relations and trade-association circles, as well as in the United States Congress. Your association is to be commended for keeping a person who is constantly improving the value and worth of your great organization.

I also desire to congratulate the officers of your group, and Mrs. Kiefer in particular, for securing the services of such a fine, intelligent, and hard-working and effective person to represent you here in Washington and on Capitol Hill as Henry Bison. If you were to look the country over you could not find a better person to do this work than Henry Bison. He not only stands well and is personally regarded highly by Members of Congress, but he is also well and favorably known by representatives of other powerful groups in the trade-association field. It is certainly a compliment to you to have a person like Henry that some of the most proficient experts in this field anxiously and eagerly follow. It can truthfully be said that they work with Henry Bison 100 percent. Such coordination and cooperation are conducive to the best results, and I predict as long as you have this type of representation here in Washington your interests will be carefully and properly served and the best results will be obtained for you.

Doubtless a major share of the credit for securing good people like Mrs. Kiefer and Henry Bison should go to the able officers and board of directors your group invariably selects to administer the work of the association.

It is very fortunate for the independent grocers that NARGUS has grown to be as strong as it is, for if ever there was a time when independent grocers need an association to fight for their rights it is now.

I know what I am talking about, because I have devoted all of my public life fighting on behalf of independent businessmen. I believe, just as you do, that the lifeblood of this great Nation of ours is the prosperity of the independent businessman.

Through the many years I have been in this battle, there have been occasions when the future did not look bright. For instance, my memory goes back to the late 1920's and the early 1930's when the juggernaut of price discriminations against independent grocers and small distributors was spreading ruin and despair throughout the Nation.

These were the days before the Robinson-Patman Act was passed when the small merchant was viciously penalized by his large rivals. These were the days when a very large corporate distributor told one of its suppliers to sell it at manufacturing cost and make up the loss by charging small customers.

The evil practices that went on at this time—before the Robinson-Patman Act—simply stagger the imagination. Many of you grocers in the audience were not in business for yourself then. For that reason, I urge you to talk to your fellow grocers, who were operating their own businesses at this time. Ask them to describe how they were hurt by discriminations imposed on them, and how they had to fight against great odds to save their business from bankruptcy. Experience is a great teacher, and only someone who has seen the effect of these practices can fully appreciate how terrible they actually were.

In 1936, the Robinson-Patman Act was passed and put a stop to most of these evil practices. But that was almost eighteen years ago. What is the situation today? How do we stand now in protecting equality of opportunity for all businesses, regardless of size? Is the Robinson-Patman Act being fearlessly enforced to its fullest extent?

I only wish I could stand here this afternoon and tell you that the act is in safe hands, that it is being applied as Congress intended it should and that you need have no fear about its future.

But in all honesty I cannot, because it just isn't so—far from it. The truth is that the Robinson-Patman Act, the Magna Carta of independent merchants, is in mortal peril. The danger to the act is now greater than ever before in its history; and with the passing of each day, it grows even worse. And I know of no group of businessmen who stand to suffer more as a result of this condition than do independent retail grocers.

This act grew out of a long history of unfair and discriminatory practices, which deprived independent grocers of their rights as free citizens to succeed and prosper according to the efficiency of their endeavors. Because the tragedy and harm inflicted on members of this association helped to give birth to the Robinson-Patman Act, you and your fellow grocers will be one of the chief groups of victims to be sacrificed by the malignant forces bent on weakening or destroying this law.

I have spent my lifetime fighting for the rights of the small-business man, and everything within me cries out against the evil which is now being perpetrated in the name of "improving the antitrust laws." Improvement. If there is much more of the "improvement" we have been having of late, the act will be "improved" right out of existence.

Well, I'm not going to sit back and see the progress this country has made in giving the little fellow a fair chance to succeed go down the drain. And I don't know any better place to "lay it on the line" than before this convention. So, here goes.

The Robinson-Patman Act is now under the most vicious, insidious, and deceptive attacks that have ever been launched against an antitrust statute. The deplorable part of the subversive attacks against the Robinson-Patman Act is that for the most part they are carried on underground by people who will not come out and identify themselves. Neither will many of them openly admit they are opposed to the act and would like to see it repealed. Instead, they claim to support the law and only wish to see it "clarified."

Now, I know you grocers, coming from the far corners of the Nation, are not up on the latest Washington "mumbo jumbo." So maybe you don't know that in the antitrust legislative field "to clarify" is a $2 word meaning "to massacre, to slaughter, to destroy," but in a slow gradual manner so no one will know what is really happening.

I hope someday that the "interests," who are pouring money into the campaign against the Robinson-Patman Act, will be forced to reveal themselves. And if I ever have an opportunity to do so, I will help put the spotlight on them.

You know the effort to destroy the act really began back in 1948-49, when there was a controversy over whether it was legal for suppliers to sell at delivered prices or to absorb freight. At that time some of the leaders in the steel industry were quoted as saying Congress must act fast to amend the Robinson-Patman Act so as to permit the basing-point system of pricing to continue. As a result of the demand for speed, a bill was rushed through Congress in 1950 to weaken the act. But, fortunately, President Truman saw the evil that would be accomplished, and he vetoed it.

Actually, all this effort and speed to weaken the act just to permit the basing-point system was totally unnecessary—assuming that was its real purpose.

The Supreme Court did not outlaw selling at delivered prices or absorbing freight, but it did hold in the Cement Institute case that the basing-point system is illegal if it is practiced by means of a conspiracy or agreement among competitors.

Now then, unless those who wanted to clarify—there's that word again—the law are really interested in permitting price discriminations of the kind we all condemn, there was and is no reason to have the act weakened.

Last year, I thought I would try an experiment to see if the basing-point controversy was actually a smoke screen to permit enemies of the act to destroy it without the public knowing their real purpose.

So I introduced a bill of my own in the House—H. R. 5848—to strengthen the act. And I put in this bill a very significant provision to see how much support it would get.

This provision specifically states that nothing in the act "shall prevent a seller from selling at a delivered price and for that purpose absorbing freight necessary to enable him in good faith to meet an equally low price of a competitor in any market, if his delivered price in the market is available to all his competing customers therein."

Now those who honestly believe that the Robinson-Patman Act interferes with the basing-point system should have favored my bill, because it gave them what they were asking. Unfortunately, and for some unexplainable reason, the people who have been fighting the act on the theory that it needs to be changed to establish the legality of the basing-point system have not taken to my bill. This makes me wonder if they do not have more behind their plans than they care to admit. However, I will leave that question for you to decide.

Now I want to say a word about the efforts being made to destroy the provision of the act prohibiting payment of false brokerage fees.

First, let me make one thing very clear. The brokerage section of the act is absolutely essential to the success of this law in protecting independent retail grocers against discriminatory practices that will rob them of their right to equality of opportunity with their larger competitors. Before the act became law, investigations brought out clearly and unmistakably that receipt of phony brokerage was a favorite device the large chains used to bludgeon small competitors, including small chains. The final report of the Federal Trade Commission report on the chain-store investigation, submitted to the Congress in 1934, revealed the fact that out of 23 instances in which food manufacturers stated they acceded to the demands of the chains, 15 were demands for brokerage. This means that the section of the act prohibiting phony brokerage payments either stands or falls with the entire act. You cannot separate this provision from the others in the law. If it goes, the whole act will go with it.

There are, however, a handful of wholesalers sponsoring voluntary groups, who persist in failing to recognize this fact. This small insignificant group is backing an attempt to fix the law so they can collect phony brokerage payments.

A subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee, under the leadership of Senator LANGER, held open hearings on S. 2604, which is one of the bills this group is backing. I was privileged to participate in the hearing at the invitation of Senator LANGER, chairman of the committee.

At this hearing, the grave dangers arising from this attempt to open up the section against phony brokerage were clearly brought out. It was shown that if this small group of wholesalers is granted the privilege of getting brokerage fees, then all buyers, including the large chains, must be given the same right, because in this country equality under the law is more than just a phrase; it is a basic principle of justice by which we live. Thus, it is not possible to give this special-interest group a privilege that is not accorded all buyers. The fact that the Robinson-Patman Act now accords to all equal rights is the source of its strength. Imagine an act designed to provide equality of opportunity for all actually creating an easy avenue for concealing price discriminations to a few.

While I am on the subject of this particular attempt to wreck the act, I want to commend NARGUS for seeing through the smoke screen sent up by the small clique, who want phony brokerage payments. I know this took real courage, because of their false claim that small independent grocers would benefit from these payments. Fortunately, NARGUS and its members refused to fall in the trap, but instead opposed any effort to amend section 2 (c). And I am glad to relate that this opposition was not passive or weak-kneed. NARGUS has been vigilant and vigorous in defense of this law. This is a matter of genuine satisfaction to me. It is also something that you can take pride in, for your interests are being well represented.

I am sure that you all know that there is now before the Congress numerous bills to weaken or destroy the Robinson-Patman Act. The last time I counted, there were eight such bills pending in Congress.

I am not going into detail explaining the harm any one of these bills would do to independent retail grocers. But I do want to call your attention to the seriousness of the situation. Never before has there been so many measures pending in Congress for the purpose of letting down the bars against harmful price discrimination.

This is really tragic, because right now—today—the Robinson-Patman Act is needed more than it has been for the past several years. The conspiracy to distort and demolish this law could not come at a worse time.

However, so far, because of the heroic resistance put up against these bad bills, they have not passed. Now please don't misunderstand me, I am not depreciating this accomplishment, but I do not want to say anything which could give you the idea that the fight is over. Any such idea would not only be wrong, but it would be extremely dangerous. For the enemies of the act, while small in number, are nevertheless very persistent and exceedingly clever. This is no time to celebrate, but rather it is a time to rededicate yourselves to defending this law against whatever attacks may come in the future.

What I have just said may have given you the impression that perhaps an even harder struggle is just ahead. This is the case and I regret very much the necessity of telling you it.

For several years now, legislative attacks have been made on the Robinson-Patman Act. They have been dangerous to the vitality and effectiveness of the law. All of us know about these attacks. We have been aware of them and have done something about them.

But within recent months, there has arisen another and more insidious form of assault on the act, which is impairing its effectiveness and hamstringing its ability to strike at discriminatory practices before they have a chance to corrupt a market and cause serious harm to the competitive system.

I refer to the recent trend in decisions since the new chairman of the Federal Trade Commission has taken over.

Let me state right now that what I am about to say is not partisan in any way. The Chairman of the Commission happens to be a Republican; so do a majority of its members. But that has nothing to do with my making the charge that recent decisions and opinions of the Commission, as well as some of the changes it has made in its rules of practice, are undermining the Robinson-Patman Act and its enforcement.

This is a very serious matter, because if the present trend continues, it will not be necessary for the enemies of the act to continue as they have in the past, seeking legislation opening up the act. This same objective could be accomplished by a slow and gradual process of erosion, whereby the authority, scope, and effectiveness of the Robinson-Patman Act is worn away by the ravages of Commission determinations that deprive it of the force and strength, which the Congress intended it should have.

My primary purpose here this afternoon is to give warning that the new leadership and control over the Federal Trade Commission bears close watching. Ominous signs are arising that a majority of its present members are not disposed to enforce the act to its fullest exent. Many of the recent actions they have taken give the distinct impression that the Commission is pulling back or withdrawing and that it considers the time ripe for a strategic retreat.

Apparently, those who now are in control believe the previous administration went too far in applying the law against monopolistic and discriminatory practices. The New Look at the Commission is one of looking for ways to counteract the Robinson-Patman Act; in other words, making it easier to violate and harder to enforce.

In just a moment I will outline to you some of the areas where the Commission has given evidence of a desire to weaken the act and its enforcement.

But before doing that, I want to make one point clear.

It is that the danger to the act, which comes from inside the Commission, is far more serious than that which it faces from without. By that, I mean an overt attack out in the open for all to see is much easier to deal with than is internal subversion. We have seen this fact time and again in our efforts to meet the Communist menace. I, therefore, caution you against any feeling of complacency that because efforts to weaken the act in Congress have not succeeded, the law and all it stands for is safe. If anyone has the idea that this is so, he had better get rid of it before it is too late. Many times, word has reached my ear that the Commission staff is being demoralized by changes in policy and personnel. I do not, at present, have the means to investigate the situation; but if what is said is true, then I can assure you the act stands in greater danger than any of us dare imagine.

Now, I have said that recent opinions and decisions coming from the Federal Trade Commission indicate a change in views, which, if pursued, will weaken and undermine the act.

I do not have time to list all of these for you, so I will pick out only a few.

The first has to do with what effect a price discrimination must have under section 2 (a) of the act before it can be prohibited by the Commission. This is a tremendously important question, because under the act, when the Commission has jurisdiction to proceed and there is an unjustifiable price discrimination, the only remaining issue is what the effect of the discrimination has been.

Prior to passage of the Robinson-Patman Act, the law against price discriminations required a showing of general injury to competition. This was found by Congress to be inadequate, because it prevented effective action being taken against discriminations before they have a chance to cause widespread harm and injury to the competitive system. As a result of this restriction, the Commission was prevented from striking at harmful practices in their insipiency, and this was one of the original purposes for creating the Commission. This idea is expressed in the adage that an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure.

To correct this defect, the Congress passed the Robinson-Patman Act and broadened the jurisdictional scope of the Commission to act against price discriminations by making them illegal, not only when their effect could injure competition substantially, but also when it could injure a competitor victimized by the discrimination. This was stated in the Senate and House report on the Robinson-Patman Act before it was enacted, and legislative history makes it so clear that I cannot see how there can be any doubt about it.

Furthermore, the Supreme Court in the Morton Salt case upheld this view. In that case, the defendant contended that since salt is a small item in the retail grocery store, the effect of its price discriminations against small purchasers did not substantially lessen competition. But the Supreme Court unanimously held a showing of a substantial injury was not necessary to prove a discrimination illegal. Here is what the Court said:

"There are many articles in a grocery store that, considered separately, are comparatively small parts of a merchant's stock. Congress intended to protect a merchant from competitive injury attributable to discriminatory prices on any or all goods sold in interstate commerce * * * The new provision [in the Robinson-Patman Act] here controlling, was intended to justify a finding of injury to competition by a showing of 'injury to the competitor victimized by the discrimination.'"

Nevertheless, despite what Congress and the Supreme Court have said on this question, a majority of the present members of the Commission have indicated that they are disposed to follow a policy of requiring a showing of substantial injury, which is reasonably probable before holding a discrimination illegal. This is the way I interpret the Commission's feelings in the matter based on its opinion in the General Foods case, which it dismissed last April.

If I am correct in this assumption, the majority members of the Commission have taken upon themselves to disregard what Congress intended when it passed the Robinson-Patman Act, and then, as if that were not enough, have proceeded to overrule the Supreme Court.

All this and the way the Commission is dismissing cases these days makes me think that unless something is done to improve the situation at the Commission, it might be better for the country to abolish the Commission entirely and put the job of enforcing the act in the hands of the local United States attorneys.

I want to call your attention to a very significant fact in this connection, which has been overlooked. It is that section 15 of the Clayton Act charges the United States district attorneys, under supervision of the Attorney General, with the duty of instituting equity proceedings to prevent and restrain violation of the Robinson-Patman Act provisions against price discriminations. The Supreme Court called specific attention to this fact in a recent opinion covering a case involving price discrimination filed by the Department of Justice against the Borden Co.

It seems clear, therefore, that the Federal Trade Commission is not essential to enforcement of the Robinson-Patman Act, even under present law. And if I may say so, I think it has been a big mistake to put so much emphasis on the need for the Commission.

All of us need to reexamine our thinking on this point, for a good argument can be made that the United States District Attorneys, acting with the help of the Department of Justice, can prevent violations of the Robinson-Patman Act more effectively and far more expeditiously than the Federal Trade Commission has done.

No one is benefiting from the act as it is being administered presently, and the least we could do is to save the taxpayers the $4 million per year it is costing to run the agency.

Certainly, if the Commission is going to continue dismissing price-discrimination cases until the harm caused by such practices contaminates the market and is about to ruin competition generally, then for all practical purposes, the Commission has repealed most of the act. The vital purpose of the act is to prevent these things from happening by protecting individual competitor's rights to equality of opportunity. When a deadly disease threatens a community, the authorities don't stand by idly until a plague develops. Instead, they go after the disease before it has a chance to develop.

Unjustified price discriminations are also a disease—an economic disease—and the only way to prevent it from becoming a plague is to strike at it in its infancy. If we wait until discriminatory practices take root, then the job becomes one of prying open the market to competition. This is difficult and sometimes impossible. The very purpose of the Federal Trade Commission is to keep equality of opportunity for all business alive and healthy in the market at all times. If it does not do this, then it fails in fulfilling the very purpose for which it was created.

Another recent action by the Commission causes one to wonder if the New Look at the Commission is not one of a deathly pale.

I refer here to the new rules of practice on consent orders. You all know that a consent order is an agreement entered into voluntarily between the offending party and the Commission which settles the cases without a trial. The party does not admit he violated the law and there is no finding that he did so. All it amounts to is an agreement that he will not do certain things considered as illegal, which the order lists.

Before going any further, I want to make one point very clear. Nothing I am about to say should be construed as meaning that I am opposed to consent settlements in all Federal Trade Commission cases. If they are entered into under a procedure, which lays down necessary rules for the protection of the public interest, they can be very useful.

This point that the public must be protected is very important, especially in Clayton Act cases—and this includes cases where price discriminations may be involved—where the illegal practices condemned jeopardize our competitive system. This means that where there is a doubt as to whether a consent order will provide adequate relief against violations, that doubt should always be resolved in favor of the Government and against the violator. It is not good enough that the violator give up his illegal activities. A consent order, if it is to be any good, must also act in the best manner possible to prevent a repetition of these activities. Otherwise, the Commission has won a lawsuit and lost a cause.

Last month, the Commission amended its rules to permit more extensive use of consent orders. Under these new rules, an amazingly easy avenue has been opened to allow violators to hamstring enforcement.

One of the provisions permitting consent orders is thoroughly unprecedented in antitrust law enforcement. It permits a settlement as to some of the issues in a case, while leaving the remaining issues for trial; or as will probably happen, allowing these to be dropped and closing the case entirely.

Permitting a violator to settle only a part of the case against him is a procedure so repellent to effective administration of the antitrust laws that I shudder to consider what the Commission had in mind when it approved this fantastic action. The Department of Justice does not and would not consider settling a part of a case it filed against a defendant by a consent decree. I doubt if any enforcement agency, other than the Federal Trade Commission, would even consider such an idea.

Apparently, the way is now open for Robinson-Patman Act violators to pick out the strong points of a case made against them and settle these by a quick informal procedure, leaving the Commission holding the bag with the rest of the case, which is more difficult to prove. Can you imagine the type of enforcement we will get under that method?

It will, of course, be said that the Commission has the power to reject any proposed consent order, which it feels is not proper. But this seems little protection, indeed, considering the fact that it has eliminated the previous requirement that a consent decree must dispose of the entire case. Furthermore, the Commission has also opened the door to allow a violator to wait until the Government has submitted its evidence against him and then interrupt the trial and ask for a consent agreement.

The main advantages of consent orders are the saving of expense of a trial and speeding up the enforcement. I contend, and believe impartial observers will agree, that neither of these advantages will be forthcoming under the consent order procedures just outlined.

You can see something of what we are up against in trying to save the Robinson-Patman Act. There is, however, one advantage that we have over our opponents. This is that right is on our side. We are fighting for a worthy cause and an important one. With such advantage, I am sure we will succeed even though the going will be tough.

I want to thank you for inviting me here today. Many thanks to you all.

Unemployment-Compensation Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 15, 1954

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I respectfully call to your attention and consideration the timely and authoritative statement filed in the interest of UAW-CIO by James Carey, secretary of the CIO, before the House Committee on Ways and Means on Friday, June 11. Mr. Carey's statement dramatically points up, in urging favorable enactment of H. R. 9430, a bill which has received my expressed support, that there is a crying need for legislative action on a Federal level if we are ever to improve State unemployment compensation laws to the point where they meet realistically the needs of our people and their families. The figures submitted by Mr. Carey are alarming; the unemployment situation in my own State of Michigan has gotten to the point where positive steps must be taken, and quickly, if we are to avert a work stoppage which is, in many respects, reminiscent of the days of the late twenties and early thirties. There are no cure-alls to the problem of unemployment, I realize, but there are certain affirmative steps which should be taken at this time. I believe that Mr.

Carey's statement is a forthright attempt to set them out. I submit his recommendations for your consideration.

The statement follows:

The UAW-CIO believes that the recommendations of President Eisenhower that unemployment compensation be extended to cover employers of one or more employees is sound. We also support the recommendations of the President with respect to the need for increasing the weekly benefits and expanding the duration of payments under State unemployment compensation laws. We believe, however, that experience has demonstrated that no substantial action can be expected if exclusive reliance is placed on State action. Action by the Federal Government is necessary if the President's recommendations are to be incorporated into State laws.

It must be remembered that unemployment compensation in this country was the direct result of Federal action. Although in the 1920's and 1930's unemployment compensation bills were introduced in most State legislatures, nothing happened until the Congress of the United States passed the Social Security Act of 1935.

It was the passage of this act that led to the enactment of State unemployment compensation laws by all State legislatures by the end of 1936.

At the time of enacting the original Social Security Act, the Congress incorporated certain standards which must be met by State legislation as a condition of permitting a tax offset to employers covered by such law. It was recognized that standards were necessary to assume that State laws were in fact unemployment compensation laws. Justice Cardozo, speaking for the Supreme Court, in upholding these Federal provisions stated:

"An unemployment law framed in such a way that the unemployed who look to it will be deprived of reasonable protection, is one in name and nothing more."

With increased unemployment, the Congress of the United States which was responsible for the birth of unemployment compensation in this country must again exercise responsibility to assure that unemployment compensation laws are more than laws in name only—that they afford workers protection by permitting them to maintain a reasonable and decent standard of living during periods of unemployment and through this maintain purchasing power to prevent further unemployment.

The UAW-CIO, on behalf of its 1.5 million members and their 3 million dependents, therefore, urges your serious consideration and favorable enactment of H. R. 9430, introduced by Representative FORAND and 80 other Members of the House.

Not since its inception has the Federal-State unemployment compensation system been put to the test of meeting a serious economic reverse. Shortly after the benefit payment provisions of State laws became operative, our country embarked on an era during which time unemployment compensation was called upon only to function during infrequent periods of short-term unemployment.

Today, the economic picture is sharply changed. In what is considered one of the most dynamic industries in our economy—we now witness serious, widespread, and prolonged unemployment. This recession in the auto industry is nationwide. Spokesmen for the industry and for the administration in Washington have tried to minimize its seriousness, but the facts cannot be glossed over.

Production-worker employment in the automobile industry, nationally, had declined to 635,700 by March 1954 (the latest month for which figures are available) from a peak of 830,700 in April 1953, a drop of 23.5 percent.

Of those still employed, a substantial proportion are employed intermittingly and on short workweeks.

In the agricultural implement industry, 109,600 were employed in March as compared to 151,600 in March 1953 and 161,700 at the postwar peak in June 1951. The decline from the peak amounts to 32.2 percent.

In the State of Michigan, where the automobile industry is of major importance, the State employment security commission reports 208,000 unemployed in May. In Detroit, alone, there were 132,000 jobless workers.

As of April, the latest month for which data are available, employment in Michigan automobile plants was 446,000, down 19.8 percent from the same month a year earlier.

Projections made by the Michigan Employment Security Commission indicate that automobile industry employment in the State will fall as low as 374,000 later this year.

Major automobile and agricultural implement producing centers, such as Detroit, Toledo, South Bend, Kenosha, Racine, Evansville, Peoria, and Davenport-Rock Island-Moline-East Moline, the quad-cities of Illinois-Iowa, are classified as areas of substantial labor surplus by the Bureau of Employment Security.

Out of 17 Michigan labor market areas classified by the Bureau, 12 are in the substantial labor surplus category as of the latest report, practically all of them being so classified because of declining employment in the automobile industry.

Increases in the weekly amount and duration of unemployment compensation can do much to alleviate the hardships and suffering of the unemployed worker. But it is not only the unemployed worker who is benefitted by a strong and adequate unemployment compensation system. Retail businessmen, landlords, doctors, and others who furnish goods and services to the worker are all dependent on the continued ability of the worker to maintain a reasonable level of expenditure.

Recognition of the role of unemployment compensation in strengthening the whole economy is not a labor-inspired idea. As stated by President Eisenhower in his economic report to the Congress, "Unemployment insurance is a valuable first line of defense against economic recession." The President pointed out that when unemployment compensation benefits are "set at appropriate levels, they can sustain to some degree the earner's way of life as well as his demand for commodities."

In order that unemployment compensation fulfill its function, the President specifically recommended that the States raise maximum benefits "so that the payments to the great majority of the beneficiaries may equal at least half their regular earnings." He also called for a uniform duration of 26 weeks of benefits to all unemployed workers who qualify for unemployment compensation.

In line with the President's recommendations with respect to benefits the Federal Advisory Council on Employment Security, composed of representatives of the public, management, and labor, recommended that "as expeditiously as possible, the maximum weekly benefit ceiling in each State be raised to an amount not less than three-fifths to two-thirds of average weekly earnings in covered employment." These recommendations were further supported by the United States Department of Labor, the National Conference on State Labor Legislation, a conference which is convened by the Federal Government and which consists of delegates appointed by both Democratic and Republican governors of 41 States and Territories, and by the Joint Congressional Committee on the Economic Report.

Despite the overwhelming support which these recommendations received, today, 5 months after the President's Economic Report was released, not one State has taken action meeting the President's specific recommendations.

In the State of Michigan, enactment of the President's recommendations was specifically urged on the legislature by a Democratic Governor in a special message, by the Michigan Employment Security Commission composed of labor and management representatives, and by resolutions from the governing bodies of local communities representing a majority of the State's total population.

Despite this bipartisan support, the amendments passed by the legislature fall far short of the President's recommendations.

The recommendations of the President as implemented by the Federal Advisory Council on Employment Security called for maximum weekly benefits of not less than 60 to 67 percent of average weekly earnings in covered employment.

Under the Michigan amendments maximum weekly benefits range from 34 percent of the State's average weekly wage in the case of an individual with no dependents to 47.7 percent of the State's average weekly wage for an individual with four dependent children. In no case do the maximums approach the 60 to 67 percent recommended.

While the Michigan Legislature extended the possible duration of unemployment benefits for some workers to 26 weeks, less than 50 percent of those persons who exhausted their benefits in 1953 would have been eligible for 26 weeks. State legislative action to pay fewer than 50 percent of the workers 26 weeks of benefits does not meet the President's recommendation that all eligible workers be provided 26 weeks of benefits.

Moreover, even these slight increases must be balanced against additional restrictive eligibility requirements, additional road blocks in the form of disqualifications to the payment of benefits, and by a revised tax system of merit rating offering millions of dollars of savings to the large employers.

The failure of the Michigan legislature to specifically meet the President's recommendations cannot be discounted as the failure of a single legislature to meet desired goals. The pattern of activity which developed during the course of the legislative session indicates what will be the pattern in the 40-some State legislatures which meet in the calendar year 1954.

Opposition in Michigan to the President's recommendations was spearheaded by General Motors and the other large corporations. Despite the President's recommendation, the legislative proposal which was supported by these corporations provided only for an increase in the maximum weekly benefit payable to the worker with four or more children. No increase in the maximum benefit was proposed for the single worker or the worker with less than four children. The proposed maximum of $37 payable to the worker with 4 or more children represented only 42 percent of the State's average weekly wage—or from 18 to 25 percent less than the 60 to 67 percent maximum recommended.

In addition the President's recommendations, as forwarded to the State by the United States Secretary of Labor, were actively opposed by the chairman of the State Republican committee.

It is clear that these persons, so active in their support of the President during the 1952 campaign, will continue their attempts to torpedo the President's legislative recommendations in the legislative halls.

It is apparent, therefore, that if the administration is serious in recognizing the need for improvement of State unemployment compensation laws that such improvement can only be achieved by Federal legislative action. The unemployed people of America, their families and the businessmen who are dependent on their ability to purchase goods and services look for action and not words or pious suggestions to State legislatures. If this committee seriously believes that the substance of the President's legislative program should be enacted it will recommend the passage of Federal legislation establishing Federal standards to assure that State unemployment compensation laws meet the standards incorporated in H. R. 9430.

In coming before this committee and urging the enactment of H. R. 9430, we recognize, of course, that an adequate unemployment-compensation program is not the whole answer to the problem of providing economic security. But unemployment compensation is an important part of the job of maintaining the health, welfare, and dignity of the people and the productive strength which America will need in the fight now being carried on in the world.

We want to emphasize that we do not consider this a substitute for other necessary positive steps to insure full production and full employment. The record of the UAW-CIO and of the CIO in urging action to implement the Employment Act of 1946 and bring about full employment makes this abundantly clear. No one will be more delighted than our members if the executive branch and the Congress move into high gear and take action that will bring about full production and employment and thereby result in a decline in the number of workers receiving unemployment compensation.

We can say honestly that we have done all within our power to secure an adequate unemployment-compensation program through State legislation action. The failure of the States having been demonstrated, we urge the Congress to enact into legislation Federal standards to assure that State unemployment-compensation laws at least meet the provisions incorporated in H. R. 9430.

Our Failure To Use the Traditions of Free Enterprise To Strengthen the Free World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 15, 1954

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address to the graduating class of Hon. WILBUR D. MILLS, Representative in the United States Congress from the Second District of Arkansas, on Our Failure To Use the Traditions of Free Enterprise To Strengthen the Free World:

Dr. Benson, members of the faculty, and the graduating class, and friends, it is a distinct honor to be privileged to address the members of the graduating class of Harding College on this the 35th anniversary of the founding of the college.

You are now embarking on careers at one of the most troubled times in world history, and I would like to take this opportunity to discuss the relationship of one of our problems and your future. You have an advantage which many persons do not have in that your education and preparation for your careers has been under the direction of a great American, Dr. Benson.

Dr. Benson is not only a leading educator—he is also an outstanding religious leader. Few people in this country are as well aware of the problems facing the world today as is Dr. Benson. He spent many years in China as a missionary and teacher, and is now a member of the Committee of the Crusade for Freedom. Dr. Benson's other activities are many and varied, but the two which I have mentioned bear directly upon my subject.

In addition, you have had the advantage of receiving training and guidance under a very fine faculty of unexcelled instructors. I can readily see they have done a good job and that you have responded admirably. Therefore, I do not hesitate to confront you with this problem.

It is my good fortune to be a member of the Committee on Ways and Means in the House of Representatives. Our committee, as you know, among other things has jurisdiction of legislative matters relating to foreign trade. I can assure you there are few subjects in the Congress which are more controversial and about which there is more feeling than this. At the same time, our trade policy is one of the most vital phases of our entire foreign economic and political policies. These, in turn, are of utmost importance to our own national security and well-being.

In the field of foreign policy, every principle that is invoked, every policy that is applied, and every action that is taken must be directed, as a matter of enlightened self-interest, toward the promotion of our national security and the preservation of our freedom. No foreign policy which fails in these objectives deserves—nor will it long receive—the support of the American people. At the same time, if I may paraphrase a current expression, "What is good for the United States is good for the rest of the free nations of the world." The strength and security of the United States will be fostered in the world situation facing us only if the nations standing with us in our fight against aggression, subversion, and Godlessness are also strong and secure.

Several years ago I decided that we could no longer, either in our own interests or in the interests of the free nations of the world, continue our economic aid indefinitely. I fully supported the Marshall plan and similar programs, and, in my opinion, these programs have been the bargains we were told they would be. They helped restore the devastated areas of the world and put the free nations on their feet so that they are now in a position to pay their own way. However, we have passed the point where these aid programs are useful. Even though they may have been a bargain for us, they were costly to the taxpayers and have now become unpopular, even in the countries which were being aided. As a matter of self-respect, even a charity can outwear its welcome.

It is my belief that about the only place left for foreign aid today is that case where such aid is in the interest of and directly related to national defense. It is much too big a price to pay for us to attempt to continue to keep the economies of certain friendly nations of the world afloat artificially. I am convinced that the only means of insuring world peace is to permit the free nations to earn their own way. In this manner, we will have allies who will cooperate with us not as servants or followers, but as free and equal partners in a joint enterprise.

The policy decisions involved in reaching this solution to the mutual problems of the free nations are extremely difficult and must be arrived at methodically and carefully. I have no illusion about this. Our guidepost is our common interest in deterring the spread of communistic aggression and subversion.

Communistic aggression does not just challenge our freedom and security, but also our way of life, which is, and always has been, based upon religion. Communistic aggression challenges the roots of our strength and growth. We must withstand its spread. If humanly possible, we must, before it is too late, devise a plan that will save us as it saves other free peoples united with us.

The only stable and lasting basis for our stand is economic strength. The groundwork, certainly, consists of military and political phases. But these can only be as strong as the economies of our allies. The strength of any security of the free world is every bit as essential to the security of the United States as our own military and economic power. Our present economic power depends in part upon our capacity to produce and sell our present productive output. Sound allied economies can buy excess output which we cannot properly use.

The best means of achieving sound economies for our allies is for us to do everything we possibly can to help them to become self-sustaining. The best way of doing this is to apply the principles of our free enterprise system in our relations with the non-Soviet world. This will require cooperative action on its part. If accomplished, our economic power remains great. In the process, our allies become stronger.

It is the consensus of opinion among economists that the phenomenal growth of industries in the United States has been due to our free enterprise system. This system has created a continent-wide market for products and made mass production possible. We have the lowest production costs and yet the highest wage scales of any country in the world.

This system can work equally well on a worldwide basis, and it has been so successful for us it is hard to understand why we have not long ago practiced what we preach in our international relations. It is of concern to me that some of the people who defend our system of free competitive enterprise at home are often among the ones who abhor the thoughts of applying it in our relations with the rest of the world. It is only in this way that men and resources can be more fully and efficiently employed and the standard of living for all Americans enhanced.

The idea that our great industries would be materially damaged by competition from abroad under an extension of the free enterprise system is hard for me to accept. Most of the competing industries are operated on a smaller scale and are greatly behind ours in equipment, efficiency, and capacity for volume output. It is a matter of simple economics that our own national interests would be far better served if we permitted others to trade with us on as near as possible the same basis as we trade among ourselves.

A statement by President Wilson in his tariff message to the Congress as long ago as the spring of 1913 very aptly expressed his feelings on this subject:

"We have seen our tariff legislation wander very far afield in our day. * * * We long ago passed beyond the modest notion of 'protecting' the industries of the country and moved boldly forward to the idea that they were entitled to the direct patronage of the Government. * * * Consciously or unconsciously, we have built up a set of privileges and exemptions from competition * * * until at last nothing is obliged to stand the tests of efficiency and economy, in our world of big business, but everything thrives by concerted arrangement. * * * Aside from the duties laid upon * * * luxuries and merely for the sake of the revenue they yield, the object of the tariff duties henceforth laid must be effective competition, the whetting of American wits by contest with the wits of the rest of the world."

I am very pleased that the National Council of Churches of Christ in America fully supports the economic approach as a means of realistically facing the problems created by the present world situation. In "A Message to the Churches from the National Study Conference on the Churches and World Order" in November 1953, it was stated in part:

"We believe that a willingness upon the part of the United States to accept more imports not only is economically and morally the logical resultant of our creditor position but also is beneficial both to the world economy and to our own. By increasing our imports we can reduce the necessity for foreign economic aid."

The only way that the economic approach can be used is for the free nations of the world to cooperate in trading with each other on a basis that is mutually advantageous to them all.

The best way of furthering the cause of communism in the world, and I do not have to tell you that this is the biggest cause of concern in our Nation today, is to isolate the other free nations of the world between an iron curtain and a tariff and trade restriction curtain. One of the best-known tenets in military operations is to divide and conquer. The Communists hope to achieve world conquest not so much by military operations as by dissension within and among the free nations. One of the best ways of creating this dissension is through unnecessary and artificial barriers against the free flow of foreign trade.

Stalin himself, just before his death, recognized this source of weakness when he stated:

"The most important result of the Second World War in its economic consequences must be considered the disintegration of a united, all-embracing world market. This circumstance determined further the deepening of the general crisis of the capitalist system.

* * * * *

"But from this it follows that the sphere of application of the forces of the chief capitalist countries to the world resources will not expand but will contract, that conditions of the world market of sale for these countries will grow worse, and idleness of enterprises in these countries will increase. In this, properly speaking, there consists a deepening of the general crisis of the world capitalist system in connection with the disintegration of the world market."

Malenkov even more explicitly expressed his feeling of happy anticipation of trade conflicts and restrictions among the free nations of the world when he said:

"American imperialism is acting today, not only as an international exploiter and enslaver of nations, but also as a force that is disrupting the economies of the other capitalist countries * * * boosting their exports through the most unscrupulous dumping while at the same time closing their home markets to foreign goods. The economic policy pursued by American imperialists is bound to aggravate the antagonism between the United States and other capitalist countries."

Though we do not agree, these statements properly describe us.

We can realize the dangers involved in these statements when we know that the very survival of a nation as a free one can depend upon its being able to stay away from the tentacles of the Russian octopus. The best way to insure this protection is a realistic attitude on the part of the free nations as to their foreign trade. To be specific, look at Japan. With an arable land area less than that of California and with 80 million people, Japan must trade in order to live. If this country and other nations outside the Soviet bloc make it impossible for Japan to trade with us, the only alternative is trade with Communist China along with Russia and her satellites. This is not pleasant to anticipate. There are already enough troubles in the Far East, without losing Japan to our cause.

It is very difficult for us to realize the effect on the economies of the free world caused by a very small ripple in our economy. This ripple can hit their shores as a tidal wave. The position of leadership and economic importance of the United States is all important. The mild recession which we experienced in the last half of 1949 reduced our gross national product by 3.4 percent only. However, exports to the United States from the Western European countries dropped 22 percent; from Chile, 36 percent; and from Australia, 34 percent. The effect on the economies of these countries, as we can see, was magnified when the small adjustment in our own economy took place.

The very introduction of a bill in Congress which might affect imports from our allies causes them very serious concern, even though in most cases it goes practically unnoticed in this country. This psychological reaction indicates how important it is for us to assure the free nations that they can depend upon us to do our part in using the economic weapon which is available to us all in our fight for survival. The direction in which we move or indicate we are about to move in our foreign-trade policy is even more important in many instances than the actual height of our tariffs, or the impediments which our customs regulations and laws have erected against imports.

I am very concerned about the direction in which many of the Members of Congress have indicated they would like to see our trade policy turn. The clamor for less, rather than more, foreign trade has grown considerably in the last 2 years. We are certainly not acting as we are talking to the other nations in our efforts to encourage foreign trade. For instance, the present resurgence of protectionism in this country presents the curious spectacle of the United States denouncing, as it should, its allies for trading with communistic areas, while at the same time many are urging that we increase our own trade barriers so as to deny them the only other market to which they can turn. These individuals must not realize the consequences of such action. Nothing could please the Communists more than for us to continue such an unrealistic approach to our world problems. Instead of taking full advantage of our greatest of all weapons in stopping the Communists—economic strength through freer trade—we are pervert this weapon so that it may become the strongest weapon which the Communists have against us. Unless we stop this retreat from our recent attitudes on foreign trade, we stand to lose as much as, or more than, any other country in the world. In fact, we haven, to begin with, more to lose. Thus we stand to gain the most by preserving what we have and improving it.

We must realize that the United States exports 20 percent of all of the goods in world trade, and imports 15 percent. Our stake in this trade is high. At home, we have practiced the doctrine of expanding production and trade, and we have reached a height of prosperity no other nation has ever known. This same doctrine can and should be applied to the greatest plausible extent in our international dealings.

A very substantial part of the markets for our production is in foreign countries. I repeat the truism, "We cannot sell where we do not buy." We should allow other nations to earn their dollars honestly and economically. This is vital to our common defense and the achievement of world peace.

By this, I am not advocating that we surrender our markets to foreign goods, but I am advocating that we permit competition on a fair basis without unreasonable and artificial handicaps. Proper recognition should be given to those segments of American industry which would be adversely affected if imports are increased. It is just as unrealistic to advocate the scrapping of our tariff overnight as it is to clamor for protection from foreign competition at every turn.

Many people either do not realize, or forget, our own selfish interest in expanded foreign trade. We are increasingly dependent on raw materials from abroad, both to conserve our own resources and to assure an adequate and increasing supply of the ones we lack in sufficient quantities. We must remember that we neither are self-sufficient nor do we possess unlimited resources.

Even in those cases where we do produce goods similar to those which we can import, we must remember that fair competition is not a disadvantage but, on the contrary, is an economic stimulus which has made our country strong and can now strengthen the whole free world.

Our conceivable alternatives to a fair exchange of goods with other nations are—either our taxpayers must continue to underwrite the military efforts of our allies, or that we must by virtue of cutting down on imports reduce the markets for our own exports, and this would mean cutting down the number of job opportunities for the young people of America.

At the present time, our exports fall far short of what they should and could be, and our imports are not large enough even to sustain exports at their present level. We also have a large investment in the Marshall Plan, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, and other foreign-air programs which should be protected. These programs have done much to solidify the nations of the free world, but this can easily be undermined unless we now use every available economic means of strengthening the economies of the free world.

Their economic strength is even more important than their military strength, in the long run. Our whole foreign policy can be undermined by our trade policies. Our industrial, economic, military, and political strength are all important in deterring communism. But we can have neither industrial, military, nor political strength without economic strength. An expanding system of free enterprise is, therefore, in my humble opinion, the great weapon we must use if we are to succeed in stopping communism, as we must if our system is to survive here in America.

Success never seems to take the road of easy living and shallow thinking. It has traveled the American road throughout our history because young people have always come forth with new determination, zeal and initiative. Such young people overcame problems as great in their day as are our problems today. They asked only an opportunity and knowledge of the facts. That opportunity is still yours, and the facts are before you. Your friends have great confidence that you are of the same fiber, determination and zeal. It is worthwhile preserving the American Way of Life and the virtues it embraces. I have every confidence you will do your part, and more.

I desire to congratulate each of you on your achievements to date as marked by this occasion and to extend my sincere best wishes as you proceed into the richer and fuller life which we know each of you will experience in the days ahead. You will go forth as exponents of the free enterprise system. Please demand that this system be fully used to combat communism wherever it may appear.

Contradictions in Official Statements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 15, 1954

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, for some time I have been calling attention to the confusion existing from conflicting and contradicting statements from the administration relative to our foreign and military policy.

Such statements, however, continue to be made. The citizens we represent become more confused each day.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I want to include two items from the Washington Post and Times Herald of April 19. One is a column by Walter Lippmann discussing the confusion resulting from Vice President Nixon's speech before the American Society of Newspaper Editors. The other is a news story by James Marlow, which lists some of the more glaring of the contradictions:

TODAY AND TOMORROW

(By Walter Lippmann)

MR. NIXON'S REMARKS

While Mr. Nixon's speech to the American Society of Newspaper Editors had much of the appearance of being a calculated indiscretion, I find it hard to believe that it was calculated. For his remarks were an assortment of ideas and attitudes—things he learned on his trip, hypothetical questions he has heard discussed—which manifestly have not been added up to make anything that could be called a considered and coherent policy.

How, for example, are we to reconcile what he seemed to be saying to the editors on Friday about dispatching troops if the French withdraw with what he said in his big television speech on March 15, a month ago:

"Since our former policy failed we then asked ourselves the question: what kind of a new policy should we announce? And in determining what that policy should be we decided to find out what the men in the Kremlin were up to.

"We found that militarily their plan apparently was to destroy us by drawing us into little wars all over the world with their satellites, however, where they, themselves, were not involved, and where, due to our inability to bring to bear our great superiority on the sea and in the air that we were unable to win those wars. * * * we decided that we would not fall into these traps * * * that we would not 'let the Communists nibble us to death all over the world in little wars.' "

What has happened in the past month to cause the Vice President to announce that he is prepared to eat his own words? The assault on Dien Bien Phu and the military reports from General Ely and M. Pleven have brought a sudden realization in Washington that the French Government is determined to try to negotiate an armistice. Suddenly there has been a reappraisal of an old and not greatly changed situation. The notion, always an illusion and always fabricated, that there was a plan to win the war—and that we were backing that plan—has suddenly given way to a sense of what has really been going on in Indochina.

When Mr. Nixon made his television speech, the whole Indochinese policy in Washington was based on a false estimate of the situation in Indochina. That was why he could say in March that "during the 1 year of the Eisenhower administration in not one area of the world have the Communists made a significant gain," and to promise that the new policy was working so well that there would be no need of "having more Korean type of wars all over the world." Now that the estimate has been discredited, and with it the policy based on it, a radical revision of policy has become necessary.

That is what Mr. Dulles has been laboring at—laboring under the greatest difficulties at home and abroad. A new policy cannot be improvised suddenly in so enormously complex a situation and under such very fluid conditions. A new policy can be arrived at only gradually by careful and astute testing of what is for American diplomacy a new ground.

Any idea that a new policy was formulated and decreed in the National Security Council one fine day recently or that Mr. Nixon has announced that policy cannot be true.

The more one searches Mr. Nixon's remarks, the more obvious it is that there is no policy behind them. Determination to oppose the domination of southeast Asia by the Communist powers is not a policy; it is an objective, necessary and desirable, which requires a workable policy to achieve it. Making up one's mind that under certain circumstances we might have to dispatch forces to Indochina is not a policy. It is an element in the implementation of a policy which has yet to be formed.

The evidence for saying that Mr. Nixon's remarks are not a new policy is that he begged all the difficult questions to which a policy would have to give the answers. "More men are needed," he said, "they will not come from France which is tired of the war, as we were tired of Korea." The men should come "from Vietnam, Cambodia, Laos, particularly Vietnam." But beside the difficulty of training these men, about which the French are slow and unresponsive, there is the "more difficult" problem of inducing the Vietnamese "to fight with more spirit." Some say that they would fight with more spirit if they were fighting for independence. But they "lack the ability to conduct a war by themselves or to govern themselves."

Here Mr. Nixon was close to the crucial questions which a policy will have to answer. If the Vietnamese "lack the ability to conduct a war and govern themselves," and since, as Mr. Nixon said, "if the French withdraw, Indochina would become Communist-dominated within a month," how do we resolve the dilemma? The Indochinese must have independence in order to fight but they cannot conduct a war and govern themselves alone.

There is no way out of this dilemma if we ask ourselves the unrealistic question—how will the Vietnamese carry on the war if the French withdraw? There is no answer to a question of how to continue the war based on the hypothesis of a French withdrawal from the war.

The French are the government and they are the army in Vietnam. Were they to withdraw, the Vietnamese Army would consist of battalions without effective commanders much above the regimental level. There would be no civil authority at the national level.

Any notion that the French could go out and that we could go in—with the civil war being fought—is an hallucination. Such a changeover would be an enormously elaborate and long operation. For all practical purposes the Americans could not go into Indochina unless the French remain. For it is the French who provide the government and the military power in all the places where we could go in. They are, moreover, we should not forget, the sovereign power.

For this fundamental reason, which I believe cannot be effectively disputed, the only military policy we can have in Indochina is one founded upon collaboration with France. It will have to be the willing collaboration of France. That willing collaboration cannot conceivably be won if we go to Geneva, as Mr. Nixon appears to want, determined in advance not to negotiate about the armistice we promised to go there to negotiate about. I say this though I share his view that partition and coalition are not acceptable solutions. That is very different, however, from trying to rule out in advance any negotiated settlement.

To do that would be mischievous indeed. For Mr. Dulles would have to go to Geneva with the impression fixed all over the world that the United States is opposed to a negotiated armistice. Then the psychological victory at Geneva is guaranteed in advance to the Communists. They cannot lose. Our talkative politicians will have presented them with an impregnable position from which to isolate us from all the peoples who are yearning for peace in Asia, and from our allies who want peace too.

IKE PRESS TALK PREVIEWED—DEPLORES MISUNDERSTANDINGS

(By James Marlow)

White House Press Secretary James C. Hagerty, in an unusual preview, has explained what President Eisenhower will say in a New York speech Thursday night to the American Newspaper Publishers Association.

Hagerty told newsmen: "The President will say that misconceptions of the aims and aspirations of America as well as those of other free nations reported and circulated here and abroad often cause needless misunderstandings and frictions between the governments and the peoples of the free world."

Some recent misunderstandings might have been avoided if members of Mr. Eisenhower's official family had (a) compared notes before they talked on the administration's foreign policy and (b) talked in language clear enough to be unmistakable.

Mr. Eisenhower himself, Secretary of State John Foster Dulles, and Vice President Nixon in the past few months have made statements which caused confusion and required later clarification. Some of the statements even appeared contradictory.

TALKED OF NEW LOOK

Nixon, in a nationwide TV and radio broadcast March 13, talked of the administration's new look in meeting Communist aggression abroad and said:

"We decided we would not fall into * * * traps, and so we adopted a new plan * * * Rather than let the Communists nibble us to death all over the world in little wars we would reply in the future primarily on our massive, mobile, retaliatory power which we could use at our own discretion against the major sources of aggression at times and places that we can choose."

On April 16 Nixon spoke to the American Society of Newspaper Editors, and in answer to a question said the United States might have to send troops into Indochina if the French quit fighting the Communist-led Vietminh there.

This seemed to be saying the United States might get involved in the very kind of little war which might "nibble us to death" against which Nixon cautioned a month before.

Some Members of Congress immediately said this country shouldn't send troops into Indochina. Others wanted to know if Nixon was really speaking for Eisenhower.

The State Department issued a statement. Without naming Nixon, it said he was only "stating a course of possible action which he was personally prepared to support under a highly unlikely hypothesis."

This was State Department language for saying Nixon expressed a view only on what could be done in Indochina if the French quit, although it's unlikely they will quit. As of now it isn't clear whether Nixon was floating a trial balloon to sound out sentiment or was expressing thinking of the administration.

But what, then, did Nixon mean in his March 13 talk when he mentioned this country's "massive, mobile, retaliatory power which we could use at our own discretion against the major sources of aggression"?

The very words he used—"massive" and "retaliatory"—were right out of a speech Dulles made last January 12.

In that one Dulles talked of this country's "capacity" to retaliate "instantly" and "massively" if the Communists attacked anywhere. That speech caused confusion here and abroad.

STRESSES CAPACITY

On March 19, 6 days after Nixon's speech, Dulles was questioned 3 hours by the Senate's Foreign Relations Committee. Did this "instant" and "massive" retaliation mean atom-bombing China or Russia for a Communist attack anywhere?

Not necessarily, Dulles said. He said he wanted to emphasize in his January 12 talk not the word "instantly" so much as the word "capacity" to retaliste instantly.

On March 29, in another speech, Dulles called for "united action" against communism in southern Asia. Then he dashed off last week to London and Paris to get promises of united action from the French and British. They promised only to look into it.

Meanwhile, in March Mr. Eisenhower told a news conference this country would not get into a war unless Congress declared it.

Dulles, in a news conference and a magazine article, said under some circumstances, such as an attack on American allies in Europe, Eisenhower could order a counterattack without waiting for Congress.

At another news conference March 17 Mr. Eisenhower tried to explain what he meant the first time by saying that if this country was attacked he wouldn't have to wait for Congress.

The Fair Labor Standards Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES G. OAKMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 15, 1954

Mr. OAKMAN. Mr. Speaker, today Representative Charles J. Kersten, of Wisconsin, and I have introduced bills intended to clarify certain provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act regarding profit-sharing plans and trusts and the computation of overtime pay for employees covered thereunder.

In 1949 the act was amended and certain items were specifically excluded from the definition of regular rates of pay. Thus, section 7 (d) (3) of the amended act excludes amounts paid pursuant to a bona fide profit-sharing plan or trust meeting the requirements of the Wage and Hour Administrator set forth in appropriate regulations issued by him. Section 7 (d) (4) excludes contributions made to a bona fide employee benefit plan.

In his interpretation of section 7 (d) (4) the Wage and Hour Administrator recognizes that a plan which is qualified for tax purposes under section 165 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code is a bona fide benefit plan—with one reservation—for wage and hour purposes. On the other hand his profit-sharing regulations under section 7 (d) (3) define the term "bona fide profit-sharing trust" in such a way that most trusts are disqualified even though they are qualified for tax purposes. Many such trusts were in existence for a number of years before 1949 and had fully complied with the detailed requirements of section 165 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code as amended in 1942. Clearly it was the intention of Congress that they should be treated as bona fide trusts by the Wage and Hour Administrator.

Without detracting in any way from the validity of the Administrator's interpretation of section 7 (d) (4) of the Fair Labor Standards Act, the proposed bill corrects the existing situation caused by the profit-sharing regulations under section 7 (d) (3) by providing that profit-sharing trusts which qualify for tax purposes must be considered bona fide trusts under the Fair Labor Standards Act. The proposed bill leaves the Administrator with authority to prescribe regulations for deferred profit-sharing trusts which are not qualified for tax purposes and profit-sharing plans where payment is made directly to the employee without the intervention of a trust.

The effect of the ruling of the Wage and Hour Administrator in requiring that certain amounts paid under profit-sharing plans be considered part of the regular compensation of the employee is to discourage many employers from entering into profit-sharing plans. Normally, it is a simple matter for an employer to compute the time and one-half he is obliged to pay his employees for overtime work under the Fair Labor Standards Act. However, when amounts paid or credited to an employee under a profit-sharing plan must be considered a part of the regular pay of an employee, the computation of his overtime pay presents a complex and difficult mathematical problem.

Thus, many employers, rather than run the risk of violating the Fair Labor Standards Act, may abandon their intention of inaugurating a profit-sharing plan.

The very fact that Congress has provided certain tax concessions with respect to profit-sharing plans, shows clearly the intent of Congress to encourage profit sharing. Furthermore, when Congress specifically exempted payments under bona fide profit-sharing plans from consideration as the regular pay under the Fair Labor Standards Act, it was also intended to encourage profit sharing by removing impediments to the adoption of profit-sharing plans in industry.

I believe that Congress clearly intended that a profit-sharing plan which qualified for tax concessions under the tax laws would also be considered a bona fide profit-sharing plan under the Fair Labor Standards Act. Congress surely did not intend to create two standards of qualified profit-sharing plans. The effect of the ruling of the Wage and Hour Administrator is to reestablish the impediment to profit sharing which Congress clearly intended to remove. The purpose of the bills which Mr. Kersten and I have introduced today is to clarify the position which Congress intended in the first instance and thereby require the Wage and Hour Administrator to regard any profit-sharing plan which qualifies under section 165 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code to also be qualified under section 7 (d) (3) of the Fair Labor Standards Act as amended.

He Who Controls Rice Controls Asia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER ROGERS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 15, 1954

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, June 10, the Wellington Leader, an outstanding newspaper in one of the fine communities of west Texas, reprinted an editorial that had been printed in 1950. The title of this editorial is "He Who Controls Rice Controls Asia." The developments in the Orient reveal the splendid foresight of the writer of this editorial and make its reprint most appropriate. It is with pleasure that I insert it in the Congressional Record so that those of the Congress, and others having access to the Record, may be benefited by it:

HE WHO CONTROLS RICE CONTROLS ASIA

(Editor's note.—This editorial was originally printed in the Wellington Leader in 1950; but in the light of recent events in Indochina, the rice bowl of Asia, we believe it is worth printing a second time.)

Most Americans consider rice as something to be thrown at weddings, a nice supplement for chicken chow mein and something to be used sparingly with ham gravy or once in a while cooked into rice pudding. It is the one cereal that we can take or leave alone.

But the cold hard facts happen to be that to the majority of the people of the world rice happens to be the most important food. Rice is the basic food of more than half the world's population. In the Orient, rice is virtually the only food of millions of people—their means of sustaining life.

It is a matter of life or death to them. The nation that controls the supply of rice will control the destiny of the entire Asiatic orbit, according to one school of thought.

This is not to minimize the importance of rubber, tin, and oil that comes from those areas; but there is enough weight to the importance of rice in the Orient to cause us to pause and give it some thought.

This school of thought believes that the primary objective of the Communist aggression in Asia is to gain possession of the rice-producing areas of the Far East. There are four principal rice-surplus countries in Asia. They are South Korea, Indochina, Thailand, and Burma. The Communists started in South Korea. Next came Indochina. The Communists are waging war in the rice-producing areas. Will Thailand and Burma be next?

Not yet have they provoked war over oil; but some of the richest oilfields in the world lie directly south of their border.

This might be well for us to think about as we contemplate sending millions of dollars' worth of food to the starving in India. They don't eat beef; because the cow is

2

sacred to them. They are not wheat or corn eaters. They are rice eaters. About all we could do would be to send them dollars with which to buy rice, and considering the corruption and despotism that is taken for granted in Asia, you can be sure that very few of these dollars would be translated into rice for the starving.

The rulers of the Kremlin do know about the importance of rice in the Orient. But they don't intend to give away any rice. They want to control it. Their thinking on rice is as realistic as it is on other goals if there can be any realism in a power-mad tyranny that is willing to risk its own nation in the hope of enslaving the world.

It is logical to believe that they can't do it; but it is also sensible to learn as much as we can about every goal they seek and to combat them at each point where we can do the most good for our cause even though it may be no more dramatic than a better understanding of a little grain of rice.

The H-bomb Decision

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 15, 1954

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, there has been much loose talk recently about the decision to proceed with the development of the hydrogen bomb. The hindsight hatchet men are again on the warpath, proclaiming wisdom they probably would not have had in past situations.

One of the outstanding facts about this H-bomb development question was that two of the men who were largely responsible for the decision, in 1950, to proceed with the development of a thermonuclear device—H-bomb—were former President Harry S. Truman, and former Secretary of State Dean G. Acheson. Let these men have the credit they deserve, along with Admiral Strauss and others, for this decision. But let us keep in mind there were honorable men who had serious misgivings about the decision at the time.

And let us hope that ours will never become a Nation where our top officials fear to disagree or dissent on major decisions such as these for fear of later punishment or being charged with disloyalty, or treason. We must never reach that state of political sterility.

I include in the Record an article on the H-bomb decision which appeared in the New York Times on April 8, 1954, by James Reston, and an editorial from the same edition:

The H-Bomb Decision: Fight on Production of the Super Weapon Went On in Capital for 4 Months, 8 Days

(By James Reston)

Yesterday's statements by President Eisenhower, former President Truman, and members of the Joint Atomic Energy Committee on Captol Hill don't begin to tell the fantastic story of the United States Government's decision to make the first hydrogen bomb.

Nevertheless, enough is know to throw some light on Senator Joseph R. McCarthy's charge that the decision to produce the bomb was held up for 18 months—maybe long enough, he suggested, to jeopardize the fate of the United States.

Conversations with several of the principals in the case in the last 24 hours seem to confirm these things:

The fight in the Capital went on actively, not for 18 months, as Senator McCarthy charged, but for 4 months and 8 days—between the announcement in Washington of the explosion of the first Soviet A-bomb on September 23, 1949, and the White House announcement on January 31, 1950, that the United states planned to try to manufacture the hydrogen bomb.

This fight developed within the Atomic Energy Commission almost as soon as the Soviet A-bomb was detected—years before official Washington expected it—and ended in two remarkable meetings in Washington on the last day of January 1950.

The first of these meetings took place in the office of the National Security Council, Room 216, Old State Department Building on Pennsylvania Avenue.

Present at this meeting were the three men who had been designated by President Truman to recommend what to do about the H-bomb: Dean Acheson, who was then Secretary of State, his personal enemy, Louis Johnson, who was then Secretary of Defense, and David E. Lilienthal, then Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission.

Also in attendance were: Gen. Omar Bradley, then Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff; Adm. Sidney W. Souers, then on the National Security Council; Dr. Henry Smyth, of the Atomic Energy Commission; and Gen. James Burns, of Secretary Johnsons Staff.

STATEMENTS ARE BLENDED

Though Secretaries Johnson and Acheson fought about many things in those days they were both in favor of proceeding with the manufacture of the hydrogen bomb. Like Rear Adm. Lewis L. Strauss, then a commissioner on the AEC, who provided impetus for making the H-bomb, Messrs. Johnson and Acheson favored proceeding at once.

Each came to the room 216 meeting with a draft statement for the President to make, ordering the AEC to go ahead with the experiment, and these were blended, but Mr. Lilienthal produced what was called "alternate C," which read as follows:

"That the President direct the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Defense to undertake a reexamination of our objectives in peace and war and of the effect of these objectives on our strategic plans in the light of the probable fission bomb (atom bomb) capabilities and the possible thermonuclear bomb capability of the Soviet Union."

Alternate "C" covered a lot of arguments against going ahead with the bomb, some of them technical, some of them philosophical. The main theme, put forward by Mr. Lilienthal, however, was this:

Merely to counter the Soviet A-bomb with a United States H-bomb would not increase our security but in the long run step up the atomic and hydrogen bomb race and decrease our security.

To proceed with the H-bomb would perpetuate the illusion that these "super" weapons were the answer to our defense problem, and postpone the day when we would face up to the weakness of the rest of the Military Establishment.

Consequently, we should not decide to go forward with the H-bomb immediately, but (a) improve the A-weapon, (b) concentrate on creating a larger and more mobile family of atomic weapons, (c) build up the Air Force and meanwhile revive the efforts with the Allies and the Russians to control all weapons of mass annihilation.

MORAL ASPECT STRESSED

Some of those who were in the "216" meetnow assert that Mr. Lilienthal's arguments before and after the President's decision to proceed with the bomb changed; that he concentrated on the moral aspects of the argument until after the President decided to go ahead.

Nevertheless he felt—and he had strong support from Dr. J. R. Oppenheimer, Dr. James B. Conant and other members of the General Advisory Committee—that to proceed with the H-bomb would create an atmosphere in which it would be impossible to work out a world agreement for the control of these superweapons.

Mr. Acheson and Mr. Johnson, however, carried the day. At 12:15 p. m., Mr. Johnson proposed that they take the question to the White House; a few words were written into the Johnson draft paying vague respects to the necessity to "examine all those factors that affect our program for peace and this country's security," and the statement was carried across the street to Mr. Truman.

There the second meeting took place, but it was marked, not by the drama of the first, but by anticlimax. The President listened to the recommendations of the three, accepted the Johnson-Acheson position, and rejected the idea of holding up the H-bomb order pending the review Mr. Lilienthal had requested. The meeting lasted less than 10 minutes and the President released the statement that afternoon.

McCarthy and the H-Bomb

"If there were no Communists in our Government why did we delay for 18 months—delay our research on the hydrogen bomb, even though our intelligence agencies were reporting day after day that the Russians were feverishly pushing their development of the hydrogen bomb?" So asked Senator Joseph R. McCarthy in the course of a broadcast attack on Edward R. Murrow.

The question was framed with a deliberate and characteristic disregard of facts published again and again. There was no delay, and nothing save the utmost dispatch, once the decision to produce the H-bomb was reached, and this was doubtless the point that President Eisenhower had in mind when he commented on the matter yesterday. There was, however, some earlier delay in reaching the decision to go ahead, and this for the good reason that in 1949 it was not certain that a hydrogen bomb could be produced.

The Atomic Energy Commission of that period was divided on the advisability of proceeding with the H-bomb. David Lilienthal, the Chairman, was against the bomb; Adm. Lewis L. Strauss urged that work begin immediately. Other members were undecided. The ablest physicists in the country were therefore summoned to give their advice. There was Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer, who doubted if the flash of heat generated by the A-bomb trigger would last long enough to transmute hydrogen into helium in a terrific explosion and pointed out that the supply of uranium was not unlimited, and that the H-bomb would be appallingly expensive. Dr. Oppenheimer was in charge of the Los Alamos laboratory and made a brilliant wartime record there. There were other trusted and experienced experts who shared these views.

That "our intelligence agencies were reporting day after day that the Russians were feverishly pushing their development of the hydrogen bomb" is highly dubious. Has the Senator free access to the reports sent from abroad by our intelligence agencies? It is obvious that his wild charge is based on Admiral Strauss' recent candid statement that the Russians were indeed applying themselves to the H-bomb problem before we did. But how far ahead of us were they? We doubt if even the Senator's imagination can supply the answer. It was the confession of Klaus Fuchs and the support of Enrico Fermi and Edward Teller, two of the most distinguished physicists of our time, that enabled Admiral Strauss to win the day.

On January 31, 1950, President Truman gave the order to proceed with the so-called hydrogen or superbomb.

All of which shows that when the Senator puts his mind to it teletype operators can become code clerks and scientists become Communists in Government positions or the victims of communistic blandishments.

Red Arms for Guatemala

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER ROGERS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 15, 1954

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the Memphis Democrat, of Memphis, Tex., an outstanding weekly newspaper in a thriving west Texas community, recently published an editorial entitled "Red Arms for Guatemala." This splendid editorial points up the situation which we in this country must face. It is with pride that I make it available to the Members of the Congress and everyone who has the opportunity to read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

RED ARMS FOR GUATEMALA

The United States Government is justifiably disturbed over the recent unloading at a Guatemalan port of $10 million worth of Communist arms and ammunition.

For anyone at all familiar with Communist tactics and aims knows that this action likely will mean trouble in the future, possibly involving bloodshed, unless enough pressure can be put on the Reds—including Moscow masterminds—to thwart Soviet expansionist intentions in the Western Hemisphere.

The Communists began spreading their power and control in other parts of the globe during the Second World War and have continued this policy ever since.

This was serious enough when it was restricted to foreign countries but it is much more so, now that the Reds have extended their operations to this hemisphere—a direct challenge to the Monroe Doctrine.

President Monroe presented the principle of the Doctrine to Congress in 1823 and the United States has followed it since then. In substance, it states that this country is the paramount power in the Western Hemisphere and will regard any attempt on the part of a European power (this probably would be expanded to include any foreign country) to obtain a foothold by conquest or to acquire any new establishment on the American Continent as an act hostile to the United States.

This policy was adopted by our Government to circumvent actions or possible actions which would be considered detrimental to the best interests of this Nation and this hemisphere.

Now this fundamental belief of our country is being tested again. Leaders in Washington no doubt are watching the Guatemalan situation closely and in the meantime are devoting a great deal of time to working out plans for meeting any dangerous developments.

We are a peace-loving people, who value our lives and the lives of other human beings. Communist leaders, on the other hand, have little regard for their peoples, mercilessly sacrificing them in the Soviet bid for world domination.

This regard of ours for humans apparently has worked to the advantage of the Reds, based on their gains within recent years.

It may be that the time has come when we are going to have to reappraise the world situation, now that the Communists have moved into one of the countries in our part of the globe.

We may be forced, regardless of our normal feeling, to tell the Soviets that, as far as we are concerned, the Monroe Doctrine is still in effect, and that if they, or their tools, undertake to use force in the Western Hemisphere, they will do so at their risk.

This will be a difficult decision to make but should be less dangerous, it seems to us, than to open the door to piece-by-piece territorial grabs, such as the Reds have made in other sections of the world.

Federal Income Exceeded Expenditures 5 of Last 8 Years

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 15, 1954

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, we have been subject to a great deal of propaganda over the years about the budget.

Perhaps the most intense barrage of propaganda about the budget came during the 1952 campaign, and it has continued since.

The gist of the propaganda has been that the Truman administration unbalanced the budget and that the Republican administration would balance it, and most recently that the Republican administration has been balancing it.

I think the record will show this to be completely false. On March 24 the Washington Daily News published a letter from Sidney Koretz, pointing out that the cash budget, which is what the administration has been talking about, was balanced during 5 of the 8 calendar years, 1946 through 1953.

Now I did not wish to take Mr. Koretz' data as accurate, so I requested the Legislative Reference Service to verify them. I was advised that this has been difficult since no source was given by Mr. Koretz. The Legislative Reference Service has given me, however, official Treasury Department figures for the calendar years 1946 through 1953, and, while not entirely consistent with the data of Mr. Korentz, they tell virtually the same story.

For the 8 years covered by the Treasury data, cash operating income of the Government exceeded cash operating outgo by $6,862,000,000.

I include both Mr. Koretz' letter to the editor, and the letter to me from Mr. Ernest S. Griffith, Director, Legislative Reference Service.

I should like to invite the attention of Members to one paragraph of Mr. Koretz' letter:

> It has been dinned into our ears that the Federal budget, which according to your rules now spells inflation, is the surest indicator of the state of the economy. Yet the largest deficit in peacetime history, that of fiscal 1953 came at the point of economic downturn. On the other hand, our worst inflation did not result from Government borrowing, as you say. It took place during fiscal 1951, when there was a sizable surplus in the Federal budget.

I think this is particularly pertinent in view of a recent speech by former President Herbert Hoover, who now holds a high post in the councils of the present administration. Mr. Hoover, talking to a convention of newspaper editors, said that governmental budgetary deficits mean inflation, while a balanced budget spells deflation. The figures would indicate that Mr. Hoover is once again wrong in his interpretation of current economic indicators.

The above-mentioned follows:

[From the Washington Daily News of March 24, 1954]

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

THE TRUMAN BUDGET WAS MISUNDERSTOOD

One of the differences between the economic situation in 1929 and now is the huge Federal debt. You have been feeding us woe about how this debt is "bankrupting" the Nation now, in your March 22 editorial Boon, Bust, and Taxes, suddenly you wake up to the importance of confidence.

The fact is that the Truman administration, after the war, did not spend more than it took in. These are the Federal cash receipts from and payments to the public in the indicated calendar years (in millions of dollars):

	Receipts	Payments	Surplus (+) or deficit (–)
1946	$41,441	$41,399	+$42
1947	44,282	38,616	+5,666
1948	44,922	36,897	+8,027
1949	41,346	42,642	–1,296
1950	42,419	41,969	+450
1951	59,278	58,034	+1,244
1952	71,339	72,980	–1,641
1953	70,382	76,541	–6,159

A reflection of the fact that, as a whole, the Truman administration succeeded in balancing its budget is the downward trend of the Federal debt, which grossed $278,700,000,000 at the end of 1945 and $267,400,000,000 at the end of 1952. The present administration promised that there would be a change from a regime of unbalanced budgets to one of balanced budgets. As things stand now, it looks like a change in the opposite direction.

It has been dinned into our ears that the Federal budget, which according to your rules now spells inflation, is the surest indicator of the state of the economy. Yet, the largest deficit in peacetime history, that of fiscal 1953, came at the point of economic downturn. On the other hand, our worst inflation did not result from Government borrowing, as you say. It took place during fiscal 1951, when there was a sizable surplus in the Federal budget.

We have been told that President Eisenhower is attempting to "put the Nation's finances into balance." The economy as a whole was "in balance" when this administration entered office. The problem was to prevent either inflation or deflation from getting the upper hand. There is nothing to be gained now from blinking the fact that it is the latter which is causing the greater apprehension.

While the goal of the balanced budget (though for how long is never mentioned) does on occasion offer a guide to proper fiscal policies, it throws little light on the operation of the economy as a whole. The budget of the Government is not the same thing as the economic budget of the Nation. Since, as you say, it is not solely the problem of the Federal Government, you should concern yourself more with the Nation's overall economic budget, which sets forth incomes and expenditures of consumers, business, and Government, and, following the lead of the Congressional Joint Committee on the Economic Report, ask whether it will be balanced at a high enough level to maximize employment and production. (This means an end to "hanging crepe" on deficits in the Government budget and the public debt (which represents assets to many) and keeping your eye on the ball, which is the performance of the economy rather than of outworn economic dogmas.)

SIDNEY KORTEZ.

THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS,
LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE SERVICE.
Washington, D. C., April 2, 1954.

HON. MELVIN PRICE,
United States House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRICE: One of the members of our staff has attempted to check the figures in the Letter to the Editor of the Washington Daily News as you requested. This has been difficult, since the source of the information in the letter is not given and figures vary depending on source used. For instance, those reported by the Bureau of the Budget and the Department of the Treasury on receipts from and payments to the public are not the same. However, the figures found in the letter are quite similar to, and in some respects identical with, amounts reported by the Treasury Department on a calendar-year basis. The amounts reported by the Treasury Department are given below in millions of dollars:

Calendar year	Cash operating		
	Income	Outgo	Net income or outgo (−)
1946	$41, 635	$41, 399	$236
1947	44, 319	38, 616	5, 703
1948	44, 971	36, 897	8, 076
1949	41, 374	42, 642	−1, 267
1950	42, 451	41, 969	482
1951	59, 338	58, 034	1, 304
1952	71, 396	72, 980	−1, 583
1953	70, 440	76, 529	−6, 089

The figures on the Federal debt have also been checked and are found to be correct.

Sincerely yours,

ERNEST S. GRIFFITH,
Director.

God and the Constitution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES W. TRIMBLE
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 15, 1954

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, Lt. Col. Paul L. Anderson, retired, a young officer of World War II and of service in Korea, lives at Rogers, Ark., in my district. Because of his hard service in Korea, he was retired for disability. He had a great part to do with the writing of the present Code of Military Justice for the Armed Forces. He is one of the brightest young men I have ever known and as loyal as they come. He is now practicing law in Rogers.

Some time ago he gave an address at the First Presbyterian Church in Fort Smith, Ark., which is so fundamentally sound, to my way of thinking, that I believe my colleagues would like to have it for study. I therefore insert it in the RECORD as part of my remarks:

GOD AND THE CONSTITUTION

"Except the Lord build the house, they labor in vain that build it" (Psalms 127: 1).

Along the bleak capes of the Virginia beach, not far below Fortress Monroe, there stands among the sand dunes a simple stone cross. A cross erected where Captain Newport and his weary immigrants first knelt on American soil in 1607 to give thanks to almighty God for a safe voyage. This band later sailed into what is now known as Hampton Roads and up what has since been named the James River to found Jamestown, the first permanent English settlement in America.

This simple stone cross is more to me than a marker of the place where these colonists first set foot on American soil. It is a symbol to me of the American faith in God, and the power of prayer that began there on that bleak shore has continued to the present day, and I pray may last forevermore. A faith that has meant so much in the formation and preservation of our Nation. A living faith, whether manifested by the formal worship of the Anglican, the solemn devotion of the Puritan, or the fervent zeal of the Scot. Faith in God and prayers that began that day launched America, a new nation under God; a nation where the principles, if not always the practices, have been Christian.

Other colonists followed these first in increasing numbers, and one by one, new colonies were formed until Georgia, in 1733, became the thirteenth. Thus, it can be said that the formal beginning of our colonial history was on the spot where Captain Newport and his colonists landed on the Virginia Capes in 1607. The formal ending can be said to have come 169 years later, when the Dclaration of Independence was signed in 1776. Few stop to realize that America had such a long colonial history before the adoption of our present Constitution.

The historic conditions that preceded the adoption of our Constitution are familiar to every reader of history. They arose from the lack of power in the Government to legislate and enforce at home such authority as it possessed, or to maintain its position as a sovereign nation abroad.

The Government, under Articles of Confederation, provided for a Congress with a single house where each colony had equal representation; a Government without an executive, without an adequate court, and without power to tax, to regulate commerce or to enforce its own laws; a Government in which the colonies had all of the real powers. This Congress could only supplicate; it could not enforce. This all worked fairly well, so long as the colonies were held in the common bond of war, but long before the economic disturbance had arisen, the voices of some statesmen were heard urging the necessity for a change.

George Washington, with his usual foresight, was among the first to see the danger that threatened the country. He and many others realized that steps had to be taken to perfect a more authoritative Government. As early as 1783, he had discussed this with friends at Mount Vernon. Afterward, he called together a group in 1785, and they decided, after long deliberation, to ask the colonies to meet at a conference at Annapolis in 1786 to iron out some difficulties that had arisen between Virginia and Maryland, and to lay a foundation for perfecting a more powerful Central Government. Nine States responded by appointing representatives, but only five actually sent them. The result was that nothing could be done save to send out a second more urgent appeal to all of the colonies to send delegates to a convention called to meet at Philadelphia on May 14, 1787, for the purpose of revising the failing Articles of Confederation.

When this date arrived 5 States were represented. These delegates waited until May 25, when delegates from 9 States had arrived. They then organized a convention and selected General Washington as chairman. Thus, the Constitutional Convention was first organized on May 25, 1787, in Independence Hall, Philadelphia, where on July 4, 1776, the Declaration of Independence had been signed. By May 28, 11 States were represented, and the next day, 12. Fifty-five delegates were present from twelve of the Thirteen Colonies.

The historian, Atwood, says: "This was the greatest body of men from the standpoint of physical vigor, mental acumen, and moral courage that ever met together for human achievement."

This assembly of delegates came at a time when the Nation was still under the happy influence of the Bible; a time when the word of God was felt among the people as a transforming power, and preached, not as a tradition, but as the very power and wisdom of God. When the forefathers of these men were fleeing from Old World tyranny, the Bible came with them. This Bible was their book of faith and morals, and from the free reading of the Bible, these men realized their own individual responsibility, their own dignity, and their equality with all before God.

Among these delegates were students who could discuss every government the world had known and were familiar with the great schools of human thought from Plato and Aristotle to Hobbs and Locke. They knew the struggles of their forefathers toward freedom. Eight had signed the Declaration of Independence, 6 had signed the Articles of Confederation, 5 had been, or were, State governors, and 4 had been in the Continental Congress.

The oldest member of the assembly was the venerable Benjamin Franklin, who was then 81. The youngest, Gilman, of New Hampshire, was 25. These were men of piety, learning, and wisdom. Men who, without exception, saw life clear and steady and whole; men of the highest attainment—moral, intellectual, and spiritual. It is always to such men that mankind owes the progress that comes in the slow, but steady, advance toward freedom. Historians—American, English, and foreign—have long agreed that no political assembly ever contained a larger proportion of members possessing high character, intellectual ability, and farsighted statesmanship. These were men whose forefathers had been inspired to sail away from all dominion but that of the Bible and such as arose from natural reason and justice.

It was a convention born not of controversy, but of consecreation; a convention composed of men of ripe scholarship and devoted piety who were able to transcend their times and make their works an inspiration for all succeeding ages.

President Ezra Stiles, of Yale, wrote, "This Convention embosomed some of the greatest characters in America."

Even the opponents of the Constitution paid tribute to the character of its framers.

Old George Mason, of Virginia, wrote, "America has certainly on this occasion drawn forth her first characters."

The problems before this assembly were numerous and difficult. Some of the people wanted a monarchy; others believed that the form of government should be republican, but that there should be three republics—one comprising New England, one the Middle States, and one the South; others were convinced that one nation—and it a republic—was the only solution.

How is it to be possible to combine peoples so distant from one another as New England

and Georgia, or Connecticut and Virginia?

(a) If we were to have one nation, upon what basis was the representation in Congress to be set up?

(b) Should there be more than one House of Congress, and if so, on what basis were its members to be selected?

(c) Should Congress regulate commerce, and if so, to what extent?

(d) Should there be one Chief Executive, or more, and how should he or they serve, and what should we call him or them?

(e) What about a supreme court, and how was it to be established?

(f) The question of slavery arose to plague the Convention. Were the slaves to be counted as population, and if so, on what basis?

These and many other problems pressed for solution. The delegates debated for weeks—at times, in anger. Rhode Island had not sent any delegates at all, and 11 of the New York delegates except Hamilton became angry and went home. At the end of 4 weeks, the Convention had agreed upon no single word of the Constitution. They were on the verge of adjourning in the midst of a heated discussion and abandoning the purpose for which they had met, when Benjamin Franklin, wisest man at the Convention, a man mature in years, ripe in wisdom and consummate in tact, arose and addressing George Washington, who was then the Chair, said:

"Mr. President, the slow progress we have made after weeks of close attention and continuing reasoning with each other, with different sentiments on almost every question, the last producing as many no's as aye's, is, methinks, melancholy proof of the imperfection of human understanding. We indeed seem to feel our own want of political wisdom, since we have been running all around in search of it. We have gone back to ancient history for models of government and examined the different forms of those republics which, having been formed with the seeds of their own dissolutions, now no longer exist, and we have viewed the modern states all around Europe, but find none of their constitutions suitable in our own circumstances. In this situation with the assembly groping, as it were, in the dark, to find political truth and scarce able to distinguish it when presented to us, how has it happened, sir, that we have not hitherto once thought of humbly applying to the Father of Light to illuminate our understanding. I have lived, sir, a long time, and the longer I live, the more convincing proofs I see of this truth that God governs in the affairs of men; and if a sparrow can not fall to the ground without His notice, is it probable that an empire can arise without His aid? We have been assured, sir, in the sacred writings that 'Except the Lord build the house, they labor in vain that build it.' I firmly believe this and I believe also that without His concurring aid, we shall succeed in this political building no better than the builders of Babel. We shall be divided by our little, partial, local interests. Our projects will be confounded, and we ourselves shall become a reproach and bye word down to future ages. And what is worse, mankind may hereafter, from this unfortunate instance, despair of establishing governments by human wisdom and leave it to chance, war, and conquest. I therefore beg leave to move that hereafter, prayer imploring the assistance of Heaven and its blessings on our deliberation be held in this Assembly every morning before we proceed to business."

From that moment, the Assembly began to make progress. One after another the troublous questions were settled, and by September 15, 1787, the Convention had completed its momentous work, and nothing was now left except the vote to adopt the new Constitution. On September 17, 1787, Franklin moved that it be unanimously adopted, but there were still some voices against it. Some who had failed in their appeal to the reason of the delegates now attempted to appeal to their fears, saying, "Unless you write into this Constitution some popular fallacies to fool and please the people, they will not adopt it."

Washington, who had taken no part in the discussion up to that point, rose from his chair and in tones of suppressed emotion, said: "It is too probable that no plan we propose will be adopted. Perhaps another dreadful conflict is to be sustained. If, to please the people, we offer what we ourselves disapprove, how can we afterwards defend our work? Let us raise a standard to which the wise and honest can repair. The event is in the hands of God."

Professor Fiske says: "These words should be written on the walls of every legislative hall, State and National, and on the walls of every convention room where men write a platform, adopt a resolution, or nominate a candidate."

After these words of wisdom from Washington, the new Constitution was submitted to the States with no word of approval or disapproval. It looked for a time as though it would not be adopted by the required number of States. Hamilton, Madison, and Jay published weighty articles, since known as the Federalist Papers, in favor of it, but the Constitution almost died in being born.

Delaware became the first State to ratify on December 7, 1787. Afterward, other States, some by unanimous vote, and others by a narrow margin, continued to ratify until North Carolina became the 12th State to ratify on November 1, 1789.

Rhode Island, which had sent no delegates to the Convention, held out on ratification, and they tell the story that this was due primarily to the influence of a prominent Baptist minister who had a weakness for fine horses. Finally, one of the men who was interested in ratification induced this minister to take one of his fine horses and drive to a distant preaching appointment. While the brother was absent on this Christian mission, the legislature rushed through the ratification by two votes, and thus Rhode Island became the last to ratify on May 29, 1790.

After the Declaration of Independence in 1776, 11 States had adopted new constitutions. Connecticut and Rhode Island, which had liberal charters from the English Government, continued under their old charters, one until 1808, and the other until 1815. All of these constitutions had carefully safeguarded the rights of individuals. The people had become accustomed to bills of rights for the protection of the individual, and when this new Constitution of purely delegated and limited powers was submitted for ratification, the people were suspicious because it did not contain a bill of rights. There were bitter conflicts over this, because these people had been familiar with oppressive governments and were determined not to submit to a similar one. Actually, when the Constitution was adopted by the convention, there was a sort of gentlemen's agreement among the great men of the Colonies that there should be attached to the Constitution at a later date a Bill of Rights, and when the first Congress met, one of the first things it did, was to arrange for the amendment of the Constitution in keeping with this agreement. Something like 130 amendments were proposed, but the House cut these down to 36, and the Senate cut them down to 12. The eleventh and twelfth were never adopted, but the first 10 amendments to our Constitution were adopted and are generally treated as a part of the original Constitution and commonly called the Bill of Rights.

The first 8 of these 10 amendments really constitute the Bill of Rights. They are concerned entirely with the rights of individuals. This Bill of Rights, is, in reality, the charter of the liberties of each and every American citizen and have stood the test of time for 167 years.

Now, in conclusion, let us consider what our Constitution does for you and for me. The very spirit of it is individualism, personal liberty, and personal rights. Our Nation is unique in the protection and privileges which its citizens enjoy under the Constitution.

There is no country in the world where the protection and privileges of the citizens are so carefully defined, so strictly adhered to, so utterly inalienable. It is admitted by every competent observer, both here and abroad, that ours is the most perfect form of Government on earth—a national government adequate for every national purpose and a State government competent for all local needs.

William Pitt, speaking of the Constitution, said: "It will be the wonder and admiration of all future generations and the model of all future constitutions."

When we stop to consider what has been accomplished under this Constitution, it continues to be the marvel to this day. At the time of the Revolution, the population was estimated at 3 million, and when the Constitution was adopted, we had hardly moved across the summit of the Alleghenies. Today, we have an estimated 160 million. Through the intervening years, we have conquered the forests, the prairies, the deserts, and the mountains. We see the sun rise on the Atlantic and sink on the Pacific. We have bound the continent together with bands of steel and mighty highways, and hung the whispering wires from sea to sea. We have contributed more to the comfort and uplifting of the human race than all mankind had done in all the ages that had gone before. Some may ask, by whom was this done? It was done by the enterprise and ingenuity of our people, secure under a constitution that protects every citizen in his property, his life, and liberty, with freedom for all, tyranny for none, this Constitution of ours is composed of a preamble, 7 articles, 21 sections, and 21 amendments. Many amendments have been proposed throughout the years, but only 21 adopted. We should never forget that this Constitution of ours, great as it is, can be maintained only by the same heroic devotion to duty and individual responsibility that characterized our forefathers. It is to God's Providence that we are indebted for all the blessings which we, as a nation, enjoy under the Constitution. The comfort, the excellence, and the achievement which have become the American way of life have come to us directly from our form of Government under the Constitution, our unparalleled natural resources, and our individual initiative, coupled with intellectual attainment, individual effort, and high standards of moral life.

Abraham Lincoln, although not orthodox, yet a man of the deepest religious sensibilities, said: "Let every American, every lover of liberty, every well-wisher to his posterity, swear by the blood of the Revolution never to violate in the least particle the laws of the country, and never to tolerate their violation. Let every man remember that to violate the law is to trample on the blood of his father and to tear the charter of his own and his children's liberty. Let reverence for the law, for the Constitution of the United States be breathed by every American mother to the babe that prattles on her lap. Let it be taught in schools, in seminaries, and in colleges. Let it be written in primers, spelling books, proclaimed in legislative halls, and enforced in the courts of justice. In short, let it become the political religion of the Nation, and let the old and the young, the rich and the poor, the grave and the gay, and all sects and tongues and colors and creeds sacrifice unceasingly upon its altars."

"Except the Lord build a house, they labor in vain that build it."

Almighty God, under whose providence our fathers founded this Nation, we humbly pray for Thy continued blessings. May we realize how futile our efforts without Thy divine aid, and seek ever to walk in the ways of righteousness all the days of our lives. We ask it all in Jesus' name and for His sake. Amen.

Ill-Advised Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1954

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, at the time Senator DIRKSEN introduced S. 3423—H. R. 9076, by Representative ST. GEORGE, duplicate—he referred to it as effectuating the recommendations set forth in the final report of the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee to Examine and Review the Administration of the Trading With the Enemy Act. The basic recommendation for return of vested property was grounded, for the most part, on the foreign policy argument appearing in the following paragraph of the conclusions and recommendations of the report, page 68:

> Appropriation by Congress of $3 billion for the economic rehabilitation of Germany looking to the creation of a bulwark of democracy against communistic aggression in the West and the expenditures of like sums for like purposes in Japan is completely inconsistent with the seizure of $500 million representing the private property located in the United States of citizens of the countries with whom we seek alliance. These individuals with economic and family associations in this country should be the ones to whom we could look for sympathetic and enthusiastic support. Today these individuals are alienated by a shortsighted policy.

In other words, the final report advocated the return of vested assets to their former owners as a means of winning the support and good will of the German and Japanese people.

The record of World War II vestings shows that more than 90 percent of the approximately 34,000—this figure does not include approximately 10,000 former owners of inactive patents and other intangible property carried on the books of the Office of Alien Property at valuations of $1 each—former owners of vested property had assets worth less than $10,000. In other words, a return of a maximum of $10,000 to every former owner would effect a total return to more than 90 percent of those whose property was vested. A program of this nature would involve the expenditure of between $65 million and $70 million, or approximately 15 percent of the total value of all vested property.

There are approximately 358 persons and firms whose vested property is worth more than $100,000. These persons and firms constitute approximately 1 percent of the total of approximately 34,000 former owners of vested property. Full return to them, as provided by S. 3423, would require the expenditure of approximately $321 million or approximately 75 percent of the total value of all vested property. Of these 358, 46 persons and firms each had property worth more than $1 million. Full return to these 46 alone would require the expenditure of $239 million or approximately 56 percent of the total value of all vested property.

It appears from these figures that a return of up to $10,000 to each owner would involve a reasonable expenditure and would achieve the desired result of strengthening our foreign relations, since it would reach the great mass of the former owners of vested property. On the other hand, general return would benefit few additional persons and firms and would entail the appropriation of very substantial sums of money.

It is significant that a large proportion of the more valuable properties—for example, General Aniline & Film Corp., with a book value of $90 million, and American Potash & Chemical and Schering Corp., which were sold for approximately $15,500,000 and $29 million, respectively—was vested from "record" owners who were alleged "cloaks" for Germans. In most cases these alleged "cloaks" were not of German nationality. Since many of the agreements with respect to "cloaking" arrangements were informal and were not recorded, the original German owners may not be in a position to obtain the property from the record owners who would benefit by the bill. It is not apparent, therefore, how the return of a large part of the vested property to non-German persons and firms in this category would aid our foreign relations with Germany.

Aside from any question of the true ownership of assets by "record" owners, the bill would result in windfalls in many cases, arising out of substantial increases in the value of the vested assets while in the hands of the Government. An example is Schering Corp. When the Alien Property Custodian vested all its outstanding stock in 1942, Schering was a mere branch of its German parent with a net worth of only $1,300,000. During and after the war Schering developed research facilities and otherwise expanded its operations so that the Government realized more than $29 million when it sold its interest to American investors in 1952. General Aniline & Film Corp., 97 percent of whose outstanding stock was vested, affords another example of a great increase in value after vesting. Its net worth at the date of vesting was approximately $35 million, and its present net worth is $90 million. Neither the former enemy owners of Schering and of General Aniline nor the "cloaks" from whom they were seized had anything to do with the phenomenal increase in their values, which was in substantial part due to the war itself. It would be anomalous indeed to give to an enemy or its "cloak" the fruits of a war brought on by the enemy firm's government.

The second proviso on page 3 of the bill is obviously designed to apply to General Aniline & Film Corp. Before the war this corporation was "cloaked" on behalf of I. G. Farben, the leading German chemical cartel, by a Swiss corporation known as I. G. Chemie. The effect of the proviso would be to take the power of sale of General Aniline away from the United States for 1 year and give I. G. Chemie that period within which to make the sale. Although the bill provides that the sale would have to be made to "citizens of the United States," it includes no safeguards to prevent the sale to American "cloaks" for foreign interests. Furthermore, it contains no provisions to insure that this important enterprise, even if sold to bona fide American interests, would not eventually get back into the hands of the German interests which controlled it before the war to the detriment of the United States.

Two hundred and ten million dollars of vested assets have been turned over by the Attorney General to the Treasury for use in paying war claims of Americans against Germany and Japan under the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended. A total return of vested property would, of course, require an appropriation by Congress of $210 million to restore the sum so expended. However, the bill provides that property seized from enemy governments or their subdivisions and from persons now behind the Iron Curtain should not be returned. Since it is estimated that the amount of this excepted property represents a relatively small percentage of the total, the bill probably would require appropriations of not less than $175 million.

In the Bonn Convention of 1952, signed by the United States, France, and Britain on the one hand and by West Germany on the other, the latter agreed to the retention of German assets seized by the other signatories and to their use as reparations. Furthermore, West Germany undertook to compensate its nationals for the loss of these assets, which, in the case of the United States, have been dedicated by Congress to the payment of American war claims. This bill would remove the burden of compensating the former German owners from the shoulders of the German taxpayer and place it on the shoulders of the American taxpayer.

In addition, the bill would burden United States taxpayers with payments resulting in benefit to certain allied governments. The United States has vested substantial amounts of property of German-owned firms domiciled within the jurisdiction of certain allied countries which have also carried on programs of seizing German assets. In most cases where the United States seized property held in the name of a firm in such allied country, that country itself has seized the German interest in the particular firm. Consequently, the release by the United States of vested assets to such firm pursuant to this bill would result in a benefit to the allied country in question.

The bill provides for the return of patents and the proceeds thereof. In 1942 the President directed the Custodian to make vested patents readily and freely available forever to American industry. Early in the vesting program this policy was widely publicized and all vested patents with respect to which no American rights would be prejudiced were offered for licensing on a revocable nonexclusive royalty free basis. This bill completely disregards the entire history and policy of the patent program, the reliance placed upon this program by American industry and the investments it made in exploiting and developing the patents. To return these patents would jeopardize American interests. It is significant that even after Italy became our cobelligerent and the vested property of its nationals was returned, patents were returned only subject to existing licenses issued by the Custodian.

This bill completely disregards the position of Americans who owned property in Germany at the beginning of World War II. Many Americans have suffered war losses of property in Germany for which they have not been compensated. Others have securities and credits in Germany which have been tremendously reduced in value because of the postwar devaluation of German currency. In many cases these Americans have been unable to withdraw even the small values remaining to them because of German foreign exchange restrictions. Enactment of this bill without regard to the losses of Americans would bestow an unjustifiable preference on Germany and its nationals as against these Americans.

New York to Honolulu—Dawn to Dusk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON

DELEGATE FROM HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 15, 1954

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial appeared in the Honolulu Star-Bulletin of May 25, 1954:

NEW YORK TO HONOLULU—DAWN TO DUSK

The arrival of a distinguished group of press, radio, and TV celebrities aboard a new DC-7 airplane Monday night after a dawn-to-dusk flight from New York scarcely ruffled the calm of aviation row.

There was a big reception for the visitors, and there will be events during the next few days to call attention to this rapid service now available through the use of the big, fast plane which United Air Lines is using on its transcontinental run.

But to the air industry, the DC-7 is the end rather than the beginning of an era. It represents possibly one of the last of the long-range propeller-driven aircraft. Already the makers of the DC-7 are working on jet-propelled airliners, and one of their American competitors has a jet prototype under test.

All of the problems of jet-propelled air transport have not been overcome. The series of accidents involving the British Comet has called attention to that, and perhaps delayed somewhat the final acceptance of the jet for regular transport service.

But it is clear that the jet age in commercial air transportation is approaching rapidly, and that makes the DC-7 one of the last, if not the last, of its line of sturdy, dependable, propeller-driven aircraft.

Even so, the fast trip from New York dramatizes once again the relative nearness of Hawaii to the large population centers of the United States. We are in fact closer to Washington today than Boston or New York was in Revolutionary times, not only because we can get there faster, but also because we can get messages back and forth at the speed of light, through the modern miracle of radio.

But this is so commonplace today that Americans think little of it.

The Star-Bulletin, with its thousands of words gleaned from the news centers of the world and printed within hours—often within minutes—of their original writing, brings the world daily to the doorstep of Hawaii's people.

Pictures of dramatic events are transmitted by radio so that the picture of a first inning-world-series home run can appear in newspapers selling on the streets of Honolulu before the direct radiocast of the game is over.

Is it any wonder then that a 17-hour flight from New York to Honolulu creates little stir among flying men?

Nevertheless, it is the summing up of a series of great aviation achievements—most of which have been telescoped into half a century of almost fantastic progress in which United Air Lines has played and continues to play an important part.

Hawaii has had a part in many of these achievements—the pioneering John Rodgers flight, the successful Maitland-Hegenberger exploit, the Smith Bronte crossing and the tragic Dole Flight.

More than 20 years ago the first transpacific commercial air service came to Hawaii and we have watched it grow into a mighty network of lines linking Hawaii with the great cities of the entire free world.

To us, yesterday'r flight is a link in a chain of progress—and an opportunity to extend our aloha to visitors who will find in Hawaii a warm welcome and, if their hosts will give them the time, much of interest and importance to their audiences.

Memorial Day Address by George W. Hinant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD DAVIS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 15, 1954

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including a Memorial Day address delivered by George W. Hinant, past commander, Memphis Post, No. 1965, Veterans of Foreign Wars, made in Memphis on last Sunday. Indeed he spoke well before an appreciative audience. The address follows:

MEMORIAL DAY, 1954

(Address by George W. Hinant)

Today, we assemble to pay homage to our soldier dead. Not only at home do we do honor to them who are gone; in far off lands the graves of our departed veterans are decorated by loving hands. It is the most beautiful time of year for expressions of the love and affection which are the due of fallen heroes.

In all the glory of God's springtime, the earth green and fresh, enfolding the dead in warm embrace, the verdant fields, dotted with the pure white headstones, present a beautiful sight. The flowers are in full bloom, and the trees in foliage. Birds singing with the joy of plenty, and all nature bursting forth in bud and blossom, the day appeals to one's abiding faith in a Supreme Being which must have willed it.

It is springtime, symbolic of the period of life when so many of our honored dead departed from us. They were filled with the enthusiasm of youth when they kissed their loved ones farewell and went forth to battle; the world was before them and their eyes were ever toward the future. They dreamed of great things to accomplish once their grim task was ended and peace had been restored. They went with joy in their hearts, but, as has been since the beginning of time, war took its bitter toll and many never returned. Of those who did come back thousands were to linger but a short time before joining their comrades who had gone on ahead.

It is well that we have a Memorial Day, because this day serves to remind us that a free and united nation has been given to us—the living—through the sacrifice of those who fought and died in defense of its ideals. We cannot add to the glory or honor or renown of those whose death saved for us our country. Those who enjoyed the accumulation of wealth and the pleasures of peace by the effort of marshaled militant youth should succor and support the service-afflicted who return from the battle.

To the men and women who are in the hospitals of the Nation today, we want you to know that your Nation—the Nation of that flag which you followed, to which you gave your devotion—is thinking of you today and tomorrow and all days and nights to come.

My deepest sympathy goes out today to the mothers throughout the land whose aching hearts feel the keen pang of the thought of lost sons, to those whose thoughts are of lost brothers, husbands, and fathers who went forth in defense of your honor and did not return. Let us, the survivors, then appreciate our destiny and above all, let us never forget that to these brave defenders in the hour of the Nation's deadly peril and under a Divine Providence we owe the blessings we enjoy today.

Eighty-six years ago Gen. John A. Logan, of the Grand Army of the Republic designated the 30th day of May for the purpose of strewing with flowers or otherwise decorating the graves of comrades who died in defense of their country during the Civil War. Logan was Commander in Chief of the Grand Army of the Republic at the time. He issued the general order under date of May 5, 1868, designating the 30th day of May that year as a time for paying reverent tribute to the departed comrades of the Grand Army. No finer purpose could have been conceived by a living man than that which prompted Gen. John A. Logan to establish the custom which has been followed since he issued his general order of May 5, 1868.

Quite a bit of history has been written into America's pages since then. History that carries its own record of service and sacrifice at home and on foreign soil and the seven seas in all quarters of the globe. May 30 honors the men who fell on native soil and on foreign fields across the wide sweep of the world. Some keep their lonely vigil near at home; others sleep on foreign shores beyond the seven seas themselves.

How long and honored is the roll of those to whom this day now pays its humble tribute. There is Custer and his troopers of the Seventh Cavalry, trapped by the encircling hordes of the Sioux, up along the bluffs of the Little Big Horn. There are the men of the storm-wrecked *Trenton*, going down to to the sea with the calmness and courage that are Navy traditions. War itself contains no finer record of valor than was written by those men out across the salty acres of the Pacific in far Samoa. The bluejackets aboard the *Maine*, down in Havana's harbor on that stricken February night. The marines who fell in the landing at Guantanamo Bay; the soldiers who made the supreme sacrifice at El Ganey and the hillslopes of San Juan. All those who gave their lives campaigning in the Philippines or in the later pursuit of wily Aguinaldo through fever-laden swamps and steaming jungles. In China there rest those who fell in the Boxer Rebellion. In Europe cemeteries have been established for the young men who sacrificed their lives on the altar of freedom in the First World War. History itself contains no finer record of valor than was written by those men at Chateau Thierry, Belleau Woods, and in the Argonne Forest as they turned the tide for victory in the greatest of all wars, until the World War II cast its dark shadow with ruthless dictators in power that engulfed the whole world in a deadly war for its existence. Again our gallant men and women went forth to make the supreme sacrifice if necessary to preserve our liberties and bring freedom to imperiled people of the earth, to make the world itself free.

War itself contains no record of valor any finer than was written by our men on land, sea, and in the air, they fought a haughty foe and wiped out their foul footsteps' pollution, in all corners of the earth. Almost a million of our fine men and women gave their lives to establish freedom abroad, a million or more were in the hospitals or under treatment in their homes, they deserve the finest treatment that a grateful Nation can give them. To care for him who shall have borne the battle and for his widow and his orphans.

Our boys in Korea with a loss of over 140,000 have sustained the traditions of the past by a valor and a courage the like of which no man hath ever seen, evidenced by their heroic accomplishments. They have been called upon to meet unequal numbers, face conditions never experienced before, but they fought on with a valor and a courage that should give us a feeling of pride. Their fight was for the cause of peace, and to protect the weak against the strong.

Today we live in the atomic age with nations in possession of deadly atomic weapons that can devastate great cities and kill thousands upon thousands in a a matter of minutes. We boast no military strength to inspire the fear of mankind, but our armed force should at all times be such as to command respect of the outside world; and at home the uniform of America is a badge of honor and a commanding symbol of a nation's call.

The rights of freemen were never achieved save by human sacrifice. The advancement of civilization was not accomplished in a sudden stride.

Our fundamental law is based on the rights of the individual—freedom of religion, freedom of speech, and of the press—and we must protect those rights against any foreign idea which would take from us that freedom. These, the honored dead, have handed us the torch. Let us carry it forward unsullied and blazing in preservation of orderly government and in defense of individual freedom.

By keeping in mind that the nation that governs least governs best, and maintaining the lawmaking power securely in the people of the several States, and may we renew the pledge and say to the spirits of our honored dead: The giving of your lives was not in vain; we break no faith; from your hand we take the torch and hold it high. The constitutional democracy that you, by your sacrifice, sought to perpetuate, shall be carried on and we pledge to you to carry on to the end that these United States shall forever be the home of freemen.

"Greater love hath no man than this, that he lay down his life for his friends and country." And if they could come and join the solemn ceremonies of this hour, what message would they bring? Would it not be the message which the angels brought to the shepherds in the early twilight of the long ago? "Peace on earth, good will to men."

Unemployment Compensation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELIZABETH KEE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 15, 1954

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following statement which I filed with the House Committee on Ways and Means:

STATEMENT BY HON. ELIZABETH KEE, DEMOCRAT, OF WEST VIRGINIA, TO HOUSE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS ON LEGISLATION TO BROADEN COVERAGE AND INCREASE BENEFITS UNDER UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION LAWS

I am wholeheartedly in accord with the proposals before this committee to expand the coverage of unemployment compensation to take in an estimated 1½ million workers in private enterprise and about 2¼ million Federal employes not now covered, and to increase substantially both the benefits paid and the duration of those benefits.

As members of the committee know, I have joined with 80 other Democrat Members of the House in sponsoring the Forand bill, H. R. 9430, which would authorize paying unemployment compensation for a maximum period of 39 weeks and would raise benefits by about 50 percent.

In the case of West Virginia, this would mean an increase in the period of benefits from the present maximum of 24 weeks to 39 weeks; it would mean an increase in benefits from the present maximum of $30 a week to a top limit of $46 each week.

The higher figure is determined by the use of the same formula recommended by the President earlier this year in his appeal to the respective States to modernize their programs. His proposed formula, which H. R. 9430 adopts, would base benefits on one-half a worker's regular wage up to a maximum of two-thirds of the average weekly wage in a particular State.

Under this bill, a worker would receive the maximum benefit of $46 a week (which is two-thirds of the average weekly wage of $68.33) providing his regular wage was at least $92 a week. For any unemployed worker whose regular weekly wage was less than $92, his benefit would be one-half of his regular wage. Thus it can be readily seen that comparatively few of our production workers would be eligible for the $46 maximum, because in most of our industries, wages have not generally been as high as $92.

On the other hand, I believe the majority of our eligible workers would easily qualify for more than the current maximum of $30 a week, if benefits were determined at one-half the workers' regular wage.

I should like to impress the members of this committee with the urgency of this matter, because unemployment is alarmingly high in West Virginia, with most of our business centers in the State listed by the Department of Labor in the group IV, or distressed, category. There are areas with more than 6 percent unemployment. Many of our areas, in fact the majority, have unemployment levels of 12 percent or greater. The suffering is great.

Those between 6 and 12 percent include my own hometown of Bluefield, as well as Charleston, Clarksburg, Fairmont, Huntington, Parkersburg, and Wheeling. Those with 12 percent or more include Beckley, Logan, Morgantown, Point Pleasant, the Ronceverte-White Sulphur Springs area, Welch, and Williamson. All through these areas and throughout the entire State, a total of 120,000 West Virginia citizens are dependent upon surplus foods to keep body and soul together. Without this food, actual starvation would already have prevailed.

Thousands of our West Virginians, especially in the coal areas, but also including former workers in other industries, have exhausted present maximum unemployment compensation benefits. Each week the list grows longer. Extending the period of benefits from the present 24 weeks to 39 weeks would be of incalculable help to these people, and would help channel needed purchasing power into the hands of families which are destitute.

I cannot urge too strongly the importance of prompt action by the Congress of the United States in bringing our unemployment compensation system into line with current requirements. The benefits are at the present time wholly inadequate—$30 a week does not go very far in feeding and housing and clothing a family, and the present 24-week period of coverage does not begin to cover the time in which many of our unemployed have had to wait to find work. Throughout our State, losing a job has been a major tragedy for many, because it is not a question of going from one job or one industry to another—all of them are furloughing or discharging workers due to lack of business.

Therefore, I feel that I must again express my full support for the Forand bill, which I regard so highly that I have added my name to its list of sponsors. And, at the same time, I again strongly urge your favorable action on this measure in order to bring in additional workers in private employment as well as Government employees. In my home State of West Virginia, the added coverage provisions of this bill would bring nearly 60,000 employees of some 21,000 small employers under the law for the first time—nearly half of them in wholesale and retail trade, about 12,000 in the service trades, 3,500 in mining, 3,800 in construction, 4,000 in manufacturing, 2,200 in public utilities, 3,300 in finance, insurance and real estate, and about 2,300 in miscellaneous categories.

While West Virginia is down almost at the very end of the list of States in the number of Federal Government employees, I think all of us in West Virginia would like to have our 10,500 Federal employees—less than one-half of 1 percent of the Government's total—also covered into the unemployment compensation system. It is only fair to these people that when the appropriations for the agencies for which they work are reduced and some of them must be let go, that the discharged Federal employee also have this protection of unemployment compensation.

One last word to bring to your attention the seriousness of our employment situation in West Virginia, and therefore to point out the need for better unemployment compensation. When nearly 13 percent of all the people in the State covered by unemployment compensation are out of work—as the latest figures released by the Department of Labor reported—then obviously we are in very deep trouble. Unemployment of such magnitude is not merely a result of the economic downturn; it tends to be a cause of further decline. For the unemployed are forced out of the market for goods; therefore sales decline sharply. Furthermore, with so many unemployed walking the streets in a vain search for employment, those who do have jobs tend to doubt the future and to curtail purchases for fear that their own jobs may shortly end. So we have an atmosphere of uncertainty building up which depresses all business, and this in turn inevitably leads to more and more distress.

Getting purchasing power into the hands of our unemployed—especially those who are able and anxious to work but are thrown out of employment through no fault of their own—so that they can continue to buy the necessities of life is the best antidote there is for the poison of recession sweeping like a virus through the population of large areas of this country.

So-Called Comic Books Are a Menace to Our Young People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD H. REES
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 15, 1954

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent approved by the House, I am submitting a statement by Alex Dreier, well-known authority and commentator, over the network of the National Broadcasting Co., on May 3, 1954. It deals with the problem of the effect of the sale and distribution of so-called comic books that go through the mail and are sold on the newsstands throughout the country.

Mr. Dreier sets out quite vividly the effect of the reading of these books upon the minds and behavior of our younger people. The statement is, also, pertinent because of legislation presently pending before this Congress dealing with the problem. I should like to add, also, that Mr. Dreier's views are supported by a report of the Select Committee on Current Pornographic Materials under House Resolution No. 596, of the 82d Congress, of which the Honorable E. C. GATHINGS, of Arkansas, was chairman, and of which I had the honor of being a member.

The statement follows:

SPECIAL REPORT

The definition of a good parent, we are told, is one who makes himself, or herself, progressively unnecessary.

Well and good.

But there has been a slip-up somewhere. because the all-inclusive facts show that the present wave of juvenile delinquency is approaching the highest proportion ever reached in the history of these United States. Buried on the back pages of the newspapers—lost in the teletype of the wire services—are the hearings on juvenile delinquency now before a Senate committee.

Buried and lost (understandably so) because of the Army-McCARTHY circus which commands so much radio and TV time; so much newspaper and wire service space.

The Senate hearings on the crimes committed by our kids is obviously of far greater import to the parents, to the Nation. This deserves attention, wide and full.

Our purpose tonight is to set the facts on the table, let the parents of this Nation examine those facts and draw their own conclusions. One of the most startling revelations made to the Senate committee has been the analysis of the contents of America's juvenile literature, the comic book.

Now, many of us may have had the impression that people attacking comic books (and trying to ban their sales) were bluenoses, busy-bodies, or imitators of thought-control police.

If you haven't read through a representative sample of these books that children are buying with their dimes, you may believe, as many do, that they are just expanded versions of the newspaper comic-strips.

What a joke that is.

Some of the comic books are innocent and comical.

About a third of the estimated 90 million cartoon books published every month—that's right, 90 million—about a third are harmless, but, Fritzie Ritz, Tubby, Little Eve, and Donald Duck are not what we are talking about, nor what has astonished the Senate committee, nor what has so concerned the noted psychiatrist, Dr. Frederick Wertham, he, the author of the Seduction of the Innocent, the kind of a book that usually receives little attention outside literary circles, and seldom makes the best seller lists, but this one may be an exception, because it is an exceptionally important book for every parent, teacher, lawyer, judge, child administrator, and child psychiatrist.

Everyone, everyone, concerned today with tomorrow's future adults and leaders, can learn something from it.

Seduction of the Innocent is a book about comic books, the kind of comic books that have an insidious and pernicious influence on our children. Hundreds of pages of expert testimony have shown this continuous flow of filth to be so corruptive in its effects that it has actually obliterated decent instincts in many of our children.

Proof? Dr. Wertham cites case after case, in which juvenile delinquents, from both good homes and bad, have exactly copied what they were taught in these books. The FBI reports that juvenile crime is becoming more vicious, and brutal all the time—all the time, incidentally, these books have been published.

Are only morbid and mentally disturbed children affected by these so-called comic books? Not at all. It's the other way around, says Wertham, as these 10-cent "horrors" pervert the normal child.

Now listen to this. The larger proportion of so-called comics are crime, horror, sex, perversion, false science and false morality. And some of the things Wertham and Senate witnesses call them, you wouldn't believe until you read them. One after another are filled with sadistic and evil torture displays, and virtual examples of the kind of things Dr. Kinsey reported.

And defiance of the law is approved, and the youngsters are taught ways, in which crime does pay with detailed explanations on how to shoplift, rob a bank, burglarize a home, maim, and murder.

Even the advertisements in some of these so-called comic books are offering children pistols, rifles, knives, superslingshots, and whips. Why?

And don't be misled by the books claiming to be romance stories and condensations of classical authors. They are often filthier and more vicious than the others. It couldn't happen to you or your child? Well, children have been found hanged beside cartoon books, opened to descriptions of hanging.

Young criminals and murders have admitted they got their ideas from these cartoon books. The taking of dope has even been described and praised.

It can't happen here? It has.

We've gone through as many of these picked off the newsstands this week as our stomach could bear. Dr. Wertham and the Senate witnesses are not exaggerating a bit. They are packed with closeup drawings of knifings, shooting, and all types of torture.

Police are referred to as dirty cops, and minority races and nationalities are held up to ridicule, and only sometimes do the bad guys pay the penalty to the society of good guys.

The only people who profit in this ugly business of seducing innocent children are the unmitigated bums who make such so-called comic books available.

Earlier generations had their wild west thrillers and books, but never anything like this.

And if you think the charges against these cartoon books are ridiculously exaggerated, or old-maidish, then pick up a copy of Dr. Wertham's book, Seduction of the Innocent, and half a dozen so-called comics at the store near your child's school. Then make yourself sit down and read them. We'll guarantee you won't remain long on the sidelines.

And then—and only when you act, you the parents—will be able to stop the cartoon criminals, dope peddlers, commies, facients, perverts from winning their points by seducing a not-so-innocent younger generation.

So, after you've done your reading give us your answer, let us know what you think—Alex Dreier, NBC-Chicago. What do you, the parents of America, think should be done about harmful comic books?

Should the publishers of these lethal books be brought before an investigation committee for public inquiry?

Should a board of leading educators, churchmen, and parents be formed to establish a code for comic-book publishing?

What do you think?

Send us your ideas, and we'll make sure they get to the right sources of authority.

Advance Trade, Advance America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 10, 1954

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, appended is the text of a pamphlet published by the newly formed Committee on Foreign Trade Education, Inc., 270 Park Avenue, New York City, which, with simplicity and conviction, portrays the necessity of continuance of the reciprocal trade agreement program. This is an organization of many people of all parties convinced that United States and free-world security demand as an integral element the development of the full potential of free world trade. They have patriotically activated themselves and are entitled to all encouragement.

ADVANCE TRADE, ADVANCE AMERICA

The American people, concerned by talk of recession and gravely alarmed by Communist agression throughout the world, must be informed of the extent to which high tariff walls impede our economic expansion, pile extra costs on the consumer, and tend to split us away from our overseas allies.

Recession, like communism, is a problem that can best be seen in a worldwide framework: our economics in midcentury are no less interwoven into the world fabric than our politics.

Through the tragic loss in combat of 319,336 lives since 1941, it was hoped that we would now see our problems and struggles in a full world perspective just as surely as we now know the terrible waste and personal sorrow of war. We have been schooled during the last decade to understand that events—whether they take place in Korea, Germany, Japan, anywhere—will have an ultimate effect on our country.

And again, the lesson has been made clear to us as taxpayers. Since 1946 the United States has spent approximately $42 billion toward the economic and military reconstruction of war-devastated countries. Each year our Nation has spent roughly $60 billion to pay the debt of past wars, to pay for aid to our allies, and to pay for preparing ourselves against possible future atomic war. This means that the annual proportionate share of each man, woman, and child is between $300 and $400.

How have these enormous expenses affected us? The direct consequence is that our cost of living has increased to a point 192 percent of the pre-World War II average. The average American has had an unpleasant time of it despite the prosperity of recent years, keeping up with the cost of living. Family income has been stretched and stretched again to meet the cost of necessities, the consumer wondering vainly and grimly why he was caught in the economic vise.

The question of paramount national importance is this: Can we invigorate United States industry; can we reduce the foreign aid burden on the American economy, on the American consumer-taxpayer, and yet not pull the skids from under the allies we need in combating communism?

Although well aware through experience of the overwhelming expense in lives and money, our Nation bullheadedly ignores the solution, the means of decreasing the chance of war and—in peace—of reducing our tax burden and cost of living.

THE ANSWER: TRADE, NOT AID

The United States in 1953 exported about $16 billion worth of goods to foreign countries, yet only imported about $12 billion worth in exchange. Our archaic protectionist system of high tariffs, import quotas, and cumbersome customs procedures, caused this $4 billion trade gap; it kept foreign producers from selling in the United States market and kept them from earning the dollars to pay for the export of our manufactures to them.

We still cling to a policy designed for a debt-ridden, fledgling nation of 150 years ago. In the beginning of the 19th century, foreign customers could take our goods and write them off against our international debts. Today our position is reversed: we are the greatest creditor nation in the world. If the foreign producer cannot earn dollars here, he is forced to stop buying American manufactures and raw materials. This constriction of trade has happened repeatedly in the postwar world. Almost all the countries of the world, in recovering from war destruction and prohibited by high tariff from selling to the United States, have experienced dollar crises and suffered from the dollar gap. Our would-be international customers have had to set up quotas on what could be spent in our country in order to conserve dollar reserves. Even Canada, our richest and best customer, was for a while forced to limit its United States purchases.

Rather than attack the key of the problem—rather than buy from abroad—the United States policy has been to try to make up the dollar deficiencies of our would-be foreign customers by just giving away dollars—at the taxpayers' expense. The result has been the discouragement of economic recovery among our allies; an additional burden on the American taxpayer; a slowing of our sales abroad; and an increasing menace to the jobs of the 4 million American workers whose jobs are directly connected to exports.

The taxpayer who must pay for the "giveaways" that keep protectionism alive must also pay a second time in his role as a consumer. Any restriction on foreign markets for United States manufacturers reduces our total production and increases per unit costs. These costs, naturally, are passed right on to us. Again, the consumer is obviously injured when, by tariffs and quotas, imported goods can come into this country only at very high prices and unessential domestic goods are sold at artificially maintained price levels. Our cost of living is increased, ultimately raising the cost of production, further pricing our goods out of the foreign market and increasing our cost of living—and the whole vicious cycle is accelerated.

The need to modernize our ideas on international trade—a trade that has such vast significance to us both nationally and individually—is coming to the fore. Fortunately the past 2 years have seen the greatest amount of public discussion on this subject since before the Civil War. But more must be done.

To date the most important factor in this swell of activity is the Randall Commission. Its membership drawn from the Congress and labor, management, and agriculture, the Commission on Foreign Economic Policy, headed by Clarence B. Randall, president of Inland Steel, has worked through the fall and winter to study United States export-import problems and reported on means of improving our trade policy. Although weakened, perhaps, in an attempt to propitiate the demands of high tariff representatives, the Randall Commission Report, published in late January, offers to President Eisenhower a firm foundation on which to build a liberalized United States trade policy.

During the previous 2½ years, 6 other Presidential commissions under the leadership, successively, of Gordon Gray, Eric Johnston, William Paley, the National Security Board, Charles Sawyer, Daniel Bell, and Lewis Douglas, also investigated our trade position and served to break the ground for the Randall report.

Each of these Presidential commissions has called for an ending to the high tariff in the interest of international peace and American prosperity.

Prominent businessmen, led by Henry Ford II, Ralph I. Straus, J. D. Zellerbach, and many others, have strongly advocated a liberalization of trade. They are joined by the Detroit Board of Commerce, John S. Coleman's and Charles P. Taft's Committee for National Trade Policy, and literally hundreds of other organizations in urging the business community to recognize high tariff as being against their own and America's best interest.

The high tariff opposition, however, has not been idle. Championed by the voice of Representative RICHARD M. SIMPSON, Republican, of Pennsylvania, the special interest groups and lobbies working for a 19th century-minded America, are girding for battle. With the expiration this spring of the Reciprocal Trade Act and the report of the Randall Commission, the high tariff bloc is fixing its lines for the biggest foreign trade fight of the century.

Our struggle for liberalized trade, for the American taxpayer and consumer, for the American who hopes for peace, for United States prosperity is to be won this spring.

Despite the tremendously increased strength of those who demand a liberalized trade policy, our battle formation is not now complete. The organizations that have sprung forward to fight high tariff are almost completely limited to business and industrial groups and to those working in somewhat abstruse levels of political and economic theory. No effort is being made to translate the campaign for liberalized trade into the vernacular of the man in the street. The pamphlets, speeches, diagrams, and charts are all directed to the boardroom and the academy. The public interest—that of the consumer and taxpayer—is being ignored.

This is contrary to the lesson of history. One hundred years ago Richard Cobden and John Bright, who led and won the fight in England against high tariff, geared their campaign directly to the groups most concerned, the great body of English consumers. The British nation, spirited by this campaign, then embraced the idea of living better for less and thereby found the path to their greatest period of prosperity.

WHAT DOES HIGH TARIFF MEAN TO US?

The essential point regarding United States tariffs is that they are high, very high. Duties imposed on manufactured goods range from 25 to 50 percent and over. The New York Times reports that there are "900 items on which (United States tariffs) stand at 40 percent or above."

In the case of finished English woolens, the tariff is a compounding of two levies, 25 percent of the value, plus 37¼ cents per pound. That means that the few who can still afford to buy 1 yard of an English cloth must pay very close to an extra dollar just for tariffs alone.

ARE TARIFFS THE ONLY MEANS USED TO CRIPPLE TRADE?

By no means. There is, for example, a weird maze of customs regulations and procedures (somewhat improved by recent but short-term legislation) which restrains the consumer from obtaining goods from other countries. ("Many goods take longer to pass through customs than it took Columbus to discover America."—Bell Commission.)

The incredible redtape and complexity of the customs law have so slowed down the flow of our trade that in December 1952, the specific tariff had not been adjudged on some 723,000 attempted importations. Cases that had gone to court then numbered 63,000 and were being adjudicated at the annual rate of about 2,150.

At that rate, the last man to get into the line a year ago could hope to have his case considered in 1980. Think of trying to do business when it might take you 28 years to get your money.

DOES THE QUOTA SYSTEM FIGURE IN THIS, TOO?

It certainly does. A rider was attached to the 1950 Defense Production Act that set up quotas, over and above tariffs, on the amount of dairy products and vegetable oils that could be imported into this country. Popularly known as the cheese amendment, it set quotas on the quantity of cheese that could be imported from Denmark, Holland, and other European producers.

It is difficult to believe that our dairy industry was menaced, for at that time we were busily and profitably engaged in exporting twice the amount of American dairy products as was being imported into this country. The cheese amendment also came at a time that our Government, in order to make the European nations self-supporting, had for several years assidiously labored to build up the Danish, Dutch, and other cheese industries.

The net result of the cheese amendment (now embodied in another regulation) and its quota system is to reduce the selection open to the American consumer; to do great damage to the United States-aided cheese industries of our allies; and to lessen the number of American dollars the foreign countries affected by quotas can spend on our products.

WHAT IS ANOTHER EXAMPLE OF CONSUMER LOSS THROUGH TRADE BARRIERS?

Do you remember when Prime cuts of steak cost 39 cents a pound? No; it was not 20 or 30 years ago. In February 1953, through a special if momentary relaxation on the restrictions against importing beef from

Australia and New Zealand, the citizens of Waltham, Mass., found steak for 39 cents a pound at their butcher shops. There was terrible anguish among lobbies, but the consumers liked it fine: Waltham (population 50,000) bought 200,000 pounds of New Zealand beef in 2 days.

WHO WANTS HIGH TARIFF AND WHO DOESN'T?

The high-tariff bloc that has had the power to shackle us in this way, although highly vocal, is a relatively insignificant group in size and economic importance. The industries that welcome a liberalized trade policy in hopes of more easily obtaining necessary raw materials and easing the strangulation of their prospective foreign customers are led by the steel industry, the motorcar industry, and the wheat farmers.

In contrast, among those in the front line of the high-tariff bloc are the pottery makers, toy makers, pecan and filbert growers, and garlic growers.

WHO WOULD BE AFFECTED BY THE LOWERING OF TARIFFS?

Even if we were to have absolute free trade, with no restrictions whatever on importations, no more than 600,000 American workers would be directly affected by increased competition. Clearly, the possible jeopardy to employment of 600,000 workers, while relatively minor compared to a total work force over 60 million, is not to be dismissed lightly. (The Randall Commission staff papers, released in March, estimate the number to be only 200,000.) The oft-proposed solution to this problem of possible dislocation of businesses not able to compete is to set up Government or business agencies to aid these no-longer protected business firms in a changeover to a line of production where they would enjoy truly economic natural advantages. And if there should be some businesses that could not convert, then governmental, business, or labor groups should retrain and financially help the workers affected.

Yet, to put the question in a completely objective perspective, even if we did not set up any Government program to aid in the relocation of once-protected industries, the onslaught they would suffer would be relatively insignificant in contrast to the "far larger adjustments * * * being made constantly to changes in demand, development, and new techniques of production, exhaustion of resources, and the ordinary process of retiring old workers from, and adding new workers to, the labor force" (Bell Commission).

IS THERE A SINGLE POTENTIAL IMPORTATION THAT WOULD OFFER SEVERE COMPETITION TO OUR DOMESTIC PRODUCERS?

While we are increasingly dependent on the raw materials from abroad which are in short supply domestically, the market for imported consumer items is in no one field very heavy. At present, the only imported finished manufacture with an annual total over $100 million is that of finished woolens and yarns—and this exceeds the 100 million mark by only a fraction. The fact is that a liberalized trade policy does not endanger anyone except the blindly selfish. No domestic industry is going to be wiped out by more United States international trade.

"The picture of European imports swamping whole sections of the American market is quite unreal. Europe lacks the productive capacity to swamp any American market. A likelier prospect is that the role of European imports in our domestic consumption might recover from the present of less than 1 percent to something under 2 percent, a level they enjoyed as recently as 1929. In a context of expanding trade, rather than of substitutions, the United States could swallow this improvement in its standard of living without a belch." (Life magazine.)

WHAT HAS HAPPENED TO INDUSTRIES FACING FOREIGN COMPETITION?

Allowing such an increase of imports of 1 or even 2 percent under a liberalized trade program, will not menace a business of any initiative. This has been proven by our domestic watch industry which once fancied itself imperiled by the Swiss. Now Elgin and Hamilton not only do very well importing Swiss movements, but have expanded profitably into the costume jewelry and electronic timing fields.

CAN HIGH TARIFFS STRANGLE UNITED STATES BUSINESS?

Yes, it can. A very graphic demonstration of this was seen in the New York Times on September 1, 1953. These headlines were seen side by side:

"Wool Growers Assert Import Fee of 7 Cents a Pound Is Not Enough—Favors 12 to 15."

"Man-Made Fabrics Held Here to Stay."

Raising the tariff on foreign wool that the United States textile industry must import will, Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL says flatly, "put domestic wool textile manufacturers out of business" and create further unemployment in the wool manufacturing centers of New England.

CAN THE AMERICAN WORKER MEET FOREIGN COMPETITION?

The American worker is not going to be subjected to "unfair competition of the underfed, underpaid hordes of Europe and Asia." Actually, the American worker, while receiving the highest wages in the world, is the world's cheapest source of labor. In his individual production of work units, he can beat any other worker in the world. A recent survey disclosed that among a sample of American and British shoe factories equipped with the exact same type of machinery, the American plants did the same work in between 60 and 74 man-hours as the British plants did, on the average, in 100 man-hours." (The Economist.)

The American worker has nothing to fear in the lowering of the tariff barriers to the freer flow of trade. As a consumer, he can realize great personal benefit from liberalized trade. If he did not have to pay 7 cents "customs fee" (on top of the regular tariff) a pound for raw Australian and South American wool, a good suit would no longer range over $50. He could buy more and better clothes, blankets, and other woolen products.

AND WHAT ABOUT RECESSION?

Paul G. Hoffman has written recently: "Congress has made clear that it does not propose to continue sending dollars abroad as gifts * * * But I am sure that Congress does not want to see our exports cut back by about $5 billion a year, which certainly will happen unless we either buy from our customers abroad or give them the dollars with which to buy from us."

Obviously this country will cut money gifts abroad. Equally manifest, the United States, threatened by recession, cannot afford to lose $5 billion in sales, but must instead work to build up its markets.

Not only is the general prosperity of the United States involved in a healthier foreign-trade policy, but 4 million American working families are directly dependent on foreign trade for their livelihoods. They should not be abandoned to the grasping interests of the high-tariff bloc.

WILL LIBERALIZED TRADE STRENGTHEN OUR FOREIGN POLICY?

High tariff, the so-called policy of protectionism, not only gravely threatens the expansion of our economy but risks the estrangement of the allies we must have in combating Soviet aggression. If we will not buy abroad, there is one power that is only too happy to do so—Communist Russia. During recent weeks the Kremlin has intensified its efforts to bring free-world goods into Russia. They offer very advantageous deals by which they will trade raw materials for finished products or just pay cash—gold.

Few nonsatellite countries have yet become economically ensnarled with the Russians. However, if we continue to refuse to trade abroad, and foreign industries are forced to face the alternatives of depression or selling to the Russians, we may soon risk not only going it alone economically, but politically and militarily as well.

And until there is liberalized trade, the dollar shortage abroad will continue and the whole cycle of "economic nationalism" which did so much to precipitate the Second World War will continue to build up. As long as America tolerates a high-tariff policy, we shall be forced into the ludicious and debilitating position of giving our dollars away to shore up our essential export trade and the economies of our friends abroad. And most directly, to us as consumers, there will be no lifting of the penalty by which we are prevented from buying more things at better prices.

It may be that the most important argument for liberalized trade is that it will serve as a solvent to many of the world's political troubles; that no free community of nations can continue to exist while each national border remains a curtain of selfishness and red tape. Many foreign countries facing these problems and no longer content to be in the degraded, uneconomic role of beggar, are striving toward trade sanity under the banner, "Trade, not aid." This, then, is the cry of foreign countries striving for the opportunity to trade fairly in the open, free enterprise United States market.

America, however, in mobilizing for liberalized trade can most tangibly bring that idea to the public with the self-interested philosophy of "Gain, not give."

Address by Hon. James A. Farley at the Dedication Ceremony, James V. Forrestal School, Beacon, N. Y.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 15, 1954

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by Hon. James A. Farley at the dedication ceremony of the James V. Forrestal School at Beacon, N. Y., on June 5, 1954:

Among the dedicated servants of our time, one who has left a positive impression upon our Nation and upon the world is James Vincent Forrestal. He came to Washington at a time when the shadows of war were enveloping the world. His peculiar genius was soon detected and diverted to national defense.

In his execution of the office of Under Secretary of the Navy, Jim Forrestal showed vision, courage, determination. It was but logical that he should, on the death of Secretary Knox, assume the office of Secretary and a large measure of responsibility for the direction of our wartime Navy. This Navy, the largest and finest the world has ever known, helped bring the war to a conclusion on August 15, 1945.

Because of his feeling that we were faced with an uneasy peace, Secretary Forrestal devoted countless hours to the structure of a pattern of defense which might be of security to our Nation. He was a prodigious worker. Checking in to his office before breakfast, he worked untiringly often into the night. He subjected all personal interests to the welfare of the country.

As a keen student of world affairs, Secretary Forrestal was one of the few leaders of our Government who in 1946 saw the great menace of communism. He knew that the triumph of communism in any section of the world meant disaster to freedom-loving people. He wanted to keep the Armed Forces at the highest possible level of efficiency. While it was his personal desire at the end of the war to return to civilian life, he acceded to the wishes of the President to become our first Secretary of Defense.

While during wartime he faced up to the responsibilities of a great world conflict, he was often disturbed by the indifference of his fellow Americans to the brigands of Moscow. The unwieldy law, since revised, which he was called upon to administer, was executed with a minimum of fanfare and expense. As Secretary of Defense he had only 57 employees in that Department which now numbers its employees in the thousands.

The finger of destiny seemed to point to Jim Forrestal as the architect of a new military strategy. His resignation as Secretary of Defense proved both a personal and a national tragedy. No higher tribute could come to him than the malicious attacks centered upon him by Communist-inspired sources. His friends may rightly claim that he was a martyr to the anti-Communist cause. His great determination was to preserve Christian civilization and the blessings it has brought to the world.

It has always been customary to erect monuments in memory of men who have performed great services for our country—in war and peace—and I know of no better monument which could be erected to the memory of James Vincent Forrestal than this splendid building, constructed for education. It is fitting and proper that the citizens of this community, where he was born, raised, received his early education, and where he grew to manhood, should name this sturdy, handsome structure James V. Farrestal School. It will be a daily reminder to generations yet unborn in this community, of the magnificent services rendered their country by one of their own townsmen.

This school building is another example of the great progress which we are making in this country and this State in providing for our children fine physical surroundings in which to get an education. But we must never forget that building and grounds and equipment are the incidental, not the principal part of education. They are the frame and not the picture. The case, not the contents.

True education is a matter of the mind and spirit. It is earnest teachers and wholesome children and cooperative parents. It is the lessons that count.

We in New York State can take pride in our schools and in the quality of our education, and in the spirit and training of our teachers.

We have provided for the entire Nation a standard to be lived up to and an example to follow. We are living proof of what a State can do without direction from above or below in building, operating and maintaining an educational system.

Education is the means by which the lessons taught by the experience of the past are given to the present and the future. It is a business of sharing with our children what we have learned from our elders and from our own contacts with the world which we have passed through.

Of course, as we all know, children do not always take for gospel truth the words of their parents. Sometimes I think that children become wise, perhaps overwise in their own day and generation and feel that the experience of the past is merely the useless teaching of the elders. However, as those children go out into the world they may well find that what we have learned the hard way might better be taken from us by word of mouth than to be taken by them through the hard knocks of experience.

But we parents have a great opportunity to assist in the process of education by cooperation with teachers. The teachers are those who are skilled in transmitting to the children the lessons that we know out of our own experience.

Another thing that is essential in education is that as society becomes more complex, as the number of people increases, and as the size of our cities grows, education must keep pace with these new conditions. That means that the need for formal planned education becomes greater and greater. There was a day when, as one educator put it, it was enough to have a student at one end of a log and a great teacher at the other. I grant that education without great teachers is not education at all. But there must be more organization now than when those of us who have passed the middle span of life went to school. I for one am amazed at the difference in education and particularly in the opportunities offered between the present and those days back there when I went to grammar school at Grassy Point, and then on to high school in Stony Point. I am not complaining. It was sound education, and it served me well. But the children of this day are facing an infinitely more complex world than I faced 45 or 50 years ago.

As I see it, there are certain essential qualities that all teaching must have if it is to be in a true sense education.

It must be free of dogma, and it must be free of dogmatic assumptions and arbitrary definitions. By that I do not mean that there are not solid and important lessons that must be learned by diligent application and that do not change with the years. But in the true sense education is the freeing of the mind to reach out and search for truth on its own account.

Next, education must be humane, in the sense that it teaches people true consideration for the rights of others. It ought to teach people to live in society with other people and exercise toward them the kindness and the consideration that ought to characterize a good neighbor in every walk of life.

Next, education must be useful. I do not mean merely that education ought to teach nothing but the means of making a living. That is essential, too. But to be truly useful education must give the student a broad grasp of the realities and a capacity to understand the outside world in all of its complex manifestations.

Next, I believe that education ought to teach true Americanism. By that I mean that after our God, and our parents, and our children, the Nation comes first. The teaching of Americanism consists of teaching the great truths that America stands for—freedom of religion, freedom of thought, freedom of speech, freedom of communication of all sorts. It must teach that our form of government, created out of the wisdom of the ages, is for us the best form of government. It must teach that, despite our consideration for the fact that we are living in a world of neighbors, we shall not be good neighbors if we do not look to the preservation of our country, its prosperity, its solvency and its strength.

Education must also teach good citizenship. It must teach children what they owe to their communities, the State, and the Nation in the way of observance of the law, in the way of participation in active political affairs, in intelligent voting, and in every conceivable effort to become well informed about the great issues of our time.

But above all, education must build character. For character is the basic factor upon which our civilization is built. Included in that expression are truthfulness, industry, and personal responsibility, as well as consideration for others and obedience to the law.

Our educational system is so constructed in this country that it is possible for those who wish to combine religion with education are privileged to do so. It is, however, so constructed that within what we call the public schools there shall be no observance of any specific religious belief, or ceremony. However, in the last analysis it is possible for all schools to teach character, and character is, of course, a form of religion expressing itself in human conduct.

I would say finally that if I were a teacher I would avoid giving children any idea that all will be well despite what they may contribute. I would teach that all will in the future be exactly what they choose to make it. If they neglect their duty, if they are something less than industrious, if they count on the Government to support them without effort on their own part, then they will find that the very basis of free civilization will crumble away.

For the individual is the basic factor in society. He can make it to be what he will.

No doubt, this warning is unnecessary here—in this community which is so truly characteristic of the American way of life. But we must be ever alert, and prepared to protect that way of life, and for which the man for whom this school is named gave his genius, his strength, and his heart.

Valedictory: Capitol Page School

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALLAN OAKLEY HUNTER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 15, 1954

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor and a pleasure for me to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD today the valedictory address given last night by Derek Hawver upon graduation from the Capitol Page School. This is a matter of personal pride to me in view of the fact that Derek Hawver has served as a page in the House of Representatives upon my recommendation. In addition to winning the top scholastic honor in his school, Derek was awarded the trophy for being the outstanding athlete, he was the editor of the school yearbook, and served with distinction as overseer of the House pages. I feel that this young man's record is an inspiration to other men all over the country and a vindication of the confidence which I and other Members of this body have placed in him.

The address follows:

As I rise to represent, on this commencement day,
The senior class of this high school, there's much I'd like to say.
But first I think I ought to thank our sponsors seated here;
Through them we gained a privilege, both wonderful and dear.

We appreciate their interest in us and in our school,
Where service and our classwork blend, and exceptions are the rule.
We thank you too for this fine school o'erlooking Cap'tol dome,
Where teachers laugh and help and teach—a home away from home.

And then I think I'd thank my God, with head bowed reverently,
That we were educated in a God-fearing land that's free.
And then there's dad and mother, over there—just on the right—
It's cost them lots of sacrifice to put me here tonight.
And so to dads and mothers, friends, and to our kid brothers, too—
To judges, teachers, Congressmen—we give our thanks to you.

And if we look beyond this stage, and gaze into the night,
Our trembling comes from eagerness, and not alone from fright.
Tonight we close the memory book, we're finished with the past.
Our training's done—the coach has called—we're in the game at last.
And as we roll our sleeves up, and take our place in line,
Please pardon us a passing glance, at things we leave behind.

Beneath the swastika's ugly cloud, in nineteen forty-two,
When half-trained boys were sent to war, and Pearl Harbor's shock was new,
That year we started in to school, in a land all filled with fear;
With service flags and casualty lists, and sad farewells—and fear.

And everyone was sad and they talked in low tones,
And even though we were first graders, we could tell they were scared.
And everything was changing—factories started making war materials,
And dad said we couldn't buy a new car because they didn't make them anymore,
And we began seeing lots of people on the streets in uniform.
The school was changing too. History classes turned into current events,
Hygiene turned into first aid. General science into modern warfare,
And they built an obstacle course to train the older boys for the Armed Forces.
And the physical education classes were teaching the boys how to drill.
We could hear them as they marched outside our school windows,
Hup-two-three-four—Hup-two-three-four.
But we were only first graders, and we were too little to train.
And we were too young to understand what was going on,
And everyone was too busy to talk to us anyway.
Some of the mothers began working in war plants, and others rolled bandages,
And everyone was doing something to help—except us,
And nobody paid much attention to us, anyway, for our Nation was in a great war.

For we were the war class—the first class after Pearl Harbor.
We learned our ABC's between war reports from Luzon, and Luxembourg, and Omaha Beach.
Our arithmetic was mixed with casualty reports,
And in reading class our teacher read to us about the Battle of the Bulge.
We joined the throngs on V-E Day, and then there was the terrible, wonderful atomic bomb,

And finally V-J Day, and the war was over, and we were in the fourth grade.
Now the school started changing back,
And the current events classes studied history again,
And the first aid classes went back to hygiene,
And they tore up the obstacle course,
And the boys stopped counting Hup-two-three-four, and went back to playing softball,
And everything was different again,
For we had never known school when there was no war.

Then came the peace talks in Europe,
And the division of Germany, and the occupation of Japan,
And the police action in Korea which grew into a full-fledged war,
But this time we understood—for we were the war class, and this was our second war.
But it was a bigger war than we thought, and some of our factories had to be converted again,
And basic materials were rationed, and the draft was stepped up.
And then MacArthur was fired, and it looked like we were losing in Korea,
And everyone was confused, and they began wondering how we could ever end the war
And for the first time in 20 years a Republican President was elected
Because everyone was tired of war, and maybe a military hero like Eisenhower could do it.
Finally the shooting war stopped, and the boys started coming home
But there were some who didn't want to come home and people spoke of "brainwashing."

And, here at home, things were changing again—
In Jacksonville, Ill.—in Farmington, N. Mex.—in Lakeport, Calif.—
In Naticoke, Pa.—in Cranford, N. J.—in Buffalo, N. Y.—
And we could feel it, because we were there.
For the graduating class I present to you today
Is not a product of the community of Podunk, or Pittsburgh, or Washington, D. C.—
Our community is the United States—
Our school is the majestic Library of Congress—our campus is the Capitol lawn—
And our laboratory is the Chamber of the Senate, or the House, or the Supreme Court—
For we are the Capitol pages.
Boasting of our proud heritage, aware of our great opportunity,
And humbly grateful that we are privileged to be here.

The hallowed halls of Capitol Page School have echoed to the footsteps
Of such pages as
Mark Trice, Secretary of the Senate;
Simon Sobeloff, the Solicitor General of the United States;
And many other greats and near greats in the affairs of our land,
Including that outstanding class of 1953 who ranked highest in the city in IQ,
And went on to become probably the only class in the Nation
To enroll 100 percent of its numbers in college in September.

This, is our past!
And what is past is prologue, we know—
But prologue to what?
And for a fleeting second we cling to our comfortable, fortunate past—
Reluctant to face the uncertain tomorrow,
The second passes—
For we are worth of our heritage
And we turn to face the future with a firm confidence
Born of our two wars of our page service,
And nurtured by the inspiration of the leaders of the world
We have been privileged to serve.
For we are the graduating class of the Capitol Page School,
And we are worthy of our heritage.

The world we inherit here tonight, is sad and sick at heart
Deceit, and hate, and bitterness, too often play a part
Too constant comes from other lands, the rumbling threat of war
Too often those within our gates, have hurt us even more.
They sell our secrets, stab our backs, and then they run away
To hide behind the freedom that they wanted to betray.
This is our challenge then tonight, we'll meet it if we can
With faith, and hope, and charity, and love of fellow man.

And we who knew two wars before, prepare for number three
Like pagans we must sacrifice, our best humanity
To appease the gods of War and Hate, and hope, as in the past
Each drop of blood will buy us peace; each sacrifice the last.
But we who only seek to learn, of medicine or law
Must first attend another school, the school of tooth and claw.
And though we must accept our fate, we may resent it still
But we have reached our eighteenth year—it's time we learned to kill.
This, too, becomes our heritage; we take our yoke and pray
That we, the class of '54, upon some future day
May turn to others on this stage, when our own fight is done
And hand to them a heritage—a peace that we have won.

No Jobs?—More Unemployment Compensation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 15, 1954

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following statement I presented before the House Ways and Means Committee:

NO JOBS?—MORE UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION

From its lack of leadership and decision in failing to respond to the distress calls from labor-surplus areas, the Federal Government bertays a callous disregard for a very human and critical problem.

It is no secret that a number of areas have been suffering from critical unemployment for years.

When unemployment compensation runs out and there are still no jobs, what then?

The Federal Government looks the other way.

At last we have a bill before the Committee on Ways and Means to provide greater security against unemployment, that cannot be brushed aside as a matter of minor concern.

I represent a district that has had a very substantial surplus of labor for several years.

The above statement is not open to opinion or interpretation.

It is a very serious fact.

We have importuned the Government time and again to extend some help. We have asked for a program to stockpile goods in order to keep industries going. We have tried to get United States contracts routed to jobless areas. We have suggested that military and atomic installations be built in such localities. We have shown how Federal loans, in part, to industrial-development committees, would spur the building of new and modern plants to attract diversified industries and create jobs.

No constructive help has been forthcoming.

H. R. 9430 recognizes the danger signals that have been blinking from labor-surplus areas, as well as the need for improving Federal standards for unemployment compensation in relation to the Nation as a whole.

None too soon.

By the end of May, 51 major labor markets were listed as having a substantial surplus labor force, an increase of 16 over the previous report—plus 73 smaller areas.

What happens when claims are exhausted, as they are within 16 weeks in some States?

What does a person do who is laid off in an establishment that is not covered by unemployment insurance?

These questions can only be answered in their full meaning by the individuals and families who suffer from unemployment.

To a lesser extent, they have a bearing upon the economy.

With overtones of challenge to free enterprise and representative government testing whether one or the other or both can solve the fudamental problems of today.

On their own, a number of States have increased benefits and have extended coverage, but there are laggards who freeze against progress.

It was understandable 19 years ago, when there were no precedents in to guide us, that we should proceed carefully at the start.

Now, however, there is no excuse for maintaining a split program—some covered and some uncovered.

Every person having one or more individuals working for him is an employer in exactly the same sense as a huge corporation is an employer. The difference is one of degree, not of kind.

Furthermore, unemployment-compensation payments, rigid in amount, have fallen behind wages and the cost of living.

Again the evidence from distressed areas proves that the maximum duration of benefits is not long enough to enable the unemployed to search for jobs that are not available in their city or town.

Finally, although it is not incorporated in this bill, we must bear in mind the further necessity of extending coverage to employees of the Federal Government to be consistent with the purpose and the goal of unemployment compensation.

There is no sound reason for economic segregation in this field.

Any person who works for a living is entitled to insurance that will protect him, in some measure, for unemployment that is beyond his power to prevent.

No one State, high or low, can set the standards for the Nation.

That is the function of the Federal Government.

A well-rounded unemployment-compensation program, both as to coverage and benefits, is inevitable.

No free government could survive if it continue to ignore these imperatives.

We are well advised by an overwhelming majority of the American people to make progress in strengthening unemployment insurance at this session.

Cancellation Die: "Pray for Peace"

SPEECH

OF

HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 14, 1954

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced the bill, H. R. 9120, to authorize the Postmaster General to provide for the use in first- and second-class post offices of a special cancelling stamp or postmarking die bearing the words "Pray for Peace."

In introducing this bill to urge that we pray for peace, my mind harkens again and again to the words of a legendary American and patriot, whose name was Abraham Lincoln; his words are as pertinent today as they were then:

> We have been preserved these many years in peace and prosperity. We have grown in numbers, wealth, and power as no other nation has ever grown; but we have forgotten God. We have forgotten the gracious hand that preserved us in peace, and multiplied and enriched and strengthened us; and we have vainly imagined, in the deceitfulness of our hearts, that all these blessings were produced by some superior virtue and wisdom of our own. Intoxicated with unbroken success, we have become too self-sufficient to feel the necessity of redeeming and preserving grace, too proud to pray to the God that made us.
>
> It behooves us, then—

He said—

> to humble ourselves before the offended power, to confess our national sins, and to pray for clemency and forgiveness.

It is my deep conviction that we in the 20th century have forgotten God. New wealth and new blessings have come to us over the decades that would have astounded Lincoln, but he would find nothing new in the same presumptuous pride that afflicts us today.

It would also seem that, in view of the manner in which our country has been catapulted into the role of leadership of the free world, in recognition of the heavy mantle of responsibility which has been thrust upon our shoulders as Americans in the face of the long-continued and ever-increasing attacks upon us by the forces of godlessness and atheism, we need constantly to be reminded of our dependence upon God and of our faith in His support. We need to remember that it is from the wellspring of humility that greatness comes. We need always be aware, as were our Founding Fathers, that there is a Supreme Being who watches over the destinies of men and nations. We need only to approach Him, suppliantly, for the assistance He will give to those who ask for it, to guide an anxious ship of state through troubled waters and into safe harbors beyond. We need a return to basic truths. We need to pray for peace.

It is only proper that the Government of this great Nation, upon which a benign providence has lavished His blessings in an unending stream, should exhort her people and the peoples of the world, through the medium of a cancellation mark upon the face of her mail, with the simple and compelling entreaty, "pray for peace."

We Have Confidence That the Organization of American States Will Help Rid This Hemisphere of Communist Infiltration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 15, 1954

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, for the first time in very many years we in the Western Hemisphere are faced with the threat of the capture of one of the American Republics by a foreign power. Soviet Russia, through its conspiratorial agents, the Communist Party, is steadily engulfing the Government of Guatemala.

We have all watched—and in the past several days many distinguished Members of this House have brought to our immediate attention—the latest developments south of us: the expulsion of American newsmen, the shipment of a large amount of arms from behind the Iron Curtain, and, most recently, the Guatemalan Government's suspension of constitutional safeguards.

Today that Government has imposed strict censorship, telephonic and cable. But private reports reaching me, which I have reason to believe are reliable, give further evidence of a mounting reign of terror in Guatemala. I am told that 400 people throughout Guatemala have been arrested and that 80 Army officers called on President Arbenz, the Communist-captive head of state. I understand that these officers questioned his statement that his government was not Communist-controlled and demanded that he clean house.

I am further informed that noted anti-Communists are being tortured, driven insane, and killed in Guatemala City. Jose Miranda, of the newspaper Mundo Libre, has been locked up; Gabriel Martinez del Rosal, anti-Communist lawyer, has been tortured and driven insane; and Alfredo Arbulach, merchant of Guatemala City, has been tortured and killed—all this from information which has run the gantlet of strict censorship.

Still, some may ask what are our interests in Latin America. One is trade—a two-way exchange which is mutually beneficial to the United States and our neighbors. We in the United States understand Latin America's heavy reliance on this trade and are anxious to increase it. President Eisenhower's message of March 30, 1954, and subsequent statements, and the report of Dr. Milton S. Eisenhower's mission to Latin America emphasize our desire and hope for a stimulation of more and more exchange of goods.

Another vital interest is military. I hardly have to remind you of the strategic importance of the Panama Canal, also the proximity of Latin America to our borders. Let me add to that the fact that we import from Latin America great quantities of such strategic materials as quartz crystal, antimony, copper, manganese ore, tin, and oil.

A third interest in Latin America is political and cultural. The Western Hemisphere is the testing laboratory of free world relations. Such proven arrangements as technical assistance, student exchanges, and NATO-type military alliances all were initiated first with Latin America.

With that background—the mutual interests between Latin America and the United States, and the clear threat that exists in one country—we must consider seriously what is to be done.

Fortunately for the welfare of this hemisphere we have an effective alliance, the Organization of American States, to which all 21 American Republics look for solution of mutual problems.

Our Secretary of State, the Honorable John Foster Dulles, has indicated recently that this problem of Guatemala is to be submitted to this Organization for action—within the framework of our inter-American system of solidarity. I am delighted to be able to join the many other Members of this House in assuring the Secretary that when he takes this case to the Organization of American States it will be with the solid support of the United States Congress.

We are confident that action by this body will be purposeful and powerful and that it will safeguard the interests of all the American Republics against further inroads of communism in this hemisphere.

We in the Congress understand further that the techniques used by the Communist conspiracy in Latin America are true to the pattern this insidious movement has used in all the other areas of the world. Let me refer the Members to my own subcommittee's report on the Strategy and Tactics of World Communism, issued in 1948, and many subsequent studies, especially Senator ALEXANDER WILEY's committee studies done most recently on this subject throughout the world. It is no revelation to us in Congress that Communists enjoy operating in underdeveloped countries. They make promises to secure adherence without regard to truth. Then when they have won, they abandon their roles of "just another political party" and enforce the Communist iron rule on their unfortunate dupes.

Mr. Speaker, permit me at this point to clarify one factor which seems to be troubling some of our sincere friends in Latin America. Our interests there are mutual and they are basic to a better understanding between fast friends. They are not in any sense determined solely upon the protection of American private investments. Of course we, as any country, are concerned about threats to the property or person of our nationals. But as Secretary Dulles so aptly said:

> If the problem of United States investors in Guatemala were to be solved tomorrow to the entire satisfaction of parties, the attitude of the United States Government with respect to the dangers of Communist penetration in this hemisphere—and in Guatemala in particular—would remain precisely the same.

Mr. Speaker, we anticipate an ever-increasing exchange of persons and of goods between ourselves and our sister Republics. I feel privileged to add my endorsement to the remarks by many of my colleagues emphasizing the great faith in the Organization of American States held by the United States Congress. We look forward to increasingly mutually beneficial relationships with members of that organization.

Faith and Learning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 15, 1954

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following address by Hon. James A. Farley at the commencement exercises at Belmont Abbey College, Belmont, N. C., on June 1, 1954:

FAITH AND LEARNING

Father Taylor, your excellency, reverend fathers, the faculty of Belmont Abbey College, the class of 1954, ladies, and gentlemen, it is indeed a privilege for me to be here today, and it is an honor and a pleasure I had never anticipated being mine—to deliver an address on the historic occasion of Belmont Abbey's first commencement as a senior college. Many months ago when I was invited to participate in your commencement I gladly accepted, although I was fearful something might develop in my business which would necessitate a European trip at this particular time. However, the necessity for such a trip came up in the latter part of March and happily my fear that I would be unable to be with you today was eliminated.

It has been my regret that, unlike you, I could not go to college. Since my formal education ended, I have acquired 17 honorary degrees from various colleges. Each of these has made me happy as having accomplished something in the school of life, but I would gladly exchange them all for one earned in college. Not that I have any regrets, but I do wish I could look back on the pleasures and the companionship of learning of college days.

In your joyous expectation of going forth from here to take your places in the world you are apt to forget what you have been privileged to experience. Let me tell you that the training you have already had has fashioned your life far more than you now realize. And as the years go on you will turn back more and more fondly in memory to this place. At the moment, I fancy, you are more triumphant over successful accomplishment than regretful, although you must bear this place affection and gratitude.

A year ago a young lady I have known since childhood was graduated with highest honors from a western university. Among her honors were Phi Beta Kappa and Phi Kappa Phi. She was editor of her school annual. She was acclaimed as the outstanding girl in the college. When she was asked to what factors she attributed her success she said it was to her years in a Catholic school, where she was given a firm grounding in learning and faith.

Integrity is the most sublime possession we can make for ourselves. It comes from learning and faith. I do not come here to teach you faith. That has already been done by minds more able than my own. Nor do I come here to instruct you as an educator. As you all know, I used to be in politics. Now I am in business. Both professions are concerned with integrity. The politician gives his word and the businessman gives his product. Both should be, and usually are, backed by integrity. If the politician fails to keep his word he courts not only defeat but disgrace. If the businessman fails to keep up his product he courts failure and bankruptcy.

All occupations have their codes of ethics. The foundations of these codes were implanted in you here. One may stray from the standards of any profession and meet with some success, just as one may smile and still be a villain. Almost inevitably there is a day of reckoning, if nowhere else in the loss of peace of mind. As you go on with life's responsibilities you will find that the honorable way you have learned here is not only the right way but the best way.

In this connection I am reminded of some words of Juan Donoso Cortes, not the man who led the conquistadores into Mexico but the first Marquis of Valdegamas, who was at one time private secretary to Queen Maria Christina of Spain and Spanish Ambassador to Paris. He wrote: "Catholicism is a complete system of civilization. It is so complete that in its immensity it includes everything—the science of God, of angels, of the universe, of men. * * * There stand revealed the final causes of all things; the adjustment of human events, the nature of bodies and that of spirit; by what ways men proceed, the limit of the progression, from whence they come, the mystery of their pilgrimage, the course of their journey, the enigma of their sorrows, the secret of life and the arcana of death. Children who are nourished at this fruitful source know more today than did Aristotle and Plato, the two luminaries of Athens. * * * Their theology is called Catholic because it is universal; and it is so in every sense, under every aspect, and in all respects. It is universal because it includes the substance of all truth. It is so because in its very nature it is destined to extend everywhere and to last through all time. It is universal in its God and its dogmas."

Any one will acknowledge that this is a fine piece of writing. But you, who were trained here, know more—that it is a correct statement of facts. You have received here a pattern of life that will remain with you always and keep you forever young. Here, as I stand before you, I may as well confess that I never got over being a boy and I hope I never shall. Now in my 67th year, the boy that I was is drawing closer to me. With each passing year I see more of what I am in what I was. And so it shall be with you and in those days you will give a true measure of gratitude to what you did here.

I have told you that there is something of the boy in me still. Let me take you deeply into my confidence. I am here somewhat under false colors. I am not a great man but a fortunate one, perhaps. Some years ago my son, Jimmy, then a boy of 9, startled me at breakfast after Mass one Sunday morning by fixing his eyes solemnly on me and asking, "Dad, did you every think, when you were a little boy like me, that some day you'd grow up to be a great American?" To borrow an expression from you young people that question really sent me. After some deliberation, I answered, "Jimmy, to tell you the truth, I don't think I am a great American." He turned the answer over in his mind and then came up with, "Well; dad, neither do I."

The more I reflect on it the more I think he was right. All that I am or hope to be—and time is running its inexorable course for me—I owe to the faith and learning implanted in me in my youth and to the power of prayer. Prayer has seen the world through dark days, days as dark as those we are now going through, if not darker, just as it has helped individuals over rough stretches in the way of life. Let me take you back 167 years to a meeting of the group of patriots in Philadelphia who were seeking to revise the Federal system of government. The meetings opened on May 14, 1787.

You remember the history of that situation I am sure. The war with Britain had been won, but the situation in America was near anarchy. The confederation was falling apart. Powerful forces were at work to keep the States apart. Geographical distances and poor communications made it difficult for people of one State to know a great deal about another. Northern States wanted to protect their industries; the South, having no industries, welcomed foreign goods free of tariffs. States levied tariffs against one another. The American people were strongly opposed to central government; because they were so jealous of the liberties we hold dear they hesitated to bestow any power on any government, local, State or Federal.

Many persons predicted that the 13 States would never be joined in union. There were many expressions of gloom, although race, religion, language, tradition and common culture all cried out for union. Furthermore, beyond the 13 States was a western empire begging for development. Wise minds brought about the constitutional convention in Philadelphia with George Washington, the victorious general and popular hero, in the presiding chair. But only 6 States were represented the opening day. Work went slowly. There was suspicion and distrust. Difficulties appeared to be insurmountable. Nothing was done in May and little was accomplished in June.

Finally on June 28, 1787, 167 years ago, the most venerable man in the convention arose—a truly great American, perhaps the greatest American of them all, Benjamin Franklin. This patriot, philosopher, and scientist was in his eighties. Listen to his words:

"Mr. President, the small progress we have made after 4 or 5 weeks close attendance and continual reasonings with each other—our different sentiments on almost every question, several of the last producing as many noes as ayes is, methinks, a melancholy proof of the imperfection of human understanding. We indeed seem to feel our own want of political wisdom, since we have been running about in search of it. We have gone back to ancient history for models of government, and examined the different forms of those republics which having been formed with the seeds of their own dissolution now no longer exist. And we have viewed modern states around Europe, but find none of their constitutions suitable to our circumstances.

"In this situation this assembly, groping as it were in the dark to find political truth, and scarcely able to distinguish it when presented to us, how had it happened, sir, that we have not hitherto once thought of humbly applying to the Father of Lights to illuminate our understandings? In the beginning of the contest with Great Britain, when we were sensible of danger, we had daily prayer in this room for the divine protection. Our prayers, sir, were heard, and they were graciously answered. All of us who were engaged in the struggle must have observed frequent instances of a superintending providence in our favor. To that kind of providence we owe this happy opportunity of consulting in peace on the means of establishing our future national felicity. And have we now forgotten that powerful friend, or do we imagine that we no longer need His assistance? I have lived, sir, a long time, and the longer I live the more convincing proofs I see of this truth—that God governs in the affairs of men. And if a sparrow cannot fall to the ground without His notice, is it probable that an empire can arise without His aid? We have been assured, sir, in the sacred writing that 'except the Lord build the house they labor in vain that build it.' I firmly believe this, and I also believe that without His concurring aid we shall succeed in this political building no better than the builders of Babel. We shall be divided in our little partial local interests; our projects will be confounded, and we ourselves shall become a reproach and a byword down to future ages. And what is worse, mankind may hereafter from this unfortunate instance despair of establishing governments by human wisdom and leave it to chance, war, and conquest.

"I therefore beg to move that henceforth prayers imploring the assistance of heaven and its blessings upon our deliberations be held in this assembly every morning before we proceed to business, and that one or more of the clergy of this city be requested to officiate in that service."

This was the beginning of real work on the Constitution, this prayer of Franklin's, because his speech was of itself a prayer. How well these men worked under divine guidance we all know. They built the greatest Republic the world has known. The draft of the Constitution was completed in September 1787. When the labors of the convention were finished and members were signing the great document, Franklin chanced to look upon the back of Washington's chair on which a sun had been painted. Franklin seized upon this sun to make a prophecy.

"Painters," he said, "have found it difficult to distinguish in their art a rising sun from a setting sun. I have often in the course of this session and the vicissitudes of my hopes and fears as to its issue looked at that (sun) behind the President without being able to tell whether it was rising or setting; but now, at length, I have the happiness to know that it is a rising and not a setting sun."

We today know that the sun is still rising. We know that its light still shines brighter than ever in a darkened world. We know that light was enkindled by faith and learning. Much of the world is still dark. However, in the darkest corner of the darkest night in the deepest hell of totalitarianism we know that the light of the faith of our Founding Fathers still shines. There can be no darkness where a single candle is lit. We have two great candles with which to light the world today—the faith in liberty that is America and the faith in our Lord.

Most of the world is indeed in darkness. Nations have sinned and individuals have sinned. They have forgotten prayer. They have, in fact, forgotten God. False idols have been erected. False prophets have been honored. Man has deserted liberty and justice and human dignity. Man has listened to the promises of power-hungry men. Man has exchanged freedom for slavery on sly promises of security. Confusion has been piled on confusion. Fear is piled upon fear. Each new conquest of science over matter has seemed to increase fear rather than bring security. Yet, we must never forget that all things are not without cause. Everything in life has meaning. Everything in man's life is related to all that has gone before and all that is to come.

These are trying times. This has been an age of splendid achievement. Man began seeking divinity in himself. Everything was explained in the laboratory. For a time man sought faith in evolution, then in science and then in progress. Men held that man came out of slime and nothing more. Men held science had all the answers. Men held that everything had to be changed in order to be better. Now men are holding that faith must be put in evolution. They would have us make a god of the state and have us give all of ourselves and all of our souls to the state.

How pathetic and how credulous are these earnest faiths in evolution and progress and science and in the state. Man has found himself with less time for himself and less time for God. Many years ago, Louis XIV proclaimed himself the state and men have come to laugh at him. In our time one who proclaimed himself the state died by his own hand in a bomb shelter in Berlin. Another was hung by the heels in Milan. Still another, more dangerous than either of the two who went before, died last year in Moscow and is rapidly being forgotten. Yesterday his word might have shaken the world. Today this spectacular destroyer of faith and learning is at last face to face with the truth of faith.

How silly is the proclamation of Hitler, Mussolini, and Stalin that each of us is part of the state and nothing more. Faith and learning in our day is growing, though it may not seem so. Two great wars in this century have not darkened faith. Nor has the atomic age. Man has loosed a force that has placed him on the abyss of chaos, but faith and learning can still give him the serenity of soul that would keep him from destroying the world by fire. The no less explosive danger of communism with its chain reaction of materialism, frightening as it may be, cannot prevail against faith and learning.

We must remember, too, that Communists are not the revolutionaries. They are the believers of brutal power which goes back to the days of man's darkness, when the earth knew not faith and had no learning. Then man knew only tyranny. The materialists of communism would turn back the clock to those days. We who believe in liberty, freedom, and the dignity of men are the revolutionaries. Historically, the philosophy of faith and learning is newer than the darkness of communism.

Revelation and teaching—faith and learning have turned the path of mankind from the downward path of brutish darkness to sunlit paths of belief and civilization. All of you will go from here seeking more education. You will become a growing part of the light, a growing part of faith. Each generation likes to think that it is living on the edge of disaster, that the precious fire of faith and reason would go out if each generation did not cherish it in its breast. This is so, of course. However, no generation has put out that fire by suicide and I am confident no generation will. There have been orgies of mass murder and destruction before. We can hope that they will never come again even though we know that we are living in a state of almost perpetual war and almost perpetual fear.

I never have taken a gloomy view of the future. Now when the future is closer to me as I near the time of the great answer, I cannot take a gloomy attitude toward the outcome of these critical and perilous years. I do not have the slightest shadow of doubt that your generation will see the end of the whole sordid corruption and repulsive fallacy of the police state. True, I confess my generation has not done too well by yours. We have given you the aftermath of terrible wars, we have saddled you with heavy debts and the headaches of tangled thoughts and false beliefs. Yet I am sure you will find it in your hearts not only to forgive us but to be merciful and to say that we contributed to the solution you will find.

Furthermore, I am confident that you will find the answer in faith, faith which is growing in our time. Faith is on the march. It has triumphed over the false beliefs and false dogmas of the ages of evolution, machines, and tyranny. False beliefs die but faith endures forever. All the arrogance of totalitarians and the rantings of the scoffers and the intellectual posterings of men intoxicated with their own minds have not darkened faith. The faith of our fathers goes hand in hand with learning. The terrors of our time have not dimmed faith. Faith is growing. It has gained strength by the very rationalism which would challenge and destroy it. It has grown because it is the truth.

It seems to me a good thing that man should have gone through the trials of the past. In the return of the mind from evolution and materialism, we can be sure there will be no straying in the future. That is what I mean when I say faith is growing. Tortuous doubts are being resolved. In your time men will learn not to doubt himself and his God again.

Meantime, nothing you graduates can possibly do will enrich yourselves more or hasten the triumph of faith or make a better contribution to your country or to your fellowmen than to proclaim and demonstrate the faith and learning you have gathered here throughout your lives. Let each of you be living candles to bring such light to the darkened world.

Opposition to Upper Colorado Project From California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 10, 1954

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the Colorado River Board of California, an official agency of the State, established to safeguard California's vital interest in Colordo River water, has gone on record in opposition to what is commonly known as the upper Colorado storage project. The following is the board's resolution setting forth the reasons for its opposition:

The Colorado River Board of California opposes the enactment of S. 1555 and H. R. 4449, 83d Congress, bills to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain initial units of the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, and for other purposes.

California favors the continuation of the development of the water resources of the Colorado River Basin on a sound economic basis, as the need for such development occurs. This State recognizes the right of the upper basin States to so utilize the waters apportioned to that basin by the Colorado River compact as approved by the Boulder Canyon Project Act, but subject to the terms and conditions of those documents as the Supreme Court may construe them in the case of *Arizona* v. *California* now pending.

By the same token, California, in the protection of its investment of nearly $700 million in water development projects which it has made in reliance upon the Colorado River compact and the Boulder Canyon Project Act, and the economy and population of more than 4 million people dependent upon these works, must resist legislation which would encroach upon the rights recognized in the lower basin States by those documents.

The proposed Colorado River storage project legislation adversely affects the lower basin States in much the same way as would the proposed central Arizona project legislation. Both are based upon interpretations of the Colorado River compact and the Boulder Canyon Project Act with which California cannot agree and which are now at issue in the United States Supreme Court. Each of them contemplates developments which would encroach upon the compact and Project Act, as interpreted at the time of enactment of those laws, to the extent of more than a million acre feet per year. Both proposals are based upon unrealistic water-supply estimates. Each is in conflict with the presentation made to the Senate by the supporters of the Mexican Water Treaty. Each ignores the legal claims which are in conflict with it, and both ignore the damage which their construction would cause to the investments already made by their neighbors. Each of these proposals is dependent upon Federal subsidies for irrigation amounting to many times the value of the land when fully developed, and most of these subsidies are concealed. Both would commit the Congress to new feasibility standards and pay-out formulas with which this board and other California State agencies have officially expressed disapproval.

The Colorado River Storage project would intercept the lower basin's water supply with giant reservoirs at Glen Canyon, Echo Park, Curecanti, capable of storing several years' flow of the river. In the absence of statutory controls of the operation of such reservoirs designed to protect the output of firm power at Hoover Dam, upon which the United States and the power contractors relied, the use of such large storage could result in seriously curtailing the revenues at Hoover Dam and other dams on the lower river and upon which these lower projects depend for financing. It is against the best interest of both the power users in the lower basin and the Federal Treasury to so legislate.

Both Glen Canyon and Echo Park Reservoirs would be located downstream from any point of use by the proposed irrigation projects in the upper basin and their major purpose would be to provide revenues, commencing almost 50 years hence, to pay the capital cost without interest of the irrigation projects proposed for construction now. This postponement for nearly 50 years from the commencement of repayment of irrigation would result in a Federal subsidy amounting to over $2,500 per acre of irrigated land—an unwarranted and unjustified burden on the Nation's taxpayers.

California, as a major taxpaying State, is doubly affected, for the amount of the overdraft on the water supply of the Colorado River Basin is directly related to the amount of Federal subsidy to the irrigation projects creating the overdraft.

The bills delegate to the Secretary of the Interior power to resolve the feasibility of the participating irrigation projects. If reclamation feasibility standards are to be changed, that should be done by Congress, in general legislation, after the Hoover Commission has had an opportunity to report upon this very matter, heretofore committed to their study.

The proposed legislation includes some, and foreshadows other, large transmountain diversion projects in the upper basin using several million acre-feet of water annually, thereby impairing the quality as well as the quantity of the water available to the lower basin and to which the lower basin is entitled under the Colorado River Compact.

For all these reasons, the Colorado River Board of California respectfully requests the representatives of this State in the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States to oppose the enactment of legislation to authorize construction of the Colorado River storage project and participating projects as proposed in these bills, S. 1555 and H. R. 4449, or similar legislation, and instructs its officers and staff to make the appropriate presentation of the views of this board to the congressional committees and executive agencies concerned with such legislation.

Communists' New Line of Infiltration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ISIDORE DOLLINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1954

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Speaker, the Communist Party, U. S. A., has, in published and secret documents, indicated a new line of infiltration of local community organizations.

Walter K. Lewis, a noted liberal anti-Communist, has, in the New Leader, given a detailed description of how the new Communist line will affect prodemocratic liberal, labor, and community organizations.

The Jewish Labor Committee, now in its 20th year, has a consistent record of combating all forms of totalitarian subversion. So concerned were they over the success of the new Communist line that they marshalled 100 liberal, labor, fraternal, and community organizations and held 8 seminars, instructing the leaders of these organizations on what the new Communist line meant and how to deal effectively with the problem.

The Saturday Evening Post of June 5, 1954, in an editorial, gives a wider picture of the whole Communist infiltration menace. The alert originally given by Mr. Lewis in the New Leader and a report on the seminars of the Jewish Labor Committee are given in detail in the editorial.

I am inserting the editorial from the June 5 issue of the Saturday Evening Post in the Congressional Record so that all Members of Congress may have the opportunity to read it:

THE COMMUNISTS YEARN FOR THAT "UNITED FRONT"

All over the country nowadays the Communists are busy in a vast and silent infiltration, moving skillfully into a wide variety of local, regional, and national groups. No pro-Moscow orations bubble up from their plausible lips. They appear to be sincere, hard-working liberals, eager for the success of the organizations in which they have become active, including unions, parent-teacher organizations, Democratic clubs, and in a few cases even Republican clubs.

And yet this insidious operation is a part of the Communist Party's effort to reestablish the popular front. Here are Communist Party National Chairman William Z. Foster's own words, an expert falsification of history:

"During the war the bourgeoisie of the United States and Great Britain did all they could to have their forces avoid the heavy fighting themselves and to see to it that the U. S. S. R. was devastated as badly as possible in the struggle. This is why they gave the U. S. S. R. such relatively small amounts of lend lease, while pouring vastly greater masses of munitions into Britain, which did very little fighting. * * * In spite of this treachery the Soviet Union pulled through, destroying Nazi Germany's army and saving the world from fascism." The

United States or Great Britain, you see, had nothing to do with it.

After airily rewriting history, Foster draws a moral: That we must "orientate the country on the basis of a friendly live-and-let-live coexistence with the Soviet Union." That is, give in to the Kremlin. "This," says the C. P. chairman, "is one of the major points of emphasis in the draft program now before the Communist Party."

That draft program is the latest revision of a Communist Party directive which ordered the present strategy of wide infiltration under deep disguise, as part of Moscow's blueprint for a worldwide united front. This infiltration has been going on for more than a year and has done much to mislead public opinion. Now the Communist Party has issued a revised directive and instructed the lower echelons to study it and suggest improvements.

Sneaking into the American camp, pretending to be American liberals, the Communists are required by the program to gain as much influence as possible in organizations of workers, farmers, small-business people, professional people, intellectuals, women, youth, Negroes, and nationality groups. Keeping their pro-Soviet purposes secret, they are gradually to swing these organizations around to appeasement.

Is this plan succeeding? Or is it only hot air? Well, one of the chief signs of success is an article in the New Leader magazine, which is prolabor and anti-Communist. The writer of the article is Walter K. Lewis, a longtime anti-Communist official of liberal organizations. He says that "the Communists plan to infiltrate, among other groups, the various parent-teacher associations" and to take advantage of "the legitimate grievances" of parents and teachers. Mr. Lewis has come into possession of a secret C. P. directive and he quotes from it. This document warns Communists not to try to become leaders of a parent-teacher organization at once, because the established leaders won't tolerate it. "They want women for their committees, typists, adgetters for the PTA paper, * * * not presidents," says the C. P. directive. "This is an organization in which you work your way to the top patiently."

These tactics which Mr. Lewis has exposed have already succeeded enough to alarm a hundred labor, fraternal, civic, and liberal political organizations in New York, whose officials are now holding meetings to devise ways to stop the Communist infiltration. Many of these officials have been aware of the Red strategy for some time and have taken quiet measures to combat it.

The infiltrators are playing the old unity game. They are under orders to unite with almost anybody on one issue or a score of issues, including local grievances about schools, bus fares, sales taxes, and so on. In politics they must try to bring about a regrouping and realinement within the Democratic Party nationally and within the Republican Party in local areas, says the C. P.

They must maneuver in congressional and State and local primaries and elections this year, working within the two big parties. They must play the balance-of-power game, helping one candidate if he will agree to be less anti-Communist than the others. Only if both the Democratic and the Republican nominees are about equally unsatisfactory to them will the Reds run a third candidate, under some other party name, such as Progressive or American Labor.

One of their main hopes is to bring into the halls of Congress a bloc of articulate and uncompromising members who will urge appeasement of the Kremlin and will oppose the congressional committees investigating communism.

What the C. P. is working for is a restoration of the Popular Front days of the 1930's, when Communists were openly welcomed in the coalition of forces that governed the country. They realize they cannot regain that standing very soon, but they hope that many people will be so angry at somebody else that they will get less angry at the Communists.

Centennial of the Territory of Nebraska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL T. CURTIS

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1954

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, in this year of our Lord 1954, the State of Nebraska is celebrating its centennial as an organized territory of the United States. On May 30, 1954, President Franklin Pierce signed the Kansas-Nebraska bill, which organized as a territory the vast stretch of land between the Missouri River on the east, and the crest of the Rocky Mountains on the west, the present State of Oklahoma on the south, and the British Dominion of Canada on the north.

Gentlemen, the organizing and settling of the Nebraska Territory is one of the proudest records of achievement that our Nation can boast. The State of Nebraska has contributed many great men to its country. Men of great stature are common in Nebraska's history. And for every Nebraskan that was great, there have been thousands of Nebraskans whose work and love and sacrifice made that greatness possible.

In 1954, we can see that Nebraska's future holds much in store for its people and for its country. But today I want to study Nebraska's past, and to add my small words to the glory of known and unknown builders of a great State.

In its birth, Nebraska was an object of national strife. It was caught up in the momentous struggle between forces of proslavery and antislavery groups. The issues of the Missouri Compromise of 1820 and of the compromises of 1850 echoed again in the Halls of Congress as the Kansas-Nebraska bill was debated. The bill as passed in Congress and signed by President Pierce was a blow to antislavery forces, for it voided the earlier compromises and stated that the people of Nebraska would be left free to choose for themselves on the question of slavery.

In Congress and the rest of the Nation, the question of Nebraska was a question of a national policy on slavery. Also involved, in the minds of many people, was the Nation's commitments to the Indian tribes which still roamed over the prairies. But the people who moved West and settled in the lonely land across the wide Missouri were more interested in building a new land for themselves and their children.

The Lewis and Clark Expedition of the first years of the 19th century passed Nebraska without much attention on its trip up the Missouri River. In succeeding decades, the only white man who saw Nebraska were trappers, missionaries, and explorers. Only a few villages of any permanence whatever were established in the first half of the century.

Nebraska's first post office was established at Old Fort Kearney in present Kearney County in 1848. My colleagues in the House were kind enough to act favorably on a bill I introduced in 1948 which provided for the issuance of a commemorative stamp on the Fort Kearney Post Office Centennial.

In the 1850's the only communities in what is now Nebraska were the ones built along or near the Missouri River, including—from south to north—Rulo, Falls City, Brownville, Nebraska City, Plattsmouth, Omaha, Tekemah, and Dakota City. In the same decade villages were begun at Fremont, Columbus, Grand Island, and Wood River along the Platte River, at West Point on the Elkhorn, and at Beatrice, Pawnee City, Humboldt, and Weeping Water in the southeastern part of the State.

Before 1870 immigrants and American settlers had founded communities at Auburn, Blair, Crete, Fairbury, Lincoln, Norfolk, Schuyler, Seward, Wahoo, York, and in the far west at North Platte and Sidney. Nebraska achieved statehood in 1867, and Lincoln had a State capital and a State university by 1871.

In the early 1870's the present cities of Hastings, Aurora, Kearney, O'Neill, and Superior were founded. Along the new railroad up the Elkhorn Valley and out to the Black Hills and Sand Hills sprung up Atkinson, Ainsworth, Valentine, Gordon, Rushville, and Chadron.

In the 1880's came the towns of Wayne, Broken Bow, McCook, Holdredge, South Sioux City, Lexington, Gering, and Ogallala. At this time, with the State's population over the 1 million mark for the first time, all parts of Nebraska were pretty well settled, except, of course, for the Sand Hills region which is still sparsely populated.

Several nationalities were dominant in the flood of immigrants who brought their families and cultures to settle and prosper in the fertile western plains.

German people set up a colony at Columbus in 1856, and in the next year farther west at Grand Island. Norfolk had its beginnings about 10 years later, in 1866. Germans largely settled Hall, Platte, Madison, Stanton, and Thayer Counties.

Thousands of Bohemian immigrants made their new homes in Nebraska. These people, who came from what is now Czechoslovakia, first located near Humboldt in the southeastern corner of the State, and later moved into Saline and Cuming Counties. Other Bohemian colonies were established around 1870 in Knox, Colfax, and Saunders Counties.

Swedes, of course, are well known and to be found in all sections of Nebraska. Our State has more than its share of Andersons, Swansons, Nelsons, Olsons, and Thompsons, and we are glad of it. The first sizable Swedish community was established at Kearney, and others followed at Saronville, Oakland, Axtell, Holdrege, and Wahoo. The Scandinavians settled Polk and Saunders Counties in the 1870's, and Phelps and Burt Counties in the following decade.

There were other nationalities, too. The Danes followed the Swedes and founded Blair and Dannebrog. The Irish settled in Holt and Greeley Counties. Russo-Germans moved first into Jefferson County, and later into Clay and Hamilton Counties. Dutch families settled south of Lincoln, and the French concentrated especially in Richardson, Nemaha, and Antelope Counties.

English and Scottish people, as well as settlers from the eastern United States, moved across the Missouri regularly throughout the period of Nebraska's early growth, and added their bit.

Nebraska is truly a "State out of many nations." Each of pioneer peoples contributed substantially to Nebraska's traditions of hard work, sound government, and self-reliance. These people gave to us a faith in Almighty God, a yearning for education, a sense of personal and public responsibility, a respect for constituted authority, and a love of the simple virtues of home and decent family living.

The Nebraskan of today, and indeed the American of today, owes a great debt to the remembered and unremembered thousands who built our homes, our churches, our schools, our cities, and our State. Each of us has a moral responsibility to try to repay that debt by remembering a motto on our beautiful statehouse to the effect that "eternal vigilance is the price of liberty."

Let us so live and work that our children will inherit from us a way of living comparable to that which we ourselves inherited from our parents.

Mining and Smelting Industry Hard Hit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 15, 1954

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, during the present recession many industries have been hit harder than others. Among the most severe blows has been that suffered by the industries engaged in the mining and smelting of zinc, lead, and copper.

Hard times have been on for these industries for more than a year. During that time the men and women who work in these industries have been formulating a program of relief, which is endorsed and supported by both American Federation of Labor and CIO unions.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the program of action proposed by these labor groups, which is designed to stimulate production of these important metals as well as to provide relief to the jobless:

IMMEDIATE AID PROGRAM

A. Defense Production Act:

1. Declaration by Director Flemming that lead, zinc, and copper are essential to national defense; immediate grant to establish floor; price contracts before DPA expires.

2. Federal grant to States to provide unemployment compensation where State funds have already been exhausted.

3. Extend DPA beyond June 30, 1954.

4. Increase tax exemptions from present $600 to $800 to $1,000 in 1955.

5. Distressed areas assistance for small communities; revision of rules to provide small communities with a greater participation.

6. Stockpiling of domestic lead, zinc, and copper at a reasonable price, which will permit immediate reopening on a profitable basis of most mine operations.

LONG-RANGE PROGRAM

A. Incentive-payment price program:

1. Reasonable price.

2. Stockpiling.

3. Exploration and development.

B. Adjustment program (is only applicable where it has been determined mines or smelters can no longer operate under new incentive payment price program):

1. Aid to employees: (A) Unemployment compensation, supplemental; (B) training for new jobs; (C) transportation to new facilities.

2. Mines and smelters: New plants and machinery.

3. Communities: School construction, public works programs.

Mrs. Roger Lowell Putnam Honored by St. Michael's College

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 15, 1954

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, on June 7, 1954 at the commencement exercises of St. Michael's College, of Winooski, Vt. a very distinguished citizen of Springfield, Mass., and one of the outstanding women of America was presented an honorary degree of doctor of humanities. This event is all the more significant because it marked the first time in the 50-year history of St. Michael's College that a woman was so honored. In departing from its tradition, St. Michael's could not have picked a finer woman. I congratulate Very Rev. Francis E. Moriarty, S. S. E., president, the faculty and the student body of St. Michael's College for their wisdom in selecting this very great lady for so high an honor.

Few women in America have labored so long and so hard in the field of interracial justice as Caroline Jenkins Putnam. And in my native city of Springfield, Mass., without fanfare or headlines, she, indeed, has been an articulate and effective force in making our community a better place in which to live. I know the people of our area rejoice in the honor that has come to her.

Mr. Speaker, because the citation of St. Michael's College is a magnificent description of the woman it honored, I insert it in the RECORD, as follows:

CAROLINE JENKINS PUTNAM, DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF HUMANITIES, HONORIS CAUSA

History is being made on this memorable occasion, for today St. Michael's College, for the first time in her 50 years of existence, is conferring an honorary degree on a woman. It is eminently fitting in this year of the Madonna that we should do honor to one who has reflected so clearly throughout her life the beauty and dignity of her who is the exemplar of all womanhood.

Daughter of Maryland, scion of one of America's most distinguished Catholic families; devoted wife of a respected public citizen; mother of six, illustrious child of Mother Church; articulate promoter of the cause of interracial justice—the entire life of Caroline Jenkins Putnam praises her.

Worthy recipient of the Hoey award to the Interracial Council of New York, for many years Mrs. Putnam has gained national acclaim for her efforts to promote the welfare of the colored. As founder and president of the Catholic Scholarships for Negroes, Inc., she has been the inspiration and guiding spirit of an organization dedicated "to promote, encourage, develop, and increase the education of Negroes, particularly in Catholic schools, colleges, and universities."

From a modest beginning, with 4 students in 1947, the leadership of this woman has made possible the extensive program which presently makes the benefits of higher education available to over 100 needy and deserving colored youth.

No mere humanitarian reformer, Mrs. Putnam has been engaged creatively in the application of Christian teaching to the enrichment of the minds and hearts of promising young men and women of the Negro race. She has labored incessantly and has importuned others to join her in demonstrating the harmonious union of the Christian apostolate and enlightened democratic social action.

It is a deep honor, therefore, Father President, in the name of the faculty and trustees of St. Michael's College, to present Caroline Jenkins Putnam for the degree of doctor of humanities, honoris causa.

The Fight for Public Housing Must Be Won

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 15, 1954

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, below is cited a forthright battlecry by a champion in the cause of public housing, M. Edward De Fazio, president of Unico National, from Hoboken, N. J.:

HOBOKEN, N. J., *June 14, 1954.*

Hon. ALFRED SIEMINSKI,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Urge you and real friends of public housing to defeat rule proposed by Chairman WOLCOTT which will, if adopted, kill public housing. Support Senate bill permitting 4 years' public-housing program. This fight must be won.

Sincerely,

M. EDWARD DE FAZIO,
President, Unico National.

PRICE OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

The Public Printer is authorized to furnish to subscribers the daily RECORD at $1.50 per month, payable in advance.

Remit by money order payable to Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C.

Add
Pe
A

IN T

Mr
unar
the
deliv
the W
ters
Wash
Th
was
as fo

It
this
No
loyal
ism
Revol
You
freedo
soldie
libert
and s
Mar
to ou
taken
freedo
and o
You
ample
inspir
publi

The
when
to pro
ernme

The
for m
may
kind
enjoy

Thr
father
ing th
ever
began

At
with
Ameri
witho

I be
in all
as thi
have
spirit
What
so m
States

Firs
cess o
our s
the w
mank

Sec
and f

Appendix

Address of Hon. Edward Martin, of Pennsylvania, Before Daughters of American Revolution

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 16, 1954

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by me on June 12, 1954, before the Washington County Chapter, Daughters of the American Revolution, at Washington, Pa.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is a high honor to be invited to address this historic organization.

No group in the Nation has been more loyal to the sacred ideals of real Americanism than the Daughters of the American Revolution.

Your membership keeps alive the spirit of freedom and the patriotic traditions of the soldiers and statesmen who established our liberty and independence with their blood and sacrifice.

Many of us may have faltered in our duty to our country but the DAR has always taken a militant stand on the ramparts of freedom to uphold our form of Government and our way of life.

Your patriotic service is a shining example from which every American can gain inspiration for deeper devotion to our Republic and our flag.

There has never been a time in our history when it was more important for Americans to proclaim their belief in our form of Government.

There has never been a time that called for more resolute courage in order that we may hand down to future generations the kind of America we have been privileged to enjoy.

Through the heroic sacrifice of our forefathers there has been placed in our keeping the greatest measure of human liberty ever granted to any people since the world began.

At the same time we have been entrusted with the sacred responsibility of defending American freedom against any attack from without or within.

I believe we are the most powerful Nation in all history. It is proper in meeting such as this to give thought to the elements that have made us the material, cultural, and spiritual superior of any nation on earth. What are the things that have contributed so much to the greatness of the United States?

First and foremost in attributing the success of the American Republic I would place our system of government, the first in all the world based on God's greatest gift to mankind, freedom of the individual.

Second, I would place the sturdy courage and faith of our people—the American character—based upon hard work, thrift, tolerance, love of liberty, and love of God.

These priceless endowments are the foundation stones upon which American initiative, energy, and know-how created the vast empire of industrial and agricultural production that twice in a third of a century saved the world from dictatorship.

How can we preserve the ideals that made us a great Nation?

How can we recapture the spirit of the patriots whose vision and courage made possible the unparalleled rise of the United States as the world's brightest land of liberty and opportunity?

It sems to me that better understanding of the real meaning of America and deeper appreciation of its history are the roots from which patriotism and love of country can grow and flourish. Equally important is the preservation of our shrines of liberty and other points of historical interest.

Dr. Clarence E. Macartney, the distinguished minister and author, has listed seven places in the territory now comprising the United States as having the greatest historical importance. They are: St. Augustine, Fla., where the Spanish established themselves; Plymouth Rock, Mass., where the builders of the Nation first landed; Philadelphia, where the Colonies declared their independence; Yorktown, Va., where that independence was achieved; Gettysburg, where the Union of the States was perpetuated and cemented with blood of the North and the South; San Francisco and its Golden Gate, where the Nation's life on the Pacific had its beginning; and the point at Pittsburgh, where the Allegheny and the Monongahela mingle their floods to form the Ohio and where the issue was decided between France and England for dominion over the territories west of the Allegheny Mountains.

In our schools we teach our boys and girls about the rise and fall of bygone civilizations. Our young people study the glories of ancient Greece and Rome.

That, of course, is a necessary part of their education, but I believe the more emphasis on our own history, including State, regional, county, and community history, would contribute to better citizenship by encouraging civic pride and greater interest in American achievement.

The history of southwestern Pennsylvania is a thrilling chapter in the advance of civilization on this continent.

It is sprinkled with names of brilliant men, military leaders, lawyers, preachers, educators, scientists, industrialists, craftsmen, farmers, and men skilled in politics and government.

Outstanding among these great names is that of George Washington. He was one of the first to recognize the strategic importance of the gateway to the West where the Allegheny and the Monongahela meet.

Two hundred years ago, in 1753, Washington then only 21 years of age and on his first mission into Pennsylvania, wrote in his journal:

"I spent some time viewing the rivers and the land in the fork which I think extremely well situated for a fort, as it has absolute command of both rivers."

Subsequent events proved Washington to be right. The course of history made this area a battlefield that ended French sovereignty in America.

The Fort Pitt Blockhouse and Point Park perpetuate the historic significance of the victory won by British and Colonial troops which decided the future of the North American continent and the destiny of two European empires.

West of us is Fort Necessity and we are all happy that the importance of Washington's first combat command is to be recognized next month in the celebration of the 200th anniversary of that battle.

Other high points in the military history are Col. Henry Bouquet's decisive victory at Bushy Run in August 1763, and the expedition of American volunteers which embarked at Pittsburgh under Gen. Anthony Wayne to defeat the western Indians in the Battle of Fallen Timbers in 1794.

Yes, the region in which we live is rich in historical associations, not in war alone, but also in the development of our great cultural and spiritual strength.

Churches, colleges, and other institutions which go far into the past are within our midst.

We are proud that here in Washington was established the first institute of higher learning west of the Alleghenies, Washington and Jefferson College. Part of the administration building, erected in 1793, is 1 of the 8 oldest college buildings in constant use in the United States.

At Canonsburg we have the Old Log Academy, founded by the Reverend John McMillan in 1780, which became Jefferson College, and later was merged with Washington College. Jefferson Medical College, the great medical center in Philadelphia, originated as a department of Jefferson College in Canonsburg.

The old Hill Church is another monument to the great cultural and spiritual leadership of Dr. McMillan. Other venerable churches recall our debt to the dedicated ministers of the Gospel like Dr. McMillan, Dr. Dodd, Dr. Smith, Dr. Corbly, and many others who came into the western wilderness to preach the word of God and to lead the early settlers in the way of righteousness.

Let us go over some of the other historic points that are close to us.

Here on Main Street we have the David Bradford house, which stands as a memorial to the first test of the Government of the new Republic. It was the headquarters for planning the whisky insurrection. Many patriotic and outstanding Americans took part in that rebellion because they felt that Government was encroaching on their individual freedom. It was so important that Washington took command of an army consisting of almost 15,000 troops to suppress the insurrection and made his headquarters at Bedford.

The LeMoyne House, built in 1812, recalls the career of Dr. Francis J. LeMoyne, a great abolitionist who built the first crematory in the United States.

Not far from here at New Geneva, near Uniontown, is Friendship Hill, home of Albert Gallatin, one of the most brilliant men of his time, whose fame rests upon his distinguished achievements in finance, diplomacy and statecraft.

In the bright pageant of our early history we see the great western migration over the old National Pike, now the heavily traveled Route 40. For many years this was the Nation's principal highway from the East to the West. It was the route taken by the courageous pioneers who pushed into the unexplored territory of the West to carve out a new empire of American progress.

This area has produced a long line of great men whose energy, vision, and courage helped to build the greatness of the United States. I shall not attempt to list them here. Their names should be remembered and honored whenever we think about American achievement. Great captains of industry have poured their creative energies into productive enterprise for the benefit of their fellow men. Scientists, inventors, preachers, educators, men devoted to the soil, and skilled craftsmen of southwestern Pennsylvania—all have helped to make this a better place to live and to work.

Here in Washington County is the birthplace of William Holmes McGuffey whose widely used textbooks, McGuffey's Readers, had a profound influence on the education of schoolchildren for many years.

Not far from here were born three men who achieved distinction in the affairs of our Nation, each of them serving as Secretary of State—James G. Blaine, once Republican candidate for President; Philander C. Knox, who also served in the United States Senate, and that distinguished soldier and statesman, Gen. George C. Marshall.

A great American in the field of science, Dr. John A. Brashear, author, astronomer, and philosopher, was born in the same section of southwestern Pennsylvania.

Music and art have flourished amongst us, encouraged by such men as Andrew W. Mellon, whose world-famous collection now in the National Gallery of Art at Washington, D. C., enriches the cultural life of the Nation.

The songs of Stephen Collins Foster have lived through generations, giving joy and inspiration to millions wherever his music is heard.

As we count the blessings that have come down to us, we cannot fail to recognize our debt to the great leaders of the past. The high principles by which they lived and their distinguished achievements in peace and war should be studied, appreciated, and honored until they become part of our very lives.

We can preserve American ideals if we are guided by their example. We can strengthen the structure of Americanism if we work with renewed patriotism, increased courage, and firm determination for higher moral and spiritual standards.

We cannot defend America with military power alone.

The real strength of America is in the spiritual and moral character of its people—the strength that comes from work, thrift, tolerance, loyalty, and obedience to the laws of man and God.

What a wonderful country we would have if we could rid ourselves of all dishonesty in public and private affairs.

What a wonderful revival of patriotic fervor would sweep the Nation if we could eliminate all disloyalty to American institutions.

These noble objectives should be our constant goal because honesty and loyalty are fundamental principles without which no nation can go forward.

On Monday, June 14, we will observe Flag Day, the anniversary of a memorable day in the history of the American independence.

On that date, 177 years ago, we were in the second year of the Revolution. It was a time of gloom and discouragement. Washington's ragged army was inadequately equipped and poorly disciplined. It was falling back before the trained regulars of the world's most powerful empire. Only the military genius of General Washington saved the small patriot force from total disaster.

But the Founding Fathers did not waver in their faith.

Meeting in the Old State House in the city of Philadelphia the Continental Congress adopted a resolution directing that the flag of the United States be 13 stripes, alternate red and white; that the union be 13 stars, white in a blue field, representing a new constellation.

Thus the stars and stripes came into being, a new emblem of human liberty, the banner of a free people who put their trust in God and placed firm reliance on the protection of Divine Providence.

Today, with the passage of 177 years, the stars and stripes is the oldest, the proudest, and the best-loved flag in the world.

Half the world would flock to our shores, if it were possible to gain admission, in order to share with us the glorious privilege of being an American.

As we approach this Flag Day anniversary may the love of the stars and stripes be our steadfast guide to better citizenship, better Americanism and a deeper appreciation of the rich heritage that is ours.

World Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ALLEN FREAR, JR.

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 16, 1954

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a sermon delivered by the Reverend Donald Douds, minister of the Hanover Street Presbyterian Church in Wilmington, Del.

In his message Reverend Douds proposes what he believes to be constructive methods for encouraging world peace.

There being no objection, the sermon was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WAGING PEACE

(A sermon given by Rev. Donald Douds)

Scripture, Luke 16: 1–11: "The sons of this world are wiser in their age than the sons of light * * * make friends for yourselves by means of unrighteous mammon."

Of all our Lord's parables, probably this one about the dishonest steward is the least understood, the most puzzling, for in it Jesus seems to commend a scoundrel and to approve dishonesty.

You recall the story. A rich man gave his steward notice of dismissal. The steward, before his work ended, quickly called in those who owed debts to his employer and cut their debts. This he did to make friends to whom he might turn for help when his work ended. The rich man commended the steward for his prudence, saying, "The sons of this world are wiser * * * than the sons of light." That is, men are more clever for bad purposes than for good. And Jesus added, "Make friends for yourselves by means of unrighteous mammon, so that when it fails they may receive you into the eternal habitations."

Was Jesus teaching dishonesty? No; of course not. He was teaching resourcefulness. Jesus did not commend the steward's dishonesty, but his cleverness, his ingenuity. He was saying men ought to be as resourceful, as clever, as imaginative for righteous purposes as they are for unrighteous purposes.

We can understand why Jesus told this parable. He saw the corrupt money-changers of his day, so resourceful for evil that they bribed their way into the very courts of the temple. If only men were that eager, Jesus must have thought, to get into the temple to worship, to serve God instead of mammon (the god of riches). He saw tax collectors like Zaccheus, so skillful in greed that they grew rich off other men's backs. If only men were that ingenious to serve rather than to get rich. He saw how Rome had conquered the whole Mediterranean world for power and profit. If only men would be that strong and resourceful for good causes, then the Kingdom of Heaven on earth would be at hand.

Here is one of life's greatest tragedies. How resourceful, clever, energetic men are for worldly, evil purposes; while how lazy, weak, unimaginative we are for good purposes. "The sons of this world are wiser * * * than the sons of light."

Look at the example of gambling. Professional gamblers and racketeers go to any ends to spread gambling. They bribe State legislators; they hide behind the skirts of charity and even the churches, trying to get gambling legalized as a blessing to churches and charities. Patiently, tirelessly, endlessly they work to achieve their degenerate aims. Defeated in last year's legislature in our State, do you think they gave up? No, they are preparing day and night to try again. They never give up. What is the proverb—fools and knaves are never idle.

How magnificent it would be if those same people were as tireless, patient, and persistent in spreading God's Kingdom as they are in spreading gambling. How fine it would be if we were as resourceful and devoted to God's work as they are to gambling. "The sons of this world are wiser * * * than the sons of light."

America is the greatest selling nation on earth. We believe in advertising and we spend billions on it. For material, worldly gain we have flooded the world with our goods. What could we not do if we turned all our creative genius to unselfish purposes, to furthering God's Kingdom? A returned missionary said, "If Christians were as resourceful as the Singer Sewing Machine Co., we would have christianized the world by now."

So our Lord in this parable challenges us and all men to be as wise and skillful for unselfish purposes as for selfish. "The sons of this world are wiser * * * than the sons of light * * * make friends for yourselves by means of the unrighteous Mammon."

The most striking practical application of this truth is in the field of war and peace. The supreme irony of our world is that we're so able, so devoted, so clever for war, but so helpless, so blind, so clumsy for peace.

For war we do anything. We give and sacrifice endlessly. We give billions—we spent more on our last war than on all else put together in our history. We give war our best natural resources, science, wealth, industry—even the lives of our finest youth. For war our resourcefulness has no bound: We invent radar, jet planes, atom bombs. We draft and send 10 million of our ablest men all over the world. Our intelligence, our ingenuity, our resourcefulness for war are astounding. Are we doing the same for peace?

This is not a political talk. Others can do that better. But here is a clear principle our Lord taught, which may be part of the answer to our world's seemingly hopeless impasse today: "Make friends for yourselves by means of unrighteous mammon." Make friends by being as resourceful in wordly ways for peace as for war.

How could we be as resourceful for peace as we are for war?

As a nation, we have a Secretary of War and Defense. Why not a Secretary of Peace? In a sense, our Secretary of State is a Secretary of Peace, but he spends most of his time building military alliances, preparing for war. We should be more imaginative than that. Military alliances and huge armaments have never yet stopped war.

Why not a Secretary of Peace to mobilize our Nation for peace, to invent new sociological and psychological methods and techniques (as amazing as the atom bomb) for creating peace? We need a Department of Peace, with as many billions of dollars and millions of men as has the Department of War.

We are ringing our world with multimillion-dollar military bases. Why not with multimillion-dollar peace bases — centers where peace and democracy would be taught and spread to millions?

All over our country we have military schools to train our youth in the science of war. But we have no peace schools to train them in the science of building international peace. Many of our universities have military training courses. But the world's best course in peacemaking, the teachings of Christ, is conspicuously excluded from our public schools and universities. We want peace, but what a strange way to go about it—to exclude the best source of peace from the training of our youth.

We have a West Point for the Army, an Annapolis for the Army, and now a new West Point for the Air Force. Why not a West Point for peace? A national academy where the ablest young men of America would be trained in the practical techniques of building goodwill and democracy, and then sent out with a drafted army of a million men to help them to build peace, friendship, democracy all over the world.

In this way we might beat the Communists at their own game. For is this not the way they work? They are waging a new kind of war—the war of ideas. When Communists want to conquer a country, they do not declare war. They send in thousands of trained, disciplined workers who begin to spread ideas, to convert, train, organize the people of that country for communism. After they have trained enough, they take over the country. They fight with ideas. And until we, too, learn to fight with ideas, they will continue to win. Our colossal folly is in thinking we can shoot or stop an idea with a gun. "The sons of this world are wiser * * * than the sons of light * * * make friends for yourselves by means of unrighteous mammon." Use money and worldly sense to make friends and build peace.

We need a peace army of a million dedicated men and women to go into the world and wage the war of ideas, wage peace—through teaching, writing, speaking, serving, working and living sacrificially with the people of each country until we win them to understand and want peace and democracy as we do.

A huge undertaking? Yes, but not as great as fighting another war. Here are some thought-provoking figures. In World War II it cost about $50,000 to kill one man. Under our Board of Foreign Missions it costs about $1,000 to convert one person to Christianity. Which is cheaper—to fight wars or to make friends?

Our church has produced an excellent film on our work in Africa called the Challenge of Africa. It is the story of two brothers in an African village. One brother went to a city to work. There he was befriended by some Communists, and he became a Communist. Just as he was about to get into serious trouble, his brother came to the city, found him and turned him to the ways of Christ. His brother showed him that communism was not the answer for him or for Africa, but that Christ was the answer.

The picture was a parable of our world. We, too, have a responsibility for our brother. It is not to slaughter him with H-bombs in another war, or even just to line him up on our side, but to go and show him that Christ is the true answer, the real way to peace and democracy and the abundant life.

Make friends. If we do that on a large enough scale there may not be another war.

Prayer: O God, give us and all leaders of men the resourcefulness to wage peace as effectively as we wage war. Amen.

Highway Reciprocity Agreements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAT SUTTON
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 16, 1954

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Speaker, I recently had occasion to request the Library of Congress to look into the history of the various highway reciprocity agreements between the States. With greatly increased funds for Federal aid to highways being made available to the various States and the problem of reciprocity between the States becoming more important, under permission, I reprint the information which the Library obtained for the benefit of my colleagues:

HIGHWAY RECIPROCITY AGREEMENTS

In general terms, highway reciprocity amounts to the granting of complete or partial relief to out-of-State vehicles from the payment of motor-vehicles assessments levied by a particular State on vehicles registered within that State. It is effected through a mutual agreement between two or more States, and is contingent upon the granting of like privileges by all participating States. Thus, two States which grant each other full reciprocity give the owners and operators of motor vehicles registered within their respective States the privilege of entering either State without paying certain of its taxes. The concept of reciprocity is based on the axiom that multiple taxation of the same vehicle by two or more States tends to create a barrier to the free flow of interstate traffic.

The granting of reciprocity with respect to the interstate movement of motor vehicles was first established on behalf of passenger car owners. Back in the early days of the automobile a driver of one State had to pay the registration fee of another State before he was allowed to travel on its roads. This was true of most of the States. For a time New Jersey required the payment of a fee for a New Jersey driver's license in addition to a registration fee. And Missouri permitted each of its counties to collect a separate registration fee from vehicles traveling through. The result of such conditions was chaos, and great expense and inconvenience to motorists, and they constituted a deterrent to the large-scale use of interstate highways.

Gradually the States recognized the evil of such laws and regulations and began to correct them. Reports indicate that by 1928 all States had agreed to exempt out-of-State automobiles from such taxes, provided the State of the original licensed car granted a similar exemption. Such provisions did not apply to fuel taxes nor to the use of toll facilities.

Extension of the reciprocity principle to commercial vehicles followed as a matter of course, although with certain limitations which tended to vary from State to State. The limitation appeared because many States took the view that, because of their size and weight, the grant of reciprocal privileges to commercial vehicles should be made with reservation.

Reciprocity is but one of four methods by which relief is obtained from motor vehicle user taxes and attendant restrictions. The other three are exemptions, nonenforcement, and evasion; only exemptions need be discussed here.

The essential difference between an exemption and reciprocity is that an exemption is granted regardless of what other States do, while reciprocity depends largely on the actions of participating States. Exemptions are most frequently granted the owners of passenger cars and farmers who use vehicles to haul agricultural produce. Vehicles of the Federal Government bearing Federal license plates are exempt from State registration and carrier regulation. There is an extensive list of specific exemptions granted by the individual States, although they differ widely from State to State.

Most States are considered relatively liberal in the extent of exemptions or reciprocity accorded the operators of automobiles. However, during World War II, war workers who moved about frequently on construction jobs complained of the expense they were put to because of the failure of some States to extend complete exemption or reciprocity privileges to residents of other States. The American Association of Motor Vehicle Administrators took note of this situation and reported that, as a result of its recommendation for the adoption of a policy of leniency, significant improvements were made.

With respect to reciprocity privileges affecting the interstate movement of commercial vehicles, many reciprocal agreements are quite informal, and, in a number of instances, do not exist in writing. The constitutionality of many reciprocity agreements is considered to be in doubt since they constitute compacts between the States without specific consent from Congress. Reciprocity agreements are characterized in many cases by a lack of permanence. In some instances such agreements have been consummated by officials whose term of office is but 2 years. And even where the persons responsible for reciprocal agreements enjoy longer terms of office, there is generally little assurance that such agreements will not be terminated at will.

In 1944 the board of investigation and research made a study of trade barriers affecting motor vehicles. The board reported that there has been no set pattern for reciprocity agreements. Some were found to be liberal and inclusive while others were conservative and narrow. The latter condition was attributed partly to an unwillingness of State representatives to yield prerogatives, and partly to constitutional or legislative limitations.

The board found that reciprocity agreements were generally established for indefinite periods. Some had been in force for a number of years while others had been terminated after being in effect for only a few months, or even a few weeks. A common cause for the termination of agreements was found to be a change in the motor-carrier laws or regulations of one of the participating States.

Reciprocity agreements have been criticized because of their inflexibility—most agreements are based on the exchange of equal or like privileges. Those who offer criticism on this count point out the difficulty of arriving at equality of exchange when considering the wide variance of tax structures extent among the States.

Tax officials have criticized reciprocal agreements for several reasons. First, they note that many of the agreements are not sufficiently specific, and do not differentiate between the various classes of carriers providing different classes of service. The informal nature of many agreements is the second cause for disapproval by the group. However, the strongest criticism of tax officials has been directed toward those States which they feel do not take the total highway user tax burden into consideration when entering into reciprocal agreements.

Regional agreements on reciprocity are a comparatively recent development. The American Association of Motor Vehicle Administrators reported that the first attempt to establish a group agreement occurred in December 1949 when 10 southern States held a reciprocity conference at Atlanta, Ga. All 10 States entered into the agreement.

During 1950, the States of Washington, Oregon, and Idaho entered into an agreement covering the registration of commercial vehicles operating in those States. Also during 1950, 12 midwestern States established a reciprocity workshop, with the stated objective of improving pertinent legislation, enforcement techniques, and agreement policy.

With respect to actions by the individual States, in 1950 the Department of Agriculture instituted a study of interstate barriers to highway transportation. The study indicated that at that time 47 States had the necessary authority to enter into reciprocity agreements. Arizona alone had no such authority. Tennessee and Illinois were reported to make little use of their authority. The report also called attention to the high degree of informality and lack of permanence of reciprocal agreements in general.

Fair-Trade Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS E. MARTIN

OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 16, 1954

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I have had the privilege of reading a very interesting discussion on the subject of fair trade presented by Emanuel Katz before the Senate Subcommittee for the District of Columbia during the hearings on the Beall bill to enact a fair-trade law in Washington. Under permission to extend my remarks, I am setting forth Mr. Katz' statement herewith to give the Members of Congress an opportunity to read it:

Mr. name is Emanuel Katz. I am president of Doeskin Products, Inc., of New York City. My firm manufactures facial and bathroom tissue, paper napkins, and sanitary napkins, which enjoy distribution throughout the United States. I would like to thank the members of the committee for allowing me the time in which to state my views in support of legislation for fair trade in the District of Columbia.

Our company operates 3 plants, employing approximately 600 people. We are a medium-size company, representative of thousands of other companies in various industries throughout the country. Our products have always been fair traded, both at wholesale and at retail, and we consider our fair-trade structure to be the backbone of our company's marketing policy.

There are numerous sound arguments to support fair trade, but I will limit myself to three:

1. It is possible, as a result of fair trade, that all prices to the consumer might tend to be reduced.

2. Deep price cutting of the leading brands makes it impossible for secondary brands to compete and, therefore, tends toward undue concentration of business in the hands of a few. It tends toward the creation of bigness, as against medium and small-size businesses.

3. The system of price cutting may, eventually, lead to Government control and, perhaps, the operation of standard retail stores, with a single label available for any one kind of commodity.

We fair traders and proponents of legitimate profit margins do not wish to impose this concept on all manufacturers and distributors of branded merchandise. We say, let manufacturers who want to market their wares without benefit of fair trade, do so, and let those who believe in the principle of fair trade, have the opportunity to market their goods under that concept.

We say to retailers, "You want loss leaders—good—but select them from among non-fair-traded brands." We, of course, decry all loss leaders as unsound, but we believe in your right to employ this sterile and unrewarding process on non-fair-traded brands.

Loss-leader selling is a sort of prima facie nonsense. The very word "loss" is a negation of the first economic principle of doing business—which is to create a profit. From too much loss, the wages can only be bankruptcy.

How is it possible to create a profit when goods are sold either (1) below invoice cost, (2) at 3 to 5 percent over cost, or even 10 percent over cost, when the average overhead costs of operating supermarkets are about 17 percent, in drugstores, chains, and independents, about 27 percent, and in department stores about 33 percent?

What kind of financial legerdemain or sorcery is this? Can the answer be found in the fact that consumers overpay for other merchandise sold in these stores, in order to compensate for the bait provided by loss leaders or low-gross profit selling?

We labor hard to put the value and the acceptance into our nationally advertised products, and it is these trade-mark values which we do not wish to be destroyed. After it has been footballed long enough, there is nothing deader than a brand which no longer yields a profit to any retailer. This is the point of no return. This is the point which we fair traders do not wish our brands to reach.

It takes millions of dollars of advertising and selling, and years of intense marketing effort, to create a brand. But, in a few years, sharp price-cutting practices can destroy all the goodwill originally created.

And now, gentlemen, let me take up in detail the three points which I stressed in behalf of fair trade, at the outset of my remarks.

Point No. 1: It is possible, as a result of fair trade, that all prices to the consumer might tend to be reduced.

In order to understand what might appear to be a paradox, we have to clearly know what actually happens when consumers buy in stores that are cutting prices.

We know advertised brands are largely employed as loss leaders to create store traffic. Those consumers who buy only loss leaders gain. Those who buy other goods (not loss leaders) pay for the bargains which the former group obtains. One day any single customer may be in the first group. Tomorrow she may be in the second group. Any gains to the consumer from all these gyrations are, perhaps, nil. Consumer customers, not sharpened to these retail pricing practices, may even overpay in the long run.

Now, let us supose the consumer decides to buy the store's private brand. The price of the private brand is exactly the same in every single market of either a chain, or an independent, voluntary or co-op group. It is interesting to note that every retailer in America, utilizing private brands, practices fair trade with his own private brand. This in spite of the fact that it is generally well known that the cost of operating varies in the respective units of any single chain, or voluntary, or co-op group, depending on sales volume, rentals, and other costs of doing business. And yet private brand prices are not reduced to the consumer in these lower operating cost stores. Were it not for the losses sustained from loss leaders and low-gross margin selling, perhaps chains would voluntarily price downward their own private brands, because they would no longer have to use them as loss off-sets.

You would think, from reading some retail ads that certain retailers have been able to work out some sort of economic abracadabra that permits them to profitably sell all their goods in their stores at deep cut prices or below cost. You and I know that this is sheer nonsense. No stores are so efficient as to accomplish this and because of this, the consumer is, perhaps, paying more for merchandise than she might otherwise have to if the national brands weren't cut so deeply in price.

Loss leaders are low-gross margin merchandise dilute the profits created by normally and fairly priced goods. Few, if any, retailers are ever willing to accept the responsibility for the creation of loss leaders. Retailers almost always saddle their competitors with the responsibility for this condition. Few are willing to accept the onus for this obvious unremunerative process, because they know it is not good business.

I would suspect that most dealers employing loss leaders would enjoy getting off the horns of this dilemma. Each, however, would prefer that his competitor take the risks involved in initiating such a program. Retailers are truly between Scylla and Charybdis and they would, perhaps, welcome manufacturers who legally try to maintain fair and equitable retail prices—prices which absorb their fair share of the overhead load and leave a fair profit.

We quote the following from a recent survey, dated April 1, 1954, issued by Progressive Grocer, a leading trade paper:

"Some operators have wondered what would happen to drug and toiletry prices if fair-trade laws became invalid. At least a partial answer to this possibility is provided by this survey. A few States are not bound by fair trade legislation and retailers in these States have complete freedom of action in pricing health and beauty aids. It is interesting to note that average margins in these non-fair-trade States are slightly higher than in fair-trade States—indicating the strongest kind of dealer determination to maintain drug sales at a profit."

This is proof that fair trade might even tend to reduce the price to the consumer, and one consumer would not be paying for the other consumer's bargains. It follows, also, that greater emphasis thereby might be placed on quality, durability, and other factors which enter into the eventual cost of merchandise.

And now my second point—deep price cutting of the leading brands makes it impossible for secondary brands to compete and, therefore, tends toward undue concentration of business in the hands of a few. It tends toward the creation of bigness, as against medium and small size businesses.

The dominant brands in any industry may survive the effects of price slashing, but the secondary brands, which follow this same course of action, will find their brands disappearing from the shelves.

Besides, it would take an inordinate and uneconomic volume of advertising, beyond the financial means of secondary manufacturers, to find a position on even a limited number of dealers' shelves. It has been thoroughly established that price cutting is one of the most effective means of eliminating competition.

The leader or, perhaps, the No. 2 brand can survive loss-leader selling, but the secondary brands cannot. This results from the fact that no retailer will stock more than 1 or 2 loss-leader brands in any one class of commodity. Therefore, the single most important marketing argument the secondary brands can advance is—profitability—which only fair trade can protect. And, it is worth repetition—that there is a limit to the number of loss leaders or unprofitable brands any retailer wants to handle in any one class of goods.

As further proof of this, we claim that the very presence of private brands, which retailers employ for the purpose of creating profit, is their answer to the price cutting on the nationally advertised brands. These private brands are, in effect, replacing what might have been normally the secondary brands in the industry. And, to carry the point still further, in many retailing operations the private brands have actually become the No. 1 seller.

And now for my final point—the system of price cutting may, eventually, lead to Government control and, perhaps, the operation of standard retail stores, with a single label available for any one kind of commodity.

The competitive practices in the distribution industry, of loss-leader selling and low-gross margin selling, has resulted in a continuing diminution of net profit before taxes and after taxes.

As this practice continues and forces the retailing industry into losses and further chaotic conditions that accompany such a situation, you will find those proposing, as they have before, the concept of the operation of standard retail stores, with a single label available for any one kind of a commodity. This, of course, will spell ruin to the entire advertising industry, and to the entire concept of brand marketing, and to the consumers' freedom of choice.

An example of this condition and the chaos which is indicated above can be found in the coupon and loss-leader selling, which is now an uncontrollable Frankenstein exercising a despotic usurpation of the grocery scene.

It was recently established that it costs the average retail store about 2.6 cents each to handle coupons. Yet manufacturers, for the most part, only allow a penny per coupon to the retailer. When you consider that coupons, for the most part, are associated with loss leaders, it becomes clear that this operating loss must be absorbed by consumers on other items bought in the store. Somebody pays for it.

And, what's more, the same thing is beginning to rear its ugly head in drug retailing. The craze for volume at any price will one day explode like an H-bomb and will destroy manufacturers, wholesalers, and retailers alike.

One of the largest soap manufacturers in the world attributes its losses in the past few years to the fierce competition of coupons and giveaways. This soap manufacturer claims, "This would come to an end if the management of the three soap companies followed their desires, but none wants to initiate the move lest it be caught on the short end of the competitive rope."

I think that this committee should also consider the importance and significance of the District of Columbia at this particular time. Washington, D. C., is an important geographical outpost which non-fair-trade operators are beginning to use as a bootlegging base of operations. Wholesaling and retailing operations are growing up in the District of Columbia, whose avowed purpose it is to circumvent fair-trade laws of all the other surrounding States, clear to New England and clear to Florida. These houses are ready to flaunt the laws of the States where their price-cutting activities have been stopped by injunction. It would seem that our legislators should not permit the Capital of our country to be used as a spawning ground for operators who would break down fair trade in States where there is clear adjudication sustaining fair trade.

Nothing I have said is intended to relieve either the manufacturer, the wholesaler, or the retailer from the burden of responsibility for lower operating costs. Manufacturers do not compete in a vacuum. In the final analysis, the consumer makes the voluntary choice of the merchandise she will buy from the shelves of the retail stores of America. Each manufacturer's production and marketing operation must employ the most modern techniques, in order to bring the goods to the consumer at the lowest possible fair price. In the final analysis, if a manufacturer can produce a competitive article, and sell it at a fair-traded price, and protect it with a fair margin to the distribution industries, and do it at a lower price than his competitor, he will have a fair advantage.

Another name for the capitalistic system is—the profit system. Our country grew strong from profits. Our schools, colleges, hospitals, roads, and so forth are the product of the profit system. It is the profit system that we wish to protect, so that it may go on improving our already high standard of living.

Capitol Page School Commencement Address by Attorney General Brownell

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1954

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an address to the Capitol Page School at their commencement exercises on Monday, June 14, 1954, by Attorney General Brownell:

You know, I'm a bit envious of you young gentlemen graduating here tonight. It isn't because you're younger than I or because you have the idealistic vision of youth.

But, I'm a bit envious because you not only have completed some fine scholastic courses but you have gained an insight into the forces of history which is denied to most of us at your time of life. In your studies, past and future, you have the knowledge to find living meaning in the words of sometimes dusty textbooks.

You have also the guidance and inspiration of your daily activities alongside men struggling to translate the ideals and heritage of this Nation into present-day actions. You see occasional examples of men who would twist those ideals to their own selfish ends. But you see more those who are living examples of the best in our free way of life. Because you have experience beyond your years, you can, if you will, become the best citizens, become the civic leaders for the good of your generation.

Of all the blessings conferred on us by our form of Government, the right of active participation in the affairs of our Nation—the right to be heard—is of fundamental importance. This right, this privilege, is expressed in various ways under our laws as free speech, free press, free assembly.

Men have fought and died to preserve these privileges for us. Our Nation even now is engaged in a lengthy struggle to maintain them for ourselves and our descendants. The cost is often high—but freemen would have it no other way.

The cost which we all must bear every day of our lives is found in the duties that go with our citizenship. Those duties are found in part in our laws, but others must be found within ourselves, each of us. They are moral obligations which stem from the law of God. Since our Nation was established on a belief and trust in God, His laws must be obeyed just as we would obey legislative enactments.

The founders of our country believed, as you and I believe, that because man was created by God he was given certain inalienable rights. Sometimes we refer to those rights as the dignity of man. When we trample on those rights, we are trampling on the laws of God. When we deny a fellow man any of those rights or when we strip him of his dignity, we are violating a moral law just as surely as killing a man deliberately and cold-bloodedly violates a written as well as a moral law.

Our statutes setting up penalties for murder stem directly from moral law. Yet there are other moral laws which are not on the statute books. We are not obliged to feed a starving person. We incur no penalty if we turn our back on the drowning man when we might have saved him. Nor is loyalty a legal relationship except insofar as the Nation can punish those who commit overt acts endangering our security. A written law cannot compel devotion or patriotism, as such. They spring from a free will to promote the interests of our Nation and its citizens.

Today there is a clash between two fundamentally different approaches to life. On the one hand is the Judaic-Christian concept of a society based on a belief in a Supreme Being. On the other hand is atheistic communism which is opposed not only to our concept of government but to the purpose of all life as we understand it.

Atheistic communism gives lip service to what it calls ideals. But we know it as a vast, sinister, worldwide conspiracy. We recognize it as tyranny in its darkest form. Like all tyranny, it feeds on ignorance and misunderstanding and deceit. It denies the very existence of justice, the very existence of moral law. It believes laws are only tools to accomplish the liquidation of those who would oppose communism, to enslave those who come under its grasp.

There is no doubt that the Communist leaders hope to enslave the world. They have proclaimed that purpose in every one of their basic writings. Likewise, there is no doubt that, to succeed, the men in the Kremlin must destroy this Nation as we know it. The United States presents to them the greatest obstacle to success, the shining example of all that freemen stand for.

As President Eisenhower pointed out recently, "There is no other subject or purpose in which Americans are so completely united as in their opposition to communism."

Yet, to our friends abroad—and indeed even to ourselves—this very opposition to communism seems to be the greatest cause of any division among us. As the President warned, we must apply more knowledge and intellect to the problem—and less prejudice and emotion.

We must remember that the strategy of the Communist leaders is that of divide and conquer. We must not fall for it; we must not let others fall for it. The Communists exploit every difference among us. We cannot, as they would like us to do, lose faith in our institutions and in the essential wisdom of freemen. We cannot accept our freedoms lightly.

The founders of this Nation were motivated by rebellion against tyranny. They were sick to death of the revolting contempt of tyrants for the individual human being.

Yet, their actions were not rash but deliberate. No government in history was ever more deliberately thought out than that of the United States. No government at its beginning was more agonizingly scrutinized from every aspect of reason and historical experience.

The founders were wise enough to know that this Nation would face constant problems, changing situations. They made provisions to meet new problems, new times.

They realized, too, that a government of law, no matter how close to perfection, must be conducted by men; that some men abuse freedoms; that there is a need for restraint. They derived a very careful system of checks and balances.

George Washington, in his writings, said the Government would rest upon the virtue of the people. He warned that possibly the greatest threat would be a listlessness among the citizens "for the preservation of the natural rights of man." Benjamin Franklin gave something of the same warning when he replied to a question as to what form of government had been devised by saying, "We have given you a Republic—if you can keep it."

While the preservation of our freedoms must be the business of every citizen, there is no need for a return to the ways of the vigilantes of frontier days. Freedom cannot be preserved by lynch law.

President Eisenhower put it all very simply by saying that our hopes and dreams "must first come to pass in the heart of America." In the same vein, he noted that the things which make us proud to be Americans "are not the jewels we wear, or the furs we buy, the houses we live in. The things that make us proud," he declared, "are of the soul and the spirit."

The spirit of America is its greatest weapon in the worldwide conflict of today. The competition is not only with force of arms. It is more a battle for men's minds. The free nations must demonstrate the superiority of their moral and social principles in everyday actions.

You are far better equipped than most to translate our ideals into action. Do not be afraid to do so. And don't lose faith, either with the past or with the future.

It is true that mankind, during the past 50 years, has made more technical and material progress than in the previous 2,000 years. But that progress is continuing, it is accelerating. You need only look at the tremendous growth of our own population to realize what that growth alone means in the way of new markets, new jobs, new technical needs.

The use of atomic power for peace almost defies imagination. Yet we are building our first ship to be powered in this fashion. A young scientist says he can run a train with atomic power. We are ready to start building our first commercial atomic powerplant. The young people of today face a period of progress and almost limitless opportunity.

But, in accepting that material opportunity, you cannot afford to forget the spiritual heritage that has withstood many challenges over the years. Our strength, in fact, stems from that fight against tyranny, in whatever guise we encounter it. There is no need to become hysterical in our present battle against Communist tyranny. There is no need to sacrifice our cherished liberties.

There are those among us who would be afraid, who would forget that the American way is the courageous way, that we would face our problems with faith, that truth must ever be the bulwark of our freedoms.

Armed with faith and truth, our Nation shall continue to grow and prosper. Armed with the same faith and truth, you can carry your responsibilities with courage and understanding.

Oh, Happy Unemployment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VERA BUCHANAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 15, 1954

Mrs. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include in the Record the following excerpt from the July issue of the Democratic Digest:

Oh, Happy Unemployment

A news release which we have received from the Department of Labor seems to indicate that the administration sees a blessing in unemployment. The release announced: "Secretary of Labor James P. Mitchell today announced that the Federal-State unemployment insurance system added $552,950,329 to local community and national purchasing power during the first quarter of this year."

We are not disposed to argue that the unemployment checks added to the country's purchasing power, since the average weekly payment for total unemployment was $24.65 and it isn't hard for a family to spend that much a week on food and clothing at today's prices. Nonetheless we cannot escape the suspicion that if the persons who were getting the average check of $24.65 for not working were getting bigger checks for producing something useful they might be spending even more than $24.65 each week.

Anyhow, we congratulate the Labor Department for an artistically written news release. You don't have to look for the silver lining in the unemployment picture—the Labor Department lets you have it right between the eyes.

House Bill Speeds Ship Inspections

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1954

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I have every hope and expectation that shortly this House will be considering H. R. 6253, to amend Public Law 410, 78th Congress, with regard to compensation for overtime, Sunday, and holiday work of employees of the United States Public Health Service, Foreign Quarantine Division.

A number of my colleagues have expressed interest in this bill and, in this connection, I quote an article from the June 13, 1954, issue of the New York Times which is self-explanatory:

House Bill Speeds Ship Inspections

Round-the-clock inspection of ships at quarantine, long sought by the shipping industry, moved a step closer to realization last week as the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of the House reported favorably on a bill that would provide the service.

United States Public Health officers, charged with the ship examinations, now work only between 6 a. m. and 6 p. m. Vessels arriving later are forced to wait for clearance until the next day, a requirement that shipowners say costs the industry hundreds of thousands of dollars annually.

The measure calling for 24-hour inspections was introduced by Representative Thomas M. Pelly, Republican, of Washington. It would provide for the examinations through the payment of overtime compensation to Public Health officers at the expense of the shipping companies asking for out-of-hours service.

Under the proposed legislation the officers would work between 8 a. m. and 5 p. m. 6 days a week, with overtime being paid after 5 p. m., and on Sundays and holidays. The overtime would consist of a half-day's basic pay for each 2 hours of out-of-hours work on a weekday and double time for Sunday and holiday work.

The favorable action of the committee was hailed by William F. Giesen, manager and counsel of the Maritime Association of the Port of New York, an organization of 1,400 members and companies engaged in every phase of the port's shipping activities.

Mr. Giesen said that 40 percent of the shipping entering the port in a normal day arrived after 6 p. m. and was forced to lie idle until the next day. The owners feel, he said, that the overtime costs involved in the 24-hour service would be small compared to the expense of long delays.

The American Merchant Marine Institute, which represents a large group of tanker and dry-cargo shipowners, also expressed approval of the committee's action. Tanker operators will be especially benefited if the legislation is enacted. These vessels can unload their oil cargoes in less than 24 hours and sail again for another cargo. Quarantine delays are not only expensive but they disrupt tight operating schedules.

Mr. Speaker, I call particular attention to the provision of this measure which would permit ship operators to reimburse the Federal Treasury for overtime costs if night or weekend service is requested. As it is now, the ships arriving out of regular hours must delay docking, which entails a cost per ship of from $2,500 to $5,500. By reimbursing the Government for overtime the shipping industry will save substantial expense caused by such delays.

Neglect of a National Shrine in New York City

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 16, 1954

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record a letter which I have received from Mrs. David B. Kushein, of Denver, Colo., relative to the neglect of one of America's most precious shrines, namely, the building in New York City where our first Congress met and where President Washington took his first oath of office.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

June 14, 1954.

Dear Senator Johnson: May I thank you again for receiving us so graciously when we were in Washington. Our children still talk about you and our wonderful Capital.

Last Friday we went to see the Wall Street section of New York. In our tour we saw the building where our First Congress met and where President Washington took his first oath of office. After the sights of Washington, D. C., it was very disillusioning to us to see the condition of this national shrine. Perhaps you didn't know about this, so I thought I should write you.

The building itself is dirty, run down, and in total disrepair. The stairs to the entrance were littered with papers, garbage from lunches, and people eating and loitering. We felt this a desecration of a place which should be a source of pride to us all. I know you will call it to the attention of the proper authorities.

Again many thanks for your courtesies and we will look forward to seeing you in Denver in the fall.

Sincerely,

JOAN PLATT KUSHEIN
Mrs. David B. Kushein.

Tomorrow's Supply of Water

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 16, 1954

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I have had called to my attention certain recommendations of the Water Resources Policy Committee of the National Conservation Conference. These recommendations take the form of a proposed bill having as its principal purpose establishment of a national policy respecting to the sound development and use of our Nation's greatest replenishable natural resource—water.

They are, I understand, the end product of many months of intensive study of this subject by the Water Resources Policy Committee development program.

My committee, Interior and Insular Affairs, has, during the past several years, conducted a study of our water resources. The study has been most interesting and quite revealing. For instance, my State, Nebraska, has the greatest amount of water of any State, yet, it is considered a semi-arid State. A study recently completed by the University of Nebraska shows that the underground water supply within the borders of Nebraska would fill a reservoir covering the entire area of Nebraska to a depth of 60 feet. It seems almost unbelievable, but those who made the estimate consider it a conservative one.

I have mentioned the studies made by my committee. To be more explicit, they are: First, photosynthesis—Basic Features of the Process; second, The Physical Basis of Water Supply and Its Principal Uses; third, Groundwater Regions of the United States; and fourth, Subsurface Facilities of Water Management and Patterns of Supply—Type Area Studies.

I am advised that the principles embodied in this measure have not been endorsed en toto by the National Water Conservation Conference, but that this group, by early next year, will have scheduled a meeting for the purpose of refining, if necessary, the broad statements of principle contained therein. I want to point out that the introduction of this modified bill does not constitute my personal endorsement of all of its provisions, even though many of these provisions do reflect the tentative conclusions reached by my committee members in studies over the past 18 months of so-called local-control legislation, having as its purpose a greater degree of Federal-local cooperation.

During the past year and a half, much has been done to help create a realistic national water policy. President Eisenhower, only recently, created a cabinet-level committee to study and make recommendations for our national water policy. That committee, quite naturally, is headed up by Secretary of Interior McKay. As chairman of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, I plan to appoint a committee to work with this group and others interested in this problem.

Since I feel this bill would supplement any action taken by the executive branch, I am today introducing a modified bill embodying most of the proposals of the National Water Conservation Conference. I feel this will help to promote a program designed to establish better Federal-State-local-private relationships in the development of our Nation's water resources. I do feel this will give Congress the opportunity to meet one of its basic obligations of studying the present situation and laying down the policy it should follow.

To point out the need for this study, I might remind my colleagues that within the 17 Western States we have three Departments of Government functioning in the field of water and land resource development—the Department of the Interior, the Department of Agriculture, and the Corps of Engineers of the Department of the Army. Members of my Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs have been acutely aware of the need for a reexamination by the Congress of national policy respecting these coordinate responsibilities.

All in all, Mr. Speaker, I do feel that the procedure set forth in this bill is an excellent example of democracy at its best with all working together to accomplish our specific aim.

Dr. Samuel Rosenblatt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL

OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 16, 1954

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, it was my honor and privilege to extend an invitation to Dr. Samuel Rosenblatt, rabbi of the Beth Tfiloh Congregation of Baltimore, Md., a congregation which numbers more than 2,500 families among its members, to offer the opening prayer of the House of Representatives on Friday, June 11, 1954.

In addition to serving as the rabbi of the Beth Tfiloh Congregation for more than 27 years, Dr. Rosenblatt has distinguished himself as an author and educator. He is presently preparing his ninth volume for publication and is associate professor of languages at the Johns Hopkins University. He has recently been invited to teach at the Bar-Ilan University in Israel upon its completion next year.

Dr. Rosenblatt, a son of the late renowned cantor, Joseph R. Rosenblatt, is the president of the Jewish Religious Council of Baltimore and of the Mizrachi Organization of Baltimore.

After listening to the stirring and profound prayer delivered by Dr. Rosenblatt, in which he called upon the Members of the House, under the guidance of our Lord, to champion the democratic way of life, and men throughout the world to recognize each other as brothers and dwell together in amity, friendship, and concord, many of my colleagues accorded tributes to Rabbi Rosenblatt to which few members of the cloth have been privileged.

It behooves me to offer my own personal gratitude to this great man.

Address by Thomas Dorgan, Clerk of the Suffolk Superior Civil Court

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 11, 1954

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following very interesting and enlightening address of Mr. Thomas Dorgan, clerk of the Suffolk Superior Civil Court, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, to the members of St. Brendan's Holy Name Society at their annual communion breakfast at St. Brendan's School Hall, Dorchester, Mass., on Sunday, June 13, 1954:

> I wish to thank the members of the St. Brendan's Holy Name Society for their kind invitation to address you this morning, and trust that what I have to say will be of interest to you.
>
> My talk this morning will be on thought control and the laxity of the executive department in following through when material was given to the Justice Department by the FBI. They kept silent when it was their duty to act.
>
> We hear a good deal today about the burning of books. People are shouting loudly about the censors who threaten human freedom. Free speech, freedom of expression, and freedom of thought are supposedly under ruthless attack by fanatics in religion, prudes in entertainment, and tyrannical inquisitors in Government.
>
> How confused and tragically amusing the thing can become was demonstrated recently when the President of the Nation slapped a gag rule over a congressional investigating committee which forbade the executive department to talk, and a few days later the same Executive proclaimed before a national audience that we must rid America of those who would impose thought control.
>
> What puzzles many Americans even more is to read the cries of alarm of leftwing publications concerning the inquisitorial methods of Senator MCCARTHY, roundly denounc- him as a national threat to freedom of thought and expression, while in adjacent columns they read the impassioned pleas of Senator MCCARTHY berating those who restrict information from the American people.
>
> There is obviously need for Americans to regain their composure and do a little fundamental thinking on the relationship between the rights of the individual and the rights of the Nation—between the liberty of the citizen and the liberty of the community. We must remember we are in a dangerous cold war, which to me is as bad as a hot war.

It is not my purpose here to present a reasoned analysis of this profound and delicate problem, which has become so acute in our times. I simply want to state that it is highly incongruous for a group of men in our administration to denounce thought control in one breath and to impose a gag rule in the next.

Policies pursued for national security are rightly supervised by the Nation's Chief Executive. The national security often demands secrecy of information. But such a demand must never be construed as being so absolute that it automatically raises the vast number of citizens in the executive department above suspicion or investigation—above denunciation and accusation—of trial and conviction. Nor is it evident that such investigation and denunciation, etc., belongs exclusively to the executive department when it is found to be at fault. As a matter of fact, the Constitution makes it very clear that certain special crimes, such as "treason, bribery, or other high crimes and misdemeanors" committed by civil officials of the Federal Government are to be tried by the Senate (par. 6, sec. III, art. I, and sec. 4, art. II), but only after the House of Representatives decide the case by a majority vote.

And if, perchance, in the present confusion in Washington the right of the congressional investigating committee to obtain knowledge of conspiracy within the executive branch of Government should be challenged before the Supreme Court by those who maintain that such investigation belongs to the magnificently competent FBI while the power to act on their findings and to hoard their findings belongs exclusively to the executive department, let such people healthily meditate on the established fact that for many years the Federal Bureau of Investigation accurately relayed astounding information of subversion to the doorstep of the executive department, which woefully bogged down on effective action in the face of such a threat to the national security. Who investigates the executive department officials when the officials appear to be criminally negligent in acting on the data of the Federal Bureau of Investigation?

It is indeed ironic to read about men in political life and in legal circles who should know the difference between right and wrong giving false information to the American people.

They try to tell the American people that the FBI and the courts will take care of subversion. The FBI is only an investigating agency. It does not evaluate, and it cannot prosecute. The courts cannot do anything until the cases are put on the active list. Prominent men and women who had experience with the Communist conspiracy will tell you that to combat communism by exposing it is the greatest weapon of all.

Attorney General Brownell, in an address given to a gathering of citizens recently, said, in substance, that the FBI and the courts would take care of subversion. He did not mention about the congressional investigating committees that made it possible through exposure to indict prominent members of the Communist Party—Remington, Alger Hiss, and many others. Last October I sent a letter to United States Attorney General Brownell urging him to have a Federal grand-jury investigation of communism here in Massachusetts, but to date we have received no action.

At the present time the congressional investigating committees are under attacks by prominent men and women in all walks of life who got tangled up with the Commie web. They are powerful because they are in key positions in our Government, in our educational institutions, in the press, radio, television, etc. They are an articulate crowd and know how to propagandize for human consumption. Until recent years the congressional investigation was not a widely employed instrument of the legislative process.

Today we have in our Federal Government the world's largest enterprise, which means that the workload has increased enormously. The Government is growing in size; in fact, we are all over the world today, and we are the No. 1 target for the Kremlin conspirators. We are actually the only real free nation left with the democratic process.

In a way, our modern story begins with the Teapot Dome scandal of the Harding administration, because that affair served as a landmark in focusing public attention on the congressional investigations. Everybody remembers the unprecedented height it reached in public interest.

Involved in that controversy was Secretary of the Interior Albert B. Fall, and Former Attorney General Harry Daugherty. According to the record, after that hearing congressional investigation became one of the most powerful weapons in the congressional armory.

From the time of the Teapot Dome scandal, which took place in the mid twenties, no particular nationnwide interest was occasioned in the congressional investigative process until the establishment of the Dies committee in May 1938. This was the House Special Committee on Un-American Activities. As growing political pressures from foreign nations increasingly made themselves felt at this time, the Dies committee began to inquire into their possible influence in America. The committee investigated nazism, fascism, and communism. At that time, the influential liberals were extremely active against nazism and fascism, but as to communism, there was complete silence, because it was held by the liberals that communism was going to be the new heaven on earth. There was no such thing as due process applied to anyone suspected of nazism or fascism. Constitutional rights were forgotten. The committee took the abuse, and vicious it was, from every angle during its early years when it delved into the Communist conspiracy. In spite of the many attacks, from the President of the United States down the line, the House itself apparently felt the committee was a worthwhile exponent of congressional work. At any rate, the House never failed to extend the life of the committee at each session of Congress.

Let us take a look at some of the investigations with a view to determining whether or not Congress ought to continue them. Take, for instance, recent and publicized inquiries looking into certain practices of the Bureau of Internal Revenue. For a great many years this Deparement of Government, like Caesar's wife, was above suspicion. Then, like a bolt of lightning out of the blue sky, came evidence that all was not well in this agency.

Another investigation hit the headlines held by a Senate committee which looked into the sale of Government-owned ships, which caused a national scandal. Another investigation by Congress consisted of looking into grain-storage deals entered into by the Department of Agriculture.

Take the celebrated case of Alger Hiss. This man had delivered secret documents to Russian Communists while he was a high employee in the State Department. His crime was reported to appropriate Government officials 10 years before Congress learned of it, and even the President of the United States (Franklin D. Roosevelt) failed to do anything, and the man Hiss continued to work for the Government. He was President Roosevelt's right-hand man in disastrous Yalta. It was only after a congressional investigation shortsighted the situation that anything was done. The Government departments involved were forced to take action which they had failed to take earlier. The publicity attendant upon the hearings compelled them to move—again showing conclusively that the weapon of exposure is the best weapon of all.

We had United States Supreme Court Justices as character witnesses for Hiss, United States district court judges, a former candidate for the presidency of the United States, and a Secretary of State. Think of it—only for the congressional investigating committee, Mr. Hiss might be Secretary of State today. Our Secretary of State said he would not turn his back on Hiss after having been found guilty of perjury.

And speaking of the executive branch of the Government, which is supposed to enforce the laws, bear in mind now that the Attorney General of the United States is the head of the Justice Department. Over a period of years, many conscientious Congressmen have been disturbed about the failure of the Justice Department to act in several cases which were turned over to it, not alone by the congressional committees, but by the FBI.

These were actual cases arising out of the investigations of Communist activities within the various departments of our Government. The Hiss case was the principal one. The Justice Department finally instituted action in that instance because of public pressure. Prior to that case, according to the Congressional Records, the Justice Department had been severely criticized on the floor of the House of Representatives for failure to act in many other cases.

Surely Congress, for the security of this Nation, must act if the Justice Department, which is a part of the executive branch of our Government, falls asleep on the job, where it has been brought to light that certain cases were put in the back files to accumulate dust.

Our three branches of government, the legislative, which makes the laws, the judicial, which interprets the laws, and the executive, which enforces the laws, are jealous of the power of each other. Many of the authorities on constitutional law are in a quandary as to where the line of demarkation lies in the matter of the respective powers of these three branches.

The congressional investigating committee has saved America and should not be tampered with. Even the saint of the liberals, Felix Frankfurter, Justice of the Supreme Court, and former President Woodrow Wilson insisted, in substance, that to interfere with congressional investigations would be a sad day for America.

Let me ask this question: Who has been smeared by congressional investigations? Very, very few, but we located and found many, many Communist conspirators who are out to destroy America.

Take, for example, the Hiss case, the Harry Dexter White case, and now the present investigation as to Captain Peress in the Army who was promoted to major and given an honorable discharge—after hiding behind the fifth amendment.

We must remember the American people are the masters of their destiny. We must respect the President of the United States, but we must never forget that the security of this Nation is more important than any one individual.

Public Laws 374 to 383, Inclusive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 7, 1954

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am extending my remarks to include my 27th report on the legislation of the 83d Congress, as follows:

TWENTY-SEVENTH REPORT ON LEGISLATION OF THE 83D CONGRESS

DEAR FRIEND: There is at this writing every indication that leadership has decided on a quick windup of the business of the 83d Congress, with the House marking time the final weeks while the Senate catches up, and adjournment not later than the first of August. Administration forces, still widely divided but now assuming a less bellicose surface appearance, are patching up compromises (on the minimum basis) preparatory to calling it a day.

Big questions in everyone's mind here: (1) How close are we to world war III? (2) Can the recession be halted or at least the worst of the economic storm be delayed until 1955? Everyone is hopeful for the best, fearful of a swing toward fresh perils. Meanwhile the attitude of leadership seems to be: Wait and see what happens.

Up to now there have been 206 rollcalls (123 in the 1st sess., 83 in the 2d sess.). I am happy to report that good fortune has made it possible for your representative to answer all 206 rollcalls. I think you wish it that way.

Here are the new laws enacted since my last report:

PUBLIC LAW 374 (H. R. 7893): APPROPRIATIONS FOR TREASURY AND POST OFFICE DEPARTMENTS, EXPORT-IMPORT BANK, AND RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

Appropriation bills will be covered in a separate and later report.

PUBLIC LAW 375 (H. R. 6186): PUBLIC LANDS LEASED FOR GRAZING

Under the Taylor Grazing Act public lands may be leased for grazing purposes. Public Law 375, which passed the House by consent, amends the act to give a preference right to a grazing lease to the original user of public land that was withdrawn from grazing purposes and later restored to such use.

PUBLIC LAW 376 (H. R. 6870): MARINE HOSPITAL AT NEW ORLEANS

Under an act of 1900 the switching, parking, or stopping of railroad trains was forbidden on or near the street passing through the property of the United States Public Health Service Hospital in New Orleans, formerly known as the marine hospital. The city of New Orleans now wishes to erect a wharf on the Mississippi River near the hospital property and to service it with a railroad spur requiring at times the switching of cars. The limitations in the act of 1900 stood in the way. Congress accommodated with Public Law 376, removing the limitations, but only after assurances from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare that with the safeguards proposed there would be no adverse effect on the comfort, care, and treatment of patients at the hospital.

PUBLIC LAW 377 (H. R. 7057): HOMESTEADING IN EDEN

Tipoff to ambitious homesteaders: The Secretary of Agriculture is about to open certain public lands in the Eden irrigation project area in Wyoming to homestead entry, 5 percent cash down, mortgage to cover balance. Public Law 377 clears the way by permitting the Secretary of Agriculture to trade lands in the area under his jurisdiction for those under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior, an arrangement assuring the maximum utilization of the properties to be benefited by the irrigation.

PUBLIC LAW 378 (H. R. 2696): EXPLOSIONS AT PORT CHICAGO

This relates to California's Port Chicago, where you may recall there were explosions in the naval ammunition depot that figured in the headline news of 1944. Most of the damage claims have been settled. Public Law 378 provides a method for the settlement of the few remaining claims, totaling only some $25,000. It passed the House by consent on the unanimous recommendation of the Judiciary Committee, which is composed wholly of lawyers, some of them former judges.

PUBLIC LAW 379 (H. R. 6374): WARRANT OFFICERS IN THE ARMED SERVICES

Ex-service persons generally, I think, will approve of this legislation providing a statutory career plan for warrant officers similar to that covering commissioned officers. At present there are 39,847 warrant officers in service (Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Air, Coast Guard). Public Law 379 establishes 4 military grades (W-1, W-2, W-3, W-4) and makes promotion mandatory after given periods of time. It will result in immediate promotions for some now in service, definite prospect ahead for others. The mandatory age for retirement is increased from 60 to 62 years.

PUBLIC LAW 380 (H. R. 7786): CHANGING ARMISTICE DAY TO VETERANS DAY

Armistice Day (November 11) was declared a legal holiday by an act of Congress in 1938. It was a holiday dedicated to the world peace then believed to have been assured by the sacrifices of World War I. But soon thereafter World War II and then the Korean conflict shattered the dream. Public Law 380, recommended by all the veteran organizations, merely changes the name of Armistice Day to Veterans Day. Hereafter November 11 will be a holiday dedicated both to world peace and to homage to veterans of all wars of our country.

PUBLIC LAW 381 (H. R. 4231): APPOINTMENT TO SERVICE ACADEMIES

Under existing law 40 appointments to West Point and Annapolis are available to sons of members of the Armed Forces (both men and women) who lost their lives in World Wars I and II. Public Law 381 extends the coverage to sons of members of the Armed Forces who were killed in action or died from disease since June 27, 1950, the commencement of the Korean action.

PUBLIC LAW 382 (H. R. 4940): REDEMPTION OF TAX STAMPS IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Another instance of the Congress of the United States serving as a combined State legislature and city council for Washington and the District of Columbia. Public Law 382 merely provides for the redemption of tax stamps damaged or destroyed (as by fire) after purchase. Congressman O'HARA of Minnesota, a ranking member of the District Committee, gets much mention in the Washington newspapers. Recently one of the newspapers here carried a highly complimentary first-page news story about a District activity of O'HARA of Minnesota illustrated with a photograph of O'HARA of Illinois.

PUBLIC LAW 383 (H. R. 7308): FEDERAL CIVIL DEFENSE

Title III of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950 provides that in case of attack or imminent attack the President may proclaim a state of emergency, afterward exercising certain emergency powers. This provision, however, continued only until June 30, 1954. Public Law 383 repeals the expiration date and extends the emergency powers indefinitely.

Reasons for the enactment (from Rept. No. 1340, House Committee on Armed Services): "It is believed that this country is in as much danger of enemy attack, if not more, than when Congress enacted the Federal Civil Defense Act (in 1950)."

Cordially and sincerely,

BARRATT O'HARA,
Member of Congress.

Upper Colorado Project Difficulties

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 10, 1954

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, an editorial in the May 23 issue of the Denver Post newspaper reveals an illustration of the difficulties in obtaining factual information relative to the upper Colorado River storage project, which has been a source of annoyance to some of the members of the committee of this House which considered the bill. For the information of Members not on the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, the editorial, entitled "Is the Storage Project Dead?" is as follows:

> The opponents of the Echo Park Dam on the Green River in the Dinosaur National Monument have been handed an important victory by the Department of the Interior. And it is the result either of incredibly poor staff work within the Bureau of Reclamation and the office of Under Secretary, or is part of a calculated plan to promote the upper Colorado project with one hand and kill it with the other.
>
> Those opposing the Echo Park project have insisted for more than 3 months that the Bureau's estimates of evaporation losses at a proposed alternative to Echo Park—a higher Glen Canyon Dam lower down on the Green—were in error. They said the Salt Lake City regional offices of the Bureau had miscalculated and had fixed the loss of water from evaporation far too high. Apparently they were right. Now they deserve credit for being so.
>
> The evaporation factor is important in comparing the feasibility of several reservoirs in the enormous upper Colorado storage project. The Department of the Interior had told a committee of Congress that the Echo Park and Split Mountain reservoirs, when compared to the much greater storage pool at Glen Canyon, would conserve enough more water annually to supply a community of 600,000 people.
>
> This week the Department of the Interior admitted that an error in evaporation estimates had been made. It turns out that if neither the Echo Park or the Split Mountain Dams are undertaken, and Glen Canyon Dam is raised to offset the loss of storage resulting from abandonment of the two upstream projects, the net additional evaporation loss will be something like 25,000 acre-feet a year. And that's not much.
>
> Now this information was known weeks if not months ago in the Utah regional office of the Bureau. Presumably it was transmitted to Washington; because when the error was finally corrected, the correction came from there and not from Salt Lake City. And the admission of error came at a time and under circumstances that played directly into the hands of those in Congress and out who have charged the Bureau and the Department with dishonesty and bad faith in this whole matter.
>
> The Bureau and the Department of the Interior are still, theoretically, in favor of the Echo Park Dam. They continue to insist that its storage capacity and power production are essential to the feasibility of a three-dam complex which includes Cross Mountain on the Yampa River and Flaming Gorge on the Green. And they point out that all are important to meeting the upper Colorado Basin States' commitments to Utah, which commitments guaranteed to that State certain

waters of the Yampa as a hedge against upstream depletions of the Green by Wyoming. We have been impressed with that position and still are.

But we must observe that the attitudes and the conduct of the Department of the Interior, not only with respect to the Echo Park Dam but also toward the whole upper Colorado project, raise grave doubts as to its sincerity. And those who are contesting the economic necessity and feasibility of investing almost a billion dollars in conserving and harnessing the water in the upper-basin States are proceeding virtually unchallenged by the Department.

Instead of fighting for the upper-basin States, of explaining, defending, and promoting their claims and obligations with respect to the valuable Colorado which rises in them, the Department is either making embarrassing mistakes, or looking the other way.

The net effect of this fumbling, whether witless or calculated, is to compound and confirm the skepticism and opposition that much of the country, outside the West, has for the reclamation-power program which has contributed so much to western growth and prosperity. That program has progressed as far as it has only because "our" Department in Government has fought for it, tooth and nail. Now our interests, as a region, are apparently to be sacrificed to false economy and the appeasement of rebellious nonwestern elements within the Republican Party, in a bid for a spurious unity which upon such terms will do no permanent good to anyone—least of all the people of the West.

Where Do We Go From Here?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WINT SMITH

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1954

Mr. SMITH of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, recently the Honorable Alf M. Landon made a speech that merits considerable thought. He points out many fallacies of our present foreign policy. He stresses the fact that many have pointed out—the dangers involved when we must assume the whole responsibility for the future of the so-called free world.

The speech follows:

WHERE DO WE GO FROM HERE?

(Address by Alf M. Landon, South Central Business Association, Inc., Kansas City, Mo., June 15, 1954)

I speak today not as a Republican. Obviously not as a Democrat. I speak as a plain American citizen who is not concerned in seeking partisan advantage by blaming whom for what. Once again I speak for a foreign policy based on an intelligent and vigorous appeal to the minds of men rather than threats and force.

I believe it ill behooves any Democrat to criticize the Eisenhower-Dulles foreign policies. By and large they are simply a continuation of the Truman-Acheson foreign policies.

I believe also that it ill behooves any Republican to criticize and recall the record of the confusions and contradictions that characterized the Truman-Acheson foreign policies, because confusion and contradictions have characterized the Eisenhower-Dulles foreign policies. That really leaves solution of our foreign situation a bipartisan mess. Any selfish politician seeking personal and partisan advantage must unscrupulously ignore the verities of those records and the intelligence of his audience.

The startling, ominous, and belligerent statements by the Secretary of State, the Vice President of the United States, and members of the General Staff justified the charge that the Eisenhower-Dulles policies are leading us step by step into another war. Their glibly waived mailed fist alienated world opinion and support.

I, also, believe that the national administration is merely following in the old footsteps of the three previous Democrat administrations.

That is no plea of confusion and avoidance. It is simply an attempt to clear away the underbrush of partisan thinking and actions so that American discussion will not have that paralyzing handicap in formulating public opinion. Some more underbrush that has clogged the thinking of the free world should be cleared by the Indochina crisis.

Americans suffer from the quixotic concept that we are responsible for the future of the free world. There is also too much of a tendency among Americans to think of America as the free world.

Atlas may have carried the world on his shoulders but no one has ever accused him of trying also to carry all the planets in our solar system—and demanding that he be allowed to tell them under what system they must revolve.

Our associates in that world have made it plain these last weeks that they consider themselves perfectly capable of looking after their own future in their own time and way, and that their policies do not go along with ours. Therefore, perhaps out of our diplomatic defeats will come, not only a long overdue reappraisal and better understanding of the realities of our relations with other free nations, but also that the free countries may see more clearly Malenkov's real purpose of world conquest in the role of a modern Genghis Khan.

We had better be realistic and realize that China is a power. We seem to be the only nation that is kidding ourselves about that and we certainly are not kidding our associates or potential enemies. Nothing is to be accomplished by trying to convince the world that China does not exist, any more than trying to convince them that Pikes Peak does not exist or that England is going to hand back to Spain Gibraltar on a silver platter.

The idea that America is going to keep Great Britain, Japan, Sweden, and other great free world countries from trading with China and Russia is absurd.

In the mounting momentum of events and crescendo of rhetoric, there are two sincere and earnest groups with different plans of action for meeting the menace of Communist imperialism.

There are well posted and conscientious people who believe we must meet force with force. That means war to stop war. That was the policy that led to World War II, and look what we got from that war that was to end all wars. War never will be the father of peace.

I oppose the fatalistic thinking that a third world war is inevitable and that we might as well get it over with.

I do not believe there is much chance for a peaceful, stable, and free world as long as the Russian people are dominated by a little handful of cruel sadistic men. However, I do not believe 800 million people of diverse races, creeds, and nationalities can be for long last governed by a committee based on a political party of 6 million Russian members out of a population of 190 million, governing by machineguns and slave camps.

As long as that is the case we will always be tottering on the brink of the holocaust. The Communists do not want peaceful and equitable solution of any situation anywhere. That is true whether it be a labor dispute in America or a political war in the jungles of Asia or the sands of Africa.

But I believe that unhappy life in an armed world is preferable to a victorious war in which death and destruction of everything we believe in can be the only outcome.

A justified anxiety of what is taking place in southeast Asia and responsibility for the future preservation of America must not blind us to the pursuit of continued efforts to find that security without the increasing involvement there that means a war in which barbarism can be the only victor.

For make no mistake. As several high-ranking generals have told us recently, there can be no limited war in Indochina. That means that talk of a limited air and Navy expedition to that country is as phony as I said it was prior to World War II.

Also, it means that for the first time since 1812, America will be invaded. The invasion will be across the Arctic Circle.

The next world war will be fought on the home fronts of both Russia and the United States. It will not be in the jungles of some far-off land or by expeditionary forces. It will be by H-bombs and atom bombs seeking to knock out the citadel of the enemy. The English Association of Scientific Works is responsible for the estimate that one properly placed H-bomb will kill at least 2½ million people in the populous Birmingham, England, industrial area.

Plans for civilian defense, evacuation of our cities, installation of war industries underground, are as illusionary as talk of limiting our military assistance to the French in Indochina to air and navy forces. Airmen and sailors bleed and die from wounds the same as soldiers.

The second group I spoke of are those who believe that we should be prepared to meet force with force, but should continue to negotiate giving both world opinion time to form and gather strength against the Genghis Kahn strategy of Malenkov or for that change in Russia or China that will force abandonment of their perilous plans for world conquest.

I am not sure that the loss of Indochina means a turning point in the history of the world. I am sure that how the free world handles the Indochina affair may mean the end of modern history and civilization.

One thing is sure. With Indochina in the hands of the Reds, I think we are either going to have to pull out of the Korean-Japanese-Formosa-Philippine line of defense or develop wholehearted support from the governments of those countries to greatly build up its military strength.

In order to do that, I believe we should end this cutting down of the Army from 20 to 17 divisions. I think we should add at least another 5 and possibly 10 divisions. Certainly, if we are going to maintain that line we will have to put at least two divisions in the Philippines plus a lot of air and navy—probably the same in Japan and some in Formosa. At the same time, if the people in Southeast Asia are willing to take effective action to defend themselves from the cruel Communists, they must be aided by equipment and training.

How are we going to do all of that on top of other defense plans and at the same time expand our domestic expenses without wrecking our economy is a problem the national administration cannot ignore.

No one can deny that hysteria and lack of statesmanship are already undermining the fundamentals of our democracy and causing lovers of peace and freedom throughout the world to lose confidence in us. Yes; not only to lose confidence in us but in many other countries a respect for the leadership they thought we possessed.

The McCarthy-Army hearing now going on before the Senate subcommittee would be disgraceful and disgusting at any time. Now, it is tragic to have the minds of so many in the executive and legislative branch of our National Government diverted and the thinking of Americans diverted from the hard decisions necessary to our national existence.

I believe the free world has the will—the intelligence—the resources—to prevent the holocaust of a third world war.

Whether it can or not depends on how wisely it uses its strength and whether the Soviet is blind to its own destruction. That, of course, we can do nothing about. But we can guide our own actions—in cooperation with other free countries.

The time is evidently here for an "agonizing reappraisal" not only of America's foreign policies but of the whole free world.

That involves deliberations not only among the military experts but political leaders of all the free world.

A start has been made by the conferences now going on between various free world governments and by the United Nations voting to send observers to Thailand over Russia's vote. If Russia vetoes further action, it will then be returned to the United Nations Assembly. That is another manifestation of the growing importance of the Assembly. It can be compared to the historic growth of the British House of Commons from a legislative body—originally of little importance in comparison to the House of Lords—to its present greater importance.

Certainly the events of the last few months have demonstrated the disastrous consequence of failing to consult and cooperate with our other associates in the free world in the formulation and maintenance of a united front against Communist imperialism. The beacon light of America for peace and freedom in the world has been dimmed by false Communist propaganda astutely taking advantage of our ineptness in the battle for the minds of men.

Instead of trying to sit on the lid of explosive forces throughout the world, we have an educational job to do that we are not doing well. We should be selling the real America to the world. But the voice of America is floundering around with a lot of waste effort.

Because of the fad of emphasizing our faults instead of selling our strength—even our own people are not fully aware of America's greatness—the joy of being free—the honor of being fair—the blessings of being generous.

We know we are rich in material things—but do we know that we are rich in the greatest treasure in the world—freedom. It is time we sold ourselves and the world on America's freedom. Soviet slave labor, shortages, starvation, terror, and torture cannot stand that kind of competition.

Doesn't America have the salesmen to sell liberty, equality, and freedom? I believe it has. Let's find them.

Positive Action To Learn Fate of Missing Americans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 11, 1954

Mr. **LANE**. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following articles from the Boston Post, Tuesday, June 15, 1954:

Death by Fiat

There are indications that the next investigation of the subcommittee of the Committee of Governmental Operations, under the gavel of Senator Potter, Republican, of Michigan, will look into what happened to Americans held behind the Iron Curtain. And not a minute too soon, for the Department of Defense, by executive fiat, is killing them off in batches. Only 27 are now left of 944.

In the news columns of this newspaper will be found an account of how it is done. There were 944 members of our Armed Forces unaccounted for after prisoner swap. Since last September there have been formal determinations of death in 420 of these cases. There have been presumptive determinations of death in 497 others. That leaves 27 cases—and in July they will also be presumed dead. And that is all accomplished under the Missing Persons Act—not on any information about the missing acquired from behind the Iron Curtain.

The missing 944 are particularly bothersome to the Defense Department, always lousing up their nice, neat records. So, dead or alive, they are just erased from any consideration. The excuse is that the Reds won't tell us anything about what happened to the missing 944. By July, on the anniversary of the capture of the last 27 men, the Defense Department will close the books.

United States Claims Only 27 of 944 POW's Alive

The United States Government is giving the "kiss of death" to 944 American youths, including an estimated 60 New Englanders, whose fate after their capture by the Communists in Korea is still undetermined, Commander Vincent A. Harrold of the Massachusetts Chapter of American Prisoners of War, Inc., charged last night.

The Government is "carefully and systematically erasing the names of those young men from their cards," he charged as he announced a mass protest meeting will be held next Sunday at 2 p. m., in Gardner Auditorium at the State House.

"Wives and parents of these forgotten men are asking why the identity of those still held prisoners by the Communists are not made public," said Harrold. "Repeated requests about the fate of these youths have been answered with a lot of double-talk and issue-dodging.

"It's a serious charge when a man deserts his Government, but a lot more serious when a Government deserts a man who left his family to fight for it."

Harrold made public a letter he received from the Department of Defense in answer to a request his organization sent to President Eisenhower asking the Government take positive action to learn the fate of the missing Americans.

PRESUMED DEAD

The letter signed by C. Herschel Schooley, director of public information, maintains that the information originally possessed about these men was in many cases scanty and inconclusive and that it was never implied that all 944 were living.

"Since last September," according to Schooley, "conclusive evidence has been obtained which has justified formal determinations of death in 420 of these cases; and presumptive findings of death as required by the Missing Persons Act have been made in the cases of 497 others. The Missing Persons Act is not yet applicable in the remaining 27 cases.

Harrold called this answer ridiculous. "Even assuming half of these men are dead," he declared, "is the Government, merely by presumption, going to kiss off the remainder who might be suffering privations and torture in Red slave-labor camps? It certainly appears that way. Under the Missing Persons Act, the remaining 27 will be wiped off the slate, leaving it clean next month, when the required year is over."

CLARK SAYS 3,000 HELD

The American prisoners of war group, he said, has insisted the United States force the repatriation of the bodies of the dead Americans, which was agreed to under the terms of the Korean truce. This would positively establish whether a soldier was alive or dead.

"As recent as Memorial Day," said Harrold, "Gen. Mark Clark, U. N. commander in Korea, declared during a speech at the dedication of an American cemetery in Nettuno, Italy, that the Communists, in his opinion, now hold 3,000 Americans captive behind the Iron Curtain.

"General Clark had previously said that positive evidence was gathered establishing that many of these men were seen alive in prison camps. The Department of Defense, in its letter, assures us that they will continue to seek a satisfactory accounting of the fate of the remaining 524 they consider still doubtful.

"They tell us that diplomatic steps have been taken and that the Soviet foreign ministry denies having any prisoners. Is the United States going to leave the matter as it stands? Is it going to bury these boys alive?"

Notices of the protest meeting are being sent to the families of the missing, and those who have lost members in the Korean conflict, said Harrold.

Let's Have That Rule

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1954

Mrs. **ROGERS** of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following editorial from the National Tribune of June 17, concerning H. R. 9020, which is pending before the Committee on Rules:

Let's Have the Rule

It is not at all surprising to the country's war veterans and their dependents that throughout the Nation a newspaper campaign of resistance to pension payments has again manifested itself. In fact, we expected it would come as soon as the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs reported favorably on H. R. 9020, a bill that is estimated will cost $231 million for the first year of operation. This measure, which is designed solely to grant cost-of-living increases in compensation and pension payments to most veterans and their dependents, does not go as far as it should in that it averages something less than 10 percent in across-the-board hikes, but it is obviously the best that can be expected at this time and the several veterans' organizations have accepted it as such even though prices have risen more by far than the contemplated increases proposed. Nevertheless, there is nationwide comment in the press about the "awful costs" involved and the "fantastic sums" that are being paid out by the Government to the veteran class.

Some inspired articles are claiming that final passage of this legislation is doubtful this year, the wish apparently being the father to the thought. Others furnish analyses of veterans' payments over the years helping to create in the minds of an uninformed public the impression that former servicemen are raiding the Treasury and that the relief they desire is utterly unwarranted, but, as we have remarked, we are not at all surprised because the same thing has invariably happened whenever such an enactment is sought. We think we would be atonished if the protests did not come. We have no means of knowing how many newsmen, specialty writers and editor commentators are themselves war veterans, and we get a little callous on occasion and wish that some of them who have so far escaped could be given a dose of duty in uniform so they could prove to themselves that war service is a rather peculiar occupation that somehow is more distinctive than normal peacetime pursuits, but failing that, we suggest that these traducers inform themselves on the policy that has been followed by this country since its inception so they can learn that we are still a free people because the few have made the necessary sacrifices and that the usually generous treatment accorded to sick and disabled and aged former servicemen, and their widows and orphans, has furnished the incentive which has kept us free, a practice that has paid handsomely in national dividends.

However, that may be, there is now pending before the House Committee on Rules a request for a resolution to provide for debate on H. R. 9020. We had hoped, frankly, that a rules action would not be necessary and that the House leadership would recognize the Veterans' Committee chairman and so expedite passage of the bill, but perhaps that is hoping for too much. There is quite a backlog of administration-sponsored legislation yet to be considered before the Congress adjourns 6 weeks or 2 months hence, and, even though such backlogs have been the rule rather than the exception in recent years, there is always a chance that something will get lost in the shuffle. We do not want that to happen to H. R. 9020 which involves over 3½ million persons, of whom 2 million alone are in the directly service-connected class. It would be both poor policy and bad politics to let this measure go by the board. We, therefore, appeal to the rules group to give it early consideration and, without our arguing needlessly its recognized merits, say to that round dozen of powerful legislators that they cannot in good conscience fail to lend their approval without violating the promises made by their respective political parties.

This is at least nominally a Republican administration. Out in Chicago, during the summer of 1952, the GOP adopted in its party platform a veterans' plank stating that "active duty in the Armed Forces of the United States of America during a state of war or national emergency constitutes a special service to our Nation and entitles those who have so served to aid and compensation in return for this service," and the Republican Party promised, among other things to adjust veterans' payments fairly and adequately to meet changes in the cost of living and to otherwise assist them. A few days later the Democratic Party made a pledge "to advance the welfare of all men and women who have seen service in the Armed Forces." The full texts of those planks are readily available, and we shall be happy to furnish them to all members of the Rules Committee if they wish them. We save space here by not quoting in full, but, Republican or Democratic, those promises are binding. The bill now pending seeks to do only what both parties have said they'd do if they were placed in power, and we think that our veterans and their dependents who are covered in H. R. 9020 should expect no less than to have these pledges fulfilled.

Actually, General Eisenhower is also clearly on record for the terms of this bill. As a candidate for the Presidency, he wrote to this editor in October 1952: "As has been clearly stated in the Republican platform, adjustments of compensation and pension payments must be made from time to time with the changes in the cost of living. This responsibility I shall never overlook." That is not taken out of context, and we would be glad also to furnish the entire letter to Rules Committee members, if they wish. It is also our confirmed opinion that even though the President does not usually interfere with legislative functions, his spokesmen should make it indelibly clear right now that this pension increase bill has his approval. We know it does. The Congress and the people should know it, and they should be informed forthwith.

We have a few hard-boiled Congressmen who are pledged to those economies also promised by the Republican candidates. We cannot quarrel with them generally in their will to cut back on reckless spending, and we have done so only with the few who have tried to make veterans the butt of some unwarranted attacks, but we call attention to the fact that the legislation now before the Rules Committee, H. R. 9020, spells out exactly direct promises made by both major political parties when they sought election. They are promises made publicly and in good faith. We know that $231 million is not chicken feed in anybody's language, and we also know—and would emphasize to everybody concerned—that wars cost a lot of money and that costs of the care of veterans and their dependents is just as much a cost of war as is the value of guns, ships, tanks, planes, and everything else besides manpower that wins wars.

There is no reason to be squeamish about this thing, and we get just a little fed up with all of the newspaper campaigns against the veteran class, especially as they come along tuned up to stop some piece of meritorious legislation. The people to be benefited by this bill are those to whom President Eisenhower said last January "the country owes so much." They are involved in a statement uttered at the White House last December when the general said, "This administration is one that believes in keeping its promises."

It looks from where we sit that the cards are all face up on the table, so let's have that special rule or, in any other parliamentary way, let's get H. R. 9020 through the House now so that the Senate may have a chance to act before the curtain falls on this last regular session of the 83d Congress.

What Is McCarthy's Objective?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. ROSS ADAIR

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1954

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the Record, I attach—by request—a letter taken from the Letters From the People column of the Fort Wayne Journal-Gazette, dated June 6, 1954:

What Is McCarthy's Objective?

Editor of the Journal-Gazette:

Throughout the McCarthy versus Stevens congressional investigation, it is obvious that McCarthy, Cohn, Carr, and Schine are using the Communist-infiltration investigation for some dire and hidden objective apart from discovering and removing subversives from our midst.

What brings these conclusions? The McCarthy approach is one of "I am the law" attitude and "I shall not let any power of American Government stop me," vibrates throughout his work.

One of the most viciously calculated and dictatorily threatening declarations was publicly made May 27 by Senator McCarthy in angry thunderous tones before the large TV audience of the American people, to wit: that the Government employees be given authority to report any suspected disloyalty or traitors in the Government, over the heads of their superiors, direct to him and his subcommittee. Thus intimating that Government department heads were deliberately coddling Communists and traitors with laxity or cover-up tactics. Senator McClellan alertly replied in no uncertain leveling tones of fire: "That to do such an unheard-of thing would destroy the security of the American Government."

McCarthy deliberately confuses and calls high Government officials, liars and completely dishonest and coverups for Communists in our Government, etc.

He is more interested in trying to trick those on the committee investigating his work than in bringing the possible Communists, themselves, into subjection.

Is it the Schine money; can it be that McCarthy, Cohn, Carr, and Schine are concentrating upon discrediting both the Truman and Eisenhower administrations in the eyes of the American people; are they working for promoting McCarthy, as America's No. 1 strong superman? Are these the McCarthy patterns?

Just look at his melancholy voice tones and monotonous repetitions and diabolical inferences of almost emotionless diction, and sudden violent temper when opposed in the least, with such phrases as "keep quiet," "let me have your attention, Mr. Chairman," and one moment condemning Secretary of Army Stevens in one breath and the next moment stating that the Secretary is 85 percent not to blame for his subordinate's falsifications of facts, etc. And filibustering and cross-examining all speakers (except his own group) and challenging everyone who dares differ from his assertions. Even going so far as to state that he will print the confidential FBI memo stolen by an aid to his committee over Attorney General Brownell's warning not to do it. Inferring that this top secret 2½-page memo was from a 15-page FBI security report by Chief J. Edgar Hoover, himself, and signed by him, until Chief Hoover disacknowledged.

In fact, this superambitious McCarthy deliberately confuses, through calculated diversions, to disorganize witnesses, implying that all are trying to cover up for guilty Communists—and never directly questions witnesses, but injects his own conclusions and asks "if this is not so," etc., testifying for the witnesses, as he asks a question.

In fact, McCarthy's entire attitude is to invoke fear in those he questions and tries to hurry up their admissions that they are guilty of misrepresentations—uses pressure of the most insidious nature.

All in all, McCarthy is promoting McCarthy to the American people, as a Sir Galahad and that he, alone, is honest and everyone else is corrupt and is permitting the Communists to undermine the Nation's security.

Crude, calculating, deceptive, and arrogant, McCarthy is more visibly dangerous to the morale and security of the American people than he is useful in circumventing purported Communists from destroying our security.

If he is the loyal and impersonal servant, honest and above board, trying to rid our country of subversives in Government, as well as elsewhere, he should not try to make everyone, not in his good favor, appear to be pro-Communist. But, no, McCarthy rides roughshod over all in his path to power, and looks with his hooded eyes (leeringly focused upon those before his august presence) insinuating, with his Napoleonic pose and his voice monotonously drolling off his cryptic lengthy sentences (without end) to make the witness before him quake and tremble and become insensible of what he is saying.

McCarthy gives the impression that he is insensible to any justice except of his own making and is playing upon the nerve center of the American people, more than the court committee assembled, which he is using as a background for his grandstand play for dictatorship power (America's first dictator bid). This is the professional analysis one versed in personality techniques is certain to deduce.

DR. NORMAN SWEET.

FORT WAYNE, IND.

A Tribute to the Memory of the Late Elmer R. Gregor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH L. CARRIGG
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 16, 1954

Mr. CARRIGG. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following address by the Honorable Richard F. Harless, former Member of Congress from Arizona, before a gathering of American patriots at the Daniel Boone Hotel, Charleston, W. Va., on May 22, 1954, in which tribute was paid to the memory of the late Elmer R. Gregor, of Forest Lake Club, Pike County, Pa.:

My friends, in keeping with our policy of honoring and perpetuating the memory of outstanding Americans who, by the mercy of God, have been taken from our midst, we pay tribute today to the accomplishments, and honor the memory of the late Elmer R. Gregor, of Forest Lake Club, Pike County, Pa.

In the long and illustrious history of the great State of Pennsylvania, there is recorded the lives and deeds of many great men. Death in its inexorable and constant pilgrimage into the ranks of the living lays claim to those we sometimes wish were spared, and whose passing leaves us sad and grieving. But death, no respector of earthly claims, lingers not in the dim shadows of postponement, but snatches who it will when the bell tolls the final hour.

Death, on April 3, 1954, extended its commanding arm and took unto its realm of the great beyond, our beloved friend and brother, Elmer R. Gregor. But death, as in every case, did not erase the trail of the past nor obliterate the record of accomplishment of the victim snatched from earthly heritance.

The fine record made during life's tenure by Elmer R. Gregor has added to the glorious pages of American history, and set a pattern that enriched the future of all who must travel the long trail from birth to death, of those of us left behind.

Elmer R. Gregor was born in New York City some 75 years ago. At the age of 7 he was brought by his parents to Forest Lake Club, Pike County, Pa., and became a member of that sanctuary of many famous men. At his death he was the oldest living member of that famous club.

Forest Lake Club is a country haven of some 5,500 acres of forest, streams, lakes, and peace. It is, and has been for decades, a place of tranquillity, a place of aristocratic simplicity, and a sanctuary for men, for wildlife, and for those who believe in the conservation of natural resources, and for those whose thoughts seek to elevate mankind to a greater understanding of "Why we're here and what the world is all about."

Great men, men like Elmer Gregor, enjoyed the solitude and the inspiration of life in those Pike County hills. Gregor's log cabin, set apart from the main club buildings, nestled atop an elevation in a grove of oak and ever green overlooking a broad vista of the Delaware River Valley and the mountains of New York State. The livingroom of this spacious log dwelling, with its huge fireplace, contained fine specimens of the arts and crafts of the Indians, some of prehistoric origin. The war bonnet of a Sioux chieftain, a memento of his visit to the far West, occupied a commanding place of honor on the livingroom wall.

It was in these surroundings that Gregor found inspiration for the 28 books and numerous short stories and articles he wrote. Most of the books were published by Harpers, and by Appleton. In these books he tried to convey in his inimitable style, the glories of life in the great outdoors.

Gregor's books were not born of fanciful thoughts alone—he was indeed a pioneer in fact as well as in spirit. Shortly after the turn of the century, Gregor, accompanied by Walter Rockwood and Jim Frame, ventured forth on a westward trek that took them to Wyoming and Montana. It was in the vicinity of the old mining camp of Cooks City, Mont., and in the beautiful Sunlight Basin country of Wyoming near the town of Cody, that even at that time was being developed into a lively community by Buffalo Bill Cody, that these young men prospected for gold. They followed the long trail, made friends with the Indians in adjacent localities. They endured the wintry blasts and blizzards of the great Rocky Mountain area that descended from atop the great Continental Divide. They traveled out of Sunlight Basin over famed Dead Indian Hill, and slept atop the soil of Elk Basin, which held in its bosom, not the gold they were seeking, but precious deposits of oil and gas that cried aloud to be released from the vast subterranean bondage. These seekers of gold knew nothing then of the fabulous riches buried beneath the ground on which their campfires burned. It remained for others who followed them to uncover the fortune that was man's for the taking.

Gold was the lure of Gregor and his companions; it was the lure that from time immemorial has challenged men and caused them to endure the awful hardships of desert heat and winter's blast. Gold, like an alluring siren, beckoned and lured strong and courageous men on the trail of hope, hardship, disappointment, and sometimes success.

In the case of Gregor and his companions "paydirt" was elusive, and it was in the very beautiful environs of Montana and Wyoming that tragedy struck. It was that the ungraciousness of nature became manifest. It was there that these young men experienced the ruthlessness of nature—winter winds descending from the peaks of the Continental Divide and from the Great Bear Tooth Range flung a challenge. Granite Mountain stood like a sentry in the grasp of the hoary ghost that came swirling, howling, and thundering over the land in furious blasts that ceased only when the whole land was enshrouded in a mantle of white that enfolded every living thing. Freezing weather followed the blizzard and took its toll. Walter Rockwood, with both feet frozen, was found alive but succumbed shortly thereafter. Gregor survived this ordeal and lived for other things. He returned to Pike County, Pa., where he remained until his death.

During Gregor's lifetime in Pennsylvania he operated bluestone quarries, which produced flagstone, curbstone, and building stone that went into much of the construction in New York City. In addition, he engaged in timbering activities and shipped mine props and ties to many of the mines in Pennsylvania. He was a friend of the rivermen, those huskies who, in the early days, piloted the log rafts down the Delaware River to the mills. His friends were legion. He knew the rough and ready stonecutters, the woodmen, and all the quaint characters who inhabited the remoteness of Pike County. He was the kind of a man who would stop to scratch the ear of a dog or cat or pat some adoring urchin on the head. He could read signs and follow dim trails with the skill of an Indian. He knew tribal traditions, and he loved all humankind regardless of color or creed. Gregor possessed a nobility of mind and soul that endeared him to all. The wild creatures of the forests were to him a glorious gift to man by God.

The birds that made the verdant forests of Pike County rich with color and song, were to Gregor messengers from a deity in a far-off land. Much of his knowledge of fauna and flora was taught to his nephew Russell. On one occasion Gregor and his nephew were visiting Central Park in New York City when the great warblers were in flight, and on that memorable occasion his great knowledge and understanding of wild life made a lasting impression on the youngster who accompanied him.

Elmer Gregor's activities brought him in close and constant touch with the late Daniel Carter Beard, who for years had been the patriarch of the Boy Scouts of America. These two great men had much in common. It is only fitting that on this occasion we recognize that the Boy Scouts of America is the outgrowth of another organization founded and organized by Daniel Carter Beard, Elmer R. Gregor, and Edward M. Joyce, all products of Pike County environment. In 1906, these three organized the Sons of Daniel Boone, which in reality was the beginning of the Boy Scouts of America, although the Boy Scouts of America later was patterned somewhat along the lines of the Scout movement in England. Lord Baden Powell, who headed the boy's movement in England, came to this country and gave invaluable assistance to Daniel Carter Beard in the Boy Scout movement, and from thence on Daniel Carter Beard was the prime leader of the movement. This, however, should not detract from, but should emphasize the important part played by Gregor and Joyce in launching what surely was the parent organization of the Boy Scout movement in America.

The threads of the lives of these three men, Dan Beard, Elmer Gregor, and Edward Joyce, were interwoven throughout the lives of Dan Beard and Elmer Gregor. Joyce, imbued with the same pioneering spirit as his other two companions, traveled in South America and Europe, finally settling down in Arizona where he became dean of the dude ranchers, served as a captain in the Army in World War I, afterward to return to ranch life in the West. Joyce became a noted trailsman with a record of more than 100,000 miles in the saddle on trails that led from Mexico, throughout western United States, Canada, and Alaska. At one time Joyce published a western magazine in Arizona called The Last Frontier. Dan Beard was not only a contributor to this publication, but was its honorary editor. Joyce, during the years, has been a frequent visitor to Pike County, Pa. On each such visit he and Gregor spent happy hours reminiscing. Joyce attended the funeral of Elmer Gregor, and is the sole survivor of the triumvirate that used their Pike County, Pa., heritage to contribute to the welfare of mankind for the benefit of this, their country, which they loved with the zeal of patriots and served well. To the glory of God and America, and to the memory of freemen everywhere, may others do as well. We honor the memory of Elmer R. Gregor, and Daniel Carter Beard, and extend our compliments to Edward M. Joyce, the surviving member of the trio, knowing well that he will carry on the fine traditions of departed friends.

We take this occasion to extend our love and condolence to Mrs. Ida Gregor, the beloved wife of Elmer Gregor, and the hope for a speedy recovery from her serious accident.

How Secure Is Social Security?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WINT SMITH

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1954

Mr. SMITH of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, recently the Kansas City Daily-Drovers Telegram in the issue of June 9 has a very timely editorial in regard to the social-security law recently passed by the House. This article points up the fact that it is doubtful security, and in no stretch of the imgination could it be called insurance, because insurance presupposes a guaranteed reserve to pay claims and in addition insurance implies an enforceable contract which cannot be changed or canceled without policyholders' consent.

The editorial follows:

How Secure Is Social Security?

If the Senate moves as speedily as the House did, social security for an additional 10 million Americans, including more than 3½ million farmers, will soon be a reality. In addition, people already covered by social security will begin to pay more in taxes to the program and receive more in benefits than they have in the past. Hence we make progress—or so we are told by starry-eyed leaders who see it as a major responsibility of Government to make sure that no individual shall want in his old age.

But in the midst of all this seeming progress, a few voices raise disquieting questions. One such is that of Thurman Sensing, executive vice president of the Southern States Industrial Council, who sees in social security the beginnings of the surrender of freedom by the American people.

"The one great test of a people's freedom is whether they accept the responsibility for their own welfare or whether they turn that responsibility over to their government," he writes. "Under the former, they are free; under the latter, they are not."

Under social security, he points out, the people turn over to the Government at least part of the responsibility for their welfare in old age. Hence, "social security is socialism—and we should recognize it as such. Socialistic security is not security at all; it only bears the false front of security." If socialism worked, we might be justified in this. But in all history, there is no record of socialism ever having brought progress and prosperity to a people. Rather, it has always eventually resulted in a low level of mediocrity for all and the gradual destruction of the people's freedom.

The belief that our social-security system offers security that we have provided by our own efforts is a delusion, he insists. Many people believe it is sound, substantial security guaranteed by a reserve to which they and their employers have contributed.

Such a belief is fallacious, he asserts. "All the money paid into the social-security fund is spent by the Government for current operating expenses as fast as it is received. An equivalent amount in Government bonds is earmarked as a reserve for this fund—but this means nothing so far as making funds available for future social-security benefits is concerned. All benefits paid out under the social-security system must be collected in taxes during the year in which paid. There is no other source."

This means that "security" as we envision it under the law must depend entirely on the willingness of future generations to tax themselves sufficiently to pay the benefits we are now promising ourselves. And as the program grows, and the number of people who are to depend on it continually grows, it will become more and more a burden on our children and our children's children who are yet to come.

How secure, then, is social security? The question can be raised, but it cannot be answered. For the answer lies with future generations, whose birthright the current generation has never hesitated to mortgage to the hilt.

Mammoth Soil Conservation Program in Texas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 16, 1954

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, a recent editorial in Soil and Water magazine, official publication of the Association of Texas Soil Conservation District Supervisors, gives an approximate idea of how much the district program is contributing in dollars and cents to the conservation movement in Texas.

The significance of this editorial extends far beyond my own State. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

It's a Mammoth Program

In dollars and cents, how much is the district program contributing to the conservation movement in Texas?

It's impossible to estimate accurately, but just to get a rough idea, a check was made in 136 districts to try to figure out how much is being contributed in the way of man-hours, newspaper space, and radio time for educational articles, equipment use, etc.

The figures show that an amazing total of over $5 million was the estimated value, which you understand does not take into consideration the value of the conservation work itself in increased production, etc.

For example, in those 136 districts, town and city governments gave service valued at over $20,000 in personnel, over $3,000 in equipment and machinery loaned.

It was estimated that supervisors and SCD cooperators gave a million and a half dollars worth of time in promoting the district program. Bankers, businessmen, chambers of commerce, civic organizations, and others, gave over half a million dollars worth of time.

In all, there was an estimated $5,381,464 worth of time and effort spent last year in those 136 districts toward the single idea of furthering conservation through furthering the district movement.

Actually, these figures are on the conservative side, because it's impossible to calculate or even hear about all the effort spent in behalf of the district program.

Nonetheless, the figures are sizable and underscore the fact that the district program is a mammoth one and is developing a grip on the people's imagination which will carry it to its ultimate goal: Every foot of Texas land treated the conservation way.

The Mighty Arkansas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 16, 1954

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an article by Charles T. Davis entitled "The Mighty Arkansas," which was published in the Arkansas Gazette of Sunday, June 13, 1954. Mr. Davis is associate editor of the Gazette and is one of the authorities in our State on river development.

I call attention to this article because the Arkansas River is one of the principal rivers in the Nation on which navigation facilities have not been provided.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Mighty Arkansas—Development of Waterway Would Revolutionize Area, But It's Treated as Stepchild

(By Charles T. Davis)

The Arkansas River is the longest in the Nation not yet provided with facilities for navigation. As the stepchild of the Nation's river system it is also the only major stream not yet fully developed for power, flood control, conservation, recreation, and the other benefits which pay such remarkable dividends for an initial outlay of Federal funds.

A great deal of work has been done in the field of flood control and the like, of course, on the more threatening tributaries of the Arkansas and still more has been accomplished in Oklahoma and on the vast reaches westward where the job of development begins.

Yet nowhere in the basic 431-mile section from Tulsa to the Mississippi has there been more than an inadequate gesture toward channel stabilization to rid this great potential waterway of the traditional characterization that it is "too thin to walk on but too thick to navigate."

The Ohio, the Missouri, and the Mississippi, to the north and east, are navigable in fact as well as name. (The Arkansas is legally a navigable stream and as such is under Federal jurisdiction.) The Illinois is navigable. So is the Tennessee, the Warrior, the Chattahoochie, the Ouachita, and even a minute section of the White. In all the broad river network of the United States only the Arkansas remains almost exactly as it was when as vice commodore of the Dardanelle Junior Boat Club I sailed it in a catboat that possessed neither centerboard nor keel and which even with a cargo of purloined watermelons had a draft of scarcely 2 inches. Even then there were shoals we could not negotiate, and even then the channel was as unruly and capricious as it is today.

It is discouraging to contemplate this picture against the background of the years—particularly when it has been proved time and again at congressional hearings in Washington that if the Arkansas were given the same chance as the rest of the country's big rivers it would stir an expansion which by contrast would be as remarkable as anything since the industrial revolution.

Facts are facts, and the facts show that the development of the Arkansas would pay off by any rational measurement.

Let us take coal for a basic example. The west Arkansas and eastern Oklahoma coal fields are not only contiguous to the river but contain an estimated 89 billion tons of high-grade bituminous and semianthracite.

Relatively little of this great supply of some of the world's finest coal has ever been mined for two reasons. The first is high production costs—an ailment that has made coal mining a very sick industry everywhere. It will be probably be cured or at least improved by the growing trend toward full mechanization of the mines. The second factor is the high cost of transporting Arkansas and Oklahoma coal to their markets. And a contrast of existing rail rates against those of potential water rates will demonstrate that navigation development may well be the answer to this problem.

St. Louis, for instance, is a good market for Arkansas coal—particularly since its antismoke ordinance was enacted in 1941. Freight rates, however, were too high for Arkansas-Oklahoma to compete there with the product of Illinois, Kentucky, and West Virginia. Shortly after the St. Louis antismoke law was adopted the Frisco Railroad established a rate of $2 a ton on a minimum shipment of 2,000 tons, to its yards in the Mound City. The MoPac denied this special rate to the mines on its line and required $2.75. Both these figures have gone up considerably since then, of course, but the contrast still exists.

Testifying before the 79th Congress as a representative of the Arkansas-Oklahoma Committees for Development of the Arkansas River, J. C. Murray, the Little Rock traffic consultant, stated flatly that a comparable river freight rate to St. Louis would be $1.85 per ton. Moreover, with due emphasis on the potentialities of such markets as Minneapolis, New Orleans, and Memphis, in which Arkansas-Oklahoma coal also has difficulty in competing because of rail freight costs, he cited these rates per ton from Fort Smith: To Minneapolis, $4.52 by rail, $3.60 by water; to New Orleans, $3.65 (or $2.05 for export coal) by rail, $1.33 by water, and to Memphis, $2.70 by rail and $102 by water.

These rail rates, incidentally, are now approximately $5.57 to Minneapolis, $4.70 ($3.62 export) to New Orleans, and $3.67 to Memphis, while water rates would be $4.65, $2.38 ($2.90), and $1.99. At the present all rates are also subject to a temporary 15 percent surcharge.

Beyond this domestic market lies a vast field of export business which the coal producers of Arkansas and Oklahoma could tap if they could cut transportation costs.

In 1939, for example, the United States exported some 5 million tons of coal to Latin America, while Great Britain sent more than 18 million and France nearly 7 million. There is no reason why the undeveloped fields of Arkansas and Oklahoma could not make up part of this export deficit in a hemisphere in which the United States should logically be the leader. Particularly is this true when reference is made to newspaper accounts back in 1945 that Buenos Aires among other cities was suffering from a fuel shortage. That situation has not changed a great deal—either so far as Buenos Aires or the Arkansas-Oklahoma coal fields are concerned.

Coal is only one product which could greatly expand its markets through navigation. Another is bauxite, a mineral of which Arkansas has an estimated reserve of more than 25 million tons. There is no reason why this could not be shipped out of central Arkansas by water. Moreover, in a troubled time like this there is a great deal of logic in having a cheap water route available in the event ocean shipments from foreign sources are threatened. There is also no reason why foreign ore could not be shipped to this growing center of aluminum manufacture by water. Certainly Reynolds Metals, for instance, should find a great deal to attract it in water route by which it could bring its Jamaican ore right to a dock in Little Rock.

Stone is another product that would find a navigable channel highly useful. Others include lumber, oil, manganese, fertilizer, lead, zinc, sand, gravel, grains of all kinds, and that historic steamboat cargo—cotton. Without venturing into the complicated realms of available statistics, it can be said flatly that all of these could be shipped cheaper by water, all have a market and all lie in close enough proximity to the Arkansas to preclude any but nominal source-to-dock trucking charges.

Oil, particularly, is an interesting example of these potentially waterborne products because the pipelines have now come into strong competition with the railroads. This provides another, and cheaper, means of transportation. But even with the added cost of loading, involving trucks, tank cars, pipelines, or all three, it is still cheaper, in the overall picture from well to market, to ship oil by water than by any other method.

A big point Murray made in his arguments before the 79th Congress—a point, incidentally, he and his fellow river-development supporters are still making—is that the expansion that would inevitably follow more attractive freight rates would actually not injure the railroads.

The railroads have always been ardent opponents of river navigation, yet it has been shown time and again that the general expansion benefits all business and all forms of transportation. The railroads are not hauling that increased potential production in Arkansas-Oklahoma coal now for the very simple reason that it isn't there to haul. But they would undoubtedly be hauling some of it, if only in transshipment, if the fields were fully developed—as they would be—to take advantage of the possibilities of river transportation.

Anywhere there is business of one kind there must be business of a supporting nature. If the coalfields were booming, the grocery and drugstores, the automobile agencies, and the appliance outlets would be booming, too, and the railroads would have their share of that traffic. When their spokesmen, as ostensibly represented by their trade organization, the Association of American Railroads, come to recognize this, perhaps the plan for development can go forward on a broader and much stronger front.

Private Medical Practice Furnishes Country With Finest Medical Care

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALTON A. LENNON

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 16, 1954

Mr. LENNON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an essay entitled "Why the Private Practice of Medicine Furnishes This Country With the Finest Medical Care," written by Robert Taylor, a North Carolina boy. The essay was awarded first prize by the National Association of Physicians and Surgeons.

There being no objection, the essay was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Why the Private Practice of Medicine Furnishes This Country With the Finest Medical Care

(By Robert Taylor)

Progress in medicine which reached its height on the continent of Europe through the contributions of Pasteur and Lister, kindled a flame of enthusiasm in the medical circles of our own land around the turn of the century. From this time forth, this flame has never been extinguished. In the first half of the 20th century, we have seen American medicine confronted with problems of both scientific and administrative proportions and always correct solutions have evolved. I refer to the conquest of yellow fever by Walter Reed, the control of typhoid fever and diphtheria, the advances made in surgery and obstetrics, and the organization and supply of medical personnel in two major world conflicts.

American medicine made possible the mass production of antibiotics, thus lowering the cost to each American in need of such. The trained American surgeon no longer hesitates to open the chest, and to do operations on the heart, lungs, and vessels. Cancer surgery has advanced greatly through the knowledge and developments that American doctors have contributed in the field of anesthesia, and in blood and fluid administration. The American mother can now be brought through childbirth with the best record in the world for survival, and her offspring has a good chance of living to be 70 years of age. Life expectancy has increased so that in the last 50 years, the total United States population has doubled. More especially it is to be noted that the population of both men and women 65 years and older has quadrupled. Consequently, the general death rate has been cut almost in half, and the American Medical Association states this manifests a saving of more than a million lives per year. Cancer detection clinics and tuberculosis surveys have been organized to detect and to present for treatment "the early case." Yes; we can truly say with pride that America is the healthiest nation in the world.

Medical educators have kept abreast by opening more medical schools and enlarging classes. Now, the American public has a larger supply of well-trained doctors than at any time in history. Postgraduate work, through constant vigilance has raised standards assuring the people of our country competent specialists. Hospital standards are continuously being checked by authorized agencies of organized American medicine. Twice in one generation, our doctors have been called upon to treat medical, military, and psychiatric casualties, at home and abroad, and the response was magnificent. Civilian doctors, adjusting to regimentation at personal and family sacrifices, gave America the lowest military mortality rate in history. The observations and experiences gained in these adversities were brought home and given to the American people that the fight against disease might continue. The unkindled flame has now spread to conquer the atom and its energy, and to divert attention from the destructive to the constructive. Today doctors use atomic energy in the study and treatment of disease and disease processes. These are the accomplishments of American medicine during the last 50 years, making America the world center of medicine and medical knowledge. This epitome of progress was achieved in an atmosphere of freedom, freedom to think, study, produce, experiment, speak, write, and act as an individual medical teacher, researcher, administrator, or practitioner. Always the guiding principle was that of unselfish service to medicine, patient, or family, and this principle did not have to answer to bureaus or complex agencies. The great success of American medicine should not fail to continue if allowed to progress in the future under the same fundamentals.

The American doctor, especially the family physician, has created and developed a beautiful relationship with patient and family. Always he has had the best interest of the patient at heart; through personal interest alone, he has come to know the family history of his patients, and has identified himself with each illness. Even in an advisory capacity, he has formed the first line of defense against disease when it strikes a family unit. The family history with which he has familiarized himself so well serves to guide him in his decisions. It is my firm conviction that this one fact has made possible the high standards we enjoy today.

The patient and the family, at the same time, have enjoyed the privilege and right of selecting through choice, and choice alone, any qualified family physician. Many factors apply in such a choice, such as the individual ability, initiative, and qualifications of the physician, friendship, personal acquaintance, and contributions on the part of the physician to community life. The personal character of the physician plays an important part in a patient's choice of a particular doctor.

No better plan could ever be adopted in the care of the sick than this working system as it exists today. The patient has a free choice of a particular physician, and the physician has a deep centered interest in both the disease itself, and the patient as an individual. The physician knows that he must render good service in an earnest and sincere spirit to be worthy of the patient's free choice of selection. If this is not done, a colleague more worthy may be selected. Thus it behooves each individual physician to study and keep abreast with the most modern medical advances, to walk upright before God and man, and to serve unselfishly. The patient, at the same time, is thus assured of the best in medical care, knowing that sympathy and understanding will be a part of medical and technical procedures employed in the treatment of any specified illness.

Yet American medicine today faces one critical problem. This problem can be simply expressed by the statement, "It is expensive to be sick." The cost of hospitalization has steadily inclined because of the necessity for use of more expensive drugs, the employment of more diagnostic tests, the rising cost of food and supplies, and the necessity for more technically trained personnel at increasing salaries. Yes, this problem is paramount in medical care today, and it amounts to disaster to the average family budget in cases of prolonged illness.

Many answers and solutions have been proposed to meet this problem. There are those who would replace the responsibility of the care of the Nation's sick under a central Federal agency. Oscar Ewing has been the principal advocate of such a plan and has disguised it under various names; but, whatever the name given to the plan, in the final analysis, it amounts to the socialization of medicine, purely and simply. Under such a plan, a tax would be put upon the salary of each working member of the family. This tax would be known as compulsory health insurance. Great Britain today has a similar plan in force, but it has almost bankrupted the economy. Patients no longer enjoy the free choice of a physician as a right, but, in many instances, they are assigned to certain doctors. Patients often abuse the plan by seeking the aid of a doctor when unnecessary. England attempted to place the responsibility for dental care, artificial limbs, eyeglasses and body supports under control of a governmental agency. So bad were the abuses that it was said with much truth that every patient in England obtained two pairs of glasses, two sets of false teeth and a wheel chair. Record keeping and the filling of forms require so much time on the part of a physician working under such a plan, that little time is actually spent with patients. The expense of this plan reaches enormous proportions and money must come from an already overtaxed public.

The plan leads to destruction of the physician's individual initiative, his ambition and his efforts. All personal identity, knowledge and feeling for the individual patient is lost in attempting to answer the problem of expense for medical care. This plan destroys the fundamentals which made the great contributions of American medicine possible, and which gave America its finest medical care.

To those who have given considerable study to this problem, it is believed the answer is contained in voluntary health insurance. Many of these plans are working effectively today in which the patient is at liberty to choose the individual plan and the physician of his choice. On the other hand, the physician is free to prescribe and treat to the best interest of his patient, and there are no excess tax dollars being levied. The patient has the privilege of prescribing to any number and to any variety of the voluntary plans. In North Carolina, the medical society cooperated with one such plan in giving reduced fees to members of families in lower income brackets.

Voluntary plans operate in the American way in that various plans compete with each other to offer better service to patients. These various plans have become more liberal and more conclusive in the last several years, and soon it is anticipated that provisions will be made to cover prolonged illnesses.

Let us, therefore, preserve our traditions and our fundamentals which have established American medical care as the finest in the world. Let us maintain our doctor-patient relationships as they have been in the past and as they exist today. Let us not incur an additional tax burden, but continue to believe in the competitive American way—the way that made America great, the only way to continue in a state of progress.

Farm Policy Change Needs Public's Help

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN

OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 16, 1954

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Farm Policy Change Needs Public's Help," appearing in the Christian Science Monitor of Saturday, June 12, 1954.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FARM POLICY CHANGE NEEDS PUBLIC'S HELP

(By George Ericson)

The recent slash in the price of export wheat by 10 cents a bushel is a striking move which should alert the American people to the necessity for a decided change in the present farm policy. This policy, which bears little relationship to commonsense, is increasingly being held to be ludicrous because under the rigid price-support program, carried over from a previous administration, mountain-high surpluses of unsalable farm products have accumulated. It appears ludicrous because it discriminates against the consumer, who seemingly has no congressional bloc to speak for him and who must pay in taxes for price support while there is exacted from him a high, uneconomic price at the grocery store or the warehouse.

It lays itself open to the charge of being ridiculous because it forces the Secretary of Agriculture to take extreme measures to dispose of these products and at the same time avoid disrupting our own or foreign economies by the dumping technique. Already leaders abroad show apprehension over the measures taken to increase our lagging wheat exports. The prospects of still greater Government stocks being bought to keep prices up indicate no lessening of the need to market more abroad if these can't be sold at home. And this means courting the resentment of other governments.

ECONOMIC REALITIES CONTINUE IGNORED

The mere recital of the huge stocks which the Government has been forced to buy to keep prices up on stilts is a condemnation which only the case-hardened politician attempts to ignore. What's to be done with the rising 825 million bushels of wheat now seen likely this fall—two-thirds of last year's crop? What of the 800 million bushels of corn expected to be in the hands of the Commodity Credit Corporation 3 months from now, or of the well over 400 million pounds of butter?

These are perishable products whose disposal, along with excess barley, rye, lima beans, etc., raises problems as difficult as keeping them in storage. Yet the farm bloc, eyeing the ballot box, holds to the outmoded, wartime 90 percent of parity price concept which, given further rope, can develop into one of the Nation's greatest fiascos. Economic realities clash with political ambitions, at great cost to the people who must pay the price.

These supported prices, originally intended to be temporary while the farmers became adjusted to the lower peacetime demand, have been extended by succeeding Congresses and are now in their eighth year after the war. Still there is no end to the spending of taxpayers' money for an admittedly irrational and dangerous scheme, which economists say may eventually damage the farmer, even as it is now held to be hurting the economy at large.

FLEXIBLE SUPPORTS SEEN RIGHT APPROACH

The Eisenhower administration has made its position clear, and, while calling for the end of 90 percent rigid support prices, is trying to ease the burden of excess stocks. Secretary Benson has ordered plantings reduced by about 30 million acres, has cut the price of butter to the housewife to around 60 cents, to foreign buyers to 45 cents, and has knocked 10 cents a bushel off the price of wheat in the export market, a move met by a 10⅛-cent reduction by Canada. That country is also plagued by a wheat surplus of 577 million bushels, highest in its history.

This week came the crop report, indicating a wheat harvest of 1 billion bushels, against a planned-for output of 900 million bushels. The likelihood, therefore, is that 100 million more bushels will be added to the present unwieldy surplus, intensifying Mr. Benson's well-nigh insuperable problem. It is a foregone conclusion that he will ask for an extension of the marketing quotas.

The slight increase of late in grain exports indicates that these could do little to ease the supply problem. With farm production about 45 percent above prewar levels, no corresponding population gain, and steadily rising foreign harvests, this Nation is producing vastly more food than it can consume or sell to others.

Unless the flexible price support principle advocated by the President and Secretary Benson wins approval in Congress, a worsening situation impends. There is no sanity in adding to the more than $6,300,000,000 tied up in unsalable products with costs adding $500,000 a day. The time has come to shift gradually to a more free, not a more managed, market. Tapping the pockets of millions to maintain an economic absurdity comes close to being a case of principle against politics.

Texas Writer Gives Basic Recipe for Useful Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 16, 1954

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, there lives in Dallas, Tex., a man whose name—and it is X. Carson—has become widely known to readers of leading newspapers in that region because of his contributions to their Letters to the Editor departments.

Mr. Carson, who is a faithful friend of mine, recently wrote for the Dallas Morning News in which he summed up his basic philosophy, after 75 years of life. It is an inspiring statement. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

In this column may I appeal to our youth for a future of strong men and women, first, in authority; second, in society in general, that our great country be saved from decay and a surrender to evil? I offer these fundamentals necessary to a useful life.

"As a man thinks, so is he." As one knows right from wrong, so is he able to choose his sources for thought. Because of these two governing principles one is responsible for his thinking and acts.

Purpose governs all things. Hard work executes purpose. Idleness leads to delinquency, crime, and trouble with the law. Purpose is a sure force that builds a great character. One with a strong character and right purpose can and will represent the people in crises.

Time frittered away by detail and uncertainty in youth may mean a sluggard, a beggar in times of harvest, a life of poverty. Time wasted on trifles leads to not great goals, puts one behind his fellows in the great race of life.

Sound preparation in school life means creative thought and action in times of opportunity and prosperity—always visitors sometime in life. Preparation and power to think are forces that guarantee success and continued prosperity through depressions and times of struggle.

Give attention, especially in high school, to know wisdom and understanding, for "a wise man will hear, and will increase learning; and a man of understanding shall attain unto wise counsels." How badly such men and women are now needed in national and world councils and conferences.

Good intentions are complimentary, but without action they are worthless and accomplish nothing. Only good results speak for the real self, the man, the woman. The stenographer who can deliver accurately and quickly instructions in a satisfactory order is the one wanted by successful businessmen.

Practical education and high-school and college wisdom do not turn one away from work. The worker creates and builds, and makes things the people want. Of all men the worker is the happiest.

The voice of the people may not be the voice of God every time, but when apprised of the facts it will rise in volume from the seat of a wise course and purpose. It is a union voice. "In union there is strength" and power to be reckoned with. At this time there is a sad lack of that voice.

Anything Goes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 16, 1954

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an editorial from the Northwest Arkansas Times entitled "Anything Goes."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Anything Goes

"Until this moment, Senator, I think I never really gaged your cruelty or your recklessness."

So said Army Counsel Joseph N. Welch at the McCarthy-Army hearings to Senator Joseph McCarthy, Republican, of Wisconsin, day before yesterday. The counsel had just learned an unpleasantness he had not expected—the fact that the Senator from Wisconsin knows no fairness in his fights and practices none.

The remark came about as the result of charges hurled by McCarthy, in which the Senator accused the Boston attorney of trying to "foist" off on the committee a lawyer who, McCarthy said, had once belonged to the Lawyers' Guild. The Senator made a number of bitter charges, including one that the young attorney had a "Communist-front record."

The chairman of the committee conducting the hearings, Senator Mundt, can be said to be no enemy of McCarthy, but he spoke up to say that as far as the record goes Mr. Welch had at no time suggested Fisher's name to the committee. His remarks were ignored as only McCarthy can ignore facts he spurns, and the charges continued unabated.

Finally Welch, who had enough, remarked: "If there is a God in heaven" the Senator would reap no benefit from such an attack.

There will be some surprise among the public which knows of the career of the Senator from Wisconsin that the Boston lawyer should be amazed at any low blow McCarthy should aim.

It was evident what the Wisconsinite was attempting to do in this case. Welch, as the interrogating counsel, had Witness Roy A. Cohn on the spot and was pressing questions which were proving embarrassing to the McCarthy camp. In order to give the witness time and to change the course of the investigation, regardless of who might get hurt, the Senator turned the affair into personalities. That such should injure a young practicing attorney was beside the point, as much of what the Senator has done for years has been beside the point. Such tactics have proven of apparent benefit to the Senator in the past—they worked again, in this case. For Welch, torn up by the seriousness of the attack on his lawyer friend, gave up questioning Cohn and allowed the witness to step down.

The longer the hearing continues, the more certain it appears American public opinion must render the only actual verdict which will come out of the case. If public opinion does not condemn the Wisconsin Senator for the tactics he uses to pursue his course, then it will be evident indeed that a great change has come over the freedom-loving people who go to make up the great United States. It must be evident to the listening and reading audience that there is no sense whatever of fair play involved in the activities of the inquisitor. Anything goes with him, so long as he thinks it will be of benefit to him—as Counsel Welch learned so dramatically this week.

French Global Rating Sags—Geneva Last-Ditch Talks Fail

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARGUERITE STITT CHURCH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1954

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I wish to call attention to the pertinent analysis contained in the following article by Volney D. Hurd, chief of the Paris news bureau of the Christian Science Monitor, which appeared in that paper on June 14:

French Global Rating Sags—Geneva Last-Ditch Talks Fail

(By Volney D. Hurd)

BIG POWER?

Paris.—The whole question of France's future role in the western alliance is being debated here following the latest show of French internal weakness and disunity.

Even strong advocates of this country are asking if France can possibly continue as a keystone in the West's foreign-policy arch, in view of its willingness to tumble its cabinet in the midst of the crucial East-West Conference at Geneva.

In the Far East, France's 7-year-long effort to keep Indochina from communism seems on the brink of failure.

In Europe the European Defense Community, which was to force a strong western shield against the Soviet Union, has failed to materialize because France has failed to ratify it.

Situation deteriorates

In Morocco, where half of the West's long-range strategic bombers are based, the situation has deteriorated into a succession of riots and terroristic attempts against Frenchmen.

It has been said that all this came from France's attempting to play a world role above its resources. The Anglo Americans, seeking to eliminate a postwar political vacuum in Europe, encouraged France to take on responsibilities it could not really support.

Having accepted this role and the support it offered, France attempted to honor the commitments asked of it. Britain, the United States, and France itself all wished to believe France had been restored to a great power position.

France was set up in the image of a world power, with an occupation zone, an equal place with Britain and the United States at the big conference tables, and some $5 billion given to it in various kinds of aid.

France now seems less able than ever to meet the demands made upon it. Until now, the French Assembly could be expected to support a government in power while a major international conference was in session. The defeat of Premier Joseph Laniel shows that even this has changed. According to observers here, all this may well force a revision of the West's defense plans in Europe. Up to now it had been assumed, to a certain extent, that there were two worlds, one Communist and one free, and that the Communist one must be contained until it had lost its dangerous expansionist urge.

What now seems to emerge is quite different. There appears to be a line of nations strong enough to act as a shield against communism. Behind it, however, is a great mass of nations in the midst of evolution, either young ones inexperienced and uncertain, or old ones too worn, weak, and individualistic to play a really active role while they seek to adapt themselves to a new world of integration and community cooperation.

Shield needed

Instead of being available as part of a great containment shield, they urgently need the shield themselves. They must have it as a strong defense behind which they can gradually grow to strength, to the point where they can stand on their own feet, strong as well as free, and no longer an easy prey to communism.

In the EDC itself this issue appears. The original idea was to have France and Germany balance each other as equal, healthy, strong powers. In the actual state of affairs, this appears completely unrealistic. Germany rates as a shield nation while France is one in need of a shield. Belgium, Holland, Luxembourg, Germany, Yugoslavia, Greece, and Turkey form a western shield of healthy nations with increasingly strong, dependable armies.

Behind this shield we find two nations, uncertain France and Italy, politically spongy with communism and needing their full energies to work out of their internal weaknesses and build up to strength.

This is the essential significance of the fall of the Laniel government, the end of 9 years of trying to make France into something it was not ready to be at this time.

Memorial Day Address by Patrick J. McNelis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM T. GRANAHAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1954

Mr. GRANAHAN. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Patrick J. McNelis, an outstanding public-spirited and highly respected citizen of Philadelphia, speaking recently at exercises on Memorial Day in Old St. Mary's Cemetery, delivered a brilliant address which points up some very timely thoughts. Mr. McNelis was the organizer and past president of the Society of Commodore John Barry, United States Navy. The address follows:

REMARKS OF PATRICK J. MCNELIS, PAST PRESIDENT OF THE SOCIETY OF COMMODORE JOHN BARRY, UNITED STATES NAVY, AT THE MEMORIAL DAY EXERCISES OF MID CITY POST, VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS, MEMORIAL DAY, 1954, AT OLD ST. MARY'S CEMETERY, PHILADELPHIA

Comrade commander, officers, and members of the Mid City Post, Veterans of Foreign Wars, and friends, we, of the Society of Commodore John Barry, United States Navy, are honored with the privilege of joining once again with you in these annual Memorial Day exercises. The selection of this cemetery to conduct these ceremonies is most appropriate. I feel it has the unique distinction of resting within its hallowed bosom, the mortal remains of men who served in every war fought for the honor and in defense of the United States of America. We stand here at the tomb of Commodore John Barry, who was one of the most distinguished participants of the war that established the independence of our great Nation, and has been called by many the father of the American Navy. In the plot on the north side of the church is buried a young veteran of World War II, who may have served with many of you present at these rites. I have no doubt that veterans of the other wars in which our country has been engaged, are also interred in these sacred precincts. But our journey here today is not to honor flesh and blood. Could our eyes penetrate the darkness of these graves we would find only the bare bones that was their frame in life. Gone is the soul, the spirit that animated them in their great deeds, and it is to this immortality that we come to pay tribute. As we stand here and gaze at the tomb of John Barry, we may read the beautiful evaluation of his character written by his friend, Benjamin Rush, early patriot and signer of the Declaration of Independence. Let me read the epitaph:

"Let the patriot, the soldier and the Christian who visit these mansions of the dead, view this monument with respect. Beneath it are deposited the remains of John Barry. He was born in the County of Wexford in Ireland, but America was the object of his patriotism and the theater of his usefulness and honor. In the Revolutionary War which established the independence of the United States, he bore the commission of captain in their infant Navy and afterward became its commander in chief. He fought often and once bled in the cause of freedom, but his habits of war did not lessen in him the peaceful virtues which adorn private life. He was gentle, kind, just and charitable, not less beloved by his family and his friends than by his grateful country. The number and objects of his charities will be known only at that time when his dust shall be reanimated and when He, Who sees in secret, shall reward openly. In the full belief of the doctrines of the Gospel, he peacefully resigned his soul into the arms of his Redeemer on the 13th day of September 1803, in the 59th year of his age. His affectionate widow hath caused this marble to be erected to perpetuate his name, after the hearts of his fellow citizens have ceased to be the living records of his public and private virtues."

There, my friends, is eloquently described the purpose of our Memorial Day exercises, by changing to the plural, the pronouns in that last sentence—to perpetuate their names—their deeds—after the hearts of their fellow citizens have ceased to be the living records of their public and private virtues. These men, as you men and women, offered themselves to bear arms for their country and when that need was past, resumed their usual peacetime occupations and were useful citizens devoted to the welfare of our beloved America. As we gaze about us here, we cannot help but think that long before the Statute of Liberty was erected in New York Harbor welcoming the poor and the persecuted, yes, and long before the Declaration of Independence, the poor and the persecuted had begun to blaze the trails in this new land of opportunity. It is evident that their love of liberty was woven into the fabric of thought in those days and that their contribution was great in establishing the independence of the United States.

Look at the names around us—Comdr. John Barry, father of the American Navy; Thomas FitzSimons, officer in the Revolutionary Army, signer of the Constitution, and Representative from Philadelphia in the First, Second, and Third Congresses; Gen. Stephan Moylan, muster master general of Washington's army; Capt. John Rossiter, of the War of 1812. The names appearing on many of these monuments and the dates of their demise, early in the days of our Republic, give testimony that many of these patriots, fleeing persecution in their native Ireland and finding a haven on these shores, never hesitated to defend it from all enemies.

It is a sad commentary that the land left has still to attain that full measure of freedom they helped win for the land of their adoption. Through the generations from their day to the present, millions of Irish have immigrated to America, have sought citizenship, and by their love and devotion to our ideals and institutions formed and produced a most honorable and useful segment of our citizenry. In recent years, since World War I, as we have realized the important part we have in international affairs, we have become increasingly aware of the importance of applying our high ideals to all nations, large and small alike. We recall that when the Senate of the United States ratified the peace treaty in 1920, it appended a remarkable reservation in which it declared: "The United States adheres to the principle of self-determination and the resolution of sympathy with the expectations of the Irish people for a government of their own choice adopted by the Senate June 6, 1919, and declares that when such government is attained by Ireland—a consummation which it is hoped is at hand—it should promptly be admitted as a member of the League of Nations." What is more remarkable is that this statement was made at a period when Ireland literally stood with her back to the wall and a British bayonet at her throat for daring to set up an Irish Republic after the people of all Ireland had voted by an 80 percent majority for such a government. Today there are men in the Congress of the United States who would like to see the fulfillment of these aspirations of the Irish people to full nationhood by calling on Britain to end the partition of the Emerald Isle. Some of their colleagues labor under the impression that it is a domestic problem and that the British colony in northeastern Ireland have an ancient and established right to a continued occupation of this territory and under British rule. The only rights they have were established by conquest and plantation. The present Irish Government will guarantee them all the rights of free citizens, but only within the framework of the Irish Republic. If they desire to remain British citizens, that is their privilege, but they should not insist on maintaining British sovereignty on any part of Irish soil.

To the immortal spirits of the honored dead buried here beneath the hallowed shadows of this sacred temple of God, we pray that their sacrifices and ours will continue to safeguard our beloved land and that the blessings of complete independence will soon be extended to the Ireland that bore them and which they loved.

President Eisenhower has called on us all this Memorial Day to lift our hearts in prayer to Almighty God, that peace may come to the world—a peace of honor and justice. In the face of the unrest and uncertainty that we find around us, I would like to quote the following lines from the pen of another great Irish rebel who escaped to America and lived to be one of our greatest journalists, John Boyle O'Reilly:

"God send us peace and keep Red strife away;
  But should it come, God send us men and steel!
The land is dead that dare not face the day
  When foreign danger threats the common weal.
Defenders strong are they that homes defend;
  From ready arms, the spoiler keeps afar.
Well blest the country that has sons to lend
  From trades of peace to learn the trade of war.
Thrice blest the nation that has every son a soldier,
  Ready for the warning sound;
Who marches homeward when the fight is done
  To swing the hammer and till the ground."

These words were written in 1862, but they are strangely applicable to the present.

We, of the Society of Commodore John Barry, USN, are deeply impressed with the unflinching campaign against communism being waged by the Veterans of Foreign Wars. We salute the inspiring leadership you have furnished in this crusade against the Red menace that threatens our institutions and way of life. We pledge to your patriotic leaders our unqualified support.

On behalf of President Joseph P. Brown and our members here present, I again express our deepest appreciation for the courtesy of your invitation to join with you in these ceremonies.

Bank Failures Old-Fashioned — Federal Deposit Insurance Observes 21st Birthday — Another Successful Democratic New Deal Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1954

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, on June 16 the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation will be 21 years old.

This activity is one of the cornerstones of the New Deal. It was born when our people had lost confidence in banks. By restoring that confidence it has brought the institution of banking to greater than ever heights. Today, thanks to this Democratic program, no one fears for the safety of his savings. This proposal, which, when first made, was labeled "socialism," and at which all the other scare epithets were aimed, is today considered a model of conservatism. One of our most conservative public figures lent his name to successful efforts to increase from five to ten thousand dollars the amount of deposits insured by the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, the Washington Evening Star for Thursday, June 3, published a brief history of the FDIC, which I include as a part of my remarks:

WHEELS OF GOVERNMENT: FDIC, BORN FOR TROUBLE, MAKES BANK FAILURES OLD FASHIONED

(By Hector McLean)

Is your money safe in the bank?

Today the answer is yes, in large measure because of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, which will be 21 years old on June 16.

Twenty years or so ago, however, the question was a real one to worry about.

In the 2 decades before that, more than 15,000 banks failed—more than even exist in the United States today.

In the District alone, 16 banks went into receivership in the depression years of 1932, 1933, and 1934.

In those days, before the Federal Government put its massive credit squarely behind the bulk of bank depositors, the merest rumor often was enough to send depositors stampeding to the cashiers' windows to get their money out before the bank failed.

Many banks, even sound ones, couldn't stand such sudden demands for immediate payoffs—too much of their depositors' money was tied up in loans that couldn't be called in immediately, at least not without disastrous results.

One prize example of a run started by unfounded rumors happened to the Perpetual Building Association, 11th and E Streets NW.

CLASSIC EXAMPLE

The institution was then in excellent financial health and has continued in that condition without interruption to the present day. While it is not a bank and is, therefore, insured by the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation—an organization similar to the FDIC—the example is a classic one for all financial institutions.

The run started about noon February 4, 1931. By 1 p. m. the Star's switchboard was swamped with calls, asking if it were true that Perpetual was about to close.

By 3 p. m. streams of taxicabs were bringing anxious housewives, with passbooks in hand, to get their money. Police were called out to try to hold the crowd in line—a line that stretched along E Street from 11th around the corner up 12th to F Street.

Presidents of other District banks conferred, determined that Perpetual was in sound condition and rushed to its aid.

Robert V. Fleming, president of Riggs National Bank, arrived with a satchel containing $500,000 to help stem the tide. He jumped to a counter and waved huge sheafs of bills before the milling crowd in the lobby, saying that Perpetual was sound and there was cash to pay all depositors.

The, run slowed some, but then rolled on with $800,000 withdrawn in a single day. It broke on February 5, after a Treasury truck drove up to deposit $900,000 and after copies of the Star, with stories demonstrating Perpetual's soundness, had been spread up and down the line of fearful depositors. The next day, February 6, all was calm.

Next year, though, four District banks went into the hands of receivers. Depositors ultimately got back from 35 to 91 percent of their money.

In 1933, two more Washington banks went under, and then Franklin D. Roosevelt was sworn in as President on March 4, a Friday. At 1 a. m., March 6, he declared the national bank holiday, which closed all institutions in the country.

Congress rushed through emergency banking legislation on March 9 and followed it with the Banking Act of June 16, 1933, under which the FDIC was established to insure depositors against loss resulting from bank failures.

The idea was not new. From 1886 to June 1933, a total of 150 bills for guaranty or insurance of bank deposits had been introduced in Congress.

Many top legislators were involved in the Banking Act of 1933, among them Senator Arthur H. Vandenberg, Republican, of Michigan, and Senator William Gibbs McAdoo, Democrat, of California.

However, the bill signed by President Roosevelt on June 16 carried the names of Senator Carter Glass, Democrat, of Virginia, and Representative Henry Bascom Steagall, Democrat, of Alabama, chairman of the House Banking Committee.

But before the storm was over and the FDIC got thoroughly squared away, 12 more District banks had failed.

The same pattern prevailed on a national scale. Failures jumped from 519 in 1928 to 1,542 in 1931 and soared to 2,397 the next year. In the 8-month period ended by the bank holiday, there were 1,084 failures.

LAWS CLOSE MANY

After the week-long holiday, banks reopened under drastically tightened Government supervision, which forced many out of business. In the first 3 days that followed, 2,630 banks suspended, while another 174 went under before the end of the year.

During that time, the FDIC examined 7,785 banks—with hundreds of borrowed bank examiners—and found that about 1,000 did not have enough assets to cover their liabilities.

On January 1, 1934, however, when insurance of deposits became effective, a total of 13,201 banks was insured.

Under rigid Government supervision, bank failures dropped year by year, from 57 in 1934 to only 1 last year.

The last time an FDIC-insured bank failed—when the FDIC paid off the depositors directly—was 10 years ago, in 1944. All the others since then have been noninsured banks.

In the District and Virginia, by the way, all banks are insured—as are 97.8 percent of the banks in Maryland.

There are three noninsured Maryland banks. One is a commercial bank of deposit, one is a mutual savings bank, and one is a nondeposit trust company, which is not eligible.

HOW IT APPLIES

Insurance applies to both commercial and savings banks if incorporated, as it does to national and State banks of deposit, which are members of the Federal Reserve System, and to nonmember national and State banks of deposit, which are members of the Federal Reserve System, and to nonmember national and State banks of deposit, which have applied for insurance and have met the requirements of law for admission to insurance.

Nationally, 13,651 banks were insured at the end of 1953, out of 14,492 banks of deposit, both commercial and savings.

Only in the five States of New England are less than 75 percent of banks insured. There, relatively large numbers of mutual savings banks do not participate in Federal deposit insurance, although they are eligible. Some, particularly in Massachusetts and New Hampshire, have their own insurance setup.

One big reason for the low rate of failures is that FDIC doesn't stand quietly by and wait for the collapse of a bank that is getting into trouble.

In most cases, it moves in quickly to straighten out the difficulty, much of which is caused by what one official calls "human frailty—fast women and slow horses."

Besides acting as a receiver if the bank actually collapses, the FDIC can force absorption of a weak insured bank by a strong one or render direct financial aid under specified circumstances.

In the case of absorption, neither depositors nor stockholders are likely to lose any money.

INSURES UP TO $10,000

As it is, the FDIC does not insure all bank deposits. It guarantees up to $10,000, which covers 98 percent of depositors, but the uninsured portion of such accounts—largely held by big corporations—amounts to 46 percent of total deposits.

Thus, in case of an outright failure, much of the big accounts might be lost, which wouldn't happen in an absorption.

The FDIC originally was financed through capital stock purchased by the Treasury and Federal Reserve banks. This was paid off with interest nearly 4 years ago, and the Corporation now is financed by a $1,451,000,000 deposit insurance fund, built up by assessments paid by insured banks and by earnings on the FDIC's assets, principally Government bonds.

The FDIC also can borrow up to $3 billion from the Treasury, but has never used its power.

During its first 20 years, the FDIC disbursed $330.3 million to protect 1,391,000 depositors in 422 banks, but estimates its final loss will be only $25.7 million when all the banks' assets are finally liquidated.

And, if the FDIC terminates a bank's insurance, it must notify depositors beforehand. Also, insurance continues on existing accounts for 2 years in that case.

SEVEN-MILLION-DOLLAR COST

The FDIC's cost of administration and expense in 1953 was about $7 million, 4.2 percent of its total income.

At the end of that year it had 1,028 employees, nearly three-fourths of whom were members of the Division of Examination.

The Corporation maintains offices in each of its 12 districts, in addition to the Washington office in the National Press Building.

The district offices are part of the Division of Examination, and each is under the direction of a supervising examiner. Washington is in the fourth district, under Robert N. McLeod, who has offices in Richmond.

Overall direction of the Corporation is in the hands of a three-man Board of Directors, of whom the Comptroller of the Currency of the United States is automatically one. The other two are appointed by the President, with the consent of the Senate.

The present Chairman is H. Earl Cook, who took over the job May 10, 1953. A Republican, he has been a member of the Board since 1947 and was made Chairman by General Eisenhower, shortly after he became President.

HARL STEPS DOWN

Maple T. Harl, a Democrat, who had been Chairman since 1946, stepped down at that time and continues as a Director. The Comptroller of the Currency is Ray M. Gidney, New York and Cleveland banker, a Republican, who was appointed by President Eisenhower on April 16, 1953.

Mr. Cook, 67, an Ohio banker, was named State superintendent of banks by Gov. John W. Bricker in 1943. He is married to the former Edna Ehmann and is the father of three grown children, two daughters and a son. He lives at 3200 16th Street NW.

Mr. Gidney, 67, has a home in Ohio and stays at the Jefferson Hotel here. He has been married to the former Jean Ellison Brock since 1913 and is the father of three sons.

Mr. Harl, 61, came to the FDIC from Colorado, where he was a State bank commissioner. Married to the former Maybelle Mayfield, of Richmond, Mo., he is the father of one daughter. He lives at 4000 Cathedral Avenue NW.

Point 4 Builds for World Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 16, 1954

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Clarence R. Decker entitled "Point 4 Builds for World Peace."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POINT 4 BUILDS FOR WORLD PEACE

(By Clarence R. Decker)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The courageous efforts of point 4 men and women as our greatest hope for the future in ideological war between American freedom and Soviet servitude.)

"There are at this time two great nations in existence which, proceeding from different points, appear to be advancing toward the same end. I mean the United States of America and Russia.

"All other nations seem to have nearly reached their natural limits, and they have only to maintain their power; but these are still in the act of growth. All others have stopped, or continue to advance with extreme difficulty; these alone are proceeding with ease and celerity along a path to which no limit can be perceived. * * *

"The American relies upon personal interest to accomplish his ends, and gives free scope to the unguided strength and common sense of the people; the Russian centers all authority of society in a single arm. The principal authority of the former is freedom; of the latter, servitude.

"Their starting point is different, and their causes are not the same, yet each of them seems marked out * * * to sway the destinies of half the globe."

These observations appeared in 1835 in a book, Democracy in America, written by the distinguished French statesman, Alexis de Tocqueville—119 years ago, and 14 years before the appearance of Karl Marx's Communist Manifesto. The problem, although aggravated by communism and fascism, arose long before Marx was born and it will continue for many years to come. It is the ancient and perennial struggle between two profoundly irreconcilable ways of life—freedom and servitude—but the struggle today is as cruel, destructive, and fatal as anything the Caesars, czars, or Nazis ever perpetrated.

The ideological war of our century is all the more ominous when we recognize that the appallingly low level of human existence throughout the world precludes for most peoples any real freedom to choose wisely between the alternatives. The vast majority of the world's population lives in filth, disease, poverty, and ignorance—an existence as low as in any previous period of remembered history.

The greatest hope for the future is to be found in the courageous and imaginative efforts of some men and women everywhere to give order and meaning to the chaos of our times. We speak of men and women because people, far more than government, represent the creative forces of life. This seems to us true whether people work for government or private business and social institutions.

We have seen what has happened to a country like Turkey in the past 30 years—a country transformed from feudalism into a progressive, modern nation almost overnight. We have seen the building of hydroelectric plants, irrigation systems, universities, medical centers, hospitals, and health programs in many backward areas. We have met women, like the 70-year-old minister of health in Delhi, fighting gallantly against seemingly insuperable odds. We have watched with pride as American goods and services flowed throughout the world, and we have seen with equal pride the valuable resources of other countries enrich our own life and stimulate our native ingenuity.

Let us consider people. I worked with Otto Hunerwadel. We had flown from Rangoon into the unsettled mountainous region of the northern Shan States, next door to Communist China. There we visited some of the homes of over 300,000 people in 1,500 villages which had been sprayed with DDT in a gigantic drive against debilitating malaria. We saw the new health center, with its special training unit for midwives. We inspected the agricultural center, where Otto Hunerwadel worked with native personnel.

Otto, a former Tennessee agricultural expert, was teaching Burmese farmers how to improve the quality of their produce, especially rice, so necessary to the food-deficit countries of Japan, the Philippines, Java, Malaya, Ceylon, and India. Hunerwadel set a fast pace across the countryside despite an artificial leg, and, practical farmer that he was, his hands were often deep in the rich soil of Burma. He demonstrated to village farmers the preparation of land for wheat, the use of pesticides, the value of commercial fertilizers; he showed how fruit trees could be protected; he advised local blacksmiths how to mold plow points more efficiently.

Otto died a year ago—died literally in the harness. His many Burmese friends miss his friendly hand. After that trip I could better understand what the 43-year-old Prime Minister U Nu meant when he told me that a healthy and hopeful people were the best insurance against communism and expressed his country's deep appreciation to Burma's new American friends.

In Indonesia one thinks of Reginald Fiedler, a fishery expert from California. The vast waters of that country teem with fish, yet the protein intake of Indonesians is appallingly low. Fiedler took a long look at the problem. The result was the installation of a few diesel engines in sailboats the Indonesian themselves built, plus 75 new power craft. It is estimated that the faster boats increased the fish catch some 38,000 tons last year. The Indonesian Government now plans to build refrigerator plants and enlarge the road system so the fish can be moved back into the mountainous and other remote areas quickly. In a very real sense this is the modern counterpart of the miracle of the loaves and fishes.

In Indochina there was young Dr. Warren Winkelstein teaching the people how to fight malaria, yaws, leprosy and other dire diseases of the Far East. Together we visited villages near the Communist front to see the newly established dispensaries with their wonder drugs, to inspect the health education programs now serving over a million people, and to watch point 4 trained local nurses treating patients suffering from the painful and blinding disease of trachoma. In some areas as much as 90 percent of the population is afflicted. We were treating some 70,000 persons a month. The program is so popular that families behind the Communist lines around Hanoi sneak through for care. We helped them for humanitarian reasons, but we knew that when they returned home they became our most powerful propagandist in the psychological war against communism.

Psychological war inevitably brings to mind Leo Hochstetter who accompanied us through Southeast Asia. Leo was known as the Marconi and Alexander Graham Bell of Indochina. That country forms an area slightly larger than Texas, half of it mountainous, populated by 29 million people drawn from many ethnic groups and speaking three major languages. Most of the people are illiterate. There are few newspapers, radio sets are scarce, and the rural postal system was disrupted by the Communists. An information program was essential to combat Communist propaganda, to publicize self-help techniques, to aid the Ministry of Education to communicate more effectively with their own peoples.

Leo's answers were tailored to meet the situation: air-drops of simple, colorful pamphlets over remote areas; a picture-poster newspaper showing concrete achievements; distribution of community radios to market places; mobile sound-movie trucks. Leo's psychological war paid off. Communists took every opportunity to undermine him in their propaganda. Leo wasn't worried. "The Commies gave us free publicity," he said. "They couldn't propagandize against good health, better crops or emergency relief and make it stick."

While the hot war continues in Indochina, much of our effort to strengthen the free world goes for relief. Herman Holiday, our relief chief, personified American friendship to thousands of innocent victims. The 37-year-old Negro from Indianapolis—carrying the ball from Saigon to Hanoi instead of on Tuskegee's gridiron—measured up to all-American standards. Six-foot, four-inch "Big Herman" towered high above the small-statured Indochinese, but the weary, sick, and homeless who saw him hard at work in their villages knew that his heart fitted his giant stature. Mortar fire didn't stop Herman from getting calico, rice, canned milk, and other relief goods to the needy. His fairness and concern for the underdog gave the people the will to live and to fight for freedom.

These and other efforts are the product of Government efforts, private efforts or a healthy combination of the two, but actually the point 4 program represents only a small, if important, aspect of the fight to build a free world. We know, our friends abroad know, that the United States is not rich enough, strong enough, or wise enough to underwrite the globe, and their pride would not permit it if we were.

In all this, of course, we are not purely altruistic. The program I hope we can promote on all these fronts helps us to replace our dwindling supplies of strategic materials—lead, zinc, copper, tin, manganese, uranium, and many others. Never before has the United States held a greater stake in world economy. And never before has the world held a greater stake in the American economy.

We have come a long way in recent years in learning that foreign policy is something more than a purely economic, political, or military matter. We know that it is basically a moral problem concerned with human dignity and self-respect. As a matter of intelligent self-interest, we admit frankly that we need the world's raw materials and that we do not want its vast resources and manpower turned against us, but, above all, we know that we need the cultural and spiritual friendship of its peoples because we are citizens of the same planet and want to keep it free.

Flexible Promises, Too

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL C. JONES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1954

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include the following editorial from the twice-a-week Dunklin Democrat, of Kennett, Mo., published by Jack Stapleton, Jr., who makes a pertinent observation relative to this administration's attitude toward the farmers of America:

FLEXIBLE PROMISES, TOO

The flexible farm price-support program of President Eisenhower and Agriculture Secretary Benson received a setback last week when the House Agriculture Committee approved a rigid price-support program for another year. The recommendation of the House committee was overwhelmingly in favor of the stable support program, with a 21 to 8 vote for fixed supports.

Immediately after the action of the House committee, which is designed to maintain farm income for at least another year, Benson indicated he would ask President Eisenhower to veto the bill if and when it gets to the White House.

What a strange situation this is. The Secretary of Agriculture wants to veto legislation designed to maintain the farmer's income. What makes it even stranger is that President Eisenhower may be inclined to follow Benson's recommendation.

And to top it all off is the fact that President Eisenhower campaigned on the promise of 100 percent of parity. Apparently the man from Abilene believes not only in flexible price supports but in flexible campaign promises as well.

Extension of 90 Percent Parity Price Support

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 16, 1954

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the Appendix of the RECORD, an editorial entitled "An Indefensible Compromise," which appeared in the Evening Star of Thursday, June 10, 1954. In this editorial the proposal to extend for 1 year the rigid 90 percent of parity price support on certain basic farm products is denounced as "an indefensible compromise."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN INDEFENSIBLE COMPROMISE

It is neither surprising nor commendable that the House Agriculture Committee has voted for a 1-year extension of the rigid 90 percent of parity price support on certaain basic farm products. Committee Chairman HOPE has said that a "compromise was inevitable" on President Eisenhower's recommendation for a flexible price support formula and it was known that maintaining the current high supports was the "compromise" favored by the farm bloc.

The high, rigid price-support program was adopted originally as a temporary wartime measure and parity has been calculated for the most part on a price relationship of 40 years ago. The program has resulted in the Government purchase of billions of dollars of farm commodities, products that were destined to be surplus even before they were planted or harvested. Millions of tons of these commodities—including cotton, wheat, corn, tobacco, rice, and peanuts—are in storage today, many of them deteriorating. The consumer-taxpayer has underwritten not only the original costs of purchasing and storage, but simultaneously is paying higher prices for the same foods because of the relatively short supply created by the Government purchasing program. The principal beneficiaries, as the President pointed out to Congress in his farm message last January, have been the 2 million large and highly mechanized farming units that produce about 85 percent of our agricultural output. Little or no benefit has gone to about 3.5 million small farmers.

The principle of flexible price supports and a modernized formula for calculating parity already have been written into law but their application has been postponed by just such a compromise as that now favored by the House committee.

The President, acting upon the basis of a year's study by farm leaders and qualified authorities, asked in his January message for termination of the rigid price-support program and its replacement at the end of this year by a flexible system related more closely to supply and demand. Various safeguards, including gradual application of a modernized parity formula and the insulation from commercial markets of present Government stocks, were proposed.

It has been clear from the beginning that a tough fight in Congress was facing the administration on this issue. At a recent news conference, however, the President said flatly that he was not prepared to compromise the principles of his program. The House committee compromise does violence to those principles. There is a political risk, of course, in offending the farm States by forcing an end to the high price supports but there is a broader national interest here in ending this costly and wasteful type of program. The President should be upheld in his position on this matter.

The Crisis in Guatemala

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 16, 1954

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, all friends of freedom in the Western Hemisphere are following with deepest interest the latest reports from Guatemala—storm center of Communist colonial intervention.

It is clear that the long-suffering people of that land and those leaders who are truly representative of them—have come to a decision. They have decided that the time is overdue to stand up in defense of liberty against the Communist minority clique which has, like an octopus, fastened its tentacles around every facet of national life and which has even reached out beyond Guatemala's borders to try to strangle sovereignty elsewhere.

At stake in the crisis, now apparently approaching a climax, is this issue among others: whether or not a people will march up the road to greater economic blessings, to higher standards of living, improved health and education, better housing within a democratic framework, and in unity with its neighbors; or whether a people will be taken in the wrong direction, cruelly deceived by Communist wolves, wearing sheep's clothing and bleating slogans of the very ideals—which the Communists themselves utterly despise.

The Guatemalan people have every right to achieve their national birthright.

No people in the world more desires this than the people of our own country.

But we know that there is no greater enemy of Guatemalan sovereignty, no greater enemy of her economic prosperity, of her political liberty, of her or any other country's judicial ways, of religious devotion, than the Communist colonial enemy.

More and more, the American press has alerted the people of our country to the deadly danger of communism in Guatemala. The press has raised the visibility and pierced the fog generated by Red lies.

Some of the press comments, I am glad to note, have been based, in turn, on some of the remarks which I personally have made on the Senate floor. It is my intention to continue to bring the facts of this situation to the attention of the American people.

I ask unanimous consent that several newspaper articles and editorials from the Dallas Morning News, the Scripps-Howard Press, and the Nashville Banner be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles and editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Dallas Morning News]

REDS IN GUATEMALA PUPPETS OF KREMLIN

(By Wayne Gard)

In the cold war Russia still is calling the plays. Just when the United States seemed about to take more vigorous action in Indochina, the Kremlin ordered a new crisis in Central America. That move diverted attention from southeast Asia to our own back yard, where Red penetration has been going on for years.

The recent big shipment of arms to Guatemala wasn't for defense. The neighbors of that small country, now a puppet of Russia, haven't been making any trouble. But trouble for them—and for us—is being brewed in the Kremlin. Air bases in Guatemala are only a short bomber hop from the Panama Canal—and from Dallas and the Texas oil fields.

Last year Russia came near taking over the government of a South American country, British Guiana. She was thwarted in that, but in Guatemala she has succeeded by a long process of quiet penetration. She has gained there a springboard for attacks on other parts of the Western Hemisphere.

Officials in Guatemala have tried to make out that the communism in that country is a home-grown variety. They have denied that they are under the thumb of Moscow. But the facts show that they merely are putting out propaganda typical of Communists everywhere. Guatemala officials take important actions only on orders from Moscow. The country is no longer a republic but a satellite of Russia.

In a speech in the Senate last January, long before the present crisis arose, Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, of Wisconsin, showed clearly the new status of Guatemala. He pointed out that Reds hold many key posts in the government of that country and that they are a part of a movement for world revolution, directed from the Kremlin. Meanwhile, they spur the spread of communism in Guatemala and nearby countries.

Senator WILEY showed that Communists occupy key spots in the government of Guatemala, including such fields as radio, press, farm administration, and social security. Both the chief of the press section of the President's publicity office and the director of radiobroadcasting are active Communists.

In the department which administers the agrarian reform law, the No. 2 official, who is chief of the lands division, is a Communist. The chief clerk of the department is the wife of the head of the Communist Party. More than 15 other officials in the department, including 4 farm inspectors, are admitted Communists.

Other Communists in the Government include the director of the social-security agency and the deputy inspector general of labor. The leaders of the party have made frequent visits to Moscow and, on their return, have carried out orders received there. The Guatemalan party has saluted Moscow as "a beacon for the workers of the world."

The Government of Guatemala provided a theater for the Communist Party for its first public rally. Government agencies support the Communist daily paper with advertising. Meanwhile, day after day, the Government newspaper and radio station have been spreading for years propaganda against the United States and in favor of Russia.

[From the Washington Daily News of May 31, 1954]

IT'S TIME TO FACE THE FACTS: GUATEMALAN GOVERNMENT IS INCONTROVERTIBLY RED

(By Edward Tomlinson)

There has been a dangerous tendency in this country to blame labor union bosses and other Moscow agents for all the communistic activities in Guatemala, and to absolve President Jacob Arbenz and his administration from any direct association with the movement. The Guatemalan Army is also generally credited with being free of any actual Red affiliations.

Yet, every bit of evidence points to the fact that the Guatemalan President and his Cabinet are willing servants of the Kremlin and that the military backs them to the hilt.

President Arbenz was and is the head of the army. Yet neither he, the Cabinet, nor the army has given the slightest indication that they disapprove of any of the communistic activities in their country.

They have, without exception openly aided and abetted every communistic move and demonstration. They have ruthlessly put down every open resistance to communism.

Nor can they be ignorant of whom and what they are supporting. They have openly and continuously played the game of such avowed Communists as Manuel Guttierez, Manuel Fortuny, and other labor leaders.

President Arbenz and his advisers have practiced every radical and extremist policy advocated and instigated by their Red labor leaders.

They have carried out the Reds' expropriation schemes, protected and encouraged them in demonstrations against United States interests, and have denounced this country every time it has asked about the arbitrary treatment of its nationals.

CONTROLLED PRESS

The Arbenz government has permitted the avowed Reds to use the Government-controlled radio and press to broadcast and openly spread the despicable and false Chinese charges that the United States engaged in germ warfare in Korea.

The Arbenz regime has permitted Red union heads, leaders of student groups, to travel back and forth behind the Iron Curtain. It has opened the country's doors to and received with open arms all the Russian sympathizers and known Reds from neighboring countries—Vicenti Lombardo Toledano, of Mexico; Pablo Neruda, of Chile; and numerous others. It plays host to Communist-sponsored international peace meetings and other conferences.

President Arbenz and his government denounce as subversive every anti-Communist comment and criticism and even the warning of the church against the Red menace.

The archbishop of Guatemala in his recent pastoral letter warning against Russian Communists was at pains not to criticize the President personally, or any official of the Government. But the Government press, radio, and Government political party leaders all denounced the primate's statement as a vicious attack on the Chief Executive and his administration.

NEWSMEN ATTACKED

Although American correspondents and editorial writers have usually stated that "President Arbenz is himself not a Communist," every Guatemalan official, including Arbenz himself, has denounced the "imperialistic and capitalistic Yankee press" for misrepresentation.

At the Caracas Conference the United States delegation in its advocacy of an anti-Communist resolution never mentioned Guatemala. Yet the Guatemalan Foreign Minister directed every one of his statements and tirades against what he called United States intervention.

Guatemalan officials and diplomats have been and are busy interfering and intervening in the affairs of practically all their neighbors.

For 3 years and more they have openly campaigned, by radio, newspapers, pamphlets, and secret agents against the British in British Honduras. Before Col. Jose Remon was elected President, the Guatemalan Ambassador in Panama openly connived with local extremists and known Reds as President-elect Remon, a militant anti-Communist, made it known he would not tolerate any foreign diplomat who consorted with these elements.

The Ambassador did not wait for Sr. Remon's inauguration, but left the Isthmian capital well in advance of the event.

NEIGHBORS COMPLAIN

The El Salvador and Nicaraguan Governments have frequently charged Guatemalan Reds with interfering with their internal affairs.

Nicaragua has finally broken diplomatic relations with the Arbenz government. There is convincing evidence in Washington that Guatemalans were involved in the recent plot, originating in Costa Rica to assassinate President Anastasio Somoza and his family.

The Honduran Government not only blames Guatemalan plotters, including three Guatemalan consuls, for the paralyzing strike which has stopped every activity in the United States-owned banana fields and other enterprises in the eastern part of the country.

American businessmen and American officials have known of and been in possession of indisputable proof of the truthfulness of these charges for more than a year.

ARMS IMPORTED

Now the Arbenz government has imported a large shipment of arms from an Iron Curtain country. Although Washington has evidence the Guatemalans deny these arms came from Russia or Poland. They do not deny these arms may have come from Czechoslovakia, which is the principal arms producer of the satellite states.

Just how much more evidence do we need to explode the myth, or disabuse ourselves of the idea that Jacobo Arbenz and company are innocent dupes of communistic plot instead of the tools of Moscow that they are?

[From the Nashville Banner of May 20, 1954]

GUATEMALA: POWDERKEG

The governments of Latin America are not one in the checkrein, proposed at Caracas last March, to curb Communist infiltration. Though the majority of the countries represented at that conference did back the Dulles proposal to exchange information on that point, there was one that did not. That was Guatemala.

It was Guatemala also which voted against the resolution which termed Red infiltration "a threat to the sovereignty and political independence of the American states (which) would call for consultation and appropriate action in accordance with existing treaties." The vote on that point was 17 to 1—Argentina and Mexico abstaining.

So it is no surprise that Guatemala declines to say yea or nay to the report from Washington that a cargo of arms has been sent from the Communist zone of Germany. Nevertheless, there is pertinency in this Nation's warning that it is a grave development.

The fact is that Guatemala is the staging area of Red penetration and insurrection. It did not become that yesterday or last month. It has been that ever since a pliable government within it yielded to Communist infiltrators working like termites from within—succeeding not only in their expropriation of American property, but in turning the policy of that government into a hymn of hate against the United States.

We have fought a war against communism in Korea. We are beginning to face the realities of an identical threat in Indochina. But within 1,000 miles of the United States—at its very back door; on the edge of the Panama Canal, and at the key point of Western Hemispheric security, America for years has tolerated a nemesis real and growing.

Mere talk won't stop that. Conferences won't stop it, unless back of the agreements they produce is a formula of action for mutual security. It is time to face these facts as facts—and act in the light of them. There is danger in Asia. There is danger just as immediate, far more direct and closer home, in what is going on in Guatemala.

If Guatemala is acquiring such armaments legally for its own defensive arsenal that is one thing—and obviously, as a sovereign power, within the law. If on the other hand it is a surreptitious deal, by which a Red wrecking crew is arming itself, that is something else.

The hostility of the Communist conspiracy nesting there—and tolerated there—demands watching. American authorities are on solid legal ground, and discharging the obligation of international agreement, in warning colleagues to the south that Moscow has turned loose Communist agitators to foment strife and chaos in Central America.

The warning is in order. The Caracas pact was designed to mobilize international safeguards by just such action in exchanging information. As a land within throwing distance of the Panama Canal, Guatemala is a point to watch.

[From the Nashville Banner of May 21, 1954]

A Security Job at Home

The United States and our Latin American colleagues jointly concerned in hemispheric security cannot dismiss as a triviality the buildup of hostility—Communist-born, and Soviet-fed conspiracy—centering in Guatemala. They cannot ignore the facts in the case, an ominous detail of which was the arms shipment from Poland for whatever trigger-happy purpose the addressee may entertain.

Washington is not ignoring the facts. The day of sleepwalking is over. It passed with the exodus of Trumanism and Achesonism; and the policy of vigilance replacing Pollyanna diplomacy is evident in America's warning enunciated by President Eisenhower, against allowing establishment of a Red outpost on this continent.

In picking Guatemala as a base of operations, the Communists chose geographically a key point. In Central America, a convenient staging area from which to foment strife north and south; adjacent to the Panama Canal. And the government of Guatemala obviously is not averse to playing the stooge in that game. It elaborately shunned participation in the Caracas agreement, which candidly declared the concern of 17 nations against Communist aggression.

It is time to face the primary security facts, and for the nations involved to stand up and be counted.

The safety and welfare of North, Central, and South America demand solidarity of mutual effort, to defend the hemisphere.

The policy for all too many years has been aid dispatched across two oceans with no corresponding concern for security at home, on these continents.

There is danger, and has been, in Europe. There is danger, and has been, in Asia. But the ultimate objectives of Communist conquest, stemming from Moscow, are the United States and its American neighbors.

Any security policy overlooking that fact is flimsy and shortsighted. It's like dispatching the fire department to Dan and Beersheba when the arsonist is loose in your own neighborhood.

Security at home is America's job; the Americas' job, to be done together.

By His Patience and Dignity a Southeast Missouri Jurist Brings Distinction to the Federal Courts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL C. JONES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1954

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted, I am including herewith a resolution recently adopted by Pemiscot County Post, No. 88, of the American Legion, commending Federal Judge Roy W. Harper, of St. Louis, for his impartiality, patience, and dignity in handling the trial of the five Communists in St. Louis which resulted in their conviction and sentencing to prison terms.

I join with Judge Harper's other friends in southeast Missouri, where he was reared and where he established an enviable record as an outstanding lawyer before his appointment to the United States district court, in this expression of esteem and in extending to him our congratulations for the splendid record which he has made and is making as a member of that judicial body.

I believe that the following resolution expresses the feeling not only of the American Legion members, but of the thousands of other friends of Judge Harper throughout this State and Nation:

Whereas Hon. Roy W. Harper, judge of the United States District Court in St. Louis, is a native of Pemiscot County, Mo., and is now and has been for a great many years a member of Pemiscot County Post, No. 88, the American Legion;

Whereas the membership of this post has followed the long trial of United States against certain Communists, and has marveled at the patience and dignity with which Judge Harper conducted the trial, and by reason thereof the membership of this post wishes to publicly commend Judge Harper therefore: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That Pemiscot County Post, No. 88, the American Legion, go on record and publicly commend Judge Harper for his patience, dignity, fairness, and impartial conduct throughout the trial of said Communists. The result of this trial fortifies our faith in the American way of life and the things for which we fought; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be mailed to the President of the United States, our United States Senators, our Representatives in Congress, the Department of Justice, and to Judge Harper.

J. R. Hutchison,
James T. Ahern,
James M. Reeves,
Committee.

Eisenhower Won't Succeed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 16, 1954

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an article entitled "Eisenhower Won't Succeed," written by Prof. Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., and published in the New Republic of April 5, 1954. I commend it to the attention of the American people.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Eisenhower Won't Succeed—the Logic of a Single-Interest Party Is a Weakening of the Presidency

(By Arthur Schlesinger, Jr.)

The battlefield of American politics is often dark and confused, with shouts and sighs and bloodcurdling screams echoing through the night, and occasional flares, rockets, and bombs bursting in air to provide brief and delusive impressions of light and action. These latter are the flaming distractions of our politics, like the firing of MacArthur in 1951 and the Cohn-Schine case today; and they often appear for a moment to be the pivots of our whole political equilibrium. But, in retrospect, they may come to seem almost irrelevant. Underneath the sound and fury, often concealed by the dazzle or drowned out by the blare, there remains a persistent deeper logic in American political life. In the long run, this continuity may be more important in political behavior than all the clamor of the moment.

Thus many interpretations have been offered of the essential significance of the change which took place in our national government a year ago. That change has been defined in many ways—from Democratic to Republican, from liberal to conservative, from left to right, from vice to virtue, from soft-on-communism to McCarthyism, from government-by-crony to government-by-postponement, and so on, but perhaps in the end its enduring significance—and the central explanation of the vicissitudes of the new administration—may be seen to lie in the consequences of a change from government by a multi-interest to government by a single-interest party.

Such a contention as this will be read, no doubt, as a partisan statement; and it is certainly impossible for the writer to deny political allegiances. Yet the basic thesis here suggested is not a partisan thesis. The role of interests in a free society has long been recognized by politicians and political scientists of all parties. James Madison, writing of the relatively primitive America of 1787, pointed out in the Federalist Papers that the competition among these interest groups provided most of the material and motives of democratic politics. "A landed interest, a manufacturing interest, a mercantile interest, a moneyed interest, with many lesser interests, grow up of necessity in civilized nations," Madison observed, "and divide them into different classes, actuated by different sentiments and views. The regulations of these various and interfering interests forms the principal task of modern legislation, and involves the spirit of party and faction in the necessary and ordinary operations of the Government."

If free society consists of a diversity of interests, one of these interests is likely to be more powerful than the others; and, if this interest is considerably more powerful, and if its power is sustained over a long period, it is likely to goad the lesser interests into an alliance against it. Under a two-party political system, one party thus tends to fall under the sway of the major interest, and the other party to become the instrument of the coalition of minority interests. The question then becomes whether the principal tasks of modern legislation—the regulation of these various and interfering interests—is likely to be best conducted by the single-interest party or by the multi-interest party; whether, in other words, the most powerful special interest of the Nation or the popular coalition against it is more likely to serve the national interest and the general welfare.

Obviously no interest in a free society is monolithic. All of Madison's interest groups had their internal disagreements over minor issues and even their dissenters on major issues; and the schimatics from the ranks of the most powerful interest—which in recent American history has meant the nonconformist members of the business community—are always likely to be considerable in number and influence. Yet the existence of such interior dissent and even heresy does not render meaningless Madison's concept of interest. Businessmen may wrangle among themselves over tariffs, trade unionists over union jurisdiction, farmers over the techniques of price supports; but each group tends to close ranks when confronted by an external challenge. No interest group can deliver all its members, thank heaven; yet each can deliver enough to establish its own identity as an interest group. Thus, when Secretary of the Interior McKay recently remarked, "We're here in the saddle as an administration representing business and industry," he was making a meaningful observation; and equally meaningful, of course, would be the implied contrast—that the Roosevelt and Truman administrations represented other groups than business and industry.

We have, indeed, been accustomed in this country for nearly a generation to multi-interest government, government by a coalition composed of members of the several minority interest groups (minority, that is, in terms of effective power). Since the days of Jefferson and Madison, the Democratic Party has traditionally been the receptacle for these miscellaneous lesser interests of the Nation. Sometimes, such interests have had very little else in common except their opposition to rule by the first interest. Jefferson's celebrated botanizing expedition up the Hudson in 1791 may not, latter-day scholarship now suggests, have sealed any alliances with Tammany Hall; but the partnership between the northern city boss and the southern planter was born in the first decade of the Republic, and in the years since ever more jarring sects have crowded under the Democratic tent. What was an implicit conception of the party with Jefferson became more explicit with Jackson. In later years Bryan and Wilson revitalized the theory of the Democratic Party as an alliance of the lesser groups against rule by the major group; and under Franklin D. Roosevelt, of course, this pluralistic conception reached its most complete and effective fulfillment.

What is the essence of a multi-interest administration? It is surely that the leading interests in society are all represented in the interior processes of policy formation, which can be done only if members or advocates of these interests are included in key positions of government. Thus the Roosevelt and Truman administrations functioned, in this sense, as working expressions of American pluralism. The farmers, the laboring men, the intellectuals and the nonconformists businessmen were all represented in the Government; and the politicians played their proper roles as the harmonizers of divergent interests. It is sometimes forgotten that Roosevelt appointed three Republicans to his Cabinet in 1933; and at no time in the thirties and forties was the business community without powerful representatives within the Democratic administrations. The presence of the Jesse Joneses, T. Jefferson Coolidges, John W. Haneses, Forrestals, Knudsens, Claytons and the rest was often a source of anguish to diehard New Dealers. But they were there nonetheless. Roosevelt had an instinctive recognition that, however much he might detest the official leadership of the business community, he needed the cooperation and support of businessmen of good will.

A multi-interest party has several obvious advantages from the viewpoint of providing wise leadership. The first is that, since policy emerges from a wide consultation among various groups, it has a much better chance of corresponding to the needs of a diversified society and a sprawling nation. If Government programs have to run the gauntlet of a variety of interests, the resulting process of criticism and modification increases the chance of producing policies which will genuinely serve the national interest. Of course, a single interest may be gifted with infallibility and thus not require the correction and chastening of other viewpoints; but this situation has not often arisen in the American democracy, where, as Jefferson has reminded us, we have not found angels to govern us.

The second advantage of the multi-interest party springs from the premium the coalition situation places on effective leadership. The driver with a team of fractious and competing horses must learn to impose his will if he is to stay on the road. Similarly a party leader who first must master his own coalition is more likely to develop the instincts and aptitudes which would enable him to lead the country. The potential viciousness of the multi-interest system lies in the possibility that a political leader might cater only to the interest groups and let the national welfare vanish in a scramble for special benefits. This is a real problem, and not to be underestimated. But the experience of controlling these tendencies only further develops capacities for national leadership. Nothing produces a more lively sense of the public interest than an awareness of the conflicts among special interests. The experience of directing a multi-interest party, in short, is unparalleled training for the experience of governing a multi-interest nation.

The third advantage of the multi-interest party springs from the premium the coalition situation places on ideas—that is, on thought and on thinking. This is only partly because the intellectuals, as a permanent minority group, will always be members of the multi-interest coalition. It is also because of the inherent need of the multi-interest party for policies, programs, formulas which will bind divergent groups together and reconcile their conflicting interests. The multi-interest party, in short, has both an urgent need for ideas and the people on hand who can work them out; and the result will be a much higher degree of intellectual activity and creativity.

The fourth advantage of the multi-interest party is that it has a better chance of winning consent for its policies. This is partly because its policies, developed from a concurrence of groups, are more likely to meet the needs of all; and partly because the multi-interest process of policy formation has a built-in tendency to secure assent since no group in the country is likely to have the feeling of total exclusion.

For better or worse, popular consent, intellectual vitality, and strong Presidential leadership have been characteristics of the multi-interest administrations of the past 20 years. As to whether the policies produced by pluralistic methods in these years have served the national interest, this is no doubt a controversial question; but it is of interest to note how few of them the present administration seems thus far inclined to repeal.

As the Democratic Party has been through most of our history the party of the lesser interests, so the Republican Party and its predecessors, the Federalists and the Whigs, have been most of the time the party of the major interest. By origin, it is true, the Republicans were a true coalition party, representing a broad variety of interests; but the natural momentum of the major interest toward dominating its own party—its reluctance, in other words, to share its power on equal terms with lesser interests—has been so strong that, in time, the lesser interest groups in the Republican Party have been sloughed off. Theodore Roosevelt, elevated to the Presidency by accident, made the last stern effort to keep the Republican Party on a multi-interest basis. His expulsion from the party in 1912 signaled the exhaustion of Republican pluralism.

In recent years, the Republican Party has been essentially the party of the business community; the Democratic Party, the party of labor, the intellectuals, the nonconformist businessmen. Of course, the role of interest in our politics has always been modified by the power of tradition, which has created party loyalties that often override considerations of interest. The tug of war that sometimes arises between interest and tradition is well illustrated in the role in recent years of the farmers, who have been the swing group in our politics. When the farmers have voted Republican, as in the twenties, the Republicans have won. When the farmers have voted Democratic, as in the thirties and forties, the Democrats have won. But through their period of Democratic voting, most farmers remained loyal to their Republican traditions and could hardly wait for an opportunity when they could vote Republican again without imperiling their economic position. When this opportunity seemed to occur in 1952, the farmers went back to the Republican Party, and were an important factor in the Republican victory. Whether their traditional Republicanism can survive Mr. Benson is one of the uncertainties of the future.

This uncertainty points up the great question which confronted the Republicans on their return to power: were they to function as a multi-interest or a single-interest administration? Many Republicans, particularly those who had the experience of governing in large industrial States, like New York or California, became convinced that Republican hopes must lie in the conversion of the party from a single-interest to a multi-interest basis. But was this possible? Could the Dewey-Warren-Lodge theory of pluralism prevail against the momentum possessed by the single major interest—the momentum which has always made it hard for the major interest to diminish its own prerogatives and settle for a mere partnership in a coalition of equals? There was one condition under which the Dewey-Warren-Lodge formula might have had a chance of success within the party; that is, if the President himself were to resist the opposing tendency by dramatizing issues and developing his personal power in the manner of Theodore Roosevelt. But President Eisenhower has not yet shown either the inclination or the aptitude for bold executive leadership.

There can be no question of the sincerity of the President's repeated assertions that he conceives himself as President of all the people; that is not the issue. The issue is whether, in hard fact, a sufficiently wide variety of the diverse interests of this teeming land are actually included in the processes of policy formation. To this question Secretary McKay returned a forthright answer when he said that business and industry were in the saddle; as did W. Randolph Burgess, formerly of the National City Bank, now of the Treasury, when he observed, "Our kind of people are now in power"; as did the Republican New York Herald Tribune when it asserted that this administration represented business sense as it has been represented in no previous national administration.

President Eisenhower began by appointing a Cabinet which inordinately overrepresented a single interest in the community. According to the calculations of David Lawrence's U. S. News & World Report, half of Eisenhower's Cabinet appointments were millionaires, a batting average of .500 as against .280 for Roosevelt (7 millionaires out of 25), and .187 for Truman (6 out of 32). Nearly all the members of the Cabinet were businessmen—a fact which seemed to shock very few Americans. If a Democratic President were to have appointed 9 farmers or 9 labor leaders or—God help us—9 college professors to his Cabinet, the Nation (or at least its press) would have erupted with horror. It is hard to see that the essential issue is much different in the case of a business monopoly of the Cabinet; and the meager comment aroused by the pattern of Eisenhower's choices shows how, despite 20 years of New and Fair Deals, the business community remains far and away the most powerful interest in the Nation.

In the first year the fact of business control in the administration has become steadily more complete. The trade unionist who marred the original symmetry of the Cabinet has resigned, to be replaced by a corporation executive. The Secretary of Agriculture was not a farmer in any case, but a "marketing specialist" (to quote his own description of himself in Who's Who); the curious episode at Augusta, Wis., last September when he addressed a farm audience from behind a barbed-wire fence and a cordon of uniformed State police suggests the extent to which he had lost the confidence of his agricultural constituents. So whatever rudimentary pluralism existed last January has been largely extinguished in the year since. And, for all the genial tolerance of President Eisenhower's speeches, Franklin Roosevelt at the most fanatical pitch of the New Deal had appointed many more Republicans and businessmen to high office than Eisenhower today has appointed non-Republicans and nonbusinessmen.

Nor has this business supremacy been much diluted by the use of politicians, who normally serve in our system as the brokers between private interests and public policy. President Eisenhower's neglect of the pros even shock Senator Robert Taft, who, while a conservative, had also a proud sense of the function of the politician in a democratic society. "I'm not at all sure," Taft remarked last spring, "that all these businessmen are going to work out. I don't know of any reason why success in business should mean success in public service." And the unprecedented scope of business rule has deeply concerned many thoughtful businessmen leading Paul Hoffman, a nonconformist businessman, to warn the business community that its power in the Eisenhower administration confronted it with it greatest challenge in history.

What are the consequences of single-interest government. The first consequence is surely a tendency to mistake a class interest for the national interest. No matter how much they may differ among themselves over minor issues, men of a single interest—whether business, labor agriculture—have a set of common assumptions and beliefs. These assumptions and beliefs, though they may constitute an important part of American life, do not constitute its whole; and any policy based on the theory, for example, that business faith and experience do adequately represent the multifarious interests of American life is doomed to disaster. This is not the fault of businessmen. Probably no other single interest could do any better. It is the inevitable consequence when decisions are reached by men with a common background, common values and common objectives; no matter how highminded and disinterested they may be personally, they can hardly escape identifying the welfare of their own group with the welfare of the Nation—unless, that is, there are other people sitting around that table with equal authority and confidence who can speak up and say, "Hold on; wait a minute; let's consider what this will do to the farmers, or to the workers, or to the minority groups, or to civil liberties." The logic of single-interest government, in short, was stated with peculiar felicity and force by the Secretary of Defense when he said last winter that what was good for General Motors was good for the country.

The second consequence of single-interest government is to create tendencies toward weak executive leadership. If the job of party leader is not to harmonize conflicting interests but to register a generally agreed-on view, then there is plainly less need for him to develop the resources of the presidential power. That is probably one reason why, except for Lincoln and Theodore Roosevelt, all Republican Presidents have been what is technically known among political scientists as "weak" Presidents.

The third consequence of single-interest government is to create tendencies toward intellectual conformity and stagnation. This is partly because of the natural hostility between the major interest and the intellectuals (a hostility now deeply inbred in the case of the business community) and partly because the homogeneity of interests reduces the need for new formulations and new ideas.

The fourth consequence of single-interest government is to complicate the problem of winning assent. The farmers, workers, independent businessmen, eggheads, minority groups, etc., who feel that, in Mr. Burgess' phrase, their kind of people are not in power, are likely to regard with suspicion the proposals of a government that represents only Mr. Burgess' kind.

The Republican press has admitted fairly freely in recent months that most of these tendencies—weak executive leadership, intellectual apathy, popular dissatisfaction—are all too visible in this current experiment in single-interest government. And the incapacity of the new administration to develop national policies was strikingly illustrated when Attorney General Brownell, considered to be the political genius of the liberal wing of the party, dedicated himself to the enterprise accurately described by Adlai Stevenson as trying to take McCarthyism away from McCarthy. The Attorney General's suggestion that the former President of the United States had knowingly appointed a Communist spy to high office was surely made, so to speak, in lieu of a more formal filing of a petition in intellectual bankruptcy.

Can the Republicans reverse their movement toward single-interest government? Is it too late for them to make their administration truly representative of the various interests in our pluralistic society? To do this, it must first be said, would require a major exertion of presidential leadership, for the business community would have to be persuaded to relinquish part of its new power to lesser groups in society—especially to labor and the farmers. Such self-abnegation seems an unlikely eventuality. And it would appear, in consequence, that the general welfare and the national interest will continue to be served better in the future, as in the past, by a frankly multi-interest party.

But this argument contains warnings to the Democrats too. This is why I would insist that its basic thrust is neither anti-Republican nor antibusiness community. The Democrats must remember first that their party is not the property of a single section or a single interest; and, second, that being a receptacle is necessary, but it is not enough. The trick of political greatness is not to serve as a mechanism for whetting and gratifying group appetites. The problem is to develop an ardent sense of the national interest which includes and transcends the special interests within a framework of positive standards of decency and justice. This cannot be done by weak indulgence of class demand or sectional prejudice. It can only be done by hard work and by hard thought, by tolerance, by imagination, by a sense of responsibility and by a belief in the exercise of leadership.

The urgent necessity today—as always in our history—remains that of remembering the limitations and possibilities of man. If our Government and our society are to work, they must rest, not on the presumed superior wisdom and infallibility of a single interest, but on the diverse and reciprocally conditioned judgments of a plurality of interests; for this alone can faithfully represent the brilliant and wonderful variety that is America.

Commencement Address by Hon. Harold E. Talbott, Secretary of the Air Force

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1954

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks I include the address given by the Honorable Harold E. Talbott, Secretary of the Air Force, at the graduating exercises of the class of 1954 of the Industrial College of the Armed Forces, held in the Department of the Interior Auditorium, June 16, 1954:

I want to thank you for giving me the privilege of addressing you and your guests today. I consider it a distinct honor both to the Air Force and to me personally to be here today.

I have been Secretary of the Air Force now for about a year and a half. The duties of this position are difficult and challenging. During my 40 years in business and industry I can't remember a job at which I have worked harder to learn and to understand the multitude of problems that face me constantly.

However, one point which seems appropriate to the present atmosphere in Washington has stood out during these months. Never in the associations of my civilian experience has it been my privilege to serve with a finer nor a more dedicated group of men than the civilian and military leaders of the Defense Department and the Army, Navy, and Air Force. All these men are determined to defend and maintain our country and our way of life. In no instance have I had the occasion to doubt the intentions nor the integrity of any man with whom I have dealt. Indeed, I have no fear for the future of our country so long as it rests in the hands of men of the caliber of those who are our present leaders.

You men have spent this last year studying the world situation and the factors that threaten our country's security. I am sure there is no need for my telling you about the fantastic growth of communism. You are all aware of the insidious character of this political phenomenon. Communism is a real threat to our security and to our democratic way of life. It has no timetable. It thrives on weakness. Moreover, the aims of militant communism to destroy our way of life can be gained just as well by causing the economic collapse of our country as by defeating us in war.

It is accepted that the United States must remain as the rallying point in the struggle of the free world against communism. To do this we must remain strong. We must establish our long term position by exploiting every possible technological advantage. Only thus can we hope to retain our economic strength and vitality.

Two great inventions of our time—the airplane and the atom bomb, which combined, give us airpower of fantastic proportions—have revolutionized warfare. Airpower gives to any nation with the resources to develop it properly, the capability of decisive action against the war-making potential of any other nation on the globe. Unfortunately, airpower is not the exclusive possession of the free world. Communist Russia has the atomic bombs and airplanes which give her the capability of striking at our country or at any other country of the Western World.

Mankind has indeed achieved a capability of destroying himself and his civilization. No country will start a war which it doesn't expect to win. The invasion of Belgium in 1914, the beginning of World War II in 1939, and the launching of the attack in Korea were all initiated because the Kaiser, Hitler, and the Communists did not think the nations of the free world would intervene. We cannot afford to have the Communists or any other dictator make a mistake on our intentions in the future. An atomic world war would send civilization back to the Dark Ages. I am convinced that as long as the Communists know that we are strong—so strong that we have the retaliatory capability of decisive action against them—they will refrain from attacking us. Our problem lies in maintaining and insuring the economic and military strength of our great country.

As I see it, it is the job of the military to remain strong and to maintain a powerful force which will deter the Communist world from aggression. Airpower is the keystone of this deterrent force. Our strength will provide a shield behind which our statesmen can work to eliminate the tensions which can cause war between the free world and the Communist world. I feel certain that we can erase these tensions. I do not believe that war is inevitable.

Our military budget comprises a high portion of our annual appropriations and expenditures. The military budget is fixed by the forces that we must maintain. The forces in turn are determined by the basic strategy that is determined by our leaders.

I know that there has been a lot of debate as to whether military strategy determines force levels, or whether force levels determine strategy. By force level, of course, I mean the ground divisions of the Army, the combat vessels of the Navy, and the combat wings of the Air Force. For my money, strategy can only be determined in light of the capability of the enemy. Our force requirements must be designed to meet the enemy threat, and so maintained that we will be able to take immediate decisive action against him to insure our victory should war occur.

You men have been trained to be commanders and planners at the highest level in our Defense Department. Your thinking will have great influence on our future strategy, and in turn, a real impact on fixing the size and type of the forces that we will maintain. A great premium for our future lies in retaining a vitality, a flexibility, and a determination in our thinking to discard outmoded arms, methods, and practices. Only thus will we be able to assure that our forces in being are strong enough to meet the threat of an enemy. To put it bluntly, we must be prepared and on the alert to eliminate every portion of our forces whose usefulness has been outlived and outmoded. There is a responsibility and a challenge to each of you to insure that in your planning and actions you have guts enough to fight for the things you know are right. Our future demands honesty and objectivity.

Competitive business and industry face this problem constantly. Here, however, we have a profit motive. Either a company meets the challenge of its competitors or it goes broke. In the military in peacetime there is no such measure. In a war, defeat to our Nation would be comparable to going broke in business. The consequence of defeat would be the loss of our democratic way of life. We must not pass down a defeat to our children and our grandchildren.

I would now like to discuss a subject you men have concentrated on during your course in the industrial college—the management of our resources. These problems of management are common to the three services—so I will concentrate on those I know best—those of the Air Force.

Since the close of the Korean conflict, the Air Force has been able to sit back and evaluate its materiel and production programs. As a result of these reviews, materiel programs have been revised with considerable savings and with improvements in the efficiency of operations. In our production programs we have been able to cut back a number of contracts. We have eliminated some high-cost producers and most importantly we have been able to put practically all of our major contractors on an efficient single shift, 8-hour operation. The 8-hour shift gives us a true mobilization base because any factory geared for a single-shift operation has an immediate capability for accelerated expansion to 250 percent of its normal capacity.

These changes have enabled the Air Force to effect appreciable savings to the American taxpayer while still giving airplanes, supplies, and equipment necessary to build and maintain the Air Force. I would say that the Air Force is doing a good job managing its materiel resources.

Our great management problem in the Air Force lies in people. I know that the personnel problem is common to all of the services. However, I am particularly concerned about the problem facing the Air Force. Our reenlistment rate has dropped from 66 percent since 1950 to a present 33 percent. There are indications that this rate will go lower. Unless we can retain more of our trained, experienced airmen I doubt that the Air Force can maintain its required peak of operational readiness. A drop in the efficiency of our striking force would surely jeopardize the peace of the world. I have had a survey made to find just what the problems are that are causing so many of our fine, well-trained officers and airmen to leave the service. I have the results of this survey.

The report shows that the officers and airmen understand the importance of maintaining adequate military forces during these unsettled times. It also shows that the men of the Air Force are loyal and devoted to their country and to their service. They are proud to serve and to be a part of it. Questions revealed that few men would choose to leave the service if they could just make ends meet. They ask only to be able to live and provide their families a normal American life.

The report shows that many of our men chose the Air Force as a career some years ago. They recognized that they would never get rich in the service. They figure, however, that their service pay, plus the additional rights and privileges along with retirement benefits, would make their future relatively secure. The report concludes that there are two causes of our airmen and officers getting out of the service. The first cause is that service pay has not kept pace with rising costs of living and that the traditional rights and privileges considered as augmentations to pay have been slowly whittled down or eliminated. Buying privileges in commissaries and post exchanges now save little money. Restrictions have been placed on the type and quality of merchandise on sale. Medical care of dependents is limited and difficult to get. Retirement benefits and incentive pay have been subject to annual question by special commissions and congressional groups. Housing to include barracks for airmen and officers and family quarters have been poor and scarce.

The second principal cause which constitutes more than 50 percent of the problems which are causing our people to get out of the service are problems internal to service administration and management. The problems themselves are too many to enumerate here; but they cover the operation of our clubs, post exchanges and commissaries, the lack of delegation of authority, the attitudes of some commanders, the frequent moves of our people, and even the frequency of payday.

Our people in this report asked for simple things. They asked that PX's and commissaries be kept open during a portion of off-duty hours and not closed for inventory on paydays. They asked if they could not be paid twice a month. They asked to be given proper warning for a change-of-station move so that they could make provision for their families. They asked for protection from gouging and other problems associated with attempts of local landlords to exploit them.

The cure to our first cause of unrest—the improvement of pay and the restoration of traditional rights and privileges—is something that must be taken up by our Congress. Congress is well aware of our problem. I think that they have stopped any further encroachments. However, I have found that legislation many times moves slowly, and the restoration of our old rights, which are in reality broken promises, will require a matter of years.

The second cause—the problem having to do with our own internal administration—is your problem and my problem. I want to appeal to you to consider your personnel and their management as the most valuable resource we have in our inventory. It is distressing to see personnel policies rigidly applied, or as it has been aptly stated, policies being used as an excuse for not thinking. I am sure that all of you will agree with me that loyalty must extend downward as well as upward. If we will only treat our men and women as human beings rather than so many numbers, we will then be able to do much to correct our own problems and to retain more and more our experienced personnel as career servicemen.

A correction of these personnel problems will, I am sure, cause a big upswing in our reenlistment rates. The doubling of our present rates with the resulting retention of our highly trained and skilled airmen, not to mention our officers, will be worth billions of dollars to our country. In addition, we will have an improvement in our operational efficiency, which because of its impact on maintaining the peace in the world has a value impossible to assess in dollars.

In conclusion, I want to wish you every success for your future. You have had the best training during this last year that your Government can provide. If you will apply this training intelligently and objectively to the primary concern of the needs of our country, you will have fulfilled your duties. You will thereby do much to insure the future security of our country.

Thank you.

The United States and a Divided China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 11, 1954

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article from the Department of State Bulletin, June 7, 1954, by Mr. Alfred leSesne Jenkins, Officer in Charge of Political Affairs, Office of Chinese Affairs. His article is based on an address made before the Scarlet Key Honor Society of Boston, University, Boston, Mass., on May 5, 1954:

THE UNITED STATES AND A DIVIDED CHINA

Until the Chinese mainland came under Communist domination in 1949, the United States had enjoyed more than a century and a half of friendship with the Chinese people, during which our contacts with China—commercial, cultural, religious, and political—were extensive. Our record in standing for the political independence and territorial integrity of China is a well-known one, and the Second World War found our two peoples comrades-in-arms against the imperialistic power of that period which sought to destroy us. The subsequent subjugation of the Chinese mainland to the alien domination of yet another imperialism is not only a cause of deep regret to us because it has severed our traditionally close relations with the vast majority of the Chinese people; it is also a cause of the greatest concern to us, in that a hostile and aggressive China, in collusion, with the Soviet Union and its European satellites, vastly enhances the threat of Communist imperialism to our own peace and security and to that of the entire free world.

The oft-confessed objective of Communist imperialism is nothing less than world domination. The Soviet leaders must be well aware that this can never be accomplished with any semblance of legitimacy. Not one national group of the 800 million souls now under Communist rule has ever voted itself into communism. The free world has shown a perverse disinclination to be liberated from its free institutions and way of life. Communist successes for the past 37 years have been the result of following Lenin's exhortation to resort to every form of "ruses, dodges, tricks, cunning, unlawful methods, concealments, and veilings of the truth." Communist tactics have included, in various combinations, infiltration, subversion, and sabotage, united fronts with other parties while control of army and police is secured, partition of countries which cannot at the time be won in toto, and, when the time seems ripe, coups d'etat or civil war. Communist conquest has by no means, therefore, been confined to bald military aggression, although this more conventional method of imperialistic aggrandizement has not been spurned when the odds appeared to be overwhelmingly in the Communists' favor.

This pattern of Communist conquest has become sickeningly familiar since World War II. Its methodology, insidious, resilient, and multiform as it is, is not easy to combat, but it can be done. The rapid growth of Communist parties in Western Europe immediately after the war has at least been stopped in its tracks. Western Europe, alarmed and awakened chiefly by the fate of Poland and Czechoslovakia, demonstrated its determination to regain its strength promptly and to remain vigilant. Communist imperialism, thwarted in the West by European acceptance of the Marshall plan, the creation of NATO, and the prospect of a European Defense Community, and in the south by the failure of its designs against Greece, Turkey, and Iran, turned its attention to the East, where the first of the three great Asian prizes had all but dropped into its lap.

WHAT THE COMMUNISTS WANT IN ASIA

Both the world Communist conspiracy and Soviet imperialism, to the degree that the two may be distinguished, want of Asia three things. First, communism needs the manpower of China, which constitutes one-fourth of the world's total population. This it now has, except for the free Chinese on Formosa. Second, it needs the industrial capacity of Japan. This was the ultimate goal in its ill-fated Korean adventure. Third, it needs the surplus food and rich mineral resources of southeast Asia. Presently threatened Indochina is the gateway to this wealth and contains a good portion of it. This characterization of the three great Asian prizes eyed by Communist imperialism is something of an oversimplification, of course. China, for instance, brings to the Communist fold a good deal more than just manpower, valuable as that is and freely as it was squandered in Korea. The important thing to remember is that the Communist rulers have every intention of using their first great Asian prize as the primary means of attaining the second and third. And the Chinese Communists, for their part, appear to be close and willing accomplices in this plot, expecting to gain much for themselves as junior partners in the Sino-Soviet alliance. It is also important to remember that the Chinese Communists are thoroughly schooled in the same tradition as their Soviet mentors. The Chinese have proved to be apt pupils and have even added a few twists of their own to the Soviet legacy, both in their internal and external conduct. Communist China's imperialistic adventures in both Korea and in Indochina, although not the same in form, have both followed orthodox Communist patterns.

The best hope of communism is in a situation where it can deal separately and individually with its intended victims. Its spread was halted in Europe only when this became impossible. The Communist attempt to swallow the whole of Korea failed because of united action of a kind unique in history, but Korea remains divided. The Communists so far have been able to concentrate their attention in turn upon Indochina without the deterrent of that collective security which must yet be devised for free Asia if it is not to be enslaved in the Communist fashion, piecemeal.

Issues of incalculable import are in the balance in Asia at this time. I have dwelt initially upon aspects somewhat broader than our immediate subject in order to set the perspective for the role Communist China has been allotted to play, and indeed is playing, in the world Communist program of conquest. It has been given primary responsibility for the communization of the rest of Asia but has recognized the leadership of the Soviet Union for the whole of the Communist camp.

Since April 26 our representatives have been in Geneva to discuss the two most serious sources of tension in the Far East, the danger spots of Korea and Indochina. In both instances it is primarily Communist China, with the full support of the Soviet Union, which has thus endangered the peace of the world. We are participating in the conference at Geneva with the sincere purpose of seeking a settlement of these two great Asian problems. We still hope that at least some progress toward reducing tensions in the Far East may be possible. We are, however, keenly aware of the Communists' record of bad faith. We are especially mindful of the Chinese Communists' wonted use of the conference table as a means of waging war by carefully timed cease-fire, a tactic used by them to great advantage in the Chinese civil war. During the cease-fire in Korea, by means of a deliberate and systematic circumvention of the armistice agreement, the Communists have engaged in a significant military buildup in North Korea. It would be fatuous to agree at Geneva to a cease-fire in Indochina without adequate safeguards against this all-too-familiar Communist tactic.

Whatever the Communist intent with respect to Korean and Indochinese settlements, they have stridently demanded that the convicted aggressor whose acts have chiefly made the conference necessary be accorded international acceptance and so-called big-power status in this conference. We and our allies refused to yield to these demands and to convene a so-called five-power conference to deal with world problems, for which the Communists were so anxious. Communist China is necessarily at the conference, since it is deeply involved in both questions to be considered. Communist China obviously wants to achieve, partly by means of this conference itself, general diplomatic recognition by the family of nations, a seat in the United Nations, and a relaxation of trade restrictions.

NATURE OF CHINESE COMMUNIST REGIME

What is the nature of this regime which unashamedly demands international acceptance at a conference called to deal urgently with problems chiefly of that regime's own creation? It came to power by force of arms and with full moral, and limited material, support of an alien power which even at that time was bound by a treaty of friendship and alliance with the Chinese Government under President Chiang Kai-shek. It came to power by the familiar united front tactics, discarded as soon as police state controls made it possible. We do not believe that it represents the will of the people it governs. It has acted on no recognizable standards of international conduct. It has repeatedly expressed contempt for the purposes and principles of the United Nations and still stands convicted by that body as an aggressor in Korea. Its aggressive record in Korea, Indochina, and Tibet, and its relentless program of infiltration and subversion in other Asian countries make it a serious threat to all the free peoples of Asia.

By stepping up the fighting in Indochina in an obvious attempt to influence the outcome of the Geneva Conference the Communists have shown the same callous disregard for the extravagant expenditure of Viet Minh lives as they showed for Chinese lives in Korea. The Chinese Communist regime disregarded the most elemental rules of prisoner-of-war treatment in Korea, committing unspeakable atrocities against United Nations troops. It has carried on a methodical "hate America" campaign among its own people and has subjected American and other foreign nationals to all manner of indignity, has confiscated foreign property without compensation, and has often made it impossible for foreign business establishments either to carry on or to close down. It still holds 32 American civilians in prison, incommunicado, under intolerable physical conditions, without trial and without even a statement of charges. It has developed "brain washing" to a fine science to secure useful, if false, confessions from prisoners and has even directed it against its own nationals to secure in recalcitrant cases the complete obedience and conformity which must characterize the "new Socialist man." The regime has liquidated millions of its own citizens, by means ranging from outright murder to induced suicide, in its attacks on private businessmen and in the spurious land reform program which brought it early support from the unsuspecting peasants but which is now, as control of the land is taken over by the state, bringing it the mute and important hostility of the dispossessed farmers. There is not only no freedom of speech, press, or assembly; there is not even freedom of silence, since all must be vocal in their support of Communist policies.

The regime has set about painstakingly to change the whole fabric of traditional Chinese society. Through endless study groups it has attempted to reach every citizen, in the attempt to make his thoughts and acts conform to the supposed needs of the party. These study groups involve lectures by Communist cadres, the reading of prescribed texts, and "discussion." The lectures invariably contain the "right" answers to the problem at hand, but hours and often even weeks are then spent in endless discussions which are preordained to end up right where they started: with the "right" answers. No segment of the population is excluded from the Communist program of remolding the individual. The soldier is given special attention, in this as in other matters. I have talked in Chinese with country boys in the Chinese Communist Army who could scarcely phrase a compound sentence on most subjects but who could hold forth by the hour with astounding facility on the subjects of dialectical materialism and the history of western imperialism, Communist version.

Even the so-called educational institutions do not escape the heavy imprint of the political requirements regarded as the current specific for the ailments of the Communist state. Academic research, like religion, the economy, and the patterns of social behavior, is made the handmaiden of the Communist brand of politics. The family unit is a special target of the Communists. Children are trained to spy and report on their parents, and they not infrequently have denounced their parents in instances where they knew it meant the death of their parents. Finally, the regime, in order to gain sorely needed foreign exchange, has stooped to trade in narcotics and to blackmail of overseas Chinese whose relatives on the mainland are at its mercy.

In short, the Mao Tse-tung regime, whose cause is pled at Geneva by Chou En-lai, internally is a police state of the worst order and externally is a convicted aggressor, a continuing threat to its nighbors, and apparently an enemy of all nations who do not choose to identify themselves completly with the camp of peace-loving nations under the leadership of the Soviet Union. It is the Communists who insist that there is no third, middle, or neutral road. All who are not for them are considered to be against them. At least there can be no doubt as to where Communist China stands, and there should be no room left for wishful thinking on the subject. Mao Tse-tung, upon the inception of his regime on October 1, 1949, proclaimed his so-called lean-to-one-side policy, that is, toward the Soviet side. This bids fair to be the understatement of our time. Mao was less reserved when, upon the death of Stalin, he sent a telegram to Moscow declaring that Red China would stand by the Soviet Union definitely, forever and with maximum resoluteness. This smacks more of prostration than of leaning.

Communist China, it is true, is not in the same impotent situation in the Communist orbit as are the Eastern European satellites. The very size, geographical location, and importance of China assure it a special status. We cannot read into this situation any significant element of divisiveness, however. The very fact of special status doubtless makes Communist China more comfortable in the Soviet camp than it would otherwise be. In time there may well be increasing frictions between the Chinese and Russians. Russia has traditionally had aggressive designs against China. Difficulties may well mount in time over Soviet influence in China's northeast and northwest, over control of the Communist movement in the rest of Asia, over Chinese disappointment at the limitations of Soviet aid commitments, and perhaps over alleged ideological heresies. For the foreseeable future, however, the affinities which bind the two powers together are likely to be much stronger than the divisive frictions.

Such is the nature of the regime which appears at Geneva to be making a bid for general recognition, for entry into the United Nations, and for freer trade with the West. The United States, for its part, cannot recognize this regime. We will continue vigorously to oppose its admission to any United Nations body as the representative of the Chinese people. And we cannot favor a relaxation of trade controls justly imposed against a convicted aggressor which has given no indication of having altered its aggressive course but on the contrary remains a constant threat to its neighbors and desires to build up its industrial base to support a war machine with the avowed purpose of "liberating" the rest of the world. We believe that to do so would, on the one hand, further confirm the Chinese Communists in their dedication to their present loyalties and courses of action and, on the other, tend to produce disillusionment and discouragement on the part of other Asian nations anxious to maintain their freedom and in many instances their newly won independence.

CONTINUING RECOGNITION OF FREE CHINA

There is another reason why we cannot accept the Peiping regime as representative of the Chinese people. We have no intention of turning our backs on the Republic of China on Formosa or of forsaking the 10 million Free Chinese on that island to a fate of Communist tyranny. We believe that the Republic of China is far more representative of the will of the Chinese people than is the regime on the mainland. It continues to represent China in the United Nations ably, responsibly, and with dignity.

It is highly important that at this juncture, when attention is focused upon the Chinese Communist regime, primarily because of its outrageous conduct, we not forget the real and potential importance of the cause of Free China. There is abundant precedent for the free nations' continued recognition even of governments in exile, for considerations dictated by reason and principle, when those governments retain no territorial control or military potential. Free China, however, is a going and growing concern, which is developing in increasingly favorable contrast to the conditions of tyranny and oppression imposed on the mainland by its would-be successor regime. That it has yet failed fully to achieve, by its own ready admission, that standard of democratic excellence by which it is often judged is hardly surprising, considering the facts that it has had only 6 years of constitutional government, is in a period of acute national emergency, and with extremely limited national resources is called upon to support a disproportionately large military establishment and maintain the morale and loyalty of civil servants on a below-subsistence level of pay. Even with outside aid this is a large order. The surprising thing is that the island is as stable as it is, that the economy, with its several weaknesses, is as strong as it is, that its military potential grows as it does, that morale both among the military and the civilian population is as high as it is, that the island is as free from subversion as it is, and that in these troublous times there is as much freedom of the press, speech, and person as there is. I have lived in both Communist China and Free China, and I am unable to view the appellation "Free China" as any misnomer. It is deserving of free world support.

The United States will continue its military, economic, and political support of the government of the Republic of China, and we will continue to support it as the representative of China in the United Nations. The Chinese Communists, in their extravagant propaganda, continue to speak of our "forceful occupation" of Formosa. This is preposterous, as all the world knows. Our advisers and technicians are there at the express invitation of the Government of China, to help it maintain its economic and political stability and to assist the Chinese to develop and maintain a military establishment capable of defending the island from Communist invasion and to make a greater contribution as an important part of the anti-Communist armed might in opposition to Communist aggression and expansion in the Pacific.

Such, in brief, is the problem and the promise presented to us by a divided China at this hour of grave crisis in Asian and world history. To meet this hour at Geneva and elsewhere with the degree of sober responsibility for which all men who treasure freedom look, requires all the resoluteness, faith, wisdom, firmness, patience, and understanding which we can summon. It would be idle at this point to speculate upon the outcome of the important conference now being held at Geneva. The next few days may be decisive. But there can be little doubt that the issues with which we are concerned at Geneva provide another severe test of the very principle of collective security on which may rest the fate of hundreds of millions of Asians, and ultimately of us all.

Don't Be Afraid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1954

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial from The Reading Times:

DON'T BE AFRAID

This is the time of the fluttering of gowns, of processions academic, and of the giving of advice to young women and young men with stars in their eyes. It is rather a sad time, in a bitter-sweet sort of way. It is commencement time in city and hamlet and every year when it comes around we wonder whether encouragement is not what these bright-faced youngsters need, rather than stern advice.

We never have had the appalling responsibility of advising a class of graduates from a commencement forum. We suspect we never shall, but if we do, we shall say something like this:

Young women and young men—young Americans:

We cannot tell you how to live your lives, nor do you really want us to. Each of you will and must fashion his life in his own way, with the tools which you alone possess. All we can tell you is that all will not be fair and kind in the bewildering world in which you will only now begin to operate as citizens and as adult human beings.

In cold fact, the world that we, your elders, proffer you is in a pretty sorry state. There is war and there are rumors of war. Suspicion vile and venomous is abroad in the land and fear walks with many men, a second shadow. Dissension is among us, and dark anger overwhelms compassion and understanding.

But don't be dismayed.

Don't be afraid.

Don't be dismayed by the tussling and bustling of angry men. There are many kind and understanding men and women in the world, too; this you must understand in order not to be dismayed.

Don't be dismayed by war and the rumor of war. There have been wars before; not too many hundreds of years ago gunpowder was as fearful a thing as the H-bomb now is. And always, always, peace has followed war.

Don't be dismayed by the suspicions and the fears of those about you. There are trusting men and women in the world, and you will find them if you look about you. In unexpected places, maybe, but they are there.

Above all, don't be afraid.

Don't be afraid to think. If your thinking apparatus is the standard equipment given to most men, your thinking will lead you along the right path.

Don't be afraid to act on the results of your thinking. There's the real danger you face, young women and young men. That, perhaps, has been the overwhelming weakness of our generation; take care that it is not that of yours.

Prize your right of dissent but do not mistake dissension for dissent. The two can be quite different, and usually are.

Don't be afraid to speak out for your conscience and your principles but also don't be afraid, if the need arises, to compromise, so long as the compromise is honorable.

Don't be afraid to see the gray in the world; those who see our planet as all white or all black are very unhappy people.

Don't be dismayed, young Americans. And don't be afraid.

Spotlight on Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD DAVIS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1954

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to include some interesting articles written by Hon. Abe D. Waldauer, of Memphis, Tenn.

Mr. Waldauer is a distinguished lawyer and has written in a most challenging way about the future of Israel. Few of us in this country really know how much has already been accomplished and what is ahead for these splendid people.

The first of the articles follows:

SPOTLIGHT ON ISRAEL

For some weeks now the world spotlight has been focused on Israel. The Kibya incident, the Jordan River controversy, the floating of a new bond issue, the retirement of Prime Minister David Ben-Gurion—all have been prominently featured in international headlines.

Whatever our opinions may be on these matters, the fact remains that Israel is making news—important news that emphasizes the state's development as an integral part of the world scene.

The American Jewish communities should review Israel's short history, for we have played an important part in creating Israel as a factor of world importance. Indeed, without the moral and material support of the Jews of America it is likely that Israel's birth as an independent nation might have been greatly delayed.

Israel's road has been a hard one—so strewn with obstacles that it is almost miraculous the state has survived. Her progress in the 5½ years since her establishment is an amazing accomplishment in current history. Let us look back a bit:

On May 14, 1948, the British mandate over Palestine ended, and the new state of Israel was proclaimed. The gates to the new nation immediately were opened without reservation to the oppressed and homeless Jews of the world. Two days after Israel's proclamation of independence Arab armies invaded from the south and from the east. Six hundred thousand Jews were assailed by six Arab nations, with a population exceeding 40 million people. The fantastically superior numbers of enemy forces made many in America shudder.

We developed prophets of gloom.

It appeared that Israel must be crushed by this tidal wave of invaders, superbly armed with aircraft and modern weapons of war.

While some in this country took to their dugouts, the Jews of Israel took to the field.

There was no alternative. They must win a war for survival, a war they did not seek, and one forced on them.

The prophets of gloom did not properly evaluate the courage and stamina of the Israeli pioneers. They won their war of liberation. They tremendously increased respect for the newborn state all over the world, and every Jew everywhere shines in the reflected glory of that increased respect.

How did they do it?

I am one who believes that the explanation is found in the Bible: "Not by might nor by power, but by my spirit, saith the Lord of Hosts."

Even while the war was being fought, Israel opened her gates to homeless Jews everywhere. The influx of immigration started amidst the shriek of shell and the clash of combat.

When the armistice stopped the fighting, Israel got down to the matter of developing a nation. Some 700,000 newcomers found haven within her boundaries, doubling the original population in less than 4 years. The burden thereby placed upon Israel was incalculable, but none was refused entry. Immigrants needed homes, food, medical treatment, and human understanding. These they found in Israel, and Israel went on building, trying to develop an economy and trying to integrate the immigrants into that economy.

Israel was short on technically skilled manpower. But she was not lacking in brainpower and spirit. Without disparaging the Hebrew University or the Weizmann Institute of Science, but with thanks also to the graduate engineers of Technion, Israel Institute of Technology, agriculture, and industry began to grow. Irrigation of the land was directed by Technion graduates; factories, homes, and commercial buildings were built by Technion architects; communications systems were set up by Technion experts; mechanical engineers developed machinery, tools, and implements for agriculture and industry; chemical engineers developed new products and processes for industrial application; civil engineers built highways and harbors. Technion graduates have made great contributions to the art of town planning and development. Technion is a unique and vital institution.

The Technion is located upon about a block and half in the center of Haifa. I stood on its campus and watched its tremendous overcrowding. The very necessities of the state and the demand for skilled technical experts inevitably forced the building of a new and larger Technion. This I shall discuss in greater detail in an ensuing article. But the heartening thing is that Israel recognizes the need for an enlarged Technion—and that need must be met so that the state may survive and grow.

Thus Israel continues her program of development. With the ingenuity, the fortitude and the drive of her people—coupled with the continued support of the Jewish communities of America—Israel will grow, will prosper and will endure.

Years ago, Jerusalem won for itself the name the Eternal City. With the development of institutions of higher learing Israel has the potential of developing into the eternal state of the Middle East.

Let us take heart in this knowledge. Let us be thankful for the bright dignity and prestige Israelis have given to themselves and to fellow Jews the world over.

This is the way of democratic progress. This is the new world spotlight that has been focused on the new State of Israel.

ENGINEERS FOR ISRAEL

In my preceding article, Spotlight on Israel, I made reference to Technion, the Israel Institute of Technology.

It is difficult to overestimate the importance of Technion. It is the only engineering school in Israel. Consequently, it is Israel's only source of engineers, practical scientists, and trained technicians. This specialized manpower is Israel's greatest single need today, since technology is the key to modern advancement. Without the specific skills learned at an engineering school, no modern nation can hope to progress.

Technion was founded in 1912, making it the oldest educational institution of university standard in the State of Israel. Erected during a period when Palestine was a sparsely populated and vastly barren area, Technion today is one of the major forces that has carried the young state to its present level of technological achievement.

Technion introduced modern engineering practices and methods to this pioneer country; it helped to develop new sources of livelihood in industry and agriculture; it provided to Jewish Palestine and Israel the first technically trained manpower in that part of the world, and its graduates now comprise some 50 percent of the practicing engineers in government, industry, and the armed forces.

The institute consists of an engineering college and graduate school, a technical high school for the training of expert technicians and industrial foremen, and an extension department that offers educational courses to adults, teaching them new trades and supplementing the training of industrial and agricultural workers.

Originally erected to accommodate only 300 students, Technion today is overflowing with more than 2,300 students. Each term the school is forced—for lack of space—to turn away more qualified applicants than it can accept. The first 100 applicants accepted each year are those named for engineering training by the Israeli armed forces, for engineering know-how is a "must" in modern military operations. It is obvious, therefore, that something must be done, for even with the current enrollment of some 2,300, Technion cannot turn out enough engineers to meet Israel's demand.

Steps to alleviate the situation already are being taken. A campaign is underway to build Greater Technion as a larger, more modern replacement of the present institute. Situated on Mount Carmel, the new school will be able to take in twice the students, provide greater facilities and equipment, and thereby increase the flow of all-important engineers.

The first of the Greater Technion buildings is almost completed, but large sums are necessary to carry forward this building program. In the United States, the American Technion Society is conducting a campaign to raise $10 million toward the overall amount needed. The society has as its members and officers some of America's most distinguished engineers, scientists, and men of industry. Under their leadership it is hoped the goal will be reached in a relatively short time.

President of Technion is Gen. Yaacov Dori, a spirited, indefatigable man who heads an outstanding faculty of educators whose reputations are worldwide. General Dori is a civil engineer whose military service will record him as one of Israel's great heroes. He was commander of the immortal Haganah, he was first chief of staff of Israel's defense forces, and he was a key figure in the state's war of liberation.

Dr. Sydney Goldstein, dean of the aeronautical egineering department, is typical of the unusually high caliber of men on the Technion staff. Dr. Goldstein is rated without peer in the field of aerodynamics, and during World War II he served as chairman of the British Aeronautical Research Council.

Another stellar member of the Technion family is Dr. Franz Ollendorff, dean of the electrical engineering department. Dr. Ollendorff is a leading figure in the world of science, chiefly through his manifold contributions to the field of electronics.

A recent addition to the Technion faculty is Dr. Walter C. Lowdermilk, noted soil conservationist, who will head the newly formed department of agricultural engineering. Dr. Lowdermilk's contributions to soil conservation are known the world over, and it was he who helped to organize and direct our own national program of soil conservation when that project was authorized by Franklin D. Roosevelt in 1933.

And there are others, like Jochanan Ratner, Alexander Klein, Max Kurrein, Hugo Heimann, Heinrich Neumann, and many more, all of whom make Technion the ranking engineering and scientific educational center of the Middle East.

The American Technion Society's campaign to help build Greater Technion is one of the most necessary endeavors on behalf of Israel. All friends of Israel may well get behind this project, for it is a program which will do much indeed to bring economic security to Israel.

And it is a source of pride to those of us in the American Negev that the Jewish Welfare Fund of Memphis assumed our responsibility in this connection. Memphis is the first southern city to do so. The board of directors has authorized the payment of the first installment of the Memphis contribution to this capital building fund. A glorious new Technion will arise on Mount Carmel, where, of old, the prophet Elijah was fed by the ravens.

With trained engineers to lead the way, Israel can go forward in her program of development of industry and agriculture. Let us help to provide this urgent need.

This Is Your Hospital

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1954

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday afternoon, May 30, 1954, there was dedicated at South Hill, Va., the Community Memorial Hospital which stands as a monument to the resourcefulness, the determination, the humility, and the will of the people of that great community to do something in their time for the benefit of their people. It was a dream come true and demonstrates that where there is a will there is a way.

Among the speakers that day was Mr. W. S. Hundley, of Boydton, Va., a member of the executive committee of the board of trustees of the Community Hospital, whose remarks were brief, to the point, and I believe are worth reading by the public generally.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include his address on that occasion:

Ladies and gentlemen, this is an unusual experience for me to attempt a speech before an audience like this. However, I realize my being on this program is more of a compliment and honor to me than for anything I might say to you. I shall at least respect this honor by departing from the procedure of many inexperienced speakers. They begin by saying "I have nothing to say" and then take 30 minutes to prove it. I shall take 4 minutes. I have great sympathy for the man who went to his doctor about an ear ailment. After a careful examination the doctor told his patient he had a serious ear ailment and must give up drinking, or he would lose his hearing. The doctor asked the patient if he would do this. "I will not," responded the patient. "Why?" asked the doctor. "Because what I drink is so much better than what I hear."

Even though I am not gifted as a public speaker, I am very glad that I have been accorded this opportunity to say a few words here today. I have been deeply interested in this undertaking from its very earliest inception. Indeed, the people of our adjoining communities have every reason to take great pride and satisfaction in now realizing that we have by joint effort, created a reality that will efficiently serve our united needs for such an institution.

There is nothing I can say, or that anyone can say here today that will more eloquently or beautifully give expression to the event of today than the wording of the subject on which I am to make a few remarks; that is, This Is Your Hospital.

It is a fine feeling in these times of high finances, Government ownership, commercial credit, long-term payments, etc., to say anything is yours.

It may be I should try to give you some word picture of the early life of This Is Your Hospital, like the program on TV, This Is Your Life, but that would be tedious and long, yet I do wonder how many of you realize how long your hospital has been being born. Most of us think of it as being just in the past 3 or 4 years, but I have a little pamphlet dated 1945. In it I read an article telling of a cooperative, nonprofit hospital in Oklahoma, that began with only a few thousand dollars capital and had grown successfully into half a million dollar institution. I was so impressed with the plan I ordered a dozen copies of the little pamphlet and passed them around to persons I knew who were talking about a hospital. So you can see that it has been at least 9 years in the making.

You, the people of three counties, as well as some who do not live here, have focused the thoughts of your minds and the feelings of your hearts to erect a monument that pierces the heavy smog that hangs so densely over all humanity today. It is refreshing to stand on top of this monument and breathe a breath of sweet, fresh air uncontaminated by fear, communism, atomic bombs, McCarthyism, and all forms of manipulation and wirepulling going on in the affairs of government and men.

You have built this, your hospital, as nature builds her great monuments. A thousand forces are brought into action to grow a tree; a million little streams trickle on their course through field and forest to pan their contribution to make the mighty ocean. Many little streams have trickled on their way to pan their contriblution to build this monument to humanitarianism. What one does for oneself, or just self-gain, in the short course of an allotted lifetime, ends with the person, but what one does for the benefit of humanity lives on and on. Too often we see big businessmen, big industrialists, wasting their lives over mountains of data and loads of theory building monuments to futility. In this, your hospital, you have built a monument of utility, and not one of futility. Just in a short time individuals may rise to great stature and position, but a breath can make them as a breath has made.

"Ill fares the land, to hastening ills a prey,
  Where wealth accumulates, and men decay,
  Politicians and statesmen may flourish or
      may fade,
  A breath can make them as a breath has
      made.
  But the bold citizenry, a country's pride,
  Once destroyed, can never be supplied."

So long as we can give interpretation to the thoughts and actions of the bold citizenry who have, like you, brought into realization this hospital, we may have hope that civilization will survive. You have obtained in this hospital that which was the goal of the Greek philosophers in their creative age—truth, justice, and beauty.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, you have surely done a magnificent job. You have contributed your time and money generously, but that is not enough. You cannot set up a million-dollar institution and then stand by and say "go forward" or "stay still." This hospital is a big business, and we shall have to continue our contribution in every respect, but the greatest need will be your loyal and moral support to the management.

So for many, many years this monument will stand, built by the people, joined together to express themselves in truth, justice, and beauty—this, your hospital.

Corps of Engineers Begin 180th Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1954

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, my close association with the Corps of Engineers, as a member of the Subcommittee on Civil Functions and Military Construction of the House Committee on Appropriations, prompts me to take cognizance today of their 179th birthday celebration.

To the Corps of Engineers have come great problems, watersheds, natural resources, flood control, and construction works, projects which have inured to the benefit of the civilian population and have contributed, in great measure, to the defense and protection of our Nation.

It is interesting to note that the United States Military Academy, one of our proudest institutions of learning, was commanded by officers selected from the Corps of Engineers, during the period from April 15, 1802, the founding of the Academy, to September 8, 1864, when the superintendency was opened to the entire Army. Robert E. Lee, later commanding general of the Army of Northern Virginia, and commander in chief of the Confederate Army Field Forces, was the ninth member from the Corps of Engineers to command the Academy, acting as Superintendent from 1852 to 1855.

The record of the Corps of Engineers is one marked with a long history of public service and duty. It is only proper that the Washington Post and Times Herald should have saluted them this morning; I am happy to include the article in the Record. The article follows:

Engineer Corps Is 179 Years Old

The Army Corps of Engineers, 179 years old today, celebrates its anniversary as the most powerful construction force in the world, its Chief said yesterday.

"Our construction power is a major deterrent to world war III," Maj. Gen. S. D. Sturgis, Jr., Chief of Engineers, said.

At the request of George Washington, the corps was established by the Continental Congress in 1775 primarily for military purposes. Its civil works assignments date from an act of Congress in 1826.

Maury Maverick: A Great Texan, a Great American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1954

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it was with much sorrow that I learned of the death of Maury Maverick who died last week in San Antonio, Tex.

His death is a great loss to the common people of Texas and the Nation. When I first learned of this great southern liberal he was a Member of Congress. He distinguished himself in the House of Representatives by his courageous stand for legislation designed to promote the general welfare of all of the American people.

Like all who take a stand for a program for the people and who dare to challenge reactionary special interests, Maury Maverick made powerful political enemies. Only a man of great ability, high principle, and great courage could succeed as he did against such powerful odds. He was a leader of the liberal Democratic forces who led the fight at the 1952 Democratic National Convention against seating Democrats with a Republican philosophy and later against these same Democrats who opposed Adlai Stevenson in the 1952 presidential campaign.

Maury Maverick was a man of great vision and understanding. He was far in front of most of his native Texans. He was a pioneer whose real fame will grow with the passing years. Then he will receive the recogniiton due one who has been in the vanguard of the forces which pave the way for human progress.

His untiring efforts in a righteous cause have not been in vain. Time and history are on his side. Future generations will honor and respect the name of Maury Maverick and the memory of his fighting spirit.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to include with my remarks an article from Labor, the official publication of the railway labor unions and a statement by Drew Pearson on the passing of Maverick:

[From Labor]

Fighting Texas Liberal Passes

The Nation lost a real fighting liberal this week when Maury Maverick died of a heart attack in San Antonio, Tex., at only 57.

For 4 years, beginning in 1934, Maverick was a Democratic Congressman from the Lone Star State. It's doubtful that a Texan like him could be elected nowadays, when that State's politics are ruled by reactionary oil magnates.

Maverick was a man of uncompromising independence, and he wouldn't take orders from anyone. Although he generally lined up with the New Dealers, he differed with them when he thought they were wrong.

A hero of the First World War, Maverick served in the infantry, was wounded and won many military honors. He was a lawyer and held local public office until he entered Congress. After his defeat for reelection to the House, he became mayor of San Antonio and was appointed to several high Federal Government posts during the Second World War.

In the 1952 Democratic convention, Maverick led the loyalists against the reactionary Eisenhower Democrats headed by Texas Governor Allan Shivers.

Maverick knew from hard experience that a public man who stands up for the common people travels a rough road, but he kept going straight ahead. "An independent thinker," he said, "has to fight his own way."

A Great Texan

(By Drew Pearson)

A great Texan died the other day. His grandfather Maverick put his name on the "maverick" steer that jumps herds and wanders at will over the plains; and Maury Maverick, his grandson, was just as free, just as independent, and just as fearless as either his grandfather or the steers.

Maverick died an early death because he was always in the front line of every battle. He died an early political death because he took on the big power companies, the big oil companies, the big racketeers—people who had plenty of money to defeat him for reelection.

And he died physically last week because he came out of World War I, his breast covered with ribbons and his body covered with wounds. A hole as big as his fist remained in his back. He was too far out in front in France as he was in politics.

Those who suffer from cancer probably don't know it, but it was Maury Maverick, a vigorous young Congressman from Texas, who, in the New Deal days, pioneered the first Government appropriation for cancer research. His legislation set up the Cancer Institute.

He campaigned for the Tennessee Valley, for slum clearance, back nearly 20 years ago when the going was tough. And he crusaded for 50,000 planes and 100,000 pilots 3 years before Pearl Harbor when people scoffed at such fantastic, unneeded goals.

And being out in the front line of political battle, the big interests of Texas knocked him off when he came up for reelection. After that he became mayor of San Antonio, and along the little muddy river that runs through the heart of that sprawling Spanish city, you will find today a great monument to Maury Maverick.

It does not bear his name. Later generations may forget that he ever had any connection with it. But Mayor Maverick transformed the slums along the sluggish San Antonio River into a replica of an old Spanish village and one of the most beautiful spots in Texas.

Maury has been out of politics in these later years. He sat like Ty Cobb or Babe Ruth on the sidelines while Texas went Republican, while the reactionaries ate high-on-the-hog in Austin, while the oil men financed McCarthy in Washington. And he was discouraged.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Printing and binding for Congress, when recommended to be done by the Committee on Printing of either House, shall be so recommended in a report containing an approximate estimate of the cost thereof, together with a statement from the Public Printer of estimated approximate cost of work previously ordered by Congress within the fiscal year (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 145, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on Printing, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

DISTRIBUTION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

To the Vice President and each Senator 100 copies; to the Secretary and Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, each, 25 copies; to the Secretary, for official use, not to exceed 35 copies; to the Sergeant at Arms, for use on the floor of the Senate, not to exceed 50 copies; to each Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress, 68 copies; to the Clerk, Sergeant at Arms, and Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives, each, 25 copies; to the Clerk, for official use, not to exceed 50 copies; and to the Doorkeeper, for use on the floor of the House of Representatives, not to exceed 75 copies; to the Vice President and each Senator, Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress there shall also be furnished (and shall not be transferable), 3 copies of the daily Record, of which 1 shall be delivered at his residence, 1 at his office, and 1 at the Capitol.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the Record.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the Congressional Record, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

T

E

H(

IN THE

Mr.
Presider
have pr
Record
New Dir
the annu
munity
York Cit
There
was orde
as follow
Tr
(Addres

Presider
when I w
Annual C
munity T
to accept.
about my
Without
large and
tion living
from the l
wait a lor
in their ov
and proud
me. I thi
small com
ours. In
heart and
for them i
The worl
this sessior
away from
resist the v
pioneers of
new indust
what I say
this gives n
tribute to
community
weakness fo
of that ter
pioneer in
developed V
This is t
as past era
age, and th
mankind w
point in his
turning poi
tronics is op
of earth, of
and of far
electronics
be an enig
mankind h
it is the ph
catalyst, th
explains oth
To most
markable,
appreciated
tronics. No
lieve for on
not humani

Appendix

Television's New Dimension

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 17, 1954

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "Television's New Dimension," delivered by me before the annual meeting of the National Community Television Association at New York City on June 16, 1954.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TELEVISION'S NEW DIMENSION

(Address of Hon. EDWIN C. JOHNSON, of Colorado)

President Malarkey, ladies, and gentlemen, when I was invited to speak to this Third Annual Convention of the National Community Television Association, I was quick to accept. In fact I was almost immodest about my eagerness.

Without community antenna service that large and important segment of our population living in the outer precincts and away from the larger centers of population would wait a long time for satisfactory television in their own homes. I am from the country and proud of it. The large city is not for me. I think in terms of the small towns and small communities of this great country of ours. In my book they represent the very heart and soul of America and what is good for them is good for this Nation.

The work in Washington has been so heavy this session that this is my first appearance away from the Potomac. But I could not resist the very great challenge to speak to the pioneers of this New Look in television—this new industry within an industry. Not that what I say will be important but rather that this gives me the opportunity officially to pay tribute to the importance to the Nation of community television service. I have a weakness for pioneering. In the usual sense of that term I have the honor of being a pioneer in the most rugged part of the undeveloped West.

This is the electronic age, just as surely as past eras were the stone age, the bronze age, and the iron age. Centuries from now mankind will record this era as the turning point in history, perhaps the most important turning point for earth dwellers. For electronics is opening to us the secrets of nature, of earth, of space, of our own solar system and of far distant solar systems. Without electronics the secret of the atom would still be an enigma. Electronics is the key that mankind has dreamed about for centuries; it is the philosophers' stone, the alchemists' catalyst, the miracle which discloses and explains other miracles.

To most of us, television is the most remarkable, and certainly the most widely appreciated of the handmaidens of electronics. No one in his right mind will believe for one split second that television is not humanity's greatest single blessing. In my judgment, it will have a far greater impact on the way we live than any other invention or development of modern times. It has restored the home to its rightful place as the center of family entertainment and pleasure. Any institution that makes the American home more than a place to eat and sleep is precious to national welfare and life generally.

Russian claims to the contrary notwithstanding, television is as strictly an American invention as the hot dog. If it weren't, we might not have made some of the mistakes in the way we went about developing it commercially.

Torn between an understandable desire to put no roadblocks in the way of its technical development, and at the same time anxious to insure a nationwide competitive system, the regulating agency made the insane decision to mix UHF and VHF as a child might attempt to mix oil and water and the FCC still stubbornly maintains that its original decision is correct. It's easy for the least of us to be Monday-morning quarterbacks but mistakes are still being made.

The Commission put together a mixed system. It entered 2 horses in the race; 1 a thoroughbred with breeding lines which showed it could run a long race superbly well; the other electronically fit, but hobbled by the big boys, with monopoly in their hearts. Already the eggs have been scrambled and the omelette is on the way to being fried. It would take a wizard to put the eggs back into the shell and start over now. Once you start down Niagara Falls you do not retrace your steps. So the Commission clings to the hope that by some miracle the jockey on the second horse will push him into running a dead heat.

What were the facts? First, the 12 remaining VHF channels could not provide a nationwide competitive television system. Second, the then known engineering facts about UHF indicated a clear technical advantage for the VHF station operator. Third, notwithstanding, the most optimistic beliefs of the RCA people who were the experts and knew the most about UHF, it was thought unlikely UHF could ever provide the range coverage of VHF, and that it would be many years before all receiving sets would receive both kinds of signals. Fourth, the then existing and subsequent VHF stations would become, in effect, a kind of clear-channel television station with all of the advantages and prerogatives that clear-channel radio stations enjoyed. That was the clincher. Fifth, it was thought that through the use of satellite and repeater stations in UHF the whole country could be blanketed with TV. No one thinks that now. But Community Television Service has found a practical way to expand and extend television service without satellites and without UHF. So now we are to have what really amounts to a monopolistic clear-channel operation in television.

Both UHF and VHF television in their original aspects were primarily large city systems. Their stupendous costs of installation and operation confined them to the densely populated areas. No community of 25,000 or less could make them pay. They could thrive only on national and big city advertising. They were not for the village and the small city. Unlike radio, their beams are limited to short distances. Hills and rolling topography are not suitable for television radiation. Satellite stations in UHF positively are not the answer.

But the scientists and electronic technicians came to the rescue and found a way to provide the whole Nation with television service. When there was an insistent demand for color television, the electronic wizards gave us color. The burning desire for television in the smaller communities challenged their ingenuity, and they suggested a practical way to extend and expand television into the far corners of our beloved country.

Now that we know how to do it, it is up to industry to accomplish the huge task of actually bringing television of excellent and even superior quality to the farms and country towns and smaller cities. Companies and corporations must be organized, finances raised, equipment manufactured, legal and political problems resolved, and associations such as we see here, created.

But every dynamic human endeavor has problems. Community television is no exception. Some of these problems seem pretty tough and roadblocks are beginning to appear. Ours is a selfish world and the chiseler and the fellow who cuts corners and does not respect the rights and the best interests of his neighbors is ever present. Ninety-nine people do not need a policeman, but the last man in the hundred needs to be supervised and regulated and regimented, or he will run rough shod over everyone.

But I recite this bit of broadcast television history for another reason. I think there may be a lesson in it for community antenna televsion today.

The general merit in community antenna television service is that it enables the public to receive television signals in areas where (for technical reasons or where the laws of economics make normal television broadcasting infeasible) satisfactory signals are not received from the nearest televsion station.

Always there will be communities, or even parts of commmunities, which do not now receive, and will never receive, a satisfactory television signal, either from the television station right in that community or from a station in a neighboring community. And it is becoming increasingly clear that advertiser revenues alone can never meet the upkeep for broadcast television stations in thousands of other communities.

That should make it clear why the freeze gave impetus to the building of community antenna television service. It also explains why there is a boom market today for community television and why it may see its biggest growth in the years ahead.

Unless by some magic, satellite stations can be operated with greater satisfaction, areas with no TV service and those which cannot support a station will be a potential market for community antenna television service.

A recently published survey of TV households showed that as of January 1 of this year 84 percent of all the television homes in the country were located in 340 leading markets. Thus, while 57 percent of the 47,500,000 households in the country had TV sets, 84 percent of these were clustered in 340 markets. Moreover, only 215 of these markets had 1 or more television stations, and the 356 stations operating in these 215 cities serviced the total 340 markets.

What this means to me is that the big national advertisers on television already are reaching more than 84 percent of television homes with 356 stations. How much more, in terms of additional station cost, is the remaining 15 percent of television homes worth to these national advertisers? Since the largest markets are already covered, how soon does additional station coverage reach the point of diminishing returns for national advertisers? And does this signify that the newer stations going on the air in smaller and smaller markets will have to rely exclusively on local advertiser income to keep their heads above water? If there is any validity in these surmises, the question resolves itself down to how large a community it takes to support a televisoin station which gets no national advertising.

Since the freeze was lifted, more than 93 television stations have surrendered their building permits or surrendered their operations for economic reasons. Many more are expected to do so. Seventy-nine were UHF and 14 were VHF stations. Television is strictly a blue-chip operation. In the large centers of population profits are fantastic. However, stations in smaller communities not having popular network affiliations, which means good programs and national advertising, often find themselves in a hopeless economic situation. All of us sympathize sincerely with an enterprise that loses its heavy investment, but the communities to be served also lose. In many cases when that happens a community antenna system is the only method whereby the public can be given television service.

But local programs always will be popular and there will be pressures to find a way for local communities to have their own television stations. Undoubtedly some communities can be served with boosters or satellites. There is even the possibility that the costs of television station construction and operation will be lowered so materially that economic operation may become possible from local advertising revenues in medium-sized communities.

As I see it, however, there is an even stronger probability that the community antenna service may some day operate a "special-occasion local studio program" in connection with its piped-in programs and thereby satisfy the pressing demand for entertainment by local talent. I shall be surprised if this is not done. When that great day is here, it can be said truthfully that you have outgrown your swaddling clothes. And yet, even now, you are not exactly an infant industry. With more than 300 separate systems serving some 275,000 households, you are reaching the volume of service where you no longer can be ignored.

Television licensees and would-be licensees, the Federal Communications Commission, the State regulatory agencies, the Senators and Congressmen, are beginning to raise their eyebrows.

Yours is a risk business. It takes venture capital to go into the community antenna television business. There have been losses; some systems have failed, and many others are scratching along, hoping for better days. Nevertheless, those systems which picked the right spots, free from the inroads of direct station competition, and have set about to increase their subscribers, are continuing to pay handsome dividends; and, what is more important, they are serving the public interest well and faithfully.

Community antenna service is premised upon picking up the signals of operating television stations and relaying the signals to subscribers through closed circuits. So one of the burning questions today is what rights have you to those signals. Perhaps a better way to put it is, what are the proprietary rights of the originating station or the network in the programs you deliver to your subscribers?

To put it simply, your function and role is to strengthen the signals of the originating station for distant areas where otherwise the reception would not be satisfactory.

A station's programs are free, waiting for and available to anyone with a receiver to tune in on them and view them. In fact, stations are anxious that more and more people buy receivers and tune in their programs. They use the number of listeners they serve to attract advertising. If one of your subscribers desired, he could rig up an antenna or install a cable and bring the signals to his home with the enthusiastic blessing of the originating station. But since it is less expensive for him to join his neighbors in such an undertaking, you have constituted yourself a sort of modified utility as an agent for the neighborhood to install the required equipment for a fee, and to deliver the service to each of them for another fee. That saves everyone time, bother and money. Your function is one of providing a technical service which results merely in an extension and expansion of the coverage of the station and thus is helpful to the station and at the same time serves the public interest.

Your service is neither a broadcast nor a common carrier operation and, therefore, should not be subject to regulation by the Commission, or by a State utility agency in the case of a solely intrastate operation. Certainly you are not engaged in radio broadcasting nor in interstate communications for hire, but are simply furnishing a purely local antenna service. And you are no more a common carrier than is a hotel with one master antenna, which serves its 100 rooms.

However, in at least two States, such an intrastate operation has been held to fall within the regulatory scope of the State utility commission. Another arm of Government, the Internal Revenue Division, assesses the same excise tax on your operations that it imposes on the communication common carriers under the theory that you are a common carrier. While neither of these actions automatically makes you a common carrier, you should take them seriously.

The Internal Revenue Division is now restudying their previous decision to impose a common carrier excise tax on you. I think their original decision was in error and that your association should make every effort to reverse it. Not only because the tax is onerous but for the more important reason that the community antenna service is not a common carrier function subject to common carrier regulation and you should not permit any decision to rest on such a premise.

Nevertheless, if your operation actually or theoretically injures anyone, heavy pressures will be exerted to bring you within the scope of the Federal regulatory agency. It seems to me that prudence would command your consideration of that possibility.

Since I am not a lawyer, I prefer not to pass judgment on the question of proprietary rights. It seems likely that one of these days it will be the subject of judicial interpretation. I understand that such a test case may be in the making now, and I am sure that its outcome is going to be watched with interest by all. I merely want to observe that your business would suffer a body blow if it should be held by the courts that the proprietary right to programs permits the broadcaster to control the means by which the public receives those programs, should the broadcaster choose to assert an equity in them.

Recently in the so-called Belnap case, in which a memorandum and order was released on May 6, 1954, the Commission, with cautious evasiveness, stated:

"It should be understood that, in making this determination, the Commission is not making any express or implied decision as to the existence or extent of any jurisdiction it may have with respect to the installation and operation of any community TV distribution systems."

Belnap was not to be the operator of the community antenna distribution systems but merely to act as a sort of a little A. T. & T. carrier of signals. The issuance of a permit to one person to install a microwave system to furnish common carrier service to a community antenna system might very well, and probably does, give the Commission regulatory authority over a purely intrastate or interstate community antenna television system. So far as I know, no community antenna service itself is a microwave owner or operator, but purchases its common carrier service from others. In the Casper, Wyo., operation and one other the telephone company, a regulated utility, furnishes the interstate carrier service to the community antenna company and, accordingly, both would be subject to FCC regulation, in my opinion.

There is still a third question which involves the regulatory concept. It was brought to the fore at the recent hearings before the Senate Communications Committee studying the problems of UHF broadcasters. I am sure you all are familiar with it. It concerns a situation in West Virginia, where the Fairmont UHF station now faces competition from Wheeling, Pittsburgh, and Johnstown stations, because the Fairmont community antenna television system pipes the programs of those three stations into Fairmont. Here is an example of the Commission's allocation plan being set to naught, resulting in an unregulated media giving a struggling station unexpected but deadly competition. If this Fairmont UHF station "bites the dust" as we say in the West, there will be no doubt about who killed Cock Robin.

In my judgment this is a serious matter, and one which should give you grave concern. I am a firm believer in local enterprise in everything, including radio and television. If it were economically feasible, the ideal would be a locally owned and locally operated radio and television station in every community of any size in this country. That can never be, and Community Antenna Service need not encroach on other stations.

Community Television Service is only asking for trouble when it attempts to serve an area already being served by its own station. Nonnetwork stations cannot withstand network competition from distant stations.

The FCC cannot sit idly by and permit one of its licensed stations to be driven off the air because distant stations have expanded their coverage into its territory. When the Fairmont station was licensed and built there was no intimation that it would have to compete with the Wheeling, Pittsburgh, and Johnstown stations. As a consequence, in good faith the station operator invested hundreds of thousands of dollars to get his station on the air so that he might bring the miracle of television to the people of Fairmont.

The philosophy back of regulation of public utilities is that since competition can destroy, it must be limited, and that a franchise or license must rest on protected territory.

There is, of course, another side on the coin. Those of us who believe in the free American competitive system find it hard to argue against competition, no matter how onerous it may be. The viewing public will have a more varied program and be better served if someone pipes in network programs from afar.

There are many other more or less minor problems. The Commission now has under way a rulemaking procedure concerned generally with spurious radiation. Some of you systems, due to careless and improper installation, emit radiations which interfere with the reception of those who are not subscribers to the community-antenna systems. In my judgment, your industry cannot afford this type of shoddy operation. You must, in your own interest and in the interest of your relations with television broadcasters and the public who own receiver sets, so engineer your systems as to repress completely spurious radiations. Anything less is a clarion call to the policeman, which in this case is the FCC, to regulate you. Also, you must watch carefully your installation costs and rates. I do not mean to suggest that installation costs ranging from $75 to $150 are exorbitant, or that monthly service charges from $2.75 to $7.50 are unfair. It is understandable that in a business where investors have reason to fear a limited life, initial rates and charges are made high enough to recoup their capital expenditures as quickly as possible. But continued high monthly service charges are the rock on which community-antenna systems may founder. Your business is too delicate an operation to earn the opposition of a public which might demand price regulation for its own protection.

Higher than necessary rates will compel cooperative associations to enter this field and render a nonprofit service. Farm cooperatives have brought electric energy to 90 percent of the farm homes of this country. Rural telephone cooperatives are serving millions of farm families because the telephone companies neglected them. They will do precisely the same thing with television.

One of the outstanding developments of your business is your friendly and cooperative relations with the television broadcast industry. So far as I know, only one station licensee has sought to deny the pickup of his programs. This cordial relationship is understandable when it is realized that you provide the station with an additional audience and market not ordinarily reached by his signal. Most licensees with whom I have talked feel that community antenna television systems constitute a very desirable adjunct to their business.

In my own State of Colorado construction of the Climax system was thrilling and heartwarming. Prime mover in this project was Robert VerSteeg, electrical foreman for the Climax Molybdenum Co. Climax lies more than 11,000 feet above sea level, hemmed in by the tallest peaks in the continental United States. VerSteeg's effort to bring television to the 2,000 residents of Climax involved the construction of an antenna on Mount McNamee, a 13,000-foot peak, the laying of 12,000 feet of coaxial cable from the mountain to the town, and an additional 60,000 feet of cable fanning out to service the homes. Today, using the tallest community antenna in the world, the people of Climax enjoy identically the same four television programs afforded the metropolitan city of Denver. This is a fine example of the benefits flowing from a community antenna system.

The Casper, Wyo., project should be singled out for special attention. It employs the longest microwave relay yet built for any system.

Casper is over 200 miles distant from Denver by highway. The fact that the operator has obligated himself to pay the telephone company more than $90,000 in annual tolls, backing it up with a 5-year performance bond, demonstrates investment courage of a high order. Indeed it indicates great faith in the future of the community television business. And I too am genuinely enthusiastic about the community antenna television business. To me, the significant aspect is the splendid record of bringing diversified television program service to locked-in communities whose residents would otherwise be denied the magic of television.

When this business resolves the legal problems which inevitably face it, and as it continues to build up its operations so that even the smallest of its systems performs an A-1 job technically, and as it continues to render good and dependable service to the public at low rates, its future development will sweep even its most optimistic boosters off their feet.

The potential market for your services can only be described by the superword "vast." It can operate profitably in communities with as few as 5,000 people. In this country there are more than 2,500 such cities and towns. It is doubtful that half or even three-fourths of these 2,500 communities will ever have television stations of their own, or receive satisfactory service from nearby cities. Here then, is a vast market of millions of people who will demand the blessings of good television entertainment in their own homes, once they learn that there is no technical reason against having it.

If legal decisions involving proprietary rights in programs go against you, and circumstances force intolerable burdens upon you, there is an escape avenue for the community antenna television service. It involves doing your own programing and becoming a pay-as-you-see television service. The recent experiments by the Telemeter promoters in Palm Springs, Calif., while designed to test out audience reaction to paying for specific movie programs, may have some valuable lessons for closed-circuit operations such as yours. The problem of piping a special program into homes once, twice, or even several times a week, offers neither technical difficulties nor legal problems, since no governmental regulatory question is involved in intrastate closed-circuit operations. For example, you may be able to work out arrangements with local motion-picture exhibitors for the showing of special features, with both you and the theater exhibitor sharing in the proceeds. In smaller communities, where the movie house already is suffering from drops in attendance, you may be able to open a new home market for him. It is, of course, no simple matter, but it does have tremendous possibilities, both for you and the motion-picture industry.

This has been an interesting and fruitful experience for me. It has restored my confidence in the future to meet you pioneers in this new offshoot development of television, which in the years ahead is certain to carve a special and unique niche of its own in the fields of homemaking and electronics. And now, may I say in closing what I tried to say in the beginning—any institution that effectively restores the American home and dedicates it to family use as the center of all of its activities has earned the highest tribute of God and man.

United States Hit on POW List

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 17, 1954

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article from the Boston Post, Boston, Mass., Wednesday, June 16, 1954:

UNITED STATES ACCUSED OF HIDING POW LIST

A hitherto secret list of names of American soldiers—over and above the famous 944—still held by the Chinese Reds, is being withheld by the Government, it was charged last night by the wife of a missing Lowell Army major and by the head of the American Prisoners of War in Boston.

Mrs. Stella Robarge, of 20 Edson Street, Lowell, and Vincent A. Harrold, of the Boston POW chapter, said the second list included hundreds of specialists and instructors.

Mrs. Robarge's husband, Maj. Paul Robarge, missing in action in Korea since July 1953, does not appear among the 944 names listed by the Government as still held by the Communists.

Major Robarge, a decorated hero of World War II, had been serving as military adviser to the Republic of Korea.

Branding the State and Defense Departments as guilty of two-faced cowardice, Harrold said the second secret list almost certainly contains the name of Major Robarge.

"Major Robarge was listed as missing in action by the Army in July 1953. Yet, his name does not appear on the list of those the Government says are missing, and still held by the Communists," he declared.

Mrs. Robarge, mother of four children ranging in age between 3 and 11, said:

"The Army told me Paul was missing in action after his jeep was overrun by the North Koreans the morning of July 14, 1953. He was returning from command headquarters with a ROK colonel, a radio man and his driver when the Communists opened fire. The radio operator escaped, but the jeep driver and the ROK colonel were both found dead later.

"There was no trace of Paul. After that, six officers in Paul's regiment told me they were certain he had been captured. Even an officer contacted by Syngman Rhee told me the same.

"A couple of months later, a friend of Paul's, another officer, was repatriated. He called me when he got back to the United States and asked how Paul was doing, saying he knew Paul was a prisoner and he assumed he had been released."

Mrs. Robarge said her husband would have observed his 35th birthday next month. He had been a member of the Regular Army since 1941. He served with the First Division during World War II and held the Purple Heart with Clusters, Silver Star with Clusters, Bronze Star with Clusters, the Infantry Combat Badge, and the Republic of Korea Distinguished Service Medal.

Harrold, citing Major Robarge's disappearance as typical of the fate of hundreds of technicians and specialists, demanded the Government reveal why it has kept the second list top secret.

He said congressional committees and his group have by the process of elimination broken down the category of men who are still missing, but never included in a Government missing-in-action list.

"We firmly believe they are being held by the Chinese Communists—not the North Koreans—as political prisoners and will never be released until we submit to direct negotiation with the Chinese Government that we do not now recognize," Harrold said.

Vocational Rehabilitation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL ELLIOTT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 17, 1954

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include in the record an article by Dr. M. D. Collins, State superintendent of schools, Atlanta, Ga., that was recently published in the Georgia Vocational Rehabilitation News.

Dr. Collins points out that although the expenditure of funds for the Federal-State rehabilitation program can be fully justified from the humanitarian standpoint alone, there are also dollars and cents advantages resulting from the program.

The article follows:

GOOD BUSINESS

(By Dr. M. D. Collins)

In the past 10 years nearly 29,000 handicapped men and women in Georgia have been rehabilitated through the services of our joint State-Federal program.

That's five times the number rehabilitated during the previous 23 years.

The people represented by the figures were victims of crippling diseases, accidents, and birth deformities. They were unable to pay for medical care, hospitalization and other services needed to restore them to lives of usefulness.

The expenditure of public funds to make them self-sufficient, I think, is fully justified from a humanitarian standpoint alone. But there's another side to it: the business angle.

These people were vocationally handicapped. Some were without work experience, education, or training. Others had lost their jobs because of their disabilities, and, most of them were dependent upon relatives or welfare agencies for support.

Those who required special training in schools, colleges, or business establishments received it, and afterward, were guided into suitable employment.

Records indicate that their average earnings the first year after rehabilitation were four times the cost of the services they received.

At the time of placement, they had many years of work expectancy.

Their earnings are going into trade channels and contributing to the prosperity of the communities in which they live.

Yes, rehabilitation, like other phases of education, doesn't cost—it pays.

It pays the individual who gets the service,

It pays their employers.

It pays the community, the State, and the Nation.

The Free World at the Crossroads

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 17, 1954

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me at Temple University, entitled "The Free World at the Crossroads":

President Johnson, members of the faculty, members of the graduating class, alumni, students, and friends of Temple University, it is indeed a great honor and privilege to be invited to speak at these commencement exercises. It is a far greater honor to be chosen to receive the honorary degree of doctor of humanitarian service and to be accepted into the fellowship of alumni of Temple University.

You who are being graduated today will find, I am sure, that your alma mater has equipped you well with all that any college or university can give its students of general knowledge and intellectual disciplines. If there is reason for concern regarding your generation, it is not regarding the excellence of your training in whatever has been your particular field of study; it is more likely to be with respect to the intelligence of your citizenship, and the depth and strength of your faith. For these must be of a higher order than my generation has demonstrated, or there may not long be a society in which you will have opportunity to use with success and satisfaction the knowledge and skills you have worked so long and hard to acquire here.

In a few moments, most of you will become bachelor of arts or of science. Some of you will become masters or doctors; others will go on to earn those degrees later. But before any of these, you are citizens. You are, or will be, parents and taxpayers. You are trustees of a great and noble heritage of freedom—trustees of a political and economic order which permitted even those of you who came from humblest circumstances, as did I, to get the expensive education which we could never have dreamed of obtaining in most countries of the world.

	Yes		No		No answer	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
1. Are you in favor of the United States continuing as a member of the United Nations?	3,218	67.0	1,436	29.9	150	3.1
2. Are you in favor of admitting China as a member of the United Nations?	604	12.6	3,949	82.2	251	5.2
3. Are you in favor of authorizing United States participation in construction of the St. Lawrence seaway?	4,150	86.4	436	9.1	218	4.5
4. Are you in favor of a 3-year extension of Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act with progressive 5-percent tariff reduction in each year, to permit easier entry of foreign goods?	2,049	42.7	2,376	49.5	379	7.8
5. Do you approve of the Republican foreign policy in general?	2,539	52.9	1,757	36.6	508	10.5
6. Do you favor trade with Communist China and Russia?	561	11.7	4,027	83.9	216	4.4
7. Do you favor further arms and military aid to foreign nations?	2,195	45.7	2,229	46.4	380	7.9
8. Do you favor continued economic aid (point 4 program) to nations for development of backward nations?	2,616	54.4	1,861	38.8	327	6.8
9. Do you approve the present prohibition of secondary boycotts under the Taft-Hartley law? (A secondary boycott is a boycott by a party not directly involved in a labor-management dispute.)	2,608	54.3	1,667	34.7	529	11.0
10. Do you favor retention of the fundamentals of Taft-Hartley law?	3,730	77.7	703	14.6	371	7.7
11. Do you agree with President Eisenhower's recommendations that the Taft-Hartley law should give employees right to vote on whether or not they should strike?	4,471	93.1	199	4.1	134	2.8
12. Do you agree that farm and other cooperatives should be taxed?	4,027	83.9	522	10.8	255	5.3
13. Do you favor continued support of basic farm products at 90 percent parity level?	836	17.4	3,552	74.0	416	8.6
14. Do you agree with President Eisenhower and Secretary Benson on their cut in dairy price supports by reducing parity to 75 percent?	3,970	82.7	481	10.0	353	7.3
15. Do you favor removal of restrictions on the amount of money earned by one receiving social-security benefits? (Under present law a person over 65 earning more than $75 per month loses his social-security benefits for that month.)	4,028	83.9	647	13.4	129	2.7
16. Are you in favor of President Eisenhower's recommendations to increase social security dollar benefits and to increase the number of people covered by the social security law?	3,955	82.3	642	13.4	207	4.3
17. Do you favor use and development of atomic energy by private industry in our own country?	4,152	86.5	469	9.8	183	3.7
18. Do you favor dismissing Government employees who invoke 5th amendment in order not to answer questions about Communist activities?	4,296	89.4	370	7.7	138	2.9
19. Do you favor allowing 18-year-olds to vote?	2,161	45.0	2,511	52.3	132	2.7
20. Do you approve the Eisenhower administration to date?	2,784	58.0	1,246	25.9	774	16.1
21. Are you in favor of the plan of gradually reducing income tax on corporate dividends?	2,595	54.0	1,822	37.9	387	8.1
22. Do you feel that business conditions and unemployment will materially influence your voting in November elections?	1,922	40.0	2,669	55.6	213	4.4
23. Do you favor an additional 35,000 public housing units in the coming fiscal year?	2,561	53.3	1,965	40.9	278	5.8
24. Do you think that Senator MCCARTHY's Senate committee should continue to reveal to the American people such Communist or subversive activities as it has already revealed?	3,620	75.4	918	19.1	266	5.5

Five of the questions on this year's survey are the same questions as the five that were asked in the 1953 survey. In order to bring out the changes in trend, I have set forth below for comparison the 1953 percentage results on these five questions:

	Percentage	
	Yes	No
14. Are you in favor of the United States continuing as a member of the United Nations?	64.1	35.9
15. Do you favor further arms and military aid to foreign nations?	44.7	55.3
16. Do you favor continued economic aid (point 4 program) to foreign nations for the development of backward nations?	43.3	56.7
21. Do you approve of the Republican foreign policy in general?	78.5	21.5
22. Do you approve of the Eisenhower administration to date?	84.2	15.8

It is to be noted that in the percentage of "yes" and "no" answers tabulated in the 1953 questionnaire just above, the "no" answers were not included in the percentage breakdown.

National Park Concessions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 17, 1954

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I insert at this point in the RECORD four resolutions which were adopted by the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee of the House on June 15, 1954, in compliance with the act of July 31, 1953—Public Law 172 (83d Cong., 67 Stat. 261).

The act of July 31, 1953, provides that the Secretary of the Interior shall report in detail all proposed awards of concession leases and contracts, including renewals thereof, 60 days before such awards are made, to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives for transmission to the appropriate committees.

Meeting in open session on June 15, 1954, the committee was apprised of no reason to disapprove the Secretary's recommendations on the four proposed concession awards covered by the following resolutions:

Whereas the act of July 31, 1953 (Public Law 172, 83d Cong., 67 Stat. 261), provides that the Secretary of the Interior shall report in detail all proposed awards of concession leases and contracts, including renewals thereof, 60 days before such awards are made, to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives for transmission to the appropriate committees; and

Whereas the Speaker has referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs a letter dated May 12, 1954, containing the recommendations of the Secretary of the Interior with regard to a proposed extension of contract No. I-1p-18029 which will, when executed by the Director of the National Park Service on behalf of the Government, extend for 1 year from January 1, 1954, unless sooner terminated by a new contract, the authorization under which Degnan, Donohoe, Inc., operates a restaurant, delicatessen, fountain, and bakery, and related services in Yosemite National Park, Calif., pursuant to the act of July 31, 1953 (67 Stat. 271); and

Whereas the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has, in session with a quorum present, this day found no reason to disapprove the recommendations of the Secretary of the Interior in this matter: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives give notice in writing to the Secretary of the Interior that it has no objection to his recommendations in this matter.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
A. L. MILLER, *Chairman*.

Adopted this 15th day of June 1954.

Whereas the act of July 31, 1953 (Public Law 172, 83d Cong., 67 Stat. 261), provides that the Secretary of the Interior shall report in detail all proposed awards of concession leases and contracts, including renewals thereof, 60 days before such awards are made, to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives for transmission to the appropriate committees; and

Whereas the Speaker has referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs a letter dated May 3, 1954, containing the recommendations of the Secretary of the Interior with regard to a proposed award of a concession permit to the Colorado Transportation Co. which will, when approved by the regional director, region No. 2, National Park Service, authorize the company to provide accommodations, facilities, and services for the public in Rocky Mountain National Park, Colo., for a period of 1 year from January 1, 1954, pursuant to the act of July 31, 1953 (67 Stat. 271); and

Whereas the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has, in session with a quorum present, this day found no reason to disapprove the recommendations of the Secretary of the Interior in this matter: now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives give notice in writing to the Secretary of the Interior that it has no objection to his recommendations in this matter.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
A. L. MILLER, *Chairman*.

Adopted this 15th day of June 1954.

Whereas the act of July 31, 1953 (Public Law 172, 83d Cong., 67 Stat. 261), provides that the Secretary of the Interior shall report in detail all proposed awards of concession leases and contracts, including renewals thereof, 60 days before such awards are made, to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives for transmission to the appropriate committees; and

Whereas the Speaker has referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs a letter dated April 30, 1954, containing the recommendations of the Secretary of the Interior with regard to a proposed award of a concession permit to St. Joseph's Hospital which will, when finally executed on behalf of the Government, authorize the hospital to obtain hot waters from Hot Springs National Park, Ark., sufficient to supply 10 tubs used in the St. Joseph's Hospital bathhouse, for a period of 10 years from January 1, 1954, pursuant to the act of July 31, 1953 (67 Stat. 271); and

Whereas the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has, in session with a quorum present, this day found no reason to disapprove the recommendations of the Secretary of the Interior in this matter: Now, therefore be, it

Resolved, That the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives give notice in writing to the Secretary of the Interior that it has no objection to his recommendations in this matter.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
A. L. MILLER, *Chairman*.

Adopted this 15th day of June 1954.

Whereas the act of July 31, 1953 (Public Law 172, 83d Cong., 67 Stat. 261), provides that the Secretary of the Interior shall report in detail all proposed awards of concession leases and contracts, including renewals thereof, 60 days before such awards are made, to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives for transmission to the appropriate committees; and

Whereas the Speaker has referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs a letter dated April 14, 1954, containing the recommendations of the Secretary of the Interior with regard to a proposed extension of contract No. I-700np-348, covering the period January 1, 1951, through December 31, 1955, which will, when executed by the Director of the National Park Service on behalf of the Government, extend for 8 years through December 31, 1963, the authorization under which the S. G. Loeffler Co. operates the National Capital Parks golf courses and related facilities, Washington, D. C.; and

Whereas the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has, in session with a quorum present, this day found no reason to disapprove the recommendations of the Secretary of the Interior in this matter: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives give notice in writing to the Secretary of the Interior that it has no objection to his recommendations in this matter.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
A. L. MILLER, *Chairman*.

Adopted this 15th day of June 1954.

Public Opinion Survey, 11th Illinois Congressional District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TIMOTHY P. SHEEHAN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 17, 1954

Mr. SHEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, each year since I have been in Congress I have conducted a public opinion survey among the people of the 11th Congressional District of Illinois, which is located on the northwest side of the city of Chicago. This year 29,900 questionnaires were sent out and 4,804 returns were tabulated. A scattering of approximately 200 more returns came in after the results were put together. The results represent a return of approximately 17 percent which, according to professional sampling averages, is a good response.

Every attempt was made to obtain an impartial distribution of these questionnaires. A questionnaire was sent to each of the 3,800 persons on my Newsletter mailing list, and the balance to people picked at random from every single voting precinct in the district, with no knowledge as to party affiliation or past voting record. It was felt this method would provide the most nearly perfect sample possible of the views of a representative cross section of the people in the 11th District.

As the representative of the people in the 11th Illinois District, it has been my political philosophy to speak to the Congress and to vote the issues before the Congress on the basis of representing the will of the majority of the people in my district, where that majority will is determined, and assuming, of course, the majority will is not contrary to the Constitution nor to the general welfare of the country. If in my conscience I believed the majority viewpoint to be contrary to either the Constitution or the welfare of the country as a whole, it would then be my duty to inform the people as to why I felt their judgment was not in accordance with these criteria. Thus far in my 4 years in Congress, I cannot recall a single instance where it has been necessary for me to depart from voting the majority will of my constituents, as made known to me.

The breakdown of the 4,804 replies tabulated is as follows:

> The civilization of which you and I are trustees is today in great peril. It is under attack on every continent. For the first time, I think, in man's existence on this planet, all cultures, all countries, all peoples are in turmoil and conflict at the same time.
>
> It is not an old-fashioned struggle for territory. It is a struggle for control of man.
>
> It is a struggle of arms, as is obvious to all.
>
> It is also a struggle of economic systems; which will crack up first?
>
> It is a conflict of educational systems; which will produce not only the smartest minds, but the toughest wills?
>
> It is a conflict of political and social systems; which will allow man to achieve the largest measure of the things he most desires, so that he will be willing to die if necessary in defense of the system?

It is a conflict of religious faiths; are there or are there not moral laws written into the fabric of the universe and the nature of man, which, like other natural laws, can be violated but not broken?

Like most wars, this worldwide cold war on all fronts has been a seesaw affairs for a long time. The free world has won a round here; the Communist world has won the next round there.

But, again like most wars, after a period of apparently indecisive maneuvering and attrition, one side or the other begins to gain the ascendancy; the opposing side begins to weaken and splinter. That is the moment of peril. Unless resolute action is taken to reverse the trend, it proceeds with rapidly increasing velocity.

I think we must admit that the free world is now approaching that crossroads. It cannot lose much more ground without beginning to disintegrate. The place where we have been losing alarmingly is in Asia.

When history is written, I suspect it will say that the greatest victory Stalin ever won was in the American mind: getting us to concentrate on Europe while he was working to get Asia. Not because he did not want Europe, but because conquest of Asia would be the cheapest and surest way to get Europe—and get it intact, with its great industrial workshop ready to use to produce the weapons and goods with which to destroy us, instead of in useless rubble as it would be if the Soviets had to attack it.

We gave our first attention to the war that might be—in Europe; while the Kremlin gave its attention to the war that was—in Asia.

As a result, all the gains we have made in Europe since the war are jeopardized by the losses we sustained in Asia, largely because we refused to see its importance. For example, the weakest spot in Europe is France. But it is not because of threats to her in Europe, it is because of the exhaustion and defeatism resulting from her long struggle in Indochina against Communist subversion and aggression, disguised as nationalism.

The Communists could not have put such a drain on France in Indochina without the Communist conquest of China—just as the Korean war could not have been without the Communist occupation of Manchuria, arranged by ourselves, and the conquest of China which inevitably resulted.

But as Stalin's greatest victory was in our minds, so his greatest mistake was to start the Korean war. The free world, by heroic effort in Korea, was on the verge of retrieving ground previously lost in Asia, victory was in its grasp, when the Kremlin, through Mr. Malik, proposed a cease fire. There were many who warned that a true proposal by Communists is not an effort to get peace, but a military tactic. It is a move not to end a war, but to win the war. The Chinese had learned that through three painful experiences with Communist truces between 1927 and 1947. But we would not listen to the Chinese.

The Communists could not win among the Koreans, because the Koreans had tasted freedom and had the will to defend it. So the Reds proposed a truce in Korea in order to shift to Indochina, because that was the weakest spot in Asia. It was the one country where the people had not yet been given their full freedom. And only for such a cause as their own freedom will people make the heroic effort necessary to win this kind of a struggle. Our evaluation of the crisis in Indochina must be based not on the fate of a French colony, but on its significance for the whole world struggle.

Today one-third of the people of the world are associated together as the free world, led, but not controlled by, the United States. That free world is locked in a titanic conflict with another one-third of the world's population totally controlled by the Kremlin.

Who holds the balance of power? The other one-third.

Where do they live? In the 12 countries constituting a series of peninsulas and island groups lying around China as a giant crescent from Korea to Iran.

Which way are these almost 800 million people to go—with the free world or with the Kremlin? This can be the most important question of the 20th century. This is where the free world must pull itself together, quickly, and be as alert, united, and determined as the Communist world; or be prepared to go down like a house of cards.

What are the overall prospects in this Asian third of the world, still on the fence?

The chief impressions gained from 2 trips to these 12 countries within a year are as follows:

1. Most of their people and leaders are now awake to the nature and objectives of the Communist world conspiracy. One unadulterated benefit of the war in Korea is that it tied down the Communist forces there for 3 years during which the truth about what communism had done to people in China became known to the rest of Asia, through the Chinese refugees and Communist POW's in Korea. The agrarian reformer myth is ended in Asia, if still, unfortunately, popping up occasionally in England and America.

2. The peoples of free Asia today fear communism instead of half-welcoming it on the basis of its promised utopia, as they might have done 4 years ago. They now know Communist conquest would mean the end of the precious freedom from foreign control which they have won so recently and at such great cost.

3. Most of them want to be on the side of the United States and the free world. They realize that offers the best chance for them to retain their national independence.

4. But they hesitate to take an open stand for the free world because they are uncertain as to the clarity and constancy of its purpose and policy with respect to them. They are afraid that if the Kremlin were to offer to the West, at Geneva or elsewhere, some sort of package settlement which would appear to give the white peoples peace and security, we in the West might accept it—at the expense of the territory, rights, and freedom of the nonwhite peoples of Asia. They do not forget Yalta.

This is the main reason for their neutralism. We cannot expect them to take a firm stand on our side unless and until we make it clear to them that if they do we will not let them down.

5. They know this planet cannot exist half slave and half free. They know they do not have the strength to determine the outcome. They know the free world does have the strength; but that it does not yet have the will or the unity—because it still does not really believe its own survival is at stake.

Many in Asia, especially in Korea, Japan, Formosa, and the Philippines, believe that, if the free world wins the war for Asia, there will not be a war for the world; but that if it does not win the war for Asia, there will be a war for the world and the odds will be against the free world's winning it. I concur in those views.

What can be done to start winning the war for Asia, or at least to stop losing it?

1. We must recognize that the Communist objective in Asia is the same as everywhere else, to weaken the free world, and especially to isolate and destroy the United States which is all that now stands between the Kremlin and total world conquest.

2. We must understand that a world war is not the most immediate danger. The first stage in the Communist program is always to subvert the weak, mostly in Asia. The second is to confuse and divide the strong, mostly in Europe. All-out war becomes advantageous to them only as the final knockout blow.

3. We must keep ourselves and our allies as strong and united as possible. At the same time we must try to help the weak become stronger and better fed and freer in order to enable them to resist internal subversion by the Reds.

4. We must prevent our enemies from gaining greater strength. We must not let the Reds win any more diplomatic victories. Admission of Communist China to the United Nations would be the greatest possible diplomatic victory. Free Asia will crumble once it becomes convinced the Communists are going to win. Admission to the U. N. would mean to Asia, and should mean to us, that the Reds have already won.

5. We must not let the Reds win any more economic victories. That means we must resist resumption of trade with them. If they are not our enemies, why do we draft and arm men to be ready to fight them? If they are our enemies, how can anyone suggest we help them become stronger?

6. We must not let the Communists win any more political victories. For America to intervene alone in Indochina, for example, would be a political victory for the Reds. It would enable them to convince millions in Asia not that we are helping orientals to defend their own freedom, but that we are helping defend European colonialism, which the people who have been under it hate worse than they hate the Communist imperialism which they have not been under.

7. We must not let the Communists win any more military victories. We must strive to create the Pacific Pact which the United States Congress called for in 1949—an alliance of the free nations of southeast Asia and the Pacific to resist further Communist expansion. The Asian peoples will join such a pact only if they know it is for their own freedom. They will not believe it is for their freedom unless the alliance has as its nucleus genuinely independent Asian and Pacific nations (of which the United States is one) which the European powers support; rather an alliance of western nations which the people of Asia are supposed to support.

8. We must recognize that we cannot achieve real security in Asia until the forces of freedom succeed in weakening, loosening, and eventually breaking, the hold of the Communist regime in China. To break that regime would immediately remove the danger to the rest of east and south Asia. Until Communist China is broken, no measures to save those areas are likely to have lasting success.

9. We must give greater encouragement and assistance to the free Chinese on Formosa to enable them to maintain that strategic island as a symbol of national freedom, a constant threat to the Communists' flank, and a base for smuggling agents and suitable supplies to the China mainland in order to keep hope alive and to enable the resistance forces to do to the Reds exactly what the Reds did to the Nationalists—destroy communications, isolate the cities, disrupt the economy. That is, when the Chinese Communists are in trouble at home, we must do all we can to keep them in trouble, not help them out of it.

10. We must recognize that the most important ally of all, because the most dependable, and the one in a position to do the enemy most damage, is the nearly 800 million oppressed peoples behind the Iron Curtain who know Communist tyranny for what it is and silently resist it. We must not betray their hopes or weaken their resolve or undercut their position by any act that would increase the strength or influence or prestige of Communists anywhere.

When there is already such determined opposition behind the Iron Curtain as was demonstrated by the revolt in East Germany just a year ago today, and by the refusal of Chinese prisoners of war in Korea to return even to their homes and families as long as they are in a China enslaved by the Communists, there is reason for great hope, not despair—if we in the free world will prove steadfast.

In the last analysis the decision we must make on this issue is a moral decision. Shall we put our faith for the future in millions of people? Or in deals with a handful of tyrants?

In the oppressed? Or in their oppressors?

What are the prospects for such an American policy? I believe they are good. Whether there still is time, or whether it is already too late to halt and reverse the Kremlin's relentless march of the last decade remains to be seen. Here are some indications:

1. Our Government, too, is becoming more aware of the nature and methods of the Communist world conspiracy. So it is demanding deeds, not words from Communist governments. For without deeds, words are useless. We do not intend to be party to any new Munich or Yalta.

Some are calling the Geneva Conference a failure. But history may regard it as one of the few conferences that we did not lose. At least, we have not yet given away anything that belonged to someone else, in order to get a worthless piece of paper to wave as pitiful evidence of supposed success.

2. Our Government is now aware that this planet is one strategic area, so there is more balanced attention to Asia and Europe. Witness the new Joint Chiefs of Staff—all experts on Asia, for the first time in our history. The illusion that we can keep Europe free without a free Asia is ended. The illusion that we can keep the rest of Asia free without a free China will have to be ended, too.

3. Our Government is aware that effective resistance to the Communist threat in Asia just now is more a military than an economic matter. The Reds have never been able to seize a single country, beginning with Russia itself, except by force of arms. Hence there is more emphasis on military aid to countries with the will to use it than on general economic aid to those without such a will.

4. Our Government is aware that in dealing with this enemy, our best military weapon, both to prevent a world war, or to win such a war if the Reds start it, is not local resistance around the periphery of the satellites, but the capacity to destroy the centers and bases which supply and control the satellites. Hence there is more emphasis on air and sea where we are strongest and can best get at the real enemy, if he insists on war; and less emphasis on land where he is strongest and we can do him least damage. What he has most of is boys; what we have fewest of is boys. Therefore, we are not going to permit the main conflict to be one of boys.

5. Our Government is increasingly aware that our strongest ally in this struggle for survival is the peoples behind the curtain. The best way to influence our enemies is to stand steadfastly by our friends, especially those who are already fighting the enemy from within and may make it unnecessary for the rest of us to fight it from without.

The achieving of a world of freedom and peace depends upon our understanding more deeply than we have the principles on which our own Nation was founded and grew great. I believe that the system of government by voluntary federation under law which our fathers established here represents the best set of political ideas ever put together in one place in the world's history. I think they are the hope of mankind. Our task is to make them work better than we have here at home, and help them spread throughout the world—with all our hearts and souls, as well as with our minds.

Commencement is a day of judgment on yesterday—and the judgment is good, else you would not be here.

But commencement is also a day of decision for tomorrow. No generation can live by defending its past. It must win the future. This will be the most crucial test of your education. I am confident that you will make good.

June 17, 1953

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VERA BUCHANAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 17, 1954

Mrs. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following editorial from the June 16 issue of the Christian Science Monitor:

JUNE 17, 1953

A year ago an almost unbelievable event took place in East Berlin. Enslaved men rose and with their bare hands shook the foundations of Communist power.

The flame of freedom, long hidden in tired, dispirited hearts, blazed up in sudden revolt, and the fire ran swiftly through the ruined streets and flung its sparks to distant cities, where the factories emptied and East German workers stormed the citadels of Communist power and tore down the emblems of Communist deception.

In Berlin's Potsdamerplatz packed, tense thousands of West Berliners stood on the "free" side of the square and watched the swirling torrent of workers in the Soviet sector battle the Communist "people's police." With tears streaming down her cheeks, one woman said simply, "This is the first time I have seen my own people dare to oppose tyranny."

There was double significance in the fact. This was a workers' revolt against a regime that declared itself to be based on the will and the welfare of the workers. And it was a German revolt against a government that claimed to speak for the real Germany.

When Soviet tanks rumbled through the streets and by nightfall brought to East Berlin and the other turbulent cities an ominous order and quiet, both these Communist myths were reduced to rubble. The Red flag might be hoisted again over the Brandenburg Gate, but no free person could believe any longer that it rested on anything more than the armed might of the Soviet Union. And in every land where the Red flag flies, the rulers and puppet rulers knew what was really in the hearts of their grim-faced workers.

Yet those workers learned also that the West could do nothing directly to help them. The fine talk of liberation could not put guns in their hands. For to do so at that time would be to invite the global atomic war that could mean defeat even for the victors. Liberation must be thought of in slower, more deeply trusting terms, in terms of endless patience and pressure and transformation from within.

There are some—too many—in East Germany today who say: "War is our only hope of deliverance now." But they are wrong. The chief hope lies in their keeping alive the flame of spiritual faith in their own hearts.

It is easy enough for those who live in the freedom of the West to say this; it is easy even for many in West Germany to forget the plight of their brothers in the East and think only of the booming prosperity in their own Federal Republic. Berlin, that symbolic island where the two worlds face each other in daily challenge, has always been an embarrassment to those in West Germany and in the free world at large who would talk big and do nothing about Soviet tyranny.

Yet the fact remains that the problem of liberation is basically a spiritual one, not to be identified with the problem of military defense. No despotism can permanently withstand the transforming power of a liberated faith. It is for the West to support this faith with an increasing demonstration of its own highest values. Then June 17 will be seen not as a tragic failure but as a heroic promise of victories to come.

H. R. 9020

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1954

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from Mr. John U. Shroyer, commander in chief, United Spanish War Veterans:

UNITED SPANISH WAR VETERANS,
Washington, D. C., June 11, 1954.

Hon. LEON H. GAVIN,
United States Congressman,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN GAVIN: I have before me a copy of amended H. R. 9020, dated May 28, 1954, and note that section 13 (c), will strike off the pension rolls all remarried widows of the Civil War and the war with Spain, the China Relief Expedition, and the Philippine Insurrection.

It has been called to my attention that some of these widows are over 80 years of age. When the law to give them pension was passed they were of the opinion that it was perfectly proper and legal for them to remarry, and if their second husband died, to be again placed on the pension rolls. They did this in good faith.

Now, at their age, where can they go? On the relief rolls, the poorhouse, or other charities.

Our organization does not know how many widows will be affected, and we have no way of ascertaining the number. However, from a hurried survey we are of the opinion that the number will not exceed 10,000, if that many.

Our organization cannot be a party to such a cruel amendment, as we could not accept any increase in our pensions and then throw these elderly widows on relief rolls, when so many people in America are now receiving much more public assistance than our widows are receiving in pensions. Then again, when America is sending so many billions of dollars overseas to create good will, to break the faith with a few thousand war widows would be deplorable.

We offer this as a suggestion. Keep our widows (remarried) on the rolls as are. Amend the law if and when H. R. 9020 is enacted, the widow who remarries after the enactment will be forever taken from the pension rolls.

As an evidence of good faith, we also wish to advise that the $3.25 that the bill proposes to give to the men, be stricken off.

Take the money that you save on this proposed increase for the men, and give it to the widows who will be stricken off the rolls under the provision of (c) section 13.

It might interest you to learn that during the month of April 1954 that 650 Spanish War Veterans died, leaving a total of 67,229 Spanish War veterans on the pension rolls. The total number that served from 1898 to 1902 was 458,161, according to the best statistics available to us today.

At the outset of 1954 our organization asked for an increase to $60 for our widows. They were receiving $51.60, and the average age was 73 years.

We did not ask for anything for our men. In your generosity you voted to give our men an increase of $3.25 per month and the widows an increase of $6.40 per month.

Our request is that you delete the $3.25 per month and leave it at $96.75. If you grant our prayer it will save the Government over $2 million. Taking into consideration that our men are passing to their last reward at the rate of approximately 6,500 to 7,000 per year, you can readily see that the Government will save approximately $7 million per year.

According to the VA, 650 of our men died during April 1954.

Praying that you will heed our plea and save these poor old souls from want,

We ask this in all sincerity.

John U. Shroyer,
Commander in Chief,
United Spanish War Veterans.

Don't Underestimate Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 17, 1954

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following editorial from the Chelsea Record, Chelsea, Mass., June 15, 1954:

Soviet Challenge

The United States had better revise its estimate of the intelligence of the Russian people. It is becoming increasingly evident that the Russians are not so ignorant and so uneducated as many Americans have complacently assumed.

It is becoming apparent that Soviet science, especially in the field of military applications, constitutes a real challenge to the United States. The Russians are known to have produced planes like our huge jet-powered B–52 and B–47 medium jet bomber. Furthermore, it is possible that Soviet research in long-range guided missiles has outstripped ours. These accomplishments cannot be attributed to spies.

The scope of this challenge to the United States can be seen in the authoritative estimate made recently in Washington that within a few years the Soviet Union will be turning out more engineers and natural scientists with doctor of philosophy degrees than will this country. In fact, Dr. Alan T. Waterman, director of the National Science Foundation, told Congress a year ago that by 1955 the U. S. S. R. would be producing 50,000 engineers annually, compared to 17,000 in this country.

Making the picture more dismal is the fact that the number of American science teachers is on the decline, and many of the present college and high school teachers are resigning for higher-paid jobs in industry. Obviously, there is reason for concern.

This challenge can be met by strengthening the American school system, first by relieving the existing shortage of 350,000 classrooms, second, by making the teaching profession more attractive, and finally by acknowledging that education, now often regarded as an unimportant luxury, is really important to the security of the United States.

Resolution Adopted by the Erie Conference of the Methodist Church

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEON H. GAVIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 17, 1954

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, I include a resolution adopted by the Erie Conference of the Methodist Church:

Timely and Pointed Amendment and Resolutions to the Report of the Committee on Peace Adopted by the Erie Conference

The Erie Conference of the Methodist Church which represents approximately 80,000 members, in this, its 1954 session unanimously adopted the following resolutions provided by Dr. Wallace C. Calvert, of Trinity Church, Oil City, Pa., as amendments to the report of the Committee on World Peace on Thursday afternoon.

"*Be it resolved,* That we commend the policies of the national administration announced early this year, and now in process of implementation by the Defense Department, of a reduction in armament consistent with the adequate defense of our Nation; which also bypasses universal military training; be it also

"*Resolved,* That we would respectfully call the President, his Cabinet, our State Department, and our Department of Defense to ponder and consider carefully any proposal to send our American citizens to war in foreign lands that would place them as soldiers defending a policy irreconcilable with our concepts of democracy, with the four freedoms of the Atlantic Charter, and with our standards of liberty, equality, and justice; and be it

"*Resolved,* That we urge all Methodists and other Americans to be on guard against any propaganda to create a war psychology and thereby condition our Nation's thinking toward war; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That the Erie Conference of the Methodist Church, which represents approximately 80,000 in this its 1954 session, convey through its secretary to the Congressmen and to the United States Senators who represent us our interest in settling differences with other nations by negotiations utilizing as far as possible the United Nations. And that a copy of these resolutions be sent to all the Congressmen and the United States Senators representing the entire area to which this conference extends—and also to the Department of State, the Department of Defense, and to the President of these United States."

Interviewed after the session on matters with which the adopted report dealt, Dr. Calvert, pastor of the Trinity Methodist Church, Oil City, Pa., commented: That there is now a definite and planned program on in this Nation to create another war psychology. That pronouncements of various leaders in Government have been timed and planned to help condition the thinking of our Nation toward war again.

Remarks in Part of Hon. Philip J. Philbin, of Massachusetts, Convention Banquet, Utility Workers of New England, Boston, June 10, 1954

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 17, 1954

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following statement:

Speaking before the convention banquet of the Utility Workers of New England at Boston last night, Congressman Philip J. Philbin, of Clinton, warned that it would be extreme folly for Americans to underestimate the gravity of the present international situation and the growing peril to our security and freedom.

"There are those," said Philbin, "who take a soft, tolerant position toward world communism and scoff at Communist activities in general. In the light of the evidence before our very eyes this attitude is most unrealistic because the strength of communism is growing day by day and the Communist movement is ruthlessly spreading its tentacles and roots into virtually every nation.

"The American people must avoid useless emotionalism, but at the same time we must most carefully appraise the dangers and speedily move to protect ourselves, not only against serious threats to the national security, but against the further inroads of organized Communist activity.

"It has now become clear that the end of the fighting in Korea was merely an armistice in one theater of the Communist campaign to overrun Asia. This Nation should ponder well the consequences before we send American boys into Indochina to fight and die for causes that do not affect the security of the United States."

Referring to the threat posed by atomic and hydrogen substances Philbin said:

"Modern science has created these substances and they should be used for constructive peacetime purposes," he said. "However," he continued, "make no mistake about the fact that they may also be used in warfare. That is one of the horrible realities of present day life. It would normally be the most cogent reason for pursuing world peace with sincerity and determination. The difficulty is that our own persistent and oft-repeated peace overtures fall upon deaf ears and the Soviet instead of honestly striving for world peace, is intensifying Red imperialistic aggression and also feverishly continuing its carefully designed infiltration of free nations."

Until peace proposals are taken seriously by the Soviet, there is no course we can wisely follow except to build the necessary armed strength as well as economic, productive strength which will enable us to set up an impregnable defense against aggression and prepare us to cope with every contingency that develops in the world. Our advances in scientific weapons and our commanding air power coupled with balanced armed services will furnish the best possible guarantee against aggression and attack.

Moreover, we must make determined efforts to reinvigorate our spiritual and patriotic motivations which are the very basis of our free Government and free institutions.

"More than ever, even as we strive for order, prosperity and peace, we must embrace the great constitutional safeguards which protect our civil liberties and keep together all our people as Americans without regard to race, class, creed, or station. In this way we will eliminate the insidious influences working so desperately to develop internal divisions and conflicts among us and, by standing for social justice and toleration for all our fellow citizens, to secure that invincible unity of purpose and action so necessary to guard the Nation in these troubled times against the spectres of economic depression and armed aggression. Thus we will preserve our precious way of life and in the end, God willing, find the sure pathway to security and peace."

PHILBIN complimented the group for its notable leadership in fostering labor policies based upon goodwill, mutual trust, and cooperation. "Your marked success during 19 years of collective bargaining in preventing strikes and other work stoppages is a great tribute to the wisdom of your leadership and the loyalty, patriotism, and cooperative spirit of your members," he said.

New York Times Comments on Legislation Providing for 24-Hour Quarantine Inspection Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 14, 1954

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, the New York Times, on Sunday, June 13, 1954, published an article regarding the round-the-clock quarantine inspection service as provided in H. R. 6253, favorably reported by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. This article, which is very timely and significant, is as follows:

HOUSE BILL SPEEDS SHIP INSPECTIONS

Found-the-clock inspection of ships at quarantine, long sought by the shipping industry, moved a step closer to realization last week as the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of the House reported favorably on a bill that would provide the service.

United States Public Health officers, charged with the ship examinations, now work only between 6 a. m. and 6 p. m. Vessels arriving later are forced to wait for clearance until the next day, a requirement that shipowners say costs the industry hundreds of thousands of dollars annually.

The measure calling for 24-hour inspection was introduced by Representative THOMAS M. PELLY, Republican, of Washington. It would provide for the examinations through the payment of overtime compensation to Public Health officers at the expense of the shipping companies asking for out-of-hours service.

Under the proposed legislation the officers would work between 8 a. m. and 5 p. m. 6 days a week, with overtime being paid after 5 p. m., and on Sundays and holidays. The overtime would consist of a half-day's basic pay for each 2 hours of out-of-hours work on a weekday and double time for Sunday and holiday work.

The favorable action of the committee was hailed by William F. Giesen, manager and counsel of the Maritime Association of the Port of New York, an organization of 1,400 members and companies engaged in every phase of the port's shipping activities.

Mr. Giesen said that 40 percent of the shipping entering the port in a normal day arrived after 6 p. m. and was forced to lie idle until the next day. The owners feel, he said, that the overtime costs involved in the 24-hour service would be small compared to the expense of long delays.

The American Merchant Marine Institute, which represents a large group of tanker and dry-cargo shipowners, also expressed approval of the committee's action. Tanker operators will be especially benefited if the legislation is enacted. These vessels can unload their oil cargoes in less than 24 hours and sail again for another cargo. Quarantine delays are not only expensive but they disrupt tight operating schedules.

The Terrible 12 of Capitol Hill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEO E. ALLEN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 17, 1954

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, this week's issue of the Saturday Evening Post, a magazine of great national prominence and wide circulation, carries an article on which I have made the following comments over the radio. I insert my comments in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that those of the Congress, and others who may read the article, may have my reactions:

There is no doubt that today we Americans, as a group, are the most literate and best-educated, best-informed people on the face of the earth. That is no mere cliche—nor is it a happenstance. It did not come about just because we wished it so. It is the result of many years of hard work; it is the result of farsightedness and years of objective planning by thousands of diligent men and women.

Without detracting even one iota from the outstanding accomplishments and objectives of our schools and other institutions of learning, I believe that much credit must be directed to our press and radio and television, particularly to the broad field of the press, which encompasses the daily and weekly newspapers as well as the magazines and other publications and periodicals which have pioneered in the dedicated task of bringing news and truth and knowledge to the people of our great Nation.

The printed word is ever available to all of us—rich, poor, young, and old. We pick up a copy of almost any one of the thousands of periodicals published today, and almost without exception we can be assured of well-written, factual, informative articles, and news stories.

Today many of our periodicals and newspapers have a well-established editorial policy of regularly publishing material that could—and I might add often does—meet textbook standards of our secondary and undergraduate schools. Regularly we read intelligent interpretations and explanations of foreign and domestic problems; articles on atomic development; articles on medical progress and discoveries; almost any one of the thousands-and-more-subjects of interest to any and all of us. Typical of the reading matter so generally available to us today is the article the Terrible Twelve of Capitol Hill, which appears in the June 19, 1954, issue of the Saturday Evening Post. I cite this particular article because it treats with a subject with which I am in intimate and daily contact—the Rules Committee of the United States House of Representatives, of which I have the great honor and privilege of being chairman. I trust that publishers and editors will long continue their laudable policy of bringing truth and knowledge to our people.

American Investments in Latin America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, June 17, 1954

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, in our tendency to be preoccupied with affairs in Europe and Asia, many Americans have lost sight of the fact that the Republics to the south and our great neighbor to the north have emerged to vital new positions in the family of nations.

From every standpoint—economic, political, cultural, military, psychological—we of the United States should devote far more attention to our friends in the hemisphere than we have tended to, in times past.

Therefore, I was interested to note a Department of Commerce release on the enormous amount of American investment and income in Latin America.

The countries to the south have not only become in many instances splendid fields for investment, but they have become most excellent, customers and, in turn, they naturally seek increased sales in the United States market.

It is a fact that some areas of Latin America are still plagued by a hostile or suspicious attitude toward foreign capital. Such a climate of opinion has prevented and limited American investments, but fortunately, a recognition is growing of the need for mutuality of treatment—the need for a friendly economic climate on both sides of the street, so to speak.

Vast new frontiers are ahead for Latin America. Populations are mounting. The standards of living are rising. There is every reason for strong inter-American cooperation.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the Department of Commerce press release be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the Department of Commerce press release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN DIRECT INVESTMENTS IN LATIN AMERICA, $5.7 BILLION IN 1952

American direct investments in Latin American Republics more than doubled from 1943 to the end of 1952, reaching a value of $5.7 billion at the end of last year, according to recently completed estimates of the Office of Business Economics, United States Department of Commerce. This represents a substantial increase over the $4.7 billion reported in the census taken by OBE as of the end of 1950.

Latin America was the first area to attract United States investors and leads all other areas by a substantial margin—the 1950 total reported in the census represents 40 percent of total direct investments abroad. There have been significant shifts, however, in the position of individual countries within that area. In 1929, for instance, the leading countries were Cuba ($919 million), Mexico ($682 million), Chile ($423 million), and Argentina ($332 million). By the end of 1950, however, United States investments in Cuba and Mexico had a lower value; although they were still substantial, investments in Argentina were about the same, and investments in Chile had increased about 25 percent to $540 million.

The most outstanding increases in the period, however, were registered by Venezuela and Brazil. Venezuela jumped from $232 million in 1929 to become the leading Latin-American country for United States direct investments with a total of $993 million at the end of 1950. Meanwhile investments in Brazil were expanded from $194 million in 1929 to the second-place position with $644 million in 1950.

Petroleum investments led all other industries in Latin America, accounting for $1.4 billion out of the $4.7 billion invested in 1950. Investments in other major industries in Latin America included public utilities ($1 billion), manufacturing ($0.8 billion), mining and smelting ($0.6 billion), and agriculture ($0.5 billion). In both mining and agriculture the value of United States investments increased since the war but by the end of 1950 had not regained the 1929 level. Petroleum investments were about $600 million in 1929 and about the same in 1943, and then more than doubled to the $1.4 billion total of 1950. Percentagewise manufacturing enterprises scored the steepest increase over the whole period, rising from $231 million for Latin America in 1929 to $780 million in 1950.

While 90 percent of the petroleum investment in the Latin American Republics is concentrated in Venezuela, Brazil, and Colombia, and the tanker fleet registered in Panama, manufacturing investments are more evenly distributed. There are three outstanding countries for manufacturing investment—Brazil, Argentina, and Mexico—with investments aggregating $575 million. There are 5 other Latin American Republics in which United States manufacturing investments were over $20 million at the end of 1950.

The largest manufacturing investment in Latin America is in chemicals and allied products, and this subgroup had also the fastest growth. Food processing ranked next, followed by motor vehicles and equipment, electrical machinery and supplies, and rubber products.

Latin America has attracted all but a small part of direct investments abroad in agriculture and public utilities. Investments in Latin-American agriculture were valued at $520 million in the new OBE census, nearly 90 percent of the world total, and were located very largely in the countries bordering the Caribbean. Investments in public utilities in this area were valued at about $1 billion, about 70 percent of the world total. Over $500 million was in electric light, power, and gas; $186 million in railroads; and $146 million in water transportation (not including tanker fleets owned by petroleum companies).

Reports submitted in the Commerce census showed American controlling interests in about 2,000 enterprises in Latin America, of which about 1,200 were foreign corporations and 800 were direct branches of United States companies. The foreign corporations were valued at $2.6 billion at the end of 1950 and the branches at $2.1 billion. Over one-third of all foreign branches were in this area, and they accounted for two-thirds of the value of all foreign branches.

Total assets employed by United States direct investment companies in Latin America in 1950 amounted to $7.4 billion. Of this total, $4.7 billion represented the equity of American investors, $0.3 billion was invested by foreigners in securities of the companies, and liabilities of the companies, mainly to local creditors, were $2.4 billion.

In 1950, the direct investment enterprises earned $905 million in Latin America, before foreign income taxes. Foreign income taxes on this total were $250 million, and the foreign owners' share was about $40 million, so that the net amount accruing to Americans on their investment of $4.7 billion was about $615 million. Over $100 million of the earnings of the foreign incorporated companies was retained in Latin America, so that the sum of dividends and branch profits received by Americans, after deducting some foreign withholding taxes, was about $500 million. This remainder was still subject to the United States income tax but the tax liability was reduced by the special tax allowances for United States corporations operating in this area.

Of the $615 million earned in Latin America in 1950, Venezuela led with $232 million, followed by Brazil ($96 million), Cuba ($56 million), Mexico ($43 million), and Chile ($37 million). Earnings of over $15 million were reported for 6 other countries in Latin America.

These and other facts about investments in Latin America are presented in the complete census of United States direct investments throughout the world soon to be published by the Office of Business Economics, United States Department of Commerce, as a foreign investments supplement to the Survey of Current Business.

Tenth Anniversary of the Republic of Iceland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARROLL D. KEARNS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 17, 1954

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following statement on the occasion of the tenth anniversary of the Republic of Iceland:

Today, a sister republic of ours, at once the smallest in population and the oldest in parliamentary government, celebrates its 10th anniversary. On June 17, 1944, the Republic of Iceland came into being, then as now, an ally and firm friend of the United States.

It is appropriate that we pay tribute on this day to the people of Iceland and to their new republic, whose lineage can however be traced to the year 930, when the National Parliament of Iceland was established on the plain at Thingvellir.

I have an especial interest in calling attention to this anniversary, since I had the privilege of visiting Iceland earlier this year with the United States Air Force Symphony Orchestra. I experienced the warm hospitality and friendship of the Icelandic people.

We are fortunate to have the friendship of this stalwart people, and the partnership of Iceland with us in NATO should be a source of pride and gratification to us all.

It is with great pleasure that on this occasion I join the many American friends of Iceland in saluting the Republic of Iceland and its people, and in extending to them and their nation our best wishes for the future.

House Resolution 407

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT W. CRETELLA

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 17, 1954

Mr. CRETELLA. Mr. Speaker, our colleague, the Honorable William H. Ayres, recently polled the Members asking their views on House Resolution 407. He has informed me that there does not seem to be any serious opposition to the resolution.

I attempt to get the views of my constituents on problems affecting them. On receipt of Mr. Ayres' inquiry I contacted Mr. Daniel J. Adley, of New Haven, Conn., who is treasurer of the Adley Express Co. In my judgment his reply to me pinpoints the problem and shows the need for the adoption of House Resolution 407.

His letter is printed below:

The Adley Express Co.,
New Haven, Conn., June 14, 1954.

The Honorable Albert W. Cretella,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Al: Thank you very much for your letter of June 7, 1954, enclosing the resolution of Congressman William H. Ayres.

There has been a gradual trend closing in all about us to stifle motor transportation. A pending case against the eastern railroads by the truckers in Pennsylvania has brought out some rather revealing techniques on the part of those who would foster restrictive legislation in the various States to the detriment of their competitors. Nevertheless, the fact remains that various States, including Ohio, have imposed some very drastic legislation. This ton-mile tax or axle-mile tax is in addition to all other taxes and I can assure you that anyone who operates in the transportation business in any State runs into so many taxes that the most astute lawyer cannot keep up with them.

Virginia does not have an axle-mile tax as this was defeated in the last term of their legislature, but they do have a gross receipts tax, a gasoline road tax, a diesel-fuel tax, a State income tax, a personal-property tax, real-property taxes, ridiculously low weight laws and just about every place we turn we have additional taxes to pay.

Part of the difficulty, in addition to the multiple taxes imposed, is the clerical work involved in such a labyrinth of tax structures. Instead of these taxes being based upon a simple formula, they are usually so complicated that the accounting and clerical time involved is sometimes more costly than the tax. Then the various States have auditors who come into your companies and take up the time of the accounting departments while they make an audit of some tax base which is imposed. If the company does not maintain an office in the particular State for the specific purpose of maintaining the records on that particular tax, for the States audits, the company has to pay the expense of the auditor to come to its headquarters office.

We have had experience with the New York axle-mile tax and, although we only go through New York State a little more than 22 miles, the bookkeeping work is tremendous. The so-called New York ton-mile tax maintains certain weight standards, but then the New York motor-vehicle laws, which have just been revised, incidentally, maintain a different structure of weight limitations, and you can believe me when I say that it is almost impossible to comply with the laws. I have heard that the administration of the New York ton-mile-tax law costs a large percentage of the income derived therefrom and any night one can see a long line of trucks waiting to be checked in through the scales at Port Chester, N. Y., creating delay, traffic hazards, increased expenses, and arrest if the very complicated ton-mile-tax regulations are not complied with, registrations properly displayed, and all other requirements complied with. If, under the motor-vehicle laws, one of the axles is slightly overweight, even though the gross weight was not exceeded, the driver would be arrested, forced to post bond, forced to have legal talent defend him at a trial, and is usually fined because the course of justice in this type of case is just the reverse of our ordinary conception that one is innocent until proven guilty. You can believe me again when I say that the reverse is true in these types of cases.

You can see that when a company operates as many vehicles over the road per night as we do, it is not economical for us to overload or to violate the law. We have a terminal at Trenton, for instance, and are having a terrible time trying to get our employees to load the vehicles in the proper delicate balance to comply with the New York laws. At any rate, it is a messy situation created mainly as a barrier for the trucking industry, putting additional employees upon State payrolls and creating additional clerical work, loss of time, and all of the other factors detrimental to the trucking industry. Of course, we cannot prove that it encourages graft, but you can readily see that such a situation is conducive to it.

I wish I could take you on a mythical trip from our Cambridge terminal, in which we recently invested a million dollars, to our terminal at Norfolk, Va. Of course, I first have to mention that we have paid personal property taxes on the equipment at the Cambridge terminal, real property taxes, motor vehicle registration fees, sales taxes, etc. We then start with a shipment in the State of Massachusetts. We pay a net income tax to the State of Massachusetts which is computed on a formula of the number of miles traveled in Massachusetts to the total number of miles traveled by all our vehicles over the eastern seaboard to arrive at a factor to be applied against our total revenue on which we pay a certain tax. The maximum weight law in Massachusetts is 50,000 pounds. We then pass into Connecticut, which has a 60,000-pound maximum gross-weight law. Connecticut, unfortunately, is one of the reciprocal States on the eastern seaboard and, I believe, gives out-of-State transportation companies a minimum of difficulty. You probably recall the Spector case, which occurred in Connecticut and which held that taxes imposed upon strictly interstate commerce constituted an undue burden upon interstate commerce. However, all of the States are very adept at reading the wording of such cases of the Supreme Court of the United States and inserting stopgaps in their legislation to circumvent the intent of the constitutional guaranties for freedom of interstate commerce. The axle-mile or ton-mile tax is one of these evasions of the intent of the Constitution.

We then go into New York State, where we are weighed and we first have to comply with the motor-vehicle laws, which require that we have no more than 22,400 pounds on each axle, unless the vehicle has tandem rear wheels (double), in which event the rear wheels can carry 36,000 pounds. The vehicle, however, cannot carry a maximum gross weight of more than the wheelbase (distance between the front axle and rear axle) times 850, plus 30,000 pounds in the case of a single-axle trailer and plus 34,000 pounds in the case of a tandem-axle trailer. This may sound complicated and it is because, as I mentioned, we actually have to weigh each trailer and shift the loads around to try and comply with this balancing act to stay within the maximum gross weight and under the maximum axle weight. If the vehicle stops suddenly and the load shifts we are due for an arrest, additional fines, taxes, etc. If this happens and our vehicle is registered at a certain weight, they make us reregister the vehicle at the weight found to be in excess and thenceforth we forever have to pay the ton-mile tax on that weight which was accidentally carried.

We have an additional difficulty in that sometimes, and this is not infrequent, shippers give us the net weight of their shipment and pay us for the transportation of the net weight and inadvertently forget to compute the weight of the skids, boxes, or containers carrying their products. We had an example of this where the Navy at Norfolk, Va., gave us a secret and sealed load over which we had no control nor way of knowing or checking the exact weight. In other words, they gave us a bill of lading showing us the weight they represented to give us. We were stopped at one of the weighing stations and arrested, our driver was held until we could make bond, and immediately thereafter was put to trial, and in spite of the fact that a Navy official tried to testify as to the mistake, the judge would not listen to him and we were accordingly fined in the neighborhood of $300 to $350.

Continuing our mythical trip, we then pay our tolls at the George Washington Bridge and probably go on to the New Jersey Turnpike, where we pay another toll, except now we have another set of weight laws for axles and gross weights applying. And so on through the various States having reciprocity, and some States do not have reciprocity; some States have complicated formulae; some States have low maximum weights and other States have high maximum weights; some States require us to purchase a sufficient number of gallons of gasoline to compare with the number of miles traveled in that State as compared with our total number of miles traveled all over or pay 7 cents per gallon on each gallon computed on a certain basis. They have various public utility commission regulations which the most astute lawyers cannot understand. Income-tax laws, weight laws, registration fees, placards, signs, rules, regulations, and always records, records, records, clerical work, auditing, accounting, tax computations, correspondence on disagreements over tax computations, hearings, trials, courts, legal research. And where we stop nobody knows. Just the painting of the various licenses and permit numbers, maximum gross weights, etc., on the vehicles is a considerable item of expense. Obtaining the axle-mile license plates of the State of New York on all of our vehicles is a greater job than one would suppose when you consider that all of our vehicles are spread all over the eastern seaboard and are constantly on the move transporting goods in the interest of the public and the national defense, the manufacturer and the consumer.

Every once in awhile a local judge will go on a rampage and stop all of the trucks and with all of the technicalities to be observed, including the safety regulations of the Interstate Commerce Commission, of the various States and all of the things a truck has to carry insofar as permits, forms, records, logs, etc., are concerned, it is almost impossible for the best intended transportation company to comply with everything.

The theory of tax law is that the tax is legal until proved otherwise and the burden is always upon the taxpayer to prove that he is not subject to a certain tax regulation.

The trucks would not care if a fair understandable and workable tax on a uniform basis was imposed. I suppose it would be utopia to wish for a single base tax of some kind, probably levied by the Federal Government and apportioned to the States on some equitable basis. Believe me, it is not the tax alone that creates a burden because as you can see, the burden on the taxpayer of keeping voluminous records and trying to comply with a complex system of tax structures is often more burdensome.

I would be remiss in failing to mention that the irony of the whole situation is that all of this complicated tax structure, all of the barriers which have been imposed upon a motor carrier industry which transports 75 percent of the Nation's freight, reflects in the cost of transportation to a point where the consumer is the ultimate victim. Every product transported to the consumer could be reduced in price if it were not for this very complicated and costly system of barriers usually involved in the tax structure someplace.

I have mentioned that there will be certain selfish interests opposing any fair study of the various barriers. Their sole interest is the stifling of competition. Competition is the essence of American life. It is the lever whereby the produce is delivered to the consumer at the fairest price. I have not even mentioned the vital nature of the motor carrier transportation industry to our national defense and the importance of eventually arriving at a system whereby the tax dollars obtained from the use of the highways shall be devoted to the construction and maintenance of the highways for civilian and military well-being.

After a long-winded dissertation, my answer is "Yes." We in the transportation industry would be vitally interested in support of a proposal to have a full hearing on the barriers to interstate truck transportation.

Thank you very much again for your kindness in writing to me.

Very sincerely,

DANIEL J. ADLEY,
Treasurer.

Remarks, in Part, of Hon. Philip J. Philbin, of Massachusetts, at Night Before Banquet, Knights of Columbus, Charlestown, Mass., June 16, 1954

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 17, 1954

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement:

Before the 62d annual night before banquet of the Knights of Columbus, Bunker Hill Council, No. 62, last night, Congressman PHILIP J. PHILBIN, of Clinton, warned that the great need of the hour to combat the growing peril of world communism was the return to the firm religious and political faith and spirit of the early American founders.

"The distressing developments at Geneva apparently mark another serious diplomatic setback for the free nations," said the Clinton Congressman. "It should be clear by now to all Americans that the leaders of the Red conspiracy have no intention of negotiating world peace in good faith but are capitalizing upon various international conferences primarily as sounding boards for Communist propaganda and as patent shields to divert attention from continued Communist aggression in Asia."

There would seem to be no prospect of stopping the fighting in Indochina short of setting up another Korea. The American people are squarely opposed to any policy which would send American boys to fight and die in Indochina while other so-called free nations take a neutral attitude toward world communism. This diabolical, unwarranted aggression will be stopped only when the free nations unite solidly behind a courageous program to check the brutal forward march of Red conspiracy and agree upon economic and diplomatic as well as military measures necessary for such a crucial undertaking.

Our leaders must definitely recognize that the Nation must be more concerned than ever with defending its own security and its own institutions. Overwhelming armed power is essential and we are building it. Cooperation with other free nations though vital can be of no effect unles it is wholeheartedly reciprocated and effectively implemented. It should be realized that our Nation has neither the resources nor the manpower to provide enormous, unending economic assistance and military support without the active help of other free nations.

To seek world peace is a sacred obligation because the awful new weapons of science, holding as they do the prospect of most devastating destruction, could well mark the end of current-day civilization. But any peace based upon injustice, appeasement, acceptance of Communist imperialism, or the surrender of our precious birthright would be a mockery, a sham, and a death-knell to American liberty as we know it.

The Godless doctrines and practices of Marx must never be permitted to gain a foothold in this country. This Nation must combat communism and all its adherents. It must prevent at all odds the further indoctrination of our people by the venomous poison of Communist ideology. In fact, one of the great tasks before us in this perilous hour is to purge our Government and all our institutions from the baneful, corrosive influences of the Communist conspiracy and thus make sure that, come what may in the world, our American liberties are secure against any force that would destroy them.

"More Bunker Hill Americans are needed," PHILBIN said, "to protect the Nation in this crisis, more men and women willing to recognize that our liberties can be protected only by eternal vigilance, and faith and hard work.

"In this great battle of the century against the forces of organized evil, let us recognize that every generation must be prepared to make its sacrifices in support of freedom, that we must take inspiration and example from those who sustained our freedom in the past, that we must cling more tenaciously than ever to the great constitutional safeguards which protect the rights of the individual American citizens, that we must pratice the virtues of toleration and justice and love of God and country which alone can bring us the spiritual strength and unity so necessary to shape the determination of all our people, regardless of race, class, or creed, to protect this great Government and the immeasurable blessings it has given us and to the world.

"This great organization, of which you may be very proud to be such an important part, is built upon the solid rock of faith and patriotism. True to its ideals, it will loyally and fearlessly continue to serve the causes of God and country to which it is pledged and its mighty contributions will continue to strengthen and preserve our Nation."

Paid Family Membership of the Farm Bureau and the Farmers Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 17, 1954

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD the paid family membership figures of the Farm Bureau and the Farmers Union. These figures were presented to the House Appropriations Committee during the hearings on the Agriculture appropriation bill. As yet I have not received the figures of the National Grange, but as soon as those membership figures are received, I intend to insert them in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Before the close of this session of Congress, I hope to be able to secure the membership figures for these three major farm organizations as of June 1, 1954.

The above-mentioned statistics follows:

AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION

Statement of paid family memberships for fiscal year ending Nov. 30, 1953

Alabama	73, 796
Arizona	3, 013
Arkansas	55, 718
California	59, 063
Colorado	10, 201
Connecticut	6, 225
Delaware	705
Florida	13, 634
Georgia	45, 673
Idaho	13, 119
Illinois	200, 015
Indiana	107, 992
Iowa	136, 000
Kansas	67, 984
Kentucky	74, 106
Louisiana	13, 839
Maine	1, 063
Maryland	10, 975
Massachusetts	6, 000
Michigan	59, 288
Minnesota	49, 509
Mississippi	45, 920
Missouri	48, 131
Montana	1, 517
Nebraska	15, 401
Nevada	1, 296
New Hampshire	4, 842
New Jersey	8, 516
New Mexico	7, 599
New York	80, 150
North Carolina	57, 022
North Dakota	9, 697
Ohio	47, 194
Oklahoma	37, 667
Oregon	6, 160
Pennsylvania	2, 832
Puerto Rico	5, 525
Rhode Island	212
South Carolina	16, 679
South Dakota	2, 930
Tennessee	48, 189
Texas	53, 195
Utah	7, 511
Vermont	7, 701
Virginia	12, 109
Washington	4, 632
West Virginia	10, 382
Wisconsin	33, 719
Wyoming	7, 131
Total	1, 591, 777

THE FARMERS EDUCATIONAL AND COOPERATIVE UNION OF AMERICA

Statement of paid family membership dues for the year ended Dec. 31, 1953

Chartered States:	
Arkansas	12, 783
Eastern Division	2, 329
Iowa	1, 311
Kansas	7, 561
Michigan	1, 900
Minnesota	21, 288
Montana	13, 759
Nebraska	15, 963
North Dakota	41, 415
Oklahoma	45, 019
Oregon	2, 711
Rocky Mountain	15, 300
South Dakota	17, 914
Texas	1, 069
Wisconsin	6, 674
Nonchartered States:	
Alabama	172
Idaho	839
Illinois	151
Indiana	229
New Mexico	249
Ohio	167
Tennessee	383
Utah	4, 463
Virginia	13
Washington	2, 440
Membership-at-large (12 States)	274
Total	216, 406

Effect of the McCarran Act on Admission of Scientists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAT McCARRAN

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 17, 1954

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, in the issue of the Saturday Evening Post of June 19 there appears an editorial entitled "McCarran Act Will Bar No Genuine Visiting Scientists." This is one of the most ably written and best drawn editorials I have seen on the subject, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MCCARRAN ACT WILL BAR NO GENUINE VISITING SCIENTISTS

The resources of the propaganda groups which are attempting to change the national policy on immigration are apparently inexhaustible. Most recent of these maneuvers is an attempt to show that the McCarran Act operates to prevent learned international scientific societies from meeting in the United States.

In Philadelphia recently, Dr. Otto Struve, of the University of California, declared that, on account of the strictness of our immigration laws, the International Astronomical Union might be forced to convene in Moscow instead of the United States, as planned. Dr. Struve said the McCarran Act was so tough that the U. S. A. had "little chance" of getting this convention. The Soviet Union, presumably, is more lenient. The same point has been raised in respect to the World Council of Churches, whose second assembly is to meet at Evanston, Ill., beginning August 15.

Before sending petitions to scrap the McCarran Act on account of such supposed consequences, the conscientious citizen would do well to study the sections of the law which could be applied to visitors coming to this country to attend such international gatherings. In section 212 of the McCarran Act there are 3 paragraphs which have a bearing on the situation. Paragraph 27 forbids the entry of aliens who "the consular officer or the Attorney General knows or has reason to believe seek to enter the United States solely, principally, or incidentally to engage in activities which would be prejudicial to the public interest, or endanger the welfare, safety, or security of the United States." Visitors in this category are excluded automatically, and why not?

Paragraph 29 bars absolutely aliens who "probably would, after entry, (A) engage in activities which would be prohibited by the laws of the United States relating to espionage, sabotage, public disorder, or in other activity subversive to the national security, (B) engage in any activity a purpose of which is the opposition to, or the control or overthrow of, the Government of the United States. * * *" Is that bad?

Between these prohibitory paragraphs lies paragraph 28, by which are excluded several categories of aliens, beginning with anarchists and including members of any Communist Party or its subsidiaries, and those who teach or advocate the overthrow of the United States Government by force. Some visiting firemen, scientific or religious, might conceivably qualify for exclusion under this paragraph 28. However, the Attorney General has the discretionary power to waive this provision of the statute and let in such aliens as he feels should be admitted in the public interest.

Thus, if Attorney General Brownell were persuaded that the admission of the Red dean of Canterbury was in the public interest, because his exclusion might stir up more of a furore than any damage he could do if he came over, then the Attorney General could let him in. Presumably, Mr. Brownell would admit intellectuals or religious leaders who have leftist ideas, since it is hardly practicable to insist that a religious gathering should be unanimously in favor of one type of economic organization. We have already admitted Archbishop Germogen, of the Russian Orthodox Church, who heads the Soviet-dominated branch of that body. Atomic scientists with Communist or fellow-traveler backgrounds might have more trouble. After all, we've had Fuchs.

But by and large, as far as the McCarran Act is concerned, there is no reason to expect that a theologian or a scientist or an economist will be turned back from our shores unless he turns out to be a really bad egg.

Nevertheless, we can be assured that the McCarran Act will continue to get the blame for sending scientific congresses to Moscow. The attitude of the groups which are moving heaven and earth to undermine our immigration policy brings to mind the motto said to have a place over the desk of a business leader: "My mind is made up. Don't confuse me with facts."

Texas Doctor Serves Small Towns 50 Years

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 17, 1954

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, a story that could be repeated many, many times was told recently in a special dispatch to the Dallas Morning News from the little Texas town of Randolph. It is a story of a man of medicine, a country doctor who has served the people of his community for half a hundred years.

The doctor's name is Thomas Burgher Stephens, M. D. He typifies the best of the American medical profession.

I ask unanimous consent that the story from the Dallas News be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

RANDOLPH DOCTOR SERVES SMALL TOWNS 50 YEARS

Randolph, Tex.—Two thousand babies and 50 years later, Dr. Thomas Burgher Stephens, Randolph's only physician, isn't exactly sure that he would select the medical profession if he had to do it over. "But, the chances are that I would," he mused.

Dr. Stephens will complete his half century as a general practitioner in a small town June 20. Forty-four of those 50 years have been spent in Randolph. Since 1919, he has been the lone physician here.

The 77-year-old physician hasn't retired, but practically all of his practice is carried on at his office in his home, about three blocks north of the town's main street.

"My eyesight isn't what it used to be, and I don't get out much at night," he said, "and I don't like to drive too much."

A native of Honey Grove, Dr. Stephens was born October 6, 1877, the son of Mr. and Mrs. S. M. Stephens, a pioneer Honey Grove businessman. He attended the Honey Grove schools, Weatherford College, Cumberland and Dixon Universities in Tennessee.

Before turning to medicine, he taught school a year at Spanish Fort near Nocona, prospected with his brother in Colorado and railroaded a year out of Denver, Colo.

He took his medical work at Fort Worth College, in Denver, and completed his work at Baylor Medical School in Dallas, receiving his degree in May 1904. After receiving his license, Dr. Stephens started seeking a place to begin his practice.

The first stop was at Yowell on the Delta-Hunt County line, then in the Allen's Point community northwest of Honey Grove. He was in Bonham a short time, then settled down to practice at Edhube, where he remained until 1910, moving to Randolph that year when he purchased Dr. Shaw's office and practice.

McCarthy and the Press

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ERNEST WHARTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 17, 1954

Mr. WHARTON. Mr. Speaker, as an erstwhile and occasional victim of slipshod and irresponsible newspaper reporting, during my years of political experience, I take special pride in extending a compliment to that profession at this time.

An editorial of the Saugerties Daily Post, June 14, 1954, Saugerties, N. Y., caught my attention this morning, and I commend it herewith to our colleagues as evidence of the high ethical standards to be found in the New York 29th Congressional District. Saugerties is a rapidly growing industrial locality in the mid-Hudson area and I predict that we have not heard the last of Editor Bertram W. Burns, of that community.

Personalities, however, are unimportant compared with the high principle of maintaining proper standards of American journalism, and I am glad to submit herewith this fine example of constructive criticism within the press itself:

McCARTHY AND THE PRESS

Some time ago, we stated editorially that we hadn't made up our mind as yet on Senator McCarthy, whether or not he was a devil's messenger or a potential savior.

We still haven't made up our mind. However, in the past few weeks, we have come to some definite conclusions about McCarthy's enemies who send us wheeling to his defense.

One of the greatest culprits, we are ashamed to say, is the press of the Nation which has been extremely unfair throughout the infamous hearings in Washington.

A majority of the newspapers in the country, it appears, are out to give McCarthy the "business" and don't seem to mind the fact that the public has a ringside seat for the maneuver.

Recently, we watched one of the sessions on television. The next morning, we read an account of the same session in one of the metropolitan newspapers. We marveled at the audacity of the reporter and his paper in printing such a falsified account, so slanted that even a child could see the object.

We would think that every newspaper would realize the need at the present time for accurate reporting of these hearings since millions of their readers are seeing the news before it even reaches print.

The hearings represented a real challenge to American journalism, a challenge to accurate, unbiased reporting through which the public would see the ability of the newspaper to record history in its proper perspective.

The American newspaper world has failed to meet that challenge and as a result, all newspapers will suffer from it. We don't blame readers for losing faith in their paper after seeing some of the false and slanted accounts of the hearings. We are just sorry that those papers which have attempted to maintain a high degree of integrity must shoulder the blame along with those who don't care.

The publishers who pull the strings with dollar bills and who have no desire to maintain the high standards of American journalism as established by generations of great men will, in the long run, defeat their own purpose.

The average newspaper reader is not stupid. He recognizes the willingness of a faction to use the smear by simple manipulation of words. And, eventually, these journalistic crooks will do McCarthy more good than harm.

Over 100,000 Unemployment Insurance Claimants in New Jersey, Week Ending June 5, 1954

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 10, 1954

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, cited below is a report showing, for the week ending June 5, 1954, and for other periods, the situation in New Jersey, by counties, on unemployment insurance claimants, as prepared by the department of labor and industry, division of employment security. Significant is the 100-percent increase this year over last in the number of claimants for the week ending June 5, 1954. Last year, for that week, 48,363 claimed benefits. This year 100,046 claimed them. The report comes to me through the courtesy of Mr. Harry Kranz, legislative director, New Jersey State Council, CIO:

STATE OF NEW JERSEY,
DEPARTMENT OF LABOR AND INDUSTRY,
DIVISION OF EMPLOYMENT SECURITY.

Unemployment insurance claimants by counties of New Jersey

[Estimated redistribution of local office data]

Counties	Week ending June 5	Prior week	Comparable week	
			Last month	Last year
Atlantic	2,504	2,554	2,810	1,595
Bergen	8,936	9,249	9,802	4,932
Burlington	2,434	2,475	2,396	698
Camden	5,347	5,232	5,133	2,317
Cape May	708	701	601	352
Cumberland	3,482	3,476	3,721	1,749
Essex	20,268	20,637	21,074	8,900
Gloucester	1,484	1,476	1,549	779
Hudson	14,383	14,536	14,906	8,092
Hunterdon	585	599	602	162
Mercer	4,957	4,760	5,467	1,439
Middlesex	6,430	6,715	6,646	3,026
Monmouth	4,400	4,563	4,640	2,446
Morris	1,818	1,886	1,976	792
Ocean	739	675	707	402
Passaic	11,326	11,720	12,140	6,211
Salem	453	451	537	239
Somerset	1,385	1,383	1,399	559
Sussex	361	362	376	138
Union	7,066	7,093	7,298	3,276
Warren	920	975	840	259
State total	100,046	101,518	104,619	48,363

Counts of claimants or the registered unemployed, are made on the assumption that any person certifying to unemployment any time during the week may be considered to be unemployed during the whole of that calendar week. The count includes therefore any certification, whether for new, continued, or reasserted unemployment. Data of workers insured under the Railroad Retirement Board are excluded, and the data are adjusted to exclude nonresidents of New Jersey and those partially employed. Unemployment of claimants who failed to file claims because disqualified or ineligible is necessarily excluded. This count, while based on receipts of claims documents, necessarily contains an estimate of the persons actually unemployed but not scheduled to appear until the following week under the biweekly reporting program.

R. & S.

JUNE 1954.

Bryson Bill, H. R. 1227

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARLEY O. STAGGERS

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 17, 1954

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include in the Appendix of the RECORD, petition and list of signers from Franklin, W. Va., in support of H. R. 1227. These citizens protest the advertising of alcoholic beverages in magazines and newspapers and over the radio and television and requested that they so be recorded:

To Our Congressmen:

We rejoice that a hearing has been granted us by Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee on the Bryson bill, H. R. 1227, to prohibit the transportation in interstate commerce of alcoholic-beverage advertising in newspapers, periodicals, etc., and its broadcasting over radio and TV. In view of the increased slaughter on our highways and the tragic disclosures that our youth are rapidly being made into hardened criminals through the use of beverage alcohol, and because of the effect of alcohol on the emotional and economical security of our homes, we earnestly beseech you to pass this bill, and remove the glamorizing of alcohol by advertising from the lives of our people, especially our children and youth.

Mrs. E. T. Judy, Roy Vandevander, Marie Vandevander, Effie Lambert, Nellie Lambert, Charles Lambert, Grail Simmons, E. T. Judy, Ralph Vandevander, G. I. Sponaugle, Mrs. Richard Grumbling, Mable Hartman, Jenny Vandevander, Garry Judy, Shilda Warner, Archie S. Crummett, Elvira D. Crummett, Earl Bowers, Naomi Simmons, Helen Pennington, Leon Ritsenberger, William Hartman, Jerry Simmons, Janet Simmons, Wilson J. Warner, Susan Judy, Charlotte Rose Crummett, Olin Simmons, R. H. Lambert, Janet Lambert, Duncan Pennington, W. A. Hartman, Delaine Winner, Ruby Bowers, Sue Bowers, Walton Shrader, Clinton Lambert, Virgil Warny, Eugene Bowers, Clara Pennington, Lee Simmons, Mrs. Olin Simmons, W. D. Mayers, Mrs. W. D. Mayers, Conley Moyers, Mrs. Conley Moyers, Mr. and Mrs. B. A. Mayers, Oscar Lambert, Ralph Mauzy, Glen Sponaugle, Essy Hartman, Charles Hartman, Blan Lambert, Kermit Judy, Arthur Sponaugle, Ervin Sponaugle, all of Franklin, W. Va.

Statement of Hon. Overton Brooks, of Louisiana, Before the House Committee on Public Works

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 7, 1954

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, on May 28, I appeared before the Committee on Public Works of the House of Representatives, headed by that distinguished American, the gentleman from Michigan [GEORGE A. DONDERO]. I appeared on that occasion as president of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, and the statement I made was as to the work and the responsibilities of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress. Under unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, I insert this statement in the RECORD under this extension of my remarks:

In beginning my statement I want to thank the committee for this opportunity of appearing before it in behalf of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress of which I am president.

In time of grave national emergencies such as involvement in war and the recent Korean emergency this congress has not held national conventions, it being recognized that in such times the development of our water resources, however desirable, must to some degree be subordinated to the primary national effort. Only this year has the congress resumed its conventions which were suspended throughout the Korean emergency. For this reason some members of this committee may be unfamiliar with the work and purposes of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress and it is appropriate that I state briefly the composition and purposes of this congress.

In the fall of 1901 a group of Congressmen and public spirited citizens, including public officials and engineers from all parts of the country, met at Johns Hopkins University in Baltimore and organized a nonprofit, nonpartisan organization which they named the National Rivers and Harbors Congress. The present membership is nationwide, being composed of State and city officials, chambers of commerce, waterway improvement associations, firms, and individuals located in every State in the Union, its Territories and insular possessions. All members of the United States Senate and House of Representatives are honorary members of the Rivers and Harbors Congress and many of them take an active part in the work of the organiaztion.

Recommendations and resolutions adopted by the congress are presented by committees to the President of the United States, the Vice President, Speaker of the House of Representatives, the proper congressional committees, the Secretary of the Army, Secretary of the Interior, Commissioner of Reclamation, Chief of Army Engineers, and other appropriate officials and agencies.

The congress has for its purpose the promotion of continued improvement and development of the Nation's rivers, harbors, lakes, and water and land resources, and the investigation and approval of practical projects throughout the country. It provides a forum for discussion of all problems relating to land and water development and use, serves as a clearing house for coordinating the activities of local and sectional organizations, and affords a means for securing united action by all the interests concerned with the various phases of land and water conservation.

This congress is the country's oldest and largest water resources organization and occupies a unique position by reason of its close liaison with the governmental agencies, legislative and executive, responsible for these public works, and the personnel of its directorate and official staff.

It acts in an advisory capacity to the United States Congress and the Government agencies charged with matters pertaining to river and harbor development, flood control, irrigation and reclamation, soil and water conservation, and related subjects. Its work has been endorsed by every President of the United States from Theodore Roosevelt to date, as well as by Cabinet members, governors, and other high officials.

The primary purpose of the congress is, and always has been, to further sound and coordinated development of the Nation's water and land resources. It pioneered the struggle for the protection of our natural resources and has taken the leadership in this fight for more than half a century. Down through the years, the organization has cooperated closely with the United States Congress. Its permanent headquarters are maintained in Washington, D. C.

Since the congress has never concentrated its effort on 1 or 2 individual projects but instead has supported all projects found worthy by the Corps of Engineers and by the projects committee of the congress, it appears proper for me to make a few observations about our water resources programs generally.

All of our people are affected either directly or indirectly by waterway improvements for flood control and navigation. The large section of our people that are directly and vitally concerned with these improvements have been most patient during World War II, the cold war, and the Korean emergency. It became necessary during these national emergencies to restrict Federal public works to projects that were essential to prosecution of the war and to our national defense. However, experiences gained during these emergencies, the exactions made in heavy drains on our national resources, and the conditions that prevail in the aftermath of these emergencies, emphasize, as never before, the wisdom and necessity of employing all prudent measures for the conservation of our natural resources and the extensive development of them for their fullest utilization and benefit to the rapidly growing population of our Nation.

I am sure that members of this committee, like myself, have heard from these patient people located in our respective districts who, in urging greater progress on worthy projects, cannot resist drawing comparisons between the limited expenditures in their areas and the large expenditures we are making overseas. I think that these people have tried sympathetically to understand the necessity for helping to rehabilitate and develop the free world, but it is becoming increasingly difficult for them to understand how as a Nation we can afford to expend more money overseas than we do at home for such improvements. It is most difficult to give them a satisfactory explanation in the face of figures which indicate that in the last 5 years we have cut our water-resources development programs at home by one-third and at the same time greatly increased our participation in such programs overseas.

While this is a matter of appropriations and not the function of this committee, it can be shown that the same tendency has developed in connection with authorizations which are the function of this committee. Whereas it used to be customary to have an authorization bill for these improvements about every other year it has now been 4 years since the last authorization bill was enacted and as I understand an effort is being made to hold to a minimum the bill now under consideration.

Expenditures of Government may be classified in several different categories. Expenditures for many functions, although essential to Government operations or administration policies, do not yield dividends in tangible material values. Other expenses of Government properly come within the category of capital investments just as private enterprise makes investments in equipment, plants, and expansions for greater efficiency and increased production. While recent foreign expenditures are definitely in the first category, expenditures for flood control, reclamation, and navigation improvements are just as definitely in the second category. Many such projects yield substantial returns to the Government on the investments made and, in fact, are self-liquidating in the course of a very few years. Many others enhance our national wealth and increase the annual income and thus broaden our tax base. They contribute to a higher national income and standard of living for the individual citizen and to increased tax revenues to the Nation, State, county, and municipalities. It would therefore appear to be highly reactionary and injurious to the Nation for the Congress to deny reasonable authorizations and appropriations to keep this program active and progressing.

Of equal importance to expanding our waterway improvements is the matter of replacement or maintenance of the improvements already constructed. In the recent years of lean appropriations, maintenance of our deepwater harbors, of our canalized rivers and of our intracoastal waterways has been seriously curtailed. As a matter of fact, we are operating important navigation arteries on which the traffic is steadily increasing, where in some instances the navigation works are 30 to 50 years old and have had only minimum maintenance. This committee has had brought before it replacement for substitute projects that would eliminate some of these antiquated works and it is sincerely hoped that the committee will not be hesitant in authorizing such replacements. In the light of commercial statistics that indicate that these waterways are steadily increasing in usefulness to this Nation, it would be the height of folly to not maintain them or make the necessary replacements when maintenance is no longer economical.

In this connection the large number of our people so vitally concerned in waterway improvements cannot help but observe that in this year when economy and conservatism are "catch words" this committee has just recently reported a highway bill which practically doubles the Federal contribution to annual highway programs. With deference, I must point out that our deepwater harbors, our intracoastal waterways, our Great Lakes, and our navigable rivers are also means of trnsportation. In the past 25 years the tonnages of waterborne commerce have increased sixfold and better. This is a fact that we can ill afford to ignore since the benefits derived from low-cost transportation affect the pocketbooks of each and every one of us.

There is a corollary phase to the construction, operation, and maintenance of waterway improvements that bears mentioning at this time. This phase is the survey and study program which should be carried on continuously if we are to move ahead with sound programs. Unfortunately over the last 10 years we have advanced this program in spurts, alternately pushing and then curtailing such activities. In the same manner that it was not practical to develop cross-country railroad and highway systems to their present status in one undertaking, so it was not possible to develop the ultimate plan for water resources in one undertaking. Single track railroads and dirt highways have gradually been replaced by double tracking and by multiple-lane highways as such improvements were warranted. Similarly deeper channels have been dug and navigation facilities have been and should be extended as warranted. To progressively improve either of these programs requires that surveys and studies be carried forward constantly. The National Rivers and Harbors Congress urges that this committee view realistically the necessity for authorization of such a survey program.

The national policy for the conservation and development of water resources is a matter of broad national interest involving the Federal Government, States, their political subdivisions, corporate entities, and individual citizens. This committee has important responsibilities in the formation of the national water policy and I ask its indulgence while I speak briefly on this important subject. This activity and policy have been studied intensively in recent years by various commissions appointed by the President under congressional authority, by the Federal executive agencies and by non-Federal organizations.

Establishment of clear national policy on all of the varied aspects of water resources development is most difficult. Existing policy has been developed over many years as a result of congressional legislation, administrative action by Federal agencies, and adjustments to meet national and local needs. It is neither prudent nor possible to make drastic changes in this policy situation. Such action would adversely affect strongly entrenched public opinion, political views, and institutions and would threaten the long established relationships between the Federal Government, States, and private individuals. It appears, therefore, that a gradual but steady approach toward improvement is necessary.

Past consideration of this matter has generally been directed primarily at organization or reorganization of Federal executive agencies and functions as a solution to difficulties and conflicts alleged to be inherent in water resource development. To a large extent the basic importance of a clearly defined Federal water resources policy, as a means of eliminating conflicts and duplications, has been overlooked. While it is not claimed that clear definition of national policy would solve all difficulties or make unnecessary a critical examination of organizational and procedural matters, it seems obvious that these difficulties will not be removed through reorganization alone. This observation is in general agreement with the findings of the special subcommittee of this committee in its report of December 5, 1952, on the civil-functions program.

Areas of potential conflicts in our water and land resources programs, that could be largely eliminated by the formulation and adoption of a well-defined water policy include (1) the extent of Federal interest and its corollary, appropriate local cooperation, (2) evaluation of costs and benefits on a uniform and sound basis, (3) comparable programs for the several types of improvements without preferential treatment for any particular type, and (4) adequate appropriations following authorizations in logical sequence. As stated earlier a number of studies on these matters have been made in recent years and I do not presume to give the answers in this short statement. However, these questions can be resolved gradually by this committee far better than by scrambling the agencies that are doing a magnificent job considering the circumstances under which they are required to operate.

What is the limit of Federal interest in the improvement, development, and utilization of our natural land and water resources? How far should it extend? The National Rivers and Harbors Congress tries to analyze proposals and willingly lends its support to Federal participation in economically justified projects that have broad national aspects irrespective of to whom the benefits may accrue as set forth in the policy of the 1936 act. There is no question about the Federal interest in alleviating the disastrous floods that have occurred in the Mississippi Valley, the Ohio and Missouri Basins, and elsewhere in major portions of the country. We are not reluctant to support the major drainage works that augment the benefits of these basin plans. On the other hand we are as zealous as the United States Congress to avoid handing windfalls to individuals by land enhancement, purely local flood protection, or drainage of individual properties and farms. It is at this point where we must consider the corollary of extent of local cooperation. In the well-known budget circular A-47 an attempt was made to delineate these fields and now this circular is under reconsideration by the Bureau of the Budget. This committee could make a genuine contribution to orderly progress by establishing the policy in this respect to be followed by all executive agencies in prosecuting improvements of land and water resources.

Similarly in connection with navigation projects, since the beginning there has been no question about Federal interest and participation in work on our major harbors and navigable channels; but a distinction should probably be drawn between these works of national benefit and small local harbors for recreation. Also this reasoning should apply to small upstream flood prevention works in connection with land management improvements. In all of these matters it would greatly facilitate uniform and just treatment if the Congress would establish the extent of Federal interest and the requirements of local cooperation to be used uniformly by all agencies of the Government engaged in such improvements.

The second item I mentioned refers to uniform evaluation of the cost and benefits in arriving at the justification for land and water resources projects. Obviously the benefits from improvements of our land and water resources cannot be evaluated in a different manner for each type of improvement without arriving at unsound and unrealistic conclusions. The so-called benefit-cost ratio becomes misleading and even worthless unless it is computed on basic assumptions and facts that are not varied by the executive agencies computing such ratios.

A third area of conflicts that we feel the Congress might correct concerns comparable programs for the development of our natural resources. Let us assume that there are worthy projects in all of these programs that are being and should be undertaken by the Federal Government for the benefit of the Nation. However, it seems perfectly obvious, that we cannot maintain a well-balanced program for the improvement and utilization of such resources if every few years one of these programs receives preferential treatment over all others. If, as we believe, there is good in all of these programs they should progress uniformly on economically justified schedules.

The fourth and last area of conflict that I mentioned involves the matter of appropriations following upon authorizations in a more logical sequence. This is probably the most difficult area to correct since we waiver between sponsoring the establishment of backlogs of worthy projects on the one hand and on the other hand urge concentration of limited funds toward the completion of works that have been underway for some time. It appears to be rather useless for this committee to continue authorizing projects while the administration continues its attitude of prohibiting or limiting new starts. Large sections of our people observe with displeasure that some projects that have been thoroughly justified and approved by law remain on the books for years while some recently authorized projects with equal, but no better, justification will be initiated almost immediately upon authorization. It is a fallacy to believe that there is any economy in alternately mobilizing and demobilizing the engineering talent and plant required to prosecute these programs. I am sure you will agree that steady progress on these programs with adequate appropriations following authorization in a more logical sequence will assure greater economy in the long run.

I want again to thank the committee for its time and to assure it that the National Rivers and Harbors Congress stands ready and willing to give whatever assitance it can to the committee and to the Congress generally to further sound and coordinated development of the Nation's water and land resources.

I thank you.

Congresswoman Sullivan's Platform

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDNA F. KELLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 17, 1954

Mrs. KELLY of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the speech made by my dear friend and colleague, the Honorable LEONOR K. SULLIVAN, of the Third District of Missouri, at a testimonial luncheon in her honor on May 15, 1954. The occasion was a tribute to a most deserving woman; a Representative who has earned the love and respect of the people of Missouri and who has charmed her colleagues in the House of Representatives by her sincere, devoted duty to her responsibilities. I hope that the district which she so ably represents will return her to Washington with the greatest majority so that she may continue the many projects she has begun.

The speech follows:

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE LEONOR K. SULLIVAN, OF MISSOURI, AT TESTIMONIAL LUNCHEON IN HER HONOR, HELD AT HOTEL JEFFERSON, MAY 15, 1954

Thank you. Thank you from the bottom of my heart.

Although the last 13 years of my life have been spent in direct and very intimate contact with the political scene, I have only been in politics myself for 2 years. I am new enough to the field to be simply overcome by an honor such as this today.

I mean that sincerely—not as a polite and formal opening to a speech. I guess when you spend enough time in political office you get somewhat used to the idea of people—of friends like you—rushing about tirelessly to set up testimonial luncheons or to organize campaign activities in your behalf. I have seen that happen; therefore, I know that it is a human tendency to become used to it.

But I hope I never do become used to it. I said I was overwhelmed, and I am. I don't know any other way to say how much I appreciate the efforts which have gone into this luncheon in my honor. I know I have worked hard since going to Congress—so hard that sometimes I just fall into bed at night completely exhausted. I like to think that I have worked effectively in the Congress in your behalf. I always will. This testimonial luncheon tells me that you also think I have done so. And that goes right to my heart.

On the other hand, if the day ever comes when you think I am letting you down in the House of Representatives, I want you to let me know about that too.

One doesn't go into this kind of field—into this 24-hour-a-day job of being a Member of Congress—with the same approach that you would go into a salaried job somewhere. I guess the most important thing in politics—at least to someone like me—is the necessity to feel that what you are doing is not only approved by your constituents, but that it is the right thing.

That makes every fight which comes up in the House a challenge and a battle—a challenge to your judgment and a battle with your conscience.

It is inevitable sometimes that your judgment will be disputed by people back home—people you love and respect. That is only natural, because if we all thought exactly the same way on every issue, we would no longer be free and individualized Americans; we would be a faceless mass of regimented ideas and assembly-line opinions.

But when it comes to motive and conscience—well, that's different.

I think you are giving me this luncheon today and paying me such an honor which is, as I say, overwhelming to me, not because all of you, 100 percent of you, think I voted right on every issue that came before the House, but because you think my motives are identical with yours; because you think I have got the kind of a conscience that you people have; because you think that the things that upset you, upset me, and the things that fire you with enthusiasm lift up my spirits in exactly the same way.

I repeat: I hope we always look at things in the same terms of human values. As long as we can retain that identity of purpose, then I can assure you that I am going to so conduct myself as your Congresswoman that you are going to want to give me some more testimonial luncheons like this in future years.

Because I want nothing more in the world than to be not just your Congresswoman but your gal in the Congress of the United States. Believe me, my heart's in it.

Believe me, too, while it is hard work all day, every day, there is no work I have ever found that is quite such happy work, even when things are going wrong, even when the wrong bills are being passed, even when the wrong policies are being followed, even when you are just a voice crying in the wilderness of the House.

It is happy work because, no matter what the disappointments, there are always the victories too. And it is amazing how much disappointment you can take, and take it in stride, when at the same time you know you are getting somewhere on an issue which is important to your own people back home, or is important to the economy of this country, or is important to the families which go to make up the kind of society we have in the United States and in St. Louis.

Now that I have got that off my chest—and I hope I did not make it sound too solemn or stuffy—I would like to tell you a little bit about my job as a Congresswoman. For most of you, with your own jobs or family responsibilities, politics—that is, the discussion and debate of national issues—of necessity has to be something of a hobby or part-time interest. You have to fight to find the time to devote to it. With me, it has to be the other way around—I have to fight to find the time to have my hair done, or to shop—even to go to the grocery store. I am sure most of you complain at one time or another about how hard it is for you to find time for political problems, just as I frequently get together with other Congresswomen to complain about our almost complete lack of personal, private lives. But I don't think the complaints on either side are very genuine. If politics is important enough to you individually, you will make time for it at the expense of other things; if more free time away from the political scene was important to me, I would make more time for it. I think we do with our time really what we want to.

So other than to say that I work hard in office, I am going to be perfectly frank with you today and make it clear that I am not complaining a bit. I love it. I am doing something I want to do with all my heart.

It was just almost exactly 2 years ago that I came back to St. Louis to make my bid for the seat my husband had held for 10 years before his death. There were no testimonial luncheons then, no ringing acclaim to greet my bid to enter the lists for Congress, no avalanche of endorsements from political organizations, or anyone else. And why should there have been? I was 1 of 8 candidates in a primary. I had the advantage of being thoroughly familiar with the work of a Congressman's office; I had the disadvantage of being a woman. Missouri had never sent a woman to Congress.

Looking back on it, I guess I certainly had a nerve.

I got mighty little encouragement in those days and I was feeling kind of blue about the whole business. Everybody loved John, but it wasn't John who was running—it was Lee.

I shall never forget one of the nicest things that ever happened to me—and it happened just at that time. Organized labor in the St. Louis area, perhaps acting on a hunch, or perhaps in the belief that after 10 years of close association with John Sullivan, both as his wife and as his administrative assistant in Congress, I not only must have learned a lot, but of necessity I had to think like John—and so organized labor gave me the pat on the back that I needed to keep me in there fighting. It gave me the encouragement to run against seven opponents and defy an old Missouri taboo. It gave me a feeling that I had friends who were willing to give me their most precious possession—their vote in an American election.

Some of you people here today were in on those early trials and tribulations of my first campaign. I think you remember how those worry lines between the eyes, those tight, tense lines around the mouth, began to smooth out.

Tell me, what greater gift could a woman ask than the kind of friendship which takes the lines out of her face, or at least softens them. You know, no beauty parlor could have done that for me—but you of organized labor did it. You didn't come to me and make a deal; you didn't say we will do this if you will do that; you said, "Lee, you're a good gal, and we're for you—get in there and fight and we'll help you." So I ran, and I fought, and I have been running ever since—running, I mean, from St. Louis to Washington, from the House Office Building to the Capitol, from the Capitol downtown to the agencies—and as I said, I love it, and I love you, too, for all you have done.

Not only do I appreciate the help you gave me, help I shall never forget, in getting the nomination 2 years ago and in winning election. I also appreciate, deeply, the fact that you have been with me and behind me on most of the things I have tried to do in the Congress. Many of those things have no connection at all with the day to day problems of organization or advancement of strictly labor union objectives. You and your people have had room in your hearts for the problems of all Americans. You have always proceeded on the assumption that what is good for the whole country and all the people in it is good for labor. Of course, that is the only proper attitude for any organized interest group in the country to take, but it is not always the case. Your support, then, is never an embarrassment to a conscientious Member of Congress, never a deal involving mixed loyalties. And for that too I thank you.

What is it we all want? Riches? Luxury? Fine houses, fine clothes, lots of servants, a life of ease? Hollywood and television may make us dream of those things once in awhile, harmless dreams, but not really very practical ones.

I think what we want, all of us in this room and most Americans, want primarily and most importantly is a decent America in a world in which there can be real peace and in which every child everywhere has an opportunity to learn and to do and to be. Unfortunately, we are still very far from that goal, that dream. But just as certainly, we are determined to pursue that goal. We are determined to make a sizable dent in our lifetime into the obstacles keeping us from that goal. While we ourselves will probably never reach it and see it accomplished, the least we want out of our lives is the feeling that we are bringing the world at least a little closer to it.

I think, when I look objectively at the hurly-burly of my work in Congress—the jumble of bills and debates and committee meetings and conferences—that this in essence is my platform, and what I stand for, and what I am trying to do.

When people are hungry, I want them fed; when they are jobless, I want them encouraged and helped to find work; when they live in slums and firetraps, I want them given an opportunity for decent housing in the sunlight and good fresh air of a decent neighborhood. When women must work in order to carry the burdens of raising a family, then I want their peculiar and particular circumstances recognized in our tax laws. When recession starts—as it has started in this country—I want the resources and imagination of Government put to work to correct our economic problems so that we have an expanding economy in which there are jobs and opportunities for all who want to work; for all those whose work we need in order to provide an improving standard of living, a better country, a better world. When we begin to fall out with our allies, with the other free nations of the world, on the steps we should take to accomplish our mutual goal of protecting freedom and assuring peace, then I want us not to use the occasion to belabor and berate each other. Rather we should heed the warning signals of disunity and join with our friends abroad in recementing our accord and mutual purpose.

These are things all Americans are for, or should be for. I am sure the President is for them in theory, and probably most of his advisers are, too. But sometimes I am not only distressed but really frightened at their fear of taking affirmative action.

We cannot win through to a better America, to a prosperous expanding American economy, and to world peace if we are too timid to act, too disorganized to think, too imbued with partisan fever to seek a common ground of action.

In the nearly 2 years I have spent in the House, 2 years in which we could have accomplished a tremendous amount of progress, virtually nothing of a bold or imaginative nature has been undertaken. The first year of this administration was wasted largely in the appointment of commissions to study problems we know all about. Nothing new, nothing startling, has come out of those studies. The various commissions reported in effect that the programs initiated under the Democratic administrations were good programs and should be continued with perhaps a minor modification here or there.

The second year of this administration has been and is being wasted in internal bickering within the Republican Party over whether or not the findings of those commissions should be written into law.

Meanwhile, we are getting very little new housing and virtually no public housing; we are getting no changes in what the President himself has called the union-busting provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act; we are getting no effective help for our overcrowded schools and overworked and underpaid teachers—no, a new study is supposed to look into that problem and perhaps have an answer in 2 years.

We may get some changes in the social-security law. If so, they will constitute about the only progressive steps taken by the administration and the Congress in this 2-year term of the 83d Congress.

Trade, not aid? It looks very much as if we are heading toward no trade and no aid.

The New Look in defense against the spread of aggressive communism? That look is so new it keeps changing every day, and for the life of us we can't seem to find out what it is until we read the latest edition of the daily newspaper, and even then the New Look we find is guaranteed to be good for that day only.

If women's styles changed as fast as our military program and our defense program and our foreign policy, we women wouldn't know what to wear. We would probably go back to bustles in self-defense.

But enough of the pessimism. I am not pessimistic. (I was told that at this meeting today I should make the kind of a speech that would take the paint right off the walls—a slashing attack on all the things that are bad. But I just can't do it. I feel too good about this whole affair to let the bad take over.) This Congress will not go down in history as one of our better ones, but I am sure it will serve one useful purpose: It will bring home once again to the American people the need for imagination and resourcefulness and boldness and initiative and humaneness both in Congress and in Government. If we have to write off the 83d Congress as a loss, then at least we can look for action in the 84th—action to meet those problems that have been allowed to slide and to fester.

I want to be in that Congress. I want to have a hand in writing the kind of legislation which will pick up where we left off several years ago and go on from there to an expanding economy, with more jobs, better opportunities, production which can be consumed, things that can be made and sold and used—a happier America than we have right now and one in which the people once again are partners with their Congress (and I hope with the Government, too) in accomplishing big, good things.

I will enjoy that, and I know you will too.

You have all been exceedingly kind. Although I had quite a bit to say here today, I am still overcome by the whole affair. I am not giving up on this Congress or slackening my efforts just because we do not seem to be getting very far. When I go back to Washington next week I am going to push as hard as ever for good legislation. If we don't get it, we will at least have put up a fight for it. And we will keep on fighting. I will be fighting harder than ever after the heart-warming experience of this luncheon, knowing I've got you in my corner backing me up and helping me do the things I think are the right things to do. Thank you very much.

Our Overabundance and Hungry People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1954

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the executive committee of the Methodist Committee for Overseas Relief, an official agency of the Methodist Church, at its regular meeting in New York on May 25, 1954, passed a resolution concerning the overabundance of food in the U. S. A. and the hungry people in the world.

Under unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, I include with my remarks this resolution which covers one of the most important issues confronting our Nation today, and which is of international significance in the fight of the free world against totalitarian tyranny:

> The surplus foods lying unused in Government warehouses offer a challenging opportunity to the United States of America, materially to meet pressing human needs in the world, and to exhibit to all nations the truly Christian heart of our country. Under the favoring providence of God, and with the machinery made possible by our national wealth, the efforts of our farmers have produced far more than the people of our country need or can use. Even after making provision for the use of some of this abundance through school feeding and other institutional programs, the enormous accumulation is taxing the imagination and political resources of the leaders of our country and using approximately half a million dollars a day in storage charges.

While we enjoy this abundance far beyond our needs as a people, a large share of the people of the earth go to bed every night hungry and undernourished, a prey to deficiency diseases and a burden on their national economies because of their low productivity. They cannot afford to purchase the more nourishing foods at any price and their governments are unable to remedy the situation. This disparity between their helpless need and our almost equally helpless abundance is a challenge to the best thinking of the leaders of our Nation. Its continuance would provide ground for assertions of our practical indifference to the plight of other peoples than our own in spite of our national expressions of concern for their welfare.

The Methodist Committee for Overseas Relief recognizes that the practical problems involved both in disposing of these surplus foods before they decay and of preventing further accumulations are tremendous. Even if means could be found to make all of them available to the undernourished of the earth, the problems of transportation alone would be very difficult to solve. At the same time, the moral problem of our use or abuse of this abundance remains.

The Methodist Committee for Overseas Relief appreciates what has already been done in making overabundant dairy products available for distribution overseas through Church World Service and other voluntary agencies and in meeting a large share of the transportation costs. It believes that this program should be greatly extended both to include all types of food and fibre above a normal carryover and to make it possible for the voluntary agencies to distribute overseas as much of these surplus commodities as they can administer effectively in accordance with high standards of responsible oversight and investigation of need.

The Methodist Committee for Overseas Relief therefore urges the Congress of the United States to take appropriate action to these ends in accordance with the expressed purpose of the President.

Extending for 2 Years Authority of Federal Reserve Banks To Buy Directly From Treasury Obligations of the United States Not Exceeding $5 Billion Outstanding at Any One Time

SPEECH

OF

HON. JESSE P. WOLCOTT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1954

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 8729) to extend until June 30, 1956, the present authority of the Federal Reserve banks to purchase securities directly from the Treasury in amounts not to exceed $5 billion outstanding at any one time.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I still say I am a little surprised and disappointed that this question should be raised here this year. This procedure has been going on, as I explained, since 1942, and it is amazing to me that the gentleman from Texas during all of these years has never had this called to his attention before, although at the present time there is a relatively small amount of Government cash in the banks. I think the gentleman's attention was called to the fact that for a good many years during the forties the Treasury balances in the banks ran into the billions and billions of dollars. Just by way of example, in 1946 the Treasury daily balance in banks exceeded $15 billion. Now, we did not hear anything from the gentleman in 1946 about deposits by the Treasury in banks and the subject of interest. In most of the months in 1946 it was not only $15 billion, but it was $20 billion, and in 1 day it reached $26 billion in 1946.

Now, I am surprised, frankly, that the gentleman from Texas in 1946 did not raise this issue. Of course, it is a keen disappointment to me that we have this issue raised at the present time. There are certain things that the gentleman said that I think he will correct his statement in respect to. This money on deposit in the banks by the Treasury is largely the increment, the receipts by the banks, when the banks sell Government savings bonds and collect taxes. Take your bond-a-month plan, for example. You leave an order in your bank to deliver to your account a bond, and your account is charged for that bond. That money goes in, of course. It is immediately transferred to the Government bond account. Now, that bond account does not cost the Government 3¼ percent interest, as the gentleman from Texas said. On the notes issued under this bill they draw one-quarter of 1 percent interest and always have drawn one-quarter of 1 percent interest and no more. No bank in the United States at the present time, unless the board of directors is absolutely crazy, is paying 3½ percent on savings.

They are not magnanimous enough to pay the Government 3¼ percent on savings, without paying their other customers who are depositors in the banks a comparable rate. I do not know of any banks, commercial or savings, that are paying the Government or anybody else 3¼ percent interest; and nobody else knows of any such banks. The Government is paying one-fourth of 1 percent on these borrowings. These balances are kept in a liquid state.

The gentleman says that the bond stays in the bank and the bank draws interest on it. The bond leaves the bank and goes into the account of the subscriber to the bond when it is delivered. The bank does not have the bond. The purchaser of the bond, which is not the bank, has the bond. Otherwise the bank would not have the customer's money in the Government-bond account.

I think that is a complete answer to the question whether the gentleman is right or wrong in respect to this. I hope that it does not come with too much surprise to the gentleman that I have not accepted this amendment.

Of course we want to be realistic about it, and the facts are that the Government leaves this cash in a liquid form in the banks so that they can draw on them from day to day. I might say that most of these deposits by the Government in the banks are subject to day-to-day withdrawal, mostly for daily expenditures. There is no new question involved here. This has been going on, as I have said, since 1942. If they did not keep these liquid balances, would it not be the same as a businessman completely absorbing in his business all the cash reserves which he has built up, before he even makes application to the bank for further credit? It is about the same situation. The gentleman would have the Government exhaust all of its liquid cash assets before it goes to the people to borrow.

So that surely in the interest of good business, in the interest of stability both in our economy and in our financing, this amendment should be overwhelmingly defeated.

John Hancock Mutual Life Insurance Co. Endorses H. R. 8356, Health Reinsurance Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 14, 1954

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, the providing of adequate medical care to the people of the Nation is one of the foremost problems facing us today. Very properly President Eisenhower has pointed out the need for legislation in this field and has recommended a program for Federal reinsurance of health insurance policies as one important and promising step forward in the extension of broader coverage and protection against the high costs of adequate medical care.

It is very gratifying to the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, which has given careful consideration to this subject, to note that some of our great life insurance companies see in this proposed legislation an avenue whereby they will be assisted in their effort to extend coverage in the health insurance field. I insert in the RECORD a copy of a letter which I have received from Mr. Paul F. Clark, president, John Hancock Mutual Life Insurance Co., dated June 10, 1954, expressing his company's wholehearted support of H. R. 8356, a bill to implement the administration's reinsurance legislation. The letter is as follows:

JOHN HANCOCK,
MUTUAL LIFE INSURANCE CO.,
Boston, Mass., June 10, 1954.

Re Administration Health Reinsurance Plan, S. 3114 and H. R. 8356

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON,
Chairman, House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN WOLVERTON: We in this company thought that your committee might be interested in our position on the administration's reinsurance legislation.

On May 17, 1954, I joined with other life insurance people, after the White House conference, in favoring the general objectives of this proposed legislation. In subsequent correspondence with the White House and at the request of the administration, I pointed out two areas in which the bills could be improved. First, a provision should be inserted that stated nothing in the bill should limit the jurisdiction of any State or of its supervisory officials over insurance; and, second, it should be made clear that the legislation in no way contemplated the further introduction of the Federal Government in the insurance business, even inadvertently.

Since then, we have had the opportunity of examining the modifications suggested by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and I am happy to say that these specific points have been adequately covered. It is our belief that life insurance companies can find in this legislation assistance for their effort to extend this coverage.

Accordingly, this company wholeheartedly supports the bill to implement the administration's reinsurance legislation.

Sincerely yours,

PAUL F. CLARK, *President.*

Extending for 2 Years Authority of Federal Reserve Banks To Buy Directly From Treasury Obligations of the United States Not Exceeding $5 Billion Outstanding at Any One Time

SPEECH

OF

HON. JESSE P. WOLCOTT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1954

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 8729) to extend until June 30, 1956, the present authority of the Federal Reserve banks to purchase securities directly from the Treasury in amounts not to exceed $5 billion outstanding at any one time.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I think I might suggest that the only reason why a rule was asked for this bill is that the language "five billion dollars" is used in it, and I know from our experience with the Consent Calendar this appears to be a goodly sum of money. It was a unanimous report of the committee with 1 or 2 reservations.

The authority was first given to the Federal Reserve to buy direct obligations of the Treasury way back in 1913, but in 1935 the authority was eliminated. However, in 1942 it was restored, but with a limitation of $5 billion on direct purchases by the Federal Reserve from the Treasury. We have continued it, about every 2 years, until the present time. The authority under the present law expires on June 30, 1954, and the bill before us now for consideration merely extends this authority for another 2 years, or until June 30, 1956.

There is nothing new in this. It is almost a timeworn policy now that the Federal Reserve and the Treasury can get together in adjusting their balances in times of stress by making direct purchases by the Federal Reserve from the Treasury and thereby keep our financial position much sounder and our economy much more stable than would otherwise be the case.

Frankly, I am a little disappointed that there would be opposition to it this year because since 1942 these bills have been going through the House and the Senate almost always, if not quite always, by consent. I am a little disappointed that now we should have any contest on this bill, because the same practice was in effect since long before the Banking Act of 1935. So I am certain that there will be no valid objections to the bill.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I probably will not be opposed to the passage of the bill, because it seems to have become an accepted practice to kite checks in the Government, but I should like the gentleman to explain very briefly how this money is made available. Can the gentleman give me just a brief explanation as to how this money is actually made available? I should like to have an answer to the statement I made awhile ago that this is a printing press money bill. I believe I am correct in that statement.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I think the gentleman is anything but correct when he makes that statement. I think the gentleman is referring to the manner, perhaps, in which the Federal Reserve exercises the constitutional authority of the Congress to regulate the value of money. The Federal Reserve does that as an agency of the Congress. Now if the regulating of the value of money is printing press money, then the Congress is to blame because they have delegated under the Federal Reserve Act the authority, the power, the prerogative, and the obligation under the Constitution to the Federal Reserve to regulate the value of our money. These moneys are made available for the purchase of these Treasury obligations by the Federal Reserve System through Federal Reserve banks.

Mr. GROSS. The money is made available, is it not through the issuance of Treasury notes?

Mr. WOLCOTT. That is correct but you cannot make money that simple. There are notes, certificates, bills, and bonds. Bonds can be monetized under the system that we set up in the early 1930's, and under this system you could theoretically convert the whole debt into cash. At that time, I might say to the gentleman, I was opposed to that practice because I saw too much affiliation between the debt and the value of our money. But until the Congress changes it that is the system that we have.

Mr. GROSS. That is the process of printing Treasury notes or certificates; is that not correct?

Mr. WOLCOTT. We cannot get a dollar bill which is used in your pocketbook, that is if you use folding money, without printing it.

Mr. GROSS. And in such large denominations they cannot be used commercially; is that not correct?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I think some of them are so large, they are used only in reserves. But you and I do not see them. But if they are in the reserves, of course, they may be broken down into bills of small denomination which can be used commercially.

Mr. GROSS. What happens is the Federal Reserve pays the cost of the printing of the certificates and notes; is that not correct? And on the basis of that, the member banks make a line of credit available to the Government.

Mr. WOLCOTT. As a matter of fact, the way the expense of operating and carrying on the war during World War II was largely financed by the Federal Reserve making aditional reserves available, permitting an expansion in our credit and money supply. We cannot deny that. If it had not been made available, probably we would not have successfully concluded World War II.

Mr. GROSS. I raised a few questions concerning this a few years ago, and I still insist that the taxpayers of this country could be saved a great deal of money. I do not believe in printing-press money or greenback money to provide the Government finances through the simple operation of a printing press.

Mr. WOLCOTT. If I may interrupt the gentleman, may I tell him this. If, as I understand the gentleman, we were to print the bills and let them circulate without the security of gold, bonds, and without the security of the other assets, including the capital assets of the banks, then, of course, you would have nothing behind your money. It has been traditional that this country has prospered under the credit system. If you turn all credit into cash, then, of course, the value of your money would depreciate proportionately as you issued money. That is the thing that I do not think any of us want because that would be destructive not only of property values but of all moral values as well.

Group Medicine's Big Test

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 7, 1954

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, prepayment group medical plans have met a need in a manner that has been highly beneficial to those who have become subscribers. Notwithstanding this fact, there are efforts made at different times and places to destroy their usefulness. The latest of these adverse tactics was contained in a resolution recently adopted by the New York State Medical Society's house of delegates. It is inconceivable that in the face of the need that exists that there are those who ignore the need and strive to disrupt, break down, and prevent this type of health and hospital care and attention. The desirability of such plans is shown by their tremendous growth and acceptance by our people in these recent years.

An interesting article entitled "Group Medicine's Big Test," was recently written by Myron Kolatch, and published in the New Leader, issue of June 14, 1954. The article reads as follows:

GROUP MEDICINE'S BIG TEST

(By Myron Kolatch)

Under the guise of cutting out a "cancerous growth," American Medical Association affiliates across the country are searching for ways to kill off prepayment group medical plans. Although the AMA may deny responsibility for what almost amounts to a door-to-door advertising campaign by some of its members against group medical practice, doctors are attending Parent-Teachers Association meetings and other civic gatherings to discourage support of such plans. They insist that the public must have a free choice of doctors, that the fee-for-service system is the only one which gives a doctor an incentive to do his best work, that various private health-insurance programs now gaining in popularity are inconsistent with our American way of life.

The most recent and effective move to shift medicine into reverse was negotiated last month, when the New York State Medical Society's House of Delegates adopted the following clarifications of the State code of ethics for physicians:

1. Advertising is unethical if it aims at enlisting patients for a panel of physicians of a medical-care plan, company, or other organization.

2. The practice of medicine by physicians on a salary "is ethical only when such diagnosis and treatment is for a patient who is a public charge."

3. Free choice of physician, a requirement of the present code, is vitiated if the patient is required to choose a physician from a panel or group of practitioners.

4. Proration of fees is not unethical if both physicians or surgeons actively participate in providing medical care and if the fee is paid by an insurance company.

At the AMA's June 21 meeting in San Francisco, the New York delegation will urge the adoption of similar clarifications for the national organization's principles of medical ethics. This would paralyze not only prepaid medical plans in the Empire State, like those sponsored by the Endicott-Johnson Co., Consolidated Edison Co., International Ladies Garment Workers Union, and Health Insurance Plan of Greater New York (HIP), but also the Ross-Loos Clinic in Los Angeles, Kaiser-Permanente Plan in San Francisco, Group Health Association of Washington, D. C., and Seattle, Wash., Labor Health Institute of St. Louis, and many similar systems established for 20 to 40 years. It is logical for the New York delegation to be spearheading this offensive, because HIP is considered the country's outstanding comprehensive-care plan and a leading proponent of the group-medicine idea that made the Mayo Clinic famous. An examination of HIP's origins and operations is thus very much to the point.

The late mayor of New York, Fiorello H. LaGuardia, was deeply concerned over the fact that city employees in lower- and middle-income brackets often suffered financial ruin when serious illness struck. He discussed the problem with his personal physician, Dr. George Baehr, former chief of staff at Mount Sinai Hospital, past medical director of the United States Public Health Service, and now HIP's president and medical director. For 3 years, too, a city commission studied ways to remedy the situation. With the help of philanthropist David M. Heyman and a prominent lay group that included Winthrop W. Aldrich, Gerard Swope, Beardsley Ruml, the late Alfred E. Smith, and Wendell Willkie, HIP was finally set up as a private, nonprofit organization.

It began operations in 1947 with 71,000 city-employed subscribers. Today, it provides general practitioners, specialists, surgeons, X-ray diagnosis and treatment, physical therapy, diagnostic laboratory service, visiting home nurses and private ambulances for 400,000 people. Of this number, approximately 275,000 are civil servants and their families, but the number of nonmunicipal units participating in HIP is growing steadily. While it carried only 12 such accounts in 1947, it now has close to 500 and covers United Nations delegations, tenant groups, social and welfare agencies, labor unions, large corporations and small businesses.

To get into the plan, one has to be part of an establishment already belonging to it or a new unit that wants to join. There are no age or physical qualifications; the annual premium for this virtually complete medical coverage is $42.72 for a single person, twice that for a childless couple, and 3 times that sum for a family up to 10. The city pays half this fee for its workers, as do most individual firms, agencies, and unions. (Some foot the entire bill.) Since 93 percent of the families covered by HIP earn considerably less than $6,500 a year, it enables them to enjoy more medical care than they ever could afford before. They are also urged to carry hospitalization insurance, like Blue Cross, to avoid staggering health bills.

Actually, HIP itself merely takes care of administrative and coordinating functions; it does not practice medicine. The 400,000 people it insures are cared for by 30 medical groups strategically located throughout the metropolitan area and Nassau County. Each of these is a self-organized medical partnership that has voluntarily sought HIP affiliation. To qualify, a group must have a minimum of 30 physicians, including specialists in medicine's 12 basic fields. All its doctors must be approved by HIP's Medical Control Board; in addition, every specialist must have a certificate from an American Specialty Board, hold an appointment in his specialty on the staff of a hospital approved by the AMA for resident training, or have equivalent qualification.

At its own expense, the group is also responsible for providing a medical center—which generally operates as an outpatient clinic—that meets HIP's standards. The plan now has 29 such centers, and another is under construction; many are newly built, some were bought and reconverted for medical purposes.

The financial burden this places on a group's doctors was illustrated at recent hearings before the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. The committee was taking testimony on two bills supported by President Eisenhower and sponsored by Representative CHARLES A. WOLVERTON (Republican, of New Jersey): One would make Federal "reinsurance" available to private, nonprofit health plans; the other would grant Government mortgage insurance to prepayment-plan medical centers.

Dr. Robert E. Rothenberg, director of Brooklyn's Central Medical Group, testified that, from 1947 to 1952, he and his associates put aside 25 percent of their earnings, before taxes, to finance a center. Their savings of $493,500 were not enough to build it, however, and they eventually secured a 20-year $250,000 mortgage at 4¾ percent from a "forward-looking insurance company." Dr. Richard M. Carey, Upper Manhattan Group director, testified that for a full year all earnings, and for another 3½ years half of all earnings, were put in a building fund. A firm then put up 24 percent of the cost for a $450,000 structure, requiring the personal security of each physician.

Representative JOHN W. HESELTON, Republican, of Massachusetts, impressed with the financial obligations assumed by HIP's doctors, said to Dr. Baehr: "I should like you to list the name of every doctor who contributed so wonderfully to the success of your effort." In tribute to them, the committee placed their names in the record.

When an individual joins HIP, he alone picks his medical group. From its general practitioners, he selects a family doctor, whom he may call to his home or visit in the office as frequently as he desires. Should he require any specialized services, a specific appointment is made at the group's medical center, where the specialists see patients. If a subscriber is dissatisfied with his doctor, he can choose a different physician in the group or transfer to another group altogether.

This is important not only because it gives members a free choice of 975 doctors, but because it provides an incentive for the medical partnerships. For each person under its jurisdiction, a group receives $29 annually from HIP. How this is divided depends on the group itself, but, as a rule, general practitioners get a certain yearly fee for every individual under their care and specialists are given a stipulated sum. Considering the financial investment that a medical partnership makes, it has a vital stake in satisfying its patients.

Perhaps one of the best features of plans like HIP, however, is that they thrive on keeping people well. HIP's division of preventive medicine and health education is constantly prodding subscribers to collect their medical money's worth. It conducts over 100 education meetings each year, and special bulletins are sent regularly to insured families.

Thus, HIP and similar comprehensive prepayment medical-care plans across the country make it possible for doctors to engage in a form of private enterprise that rewards them professionally and financially while it benefits the general public.

Why are medical societies determined to to destroy this type of plan? The reasons given range from the claim that it "would result in the deterioration of the quality of medical care to our patients" to the somewhat frantic assertion that it is inconsistent with American tradition. None stands up under investigation. In fact, there is reason to doubt that the societies themselves really believe the line they have prescribed for public consumption. When HIP went into business, for example, it had the implicit blessing of the AMA, whose judicial committee ruled that organizations like it could advertise. In 1948, the New York County Medical Society added its good wishes by issuing a similar ruling, but this was rescinded in 1952.

The real answer to the above question can be found in a statement made by Dr. Alfred P. Ingegno, Kings County Medical Society president and leader in the clarifications fight: "Naturally the idea of letting subscribers go to any individual doctor or group of doctors is going to hit present HIP doctors right in the pocketbook." As this clearly indicates, local AMA components are now opposing prepaid group medical plans, which they once approved, for purely economic reasons. The fear that stems from the latter's rapid growth across the Nation was pointed up in Dr. John R. Garlock's May 24 address as retiring president of the New York County Medical Society: "I don't want to sound like an apostle of glood, but, as far as I can determine, the handwriting is on the wall. * * * The time for aggressive treatment is now, and it demands a bold attack."

It may be argued that medical societies have a right to protect their doctors' incomes, but there is no problem of oversupply and little demand in this profession. In his January 14 health message to Congress, President Eisenhower noted: "There are * * * 159 practicing physicians for every 100,000 of the civilian population in the Northeast United States. This is to be contrasted with

126 physicians in the West, 116 in the north-central area, and 92 in the South." And a report just released in Washington states that the country is faced with a severe doctor shortage.

True, every time an individual joins a prepaid medical plan, a prospective customer is taken off the open patient market. Usually, however, he is a person who gets financially sick when he has to pay present-day fees to cure his physical ailments; he would normally wait until his illness became really serious before visiting a doctor. By protecting their members' incomes, therefore, medical societies are actually inflicting hardship on a large segment of the population.

What action is the AMA likely to take at its San Francisco convention? If it rules against the group medical plans, do they stand a chance in the courts?

The AMA's national leadership seems to recognize the fact that group-practice plans provide a valuable service and are here to stay, even though its local branches are not yet this far advanced in their thinking. In his testimony before the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, AMA President-elect Dr. Walter Martin cited article VI, section 4 of the principles of medical ethics—which was reapproved by the AMA's house of delegates in December 1953—and indicated that free choice of physician was not an ethical requirement of medical-service programs for which a prepayment plan or other third party legally assumes the cost.

In addition, at the AMA's St. Louis meeting last December the following warning was issued by its judicial council:

"There have been instances in which a State association or a specialty organization has announced an interpretation of a segment of the principles of medical ethics which is definitely contrary to that adopted by the American Medical Association. * * * The adoption and broadcasting of so-called principles of medical ethics by any other process or by any other society or organization is to be condemned."

In view of these facts, it seems that the national organization will probably try to discourage adoption of the New York delegation's clarifications. This is particularly so since the judicial committee is likely to report that the courts will declare them unenforceable.

When the Group Health Association of Washington, D. C., was organized in 1937, the District of Columbia Medical Society immediately ostracized it by declaring that its doctors were guilty of unethical conduct. Trustbusting Thurman Arnold, then an Assistant Attorney General, initiated proceedings against the AMA and its local society, and in 1943 the Government won a decisive 9 to 0 victory for the GHA. In reading the Supreme Court's opinion, Justice Owen J. Roberts said:

"The indictment * * * devotes many paragraphs to a recital of the plan adopted by group health and alleges that, principally for economic reasons and because of fear of business competition, the defendants have opposed such projects. * * *

"In truth, the petitioners represented physicians who desired that they and all others should practice independently on a fee-for-service basis, where whatever arrangement for payment each had was a matter that lay between him and his patient in each individual case of service or treatment. The petitioners were * * * an association of individual practitioners each exercising his calling as an independent unit. These independent physicians, and the two petitioning associations which represent them, were interested solely in preventing the operation of a business conducted in the corporate form by group health."

Since the Supreme Court today seems keenly aware of the necessity for social advance, it probably would not now turn the wheels of progress into reverse.

Veterans' Administration General Operating Expenses Appropriation

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 7, 1954

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from Mr. J. C. Palmer, Acting Deputy Administrator of the Veterans' Administration, explaining the effect the reduction recommended by the conference committee will have on the operation of the Veterans' Administration:

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., June 17, 1954.

Hon. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
Chairman, Veterans' Affairs Committee,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MRS. ROGERS: In response to your request there is transmitted herewith an explanation of the effect the reduction recommended by the conference committee of $4,250,000 from the amount approved by the Senate for the appropriation "General operating expenses" will have on the operation of various activities of the Veterans' Administration.

Sincerely yours,

J. C. PALMER,
Acting Deputy Administrator.

ANALYSIS OF THE REDUCTION OF $4,250,000 MADE BY THE CONFERENCE COMMITTEE TO THE GENERAL OPERATING EXPENSES APPROPRIATION OF THE VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

Based on the original estimated workload for fiscal year 1955, it was determined that an appropriation of $174,700,000 for general operating expenses would be required to continue to provide adequate services to veterans in the same manner as those services were currently being provided. However, in reviewing our appropriation needs for this purpose the Bureau of the Budget gave consideration to the possibility of consolidating certain workloads and activities at field stations which, if accomplished prior to the beginning of fiscal year 1955, would result in an estimated savings of $10 million. Accordingly, the 1955 budget request for the appropriation "General operating expenses" submitted to the Congress was in the amount of $164,700,000 on the assumption that the consolidation of workload and activities would be accomplished prior to July 1, 1955.

After the House of Representatives had considered this request and recommended an amount of $163,922,300, it became evident that this consolidation of activities could not be accomplished during fiscal year 1955 in sufficient time to save an estimated $10 million over the actual amount required based on workload. Therefore, the President, based upon a reappraisal of projected workload requirements, submitted a supplemental in the amount of $7,500,000. The Senate gave consideration to this supplemental request as well as to the restoration of reductions made by the House of Representatives and recommended an appropriation of $171,922,000.

The reduction of $4,250,000 proposed by the Conference Committee would cause the Veterans' Administration to reduce its employment at regional offices by a minimum of 1,000 employees by July 31, 1954, in order to live within the amount recommended. Every regional office in the country would be affected by this reduction at a time when workloads are increasing at a rapid rate. It would have a disastrous effect on the service that this agency would be able to render to veterans in the Loan Guaranty activity, Vocational Rehabilitation and Education activity, and the Claims activity. For example, the Loan Guaranty workload has increased from 36,000 appraisal requests in December 1953 to 89,000 appraisal requests as of May 31, 1954, or by approximately 147 percent during this period. The applications for home loans during this same period have increased from 23,864 in December 1953 to 41,916 as of May 31, 1954.

This enormous increase in the loan guaranty workload has resulted in backlogs accumulating in practically all regional offices with the result that veterans have been delayed in proceeding with their plans to acquire homes, and there has been a delay in the issuance of certificates of reasonable value to builders which has resulted in a delay in the construction program throughout the country. In order to alleviate this situation, regional offices have been authorized to spend funds for overtime work in the loan guaranty divisions. Where possible, employees from other divisions have been detailed to the Loan Guaranty Division and regional offices have been authorized to employ additional people to the extent that, as of today, the authorized employment for the Loan Guaranty Division is 378 in excess of the number of employees contained in the 1955 budget request as amended in the Senate. Requests are being received daily for increased number of personnel for the loan guaranty activity in the various regional offices to overcome the backlog which is as much as 3 months or more in some offices, and to continue on a current basis with the increasing workload.

Unless the funds are restored, it will not be possible for additional relief to be given for the loan guaranty activity in regional offices and there will have to be drastic reductions in the number of personnel already authorized, thereby compounding the backlog problem. This will mean further delays on the part of veterans acquiring satisfactory housing and will also mean that the general construction program for the Nation will be slowed down and delayed because builders cannot be furnished certificates of reasonable value on a current basis.

The veterans in training under Public Law 550 (Korean veterans) under the vocational rehabilitation and education activity have increased from 262,000 in December 1953 to 355,000 in April 1954. In this program it is estimated that the training load under Public Law 550 will exceed a peak of 500,000 veterans in training during fiscal year 1955.

At the suggestion of the House Appropriation Committee, a review was started during fiscal year 1954 of all running awards for compensation and pension purposes. It was planned to continue this review to completion during fiscal year 1955, but unless the cut in the general operating expenses appropriation is restored, personnel will not be availble to continue this review.

In view of the rapidly increasing workload trends as shown above, the amount reported by the Senate Appropriation Committee of $171,922,300 in H. R. 8583 represents the absolute minimum that will be needed for fiscal year 1955. If these workloads continue to increase at recently experienced rates, it is probable that the $171,922,300 which the Senate passed would prove inadequate to properly service this tremendous workload.

If the reduction of $4,250,000, as made by the conference committee, is not restored, it appears that it will be necessary to proceed as rapidly as possible with the consolidation of activities and workloads at regional offices or to reduce materially the number of regional office locations, and also to close some 50 to 100 VA contact offices throughout the country. This would result in the shifting of personnel in substantial numbers at a time when this agency is faced with the tremendous problem of gearing operations to process these loads in order to provide adequate service to veterans. Of course, the standards of service to veterans would be impaired if this action becomes necessary at this time.

The reduction in travel limitation of $344,000, in view of workload trends in the vocational rehabilitation and education, and loan guaranty activities, would seriously hamper the mission of the regional offices. The workloads to be processed by the loan-guaranty activity require the travel of appraisers and compliance inspectors to assure that the veteran gets value received in the construction of his home. The travel requirement of the vocational rehabilitation and education activity is to provide for (1) supervision of training institutions to insure that veterans are obtaining training benefits as authorized, (2) visiting Public Law 550 training facilities to assure that payments of education and training allowances are in accordance with the requirements of the law, (3) the induction and supervision of disabled veterans at their places of training in order to facilitate their rehabilitation, (4) negotiation of contracts with training facilities, verifying charges for services rendered and performing of audits in connection with contract terminations. Restoration of the travel limitation to the $3,144,000 as reported by the Senate would preclude serious curtailment of this essential travel.

The Veterans' Administration during the current year has made substantial progress in its goal of achieving economy at no sacrifice of service to veterans. For example, the Department of Veterans Benefits, which is the department primarily affected by the reduction made by the conference committee, has reduced its total employment by 2,783 employees from June 30, 1953, to May 31, 1954.

Churchill Visit Underlines Wise Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 17, 1954

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, it is always open season on the British Empire. Long before "the shot that was heard around the world," which marked the first great revolution against an imperial power, our Founding Fathers in America were speaking their mind about British policy. We have come a long way since the Revolution, but we are still quick to become angry with England and its colonial tradition.

Nevertheless, whenever we analyze the world situation, it becomes obvious that Uncle Sam and John Bull are the two cornerstones on which the future of Western civilization must rest. Without our combined strength the prospect for a free Europe is disturbing indeed. France and Italy have been pressed to establish stable governments. Germany is divided and still largely dependent upon foreign aid for defense.

American foreign policy is designed for one basic purpose—to preserve our freedom and security. The primary effort is to prevent war. But secondary to this, the object of our policy is to assure us a victory—if any kind of victory is possible in modern warfare—if we are compelled to wage war. Certainly in such a situation the dictates of intelligent foreign policy compel us to seek the strongest possible allies. The more we have, the better. We are a powerful nation, to be sure, but we have only 6 percent of the total world population. We must have allies and alliances in this complex and difficult world, even though we share George Washington's feeling on alliances. The British are our closest Western ally. Even though we may dislike much that they do, it is the task of statesmen to help them and every other potential friend so that they may be strong for us if the need ever arises.

Bedford, Va., Heroes Honored

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 17, 1954

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, one of the toughest and bloodiest jobs undertaken by American troops during World War II was the landing at Omaha Beach on the Normandy coast. One of the units participating in that assault, which the distinguished historian, Dr. Douglas Freeman compared to Pickett's charge at Gettysburg, was a regimental combat team of the 116th Infantry, a Virginia National Guard unit with a distinguished background tracing back to the French and Indian Wars. Company A of the 116th Infantry, was particularly hard-hit in the Omaha Beach landing with two-thirds of its strength, including all officers and most of the sergeants becoming casualties.

Members of Company A who lost their lives on this occasion included 23 men from Bedford, Va., and the memory of these men and of their heroic companions was honored on June 6, 1954, the 10th anniversary of the Normandy invasion, by the dedication of a stone which was brought to Bedford after being cut out of the rock near the beach where the landing was made.

As a further tribute to the memory of those brave Americans, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a summary of the memorial program, the text of the prayer offered by the Reverend William Burke and the text of the dedicatory address delivered by Rear Adm. Andre Jubelin, Naval Attaché of the Embassy of France, Washington, D. C.

There being no objection, the summary of the memorial program was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Program of the dedication of the D-day memorial in Bedford, Va., on Sunday, June 6, 1954, honoring the 23 men from Bedford County who gave their lives in the Omaha Beach assault:

Music, Battle Hymn of the Republic: Bedford Firemen's Band, Warrant Officer A. W. Hull, director.

Presentation of colors.

National anthems, La Marseillaise and Star-Spangled Banner: Bedford Firemen's Band.

Invocation, Rev. William F. Burke, rector, St. Thomas Episcopal Church, Orange, Va.; former chaplain, 116th Infantry Regiment, 29th Division.

Address of welcome, Charles E. Green, Jr., member, House of Delegates of General Assembly of Virginia.

Introduction of guests.

Remarks, Maj. Gen. S. Gardner Waller, adjutant general of Virginia.

Music, Dixie: Bedford Firemen's Band.

Introduction of speaker, Maj. James D. Sink, executive officer, 1st Battalion, 116th Infantry Regiment, 29th Division.

Address, Rear Adm. Andre Jubelin, naval attaché of Embassy of France, Washington, D. C.

Acceptance of stone, Alexander Reynolds, vice commander, Parker-Hoback Post, No. 74, 29th Division Association.

Unveiling of memorial, Mrs. P. A. Fellers.

Reading of memorial tablet, Maj. R. Sherman Watson, past commander, Parker-Hoback Post, No. 74, 29th Division Association.

Taps, Richard Puckett.

Retiring of colors.

Benediction, Dr. J. H. Grey, pastor-emeritus, Bedford Presbyterian Church.

William W. Berry, master of ceremonies.

Text of invocation by the Reverend William F. Burke, rector, St. Thomas Episcopal Church, Orange, Va., former chaplain, 116th Infantry Regiment, 29th Division:

"Almighty God, our heavenly Father, in whose hands are the living and the dead, we remember before Thee those men, our brethren of Company A, who gave their lives on Omaha Beach 10 years ago this day. May our remembrance be not superficial or casual; may the honor we pay them be not a routine articulation of words and phrases with no meaning and vibrancy. Above all, keep us honest, with them, with ourselves, with Thee.

"What we do here is a sacrilege unless we give ourselves to those convictions for which they died. If in us honor be dormant, if in us heroism and bravery by acts foolish to him who seeks personal security, if in us complete sacrifice be the mark of a fanatic, if in us love that knows no finish in its giving be the insignia of a foolish man, then surely these men have died a futile death, and we among all men are the most miserable and the most pitiful.

"But, O God, as mysterious is the way of life and death, as confused as we know ourselves to be, one thing we do know is that wherever we see sacrifice in its rawest, heroism at its greatest, duty performed irrespective of consequence, honest convictions obeyed, even to death, there we see a part of Thy nature. We bow our heads in humble acknowledgement of the mighty acts of these men, for above everything else, they, in their way, have shown us that he who would save his life must lose it.

"Here we stand, O God, meekly, sorrowfully, and yet proudly, and to them we say:

"'O valiant hearts, who to your glory came
Through dust of conflict and through battle flame;
Tranquil you lie, your knightly virtue proved,
Your memory hallowed in the land you loved.
Proudly you gathered, rank on rank, to war.
As who had heard God's message from afar;

"'All you had hoped for, all you had, you gave
To save mankind—yourself you scorned to save.
Splendid you passed, the great surrender made,
Into the light that never more shall fade;
Deep your contentment in that blest abode,
Who wait the last trumpet-call of God.'

"Amen."

Speech of Rear Adm. Andre Jubelin, Naval attaché of Embassy of France in the United States, on presentation of memorial stone as gift from the Republic of France for the D-day Memorial in Bedford, Va., on June 6, 1954:

"Mr. Chairman, Honorable Mr. Green, Major General Gerhardt, veterans of the 116th Infantry Regiment, ladies, and gentlemen, this is a great honor for me to be here among you as the representative of the Ambassador of France on this anniversary of D-day when a memorial is dedicated to the glorious soldiers of Bedford County who 10 years ago gave their lives for the liberation of France and Europe.

"I wish to express my deep gratitude to the members of this post for having invited me.

"As you know, part of the memorial is a stone quarried from the area of the Normandy battlefield close to the small village of Vierville-sur-Mer which was the first objective of the 116th combat team after the initial landing on Omaha beach.

"Shortly after the suggestion was made that a memorial be erected here to honor the heroes of Bedford, a distinguished citizen, friend of the men sponsoring the event, conceived the wonderful idea to have a stone from the area of the assault shipped here and made a part of the memorial.

"Through the French information and press service in New York, he contacted His Excellency Mr. Henri Bonnet, Ambassador of France. Mr. Bonnet was enthusiastic about the idea and he advised the French authorities in Normandy.

"Thanks to the action of Mr. Stirn, prefet of the Calvados province of France, necessary steps were taken to have a granite rock quarried near the village of Vierville-sur-Mer and sent to the United States. The stone was carried by the S. S. *Cavelier de la Salle* of the French Line and it arrived in Bedford the 21st of April 1954.

"In the name of His Excellency Mr. Henri Bonnet, Ambassador of France, I have the great honor to present this stone to the members of the Bedford post. This rock supporting a tablet on which are engraved the names of the Bedford County men who in 1944 made the supreme sacrifice in the cause of freedom will forever stand as a memorial to the indomitable courage of those heroes. As a gift from France, it will also stand as a permanent symbol of the indefectible gratitude of the people of Normandy and France to their liberators.

"May I read now to you my Ambassador's message to your country:

"On this 10th anniversary of D-day, the dedication of the Bedford memorial appears as an event of great significance to all of us.

"Ten years ago today, the gallant soldiers of the 116th United States Infantry Regiment landed on the soil of France as the spearhead of the great crusade for the liberation of Europe and the defense of freedom, launched under the leadership of Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower. On the beach of Vierville-sur-Mer, a tiny village of the Norman coast, they fought, together with their comrades of the 29th Division, the grim battle of Omaha Beach, which will forever remain in our memories. Twenty-three of the Bedford sons, belonging to Company A of this regiment, were the first to give their lives in this epic struggle.

"This rock, upon which are inscribed all the names of these young heroes, will stand out for generations to come as a memorial of their sacrifice, and as a token of gratitude from France to the people of Bedford."

Tide Water Oil Co., of Bayonne, N. J., Might Well Be a Pace Setter in Granting Employees Transfer Accommodations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 2, 1954

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, reports have it that the Tide Water Oil Co., of Bayonne, N. J., plans to pull up stakes and locate elsewhere.

The move will put many skilled and devoted employees who have lived, talked, eaten, and slept nothing but Tide Water all their lives out of work.

The question is, Will Tide Water rise to the mark and grant those of its workers who wish to follow it, transfer accommodations? This means a job in the new location for every qualified employee who makes the move. It means, too, keeping bread on the table of the worker's family.

Free enterprise? Sure. Industry in the United States can move anytime it likes. And it does not have to tell anyone why. It can slip into a community, spawn its profits, and then move on.

This is a request for the Tidewater Oil Co., Mr. Speaker, to become a pace setter in granting employees whom it would otherwise leave flat, transfer accommodations, to give them jobs in Tidewater's new location.

Do I hear someone say "No"? Why not? Going to a cheaper labor market, getting a better tax break? You may, for a short while. But Uncle Sam eventually catches up, because the people you leave flat who cannot get work, start collecting unemployment benefits, thus setting in train a series of local, State, and Federal aid measures. Some call this socialistic. Others say that you have socialism only when Uncle Sam pockets the profits or polices production. Tidewater is too smart to think it can kid itself long on that score. Oil people get good Federal tax breaks.

Free enterprise? Of course.

If Tidewater gives everyone the lift it can, it will have a pleasant hayride.

Tidewater Oil Co. is too smart to allow the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey to outpace it too long in the field of worker transfer accommodations.

It is our earnest desire, Mr. Speaker, that the Tidewater Oil Co. may continue to operate with as many of the skilled and steadfast citizens of Bayonne on its payrolls as possible. Long may both prosper.

Question of the Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 17, 1954

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, which Roosevelt will inherit the toga—John, who is working with the Eisenhower Citizens Committee? Frank, who is running for Governor of New York? Or Jimmy, who is running for Congress out of the California divorce court?

Speaking for the Farmer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE CANNON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 17, 1954

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, the woods are full of self-designated farm experts who take advantage of every possible occasion to tell us what the farmer wants—and what is best for the farmer, whether he wants it or not.

Among the most insistent and most vociferous of them all are various editors, Government and organization officials, professional politicians, middlemen, pollsters, and other self-constituted farm authorities clothed in purple and fine linen, who infest luxurious offices with mahogany furniture and plush carpets and fare sumptuously every day. These gentlemen rush into print on the slightest provocation, dictate headlines, race their mimeographs at top speed, address meetings, beat the air waves, and haunt the television screens telling all who will listen or read that the farmer does not want as high a price for what he sells as he pays for what he buys—that the farmer would scorn to ask for a fair share of the national income—that the farmer prefers for his children to grow up without the advantages enjoyed by the children of every other class and industry—that he is perfectly contented to accept 75-percent quotas when everybody else is getting in excess of 100 percent—that he decries legislation which would place him on a plane of equality with other beneficiaries of congressional enactments which for years have been legislating money out of his pockets and into the pockets of people who work less hours in less important capacities and render less service to the Nation than he does—that the farmer does not really feel his family is entitled to an American standard of living and would feel regimented and disgraced by creeping socialism if he countenanced efforts to give him 90 percent of the income all other American families are enjoying.

Apparently these loquacious and ubiquitous gentlemen who improvise their statistics or compile them on loaded questionnaires—"Do you favor the President's and so forth"—have no interest in the editorials of the farm journals which live close to the farmers and the soil and which are in a position to understand the farmer's problems and have a legitimate interest in farm progress and farm prosperity.

In view of that hiatus I venture to quote a few timely and pertinent paragraphs appearing in this week's edition of Wallace's Farmer and Iowa Homestead, one of the oldest, ablest, and soundest farm periodicals published on the North American Continent. Although Republican in politics—founded by a great Republican Secretary of Agriculture—its first interest is agriculture and the welfare of the farm family. Here is one of this week's editorials:

Benson in Iowa

Have Iowa farmers quit raising hogs in order to sell corn to the Government?

You'd get that idea from Secretary of Agriculture Ezra T. Benson's Iowa speeches around the first of June.

Benson told Iowa people that the present farm program had encouraged farmers "to produce corn and wheat for storage * * * rather than for meat, eggs, and other livestock products."

Let's look at Iowa hog production. What do the figures show?

Iowa farmers produced over 19 million hogs for market in 1953. Only four times in history has that total been exceeded.

The years when last year's hog production were exceeded in Iowa were 1943, 1950, 1951, and 1952. The total in 1950 was only slightly over the 1953 total.

The 19 million hogs produced in Iowa last year was 7 percent above the 10-year average.

And for this year, 1954, the Iowa hog production total promises to bounce right up near former record highs despite corn price supports.

The Secretary should know that drought had a great deal to do with reduction in hog totals nationally. For example, 1953 spring pig crop in the south central States was 32 percent below 1952.

Figures on hog production used here are from Benson's Department of Agriculture.

And there are more figures there to prove that meat production has gone up, not down, in this period when so-called high price supports were in effect.

Meat production in 1953 exceeded that of any peacetime year. Consumption of red meat per person at 154 pounds was highest since 1908.

Price supports at present levels have not made Iowa farmers quit raising hogs as Benson implies. Neither have they cut national production of meat and livestock products.

Supplementing this article is a convincing editorial in refutation of a widely circulated fallacy to the effect that reducing farm prices will decrease farm production and eliminate farm surpluses:

Low Prices No Cure—Farm Price Cut Will Not End Surpluses

Lower farm prices will not solve our food-surplus problem as some would like to believe.

Farmers' prices would have to go very low to reduce production and increase consumption effectively.

Drastic price reductions required would break many farmers. And businessmen who deal with farmers would be hit almost as hard.

Political reaction would come quickly. Congress would pass farm-price-support laws stronger than those we have. And, very likely, with no real solution of the food-surplus problem.

We must look for some other method or methods. Farm price cuts won't cure the surplus problem.

First effort for disposal of food surpluses should be to stimulate consumption. Spend money, if need be, to feed our own people better.

We have millions of people who do not get enough meat and milk products for good health. There'd be no surplus food in anything but wheat if all of our people were fed well.

That's a consumption subsidy, of course. But we subsidize producers. What's the difference?

Direct subsidies to consumers might not cost any more and might have more benefit to all concerned.

The specific measures could be school lunches, food stamps, and production payments on perishable products.

Such surplus disposal measures would have the advantage of strengthening our whole people through better nutrition.

Can we move the surpluses by stimulating consumption?

In everything but wheat, the surpluses will disappear if we get the food to the people that they really need.

And if, along with consumption efforts, we store feed grains in years of big production to smooth out the supplies one year with another.

Then, when our people are well fed, production controls, through soil conservation methods, would be justified. And controls can be made to work if people are convinced they are necessary.

Let's help people to eat up our food surpluses. Then use production controls only as absolutely necessary.

That kind of a farm program has a chance. The low-price method of controlling production and increasing consumption has not worked in practice.

And in this connection, quoting from the same editorial page, is an appropriate answer to the admonition given evicted farmers who appealed to legislative committees in the last depression, "You farmers are always bellyaching. Go on back home and raise more hogs and less hell":

Town folks say farmers complain too much. Might be the businessman would complain, too, if he had nothing to do with his buying or selling prices—and if the real buyers of his products were folks in distant cities that he never even sees.

The folks who lecture farmers about tinkering with the law of supply and demand are usually those who have been able to manipulate demand or supply to make their own business successful.

Mr. Speaker, in these—and similar editorials published over many years—Wallace's Farmer and Iowa Homestead is not pleading for the farmer alone. The great farm spokesman is also speaking for America as a whole. For farm prosperity means American prosperity. Abraham Lincoln said, "This country cannot exist half slave and half free." He might have added with equal conviction that it cannot exist half busted and half rich. When farm income dwindles—when the farmer can no longer buy—the merchant can no longer sell. When the merchant can no longer sell, the factory closes down and the highways are crowded with men looking for jobs. Banks liquidate. The stock exchange crashes. The new television set is repossessed. All for the want of a farmer with enough buying power to support his family.

"An All-Out Raid on the United States Treasury," Mr. Postmaster General?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 15, 1954

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, in a resolution recently passed by the New Jersey Federation of Post Office Clerks, bitter resentment is expressed at a remark reportedly made by the Postmaster General when he is alleged to have said publicly that postal employee organization requests for pay increases is "nothing less than an all-out raid on the United States Treasury."

If the above be a raid, then would it be fair to say that the failure of the Postmaster General to raise postal rates for commercial users of the mails is an all-out drain on the United States Treasury?

Were the drain plugged, the requests for postal pay raises would be considered mild as well as proper.

Mr. Dulles Reorganizing Our State Department

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 17, 1954

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, all of us become impatient with the slow processes of government in a free republic. But we must remember that no responsible administration can undo in 18 months what was 20 years in the making. Secretary of State John Foster Dulles has just adopted as policy for the Department of State a special committee report dealing with reorganization of our Government's diplomatic agency.

Under the recommendations, our Foreign Service Corps will seek to obtain a regular flow of topnotch men and women representing a high-level cross section of American life, and will attempt to integrate the functions and responsibilities of the Home and Foreign Service units of the State Department. In selecting people for the Department, Members of Congress would encourage to suggest outstanding people, much as they now do for West Point and Annapolis.

A training program involving scholarships at colleges is another important recommendation under study. Fine people will be given this opportunity to serve their country on a broader basis than ever before when the whole reorganization program goes into effect.

Graduation: Youth's Finest Moment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ROONEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 17, 1954

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, on last Sunday evening, June 13, one of my sons, Arthur Patrick Curran, was graduated from Gonzaga College High School here in Washington. The following splendid address on this great occasion to the 135 graduates of Jesuit training was delivered by my friend and distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Michigan, the Honorable LOUIS C. RABAUT:

GRADUATION: YOUTH'S FINEST MOMENT

(Address by Hon. LOUIS C. RABAUT, of Michigan)

It is with a deep sense of pride and a realization of unmerited honor that I am here today to address this 1954 graduating class of Gonzaga College High School. Proud in the distinction that is mine by your invitation to join you; honored that I am part and product of a system of education that has played such a role in my life and which, I expect and hope, will, in yours.

No words of mine, on this joyous and at once solemn occasion, could do as much to impress upon your minds a more sober appreciation of the transitory nature of this life, of the certainty of death and the uncertainty of the time thereof, than has the tragic accident which lately befell a number of your classmates and friends. To them we offer our prayers. May we say to their parents and friends, that heart breaking though it be, the ways of the Lord are not known to us. We must bear the cross if we would wear the crown. For grief and joy walk ever side by side.

To you young men of Gonzaga, my congratulations. You have many to be thankful to and much to be thankful for.

To your parents who, through anxious and troubled times, have worked, hoped, and sacrificed that this day might come.

To your teachers, who have chosen, to make their way toward their eternal salvation, by a dedication of their lives to the education of youth. The Jesuit Fathers build their thrones in the hearts of boys.

To your country, which has helped to make all these things yours.

Today is the climax of one definite phase of your lives. Where you go from here is your choice and your responsibility. Right now, in many other countries of the world, lads no older than you are being called upon to perform tasks that were heretofore those done only by mature men. Many have been called upon to shoulder arms at their country's bidding. Hundreds of thousands of your countrymen have given their lives on battlefields far from home, in defense of what they knew to be right, that you might enjoy the privileges that are yours today. You, too, may be called upon to serve to safeguard that heritage.

The world is in a state of great tempest and turmoil. As a result, the education you have received here at Gonzaga takes on an increased significance. You have been provided with many of the implements with which you may earn your daily bread. You know, through your courses in religion, what is expected of you as moral beings in a society of men. You are cognizant of your duty to God and country. You have been taught the strength and power and music of the spoken word, the poetry of the well-written phrase. You have learned how to learn, and you know that education is a process of formation, not information. You have been instructed to think clearly, and what is more, to think correctly. You are aware that learning should never be striven for as an end merely in itself, but as a means by which we so perfect ourselves that we are able the better to help others. But you know these things, and more. Remember them.

It is my belief that the youth of today can take great example and courage from the life of our most recently canonized saint of the church, Pius X; he, proved in everything that he ever did or attempted to do, the basic fact that even the humblest man can achieve greatness, if he will but approach the problems and duties which arise from day to day with diligence, application, and dedication. The boyhood of Pius X was spent in poverty; all his life he lived as an ascetic. And yet he rose to be the Vicar of Christ on Earth. He lived to exert a more powerful sway over the minds and hearts of men, in every clime and in ever tongue, than has any leader of modern times. And through it all he retained his simplicity and humility. Truly his is an example to emulate.

You might wonder what chance you have in today's stepped-up pace of living. What openings are there in 1954 for a youth on his leaving high school? Are not the days of rugged individualism dead? Is it not true that science and invention are moving at such a breathtaking pace that it seems as if there will be nothing left for you to do in the field of new thought and accomplishment? And yet I say to you, whether you choose to go on to higher education, or you prefer to step into the highly competitive arena of business competition, don't feel that your chances are limited. Don't believe it for one second. America is still the same grand land of opportunity that it was when I was a boy. It will still provide for you the maximum yield from a day's hard work. It still believes in the proposition that the harmony of sweat and honest labor is more to be desired than the siren-song of security and paternalism. And yet you must alert yourselves to guard against these new theories, which would take, while seeming to to give, and leave your framework of bequeathed liberty nothing but a hollow shell of slavery and statism.

Too many people today feel that it's clever to be different, that old-fashioned patriotism is something that should be interred quietly in some secluded section of an even more secluded mausoleum, there to be viewed in years to come as a collector's item, a passing fancy of the times, a throwback to our days of infancy and immaturity as a nation. And yet, much of our trouble as a nation stems directly from a lack of genuine patriotism. There was a time, and it seems even longer ago than it has been, when a group of men gathered together, and calling down upon their work the blessing of Almighty God, set about to create a form of government that would welcome all the oppressed of the earth and for the first time set them on a plane of equality, make them equal in the eyes of each other, just as they were destined to be in the designs of the Creator of mankind. These men drew up a Constitution, a Bill of Rights, and made a flag. In good times and bad these have served us well. Through war and depression, through change and circumstance, these have stood as the pyramids of old, amidst the shifting sands of world unrest. They have stood foursquare, and so they stand now in the cold-war struggle in which we, as the leader of the sister nations of the earth, find ourselves engulfed. And should it happen that our cities be destroyed, our flag will still wave quietly in the clear, cool breeze of freedom, freedom that has been ours, inherited, loved, and cherished—and maintained by heroes on the field of battle.

We know, that unless the leaders of nations begin to realize the necessity of a reaffirmation of basic truth and principle, then all may be lost. The clock of civilization may be turned back to the darkest of the dark ages.

America is where she is today because of what she is. She has chosen to invoke the blessing of God on her endeavors and to thank Him for those blessings. In our Nation's greatest tribunals, in the Congress of the United States, she opens each day's proceedings with a prayer. In many ways, she has remembered Him. And He has not forgotten her. She has remembered His generosity and she has spilled out her wealth in an unending stream, ever mindful of the necessity for service, when catastrophe visits an unfortunate people. She has been the good neighbor. She has shared her measureless advances in the field of science with those who have been less privileged. And for this she has often received from them rebuke instead of thanks, scorn in place of appreciation. But she has remained steadfast in her purpose—for it is the American way.

It is important that you young men realize the need for equality and fair play in your dealings with your fellow men. Whether employee or employer, treat with justice those who work with you. Treat with decency those with whom you come in contact, whether they differ from you in color or in creed. The recent action by our Supreme Court in the field of segregation has been a great step forward in this direction. The shame of it is the long delay in its arrival. In the worldwide conflict against communism this decision will do as much to further the cause of freemen as anything this Nation has said or done in the last half century.

It is well to remember, as you make your way in life, the importance of making friends, friends who will be with you, no matter what. There is a saying that "prosperity makes friends, adversity tries them." And poor indeed is the man who, despite whatever material successes he may enjoy, looks about only to find himself friendless. Money and wealth may go, but a true friend is a priceless treasure.

Independence of thought and action are attributes which the youth should possess. Do what you believe to be right, even if it means that you must face a hostile world, in defense of that belief. Stand firm, even if you must stand alone. Let all men count with you, but none so much that you must sacrifice principle to retain their company.

Bear always in mind that in whatever you do, you must work hard. Persevere and you will succeed. Perhaps I could put it this way: Never give in when giving in means giving up. But, in reality, youth needs scarcely to be told these things. He is wiser, often, than we know.

It is wise for you young men to temper your natural exuberance with the advice and wisdom which your parents stand in a position to give to you. Experience is the best of teachers. The qualities which are yours often need guidance. Beware of the all too many pitfalls which milestone life's path.

You have heard the story of the talents, that each will be judged according to what he has been given. And there is no more pathetic a sight than that of one who has wasted the abilities with which he as been endowed. The God who sits in judgment will call each of you to account for your gifts of intellect. Use them wisely and well while you may.

It is true that the future belongs to the youth of the world. It is in you that we place our hopes, our confidences and our aspirations. Spend yourself for God and country. Be one who puts something into the world rather than takes from it.

The history of Gonzaga is steeped in tradition. Your school was founded in the days when our Nation was coming of age. In the shadow of the capitol, here in Washington, it has grown, as your country has grown—great, and uncompromising. Through the years, Gonzaga has been blessed with wise administration and teaching method. These find their fruition here today, as they have on other graduation days for over 130 years. Retain what has been taught to you. Return often and always to these halls, to refresh your memories and to refurbish your ideals. Return, if only to visit, but return. For it is here that you have been given a great possession—it is here you have become men.

And so men of Gonzaga, on this your graduation day in 1954, with all sincerity of heart, I hail you. I appreciate this opportunity that has been mine today.

With congratulations and best wishes for the years to come—years to record your leadership—I wish you good luck, Godspeed, and I wish you goodby.

H. R. 1227

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 17, 1954

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to leave granted, I include in these remarks a petition signed by citizens of Portland, Oreg., in my congressional district, with reference to H. R. 1227, as follows:

> We, the undersigned, believing that the cause of total abstinence can be served by the reduction of advertising of alcoholic beverages over radio and television urge that our congressional Representatives help bring the Bryson bill (H. R. 1227) from committee and support it by their vote. This bill would prohibit the transportation in interstate commerce of alcoholic-beverage advertising in newspapers, periodicals, and its broadcasting over radio and TV. We also request that you present the petitions to the House and to have a note made of them in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.
>
> Mrs. Victor A. Johnson, Mrs. Carl R. Hammer, Carl Hammer, Mrs. Wm. Purves, Mabel A. Root, George H. Root, Lenora Glover, Gerhart R. Knutson, Elisabeth Huber, E. L. Milliken, Robert V. Hagell, Evangeline Sheppard, Austin Ricketts, Katherine Ricketts, A. J. Oeder, Inez M. Bowman, Mary A. Ferrier, Hazel L. Tonkin, Christine E. Blomfield, Edna N. Oeder, Mrs. Roy B. Kelly, Mrs. Rena Clisby, Mrs. Mary Welch, Mrs. Lucinda L. Haak, Mr. Geo. Westcott, Mrs. Alice Dunlap, Mrs. Winnie G. Boylan, Mrs. L. C. Van Winkle, Betty S. Weatherby, Jermie M. Smith, Barent J. Borcourt, Myrtle S. Borcourt, Bessie E. Sanders, Ethel M. Smith, Frances M. Smith, Minnie Malmsten, S. T. Malmsten, C. G. Shay, Fred Sanders, Grace Carleton, Mary Dickman, Minnie E. Schad, C. S. Schad, Evelyn M. Aaron, Dorothy M. Irwin, Lila Curnow, Del Knutson, Dorothy Buck, Grace B. Hampton, Mrs. Lillie Thompson, Beulah I. Lepley, Ben W. Taylor, Nellie M. Brown, M. C. Shelton, Don R. Hampton, Elaine B. Naglee, Ruth B. Idol, all of Portland, Oreg.

The House Mustn't Scuttle Public Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 17, 1954

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include an editorial which appeared in the Providence Journal, Providence, R. I., on Wednesday, June 16, 1954.

THE HOUSE MUSTN'T SCUTTLE PUBLIC HOUSING

The House Rules Committee was not acting for the public welfare when it ruled out a conference committee compromise on the public housing provision of the administration's general housing bill. When the House passed its version of this measure, it made no provision whatever for a continuance of new public housing construction despite Mr. Eisenhower's recommendation that 35,000 additional units of such housing be built anually during the next 4 years.

The Senate wisely heeded the President's advice that the public housing program should not be interrupted. In voting continuance of the prorgam, it not only well discharged a public duty but gave both the administration and the supporters of public housing across the Nation fresh confidence that the House would reverse its position. Certainly the lower Chamber should do so. And the administration is clearly justified in bringing all possible pressure on legislative leaders to persuade the Rules Committee to withdraw its nonnegotiation ruling in the joint conference.

Despite the bill's provisions for giving small-income families more liberal financial assistance on more extended terms for repayment of their mortgage loans, the fulfillment of the home-owning ambition of such families will not solve the problem of adequate housing for countless other families who cannot afford independent home ownership. For these families the only hope for decent housing in conformity with minimum standards of social welfare is public housing. The House Members who are trying to scuttle this part of Mr. Eisenhower's program are not keeping faith with either the President or the public.

Little Items That Make Big News

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 17, 1954

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, we often say that inflation is the world's biggest thief. Here is proof. If you were a married man with two dependents in 1939 and earned $77 a week, you have to be making $173 a week today to be just as well off. That is why the Eisenhower administration is battling so hard to cut down Federal spending from the record levels reached under the Democrats.

Some folks thought the Smith Act was only conversation and that the Communist Party leaders would just burrow underground. As of now, 109 Red agents have been arrested under this law, and their yelps of anguish can be heard all the way to Moscow.

Under the Eisenhower administration, the Federal Government has eliminated the use of 7,000 automobiles, saving the taxpayers $2 million a year; new purchasing procedures by the General Services Administration are saving us $67 million annually; new licensing procedure is giving us $30 million more in revenues each year. It all adds up—our way, for a change.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Printing and binding for Congress, when recommended to be done by the Committee on Printing of either House, shall be so recommended in a report containing an approximate estimate of the cost thereof, together with a statement from the Public Printer of estimated approximate cost of work previously ordered by Congress within the fiscal year (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 145, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on Printing, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

DISTRIBUTION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

To the Vice President and each Senator 100 copies; to the Secretary and Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, each, 25 copies; to the Secretary, for official use, not to exceed 35 copies; to the Sergeant at Arms, for use on the floor of the Senate, not to exceed 50 copies; to each Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress, 68 copies; to the Clerk, Sergeant at Arms, and Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives, each, 25 copies; to the Clerk, for official use, not to exceed 50 copies; and to the Doorkeeper, for use on the floor of the House of Representatives, not to exceed 75 copies; to the Vice President and each Senator, Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress there shall also be furnished (and shall not be transferable), 3 copies of the daily RECORD, of which 1 shall be delivered at his residence, 1 at his office, and 1 at the Capitol.

PRINTING DOCUMENTS AND REPORTS

Documents and reports of committees with the evidence and papers submitted therewith, or any part thereof ordered printed by Congress, may be reprinted by the Public Printer on order of any Member of Congress or Delegate, on prepayment of the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 162, p. 1940).

Appendix

The Free World at the Crossroads

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 17, 1954

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me today at Temple University, entitled "The Free World at the Crossroads":

President Johnson, members of the faculty, members of the graduating class, alumni, students, and friends of Temple University, it is indeed a great honor and privilege to be invited to speak at these commencement exercises. It is a far greater honor to be chosen to receive the honorary degree of doctor of humanitarian service and to be accepted into the fellowship of alumni of Temple University.

You who are being graduated today will find, I am sure, that your alma mater has equipped you well with all that any college or university can give its students of general knowledge and intellectual disciplines. If there is reason for concern regarding your generation, it is not regarding the excellence of your training in whatever has been your particular field of study; it is more likely to be with respect to the intelligence of your citizenship, and the depth and strength of your faith. For these must be of a higher order than my generation has demonstrated, or there may not long be a society in which you will have opportunity to use with success and satisfaction the knowledge and skills you have worked so long and hard to acquire here.

In a few moments, most of you will become bachelor of arts or of science. Some of you will become masters or doctors; others will go on to earn those degrees later. But before any of these, you are citizens. You are, or will be, parents and taxpayers. You are trustees of a great and noble heritage of freedom—trustees of a political and economic order which permitted even those of you who came from humblest circumstances, as did I, to get the expensive education which we could never have dreamed of obtaining in most countries of the world.

The civilization of which you and I are trustees is today in great peril. It is under attack on every continent. For the first time, I think, in man's existence on this planet, all cultures, all countries, all peoples are in turmoil and conflict at the same time.

It is not an old-fashioned struggle for territory. It is a struggle for control of man.

It is a struggle of arms, as is obvious to all.

It is also a struggle of economic systems; which will crack up first?

It is a conflict of educational systems; which will produce not only the smartest minds, but the toughest wills?

It is a conflict of political and social systems; which will allow man to achieve the largest measure of the things he most desires, so that he will be willing to die if necessary in defense of the system?

It is a conflict of religious faiths; are there or are there not moral laws written into the fabric of the universe and the nature of man, which, like other natural laws, can be violated but not broken?

Like most wars, this worldwide cold war on all fronts has been a seesaw affair for a long time. The free world has won a round here; the Communist world has won the next round there.

But, again like most wars, after a period of apparently indecisive maneuvering and attrition, one side or the other begins to gain the ascendancy; the opposing side begins to weaken and splinter. That is the moment of peril. Unless resolute action is taken to reverse the trend, it proceeds with rapidly increasing velocity.

I think we must admit that the free world is now approaching that crossroads. It cannot lose much more ground without beginning to disintegrate. The place where we have been losing alarmingly is in Asia.

When history is written, I suspect it will say that the greatest victory Stalin ever won was in the American mind: getting us to concentrate on Europe while he was working to get Asia. Not because he did not want Europe, but because conquest of Asia would be the cheapest and surest way to get Europe—and get it intact, with its great industrial workshop ready to use to produce the weapons and goods with which to destroy us, instead of in useless rubble as it would be if the Soviets had to attack it.

We gave our first attention to the war that might be—in Europe; while the Kremlin gave its attention to the war that was—in Asia.

As a result, all the gains we have made in Europe since the war are jeopardized by the losses we sustained in Asia, largely because we refused to see its importance. For example, the weakest spot in Europe is France. But it is not because of threats to her in Europe, it is because of the exhaustion and defeatism resulting from her long struggle in Indochina against Communist subversion and aggression, disguised as nationalism.

The Communists could not have put such a drain on France in Indochina without the Communist conquest of China—just as the Korean war could not have been without the Communist occupation of Manchuria, arranged by ourselves, and the conquest of China which inevitably resulted.

But as Stalin's greatest victory was in our minds, so his greatest mistake was to start the Korean war. The free world, by heroic effort in Korea, was on the verge of retrieving ground previously lost in Asia, victory was in its grasp, when the Kremlin, through Mr. Malik, proposed a cease fire. There were many who warned that a true proposal by Communists is not an effort to get peace, but a military tactic. It is a move not to end a war, but to win the war. The Chinese had learned that through three painful experiences with Communist truces between 1927 and 1947. But we would not listen to the Chinese.

The Communists could not win among the Koreans, because the Koreans had tasted freedom and had the will to defend it. So the Reds proposed a truce in Korea in order to shift to Indochina, because that was the weakest spot in Asia. It was the one country where the people had not yet been given their full freedom. And only for such a cause as their own freedom will people make the heroic effort necessary to win this kind of a struggle. Our evaluation of the crisis in Indochina must be based not on the fate of a French colony, but on its significance for the whole world struggle.

Today one-third of the people of the world are associated together as the free world, led, but not controlled by, the United States. That free world is locked in a titanic conflict with another one-third of the world's population totally controlled by the Kremlin.

Who holds the balance of power? The other one-third.

Where do they live? In the 12 countries constituting a series of peninsulas and island groups lying around China as a giant crescent from Korea to Iran.

Which way are these almost 800 million people to go—with the free world or with the Kremlin? This can be the most important question of the 20th century. This is where the free world must pull itself together, quickly, and be as alert, united, and determined as the Communist world; or be prepared to go down like a house of cards.

What are the overall prospects in this Asian third of the world, still on the fence?

The chief impressions gained from 2 trips to these 12 countries within a year are as follows:

1. Most of their people and leaders are now awake to the nature and objectives of the Communist world conspiracy. One unadulterated benefit of the war in Korea is that it tied down the Communist forces there for 3 years during which the truth about what communism had done to people in China became known to the rest of Asia, through the Chinese refugees and Communist POW's in Korea. The agrarian reformer myth is ended in Asia, if still, unfortunately, popping up occasionally in England and America.

2. The peoples of free Asia today fear communism instead of half-welcoming it on the basis of its promised utopia, as they might have done 4 years ago. They now know Communist conquest would mean the end of the precious freedom from foreign control which they have won so recently and at such great cost.

3. Most of them want to be on the side of the United States and the free world. They realize that offers the best chance for them to retain their national independence.

4. But they hesitate to take an open stand for the free world because they are uncertain as to the clarity and constancy of its purpose and policy with respect to them. They are afraid that if the Kremlin were to offer to the West, at Geneva or elsewhere, some sort of package settlement which would appear to give the white peoples peace and security, we in the West might accept it—at the expense of the territory, rights, and freedom of the nonwhite peoples of Asia. They do not forget Yalta.

This is the main reason for their neutralism. We cannot expect them to take a firm stand on our side unless and until we make it clear to them that if they do we will not let them down.

5. They know this planet cannot exist half slave and half free. They know they do not have the strength to determine the outcome. They know the free world does have the strength; but that it does not yet have the will or the unity—because it still does not really believe its own survival is at stake.

Many in Asia, especially in Korea, Japan, Formosa, and the Philippines, believe that, if the free world wins the war for Asia, there will not be a war for the world; but that if it does not win the war for Asia, there will be a war for the world and the odds will be against the free world's winning it. I concur in those views.

What can be done to start winning the war for Asia, or at least to stop losing it?

1. We must recognize that the Communist objective in Asia is the same as everywhere else, to weaken the free world, and especially to isolate and destroy the United States which is all that now stands between the Kremlin and total world conquest.

2. We must understand that a world war is not the most immediate danger. The first stage in the Communist program is always to subvert the weak, mostly in Asia. The second is to confuse and divide the strong, mostly in Europe. All-out war becomes advantageous to them only as the final knockout blow.

3. We must keep ourselves and our allies as strong and united as possible. At the same time we must try to help the weak become stronger and better fed and freer in order to enable them to resist internal subversion by the Reds.

4. We must prevent our enemies from gaining greater strength. We must not let the Reds win any more diplomatic victories. Admission of Communist China to the United Nations would be the greatest possible diplomatic victory. Free Asia will crumble once it becomes convinced the Communists are going to win. Admission to the U. N. would mean to Asia, and should mean to us, that the Reds have already won.

5. We must not let the Reds win any more economic victories. That means we must resist resumption of trade with them. If they are not our enemies, why do we draft and arm men to be ready to fight them? If they are our enemies, how can anyone suggest we help them become stronger?

6. We must not let the Communists win any more political victories. For America to intervene alone in Indochina, for example, would be a political victory for the Reds. It would enable them to convince millions in Asia not that we are helping orientals to defend their own freedom, but that we are helping defend European colonialism, which the people who have been under it hate worse than they hate the Communist imperialism which they have not been under.

7. We must not let the Communists win any more military victories. We must strive to create the Pacific Pact which the United States Congress called for in 1949—an alliance of the free nations of southeast Asia and the Pacific to resist further Communist expansion. The Asian peoples will join such a pact only if they know it is for their own freedom. They will not believe it is for their freedom unless the alliance has as its nucleus genuinely independent Asian and Pacific nations (of which the United States is one) which the European powers support; rather an alliance of western nations which the people of Asia are supposed to support.

8. We must recognize that we cannot achieve real security in Asia until the forces of freedom succeed in weakening, loosening, and eventually breaking, the hold of the Communist regime in China. To break that regime would immediately remove the danger to the rest of east and south Asia. Until Communist China is broken, no measures to save those areas are likely to have lasting success.

9. We must give greater encouragement and assistance to the free Chinese on Formosa to enable them to maintain that strategic island as a symbol of national freedom, a constant threat to the Communists' flank, and a base for smuggling agents and suitable supplies to the China mainland in order to keep hope alive and to enable the resistance forces to do to the Reds exactly what the Reds did to the Nationalists—destroy communications, isolate the cities, disrupt the economy. That is, when the Chinese Communists are in trouble at home, we must do all we can to keep them in trouble, not help them out of it.

10. We must recognize that the most important ally of all, because the most dependable, and the one in a position to do the enemy most damage, is the nearly 800 million oppressed peoples behind the Iron Curtain who know Communist tyranny for what it is and silently resist it. We must not betray their hopes or weaken their resolve or undercut their position by any act that would increase the strength or influence or prestige of Communists anywhere.

When there is already such determined opposition behind the Iron Curtain as was demonstrated by the revolt in East Germany just a year ago today, and by the refusal of Chinese prisoners of war in Korea to return even to their homes and families as long as they are in a China enslaved by the Communists, there is reason for great hope, not despair—if we in the free world will prove steadfast.

In the last analysis the decision we must make on this issue is a moral decision. Shall we put our faith for the future in millions of people? Or in deals with a handful of tyrants?

In the oppressed? Or in their oppressors?

What are the prospects for such an American policy? I believe they are good. Whether there still is time, or whether it is already too late to halt and reverse the Kremlin's relentless march of the last decade remains to be seen. Here are some indications:

1. Our Government, too, is becoming more aware of the nature and methods of the Communist world conspiracy. So it is demanding deeds, not words from Communist governments. For without deeds, words are useless. We do not intend to be party to any new Munich or Yalta.

Some are calling the Geneva Conference a failure. But history may regard it as one of the few conferences that we did not lose. At least, we have not yet given away anything that belonged to someone else, in order to get a worthless piece of paper to wave as pitiful evidence of supposed success.

2. Our Government is now aware that this planet is one strategic area, so there is more balanced attention to Asia and Europe. Witness the new Joint Chiefs of Staff—all experts on Asia, for the first time in our history. The illusion that we can keep Europe free without a free Asia is ended. The illusion that we can keep the rest of Asia free without a free China will have to be ended, too.

3. Our Government is aware that effective resistance to the Communist threat in Asia just now is more a military than an economic matter. The Reds have never been able to seize a single country, beginning with Russia itself, except by force of arms. Hence there is more emphasis on military aid to countries with the will to use it than on general economic aid to those without such a will.

4. Our Government is aware that in dealing with this enemy, our best military weapon, both to prevent a world war, or to win such a war if the Reds start it, is not local resistance around the periphery of the satellites, but the capacity to destroy the centers and bases which supply and control the satellites. Hence there is more emphasis on air and sea where we are strongest and can best get at the real enemy, if he insists on war; and less emphasis on land where he is strongest and we can do him least damage. What he has most of is boys; what we have fewest of is boys. Therefore, we are not going to permit the main conflict to be one of boys.

5. Our Government is increasingly aware that our strongest ally in this struggle for survival is the peoples behind the curtain. The best way to influence our enemies is to stand steadfastly by our friends, especially those who are already fighting the enemy from within and may make it unnecessary for the rest of us to fight it from without.

The achieving of a world of freedom and peace depends upon our understanding more deeply than we have the principles on which our own Nation was founded and grew great. I believe that the system of government by voluntary federation under law which our fathers established here represents the best set of political ideas ever put together in one place in the world's history. I think they are the hope of mankind. Our task is to make them work better than we have here at home, and help them spread throughout the world—with all our hearts and souls, as well as with our minds.

Commencement is a day of judgment on yesterday—and the judgment is good, else you would not be here.

But commencement is also a day of decision for tomorrow. No generation can live by defending its past. It must win the future. This will be the most crucial test of your education. I am confident that you will make good.

Statements by Senator McClellan at the So-Called McCarthy Hearings on June 17, 1954

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 18, 1954

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, on yesterday, during the course of the so-called McCarthy-Army hearings, my colleague, the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McClellan], made some very statesmanlike remarks. He made a statement early in the session of the committee, and another statement at the conclusion of the hearings which have been going on for some weeks. I ask unanimous consent that both statements be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Statement of Senator McClellan at Morning Session of McCarthy-Army Hearings, June 17, 1954

Senator McClellan. Mr. Chairman, there may be those who get a great deal of comfort out of such harangues as have been injected into these proceedings this morning, but I doubt if the fine, loyal, patriotic American citizenship particularly appreciate it. I think some of the proceedings in these hearings have disgusted the public with the conduct of some of us who have participated in it. I say that regretfully. Because I think the American people believe and have a right to expect the United States Senate and its committees to conduct the proceedings of this Government with dignity, with solemnity and in a spirit of service to country rather than as a show and as an attempt to ridicule and to smear.

I seriously regret many things that have happened in the course of these hearings.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I could answer you quite facetiously. I could very well say that instead of having a famous memo of understanding that it has turned out to be an infamous memo of misunderstanding. I do not know what transpired. I am not particularly concerned. Although a member of the committee, I was not invited to participate. Therefore, it was purely a partisan action and the party responsible, and the members of that party who conducted the proceedings in that fashion, simply have to take the responsibility.

But, Mr. Chairman, I can say to you this morning that you have testified eloquently, eloquently, more so than I can express, to the ineptness, to the lack of capacity of this administration and the Republican Party to conduct the affairs of Government without turmoil and harangue.

I don't know what happened. I don't know whether anyone was deceived or not. But I do know that before supper, this luncheon soured on the stomach of the Secretary of the Army. You can take from now until doomsday to explain it if you want to. I may say to you in all candor, and I say it sincerely, I believe the American people will agree with me that if you Republicans would consult with the Democrats a little more, and take us into your confidence, and welcome our help, you will have a better administration and a better government.

Bear in mind that everything that is under investigation here now occurred when the Democratic Members were not on this committee. We were off of this committee in protest of a development and a situation that obviously led to this tragic situation. I can do no more except to offer to assist. I didn't send for Mr. Adams or Mr. Stevens. They came to me. They didn't come to me with the advice and the counsel of a Mr. Clark Clifford. They came to me with the advice and counsel and upon the instructions, as I understand it, of Mr. Bill Robers, who is next to the highest legal authority in this Government today and under this administration. What are we to do as Democrats? We are not invited to participate until a row develops between the Republicans. Then you seek our advice. I gave the best advice I know. I immediately told Mr. Adams to go to the Republican members of this committee and, with respect to the story that he related to me, I told him I would not touch it unless he gave it to me in writing.

I can do no more than that, Mr. Chairman, to help you. I have throughout the course of these hearings tried to keep them on track, tried to keep out the extraneous matters, and do a dignified job, and bring these hearings to a conclusion by getting all of the testimony that was pertinent and relevant so that we might have the benefit of it when we undertake to perform our solemn duty of writing a report.

Mr. Chairman, I say to you now that if these hearings are concluded today, and I know you are going to conclude them, without the testimony of the three witnesses whom I urged this committee to subpena, Mr. Clifford, Mr. Schine, and General Lawton, then this record will not be complete, and these hearings will not be through, and very important testimony, essential for a full and proper consideration of the issues involved, will be forever foreclosed to us.

I hope, Mr. Chairman, that we can end these hearings in a spirit of real Americanism, not on a partisan issue, although partisan issues have been injected, I think wrongfully so, but they are here. May I say to you that so far as I am concerned, I am a Democrat, but I place the security and welfare of my country above any party.

Concluding Satement of Senator John L. McClellan, June 17, 1954

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. In much of what you have said, I fully agree. I express, too, my appreciation to all of those who have unfortunately been compelled to participate in these proceedings, and who performed their duties by attending the hearings and reporting them, by medium of press, radio, and television.

Mr. Chairman, I am compelled to say, however, that this has been one of the most disagreeable, one of the most difficult, public services that it has ever been my duty to perform. I had no animosity toward anyone, toward any individual, when these hearings began. I think I can say without any reservation whatsoever that I hold no animosity now toward anyone involved in these proceedings. I did say in the beginning, Mr. Chairman, in that brief statement that I made when we opened these hearings, that the charges and countercharges that gave rise to this controversy were of such a grave nature as to make these proceedings mandatory.

I think that statement was true. I also said that the charges and the accusations were so diametrically in conflict that, as I saw it then, they could not possibly be reconciled.

I do not believe the testimony that has been given here over these long weeks can now, by any process of reasoning, be reconciled.

I further stated at the beginning of the hearings, Mr. Chairman, that we, the Democrat members, would wholeheartedly undertake to cooperate with and assist the majority in making these hearings impartial, fair, and thorough, to the end that that which was true might be revealed and that which is false be exposed without regard to any of the personalities that might be involved.

Mr. Chairman, I trust I have kept that pledge.

You, my colleagues on this committee, the personalities involved in the controversy, this audience and above all the American people who have witnessed this proceeding, may be my judges as to whether I have been sincere and conscientious and faithful in trying to perform that trust.

I am compelled to say in conclusion, Mr. Chairman, that the series of events, actions, and conduct that precipitated the ugly but serious charges and countercharges that made these lengthy and unpleasant public hearings mandatory, I think, will be recognized and long remembered as one of the most disgraceful episodes in the history of our Government.

Simply to say that this series of events is regrettable is a gross understatement. They are deplorable and unpardonable. There is no valid excuse or justification for this situation having occurred, and it will now become our solemn duty, the duty of this committee, to undertake to determine and fix the responsibility.

I think that is a part of our responsibility. We have a tremendous amount of testimony here, much of it irrelevant, some of it competent, but some of it goes directly to the issues involved.

In trying to determine or come to a conclusion and to a decision, I shall undertake to be as judicial as my capacity will permit, to weigh that which I think relevant and discard that which I consider to be irrelevant.

Something has been said here this afternoon about cooperation of the Democrats. Mr. Chairman, you can always have the cooperation of this Democrat in anything that is right, and certainly you can have it wholeheartedly to the full extent and limit of my energies and capacities when the sole purpose and the primary purpose of any action is to ferret out Communists or to expose Communist infiltration.

I say that because I don't think I have ever been accused of not being willing to face the test.

Mr. Chairman, it is easy to ask for cooperation, but the best way to get it is to reciprocate. I recall when I begged this committee not to take an action that would drive the Democrat members away from it. I did it on principle, Mr. Chairman. I begged you not to silence the voice of the Democrat members of this committee. Our voices were silenced, and we left the committee.

These things occurred during our absence, and I let the public judge in this closing hour whether any Democrat was responsible, as has been intimated here, for what happened that necessitated and brought about these proceedings.

I trust that the American people will not judge these proceedings as the best or as regular proceedings of the United States Senate.

I do not think we have altogether lived up to the dignity and prestige of this body in which I am honored and privileged to serve. I think we could have conducted the hearing a little better, and I will take my share of any responsibility that falls upon us for that. But I would hate for the country to think, the people of the Nation to think, that this is a fair sample of the proceedings and the manner of conducting proceedings in the highest lawmaking body in the world.

Mr. Chairman, I can only pledge that in the further duties we have to perform here, I shall try to be as conscientious and as sincere and as fair and impartial as I possibly can to arrive at a just decision and the proper action to be taken thereon.

Public Opinion Survey, 11th Illinois Congressional District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TIMOTHY P. SHEEHAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 17, 1954

Mr. SHEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, each year since I have been in Congress I have conducted a public opinion survey among the people of the 11th Congressional District of Illinois, which is located on the northwest side of the city of Chicago. This year 29,900 questionnaires were sent out and 4,804 returns were tabulated. A scattering of approximately 200 more returns came in after the results were put together. The results represent a return of approximately 17 percent which, according to professional sampling averages, is a good response.

Every attempt was made to obtain an impartial distribution of these questionnaires. A questionnaire was sent to each of the 3,800 persons on my Newsletter mailing list, and the balance to people picked at random from every single voting precinct in the district, with no knowledge as to party affiliation or past voting record. It was felt this method would provide the most nearly perfect sample possible of the views of a representative cross section of the people in the 11th District.

As the representative of the people in the 11th Illinois District, it has been my political philosophy to speak to the Congress and to vote the issues before the Congress on the basis of representing the will of the majority of the people in my district, where that majority will is determined, and assuming, of course, the majority will is not contrary to the Constitution nor to the general welfare of the country. If in my conscience I believed the majority viewpoint to be contrary to either the Constitution or the welfare of the country as a whole, it would then be my duty to inform the people as to why I felt their judgment was not in accordance with these criteria. Thus far in my 4 years in Congress, I cannot recall a single instance where it has been necessary for me to depart from voting the majority will of my constituents, as made known to me.

The breakdown of the 4,804 replies tabulated is as follows:

	Yes		No		No answer	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
1. Are you in favor of the United States continuing as a member of the United Nations?	3, 218	67.0	1, 436	29.9	150	3.1
2. Are you in favor of admitting China as a member of the United Nations?	604	12.6	3, 940	82.2	251	5.2
3. Are you in favor of authorizing United States participation in construction of the St. Lawrence seaway?	4, 150	86.4	436	9.1	218	4.5
4. Are you in favor of a 3-year extension of Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act with progressive 5-percent tariff reduction in each year, to permit easier entry of foreign goods?	2, 049	42.7	2, 376	49.5	379	7.8
5. Do you approve of the Republican foreign policy in general?	2, 539	52.9	1, 757	36.6	508	10.5
6. Do you favor trade with Communist China and Russia?	561	11.7	4, 027	83.9	216	4.4
7. Do you favor further arms and military aid to foreign nations?	2, 195	45.7	2, 229	46.4	380	7.9
8. Do you favor continued economic aid (point 4 program) to nations for development of backward nations?	2, 616	54.4	1, 861	38.8	327	6.8
9. Do you approve the present prohibition of secondary boycotts under the Taft-Hartley law? (A secondary boycott is a boycott by a party not directly involved in a labor-management dispute.)	2, 608	54.3	1, 667	34.7	529	11.0
10. Do you favor retention of the fundamentals of Taft-Hartley law?	3, 730	77.7	703	14.6	371	7.7
11. Do you agree with President Eisenhower's recommendations that the Taft-Hartley law should give employees right to vote on whether or not they should strike?	4, 471	93.1	199	4.1	134	2.8
12. Do you agree that farm and other cooperatives should be taxed?	4, 027	83.9	522	10.8	255	5.3
13. Do you favor continued support of basic farm products at 90 percent parity level?	836	17.4	3, 552	74.0	416	8.6
14. Do you agree with President Eisenhower and Secretary Benson on their cut in dairy price supports by reducing parity to 75 percent?	3, 970	82.7	481	10.0	353	7.3
15. Do you favor removal of restrictions on the amount of money earned by one receiving social-security benefits? (Under present law a person over 65 earning more than $75 per month loses his social-security benefits for that month.)	4, 028	83.9	647	13.4	129	2.7
16. Are you in favor of President Eisenhower's recommendations to increase social security dollar benefits and to increase the number of people covered by the social security law?	3, 995	82.3	642	13.4	207	4.3
17. Do you favor use and development of atomic energy by private industry in our own country?	4, 152	86.5	469	9.8	183	3.7
18. Do you favor dismissing Government employees who invoke 5th amendment in order not to answer questions about Communist activities?	4, 296	89.4	370	7.7	138	2.9
19. Do you favor allowing 18-year-olds to vote?	2, 161	45.0	2, 511	52.3	132	2.7
20. Do you approve the Eisenhower administration to date?	2, 784	58.0	1, 246	25.9	774	16.1
21. Are you in favor of the plan of gradually reducing income tax on corporate dividends?	2, 595	54.0	1, 822	37.9	387	8.1
22. Do you feel that business conditions and unemployment will materially influence your voting in November elections?	1, 922	40.0	2, 669	55.6	213	4.4
23. Do you favor an additional 35,000 public housing units in the coming fiscal year?	2, 561	53.3	1, 965	40.9	278	5.8
24. Do you think that Senator McCarthy's Senate committee should continue to reveal to the American people such Communist or subversive activities as it has already revealed?	3, 620	75.4	918	19.1	266	5.5

Five of the questions on this year's survey are the same questions as the five that were asked in the 1953 survey. In order to bring out the changes in trend, I have set forth below for comparison the 1953 percentage results on these five questions:

	Percentage	
	Yes	No
14. Are you in favor of the United States continuing as a member of the United Nations?	64.1	35.9
15. Do you favor further arms and military aid to foreign nations?	44.7	55.3
16. Do you favor continued economic aid (point 4 program) to foreign nations for the development of backward nations?	43.3	56.7
21. Do you approve of the Republican foreign policy in general?	78.5	21.5
22. Do you approve of the Eisenhower administration to date?	84.2	15.8

It is to be noted that in the percentage of "yes" and "no" answers tabulated in the 1953 questionnaire just above, the "no" answers were not included in the percentage breakdown.

Americanism and the Communist Menace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY C. DWORSHAK

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 18, 1954

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record excerpts from an address which I delivered before the Idaho State Elks convention at Idaho Falls on June 11, 1954.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Excerpts From Address of Senator Henry Dworshak Before Idaho State Elks Convention, Idaho Falls, June 11, 1954

It is no longer proper to express oneself on patriotism or Americanism because it has become fashionable to smear anyone so daring with a charge of flagwaving. My friends, there is something wrong when such words as "patriotism" and "Americanism" have come to be regarded as reactionary words.

Having come through two decades of economic materialism, this country cannot afford the luxury of political materialism, too. It would be the end. If we lose our love of country, we shall lose our country. Today, we are seeing this love of country, this patriotism, being choked to death by ridicule, and I mean ridicule by conspiracy.

Some people question that we have a Communist menace in our country. They have tried and are trying to discredit the efforts of congressional investigating committees to dig out and expose Communists and communism. They have sniped at the administration for its efforts to fight these subversives.

Don't be misled. There is a Communist menace, a serious one, right in our own United States. So far we have only lifted one corner of the veil hiding the activities of the Soviet fifth column in the United States. And these enemies are not all Russians. Most of them are men and women who were reared in this country. They speak English, with our native southern drawl, with our western twang, or with the down-East tongue of our New England. They have had the benefit of America's free education, and they can quote the Constitution (especially the fifth amendment) with ease. They resort to intrigue. They are economical with the truth, but when they use it, they follow the precept that it's not necessary to lie when the truth can be misleading.

They are blindly motivated by one objective—to destroy all things American, to corrupt our Government, weaken our security so that we will accept the so-called blessings of a people's government, the kind they now have in Czechoslovakia, in Hungary, in Rumania, in Bulgaria, in China, in North Korea.

We must match their blind motivation with unadulterated devotion to our own country, and I do not mean blind devotion, either, I am speaking of patriotism built on intellectual foundations. Our free institutions do not need to be defended. They need to be repeated, over and over. Patriotism, my friends, is the catalyst which brings together and fuses all of the elements that make a nation strong from within and without.

I have told you not to allow yourselves to be deceived into believing that there is no Communist menace in this country and that the administration and congressional committees are just hunting headlines instead of Reds. On June 2 of this year, the President issued a statement showing the extent of this administration's activities against Communist subversives. I am going to cite these accomplishments, not from any partisan motives—because I believe that our country's leaders are Americans before they are Republicans or Democrats—but because they show that it can happen here.

Over a 16-month period, agencies of the Department of Justice have arrested 7 Connecticut leaders of the Communist Party; convicted 41 Communist Party leaders in New York, Honolulu, Pittsburgh, Seattle, Detroit, and St. Louis; indicted 20 additional Communist leaders; ordered the addition of 62 new organizations to the Justice Department's list of subversive groups (the total is now 255); secured the conviction of 1 person for treason, 2 for espionage, 8 for making false statements to the Government, 3 for perjury; deported 84 alien subversives; ordered deportation of 268 other persons with records of subversive activity or affiliation; started denaturalization proceedings against 24 persons charged with being subversives; and barred entry into this country of 127 subversive aliens.

That is a quite a list. To me it is of frightening significance. But from all the information I have, we have hardly scratched the surface in battling this hostile, internal army of the enemy.

While we are fighting communism from within, we cannot allow ourselves to be caught like a sitting duck in a pond that is surrounded with hunters. We are living in a world that is full of movement, and most of this movement carries the "made-in-Moscow" label. For that reason our external policy is just as important to our national security as is our internal policy.

The keystone of our foreign relations has been the policy of containment, which is something like a chess game in which we match our pawns against the stronger pieces of our opponent. The danger is that pretty soon all our pawns are gone and our strong points are left exposed.

We have already witnessed the result of this policy in Korea. It should be obvious that the policy is foolhardy, if not absurd, when we realize that Moscow today dominates one-third of the world's population, some 800 million people. The United States, and those of our allies who are committed to the antiaggression policy, muster a population of some 350 million. And of this group, it appears today that only the Americans seem willing to give active support to this policy. Gen. Bonner Fellers, a former aide to General MacArthur, said recently the policy of containment is like a group of children trying to play farmer in the dell without enough children to join hands and surround the farmer. And General Fellers has seen the results of the policy firsthand, for he was with General MacArthur in Japan and served as Secretary General of the Allied Council for Japan. * * *

There, in Korea, we suffered 140,000 casualties, of which about 30,000 are dead and missing. After 3 years of fighting, we signed an armistice without a victory. We did not drive the Communists out of Korea. The Chinese and North Koreans are now far stronger than they ever were. I think this administration acted wisely in bringing to an end the fighting in Korea. We had allowed ourselves to become involved in a hopeless mess that seemed likely to drain our military and economic strength for years to come unless we were willing to make huge blood sacrifices to retrieve a victory that was once in our grasp.

If we should intervene in Indochina, the Red Chinese are in a position to take advantage of an easy opportunity to strike once again in Korea. * * * To me, it would appear that intervention in Indochina would be futile, especially on a unilateral basis which would reflect the indifference of other free nations.

Let's say, for the sake of argument, that we intervened and drove every living Communist out of Indochina. Does this guarantee that Japan, the Philippines, India, Pakistan, Burma, Thailand, and Australia will be free from Communist aggression? The record shows that there can be no such guaranties. It shows that the Communists want us to fight a whole series of little wars and, then, when we are bled white, we will find ourselves confronted with the colossal and unimpaired military might of Russia.

If we were to intervene in Indochina, we would be lending credence to the Communist propaganda that we are trying to perpetuate colonialism in Asia and in the Pacific. The natives don't want us there and they want to be free. We must direct our diplomacy to help free Asia's millions. And we must be prepared to help them defend themselves against communism by training and arming them. But they must have their own desire for survival. We must not send our own boys to do their fighting.

There is a tendency among some of us to build up a Maginot line of hope against the possibility of a Soviet attack against the United States and free Europe. They point to the growing strength in Europe under NATO. * * * If anyone thinks that NATO could stem an all-out attack by the Communist hordes in Europe, he is an unmitigated optimist. I have talked to military men in Washington, and they tell me that the Red army could overrun Europe in a matter of weeks, and without using an atom bomb.

Well, that's the picture, a dismal one, but not hopeless. In talking about the situation with military men, they agree that while the situation looks grim, the task of coping with the Communist menace is not insuperable. They would set up a program containing at least two basic parts, and I must admit that their suggestions provide attractive possibilities.

The first part of this program calls for the development of overwhelming air supremacy. We have demonstrated that we have the capabilities for doing this. And I believe we are on the road toward that objective. The best military minds in our country and abroad agree that in any future war, the side winning the battle of the air has the best chance for winning the war. That is why I am willing to cut spending for foreign aid and to spend the money saved on building air supremacy. We have to remember this stark fact—regardless of the outcome of any war in Europe, Soviet planes have the capability of striking directly at the United States.

Now, the second step—one which has been talked about a great deal but hardly exploited. That would be to give full and unqualified support for the underground movements which exist in the Soviet Union and its satellite states. There are numerous indications that these undergrounds are becoming more active and more effective. We must exploit the weaknesses in the Communist armor and not try to break through by beating our heads against it.

Perhaps I have followed a pessimistic theme here today. But pessimism does not mean surrender. It is an antidote for overoptimism. I cannot help but think of the words of Elbert Hubbard, who said:

> "There is no failure except in no longer trying.
>
> "There is no defeat except from within, no really insurmountable barrier save our own inherent weakness of purpose."

We have sent our boys, our dollars, and our brains abroad in an effort to promote those principles for which America stands. We have not succeeded and we cannot succeed until we ourselves become militant crusaders for those ideals. They are not material things. They are spiritual in nature. They are the sound principles set forth in the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States—the principles of eternal truth.

Testimonial to Dr. Frank S. Horne and Mr. John Ihlder

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. DAWSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 17, 1954

Mr. DAWSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, May 10, 1954, an event took place in the city of Washington which I believe to be highly significant in the relations of government to its people in a democracy. In the midst of sharp criticism of and attacks upon devoted public officials, a neighborhood association of Negro citizens tendered a testimonial to two public servants—one Negro, the other white—one a local official, the other a Federal officer. The citizens were expressing their gratitude for distinguished and humane service beyond the ordinary call of duty by these public officials in helping to save the homes of some 176 Negro families. This action by a group of local Negro citizens constitutes, in my opinion, a unique contribution to the cause of interracial good will in the Nation's Capital.

I refer to the testimonial tendered on May 10, 1954, by the Ivy City-Trinidad Citizens' Association, Inc., District of Columbia, to Dr. Frank S. Horne, assistant to the Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency, and to Mr. John Ihlder, former Executive Director, National Capital Housing Authority. Plaques were presented to the honorees in a public meeting at the Samuel Wheatley School "in recognition of distinguished service and humane consideration of the tenants in the Ivy City area during the years 1948–50."

A report submitted to the meeting by the president of the Ivy City-Trinidad Citizens' Association, Inc., stated:

THE REHOUSING OF NEGRO FAMILIES DISPLACED FROM THE WEST VIRGINIA AVENUE TEMPORARY WAR HOUSING PROJECT—A REPORT BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE IVY CITY CITIZENS ASSOCIATION, INC.

MAY 10, 1954.

During World War II there was intense need for housing in Washington. Many people came here from different sections of the country as defense and war workers. The Public Housing Administration, through the National Capital Housing Authority as local agent, erected 176 temporary mobile housing units for Negro workers at West Virginia and Montana Avenues NE., at Fenwick and West Virginia Avenue NE., and on 14th and 15th Streets NE. Families lived here all through the defense and war years, meanswhile seeking permanent decent housing in the community since, after the war, these temporary dwellings were to be torn down. There were few such dwellings open to Negro families of low income, especially for those with children.

On December 20, 1945—5 days before Christmas—these tenants were served eviction notices, stating that they would have to find homes elsewhere since the war housing law so required and the owners of the land, which had been leased by the Government, wanted the land to expand their businesses. From December of 1948 to April of 1950, there followed a long and involved series of negotiations under the leadership of the Ivy City Citizens Association to find homes for the evicted families and delay the eviction until homes were found. On April 30, 1950, after some 16 months of coordinated effort, the last 6 of the 176 families were rehoused.

The effort included the filing of letters, petitions, and exhibits, formation of the delegations, and repeated conferences. Representations were made to the President of the United States, the District Commissioners, and congressional committees, including those on Banking and Currency, Appropriations, and the District of Columbia, as well as the Richmond, Va., and Philadelphia field offices of the Public Housing Administration. Delegations formed by the Ivy City Citizens Association held repeated conferences with the National Capital Housing Authority, the Commissioner and staff of the PHA, the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency and the land owners, including Safeway Stores, Stewart Motors, and Cassin. At one stage, the association employed counsel in the person of Judge James E. Cobb to represent the interests of the families in court action. Throughout this effort the Ivy City Association gained the support of 17 districtwide organizations, including the Federation of Civic Organizations, the Urban League, the Ministerial Alliance, NAACP, and others, as well as newspapers like the Afro-American, Pittsburgh Courier, Evening Star, Post, and News.

The civic leadership in this citywide effort was discharged by Lewis W. Crowe, president of the Ivy City Citizens Association. Consistent governmental cooperation was provided by John Ihlder, Executive Director of the National Capital Housing Authority on the local level and, in behalf of the Federal housing agencies, by Frank S. Horne, Assistant to the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency. It is for this cooperative service that the Ivy City Citizens Association extends citation tonight to Dr. Horne and Mr. Ihlder.

The objective of the total effort was to relieve the distress of families with children and dramatize the necessity for coordinated action by Government, civic organizations, and private enterprise to provide decent housing for Negro families, with children, within their ability to pay. At the close of his full report filed on January 12, 1951, President Lewis W. Crowe stated:

"The Ivy City Citizens Association, Inc., and the Montana Petition Committee hereby express their gratitude to all who helped in bringing this case to a successful conclusion. We would urge the necessity of alertness by all civic groups to similar problems which may arise later if and when other temporary war housing projects are liquidated. Since housing needs for Negro families are still acute, this will mean continual activity in cooperation with private and governmental agencies to assure the provision of added land space and both public and private permanent housing necessary to accommodate the increased Negro population of different income levels and ease the unhealthy congestion in present Negro neighborhoods."

The main address at the testimonial, delivered by Mr. Lee F. Johnson, executive vice president of the National Housing Conference, Inc., and formerly Assistant Commissioner of the United States Housing Authority, constitutes such a distinctive contribution to the cause of housing and racial amity that I submit it in full with the hope that it may inspire comparable action in other cities across our Nation.

Address Delivered by Lee F. Johnson, Executive Vice President, National Housing Conference, Inc.

This is a rare opportunity that you have granted to me this evening, for which I cannot express my gratitude adequately. Our purpose tonight is to honor two truly great Americans. I use the word "great" advisedly.

What constitutes greatness? Many masters of the written and spoken word have defined it far more accurately than it is within my power to define. But this is my chance to pay a brief tribute between friends to two men, John Ihlder and Frank Horne, with whom I have worked for many, many years and for whom I have deep affection and eternal respect. If you will bear with me for a few moments, I would like to tell you in my own way why I feel that each has woven and wears the cloak of greatness, and to tell you why I think that they merit your tribute of affectionate appreciation.

To have achieved greatness in the hearts of their friends and neighbors, our honored guests tonight have been dedicated to a single purpose—that of enriching the lives of every single one of their fellow men. Each has acquired a vast treasure of knowledge as to the strength and frailties of the human race. Each has lived with dignity and humility. Each has plowed deeply in the vineyard of humanity, and as a result of their efforts millions of our neighbors today find life a little better, a little richer, a little bit closer to the ideals of the brotherhood of man.

I suppose that in a broad, general term you would describe our guests as "housers." We can be very sure, however, that neither one entered adulthood with the objective of being known as such. They are both men of letters. They write frequently and well, although in that regard I believe that Dr. Horne gets the nod, because I have not heard of Mr. Ihlder's poems being published, and writing poetry is Dr. Horne's hobby.

Both of our honored friends drifted into the field of housing, public low-rent housing to be precise, from other fields of public service. Mr. Ihlder concentrated his activities first through local citizens activities, and then as the executive director of the Alley Dwelling Authority, now the National Capital Housing Authority, from which he retired just a short time ago. The fact that in Washington today vast programs are underway to eliminate the blight of slums and all of their attendant evils, is a living monument to the vision, the energy, and the practical administrative abilities of John Ihlder. The same is true in other great American communities, Philadelphia, Boston, and Pittsburgh where he organized and led citizen movements in behalf of better housing and better living. Once more he is devoting his unflagging energies to the citizens' interest in housing.

John Ihlder is a kind of magpie. He has an eye for facts. He is relentless in gathering them together then trotting them forth in irrefutable order to do battle for the cause for which he fights. In his long and personal war against inhuman living conditions into which some of our neighbors have been forced to live, he has never resorted to slander, half-truths, and countless other tricks employed by his adversaries, to establish a point. Facts and truth have tempered his sword. That is why disgraceful alleys are gradually disappearing from our Nation's Capital. That is why more and more families are able to escape from the degrading shadow of the slum, into the sunlight of decent, healthful housing conditions.

The integrity, and the intelligence of his local crusades have made John Ihlder a national figure. Our national housing policy adopted in the Housing Act of 1949 which establishes a goal of a decent home in a suitable environment for every American family, was made possible in part through his untiring efforts.

Never let it be said that I stood in the midst of friends and painted John Ihlder as a saint, a man whose judgment is unerring, and that association with him is always a joy.

It was my privilege to meet John Ihlder first in 1938 when I joined the staff of the United States Housing Authority. By that time he was already known as the granddad of housers. The first national housing program for families of low income provided for in the United States Housing Act of 1937, was just getting under way. Having worked on Capitol Hill for a number of years I became a houser to handle congressional and other headaches. Nathan Straus was Administrator. I hadn't sat through more than two staff meetings before learning that John Ihlder fell within the second category of my assignment, "other headaches." After hearing Mr. Ihlder described, you can imagine my relief on being advised that I lacked experience and know-how to handle him, and other people of greater competence would attempt to keep him off the Administrator's neck.

At that time a mighty battle was being waged as to how rents should be charged tenants of public housing. John Ihlder had stepped forth with the unheard-of proposal that a graded rent system should be applied so that each family paid according to its means. In other words a family with 5 kids might pay $15 a month rent for a 4-bedroom apartment, and another family with a larger income might pay $30 a month for an identical apartment. Obviously it required a person with psychiatric training to deal with a man who would propose such a monstrous plan.

A very few years later I had been switched to the position of Assistant Administrator for Project Management, and it was my great privilege to approve the order that made John Ihlder's graded rent system standard practice for all low-rent public housing projects in this country. I have always been everlastingly proud of my contribution to the rental system that has assured the success, the workability, and the justice of the low-rent public housing program. And all that I did was to approve what John Ihlder had originated, fought for, and made possible. Had it not been for his original thinking, his stubborn determination and his persuasiveness the program might well have bogged down at its inception because of unfair and inequitable rent charges. For that contribution alone, John Ihlder has earned immortality in the field of American housing, and believe me, it is but one of countless contributions he has made.

I would be derelict in my report to you if I failed to indicate two other highlights of the Ihlder career. As a young man, a graduate of Cornell, he had the good sense to start life as a newspaper reporter in New York City. How he ever left that noble calling to start working his way up in the United States Chamber of Commerce his friends will never know. But perhaps it was a good thing. John Ihlder was not always an advocate of public housing. He became a convert through his own education. He believed firmly, because it is the nature of the man, that all families are not only entitled to, but have a right to decent shelter. He believed it important that decent housing be supplied through normal channels of private enterprise. As an official of the United States Chamber of Commerce he worked in the highest temple of private enterprise. When he had explored all ways of getting the job done, he was convinced that public aid was essential. He tested every means for providing such public aid, local, State and finally, Federal. When John Ihlder was convinced that if substandard housing conditions were to be attacked effectively Federal assistance was required, he was far ahead of most of his friends in the fields of sociology and economics. He became an early exponent and effective champion of the low-rent housing program as we know it today. He has given a lifetime of intelligent leadership in behalf of the people, all people, of our Nation. That is why we, his neighbors, tell him thanks tonight.

Now, let's talk for a couple of minutes about Dr. Frank S. Horne, assistant to the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency. I doubt very much if there is a busier public official in Washington than Frank Horne. That is one reason that he had time to give a helping hand to you when you called on him. He always has time for those who seek his counsel, and if no one is waiting at his doorstep he goes out and rustles up a few clients.

The year 1938 seems to be a banner year for me because it was then that I also first met Dr. Horne. I'm wondering if you know what kind of a doctor he is. When I first knew him I simply assumed that he was a doctor of philosophy. As I knew him better it seemed logical that he must be a doctor of humanities. But I had worked with him for 15 years before I discovered that he actually is a doctor of optometry, or some such thing. In other words, he understands your eyes inside and out. With his training, Dr. Horne could have lived a prosperous, comfortable life prescribing glasses, rose-colored or clear, to help a limited number of persons see better both the beauty and perhaps the ugliness of the world surrounding them. Perhaps it was that training that has given him so keen an insight into the intricacies of what makes people tick.

A native of New York City, Frank Horne obtained his formal education from coast to coast. He graduated from the City College of New York, obtained his doctor's degree in Chicago, and traveled to Los Angeles for his master of arts degree at the University of Southern California.

With all of that education, he went south to teach school, and was dean and acting president of a junior college at Fort Valley, Ga., for 10 years. While I didn't know him in those days, he must have exhibited those sterling qualities of leadership, which today we all admire, because he was called to Washington by one of the greatest American women of all time, Mary McLeod Bethune, to serve as Assistant Director of Negro Affairs of the National Youth Administration. What a rich experience it must have been to work with Mrs. Bethune. On a few occasions it has been my great good fortune to talk with Mrs. Bethune, and I have never left her without experiencing the kind of exultation that comes only from meeting what is in truth a noble spirit.

In 1938 Dr. Robert Weaver, who was special assistant to the Administrator in charge of racial relations, brought Dr. Horne into housing as a racial relations adviser. That was a great day for housing. In the intervening 16 years he has filled every top policy post on racial relations in the expanding housing agency.

When the Eisenhower administration took over the reins of Government 16 months ago every conceivable pressure was exerted to have a Republican named to supplant Dr. Horne as the top adviser on racial relations. It was an important job, because Dr. Horne and his able colleagues had built the racial relations service in housing as a model for all government. I don't believe, in all honesty, that anyone had ever considered Frank Horne as a Democrat. His activities were totally nonpolitical and nonpartisan. He had brought rare judgment, tact, diplomacy, and intellectual honesty to bear on a delicate job to such an extent that honest seeds of tolerance and true democracy that he planted not only sprouted but grew, flourished, and bore fruit in every section of our great Nation.

Dr. Horne's position was filled by another, but not until he had been given even greater policy authority as assistant to the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency. Never have I seen one person paid greater tribute than when it appeared that his works were in danger. Organizations and individuals from every section of this Nation spoke as one to say this man had risen above all political considerations—the housing program of our country cannot spare him. Spontaneous support for him was just as articulate in the South as from his native New York. For those who love him it was a heartwarming experience.

Throughout the length of this country today you may visit one public housing community after another and find families of all races, creeds, and color living as friends and neighbors with mutual respect and affection. Of course the millenium has not arrived, perfection is a long way off, but it is a much more intelligent, understanding nation today than we lived in 16 years ago when Frank Horne began his work with the racial relations service in our national housing program. There has been progress, enough progress to lead us to believe that with leadership such as only a Frank Horne can give, the day will come in our lifetime when there will be no second-class citizens.

I remember one incident about 12 years ago when Frank and I were working closely together and I had just returned from Detroit where I had witnessed the so-called sojourner truth riot. Believe me, my spirits were low. Frank told me that he was calling a meeting of his regional racial relations advisers and they would like very much to have the gentleman who was Public Housing Commissioner at that time meet with them. He had invited the Commissioner and received a vague answer. And so I added my invitation to his and was told by the gentleman in question that he was terribly busy but would drop by for a few minutes. To make sure that he did I went and got him and brought him to the meeting. After a few moments the Commissioner discovered that he was not so busy after all, and he stayed for the full session.

Afterward he said to me: "I never dreamed it possible, but those men represent the finest minds we have in housing." That was the staff Dr. Horne and Dr. Weaver had recruited, trained, and made into a working unit. Today you will find them all over the country, many of them still in housing, and all of them in positions of responsibility and trust. They are a working team, educating all of our people to tolerance, understanding, and the meaning of democracy that we must accept if we are to conquer internal as well as external enemies, and maintain our place of leadership among the free nations of this troubled world.

And so tonight we are honoring two of our friends and neighbors, John Ihlder and Frank Horne. They have a common cause, in that each has spent his conscious hours helping to create a total American community where each of his brothers, and all men are brothers, may live with dignity and self-respect. This is a better Washington and a finer America because they have helped make it so.

Because you called on them to help your immediate neighbors and they responded, you honor them tonight. What they did here was the most natural thing in the world. They expected no thanks. What you asked was justice and right. Their reward lay in the fact that they were in a position to help, and the resulting friendships that you have given to them are, I dare say, all that they would ever hope to achieve.

Thank you again for this opportunity to tell you a little more about John Ihlder and Frank Horne, our friends and neighbors, whom you so rightly honor tonight. I hope you understand a little better why countless folk all over America know them as truly great Americans.

In conclusion I must say that there are few possessions that any man possesses that I covet, but it would be mighty fine to, like Frank, be Lena Horne's uncle.

Communist Penetration in Latin America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 17, 1954

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, a few days ago the Miami Daily News completed publication of a series of five articles relating to Communist penetration in Latin America. These articles, apparently well authenticated, reveal new details of the design upon our hemisphere by world communism, and provide us warnings of what may be in store for the future.

This newspaper, as well as other newspapers which have been keeping us informed of this particular Communist menace, is to be commended for the performance of a worthwhile public service.

I ask unanimous consent that the articles be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Miami Daily News of May 24, 1954]

COMMUNIST WEB PERILS UNITED STATES TRADE

(First of a series)

(By A. T. Steele)

NEW YORK, May 24.—Communism in Latin America is like hot lava in a crater—it sputters in one place, smokes in another and elsewhere is hidden under a deceptively safe-looking crust.

Though Latin American Communists are not always taken seriously by their fellow-countrymen, they are more dangerous than they look. The ill will they have propagated against the United States and the damage they could cause in event of another world war are incalculable.

In no Latin American country are Communists in actual control at the top level of government. But in at least one—Guatemala—their influence on government policy is great. And in the colony of British Guiana Communists dominate the leading political party.

In other countries the degree of Communist infection can be classified thus: Significant Communist activity: Chile, Brazil, Mexico, Argentina, Bolivia, Panama, Colombia, Venezuela, Ecuador, Uruguay, and Cuba. 2. Light penetration: Peru, Costa Rica, Nicaragua, Paraguay, El Salvador. 3. Insignificant penetration: Haiti, Honduras, Dominican Republic.

ACTIVITIES HIKED

A report issued in October by a congressional subcommittee headed by Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, Republican, Wisconsin, estimated total Communist strength in Latin America at 200,000, as compared with a high of 330,000 in the period 1944–47. A more recent Government survey showed that despite this apparent decline in party numbers there has been a stepping up of party activities. For example, 1,000 Latin Americans made junkets of various kinds to Iron Curtain countries in 1953, compared with only 500 the year before.

If the Wiley committee's estimates are correct, card-carrying Communists represent less than one-tenth of 1 percent of Latin America's total population. It cannot be doubted, however, that through their propaganda and their popular front organizations they influence millions. The deceptiveness of numbers in analyzing Communist strength was demonstrated recently in British Guiana. There a mere handful of hard-working Reds won control of the Peoples Progressive Party (PPP) and led it to a surprising election victory. And these Communists still command popular support despite their expulsion from ministerial office by the British.

Communist tactics in Latin America vary from country to country, but their over-all strategy is more or less uniform. For the present, the main Communist effort is concentrated on fostering misunderstanding and bad relations between Latin America and the United States.

The Communists seem at the moment more interested in organizing "fronts" with other parties than in seizing immediately political mastery for themselves, though doubtless the latter is their long distance goal. The Reds probably realize that to seize power now (if it were possible) would be to invite intervention from the outside.

They make occasional mistakes. In British Guiana, for instance, their irresponsible behavior cost them an opportunity to get everything they wanted by constitutional means.

In almost all these lands, the Communists are riding the bandwagon of nationalism. Meanwhile, they seek to infiltrate those branches of public life that offer opportunities to influence government decisions, promote class hatred and create a base for eventual revolution. Their main fields of activity are organized labor, agrarian movements, education, newspapers, and propaganda.

THREAT TO TRADE

It is only since World War II that the Communists have become a serious hemispheric problem. In a third war the threat they would pose in terms of hemispheric disunity, crippling strikes and sabotage of production and supply lines is unpleasant to contemplate.

The stakes are tremendous. Latin America accounts for roughly one-third of United States foreign trade. It is an important and close-at-hand source of certain strategic materials—copper, tin, bauxite, iron, petroleum and natural nitrates, to name only a few. In some of these industries (nitrates for example) there has been heavy Communist penetration via the labor unions.

Another vital cause for concern is the Panama Canal, which cuts a corridor 50 miles long across the middle of the Republic of Panama. Though the Canal Zone is guarded by American troops, it would be comforting to know that there was no Communist problem in adjacent parts of Central America. Unfortunately, this is not the case, Guatemala being a close-at-hand example.

In the Republic of Panama some Communists are found in labor unions and schools, but the movement has been quiescent since the outlawing of the party last year. President Jose Antonio Remon, of Panama, is an enemy of the Communists and a friend of the United States. His prestige and effectiveness would be bolstered, however, if the United States were to reciprocate his efforts to obtain a fairer deal for Panama under the Panama Canal agreement. This matter has been under negotiation in Washington for many months.

The Communist Party is outlawed in 13 of the 20 Latin American Republics, but in most countries this has had only a moderately deterrent effect on the party's activities.

Take Chile, for example. There the party has no legal standing, yet Communists effectively control the coal, nitrate, and electrical unions with a following of more than 50,000 workers. The Reds have also achieved some infiltration in the copper mining and transport workers unions. Besides this, they publish a newspaper, El Siglo, which happily blares the party line to the inflation-ridden Chilean public.

PARTY GROWING

Because of its economic and political instability, Chile is one of the danger spots in Latin America.

In Brazil, largest and most populous of Latin American States, the Communist Party is also outlawed yet is the biggest (about 60,000) in the whole Latin American region. It not only influences important sections of organized labor but is reputed to have well-placed representatives in a number of other government departments.

Brazilian Communists are said to have authored the slogan, "The Petroleum Is Ours," which had a lot to do with persuading Brazilian legislators to vote against foreign participation in the development of Brazil's oil reserves.

[From the Miami Daily News of May 25, 1954]

HOW FEW LEFTISTS CAN SEIZE POWER

(Second of a series)

(By A. T. Steele)

As an object lesson in the hows and whys of Communist penetration in Latin America, the Republic of Guatemala (population 2,800,000) is unsurpassed.

Here is an almost classic example of Communist infiltration in an almost classic Central American setting.

Ten years ago, Guatemala was suffering from an oppressive military dictatorship of a kind familiar to Latin Americans. Most of the wealth of the country was concentrated in the hands of a small oligarchy of landowners and merchants whose outlook had changed little since Spanish colonial times. Two percent of the people, it was claimed, owned 70 percent of the land. The gap between the rulers and the ruled was tremendous, and the middle class was small and unimportant. The majority of the people were Indians—poor, illiterate, looked down upon by the whites and mestizos.

This dictatorship (of Gen. Jorge Ubico) was brought to an abrupt end in 1944. The people of the country got their first taste of freedom and democracy and liked it. In due course a rather fuzzy leftist, Juan Jose Aravelo, was elected president. Meanwhile, a group of young radicals, mostly ex-students still in their twenties, were clandestinely organizing a Communist Party in order to exploit the revolution to their ends.

MURDER OPENS THE WAY

As the 1950 elections approached, it looked like Maj. Francisco Arana, a moderate, was the man most likely to succeed Aravelo. This was more than the extremists could stomach. Arana was waylaid and murdered, and the history of Guatemala was thus profoundly affected. Capt. Jacob Arbenz, an army officer of distinctly leftist leanings, was elected president. The Communists, who had helped campaign for him, came into the open for the first time immediately after Arbenz' inauguration in 1951.

Guatemala's history since then has been a story of steadily growing Communist influence. Today Communists dominate organized labor and are making a strenuous bid for the support of the rural population (mostly Indian) through active participation in the land reform program.

The Reds have also infiltrated deeply into Guatemala's social service system, the educational system and the propaganda services. They do not, however, control the government. They owe their success in large part to such influence as they may have with President Arbenz and other government leaders. For the present, President Arbenz holds the key to the Guatemala political situation through his authority over the army. If there has been any Red infiltration of the army, it has not gone very deep, according to most observers.

LABOR PARTY IS ALIAS

Guatemalans, trying to convince outsiders that the Communist threat is being greatly exaggerated, point to the fact that there are no Communists in the cabinet and only four in the Guatemalan Congress. What they overlook is the influence exerted by the Communists through their participation in the high councils of the National Democratic Front, the ruling political coalition.

Indeed Guatemalan Communists exert an influence far out of proportion to their numbers. What these numbers are is debatable. Almost certainly there are no more than 3,000 dues-paying Communists in the country, and the number may be considerably fewer. But they are hard workers, and they know exactly what they want, which is more than can be said for the other parties.

For political reasons, the Communists find it more convenient to call themselves the Guatemalan Labor Party rather than the Community Party. Nobody is fooled. The organizational setup and the membership are strictly Communist.

HOW RED MACHINE WORKS

The Communists are accomplishing in Guatemala what they would like to be accomplishing in other Latin American countries. They have achieved membership in a popular front. They have spawned a variety of other front organizations. They carry considerable influence in the government, without the necessity of making themselves too conspicuous. They have a growing mass following among workers and peasants. They are steering the official press and radio into increasingly anti-United States lines. In short, just what the Red "doctors" ordered.

The sprawling Communist organism in Latin America has not one head but many. But all channels of leadership lead eventually to Moscow and other capitals of Eastern Europe. There are many lines of contact. The Guatemalan setup provides a good illustration of how they work. For example, 6 of the 11 members of the political committee (politbureau) of the Guatemalan Labor Party (Communist Party) have visited Moscow on one pretext or another in recent years. Presumably this represents direct liaison between a local Communist Party and the Russian Communist Party on matters of high policy.

But much more frequent—and more open—are the relations between the Guatemalan Communists and the World Federation of Trade Unions (WFTU), which appears to be one of the main channels of contact between international communism and regional communism in Latin America.

PUSHBUTTON PROPAGANDA

In addition there are the various world-front organizations, each with its headquarters in Eastern Europe and each with subsidiaries in all countries where the creation of such subsidiaries is not prevented by law. Among these Communist-dominated bodies are the World Peace Council, the World Federation of Democratic Youth, the International Student Union, and the International Women's Democratic Federation. Through annual congresses and a steady flow of propaganda material the Communist find these agencies immensely useful in developing a worldwide following of fellow travelers and dupes.

The system provides a convenient device too far pushbutton propaganda on an international scale. Any appeal or protest from the world headquarters of any of these organizations, be it in Moscow, Prague, Bucharest, or Vienna, evokes instantaneous echoes from the dutiful satellite organizations.

A training school in Eastern Europe provides courses for Latin Americans wishing to make communism a career. For Communists in the field, the Cominform Journal (For a lasting peace, for a people's democracy) is indispensable reading. It is the bible for the initiated. In its dull columns may be found round-the-world guidance on the latest convolutions of the party line.

[From the Miami Daily News, of May 26, 1954]

PARTY LINE LINKS POETS, TOUGHS

(Third of a series)

(By A. T. Steele)

NEW YORK, May 26.—"Our Communists are different," Latin Americans sometimes tell you. They point to the high percentage of dreamy intellectuals (even poets) among Latin American Reds. They cannot believe that such people are of the same lik as, say, those rough fellows around the Kremlin. They think we North Americans have a highly exaggerated view of the Communist danger in their part of the world.

All this has a painfully familiar ring to anyone who (like this correspondent) was in China during the build-up years of the Communist revolution in that country. There too, while they were still a minority, the Communists charmed non-Communists with their friendly ways, their "democratic" behavior and their apparent desire to cooperate with other "democratic" parties on an equal basis. There too, there were many who thought the Chinese Communists were different. Once in power, however, the Chinese Reds showed themselves capable of a ruthlessness that many of their misguided followers would have deemed inconceivable.

THEY ADMIRE YENAN WAY

Yet the Chinese pattern of revolution, with its emphasis on agrarian reform, is much admired by Latin American Communists and their friends. It is viewed as a formula adaptable in many particulars to this hemisphere. The Yenan way, they call it. To learn about the Yenan way many Latin American Reds have read the works of Mao Tze-tung. These and other Chinese Communist writings are on sale in all cities where they are not proscribed. A few Latin Americans have made the long pilgrimage to Peking (via Moscow) to see Mao's teachings in practice.

It is true there are a few poets among Communist leaders in Latin America, but there are also teachers, labor organizers, office clerks, and "tough guys" in the best Moscow tradition.

BRAZIL'S LEADER IN HIDING

Perhaps the best known Communist in Latin America is the Brazilian, Luiz Carlos Prestes. This veteran organizer and agitator played an important part in building up the Brazilian Communist Party to formidable proportions and helped direct the infiltration of Brazil's government departments, labor unions, universities, newspapers and, to some extent, the army.

Prestes' activities were curtailed but not halted by the outlawing of the party in 1947. Today he operates from hideouts which have been variously reported as being in a dozen different places. And despite a shakeup of the Brazilian party's leadership, Prestes retains much of his old prestige.

No Who's Who of Latin American Reds would be complete without mention of Mexico's Vicente Lombardo Toledano. Once a powerful political figure, Lombardo has lost some ground in recent years. As a candidate in the presidential election of 1952 he received fewer than 75,000 votes. But he still has considerable following and influence in leftwing labor circles throughout central America through his Latin American Labor Federation, an offshoot of the WFTU.

Lombardo played adviser to the inexperienced leaders of the Guatemalan revolution during its early years and was one of the architects of the pro-Communist orientation that the revolution has taken. There is some doubt whether he is himself a Communist Party member, but the question is of academic interest only. His policies are usually right on or alongside the Moscow line.

The most recent claimants to Red notoriety in this hemisphere are Dr. Cheddi Jagan, the deposed chief minister of the British Guiana Government, and his Chicago-born wife, Janet. These two, with the help of a dozen or so other Communists and extremists, succeeded first in achieving, then in bungling an election victory in the British colony. Dr. Jagan, dentist son of an East Indian mule driver on a British Guiana sugar plantation, got his training at Northwestern University, Chicago. Janet Jagan—blonde, thinnish, bespectacled—is generally credited with being the organizational brains behind the politically dominant People's Progressive Party.

HOW JAGANS LOST

S. Gangadeen, a leftist who was associated with the Jagans up to the time of the fateful election in British Guiana, recently wrote a devastating analysis of his former colleagues. He gives the Jagans rough handling, describing Jagan as a man who "knows literally nothing except what he has half-learned from Communist literature and association with Communists." Jagan, he asserts, is "loyal only to his vainglorious ambitions and Communist ideology."

As for Janet Jagan, Gangadeen finds her "a good organizer and energetic executive," also "an appealing speaker whose utterances and style reflect both her sincerity and her ignorance." He sums her up as "potentially a high intellect whose development has been warped and stunted by too early an acquaintance with Communist ideology." Gangadeen holds that the Communists in British Guiana threw away their chance by stupidly overplaying their hand. The Jagans, who are still popular, have now fallen back on passive resistance.

THREE PARTY POETS

In an earlier paragraph we said something about Latin American Communists who are also poets. Pablo Neruda, Chile's leading Communist, is one of them. Neruda's ability as a writer of verse is generally acknowledged, though some of his efforts are spoiled by their propaganda content. His latest product is a 200-line tribute to Guatemala.

The Cuban Communists also boast a poet, Nicolas Guillen, among their leaders. And in Guatemala, the party chief, Jose Manuel Fortuny, once won a poetry competition. But Fortuny's career has also included employment in an American-owned business house, in the British legation, and in various Guatemalan radio stations. Today he is a full-time Communist worker who is said to have considerable influence in Guatemala's highest official places.

Communistic Methods and Infiltration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. STENNIS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 18, 1954

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I have received and read with a great deal of interest a very fine and illuminating letter from Hon. Frank C. Englesing, presently mayor of the town of Port Gibson, Miss.

Mr. Englesing writes from a background of experience and actual contact with those in other areas of the world where he has been an observer of communistic methods and infiltration. I believe a great many of his comments and observations are timely, sound, valuable, and worthy of serious consideration. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the letter be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PORT GIBSON, MISS., *June 10, 1954.*

Senator JOHN C. STENNIS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR STENNIS: I have read with a great deal of attention the excerpts from your radio broadcast of May 10 on the subject of our Far Eastern policies and it occurred to me that you might be interested in what one ordinary Mississippian thinks on the matter of discouraging communism in southeast Asia, as well as in Latin America.

The only reason I have for intruding my personal ideas is that of considerable foreign experience and a first-hand knowledge of the great mass of "have not" peoples which form the majority in Asia, Latin America and Africa. These are the people who are most readily influenced by the Red fairy tales used as propaganda. For some 25 years I was professionally employed beyond the limits of the United States, mainly in the so-called "have not" countries. During this period I have lived in close contact with all levels of society from the ruling classes down to jungle villagers. That kind of experience, I find, gives a perspective on some phases of foreign policy which is not always available even to those who receive intelligence reports and official briefings.

It is well known that communism thrives among low social and economic standards and general ignorance. On that basis some areas of Asia, Latin America, and Africa present every factor favorable to the inoculation of the masses of the population with Communist fables preached to them by some of their own people.

Most of us know the general methods used by communism in the subversion of governments by the people themselves. Advance agents, by preaching the doctrine of better social and economic conditions, make a few converts. Some of the cleverest of these are sent to Russia for education in the techniques of political organization and subversion, after which they are returned to their own countries to work for the spread of communism. This is done by means of arguments and promises appealing to the natural aspirations of the discontented and underprivileged, by painting a picture of wonderful conditions under a new regime which they themselves will set up. Greater and greater numbers are attracted into the Red organization by such means until, one day, there will be a political crisis and the country finds its control taken over through a purely domestic revolution and another nation is added to the Russian hegemony without any risk of outside interference, for it is a purely domestic affair.

Such advances by the Communists cannot be stopped by military force, for they are purely internal affairs of the country involved. The only possible use for military action would be against the centers from which the infection is spread.

I agree with you that, theoretically, Asiatics and others, threatened by communism, ought to be equipped to save themselves by their own efforts. We cannot afford to fritter away our power in numerous petty wars here and yonder. That is basic commonsense. But unless the will to resist Red domination by the peoples affected can be made to exist, our theory of helping them to help themselves by means of military training and the provision of arms is utterly useless. No one is going to fight communism just because we give them a pep talk, train some of them for soldiering and supply them with the tools for resistance. They will not move a finger unless they are convinced that under Red rule they would be worse off than they are at present. What they are realistically interested in is a full belly, a step-up in the social and economic scale, and the power to humble their present exploiters. Communism promises them those things with a high degree of plausibility and provides a plan of action for acquiring them.

If the free world can give these peoples the conviction that with its help their condition can be bettered, then they will fight for that conviction. But if we cannot instill into them the confidence that they can achieve their desires by our help better than by the assistance of communism, then we will lose them no matter how many guns we supply.

This raises the question as to how we can convince the "have not" peoples of the world that they can expect more from us than from the Communist system.

In the countries which I know rather well there are many clever young men and women (many of them political exiles) who believe that the salvation of their peoples lies in raising them in the social and economic scale. Some of the best of these could be brought to this country and educated in political organization and ways and means for bettering the conditions of their people after they have gotten control of the government. They should also be trained in the techniques of spreading these ideas and by them forming a close-knit party among the underprivileged. This organization would be devoted to acquiring the necessary control of the government by which the promised reforms could be carried out. If this method were used with the proper moral and financial backing, I am convinced that Communist plans for subversion would have no chance of success. Moreover, the cost of this method would be relatively small in comparison with the enormous sums sunk in well-meaning attempts to get the backing of the exploited peoples of the world by such means as we have been accustomed to use.

Sincerely,

Frank C. Englesing.

Hessians in Indochina War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 18, 1954

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, in order that the people may know, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the Record an article by Dorothy Thompson entitled "Hessians in Indochina War." The British military expert, Liddell Hart, according to Miss Thompson, reported a year ago that of 100,000 legionnaires serving in Indochina in the French Army, 80,000 were Germans. Miss Thompson did not say so, but the taxpayers of the United States were financing these non-French soldiers who were fighting the native rebels of Indochina in this war against French colonialism.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Hessians in Indochina War—West Germany Takes Steps To Prevent Recruiting Its Citizens Into French Foreign Legion in Asia

(By Dorothy Thompson)

* * * * *

France, taking advantage of her presence in Germany as an occupying power, has been and is recruiting Germans on German soil into the French Foreign Legion, against the laws of the German Federal Republic.

Except for the officers' corps, the French Army in Indochina is not French. The rank and file are drawn from North Africa and Germany.

The son of the British military expert, Liddell Hart, visiting Indochina over a year ago, first reported that 80,000 of the 100,000 legionnaires serving in Indochina were Germans.

The earlier recruits were reportedly former S. S. officers and soldiers wishing to bury their pasts.

The fact has political implications. The Soviets, in negotiating about Indochina and prisoners, hold an ace in maintaining that the war against Viet Minh is being fought by Nazi Germans.

But Nazi or not, the political effect on German opinion is seriously disturbing.

In mid-March the Bonn government planned measures to halt recruiting and smuggling of men out of Germany. An anti-French Foreign Legion campaign was prepared, including placards and posters to be displayed in factories, schools, labor exchanges, and refugees camps, especially in the large cities of the Ruhr, and in Coblenz, Landau, and Kehl, where the recruits are assembled and outfitted.

Recruiting agents are Germans, paid 500 marks a month, with a bonus for each recruit. Their activities are illegal.

Recruits are transported to France by air or simply driven across the frontier dressed in French uniforms, with the German authoities helpless to interfere.

Reassembled in Strasbourg and Metz (France), they are routed via north Africa, where they are trained, to Indochina, where the Germans believe 25,000 have fallen.

The Adenauer government, losing German support by conciliating France, has threatened to carry out the antirecruiting measures planned unless the French Government stops, but has not yet taken concerted action.

Unofficial German groups and institutions, especially church organizations—Catholic and Protestant—are, however, very active. In Landau, particularly, a campaign is being waged to induce German youth not to join those who have done so to desert. The churches have opened homes, with free board and room for young derelicts, and are helping them find jobs.

One-hundred-and-seventy-odd years ago another colonial power, Great Britain, attempted to suppress a national revolution with a foreign legion of Germans. The national revolution was American, the soldiers were Hessians. Britain failed, and descendants of those Hessians serve in American armies today.

There are many reasons why this column has seen dim about any Western war fought in Asia against national revolutionary forces.

But just how the French can explain to a German or to any one else that it is honorable and permissible to serve as a mercenary in Asia, but dishonorable and impermissible to bear arms for the defense of his own country and family and their immediate European neighbors baffles this columnist.

Who will be the ultimate beneficiary of such goings-on?

Ask Senator McCarthy. He knows all about what advances communism.

Will GOP Again Give Democrats Issue of Do-Nothing Congress?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 10, 1954

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the Brooklyn (N. Y.) Eagle of June 7, 1954, speaks for itself:

Will GOP Again Give Democrats Issue of Do-Nothing Congress?

If President Eisenhower spoke with truly prophetic vision at a press conference last December, the Republican Party's continued control of the Federal Government is in danger.

At that time the President declared that "whether or not the Congress enacts a progressive, dynamic program enhancing the welfare of the people of our country will determine the future political complexion of the Congress and the future of the administration."

The President added the stern admonition that "unless the Republican Party can develop and enact such a program, it does not deserve to remain in power."

Up to now, which is about 2 months before the time set for adjournment, Congress has shown little sense of its responsibility to the American people, little awareness of the political hazards it is creating for November, and little disposition to respond to the President's appeals for action on his program.

While extremely patient and restrained in his comments, President Eisenhower is understandably disturbed by the plight of the program, which consists of 214 specific proposals. Senator Knowland and Speaker Martin have given a renewed pledge that major provisions will be enacted before Congress adjourns, but the President realizes that large obstacles lie ahead.

The trade program, as an example, faces a well-organized and powerful lobby. What is being done to overcome its opposition? Nothing insofar as surface indications are concerned. The administration's amendments to the Taft-Hartley Act have already gone down to defeat. In fact, only a handful of measures has been passed, including the St. Lawrence seaway bill.

Fortunately the Senate has approved most of the housing legislation the President asked for. But final congressional action will wait on the results of a Senate-House conference committee.

Awaiting action are questions about agriculture, defense policy, foreign aid, appropriations, health and welfare.

Traditionally, it is true, a great volume of work of every session is crowded into the final 2 months and much can be accomplished if there is majority unity, advance preparation, effective leadership, and intense concentration upon the work in hand.

There is little prospect, however, that these favorable factors will be present in the congressional situation existing between now and late July. To begin with, there is the distraction of the Army-McCarthy hearings, a diversion which will continue in many forms even after the last witness has been heard.

To make the prospect darker, party unity is nonexistent and leadership is impotent. As a matter of practical political interest, if not of disinterested public service, Republican leaders should conern themselves with the importance of doing their work well. They can recall that in 1948 President Truman won because, among other reasons, he was able to call the 80th Congress a do-nothing Congress. Are they prepared to give the Democrats the same issue in 1954?

Teaching Remains Labor of Love

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1954

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, Miss Sophie Reinoehl of Jacksonville, Fla., has just concluded more than half a century of continuous service in the teaching profession, a profession which she describes as wonderful and which she has urged young people to embrace.

She started teaching when she was only 16 years of age and she recollects that her starting salary was $25 a month. It should be noted, however, that she only paid $7 per month board in those early days.

One of the greatest unmet needs of this day is providing for adequate teachers' salaries and adequate schools throughout our country. The responsibility is primarily upon the local communities under our Federal Constitution; but it is certain that something needs to be done to improve these teaching conditions as promptly as possible and that this need is felt from one end of our country to the other, with few exceptions.

It is inspiring to everyone to know of a life of dedicated public service such as that of Miss Sophie Reinoehl.

It will be still more inspiring when we parents and friends of public schools do more of our duty in showing our gratitude to the teachers by improving their working conditions. It is to be hoped that this challenge will be met on a local basis and that we can evade the centralization and nationalization of our school system.

I take pleasure in including at this point in the Record a fine editorial about Miss Sophie Reinoehl, which appeared in the Florida Times-Union. It pays a well-deserved tribute to a great public servant:

Teaching Remains Labor of Love

Upon her retirement from the Duval County school system after a distinguished teaching career of 52 years, Miss Sophie Reinoehl declared her profession was still wonderful and urged more young people to go into the field.

Fortunately for us, such devotion of our teachers to their work is not unusual, although a career as long as Miss Reinoehl's is exceptional. Most teachers are in the field for the love of it; certainly the other inducements are few enough.

While teachers' salaries have improved considerably since Miss Reinoehl began teaching in Bradford County for $25 a month, they still remain lamentably short of what they should be. The last half-century has brought the Nation to a truly spectacular peak of prosperity, yet the teaching profession—in some ways the most important—has remained behind most of the others in remuneration while its qualifications for entry have risen.

It is ironic that a field which requires so much time and money to prepare for offers less material reward than many unskilled and semiskilled pursuits. And the irony is heightened when the teacher's role in the Nation's well-being is considered. Certainly nothing in our power will influence the country's future as decisively as the education of our children.

Our teachers are truly the builders of tomorrow. Their unselfish devotion to their work, dramatically illustrated in Miss Reinoehl's record, benefits all of us.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the Record.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

Code of Laws of the United States

Title 44, Section 181. Congressional Record; arrangement, style, contents, and indexes.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the Congressional Record, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the Congressional Record semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

Title 44, Section 182b. Same; illustrations, maps, diagrams.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the Record without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the Congressional Record the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily Record as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided,* That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the Record with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the official reporters of the Congressional Record, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the Record shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the Record issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the Record for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the Record of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the Record shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the Record style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the Record.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the Congressional Record any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix, but this rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the Congressional Record.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the Congressional Record Appendix the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed.

10. *Official reporters.*—The official reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the Congressional Record by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this restriction shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. The Public Printer or the official reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the Congressional Record which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Illustrations.*—Pursuant to section 182b, title 44, United States Code (as shown above), requests for authority to insert an illustration in the Record should be submitted to the Joint Committee on Printing through the chairman of the Committee on Printing of the respective House in which the speech desired to be illustrated may be delivered. Illustrations shall not exceed in size a page of the Record and shall be linecuts only. Copy for illustrations must be furnished to the Public Printer not later than 12:30 o'clock p. m. of the day preceding publication.

13. *Corrections.*—The permanent Record is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

Thi
o

I

IN

M
er, t
the
ered
acti
cere
nive
Stat
addi
by C
of th

Ca
the
gent
thar
Chic
assis
anni
syste

It
of o
that
but,
avia
char
and
ship
know
airli
of m
of a
tute
cam
liner

Th
Wils
mod
form
with
$100
wou
a m

Th
whic
equi
shop
requ
port

Ho
hist
only
it b
hun
pan
and
form
indu
indu

Co
deb
you
con
adeq
ful
grea

Appendix

Thirty-sixth Anniversary of the Founding of the United States Airmail System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD W. HOFFMAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 21, 1954

Mr. HOFFMAN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an address delivered by the Honorable Carl A. Schroeder, acting postmaster of Chicago, Ill., at ceremonies commemorating the 36th anniversary of the founding of the United States airmail system. I also include an address delivered on the same occasion by Capt. Benjamin B. Lipsner, founder of the United States airmail system:

Captain Lipsner, Mr. Forgan, generals of the Army, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, first permit me, Mr. Forgan, to thank you and the First National Bank of Chicago for your generous cooperation in assisting in this great observance of the 36th anniversary of the founding of the airmail system of the United States.

It was through the great genius and skill of our fellow Chicagoan, Captain Lipsner, that we not only have the airmail system but, due to his great knowledge, modern aviation is what it is today. It was he who chartered the first airlines and air routes, and under his efficient and capable leadership scheduled powered flights, hitherto unknown, became a reality. Thus our great airlines came into being. The minute details of maintenance, costs, efficiency, and records of all description were so efficiently instituted and maintained that this system became the nucleus and foundation for all airlines and operations as we know them today.

Thirty-six years ago, President Woodrow Wilson appointed an unknown and seemingly modest and obscure captain of aviation to formulate and institute an airmail system, with a meager appropriation approximating $100,000, which by our present standards would hardly pay 10 percent of the cost of a modern giant airliner.

This small sum represented all the money which was to be used to purchase planes and equipment to provide facilities for hangars, shops, and personnel, and to meet all the requirements to make a workable air transport system.

How well he succeeded is a matter of history for all posterity to remember. Not only was scheduled airmail established, but it became so efficient that from this very humble beginning, the great airline companies were organized and have flourished and succeeded, and given impetus to the formation of the great plane construction industry, which is today the fifth largest industry in America.

Captain Lipsner, America owes you a great debt of gratitude which we can never repay you. We regard you as a great pioneer whose contributions cannot really be measured nor adequately appraised. On behalf of a grateful Government, and more particularly the great Post Office Department, I extend to you its deepest thanks and most sincere appreciation, and congratulate you and wish you many, many more happy anniversaries and airmail celebrations for many years to come.

SPEECH BY CAPT. BENJAMIN B. LIPSNER IN ANSWER TO POSTMASTER CARL A. SCHROEDER

Mr. Postmaster, officers of the First National Bank of Chicago, distinguished guests, ladies, and gentlemen, I consider this great ceremony a tribute not to me, but to those stalwart heroes who gave their lives in the discharge of their official duties in the formulation of the airmail system and the delivery of our early airmail. While I was more fortunate, but for fate, I, too, might have been added to that list of immortals. To them we dedicate each instance that we are conscious of mailing an airmail letter. The many fine compliments paid me could never have been possible if it had not been for the Millers, Gardners, Lindberghs, and the host of other airmail pilots who blazed the trails with the early attempts to establish a well grounded and efficient service for posterity. Today every great nation on earth has its own airmail system, whose schedules are meticulously maintained in the tradition of the United States airmail system. To have been instrumental in founding such a great system is in itself adequate reward and honor. It was these early pilots of the airmail who chartered the courses, and air routes, after which we patterned all scheduled airplane activities. Today, thanks to those unsung heroes, we can board giant air monsters, and go to all corners of the earth in hours instead of the weeks which would formerly have been consumed. All this, we owe to the wisdom, foresight, confidence, and perseverance of the officials of the United States Government.

I want to thank you, Postmaster Schroeder and the officials of this great bank and the many distinguished generals, Army personnel, members of the Air Corps, Navy, Marines, Legionnaires, and all officials for participating in this 36th anniversary of the founding of the United States airmail system. My sincere thanks to the many pilots representing the Airline Pilots Association International, and the great host of friends and the many hundreds present today, to all I extend my heartfelt thanks and appreciation and to you Postmaster Schroeder, knowing of your great contributions, not only to your Government, but to all worthy and charitable undertakings, I, as an engineer and executive can well appreciate the great success you are having in the conduct of your affairs as head of the second largest post office in the world. Yet, with all these great attainments you still are recognized as a leader in every civic and fraternal movement for the benefit of mankind. We in Chicago are indeed most fortunate in the wise selection by President Eisenhower in giving our great city so magnificent an administrator as you to direct our great Chicago post office.

Knowing you have always been a great philatelist and collector of outstanding historical items, it affords me the extreme and great pleasure to present to you with my most sincere wishes this original Historical Kitty Hawk Cover properly framed and duly authenticated, which was personally mailed by me in the presence of the late lamented Orville Wright from the very spot at Kill Devil Hills, Kitty Hawk, N. C., where the first powered flight in world history was duly made, bearing the complete historical facts pertaining thereto. Please accept this token of my personal esteem and regard. Thank you very much.

The "Bennington" Disaster

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. ROBSION, JR.

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 21, 1954

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, all of us were profoundly shocked by the recent disaster which befell the aircraft carrier, U. S. S. *Bennington*. We were also greatly impressed by the behavior of the officers and enlisted men whose heroism was in the best tradition of the United States Navy.

News of the *Bennington* disaster brought to my mind an incident which occurred in 1912 aboard the U. S. S. *Minnesota*. One of my constituents, Mr. Howard C. Mayberry, now a successful businessman of Louisville, Ky., was an ammunition hoister aboard that vessel and his quick thinking prevented the destruction of the ship following an explosion in one of the gun turrets. Mr. Mayberry, who was only 15 years of age when he entered upon that enlistment in the Navy, has never received the proper recognition for his heroism on that occasion.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to insert in the RECORD the following excerpt from the Louisville Courier-Journal of May 29, 1939, which sets forth Mr. Mayberry's feat:

It was a blustery, squally late afternoon when the old *Minnesota* poked its nose at top speed through the Atlantic off Cape Hatteras, Va., the ship throbbing to the beat of her engines and heeling under the recoil of salvo after salvo of broadside fire on a record target practice run.

Seaman Mayberry was at his post as ammunition hoister for the 12-incher of the twin forward turret, braced securely against the shock of the firing, an important member of a highly skilled gun crew whose movements were precision personified.

It was Seaman Mayberry's job to signal upward from the ship's magazine the carrier which brought four 84-pound bags of black powder and a 580-pound projectile for each charge. In addition, it was his job to man the safety device in the event of emergency.

Then, but let Mayberry tell it:

"The gun crew just had completed placing a charge and I had signaled up the carrier with another load and braced myself waiting for the shock of the discharge.

"As the gun fired there was an unusually heavy blast and a glance through the port showed the barrel of the rifle had burst and dropped to the deck below.

"Then, as the breechblock was thrown open there was a terrific backflash, the force of which knocked all the crew except me to the floor of the turret. I was holding supports at the top of the chamber in which we were locked.

"It seemed as though a ball of fire flashed out of the breech and bounced from side to side of the room. Almost without giving it a thought I signaled the magazine crew to reverse the carrier with the fresh load, then opened the valves of the emergency water tank which flooded the turret and put out the fire. Then I opened the valves of the starboard gunroom, too, because I didn't know what might have happened on that side.

"After that I don't remember much what happened until they opened the room and dragged out my stunned mates and myself. Three of the boys were burned severely and all were suffering from shock.

"If any of that fire had shot down the ammunition hoist into the magazine it would have been curtains for a $15 million battleship and the crew of more than 800 men and officers. I really believe my action may have prevented that, although, of course, I can't say so definitely."

News of the incident, however, leaked out, Mr. Mayberry reports, and newspapermen were waiting when the craft docked.

"Shortly after that," Mr. Mayberry said, "the ship steamed into Veracruz, my enlistment expired, and I left the Navy, a kid of 19, who didn't think too much about the part I had played.

"Later, I attempted to learn whether there had been any mention of what actually had occurred, especially insofar as I was concerned, but was informed by the Navy Department the episode was covered generally in numerous reports without particular identification of men involved, with the exception of the injured. An ensign in charge of our crew, I believe, prepared the detailed report of the actual explosion."

Ruth Thompson: An Appreciation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS E. GRAHAM

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 21, 1954

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, it is my very pleasant duty to insert in the Record the following statement concerning the work, the character, and the ability of our esteemed colleague, Miss Ruth Thompson, of the Ninth Michigan District.

Almost immediately after her appearance here in Washington she was placed on the Committee on the Judiciary and assigned to Subcommittee No. 1, of which I am the chairman. Therefore, for the last 3 years I have had ample opportunity to observe her work. We have no more faithful member of the committee than Miss Thompson. She is punctual in her attendance upon subcommittee meetings and upon meetings of the full committee. She has a fine legal background and this is of material assistance in aiding her in our work.

Our committee probably carries the heaviest workload of any committee of the Congress, particularly so, Subcommittee No. 1, which at the moment has before it 2,700 private immigration bills.

Plus her legal background and experience upon the bench, Miss Thompson spent 17 months abroad in Frankfurt, Germany, and Copenhagen, Denmark, and this has given her a very personal viewpoint of the present immigration problem that now confronts this country.

Just as she has been faithful and active in her committee duties, she is likewise equally diligent upon the floor of the House. She is a strong Republican, a very valuable Member of the House, and I am only too glad, as chairman of this committee, to bring to the attention of her constituents in the Ninth Michigan District, her value and worth. We, in the Congress, particularly those on the Republican side, are indeed fortunate to have a woman of this character in our membership.

Oregon's Initiative Law Viewed as Potent Curb on Legislature

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 21, 1954

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, Oregon's initiative and referendum act was adopted in 1902 by an overwhelming vote and has served the people and State many times since that date.

Kelley Loe has written for the Oregonian a brief history of the formulation of this act and some accomplishments through its use which was published in the June 13 issue of the paper. This procedure is of nationwide interest, and I include Mr. Loe's article as part of these remarks:

OREGON'S INITIATIVE LAW VIEWED AS POTENT CURB ON LEGISLATURE

(Editor's Note.—Kelley Loe, author of this article, retired April 1 as assistant secretary of Oregon State Federation of Labor after 20 years as a lobbyist and top strategist for labor. He was a voice of labor at every legislative session from 1931 to 1951. He did not attend the last session. He has launched and managed numerous country newspapers, has written a textbook on labor, and is a member of Multnomah Typographical Union, No. 58, and office employees' local, No. 11. While he has officially retired, he still works several hours a day for labor "for free.")

(By Kelley Loe)

Citizens of Oregon on June 2, 1902, by a vote of approximately 1 to 1 (62,024 to 5,668), adopted a constitutional amendment that made every citizen of the State a member of the State legislature. Known as the initiative and referendum system of direct legislation, it provides that 8 percent of the citizens of the State may place on the State ballot a proposed statutory act or constitutional amendment for approval or rejection by the voters at the next general election.

In the same manner, 5 percent of the citizens may invoke the referendum on a measure adopted by the legislature and give the voters an opportunity to concur in the action of the legislature or to exercise a veto by majority rejection. A legislative act so referred does not become effective unless and until it receives voter approval.

Gist of the constitutional provision adopted in June 1902 is in the following formal language:

"The people reserve to themselves power to propose laws and amendments to the constitution and to enact or reject the same at the polls independent of the legislative assembly, and also reserve power at their own option to approve or reject at the polls any act of the legislative assembly."

People living in Oregon in 1902 still recall the enthusiastic frenzy of the campaign which preceded adoption of the amendment. On adoption of the measure, oldtimers say, it was the prevailing opinion that it conferred on the people full, easy, and everlasting control of their State government, and that, through legislative power conferred on the people, they would indirectly influence the policies and acts of the executive department.

Some were so optimistic as to believe the new-lodged power of the people might place some restraints upon the courts, for it was at about this time that Mr. Dooly was observing that "the Supreme Court reads the election returns."

The new system of people's government in action has not proved a panacea for all political and economic ills; nor has it proved the infallible collective judgment of the people. what it does seem to have accomplished is a directive to the legislature in a number of fields of legislation.

SLOW START MADE

After the people have spoken decisively on an issue, legislators are wary about taking a stand contrary to that taken by the citizenry. So, if a defeated referendum measure is again proposed, legislators are inclined to submit it to the people rather than pass it outright without including the reference clause.

Two years after gaining the right of initiating measures, in 1904, only 2 measures were initiated: 1 to provide that political party nominations be made in primary elections, which was adopted; the other provided local option as to sale of intoxicating liquors. It, too, was adopted.

In 1906, 4 years after adoption of the initiative system, 10 measures went on the ballot by petition, and each biennial election after that found a steady increase in number of measures to be voted on, until 1918, after which the number began to decline.

TRIVIAL MATTERS LOSE

The seeming decline in use of the direct legislation device was not due to the populace tiring of its new tool of government, but rather to the refusal of the voters to ratify more trivial measures, such as the one which proposed creating a State office of hotel inspector, and a number of initiated measures to create new counties.

Measures of fundamental importance were adopted, usually by decisive majorities.

In 1906 an adopted initiative measure extended the initiative to local units of government. In 1908 the people enacted the recall of public officials, and also the same year a method of electing the State's United States Senators by popular vote, the first of its kind in the Nation, and 5 years before a change in the Federal Constitution to provide for election of Senators by the people instead of by legislatures.

Election of Senators by popular vote had been an issue after 1901 when Governor Geer urged the legislature to memorialize Congress to submit a constitutional amendment to the States for ratification. The Oregonian editorially supported the Governor's recommendation.

Having the new tool of direct legislation, the people initiated a device by which candidates for the legislature could pledge to vote for the people's choice for United States Senator, the choice being expressed by the people on the regular election ballot. The device was known as statement No. 1.

Among other early enactments were the employers' liability law and the Workmen's Compensation Act, both of which provided compensation for workers injured in hazardous industrial employment.

One notable exception of refusal to adopt a progressive measure was the failure in three successive elections to adopt women's suffrage. One the fourth try, in 1912, the vote was given women, but by only a 4,000 majority.

FIGHT LONG ONE

Oregon's adoption of the initiative and referendum system in 1902 was not a spontaneouc act, but was the culmination of a decade of agitation. Pattern for the system was that in effect in Switzerland.

One of the earliest and perhaps the most persistent advocates in Oregon was Mrs. Sophana Llewelling, of Milwaukie.

She and her husband were among the early homesteaders. A part of the homestead is now within the limits of the little city of Milwaukie. Mrs. Llewelling, a crusading matriarch, made the Milwaukie Grange her forum.

Attorney William S. U'Ren, then residing in Oregon City, was the best-known advocate of people's government and is credited with drafting the original constitutional amendment and much other legislation that became the superstructure built upon the foundation of the original 1902 initiative amendment.

The first organization known to have endorsed the idea and the program for its adoption was the Oregon State Grange in 1894. The Federated Trades Council (now the Portland Central Labor Council) followed.

By the time the measure appeared on the ballot, 8 years after its espousal by the State grange, most segments of the population appeared to be converted.

The campaign committee in 1902, operating under the title "Direct Legislation League," included numerous citizens of distinction whose names have come down in history.

Among them were Gov. T. T. Geer; Jonathan Bourne, later to be the first United States Senator chosen under the "statement No. 1" device; George H. Williams, former United States Attorney General; Ben Selling; Charles E. Ladd; Joseph N. Teal, Judge Stephen Lowell; G. Y. Harry, first president of the Oregon State Federation of Labor; and Harry Gurr, president of the Portland Federated Trades Council.

Members of the campaign committee wrote arguments printed in a campaign document. Harvey W. Scott, editor of the Oregonian, wrote one such argument emphasizing the value of the referendum provision in these words: "The referendum is an obstacle to too much legislation; to legislation in particular interests; to partisan legislation; and to boss rule."

The State federation of labor, organized only a month preceding the 1902 election, appointed a statewide committee of 33 charged with the duty of campaigning on election day. (At that time it was not illegal to campaign at the polls.)

DEMOCRAT MOVES IN

Former Gov. Oswald West thinks the astounding sweep of sentiment for the initiative system may have been a deciding factor in the gubernatorial election that June day in 1902, and probably furnished the first political reprisal for a candidate for public office.

Judge Lowell, an advocate of the initiative system, was a preconvention candidate for the Republican nomination for governor. The party convention rejected Lowell and nominated W. J. Furnish, a Pendleton banker. The voters took it out on Furnish, who was defeated by a small margin by George E. Chamberlain, Democratic nominee.

Adoption of the initiative system in Oregon might have occurred earlier than 1902 but for a provision of the State constitution that required two succeeding sessions of the legislature to vote to submit a constitutional amendment to the people and, of course, there was no method of submitting constitutional change other than by the legislature.

A resolution submitting the initiative amendment, introduced by Representative John L. Kruse, of Clackamas County, was approved by the 1899 legislature, the House of Representatives adopting it on a 43-to-9 vote, and the Senate concurring in a 20-to-8 vote.

Advocates seem to have kept up their agitation between 1899 and 1901, for the legislature of the latter year adopted the 1899 resolution with only one dissenting vote, that of Senator Theodore Cameron, of Jackson County.

OTHER STATES ACTIVE

Oregon was not the first State to use direct vote of the people in adopting or rejecting legislation. Other States had made feeble starts in that direction, and South Dakota had adopted an amendment to its constitution in 1898 to provide the initiative system.

Some 40 States now have some form of provision for the citizenry to have some direct voice in legislating.

It is claimed that no State has gone further in this direction than has Oregon. The Oregon system has had no essential change in the 50 years since its citizens first voted directly on legislation, 1904.

In the half century 371 measures have been on the State ballot.

Of the 198 initiated by petition, 75 were adopted and 123 were rejected. The referendum was invoked on 34 measures adopted by the legislature, the legislature being sustained and the measures approved in 15 bills but reversing the legislature and rejecting 19 bills.

The legislature referred 139 measures, some of which were proposed constitutional amendments, which only the people could adopt. Of the 139 so referred, the voters approved 93 and rejected 46. The legislature in submitting statutory acts probably did so in some cases because it feared the referendum would be invoked and the legislature rebuked by the people. In still other instances the legislature may have passed a hot-potato measure along to the people.

PEOPLE GAIN RESPECT

Few will deny that experience under the direct legislation system has developed a healthy respect of the people by legislators. And if that is true, then the legislature is more responsive to the desires of the citizenry than otherwise would be true.

The decline in the number of measures initiated seems to indicate that the people, too, have learned that trivial measures have little chance of adoption, that voters are becoming more discriminating in their judgment of legislation. Persons who formerly sought to make a business of promoting initiative measures are less in evidence in recent years.

Part of the decline in measures gaining ballot places undoubtedly is due to a measure enacted by the 1935 legislature prohibiting payment for obtaining signatures on an initiative petition, the measure being promoted by Ray Gill, then master of the State grange, and by the late Ben T. Osborne, executive secretary of the Oregon State Federation of Labor.

Previously, when petition pushers had received as much as 10 cents per name, it was asserted that some circulators had attempted, and possibly on some occasions succeeded, in selling filled petitions to persons or interests opposing the measures. No prosecutions resulted from the alleged racket. But enactment of the bill prohibiting pay for petition circulation ended commercialization of initiative legislation in this respect.

WEAKNESS POINTED OUT

One criticism of the initiative often heard is its use to promote constitutional amendments when the measures should be statutory acts. This is pointed out as being in part responsible for the extreme lengh of the Oregon State constitution.

A proposed amendment of the initiative section of the constitution will appear on the State ballot in November this year. It would increase the percentage of names required to initiate a constitutional amendment from the present 8 percent of voting citizens to 10 percent.

This would raise the number of names required from 37,000 plus to approximately 48,000. Steadfast defenders of the initiative system are opposing the proposal as an entering wedge to weaken the system, while supporters assert that effect of its adoption would be to end, or lessen, the tendency to make the constitution a catchall for diverse statutory enactments.

EMERGENCY RIGHT SOUGHT

In recent years agitation has been heard for a constitutional amendment to give the legislature power to attach the emergency clause to tax bills, which would nullify the right of referendum on tax legislation.

The proposed amendment would repeal an initiated constitutional provision adopted by the people in 1912. That year Oregon citizens appeared extremely tax conscious, nine tax measures being on the State ballot. Of the 9, 7 were rejected by close margins, prohibition of use of the emergency clause received a preponderant majority.

Since 1912 tax legislation proposals have exceeded any other single issue on the ballot. Appearance on the ballot of such proposal may be expected to generate more interest than any other proposal in the year when the issue is submitted to the people.

Still another criticism of uses to which the referendum is put is accusation of unethical, but not illegal, exploitation. Illustration of this was an example of recent years when the legislature adopted a measure placing a costly tax upon a particular industry.

The industry invoked the referendum but the legislative act was sustained by a majority of more than 179,000 on vote of the people. The industry affected reported expenditure of $120,000 attempting to defeat the measure. That expenditure was trifling when it is considered that the industry saved more than $2 million in taxes by postponing the effective date of the measure for almost a year.

LABOR BILL BEATEN

At the time the initiative system was adopted, its ardent supporters hoped and credulously believed the device would insure only good legislation would result—good from their point of view.

There have been bitter disappointments. Farmers who preponderantly favor standard time found that a measure presumably establishing standard time was interpreted to do the opposite, but they found their recourse in initiating another measure which really did accomplish what they wanted.

Labor, too, like the farmers, had supported the direct legislative system, but in 1938 a measure initiated by some employing interests placing drastic restrictions on labor organizations was adopted by a 50,000 majority.

However, labor took the measure to the courts where that branch of government nullified the bill adopted by the people functioning as a legislature.

On the other side of the question, the people, by adopting a constitutional amendment in 1952, redistricting the State for legislative seats, carried out a mandate of the original constitution which the legislature had defied through the period from 1911 to 1952. Legislative reapportion in the latter year was adopted by the whopping majority of more than 160,000.

The people of the State have learned that any device of government may be used to enact, or to seek enactment, of measures good or bad, depending upon the point of view.

EFFECT PROVES STRONG

Regardless of how one views the system of direct legislation, few will dispute that it has had a profound effect on State legislation through the initiative and the referendum, and also in an unmeasurable degree through its salutary effect upon the legislative assembly.

No one has the temerity to suggest that the system be repealed, although there have been numerous proposals to limit, most of them getting no further than futile attempts in the legislature to submit amendatory proposals.

Nothing on the political horizon in Oregon indicates sentiment for drastic revision of the direct legislation system. The situation is probably well reflected by C. C. Chapman, editor of the Oregon Voter, which is accepted as something of a political barometer. The publication is regarded as being conservative in outlook.

Editor Chapman, both in the publication and before a committee of the legislature in 1953, declared: "The people of Oregon do not want the initiative and referendum monkeyed with. Their resentment against such attempts are very keen. Monkeying with it is like monkeying with a buzz saw."

President's Pledge to People in TVA Area Broken—TVA Steam Plant Denied While Three Steam Plants Are To Be Built by United States Government in Korea—GAO Questions Wisdom and Authority of President To Order Atomic Energy Commission To Contract for Private Power; Urges Competitive Bidding

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 21, 1954

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, during the campaign in Tennessee in 1952 of President Eisenhower—then Candidate Eisenhower—there appeared in the press a cartoon depicting a TVA dam being destroyed, the TVA system impaired, by the election of a Republican Congress and President.

Candidate Eisenhower denounced this action and praised the TVA, giving out repeated statements of his admiration for the work and efficiency of the TVA. Yet, today, Mr. Speaker, I must again conclude that the cartoon depicted, in truth, was the future held for the TVA.

Since Mr. Eisenhower entered the White House, funds have been denied for the building of essential, needed and necessary steam generating capacity for TVA—and more recently, the President has ordered the Atomic Energy Commission to enter into a contract with a private syndicate for the purchase of from 500,000 to 600,000 kilowatts of power instead of procuring this power through the TVA system at a greatly reduced cost to the taxpayers of the Nation.

The TVA itself is not only being denied and has been denied funds for needed expansion of its facilities for normal growth and defense needs in the area, but the President in this unwarranted and unprecedented order seems bent on destroying the TVA—and the low-cost yardstick rate established by the TVA operation—and fostering a return to high-cost private power for the TVA area.

This proposed contract is opposed by three members of the Atomic Energy Commission—it is opposed by the TVA—and, certainly, it is opposed by the taxpayers of the Nation who will, in the event of its completion, have to foot the bill.

The Acting Comptroller General of the United States has questioned the wisdom of the proposed contract, as well as the General Manager of the Atomic Energy Commission. Each has pointed out that the private-power contract would cost in excess of $3,600,000 a year more than a similar arrangement with the TVA. The contract is for a 25-year period—the ultimate cost of this thing is estimated by the Atomic Energy Commission's technical staff to be in excess of $92 million. TVA's power manager puts the figure even higher—at an estimated increased cost of $139,175,000 over the 25-year period of the proposed contract.

In addition to this windfall, the private-power combine will get still another windfall in the form of the proposed requirement that TVA will build and maintain transmission lines from the site of the plant to be so built to the TVA system.

Should President Eisenhower's shocking order be carried into effect, a brazen deal thus will not only block TVA's expanding to meet its normal need, but it will give the private-power combine a foothold in the TVA area it has long been seeking and a guaranty to private-power companies of huge profits at the expense of the American taxpayers.

The warning of enmity and hostility to TVA which were so hotly denied by Candidate Eisenhower have now clearly been demonstrated.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, as if this threat were not sufficiently wounding, simultaneously there has been issued by the Foreign Operations Administration (FOA) a press release to the effect that the United States Government through the FOA will finance a $30 million project for the construction of 3 steam plants in Korea to increase the Korean Government's power supply. The steam plants for Korea will be built at Masan, which is near Pusan, at Seoul, and at Samchok.

I am reminded that the President has referred to the TVA as "creeping socialism," and I am just wondering if he has embraced "creeping socialism" for Korea.

And, I may add, Mr. Speaker, that still another distressing and unfortunate aspect of the proposal which has come from the White House is the direct intervention and interference with an agency of the executive branch which has traditionally operated in a nonpartisan and independent atmosphere, with primary concern for the Nation's safety and the taxpayers' money. But here we have a regrettable instance of direct intervention with the Atomic Energy Commission by the Chief Executive—the giving of an order to this Commission to enter into and to sanction a contract which is clearly in excess of what it should be, and a contract which would clearly penalize the Nation's taxpayers. There is evidence strongly showing that not only could a contract be let at a greatly reduced cost—but there is evidence that other private power companies could execute the contract at a lower cost than the well-known syndicate here singled out for special favors, if given an opportunity to bid.

Need more be said, Mr. Speaker, on the subject of President Eisenhower's avowed "friendship" for TVA?

I think not. Any illusion that the President may have been friendly disposed toward the TVA must now be completely discounted and disregarded.

In this connection, I desire to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD two editorials recently appearing in the press. One, entitled "Mr. Giveaway Does It Again," is from the June 19, last, issue of the Nashville Tennessean; the other, entitled "Condemning TVA," is from the June 20, last, issue of the Washington Post and Times Herald; also, a copy of the FOA press release of June 10, last, relative to the building of steam plants in Korea.

The editorals and press release follow:

[From the Nashville Tennessean of June 19, 1954]

MR. GIVEAWAY DOES IT AGAIN

Even in an administration that has shown a singular capacity for disregard of the national interest, the giveaway President Eisenhower has now ordered over the objections of the Atomic Energy Commission assumes monumental proportions.

From the standpoint of the American people, there simply is no way to justify the Presidential order that the AEC contract with a private power syndicate for a steam plant that would supply electric power to the Tennessee Valley Authority.

For what purports to be an economy administration, the cost factor alone should have been sufficient reason for expanding TVA's facilities enough to meet the AEC needs instead of negotiating this circuitous handout to the private power industry.

According to the AEC's technical staff, the projected 25-year contract will cost the Government $92,125,000 more than if the power were supplied by its own publicly owned project—the TVA. And the TVA's power manager puts the figure even higher; his estimate is that the taxpayers of the Nation will be out an additional $139,175,000 over the 25-year stretch.

Either figure is staggering when viewed as an unnecessary expenditure. It is small wonder indeed that the AEC refused to accept responsibility for the decision but instead passed the issue back to the "higher authority" on whose instructions it had explored the possibility of contracting for private power.

Nor is it surprising, though it may be unusual, to find the Nation's Acting Comptroller General criticizing the President for giving no consideration to the lowest bidder.

More is involved, however, than just the added cost, for in forcing this strange course of action upon the Atomic Energy Commission, the President has placed that body in a strange, new role.

This is so because the power that will be provided by the new plant will not go directly to any of the AEC's installations. Instead, it will go into the TVA system to make up for 600,000 kilowatts of the power the TVA is furnishing AEC.

By that roundabout process, the President has evaded—for the time being, at least—the necessity of expanding the TVA enough to meet the normal defense needs of the valley.

But in so doing he has involved the AEC in what one of its three commissioners in the majority opposing the arrangement describes as "a matter remote from its responsibility." That is, Mr. Eisenhower has put the Commission "into the business of being the broker for power."

In this capacity the AEC will be responsible for fantastic concessions to the private power syndicate. This governmental agency, it is revealed, will pay all State, local, and Federal taxes on the private plant. Moreover, it will be required to pay one-half the cost of the plant over $107,250,000 and up to $117 million.

And as if these windfalls were not enough, the private combine will get another in the form of a requirement that TVA build and maintain the transmission lines from the West Memphis plant to the TVA system.

The net effect of this brazen deal will be to block needed TVA expansion, to give private power the foothold in the TVA area it has been seeking so long, and to guarantee the participating companies a huge built-in profit at the expense of the American taxpayer.

It is not without reason, therefore, that Senator ALBERT GORE has denounced the proposal as "a deal to operate Dixon-Yates (the utilities syndicate) at maximum efficiency."

And in ordering this incredible contract, President Eisenhower not only has reemphasized his hostility to public power but has demonstrated the hollowness of his platitudes about encouraging local private interests to develop power projects.

For Middle South Utilities, Inc., and the Southern Co. are not local interests but are holding companies with headquarters in New York.

They represent big business in a big way. And because they do, they can now look forward to bountiful rewards won at the expense of the public interest and bestowed by an administration that points proudly to its business philosophy.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of June 20, 1954]

CONDEMNING TVA

President Eisenhower's letter instructing the Atomic Energy Commission in effect to purchase power from certain private utility companies is unfortunate from every point of view. As a matter of administration, this kind of interference with the independent judgment of a commission is mischievous. In terms of business practice, it is an uneconomic and imprudent arrangement, certain to prove costly to American taxpayers. Considered as policy, it seems to reflect a doctrinaire preference for private power instead of public power, regardless of the needs and problems of a specific situation. Indeed, it seems an unhappy reversion to the President's reference to TVA just a year ago as an example of "creeping socialism."

Through the Bureau of the Budget, the President has virtually ordered the AEC to do what 3 of its 5 Commissioners actively oppose and what the other 2 regard if not with misgivings at least without fervor. The Commission is to sign a 25-year contract with a private syndicate for the purchase of 500,000 to 600,000 kilowatts of power to be provided for a new $107 million plant in the Memphis area. This new private plant will be used to serve residents of the area who now get their power from TVA, and it will also serve as a justification for denying TVA the funds it has requested for the purchase of steam plants to meet the power needs of the AEC and of area residents. In short, the AEC, which does not now need additional power, is being used, as Senator GORE put it, "to prevent the TVA from building more capacity."

Representative CHET HOLIFIELD has performed an immensely useful public service in bringing out the uneconomic aspects of this arrangement. His persistent questioning elicited from Brig. Gen. Kenneth D. Nichols, AEC general manager, an acknowledgment that the AEC staff has estimated the private power contract will cost about $3.6 million a year more than a similar arrangement with TVA.

"Over the life of the contract [Mr. HOLIFIELD asserted] American taxpayers will pay at least $90 million more than the cost of equivalent power supplied by TVA. The public will foot the bill while the private utilities get a free ride. At the end of the ride the private utilities will own the automobile paid for by the taxpayers."

We applaud the determination of Representatives HOLIFIELD and MELVIN PRICE, both members of the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy, to take their fight against the administration power proposal to the floor of the House. It is really a fight for TVA's life. There have been few American achievements of the 20th century which have contributed more to the public welfare than TVA's achievement in enriching the great Tennessee Valley and harnessing the Tennessee River and its tributaries for the welfare of the valley's residents. That magnificent American development must not now be stifled out of a mere doctrinaire opposition to public power and a nightmare fear of "creeping socialism."

FOREIGN OPERATIONS ADMINISTRATION PRESS RELEASE

WASHINGTON, June 10.—The FOA today announced a $30 million authorization for building three new thermal (steam) electric powerplants in the Republic of Korea which will add 100,000 kilowatts to South Korea's power supply.

The power project is the largest single authorization approved for South Korea, and will provide a foundation upon which the country's overall economic rehabilitation may be achieved. It and other power projects now underway will quadruple the country's available power.

The present 4 hydro and 3 thermal plants in South Korea are currently capable of producing 68,000 kilowatts of firm capacity. Rehabilitation work now being done on them will increase this to 143,000 kilowatts.

Since 1947, when the Russians cut off South Korea's flow of power from North Korea, two American military power-generating barges have been pumping power into the South Korean electric system at a cost estimated at $3 million a year. The two barges, which have been providing about half as much power as the entire South Korean power system, will be removed upon completion of the new thermal plants.

The $30 million will finance the estimated dollar costs of a contract negotiated last week in Seoul between the Government of Korea and the Pacific Bechtel Corp., with offices in San Francisco, which will design and construct the plants and train Koreans to operate them. The work is to be completed within 30 months.

The Korean Government is adding 720 million hwan (equal to $4 million) from its own resources to pay costs, such as local labor and materials, which can be met from Korean currency. It is estimated that Bechtel will take about 300 American engineers and construction technicians to Korea to supplement local labor forces in the construction work.

One plant of 50,000 kilowatt capacity is to be built at Masan, which is near Pusan on the southern tip of Korea. One 25,000 Kilowatt plant will be built at Seoul, and another at Samchok, on the east coast.

The plants will be designed and equipped to burn pulverized Korean anthracite coal, but also will be capable of operating at full capacity on fuel oil.

Ninety percent of Korean electric power has historically been generated in the industrial area north of the 38th parallel. One of the objectives of American programs is the establishment of a self-sufficient economy in South Korea as soon as possible. South Korean sources of electric power are basic to this objective.

The New York engineering firm of Burns & Roe, Inc., is rehabilitating two of the existing thermal plants under the terms of a $3,600,000 contract with the United Nations Korean Reconstruction Agency. This contract covers the rebuilding of a portion of the transmission network, and the repair of a number of substations. It will add 75,000 kilowatts in firm capacity to the existing output.

Also underway is an FOA-financed contract with International Engineering Co., Inc., of San Francisco, for repair of the huge Hwachon hydroelectric plant north of the 38th parallel, which was captured by the U. N. forces.

FOA has set aside $720,000 as an initial sum to put the Hwachon generating plant into full operation and to launch a survey to determine total costs of rehabilitating the installation. The big dam, located on the Han River about 15 miles north of the parallel, is the largest hydroelectric installation available to South Korea. One of its turbines, capable of producing 27,000 kidowatts of power, has been out of operation since the Communist fighting. With both turbines back in operation, it will produce at the rate of 54,000 kilowatts during most of the year. The big dam, built in the 1930's, was poorly constructed and has been weakened by war damage and the flow of water over the years. A preliminary survey has been made to determine the amount of reconstruction that may be required.

Along with the electric power development, FOA and the U. N. Command are financing the development and expansion of Korean mines, and building railway lines to connect them with the railroad network.

Upon completion of the new powerplants, the Bechtel firm will supervise their operation for an additional 12 months, during which time they will train Korean technicians in their maintenance and operation.

The $30 million authorization brings to $158 million the expenditures so far authorized out of this fiscal year's $200 million FOA funds. Additional purchase requests from Korea, totaling $42 million, are being processed to complete the fiscal 1954 program.

Depletion Level Should Remain Same

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 21, 1954

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial entitled "Depletion Level Should Remain Same," which appeared in the June 12, 1954, issue of the Owensboro Messenger, of Owensboro, Ky.

The editorial is as follows:

DEPLETION LEVEL SHOULD REMAIN SAME

From time to time since 1934 there have been various proposals made to Congress regarding the provision in the Internal Revenue Code which allows persons deriving income from oil a deduction of 27½ percent of the gross income or 50 percent of the net income (whichever is less). This is the so-called oil-depletion allowance, which has been a part of the tax code since 1926.

The proposals made to Congress have, in general, sought a reduction of the amount allowed for depletion; currently there is a bill before Congress which will reduce the depletion allowance to 15 percent. The proposals made in the past were turned down by the congressional committees that studied them. We predict that the current bill will likewise be turned down.

Congress established the depletion provision in order to assure an adequate supply of oil. Such a system has proved to be a practical method of setting aside a sufficient part of oil income and providing sufficient incentive to spend this income in exploration and developing new oil reserves. Assurance of an adequate supply of domestically produced oil is deemed by our military leaders essential to our national security. With our Government continuing to fight a cold war, it would seem to be most unwise to throw up a barrier in the way of making new oil discoveries in the United States. Should there be an outbreak of war, foreign sources of oil would be cut off from us with the result that our military effort would be greatly hampered.

In view of the fact that our present oil reserves are nowhere near the point of exhaustion, it is not necessary that we rely on foreign sources with a view to conserving our own supplies for the future. It should also be noted that it takes considerable preparation and time to put a discovered oil field in production once it is found. For the oil industry to meet a sudden demand upon it because of an outbreak of war it is necessary that production facilities be in readiness.

In supporting the opposition to any effort to reduce the depletion allowance, Lt. Gen. Ernest O. Thompson, of the Texas Railroad Commission, made some very strong points against such proposals. His statements, as made in an address at an Oil Progress Week celebration, are paraphrased, as follows:

"The quest for oil is a difficult one. New discovery or so-called wildcat wells are successful only 1 in 9 holes. Eight of every 9 efforts are failures—dry holes.

"The chances of finding even a very small oil field are 1 in 16 tries. A small field is one that would supply the United States with oil for only 4 hours. Since we use 6 million barrels a day, a 1-million-barrel oil field would be only a 4 hours' supply for the United States.

"Chances of finding a small field which would supply the Nation's needs for 2 days are 1 in 53, while chances of discovering a medium-sized oil field are 1 in 330 tries. Such a field would supply America's needs for 1 week and would be a 42-million-barrel field in ultimate recoverable oil.

More remote are the chances of hitting a major oil field, as they are only 1 in 911. A major oil field is defined as one that will produce over 100 million barrels of oil in its life.

"Only depletion makes such exploratory efforts possible, and the depletion comes only out of the money the producer makes—if he makes it. The man who has only dry holes gets no depletion allowance.

"Depletion is the recognition that every time you take out a hundred barrels of oil there is just that much less oil (capital) in your reserve under the ground.

"If the people knew these facts, there would be no effort made to change the law; I mean there would be no successful effort possible in the face of an informed electorate.

"The people are fair when they are fully and fairly informed.

"Although the fact goes contrary to a widely held opinion, the oil industry is not the biggest moneymaker among our many industries. It makes less than the average on the money invested in general business, surprising as this may seem. But the following statistics prove this fact:

"A total of 400 other industries make more profits than does the oil industry.

"The record shows that the oil industry makes 4.27 cents on the dollar after taxes. The average for 400 other industries is 4.48 cents on the dollar after taxes.

"On every oil-industry-dollar revenue there is paid 5.71 cents in Federal and State income taxes. Other industries pay 4.19 cents in income taxes.

"So the oil industry is not only paying its way in taxes, but it pays even a greater tax percentage than many other industries. Oil, in fact, pays more taxes and takes less net profit than any of the other industries of this country."

Critics of the present percentage allowance would have us believe that it is too large. But we suggest that the oil industry is not closed to new equity capital, and, should other taxpayers care to take advantage of the oil-depletion allowance, nothing is to prevent them from investing in oil wells and taking the chance should they be lucky enough to hit a well. So far as we are informed, taxpayers are not clamoring to put dollars into oil exploration and development. If we can assume that the oil industry is not overcrowded, then it follows that the depletion allowance is not exorbitant. Oil producers point out that only 1 well in 9 drilled is a producer. Even with the 27½-percent allowance, the 1-to-9-odds apparently are not very good for the tremendous majority of American investors and this lends fuel to the argument that the 27½ percent is not disproportionate to the risk involved.

Accordingly, it is our belief that Congress should once again turn down the proposal to reduce the oil-depletion allowance below its present level of 27½ percent.

Tariffs on Imported Textile Products

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 21, 1954

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from President Eisenhower:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, June 17, 1954.

The Honorable EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MRS. ROGERS: I want to thank you very much for your letter of June 10 transmitting a petition from the citizens of your home city of Lowell, Mass., and neighboring communities with respect to possible future action affecting tariffs on imported textile products.

In my message to the Congress on foreign economic policy, I indicated that further progress in enlarging profitable world trade must be made gradually and in the light of what is best in the interest of the American economy as well as the economies of friendly nations in the free world. It was for that reason that, in my recommendation with respect to the extension and amendment of the Trade Agreements Act, I specifically endorsed the escape clause and peril point provisions of the present law. These provisions, as you know, are specifically designed as safeguards against unjustifiable changes affecting the American economy.

I want to express my deep appreciation to you for bringing this petition from your people to my attention. I want to assure you and to assure them that the views set forth will receive careful attention in any specific matter coming before me for judgment.

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

While the Interstate Commerce Commission Procrastinates Unemployed Railroaders Go Hungry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 21, 1954

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the residents of Altoona, Pa., and protesting the unnecessary delay of the Interstate Commerce Commission regarding tariffs for the new piggy-back service on the Nation's railroads.

The following editorial from the June 19, 1954, issue of the Altoona (Pa.) Mirror charges:

The question of rates may be a weighty one in the opinion of the members of the ICC. So is the question of eating for men who may be kept from gainful employment while the Commission takes 7 months to decide the matter.

Mr. Speaker, there are nearly 7,000 railroaders unemployed in the city of Altoona, and if the ICC will permit the railroaders of the Nation to put into operation the new piggy-back service, the Pennsylvania Railroad shops at Altoona will be called upon to build 200 new piggy-back cars which means the recall of hundreds of unemployed railroaders.

While the ICC procrastinates, railroad employees in Altoona are trying to exist on unemployment insurance, surplus commodities, and public assistance.

The editorial follows:

Procrastinating Bureaucracy

If American business and industry would take as long a time to decide the important questions that continually confront them as the Interstate Commerce Commission seems about to take to decide an issue concerning tariffs for the new piggy-back service of the railroads, the country would soon come to a standstill. The question of rates may be a weighty one in the opinion of the members of the ICC. So is the question of eating for men who may be kept from gainful employment while the Commission takes 7 months to decide the matter.

Sometimes it seems to those of us who are just casual observers of the actions of the many commissions, investigating committees, and other forms of bureaucracy that have grown up over the past 50 years that the Nation would be much better off without them. It also appears to some of us that they have assumed powers far beyond those intended for them by the acts of legislative bodies that created them.

If three men who are but a division of the ICC can stall a program that has captured the public imagination for a period of 7 months, it seems to us that it is about time for the real Government of the people to start clipping a few wings or taking away some of the self-invested power that these superstructures of Government seem to have abrogated unto themselves.

If the rates proposed by the six major railroads serving over 75 percent of the people of the United States seem to be in error, then it would be only logical for the division of the ICC which seems to have so much power to call for a new schedule. Certainly it should not take 7 months for that to be prepared. If the rate schedule is substantially correct, then there is no excuse for any delay whatever in allowing the railroads to put the plan into operation.

It may be that men in ivory towers do not know that this great industrial Nation of ours is straining at the seams to recover from readjustment from wartime economy to what all of us hope will be a long period of peacetime production for use.

It may be that they do not have the word unemployment in their copious volumes of writs, decisions, and powers, but in case they do not know the word we hasten to assure them that it is an unpleasant one for those who are unemployed.

A prosperous economy is built upon many factors. Some of the main factors are ample production at a cost that is within the province of the purchaser. The great secret behind American prosperity has been the ability of industry and agriculture to produce a constantly expanding number of goods and services at a cost bracket that is within the range of the public's purse.

Great production facilities are useless without equally great distribution facilities, and rail transportation plays an important role in the distribution of American goods and services. For any nation as great as ours to place the power to disrupt such a great transportation system within the hands of 3 men and to allow them to disrupt this planned distribution for as much as 7 months by a 2-to-1 vote seems fantastic.

The days of kings and emperors was supposed to have ended for this Nation at least some 178 years ago this coming July. The American system of free enterprise was built by leaders unhampered by the royal edicts of kings and emperors or all-powerful bureaucrats.

Sometimes we have gone a little astray and there have been times when power-drunk individuals have seized the reins for a brief span and ruled for a time as autocrats. Eventually, all such individuals have been disposed of in one way or another and most frequently after they have committed the fatal blunder of seeking to seize too much power.

This is a nation which develops leadership. Try as we might, we cannot visualize as leaders any individual or group of individuals as leaders who seek to hold back progress by delaying action. It may take the combined power of several diesel units to drag them down the rails of progress, but an aroused public opinion has the power of a million diesels and we hope that in this instance the public, which deserves the best possible service at the earliest possible moment, rises up in its righteous wrath and says, "This cannot happen here."

National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 21, 1954

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I have sponsored and supported legislation for the benefit of the handicapped during all my legislative service, both in the Oregon Legislature and in the National Congress, and I am glad to include as part of these remarks a letter and statement of Paul A. Strachan, president of the American Federation of the Physically Handicapped, Inc., calling attention to the 10th anniversary of National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week, as follows:

American Federation of the
Physically Handicapped, Inc.,
Washington, D. C., June 18, 1954.

To All Members of Congress.

Dear Friends: Your attention is respectfully invited to copy of my annual letter to all Governors of States and Territories, respecting operations of National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week, in particular, and, discussion of the whole handicapped program, generally.

I am sure you will find much of interest therein, and offer the further suggestion that this might be inserted in the Appendix of the Congressional Record, together with such comments as you deem appropriate.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely,

Paul A. Strachan,
President.

June 17, 1954.

The tenth anniversary of National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week will be observed, this year, from October 3 through October 9. I trust you have alerted your governor's committee on employment of handicapped to see that this significant national event is properly celebrated in your State.

The national kickoff dinner, officially launching NEPH Week will be held at the National Press Club auditorium, Washington, D. C., Friday, October 1, and we hope you will send a representative to this annual dinner.

Each year, as author and sponsor of NEPH Week, I write all governors of States, citing the record of achievement under aegis of the week and offering such suggestions as may be pertinent, to improve the whole handicapped program.

Since 1940, overall placements of handicapped, cumulatively, approximate more than 3 million through activities of Federal-State employment services, and those placed during the week total 366,096, of whom 224,345 were disabled veterans. It is further estimated that more than 700,000 have been placed through private agencies, organizations, and individuals.

Of those placed by Federal-State agencies, statistics show that approximately $3,250,000,000 has been earned by them in salaries or wages, and they have paid taxes to the various instrumentalities of Government of more than $800 million. Therefore, there can be no question but that this program has proven practical and beneficial, and, entirely apart from its humanitarian aspects it has paid for itself a thousandfold.

Again I urge that you appoint practical, experienced people to your Governor's committee, and once more I assert the positive necessity of integrating this program into a regular part of labor-management relations.

The handicapped program as a whole, of which NEPH Week is a vital part, must continually expand, in the light of experiment and further additional knowledge gained through experience. Placement in itself is essential if the whole program is to succeed, because what is the use of spending millions—even billions—of public moneys for treatment, training, counseling, and guidance, etc., unless the end is a job?

NEPH Week opened the door to greater employment of handicapped, based upon actual knowledge of their capacities and abilities. But in addition there must be an overall program, into which each phase is integrated, and given adequate recognition and support.

There is now pending before the Congress a bill to establish a Federal Agency for Handicapped (S. 2570; H. R. 2096, 2463, etc.), and action is anticipated this session. This bill constitutes the first overall program containing all elements of successful operation—medical services; education and training; vocational guidance and counseling; and selective placement—ever presented to Congress.

More important, it makes a beginning, through establishment of an interagency committee on rehabilitation and employment of handicapped, on coordinating the varied activities of the present 35 Federal agencies, each of which now has a part of the program. This would establish the program on a sound business base and enable it to be operated in the interest of the taxpayers on a more economical and efficient plane.

Again, I assert, this Federal agency for handicapped bill does not, in any way, disturb the present Federal-State relationship, except that it will provide more means to effectuate a sound overall program for handicapped.

At this time, when unemployment is rising, and selective placement of handicapped is imperative, if they are to have any opportunity for employment, there must and should be close cooperation between the Federal Government, and all States, in the operation and development of this program, and to that end I most earnestly request that you immediately favorably consider appointment of a coordinator, in your State, who would supervise, generally, the activities of the several agencies dealing with problems of handicapped, including the State employment service; State rehabilitation service; certain parts of the State civil-service commission; workmen's compensation, etc.

Such coordinator is needed because the Federal trend is bound to take the course of ultimate appointment of a similar coordinator for all Federal agencies having to do with this program, and it would greatly facilitate matters if the States now take affirmative action along similar lines.

Also, the necessity of providing ample funds for all phases of the handicapped program, on both Federal and State levels, is clear. This must no longer be regarded as a charity proposition, but, instead, a cold-blooded, economic necessity. We cannot go on, year after year, piling up 2 million persons injured or diseased in industry alone, of whom some 350,000 are permanently disabled, when rehabilitation processes of Federal-State agencies only restore to usefulness approximately 60,000. Permitting such a colossal "human scrap pile" to even exist in our great Nation is not only a terrific waste of our human resources, but it is a disgrace, and must be remedied at once.

We must consider the handicapped as assets—not liabilities. We must provide means, when such are necessary, so that the individual may be given essential treatment, training, counseling, and placement, rather than continue the totally inadequate public-assistance programs, which neither "assist," nor remedy the evil. We must substitute a broad program, even if it costs billions of dollars, so that our own people, right here at home, will be brought to a state of physical and mental proficiency that will enable them to earn a living, wholly or in part, and thus take their share of responsibility, as citizens, for the upkeep and defense of our country.

In short, we must adopt a national program that provides for a capital investment in the individual, so that he or she will no longer be dependent upon a public dole, or a sadly insufficient charity. Public assistance, in itself, produces nothing; is expensive, and, on experience, has proven wholly inadequate to meet the needs of our 38 million handicapped citizens.

I am sure that you are personally interested in this matter and urge that you give our program full support, knowing, as we do, from experience, that the program, as so far adopted, has proven immeasurably beneficial to the Nation as a whole, and that, for every dollar expended thereupon, more than $10 has been returned in products and services.

I will be glad to advise you in any way that will benefit the work of agencies under your direction, and assure you of my desire to assist.

Sincerely,

PAUL A. STRACHAN,
President, American Federation of the Physically Handicapped, Inc.

Coal Moves South to Power Growth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER

OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 21, 1954

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial entitled "Coal Moves South to Power Growth," which appeared in the June 14, 1954, issue of the Madisonville Messenger, of Madisonville, Ky.

The phenomenal expansion of the South as an industrial section of the Nation, plus the continued development of TVA and the atomic plants located there has as a byproduct increased the steady shipment of coal to that section. As all of these markets expand so will the demand for larger and larger shipments of coal into the South, which should do much to keep in force during peacetime an industry which is a necessity in case of national emergency. As pointed out by the Madisonville (Ky.) Messenger, the industrial South is moving ahead, and a substantial and growing coal market is a present reality and a future expectation.

I include at this point in the RECORD the editorial:

COAL MOVES SOUTH TO POWER GROWTH

One of the major economic factors affecting the plans of American businessmen for two decades has been the striking industrial growth of the South. This growth has had meaning for the coal industry, among other things, in the increased demand for energy and heat. Appalachian Coals looks over this question of growth as applied to coal demand, and comes up with some interesting facts.

In 1953, business volume in the 16-State historic South totaled $217,800,000,000, some 25.8 percent of the national total. The rate of growth has been averaging about one-fifth greater than in the other 32 States since 1939. Compared to that year, 1953 has recorded a 375-percent increase for the South, as against 309 percent for the other States.

Significantly, this larger volume has not been achieved merely by a larger population. Actually, the South's proportion of total population has not increased since 1930, accounting for 33.6 percent of the national total in that year, and 33.4 percent in 1953. Business dollar volume per capita has therefore shown an important growth, and there is ample margin for further increase as evidenced by the 1953 data which reveals that per capita business dollar volume in the South was $4,112 per capita as against $5,933 in other States.

The trend toward an industrialized South is also revealed in the data on farm income and harvested acreage. In the 13-year period ending in 1953, the South's share of farm cash income showed a rise from 30.6 percent to 31.9 percent of the Nation's total. This was achieved despite a drop in harvested acreage, which in 1940 amounted to some 35 percent of the United States total, and to only 29.4 percent in 1953.

Evidence of the greater proportion of business volume is found in manufacturing and mining, in addition to the modest increase in farm income. In 1939, the South recorded 19.7 percent of manufacturing volume in the Nation, rising to nearly 22 percent in 1953. The rise in mining output has been even more spectacular, rising from 40.2 percent of the national total in 1939 to 53.8 percent in 1953—not all by any means attributable to oil and gas growth.

That southern business leaders are looking for a continuation of the strong growth trend is found in the figures on construction as published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics. Where in 1939 construction put-in-place was about one-third that in the other 32 States, this had grown to about one-half the other States total in 1953. Expressed as a percentage of the national total, construction volume amounted to 25.2 percent of the nation's building in 1939, rising to 34.6 percent in 1953.

The growth leadership in textile manufacturing, apparel output, pulp-paper manufacturing, and chemical output has moved to the South in the past 15 years. In the manufacture of textiles, the South is now the principal producing area, accounting for over half—52.7 percent—of the 1953 volume, compared to only 36.5 percent in 1939.

To power this growth, coal is moving to the South in larger quantities in the postwar years. Fully detailed statistics are not available, but those that are substantiate the growth trend. For instance, one of the expanding coal markets in the South is the electric utilities which have shown an unusual gain in recent years.

A recent Federal Power Commission release forecasts the electric energy requirements through 1956 by regions. For the United States as a whole, an increase of 32.5 percent over 1953 generation is looked for in 1956. The figure for the Southeast is 61.5 percent, and 33.8 percent for the South Centarl States.

The industrial South is moving ahead; and a substantial and growing coal market is a present reality and a future expectation.

Collective Action in Asia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 21, 1954

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, with the eyes of the American people focused on Asia the following address of Adm. Arthur Radford, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, is interesting and informative.

The address was delivered before the national convention of the American Red Cross, Los Angeles, Calif., June 16, 1954, and is as follows:

COLLECTIVE ACTION IN ASIA

Mr. Harriman, members, and friends of the American Red Cross, it warms my heart to come before this assembly and thank you in person for your splendid contribution on behalf of the welfare of our Armed Forces. Undoubtedly one of the major contributions to our Armed Forces welfare, both in World War II and since, has been that of the Red Cross.

As you realize, a military commander always is sensitive to the well-being of his command. That is part of his business and he lives with it. For many years now, and in particular for the past 12 years, I have been trying to thank the American Red Cross and to tell them how grateful I am for their work with the soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines in my commands.

Unfortunately the mere expression of thanks cannot convey all the depth and meaning I intend. I am confident that this feeling of gratitude is one which I share with many fellow countrymen. The Red Cross has done much for the good of the Armed Forces and for the good of the country.

At the Government rally in February for this year's Red Cross campaign, I said: "This is a reflection of one of America's strongest traditions * * * the tradition of community teamwork." I say it again here, because tonight I would like to emphasize the importance of teamwork and collective action in our national security affairs.

Teamwork is essential. Among free men, it should be a universal rule of conduct. It has never been more important than it is today. I hope that we will always work for it, and endeavor to achieve it to a greater and greater degree.

So grave are today's events, however, that all of us should strive to understand them and, if possible, determine their significance for our national security, our freedom, and our future life. Are the borders of free nations fortified with determination and resolution? Or can those borders be erased by the floodwaters of an international despotism which wash in upon us to submerge whole countries at a time?

COMMUNIST MENACE

At the beginning of this year, President Eisenhower warned in his state of the Union message that: "American freedom is threatened so long as the world Communist conspiracy exists in its present scope, power, and hostility."

Today, the threat seems even more intense. There is no need to deal in vagaries and ambiguities about it. In essence, we are confronted with the diabolical enmity of international communism, supported by the power position of the men in the Kremlin.

In certain respects, the Soviet leaders enjoy a competitive advantage. For example, through repression they can speak with a single voice. They can control natural resources, mobilize manpower, adjust finances, and promote conspiracy. Within wide limits, they can marshal great amounts of political and psychological pressure, or great military power, by squeezing it out of the masses under their domination.

In addition, they can continue to create situations which pose to us courses of actions, all of which are unpleasant, or which have definite disadvantages for us. They are expert at creating and exploiting issues and conducting cold war. The threat is not a short-term threat, nor is it exclusively a military threat.

The military aspects of the Communist threat are the most easily recognized and the most assessable. We know that the Soviets have military strength, great natural resources, and a powerful industry. We know that the Red forces are aggressive and that they can attack in any direction. They can and do conduct aggression by proxy, as in Greece and in Korea, utilizing the forces of some satellite suffering Soviet domination. And, what is of grave concern at all, the Soviets now have nuclear and thermonuclear devices.

But the other Communist threats to peace and freedom are not always so easily recognized nor so readily understood. These are the sinister and devious operations in the political, economic, scientific, psychological, and spiritual fields of human endeavor. In many ways these other threats are the more dangerous. They are war by means of diplomacy, money, ideas, sabotage, subversion, and politics.

Within the short space of 15 years, communism has amassed under its control five times its population prior to World War II, and millions of square miles of land complete with resources. Whole countries have been dragged behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains.

There is a lesson for us here. The lesson is this: In a world menaced by power-hungry aggressors, there are certain positions and issues which free nations must show themselves willing to defend with firm measures; diplomatic measures where possible, and military measures, if necessary, when all others have failed.

ASIA

At this moment, the immediate target of Communist aggressor forces in Asia. Specifically it is southeast Asia, but their objective encompasses the whole of the Far East. The fight is now in Indochina. Who is there to say that it will not be in Thailand next, and then perhaps in some other country?

Asia is much more than an area of faraway places with strange-sounding names. It is the world's greatest land mass and the world's greatest congestion of population. Potentially, it is the world's greatest source of raw materials. Unfortunately, it is currently the world's most explosive area.

In Asia, as elsewhere, Communists are operating according to their worldwide scheme of international imperialism and the colonialism which it embodies. First, there was intrigue, subversion, and infiltration. Then there were the Red Chinese forces attacking their Chinese brothers of Nationalist China. Next, there were the North Korean forces invading and attacking their Asiatic brothers in South Korea. Now there are the Red-controlled Viet Minh forces of Ho Chi Minh, aided and abetted by Red China's support, attacking to seize and dominate the States of Laos, Cambodia, and Vietnam. The pattern is: Aggression on the installment plan.

Red China obviously is empire-bound, seeking not so much an Asia for Asiatics as they claim, but seeking instead what might be called a Red Asia for Asiatic Reds. They want all of Asia incorporated into a Red Asia, one that is a basic part of the long-term Communist dream of one big Red world.

Southeast Asia has significant military and strategic importance. It has naval and air bases. It is both a source of raw materials and an important market. It is astride the best sea and air routes between the Pacific and south Asia, and it is the gateway to south Asia and Indonesia.

In my view, Communist control of southeast Asia would constitute a security threat to India, Australia and New Zealand, the Philippines, Japan, and, indeed, to the entire western Pacific area, including the offshore island chain from Japan on the north through Indonesia on the south. Its repercussions on situations in other parts of the world, including Europe, would be almost beyond calculation.

NATIONAL SECURITY PLANNING

Today's conflicts and strifes, of course, are not always military. Communists are adept at waging war with words of diplomacy, with economics of production and resources; and with attacks on our social, educational, industrial, and spiritual institutions. To counter them all, it is difficult at best to know which actions should be adopted, and when they should be taken.

The key to all our military planning is found in our national policy. Under our system of government, the national policy decisions are made by the civilian heads of our Government. This is wise and as it should be. It is traditional and in keeping with what President Eisenhower has referred to as "the necessary and wise subordination of the military to civil power."

Basically, national policy is determined and set forth by the President and his National Security Council. It is the function of the Joint Chiefs of Staff to advise the President, the National Security Council, and the Secretary of Defense on military matters. Accordingly, the Joint Chiefs of Staff develop and recommend the military strategy, and the military implementing actions necessary to carry out national policy.

In other words, the country looks to the Joint Chiefs of Staff to see that the military plans of the United States are prepared to meet the challenge of an enemy. These plans must provide for the coordinated action by each of our armed services, and take advantage of the capabilities of them all. While such plans are based primarily on military factors, they must also take into account a wide range of political and economic factors and must consider the most advanced developments in modern science.

We have seen mankind wring from science some amazing technological advances. We have witnessed generations of scientific developments compressed into something less than a decade. As a result, the age-old military barriers of time and space, and oceans and icecaps, have been wiped out in many respects.

Accordingly, all nations live in a smaller world by the scales of time and distance. They are more vulnerable to their enemies, and more accessible to their friends. Yet, the world seems further apart in social and political concepts than ever. It is most unfortunate that divergences and conflicts between nations have not been reduced materially.

It is true that today we live in a nuclear age. This, too, has special meaning. It means that evolution of atomic plenty and mammoth destructive power, and it also means the evolution of atomic power for peace. Either way, and both ways, it staggers one's imagination. It must be taken into account in our national security planning.

It is my personal belief that developments in the nuclear field can be a great power for the good of mankind if the peoples of the world so will it. Nuclear power can be the servant of man, and a service to peoples everywhere. Given half a chance, it can be used to protect life, instead of just destroying it.

COLLECTIVE ACTION

Under present-day circumstances, with the advent of this nuclear power, with aircraft faster than sound, and in the face of continuous Communist encroachments upon other nations, the situation is threateningly serious. The stakes are high. Shall mankind be free, or shall he be enslaved?

A problem having thus been stated, you have the right to ask for a solution. Actually, I indicated in my opening remarks my own recommendation: namely, teamwork * * * a greater amount of effective teamwork and resolute collective action. Collectively, we can make this a better world in which to live.

By pooling our resources—material, human, and moral—we present a united front. While there must be certain enlightened limitations on the extent to which any nation contributes material and human resources, there are no limitations on the extent of its moral contribution. Regardless of a nation's size, each should be expected to contribute to collective action against an aggressor, 100 percent of its moral strength.

Of course, free nations can be, and often are, diverse in their approach to today's tight, tense world problems. Not all of us view the world in the same light, or through the same eyes. We speak with multiple and varied voices in formulating our opposition to communism. This makes it possible for Communists to continue their efforts to create disunity, and thereby to attempt to weaken us.

Even so, the free nations are bound together by common ideals and objectives. For example, all of us are concerned with the protection and preservation of freedom. Thus, we have a common purpose * * * to meet a common threat of annihilation. whether we realize it or not, the national security problems of one are the concern of all. Together, we face a dictatorship which has no time limit for the accomplishment of its objectives, and which needs no logic or reason or moral purpose to guide its actions. Thus, the need for collective cooperation should be apparent.

Traditionally, the United States has rejected the role of an aggressor. Characteristically, our military organization is called the Department of Defense * * * not a Department of Aggression, not even a Department of War. And within the framework of freedom, our military purpose is not to wage war, but rather it is to deter aggression and to prevent war. When we talk about war, we do so because we hate it, and do not want it. What we really want is peace and security; and our effort for peace and our effort for defense are mutually complementary.

Basically, all free nations share this same purpose. As has been stated by our Secretary of State, national security will not be achieved in isolation. Militarily, most free nations recognise this. Security can best be acquired by steady cooperation, one with the other, each group with its neighbors.

This requires a common devotion to the principles of a free system. It requires a common determination to cooperate unreservedly in working for it. Knowing that a self-imposed military inferiority is an invitation to aggression, it requires us to collectively maintain our military strength indefinitely over the long-range future. We must keep our determination and our resolution to have that strength which is able to counter effectively against any aggression.

Perhaps you have noted the emphasis I give to the qualities among nations of determination and resolution. These two ingredients are manifestly essential to a successful and secure community. Yet you cannot buy them on the open market, or serve them on a silver tray. Instead, these qualities must come from within the hearts and minds of peoples themselves.

Up to a certain point, every nation has certain choices in the actions which it can use to preserve its way of life. Demosthenes spoke of this three centuries before Christ. It was 348 B. C., and Philip of Macedon had just seized and destroyed the city-state of Olynthus as part of his plan for the domination of Greece, when Demosthenes said:

"It is shameful to say afterward, 'Who would have thought that this could happen? We really ought to have done this or that, and not done the other.' The people of Olynthus could mention plenty of things today which, if they had foreseen in the past, would have saved them from destruction. So could all the other peoples who have been eliminated. But what is the use? While the boat is undamaged, then is the time for sailor and helmsman and all on board to show unceasing vigilance and prevent anyone from upsetting it, either purposely or accidentally. But when the sea has overwhelmed it, all effort is in vain."

This seems like good advice. Who would have thought that in the short space of 15 years Central Europe would be divided, China would have become Communist, and Red forces would invade the Republic of Korea, and now Laos and Cambodia? Where will the floodwaters of Communist colonialism be stopped? We can, and undoubtedly shall, hope for the best; but, at the same time, we must keep ourselves prepared for something much less—perhaps for even the worst.

Certainly, this is not the time for free nations to do nothing. Nor should we go jogging along, just hoping for something better to turn up. It is true that the negative always seems an easier path, since it holds that nothing should be done. But difficulties sometimes will fade away when confronted with positive action.

As for the perils which now confront free Asian and southwest Pacific nations, their military situation could be improved materially by an effective southeast Asia collective security arrangement. Positive collective actions by countries which have vital interests in that area would help prevent further Communist empire building in that part of the world. Such actions would help pave the way for building that peaceful world which is the aim of free societies everywhere.

United States foreign policy is determined by the recognized national authorities on foreign policy. These authorities have stated and restated that a Communist southeast Asia would be a grave threat to many; that it should not be passively accepted, but met by unity of will and, if need be, unity of action. Whatever policy our Nation's recognized authorities announce, the military will support, as always.

Today, "the ramparts we watch" encircle the globe in the form of treaties and mutual defense arrangements. By these arrangements, free nations demonstrate their global concern for their vital interests, and the conclusiveness with which the issue between tyranny and freedom has at last been joined.

We shall not find the pathways to peace by retreating from danger. Danger must be faced boldly, courageously, and unitedly before it explodes into a world conflagration. Resolute collective action and determined teamwork can bring us through our present perils. With such teamwork and eternal vigilance, our way of life, our standard of living and hopes for the future can surely continue strong, free, and unafraid.

Central, South America Should Act Now on Reds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 21, 1954

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial entitled "Central, South America Should Act Now on Reds," which appeared in the June 15, 1954, issue of the Park City Daily News, of Bowling Green, Ky.

The time has come for the Western Hemisphere to give the Eastern Hemisphere a concrete example of the advantages of cooperation and united action. Today we are faced with the attempt to establish a Communist core in Central America. The consequences of any success in this direction could be grave for the Americas. Guatemala lies astride the Pan-American road and close to the Panama Canal and a nest of Communists at that point could have serious repercussions in case of any emergency. As pointed out by the Park City Daily News, this is the time for the 21 nations of the American alliance to act together.

I include at this point in the RECORD the editorial:

CENTRAL, SOUTH AMERICA SHOULD ACT NOW ON REDS

If the United States and its western friends needed any further evidence that freedom is in trouble in Guatemala, the recent suspension of constitutional guaranties of civil liberties should supply it.

On the flimsy pretext that an emergency was created by the reappearance of an unidentified aircraft dropping leaflets over Guatemala City, the leftward-leaning government has lifted these guaranties for 30 days.

And under the Guatemala constitution, this time limit is virtually meaningless, since the suspension is renewable at the government's will.

The liberties that now go by the board include the right of assembly, the right to organize political parties, protection against arrest without written order, safeguards against home entry without court authority, and against the examination of private documents without order.

In other words, a government widely considered to be Communist in sympathy has now established for itself the conditions of rule by decree. At least temporarily, it has swept away the hampering controls of a constitution designed—in theory, anyway—to assure individual freedoms.

And this is the government, we must remember, which recently received a substantial shipment of arms from Communist Europe.

These new developments lend great point to the fresh urging from Secretary of State Dulles that a special inter-American meeting be convened to study the Communist threat to the Western Hemisphere from Guatemala.

Dulles properly disparaged effort by Guatemalan officials to represent the current problem as simply one between their country and the United States, over the position of the United Fruit Co. in that area.

He said the problem of Red infiltration in Guatemala would exist—and would menace the hemisphere—even if United Fruit "gave a gold piece for every banana."

Talks with other American governments are now in progress on the question whether to bring the matter before the 21-nation alliance of American states.

From our vantage point in the north, Guatemala seems clearly to have urgency. It is an actual potential focal point for Communist activities fanning all over the hemisphere.

Its relative nearness to the Panama Canal is an evident peril. It stands athwart the land routes between the continents. In the grip of aggressive Communists, it could quickly become a major sore spot.

The march of communism in Asia shows how the Red infection spreads once it gets a foothold. The way to check it is to snuff it out at the source. The countries of Central and South America should take up Dulles' warning and assemble in early convention toward that goal.

Communist Satellites Also Being Made Economic Monolith With U. S. S. R.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 17, 1954

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, bearing upon my address in the House of Representatives on the Reciprocal Trade Act and which developed the subject of the danger to the free world of the making of the Communist world into a monolith now in economic as well as in political terms, there is appended the following editorial from the New York Times of June 15, 1954:

SATELLITE INTEGRATION

There has long been good reason to believe that the ultimate Soviet goal in Eastern Europe is the complete conversion of the satellite countries into component "republics" of the U. S. S. R. The Kremlin can hardly desire that Poland, say, should have any more status or sovereignty than the Ukraine or Armenia. This belief is further strengthened by reports that even the pretense of separate economic planning is to be abandoned in Eastern Europe. Judging by statements at the recent Communist Party Congresses in Hungary and Czechoslovakia, future 5-year plans will be Soviet bloc plans, not separate Soviet, Hungarian, and Polish plans, as heretofore.

What is presumably the official rationale for this change has been stated recently by Hungary's Communist boss, Matyas Rakosi. He emphasized that no country can do everything itself, that there are advantages to international division of labor and that Hungary could gain by economizing on investments which had already been made or will be made in other Soviet bloc countries.

All these arguments are, of course, beside the point. The Soviet bloc has had economic integration, directed from Moscow, at least since January, 1949, when the then much-publicized Council for Mutual Economic Aid was formed. The fact that satellite economic development has followed Moscow's policy has been plain for all observers to see this past half decade and longer. Any technical or purely economic advantages that a new setup may bring can be only minor compared to the psychological gain from giving the satellite people one more important sign that they are moving closer to becoming part of the "workers' fatherland," the Soviet Union. From the Marxist point of view economic integration is the indispensable prerequisite for political integration.

Scott Air Base Brain Center of Air Training Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 16, 1954

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, at the end of this month, Lt. Gen. Robert W. Harper, commanding general of the Air Training Command, will retire from active duty. He will enter retirement with the feeling of a job exceptionally well done—a job which has been of the greatest importance to the security not only of the United States but to the free world. On Wednesday next, I will go into detail of the remarkable record of service of General Harper.

I make these few remarks only to comment on a fine article which was syndicated recently by the Central Press Service, and which appeared in the Belleville (Ill.) News-Democrat on June 17, 1954. This article calls attention to Scott Air Force Base at Belleville, Ill., as the principal center of the Air Force training program. I call attention of my colleagues to this fine article:

They Train Air "Tigers"—Scott Air Base Brain Center of Program

(By Charles J. Thobaben)

Scott Air Force Base, Ill.—The greatest effort in history to produce tigers has its brain center here at Scott Air Force Base.

It's no zoo that's being run. But it is the greatest military training operation known in the world today.

Scott is the headquarters of the United States Air Force's Air Training Command, which includes in its operations some 300,000 men, officers, and aviation cadets.

To the United States Air Force has been given a primary responsibility for maintaining the peace and security, not only of the home nation itself, but of all its allies scattered around the world.

To accomplish this mission requires a vast reservoir of new men, the members of the "tiger" training program designed to produce young pilots with the desire to fly the fastest planes the world has produced, the jets of today.

The USAF has long since realized the glamor days of aviation pioneering have long since passed, that the day of seeking adventure because a field is new is long since gone. There must be other appeals to make today's young men want to fly at sonic and supersonic speeds.

The Air Force has selected able men to run the program, men who think as well as act, men who think in terms of today's young men, not of their own generation alone.

They are Lt. Gen. Robert W. Harper, commander of the ATRC, and his vice commander, Maj. Gen. Glenn O. Barcus.

Even a few minutes' conversation with these generals will convince an interviewer of their deep insight into what makes today's young American tick. Every decision takes this into consideration and is aimed at making the entire training program conform to that modern, youthful thinking.

Perhaps it would not be amiss to mention a fragment of these two officers' backgrounds. General Harper graduated from West Point in 1924 as an infantry officer, but entered the Army's then-infant air arm in 1925, graduating from old Kelly Field in Texas in 1926.

Among other things, Harper set up and maintained the air corridors across Russian-held territory that made the Berlin airlift.

General Barcus, like a surprising number of present-day senior Air Force officers, started his professional life as a horse cavalryman. Changing to the air many years ago, the general climaxed a long career before coming to ATRC by commanding the Fifth Air Force in Korea. No one who fought in Korea can fail to know what the Fifth Air Force did there.

Under his command, General Harper has more than twoscore bases, encompassing the three commands of ATRC—the Flying Training Air Force, based at Waco, Tex.; the Crew Training Air Force, based at Randolph Air Force Base, Tex.; and the Technical Training Air Force, based at Gulfport, Miss.

Among the three, they teach the airmen, the officers and the WAF of the Air Force to do their jobs, whether it be flying a jet bomber or fighter or flying a typewriter keyboard. Until they have passed through at least 1—and usually it's at least 2—of these training air forces they are not fullfledged members of the United States Air Force.

Three Winning Essays by Schoolchildren on the Declaration of Independence and Its Effects

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 11, 1954

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker in May of this year at a meeting of the Compton, Calif., Sertoma Club, I had the honor and privilege of presenting to the winners of three significant essays, on the subject of The Declaration of Independence and Its Effects on the American Way of Living Today, worthy and substantial material rewards which were furnished by members of the said Compton Sertoma Club, of which I have the honor of being an honorary member.

The name chosen as the Sertoma Club is a composite abbreviation of the following words, to wit: "Service to mankind." Hence, these Sertoma Club members are, by the very name of their club, reminded that their service club affiliation dedicates them to the service of mankind.

The judges selected by the club to designate the winners were Messrs. Paul Martin, Donald Dunbar, and Ben J. Little of Compton. The first-place winner was Nancy Dixon. There being a tie for second place, the Sertoma Club, therefore, divided the awards for second place between Julia Schwartz and Johnnie Ruth White.

Having obtained the approval of the Sertoma Club and of the three winners to present these three significant essays to you and to all of my other distinguished colleagues in this great legislative body, I wish to thank you for granting me unanimous consent so to do.

Herewith, I present the text of a letter to me, dated May 12, 1954, transmitting the essays to me from the distinguished chairman of the judges committee, Mr. Chaffee. I am sure that you and all of my colleagues will join with me in complimenting the Compton Sertoma Club, which is a group of patriotic, vigilant, and earnest business and professional men in one of the important cities in the great 23d Congressional District, upon initiating such a worthy essay contest. Also, that we compliment these three important young Americans who wrote them. You will note their young ages and grades in school together with the cross section of America as set forth in the Chairman Chaffee letter to me.

The letter from Chairman Chaffee and the three essays follow:

Compton, Calif., *May 12, 1954.*

Hon. Clyde Doyle,
Post Office Building,
Huntington Park, Calif.

Dear Clyde: You will find enclosed herewith the three top essays as chosen by our judges, Paul Martin, Donald Dunbar, and Ben J. Little, in our Compton Sertoma Club American Way essay contest. I had the originals copied on a typewriter for your convenience, and they show the names, ages, addresses, and school data on the three winners.

As you will remember the 3 were all girls, 1 a Catholic, 1 a Jewish girl, and the third a Negro. We feel that this rather emphasizes the spirit of the contest, although, or perhaps especially because, there was no possible way for any of the judges to know what school the girls were from or who they were.

Thanks again and best wishes.
Sincerely,
Edwin W. Chaffee,
Attorney at Law.

First Place

THE DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE AND ITS EFFECTS ON THE AMERICAN WAY OF LIVING TODAY

(By Nancy Dixon, age 13, 613 North Spring Street, Compton, Calif.; room 5, eighth grade, Our Lady of Victory School, Palmer and Willow Streets, Compton, Calif.)

Our concept of the American way of living is based entirely on the Declaration of Independence. This is mainly contained in the first two sentences of the second paragraph, which are: "We hold these truths to be self-evident that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed."

This great document has had many effects on the people not only here in the United States but everywhere in the world. In listing their grievances against the King of England, the writers laid the groundwork for our Constitution and, especially, the Bill of Rights. They righted the wrongs of which they spoke. For the first time in history the common man's rights were put on paper. It resulted not only in our Revolution and subsequent self-government but in the uprising of liberty-loving people all over the world. The intangible right to happiness is in its essence the definition of our free enterprise system. Any man, no matter how humble his birth or origin, may, by his own efforts, rise to whatever goal he has the ability to attain. He may speak publicly his political opinion. He may own property. He may worship at the church of his choice. For the Declaration of Independence is a declaration of independence not only for the body but of the mind.

The Declaration of Independence defined at the time it was written, an entirely new way of living which has since become known as the American way. Naturally we in America feel it should be called the only way.

SECOND-PLACE TIE

THE DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE AND ITS EFFECTS ON THE AMERICAN WAY OF LIVING TODAY

(By Julia Schwartz, age 13, 14625 South Frailey Street, Compton, Calif., room 21, eighth grade, Whaley Junior High School, Compton, Calif.)

My history book was heavy in my hands as I stared at the dreaded pages. My teacher had assigned the work of reading the Declaration of Independence. I wondered how men could have written somthing so dull. I closed my eyes and leaned back in my chair.

All of a sudden I heard strange music and right before my eyes I saw a huge document towering over me. It seemed to be talking. "Shame, shame," it said. "You think I am dull, but you don't even begin to realize what I mean. I'm not just a paper. I stand for the ideals of freedom and equality. To you that should be particularly important because although you are part of a minority group, you have the same advantages of education, justice, and liberty as all other young people looking into the future. Because of me you are given certain unalienable rights which cannot be taken away from you. You have the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. However, I am not to be taken for granted because I can be taken away."

I woke up with these words echoing in my mind. I was frightened even though it was only a dream. I thought with horror of what my life might have been if the Declaration of Independence had never been written and I resolved to do my utmost to cherish and protect its great principles.

THE DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE AND ITS EFFECT ON THE AMERICAN WAY OF LIVING TODAY

(By Johnnie Ruth White, age 13, 13140 Willowbrook Avenue, Compton, Calif.; room 810, eighth grade, Willowbrook Junior High School, Compton, Calif.)

Independence Day is celebrated all over the United States. The Declaration of Independence was written July 4, 1776 by Thomas Jefferson and a committee of Congressmen.

It plays a very important part in our lives because it is a written expression of man's desire for freedom. It expressed the purpose and goals of which man hopes to live. It expressed the colonist's ideal of government and listed 27 reasons why they had been brought to the necessity of declaring themselves independent to the King of England. It reviewed the appeals by which the colonist had made to England and the way they had been denied. I think it makes a great effect on the people of then and today. We wouldn't be enjoying our rights of freedom.

We wouldn't have as many privileges if Jefferson hadn't written it from his heart and soul to express his belief for each and every individual's rights to freedom. We wouldn't be free today. Slavery would still be. We wouldn't live our lives in our own way if this hadn't come about.

Life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness are God-given rights. To me life means everything. Liberty, my right to freedom, to enjoy it as long as I live in a free country; pursuit of happiness, my right to enjoy myself as long as I don't make others unhappy.

It affects our way of living today because we can attend free public schools. We have the right to go to any church of any religion we choose. We have police and other Government protections. We have the right of happiness as long as others are happy too; freedom of speech as long as we can prove what we say true. We have right of trial by jury. The Declaration of Independence has truly made America a better place in which to live.

What Success Means To Me

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EUGENE J. McCARTHY

OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 21, 1954

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD the prize-winning essay written by Mr. David Erling West, of Central High School, St. Paul, Minn., in the Thomas McAn success awards contest:

WHAT SUCCESS MEANS TO ME

(By David Erling West)

Success to me is the fulfillment of the goals that I have and will set for myself. It is the satisfaction of knowing that I have made the best of my opportunities and the most of my capabilities.

I don't believe that anyone can accurately judge or measure another man's success. When I think about people, past and present, who have been considered successful in their particular fields of endeavor, I cannot help but wonder if in their public success they have found personal success. To me, wealth, social position, and public acclaim are not the measures of success.

In general, I will consider myself successful if I make the most of my educational opportunities; get established in an occupation that is a challenge as well as the one for which I am best suited; remain honest with myself and my friends in all associations; and become a helpful and useful citizen in my community.

I know I can't expect to have success without struggle and some failure. The important thing will be to profit by my mistakes and to become a better person through these efforts. I don't look for one specific day when I can suddenly say, "I am now a success." I must be able to say that everyday is a step forward on that endless road.

Joseph Addison, an English essayist, set down a good rule for achieving success when he wrote, "If you wish success in life, make perseverance your bosom friend, experience your wise counselor, caution your elder brother, and hope your guardian genius." To the degree that I can do this, I will be able to realize success. I don't believe that anyone can fail if he has worthy goals to work toward and the determination to succeed in accomplishing them.

Address by Maj. Gen. S. D. Sturgis, Jr., on 25th Anniversary of the Waterways Experiment Station at Vicksburg, Miss.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLIFFORD DAVIS

OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 15, 1954

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, at a later date it is my intention to ask for time to discuss the splendid accomplishments of the Corps of Army Engineers. At the moment, however, I am pleased to include a splendid address made by Maj. Gen. S. D. Sturgis, Jr., Chief of Engineers, United States Army, on the occasion of the 25th anniversary of the Waterways Experiment Station at Vicksburg, Miss., on June 18.

The address follows:

Just 27 years ago, water of the Mississippi River's greatest flood of record was beginning to subside. Many of you will remember that it left unbelievable damage far beyond the comprehension of the Nation. Some 20,000 square miles of the States of Mississippi, Arkansas, Louisiana, Missouri, Tennessee, and Kentucky were inundated. More than 4 million acres of crops were destroyed. Nearly 2 million farm animals were destroyed. Six hundred thousand people were made homeless. Overall property damage was figured at $270 million. And, worst of all, some 350 persons were drowned.

It was a day of stark never-to-be-forgotten tragedy.

The American people had come once again to a climax in the age-old struggle between humanity and the deluge. Since the days of the Old Testament it seems that Man had to contend with either too much or too little water; and the Mississippi flood of 1927 was a new proof that the struggle had not been won. It was a grim challenge which the Corps of Engineers accepted boldly on the spot.

Even before the flood had passed, the then Chief of Engineers, Maj. Gen. Edgar Jadwin, began preparation of a special report recommending ways and means of controlling the Mississippi, and within the same year on May 15, 1928, the plan was approved by the Congress.

This date may be called the beginning of the modern flood-control program. For it marked the end of efforts to control major rivers on a piecemeal basis, and the adoption as national policy of a type of planning based on the integrity of each river basin as a natural unit. Through hard-won experience, we had learned that floods can be controlled only through programs reaching from the headwaters to the mouth of each river. Similarly from the integrated development of flood control, the Nation as a whole is beginning to realize that navigation, the generation of power, the abatement of pollution, low-flow regulation, irrigation, the provision of municipal and industrial supply, recreation, and fish and wildlife conservation are all inter-related, inter-acting purposes which must be dealt with together as we plan to work on our rivers. Soil conservation and watershed management, too, are parts of the same integrated conservation problem. While the country has become aware of the importance of a comprehensive approach, and there is much talk of it, the corresponding willingness to act in accordance with such a concept is still not firmly accepted and I shall return to this subject shortly.

Once this basinwide approach to water-resource problems became generally recognized within the Corps of Engineers, our progress and accomplishments reached a scale never before dreamed of by any nation. Today the Corps of Engineers alone has completed some 2,000 projects, of which about 70 percent are multiple-purpose developments of the modern type, while the remaining 30 percent represent the accumulated achievement of the full century of piecemeal work which preceded the Mississippi River plan of 1928.

These 2,000 projects have cost a total of about $6 million and so far have returned about $2 in direct measurable returns for every dollar of cost. The returns are still coming in, and will continue to accrue to generation after generation. They have provided us with 28,000 miles of inland and coastal waterway; with nine-hundred-odd flood-control developments which protect more than 860 communities and some 26 million acres of farmland; and with more than 400 coastal and lake harbors. They are indispensable to our Nation's commerce, industry, and agriculture as we know and need them today. Although our programs are still far from complete, we are steadily making progress toward our goal of providing the maximum feasible control and use of all our major rivers.

Meanwhile the Nation's need for its water resources grew fully as fast as our capacity to develop them. Other Federal and many non-Federal agencies, State, local, quasi-public, and private alike, found themselves actively at work in our river basins. While great strides have been made in the integrations of these efforts, much remains to be done to remedy laws that are inconsistent and concepts that are unsound, both selfishly advanced by special interests.

Therefore one of my first objectives when I became Chief of Engineers a year and a half ago was to seek better coordination between at least the Federal agencies involved. I sought first to achieve the greatest possible uniformity and teamwork under existing laws; and second, to seek ways of clarifying the laws themselves and making them more consistent. After many conferences with top officials of the Interior and Agriculture Departments and the Federal Power Commission, substantial progress was made toward both objectives. Previously differing practices have been brought together in a number of important fields and the operating agencies recently submitted to the President a plan for a streamlined, more potent, reinvigorated Federal Interagency Committee to continue this work.

About 3 weeks ago, on May 26, President Eisenhower took a most significant step. He approved the proposed interagency committee, on which the Departments of Commerce, Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare would also be represented. This committee will improve coordination of existing water-resource policies and activities which it is admirably suited to do, because, I think, in reflecting on the innumerable boards, commissions, and committees that have been appointed to look into natural water-resource policies and procedures in the last 20 years, none of them do nor possibly can have the experience and the load of responsibility that the governmental agencies themselves possess. The real key is getting these agencies together. So above this operating interagency group, the President created another committee to be composed of three Cabinet members—Defense, Interior, and Agriculture—which will review all aspects of water-resources policy.

By this action, the President has given powerful impetus to the movement for better Federal water policy and has provided means for preparing more economical and smoothly working programs. Once the Federal Government speaks with one voice, it will be in a better position to coordinate its efforts with non-Federal agencies. Particularly important, in my view, is the fact that the shaping of water policy remains largely in the hands of the operating agencies actually at work on the Nation's waters—the agencies which embody generations of experience, which have already established a network of relationships with construction and user organizations, and which have the responsibility for carrying out laws, programs, and policies.

Thus the past 25 years have seen tremendous progress in both the expansion and the coordination of our water-resource development work. Thus at this point I would like to make it clarion clear to the country and the whole world that it is not a mere coincidence that the 25 years of existence of the Waterways Experiment Station not only have been the most productive 25 years in the corps' history but in the tremendous national impetus to water resource development. It is impossible to measure the full contribution of the station to our progress; but we can say with certainty that much of our work would have been far more costly, and some of it could not have been done at all, without the aid of this magnificent research facility. It has helped give us the technical competence to put our modern conceptions to practical application in the field.

The experiment station was established on June 18, 1929, only a year after the adoption of the Mississippi River program. It, too, represented a new departure in tackling water-resource problems.

Water follows the same hydraulic principles whether in quantities of a hundred gallons or a hundred million gallons. With small models, if they be true and exact, engineers can copy nature, study the behavior of streams and currents, and predict the fate of proposed works and structures, just as accurately as and far less expensively than by trial in the field. Such use of models appears to have originated at the University of Michigan, where it attracted little attention until a visiting German engineer observed the technique and developed it further in Europe. Officers of the Corps of Engineers studying hydraulics on the continent reimported it to this country for further refinement here at Vicksburg. But never has it been so boldly, imaginatively, or effectively applied as in the case of the great Mississippi's model covering several acres here in the State of the same name.

This technique has proved its worth in nearly every State in the Union. So far the station has constructed more than 300 models of dams, levees, spillways, canals, estuaries, and harbors. It is conservatively estimated that these models have saved the taxpayers at least $100 million by enabling us to devise better, sounder, more economical designs at less cost. In addition, they have yielded indirect benefits of incalculable value.

In 1952, for example, when the Missouri River approached flood stage, Army engineers along the route telephoned rainfall and runoff information to Vicksburg. The flood conditions were reproduced in miniature on a giant model of the Mississippi Basin. As a result, the station was able to predict, with extraordinary accuracy and about a week in advance, the time and level of the flood crest at each point along the endangered levees. As the data were developed on the model, they were telephoned back to the flood fighters, who were able to concentrate their efforts at the most critical points. The model was one of the several vital factors in the success of the flood fight which prevented flood damages of $62,500,000 in the Omaha-Council Bluffs area.

But hydraulic models are only part of the story.

As our program grew, it became apparent that we needed a laboratory to study principles and practices in the design of earth dams and levees. Hence our soils laboratory was added in 1932.

In 1946, as a measure of consolidation and economy, our concrete laboratory, formerly located in New York, was transferred to Vicksburg. Its studies in aggregates, mixes, the construction of forms, placement techniques, and a score of related fields have led to important economies in the corps' vast program of concrete construction. Despite increased costs of labor and materials and increasingly rigid specifications — factors which might well have doubled our concrete costs—the unit bid price for gravity dams has actually decreased by 30 percent since 1948. This happy result is due in large part to the discovery of better concrete techniques and less expensive mixes.

Thus, the Waterways Experiment Station is constantly helping us to build better structures at less cost. Almost any of our modern structures would provide a fitting example. Only a few weeks ago, I participated in the dedication of Texarkana Dam, a $33 million structure on the Sulphur River near Texarkana, Tex. Since it is an earth-fill dam, the station's soils division tested samples of the local soil, made basic studies of the foundation, and designed the slopes and embankments. The concrete division of this station located sources of aggregate and riprap and set the basic specifications for the concrete portions of the dam. Then a proposed design for the spillway and outlet structures was tested on a model developed by the hydraulics section. When water was turned into this model it was found that the proposed stilling basin was so shaped as to shoot the high-velocity jets of water emerging from the conduits against a splitter wall at virtually full speed. It was therefore deduced that water emerging from the basin would dig up the bed of the exit channel under the particular soil conditions there found and the design was accordingly changed.

Thus the model prevented costly damage and costly correction. Texarkana Dam, which I dedicated last April, stands today a structure of assured soundness and service, thanks to the unspectacular but vital work of the Waterways Experiment Station.

The Army engineers have a twofold responsibility to the Nation. Not only are we charged with developing its water resources, but we also must provide the construction base for the great defense effort with which America is preparing to meet a threat of aggression unprecedented in its history. Throughout the free world we are building bases and installations of all kinds and all sizes, under all sorts of conditions and in all sorts of terrain, from the deserts of Morocco to the perpetual ice of the Arctic, and from Saudi Arabia to Korea. Measured in dollars, our military construction program this year is about three times as great as our rivers and harbors job throughout the entire Nation.

The Waterways Experiment Station is playing the same vital part in the military construction effort that it plays in civil works. The swift changes in defense armament are a constant challenge to our laboratories. We must devise pavements and runways that can handle every type of aircraft—hot jets, massive bombers, and blasting rockets—under every type of climate and weather. We must house not only men but intricate equipment under all conceivable conditions. The rigid and flexible pavement laboratories and other parts of this station not only save money for the American people but help give our military planners the ability to plan operations of any kind they wish in any part of the world.

It is with no small amount of pride, therefore, that we mark the end of the first 25 years of what we expect will be a long life for the experiment station. That it was born of the tragic 1927 flood is not unusual. The American people have a history of turning adversity into advancement. That it serves the purposes of both peace and defense is characteristic of the Corps of Engineers; for one of the main, though invisible, benefits of our water-resources work is that it enables the Nation to maintain a construction organization in existence ready to meet any emergency construction need.

This station is to a large extent the technical research brain center of a vast and world-famous resource-development program. Visitors from many Nations come here to study our methods with the view of applying those methods wherever feasible in protecting and developing their own resources. Vital to the growth and strength of the Nation's economy, and vital to the national defense, it is a prime asset to the United States of America.

Therefore, in connection with the 179th year of the existence of the Corps of Engineers and on this 25th birthday of our great Waterways Experiment Station, with all my heart I congratulate the director and the employees of this station, among whom are many of the most prominent hydraulic, structural-concrete, and soils engineers in the world with national and international reputations.

The course of conquest and international diplomacy is a fickle thing that changes the whole course of humanity, not only by century but by decade, as dictated by man's own selfishness whether as an individual or on a national level.

But the knowledge you men and women have produced here will never be lost. It will act as a beacon to humanity to signal ever safer harbors, peacefully flowing rivers, energy to replace man's bitter sweat and a plentiful supply of that most precious element—water—to assuage his thirst, nourish his crops, and transport his goods in peaceful trade with his neighbors.

Thus in our long history of 179 years concluded day before yesterday, of all the great accomplishments of the Corps of Engineers during that period, none will be more remembered than the engineering prodigy which it created 25 years ago today. This I say because of the great promise the Waterways Experiment Station at Vicksburg, Miss., holds for the happiness and prosperity of future generations of our people.

Atomic Marshall Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1954

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, Soviet Russian rejection of President Eisenhower's proposal to pool fissionable materials under an international agency for peaceful pursuits calls for a new approach to this problem.

If Soviet Russia is allowed to win the worldwide race to put the atom into the hands of smaller nations for production of power for peacetime uses, the United States will have lost a vital round in the cold war.

An imaginative proposal to meet this challenge has come editorially in America, a national Catholic weekly review. This proposal is to build atomic-power reactors in those neutral and friendly countries which lack other sources of power. Such a proposal is worthy of the consideration of the administration and of the Congress.

I include in the Record the editorial on this subject which appeared in America, June 12, 1954:

Atomic Marshall Plan

Time and time again, just when the Soviets seemed to be winning the cold war, they have let the advantage slip to their rivals by some diplomatic faux pas. Such was their rejection of the Marshall plan for the rehabilitation of Europe, which led to the growing military, economic, and political integration of Western Europe.

In his address to the U. N. Assembly on December 8, 1953, President Eisenhower outlined what was in effect a worldwide atomic Marshall plan. It was a daringly imaginative proposal to pool fissionable materials under an international agency to serve the peaceful pursuits of mankind. So great was the enthusiasm of the peoples of the world that the Soviets reconsidered their original rejection of the plan and agreed to discuss it.

Six months later, however, the President was obliged to announce that Russia had spurned this new Marshall plan. He told Columbia University bicentennial celebrants on May 31:

"In our efforts to find the ways by which the miraculous inventiveness of man should not be dedicated to his death, but consecrated to this life, there have been written exchanges of views between the United States and the Soviet Union. Secretary Dulles has personally conferred both at Berlin and at Geneva with the Soviet Foreign Minister, Mr. Molotov. These have not been productive of the results we seek, but we, on our side, are continuing exchanges of views and consultations with the other free nations principally involved."

The authoritative Pravda has attacked the atom-for-peace plan in an invective-embroidered blast May 29. Obviously, another American attempt to relieve international tensions is dead. It is not clear what the President intends to do next. To what purpose are the "exchanges of views and consultations with the other free nations" being continued? When he was asked in his press conference on May 19 what he would do if Russia rejected the plan, the President said that he and his advisers were trying to find a way the United States could go ahead in some enlightened form, some enlightened method along this line without waiting for anyone else.

The only enlightened form or method along this line worth trying is a radically different one. The prime purpose of the pool plan was "to relieve international tensions." If it succeeded, mutual mistrust might be abated, and the more difficult job of working out general disarmament might then have some chance of success. Exploiting the great peacetime potential of atomic power was to be a byproduct of the project. Now that the political purpose of the plan is unattainable, the most direct and efficient means of attaining that secondary objective is to build atomic power reactors in those neutral and friendly countries which lack other sources of power. By offering to do this directly, and not through a cumbrous international agency, we could, without jeopardizing our security, multiply the goodwill effects of point 4 and nullify the bad effect of the Pravda charge that our pool plan is a scheme to organize "an international cartel for atomic energy."

This would be an enlightened method in the sense of being in our enlightened self-interest. Even now a race is on to see which side can first put the atom "into the hands of those who will know how to adapt it to the arts of peace." There are reports that Russia is already building two power reactors in east Germany to provide electric power for its satellites. With its flair for direct action, the Soviet may soon extend its offer to neutral nations.

Our Atomic Energy Commission has just authorized erection of three more experimental reactors on United States soil. Let us amend the Atomic Energy Act to permit AEC, under an enlightened point 4, to build another three for our friends and those we seek for friends.

What Success Means to Me

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PORTER HARDY, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 21, 1954

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of pride that I announce that Donald Rosendale, of Portsmouth, Va., in my district, has been selected as the first-place winner in the Thom McAn success awards for this year. Donald will receive a $1,000 scholarship to the college of his choice, and a free trip to Washington and New York. He was chosen on the basis of scholastic achievement and his essay on the subject What Success Means to Me. This was a nationwide contest, and Donald was chosen by five distinguished judges from among thousands of participating high-school graduates.

Donald's essay is brief but profound. I take pleasure in quoting it in the Record so that my colleagues in the Congress may have a chance to read it:

What Success Means to Me

(By Donald Rosendale, St. Pauls School, Portsmouth, Va.)

I can remember as a small boy lying in the grass and gazing at the sky, as many a small boy before me has done. I was dreaming of the day when I would be an all-American football star or a great inventor or even the President.

In those dreams I ran many touchdowns. The world was astonished at the gadgets I turned out by thousands and the United States flowered under my wise jurisdiction. But as I grew older, I began to shape a different criteria with which to measure my happiness. Perhaps I would lack the skill or good fortune to become any one of those enticing celebrities that I visualized. Must I then be miserable with unattainable goals always beyond by reach? Then and there I drew up my definition of success.

First of all, I shall not choose to be a common man. I shall seek opportunity and chance to lift myself above the run-of-the-mill citizen because I firmly believe in America's fifth freedom, one that is little known and completely unsung—freedom to do one's best.

This freedom, like all the other four, is not only a privilege but a test. Passing this test is success. Not measuring up to one's ideals and aspirations, placing gratification before integrity, raising wealth or fame above justice or charity make a man a failure.

Then a certain amount of education and preparation are necessary before I can take my place in the adult world. My immediate goals are easy to see: graduation from high school in June, completion of my college courses, continuing my hobby, and part-time job of free-lance journalism. But from that point on, the path becomes less clear and yet more important. These clear-cut years are all preparation, but for what? Perhaps electronics or civil engineering? Maybe journalism?

Sometimes I worry because I cannot decide definitely what type of work I should choose. Just as I outgrew those childhood phases of daydreaming, I know I shall outgrow these periods of uncertainty. With each step in this maturing process, I can see that success becomes more intangible. It takes its place as a quality, an attitude of mind rather than an end in itself.

And so I shall not rest my claim to success upon a certain type of work nor upon a bank account nor even on the number of times my name is mentioned in the headlines of the papers. If I live up to the obligations of my fifth freedom—the freedom to do my best—I shall be successful.

Foreigners Continue To Levy on Americans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 21, 1954

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I have often denounced the authority that has been delegated to the United Nations and related organizations to lay claims upon the lives of Americans and their productive energy.

The following editorial from the Marshalltown (Iowa) Times-Republican points up the insidious means by which foreigners can spend our money and indirectly levy taxes upon the citizens of this Nation.

What has happened in this instance points up the need for two legislative enactments: First, the Bricker amendment; and, second, ratification of treaties with foreign governments by the House of Representatives as well as by the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, the Constitution of the United States and the rights of our citizens have already been done serious injury by the delegation of powers to such organizations as the United Nations where we have 1 vote in 60; where Russia has 3 votes to our 1.

Following is the excellent editorial to which I have called attention:

HOW THE U. N. TAKES OVER

Those who question the need for the proposed Bricker amendment to the Constitution, and who question the validity of the charge that treaties could undermine the authority of the United States Goverment, have only to consider the meeting at Geneva of the World Health Organization, one of the junior offshoots of the United Nations, which is generally known as the WHO.

At the meeting in Switzerland it developed that the WHO needs a lot more money, so the delegates to its international assembly in Geneva last month voted to assess the United States Government an additional $350,000 over and above the sum that the United States Congress has already authorized for the U. N. agency. The United States delegation voted against the assessment but were heavily outvoted by all the delegates from the other member nations.

Compared with other Government spending these days $350,000 may seem a trifling sum, but it is startling to realize that this supranational agency is empowered to vote money right out of Uncle Sam's cashbox without so much as saying by your leave or thank you.

The United States, in 1948, ratified the treaty founding the WHO and approved the constitution of that organization which creates the power to assess all member nations, and to fix its own budget.

The United States Congress, by our own Constitution, is given control of the public purse. But the Constitution says that treaties are the supreme law of the land, so it appears that Congress will have no choice except to appropriate the additional $350,000 which WHO so imperiously demands.

War Is Not the Answer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 9, 1954

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Post, an interventionist publication, on June 7, on the front page, carried a statement captioned "United States Twice Proposed Indochina Strike," and above it the words "Blocked by British 'No.' "

The proposed air strike would have involved us in war, just as President Roosevelt's use of American destroyers to attack German shipping, just as Truman's sending of troops into Korea, involved us in World War II and world war III.

Reading the story, I learned that Admiral Radford, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, broached the idea and was backed by Secretary of State Dulles.

Undoubtedly the President, while he did not himself discuss the proposed intervention, knew of it, and made no protest.

Radford's proposal was not supported by the other members of the Joint Chiefs.

When Radford met in secret session at the State Department with eight congressional leaders, representing both parties, he learned the Congress did not favor bombing Indochina's strongholds by the United States.

The statement "United States Twice Proposed Indochina Air Strike," is obviously untrue, but typical of those who would willynilly involve us in world war IV, continue to send American youth to fight abroad, establish here at home a military dictatorship. Radford and Dulles are not the United States.

I'll go along with Secretary of Defense, Charles E. Wilson, when, speaking at the University of South Carolina graduation exercises on June 7, 1954, he said:

> We cannot knock out false ideas with bullets; we must counter and destroy them with the truth, with superior ideas, and sound philosophy.

He added:

> Even a victory in such a war could be purchased only at the cost of such horrible waste and destruction that the course of human progress would be set back many decades * * * after such a victory in a third world war, the free world would still have the problem of what to do with the vanquished and how to establish conditions of peace in the world.

Secretary Wilson emphasized the fact that we must remain militarily strong.

With what he said, I agree and would like to add that we should also refrain from any provocative action which would offend our neighbors, cause them to misjudge us.

I might add that the British flatly refused to go along with the suggestion of Admiral Radford and Secretary Dulles. Of one thing about the British, you may always be sure—they always, and I think rightly, are first concerned with the security, the progress, of the British Empire.

We, of the United States, should follow a like philosophy. Just as each of us thinks first of his own, so, on the international front, we should think first of the interests of our country.

Mr. Jack Carley, Chief Editorial Writer on the Memphis Commercial-Appeal, Honored by Corps of Engineers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD DAVIS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 21, 1954

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, on the occasion of the 25th anniversary of the Waterways Experiment Station at Vicksburg, Miss., Mr. Jack Carley, chief editorial writer on the Memphis Commercial-Appeal, was distinctly honored by the Corps of Engineers.

He was given a citation of merit reflecting his long interest in flood control and the work of the engineers. Indeed, this honor is emphasized because he is the second in the long 179 years of engineer history to be so selected and recognized.

I include herein the statement made by General Sturgis when he presented the award to Mr. Carley.

His remarks follow:

It is my pleasant duty at this time to recognize the life work of one of the best friends the Corps of Engineers has ever had.

Although I am reminded by the calendar that I personally have known him for only some 14 years, so completely in accord are we that it is difficult for me to remember when I have not enjoyed his counsel, his confidence, and his trust. By coincidence, we even share a mutual interest in Custer's Last Stand, to which he has devoted many years of patient research, and at which my Uncle Jack fell.

But the real basis for our association lies in a common desire to provide for the best utilization of our Nation's resources for the benefit and protection of the American people in peace or war. Coming to this valley more than 30 years ago, he was deeply impressed by the shadow of danger from floods which continually hung over the delta, retarding and stifling its growth and development. From that time forward he has been a dedicated man. He has played a leading part in obtaining a sound overall plan for the control of floods on the lower Mississippi. When great disasters have occurred, as in 1927, 1937, and 1943, his calm voice has helped bring order out of chaos. His efforts to make this valley safe from the ravages of natural forces have materially enhanced the expansion of transportation and industrial facilities in this region to the point where today the delta stands as one of America's most promising frontiers. And, during World War II, his objectivity and loyalty were of inestimable value to the vital work of the Manhattan project in his chosen State of Tennessee.

All of these achievements required the exercise of true leadership on his part. Those same attributes of courage, integrity, and professional skill which are required of a commander in battle are also essential to the leader of a civil community. But his task is doubly difficult, for he must necessarily rely upon persuasion rather than command.

The American press has always been the most powerful influence upon our civilization. The gentlemen of the fourth estate have ready access at all times to our schools, our homes, our very minds. We depend upon them for the information which must serve as the basis for all our actions. Because of this, it is sometimes a source of wonder to me that our press so consistently acts as a force for good. But I have only to consider the character of reporters like the man we honor here tonight and I know that our trust has not been misplaced. With men such as these who serve our people by properly informing them, our Nation can never fail.

Now I want to read a citation of one of these men—a man who has done as much for his community, for his valley, for his country, as anyone I know.

Mr. Jack Carley Replies to Remarks of General Sturgis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD DAVIS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 21, 1954

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr .Speaker, Mr. Carley replied in beautiful language to the remarks made by General Sturgis. Under authority granted me for the extension of my remarks, I include his response.

The response follows:

General Sturgis, officers of the Army, ladies and gentlemen, any man should be proud to receive such recognition as this from the country's senior service—the United States Army and its Corps of Engineers.

I am especially proud and grateful that it has been given to me during one of those periods when the Army doesn't seem to be quite as popular as it always is when involved in actual war. I would be grateful for this citation and certificate at any time.

I am doubly happy to get it at a time when the Army's friends ought to be willing to stand up and be counted.

To that particular rollcall, I am answering, "Here."

It is a good Army. It is a great Army—of heart and of purpose.

It was a small but great-of-heart Army when, in 1775, Washington named Gen. Richard Gridley, then hastily building fortifications on Bunker Hill, to be Chief Engineer of what was designated "the Grand Army."

And really, it has been a grand army ever since—through many a rough and rugged period of our country's history—and over many a bloody, bitter mile marked by the graves of those who lives were given in its service.

The Army needs no eulogy or defense from me, nor from any man, nor does the Corps of Engineers. The two are inseparable. Where the Army goes, there goes the Army engineer with his roadbuilding and bridging equipment, his earth-moving equipment, his fuel pipelines—doing the thousand and one tasks that the military engineer is called on to do—making it possible for the Army to advance or dig in, as the case may be—and, sometimes, last to withdraw from impossible positions, thwarting pursuit of the enemy.

I would be less than grateful for what has happened here tonight if I failed to plead with you all not to sell the United States Army short—not to let political bickering cause you to forget that without it our freedoms would be short-lived, indeed. Don't let the quarreling of little men blind you the magnificence of its achievements. Those are in the record and, thank God, cannot be erased.

I hope the day will never come when the Army engineer will pack up his tools and move out of this green valley—this rich valley in which Theodore Roosevelt predicted the future of Western civilization might well be determined. If that day should ever come when the Corps of Engineers would be stripped of its civil functions, it would mean more than great loss to the Nation's river valleys—it would mean destruction of one of the elements most essential to a military victory in this technological age—a military construction force in being.

This is the force which makes up the Army engineer-civilian employee team—a team which has on counterpart anywhere in where in the world—the unbeatable team which provides a design for military victories.

Acquisitive, jealous hands have long reached and are reaching now for the civil-functions tasks which the Corps of Engineers has been so long performing to the Nation's great benefit. It will be a tragedy for this valley and our country if we permit their grasping to succeed.

One of the things which has made me happiest tonight is receiving this certificate through my friend General Sturgis. Sturgis is a fine old name in American military history. It is a name of honor and integrity and it is to be found wherever deeds of American military valor are recorded even as far back as the formative years of the Nation.

Many things are personified in this kind friend of mine who has the proud title of Chief of Engineers—tradition, esprit, pride of outfit—Army—the Grand Army of Washington's day and of our day, and of that hot Sunday afternoon long ago when young Jack Sturgis, 1 year out of West Point, died with his men in another river valley—that of the Litile Big Horn.

It is a grand Army, I say, and men like General Sturgis, General Hardin, General Vogel, and the other officers you see here are its worthy representatives and they honor me by calling me friend.

I am grateful for having had the opportunity to support the Army and the Corps of Engineers.

I am proud and grateful that the Commercial-Appeal, the newspaper with which I have so long been associated, has never, in its more than a century of publication, faltered in devotion to the Armed Forces of this country.

If I have a regret tonight— and I do have one—it is that I have never had the privilege of serving as an engineer soldier. There is no better soldier. He has never let you down. He never will. Don't let him down.

Select Committee To Investigate Rent Hikes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 17, 1954

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise to give notice that when the House convenes next week I shall offer a resolution creating a select committee to investigate the rental situation in Chicago and other large cities. As a member of the Banking and Currency Committee I shall petition the distinguished chairman of that committee immediately to call the committee into executive session either to vote endorsement of my resolution or itself to undertake the investigation through a special committee created for that purpose.

What I predicted in my remarks in this Chamber when we were discussing the lifting of rent controls has happened. I pleaded then for at least an emergency control power to be vested in the President so that he could act promptly if matters did not work out as smoothly and equitably as the administration hoped.

The lifting of rent control was followed by rental boosts. Responsible real-estate interests tried to keep them to 10 percent, but in many instances owners of properties spurned their counsel. One increase followed another until tenant's were paying to the extreme maximum of their ability. Now it is proposed to slap on another increase of from 10 to 20 percent this fall.

On June 14, 1954, the Chicago Daily News at the top of page 1 ran an eight-column streamer reading "Many Here Face Rent Hikes in Fall." Lower on page 1 was a three-column subhead that stated, "Rent Hikes Up to 20 Percent Face Many Here in Fall—Flat Shortage Still Tight Despite Forecasts When Controls Died."

The Chicago Daily News is an independent Republican newspaper that gave major journalistic support in the Middle West to General Eisenhower in his preconvention campaign.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that the administration will heed the storm warnings. With unemployment and diminished family incomes, due to stoppage of overtime and other causes, this certainly is no time for telling tenants to cough up another 20 percent or get out.

By fall the Congress will be in adjournment. If anything is to be done, it must be done now. If nothing is done, the administration must answer to the people come November.

Mr. Speaker, I am extending my remarks to include the news article in the

Chicago Daily News of June 14, 1954, which follows:

Rent increases ranging from 5 to 20 percent face many Chicago and suburban tenants whose apartment leases expire later this summer and in the fall.

A survey also showed Monday that apartment hunters here are bucking a near-zero vacancy rate for flats.

Officials of rental management offices said the new boosts this fall in the city will run from 10 to 20 percent, following the pattern set June 1.

Increases in the suburbs this fall are expected to range from about 5 to 10 percent.

The boosts in Evanston chiefly will be confined to smaller apartments up to five rooms, said Lois K. Stewart, of Hokanson & Jenks, Evanston realtors.

Miss Stewart, the immediate past president of the Evanston-North Shore Board of Realtors, stated that increases were not likely for larger units, which have been moving more slowly in the rental market.

Real-estate men reported that prevailing rents in Chicago now range from about $13 per room per month for units in old neighborhoods to about $27 per room for more desirable locations.

Average rents are about $20 per room for well-maintained walkups.

William Everett, of Browne & Storch, said rents for elevator apartments range from $45 to $50 per room.

The survey showed that predictions of real-estate dealers of a loosening up in the apartment supply with decontrol of rents July 31, 1953, has failed to pan out.

Management firms handling approximately 14,000 rental units reported only 34 vacancies this month.

This is in line with estimates of only a 1 percent vacancy rate in all types of dwelling units made by the Real Estate Research Corp.

Against this tight supply is a continuing demand.

Joseph Ford, West Side real-estate man, said from 8 to 10 people visit his office daily looking for flats.

In addition, the office receives from 5 to 10 telephone inquiries for apartments each day.

"However, the situation is not as bad as it seems," said Arthur Mohl of Downs, Mohl & Co.

"We have had more of a turnover in the last 4 months than in the whole previous 2 years.

"As a result, we can usually find some place for a tenant in a comparatively short time.

"It may not be exactly what he wants at the price he'd like to pay, but at least he can get a place."

The continued shortage of apartment units here is closely linked to a negligible amount of new multiple-unit buildings.

Since expiration of rent controls, permits have been issued for only 2,681 apartments in Chicago, according to D. H. Mackelmann, deputy housing coordinator.

Of this number 1,664 units, or over half, were in public-housing projects.

"High construction costs and stiff financing requirements are holding down apartment building," said A. L. Alcorn, head of the rental management division of Draper & Kramer.

"New 5-room apartments today have to rent around $150 per month," he pointed out.

"In contrast, a man can buy a new home and pay out about $100 per month.

"He's willing to become his own janitor and maintenance man to save paying for these services in an apartment building."

Predictions that rent decontrol, followed by an increase in rents, would lead to a doubling up by many individuals to free many apartment units has failed to materialize.

George W. Kemp, Jr., president of McKey & Poague, said that while there has been some doubling up, it has not been on the scale expected.

Winning a War by Cease-Fire in Asia—Communist Truce Tactics Now in the Open

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 21, 1954

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an article that has come to my attention and which I believe should be read by all Members in the Congress. It clearly indicates the Communist strategy in Asia at the present time, which is the winning of a war by cease-fire. It will not be seriously doubted today that the Communists won the war in Korea, and at this moment they are winning the one in Indochina. A reading of this article will clear up considerable confusion as to Communist strategy throughout the world:

"Truce is the military counterpart of the political tactic of coalition government. It is a means to an end, not the ultimate objective."—Chou En-lai.

In these words the man who is now premier and foreign minister of Chinese communism gave to the familiar military truce a meaning entirely new in the history of war. That meaning was to be spelled out in the wars of Communist aggression both in China and Korea. Today the same concept hangs over the battlefields of Indochina.

Students of past wars have learned to look on the truce as a simple matter. Opposing armies reach a situation where both sides wish to end the fighting. A brief parley is held, lasting a few hours or at most a few days. Either a cease-fire is agreed to or the talks are broken off and the fighting continues. If there is a cease-fire, a peace settlement follows in due course and the war is over.

The words of Chou En-lai foreshadowed a total abandonment of this idea. Just as coalition government in Communist practice is aimed at the absorption of the coalition partner, so the military truce is aimed at the continuation of the war by other means until victory is achieved.

This revolution in the meaning of truce in Communist practice is no more complete than other innovations which communism has introduced in its political and military wars against freedom. Another such change, the handling of prisoners of war as pawns of political aggression and propaganda, was demonstrated on a mass scale with German prisoners in World War II and again in Korea. All such changes stem from a central reality: in the Communist mind war is fought not for limited national objectives but to advance the unlimited aim of world conquest. As there is no limit to the aim, so there is no limit to the methods. Acts of brutality, dishonor, and bad faith, from which a power seeking a permanent compromise settlement must refrain, can be committed without restraint.

The talk of a cease-fire in the war in Indochina, heightened by the appeal of Indian Prime Minister Nehru and by the prospect of negotiations at Geneva, makes the study of Communist truce tactics more than an academic matter. An observer seeking a sign for the future in Indochina could do worse than to review the history of the truce as the Communists developed it in the Chinese civil war and the Korean war.

The pattern of development revealed in this history points a clear lesson: Whoever seeks to negotiate a truce with the Communists should proceed with caution.

THE CEASE-FIRE IN CHINA

The truce as military-political tactic first appeared in China well before 1946. The very ability of the Chinese Communist regime to exist and grow as a state-within-a-state for 20 years before it came to power rested in part on a military posture that was half war, half peace. Since its very beginning this regime, in its relation to the government it sought to conquer, had followed an irregular succession of tactics mixing open attack, retreat, diversion, temporary reconciliation, agitation, and guerrilla warfare.

It was not until the Japanese war, however, that the Chinese Communists fully developed the truce as a weapon against their antagonist. The truce in this case dissolved into the united front against Japan, under which Communist and Nationalist forces agreed to a demarcation of areas of military operations against Japan.

The Communists in no way abandoned their basic policies of extending their power and control in China during this truce period, but pursued these policies in a new way. They toned down their violent social and economic measures. Operating in a remote region screened from direct observation by the foreign press, they issued a continuous and highly impressive stream of publicity about their heroic exploits against the Japanese invader. And behind this smoke screen they avoided pitched battle with all the diligence they had learned in years of guerilla warfare. How successful they were in this objective is clear from the official Japanese account of the war, which indicated that no more than 20 percent of the Japanese forces in China were ever engaged in battle with the Communists.

Meanwhile, exploiting their patriotic propaganda about the struggle against the Japanese, the Communists intensified their recruiting. Then with their forces expanded by the new influx of Chinese patriot soldiers, the Communist armies began to move outside the areas assigned to them under the united-front agreement with the Nationalists. Beginning in 1940, clashes began once again between Communist and Nationalist troops and the relations of the government with its Communist rival went from bad to worse. But by this time the purpose of the truce strategem had been largely achieved. The armies of the National Government were confronted with a Communist challenger far stronger than before.

More than 5 years later this same conflict was marked by another truce period. The war with Japan had been won, but instead of peace the people of China found themselves in the midst of a new and savage chapter in the civil war. Both sides launched large-scale attacks; embryonic industries and large rural areas were disrupted as the Communist forces destroyed communications lines; the great walled cities, centers of population and government, were victims of siege, capture, and recapture.

The popular longing for peace after a decade of war was answered when the United States, interested in a strong and united Chinese Republic, undertook to mediate between the Nationalist Government and the Chinese Communists. The basis for peace was to be a coalition government and a nationalization of all armed forces.

On January 10, 1946, in order to achieve a constructive atmosphere for the political discussions, a cease-fire or truce was agreed to by both sides. The cease-fire order stipulated:

1. A cessation of all hostilities.
2. Cessation of all movements of troops in China, with the exception of a provision permitting certain movements of Chinese Nationalist troops—especially their entry into Manchuria for the purpose of restoring Chinese sovereignty there following the Japanese surrender to Soviet forces.
3. Cessation of destruction of and interference with all lines of communications, and
4. Establishment of an executive headquarters in Peiping for the purpose of carrying out the agreement for immediate cessation of hostilities.

The events which followed over the 10 months of this pretended truce were a nightmare of confusion and unreality. In Chungking and Nanking, the wartime and postwar capitals of the Chinese Republic, peace talks continued—in theory at least—from January to November. On the battlefield there was no peace, and a truce only in name. Violations of the truce by the Communists were reported throughout this period at an average rate of about 1 every 3 days. When the truce was officially abandoned on November 19 the official count of verified Communist violations stood at not less than 91.

In self-defense the Nationalists responded to these violations by a furious renewal of the war, which spread from Manchuria throughout north China during the spring and summer. But the military initiative which the Communists gained by their violations enabled them to move a long way toward the total conquest of China.

The most significant violations were directed at strategic Manchuria, where Soviet forces after their 8-day war had accepted the Japanese surrender. Over 40 of the Communist truce violations are accounted for in this Manchurian operation. Brazenly ignoring the truce stipulation on Manchuria, their regiments and battalions marched piecemeal over mountain passes from neighboring Jehol Province until by April they had occupied most of Manchuria including the key cities of Changchun, Szepinchieh, Harbin, and Tsitsihar. In each case they entered as soon as Soviet troops had left the city, conforming perfectly to the Soviet timetable of withdrawal. As an additional prize the Soviet forces handed over huge stocks of captured Japanese arms and equipment; these the Chinese Reds were to use later in organizing and equipping new armies in the final struggle for power.

But the assistance from the Soviets did not stop there. They largely nullified the Nationalists' right of entry into Manchuria, guaranteed by the truce terms, by the simple expedient of closing the port of Dairen to Nationalist ships. Thus the National government troops were forced to enter Manchuria by air and by difficult overland routes. The whole Communist operation was beautifully conceived, smoothly executed, and completely illegal.

After furious fighting for key Manchurian communications centers, the most the Nationalists could achieve against these odds was a military stalemate which lasted from April to June. In an effort to break this stalemate and get on with the peace talks the Nationalist government on June 7 ordered a 15-day cease-fire for its own troops in Manchuria. Later this new cease-fire was extended to the end of June. But extensive efforts to revive the peace talks were fruitless. The Communists rejected the Nationalist offer to give General Marshall the power of arbitration. The sound of guns again drowned out the peace efforts at Nanking. By summer Manchuria was mainly in Communist hands.

Meanwhile the remainder of the Communists' strategic plan began to unfold amid renewed warfare south of the Great Wall, in China proper. Here, beginning in the spring, Communist truce violations occurred with increasing frequency, aimed for the most part at a single objective: Breaking Nationalist control of the north-south rail lines. Early in June these violations blazed into a general Communist offensive in north China and the central plain area. The Nationalists, determined to reopen the communications system in north China, answered in July and August with a strong counteroffensive.

The battle for the railroads continued throughout the summer. On August 3 the Communists began a ferocious attack on Tatung, a key rail center in northern Shansi. After 45 days the siege of Tatung was abandoned; but it was the fuse that set off major hostilities ranging over five Provinces of North China—Suiyuan, Chahar, Jehol, Hopei, and Shantung.

Thus for 10 months the Communists in China waged open war under the flag of truce. At last on November 19 that flag was lifted by the departure of the Communist delegation from the peace table at Nanking. The civil war, which the Communists had never stopped fighting, was now officially resumed.[1]

Looking back on Communist action in this period, it is possible to see with perfect clarity the military strategy they followed. It was to deny the strategic position and resources of Manchuria to Nationalist control, and to establish a corridor from west to east across north China. By the latter move they cut all China's main north-south communications routes and split the Nationalist forces into isolated commands powerless to launch a coordinated offensive.

At the peace table in Nanking the Communists had found they could not gain entry into a coalition government except at the price of nationalizing their army—thus losing the base from which they could later seize full power. So victory by diplomacy was denied to them. But they found another road leading to the same goal. Using the cover of truce and peace talks to surprise and demoralize their enemies, they carried out vital and illegal military movements and reaped a strategic advantage which the Nationalists were never to regain.

It may seem strange that the Communists were able to violate their pledged word 91 times in this period without effective hindrance from the authorities. Certainly there was no lack of efficiency in reporting the violations as they occurred. When a truce violation was complained of by either side, the executive headquarters in Peiping sent out a team under United States command to investigate and rectify the violation. After 2 weeks five such teams were in the field. By November there were 36 teams. They inspected, verified, reported, and protested each violation. But they had no means of commanding respect or obedience. The Communists showed only contempt for their efforts. One team in Manchuria was met with Communist gunfire. Another, sent to stop a Communist attack on Po-t'ouchen in Hopei Province, was tricked into leaving the area while the Communists resumed their attack and captured the town. Thus the prestige of the truce teams dwindled steadily. One American official was quoted as saying: "There have been so many violations I could not count them."

The basic difficulty was simple. The only sanction against truce violations was the very act which was least desired: openly avowed renewal of the war. The irony is that precisely this sanction was applied in the end—but not until the Communists had taken a decisive step toward final victory.

THE ARMISTICE IN KOREA, 1951–54

On the surface, the pattern of events in the Korean armistice may appear entirely different from the history of the truce in the Chinese civil war. The Korean truce talks, for one thing, covered an alltime record period of 2 years—during which time the war continued along a rather stable front but with occasional bursts of great violence. Secondly, the issues at the truce table were prolonged for months over a problem that never appeared in the Chinese case: the question of nonforcible repatriation of prisoners of war.

These differences are important because the Korea experience has given us an excellent illustration of prolonged Communist exploitation not simply of the truce itself but of the agonizing negotiations leading up to it.

Still another difference must be noted. The U. N. side has announced its intention to maintain its military readiness and meet a renewal of Communist military aggression by united action it may not be possible to confine to Korea. This determination has been a main source of hope that the truce would endure, and in fact the truce remains in effect after 9 months.

The history of the Korean armistice is basically similar in many ways to the pattern revealed in China. Certainly this is trus of its beginnings. After the U. N. command was forced back by massive Chinese Communist intervention to a fixed line near the 38th parallel, the enemy's logistical problems increased, a strong U. N. "spoiling offensive" was launched, and the fighting lapsed into a stalemate in the spring of 1951. Neither side was both able and willing to commit the extra strength needed to win the war. When the Communist side offered to parley the United Nations side agreed.

Thus began the long period of truce negotiations. From the beginning it became clear that the Communists were determined to exploit the truce talks for maximum propaganda advantage and to wear down the U. N. negotiators by ceaseless harping on irrelevant issues, as well as by coordinated military and other pressures far from the truce tent. To cite only one example, it is known now that the chief Communist negotiator, a Soviet native of Korean ancestry named Nam Il, was at the same time in general charge of Communist-instigated riots and terrorism in the U. N. prison compounds in South Korea. When these riots occurred, as planned under Nam Il the terrorist, Nam Il the negotiator commenced incessant tirades in the tent at Panmunjom against the killings of prisoners which these same carefully engineered riots had provoked. Not hesitating to sacrifice lives to make a propaganda point, the Communists thus used the forum at Panmunjom to give the world a concocted picture of U. N. terrorism against prisoners of war—thus spreading hate propaganda against the West and supporting their insistence that all prisoners be repatriated regardless of personal choice.

On one issue, that of the right of prisoners to refuse repatriation, the U. N. side stuck fast and eventually won its basic point. On some other issues the U. N. side compromised in an effort to reach agreement and to end the bloody fighting.

---

[1] There was another kind of warfare during this period not waged with bullets—a cold war of propaganda. The United States was pictured by the Communists as an aggressor in Asia, the imperialist rival and successor to Japan. Appeals to Nationalist troops to desert called on them to join in opposing America as they opposed Japan. Mass propaganda claimed that United States imperialism was more refined and legal than that of Japan—but more dangerous and deadly because the United States was stronger. The history of Japanese support of Chinese puppet governments and warlords was now applied to the relation between America and the Kuomintang, which was pictured as a puppet of the United States in Communist propaganda.

With respect to arrangements for inspection to prevent reinforcement of troops or equipment, the Communists at Panmunjom were adamantly against a far-reaching inspection system. The U. N. negotiators recognized that no inspection system would work if the parties to that system did not want to make it work, and that the real sanction against renewed Communist aggression was the Joint Policy Declaration. With these considerations in mind, the U. N. side finally agreed on five port-of-entry inspection sites for either side. This agreement, of course, left nearly the entire Yalu River frontier of North Korea exposed, and since the armistice, a new railroad and bridge have been built, and over this whole border the Communists can and have moved in supplies, troops, and aircraft at will, beyond the reach of the U. N. supervisory teams.

So much for the negotiating period and for the armistice agreement itself. The pattern of Communist behavior since the guns stopped shooting begins to look much like the old story in China.

It began in the very night that the truce became effective, July 27, 1953. The day before, almost all the Communist combat planes supporting their Korean aggression were based in the Manchurian sanctuary beyond the Yalu. That very night, as soon as the U. N. air force conformed to the cease-fire, scores of Red aircraft flew across the river and landed on airfields in North Korea—airfields where U. N. photo reconnaissance before the armistice had failed to spot a single plane. Many other planes were later delivered in crates in clear violation of the truce: We know, for instance, that 80 crated MIGs arrived at Uiju at the northwest corner of Korea last August 2. We know also that the Communists have been energetically repairing their North Korean airfields.

The greatest area of truce violation results from the ports-of-entry provision of the agreement. The neutral inspection teams in North Korea are restricted like tethered animals to the five agreed locations. This is why the Communists could unload the 80 MIGs at Uiju with complete impunity. In 1 of the 5 inspection sites the neutral team can look up the river and watch railroad trains rolling across a bridge from Manchuria. The bridge is out of their jurisdiction.

A broad look at Communist activity since the armistice shows that they have violated the agreement with respect to air forces, ground forces, retention of prisoners of war, and political subversion in the Republic of Korea. These are the highlights:

1. Air: By actions such as those just described, the Communists moved a number of jet fighters into North Korea and turned them over to the North Korean Air Force.

The net result of this transfer, and of the rebuilding of the airfields, is that the Reds have acquired for the first time an offensive air-striking power in Korea. They are now flying MIG–15's in squadron-size formations at night—something they could never do during the war. And they are based hundreds of miles closer to the frontline.

2. Ground: The Communists have infiltrated both military units and supplies across the Yalu—again beyond the jurisdiction of the impotent inspection teams, and free from the danger of air attack which harassed their lines of communication throughout the war.

For example, reports were received that on a certain day 25 trains had crossed the Yalu into North Korea. Only two of these were reported to the Military Armistice Commission by the Communists.

Although Chinese Communist troop strength in North Korea has declined slightly in point of numbers since the armistice, the illegal flow of materiel has meant a great increase in their combat efficiency, especially in the support arms. Meanwhile the North Korean Army has been significantly increased in both combat and service units. These refurbished forces stand behind a formidable defense line, an intricate network of trenches, tunnels, and bunkers.

Charges concerning violations of the demilitarized zone were brought by the U. N. C. before the Military Armistice Commission, but the operation of the Neutral Nations Supervisory Commission was seriously hampered in carrying out its inspection and reporting functions in North Korea. Because of the refusal of the Czech and Polish members, the Supervisory Commission was unable even to agree to conduct an investigation of many serious charges brought by the U. N. C.

3. Retention of prisoners of war: The U. N. victory on free choice of prisoners as to repatriation was effective where the U. N. authority extended to enforce it. But in North Korea many thousands of former prisoners were denied the right to go home. Reports from former South Korean soldiers who escaped to South Korea during November and December 1953 confirmed this fact, which has been long suspected.

The suspicion goes back to the truce negotiating period, when the U. N. negotiators demanded an accounting of 53,000 missing ROK prisoners. The Communist coolly announced that all of them had been released at the front. The fact is that they had either been impressed into the North Korean Army, recruited as subversive agents, or eliminated. The technique of impressment was simple: either the prisoner would fight or spy against his homeland, against all the rules of warfare, or face a firing squad. Legally the Communists refused to call these men prisoners of war; they were "liberated warriors," with no rights but to serve the Communist cause. Hundreds of U. N. prisoners, reported alive by their returning fellow prisoners as of the day of cease-fire, but never heard from since, have presumably been treated on the same principle.

4. Political subversion: Literally, the armistice agreement extends only to military hostilities. If the enemy had been capable of good faith it might have been supposed that they would honor also the spirit of the agreement, and suspend subversive activities in South Korea. But to the Communists hostilities are a much deeper matter than the shooting of guns. In their minds shooting is a variable; war is a constant. The political subversion against the Republic of Korea which they carried on before and during the shooting war in Korea still flourishes today.

This activity is controlled by the North Korean Government, a creature of the Soviet Union and a signer of the armistice agreement. The executive agent is the central executive committee of the Korean Labor Party—the Communist Party of North Korea. Subversive agents are directed to join underground units of this party in South Korea, organized at provincial, county, and city levels. There they become members of three-man workers' partisan teams. Their instructions continue in the spirit of full-scale war:

1. Carry out espionage of all types, especially industrial.

2. Make propaganda among the people, supporting the policies of the "Democratic Republic of Korea" and explaining the truth about United States imperialist aggression and the treason of Syngman Rhee's puppet regime.

3. Hinder enemy military action and harass his installations.

4. Help to restore the people's government in the unliberated areas (i. e., all of South Korea). Set up interim governmental structures with sections named as follows: staff member guidance, confidential, finance, labor, health, purchasing, education, planning, good administration, agriculture, livestock, propaganda, forestry, road building, general affairs.

5. When a general offensive is launched, assume leadership of the people in the struggle against the enemy.

6. Cooperate with other units to restrict enemy activities.

7. When appropriate in a liberated area, act as a home guard unit to keep order.

As late as the period of February 21 to 27, 1954, 49 incidents were reported in which an estimated 190 Communist guerrillas were involved, of whom 18 were killed and 48 captured. As of April 1954, an estimated 800 Communist guerrillas are active in South Korea. Captured guerrillas have confessed that they are connected with the North Korean Government and are carrying out orders of the central executive committee of the Korean Labor Party.

Such, briefly told, is the story of the Korean armistice and its aftermath. The broad lessons of this experience can be expressed in these conclusions:

First, as to negotiations, the Communists have a clear-cut strategy: (a) Virulent propaganda exploitation of the negotiating forum to try to embarrass and divide the enemy, (b) obstinate delay and introduction of irrelevancies.

Second, following an armistice, the Communists carry on the war by other means, exploiting any truce loopholes and frustrating any effective controls which remain in the truce agreement.

The Communist aim clearly remains the eventual absorption of all Korea. In pursuit of this aim, since the armistice 8 months ago, the enemy has increased his military combat efficiency in North Korea, moved part of his air force hundreds of miles south, begun repairs to his communications and industrial facilities, strengthened his field fortifications, illegally retained prisoners of war, and conducted continued political subversion in South Korea. He has done this under cover of the truce, by violating its obligations on a vast scale.

All this activity is in harmony with the Communist concept of law. In the U. N. General Assembly last December 2, when Communist atrocities in Korea were under debate and Ambassador Lodge had cited the words of Lenin that the dictatorship of the proletariat was above all law, Mr. Vishinsky replied:

"Lenin did say that the dictatorship of the proletariat is power which does not recognize laws. However, what laws? We have our own laws * * * when the proletariat comes to power, when the workers come to power, they smash the old state and the old laws. They create new ones."

THE PROSPECTS IN INDOCHINA

The truce tactic as developed in the past by the Communists can be broken into three time phases. Phase one is the pretruce situation, with open military conflict in a situation of comparative stalemate, and increasing demand for a cease-fire. Phase two is the truce period itself, accompanied or followed by discusssjons for a political settlement, and characterized by Communist exploitation of the terms of truce. Phase three is the period of open breach of the truce leading to Communist victory.

In China all three phases were completed. In Korea we are in phase two. In Indochina we are still in phase one.

It may be that the wisdom we have acquired from past dealing with the Communists will prevent a recurrence of this cycle in Indochina. But it must be recognized that some of the basic factors there are the same as in China and Korea.

The fight is against the same Communist enemy. It is carried on by nations with varying aims and interests. It has long been in a state of near-deadlock in which clear victory for either side seems doubtful unless larger forces are committed. And over the border stands a Communist big brother who looks on this war as a part of his grand strategy, who supplies it, gives it strategic direction, and supports it in his propaganda and diplomacy.

To this common picture must be added special factors which the Communists exploit energetically. One is the transitional relation of France to the associated states, only recently her colonial possessions. A second is the desire prevalent in France to end the conflict with whatever honor and prestige can be saved from it.

Still another special factor is the complex nature of this war, increasingly featuring large organized armies with air support and heavy equipment, yet still characterized, as it has been for years, by wide areas subject to the nightly terrors of Viet Minh guerrilla detachments. Where there are no identifiable frontlines, a truce can be exploited by the side with the best guerrillas to a point almost beyond policing.

Guerrillas and their political cadres, in fact, are characteristic military features of the war in Indochina. In China the distinguishing military feature was the decisive importance of controlling lines of communication. In Korea the distinguishing feature is the balance between opposing forces—hence, the Communist concentration on reinforcement through loopholes in the truce. A glance at the battle situation in Indochina makes it obvious that the guerrilla war is of peculiar importance there.

The fluid battle situation in Indochina, without identifiable battlelines, and the experiences in China and Korea lead inescapably to the conclusion that a secure truce in Indochina could be based only on the most stringent terms and controls. These would not only have to provide absolute assurance against renewed Viet Minh aggression by organized forces or guerrilla bands, but would also have to be designed to meet effectively the problems of widespread guerrilla pockets, infiltration, subversion, propaganda, arms traffic, and the personal security of the supporters of the legal governments of the associated states.

Spritual Weapons Will Defeat Reds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 21, 1954

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, under leave previously granted, I include the following thoughtful editorial from the Florida Times Union:

SPIRITUAL WEAPONS WILL DEFEAT REDS

"Truth from his lips prevail'd with double
sway,
And fools, who came to scoff, remained to
pray."

Oliver Goldsmith's familiar lines were recalled to many by a news item from Helsinki. In the Finnish capital to open his European Crusade for Christ, American Evangelist Billy Graham was holding a press conference shortly before addressing a crowd of 15,000. A Communist reporter, attempting to heckle him, asked him if he had come to fight communism.

Graham's answer, in keeping with the admonition of the Bible, was a soft one: "I am no politician. I am only a preacher of Christianity * * * And not a good one, either." It is doubtful the Red reporter was able to make much of the reply for propaganda purposes.

Often, however, Communist hecklers are more successful. They have developed harassment to an art and assail speakers of opposing interests with considerable vigor and ingenuity. Perhaps their favorite targets—as illustrated in the Graham incident—are those who are trying to bring the people back to the worship of God. Exalting dialectical materialism, the Communists declare that religion is a drug designed to keep the people in a stupor of obedience to their masters.

Fortunately, however, there are many indications that the appeal to atheism isn't as successful as the Reds would hope. Religion persists among the people, even though persecuted by Communist governments.

Of all the factors to consider, this probably is the most encouraging when we examine the prospects of the ultimate liberation of enslaved states. Where spiritual values are preserved there is still reason and a basis for a free society.

Spiritual weapons, however, are the only ones that will win us the ultimate victory and assure the extermination of worship of the material.

Mr. Speaker, I think that the success which has attended the meetings of Billy Graham in this country and abroad should be an encouragement to us all. Similarly, the recent meetings in Holland of the delegates of International Christian Leadership, headed by Abraham Vereide, spoke volumes for the forces of freedom and spiritual strength in this day. Similarly, the worldwide efforts of moral rearmament under the leadership of Frank Buchman, stressing the necessity of absolute honesty, absolute purity, absolute unselfishness, and absolute love, provide a vehicle which can unite men as tools of God in the face of efforts by communism to divide and conquer for atheistic materialism.

It is my opinion that every good American should do all he can to assist such leadership in the conflicts of this age. Materialism will never be an answer to materialism. The true answers are spiritual. Only those true answers can bring freedom and peace to the world.

The Facts, Mr. Harriman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KIT CLARDY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 21, 1954

Mr. CLARDY. Mr. Speaker, the editor of the Flint Journal has on Wednesday, June 16, 1954, made a most devastating reply to the untrue charges made by Mr. Harriman, Red Cross national chairman, concerning the 1953 tornado disaster relief work. Flint received national acclaim for its instantaneous response to the needs of its people when disaster struck. Over the years it has contributed generously to the Red Cross. The chairman's attack was utterly uncalled for. The falsity of his charges is aptly demonstrated by the editorial, which reads:

THE FACTS, MR. HARRIMAN

The charge by E. Roland Harriman, Red Cross national chairman, that Flint was unwilling to help itself in the 1953 tornado disaster is amazing. It is belied by the wide and competent acclaim accorded Flint for the job it did to restore, as far as possible, the material loss suffered by victims of the 1953 tornado. Without the countless individual and unaffiliated group instances of help, this restoration amounted to more than 70 percent. Besides, a trust fund of $110,000 was set up for the education of children who lost parents in the catastrophe.

The total loss to victims was estimated, through scrutinizing appraisal, at $5,124,870, of which there was a $2,349,035 recovery through insurance. Of the remainder, the rules of Red Cross permitted $590,531 aid. A fine virtue of this was its expert service applied immediately. But there still remained more than $3 million in loss to families whose most grievous suffering was 116 deaths besides hundreds of injuries.

Humanely, Flint, largely through its Red Feather disaster fund, sought to supplement assistance as equitably as good minds could devise. High management, top labor, civic, and business leaders, backed by the rank and file in every category, worked out a formula and application which have been described in social service circles as a great accomplishment. Not one cent was spent for overhead.

People could give as they chose. The Red Feather fund did not put on a drive. Red Cross received $62,746 in this voluntary response. Early the next morning after the tornado, General Motors gave $100,000 to the Red Feather fund. The International UAW-CIO followed with $50,000, Flint locals gave $50,000 and $50,000 came from other Michigan locals. GM and the unions agreed to an exception to permit payroll deduction for voluntary contributions from workers. About $200,000 more resulted from this. All was given through the Red Feather disaster fund. Operation Tornado got worldwide note when 7,800 volunteers gave 2 days of labor estimated at $211,000 toward rebuilding 193 of the homes.

Then the audited accounting given the contributors and the general public was unprecedented. The Flint Journal published gratis, a 16-page tabloid section devoted exclusively to this report which listed every case anonymously by number. Included were the casualties suffered, total loss in property, total recovery and the amount of Red Cross, Red Feather and Operation Tornado aid.

Despicably, Mr. Harriman has used this disaster and has smeared Flint's good name in a desperate effort to retard the national development of federated giving. Undoubtedly, it is more than a coincidence that Flint and Michigan have been notable in the successful application of this principle. This plan applies the generally accepted Community Chest idea for local needs, to State and national quotas with contributor representation in the scrutiny of budgets. Flint is a generous city and, since World War II, has contributed $1,176,311 to Red Cross. For awhile Red Cross continued on its own but encountered difficulties. In 1950 it raised only 65 percent of its budget needs. In 1951 it was 64 percent. The local chapter board realistically found a way to participate in the federated drive and was accepted by the Red Feather fund. Therefore, for the last 3 years, Red Cross has been able to meet its full needs including its allotment to the national organization. The 1953 drive produced $179,000 for Red Cross, plus $6,000 for its gamma globulin program. It included $85,245 for national requirements. This latter amount is more than Red Cross itself was able to raise for both local and national needs in 1950. In 1951, the Red Feather fund contributed

$10,000 to Red Cross for Kansas City flood relief without a public solicitation.

Ironically, Mr. Harriman's grip, his distortion of truths to the extent of misstatements, are inspired by the fact that Flint has been able to do so well for Red Cross after financial failures. Flint is one of the Nation's strongest arguments for the federated giving which he seeks to obstruct.

His slander of this community is a disservice to the organization he heads. Red Cross has suffered from prejudiced and inaccurate reports but Mr. Harriman makes criticism of Red Cross more effective by his own excesses.

Flint resents this cruel and unwarranted attack.

Red Cross Charges Completely Unfounded

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KIT CLARDY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 21, 1954

Mr. CLARDY. Mr. Speaker, while in Seattle on Un-American Activities Committee hearings I was shocked beyond measure by the remarks of Mr. Harriman, chairman of the American Red Cross, in his attack upon the people of the city of Flint, Mich. The utterly false statements he made as a premise for his unwarranted conclusion that Flint was not living up to its obligation are unworthy of one occupying such a position. I completely subscribed to the editorial comment in the Flint Journal for Wednesday, June 16, 1954, which reads:

Red Cross Charges Completely Unfounded—Tornado Talk Ignores Fact

E. Roland Harriman, chairman of the American Red Cross, apparently is a man who does not let the facts interfere with his fictions.

Monday he said in Los Angeles that the Red Cross is tired of helping disaster-stricken communities which recognize no obligation to the Red Cross in return, and he named Flint as such a community.

"In Flint, Mich., when the tornado hit," he said, "Red Cross immediately moved in to meet the needs of the sufferers. We spent nearly $600,000 contributed by all the country. Meanwhile a committee in Flint solicited funds and received over $900,000. Not one cent of this was turned over to Red Cross to meet needs.

"On the contrary," he continued, "after Red Cross finished its job, all that money was distributed to people over and above what they had received from Red Cross—irrespective of whether they could have taken care of themselves from then on in whole or in part. Communities that don't help themselves in the total responsibility of a disaster can scarcely expect in the future to be recipients of nationwide generosity."

So much for Mr. Harriman's fictions. Now let's look at the facts. Conspicuous by its absence from his statement is any mention of the fact that for many, many years Flint people have been contributing generously to the Red Cross. Since World War II, Flint and Genesee County residents have given the Red Cross $1,176,311, of which about half was forwarded to Washington, D. C., for national Red Cross activities, including disaster relief. Some $450,000 of that amount was raised as part of the last three red feather campaigns, in which the Red Cross participated and benefited.

That is only since World War II ended—less than 10 years. The Red Cross conducted campaigns here, as elsewhere, for many years prior to that. And Flint's response to those campaigns was always generous.

And in 1951, when the Red Cross quota here was $23,320 in a drive for funds to help flood victims in Kansas, our red feather fund contributed $10,000 to the Red Cross. That, of course, was in addition to individual contributions.

Most people will agree with Postmaster Osmund Kelly who said Tuesday, "A man who has paid up his fire-insurance premiums doesn't expect to have to pay to rebuild his house when fire strikes."

Flint's premiums to the Red Cross are more than paid up.

Conspicuous also by its absence from Harriman's charge is any mention of the fact that the federated system of giving; which we in Flint call the Red Feather fund has enabled the Red Cross to collect more money here than it did before it became a Red Feather agency. Prior to its joining the Red Feather fund, it was not meeting its quotas here—simply because Flint people believed it should be affiliated with the Red Feather.

Completely erroneous is his allegation that the Red Feather disaster fund solicited funds for tornado relief here last year. The fact is, contributions started pouring into Flint for tornado relief before the disaster fund was even conceived. It was organized in response to a need for a responsible agency to handle these contributions—not as a means of soliciting them.

Ignored by the Red Cross national chairman is the fact that the great majority of contributions for tornado relief here were not made through the Red Cross at all. Hundreds of checks were made out to this newspaper, or simply "For Tornado Victims," or were sent in care of the mayor and other officials with a note designating that the contributions be used for victims of our twister. Those that were made out to the Red Cross were carefully sorted out and forwarded to that organization. Almost $63,000 thus received found its way into Red Cross coffers.

He also neglected to point out that of the hundreds of thousands of dollars handled by the Red Feather disaster fund, not one cent went to pay overhead. All of it went for the purpose it was intended—to help victims of the tornado recover in some measure the staggering losses they had suffered.

There was a complete accounting by Red Feather disaster fund administrators of every penny received. It revealed that the recovery of material loss suffered by storm victims exceeded 70 percent. That included all the help they received—Red Cross, Red Feather, Operation Tornado, insurance, and so on. And in addition, the Red Feather set up a trust fund for children who were orphaned in the disaster.

Red Cross' own rules limit the aid it can give, and include various inequities which it feels are unavoidable. For instance, in disaster cases it takes into consideration the amount of money a person may have in a savings account and reduces the help it renders accordingly. It helps on the basis of need. That is all right, of course, but the Red Feather disaster fund policy was to help restore victims beyond their basic needs, and to return them to their predisaster status, to the degree that it was possible. Rather than need, it operated from the standpoint of loss.

The official minutes of meetings between Red Cross representatives and Red Feather officials here reveal just how far Mr. Harriman was caught off base. A statement said that locally raised funds "will augment those moneys allocated by the American National Red Cross for the relief and rehabilitation of tornado victims." And minutes of a June 10 meeting disclose that the assistant director of the National Red Cross disaster committee said Red Cross money would be distributed here with "no strings attached to their help."

It would appear that Mr. Harriman is trying to attach strings now.

And that is a strange attitude in view of how voluble the Red Cross was in expressing its appreciation of publicity given its work here.

Flint was, and is, grateful to the Red Cross for the speedy and invaluable help it rendered in the wake of the tornado. But the characterization of this city as ungrateful or unwilling to help itself is a plain lie. Or else he simply doesn't know what he is talking about.

How, it can be wondered, does he think Flint earned its All-American title which was bestowed on it by outside and impartial observers for the outstanding job of tornado rehabilitation done here?

For the Benefit of a Comparative Few

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DOUGLAS R. STRINGFELLOW

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 21, 1954

Mr. STRINGFELLOW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Salt Lake Tribune entitled "For the Benefit of a Comparative Few," dated June 14, 1954:

For the Benefit of a Comparative Few

"Afghanistanism" in newspaper parlance applies generally to the custom of writing about Afghanistan or some other distant country or subject. "Afghanistanism" appeals to some editorial writers because they get involved in no local controversies by discussing the sad state of affairs in Afghanistan.

Echo Park, Colo., is supplanting Afghanistan in some editorial offices and the farther some editors live from the Colorado River system the more authority they assume and the stronger language they employ. And, judging from the clippings we receive, nothing alarms an armchair wilderness enthusiast more than the thought of a hunk of concrete in a remote canyon.

Take the case of the associate editor of the Columbia South Carolina State, who is, incidentally, also president of the South Carolina Wildlife Federation. Editorials in his newspaper follow the line of certain spokesmen for lower Colorado River Basin water interests who stand to benefit if the upper Colorado Basin project does not materialize.

"We have seen numerous photographs taken from the rim of the canyons (of Dinosaur National Monument)" and "an employee of the State has visited the park as one of the 23,500 who did so during the past year," say an editorial in South Carolina's largest newspaper.

"For that matter," the editorial continues, "the wilderness of the area is one reason certain people want it preserved as it is. If a fraction of the proposed $21 million were spent on rough roads it would be made available to many more without despoiling its scenic splendor."

Since the Yampa River meanders 44 miles through Dinosaur monument and the Green River winds through about 46 miles of park country, one hardly gets a very complete picture from separated points along the irregular canyon rims. Several rough access roads already serve a limited number of places along the canyons but it would be difficult and incredibly expensive to hack out roads in the solid rock walls sufficiently long to get a representative view of the vast, rugged country.

Only a tiny fraction of the 23,500 listed as having visited Dinosaur Monument last year went down the canyons. Doubtless most of the visitors saw only the section of the park near Vernal, site of the original 80-acre dinosaur graveyard. This is a fine attraction, but visitors of this area have little conception of the remaining 200,000 acres of mixed grandeur and desolation. It might be compared to basing a tour of Yellowstone Park on a visit to West Thumb.

The editorial continues: "The Plains States were deserts when they were settled and the settlers and their descendants went there and stayed there with their eyes open and should not feel that the general public owes them a living by sacrificing a national public property for the benefit of a comparable few."

Doubtless the editor means the Mountain States since he is discussing Echo Park. The settlers came here with their eyes open and nobody is asking the general public for a living. Despite false propaganda to the contrary, reclamation projects are self-liquidating and proceeds from the sale of water and power reimburse the Federal Treasury for its investment in them. And the increased wealth of a region is reflected throughout the country.

Since South Carolina has more than 1,700 miles of Atlantic seacoast and some navigable rivers, it is safe to presume that it has benefited on occasion from various Federal rivers and harbors projects as well as other programs. And we venture to guess that the Federal Treasury is not reimbursed on any formula comparable to that of a reclamation project.

As to sacrificing a national property for the benefit of a relatively few the South Carolina State is again parroting some false propaganda. We cordially invite its editor to take the standard 100-mile boat trip through Dinosaur National Monument. (Hurry because the water is getting so low in the Yampa it soon may not be possible this season) and see the scenery about when he writes, enjoy the great outdoors, minus any modern conveniences; ride the rapids and help lift the boat off the rocks and sandbars and then reflect on the changes that Echo Park Dam would bring. One difference would be many more boats in the canyons which would be safe for amateurs, good fishing, and comfort facilities. The Yampa and Green River canyons are now being seen by relatively few adventurous or affluent persons. They could be opened to hundreds of thousands each season by building the proposed upper Colorado dams, meantime facilitating industrial and agricultural development of the region.

On Colonialism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 17, 1954

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, our country faces the grave dilemma of its desire, in accordance with its honored traditions, to see people have self-government and independence and at the same time being concerned that those in the initial stages of developing their free institutions may be infiltrated or subjugated by the Communists. It is very important that we understand the answer to this problem and our responsibilities in respect of meeting it. The emphasis on the economic development of the free world, a point which I have repeatedly made in the Congress, is a fundamental answer to the problems of reconciling the self-government and independence of formerly non-self-governing peoples with the dangers to them and the free world inherent in communism. There is appended the excellent analysis on this subject by Walter Lippmann entitled "On Colonialism."

TODAY AND TOMORROW

(By Walter Lippmann)

ON COLONIALISM

Recently I have been reading a speech, which was delivered in New York in January, by Mr. Moekarto, the Ambassador from Indonesia. Mr. Moekarto made plainer—than I have seen it done elsewhere—what is at the bottom of the charge of "colonialism" which is brought against us not only in Southeast Asia, but also in so many countries of Latin America.

Though Mr. Moekarto did not say it in so many words, the essential idea implicit in what he said, is that colonialism does not end with the grant of political independence. As long as the economic life of the newly independent state is dependent upon the export of a few primary commodities, it will feel itself in a colonial relationship with the industrialized nations to which it exports its primary products. This is the main reason why countries which are no longer political colonies of any of the Western empires which have no reason to fear and do not as a matter of fact fear any scheme of reconquest, do nevertheless continue to agitate the issue of colonialism.

It also explains why we have become the pricipal object of this anticolonial agitation. As we are the largest industrial power and therefore the greatest user of primary products, the ups and downs of our business cycle, the fluctuations of our commercial transactions and most importantly the character of our trade policy, have enormous impact upon the countries which have a "colonial" economy. Their standard of living, their prospects of development, their very political stability is affected by this relationship. A change in the United States tariff, quota, or stockpiling policy can upset completely the economy of many of the underdeveloped countries. American imports of tin and rubber are vital for Indonesia, as is oil for Venezuela, tuna fish for Peru and tin for Bolivia, to cite a few examples. This dependence causes the grievance of colonialism, a grievance which is aggravated, of course, by the uncouth manners of politicians recklessly throwing their weight around.

Mr. Moekarto described the conditions of his country and of the other countries of southeast Asia as being "unstable, uneasy, and a source of increasing social discontent." And he asserted that

"The emphasis of the Western Powers has been on achieving a military balance of power. They have neglected the even more basic problem of the economic balance of power with respect to southeast Asia. The danger stems from a number of factors. First is a psychological one—the achievement of substantial progress in Communist countries cannot fail to exercise powerful attraction on underdeveloped countries whose rate of progress has not been so rapid. In the second place, a nation which has no sound economic base is vulnerable both politically and militarily because it cannot retain the loyalty of its population when it does not satisfy their basic needs and their aspirations for the future. The consequence of this economic imbalance is to create pressures which may tend to attract underdeveloped countries toward a system which in a similar stage of development, has apparently succeeded in some degree in meeting the problems which they have not begun to solve."

The Indonesian ambassador illustrated his argument by pointing out that his country is dependent upon a few major exports, principally tin and rubber. They account for approximately two-thirds of its earnings in foreign exchange and for its imports of capital and consumer goods. He then pointed out that the price of tin and rubber in the past 3 years has varied more than 250 and 300 percent respectively.

The feeling of dependence upon fluctuating prices which are fixed in foreign markets, of being the helpless object of violent changes, is painful in itself and is difficult to reconcile with a sense of national independence. Indonesia, like all other countries which have ceased to be political colonies, wishes also to cease to be an economic colony. How is that to be done? In the long run, only by "a greater diversification of the bases of their economic viability." This will tend to make them less vulnerable to the violent ups and downs in world prices.

But diversification requires capital investment. And capital for investment depends on the dollars and the sterling that can be earned by the export of these violently fluctuating primary products. "It is impossible," said Mr. Moekarto, "to execute or even plan continuous development programs without being assured of a steady flow of our most important resource of finances: foreign trade earnings."

Mr. Moekarto was speaking several months before Mr. Dulles made his celebrated call for united action in southeast Asia. Mr. Moekarto called for "common action" in southeast Asia which would be designed "to act on the vital problem of international stability as it concerns the commodity trade as a whole."

Needless to say, this problem is not confined to southeast Asia. The relation between the developed and the undeveloped regions of the world is usually an uneasy one and it is the basic problem of inter-American affairs. The Latin American countries have had their political independence for more than a century. But there is much unrest among them. There is a mounting sense of grievance directed in some considerable measure at the same kind of thing which the Indonesian Ambassador complained about. It does not solve the problem but it clarifies it somewhat for us to remember that the same essential problem exists within the United States, and that it is to the solution of this problem that our agricultural parity price system is addressed.

What Mr. Moekarto hopes for, what many of our American neighbors are asking, is in effect that we engage in the attempt to apply on a world scale something like our own internal agricultural stabilization system. But to Americans, who know about our own farm problems, the mountainous difficulty of an international scheme is obvious enough. For any plan which attempts to support prices over periods of time at an artificially high level, out of line with the long-term trend of supply and demand, will not only inevitably break down but will interfere with economic growth and development itself.

Although commodity-price agreements no doubt have their place in any program of stabilization and economic development, I doubt if there is any automatic formula of price guaranties, appealing as it is, which can give these countries what they really want. We must, however, provide some effective alternative, which will offer a reasonable hope of social and economic progress of security, and above all of self-respect. The negative and piecemeal approach which the United States and the other industrialized countries are now using is not good enough. Nor can we afford to postpone or ignore the question on the ground that the military cost of the cold war is so high that we cannot afford much else. It would be truer to say that we cannot afford not to offer convincing proof that we are willing to join in dealing with the problem.

In passing, but nevertheless significantly, Mr. Moekarto had this to say in connection with the slow economic development of southeast Asia: "Even more important for our part of the world is the fact that according to a recent survey of ECAFE, the economic progress of another underdeveloped area, namely China, has made very substantial advances since the achievement of power by Mao Tse-tung."

This is an ominous remark, which I have learned to appreciate only after I had been to southern Asia a few years ago. It is that the principal attraction of communism in Asia is the belief—based upon what has happened in Russia since 1917—that a Communist totalitarian dictatorship is the short-cut, that it is the quickest way, to the development of underdeveloped countries. The rise of Russia from impotence and defeat in 1917 to being the greatest power in the Eurasian Continent, all accomplished within one generation, is what impresses Asia. The report that China is also being developed—more ruthlessly but nevertheless faster than Indonesia—has impressed the Indonesian Ambassador.

The challenge that we shall have to meet is to convince the uncommitted nations of Asia that they can develop out of their primitive condition and their colonialism without submitting to the despotism by which the Communists make a forced development of backward countries.

Editorial Comment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JEFFREY P. HILLELSON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 21, 1954

Mr. HILLELSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following editorial from the Thursday, June 10, 1954, edition of the Kansas City Star, Kansas City, Mo.:

LABOR POWER ABUSED

We can't imagine that the American public is ready to let any individual or group exercise the power to cripple the business of a great city.

The St. Louis Federal grand jury's interim report gives a bald picture of such power used by a few demanding labor leaders. It has been used to the shocking extreme of actually driving businesses out of the St. Louis area, according to the jury.

From the public's standpoint one answer to abuse of power is law enforcement. For many months St. Louis has had its grand jury investigations followed in some cases by court action.

Leaders of several unions have been involved in the racketeering and bulldozing activities that led to a showdown with Federal law enforcement in St. Louis. But grand juries are only part of the answer.

The kind of pressures that discourage business may come within the scope of present laws, or they may not. The end result is the same in either case.

The St. Louis grand jury report rings a familiar bell for Kansas Citians with the special attention given the leadership of a powerful teamsters' local. The teamsters' leadership was largely responsible for the construction shutdown of last summer which was the worst in Kansas City history. Although the current situaion is much improved the demonstration of ruthlessness hurt Kansas City's reputation for good labor relations. Business heads consider the labor situation when they are considering the location of a new plant.

When labor leaders discourage business they reduce the job opportunities for the union members who pay their salaries through dues. We have seen little evidence of concern for the wage earners in the activities reported by St. Louis grand juries. There was little concern for the men in the teamsters jurisdictional demands that put thousands of men out of work last summer.

Law enforcement is the first essential step. A Kansas City grand jury, now in recess, is looking into evidence of law violations, past or present. Beyond that the best hope seems to be an aroused public—including union members. If more laws are needed public demand can get them. Anyone who claims the power to cripple a large city has challenged the American people.

Some Democratic Representatives Propose a Democratic Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1954

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, an 18-point legislative program was today advanced by a group of Democratic Congressmen headed by me, and including Representatives Isidore Dollinger, Sidney A. Fine, Louis B. Heller, Arthur G. Klein, and Adam C. Powell, Jr. Covering virtually all phases of domestic and foreign policy, the program was promulgated by the Democratic group because of their deep-seated conviction "that the people of this country cannot accept as responsive to their needs the half hearted endorsement given by the Republican Party to a middle of the fence program culled at random from the preatomic age leftovers of the New Deal, Fair Deal, and NAM."

The group pointed out that the exigencies of the times necessitated a forward-looking legislative agenda to meet fully the responsibilities of Government "in the historic and epochal age in which we live." In view of the tremendous dangers as well as potentialities inherent in the development of nuclear power and atomic energy, the Congressmen felt compelled to set forth an affirmative program to fill the void left by the few legislative recommendations of the administration.

Americans—

They stated—

cannot afford the luxury of a dilatory, equivocating, or lacklustre program lifted piecemeal from the dredges of the past.

Special emphasis was placed upon the need for a vigorous program for the fullest development of military and peacetime uses of nuclear power. The Congressmen advocated amendments to the Atomic Energy Act of 1946 to provide, under proper controls, for the commercial development of atomic energy for peacetime purposes by private industry both at home and abroad.

We have faith—

The group concluded—

that man, given the opportunity to choose freely between a century devoted to repairing the devastation wrought by the atomic bomb upon his cities and populations or one dedicated to exploring cooperatively the great promises held out by the infinite world of the atom must inevitably choose the latter.

The Congressmen included in their program many provisions to reduce barriers to foreign trade including removal of all tariffs on strategic minerals and metals, extension of the reciprocal-trade program with added powers for the President to remove completely tariff barriers on selected items; and repeal of the peril-point provisions of existing law. The group also concluded that "now is the time to expand, not contract, our foreign aid and assistance programs to aid other nations."

Also contained in the program of the Democrats was a National Health Insurance Act providing for compulsory health insurance for all workers to be supported by a combination of joint employer-employee contributions and tax revenues; repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act; a mandatory farm price-support program but with the additional authority to make production payments in addition to commodity loans and purchase agreements similar to the provisions of the Brannan plan; drastic revision of the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act; Federal aid to education; a strong antimonopoly program which would preserve competition throughout the economy and prevent the functions of Government from being subsumed by big business; a full-employment program; the extension of unemployment benefits to Government employees; the establishment of an FEPC; Federal poll tax legislation; and the establishment of a joint committee to investigate subversive activities to replace the multitude of committees now purporting to investigate such activities but which pay greater attention to newspaper headlines than to the propriety of their inquiries and the civil rights of their witnesses.

The Congressmen also expressed their unalterable opposition to giveaway programs, whereby the natural inheritance of the people in the resources of the country are disposed of for exploitation by particular interests. They pledged themselves to resist to the utmost any and all efforts to convey the natural resources of the people of the Nation for private exploitation. They also alined themselves against all moves to weaken the authority of the TVA and affirmed their belief that the Federal Government has the primary responsibility of developing the Nation's river basins on a regional basis to provide for flood control, navigation, irrigation, and hydroelectric power.

The group concluded its program with recommendations for strengthening the

United Nations Organization as an important step toward world peace. The program follows:

Democratic Program of Some Democratic Representatives

Believing sincerely that the American people are desirous of a forward and positive program looking toward a future of economic prosperity at home and peaceful international relations abroad, we as members of the Democratic Party in Congress, have adopted the general principles outlined below and have pledged to devote our united efforts to achieve the objectives stated therein. We have formulated and united upon this legislative agenda because we cannot accept as responsive to the needs of the people of this country the halfhearted endorsement given by the Republican Party to a middle-of-the-fence program culled at random from the preatomic age leftovers of the New Deal, Fair Deal, and NAM. We want to go forward, not backward, and we can see nothing progressive in the Republican Party's begrudging and expedient acceptance of what the Democratic Party stood for more than two decades ago.

It is our earnest conviction that responsible government must today undertake a broad program designed to eliminate insecurity at all levels of our national and international existence. Worldwide tensions must be eased by a program not only devoted to peace but also designed to acknowledge the legitimate aspirations of the many countries abroad who are our friends. At home, the fears of recession must be alleviated so that private investment will continue to expand productive facilities thereby bringing the comforts and necessities of modern civilization to more and more people. The individual and worker must be adequately protected against the ravages of economic readjustments in the economy which occur through no fault of his own. Minimum health standards should be provided for all of our people and not entrusted to the whims of chance. Affirmative strides toward erasing inequility of opportunity must be made to accord with the prescriptions of our constitutional government. Adequate housing must be assured our people not only in the interests of humanity but to eradicate disease, crime, and violence which thrive in slum laden areas.

Above all, we must emphasize a program consonant with not only the new problems but the vast new resources as well which will become available to us in the forthcoming atomic era. It is essential that we bend all our efforts to prevent mankind from unleashing the destructive forces of atomic power upon himself and condemning civilization to return to the Dark Ages. But equally important is it to harness the atom to its fullest peacetime uses so that the fruits of this tremendous new source of energy may be enjoyed to their utmost. We have faith that man, given the opportunity to choose freely between a century devoted to repairing the devastation wrought by atomic weapons upon his cities and populations or one dedicated to exploring cooperatively the great promises held out by the infinite world of nuclear power must inevitably choose the latter.

Poised upon the threshold of a new age beset at once with the wondrous possibilities as well as the fearful dangers of atomic energy, Americans cannot afford the luxury of a dilatory, equivocating, or lack-luster program lifted piecemeal out of the dregs of the past. The program set forth below to which we are irrevocably dedicated we feel is one which deserves the respect and support of the Congress and the people. It is one which gives full recognition to the hopes and aspirations of our citizens and places upon the Government the full responsibilities which it must today assume in the historic and epochal age in which we live.

The program is as follows:

I. ATOMIC ENERGY

We believe that the development of atomic energy, both at home and abroad, cannot be entrusted to chance and that a vigorous program for the fullest development of military and peacetime uses of nuclear power must be undertaken immediately.

1. The fullest interchange of confidential atomic data between ourselves and our important allies with respect to atomic weapons and armaments should be immediately undertaken to promote the collective defense of the free world and to assure our own Nation continuing access to latest scientific developments in this field.

2. Open exchange of atomic information of a nonmilitary nature with all nations of the world, either collectively or bilaterally, should be commenced on a continuing basis so that the peacetime development of atomic resources can be promoted as promptly as possible on a worldwide scale.

3. Amendments to the Atomic Energy Act should be enacted to provide for the commercial development of nuclear power in the United States by private enterprise. Adequate safeguards must be included in such legislation, however, to prevent giveaways to favored groups and to protect the interests of the Government. This aspect of atomic development should also contain positive features to assure participation in nuclear development by all segments of American business, small as well as large, and prevent monopoly or undue concentration in the development of atomic industries. Under proper safeguards, the relinquishment of the basic secrets of the atom to the genius of American industry will go far toward hastening the day when the full benefits of nuclear energy will be available to mankind.

4. A large-scale program designed to encourage the development of atomic projects for peacetime industrial uses in friendly foreign nations should be undertaken. Not only should American technical assistance be furnished pursuant to this program, but means should be devised so that underdeveloped nations in particular could obtain the wherewithal for the erection of nuclear power facilities. Encouragement of American investment abroad as well as expansion of the lending powers of agencies of the United Nations are only two methods of obtaining capital funds for such purposes.

II. NATIONAL DEFENSE

We are in favor of a national defense program which will not limit the scope of American military power and which will enable the United States to meet military emergencies ranging from full-scale belligerency to local skirmishes whenever the national interests or the interests of the free world are endangered thereby. We are in favor of altering military policies to coincide with advancing technologies, but at the same time believe that the Nation must also be prepared to meet all military contingencies short of all-out warfare. In such circumstances, it is essential that our defense policies be such as not to precipitate or engender even greater conflicts. Nor dare we sacrifice our national security on any altar of false economy.

III. FOREIGN TRADE

Recognizing how vital is the flow of international trade to the future prosperity of the United States and to the sound rehabilitation of our many allies abroad, we recommend a broad program based upon the general principal of reduction in tariffs and other trade barriers so as to promote the greatest interchange of goods and materials between the United States and other nations of the world.

1. We are in favor of eliminating all anomalies and discriminatory provisions in the tariff schedules which serve no protective purpose whatever and actually redound to the detriment of American industry.

2. Tariffs on all strategic minerals and metals should be removed so as to encourage foreign production and shipments of resources in which this Nation is deficient.

3. The reciprocal-trade agreements program should be extended and broadened so as to give the President power to suspend duties completely when obtaining concessions from other nations. The cumbersome and unnecessary peril-point provision should be repealed and the poorly drafted escape clause should be rewritten so as to clearly define its scope and application.

4. There should be immediate legislative recognition by the Congress of United States participation in GATT (General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade).

5. There should be simplifications of our customs laws in line with the recommendations contained in the report to the President by the Public Advisory Board for Mutual Security in February 1953.

6. We advocate repeal of the buy-American provisions which now encumber our statutes in order to reduce costs of Government expenditures to taxpayers, promote competition and efficiency among Government suppliers, and encourage economic development in friendly foreign nations.

IV. FOREIGN AID AND ASSISTANCE

We must continue our foreign aid and assistance programs to strengthen the economies of our allies to meet the perils of aggression, and to promote higher standards of living throughout the world. These programs should be disassociated completely from military control and directed primarily to the development of the peacetime productive potentials of friendly countries throughout the globe. Burdensome conditions should be stricken from all forms of assistance so as not to permit our actions to be associated with any manner or form of colonialism or imperialism.

1. Technical assistance to foreign nations is an essential element of a forward-looking foreign-aid program. The scientific know-how indigenous to the American free-enterprise system can often be supplied at comparatively small cost when measured by the harvest of goodwill and economic productivity reaped therefrom, particularly in underdeveloped areas. This form of assistance should therefore be stepped up in the future to enable other nations to direct their skills and resources most efficiently by themselves once they have mastered the technological innovations of the 20th century.

2. It is essential that capital funds be obtainable by the free nations of the world, particularly those nations whose resources have lain undeveloped for centuries, so that the standards of living may be raised in these areas and their general economies stabilized. In particular, measures designed to encourage investment of private United States capital should be enacted such as confiscation insurance, tax assistance, and similar stimuli for investment abroad. Then, too, the lending powers of agencies of the United Nations should be expanded to encompass long-term loans for capital development in underdeveloped areas of the world.

3. American surpluses—in agricultural as well as other commodities—should be employed in our foreign-aid programs to raise the standards of living in areas where not even the minimum requirements are available and to obtain needed goods and services from countries who cannot otherwise afford to obtain our goods through dollar purchases.

V. CIVIL RIGHTS

1. We are in favor of immediate enactment of a Fair Employment Practices Act prohibiting discrimination in employment based upon race, color, or creed and containing

comparable provisions prohibiting discrimination in union membership and membership in professional organizations. We further believe that a Commission should be established to administer the act for only in this way can the rights guaranteed by the Constitution be fully assured to all.

2. In the District of Columbia all forms of segregation should be abolished immediately. In addition, legislation should be enacted providing for self-government for District residents, and constitutional amendments should be enacted which would permit residents of the District of Columbia to participate in Presidential elections and obtain representation in the Congress.

3. Congress should enact legislation immediately eliminating the poll tax as a prerequisite to voting for candidates for Federal office.

4. Legislation should be passed strengthening the provisions of the Criminal Code now applicable to violation of the rights of individuals as recommended in the report of President Truman's Committee on Civil Rights.

5. Immediate enactment of House Joint Resolution 259 (CELLER, of New York) to establish a single joint committee to investigate subversive activities to replace the multitude of committees now purporting to investigate such matters but which pay greater attention to newspaper headlines than to the propriety of their inquiry or the civil rights of their witnesses. We recognize the internal Communist threat to our security but do not want to dilute congressional responsibility in this matter by a multiplicity of frequently irresponsible committees.

6. Enactment of legislation which would withdraw tax-exemption privileges from private educational or medical institutions which practice a policy of racial, religious, or color discrimination in employment or admission policies.

7. Amendment of the rules of the House and of the Senate to insure a fair code of procedure on the part of all investigative committees of the Congress. This code, among other things, should afford a witness before a committee the right to counsel, the right of confrontation of witnesses, and a right of rebuttal.

VI. EDUCATION

In an atomic age, it is vitally important that citizens of a democracy be well informed and capable of thinking about complicated issues for themselves. We therefore recommend a program of Federal aids to education which will strengthen the educational facilities of the States at all levels of learning.

1. We are in favor of immediate enactment of the so-called Hill amendment which would dedicate the income from offshore oil resources to educational purposes.

2. We believe in a program of Federal scholarships to qualified students who would otherwise be unable to pursue higher education on the college or graduate level.

3. We are in favor of expanding our program of exchange fellowships with students of foreign nations in conjunction with our foreign-aid program so as to provide technical training and familiarity with American institutions to students of foreign lands and permit the youth of America to become acquainted with the customs and philosophies of nations abroad.

4. There should be established a national university of postgraduate studies by the Congress which would be open on a nonsegregated, tuition free basis to qualified students from all States and Territories of the United States, admission to be based solely upon merit. Special emphasis should be laid upon graduate studies in atomic science, medicine, foreign service, government administration, law, and other fields of particular interest to the Nation.

VII. PUBLIC HEALTH

If we are to maintain a strong nation, sturdy in peace as well as in war, we must launch a full-scale program, with participation by the Federal Government, designed to conserve the most precious natural resource we possess, the health of our people. Toward this end, the following projects should be undertaken.

1. A system of Federal grants to enlarge the educational facilities of private institutions of medicine, dentistry, and nursing.

2. A system of Federal scholarships and loans for the training of doctors, dentists, and nurses to permit entry into these professions of those otherwise qualified who cannot meet the expenses entailed in completing a professional education.

3. Federal appropriations for the erection or enlargement of hospital facilities in areas where inadequate treatment facilities presently exist.

4. Enlargement of the health facilities of the District of Columbia to provide the best medical and mental institutions known to modern science for residents of the District of Columbia, Members of Congress, and others needing specialized treatment or care.

5. Enactment by legislation of a broad program based upon the principle of prepaid health services so as to expand the present coverage of medical insurance to protect against the ravages of illness the rich and poor alike without regard to race, color, or religion. Legislation should take the form of a National Health Insurance Act providing for health insurance for all workers and their families supported by a combination of joint employer-employee contributions and tax revenues.

VIII. SOCIAL SECURITY

1. We are in favor of increasing benefits payable under our old age and survivors insurance program. Furthermore, coverage should be greatly extended and the retirement age for women should be reduced. Benefits should be made available upon reaching retirement age regardless of whether the beneficiary continues to work part or full time.

2. Increased benefits under unemployment insurance programs should be provided for and appropriate allowances made for dependents. Coverage should be greatly extended, particularly to Government employees.

IX. HOUSING

Inadequate housing for our citizens can no longer be justified. Low-cost housing of minimum standards should be available to all on a nonsegregated basis. Prevalence of substandard dwellings and housing units has contributed greatly to the spread of disease and the prevalence of ill health among our populace. Slum areas in the major cities of the United States, including the Nation's Capital, have been the catalyst for the flourishing of vice, delinquency, corruption, and crime. We are therefore in favor of—

1. Carrying out and implementing with appropriations the original intention of Congress as set forth in the Housing Act of 1949, for the erection of 810,000 public housing units on an average of 135,000 units per year. This goal should be expanded in accordance with a reexamination of public housing needs upon the completion of the program, should it appear necessary.

2. Substantial broadening of present authority for Federal grants for slum clearance and redevelopment throughout the country.

3. A slum clearance and redevelopment program for the District of Columbia to eliminate permanently the intolerable living conditions that prevail in the shadow of the Nation's Capitol.

4. Expansion of FHA insurance programs to permit more persons to own their own homes.

X. NATURAL RESOURCES

1. We are unalterably opposed to all giveaway programs whereby the natural inheritance of the people in the resources of the country are disposed of for exploitation by particular interests. We will resist to the utmost future attempts to convey the resources of the people of the Nation to favored private parties whether such resources be in the form of grazing land, offshore lands, national parks, national forests, publicly owned powerplants, or otherwise.

2. We will resist all attempts to weaken the position of the TVA in the national economy and will exert all of our efforts to fight any program to curtail its powers on the ridiculous and far-fetched grounds that it is creeping socialism.

3. We believe the Federal Government has the primary responsibility for developing the Nation's river basins on a regional basis to provide for flood control, navigation, irrigation, and hydroelectric power. Congress should formulate comprehensive programs for national development of our water resources region by region and provide for their execution as soon as possible.

4. The Federal Government should encourage research and development of new sources of raw material for critical national resources. We are in favor of continuation of research by the Government in its pilot plants designed for hydrogenation of coal, which proved so successful until eliminated last year under the administration budget. Research should also continue in converting shale into petroleum. Government research in the use of new sources of raw materials for the production of pulp and paper products such as bagasse, hardwoods, and wheat straw should also be continued.

XI. FULL EMPLOYMENT

We believe that now is the time to formulate programs for the maintenance of full employment during periods of adjustment in the economy rather than waiting until an emergency confronts us. We therefore recommend immediate study by Congress of the problems of full employment and the formulation of standby legislation designed to continue production and employment at optimum levels. Such study should include:

1. Ways and means of employing Government incentives to stimulate private investment in productive facilities with particular emphasis on the role played by taxation in governing policies of private industry respecting capital outlays.

2. Methods of coordinating Government social security, public health, and public welfare so as to obtain their full benefits with respect to stimulating economic activity.

3. A blueprint of public works including highway systems, improvement of national park systems, and development of natural resources to be undertaken upon any substantial decline in the Nation's economic activity.

XII. TAXATION

We believe the tax structure should be amended so as to encourage productivity and the full development of the Nation's economic resources and discourage tendencies toward monopoly. At the same time, loopholes granting special privileges to selected groups should be stricken. Preferences for tax relief should be granted to those in lower-income brackets if preferences are to be made. Gradual reductions in excise taxes as well as raising the personal-exemption rate are essential before reduction in corporate levies or granting special favors to wealthy stockholders.

XIII. ANTIMONOPOLY PROGRAM

We are in favor of a strong antimonopoly program which would preserve competition throughout the economy and prevent the functions of Government from being subsumed by big business interests. The antitrust laws should be strengthened by eliminating exemptions which have crept into the law either through statute or judicial decision or administrative ruling. Thorough studies of the competitive structure of the economy, industry by industry, should be undertaken by the Congress so that we may learn of the present framework in which the antitrust laws must operate. We are sympathetic to the need of clarification of the antitrust laws in certain areas, but such clarification must occur only upon ascertaining all the relevant economic data and must be undertaken with enlightenment, not repeal, as the true objective. Realistic enforcement of the antitrust laws must continue without letup and adequate appropriations for antitrust administration must be assured by the Congress. Administrative agencies should be directed to conduct continuing studies in the field of antitrust both as to the effect of past decrees and decisions upon industry as well as to the impact of recent enactments by Congress in the antitrust field upon our competitive system.

XIV. LABOR

We advocate repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act and the enactment of a fair and equitable law governing the relations between unions, between workers and employers, and between workers and the Government. Patchwork amendments to the Taft-Hartley Act cannot be a substitute for complete revision of the law in the light of a thorough study of how the act has worked in practice.

XV. TERRITORIES OF THE UNITED STATES

We place the rights of those persons living in Hawaii and Alaska above all thoughts of partisan politics. In justice to the loyal residents of these Territories, it is only fair that both of these areas be admitted to the Union with all the rights and privileges of sovereign States, including representation in the House and in the Senate.

XVI. IMMIGRATION

We are in favor of substantial revision of the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act so that our immigration laws by which we stand in judgment before the peoples of all the world can be administered on a fair and nondiscriminatory basis. Among other things—

1. The national origins quota system should be removed so that admission to this country can be equally open to all qualified persons without regard to national origin, race, or creed.

2. Admissions should equal about 250,000 per annum and should recognize our needs for skills in our industry as well as union of families.

3. Hearings in deportation cases should be made to conform to the salutary provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act.

4. Sections of the law relating to admissions and deportations should be amended so as to remove all harsh and discriminatory features.

5. Discriminations in the law between naturalized and native-born citizens should be eliminated. There should be no so-called second-class citizens.

XVII. AGRICULTURE

1. We will oppose any and all attempts to weaken the rural electrification program so successfully operated under previous Democratic administrations.

2. We will oppose efforts to weaken the Soil Conservation Service as a vital Government adjunct to American agriculture, and we will support a vigorous soil conservation program.

3. We believe the problem of agricultural surpluses must be dealt with realistically, and are therefore in favor of mandatory price supports. We believe, however, that a system of production payments in addition to commodity loans and purchase agreements be authorized to sustain price-support levels.

4. We realize that, on a worldwide basis, there is no such thing as an agricultural surplus. We believe that the United States Government should therefore utilize domestic surpluses to ease famine and starvation conditions in underdeveloped areas abroad wherever possible. In so doing our Government should cooperate with the agencies of the United Nations.

XVIII. UNITED NATIONS

We believe that world peace can be achieved if all nations are willing to cooperate through an international organization. We will give our full support to participation by this Government in the United Nations and are in favor of studies to determine in what ways this international organization may be strengthened, so as to promote collective security, assist in the political and economic development of all nations, and serve as a means of easing international tensions through cooperation by all governments.

Trade Not Aid—International Travel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 17, 1954

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, progress on international travel—the largest single element in trade not aid—is shown by the appended editorial from the Washington Post and Times Herald June 16, 1954:

LESS TRAVEL RED TAPE

One of the fastest growing industries of the postwar world is vacation travel. As a result of improved means of transportation and more money in average pocketbooks, it has widened from a carriage trade to a mass consumption enterprise. This has great economic as well as cultural significance. For example, tourism is one of the biggest businesses in France and Italy and materially helps in maintaining the economies of these countries.

Laws—in this case customs regulations—are slowly beginning to catch up with this new fact of life. A basic step along this line was the adoption of two conventions by the recent international conference on tourism called by the United Nations. These, when ratified by the participating states, will smooth to some extent the path of the traveler abroad. Many countries already offer the proposed facilities—and even more liberal ones—but these would bring the less generous nations into line. They also would make a start on a standardized system of regulations so that tourists eventually would not be faced with different lists of perplexing formalities at every frontier.

One convention makes it somewhat easier for a traveler to take his car with him when he visits a foreign country. The other lists certain basic items, such as clothing, sports, photographic equipment and personal possessions, each state would permit a tourist to bring in without charge. The United States and more than a score of other countries participating in the conference signed the conventions, which will come into effect 90 days after 15 states ratify. Prompt action on this by Congress would not only give encouragement to the general effort to simplify world travel, but would serve self-interest as well. For Americans comprise the greatest number of globetrotters, and are increasingly turning from Europe's beaten paths to less charted ones in remoter areas.

What Is Wrong With GATT?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 21, 1954

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to call attention to an address by Mr. O. R. Strackbein, chairman of the Nation-Wide Committee of Industry, Agriculture, and Labor on Import-Export Policy, delivered at the annual convention of the American Flint Glass Workers Union, Chicago, Ill., June 15, 1954.

Mr. Strackbein handled this very complex matter in an informative manner, and makes clear the inability of the Congress to function in a normal and constitutional way so long as this illegitimate international agreement exists.

The address follows:

WHAT IS WRONG WITH GATT?

(Address of O. R. Strackbein)

I hope that this title is not too obscure. Some of you have heard of GATT but not all of you, I am sure.

What does GATT stand for? The letters "GATT" only represent the initials of the general agreement on tariffs and trade, but it will be the principal purpose of this address to elucidate what the organization stands for.

The general agreement on tariffs and trade was signed in Geneva, Switzerland, on October 30, 1947. It went into effect in January 1948. Thus it has been with us nearly 6½ years, but it is doubtful that one person out of a thousand in this country knows what it is or what it means.

The trade agreements program itself was enacted in 1934. Under it the President was authorized to enter into trade agreements for the reduction of tariffs. Before GATT this country had signed individual trade agreements with 29 countries. This was from 1934 to 1948. They were all bilateral agreements.

Under the Trade Agreements Act of 1934 the President was authorized to lower or to increase duties by as much as 50 percent. Actually all duty changes made in the trade agreements were tariff reductions. Later the President was empowered to reduce the rates another 50 percent from the rates that were in effect on January 1, 1945. If a rate had already been reduced 50 percent a further 50-percent reduction could be made and the two combined would amount to a total cut of 75 percent. In a considerable number of cases the double reductions have been made.

The bilateral system, i. e., the system of making agreements with 1 country at a time and followed before 1947, was, however, too slow to satisfy the State Department zealots. They wanted to move as rapidly as possible toward free trade. That is why GATT was hatched. Some 22 countries came to Geneva in April 1947 and by the end of October the agreement was signed.

How did it differ from the bilateral agreements previously made?

For one thing, it was much more ambitious and reflected the new thinking in the State Department at that time. That Department had become highly impatient over mere tariff reductions and removal of trade barriers. It wanted to set up a system of world economic planning and set into motion a plan that was designed to bring it about. It was called

"Proposals for the Expansion of World Trade and Employment," and made its appearance in December 1945.

These proposals were the subject of several international conferences and soon took the form of a proposed charter for an International Trade Organization. After 4 conferences the final charter was signed in Habana, Cuba, on March 24, 1948, by fifty-odd countries, including the United States. This country, although doing from 15 percent to 20 percent of the world's trade, was to have 1 vote.

It will help to keep these dates in mind. The State Department's proposal for the expansion of world trade and employment was issued in December 1945; but it was March 1948 before the resulting charter of the ITO was signed.

In the meantime, we entered into GATT, the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, i. e., in October 1947, or several months before the ITO Charter was signed.

The degree of impatience of the State Department enthusiasts may be judged from the fact that several of the general provisions of the ITO Charter were incorporated in GATT, even though the Trade Agreements Act, under which GATT was negotiated, did not authorize the President to make such a broad agreement, but merely to reduce or raise tariffs.

The idea, clearly expressed in hearings before the Senate Finance Committee in 1947, was that GATT would be absorbed by ITO when the latter went into effect.

Now, here is the significant point. The State Department admitted that the ITO Charter would and should be submitted to Congress for ratification. Once ratified it would swallow up GATT. In other words, GATT was looked upon as a temporary or interim arrangement pending ratification of ITO. No one therefore bothered much about the need of ratification of GATT before it would take effect. Yet GATT carried a number of provisions, as already said, that carried it far beyond the President's authority under the Trade Agreements Act.

These provisions related to internal taxation, dumping, and countervailing duties, valuation for customs purposes, marks of origin, quantitative import restrictions (quotas), balance-of-payments restrictions, most-favored-nation clause, subsidies, governmental assistance to economic development and reconstruction. The act of 1934, the source of authority, did not mention these matters.

How, then, did they get into GATT? Where was the authority for them? The agreement with respect to these subjects conflicted with a number of our existing laws. GATT was purely an executive agreement. It was not entered into as a treaty.

The only answer is that the State Department took very lightly the responsibilities of Congress under the Constitution to regulate our foreign commerce. Mere constitutional questions were brushed aside. The world economic planners were in a hurry.

But there was a slip 'twixt the cup and the lip. The ITO Charter was sent to Congress for ratification and never advanced beyond the House Committee on Foreign Affairs. There it died in 1950 and at the end of the year the President withdrew the charter from Congress.

What now about GATT that was to be absorbed by the ITO when the latter was ratified? GATT, so far as this country is concerned, stood naked before the world as an illegitimate offspring of State Department impatience and zeal. In spite of its unhappy state it has never been brought before Congress for ratification and therefore has not been legitimized.

Obviously when the ITO charter failed of ratification, GATT should have been brought before Congress, but this has not been done to this day. On the contrary, GATT has continued to operate as if nothing untoward had happened to its foster parent, the ITO. No doubt GATT's backers hope by a species of squatter's rights to establish it permanently without benefit of congressional ratification.

GATT has accordingly been placed in effect only "provisionally," the hope being that those of our laws that conflict with it will be changed piecemeal. One such attempt was made in the so-called customs simplification bill. Among its many provisions were secreted a half dozen that, having little or nothing to do with the simplification of Customs administration, would have adapted our laws to conform to certain GATT provisions. This concealed play was, however, frustrated. Now there is a universal copyright treaty that has another conforming provision in it.

The upshot is that GATT, far from shrinking modestly under its status of illegitimacy has made bold to review sovereign acts of the United States.

GATT's presumptions in reviewing official acts of the United States are disavowed by the State Department which maintains that only the "right of consultation" has been conferred on GATT. I will leave to you the difference between review and the "right of consultation" after citing two cases.

The first principal action of review taken by GATT was in the fur-felt hat case in 1950–51. The United States Tariff Commission under an escape-clause action recommended to the President the withdrawal of a tariff concession that we had granted under GATT. The consession had been negotiated with Czechoslovakia, the only iron-curtain country that is a member of GATT. The President proclaimed the restored rates in question as he was authorized to do.

In accordance with GATT procedure, however, the Department of State notified GATT of our action. Czechoslovakia protested. Thereupon GATT at its next meeting appointed a working party to determine the facts in the case and to make a finding. In a long detailed report the working party found that we had not violated the provisions of the general agreement (GATT). The question was put to a vote of the contracting parties, and the position of the United States was sustained. We accepted the results.

The second important GATT action in this field also occurred in 1951. It arose from a provision in the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951 which directed the President "as soon as practicable" to abrogate our concession under the trade-agreements program to all Communist-controlled countries. The Department of State complied expeditiously with respect to all the Communist-controlled countries except Czechoslovakia. Here there was an impediment. Czechoslovakia was a member of GATT and the United States was not free without violating the provisions of the general agreement simply to notify Czechoslovakia of our abrogation.

Once more, in conformity with the provisions of GATT, our Department of State notified the Secretariat of that organization of our proposal, although there is no known statute that authorized the setting up of such an organization. The question was debated by GATT. The outcome was once more favorable to our position and we were declared justified in withdrawing our agreement with Czechoslovakia.

These actions have been explained quite disingeniously by the Department of State as representing only the right of consultation and in no wise as embodying a power of review. That such a distinction is mere hair-splitting may be concluded from that Department's own explanation. In a letter from Assistant Secretary of State Jack K. McFall, to Representative Robert T. Secrest, dated February 19, 1952, Mr. McFall in commenting on the Czech case said:

"It must be emphasized that the parties to the agreement cannot overrule acts of Congress or the Executive."

Then he says the parties do have the right to consult. Later he continues:

"To have ignored these undertakings (consultation procedures) would have given the Soviet bloc a strong propaganda theme against the United States.

* * * * *

"The working party (which had been appointed by GATT at the instance of Czechoslovakia to review the actions of the United States) found that there was no conclusive evidence that other action taken by the United States Government under article XIX constituted a breach of its obligations under the general agreement (matter in parentheses added).

* * * * *

"The blow to our allies," he went on, "would not be economic alone. In other countries, the inconsistency of giving with one hand * * * while taking away with the other would raise fundamental doubts regarding the basis of our leadership in the free world."

Here are exposed the compulsions or sanctions that reside in the innocent right to consult. The process of consultation is not generally understood as including the authority of passing on the validity of an action by a poll of delegates; nor does it ordinarily involve a decision that an obligation has or has not been breached. Having thus accepted the GATT vote in those instances in which GATT sustained us, it would, indeed, be an act of bad faith to reject a finding and decision if they went against us.

Of such stuff is the usurpation of power made. By a species of innocence in procedures, precedents are created which, in time, create strong moral and practical political commitments. The State Department's strenuous denials to the contrary notwithstanding, GATT has moved into a position of reviewing de facto acts of our Congress no less than actions of the President. If this continues unchallenged or unchanged such de facto practices will become solidly established and our Constitution will have been bypassed effectively by an executive agreement.

In the most recent GATT action, taken on October 13, 1953, the contracting parties, sitting in Geneva, adopted a resolution authorizing the Netherlands to suspend certain obligations that it had contracted with the United States in a trade agreement. This was by way of compensating Holland for our imposition under an act of Congress of certain import quotas on dairy products, some of which are imported from that country. Our own action in establishing these quotas had been taken under the authority of section 104 of the Defense Production Act. This was held by GATT to be in violation of one of its provisions, a decision assented to by our representatives after first promising to try but later failing to obtain United States withdrawal of the quotas.

All these actions were taken in a field where Congress had conferred no powers upon the Executive except to enter into trade agreements for the raising or lowering of tariffs. The Department of State, however, wishing to give impetus to its own trade philosophy no less than its grasp of power, has consistently abetted foreign protests. Not only is Congress thus bypassed; the State Department, to the exclusion of all others, represents the United States in such disputes before GATT, without consulting American producers about the facts or about their views. This is statism, pure and simple.

By contrast, our adherence to the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, better known as the World Bank; the International Court of Justice, better known as the World Court; the International Labor Organization and the United Nations, was preceded in each case by legislative authorization. Not so in the case of GATT.

The United States adherence to GATT has the effect of tying our hands in tariff legislation.

With a few exceptions Congress is not free unilaterally—

1. To put a tariff on an item bound on the free list. Numerous items have been thus bound;

2. To increase a tariff on any item on which the rate has been bound at the existing level. Many such bindings have been made;

3. To raise a rate that was reduced in a trade agreement negotiated under GATT (i. e., in the Geneva, Annecy, or Torquay conferences) or in any bilateral agreement superseded by GATT;

4. To place an import quota on any industrial item (as distinguished from agricultural items) unless this country should come into balance of payments difficulties or should seek to conserve an exhaustible natural resources by also restricting domestic production or consumption of the article;

5. To place an import quota on any agricultural or fisheries item that is not the subject of a governmental program designed to restrict domestic production or marketing of the same item or to remove a temporary surplus.

Aside from the exceptions on agricultural products, other exceptions generally do not apply to the United States.

The duty on most items has been reduced. With respect to them the only remedy lies in the escape clause.

Thus the straitjacket into which Uncle Sam has been placed by the simple process of delivering administrative control over the tariff to the State Department is revealed in its completeness.

The need is for a tariff and trade regulation system that will remain responsive to the American people without returning tariff making itself to Congress. This can best be done by delegation of the congressional tariff-making power under appropriate limitations, to an agency of Congress, responsible to Congress alone. Such an agency should, upon application by interested parties or on its own motion, examine the tariff or quota needs of individual industries and make a final determination, subject only to congressional veto and to court review. Such determination should be based upon a careful study of domestic and foreign competitive conditions, including wages and productivity. The criterion should be fairness of competition rather than some international political gamble.

Because the Department of State is far removed from the realities of production and competition it is not a competent administrator of the tariff. Its vision is not inward toward the farms and factories, mines and fisheries of this country; it is outward toward relations with other countries. The outer field is its bailiwick; not the home grounds. The maintenance of the economy of the country as it is affected by international impacts is one of the reasons for engaging in diplomacy. Diplomacy is not an end in itself to be fed by sacrificial economic offerings.

Maintenance of the domestic market (as far as foreign competition is concerned) in a condition that promotes high employment and therefore a high purchasing power should be the concern of the tariff agency. Success in that effort would automatically assure a maximum of mutually beneficial foreign trade.

Thomas Moore, Ireland's National Poet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 10, 1954

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, the Library of Congress has presently on exhibition manuscripts, early editions, letters, and other material pertaining to the literary activities of Thomas Moore, Ireland's beloved national poet. This exhibit, found on the first floor of the south gallery of the Library, will remain on view through August 31. Appended hereto is an address on this world-acclaimed lyricist by Mr. James McGurrin, president-general of the American Irish Historical Society, delivered at the opening of the Thomas Moore exhibit in the Library of Congress on May 21, 1954:

THOMAS MOORE

In the domain of letters, as in other fields, we occasionally come across great-souled men and women who, taken apart from their artistic acquirements, hold claim to our affections by their vitality and charm, their generosity of spirit, and their abiding love of humanity. Thomas Moore was one of these. Indeed, it is the opinion of his most competent biographers that even if he had never written his imperishable lyrics he would still be remembered as a vivid and compelling personality.

Whether in the home of Lady Blessington singing his own songs before a company of enraptured listeners, representative of the intellectual aristocracy of London, or sitting under a tree in the Vale of Avoca in the midst of a group of schoolchildren, firing their youthful minds with enchanting stories of ancient times when "the harp that once through Tara's Hall the soul of music shed," he was always the same gay, gentle, knightly character whose life's mission was, it would have seemed, to make this old world a little brighter and happier than he found it.

Thomas Moore was not the greatest of Irish poets but he was certainly the most beloved. He did not possess the deep mystical qualities that give unrivaled distinction to the poetry of Yeats. He lacked the flaming passion of James Clarence Mangan, referred to by George Meredith as the greatest of Irish poets. He never achieved the simple, homely perfection that adorned the writings of Oliver Goldsmith; nor did he possess the divine fire which found expression in the noble exhortations of Thomas Davis. As a lyric singer, however, he was the superior of them all.

It is, I think, generally conceded that Moore was one of the great lyric poets of all time. He mastered the pure idea of a song and shaped it with unrivalled technical skill. Having conceived the basic thought he adorned the structure with resplendent garlands and banners and produced a spectacle worthy of a great anniversary celebration or a day of national triumph. I Saw From the Beach and Dear Harp of My Country are songs of this distinctive type. But he achieved something more than the mastery of an idea. To the poets of other lands history furnished inspiration for great themes—themes of military and naval victories, themes of pageantry and the pomp of power, themes of great wealth and the acquisition of territorial possessions. But such luxuries were denied to Moore. For nearly 7 centuries the history of his native land was a tragic, monotonous record of persecution and suffering—one of the darkest pages in all the dreary annals of despotism. No wonder that while reflecting on the hopelessness of his country's plight his thoughts found expression in these plaintive lines:

"Thus freedom now so seldom wakes,
The only throb she gives
Is when some heart indignant breaks
To show that still she lives."

So having no fitting poetic theme in the Ireland of his day he recreated in his poetry the faraway past and revived the glories of other days in such haunting lyrics as Let Erin Remember the Days of Old and the Harp That Once Through Tara's Hall.

Sir Walter Scott once wrote: "There is not in all the world a more beautiful union of thrilling thought and fascinating sound than in the Irish melodies of Thomas Moore." It was Moore himself who said that music is a language more universal than words because it touches depths of feeling that language can never reach. Indeed, it is characteristic of the Irish melodies that the poetry is always in sympathy with the music.

Like Scotland's great national poet, Robert Burns, and in a lesser degree, like our own Longfellow, Moore was satisfied to work on the old eternal themes—the joys, the sorrows, the longings, and the aspirations of the human heart. Moreover, his poems have an almost magical power of associating the mind with incidents and occurrences upon which memory delights to linger. We have a striking example of this in the haunting melody, Oft in the Stilly Night:

"Oft in the stilly night
Ere slumber's chain has bound me,
Fond memory brings the light
Of other days around me;
The smiles the tears
Of boyhood's years,
The words of love then spoken;
The eyes that shone,
Now dimmed and gone,
The cheerful hearts now broken!
Thus in the stilly night,
Ere slumber's chain has bound me,
Sad memory brings the light
Of other days around me.

"When I remember all
The friends, so linked together,
I've seen around me fall
Like leaves in wintry weather,
I feel like one
Who treds alone
Some banquet hall deserted,
Whose lights are fled,
Whose garlands dead,
And all but he departed!
Thus in the stilly night,
Ere slumber's chain has bound me,
Sad memory brings the light
Of other days around me."

With infinite patience Moore assembled the fragments of the old Irish airs, wedded them to his own beautiful words and imparted to them something of the melody of the cadence of the Atlantic as it strikes and moans upon the rock-bound shores of his native land.

It is not surprising that his memory is imperishably enshrined in the affections of Americans of Irish lineage. For we cannot forget that the immigrants who came here from Ireland, more than a century ago, having been driven from the soil that held the hearthstones of their kindred and the ashes of their sires, were comforted in their exile by the songs of Thomas Moore. Wandering through pathless wastes, under burning skies and in the teeth of icy blasts, they sang those songs and as they sang they were able to dream dreams of happier days in this free land, under the protection of American institutions.

I appreciate the honor of participating in this tribute to a gifted poet, a chivalrous gentleman, and a great Irishman. During his lifetime Thomas Moore evoked the admiration of his literary contemporaries by his lofty idealism and impeccable integrity and inspired the affection of his countless friends by his nobility of spirit and the winning sweetness of his personality.

The Oppenheimer Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 10, 1954

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following article by Walter Lippmann which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of June 7, 1954, is worthy of our careful attention:

THE OPPENHEIMER CASE

(By Walter Lippmann)

Immediately after deciding that they do not recommend reinstatement of clearance of Dr. Oppenheimer, Mr. Gray and Mr. Morgan did an extraordinary thing. They impugned the good sense of their own verdict. It seemed to us that an alternative recommendation would be possible, if we were allowed to exercise mature practical judgment, without the rigid circumscription of regulations and criteria established for us? This is, to say the least, a destructive admission: that the majority of the board were not allowed, or thought they were not allowed, to exercise mature practical judgment in a matter of such great consequence. How can they expect their findings to be accepted when they themselves impugn them? How can they expect confidence when they themselves say that they would have made a different recommendation but for the rigid circumscription of regulations and criteria established for us?

So much did they doubt and distrust their own recommendations that they asked the Atomic Energy Commission whether they had to override their own mature practical judgment. The answer they got from the Commission was, they tell us, that they did have to stay within these rigid rules, that they had to overcome what they believed was good sense and that they had to make their verdict fit the rigid regulations and criteria.

What, in their mature practical judgment, was the good sense of this case? It was that Dr. Oppenheimer simply not be used as a consultant. The administration had every right not to use him. The administration had as much right to cease to use Dr. Oppenheimer as a consultant as it had to replace the Chiefs of Staff. Had the administration taken this simple decision, there would, say Messrs. Gray and Morgan, "exist no need for a categorical answer to the difficult question posed by the regulations, since there would be no need for access to classified material" by Dr. Oppenheimer.

What prevented them from doing what they would have preferred to do? The Atomic Energy Commission, presumably speaking through General Nichols, told them that, "without the positive act of withdrawal of access, he (Dr. Oppenheimer) would continue to receive classified reports on atomic energy activities as a consultant, even though his services were not specifically and currently engaged." Moreover, other agencies of the Government would have gone on giving him classified information, and he might have been used by the Atomic Energy contractors.

Messrs. Gray and Morgan do not sound as if they were enthusiastically convinced by this explanation. And how could they be? For it takes the nonsensical view that the administration is incapable of doing what it wishes to do because it is tangled up in its own red tape. If the administration wanted Dr. Oppenheimer to retire from the whole field, where there is classified information, there were any number of ways of achieving that result. It is simply idiotic to argue that some other agency of the Government might have been employing him as a consultant even if the Atomic Energy Commission had ceased to employ him. How many agencies of the Government are there which could employ Dr. Oppenheimer, and which have to do with classified information? Are not all the agencies in this category on speaking terms with each other? Do they not belong to the same administration?

As a matter of fact, immediately after the story broke that Dr. Oppenheimer was to be investigated, but before the board had held any hearings, Secretary Wilson announced at the Pentagon that the Department of Defense would not use Dr. Oppenheimer as a consultant, regardless of the findings of Mr. Gray's board. Thus, regardless of this investigation, the decision had already in fact been taken not to use him in the Defense Department. In the Atomic Energy Commission he was still a consultant who received classified information. But "during the entire year 1953 * * * his services as a consultant * * * were used * * * for approximately only 2½ days." There was no legal obligation to use him at all, and if the administration had exercised its right with firmness and tact, they would not have involved themselves and this country in this inglorious mess.

Mr. Gray and Mr. Morgan should not have participated in the mess. For they knew better. They found, as they tell us themselves, that within the rigid regulations and criteria they were not able to exercise their mature practical judgment. Why, then, did they not make this critical conclusion the substance of their findings? What kind of judgment did they think they were called upon to exercise if it was not their mature practical judgment? Why in honor and decency did they not return the case to General Nichols with a statement of what they really believed; namely, that within the regulations and criteria laid down by the administration, they could not make a finding which made "good sense?"

They were a distinguished board, selected from the outside to deal with a momentous and delicate issue involving in more senses than one the security, the dignity, and the good repute of the country. If the regulations and criteria prohibited a wise and just verdict, why did they feel compelled to behave like timid little bureaucrats in the face of the regulations? It was their right and it was their duty to find what they really believed—which was that the regulations and criteria did not fit the case of Dr. Oppenheimer.

Their effort to make the regulations and criteria fit his very special, his well-nigh unique, case led them into a self-justifying argument which reflects more upon their own embarrassment than upon the merits of the issues.

Dr. Oppenheimer's loyalty had been questioned. They investigated that charge and came to the conclusion that there is "no evidence of disloyalty." Since he was loyal, the next question was whether he is a security risk. What is a security risk? It is a man who, though loyal, might give away secrets because he is a loose talker or because he is subject to blackmail or blandishment. The board found that "it must be said that Dr. Oppenheimer seems to have had a high degree of discretion reflecting an unusual ability to keep to himself vital secrets." He is not, therefore, a security risk. A man with a high degree of discretion, who is loyal, is not a security risk.

What, then, is there against him? That though he is loyal to the United States, though there is no suggestion that he has ever failed to be discreet about secret matters, he was a fellow traveler from 1936 to 1942, he has expressed opinions, and has met and talked with men and helped physicists under circumstances which reflect on his judgment. That is the only real doubt that can be raised against him—how sound is his judgment outside the realm of science where he is a genius and of feeling where he is a poet.

There is doubt about the soundness of his judgment in the affairs of this world, as he himself has testified with such poignancy and grace. There is, so at least it has seemed to me, doubt about his political judgment in such matters as the control of atomic weapons and the strategical implications of atomic warfare. His famous thesis, for example, that the Soviet Union and the United States, each armed with atomic weapons, are like two scorpions in a bottle was, in my opinion a misreading of the true political situation, and has, I believe, misled official and general opinion.

But of course it was an honest error of judgment, assuming it was erroneous, and it has been shared by the great majority of those who have written and talked about the question.

It is not then his loyalty and his being a security risk which are in question but his judgment. That is a relevant consideration in the choice of a consultant at the top level. It is not, however, a matter that can be tested by a trial.

A strong government of adult men would have known how to use a man of Dr. Oppenheimer's genius, discounting his political advice. A weak government, not trusting its own judgment but distrusting his judgment, and fearing the impact of his brilliance, would be justified in terminating his services. But what will not do at all was to entangle this decision not to use him in a grandiose procedure during which his loyalty and his discretion were made the issue.

That was a case of using a bulldozer to sweep the carpet, and that is why, as Messrs. Gray and Morgan say so apprehensively and so plaintively at the beginning, "in a very real sense this case put the security system of the United States on trial both as to procedure and as to substance." What has put the system on trial is the bad judgment of the men who put the system to a test which no system could hope to meet.

For no system will work for a special case like this one. For such a case wise and resolute men must make their own judgments—not trying to hide behind boards, procedures and regulations.

H. R. 1227

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 21, 1954

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I include in these remarks a second petition sent to me by residents of Portland, Oreg., in my congressional district, with reference to H. R. 1227, as follows:

We, the undersigned, believing that the cause of total abstinence can be served by the reduction of advertising of alcoholic beverages over radio and television urge that our congressional representatives help bring the Bryson bill (H. R. 1227) from committee and support it by their vote. This bill would prohibit the transportation in interstate commerce of alcoholic-beverage advertising in newspapers, periodicals, and its broadcasting over radio and TV. We also request that you present the petitions to the House and to have a note made of them in the Congressional Record.

Mrs. Roger M. Minthorn, Mildred H. Minthorne, John R. Williams, Betty Lou Williams, R. Allen Hester, Philip G. Fendall, Vida Lanz, Carrol Hannah, Dorothy Lansen, E. D. Pruitt, Milton Pressnall, James Raymond, Laura Dymoke, Doris Pressnall, Fern A. Mills, Mildred M. Raymond, Dorothy E. Reed, Labuta June Jacoby, John Reid, Margery R. Lamb, Pearl N. Pruitt, E. Bernie Cammack, L. Dell Lamb,, Clara E. Lund, Dillon W. Mills, J. Wesley Wood, Hathaway Buell, Ivan L. Saunders, Simon Chilvik, Warren Bolen, Mrs. Ruth Chaney, Mrs. Bertha Hugo, Gladys G. Chilnik, Cordelia Stickney, Arthur Stickney, Elmer J. Mueller, Ralph P. Hugo, Pearl Frankhauser, W. I. Hayden, Belle Irene Elmer, Adah Jeanne Bond, Clyde V. Bond, Naomi C. Hain, Mae L. Hayden, Mrs. Blanche Baracco, Cora Thornbrue, Barbara Frietag, Lena Hardin, Alice Hedppeth, Susanna Dapp, Hilma Hangland, Tillie Culbertson, Bertha Bradley, Frances S. Johnson, Ruth Edith Buell, Alonzo J. Barrett, Melvina S. Barrett, Dorothy A. Helm, all of Portland, Oreg.

The Town That Smith Built

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES R. HOWELL
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 1, 1954

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, in the rush of present-day living we so often overlook and fail to appreciate those remnants of our past as a people. Some of these evidences of past activity are of historical importance. Such a place is Williamsburg, Va. May I call to your attention an article in the May-June issue of Lincoln-Mercury Times, by Robert M. Hodesh, on the village of Smithville, N. J., in the Fourth District of New Jersey which I represent, regarding a much later period.

Smithville is now almost a ghost town, but it once was the center of bicycle manufacturing in the United States. This community with its crumbling houses and forgotten bicycle railway would lend itself to a restoration project of undoubted worth. Henry Ford recreated a past era at Greenfield Village, and Smithville was surely a place that Henry Ford would have loved. Hezekiah Smith and Henry Ford were much alike.

The strange story of the Burlington County town of Smithville and its prominent citizen, Hezekiah B. Smith, is well told. Hezekiah B. Smith came to Smithville in 1865, bought an abandoned cotton-spinning mill, and went into manufacturing on a large scale. His bike gained real fame. He helped make its name by such publicity as sending a man to Washington to ride the bike down the Capitol steps. The rider was arrested, but bicycle sales soared.

Here is a remembrance of bygone days that I commend to those who may find some relaxation in it, and I include it in the Record for others to read and enjoy.

The article follows:

THE TOWN THAT SMITH BUILT

(By Robert M. Hodesh)

Every once in a while someone remembers that Smithville, N. J., used to be called "the bicycle town" a title that was conferred because the famous high-wheel Star bicycle, one of America's first vehicular menaces to life and limb, was manufactured there 60 or 70 years ago.

The title is as good as any, because Smithville is otherwise hard to define. Occasionally it is classified as a ghost town by peoppie who notice that its edges are frayed, its weeds and ivy too successful, and its brick crumbling in places, but the classification doesn't hold after one observes that there is a factory humming along at a pretty good clip.

It gives a strong sense of isolation because of the thick greenery all around it and the rather unpromising little road that leads to it, but the map shows how close Philadelphia is and how perilously near is the Jersey Turnpike.

It isn't new, of course, but neither is it very old. It has about 200 residents and is neither urban nor suburban, but rather a small chunk of the 19th century that somehow got lost before it was overwhelmed by today.

The real pleasure to be derived from Smithville is to wander about in it, bearing in mind the old Star bike, the fact that a steam automobile was invented here in 1879, that the town had a queer bicycle railroad, and that it was the center of operations of a wealthy, clever, and odd Vermonter who left a mark that time can't bleach out.

First is the great mansion, a 28-room study in elegance, wealth, ivy, age, and gentility. The wide walk leading to its front door begins at two massive gateposts, each of which supports a huge metal eagle, and on either side of the walk is a generous array of flowers interspersed with such pleasantly archaic items as iron furniture and iron deer. On one side of the house is an English boxwood maze of the kind very fashionable in the 18th century. It must have been planned and nurtured with great patience, for boxwood grows only a few inches a year.

There is an old bandstand nearby, shaky and weatherbeaten but still trying to maintain its integrity amidst weeds that in late summer reach nearly to its top. The concerts and the band are, of course, long past, having expired with the era when mill workers were proud to be associated with a band that displayed their factory's name on the bass drum. The H. B. Smith Machine Co. Band must have had a lot of talent, for it used to go on tour and even journeyed on occasion to Philadelphia to concertize in the Academy of Music.

The nearby row of workers' houses exerts a special fascination with its melancholy and uncertain hold on life. Some of the houses are occupied, others aren't—by people, anyway. The visitor may look with interest on a weedy front yard where children are playing and then notice that the very next house hasn't a pane of glass in its sashes—as if it were bombed out by time. There may even be a horse stabled in its gaping emptiness, while grasshoppers jump freely in and out.

These houses, the mansion, the stream that flows dreamily past the mill and over the dam, all offer a consistent picture of romantic decay. It is an uncommonly silent place. There are scarcely enough people around to dispute the claim being laid on everything by the ivy and the weeds. There is something a little regretful about it all, but at the same time it is pleasing and quaint.

Although Smithville was a bustling industrial town fairly early in the 19th century, it owes the best and liveliest years of its life to a Yankee named Hezekiah B. Smith, a native of Vermont, who arrived in 1865. Precocious and inventive, he was an accomplished furniture maker by the time he reached his teens. At 31 he owned his own plant in Massachusetts. In 1865 he moved to Shreveville, N. J., a milltown, where, among other manufacture, cotton was spun. The Civil War, however, had cut off cotton and supplies, and the mill languished. Smith acquired a factory representing a $200,000 investment for a mere $23,000. It was the sort of situation a Yankee would thrive on.

Smith converted the factory in accordance with his own knowledge and training and soon was turning out every conceivable kind of machine for working wood. At one time the plant, operating on a 60-hour week, was making a fourth of the furnituremaking machinery in the country.

Now ensconced in the mansion, which had been built by a Shreve in 1841, and with his future rosy, Hezekiah expressed a typical facet of his Yankee individuality. He changed the name of Shreveville to Smithville. Why not? He was brilliant, successful, assured. He had the singular traits of personality that characterize the Yankee at his best. He considered the town his, and, indeed, it was.

H. B. had several ways of expressing his bizarre and impulsive nature. Just to let people know who was who in Smithville, he imported a moose from Vermont, hitched it to a two-wheel cart and rode around town. At first the moose scared all the horses and half the people, but that didn't faze H. B. any. He was Hezekiah B. Smith. Why should he care what people thought? The people must have recovered from their fright, however, because H. B. campaigned for Congress in the contraption, and by golly he won.

In another assertion of his personality, he built a stone tower over one of his buildings, and instead of sending out at-home cards to potential visitors he simply flew a flag from the top. It was the signal for company to come.

There may have been other reasons for the tower. One suggestion is that H. B. fancied himself in the role of a feudal baron and enjoyed climbing the tower to look over his holdings (he had acquired considerable surrounding farmland) and also his employees, on whom he spied with field glasses to be sure they were doing a day's work.

H. B.'s talent for mechanics and invention made him sympathetic to the presence of similar talents in other people, and by encouraging inventors to come and work for him he brought to Smithville a certain historical importance. In 1879, for instance, his company developed a steam automobile which actually ran successfully on the roads—this a good decade before the automotive age began to blossom. One of Smith's employees, William S. Kelly, is credited with having invented the pneumatic tire. And there was the famous Star bike. In order to get free publicity for the bike, Hezekiah sent it to Washington with a rider with instructions to ride it down the Capitol steps. This the rider did, and was promptly arrested. It did sales no harm at all.

H. B. died in 1888, and after the funeral at which the factory band played the dirge he was revealed to have made one final assertion of his Yankeeness—he cut off his heirs without a dime, but bequeathed a million dollars for the establishment of a vocational school for the education of young inventors, for whom he had more regard than for his own descendants. The heirs, of course, were outraged and immediately began litigation to break the will. Their lawyers, quite naturally, enlarged on every one of H. B.'s eccentricities, and in the end the courts ruled in their favor.

Another man who wrote a merry chapter of his own in Smithville's history was Clarence Hotchkiss, a Yankee friend of Hezekiah's and an inventor also, who devised Smithville's bicycle railway. This charming and goofy transportation system used to carry Smith's workers through the countryside between Smithville and Mount Holly. It consisted of bicycles of special design slung over a single rail that ran along the top of a fence 4 feet high. It was ingenious in its metal spring type of propulsion and scenic in the way it crossed the Rancocas Creek 10 times via little bridges.

The bicycle railway worked very well, although there were drawbacks. A fast rider, for instance, had no way of passing a slower one unless the slower one had the good nature to stop and remove his vehicle from the rail. There was also the hazard of temperamental cattle in some of the fields along the way. If a bull decided to charge, the cyclist had to bike wildly to reach a fence in time.

With these minor exceptions, everything went more or less merrily for a year, and then one Sunday afternoon a love-smitten philanderer named Warner pounced out behind the beauteous Lizzie Peak as she was biking along with a boy friend and stabbed her in the back. The murder took the joy out of the railway, which continued, however, to carry workers.

Finally, in 1893, Hotchkiss up and disappeared, leaving his railway and six canvas bags full of dimes. He was never heard of again. The railway fell into disrepair and ultimately was abandoned. Today all traces of it are gone, except for one of the bikes, which is in Mount Holly.

The railway seems to have been just about the last hot spark in Smithville. The fortunes of business began to shift direction and Smithville's importance as a manufacturing center waned. The town has not succumbed by any means, however. The mill is still going. It manufactures sanding machines—not the portable sanders that people rent from the paint store, but huge affairs, weighing tons. They are shipped everywhere in the world.

The town now seems to have achieved a fairly stable middle age. It does have a touch of the ghost town about it, but there is still color in its cheeks. As a place to live it probably wouldn't satisfy a great many moderns, what with the absence of both small-town and big-city stimuli. But as a place to visit and wander through on a summer afternoon it could hardly be surpassed.

Millionaire Myth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK IKARD

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 21, 1954

Mr. IKARD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include a very fine editorial by S. Leslie King, of Wichita Falls, Tex., which appeared in the current issue of the North Texas Oil and Gas Review. This editorial deals with the matter of statutory depletion about which there is currently so much misunderstanding:

MILLIONAIRE MYTH

"Taxing is an easy business; any projector can contrive new impositions; and any bungler can add to the old."—Burke.

Recently several of our nationally read magazines and commentators have made reference to depletion allowance as a "tax bonanza enjoyed by all oil men," and have indicated by inference and direct statement that the only result of depletion allowance has been to create a group of new rich wheeler-dealers.

Jefferson once said that "Error of opinion may be tolerated where reason is left to combat it." We might add to this statement that opinion, even when in error, should in all reason be based upon fact. Assuming that the facts are worth examining, let's take a look.

Many industries, such as coal and sulfur, as well as the oil-producing industry, which depend upon the extraction of minerals from the earth are given a delpietion allowance. This depletion allowance is based upon the fact that once a ton of coal or a barrel of oil has been extracted from the earth and used it is lost and cannot be made by man to take its place as can a piece of paper, a suit, or an automobile. Only God has found the way to make a barrel of oil which can be commercially produced. The percentage of depletion allowance is based upon the cost of finding and extracting such irreplaceable minerals as these. It should be noted here that the farmers and royalty owners on whose property the minerals are found are the recipients of depletion allowance too. However, related businesses such as drilling operators, contractors, pipelines, refineries, distributors, etc., who are constantly referred to as oilmen do not receive depletion allowance.

From 1859 to 1926 the United States accumulated an estimated reserve of 8,800,000,000 barrels of oil. For the few years prior to 1926 the known oil reserves began to drop rapidly in comparison with consumption. Exploration operations were not sufficient because risk capital could not be found. In 1926, after the passage of the first act dealing with depletion allowance, drilling operations began to increase and reserves increased until today the United States has an estimated reserve of 28,944,828,000 barrels of oil. Depletion allowance made it possible for many investors, farmers, housewives, and large capitalists to find a normal return on their money invested in exploration and producing of oil. Adequate petroleum supplies depend on the maintenance of reasonable economic incentives, sufficient materials, and a favorable climate for private investment.

The results of depletion allowance have been beneficial to John and Jane Doe as consumers for the cost to them of oil and oil products such as gasoline has remained fairly constant even though the cost of producing that same barrel of oil has increased by leaps and bounds. An interesting comparison could be made with respect to other common items that Jane and her husband buy each day.

Not all oilmen are rich nor is oil so easy to find. Last year there were 49,039 wells drilled in the United States, and 18,449 of them were dry holes. The 31 largest companies in the United States drilled about 25 percent of them; the other 75 percent was drilled by the little operators who, incidentally, produced only 30 percent of the oil. There are the rich oilmen who have accumulated millions because of depletion allowance. Seventy-five percent of their wells are classified as stripper wells and each of these wells averages only three barrels of daily production. Almost any reduction in the depletion allowance would break these small operators and the oil industry would follow the same course as have other great industries when a few have gained control.

In the final analysis, our national growth and security depends not only on what we produce in commodities and resources but also on our continued production of character, understanding, and intelligence.

Increase in the Price of Coffee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. DAVIS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 21, 1954

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, there has been a rapid and constant increase in the price of coffee during the last few months. While prices vary somewhat, depending upon individual stores and localities, the increases have ranged from 40 cents to 50 cents a pound. It is predicted that the price will soon reach $1.50 a pound.

Investigations have been made as to the reasons for the tremendous increase in the price of this article, which not so many years ago sold for 35 cents a pound. No relief whatever has resulted to the consumer from the investigations.

On February 10, this year, the Senate unanimously passed and sent to the House Senate bill S. 1386, which would require exchanges, commission merchants, and floor brokers dealing in coffee futures to register with the Commodity Exchange, and to provide for regulation of coffee futures trading, so as to prevent price manipulations, cornering the market, and similar undesirable practices.

The House has not up to this time taken any action on this bill, which is of great importance to the housewives and the grocery budgets of our people.

While we in the House are taking no action to bring coffee under the Commodity Exchange Act, on last Friday another effort was made in the Senate to bring coffee under this act. In that body an amendment was made to a House bill, H. R. 6435, which would bring onions under the act. The Senate amendment added coffee to the bill. That bill as amended will no doubt come back to the House this week for concurrence in the Senate amendment.

As was the case when Senate bill S. 1386 passed the Senate, not a vote was cast against the amendment to House bill H. R. 6435 which was adopted Friday in that body, and which, if we concur in the amendment, will provide for the regulation of trading in coffee futures, prevent price manipulations and such practices as cornering the market.

I take the floor today to urge that the House take immediate action on this important matter. We have our choice of bringing Senate bill S. 1386 to the floor and passing it, or of simply concurring in the Senate amendment to House bill H. R. 6435.

The author of the amendment to H. R. 6435 said in the other body when he offered the amendment on Friday that a rise of 5 cents a pound in the price of coffee means a quarter of a billion dollars out of the pockets of American taxpayers. That is equivalent to 50 million for every 1-cent rise in the price of coffee.

Mr. Speaker, I urge that we either concur in this Senate amendment, or bring Senate bill S. 1386 to the floor and pass it, and in one way or the other do all that we can to afford this needed relief to the millions of Americans who are feeling the pinch of the abnormally high price of this almost universally used article.

Editorial Comment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

of

HON. JEFFREY P. HILLELSON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 21, 1954

Mr. HILLELSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following editorial from the Wednesday, June 9, 1954, edition of the Kansas City Star, Kansas City, Mo.:

POLITICAL EXPEDIENT

Not a single phase of the farm problem has been solved by the House Committee on Agriculture which has voted to recommend extension of the fixed price supports on basic crops at 90 percent of parity for another year. The committee's action is a political way of putting off any decision until after the next election.

The administration has proposed a complete farm program with flexible price supports that will cushion farmers against wide breaks in the market. At the same time they would permit supply and demand to function sufficiently to influence shifts in production. These shifts in time should help control surpluses as well as add stability to prices.

Actually, supply and demand do affect the market regardless of what the Government attempts to do. There is no use blinding ourselves to this fact. When rigid supports are imposed without accompanying methods of getting rid of surpluses, the Government stockpile is going to grow higher and higher. Eventually this will lead to severe controls, not the kind we have experienced in recent years, but something far more stringent. One way out, of course, is war. But you don't propose war in a farm program.

The House committtee's recommendation does not mean that the bill to extend the fixed price supports has won. It is a rather safe assumption that the measure will find tougher going before the House as a whole than in the committee. The committee is dominated by lawmakers from States with big acreages in the crops most affected. Also, the bill still would have to pass the Senate and then receive the approval of President Eisenhower.

The farm program suggested by the President calls for a gradual change from the rigid price supports. There is nothing abrupt about it. But something may happen abruptly at some future time if the Government becomes the only market for certain farm products and it has no outlet for those commodities. The farm program might fall of its own weight.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the Congressional Record, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the Congressional Record semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the Record without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the Congressional Record the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily Record as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided,* That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the Record with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the official reporters of the Congressional Record, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the Record shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the Record issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the Record for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the Record of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the Record shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the Record style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the Record.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the Congressional Record any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix, but this rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the Congressional Record.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the Congressional Record Appendix the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed.

10. *Official reporters.*—The official reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the Congressional Record by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this restriction shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. The Public Printer or the official reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the Congressional Record which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Illustrations.*—Pursuant to section 182b, title 44, United States Code (as shown above), requests for authority to insert an illustration in the Record should be submitted to the Joint Committee on Printing through the chairman of the Committee on Printing of the respective House in which the speech desired to be illustrated may be delivered. Illustrations shall not exceed in size a page of the Record and shall be linecuts only. Copy for illustrations must be furnished to the Public Printer not later than 12:30 o'clock p. m. of the day preceding publication.

13. *Corrections.*—The permanent Record is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

Appendix

Address by Hon. John Marshall Butler, of Maryland, Before Maryland and District of Columbia Radio and Television Broadcasters' Association

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRY M. GOLDWATER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 22, 1954

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an address delivered by the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. Butler] before the annual convention of the Maryland and District of Columbia Radio and Television Broadcasters' Association, at Ocean City, Md., on June 19.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Developments of the past several months would seem to signal greater activity in all parts of the world by the partisans of atheistic communism. Undoubtedly, Communist infiltration of Central and South America, the impasse at Geneva, in conjunction with continued and devious subversion in our country and other areas, are but part of a planned program for the complete subjugation of the United States and of all freedom loving people everywhere. There is much expert testimony to substantiate this point.

Thus, the repugnant pattern of world domination, conceived by Marx and Lenin and implemented by the Bolshevik terrorists immediately following World War I and since, moves closer to ultimate attainment. It envelopes all it touches, and the free world, indolent, apathetic, and partially blind to the true nature and goal of the Red menace, seems unable to summon the strength, the courage, the leadership, or even the interest on which the very survival of the free world depends.

Let it not be forgotten that international communism has but one objective—world domination and total subservience to its philosophy and its ends—the accomplishment of which has followed a definite plan composed of several phases:

First, the overthrow of the Czarist regime in Russia after World War I for the purpose of obtaining a national base for international operations. Second, in the years prior to World War II, the consolidation of Russia under Communist control. Third, a program of expansion to assure support from surrounding satellite nations. Fourth, the mastery of Asia by either direct or indirect means—the latter having proved most effective. Fifth, the mastery of Africa with its vast storehouse of natural resources. Sixth, the control of Latin America as a prelude to the economic strangulation of the United States. None of these requires direct military intervention by Russia; on the contrary, results are obtained through the typical Kremlin-inspired tactics of subversion, subtle infiltration, and vicious propaganda. Only recently the scope of these tactics has been broadened to include a campaign of negotiated economic ties with the Communist orbit.

The significance of the tremendous buildup in their merchant marine to carry this campaign into effect can scarcely be overemphasized, especially in view of the rapid deterioration of our own merchant fleet.

The present world tension might well be viewed in the light of results thus far achieved through this phased plan of conspiracy since World War II: Establishment of Red China, occupation of Tibet by "a people's army of liberation," invasion and division of Korea, support of Communist leaders in Indochina, attempts to aid the insurrectionists in the Philippines, support of independence for Indonesia, infiltration of Burma, a program to communize Thailand and Malaya, creation of an "Iron Curtain" defense, disruption of most Middle East Governments, except for Greece and Turkey.

With the knowledge of such a global conspiracy, and the inroads which have already been made in the community of free nations, the widespread reaction of indifference to situations such as now exist in Guatemala, Indochina, and Geneva is indeed unbelievable.

It would appear that there is a tendency to minimize the Red menace and its spreading control in all corners of the globe. The rights of the individual and the cherished heritage of human liberty are here at stake, and the continuing and ever-growing threat to our way of life cannot be casually discounted.

You, as representatives of the broadcasting and telecasting profession of Maryland and the District of Columbia, have a great public trust in this matter, and I commend you and your colleagues for the forthright manner in which you have accepted this essential responsibility of presenting to the American people the true meaning of this menace. Thomas Jefferson once said, "I know no safe depository of the ultimate power of society but the people themselves; and if we think them not enlightened enough to exercise their control with a wholesome discretion, the remedy is not to take it from them but to inform their discretion by education." Yours is the challenge of education and enlightenment, and I feel that you share my optimism with regard to the future.

The ominous nature of the world Communist conspiracy can be dramatically characterized by a review of two seemingly unrelated incidents of recent happening. I say "seemingly unrelated" but, as mentioned earlier, I am convinced that these conform to the plan and pattern of eventual world domination and subservience by the Communists.

Any goal of world conquest must of necessity include the use of all possible military, political, and economic weapons. Among others, I would certainly include psychological warfare, espionage, subversion, sabotage, propaganda, and the promotion of internal strife—all of which have already been practiced with alarming success by the Communists. But the minions of the Kremlin have now introduced another thoroughly inhuman device—that of moral ruin. To carry out such an objective the Communists have established a far-reaching system for the distribution of narcotics.

Official emphasis as to the seriousness, both present and potential, of the new threat can be found in the remarks of the Honorable Harry J. Anslinger, United States representative at the 1954 session of the United Nations Commission of Narcotics. Several of his observations, which I am taking the liberty of quoting, are indeed alarming and awesome:

"Last year I told this Commission that the United States is a target of Communist China to be supplied with a flood of foreign-exchange earning, health and morale-devastating heroin. For several years I have presented documented facts which established that narcotic trafficking from the Chinese mainland is an insidious, calculated scheme of the Chinese Communist regime to obtain operating funds and at the same time spread the debauchery of narcotic addiction among the free nations."

It offers additional dramatic proof that we are not dealing with a petty adversary but rather with a formidable and far-reaching plot to gain foreign exchange and at the same time to demoralize the people of the free world.

"Spreading narcotic addiction and obtaining funds for political purposes through the sale of heroin and opium is not just the policy of one man in the Communist regime. It is the policy of the entire Communist regime in mainland China."

Mr. Anslinger continued, "The threefold increase in some areas in the land devoted to the cultivation of the opium poppy in Communist China, the establishment of new heroin factories in Communist China, the continuation and expansion of a 20-year plan to finance political activities and spread addiction among free peoples through the sale of heroin and opium by the Communist regime in China, and the extension of the same pattern of narcotic activity to areas coming under the jurisdiction of Communist China has mushroomed the narcotic menace from Communist China into a multiheaded dragon threatening to mutilate and destroy whole segments of populations from whom the danger of addiction through ready availability of drugs had been removed during the past 40 years by the uncompromising work of the narcotic enforcement authorities in the free countries of the world.

"Until this Communist traffic in narcotics is dried up, the agents of this menace wherever found must be apprehended and dealt with surely and severely as a means of bringing under control this unbridled monster."

Warfare, in the minds of the vast majority of our population, is pictured solely in terms of direct combat, and the horrible recollections of two world wars and the Korean crisis, with their vast mortality and destruction, are indelible memories. But, the all-pervading concept of indirect, yet constant warfare, as a doctrine of the Communist movement, is something new to most of us. The danger of this concept cannot, and must not, be taken lightly.

Communist tactics are aimed at the destruction of society and the will to resist. They are based on the principle that a country can be destroyed as surely and as easily from within as from without. The evil traffic in narcotics and drugs, with its demoralizing results, in combination with the other more familiar weapons of subversion and infiltration, is in accord with these objectives, and brings into clear perspective the monstrous wrong which the philosophy of communism permits and promotes in its followers.

The division between the communistic forces and those of the free world is further stressed by the recent publication of the photographs of the cigarette-case gun which silently injects cyanide into its victims, and which is apparently part of the equipment of Russian murder experts sent abroad by their masters to hunt down those whom the MVD wishes to destroy.

This is the story of a former captain of the MVD, a 31-year-old officer of the terror and diversion section of the Russian secret police. This captain, the most recently revealed Communist convert to the west, reported to West German authorities all the cynical details of a global Soviet network dedicated to sabotage, assassination, kidnaping, and other violent and clandestine activities." The Russians called this story a horror tale without basis in fact.

It was a horror tale indeed and American intelligence agents say it was a true one as well. They report that he gave himself up in February, along with two East German accomplices who were assigned to assassinate, with the above-mentioned toy guns, one of the key Russian members of an anti-Soviet organization which reaches even behind the wall of the Iron Curtain. Only a plea by his wife dissuaded him from carrying out the killing. That wife remains in Moscow, together with their young son and daughter, at the complete mercy of those, who don't even know the meaning of the word.

This Russian captain said that his Kremlin boss in the MVD told him that the job of killing the Russian resistance leader in West Germany would be a simple one and in many ways quite attractive. The murder was planned with painstaking care, four fat volumes of information were compiled on the intended victim, so that no slip-up could occur. But, thank God, one did occur—the dormant conscience of this young Russian officer finally shook off the moral paralysis which communism injects in the veins of its victims, and he refused to murder a good man in cold blood.

On Soviet principles, this assignment was logical, legitimate and in the ordinary course of business, so to speak. On those principles the life of an individual human being has no values in itself; only the self-interest of the Soviet is to be considered.

For the advancement of the dictatorship of the proletariat, many millions of human beings have been killed or enslaved in the last 30 years. So there was really nothing odd about the MVD's chief executioner telling the captain that murder was a simple enough job and in many ways an attractive one, and that it might even involve the thrill of "using a new model fountain pen with electric firing apparatus" so innocent looking, yet so very, very deadly. The debasement of the human soul, which the above statement illustrates, is the greatest sin that communism could commit against mankind. After having undergone a lifetimes of systematic smothering the flame of conscience, it is reassuring that a man, so mutilated, could still strike out against that tyranny. Not with the weapon of force which the Communists use, but, with the weapon of moral repudiation, he dealt communism a blow of such shattering impact that it was heard around the world.

"By their fruits shall you know them." So does the Bible warn against those who make prideful, hypocritical speeches of their high intentions but whose actions are the opposite of their words. This biblical quotation states a principle so fundamental and obvious that it is difficult to realize how our sometimes wavering and confused allies have missed its application to Soviet Russia.

The German murder plot gives a true picture of the rottenness of communism that the world has ever seen. But the world paid more attention, I fear, to the spectacular, cloak-and-dagger side of the story than to its moral implications. This is the element that we must seize upon as our weapon in the continuing struggle against the false pose of respectability and regard for mankind which the Communists put on to deceive and entrap the unwary.

It is unfortunate that so many of our own people do not realize to this day the extent of Communist infiltration of free institutions, that they do not recognize the footprint of the Kremlin in our Government, our labor unions, and even our schools. "What can 25,000 card-carrying Communists do?" they scoff.

Ask the people of Estonia, Latvia, Rumania, Hungary, Yugoslavia, and Czechoslovakia. Ask them how a handful of people in the right places were able to open the gates of their country and place the lackeys of Red Russia in the very seat of their governments? Ask the people of Germany what six men and a painter by the name of Adolf Hitler were able to do to their homeland? Ask the people of the Soviet what Lenin and a few faithful followers were able to do to the Russian bear and her untold millions of martyred people? Ask the Christian world, what 12 simple men, filled with dedication and purpose, were able to do in transforming the spiritual face of the earth?

Dedication and purpose, those are the keys that give a single man the power and strength of an army. That is a point the scoffers might well heed. And all the rest of us have to do to betray America is precisely nothing. Be neutral and indifferent. Continue in our complacency long enough, and all of our troubles will be over. Neither a dead man nor slave worries about maintaining the strength and integrity of free institutions. And if the Communists succeed in what they most certainly plan and are trying to do, you will be one of these—a cringing slave or an honorable dead man.

Some of our own good neighbors may be an unwitting accomplice of those who exploit the decency and the traditional tolerance of our country. Not, I say, because they do not love America, but because they do not know the evil that would enslave them. If they could clearly see the beastliness of communism and the falsity of its pretended concern for peace and human welfare they would surely be able to summon the moral courage and the necessary action to oppose this diabolical philosophy in all its many faces.

You will notice that in speaking of the dangers that beset the free world, I have made an effort to avoid any political partisanship, because the issues here involved should be beyond partisan feeling. The problem of protecting and enriching the fundamental principles upon which the American faith is based may cause some difference of opinion. But the question of what those principles are, their value to the continuation of our way of life, and our firm determination to preserve them are elements on which the American people must remain united. On this common ground we can meet any challenge, and with God's help, I know we will.

Thank you very much.

Andrew Furuseth, Abraham Lincoln of the Sea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. HART
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 22, 1954

Mr. HART. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an article concerning Andrew Furuseth, the 100th anniversary of whose birth was celebrated this year. The article was written by Carl Soyland, editor of Nordisk Tidende—Norwegian News—and translated by Mr. Dagfinn Aus, a member of the staff of that publication.

The article follows:

ABRAHAM LINCOLN OF THE SEA

In a small cottage in Romedal, Hedmark, Norway, Andrew Furuseth was born 100 years ago, March 12, 1854.

So strange is the life and the history of the immigrant that it was possible that this son of a peasant from Hedmark in Norway should become the first great champion of American seamen's rights to better working and living conditions.

Furuseth died in 1938, 84 years of age. after a life of constant struggle. He was a lonely man, he never married. He had a "den" in San Francisco, but spent much time in Washington, D. C., working continuously to convince Congressmen and committees on maritime matters in his struggle for the passage of new laws protecting seamen.

During his last days he got something of the martyr's glory. He was not the sort of labor leader who accumulated wealth—mountains of gold—out of his work. He often said in his speeches to union delegates and members "A union official to be efficient should have nothing of his own and want nothing for himself." And he lived according to that precept.

His life has been celebrated; he has gotten the name: "The Abraham Lincoln of the Sea." When he started his work, seamen on board American and foreign vessels lived under the chains of slave conditions and he was one of those who loosened these chains.

The paradox concerning Furuseth was that he did not come from a seafaring family, he was not even born near the coast. To this can be replied the cry of Captain Thorsen of Oslofjord that the best seamen in the world can happen to be from Hedmark.

Furuseth's greatness was not that he was sailor Furuseth but that he was champion and reformer Furuseth.

His parents were Andreas Nilsen and Marthe Jensdatter. His father was from Hammaren in Loiten and was a charcoal worker, in Berg in Loiten and in Skramstad, Vang. His father became a widower when his wife died in confinement. He then remarried and moved to Furusethstua on Graberget and after many years to Damstua near Gjeitholmsjoen. They lived in a caretaker's cottage and raised a family of 10 children, who because of straitened means soon left home. Anders left home when he was about 8 years old and lived with a rich farmer who noticed the boy's unusual ability and took care that he got more schooling than in the usual ambulatory school. Later he went to Christiania (now Oslo) where he attended a school for noncommissioned officers. After this experience he wished to go to officer's school and become an officer but he was not accepted. Therefore he became a seaman aboard the bark *Marie* of Drammen in 1873.

Twenty-five years passed before he returned to Norway on a short visit to his 90-year-old father; that was in 1908, when Andrew Furuseth was elected president of the International Seamen's Union of America, which a little later had a membership of 90,000.

In his youth Furuseth sailed on vessels of many nations—Norwegian, Swedish, German, English. In 1880 when 26 years old he came to America for the first time; he then sailed for 5 years on the west coast, and he became a member of the Sailors Union of the Pacific in 1886. One and a half years later he became union secretary. In 1894 he went to Washington for the first time, when a law for the improvement of seamen's conditions was coming up for consideration.

Furuseth told me in a conversation some years before his death that his most important work in the Capital was as a lobbyist going from one Congressman to another, trying to open their eyes to the conditions under which seamen had to work, and to enlist their aid in passing legislation to do away with these conditions. For many years he had his office in the American Federation of Labor building in Washington. From there he distributed his many pamphlets, which he wrote with a thorough knowledge of the subject; some of the titles were: An Article on the American Seapower and the Seamen's Act; A Message to Seamen; A Call to the Sea and to Seamanship; Forced Labor; etc.

He attended international congresses in Europe. He was no doubt the greatest authority on matters concerning the seafaring class. He, above everyone else, has fought for seamen's rights in America.

After his death in 1938 a Friends of Andrew Furuseth Legislative Association was founded on the initiative of the lawyer, Silas Blake Axtell, who still has his office at 15 Moore Street in New York City, and who specializes in seamen's cases.

In a conversation with Axtell he told me that he met Furuseth in quite a strange way. In 1907 Axtell was attending Columbia Law School, but because of illness was compelled to miss his second year and, being penniless, took a job as clerk in the Legal Aid Society, where legal advice is given to people who haven't the money to defend their rights by hiring personal counsel, He had been there for 8 years, when one day a tall, lean, gruff man came into his office to secure help for some seamen, and then began the lifelong friendship and collaboration of these two men.

In 1947 Mr. Axtell edited A Symposium on Andrew Furuseth, a 230-page volume, which is an inestimable primary source of information for those who wish to study Furuseth's work. In the preface to this book Axtell writes that it has been published "in the hope of making better known and appreciated the life and work of Andrew Furuseth, whose unselfish and untiring devotion to all those who go down to the sea in ships constitutes a notable chapter in the achievement of human liberty. Life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness though enumerated in the Declaration of Independence as inalienable rights were empty words so far as seamen were concerned until Andrew Furuseth, though born abroad, gave them a meaning in his adopted country, and lived to see them written into fundamental law of the land with resultant benefits worldwide in their scope and effect.

Axtell is a lawyer of the old school, a man of eloquence. He has declared that Andrew Furuseth has been his life's greatest inspiration. He emphasizes that Furuseth was unlike the typical labor leaders of today, he was a frugal, gentle, and unassuming in his personal life; he lived on a seamen's salary. He was an idealist, a deep thinker. In a speech before the students at the University of California, Labor Day 1927, then 73 years of age, Furuseth said: "Work is worship, to labor is to pray, because that is to exercise the highest, the divine faculty implanted in us as the sons of God. It matters not if the labor be in the writing of a thesis or the digging of a ditch, it is the use of the same divine faculty to labor, to create, and upon its proper and free use that depends the life of individuals, nations, and races. Those who have been untrue have shared the fate of the tree without fruit. Those that have been true have lived, and according to history and to religious belief they are to live. Let us try to profit by this lesson and so live that labor shall be free, that it shall come into its own."

That speech may be called his intellectual testament; the testament of a strange Norwegian immigrant who is now called the Abraham Lincoln of the Sea.

Faith in American Institutions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES J. DELANEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 1954

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I should like to include the following address given by Hon. James A. Farley, former Postmaster General of the United States, at the commencement exercises of the Packard Junior College in New York City on June 14:

On this occasion, 48 years after my graduation from this school, I feel a keen temptation to dwell upon the past. There are so many changes that have taken place in the course of that long stretch of years—changes in business methods, changes in the things that must be learned before going into business and, above all, changes in the attitude of the public toward business. It is a pleasure to note with respect to all these things that there has been a distinct gain. Business has, over the past 48 years, developed to an extraordinary degree in its capacity to accomplish greater units of work with smaller units of effort. This has benefited consumer, worker, and investor alike. Because of the great camplexity to enter it with a fair chance of success must be vastly more detailed and scientific. And, finally, there has developed in the past few years a changed attitude on the part of the public toward the various business enterprises that serve it.

There was a time when it was regarded as good business to give as little and to get as much as possible. The objective of business now is to give as much at as small a price as is consistent with solvency. There was also a time when it was regarded as legitimate to exact long working hours from employees, to pay them small compensation for their work and, at the same time, to pay large dividends to the owners of business.

In the years since then, a change has taken place in the whole attitude toward these questions, partly through the legitimate efforts of organized labor, partly through a more enlightened attitude on the part of employers and partly because of the necessity that the good will of the public be maintained. New principles of employment have come into being and many of these principles have become embodied in the law of the land.

The greatest change in business, however, has been the development of a new profession of business management. As business has grown in size and in complexity it has become impossible, except in the smaller units, for owners themselves to supervise and direct. That has brought about the development of a system of business enterprise in which essentially all the activities are carried on and the decisions made by that group which bears the general name of management. Upon this group falls a threefold responsibility. It is responsible to the public for providing at a fair price a sound and honest product. It is responsible to labor for good working conditions and a fair wage. And, lastly, it is responsible to stockholders for the preservation of their property and for a fair return on investment.

This threefold responsibility involves a great degree of skill in management, of diplomacy in handling human relations and mastery of the technical details of the business itself. Men and women charged with responsibility in management must therefore embody in their intellectual equipment the ability to do many things. In some of the more highly specialized businesses this means a combination of knowledge of finance, of acquaintance with engineering problems, of familiarity with sales methods, of mastery of difficult problems of public relations and, above all, of the ability to get along with other people. Management has therefore become a highly specialized profession, an honored and respected profession and a profession that requires the highest degree of training. The time has passed when anyone without training in management can go into business and hope to be successful.

Our schools have had to keep pace with this development and consequently their training has had to go far beyond the simple lessons that were taught when I was a student of this school. You have to know more than spelling, writing, and arithmetic these days to succeed in business.

For over a year, we have been experiencing a new overall phase of governmental policy—and I am referring to the role businessmen have been called upon to play in the administration of President Eisenhower.

We have been led to believe that President Eisenhower has taken the position that the affairs of the country can best be handled by businessmen, and his appointments to the Cabinet and lower administrative levels have clearly indicated what he has in mind.

I would like to quote a distinguished editorial writer and historian, Mr. Gerald Johnson. I quote him now: "When a man has made a vast success in private business it is usually the case that he has been the boss for many years and is accustomed to having his lightest word regarded with respect. It is hard for him to realize that when he takes a Government office in a democracy he becomes a subordinate and must expect to have anything he suggests regarded with suspicion unless he can explain it very clearly. Explaining to the public is a large part of the art of democratic government and it is an art in which few big businessmen are well trained." That is the end of Mr. Johnson's quotation.

Now I do not wish to either disparage or praise the views of Mr. Johnson, but I should like to talk to you tonight both as a businessman and as one who has spent half a lifetime in the public service. I think there are many facets to this discussion and it is well that we should consider objectively what is meant by a businessman in Government and what is mean by what some have chosen to refer to as business statesmanship.

We are often misled or deceived by labels or words or phrases and it is well to remember what we have in mind, or shall I say that it is well to approach this problem with a feeling that in the final analysis this country is not run for the benefit of any particular segment of its population such as business, labor, or professional interests; but it should be, and I believe has been, run for all the people no matter to what group of private or public life they belong. It is quite true that we are what may be called a business Nation; that is to say that within the brief span of 200 years which is, as Dr. Santayana once said, a brief moment in eternity, we have built up one of the most fabulous nations in the history of all mankind. We have had able and courageous men who have built throughout the years great railroads, developed our mines, worked our farms, and created great industrial empires.

In connection with their activities, we have also attained some amazing achievements in the field of science.

We have crossed the frontiers of hidden meanings on earth and in the sky and have brought forth instruments of mercy for the sick and evolved weapons to fight the elements in order to destroy those factors which militated against a better and more comfortable life. We have been leaders in the solution of transportation problems.

So that today we may consider ourselves as world leaders, not only in business and commerce but also in the fields of invention and scientific developments. It has been said that we have neglected to build up and foster a culture, or shall I call it an indigenous culture. But I, for one, dissent from this view for I believe that we have slowly but nevertheless surely expanded our native culture and have made as much progress in this brief period of our national existence as have older nations in the early stages of their growth.

The glory that was Rome's and Greece's is now the glory of the whole world. The glory of America, while it may reside in the creation of new and embracing and almost magical facilities for the cónvenience and comfort of mankind, is also tied up with the important fact that this has been accomplished in a country which held out the first torch of democracy to the world.

All this has been achieved in a country which is rooted by heritage in a high-minded conception of the dignity of human beings, flowing from the pure waters of democracy. It is a country where the voice of the common man has risen in full strength and fine eloquence so that together our people have contributed with brawn and brain and articulate ideas a tremendous share toward the evolution of our modern civilization.

We have now, by force of circumstances, taken a foremost place in world leadership. We have reached this international eminence in such a short time that there is no record in history to compare with our breathtaking progress and the momentum with which we have moved as a united Nation. It has carried us to obligations and responsibilities which we have been forced to assume by the march of events.

It is no longer a question which direction we should take or how we should act. We are one of the leading components of a world that has shrunk in size because science has destroyed the meaning and significance of physical distance. From our national front porch we are but a day or two away from the other continents. When European, South American, Asian, or African leaders speak we can hear them at the very moment they are speaking.

Now, the question is—how can we, a so-called business nation, carry the obligations that have been thrust upon us with the resources, both material and mental, that we have at our command? Can the businessmen who have been hailed as business statesmen and who have been called to Washington by President Eisenhower meet with a high degree of intelligence and a keen perceptive sense the incredibly staggering problems, not only in our country but throughout the world?

Mr. Johnson, whom I quoted at the beginning of my talk, does not think that businessmen are sufficiently trained in the art of government in a democracy.

Now, may I recall that during the second World War, when I was in Washington as a member of President Roosevelt's Cabinet, I was in a position to observe at first hand many able and distinguished businessmen who had temporarily abandoned their private interests to serve the Government. They were men of patriotism and were qualified by reason of their native ability and wide experience to carry out the assignments given them.

I yield to none in my respect and admiration for those businessmen who gave so willingly of their time and effort in a spirit of usefulness to help their country. The men who were picked had demonstrated their preeminence in the particular field which was related to the carrying out of the war program. I need not dwell on the results they achieved. It is a matter of historical record. Their contribution to the victory cannot be overestimated.

But if we are to accept the theory that businessmen are not trained to participate in governmental affairs we must assume that they are limited by a knowledge of their own particular industries and that the national horizon is too broad for them. It may be urged that their experience and knowledge are largely confined to the problems in their industries and does not stretch out to the wider scope of human relationships in a vast country like the United States with its 160 millions of many races, colors and creeds. Where they may deal successfully with their business associates, the personnel of their organizations or their customers they might not be as effective when they are confronted with the challenge of domestic and global problems.

In this mixed-up age, there is considerable confusion about business. Attacks are made upon all the business processes, upon big business as monopolistic, upon small business as wasteful and uneconomic, upon the men who achieve success in business.

Nevertheless, the production and distribution of goods and the provision of services are the functions of every business organization, whether the economy is capitalistic, socialistic or communistic. The methods have to be the same or the production will fall short, or the distribution will become fouled up, or the services will be inadequate.

In a word, those who attack the American business system have to use the best methods developed by American business. That, Soviet Russia has done. For years, Russian engineers, factory superintendents, distribution experts worked in this country studying our methods, analyzing our processes, learning how to do business in their own country as we do busines in our country. They spent millions of dollars buying our Patent Office reports, our Department of Commerce reports, our Agricultural Department reports, the product of business schools and our scientific societies.

What they did in the United States they duplicated in Great Britain and in Germany. If you look at a Russian tractor factory it is like something out of Detroit. If you look at a Russian department store it is like Gimbel's. Even in that Communist country, where the government owns the means of production and distribution business must be done along business lines; cost accounting must be accurately worked out. engineering estimates must be correct; the stresses and strains of the market have to be taken into consideration. No philosophers have yet devised a system for making or moving goods without the use of money for exchange.

American business need not apologize for its ideas or methods. It need not retreat before the onslaught of alien and antagonistic propaganda. Its capitalistic, competitive system has justified itself by its tremendous and varied productivity, by the maintenance of the highest standard of living, despite depressions, wars and inflations, by the high wages paid to labor, by the flexibility with which American business approaches new problems and new products.

So firmly has the competitive system stood in the face of dangerous economic conditions that while other countries have found themselves forced to resort to government protected and, at times, government-owned trusts and cartels, in the United States no such development occurred. Business remains competitive and new industries are constantly coming into existence.

As long as competition continues the business system remains buoyant and vital. Trusts and cartels are the processes which lead to socialism. Business then suffers from the same weaknesses as governments. The dead hand of bureaucracy stifles new ideas and new methods. The routine-minded personality emerges to the top; the man who never tries anything new and therefore never gets into trouble becomes the master. Genius dies on the vine; experimentation is discouraged.

This has never happened in the United States and as long as it does not happen our people will continue to benefit from a dynamic, living, progressive business system.

This is an age of scientific methods, of psychological approach to many business problems. American business has come of age, and we have a duty not only to be good businessmen but also good citizens. We are going to hear more and more of the businessman's place in politics and government. The experiment is now going on in Washington should yield some significant results.

When I say a good citizen I mean that we must take an active interest in the affairs of our community, our State and our Nation, within the limits of the time at our disposal. I am inclined to think we can make an interesting and fascinating hobby out of the study of the real meaning of good government.

It is impossible for any one to say what the future holds for any of us, whether we are in professional or business life, but we all have it within our power to be in the forefront of a movement to reenforce, by words and deeds, the theory and philosophy of democracy.

We all need experience, to be sure, for that is one of the prime requisites of effective citizenship and wise leadership. In my book, nothing can take the place of experience. This applies not only to business but to the professions. In the final analysis we conduct our lives on the basis of trial and error. Our mistakes, and all of us make many of them, are often canceled out by the good we do and the progress we make as we go about our daily affairs. It is the law of compensation.

I think that perhaps it would be appropriate at this time to point out that there is one desirable quality that we should endeavor to cultivate throughout our personal and business lives and that is good manners.

Good manners is something more than knowing how to hold your spoon; much more than mere tact. It is to feel and show a genuine concern in others. It means caring for people, respecting them, treating them as equals, and sharing their fears and earthly concerns. It means extending the hand of honest comradeship and understanding. We would have a better and more cheerful world to live in if we fostered such an attitude at all times.

Our problems today are complex and cannot be solved over night. We find, as we go along, that some of our personal concerns are not very large as compared with the concerns of all of us as a nation. We stand today at the crossroads and we must strive not to make any false moves.

I speak to you as a businessman and also as one who has some familiarity with Government. Each phase of our national life has its peculiar problems and it would seem to me that the ideal state of affairs would be the blending of business acumen and know-how with the overall problems of all the people.

I shall not attempt to urge you at this time to take a definite side in this discussion. I think that we all should give this serious thought. The President feels that the affairs of the country can best be run by businessmen. He has been going ahead on the basis that the policies which he advocated and the principles which he espoused in the past campaign can become a potent and essential part of our national economy and daily life under the direction of the leaders in the world of commerce and business.

It has been said that many men in business have hitherto shown an almost shocking indifference to the affairs of their country and even their local communities. Indeed, while holding aloof from their duties of citizenship they have been disposed to disparage political leaders and statesmen and blamed them for all the ills of the country. At the moment, I do not believe that this is of much importance, nor can it serve our national interest by arguing the point. I think it is largely academic now.

We must accept the situation as it actually exists; we must recognize that we have voted, by a democratic process, a new administration into power. The executive head of our great country has a responsibility the like of which has never devolved on a single human being in the history of the world. The next 2 years may spell the difference between slavery and freedom, between a happy world or an earth devastated by the atom bomb.

In meeting head on these frightening problems, President Eisenhower has called to his side men whose experience has been in the spheres of mining, banking, farming, transportation and in the professions. We cannot, indeed must not, say whether his judgment has been wise or unwise. Time and events in the days ahead will supply the appraisal of his course and the soundness of his judgment.

It is important, from the standpoint of a growing and progressing American society that our philosophy of business continue to prevail in this country and that we all be guided by it. We will do well if we adhere to the fundamental principles of our competitive system. If we keep our minds flexible, sharp, effective, never permitting ourselves to be diverted from right thinking, we will make our contributions to the strengthening of our country.

If we permit our minds to be diverted by the fantastic notions which are nowadays current in a disordered world, our lives will be embittered by failure and frustration.

You are about to enter upon business careers. You have been trained in the techniques of our system. Some of you undoubtedly are graced with the genius to rise to the topmost rungs of the business ladder. Some of you will be discouraged by the tough competition which you will encounter. Some of you will be diverted into other fields. Some of you will even go into politics—who knows but one sits here who may achieve such outstanding brilliance as to reach the most enviable of all positions.

Your opportunities are enormous. The bottom of the ladder may be crowded; at the top there is the luxury of plenty of room. If we make the top the target of our ambitions and work within the margins of correct thinking we shall reach the peak of our own abilities and will to accomplish useful and satisfying tasks. Strong men depend upon themselves, upon their own abilities and choices.

In the meantime, we must stand close together, not as Democrats or Republicans but as Americans. Our minds must function in a spirit of teamwork and sensible cohesion. Our hearts must beat as one. For whether President Eisenhower was correct in his selection of the men around him does not count so much at this particular moment. What counts is national strength and a vibrant and articulate democracy. If we forget our personal feelings as partisans we must gain victory under God in the formidable struggle for survival.

About Trieste and Other Random Thoughts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. HART

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 1954

Mr. HART. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I submit herewith address delivered by Mr. Frank J. V. Gimino, of Jersey City, N. J., assistant supreme venerable of the Order Sons of Italy, delivered at a testimonial dinner in honor of Mr. John Ottaviano, Jr., the supreme orator of the order, which took place at Towne House, New Haven, Conn., on April 3, 1954.

Mr. Gimino is a well-known and learned member of the New Jersey bar and for some years has been an assistant prosecutor of the pleas in Hudson County, N. J.

The address follows:

It is an unusual pleasure, not to say privilege, for me to be here to take part in honoring your former grand venerable now my colleague in the supreme council, Attorney John Ottaviano, our newly elected supreme orator.

I know that the pleasure and privilege statement is standard routine procedure for the opening remarks but I want you to believe that with me here tonight it is both sincere and abiding.

Here am I tonight in your lovely city of New Haven, the home of Yale University and the Yale Bowl. How dear to my heart are the scenes of my childhod goes the old song—well while I was not a child exactly in years, I was a child mentally when I was here last. The best proof of that is that I played football—anyone who does that has not grown up, is not mature and ought to have his head examined. When I look back and think of the murder and mayhem that took place in the bowl that fine October afternoon when my alma mater, Wesleyan, the kids from the sticks, played the great Yale Bulldogs, I shudder to think of what might have happened and I want to light candles to St. Christopher. While St. Christopher is not exactly the patron saint of football players he'll do unless, of course, you want to consider the patron saint of desperate cases and despaired of causes—St. Jude. Now I hope that that is not too obscure.

Yes; Connecticut was a wonderful place those days and Middletown was the finest part of the State. If you don't believe me ask Arthur Vanderbilt, the manager of our team. He is now chief justice of New Jersey and he still gets up at 6 o'clock in the morning. Governor Lodge, if when you are elected President of the United States, as we all expect you to be, certainly you will be elected if we all get the chance to vote, I would like you to consider my chief justice because, and you can believe me, he is certainly on the ball. And I hope you distinguished judges here assembled will pardon me for putting in this "plug" for my chief—after all, we Wesleyan boys must stick together.

Some of the happiest days of my life were spent at Midditown and Wesleyan. I remember with particular joy the fact that it was the one college in the Nation where the romance languages were taught in the old classical tradition and the language that led the list was the language of Dante Alighieri, the language of the land from which most of your ancestors care, Italy, the mother of civilization.

One of the reasons why I admire and respect your great Governor is because he speaks the language of Dante better than many, many natives. Governor Lodge, you have, sir, many talents not the least of which is the fact that you have established the only 75-cent minimum wage law in the Nation, that you have improved programs for the disabled and for aged aliens but to me, and to us, and I am sure I speak for the entire order when I say that your crowning glory is the fact that you speak the language of Dante and speak it to a fair lady whose maiden name was Francesca Braggiotti. Is not Francesca a lovely name?

Now I hope that same sweet darling of the DAR, which I honor and respect when it sticks to the Declaration of Independence and the Constitutions, finds nothing that is not Kosher or un-American in this deserved tribute to one of the Nation's most outstanding executives and his lovely lady.

After all, what is an American?

To my mind he is a citizen who lives by the Declaration of Independence whether he be naturalized or native-born. The Declaration of Independence, America's gift to the world, accords to all men an equal share in the inherent rights of humanity.

That, good friends, is a principle, a principle to live by. When we go contrary to that principle we are not acting as Americans. And we surely violate the declaration when we attempt to smear or disparage any citizen on account of color, race, nationality, or living customs. The declaration says "all men"—that means black men as well as white men, men from the south of Europe as well as the north, men from Israel as well as those from merry old England, and that whether they came by the first boat or landed only a couple of years ago, just in time to qualify as citizens, register, and vote. We shall have to officially recall the declaration before we can, I submit, limit the application of its principles to this or that group of men or women.

Now it is not my purpose here tonight to criticize or catechize anyone whether he deserves it or not—I come here to praise Caesar—to honor Johnnie for the outstanding job he did as your grand venerable and to wish him well in his new and higher post of responsibility as supreme orator.

He may not know it but he has taken on the toughest, busiest job in the entire national organization. I speak from experience. I held the office during the war years and believe me I practically lived in my suitcase between taking the midnight to Washington to confer with the Attorney General—this committee and that, writing briefs, arguing before the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate and its counterpart of the House, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and then seeing every Senator to get his views on the proposed treaty of peace with Italy by which Russia asked for and obtained $100 million in reparations, although she had not sent a single soldier to Italy or fired a single shot on Italian soil; asked for and obtained the stripping of the city of Trieste and all of the Italian colonies, including those acquired long before Mussolini came to power to ruin Italy.

The Western World now knows that was wrong. We called the turn then but the boys wouldn't listen. Trieste still hangs and while I do not speak for anyone except myself, it is my guess that there will be no EDC unless and until Trieste is taken off the hook and handed back to its rightful owners, who were then as they are now and will continue to be, secola secolorum, the only bulwark in the Mediterranean against Godless communism whether it be the original or the diluted satellite variety, with or without, the Yugo gimmick. Remember that France refuses to sign until the Saar is settled—at least that is what we are told. Scelba says that Italy will sign—but he has a majority so slim—well you figure out how many votes he would pick up if Trieste was settled right. See what I mean.

Yes, sir, that is what you are letting yourself in for, Johnnie, boy. But I have every confidence you will do, as you have always done, a first class job. Your record proves that. The grand lodge of Connecticut would not be what it is today but for your youthful enthusiasm, your 100 percent dedication, and that fine lawyer's brain that calculates risks and takes them. You have lived up to the great tradition of your predecessors in the office of Grand Venerable of Connecticut, Michaelangelo Russo, Anthony Tapogna and the late Gino Santella whom it was my honor to eulogize at Tampa.

Of course you have not done this fine work all by yourself. You had the good fortune to be surrounded and supported by these fine officers, men, and women, who worked with you, and that is an attribute, an ability all its own.

We know you will make good. We know that what is the grand lodge of Connecticut's loss is the supreme lodge's gain. And so in the name of the supreme body which I have the honor to speak for tonight, I bid you welcome and wish you every good wish. And to the grand lodge of Connecticut, to its fine officers and loyal members, the supreme lodge sends its official greetings, its thanks, and its gratitude for the training, the discipline and most important of all, the opportunity it gave its sterling son now by the will of the delegates from all of the States of the Union, Supreme Orator of the Order Sons of Italy in America, the largest and oldest fraternal organization of our people in these United States. John, may God bless you and keep you, your lovely wife, and little Carl.

George O. Walker, 77-Year-Old Saugus Town Meeting Member From Precinct 3, Presented Resolutions Honoring Flag Day at Special Town Meeting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1954

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following resolutions presented by Mr. George O. Walker, a leader in his community, who has held many offices in veterans' organizations in Lynn and in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

He is a past commander of Gen. Joseph E. Sanger Camp, Spanish War Veterans, a member of both the American Legion and Veterans of Foreign Wars, and a member of the town meeting for many years.

My attention was called to this resolution by the town moderator, Paul A. Haley, who states:

> Mr. Walker is a tower of strength to him in the Saugus Town Meeting. He is 77 years of age, the second oldest elected member of the town meeting.

Town Moderator Paul A. Haley pointed out it was an honor to the town meeting to have such a proved servant in time of war similarly a loyal and patriotic citizen participating in his local government.

The resolutions were read and voted unanimously by the town meeting just prior to the invocation and salute to the flag and playing of the National Anthem with which all town meetings in Saugus are opened.

His resolutions, which follow, were read to the town meting by Town Moderator Paul A. Haley prior to the customary salute to the flag opening the meeting, and unanimously adopted:

> Whereas the Continental Congress adopted the Stars and Stripes as the national emblem of the United States of America, 177 years ago today; and
>
> Whereas by blood and sacrifice, its citizens have preserved the sanctity and integrity of its sovereignty, and have protected the rights and priveleges of its individual citizens, under Old Glory, and the Constitution; and
>
> Whereas under these rights, we today, on the anniversary of the birth of Old Glory, are, by this assembly, demonstrating the right of free assembly which might otherwise have been denied to each and all of us: Therefore be it
>
> *Resolved,* That this assembly, in meeting assembled, give thanks to God for the freedom we enjoy under the banner of Old Glory and the Constitution of the United States of America and that a copy of this resolution be spread upon the records of this meeting.

Separation of Church and State Defended in Sermon at Church Here

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. MILLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 1954

Mr. MILLER of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from Rev. George N. Marshall, minister, First Unitarian Church, Niagara Falls, N. Y., along with an extract of Mr. Marshall's sermon preached June 13, 1954, as reported in the Niagara Falls Gazette:

> FIRST UNITARIAN CHURCH,
> *Niagara Falls, N. Y., June 15, 1954.*
>
> Representative WILLIAM E. MILLER,
> *Fortieth Congressional District,*
> *Washington, D. C.*
>
> DEAR REPRESENTATIVE MILLER: Enclosed is an extract of a sermon I preached June 13 at the First Unitarian Church, as reported in the Niagara Falls Gazette.
>
> I would be happy to have you note this statement and, if you care to, read it into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as representing a viewpoint shared by many clergymen and church people.
>
> Yours very truly,
> GEORGE N. MARSHALL.

> SEPARATION OF CHURCH AND STATE DEFENDED IN SERMON AT CHURCH HERE
>
> Four areas of concern exist for those anxious to defend the principle of the separation of church and State, the Reverend George N. Marshall stated yesterday in his sermon at the First Unitarian Church. The proposed change in the flag salute approved by a committee of Congress, the Flanders amendment to the Constitution of the United States affirming the "authority and law of Jesus Christ," the church loyalty oath amendment recently adopted by the California Legislature and the released-time program of religious instruction in the public schools were listed by the Reverend Mr. Marshall as representing areas where the church-state issue is being challenged.
>
> Asserting that fundamental to the principles of the Founding Fathers is that of the separation of church and state, Mr. Marshall warned his congregation that the strength and stability of the American system of democracy rest primarily upon this separation.
>
> Noting that Senator JACKSON pointed out last Friday that separation of church and state is not the position of many European countries, the minister said that many Americans are familiar with old-world patterns of church-state liaison, or are members of ecclesiastical institutions which in Europe rely upon the state for funds, educational assistance and special privileges, "so that there is a constant need for a steady and forceful educational program to make clear to all Americans the primary need of freedom from church-state domination to insure the continuity of the American way of life."
>
> BILL OF RIGHTS CITED
>
> Noting that the first article of the Bill of Rights—"Congress shall make no laws respecting the establishment of a religion or the free exercise thereof"—was the 1st not the 5th or 12th amendment, thus indicating its importance to the Founding Fathers, he stated. "This judgment I would in my meek and mild way seek to underline. The stability of American democracy is due to the well-developed principles of that remarkable group of publicists, philosophers, statesmen and rebels who fashioned this Nation in a creative age of turmoil, challenge and high decision. What they wrought in so magnificent a moment remains the greatest instrumentality of government yet conceived. On this Flag Day weekend, it may be well for us to pause a moment in reverence and thoughtfulness for the achievement of those who created a nation to insure the perpetuity of the flag today commemorated.
>
> "But let no false patriotism or heroics displace our concern. Let no smug complacency over the surviving power of our Nation creep in. Let us recall the warning of James Russell Lowell that this government will survive only so long as the people remain true to the principles of the Founding Fathers."
>
> Citing the proposed House amendment to the pledge of allegiance to read, "One nation, under God, indivisible with liberty and justice for all," instead of the present wording, "one Nation, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all," the Reverend Mr. Marshall asked:
>
> QUARREL WITH GOD?
>
> "A minor point you say? Who wants to quarrel with God? That, indeed, will be the question the Representatives and Senators will say when the roll is called up yonder on Capitol Hill. Who wants to vote against God? Well, as someone who prays to God daily in the church, where democracy is concerned, I will vote against Him. Our democracy was not founded by God, but by men who fought with all the power and might and substance of their lives against a tyranny of the state and a fear of a greater tyranny of the church. The church and state; they must not meet; was the battle cry of the Revolution and the Constitutional Convention.
>
> "The second great area is that of the proposed amendment to the Constitution, the Flanders amendment, reading, 'This Nation devoutly recognizes the authority and law of Jesus Christ, savior and ruler of nations, through whom are bestowed the blessings of Almighty God.' A harmless religious platitude, you say? What harm can it do? It

will satisfy the grandmothers, ministers, and Sunday-school teachers; put it in and forget it, a busy nation cannot waste time over pious manifestations. I would like to urge a reconsideration, for the issue is not this simple.

"This Nation recognizes the authority and law of Jesus Christ. Does it? I thought that the authority we recognized—as a government—was of the Constitution. Are we to suddenly accept another authority and law? What of the citizen who does not recognize the authority and law of Jesus Christ. Are we to try and compel him to by laws? The Jew, the Unitarian, the humanist, the agnostic? What would that do to Jefferson who wrote the Declaration of Independence, but was a Unitarian?"

COMMUNISM IN CHURCHES

"The area of loyalty oaths for churches as passed in California shows this question of church control by state, or a closer liaison between the two, not merely to be a Washington movement, but one throughout the land. Conceivably aimed at communism in churches, a contradiction in terms, it would fall hardest on pacifist churches and ministers, who let it be said by a former Army chaplain, have their rights which all must protect.

"The released time for religious instruction from schools is a final example of the breach in the wall of separation which has swept across the country, touching many communities including our own. Ministers and church people interested in supporting the safeguards of democracy, as we know it in America, must reconsider their position. How can they oppose it in some areas when they organize for it in other areas?

"Let it be clear, we stand foursquare against any breach in the wall of church and state. The separation is the basic instrument of our form of government, and we are called in this day to defend it in peril of losing our freedom of religion and freedom of conscience," he said.

The sermon was the third in a series on church-state issues which will conclude next Sunday morning at the First Unitarian Church.

Less Travel Redtape

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 1954

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to include the following editorial from the Washington Post and Times Herald of Sunday, June 20, 1954, entitled "Less Travel Redtape":

LESS TRAVEL REDTAPE

One of the fastest growing industries of the postwar world is vacation travel. As a result of improved means of transportation and more money in average pocketbooks, it has widened from a carriage trade to a mass consumption enterprise. This has great economic as well as cultural significance. For example, tourism is one of the biggest businesses in France and Italy and materially helps in maintaining the economies of these countries.

Laws—in this case customs regulations—are slowly beginning to catch up with this new fact of life. A basic step along this line was the adoption of two conventions by the recent International Conference on Tourism called by the United Nations. These, when ratified by the participating states, will smooth to some extent the path of the traveler abroad. Many countries already offer the proposed facilities—and even more liberal ones—but these would bring the less generous nations into line. They also would make a start on a standardized system of regulations so that tourists eventually would not be faced with different lists of perplexing formalities at every frontier.

One convention makes it somewhat easier for a traveler to take his car with him when he visits a foreign country. The other lists certain basic items, such as clothing, sports, photographic equipment and personal possessions, each state would permit a tourist to bring in without charge. The United States and more than a score of other countries participating in the conference signed the conventions, which will come into effect 90 days after 15 states ratify. Prompt action on this by Congress would not only give encouragement to the general effort to simplify world travel, but would serve self-interest as well. For Americans comprise the greatest number of globetrotters, and are increasingly turning from Europe's beaten paths to less charted ones in remoter areas.

Juvenile Delinquency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 17, 1954

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following radio address I delivered on station WMEX, Boston, Mass., on Saturday, June 19, 1954, entitled "Who's Delinquent—Juveniles, Parents, Communities?"

They call it the problem of juvenile delinquency.

Young people running wild, getting into trouble, causing damage, hurting themselves and others, and making everybody wonder "What are we going to do about them?"

Our first reaction and error is to oversimplify the situation.

Of course, we are exasperated when teenagers become promiscuous, intoxicated, assault law-abiding people, or break into a public building and maliciously destroy valuable property.

Mocking every standard of good conduct and character.

Seeing them headed for disaster, we want to do something to save them.

But how and what?

First off, let us try for perspective.

The juveniles themselves are not entirely to blame. There are also delinquent parents and delinquent communities.

Just because 5 percent of our children go wrong is no reason for taking a dim view of the younger generation. And the same applies to parents and communities. The preponderant majority of children, parents, and communities are doing a fine job of living up to their responsibilities, and they deserve great credit for doing so.

To protect them we must salvage the few whose bad example could infect all.

A recent headline of a New York paper bluntly informed us that "accused slayer of 4, child of drunken parents."

A probation report 8 years before pictured the accused slayer as a child of drunken parents with "neurotic conflicts so serious that it would take some time to straighten them out, if they could be straightened out."

At the age of 17 he was described as "without aim and ambition, with a hard and cynical outlook on life."

After growing up in a sordid home and seeing the hypocrisy of adults in the world around him, preaching one thing, and doing just the opposite, perhaps he didn't have much of a chance to be normal.

Now he must answer for the four lives he destroyed.

This is the point of no return, the final degradation to which any delinquency may lead, unless it is caught and cured in time.

Strong measures involving the use of youth service boards, psychiatrists, social workers, juvenile courts might have redeemed him before it was too late.

Eight years ago the report on him stated: "He seems to have developed a definite antisocial pattern of behavior, and obviously has profited little by his institutional treatment and supervision."

Today, four lives plus his own have been the price of neglect.

For some time now the Subcommittee to Investigate Juvenile Delinquency of the United States Senate has been exploring all phases of this difficult problem. Its interim report warns us that the Nation is losing its fight against juvenile delinquency.

We devote much attention, energy, and resources, rightly so, to the fight against communism both at home and abroad. We are waging that fight to keep this Nation free. To what avail is that fight if the moral fiber of more and more of our children is being undermined? These are the children who will one day become our Nation's leaders. It is for them that we are fighting to keep America free.

The time has come to declare all-out war on juvenile delinquency. To turn the losing tide of battle, we must immediately dedicate to the waging of this war, whatever efforts and resources that are necessary. There is no longer time for feints and skirmishes.

From 10 to 17 years of age—that is the time of a child's life that delinquency occurs most frequently.

The stream of children through the Nation's juvenile courts grew from 300,000 in 1945 to 385,000 in 1952, and only 6 percent of this increase is due to the enlarged juvenile population.

This trend becomes more serious when it is realized that there are at least three young offenders brought to the attention of the police for every child actually brought before the courts.

It is not confined to big cities. It applies to all economic groups. Rich families as well as poor families suffer from these tragedies.

Juvenile delinquency does not result from a single cause. One delinquent child has been strictly disciplined from birth. Another has been subjected to little or no parental control. Some boys and girls have suffered gross neglect. Others have been overprotected by their parents. Both read comic books and watch crime programs on television. No child is born delinquent, but he is subject to a wide variety of influences and conditions which tend to either lessen or increase his chances of going astray.

He is subjected, first of all, to the profound influence exerted by his parents and immediate family. The child of parents who provide affectionate and consistent care, correct instruction and example, who can offer support and protection and yet give sufficient freedom for growth and development has found the world a friendly place. He has not built up abnormal hostilities. He has learned to trust others. He feels worthy of love and respect. He faces new situations with at least some security and confidence. A solid foundation has been laid in conjunction with school and church for the development of normal self-discipline and self-control.

Many delinquent boys and girls, however, do not come from homes marked by internal conflict and abnormal family relationships.

Through both acts of commission and omission, larger society may and does contribute to delinquency. The child who is denied acceptance and opportunity because of his race, religion, or nationality, for example, may learn to hate and rebel against the community, even though he has received affection and guidance at home. The child exposed to adult example of vice and crime, reared in neighborhoods whose most influential and well-to-do residents are racketeers, may grow up into a life of crime despite the devoted efforts of law-abiding parents. So may the perfectly normal urge for achievement, for new experiences, for adventure and excitement lead to delinquency in a community which fails to make provision for meeting these needs through adequate school, work, recreational, and leisure-time programs.

There are other pervasive influences.

The materialism of our age, with its emphasis on getting ahead, putting too much emphasis on financial success, subjects children to great strain and oftentimes frustration. Modern advertising coupled with easy pay-as-you-go plans, which divert too much income to keeping up with the neighbors, may throw added strains upon family life, causing undue frictions and tensions.

TV, movies, radio, and comics must be considered for their influence on a child's attitude toward the standards of society and his sense of right and wrong.

All measures which improve family and community life for children help to prevent delinquency.

Perhaps you have seen gangs of boys and girls roaming the downtown streets at night looking for excitement.

They will find it the wrong way, unless we provide them with a happy and useful release for their boundless energy.

Truancy is one of the first symptoms of delinquency.

Falling in with dubious companions is another.

It has long been recognized that youngsters on the verge of delinquency do not participate in many community services. This is true of the juvenile who joins a street corner gang. The aggressive pattern of the group behavior, and the drive on the part of its members for exciting and new adventures, makes it difficult for recreational and group work agencies to meet the needs of this group. Supported in their rebellion against society by the "gang," individual members recognize no need for, and do not seek help from, case work agencies or mental health clinics.

There appears to be real need for educational, recreational, social service, and mental health agencies to reexamine programs to the end of more adequately serving the unreached youngster. This is said, without in any way repudiating the valuable work that these agencies are presently doing. In fact, they are deserving of much greater support.

How to handle a delinquent?

Should we punish him or give him corrective treatment?

That depends upon the individual boy or girl and the nature of the delinquent act.

Whatever the nature or history of the offense, efforts should be made, of course, to save the child from a delinquent career. On the other hand, the rights of the public must be fully recognized. A citizen is entitled to protection from bodily harm and theft or destruction of his property, whether these acts are committed by either juveniles or adults.

Law-enforcement agencies can't do the job alone.

Perhaps we need a national institute of juvenile delinquency for fact-finding, training of personnel to deal with wayward youth, and to develop techniques in preventing, controlling, and treating juvenile delinquency.

The problem evolves out of at least two basic causes, as Dr. Leonard W. Mayo, a social welfare expert, testified. One, what goes on inside a youngster (his emotional life, his conflicts, his difficulties, his internal problems); and the other major influence is, what goes on around him, in his home, in his community.

The schools, the churches, the people in the neighborhood, all have contributions to make for the well-being of youth.

For, in the last analysis, juvenile delinquency points to adult failure somewhere along the line.

General Fellers Denounces Circumvention of United States Constitution, Overcommitments in Foreign Lands, and Demands that American Youth Be Free To Seek Destiny in This Country

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 1954

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I submit for the RECORD and call the attention of Members of Congress to the following address delivered by Brig. Gen. Bonner Fellers, retired, in connection with the second annual Flag Day dinner at the Adelphia Hotel in Philadelphia the evening of June 14, 1954:

Mr. Chairman, members of the American Flag Committee, and your guests, I hold that it is a distinct honor to address the second annual Flag Day dinner here in Philadelphia. And for this opportunity I am most grateful. It is indeed appropriate and reassuring to pay tribute to our flag, in Philadelphia, where American liberty was cradled. And where the immortal Betsy Ross, at the invitation of General Washington, made our first American flag.

This occasion today is especially significant, in view of the present nationwide tendency to play down—even to neutralize—pure patriotism. This unfortunate trend is especially prevalent in some of our colleges. As the result of personal inquiry, I have found that students in certain leading institutions are being taught that patriotism is old-fashioned. They are being taught that it is proper to display the flag, upon occasion, but that to wave our flag is a sign of narrow nationalism, which might react unfavorably upon some of our foreign friends.

Such an inglorious attitude toward the Stars and Stripes is intended to relegate the high virtue of patriotism into disrepute. And for patriotism, some would have us substitute internationalism. After such an attitude is inculcated into a generation of college students, the next step is easy.

Our mission then becomes not the salvation of America and our own souls, but rather our mission becomes one of saving the world—despite the fact that some of the world doesn't want to be saved. This highly sophisticated international undertaking, in turn, leads to the buying of friendship—just as if friendship could be bought. And to insure success of the expansive undertaking, we find it necessary to clothe ourselves with the attributes of imperialism. But should our global undertaking falter, it must, we are told, be reinforced with more dollars and even with the blood of our youth.

Our flag, like our religious faith, is something to which we all turn in time of trouble. Let me give an illustration of what the flag means to soldiers.

During the dark days of Bataan, when the surrender of MacArthur's forces was imminent, a handful of spirited United States cavalrymen decided that they would not surrender. It would mean certain death if they were caught, but somehow they managed to escape into the great Zambales Mountain Range of Luzon, which parallels the China Sea. There they hid out for 3 long years. Loyal Filipinos, at the risk of torture and death, gave warning when Japs came near. And what did these cavalrymen take with them into the Zambales Mountain fastness? It was the American flag—the colors of the defeated 26th Cavalry.

On sunshiny days when the mountain passes were clear of the enemy, these American patriots unfurled their emblem of freedom into the breeze, and they lay there by the hour feasting on its glory.

While Manila was being liberated, these lads made their way through the battlelines and proudly presented their honored flag to General MacArthur. Throughout the Japanese occupation, the colors of the 26th Cavalry had never been hauled down.

I should like to hear some of our promiscuous internationalists tell these hardbitten cavalrymen not to wave the Stars and Stripes.

Shortly after Japan's surrender, your speaker of tonight, together with less than a dozen officers and a small color guard, stood at the American Embassy in Tokyo and General MacArthur, visibly moved, ordered the Stars and Stripes raised over the Embassy. It was the end of a long and frustrating and heartbreaking and bloody trail. And as our beautiful flag unfurled in the blue over Tokyo, emotion shook everyone of us to the marrow of his bones.

I tell you our flag does have a meaning. And if it ever loses its meaning, it will not only be the end of freedom in America, it will be the end of freedom everywhere.

THE RED THREAT

Today America faces greater danger than ever before in our history. The issues are joined. The Kremlin dictatorship over a population of 800 million is committed to world domination. The United States is the only power strong enough and willing to meet this challenge. Neither side wants total war, but each will doubtless accept total war than yield to the other.

The Communist cause is the most unGodly and brutal yet devised. And the tragic element in this conflict is that we, ourselves, in a measure are responsible for some of the danger we face. It was we who in 1933 recognized Russia, when her Communist experiment was on the verge of collapse. It was our World War II European effort which enabled the Red army to move deep into Europe and remain there. It was we who insisted on unconditional surrender, thereby removing the straitjacket—Germany and Japan—which had long been holding Russia out of China.

In all these and in similar events it would seem as if a sinister and invisible hand were controlling our destiny. Each step we took in the international field appeared innocent and inescapable, but the sum total undermined our strength while it strengthened the Soviet Union. Thus, many of our own faulty decisions have contributed to the Communist conspiracy, the most ruthless and diabolical conspiracy for world domination in all history.

OUR GLOBAL UNDERTAKING

For more than 20 years our Government has pursued the policy that certain strategic materials—those materials essential to world industry and our survival—should be obtained from overseas. This policy was decided, despite the fact all the strategic materials we require can be found in the Western Hemisphere, which we know we can defend. Nevertheless, the argument was advanced that we would leave the strategic materials of the Western Hemisphere in the ground, as an all-time reserve, while we encouraged foreigners to develop strategic materials on which our very survival depends. Funds were made available to foreign powers for the development of their resources. And strangely, the most favored nation was Russia. And who, you may ask, originated this scheme? It was none other than the late Harry Dexter White; one-time No. 2 in the Treasury Department and long-time FBI-reported Communist spy.

The next step for the internationalist was easy. Since we were making ourselves dependent upon strategic materials to be drawn from the four corners of the world, we must create the necessary military forces to guard them, wherever they might be found. Henceforth, it became clear that war, anywhere on the globe, might deny us some of those materials. If they were to fall into the hands of the enemy, disaster would be upon us. Therefore, we must guard our security by entering the war.

In 1952 the State Department announced its policy: "There are no longer any wars. * * * There are no more sidelines for a nation to sit on. * * * The only way to avoid being drawn into war is to prevent war."

This policy—that we must intervene in every war—has never been repudiated. The global allocation of our forces—Americans in uniform are serving in 63 countries or foreign areas—has given rise to critical issues. Since the framers of our Constitution did not shape it to provide for our present global undertakings, the Constitution itself is being circumvented, even superseded by treaties, which if properly made becomes the supreme law of the land.

STATUS OF FORCES

It is well known that the GI's stationed in foreign lands are usually considered as our best American ambassadors. Nevertheless, all self-respecting peoples naturally resent foreign troops stationed within their country. To make this situation more tolerable to our allies, our Government has made a concession known as the Status of Forces Treaty.

This agreement denies the full protection of the United States Constitution to servicemen and women stationed overseas. If an American member of a United States military unit commits a criminal or civil offense while serving abroad, he is subject to trial and punishment under foreign law. This may well deny him the protection of our Constitution, its Bill of Rights, writ of Habeus Corpus and trial by jury.

The irony of such an arrangement is obvious. Here in the United States, the Constitution extends protection to fifth amendment Communists. But under the Status of Forces Treaty, full protection by the same Constitution is denied to servicemen who have been ordered to duty overseas by their own Government.

Now it is an established principle of international law that when one nation invites the military forces of another nation to help defend it, the inviting nation waives criminal and civil jurisdiction over the visiting foreigners. Moreover, this principle is much older than international law. It goes back to the Bible.

It will be recalled that in the Acts of the Apostles, "Certain of the Jews banded together and bound themselves under a curse saying that they would neither eat nor drink till they had killed Paul." But Paul the Apostle was a Roman citizen and he appealed unto Caesar for protection.

Palestine at that time was under Roman rule and the Roman officials there recognized Paul's right and took the stand that "It is not the manner of the Romans to deliver any man to die." And Paul, the Apostle, was not turned over to those who had sworn to kill him. For he was a Roman, under the jurisdiction and protection of the Romans. And the Romans assumed their responsibility to their citizens and saved Paul from death.

It is my understanding that several hundred American GI's have—under the Status of Forces Treaty—been tried for civil or criminal offenses in foreign courts. There they were sentenced and jailed by the foreign government. A test case is now being made by a patriotic organization in Washington known as the Defenders of the American Constitution.

It is the case of Pvt. Richard Thomas Keefe, and it is the intention of the defenders to carry his case to the Supreme Court. The defenders hold that under our Constitution, Private Keefe should be returned to the jurisdiction of the United States courts and that he should be released from French imprisonment immediately and returned to his native land.

Since today some 55 percent of our Armed Forces are serving overseas, is it any wonder that conscription is necessary? Is it any wonder that West Point now suffers from the greatest number of vacancies in its history? Is it any wonder that morale is low in the Military Establishment?

CONTAINMENT

Our determination to oppose the Communist dream of world domination—which I am sure we all endorse—led us to adopt a policy of containment against Red aggression. Mr. George Kennan, formerly Chief of the Department of State planning staff, is credited with having originated the containment concept.

Briefly, it provides that we shall meet Communist aggression, when and where it may occur, with an equal counterforce. Such a proposal really means that the NATO peoples, some 350 million strong, are being called upon physically to contain the Communist population onf some 800 million peoples. On the basis of manpower resources alone, this containment policy has led us into an insuperable military undertaking.

This concept of physical containment is being implemented in Europe, where our Ground and Air Forces are tremendously outnumbered. It was tried out in Korea, where we now are experiencing an uneasy truce. And at the moment the tragic course of Communist aggression in Indochina challenges our leadership. Whether or not to contain Communist aggression in this farflung tropical country is the question.

INTERVENTION

Today our entry into the Indochina war would seem very likely. Speaking at West Point some 6 months ago, Admiral Radford, Chairman of our Joint Chiefs of Staff, twice stressed that it was inconceivable that we would permit the French to lose in Indochina. Since no one has expected the French to win their 7-year struggle, the admiral's statement is laden with meaning.

Press dispatches of a week ago revealed that the President recently might have asked the Congress to declare war against the Communist rebel forces in Indochina if Great Britain had been willing to go along. Fortunately, to my mind, Great Britain held us back.

The military picture in Indochina is not widely understood. In the first place, all of the natives except puppets are unalterably opposed to French imperialism. When the present war started, the natives were fighting for independence. Only puppets and mercenaries supported the French. Then the Communists, as is their technique, came in to support the rebels. Although the French need help, American forces or any other white forces would not be well received by the natives.

Indochina has been liked unto the end domino of a domino set standing on end and close together. If the first domino falls, the others in turn go down. Likewise, it is argued, if Indochina falls, neighboring powers will also fall in quick succession—Thailand, Burma, India, Pakistan, Indonesia, Philippines, and Australia.

Now suppose that the United States forces intervene, that the Reds are decisively defeated, and Indochina is liberated. Would the corollary to the domino story follow? Would a liberated Indochina save Thailand, Burma, India, Pakistan, Indonesia, the Philippines, and Australia?

It is Communist technique to attack from within. First the opposition is liquidated and Communists put in control. Then from neighboring satellites or from Russia herself, munitions and Red volunteers are fed to the Communist rebels. There seems no basis for the belief that the liberation of Indochina would guarantee Communist inactivity in neighboring states.

A free Indochina could not be considered as a telling lesson to the Communists. Just as our intervention in Korea failed to discourage the Communist war in Indochina, likewise our intervention in Indochina will not prevent Communist activities nearby. Does the United States, or would a southeast Asia treaty organization, were it formed, have the forces to intervene successively in the several countries south of Red China and Tibet?

Our intervention would be a very great psychological blunder. It would be used by the Kremlin to prove that America has aggressive intent. Today the Kremlin is waging an intensive hate America campaign.

In Europe the Kremlin can point to our Armed Forces on the Rhine as a visible symbol of American aggressive intent. The Kremlin can point to our intervention in Korea as American imperialism. Intervention in Indochina would clinch the charge. To the Soviet people, who find it most difficult to learn the truth of the outside world, these reports of our farflung military activities are made to appear as convincing proof that we, and not Russia, seek world domination. And the Kremlin finds these charges a much needed unifying agency for the enslaved Soviet people.

Now let us suppose that we intervene in Indochina and that soon all Communists have been killed or captured or driven out. In a free election, Indochina might still vote Communist. Could we continue then to impose another form of government upon the natives?

Intervention in Indochina might intice Red China to send peoples' volunteer forces on precisely the same scale and terms as in Korea. Even if cooperative, Allied ground forces would be enormously outnumbered. And the Red Chinese Air Force, which is now the fourth largest in the world, could lend more support than it did in Korea.

There will be little help from Chiang Kai-shek, because he cannot threaten the mainland until the Red Chinese Air Force is neutralized. And only the United States could effect this neutralization. Syngman Rhee's forces, for the most part, are pinned down on the 38th parallel. He could not deplete this command for major operations in Indochina.

Our intervention in Indochina could lead to a full-scale modern war. Suppose while we are heavily committed, war starts in Korea. Decision to resume war there is not in our hands. Rather, it is in the hands of the Reds, or possibly President Rhee.

Trouble is also brewing between Israel and the Arab States. And when the time is ripe, France's north African colonies are set to revolt. In view of our strategic air bases in north Africa, what shall be our stand if this new colonial war comes to pass?

With a third of our Armed Forces pinned down in Europe and another third backing

Syngman Rhee in Korea, it is conceivable that intervention in Indochina could lead to our participation in war against Red China, as well as to war in the Middle East and north Africa. And mind you, all this could happen to us, while not a single Red soldier is committed to battle. Such a predicament would indeed be to the advantage of the Kremlin. Nevertheless, the probability of our entering the war somewhere in southeast Asia is very great.

Within 5 or 6 months it is likely that in British Malaya, the British may then find it is to their interest to lead us into intervention. A recent remark attributed to Prime Minister Churchill is significant: "While the American public is now against entering the war, public thinking can be changed by two Eisenhower TV appeals."

Already, every American boy is subject to the draft. To raise more troops would require a full-scale mobilization including universal military training. It would put America on an indefinite wartime basis. And our budget, out of balance for years, would skyrocket. Continued unbalanced budgets will leave a heritage of debt to our youth which they can never shoulder.

I hold that military intervention in southeast Asia would be the greatest mistake of our times. It could lead to no decision and no end of trouble.

BRICKER AMENDMENT

Thus we see that the world has never been more turbulent than it is today. Our commitments by treaty and by moral obligation are global. For the past two decades we have been moving inexorably toward the vortex of this turbulance. Is it any wonder that citizens, by the millions demanded the Bricker amendment as a safeguard? It is my sincere hope that this demand will continue until adequate constitutional safeguards are established.

SOLUTION TO RED THREAT

The question, of course, arises, if we fail to intervene in Indochina, will not Red Russia and Red China absorb one small nation after another, until all Asia is under the Kremlin heel? Of course, this is the Kremlin objective.

In those countries where there is a genuine desire to fight communism, where the people sincerely ask for help, we should supply weapons to their ground forces. Under certain conditions and if our own security is threatened, it might be indicated to extend sea and air support only. The greatest military authority on the Far East is Douglas MacArthur. I will read you his testimony under oath: "No man in his right mind would advocate sending American ground forces into continental China. It would be reckless and foolish for the United States even to consider it."

I should like to amplify this statement. The use of American ground forces on the continent of Asia or Europe is unjustified and if continued will lead to disaster. War on the mainland of the Eurasian Continent should be conducted entirely from the air with sea support, and without the use of ground forces. We cannot match the Communist ground forces. Our best hope lies in overwhelming American air supremacy. But, after all, is war the proper agency to resolve the Communist threat? History indicates otherwise. World War I made Communist Russia possible. World War II made Red China possible. World war III will extend communism all over Asia and Europe. Even the United States of America will be compelled to go totalitarian.

The task of meeting the Red threat is not at all insurperable, because communism itself, contains the seeds for its own destruction. Communist powers are strongest on their borders; they are most vulnerable deep within these borders. Despite this fact, we continue to attack Red strength and avoid Red weakness.

It will take more intelligent planning than has been devoted to it in the past, if we are to exterminate the Red menace. The solution does not lie in southeastern Asia, where I am certain the Kremlin would enjoy our intervention. The solution lies within the Soviet Union itself. The Kremlin's great weakness is her tremendously dissatisfied population. Fifteen million of the Soviet people are in slave labor camps being worked and starved to death. This means that every family in the Soviet Union has a relative or member in a slave labor camp. The Soviet peoples are living under their own military occupation. They don't like it.

There are two great fears in the Soviet Union. First, the peoples fear of the Kremlin and second, the Kremlin's fear of the people. These fears are in equilibrium, held so by the bayonet. Once the people fear the Kremlin less, than the Kremlin fears the people, then Kremlin domination will come to an end.

How can we find a solution in southeast Asia, when our real enemy is the Kremlin? Why not, therefore, create overwhelming American air supremacy as a war deterrent, or instrument of massive retaliation, should war be forced upon us. With this deterrent in being and ready to strike, we should withdraw American diplomatic recognition. This would give the greatest possible encouragement to the enslaved Soviet peoples. It would close the Soviet Embassy and other agencies in the United States from which most Communist activities in our country are financed. It would deal a mortal blow to most subversive programs in the United States.

At the same time we should assist the anti-Communist underground in a vast educational program to convince the Soviet people that, we want peace—not war—and that we will never again recognize the Kremlin dictatorship.

The recent cracks in the Kremlin's MVD, the desertion of key MVD agents in Japan, Australia, and Europe, together with reliable reports from inside the Soviet Union, disclose that since Stalin's death, the Kremlin grip on the Soviet people is not firm.

Let us therefore avoid panic over conditions in Indochina. Rather let us take immediate steps to confine the Kremlin's attention to its own internal turbulence. With overwhelming airpower we can deter war. Meanwhile, there is real hope that during the time thus gained, the Soviet people and Red army itself will eventually overthrow the dictatorship of the Kremlin.

AMERICAN YOUTH HERITAGE

And now, as America is plagued and tormented and bedeviled with trouble, what of our great heritage can we pass on to our youth?

If we continue to subject our Constitution and our law and our Armed Forces to the will of foreign peoples, then our youth will have no heritage of freedom. They will soon be victims of enslavement. It is imperative that we take our own destiny in our own hands, that we unshackle ourselves from foreign domination and proceed immediately to do precisely what is best for America.

This is not a selfish stand. We are the only great roadblock in the Kremlin's march to world domination. When liberty dies in America, the curtain will ring down everywhere on man's vast hope for freedom.

May this then be our prayer on Flag Day, 1954, in Philadelphia: That we create overwhelming airpower, without conscription; that we exploit the Kremlin's weakness and avoid its strength; that our youth be free to seek its own destiny here in America; that the Stars and Stripes fly over an independent, sovereign United States, in perpetuity.

The Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1954

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. HALLECK

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 1954

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, on May 6, 1954, President Eisenhower signed the McGregor bill, officially designated as the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1954.

This legislation, enacted by the Republican 83d Congress, reflected the deep concern of the American people arising from the deficiencies in the Nation's road system.

Our people wanted a modern road system in keeping with the progress of a growing Nation. The Republican Congress and the administration has provided them with tools to help build that kind of a road system, one that will bring the Nation's antiquated highways up to the standards necessary. Vehicular traffic imposed today upon our inadequate road system exceeds 500 billion motor-vehicle miles annually. It was high time we met this problem squarely.

As finally signed into law, the Federal Highway Act authorizes expenditures of $966 million in each of the fiscal years 1956 and 1957. This, for the first time in history, allocates for road construction in your home town and mine, on the farm to market roads our busy farmers travel daily, and on the highway between States so necessary for defense, almost all of the taxes collected from the people on gasoline and motor oils.

This $966 million for each of the 2 fiscal years ahead exceeds the amount provided for highway construction in the Nation by $253,500,000 more than in any previous year in our history.

The McGregor highway bill contains many important changes benefiting those who use our roads and highways for business and pleasure. For the first time the Congress, under Republican leadership, recognized the need for improving our 40,000 miles of interstate highways, providing $175 million for this job. A new formula was adopted, providing an apportionment of one-half on population, and one-half on section 21, the formula which has historically been applicable to our 3-system network of roads. The modification in the formula for apportionment of the increased interstate road fund allocates a greater amount proportionately to those heavily populated States wherein the cost of the interstate system, due to our growing traffic burden, is so great.

Our interstate road system is part and parcel of our primary and urban road systems. The Republican Congress, therefore, adopted a new method of matching funds on a 60 percent Federal and a 40 percent State basis. This Republican-sponsored matching ratio will encourage less populous States to improve the relatively small but highly important mileage of the interstate system within those States.

Another major change in this Republican administration's approach to supplying our States with the tools for building modern road systems is also provided in the McGregor bill. It gives all States a greater degree of administrative control over their own roads included in their Federal-aid secondary systems. They have the right under this law to specify the kind of planning, design, and construction for their secondary roads, including farm-to-market roads, which their own State highway departments consider necessary. This means there is no longer the unnecessary interference from the Federal Bureau of Public Roads. Under the highway construction law which the President has praised so highly, county, township, and State officials are now able to use their Federal funds on secondary roads without rigid adherence to Federal specifications which often in the past have prevented the construction of needed roads in many sections of our rural area in the Nation.

In addition, the McGregor Act provides a better working procedure with regard to forest highways, parkways, and other roads on federally owned lands within many of our great States.

This legislation corrects a basic neglect on the part of previous administrations to recognize the fact that this is an expanding Nation, with a growing economy, and with a people moving forward to a busier and better life.

First. It authorizes the Secretary of Commerce to turn over to any State highway department on request full jurisdiction over the engineering and construction of farm-to-market roads.

Second. It improves and enlarges authorization for our national system of interstate highways, allowing our States on a 60-40 matching basis to complete the road nets vital to our security.

Third. Most important of all to many communities, the new Highway Construction Act provides for the transfer of funds between primary, secondary, and urban roads, providing the flexibility necessary to meet needs which may vary from State to State.

This is a truly modern Highway Construction Act, geared to the needs of our people. It is a workable system, containing provisions which many of us have known to be desirable for years. Our very security may be at stake; a fact President Eisenhower and the Republican Congress recognized at the outset.

Our people will recognize the improvements by comparing the Highway Act of 1952 to the McGregor Highway Act of 1954, now signed into law by our Republican President.

State	Primary		Secondary		Urban	
	1952 act ($247,500,000)	1954 act ($315,000,000) (approximate)	1952 act ($165,000,000)	1954 act ($210,000,000) (approximate)	1952 act ($137,000,000)	1954 act ($175,000,000) (approximate)
Alabama	$5, 254, 353	$6, 722, 000	$4, 071, 630	$5, 209, 000	$1, 767, 190	$2, 261, 000
Arizona	3, 682, 659	4, 711, 000	2, 508, 001	3, 208, 000	524, 664	671, 000
Arkansas	4, 099, 014	5, 244, 000	3, 280, 781	4, 197, 000	754, 576	965, 000
California	11, 302, 419	14, 459, 000	5, 819, 399	7, 444, 000	11, 990, 492	15, 339, 000
Colorado	4, 430, 632	5, 668, 000	2, 959, 462	3, 776, 000	1, 121, 056	1, 434, 000
Connecticut	1, 596, 556	2, 042, 000	804, 375	1, 029, 000	2, 612, 362	3, 342, 000
Delaware	1, 206, 563	1, 543, 000	804, 375	1, 029, 000	276, 696	354, 000
Florida	4, 000, 064	5, 117, 000	2, 614, 900	3, 345, 000	2, 418, 720	3, 094, 000
Georgia	6, 093, 832	7, 796, 000	4, 654, 049	5, 954, 000	1, 965, 808	2, 515, 000
Idaho	3, 035, 086	3, 883, 000	2, 134, 840	2, 731, 000	259, 590	332, 000
Illinois	9, 485, 889	12, 135, 000	5, 165, 722	6, 608, 000	9, 433, 309	12, 068, 000
Indiana	5, 844, 963	7, 477, 000	4, 028, 914	5, 154, 000	3, 227, 030	4, 128, 000
Iowa	5, 946, 365	7, 607, 000	4, 351, 647	5, 567, 000	1, 901, 372	2, 049, 000
Kansas	5, 975, 744	7, 645, 000	4, 183, 753	5, 352, 000	1, 267, 798	1, 622, 000
Kentucky	4, 538, 481	5, 806, 000	3, 767, 905	4, 820, 000	1, 400, 780	1, 792, 000
Louisiana	3, 836, 826	4, 908, 000	2, 777, 082	3, 553, 000	1, 977, 289	2, 529, 000
Maine	2, 065, 955	2, 643, 000	1, 478, 426	1, 891, 000	563, 746	721, 000
Maryland	2, 164, 618	2, 769, 000	1, 323, 108	1, 693, 000	2, 289, 281	2, 929, 000
Massachusetts	3, 127, 509	4, 001, 000	1, 161, 437	1, 486, 000	5, 614, 329	7, 182, 000
Michigan	7, 641, 646	9, 776, 000	4, 662, 919	5, 965, 000	6, 277, 985	8, 031, 000
Minnesota	6, 385, 910	8, 169, 000	4, 508, 055	5, 767, 000	2, 196, 488	2, 810, 000
Mississippi	4, 401, 911	5, 631, 000	3, 666, 740	4, 691, 000	746, 808	955, 000
Missouri	7, 177, 220	9, 181, 000	4, 856, 080	6, 212, 000	3, 321, 925	4, 250, 000
Montana	4, 945, 242	6, 326, 000	3, 401, 828	4, 352, 000	317, 626	406, 000
Nebraska	4, 801, 122	6, 142, 000	3, 404, 259	4, 355, 000	791, 122	1, 012, 000
Nevada	3, 179, 310	4, 067, 000	2, 124, 823	2, 718, 000	102, 729	131, 000
New Hampshire	1, 206, 563	1, 543, 000	804, 375	1, 029, 000	399, 467	511, 000
New Jersey	3, 183, 593	4, 073, 000	1, 071, 310	1, 370, 000	5, 904, 745	7, 554, 000
New Mexico	4, 002, 794	5, 121, 000	2, 749, 864	3, 518, 000	442, 682	566, 000
New York	11, 573, 650	14, 806, 000	4, 637, 841	5, 933, 000	18, 029, 580	23, 064, 000
North Carolina	6, 101, 355	7, 805, 000	5, 211, 948	6, 667, 000	1, 733, 316	2, 217, 000
North Dakota	3, 572, 139	4, 570, 000	2, 593, 772	3, 318, 000	228, 084	292, 000
Ohio	8, 586, 082	10, 984, 000	5, 222, 980	6, 681, 000	7, 805, 716	9, 985, 000
Oklahoma	5, 269, 114	6, 741, 000	3, 772, 951	4, 827, 000	1, 473, 687	1, 885, 000
Oregon	4, 209, 393	5, 385, 000	2, 941, 860	3, 763, 000	1, 081, 596	1, 384, 000
Pennsylvania	9, 663, 980	12, 363, 000	5, 751, 129	7, 357, 000	10, 211, 618	13, 063, 000
Rhode Island	1, 206, 563	1, 543, 000	804, 375	1, 029, 000	964, 266	1, 234, 000
South Carolina	3, 315, 477	4, 241, 000	2, 745, 191	3, 512, 000	927, 881	1, 187, 000
South Dakota	3, 845, 626	4, 920, 000	2, 746, 570	3, 514, 000	261, 991	335, 000
Tennessee	5, 335, 882	6, 826, 000	4, 158, 793	5, 320, 000	1, 950, 550	2, 495, 000
Texas	15, 972, 097	20, 432, 000	10, 694, 852	13, 681, 000	6, 462, 029	8, 267, 000
Utah	2, 830, 795	3, 621, 000	1, 872, 691	2, 396, 000	571, 559	731, 000
Vermont	1, 206, 563	1, 543, 000	804, 375	1, 029, 000	210, 027	269, 000
Virginia	4, 676, 730	5, 983, 000	3, 634, 841	4, 650, 000	2, 103, 426	2, 691, 000
Washington	4, 070, 327	5, 207, 000	2, 719, 183	3, 479, 000	2, 035, 293	2, 604, 000
West Virginia	2, 685, 059	3, 435, 000	2, 337, 564	2, 990, 000	877, 871	1, 123, 000
Wisconsin	5, 816, 900	7, 441, 000	4, 058, 553	5, 192, 000	2, 641, 382	3, 379, 000
Wyoming	3, 070, 586	3, 928, 000	2, 080, 954	2, 662, 000	146, 664	188, 000
Hawaii	1, 206, 563	1, 543, 000	804, 375	1, 029, 000	453, 586	580, 000
District of Columbia	1, 206, 563	1, 543, 000	804, 275	1, 029, 000	1, 165, 310	1, 491, 000
Puerto Rico	1, 278, 217	1, 635, 000	1, 335, 768	1, 709, 000	1, 159, 454	1, 483, 000

State	Subtotal		Interstate		Total	
	1952 act ($550,000,000)	1954 act ($700,000,000) (approximate)	1952 act ($25,000,000)	1954 act ($175,000,000) (approximate)	1952 act ($575,000,000)	1954 act ($875,000,000) (approximate)
Alabama	$11, 093, 173	$14, 192, 000	$536, 065	$3, 528, 000	$11, 629, 238	$17, 720, 000
Arizona	6, 715, 324	8, 590, 000	374, 943	1, 962, 000	7, 090, 267	10, 552, 000
Arkansas	8, 134, 371	10, 406, 000	417, 845	2, 494, 000	8, 552, 216	12, 900, 000
California	29, 112, 310	37, 242, 000	1, 156, 953	9, 746, 000	30, 269, 263	46, 988, 000
Colorado	8, 511, 150	10, 888, 000	451, 275	2, 299, 000	8, 962, 425	13, 187, 000
Connecticut	5, 013, 293	6, 413, 000	163, 779	1, 652, 000	5, 177, 072	8, 065, 000
Delaware	2, 287, 574	2, 926, 000	121, 875	1, 072, 000	2, 409, 449	3, 998, 000
Florida	9, 033, 684	11, 556, 000	408, 607	2, 923, 000	9, 442, 291	14, 479, 000
Georgia	12, 713, 689	16, 265, 000	621, 611	4, 034, 000	13, 335, 300	20, 299, 000
Idaho	5, 429, 525	6, 946, 000	308, 923	1, 730, 000	5, 738, 448	8, 676, 000

State	Subtotal		Interstate		Total	
	1952 act ($550,000,000)	1954 act ($700,000,000) (approximate)	1952 act ($25,000,000)	1954 act ($175,000,000) (approximate)	1952 act ($575,000,000)	1954 act ($875,000,000) (approximate)
Illinois	$24,084,920	$30,811,000	$970,391	$8,085,000	$25,055,311	$38,896,000
Indiana	13,100,907	16,759,000	596,664	4,208,000	13,697,571	20,967,000
Iowa	11,899,384	15,223,000	605,903	3,537,000	12,505,287	18,760,000
Kansas	11,427,295	14,619,000	608,403	3,162,000	12,035,698	17,781,000
Kentucky	9,707,166	12,418,000	463,271	3,209,000	10,170,437	15,627,000
Louisiana	8,591,197	10,990,000	391,908	2,818,000	8,983,105	13,808,000
Maine	4,108,127	5,255,000	210,595	1,384,000	4,318,722	6,639,000
Maryland	5,777,007	7,391,000	221,739	2,036,000	5,998,746	9,427,000
Massachusetts	9,903,275	12,669,000	321,494	3,646,000	10,224,769	16,315,000
Michigan	18,582,550	23,772,000	781,229	6,164,000	19,363,779	29,936,000
Minnesota	13,090,453	16,746,000	650,982	3,889,000	13,741,435	20,635,000
Mississippi	8,815,459	11,277,000	448,780	2,747,000	9,264,239	14,024,000
Missouri	15,355,225	19,643,000	732,034	4,695,000	16,087,259	24,338,000
Montana	8,664,696	11,084,000	503,085	2,413,000	9,167,781	13,497,000
Nebraska	8,996,503	11,509,000	488,697	2,430,000	9,485,200	13,939,000
Nevada	5,406,862	6,916,000	323,336	1,780,000	5,730,198	8,696,000
New Hampshire	2,410,405	3,083,000	121,875	1,072,000	2,532,280	4,155,000
New Jersey	10,159,648	12,997,000	327,310	3,744,000	10,486,958	16,741,000
New Mexico	7,195,340	9,205,000	407,405	2,076,000	7,602,745	11,281,000
New York	34,241,071	43,803,000	1,187,586	12,130,000	35,428,657	55,933,000
North Carolina	13,046,619	16,689,000	622,886	4,369,000	13,669,505	21,058,000
North Dakota	6,393,995	8,180,000	363,355	1,921,000	6,757,350	10,101,000
Ohio	21,614,778	27,650,000	878,337	7,351,000	22,493,115	35,001,000
Oklahoma	10,515,752	13,453,000	536,936	3,086,000	11,052,688	16,539,000
Oregon	8,232,849	10,532,000	428,962	2,325,000	8,661,811	12,857,000
Pennsylvania	25,626,727	32,783,000	989,979	9,112,000	26,616,706	41,895,000
Rhode Island	2,975,204	3,806,000	121,875	1,072,000	3,097,079	4,878,000
South Carolina	6,988,549	8,940,000	338,411	2,326,000	7,326,960	11,266,000
South Dakota	6,854,187	8,769,000	391,167	2,019,000	7,245,354	10,788,000
Tennessee	11,445,225	14,641,000	544,484	3,680,000	11,989,709	18,321,000
Texas	33,128,978	42,380,000	1,628,769	9,865,000	34,757,747	52,245,000
Utah	5,275,045	6,748,000	288,296	1,657,000	5,563,341	8,405,000
Vermont	2,220,965	2,841,000	121,875	1,072,000	2,342,840	3,913,000
Virginia	10,414,997	13,324,000	477,631	3,459,000	10,892,628	16,783,000
Washington	8,824,803	11,290,000	415,444	2,737,000	9,240,247	14,027,000
West Virginia	5,900,494	7,548,000	274,317	2,040,000	6,174,811	9,588,000
Wisconsin	12,516,835	16,012,000	593,492	3,930,000	13,110,327	19,942,000
Wyoming	5,298,204	6,778,000	312,346	1,742,000	5,610,550	8,520,000
Hawaii	2,464,524	3,152,000	----------	----------	2,464,524	3,152,000
District of Columbia	3,176,248	4,063,000	121,875	1,072,000	3,298,123	5,135,000
Puerto Rico	3,773,439	4,827,000	----------	----------	3,773,439	4,827,000

The Bryson Bill, H. R. 1227

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 1954

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include in the Appendix of the RECORD, at the request of the signers, the following petition and list of signers from the 10th District of Virginia in support of H. R. 1227, a bill to restrict the advertisement of alcoholic beverages:

We, citizens of Virginia, urge passage of bill H. R. 1227, to ban advertisement of alcoholic beverages from interstate commerce both in public and common or private carriers, and over the air.

We feel that passage of the bill and enforcement of the act will give better protection to our homes, insure greater safety on the highways, and will help to make our Nation strong.

R. G. Key, pastor, Woodlawn Church, Barbara F. Hunter, Lois Jane Arison, Nancy L. Kelvington, Wanda Rosentrater, Lavern Rosentrater, Robert L. Anderson, Jack B. Stufflebiem, Helen Miller, Alexandria, Va.; Florence J. Hassler, Fort Belvoir, Va.; Alice D. Lowry, Mrs. J. W. Hughes, Mrs. T. D. Fraley, Jr., D. W. Craigmyle, Freda Craigmyle, T. D. Fraley, L. T. Mitchell, Henry M. Ford, A. G. Lowry, Vernon R. Pettie, Mrs. J. H. Westbrook, Alexandria, Va.; R. A. Winstead, Lorton, Va.; Clara B. Pettie, Jeanette Sostrom, Robert H. Sostrom, Robbie Reed, Daniel Reed, Alexandria, Va.; G. W. Miller, Sr., Mrs. G. W. Miller, Sr., Mount Vernon, Va.; Walter S. Thurston, Mrs. Alice Thurston, Alexandria, Va.; Mrs.Theresa Sumler, Newington, Va.; Miss Rita White, Mrs. Stephen M. Satterwhite, S. M. Satterwhite, Alexandria, Va.; M. A. Rogers, Mrs. M. A. Rogers, Mrs. Edith Petitt, Mount Vernon, Va.; Pvt. Gwendolyn E. Cox, Fort Belvoir, Va.; Miss Ruth Petitt, Mrs. H. V. Biddle, Mrs. Mary Nadin, Lily Nadin, Alexandria, Va.

Joseph R. Farrington

SPEECH

OF

HON. PAUL B. DAGUE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 21, 1954

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, in the passing of the gentleman from Hawaii this House has lost one of its ablest Members and the Nation has lost a great public servant. To have known JOE FARRINGTON was to have been invigorated by the warmth of his personality and stimulated by the soundness of his logic in matters of public concern.

His unswerving loyalty to the people he served and his undeviating dedication to their interests commanded for him the respect of all those who were privileged to serve with him in this body. Because of the limitations placed upon him by reason of the status of his constituency one could have expected him to remain mute on questions upon which he could not vote, but not JOE FARRINGTON, and the RECORD is replete with his appeals in behalf of all the people.

It was but a few days before his death that I stopped him on the floor to assure him that out of deference to the renewed request of President Eisenhower for statehood for Hawaii and also out of my personal regard for the Delegate from Hawaii I had determined to cast my vote in his favor should the question again come before us. He thanked me for my pledge and I am glad that I announced by intentions while he was still with us.

I have never been to that island paradise which JOE so pridefully represented but should future events take me to those golden isles I know that I shall see him in the glistening beaches and the stately palms—I shall think of Diamond Head as nature's monument to his steadfast loyalty—and I shall hear in the soft cadence of the song of the islands the voice of his people welcoming him home. We pray that they, and especially the members of his family, will let us share their grief and with them keep his memory green.

The Shilshole Breakwater

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 1954

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, the House Public Works Committee will soon report a Rivers and Harbors program calling for authorizations of some $1 billion in public works construction throughout the country. The last program approval occurred in 1950, when $1.5 billion was authorized.

One of the projects approved by the full committee recently is of intense interest to the people of Seattle, Wash. This is the breakwater at the entrance to the Lake Washington Ship Canal in Shilshole Bay immediately off the Government locks, which regulate the water level between Puget Sound and Seattle's fresh-water lakes. Inasmuch as authorization of this breakwater has been sought for over a quarter of a century, I can truly say that I was delighted by the action of the committee and extremely happy to be a part of this important step forward.

As you and my colleagues well know, Mr. Speaker, authorization is only one-half of the battle. When the Congress approves the rivers and harbors program contained in the committee report, we of Seattle will then face another hurdle in obtaining Federal appropriations to begin construction. That is for the future.

In order that my colleagues will have at least a brief understanding of what the breakwater is, what it will do, and the many ways in which it will benefit the city of Seattle, I am inserting in the RECORD a fine statement made early last March before the Rivers and Harbors Subcommittee of the Public Works Committee by State Representative Dwight S. Hawley, who also serves as chairman of the Shilshole Breakwater Association in Seattle. Mr. Hawley's statement is brief, factual, and speaks for itself. I think even a casual reading of his testimony will indicate what an important event authorization of the breakwater will be for the city which I have the honor to represent in this body.

Mr. Hawley's statement before the subcommittee on March 5, 1954, follows:

SHILSHOLE BREAKWATER ASSOCIATION,
Seattle, Wash., February 25, 1954.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE MEMBERS: The following report has been prepared for presentation to the members of your committee in support of the proposed Shilshole breakwater project Seattle, Wash.

The Shilshole Breakwater Association retained the engineering firm of Lochow & Fisher, of Seattle, Wash., to conduct a survey relative to the economic benefits of the improvement. The information in this report is taken from the Lochow & Fisher survey, and the report of the Chief of the United States Army engineers as of October 14, 1949. It is our desire that both of these reports, and photos contained in a separate folder, be made a part of this record.

Yours very truly,
DWIGHT S. HAWLEY,
Chairman.

INTRODUCTORY

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, my name is Dwight S. Hawley. I am from Seattle, Wash. Our city celebrated its 100th anniversary last year. In this 100 years the State of Washington and the city of Seattle have contributed much to the economy and the welfare of our Nation.

I speak for the Shilshole Breakwater Association. Our organization represents fishing vessel owners, sawmill operators, towboat companies, the boatbuilding industry, Seattle inner-harbor industries, yacht clubs, sailing vessel owners, and civic and community clubs of the Puget Sound area.

In addition, the association represents a large group of taxpayers in Seattle and King County who have been actively supporting the project for many years. These individuals are evidenced by petitions bearing 15,000 signatures filed with the district engineer in connection with the hearings resulting in the approval of the project.

I served as the secretary of the association from 1928 until 1944. Since 1944 I have served as the chairman. No salaries have been paid to officers or members of the association since organization. Expense money has been received through voluntary contributions from members.

The expense of my appearance in Washington is being paid by the association through funds furnished by the Ballard Commercial Club. The Ballard Commercial Club is a group of Seattle businessmen who are active in sponsoring the project.

BACKGROUND: 1916–54

The need for protection from rough waters in Shilshole Bay was recognized within several years after the completion of the Government locks in 1916. It was apparent that a breakwater constructed in the outer harbor would serve as an auxiliary to the locks and provide the needed protection. The open water frequently made it impossible for log tows, barges, fishing vessels and other craft to anchor while waiting for passage through the locks.

In 1928 the Shilshole Breakwater Association was organized for the purpose of study and recommendation in connection with the proposed improvement.

One of those present at the first meeting was Hon. John F. Miller, Congressman from the Seattle district. Mr. Miller was much interested in the project, and he supported it during his years in Congress.

In one of the early meetings, Mr. Miller made the following remark: "This project has much merit. However," he said, "there are many such projects before the Congress at each session. This one will take its turn along with the others. Get all the facts and present them properly, and one day your project will be authorized."

These words of wisdom from a fine statesman of many years ago bring us here today with carefully compiled facts and figures supporting the Shilshole breakwater.

In 1931 Congressman Miller and Senator Wesley L. Jones were successful in prevailing upon Congress to authorize a hearing. Business conditions were depressed, and it was determined that the improvement was not needed at that particular time.

The complete plans for the physical construction of the breakwater have been prepared by the Seattle district engineer's office, file No. C 2–4–104.3, February 11, 1949. A copy of the plan is filed with this report.

The improvements to be made by the city of Seattle are also shown on the map.

In the words of the district engineer, the breakwater will be a small boat basin on the north side of the canal entrance of approximately 72 acres in area, for the protection and moorage of fishing and pleasure boats by the construction of a rock mound breakwater 4,200 feet long, and dredging the area shoreward thereof to depths of 15 to 10 feet; all at an estimated Federal cost of $3,064,808 (including $22,100 for navigation aids to be constructed by the United States Coast Guard) plus $25,000 annually for maintenance.

BENEFITS

The benefits resulting from the construction of the proposed Shilshole breakwater are many and varied.

The inner harbor of the city of Seattle contains numerous terminals owned by industries, the city and county, and Federal agencies; facilities for handling rafts of logs at 5 sawmills, 4 seaplane moorages, about 55 private facilities for mooring, servicing, and repairing small craft, and several small-boat clubs.

The port of Seattle operates a base for commercial fishing boats in Salmon Bay. This base has been recently expanded by an expenditure of more than $500,000 provided by a bond issue by a vote of the people.

All outer harbor and Puget Sound traffic entering or leaving the inner harbor must pass through the locks. The breakwater would relieve the resulting congestion.

Recreation craft make frequent passage through the canal in view of the attractiveness of Puget Sound as a boating area, it being only second to New York in the number of registered pleasure boats.

One thousand two hundred commercial fishing boats moored in the inner harbor use the canal to reach the outside fishing grounds, the main fish markets, and processing plants and suppliers which are located on the outer harbor.

The rafted log traffic is principally inbound through Shilshole Bay. Passage of log tows through the locks requires movement in sections to designations above the locks while remaining sections are moored in Shileshole Bay at floats maintained by the Federal Government. The use of extra towboats is required to safeguard the log rafts in the open waters where the tows are subject to disintegration by storms, and to maintain channel clearance when log rafts are temporarily moored in the basin below the locks.

The construction of the breakwater will facilitate the movement of these logs at a substantial saving to the sawmills.

The report of the United States Army Engineers shows that the canal accommodated 56,398 one-way trips by vessels in 1 year. About 98 percent of the trips were made by vessels drawing 14 feet or less, including 16,992 trips by commercial fishing vessels drawing under 12 feet, and 18,716 trips by recreational craft drawing less than 12 feet.

These craft would be accommodated by the proposed breakwater, and it would postpone the necessity of constructing an additional lock for many years.

The report also states that an average of 1,238,286 tons in vessels and 1,114,250 tons of rafted logs passed through the locks in the 10-year period, 1938 to 1947, inclusive. A survey reveals that the vessel tonnage has increased substantially in the past few years.

Boats moving between Lake Washington and Puget Sound continually interrupt automobile traffic crossing the 4 bridges located at 15th Avenue NW., Fremont, University and Montlake. The result is great inconvenience and loss of time to the general public. The Lochow & Fisher report has placed this loss at $160,580 annually.

The district engineer has summarized his estimates of annual benefits by the construction of the proposed breakwater as follows:

Commercial fishing industry	$114, 170
Recreational boating and reduced bridge openings	160, 810
Miscellaneous items	6, 000
Total	280, 980

The benefit cost ratio is 1.82 according to the Army engineers report.

The Lochow & Fisher report is based on the projected increased population figures for the year 1970. The City of Seattle Planning Commission places this estimate as 670,000 people.

The projection summarizes the benefits as follows:

Fishing vessels	$346, 000
Private-boat owners	109, 600
Creation of new business	71, 560
Reduced bridge openings	161, 780
Increased county taxes	33, 175
Total annual benefits	722, 115

General benefits are as follows:

Maintaining water levels sufficient to efficiently operate the locks during the extremely dry seasons is a serious problem. In addition to the problem of limiting the passage of vessels and commerce through the locks, industries using water facilities have been forced to retard operations, and residents residing on the shores of the lakes have been seriously inconvenienced and damaged by the receding shoreline.

It is estimated that the Shilshole breakwater operating as an auxiliary to the locks could result in a saving of from 6 to 10 inches of water when necessary.

A ferry operation from Shilshole Bay to Kitsap County was abandoned partly due to not being able to operate from the unprotected location. Increased population in north Kitsap County and north King County will demand reestablishment of a cross-sound ferry service at this location. The breakwater will make this possible, thereby serving thousands of people on both sides of the water.

The small-boat industry, both repair and new boats, contributes substantially to the payrolls of the Seattle area. Our survey indicates that hundreds of people are not building or buying pleasure craft due to the congested conditions in the canal and locks. Also the time lost due to this congestion presents a serious problem to present boatowners. The proposed breakwater would provide outside moorage for 1,100 of these boats, thereby contributing to the solution of the problem.

The United States Coast Guard maintains a base on the inner harbor. Much benefit would come from utilizing space behind the breakwater for smaller craft operating in Puget Sound areas. Other Government agencies benefited would be Sand Point Naval Air Station, United States Naval Reserve Station, United States Army Engineers, Department of Interior, United States Fish and Wildlife Service. These agencies have vessels which pass through the locks continually.

The city of Seattle has expended more than $150,000 in the past 20 years constructing and maintaining a roadway on Seaview Avenue along the shoreline adjacent to the proposed breakwater. The upkeep cost has been heavy due to the erosion from the surf from Shilshole Bay.

The breakwater would provide a haven for small boats operating north and south on the west side of Puget Sound between Elliott Bay and Whidbey Island, a distance of 20 miles.

The project would create recreational benefits for thousands by providing facilities for boating, fishing, and picnicking. It would be located adjacent to Golden Gardens Park, one of Seattle's finest saltwater bathing beaches and parks. More than 200,000 people visited this park during the summer season of 1953.

LOCAL PARTICIPATION

The city of Seattle acquired title from the State of Washington to shore and tidelands adjacent to the proposed breakwater in 1929. The area is approximately 72 acres with more than 5,000 feet of shorelands. The appraised valuation is $430,000.

To provide bulkheads along the shore to retain the dredge spoil, moorage facilities, utilities and parking area has been estimated by the district engineer to cost $1,845,250. This cost is to be borne by the city of Seattle. The operation of the mooring facilities will be under the supervision of the Seattle Park Department.

The local interests have complied with all requirements of the Federal Government by agreeing to—

(a) Furnish without cost to the United States all necessary lands, easements and rights-of-way and spoil disposal areas including the providing and maintaining of necessary bulkheads for retention of the spoil;

(b) Provide and maintain all alterations in utilities as required;

(c) Hold and save the United States free from all damages that may result from construction and maintenance of the improvement;

(d) Maintain project depths in the basin areas occupied by boat slips and stalls;

(e) Provide, maintain, and operate suitable mooring facilities including public landing with supply facilities, utilities, and parking area, open to all on equal terms.

SUMMARY

The Shilshole breakwater has been under consideration for more than 25 years.

It has the approval of the Seattle Planning Commission, all local interests involved, the Governor of the State of Washington, the United States Army engineers and the Bureau of Budgets.

Each and every requirement for local participation has been satisfied.

Thousands of dollars have been expended by the United States Army engineers and local interests in providing complete plans and study of the project.

The Lake Washington Ship Canal Locks are the Nation's busiest. They are second in size on this continent only to the Panama Locks.

The breakwater is a proven necessity as an auxiliary to the locks. It will defer for many years the need for an expensive additional lock.

It will provide money and jobs for hundreds through the expansion of the boating industry.

It will save hundreds of thousands of dollars for fishermen and industries located on the inner harbor.

It will assist in conserving the water in the lakes during the dry season.

Time and money will be saved by thousands of Seattle residents through reduced opening and closing of the four bridges crossing the canal.

Small craft will be provided a haven in event of stormy weather with a saving to life and property.

Thousands will be provided with additional recreational features.

This project has stood the test of time. Each year shows more pronounced need for the improvement.

Hundreds of people in the Puget Sound area have been giving their time and money these many years toward the final approval of this project.

Our hope is that today is the day that Congressman Miller spoke of 26 years ago, and that the Shilshole breakwater will get the approval of your committee.

After the Geneva Failure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 1954

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, it is with gratification that I note from the press as well as from the letters I received from my constituents and fellow Americans all over the country the favorable response that was given to the remarks I made on the floor regarding the crisis in southeast Asia. I am also grateful to the radio and TV commentators who spoke so glowingly of the idea that an Asian equivalent of the Atlantic Charter should be drafted and that the United States should participate in its drafting.

We are engaged in a fight for men's minds more than for the conquest of anything material. Man will fight for principles. They can be united only by a common ideal. Such ideal we must offer to the peoples of Asia. We must convince them that we are fighting for their freedom and that the faith that gives life to the principles we uphold is our faith in the dignity of man no matter whence he comes or the color of his skin. This was the basic idea behind my remarks on the floor regarding Asia and I am happy that it was caught by all those who commented on it.

With the unanimous consent of the House, I insert in the RECORD a recent address by Gen. Carlos P. Romulo, who was the keynote speaker at the national convention of the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce held in Colorado Springs this week.

AFTER THE GENEVA FAILURE

(Excerpts of address delivered by Gen. Carlos P. Romulo before the Junior Chamber of Commerce National Convention in Colorado Springs, Colo., June 16, 1954)

I speak as a private citizen. I do not presume to be the spokesman of the Philippine Government or of President Magsaysay on this particular subject. My views are my own and they are strictly personal.

It was urged in the beginning that in Geneva our side should negotiate in good faith. The United States has done well to agree to this policy and has participated honestly in the deliberations of the Geneva Conference. Nobody may justly accuse the United States later of having negotiated in bad faith or of sabotaging the Conference. The record will be utterly clear on this point, and responsibility for the failure of the Geneva Conference will rest squarely on the shoulders of the Communists.

However, it has now become apparent that our side is negotiating, not with reasonable people bent on peace, but with arrogant men who act as if they are victors dictating the terms of peace.

But the arrogance of the Communists is justified neither by what has happened in Korea nor by what is happening in Indochina. The present situation in Korea clearly calls for a sincere effort on both sides to achieve the unification of that divided country by peaceful means. In Indochina a bloody and destructive war continues to rage, and there is need to put an end to the fighting on just and reasonable terms. In both cases, thero is no reason for the Communists to feel that they have a right to win at the conference table what they have so far failed to win in the battlefield.

It is now generally agreed that the time for negotiations is nearly over and that the time for decision and action is near at hand.

That decision will be one of the most difficult and far-reaching which the United States of America has to make since the Second World War. What are the alternatives for the free world?

First, the United States can limit itself to the present policy of giving material assistance to the French in Indochina, leaving to the French the basic political and military decisions. This is the road to to the ultimate end, possibly quick disaster.

Second, the United States can decide boldly to do all that is necessary and all that lies in its power to halt the Communist aggression in southeast Asia through effective political and military action in Indochina. This is the only road that promises favorable results in the struggle against communism.

It is necessary to emphasize that action must be both political and military. Military action alone may not win the fight, but, coupled with political action, it can prove to be invincible. And I put the political phase first.

It is also necessary to stress that in order to succeed, the United States must be prepared to give to this course all the resources of its moral and physical power. Confused and haphazard measures may be worse than nothing and would be doomed to fail.

The political action must begin with a clear statement of America's purpose in southeast Asia. That statement should unmistakably affirm that America's purpose is not to support the colonial power of France in the region but solely to assist the people of the area in defending themselves against Communist aggression and tyranny. Secretary Dulles has already made this statement but, I must underscore, such a declaration should immediately be translated into action in two ways: First, by an effort on the part of the United States to formulate, together with the free states of the region an Atlantic Charter for Asia, and secondly, by making it clear to the French Government that as of the moment the United States intervenes directly in Indochina, it will assume direct charge of the political and military phases of the struggle including a guaranty of complete independence of the three Indochinese states.

Two weeks ago I first advanced in a speech in Portland, Oreg., the idea of an Atlantic Charter for Asia. This was inspired by a previous suggestion which President Magsaysay had made last May as a precondition before pledging support of the American proposal for united action in southeast Asia.

Fundamentally, this proposal is based on the principle that it is no less important for the United States to obtain the moral support of the free countries of Asia for effective united action in the region than it is to secure the military support of England and France.

I am still of the opinion that military action alone cannot save southeast Asia from communism.

The most massive military power cannot save people who do not want to be saved from communism. Conversely, the need for massive military power would diminish in proportion as the peoples who are threatened are themselves willing to assume their share of direct responsibility for fighting communism.

There is the further consideration that in the present intellectual and moral climate of America it is absolutely necessary that any military action which this country undertakes must, in order to succeed, have the warm and determined support of the great majority of the American people. That support will come only if it is made utterly clear to them that such action is in the interest not only of their own national security but in the interest of the freedom of other peoples who are themselves in the field fighting the common enemy.

In short, it is necessary that united action in Indochina should have the support of the Asian peoples concerned as well as the overwhelming majority of the American people themselves. This twin support can only be assured if the cause is just. The freedom of peoples from any form of tyranny whatever is the only just cause in the context of the present struggle.

This twin support would be most effective if assured by a declaration such as an Atlantic Charter for Asia to which I have already referred. Such a declaration of principles would be a most appropriate meeting ground for the peoples of Asia and America in this time of crisis.

It has been said that in the present crisis, it would not be possible to save southeast Asia with "mere words." Nobody is trying to save southeast Asia with mere words. What we are trying to do—what we should do at all cost—is to establish certain sound moral principles on the basis of which southeast Asia may be saved for freedom.

Too often in the past we have seen that victory without principle has ended in defeat through moral bankruptcy.

In southeast Asia, what we need to do above all is to regard the task not as a "salvage" operation for French colonial interest but as a bold operation to help millions of people defend their own freedom against Communist aggression and tyranny.

The Strategic Air Command

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STUYVESANT WAINWRIGHT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1954

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, Arnold Brophy, a special correspondent for Newsday, a daily publication on Long Island, has written a special story on the Strategic Air Command. Mr. Brophy, it seems to me, provides an adequate answer to those who say that we are unprepared. In this modern age, it is a wonderful thing to see our military leaders acclimatize their thinking to the techniques and demands of the day. Mr. Brothy is to be congratulated for his task in a field of public education.

The above-mentioned follows:

WASHINGTON.—Strategic Air Command planes and crews are primed to do their job: plaster Russia with atomic and hydrogen bombs if the Soviet Union attacks the free world. But can SAC deliver?

Yes, say the men and women in SAC. Yes, say the Nation's top officials. Certainly, snorts the 48-year-old cold-blooded SAC commander, Gen. Curtis E. LeMay.

Air Force Secretary Harold E. Talbott put it this way: "The offensive power of the Strategic Air Command is the keynote to our modern military strategy."

Defense Secretary Charles Wilson, appearing before a congressional committee recently, declared "The Russians are not going to start a war by dropping a a bomb on us when they know there is going to be immediate and massive retaliation."

And Gen. Nathan F. Twining, Air Force Chief of Staff, in evaluating SAC's role, said: "Since our national objective is to deter war, our Strategic Air Force and its deterrent effect are vital to the security of the United States and the free world.

"To insure maximum operating effectiveness, we have a rigorous training program within the Strategic Air Command. We are modernizing our strategic force with jet bombers whose performance will greatly increase our strategic potential."

KEYNOTE OF STRATEGY

Talbott, who lives in Old Westbury, said: "I'm sure that it appears clear to you that air power and especially the offensive power of the Strategic Air Command is the keynote to our modern military strategy. Our earnest hope for peace finds its greatest support in the massive striking power of our Strategic Air Force, coupled with the growing capabilities of our air defense."

LeMay, a cigar-smoking, determined soldier who has been called the "architect of systematic destruction," would not hesitate if he were ordered to unleash the tremendous destructive power under his command. That is, he explains, his job. He demands perfection and if he is satisfied with the potential of his command now, he isn't saying so. He is constantly measuring the combat capability of his organization, looking for ways of improving it. But when he is not happy with something, those who caused his concern learn about it very quickly.

And LeMay isn't happy about one important aspect of SAC, the manpower situation. SAC is, he said, only as strong as its men and equipment.

There are some 15,000 people in the elite Air Force arm. LeMay watches over them carefully, always aware of his responsibility, always seeking a new device to make SAC more efficient. After touring several SAC bases throughout the country, the weakest link in the chain soon became apparent. That is the constant, frustrating struggle to keep sharply trained airmen and officers available in case the bell rings for a global war.

TOP AIRMEN

The airmen in SAC are the cream of the crop. And the heavy-jowled general who is their boss works hard to make sure that the cream does not sour. LeMay, who spurned an invitation to eat with a group of staff colonels with the curt statement, "A man should have dinner with his friends and the commanding general has no friends," has his own machine system of measuring the men in his command. Sentiment has no place in it.

But the system has to accept certain facts and evaluate accordingly. There is no doubt that LeMay has done wonders with what he has available. LeMay, however, has no control over Congress or the attitude of the pepole toward the Air Force. It is these that cause him the most concern.

It takes 3 years to train a SAC crewman. Since GI's serve 4-year enlistments and the Air Force only gets maximum output from a trained technician for the final year. There is a steady turnover.

REPLACEMENTS A PROBLEM

SAC officials said they did not have any statistics as to replacements. But they agreed that it is a problem. After being schooled by the Government, many airmen and officers hang up their uniforms for civilian clothes and jobs at much higher salaries. Often, it is the little things other than money that bother the GI's.

One SAC aviator at Lockburne Air Force Base, Columbus, Ohio, told me it wasn't just money with him and several of his friends. "The enlistment posters talk about free medical care for dependents," he said. "Where? I haven't been able to find any."

A major at a SAC base in Texas said he would resign his commission soon. "I'm not looking for a pat on the back all of the time," he declared. "But the sacrifices—and not just financial—that we are making are not appreciated outside. It's too rough on the women."

The major, who has 10 years of service, earns $5,157.36 a year base pay. He plans to accept a position with a private concern for $12,000 a year.

LeMay, a four-star general, earns slightly more than $15,000 a year, including flight pay and other allowances. His base salary is $11,459.60.

Aware that these things are important, LeMay is fighting for the best deal possible for those who live with the shadow of war in their living rooms. "They realize that they will never get rich in the military service," he said. "And they don't expect to do so. But there has to be compensation for the important contribution these people are making. Appreciation, recognition by the public is important. The so-called fringe benefits—medical care, better living quarters—are some of the things needed to indicate to the honest men and women in the service that the country is thinking of them, that they are not wasting their careers in military service."

The manpower problem is a genuine one. Judging from what LeMay says, what his staff officers say, what his fliers think and from what I saw on a 4,476-mile tour of SAC installations, the problem, while making LeMay's task tougher, hasn't stopped SAC from becoming, as Twining puts it, "the best trained and finest equipped long-range striking force in the world. It is capable of delivering on short notice the highest yield nuclear weapons on targets located any place in the world during daytime or nighttime."

The men who ride in the transcontinental bombers know they can deliver on a single mission more death and destruction than was unleashed during all the bombing raids on Germany and Japan in World War II. They know that no American bombing mission has ever been turned away from a target by enemy action. And they know their target is Russia.

GI Bill: Ten Years After

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 1954

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post of June 22, 1954:

GI Bill: Ten Years After

Ten years ago today, President Roosevelt signed into law the Servicemen's Readjustment Act, popularly called the GI bill, initiating a new American concept of national responsibility for its former servicemen. In the past, the Federal Government, for the most part, concerned itself with the civilian rehabilitation of the disabled veterans. The physically able veterans were kissed off with a bonus, in one form or another, and then forgotten.

The GI bill, however, established a new national policy: to give our former GI's the opportunity to help themselves make up for the precious time they lost in war service. During the past decade, millions of veterans eagerly took advantage of this opportunity—to the benefit of themselves and to the enrichment of the Nation.

More than 7,800,000 former GI's—1 out of 2 World War II veterans—hurried to catch up, at least in part, with their interrupted training—in school, in college, on the job, and on the farm. As a result, the veteran's educational level advanced and his income increased; the Nation's reservoir of professional and skilled manpower was substantially increased. Veterans' Administration calculates that the additional income taxes paid by these higher-income former GI citizens will add $1 billion a year in income taxes to the United State Treasury.

GI bill loans, guaranteed by VA, have permitted 3,600,000 veterans to purchase homes, farms, or establish themselves in business; and there have been other benefits stemming from this historic legislation. There were some abuses, but these have been pretty much eliminated, through the knowledge gained by experience, in the Korean veterans' version of the GI bill.

The 10 years of the GI bill have clearly demonstrated that given an opportunity to catch up, the bulk of American youth will make the most of it—to their benefit, and to the benefit of the Nation.

Germany and America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TIMOTHY P. SHEEHAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 1954

Mr. SHEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, the Volksbote is the most important newpaper of the German expellees in Germany, of whom there are approximately 9 million in West Germany. This newspaper represents the views of the Sudeten German expellees and has editions for the East German and southeast German expellees as well.

It is my understanding that the Volksbote was the original newspaper in Germany to call for a realistic German-American cooperation and friendship program in the fight against communism. It has published a series of articles about outstanding Americans, like those who are mentioned in the articles, and has done its best to show the people of Germany the men who are fighting the Communist influence in America.

We all know that American money has subsidized other newspapers in Germany and, according to my information, they have not carried on the Communist fight with the same spirit nor as effectively as has the Volksbote.

The Volksbote thus shows itself to be a pioneer in the work of fighting communism and is bringing America and Germany together, and a great deal of praise is due the editor in chief, Mr. Frank Gaksch, who himself is a Sudeten German expellee.

The first article from the Volksbote is as follows:

Germany and America: The Future Policy Will Be Friendship and Cooperation With the United States of North America—A New Strategy for Preserving Peace and Defeating Communism—Part I

(By Robert Winter)

After the defeat in 1945, Germany was surrounded by Communists and delivered to them. In the east where Stalin, Beria, Kaganovic, and all those others—and in the West, in America there was an army of crypto-Communists. Other areas too fell under direct Communist rule thanks to this cooperation of the Communists in the East and in the West, as e. g., China or Central Europe. This was the time of the great triumph of the Communist world conspiracy and Germany seemed to be lost.

It soon appeared, however, that the rule of the crypto-Communists in America was by far not so stable as that of the Communists in Russia. Real, true Americans—as they had once led their country in its great past—started to make their voice heard. What followed was one of the most gratifying developments which had ever taken place in history. America began to awake out of her crypto-communism to Americanism. America began to transform herself from a country of communism, treason, hypocrisy, and corruption into a land of patriotism and greatness.

This development is by far not yet at its end. We are living right in it. Its result, however, can be clearly and unequivocally forecasted: The rule of the alien, strange Communists will be ended and the great Christian country will regain its freedom. At the helm of the free world, America will finally return the freedom also to the slaves of communism in the east.

Usher L. Burdick

The German expellees who have been the principal victim of the Communists—15 millions of these were expelled and 3 millions killed by the Communists—and who are the logical sharpest anti-Communists, were able to experience, a short time ago, the practical effects of this great change in America. The Honorable Usher L. Burdick, Representative in the House of Representatives from the State of North Dakota, inserted, in August 1953, in the United States Congressional Record a description on the expulsion of the Sudeten Germans from National-Front-Czechoslovakia by the Communists, and in March 1954 a long historical and political representation of the Sudeten German case. Mr. Burdick is an upright, great man and statesman, who is used to act independently and proudly, and who does not fear the mighty anti-German propaganda in America and who is always ready to stand for right and truth. His name is forever written in the history of the German expellees and—since the problem of the German expellees and that of the German eastern territories is the German problem, the chief problem of Germany—it is written in the history of the entire German nation.

This great assistance which Mr. Burdick has given to the German expellees is emphasized by his statesmanlike greatness. For Mr. Burdick is today one of the foremost great Americans who lead the present fight against the inner Communist conspiracy in America. He is an adversary of international communism, of the internationalists, of the world federalists who would like to force upon the world a kind of crypto-Communist and collectivist world government, which—as Mr. Burdick says—would enslave all governments. Mr. Burdick is also against the United Nations, which is inimical to the Constitution of the United States. "If the purpose is to destroy this Government, the taxpayers should not be asked to contribute to their own destruction," Mr. Burdick said.

Representative Burdick is also one of the sharpest critics of the Communist infiltration of American universities. So he criticized the former President of the Columbia University, saying that he is going around in Europe while his professors are Communists. "These professors are more Russian armies" declared Mr. Burdick.

Mr. Burdick has also criticized the British Empire; and he opposes sharply Britain's trade with Red China. American should support only those nations which support the American actions. Since ever against Truman, Acheson, Morganthau etc. Mr. Burdick declared that the secret agreements of Teheran, Yalta, and Potsdam created nothing but a temporary situation.

In the person of Representative Burdick the hopes of the German expellees and those of the German anti-Communists unite themselves in a perfect way. Indeed, for such an America, for such a country of justice and anti-Communism and the German expellees and the German nation can have full sympathy and admiration.

Senator Robert A. Taft

Another great American, the late leader of the Republican majority in the United States Senate, Senator Robert A. Taft deserves also to be mentioned in the first place. Taft is author of an anti-Communist strategy which is the only and exclusively right one, and which can save and will save Germany. Because of this his wise policy—apart from his general pro-German attitude—Taft deserves to be called a great friend of the German people.

His political strategy, as he formulated it during his campaign in 1952 in many speeches for the Republican nomination for United States Presidency, was as follows:

1. America should build up an enormously great Air Force and should obtain a technical and scientific superiority, especially in the field of atomic science, in order to prevent, in case of war, a fight with the Russian masses on the European (and mainly German soil), and to hit Russia, at the very beginning of war directly at home, in the Russian cities and factories, and to destroy her. Thus it will be possible to prevent a war at all, since Russia can never attack an America superior in both, in techniques and in her Air Force.

2. A substantial change and improvement of the American anti-Communist ideological warfare in the radio broadcasts to the East, as Mr. Taft considered the present warfare (as it is manifested in the programs of the Voice of America and Radio Free Europe) completely inadequate.

3. When the time will be mature, an effective support on materials has to be given to the underground agencies in the East, so that the Communist regime could be disintegrated and destroyed from within, without a war at all.

This is a strategy really gifted by genius, which is able to bring about the liberation of the East without war and, in case of war, to prevent by intelligent and responsible acting the eradication of the Europeans and the Germans. This is the strategy which is deadly for the Communists, and it is therefore that the crypto-Communists in the United States have done everything in order to prevent a nomination of Mr. Taft.

Everybody who has worked against this policy has worked for Communist interests. Everybody who is not for a great, enormous Air Force, but for great land armies which should meet each other on the European soil with Bolshevist armies, everybody who is for the handing over of atomic secrets to others, and thus against the development of a great technical superiority in America, everybody who is for a delay in the atomic research, works in the sense of those traitors who, once in 1945, handed over German scientists to the Soviet Union, and who allowed the atomic spies to work in America. Such men work for communism, for they work against the development of the Western technical superiority—against the natural weapon by means of which the West is and can be stronger than Russia—and thus they work towards a future war between land armies in the Korean style, maybe with atomic guns, on the European and the German soil, resulting in the eradication of the Europeans and the Germans. Such a policy was the one which the adversaries of Taft have always followed.

Taft has always been for the freedom and independence of any nation. He declared:

"When not carried to excess, nationalism is the basis of individual freedom and patriotism and other qualities which make life worth living. Therefore in making the peace settlement, we must provide for the self-determination of nations and we must do it with more skill and less theory than was used at Versailles."

Taft has always been against unnational superstates; he declared that such states would be no more free and democratic, for their governments would be dominated by cliques and pressure groups and the citizens of individual states would have no direct access to the government of such superstate. According to the plans of Taft, the world should be a free community of individual independent nations which America would lead by example. Only such a free communitly—and no superstate—is the guarantee of freedom and democracy.

Because of his aims—since he wanted to isolate American science from Communist spies, since he wanted to isolate America from superstates with Communists and Socialists, since he desired that all nations should enjoy freedom and independence, since he wanted to isolate them from their suppressors and since he did not want America to enter World War II, but wanted to isolate America from an alliance with the Soviet Union, Taft was called an isolationist by the Communists, the crypto-Communists, and blockheads. Let us note that the name "isolationist" is a name which the Communists and blockheads give to great Americans, instead of designations such as "patriot" or "intelligent anti-Communist."

The Taft men constitute the majority of the Republicans in Congress. This is of importance for Germany, since only the United States can defeat the Soviet Union, recall the agreement of Teheran, Yalta, and Potsdam, and enable the return of the expellees.

The strategy of Taft may finally effect the abolition of communism without war. An American who wants the best for his own country like Taft, wants also the best for Germany and the entire anti-Communist world. This is a great compliment for America and the greatest hope for Germany as well as for the non-Communist and non-Socialist world.

GEN. DOUGLAS MAC ARTHUR

General of the Army Douglas MacArthur is one of the greatest sons of the American Nation. I do not want to mention here his glorious military career, his wise strategy during World War II which saved millions of lives, not only of American soldiers but also of his Japanese adversaries. Nor do I want to quote here his opinions as a general, who, nevertheless, is the greatest enemy of war and bloodshed, nor his statesmanlike skill and wisdom which won him the love and admiration of the defeated Japanese people.

I only desire to mention the fact that General Douglas MacArthur is one of the best experts on Communist international conspiracy. Therefore, he is hated by the Communists. These are his words:

"Foremost of these forces is that directly, or even more often indirectly, allied with the scourge of imperialistic communism. It has infiltrated into positions of public trust and responsibility—into journalism, the press, the radio, and the schools.

"It seeks through covert manipulation of the civil power and the media of public information and education to pervert the truth, impair respect for moral values, suppress human freedom and representative government, and, in the end, destroy our faith in our religious teachings.

"This evil force, with neither spiritual base nor moral standard, rallies the abnormal and subnormal elements among our citizenry and applies internal pressure against all things we hold decent and all things that we hold right—the type of pressure which has caused many Christian nations abroad to fall.

"What, I have been asked, is our greatest internal menace? If I were permitted but one sentence of reply, but one phrase of warning, it would be end invisible government based upon propaganda and restore truly representative government based upon truth."

So Douglas MacArthur understands communism exactly in the same way as the Germans have always understood it. It is, therefore, no wonder that he is being hated by the Communists exactly as much as the Germans. In addition, it is, therefore, no wonder that he has been always friendly toward the Germans. Around General MacArthur there have been, after all, Americans of German origin, for example, the Chief of Intelligence in the Far East, Maj. Gen. Charles A. Willoughby.

In 1951 Gen. Douglas MacArthur said about the Germans before the Senate Investigations Committee:

"I believe that the termination of hostilities should be a definite and definitive thing, and it should not carry with it the punitive potentialities, the mortifications, the indelible wounds that go to some people in the occupied country that did nothing but display patriotism for their own country and its cause, good or bad.

"The German people were a mature race. If the Anglosaxon was say 45 years of age in his development, in the sciences, the arts, divinity, culture, the Germans were quite as mature.

"Now, you are not going to change the German nature. He will come back to the path that he believes is correct, by the pressure of public opinion, by the pressure of world philosophies, by his own interests and many other reasons, and he in my belief will develop his own Germanic tribe along the lines that he himself believes in, which do not in many basic ways differ from our own."

The speeches of MacArthur sound like high noble prayers.

"I have seen in the faces of the American people that to which Mr. Lincoln prophetically referred. I have clearly seen that the soul of liberty is still living and vibrant in the American heart. It is neither Democratic nor Republican, but American. It will assert itself by constitutional process and with invincible force in the battle to save the Republic. The people will still rule."

No doubt that this great man must be respected by friends and foes and that when America will once be led by such men, she would automatically take that position of leadership among other nations which Taft had in mind and which cannot be bought by money.

SENATOR JOE M'CARTHY

The Germans knew that in 1945, together with the Americans, communism came from the West too. They had no respect whatsoever of the mental qualities of those who considered themselves Democrats, but in reality were merely stupid servants of crypto-Communists. They are used to speak of them in sharp words.

No German, however, can condemn more sharply these people, their servitude to communism and their stupidity than the Americans are doing themselves today. These Americans are rehabilitating the name of the American Nation and cleaning it from the Communist treason which had brought the Soviets as far as the Elbe and which was guilty of the loss of China, cost the lives of 3 million German expellees and forced 18 million Germans into an alien and hated slavery.

It is criminal stupidity—in the best case—and treason—in the worst case—as Senator JOE MCCARTHY uses to call these treacherous actions of the American past.

"I do not think we need fear too much about the Communists dropping atomic bombs on Washington. They would kill too many of their friends that way" declared Senator MCCARTHY in his historical speech on the Senate floor, on June 14, 1951.

Since MCCARTHY reveals and doublecrosses so effectfully the Communists and their sly methods, the Communists in America make a great fuss about MCCARTHY's methods, a fuss which is being repeated by vain and empty blockheads. We can understand why Senator MCCARTHY is hated by all Communists and slandered in the entire American crypto-Communist press and why they operate against him with such trifle things as the Stevens-Shine case, if we know that he considers the greatest danger for America not those overt members of the Communist Party, but the secret Communists in the press, the radio, Government, etc. He said:

"This must be the result of a great conspiracy, a conspiracy on a scale so immense as to dwarf any previous such venture in the history of man. A conspiracy of infamy so black that, when it is finally exposed, its principals shall be forever deserving of the maledictions of all honest men."

McCarthy originates from an Irish-German family from the State of Wisconsin. He had saved the lives of 16 German soldiers, falsely accused in the so-called Malmedy trial. He is the author of a Senate resolution calling for the rearmament of Western Germany. Just as he stands at the very top of the friends of Germany in America, is he the leader of the anti-Communist Americans—his name was taken over by the awakening American patriotism, Americanism—"McCarthyism."

When the New York Times wanted to convince the Americans that McCarthy harms the American reputation abroad, it quoted also voices of the German press. This press has, however, nothing to do with the German people. While the Morgenthau plan has not been effected in the economic life of Germany, the very same plan was fully realized in the German press.

The well-known Morgenthau press in Germany attacks McCarthy and slanders him, exactly as the crypto-Communists and their press do it in the United States of America. But it has nothing to do with the real opinion of the German people. The Germans know that McCarthy's foes have always been their foes too. If the Germans were against McCarthy—as the New York Times would like to present it—then they would act against every reason, every intelligence.

McCarthy is a fighting man, a sincere patriot, a dramatic fighter for the cause of freedom, and one of the greatest orators who has ever been born. He is a brilliant man, of whom every nation can be proud.

How actual are, after all, his words which he uttered 3 years ago in the United States Senate, on June 14, 1951:

"And for 5 years those diplomats have done nothing to clear up the situation. Periodically, our State Department has talked of rearming Western Germany. But it is nothing but talk—words apparently planted to lull the American people into a sense of security. Clever administration of sleeping tablets, if you please."

CONGRESSMAN CHARLES J. KERSTEN

The chairman of the Committee on Communist Aggression, Representative Charles J. Kersten, is one of the main defenders of the really American concept that every nation has the right for national independence; and he is being considered by the European peoples who are longing for national freedom, such as the Baltics, the Slovaks, Ukrainians and others, as their main hero.

Mr. Kersten is the author of the Policy of Liberation. For many years he is fighting for an energetic policy against the Soviet Union which requires:

1. To recall the diplomatic recognition of the Communist regimes.
2. To exclude the Communist delegates from the United Nations.
3. To build up national military units out of the eastern nations in Europe which would be a strong magnet of defection for the soldiers in the East.
4. To assist the forces of the liberation movements in the East.
5. To interrupt every trade with the East.
6. To bring about the definitive dissolution of the Communist system in the East by supporting the underground agencies.

How different sounds this firm, active, anti-Communist policy of Representative Kersten when compared with the empty, unsincere phrases of men who merely speak and never act.

These are Mr. Kersten's words:

"Mr. Speaker, this is no time for a counsel of timid and superficial fear. This is a time for faith in human liberty. The people behind the Iron Curtain still have that faith. Have we?"

I compared, in an article, Mr. Kersten with President Lincoln. Kersten is the incarnation of freedom and justice, which used to be once great ideals of America. He is a man with a great future, a hope for all slaves of communism, and it will be him whose great foreign policy will once liberate the world.

Germany and America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. TIMOTHY P. SHEEHAN

OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 22, 1954

Mr. SHEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, the German newspaper Volksbote, which represents the views of the various expellee groups in Germany, carried an article by Robert Winter, covering the future policy of cooperation between Germany and America. The article represents the editorial policy of the Volksbote, whose editor in chief is Mr. Frank Gaksch, a Sudeten German expellee.

The article is as follows:

Germany and America: The Future Policy Will Be Friendship and Cooperation With the United States of North America—A New Strategy for Preserving Peace and Defeating Communism—Part II

(By Robert Winter)

SENATOR WILLIAM E. JENNER

Another great American is Senator William E. Jenner, who presides over the Senate Subcommittee on Inner Security and stands like McCarthy in the fight against the American crypto-Communists.

Senator Jenner declared about the Communists:

"They were moving efficiently, quietly, with brilliant strategical skill, to take over a large share of our national life—industry, labor, the schools, the press, the local parties. They used the age-old instruments of political gangsters in search of absolute power. These instruments are bribery and punishment, the carrot and the stick."

"But they never look the least bit like Communists. It takes months or years for us to warn our people of the new disguise."

"Their only interest was power, power for themselves and for the little group of servile courtiers who joined them in the hope of sharing in the crumbs that fell from the table."

"They seek to capture whichever is stronger of our 2 parties at the moment. They use it as the parasite uses a host, as the ivy uses the oak.

"They will stay like ticks, until we pluck each one, by his head, out of the spot where he sucks the blood of the American people to make himself fat and strong. That work of surgery must go on."

It is clear that Mr. Jenner has the same interpretation of communism which the Germans have always had. It is, therefore, no wonder that he is being so much hated by the Communists as Senator McCarthy or the Germans.

"We do not intend to let the United States be destroyed from within. We intend to destroy the invading armies of Soviet fifth columnists and we shall continue in that fight until all our hidden enemies are routed, and our people can turn again to their true interests, without fear of a stab in the back."

All these men are conscious of the greatness of their duty and of their time. "I have set my course by the pole star of American liberty," said Mr. Jenner in January 1954 in Indianapolis.

OTHER GREAT AMERICANS

Senator Pat McCarran is the author of the new immigration law which should protect America in the future against the infiltration of international Communists and keep up the present composition of the American people; and which allots the greatest quota to the British, Germans, and Irishmen. Every German who has doubted that the Americans are able to have real patriotism, can see from the work of Senator McCarran that there are men in America who love their country and who fight for it. "In the name of God, in the name of the people of America, let us override this veto" said Senator McCarran before the vote in the Senate, which then really overrode the veto of Truman against McCarran's immigration law.

Representative Harold H. Velde, chairman of the Committee on Un-American Activities of the House of Representatives, declared himself for an absolute abolishment of the secret agreements of Teheran, Yalta, and Potsdam which resulted in the expulsion of the Eastern Germans and the enslavement of the Soviet Zone of Germany. His words were: "There can be no compromising or appeasement of communism."

Other very able members of the latter's committee are the Representatives Kit Clardy, Donald L. Jackson, and Francis E. Walter, who is also coauthor of the McCarran immigration law. The Senators Everett McKinley Dirksen, Karl E. Mundt, and Charles E. Potter are outstanding members of the McCarthy committee, in which is working also Senator Henry C. Dworshak. Senator Herman Welker from the Jenner committee now investigates the members of the Red Council of Free Czechoslovakia. Senator John W. Bricker was author of an amendment to the American Constitution which was destined to protect this Constitution against foreign encroachment, especially by the United Nations, and to preserve full freedom to the American people; and to render impossible, in the future, such disastrous secret deals as those of Yalta and Potsdam. Representative Carroll Reece introduced a resolution according to which rich private foundations should be investigated; private foundations which, as known, stand also behind leftist Radio Free Europe in Munich. Representative Alvin M. Bentley, like Mr. Kersten, is a fighter for freedom and independence for any nation, exactly as the former Representative O. K. Armstrong. Senator Homer E. Capehart and Representative Fred E. Busbey are both friends of the German people. Representative Albert H. Bosch, vice president of the Steuben Society of America, is one of the chief adversaries of the expulsion of the Eastern and Sudeten Germans. Senator William F. Knowland, the leader of the Republican majority in the United States Senate, and Senator Homer Ferguson, chairman of the Republican policy committee in the Senate, are both sharp, anti-Communists. Senator Hugh Butler has already intervened in favor of German interests. Another friend of the German people is Senator John Marshall Butler. Senator William N. Langer, who is also from the State of North Dakota, like Mr. Burdick, has great merits on the German expellees. One of the most intelligent adversaries of communism and friend of the independence for all nations is the young Representative Timothy P. Sheehan. The chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House, Representative Robert B. Chiperfield, is also an anti-Communist, exactly as the Members of Congress: Clare E. Hoffman, James E. Van Zandt, and John Taber. Two of the best experts on communism in America are the former Representative John E. Rankin and Representative Martin Dies. Senator Harry Flood Byrd, too, has the sympathies of McCarthy. Senator Arthur V. Watkins declared himself for the abolishment of the expulsion of the Eastern and of the Sudeten Germans. Senator Edward Martin and Senator Andrew F. Schoeppel have both sympathies for the German people. The Senators H. A. Smith and A. Wiley have also effectively intervened in favor of the German people. Senator Styles Bridges belongs to the leading anti-Communists in the United States Senate. Representative Leslie C. Arends was a Taft-man. The Representatives Paul W. Shafer, Gordon H. Scherer, Daniel A. Reed, H. R. Gross, Lawrence H. Smith belong also to this group of patriotic Americans, exactly as the Senators J. Glenn Beall, George W. Malone, Eugene D. Millikin, and the Representatives E. Y. Berry, Frank T. Bow, Courtney W. Campbell, Paul D. Dague, Marguerite Stitt Church, Glenn R. Davis, E. L. Forrester, H. R. Gross, Burr P. Harrison, George A. Dondero, William H. Harrison, Wayne L. Hays, Patrick J. Hillings, Joseph F. Holt, Thomas A. Jenkins, Ben F. Jensen, Charles Raper Jonas, Edgar A. Jonas, B. W. Kearney, Kenneth B. Keating, Russell V. Mack, Ray J. Madden, Noah M. Mason, A. L. Miller, Barratt O'Hara, Joseph P. O'Hara, James T. Patterson, Philip J. Philbin, Richard H. Poff, L. Mendel Rivers, Katharine St. George, Errett P. Scrivner, Dewey Short, Charles W. Vursell, Alvin E. O'Konski, John Bell Williams, John M. Vorys, Jesse P. Wolcott, Hugh D. Scott, Jr., J. Frank Wilson, Wint Smith, and John J. Riley. The Speaker of House of Representatives, Representative Joseph W. Martin, Jr., hoped, exactly as we did, that General MacArthur would become the Republican presidential candidate of 1952. Representative William Jennings Bryan Dorn has not only the name, but also the high opinion of a Secretary of State in the Wilson government who resigned on protest against measures of the Wilson administration which, in the end, caused America's entrance in World War I against Germany.

These men, of whose statesmanlike and human greatness history will once report in the same way as it is reporting of the founders of the American Republic, stand at the helm of other great Americans who constitute the majority in the United States Congress and who have nothing to do with the actions of the American Government of the past, nor with its then representatives, and who represent the true greatness of their Nation.

THE FUTURE GERMAN POLICY

So we see that there are men in America who are exactly against communism as the Germans are, who condemn the actions of the American Government of the past which have brought so much suffering and injustice and whose world philosophy is the same as that of the Germans and whose greatness and intelligence fulfill all German expectations. These men have the same aims—including the redress of the injustice which was done to Europe and Germany by the Communists. Their aims, their policy, their opinions are the same ones as those of the Germans.

From this identity of aims and ideals results the natural consequence of an absolute cooperation between Germany and America in the future, of a friendship and cooperation between Germans and Americans.

The Americans are the natural allies for Germany. This alliance cannot be substituted by any European Federation. An alliance which would be enforced, merely on the basis of territorial neighborhood would bring as less freedom to Germany as a superstate could bring to the people of the United States, consisting of United States of America, Mexico, and Guatemala.

Moreover, I cannot see an honest and sincere unification in efforts which in reality, under the pretext of "Europeanizing", do not unite but separate one and the same people—as is the case of the Saar territory.

Therefore, while the wise and statesmanlike policy of Bundeskanzler Dr. Konrad Adenauer must be continued and while above all an effective army must be finally built up in Europe with a German participation, it must never be allowed that unnatural, artificial superstates with Socialist and semi-Communist states as their members would bind Germany or prevent her contact with America. True freedom means that all peoples should be independent, untied by territorial coexistences and should have the possibility to enter freely into contact with any other nation of the world—and above all with the United States.

The territorial neighbors are not always necessarily those who are the most kindred ones.

Under these circumstances a free community of nations must be aspired to, a community which America as the strongest nation would lead by example, as Taft wanted it. And other nations should take part in this leadership of the world, in the extent in which they can reach the American example.

There is, indeed, no other solution possible, no collectivist solution, as e. g., the United Nations. In a free community of nations there is no doubt that the Germans will participate in the leadership; there are no other two nations more similar than the Germans and the Americans—the real, true Americans, who finally started to come again into the foreground. In the future, in this free cooperation of free peoples, there will be no closer partners than America and Germany.

Both nations are dedicated to free enterprise and to private property, and are strongly anti-Socialist, which cannot be said about France of England. Both are strongly anti-Communist, i. e., intelligently anti-Communist, against the secret conspiracy of communism—which cannot be said of other states. The history of both nations is very similar, since the Germans in Europe as well as the Americans in America have colonized uninhabited territories, built up towns, spread trades and crafts, etc. Both nations stand or stood—as long as Germany was free—at the helm of scientific research and technical progress. Just as the Americans have bled in Korea, so do today the Germans—and many German expellees among them—in Indochina, unfortunately merely as foreign legionnaires, for foreign interests and for foreign glory.

The interests of both peoples are identical. Exactly as the Germans will always welcome and support a peaceful political expansion of the United States, and the application and enforcement of American principles—the principles of MacArthur, Taft, McCarthy, and Kersten—upon a world which is full of Communists and Socialists, it will be in the interest of America that the Eastern and Sudeten German expellees return to their homeland, so that these territories be drawn away from the Socialist sea, for the free world.

Close friendship and cooperation between Germany and America is therefore the command of the present time and especially of the future. That this command was first recognized by the German expellees lies in the nature of their problem. This recognition is above all the greatest merit of the Sudeten Germans and of the secretary general of the Association for the Protection of Sudeten German Interests, member of the Bavarian Landtag, Dr. Walter Becher, who has done pioneer work in this field. This work finds full support from the side of the chairmen of the Association for the Protection of Sudeten German Interests, Dr. Rudolf Lodgman von Auen, and the members of the German Bundestag in Bonn, Hans Schuetz and Richard Reitzner.

While the Germans and the German expellees negotiate with their neighboring nations and come to agreements with them, they must never forget that their cause must be fought before the international forum in America. It is there where the decision will be made. This basic insight can save much time and unnecessary work and protect the expellees against blunders and political shortsightedness.

In the future the Germans must go conform with the United States foreign policy. They should and must demand that whatever is valid for America must be valid for Germany too—the right for national freedom, the right to eradicate everything that the Communists have done to them and also the right to the return of the expellees, the return of Germany's eastern provinces and the Saar territory to Germany.

With reference to the liberation of the east, where there is also situated their homeland, they must set up two clear points:

1. The restoration of the status quo, as existing before the Communist seizure of power, that is, before 1945 (and also before 1939), a postulation which involves the return of the private property to its former proprietors (to the Czechs, Slovaks, Baltics, Hungarians, etc.), the return of free enterprise and also the return of the German expellees and their properties—with other words, the full return of order, justice, and property. Nothing what the Communists have stolen and socialized should remain stolen or socialized.

2. After the restoration has taken place, the right for self-determination must be applied without compromise. Slovaks, Baltics, Ukrainians, Croatians, and Sudeten Germans have a right to their self-determination and independence. The restoration of justice and order must be all or nothing.

These two points are quite clear and concrete, and based on morale; nobody can object to them. They are also in the interest of America. Through these aims the Germans will win also the gratitude of the nations in the East, for they are longing to throw off the Communist forced Socialist economy and they are longing for their national independence. By these aims the Germans will also strengthen substantially the fight against communism—the nationalism of the eastern nations being the source of strength against international communism.

The Germans must hope that the right men reach government in America as soon as possible. They must give them every help, every information, every practical and moral support.

The Germans must support McCarthy in his fight against the Communist conspiracy in the West and supply him with all the material he may be in need of for a successful carrying out of his investigations.

The Germans must urge that the great strategy of Taft be developed and realized. Only this strategy can lead toward an abolishment of communism in the East without war. In the case that a war has been provoked by the Soviets, the Germans must demand that no war will be led with atomic weapons on the European soil, but that the Soviets will be hit by means of these weapons in their own country. Thus the Germans will not only save themselves, but also the other European nations and deserve their gratitude. Instead of letting the Germans bleed as foreign legionnaires or mercenaries in land armies, they must be enabled to use their scientific and technical talent there where it is needed: German scientists must be able to work freely in the field of atomic science. When America will have removed the Oppenheimers, the

Rosenbergs as well as the other traitors, no doubt, there will be room again in the West for German scientists—for those scientists, whom Russia was clever enough to exploit as slave workers, so that the Soviets today—with the additional help of the American spies—are almost as far advanced in atomic science as America itself.

The Germans must insist on it that atomic secrets be neither smuggled to Russia nor delivered to leftist allies, and that America will develop an enormous technical superiority, a technical monopoly, by the means of which Russia can be overcome even without war. The destruction of communism as a result of war and devastation is no achievement. We must prove our spiritual superiority by reaching the same aim without war.

The policy of liberation of Representative KERSTEN must be also Germanys policy: exclusion of the Communists from international organizations, abolishment of the diplomatic recognition of Communist regimes, the building up of national military units out of the refugees who came from the East and who should liberate their national territories, active support for the underground movements in the East, and interruption of any trade with the East. Germany, in this respect, has proved that she is not guided by egoism, as are many other countries.

All these measures, however, must be carried out sincerely, intelligently, effectfully, purposefully, and must be carried out by the entire West, as MCCARTHY demands.

Here is an unlimited field for a great and independent German foreign policy, for men of courage and vision, in which so many aims can be reached and so many possibilities are offered. By reaching these aims, Germany can regain her rights and all that what belonged to her; and at the same time she can help decisively to liberate other nations from the plague of international communism. Thus, a real friendship will be chartered between the Germans and all other nations, a friendship which will be much more effective than the collectivist phantasies about the supernational world states.

The supreme principle of the German foreign policy remains an intelligent anti-Communist policy. Because of the fact that such a policy is being made by Americans like MacArthur, Taft, and McCarthy, the supreme law of Germany, in the future, will be a sincere and everlasting friendship and cooperation with the United States.

This cooperation meets the egotistic, practical interests of Germany, but equally corresponds to the moral laws which the German carries in his heart and which now—after Germany has overcome her past radicalism and America has rejected her past of treason and communism—are the same ones as those of the Americans. This alliance can effect the realization of best international activities for Germany and it can be realized without Germany's subjection to Socialist nations and without losses on territory and honor. This is the highest alliance, and this is also the future policy of the German people.

Who Are We Neutral Against?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT H. BOSCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 1954

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Speaker, we are all very much concerned with the situation in Guatemala, as we should be. Is our Department of State going to recognize this situation for what it really is—outside intervention in Latin America? Under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the New York Daily News entitled "Who Are We Neutral Against?"

WHO ARE WE NEUTRAL AGAINST?

The long expected Guatemalan upheaval began last Friday. It is an affair having many aspects and angles, and it is made the more difficult to understand by the Communist-controlled Guatemala government's clam-up on war news.

What is most significant from the American point of view is that Soviet Russia has been trying to acquire Guatemala as a Western Hemisphere toehold, and that now somebody is trying to stop that stuff.

The somebody may be nobody but a bunch of Guatemalan exiles led by Col. Carlos Castillo Armas. Or it may be unofficially, Nicaragua and Honduras, long worried about communism's gains in their neighbor nation.

Here's another important and highly unpleasant angle: There have been numerous Latin American revolutions in which the United States took some part, but this is only the second since the Monroe Doctrine was announced in 1823 where a non-Western Hemisphere nation is concerned. The first was the unsuccessful French attempt to establish the Archduke Maximilian of Austria as Emperor of Mexico, 1863–66.

That Soviet Russia is concerned with Guatemala was proved by the fact that the Soviet delegate to the United Nations spearheaded the attack, at Sunday's emergency Security Council meeting, on United States "imperialism." It is the Kremlin's contention that the United States really is the villian behind Col. Castillo Armas, and that its prime object is to make Guatemala safe for the United Fruit Co.

The Kremlin conveniently overlooks its own backing of the Reds in Indochina and, earlier, in North Korea.

What's the smart attitude for the United States to take?

Well, it is obviously to our interest that Jacobo Arbenz's Reds be overthrown and replaced by some anti-Communist outfit—just as it is to the Kremlin's interest that Arbenz and his Red pals remain in power.

Direct United States intervention, however, would most likely be a serious mistake. It would revive a lot of the old Central and South American fear of the "colossus of the North" (meaning us), and give the Reds valuable fuel for the anti-American demonstrations they are already stirring up in several Latin American countries.

To repeat, though, it's to our interest that Arbenz be tossed out. So how about our Government remembering the story of the Irishman in World War II who indignantly remarked: "Sure, Ireland is neutral—but who are we neutral against?" And how about making that our guiding principle in meeting each new development in the Guatemala conflict?

Loss of Momentum in Federal Aid Airport Program Should Be of Grave Concern to Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 1954

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to do so, I herewith include a statement directed to the House Appropriations Committee by Joseph K. McLaughlin, director of the department of aeronautics, State of Illinois:

STATE OF ILLINOIS,
DEPARTMENT OF AERONAUTICS.

Re Federal aid airport program appropriation, fiscal 1955 (H. Doc. No. 428)

As one of the earliest and most substantially contributing members of the national airport program partnership, this department is perhaps not unnaturally very much interested and concerned in its continuing implementation, without further debilitating hiatus.

It is assumed that the facilitation and enhancement of the Nation's business is a matter impressed with the national interest; one of the most graphically demonstrable facts and results of the program as thus far carried forward has been the very substantial use made of even the smaller improved airports having a reasonable degree of year-round utility by aircraft of concerns of truly nationwide significance. Indeed, the utilitarian and economical business use of aircraft becomes accepted under the rigorous criteria imposed by business concerns when aircraft are used extensively and over long distances where monetary savings and time savings become significant. Accordingly attaching a local or statewide character to all except the larger terminal airports is arbitrary and simply not in keeping with the factual realities. Such business usage by chartered and company-owned aircraft is not only presently substantial but is constantly increasing.

A very ready analogy to the foregoing is to be found in the recognition by the Federal Government of inherent national interests in point of its definite allocation, under the PRA program for secondary and intracity highways. The two cannot be qualitatively dissembled.

After the Federal Airport Act became effective on June 13, 1946, the State of Illinois in a minimal period of time enacted into law enabling legislation as would permit the State, in the agency of this Department, and the municipalities and political subdivisions to do and perform those acts necessary to finance, develop, own, maintain, and operate airports for the public use and benefit, and the cooperation with the Federal Government under the Federal Airport Act was specifically referenced therein.

In complete good faith and in reliance upon the letter and spirit of the Federal Airport Act, the State of Illinois and its municipalities and political subdivisions have gone forward with an airport program in complete cooperation with the Federal Government to the extent that limited Federal funds have been available therefor, which in point of numbers, individual quality, responsiveness to public need, and money's-worth for each construction dollar expended we place against any in the Nation.

The appropriations of State general funds to carry forward this work have approximated $2¾ million during each of the last four biennia and these funds have been approximately matched by local funds, except in the case of the city of Chicago where the local expenditures have far exceeded either State or Federal expenditures.

Furthermore, under the provisions of the Federal Airport Act, municipalities of this State have expended approximately $4,700,000 in land acquisition and planning costs, Federal participation in which has been deferred in order to accomplish within the framework of limited Federal funds available in any given year construction work necessary to achieve an operational facility.

Furthermore, during the hiatus which has ensued since Under Secretary of Commerce Murray on February 15, 1953, by administrative fiat, froze all remaining fiscal 1953 FAAP funds not then under binding grant agreement and his omission to include any budgetary request for FAAP implementation during fiscal 1954, the State of Illinois has expended or is expending $470,500, and 11 of its municipalities $135,000 in order to accomplish on a reduced-scope basis in the absence of Federal funds, some sort of usable and useful facility in partial execution of work that had been previously jointly determined with the Civil Aeronautics Administration was needed and in the public interest. These expenditures during this hiatus unquestionably should be recognized for purposes of non-Federal participation in further stage construction under the FAAP.

Aside from the very real national interest with which an adequate system of airports is impressed, irrespective of what may be the policy criteria and appropriations implementation as to completely new airport projects, it is earnestly submitted that as an irreducible minimum, under any concept of full faith and credit as might be conceived, it is incumbent upon the Federal Government to carry through its part of the spirit of this undertaking in those instances where there has been a substantial change of position by the States and their instrumentalities in the way of general-obligation bond issues, land-acquisition costs, and engineering costs to the extent that construction work thereunder is needed and useful and meets Federal construction specifications.

Aside from the well-analyzed analysis submitted by the National Association of State Aviation Officials for the need of an appropriation to implement the FAAP for fiscal 1955 of $50 million, it will be noted that the American Municipal Association submitted an analysis in the order of $65 million. The figure of $33 million has been repeatedly mentioned as being the one arrived at by the Civil Aeronautics Act as an irreducible minimum for current implementation. The $22 million request sent to the Congress by the administration can therefore be considered only as a wholly inadequate amount from any standpoint. The irreparable loss to the public interest in point of loss of momentum, loss of experienced Federal personnel who have experience and qualification in the administration of this program, and the loss of faith by the States and their municipalities in their Federal Government if there be a further lapse in this program should be manifest and of grave concern to everyone.

We would therefore earnestly bespeak the most careful and favorable consideration of this very, very important appropriation measure by you and the honorable members of this committee.

Respectfully submitted.

Joseph K. McLaughlin,
Director.

That Smalltown Stuff

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 1954

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks I include two articles written by Bert A. Gipple appearing in the Galesville Republican, Galesville, Wis., one on November 5, 1953, and the other on May 27, 1954, entitled "That Smalltown Stuff."

The references to our colleague from Wisconsin, Mr. Johnson, are correct.

The premise upon which Mr. Gipple bases his articles is correct, the importance of persons from small towns or communities in the establishment and the building of our country.

The great success of our Nation is dependent upon those who came from all parts of our country towns, as well as cities, and the contributions made by those born in rural communities and towns have been and will continue to be of primary importance.

The articles follow:

[From the Galesville (Wis.) Republican of November 5, 1953]

THAT SMALLTOWN STUFF

Whether a Congressman elected by any political party from the Ninth District, or any other district, comes from a large city, or from a small one, a village, or a rural community should not count in the selection.

The repeated references of the Associated Press, other news agencies, newspaper columnists, and radio commentators, to Lester Johnson being a "small town district attorney," and "country lawyer," may well be taken by people in small cities, villages, and rural areas in general as a slam, and put them in a resentful turn of mind. Well may they ask why they are to be stigmatized because of the locality in which they reside.

People in rural communities, whether in small cities, villages, crossroads, hamlets, coulees, or valleys have a commendable sense of pride, and they don't take kindly to being rated as hayseeds, yokels, or in any way inferior to big-town folks.

Those writers should keep in mind that Abraham Lincoln was a country lawyer; that Wisconsin's senior United States Senator at one jump sprang from a "small town district attorney" to a seat in the greatest lawmaking body in the world; that Elmer Barlow was a country lawyer in Arcadia and arose to a place on the Wisconsin Supreme Court without losing residence in his home town; that a half century earlier Alfred W. Newman was a country lawyer in Trempealeau, and he, too, became a member of that court. And last but not least, Merlin Hull was a country lawyer, in the same small town in which Lester Johnson resides, and that for 20 years the Ninth District returned him to Congress by overwhelming majorities.

Lester Johnson is the Congressman-elect. True, he may or may not hold that position longer than to fill out the unexpired term, but so long as he does, regardless of his brand of politics, he has every right to be regarded as one of us—not a hayseed or a geek from the sticks. And every such crack by writers and commentators will have a tendency to strengthen him, rather than weaken him, as was the case with his predecessor.

[From the Galesville (Wis.) Republican of May 27, 1954]

THAT SMALLTOWN STUFF

Last year, when the special congressional campaign was on, correspondents of press associations and other news agencies in writing of Lester Johnson's candidacy mentioned over and over that he was a small town district attorney. Now, with another campaign on, this has been resumed. The term now is "small town attorney."

The inference is plain. Nothing of importance can come from a small town. The same was heard 2,000 years ago, when scoffers said, "Nothing good can come out of Nazareth."

Newspaper correspondents who use the small town stuff in their reports, and newspapers who let the slap at small towns get by without deletion are equally culpable. Men and women of both major political parties have been elevated to high positions and served with distinction. In Wisconsin, Senator Alexander Wiley, now at the top in Congress for important positions and influence, was a small town district attorney when he became Senator. The late Congressman Merlin Hull, a small town attorney, was for 20 years returned to Washington from the Ninth Congressional District. Senator Owen, named as the Republican candidate for Congress last week, is a resident of Menominee. The term "small town" is relative. A dozen Eau Claires could be taken from Chicago without more than scratching the surface.

Congressman Johnson is a Democrat, and it is but natural that Republicans desire to unseat him; but the difference in political policies should enter into the campaign, not the difference in size of Eau Claire and Black River Falls. At best, that "small town stuff" is silly.

An Anglo-American Alliance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT H. BOSCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 1954

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Speaker, we are all very much interested in the meetings this weekend between President Eisenhower, Sir Winston Churchill, and Anthony Eden. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the New York Daily Mirror entitled "An Anglo-American Alliance?" which is very timely:

AN ANGLO-AMERICAN ALLIANCE?

The British have at long last discovered that it is impossible to make peace with the Soviet Universal State, whether it be with its Russian or Chinese manifestation. The Communists do not want a peaceful world because it does not pay them to have a peaceful world. They also do not want a fighting war because it does not pay them.

What the Kremlin wants and needs is a disturbed, an anxious, a frightened world. Therefore, they stimulate trouble on every continent.

John Foster Dulles was correct when he left the Geneva Conference, on May 1, as a hopeless mess. Anthony Eden and Sir Winston Churchill were wrong when they assumed that by appeasement they could either get some kind of peace out of the Kremlin or they could achieve a split between Russia and China.

They now know that they will have neither peace nor a split. They know that Geneva is a failure. They know that their policies imperiled Anglo-American relations, which are approaching a state of noncooperation, to say the least. They are now coming to the United States to mend their fences.

Their presence in this country will be welcomed because the American people wish the Anglo-American alliance to be continued, provided it is a two-way street.

The American people would prefer both countries to have common objectives, to employ common methods, and to engage in mutual assistance.

Any program that requires the United States to make all the sacrifices while Great Britain gets all the benefits will be rejected as unworthy and unwarranted.

In Asia, if there is to be a common objective, the program must include a limitation upon trade with Red China.

The British desire unlimited trade with Red China in order that Hong Kong and

Singapore may not suffer economically. Both India and Ceylon throw their weight around in the commonwealth every time a stoppage of trade with Red China is proposed and the British fear to antagonize Nehru, who has generally been wrong in his China policy.

It is clear that if the British insist on selling the Reds nonstrategic commodities which they can turn into strategic commodities, the American people will continue to oppose British policy. We want trade with Red China reduced to a trickle, if not abolished altogether.

It is possible that on this issue, the British have been confused by the attitude of Harold Stassen, who seems to be so anxious that the Russians and the Red Chinese should trade with the western countries that he does not always present the American viewpoint accurately or even at all. Churchill and Eden will discover during their visit to this country that Red China is not forgiven for her intervention in Korea and in Indochina and that Americans want no commerce with Mao-Tse-tung's savages.

As to Indochina, the British must understand that Americans were surprised when Anthony Eden continued to hope for peace with Red China while the war continued in Indochina. Perhaps one of President Eisenhower's press conferences added to the confusion, but the British visitors will learn that the voice of the people is stronger than that of any official.

What it comes down to in very plain language:

If there is to be an Anglo-American alliance, let it be a complete alliance, for the entire world, on a program mutually conceived. This is the time to arrange such an alliance and it will be welcome. But it must be of such a nature that it can be and will be publicly proclaimed with no hidden clauses and with no diplomatic tricks.

It is known that it has been Sir Winston Churchill's great ambition and hope that he could end his public career with a peace treaty that would include a Russian signature. He has labored valiantly to that end. It is regrettable that he has failed, not through any fault of his own, but because the Russians have rejected peace.

The time has come to drop all this and to return to an Anglo-American partnership which can stand on solid rock.

Governor Stratton, of Illinois, Urges Full Recognition of States' Participation in Airport Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 1954

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I include herewith a telegram from the Honorable William G. Stratton, Governor of Illinois, urging Congress to give careful and full recognition of State and municipalities participation in the airport program. The telegram from Governor Stratton follows:

SPRINGFIELD, ILL., *June 21, 1954.*

Hon. MELVIN PRICE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Re Federal aid airport appropriation for Federal fiscal year 1955

I urge careful and full recognition of the substantial disbursements made to date by the State of Illinois and its municipalities including bonded indebtedness and cost of acquiring land according to Federal design criteria requirements, in carrying out their part of what in complete good faith has been conceived to be a full partnership undertaking, as well as recognition of the very real national interest inherent in an adequate system of airports, in point of facilitation of the national business economy. This applies to improved airports other than just those of the larger terminal-type category. The non-air-carrier business usage of improved airports in this State is constantly increasing, characterized in very large measure by aircraft traveling interstate.

WILLIAM G. STRATTON,
Governor of Illinois.

The Leveck 50-Year Success Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 22, 1954

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by R. D. Arnold regarding the 50th anniversary of an Arkansas business firm, J. H. Leveck & Sons. The article appears in the May 1954 issue of Contractors and Engineers.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE LEVECK 50-YEAR SUCCESS PLAN—POLICY OF CAUTION AND INGENUITY HAS PAID OFF FOR THIS PIONEER ARKANSAS CONTRACTING COMPANY

(By R. D. Arnold)

Arkansas' oldest firm of general contractors is celebrating its 50th anniversary this year. But J. H. Leveck & Sons isn't taking much time out to reminisce. There are too many construction jobs under contract just now.

This Little Rock, Ark., firm can look back, though on a half century's building activity which has left the Leveck mark on buildings and other projects throughout the State. And if the company has a byword, it is "caution," which owner Donald Leveck feels has helped the firm to weather two world wars, a depression, inflation, and local disasters, such as floods.

Before World War II there was little industrial activity in agricultural Arkansas. Immediately after the war the State's contracting firms were deluged with contracts, but large out-of-State firms soon moved in to get their share of the pie. Today, construction is a highly competitive business for companies like J. H. Leveck & Sons.

The firm has seen such business trends come and go in the 50 years since Don's father first hung out a shingle reading: J. H. Leveck, Building Contractor. And since 1920, when the founder took his two sons into partnership, Don has had an active part in guiding the business.

Don has owned and operated the Leveck firm since 1942, when his father retired and his younger brother, Herbert, went west where he is now in the construction business also. Don's wife, Ruth, is her husband's only partner and directs public relations for the company.

An active 58, Don is 5 feet 7 inches of initiative and ingenuity, quick temper, and friendliness. As far as other vital statistics go, he is of average build, blue-eyed, and—from testimony of his business associates and friends—has always been bald. Educated at Hendrix College, Conway, Ark., he also attended Arkansas Law School at night to learn interpretation of the legal aspects of building contracts.

Trained in every phase of the business from operation of the commonest hand tool to running of huge pieces of machinery, Don turns his spare time to designing new products for use in construction. He has designed and built a trench hoe, a concrete bucket, a 45-foot boom, and a ⅓-yard clamshell bucket. His ingenuity was illustrated recently when he devised an economical signal system for directing traffic over a one-way bridge lane.

SIGNAL DEVICE

In order to permit one-way traffic while his firm was paving a bridge, Don rigged up a system of stop lights operated by a synchronous motor. For 45 seconds the light at one end of the bridge is red, while at the other end it is green. For 10 seconds, while the bridge is cleared, both lights are red, and then the arrangement is reversed. The contractor feels he has saved $1,000 with the device, which eliminates the need for two flagmen to direct traffic.

Even today, as owner of the firm, Don may be found pinch-hitting at repairing machines, running a hoist, or any one of dozens of other specialized jobs. He has tool-working equipment at his home and spends many hours experimenting with equipment ideas.

When his employees were called into service in 1942 and building materials became hard to get, Don answered an urgent Government call for the use of home machinery. In his workshop, he made thousands of loading devices for detonators being manufactured at a nearby defense plant.

The wartime curtailment of commercial building activity, together with numerous consumer product shortages, seemed to bring out the best of Don's inventive talent. A pianist and organist, he built an electronic organ for his home when electrical machines were almost impossible to get. He built a basement chicken brooder. Together with Mrs. Leveck, he entertained hundreds of servicemen at the Leveck home during the war, and the menu invariably included vegetables from the terraced victory garden out back, chickens from the basement brooder, and music from the home-built organ.

Even this contractor's home was a wartime project. It is a solar-heated structure on a hillside site, with an 18- by 34-foot concrete swimming pool in the garden. Throughout the house are features designed by Don himself and constructed with the aid of a few friends. The pickled oak furniture and oak stairway nosings were built by the contractor with his home lathe and band saw. The Acousti-Celotex ceilings and door closers were remnants from building jobs. The ammonia-refrigeration unit was adapted for air conditioning. The swimming pool was built first so that the forms could be used again in building the house.

CREDIT TO FATHER

In reviewing the history of the firm, Don Leveck unfailingly credits his father with keeping the firm on a sound financial footing. J. H. Leveck instilled in his son a respect for the same business principles he himself had always followed. Today, as Arkansas' oldest living contractor in point of both service and age, the elder Leveck is affectionately known in the trade as "Pops."

The Leveck organization includes, besides Don and General Superintendent Roy C. Bridges, a full-time office man, a full-time maintenance man, and additional employees as they are needed. Individual projects sometimes call for hundreds of workers, not to mention assistant superintendents, draftsmen, estimators, and clerical workers.

Among half a dozen projects for which J. H. Leveck & Sons holds contracts at present are two bridge repaving jobs. The State has launched a program to replace old asphalt-covered-oak bridge floors with welded steel grids poured full of lightweigth concrete. Leveck, first in the State to construct the grid jobs, has two such projects under way now.

EQUIPMENT CHANGES

In this 50th year of his firm's existence, Don Leveck can look back almost the entire span of the days when he carried water for his father's laborers to drink. He has watched modern earth-moving machinery replace the mule team, pick, and shovel as standard equipment, and has seen construction methods change radically from those first employed by his father as a pioneer contractor.

But although he has grown up with the industry and brought his company into an age of spirited competition, the Arkansas contractor prefers to think of his firm as a conservative one. He is content with his share of jobs and declares that occasional slack periods add zest to living, besides building momentum for the frenzied pace which the contractor learns to accept as normal.

All of which might seem like a pretty good recipe for a half century's success in the construction business. Certainly caution, careful training, and ingenuity have paid off for Don Leveck.

Freedom Is Your Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRY M. GOLDWATER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 22, 1954

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excellent commencement address delivered by Eugene C. Pulliam at the University of Arizona, on May 26, 1954.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

There are few more thrilling experiences than to look into the faces of young Americans who are able, eager, and ready to take on the responsibility of leadership, because never before in this Nation have we so urgently needed intelligent and dedicated leadership.

To me this is a great personal privilege and a unique experience. I am especially happy to bring you the personal greetings of two of this university's illustrious sons. Both are governors of great States, both are graduates of this university, and both take great pride in telling their friends that they are from the University of Arizona.

Gov. William G. Stratton, of Illinois, not only sends his greetings to you, but also told me he would be happy to have me tell this audience that his oldest daughter, Sandra, will enter the University of Arizona next fall. Her presence here will give Governor and Mrs. Stratton an opportunity to renew many of their old friendships.

Gov. George N. Craig, of my own State of Indiana, also sends his greetings to you in these words:

"*To the Students and Faculty of the University of Arizona:*

"I am happy to take this means of communicating to you through my good friend, Gene Pulliam, my best wishes upon the day of graduation at the University of Arizona.

"Many is the time that my mind returns to the experiences and pleasures that I enjoyed as a student of the university, and the fine and lasting friendships that were made to provide rich memories.

"In these critical and interesting days in America, more than ever before, is the principle of the university, 'Bear Down,' applicable to the American way of life.

"Not only is a belief in this principle necessary on the athletic field, but it is equally important in our everyday lives as we work together to preserve the happiness that results from the enjoyment of the fruition of liberty and freedom.

"Sincerely yours,
"GEORGE N. CRAIG,
"*Governor of Indiana.*"

I think it is an unusual distinction that two of the youngest governors among all the States both are also graduates of the University of Arizona, and Arizona is the youngest State in the Union. No other university—large or small, old or young—can make that statement. And so it is a pleasant experience for me on this commencement day to bring you the greetings of two of my dear friends who are also two of your most distinguished alumni.

Your commencement day is here. It is a day of endings and a day of beginnings. This particular little world in which you have lived and have been happy together is at an end. It is finished. You can never bring it back. You can never reconstruct it. But always the years which you have spent here will be the magic years. You will cherish and hold them dear—and well you should. For you have built here foundations on which your life henceforth will be lived.

And now I come to ask you a blunt, stark question. What have you learned? What do you intend to do with the knowledge and the information and the inspiration you have received here? The real purpose of education is to make life useful. How useful will your life be? It all depends on how well you understand the true meaning of life. For a university, my dear young friends, deals with the spirit and not the fortunes of its students.

And so I will offer you a rule of life to help make your life useful, which is the only way it can be made satisfying, to help you realize the hopes and reach the goal which only a useful life can hold, and only if you will listen to the good voice within you which has been awakened during your years on this campus.

My gentle and beloved mother was a preacher's wife, the wife of a frontier missionary. And she gave me this rule of life at about the time I stood where you are standing today. It came of course from Shakespeare, but to my mother it came straight from the heart of God. This is it: "To thine own self be true, and it must follow as the night the day, thou canst not then be false to any man."

Character and personal integrity are the essentials which will make the knowledge you have gained here worthwhile to you and to your fellow human beings in the society in which you are to spend the rest of your life.

If you are to be a farmer, farm the very best way you know, and never stop searching for still better ways.

If you are to be a lawyer, practice the law with a firm resolve that you will do nothing to undermine its basic foundations, which are justice and right.

If you are to be a doctor, an editor, an engineer, an artist, or an architect, be guided solely by the good voice that is within you.

The world could not be saved if all the people in it were merely good. The world can be saved by the good in people—the good in people irresistibly dedicates them to the proposition of living if they can, or of dying if they must, for the enlargement and the perpetuation of all the noble aims and efforts toward mankind's better way of life.

Now I want to talk to you about the most precious thing in your life. Every American boy and every American girl who graduates from an American university comes to the threshold of adult life with the greatest heritage that God has bestowed on any group of people—your freedom, your liberty as an American. And when I plead with you—to thine own self be true—I also earnestly and prayerfully urge you to be true to the heritage of American freedom which is yours solely by reason of the glorious experience which befell you by being born on American soil.

What is liberty? It has been defined in many ways and in many tongues, but probably the best definition is this, "Liberty is the power which of right belongs to every man to use all his faculties as he may choose. Its rule is justice. Its limits are the rights of others. Its principles are drawn from nature. Its protector is the law."

Today the world is confronted by problems which unquestionably are more difficult of solution than those which any preceding generation has had to face. At a time when we should be making magnificent progress in mankind's struggle toward real civilization through proper utilization of the mysterious miracles available to us in atomic power, what do we find? We find an uncertain and chaotic world wherein every country is filled with doubts of herself and fears of her neighbors and without faith in anything. In short, most of the world today is in a frightful mess. I know something about that mess because I have seen it with my own eyes. My wife and I have traveled through 66 countries during the last 5 or 6 years. What happened? How did the world get such a headache and such a heartache? What is the matter with America that we find ourselves in a position where the whole world needs and clamors for our leadership, only to find that we too have become too confused to give that leadership? It's not a nice question for an American to ask himself, but we had better face it fast because already it is later than we think.

All over the world the 20th century version of socialism—no matter what name it takes—has planted its virus in the bloodstream of the human race, leaving us wishy-washy, weak-kneed and groggy—spiritually, morally, and financially. The soft-soap promises of easy living of the power-mad politicians and the hybrid socialists—whether they call themselves Nazis, Fascists, or Communists—have sold the common people of nearly every country on earth down the river. Socialism is as old as the hills. It has been tried for thousands of years and it has been found utterly wanting so far as the needs of mankind are concerned. It is the essence of retrogression, utterly threadbare of virtue. It deprives the individual of his hard-won freedoms and stops his slow but thrilling march toward a real civilization. It is a flagrant fraud which masquerades as a democracy come to save the common man, but in reality it is nothing but the tyranny of an organized and greedy minority which eventually saddles onto its supine victims the stultifying shackles of admitted dictatorship.

All over the world the common man—the men and women like us—have been sold out to some such form of government, and whether that government retains the garb of decency as in the case, let us say, of England, or is openly barbaric as in the case of Russia, make no mistake about it. The end is the same: suppression, dictatorship, decadence, and despair. All over the world people have frittered away whatever freedoms they had gained for a handful of socialism's dubious security and phony silver. And look at them now.

How do the socialist dictators go about the business of taking away freedoms and taking over governments? What is always the cardinal requirement for a successfully performed robbery? Secrecy, of course. So the first step of the socialist dictator is to destroy by whatever means he can the voice of the people, their right of free speech—in short, their free press. The socialist dictator may, like Mussolini, coddle and court and flatter. Hitler tried that method and it failed, so he took over the radio, then the Jewish press, and the final step was easy. The suppression of news was complete and so was the suppression of the people. The Perons used a different method in Argentina, but whatever the means, the end is always the same.

The dictator knows he cannot survive while the press remains free. A free press is his doom, for it is the people's one weapon against him. He has got to safeguard his position by seeing that the common people, those who are not with him in his big lie, do not know the truth, do not know what is really going on, and have no way to reject the dictator or repudiate him.

Examine Europe, examine Russia, look at China—the story is monotonous. Where there is no freedom, civilization perishes.

And what of us? What of America? Happily for us, being more virile and perhaps less willing than most other people in the world to adopt goosestepping, we stopped in our pellmell downhill rush toward socialism and looked around to see just where we were going, and it wasn't a pretty picture. We suddenly discovered that we had grown soft and lazy, mentally and spiritually. We discovered we had thrown a cloak of respectability about the shoulders of a little group of politicians, social planners, and thugs who were taking control of our affairs. We had come to the place where we actually curried their favor. We thought it was cute to go along with the bright young men who ridiculed the old-fashioned virtues which are the deepest-down foundations of our country. We didn't want to be accused of being patriotic for fear we would appear to be provincial hicks, and we wouldn't be caught dead getting really thrilled by the words and music of anything as old-fashioned and reactionary as the Star-Spangled Banner.

But fortunately, being young and virile, this country is resilient. We startled a great deal of the rest of the world by stopping ourselves on this side of the brink. There still is mild suppression of information in our Government. It is not as bad as it was during the preceding 20 years, but we have not yet regained the freedoms we so blithely surrendered to government and the self-created bureaus which made like government during those discredited decades.

Yet there are political leaders and leaders in education today who try to discard our Constitution. They would reshape our form of government and throw away the institutions of liberty on which this republic has moved forward to undreamed of progress. They would replace our form of government with other institutions of government which have been tried and found wanting and so were abandoned by freedom-loving people a century or other centuries ago.

In America the great threat to our freedom comes in less blatant ways than those adopted by the Hitlers, the Perons and the Stalins of the world. It comes by stealth, little by little, percent by percent. It comes nicely shined up by soft-soap promises of easy living and cradle-to-the-grave security. It comes not by legislation nor by revolution, but by taxation and inflation.

You are about to become the wage earners, the taxpayers, the spirit and the sinews which must push and pull our country forward. You and those hundreds of thousands of you being graduated this month from other universities and lesser schools across the Nation. You—if you please—are the new voice of the people. And as one great voice you must speak out and demand that Federal taxes be reduced. We must reject utterly and further increase in taxation. We could take great heart from President Eisenhower's state of the Union message in which he said tax burdens should be reduced so that taxpayers may spend their own money in their own way. And it is our business to insist that this become an accomplished fact and not merely a pleasant sounding promise. For unless this is done, this country will continue to move ineluctably toward socialism to the noiseless subtleties of strangling taxation. And never forget it, if we get socialism in this country the freedoms of the American people are gone for good and freedom will vanish from the face of the earth because ours is the only free country left in all the world.

The preservation of freedom in America is more important than any other thing any of us can ever do. It is the finest and the ultimate service we can offer to our family, our State, our country and our God. Do not allow yourself ever to forget that freedom breeds independence and independence is the only dependable guaranty of freedom.

Frequently Americans boast of the great natural resources of this land of ours, but the greatest natural resource in all the world lies in the good earth of the Nile Valley. It is 400 miles long, 50 to 100 miles wide. The soil is thick and soft and black and pulverized. You can grow 2, 3, even 4 crops a year—and yet what is wrong there?

I have seen humanity at its lowest ebb in all the great cities of the world—in Rome, in Jerusalem, in Bombay, in Athens, Calcutta, Cairo. Yet in all the world the worst degradation, the most futile frustration, the most abject poverty I have seen anywhere, I saw in the agricultural villages of the Nile Valley. Why? Because nobody cares. There is no incentive there. There is no freedom. They live and work and plow and die just as they did 5,000 years ago. Yet a group of American farmers in the Nile Valley, equipped with modern agricultural machinery, will create there a utopia, a paradise which cannot even be imagined.

There is only one difference between the valley of the Nile and our own great prosperous valleys in America—and that one difference is freedom.

For many years the slogan of our newspapers was Fair and First. As I traveled across the world in recent years, watching the rising tide of godless tyranny relentlessly engulfing more than 800 million of the earth's people, it seemed to me that we must rededicate ourselves, restate our purposes. Today the watchword of our newspapers is this—and we are proud to have taken it from the Holy Bible: "Where the spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty."

"Where the spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty."

That is the watchword of every newspaper we publish. To the people who read our newspapers we are trying to say simply this: Man's most priceless possession, his finest tool for today and his greatest hope for tomorrow is his freedom, his liberty. There can be no liberty where there is no God. It doesn't matter greatly what a man's personal concept of God may be. Whatever his belief, he cannot give expression to it and he cannot implement his faith in it by action unless he has liberty. God and liberty are synonymous. Where you find one you will find the other.

That is why the basic objective of the Soviets is to ridicule and destroy man's faith in God and the corollary belief in the dignity and integrity of the individual. They know their antichrist tyranny can survive only in a land where the spirit of the Lord is not; because there, there is no liberty.

Today America stands alone; the only free country in all the world. Blest to have such a beachhead, we should be proud to do battle for our God and for our faith in freedom. If America remains free under the spirit of the Lord, the things we hold dear and all our bright hopes for the future are secure. The dreams which your years here have made you dare to dream can become realities. And if we preserve and protect our freedom, then sometime, some way, somehow, America, being free, will show the rest of the world the road to freedom. This is the mission I urge you now—with your youth and your courage—to assume as your own.

This is the divine mission of America—freedom for ourselves and eventually freedom for all the world in which the spirit of the Lord will abide.

I salute you graduates of this university on your magnificent opportunity to become American ambassadors for freedom. Wherever you go, remind the people you meet and with whom you come in contact that America is great only because it is free.

You have entered adult life in one of the most exciting and most dangerous and most challenging eras of all history. I urge and beseech you to know and understand what freedom means to you. And always, under all circumstances, wherever you are, acquit yourselves as free Americans.

I am deeply grateful for your gracious courtesy in inviting me to be with you here tonight. It is an inspiration to look into the eyes of men and women who have been trained in this great university for the serious but thrilling responsibilities of leadership in free America. To thine own self be true, and you cannot fail.

Good luck and God bless all of you.

Commencement Address by George F. Kennan at Radcliffe College

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 22, 1954

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record a very excellent commencement address by Mr. George F. Kennan, of the Institute for Advanced Study, of Princeton, N. J., delivered at Radcliffe College, Cambridge, Mass., on June 16, 1954.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Address by George F. Kennan, of the Institute for Advanced Study of Princeton, N. J., and Former Ambassador to Russia, at the Radcliffe College Commencement Exercises, Cambridge

Our time, this morning, is brief; the occasion pleasant. I have racked my brain to think of something to say to the members of this graduating class at such a moment that would not involve those bitter questions of foreign and domestic policy that have been debated at such length and at the cost of so much unpleasantness in these recent months. One alternative, of course, would be to speak of personal life. But some two decades of parenthood, if they have taught me nothing else, have finally taught me something of my limitations as a dispenser of wisdom and advice to younger people in personal matters. And in the field of public affairs, the choice is not so great. A distinguished American recently observed, on a similar occasion, that "one of the most curious and persistent myths of democratic society is that political figures have anything important or interesting to say, especially when they are out of office." The same, goodness knows, would be even more true of retired government officials. We are, I fear, a gloomy race. Our faith in our country is there, and undiminished, but it lies deeply imbedded within us, in troubled depths. We do not fail to greet with immense inner satisfaction those things that do seem to us to be constructive and hopeful; but by and large we follow the course of public events with a sort of anxious and paternal apprehension, like a sailor who watches a strange crew sailing his craft; and if you prod us into a reaction—as anyone does who asks us to speak at commencement ceremonies—what you get are our anxieties, for they are so much more explicit and much closer to our tongues than our hopes.

So this morning, at the risk of speaking of matters that have perhaps been too much spoken of already, I am going to tell of 1 or 2 things that cause me anxiety and then of a common conclusion I derive from them that might usefully be borne in mind by people just entering on the status of adult citizenship.

The first of these anxieties relates to foreign affairs. As many of you may know, I have never taken an alarmist view, and do not take one now, of the nature of our conflict with Soviet power. I have never felt, and do not feel today, that another great war could possibly serve as a useful instrument for promoting the interests of either side in this unhappy conflict. In a number of reflections about the nature of our world—in the fact that war has become so obviously self-defeating and suicidal in the growing clarity with which the last two world wars begin now to stand out on the landscape of history as tragic, colossal follies from which no one could be said to have gained—in the tendency of time to change all things and to erode all militant faiths—in these things I have found reason for hope and good cheer, and have spent much of my time and energy in these recent years trying to persuade others to approach what we call the East-West conflict in a similar spirit.

Yet I am bound to say that in recent weeks and months I have witnessed with increasing dismay what has seemed to me to be the progressive neglect or rejection, or disappearance for one reason or another, of the more hopeful possibilities for making progress in this problem by peaceful means. Above all, I have watched with a sinking of the heart the way in which many people in our country have, as it seems to me, been pressed relentlessly into states of mind where they can see no solution to these difficulties at all, and even no end to them, except in the horrors of atomic war. This has happened in some instances because people have been impatient of partial solutions and unable to contemplate continued uncertainty. In other cases, I suspect people have been carried by the deceiving compulsions of the weapons race into conclusions that neglect all the ulterior considerations, and particularly the imponderables. In still other cases, they may have been the victims of their own brave and rash slogans. But in any event, the longer and more subtle and less obvious paths by which it seems to me we might reasonably hope to make progress in this situation are ones that they, for one reason or another, either reject or fail to understand; and with this rejection or failure of understanding, I fear I see a deterioration in the prospects for our continuing to muddle through these difficulties in the direction of a more hopeful future.

I do not mean to blame ourselves in any exclusive way for the present trend—we do live in a world where there have been released great forces of hatred and violence and vindictiveness, and we have been confronted with a great deal more in the way of provocation than we have given over the course of these past two decades. And I do not mean to blame any party or administration among us. But I must emphasize that today it is precisely these subjective factors—factors relating to the state of mind of many of our own people—rather than the external circumstances, that seem to me to constitute the most alarming component of our situation. It is such things as the lack of flexibility in outlook, the stubborn complacency about ourselves and our society, the frequent compulsion to extremism, the persistent demand for absolute solutions, the unwillingness to accept the normal long-term hazards and inconveniences of great power—it is these things in the American character that seem to me to give added gravity to a situation which would in any case be grave enough, and cause me for the first time to question seriously whether we are really going to be able, with our present outlooks and approaches, to avoid the complication of our international situation to a most dangerous degree.

The second of the anxieties I wish to mention relates to our internal situation. It is equally well worn and equally unstartling; but it must be mentioned nevertheless.

There is a great deal in our domestic life of these recent months that I am sure we would all like to forget; and I hope that we shall soon be permitted to forget a great deal of it. But there are certain overriding facts that ought not to pass too quickly out of our memories. We ought not to forget that we have witnessed in these recent months the spectacle of many millions of Americans unable to put in its place and to assess with any degree of balance and equanimity the time-honored and unexceptional phenomenon of foreign political activity, intrigue, and espionage in our midst—phenomenon which no great power has ever been spared throughout the course of human history, and from which surely no other great power is immune today. Millions of our people have been unable to accept this normal burden of international leadership at its true worth—have been uncertain as to the value to be assigned to it, uncertain as to what weight to give it in comparison with other problems of our national life. And this uncertainty has given them a peculiar vulnerability—a vulnerability to having their fears exploited and to being stampeded into panicky, ridiculous, and dangerous attitudes, unworthy of their own national tradition, unworthy of themselves.

Under the sign of this weakness we have seen things that cannot fail to bring deepest concern to any thinking American. We have seen our public life debauched; the faith of our people in great and distinguished fellow citizens systematically undermined; useful and deserving men hounded thanklessly out of honorable careers of public service; the most subtle sort of damage done to our intellectual life; our scholars encouraged to be cautions and unimaginative in order to escape being controversial; a pall of anxiety and discouragement thrown over our entire scientific community; our libraries and forums of knowledge placed on the defensive before the inroads of self-appointed snoopers and censors; a portion of our youth encouraged to fear ideas on the pretext of being defended from them. We have seen the reputations of our great private philanthropic foundations, with their immense and unique records of contribution to the national life, recklessly attacked; ingratitude flung in the face of the entire institution of private benevolence. We have seen our people taught to distrust one another, to spy, to bear tales, to behave in a manner which is in sharpest conflict with American the traditions. We have seen our friends in other countries frustrated in their efforts to help and support us, reduced to an embarrassed and troubled silence before the calumnies of our enemies upon us, for they were no longer sure whether these calumnies did not contain some measure of truth. And all of this in the name of our protection from Communist subversion, and yet every bit of it agreeable to Communist purposes, as almost nothing else could be—and all of it supported by people who then have the effrontery to come before us and to say: "Show us one innocent man who who has suffered."

Now, it would not be hard to name such a man—but it would be possible to name something far more important: It would be possible to name a great people, no more innocent or less innocent than any of the other great peoples of this world, but nevertheless a people of an immense fundamental decency and good will and practical energy, a people in an unparalleled position to exercise a useful and hopeful influence in this tortured and threatened world community, a people to whom a historic opportunity had been given, to whom the hopes of the world had turned; it would be possible to name such a people and to show it now, at the moment of its greatest historic responsibility, disaffected and disoriented in some of the deepest sources of its national morale, injured in its capacity to react to the challenge history has laid upon it, reduced from its natural condition of confidence and buoyancy to a state of cynicism and fearfulness and disgust with the processes of its own public life—and all of this primarily as a result of things within itself.

Now, I do not mean to overrate these things. I have no doubt that in its superficial aspects, all of this will pass—is probably already passing. The names, the idols, the scapegoats, the stereotypes, the abused words, and the perverted symbols—I have no doubt that these will all soon disappear, to join the records of the know-nothing movement and the chauvinistic hysteria of 1919 in the unhappier annals of our public life.

But I think we cannot comfort ourselves too much with this reflection. These things have happened. We have reacted this way, on this occasion. There must have been a reason for our doing so. Have we found that reason and learned from it? Are we going to be better armed to understand the next danger—to resist the next attempt by the unscrupulous to mobilize us against ourselves under the banner of our fears?

Now, the causes of these phenomena have undoubtedly been many, and deep, and complex. One cannot attempt to recount them or to analyze them in the few brief moments we have at our disposal this morning. But among these possible causes there is one I would like particularly to mention as perhaps worth your attention at this time.

In the case of each of these disturbing situations I have spoken of, I wonder whether an appreciable portion of our difficulty has not been a certain philosophic error to which we 20th-century Americans, for one reason or another, are prone. I am referring here to that peculiar form of American extremism which holds it possible that there should be such a thing as total security, and attaches overriding importance to the quest for it. A great deal of the impatience that underlies the growing despair in some quarters over the prospects for coping with world communism by means short of large-scale violence, seems to me to flow precisely from the illusion, no doubt bred by our 19th-century experience, that there could and should be such a thing as total military security for the United States, and that anything short of this is, in the long run, intolerable. And similarly, these frenzies many of us seem to have developed with respect to the problem of internal subversion—do they not reflect a belief that it should be possible for a great power to free itself completely from the entire problem of penetration and intrigue in its life by outside forces and, again, that it is intolerable that this should not be done—so intolerable, in fact, that if it is not done, this must be attributed to some stubborn delinquency, if not treason, in the bowels of our public establishment?

Now, if the evil of all this were limited to the fact that it involves the philosophic error of a perfectionist view of human life, that it causes people to bark up the wrong trees, and occasions an inordinate and futile sort of effort, I would not bother to speak of it this morning. But the fact is that it bears dangers worse than any of these. For there is something about this quest for absolute security that is in the deepest sense self-defeating. It is an exercise which, like every form of perfectionism, undermines and destroys its own basic purpose. The French have their wonderful proverb: Le mieux est l'ennemi du bien—the absolute best is the enemy of the good. Nothing truer has ever been said. A foreign policy aimed at the achievement of total security is the one thing I can think of that is entirely capable of bringing this country to a point where it will have no security at all. And a ruthless, reckless insistence on attempting to stamp out everything that could conceivably constitute a reflection of improper foreign influence in our national life, regardless of the actual damage it is doing or the cost of eliminating it, is the one thing I can think of that could reduce us all to a point where the very independence we are seeking to defend would be meaningless, for we would be doing things to ourselves as vicious and tyrannical as any that might be brought to us from outside.

This sort of extremism seems to me to hold particular danger for a democracy; because it creates a curious area between what is held to be possible and what is really possible, and within this area Government can always be plausibly shown to have been most dangerously delinquent in its performance. And this area thus provides the ideal field of opportunity for every sort of demagogery and mischief making. The heart of our problem here lies in our assessment of the relative importance of the various dangers among which we move; and until many of our people can be brought to understand that what we must do is not to secure a total absence of danger but to balance peril against peril and to find the tolerable degree of each, we will not wholly emerge from these confusions.

Now I renounced, at the outset of these remarks, any intention of peddling personal advice on this occasion. But perhaps I may be permitted, in conclusion, to observe that these reflections are not without their relevance to the problems of individual life.

In this personal existence of ours, bounded as it is at both ends by suffering and uncertainty, and constantly attended by the possibility of illness and accident and tragedy, total security is likewise a myth. Here, too, an anxious perfectionism can operate to destroy those real underpinnings of existence, founded in faith, modesty humor, and a sense of relativity, on which alone a tolerable human existence can be built. The first criterion of a healthy spirit is the ability to walk cheerfully and sensibly amid the congenital uncertainties of existence, to recognize as natural the inevitable precariousness of the human condition, to accept this without being disoriented by it, and to live effectively and usefully in its shadow.

In welcoming you, then—as it is my privilege this morning to do—into the fellowship and responsibility of maturity, let me express the hope that in each of your lives, as individuals and as citizens, le bien may be permitted to triumph over its ancient and implacable enemy le mieux. And if any of your friends come to you with the message that the problems of public life have become intolerable and require some immediate and total solution, I think you might do well to bear in mind the suggestion once made by a great European statesman, Bismarck, to certain of his more impatient and perfectionist contemporaries, who wanted him to solve all his country's problems right away, and entirely. "Let us leave just a few tasks," Bismarck suggested, "for our children to perform; they might be so bored in this world, if they had nothing to do."

Nuclear Reactor for Educational and Research Use

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 22, 1954

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement which J. R. Killian, Jr., president, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, made at the commencement exercises of the institute on June 11, 1954.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Massachusetts Institute of Technology announced this morning a decision to proceed with plans for the construction of a nonsecret, unclassified nuclear reactor for educational and research use, and forthwith to seek the necessary means to build it. Coupled with this new reactor are plans for a new building for the physical sciences at the institute.

Several considerations have led to this decision. MIT needs a reactor as a laboratory instrument for the education of scientists and engineers, particularly engineers broadly prepared to advance the industrial and peacetime application of atomic power. In 1951, we established a graduate program in nuclear engineering, in addition to our extensive program in nuclear science. These programs, operated by a staff of exceptional competence, need the addition of such a facility to be fully effective in their educational and research objective. We are well aware that there will be a steadily increasing demand for nuclear engineers and that these engineers will help to accelerate the beneficial uses of the atom in the same way that the chemical engineers helped in putting molecules to work.

A reactor of the kind we propose to build, with the approval of the Atomic Energy Commission, will be useful not only to our engineers but also to our scientists, including physicists, chemists, and biologists. The total cost of this reactor laboratory will be $1 million.

The second reason we have decided to proceed lies in the growing conviction that the benign and nonsecret use of atomic energy for the health and welfare of man requires a multiplication of private research groups working in areas that have been declassified and which are seeking primarily to advance knowledge or to make technological advances which will serve economic ends and be subject to industrial development.

The third reason underlying this decision is the conviction that nuclear technology will be of mounting importance to the Nation, and of very special importance to New England. The recent action of the New England Council of Governors in appointing its own Atomic Energy Committee is evidence of their concern for expediting the public benefits potentially present in this new area of technology. There is no reactor in this region at the present time and there should be if New England is to secure its proper share of the new technology's benefits. In the last two decades we have seen how research and development in electronics helped this State and this region to acquire a flourishing new industry. The same is possible in nucleonics, a field in which we already have a start through a group of enterprising engineers and industrialists. Research begets more research, and a concentration of research in nuclear technology will encourage both more research and new industry.

As a nation and a region we have a growing appreciation of the importance of energy to our strength, our wealth, and our welfare. Atomic energy is not yet economically feasible, but its practical use is looming over the horizon, and the way to hasten its commercial use is patiently to develop the men and the technology which must be available to achieve any great industrial advance.

Finally, we are moved by a conviction that the development of atomic energy for peaceful use is important to the spirit and to the leadership of America. Though we must build bombs in a world out of joint, we will move ahead into a better time only by improving the lot of mankind and addressing ourselves to more noble ends than atomic might. The use of science for defense is necessary, and we canot be strong without it. But such use of science and technology is not a natural or satisfying use and in the end can only thwart and distort their true spirit. Is it not possible that bold and imaginative acts by Americans to demonstrate the moral purpose and the nonmilitary uses of science and technology can contribute to our own reassurance and to our leadership of a world seeking peace? Our great resources of intelligency, imagination, ingenuity, and risk-taking spirit are moral forces that can lead a world out of a cold war. Science, with its spirit of creativity, its search for understanding, its dependence upon freedom and goodwill, and its worldwide currency, offers an avenue to a higher standard of living for all the world, but more importantly, to a resurgence of a spirit of reconciliation and goodwill among nations. In this period of cold war, we are engaged not only in an atomic armaments race but in a race to apply atomic energy to peaceful and beneficial use. This is a race we must win not only for our own welfare but for our influence in the community of the free world.

Our own modest project is in the spirit of this hope and possibility.

In deciding to move ahead with this project, our corporation executive and development committees have also authorized a concentrated fund drive to secure the moneys needed to complete a $4 million fund for a physical sciences building, the top priority space need at the institute. Some of the same reasons affecting the reactor warrant us in pushing ahead on this project, and the two, in fact, are closely related. The activities associated with each will strengthen the other. The institute has already received $1 million toward the cost of both projects, leaving a total of $4 million to be secured.

In deciding to build a nuclear reactor together with the physical sciences building, we anticipate opportunities to collaborate with neighboring institutions, educational, industrial, and governmental. We do not wish to seek an exclusive reactor facility but only one so designed and managed that it can serve an educational end and provide an unclassified, nonsecret research center. We look forward particularly to associating with us a group of industrial companies who wish to be in contact with this advancing technology and who will be needing a wide variety of scientists and engineers skilled in these new arts of science, engineering, and instrumentation.

I hope that this research reactor will be the forerunner of a power reactor in this region and that it will serve in other ways to hasten the expansion of nuclear industry and thus contribute substantially in new ways to the economic prosperity of New England.

Nationalism as a Weapon Against Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 22, 1954

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, the All-American Conference To Combat Communism is composed of some 55 national, loyal American organizations and is just what its name implies—a conference-type activity. The participating groups—including major veterans' organizations and their auxiliaries, religious groups representing all major faiths, fraternal and service clubs, important women's groups, and patriotic organizations—represent a rainbow of interests constituting our American way of life which, despite individual differences, work together on programs and activities to expose and oppose the godless conspiracy of communism, to emphasize the benefits of a free society, and to reawaken American citizens to the fundamental freedoms which are the foundation of our American way of life.

These groups cooperate in the All-American Conference To Combat Communism on such projects as: the observance of Know Your America Week; the compilation and distribution through organizational channels of a recommended reading list on communism and how to combat it; a monthly bulletin, Freedom's Facts Against Communism; and the publication of a series of pocket-size booklets, simply and factually written, on the several phases of the Communist conspiracy.

The address by Dr. L. E. Dobriansky was one of several given before the representatives of organizations during the annual meeting of the conference held in New York City on May 21 and 22, 1954. I ask unanimous consent to have the address printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

NATIONALISM AS A WEAPON AGAINST COMMUNISM

(Address by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, professor of political economy, Georgetown University; president, Ukrainian Congress Committee of America)

In this distinguished company of American patriots and nationalists, the privileged opportunity of delivering an address on the appropriate subject of nationalism becomes unavoidably a luxurious experience filled with much pleasure and ease. This cannot be otherwise, unless, with typical professorial digressiveness I should fail to strike the responsive cord of sympathetic understanding and feeling that vibrates in the consciousness of every one of us. Then, sadly enough, I would only obscure a powerful bond of universal significance that inextricably ties us with the peoples of all other nations, a natural bond of civilized existence that the Kremlin endeavors in vain to destroy—specifically, the solid bond of enlightened nationalism which spells the death of Communist imperialism and the life of a reconstructed international society, founded on truth, justice, and grounds of enduring peace.

There are several particular ways in which we view and interpret communism. Some observe it largely from the viewpoint of religious interest, others in terms of labor, management, or individual and civil liberties. Each of these viewpoints and its respective orientation is well represented here. Beyond question of doubt, these lines of analysis and interpretation bear close pertinence and relationship to particular spheres in the total phenomenon of Moscow-centered communism. Also, they point sharply at important sources of social force capable of contributing heavily to the defeat of communism and to the liberation and advancement of all the enslaved peoples. For their synthesis and integration into a whole truth, however, these viewpoints require a sound, historical perspective that is constantly reflected in the behavior of every patriotic American. It is one that synthesizes and integrates the thoughts and energies of the patriot in every other nation. It is one that brings us together here, despite the relative differences of our viewpoints. This is the common denominator, the motivating perspective of the national interest. Again, the overall, synthetic force of enlightened nationalism.

THE NATURAL TRUTH OF ENLIGHTENED NATIONALISM

Now, what is nationalism? Surely we must first answer this basic question before we could at all assess the potency of nationalism as a weapon against communism. Is nationalism the racism and supernationalism of a Hitler or Mussolini? Is it the racism or national chauvinism of the Russian Communists who propagate the superiority of the Russian nation and culture over all others? Is nationalism the blind fanaticism of a few Puerto Ricans who blemish the very integrity of a nation possessed not only with the natural right but the real and genuine opportunity for independence and self-government? These cancerous growths in a national body are certainly not the evidences of that sound and healthy nationalism which we, as Americans, breathe and live by. Nor are they the characteristics of the national patriot elsewhere, struggling at the risk of death and seeking for his own beloved country the very fruits of national freedom and independence that we enjoy. Nor can they possibly serve as a requisite basis for international brotherhood and peace, with justice and fairness toward all.

Nationalism is the conscious expression of a nation which, as a collective personality, sustains the rich individuality of a people distinguished by elements of language, culture, tradition, race, and religion. As the great priest and internationally recognized authority on nationalism, Father Don Luigi Sturzo, describes it: "Nation means individuality of a people; and this cannot come about without a stable geographical contiguity, a historical and cultural tradition, an economic interest. When to these preliminary conditions is added an awakened consciousness on the part of the people of one of those sociological syntheses which only great ideas, such as religion, liberty and independence, can bring about, then there develops the collective personality which we call nation."[1] For the existence and cultural flowering of any differentiated people, for the free and natural expression of a people's potentialities, these three ideas—religion, liberty, and independence—are necessary. These are the indispensable props of human and national freedom that Russian communism negates. In theory and practice, communism cannot live with enlightened nationalism, and once it dominates an area, it immediately sets out to destroy it.

Our own country is the magnificent example of this conscious expression of a nation. Religion, liberty, and independence are the ultimate sources of the greatness and power of this collective personality, this organic entity, which is the very structural basis of our enlightened nationalism. Our Founding Fathers envisioned all this, and this vision, for everyone to witness, is in the Declaration of Independence itself. It is the essence of enlightened nationalism, manifesting itself in patriotic devotion to God and country, to liberty in the economic and civil spheres, to the perennial rule of moral and political principles of equity, justice, and freedom among all nations. The great American tradition has long been founded on these principles which, despite the confused speculations of Mr. Kennan, are the true criteria of international relations as well as of other relations in society.

This is our history, and whether we are aware of it or not, its moving spirit has captured the souls and minds of dominated peoples and nations everywhere. This is our priceless heritage, and whether we are cognizant of it or not, its proper and vigorous observance in our schools and institutions could have been the best preventive check on the emergence of native Communist traitors in the past 20 years. This is the integrating force that welds us together here, and, again, whether we are fully conscious of it or not, its historical permeation binds our destiny as a nation with the aspirations and struggles of the national patriots in every captive or dominated nation. True, we are fighting against Muscovite communism, but we are motivated primarily to fight for the preservation of our independence, sovereignty, and freedom as a nation. Others are motivated likewise and treasure their stake in the future, as the preliminary lesson of Indochina so tragically teaches us.

THE GLOBAL FORCE OF NATIONALISM

Secretary of State Dulles has rightly warned us that "in our own interest, our enlightened self-interest, we have to pay close attention to what is going on in the rest of the world. And the reason for that is that we have enemies who are plotting our destruction. These enemies are the Russian Communists and their allies in other countries."[2] But it is common knowledge that we Americans are a notoriously historical people, impatient at learning the uncensored histories, traditions, and cultures of other peoples, no less our own. The deep-rooted forces of history, shaping and in part determining the course of this century, elude us, while we content ourselves with fleeting events that characterize the fight against communism in a historical void. We win wars and always manage to lose the peace. We lean heavily on the quantitative threat of material power—graced as mass retaliation or containment by threat—and, aside from bold and excessive speechmaking, timidly shy from the qualitative, decisive use of those tremendous moral and spiritual forces of our own tradition in a world environment that clamors for it.

Footnotes at end of speech.

The sweeping force of nationalism is a global force today. In this century of revolutionary change, so remarkably similar to the 14th century at the dawn of the modern period, the force of enlightened nationalism is the liberal and the true revolutionizing force of freedom of nations and peoples who, in one empire or another, are ready to cast off the yoke of foreign domination. In historical time, decades are but minutes. It was just a few minutes ago of historical time that nations, like Germany, Italy, Japan, and others, began to express themselves against a background of tradition that, unfortunately, did not conduce to enlightenment at the time. It was just a few minutes ago that nations in Central and Eastern Europe rose to cast off the yokes of the Russian, Ottoman, and Hapsburg Empires.

It is in these minutes of time that peoples and nations in Africa and Asia are found inflamed with the same spirit of national independence, equal sovereignty, and self-government.

This is the unmistakable sign of our times. The global force of nationalism, the awakening of subdued and enslaved nations everywhere, is the revolutionary force of freedom on the part of nations throughout the world. The age of empires is vanishing. The age of colonialism is at its end. These are the strong tendencies of our day that we must recognize, be guided by, seize upon, if freedom is to establish itself permanently. It is this force that the most reactionary movement in our day—communism, built on the foundations of the Russian Empire—seeks to pervert and destroy. Unless we are given to moonshine internationalism, the realization of this overall freedom force, partaking of the very substance of our own tradition, is the only just, equitable, and peace-insuring basis for a sound internationalism and a community of nations with mutual respect among all.

We have witnessed its realization in the Phillipines, Indonesia, Israel, India, and Pakistan, broadening further the natural bases for sound international relations, despite momentary strains and tensions. In Indochina, this overwhelming force against Moscow-directed Communist aggression is the weapon of victory as well as an end in itself, only to be left in disuse by a myopic disregard of the sign of our times. The invincible urges of nationalism we observe also in Korea, China, Manchuria, Mongolia, as well as in Africa.

We turn to the so-called satellite countries and the nations therein—Polish, Slovak, Hungarian, Czech, Bulgarian, Rumanian, and Albanian—nations that only yesterday found surcease from the chains of empire, but today grovel under the yoke of Moscow in an expanded empire that spells the death of nations. Detailed reports on Russian Communist activities in these areas point to this horrible outcome. National genocide, Russification, the rewriting of histories, economic exploitation, and the complete annihilation of patriotic national leadership from the pattern of genocidal consolidation in which, behind a facade of peace and good will before the free world, the Muscovite imperialists are now feverishly engaged. The supreme task of the nationalist in each of these nations is to resist this barbaric onslaught upon his nation's identity, his national personality, his native land.

This pattern is not new. In the multinational arrangement, called the Soviet Union, the pattern was hatched before World War II. Here, too, the chains of empire were overthrown in the non-Russian revolution for national freedom and independence in 1917. Here, too, independent national states and governments, recognized by the great powers and ethnic Russia itself, fell under the weight of Russian Communist aggression. In historical time, the Communist conquest of Ukraine, White Ruthenia, Georgia, Armenia, Azerbaijan, North Caucasia and Turkestan, in the years of 1920–22, preceded only by minutes the similar conquest of the Baltic states at the start of World War II. Among the non-Russian nations in the Soviet Union, the freedom force of enlightened nationalism has carved a history of its own, worthy of study by all true believers in the freedom of all Nations.

This force of nationalism in the non-Russian nations of the Soviet Union is a veritable powder keg in close proximity to the very base of the Russian Communist Empire. It defies the tyrrany and terrorism of Moscow. Since Stalin's death, the many Unity calls, the funeral orations and the entire Beria case are suffused with Moscow's fear of this natural, irresistible freedom force. "Our sacred duty," proclaims Malenkov, "is to strengthen and further the unity and friendships of the nations of the Soviet Union." He then warns, "We are not afraid of any internal or external enemies." The retionary and savage Communist way to attain this unity is, as always, to liquidate the very existence of these nations as distinctive collective personalities. The American way to achieve this unity in our behalf, among all nations from East Germany to northern Korea, is to universalize by word and deed the spirit of the American Declaration of Independence. Mr. Dulles has said, "We could seek to bring other free nations to unite with us in proclaiming, in a great new Declaration of Independence, our policies toward the captive nations."[3] The time has come for this Unity Call of Freedom.

COMMUNISM EXPLOITS NATIONALISM

The exploitation of nationalism, be it non-Russian or Russian, has been the paramount means of empire building by the imperialist Russian Communist minority. Even before coming to power, it grounded its sinister appeal in nationalism. Lenin addressed this appeal to the non-Russian nations of the old Russian Empire: "* * * if we want to learn the meaning of self-determination of nations not by juggling with legal definitions, or 'inventing' abstract definitions, but by examining the historical and economic conditions of the national movements, we shall inevitably reach the conclusion that self-determination of nations means the political separation of these nations from alien national bodies, the formation of an independent state."[4] The rape of Ukraine, Georgia, Armenia, and others by Communist imperialism soon followed.

It was this same appeal to the substance and integrity of the Baltic nations, Poland, Hungary, Slovakia, Rumania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, and Albania that heralded their rape and conquest by the weight of Communist force. In Asia, the Middle East, and Africa the Communist conspiracy utilizes the great freedom force of nationalism for its own perverted end of world domination and tyranny. Even this very weekend the Moscow-sponsored World Council of Peace is called into an extraordinary session in Berlin to "deal more particularly with the questions of the security and independence of nations." In every moral and civilized respect bankrupt in itself, Russian Communist totalitarianism thrives within the confines of its present empire on force, fear, and fraud and conspires to expand it by its cunning exploitation of values and ideals cherished by the free world.

The spirit of enlightened nationalism is a respecter of all peoples and nations, and this necessarily includes the Russian nation. The morally perverse concept of common guilt is irreconcilable with the mentality of enlighted nationalism. The masses of the Russian nation cannot be indicted for the barbarities of the controlling Russian Communist minority any more than the masses of the German nation could be for those of the ruling German Nazi coterie. In the nationalism of both, the elements of enlightenment have been denigrated by a technically equipped totalitarianism feeding istelf on degeneracies of chauvinism and racism. Communist totalitarianism exploits Russian nationalism, disfigures its cultural proportions, pollutes it with excesses of the autocratic past, and dries its springs of rich idealism and enlightenment to secure for itself the mute base for world conquest.

This Communist exploitation of Russian nationalism is to every enlightened Russian patriot a diabolical agency of deculturalization and spiritual degeneration. The real opportunities for cultural and national growth are being buried under mounting layers of thought control, hostility toward alien cultures, human automatization, and the intensification of predatory instincts. The worst of the dark past is magnified in the present. Those in the finest tradition of Russian scholarship and enlightened nationalism bring this to our pointed attention. The most outstanding Russian philosopher of this century, Nicholas Berdyaev, writes: "Bolshevism is the third appearance of Russian autocratic imperialism, its first appearance being the Muscovite Tsardom and its second the Petrine Empire."[5] Elsewhere in his classic work, we read: "The Soviet Government is the one totalitarian state in the world which is carried to its logical consistent end; it is a transformation of the ideas of Ivan the Terrible, a new form of the terrible hypertrophy of the state in Russian history."[6] Numerous others can be cited, testifying in the vein of the Russian Christian scholar, George Fedotov, that "The loss of the empire means moral purification, the liberation of Russian culture from a crushing load distorting its spiritual image."[7]

AMERICA NEGLECTS THE FREEDOM FORCE OF NATIONALISM

The great irony of our day is America's comparative neglect of the force of nationalism for the cause of freedom everywhere. Whereas Russian communism exploits the freedom force of nationalism for the negation of freedom itself, the United States, with the overwhelming power of its own great tradition, falls short of its moral and political responsibility. As in Indochina, so elsewhere, both on the periphery and in the hinterland of the vast Communist empire, we shall come to learn that the force of national freedom and independence is not only an end in itself but also the most formidable means for the defeat of communism. Our relative neglect of this force is the measure of our incapacity to read the sign of this century. It may well be the cause of incalculable losses.

In certain sections of the Voice of America, for some time the mention of national independence was taboo. Reports of nationalist underground activity could not be reported on. People with the slightest inclination toward the nationalist ideology were deemed extremists and unworthy of employment. In a psychological warfare operation undertaken in Munich the same moonshine internationalism prevails. Socialists, neo-Marxists and totalitarian emigrees, with a high vulnerability for Communist infiltration and no affinity with enlightened nationalism, become the special order of the day. The network extends itself to include certain cased foundations, research centers, and even naked endeavors, as

---

Footnotes at end of speech.

Footnotes at end of speech.

in the case of Professor Sharp's book on Poland: White Eagle on a Red Field, debasing the patriots' struggle for national freedom and independence. These evidences constitute a travesty of our great tradition.

UNIFYING PRINCIPLE OF ENLIGHTENED NATIONALISM IN A GLOBAL AMERICAN POLICY

"We could make it clear * * *," states Mr. Dulles, "that United States policy seeks as one of its peaceful goals the eventual restoration of genuine independence in the nations of Europe and Asia now dominated by Moscow."[8] In our self-interest, which is not a selfish interest, we should make this clear now, in word and deed. In the last analysis, moral ideas and forces shape history, not the power threats of mass retaliation. The history of our century is the consummate phase of man's long struggle for freedom, and we must meet the challenge. We can meet this challenge only by a single and absolute standard of morality, not by a compromising double standard. The enemy is total, monistic, and singularly nihilist: our allies, both captive and free, large and small, are nations bound together by the unifying principle of enlightened nationalism.

A decision in the struggle is inevitable, regardless of the form it may take. Through the overall freedom force and unifying principle of enlightened nationalism we can best prepare for the decision of freedom everywhere. It unifies us in certitude and duty with the immortal principles of our own great tradition. It unifies us with all our allies in the free world, faced by the common threat to their independent national existence. It unifies us with all the colonial nations in the free world which would fight to death communism, the destroyer of nations. Of great consequence, it unifies us with all the captive non-Russian nations, from the Danube to the Pacific, which represent a vast centrifuge of power capable of weakening, undermining, and destroying the yoke of Communist imperialism. It unifies us with the Russian nation in its enlightened search for freedom and independence of historic tyranny and the costly burdens of imperialist conquest. For the global peace of tomorrow, it unifies us with the great human promise of a world community of sovereign and equal nations, bound by justice and mutual respect toward each other; open to contracts of whatever federative form of organization.

Only with a clear and united outlook, grounded in firm resolve and moral conviction, can we meet history's challenge of this century. "A wrong step made now will plunge us into misery, and our Republic will be lost." These words of an early American patriot ring true today. But more so, on the lips of every patriot in nations throughout our world, resounds his immortal utterance:

> "Is life so dear, or peace so sweet, as to be purchased at the price of chains and slavery?
> Forbid it, Almighty God.
> I know not what course other may take; but as for me, give me liberty or give me death."

---

[1] Nationalism and Internationalism, p. 13.

[2] New York Times, January 28, 1953.

[3] A Policy of Boldness, May 19, 1952.

[4] V. I. Lenin, the Right of Nations to Self-Determination, p. 11.

[5] The Origin of Russian Communism, p. 120.

[6] P. 186.

[7] The Fate of Empires, the Russian Review, April 1953, p. 94.

[8] Life, May 19, 1952.

Report to Europe on America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 22, 1954

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the Record a very interesting article by the well-known authoress, Barbara Ward, on the subject of Report to Europe on America, which appeared in the New York Times magazine on Sunday, June 20, 1954.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Report to Europe on America

(By Barbara Ward)

This is a time of strain and criticism between America and its allies—a situation which lies behind the forthcoming visit of Winston Churchill and Anthony Eden to America. Every traveler returning to the United States from Britain or Europe brings back reports of an increase in anti-American feeling. In Asia it is combined with traditional anti-Western sentiments. All around the world it is tirelessly exploited by Communist propaganada. No nation can expect to be completely immune to criticism. Not to be automatically loved is one of the penalties of power. What is disturbing, however, in the present phase of distrust is is that the criticism seems to go beyond facts, incidents, and genuine occasions. It appears to be a general miasma of suspicion, an indiscriminate condemnation of all things American.

Critics do not say, "A policy of atomic retaliation is ill-judged." They say "The Americans are warmongers." They do not say "Some loud voices in America advocate the withdrawal of America from its alliances." They say "The Americans are isolationist." They do not so much criticize the junior Senator from Wisconsin as to declare the American people to be McCarthyite. And if one general conviction seems to prevail over all of this, it is that the fundamental attitudes of American life are materialist, lacking in the finer values and offering to the world the spectacle of a wholesale service of Mammon—often in the name of God. Edmund Burke may have written: "I do not know the method of drawing up an indictment against an whole people" but his wisdom seems largely forgotten in the present phase of suspicion and attack.

The difficulty in countering this damaging breach of confidence between allies—on whose continued cooperation the future of freedom depends—lies in the fact that many of the concrete criticisms must stand. Americans themselves are deeply disturbed and divided by such policies as the so-called New Look in strategy. The isolationism of certain newspapers and certain political leaders is an undoubted fact. Many people inside America have not remarked with any pleasure the eyes of the Nation glued to the television screen during the Stevens-McCarthy hearing. So the list could be continued. There are as many people in the United States as anywhere else bent on criticizing various aspects of the American scene. The problem is to prevent genuine—and often justified—criticism from degenerating into the indictment of a whole people, from degenerating, in short, into irrational phobias and destructive nationalist emotion.

Unhappily, the best antidote to this danger is one which, in the nature of things, is not available to everyone—although it certainly could be made available to many more. This antidote lies simply in leaving the reports and the secondhand information and the news stories behind and going out to see the Americans themselves. No journey can bring travelers in contact with the whole people, but a long journey can give them insights and experiences which go beyond the headlines and the crises. Such a journey my husband and I have just been privileged to make and for 3 months we have traveled across America from east to west and south to north, visiting some of the major development projects and encountering a most varied cross section of the American people. We have, therefore, been rather better placed than some to weigh the particular criticisms against the general indictment.

One point must be established immediately. Wherever we went, whenever we talked with engineers, professors, businessmen, men on tractors, waiters in mess kitchens, the boy in the elevator, the porter on the train—we found no trace of the supposed American warmongering. The mood certainly was not one of peace at any cost including surrender. Nor did we have the impression that Americans would not be ready under any circumstances to stop communism's spread by force. But this fact did not alter their profound conviction that, with the coming of atomic weapons, general war has ceased to be a rational instrument of policy. We had strongly their sense of the insanity of a violent settling of issues, when, as an outcome, nothing at all might be left to settle.

In this context we saw, with new force, a contrast which those left-wing critics in Europe, who attack American aggression while showing unlimited tolerance of Communist arrogance, might do well to consider. Systems such as the present Chinese dictatorship, in which free choice is extinguished and in which manpower is one more raw material to be manipulated by the state, are in a position to use war as a convenient form of public works program. It keeps unemployed townspeople off the streets. It lessens prison population. With luck, a surplus will be killed off. Meanwhile, warfare generates popular jingoism. The bodies without identity disks on Russian or Korean battlefields are proof enough that war cannot mean to the East what it means to the West.

So much, perhaps, any western citizen can grasp by commonsense. But it is almost certainly only by visiting America at some length and by moving over the whole breadth of the great continent that one can fully grasp how much the average American has to lose by any involvement in war. The insanity of war for him is underlined by the sanity of his own way of life.

In scores of homes in which we were made welcome, we found the dogwood and the cherry tree in flower at the gate, the small back garden with brown earth steaming in the open trench, the spade leaning against the garage door, the car itself standing at the curb and along the tree-lined street, others' cars at other doors, blue-jeaned children playing beside them, and as evening drew in, the call of parents, summoning sons and daughters to supper, the good smells of baked Virginia ham from our hostess' oven, the laden table, the friendly faces, the open discussion of issues without any sensed division in national interest or approach.

From Westport, Conn., to Bethesda, Md.; from Knoxville to Yellow Springs, Ohio; from Denver to Sonoma, Marin County; from Portland to Ephrata, the pattern was the same—the home and the family, with house to lose and land garden to lose, with love to lose and security and the human round of work, and achievement and leisure and fun.

Nor did we see it as a sample pattern of security. America is not yet a fixed and settled land. The adventurous need not feel restricted behind its vast frontiers. Out on the Columbia Basin project we found young farmers in tents and trailers, the tractor purchased before the home, and the irrigated fields beginning to stretch out round a family base almost as primitive as the cabin of pioneers in the early days of rifle and ax.

The great enterprises and the small go forward together. A couple of days after we had stood and watched the tall silver chimney stacks at Kingston in Tennessee, where the largest thermal powerhouse in the world is within a month of production, we met the elderly taxi driver who was giving up his secure job and taking his life saving with him to California to finance his son, a garage mechanic, in the setting up of a small machine shop of his own.

Even without such daily evidence of scope and opportunity, the simple physical scale of the American continent should impress on the visitor the stupidity of seeing in the United States an imperialist or an expansive power. The typical colonizers of the past—Portuguese, Dutch, British—were maritime peoples within cramped frontiers. Russia with its drive for warm water ports, China with its inexorable pressure of population—they, too, have a physical spur to expansive policies. But in America, this empire in itself, this broad land where every climate meets, where spring can follow the traveler—as it followed us—for a full 3 months from south to north, yet never bring a tree to leaf that does not grow on American soil—here there is space enough and bounty enough for a man to stay at home and never in a whole lifetime exhaust one tiny part of all the opportunities of his native land.

Is the opposite criticism, then justified? Are Americans turning in upon themselves within their ample boundaries and allowing an almost neurotic concern with internal subversion to do duty for a genuine policy of containing and holding communism abroad?

Some definitions seem necessary at this point.

It is not isolationism to wish to avoid war if alternative policies are in any way feasible. Would that Russia or China had more of that healthy hesitation.

It is not isolationism to see no straightforward solution to the critical dilemma of our times which is, in essence, to find ways of checking Communist expansion by means which do not involve the use of total atomic destruction—an agonizing problem since the Chinese, at least, appear ready to ignore the risk. If this problem bewilders the best minds in Washington and London, it must be allowed to puzzle the inhabitants of Norris, Tenn., or Wenatchee, Wash.

To say, therefore, that we found a great sense of uncertainty and concern on our journey is not to report isolationism but to remark that Americans at large—like their neighbors in Britain—do not see more clearly than their leaders and are not likely to do so until they are given what perhaps they await most eagerly from those leaders—and that is precisely a clear lead.

But the "isolationism" of which we found very little was the kind which turns its back on international affairs and refuses—because they are difficult and tiresome—even to consider them. On this score of concern and interest, the memories crowd in from every stage of the journey—a Chicago meeting with searching inquiries over the meaning and justification of India's policy of neutrality, a convention at Denver of one of the most powerful of America's women's organizations devoting one-half of its program to a consideration of foreign trade, a mountain state university opening a week's seminar on international problems, the student chairman at the first session reclaring with earnest youthful conviction: "We know we have to study these problems because our world is so small and they affect all of us now."

Besides such official occasions were private conversations beyond number—over lunch tables, in club cars, at breakfast, at dinner, the shy questions after the lectures, the arguments late at night—"But it seems to me the British just aren't playing straight with us over Southeast Asia"—the particularly urgent discussions which seem to arise over washing up—"Can you be certain that Western techniques of development have the right impact on primitive communities?

We had a similar impression of questionings and probings which have yet to be fully assessed in relation to the other facet of America's supposed isolationism—the criticism abroad that the pursuit of a domestic Communist scapegoat has widened into a general intolerance of nonconformity and into a genuine danger to civil liberty itself.

It would certainly not be true to say that we found no evidence of this attitude. On the contrary, we found in most areas saddening proof of the harm done to neighborly relations and to the unconscious trust of local communities by irresponsible smear campaigns, by denunciations of supposed nonconformists and the exploitation of such things for political purposes. Yet the nature of our evidence on the existence of such evils is at least significant. It was, again and again, derived from the angry comments of American men and women pointing to this or that abuse in their own experience—a school teacher under pressure here, a Government official waiting desperately for clearance, a local vigilante group in action, a biased piece of reporting—and denouncing it in the strongest terms precisely as a danger to the Nation's traditions of freedom.

Here, surely, is a movement of ideas to which far too little attention has been paid in foreign reporting—the concern felt by ordinary citizens neither as Democrats nor Republicans, leftwingers or rightwingers, progressives or conservatives, but as citizens of a constitutional Government for the fundamentals of their freedom and their readiness to consider—as it probably has not been considered for a hundred years—the concrete issue of civil liberty and the safeguards it entails.

This aspect of America's political debate depends very little on the Gallup rating of this or that Senator, even though, undoubtedly, throughout our journey, one at least of the more notorious political reputations slumped considerably. The issue went deeper than personalities.

It seemed to us to be, in many cases, a determined personal attempt to restate the principles which should underpin a free society in a century in which totalitarianism arrives as easily from the right as from the left. In the long run, critics abroad will perhaps be confounded to discover that a deepened awareness of the meaning of liberty—quite as much as any present abuse—will prove a significant feature of America in the fifties.

Yet even if the critics of American society can be persuaded to shift their attacks from America in general to particular aspects of American policy, if they can be brought to see that official discussions of a particular atomic strategy do not imply general aggressiveness or that one Senator cannot speak for a whole people, there is nevertheless one general indictment of American society which critics abroad will, it seems, only give up with the very greatest reluctance. This is the branding of American society as materialist, as lacking in culture, expanding its body and losing its soul.

Yet to be concerned with material things is not of itself a sign that culture is lacking. On the contrary, a large proportion of the measurements of culture are based on material objects—architecture, furniture, materials, pottery. In the past, the culture has rested on the material choices of the few. Our own culture, in the wealthy West, has brought a comfortable margin to the many. They are beginning to set the tone of society. It is by their efforts that the outlook of the community must be judged. Can anyone doubt that, in the central position in American society—in short, in the American home—the effort to improve, to simplify, to make more beautiful and more functional does not amount to what would be called, if prejudice were less, a cultural effort?

In how many homes did we not find that the long pondered, long saved-up for doing over of the living room had produced new effects of space and light and color? In how many had not the kitchen become the clean, convenient, shining workplace of the whole family? By the same token, the design and spacing of new houses and flats in the United States is, in our judgment, incomparably, the best in the English-speaking world.

There is, moreover, a factor in this American culture of the home which, by any standard, should give it a higher social value. It is that so much of it is done by husband and wife in overalls, paint brush and glue pot in hand, working to the plan they have puzzled out together.

For so many people abroad—especially in the hotter, lazier continents—the American way of life appears to have come down, in some vast cornucopia, from heaven. What is not measured is the steadiness and the intensiveness of the work which sustains it all—not simply the frantic life-consuming work of the senior executive but the sense of speed and rhythm in work all down the line, a rhythm we meet again and again—in the drivers working 14-hour days to pay off the hire purchase on their taxicabs, among the innumerable waitresses as friendly and brisk at the end as at the beginning of the 8-hour stint, above all, with that dynamo of controlled energy, the American housewife, whose meals we ate, whose children we greeted, whose garden we walked in and whose handiwork, from junior's overalls to the net curtains in the guest bedroom, we saw on every side.

If work, disciplined, steady work, is materialism, then, certainly, the Americans are materialists but it is the oldest wisdom of Europe that to work is to pray.

Nor is prayer itself irrelevant. The fact of a religious revival in America cannot be gainsaid. We did not need the evidence of polls or church attendances to confirm what we could so easily observe—the walls of new churches rising in the towns and countryside whenever we went.

The critics—and not only foreign critics—have discounted the fact. They put it down to respectability, to the desire for conformity, to insecurity, to the hydrogen bomb, to fear. For our own part, while leaving the confident delineation of hidden motives to braver critics, we would rather suggest that the revival of churchgoing—the strengthening of parochial activities—of Sunday schools, of clubs and societies—can help to revive the social fabric of our overgrown society. It is at least significant that it is just these apparently small and negligible activities of the Christian communities that Hitler in Germany and Soviet Russia in Eastern Europe have attempted most vigorously to destroy. When neighbor meets neighbor within the loyalty of his religious faith, he strengthens a bond which no government, no state, no political authority can break.

We had the impression that quietly, in many places in America, a stronger sense of neighborhood, of community was making itself felt, a reknitting of a raveled fabric, a drawing together from the loneliness of our urban age. This, surely, has little to do with "materialism." It is, on the contrary, the final defense which the materialist dictatorships seek at all costs to destroy.

It is, perhaps, this deep sense of the reserves available to American society that we carry away as our most profound impression from the 3-month journey now at an end.

And if one may venture a judgment on the reason why this depth of goodness and responsibility is not more apparent abroad, it is that the American people, so vast, so diverse, so basically unregimented, cannot give full expression to their potential greatness unless they are given, over their wide continent, some clear notes of confidence and leadership. Instead, it cannot be denied that at present the dominating note is a babel of voices, advocating contradictory attitudes and policies, and as a result rallying the people to nothing and leaving them to the fears and restlessness of the atomic age.

If, however, the lead is given—the lead of confidence and generosity, of magnanimity and courage, that note which has sounded so often in American history and which found, in Lincoln, its supreme expression for all time—if that chord were touched, there need be no doubt that America, out of the sum of its individual citizens' endurance and responsibility, would once again, as a Nation, confound its critics and, in the same measure, confirm its friends.

Inaugural Speech of South Dakota's Boys State Governor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 22, 1954

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, earlier this month there assembled on the campus of Northern State Teachers College, at Aberdeen, S. Dak., the 12th annual Boys State, sponsored by the American Legion. Some 300 representative juniors from high schools of the State, selected on the basis of leadership exhibited in their respective schools, learned of government, not from books, but from active participation and observation.

Following the election of officers, the entire group traveled to the State Capitol, at Pierre, for the inaugural ceremonies. The delegates to Boys State were divided into two parties, the Nationalists and Federalists. Each party held nominating conventions.

The candidate of the Nationalist Party, James—Jimmie—Kineen, of Rapid City, S. Dak., was declared the winner only after intense and active campaigning by his supporters. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the inaugural speech which Jimmy made on that occasion, in the legislative halls of our State Capitol. One who reads the address is assured that America will be in safe hands as the younger generation take over and approach their task with determination and the humility which reflects a true sense of responsibility.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BOYS' STATE GOVERNOR'S INAUGURAL SPEECH, 1954

(By James Kineen, Rapid City, S. Dak.)

Governor Anderson, citizens of 1954 Boys' State, members of the staff, friends, it is in a spirit of humbleness and responsibility that I come before you today to accept this great honor. The privilege of carrying out the duties and traditions of Boys' State governor is one that I will execute to the best of my ability.

May I express my sincere thanks to the Nationalist Party for supporting me as their candidate. The untiring effort of Party Chairman Charles Ehrensperger and my Campaign Manager Lowell Jones made success possible; but without the wholehearted support of the entire party, victory would not have been achieved. This government of Boys' State is like any other—only through cooperation by all citizens, working toward a common goal, can we win results that will be worthy and lasting. Because of this, my executive appointments include capable leaders from both the Nationalist and Federalist Parties, and I feel certain that with the help of my friendly and capable opponents, George Donohoe and Don Pederson, we can enact a legislative program that will carry out the high principles of Boys' State.

It's hard to find words that can express our appreciation to those who made Boys' State possible. Dr. W. C. Lovinger and his staff at Northern States Teachers' College, the American Legion, and especially our counselors, all deserve more than we can ever repay. To these wonderful people who devote so much time and work that we might become better citizens, we give our most sincere thanks.

I think it's significant that we are meeting in our State capitol on this occasion, in the very same chambers where our own South Dakota Legislature considers and enacts the laws that govern you and me. It is significant because we were chosen to represent over 6,000 high-school juniors throughout the State in a program of revitalizing the American system of government. The staff of Boys' State, in the short span of a week, have attempted to plant within each one of us the will to seek a better understanding of American Government, so that we may fully participate as active citizens. During the past week we've learned local, county, and State government not from books, but by actual practice. We have come to realize that American Government depends upon the intelligent participation of all citizens, if it is to protect "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." May we each, pledge ourselves right here, today, to bring this lesson in working democracy home to our fellow students, and to keep it always in our own minds. It is for all of us to remember that just understanding government isn't enough. We must lead the way in actively working for good, honest government. The men who, in a few months, will sit in this chamber to make our laws cannot be representative and responsible unless the people are interested enough in their own government to make their wishes known enforcing those desires by us of the ballot.

Yes; we've had the opportunity to learn a great deal at this 1954 session of Boys' State, but perhaps the greatest lesson has been that spirit of universal friendliness that is so much a part of Boys' State. The deeper understanding and respect for the other fellow's rights and beliefs are two things that will never fade. The true and lasting friendships that we've made during this week are living testimony to the worth of the American way of life.

Because of all of these wonderful experiences, it's easy to see that each and every American is an equal shareholder in our democracy—that our purpose as members of South Dakota Boys' State is clear—to encourage more people to exercise their rights and responsibilities as American citizens, and to protect the basic liberties which make them a living reality.

You fellows have granted me the privilege to lead you as your governor. We can't all be governor, but we can all be leaders in the task of making democracy work. Let us take up the torch and keep the flames of freedom always bright as the beacon of hope in a world of darkness.

Thank you.

Soviet Progress in Arms

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 22, 1954

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an important article appearing in the New York Times, June 22, 1954, entitled "Soviet Progress in Arms is Hinted," written by Harry Schwartz.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOVIET PROGRESS IN ARMS IS HINTED—UNITED STATES OFFICIALS' WARNINGS SEEM TO BE A REACTION AGAINST PREVIOUS UNDERESTIMATES

(By Harry Schwartz)

Soviet spokesmen have been making statements during the last 6 months that, if true, suggest that at best this country has very little lead in military technology and at worst is lagging in some key technological fields.

Last Saturday's speech by Assistant Secretary of Defense Donald A. Quarles made clear that high policy officials no longer felt safe in dismissing Soviet technological capabilities. On Sunday Secretary of Defense Charles E. Wilson said he thought we had an overall lead of 2 to 3 years over the Soviet Union, and added, "We now know that Russia has the capacity to do everything we have done here."

These statements seem to represent some shift of official thinking recently. When a warning somewhat similar to Mr. Quarles' was made 3 months ago by the Director of Classification of the Atomic Energy Commission, Dr. James G. Beckerley, he was the target of sharp criticism from some superiors in the Commission. Dr. Beckerley has since resigned, an event that may not be unrelated to this difference in views.

If the Soviet assertions of technological achievement were merely talk, they would be dismissed as lightly as have been Moscow's claims to priority in all inventions of the past millenium. But last August's Soviet hydrogen bomb explosion and last May 1's display of giant Soviet jet bomber have done much to wipe out foreign skepticism about Soviet achievements.

ROCKET RECORD IMPLIED

The most dramatic Soviet assertion of priority in military technology was made last week by Nikita S. Khrushchev, Communist Party secretary, when he asserted without equivocation that Soviet scientists had invented the hydrogen weapon, though he did not contend they had set off the first thermonuclear explosion. A similar statement was made last March by Deputy Premier Anastas I. Mikoyan, while the first hint of such a claim can even be traced in a statement by Andrei Y. Vyshinsky, Soviet delegate to the United Nations, here late last year.

A Soviet scientist several weeks ago asserted that a rocket had been sent more than 250 miles above the earth's surface, implying that the Soviet rocket had bettered the record set by the United States Wac Corporal rocket in early 1949. Other Soviet commentators have hinted strongly at Soviet possession of long-distance rockets, at least near the capabilities of true intercontinental missiles.

Last weekend a Moscow radio commentator said a Soviet plane had flown at the fastest speed, 1,659 miles an hour. The United States X-1A rocket plane was reported late last year to have exceeded 1,600 miles an hour.

Articles in the Soviet press in the last 3 months have asserted that the Soviet Union knows more about Arctic flying conditions, meteorology, navigation, and the like, than any other nation. It is across the Arctic regions that the shortest distances for bombing missions from the Soviet Union to the United States or vice versa exist. The Soviet statements in this area are being received with anything but skepticism by those who know the history of Soviet interest in the Arctic.

In electronics technology, particularly the development of giant brains or computers and the application of transistors instead of vacuum tubes, both among the most important current areas of scientific advance, Russia is abreast of current developments at least, Soviet commentators have declared. That this is true in the computer field seems borne out by the Soviet atomic and hydrogen bomb blasts, all of which require enormous amounts of computation.

The warnings issued recently by Assistant Secretary Quarles and Dr. Beckerley appear to be a reaction against earlier American underestimation of Soviet military scientific capabilities.

One measure of the extent of this underestimation is given in the published hearings of Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer before an Atomic Energy Commission Special Personnel Security Board.

Writing in April 1948, Dr. Oppenheimer had predicted that "for a long time to come" the Soviet Union would not achieve significant atomic armament. He testified this was then the prevailing view. The first Soviet atomic bomb explosion took place only a little more than a year later, rudely upsetting Washington calculations about our lead and precipitating the American crash effort to build the hydrogen bomb.

Arab League Unity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1954

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to direct the attention of our colleagues to the last in a series of 8 articles on the Arab States. It appeared in the May 17, 1954, issue of Congress Weekly, official publication of the American Jewish Congress:

ARAB LEAGUE UNITY

(By Sh. Yin'am)

The Arab countries have been a stage on which one could perceive the play at once of both unifying as well as divisive forces. The factors operating for unity are their common language, culture, and literature, the Islamic faith shared by all of them except the Lebanon, and memories of the golden age of conquering Islam and the Khalifate. This has naturally produced similar psychological and social conditions and some degree of common political consciousness.

On the other hand, the Arab countries are driven apart by the existence of separate states, none of which is prepared to forego its complete independence and sovereignty; by the rapid development of separate nationalist consciousness in each of them; by the considerable national, ethnological, social differences that have developed among them over the centuries—including a fairly large degree even of linguistic difference (only the written language of the educated is the same in Iraq, Egypt, Morocco, and the Yemen, while the spoken language of the common man has grown so different that an Iraqi can hardly understand an Egyptian's everyday speech).

Within the Arab national movement there developed therefore two divergent, mutually contradictory trends: One aspiring to comprehensive all-Arab unity, expressed in the desire to establish an all-Arab state or federation of states; and one stressing the separate sovereignty of the different Arab States. The period of fulfillment of Arab nationalism—the years of the "Revolt in the Desert" and the early years after the First World War—witnessed an upsurge of the pan-Arab drive for unity under Hashemite leadership. It was then envisaged that one Arab State or federation would embrace all the territory of the Arabian peninsula and of the fertile crescent with the exception of Jewish Palestine, to the establishment of which King Faisal, speaking for the Arab national movement, had wholeheartedly agreed. It should be noted that it was not then envisaged to include Egypt or any part of the Arab fringe in Africa.

As separate political units emerged in the area during the early twenties; and as those units gradually gained their full independence (as described in the preceding articles) a triple process set in. The emerging separate independence was accepted as a fact, and appreciated as a gain and achievement jealously to be guarded and defended. To the growing opposition to Hashemite unity plans were added the apprehensions of the rival dynasties of Egypt and Sa'udia and the disturbed and hostile atmosphere between these dynasties. Hashemite unity plans, which for a time were universally accepted as a guide to thought and action, were later splintered into partisan schemes, made all the more unacceptable to many because of the support—real or imagined—given to them by British imperial interests. Non-Hashemite, alternative plans for all-Arab unity inevitably failed to attract sufficient support, since the Hashemites alone had positions of strength transcending the boundaries of the separate national states. Thus the process of separate nationalism proved stronger than aspirations for unity to which everyone paid lip service.

Further action had of necessity to be based on the realities of the now existing sovereign states. Egypt had emerged during the later thirties as the leading Arab State and had begun, not without British encouragement, to take a stronger interest in Arab affairs. When the Arab League was founded on March 22, 1945, after 2 years of preparatory talks, again strongly encouraged by Britain, it was therefore Egypt that took the lead—which means, inter alia, that Hashemite plans for unity or federation could not expect to find encouragement or fulfillment in the new organ.

Indeed, while the Arab League continues the tradition of the pan-Arab movement by taking on an ideological appearance of "Arab unity," it is actually the completion of the edifice of separate, sovereign Arab States. For it is based on that separate sovereignty, it guarantees it and it jealously guards the inter-Arab status quo. As the Lebanon was apprehensive of possible infringement of its sovereignty, a special annex to the league charter expressly guarantees its independence and boundaries. Although the league charter does not rule out federations or special ties between some of its member states, if they do desire, any attempt to bring about changes—such as Iraqui-Hashemite interference in Syrian affairs and aspirations to union with Syria—have always met with the strongest resistance. The one major event that threatened the inter-Arab status quo—the Arab-Israel war of 1948, with the Arab part of Palestine as the price of "victory" and the element of change and additional power to whoever might get it—caused a major crisis in the league. When King Abdullah, of Jordan, disregarded Egypt's and the league's violent protests and incorporated the Arab part of Palestine in his kingdom, his action almost caused his expulsion from the league and the disintegration of that alliance. This was prevented by the face-saving device of a declaration that the annexation of Arab Palestine to Jordan was temporary only until the Palestine question would be finally solved.

In constitutional-legal terms the charter of the league provides that no decision of the league council shall be binding upon such member states as have not voted for it. In other words, the league has no legally binding power over its member states, and none of the members has given up even the slightest part of its sovereignty in order to enable the establishment of some form of federation. The league is no more than a loose alliance of independent states.

Those parts of its program and charter that bear upon practical cooperation among the Arab States have hardly been implemented. The coordination of Arab legal codes, an all-Arab court, specialties of commercial cooperation and the mutual waiving of customs rights, joint economic projects and development funds, relaxation of passport and visa controls or the establishment of an all-Arab citizenship and passport, coordination of military equipment and procedures—all these have been proposed and debated for 9 years, but practically nothing has resulted.

The league is basically a political alliance designed to confer upon the Arab States such additional political strength as may be derived from their appearance on the international scene as a bloc. As such, its value is considerable, although the Arab States are not united even on the major political problems of the day while all of them are basically neutralist as far as public opinion and political climate are concerned. Lebanon and Iraq have in many instances voted with the West in "cold war" issues, and the other Arab members of the U. N. have neutralistically abstained. Nevertheless, in the lobbies and meeting halls of international politics, the Arabs are usually reckoned with as a united bloc—and this was and is the league's main object.

The league's member states are united in their common hostility to Israel, and they are joined in an anticolonial front, mainly anti-French, on the issue of Tunisia and

Morocco. Even this unity, however, did not in the past extend to the field of practical implementation. In the war against Israel, for instance, mutual suspicion prevented them from conducting the war under joint leadership and planning. Politically, however, common enmity to Israel constitutes the main single item holding the league together. The supervision of the anti-Israel boycott and blockade is the league's chief occupation.

The league's newest venture, the "Arab collective security pact," should also be understood in this light. The new pact, concluded in 1950 and in force since August 1952, establishes an apparatus for military consultation and cooperation, something that could have been established under the league charter as well. Its principal aim, however, is to overcome the nonbinding character of the league charter by a provision that decisions of the defense council adopted by a two-thirds majority shall be binding on all the members of the defense pact. Again the pact's main value lies in the psychological and political sphere; further stress on military unity and joint defense obligations, mainly against Israel, was deemed necessary for internal purposes, and the appearance of a united military defense front was deemed to be of value for the Arabs' international position as well. Whether the new pact will overcome the basic reasons that prevented cooperation in the past remains to be seen.

The foregoing, while a description of the Arab League's character today, does not mean that elements of real and practical cooperation may not develop in the course of time. Movements toward full union or federation of some of the Arab States, while hardly probable are not altogether impossible. But even on the present basis of the territorial status quo and the full recognition of the member states' sovereignty, greater cooperation, especially in the field of practical coordination and joint ventures, is possible and may be attained some day. It is not the organizational procedures or legal constitutions that have prevented such cooperation thus far, but the deeper reasons of mutual suspicion. Whether fuller cooperation will be attained would depend, therefore, on basic social and political developments rather than on organizational measures or reforms.

Beyond the idea of Arab unity—which theoretically includes non-Muslim Arabs, such as the Christians of the Lebanon—looms the vista of Islamic unity, which would include non-Arab Muslim nations, such as Iran, Afghanistan, Pakistan, and Indonesia, while excluding non-Muslim Arabs. Although "Islamic blocs" are mentioned from time to time, the idea hardly belongs to the realm of practical politics. As an ideological movement, however, it is not without some strength. The average Muslim Arab of the uneducated classes is hardly aware of the difference between the logical-political category of the nation (Arab), and that of the religious community (Islam). Moreover, in the East, religious communities have often developed characteristics of national consciousness, and the borderline between national and religious-communal categories is often blurred. The average man in Cairo, Damascus or Baghdad would often be unable to tell whether he takes a certain action as an Arab and for nationalist purposes, or as a Muslim and for religious aims.

While the pan-Islamic movement as a political force has completely failed, it has reality as a psychological state of mind. Fanatical groups, such as the Muslim Brotherhood in Egypt, or similar groups in Iran, have won a considerable hold over large masses on the strength of their Islamic and pan-Islamic appeal. In their hands, however, pan-Islam is mainly a negative force, used as a tool against non-Muslims rather than for constructive purposes of creating a larger unity.

Israel's Race Against Time

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD DAVIS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 1954

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including two other articles on the accomplishments being made by the State of Israel written by the Honorable Abe D. Waldauer, a distinguished lawyer in the city of Memphis, Tenn.

Great advances are being made in this little country by the training of technical experts within the United States. These well-trained men will return to Israel to teach others in a more forward development in all technical fields.

The articles follow:

ISRAEL'S NEW TECHNION

The Israel Institute of Technology at Haifa was founded in April 1912.

It was designed to accommodate 300 students. Originally five buildings were built.

Then, no one could foresee the historical events of the future: The partition and independence of the State of Israel, the war of liberation fought immediately thereafter, "The ingathering of the exiles"—and the doubling of the Jewish population of the state within 4 short years.

How could anyone foresee the tremendous needs for training in engineering, soil conservation, town planning, electrical development, and the many other varied demands for technological skills in the upbuilding of the State of Israel?

The faculty of the Technion now consists of approximately 150 teachers. This is exactly half of the total number of students the Technion was originally designed to accommodate.

One of the primary needs of the new state is a greatly enlarged and expanded Technion. In fact, there are those who believe that it is impossible to put the State of Israel upon a basis of economic self sufficiency unless the Technion is enlarged and expanded.

For many years, Israel will need 600 new graduate engineers each year.

Where originally it cost approximately $200,000 to complete the Technion, a new educational institution will cost $22 million.

But the need is decisively imperative. As was said by David Ben-Gurion, who recently retired as Prime Minister of the state, "The importance of technical education to Israel's very existence cannot be exaggerated, and it is in this connection that the Technion plays a central and decisive role."

What are the plans for the new Technion?

First, the Jewish National Fund and the Government of Israel have made available a tract of 1,200 dunams to serve as a campus site. This is 300 acres of land. The land is located on the gentle slopes of Mount Carmel, overlooking the Haifa Harbor.

An entire campus is being planned. This work is being done under the direction of Dr. Alexander Klein. It contemplates the erection of more than 25 buildings, including dormitory facilities and dwellings for the student body.

The first building is nearing completion, and will shortly be in use.

Among the facilities to be erected are:

(a) The administration building, from which the overall management and control of the enlarged institute of technology will be directed.

(b) A library, where it is ultimately hoped to assembly the largest collection of technological literature in all of the Middle East.

(c) A building for the study of electrical engineering. In view of the shortage of coal and other natural sources of power, electricity looms as the greatest need for power in the Middle East.

(d) A building for chemical engineering: Here will be the resources of the new Technion be devoted to research for chemical engineering in many fields, including food, rubber, metals, and industrial chemicals, oils, and other materials. This new building is to be known as the Karl Taylor Compton Institute of Chemical Engineering. Dr. Compton is chairman of the board of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and it is a fortunate circumstance that one of the outstanding technical institutes of the New World is thus linked directly with the Technion—which has sometimes been called the Massachusetts Institute of Technology of the Middle East.

(e) There will be buildings for the study of town planning, architecture, and similar kindred subjects. In view of the rapid expansion of Israel population, the building of towns and cities, and the great influx of population, no need of the new state is greater than this.

(f) There will be buildings and facilities to develop and conserve Israeli water resources. More than half of the land of Israel is marginal land. There is a great shortage of water.

Much of the area of this land can be reclaimed if the water available is harnessed and put to the highest possible use. There will be studies in the harnessing of this water. A unified national program will be developed for the reclamation of arid lands and above all the development of ways and means to enable Israel to use water to fructify land and thus to feed the expanding population of the new nation. The hydraulics and water research departments of the new Technion should be models for the entire world.

(g) There will be facilities for studying ways and means of developing the metallurgical resources of the new state. Even superficial surveys of the Negev and other areas of Israel have disclosed that there is a rich potential in metals, natural resources, and metal ores. Technion students and graduates will explore and find new methods of adding to the durability of metals, of extracting metals from raw rocks, and of developing scientifically large-scale metallurgical production.

(h) A school of aeronautical engineering is essential. Israel stands on the air cross roads of the Midde East. There must be expanded airport facilities, development of airplanes, searching out of new methods of flight—and all of these are required not only for the protection of the new state, but for the expansion of the ways of peace.

In short, in the new Technion, there will be an opportunity required by the state for its growth, permanence, and economic self-sufficiency.

This is more than the building of an educational institution.

This involves a daring adventure in world education.

By the character of work it will do in the future, the new Israel Institute of Technology may not only furnish an opportunity to develop Israel—geographically a very small state—but it may also afford a dynamic demonstration of how arid areas of the world may be reclaimed through genius, the stout hearts, the brains, and the skill of men.

ISRAEL'S RACE AGAINST TIME

Even devoted friends and supporters of Israel have sometimes asked: "Can this small state possibly survive?"

It is easy to understand why this question should be raised: No state in history has doubled its population in 4 years. No state in history has absorbed peoples from more than 60 countries, who speak more than 60 languages and dialects.

No state has been confronted by graver problems, of absorbing immigrants, housing and feeding a vast influx of refugees.

No state in history ever won its way to freedom and tried to achieve economic self-sufficiency under more trying circumstances, than Israel.

No nation in history has been surrounded, as is Israel, by seven hostile nations, refusing to make peace—and to open its natural trade areas and arteries. No nation in history has had to assume, proportionately, so heavy a burden of armament for self-defense, and for the preservation of the state.

Small wonder, then, that the question is asked: "Can Israel possibly survive?"

I have no doubt of survival of the state. A nation of 600,000, opposed by 40 million, that can win through to freedom, is not to be discounted.

But grave problems confront the young state—and will continue to do so for some crucial years ahead.

Israel is in a race against time.

Many of the immigrants coming to Israel were not inspired by the early idealism of the Zionist movement. Many are there because there is no other place on earth for them to go.

Many come from backward civilizations—from countries that are at least 10 centuries behind the educational, cultural and living standards of the older and more progressive democracies of the world.

The standards of these people must be raised—and that, speedily.

This requires not only a general upbuilding of a nationwide educational process, but also the development of the Institute of Technology—so that the vocational, occupational and technological skills needed to erect a civilization and raise the standard of the Israelis may be furnished, dedicated to the upbuilding of the state—and that, "bimhera beyamenu"—speedily, and in our time.

Hence the importance of the rapid building of the new Technion at Haifa. The democracies, in World War II, learned the bitter lesson of "too little and too late."

History must not repeat itself, in this respect, in Israel.

The building of the new Technion must be pushed with all possible speed, to the end that from its halls of learning may come the technical experts necessary to build a nation.

The shift from the old Technion (suffering from claustrophobia, crowded on a little more than a city block, designed to accommodate a student body of 300 but with 2,300 students) to the greater Technion (with its glorious vistas on the slope of Mount Carmel, its new facilities, worthy of the best that modern education in technology can give), must proceed—and that, speedily.

The major part of the funds necessary to expedite the building of this new Technion must come from the Jews of the United States of America. And that, speedily.

The Jews of America will not fail to meet this challenge.

We must do our part to see that Israel wins its race against time.

Within 3 years, this new Technion must be built. The transition from the old to the new Technion must go forward—as each new facility is completed, the student body, alert, eager, and dedicated to the larger task of building the new State of Israel, will shift from the old Technion to the new Technion. And this process must go forward—and that, urgently, speedily.

When I was in Israel, on the campus of the Technion, I talked with Dr. Sydney Goldstein, world famous aerodynamicist, and vice president of the Technion.

"When," he asked, "are the technical experts coming from America to help us?"

"They are not coming," I replied, "not in great numbers needed."

His face fell. The answer was disconcerting, unwelcome.

"Why?" he asked.

"Because there is a shortage of technical experts in America. There is a place waiting for every graduate of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. Why should they leave the abundance of America for the austerity of Israel?"

"Then is there a solution to the problem?" Dr. Goldstein asked.

I think we have found it. One educational trust in Memphis, Tenn. (in the American Negev) has brought to this country a graduate of the Technion. He will acquire the practical knowledge in this country. He will take this knowledge, these skills, back to Israel, and dedicate them to the service of the state.

The trustees of this Memphis trust have brought a Technion graduate to America for postgraduate work. When he returns to Israel, he will not only become a member of the faculty of the Technion, but will also serve the Israeli Government. He is learning land conservation, use, and irrigation. He is specializing in building dams, digging wells, discovering new water resources. His name is Gdalyah Wiseman, a resident of Jerusalem. His knowledge and skill will aid in the revival of the arid areas and the deserts. Israel will again become "a land flowing with milk and honey."

But there should be a hundred—yea more—like him. And that speedily. If other cities throughout America will undertake to bring one graduate of the Technion here, to give him not only the postgraduate work so vitally needed, but also the opportunity to study American technological methods, a solid economic floor will be placed under the new state by these postgraduate students who have captured something of what is popularly called the American know-how.

This, then, is the objective: A new Technion, girded to the tremendous task of upbuilding a people; and led by inspired postgraduates of the institution who have been brought to America, and here equipped for the larger, the challenging tasks ahead of them, and of the state.

Thus will Israel win its race against time.

Reappraising Our Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY W. WIER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 1954

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include an address given at the Harvard commencement, Cambridge, Mass., June 17, 1954, by John Cowles, president of the Minneapolis Star and Tribune and president of the Harvard Alumni Association, entitled "Reappraising Our Foreign Policy":

The address is as follows:

REAPPRAISING OUR FOREIGN POLICY

(By John Cowles)

We Americans must learn not to fear change solely because it is change. As the geochemist, Harrison Brown, says in his stimulating and important new book The Challenge of Man's Future, "no matter what happens in the world of the next few decades, change will be the major characteristic."

Let me give one more quotation from Brown's book: "We in the United States are in a position of overwhelming responsibility at the present time, for in a very real sense the destiny of humanity depends upon our decisions and upon our action. * * * Never before in history has so much responsibility been inherited by a group of human beings. Where in previous times the lives of individual nations and cultures were at stake, today the stake is destiny of all humanity."

I think we can all agree that the maintenance of our freedom, without war, if that is possible, is our prime objective. In addition, we want to keep as much of the rest of the world free as we possibly can, knowing that the more the globe is overrun by the Communist imperialists the smaller is our chance of maintaining our own long-term freedom and security.

The problems confronting us are incredibly complex. Some of them appear insoluble. Any brief discussion of them must necessarily be an oversimplification, but I would like to comment on a few.

AGONIZING REAPPRAISAL NECESSARY

I believe that events have made necessary that agonizing reappraisal of our foreign policy to which Secretary Dulles has referred.

In connection with this agonizing reappraisal I hope, first of all, that President Eisenhower and Secretary Dulles will consult with responsible Democratic leaders as full partners along with Republican congressional leaders in the formulation of major foreign policies and make every effort to secure bipartisan agreement.

If, as it now appears, the European defense community is not going to be ratified, alternative measures for keeping Western Europe free and secure will have to be devised and adopted.

Not only is the French political situation hopelessly confused, but the recent attacks on Chancellor Adenauer's policy by two of the most influential members of his own party, former chancellors Bruening and Luther, may be of deep significance in foretelling a major shift of German policy away from integration with the West.

I have no doubt that those critical problems relating to Western European defense will receive the full consideration and debate that their high importance merits, and I am not going to take the time to discuss them today. I suggest, however, that there are other phases of our foreign policy that also deserve reappraisal and which over the long run may prove equally important. Moreover, in order to secure agreement on a new plan for the defense of Western Europe if EDC is abandoned, we should not lightly make new commitments there that would tie our hands and prevent our pursuing policies that we regard as right in other parts of the world.

COLONIALISM IS DYING

For example, we should recognize that the whole idea of colonialism is dying, and set our future foreign policies within the framework of that emerging fact.

Admittedly many of the still subject peoples are not yet sufficiently educated and trained to be ready for independence and self government. But the desire for independence in many areas promises to become almost irresistible. Should not the United States, then, in its agonizing reappraisal, adjust its policies so that they will not clash with the aspirations of the people to be free? We simply cannot afford to continue to let the Communists create the false impression that they alone are against colonialism, and that the United States is for it.

I fully realize the short-run, tactical difficulties that might be involved in clarifying our attitude on colonialism. I venture to suggest, however, that part of the reason for the deterioration in the United States position is because in conducting our foreign policy we have placed altogether too much emphasis on short-run tactical, and defensive aspects and not enough on an affirmative long-range program.

What would happen to our air bases in Morocco, one may ask, if the Moroccans should become free? But if a free and independent Morocco felt that the United States was genuinely its friend, why should it not be willing to let us keep our air bases there as one way of helping to preserve its own liberty?

The desire for self determination, for independence, is on the march throughout the globe. The United States must not permit the impression to be created that it resists that trend. Why let Soviet Russia and Red China appear to the natives anywhere to be the only powers sympathetic with their legitimate aspirations for freedom, when we know that Russia and China are imperialistic exploiters bent on subsequently enslaving the people who succumb to their wiles?

Why should the United States not make crystal clear its sympathy with Nehru in his aspiration to have Portugal give up the 3 colonies or enclaves that it still holds in India, and France give up the 4 that it holds? If we want to bring Nehru into closer alinement with us, what more effective thing could we do?

NEHRU UNDERESTIMATED IN UNITED STATES

We fail to grasp how deeply most Asians, including Nehru, loathe colonialism, and how instinctively they suspect that the Westerner who talks about preventing the spread of communism in Asia may secretly be wanting to exploit the natives just as the French exploited the Indochinese.

The United States also seems grossly to underestimate both Nehru's prestige throughout Asia and, as the prime minister of the most populous member of the British commonwealth, his influence at 10 Downing Street, London.

In the reappraisal of our overall long-range foreign policies, I suggest also that the United States put much more emphasis on its genuine desire to help raise the standard of living of the underdeveloped areas by aiding in their rapid industrialization. We are already doing some splendid things under the point 4 or Technical Cooperation Administration, but not nearly enough.

Tonight, three-fourths of the peoples of Asia and Africa will go to bed hungry, or half hungry and undernourished.

Most people in Asia and Africa are farmers barely able to produce enough food to keep themselves alive. Since almost all of their energy goes into food production there is little surplus available to produce capital goods. As a result they badly need dams and irrigation systems, chemical plants to make fertilizer, factories to make farm equipment and other things which would enable them to increase their total output and so raise their standards of living.

By spending only a fraction of the amount of money that we spent in Western Europe on the Marshall plan, we could help the underdeveloped areas of Asia and Africa enormously.

THERE'S A POULATION BOMB, TOO

In a reappraisal of foreign policy we should realize that the problems of getting rid of war and eliminating poverty are inextricably intertwined. We should also understand that starvation can't be overcome unless the underdeveloped nations become industrialized faster than their population grows.

Unless hundreds of millions of people are killed by atomic or hydrogen bombs or die from starvation in the ensuing devastation, at the current birthrate the world's population is going to treble or quadruple within a hundred years.

We should also realize, as someone has wisely said, that while the atom bomb is only being stockpiled, the fuse of the population bomb is already lighted and burning. Every day adds 93,000 more people to this planet.

It is in these underdeveloped areas, areas not yet solidly alined with either the free world or the Soviet bloc, that population growth is the most rapid. Poverty is the soil in which communism breeds fastest. In addition to helping industrialize these underdeveloped areas, wherever the people and their governments want it, we should include education in methods of birth control as a major part of the public-health program. Lowered birth rates will result in better public health and higher standards of living.

Our overall program for these underdeveloped areas should have as its ultimate goal the production of goods sufficient for their needs. In that way everyone would eventually have adequate food and housing, education, medical facilities, and nutrition.

In addition, I believe our long-range foreign policy program should include the advocacy of universal disarmament under effective and continuous international inspection and control. The attainment of this goal may not be possible in our lifetime, but the more we advocate it in the U. N., the more we will convince the other nations that we are not militaristic warmongers, and the sooner we will spike the Communists' principal propaganda guns.

Some people say that universal disarmament under effective international inspection and control is too remote to consider, and an idea too dangerous to discuss. My reply is that timidity is tragic when the free world's future is in balance. Like the elimination of poverty, it may take a long time to accomplish, but let's set our sights high.

And until we do eventually achieve the goal under which we could safely join in universal disarmament, let's build our military defenses and our retaliatory striking power to such a point that there can be no doubt in the minds of the Communist leaders as to what the result would be if they attacked.

NO MONOPOLY ON WISDOM

Again, in reappraising our foreign policy we should recognize that we don't have a monopoly on all wisdom, and we should be less insistent in trying to force our views down the throats of our allies or potential allies, particularly in comparatively unimportant matters.

Since the United States contains only 6 percent of the population of the globe, our foreign policy must rest on a system of alliances. Therefore we should reexamine those of our policies which irritate or alarm our allies. Such policies as reexamination indicates are vital to our security should of course be maintained. But some policies on which we have taken strong positions may seem, after we have reappraised them, less important than we have assumed. In any event, I believe, we should be more flexible and more conciliatory in our efforts to reach complete agreement with our partners, particularly the British.

I favor making every possible effort to persuade Nehru immediately to accept leadership of a movement to organize a defensive alliance of the southeast Asian countries. We should make clear to members of such an alliance that a request to the United Nations to guarantee their independence and help them protect themselves against external aggression would have our hearty support.

I hope this group of Asian countries would include India, Pakistan, Ceylon, Burma, and Indonesia as well as the Philippines and Thailand. And I hope that Great Britain, Canada, Australia, and New Zealand would join the United States in guaranteeing the independence of the still free nations against external aggression, and in sending military contingents to train and equip the armed forces of those nations to defend themselves.

WHY WE HAVE NO PACT NOW

The real reason why we do not already have a united front or a Pacific NATO is, I believe, crystal clear. It is because the British, and the leaders of the Commonwealth, including Nehru, have feared that if it were under American domination it would prove but the opening act of an inexorable three-act tragedy. The first act would be fighting the Viet Minh. The second act would be our blockading and bombing Red China. The final act would be allout atomic world war III.

Important as Vietnam—or all of Indochina for that matter—may be, particularly since the issue of colonialism is involved, it is not, in my opinion, worth world war III.

In this connection we must recognize that within the Eisenhower administration and within the Congress there are some influential and vocal leaders, only a small minority, but men in key positions, who believe that the Red regime in China must be overthrown at any cost.

I do not share their views. Neither do I believe that Chiang Kai-shek's Nationalist forces on Formosa would, if we went to war with Red China, prove anywhere nearly as valuable and effective allies as some people claim.

I would far rather have us participate in the defense of the rest of Southeast Asia, at the invitation of the Asian countries, and with Great Britain and the British Commonwealth as our complete partners and allies, with the limited objective of preventing any further Communist expansion, than have us go it alone, except for Chiang Kai-shek and Syngman Rhee, in launching a war on Red China. Such a conflict, I fear, would almost inevitably produce World War III.

HONEST DISSENT IS HEALTHY

My opinions are based only on the information that anyone can read in the papers. Obviously no man who does not have access to the reports of the Central Intelligence Agency, the State Department and the Joint Chiefs of Staff, should be too dogmatic as to what we should or should not do where questions of our national security are involved.

At the same time we should realize under what frightful strains and incredible pressures our day-by-day foreign policy decisions are being made. We should realize, moreover, that public opinion and discussion do shape and mold those policy decisions. Honest dissent is a healthy thing.

It is a terrible, an awesome decision that destiny is forcing President Eisenhower to make in the days or weeks or months immediately ahead. Whatever his decision proves to be, once it is made I pray that the American people will support it unitedly.

Maritime Myopia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 22, 1954

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very excellent editorial entitled "Maritime Myopia," published in the American Metal Market of June 18, 1954.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARITIME MYOPIA

The maritime industry once again is appealing to Congress for economic assistance, a condition that has been chronic in peacetime for many recent generations.

Experts have figured that the Nation's shipyards must be given contracts to build at least 60 ships a year in order to maintain their economic health and not lose that nucleus of efficient workers and equipment essential in the even of another war emergency. Under such a program, maritime officials figure that a minimum of 35,000 skilled shipyard workers and 30 building ways would be kept in operable condition. This program, which has also been suggested by Robert B. Murray, Jr., Under Secretary of Commerce, would contribute materially to the general level of activity in the Nation.

Congress is being asked to underwrite this industrial rejuvenation in the shipyards in order to equip the United States with a merchant fleet of about 1,200 active ships, which would employ some 72,000 skilled seamen. A potent reason advanced for a Federal subsidy for this program is the wide difference between United States building and operating costs and those of other nations. It is recognized that such wage and cost differentials are quite general, but it is held that their impact is particularly severe in the shipping field because of the highly competitive character of international shipping. The program was proposed as far back as 1947 by a Truman Commission but for much of the intervening time it has been gathering dust. So far, the present administration has shown little inclination to underwrite it, but has urged private financing for the new ship construction which is admittedly needed.

A step toward the eventual adoption of the program could be the assumption by labor of a greater share of responsibility for increased efficiency in construction and operation with a view to improving the competitive position of the industry. Shipowners have been striving desperately for such a revival of interest in the problem because with the passage of time, it is rapidly becoming more acute.

At present, the United States fleet consists of 1,229 privately owned ships of 15,208,941 deadweight tons. Of these, 206 (one-sixth of the total in tonnage) are laid up, inactive at many ports along American coasts, due to lack of cargoes. Not included in the above total of idle ships are the 1,975 vessels, principally Liberty cargo ships, that make up the Government's reserve fleet. About 35 of the idle United State ships represent those seized by the Maritime Administration from foreign interests because of misrepresentations made when they were sold by the Government. During the past 17 months our shipyards have received no orders for commercial merchant ships, and there appears little hope that any are in the making. Some yards are said to be considering closing down for the summer. The labor force still left in the shipyards is estimated at less than 20,000 skilled workers, somewhat more than half the number considered necessary to maintain a desired reserve labor force.

These workers are now engaged in clearing up the shrinking backlog of orders still on the builders, books. They at present amount to only 27 vessels which are to be delivered this year, leaving only 2 for delivery in 1955.

In the meantime the world's merchant fleet has grown to an all-time high of 119 million deadweight tons. This great expansion has been due mainly to the reappearance in the industry of a number of nations that were practically eliminated from the field by the war. It is contended that some can operate at about one-fifth the cost of operating an American ship. A further factor which, it is held, makes a revival of American construction essential is the recent approval of the St. Lawrence seaway. Exclusive of some 200 "tramp ships," our existing fleets require greater draft than the 27 feet to be provided by the seaway. Lacking modern vessels suitable for this trade, foreign shipping is almost certain to have an additional advantage over us on this route into the heart of the continent.

This is a sad and depressing picture which holds frightening possibilities when placed beside current developments in the East, and even in this hemisphere. Senator SALTONSTALL, of Massachusetts, who sits on both the Military Affairs and Appropriations Committees of the Senate, has described the situation as "maritime myopia." Speaking as one steeped in the tradition of the great days of American shipping, the New England Senator observed that "our maritime industry is and must always be considered as a dual-purpose industry—one which is vital to the preservation of a healthy economy as well as essential to our national security." He reminded the Senate that it is never "wise to permit any single link in our great economic chain to become weak" because the "reaction might imperil the strength of the other segments," and stressed that the "beneficiaries of a strong national maritime policy are not solely the ship builders, owners, and operators, but the people of all the States, for every single region of the country contributes to and shares in the benefits which flow from maintaining a strong merchant fleet."

Nevertheless the outlook for remedial action is not bright. There is a sharp conflict in views concerning method as well as policy, and in the meanwhile this depressing condition is getting no better.

The Fifth Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1954

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following speech made by Erwin N. Griswold, dean of the Harvard Law School, was delivered by him before the Massachusetts Bar Association. It is deserving of careful study:

THE FIFTH AMENDMENT

(By Erwin N. Griswold)

Old friends are good friends.

Yet even with the best of friends problems sometimes arise. I have that feeling with respect to the fifth amendment.

It has been with us a long time. It is rather comforting to have around. Yet in the past few years it has come to our consciousness as it rarely has before.

The fifth amendment contains a number of provisions which are commonplace. It is the source of our constitutional rule that serious criminal charges must be made by indictment of a grand jury. It provides against double jeopardy, against the taking of property without due process of law, against the taking of private property for public use without just compensation.

Along with these other provisions is the phrase which has currently come to the fore: "No person * * * shall be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself."

Historians can trace the origin of this privilege back to the 12th century. It was apparently standard practice not only to make suspected persons give evidence against themselves, but also to use torture to make the accused speak. As we think of the development of the privilege, we should not overlook its close connection with the struggle to eliminate torture as a governmental practice.

We owe the privilege of today primarily to freeborn John Lilburn, a cantankerous person, the sort to whom we owe much for many of our basic rights. One of his contemporaries said that "if all the world was emptied of all but John Lilburn, Lilburn would quarrel with John and John with Lilburn." Like most contentious people, he was stubborn. In 1637, he was haled before the star chamber on a charge of having imported certain heretical and seditious books. He refused to take the oath to answer truly, and the council of the star chamber condemned him to be whipped and pilloried for his boldness in refusing to take a legal oath without which many offenses might go undiscovered and unpunished. The sentence was carried out.

But Lilburn persisted. He filed a petition with Parliament and, in 1641, the House of Commons voted that the sentence was illegal and against the liberty of the subject. Later, the House of Lords concurred and ordered an indemnity of £3,000 paid to him, a very large sum in those days. This event seems to have been enough to establish the privilege against self-incrimination as a part of the common law.

The privilege came to this continent as a part of the legal heritage of our early settlers. Some trace of it is found in Massachusetts as early as 1637. And in 1689 William Bradford, the man who introduced the art of printing to the middle provinces, was summoned before the Governor and Council of Pennsylvania. He was about 26 years old and he had printed the charter of the province so that people could see their rights. He had not put his name on the pamphlet, apparently anticipating some trouble.

"GOVERNOUR. Why, sir, I would know by what power of authority you thus print?

"BRADFORD. It was by Governour Penn's encouragement I came to this Province, and by his license I print.

"GOVERNOUR. What, sir, had you license to print the charter? I desire to know from you, whether you did print the charter or not, and who set you to work?

"BRADFORD. Governour, it is an impracticable thing for any man to accuse himself; thou knows it very well.

"GOVERNOUR. Well, it shall not much press you to it, but if you were so ingenuous as to confess, it should go better with you.

"BRADFORD. Governour, I desire to know my accusers; I think it very hard to be put upon accusing myself.

"GOVERNOUR. Can you deny that you printed it? I do know you did print it, and by whose directions, and will prove it, and make you smart for it, too, since you are so stubborn.

"BRADFORD. * * * Let me know my accusers, and I shall know the better how to make my defense."

The privilege was included in the Virginia Bill of Rights of 1776 drafted by George Mason and, apparently largely because of its presence there, it made its way, in various forms, into the constitutions of 6 or 7 of the original States. When the Federal Constitution was ratified, a number of the States proposed amendments, and the privilege against self-incrimination was specifically mentioned. Accordingly, it was included in the proposals made by Congresss which became the fifth amendment in 1791. It has been there unchanged ever since.

A good many efforts have been made to rationalize the privilege, to explain why it is a desirable or essential part of our basic law. I would suggest that the privilege against self-incrimination is one of the great landmarks in man's struggle to make himself civilized. Its establishment is closely linked historically with the abolition of torture—the torture once used by honest and conscientious public servants as a means of obtaining information about crimes which could not otherwise be disclosed.

We want none of that today, I am sure. For a very similar reason, we do not make even the most hardened criminal sign his own death warrant, or dig his grave, or pull the lever that springs the trap on which he stands. If a man has done wrong, he should be punished. But the evidence against him must be produced and evaluated by a proper court in a fair trial.

Neither torture, nor an oath, nor the threat of punishment such as imprisonment for contempt should be used to compel him to provide the evidence to accuse or to convict himself. If his crime is a serious one, laborious police work may be required to prove it by other evidence. Sometimes no other evidence can be found. But for about three centuries in the Anglo-American legal system we have accepted the standard that even then we do not compel the accused to provide that evidence.

Where matters of a man's belief, or opinions or political views, are essential elements in the charge it may be difficult to get evidence from sources other than the suspected or accused person himself. Hence, the significance of the privilege over the years has perhaps been greatest in connection with resistance to prosecution for such offenses as heresy or political crimes. In these areas the privilege against self-incrimination has been a protection for freedom of thought and a hindrance to any government which might wish to prosecute for thoughts and opinions alone.

Don't we go too far in giving this protection to criminals? Isn't the claim of the privilege the clearest sort of proof that the person who claims it is guilty of a crime?

I do no believe so.

One purpose of the fifth amendment is to protect the innocent. But how can a man claim the privilege if he is innocent? How can a man fear he will incriminate himself if he knows he has committed no crime?

Well, let us assume two sets of facts. You may think that both are unlikely, but I am simply putting hypothetical cases (and the facts are not the facts of any specific case).

Here is case 1: A man is a college teacher. He is an idealist and perhaps slow to recognize realities as idealists sometimes are. He has a great urge for what he regards as social reform. He is native born, went to American schools and loves his country despite what he regards as its imperfections. You may not agree with his ideas but you would respect his honesty and sincerity. He abhors anything involving force and violence.

He is a good teacher and works hard on his subjects. He has always believed that as a good citizen he should be interested in politics. Neither of the established political parties provided what he wanted. In the relatively calm period of the past middle 1930's, on the solicitation of a friend, he went to a Communist meeting and soon joined the Communist Party.

At that time the Communist Party was perfectly legal and regularly appeared on our ballot. He thought he was simply joining a political party. One of the reasons that led him to join was because he regarded fascism as highly immoral and a great danger to the world, and he felt that the Communists were fighting fascism in Spain at this time. His interest was not merely in protecting Spain, but because he thought that fighting fascism there was an important means of guarding against such a danger here.

You may feel that such a man must have been very naive or lacking in intelligence. But to say that involves the use of a large amount of hindsight. A man's actions at any time should be evaluated on the basis of the facts then available to him, and the state of his own mind on the basis of what he actually knew, and not by facts we learn later that were not known to him. And, even granting that the man may have been naive or obtuse, or misguided and unwise, these are very different things from being a traitor or a spy.

Let me add a few more assumed facts. Our teacher was in a Communist cell, with other teachers. The Communists wanted to use it to infiltrate American education. However, they knew that many or all of the members of this cell of teachers were politically innocent and that they would recoil quickly from any proposals for sabotage cr the use of force and violence. So they treated this group with great care, never subjecting it to the rigors of Communist discipline. It was a study group, and its discussions were kept on a high intellectual plane. Our teacher never engaged in espionage or sabotage—he would have been horrified by any such actions.

Nevertheless, there were things from time to time which he did not like. He rationalized them in various ways—nothing can be perfect; the thing to do is to stay inside and work against excesses; and so on. Besides he was a stubborn fellow. Once having started out on something he thought was good, he did not lightly give it up. But he became troubled; and after the war he slowly drifted away from the group. He never formally resigned. He just turned away. By the time of the Korean invasion in 1950, he was thoroughly disgusted and saw that he had been used as a dupe. But he was also convinced in his own heart of the rectitude of his actions, if not of their wisdom; and he did not doubt that many of the people who had been associated with him in the venture were just as innocent of wrongdoing as he was sure he was.

Now to case 2: This man is also a college teacher. He never joined the Communist Party. He knew a good deal about the realities of communism and was thoroughly opposed to it. He was, however, a man who was interested in causes. In fact, he was a sucker for almost any kind of an appeal. He contributed modest amounts to China relief. Sometimes he found himself on the letterheads of some of these organizations as a sponsor. He was not sure that he remembered giving permission to use his name, but the cause was one that appealed to him and he did not bother himself much about it.

After awhile he heard some rumblings that there might be some Communist influence in these organizations but he was slow to believe it. In some of the organizations he had been on committees with thoroughly respectable fellow citizens. Eventually he heard that some of these organizations had been ruled subversive by the Attorney General. But he, too, was a stubborn fellow. He believed in the stated objectives of these organizations. He was also a freeborn American, proud of his country's great traditions, and he allowed his name to be used, as has been said, "as a gesture of opposition to the procedure of proscribing organizations without giving them the right to be heard."

That ends my assuming. What happens to these two individuals? Consider Case 1 first.

The man who was a Communist Party member is summoned to appear before a congressional committee, and asked whether he is a Communist. He answers truthfully: "No."

Then he is asked whether he ever was a Communist. He is now surely subjected to a substantial risk, even though he honestly believes that he has committed no crime. He knows that a number of Communists have been convicted under the Smith Act of 1940 and more have been indicted. Our teacher perhaps magnifies his own predicament. After much internal torment, he finally decides to claim the privilege of the fifth amendment. Putting aside the question of his wisdom in doing this, can there be any doubt that the claim is legally proper?

Past membership in the Communist Party is not a crime in itself; but admitting such membership may well be a link in a chain of proof of a criminal charge against him. Persons have been prosecuted under the Smith Act for membership in the Communist Party plus something else. If he supplies the proof of his own membership in the party, he does not know what other evidence may then be brought against him to show that he has committed a crime. Thus, an answer to the question will definitely incriminate him, that is, provide evidence which could be used in a prosecution against him. Yet, remember that he thoroughly believes that he is not guilty of any crime and on the facts I have given he is not guilty of a crime.

There are other factors that influence his conclusion. His own experiences are an ordeal. He does not want his friends to be subjected to it. He believes in their innocence of any crime. By claiming the privilege against self-incrimination, he can refrain from naming any of his associates. He feels a strong sense of loyalty to them. He feels a strong sense of loyalty to his country, too; but since he is convinced that neither he nor his associates have in fact done anything wrong, his desire to protect them from having to experience his own predicament seems to him to have prevailing weight in the actual circumstances.

He claims the privilege. He cannot be prosecuted on the basis of any evidence he has provided. There can be no doubt, I believe, that his claim of privilege is legally justified even though on the facts I have assumed he is not guilty of any crime.

Case 2: This man likewise is summoned before a congressional investigation committee. The mere fact that he is summoned shows that he is suspected of something rather serious, and he is badly worried. He is asked whether he is now a member of the Communist Party. He answers: "No." Then he is asked whether he ever was in the past. The answer is in fact "No," but he is now in great fear. If he says "No," then he may be subjecting himself to a real risk of a prosecution for perjury. He may rightly fear that proof of the fact of his joining and contributing to so many causes which have turned out to be front organizations might lead a jury to believe that he actually was a Communist.

Now it is probably true that fear of a prosecution for perjury is not a proper basis for a claim of the privilege. But our man is in a somewhat different situation. If he says "No" to the question of Communist membership, then in his own interest he may have to undertake to state and explain his membership and activities in the various front organizations. The net result may be that he will have to give much evidence which could be used against him in an attempt to prove that he was a member of the Communist conspiracy. It would appear, therefore, that he can properly claim the privilege even though his answer to the question as to Communist Party membership at any time would honestly and rightly be "No."

Ordinarily when the privilege of the fifth amendment is exercised, it is in a criminal trial. There a specific charge has been made, and the prosecution has by evidence established a prima facie case of guilt so that there is much more than the mere claim of the privilege on which to rest an inference of guilt.

In investigations, however, there are no carefully formulated charges. Evidence to support such charges has not been introduced and made known to the witness. He has no opportunity for cross-examination of other witnesses, and often little or no opportunity to make explanations which might have a material bearing on the whole situation. In the setting of an investigation, therefore, the basis for an inference of guilt is actually much less than it is when the privilege against self-incrimination is exercised in an ordinary criminal trial.

We have a rather techical legal doctrine known as waiver of the privilege. A clear instance of waiver occurs when a defendant in a criminal case voluntarily takes the stand. He then becomes subject to cross-examination and must answer relevant questions.

For investigations, our current learning on the doctrine of waiver is based largely on a 1951 Supreme Court decision (*Rogers* v. *United States*). In that case, a witness testified she had been treasurer of a local Communist Party and had turned the records over to another person. She declined to name the person, claiming the privilege under the fifth amendment. The Supreme Court held that by giving the testimony she did, she had waived the privilege. There was a dissenting opinion by Justices Black, Frankfurter, and Douglas.

My own view is that this decision was not soundly reasoned and that it has led to unfortunate results when applied to an investigation. As a consequence of this case, witnesses who have legitimate fears of prosecution, but who might be willing to cooperate as far as they could, are induced (if not actually compelled) to refuse to answer any questions at all.

This doctrine of waiver is, I believe, the true explanation of the refusal of some witnesses to answer such questions as "Have you ever taught Communist doctrine in your classroom?" or "Have you ever solicited students to join the Communist Party?" These refusals have been deeply disturbing to the public. Yet, answers to these questions may be "No," but the witness nevertheless fears that he cannot give that answer without its being said that he has waived the privilege as to questions about other sorts of Communist activity.

There is one more problem which is collateral to that of the fifth amendment. Suppose a witness first refuses to answer virtually all questions, but he later decides to waive the privilege as to himself. However, he refuses as a matter which he regards as one of principle to identify other people. Should he be worse off for being willing to speak fully and frankly about himself than he was when he would not talk at all?

Let me do a little more assuming: The witness feels positive in his own mind that the persons with whom he was associated did no wrong to our country. They were merely hopeful but misguided people, as he was. Let us assume, too, that this is all far in the past. The persons in question are in other work. They have families to support. He must then resolve for himself the question whether he will give their names and subject them to the same sort of ordeal.

Of course, he may be wrong in his judgment of these other people. They may be worse than he thinks they are. But to a considerable extent, such questions can only be resolved in a man's own conscience.

I do not justify the past or present conduct of anyone. I seek only to explain. Because of claims of privilege under the fifth amendment and refusal to answer questions, many Americans have come to have fear of our educational institutions and general mistrust of academic people. I firmly believe that these fears are unwarranted.

But I also believe that charges made against our universities and other educational institutions are more or less believed by some segments of our people.

As conservative a judge as Pierce Butler once wrote:

"It has always been recognized in this country, and it is well to remember, that few, if any of the rights of the people guarded by fundamental law are of greater importance to their happiness and safety than the right to be exempt from all authorized, arbitrary or unreasonable inquiries and disclosures in respect of their personal and private affairs."

In our criminal courts, we would never think of requiring an accused person to answer questions. He doesn't have to take the stand at all, and if he does do so, he has the protection of an impartial judge, and the right to have his counsel speak in court in his behalf.

Why should it be so different in a legislative inquiry, when the information that is sought relates to the witness' own conduct?

TVA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT GORE

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 22, 1954

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the New York Times, an editorial from the Washington Post, an editorial from the Memphis Press-Scimitar, and an article written by Doris Fleeson, dealing with President Eisenhower's recent order relating to power for TVA.

There being no objection, the editorials and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times]

DEBATE OVER POWER

Controversy between partisans of public and private power has focused on the Tennessee Valley Authority since its inception in 1933. Under the Eisenhower administration the controversy has had fresh impetus. President Eisenhower was in office only 6 months when he cited TVA as an example of creeping socialism, although he made clear he was not out to destroy it. The administration spoke of a partnership between the public and private power.

The new policy was to retain existing public power projects but to try to remove obstacles to private development. In his budget message last January, the President said he planned to reduce TVA commitments to meet power requirements for the Atomic Energy Commission's new plant at Paducah, Ky. A TVA request for funds to start a steam generating plant to supply the AEC project was rejected. The President, instead, declared TVA would use its available capacity to serve regular consumers while other sources of power were sought for the atom plant.

Last week President Eisenhower specified what he meant by other sources. He directed AEC to negotiate a 25-year contract to buy power for the new plant from one private utility group which offered to construct a $107 million steam generating plant at West Memphis, Ark.

The President's order came under scrutiny of the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy. Rowland R. Hughes, Director of the Bureau of the Budget which developed the project, defended the President's order. He explained that the private company must pay taxes which would benefit the Government. In addition, use of private power will avoid an outlay of $100 million of Federal tax revenues, he declared, to build the TVA plant.

Witnesses for TVA and AEC, however, were critical. The privately owned plant, the TVA men said, would cost $5.5 million more to operate each year than TVA's own proposed powerhouse. Experts from AEC figured the additional cost at about $3.6 million each year.

PARTY FIGHT

Democrats on the committee, including Senators GORE of Tennessee, and SPARKMAN of Alabama, accused the administration of trying to block TVA development by using the AEC to promote private power combines. Representative CHET HOLIFIELD, of California, estimated the Government would be forced to pay $90 million more in costs during contract's lifetime than it would with a TVA plant. Even AEC members split along party lines: the 3 Democrat appointees said they doubted the wisdom of the contract but added they would go along with it and the 2 Republican appointees approved of it.

By the end of the week it appeared likely that a floor fight would be made in Congress to prevent negotiation of the private contract for one in favor of TVA expansion. There was a possibility also that the power question would become an issue in the elections this fall.

[From the Washington Post of June 20, 1954]

CONDEMNING TVA

President Eisenhower's letter instructing the Atomic Energy Commission, in effect, to purchase power from certain private utility companies is unfortunate from every point of view. As a matter of administration, this kind of interference with the independent judgment of a commission is mischievous. In terms of business practice, it is an uneconomic and imprudent arrangement, certain to prove costly to American taxpayers. Considered as policy, it seems to reflect a doctrinaire preference for private power instead of public power, regardless of the needs and problems of a specific situation. Indeed, it seems an unhappy reversion to the President's reference to TVA just a year ago as an example of "creeping socialism."

Through the Bureau of the Budget, the President has virtually ordered the AEC to do what 3 of its 5 Commissioners actively oppose and what the other 2 regard if not with misgivings at least without fervor. The Commission is to sign a 25-year contract with a private syndicate for the purchase of 500,000 to 600,000 kilowatts of power to be provided for a new $107 million plant in the Memphis area. This new private plant will be used to serve residents of the area who now get their power from TVA. And it will also serve as a justification for denying TVA the funds it has requested for the purchase of steam plants to meet the power needs of the AEC and of area residents. In short, the AEC, which does not now need additional power, is being used, as Senator GORE put it, "to prevent the TVA from building more capacity."

Representative CHET HOLIFIELD has performed an immensely useful public service in bringing out the uneconomic aspects of this arrangement. His persistent questioning elicited from Brig. Gen. Kenneth D. Nichols, AEC general manager, an acknowledgement that the AEC staff has estimated the private-power contract will cost about $3.6 million a year more than a similar arrangement with TVA.

"Over the life of the contract," Mr. HOLIFIELD asserted, "American taxpayers will pay at least $90 million more than the cost of equivalent power supplied by TVA. The public will foot the bill while the private utilities get a free ride. At the end of the ride the private utilities will own the automobile paid for by the taxpayers."

We applaud the determination of Representatives HOLIFIELD and MELVIN PRICE, both members of the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy, to take their fight against the administration power proposal to the floor of the House. It is really a fight for TVA's life. There have been few American achievements of the 20th century which have contributed more to the public welfare than TVA's achievement in enriching the great Tennessee Valley and harnessing the Tennessee River and its tributaries for the welfare of the valley's residents. That magnificent American development must not now be stifled out of a more doctrinaire opposition to public power and a nightmare fear of "creeping socialism."

[From the Memphis Press-Scimitar]

MAKE A BETTER POWER DEAL FOR THE PEOPLE

The contract which President Eisenhower has directed the Atomic Energy Commission to make with private utilities to supply the West Tennessee and West Kentucky areas with needed power is not the best deal that could be made for the people.

The Atomic Energy Commission is a specialized agency, charged with a grave responsibility in a highly technical field. It should not have to deal with a question of power. Its power needs should be supplied by a power agency.

The Government has a power agency of high competence and much experience in the power field—the Tennessee Valley Authority—which President Eisenhower, during the campaign, promised the editor of this newspaper would "be operated and maintained at maximum efficiency."

The meeting of the power needs of the AEC should be left to the TVA.

The best solution is the building of the steam plant by the TVA. The next best is the building of the plant by the financial group represented by Walter Von Tresckow and Lucius Burch of Memphis, for under that plan the TVA would eventually own the plant. The poorest solution is the letting of a contract to the Middle South Utilities Co. and the Southern Co., as proposed by the President, for it is the most costly and at the end the people would own nothing.

While the Memphis area, including this newspaper, would profit from the building of this huge plant just across the river from Memphis, nevertheless we think the Government should put the plant on the site which is best from the standpoint of the national interest. That site, we believe, is the one on the bluff at Fulton, Tenn., the one chosen by TVA experts after years of study. It is nearer to the coal fields. It is out of the range of bombs directed at a large city.

TVA should be allowed to build the steam plants required for Government needs and industrial needs in its area. TVA should be put on its own bottom, and such expansion financed by the issuance of TVA's own bonds, underwritten by the Federal Government. That is "maximum efficiency."

Not quite so good, but next best, is the Von Tresckow plan. Far below "maximum efficiency" is a plan favored by the President, which subsidizes private utilities which are not needed to do the job.

EISENHOWER ORDER CRITICIZED—FORCING OF AEC TO SIGN CONTRACT WITH PRIVATE UTILITY CALLED UNPRECEDENTED USE OF EXECUTIVE AUTHORITY

(By Doris Fleeson)

In an unprecedented exercise of Presidential authority. President Eisenhower has ordered the Atomic Energy Commission to sign a 25-year contract with a private utility for the production of power to be distributed through the Tennessee Valley Authority. He also ordered TVA to cooperate.

The AEC does not itself need the power. It is getting all it wants and needs at a fair price from TVA.

At least two AEC commissioners informed the White House and have now said publicly that such use of AEC's contracting power is "incongruous * * * awkward * * * unbusinesslike" and a handicap to AEC in the execution of its "sober and exacting principal mission." A commission majority is against it.

That the AEC had no disposition to take the rap for the controversial arrangement is shown by the fact that the President had to order it to make the contract.

Great issues are involved in the story as it unfolded at a tense hearing of the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy yesterday. They are so great that the obvious questions of whether the contract is provident and wise and what it does to TVA—important as they are—must take second place.

The President is shown attempting to enforce his power policy at second hand through an independent agency. Has he that right?

Of all the independent agencies, the one chosen deals with the most crucial, far-reaching and secret activity of the Government. Is it wise to inject it into a largely irrelevant matter?

AEC is already in the throes of embittered controversies over the rights and actions of its chairman, Lewis Strauss, and the security of its best-known scientist, Dr. Robert Oppenheimer. Is it good administration to toss another divisive problem into the boiling pot?

Atomic energy policy is at a legislative cros-roads with the congressional committee trying to shape a more flexible law so that a broad base for peacetime use of the atom may be more quickly achieved. Is a single power project worth upsetting the orderly progress of this legislation?

What is almost the most astonishing aspect is that the President, so reluctant to cross Congress or even one Member of it, should intervene so arbitrarily with the pet agency of Congress.

Every legislative safeguard that could insure bipartisanship was thrown about it. The joint committee, under Republican and Democratic chairmen alike, has prided itself on acting as a nonpolitical board of directors to AEC. The President's order was unexpected, and to some, shocking.

The joint committee has known for some time about the private utility effort to utilize the AEC's power to make 25-year contracts. It is known as the Dixon-Yates proposal and involves a group of utilities in the TVA area.

Last April 16 two of the dissenting Commissioners, Dr. Henry Smyth and Eugene Zuckert, wrote their trenchant reasons for opposing it to the Budget Director. The letter from the Director of the Budget, conveying the President's orders to proceed, is dated June 16. Senators are pointing out bitterly that the President waited until after the AEC appropriation bill was on his desk for signature. They are looking for and expect to find another means of making their views known.

The Charles E. Wilson Library

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. BEAMER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 1954

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, Indiana is justly proud of its citizens and former citizens who have distinguished themselves in special fields of endeavor. When some person distinguishes himself in more than one special field, then we are doubly proud—and recognition is made by the community.

Under unanimous consent, I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial from the Anderson (Ind.) Herald of June 19, which pays respect to Charles E. Wilson, Secretary of Defense:

THE CHARLES E. WILSON LIBRARY

Andersonians in all walks of life, we think, will applaud the decision of the Anderson College board of trustees to name the college's new library in honor of Charles E. Wilson, former general manager of Anderson's Delco-Remy Division, former president of the General Motors Corp., today the Nation's Secretary of Defense.

In deciding that the library should bear the name of our most distinguished former townsman, the college community seeks simply to recognize Mr. Wilson's long-time interest in the college and its welfare—an interest demonstrated over a period of 25 years. The college seeks also to recognize Mr. Wilson's contribution to Anderson and its people—a contribution too significant to be measured in terms of dollars or cents—a contribution from which every man, woman, and child in Anderson benefits even today.

Mr. Wilson came to Anderson at the relatively tender age of 29. He had emerged not many years before from an engineering school, and he came to our community to become affiliated with the young and growing Remy Electric Co.

In an amazing short span of time, Mr. Wilson's talents as an engineer, as a designer, as an industrial administrator saw him at the top of the company—by then an enterprise affiliated with the vast network that comprises the General Motors Corp.

In 1929—10 years after he had come to Anderson as a somewhat callow engineer—Mr. Wilson was on his way to Detroit to assume a position of far broader responsibility in the corporation's management. Finally, in the days when General Motors was girding to make its extraordinary contribution to arming the free world, Charles E. Wilson became the corporation's president—certainly one of the weightiest industrial responsibilities in the world.

If that had been the end of the story, the circumstances would scarcely have warranted the extraordinary honor that Anderson College now proposes to extend. In many ways, though, that was only the story's beginning.

For from the moment Mr. Wilson set foot in Anderson, he detected something in the spirit of this community; he captured a vision of this community's capabilities of growth and development. That understanding of the community's spirit, that vision of the community's future, that confidence in the community's people all conspired to induce Mr. Wilson to gamble on Anderson.

We see the results of that gamble in every quarter: in the fact that Anderson ranks as General Motors' Indiana capital, in the fact that some 20,000 Madison County people derive their livelihoods directly from General Motors and that thousands more earn their livings in subsidiary industries. We see the results in the mere fact of Anderson's continuing growth, in the prosperity of our retail establishment, our professional men and women, in the success of our charitable agencies, in the size of our churches, the beauty of our schools. We can look in no direction on the Anderson scene, in short, without seeing what Charles E. Wilson did for Anderson.

How can that debt be repaid? By a statue on the courthouse square? By a broad boulevard bearing Mr. Wilson's name? By mere commendation and praise? Or by a library that will be of service to generations of young Andersonians for many years to come, by a library associated with an institution in which Mr. Wilson himself has been intensely interested.

The fact that this college library will be the Wilson Library gives a double meaning to the fund-raising campaign in which hundreds of Andersonians now are engaged. For in addition to building an institution of incalculable value in itself, the people of Anderson now have the additional opportunity to honor Anderson's most notable benefactor.

Southeast Asia a Challenge to Free World Policymakers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HORACE SEELY-BROWN, JR.

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 1954

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include herewith a thought-provoking editorial which appeared in the May 14 issue of the Middletown Bulletin:

SOUTHEAST ASIA A CHALLENGE TO FREE WORLD POLICYMAKERS

(By Max Convo)

While the fall of the stronghold of Dien Bien Phu has served to electrify the imaginations of the peoples of the free world, its defense will have been a useless gesture if there is no follow-up by the United States and its allies guaranteeing the general area of southeast Asia against a reoccurence of the episode.

It is our belief that both the French and our own policymakers greatly underestimated the capability of the enemy in Indochina and that the tactics adopted against Ho Chi Minh's irregulars were inadequate in facing the situation.

From a morale and propaganda point of view the views expressed by various members of our national administration at various times have been conflicting and have been running hot and cold. This expression of views still has not been brought under control as can be seen from the effect which the statements of our Secretary of State have had in recent days.

If we are to write off Indochina and take up the defense of other southeast Asia nations let us so declare—however, wishful thinking will not save Laos, Cambodia, and Vietnam from the attacks which the Viet Minh has scheduled. If it is our intention to defend those areas we can do so without commiting large bodies of our own infantry to bolster the French and local forces.

While the idea of creating a powerful coalition of nations in the southeast Asia area had great merits a year or so ago and still has great potentialities, we must assume that even if the road to the establishment of such a coalition were a smooth one, it would be a long one, and that the military forces which would be put at the disposal of such a treaty organization could not be employed on time to have any positive bearing on the foreseeable outcome of the war in Indochina.

It is therefore necessary that a program of immediate usefulness be developed in time to play a decisive role in the present struggle.

It is obvious that the legislative branch of the Government looks with apprehension upon direct United States intervention in the struggle that is going on and that the present administration will not act without the consent of Congress, however, there are organizations within the United States Government which are in the position to assume an important role in the fracas which is taking place and whose facilities could be intelligently used to have great bearing in the outcome in Indochina without getting our Government or United States Army embroiled directly.

There are presently several large manpower pools in the Far East which could supply enough manpower to have a bearing in the battle. These manpower pools exist in Japan, Formosa, and South Korea.

We do not suggest that such forces be used in orthodox military operations, but we do suggest that neither Chiang Kai-shek nor Singman Rhee would oppose the sub-rosa employment of such forces to strike at the common enemy, nor would we find great difficulty in recruiting Japanese personnel familiar with the terrain and the people of Indochina.

The war in this area of the world will not be won through the application of standard military tactics—it will be won through the application of special knowledge of the enemy's intention and methods of attack * * * it will be won by Trojan horse tactics * * * it will be won by the side which is capable of inflaming the minds of the participants in what is turning out to be a war of the people in which whole populations are harnessed to the effort.

Let us examine the use of Chinese Nationalist troops and the possible consequences:

1. A predominant number of the inhabitants of Indochina are of Chinese extraction and thus are ethnically close to the Nationalists who as a matter of historical fact financed Ho Chi Minh's efforts during the Japanese occupation.

(a) Such troops could be used in small units to be dropped in areas where Communist activity is strongest with the object of adopting the enemy's tactics and creating havoc within their ranks.

(b) They can also be used in the application of infiltrating tactics in such instances where the Viet Minh resorts to massive attacks against key objectives.

(c) They could further be employed in real-line security work which is presently entrusted to Vietnamese units whose loyalty is sometimes questionable and which have undoubtedly been penetrated by the Communists.

2. Use of these forces does not have to wait upon the creation of a southeast Asia alliance and need not be openly acknowledged. The units from whence such personnel could be made available are already in existence and are not presently materially contributing to any overall allied effort, neither would the French Government have have to be embroiled in the transaction which could be directly handled by Bao Dai and Chiang. Such experience as the Nationalist troops would gain in Indochina could later be applied against the wresting of the Chinese mainland from Communist control.

Another important and readily available manpower pool presently exists in South Korea. President Rhee has already offered the use of several United States-trained Korean divisions. The South Korean soldier has already been tried and proved under severe battle conditions in action against the Chinese Communists. Deployment of these additional troops under the command of General Navarre or whoever the commandant of the sector may be, will serve to uplift the morale of the French and Vietnamese troops who have long been engaged in the struggle and will materially increase their capabilities to undertake orthodox operations in areas where such operations will prove profitable.

Again the employment of such troops need not be of an organic nature but can be undertaken along the lines of the Chinese Nationalist operation with a bilateral agreement between Bao Dai and President Rhee. Their deployment would be the problem of the sector commander, however the principal point is that South Korea does constitute a potential manpower pool.

The third suggestion involving the use of specially recruited Japanese personnel poses a ticklish problem in that Indochina was one of the regions occupied by Japanese imperial forces during World War II and as a consequence of that occupation the Japanese are not too well liked, however the resourcefulness of such personnel could make a material contribution to the overall effort in that the oriental mentality can be profitably employed in finding a solution to some of the psychological problems peculiar to the area. This as well as the fact that many Japanese are well acquainted with the terrain in question would indicate that they could be profitably used.

The timetable to bring these units into play should be set up by a combined operations board to include all interested parties with provisions for integrated training under United States—British and French instructors.

Only in this manner can we hope to stalemate the Viet Minh forces and Chinese Communist specialists who have taken the initiative away from the French Union Forces, without committing United States Armed Forces.

This would give us ample time to undertake the creation of the southeast Asia alliance, work out the wrinkles of the treaty and provide a basis for the eventual employment of such forces as the alliance can muster to tip the scale in favor of the free peoples.

Unless this is done without loss of time we will either be forced to commit our own force or face the reality that communism has been once again able to muster the people of the entire area against our allies and consequently against us.

Resolution by Kansas Oil Men's Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD H. REES

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 1954

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me by the House, I submit herewith a resolution adopted by the board of directors of the Kansas Oil Men's Association at their meeting held in Salina, Kans., on June 11, 1954.

The resolution deals with the important matter of importation of crude oil and petroleum products from foreign countries that compete with the independent producers of America. Oil producers are deeply concerned because the importation of crude oil continues to increase, while American producers are required to reduce and curtail the amount of production in order to prevent an oversupply of crude oil in this country.

The resolution follows:

The Kansas Oil Men's Association has discussed and considered the current situation with respect to the importation of crude oil and petroleum products, the action of those individuals and groups who are seeking legislative restrictions on such imports and particularly the statements of those individuals speaking on behalf of the coal industry who advocate an "end-use control" national fuels policy, and believing that such proposals are not in the best interests of the Nation or of the petroleum industry, do now this 11th day of June 1954, in meeting assembled—

"*Resolve*, That—

"1. The Kansas Oil Men's Association continues its opposition to any legislation which would or could result in the imposition of quantitative restrictions and/or increased taxes or duties on imports of crude petroleum or petroleum products; and

"2. The association is opposed to the imposition, by legislation or otherwise, of a national fuels policy which would or could result in the end-use control of energy producing natural resources; and

"3. The members and officers of the Kansas Oil Men's Association be and are hereby authorized to cooperate with and lend whatever support may be necessary to the National Oil Jobbers Council and its general counsel to carry out and effectuate the policies of this resolution; and

"4. The officers, directors and legislative committees of the National Oil Jobbers Council are urged to do whatever is deemed necessary to make known and effectuate these resolutions and policies of the Kansas Oil Men's Association."

The Persecution of Jews in Rumania by the Soviet Puppet Communist Regime

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 10, 1954

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, the appended survey of the Jewist situation in Rumania was issued by the American Jewish Congress as a white paper exposing the mass arrests, secret trials, and cruel punishments of Jewish leaders in Rumania by the Soviet puppet Communist regime. The facts thus revealed point to a deliberate effort on the part of the Rumunian Communist authorities to extirpate all vestiges of Jewish communal and spiritual life in that country:

THE PERSECUTION OF JEWS IN RUMANIA

Four years ago, about 150 Jews in Rumania, from various walks of life but sharing one feature in common—their prominence in the communal life of Rumanian Jewry—vanished from their families and communities. Only recently has the world received news of their fate. It develops that these men and women had been languishing in Rumanian jails, incommunicado and ignorant of the charge under which they were held. Later they were reassembled in groups and brought before secret tribunals to hear sentences imposed on them ranging from 3 months to life imprisonment. In these trials, the defendants were informed that their penalties were the price they had to pay for an assortment of crimes: Zionist activities and propaganda efforts to assist in the illegal emigration from Rumania, contacts with the Israel Legation, communication with the World Jewish Congress and Zionist organizations in foreign countries, and distribution of funds supplied by the Israel Legation in Bucharest.

The purpose of this paper is to present the situation of the Jews in postwar Rumania, to show the progressive deterioration of this Jewish community, culminating in the arrests and trials of the leadership of Rumanian Jewry, and to expose the bankruptcy of Rumanian justice, as manifested in these trials.

AFTER WORLD WAR II

At the outbreak of World War II there were about 850,000 Jews in the kingdom of Rumania. Despite the uncertainty of their fate from day to day, brought about by Rumania's shameless anti-Semitic policy pursued between the two wars, the Jews of Rumania somehow clung to the hope that better days would come. These hopes were shattered when the puppet regime of Antonescu gained control. This regime, which looked to the Third Reich for its political and spiritual guidance, eagerly cooperated with the Nazi regime in applying to Rumanian Jewry the whole complex of Nazi laws aimed at the total annihilation of the Jewish people. However, due to a combination of circumstances, the tempo of the liquidation of Rumanian Jewry was slower than it was in other countries which came under the Nazi domination, with the result that slightly less than half of Rumanian Jewry survived the war. Thus, with the single exception of Jewry in the Soviet Union itself, Rumanian Jewry—numbering between 390,000 and 420,000—emerged at the end of hostilities as the largest Jewish community on the European Continent.

The war ended in Rumania in 1944. Traditionally sanguine, many Jews in Rumania felt that it was possible for them to rehabilitate their lives in their accustomed surroundings and to reconstruct the organizational life of the Rumanian Jewish community. It was their belief, combined with the distaste for communism—albeit many Jews of Rumania found refuge in Soviet Russia during the war—which persuaded the 50,000 of the 51,000 Jewish survivors of Bessarabia and Northern Bucovina (parts of prewar Rumania ceded to the Soviet Union), to choose Rumanian citizenship when given that option in 1945.

At the outset, the optimism seemed justified by a succession of official acts on the part of the Rumanian Government. Thus a royal decree of August 31, 1944, placed Jews on equal political footing with all other citizens; a new nationality law recognized the Jews of Rumania as a separate nationality; and in 1945, there was some restitution of property of which the Jews were deprived by confiscatory measures adopted by the former regime. Moreover, the economic situation offered promise of a prosperity which would enable the Jews to recoup some of their losses (estimated at $1 billion).

Not all Jews shared the hope of reestablishing themselves in Rumania. Many, haunted by the bitter memories associated with the fate suffered by the 350,000 Jews who had lost their life in Rumania during Rumania's active partnership with Hitler Germany, were not impressed with the bait thrown out to the Jews. They had lost faith in the Rumanian people and were determined to make a complete break with their past in Rumania. These people and those who returned from the concentration camps completely destitute, and who had met with frustration in their early attempt to gain an economic foothold in postwar Rumania, looked westward for their future. Thus, in a 10-month period, from April 1947 to February 1948, about 20,000 Rumanian Jews entered the United States zone of occupation in Austria. They felt that under the protective care of the United States military forces they would be safe, and that from the United States military forces they would eventually continue their way to permanent destinations. The irrepressible desire on the part of a substantial fraction of Rumanian Jewry to make new beginnings elsewhere can be best gaged by the fact that, despite increasing difficulties attending escape, about 175,000 Jews left Rumania in the postwar period. Of these, the overwhelming majority—about 150,000—found new life in the State of Israel. The remainder secured refuge in Western Europe, principally in France.

The Jews who remained in Rumania, aware of their comparatively large numerical strength, lost no time in laying the foundation for the reconstruction of Jewish communal life in Rumania. As early as October 13, 1944, the first conference of Jewish communities in Rumania was held. Religious life soon began to reassert itself in the reestablishment of hundreds of synagogues; Jewish schools, libraries, and 2 Yiddish theaters (in Bucharest and in Jassy) were organized or recreated; 16 Jewish weeklies served the reading requirements of the people; and the traditional Jewish consideration for the social needs within the community found expression in the restoration of a network of charitable institutions, such as hospitals, orphanages, and homes for the aged. Finally, a dynamic Zionist movement, embracing virtually the whole of Rumanian Jewry, and numbering in its component parties and youth organizations no less than 108,000 members, was reactivated.

THE STORM GATHERS

Parallel with the revival of Jewish life in Rumania, a process was going on in the country generally, which was common to all countries that had been occupied by the advancing Soviet armies, namely, the gradual but inevitable integration of the country into the Communist system. This process manifested itself in every facet of the political and social life of the country. Insofar as the Jewish community was concerned, the process was reflected in the attempt on the part of the Jewish Democratic Committee, a Communist-oriented organization, founded in September 1945 with the view of serving as the official mouthpiece of the regime in Jewish affairs, to gain complete hegemony over Rumanian Jewry. The committee sought to achieve this end by infringing upon the rights and activities of all other organized Jewish groups which represented the vast majority of Rumanian Jewry.

Rumania emerged from the rigged general elections of March 28, 1948, in which the Workers' Party received 90 percent of the votes cast, as a full-fledged Communist state, with all the customary trappings, including the single-party system. The same year, the central committee of the Workers' Party adopted a caustically worded resolution against Zionism. This precipitate reversal of official policy toward Zionism was accompanied by a campaign of violent anti-Zionist propaganda, going to such lengths as to maintain that in Israel Jewish children were being sold as slaves to Jewish capitalists. Other assaults on Jewish organized life followed. Thus, the charitable institutions as well as the schools which had been restored with substantial Jewish help from abroad, principally with the cooperation of the American Joint Distribution Committee, were nationalized.

Like all non-Communist parties and movements in the Communist-dominated states, the Rumanian Jewish organizations could not long withstand the pressures for their dissolution. First, the Union of Rumanian Jews, the traditional stronghold of Rumanian Jewry, then the Jewish Party, and finally, the Zionist Organization of Rumania, decided to dissolve. The Zionist Organization went out of existence on December 23, 1948, while the hachsharot (training camps for prospective young settlers in Israel) clung on to life for a few additional months. On March 8, 1949, a date generally recognized as the formal end of Jewish survivalist activities, the hachsharot saw their end. Only a disintegrating religious life remained. While official Rumanian sources claim that at present there are hundreds of synagogues open in Rumania and that Rumanian Jewry is served by more than 100 rabbis, other sources indicate that the number of Jewish spiritual leaders in the entire country has shrunk to 30. The gradual destruction of organized Jewish life was the prelude to its final blow administered by the regime in the imprisonment and trial of the leaders of Rumanian Jewry.

THE WAVE OF TRIALS

Some time in 1950, over 150 leaders of Jewish life in Rumania were arrested and hurled into Rumanian prisons. In spite of all efforts from abroad to secure their release, or at least to learn the nature of the accusations against them, the fate of the prisoners remained a secret until several months ago. The veil of secrecy shrouding these men and women was first lifted in the fall of 1953 when a trial of six leaders of the former Zionist Revisionist Party in Rumania was held and the sentences were announced. The men tried and convicted, all members of the former Zionist Revisionist Party in Rumania, were E. Kanner, Solomon Shitnowitzer, Pacus Schechter (or Schechtel), Jancu Tabacaru, A. Horowitz, and Jean Cernauteanu. They received sentences ranging from 10 to 18 years of imprisonment.

A second trial, held in November 1953, was against two prominent leaders of the Rumanian section of the World Jewish Congress, namely, Jean A. Littman and Mrs. Susanne Benvenisti. They were sentenced to 15 and 10 years of imprisonment, repectively. According to reports which reached other countries at that time, a third person was involved in that trial, about whose identity or fate nothing could be learned.

In March 1954, after a lull of a few months, secret trials were started against more than a hundred Zionist leaders. The free world has learned of only three of these trials. However, it can be assumed that other proceedings against members of this group of a hundred defendants have either been held, or are currently in progress, or will eventually take place.

The three secret trials, about which at least the names of the defendants and the sentences are known, are the following:

A trial against leaders of the Zionist movement in Rumania including A. L. Zissu, the courageous leader during the Nazi occupation and former head of the Jewish Party as well as of the Zionist Organization of Rumania; Dr. Mishu Benvenisti, former president of the Zionist Organization; and Jean Cohn, former chairman of the WJC Rumanian section. These three were all sentenced to life imprisonment. At the same trial, three other defendants, receiving prison terms of 20 years, were: Mrs. Melli Jancu, former chairman of the Rumanian Committee of OSE; Moshe Weiss, a leader of Zionist youth, and Mishu Moshkowitz (ky), a journalist and former employee of the Israel legation in Bucharest.

A second secret trial directed against 22 members of Hashomer Harzair and distinguished by the courageous statement which the principal defendant, Abir Mark, made before the court. He said that the aim of his organization was to help the State of Israel and to further the ingathering of the exiles into that state. "For this reason," he exclaimed, "you have imprisoned dozens of my Zionist friends and colleagues and have tortured and killed in prison many of our comrades. These crimes will never be forgotten." This defiant statement in all likelihood, explains why Mr. Mark was given 20 years imprisonment, the most severe sentence administered among the group with which he was tried.

A third secret trial just concluded, involving 40 Zionist leaders, among them 6 women. The best known and most prominent among them are Dr. Cornel Jancu, a former deputy chairman of the World Federation of General Zionists (according to some reports received. Dr. Jancŭ has meanwhile died); Dr. Bernard Rohrlich, a former president of the Zionist Federation of Rumania; Leon Itzcar, former chairman of the Jewish National Fund and other Jewish institutions in Rumania; Dr. Theodor Lowenstein, well-known philosopher and Jewish historian; and Dan Ishanu, former chairman of the Zionist Labor Party Poale Zion. Further reports indicate that other trials against Zionist leaders are at present conducted in provincial towns, in contrast to the preceding trials which took place in the capital city of Bucharest.

In addition to these major trials, accounts of which have filtered across the Rumanian borders, there are reports of sentences pronounced in Bucharest on September 14, 1953 against 19 defendants, all of whom are from the ranks of the Zionist leadership in Rumania. Sentenced to terms of imprisonment ranging from 5 to 12 years, the accused are said to have included A. Argintaru, Leon Winshtein, S. Drimer, Isaac Permo, Jacob Rosenblatt and Leiba Grossman. Three other Jewish leaders, Stephan Kraus, Ludovic Gardos, and Moshe Weissberg, were sentenced at the end of 1953 to various terms of imprisonment. At this trial, three codefendants were acquitted. It is also reported that the Chief Rabbi of Arad, Dr. Miklos Feinfeld, reputed to have served as government appointed member of the National Board for the Jewish Religion, was arrested in December 1953. Unverified reports speak further of the arrest of at least 200 Jews in the second half of 1953.

As indicated at the outset, at the trials the prosecution charged the defendants with engaging in Zionist activties and propaganda, with participation in secret meetings, with efforts to encourage and assist in the illegal emigration from Rumania, with establishing and maintaining contacts with the Israel Legation, with maintaining contacts with the World Jewish Congress, and with the distribution of funds supplied by the Israeli Legation in Bucharest. Some of the defendants were even accused of having been supporters of nazism during the war years. The defendants were provided with counsel, in some cases Jewish, in others non-Jewish, all of them, however, either members of the Communist Party or faithful supporters of the regime.

EVALUATION OF THE TRIALS

To gain a true perspective of the trials, it is essential to bear in mind that when the defendants were engaged in Zionist activities and in maintaining contacts with other Jewish communities, they were engaged in work which was perfectly legal and which had either the expressed or tacit approval of the Rumanian Government. With respect to Zionism, it need only be recalled that at the end of 1945, a declaration of the highest competent authority, namely, the Rumanian Minister of the Interior, reaffirmed the legality of Zionism in Rumania. This declaration asserted that the Zionist movement was "a legally constituted body enjoying the same rights as all other groups." This is no less true of the close and fraternal relations which Rumanian Jewry rapidly reestablished with fellow Jews abroad after Rumania emerged from the darkness of the Hitler period.

Thus, at the end of November 1944, only a few weeks after the first conference of Jewish communities in Rumania was convened, the Rumanian section of the World Jewish Congress held a conference. This conference, attended by 60 delegates from all parts of the county, with the knowledge and sanction of the Rumanian authorities, was the clearest manifestation on the part of Rumanian Jewry that it regarded itself spiritually linked with the Jewish communities throughout the world. From that date until March 1949, when under government pressure it was closed, the Rumanian section of the World Jewish Congress was one of the most active constituents of the World Jewish Congress. Representatives of all political parties, including Communists, participated in the local activities of this affiliated body.

As late as the summer of 1948, at the second plenary assembly of the World Jewish Congress held in Montreux, Switzerland, Rumanian Jewry was represented by 11 delegates, including not only the then chairman of the Rumanian section, Dr. M. Benvenisti, (who, as noted above was sentenced to life imprisonment), but also the chief rabbi of Rumania, Rosen, and three members of the Rumanian Parliament (which by that time had become a Communist body), namely, Bercu Feldman, S. Leibovici, and E. Manolescu. The pro-Zionist orientation of the World Jewish Congress and of all its constituent bodies is common knowledge and was certainly known to the Rumanian authorities. Moreover, among the resolutions which received unanimous approval at the Montreux Assembly was one expressing the unequivocal support of Israel on the part of the World Jewish Congress. The Rumanian delegates, with the knowledge and consent of the Rumanian Government, participated in the adoption of this resolution.

CONCLUSIONS

A mere recital of the facts exposes the hollowness of the charges against the leaders of Rumanian Jewry. There is not a scintilla of evidence that any of these victims committed any act hostile to Rumania or in violation of its laws. Conduct which is legal when performed cannot become an offense by the mere passing of time. The ex post facto character of the charges against the leaders of Rumanian Jewry is repugnant to every system of law based on rational principles of justice.

It is apparent that the trials of the leaders of Rumanian Jewry are designed by the Rumanian authorities to obliterate the last vestiges of the spiritual autonomy of the Jewish community and to cut off all contact between the Jews in Rumania and their fellow Jews in other parts of the world.

The implications of the arrests, sham trials and cruel sentences involving the leaders of Rumanian Jewry are such as to strike terror in the heart of the individual Jew in Rumania and to underscore the sad plight of Rumanian Jewry as a spiritual entity. If the persons convicted are guilty of crimes, every Jew in Rumania who was at any time identified with either the Zionist movement, the World Jewish Congress, or any other Jewish organization abroad—and virtually every Jew had such connections—must live in daily fear of sharing personally the fate of his leaders. The trials strike at the very roots of the one East European Jewish community which, though exposed to the Hitler tyranny, miraculously managed to survive in numbers large enough to offer some promise of being reconstituted. Having outlived the terror of the Nazi ordeal, this hapless Jewish community now finds itself in the position where, robbed of its leadership, its spiritual survival is mortally imperilled.

The Jewish people will not accept the decisions of the Rumanian authorities which, in effect, spell the final dissolution of Rumanian Jewry as a spiirtual and cultural entity. And because the decisions are both cruel and unjust, the civilized world must not accept them. It must make its protest heard until Rumania desists from its callous treatment of the leaders of Rumanian Jewry and restores to the imprisoned leaders their personal freedom and the opportunity to work in the spiritual interests of their fellow Jews.

Dairying's Hump

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. THYE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 22, 1954

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, the dairy industry faces a number of problems with relation to needed changes in existing laws and Government policies, both State and Federal, quite apart from the question of the level of price supports. Mr. Alfred D. Stedman, associate editor of the St. Paul Pioneer Press, and an expert on agricultural problems, has cited some of these factors in an article entitled "Dairying's Hump," which appeared in the Pioneer Press on June 13.

I ask unanimous consent that the article by Mr. Stedman be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DAIRYING'S HUMP

(Alfred D. Stedman)

Not the advance in dairy methods, which has been revolutionary, but the slow change in the law to fit that progress looks like Midwest dairying's biggest hump. And this seems the time to tell the story of contrasts between the advancing techniques and lags in the law.

For this is June Dairy Month when the program for promoting use of dairy surpluses is at its height. Minnesota and Wisconsin farmers lead the Nation in financing that self-help effort. And they are backing it by offering consumers nutritious milk and its products at the lowest prices in years. Let's look first at dairying's progress.

In the old days, the dairyman got out and got under; now in a milking parlor he attaches a sterilized milking machine. Then milk crocks in cellar, cave, or well were the cooler; now it's a refrigerated milkhouse. Then the herd was a few scrub cows and a bull, with by-guess-and-by-gosh methods of judging production and costs; now the herd is built by fine sires through artificial breeding, with tests and accounting of production and costs.

Then the dairyman peddled milk in town or churned butter at home; now it is scientifically handled in milk plants or dairies. Then unpasteurized milk from sick herds could spread disease; now tuberculosis is cleaned up, brucellosis is being cleaned up, milk must be clean and safe and plants must pasteurize all milk they sell.

Of course, those and other transformations in dairy techniques have been achieved with the aid of law. But in some respects the law is still a laggard. Where is the lag and what can Midwest dairying do about it?

Cheese, for instance, is of great potential importance to Minnesota dairying and to all business and labor that depend on dairying for markets or employment. But the law hasn't yet waked up to the fact.

For while Americans have been cutting their average use of butter in half, their use of cheese has gone up nearly 80 percent since 1932. And now Wisconsin, that has run rings around us as a cheese producer, is swinging more and more into fluid-milk production. Minnesota, whose cheesemakers are of the best and whose output has risen in 20 years from 10 million to about 50 million pounds, looks like a big-scale goal for migrating cheese businesses.

But the Minnesota personal-property tax law impedes. For the best cheese must be held for curing. And, unlike Wisconsin's, the Minnesota law directly penalizes the production of aged cheese by taxing any being held for curing over the May 1 assessment date.

Butter is another case in point. Halting its declining use is a main concern of this top butter State. Most Minnesota butter is excellent. A Minnesota fight has gone on for years for enforced grades that would spot for consumers any bad butter made in or coming into this State, as Wisconsin soon starts to do. But Minnesota's fight remains to be won. And the United States Government, buying only good butter for itself, does not enforce that rule of quality for private citizens. So the laws let a minor fraction of bad butter go on losing customers for Minnesota's No. 1 dairy product.

Worst of all is the lag in overhauling the State, municipal, and Federal laws or rules that continue to ban the Midwest's cheaper milk from high-priced cities, especially of the East and South. These ignore scientific advances in producing, refrigerating, concentrating, and transporting pure milk. The resulting high prices in those areas squeeze milk consumption there and pile up surpluses that wreck prices here in the Midwest. The pending Andresen bill would abolish those barriers. Enactment of that bill, the outlawing of bad butter and Minnesota tax reform for cheese should help our dairying over the hump.

Civil Air Patrol Cadet Exchange Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT P. MORANO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 1954

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like at this time to commend the Civil Air Patrol, an auxiliary of the United States Air Force, for the fine international exchange program now going into its seventh year. This program is a great instrument for the development of international understanding and goodwill among nations.

This year the State of Connecticut has been selected by the national headquarters of Civil Air Patrol to entertain five Italian aviation cadets and two senior escorts of the Republic of Italy. These Italian airmen will visit the Connecticut wing during the week of July 29–August 7.

In view of this important event, I would like to insert the following statement recently issued by Capt. Arthur Lenzi, project officer of the Connecticut wing, Civil Air Patrol:

SEVENTH ANNUAL INTERNATIONAL CIVIL AIR PATROL CADET EXCHANGE PROGRAM

To promote international understanding, and thus serve the cause of peace, the Civil Air Patrol has included among its cadet activities an ambitious exchange program to give outstanding air-minded youth of each participating country an opportunity to observe the life and institutions of other nations at first hand; a chance for each to see for himself what sort of people his neighbors are and, equally important, to show them what sort of people we are.

This year over 150 Civil Air Patrol cadets will go abroad for 2 weeks, with all but minor expenses paid, to see the historic spots about which they have read in their school books and newspapers, to live with and get to know the youth of another country, and to hear what they have to say about us. A like number of air cadets from 20 participating countries, meanwhile, simultaneously will be given similar tours in the United States by the Civil Air Patrol.

We have many things in common with our visitors from Italy. Chief among them is our common interest in aviation. The air age demands that we look more and more to the skies for social, economic and political impacts that will affect our daily living for centuries to come. In the air lies the security of much of our free civilization.

The Civil Air Patrol is grateful to those individuals and organizations who reflect the highest spirit of self-sacrifice in the cause of aviation and international goodwill by their assistance in this program in honor of the visiting cadets.

We are sure that the foreign cadets who are guests of the Civil Air Patrol and the United States Air Force will all return to their homes with new conceptions of the world we live in; with a new understanding of the citizens of our country and with new friendships, many of which may endure for a lifetime.

Comparing Legislative Records

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 1954

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I herewith append an article by Roscoe Drummond, Washington correspondent, New York Herald Tribune. This article is syndicated in other papers throughout the country. Mr. Drummond sets out a number of measures indicating that President Eisenhower's legislative program is moving along toward full enactment. This is something that most of us here in the House have known for many weeks. The House is up to date on all of its legislation. The list of accomplishments which Mr. Drummond sets out in his article is impressive by any standards and the article is appended herewith in full:

COMPARING LEGISLATIVE RECORDS: EISENHOWER GETTING MORE ACTION OUT OF CONGRESS THAN TRUMAN DID

(By Roscoe Drummond)

WASHINGTON.—The President's legislative program is, on balance, looking up. Several important pieces of it—social security, public housing, tax reform—have lately moved along toward enactment.

It is too early to estimate what will pass and what will be lost in the remaining weeks of this Congress. Anything can happen in the closing days, even in the closing hours of a Congress eager to get home.

But there is one judgment which now seems amply visible and which deserves to be brought into focus. It is this:

Regardless of what percentage of Mr. Eisenhower's program is passed, defeated, or deferred, the President is getting through this Congress as much significant new domestic legislation as his predecessors achieved at any session during the past 14 years—possibly more.

Relative to all the President wanted, the results which he wins from this Congress may or may not look good. It remains to be seen. It is still undecided.

But relative to what other recent Presidents have won from Congress, by way of significant new domestic legislation—either in a 1-year or a 2-year session, Mr. Eisenhower's legislative achievements now look as though they will be substantial, truly substantial—without anything to outmatch them in more than a decade.

Here are the parts of the President's program which seem reasonably secure:

Social security: Increased payments and extension of coverage to take in 10 million more persons.

Unemployment compensation: 6 million more citizens to be covered.

Housing: Decisive Senate approval, including authority to subsidize 35,000 public housing units, greatly increases the prospect that this legislation will emerge from House-Senate conference about as the President asked.

Tax reform: A massive and monumental overhauling and updating of the tax structure with considerable relief to the taxpayer and downward revision of excise taxes.

Highways: Expanded highway construction program passed by both Houses.

St. Lawrence seaway: Sought by every President since Woodrow Wilson, finally passed by both Houses.

Public health: Bill for Federal reinsurance of health plans and federally-assisted building of medical facilities still has fair chance of enactment at this session.

I am not arguing that this is a monumental record as it now stands.

I am simply saying—and I think it deserves to be said—that it equals, perhaps even exceeds anything which either President Roosevelt or President Truman accomplished over a similar period in their last 12 years of office.

In appraising the 1954 congressional record, not in comparison with what Mr. Eisenhower asked for but in comparison with what other recent Presidents have obtained, it is useful to bear in mind that only one new, major piece of "New Deal-Fair Deal" domestic social-reform legislation was enacted after 1938, namely, the Public Housing law of 1947.

Mr. Truman did get substantial legislation in the social security and housing fields.

Throughout the 1952 campaign Mr. Eisenhower pledged himself to retain all and expand some of the New Deal social legislation.

By the time this session ends, it will be evident, I think, that as much, if not more, social humanitarian legislation will have come from this Republican Congress as from any of its predecessors in a long, long time.

The Late Honorable Joseph R. Farrington

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN W. BYRNES

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 21, 1954

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I wish to express my personal sorrow in the passing of my friend and colleague the Honorable Joseph Farrington, the Delegate from Hawaii.

He was certainly a friend to all who knew him. Kindness, tolerance, graciousness, and sincerity marked Joe Farrington as a man who was an inspiration to us all.

We who come from Wisconsin feel a special loss at his passing because there was a bit of Wisconsin in the Delegate from Hawaii. He was a graduate of the University of Wisconsin.

Hawaii and the country has lost one of its finest statesmen.

To Joe Farrington's family I wish to express my sincerest sympathy. Although consolations are small at a time like this, they can be sure that Joe will long be remembered with deepest respect.

The President's Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 17, 1954

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to direct the attention of our colleagues to the following editorial which appeared in the June 11, 1954, issue of the New York Times:

THE PRESIDENT'S PROGRAM

President Eisenhower went to the Nation last evening in an attempt to arouse interest in and support for his legislative program. He has already said that he could not conceive of anything more important to the United States today than its enactment, and there is no doubt that the President means it. He has also said that unless the Republican Party can put on the statute books a progressive, dynamic program of the type he has suggested, then it does not deserve to remain in power.

For some months we have watched with increasing concern the slow progress of significant legislation in Congress. As Washington is only too well aware, this is an election year; but the Republican leadership cannot afford to permit Congress to adjourn without a great deal more substantial accomplishment than has already been recorded. It is true that matters of importance have actually been enacted and that others are on the way; and it is also true that there is a tendency in the Senate, at least, to defer until the latter part of the session consideration of the more controversial matters. But the fact remains that there is still a great deal to do, and it must be done with relative speed if it is going to be done this year at all.

What has been accomplished? The most important enactments thus far have been passage of the St. Lawrence seaway bill, revision of excise taxes, and postponement of reductions in the corporate income tax. Federal aid for highway construction, authorization of an Air Force Academy, approval of the Korean defense treaty, and increase in borrowing power for the Commodity Credit Corporation just about complete this unimpressive list, except for an appropriation bill or two.

What may be moving toward accomplishment? The remaining appropriation bills will, of course, be passed, though when and in what form nobody now can say. The major legislative achievement that seems almost certain of success is extension of Social Security, which has been approved in the House and will doubtless receive favorable consideration in the Senate. The fundamental revision of the internal revenue laws that passed the House in March has been under careful consideration in the Senate Finance Committee and should be ready for the floor before the end of the month. A major obstacle in revision of the Atomic Energy Act has just been surmounted. Authorization for the foreign-aid program is in the works. The housing bill is in conference, but with a world of difference—so far as public housing is concerned—between Senate and House versions. A one-year extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, a pale version of what the President wants, will probably go through.

What, at this writing, seems difficult of accomplishment or not likely of accomplishment at all? Revision of the Taft-Hartley Act is regrettably dead for the session, and so is lowering of the voting age to 18, which is not so regrettable. Hawaiian statehood is in suspended animation, and prospects for its revival are not good. The President's flexible farm-price program is in deep trouble; but if he stands firm, as we sincerely hope and believe he will, he can prevent continuation of the unrealistic and destructive rigid price-support system that now prevails. Various health and welfare bills are in a doubtful state. A proposal to raise the debt ceiling is still tied down in the Senate. The wiretap bill, containing essential judicial safeguards, has passed only the House. Home rule for the District of Columbia has got nowhere. There has been no concrete move on the part of the leadership to enforce general rules of procedure for congressional investigating committees, though action here is sorely needed.

Clearly, Congress still has a long way to go before it can claim a respectable record of achievement. The responsibility is that of the Republican leadership, even though it will of course be necessary to pick up Democratic votes on every bill. And time is really growing short.

Parity Price Only Part of Farm Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. THYE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 22, 1954

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, a great deal has been said by metropolitan newspapers editors and national magazines about the farm program. I think we need to give consideration, also, to the views of people in the rural areas which would be most immediately affected by any action that would tend to create a further downward trend in the income of farmers.

A leading newspaper editor and publisher in Minnesota, Mr. Clifford Russell, of the Mankato Free Press, recently wrote for his newspaper an editorial which is thought-provoking, and which, in my opinion, presents an accurate picture of the agricultural situation in the light of pending legislation in Congress.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial entitled "Parity Price Only Part of Farm Issue," which appeared in the Mankato Free Press on June 12, be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PARITY PRICE ONLY PART OF FARM ISSUE

It is doubtful if President Eisenhower would carry out the implied threat which some observers have read into his address to Young Republicans this week, to veto any farm bill which carries fixed farm support prices of 85 to 90 percent.

There are too many points and issues in the President's complete legislative program, on which he has already yielded ground, for him to consistently maintain an adamant position on this question of farm price supports. Granted, as he says, that accumulating surpluses create a constantly growing problem, still there is no proof that a resort to flexible supports will appreciably or immediately lower these surpluses.

The basic need is to set in motion a program which will reduce these surpluses, through some method of disposing of them; which will insure stable and even declining prices of the things the farmer must buy so he can accommodate himself to a lowered income; which will open and expand the channels of foreign trade so that agriculture can look to larger markets abroad for disposing of its products, thus keeping production in balance with demand when the flexible price program eventually becomes operative.

Thus far Congress has not provided, nor has the President insistently demanded, the other essentials which go with his proposed farm program.

Great economies have been made in the cost of operating the Government, still the budget is not in balance and the grave international crisis may mean another round of inflation rather than the early realization of a balanced budget. Until the inflation threat abates the farmer fears higher rather than lower prices for the things he must buy. He wants the present floor under prices for his products until that danger is past.

Nothing constructive has been done to dispose of existing surpluses. They might be used as part of our "aid" program abroad, but Congress is more interested in cutting such assistance than in expanding it—this is a fading hope rather than a possible reality, in the solution of the farm program. An expanded and more liberal tariff program might improve the market for farm crops abroad, over the long pull. Still the best that seems likely to pass Congress is an extension of existing tariff legislation for another year. Here again, the tendency of the lawmakers is to limit rather than to extend authority to lower tariffs—the farmer's potential market would be shrunk accordingly.

All down the line the President has been forced to, and has agreed to compromise his full program on the points mentioned. Each of these compromises adds to the complexities of a long range and sound solution of the farm program. Granting that flexible price supports are desirable, and unquestionably inevitable in any long-range economic program, still they are only a part of the whole. When Congress adopts a complete, well-rounded economic program, in which the farmer can safely accommodate himself to flexible supports, he will readily accept such changes as part of a new and sounder economic order.

Until that time, agriculture cannot safely be compelled to go all the way in such adjustments, while other segments of the economy make little or no contribution to a new and changed economic order.

Health Reinsurance Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 1954

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, many of my colleagues in the House have asked me whether or not the insurance companies favored the President's health reinsurance legislation. Some of the major companies have taken the occasion to write me on the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce as to their position. I have just received a letter from Paul F. Clark, president of the John Hancock Mutual Life Insurance Co., with reference to the position of that company on the health reinsurance program. The House will note that this company wholeheartedly supports the bill to implement the President's reinsurance legislation. The letter is herewith appended in full:

JOHN HANCOCK
MUTUAL LIFE INSURANCE CO.,
Boston, Mass., June 10, 1954.

Re administration health reinsurance plan, S. 3114 and H. R. 8356

Hon. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER,
House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN SPRINGER: We in this company thought that the members of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce might be interested in our position on the administration's reinsurance legislation.

On May 17, 1954, I joined with other life insurance people, after the White House conference, in favoring the general objectives of this proposed legislation. In subsequent correspoudence with the White House and at the request of the administration, I pointed out two areas in which the bills could be improved. First, a provision should be inserted that stated nothing in the bill should limit the jurisdiction of any State or of its supervisory officials over insurance; and, second, it should be made clear that the legislation in no way contemplated the further introduction of the Federal Government in the insurance business, even inadvertently.

Since then, we have had the opportunity of examining the modifications suggested by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and I am happy to say that these specific points have been adequately covered. It is our belief that life insurance companies can find in this legislation assistance for their effort to extend this coverage.

Accordingly, this company wholeheartedly supports the bill to implement the administration's reinsurance legislation.

Sincerely yours,

PAUL F. CLARK, *President.*

Segregation and the Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. TUCK

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 1954

Mr. TUCK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a very able and timely editorial which appeared on June 17, 1954, in the Richmond News Leader, a newspaper published in the city of Richmond, Va. The editor of this newspaper, Mr. James Jackson Kilpatrick, is a courageous and dexterous journalist.

The editorial is as follows:

SEGREGATION AND THE LAW

When the United States Supreme Court handed down its opinion in the school segregation case, just 1 month ago today, a long line of judicial interpretation apparently was wiped out. Yet the extent of the Court's turnabout is perhaps not widely understood, and some of this judicial history is worth recalling in order to buttress an observation that seems to us valid.

In 1897, in the famous case of *Plessy* v. *Ferguson*, the Supreme Court had this to say: "Laws permitting, and even requiring, their separation (of the two races) in places where they are liable to be brought into contact do not necessarily imply the inferiority of either race to the other, and have been generally, if not universally, recognized as within the competency of the State legislature in the exercise of their police power. The most common instance of this is connected with the establishment of separate schools for white and colored children, which has been held to be a valid exercise of the legislative power even by courts of States where the political rights of the colored race have been longest and most earnestly enforced."

Thirty years later, in the case of *Gong Lum* v. *Rice*, the court had this to say of Mississippi's refusal to admit a Chinese girl to a white school: "We cannot say that this action * * * was, within the meaning of the 14th amendment, a denial * * * of the equal process of the law. * * * The education of the people in schools maintained by State taxation is a matter belonging to the respective States. * * * The right and power of the State to regulate the method of providing for the education of its youth at public expense is clear. * * * The decision is within the discretion of the State in regulating its public schools and does not conflict with the 14th amendment."

That opinion in *Gong Lum* v. *Rice*, incidentally, was written by Mr. Justice Taft for a unanimous Court that included such great justices as Holmes, Van Deventer, Brandeis, Stone, McReynolds, Sutherland, Butler, and Sanford. This same view of the police power of the States was affirmed in a dozen other decisions of the Supreme Court and in no fewer than 59 decisions of the highest State and Territorial courts over a period of more than 100 years.

Now, it might apear that a unanimous Court in 1954 had wholly reversed everything that was said by a unanimous Court in 1927. When Chief Justice Warren said flatly that "we conclude that in the field of public education, the doctrine of 'separate but equal' has no place," he was taking the Court, beyond question, in a brand-new direction.

Yet it is not a mere grasping at straws to suggest that many of the legal principles enunciated by the Court in the past, going to the ancient doctrine of a State's "police power," remain untouched by the opinion of May 17. It would be sheer defeatism to accept the notion that in one stroke the high Court wiped out all local discretion in the administration of public schools. If the police power of the States as to public education has been restricted, it has not been eliminated.

And it is in this field—in the remaining police power of the States—that we believe a solution to the grave problems of public education in the South can be found. The localities still can regulate private schools; they still can regulate enrollment districts; they still can regulate the employment of teachers and principals; they still have the right to put education on a voluntary, and not a compulsory, basis.

This newspaper has not abandoned hope, by any means, that an effective segregation of the races in public education still can be mantained in vast areas of the South where the majority of the people wish it maintained. Neither have we abandoned our firm conviction that such a policy is in the long-range best interests of the white and Negro races.

Moral Issues of "Right To Work" Bills

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROY W. WIER

OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 22, 1954

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a statement of the New Orleans archdiocesan unit of the Catholic Committee of the South, appearing in the AFL News-Reporter, Washington, D. C., Friday, June 18, 1954, entitled "Moral Issues of 'Right To Work' Bills."

The statement follows:

MORAL ISSUES OF "RIGHT TO WORK" BILLS

The current session of the Louisiana State Legislature is faced with many important problems. But none is more important, none more controversial than the proposed statute known as the "right to work" bill. If this bill were concerned merely with technical matters, it would not be proper for such an organization as the Catholic Committee of the South to enter the controversy. But grave moral issues are involved. Hence we feel justified in discussing the ethical aspects of this subject.

The principal contention of those advocating the passage of the "right to work" bill is that no worker should be required to be a member of the organized labor movement in order to obtain or to retain employment. This requirement, so they argue, is an unnecessary and dangerous restriction of a freedom fundamental to American citizenship.

They assert that they are not opposed to unions as such, but that the closed shop and the union shop provisions in a labor contract conflict with the individual freedom of a worker to exercise his right to work where and how he pleases. Therefore, the argument continues, in order to protect a worker against infringement upon his free access to a job, compulsory unionism should be prohibited by law.

The foregoing paragraph gives us, we believe, a fair summary of the position of the advocates of the right to work bill. On first glance this position seems unassailable. But upon deeper examination certain serious weaknesses appear.

In the first place, there is no such thing as unlimited freedom. Freedom to be genuine must be exercised within reasonable limits. These limits are determined by the natural moral law, which has the exact same validity in economic relations as in every other phase of human activity.

Thus in the exercise of freedom of contract by which an employer and a worker agree on wages, hours of work, and working conditions, the terms of the contract must be in accord with the demands of morality. And there is always underlying such agreements an element of natural justice, and one greater and more ancient than the free consent of contracting parties, namely, that the wage and other conditions of work be such as to conform with the intrinsic dignity of the human personality, which is as sacred in one person as in another.

If, compelled by necessity or moved by fear of a worse evil, a worker accepts a harder condition, which although against his will he must accept because the employer imposes it, he certainly submits to force against which justice cries out in protest. Freedom of contract then is not absolute. It is conditioned by, among other things, the moral necessity of fulfilling the demands of justice and charity. And so, too, with the right to work.

The associations of workers called trade unions are dedicated to safeguarding and advancing the common interests of their members. Such organizations would seem to have an altogether indispensable role to play in the proper ordering and integrating of human labor in modern economic life. An individual's right to work then may not be exercised in disregard of the needs of the common good of these workers' organizations.

If unions are to perform effectively their highly important function, the requirements of their common good must be recognized. In existing circumstances, therefore, may not closed-shop and union-shop provisions be among these requirements? The archdiocesan unit of the Catholic Committee of the South would say "Yes" to that question. Consequently we hold that it would be unwise to prohibit these provisions as a matter of public policy.

Another consideration has caught our serious attention. It is a fact that already the proposed right-to-work bill has become a symbol of bitter struggle between organized management and organized labor in our State, which up to now has enjoyed an enviable degree of industrial peace.

Thus this bill is setting class against class. It should be plain for all to see that the desperately sought-for unity of human society cannot be founded on an opposition of classes; no more than can the right ordering of economic life be left to an unrestricted competition of forces. The whole free world longs for peace with justice and charity, and here in Louisiana we are preparing the conditions which can easily lead to economic warfare and intense bitterness among ourselves. In this way we are playing right into the hands of the Communists, whose principal weapon is hatred.

In conclusion, we address ourselves to the parties principally concerned in this controversy.

To management that it may recognize in its support of this piece of legislation, aside from the moral issues to which we have alluded, a serious disregard of the danger of industrial strife which may ensue. Moreover, let them consider the divisive influence that would be set up now when unity and teamwork are the bywords of every person from the President of the United States to the most recently returned veterans of the fight against Communist aggression.

To labor that it may exercise mature judgment and self-discipline in rooting out the internal conditions in some unions which invite agitation for such punitive measures as right-to-work bills.

To legislators that they may weigh carefully the serious action they are about to take and that they come to realize that a catch phrase like right to work for the individual may well be an invitation to disaster for the general welfare. All of which imposes the gravest responsibility upon them, especially when we are faced with forces from within and from without that breed and thrive upon the type of discontent and insecurity which this legislation would probably foster.

The Library of Congress Has Become Far More Than a Legislative Tool

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRAZIER REAMS

OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 22, 1954

Mr. REAMS. Mr. Speaker, I was disturbed that the House of Representatives so drastically cut the budget of the Library of Congress for the ensuing year. It was done with the best of intentions on the part of the Appropriations Subcommittee, I am sure. It has to give the new Librarian, Dr. Lawrence Q. Mumford, an opportunity to take stock of those activities of the Library that are essential and vital and to lop off any of the barnacles which are so apt to become attached to a Government institution so large and of so long existence as the Library of Congress. Dr. Mumford is a trained professional librarian. I am sure that he will do what is expected of him.

In the meantime, I do hope that the Senate and the conference committee will restore enough of this cut in order to give Dr. Mumford adequate tools with which to start his work. I believe that with the full cut the Library has received in the House in the recent appropriation bill for 1955, he would be seriously handicapped to do the job we expect of him.

Mr. Speaker, under permission, I include with these remarks a letter in the Sunday Forum section of the Toledo Blade of June 20, 1954, written by the very able director of the Toledo Public Library, Mr. Herbert M. Sewell. This refers to the wide scope which the Library of Congress has come to have in the life of the Republic:

THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS HAS BECOME FAR MORE THAN A LEGISLATIVE TOOL

To the EDITOR OF THE BLADE:

The tenor of certain remarks made during recent hearings on the appropriations for the Library of Congress and the action of the House of Representatives in substantially reducing the Library's funds have aroused apprehension among those who understand the many contributions the Library makes to our national life.

The Library of Congress was founded in 1800 under a law appropriating $5,000 "for the purchase of such books as may be necessary for the use of Congress." Although its primary function is to serve the needs of Congress, its range of service has for many years included all branches of Government service as well as the public at large. It has, in fact, become a truly national library.

The Library's collections today number more than 9 million volumes and 12 million manuscript pieces, and the use of these resources by research workers increases each year. In 1953, 710,000 inquirers were assisted and special study facilities were provided for 987 workers from every State in the Union and from 36 foreign countries. Among these users were workers from 242 American colleges and universities, 84 foreign institutions, Government agencies at all levels as well as business organizations.

In addition to the use made of the Library in Washington its usefulness is extended throughout the country in many ways. Through an interlibrary loan system it serves scholars and the public by making books and other materials available either by actual loan or by photographic reproduction. In 1953 loans of this sort were made to 1,540 libraries in the United States and to 111 libraries in 26 foreign lands. The catalog cards prepared by the Library of Congress are economically used by thousands of American libraries as time-saving aids for recording their own holdings.

Another useful project is the National Union Catalog maintained by the Library in cooperation with other libraries. This master file contains over 14 million cards for important books now in American libraries, many of which are not to be found in the

Library of Congress. As an aid in locating unusual material such a file is of the greatest value to the student and research worker.

Through 28 distributing points the Library of Congress provides books in raised type and "talking book" records for the use of the blind.

The 209 volume author catalog of the Library's holding was recently brought up to date by a 24-volume supplement published at no cost to the Government by a private company. This remarkable work, called "the world's largest bibliography," enables our citizens at many points throughout the country to possess a key to the vast collection in their National Library.

The services noted above by no means exhaust the services offered by the Library of Congress, but it is hoped that they will show to what extent the Library serves the serious interests of our whole Nation.

Another point should be kept in mind by those who would restrict the scope and usefulness of our National Library. Throughout its history the Library of Congress has been the beneficiary of many gifts of incalculable value in the form of books, manuscripts, and endowments, which were given because the Library was regarded as a national treasurehouse. These riches have drawn scholars from all parts of our country and from foreign lands as well. To so reduce the Library's budget as to make it merely the handmaiden of the Congress would be to break faith with these donors, and, indeed, with the whole world of scholarship.

It is to be hoped that the Congress will not, in a fit of dubious economy, do anything to impair the full usefulness of a great national institution, our Library of Congress.

HERBERT M. SEWELL,
Director, Toledo Public Library.

Farm Surpluses and Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILL E. NEAL

OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 22, 1954

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, Senate bill 2475, the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, with some minor amendments, passed the House last week and most likely will pass the Senate and then become the first evidence on the part of the legislative bodies that surplus foods are becoming a matter of serious concern for the American people.

The act authorizes an attempt to reduce alarming supplies of overproduced commodities by creating markets abroad through the media of barter, compensations with foreign currency, and through downright gifts. If successful, within 3 years it would dispose of about one-sixth of the food products now held in Government storage in the account of the Commodity Credit Corporation purchased in connection with the price supports and stockpiling program, which taxes the consumer to purchase and store these stocks and then doubles the price the consumer must pay for his food at the market.

It is an act conceived in pure desperation. It is only an expedient to blindfold the farmer, the consumer, and the taxpayer to the unworkability of uncontrolled production and a system of high supports. It makes no attempts to correct the evils resulting from previous irrational legislation.

Basically, it is unfair to tax three-fourths of the people in order to support the other one-fourth, many of whom are large-scale commercial farm producers who operate by remote control as mere speculators. The small farmer derives very little benefit from present price supports. Most agriculturists in West Virginia are small farmers. Only 2 percent of the total income to West Virginia farmers is derived from the sale of price-supported commodities. If tobacco—supported—is included, only 3 percent of the total comes from the sale of supported farm products. Still worse, West Virginia dairymen and stock raisers, compelled to sell on a free market, are penalized when they buy stock feeds made from high-price-supported grains.

High rigid price supports for farm products without provision to regulate production in keeping with demands will continue to make it necessary to face the problem of surpluses. In peacetime foreign countries, able to produce for themselves, are not good customers. This bill would create markets among nations experiencing food shortages. It is especially deserving of trial, but, in the meantime, existing high support policies will pile up surpluses more rapidly than we can hope to ship abroad. This brings us back to the original question of how to continue high supports unless we strictly control production. Farmers may not want this. They detest regulations from Washington, but they must accept one or the other, or approve flexible supports as a means of readjusting farm production to the Nation's capacity to buy and consume. Otherwise, the doubly penalized consumer can be expected to voice disapproval of a Government policy that imposes on him responsibility for the lion's share of its support cost.

An Expression of Views From the Minneapolis Friends Meeting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROY W. WIER

OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 22, 1954

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter from the Minneapolis Friends Meeting, Minneapolis, Minn., a religious society of Friends, signed by Rev. Richard P. Newby and Merle O. Brauer, clerk, dated June 17, 1954.

The letter follows:

MINNEAPOLIS FRIENDS MEETING,
Minneapolis, Minn., June 17, 1954.

The Honorable ROY W. WIER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. WIER: As a religious Society of Friends we feel a deep responsibility toward the ominous questions that face all of us—questions which we must all help to answer. The truth that is becoming crystal clear in this atomic age, is that our world will be one world or none. Because of the fear that prevails, many people of the world seriously doubt that there is a way out but believe we are steadily moving toward destruction.

Friends believe that war can be avoided, but we must make a bold new approach toward world problems. The day is here when honest negotiations must replace the battlefield, and are undertaken on the basis of a will to find agreement, without the backing of arms. The concept of negotiation from strength has resulted not only in a race of atomic armaments, but in an overwhelming fear which overshadows all attempts at agreement. The threat of force cannot secure an honorable peace, because peace secured only by menaces will not be permanent, and is open to grave injustices.

It is also our concern that our Government seize the initiative in the world quest for the minds and hearts of the masses of people. This we can do by really doing what communism only claims to do. We must launch a large-scale program that is designed to bring mental peace, true freedom, and material help wherever they are needed. This can be coupled with new disarmament proposals so inviting to all who are laboring under crushing armament demands, that the Communists would either have to agree to them or have world opinion turned against them. If these things are launched from a true spirit of generosity on our part could they not help catch the imagination of the masses who are sick, starving, and desperate?

We also feel compelled to speak out against military involvement in Indochina. In light of the Geneva Conference failure, there is still the need for real statesmanship, and not a panic decision to form a southeast Asia treaty organization.

Wise statesmanship will see the real causes underlying the conflict in Indochina, and seek to find the solution not in so-called defensive pacts but in the determination to grant self-government, independence, and adequate aid to those who for too long have been exploited.

We recognize the evil in communism, and share in the concern that the evil must be overcome. We question, however, the advisability of military means. We must see that it is truly not by might but by spirit that we overcome evil and wrongdoing. A new start is what the world needs, and it is not too late; it is never too late to do what is right. We know this basic spirit of truth and generosity lies at the heart of America, and that in its application the wave of fear may yet be lifted from the world.

On behalf of Minneapolis meeting of the Religious Society of Friends,

MERLE O. BRAUER, *Clerk.*
RICHARD P. NEWBY, *Pastor.*

TVA and the Public Lose

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLIFFORD DAVIS

OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 22, 1954

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, those of us in the Tennessee Valley Authority area are very much concerned over the Presidential order directing the Atomic Energy Commission to enter into a contract with private power interests to furnish 600,000 kilowatts of electricity to be fed into the TVA lines.

We are disturbed because it is agreed that it will cost more than $125 million for the private power people to supply this electric energy instead of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

A very revealing editorial appeared in the Memphis Commercial-Appeal and I am including it herewith. The editorial follows:

TVA AND THE PUBLIC LOSE

Another year's decision on the future of the Tennessee Valley Authority seems to have been made in Washington.

The two Houses of Congress have agreed on TVA financing. The agreed figure is 120 millions, which compares with Senate approval of 129½ millions, a presidential budget figure of almost 142 millions, appropriations of 188½ millions for the year that will end in a few weeks, and 386 millions for the year that ended last June 30.

The downward path is steep.

Of the many TVA activities, by far the most often discussed is generation of electricity. The generating plants started in 1952 are being completed, but starting of new ones was blocked last year, this year, and the new budget blocks them for next year.

Power expansion was the final big TVA question before Congress, specifically more power for the national-defense plants in the TVA region.

The decision on defense power that allowed the TVA budget decision was that the Atomic Energy Commission is to buy electricity from a private company. The AEC is preparing to accept a proposal by Middle South Utilities, Inc., for a 25-year contract.

The proposed price is estimated to be $140 million higher than power bought from TVA. In a way this difference will be reduced by collection of Federal taxes on the privately-owned plant. But what a way. The tax money will move out of the Treasury through AEC and back into the Treasury as collections.

On its face it is a losing decision for the Nation's taxpayers who will pay the AEC bill for electricity, whether it is generated by TVA or private power. The private power industry, which has been weeping across the land about subsidies in TVA power prices, will now collect money from the Federal Treasury which could have been saved by financing more TVA power.

The money used by TVA would have gone back to the Treasury, one-fortieth every year, and the people would have still owned the powerplant when the cost had been retired.

Instead, the Nation's taxes go into a new plant to be owned by Middle South, a holding company which includes the Arkansas Power & Light Co., the Mississippi Power & Light Co., the Louisiana Power & Light Co., and the New Orleans Public Service. Associated with this combination is the Southern Co., a holding company which includes the Mississippi Power Co. (serving the southeastern quarter of the State), the Alabama Power Co., the Georgia Power Co., and the Gulf Power Co. In other words, the private companies across the southern and western borders of TVA's public power domain are the winners.

For Memphis we have relief from the creeping power shortage, since the private power will reduce the amount of TVA power needed by the AEC. It is expected that the West Memphis portion of the metropolis will gain a large new industrial plant, as the site of the Middle South generating plant.

For the Nation's taxpayers, including income taxpayers of Memphis and West Memphis, we have a higher bill for defense electricity.

For the private power industry we have wide grin of grim victory.

No Guts in Congress?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 1954

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, can Uncle Sam take it?

Since Pearl Harbor, Uncle Sam has been so busy dishing it out, politically, economically, militarily, and socially, that one wonders how well he could take it, if he had to; criticism, of course.

In today's Washington Daily News, Tuesday, June 22, 1954, Robert C. Ruark takes the measure of Congress in his article entitled "They Haven't Got Guts." It covers the issue of congressional compensation.

This has been a half century of conflict in which man has moved from the speed of the horse to the speed of the jet. Miracles have happened. With the flip of a switch, men can see through steel and concrete. Television places the world at our feet. As the world grew smaller, men grew further apart. Three vicious wars in the last half century have taken their toll in blood and treasure. What would the American people, at least those families who carry the scars of war, be willing for the members of Congress to have been paid had they had the wisdom, if possible, to have avoided the misery in this half-century of conflict? What would they be willing to pay to avoid such misery in the next half century? In the history of man, we are told, wars have been fought every generation.

That, it seems to me, is one of the pivotal points on which the issue of congressional compensation should be resolved. It is not so much whether a Member of Congress can or cannot live in a tent or a trailer with his family—he can do anything if he has to—rather is it to what extent can he help promote the general welfare, at home and abroad.

While I question many points in Mr. Ruark's article, it is, nevertheless, a frank and forthright statement. Congress has guts plenty. So have the people. It is hoped that Mr. Ruark's remarks will help serve as a catalyzer to bring the Congress and the people closer together on the issue of congressional compensation.

One generally gets what one pays for. What price the last half-century of conflict? What price the next half-century? Conflict or contentment?

Here follows Mr. Ruark's article. Joined with it, could be today's editorial in the Washington Post on the New Jersey scandal, in which false standards are taken to task:

THEY HAVEN'T GOT GUTS

(By Robert C. Ruark)

If there is any acute index of the weaselly thinking of our Members of Congress, it is the decision to drop the idea of voting a $12,500 pay increase to themselves this year.

It's an election year, of course, and Senator McCarthy's been misbehaving, so the brave men we send to the Capitol have shelved the one important measure that might manufacture men out of mice.

Fred Keating, Republican Representative from New York, summed it neatly when he said that he "didn't think the McCarthy hearings had increased a respect for Congress," which may be the greatest understatement of the epoch. "That's an added factor," said Representative Keating, who was referring to the elections in the fall.

This leaves the pay rise in Senate hands, and the Senate hasn't shown any inclination to bull it through. And for the same reasons. The pigeon-holing of the bill, even though President Eisenhower had blessed it in January, loses, in limbo, pay increases for the Supreme Court, Federal judges, and the Vice President.

This is typical political thinking by a body of men who will sanctify grants of billions to upgrade the living conditions of faceless pagans and unscrupulous expediters all over the world; who will send you off to war or raise your taxes as blithely as they'd order a cup of coffee; who run the United States and, with it, the H-bomb and the world.

But they haven't got guts enough to give themselves a living wage worthy of the job they attempt to do—and never have, except in sly little penny-larceny increases. Which is why our legislative Halls today are packed with ambulance-chasers, kickback experts, and pool-hall politicians, as well as the independently wealthy who wear election as a tin medal.

It is absolutely impossible for a Congressman to live up to the demands of his job—now nearly a 12-month task—unless he's got dough on the side, whether it's honest or dishonest. In the good old uncluttered days when Congress adjourned in June, the honorables could go back to Hawg Jowl Junction and raise collards or pursue their legal profession, thereby taking up the slack in their budgets.

At least you could call election to Washington a prestige job, willingly attempted or in the case when they did it for peanuts, the peanuts were at least semiample to feed the hawgs.

A Senator or Representative can't meet the ordinary demands of simple living and entertainment in Washington today on what he earns. If he doesn't have the dough to fill in the chinks, he's got to find it on the Q. T.

The President Directs a Payoff for Interests That Helped To Elect Him

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN D. JOHNSTON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 22, 1954

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an editorial entitled "The President Directs a Payoff for Interests That Helped To Elect Him," which was published in the Independent, of Anderson, S. C., on June 19, 1954.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

THE PRESIDENT DIRECTS A PAYOFF FOR INTERESTS THAT HELPED TO ELECT HIM

President Eisenhower has ordered that the Atomic Energy Commission sign a $107 million contract to supply the Memphis area with privately generated power instead of cheaper TVA power.

The cost of the taxpayers will be $20,569,000 annually instead of $16,885,000 under the TVA proposal.

This means a difference of $3,685,000 a year. On a 25-year contract, the loss to the taxpayers will be $92,125,000, or more than the total cost of constructing such a project as the Hartwell Dam.

The President's action is not surprising in itself. The surprising thing is the arrogance with which the public interest is shoved aside in favor of paying off political debt to the power interests that helped elect him.

The action is also in straight contradiction of Candidate Eisenhower's promises to balance the national budget and relieve the burden of the taxpayers, for here we have him deliberately spending $3,685,000 more than necessary every year for 25 years.

Think how many jet planes could be bought with the money that will be wasted under this contract.

Think how many miles of highway could be built with the money if it had been saved by letting the contract to TVA.

Candidate Eisenhower had nothing but sweet words for TVA when he was running for office. Once elected, he has called it an example of creeping socialism and at the direction of his Wall Street pals is out to kill TVA and all other public projects.

Special interests are in the saddle, riding hell for leather to gouge the American people of their natural heritage and property built with their tax money. Is this the moral crusade we were promised by "King Ike and his knights of the spoils table"?

Blue Over Pinks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 10, 1954

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I direct the following article, written by Frederick C. Othman, which appeared in the June 7, 1954, issue of the New York World Telegram and Sun, to the attention of our colleagues:

BLUE OVER PINKS

(By Frederick C. Othman)

WASHINGTON, June 17.—Congress is investigating foundations again, and I hasten to add that this has nothing whatever to do with ladies' underwear.

The foundations that interest Congress are trust funds, usually set up by some rich man to do his fellow humans some good, such as educating them, giving them books to read, and curing some of their ills. As such, these foundations pay no taxes.

A couple of years ago the statesmen concluded that the great majority of foundations, such as those bearing the names of the Messrs. Ford, Carnegie, and Rockefeller, truly were spending their millions for the benefit of mankind and, hence, could ignore the tax collector. Only a few foundations, the gentlemen concluded, were set specifically to dodge the payment of income taxes.

Now comes a special committee headed by Representative B. CARROLL REECE, Republican, of Tennessee, with a new pitch. Its idea seems to be that many of these foundations are run by dreamers promoting the idea of world government, 1954-style socialism, and no telling what all else.

Upon this committee, however, is a young Democratic Congressman from Ohio, WAYNE L. HAYS, who figures his fellow lawgivers are handing the foundations a bum shake. This attitude has kept the proceedings for weeks in an uproar, which reached its climax the other day when Representative HAYS read two brief quotations about world conditions.

What about them, he demanded. Did they sound like the words of Communists?

Thomas M. McNiece, the committee's assistant research director, said yes, they did, or at least like the words of Communist sympathizers.

Representative HAYS then threw his sinker. He identified the authors of the quotations as popes of the Catholic Church. Regular attendants at the hearings report Researcher McNiece has had little to say since.

When I dropped in, Ken Earl, a youthful attorney from Moses Lake, Wash., was trying to read a 37-page statement about something called the League for Industrial Democracy. Earl, who was a sober-sides in eyeglasses, identified himself as a one-time investigator for the Senate Internal Security Committee.

This league, hereinafter to be called LID, he said, was no scholastic organization, but a lobbying outfit, with a wide assortment of ideas it wanted Congress to turn into laws. So he mentioned several prominent people who were honored at the LID's 48th annual banquet last year. These included Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, Dr. Ralph Bunche, Senator Paul Douglas, Democrat, of Illinois, and Representative Jacob K. Javits, Republican, of New York.

"Are you implying these people are mixed up with some leftwing outfit?" demanded Representative HAYS.

"I did not say they are left wingers, but they are proud of their association with the LID," replied Mr. Earl.

Mrs. GRACIE PFOST, the pretty Representative from Idaho, said she'd been listening a long time to Mr. Earl's statement, or nearly 2 days, and weren't the statesmen wasting time? The chairman said they weren't. Mrs. PFOST left to answer a rollcall on the floor. I just plain left.

What's Happened to Rainmaking?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS CASE
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, June 22, 1954

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, back in 1951 there was the first flurry of excitement over the possibilities of rainmaking. Since that time there has been less excitement, but experimental projects have continued on a large scale. In the July issue of the Farm Journal, an article excellently written by Paul Friggens makes the point that farmers are sponsoring fewer rainmaking projects, but that "rainmaking is going stronger than ever" under the sponsorship of public utilities and big cities.

Farmers have far from abandoned rainmaking. In my State of South Dakota, for instance, two large-area projects are going ahead at this time, and in other States there are many other farmer-sponsored projects which attract less attention now, because the novelty has gone. But many proposed experimental projects have failed to obtain sponsors, for the reason that proof of the effectiveness of artificial cloud nucleation on a large scale has been inconclusive.

To find the answer to this important question, the Congress last year passed a law establishing an Advisory Committee on Weather Control, and President Eisenhower has appointed to that committee a distinguished group of citizens. It has been given the job of impartially and independently evaluating cloud-seeding activities. Whatever the findings, they will have considerable economic significance for the public. As Mr. Friggens concludes:

> If [the committee] finds rainmaking of little value, that finding will save millions of dollars. But if it gives a go-ahead to reputable, competent operators, the benefits could be incalculable.

Mr. President, I commend Mr. Friggens' article to the reading of all persons who recognize the grave importance of our national water problem. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT'S HAPPENED TO RAINMAKING?—FARMERS HAVE LARGELY DROPPED OUT, BUT BUSINESS FIRMS AND CITIES HAVE TAKEN OVER—IT'S SPREADING AROUND THE WORLD

(By Paul Friggens)

Farmers have all but dropped out of rainmaking activities these days—but even so rainmaking is going stronger than ever.

Public utilities and big cities, worried about water supplies for their industries, are footing the bills. And they claim that it pays.

The only farmers booming rainmaking right now are the western Canadians. But over the world, 26 nations are now operating some phase of "cloud modification."

The United States Government has established a Weather Control Advisory Committee to check cloud-seeding claims, and at Tucson, Ariz., the University of Arizona and the University of Chicago are jointly setting up a University of the Clouds.

What blew up the farmers' big experiment? It boomed too fast. Too many weekend projects in which farmers and ranchers hastily pledged $50,000 to $75,000, and ordered the magic generators air freighted to tap the skies. A lot of early claims were exaggerated, and no doubt countless farmers expected too much.

In some areas farmers decided that rainmaking is "hooey," and did'nt pay up. Cloud seeders claim that they lost at least half a million on contracts.

Other farmers are just as sure it has paid. Where farmers are still faithful, cloud seeders are hopefully settling down to stable, long-term projects.

About 100 farmers in Oregon's western Columbia Basin are contracting for the 4th year, and with the third different cloud seeder, Weather Modification Co., of Redlands, Calif.

Around Horse Heaven Hills, Wash., dryland wheat farmers signed their fourth straight contract with Dr. Irving P. Krick's Water Resource Development Corp. of Denver. They're happy. But nearby bean and cherry growers are still fighting cloud seeding. They claim that it ruins their irrigated crops.

Medford, Oreg., pear packers and shippers are in their 5th year of prevention program. After 4 years with a pair of pilots using aircraft to seed hail clouds, growers now are signed with Dr. Krick, who uses silver-iodide generators instead of planes.

To do the job right, pilots practically have to fly into a thunderstorm. Dangerous business. Besides, while a plane is working one cloud it's hailing elsewhere.

In Oregon and California Krick is undertaking the most extentive hail-suppression research anywhere. With specially designed electronic instruments, he hopes to "pick up" a thunderstorm hours before it develops. Then he plans to reduce to turbulence and put a "lid" on the cloud before hail forms.

Krick feels that this same method may break up or prevent disastrous lightning storms, which now take a terrific fire toll in our forests.

"Our operations of 2 or 3 years ago are entirely different from those we're now using," says Ronald Bollay of North American Weather Consultants, Altadena, Calif. (In Denver, Krick is now releasing his 15th generator model.)

South Dakota is an example of what's happening to cloud seeding. An impartial investigation by the State college strongly indicates that cloud seeding works. Some claims that "verdant" South Dakota is dramatic proof.

Says Dean A. M. Eberle: "We feel that cloud seeding has increased precipitation. Our composite map of June, July, and August last year shows it. Now we're trying to find out how much."

Yet South Dakotans barely financed their program this year.

Colorado and New Mexico ranchers have cooled off, too. But the last Colorado Legislature asked Dr. Krick to seed the east half of the State in a desperate effort to halt the spreading drought.

Krick agreed reluctantly. "We can't increase rain without the proper clouds." Krick has never claimed to make it rain—only to increase it under favorable conditions. Cloud seeding can't break a drought if the rain-bearing clouds aren't there.

Increasing the snow pack, however, has helped the water situation a lot. Denver and other Colorado cities, power companies, Great Western Sugar, and farmer-ditch companies have joined for 4 years in Operation Snow Pack.

The Rockies have been dry, for the most part, but the seeded areas averaged more than 12 inches of snow water, as against a 12-year average of 7.3. Claims Krick: "This could have occurred naturally only 3 times in 1,000 years."

The Pacific Gas & Electric Co., of San Francisco, has 3 experimental snow-pack seeding projects high in the Sierras, and is planning 2 more.

Drought-gripped Dallas, Tex., resorted to cloud seeding last year. Says Carl Hoefle, city water engineer: "In 6 months (November to May) we got 20 percent more rainfall than the surrounding area. For all of 1953 we got almost double the water that fell nearby." Dallas renewed its contract.

Droughty Oklahoma City is cloud seeding, too, as a result of the success in Texas. Nearby El Reno blames Krick for a 6-inch cloudburst.

Utilities now employ cloud seeding from the west coast to New England. The Bonneville Power Administration tried cloud seeding to fill Grand Coulee and avert a power shortage. The rains came, and today TVA is said to be exploring the idea. Sugarcane and pineapple plantations are financing experiments from Hawaii to Cuba. Even in Indochina the French seeded clouds to try to bog down the Chinese Reds.

What's the future for cloud seeding, and what can it mean to farmers? A Government committee is looking into that. If it finds rain making of little value, that finding will save millions of dollars. But if it gives a go-ahead to reputable, competent operators, the benefits could be incalculable.

Three Hundred and Seventy-fifth Anniversary of the Landing of Sir Francis Drake

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT B. SCUDDER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 1954

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Speaker, on June 17 and continuing through June 20, observances were held in Marin County, Calif., commemorating the 375th anniversary of the landing of Sir Francis Drake on the Marin County shore.

It was on June 17, 1579, that Sir Francis Drake sailed his ship ashore at what is now known as Drake's Bay. He posted the famous "plate of brasse" claiming possession of the land "in the name of Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth of England."

An honored guest at the observances was Royal Naval Cadet Christopher Scott Carlisle, a representative of Queen Elizabeth II of England, who was winner in the Sir Francis Drake essay contest conducted in England.

Cadet Carlisle was honored at a banquet held in the Hotel Sir Francis Drake, San Francisco. The Drake Navigators Guild of Point Reyes staged the banquet as well as other appropriate ceremonies.

On Sunday, June 20, an antique stock anchor from Drake's home port of Devon was presented to the Drake Navigators Guild by Sir Arthur H. Hadow, H. M. Consul General, in behalf of his country. The anchor was a gift from the Royal Naval Barracks at Devon, England, and takes an honored place in California history.

I have in my office a mounted replica of the original "plate of brasse" which was presented to me by the Drake Navigators Guild of Point Reyes.

We are extremely proud of the glorious history of California and of the First Congressional District. Anyone wishing to view the "plate of brasse" is welcome to do so, and I would like to present herewith its laboriously prepared inscription:

> Bee it knowne vnto all men by these presents, Jvne 17, 1579:
>
> By the grace of God and in the name of Herr Majesty Qveen Elizabeth of England and Herr svccessors forever I take possession of this kingdome whose king and people freely resigne their right and title in the whole land vnto Herr Majesties keepeing. Now named by me an to bee knowne vnto all men as Nova Albion.
>
> FRANCIS DRAKE.

In behalf of the members of the Drake Navigators Guild and the people of the First Congressional District of California who are justifiably proud of this historical event, I wish to include the following editorial from the San Rafael (Calif.) Independent-Journal which gives a brief story of the occurrence:

TODAY WE CELEBRATE 375TH ANNIVERSARY OF DRAKE'S VISIT

Just 375 years ago today, on June 17, 1579, Sir Francis Drake sailed his vessel, the *Golden Hind*, into quiet waters off Marin and came ashore.

In recent weeks there have been claims made that he came inside the Golden Gate and actually landed in the neighborhood of Greenbrae. But the most widely held belief is that he landed at Drake's Bay, which he called Nova Albion, or New England.

He sailed his ship ashore, careened and repaired it. He built a small fort during his month-and-6-day stay, a fort older by 8 years than the first English camp on the east coast and 28 years older than Jamestown. His New England was so named 41 years before the Pilgrims landed on Plymouth Rock.

Most important impetus to research on Drake's visit was the finding of the famed "plate of brasse." It was on the Laguna ranch, now owned by R. D. Marshall, that this "plate of brasse" was originally found by William Caldeira in 1933.

Caldeira was a chauffeur employed by Leon Bocqueraz, a San Francisco banker who was hunting in the area. The chauffeur attempted to interest his employer in the find of what he believed to be foreign writing. But Bocqueraz was tired from his hunt and suggested he look at it later. Then Bocqueraz forgot about it.

Caldeira subsequently threw the plate from his automobile in the area of the Greenbrae Wye. Here it was later found by Beryle W. Shinn, who was on a picnic, and taken to the University of California. It was then sent to the electrochemical laboratories of Columbia University and after months of tests and research was pronounced the original "plate of brasse" with which Drake claimed the west coast for Elizabeth I.

Tonight in Hotel Sir Francis Drake, San Francisco, the Drake Navigators Guild are holding a banquet to celebrate the 375th anniversary of Drake's landing. Guest of honor will be Royal Naval Cadet Christopher Scott Carlisle, a representative of Queen Elizabeth II, who was winner in the Sir Francis Drake in California essay contest conducted in England.

We welcome Cadet Carlisle and hope that his visit to California and Marin will help to further cement the peoples of our two countries, countries which have so much in common in their historical background.

It Has Saved Us Millions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD DAVIS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 1954

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial which appeared in the Memphis Commercial-Appeal, commending the effectiveness of the waterways experiment station operated by the Corps of Engineers at Vicksburg, Miss.

The editorial follows:

IT HAS SAVED US MILLIONS

The waterways experiment station operated by the Corps of Engineers at Vicksburg has been aptly described as the "research brain center" of worldwide water resources development programs. To it go experts from all the major nations in search of proved knowledge in the fields of hydraulics, soil mechanics and concrete construction. Internationally, it is one of this country's most famed scientific facilities—an instrument designed to promote the national welfare and through which millions of dollars have been saved for the taxpayers.

Today the waterways experiment station begins a 3-day observance of an anniversary notable in the 179 years of Corps of Engineers achievement. Open house is being held and it is hoped that as many citizens of the Midsouth who can, will visit the station between now and Monday. The Experiment Station has vital bearing on this section's well-being and economic progress.

Its mission has been defined as one of assistance to "the divisions and districts of the Corps of Engineers and other agencies of the Department of Defense to develop the best hydraulics, soils, concrete and flexible pavement designs possible, for the lowest possible cost." Maintained as a vital part of the station is the Mississippi Basin model at Jackson, Miss., the world's largest hydraulic engineering model, whose operation during the build-up of the Missouri Valley flood of 1952 enabled flood fighters to prevent disaster along great stretches of the Missouri.

The worth of the Waterways Experiment Station to all of this country's river valleys is incalcuable, but we know that the people of the lower Mississippi especially will be happy as are we to salute it on its anniversary.

Address by Dr. Frederick Brown Harris

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 22, 1954

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an outstanding address entitled "In Such an Age," delivered by Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, minister of the Foundry Church—Methodist—in Washington and Chaplain of the United States Senate, at the commencement exercises at Baxter Seminary, Baxter, Tenn., on Friday, May 14, 1954.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

My dear friends of Baxter, President Upperman has certainly described himself as he read that last stanza of Kipling's poem. I do not know anybody who in a better sense exemplifies what he has just read about walking with the high and mighty and not losing the "common touch."

May I say, first of all, that it is a joy to me to leave that big, buzzing confusion which is Washington, with its loud and raucous voices, and to wake up in this enchanted Southland where, beyond those voices, there is peace. It is a relief for a while to exchange the wild whirl of Washington for the gentle Tennessee Waltz.

It has been years since I have had the privilege of being in this great city. I journeyed here years ago because one of your educational institutions was good enough to give me a degree. We all get there by degrees, you know. The only man I ever heard of who refused to take a degree from a college was a preacher. The institution had asked him to accept a D. D., which someone has described as donated dignity. He wrote with appreciation, but said that while he knew that they meant to honor him he must ask them not to confer it. His name was Fiddle. And he suggested that it was bad enough to be Fiddle, without being Fiddle Dee Dee.

Without any reservation whatsoever I can say that it is a genuine joy to be at last on the campus of Baxter Seminary, a school whose name has been written on my heart and which has been in my prayers for years. Of course, to me and to multitudes Baxter means my very dear friend, Dr. Harry L. Upperman. This is a sort of sacramental journey for me, as I come here personally to raise my Te Deum—as you all have done—because he and his dear wife and noble partner have been snatched from the very gates of death to carry on for more fruitful years of service here.

Since entering this State I have had my fears concerning him quite confirmed. I have had a certain apprehension with regard to him for a long while. Even the State policemen who helped bring me over here safely, through the rain last night, by what they said about the president of this institution made me all the more fearful along the line I already had in mind. I think Dr. Upperman, from all I have heard about him here in Tennessee, is really in danger of the scriptural woe. Do you know what that is? "Woe be unto you when all men speak well concerning you."

It is no exaggeration to say that in all my ministry I have never known a life more utterly dedicated, more devoted to a ruling passion, pouring forth every power of a personality as it says, "This one thing I do," than has been personified in Dr. Upperman's sacrifice and service to this institution. This very morning, as I listened to him as we rode together over these vast expanses—the adjoining farms which are now the property of Baxter—I seemed to be listened to a new chapter in the Acts of the Apostles.

So I am really, in my heart, very happy to be here.

Nothing has been said particularly about the topic for this address. At least I will assure you that I am not going to bring the same speech that I made a few weeks ago near Washington. Somebody said that they saw my name on a bulletin board outside a church in Arlington, across the Potomac. One, in introducing me, said that all that there was on that bulletin board was the following:

"Rev. F. B. Harris will speak in this church tomorrow night, after which this church will be closed for 2 weeks for repairs." [Laughter.]

A subject can make quite a lot of difference.

Let me start by a reference to a radio program which I happened to hear a few nights ago. In it there was the recording of two voices, one of which is heard here no more. Always, to me it seems a miracle that we can listen to the actual voices of men who have gone into the great beyond. One of those voices was that of Franklin D. Roosevelt. The other was of a great statesman who is still with us, Winston Churchill. There were the actual voices uttering some of the great words for which they were so well known in times that tried men's souls.

With the record of their voices fresh in my mind I sat a day or two ago in the quietness of our sanctuary at Foundry, by that which has now become a famous pew there, where those two men sat, side by side, at the Christmas service in that crucial year of 1941—the Christmas of Pearl Harbor. The plate on that pew tells people who come to see it—and many do—that "Here, side by side, at the Christmas service of 1941, sat President Franklin D. Roosevelt and Prime Minister Winston Churchill." Standing there alone in our beautiful sanctuary, beside that pew, just having listened to their voices so recently broadcast, I seemed to hear them again in the silence.

First, the voice of Winston Churchill: "In times like these it is well for us to remember other times, especially when with diabolical cleverness our foes are trying to divide the English speaking people of the world, as we face the enemy who desires to destroy the very world."

It is good for us to remember that there was a time when only one man, with nothing but words—words of faith and hope and courage and definance—one man with words that sprang from the deepest depths of our glorious language—one man, and about 300 youngsters—most of them British, some of them American and Canadian; yet with that meager backing one man, with just words, broke through the frozen paralysis of a nation and stood it upon its feet while those anonymous eagles of the air held back the threat to civilization. That is what Winston Churchill did with words that were like trumpets. It is literally true that never did so many owe so much to so few. But, thank God that in those dark days they defended that little island long enough for us to prepare to defend our own liberties and, now, in the providence of God, the liberties of the whole world.

I have in a prominent place in my study the photograph of a young man. I can never look at it without a choke in my throat, because he is the one from our own family who in World War II marched away and came not back. He was the husband of my younger daughter, who was killed on his 23d birthday. Whenever I gaze at that picture I always find myself thinking of haunting words that came out of the First World War, but which apply just as truly to the fighting that has been going on in the Far East in defense of freedom everywhere in the world.

"I have a rendezvous with death," wrote Alan Seeger:

"When Spring comes back with rustling shade
And apple-blossoms fill the air,
I have a rendezvous with Death * * *
And I to my pledged word am true,
I shall not fail that rendezvous."

We have known poignantly enough during the last few years all that is wrapped up in that phrase "a rendezvous with death." Echoes of it have come during the last few days in the brave defiance of that surrounded fort in Indochina. But I have come not here, on this occasion, to talk to you graduates and this other splendid audience of friends about the rendezvous with death.

Somebody, with Alan Seeger's words before him, wrote a sort of parody on those lines, with every verse beginning "I have a rendezvous with life" and ending with—

"Yet fear I deeply, too,
That Death will seek and find me
Ere I keep life's rendezvous."

Now may I say that the second voice which I heard in that late night recording was that of Franklin Roosevelt. He was uttering a sentence from one of his most important addresses. It has been quoted hundreds of times. He said: "This generation has a rendezvous with destiny." When, as President of the United States, he uttered that it was mostly prophecy. But now we know that that prophecy has come to a fiery focus on this generation of ours. It is being fulfilled in blood and sweat and tears, in terror and toil and pain.

We come with the consciousness that we are a part of a generation that has a date with destiny. These are tremendous and exciting times in which our lot is cast, full of momentous happenings. One era in human history is closing and another chapter is opening. Whether we like it or not, the world that those of us who are older knew has vanished, and another and very different one is rising above the churning waters about us, taking shape before our eyes. Whether this is to be the new earth of the redemption, in which shall dwell righteousness, or merely another futility and bungling, so marred and misshapen by our clumsy, blundering hands that God will ultimatley have to blot it out and start to build on yet another plan—for, never forget, in the end God will not be defeated—depends on what this generation summoned to play its part in these revolutionary days will do. It is a time when each one of us is called to stand in his own place and to play his part with valor, that we may prove worthy of the daring trust which has been committed to our hands in such a day, an age on ages telling:

"To be alive in such an age!
With every year a lightning page
Turned in the world's great wonder book!

* * * * *

O age of strife!
O age of life!

* * * * *

Rise, soul, from thy despairing knees * * *
Give thanks with all they flaming heart—
Crave but to have in it a part.
Give thanks and claim thy heritage
To be alive in such an age!"

Often, as late at night I drive our Massachusetts Avenue, in the Capital, on the way home to our parsonage, I notice the lights blazing brightly in the chanceries and embassies of the nations. But this is a time to remember that no matter how important are the things going on where those late lights are to be seen, it is not in the chanceries of the nations, but in the hearts and minds of individuals, where are to be found the issues of life and death.

If the best elements of our civilization are to be saved they will be saved, not by fanning fires of hatred for dictators abroad, or by any social panaceas for whatever it is that ails our sick social order. Our civilization will be saved by individuals, hundreds of them, thousands of them—tens of thousands, hundreds of thousands of individuals—whose own attitudes across all the lines and borders that separate them from their fellows make their own lives a part of the solution, and not a part of the problem.

The other night, in a very scintillating after-dinner speech—usually there is not much meat in those speeches, but there was in this one—I heard a man talk about the U in education, the U in industry. I found myself adding another U, the U in church; that would mean of course, the U in religion. That, somehow, suggests the rhyme I quoted a while ago:

"Yet fear I deeply, too,
That death will seek and find me
Ere I keep life's rendezvous."

Your principal problem is yourself. Ibsen, the dramatist, wrote to a youth who was facing his own date with destiny, a letter which contained sound advice each one of any age might well take to heart. This famous man of letters said to this young boy: "There is no way in which you can benefit society more than by coining the metal you have in yourself." How true.

One of the most dangerous psychological tricks is to survey all the world and its problems, and forget that the principal problem is oneself. Dwight L. Moody, the great evangelist, used to say: "I have had more trouble with myself than with any man I ever met." All the water in a sea cannot sink a ship unless it gets inside a ship. All the evil in the world cannot defile a person unless it gets inside the mind. All the selfish crookedness and corruption being revealed by congressional committees cannot contaminate you unless it gets inside your skin and corrodes your own soul.

Who can doubt that our day is largely characterized by a tragic breakdown of individual integrity as this personal corruption has seeped into public life, into sports life, and into commercial life? Many in our day seem to think that just because they have so many mechanical slaves working for them they themselves are masters. Too often they rate being clever as a higher attainment than being clean, to sell shoddy goods or shady propositions as more important than to tell the truth. In fact, there are many people in this mammon-mad age for whom life is largely a matter of deals, rather than of ideals. If one questions the ethics of some of their actions and attitudes, as measured by so-called old-fashioned standards, such people are likely to retort, "What I am doing may be morally wrong, but it is legally right. So what?"

That is a symptom of a fatal ethical disease which makes life a desecration, rather than a consecretion. The greatness of any nation, including our own, lies in the number of its citizens who yield obedience to laws that no policemen can enforce. And, so, I wish I could write this on each one of your diplomas:

"Yet fear I deeply, too,
That death will seek and find me
Ere I keep life's rendezvous."

Let us here highly resolve that in this day, often revealing a lack of personal honor that is positively appalling, we will hold on to that sensibility of principle, that chastity of honor, which will enable us to make the finest and fullest contribution as we serve the present age. Let us go out into this torn and tortured world to keep our date with destiny, in such an age, to be true—

"To all truth the world denies,
Not tongue-tied by its gilded lies,
Not always right in all men's eyes,
But faithful to the light within."

And, above all, keeping our honor bright and maintaining our personal integrity, let us "put into the fugitive fragments of each day such quality of work as shall make us unashamed when the day is over and all the days are done."

The Republican Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL B. DAGUE
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 22, 1954

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, it is expected, and as far as I am concerned not the least resented, that the gentlemen across the aisle should try to capture as much comfort as possible from the fact that a portion of the President's program may be temporarily held up. It is also understandable that the New Deal and leftwing commenators should try to read into the current legislative situation evidence that the President's party is hopelessly divided and that his proposals have by and large been tossed into the discard.

As a matter of fact President Eisenhower is doing quite well. There has not been the slightest indication that his requests for money will be tampered with and the evidence is clear that all of the appropriation bills will be approved on time which, when compared with the delays encountered by his predecessor when his party was in control, is an indication that the 83d Congress is giving him about everything for which he has asked.

Tax revision and social-security expansion are positive accomplishments and as one who has always voted against public housing but who is now determined to reverse that position out of deference to the President's appeal I am pretty sure that he will come through on that issue as well. And accepting the fact that Taft-Hartley revision has been set aside for this session, who will be so naive as to predict that such a postponement will do the Republican cause serious damage, particularly in light of the fact that labor generally is quite content with the law as it is. As for a new farm program the President is pretty sure he will get what he wants, for granting that a rigid program can be carried in both Houses, which is extremely doubtful, the President has only to exert his right of veto to bring into operation at the end of the year the law which is already on the books.

As I see it at the moment the climate is much more healthy for the election of a Republican Congress. With the shooting ended in Korea and the promise of no military intervention in Indochina unless Congress wills it, with inflation halted and with the dollar worth as much as it was a year ago, a phenomenial to which the American people have not been treated for a long time, and with labor peace such as we have not had in 20 years, the American voter doesn't seem nearly as disturbed as the commentators and the bleeding hearts would like to make it appear. And I very much doubt that the voters are going to hold House Members to account for the spectacle that has just concluded at the other end of the Capitol since to do so would be to charge us with that "guilt by association" which they condemn.

Included with these remarks is an editorial taken from the issue of the Wall Street Journal for June 14, and I would commend it to you as a reasoned analysis of the situation as it presently obtains:

THE REPUBLICAN RECORD

As is usual at this time of year, commentators are deploring the alleged inaction of Congress; lagging is the favorite adjective for the President's program there. Mr. Eisenhower himself is concerned enough to have appealed to the country for support of his proposals.

Actually, the President's program is in good shape. He will get a number of the things he wants, like tax revision and social-security extension. More urgent than these is a new farm price-support formula, and this the President can have even if Congress votes for continued rigid high supports; by vetoing such a bill he would create a situation in which a flexible price-prop law would automatically take effect. Apart from this, and annual necessities like appropriation bills, the rest of the proposed legislation could be postponed (in some cases abandoned), and no particular hardship would be worked.

But, it is objected, this is an election year, and Republican Members of Congress have to run on the record of their performance; the more they have done the better their chances. There is some truth in this, but not as much as many politicians believe.

What Congress does or does not do is only part of the basis of the voter's decision—even in the congressional elections. The decision in November will be determined for most people by their judgment of the Republican Party, with which the local Republican Member of Congress is identified, in its operation of the Government as a whole.

In these days the individual feels the impact of government, for good or ill, regardless of legislation. An administration, for example, can by itself commit the thievery of inflation or safeguard the people's purchasing power. Most voters in November will not be thinking about the Republican administration's financial and economic policies as such, but they can hardly help noticing that, for the first time in a very long time, their dollars buy as much this year as they bought last year.

Similarly, it was not an act of Congress that stopped the fighting in Korea last year, but deliberate efforts of the Republican administration—an administration, moreover, that shows every sign of thinking more than twice about participating in similar wars. And though Congress will do nothing about the Taft-Hartley law now, this is a year of labor peace, at least partly because the administration has removed the controls that led to much past labor friction and because it refuses to take sides in disputes.

We have no wish to minimize the work of Congress. We merely suggest that unusual conditions such as stability in the price of groceries, the absence of casualty lists and the general lack of bitter, crippling strikes are at least as significant politically as the fate of the housing bill or even the highly publicized distractions on Capitol Hill that the President noted the other night.

In November 1952 the people showed that they liked Mr. Eisenhower much better than they liked his party. What they will think of the party in November 1954, it would be silly to try to say. But this time, at least, the party, in the form of the Members of Congress up for reelection, has a record of substantial accomplishment to run on. And the record will be there no matter how inactive Congress is the rest of this session.

Unity Is the Theme

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEO W. O'BRIEN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 1954

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, the Congress of the United States joins officially tomorrow with the State of New York and the city of Albany, N. Y., in celebrating the 200th anniversary of the First American Congress.

On June 24, 1754, Benjamin Franklin presented to that Congress, composed of delegates from the colonies of New York, Pennsylvania, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, Maryland, and New Hampshire, a resolution stating that a union of all the colonies was essential. The plan drafted and approved by the delegates is recorded in history as the Albany Plan of Union.

Rejected by the British Crown because it would give too much power to the colonies and rejected by the colonies because it gave them too little, the plan nevertheless, became the seed from which sprang, 22 years later, the Declaration of Independence, and eventually, the perfect union which is the United States of America.

The people of New York State and of Albany are deeply grateful to the present Congress and the President for their approval of my resolution commemorating our stirring beginning and for sending to Albany today a delegation of 7 Senators and 7 Representatives from the 7 States which, as colonies, sent delegates to that long ago First Congress.

We are grateful because, by your action, you have helped to remove the dust from an almost forgotten page of American history, giving that page its proper place in the great march of events which has transformed those little colonies of 1754 into the world giant of 1954.

Why has the Congress of today, with its many problems, seen fit to dispatch 14 busy Members to these commemorative ceremonies? Why have my city and my State embarked upon this celebration?

The answer, I think, is twofold.

First, because it is important n these stark days to remnd ourselves of the greatness of our past; to strengthen our minds and resolution by reflecting upon the courage of those who clamored for union two centuries ago; to warm our hands and our hearts at the banked fires of history.

Secondly, because the theme of the celebration is national unity. Twice, in my own generation, we have been compelled to go to war because tyrants in other lands misunderstood the temper of the American people, seizing upon their surface disagreements as a symptom of disunity.

That must not happen again. We must serve notice upon those who think they can seize the world without interference from us that the people of the United States are as united basically as they were in 1754 or at any other time in our history.

Let those who think otherwise look long and well at what is happening in Albany, N. Y., where, almost on the eve of a great political campaign, men and women of both major parties gather to pay tribute to the past and to say again, as did the Congress of 1754, that union is essential to our freedom.

Flag Presentation to Adams Memorial High School

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 22, 1954

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD articles from the North Adams (Mass.) Transcript of May 27 and May 29, 1954, describing the ceremonies in connection with the presentation to the Adams Memorial High School of an American flag which has flown over the Capitol in Washington. It is to occupy a place of honor in the gymnasium of that high school, in respect to the memory of Lt. D. F. Curtin, Jr., who gave his life for his country in World War II, and who was a distinguished member of the faculty of that school before entering the military service.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the North Adams (Mass.) Transcript of May 28, 1954]

TO PRESENT FLAG TOMORROW IN HONOR OF LIEUTENANT CURTIN

An American flag that has flown over the Capitol at Washington, D. C., is to occupy a place of honor in the gymnasium at Adams Memorial High School in memory of a former member of the faculty who lost his life while serving with the Armed Forces in World War II.

SPECIAL CEREMONIES

Tomorrow afternoon at 2 o'clock at special ceremonies arranged in observance of Memorial Day, the flag, donated by Paul G. Cavicchia, of Newark, N. J., formally will be presented to the school, in memory of Lt. Daniel F. Curtin, Jr., who taught mathematics and industrial geography at Adams High School from September 1, 1939, to October 1, 1942, and who was drowned during amphibious landings in Europe in November 1944. The presentation will be made by Lieutenant Curtin's cousin, Selectman Thomas J. Curtin, Jr., of Cheshire, on behalf of Mr. Cavicchia, who was Lieutenant Curtin's classmate at American International College, Springfield. School Supt. J. Franklin Farrell will accept the gift, on behalf of the school.

An invitation was extended today by Principal John J. Gross, to representatives of any patriotic organizations in Adams to attend the presentation program.

Principal Gross, who will preside at the ceremonies, is also to read all of the official correspondence relating to the gift.

TO PRESENT PLAY

Thomas Tanguay, of the senior class, will recite Lincoln's Gettysburg Address. A play, entitled "Bury the Dead," by Irwin Shaw, will be presented by a cast of 15 pupils, with Miss Mary E. Malley, of the English department, as director.

Lieutenant Curtin was 29 years old when he lost his life by drowning during landing operations on the Normandy coast of France in November 1944.

A native of Pittsfield, where he was born on December 25, 1915, son of Mrs. Anna Curtin, now of Ware, and the late Mr. Curtin, he had spent most of his life in Cheshire where his parents moved when he was a small child. He attended public schools there, was graduated from Adams High School, and then went to American International College, Springfield, where he received his bachelor's degree. After graduate study at North Adams State Teachers College to prepare himself for a teaching career, he was named to the faculty of Adams High School.

INDUCTED IN 1939

Inducted into the service in March 1939, he served for 6 months, then was put on inactive status and in September of that year was appointed a teacher in Adams High School.

In October 1942, he was called again to active duty. Selected then for officer training, he attended the Infantry Officer Candidate School at Fort Benning, Ga., where he received his commission.

He was assigned to an infantry division training in this country and went overseas with it in the late summer of 1944.

His body was returned to Cheshire for burial early in 1948.

[From the North Adams (Mass.) Transcript of May 29, 1954]

LT. D. F. CURTIN EXTOLLED DURING FLAG PRESENTATION

The virtues of Lt. Daniel F. Curtin, Jr., and the ideals for which he fought and died were extolled in spoken and printed words as an American flag, that once flew over the Nation's Capitol, was presented in his memory for use in the Adams Memorial High School gymnasium at impressive ceremonies there yesterday afternoon.

FLAG PRESENTATION

A hushed and attentive audience of pupils and faculty, most of the latter former associates of Lieutenant Curtin when he was a faculty member, attended the program arranged in observance of Memorial Day with the flag presentation as the feature.

Lieutenant Curtin's cousin, Selectman Thomas J. Curtin, Jr., of Cheshire, made the formal presentation to the school on behalf of Paul Gaetano Cavicchia of Newark, N. J., a classmate of Lieutenant Curtin at American International College, Springfield.

In accepting the gift, School Supt. J. Franklin Farrell warmly praised Lieutenant Curtin for his virtues and for his "many fine qualities as a member of the school faculty and as a friend."

Principal John J. Grosz, who presided at the program, read all of the official correspondence relating to the gift. This included a letter from Bernard M. Shanley, special counsel to President Eisenhower in which he stated, "Although I am unable to be present I want to add my tribute and to tell you that we shall most certainly remember the occasion here."

SALTONSTALL LETTER

Also a letter from Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, which read, in part: "This flag will symbolize that spirit of dedication to freedom which has inspired America's soldiers in all its wars, in this world of tension and crisis, we more than ever need to be reminded that freedom is a cause which not only demands sacrifice but which amply rewards sacrifice. We, who today enjoy that reward, must never forget our indebtedness to those who have won it for us."

The letter to Principal Grosz from Mr. Cavicchia, paid tribute to his friend, Lieutenant Curtin, as follows:

"Dan was always a grand fellow and was well liked by all with whom he came in contact. He was a firm believer in our American way of life and always had a great deal of respect for all, regardless of race, creed, or color.

"Dan died on foreign shores, wearing the uniform of the United States Army, in the greatest war this country of ours has ever been involved in.

"The victory in that conflict continued to make this country the greatest and most powerful in the world, as well as to unshackle most of Europe whose citizens were shackled under a brutal government.

"As we honor the dead on this Memorial Day, so we rededicate ourselves to continually work to better the community in which we live; to respect our neighbors; to take an active and prominent part in our Government on all levels, and to worship our Lord in our own way.

"In doing this, we are carrying out the philosophies of Dan Curtin and his colleagues who before him on the wooded fields of Bunker Hill, to the mountains of Korea have upheld American democracy."

TWO OTHER LETTERS

Mr. Grosz also read a letter from Congressman PETER W. RODINO, Jr., of New Jersey, regarding the securing of the flag and one from David Lynn, Architect of the Capitol, certifying that the flag had flown from the Capitol staff.

The program also included a flag salute, Lincoln's Gettysburg Address by Thomas Tanguay, of the senior class, the presentation of $5 and $3 cash prizes, respectively, to Lawrence Williams and Miss Zilpha Brown, winners in the United Nations contest, with honorable mention to William Varno and William Tattersall, and a play entitled "Bury the Dead," directed by Miss Mary E. Malley, of the English department of the school faculty.

Parts in the play were taken by Lawrence Williams, Andrew Gospodarek, Paul Olendrowicz, Kenneth Soha, Roger Picard, Donald Kordana, John Miles, Richard Guettler, Raymond Wellspeak, Misses Elaine Alibozek, Lucille Dennett, Salome Les, Lillian Soja, Barbara Cardonnel, and Theresa Gelineau.

Regarding the Religious Persecutions and True Status of Croatia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. PILLION

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 1954

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to insert the following memorandum in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD submitted by the Croatian Catholic clergy of the United States of America, and other parts of the free world:

MEMORANDUM REGARDING THE RELIGIOUS PERSECUTIONS AND TRUE STATUS OF CROATIA AND ITS PEOPLE

(Submitted by the Croatian Catholic clergy of the United States of America, and other parts of the free world)

We, the members of the Croatian Catholic clergy living in the United States of America and in other parts of the free world, wish to bring to the attention of the world the history of the religious persecutions and systematic attempts to destroy the Croatian people.

The systematic destruction was begun in the prewar Kingdom of Yugoslavia and is being pursued at the present time by Serbian groups and ruling circles in Communist Yugoslavia and has succeeded in winning over and influencing large segments of the Serbian people.

As clergymen and Croats, we feel duty-bound to take this action for the following considerations:

1. Silenced by Communist censorship, the Croatian people cannot speak for themselves;
2. Being ourselves Croats, we are familiar with the national aspirations and struggles for national independence of the Croatian people;
3. We feel compelled to counter the well-conducted, 30-year-old campaign of anti-Croatian propaganda;
4. World opinion should have the true history of the religious persecutions and conditions prevailing generally in Croatia since 1918.

Supported by several documents of the Croatian Catholic hierarchy, we submit this memorandum.

This type of protest does not belong to the regular domain of priestly activity, the undersigned clergymen are well aware. We believe, however, that priests, as well as all people, have a real moral obligation to come to the defense of the helplessly oppressed. This is especially true when suppression of religious, cultural, and economic liberties threatens even the physical extinction of people whose pastors and descendants we are.

BEFORE VERSAILLES

The Croats first appeared on the political may of Europe as early as the seventh century A. D., and by the beginning of the 10th century had formed the powerful Croatian State. Centuries of incessant wars fought on this crossroads between Europe and Asia prevented the nation from progressing as swiftly and as successfully as its less-fought-over neighbor nations.

Relying on the Wilsonian principle of self-determination, the Croats took advantage of the disintegration of the Austro-Hungarian Empire toward the end of World War I and proclaimed their national independence 2 weeks before the Armistice, on October 29, 1918. But the Versailles Treaty, which created the artificial Kingdom of Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes over the protests and pleas of the Croatian people, put an end to this short-lived independence. All marks of a sovereignty ended and the era of oppression and persecution began.

TERROR IN THE TWENTIES

Since its creation in 1918, Yugoslavia has never been a democratic state. On December 1, 1918, detachments of the Serbian Army and police overran Croatia and instituted a rule of terror, of intimidation, of beating Croatian peasants, and of imprisoning their leaders.

The terror which has begun in Croatia with the killing of Croatian soldiers by the Serbian troops on the streets of Zagreb in December 1918, and the flogging of Coatian peasants in the winter of 1918–19, reached its height in the murder of the Croatian national leader Stephen Radic and other Croatian leaders on June 20, 1929, in the Belgrade Parliament.

Suspension of the rights of assembly and free speech followed the establishment of the dictatorship. Muzzling of the press and imposition of rigid censorship on the whole nation cut off all cries for help beyond the frontiers.

Jails and penitentiaries of the land soon filled with patriotic Croats who dared remain true to their race and nation. The prisoners were subjected to extreme cruelties to extract "confessions" designed to incriminate and convict other patriots.

PERSECUTION—RELIGION

Religious liberty enjoyed by the Serbs was denied the Croats. Laws were promulgated against the Roman Catholic Church and its priests. The Frenchman Pezet in his book La Yougoslavie en Peril? and other foreign observers noted this discrimination. The extent of the Serbian persecution of the Croats can be seen from the fact that at least 200,000 Croats were morally constrained to abandon their religion and join the Serbo-Orthodox Church.

The Croats became second-class citizens and Croatia a Serbian colony. The late well-known British writer on Balkan problems, Seaton Watson, brought this condition to the attention of the world in his book Eastern Europe Between Two Wars.

INDEPENDENT STATE OF CROATIA

In view of the above history, one can understand the refusal of the Croats to defend Yugoslavia in 1941. Taking advantage of the disintegration of their unnatural and unfriendly government, they proclaimed the Independent State of Croatia in April 1941.

At this point, we take the opportunity to correct the prevailing erroneous opinion that the Axis Powers brought the Independent State of Croatia into existence. As a matter of historical fact, the Croatian people had proclaimed its independence before the Germans, Italians, and representatives of the wartime regime had appeared on Croatian soil. The proclamation of independence had been the spontaneous expression of the whole Croatian people and not at all related to later developments and political implications.

A statement by Dr. Alojzije Cardinal Stepinac made at his own trial supports this contention: "The entire Croation nation has unanimously declared itself for the Croatian State, and I should have been a despicable man had I not understood the beating of the heart of the Croat people who were slaves in former Yugoslavia."

MIHAILOVICH

Serbian nationalists and imperialists under the leadership of Draza Mihailovich, and the Communist partisans under Tito, mostly Serbs, directed vicious and well-planned attacks upon the new Croatian State from the beginning of its existence in 1941.

Mihailovich aimed at destroying the Croat State and reestablishing the lost Serbian supremacy over the Croats within the boundaries of Yugoslavia. He testified at his trial in Belgrade in 1946 that his principal objective had been to destroy the Croat State. To that effect he had even obtained arms from the Germans through General Nedich, at that time premier of the Serbian Government under the German occupation. The Serbian Chetniks had collaborated with both Germans and Italians in the Croatian provinces against the Croats and had killed thousands of the Croatian civilian population, including children and the aged.

TITO THE PARTISAN

The campaign of the Tito-led Communist Partisans against the young Croatian State was no less cruel and bloody. Masking its true nature under the guise of a liberation movement, it aimed at the establishment of a Communist dictatorship as soon as the whole territory of Yugoslavia had been occupied by Tito's forces.

Camouflaged under the name Peoples Liberation Army and People Liberation Front, it gave the impresion of being a nationwide liberation movement of various political and social parties and groups. The number of Croats who joined it was small. Tito himself declared on one occasion that he had but a few Croat partisans, and it is significant that even this small force were Croats from the coastal regions occupied by Italian Fascist forces.

The Serbs, on the other hand, joined the Communist-led movement en masse. It is no coincidence that during World War II as well as at the present time the officers' staff of Tito's army was and still is almost exclusively made up of Serbs.

What prompted the Allies first to accept and then to recognize Tito as their fighting partner, still puzzles the Croatian people. This recogniztion, accompanied by enormous aid, not only saved the Partisan movement from extinction but brought Tito and his clique to power.

TITO THE COMMUNIST

When the Tito regime felt its position secured, it inaugurated a campaign designed to liquidate all its opponents. It threw itself with particular fury against the Roman Catholic Church, its leaders, religious and lay, and against many Moslem leaders. By the end of the spring of 1945, the number of murdered Croatian Roman Catholic priests had reached 230.

These brutal killings led the last President Roosevelt to conclude the granting of plebiscite to the peoples of Yugoslavia to determine whethe they would like to live in that state or not.

Excesses were committed by all parties concerned, it must be admitted, although both the Nationalist and the Communist Serbian propagandists declared the Croatian wartime authorities and the Croatian people also responsible for all of them. In an effort to arrive at the real truth, we subcribe to an official statement issued by the Catholic bishops of Crotia at their meeting in Zagreb on March 24, 1945: "Wherefore the gathered Croatian bishops recommended that a committee be set up to examine all cases, and to gather facts which shall be readily presented to an international commission. Thus the truth will be known, and how lies were made the instrument of an ideology."

Thus the Croats were forced to fight during World War II against both groups, Fascist and Communist, to preserve not only the independence of their state but their very existence, for all the fighting occurred on Croatian territory because it was the Serbs who invaded Croat lands and led the Croats to wage a defensive war.

It is difficult to believe that the allied governments were not aware of the crimes committed by the partisans during the war and immediately after. Yet, to our knowledge and for reasons unexplained, we have never heard a public condemnation made of these crimes.

MOST TERRORIZED NATION IN EUROPE

It is probably true to state that, proportionate to its population, no other nation in Europe has been the scene of more racial persecution, more murder, arrest, and mass terrorism than Yugoslavia.

The state has a population of about 16 million, of which the Serbs make up slightly more than 6 million. The remainder of the nation is comprised of 5,250,000 Croats, 1,200,000 Slovenes, 1 million Bulgarian-Macedonians, and other minorities such as Albanians, Hungarians, Germans, Montenegrins and Romanians. The Serbs, though representing only about three-eights of the total population, have been the absolute rulers of the country since its creation. They have kept full control of all foreign affairs, the national economy, and the army and the Croats have been treated from the beginning as second-class citizens. In religion, the Croats, predominately Roman Catholic and partly Mohammedan, have been denied the religious liberty granted Orthodox Serbs. Obstruction and suppression chokes out every expression of Croatian national and cultural aspiration.

PERSECUTION OF RELIGIOUS LEADERS

The leader of the Croatian Catholics and the Metropolitan of Croatia, Archbishop (now Cardinal) Stepinac of Zagreb, was sentenced to 16 years imprisonment because he refused to bow to Communist tyranny and chose instead to speak in defense of his persecuted church. He was given his release from prison in December 1951 under the impact of world opinion and Tito's desire to secure economic aid from the West.

The exile of Cardinal Stepinac to his native village and the imprisonment of Bishop Dr. Petar Cule of Mostar and more than 200 Croatian Catholic priests and religious as well as a large number of Mohammedan clergy testifies to the unchanged Communist attitude toward all non-Serbian church elements. Croatian Orthodox Church head, Bishop Hermogenes, Ismet Muftic, head of the Mohammedan religion in Zagreb and Bishop Dr. Philip Popp of the Evangelical-Lutheran Church of Croatia have been murdered since the Communist occupation of Croatia. Two other Roman Catholic bishops, Dr. Josip Carevic and Dr. Janko Simrak have been murdered and Josip Garic, bishop of Banjaluka, died in exile at Graz in Austria and the Archbishop of Sarajevo, Dr. Ivan Saric still lives in exile.

Arrests of Roman Catholic priests continue, the clergy are insulted and ridiculed in public, all convents for religious women have been seized and the property confiscated and the entire Roman Catholic press has been suppressed and its property seized by the Government. In fact, all non-Communist publications have suffered a fate similar to that of the Roman Catholic press.

STILL THE POWDER KEG

Since the creation of the first Yugoslavia, constant fear of war and loss of independence has haunted the peoples of the Balkan countries. People still remember that the spark of World War I was ignited by a young Serb fanatic who assassinated Austrian Archduke Franz Ferdinand at Sarajevo in 1914.

Peace cannot be guaranteed in this part of Europe as long as the Serbians hold hegemony over the other peoples of Yugoslavia. These people want their freedom and the independence of their own states. The Croats have never wanted to be a part of Yugoslavia and yet have suffered the imposition of this artificial state upon them not once but twice within the space of 30 years. And even now, after the terrible nightmarish years, the Croats want to live in peaceful separation from the Serbs and history has shown that the Croats and Serbs, although centuries-old neighbors, never warred upon each other and never knew enmity until forced to live with each other in the same artificial state.

Cardinal Stepinac at his Communist trial in October 1946 solemnly declared: "The Croatian nation has been enslaved in former Yugoslavia * * * Whatever I have said of the right of the Croat nation to its freedom and independence is in complete accord with the basic principles enunciated by the Allies at Yalta and in the Atlantic Charter. Everything I said of the right of the Croatian people to their national freedom and independence is in full agreement with the moral law, and no one can reproach the Croats because they want that * * * If you think that the Croatian people are satisfied with their present fate, I challenge you to give them once more the opportunity of expressing freely their own will."

CROATS WANT INDEPENDENT STATE

The historical struggle of the Croatian nation for independence proves its determined will for the establishment of a democratic and sovereign state, Crottia, which will guarantee its religious freedom and cultural development, Therefore, we, the members of the clergy, deem it our sacred duty to exert every effort to bring this fact to the attention of the world: the Croatian people do not desire to be a part of any Yugoslav state, in any form whatsoever.

This declaration of the right of the Croatian people to national sovereignty creates no international problem but reaffirms the long-ignored demand and the indisputable right of a neglected and mistreated people to its full national independence.

Most Rev. Ivan E. Saric, archbishop of Sarajevo; Rt. Rev. Msgr. John Juricek, Rt. Rev. Msgr. M. Domladovac, Very Rev. Dr. Dominik Mandic, Very Rev. Venceslav Ardas, United States; Very Rev. Stejepan Rade, Argentina; Very Rev. Dobroslav Soric, Very Rev. Msgr. Dr. Tomislav Firis, Rev. Bono Andacic, United States; Rev. Pasko Anric, Argentina; Rev. Spiro Andrijanic, United States; Rev. Petar Antic, Rev. Gabriel Arko, Argentina; Rev. Franjo Bahoric, Rev. Dr. Vjeko Bambir, Rev. Bosiljko Bekavac, United States; Rev. Eugen Beluhan, Spain; Rev. Theodore Benkovic, United States; Rev. Dr. Vlado Bilobrk, Argentina; Rev. Innocent Bojanic, United States; Rev. Josip Borosak, Italy; Rev. Stjepan Budrovic, Rev. Petar Bulum, United States; Rev. Vilim Cecelja, Austria; Rev. Patrick Cigic, Rev. Ljubo Cuvalo, United States; Rev. Dominik Corie, Italy; Rev. Dr. Mirko Covic, Austria; Rev. Dr. Felix Diomartic, Rev. Berto Dragicevic, United States; Rev. Bogdan Dragun, France; Rev. Pavao Drenjancevic, Italy; Rev. Dr. Hijacint Eterovic, Rev. Nikola Babijanic, Rev. Fidelis Fajt, Rev. Petar Fiser, United States.

Rev. Ivan Frankovic, Israel; Rev. Ante Gabric, India; Rev. Dragutin Glavanic, Canada; Rev. Stanislav Golik, Rev. Rafael Grskoic, Rev. Silvije Grubisic, Rev. Dr. Rudolph Hrascanec, United States; Rev. Ivan Hrstic, Argentina; Rev. Dr. Lujo Ivandic, Canada; Rev. Jeronim Ivankovic, Austria; Rev. Marko Japundzic, Italy; Very Rev. Blaz Jerkovic, United States; Rev. Michael Juric, Austria; Rev. Dr. Ignacije Jurkovic, Rev. Dr. Dragutin Kamber, United States; Rev. Pio Karadzole, Rev. Dr. Metod Kelava, Argentina; Rev. Roman Kirin, Rev. Ivan Knego, Rev. Dr. Oton Knezovic, United States; Rev. Ante Kopunovic, Argentina; Rev. Andrija Kordic, United States; Rev. Lucijan Kordic, Switzerland; Rev. Dr. Predrag Kordic, United States; Rev. Mirko Kovacec, Rev. Marin Kovacev, Argentina; Rev. Ilija Krajacic, United States; Rev. Franjo Krautzer, Rev. Ferdinand Kremar, Austria; Rev. Jerome Kucan, United States; Rev. Dr. Stjepan Kukolja, Germany; Rev. Dr. Rajmund Kupareo, Chile; Rev. Dr. Stjepan Lackovic, United States; Rev. Stejpan Laptalo, Argentina; Rev. Dr. Dionizije Lasic, Italy; Rev. Dr. Miron Lasic, United States.

Very Rev. Sebastian Loncar, Rev. Dr. Castimir Majic, United States; Rev. Petar Mandac, Argentina; Rev. Zvonko Manduric, United States; Rev. Vlaho Margaretic, Argentina; Rev. Dr. Branko Maric, Spain; Rev. Marije Matic, United States; Rev. Innocent Mihojevic, Chile; Rev. Josip Mikulic, United States; Rev. Josip Murkovic, Argentina; Rev. Ambro Misetic, Rev. Josip Misic, United States; Rev. Vitomir Naletilic, Italy; Rev. Ivan Nikolic, Rev. Ante Nizic, Rev. Zoran Dr. Ostojic, United States; Andrija Ostric, Argentina; Rev. Dr. Bazilije Pandzic, Italy; Rev. Dr. Kruno Pandzic, United States; Rev. Luka Pavlinovic, Rev. Lino Pedisic, Argentina; Rev. Teofil Pehar, United States; Rev. Dr. Bonifacije Perovic, Argentina; Rev. Irenej Petricak, Rev. Karlo Piese, Rev. Vilim Primorac, United States; Rev. Franjo Radisic, Italy; Rev. Celestin Ragus, Rev. Steve Raich, United States; Rev. Bruno Raspudic, Rev. Dr. Gracijan Raspudic, Spain; Rev. Kornelije Ravlic, Very Rev. Viktor Rogulj, United States; Rev. Rafael Romac, Bolivia; Rev. Leonard Ruskovic, Argentina.

Rev. Ivan Sandri, Italy; Rev. Josip Simic, United States; Rev. Bonifacije Sipic, Argentina; Rev. Dr. Ivo Sivric, Rev. Ferdinand Skoko, Rev. Anselm Sliskovic, Rev. Dr. Nikola Sojat, Rev. Tugomir Soldo, Rev. Marijan Soric, United States; Rev. Stjepan Sprajc, Canada; Rev. Blaz Stefanic, Rev. Urban Stefanic, Argentina; Rev. Oskar Suster, United States; Rev. Josip Tibljas, Rev. Nikola Tojcic, Argentina; Rev. Peter Topic, United States; Rev. Ivan Triplat, Bolivia; Rev. Vinko Uvodic, Rev. Dr. Vladimir Vancik, Rev. Dr. Kvirin Vasilj, Very Rev. Dr. Vendelin Vasilj, United States; Rev. Bozidar Vidov, Italy; Rev. Serafin Vistica, United States; Rev. Josip Vizjak, India; Rev. Vladimir Vlahovic, United States; Rev. Jure Vrdoljak, Canada; Rev. Ivo Vukina, Italy; Rev. Vjenceslav Vukonic, United States; Rev. Trpimir Vuljan, Italy; Rev. Janko Zagar, Great Britain; Rev. Karlo Zanic, Rev. Dr. Serafin Zecevic, Canada; Rev. Vid Zic, United States; Rev. Josip Zovko, Rev. Marko Zovko, Argentina; Very Rev. Dr. David Zrno, United States.

DISTRIBUTION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

To the Vice President and each Senator 100 copies; to the Secretary and Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, each, 25 copies; to the Secretary, for official use, not to exceed 35 copies; to the Sergeant at Arms, for use on the floor of the Senate, not to exceed 50 copies; to each Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress, 68 copies; to the Clerk, Sergeant at Arms, and Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives, each, 25 copies; to the Clerk, for official use, not to exceed 50 copies; and to the Doorkeeper, for use on the floor of the House of Representatives, not to exceed 75 copies; to the Vice President and each Senator, Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress there shall also be furnished (and shall not be transferable), 3 copies of the daily Record, of which 1 shall be delivered at his residence, 1 at his office, and 1 at the Capitol.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

Code of Laws of the United States

Title 44, Section 181. Congressional Record; arrangement, style, contents, and indexes.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the Congressional Record, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the Congressional Record semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

Title 44, Section 182b. Same; illustrations, maps, diagrams.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the Record without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the Congressional Record the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily Record as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided*, That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the Record with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the official reporters of the Congressional Record, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the Record shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the Record issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the Record for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the Record of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the Record shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the Record style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the Record.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the Congressional Record any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided*, That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix, but this rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided*, That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the Congressional Record.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the Congressional Record Appendix the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed.

10. *Official reporters.*—The official reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the Congressional Record by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this restriction shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. The Public Printer or the official reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the Congressional Record which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Illustrations.*—Pursuant to section 182b, title 44, United States Code (as shown above), requests for authority to insert an illustration in the Record should be submitted to the Joint Committee on Printing through the chairman of the Committee on Printing of the respective House in which the speech desired to be illustrated may be delivered. Illustrations shall not exceed in size a page of the Record and shall be linecuts only. Copy for illustrations must be furnished to the Public Printer not later than 12:30 o'clock p. m. of the day preceding publication.

13. *Corrections.*—The permanent Record is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided*, That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further*, That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

Appendix

Importation of Foreign Oil

SPEECH

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 23, 1954

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, for years I have watched, and watched with growing alarm, the ominous march of foreign-produced oil into this country.

This oil may have all the glamour of coming from faraway places, but its production contributes nothing to the stability of this Nation's economy. It may buy silks for some mid-Eastern potentate's royal entourage, but at the same time it causes a substantial loss of tax revenue to our own local, State, and Federal Governments. It may, as in the case of Iranian oil, for example, offer a tempting morsel for oil-hungry Russia, but at the same time it injures this country's historical self-sufficiency as to oil in an era of machine warfare.

Yet this Nation is being fooled into an increasing reliance on such oil. In 1946 only 7.7 percent of the Nations' oil consumption was supplied by foreign oil. In 1954 more than 13 percent will be so supplied. This, mind you, is not the result of any incapability on the part of domestic oil producers. As a matter of fact, the domestic oil-producing industry is now capable of producing at least 1,500,000 barrels of oil per day over what it now produces. It does not do so, for the simple reason that its markets have been taken by foreign-produced oil.

Its markets have been usurped at a time when its productive capacity is unparalleled.

How has this been possible? The answer is really quite simple. Long ago the citizens of oil-producing States in this country became aware that to produce oil above a maximum efficient ratio was wasteful. They have recognized the need to relate production to market demand. In practice, this has prevented production in excess of market demand and stopped the wastes which are coincident to aboveground storage. These efforts have resulted in effective conservation. However, in recent years this relationship of production to market demand has resulted in an open sesame to foreign oil. Some of these countries, thanks, in part, to scanty population and meager demand, operate without the need for similar conservation measures. By contrast, in an attempt to preserve conservation measures which have over and over again proven to be wise, the domestic oil-producing industry in this country has seen its markets, like the proverbial Arab, steal silently away.

This threatens to cause a situation whereby oil-producing States are faced with a choice of keeping wise conservation programs, and losing markets for their oil, or tossing such programs out the window, in order to compete with foreign oil.

It is deplorable when such a situation impends. These conservation programs, after all, have contributed to the Nation's strength in petroleum fuel and lubricants through two tough World Wars. Their abandonment, it is obvious, might very well result in a return to the general chaos which prevailed in the industry prior to the realization of the wisdom of conservation.

It is a national problem, rather than that of any one State, or group of States.

My State, Pennsylvania, is only one of the 30 oil-producing States. Oil is found from Florida to California; from New York to Texas. Crude oil is, in fact, the Nation's most valuable mineral, in terms of actual value of production. Petroleum produced in this country, as a matter of fact, is worth more than all the Nation's other minerals put together, reaching a total value of $6,332,070,000 in 1953 alone. All told, the Nation has produced more than $76 billion worth of crude oil in the 95 years since its discovery in this country. The producing industry alone employs nearly 300,000 people, and when they add those people who are employed to refine and distribute those products and others who are indirectly dependent on a strong domestic oil-producing industry, you will see that the industry's national impact on employment involves millions of people.

The United States had just over a half-million oil wells in 1953. These wells averaged a production of 12.2 barrels per day, as compared with a Middle East average running well into the thousands of barrels daily. It is obvious, on the face of it, that if this oil continues to be unleashed, it will engulf an industry which is a major economic force in this country. It will also injure an industry which is vital to the national security. Something must be done to avoid this. Keep in mind that domestic oil producers have not asked that oil imports be completely prohibited, but, rather, that they be kept within some determinable bounds such as those which existed during the years just after World War II.

Unless something of this nature is done soon, we may well see the first of a series of events which will ultimately result in severe injury to the domestic oil industry. This first sympton of disaster could be the collapse of the industry's conservation system.

The situation in my own State, however, is unique in that the aforementioned conservation situation is not a key factor. Nonetheless, a series of events have combined in recent years to demonstrate that excessive oil imports have resulted in a real danger to Pennsylvania oil production. Here, in Pennsylvania, is where oil imports exert their initial impact. This is partly due to my State's geographical susceptibility to imports, but not completely so.

The situation of global oil oversupply, for example, has had much to do with a sharp decline in the volume of exports of Pennsylvania lubricating oils, and even more serious, has resulted in approximately a $2 per barrel drop in prices of Penn Grade oils in the last 5 years. Thus, the Pennsylvania oil producer is placed in a vise, between the inflexible forces of restricted markets and sharply curtailed prices, and is beaten by the hammer of soaring costs. To point this up in its true significance, you must first realize that all of Pennsylvania's oil production is marginal, stripper-well production. This means, in brief, that it takes only a little shove in the wrong direction to cause such wells to become unprofitable to operate. In the case of these wells, a continuation of excessive oil imports may very well mean the fatal difference between life and death. The resulting loss, in terms of inhibited discovery of additional oil reserves, would be a needless blow to our supply of oil for national defense.

Oil is the third-ranking mineral in Pennsylvania in terms of value of production. Coal, the most valuable mineral in the State, has also seen its production drastically restricted by oil imports. When production of 2 of a State's top 3 mineral products is impaired by a single force of dubious trustworthiness, it is time for citizens of that State to become alarmed.

I am, admittedly, so alarmed. Some 25 of Pennsylvania's 67 counties produce oil. My State is proud to be the birthplace of American oil. As of the first of the year, more than $2,300,000,000 worth of oil had been produced in the Keystone State. In 1953 alone, a total of $45,880,000 worth of crude oil was produced. In addition, a total of over $31 million worth of natural gas was produced, often as an added result of oil production. Nearly 7,000 people are employed in the production of oil in Pennsylvania. The further loss of markets for Pennsylvania oil will result in a loss of jobs for many of those people.

Production in recent years has already demonstrated a disturbing trend. In 1950, for example, Pennsylvania's average daily production was 32,500 barrels. This had dropped off to 29,300 barrels by 1953. This production, I might add, came from 80,500 wells. It is obvious from the fact that the average

Pennsylvania well produces three-tenths barrels of oil each day that the income from such wells is diversified. Compare this, if you will, with the fact that the average Saudi Arabian well produces more than 6,000 barrels per day, and you can see why foreign oil poses a real threat to the Pennsylvania oil producer. It offers a bonanza, by contrast, to the rulers of shiekdoms in the Near East.

As I mentioned a few moments ago, Titusville, Pa., is where the oil business, as we know it today, was born. The year 1959 marks the centennial of the discovery of oil in Pennsylvania. I earnestly hope that it isn't celebrated to the tune of bleak winds whistling above fertile but unfulfilled deposits of good Pennsylvia oil. For almost 100 years, Pennsylvania has built up her reserves of oil for America's consumption both in time of peace and time of war. Her proved reserves of crude oil, as of January 1, 1954, were more than 111 million barrels. It is my heartfelt hope that these reserves will be developed for the Nation's use and not callously sacrificed on the altar of the deceptive expedient which is offered by overseas oil.

Yet that may very well happen unless something is done soon. Since 1947, the oversupply of oil has caused the price of a barrel of Penn Grade crude oil to drop approximately $2 per barrel. Yet, at the same time, the industry's costs have continued to increase. The situation confronting Pennsylvania oil producers is serious. Make no mistake about it.

It also has some startling paradoxes. For example, the loss of export markets for Pennsylvania oil was in part accomplished through the buildup of European refineries, which, in turn, were made possible by the use of funds supplied by American taxpayers. Having paid for the buildup of refineries to process Middle Eastern, not American crude oil, we now find that foreign oil, never satisfied, would like also to take over the domestic markets for American crude oil. Thus, the recipient of tax revenue, rather than the payer of such taxes, emerges as the real winner in a situation which has few, if any parallels, in American history. It is a deplorable violation of every rule of equity and justice known to man. I, for one, do not propose to sit by in resigned acceptance of the so-called inevitable. I am not so certain that our country is eternally committed to a role of turning the other cheek for slaps from people whose friendship is questionable.

It is easy enough, in peace, to forget the role of oil in war. Easy, but not wise. It is good to remember that in today's American armed services, with all of their hundreds of thousands of varied machines, only one lone atomic-powered submarine can be fueled without oil. And even that single submarine makes generous use of petroleum lubricants.

Oil is vital to our defense. It is hard to think of a product more important to our national security.

Oil which cannot be protected during time of war is, however, of no value at all. When I hear that we must do this or that to protect Middle Eastern oil so we can use it in time of war, I am appalled. This oil, at Russia's very doorstep, would probably fall in any crisis as an easy prey to her vast land armies. Aside from the question as to whether she could actually use such oil for her own armies, it certainly holds little promise as a factor in this Nation's plans for defense.

The military experts of this Nation are vocally aware of this vulnerability. Gen. Alfred H. Johnson, the Defense Department's top expert on petroleum logistics, on December 22, 1953, told Senator GEORGE W. MALONE'S Special Subcommittee on Minerals, Materials, and Fuels that "we do not desire to place any reliance on any sources outside the Western Hemisphere." The general later added that he thought that any petroleum used in the Western Hemisphere would undoubtedly be Western Hemisphere petroleum.

Gen. Albert C. Wedemeyer, commander of the China Theater during World War II, discussing this problem before the same committee, commented as follows:

> I think it is unsound for a nation to depend upon sources of raw materials which are remote from that nation's dynamo or industrial potential.

That oil is a vital raw material was exemplified during World War II. Its importance to armies was graphically described by Gen. Carl Spaatz, in the February 9 issue of Newsweek magazine, when he said:

> Oil is the essential ingredient of modern warfare. Even supermodern atomic weapons amount to nothing unless the means of their delivery are fueled with oil.

It is obvious then that the Nation's military experts feel that adequate supplies of accessible oil are all-important to defense. I have heard no military leader say that we could defend supplies of oil in the Middle East, for example.

Yet we continue, as a nation, to become increasingly reliant on the Trojan horse of Mideast oil. It is a policy of folly, and one that we must, at all costs, reject before it results in irreparable harm to the domestic oil-producing industry.

The oil industry itself is well aware of such a danger. Through the National Petroleum Council, which includes oil importers, and is the industry's national advisory group to the Government on petroleum, it has specifically expressed this awareness. The council's policy on imports is as follows:

> 1. The Nation's economic welfare and security require a policy on petroleum imports which will encourage exploration and development efforts in the domestic industry and which will make available a maximum supply of domestic oil to meet the needs of this Nation.
>
> The availability of petroleum from domestic fields produced under sound conservation practices, together with other pertinent factors, provides the means for determining if imports are necessary and the extent to which imports are desirable to supplement our oil supplies on a basis which will be sound in terms of the national economy and in terms of conservation.
>
> The implementation of an import policy, therefore, should be flexible so that adjustments may readily be made from time to time.
>
> Imports in excess of our economic needs, after taking into account domestic production in conformance with good conservation practices and within the limits of maximum efficient rates of production, will retard domestic exploration and development of new oil fields and the technological progress in all branches of the industry which is essential to the Nation's economic welfare and security.

Nor is the industry alone in this awareness. On April 14, 1953, Senator FRANK CARLSON, of Kansas, addressing the Senate on the need for reasonable restrictions on oil imports, had this to say:

> There is nothing in our history that justifies aiding others by trading away our security.
>
> If we become reliant on others for our oil supply, we must become dependent on others for security.
>
> * * * * *
>
> Steel, operated by men and powered by petroleum, constitutes our real defense. These are the elements of a successful national defense. With petroleum, we can fuel planes, destroyers, tanks, submarines, and all the other military machines. Without petroleum, we could not even bring our men and machines into a posture of defense against our enemy.

Consumers of oil products are probably generally indifferent as to the peacetime source of crude oil, as long as security requirements are met and an adequate supply is available at the most reasonable price.

This latter requirement, incidentally, has certainly been fulfilled over a period of years. A recent comparison shows that 1 hour's average wage will buy almost 2½ times as much gasoline as it would a quarter of a century ago. In addition, 2 gallons of today's gasoline will do the work that it took 3 gallons to do 25 years ago. There is, beyond doubt, at least an adequate supply of such gasoline.

The military is aware of the dangers inherent in excessive dependence on foreign oil. The industry is aware of the unwisdom of such a policy. Consumers are interested primarily in an adequate supply of oil at a reasonable price. The domestic oil industry has been able to accomplish this.

If this is true as to the military, the industry, and the consuming public, why, then, do we import more and more oil?

That, indeed, is the $64 question, and one which this Congress should never evade. The basic constitutional responsibility for dealing with world trade lies with Congress.

The delegation of this responsibility to the executive branch was a deplorable mistake. It is a mistake which has extremely disturbing implications for this Nation's future unless Congress renews its proper role. The need for congressional action on such problems as that of oil imports is especially acute. The Congress, with responsibility to the electorate, should see that the wishes of the electorate are not forgotten in the rush to win friends and influence people all over the globe. There, are, after all, certain homefront considerations, too.

I think it was my colleague, Representative JOHN JARMAN, of Oklahoma, who said in an address to the House recently, something to the effect that our extractive industries are being injured, while our assembly-line industries are being helped, under the administration of the present trade-agreements program. This is an astute observation, and it is certainly a true one in the case of the oil industry.

We often hear an unembarrassed clamor on the part of certain production-line industry officials for free trade, and for getting dollars overseas. Dollars overseas for whose products you might ask? Why, what these fellows really have in mind is that those dollars be sent overseas in return for foreign crude oil, or iron ore, or anything else but the products which the free traders themselves manufacture. If these dollars get overseas, a lucrative market for production-line goods may result. Thus, their cry for free trade rings more than a little hollow.

Assembly-line industries can control output through manipulation of machines and manpower. When they want more output, they buy more machines or hire more manpower. Thus, in time of either peace or war, they can control the flow of goods. If markets can be created overseas, then such industries can increase their peacetime output and, perhaps, profit thereby.

This is a normal and natural desire. But when these overseas markets are created at the direct expense of extractive industries, such as oil, we enter the danger zone. For our extractive industries are not only vital to our defense, but they are also impossible to gear to the concepts of the production line. This is due to the fact that extractive industries are subject to the foibles of nature. Reserves of such products cannot always be located on the whim of a moment's notice.

They are found through continuous search in both peace and war. It is axiomatic that if it becomes uneconomic for an extractive industry to operate in peacetime, the industry will not discover adequate reserves of products which are vital in time of war.

In such a case, this philosophy of so-called free trade might well turn out to be the most expensive kind of trade, in the interests of national defense, that this Nation has ever seen. Yes; free trade can be expensive trade. The Congress would be wise to see that the interests of national defense are not so violated.

Domestic oil producers have pursued all of the other practical alternatives of possible solution to the problem presented by too much foreign oil. They have tried first of all to find administrative relief. This is apparently impossible under the trade-agreements program. That this alternative failed miserably is perhaps best seen from the fact that oil imports rose from 377,000 barrels per day in 1946 to well over a million barrels per day in 1953. The administrative route was a disappointing dead end, mostly because the State Department has called the shots with the primary intent of furthering global, as opposed to domestic, objectives. These objectives have been rationalized through such reports as that of the Randall Commission.

The domestic oil industry has also sought to convince the major American oil importers of the necessity to directly reduce their imports. Only in the last month has there been any evidence whatsoever on their part of even a recognition of the need to cut back. This came when some of the importing oil companies sliced off a small part of their large volume of imports. These cuts, when fully implemented, will amount to a total of perhaps 50,000 barrels per day.

When you relate this to the total volume of imports, you find that this token cutback amounts to perhaps 5 percent of that total volume. It can hardly be contended that a cut of such an amount is a real contribution to this problem when the industry is capable of turning out a million and one-half barrels of oil daily more than it now produces.

For a true indication of the future intentions of major oil importers, look at the testimony of Mr. J. W. Foley, vice president of the Texas Co., before the aforementioned Malone subcommittee. In December 1953, at a time when the situation of oversupply was already serious, Mr. Foley said, and I quote:

> It is apparent to us that domestic production cannot be increased sufficiently to meet * * * ever-increasing demand. This means we will be forced to further supplement our domestic supplies.

I might add again at this point that the industry's present capacity to produce is a great deal in excess of the demand for domestic oils and that ever-increasing imports are one of the chief reasons for this situation.

The possibilities of voluntary reduction are graphically demonstrated by figures which show that, by 1953, oil imports had increased by 179 percent during the postwar period since 1946, while domestic production had gone up only 36 percent. Total oil imports thus have increased five times as fast, percentagewise, as domestic oil production in the few years following World War II. Yet everyone remembers the sunken tankers of foreign oil during that war. Everyone knows that the atomic-powered submarine has made dependence on overseas oil for defense more foolhardy than ever.

Thus, administrative alternatives and voluntary reductions of oil imports have both failed. The domestic oil producer has recourse to only one other hope. That is the hope that Congress will see fit to correct this situation in the interests of national security.

There are good precedents for such action. There is now an excise tax, although now made ineffectual, which was passed by Congress in 1932. It was emasculated by the aforementioned trade-agreements program. Prior to that program, in keeping with the desires of the Congress, the excise tax on oil imports resulted in a reduction of such imports from about 300,000 barrels daily early in 1932, to about 110,000 barrels daily at the end of that year. The Congress thus has established effective precedents in dealing with the oil-imports problem.

There may be some who have misgivings about what effect a limitation of oil imports would have on relationships with our allies. In this connection, it must be realized that the responsibility of industries in world trade should be diversified. No one industry should be singled out to carry the bulk of the burden. Nor should trade be a one-way affair. I think this was pointed up very well by Mr. Russell B. Brown, general counsel of the Independent Petroleum Association of America, in a speech on January 27, 1954, before the World Trade Club of the Cincinnati, Ohio, chamber of commerce. Here are some excerpts from that address:

> In discussing petroleum imports into the United States, we are * * * talking primarily of four countries, Venezuela, Netherlands West Indies, Saudi Arabia, and Kuwait. Based on dollar value, these countries accounted for more than 90 percent of all United States petroleum imports during the year 1952.
>
> It is argued that by increasing imports of oil, we enlarge our export of other commodities.
>
> Using the above four countries as an example, we find that petroleum constitutes their principal export commodity.
>
> Since World War II, the dollar value of petroleum imports from these four countries into the United States has continuously increased from less than 200 million to more than 600 million dollars.
>
> In contrast, our exports to these countries have not shown an increasing trend. From 1948 to 1952, oil imports into the United States from these 4 countries increased 62 percent, while our exports to these countries on products other than oil actually declined 5 percent, clearly demonstrating that the amount of goods we can sell these countries is not directly dependent on the amount of oil we can import from them.
>
> Venezuela alone is receiving over $700,000 per day more from oil shipments to the United States than that nation enjoyed in 1946.
>
> The Middle East is receiving about $350,000 per day more than in 1946. This is a total postwar contribution of more than $1 million each day.
>
> How much more must the domestic oil producer give?
>
> How much more can he give and survive to meet our country's needs and security?

To summarize, I would like to point out that further injury to an industry which supplies over half of the Nation's mineral value will be a severe blow to the national economy. Continued excessive importation of oil will result in a further loss of revenue to Federal, State, and local governments. A continuation of a policy of favoritism in behalf of assemblyline industries will hurt the Nation's overall raw-material potential. A continued high level of oil imports will seriously threaten a conservation program possessing a tradition of success which clearly illustrates its value. Too much foreign oil will ultimately cause a substantial loss of employment in some of our major industries. My own State, Pennsylvania, will be directly affected.

All of these threats are real and immediate. None of them, however, is as important as the danger to our structure of defense. Without accessible oil, we cannot hope to maintain even the pretense of defense. For oil is essential to each and every existing machine of war. It is the heartbeat of a mechanized army. When it stops, the army stops.

This, then, is a problem for Congress. It is a problem with which the Congress should deal now, before it is too late.

At this moment, we risk reliance on oil far from our lines of practical defense. Unless we do something, and do it soon, this reliance may become a reality rather than a risk.

It is up to this body to see that such a mistake is avoided.

Guatemala

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 23, 1954

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following editorial from the Christian Science Monitor, Boston, Mass., Monday, June 21, 1954:

BANANA COMPANY

(By William H. Stringer)

Whenever a United States journalist interviewed a Guatemalan official and began to talk about the Communist menace there that official was likely to shift his ground and say, "Ah, but the United Fruit Co."

Well, what about the United Fruit Co.? Is this constant reference to its alleged plotting a diversionary tactic learned from Moscow? Or is the company using its vast economic power against the best interests of poorly organized labor? Is the fruit company good for Central America, or is it doing harm there?

Not so many months ago, in point of what's happened since, a group of United States publishers and editors including myself were rolling along at a clicking 30 miles per hour on a narrow-gage railroad in the heart of the United Fruit Co.'s empire. We were starting at its plantations in Honduras, would later see Costa Rica, would end up in Guatemala City.

The mood was high-spirited, the repartee clever, and the theme song of the moment was, "Yes, we have seen no bananas"—which we hadn't in 2 hours of travel through plantations growing everything else under the hot sun. The previous evening, one publisher, a rhythmical gentleman, had taken over the drums in a marimba band at the La Lima golf club. The local players were first given to understand that he was Paul Whiteman's drummer, traveling incognito. I do not think they were deceived.

Did you ever hear a native marimba band, which learns all its haunting music by ear, play the Third Man Theme at a fast clip, under the palms and the starry sky of a little club in the far-off nowhereland of a fruit company port? It is weird and lovely. One thought of O. Henry, the old swashbuckling "banana republic" days, and the early mountain-capital dictators.

This was different. We were living on the 20th-century side of Central America. We were seeing controlled, scientifically managed agriculture, in vast acreages. We were living at guest houses equipped with modern plumbing and electric refrigerators. And we were riding in a strange kind of private car—a half-ton elongated Ford truck with flanged wheels.

The mestizo driver of the autocar slowed his vehicle, blowing his horn. We had passed in and out of jungles—which looked too dry for jungles, this not being the rainy season—and now, as we neared a native clearing, there was a cow on the track. A supercargo who passed for brakeman reached a long foot forward from the front platform and booted the bovine off the right of way.

We rolled on. A crane posed beside an irrigation ditch. Hibiscus flamed (proper verb for tropic tales) beside a native Indian hut, four shaky walls with a reed roof. A goat was asleep in the hot front yard. Soon we were approaching a company town, with clean, white, wooden houses, a vast grassy square, a commissary, and a school.

The natives who lived here and worked for the United Fruit Ço. were of every pigmentation, from light complexion, preponderantly Spanish, through Indian bronze to Negro black. They were being paid the highest wages of any agricultural workers in Honduras, and the same applied in Guatemala. No magnificent sum, but twice the wages of coffee plantation workers. Not many, to be sure, rose to executive rank.

We inspected the fruit company's Lancetilla experimental station in the course of our journey, mile on mile of plantings of every tropically useful wood, fiber, or fruit—teak and mahogany saplings, the perfume-base Elang Elang, abaca for hemp, varieties of cacao and coffee and bamboo. Some of these could one day become major money crops for Central America. That is, if nationalist pride permitted.

We saw acre on acre of African oil palm, whose berry-like fruit is pressed to produce a thick oil which becomes cooking fat and soap. Finally, we saw miles and miles of banana plantations, in Honduras, Costa Rica, and Guatemala, and watched the fat green stems being hurried—by railroad, truck, or river-jumping conveyor belts—to the waiting spic-and-span banana freighters.

The scope of activities reminded one of the big oil company operations in Saudi Arabia. This empires runs 400 miles of railroad in Honduras alone, repairs its own rolling stock, mixes its millions of gallons of tree spray, operates schools and hospitals, runs company stores, keeps dairy cattle, grows firewood, maintains its great white fleet of ships, some with tourist accommodations, and has its own wireless company.

A company as big as this could throw its weight around dangerously if it wished. But it now maintains correct, cooperative, and friendly relations with Honduras, Costa Rica, Panama. It has just signed a new contract with Costa Rica, increasing its income-tax contribution to the national treasury. In Guatemala there are old grievances, stemming from the long harsh rule of the former Guatemalan dictator, Jorge Ubico. But those days are gone forever.

Guatemala has plenty of opportunities for a bright, progressive future. Its rich coastal areas can grow boatloads of bananas and other tropical products. Outside capital and know-how are needed: whole banana plantations have to be flooded periodically to wipe out fungus attacks; the plants have to be sprayed and irrigated (miles of pipe are laid throughout the flat acres); replanting is necessary when high winds devastate. Its crops need diversification.

Guatemala is also a tourist's delight. Its capital city, 5,000 exhilarating feet in the air on a broad plateau, with two ancient volcanoes brooding on the horizon, has a climate which is close to that ideal: perpetual spring. Its new tourist hotels are charming. Its ancient Spanish capital in the hills, Antigua, partially wrecked by earthquake, is a treasure house of Spanish colonial architecture and customs. Its Mayan ruins are close at hand. And market day among the Indians at Chichicastenango has you mingling with the colorful but superstitious crowds of long-lost centuries.

Will the ultranationalism of Guatemala, influenced by Moscow's propaganda, curtail and limit Guatemala's normal development? Obviously if Guatemala wants to oust the fruit company, expropriate all foreign firms and try to operate without foreign capital or advice, that is the prerogative of a free country—so long as it pays just compensation, and so long as it does not become a menace to inter-American security.

Our traveling editors interviewed Prof. José Figueres of Costa Rica (who shortly afterward became President of that republic). Señor Figueres said no Central American republic wanted anything to do with North American carpetbaggers who came down there, exploited the country in the interests of making a fast buck, and then pulled out. But the companies that came to stay, and to benefit, or build up the native economies, such as Sears, Roebuck or the United Fruit Co., he welcomed, providing they behaved themselves.

Is there any question as to which attitude better serves the genuine interests of the people—that of Costa Rica or that of Guatemala?

Arms Budget Inadequate for Needs in Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 23, 1954

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I include in my remarks an article written by John Harriman appearing in the Boston Globe of June 21, 1954.

I have repeatedly said in and out of the House of Representatives: "That if we err, it is better to err on the side of strength than weakness"; also, "the Communist mind is the mind of a world killer"; also, "the only thing the Communists respect is what they fear, and that is strength and power greater than they possess."

The article follows:

ARMS BUDGET INADEQUATE FOR NEEDS IN CRISIS

(By John Harriman)

Don't take the administration's military budget, just passed by Congress, as the last word on armament spending in the fiscal year beginning July 1.

To be sure, this measure will be signed by President Eisenhower after minor differences between Senate and House versions are ironed out in conference. But already the military policy which this bill reflects is being restudied in the Pentagon and National Security Council. And unless we are to trifle with the national security, we are bound to see requests for larger appropriations, probably within the next 12 weeks.

ARMY CUT BACK FROM 20 TO 17 DIVISIONS

The administration's military budget as it now stands makes significant reduction in our armed strength.

It cuts total military spending from last year by $5,500,000,000, down to about $29,200,000,000 in the Senate version.

Most of this cut comes out of the Army, which is to be pruned back from 20 to 17 divisions. (An amendment offered by Senator KENNEDY to limit the cut to one division was defeated.)

The Air Force comes off relatively better, losing only $185 million. The Navy gets a little more money than in the current fiscal year.

But the important thing is to realize the background against which these cuts are to take place, the fact that we face an unpredictable destiny in southeast Asia, and are currently engaged in the most delicate negotiations in Europe.

If ever we have needed military strength to back up our diplomatic negotiations, it is now. While to reduce our land forces to 17 divisions would seem like nothing but an engraved invitation to aggression by the Chinese.

OUR STRENGTH IN COMPARISON WITH RUSSIA'S

Actually, even at present levels of armament expenditure we are losing ground in military strength in relation to the Soviet Union.

As against our 20 divisions (and proposed 17 divisions), the Soviet Union can muster 22 divisions in East Germany alone. Total Russian strength is 175 divisions, 65 of which are armored. And this force is backed up by 85 satellite divisions, not, of course, including the Chinese.

Russia has 20,000 planes ready to go compared to our 10,000. Annual production is usually put at 5,000 in the Soviet Union, against 6,000 here.

Furthermore, Russia's air arm is almost entirely jet, including a new four-jet intercontinental bomber capable of round-trip flights to the United States. Russia has also the world's largest submarine fleet, and her guided-missile program is said to equal our own.

In H-bomb development we are said to be only about 1 year ahead.

And all of this, of course, does not take into account the growing power of China.

In a world in which peace seems increasingly dependent on a balance of power, it is inconceivable that we shall sit tight on this new military budget, and watch the scales of strength tip more and more in favor of our antagonists. So count on further requests for military appropriations, probably before the present Congress adjourns.

The Ohio Society Sons of the American Revolution Answer Questionnaire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 23, 1954

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, my longtime friend, Mr. Charles A. Jones, of Columbus, Ohio, has sent me the result of what I think is a very interesting poll. Mr. Jones for years was the administrative assistant to a distinguished Ohio United States Senator, and while serving in that capacity he showed remarkable talent in keeping in touch with public opinion.

Mr. Jones says that the Ohio Society Sons of the American Revolution tried an experiment during the past few months. Early in January the president, Mr. Thomas A. Calhoun, of Dayton, mailed to each member a questionnaire dealing with pertinent public questions. This questionnaire was designed to avoid any partisan basis.

A 43 percent return was received on the 1,400 questionnaires sent out. The general protection of things American is evidenced in the answers to many of the questions.

Regardless of the attitude of the members of the Ohio Society Sons of the American Revolution on any of the specific questions in the three general areas, the majority of the members, 51.3 percent, held favorable opinions toward the present Republican administration in Washington. Only 3 percent were opposed without qualification to the policies and action of the present national administration; 15 percent were of the opinion that the present administration had served an insufficient length of time to overtly criticize the administrative function; 14.1 percent were of the opinion that more diligent work was needed by the administration; 2.4 percent indicated that the motivations of the present Federal governing unit was based on pure politics, and only a very few members, 0.9 percent, thought the New Deal influences of the previous administration were evidenced in the attitude and actions of the current Republican administration.

The thinking of the Ohio society on this particular question is basically the same regardless of the area of environment. The opinions expressed were in fundamental agreement whether the member lived in a small town or metropolitan area within the State of Ohio or outside the environs of the State.

Comments on the activities of the present administration in Washington

[Expressed in percentages]

Ohio	Adverse	Favorable	More work	Wait and see	Politics	"Dewey"
Small towns	3.5	52.8	16.3	9.3	4.7	14.0
Metropolitan areas	2.7	51.7	13.9	16.6	2.1	11.8
Out of State	3.9	47.1	11.8	13.7	------	23.5

In the more specific and delimited area of questioning on internationalism, almost three-fourths—70.1 percent—of the members were emphatic in the belief that the United States should maintain membership in the United Nations. However, the members were not as firmly convinced that the United States should continue to supply direct, tangible economic aid to the members of the U. N. The members were about evenly divided in favor—38.3 percent—and opposed—35.6 percent—to economic aid to foreign countries.

Do you believe the United States should remain in the United Nations?

Ohio	Yes	No	Qualified
Small towns	63.4	23.2	13.4
Metropolitan areas	71.8	17.8	10.4
Out of State	71.4	21.4	7.2

Do you favor continued foreign economic aid?

Ohio	Yes	No	Qualified
Small towns	35.5	34.8	29.7
Metropolitan areas	41.1	35.2	23.7
Out of State	22.4	39.7	37.9

Do you favor continued foreign military aid?

Ohio	Yes	No	Qualified
Small towns	47.8	25.7	26.5
Metropolitan areas	52.3	23.9	23.8
Out of State	47.8	25.7	26.5

The internal security of the United States is a subject of great concern to all citizens of the country and even more pertinent to the members of the Sons of the American Revolution. The current issue of subversive infiltration into the governmental and defense function tends to make questions concerning this issue more pronounced in importance. The importance and interest of this area of questioning is indicated by the fact that more of the members answered the questions pertaining to national security than any other group of questions on the survey. 93.8 percent of the members favored the investigations by the Un-American Activities Committee.

Do you favor the Un-American Activities Committee investigations?

Ohio	Yes	No	Qualified
Small towns	95.6	2.6	1.8
Metropolitan areas	94.4	2.7	2.9
Out of State	96.6	2.4	------

On the question of taxation the replies are as follows:

The question:

Do you believe we should cut taxes first and balance the budget later?

The replies:

Ohio	Yes	No	Qualified
Small towns	47.5	45.5	7.0
Metropolitan areas	35.6	58.5	5.9
Out of State	28.6	60.7	10.7

Would you approve higher Federal taxes if needed to balance the budget?

Ohio	Yes	No	Qualified
Small towns	41.3	51.4	7.3
Metropolitan areas	40.0	54.3	5.7
Out of State	42.9	46.4	10.7

On the question of economic assistance to the farmer through the price support program, over one-half, 53.3 percent of the members were directly opposed to this type of program. However, over one-third, 33.6 percent, did favor price maintenance for products from the farm.

Do you favor farm price supports?

Ohio	Yes	No	Qualified
Small towns	37.0	52.9	10.1
Metropolitan areas	34.0	52.4	13.6
Out of State	23.6	60.0	16.4

On Government assistance through social-security programs, 55.9 percent advocated a more inclusive type of coverage than the present program which excludes farmers and professional workers, 30.4 percent indicated acceptance of the present type of security benefits and saw no need for change.

Should social security be broadened to include groups not now covered?

Ohio	Yes	No	Qualified
Small towns	53. 2	30. 6	16. 2
Metropolitan areas	55. 6	32. 7	11. 7
Out of State	63. 6	14. 6	21. 8

Two other questions were asked of the Ohio society members which present problems of classification in the three general groups, enumerated previously. These questions are of national and international importance. The outgrowth of such legislation affects our relations with the rest of the world and our internal security. The member opinion was sought on the controversial Bricker amendment and the McCarran-Walters Immigration Act. A majority of the members favored the proposed Bricker amendment 86.6 percent to 11.1 percent, which is designed to protect the constitutional rights of American citizens.

On the McCarran-Walters Act, 74.8 percent of the members polled opposed a more liberal admission of immigrants and only 16.2 percent favor any changes in the restrictive nature of the Immigration Act.

He Should Be Admiral

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT HALE

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 23, 1954

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Boston Herald of June 22, 1954:

HE SHOULD BE ADMIRAL

Most of us still think of the world as we saw it first in the classroom—laid out in a line, North America, the Atlantic, Europe, Asia, the Pacific. We hardly think of the white space at the north as being anything at all.

But the men in the Pentagon and the Kremlin see a different world. They look at a polar-projection map, the map of the air age, and see the might of both East and West concentrated in a small circle around the Arctic. They see a comparatively few air miles instead of many ocean miles separating continents.

The Arctic will almost certainly be a major battleground in another war. We have officially recognized that, putting our air defenses first in the Arctic, giving highest priority to bases at Thule in north Greenland and elsewhere.

Yet we have few men who really know the top of the world and we have not paid proper honor to those who have taught us what we know. The Air Force's Bernt Balchen is still a colonel buried in a Pentagon office although the Air Force, day in and day out, depends in large part on work he has done.

One of the few men who have taught us about the Arctic is New England's own Donald B. MacMillan, 80 years old this September, who will leave on his 30th trip to the Arctic Saturday.

His ship will be filled with scientists who will bring back another load of information—facts which will be of vital importance to all services as they plan to defend the free world in an air age.

In the past his knowledge—and the knowledge of the hundreds of young men he has either taken to the north or inspired to study the Arctic—has served our country well in many levels.

He himself wrote an Eskimo dictionary which was distributed to our servicemen in the north. During the last war he served in the Navy and was influential in many ways. For example, his command took 10,000 aerial photographs of Labrador, Baffin Land and Greenland coast. He worked on Arctic fighting plans and helped choose sites for eventual bases.

As a scientist, a military man, a citizen, a teacher and as one of the last great explorers he deserves every honor the Nation can give him. Senator PAYNE, of Maine, with the support of other Senators including SALTONSTALL, KENNEDY, and BRIDGES, has a bill to make Donald MacMillan a rear admiral. Maine's Representative HALE has a similar bill in the House.

There is no title which can reward "Dan" MacMillan properly for what he has done for his country and for the free world. An admiral in every sense except name, he should be so recognized as he once more sails north to push forward the borders of man's knowledge.

Illegal Entrants Going Home, Officers Believe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 23, 1954

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, we recently passed a wetback control bill aimed at making possible a more workable system for employing legal Mexican agricultural workers in this country. There was considerable opposition to such legislation, which stated that our action would do little to help control this admittedly deplorable situation, whereby thousands of illegal aliens were coming into this country in search of work. Those of us who live along the Mexican border are pleased to note that the vast majority of farmers have availed themselves of the opportunity to hire legal workers, and have thus helped to dry up the conditions that made this influx possible. Under unanimous consent, I insert in the Appendix of the RECORD the following news item from the San Diego Union of June 17, 1954:

ILLEGAL ENTRANTS GOING HOME, OFFICERS BELIEVE—ONLY 400 CAPTURED FIRST DAY IN COUNTY; IMPERIAL GETS 880

Six hundred United States border patrol officers yesterday started an intensive drive to round up wetbacks in San Diego and Imperial Counties but found most illegal entrants had already fled the area.

Officers in charge of the operation which will spread later to other parts of the State, said a majority of wetbacks had apparently returned to Mexico or moved on to other parts of California during the much-publicized 7-day period of grace.

FOUR HUNDRED APPREHENDED

In San Diego County, 200 border patrolmen fanned out in squad car, jeep, airplane and on horseback but by nightfall had apprehended only 400 wetbacks. A normal day's haul is 700.

In Imperial County, 375 inspectors searched the El Centro border-patrol area but rounded up only 880 aliens, far below a normal day's haul of 1,800.

"The illegals sure took head" commented Herman Landon, Immigration and Naturalization Service district director, who was in El Centro to supervise the roundup. "They scattered in every direction."

DRIVE TO CONTINUE

Landon estimated that the all-out drive would continue in Imperial and San Diego Counties for about a week. Then the additional patrolmen, who were brought here from throughout the country, will move to northern sections of the State to continue the roundup.

Ranches and industries are key targets in the drive. Flying squads of patrolmen converged on hotels in Coronado and San Diego which have frequently employed aliens as busboys and other types of labor. But only a handful were found.

Seven planes flew over desolate mountain and desert terrain to spot wetbacks for radio-equipped jeeps and patrolmen on horseback. Uniformed patrolmen began a systematic check of ranches and farms in the area.

LARGEST ATTEMPTED

Justice Department officials, who ordered the mass roundup, said it was the largest ever attempted in California.

Landon estimated that about 2,000 wetbacks would be rounded up in southern California during the day, compared with 2,050 on Wednesday, the day before the drive started.

He said about 1,000 aliens a day will be transported to Nogales. From there they will be deported by train to the interior of Mexico.

SUPPLY AMPLE

Landon said ample quantities of Mexican contract labor is available at Mexicali to meet the needs of California growers.

Harlan Carter, border patrol chief in Washington, was in El Centro coordinating the drive there. Although most of the additional patrolmen will move north within a week, he said, "we intend to keep enough patrolmen here to keep the area clean."

Joseph L. Van Orshoven is in charge of the roundup in San Diego County. His sector also includes part of Riverside County.

AREAS INCLUDED

The Coachella Valley and Yuma areas are included in the El Centro sector. Landon said the patrol was checking 265 miles of border between San Diego and the Arizona line.

In June of 1951 the Government resorted to a wetback airlift in an attempt to discourage aliens from flocking across the border. Wet backs were flown from the Imperial Valley to Guadalajara, 1,100 miles south of the border, but the experiment was soon abandoned.

Statement of Principle Made by Hon. Gardner R. Withrow, of Wisconsin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GARDNER R. WITHROW

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 23, 1954

Mr. WITHROW. Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as I have announced my candidacy for renomination and election to Congress on the Republican ticket, I want to take this opportunity to make a brief but formal statement as to principles, which is as follows:

In my judgment, the American people voted for a change in 1952. I regarded my own reelection to Congress as a mandate to help give them that change. I have worked toward that end.

Insofar as I have felt that the policies of the Eisenhower administration contributed to this much-needed change, I have supported them—and will continue to do so.

I have supported the administration economy measures and tax program as the basis of sound national prosperity. I have supported administration efforts to strengthen American military defenses, particularly through airpower and improved weapons. I have supported and voted for the St. Lawrence seaway project, which, under President Eisenhower's leadership, has finally become an assured reality. I have supported any move which gave promise of a firmer and more realistic foreign policy and have especially commended the President's pledge to recognize the congressional authority to declare war.

On the other hand, insofar as I have felt that administration policies have failed to accomplish the much-needed change or have continued the discredited Truman-Acheson foreign program, I have opposed those policies and will continue to do so. What I believed to be wrong in 1952, I still believe to be wrong in 1954.

I have opposed, and will continue to oppose, the giveaway of American resources, tax funds, and manpower to unreliable, fair-weather allies who seek continued handouts from Uncle Sam but direct their policy of appeasement only to America's enemies.

I have supported, insofar as opportunity has afforded—and will continue to support—the Bricker amendment. I believe it is absolutely necessary to have a constitutional guaranty that the Constitution cannot be nullified by treaty provisions or executive agreements.

I have opposed, and will continue to oppose, subjecting American servicemen to the courts and judicial processes of foreign countries, where rights guaranteed all Americans by the Constitution are jeopardized or destroyed.

I have supported, and will continue to support, congressional investigations of Communist subversion and infiltration. Whatever improvements may be possible in such investigative procedures should be made. These Congressional investigations are the one safeguard available against Executive indifference to this Communist peril and the one principal means of public knowledge and understanding of this threat.

We all recognize agriculture as being basic. The prosperity of the entire Nation is dependent upon it, and that dairying comprises an important segment of agriculture. I firmly believe that dairy products should be supported under the same system as basic commodities. In the next few weeks we will know definitely the manner in which dairying and associated activities will be handled by the Congress.

It is necessary for the prosperity of the Nation that labor-management relations shall be harmonious in that each should recognize the rights of the other. I have always worked toward that end.

My office has always rendered service to the public of this district without regard to their political affiliations. That policy will be continued.

Resolutions Adopted at the 65th Annual Convention of the Nebraska Stock Growers Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 1954

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include a portion of some resolutions adopted at the 65th annual convention of the Nebraska Stock Growers Association at Chadron, Nebr., June 10 to 12, 1954. Attached are the resolutions which I commend to my colleagues for their reading:

Statement of Policy

We, your committee on resolutions, believe it appropriate to call attention again to the policies, objectives, and beliefs of this association.

The object of the Nebraska Stock Growers Association shall be to promote unity of purpose of cattlemen; to foster and to protect the interest of all cattle breeders and producers of the State of Nebraska; to seek to improve the general merit, and extend the favorable reputation of Nebraska cattle; and do all things necessary to advance the prosperity of the industry.

This committee desires to reaffirm these purposes and objectives of this association and that it will continue to be its aim to vigorously promote this interest and welfare of Nebraska cattlemen.

It has been through the organized efforts of the members of the Nebraska Stock Growers Association that the promotion and protection of the livestock interests have been achieved.

Thus, we summon all Nebraska cattlemen to become members of the association and to be more closely united to safeguard and to further their industry, always keeping in mind the general welfare and prosperity of our State.

EXECUTIVE COUNCIL AND OFFICERS

Be it hereby resolved, That all of the acts and proceedings of the executive council and the officers of the Nebraska Stock Growers Association since the last annual meeting on June 11, 12, 13, 1953, in Omaha, Nebr., as set forth in the respective minutes of the Nebraska Stock Growers Association in furtherance thereof, be and the same hereby are fully ratified, approved, and confirmed.

BUY AMERICAN

Whereas the appropriation for the armed services for several years carried a Buy American provision, which resulted in large purchases of beef for the Armed Forces; and

Whereas the freetraders are now attacking this provision: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we urge the continuation of this program in order to continue this outlet for beef.

NATIONAL LIVESTOCK AND MEAT BOARD

Whereas the National Livestock and Meat Board is carrying on an extensive program of research for the purpose of expanding the nutritional knowledge of meat and is conducting extensive merchandising and meat cookery programs, and is performing many educational and promotional activities that place meat as the most important food in a well-balanced diet; and

Whereas the National Livestock and Meat Board is doing a very constructive service to our industry and is dependent upon voluntary contributions of livestock producers, feeders, and packers for its financial support: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Nebraska Stock Growers Association fully endorse the work of the National Livestock and Meat Board.

AMERICAN NATIONAL BEEF PROMOTION

Whereas there is a well-recognized need for more intensive promotion of beef and a broader public relations campaign, for more intensive research in the field of marketing and for the developing of new uses for beef and its byproducts; and

Whereas the American National Cattlemen's Association has appointed a marketing committee to head up their beef promotion program: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we commend the American National Cattlemen's Association for their leadership in beef promotion and urge our members to cooperate in it.

NATIONAL LIVESTOCK TAX COMMITTEE

Whereas the work of the National Livestock Tax Committee relating to the problems of capital gains allowance on the sale of breeding stock has been most important, effective and in the interest of our industry: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Nebraska Stock Growers Association do particularly commend and thank the National Livestock Tax Committee for its effort and congratulate the said committee and express our hope that the committee will continue its good work in all tax matters of national importance, affecting our industry, with continuing success.

AMERICAN MEAT INSTITUTE ADVERTISING PROGRAM

Whereas the American Meat Institute has carried on a broad advertising campaign which reaches millions of American consumers through foremost publications and national radio program, stressing the importance of the producer in contributing to the health and economy of the Nation in meat production; and

Whereas this advertising is a benefit to every producer and feeder in the meat-animal industry: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Nebraska Stock Growers Association expresses its thanks and appreciation for this advertising.

WORLD TRADE

Whereas it is vital, not only to the United States but to the whole world, that the United States economy be maintained at its strongest during these times of world unrest; and

Whereas the country cannot compete with the products of low-paid foreign labor: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we restate our position that the promotion of world trade must not endanger the standards of the American workingman, American industry, or American agriculture, but must be done within the area of protection for these groups.

ECONOMY

Whereas the United States has for a number of years been making large appropriations for defense purposes and for foreign aid of various kinds; and

Whereas it now appears that many billions of dollars of the American taxpayers' money has been squandered on foreign aid; and

Whereas the present administration has promised the American people that it would reduce taxes and balance the budget: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we urge the Congress to scrutinize all appropriations for foreign aid with the view of eliminating many billions of dollars as gifts and handouts to countries now able to provide for and protect themselves. Only through the elimination of such gifts and handouts can our expenditures be reduced, our budget balanced, and the solvency of the Republic maintained.

PRICE SUPPORTS

Whereas the Nebraska Stock Growers Association has traditionally opposed Government controls and subsidies; and

Whereas it is economically unsound for the Government to maintain support prices on any agricultural commodities that will guarantee the producer of that commodity a profit, thereby creating a surplus: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That in order to reestablish a sound agricultural economy as a long-range program, we recommend immediate action by the Congress to amend the present law to provide for flexible price supports on agricultural commodities to be determined annually by the Secretary of Agriculture before the crops are planted.

GOVERNMENT BEEF BUYING

Whereas the Government's beef buying program, which came to a close after purchases of about 250 million pounds of beef, representing about 860,000 of the lower-grade beef animals, has been of great value to the cattle industry in bolstering sagging cattle prices; and

Whereas this program is not at the expense of the taxpayer because purchases were made (1) with section 32 funds derived from import duties on cattle, beef, and beef products and (2) with a small percentage of foreign-aid funds already voted; and

Whereas most of the purchases under this program have been for school lunches and the remainder for foreign aid. We believe the public benefits by the school-lunch program and that it is better to send beef than dollars to needy foreign nations: Therefore be it

Resolved, That in conducting the program this year, the Department of Agriculture should plan purchases to coincide with anticipated major runs of cows and grass beef to market and should contract for a future limited delivery date on a market-cost plus basis.

SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

Whereas the administration has presented a plan to Congress, which, if enacted into law, will make ranchers and farmers subject to the Social Security Act; and

Whereas we believe such legislation to be unnecessary and not desired by self-employed farmers and ranchers: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, the members of the Nebraska Stock Growers Association, in convention assembled, are opposed to any such amendment; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to each of our Senators and Representatives in Congress and that they consider it a request to do everything in their power to defeat such proposal or any similar plan.

SENATE BILL 3504

Whereas section 317 of the Packers and Stockyards Act of 1921, as amended, does not give adequate opportunity to inspect for brands on cattle shipped into Nebraska from other States; and

Whereas Senate bill 3504 as introduced by Senator BOWRING on May 24, 1954, will make for better administration of the law and permit better inspection: Therefore be it

Resolved, That this association go on record as favoring the passage of Senate bill 3504; and be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary be instructed to write the Members of Congress from Nebraska urging them to get every possible support on the bill.

DISEASE RESEARCH PROGRAM

Whereas livestock and livestock products account for from two-thirds to three-fourths of Nebraska's farm and ranch income; and

Whereas animal diseases are becoming a greater problem every year, and losses suffered therefrom are especially of economic importance in this time of lower prices; and

Whereas we feel our present research is not keeping up with livestock diseases: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That our legislative committee and executive council take whatever action they deem necessary to correct this situation, and to work with our legislature and other State agencies to vigorously further a better and more complete animal disease research program.

High, Fixed Price Supports Dangerous

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 23, 1954

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the San Diego Union of June 21, 1954:

HIGH, FIXED PRICE SUPPORTS DANGEROUS

When man subsisted primarily on leaves and roots, the appendix performed a necessary digestive function. Now it can be a menace.

During World War II when the United States was supplying food to more than half the world, high, rigid farm-price supports were required to stimulate the necessary farm production. Now, however, wartime farm-production stimulants endanger the health of the national economy.

An idea of just how dangerous they are can be had from President Eisenhower's recent statement that the Government is spending $30,000 an hour—every hour—just to store agricultural surpluses.

There are many aspects of price supports which are glossed over by the articulate spokesmen for the farmer who, headquartered in Washington offices, seek to pressure Congress and mold public opinion.

One neglected aspect is that rigid price supports affect crops which constitute only 23 percent of the farmers' income. Only wheat, corn, cotton, rice, tobacco, and peanuts enjoy 90 percent parity support.

Another fact which we do not hear Charles Brannan, and other New and Fair Dealers, mention is that the present fixed supports encourage farmers to produce crops for which their land is not suited.

Here is economic waste. Its industrial counterpart would exist if all the machine shops which mushroomed up to satisfy the Government's need for war materiel, still continued to produce the same old parts.

President Eisenhower and Ezra Benson know the facts of farm economics—that a lot of small producers must sell to a relatively small number of buyers; that the production cycle is long and resists adjustment; that weather exerts great influence.

Because they know these things, they want price supports for farmers. They want flexible supports to permit prices to be adjusted to the realities. They want farmers to produce for the consumers, not the Government. The present program cost the Government $2.8 billion during the last 12 months. Is it any wonder that the President thinks it's time for a change?

The Crisis in the Textile Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 9, 1954

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following testimony on behalf of the Textile Workers Union of America, CIO, in support of H. R. 9430, presented by Mr. John W. Edelman, Washington representative of the Textile Workers Union of America, before the House Ways and Means Committee:

Textile is again a sick industry.

For a long and weary stretch of years dating back into the twenties and all the way up to the postwar period—that is right after World War II—the textile industry was one of the Nation's most serious social and economic problem areas.

Therefore, we say the present illness in textiles is a recurrence of a malady whose causes are basically very much the same as those which caused the earlier ailments of this important and basic industry. As was pointed out so clearly by the New York Times in its editorial of June 7, a general revival of business prosperity would not of itself insure any substantial measure of recovery for the textile industry.

Congress and the administration must seriously grapple with this overall problem of economic maladjustment in the textile industry. This will involve legislative and executive action in several different fields.

One immediately urgent and necessary action by the Congress for the relief of the unemployed textile workers, and to help the very considerable areas of our economy where textile plants are located, is the substantial improvement and standardization of our unemployment-compensation laws.

As one of the principal affiliates of the Congress of Industrial Organizations, the Textile Workers Union of America strongly supports and urges enactment of H. R. 9430, introduced by Representative AIME J. FORAND and by almost 90 other Members of the House of Representatives.

This union advocates passage of H. R. 9430 both as a very necessary prop for our total economy during this period of mounting unemployment and as a long-delayed measure of social justice. In addition, we point out that there would be a very special value to the roughly 1 million textile workers scattered in some 30 States who have been suffering in varying degrees, depending on the particular branch of the industry, from a steadily contracting demand for the products which their plants manufacture.

It is not appropriate in this statement to attempt to set forth in any detail the whole range of the problems of the textile industry. We merely refer to certain aspects of these difficulties which illustrate the need for prompt improvement both of the average amount of unemployment benefits and on increase in the number of weeks which the unemployed worker may be paid these benefits.

For instance, one important branch of the textiles is suffering critically and simultaneously from a contraction in the demand for its products plus the institution of sweeping technological changes which drastically reduce the number of employees needed to produce a given volume of goods.

We call the attention of the Ways and Means Committee to the situation in the rayon section of our industry.

In Cumberland, Md., we have a synthetic-fiber plant which when first established probably employed a greater number of men and women in one location than in any other mill of its kind in the country. Five years ago this establishment employed a force of 8,000. Today, after new processes have been installed the plant can produce as much, if not more, than it did 5 years ago with a work force of 4,000, or half of the number employed before the most recent technical changes were made.

This further point should be made about the Cumberland plant. Because of the widespread slum in demand for acetate fibers, this mill has been obliged to curtail its operation and the number of people who are today actually working is not more than 1,400 persons.

Four years ago, when the first drastic layoff occurred in Cumberland, the Textile Workers Union of America interested practically all of the appropriate agencies of government in making an extensive study of this particular area with a view to developing alternative types of employment. The city of Cumberland, the county of Allegheny, and the Free State of Maryland, all cooperated in that study, as did the local business community and the entire body of organized labor. The most diligent efforts have been expended on this problem. No substantial ameliorative measures have resulted from all this study and effort, and today Cumberland is probably even worse off than before the first major layoffs occurred.

In Marcus Hook, Pa., the American Viscose Corp. is in the process of permanently and completely closing down its plant, owing to the precipitate drop in demand, which has overtaken the acetate section of the synthetics industry. This big mill in Marcus Hook was the original plant in the chain now operated by the Viscose Corp. For some time now, this unit has been working on with a reduced force, but even at that, the number of people who will be thrown out of jobs permanently at this point is about 1,400.

Mr. Wesley W. Cook, director of the synthetic division of the Textile Workers Union of America estimates that nationwide the mills making the acetate type of fiber are operating at less than 35 percent of normal capacity.

At this point, in our testimony, we wish to quote from a report made by the officers and executive council of the Textile Workers Union of America to its recent eighth biennial convention. This report is entitled "Depression in Textiles: A Warning to America." Herewith, we reproduce pertinent portions of this analysis:

"Although the American economy as a whole operated in high gear through the first three quarters of the last 2 years, the textile industry did not. The Nation's output broke all records as tremendous plant improvement and expansion programs were completed; more people were employed than ever before, and consumer income reached new peaks. Yet the textile industry was unable to sustain the level of activity it had reached in the first quarter of 1951, when it was producing at an annual rate of 14.8 billion yards of cotton, synthetic, and wool woven fabrics.

"Textile production declined in the second quarter of 1952 to 78 percent of the first quarter's volume. Man-hours of work shrunk almost as much though employment dropped only 12 percent, since about half the adjustment came through reduction in hours. There was a pickup at the end of 1952 which touched its height in the first half of 1953, when production reached 90 percent of the first quarter of 1951. The rise in man-hours was only slightly less and employment was at about 93 percent of the 1951 level. But the recovery faltered and production declined through the last half of 1953 to 80 percent of the 1951 first quarter. By the end of 1953 employment had dropped more than total man-hours; employment was about 4 percent below the second quarter of 1952 but man-hours were about equal. The overall contraction in production, accompanied by many mill closings, has therefore begun to reflect itself sharply in complete liquidation of textile mill jobs."

INDUSTRY DID NOT SHARE IN GROWTH OF CONSUMER DEMAND

"Thus the textile industry was operating at a low level at a time when output in other major industries was slowed only by material shortages or other production bottlenecks. In addition, the textile industry had failed to share equally in the growth of consumer demand stemming from the high level of economic prosperity. From 1939 through 1953 our physical national product doubled and the consumer actually enjoyed 70 percent more in services and goods, but the increase in textile yardage was only about 30 percent.

"While the total number of workers actually employed in the Nation rose from 45.8 million in 1939 to 62 million in 1953—an increase of 35 percent—the number actually employed in the textile industry dropped by 3 percent, with workers averaging less than 40 hours a week.

"As in the 1920's the textile industry was sick while the rest of the economy flourished. Government, management, and the public, unfortunately, remained oblivious to the fact that this was a harbinger of more far-reaching economic difficulties.

Production of broad-woven fabrics

[In million of linear yards]

	Cotton	Synthetic and silk	Wool	Total	
				Quarterly	Annual rate
Capacity [1]	2,850	710	130	3,690	14,760
1952:					
1st quarter	2,305	557	86	3,038	12,152
2d quarter	2,275	518	81	2,874	11,496
3d quarter	2,314	569	88	2,971	11,884
4th quarter	2,539	623	96	3,258	13,032
1953:					
1st quarter	2,612	624	85	3,321	13,284
2d quarter	2,616	622	93	3,331	13,324
3d quarter	2,414	577	84	3,075	12,330
4th quarter [2]	2,400	530	80	3,010	12,040

[1] Per quarter—based on production in 4th quarter of 1950 and 1st quarter of 1951.

[2] Estimated.

"As a result, civilian per capita consumption of textiles (in terms of fibers) is only 36 pounds in the postwar years in comparison with 29 pounds before the war—a rise of 24 percent when compared with the 50 percent rise in real per capital disposable income.

"The heavy burden of consumer debt has also had a restrictive effect on textile consumption. Mortgages make first claim on the income of the more than 7 million families who have bought their own homes since the war. Between the end of 1945 and 1953, the amount of mortgage debt outstanding on 1- to 4-family houses rose from $18½ billion to $65 billion.

"Other types of consumer debt have also dampened current expenditures. Consumer credit outstanding has soared in the last few years as more and more people have used this means to purchase automobiles, furniture, television sets, and household appliances. Total consumer credit rose from $5.7 billion at the end of 1945 to $28.9 billion at the end of 1953; automobiles alone account for $11 billion of this total.

"Thus there is a total consumer-home-owner debt of nearly $95 billion, which takes a big bite out of consumers' current income. This reduces consumer expenditures for items which can be postponed, with apparel one of the chief victims. The proportion of the consumer's dollar spent on apparel has declined steadily since the war."

Apparel expenditures as a percent of total consumer expenditures

1946	10.4
1947	9.6
1948	9.5
1949	8.8
1950	8.0
1951	8.0
1952	7.8
1953	7.3

"For the last 4 years, the proportion spent on apparel has been below the prewar level (8.6 percent in 1939)."

DISILLUSIONMENT WITH NEW FIBER

"The last 3 years have witnessed a series of aggressive advertising campaigns to promote new textile fibers like orlon, dacron, acrilan and dynel. However, great irresponsibility has marked the launching of these new products as 'miracle fibers.' Consumers found the claims for these synthetics to be exaggerated. Moreover, many spinning mills lacked proper equipment or know-how to process the new fibers, and often resorted to shortcuts which resulted in inferior yarn and fabric.

"The widespread disillusionment of consumers hurt the market for these new fibers. Also creating confusion was the multitude of different blends of natural and synthetic fibers, generally marketed without reporting the proportion of each fiber or the special advantages offered. Nevertheless, the bulking quality which enables the new fibers to be used as a wool substitute or for blends, plus their superior crease-resistance and launderability, makes them a formidable threat to the older fibers."

COTTON HAS RECOVERED PART OF THE MARKET PREVIOUSLY LOST TO RAYON

"Spinners and weavers of wool, rayon and acetate have all suffered from the inroads of the new fibers. Although there is no assurance that they will hold their present position, they have seriously upset the industry, especially the older branches, and discouraged consumer buying. Cotton, on the other hand, has recovered part of the market it had previously lost to rayon and acetate.

Percentage distribution of fiber consumption

	1946	1950	1952
Manmade fibers:			
Rayon and acetate	13.5	19.8	18.9
Other	.9	2.1	4.0
Cotton	74.1	68.5	69.6
Wool	11.4	9.5	7.4
Silk	.1	.1	.1
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0

"In addition to the displacement of natural fibers by synthetics, the textile industry has suffered from the substitution of nontextiles in various household and industrial uses. Plastic film has made major inroads in the upholstery fabric market and in automobile seat covering and door paneling. When added to the earlier displacement in window and shower curtains and tablecloths, these developments assume major importance."

WOOLEN AND WORSTEDS IN BAD SHAPE

"Failure of the woolen and worsted branch of the industry to protect its competitive position stands in marked contrast to the success of the cotton interests in improving their styling, finishing and merchandising. With Government aid in studying the properties of cotton and its potential uses, growers and manufacturers cooperated in developing new processes and staging an effective promotion campaign. Research is needed in the wool field to improve its qualities with respect to shrinkage and mothproofing. Fabric design has lagged behind the times as domestic mills generally gave up the initiative to foreign producers. While many woolens have been styled to meet the shift in consumer preference toward casual wear worsteds have not yet been adequately adapted to this trend. Many mills are also unable to compete because of obsolete plant and equipment. The woolen and worsted industry will have to bestir itself to meet the growing challenge of the newer synthetics. Creative answers must be forthcoming to the problems posed by product design, technology, merchandising and sales promotion."

MILL LIQUIDATIONS

"The rate of mill liquidations increased substantially in the last 2 years, leaving a train of ghost towns and some 50,000 jobless workers. Management deficiencies which had been glossed over in the textile booms that followed World War II and the Korean war were glaringly exposed by intensified competition. Companies whose stockholders enjoyed a bonanza in dividends from highly profitable operations in 1946–48 and 1950–51 found that their failure to plow back sufficient funds to modernize plant and equipment left them at a serious disadvantage in 1952–53. The necessity of cutting costs posed financial problems for which they had not prepared themselves and many mills were forced out of business."

FINANCIAL MANIPULATIONS CAUSED SOME CLOSINGS

"A number of mills were liquidated as a result of deliberate schemes by management to achieve maximum financial gains. The welfare of the workers who had devoted the major portion of their lives to these mills was ignored in the ruthless drive of a few men to profit from loopholes in our tax laws, under which capital gains (such as a gain from the sale of a plant) are taxed at only 26 percent compared to a maximum rate of 92 percent on ordinary income. No consideration was given to the fate of communities whose entire economic life depended upon the operation of these mills. Instead, every opportunity was seized to exploit communities in other parts of the country through acquisition of new plants and equipment paid for by industry-hungry towns which used their tax-exempt authority to float municipal bonds. * * *

"The pressure for cost reduction in the last 2 years resulted in the expenditure of over $500 million for plant improvement and expansion. The bulk of the postwar expansion program had been completed by 1951 so subsequent capital expenditures were concentrated in improvement of existing facilities. Altogether the industry has spent more than $3½ billion on new plant and machinery since the war. By the end of 1953 more than half the gross value of the industry's capital assets was made up of postwar installations."

INDUSTRY HAS MODERNIZED

"Along with improved technology the textile industry has transformed its methods of operating along the lines of the most modern American industries. Centralized controls have been instituted over scheduling and production, and systematic checks imposed on quality. Plant layouts have been revamped to provide a straight-line flow of production. Materials handling has thereby been reduced to a minimum and, where actually necessary, mechanical means have been substituted for labor. Technically trained supervisors and time study engineers have combined to tighten labor standards. Man-hour output has been substantially increased. With the decline in activity at the end of 1953 many companies pared their overhead and work force. Demands for higher machine assignments for workers were more numerousthan ever."

FAILURE TO SECURE TARIFF RELIEF

"To protect the industry from further destruction TWUA in 1953 requested the United States Tariff Commission to implement a provision of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade which authorized raising tariff rates on woolen and worsted fabrics when imports exceed the 'trigger point' of 5 percent of production. This request was rejected on a technicality. Early in 1954 the union again urged the commission to raise the tariff rate from 25 percent to 45 percent as soon as imports in any weight category reach 5 percent.

"While woolen and worsted imports have been rising, exports of cotton goods (the only textile item which the United States exports in substantial quantities) have been dropping sharply. Shipments of cotton fabrics declined from 802 million square yards in 1951 to 762 million in 1952 and 630 million in 1953, a drop of 21 percent in 2 years. Foreign markets for cotton goods have been contracting as domestic textile industries have been built up in the underdeveloped areas of the world. Japan and India have expanded their capacity to a point where their exports exceed those of the United States. Great Britain's industry is also geared to supply a larger portion of the world cotton goods market. The United States therefore faced a shrinking foreign market."

VIGOROUS ACTION BY GOVERNMENT NEEDED

"The economic problems faced by the textile industry call for vigorous action by the Federal Government to aid in making the necessary adjustments. In the 1952 Presidential election campaign, General Eisenhower made specific promises to aid distressed areas and to effectuate other policies leading toward a recovery in textiles.

"In Lawrence, Mass., where more than 20 percent of the labor force of 53,000 was unemployed as a result of woolen mill closings, the President had promised preference for distressed areas in obtaining Government contracts. The Truman administration's policy of setting aside parts of contracts to be let in distressed areas had not been sufficient because of the requirement that the lowest bid be matched. At the end of 1953 President Eisenhower announced he favored strengthening the set-aside program to assist distressed areas, but withdrew his support before any alleviation could be worked out. He explained that it was not his intention to offer special assistance to any area, but rather to improve conditions throughout the Nation; the only result was continued unemployment in Lawrence and other hard-hit cities."

DROP IN MAN-HOURS WORKED OVER 28 PERCENT

We wish to offer herewith the most recent statistical compilation made by the research department of the Textile Workers Union of America, showing levels of employment and weekly manhours worked in 23 principal textile States. This compilation gives the figures on employment in the industry at about the high point in February 1951 as contrasted with the situation in April 1954. We can say to this Committee that since April the drop has continued.

According to these data, there has been a reduction of employment in textiles in the United States between February 1951 and April 1954 of 21.2 percent. The drop in average weekly manhours in that same period has been even more severe. The decline in manhours is 28.2 percent.

Although the economic blight which has overtaken textiles is nationwide, it is painfully clear that certain geographical areas are suffering much worse than others. The fact that the drop in employment and manhours worked in the 6 New England States has been so severe is no doubt due largely to the fact that so large a proportion of the woolen and worsted mills of the country are located in that region. The woolen and worsted section by and large is the most badly hit portion of the industry and the type of manufacture which has experienced the most prolonged difficulties.

In the New England States employment has dropped 39.7 percent between February 1951 and April 1954, while manhours worked have been cut 44.2 percent.

In the 9 most important textile-producing States in the South-East there had been an 8.5 percent drop in employment between February 1951 and April 1954, while the manhours worked have been reduced in the same period 18.3 percent.

We reproduce the table in full, herewith:

TEXTILE WORKERS UNION OF AMERICA, RESEARCH DEPARTMENT, NEW YORK, N. Y.

Employment and average weekly man-hours in the textile mill products industry, by State, February 1951 and April 1954

State	Employment (wage and salary workers)			Average weekly man-hours		
	February 1951	April 1954	Percent change	February 1951	April 1954	Percent change
	Thousands	*Thousands*		*Thousands*	*Thousands*	
United States[1]	1,365.0	1,075.0	−21.2	55,692	39,775	−28.6
New England[2]	286.1	172.4	−39.7	10,268	5,728	−44.2
Maine	27.5	19.8	−28.0	(³)	(³)	
New Hampshire	21.1	13.8	−34.6	882	537	−39.1
Vermont	5.2	3.0	−42.3	(³)	(³)	
Massachusetts	125.0	69.8	−44.2	5,075	2,708	−46.6
Connecticut	41.6	28.0	−27.9	1,722	1,016	−41.0
Rhode Island	65.7	38.1	−42.0	2,589	1,467	−43.3
Middle Atlantic	307.2	220.1	−28.4	12,489	8,311	−33.5
New York	96.1	66.6	−30.7	3,930	2,557	−34.9
New Jersey	65.8	46.0	−30.1	2,724	1,789	−34.3
Pennsylvania	141.7	104.7	−26.1	5,668	3,853	−32.0
Delaware	3.6	2.8	−22.2	167	112	−32.9

[1] Data includes States not shown separately.
[2] Maine and Vermont are not included in man-hour data because they are not available.
[3] Not available.

Employment and average weekly man-hours in the textile mill products industry, by State, February 1951 and April 1954—Continued

State	Employment (wage and salary workers)			Average weekly man-hours		
	February 1951	April 1954	Percent change	February 1951	April 1954	Percent change
	Thousands	*Thousands*		*Thousands*	*Thousands*	
South [4]	667.1	610.1	−8.5	26,554	21,706	−18.3
Maryland	11.6	7.2	−37.9	(3)	(3)	
Virginia	42.7	36.8	−13.8	1,738	1,240	−28.7
North Carolina	244.2	[5] 226.7	−7.2	9,841	8,207	−11.7
South Carolina	139.8	134.4	−3.9	5,816	5,174	−11.0
Georgia	114.8	104.4	−9.1	4,799	3,800	−20.8
Alabama	55.5	48.4	−12.8	2,298	1,665	−27.5
Tennessee	39.9	33.8	−15.3	1,616	1,247	−22.8
Texas	10.2	9.4	−7.8	446	373	−16.4
Louisiana	8.4	[5] 9.0	−7.1	(3)	(3)	
Midwest [6]	22.1	17.7	−19.9	901	698	−22.5
Illinois	13.5	11.0	−18.5	552	435	−21.2
Minnesota	4.9	3.2	−34.7	197	123	−37.6
Missouri	3.7	[5] 3.5	−5.4	152	140	−7.9
Far West [7]	8.2	7.2	−12.2	333	269	−19.2
California	8.2	7.2	−12.2	333	269	−19.2

[4] Employment and man-hour area totals are for those States for which data are available. Maryland and Louisiana, which are included in employment totals are excluded from man-hour totals because data are not available.

[5] April 1954 figures are not available. Figures shown are for March 1954.

[6] Employment and man-hour totals are for those States for which such data are available.

[7] Area totals are for California, the only Far West State which reports such data.

Source: State Departments of Labor and U. S. Bureau of Labor Statistics.

One other statistical table which we believe to be of considerable importance in connection with this testimony dealing with the general problem of unemployment in textiles is appended herewith.

This table illustrates the wide variations in the different States in the average contribution rate for unemployment insurance in the textile industry. We have used the latest data available in each case. Whereas in Rhode Island the rate was 2.7 percent, in such competing States as Alabama, Georgia, and South Carolina, average employer contribution rates were respectively 1.02 percent, 1.21 percent, and 1.23 percent in 1952:

Average contribution rates for unemployment insurance in the textile mill products industry

State	Period	Average contribution rate (contributions as a percentage of taxable wages)	Textile taxable wages as percentage of State total
Alabama	1952	1.02	11.51
Arizona	1951	2.72	.02
Colorado	1951–52	1.54	.06
Connecticut	1952	2.19	4.96
Delaware	1952	.85	2.97
Florida	1951–52	1.60	.06
Georgia	1952	1.21	18.90
Indiana	1951–52	.73	.45
Iowa	1951–52	.50	.29
Kansas	1951–52	.97	.01
Kentucky	1952	1.41	.63
Maine	1952	1.91	15.18
Maryland	1951–52	1.99	1.84
Massachusetts	1952	2.70	6.88
Minnesota	1952	.73	.62
Missouri	1951–52	1.32	.33
New Hampshire	1953	2.38	13.59
New Jersey	1952	1.81	4.06
North Carolina	1952	1.51	33.86
Oklahoma	1951–52	1.65	.36
Pennsylvania	1952	1.34	3.88
Rhode Island	1952	2.70	23.74
South Carolina	1952	1.23	38.61
Tennessee	1952	1.84	6.62
Utah	1951–52	.86	.25
Vermont	1953	2.28	5.92
Virginia	1953	.96	7.31
Washington	1951–52	1.63	.10

Source: U. S. Bureau of Employment Security; from table published on p. 111 of Senate Finance Committee hearings on Employment Security Administrative Financing Act, March 1954, and typewritten table dated Apr. 9, 1954. The textile mill products industry is as defined in industry code No. 22 of the Standard Industrial Classification Code.

Our purpose in presenting this table is to emphasize our point that in an industry which is as competitive as textiles, the need for substantial standardization of taxes collected from all establishments, irrespective of location, should be very evident. Moreover, we feel strongly that the great disparity in amount benefits and duration of benefits between the textile States is socially unsound and economically harmful both locally and nationally.

THE HUMAN ASPECT

In all of the above materials dealing with broad statistical trends and the basic economic difficulties of this widespread industry, we have not mentioned the human aspect of this problem. The committees of Congress can so easily fall into the habit of forgetting that back of all these tables and sets of figures, which must be part of testimony such as this are men and women and children, each of whom has special needs and problems which cannot actually be portrayed by any set of statistics.

In Rhode Island in the past few months, a well-known institution of learning has made a careful sample study as to what is happening to the men and women who were thrown on the labor market due to the closing of textile mills. TWUA has been privileged to see the preliminary findings of this survey which will be officially released in the next couple of weeks. The facts we summarize here will be borne out by the formal report.

The investigators interviewed 131 individuals who were laid off over a year ago as a result of mill closings.

Of this number only 29 percent have found new jobs. This investigation did not inquire into the type of employment or the rates of pay obtained by this group of workers. But from past experience in similar situations, we can be positive that most, if not all, of these workers are now employed in less desirable jobs and at a lower scale of wages than they earned when they lost out in their former place of employment.

Eighteen percent of the 131 persons in this group have retired from the labor market and are not looking for work. This does not mean that none of these individuals no longer need jobs; it simply means that they have given up the search for reemployment.

Fifty-two percent of the total are today unemployed after having been laid off for longer than 12 months.

Thirty-six percent of these 131 men and women have not been able to find a paid job of any kind for even 1 day during this period of over a year. All of the 52 percent that are still jobless are actively looking for work and have done everything possible to find jobs during all these long weary months since their plant went out of business.

What these figures mean is that a small proportion of the 52 percent that are today idle have picked up occasional jobs during the past year, but that the bulk of those who are seeking work have not earned a cent from any kind of paid employment since they were first thrown on the labor market more than a year ago.

DURATION OF BENEFITS MUST BE INCREASED

Surely the members of this committee must see from these figures, which certainly apply to similar situations in other textile States, that the average duration of employment benefit payments must be increased. Maximum duration of benefits in Rhode Island is 26 weeks. Textile States elsewhere do not even pay for that number of weeks. Therefore, it is painfully evident that practically all of these 52 percent who lost their jobs have had no income whatever, except possibly from relief for a period of at least 6 months. Even assuming that some of these families had savings, it is certain that by now these accumulations have been completely exhausted.

How are these people living? Frankly, we do not know. We do know that there is suffering and deprivation among this group despite their diligent search for work. The community suffers also from the fact that these people have no purchasing power. Moreover, friends and relatives of such individuals must be stinting themselves and possibly even going into debt to share with those who are absolutely without funds.

Results of this Rhode Island survey are in line with an earlier report along the same lines appearing in Business Week for March 6 of this year. We quote from this article:

"When a New England textile mill closes its doors, what happens to the uprooted workers? That's a big question throughout New England today, and one that, so far, has never been adequately answered.

"Unemployment figures tell only part of the story. That is clear in Lawrence, Mass., where many more textile jobs have been wiped out in recent years than are shown by jobless data and figures on expanded employment in other industries. What happened to the rest?

"Tracking them down: The bureau of business and economic research of Northeastern University in Boston, is trying to find out in a survey of displaced workers in Lawrence—part of a broad study launched about a year ago that's now beginning to show some interesting results.

"Under the direction of William H. Miernyk, the bureau has so far interviewed 756 workers from three liquidated mills in three cities—a woolen mill in New Hampshire; a cotton mill in Fall River, Mass., and a cotton mill in Lowell, Mass.

"The general picture: First findings, which later case studies probably will confirm, show:

"Most of those laid off were still in the labor force, either employed or actively seeking employment, though a few of the displaced workers—mostly young married women or very old workers—dropped out within a year.

"More men than women had been reemployed, and workers over 45 years of age were having a particularly hard time finding new jobs. Among the job-seekers, 80 percent were drawing unemployment compensation when interviewed.

"Most of those with new jobs were in other textile mills, in nonmanufacturing work, or in established, relatively static 'nongrowth' industries; comparatively few had found their way into newer, expanding growth industries—machinery, electronics, and the like.

"The majority of the reemployed were earning less than before, and many had been downgraded—from skilled to semiskilled, or from semiskilled to unskilled classifications.

"Most told interviewers they were unhappy in new jobs, in part because of the lower pay and rating, but also because they had lost seniority and saw little opportunity for advancement.

"Shattered illusion: According to Miernyk, these findings explode a myth that has gained currency among New England businessmen and many economists in the last few years: that growth industries, particularly electronics, have been taking up a lot of the textile slack in employment. That's not the way it looks, Miernyk says, commenting:

"'In view of the recent public statements that New England will gain by the * * * diversification of industry, we feel that these findings are timely. * * * Statements by persons in important positions have created the cruel illusion that new jobs are to be provided for the displaced textile workers.'

"Diversification helps, but new industries evidently are filling jobs with newcomers in the labor market instead of with displaced textile workers, according to the bureau's findings. Of the first 756 workers checked, only 5 percent found jobs in growth industries.

"Variations: Along with these general conclusions each of the first mills surveyed turned up some interesting sidelights.

"In Lowell, younger male workers found new jobs, but those over 45 years of age still were largely unemployed after a year; women in all age groups were having a harder time getting new jobs than men were.

"In New Hampshire, the woolen mill closed in a one-factory town with a population of 1,500, miles away from any fair-sized city. The mill closing idled 200 workers. A leather products firm moved into the mill building, and reemployed part of the textile jobless. But 2 years after the shutdown, almost a third of the 200 laid off in the woolen mill were still out of work. For the other two-thirds, who got jobs, the average period of unemployment was about 5 months."

The picture of what is happening in the textile industry which we have given here is not a pretty one. Indeed, it is an alarming situation and one that, in the view of the workers in the industry, cannot be further ignored.

The Congress will be utterly delinquent in meeting its responsibilities, if it fails to take at least the one important step to aid unemployed workers, which is embodied in H. R. 9430.

We Are Just Not Aware

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 23, 1954

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following editorial from the Army-Navy-Air Force Register of June 19, 1954:

WE ARE JUST NOT AWARE

The solemn and considered warning of Admiral Radford, citing the dangerous Communist threat materializing in Far Pacific, south Asia, and Indonesia should be taken to heart and given concrete support by every American citizen.

But, frankly, the average American citizen just doesn't listen and doesn't recognize his impending peril across the far ocean waters.

The United States wants peace. Very well. But it costs money, personnel, materiel, and, above all else, nationalistic esprit de corps—which we haven't got until a hungry and aggressive nation slaps our dreaming face by sinking our *Lusitania* by U-boat in the Atlantic or blasting the United States fleet out of the waters of Pearl Harbor.

The United States seriously selects what we deem the best brains to be our defense, military, naval, and air leaders. But when these leaders time after time, time after time, almost exhaust themselves with gravest warnings and the American people neither heed nor act in consonance with the warnings, such leaders must reach new lows in spirit and discouragement.

Admiral Radford crystalized the international situation briefly: "Who would have thought that in the short space of 15 years, Central Europe would be divided, China would have become Communist, Red forces would invade Korea * * * and now Laos and Cambodia?"

Defense Secretary Wilson warns. Forthright and sound Admiral Carney warns. General Twining warns. General Shepherd, hard-bitten and practical Marine, warns. What happens? The average American citizen dismisses it with another cocktail and a game of golf.

Yet these same average Americans will scream to high heaven when we are hit by world war III and cry out: "Why didn't our leaders tell us?"

Fellow Americans, they've been telling you. They're telling you now. For years this editorial column has told you. But your long apathy assures us that you are just not aware.

On the Offensive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 23, 1954

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the Record, I desire to call to the attention of my colleagues a timely editorial that appeared in the Wheeling Intelligencer, Wheeling, W. Va., June 9, 1954.

The basic theme of this article deals with the problems of our overall trade policies and raises some pertinent questions for which the Congress alone must find the answer.

The editorial follows:

ON THE OFFENSIVE

Not all of the tariff activity in Washington is directed toward the weakening or removal of what remains of our protective principle. There is H. R. 9159, sponsored by the Nationwide Committee of Industry, Agriculture, and Labor on Import-Export Policy, which would restore a greater measure of tariff control of Congress. In brief, protectionists have dropped the defensive attitude that has marked their bearing for two decades.

This bill would empower the Tariff Commission under stated conditions and following investigation, to increase, reduce or establish rates of duty, or to impose, modify or withdraw import quotas, but only with the approval of Congress. In other words, the Commission would the fact-finding and advisory body, but Congress rather than the administration as under the present policy, would make the decision.

In advancing this proposal the committee argues that a reversal of the present emphasis on lower tariffs and more trade concessions is necessary to achieve the twin goals of preserving American wage levels and living standards against the unfair competition of low-wage subsidized imports, and maintaining the productive capacity and worker skills so necessary to national defense and a sound national economy.

In support of its position the committee cites these important points:

"Greater American productivity, except in a few mass production industries, is not sufficient to offset the disparity in production costs in the United States and foreign countries. United States wage rates are 3 to 10 times the average in other countries for similar work. Capital investment costs are greater here. Production methods and machinery are the same in many industries, especially since many European industries have been restored and modernized with United States funds.

"Many nations encourage production for export through subsidies, currency credits, tax concessions, and other inducements.

"They seek greater access to American markets, but they block entry of United States goods into foreign markets through quota limitations, currency manipulations, exchange restrictions, etc.

"The United States is already a low-tariff nation. About 60 percent of the goods entering the country are duty free. The United States tariff averages only 12 percent on the remaining imports. Only 45 nations have lower tariffs than the United States."

Advocates of the free trade principle seek now, as they long have sought, to create the false impression that prohibitive American tariffs have stifled trade with foreign nations and have somehow created both war and economic stagnation. Yet after more than 20 years of whittling away steadily at tariff protection, they are confronted with the facts that there is less peace in the world than ever and that world economic conditions are more chaotic than ever before.

There isn't the slightest good reason for believing that further destruction of the protective tariff, increased American investment abroad through such artificial inducements as preferential tax treatment and low tariff or free tariff entry of goods, and other devices to stimulate the consumption of imports, would promote peace in any degree. We have ample evidence, on the other hand, that it would deal harshly with our great handicraft and some other industries, and disastrously influence both employment and wage standards here in the United States.

Experience over the years has taught us that Congress, more responsive to the public will, is a much safer agency than is the executive department in which to repose tariff control. H. R. 9159 not only holds far greater promise of conserving our national interest than does the proposal to extend the Trade Agreements Act for 3 more years and intensify the tariff-cutting process under it, but it represents, this newspaper is confident, the sentiments of a great majority of the American people.

Revision of the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands

SPEECH

OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 1954

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 5181) to revise the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands of the United States.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, may I say to my colleagues in the House that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] and his committee have held thorough hearings and have given long attention to this revision of the Virgin Islands Organic Act. This legislation is needed for the Virgin Islands. After you have listened to an explanation of the bill by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] I feel sure you will be impressed with the merits of the bill and give it your approval. I want to compliment the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] for his diligence and his patience in working out the bill that is presenty before you.

Mr. Chairman, at this time I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] 15 minutes.

Fundamentals and Segregation at the Bar of Justice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENDERSON L. LANHAM
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 17, 1954

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, with leave obtained to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including therewith an address to the Georgia Bar Association delivered on June 10, by the Honorable R. Carter Pittman, of Dalton, Ga., a member of the board of bar examiners of the State of Georgia. This is a most scholarly and comprehensive discussion of the recent Supreme Court decision holding that segregation in the public schools of America is unwise and therefore illegal.

This decision was a disappointment to all those who believe in the rights of the States to determine educational questions and policies. The only surprise, however, was the fact that all nine judges voted against segregation in the public schools.

One of the sanest comments on the decision was that which appeared in an editorial in the Evening Star for Tuesday, May 18, where it was said:

> In effect, nine men have concluded that segregation in the public schools is a bad thing, and have asserted the power to outlaw it. The constitutional basis for the decision is obscure. No act of Congress or State law is relied upon. This momentous policy determination, in short, is imposed on the country by the will of nine men.

Further along in the editorial, the Star says:

> In short, with respect to this aspect of the decision, it may be doubted that any court—not even the "nine old men" of the Franklin D. Roosevelt era—has gone quite as far as this Court. If ever a decision "made" law at the expense of States' rights, this one does.

Not only was the decision an invasion of the rights of the States but it was an invasion of the legislative branch of the Federal Government. Moreover, it overturned a decision of the same Court of some 60 years ago which upheld the doctrine of separate but equal opportunities.

Acting upon the faith of this old decision, the Southern States have spent large sums of money to supply equal facilities for the Negro race. The result of the decision will be to retard the progress that the South has been making toward the equalization of opportunities for all our people while maintaining the segregation of the races in our schools which, in my opinion, both races prefer. If the decision should ever be translated into reality in Georgia, it would mean the loss of jobs for many splendid teachers of the Negro race.

The title of Mr. Pittman's address to the Georgia Bar Association is "Fundamentals and Segregation at the Bar of Justice," and the address follows:

FUNDAMENTALS AND SEGREGATION AT THE BAR OF JUSTICE

(By R. Carter Pittman, of the Georgia Bar (Dalton))

On May 18, 1954, the New York Times headlined "A Sociological Decision." Beneath those headlines was the story of that which history will likely record as the most reactionary and counter-revolutionary Court decision in the history of the Anglo-Saxon race. The Times editors were not fooled. They lived up to the highest standards of their profession and revealed to a waiting world that the Supreme Court of the United States had at last crossed the Rubicon and substituted marxist sociology for law and precedent, or a government of flesh for a government of law; that the Ship of State is no longer to be navigated by planetary tangibles, but must wallow in a sociological sea, with its course determined by comets' tails and falling stars.

On Sunday, May 23, the Atlanta Constitution reproduced one of the New York Times editorial comments by James Reston. In it he said:

"The Court's opinion read more like an expert paper on sociology than a Supreme Court opinion. It sustained the argument of experts in education, sociology, psychology, psychiatry, and anthropology. * * *"

Thinkers in the profession of journalism all over America, such as Raymond Moley of News Week, immediately saw beneath the synthetic skin of the Trojan horse, named "Segregation." They perceived the Slavic philosophy and instruments of destruction within. As more and more sense the impact of that decision on American civilization, they are staggered and stunned. In one judicial flash we, as a Nation, find ourselves without anchor, rudder, or compass.

The purpose of all sincere investigations is the discovery of truth. Basic truth is discoverable in the midst of external realities. It may not be manufactured by the mind. It is a tangible reality and is never new. Once found, we may seize and hold fast to it.

In its recent decision, the Supreme Court did not hold that the old "separate but equal" doctrine, laid down in *Plessy* v. *Ferguson* (163 U. S. 537), was bad law. It held that it was bad sociology. It did not hold that the facts (or truths), disclosed by the records in the cases before the court, justified a departure from the "separate but equal" doctrine. It held that "psychological knowledge," apart from those records, was of more validity than factual truths.

The Court conceded that the records in the cases before it demonstrated equality of white and colored schools in respect to all "tangible factors," and for that reason its decision could not "turn on" such "tangible factors," saying:

"We must look instead" (not also) "to the effect of segregation itself on public education."

The Court then asked:

"Does segregation * * * (alone) * * * deprive the children of the minority group of equal educational opportunities?"

The answer was: "We believe that it does." Why? Because:

(1) In the graduate school case of *Sweatt* v. *Painter* (339 U. S. 629), "* * * this Court relied in large part on those qualities which are incapable of objective measurement but which make for greatness * * *"

(2) In the other graduate school case of *McLaurin* v. *Oklahoma Regents* (339 U. S. 637), "* * * the Court * * * again resorted to intangible considerations: * * * 'his ability to study, to engage in discussion and exchange views with other students * * *.' Such considerations apply with added force to children in grade and high schools. To separate them * * * solely because of race generates a feeling of inferiority as to their status in the community that may affect their hearts and minds in a way unlikely ever to be undone."

(3) In the Kansas case, then before the court, the trial judge had found that "a sense of inferiority affects the motivation of a child to learn. * * *"

Thereupon, the court transplanted the "intangibles" found in Kansas into the records of the South Carolina, Virginia, and Delaware cases, to fill with void the vacuum left in those cases by failure of proof.

Next came the Russo-marxist "intangibles" transplanted from Europe, to end all tangibles in governments of law:

(4) "Whatever may have been the psychological knowledge at the time of *Plessy* v. *Ferguson*, this finding is amply supported by modern authority. Any language in *Plessy* v. *Ferguson* contrary to this finding is rejected."

Footnote 11 sets forth the "modern authority" the court relied on, as follows:

"K. B. Clark, Effect of Prejudice and Discrimination on Personality Development (Midcentury White House Conference on Children and Youth, 1950); Witmer and Kotinsky, Personality in the Making (1952), c. VI; Deutscher and Chein, The Psychological Effects of Enforced Segregation: A Survey of Social Science Opinion, 26 J. Psychol. 259 (1948); Chein, What Are the Psychological Effects of Segregation Under Conditions of Equal Facilities? 3 Int. J. Opinion and Attitude Res. 229 (1949): Brameld, Educational Costs, in Discrimination and National Welfare (McIver, ed., 1949), 44–48; Frazier, The Negro in the United States (1949), 674–681. And see generally Myrdal, An American Dilemma (1944)."

That "authority" appears to be in the field of sociology rather than "psychology", but that is of no moment, except to illustrate that when the court took its first step from "tangible factors" to "intangibles" and jumped from fundamental principles of law to pseudo-socio-science, it went in over its head. Whatever it was, how did such "intangibles" find their way into the cases? They were not authenticated as "authority" by any method known to Anglo-Saxon jurisprudence or rules of evidence. If not in evidence, the universal rule is that it was harmful error, prejudicial to the parties defendants, for them to be considered by the court.

Under elementary and elemental law, a court may not consider treatises in a field other than law, unless the treatises themselves are the very subject of inquiry. The doctrine of judicial notice extends only to those things of common knowledge that lie without the realm of science, or to that one science in which judges are presumed to be learned or experts themselves—the science of law.

Of frequent application is medical knowledge. Since that is a science without the realm of legal science and is not of common knowledge it must be proved under the oath of a member of that profession. He may not testify as to the knowledge of other physicians, whether revealed by word of mouth, books or treatises. That is true, because hearsay evidence is no evidence. A party to a cause is entitled to have and the law demands that evidence come to the bar of justice under the sanction of an oath; that a thorough and sifting cross-examination and an opportunity to impeach be afforded to shake and destroy it for any cause, including the "intangible" nature of it.

That law is neither new nor strange. It is as old as justice and as fresh as virtue. The Supreme Court is not a stranger to it.

In *Pinkus* v. *Reilly* (71 Fed. Supp. 993), Judge Meaney, of the Federal District Court of New Jersey, enjoined the enforcement of a fraud order issued by the Postmaster General based on opinion evidence arising in fact, where the right of cross-examination was not afforded with respect to certain medical treatises on which the opinion was based. He held that an order based on such evidence was illegal and without authority, citing *American School of Magnetic Healing* v. *McAnnulty* (187 U. S. 94), and *Jaris* v. *Shackleton Inhaler Co.* (136 Fed. 2d, 116).

In *Pinkus* v. *Reilly* (170 Fed. 2d 786), the Circuit Court of Appeals affirmed Judge Meaney saying, in part:

"The testimony of medical experts at the hearing in the Post Office Department seems clearly to have been founded solely upon professional opinion based upon a general reading of authoritative textbooks and discussions with other members of the medical profession and indicates that with respect to the efficacy of appellees product there are 2 schools of thought, albeit 1 may be outmoded and fallacious in the opinion of the medical profession."

The court agreed with Judge Meaney that no such intangible could support a finding of fact in America, and affirmed the judgment.

The case then went to the Supreme Court where it was affirmed and reported in *Pinkus* v. *Reilly* (338 U. S. 269). The Court quoted with approval the ancient doctrine laid down in the McAnnulty case, saying that the assumption, itself questioned in McAnnulty, to the effect that the "* * * mind of the human race is largely responsible for its ills, * * * and that the human race does possess the innate power, through proper exercise of the faculty of the brain and mind, to largely control and remedy the ills that humanity is heir to * * *" was a matter of opinion about which men might differ, and "* * * that scientific knowledge had not advanced to the point * * *," where it may be said that there is an exact standard of absolute truth by which to prove the assertion of such a postulate on such subject to be true or false, and that opinion, whether based on hearsay or not, does not rise to the dignity of proof where imperfect knowledge makes proof impossible.

Mr. Justice Black, speaking for the Court, with the approval and concurrence of every member of the present bench, except Warren and Douglas, pointed out with respect to the testimony relating to that which medical treatises said, and on which the fraud order was based:

"The present fraud order should not be enforced. It has been pointed out that the doctors' expert evidence rested on their general professional knowledge. To some extent this knowledge was acquired from medical textbooks and publications, on which these experts placed reliance. In cross-examination respondent sought to question these witnesses concerning statements in other medical books, some of which at least were shown to be respectable authorities. The questions were not permitted. We think this was an undue restriction on the right to cross-examine. It certainly is illogical, if not actually unfair, to permit witnesses to give expert opinions based on book knowledge, and then deprive the party challenging such evidence of all opportunity to interrogate them about divergent opinions expressed in other reputable books" (338 U. S. 275).

If it was illogical, unfair, and illegal—if it shocked the courts' sense of justice on November 14, 1949, what has happened since to render the same legal, logical, fair, and consonant with the courts' sense of justice in 1954? In the Pinkus case the parties at least had an opportunity to rebut, to disprove, and to impeach, by means other than cross-examination. In the so-called segregation cases no such opportunity was afforded to parties. The intangible considerations, discovered in obscure publications, first appeared in the secrecy of the judge's chambers. Notice of it was first given to the defendants in the judgment itself. No precedent short of star chamber and high commission cases of the Stuart kings 300 years ago may be found for like judicial deportment. We thought we had closed the door forever on the precedents of those courts.

In *Ohio Bell Telephone Co.* v. *Public Utilities Commission of Ohio* (301 U. S. 292 (1937)) Justice Cardoza, speaking for an unanimous bench, held that the due process clause of the 14th amendment forever inhibits in America any judgment based in part upon information secretly collected by a judicial body. That case has never been overruled and will never be overruled or ignored so long as we have virtuous judges in a government of law.

The so-called modern authority relied on by the court could easily have been shown to be no authority at all and the psychological knowledge to have been a myth, in a short and pointed cross-examination, had it been afforded. Leading sociologists in the Nation would have testified then and will testify now that social science is largely a misnomer and that many who profess otherwise are mere imposters and quacks.

Dr. A. H. Hobbs, a nationally famous sociologist now on the faculty of the University of Pennsylvania, is trying manfully to bring order out of chaos in that field. He points out in recent books and articles that the field is overrun with imposters, quacks, leftists, and Marxist disseminators of anti-American doctrines. Ethics are unknown to such "doctors" as he describes. In an article appearing in Collier's Encyclopedia, 1953 Yearbook, Dr. Hobbs says at page 522:

"Most of the behavior which is deeply significant to us as persons and most important in our relations to each other as members of civilized society has never been reduced to quantitative, uniform, stable, and divisible units and is hence not suitable for the type of controlled observation which is such a vital element in scientific procedure. Our hopes and fears, our loves and hates, likes and dislikes, prejudices and preferences, our ideals and honor—these are qualitative rather than quantitative. They are neither uniform, divisible, nor stable. Love may range from tempestuous unreasoning passion to gentle, affectionate regard. With some persons ideals may not only persist despite temptation and hardship but bear their finest flowers upon such stony soil, while with others they may perish with the first breath of adverse drought. Of ideals and of the deepest and most meaningful sentiments, there is no quantitative measure. There is no precise instrument to record their magnitude nor to gage their fluctuation. Further, in the very process of examination sentiments and beliefs may change—they lack the stability so necessary for controlled and uniform observation."

Again he said at page 523:

"Most of the conclusions which are popularly believed to be scientific explanations of human behavior or scientific answers to the major problems which have perplexed mankind for many centuries are illustrations of scientism rather than examples of science. In circumstances wherein the majority of the practitioners of scientism are possessed of particular prejudices, these can be foisted upon students, and upon an unsuspecting public, in a weighty barrage of propaganda disguised as science and sheltered from the open air of honest controversy by the borrowed prestige which attaches to the term.

"Science has been enormously successful in answering a multitude of questions, but the great successes of science have been restricted to studies of inanimate matter. The questions asked are comparatively simple and the answers are proximate and temporary rather than ultimate and permanent. In matters important in the life of civilized man, science has been much less successful. Here the questions are of infinitely greater complexity, and the variables much more numerous. Issues which are most fundamental to human beings and to civilized society may well be of such nature that the scientific method is not applicable. Meantime the techniques of scientism are such that we can easily be propagandized into accepting doctrines alien to our heritage under the delusion that they have been revealed by the cold and clear light of science. Scientism is a real and present danger, while for the major problems which perplex our personal lives and plague our social structure, now and in the foreseeable future, science is no panacea."

See his recent books on Social Problems and Scientism and the Claims of Sociology.

The modern authority the court seemed most to rely on was Myrdal and his An American Dilemma. Apparently he supplied most of the psychological knowledge and scientific thought control that has nullified the Constitution, common sense, reason, law, experience and American history. Myrdal claimed to be an economist in Europe. Suddenly he showed up in this country as a doctor, whose specialty was in the field of social science. He had a peculiar characteristic that seemed to appeal to some foundations such as Carnegie, Rockefeller, and Ford. He could start with a fixed hypothesis and then manufacture appropriate phenomena to support it. Knowing absolutely nothing about America, its former race problem, solved long ago, its Government, its Constitution, or its history, and sporting the authoritarian title of doctor, no man was better fitted to become a modern authority on any and all subjects.

By some coincidence both Myrdal and Hiss found themselves in charge of the key to Carnegie's safety deposit box. Carnegie paid Hiss $25,000 per year and paid Myrdal $148,000 for 1,483 pages of psychological knowledge and scientific thought control.

It is amazing how much psychological knowledge Myrdal records that Americans never knew, Myrdal never knew and no other person will ever know. He first created an American Creed and dressed it in the dialetics of sociological science. That Creed contained the foundation stone of our country but, strange to say, no one had ever discovered it before. He was the first to discover it—but it does not yet exist. He says: "* * * after a long period of material expansion but not rapid spiritual growth, the American Creed is * * * in a formative stage * * * it is now discovering its ideals in the social and economic sphere and in the realm of international organization," pages 22-23.

By the way, at pages 12-13 he made a most interesting contribution to psychological knowledge. Here is a taste: "* * * the judicial order is contrary to all American inclinations."

The American Creed started out pretty well fixed, but on page 212 the Creed starts: "* * * changing to include a decent living standard and a measure of economic security among the liberties and rights which are given the highest moral sanction."

It took just 200 pages for it to get fluid. The Creed finally became so fluid that it turned into a flood. Segregation of races was the villian to be drowned in it. It was the dilemma. Social equality must ride the tide of the changing Creed and shifting sands.

One hundred forty-eight thousand dollars' worth of inadmissible, intangible, false, and prejudicial thought control clay-trap flooded the chambers of the Supreme Court. The Constitution, that Myrdal so astutely sets on sand, fell. With it went ageless fundamental principles that had been filtered by our race from 5,000 years of history's bitter fruits gathered from her gardens of Gethsemane.

You may search the pages of the modern authority, to which the Supreme Court has abjectly surrendered, and you will find no reference to Russian slavery. Not a word about Slavic segregation by way of scaffolds, firing squads, or the old Siberian Road. The modern authority that is so greatly concerned about segregation within the traditions of the American way of life, shows no corresponding concern about segregation by extermination, in the only country they love.

The Russian Kulaks, the White Russian refugees, the non-Slavic Poles, and the untold thousands of our kin and kind in Europe, as well as many of our own soldiers, who passed from freedom to Russia death or slavery, do not merit a page or footnote in modern authority on segregation. Modern authority is concerned with racial segregation within America in order that America may be weakened and confused and that they may make a breach between race and race and brother and brother, to enable Russia to complete the subjugation of the world.

In New York on May 31 President Eisenhower cautioned the American people against the alien thought control ideologies that "* * * attack our social, industrial, educational, and spiritual institutions and encourage every type of internecine struggle of whatever kind."

It is a pity that he didn't make that speech to the Supreme Court 1 month earlier, as a true "friend of the court."

Benjamin Disraeli, the Jew who rose to the summit of political power and statesmanship in England, scribbed out a powerful message in his book Endymion, during the short interval between his retirement and his death. It was born of experience. The Russian Slavs had gone to the aid of the Bulgarian Slavs in their war with Turkey in 1877 and soon overwhelmed Turkey. Russia dictated the treaty of San Stefano at the point of her guns in February 1878. Turkey was dismembered, prostrated, and destroyed. Millions of non-Slavic people were measured for the Russian yoke. Disraeli and others called for a conference to consider that treaty at Berlin. Quietly the British Navy was readied at battle stations. Her soldiers were on transports and moving at sea when the conference met at Berlin on June 13, 1878. Of course, Russia spies had the"leak." Of course the Russians said "No." Whoever heard one say "Yes." Disraeli whispered to an aide to put his special train in immediate readiness for return to London. As Disraeli intended, that information was "leaked" too. The train left on time. So did Disraeli with the treaty he wanted.

The iron-fisted Bismarck was impressed. That "Old Jew" knows his Russians—was his terse comment.

Disraeli summed it up in two sentences: "No man will treat with indifference the principle of race. It is the key of history, and why history is so often confused is that it has been written by men who were ignorant of this principle and all the knowledge it involves."

Why our current and recent history is so confused is that it is being made by men who are ignorant of "the principle of race." The only person Russian rulers will believe is a spy. That is a racial characteristic. The only thing he fears is power. That is bred into him. The only way to touch his heart is with a bullet. The only people yet powerful enough to touch such hearts are Americans. But not for long. Russia knows that she will never break the power of the Anglo-Saxon race, except by boring within. Social scientists have become her most effective borers with scientific thought control. They are openly working like beavers with American money behind them and American fools patting their feet and clapping their hands.

There is no longer a race problem to be solved in the South. It has been solved by segregation. There is but tranquility to be disturbed. As Booker T. Washington expressed it, the two races worked together to rebuild their temples upon the ashes of external hate like two fingers working on the same hand. The mature Christian leaders of both races saw the necessity of doing it that way or not at all. Children, young people, and hot heads could not be trusted with racial fates then or now. Intermingling in schools and churches was forbidden to preserve tranquility. It conveyed no idea of superiority or inferiority except such as God may have been responsible for. Each was entitled to equal justice under law—not sociology. Race hatreds quickly died, except for sporadic flare-ups caused by some depraved individual of one or the other race.

One of the fine citizens that the South has given to America is Joe Louis. He is a credit to his race and to the white race that shared his childhood poverty and hardships in a region first reduced to poverty and then forsaken.

In the first edition of his story, as it appeared in Life magazine November 8, 1948, pages 129–130, Joe Louis explained it in simple eloquence:

"Before I get to tell how we came to move north to Detroit when I was 12 years old, there's one other thing: in all those years in Alabama I never knew anything about race or anything like that. No one talked about it, as I can remember. If there was lynch talk, it never got to me or my folks. Not like now. I never got to know about such things until we got to Detroit. In Alabama I played with the Langley twins and other white kids, and we had no color talk. I knew they had things I didn't have but I took that natural. I never hooked it in with race difference. I think I would have remembered if I had."

It is no wonder that the publishers struck that passage from later editions of his book.

As we grew up, in the manner Joe Louis describes in his unexpurgated book, we recall that one of our colored friends went north. After about a year he was back. Someone asked him: "What made you come back?" He answered: "Up north dey treat de black race white, but dey treats de Negro black. Down here dey treat de black race black and treats de Negro white. I'm a Negro."

That is what Joe Louis meant 30 years later. "Modern authority" can't make a lie big enough to budge that truth. They may only smother it with "scientific" thought control.

Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt understood the matter sympathetically and well in 1933, before Washington was flooded with European sociologists and thought control experts. Henrietta Nesbitt tells it in the White House Diary (1948), page 78:

"But the first criticism I heard against our housekeeping was when Mrs. Roosevelt brought in all colored help instead of the mixed staff the Hoovers had in the kitchen, until it was solid Negro. * * * We had our reasons for making this change. Mrs. Roosevelt and I agreed that a staff solid in one color works in better understanding and maintains a smoother running establishment."

Mrs. Roosevelt found "tangible factors" to justify enforcement of racial segregation in the White House for 13 years. If she practiced one way and preached another, that is a matter for her to square with her own conscience and her God. Myrdal was never able to explain that practice, even in decibels on sociological charts. The American creed she lived by never became fluid except on her tongue.

Thurgood Marshall, the "friend of the court" who speaks for NAACP, concedes that the Negroes of the South don't consider him or NAACP their friends. The Atlanta Journal recently printed the NAACP agenda, adopted in Atlanta during the last of May. Point No. 2 was as follows:

"Some Negroes may not desire segregation. The NAACP considers those Negroes in the minority. It will act independently of protests from Negroes who oppose its program."

Note the word "considers." That word would not have been used if Marshall had not known that "those Negroes" who favor segregation are in the majority. Marshall couldn't even use the word "believes" instead of "considers" because he knew the intelligent men of his race would laugh him to scorn.

The urge in man to preserve and prefer his own kin and kind is as old as creation. That which God built into man is never to be sacrificed on the altar of sociology or Slavic thought-control. The family, the tribe, and the race predate governments themselves. Governments were made to protect—not to destroy them. It has never been a crime for man to kill to shield his brother and his hearthstone. That comes with the national right of self-defense, which lies beyond the power of any government. Self-preservation is the first law of nature. Government didn't make that law and government can't repeal it.

The right of self-preservation includes the right of selective associations—the right to erect and fortify frontiers—frontiers between countries, governments, races, and between homes. The constitutional "right of the people to keep and bear arms" as set forth in the second amendment of the Federal Constitution is founded solely upon that natural law. The Constitution did not create that right—it merely preserved from infringement that God-given right. The 14th amendment did not destroy natural rights. It confirmed natural rights that George Mason of Virginia endeavored to have protected in the Constitution at Philadelphia in 1787. It was Ellsworth of Connecticut and others of his kind that beat him down. We agree with Theodore Roosevelt, who said that for what Ellsworth spoke then and there his "name should be branded with infamy."

The source of natural rights is God. The source of civil rights is government. The source of government is the people. Governments have only such powers as are granted by the people. Its officers are the servants and trustees of the people. Constitutions constitute. They constitute the power of attorney of the servants and trustees of the people.

Article III of the Federal Constitution vests judicial powers of the United States in the courts to adjudicate cases according to law and facts—not sociology.

The fifth amendment preserves liberty from infringement by the Federal Government by any method known to man other than due process of law. The 14th amendment preserves liberty from infringement by the States by any method known to man other than due process of law. Nowhere in the constitution of any government, except Russia and her satellites, may be found the power to infringe liberty by due process of sociology.

It was to arrest and forestall the rule of sociology and to reinstate the rule of law that Magna Carta was rammed down the throat of a sociological king of England. It was to reaffirm Magna Carta that Charles I lost his sociological head; that the sociological James II lost his crown, and the sociological George III lost an empire. The Anglo-Saxon race has paid out rivers of blood to retain government by law. It will pay again and again. Eternal vigilance is not the price of Anglo-Saxon liberty. It is blood.

Precedents of usurpation of power create no legal authority. Upon the integrity of that principle rests the validity of every right man has ever wrested from power and every liberty he has ever torn from tyrants. A Supreme Court decision that usurps the power of God is entitled to and will receive just that respect that the Anglo-Saxon race has always given to such decisions. When the king's judges usurped the power to nullify the natural rights of our forefathers in 1773, they were driven from the benches to His Majestic's ships by Sons of Liberty, who cried out their watchword: "To your tents, Oh Israel."

Our people never have and never will tolerate "divine right" in judges to nullify divine rights in men.

Judge Robert N. Wilkin, of Cleveland, Ohio, a profound lawyer, scholar, and author, explained the matter with reason and deep understanding in the recent case of *Hayes v. Crutcher* (108 Fed, Supp. 582, at pp. 585–586), where he upheld segregation. We quote a part:

"It seems that segregation is not only recognized in constitutional law and judicial decision, but that it is also supported by general principles of natural law. As nature has produced different species, so it has produced different races of men. Distinguishing racial features have not been produced by man, or man-made laws. They are the result of processes of evolution and it seems natural and customary for different species and different races to recognize and prefer as intimate associates their own kind. Nature has produced white birds, black birds, blue birds, and red birds, and they do not roost on the same limb or use the same nest. Such recognition and preference for their own kind prevails among other animals. It prevails also among all people, among the yellow, black and red skinned races.

"The law recognizes these natural and instinctive principles and practices of life. It does not attempt to inhibit them. It would be futile to attempt to do so. This Nation's experience with the 18th amendment shows that there are forces of nature that cannot be changed by a constitutional amendment or judicial decree * * * A court of sense and character, or experience, does not command anything to be done which is impossible, because there is no method by which its order can be enforced. * * *

"During recent years there has been a tendency prompted by over-zealous champions of democracy to extend democratic processes and legal procedure into fields where they are not qualified to serve. By burdening democratic and legal processes with obligations which they are not able to meet, they bring democracy and law into disrepute and disintegration. This tendency has been incited and increased by open champions and subversive agents of the world revolution which has been advancing under the banner of communism. The open and avowed purpose of such revolutionaries is to eradicate all religion and to destroy our system of law and jurisprudence which has been developed in the Judean-Greek-Roman-Christian tradition. Those who intentionally or unwittingly are overburdening democratic and legal processes and destroying the delicate balance and apportionment of powers upon which our way of life depends, play into the hands of the revolutionaries. While they may think they are championing freedom and liberalism, they are bringing about a totalitarianism which will destroy the very object that they seek to serve."

The difference between the profound reasoning of Judge Wilkin, the eternal lawyer, and that of the judges of the Supreme Court on the same subject, is the difference between professional devotion to law, order, and country, and some other kind of devotion to some other kind of thing. The Federal judiciary has been homogenized by sociological thought control so that cream no longer rises to the top. If the people can't have their cream to nourish their freedoms under law, they will not forever tolerate shrouded pallbearers at the tombs of their liberties.

The dilemma we find ourselves in today is not new. History repeats itself. Around 2,000 years ago, government by law had broken down in the Roman Republic. Judaism had lost touch with God. Mankind had cast itself loose from the traditions of the past and had lost its way. Wearied by excitement the world had gone mad. Form had replaced sustance. Names had replaced things. Judges had forsaken the science of law for soothsayings. What we know now as social justice had replaced legal justice. The will of the people as interpreted by judges had replaced mandates of the laws of God and man. In that dark hour of history God sent His only Son to show the way to a world that was lost. He started with simple fundamentals. He taught the hopeless people to pray to God just one simple prayer that begged deliverance from their hunger, their trespasses, their temptations, and their evil, leaving to their own pitiful wits the phrasings of prayers of things less urgently needed.

As He was gently leading mankind back to tangible truth, He was also moving to his Garden of Gethsemane, Golgotha, and the Cross. Along the way he was trailed and shadowed by sociological judges, seeking to trap Him in His words. Seeing them in the multitude and among His disciples (one of whom was a friend of the court, and a traitor to his race and to his God) He began to speak of and to them. To the multitude He said:

"The * * * Pharisees sit in Moses' seat. All therefore whatsoever they bid you observe that observe and do; but do not ye after their works. * * * For they bind heavy burdens * * * and lay them on men's shoulders * * * all their works they do * * * to be seen of men: they make broad their phylacteries, and enlarge the borders of their garments * * *."

He then turned upon the sociological bloodhounds:

"But woe unto you * * * ye have taken away the key of knowledge * * * ye shut up the kingdom of heaven against men: for ye neither go in yourselves, neither suffer ye them that are entering to go in * * * ye compass sea and land to make one proselyte; and when he is made, ye make him twofold more the child of hell than yourselves * * * ye pay tithe of mint and anise and cummin and have omitted the weightier matters of the law * * * these ought ye to have done, and not to leave the other undone * * * ye blind guides, which strain at a gnat and swallow a camel * * * ye make clean the outside of the cup and of the platter but within they are full of extortion and excess * * *."

Thereupon He turned again to the helpless multitude: "Behold your house is left unto you desolate * * * ye shall not see Me henceforth. * * *"

He knew that the hour was at hand. He was in the clutches of sociological judges in a government of flesh. The judges who condemned him trailed him to the executive chambers of Pontius Pilate. Pilate, yielding softly to the will of the people, or to social justice, influenced by scientific thought control, asked the multitude whether it should be He to be executed. The judges stirred up the will of the mob to cry: "Let Him be crucified."

Above the din of the mob were heard a few broken phrases as Pilate pressed the Saviour to declare whether He came to infringe the prerogatives of the tyrant Caesar, in his government of flesh "to this end was I born, and for this cause came I into the world, that I should bear witness unto the truth."

Pilate was faintly heard to close the last colloquy: "What is truth?"

Even He paid a final tribute to truth that puts our Supreme Court to shame.

Thus the Son of God who branded the races of men with the marks of their kin and kind was, himself, history's honored victim of sociological judges in a government of flesh. It was their crown He wore, and their cross He bore.

That story may be found four times told in a book that may yet be found in most American homes. That book is a bur that mysteriously rides beneath the saddles of all modern authority in the field of sociological justice and scientific thought control. Our Supreme Court has virtually banished that book from the public schools of America in the specious names of religious freedom, and liberalism, and our children are not longer taught its lessons. That holy book contains no shifting creed and cannot rest on the same shelves with unholy ones that are now modern authority.

As we in the South once more pass into our Garden of Gethsemane thence to bear our socio-judicial cross, we plead with our brothers of the North not to let their sympathy and understanding be limited by latitude.

In the words of Henry W. Grady, speaking on the Race Problem in Boston, on December 12, 1889:

"Can we solve it? The God who gave it into our hands, He alone can know. But this the weakest and wisest of us do know: We cannot solve it with less than your tolerant and patient sympathy—with less than the knowledge that the blood that runs in your veins is our blood—and that, when we have done our best, whether the issue be lost or won, we shall feel your strong arms about us and hear the beating of your approving hearts."

Lavaca Flats, Mirage Flats Extension, and O'Neill Irrigation Developments

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN W. BYRNES

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 1954

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, earlier I asked that this bill be passed over without prejudice. My understanding at that time was that the departments concerned reported that they had not had time to form an opinion one way or the other as to the merits of this legislation. Since that time I have talked to the chairman of the committee, and I would appreciate his advising the House as to the position of the departments on this bill.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, this bill does not provide for the construction of these projects, but merely provides that they shall be included in the Missouri Basin project. There is no construction involved in the bill. All charges and all costs and all reference to appropriations have been taken out of the bill. I understand now from the Department that they have no objection to including them in that part of the Missouri River Basin project.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. As far as the chairman knows, there is no objection to this bill by anybody, including the departments?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. That is correct, so far as the bill, as amended, is concerned.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

First "Flying LST"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 23, 1954

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Army-Navy-Air Force Register of June 19, 1954:

FIRST "FLYING LST"

A water-based plane that can land guns, trucks, supplies or an assault company of Marines directly onto an enemy beach—like the water-bound landing craft of World War II but hundreds of miles an hour faster—is in production at Convair Division of General Dynamics Corp. in San Diego, Calif.

The world's first "flying LST" is a bow-loader version of the Navy's water-based turboprop transport, the four-engined R3Y–1 Tradewind built by Convair. The new plane is designated the R3Y–2 and retains the same high performance characteristics of the regular transport.

Both the R3Y–1 and the R3Y–2 are scheduled to go into service late this year with the Navy's Fleet Logistic Air Wings, Pacific, at Alameda, Calif. They have a range of more than many World War II fighter planes.

For an assault operation, the R3Y–2 lands in off-shore waters and taxis to the beach. When the hull touches the sand, the bow opens upward like the luggage compartment on an automobile. A ramp is dropped and the loaded vehicles or troops debark directly onto the beach. To pull off the beach, the pilot simply reverses the propellers and backs away. A 30-second taxi run lifts the 80-ton plane into the air for the return trip.

The bow-loader can fly 24 tons of cargo. The main deck, made of extruded magnesium for strength without excessive weight, is 88 feet long and more than 9 feet wide.

The cargo deck stretches back from the bow door on one level, unbroken by bulkheads or other obstructions. The cleared load space was achieved by concentrating the five-man flight crew on a higher deck in the bow and by compartmentizing the hull below the cargo deck, as in modern ship construction. The compartmentation gives the hull superior strength as well as watertight integrity.

The R3Y–2 can carry four 155-millimeter howitzers, three 2½-ton trucks, 6 jeeps, 2 half tracks or several other types of military equipment. The bow door opening is 8 feet 4 inches wide and 6 feet 8 inches high. A multipurpose airplane, the R3Y–2 can be fitted with 103 demountable, rearward-facing seats for normal transport operations. It also can carry 92 litters and 12 attendants if it is needed as a hospital evacuation plane.

Like the regular transport version, the R3Y–2 also has a 10-foot wide door on the aft port side of the hull for normal dock loading of cargo. Both the R3Y–1 and the R3Y–2 have air conditioning and pressurization systems, the first ever built into large water-based airplanes.

The slim hull of the R3Y's was developed through exhaustive testing by Convair's Hydrodynamic Research Laboratory at San Diego. The hull has a length-over-beam ratio of 10 to 1, double that of previous Convair seaplanes and in sharp contrast to the old-style stubby "boats with wings."

The R3Y's are the largest water-based planes ever built by Convair. Each is powered by 4 Allison T–40 turboprop engines developing a total of approximately 22,000 horsepower and driving contrarotating Aeroproducts propellers.

The new planes are the culmination of more than 25 years' experience with water-based aircraft. Convair built the famed PBY Catalina and PB2Y Coronado patrol bombers of World War II. One of the newest water-based Convair planes is the delta-wing XF2Y Sea-Dart, a jet powered Navy fighter that lands and takes off on hydroskis.

Commencement Address by Hon. Herbert H. Lehman of New York, at Brandeis University

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 23, 1954

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address I delivered at the commencement exercises at Brandeis University on June 12, 1954.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TODAY'S CHALLENGE: TO PROTECT THE PEOPLE'S RIGHTS AGAINST CONGRESSIONAL LAWLESSNESS—PROPOSAL FOR RULES OF CONGRESSIONAL CONDUCT

(Remarks of Hon. HERBERT H. LEHMAN, of New York, at meeting of Brandeis University associates on commencement eve)

This occasion speaks for itself. Tomorrow we will see the third graduating class emerge from this young but already mature university.

There is no longer much time to be young. Problems which will not wait are beating impatiently upon the gates of this university, and demanding the attention and devotion of both faculty and graduates.

Outside, the world is not bright. The forces of fear and tyranny are rampant both within our land and beyond our shores. Never, within my memory, has the prospect seemed so grim and so demanding.

I am reassured, it is true, by the record of history. There have been other periods in which darkness has threatened to close in on civilization, periods in which truth, reason, decency and integrity have been subjected to the most fearful pressures.

Somehow despite temporary defeats, and even eclipses, the human spirit—the spirit of light and freedom—has survived and prevailed. It is history's proof that the human spirit is immortal, and that a supreme Divinity, a Higher Order, does indeed preside over the affairs of mankind.

But our salvation will require dedication, devotion, and sacrifice. We must resolve our problems or be lost. That is not an easy challenge.

Beyond our shores, the forces of Communist imperialism stand at the gates of new conquests. Forces of incalculable power strike out at the old order in many quarters of the globe, but most significantly now, in Asia.

In this situation, our Government, and our people generally, appear, unhappily, to show little appreciation of either the extent or the nature of the forces which have been unleashed, and of the dangers we face. There seems to be little understanding of the kind of approach we must take to these new forces, and the kind of response we must make to these dangers.

Seeming to depend ever more heavily on military force, and on atomic weapons, our country appears, in the eyes of the world, to invoke only the power of force in a world whose only hope for survival lies in the power of faith.

Here at home we are reaping a tragic harvest from the panic and hysteria sowed so recklessly with regard to the internal menace of communism. Deadly blows have been dealt to our prestige abroad, the public faith in freedom has been corroded, and the Congress of the United States has been converted from a national institution into a national spectacle.

These are harsh words, but no harsher than are being spoken today by many of our most thoughtful observers. When 2 and 3 years ago I sought to warn against the present consequences, I was dismissed as an alarmist. I was accused of magnifying the danger of what I called McCarthyism. Believe me, I take little pleasure in today's general recognition of what I observed months and years ago.

But my faith in democracy, in freedom, and in the American people is deep and unshakable. I firmly believe that we will overcome the present dangers, both at home and abroad. Civilization will survive. The cause of freedom will prevail.

This I believe. But for this to happen, the American people must be roused to a deeper awareness than they now have of the dangers we confront and the strenuous measures necessary to overcome them.

Our national leadership must be the first to show that awareness and to propose programs of action to be undertaken. I regret to say that thus far the administration has shown a strong inclination to formulate slogans instead of policies, and, in general, to follow cautiously in the wake of events and of public opinion, rather than to anticipate events and to lead public opinion.

Up to this point I have been referring collectively to the dangers we face both at home and from abroad. In a major sense, these are opposite sides of the same coin which should be looked at together.

True, actions required to meet our problems abroad are of a very different sort from those needed to meet the dangers at home. But, in both areas, courageous and imaginative moves are called for. In both areas, responsible leadership must lead. And no policy to combat communism abroad can succeed unless immediate steps are taken at home to restore the balance of power between the executive and the legislative branches of Government; and until dignity, decency, and a wholesome respect for the rights of individuals are reestablished as the immutable standards of all branches of the Government.

One of the principal theses of the fearmongers at home is that we are in greater danger from internal subversion than from external aggression. According to this argument, the farflung forces of Communist imperialism, assaulting everywhere the vulnerable outposts of the free world, should give us less concern than the case of an obscure American dentist named Peress who failed to sign a loyalty form when the received a commission in the Medical Corps of the United States Army.

I do not mean to minimize the real dangers from internal subversion—from spies, secret agents, and saboteurs. But let us see the problem in perspective. What is the source of the most effective damage being done to the United States today? What network of Communist spies and saboteurs could have succeeded in turning this Nation upside down and inside out, in paralyzing the Army and the Congress, and in sabotaging the defense effort in terms of delay and interruption, beyond any reckoning of it? No Communists could have done it. But McCarthy has accomplished it as a mere side effect of his activities.

Senator McCarthy has frequently quoted a remark by Abraham Lincoln, to the effect that if this country is ever imperiled, the danger would come from within and not from without. This Lincoln quotation is intended to prove McCarthy's favorite thesis about the danger from internal subversion.

You will be interested to know that an examination of the context from which this remark by Abraham Lincoln was taken tells quite a different story from that which McCarthy has tried to convey. No, not even Abraham Lincoln is safe from misuse and abuse by Senator McCarthy.

In fact, the Lincoln quotation referred to is from a speech he made in 1838. Abraham Lincoln's remarks on that occasion were directed at vigilantism and mob violence and not at subversion. Just 2 months before, Elijah Lovejoy, a leading antislavery editor, had been murdered by a proslavery mob in Alton, Ill. There were similar outbreaks in both the North and in the South. To favor the outright abolition of slavery in those days was to be regarded in some quarters as dangerously subversive. It invited physical violence. And so Abraham Lincoln said, in that same speech from which Senator McCarthy has so often quoted:

"There is even now something of ill-omen amongst us. I mean the increasing disregard for law which pervades the country; the growing disposition to substitute wild and furious passions in lieu of the sober judgment of the courts; and the worse than savage mobs, for the executive ministers of justice."

That was Abraham Lincoln in 1838. He was, of course, speaking of a particular situation in his own day. But if his words are to be applied to current events, I leave it to you, my friends, to say whom the shoe fits best.

Today we are, indeed, faced with a lawless situation in the United States Congress. I use the word "lawless" advisedly. There are no uniform laws protecting the rights of the people of this country against the investigating committees of Congress.

The Bill of Rights in our Constitution protects the people in their rights against abuses of power, invasion of privacy, and repression on the part of the executive branch of Government. The Bill of Rights assures the people fair play in the courts of the land as against the police power.

But there appears to be no effective protection of the people, in their rights, against abuses and repression on the part of the investigating committees of Congress.

I would like to read to you a statement made in 1948 by the then chairman of the House Un-American Activities Committee. Addressing himself to a protesting witness, the chairman said:

"The rights you have are the rights given you by this committee. We will determine what rights you have got and what rights you haven't got."

That was the chairman of the Un-American Activities Committee speaking, in 1948. He was speaking accurately.

Without a set of rules, adopted by the Congress, American citizens have no rights before a congressional investigating committee. They can be subpenaed, harrassed, abused, denounced and ruined, and they have no avenue of relief or recourse.

If an eminent general in the Army, General Zwicker, with a splendid record of heroic service, can be abused and humiliated before a congressional investigating committee, what happens to an ordinary citizen, without the United States Army behind him? I shudder to think. The American people should shudder too.

The investigating power of Congress is a precious one for the promotion of the general welfare, for the gathering of essential information for the guidance of legislators, and for the protection of the people against evil and corrupt practices in the economic institutions of our country, and in the Government.

But certainly the investigating power of congressional committees was never intended, nor should it be permitted to be used, to oppress the people, to invade their legitimate privacy, and to set at naught the guarantees in the Constitution of the right to free speech, free press, free assembly, free petition, and free worship.

Nor should the congressional investigating power be a weapon for the intimidation of the executive branch of the Government or the courts, and thus to gain dominance over them.

Yet all this, in fact, has taken place.

My friends, let us read the lesson of history. It warns us of terrible danger along the path which has been recently followed.

There are many instances in history where inquisitorial committees of legislative bodies have seized more and more power until the legislative bodies, and then the nation, were subjected to tyrannical control.

Let us recall, for instance, the glorious Republic of Venice, one of the most powerful states of the Renaissance period. Its citizens were rich, and proud, and free.

In that time, too, there was suspicion of subversion. The great council of Venice, which was the popular, legislative body of that day, established a committee of 10, an investigating committee, instructed to root out subversive elements. It functioned as investigator, prosecutor, and judge.

Soon that committee of 10 appointed a subcommittee of 3, who came to be known as the inquisitors of state. Gradually this inquisitorial subcommittee took over the executive as well as the legislative power of government. They inquired, they judged, they punished. They issued decrees. They conducted foreign relations. They were supreme.

Tranquillity developed in Venice, tranquillity and conformity. Dissidence was stamped out. But it was the tranquillity and conformity of decay. Venice didn't know it, but she was dead. At the first major crisis the Venetian Empire collapsed like a house of cards.

Does this have any lesson for us? Does the experience of Venice have any parallel with events today in the United States? I see many parallels. I am sure you do, too.

We have not yet, of course, gone very far down the road which Venice traveled. But we have taken some long steps on that way. We have, perhaps, gone further than we think.

I am sure, however, that we can retrace our steps.

The McCarthy hearings have surely given the American public an idea of the dangers of congressional investigating committees if uncontrolled by rules of justice and fair play. The public has seen some of the abuses and ugly implications of what has been taking place behind the scenes of the McCarthy committee during the past 2 years.

Some very fundamental reforms are certainly needed, reaching deep into the causes of the present situation. First of all, there needs to be a clearer limit on the scope and jurisdiction of investigating committees. The Executive, the courts, and Congress itself must contribute to the establishment of some clear out-of-bounds signs on the now limitless expanse of the investigative power. Indeed, in regard to a related problem—the problem of the wholesale encroachment of the legislative branch upon the legitimate rights of the Chief Executive—the simplest remedy is a show of some old-fashioned spunk on the part of the Executive. We have not seen much of this in recent months.

But the assumption by congressional investigating committees of the right to inquire into personal political beliefs—into the innermost reaches of the soul and conscience of the individual—this is the really revolutionary development of recent times. And this is the development most fraught with danger for the liberties of the people and the integrity of the Congress.

It is this circumstance which most urgently calls for the immediate adoption of a uniform set of rules for the conduct of investigating committees—a code of fair play. Unlike some of the other aspects of the problem which require comprehensive study and profound thought, this proposal is ready for immediate consideration and action.

A code of fair play—a uniform set of rules—should accomplish the following purposes:

1. Protect the basic rights and reputations of individuals appearing as witnesses before investigating committees;

2. Protect the rights and reputations of individuals who might be adversely affected by testimony given in hearings or in committee reports; and

3. Define the rights of committee members as against the rights of committee chairmen.

A set of rules to accomplish these purposes also needs to have provision for effective enforcement. Rules without sanctions are like bricks without straw. These rules must be able to be enforced, and to withstand the pressure of the willful violator.

Such a set of rules is now pending before the Congress. Indeed, there are a number of pending proposals on this general subject. I participated in the drafting of what I believe to be the most comprehensive of all the pending proposals—the only one with provision for enforcement.

Nineteen of us in the Senate and six Members of the House recently joined in introducing this particular set of rules. In my opinion it is absolutely essential that action be taken on this subject at this session of Congress. But that will require strong and widespread public support.

Until some such rules are passed, individuals coming before congressional committees will continue to be defenseless and without substantive rights. The adoption of the uniform rules of procedure I have described, by both Houses of Congress, will help to establish these rights.

But the other fundamental reforms I mentioned are also essential. The achievement of these reforms will take much soul-searching, much study, much thought, and much education of the general public.

Implicit in these reforms is an attack on the entire problem of McCarthyism—on the basic factors of fear and insecurity which today grip so many of our people. There must be a return to faith—faith in principles, faith in our country, faith in ourselves, faith in God, in liberty, and democracy.

There must be a reelevation of the virtues which have for so many years been identified with the American character—compassion, tolerance, decency, truth, honor, and integrity. And those who, by their acts, violate and trample upon these virtues must be driven by an aroused public opinion from positions of public trust and confidence.

We must be able to turn outward to the rest of the world a countenance that reflects an inner serenity, an inner confidence in our own principles, and in the justice of our ways.

There is a noble standard to which all of us, with great profit, can repair. That is the standard set by the Founding Fathers, by those who struggled to achieve our liberty, and who established the institutions designed to secure the blessings of liberty for themselves and for us, their posterity.

We must seek to emulate their courage, their confidence, and their belief in the power of good and the strength of freedom.

Let us recall the words of Justice Brandeis in his famous dissent in the Whitney case, when he said, referring to the beliefs of the Founding Fathers:

"They believe liberty to be the secret of happiness, and courage, the secret of liberty * * * they believed * * * that fear breeds repression; that repression breeds hate; that hate menaces stable government."

I hope this university will help show the way to fight fear with faith; hate with understanding; and repression with courage, devotion, and eternal dedication to the cause of liberty.

Postal Service Reclassification and Pay Proposal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 23, 1954

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, despite the extraordinary pressure by the Post Office Department, the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee rejected the Summerfield-Rees reclassification and pay proposal. It was a nonpartisan decision made by a majority of committee members in approving the Corbett substitute.

I believe that most of the majority who approved the Corbett measure were deeply concerned over the increased authority which the Rees bill would give to the Postmaster General.

There have been many recent examples of the abuse of personal power in Government service, and it would be unwise to grant additional power to the Postmaster General.

The overwhelming majority of postal employees oppose the Summerfield-Rees bill. This has been reconfirmed by letters I have received in the last few days from organizations which represent the vast majority of the employees.

As an example, Mr. Speaker, I include herewith the following letter I received from the National Federation of Post Office Clerks, which expresses the sentiments of most postal employees:

JUNE 18, 1954.

Members of House of Representatives,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMEN: On Tuesday, June 15, the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service reported the bill H. R. 9245 which would establish a joint committee of Congress to study postal service reclassification and increased rates of basic compensation pending reclassification pursuant to recommendations of the joint committee. The National Federation of Post Office Clerks believes that this bill by Congressman CORBETT of Pennsylvania is far superior to the destructive proposal advanced by the Postmaster General and embodied in the bill H. R. 8648.

We are cognizant of the fact that a minority report was submitted and since that minority report embodies all of the warmed over arguments advanced by the Post Office Department—which the committee rejected in making its report—we believe that an expression of our views may be helpful.

In our opinion, the minority report is only another facet of the desperate struggle now being waged to force Congress to abdicate its authority on postal salary matters. One would gather that it is the present policy of the Post Office Department to continue its pressure tactics but to substitute hit and run actions for the frontal attacks that have thus far failed. This strategy which employes techniques that some Senators have called "illegal" and that your committee has denounced as an attempt to create unwarranted and untrue impressions, remains the same.

We seem to be faced with a campaign employing more subtle methods, such as hinting—although never saying so outright—that the President will veto any measure other than the Department's reclassification plan. Inasmuch as this policy would make a pawn out of Congress and whip it into line on postal matters, we think it unfortunate that the minority report lends support to that effort.

I hope you will find the time to study the report, No. 1870. The majority views are extremely well documented and the bill which those views support would provide not only a thorough and objective study of the entire reclassification question—to be completed not later than May 1 of next year—but would also provide sorely needed interim salary increases.

The point that stands out in the minority report is an acceptance of the Post Office Department's arguments. In several instances this minority report makes the rather general statement that across-the-board salary increases, which the Congress has approved in the past, have distorted pay schedules. Your attention is invited to the fact that the actual dollar difference between the salaries of rank and file employees and their supervisors is greater today than it was when the present classification law was enacted in 1945.

The minority report makes the statement that "employee representatives resisted all proposals for reclassification presented at our hearings." As a matter of fact, the employees resisted only one proposal, that which was prepared on the recommendations of the George Fry Associates which in turn was based on a study completed in approximately 10 or 11 weeks by a handful of men without previous knowledge of the postal service. My own statement to the committee recommended the appointment of a joint committee to make a thorough and objective study of this subject so that some factual basis for a reclassification proposal could be made available.

The minority report states that "the lack of adequate differential between routine jobs and supervisory positions makes it difficult for the Department to persuade the superior employees to accept additional responsibilities." The fact that more than 50,000 employees, clerks and carriers, in grade 7 and above, have recently competed in examinations for postal supervisory positions, makes such a statement necessarily questionable. If the lack of an adequate differential really existed, it is extremely unlikely that so large a percentage of employees would have taken the examination in the faint hope of promotion.

The minority views apparently make much of the fact that elevator starters, cleaners, and charwomen receive a slightly higher salary in the field postal service than they do in the Federal service generally. If this be true the answer most certainly lies in improving the salaries of those in the classified service, rather than in attempting to bring postal people down to such a lower level. All Members of Congress might well ask themselves how many post offices in their own districts have elevator service. They might also ask themselves how many post offices that have elevators actually have an elevator operator. In truth, there are not more than a mere handful of post-office buildings throughout the country that have elevators, let alone use elevator operators.

The minority statement makes the point that in the opinion of those signing the minority report, the "legislation supported by the minority of the committee is far better for the rank and file of postal employees."

It would be difficult, indeed, to find any rank-and-file post-office clerks who would consider the Summerfield proposal as being better for the rank and file of postal employees. This paternalistic attitude that "Papa knows best" about what is good for the postal employees is the real basis for the existing difficulties. If the officials of the Post Office Department had made an honest effort to find out what the employees themselves thought was good for them, or if the members signing the minority report had been willing to credit the views expressed by the employees themselves, the present unfortunate situation would not exist.

Once the facts are known and the errors contained in the minority report are corrected, the arguments for the bill the minority supports appear ridiculous. That is because the bill itself is indefensible.

We believe that the bill, H. R. 9245, merits your support as well as your opposition to all destructive amendments such as those suggested in the minority views.

With kindest personal regards and assurances of esteem, I am,

Sincerely yours,

E. C. HALLBECK,
Legislative Representative, National Federation of Post Office Clerks.

The Air Force Academy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MILTON R. YOUNG

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 23, 1954

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an open letter to the Air Force, prepared by Walter R. Whitver, Jr., of Washington, D. C., and dealing with the pending construction of the Air Force Academy.

Mr. Whitver was born and raised in North Dakota. He is a well qualified and competent architect. His educational background in this field includes study at the University of North Dakota and a doctor's degree in architecture from the University of Rome, Italy.

He has given a great deal of thought and study to the problem and challenge that the Air Force faces in building its new Academy. I am quite sure that a great number of architects feel much the same as does Mr. Whitver. The Air Force has a great obligation to meet in erecting its new Academy.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN OPEN LETTER TO THE AIR FORCE

Ten years ago today American airmen took part in a great joint venture of our fighting men. No one but God knows where the men of the Air Force spent their flight, but this we do know: They have made their path in the sky. As heroes they have proved their passion of manhood, the wisdom of their age, and now have the splendor of kings and the triumph of warriors, the fame of poets, and the honor of true patriots. As it should be, they have the challenge that when met with love and understanding will always go upward and onward to true glory.

In these few short years the Air Force has acquired a wealth of tradition and history that is at last to be hewed in stone and fashioned to liberty and beauty. A memorial which will be suitable to commemorate greatness, both of men and events, and it must be conceived by those who in their hearts and their minds know the real and everlasting significance of the fame and spirit that will be immortalized by the Air Academy's yearly pride of men to the United States Air Force.

This Air Force Academy, a school for boys, a training field for men and a memory for heroes will be a job to build that is so vast in its complexities that the genius of a Leonardo de Vinci would be taxed. One wonders if it is possible to do what should and must be done to create a group of buildings and fields and give them the pride and spirit of our American airmen and the practical uses that the Academy must have for a training that advances as fast as the airplane. Will the American people, with their great pride in the airpower of America, have a waffle and pudding like the United Nations buildings, as a glass encased supermarket or the square of the circle with projecting angles?

It cannot be like the Gothic ramparts of West Point, or the French style of the Naval Academy, even though they be hallowed and beautiful. The need is great for understanding and interpretation of what the Air Force was, is and will be. The designers must work with the greatness and glamour of its beginning, from box kites and Kitty Hawk, to Eddie Rickenbacker, to the United States mails, and to the B-17, the jet and Niki. They must sculpt the spirit of Selfridge, the vision of Billy Mitchell, the strength of Arnold, and the love and devotion of Hoyt Vandenburg. There is military tradition and there is the transitional of by ground, by sea, and by air, and there is the future that changes as it arrives.

Where will the geniuses come from who will create this dream of the Air Force? They are here, just as we have them in other works; we will have them for this Academy if the men of the Air Force understand their enormous responsibility to America, to the Air Force, and to the future. These Air Force men, these artists, planners and artisans, will breathe beauty and love, memory and tradition, genius and leadership and spirit into these buildings and fields that will be the Air Academy and the thousands who will train there will be inspired and will benefit, and carry the glory that is America.

The halls of learning are loved because learning is loved. No man goes forward without love for the place where he has received learning, be it the small red schoolhouse with its row of willows, be it a city school with its fenced-in playground, or be it his mother's knee and his father's whip. But halls of learning grow like a village grows, from a crossroads, as a town grows from a village and the city from a town, and each leave their mark as permanent as the rings of a tree. Some marks are round and true while others are scarred and ugly from the wounds of growing, just as the trail marker chips a young tree in blazing a path for others to follow and that cut remains forever on the tree. In building the halls of learning the fathers of a village work so their children will learn, and a town will build Old Main, and as the city grows the schools will grow around the first building which remains—either in reality or memory, in the style and workmanship of the village fathers.

Now the gentlemen of the Air Force are as the village fathers and they are to build Old Main, and if it be of greatness and beauty, as it must be, they shall place their style and their workmanship on this Academy. It is not to be over many lives, but is to be complete and lasting from one idea, one plan, and one generation. In building this college at one time there are great advantages, but no mistakes will be allowed these men of the Air Force lest their sons and their son's sons lose pride.

This Air Force Academy must be good; it must be of the best. The planning, design, and construction must be of genius for it is to pick up the past, be perfect in the present, and be built for the future. The men who work on this school must be dedicated to the Air Force, to what the Academy represents and needs, and to the love and understanding of the brick and stone they mould. They must have a deep sincerity and honesty in their principals so that the plan, the design and the use shall not fail the glory of the Air Force, our military tradition, and the American people.

WALTER R. WHITVER, Jr.

WASHINGTON, D. C.

Southland Paper Mills: Great Texas Asset

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 23, 1954

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, some 15 years ago E. L. Kurth and associates, of Angelina County, Tex., saw a dream come true when the first unit of Southland Paper Mills, Inc., was constructed.

Since then the progress of this important industrial institution has been steady and sound. A new step forward was taken recently. It is described in an editorial in the Lufkin Daily News of June 15, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Continued industrial and economic progress for Angelina County is assured by the announcement of Southland Paper Mills, Inc., that sufficient newsprint contracts have been executed to justify installation of a third machine.

On March 31, following the annual meeting of Southland's board of directors, President E. L. Kurth cited these factors involved in the proposal:

The project will cost several million dollars.

Southland's present personnel of 837 will be increased by approximately 200 once the third unit is in production.

The added personnel will increase Southland's annual payroll by $1 million.

Southland will increase its purchase of pulpwood within a 75-mile radius by 100,000 tons annually bringing this annual expenditure to more than $6 million.

It is noteworthy that this expansion program at Southland Paper Mills, Inc., represents capital investment, increased payroll, and purchases of raw materials well in excess of that represented by any other new industry that has come into any area of east Texas in recent years.

E. L. Kurth and associates pioneered the southern pine newsprint industry back in 1939 when the first unit of Southland was constructed; now they give an added guaranty to industrial progress for Angelina County and east Texas today and in the future.

The industrial progress in Angelina County in the foundries, woodworking, and lumber manufacturing plants, as well as at Southland, during the past 5 years has been far in excess of the progress made by any other single community in east Texas.

This progress has been steady and perhaps unspectacular, but the figures on payrolls and plant investments bear out the gains that have been made. All you need do is to check payrolls in Angelina and other counties in yesteryear and today to realize this fact.

Fifty-one Americans Remain in Captivity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GUY M. GILLETTE

OF IOWA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 23, 1954

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Fifty-one Americans Remain in Captivity." The article was written by Fletcher Knebel.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Look magazine]

FIFTY-ONE AMERICANS REMAIN IN CAPTIVITY

(By Fletcher Knebel)

AO-2204126, the service number of an American flier, has become a symbol of Red China's perfidy. It belongs to Air Force Capt. Harold E. Fischer, Jr., 29, of Swea City, Iowa, a double jet ace (credited with 10 "kills") in the Korean war. Every shred of evidence indicates that Captain Fischer has been held on Chinese soil since April 7, 1953, when he was shot down near the Yalu River.

Yet for 15 bitter months, the Communists have refused to utter a single official word to confirm or deny that evidence. They counter every demand for information with bland, insolent silence. When they did not return the flier at Panmunjom in the big-switch operation which ended last September, they broke their solemn word to exchange all prisoners of war.

Top Washington officials believe now that approximately 51 Americans, like Fischer, are being held captive. Thirty-two are civilians, some of whom have been prisoners for 3 years. The remaining are military captives of the Korean war: 15 Air Force airmen, four naval officers.

The Defense Department has no recent positive evidence that these 19 servicemen are still alive, but it does have reliable information that they were alive at the time the prisoner exchange took place last summer.

The Reds' silence has inflicted torture on the wives, mothers, and fathers of the missing men. And that torture has been compounded at home by another version of the Washington "numbers game." Legislators have played this game with POW figures, some with the best of intentions, others with mixed political motives.

Despite repeated denials by the Defense Department, there is a widespread belief that the Chinese Reds are holding 944 Americans.

Senator JOHN M. BUTLER, Republican, of Maryland, told the Senate in January that between 700 and 944 American boys were held in the slave-labor camps of China and Siberia. Senator JOSEPH MCCARTHY last fall, and again this spring, accused the Eisenhower administration of abandoning 900 American POW's to the Reds. Others, including Democrats, have made similar statements.

This most-misunderstood number—944—was first heard on September 9, 1953, when the United Nations command in Korea demanded that the Communists account for 3,400 U. N. personnel missing in action, including 944 Americans. Said the State Department on February 10, "It has not been believed, nor has the United Nations command ever implied, that all 944 were living." The Pentagon consistently denied that the Reds held 944 Americans, but never announced the exact number it contended the Reds were holding.

Meanwhile, behind the coils of diplomatic maneuvering and policy dilemmas, somewhere in a Manchurian camp sits Captain Fischer. Two days after he was shot down, radio Peking announced that he had been captured. In June 1953 his parents received a letter in garbled English from Red China, saying their son was still alive. Subsequently, a Communist newspaperman told United States reporters that Captain Fischer was a captive, and six repatriated United States prisoners of war said they had heard from Communists that the flier was being held as a war criminal.

The Air Force reviewed Fischer's case in April and found that a reasonable possibility of his survival exists.

Yet the passage of time is marked only by formal United States protests and the arrogant silence of Red China. The Eisenhower administration must find a way to force the release of Fischer and his fellow Americans—or face an explosive political issue.

Tough Tip From Wedemeyer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN WELKER

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 23, 1954

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an editorial entitled "Tough Tip From Wedemeyer," published in the New York Daily News of June 12, 1954.

I commend the editorial to my colleagues for their careful attention and study at this time.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Tough Tip From Wedemeyer

The smart thing for the United States to do next in the cold war, says Lt. Gen. Albert C. Wedemeyer, retired, is to break off both diplomatic and trade relations with all the countries of the Red Empire, period.

It isn't possible, General Wedemeyer told a Senate subcommittee Thursday, to deal with the Kremlin. It may be too late, he went on, to stop the Red surge for world conquest. As Wedemeyer sees it, the West's only hope lies in acting realistically.

He doesn't feel that it's realistic to do business with scoundrels who intend to cut your throat, or to go on keeping embassies in their capitals on the theory that by so doing you maintain valuable listening posts inside the Red empire.

Come to think of it, our envoys behind the curtain are severely limited as to where they may go and what they may observe. Their own dwellings are wired for sound, down to the smallest powder room and clothes closet, with Red secret police listening around the clock. So who is listening the more profitably to whom?

Admittedly, this is a tough tip that General Wedemeyer has offered his fellow Americans. It will shock the Dean Achesons and Harry Trumans.

Wedemeyer, however, happens to have had vast experience in combating Reds, and many opportunities to study the workings of their minds. It's quite conceivable that he knows what he's talking about, and is suggesting the best possible next move for us to make in the cold war.

One Hundred and Seventy-fifth Anniversary of Founding of Upper Buffalo and Cross Creek Presbyterian Churches

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 23, 1954

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an article relative to the 175th anniversary of the founding of Upper Buffalo Presbyterian Church and the Cross Creek Presbyterian Church, in southwestern Pennsylvania. I desire to call the attention of my colleagues to the fact that in 1802 there was held at that place, at that time in the woods, a revival service in which over 10,000 persons participated.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Upper Buffalo, Cross Creek To Hold Joint 175th Anniversary Observance

Congregations of the Upper Buffalo Presbyterian and the Cross Creek Presbyterian Churches are uniting for the 175th anniversary of the founding of the two congregations. An observance is planned for Saturday, June 26, at the Upper Buffalo Church.

As it was 175 years ago when the two congregations called Rev. Joseph Smith on June 21, 1779, to direct the spiritual and religious life of the two neighboring groups, the present members have planned to unite for a day's observance of the anniversary.

The day's program will open at 11 a. m. with a memorial to Rev. Joseph Smith, who banded together the two congregations until his death in 1792. A memorial marker will be placed at the grave of Reverend Smith, who was buried in Upper Buffalo Cemetery.

A family style dinner will be served at noon.

All friends and formed members of both churches are invited to the anniversary services and dinner. Those attending the picnic are asked to take basket dinners and their table service.

At 2 p. m. the 175th anniversary worship service will be conducted.

Guest speaker at the memorial service and the anniversary service will be Rev. E. B. Welsh, pastor of New Concord (Ohio) Presbyterian Church. His ancestors, Robert and Mary Caldwell Welsh, and Robert and Elizabeth Dawson Welsh were early members of the church.

Mr. Welsh is a graduate of the College of Wooster and Princeton Seminary and studied in Switzerland and at Columbia University.

His topic Saturday afternoon will be Our Future in Debt to Our Past. The choirs of both the Upper Buffalo and Cross Creek Churches will sing anthems.

Presiding ministers will be Harold Byers, Jr., of Upper Buffalo, and Rev. D. G. Phillips, of Cross Creek. Mr. Phillips is preparing to assume a foreign mission field post soon.

The 2 churches, whose history was parallel for 13 years, have added much to the religious life of the county as well as educational endeavor. Many young people were trained for the ministry by the early preachers and these same ministers were leaders in academies of the area.

The Scotch-Irish, who settled the area, fought for their religious freedom after their arrival from overseas, and banded together in the era of frontier wilderness infested with hostile Indians.

Both congregations experienced growth and a spiritual depth in the great revivals held in 1781 and 1802. At the latter revival more than 960 received communion.

Star of Solidarity to Vineland Men

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. T. MILLET HAND

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 23, 1954

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, four civic-minded men of my district were honored recently by receiving the Star of Solidarity from the Italian Government for relief work undertaken in this country in behalf of Italian citizens suffering from the flood of the Po River disaster following World War II.

This honor has been noted by the Hammonton (N. J.) News and has also been editorially referred to by the Vineland Times-Journal. Both of these articles are appended.

I add my own congratulations to these four men who have been variously noted for a strong and continuous interest in their own community in Vineland.

The articles follow:

[From the Hammonton (N. J.) News]

Philip Rudich, former manager of the South Jersey Joint Board, Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, was among four men who yesterday received the Star of Solidarity from the Italian Government for relief work done in behalf of the Po River flood disaster after World War II.

Others honored with the Italian citation, highest that can be awarded by the Italian Government to a noncitizen, were Dane Barse, Vineland clothing manufaturer; Albert Giuliani, former secretary-treasurer of the joint board, and Mayor John C. Gittone, of Vineland. Giuliani, ill, was unable to attend the ceremonies held in the offices at Trenton of the Italian vice consul, Turiddu Simoni.

Rudich was honored because of his personal appeal to the union to donate funds in order to purchase trucks and ambulances for Italy, and he also appealed for food and clothing. The result was enough money to purchase 22 vehicles and innumerable packages of food and clothing.

Barse, a civic leader and a Papal Knight of St. Gregory, was cited for his contributions in the same cause, while Mayor Gittone was cited for his achievements in aiding men and women of Italy and of Italian extraction in America.

Giuliani, now a manufacturer, also was cited for his aid in assisting during the Italian disaster.

[From the Vineland (N. J.) Times-Journal]

NO LACK OF AMERICANISM

(By Ben Leuchter)

Awarding of the Star of Solidarity of the Italian Government this week to Mayor John C. Gittone, Dane Barse, Albert Giuliani, and Philip Rudich not only was deserving but also significant, for it proves that loyal Americans can help unfortunate peoples in other lands without sacrificing one iota of their own love for this Nation.

The fact that this well-known quartet provided so much leadership and effort to help Italy in no way could have been construed to mean that they owed an equal amount of allegiance to Italy as to the United States. A paralled can be drawn between the work for which they were honored and the efforts of many Vineland residents on behalf of the state of Israel, which is the recipient of much humanitarian effort from this area.

In either case, there is no question of dual loyalty. It is commendable for Americans to be moved by the plight of people in other lands and to offer concrete help.

Such help always can be given without being inconsistent with Americanism.

The Big Picture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 23, 1954

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Reading Times of June 17, 1954:

THE BIG PICTURE

I seems to us that Adlai E. Stevenson, who said he wanted to talk sense to the American people when he was the Democratic candidate for President in 1953, is still talking sense. At least what he had to say when he spoke recently at the Columbia University Bicentennial Conference and the Vassar College graduation cut to the heart of several of our more pressing problems more adroitly and more clearly than most of the conflicting pronunciamentos out of Washington.

To a distinguished gathering of educators of Columbia, Stevenson said: "We here in America have written the greatest success story in human history * * * We here in America have in a few years made socialism obsolete, shown that communism is nothing but a noisome, stagnant pool of reaction."

To the young ladies just getting their degrees from Vassar, the former presidential candidate declared: "Align yourself with the forces of courage—of nonconformity * * * Fear is the miasma of the soul. Its noxious vapors are nonfilterable and seep into every recess. And corruption is complete when expediency and fear, rather than conscience and courage, dictate our course."

These, it seems to us, are the words of a man who perceives in all their awful clarity the dangers that beset America Anno Domini 1954. That these dangers are our fear and our frightening eagerness to conform are plainly written into the record.

One cannot doubt that "we here in America have in a few years made socialism obsolete." Within the framework of our democraitc structure we have exercised many of the evils of joblessness and insecurity in old age, eased the impact of bank failures by insuring deposits, replaced crime, and disease-breeding slums with clean, airy apartment houses, dammed great rivers to provide abundant electrical power and prevent disastrous floods.

In spite of many angry cries to the contrary, we cannot believe that many Americans see communism as anything but a "noisome, stagnant pool of reaction" that menaces our social and political health and must be cleansed.

Unfortunately, the fear that Stevenson calls "the miasma of the soul" is abroad in the land, corrupting too many minds, so that even some Americans with the most profound convictions are afraid to speak out against obvious evil. There are others who, beset by fear of communism, fear of the A-bomb and the H-bomb, fear of another depression, refuse to look at the big picture and see the United States of America as it really is—a healthy and prosperous democracy, fully alert to the danger from within and from without and prepared to defend it at any cost.

We need, every once in a while, someone like Adlai Stevenson to remind us that we here in America "have written the greatest success story in human history"—as well as to remind us that that success story may not have a happy ending if fear corrodes our will to keep America strong and great.

Surplus Food for Needy Americans

SPEECH

OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 15, 1954

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (S. 2475) to authorize the President to use agricultural commodities to improve the foreign relations of the United States, and for other purposes.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, most of the attention in connection with this bill has been directed at its provisions for selling or bartering some of our surplus food abroad—for foreign currencies or for strategic materials—and also for donating up to $300 million worth for the relief of famine, suffering, or inadequate diets among people in other nations. I should like to direct my comments to its provisions for using some of this surplus food for the relief of distress in this country—a very real problem.

It seems to me this matter has been brought into the bill as something of an afterthought. The bill as it passed the Senate nearly a year ago made no reference whatsoever to any domestic use of these surpluses. It dealt exclusively with the export and foreign trade aspects of the surpluses.

I wish the House Committee on Agriculture had treated the two matters in separate legislation, instead of putting them together in one measure, as this bill does. If they had been handled as separate problems—which they most certainly are—I believe the provisions dealing with domestic use of the surpluses would have received greater and more detailed attention. For, as I said, in my opinion this bill seems to tack on the domestic provisions as something of an afterthought.

This is not to say that the committee has not suggested some worthwhile methods for expanding the distribution of surplus foods to needy people in this country. In this connection, I am pleased that the committee has incorporated into the bill some of the provisions included in my bill, H. R. 7870, which would have established a new food stamp plan as part of such distribution.

For instance, the committee's bill removes the requirement that surplus foods must be in danger of imminent spoilage before they can be distributed to needy persons. Furthermore, it provides blanket authority, as my bill would do, to the Secretary of Agriculture to determine the volume and variety of foods to be made available at any one time. In addition, it specifies, as my bill does, that any commodities disposed of for relief purposes should be in addition to and not in substitution for any normal consumption. This is extremely important in connection with the distribution of this food to families on relief. We would want them to have additional food rather than merely shift the burden of their present meager diets from local or State to Federal shoulders.

Even with these provisions, however, the committee bill leaves much to be desired in the establishment of a really effective program for distribution of surplus foods to needy Americans.

When I testified before the Committee on Agriculture and urged approval of my bill, I pointed out that the present system of distribution—which would largely continue under the bill we are considering today—is a somewhat hit-and-miss affair with some States not participating at all and others participating in a disinterested manner. Local distribution programs differ widely. In some areas, private agencies carry the responsibility for administration. There is no attempt made to define the kind of people we think should be receiving this food.

I am sorry to have to report that under the present system of distribution there have been widespread reports of irregularities, of people not in need registering for this free food, with very little machinery in existence for screening the applicants properly.

My bill specifies that the first priority among domestic recipients should be families on public assistance or families in need of this kind of public help under normal standards but excluded from relief because of the peculiarities or technicalities of local or State law. For example, in Missouri, no matter how destitute a man's family might be, it cannot receive public assistance if he is employable. It matters not whether he can find work or how long he has been involuntarily unemployed. If he is physically employable, his family cannot get public assistance. Assuming such a family otherwise met the standards to qualify for public assistance, it could receive these surplus foods under my bill.

It may very well be that we could properly include in such a program additional people, such as those on social security or on unemployment compensation. But to me that is a matter that the Congress should decide affirmatively. We should set up standards—spell out definitions. Instead, this bill turns over to the Secretary of Agriculture the very difficult task of determining not merely what products should be distributed and in what manner, but who should receive them. I do not think that is properly his job. I think that is our job.

My bill set a top maximum of $1 billion of surplus food which could be distributed to needy families in this country each year under the proposed food-stamp plan. But this bill says to the Secretary of Agriculture that he can donate an unlimited amount of such foods to anyone in this country under any regulations he may determine. We are giving him a frightfully complex problem. If he so desired, I suppose he could give it all away. Or he could give very little of it away. He could dump it on the States and say: "Here, you worry about it. Get rid of it any way you like."

I am not suggesting the Secretary will do anything but a conscientious job in this respect. But I submit, Mr. Chairman, that the Committee on Agriculture is asking him to take over functions and the determination of policy which properly belong with the Congress, or, at least, with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. I do not think Mr. Benson or his Department are equipped for the role we would give him in this bill.

In other words, unless the intention here is just to give the Secretary of Agriculture additional outlets and machinery for getting rid of his storage headaches on this surplus food, this bill is too limited in its approach. I am concerned not merely with dumping surpluses, but in feeding hungry people. That is much more important.

In view of the circumstances here today, I am not going to try to amend the bill. The unanimity of the Committee on Agriculture in reporting out this bill in its present form indicates that as a committee the members were not prepared to go into this matter further at this particular time. And to attempt to handle so complex a problem through an amendment from the floor, with the strict 5-minute limitations on time for discussion of any amendment, is not, it seems to me, a very efficient or effective way of trying to meet this problem.

I have been assured by the committee that there will be a further opportunity to go into this matter in connection with subsequent legislation dealing with the surpluses. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, all I want to do at this time is make it clear to the Members that we have not in this legislation faced up to the overall problem of getting this surplus food into the hands of the people in this country who need it most desperately. We are passing only patchwork legislation on that point, although, as I said, there are some good provisions in this bill. But primarily it is a bill for distributing surpluses abroad—not in the United States. And any distribution of surpluses to needy families in this country is covered only as an afterthought, and then primarily from the standpoint of easing the Agriculture Department's storage problems rather than feeding the hungry.

The Fight for Better Agricultural Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 23, 1954

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter dated June 19, 1954, which I have received from Mr. John Remmick, of Pingree, N. Dak. This letter deals with the fight for better agricultural prices.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PINGREE, N. DAK., *June 19, 1954.*

DEAR BILL: This is regarding to the fight for better agriculture prices. Beef and cream are the products we raise. Their prices have been going down for so long that the expenses are as much as the prices. The stuff we have to buy costs as much as we receive for the finished product; 59-cent cream and 25-cent eggs are a crime all things considered. Feeder cattle 9 to 13 cents. Takes a lot of them to just pay the taxes and insurance. Benson is doing his best to see that the family rancher goes broke. He is one of the best vote getters the Democrats have got. The Republicans better get him back to preaching or the Democrats will go over in a landslide next election in this locality.

Thanks for being down there fighting for us. I am

Yours sincerely,

JOHN REMMICK.

Asia: Ten Basic Facts for Americans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 23, 1954

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, an understanding of Asia by Members of Congress is essential in helping to make proper decisions relating to Far East problems. I am, therefore, under a unanimous-consent request, inserting with my remarks an interesting and informative article by Gen. Carlos P. Romulo, which was published in the current issue of the New Leader.

General Romulo is a 55-year-old renaissance personality. He has been a playwright, college teacher, newspaperman, radio broadcaster, Boy Scout leader, soldier, public-relations man, political leader, and diplomat. A veteran of Bataan, he won the Pulitzer prize for distinguished correspondence in 1941 before entering the Philippine President Manuel Quezon's war cabinet. Since the end of World War II, he has been the Philippines' permanent delegate to the United Nations, serving as President of the United Nations General Assembly in 1949. This article is based on a recent address by General Romulo at the commencement of the University of Seattle:

ASIA: TEN BASIC FACTS FOR AMERICANS

The most dynamic single fact of our time is the awakening of Asia. This must be true, because everybody outside of Asia seems to know about it and speaks about it constantly.

In Asia, however, since we are right in the middle of it, we do not talk about it. We simply adjust ourselves to the fact, and we keep on with the process of awakening. Therefore, to us in Asia the most significant fact of our time is rather America's awakening to the awakening of Asia.

Let us alert the American people to the present crisis in Asia. But let us not reduce them to wringing their hands helplessly, not knowing what to do about it. The method of trial and error, the technique of improvisation, no matter how cleverly managed, will no longer do. Though we are racing toward catastrophe, there is still time to do some hard thinking and intelligent planning for the difficult tasks that confront us.

There is no excuse for hazy thinking about Asia. For it is not true that Asia is mysterious, enigmatic, and unpredictable. This outdated notion is merely an excuse for insufficient action or postponement of action or no action at all. Once it is realized that Asia is in a state of revolutionary ferment, one knows for a certainty that there is going to be an explosion of some kind, unless we do something to prevent it. That is almost as certain as the physical fact that the dynamite stick with a lighted fuse will explode unless we step on the fuse and put it out in time.

It is important to remember that there is no mystery about what hungry, impoverished, and oppressed peoples will do in the end, if no relief is forthcoming. Asians are also human beings, and what Europeans or American would do or have done in the same circumstances the Asians will do also. Skin pigmentation has nothing to do with it, nor the fact that they subsist on rice.

The Asian peoples are so much older than the peoples of the West that the latter can hardly claim to have invented revolution.

After all, it was the Chinese who invented gunpowder, though they left it to the Western peoples to use it to propel bullets to kill fellow human beings. The Asians will also react just as quickly to sympathy and understanding, and will prize no less dearly the blessings of prosperity and freedom. They are quite human that way, too.

Wherein, then, lies the mystery or the enigma? Asia is no longer mysterious, resigned or meek. Asia has become too real, challenging and proud to warrant further recourse to such illusions.

To understand Asia, it is necessary, first of all, to realize that many of its problems will not yield to pat, easy solutions. One such solution is embodied in the common notion that Asia must somehow be saved. Saved from communism, we are told. But saved for what ends? In whose interest? And by what means?

To these questions we have so far no clear answers. It is not wholly certain that it is means to save Asia in the interest of its own peoples. Nor is it unmistakably plain that the intention is to save Asia by means other than military.

I do not speak as an expert on Asia, or even as a spokesman for Asia. However, anyone who has studied the situation in Asia no further back than the last decade will be in substantial agreement with a capsule analysis of the Asian problem which I have tried to formulate in the following terms:

1. The Asian peoples will no longer tolerate the shackles of colonialism. What they want is a status of equal partnership and voluntary cooperation with other peoples.

2. The Asian peoples are fired with an aspiration to human dignity and economic well-being which can no longer be held in abeyance.

3. The Asian peoples will not fight for the vague concept of a free world; they will fight on the side of the free world only if they have a stake in freedom themselves.

4. The West must work with and through the responsible nationalist movements in Asia rather than through puppet regimes that have no popular support. By denouncing and opposing genuine freedom movements in Asia as Communist-inspired, the West in fact exposes such movements to Communist infiltration and control. The objective must be to isolate Communist agitation from the legitimate nationalist aspirations of the Asian peoples. After achieving independence, countries like India, Indonesia, Burma, and the Philippines have shown themselves quite capable of combating Communist influence in their midst.

5. Military measures are at best a short-term device for staving off an immediate threat of Communist aggression. The long-term struggle against communism, however, requires economic and financial assistance that will enable the Asian peoples to raise their standards of living.

6. Assistance should be offered on a basis of equality and mutual respect, and not as a special favor with political strings or as a disguised survival of colonialism.

7. As there can be no world peace without Asia, so there can be no economic stability in the world without Asia. You cannot neglect Asia and, by continuing to pour dollars into Europe, expect to stabilize the world economy, including the European economy itself.

8. Asian political, economic, and social organization is predominantly on an authoritarian pattern. Therefore, it should not be assumed that the Asian peoples will automatically adopt democracy of the Western type; rather, they will adopt it with necessary modifications and only as it demonstrates its superiority in the actual experience of daily life.

9. Asian neutralism must be recognized partly as the result of a genuine desire for peace, partly as dictated by the serious internal problems of many countries in the region, and partly as inspired by a lingering distrust of the motives of the colonial powers.

10. The Asian peoples will not give their support to any program, policy, or course of action affecting Asia that is taken without consulting them. In the Southeast Asia Conference held in Baguio in May 1950 on the invitation of the Philippine Government, the representatives of seven countries in the region solemnly affirmed that "in the consideration of the special problems of south and southeast Asia, the point of view of the peoples of this area be kept in mind, by any conference dealing with such problems, so that better understanding and cordial relations may subsist between the countries in the region and other countries in the world."

At this juncture of history, America has a splendid opportunity to proffer the hand of friendly understanding to Asia, in the certain knowledge that the hand will be grasped with equal friendliness and with gratitude. People who have traveled in Asia will testify that its people are the humblest, most hospitable, and friendly you can find in the world. They have all the fine qualities of men who live close to the soil and cleave to it as to a mother. And their sense of gratitude is the type that leans over backward and manifests itself to excess.

The hardheaded, practical American will sometimes be embarrassed by this Asian trait. But the American is also a generous, warmhearted human being, and this quality appeals strongly to the Asian character. Therefore, beneath the outward differences there is much that Americans and Asians have in common.

Friendly cooperation between Asia and America is the greatest thing that can happen in the world. To me, as a child of Asia and, as it were, a foster-child of America, nothing could be more inspiring than the spectacle of the oldest and the youngest of continents clasping hands and standing together to defend the frontiers of freedom.

H. R. 9434, the Merchant Marine Academy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 1954

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 9434, the result of much study and work in the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, is the product of laborious hours by well-meaning men of that committee who support this legislation. This bill has a companion in the Senate, S. 3610, and has bipartisan sponsorship.

The bills would accomplish the following:

First. The Merchant Marine Academy at Kings Point would be a permanent establishment.

Second. Place the Merchant Marine Academy at Kings Point on the same level with West Point and Annapolis.

Third. Improve the appointment program to the Merchant Marine Academy at Kings Point.

Fourth. Assure the midshipmen United States Naval Reserve status of cadet-midshipmen and ensign, United States Naval Reserve status of Kings Point graduates.

The present administration of the academy is one of accomplishment and thoroughness. Its present staff and curriculums offer an excellent opportunity for the creation of an experienced and high-type merchant marine officers corps. We need this strong officers corps and we need a permanent establishment at Kings Point. I urge immediate passage of H. R. 9434.

The Truman-Eisenhower Foreign Policy as Applied to Ethiopia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 23, 1954

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record a newsletter issued by Hon. Usher L. Burdick, a Representative in Congress from the State of North Dakota, entitled "Your Congressman Comments." The newsletter deals with the so-called Truman-Eisenhower foreign policy as applied to Ethiopia.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

YOUR CONGRESSMAN COMMENTS

(By Usher L. Burdick)

HAILE SELASSIE'S VISIT

Williston, N. Dak.—The Truman-Eisenhower foreign policy assumes some strange positions. Anything that is done on foreign affairs is prefaced by the stereotyped phrases, "The free nations," "democracy," and "a free world."

When the Italians entered Ethiopia they found Selassie engaged in a huge slave traffic. Natives from the jungles were rounded up and driven like cattle to the slave marts operated by Selassie. That was in World War II. His antics indicated that he was an absolute and ruthless dictator, who had all the barbarous instincts of a complete savage. Yet our foreign policy was, and is, to support Haile Selassie, because in so doing we are following our slogan of "free nations, democracy, and a free world." If Selassie represents the kind of free world and democracy that all our foreign appropriations are directed toward it must be that this free world business puts a premium on the selling of human beings over an auction block.

When old Selassie was in Washington a few weeks ago and spoke to Congress I didn't hear his speech, and didn't want to, but I know what he came for. He wants a few millions so he can support the proposition of free nations, democracy, and a free world. If we have to crawl in bed with a rat like old "Nero" Selassie we had better let his conception of a free world simmer a while before we jump in and shell out our millions to a perfectly ruthless dictator who would make Nero turn over in his grave for having forgotten to deal out the finer qualities of human misery that have characterized Haile Selassie's reign.

I will do my best to stop a loan to this tyrant, but I think he will get it, for the Truman-Eisenhower foreign policy is to support "democracies" and a "free world." Both administrations—this one and the previous one—should feel mighty proud of their support given to this Nero of modern times.

H. R. 9245, Interim Pay, Postal Reclassification, and Other Postal Considerations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 1954

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, here follows, under unanimous consent, a letter from the National Association of Letter Carriers, signed by its officers, dealing with H. R. 9245, which provides for an interim pay increase and for a study by Congress of the Postal Reclassification Act. Other postal considerations are covered in two other letters likewise listed, one deals with "an antigag attitude" and the other beats the drums for raising income-tax exemptions.

The letters follow:

National Association of
Letter Carriers,
June 18, 1954.

Hon. A. D. Sieminski,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Congressman Sieminski: As you undoubtedly know, the Post Office and Civil Service Committee has reported out H. R. 9245, a bill providing for a study of the postal reclassification act and for an interim pay increase.

The National Association of Letter Carriers and its 103,000 members are solidly behind the Corbett bill, H. R. 9245, as it was reported out by the committee.

We are strongly opposed to the Summerfield plan, as presented originally, and also with proposed amendments. The Summerfield-Fry plan itself is basically unsound and, no matter how amended, it would still be basically unsound.

For over 70 years, Congress has set the salaries and determined the grades for postal employees. Now the Postmaster General, after a brief study of the intricate postal service, wants to have the authority that has been exercised by the Congress transferred to him. Such a grant of authority would be unprecedented, unwarranted, and unwise.

In actual practice the postal reclassification act has worked out better than the Classification Act of 1949. The criticisms made against the ,Postal Classification Act are entirely on minor matters, magnified far out of importance, and could be readily corrected by Congress, if correction is necessary.

H. R. 9245 provides for a study by Congress of the Postal Reclassification Act; it provides for an interim pay increase. It is a god bill and we hope that you will give it your complete support when it comes up for a vote in the House.

Sincerely,

W. C. Doherty, *President.*
Jerome J. Keating,
Vice President.
Peter J. Cahill, *Secretary.*
R. B. Kremers,
Assistant Secretary.

New Jersey Federation
of Post Office Clerks,
Jersey City, N. J., June 1, 1954.

Hon. Alfred D. Sieminski,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Sir: The following resolution as adopted by the 32d annual convention of the New Jersey Federation of Post Office Clerks is forwarded to you for your consideration and action:

"raising income tax Exemptions

"Whereas the take-home pay of most employees in the lower income brackets is severely curtailed by high income taxes: Be it

"*Resolved*, That the NJFPOC meeting in-convention at Atlantic City, N. J., go on record as endorsing the raising of the present individual income tax exemption from $600 to $1,000; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the entire congressional delegation from the State of New Jersey."

Sincerely yours,

August J. Cacioppo,
Secretary.

New Jersey Federation
of Post Office Clerks,
Jersey City, N. J., May 27, 1954.

Hon. Alfred D. Sieminski,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Sir: The following resolution was adopted unanimously by the New Jersey Federation of Post Office Clerks in convention assembled on May 9, 1954, in Atlantic City, N. J., and expresses the feelings of all postal clerks in the State of New Jersey:

"Whereas Government workers have a right under the Lloyd-La Follette Act of 1912—popularly known as the antigag law—to petition Congress, either individually or collectively for wage adjustments, and other improvements in their working conditions; and

"Whereas the current salary negotiations can be cited to demonstrate the continuous fight in which Government workers must engage in the battle of arguments and statistics, which have proven conclusively that the past several years have been a period of continuously rising cost of living; and

"Whereas the National Federation of Post Office Clerks, through its national officers, has introduced an equitable bill, namely, the Rhodes-Withrow bill, H. R. 2344, to provide an $800 increase, which would adequately compensate for the increase in the cost of living in these United States: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the New Jersey Federation of Post Office Clerks go on record unanimously as bitterly resenting the public statement made by Postmaster General Summerfield regarding the postal employees organization's requests for pay increases as being "nothing less than an all-out raid on the United States Treasury"; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be sent to President Eisenhower, Postmaster General Summerfield, Leo E. George, president, NFPOC, all New Jersey Senators and Congressmen."

Respectfully yours,

August J. Cacioppo,
Secretary.

Conditions Among Soviet Youth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 23, 1954

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have long been interested in acquainting the American people with the news of actual conditions which prevail inside the Soviet Union.

By means of the series of Senate Foreign Relations Committee studies entitled "Tensions Within the Soviet Union" and "Tensions Within the Soviet Captive Countries," my colleagues and I have brought out the boiling tensions and hatreds behind the Iron Curtain.

I was pleased, therefore, to supply an answer which had been asked on this subject by America's teen-agers in the popular Youth Wants To Know column. This feature is a companion to the famed NBC radio-TV show of the same name and is carried in Parade magazine, the national weekly supplement issued with many of America's leading newspapers.

My answer to the teen-agers' inquiry was carried in last Sunday's, June 20, Parade.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of my article be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Youth Wants To Know—How Do Soviet Teen-Agers Look at Life?

(Editor's Note.—One of the most persistent questions from American young people is the one above. For an answer, Theodore Granik, of NBC's Youth Wants To Know program on radio and television, went to Senator Alexander Wiley, Republican, of Wisconsin. Here, Parade presents the response of this distinguished statesman.)

The carefree individualism of our American teen-agers is a world apart from the grim, robot-like experience of Soviet youth. Behind the Iron Curtain, young people, like their elders, are the victims of endless brainwashing, of perpetual dictation over everything they do and say and read, over their studies and play and work. But Communist leaders are not content with the results on Communist youth.

Recently, the first National Congress of Communist Youth to be held in 5 years heard sharp criticism of "spongers, idlers, and parasites" among Soviet youth. Young people were reported loafing on the principal streets of Moscow, Leningrad, Tiflis, Erivan, and other cities. "They wear Tarzan haircuts and dress like parrots—the so-called stilyag (zoot-suiters). They don't work anywhere, nor do they study, and they spend their nights in restaurants and chasing girls."

Zoot-suitism, however, isn't considered as bad as piety. Communist leaders are particularly furious over the continued devotion by many young people to religion. Red leaders work themselves up into a frenzy because there is allegedly not enough atheistic propaganda being carried on among the Young Pioneers and Young Communists. As a result, they complain, some youngsters still go to church and some later want to get married in a religious ceremony.

"Shocking," say the Reds.

An article in the Soviet Youth newspaper contains a letter from the father of a much-harried 10-year-old in grade 4-B in Odessa. The parent protests at school conditions in which older children terrorize little ones. The father saw a 16-year-old smoking during class. Pupils trying to hear the teacher heard nothing because of the tumult. Two youngsters "were pulling each other's hair, and a third was shoving his pen into his neighbor's ear."

Another Red paper condemns a bobby-soxer who, instead of spending her time at work, absents herself in order to listen to her favorite operatic star. Inna Zavyalova keeps cutting photographs of the star out of magazines, buys them from potographers and ushers and swaps them. "She already has enough photos to cover the whole of her apartment, but Inna does not hang them up. She is afraid of thieves."

The Soviet sheet adds sourly, "This type of hysterical theater fan was to be found (formerly) among the high-school girls, wealthy idlers and other representatives of the so-called 'gilded youth.' But surely times are different now."

TENSION MOUNTS

Meanwhile, tension against the state mounts among youth. While the youngsters are taught in schools about all sorts of "socialist" ideals, they behold around them terrible food shortages, crowded and dilapidated housing, wretchedly low living standards, endless purges.

Their friends and relatives disappear in the middle of the night. Compulsory labor service awaits them. There is difficulty in obtaining a higher education, unless you are the son of a member of the elite—high party officials, police or government bureaucrats.

Elsewhere behind the Iron Curtain, what is the situation? There, too, we see misery among youth. A Czechoslovakian Communist paper announces a new purge of "saboteurs" in the youth organization. A Czech leader emphasizes that the purpose of sport is not fun for its own sake, but "mass development" of a new "Socialist Man."

All in all, if the 6,000 members of the Communist Labor Youth League in the United States could witness the hideous features of the so-called Soviet "paradise," the misguided American youngsters would forever renounce their Communist allegiance.

The Challenge of Economic Fluctuations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH E. FLANDERS

OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 23, 1954

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "The Challenge of Economic Fluctuations," delivered by Arthur F. Burns, Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, in the Office of the President of the United States. The address was made at the opening meeting of the bicentennial conference of Columbia University, in New York City, on May 26, 1954. In the address Dr. Burns eloquently states the positive role of the Federal Government under the Employment Act of 1946. His statement puts to rest any doubts as to this administration's determination to carry out the objectives of the Employment Act of 1946 and to use all agencies of the Federal Government to maintain sustained economic growth.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CHALLENGE OF ECONOMIC FLUCTUATIONS

(By Arthur F. Burns, Chairman, Council of Economic Advisers)

We have gathered today to celebrate the bicentennial of a great institution of learning, to express our gratitude to Columbia University for its noble vision of man's right to knowledge, and to reaffirm our faith in the power of disinterested scholarship and free inquiry to build a better world.

One of the major problems with which the United States and Western Europe have long struggled is the wavelike course of business and industrial activity. In the early 19th century these fluctuations were little understood and even men of learning commonly dismissed them as speculative blemishes of a smoothly functioning economic system. But as the decades rolled by and large works of industry multiplied in expanding urban centers it became increasingly plain that the vicissitudes of financial markets were accompanied by fluctuations in investment expenditure, in industrial production, and in the amount of employment afforded by factories, mines, shops, and construction yards. Every few years, as unemployment raised high its ugly head, a clamor arose for relief and reform. With the return of good times the pleas of reformers became softer or stirred little interest. The settled view of reputable economists and men of affairs came to be that periodic visitations of mass unemployment were the price of progress, that economic contractions served the ends of society by eliminating unfit enterprises and exciting workingmen to greater efforts, and that depression automatically brought its own cure just as prosperity generated its own undoing.

This comforting theory of the beneficence of business contraction and the automaticity of recovery, on which many of us were brought up, has gradually lost its hold on the minds of men. If economists invented the theory, many of them have labored hard to qualify it in response to teachings of experience. Their studies of the monetary institutions of other countries led to sweeping reforms of the currency and banking system, so that our economy might be spared the disruption caused by financial crises. Their studies of the effects of unemployment on the lives of workers and their families led to bold proposals for unemployment insurance and for accelerated expenditure on public works in times of depression. When Columbia celebrated its 175th anniversary in 1929, discerning scholars of economics already knew that, while business contractions may be self-correcting, the cure often came slowly, that in the course of a depression many worthy enterprises followed the unfit into bankruptcy, and that any gains of efficiency attained during a mild decline of business activity were apt to be lost many times over when the decline deepened and millions hunted for jobs that no longer existed.

Since 1929 this knowledge of the few has become the knowledge of the many. The extension of economic scholarship was not alone in transforming our traditional attitudes. Indeed, the decisive force came from personal experience and the maturity that tens of millions gained during the hard thirties. Thoughtful citizens who witnessed how the great depression wrecked the morale of men, how it dissipated their assets, how it fanned the flames of communism and fascism abroad, how it stimulated political demagogery in our own country, were no longer inclined to debate whether storms of economic depression should be permitted to blow themselves out. Men in all walks of life came to recognize that if our Nation of freemen is to be preserved, the Federal Government must assume a definite and continuing responsibility, "to use all practicable means * * * to promote maximum employment, production, and purchasing power."

This responsibility was defined in the Employment Act, which was passed by overwhelming majorities of both parties in the Congress, early in 1946. The framers of the act wisely recognized that, in the event of an economic contraction, neither governmental spending of borrowed money, nor any other simple rule of policy, would necessarily suffice to generate recovery. The act, therefore, did not attempt to prescribe what means were to be used by Government in promoting maximum employment and production. It merely specified that the means must be "consistent with the needs and obligations" of the Government and with "other essential considerations of national policy." In other words, in implementing the Employment Act, the Federal Government must honor the constitutional rights of individuals; it must respect the authority of the States; and it must always be mindful of the integrity of the money in which contracts are expressed and payments made.

The authors of the Employment Act recognized also that the Government had no way of guaranteeing prosperity, and that the main source of the economic strength of a nation consisted in free institutions and the quality of its people—their ambition, skill, enterprise, and willingness to make great efforts in their own behalf and in behalf of their families. The act therefore emphasized economic growth rather than the mere stoppage or alleviation of business contractions. And it stressed repeatedly the importance of using the powers of Government to foster free competitive enterprise, which has been the great energizer of our own Nation and of every other nation that has possessed the fortitude to submit to its discipline.

Under the spur of competition the American economy has created new jobs and produced miracles of abundance in the past. If we are to do as well or better in the future, we must look carefully to our institutions and to the ways in which we propose to arrange our economic affairs. With our population growing rapidly, with working skills improving, with incomes distributed widely among the people, with businessmen eager to start new enterprises and expand old ones, with research and technology opening up new opportunity on all sides, our country has the capacity to raise physical production from its current annual level of around $360 billion to $440 billion, or even more, in a mere 5 years. It is essential for our national security, as well as in the interests of increasing welfare, to realize this potential growth. How well we succeed will depend, first, on the measures we take to release the creative forces of individual enterprise, second, on our ability to foster among all groups of the population an abiding sense of confidence in the economic future. In all this the role of the Government is bound to be highly significant, if not decisive.

Economic life is never static. Even the conditions of progress keep changing with the cultural attitudes and moral values of a people, as well as with their material circumstances. The past quarter century has been a time of rapid change, with depression, fascism, war, high taxes, prodigious debts, inflation, communism, and nuclear weapons moving ominously across the stage of affairs. The human mind does not compartmentalize fear and the anxieties of men have a tendency to accumulate as they move swiftly from concern over one problem to concern over another. Surely, the need for security is felt more keenly by Americans today than in earlier times. The growth of life insurance and private pension plans is an expression of this need. So are deposit guaranties and social security programs. So, too, is our extreme sensitivity to the business cycle, with laymen not far behind the experts in seeking light and reassurance from every minor wiggle in the economic indices that statisticians nowadays produce in abundance. If we are to expand our economy rapidly in the years ahead, we must take account of these psychological currents; we must put economic orthodoxy of both the right and the left to one side; and we must work toward a virile synthesis of the economics of personal security with the economics of individual enterprise.

The complex conditions of modern life and the ruthless designs of the Communist bloc require a much larger role for our Government than suited earlier generations. A wise government can use its vast powers, however, to create that atmosphere of confidence among businessmen, wage earners, farmers, and consumers, on which great economic achievement must ultimately rest. To establish a high and sustained level of confidence, it is not enough for the Government to avoid specific controls over individual decisions to engage in one line of work or another, to spend or save, to lend or borrow, to produce much or little. The Government must also take positive measures to promote progress, first, by increasing economic incentives and fostering enterprise, second, by strengthening the floor of security for the individual, third, by coordinating its policies so as to help keep the overall level of output and employment on a reasonably even keel. The former President of this university, now serving as the President of the United States, is building the economic program of his administration upon these basic concepts.

The new administration moved quickly to rid our economy of direct controls over wages and prices, which were interfering with competitive forces and restricting economic horizons. It made substantial reductions in taxes, so that private citizens may have more money to spend, instead of having the Government spend it for them. It projected a reform of the tax structure and of existing credit facilities, with a view to encouraging business investment, the construction of new dwellings, the modernization of old homes, and the rehabilitation of declining urban neighborhoods. And it has sought to increase the efficiency of labor and capital all around, by continuing to spend more than $2 billion per year on research and development, by extending and improving the highway system and other public facilities required for the growth of the private economy, by encouraging foreign trade and investment, by releasing agricultural resources from the bondage of high and rigid price supports, and by hastening the application of atomic energy to agricultural, medical, and industrial uses.

These legislative measures to stimulate the expansive power of individual enterprise have been accompanied by others which, while immediately directed to enhancing the stability of the economy, are likely to work toward the same end. Although our Nation's defenses against depression are better today than they were 20 years ago, they require further strengthening. In a free economy the progress of individual trades and localities is bound to be uneven. There is always a danger, therefore, that the difficulties of one part of the economy may spread to others, or that many sectors may respond simultaneously to shifts in the community's attitude toward spending or investing; so that one way or the other, an economic contraction may gather force and cumulate. To increase the ability of the economy to resist a deflationary setback, the President has proposed, besides certain changes in the tax laws and in the mortgage market, the extension of unemployment insurance and old-age insurance to millions who now lack this protection and an increase in benefits to those covered under present laws. By lifting from workers some of the anxieties that surround life in our complex society, these measures will tend to stabilize their propensity to consume as well as to increase their productivity.

This economic program covers a large front of social action. Whether the program expresses a proper balance between the interests of enterprise and security, or of consumption and investment, or of the present and future, may be debated. These are difficult and controversial issues in economics and I am not inclined to underrate them. I wish to note only that the President's economic program does represent a very significant effort to establish the conditions of widespread confidence without which a sustained growth of our economy will not take place. The time for full appraisal will come later when the effects of the new policies can be seen in the crucible of experience.

In the meantime, we may derive some encouragement from the fact that the letdown in economic activity, which began last year as an inventory adjustment and which was later complicated by the decline of military spending, has thus far at least turned out to be a very limited decline on an overall basis, although some localities have suffered seriously. Early this year a scissors movement began to develop in the economy, with the financial and investment sector occupying the upper blade and the industrial sector the lower blade. Such a disparity of economic movements is unlikely to continue for an appreciable period. Which of the blades will move is uncertain, but there are reasons for believing that the scissors will close through a movement of the industrial blade. In the first place, an upturn of construction contracts, of orders for durable and other factory goods, of prices in security markets, and of prices of basic commodities, such as has recently occurred, has in the past usually heralded the end of an economic contraction. In the second place, the rate of decline of output, employment, and trade has been very rapidly diminishing of late. Taken altogether, the outlook for early recovery therefore seems favorable, and the business-cycle policies pursued by the Government seem to be working out reasonably well. But history carries a stern warning on how easily economic developments may be misjudged. The welfare of the entire free world, as well as of our own Nation, is linked to the strength of our economy. The Government is, therefore, continuing to take steps to reinforce and speed the natural processes of recovery, in addition to the coordinated measures of policy that have already been announced and taken.

The bridge between the realm of thought in universities and the realm of action in Government has become very short in our generation. Across this bridge a steady traffic of new ideas, new facts, and new problems has developed. The ways open to Government for dealing with any threat of economic depression are now many. They include the quiet measures of maintaining a growing money supply, of easing credit conditions, of revising the structure of taxation, of modifying loan and insurance programs, of rescheduling expenditure within existing budgetary plans, of revising administrative rules or hastening administrative decisions at a hundred different points in the interests of the private economy, besides the dramatic devices of fiscal action on which current debates tend to center. If some of us dare believe that our economy will manage to stay firmly on the rather narrow road that separates depression from inflation, we do so in the faith that basic knowledge of economic fluctuations and ways of dealing with them will continue to flow from Columbia and sister universities throughout the world.

Address by Philip Ray Rodgers Before Lithographers National Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRY M. GOLDWATER
OF ARIZONA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, June 23, 1954

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an address delivered by Philip Ray Rodgers, a member of the National Labor Relations Board, before the Lithographers National Association, Inc., 49th annual convention, at White Sulphur Springs, W. Va., on June 8, 1954.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

When first I received the invitation to speak before this national convention of lithographers I was somewhat dubious about an acceptance, largely because, knowing the etymology of the word "lithographic," I was unable to associate that word in any compatible sense with the National Labor Relations Board. It occurred to me that perhaps you wanted to show me the handwriting on the wall—stone wall, of course; or that you were inquisitive to see for yourself one of those men with heart of stone and head of rock who represent that Government agency which has hung about your necks like a millstone for lo these many years.

In any event, I am here. And while I would be the first to concede that nothing I may say here today should be written in stone for the benefit of posterity, I do sincerely hope that nothing I may say will type me as a throwback to the paleolithic age. And, having gone that far, I may as well go the whole distance and say that if you do not approve of my remarks I much prefer that that fact be indicated by a stony silence rather than by a storm of stones.

But lest these comments be taken to betray an inward timidity on my part, let me hasten to add that in view of the various aspersions which have been cast upon the NLRB it would occasion but brief comment and only passing concern if, at any given time, the process of casting aspersions were replaced by the more elementary but much more satisfactory practice of casting stones.

Indeed, having served some 9 months on the NLRB, and having observed the many unique and incredible events that transpire there, I must confess to a continuing curiosity, part mirthful, part mystic, which causes me to approach each day at the Board with this unspoken inquiry: "What in the hell is going to happen next?" And all this with the sense of certainty that whatever "it" is, "it" is bound to happen.

Now it is not my purpose to review with you today the specific problems confronting this agency, nor to dwell at length upon certain decisions which this agency may have recently handed down. It is my purpose to speak about this agency and about the law which it administers in the terms of effectuating a national public policy. For that, it seems to me, is in the broad context a matter of far greater significance at this time than the isolated, individual actions which this Board may be contemplating or taking in the course of its daily grind.

PURPOSE AND PLACE OF THE NLRB

In the first place, I would like to point out that there is a general and persistent misconception on the part of the public as to what the National Labor Relations Board is and what it does. And this misconception, incredible as it may seem, is just as prominent in Washington, D. C., as it is in the far reaches of the country. Contrary to the belief held by many, the National Labor Relations Board is not an agency created for the purpose of settling labor disputes. Neither is the National Labor Relations Board a branch, bureau, or board of the Department of Labor, created to serve primarily the interests of labor.

The fact is—although it may not be generally recognized—that the National Labor Relations Board is a duly constituted independent agency of government created for the purpose of resolving legal disputes arising under a particular statute. And those who established this agency decreed that it resolve those disputes in accordance with the basic concepts of American jurisprudence. In other words, the creators of the NLRB cast it in the mold of a quasi-judicial agency, to be concerned only with the application of law, and not with the accomplishment of social, economic, or political results. This agency, moreover, was established to function in the public interest, not in the interests of any particular constituency or clientele. That being so, it becomes apparent to even the most casual observer that the responsibilities placed upon this agency are both serious in nature and vast in scope.

Now in the eyes of many, this agency has, over the years, failed to achieve that statute and that strength which the Congress intended it should achieve. Whether that conclusion is sound or not may be open to question. But the fact that that conclusion has been reached by many is, I believe, not open to effective denial. Indeed, there are those in the Congress today, whose combined number and statute represent a not inconsiderable power, who are collectively convinced that this agency might well be abolished and its functions vested in the Federal district courts.

I speak of this situation not for the purpose of evaluating the merits of that proposal, but for the purpose of indicating to you the extent to which the quasi-judicial character of this agency has been neither acknowledged nor accepted in the public mind. Whatever may be the reasons for this unfortunate development—and I do not profess to know all the reasons—the individual Board member can only resolve to do his utmost to make clear the nature and purpose of this agency and to demonstrate to the best of his ability that this agency is accountable to all the people of America, and not to any faction thereof. Such action may, it is hoped, aid in overcoming the misconception which abounds as to the nature and purpose of the NLRB. But such action in and of itself cannot possibly achieve complete success, for that problem is complicated by the existence of an equally widespread misconception as to the nature and purpose of the law which the NLRB administers. And I might add that the decisions of the NLRB—whatever else may be attributed to them (and almost everything is)—are not responsible for this particular development. This misconception as to the nature and purpose of the Taft-Hartley Act is primarily the result of the torrid political tempest which has swirled around this law almost from its very inception.

So unrestrained has this political controversy been, that the status of this law, as an expression of duly-considered public policy—designed primarily to protect the public interest—has been lost from view; and in its stead has been created the unfounded belief that this law is concerned only with private rights, private obligations, and private quarrels. This unfortunate characterization of the Taft-Hartley Act certainly has not facilitated public interest in, nor public understanding of, either its nature or its purposes.

The enactment of this statute—as the lengthy hearings and detailed debates which preceded that event will illustrate—was predicated upon the sound and irrefutable concept that the rights of the general public are paramount to the rights of either labor or management.

Such rights and obligations as this act confers upon employers, unions, or individual employees were so conferred, not because the Congress wanted to do something for or to one of these groups. They were so conferred because the Congress regarded the granting of these rights and the imposition of these obligations as necessary components of a public policy designed to protect the public interest in the free and untrammeled flow of commerce.

To attribute to the Congress a private rather than a public concern in the enactment of this legislation serves only to factionalize the public, to invite divergent political pressures and recriminations, and to discourage reasonable discussion and reasoned alterations of that policy. This result is clearly borne out in the recent inability of the United States Senate even to consider the merits of various proposals which had been advanced to amend the law. As a result, the law remains unchanged, the factional demands for amendment continue, and the political storm rages unabated. All this, in turn, serves to keep this agency enmeshed in a contentious atmosphere from which there is no apparent escape.

In such an atmosphere, it is little wonder that the judicial nature of this agency has been accorded so little public recognition. I know of no other quasi-judicial agency in the Government whose decisions are dissected with such surgical certainty and criticized by such caustic commentary as are the decisions rendered by this Board. Indeed, not only are the decisions subjected to a continuous barrage of unwarranted criticism, but oftentimes the attack on a decision is accompanied by a personal attack upon the character and integrity of a Board member. Such attacks, oft-repeated, contribute little to the efficacy of the law, and nothing to the stature of this agency.

Hence, it is not surprising that in these circumstances at least one Board member keeps before him at all times a motto—"IJODTAA"—which, properly translated, means "It's just one damned thing after another." Indeed, the fact that five American men can be found who are willing to serve on this Board speaks volumes for the inherent optimism of the adult American male. Or, perhaps, in anticipation of my critics, I should observe that it signifies the eternal truth of an old adage which holds that "all fools are not dead yet."

Seriously, this statute, enacted as it was in the public interest, requires, as do most sound statutes, nothing more or less than reasonable conduct on the part of those who come within its purview. It is not designed to accommodate the unreasonable or to reward the unreasoning. Neither is it designed to ruin the reasonable or penalize the prudent.

Of course, neither this law, nor any other sound law leaves to the parties affected the right to decide for themselves whether or not their own particular conduct is reasonable. And, needless to say, most of the difficulties which arise under this statute arise from the very fact that one or both of the parties involved in a particular case have insisted on the right to determine the standard of reasonableness which shall apply to their own conduct. And, as is usually the case, those who insist on evaluating the reasonableness of their own conduct, err on the side of self-justification. Eventually, therefore, they find themselves on the receiving end of a Board order. And more often than not, the Board finds itself on the receiving end of a verbal blast, because in the eyes of this aggrieved party, the Board is incapable of recognizing reasonable conduct when it sees it.

It is characteristic of Americans that they are both conscious of their rights and resentful of regulations which they deem to be unwarranted. And Americans, generally, can, and, on most occasions, will, without the slightest invitation, expound fully and eloquently upon both the nature and scope of the rights which are theirs. But, while the average American construes his rights liberally and broadly, he tends, I believe, to construe his responsibilities literally and narrowly. Indeed, many of us at times come almost to the point of insisting that we have a right not to meet our responsibilities. Certainly that is all too often the case in the field of labor-management relations.

Now the success or failure of the Taft-Hartley Act as an expression of public policy depends far more on the parties subject to it than it does on the National Labor Relations Board. For that law, like any law, requires for its success the voluntary acceptance of responsibility by the overwhelming majority of all those affected by it. In other words, such groups and individuals as are affected by this law, have a public duty to see to it that the public policy embodied in this statute is realized. Unless those groups and individuals fully and willingly assume that responsibility, the projected public policy must fail. For this agency, no matter how many employees or agents it might command can never effectuate the public policy enunciated by this act, in the face of any substantial refusal on the part of the affected parties to meet their particular legal responsibilities to other individuals and groups, and their general legal responsibilities to the public at large.

The basic tenet of this statute is the right of the individual employee to freedom of association with his fellow employees. That is a right which every other employee, every employer, and every union has a legal responsibility to respect.

And, regardless of what any individual employer may think, that responsibility is not met by any paternalistic attitude of "papa knows best." Neither is it met by threats or bribes, or by any of the various discriminatory practices which some employers have resorted to, in order to discourage the unionization of their employees.

Shocking though it may be to some, neither this law, nor the Congress which enacted it, ever intended to place the employer in loco parentis insofar as the union activity or nonactivity of his employees is concerned. Indeed, the Congress went to considerable length to make it clear that it regarded the individual employee as fully competent to decide the question of union affiliation for himself. And though some may disagree, a simple recognition of the basic tenets of Americanism justifies that decision by the Congress and requires its universal acceptance.

Now the union's responsibility to the individual employee is not met by forcing or attempting to force him to join a union against his will. Nor is it met by refusing to accept into union membership on a nondiscriminatory basis any person otherwise qualified for such membership. This law, amazing as it may seem to some, recognizes the union simply as the agent of the individual employee. It permits the union to represent the employee, not to possess him. This, too, represents a decision made by the Congress, the soundness and general acceptance of which is justified and required by the basic principles of Americanism.

Another basic purpose of this statute is the encouragement and effectuation of collective bargaining. And in that regard, this act places a public responsibility of great proportions upon all unions and all employers. Indeed, this responsibility goes to the very heart of the statute, for the extent to which collective bargaining is implemented and sustained by unions and employers will largely determine the success or failure of the national policies embodied in the act.

Now, it goes without saying that this responsibility is not met by any employer who by word or deed makes it clear that he will not deal with a union of his employees "under any circumstances whatsoever." Neither is this responsibility met by any union which does not represent the employees concerned, and which resorts to illegal action to compel the employer to deliver his employees to the union. Collective bargaining is after all a mutual undertaking. Its most essential element is reasonable conduct on the part of those immediately concerned. If negotiations are marked by a reasonable attitude and a sense of responsibility on both sides of the bargaining table, the chances are overwhelming that those negotiations will be successful.

But the obligation of collective bargaining encompasses more than the mere signing and continued administration of an agreement between union and employer.

I my opinion, a union-employer agreement which contemplates the evasion of any of the fundamental premises of this statute is an irresponsible agreement. An agreement encompassing a closed-shop arrangement in derogation of the rights of the employees affected does not effectuate this act; it stifles it. An agreement which seeks to legitimize or condone certain practices prohibited by the Congress in the public interest represents a rejection, rather than an acceptance, of true collective bargaining. An agreement wherein one party or the other seeks to abdicate—or some may say "delegate"—its responsibilities under this act constitutes a frustration, rather than a fulfillment, of the public policy encompassed by the statute.

It is my opinion that to the extent this type of agreement is entered into, the parties involved have failed to meet their basic responsibilities. And to the extent they fail to meet their responsibilities, they contribute to the failure of public policy. And, should such agreements become general, the failure of the public policy will become general. For, as I have previously pointed out, this agency cannot compel acceptance of a public policy which is threatened by either a general indifference on the one hand or a general hostility on the other. This is so because in fundamental truth and fact, every modern political society must place its primary reliance upon the voluntary assumption of legal responsibility by its citizens, and reserve the use of force and sanctions for that comparative few who, for one reason or another, will not voluntarily meet those responsibilities.

Now the particular statute under which we operate is a sound and sensible one. The responsibilities which it imposes are neither crushing nor burdensome. Indeed, if reasonable conduct were adhered to by all the parties affected by it, existence and operation of this statute would go almost unnoticed day by day.

Such reasonable conduct would, of course, go far to improve the status and stature of this agency. For a reasonable attitude on the part of the parties concerned would greatly diminish the criticisms being leveled at the Board, if only because the Board would be called upon to render a judgment in far fewer cases.

Indeed, if such reasonable conduct could be sustained for any respectable period, it might be possible for the Board to make its own voice heard, and thus contribute its small bit toward the effective realization of the public policy which has been committed to our charge. And, if our luck held out, it is barely possible that we might convert to the school of reason that discordant core of dissidents whose present conduct indicates that they would much prefer to rail against injustice rather than refrain from wrongdoing.

In conclusion, I would like to make this brief observation: In the American scheme of things, this law is, after all, your law, and this agency your agency. Both were created in your behalf by representatives elected by you as freemen. You can well strengthen the bulwarks of your freedom by meeting your responsibilities under this and other laws with the same vigor with which you insist upon your rights. If you but do that, you will broaden the bases of your liberty, and you will assure to tomorrow's generation an era unmarked by agencies of regulation and a land unchallenged by the tides of tyranny.

Tax Treatment of Dividend Income

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 23, 1954

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, on June 11, 1954, Mr. Robert P. Vanderpoel wrote a most interesting and thought-provoking article in the Chicago Sun-Times entitled "Agree Consumers Pay Corporate Income Tax." The article dealt primarily with the proposal in the present tax revision bill to give tax credits for dividends. While one cannot agree with all the reasoning contained in the article, it is a thought-provoking one, and I believe would be profitably read by every Member of the Senate. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appedix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AGREE CONSUMERS PAY CORPORATE INCOME TAX

(By Robert P. Vanderpoel)

The most controversial feature of the tax bill approved by the Senate Finance Committee involves special favorable tax treatment of dividend income. Hot debate on the Senate floor is almost certain.

The proposal to give income received from dividends a special status is defended on the ground that such income is now doubly taxed. It has been my position that this is a fallacious contention. I have cited the statements of many business leaders to the effect that taxes represent another cost of doing business and as such must be passed on to the consumer in the price of goods. If this is so, clearly it is the consumer that is paying the tax, not the corporation and its stockholders. Such being the case, there is no double taxation and there is no justification for giving stock dividends favorable tax treatment.

As further evidence of the correctness of my position, I have presented figures showing that corporation earnings, after taxes, throughout this period of high taxes have, on the average, been lucrative, well above the level needed to maintain a healthy private enterprise system. Clearly, if corporations have been able to earn, after taxes, profits greater (as a return on net worth) than they did during normal years before the advent of these high war taxes, stockholders have no complaint and there is no justice in treating dividend income in a more favorable manner than wage income or interest income.

DIVIDEND RETURN GOOD, PRICES UP

If any further proof were needed of the correctness of my position it is to be found in the statistics of dividends and stock prices. Even though corporations have paid out throughout this period a much smaller portion of net earnings than normal, the dividend return consistently has been good and stock prices have moved upward to the highest levels of all times. Under the circumstances, it seems to me not only unjust but absolutely ridiculous that Congress should consider giving this proposed handout to shareholders.

The Wall Street Journal, which has sometimes been called the voice of business, recently substantiated in decisive language my contention as to corporations passing on the taxes which are levied against them.

"A tax which successfully conceals its true impact," said the Journal, "is the corporation income levy. All who have given this impost any real thought know that neither the corporation nor its stockholders pay it. It is a cost, just like wages and raw materials, and thus it is a component in the prices that businesses charge for the goods they make or the services they render. It is indeed, in point of fact, a sales tax in all but name."

If the Wall Street Journal is correct, and certainly there are few who will say that it is not, the whole argument for favorable tax treatment of dividend income explodes.

The Journal stated that it is difficult to estimate how much of the end sales price represents tax because its effect is cumulative from the mine through the whole manufacturing and distribution process to the retail sale. It estimated, however, that the burden on the consumer, "even with the excess-profits tax gone," approximates $20 billion a year.

CONSUMERS KEPT IN IGNORANCE

"Not only is the consumer usually unaware that he pays this huge sum," said the Journal's tax expert, George Shea, "but great efforts are made to keep the knowledge from him. Labor union leaders sin in this respect about as much as any group."

Many liberal economists, including, for example, Leon Henderson, have favored a gradual trend away from all corporation taxes. During a period of great competition and relatively low profits, this could be accomplished with greatest benefit to the consumer and the smallest windfalls for corporations.

It seems to me unfortunate that some Democrats, no doubt playing the game of politics, have fought the unjustifiable proposal for favoring dividend income with the alternative of increasing the amount of individual tax exemption. This tends to make the fight one of class against class.

The handout to stockholders should be discarded because it lacks justification. The raising of individual exemptions should be rejected at this time, first of all, because the Government badly needs the revenues and until the budget has been balanced and something set aside for payment on the debt it is unsound to lower taxes. Secondly, unless a great many people, including those in the low-income brackets, appreciate the cost of Government through the pain of taxes, they are unlikely to place sufficent pressure upon Congress to hold waste and extravagance in check.

Thus, it seems to me, we should reject the dividend tax measure and consider such tax relief as may be in the best interest of the Nation, only after the budget has been balanced.

The Surplus Problem—Additional Controls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRY M. GOLDWATER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 23, 1954

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Surplus Problem Seen Bringing More Controls," written by Karl D. Butler, and published in the Syracuse (N. Y.) Post-Standard of June 6, 1954.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Farm and Food: Surplus Problem Seen Bringing More Controls

(By Karl D. Butler)

Because of present farm policy, Government-held stocks of butter and a number of other commodities continue to pile up. With this situation getting more critical every day, I cannot help but wonder how long it will be before some courageous soul rises to the platform and challenges the whole farm program now in force.

Continuing down the road on which we are now headed, there is little question but that farmers will be led into chaos and controls far beyond anything now dreamed of. I say this because it is a fact that, unless almost an about-face is performed, it appears highly probable that more complete Government controls than yet experienced over farm operations are coming closer and closer to actuality. I say this despite the firm efforts of the present administration to move in exactly the opposite direction.

Some of the best-informed farm managers in the country are making plans and advising along these lines right now. They are saying: "To farmers, 1954 should be a year to get established in a farm operation that you want to follow for years to come. As acreage controls, allotments, marketing quotas and multiple compliance measures become more strict, changes from one crop to another will become more and more difficult."

APPEARS INEVITABLE

It appears that such a course will be inevitable unless Congress chooses to face up to the problem and avoid extending legislation now in force. The prospect of what could happen in this respect isn't bright.

The United States Department of Agriculture will soon be up against the deadline on wheat, and this may give an idea of things to come. Details of proposed production controls on wheat must be announced by July 1. Apparently wheat growers will be called upon to vote on the question of whether or not rigid marketing quotas now in force should be continued. Similar quotas are in effect this year on cotton, peanuts and certain types of tobacco.

It may not be too difficult to hold down the production of wheat and other crops by use of marketing quotas with stiff cash penalties for noncompliance, but there is no legislation in force yet to prevent farmers from taking land out of crops in oversupply and using it to grow crops which will create other headaches, for example crops such as oats, barley, flaxseed, soybeans, dry beans, grain sorghums, and vegetables. In fact, there is evidence right now that we are headed for plenty of trouble with some of these.

SITUATION REVIEWED

Here is a brief of the situation: The USDA asked for 71 million acres of corn this year, and it looks like there will be more than 80 million acres planted. Also, it is estimated that there will be an increase of about 3 million acres of oats, about 4.5 million acres of barley, 4 million acres of sorghums, 2 million acres of soybeans, a little less than 1 million acres of flaxseed, and perhaps a quarter of a million acres of dry beans, as well as more than 1 million acres of other cash crops.

In other words, of the 25 million acres of so-called diverted acres millions of acres will be used to grow other cash crops.

Another bogyman facing the farmer is that some are proposing that a system of cross compliance for price supports be inaugurated. Under such a system, it would not be enough for a farmer to plant within his allotments for cotton, wheat, corn or other crops to be eligible for price supports on these crops. If the farmer should exceed his allotment on any one crop or fail to divert a specified portion of his cropland to noncrop use, he would be ineligible for price supports on any crops. This system has never yet been employed, but it has been talked about from time to time.

Many other kinds of proposals are being advanced to figure out how to control the situation with which the country is faced. The sad fact is that some farmers face the possibility of being penalized for overplanting, even though they have never taken any subsidy payments and actually don't want them. Right here in New York State there are such farmers who face possible trouble because they have overplanted their wheat acreage.

How long will farmers and the rest of the country be willing to move toward more controls, more subsidies and more of all of the headaches brought on by extending a planned economy rather than facing up to the real problem of developing legislation within the framework of which farmers can produce and live as freemen?

Tribute to Senator Hunt, of Wyoming

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 23, 1954

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an editorial published in the Thermopolis Independent-Record, of June 17, 1954. The editorial makes laudatory references to our late colleague, Senator Lester Hunt, of Wyoming. Although I agree with the statements contained in the editorial, I wish to point out that Senator Hunt was also an extremely able Senator for the United States as a whole.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Senator Hunt Has Been a "Wyoming Senator"

Retiring United States Senator Lester C. Hunt, Democrat, of Wyoming, has been one of less than 1,600 (sixteen hundred, not thousand) American citizens to have enjoyed sovereign United States senatorial prerogative. The average tenure of all these some 1,580 United States Senators has been approximately 7 years, or 1 year more than a full term of 6 years. Recent observers of United States Senate history may think that because of the McCarthy-Army hearings, etc., the Senate is becoming more hectic. But before the Civil War, the Senate frequently used its power to expel and unseat its own Members, just about as hectic a procedure as the Senate is capable.

Nine United States Senators have been elected for 6 terms or more, and Wyoming's United States Senator Francis E. Warren was in fact elected 7 times (although not all for full 6-year terms), the record, and in fact still holds the record for total length of service in the Senate, namely 37½ years.

The Senate of the United States is the only Federal instrumentality which cannot be changed by the usual amendment procedure. It is even doubtful if an amendment changing the amendment procedure to change the Senate would be constitutional. The Romans used as their insigne the initials SPQR, which were the initials for, in translation, the Senate and the Roman people. Because of the fact that the Senate of the United States is in effect our one truly permanent Federal body, come any eventuality, we could in fact mimic the ancient Romans and hence say, "the Senate and the American people."

Due to its power to veto Presidential nominations of all high Federal officials in the executive and judicial branches, due to power to ratify treaties (treaties, which become the supreme law of the land, made under the authority of the United States, and not necessarily in pursuance of the Constitution, a lesser injunction in effect for domestic laws, State and Federal), and due to the fact that the Senate can convict (upon two-thirds of those voting, a quorum being present) any Federal official impeached or indicted by the United States House of Representatives, and that since the United States Supreme Court decided the little noticed but phenomenal Ritter case in 1937, the Senate is not required to vote on any specific charge brought by the House. The House can say, in effect, "We impeach so-and-so," and if the Senate concurs by the constitutional majority, said so-and-so is out. All this in effect makes the Federal Government a senatorial government, and not absolutely, in a showdown, a three-branch government.

We think of all these things now with the retirement of our Wyoming Senator Hunt. We mean that—that he has been a Wyoming Senator, and not a Potomac Senator, or a Washington bureaucracy Senator. Senator Hunt has, at crucial times, supported the best interests of Wyoming against Democratic party line. We hope any and all United States Senators from Wyoming will always vote for Wyoming against any party line, Democratic, Republican, or what have you.

Editorial Tribute to Hon. Margaret Chase Smith of Maine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FREDERICK G. PAYNE

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 23, 1954

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record several editorials in tribute to my colleague, the distinguished senior Senator from Maine, Mrs. Margaret Chase Smith.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington Evening Star of June 23, 1954]

Mrs. Smith Stays Here

Although there is nothing unexpected about it, Senator Margaret Chase Smith's runaway victory in Maine's Republican primary is gratifying nonetheless.

It is, in the first place, a triumph for that school of Republicanism which does not think that the clock can be turned back half a century. It is also a triumph, and an impressive triumph, for a woman who has not hesitated to put herself publicly on record against the excesses of Senator McCarthy.

In all probability Senator McCarthy was not much of an issue in the Maine primary. The Wisconsin Senator spoke in the State twice last winter, and in each speech he mentioned Robert L. Jones, Mrs. Smith's opponent, as a young Maine man who was making a name for himself in Washington. Senator McCarthy stayed out of the primary campaign, however, and Mr. Jones did not try to bring him into it.

The fair inference is that Mr. Jones, having sampled Maine sentiment, found nothing to encourage a belief that Senator McCarthy's support would be a political asset. If this is correct, it is gratifying. For if Mr. Jones, backed openly by Senator McCarthy, had beaten Mrs. Smith, or even if he had seriously threatened, the result would have been a big boost for that type of politicking which has come to be known as McCarthyism.

[From the Washington Daily News of June 23, 1954]

Lady From Maine

Margaret Chase Smith is an able Senator, so it is not surprising that Maine Republicans voted for her 5 to 1 in their primary, which normally is equivalent to election. Since her brash young opponent pitched his campaign on his own isolationism versus Senator Smith's enlightened republicanism, he was lucky to get as many votes as he did. Maine men were trading with other countries before most of this Nation was inhabited, and they need no warnings about foreigners.

Young Robert Jones was publicized earlier in the year as a protege of Senator McCarthy. He turned out to be something less than that, for Senator McCarthy did not appear in the campaign at all and Mr. Jones chose to play down whatever connection he may have had with the Wisconsin windbag. It probably was a wise choice. Whatever the faults of old-line New Englanders, their sense of decency runs deep and strong, and it has had a wholesome effect in Congress through such people as Senator Smith.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of June 23, 1954]

Victory in Maine

Far beyond the borders of Maine there will be rejoicing at the handsome vote of confidence just accorded Senator Margaret Chase Smith. Challenged in the primaries, Mrs. Smith carried off the victory by a 5 to 1 majority. From the time the first returns started coming in, the outcome was never in doubt.

First and foremost, this vote is a tribute to Mrs. Smith herself. As a United States Senator she has been of a caliber to make Maine proud. She has raised the prestige of a Chamber where simple integrity and commonsense have too often seemed at a premium. As a Republican, she has been a spokesman for all that is best in the party and a stanch supporter of the President. The expression of satisfaction from the White House is a reminder of the kind of party which President Eisenhower seeks to build and to stamp with the mark of his own progressive leadership.

There are other considerations which should not be overlooked. Mrs. Smith's opponent was Robert L. Jones, at 34 a newcomer to politics. Campaigning vigorously, Mr. Jones stood against virtually every measure of internationalism and enlightenment. He had been praised by McCarthy during the latter's visit to Maine, and although the facts do not warrant saying that he provided a test of the Wisconsin Senator's strength, he nevertheless provided a rallying point for any who were seriously at odds with the administration's policies. As such a rallying point he showed himself significantly weak. By her own strength, moreover, Mrs. Smith showed that opposition to the methods of Senator McCarthy—in her case going back to the famous "Declaration of Conscience" of 1950—is by no means a political handicap.

Mrs. Smith will return to the Senate—a figure of great charm with a firm grasp on political principles and her own quiet way of making her influence felt in the National Capitol. She is to be congratulated—and so are the voters of Maine.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of June 23, 1954]

Victory for Mrs. Smith

It is always good news when constituents recognize the merits of a sane and progressive legislator. There is cause for real satisfaction, then, in the nearly 5-to-1 victory of Senator Margaret Chase Smith over Robert L. Jones in the Maine Republican primary. Mrs. Smith will face somewhat more intensified competition from the Democrats in the September general election, but her return seems assured.

Unquestionably the issue of McCarthyism was more of an issue outside Maine than in the minds of Down East voters. Mrs. Smith gained fame with her 1950 Declaration of Conscience against McCarthyism, and there were reports that Mr. Jones, who had been dismissed as an assistant to Senator Potter, was planted in the race by the McCarthy wing to oppose her. If so, the move backfired. Mr. Jones turned out to be a weak campaigner who talked in vague generalities about Americanism and not much else. The attitude among voters seemed to be that a man without a program was a poor substitute for a Senator with a demonstrated record of moderation and an international outlook.

What is encouraging is that Mrs. Smith's kind of decency commands respect at the grassroots. Maine can take pride in its confidence in the only elected woman Member of the Senate, and we join with citizens of the Pine Tree State in congratulating her.

[From the New York Times of June 23, 1954]

Smith Versus Jones

On the afternoon of June 1, 1950, a trim, gray-haired woman stood on the floor of the United States Senate and told her colleagues, including Senator Joseph R. McCarthy, who was sitting hardly 3 feet away from her:

"I do not like the way the Senate has been made a rendezvous for vilification, for selfish political gain at the sacrifice of individual reputations and national unity. I am not proud of the way we smear outsiders from the floor of the Senate and hide behind the cloak of congressional immunity * * *. As an American, I am shocked at the way Republicans and Democrats alike are playing directly into the Communist design of 'confuse, divide, and conquer.'"

The woman was Mrs. Margaret Chase Smith from the State of Maine. She was making a brief introductory speech to the famed "Declaration of Conscience" that she and six fellow-Republicans (including Mr. Ives of New York) had drawn up in protest against "the selfish political exploitation of fear, bigotry, ignorance, and intolerance" by "certain elements of the Republican Party," and also against other divisive tactics employed by Democrats as well.

Mrs. Smith is now nearing the end of her first term as Senator. On Monday she won the Republican primary by an overwhelming vote against an opponent who was widely identified as belonging to the McCarthy wing of the GOP. McCarthyism as such was apparently not a major issue in the campaign, so far as the voters were concerned. Yet there is not the slightest doubt that if Robert L. Jones had defeated Mrs. Smith his victory would have been considered a triumph for Mr. McCarthy, who on a speaking tour of Maine some months ago had gone out of his way to praise Mr. Jones. During the campaign Mr. Jones returned the compliment.

Fortunately, there never was any doubt that the Republicans of Maine were behind Mrs. Smith. They have given her the enthusiastic endorsement which she richly deserves.

Superintendent Lyon Cites Difficulties From FDIC Levy, Corporation Bill Holdings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1954

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I believe the following address by the New York State Banking Commissioner William A. Lyon, is important and worthy of our attention:

The Competitive Position of New York Banking—Superintendent Lyon Cites Difficulties From FDIC Levy, Corporation Bill Holdings—Tells Association of Bank Women's Dinner City's Money Market Position Is Not Threatened

(Address by William A. Lyon, superintendent of banks, before the dinner meeting of the Metropolitan Group of the Association of Bank Women, May 13, 1954, at the Belmont Plaza Hotel, New York City)

If you look at deposit figures, you will see that our New York City banks now have a smaller percentage of the bank deposits of the country than they had 15 years ago.

Corporation treasurers are hearing a lot of reasons why they should switch from New York depositaries to banks in other centers. Trend detectors are getting on the job. Our strength is said to be ebbing. Outcountry new businessmen of competing banks, from what one hears, hope that any ailment New York may have is not trivial.

In my view these dolorous reports about New York banking's condition and prospects are, as Mark Twain said of rumors about his death, greatly exaggerated. It is plain for all to see that New York banking is the repository of a relatively smaller amount of the country's commercial bank deposits than it was before Pearl Harbor. New York City's commercial banks now have 15 percent of all the commercial bank deposits of the Nation. That is a sizable figure, but instead of evoking pride it has called forth a measure of concern among our own bankers in the past few years. Substantial though our deposit percentage now is, the 1940 figure was still higher—27 percent. And so we look back longingly to yesterday's glories; we wonder apprehensively whether our laurels are really fading.

Is it as bad as all that? I don't think so. Let us give the picture a little more breadth and depth. When our percentage of the country's commercial bank deposits was at 27 percent in 1940, it was higher than it had been for a generation. When you come right down to it, the 1940 percentage had more abnormalities in it than that for 1954. Go back to the beginning of this century and fit New York banking's performance into the half-century picture and you will find a wiggly trend line that swings now above the 20 percent level and now below it. Only once before, and that briefly, did the percentage rise as high as it did in 1940.

USUALLY UNDER 20 PERCENT

If you throw out the two sets of war and postwar years you will see that New York's share of the Nation's commercial bank deposits tends to be under 20 percent rather than above it.

Let us go back to the turn of the century. After sloping off gradually for the first decade from a level of just under 27 percent to one of a little below 18 percent, New York City's deposit percentage shot up suddenly just before and just after the outbreak of

World War I. The earlier decline was entirely canceled out. Funds accumulated in large quantities in New York City banks as Europeans sold dollar securities here and the belligerents floated large dollar loans in this market. The shifting of member bank's reserves into the Federal Reserve banks upon the system's founding, combined with purchases of war goods by the European allies and by the United States Government, brought about a steady slide in New York City's percentage of all commercial bank deposits from the 1915 peak until a bottom of 16 percent was reached in 1920.

We all look on the 1920's as enormously prosperous times—for those days. New York City's banking succeeded to world leadership. Funds were drawn here from all around the country, and, indeed, from all around the world, for trade reasons and also to take part in the tremendous boom in the stock market. For all the magnet that New York was for funds, our share of all United States commercial bank deposits, be it noted, stayed rather close to 16½ percent. That level is a far cry from the 1940 figure of 27 percent.

After the crackup in the stock market the New York City percentage began a rise that lasted all through the 1930's and amounted to 10 percentage points in all. From that wartime peak a drop set in that extended all through the 1940's. New York banking's experience during and after World War II has an almost exact precedent in the years during and after World War I. As we try to estimate the significance of events in the years since 1940 it is wise to keep this historical perspective in mind.

UNDERLYING FORCES

The forces that underlie these shifting tides in New York City banks' deposits can be isolated and identified. We should begin, I think, with an appreciation of the fact that New York City is both a heavy importer and a heavy exporter of funds—of bank deposits, if you will—but seldom do the exports and imports balance off at any one time. These generalizations appear warranted: when industry and business are slack or disturbed, funds have a habit of piling up in New York City. In periods of active business, when the money supply is rising all over the country, funds flow out of New York City's commercial banks as fast or faster than they flow in.

To a larger degree than anywhere else in the country, New York City banks' customers are national and international enterprises. Funds borrowed here are to a large extent spent elsewhere. It is almost inevitable that increased commercial lending by New York banks goes to swell bank deposits more in other parts of the country than here.

Let the demand for commercial loans die away, however, and a decline in business make for deposit stagnation, then you will find balances accumulating in New York without an outlet. A large portion of the idle and unemployable funds at the disposal of banks in other parts of the country was sent to New York in the 1930's because the banks in the interior had nothing to do with them at home. That is the magnetizing influence which a money market always exerts.

OTHER MARKETS NOT PROBLEM

What our banks here mainly have to fear is not a dispersal of funds throughout the country in times of booming business but the springing up of one or more important money markets elsewhere in the country. That does not appear to be in prospect. Greater decentralization of industry and marked growth in banks in other parts of the country do not in themselves give rise to rival money markets.

Let me add another important fact about 1940, the peak year in New York City's deposit concentration. It followed several years of inflow of flight capital from Europe. With dictators' bombast and threats of war filling the European air, great quantities of liquid funds in Europe took refuge in New York banks. The flow of capital is not running as strongly from Europe these days, but the normal, the long-range attractiveness of New York to foreign funds seems undiminished.

ONE AND TWO-TENTHS BILLION DOLLARS FOREIGN FUNDS

Certainly there is no falling off in the foreign bank representation in our market or in the funds these agencies have in their custody. I wonder if you realize that there are 31 foreign banking agencies in New York City under the banking department's supervision. These agencies have about $1,200,000,000 of resources, of which five-sixths are assets in New York State. They do not publish call reports, their condition statements are usually not spread around, and their figures are not included in New York City's banking totals.

SAVINGS FUNCTION

We have also a number of investment companies, some of which are engaged in activities closely related to banking. Catering to the public's savings is less exclusively a commercial banking function in this city than in some others. New York has a more highly developed mutual savings system than most cities have. Indeed, our banking structure is designed along functional lines to an unusual degree. In measuring New York's role in the banking scene for the whole country we must keep the sum of all these various activities before us. They give us a better overall showing today.

I may sum up this discussion of deposits by saying that I see no signs that New York is experiencing any real diminution in its importance as the money and banking center of the Nation and the world. It is true that our commercial banks in New York City have not shown a growth as vigorous as their opposite numbers in other parts of the country since 1940. But I have tried to show that 1940 was an abnormal year which marked the culmination of a trend that began with and marked the great depression; that New York commercial banks' current share of the Nation's deposits is almost exactly equal to that of the roaring 1920's, and that the drop in the percentages in the last several years is an inescapable accompaniment of the enormous expansion in business and the huge demand for credit.

When I say that the alarms are unfounded, I do not mean that there are no problems anywhere around and that New York banking can indulge itself in a dash of the luxury of complacency.

EARNINGS REAL PROBLEM

We should direct our concern and study, I should say, less toward the amount of business the New York banks are doing and will do than toward their relative earning power. This brings me to my second major theme.

In spite of all the careers in demagogy that have been based on denouncing our New York banks, the fact is that for some years now they have not had earnings up to the standard of banking generally, and they have fallen short by an even wider margin of earning the return on capital that industry has shown.

The persistent discount under book value at which most of our banks' stocks sell reflects this unsatisfactory situation. The discount is troublesome when it comes to raising new capital, a step which most of them have to take at one time or another. Banking strength resides as much in a good capital position as it does in asset quality. This matter of relatively low earnings and its reflection in the value of bank capital in the market is not, I am sorry to say, a new development. We can trace it back for almost 20 years.

Our large banks are laggards in earning power for various reasons. For one thing, they are more strongly capitalized than most banks are and thus the earnings dollar has further to go around. For another thing, they deliberately sacrifice some earnings for the sake of higher asset quality and liquidity.

Beyond those things, however, the earning power of our banks is held back because of burdens laid on them in other years on the assumption that their profits were good both absolutely and relatively and their ability to shoulder a public responsibility almost unlimited.

Before I go any further in this direction I should like to sketch out the effect on earnings of the New York banks' capital and asset quality positions.

To begin with, New York City's banks had at the year end a ratio of capital to assets of 8.29 percent, against one of 6.63 percent for all banks. Our banks here had net current operating income of 13.8 percent of capital accounts, against 17.8 percent for all banks. Net profits here were at the rate of 6.3 percent of invested capital, against 9 percent for all banks. The lower earning power of the bank capital dollar in New York City stands out.

I want to show you that the difference in capital ratios between New York City banks and all banks does not explain all of the difference in earning power. I have subtracted enough capital from the New York City banks' total to put their ratio on a parity with that of all banks. This brings their rate of net profits up from 6.3 percent to 7.9 percent. The new and higher earning rate is still well below that of 9 percent for all banks. The remainder of the earnings gap reflects the New York banks' policy of deliberately sacrificing earnings in the interest of keeping asset quality high.

THREE QUESTIONS

Thus we have here in this city a group of big banks that is deserving of high marks for relative adequacy of capitalization and soundness and liquidity of assets. They are strategically situated in our banking structure; they are uniquely responsible; we expect them to be both exemplars of good banking practice and bearers of a full share of the cost of keeping the heart of our banking sound. I wonder, though, whether we have overdone it a bit in piling the burdens on the strong and rather long suffering backs.

In this connection I want to raise three questions. The first question I should like to offer as deserving study is the level of reserves required of central reserve city banks, that is to say, the big New York City and Chicago banks. Why, you might ask, is that level so much higher than elsewhere?

A complete answer would take us far back into banking history, long before there was any Federal Reserve System, to a time when New York and Chicago banks kept the bulk of the cash reserves of institutions in other centers small and large.

You can readily see that the liquidity of the entire banking system in those days depended on the ready availability of these interbank deposits, and you can understand that the lessons of those times, learned through panics and crises, became a banking tradition. To this day the idea that required reserves should be the highest against banks holding a large part of other banks' liquid funds can be found among the cardinal articles of the central banking faith.

HITS DISCRIMINATION

Yet it is equally plain that today our notions about what constitutes the ultimate liquidity of our banking system have radically changed. Look at the vast discretionary powers given to the Federal Reserve to make bank assets liquid in times of crisis.

Our supply of notes and currency is no longer rigid as it used to be in the old days. Still, in spite of all these reforms, one of the changes we have failed to make has been in the pattern of reserve requirements.

What used to be sound common sense has become with the passage of time discrimination which falls most heavily on our large banks. The survival of this regional discrimination is quite irrelevant to the basic purpose of required reserves today, which is to control the money supply. All that discrimination does is to lock up assets that our banks could put to far better use in improving their income position.

It would be harsh and unfair to put all the blame on the Federal Reserve. For 15 out of the 18 years since the Banking Act of 1935, we have witnessed inflation when major changes in reserve requirements would be added fuel to the fire.

But now that a leveling-out period seems ahead of us the time may be ripe for a new look at reserve requirements. If this should bring about a removal of the inequities that exist against banks in New York City, a redress will be made which is long overdue.

The second and third questions that I should like to raise concern policies and assumptions that are tied in with deposit insurance. Any debate over the wisdom of continuing deposit insurance has long since ended.

It has given our banking system the full measure of public confidence that is so vital to the achieving and maintaining of economic stability at or very near full employment. There is no turning back of that particular clock.

ON FDIC COST

My only questions have to do with the way the cost of deposit insurance is being borne. It seems to me that the burden is disproportionately heavy on the New York City banks particularly, and all big banks to some degree. Our banks here pay a heavy share of the freight for deposit insurance. They do this in more than one way.

In the first place, our big banks here retained the public's confidence right up to and through the banking holiday, and they still have it. If any banks could do without deposit insurance, it is our big banks here. They are better capitalized than most and they are conservatively operated, as we have noted.

The insurance of any part of any deposit in banks which do not enjoy so large a degree of public confidence can only cut in to some extent on our big banks' business. Deposit insurance has undoubtedly led a good many big corporations to leave funds on deposit with many a small bank that would otherwise have been shifted to our big banks.

Where the weight of deposit insurance has fallen hardest on our big banks, though, is the system of extending the assessment to those parts of deposit balances that are not covered by the insurance. Remember, anything above $10,000 in a balance in unprotected by the FDIC.

In order to get deposit insurance started 20 years ago it was, no doubt, the better part of wisdom to build the insurance fund up rapidly by placing on the big banks a cost considerably more than the coverage they were getting out of it. Now the fund is built up to a reasonable size and a substantial share of the annual assessment income is being rebated by the corporation to the banks.

I believe it is time to give thought to the question whether deposit insurance cost should not be more directly related to the protection afforded so that New York banking will not have to continue, in a sense, to subsidize its competition.

This issue would lose some of its point if the earnings position were reversed, and our big banks were doing better than banking generally. There are those who will regard it as naive and quixotic and even daffy to take a stand publicly in favor of easing the burden on the big banks. Perhaps.

CITES INEQUITY

But I think that the present method of assessing unprotected deposits is no more equitable than billing a skyscraper for fire insurance at so much a floor, right up to the roof, and paying off losses resulting from fire only so far as they are incurred on the first floor.

It does not do any good to rationalize the present assessment method by maintaining that through its operations the FDIC is protecting all depositors even through its insurance liability extends only to the small accounts. At the hearings 3 years ago a Senate committee made it pretty clear that Congress had not given the corporation any such latitude.

My last question relates to a practice that has grown up since deposit insurance was started. When the Insurance Act was passed in 1933, Congress ingeniously sought to help the banks find the money to pay the insurance assessments by forbidding the payment of interest on demand deposits. The large depositors, and especially some of the large corporations, did not care much for this scheme, but there did not seem to be much that they could do about it.

Now, years later, some of them are coming up with a way around this prohibition. Unable to get any interest from the banks on their cash balances, corporations have been turning in increasing numbers to employing idle balances in short-term investments, including, I want to emphasize here, commercial paper offered by other corporations. Instead of banks themselves being the largest buyers of commercial paper, nonbanking corporations are now the principal takers.

WARNS OF HAZARDS

After the stock market crash of 1929 it suddenly became clear to everybody that it was not desirable for nonbanking lenders to have such huge amounts of funds placed in the call loan market. Nonbanking lenders can be pretty skittish. They ran fast in 1929, and the banks had to assume their loans. They are further out of reach of credit control than banks. Short-term lending, it was felt, was properly a function of banks.

Now is the time to determine whether the same faults that were found to exist in call loans by others are also present in short-term commercial lending by others.

It is apparent that the nonbanking commercial lending which is an offshoot of prohibiting interest payments on demand deposits falls hardest on the banks with the large corporate balances, that is, our big banks, which were not the chief offenders against good practice in the rates of interest paid on deposits in the prebanking holiday period. This lending shortcircuits the banking system and affects the banks' earning power adversely.

As I come to the end of my remarks, I should like to say once more that the deposit fluctuations of the last decade do not indicate that New York banking is losing its competitive edge or the uniqueness of its position.

All of us in this city and State ought also to have a certain sense of pride in what our banking has accomplished, over the worldwide eminence it has attained, through the years. Our people's interest in seeing New York banking continue to excel is anything but academic.

ASKS FAIR CHANCE

Ours is the most practical of interests. Finance is two and a half times as important to New York City employment as to that of the United States as a whole. This one city gives jobs to 15 percent of the Nation's financial labor force. Banking is the backbone of our large and complex financial structure.

Banking service for the Nation and much of the world is our city's and State's most celebrated product. If you include all the activities that are related to our banking and cater to it and grow from it, you will have one of our most vital economic activities as well.

You cannot assume that our New York banking will continue to function as strongly and successfully as ever, like some force of nature such as the Gulf Stream, if we take it for granted. Its problems are the concern of all of us in this city and State. Its well-being affects more than our pride. The success of our banking system means nearly as much to us as a good tourist season means to Florida.

We need not only to believe in ourselves in banking. We need also to see that this industry so vital to our economic health in New York is given a fair chance competitively. I do not know how an organization such as oyurs could enlist its energies and enthusiasm in a better cause.

When the New York Yankees lose three straight games, said Mr. Lyon, by way of introduction, "heads begin to shake" about their future.

"That is the way with all champions," he added.

And with statistics showing that the percentage of the Nation's bank deposits which the New York City banks hold has been almost halved since 1940, "so it is in the banking world with New York City's."

Though he points out that this bleak picture is the result of a false comparison, Mr. Lyon is quite insistent that New York bank earnings are not nearly as good as the rest of the banks in the country. He discusses causes, and discriminations which he feels should be righted. New York should get a fair chance at the competition, he says.

Religion Alive and Vital at University of Texas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 23, 1954

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, those of us who have a strong faith in the innate good sense and soundness of character of our young people will find evidence to back up our belief in an article in the May issue of the Alcalde, the alumni magazine of the University of Texas.

The article was written by L. D. Haskew, dean of the college of education at the university. I ask unanimous consent that Dean Haskew's report on an upsurge in the religious life of the university community be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Late one afternoon recently I stood on the east curb of The Drag at 22d Street, waiting for the traffic to subside sufficiently for the usual hazardous dash to the other side. Three couples of college students joined me. Finally, we all made it across. I stopped at the corner to await my ride home, while the students continued on out 22d. Quite naturally and casually they turned into the chapel prayer center at the Baptist Student Center, not to attend a meeting but to engage in a quiet time of meditation and prayer.

Those students were a symbol of one of the most significant developments to occur in higher education in the past 20 years. That development is an unspectacular but genuine upsurge of interest in religion as a normal and necessary component of satisfactory education.

Campuses from New England to California, from Michigan to Florida report the same experience. Undergraduates are asking more questions, seeking more personal counseling, showing more curiosity as to what religion may hold for them. College and university faculty members are discussing religion more frequently. They are examining their course offerings and college programs generally to see whether religion is accorded the position it should occupy. Provisions for cultivating religious maturity are putting in their appearance in fraternity and sorority houses, in college residence halls, in student unions, in faculty clubs. Church-connected services to students are expanding and finding themselves hard-pressed to meet demands.

The heedless, indifferent student is still with us. The faculty member who is apparently unaware of religion or who is openly skeptical about it has not vanished. Those who honestly doubt that religion and education can mix have not disappeared. But, these individuals do not dominate the field of higher education in 1954. Religion is becoming an increasingly common component of a college education.

At the University of Texas the picture is an encouraging one for those who believe that students should find a center as well as a circumference for their lives, and that the one reliable center is God. Every now and then here on the campus we read or hear of some statement which implies that religious influence is sadly lacking around the Forty Acres. Such charges would be ludicrous if they were not so tragically misleading. Few of us are satisfied with our present attainments, but the religious assets we have compare very favorably, indeed, with most of our other attainments toward being a university of the first class.

The University of Texas is a public institution, an agency of the State. We are dedicated to the principle of the separation of church and State. We must never use the power or the resources of the State to promote or retard sectarian religion. But, we are also an educational institution, an agency dedicated to the full, responsible development of young men and women. We know that while we can separate church and State, we cannot—save at the peril of life itself—separate man from his God. Therefore, we are concerned that students at the University of Texas have free and constant access to religion, and that they get full opportunity to weigh the importance and conseqence of God in their lives.

The first plank in the religious platform of the University of Texas is that the proper agency to teach and preach religion is the church. It is a matter of high pride to us that the campus is ringed by churches and student centers of organized religious groups and that many other churches in Austin offer special features for college students. The tremendous expansion in the church plants around the campus during the past 5 years is one strong testimony to the aliveness of religion at the university. The student life staffs of these churches are showing similar expansion, and their faculties compare favorably in training and experience with the faculty of the university itself. More noticeable than even the expansion of the physical plants and staffs, however, has been the strong spiritual flavor that has been growing in the programs and activities of these church-operated enterprises in recent years.

The attitude of the university toward church-centered religious opportunities is a positive one. Many university faculty members occupy key roles in church programs for college students. Full cooperation is extended to all religious groups in publicizing their offerings and in establishing contact with individual students. An annual Religious Emphasis Week is a joint enterprise of the university and the combined religious groups. University faculty members and officials have displayed keen interest in the recent establishment of the Christian Faith and Life Communities, unique residence centers for young men and women students of the university.

A second outstanding feature of religious influence at the university is the personal commitment and strong religious life of hundreds of faculty members of the University of Texas. One of the difficulties in demonstrating the importance of religion to college students lies in the fact that in some colleges very few faculty members show that they consider religion as a significant part of day-to-day living. Such difficulty is not encountered at the University of Texas. Here the student who gets to know 5 faculty members well is quite likely to find that at least 3 of them, on the average, are actively and positively including religion in their lives.

Religion was once avoided in intellectual circles. All around us on the University of Texas campus are evidences that such avoidance is vanishing and in its stead is coming an acceptance of religion as one of the usual means for high-level living. Music interpreting the religious aspirations of man is performed frequently to capacity houses. Students deal with religious themes as they study literature and philosophy. Art and drama are featuring religion in public exhibitions and presentations. Students who are preparing to be teachers in the elementary and high schools take course work in dealing with how such schools can foster moral and spiritual values. The library reports an increasing circulation in its excellent collection of religious literature for the layman.

The fact that religion is alive and vital at the University of Texas should be good news to those who are concerned with the university's impact upon students. However, it would be a mistake to convey the impression that most of us are satisfied with the achievements to date. We can see the need for expanding the influence of religion to thousands of students not now touched sufficiently by it, as well as the need for enabling students to reach religious maturity as they reach intellectual maturity. To meet these needs is not easy and will require the best thinking of church officials, faculty members, and students themselves. But, we are working together at the job and making real progress on a tremendously important phase of education for living.

June 1954 Valedictory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 1954

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, recently awarded a Fulbright scholarship to further his studies abroad, Mr. Roy Barnett, Jr., a distinguished constituent of the 13th District of New Jersey, graduated magna cum laude on June 6 of this year from St. Peter's College in Jersey City, N. J. It was his honor to deliver the class valedictory, his third; the first he delivered in grammar school, the second in preparatory school. If there is a counterpart to a valedictory under the Fulbright setup, one can be sure that Roy will make it.

The June 1954 valedictory delivered by Roy sparkles with the yearning of youth to be honest, to be pure, to be unselfish, and to be in love.

Under unanimous consent, the address follows:

JUNE 1954 VALEDICTORY

(By Roy Frederick Barnett, Jr.)

The past, the present, and the future—these are the three threads which weave the pattern of our very lives. The past for many of us has been our 4 years at a Catholic college. It has been a unique experience. For the Catholic college is different. It is more than a cluster of ivy-covered buildings attached to a library and a gymnasium. It is not merely the place where we learned that Shakespeare wrote 154 sonnets or that there are 5 basic types of human tissue. Nor is it just another school with the added attraction of advanced religion courses tacked on to the rest of the curriculum. The Catholic college is different because its all encompassing purpose is to give the student the valid Christian motives for life. It is interested in training men not only to be lawyers or scientists or teachers, but to be saints and lawyers, saints and scientists, saints and teachers. This is the kind of education we have just completed. Now it is part of our past. We stand in the present, Sunday afternoon, June 6, 1954. This day is an auspicious one. It is charged with sparks of hope and clouded by the shadows of danger. The hope is the hope of the Feast of Pentecost when the Holy Ghost enlightened men's minds with the sacred flame. It is the hope of proud families who have seen their sons receive the coveted diplomas, the hope of the faculty professors who have so generously striven to help us attain our goals, the hope of the graduates who soon will leave this stadium, and take a personal place in the world. But there are warnings, too. The warning of a June 6, 10 years ago, D-day, when invasion became the fact on the Normandy beaches. There is the warning that comes from the hot green jungles of Indochina and the warnings that come from Los Alamos and Eniwetok with their threats of grotesque and overwhelming disasters.

There is hope and there is warning. Both are reflected into our futures.

Today for a great many of us it is the end of formal education. And so it might be wise to consider just what our position must be as Catholic College graduates in the shape of things to come. Pius, the 12th, has told us. He has demanded that we be more than apologists for the truth, he demands that we be witnesses of it. By this he means that our every action must be an embodiment of our ideals. Every Christian has a mission to strive not only for his own sanctification but also that of his fellow men. We must be more than saviors of individuals, we must be saviors of society.

The doctor must be more than a healer of bodies, he must be a healer of souls. Not content simply with his own personal integrity he must strive to extend charity through the ranks of the whole medical profession.

The lawyer must be more than a clever weaver of words to win a case. Both in court and in the chamber he must be the steadfast and untiring champion of liberty and justice.

The businessman must not be satisfied to turn a quick but earnest dollar. He must unite with his associates to reconstruct the social order according to the principles of Leo XIII and Pius XI.

The creative artist must be more than a competent technician with poetic intuition. His grasp of the incarnation must make him see more deeply into realty and express it with more vision and color.

The world dies without such reform.

Karl Marx was a single intellectual pouring over his texts in the staid London Museum but he started a revolution motivated by hate that now engulfs over half of the globe. Can not we hundreds of college graduates spark our own revolution motivated by love and guided by Christian principles?

The Middle Ages had their challenge. And the Gothic cathedrals were built. Dante has written his Divine Comedy. We have our challenge too. Poetic vision can and must be restated in the 20th century idiom. The new fledged age of atomic science can and must be interpreted in terms of Christian philosophy. A stable social order must be erected on the value of justice and love.

This is our task. It is not a novel one, but it is new for us. We must work at it with all muscle and brain. It will not be easy. But we are refreshed by the experience and knowledge of our past, by our strength in the present, and by our courage for the future.

Public Laws 384 to 388, Inclusive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 17, 1954

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am extending my remarks to include my report to my constituents on recent legislation, as follows:

TWENTY-EIGHTH REPORT ON LEGISLATION OF THE 83D CONGRESS

DEAR FRIEND: Here are the most recent laws enacted by the 83d Congress. You will notice that some of the measures passed the House by consent. Perhaps I should explain.

The Consent Calendar (called twice a month) lists certain bills unanimously reported from committee and on which there is thought to be no controversy. They must be on the calendar at least 3 days before consideration.

Meanwhile printed volumes of the public hearings, if any were held, are made available to all Members together with the printed reports and recommendations of the committees. This gives Members ample opportunity by diligent homework to acquaint themselves with the provisions of the bills.

When the Consent Calendar is called if any Member is in doubt on a measure he can stop further immediate consideration by joining with others in an objection or merely by requesting that the bill go over without prejudice. Otherwise the bill is declared passed by unanimous consent, usually with no one actually voting. Silence is equivalent to an affirmative vote. The purpose of the Consent Calendar is to expedite the legislative work of the Congress.

PUBLIC LAW 384

H. R. 7541, National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics: This is a perfecting amendment. It perfects the language without changing the substance. The organic act of the National Advisory Committee on Aeronautics specifies that one of the 17 members of NACA shall be the chairman of the Research Development Board of the Department of Defense. But presently there is no such office since Reorganization Plan No. 6 of 1953 abolished the office of Chairman of the board and transferred his duties to a selectee of the Secretary of Defense. Public Law 384 substitutes "one Department of Defense representative who is acquainted with the needs of aeronautical research and development" for the old language. Thus by this perfecting arrangement NACA continues to have the helpful representation of the aeronautical research expert of the Defense Department regardless what his title.

PUBLIC LAW 385

H. R. 116, transportation of fireworks: You will find local interest in Public Law 385 since its enactment resulted from a popular indignation in Chicago following a premature celebration of July 4 of 1951. Three children were killed by the explosion of bootleg fireworks, prohibited by the laws of Illinois, but obtained by the children mailing a coupon from a comic book to a manufacturer outside of the State and receiving through shipment by railway express a package containing such power of destruction as should not have been permitted to pass into their hands.

The late beloved A. L. Brody then was coroner of Cook County. He inaugurated the movement that culminated 3 years later, almost to the day, in this law making criminal the interstate shipment of fireworks into any State in which the sale or use of such fireworks is prohibited.

At present 36 States, including Illinois, have comprehensive legislation on the subject, 10 have regulatory statutes, only 2 (Nevada and Tennessee) have no legislation whatever. But all any child had to do to obtain illegal fireworks was to cut out and mail coupons freely inserted in comic books and magazines to an out-of-State manufacturer for direct shipment to the purchaser. Public Law 385 stops that. It becomes effective July 1, 1954.

The July 4 observation of 1952 was marked by 266 bootleg fireworks accidents (9 deaths, 8 of children) in Illinois. Future celebrations of Independence Day will not be so desecrated. Thanks go to an alert public official in Chicago, who after the 1951 tragedy did something about it beyond his routine duties as coroner. Public Law 385 is a monument to the memory of "Al" Brody. I always regarded him as a pattern of what a public servant should be in integrity, alertness, courtesy, and genuine interest in advancing the public welfare.

The bill passed the House by voice. In the Senate there was a rollcall. Senator Douglas was among the 73 who voted for the measure. Senator Dirksen was absent. Senator Joseph McCarthy, of Wisconsin, was among the 3 Senators who voted "no."

PUBLIC LAW 386

H. R. 232, Tent City, Ind.: Tent City, an area of some 14 acres adjacent to Stout Field in Indianapolis, was used for barracks by the Air Force during World War II. Public Law 386 authorizes its transfer to the State of Indiana for the exclusive use of the National Guard, subject to its return to the United States in the event of a war emergency. The House passed the bill by consent.

PUBLIC LAW 387

H. R. 1815, sale and lease of public lands for recreational use: This marked the final legislative accomplishment of the late Senator Hunt (cancer victim, second Member in the history of the United States Senate to die of self-inflicted wounds). His interest stemmed from the desire of the city of Worland, Wyo. (in the Big Horn Basin on the route to Yellowstone National Park), to obtain 160 acres of unused federally owned land for an 18-hole municipal golf course, wading pool for children, tennis courts, picnic, and parking facilities. Senator Hunt argued that small tracts of the public domain lying waste and useless for other purposes should be made available to local governments in contributing to the out-of-doors enjoyment of the public. I think he was entirely right.

Public Law 387 gives a limited authority to the Secretary of the Interior to sell (at 50 percent appraised value) small isolated tracts to States, Territories, municipalities, and nonprofit associations (Boy Scouts as an example) for camping, recreational, and similar uses. Land in national parks and monuments properly are excluded. Oil and mineral rights are reserved. Public Law 387 also broadens the leasing provisions of the Recreation Act of 1926.

Especially benefited will be Alaska, where 99.9 percent of the total land area is owned by the Federal Government.

The House passed the measure by consent.

PUBLIC LAW 388

H. R. 2225, binoculars loaned to the Navy: If perchance you loaned binoculars to the United States Navy during World War II, I suggest you lose no time in reclaiming them. For 7 years after the close of the war the Navy Department has been trying to locate the owners to keep its pledge of return of the property. Thirty sets of binoculars remain unclaimed. Public Law 388 relieves the Navy of the continuing burden of keeping the binoculars on hand while it goes on trying to find the owners. After December 31, 1954, the Navy is authorized to call it a day as far as binoculars are concerned.

Public Law 388 also covers other administrative matters of minor importance. Routine legislation.

When you visit Washington please drop in on us at 1420, my office, in the New House Office Building. It means so much to the happiness of us all.

Cordially and sincerely,

Barratt O'Hara,
Member of Congress.

What Happened to the Bust?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 17, 1954

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the Congressional Record an editorial which appeared in the Daily Times, Mamaroneck, N. Y., on Monday, June 14, 1954, titled "What Happened to the Bust?"

WHAT HAPPENED TO THE BUST?

It was around the first of the year, wasn't it, when the gloom-and-doom boys began working us over?

We were going to have a depression. Business was on the skids. Breadlines were being formed. Unemployment would mount. People had stopped buying. Farmers would soon be mortgage-foreclosed into the poorhouse. Wall Street was going to have one "black Friday" after another.

Remember?

The only thing which would save the Nation from utter collapse and ruin was another New Deal pump-priming job, with a huge public-works program, lowered interest rates, higher unemployment pay, more Government subsidies, easier terms on installment buying—all the boondoggling and "gimmie" favors which featured the two preceding administrations.

Remember the cries of warning from Walter Reuther and Senator Paul Douglas, of Illinois, the self-anointed prophets of the doom-and-gloom era? Remember the demands upon President Eisenhower from spokesmen for the CIO, and the Socialists—there is little distinction—that we restore the New Deal or "go bust"?

Well, what has happened?

Construction is setting new records. Home buildings and sales are holding up fine. Orders to manufacturers are rising each month. Production is rising to keep pace with demand. Prices have firmed and inflation has been halted. Stores report excellent sales. Wall Street's 60 representative stocks hit a new high. There is more employment than ever before.

Lost, strayed or stolen: One "bust."

No reward if found.

Resolution by the Medical Society of New Jersey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 1954

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, here follows a resolution by the Medical Society of New Jersey dealing with medical and hospital care:

Whereas the most urgent problem in the distribution of medical care is that relating to the provision of medical and hospital care for elderly and aged, disabled, physically and mentally handicapped, indigent, medically indigent, unemployable, and employed persons for whom adequate medical and hospital care cannot be provided by established prepaid sickness insurance plans operated upon sound insurance principles; and

Whereas medical and hospital care for such persons can be provided on a cost-plus or reimbursable basis through tax subsidies from tax funds administered on a local level by nonpartisan, nonpolitical, and nonprofit organizations, as has been demonstrated so clearly and convincingly by the medical service administration of New Jersey in its operation of the city of Newark plan for the provision of medical care to indigent and medically indigent; and

Whereas the commendable objectives of President Eisenhower and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, as set forth in proposed reinsurance legislation now before the Congress of the United States and sponsored by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and her advisors, cannot possibly be attained without a huge subsidy by the Federal Government and without the risk of Federal control of the insurance industry and the socialization of medicine; and

Whereas Senator H. ALEXANDER SMITH and Congressman CHARLES A. WOLVERTON, of New Jersey, have demonstrated their interest in and concern for the attainment of a solution of the problem of the distribution of medical care by sponsorship of S. 3114 and H. R. 8356 respectively: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the attention of Senator SMITH and Congressman WOLVERTON be drawn to the really pressing facets of the medical care problem and that they be urged to concentrate their attention and effort upon legislation designed to make adequate medical and hospital care available to indigent and medically indigent persons, and that these legislators be courteously reminded of the contribution already made by the Medical Society of New Jersey in the field of medical care of indigent and medically indigent persons by the establishment of the effectively functioning Medical Service Administration of New Jersey, and that the Medical Society of New Jersey offer to collaborate with Senator SMITH, Congressman WOLVERTON and other legislators in the development of an appropriate and satisfactory bill designed to provide adequate medical and hospital care for the indigent and medically indigent; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and to our Senators and Congressmen from New Jersey, secretary and chairman of the legislative committee of the AMA, and other appropriate agencies.

THE MEDICAL SOCIETY OF NEW JERSEY,
Trenton, N. J., June 10, 1954.

Hon. ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI,
United States House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN SIEMINSKI: The house of delegates of the Medical Society of New Jersey, assembled at the 188th annual meeting of that organization, adopted the attached resolution and directed that a copy be forwarded to you for your information and possible action.

Respectfully yours,
MARCUS H. GREIFINGER, M. D.,
Secretary.

Inexpert Expert

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 17, 1954

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend the following editorial from the June 11, 1954, issue of the New York Times to our colleagues' attention. The advice contained therein is worthy of our attention:

INEXPERT EXPERT

How inexpert can an "expert" be? The country now has one indication of the answer in Wednesday's demonstration by Thomas M. McNiece, associate research director of the House committee investigating foundations. He was the "expert" who was so unwary as to conclude that several unidentified quotations "paralleled very closely Communist ideals," only to learn that they were quotations from Papal encyclicals—one of them a half century old.

Representative HAYS, who arranged this demonstration, has emphasized one useful lesson—namely, the ease with which quotations out of context can be misinterpreted. But there is another and perhaps even more important lesson. This is the "why" of Mr. McNiece's error.

Mr. McNiece could have adjudged the Papal paragraphs communistic only on the ground that all serious criticism of the existing political, economic, and social order is communistic. It is true that the Communists criticize our society. They loudly attack poverty, low wages, poor housing, racial discrimination, and the like. But does this make all criticism of poverty, low wages, poor housing, racial discrimination and the like communistic?

Mr. McNiece has missed the essential point: what is dangerous about Communists in this country is not their criticism—justified or unjustified—of our society. Communists are dangerous because in the last analysis they are agents of a wicked foreign power, the Soviet Union. Communist Party policy is not basically dictated by concern over injustices and inequities here, but by the needs of Kremlin foreign policy and Kremlin plans for world domination.

Our society needs all the honest criticism it can get. Only in that way can we be stimulated toward improvement. But to identify communism with honest criticism gives the Communists a prestige and honor they do not merit.

The Guard's General Paxton Retires

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. SMITH

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1954

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, Maj. Gen. A. G. Paxton is retiring as commanding general of the 31st—Dixie—Division, after a brilliant record of military service in three wars. General Paxton was made commanding general of the 31st Division when it was reconstituted as the National Guard Division for Mississippi and Alabama following World War II. Under his command the division was soon recognized as one of the best trained National Guard units in the country. Because of this fine record, it was one of the first divisions mobilized into service after the outbreak of the Korean war. The division itself was not sent into Korea, but served as a training vehicle for thousands of men and officers who served with distinction in combat in Korea.

General Paxton's service is in the best tradition of a long line of distinguished American militiamen. Under unanimous consent, I include the following editorial from the Greenville (Miss.) Delta Democrat-Times, written by Hodding Carter, who served under General Paxton in World War II:

THE GUARD'S GENERAL PAXTON RETIRES

Back in the midthirties when we came to Greenville, folks had more time on their hands than money in their pockets, and a lot of our friends spent much of that spare time joking with each other around at Gervys Lusk's brokerage and cotton exchange. Even though times were hard, few took much of anything seriously in those daily gatherings, and least of all were they serious about Col. Galla Paxton and his 114th Field Artillery of the National Guard's Dixie Division.

Galla felt differently about it. He used to rear back a little when Brodie Crump drew what passed for cartoons of Colonel Paxton or some of the others would kid him about his spare time dollar-a-drill artillerymen. In fact, Galla didn't think it was funny.

Four or five years later, no one was making jokes about the National Guard, which was just about all we had to rush into combat or to use to train the new selectees. We went along with the 114th when Galla took it to fantastically unpleasant Camp Blanding; and it was there that we learned to what purpose Galla and his staff had worked. In all modesty as an unimportant and near-useless member of that regiment, we say it was the best outfit in the best National Guard division of them all.

That was because Galla Paxton had devoted much of his energy and zeal to the National Guard ever since he had come out of World War I as a young lieutenant. He led Mississippi's guardsmen and others through World War II, and he came out a brigadier general. He led the Dixie Division itself into service during the Korean war, this time as a major general; and we'd say that is a pretty fair 37-year record for a fellow who is a cottonman and not a professional soldier.

This month Maj. Gen. Alexander Gallatin Paxton, commanding officer of the 31st Division, retires from service. Maybe we ought to let go now with a lot of high sounding, many-syllabled phrases about devotion and patriotism, all of which would be true enough. But we think it's more to the point to remind Galla, and our friends who used to kid him, of those long-ago days when most of us didn't think we had anything to worry about but 12-cent cotton. And just for the record we'd like to put down again something about Galla in a book not long ago:

"Looking back now, I know that the Nation should have thanked God for the inept Guard divisions, for men like Bullwhip Shorty Paxton and his civilian-soldier subordinates who fashioned the youngsters of a country with no strong military tradition into an indispensable nucleus of the most powerful fighting force the battered world has ever known."

You can take that as a special citation, General, from the most unsoldierly lieutenant who ever got in your hair. We're even giving you a willing and admiring salute, and with it the thanks of more people that you might suspect. And with all our heart, we pray that you won't be needed again.

Public Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1954

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the House, I trust, will shortly have another opportunity to vote on public housing. The old argument of "socialism" will again be heard. It is, therefore, appropriate to call attention to the following indisputable facts.

Those who live in the so-called better neighborhoods pay heavy taxes to offset the lower taxes that are paid by the slum areas, most of which higher taxes are poured into the poorer neighborhoods to make up the excess costs of maintaining those areas.

For instance:

Boston, taking the city as a whole, the average Bostonian pays $74.40 in taxes. But the average slum dweller pays only $13.30 in taxes, even though it costs the city $92.30 per slum dweller to govern and care for the blighted areas.

Hartford, every Hartford citizen outside of the slum areas pays an extra $2.28 in taxes to maintain the slums.

Baltimore, a blighted area less than 10 percent of the city's total size receives 40 percent of the total city expenditures.

Denver, 6 percent of the city's population living in blighted area receives 40 percent of the city's general relief funds, 34 percent of all aid to dependent children, accounts for 32 percent of all police calls, produces 30 percent of hospital caseload.

Every sensible realtor will tell you the same story that is so well told in the following article by Carroll McGaughey, which appeared in the Democratic Digest of June 1954:

A REALTOR DEFENDS PUBLIC HOUSING

(By Carroll McGaughey)

For the past decade, a considerable portion of R. Redding Stevenson's diet has consisted of his own words. He has discovered, however, that eating them, now that they have been well seasoned with experience, is not entirely distasteful.

In 1938, Stevenson, as president of the Little Rock Real Estate Board, headed a group of realtors who journeyed to Memphis to take a close look at the then brand-new Dixie Homes, one of the Nation's first low-rent public-housing projects, hopefully heralded as a step toward ridding the city of slums. The special investigators looked over the project, talked to the administrators, admired the buildings, and returned.

Thereupon quoth Mr. Stevenson: "The venture has every appearance of being a beautiful ideal, entirely impractical under a democratic and sound government. A beautiful—but vain—attempt at Utopia."

In 1940, Stevenson—still a member of the real estate board and still opposed to public housing—supported his close personal friend, J. V. Satterfield, Jr., in the latter's successful race for mayor of Little Rock.

From the mayor's office, Satterfield promptly issued a statement that he favored the creation of a public-housing authority to take advantage of a $1 million Federal allotment to Little Rock for construction of low-rent dwellings.

"I," says Stevenson simply, "hit the ceiling."

Stevenson helped beat back Satterfield's first attempt at creation of an authority, appearing with other opponents at the city council meeting at which the proposal was narrowly defeated.

Then there was an ominous shift in the Little Rock business picture. World War II clouds were boiling up, the Nation's defense effort was shifting into high gear. There were intimations that Camp Robinson would be reopened, and a boom for business was promised if it did. But a hitch developed. Little Rock had a housing shortage, the Army took a dim view of opening a camp so near an already overcrowded city. Satterfield went to Washington; Stevenson, still friendly, met him at the airport on his return.

"Maybe I'd better tell you what I've done before I get into your car," said Satterfield. "You may not want to drive me home."

Satterfield explained he had again set the wheels in motion to take advantage of the million-dollar public-housing fund earmarked for Little Rock. Stevenson drove the mayor home, but he argued ("I wouldn't be surprised if I used a little profanity," he says) the entire distance. Satterfield held his ground.

"Just as I drove into his driveway, he added insult to injury," Stevenson now recalls with a chuckle. "He just said, 'Steve, you haven't heard anything yet. I want to appoint you chairman of Little Rock's housing authority.' "

Skip now to 1948. R. Redding Stevenson that year was named outstanding housing official in the National Association of Housing Officials' southwest region; the following year he became a member of the association's board of directors.

Last year the Little Rock Housing Authority, which he still heads, was named the best in the Nation for cities of between 100,000 and 1 million population.

There was no abrupt about-face in Stevenson's attitude toward public housing. He's not even sure exactly when his own mental balance tipped from negative to positive.

"Why did I accept? Well, I figured it this way," he says candidly. "It had become apparent that the national public-housing program had become established. Then there was this Camp Robinson thing. Facing facts, it looked to me as though Little Rock was going to have a public-housing program whether the real estate board wanted it or not. I took the job with the idea of 'policing' the program. I wasn't two-faced about it. When I accepted the chairmanship I laid it on the line. The 250 housing units were going to be built, all right, but I was going to help see that the agency didn't get into competition with the real-estate business. It was a dollars-and-cents matter with me then."

The units were built—Sunset Terrace and Highland Park for whites and Tuxedo Courts for Negroes. For the duration of the war they had a high percentage of occupancy by defense workers and military personnel. But in 1945 the defense emergency ended and "we were faced with having to convert them to low-rent projects, their original purpose."

Stevenson's feeling about public housing already had begun to mellow. Experience at Little Rock and at other cities with larger programs had shown him something he had not believed before: Adequate housing for low income families was "a tremendous instrument in the rehabilitation of those families."

The crisis for Little Rock's program, Stevenson feels, came in 1949 and 1950. The Housing Act of 1949, in addition to the funds it made available for construction of new dwelling units, also contained a section aimed at the planned clearance and redevelopment of slum and blighted areas.

Already the city had begun on its problem by voting in 1949 a $359,000 bond issue for creation of a Negro park and community center. Now the Housing Authority determined that the city must have approximately 1,000 dwelling units, most of them for Negroes. While construction funds for the units were available from the Government, funds for rehabilitation and redevelopment of slum areas required the city to put up one-third of the cash. Little Rock didn't have the cash to put up.

But in the 1949 Housing Act was a provision that if a city built schools, parks, and other facilities in accord with a comprehensive plan that measured up to those envisioned under the act, the value of the projects could be used in lieu of cash for matching money. Stevenson and others believed that, with some modifications, the projects planned under the $359,000 bond issue could be used to match the Federal allotment. They asked a temporary holdup on the spending of the money.

A public referendum was called on the housing program, and the scene was set for one of the hottest political fights ever witnessed in Little Rock. The housing program won by a 5 to 4 margin.

A week after the referendum, Stevenson and the late architect George Wittenberg boarded a plane for Washington bearing two suitcases full of documents, books, surveys and plans. Little Rock became the first city in the Nation to qualify for and receive slum clearance money under the "in lieu of cash" provision.

Since that date 928 dwelling units have been built. The projects include the 400-unit Booker Homes project at Granite Mountain, a 50-unit addition to Tuxedo Courts (renamed Ives Homes), and the 200-unit Hollinsworth Homes, all for Negroes, plus a 278-unit expansion of the Highland Park project for white residents. Total cost of this construction, all from Federal funds, came to $9,686,000.

Approximately 90 percent complete is the Dunbar redevelopment project which has completely cleared seven blocks surrounding the biggest Negro school center in the city and "spot cleared" three more blocks to allow for relocation of the repaired best homes in the seven-block area. The cleared area provided a block for a new community center, already completed with funds from the $359,000 bond issue, and three blocks for expansion of school facilities.

Awaiting final approval in Washington before the grant is forthcoming is the redevelopment plan in the Granite Mountain area surrounding Booker Homes.

Stevenson points to the Booker project as his defense for his changed attitude toward housing. Because of natural barriers, Little Rock's natural development had been forced westward. The blockade to the south was Fourche Creek and a series of railroad tracks which made the cost of extending trunk sewer and water lines toward Granite Mountain uneconomic for private business. The huge size of the Federal project made the "jump" feasible. The result was the opening up of a vast new area for present and future expansion.

"Private enterprise never could have done it, and probably never would have been able to," said Stevenson.

With the pressure of his private business duties, the personal condemnation he endured during the critical phases of the program, why has Stevenson stuck with the thankless—and unpaid—job he had accepted unenthusiastically in the first place?

"Well, first I've become convinced not only that low-rent public housing is the only answer for rehousing people in slum and blighted areas, but since 1940 it has become increasingly apparent that private enterprise cannot and will not build housing for this group of people.

"And," he adds with a grin, "you know the old business about the man who grabbed a tiger by the tail? Well, I still haven't found a time that I could turn loose."

Address of Governor Dewey at Albert Einstein College of Medicine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 1954

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, appended is the text of an address by Gov. Thomas E. Dewey delivered on the momentous occasion of the placing of the cornerstone of Albert Einstein College of Medicine of Yeshiva University, the Bronx, N. Y., Sunday, June 13, 1954:

It is a high privilege to take part in this ceremony. To start a new institution devoted to human healing in the midst of a world torn by agonizing and uncertainties is a magnificent affirmation of faith in the true mission of man upon this earth.

The Albert Einstein College of Medicine at Yeshiva University will not only train future generations of physicians and surgeons in the healing arts with faithful adherence to the historic ideals of American Jewry, but it will select its faculty and admit students on the basis of scholarship and ability, without regard to race, creed, color, or sex.

It has given me a particularly warm feeling of personal relationship that the leader of this magnificent enterprise has been for 12 years my partner in the government of the State, the distinguished Attorney General Nathaniel Goldstein. I know how much of his heart, his strength, and his substance he has given to the cause and all of us—the people of the city, the State, and the Nation are in his debt.

Yeshiva will soon be doing more than its part in meeting the great and pressing need for doctors, and it is particularly gratifying that in so doing we are also paying honor to one of the greatest scientists of our generation—Dr. Albert Einstein.

I often wish that there were a tradition in our public life to correspond with the great tradition of scientific inquiry and medical training which are here so nobly combined in the Albert Einstein College of Medicine. Scientific and medical progress rests, above all, on a fierce determination to relate effects to causes, symptoms to diseases, and to find the general laws which govern life and nature on the basis of patient, honest observation, experiment and knowledge.

Yet the same man or woman who will unhesitatingly accept—even insist on—X-rays, blood tests, and other medical devices where his own bodily health is concerned, will base his political opinions and philosophy on capsule information—on headlines, 5-minute news summaries, on gossip columnists, or hearsay. Even as we expect scientific accuracy of doctors, engineers, and other learned professions, too many of us take smear for truth, charge for proof, opinions for fact. There are people who accept insinuation as evidence and character assassination as excusable. In these circumstances nations become divided, high emotions rule, and the science of government is a tragic victim.

For example, we are all against disease. So are the witch doctors. We know the difference in medicine but we sometimes fail to see it in politics. Here at Yeshiva we are all wholly committed to the hard task of curing disease by finding and removing its causes through the scientific approach. Why cannot this also be true of politics?

Our danger is typified by the threat of the hydrogen bomb, which is, of course, Albert Einstein's intellectual grandchild. The threat of the abrupt extinction of civilization and perhaps of the human race is, I submit, as worthy to be combated as cancer, heart disease, or tuberculosis.

Yet we find that the approaches to a sober, patient, scientific study and solution of this problem are blocked by mental barbarians who prefer criticism to intelligent action. They are against the danger and are also against any attempt to deal with it.

One example is the Communist aggression in Indochina. Indochina is the key to southeast Asia—Burma, Malaya, Thailand, and Indonesia—which provide rice to Japan and nine-tenths of the free world's rubber and 60 percent of the tin. If the Communists gain control of this vital area, they expect to starve Japan into surrender and if Japan's industries and hard-working people fall under Communist control the whole Pacific is in mortal peril.

There just seems to be too many people in this country who will always claim that everything Government does is a fatal mistake, an irretrievable blunder, a sellout, a betrayal.

This point of view dictates that if the American Government should take action in Indochina, any number of our citizens will promptly accuse the President of warmongering and risking a third world war, while if we do not act the very same people will accuse the administration of supine surrender or appeasement of the forces of communism. Such people are on both sides of every issue. They are all things to all men.

It was Woodrow Wilson who called for open covenants openly arrived at. But even he could never have foreseen the openness of modern diplomacy. Surely, he could not have foreseen the vulgar level of tyrannical abuse and fantastic falsehood to which international relations have been reduced by Communist spokesmen.

Even this can be turned to our advantage provided we are as astute and skillful in the use of the conferences to present the truth to the free world. I honestly believe that we have made mighty progress in this direction.

At least we on the free side are dealing in the open and what happens? We find elements of the press and public officers denouncing one ally or another because they do not agree with our every thought. Some denounce another ally because of its unhappy political instability. We find others denouncing our policy of shoring up weak nations because we have not by the wave of a wand succeeded in transforming ancient poverty into a carbon copy of American comfort, luxury, and political stability.

It is a hard fact that our free system has made America so colossally productive and rich that both Hitler and Stalin commented enviously on its miraculous capacity to produce. Our very genius for production has made us the leaders of the free world and as a people I regret to say that I think we are not yet willing to accept the great and sober responsibilities which go with great power.

What do we need? We must grow a hundred years in a decade. We need to grow in maturity, in forbearance, in understanding of other people's difficulties and, most of all, we need to acquire a little sense of humility.

We are not all-wise. There are nations which existed a thousand years before the discovery of America. I suggest that they acquired some wisdom during those centuries.

We are not so powerful that we do not need friends. All of America's might would grind to a halt if we lost access to the critical raw materials of other nations.

We can provide the free world with strength and give it courage. Our allies around the world can provide the wisdom and experience of centuries of survival as well as hundreds of millions of people on our side.

It is almost incredible that the catastrophies which have befallen the free world are more the result of the careless acceptance of falsehood than of the superior skill or strength of totalitarianism.

I can remember when naive people in the 1930's were deluded into apologizing for Soviet tyranny and the purges of tens of millions of human beings. I can remember when others even sought to justify the notorious Stalin-Hitler pact which resulted in the launching of all the horrors of World War II.

We can all remember what happened in the late 1940's. We were told that Free China was so incompetent and corrupt that "it was not worth saving," while Mao Tse-tung was just a pleasant "agrarian reformer." Of course we now know that Mao Tse-tung has murdered some 10 to 15 million of his own people in a tyranny which makes Genghis Khan look like a peaceful shepherd.

The incredible thing is that after Free China fell to Communist dictatorship, there were too many who swallowed the identical line about Korea. It was "incompetent and corrupt"—it was "not worth saving," according to the propaganda line.

Why is this so relevant? It is relevant right now, today, because we are again hearing that the non-Communist leaders of Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos in Indochina are "not worth saving."

What will happen tomorrow I do not know, but I venture the prophecy that we will begin hearing the same about Thailand, Burma, Malaya, and Indonesia, the sixth largest nation on earth with its 80 million people.

If this process continues we eventually will be hearing from the same sources that we, ourselves, in a surrounded world, are "incompetent and corrupt" and that America, like its fallen friends, is "not worth saving."

I do not here presume to give you the answer on the desperately difficult problem of Indochina. Having spent a summer 3 years ago in that area, and written a book on the subject, I know enough to know that I do not know all the answers. But this I do know, that unless we lift our sights, broaden our point of view, learn to love our fellowmen more and understand our friends more generously, we shall end up with no friends and ultimately no country.

There is still time to save the free world. The incredible strength of our industry and our scientific achievement can win the arms race. But neither science nor industry can prevent us from rushing headlong to our own destruction. Only free Americans can do that—the whole American people.

We are committing many sins against our children today. We are allowing a miserable television show in Washington to divert the attention, not only of this country, but of the free world, from the threats to its very foundations.

We listen eagerly to people who tear down the leadership in one after another of the free countries just because their governments are not like ours. We, ourselves, are far from perfect and we had better grow up fast enough to extend to others, from France to India, and from Indonesia to Britain, the same tolerance of their difficulties which we ask them to extend to us. If they should judge us by our preoccupation with the stupidities, or, if you will, the cruelties of single individuals, we would lose our world leadership and a free world.

These times call for greatness—greatness of mind and spirit and charity of soul. Surely in the American tradition in which we, the melting pot of the world have learned to live together in happiness and harmony, we can make that century of growth in a decade if we will only determine that freedom is worth it.

We have one other decision to make and it is a hard one. We must recognize that the free world is indivisible. If a million people 10,000 miles from New York are swallowed up by the Communist maw, we have lost brothers into slavery. It makes no difference whether this occurs in Southeast Asia, in the Near East or in Central America. Each time, we have lost a finger or a toe or a limb or perhaps we have suffered a fatal injury to our heart.

We can, indeed, grow up to our responsibilities but we must do it fast. The first thing we must do is to stop cavilling at the defects of others who would like to remain free and independent, whether we think of them as close friends or not.

Second, we must learn to recognize that other peoples have differing kinds of government and to respect them even as we expect them to respect us.

Thirdly, we must recognize that we cannot make the world over into our image and if we succeeded the result would not be what we had hoped.

Fourth, we must learn to recognize that those who would divide us by appeals to passion or hatred or jealousy are not more political partisans but are enemies of freedom itself.

Fifth, we must learn to recognize that the differences of opinion among free nations are the very heart of our strength. We are fighting a cold war—perhaps a cold war of a hundred years—and we are fighting it for the very right to disagree. That principle applies as much in international affairs as it does between neighbors or between friends or between scholars. We must learn to recognize that the very divergencies which create such unhappy headlines in international affairs are the secret of the basic strength of free nations.

Sixth, in all things, we must recognize that we cannot leave to the enemy the exclusive right to make compromises in order to make gains. It is a truism in diplomacy, that if either side wins the result is a failure because the loser becomes an enemy. In the same way, if we appear to dominate the thinking of the free world we no longer would have friends, but reluctant puppets who would resent us as much as the common enemy. We must be willing to accept genuine, equal partnership.

From a low level of petty disagreement, we have to rise to the high level of realizing that we must live in peace with every free nation however much we may disagree on many things. The cause of freedom is too great to permit the termites of pettiness to destroy the house.

In laying the cornerstone of the Albert Einstein School of Medicines, we are symbolizing our own point of view at home. We really believe that we are each our brother's keeper. We really believe that each life created by God is precious and this medical school is designated to save it. We really believe that every man was created equal in the sight of his Maker and that discrimination on grounds of race, color, creed, or national origin is an evil thing.

We have not only led the Nation in enacting laws to express these principles during the last 12 years in the State of New York but we have accepted them in our minds and hearts.

If we can do these great things for our internal welfare, how much more important it is that we give the fullest devotion to these principles in order to preserve liberty itself.

Private Versus Public Power Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLIFFORD DAVIS

OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 23, 1954

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including a very splendidly written article by Mr. Lowell Mellett on the question of private versus public power.

Those of us in the Tennessee Valley Authority area are greatly disturbed by the President's directive to the Atomic Energy Commission to purchase power from a private plant to be erected in Arkansas which will cost over a period of 25 years more than $100 million more than it would cost should the federally owned TVA supply it.

The article follows:

PRIVATE VERSUS PUBLIC POWER ISSUE—PRESIDENT'S PHILOSOPHIC APPROACH TO TVA AND OTHER POWER DEVELOPMENTS IS BRINGING ON A MAJOR POLITICAL STORM

(By Lowell Mellett)

Creeping sabotage of public power programs continues throughout the country under the encouragement of the Eisenhower administration, but it continues also to meet with determined resistance. Already a political issue, thanks to the devious maneuvering of Interior Secretary McKay in the matter of certain big Western projects, it has exploded into a major battle, thanks to extraordinary steps taken by the President himself in the matter of TVA. First there was his refusal to reappoint Gordon Clapp as head of TVA, despite his illustrious record, the almost unanimous demand of the Tennessee region, and the lack of any competent successor. The President offered the excuse that he wants someone more in line with his own philosophic approach, whatever that may be. Second, there is his effort to eliminate TVA as a supplier of additional power to the Atomic Energy Commission. This seems certain to bring the whole public power issue to a head, as revealed by the rising storm in Congress.

The President quite probably believes he is striking a blow for the American way of life in the undertaking to curb the natural development of the Tennessee Valley Authority. But there is nothing wrong with the American way of life in the Tennessee Valley. Life has been getting better and better year by year in that region, better for the citizens and for business. There has been no encroachment on business, not even the private utility business, since the Government bought out the Commonwealth & Southern at a price highly profitable to the stockholders.

Before he allows his philosophic approach to carry him much further the President should take a look at what it has meant for another section of the country—New England. A task force of the Hoover Commission has been taking such a look.

New England in recent years has been threatened with the label once worn by the South, the Nation's Economic Problem No. 1. It has not kept pace with the national industrial growth. Public-power advocates attribute this largely to the fact that it has failed to develop its power resources. It is the only large geographic region in which there is no Federal power development of any kind, despite an abundance of fast-falling rivers. The hydroelectric potential of these rivers has not been fully utilized by the private utility companies and the companies have thus far fought off every proposal for Federal cooperation.

The result has been limited power production and high rates, putting New England industries at a disadvantage with their competitors in other sections. Many plants have closed or moved away. Unemployment is a serious problem.

Some figures furnished the Hoover task force by the United States Census Bureau illustrate what New England is up against. Power costs are 52 percent higher than in the country as a whole, 80 percent higher than in North Carolina and 246 percent higher than in Tennessee.

Pushing hardest for regional power development in New England are the labor organizations, whose members are among the chief victims of the present trend. The Textile Workers Union has made elaborate economic studies for itself. Union spokesmen report to the Hoover task force that the resistance of the private companies has not only been bad for everybody else but also bad for the companies. Their profits, due to limited output, are less than those enjoyed by private companies in regions developed by Federal aid.

A New England TVA might not solve all of that region's troubles, but it surely suggests a better philosophic approach than that which appears to be guiding the President at the moment.

E. L. (Ed) Williams, of Texas A. and M.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 8, 1954

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an article on Mr. E. L. Williams, who was vice director of the Texas Engineering Extension Service and who was a pioneer in the field of vocational education.

Mr. Williams was a professor of mine at the Agricultural and Mechanical College of Texas, and his warm and congenial personality endeared him to all the students who studied under him. While the article was written on June 9, today Mr. Williams is dead, but the engineering extension service in Texas will be a living tribute to his untiring service in the field of vocational education.

The article follows:

[From the Bryan (Tex.) Daily Eagle of June 9, 1954]

Only Illness Could Retire a Man Like E. L. Williams of Texas A. and M.

(By Eleanor Burchard)

E. L. (Ed) Williams, who built the Agricultural and Mechanics College of Texas' department of education into the Texas engineering extension service, has retired after nearly 30 years of service.

Serious illness has forced Mr. Williams' retirement at this time. No less drastic reason probably would suffice to induce him to give up the work to which he has devoted his life.

It has been part of his philosophy that a man who taught vocational subjects needed a solid background of experience in the working end of the business he was attempting to teach. His own experience is a living example of this tenet, for Ed Williams has always been intimate with work.

When he was only 12 he secured his first factory job, stretching his age a bit to meet the legal work age of 14. Although he had to keep out of sight when the inspectors made their rounds, he did his share of the work. And in those days the workday was 10 hours long and the boys earned the magnificent wage of 50 to 75 cents a day.

Although he was born April 9, 1893, at Sherman City, Mich., he moved at the age of 6 to Muskegon, manufacturing and port city on Lake Michigan. Muskegon boasted one of the most advanced public-school systems of that era including manual training for boys and girls from the 3d to the 12th grade.

Obliged to quit school at 14 for financial reasons, he decided to learn a trade and looked for a job with this in mind. He changed his plans a year and a half later when he learned that a neighbor boy who had completed the course at Hackley Manual Training Normal had secured a teaching job for $80 a month.

The youthful Williams returned to high school firmly dedicated to a teaching career. He was graduated from the Muskegon High School in 1913 and 2 years later finished at Hackley Normal. His first job was in the high school at Elkins, W. Va., where he established the school's first manual training course.

Within 2 years he had his own students at work and had set up night school classes for railroad-shop workers of the town. In 1917, he moved to McKeesport, Pa., where he was appointed acting supervisor with a manual training staff of several teachers in four schools.

He entered Army service in July 1918 and the end of World War I found him just 3 weeks short of a commission in the artillery. He returned to McKeesport and launched the first vocational drafting class in Pennsylvania following passage of the Smith-Hughes Act.

Three years later he was in Braddock, Pa., as director of vocational education, building a vocational program in the schools to serve the vast industries of the Pittsburgh area. He remained at this post until he came to Texas in 1925.

Somehow between his hours in the classroom and bread-and-butter jobs as machinist, millwright, carpenter, woodchopper, draftsman, sawmill worker, printer, and cabinet worker he managed to acquire a college education. It took nearly 10 years.

Since his graduation from Hackley Normal, which was not accredited, he had taken Saturday, night and summer work at any college which happened to be handy. From the University of Wisconsin, University of Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania State and Carnegie Institute of Technology he finally accumulated enough credits for a bachelor's degree.

With much of his education acquired through extension courses, the only one of his alma maters for which he could meet residence requirements was the University of Pittsburgh. He received his diploma from this institution in August 1925 just before coming to Texas.

Five years later, having sandwiched graduate courses into a busy schedule as a college department head, Mr. Williams received his master of science degree from the A. and M. College of Texas.

It was perhaps as well that he pushed on toward his graduate degree during his early years at A. and M. because his department of industrial education flourished, expanding to an industrial extension service offering college credit courses by 1940.

When in 1948 the Texas Engineering Extension Service was created with Mr. Williams as vice director, A. and M. had become the fountain head for industrial training for the entire State.

Since its organization the service has trained an average 10,000 Texans annually for work in industry and municipal jobs through extension classes held throughout the State. Such annual courses as the fireman's training school and the police officers school have received national recognition.

In 1946 Mr. Williams was elected president of the National Association of Industrial Teacher-Trainers and in 1949 he headed the American Vocational Association. He has also held high offices in the Texas State Teachers Association and the Texas Vocational Association.

He was given leave of absence by the college in 1951 and 1952 to assist the United States Bureau of Mines in the reorganization of its educational program, conducting and supervising training programs for the Bureau's instructors in its eight regional fields.

But all of this does not quite tell the story of Edward Lafayette Williams. In a letter received this week, Edgar W. Glenn, Government school-building inspector at Washington, D. C., and a former teacher under Mr. Williams, wrote:

"I remember a number of young boys seeking guidance from you, fathers with problem boys seeking advice, certain students finding themselves under your guidance after failing in other college courses.

"I remember the many problems such as driver training which were visualized by you in the early days, turned down by teachers with no foresight, which are now major issues. I remember the school superintendents and principals seeking degrees in other departments of the college scheduling industrial education courses because they were applicable to school administration problems.

"Also I remember the many conferences and conventions where it was necessary for Ed. Williams to guide the group back to the fundamental principals of industrial education. Think of the great service which has been rendered by the engineering extension service and your days will be happier."

Mr. Williams was married December 21, 1920, at McKeesport, Pa., to Miss Jane Wheeler, of Winsted, Conn., who was at that time supervisor of music in the McKeesport schools. They have one son, E. L. Williams, Jr., who is commanding officer of an artillery unit at Fort Lawton, Wash., and a daughter, Jane, married to Dr. George T. Dugan, D. V. M., of Texarkana.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Printing and binding for Congress, when recommended to be done by the Committee on Printing of either House, shall be so recommended in a report containing an approximate estimate of the cost thereof, together with a statement from the Public Printer of estimated approximate cost of work previously ordered by Congress within the fiscal year (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 145, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on Printing, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

DISTRIBUTION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

To the Vice President and each Senator 100 copies; to the Secretary and Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, each, 25 copies; to the Secretary, for official use, not to exceed 35 copies; to the Sergeant at Arms, for use on the floor of the Senate, not to exceed 50 copies; to each Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress, 68 copies; to the Clerk, Sergeant at Arms, and Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives, each, 25 copies; to the Clerk, for official use, not to exceed 50 copies; and to the Doorkeeper, for use on the floor of the House of Representatives, not to exceed 75 copies; to the Vice President and each Senator, Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress there shall also be furnished (and shall not be transferable), 3 copies of the daily Record, of which 1 shall be delivered at his residence, 1 at his office, and 1 at the Capitol.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. The money derived from such sales shall be paid into the Treasury and accounted for in his annual report to Congress, and no sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the Congressional Record is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Frank Brodie is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the Record at $1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

Addr
of
cis
Ma

I

IN

M
coln
for
so n
form
in A
were
in t
Her
M
ent
185
tow
bre
juic
boy
tow
I
tion
Lin
uni
ver
bef
186
ur
of
his
cat
I
Ur
the
tio
ke
pe
th
"h
he
in
ot
si
m
sc
sc

cl
1
a
M
E
i
A

Appendix

Address of Hon. Theodore R. McKeldin, of Maryland, at Commencement Exercises, Lincoln College, Lincoln, Ill., May 31, 1954

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER

OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 24, 1954

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, Lincoln, Ill., is the first town to be named for Abraham Lincoln and the only one so named in his lifetime. Our best information is that the town was named in August 1853, when the proprietors were drawing up the power of attorney in the Springfield office of Lincoln and Herndon.

Mr. Lincoln is said to have been present at the first lot sale on August 27, 1853, and to have then christened the town by purchasing a watermelon, breaking it open, pouring some of the juice on the ground, and saying, "Now, boys, we have dedicated the new Lincoln town."

It was natural that when an institution of higher education was founded in Lincoln, Ill., in February, 1865, that this university should be called Lincoln University. This was only some 2 months before Lincoln's death. On March 4, 1865, the date of Lincoln's second inaugural address, Colonel Latham, a trustee of Lincoln University, wrote a letter to his good friend Abraham Lincoln dedicating the new university to him.

Lincoln College—formerly Lincoln University—is now recognized as one of the leading privately endowed, coeducational, junior colleges in America. The keynote to its success is immediate experience. In life one meets problems that can be solved only by knowing "how"—at Lincoln they specialize in helping you get this know-how. Following the ideals of Abraham Lincoln, another keynote of this college's success is simplicity—not marble halls and monumental buildings, but vital sacrificial service from teacher to student. This seldom fails.

Lincoln College commencement exercises were held on the campus May 31, 1954, at which time the graduates were addressed by the Honorable Theodore R. McKeldin, the Governor of Maryland. His address on that memorable occasion is herewith appended:

ADDRESS OF THEODORE R. MCKELDIN, GOVERNOR OF MARYLAND, COMMENCEMENT EXERCISES, LINCOLN COLLEGE, LINCOLN, ILL., MAY 31, 1954

From ancient Plato to modern John Dewey, the battle over what constitutes education has raged incessantly, and although many of the world's greatest men have participated in it, the battle still goes on. You will not expect me, therefore, to settle a question that has baffled the lordliest minds. The most I can offer you is a restricted view of one small part of the enormous field.

In considering what I have to say I warn you to bear in mind that it is limited in three directions—to a specific time, that is, this year of 1954, to a specific place, that is, the United States of America, and to a specific point of view, that is, of the public service. As the Governor of a State, I think I may claim to know what the public service needs from college graduates; but I speak as a public servant, not as a businessman, or a theologian, or an educator.

However, I firmly believe that when a man has qualified himself to do his duty to his country, it needs only a shift of emphasis, and not a very great shift, to qualify him to do his duty to his fellowmen and to God. So while I shall confine my argument to the area that I know best, I am convinced that in describing what it takes to make a good citizen, I am describing more than half of what it takes to make a successful man and a good man. "What doth the Lord require of thee," asked the prophet, "but to do justly and to love mercy and to walk humbly with thy God?" Two of those requirements—to do justly and to love mercy—are also demanded by the State; and it is those that I propose to discuss.

Perhaps you may be inclined to challenge the assertion that the civic duty of an educated American is comprised in the command to do justly and to love mercy. What about defending the Constitution? What about the sovereignty of the people? What about promoting the arts and sciences? What about the leadership of the democratic nations and the battle against communism? Can all these things be bounded within such narrow limits?

The answer is that only the words are narrow. Justice and mercy are as wide as the world. Take, for example, the defense of the Constitution that is enjoined upon us all. As stated in its own words, the first object of the Constitution is "to form a more perfect Union," but the second is "to establish justice." To do justly, therefore, is to defend the Constitution; it can't be anything else. The fifth of the stated objects is "to promote the general welfare," which is certainly the desire of any man who loves mercy. Micah's words amply cover that civic duty.

So it is with the rest. The three words, "to do justly," are simple, but if you think the requirement is simple, your education has been wasted. In our complex modern civilization few things are more difficult than to determine what is just. We all know that to do the right thing is hard at times, but I speak from the heart when I assure you that in the public service, at least, doing the right thing is easy by comparison with the terrible difficulty of finding out what is the right thing.

To enable you to overcome that difficulty has been the object of your education. No school can give you grace to do the right thing; only God can grant that. But schooling can sharpen your intelligence to the point at which you will not be deceived by wrong, even when it appears in the semblance of an angel of light.

We talk of the sovereignty of the people as the great principle underlying our system of government, and it is a great principle. But I suggest to you that it is also a terrible principle. For the sovereign is not only free, he is also responsible. In the old days of monarchy a nation ruined by a bad king was to be pitied, but not much to be blamed. But in this Nation where the people are sovereign, the President is only their deputy, chosen by them and accountable to them for executing their decrees. For the wisdom of those decrees, the people, in the last analysis, are responsible.

In such a system the responsibility of the individual increases in direct ratio to his influence. An ignorant and foolish man influences nobody. A man of sound mind may influence one or two, even though he may be without learning. But an educated man influences many and for that reason bears a tremendous responsibility for good government.

You who are college graduates have won for yourselves a respected and privileged position in the world, but never forget that you have also acquired responsibilities more important than your privileges. The Latin word from which the English "educate" is derived means "to draw out." You are educated, that is to say, you are drawn out from the masses of those who have not had the advantage of formal schooling, and being drawn out, you have obtained a new freedom, but at the same time you have lost the excuses that an unlettered man may plead when he drifts into folly. But this is only just. No man pays the full cost of his education, and few men pay more than a small part of it. Parents and friends contribute, and society contributes, sometimes through the State, sometimes through the church, often through endowments left by older generations. It is the law of God and man that "unto whomsoever much is given, of him shall much be required; and to whom men have committed much, of him they will ask the more."

To do justly, therefore, you must shoulder the burden of sovereignty; for the king is free only to rule wisely and well. If he does otherwise, he is no true king, but a tyrant.

To promote the arts and sciences is certainly the duty of every educated American, but that, too, falls under Micah's words, for to promote the arts and sciences is to love mercy.

Some people may be startled by that assertion, for they will immediately think of the science of nuclear physics, which has lately produced the most terrible engines of destruction that the world has ever seen. There is certainly nothing merciful in the atomic bomb. But that is a passing phase. The time is coming, and I have faith to believe that it is not distant, when men will have cause to regard the bomb as merely an evil byproduct of a great achievement.

Already from the breeding place of the bomb we have drawn powerful new weapons against the scourge of cancer and there is hope that other painful and deadly maladies may be brought under control by similar means. We are beginning to draw from it electric power, and there is hope that this power may eventually become so cheap and plentiful that it will greatly reduce the toil of those who do the work of the world.

Two thousand years ago Aristotle, asked about universal liberty, answered that when the shuttle moves itself, then the slave shall be free. What Aristotle meant was that slavery would never end; but the development of the arts and sciences since his day has already put an end to chattel slavery, and in the enlightened nations we are drawing closer and closer to the end of economic slavery. If the development of atomic power fulfills its promise, we shall draw very close to the time when the shuttle moves itself, which is close to the time when earth's last slave shall be free.

No rational man will deny that to free the slave is a very great work of mercy and those who strive to bring it about may fairly claim to love mercy. Yes, the duty of every educated man to advance the arts and sciences comes easily within the old prophet's list of duties.

Surely I need not labor the point that leadership of the democratic nations calls for just those qualities that Micah described. If government by consent of the governed does not establish justice and mercy as qualities of government, then it is a sham and a fraud and we should do better to seek for a benevolent despotism.

But if it is hard for a man to know what is just and what is truly merciful, it is much harder for a nation, and for a nation that is to be a leader of other nations, it is hardest of all. The young people who are just coming of voting age are taking up the duties of citizenship at a moment when our Nation faces difficulties greater by far than anything in its past, and perhaps greater than any nation ever faced before. For events, not our ambition and will have forced us into leadership of half the world, and to do justly and love mercy, as the leader of half of mankind, is a stupendous task.

Yet, while I have sympathy for young Americans, I am not sorry for them because the reward they may win is commensurate with the greatness of the task. The rising generation in this country has a fair chance to achieve what has been the dream of every statesman since Alexander the Great had a fleeting vision of combining the nations into a worldwide brotherhood—the dream of a world organized to establish equal justice under law from pole to pole, thereby eliminating not only the necessity, but the excuse for war.

I dare not say that the coming generation will achieve it, but I do say that the chance exists, and to have even a chance of so great an accomplishment, is a fair destiny indeed. That is why my sympathy is not mixed with pity. To be compelled to be great is not a misfortune; and the next generation of Americans will either be great or perish.

I have no doubt whatever of the outcome. I repeat, I cannot predict complete success, but I can and I do predict an honest effort to create a better world, and the mere effort will produce a great generation.

So I welcome you graduates into the world of affairs, even though at this moment it is dark and chaotic world. Since the beginning of this century, we have come through what I know is the bloodiest and I suspect is the blackest period that western civilization has endured since the Hundred Years' War. We are not out of it yet. I will not insult your intelligence by hinting that all is well, for it isn't. The darkness is still so thick that the wisest man among us can hardly see more than one step ahead. But I do believe that a suggestion of dawn is in the air, and that before you have had time to settle fairly into your duties as citizens, you will find that—

"Night's candles are burnt out, and jocund
day
Stands tiptoe on the misty mountain-tops."

Appropriations for the Library of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK A. BARRETT

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 23, 1954

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD various newspaper editorials all having reference to appropriations for the Library of Congress for the next fiscal year. The editorials represent a good cross section of the country. In my judgment the editorials present the case in an admirable and forceful manner.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Roanoke World-News of May 27, 1954]

Butter or Brains?

In its search for economy the House Appropriations Committee has reduced sharply the annual appropriation for maintenance of the Library of Congress, and at the same time has criticised the Library for going far beyond its original function as an agency of Congress.

This action ignores the fact that the Library is the greatest repository of historical information in America, that it is the constant resort of scholars, writers, and research workers, that in many respects it ranks with the British Museum and the Bibliotheque Nationale in Paris.

It is true that the Library was started as an agency of Congress, and that it employs experts who will write speeches for Congressmen on almost any subject. But it is far more than that. It is the repository of our history and a center of our learning, used by the citizens and students of every State.

The Washington Post points up the absurdity of this so-called economy action by showing that before this reduction, the Library's request for funds for an entire year is less than the present Federal crop support program costs each day.

During the war the British used to discuss whether they would spend their money for guns or butter. The Appropriations Committee seems to prefer butter to brains.

[From the Wilmington (Del.) News of May 27, 1954]

Our Greatest Library

The Library of Congress is one of the great libraries of the world, a scholarly institution of which every American can be proud. Congress itself, having founded the library in its own name in 1800, has special cause for pride. But some Congressmen are not proud of it. Just this week the House Appropriations Committee chided the Library for not being more "mindful" of the fact that it is "the instrument and the creature of the Congress." And, to keep it from getting too big for its breeches, the committee slashed the library's 1955 budget request from $10,210,000 to $8,915,000.

This is $544,000 less than the library is getting for the fiscal year which ends next month, under which it has already been forced to curtail its activities. This institution which served more than 700,000 scholars, research workers, writers, and readers last year has had to cut its hours of operation and maintain an underpaid staff too small to give the kind of service it is capable of. Its cost in a year is less than our fantastic agricultural price-support program costs in a day. Its 10 million books and 22 million other items, including rich collections of historical research material, are one of the educational treasures of the world.

The Appropriations Committee seems to disapprove of all this. Without specific congressional authorization, the Library of Congress has become something greater than a mere congressional adjunct. This is considered lese majeste, or something. The library has published compilations of American folklore, and the penny-pinching committee sees no sense in spending the taxpayer's money on that stuff. It serves as a kind of model and bureau of standards for libraries in every State in the Union, including our own Free Library of Wilmington.

A nation which belittles such an institution and proposes a progressive curtailment of its activities is a nation with little respect for education and less for scholarship. We cannot believe that the Senate will follow the House's lead in this matter.

[From the New York Times of May 31, 1954]

The National Library

The Library of Congress has had a long history from its conception in the late 18th century until today. It is clear that the Library has been developing along the lines of a national library when 710,000 people used it last year, in addition to Members of Congress themselves. In one appropriation bill after another the budget of the Library has been increased to afford added services to the public at large. Huge collections of manuscripts, orientalia, music, and incunabula of little direct use to the Members of Congress have been purchased and added over the years with the approval of Congress. For these collections research workers in many parts of the United States have been grateful.

On the basis of the inferred interest of succeeding Congresses in the work of the Library, its collections have been enlarged to the point where in most cases they are the best in the country. If the Library's budget is cut, as the House of Representatives proposes, to eliminate some of the services necessary to make this material available to the public and to Congress it would seem to be a wasteful move to have hoarded treasures in one place and then by lack of adequate service prohibit their use to the people who depend on them. Rather than being an institution subject to the caprices of Congress the Library should be considered more definitely the National Library of the people whom it has served so well since the beginning. With this in view, the cut made by the House should be restored, and definite steps should be taken to formalize the Library as the National Library of the United States so that its place in this country may never again be doubted.

[From the Emporia (Kans.) Gazette of June 3, 1954]

A National Library

Apparently there are in Congress a few individuals like the fellow who told the book salesman he wasn't interested in his line—he already had a book. The New York Times says the House of Representatives proposes to eliminate some of the services of the Library of Congress in order to reduce the budget.

The Library in Washington has become a national library. Last year 710,000 people used its facilities in addition to Members of

Congress. In one appropriation bill after another the Library's budget has been increased through the years to afford added services to the public. Huge collections of manuscripts and other valuable records have been added with the approval of Congress and expertly cataloged. For these collections, research workers in many parts of the country have been grateful.

Now a budget cut for the Congressional Library would seem to the New York Times to be a wasteful move. The country would have hoarded treasures in one place and by lack of adequate service prohibit their use by people who depend on them.

"Rather than being an institution subject to the caprices of Congress," the Times asserts, "the Library should be considered more definitely the National Library of the people whom it has served so well since the beginning. With this in view, the cut made by the House should be restored and definite steps should be taken to formalize the Library as the National Library of the United States so that its place in this country may never again be doubted."

E. T. L.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of June 6, 1954]

The Library of Congress

If you are an engineer, author, lawyer or just interested in anything from Oriental law to thermodynamics or American folk songs, your questions can probably be answered in the Library of Congress. Most of us tend to consider the Library as simply a resting place for one of the largest collections of printed matter in the world, which it it: almost everything published anywhere eventually finds its way there. Congressmen often think largely in terms of its valuable Legislative Reference Service, which answers their questions and helps them draft bills. Writers seeking copyrights know that the Library safeguards their manuscripts. Organizations helping the blind appreciate nearly a million containers of talking books and close to 200,000 books in braille. Professional librarians think of the ornate Renaissance building and its annex of Georgia white marble as the source of catalog cards—21 million distributed among 9,000 subscribers in fiscal 1952 alone.

In April President Eisenhower nominated a professional librarian, Mr. Lawrence Quincy Mumford, as Librarian of Congress. If confirmed by the Senate, Mr. Mumford, who has served in responsible library posts in New York and elsewhere, would fill the office vacated by Dr. Luther H. Evans when he became Director General of UNESCO last July.

Mr. Verner Clapp, Acting Librarian, and Mr. Mumford were only two among many troubled by the recent action of the House Appropriations Committee. The committee proposed allotting the Library $544,293 less in fiscal 1955 than it received during fiscal 1954, even though its activities are constantly being enlarged. The $8,915,000 recommended for fiscal 1955 was fully $1,294,883 less than the Library's estimate. The Senate will want to pause for a second or third thought before confirming an important cut in funds for an institution that has done so much to establish our position as a major intellectual center of the world.

[From the Louisville (Ky.) Times of June 7, 1954]

Is This the People's Library or Congress's?

Is the Library of Congress to be primarily a library for the benefit of Members of Congress or is it to continue to be what it has been for years, a library for the people of the United States?

If the House Appropriations Committee has its way, the overflowing services of the Library of Congress may be narrowed and curtailed. In a report accompanying a cut in the Library's appropriation, the committee said, "* * * The new Librarian should be mindful that the Library is the instrument and the creature of Congress. Its duties historically have been to meet the needs of Congress first and to limit its service to that which can be furnished with the funds and staff available."

Despite the committee's use of the word "historically," we suggest that is a new and disappointing concept of the Library of Congress. It is true that the Library was formed in 1800 to help Members of Congress. But it has long since become the public library of the Nation. Thomas Jefferson thought of it as "the Library of the United States." James Truslow Adams, the historian, described it this way: "One sees the seats filled with silent readers, old and young, rich and poor, black and white, the executive and the laborer, the noted scholar and the schoolboy, all reading at their own Library provided by their own democracy."

The Library of Congress probably is the greatest depository of knowledge in the world. It has more than 32 million separate items which last year were used by more than 700,000 readers, writers, researchers, and students. The collection grows at a tremendous rate.

In a sense, the Library is a university. Anyone over 16 can use its material in its 23 reading rooms. Its staff provides information on almost anything from a history of clothespins to architectural designs for churches. In the course of a year hundreds of faculty members and graduate students from more than 100 universities use its facilities.

We don't know how seriously to take the House Appropriations Committee's desire to restrict the people's access to their own Library. Surely other Members of Congress, having more regard for man's right to know, will expand the committee's narrow definition of the Library's purpose. As Verner Clapp, Acting Librarian, told the committee: "I would be very sad if these enormous collections of music, of law, and of manuscripts * * * could not be utilized and if the public at large were deprived of the use of them."

Tidelands Drilling Will Increase National Oil Reserves

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 24, 1954

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, an authoritative prediction was made recently that oil development in the tidelands might increase national petroleum reserves by approximately 20 percent in the next 5 years.

The prediction was offered at a recent meeting in Corpus Christi, Tex., by Ben C. Belt, of Houston, vice president in charge of production for the Houston division of the Gulf Oil Corp.

The story of how the oil industry is handling drilling operations in the tidelands area, as outlined by Mr. Belt, is both fascinating and important. I ask unanimous consent that this story, as reported in the Fort Worth Star-Telegram by the able writer LeRoy Menzing, oil editor of that great newspaper, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CORPUS CHRISTI, June 19.—Development in the tidelands from the mouth of the Rio Grande River to the mouth of the Mississippi River could increase national oil reserves approximately 20 percent in the next 5 years.

This opinion was expressed here this week by Ben C. Belt, of Houston, vice president of the Gulf Oil Corp., which unveiled a new drilling tender to several score oil writers.

The tender, named the *Eagle* and converted from a Navy LST, is a supply yard, warehouse, helicopter, port, and hotel—all in one. Its initial and conversion cost approximates $2,500,000.

SUBSTANTIAL GAIN PREDICTED

Belt predicted his forecast of a substantial increase in petroleum reserves on the Federal Government offering leases for sale in such quantities to permit spirited wildcatting and development.

He said this development easily could add from 4 to 6 billion barrels of oil to national reserves and might add some 15 to 20 trillion feet of natural gas.

The Government has scheduled a sale of tideland acreage off Louisiana in October and one off Texas in November.

Belt said the sales probably would result in considerable money being spent for leases, pointing to the fact that Texas' first sale after the tidelands were returned to the States brought approximately $32 million for more than 400,000 acres, or an average of $78 per acre.

GULF TO START TEST

Gulf paid Texas slightly over $3 million for the 5,700 acres on which it is preparing to start its first tidelands test 8½ miles off Port Aransas.

Belt told the group it was the opinion of the best-informed geologists that 85 percent of the value of tidelands lies within the land owned by the Federal Government beyond the historic boundaries of States. In the case of Texas, this is 10½ miles.

Belt explained the reason the companies were willing to expend large sums for tideland acreage was because the 15 million acres lying inside the 150-foot depth line and between the mouths of the Rio Grande and Mississippi Rivers compares favorably with the 9,500,000 acres along the coast.

STATISTICS QUOTED

In the onshore 9,500,000-acre strip there have been found some 100 interesting structures, 62 oil pools which will make in excess of 20 million barrels ultimate recovery, 29 of which will make in excess of 50 million, and 11 of which will make in excess of 100 million.

He said geologists reason that if the sands continue out under the sea to the 150-foot line that at least part of the 15 million acres should be as prolific as the coastal strip.

However, Belt warned that the finding of an oil pool in the gulf with an estimated yield of 10 million barrels will be considered a failure and that such an area will have to be handled as a fisherman does a nonkeeping fish and merely thrown back into the sea.

The Gulf official quoted statistics showing 1,600,000 acres now are under lease on the Continental Shelf in front of Texas and Louisiana.

The leases, held by 25 operators, have supplied 14 oil areas producing 25,000 barrels per day from 118 wells. He added there ws 12 gas fields, most of which are shut in, and that 18 development projects and 8 wildcats now are being drilled.

NO HINDRANCE SEEN

Belt saw no hindrance in drilling to depths up to 200 feet, only greater expense than for current operations to depths up to 65 feet.

In explaining Gulf's initial operation on its 5,700-acre block, Belt said the platform cost $450,000, with a typical rig requiring $550,000 which with the $2,500,000 for the tender, brought expenditures to $3,500,000 before the start of operations. He placed demurrage for the tender, platform, and rig at approximately $4,500 per day, and the cost of a 10,000-foot well at $1 million.

The project isn't Gulf's initial water operation, as it drilled the world's first such well in Ferry Lake near Caddo, La., in 1010–11.

Gulf's answers to many of the problems presented by offshore drilling are found in the Eagle.

MOBILITY IMPORTANT ASPECT

The converted 2,600-ton Navy vessel provides space for mud pits, pumps, and cementing equipment. It carries all pipe, bulk mud, and cement necessary to drill a 12,000-foot hole and also has adequate, air-conditioned sleeping, eating, and recreational facilities for some 70 men.

An important aspect of the ship is its mobility. In case of hurricane or impending disaster, the self-propelled vessel can load all hands and carry them to safety. Standby pumps and generators on the drilling platform are available to keep mud circulating.

Pipe handling from the ship is effected by means of a tramway running most of the length of the 328-foot vessel. Bulk mud is stored below deck, mixed, and pumped to the well. Cement will be handled similarly.

There is additional storage space for necessary drilling water, drinking water, and fuel oil.

The drilling crew will work 12-hour tours for a week or 10 days at a stretch before getting 5 days to a week's shore leave.

The Heritage of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 24, 1954

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "He Lives," written by Dr. George S. Reuter, Jr., and Mrs. G. S. Reuter.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HE LIVES

(By Dr. George S. Reuter, Jr., and Mrs. G. S. Reuter)

The writers recently returned from a 4,948 mile trip that once again emphasized the greatness of the United States and the worth of the individual.

When Dr. George W. Diemer recently became the first president of the International Council on Education for Teaching, he listed the aims of the new world educational organization. They were: To foster a conception of education directed toward promotion of international understanding and good will, with a view to safeguarding peace, freedom, and respect for human diginity; to improve teaching methods, educational organization and the academic and professional training of teachers, to equip them better to serve the interests of youth; to defend the rights and material and moral interests of the teaching profession; to promote closer relationships between teachers in the different countries; to define and explore ideas and principles underlying the education of those preparing to teach; to examine problems of the continued education of teachers in service; and to promote opportunities for consultation and collaboration among organizations and persons engaged in such education in different countries. This is just another indication of the vast educational progress in our time. Dr. Diemer is to international education what the late Mayor Ernst Reuter, of West Berlin, was to European democracy.

On the trip, the writers attended a morning service at the First Baptist Church of Minneapolis. This was the church where the late Dr. W. B. Riley was pastor some 40 years. At the time of his death, he was to the North what the late Dr. George W. Truett was to the South. Prof. and Mrs. George S. Syme, Jr., of Northwestern Schools greeted us again with a reminder that Dr. Riley established these schools, too. Dr. Billy Graham was a recent president of the latter institution. Across the river at the First Baptist Church in St. Paul, famed Dr. J. Harold Smith, pastor of the First Baptist Church of Fort Smith, Ark., spoke in the evening.

By seeing all of the Great Lakes and Niagara Falls, we could see all the future possibilities that such leaders as Senator LEHMAN and Representative ROOSEVELT have been talking about. From the calm ferry trip from St. Ignace to Mackinaw City, which made visable the beauty of the lakes, to the ride on the Maid of the Mist at Niagara Falls, we could see a busy, happy America.

It is easy to note the warm feeling of the Canadian people, whether it be Victoria, Niagara Falls, Toronto, Montreal, Ottawa, Quebec, or St. John, New Brunswick. The tour through the Capitol Building at Ottawa was so complete and friendly that even our Nation's cities could learn what a policy of goodwill has done. It was as refreshing as the Detroit visit with Dr. Richard V. Morrissey.

As we stopped in Lisbon, N. H., to attend church, it was easy to see how loyal the people were to the late Senator Charles W. Tobey. Perhaps his death, the death of Maurice J. Tobin, that of Chief Justice Fred M. Vinson, Senator Robert F. Wagner, and Gov. Dan McCarty, of Florida, were the greatest losses during 1953.

We visited two historic scenes at Hyde Park, N. Y.—the Roosevelt estate and the Vanderbilt estate. Both were lovely and the view of the Hudson River from the Vanderbilt estate is a sight to remember. Yet, as we carefully reviewed the life of Franklin D. Roosevelt, while visiting his old church, St. James, where he and his family worshipped and where his family is buried in the rear of the church; his beautiful home and his library, it became evident to us that he lives. Yes; he is a man of the ages.

Dwight L. Moody said he would never die, and his spiritual leader still lives in the Moody Bible Institute, the Moody Memorial Church, and in the hearts of born-again Christians. Roosevelt, the leader of mankind, lives, too, through great liberal legislation, better world understanding, a happy, proud Nation, good neighbors, and in the hearts of all lovers of freedom and good will in all this vast world, whether it is Wendell L. Willkie's One World, or Adlai E. Stevenson's Three Worlds.

After seeing Hyde Park, New York City had a greater meaning. The fine United Nations, Radio City, the tombstones to Robert Fulton and Alexander Hamilton at Trinity Church near Wall Street, the Washington Museum, the Washington Square, the Johann Strauss operetta A Night in Venice at Jones Beach, the trip to Staten Island around the Statue of Liberty, and the visits with the J. F. Cervantes, Harold Emery, and Harold Schell, all reflected the pride of our people in our Nation.

At Souderton, Pa., Rev. Gerald L. Stover is doing a great work at the Grace Bible Church. The services were fine. At Washington, D. C., there were more great monuments and buildings. Washington, Jefferson, Lincoln, and Wilson were there, but so was Franklin D. Roosevelt. The people, whether it be N. E. Simpson, D. M. Ginnings, or the Francis Hutchinsons, all remembered Roosevelt and his vast interest in the people.

Near Charlottesville, Va., we visited the homes of Patrick Henry, Thomas Jefferson, and James Monroe and thought how proud these great leaders must be that Franklin D. Roosevelt followed them. The Natural Bridge in Virginia reflected the physical beauty.

It is still unknown whether Robert F. Wagner, Jr., will be as great as his father or Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., as his father. On the other hand, how can we go wrong as a Nation in the long run of events, with so proud a heritage.

Roseau, Minn.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 24, 1954

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an item from June 1954 issue of Fortune magazine relating to the community of Roseau, Minn., and its growing industrial activity. We are proud of the progress in our community and we are proud of our Minnesota industry.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ROSEAU, MINN., AND EDGAR HETTEEN

Roseau, a wheat town of 2,400 in northwest Minnesota, celebrated on April 1 the formal opening of its first metal manufacturing company, Polaris Industries, Inc. The president is Edgar Hetteen, 33, son of a local farmer, who, except for a short time in the Navy, has been in Roseau since he was 14.

Polaris will manufacture Hetteen's invention, a straw-cutter attachment for combines. This is not an untried tool; Hetteen's own little company, the Hetteen Hoist & Derrick Co., has been making them since 1950. In early 1954, Red Lake Falls, Minn., offered to give him a $250,000 abandoned factory if he moved there. To keep him in Roseau local merchants are putting up $45,000 in preferred stock; Hetteen, his brother, and a brother-in-law get all the common.

Roseau's hardheaded merchants are not betting on an immediate payroll bonanza, for they know the little company cannot possibly employ more than 30 people the first year. Like most seasoned investors, they are betting on a man. They believe Hetteen can develop a line of farm-machinery products as good as his straw cutter, and in time build a stable company.

Hetteen already has weathered more than one crisis. In 1945 he interested two businessmen in a design for an electric winch. They put up $1,700; he bought a building for an equal amount and tried to produce the winch. It was a flop. Instead of going back to his old job of truckdriver, Hetteen turned to repairing farm machinery. This business grew rapidly. Hetteen turned it over to two relatives and concentrated on product development.

The first successful product was a portable grain elevator, which pushed sales to $76,000 in 1948, a $25,000 increase over 1947. By the spring of 1950 Hetteen had developed the straw cutter (the shredded straw, distributed evenly instead of being left in windrows or stacks, quickly returns its plant nutrients to the soil) and sold 31 to combine owners in the area. There wasn't a complaint. The next year he grossed $150,000 and earned a substantial $27,000. But during the winter Hetteen had to rebuild (at a cost of $100 each) every one of the 500 cutters he had produced. Tests in 1950 had been under ideal weather conditions; damp straw in 1951 clogged his cutters.

For a while Hetteen wished he had never heard of a straw cutter, but the rebuilt units worked for his old customers, and new customers bought enough to keep gross sales high in 1952 and 1953. Profits vanished; he used almost every extra penny to pay off his $50,000 mistake.

Orders for the straw cutter this spring indicate a banner year. Hetteen is readying another tool, a self-cleaning harrow, but he won't introduce it until it has been tested in every United States region under every possible condition.

Memorial Day Address of Hon. Chauncey W. Reed, of Illinois, at Forest Hill Cemetery, Glen Ellyn, Ill., May 31, 1954

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. McVEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 24, 1954

Mr. McVEY. Mr. Speaker, appended is the text of an address by the Honorable CHAUNCEY W. REED, of Illinois, delivered at Forest Hill Cemetery, Glen Ellyn, Ill., on Memorial Day, Monday, May 31, 1954:

Mr. Chairman, of all the holidays in our national calendar, Memorial Day is the one that provides for me the deepest sense of gratification—indeed of reverence—and I am confident that this feeling is shared equally by you, as your presence here today gives testimony. And for many reasons there is no other place in this great land of our where I should prefer to celebrate this holiday than in our beloved Illinois. We in Illinois have, it seems to me, just a little greater claim to Memorial Day, as our own particular holiday, than anyone else, for several reasons. First of all, it was instituted by a great Illinoisan, Gen. John A. Logan, who as commander in chief of the Grand Army of the Republic, on May 5, 1868, issued his well-known General Order No. 11, calling for the decorating of the graves of the veterans of the Civil War, and in which he said: "Let no ravages of time testify to coming generations that we have forgotten as a people the cost of a free and undivided Republic." That general order has, of course, become the subject of an act of Congress making this day a national holiday to be observed in each and every State of the Union. Today, Memorial Day 1954, we shall have been observing for four score and seven times this great American tradition.

This holiday now belongs also to the glorious veterans of all our conflicts—of the Spanish American War, World War I, World War II, the Korean conflict, and every fine American who has shed his blood for the cause of freedom here and throughout the world. It is a privilege, in which each one of us must take great pride, to be present at the final resting place on this earth of brave, self-sacrificing and idealistic Americans who walk among us no more because they cherished liberty—not only for themselves but for mankind—more than life itself. "Give my fellow men liberty, or give me death!" was the ideal that activated them. Now there is scarcely any corner of the globe where there are not interred the flower of our Nation who willingly gave their own lives so that others, not only in this land, but in far-off countries could receive the blessings of liberty.

So, then, Memorial Day is a time to commemorate all our valiant dead, and if in our minds we turn particularly to that strife between the States it is not to deprecate the wonderfully unsurpassed deeds of our latter-days heroes. It is to point out that those who fought and died in the awful Civil War were the prototypes of our fighting men who came after them.

When I was a young boy there were many survivors of the Civil War in our midst and they were the center of all our commemorative exercises. Illinois had more than her share of distinguished participants in that war as we so proudly acknowledged in the last stanza of our State anthem—Illinois:

"On the record of our years, Abraham Lincoln's name appears, Grant and Logan and our tears—Illinois."

As Commander in Chief, the martyred Lincoln was truly a veteran of that awful struggle whose life was spent in the cause of unity for our people. What he contributed to the greatness of the United States is known to every school boy and girl and needs no recital at this time. We need only paraphrase the words uttered many centuries before by the eloquent Roman orator Cicero in one of his orations against Cataline:

"If the glory of him who founded Rome was great, how much greater should be that of him who saved it from overthrow after it had grown to be the mistress of the world."

It is in that light that we very properly think of Lincoln.

War is no holiday spectacle or parlor amusement and yet our great military and naval leaders are noted not only for their valor in battle but for their Christian compassion in victory.

Today I want to dwell for a few moments on the character of that truly great military leader, Ulysses S. Grant, who was the exemplar for many more of our glorious naval and military men—Dewey, Pershing, Eisenhower, MacArthur, Clark, Halsey, and Stilwell, to name only a few.

General Grant's statement, "we will fight it out on this line if it takes all summer," illustrates the military mind, while his Christian charity was demonstrated by his equally well-known statement to General Buckner who had surrendered unconditionally to him. "General Buckner, you are a prisoner of war and will be sent North. I presume you have no money that is current with us and I wish to share mine with you."

While engaged in battle, Grant was a relentless and implacable adversary but as soon as victory was won he displayed his forbearance and compassion for the defeated as when he said to Lee: "Let the men take their horses, they will need them on their farms for the spring plowing." The Grant who boldly demanded "unconditional and immediate surrender" also breathed the hope and prayer "Let us have peace."

We are all familiar with many instances of the prowess of Grant as a leader in battle. He won the respect of his adversaries and even military leaders in the Old World came to recognize his brilliance—even though belatedly.

You know, of course, that I am chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives—a committee not generally associated with military matters. But I recently unearthed some old records of my committee that shed a great deal of light upon the character of Grant as displayed in an incident that has long since become almost entirely forgotten. I want to recall it to you now.

In the trying times following the conclusion of hostilities after the Civil War—times that are reflected after every great struggle—there emerged a movement for an exceedingly drastic step, the impeachment of President Johnson who, you will remember succeeded to the Presidency after the assassination of President Lincoln. Under our Constitution the House of Representatives has the sole power of impeachment and all resolutions of impeachment are considered first by the Committee on the Judiciary. In the course of its considerations of the resolution concerning President Johnson the committee called upon General Grant to testify.

You will recall that at the McLean House at Appomattox Grant met Lee, who was then completely at the mercy of the Union General. Grant could have imposed any terms that could be conjured up by the mind of a victorious general flushed with victory. Listen, then, to the stipulation called for by Grant:

"The officers to give their individual paroles not to take up arms against the United States until properly exchanged and each company or regimental commander to give a like parole for the men of his command; the officers to retain their sidearms, private horses, and baggage. This done, each officer and man will be allowed to return to his home, not to be disturbed by United States authority so long as they observe their parole and the laws in force where they may reside."

Now, among the complaints against President Johnson was the charge that he had neglected to prosecute and punish the military and civil leaders of the South. The Committee on the Judiciary, consisting of northern men, felt that it was incumbent upon them to hear what Grant had to say about such a charge.

On July 18, 1867, the general appeared before the committee and testified that when he first took office Johnson was of the opinion that Lee and other former Confederate officers should be prosecuted, and asked Grant when the time would come when they would be tried and punished. Grant testified: "I told him not so long as they obeyed the laws and complied with the stipulation; that was the ground I took." Grant obviously felt so strongly about the matter that at one point where the questioning seemed to him to reflect criticism of his magnanimity, he declared: "I will state here that I am not quite certain whether I am being tried or who is being tried by the question asked." He then continued that the President "seemed to be anxious to get at the leaders to punish them. He would say that the leaders of the rebellion must be punished and that treason must be made odious."

Grant also stated that he had felt that it was essential that something be done to establish government and civil law in the States of the former Confederacy. He also had recommended pardons for Generals Longstreet, French, Stuart, Roddy, and Johnson, as well as Robert E. Lee. He concluded his testimony by answering a question about the difference in opinion between President Johnson and himself as follows:

"He [Johnson] claiming that the time must come when they could be tried and punished, and I claiming that the time could not come except by a violation of their parole. I claimed that I gave them no political privileges, but that I had a right, as military commander, to arrange terms of surrender which should protect the lives of those prisoners. I believe it is conceded by everybody that I had that right. I know that Mr. Lincoln conceded it at that time."

There we have the testimony of the victorious military leader that he strongly advocated that there be no prosecution and punishment of the Confederate leaders and that President Johnson, despite his predisposition to make them stand trial, finally came around to Grant's views.

In order to appreciate fully the lasting significance of Grant's accomplishment in helping to dissuade Johnson from prosecuting and punishing Lee and the other Confederate leaders it is necessary to recall first the conditions existing in the United States immediately after the Civil War and then the almost unbelievable strength and unity of all sections of the Nation when crises have arisen in later times. The years following the Civil War were indescribably trying ones for North and South alike. Both sides had just emerged from the bloodiest and costliest warfare in all recorded history. Their manpower and other resources were spent. As always, and particularly in internecine strife, there remained bitterness in the minds and hearts of many persons. The Federal Government was controlled by northerners who could inflict their will upon the vanquished South. The South was completely subdued, its plantations in ruins, and its morale at the lowest ebb. The action to which Johnson was inclined and which was being urged upon him by many persons of influence would have alienated the South for all time. Many in the North would not only have refrained from censuring Grant if he acquiesced in punishment but would have found ample justification for such a course. It was only a man with the moral fiber of Grant who could have stood firm in insisting that the paroles be honored.

We respect and admire Grant for his brilliance as a military leader. As a result of it the awful conflict was brought to an end with victory for the Federal Government. Who knows—who can even surmise—what would have become of this Nation if Grant had been defeated. Yes; Grant saved the Union by military success. To my mind his even greater success was the result of his magnanimity and forbearance at a time when it would have been easy to succumb to the popular clamor for reprisals. A militarily victorious South might have welded together another strong Union, but a South disallusioned and embittered by postwar punishment might have foreclosed for too many years any hope of unity.

Many of us today are aware, in an intensely personal way, of what that unity has meant to this Nation and the world. We are the bulwark turning back the tide of atheistic communism that is threatening freedom-loving people everywhere.

If, after having achieved final military victory in the Civil War, our leaders had not been successful in healing the wounds of that strife, this Nation would never have grown to be the modern mistress of the world that twice brought victory in world wars and is now leading the global fight against the tentacles of godless communism. If, for years after the end of the Civil War the North and South had remained embittered instead of joining together to rebuild and lay the foundation for the greatness this Nation ultimately found, the entire world today would be under the heel of some tyrannical dictator—whether he be a kaiser, a fuehrer, or a commissar. The strength of our Nation which has enabled us to bring victory for ourselves and the allies had its foundation in the healing of the scars of the Civil War by the actions of our victorious generals.

One of the most remarkable instances in modern times—indeed of all time—of the exercise of the spirit of Christian compassion by a victor in war was that demonstrated by General MacArthur in Japan after arms were laid down in World War II.

The stubborn fanatical resistance, never before equaled in the history of warfare subsided and was forgotten. The terrible enmities and bitternesses were washed away. Under the superb guidance of this great American, a vanquished foe was rehabilitated, made self-supporting, encouraged to establish a democratic government and maintain law and order. Firmness, humaneness, impartiality, integrity, and good judgment were the characteristics of General MacArthur's administration that won him the respect, admiration, and genuine esteem of the Japanese people from the Emperor to the lowliest coolie. Through his influence this nation, lately our bitter foe, has become our principal Asiatic obstacle to communism.

It is, of course, highly desirable that we carry out Logan's idea of setting aside a day each year to pay homage to those who have gone before us in the cause of liberty. We would be woefully remiss if we did not do so. But we would be dishonoring them if we sought no lesson from their glorious deeds and their noble character. Others before us have learned well from Lincoln and Grant. We, too, must profit from the valor and nobility of Grant, Eisenhower, and MacArthur.

This is a resourceful Nation in every sense of that word. We are blessed beyond all others with the richness of nature's resources. Not only our leaders, but the man in the street, are endowed with a nature capable of turning to advantage every situation with which they are faced. The generosity of the GI was taken for granted by ally and foe, alike, but his resourcefulness was ever a matter of wonderment. That resourcefulness is born of an appreciation of our heritage and a firm will to protect and extend it in the face of danger.

I believe that this is a propitious time to take stock nationally and individually to determine whether our actions now are in keeping with our national principles which so much need to be preserved.

We are a strong nation, indeed, and we must always conserve that strength to use in defense of our principles. If we are to be worthy of our heritage we must not allow it to be dissipated. It it not unlimited. Military strength alone is not enough. Without moral stamina we would betray those whom we honor today. By example and persuation we must convince the rest of the world—on both side of the Iron Curtain—that we remain a nation of God-fearing and God-loving people. Throughout our Nation's history we have had leaders who have expressed the ideals and truths upon which our Government is based and which we must ever strive to preserve. Those ideals are simple and plain and are as valid today as when they were first enunciated. They were set out first in our Constitution and the Bill of Rights and have been reiterated by word and deed by great Americans when the occasion demanded in the course of time.

The patriotic Continentals at Valley Forge and Brandywine were inflamed with the fire of those principles even before they were set on paper at Independence Hall.

The heroes of Manassas, Antietam, and Appomattox fought to preserve them and Lincoln so eloquently memorialized them at the field of Gettysburg.

Then a little more than half a century ago idealistic Americans left our shores to extend those ideals to the people of Cuba, Puerto Rico, and the Philippines.

In World War I more than 2 million American servicemen again sailed from these shores in the cause of freedom.

The enormity of the sacrifices made by gallant Americans all over the globe in World War II needs no recounting here. Words are inadequate to do it justice.

As we take stock of our own sacrifices in money, resources, and human life in order that we might survive as a nation among those of the world, should we not again resurvey our own position on the international checkerboard. We led in the formation of the United Nations. We are probably its most influential member. Through it, however, we and other peace-loving nations are currently unable to prevent one-member nation from threatening the peace of the world. Does this mean that there should be a realinement of the nations of the world who honestly and sincerely crave peace? Or does this mean that we should withdraw from the United Nations, fortify ourselves, and risk a combination of other nations against us, economically, militarily, or both?

These are momentous questions and must some day be determined thoughtfully, firmly, dispassionately, and prayerfully.

Today our Armed Forces are stationed in Korea and in many parts of the earth actively combating the forces of aggression or aiding in preventing hostile moves on the part of the aggressors.

These ceremonies which were once confined to places within our own shores are now being held everywhere throughout the world. The sun never sets on the white crosses marking the graves of heroic American servicemen everywhere on the face of the globe.

We must cherish and nurture the memory and the example of those who have made our greatness possible. We must be true to them.

Poverty and Communism: The Lesson of Guatemala

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES R. HOWELL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 24, 1954

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the Washington Post of June 24 points up in convincing fashion several important lessons we should learn from the warfare now going on in Guatemala.

The first lesson should be familiar to us—that poverty and communism go hand and hand. In nations around the world where extremes of poverty exist, communism finds a ready breeding ground. Our program of foreign aid has neglected Latin America. In other parts of the world, point 4 has shown its value in enabling nations to make a start toward bringing poverty under control. I hope this wonderful program will be continued and extended, particularly in Latin America, as a shield against communism.

The second lesson of Guatemala is that neglect by the United States of our proper interests in Latin America can be disastrous. The enlightened policy of this country toward Latin America that evolved during the Roosevelt administration went far toward increasing the economic and political self-reliance of our neighbors to the south. The work of Nelson Rockefeller as Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs was of especial merit during this period, and Mr. Rockefeller deserves commendation for continuing this work under private auspices in recent years.

Since the close of World War II we have neglected Latin America. Our policy has become obscure to these nations. The economic and political progress of some of these nations has been impeded by lack of a clear-cut American policy. I hope that we can very soon take steps to clarify our policy toward Latin America so that they can resume their forward progress.

The above-mentioned editorial follows:

POVERTY AND COMMUNISM

Either way the somewhat murky conflict in Guatemala turns out, as one correspondent has noted, the United States stands to get blamed. This is indicated by the vote of the Chilean Chamber of Deputies condemning the revolt and expressing to the United States its grave preoccupation. However questionable the origin of the insurgent movement, it cannot be doubted that the Arbenz government in Guatemala has become a vehicle of Soviet imperialism. But the struggle in Guatemala is symbolic of the underlying discontent throughout Latin America, and it behooves this country in its own interest to take a closer look at some of the conditions that make Latin America such a fertile seedbed for Soviet designs.

It would be foolish to think that many of the people of Guatemala, largely Indian in background, have any sympathy with communism as such. Guatemala emerged in 1944 from long years of oppression under the dictator, Jorge Ubico. Unquestionably there was a good deal of idealism in the movement for social reform, and the Mexican revolution of 40 years ago was held up as an example. But the revolution miscarried when the leaders found that there was no ready alternative to Guatemala's economic dependence on other countries, and they sought a scapegoat.

Many of the sins charged against the United Fruit Co., were sins of the past; in recent years the company has paid good wages and has promoted scientific agriculture, and it has shown itself willing to share its profits fairly. It was easy enough, however, for demogogues to play native antiforeignism and to blame foreign exploitation for Guatemala's poverty and other ills; and it was also easy for Soviet agents, playing upon the discontent of the students and intellectuals, to bend the movement to suit Communist purposes.

The situation in Guatemala is different from that in other Latin American countries, but only in degree. Throughout the hemisphere there is the same sort of resentment over real or fancied economic exploitation, deriving from the fact that the production of raw materials is the primary industry. The Latin producer is somewhat in the plight of the American farmer in that he has no control over the final use or price of his product, but in Latin America the producer cannot generally rely on a price-support system. Hence the concern in Chile over world copper prices, the concern in Bolivia over tin markets, the recent complaint in Costa Rica that the United Fruit Co. was bigger than the government, the hypersensitivity in a number of countries to criticism of coffee prices.

The plain fact is that since World War II Latin America has not kept pace with the remainder of the free world. During the war Latin American countries enjoyed guaranteed markets at high prices. Since then they have seen the great bulk of American aid go elsewhere, and they have not understood the urgency; they have seen us pouring out billions to Europe and Asia but expecting Latin Americans to jump at the slogan of hemisphere solidarity. Grinding poverty and illiteracy remain the common denominator in much of Latin America. Many improvements have been made through technical assistance in agriculture, public health, and the like. But the improvements have merely whetted the appetites of peoples newly awakened from a sort of economic peonage; and they have not been enough to prevent demagogs and misguided nationalists from directing the complaint against the United States.

There is no simple or easy answer to the problem, and any sensible approach must have the cooperation of the countries concerned. Latin American nations themselves have complicated the difficulty by unreasonable restrictions on foreign investments. Certainly the solution is not in a dole. More technical assistance, more help in diversifying the economies, more aid in development projects that contribute directly to the welfare of the people, more rational American trade policies—these are part of the answer. So, too, are enlightened policies by American firms such as the oil companies in Venezuela.

But the problem is not wholly economic, it also is psychological and emotional. Former Assistant Secretary of State Cabot touched on an important consideration when he pointed out that the United States cannot be placed in a position of resisting social reforms. If we hope to divert the people of Latin America from false panaceas, we must have something positive to offer in their stead. Somehow we must persuade the Latin Americans, with a lot more vigor than we have hitherto employed, that we are not dedicated to the status quo, and that we are sincerely anxious to help them better their lot. Poverty does not automatically make communism, but it is a strong ally when an international conspiracy stands ready to exploit it. That is the real lesson of Guatemala.

Markham Ferry Project

SPEECH

OF

HON. TOM STEED

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 23, 1954

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (S. 119) to provide for the construction of the Markham Ferry project on the Grand River in Oklahoma by the Grand River Dam Authority, an instrumentality of the State of Oklahoma.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Chairman, I would like to correct a statement made by the chairman. The project is located in the district of my colleague, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON], who will discuss the project in detail.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to say for the information of the committee that if there is any opposition to this bill from any of the areas, private or public, State or Federal, I have not heard anything about it. The bill passed the Senate unanimously. It came from our committee unanimously. Insofar as I know, it is in accord with the policy of the present administration and the wishes of everyone concerned in this type of project. I hope the committee will go along with the bill so that we can dispose of it in due time today.

1954 Platform of the Democratic Party of Massachusetts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 24, 1954

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include the 1954 platform of the Democratic Party of Massachusetts, a splendid platform of promises drafted under the chairmanship of my close friend, State Senator John E. Powers, Democratic leader of the Massachusetts State Senate:

1954 PLATFORM OF THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY OF MASSACHUSETTS

PREAMBLE

We, the Democrats of Massachusetts, in convention assembled proclaim our pride in the contributions of our party to the welfare and the security of the citizenry of our Commonwealth and Nation.

We, the Democrats of Massachusetts, salute the vision and leadership which has characterized the administrations of members of our party in the Government of our Commonwealth and our Nation.

We, the Democrats of Massachusetts, hail the integrity of our former platforms, and the fidelity to their stated principles exemplified by the talented and courageous public servants whom we have given to our Commonwealth and our Nation.

We, the Democrats of Massachusetts, in this, the preprimary convention of the year 1954, issue as a component part of this our platform, a sincere denunciation of the policies of the present Republican administration in our Commonwealth and in our Nation.

We protest, as Democrats and as citizens, the policies which have reduced our Nation from its proud status as the mighty bulwark against the engulfment of human dignity, to the plight of an ineffectual, vacillating giant chained by the links of misdirection, indecision, and unsound expediency.

We, as Democrats but particularly as citizens, denounce as alien to our most fundamental doctrines, the return to the policy of enrichment of the few at the expense of the many.

We, as Democrats and as citizens, publicly state our revulsion at the spectacle of the foremost Nation of the earth, retarded in the fulfillment of its destiny as the impregnable fortress of liberty and the militant bastion of freedom, by the puny quest for personal favor and recognition of the palace guard competing with the membership of the Republican Party in the legislative halls.

We, as Democrats and as citizens, publicly label the present Republican administration in the Commonwealth as inept, heartless, unfair, unscrupulous, deceitful and fraudulent, basely motivated by a passion for power and self-enrichment, conspicuously devoid of a sense of justice, and obviously unaware of the fundamental intendments, aims and purposes of government—the elimination of need, the providing of services, the protection of its citizens, and the promotion of human dignity in accordance with the principles of enlightened social consciousness.

We, the Democratic Party of Massachusetts, in convention assembled in this city and county of Worcester, confident that our party is to be entrusted with the administration of the Government of the Commonwealth for the next 2 years do hereby adopt, proclaim, and publish this.

DECLARATION OF PRINCIPLES

I. National affairs

We regret that we must record the disappointment and dismay with which the vast majority of our fellow Americans contemplate the "mess" which the present Republican administration has made in attempting to conduct the affairs of our National Government. In the face of the worldwide atheistic conspiracy of Russian communism, a conspiracy recognized everywhere as the greatest menace of all time, not only to our liberties and way of life, but to the survival of western civilization itself, the promised great crusade of the Republican Party falters, hedges, and fails. It fails because of the lack of firm leadership, because of divided counsels, because of ill-considered and unsure policies both foreign and domestic, because of subversion of the national interest to political expediency, because of fear—fear among Republicans of themselves and of one another, fear on the part of their leaders to assert, and resolutely to defend the greatness and invincibility of this powerful Republic.

The "slogan-creating" Republican Party has given to the American people a 1954 version of 3-D Government, namely: a government of disappointment, a government of discouragement, a government of despair.

By way of contrast we refer, for studious consideration, to the record of prior Democratic administrations. As a result of the wise and successful policies of Franklin D. Roosevelt, brought to full measure during the Presidency of Harry S. Truman, this present Republican administration inherited a national economy which in wealth, production, full employment, high wage scales and national and per capita incomes has never been equaled in history.

The Democratic administrations respected, and preserved inviolate, the constitutional divisions of powers, which the Republicans have conspicuously failed to do. We pledge ourselves to restore harmony and efficiency to the coordinate branches of Government, by observing the spirit as well as the letter of the Constitution.

The Truman doctrine, the Marshall plan, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, the point-4 program, all Democratic administration policies, were timely and effective in checking the march of Russian communism.

The Republican administration promised liberation of the enslaved peoples of Poland, Lithuania, Estonia, Latvia, and other Communist-dominated countries to give freedom and independence to their people.

They made promises of liberation, promises now forgotten and silently repudiated. We Democrats wonder how our Americans of Polish, Lithuanian, and other bloods, whose people are dominated by vicious Communist dictators, feel in the knowledge that the promises given during the campaign have been completely broken and, in fact, forgotten.

In contrast, the Democratic national administration recognized, and fearlessly faced, the menace of Red totalitarian aggression in Greece, Turkey, Israel, Iran, and in Korea, and moved with firmness and courage to safeguard, protect, and defend the security of these nations. We are proud of the role played by these same administrations in a now historic election in which, through the invaluable aid of the famous letter-writing campaign, initiated and carried to success by American citizens of Italian ancestry, Italy and the Eternal City of Rome were saved from Red Communist desecration.

The Democratic Party recognizes the sinister purposes and objectives of communism—to conquer all countries and to enslave all peoples. We recognize the only thing the Communists respect is what they fear, and that is military power, strength, and force greater than they themselves possess. The Democratic Party stands for such a military organization.

We remind the Republican Party of the undeniable fact that the only Communists and subversives who have been prosecuted and convicted since 1932 have been prosecuted and convicted by the Democratic administrations, and by none other, until recently.

We remind the Republican Party that it was the Democratic Gov. Paul A. Dever who signed the bill outlawing the Communist Party in Massachusetts as of November 17, 1951.

We pledge our continued support to all duly constituted agencies in their legitimate efforts to weed out and get rid of subversive or communistic types, both within and without the Government. We of the Democratic Party have defended, are pledged to defend, and will continue to defend the eternal truth that is ours and the freedom that we love.

II. Foreign affairs

In foreign policy, we call for a return to those policies of strength, dignity, courage, and unity which built up the power and resolution of the free nations in the years after the war, and administered a decisive check to the imperialistic aggression of Soviet communism.

In the past year and a half we have seen a steady weakening of the international position of the United States.

Rash and reckless administration policies have weakened our system of alliances, have slashed the size of the Army, have reduced the planned buildup of our Air Force, have sought to substitute inflammatory language in foreign relations for calm and confident strength.

In 1953 the Democrats in Congress voted for 143 air wing groups and a powerful Air Force by late 1955. The Republican policy was 120 air wing groups, which policy the Republicans in Congress adopted. The Republican policy this year is 137 air wing groups to be built up by latter 1957. This constitutes an admission on the part of the Republican Party that they were wrong last year and the Democrats were right.

The Republican policy this year is to reduce our Army and Navy. In the reduction of our Air Force, only last year, the Republicans admit they were wrong. They can be wrong this year in the proposed reduction of our Army and Navy.

The Democratic Party stands for powerful military forces in the air, on land, and on sea, not only for offensive purposes, but for defensive purposes.

The Democratic Party stands for the best defenses possible to protect our shores, our people, and our cities.

The Democratic Party stands for a powerful America, spiritually and militarily.

The inner divisions and paralysis of a party which cannot govern have clothed our foreign policy in the straitjacket of inflexibility. The Republican Party today cannot move in foreign policy—as in Indochina, where it cannot develop a bipartisan foreign policy between its own major factions.

The crisis in Indochina is the climax of months of Republican words and waste, the direct result of peace without honor, instead of using the months before the fall of Dien Bien Phu to strengthen southeast Asia through building up our own power and through consolidating our ties with our Asian and European friends, the administration spent this precious time cutting back our defense budget, and the taxes necessary to support such a budget, reducing our ground forces, frightening and alienating our allies, both in Asia and Europe, and brandishing futile and irrelevant slogans about instantaneous atomic retaliation.

Idle boasts about capturing the initiative are no substitute for intelligence, resolution, and collective strength.

We call for a return to the bipartisan foreign policy of the Truman administration and a sincere effort to deal realistically with the problems facing this Nation, without subverting the ideals of the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution.

III. Point 4

In Asia, Africa, the Middle East, the Pacific, and much of Latin America there are perhaps a billion and a half men, women, and children for whom varying degrees of poverty, hunger, disease, and ignorance are the typical way of life.

These people are now awakened to demand these minimum conditions of decent living to which surely all human beings are entitled.

They are in revolt against feudalistic control of their lands, they wish to be free to run their own affairs at the expense, if need be, of suffering from their own mistakes.

We Democrats pledge our support to these emerging nations as well as our aid to their undeveloped areas. To do so is not only in the interest of these people themselves, but is in the enlightened and practical self-interest of those who cherish freedom in the struggle against Communist aggression. By helping them to become more prosperous we become more prosperous ourselves.

We call for the immediate end of partition of Ireland. The last remnants of former British outrages against a long-suffering people should be removed and withdrawn at once.

IV. Hydroelectric and atomic power

Since taking office the Republican Party has shown itself to be the subservient tool of the predatory interests which wish to monopolize the means of producing and distributing electric light and power. This is all too evident from their recent efforts to weaken TVA by withholding appropriations and by the failure to reappoint Gordon R. Clapp as chairman. It is also from their efforts to turn over to private industry the development of atomic power. As a result of the latter, the United States appears to be falling behind their development of atomic power for civilian uses.

We therefore favor—

1. The condition of governmental control of atomic energy in the interests of all the people.
2. The establishment of a New England Regional Authority similar to the TVA to plan and develop multipurpose projects for hydroelectric power, flood control, soil conservation, reforestation, and allied activities.
3. Development of the Connecticut and Merrimack Rivers and the Passamaquoddy Basin.
4. The establishment of atomic research facilities for both military and peaceful purposes in Massachusetts because of the extraordinary concentration of highly skilled scientific and medical talent in the Commonwealth.
5. The location of processing plants for atomic materials in the Commonwealth in view of the abundant supply of skilled labor, abundant water supply, and skillful technicians.
6. The redressing by the Federal Government of the injustice done New England in the construction elsewhere than New England of federally financed public power facilities by now giving New England priority in the program for generation of electricity by atomic power.

V. Labor plank

We believe in the dignity of labor and the right of individuals to join labor unions for collective bargaining free from interference, restraint, or coercion from the employer. We believe in free collective bargaining. We believe that a free labor movement is essential to democracy and the free enterprise system.

We are reminded of the unfulfilled promise of the Republican Party to amend the Taft-Hartley Act in a workable and satisfactory way. There is only one way to write a workable and satisfactory labor law and that is to repeal the present law and to enact simultaneously a fair law, a good law.

We are reminded also of the Republican promise of greater prosperity, of the hard dollar, of lower prices, of greater purchasing power. None of them has materialized.

Instead of the promised lower prices, our people are paying higher prices for food.

Instead of greater prosperity, we have close to 4 million persons unemployed in the United States with approximately 150,000 unemployed in the Commonwealth.

VI. Agriculture

Any realistic appraisal of our economy must recognize that we cannot remain prosperous if our farmers are not sharing in the prosperity of this Nation.

We pledge our support to a sensible farm price-support program to insure a stable agricultural economy.

Recognizing the vital importance of the production of food and fiber as it affects the future security of our great Commonwealth, this convention supports an agricultural program which will maintain our agricultural population on a wage level with other segments of industry.

To secure the continued production of quality foods at reasonable consumer prices we recommend a vigorous program of sales promotion of Massachusetts farm products instituted by and acquiesced in by the Massachusetts Department of Agriculture. We recommend a program which will bring new hope to our farm people who for the past 2 years have suffered depressed and disastrous price levels.

VII. State administration

With justifiable pride we direct the attention of our fellow citizens to the great record of accomplishment of the Democratic administrations of Gov. Paul A. Dever, from 1948 to 1952. No other administration has done so much to restore Massachusetts to its historic role as the great leader of democratic government in this great democratic Union of sovereign States.

Alert, always, to the needs and problems of the hour, democratic administrations, motivated by impulses that spring from the heart and guided by sure and sound governmental principles, have pushed forward, with courage and with faith, to solve the problems of those who toil, to assist the unfortunate, the afflicted, and the poor, to safeguard the health and the lives of mothers and little children, to correct and guide the wayward and the delinquent, to shelter the homeless, and to assist all those, who, through no fault of theirs, find themselves in need. The last Democratic administration accomplished more, along these lines, than did all its Republican predecessors in 50 years.

We condemn the Republican administration in Washington for:

(a) Wiping out New England regional offices of various Federal agencies.

(b) Heartless and unwarranted reductions in civilian personnel.

(c) Failure to assign contracts and work for labor distressed communities in Massachusetts.

(d) Taking repair work away from the Boston Naval Shipyard.

(e) Failure to give proper consideration to the Quincy yard of the Bethlehem Shipbuilding Co.

(f) The attempt to close Murphy General Army Hospital.

(g) Ignoring other justifiable considerations of Massachusetts and its business and workers.

Though confronted, always, with Republican opposition, the Democratic Party has written into the statutes of this Commonwealth the great body of just, humane and progressive legislation which exists today. The Democratic Party has consistently advanced the welfare of all citizens, regardless of race, creed, or color. It will continue to follow in this path and to support these principles.

The Democratic Party will continue to advance the great, intelligently planned and economically executed highway program initiated and largely completed under the administration of Gov. Paul A. Dever. This great program has opened all sections of the Commonwealth to safe, pleasurable, and time-saving travel. It has attracted to this State not only those who desire to enjoy our unequalled vacation and recreational facilities, but, also, and more important, it has been the greatest inducement to the location of new industries and new mercantile and business establishments within our borders. Safe and rapid transportation was the correct answer to the needs of the business community. Gov. Paul A. Dever supplied the answer. His highway program, combined with other modern developments, has provided the friendly and cooperative business climate which employers of our great pool of skilled labor have a right to expect from a progressive State government.

VIII. The Herter administration

Never, in the history of our Democratic Party, have we found it so necessary to condemn an administration for conducting the affairs of state for partisan political advantage. We charge that the present Republican administration on Beacon Hill is the most politically minded administration in the whole history of this Commonwealth. Its leaders have deliberately delayed, until this election year, any attempt to put into effect the glittering promises they made during their fraudulent campaign to establish themselves in power.

They could have enacted, in 1953, some program of salary and wage increases for State employees, as they had promised to do. But not until this election year did they propose any such program, and even now, their program is not only unsatisfactory to State employees generally, but their schedule of wage adjustments actually proposes to reduce the wages of many of the lowest paid State workers.

They neglected, during all of 1953, to turn a shovel, to make any attempt to put into effect the programs and the plans for needed public buildings, for housing for the mentally ill, and for others entitled to public assistance. Though the bond issues have been approved and the monies appropriated for these and other reforms during the prior Democratic administration, this Republican administration has delayed, until this election year, to make the slightest endeavor to implement the plans and to expend the moneys necessary to promote and advance the general welfare.

They abandonded their outrageous gerrymander of congressional redistricting because they feared repudiation in this election year.

We defy the Republican administration of Gov. Christian A. Herter to disprove a single charge in this most serious indictment.

Elected by a campaign of misrepresentation and deceit, by unrestrained and unscrupulous charges of fraud and corruption, not one of which charges they have even attempted to sustain, the present leaders of the Republican Party are prepared, today, to renew the same election tactics, to continue the same charges, and to endeavor again to blind the voter to their own failures, their own inefficiency, their own mismanagement of State affairs.

But the people cannot be fooled all of the time. They will throw out this Republican administration which has been found unworthy of our great Commonwealth. They will return the Democratic Party to power in all branches of government.

The Democratic Party pledges itself to resume the forward-looking and statesmanlike program which the advent of the present Republican administration interrupted and delayed.

IX. Housing

We condemn:

(a) The present administration for its failure to initiate the low rent housing program for elderly persons in 1953 at the time of the passage of the legislation.

(b) The present administration for permitting public financing of present veterans housing program with 6 percent loans and large premiums thereby providing a bounty of tax-exempt income to large investment houses.

(c) The present administration for failure to authorize any construction under the presently authorized $25 million program of additional veterans housing for low-income families of veterans and and for adopting such strict standards for local housing authority applications that a program is almost impossible.

We favor:

(a) A housing program of State-guaranteed loans for veterans and low-income families at an interest rate substantially equal to the State rate of borrowing money, to permit purchase of single family homes in cooperation with Federal Housing Administration inspections.

(b) A program of rental housing for low-income aged persons of at least $25 million.

(c) Amendment of the present veterans housing laws to provide housing for low-income families of veterans to permit occupancy by all low-income families eligible for same, and to relax the standards of approving applications by cities and towns to permit construction of the presently authorized $25 million program which is bogged down because the present administration requires a 3-to-1 ratio of eligible applications before approving applications by cities and towns and permitting construction.

(d) Taking advantage of the present good bond market by placing all veterans' housing loans under the present program into permanent bonds instead of continuing temporary financing which is subject to the fluctuation of the bond market.

(e) Some system of control over local zoning and planning regulations to prevent local communities from placing such burdensome requirements in planning and zoning that it becomes impossible to build low-cost private housing at prices within the reach of the working family.

(f) Rent control.

X. Reform of legislative procedure

We condemn the Republican policy of flaunting the guaranty of the Constitution by holding in the Committee on Rules over 400 legislative proposals, without granting the right of free American expression on their merits. Their action constitutes a violation of express provisions of the constistitution of the Commonwealth.

Reform of legislative procedure is imperative. Chief among these important bills which should be reported out and passed is the usury and small-loan bills which would eliminate vicious lending practices and exorbitant interest rates which are rampant in Massachusetts today and which victimize those least able to afford it.

XI. Civil liberties and civil rights

In respect to civil rights both nationally and in Massachusetts, the Democratic Party has made equality of opportunity not an ideal to be sought but a reality to be practiced. Since any impairment of equality through segregation or discrimination constitutes not only an act of injustice to the victim, but an assault upon those basic beliefs that have sustained our institutions and defined our national character, and since nothing so gives the lie to Communist propaganda charges as passage and effective administration of laws which prohibit discrimination and segregation when based on race, creed, color, and national origin, we recommend the boldness and imagination with which this evil has been outlawed in Massachusetts under a Democratic administration as a model for the rest of the Nation. It is our firm determination to support legislation which eliminates discrimination in employment, in admission to educational institutions, in public housing, in hotels and restaurants, or that based on racial or religious grounds.

We affirm our opposition to all forms of totalitarianism whether Communist, Fascist, or any other as destroyers of human equality and liberty, and as menaces to the establishment of world peace. We cannot separate our obligations to combat totalitarianism and preserve and enhance democratic freedom.

In the struggle for freedom and security we must be careful we do not sacrifice our individual liberties guaranteed us by the Constitution.

At the same time we must recognize that these rights carry obligations with them.

XII. Redistricting

We believe the question of the apportionment of the congressional districts to be one which should be scientifically approached in order that the following results be obtained:

1. A division into districts which would not vary in population by more than 5 percent from an ideal figure arrived at by dividing the total population of the State by the number of districts.
2. Districts which would be contiguous and compact.
3. Districts which would keep every city (except Boston) within one congressional district.

The redistricting plan proposed in the 1954 session of the general court by the Republican-controlled Commission on Congressional Districts failed to meet any of the above standards and was so preposterous that it could not even pass a Republic-controlled legislature. We recommend a constitutional amendment providing that no city of this Commonwealth which has a less number of legal voters than the numerical quota for a State senatorial district, shall be divided for redistricting purposes.

A constitutional amendment to provide that there shall be 240 single representative districts in this Commonwealth.

XIII. Automobile insurance classification

We recommend:

1. The repudiation and repeal of the 60-percent surtax on drivers of motor vehicles under the age of 25 years. This unfair and inequitable system of making the youth of this Commonwealth pay an additional 60-percent premium on their compulsory automobile insurance is not supported or substantiated by statistical data. It was a case where the special interests, to wit, the insurance companies wanted an additional $5 million dollars, and they assessed it against the youth of this State. This plan has the blessings of Governor Herter.

2. The adoption of an order whereby the Commonwealth will setup and maintain within the division of insurance a rating bureau of its own. Today the Massachusetts Rating Bureau which provides the insurance commissioner with the necessary data upon which he promulgates automobile insurance rates is privately owned and controlled and maintained by the insurance companies.

XIV. Medical and dental schools, other health needs

We repeat our 1952 platform on this important matter. One of the most priceless possessions of mankind is good health. A large segment of our population does not enjoy that blessing. Chronic diseases such as heart disease, arteriosclerosis, high-blood pressure, nervous disorders, arthritis, kidney disease, cancer, diabetes, and asthma, among others—victimize many of our citizens. Chronic diseases in Massachusetts account for nearly $150 million loss in income annually.

Statistics show that more than one-half of the chronically ill are under 45 years of age; 16 percent of them are under 25; 75 percent of them are in the productive years between 15 and 64.

We hail Governor Dever for recommending the erection of a 600-bed chronic disease hospital, in the Forest Hills section of Boston to care for all citizens of the Commonwealth stricken with a chronic disorder. This laudable accomplishment has been destroyed by the present Republican governor, who has changed this hospital into a clinic.

There is an acute shortage of trained practitioners in the medical profession in Massachusetts.

There is a greater shortage of dentists.

There is an alarming lack of trained nurses, especially in the Greater Boston area,

Health agencies are scattered in separate locations, thereby causing an obvious lack of coordination among them.

Many sane, elderly citizens, suffering from chronic diseases, are now hospitalized in mental hospitals.

In the 48 States, Massachusetts ranks fortieth in terms of family doctors. Figures also indicate that of the 3042 such doctors, 48 percent are graduates of schools which have since been closed. Records indicate further that approximately 15 percent of interns and 10 percent of the residents in Massachusetts hospitals are graduates of foreign medical schools and not more than one-fifth of these will ever be admitted to private practice.

The three private medical schools in the Boston area drew students largely from beyond Massachusetts' borders.

Although Massachusetts has 4 percent of the total number of dentists in the United States, they are disproportionately distributed among our communities. They are higher than average age of dentists—there is a very high incidence of dental disease in our population, and there is an annual decline in the number of practicing dentists.

We hail the magnificent undertaking of former Governor Devers, which called for the establishment of these much needed institutions, which would actually be located within quick commuting distance from Boston, and on a single tract of land, on which would be a State medical and health center, containing an 800-bed chronic disease hospital, a medical school, dental school, school for nurses, a 200-bed tuberculosis hospital and a single integrated administration building for all allied State health agencies. This is our aim and we pledge ourselves to its fulfillment.

XV. Efficiency in State government

Under Governor Dever a sincere start has been made in the direction of a comprehensive reorganization of State departments through the creation of the special commission on the structure of State government which he recommended and signed into law.

We reaffirm our previous position in advocating sound organization to effect more efficient, responsible, and economic operation.

XVI. Election laws' revision

Democracy begins with the registration of the voter. Every avenue of convenience should be left open to the unregistered and prospective voter to perform this civic duty. We condemn the Republican Party in this State, for reducing the registration period by 12 days when it was last in control of the entire legislature and the gubernational office and we condemn it since then for repeatedly blocking attempts of the Democratic Party to restore them.

Four separate efforts have been made at restoration, but on each occasion the endeavor has been blocked by the Republican-controlled senate.

We reaffirm our previous position. This and other election reforms can only be achieved, however, by the election of a majority of Democrats in both branches of the legislature.

Once again, we stand foursquare for the elimination of the vicious gerrymander. Reapportionment of congressional districts to provide equitable representation and community interest and in conformity with the Constitution has been scoffed at by the Republican house and senate.

The Republican Party too long has been able to hold congressional seats which do not belong to it by encouraging its senators to sit on their hands when this important matter is before the body in utter nullification of the constitution and laws of the Commonwealth. This evil practice must end. To secure its abolition, the Democratic Party must prevail in November.

Counting of ballots during the progress of an election, as presently permitted in towns of the Commonwealth, is another untoward practice that should be halted. The sacredness of the ballot should be held inviolate. The Democratic Party pledges itself to support legislation forbidding the opening of ballot boxes during polling hours.

It further takes a position in support of proposals establishing a statewide uniformity in police listings and in plant registrations.

We favor legislation providing for:

1. Bipartisan boards of registrars of voters in all cities and towns.
2. Bipartisan count of ballots in all of the 204 single precinct towns which by statute now can have the ballots counted by the selectmen and town clerk even though all of them are Republicans.
3. A count and record in each precinct of all unused ballots in elections, and a count of all unused ballots in recounts.
4. The outright repeal from our statutes of the un-American system known as P. R.

XVII. State labor recommendations

We favor:

1. A $1 minimum wage for all persons with time and one-half in excess of 40 hours per week and 8 hours per day.
2. Compulsory sickness disability insurance with a State fund.
3. An increase from $25 to $35 per week in unemployment compensation benefits.
4. Reemployment rights for injured workers.
5. Workmen's compensation benefits equal to two-thirds of the injured workers' average wages; and subsistence payments adjusted to the fluctuations in living costs to injured workers and their families. Same to be integrated under a State-operated program of workmen's compensation.
6. An investigation of insurance companies engaged in workmen's compensation and automobile insurance.
7. Increases in salaries for schoolteachers with a $3,000 minimum.
8. A labor representative on the department of public utilities trained in labor relations and consumer problems.
9. An adequate flat salary increase across the board for all State employees.
10. A graduated State income tax and a complete overhauling of out antiquated and inequitable tax structure. Unequivocal opposition to a general sales tax and other regressive forms of taxation.
11. Election day a half holiday.
12. Strengthening and better policing of minimum wage and of the child-labor laws, including the school-attendance law and correction of abuses under the industrial homework laws.

XVIII. Judiciary

We deplore as needless and unnecessary the creation of eight juvenile justices as an expensive experiment under the guise of a corrective approach, but in reality a prostitution of justice for political gain. Termed in its proper light as a $500,000 needless expenditure of the people's money for life tenure of gubernatorial babysitters.

The judges authorized by this bill will be required to perform duties far beyond the scope of their experience. For example, the judge of the Berkshire, Franklin, Hampshire, and Hampden Counties will be faced with all of the juvenile-delinquency problems and with the requirement to coordinate youth activity in a district which is 65 miles from one end to the other which contains 75 towns and 6 cities with a population of 600,000 persons.

We believe that more recreational activity, particularly in congested areas, such as supervised playground programs, is the preventive medicine. A greater concentration of recreational facilities for the family unit is sorely needed. This administration has neglected to recognize the need, but has promoted a false philosophy of promises, but no action.

We recommend widening of the scope of activities of the Youth Service Board, with larger appropriations for supervised recreational activities.

We urge a frontal assault on the present problem, not a rear-guard action after the battle has been lost.

These problems can best be solved by judges in the local districts who are close to the people of their district and to their districts' problems. The Republican legislation was an example of patronage at any cost.

We laud the Hearst publications for its editorial expressions against this wasteful expenditure.

XIX. McCarran-Walter Immigration Act

We pledge continued revision of our immigration and naturalization laws to do away with any unjust and unfair practices against national groups which have contributed some of our best citizens. We will eliminate distinctions between native-born and naturalized citizens. We want no second-class citizens in free America. We are unalterably opposed to and we demand the repeal of the iniquitous McCarran-Walter Immigration Act.

XX. Boston

We reaffirm the sympathetic attitude of the Massachusetts Democratic Party toward the problems of Boston. Boston is the capital city of Massachusetts and New England and its economic health is essential to the economic health of the Commonwealth.

We shall continue our efforts to rejuvenate the historic city of Boston and restore it to its former glory.

The St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES G. OAKMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 24, 1954

Mr. OAKMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement made by me before the House Committee on Rules concerning the St. Lawrence seaway:

Mr. Chairman, I doubt that it has been made crystal clear to all of the members of the Rules Committee that the only issue facing the Congress of the United States today, and this committee at the moment, is the decision as to whether we shall let Canada build the locks and the canals in the International Rapids section on Canadian soil as a result of inaction on our part, or whether by the positive approval of the Wiley-Dondero bill and the consent of the Canadian Government we shall be allowed to build these locks and canals on American soil in northern New York State.

The bill before the Rules Committee does not create the seaway. That decision has already been made by Canada. It merely changes the location of these limited facilities from the north side of the river in Canada to the south side and inside the United States for a reimbursable investment of $105 million.

Since the money will be returned to the Federal Government together with interest and at no ultimate cost to the American taxpayer, we shall acquire permanent and perpetual control, equal in effect with the control exercised by Canada, of this very vital artery of commerce and defense.

Why is it desirable to have these facilities on American soil? The reasons on which the Eisenhower administration, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and the National Security Council reached a unanimous decision on this bill are briefly these:

This is a vital and strategic waterway that leads directly to the heartland of the United States. No nation has ever voluntarily forfeited control of a major waterway. Witness the struggles still going on regarding the Suez Canal and the controversy that raged for 50 years between Great Britain and the United States about the control of the Panama Canal before construction was undertaken.

The people of the United States will pay for the seaway in any event as the major share of the traffic will be of United States origin or destination. We shall pay for the project through navigation tolls. It is desirable to own a portion of it, since we are paying for it anyway.

In this atomic age, inspection of foreign ships coming into the heartland of the United States may become very important. The United States should have a say in this matter. We can acquire this authority by controlling the International Rapids locks and canals, before the ships get into United States territory.

The United States should have a say, I believe, in the arrangements to protect the seaway against sabotage and military action. When built, the seaway will become strategic whether it is on the Canadian side or the United States side. We shall have a better chance of making our interest heard if we have control over a part of it.

In the event of different neutral or belligerent status between the United States and Canada in the case of any emergency or possible war, rights of entry and navigation, if subject to investigation, a controversy could be more favorably adjudicated if we were actual participants in the project.

In the event of capacity operation of the seaway, the determination of priorities may become important. Control of a portion of the seaway will give us an effective voice and permit protection of United States interests.

In the determination of tolls, the United States will have a partner's voice instead of merely being in the position of a pleader before the tribunals of another nation.

Last, but not least, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, it is an example to the world of two great neighboring democracies working cooperatively and harmoniously together as we have for the past 140 years. We owe this cooperation to our great and good neighbor to the north, the Dominion of Canada.

The Late Maury Maverick, of Texas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 24, 1954

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, since the recent passing of the Honorable Maury Maverick, of San Antonio, Tex., former Member of Congress, individuals and newspapers of my State have joined in paying tribute to Mr. Maverick's integrity and courage.

The Austin (Tex.) American has summed up editorially those qualities which caused Mr. Maverick to be so widely respected. I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAVERICK UPHELD NAME—STOOD BY HIS IDEALISM

The pioneer Maverick family gave the name to a Texas county, and it gave the English language a colorful word of general use. The word, in its political derivative, means an irreconcilable nonconformist.

Dynamic Maury Maverick, Sr., who died Monday, lived up fully to the political connotations of "maverick." He was independent, determined, and though he alined himself generally with the liberalist New Deal and loyalist factions in Texas politics, he relied on his own ideas wholly how far to go, and in what direction.

Though only 57, he had been a leader in political affairs so long that he had become something of a tradition, particularly in the realm of the liberalists' long fight against the faction of Texas Democrats variously labeled "Jeffersonian Democrats," "Dixiecrats," "Texas Regulars," and the life.

He had been mayor of San Antonio, Congressman from the San Antonio District, and during World War II, head of the Government Small Business Agency. He was a veteran of World War I and carried battle wounds through life which impaired his health in later years.

Maury Maverick, living out a turbulent life in the thick of political brawling, was a man who kept the highest sense of personal integrity, and who early carved out for himself a set of personal and political ideals with which he lived out his life. He was unyielding, and his determination to stick by his own concepts made him a major foe to the opposition, and often an uncomfortable ally to those who went in somewhat the direction of his course.

San Antonio bears the impress of his achievements and possibly some of the scars of his battles, or the battles in which he figured.

He liked to scrap, and sometimes in his political battles, it appeared that the fight itself interested him more than the prize. But to those who understood his rugged individualism, strangely intermingled with the doctrine of human welfare, against the background of cynical politics, found in him a consistency that made almost constant political combat a logical corollary.

The Maverick family carries on his political philosophy in Maury Maverick, Jr., who has followed the elder's footsteps in the path of liberalism and upon the field of politics. Maury, Jr., is a member of the legislature, a recognized leader of the liberalist forces there. Like his father, he is an able speaker and debater, a keen parliamentarian, and a rough and ready slugger in verbal warfare and legislative strategy.

A unique phase of the senior Maverick's public service was when he abandoned the discussion of politics and the urgings of the tenets of what at the time was called the New Deal, to undertake a vastly toilsome task in the national-defense effort. Through him, thousands of small factories and plants were drawn into the defense production program, and thus, through his efforts, many small-business men came through the war with their enterprise still on its feet.

The 1-Year Extension of the Trade Agreements Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 24, 1954

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an editorial entitled "Administration Bill?" published in the Daily Courier-Democrat, of Russellville, Ark., on June 21, 1954.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

ADMINISTRATION BILL?

One of the more interesting stories on today's wire quoted Senate Republican Leader Knowland as saying he is confident the "Senate will be able to beat down Democrat efforts to revise the administration's reciprocal trade bill."

Now to the casual reader, it would seem that the GOP leader is holding the reins on a team and steering a Presidential measure through the Senate. But, unfortunately, the GOP leader creates a false impression when he insinuates that the Democrats are trying to scuttle an administration measure while the Republicans are backing the President.

In the first place, the Senate will not take up the administration's reciprocal trade measure Tuesday, depite the fact that Senator Knowland claimed the title for the measure. What is coming before the Senate is a 1-year extension of a Democrat law that has served its purpose and needs expanding.

Incidentally, it is a far cry from the measure the administration sought. Here, briefly, is the story:

Back in 1930, the Republican Congress passed and President Hoover signed the Smoot-Hawley tariff law that set the highest schedule in history and practically closed the door on foreign trade. Foreign countries retaliated with high tariffs against American products. The depression was in full swing, and this action added to the problems of the American businessman who was trying to peddle his products.

In 1934 the Democrat Congress passed the first reciprocal trade law in an effort to solve some of the problems created by Mr. Hoover and the Republicans. Under this plan, Americans agreed to reduce certain tariffs in return for similar reductions in tariffs against American gods. The law has been revised and renewed as the need arose.

At the beginning of the Eisenhower administration, the President named a commission, headed by Clarence Randall, to study the foreign economic problems. This commission recommended that the reciprocal trade law be extended for 3 years, and provisions made for sharp cuts in some of the tariffs.

At the time, the Eisenhower administration was full of high-sounding slogans and one of the most popular was "trade, not aid."

As Senator Fulbright pointed out, it was a good slogan and made sense in that we would no longer be asked to subsidize our exports by taxing ourselves.

The Randall report (which was not unanimous since prominent Republicans on the commission opposed it) represented President Eisenhower's policy, but the Republican Congress rejected it. Instead, the House finally agreed to a 1-year extension of the old law. It has yet to come up in the Senate. But the bill is not an Eisenhower measure; it is a warmed-over Democrat law that has served its purpose and needs expanding.

Typically, Senator Knowland is accusing the Democrats in advance of attacking an administration bill when the Republicans have already cut the heart out of the measure.

How absurd can we get?

Taxpayers Pick Up the Check

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 1954

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following editorial from the Oil City Derrick, of Oil City, Pa., Tuesday, June 22, 1954:

TAXPAYERS PICK UP THE CHECK

Passage by the House of Representatives of a $1,300,000,000 farm surplus disposal bill again puts under the spotlight the farm price support program which has saddled the Government with huge stocks at tremendous cost to the taxpayers.

Under the House bill, the administration would be empowered to sell up to a billion dollars worth of surplus food and other farm products to friendly nations for their own use. It would also authorize the President to make gifts of an additional $300 million worth to relieve famine or promote the interests of American foreign policy.

Major objective of the legislation, of course, is to reduce the mountain of surplus farm products acquired under the price support program—stocks which are costing an estimated $700,000 a day in storage charges alone. Some good naturally will come from the disposal program through aid to sufferers from famine, flood and other distress, and through helping fill the larders of friendly nations.

But these advantages will be accomplished only at terrific cost to American taxpayers, for the disposal of the surpluses will be made at a fraction of what the Government was forced to pay under the present price support law.

There's a way to avoid such costs in the future. That's to have a farm policy that makes sense and avoids accumulating such vast surpluses.

Efforts now are being made by President Eisenhower and Secretary of Agriculture Benson to win congressional approval of a change in the Truman administration's price support policy under which the surpluses have grown to mountainous proportions. Instead of rigid price supports at 90 percent of parity, the administration would substitute a program of flexible supports beginning next January 1.

The present price support program is wrong economically. Only a relatively few farmers profit greatly from it, the fact being that it affects just 23 percent of the total annual farm income. It is damaging to the large urban population who have their living costs—and their taxes—hiked to pay for it.

The real fact of the matter is that the price support program has reached the place where it is not only unpalatable to people who aren't farmers but its unappetizing and uneconomical aspects are becoming ever plainer to a great many who are. It's time for a change.

The Supreme Court Decision Holding Segregation in Schools Unconstitutional

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. M. (DON) WHEELER

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 24, 1954

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I should like to call attention of the House to a letter I have received from Mr. M. L. Powell, principal, Pearson Public Schools, Pearson, Ga., and to a statement from and by Mr. J. Malcolm Wade, of Folkston, Ga. Both Mr. Powell's letter and the statement by Mr. Wade are remarkably expressive of the feeling held by the majority of the people of the South relative to the recent decision by the Supreme Court which holds segregation of the races in public schools to be unconstitutional.

In order that the Members of Congress and all readers of the Record may have the benefit of the fine expressions from Mr. Powell and Mr. Wade, I am inserting their statements.

The letter and statement follow:

PEARSON PUBLIC SCHOOLS,
Pearson, Ga., June 17, 1954.

Hon. DON WHEELER,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WHEELER: This communication concerns the unfortunate decision recently rendered by the Supreme Court. I firmly believe that this unwise decision is primarily due to the lack of judicial experience of the men who now comprise the Supreme Court. It might be well indeed for the Members of Congress to take a very careful look into the qualifications and judicial background of each man now on the court. However, in my opinion, you would be without recourse to remedy the matter at the present time because the Constitution neither stipulates any qualifications or limits the authority of the Supreme Court.

Regardless of the merits or demerits of the issue concerning segregation, the decision was most unwise and unfortunate for several reasons. In the first place it destroyed the stability and permanency of the Constitution itself and made of it a pliable and meaningless instrument to be twisted and warped to fit in with the ideologies of the men of the moment. It set a dangerous precedent of reversing decisions of the Supreme Court itself that have stood for a long period of time and been sustained by a very able group of jurists. Perhaps the most damaging aspect of the decision is the effect it will have upon rights of the sovereign States to govern their own internal affairs which were left to their jurisdiction by the Constitution itself.

The greatness of this Nation is due in a very large measure to the freedom enjoyed by the sovereign States in the control and direction of their internal affairs. When the Supreme Court or any other power seeks to destroy this right and this privilege, the unity, power, and strength, of this great land of ours will be in a grave and perilous predicament indeed. The sovereignty of the 48 States that make up this great Nation of ours is so deeply ingrained that they will never submit to the domination and coercion of a central power whether it be of the Congress, the executive, or the judicial branch of our Central Government. Ours is a mutually dualistic system of government each respecting the rights and prerogatives of the other.

It is, therefore, extremely unwise to permit any nine men however wise or sincere they might be, to nullify the constitutions of the sovereign States, to reverse the time-tested decisions of the Supreme Court itself, to destroy the stability, permanency, and the faith in the Constitution of the United States, and to set loose the chaos, confusion, ill will, hatred, and racial strife that is bound to be the ultimate result of this decision.

It is my humble opinion that the Congress of the United States should look well to the idea of prescribing limits for the operation of the Supreme Court and to set up qualifications for the Justices of the Supreme Court in keeping with the grave responsibilities of the high office to which they have been appointed.

With every good wish for you and your success in this matter, I am

Sincerely yours,

M. L. POWELL,
Principal.

ONE SOUTHERNER'S VIEWPOINT

I am writing this as a southerner, born in the South and brought up in the South. This statement is not prepared by, nor promoted by any group or political clique. However, I do believe it to follow a close parallel of thought of most any southerner you might approach on the subject of segregation and most of the people of our Nation.

In my opinion the white citizen of the South and his wishes, his customs of several generations are just as pertinent to preservation, just as important for upholding as the advancement of the colored race. In my opinion the white people of the South, their wishes as individual citizens and as a group together should be upheld by constitutional law as much as the desires of any other race or group.

In my opinion, any forced law or opinion of law that says that a people must suddenly divert from regional common custom as prevalent and as important as racial segregation in the South is a direct violation of the individual's rights as guaranteed under the laws of our land as a free land.

Does this truly make freedom? This which contends to make, compel to force a people to live as they wish not to live? I say no.

Can this be made a land more free by suddenly stifling the wishes and customs of lifelong habit prevalent here in the South?

Is it right to arbitrarily force the people of these many Southern States to cease to live as they desire?

As I have been taught to believe, an individual has a right to live as he wishes, free to do as he desires until his desires interfere with the rights of some other person. This right then, also applies to a city, county, or parish and then to its State in turn.

In my opinion a people of a State are supposed to be able to live as free as they wish, other States rights not conflicting. Our State's rights are being taken away. I call on each of you as leaders to preserve our statehood.

Is this freedom? This which forces down the throat, so to speak, the apparent wishes of several of the more populous States upon several of our States here in the South?

I have been raised to respect the rights of colored people, just as any other rightly taught person here in the South does. However, the rights of colored persons here in the South today does not include the right to sit with white people. It does not include the right to attend school with white children. It does not include absolute right to intermingle with white people just anywhere or at anytime. Neither does the right of a white person here in the South today include the right to sit with colored people in a group. It does not include the right to attend school with colored children. It does not include the absolute rights to intermingle with colored people just anytime or anywhere. All this for certain necessary basic biological reasons. These reasons arising from definite sharp differences of race. The above-mentioned reasons are obvious to any person living here for a lifetime in the South.

From what I have been told and from what I have seen, the colored person is treated here in the South with much more consideration than is shown him in the several more populous States of the more northern region.

We here in the South feel that if justice is to be done in a matter, then firsthand true knowledge of the matter must certainly be within the minds of those concerned with meting out this justice.

We of a fair mind here in the South try to understand how our fellow countrymen arrive at a decision in any matter. When it seems clear to us that perhaps there is a lack of personal firsthand knowledge, then certainly it becomes our duty to try to convey those needed items of information necessary to build up this knowledge where lacking.

We have felt all along that there has been needed more of an understanding in other sections of the segregation problem in the South which was of no concern to political groups until the last few years. The wishes of the Negro race at large are not represented, in my way of thinking, by the proposed banishment of segregation in the South. Rather, the proposed nonsegregation represents the views and work of minority pressure groups. In my opinion the wishes of the Southern Negro are in definite support of segregation in the South, by and large, as it is practiced today.

We here in the South feel that we are perfectly capable of handling the rights of individuals, the rights of any race or of any religion or creed that might be in our midst. This, without at the same time imposing too much on any other individual, any other race, religion, or creed in our home, city, county, or parish, or our State, or our group of States as a southern group.

There are questions for law to decide, from a legal standpoint.

There are questions for people to decide, from a moral standpoint.

There are questions for God and time to decide.

This is my humble viewpoint, but a viewpoint I must state.

This is a question for God and time to decide.

Respectfully yours,

J. MALCOLM WADE.

FOLKSTON, GA.

Intervene: How and With What?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY

OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 24, 1954

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, the administration's cold war policy of talking tougher and carrying a smaller stick has now brought us face to face with a serious setback in southeast Asia. We have lost face in the Orient, lost the leadership of the free world at Geneva, and what is more, we are threatened with the loss of our unspeakably vital lead in weapons technology.

The defense of the United States is not a matter of partisan politics. But partisan politics is today obscuring and soft pedaling administration defense blunders. Our people need to know the facts. They are entitled to the facts—pleasant or unpleasant. And they are entitled to demand an end to the contradictory statements emanating from military and civilian leaders in the Defense Department.

It is very apparent that slogans and clever phrases have not and cannot deter the Communists although they do confuse our own people. Has the New Look or speeches about massive retaliation slowed the Communist drive to take over Indochina?

When the Indochina situation began to rapidly deteriorate, the administration hurriedly sent Secretary Dulles flying off to friendly capitals to get agreement on some kind of an intervention scheme. Just what the scheme was has not been frankly divulged. The British are now being condemned for its lack of fruition. This assumes the scheme was desirable and practicable. It may well be that it was not.

It is widely assumed that if Britain, and perhaps others, had agreed, we would have intervened in Indochina. But how and with what? We had the backing of the United Nations in Korea. Yet, aside from the South Koreans, how much help did we get from others? Based upon our experience in Korea, what could we expect in Indochina? Moral support, but not much else, and this fact was and is crystal clear to the Communists.

Under the New Look policy, our ground strength is being reduced to 17 divisions. Six divisions are tied down in the Far East because of the Korean impasse. They could be moved from that area only at the gravest risk because of the reported Communist build-up and our treaty with South Korea, not to mention our responsibilities in Japan.

Five divisions are tied up in Europe and we have agreed to maintain strength there.

This leaves only six Army combat divisions available for all of our other far-flung commitments, including Indochina should the administration decide to intervene there. It is perfectly clear that we cannot forcefully intervene with ground troops in Indochina without greater mobilization, and this would require considerable time.

But this is not all. The recent testimony of Maj. Gen. R. W. Colglazier, Jr., Assistant Chief of Staff for Plans, indicates that the New Look cutbacks have created some materiel deficiencies that could prove disastrous in a sudden emergency.

If it is said that our intervention could be limited to airpower, a Pandora's box of problems is opened up—defensible airbases in the theater of war; enemy targets; and whether or not to confine our air attacks to targets in Indochina; our preparedness to risk great expansion of the conflict; these and more should give us, and our allies, reason to be circumspect.

Our allies and our enemies know these facts. They know the administration has bluffed and sloganized, yet weakened our military buildup, particularly airpower, all the while talking tougher and increasing our global commitments. Many of our own people have been misled by the slogans and the conflicting statements, but not the Communists. They have been getting bolder and increasingly defiant. To try now to make the British the scapegoat for all of the administration's blunders may be good domestic politics, but it is not statesmanship, and it will only serve to lower our decreasing prestige still further. When we talk about intervention, we had better explain how and with what, instead of trying to blame administration failures and indecision on our allies.

Only this week the Secretary of Defense again contradicted military estimates of Russian strength in the matter of technological progress. Whom are we to believe? I am increasingly concerned over the illogical easygoing complacency of a Secretary of Defense who appears to lack any real appreciation of the critical nature of our current defense problems. For instance, new weapons systems cannot safely be shunted aside and postponed because they make costly old ones obsolete. This will work in the motorcar business, but not in national defense.

No one can deny there is confusion in the Pentagon and the State Department. It is time for the administration to decide on a policy and give us the facts.

Hennings Seeks Justice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. A. S. J. CARNAHAN

OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 24, 1954

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the Record, I include an article from the Farmington Press entitled "Hennings Seeks Justice":

HENNINGS SEEKS JUSTICE

Because it is an all too human tendency to criticize and seldom praise officials, we feel that considerable good work on the part of our elected Representatives sometimes goes unnoticed. And it is the duty of responsible newspapers to see that unusual efforts in the public interest by Members of Congress and others is called to the attention of their readers.

Take Missouri's senior Senator, Thomas C. Hennings, Jr., for instance, and his efforts to get at the bottom of the Lorwin affair. This is an example of statesmanship over and above the call of duty, for Lorwin is not a Missourian nor a constituent of Mr. Hennings. Mr. Lorwin is merely an American who has been grievously wronged by the witchhunters and vigilantes who call Jumping Joe McCarthy their prophet. Mr. Hennings is a United States Senator, elected by the people of Missouri, but also with deep obligations to uphold and defend the Constitution and the welfare of the American people as a whole.

Briefly, the Lorwin affair is this: Mr. Val Lorwin, a former State Department employee and a college professor, was indicted last year by the Justice Department for allegedly lying to a loyalty board which cleared him. But now it develops that the Justice Department attorney, one Mr. Gallagher, gave perjured testimony to the grand jury which indicted Mr. Lorwin—testimony gleaned from one of the professional ex-Communists playing the Washington circuit. The Justice Department hurriedly dropped the case, but not until after Mr. Lorwin had been forced to resign his job and spend $25,000 defending himself from the absurd charge. And then there is the misunderstanding and the public confusion about a person once accused of disloyalty which a person, even though cleared, can seldom live entirely down.

This should be one of the outstanding answers to the challenge by supporters of McCarthy—the challenge, "What innocent person has McCarthy hurt?" This is only one outstanding example, of which there are several. And there are numerous—perhaps hundreds—of smaller people whose cases haven't received as much publicity.

We think Senator Hennings should go ahead with his plan to press for an inquiry of the Lorwin affair. If there was ever a miscarriage of justice, this was it. The fact that the offending attorney was fired doesn't entirely clear up the matter.

Hon. James E. Folsom Urges Maintenance of Current Rate for Federal Public Assistance Payments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CARL ELLIOTT

OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 17, 1954

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I should like to take this opportunity to join the Governor-elect of Alabama, the Honorable James E. Folsom, in urging the Congress to maintain the current formula for determining the amount of Federal payments to the States for public assistance.

In a recent editorial, the Birmingham News pointed out very clearly the evils that would result from adoption of the new formula now under consideration. It points out that Alabama's needy would suffer severely, since the State would stand to lose approximately $2 million under this formula.

I would like to make these facts a matter of public record. In order that everyone might know, I, under unanimous consent, include this editorial in the Record:

MANY IN ALABAMA MAY SUFFER IF CONGRESS CHANGES PRESENT PUBLIC ASSISTANCE SCHEDULE

This newspaper joins with Governor-nominate, James E. Folsom, in the hope that the present Congress will take action to maintain the existing scale of Federal public assistance payments. Under the existing laws, the current schedule will expire September 30 of this year. And while an administration-backed bill has been introduced to extend the present formula for 1 year, it is also proposed to apply a new formula beginning with September 30, 1955. Under the new formula Alabama would stand to lose an estimated $2 million.

Alabama's needy would suffer severely under such a loss. Already they are receiving pitifully inadequate incomes. In March of this year, for example, the recipients of public assistance in Alabama received an average of $28.30 per case, as compared with a national average of $56.35 and an average of $39.85 for the Southern States.

But the trouble does not lie in any unwillingness on the part of Alabamians to help those in need of public assistance. That may be said despite the fact that during the fiscal year 1952–53, Alabama spent less from State and local funds for public assistance than it did in 1951–52. It still remains true that, considering its low per capita income, and its high percentage of population that do not fall under social security benefits, Alabama is doing a creditable job of caring for its aged and blind and disabled and dependent.

The new formula proposed in Congress would vary the amount of Federal assistance according to the State's per capita income. The principle of granting more assistance to States with low per capita income is sound, but some consideration should be given to the effort States put forth. Alabama has considerable reason to be proud of the way its department of public welfare has been run. It has the lowest operating costs in the Nation. However, with the need far greater than the means for meeting it, there are naturally many criticisms and complaints. We do not want the situation to get any worse because of cuts in Federal grants to the needy.

The Gentleman From Nevada

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES O. EASTLAND

OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, June 24, 1954

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an article entitled "The Gentleman From Nevada," written by Howard Rushmore, and appearing in the June 1954 issue of American Mercury.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

THE GENTLEMAN FROM NEVADA

(By Howard Rushmore)

High on the leftwing's list of men for extinction is the name of a Nevada sheep rancher who 50 years ago led the fight for an 8-hour day for labor and other causes on behalf of the underprivileged.

Pat McCarran is still battling for the rights of the underdog, although in the half century he has been in politics, the sturdy son of Irish immigrants has seen the wheel swing full circle and the minority now emerge as old-fashioned Americans devoted to certain basic principles often forgotten in 1954.

Consequently, the man from the banks of the Truckee River has been under heavy crossfire from the Communists, the Americans for Democratic Action, and particularly the portside of his own party. And McCarran is a Democrat.

But he is the kind of a Democrat that outdates Roosevelt and the New Deal. Many of the latter claque have openly branded the Senator from Nevada as a traitor because of his vigorous stand against FDR's Supreme Court packing of 1937 and particularly for Pat's determined offensive against communism.

Only recently the Democratic National Committee issued a long statement adding up the score of their alleged fight against communism. But left out entirely was the name of Pat McCarran and his authorship of such laws as the Internal Security Act and the Immigration and Nationality Act.

No mention was made by McCarran's own party of these two important pieces of legislation which really hurt the Communist conspiracy. And Pat's chairmanship of the Internal Security Subcommittee when the Institute of Pacific Relations was smoked out and ran up a tree also was ignored in the boasting of the Democrats about their anti-Communist heroes.

These antics by his party leaders don't bother the tough man with the thick mane of white hair, and the brilliant blue eyes that survey life and the Democrats with that philosophic calm gained after 77 years.

Typical of Pat's reaction was his reply to a member of his staff when he was considering the chairmanship of the subcommittee that was later to expose the IPR. "You'll be smeared from hell to breakfast," he was warned. "Every organization and publication left of center will never let up on you because this IPR mob is part of the Democrats' machine." McCarran fingered his gold Nevada nugget tiepin about 10 seconds and snapped back: "I'll be chairman."

He made the same decision back in 1902 when a Nevada political leader drove out to the McCarran sheep ranch and asked him to run for the legislature. Pat remembers the incident. "I wasn't a likely looking candidate for office. I was out working in the corrals and had about 2 weeks' growth of beard and was dressed in the usual sheepherder's outfit. And I had a lot of sheep to take care of. But I decided to make a try for it, beard or not."

McCarran spent a typically western boyhood on his father's ranch. He rode horseback to a country school 10 miles from the McCarran home, after getting up at dawn to milk 12 cows. He attended high school in Reno and was a top athlete and scholar. Young Pat set records for the 100-yard and 50-yard dash that were to stand for 20 years, and he graduated valedictorian of his class in 1897.

That fall he enrolled in the University of Nevada and soon emerged as a football star. "I played left guard my first year," McCarran reminisces, "but the next year I shifted to right tackle and I've never been left of center since."

A few weeks before he graduated his father became ill, and Pat had to leave school and take care of 1,400 sheep on the ranch. But McCarran kept up his law studies, often from horseback as he guarded the sheep, and his books still have the marks of the rawhide thongs he used to tie them to the saddle. He was admitted to the bar in 1905.

In 1903 he married Harriet Weeks, of Elko County. The first 2 of the 5 McCarran children were daughters, and both have since become nuns in the Order of the Holy Name.

Pat's legislature experience gave him a taste of politics and the quick-minded young orator led the fight for an 8-hour day in the Nevada mines. The bill passed and was later upheld by the Supreme Court.

After the legislative office came the nomination and election of McCarran as district attorney of Nye County. In 1912, he was elected a justice in the State supreme court and in 1924, tried for the United States Senate, but was defeated. In 1932, the Democrats sent McCarran into the arena again and he licked the incumbent, Tasker L. Oddie.

That election sent the freshman Senator from the sheep ranch to a sleek, sophisticated Washington, overflowing with brain-trusters and the bright young men who had learned that the quickest way to get into the New Deal class struggle was to go to Harvard and turn left. To the Irishman who had studied for his law degree atop a restless broncho, this was all a bit bewildering and alarming.

One thing also bothered the rancher from Truckee. It was the growing concentration of power in the executive branch of the Government, and his old-fashioned Jeffersonian principles led him to thunder out against the trend. This didn't place him in FDR's inner circle, but it won him wide respect in the Capitol. Even Time magazine (which of late has batted Pat around because of his ruthless pursuit of the IPR mob) in those days said of him, "He is one of the best-liked Members of the Senate; considered intellectually honest, frank, logical."

Long before Senator McCarthy assumed the mantle of the left wing's favorite book burned and witch hunter, Pat McCarran was being called these names by the eggheads of 1935. This came after the Nevada Senator had warned the American Legion to be on guard against Red infiltration of the schools and had urged examination of textbooks in the colleges.

When FDR launched his arrogant court-packing plan of 1937, McCarran became one of the most vehement Democrats in opposition to this effort to bend the Supreme Court to the will of the White House. Roosevelt struck back at Pat and all Democrats who didn't go along by threatening them with loss of all party patronage. McCarran didn't budge, and when he came up for reelection in 1938, he was on the President's purge list. But the Railroad Brotherhoods, remembering McCarran's pioneer fight for labor legislation, rallied behind him in his home State and so did the rest of his constituents. Despite a speaking tour by Roosevelt through Nevada with Pat's opponent in the primaries, McCarran was reelected by a 3-to-1 vote ratio.

In the 1944 campaign, the CIO's Political Action Committee marked McCarran for defeat and sent their agents and money into his State to defeat him. They didn't, because the people of Nevada not only liked their Senator but decided the right of choice was not up to a bunch of Union Square left-wingers. The same defeat was handed McCarran's opponent in 1950, although the out-of-State campaign against Pat was redoubled. His Internal Security Act, which among many other things set up the Subversive Activities Control Board, had just been passed over Truman's veto, and the Fair Deal set was either roaring or lisping for his head.

In 1952, another law, coauthored by McCarran and Representative Walter, was passed, again over Truman's veto. This was the Immigration and Nationality Act, still the favorite target of the various Communist and pseudo liberal groups. The opponents of the bill forget that McCarran, the son of Irish immigrants, had pondered this legislation for years, had won the support of practically every Democratic-controlled agency and department and was supported in the Senate and House by a majority of his fellow Democrats. He has never been against amendments to work out flaws in the law but insists those changes should be made by "its friends and not those whose criticism is only used as a method to kill the bill altogether."

Still hale and hearty at 77, McCarran is continuing his fight. During recess he hunts in his native State (he still can outshoot men half his age), visits with stock raisers around Nevada and listens to their opinions about what's wrong with Washington. Back at work, McCarran keeps his staff (headed by his trigger-minded and hard-working administrative assistant, Eve Adams), on the run. He arrives at his office at 8:30 in the morning and keeps a fast schedule all day. Often when important legislation is coming up, Pat will work through the night. Big, black cigars, once his favorite, were discontinued when he was told to cut down to a certain number a day. "I just stopped smoking," says Pat. "Who has the time to count cigars?"

He carries his 190 pounds at all times with complete dignity and one day a group of tourists in the Senate Office Building paused to watch him go by. "That must be a Senator," said one of them. "He looks like one."

"He sure is, lady," said the guide. "That's Patrick McCarran. He really is a Senator."

Commander's Message

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 1954

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following article from the Liaison of June 1954, the official publication of Henry H. Huston 2d Post, No. 3, the American Legion, Germantown, Pa.:

Commander's Message Delivered at the Exercises Held at the Post Home on Memorial Day, May 31, 1954

Distinguished guests, members of the American Legion and its auxiliary, and ladies and gentlemen, it seems to me that as we gather each year to pay tribute to our honored dead the occasion becomes more serious than the one previous. Let us pause for just a moment as I read to you an interesting excerpt from the Memory of Sergeant Younger, who selected the casket containing the body of the Unknown Soldier, now rest-in Arlington Cemetery:

"In the city hall at Chalons, Sur Marne, France, four earth-stained caskets lay in a flag-decorated room. One coffin had been brought from each of the four American cemeteries. As I walked slowly past the honored row, a bunch of white roses in my hand, the strains of a dirge from a French infantry band floated through the door.

"Twice I made a tour of the room, overwhelmed by the seriousness of my mission. A shaft of sunlight gleamed through and it seems that I was walking with God. He guided my trembling hand as I gently placed the roses on the coffin to the right of me.

"I had selected the body of a deceased comrade: A soldier known to none but God.

"The coffin was placed in an outer case, which was then placed on board the old flagship of Admiral Dewey, the *Olympia*, at LeHavre for its journey to the United States.

"On its arrival in Washington, it was conveyed to the rotunda of the Capitol, where it lay in state on the same catafalque that had borne the bodies of Lincoln, Garfield, and McKinley.

"Thousands passed the bier and thousands wept quietly as they saw in retrospect the body of a loved one.

"It was 8:30 in the morning when the casket was lifted very tenderly onto a caisson while a military band played 'Nearer My God to Thee.'

"It seemed that all America was at the graveside as the body of the unknown soldier was lowered slowly into the tomb. Taps were sounded and a battery began the national salute."

This, my friends, from the memory of Sergeant Younger.

My friends, I really believe that, due to the explosive condition of the world today, that this Memorial Day can be our most important one so far observed. We Americans write our own "ticket." We make our own laws and we obey them; we establish our own religious standards and we worship accordingly, we hold in reverence certain ideals and we believe in them. We live under a standard of freedom known nowhere else in the world.

We celebrate Christmas and Easter, the birth and resurrection of Christ. We, as a nation, on bended knee, give thanks to God on high at Thanksgiving time for the bountiful existence we enjoy. We celebrate Independence Day, a day long to be remembered in world history, when a little band of American patriots wrested from a tyrant a freedom never known elsewhere in the world. We, as Americans, love our heroes and we honor the births of Washington, Lincoln, Columbus, and others; and then we come to Memorial Day, the time when we honor our beloved dead. Coming as it does on the last breath of spring, when the flowers are in full bloom and the grass is green, I am afraid we often take the occasion much too lightly. I wonder whether we realize that were it not for these heroes whom we honor at this time, we would not have these wonderful American standards that we now enjoy.

Too many times, I am afraid, we feel entirely too secure in our way of life in that we really believe that our patriotic dead have purchased for us who remain a paid in full freedom. How completely wrong this is, my friends, how entirely wrong.

Those of our heroes who have paid the supreme sacrifice by laying down their lives, many on the field of battle, yes, even in all its glory, have not paid the price of freedom in full but have only made the down payment on it. In our 178 years of existence, our American people have paid 7 additional installments on this great price of freedom, in the form of 7 major conflicts. One million men and women have helped in this payment with their lives. Since 1900 the American Armed Forces have had to go into action exactly 19 times: Mexico, Nicaragua, Honduras, and Vera Cruz and others, and I am afraid another installment may be due soon again. I can assure you there can be no freedom as long as we have "fifth amenders" in our midst.

In the Old Testament, Joshua 4: 12, these words will be found: "What mean these stones." What mean these stones? The children of Israel asked that question many times. It appears that the people of Israel had the custom of placing a large stone in an area to mark the passing of some important event; possibly the beginning of our monument system.

I trust that no American child will ever have to ask "What mean these stones?", or "What mean these crosses or monuments?" Our responsibility—yours and mine alike—is to teach our children now, not tomorrow, but now—loyalty, truth, love, and country. The freedom of religious belief. Oh, teach them now before it is too late.

The forces of evil running rampant today seek to take from us, the American people, all these things that are good, and they will be successful if we are not strong. If we are to honor our beloved dead, we have a task to perform. The definition of the word patriotism is love of country, national loyalty. National loyalty, how important today. If we are to honor our dead, Henry H. Houston, 2d, and also his patriot father, Samuel F. Houston, then we must stand squarely on our two feet, lest we fall short of our duty.

If the stilled voice could speak from the grave, down from the heavens and up from this sea of white crosses, of stones, if you will, I am sure these words would be heard: "Keep faith—keep faith—ere I shall have died in vain."

In closing, let me say this: If we be strong, if we be fearless, if we be courageous, we can continue to live under the grant of God's gift to America; freedom under the white Star of Bethlehem. But, if we be weak, if we are not true citizens, if we don't care, if we have no courage and no valor, let me warn you, that just as sure as Monday follows Sunday, just so sure am I that we could perish under the Red Star of the Kremlin.

Charles R. Bechtle, Sr.,
Commander.

Republicans Carry Politics Into Veterans' Administration Press Releases

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 24, 1954

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, regardless of the protests Republicans may lodge against the Veterans' Administration's reference in a press release to the fact that Franklin D. Roosevelt signed the GI bill of rights, the truth is that President Roosevelt did just that on June 22, 1944.

Members of this House who lodged such protests should realize that the Veterans' Administration is an agency of the United States Government and is not a subdidiary of the Republican National Committee.

I regret that officials of the VA yielded to political pressure in the incident which is explained in the Associated Press article which appeared this morning in the Washington Post and Times-Herald. It follows:

VA RELEASE OMITS NAME OF ROOSEVELT

(By Rowland Evans, Jr.)

A friendly reference to the late Franklin D. Roosevelt was deleted from a Government news release this week after some Republicans raised anguished cries.

It happened when the Veterans' Administration issued a statement taking note of the 10th anniversary of the GI bill of rights.

The release, as it first appeared, read this way:

"The law, signed by President Franklin D. Roosevelt on June 22, 1944, contained three major benefits. * * * On signing the GI bill in 1944, the President said * * *."

REFERENCE TAKEN OUT

A second installment shortly appeared, reading this way:

"The bill, signed into law June 22, 1944, contained three major benefits. * * * On signing the GI bill in 1944, the White House said * * *."

Gone was any reference to the World War II Democratic President.

"Unbelievable pettifoggery," Senator Lister Hill, Democrat, of Alabama, commented yesterday. "It shows that many people fear the mighty Franklin Roosevelt."

Senator Paul H. Douglas, Democrat, of Illinois, said: "Evidently the propaganda agencies of the Republican Party are bent on rewriting history in the manner of George Orwell's 1984." That novel by the late British writer depicted a mythical totalitarian state in the year 1984. The dictator, "Big Brother," brooked no criticism and ordered history rewritten to suit his purposes.

PROTESTS LODGED

A VA official, questioned about the change in the release, said the first batch put out numbered about 3,500. When they were distributed, he said, some GOP Congressmen he did not name lodged protests that the GI bill of rights was nonpartisan legislation. They objected to any mention of Roosevelt's name, the VA official added.

A second batch of some 600 copies, containing no mention of the late President, was then run off.

The official said the original release was "not rescinded or recalled" but that when it became apparent more copies would be needed "we decided Roosevelt's name didn't add to or detract from the news value" of the statement.

"We had a number of protests that the GI bill was national legislation, passed without regard to political lines," he said. "We took these protests into consideration."

The official, asking not to be named, said he had no indication that anybody in the White House objected to the original language.

"I'm pretty positive we didn't hear from them," he said.

Foster Creek Division of Chief Joseph Dam, Wash.

SPEECH
OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 23, 1954

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4854) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the irrigation works comprising the Foster Creek division of the Chief Joseph Dam project, Washington.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, H. R. 4854 was reported by the full Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. The bill was carefully considered by a subcommittee. It comes out with a unanimous report from the subcommittee and from the full committee.

The purpose of the bill is to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct works necessary to furnish irrigation water to 4,500 acres of land now presently irrigated, and to furnish supplemental water for an additional 1,130 acres. The total area to be served is 5,950 acres. The area to be served is comprised of three units. We have taken out the Indian lands which were at one time in dispute. It is anticipated additional units will be authorized in the future, involving the irrigation of some 32,000 acres and the furnishing of supplemental water to some 30,000 additional acres.

The bill was carefully considered by the committee. The people interested from the area were heard, and the bill was reported.

Statement of Opposition to Toronto Reservoir

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD H. REES

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 24, 1954

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I want to call the attention of the membership of the House to the views of people who live in the vicinity of the proposed Toronto Reservoir on the Verdigris River in Kansas on account of the approval of $500,000 placed in the civil functions appropriations bill by the membership of the other body. It will finally cost the taxpayers approximately $20 million.

This item was not included or even mentioned in the House bill.

A statement by those who live in the area follows:

Details of Toronto Dam

The Toronto Dam is part of a four reservoir system planned by the Corps of Engineers; and authorized by Congress in 1941.

The area involved includes the Elk, Fall River, and the Verdigris River valleys in Kansas and Oklahoma, as far down as the Oologah Reservoir. (The Caney River watershed is excluded.)

Details were published in House Document 440, of the 76th Congress (1939).

Cost, $17,361,000 (1953 estimate) (present estimate over $20 million).

Drainage area, 750 square miles.

Cost of catching runoff water from each square mile in watershed above the Toronto Reservoir is $23,148 (or $36.16 per acre).

Inundates 10,000 acres.

Protects primarily 15,000 acres from dam down to upper end of Neodesha Reservoir.

Not designed to control the great floods (as 1904 and 1951).

Authorized capacity: 20,000 acre-feet in conservation pool; 140,000 acre-feet of flood storage.

EXCESSIVE COSTS IN STORING WATER IN BIG DAMS—PROPOSED TORONTO DAM POINTS OUT NEED FOR CHANGE IN POLICY—WATERSHED STORAGE FAR CHEAPER AND PROTECTS GREATER AREA

How and where to store water to meet increased uses, and to overcome drought and flood problems has become one of the foremost issues facing citizens today. The public should have all the facts about the cost and effectiveness of the various methods that have been proposed.

One of the first methods developed has been to build big dams in the river valleys, based mainly on the theory that large bodies of water should be impounded and released to provide navigation on the rivers. The Toronto Dam is an example of this type of dam. It is 1 of 4 dams authorized in the Army engineers' plan for the Verdigris River in Kansas.

The 4 dams in the Kansas group cost $68,199,000 to catch water from a drainage area of 2,368 square miles. This amounts to $45 per acre or $28,800 for every square mile in the watershed. In addition, the Army engineers have over $63 million authorized for building navigation locks and channel enlargements in the lower Verdigris River to provide a river channel with a minimum depth of 9 feet for river freight barges.

REASONS FOR ENORMOUS COSTS

Why the huge cost in catching water in big dams? The proposed Toronto Reservoir illustrates some of the causes.

The spillway structure of the Toronto Dam is estimated to cost $6,923,000 out of a total cost of $17,361,000. When the runoff water from hundreds of square miles is piled high in a narrow river valley by a big dam, then the cost is great for a structure capable of dropping the water back down on the lower side of the dam. In the case of the Toronto Dam, the earth fill to raise the water level is scheduled to cost less than $2 million ($1,775,000), but the spillway to drop the water back down costs nearly $7 million.

Another reason for the high cost of catching water in river valleys is the expense of clearing the reservoir of homes, railroads, roads, pipelines, schools, and other developments. The cost for relocations for the Toronto project has been estimated at $5,195,000 by the Army engineers.

Another cost is for the high-priced river bottom land that will be inundated. This cost item is $2,267,000 for the Toronto Reservoir.

WATERSHED STORAGE ELIMINATES BIG COST ITEMS

When water storage and flood-control storage reservoirs are distributed over the watershed, the smaller structures eliminate many of the high costs involved in the big river-valley dams.

The spillway structures for small dams are comparatively simple, and often native grass sod, etc., can be utilized with little cost. Most of the smaller reservoirs can be located in pasture areas where there are no costs for relocations. Cheaper land can be used for watershed storage, and in most cases the landowners grant an easement for the land at no cost, or for a nominal fee.

BETTER SITES AVAILABLE THAN TORONTO LOCATION

The Toronto project is located in the Flint Hills or Bluestem grass pasture area. The watershed is used mainly for cattle grazing. There are many ravines and small creeks where reservoirs from 5 acres to 500 acres in size can be built, at a small fraction of the cost of river reservoirs. These watershed reservoirs can provide an equitable distribution of water and flood prevention over the upper valley as well as the lower valley.

SQUANDER MILLIONS TO DUPLICATE WATER SUPPLY FACILITIES

Most of the political pressure to start the Toronto Dam comes from cities wanting water for municipal and industrial uses. Yet the same cities are already provided water by the Fall River Reservoir.

Fredonia, Neodesha, Independence, Coffeyville, etc., secure water from Fall River (or from the Verdigris, after the two join at Neodesha) downstream from the Fall River Reservoir. They circulated stories in the fall of 1953, during the drought, that they had no water supply worries because of the releases of water from the Fall River Reservoir. These same cities are now promoting the Toronto Dam to increase water supplies. If there is any merit in the theory that the Federal taxpayers should furnish these cities more water, then the water level can be raised in the conservation pool of the Fall River Reservoir.

The Fall River Reservoir is already built and has operators on the job. The Fall River Reservoir conservation pool contains 27,000 acre-feet and the proposed Toronto Dam is to have about 20,000 acre-feet of water. By raising the conservation pool about 7 feet, the additional water can be provided in the Fall River Reservoir without any additional expense.

DECEPTION IN 1951 FLOOD REPORTS

After the great flood of July 9 to 13, 1951 in eastern Kansas, advocates of big river dams circulated a story that pointed out the flood damage in the Verdigris Valley which had no dam, and emphasized that the Fall River Valley below the Fall River Reservoir had only minor flood losses.

But that report, while true in itself, did not present a true story of the situation. There was great flood damage downstream from the site of the proposed Toronto Dam. But if the dam had been built, it would have been full because of rains in May and June, and the dam could have reduced the flood crest only about 1 foot or 34,000 cubic feet per second. The 1951 July flood crest at the dam site was about 130,000 cubic feet per second. (Report of U. S. Geological Survey.)

The Fall River Reservoir was nearly full after the rains of May and June. Some water was released during the first week of July. When the great flood producing rains fell July 9–13, 1951, fortunately for the Fall River Valley the center of the heavy rain was in the Eskridge-Emporia area, and the bulk of the floodwater went down the Kaw, Marais Des Cygnes, and the Neosho. Much less rain fell in the Fall River Valley. The runoff was about 3 inches, and caused the water level in the reservoir to raise only about 9 feet.

Another factor to be considered is that the Fall River Reservoir has a much higher capacity than others and can contain nearly an 8-inch runoff. The Toronto Dam has capacity for about 4 inches of runoff; and has a spillway discharge capacity of 222,000 cubic feet per second.

Give H. R. 9020 a Rule for Consideration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 21, 1954

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I want to call attention of the House to the fact that H. R. 9020, a bill providing increases in compensation and pension rates for veterans and their dependents, has been pending before the Committee on Rules ever since May 28, when our Committee on Veterans' Affairs reported it unanimously.

I have asked the chairman of the Rules Committee for a hearing in order that we might obtain a rule for its consideration. To date I have not received a reply to my request. In view of the lateness of the legislative hour—and we are now hearing rumors of a Fourth of July hiatus—it becomes imperative that immediate action be taken upon this measure.

The veterans' organizations are solidly in back of the proposal, and almost every Member of Congress with whom I have talked is ready and willing to act upon it. Now is the time that we should consider the problems of our disabled veterans and their dependents and give this proposal priority over the needs of foreign countries who are clamoring for our financial assistance.

Will Our State Department Oppose Formation of a New Coffee Cartel?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 24, 1954

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include herein a letter I sent to the Honorable John Foster Dulles, Secretary of State, on June 14, 1954, calling his attention to facts as they have been coming to the surface with regard to the artificially rigged "scarcity" of coffee:

JUNE 14, 1954.

Hon. JOHN FOSTER DULLES,
Secretary of State,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. DULLES: Last January when I wrote to you urging action by our Government in an effort to halt the spiraling price of coffee imports, I received a reply from your Department professing that there was really nothing that this Government could do—that the price increases resulted from shortages of supply.

The facts, as they have been coming to the surface, including facts provided by our own Department of Agriculture, prove conclusively that there has been no shortage of coffee supplies coming into this country. The facts show that the price increases that we have been experiencing have been based on an anticipation of shortages in the Brazilian crop; that is, shortages in the current 1953–54 crop and worse shortages in the 1954–55 crop.

Brazil's crop in the 1954–55 crop year beginning next month may, indeed, be short compared with other years, but our Department of Agriculture believes total supplies in the Western Hemisphere will not decline. Furthermore, the pessimistic estimates publicized by Brazil some months ago on supplies available in the current crop year have not materialized. In contrast to the estimate given to me on January 26 by Assistant Secretary of State Thruston B. Morton that Brazil's crop in this current year would reach only 14.1 million bags (of 132 pounds each), the New York Times reported yesterday from Brazil that that nation's crop the past 12 months had been registered at 15,049,000 bags, which is about 132 million pounds more coffee than the estimate your Department had given me.

I cite these facts as background, partly in case your Department is not up to date on them, and partly because I again want to request action by you and your assistants on this matter of preventing the gouging of the American consumer on coffee prices.

As I told the House a week or so ago, the coffee "shortage" has been a hoax and a myth which has been costing the people of the United States about $600 million a year in excessive prices. I was terribly disappointed in the lack of interest displayed in this matter by the State Department last January in answer to my previous inquiry. I hope that this time we can get some action.

Briefly, the situation is this: With the revelation that the coffee "shortage" has been a hoax, Brazil has just taken unilateral action to try to maintain the present artificially high export price of the green bean, setting by Government decree a minimum export price of 87 cents a pound at shipboard. This is just about the highest price Brazil has received for coffee during this recent frantic period of alleged shortage. A minimum export price of 67 cents at shipboard in Brazil would mean an import price in the United States of 89½ cents or 90 cents a pound. That, in turn, would eventually mean a price to the consumer in the grocery store of $1.50 a pound for familiar brands of coffee.

Ninety cents is 10 times the import price in 1939 and nearly double the price from 1950 until last October or November, when the "shortage" scare began to send prices soaring.

May I call your attention to the letter of January 26 from Mr. Morton in reply to my letter to you of January 18. Mr. Morton said, at one point in his letter:

"The Department of State takes a great interest in keeping coffee prices within reach of the American consumer, since coffee is one of the principal items of trade between the United States and Latin America, and an expanding trade is in the interest of both. It is my understanding that coffee prices have receded somewhat from the recent peak, and it is my belief that the governments of the producing countries will make every effort to bring prices back to normal."

On the day that this letter was written to me, the cash price of Santos 4's at New York was 70¾ cents per pound. Mr. Morton was under the impression that this represented a recession from the peak price. May I say that the price continued to advance all through February to 82 cents a pound, continued to advance in March to 93½ cents a pound, reached 94½ cents a pound in April, and only then began to recede slightly, and is now around 88 cents.

Furthermore, in contrast to Mr. Morton's assurance in January that the producing countries "will make every effort to bring prices back to normal," I must point out that all the effort on the part of some of the producing interests in Latin America seems to be devoted at maintaining this artificially high price in the face of adequate supplies, which would normally cause a declining price.

The New York Times reported from Rio de Janeiro yesterday that certain influential Brazilians are attempting to set up, in concert with other Latin American coffee-producing interests and nations, a cartel to keep prices at present levels—at about the highest levels that they have reached in a period of anticipated shortage. I submit that this is certainly an area for United States intercession.

What steps can your Department take to discourage the formation of such a cartel? Will you take them? What steps can your Department take to persuade Brazil to abandon this minimum export price of 87 cents a pound for green coffee at Brazil, which would mean $1.50-a-pound coffee for American consumers? Will you take them?

Certainly it is to the best interests of our Latin American friends to remove any artificial restraints on the use of coffee in the United States. I understand that Brazil is new suffering from a sudden drop of coffee exports in May resulting from reduced purchases, following the revelation that the expected shortage would not materialize. The news yesterday reported that Brazil's coffee exports in May amounted to only $27 million, as against an average monthly total of $90 million. This should certainly be a warning of serious troubles ahead for any country which, in the face of adequate worldwide supplies of coffee, attempts to highjack the consumers by artificially rigged scarcity price levels maintained by government decree.

I sincerely hope that you can and will move into this situation and that you will advise me of what steps are being taken.

Sincerely yours,
Mrs. JOHN B. (LEONOR) SULLIVAN,
Member of Congress.

Big Advertiser Puts Heat on Newspaper

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY W. WIER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 24, 1954

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include an article from Labor, a national weekly newspaper, dated June 26, 1954, entitled "Big Advertiser Puts Heat on Newspaper."

The article is as follows:

BIG ADVERTISER PUTS HEAT ON NEWSPAPER

In all its 35 years of existence, Labor never has printed a line of advertising. That policy was adopted to keep the railroad workers' newspaper free from any possibility of commercial pressure. The wisdom of the policy was strikingly illustrated this week when General Motors cracked down on the Wall Street Journal.

The giant automobile combine canceled its contract for $250,000 advertising in that business newspaper. Also, GM put on the heat in other ways.

It refused to give the Journal any more of the auto production figures which GM had been furnishing to that paper each week. The paper then tried to get these figures through the Associated Press, of which it is a member. GM said, "nothing doing."

GM's boycott was backed up by a big auto industry news service, Ward's Reports. It canceled the Wall Street Journal's subscription for Ward's weekly Newsletter.

Why is all this powerful big business pressure being put on a business newspaper? The main reason is this:

Instead of relying solely on the kind of news General Motors chooses to put out through Ward's, the Journal also has been digging up its own news. In several recent articles, it told its readers about the shady practices of some car dealers and scored scoops by revealing details of the improved new models which GM and other car manufacturers will turn out later this year.

Auto dealers hit the ceiling. They wrote GM saying the stories about the new models make it harder to sell the present models, of which the dealers have more than enough. They also wrote bitterly protesting letters to the Wall Street paper.

In reply, it published an editorial which, among other things, said this:

"A newspaper exists only to provide information for its readers; it has no other reason for being. It provides that service only so long as it diligently seeks out what is happening and reports it as accurately and clearly as it can."

Therefore, the editorial said, the Journal refuses to "suppress news, whether at the behest of advertisers or on pleas from special segments of business."

Labor often disagrees with the Wall Street paper, but we congratulate it on its courageous stand against pressure. It not only printed another article of the sort which brought on the GM boycott, it also editorially advised auto manufacturers that they would sell more cars if they stopped holding their prices so artificially high.

This particular case of pressure on a newspaper was of a kind which couldn't be concealed, but how many others go on behind the scenes? How many papers surrender to the advertisers who pay their profits? The answer is "plenty."

Moreover, in most cases, there is no sudden surrender. Too many editors know what kinds of news they are not supposed to print, and act accordingly all the time.

We don't claim superior virtue, but we're glad Labor doesn't depend on advertising. All our support comes from our readers, and our sole obligation is, as the Wall Street Journal said, to "diligently seek out what is happening and report it as accurately and clearly as we can."

Miss Barbara Davis, of Cornelius, N. C., Selected as American Girl Most Likely to Succeed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES RAPER JONAS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 24, 1954

Mr. JONAS of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, Mecklenburg County, N. C., is justly proud of the accomplishments of one of its talented young women. Miss Barbara Davis, of Cornelius, N. C., daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Clyde O. Davis, has just been selected by a distinguished panel of judges as the American girl most likely to succeed.

This selection was made from high school students graduating this year. The contest was sponsored by CBS Television's The orning Show. The judges were: James A. Farley, chairman of the board of Coco-Cola Export Corp.; W. Averell Harriman, former Director of the Mutual Security Administration; Harold Stassen, Director of the Foreign Operations Administration; Bernard F. Gimbel, chairman of the board of Gimbel Bros.; Mrs. Katherine Howard, Assistant Administrator of Civil Defense; Mrs. Alice Leopold, Assistant Secretary of Labor and Chief of its Women's Bureau; Basil O'Connor, president of the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis; Philip Willkie, son of the late Wendell Willkie and a State legislator of Indiana; and Miss Virginia Warren, daughter of United States Chief Justice Earl Warren.

In each community throughout the country served by CBS, civic, religious, and educational leaders had previously chosen from among the students graduating from the local high schools a boy and girl found to be best qualified to represent the community in the national contest. From among these local winners, the panel chose Miss Barbara Davis as the girl and Mr. Lawrence J. Bugge of Milwaukee, Wis., as the boy most likely to succeed.

The choice of winners in the contest was based on scholastic standing, participation in school, church and community activities, and each candidate's expressed feelings as a young person assuming adult responsibilities in a democracy.

Miss Davis expressed her ideals, in part, as follows:

America was built upon a moral idea—faith in common men everywhere, faith in their ability to govern themselves, faith in their capacity to advance their mutual interest through their own labors. Many peoples have pioneered paths to freedom. Nations all over the world have achieved independence in ways of their own choosing. But our Founding Fathers created a government of checks and balances, so arranged that no man or group could tyrannize the people, in whose hands lay the final power. We owe our debts to God and our country for giving us the opportunity to fulfill responsibilities and obligations in this democratic America. May we, as youth today and leaders tomorrow, help to make America a better place to live, now and in the future.

Congratulations to you, Barbara Davis. Our country's future is safe and secure if this expression of faith in it fairly represents the thinking of the young people of today.

This statement of the faith of a young American in her country is so significant and inspiring that I feel justified in using this space to call it to the attention of the House and the country.

Growing in Stature

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 24, 1954

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, the Ohio University, located at Athens, Ohio, which is one of the fine cities in my district, held a very important service on Sunday the 13th of June. Ohio University is the oldest university west of the Allegheny Mountains. I have not time nor space at this time to give a thorough history of this great and useful university. I want to say, however, that it is one of the finest institutions of learning in the whole United States, and especially when we consider the circumstances under which it was founded and the course it has followed from its foundation.

Without going further into the history of this great institution, I want to present a copy of an editorial which appeared in the Athens Messenger on Monday, June 14. The editor of this paper, Mr. Gordon Bush, was born and brought up in Athens and has had official connection with Ohio University for many years. His appraisal of this institution is well set forth in this editorial, which is as follows:

GROWING IN STATURE

Succeeding periods of commencement at the Ohio University prove the growth of the college community and the increase in the stature of the institution. Perhaps some Athenians and some of our neighbors whose daily lives and thoughts do not bring the college green into sharp focus as a part of the development of southeastern Ohio are unaware of what it all means. They must be four in number.

For instance, the last commencement brought outstanding men to the campus to take part in the graduation activities, as speakers, and it also brought back graduates and former students who have gone far in the world since their stay in Athens. Few smaller cities and not many of the larger centers of population have the chance to see and hear the impressive array of talent and notables in all areas of human interest who visit the college green of Athens each year—and in increasing number. It is natural enough that old grads come back to the scenes of their college days. Now because of the importance of the Ohio University in education, leading men of all fields are glad to have opportunity to be heard and seen on the 150-year-old campus.

We live in the midst of an educational center the fame of which has gone far abroad, farther than most of us could possibly realize. We see young people everywhere in the town but they are so numerous that town-grown relationship is not what it used to be when some of the comparatively few undergraduates were not uncommonly found engaged in a courthouse corner confab with the older heads who have always congregated there. It was then a small town, a small college atmosphere and one that is pleasantly remembered by graduates of years ago. Before the days of the dormitories, students were a part of the family life in many Athens homes, homes to which they returned in their mature 'years with genuine affection for everybody from the head of the household to the old horse which still stood in the barn, the nag which they once tended and drove on occasion.

Few people in southeastern Ohio dreamed in those days what the college community might one time become—a huge institution scattered all over the college area, with thousands of students from everywhere, with a leadership and faculty of men and women honored in their fields, with activities on the campus which are so varied and important that outstanding men in all lines take part in them. As the thousands of graduates increase in number the 150-year-old institution increases in value to the country at large. From the preparations made for the future made by its administration, the Ohio University will continue to grow and its long tradition will be carried on for generations of young people of tomorrow.

Jobs for 66 Million More Americans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 24, 1954

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article, Will There Be Jobs for 66 Million More Americans? appearing in the July 1954 issue of the Democratic Digest, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WILL THERE BE JOBS FOR 66 MILLION MORE AMERICANS?

Thirty-three million babies have been born in this country since the end of World War II. This bumper crop is more than half again the number of babies born during the entire 1930's.

Fortune magazine has estimated that this baby boom, which has already pushed the population up by 21 million, may well mean 66 million more Americans by 1975.

The postwar babies, says Fortune, have changed the American business market as much as they have changed the lives of their parents. They have already led to healthy profits for manufacturers of maternity clothes and baby food, to operators of diaper services and nursery schools. Dr. Benjamin

Spock, author of Baby and Child Care, has seen 5 million copies of his book snapped up by eager parents since its publication in 1946.

Tomorrow as these new American citizens turn into teenagers they will push the Nation's food bill up by $2 billion, maybe more, if their parents let them eat steak. They will increase the potential demand for movies, phonograph records, and athletic equipment.

Still later, around the late 1960's, they will want wedding rings, homes, and automobiles. But they will be important customers for the businesses which produce these things only if they have the money to turn their needs and pleasures into what the economists call effective demand. Mere numbers is no guaranty of buying power as many Americans learned personally during the lean depression years.

Unless greater buying power stimulates higher production, a growing population will mean a poorer population as more and more people divide the same amount of goods.

But if we are prosperous, our new babies and their younger brothers and sisters will mean the biggest market in our history.

What are we doing to assure a steady growth in our population and its living standards? And is the need for continued growth generally recognized?

Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey answered both these questions for the current administration during recent congressional hearings of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report. When Missouri's Democratic Congressman DICK BOLLING expressed concern that production and employment were below the 1953 level, Mr. Humphrey said: "I do not think, and I am sure that none of you think, that in order to have a good, sound economy we have to set a new record every year. Nineteen fifty-three was a record year.

"I would not object if we had the second-best year in our history. I do not believe that we need to get too alarmed at this time just because we are not making new records all along the line."

President Eisenhower has expressed the same point of view. In the economic report which he sent to Congress last January, he said that "Our economy is marvelously prosperous today by any historical standard." He seemed to regard declining output and employment as nothing more than a shift to normal levels of peacetime operations.

The Joint Economic Committee seemed a little disappointed by the President's complacency, and chided him gently for not spelling out the levels of employment, purchasing power, and production which we could achieve.

Democratic members were more critical in their supplemental views. They pointed out that our economy must expand sufficiently to promote jobs for new workers who now enter the labor force at the rate of 700,000 each year. They protested any downward readjustment of the sustained improvement in national living standards of over 3 percent per annum which has taken place during the years 1939–52.

Harvard Economist Alvin Hansen, one of the expert witnesses, warned the committee that a pattern of only moderate growth could involve a loss of $330 billion by 1960.

By citing this figure, Mr. Hansen was saying in effect that the 5 percent decline anticipated in our economy this year should not be measured only against last year's output. We must count as a loss the normal growth we should have achieved. In other words, the 5 percent drop from last year's $367 billion gross national product is not the whole story. We must also concern ourselves, particularly in the light of our rapidly expanding population, with the 3 percent economic growth of recent years which will not occur.

Syndicated columnist Stewart Alsop has called these views "the Red Queen theory of the American economy." The Red Queen, it may be recalled, told Alice in Wonderland, "Now here, you see, it takes all the running you can do to keep in the same place. If you want to get somewhere else, you must run at least twice as fast as that."

"In the same way," says Mr. Alsop, "the American economy cannot go backward or even stand still. It must constantly expand." Otherwise, goods pile up on the shelves and the downward spiral starts.

The outcome of this debate over an expanding economy will affect the Nation's markets far into the future. It will not only set a ceiling on the toys, clothes, and food of the 33 million new babies. It will influence the number of babies born tomorrow. For it is a fact that in hard times, marriages are postponed and the births are fewer and farther between.

This explains why Fortune set "a reasonable prosperity" as one of the conditions on which its bullish prediction of our population depends.

We are already on the brink of a temporary slow-down in births, since the pleasures of populating the Nation during the next few years will fall primarily to those comparatively few citizens born during the 1930's.

That decade with its depressing early years saw the smallest percentage increase in United States population in our entire history, while the absolute increase of 9 million Americans was the lowest since the decade of the Civil War.

Even this rate of expansion could not have continued indefinitely without a rise in the birth rate. Not enough girls were born during those 10 years to replace the women who were growing out of the childbearing ages.

Fortunately the birth rate has risen sharply from its low point of 19 per 1,000 people. It was 22 in the early war years, has been at least 23 every year since the war, and rose to 27 in 1947. This means that once the depression babies begin a get a little help on the production line from their younger brothers and sisters, we can look forward to another boom in babies. Provided, of course, that the country is prosperous enough to continue today's style in larger families.

Americans in recent years have not only been having more children, they have been having more second, third, and fourth children. Gallup polls taken at the beginning and end of the war showed a strong movement away from an ideal of 2 children in the direction of 4 children. What this will do to the average size of families can't be figured until today's mothers pass the childbearing age.

Studies show that more and more families are planning the births of more and more children. The middle classes seem to be favoring a family size of 3 or 4 children. Final figures for the Nation seem certain to show an increase over the recent average of 2.4 children in the population as a whole.

The trend toward larger families, particularly toward larger planned families, has come as a surprise to the population experts. Volumes have been written by social scientists on the tendency of the poor to have more children than the rich. "Wealth leads to sterility," said the French statistician Jacques Bertillon at the turn of the century. Fortune has rephrased this to read "the rich get richer and the poor get children."

But now that the whole Nation has become richer, a New Look in family size seems to be setting the style. High employment levels have led to earlier marriages and births. American mothers are even younger than they were in the 1920's. The fact is that 14 percent of native-born white women 16 to 20 years old are now mothers, compared to 8.5 percent during the earlier years. The percentage of mothers in the 20 to 25 age group has gone up from 42 to 56 percent in the same years.

The changing American pattern can be seen most dramatically in the new suburbs, where young married couples are clustered together in communities designed for the family. It is clear that suburbanites have more children than city dwellers, but sociologists and even many of the suburbanites themselves cannot say whether they move to the suburbs to have children or enlarge their notion of the ideal family size once they get there. In the intimacy of community living, a family with only one child seems almost to call for some explanation to friends and neighbors.

Fortune analyzes the marketing implications of this tendency toward larger households this way:

"First babies revolutionize families' spending habits the most. By the time the later children come, many of the major adjustments have already been made. Furthermore, direct spending for the later babies is somewhat curtailed; the cribs, bottles, baby carriages, and playpens can all be used again.

"But the problem is somewhat more complicated than that. For in middle-income families, at least, something changes at about the third birth; it is not just more of the same. The most pressing change, of course, centers around living space. The first child, and probably the second one, can be put in the spare bedroom; but the third child calls, rather loudly, for a new home * * * or at least the construction of an extra room. Builders generally, with an eye on this increase in family size, have been putting up larger homes; the president of the National Association of Home Builders recently estimated that three-qaurters of all the homes built in 1954 would have three or more bedrooms. In 1947–48 the proportion was one-third."

Will this new family look be a permanent American feature?

One thing at least seems clear, if the Government continues to be satisfied with second-best years and healthy readjustments to lower levels of production and employment, it is certain to put at least a cramp into the new style in family sizes.

Bicentennial Celebration of Fort Necessity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS E. MORGAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 24, 1954

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following article from the Washington Daily News regarding Fort Necessity, which is located on United States Route 40, 11 miles east of Uniontown, Pa. This article is very timely because the bicentennial celebration of Fort Necessity will be held on July 3 and 4. The occasion will mark the 200th anniversary of the Battle of Fort Necessity. The Department of the Interior in cooperation with the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania has reconstructed the fort exactly as it was that fateful day of July 3, 1754, when George Washington commanded 400 soldiers in a desperate battle with 600 French and 100 Indians. The article follows:

Two Hundred Years Ago Colonel Washington Fought at Fort Necessity

(By J. Herbert Walker)

Drums were beating, colors flying, and a colonel in buckskin left the field of conflict, defeated, but with the honors of war. He was permitted by the French to "retire into his own country."

That was 200 years ago, July 3-4, 1754. The colonel was George Washington. The battle was with the French and Indians at Fort Necessity, near Uniontown, in southwestern Pennsylvania.

July 4 was to linger long in the memory of Washington. It was also on that date, in 1776, that the Declaration of Independence was adopted in the old State House of Pennsylvania, in Philadelphia, now for long years known as Independence Hall. And Washington had allied himself with the cause of the Colonies and against the British, for whom and with whom he fought only a score of years before.

RAIN

Fort Necessity was Washington's first engagement—but the lessons he learned during the French and Indian War, especially on the Pennsylvania frontier, served him well.

On July 3, at noon, a force of nearly 800 French and Indians appeared on the scene and began an attack on the stockade. Fighting continued until darkness drew a veil over the scene. Rain was falling in torrents. A South Carolinian company fought in trenches outside the fort. Washington and his Virginians were on the inside. The rains flooded the ground and filled the trenches, the soldiers fighting knee deep in water and mud.

Washington's forces, greatly outnumbered, suffered heavily. There was no opportunity to win over an army that outnumbered Washington's force 4 to 1. The French, tired also of the battle, called for surrender. Washington declined. But on looking over the situation, conferring with his officers and men, he agreed to a second call to surrender.

Young Washington in his report wrote: "About midnight we agreed that each side should retire without molestation, they back to their fort at Monongahela, and we to Wills Creek. That we should march away with all the honors of war and with our stores, effects, and baggage. Accordingly, beating and our colors flying, we began our march in good order with our stores and in convoy."

Earlier, in his journal, he had called the stockade "Fort Necessity."

THE ROAD

Now motorcars speed over United States Highway 40 and giant buses transport people back and forth over that famed highway that, in itself, has great historical significance. It was the Nation's first national road extending from Cumberland, Md., through Pennsylvania to Wheeling, W. Va. Earlier it had just been a wide path hewn through the wilderness. Over it went not only military expeditions but later the Conestoga wagons carrying families West.

The site of Fort Necessity can be seen easily from this highway and frequently bus drivers slow down momentarily so that passengers may catch a glimpse of the site and restored stockade.

History sometimes errs, but history frequently corrects itself. For many years it was believed that Fort Necessity was a square and on that assumption the stockade was reconstructed in 1932. About a year ago maps of 1754 were discovered, along with other documents, that showed the original stockade was round. New archaeological studies made at the site definitely showed that it was circular.

Now the stockade has been reconstructed again on the basis of documents and maps found recently in South Carolina. Included in the documents was a deposition made after the battle by a soldier who had fought with Washington. That soldier described the fort as circular, protected by entrenchments. These entrenchments were mistaken in 1932 for the site of the original stockade.

J. C. Harrington of the National Park Service in the spring of 1952 opened several trenches across lines where he believed the circular stockade might be located. Within 2 days he came upon pieces of charged logs about 3 feet below the surface of the ground, and, by additional excavation, he was able to plot the outline of the circular fort.

A collection of musket balls, clay pipes, jews harps, flints from muskets, the tip of a scabbard, and other relics were uncovered. Human bones, with Indian arrows still sticking in them, were a later find.

Protect Our Patent System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 24, 1954

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call the attention of the Members to the following statement made by Mr. Don L. Davis during the hearings relative to the Patent Office appropriation:

Mr. Chairman, and members of the committee, first, may I as an American and as spokesman for the gadget industry express my sincere personal and professional appreciation for the courtesy extended to us in this invitation to appear before your committee.

I appear before you today in my official capacity as chairman of the Coordinating Council of the Gadget Industry. The council is composed of the National Association of Inventors, Inc., a trade association of American inventors duly chartered as a nonprofit organization under the State laws of California; the National Gadget Manufacturers Association, a trade organization composed of manufacturers who make new products and registered and duly chartered as a nonprofit corporation under the State laws of California; the National Independent Distributors Association, Inc., a nonprofit corporation chartered under the State laws of Illinois; the Gadget-of-the-Month Club, Inc., a worldwide manufacturing and marketing organization specializing in new, patented products of every nature, kind, and description; Consumers Testing League, a new product research organization; and Gadget-of-the-Month Club Foundation, a worldwide, nonprofit corporation founded to stimulate and sustain international interest in invention as the keystone of human progress. These six organizations comprise the Coordinating Council of the Gadget Industry.

The council, established in 1947, is the public relations agency for our industry.

THE GADGET INDUSTRY

In order that you gentlemen may be able to better understand the gadget industry, may we explain that the gadget industry is composed of those inventors, manufacturers, and distributors who are primarily interested in making and selling new products of every nature, kind, and description protected by patents. Simply stated, our industry has found that discovering and selling new products is a business of its own.

The foundation of the gadget industry is the American patent system. The instrumentality of the American patent system is the Patent Office. Therefore, whether it be by choice or by necessity, it has been our lot to fight against anything which reduces the efficiency of the operations of the Patent Office.

I am here by specific resolution of the Coordinating Council of the Gadget Industry, unanimously adopted on April 19, 1954. We learned at that time that the House Appropriations Committee had approved a budget of the Department of Commerce which reduced the Patent Office appropriation by over $1,250,000.

DELAYS IN PATENT OFFICE

As you gentlemen may or may not know, the Patent Office has always had a tremendous work-load. It is currently from 2 to 3 years behind in the prosecution of patents. In other words, it has taken an individual with an invention about 3 years to get a patent issued on his invention. If the present cut is not restored immediately, it is safe to conclude that it may take 4 or more years from the time a patent application is filed until it is finally granted. This is where we, the gadget industry, are vitally concerned.

When a patent application has been filed with the Patent Office and its receipt acknowledged, the law says that said new product covered by the patent application may be manufactured and marketed and the individual item marked "Patent pending" or "Patent applied for." Unfortunately, despite tremendous educational efforts by the gadget industry, many manufacturers and distributors are not aware of the fact that the said patent-pending application offers little or no protection to the inventor, manufacturer, or distributor of a new product. Only when the patent has been granted can the inventor or the manufacturer attempt to stop infringers. As a result, we find literally millions of dollars invested in new products—patents, tooling, production, and manufacturing costs—by small manufacturers who are under the illusion that they were fully protected. I wish to point out that these investments represent an average of $6,500, with many of the investments hugging the $75,000 and $100,000 figure. This money represents lifetime savings. Our men are going broke! We're in bad shape. We need help and immediate relief and we need it now! The only way we can get relief is for the Patent Office to be appropriated sufficient money so that it may operate with a maximum efficiency at a minimum cost. The first step in that direction is the immediate restoration of the cut.

Additionally, the gadget-of-the-month club and other similar organizations are holding up the manufacture and sale of thousands of screened meritorious inventions, which are today awaiting the granting of patents. Those inventions range from a new golf tee, unconditionally guaranteed to prevent a golfer from hooking and slicing to a process which takes low-grade coal, loaded with moisture, and by retort distillation makes it more valuable than top-grade virgin coal.

THE PATENT PIRATES

Why are these inventions being held up? Because there abounds in this country, numberless individuals and companies constantly on the prowl for new ideas and products marked "Patent pending"; we call these unscrupulous people patent pirates, because they know only too well the limited protection of "patent pending," and they use that knowledge to their own benefit. The limitation of time prevents me from adequately describing to you the horror and the heartbreak which is occurring almost daily in the gadget industry, when manufacturers and inventors find out that they are powerless to do anything to those who have deliberately taken all or part of their own invention, protected only by the misleading words "Patent pending" and "Patent applied for." That's why we have come to you in sheer desperation asking for help.

A 10-year study of the whole Patent Office procedure by the Gadget-of-the-Month Club, Inc., has convinced us that there are many ills in the present Patent Office setup. We are now working with various Congressmen and Senators with the view of the introduction of bills to correct the present evils. However, this is neither the time nor the place to discuss that program. Our only request at this moment is the restoration of the cut of the Patent Office budget for 1955.

HUGE BACKLOG OF APPLICATIONS

Our discussions with the Patent Office has revealed that the Patent Office has a backlog of 185,000 uncompleted patent applications. One examiner can prosecute approximately 104 patent applications a year. Based upon an average salary of $5,000 per year per examiner, if the present cut is restored, the Patent Office will be able to employ approximately 225 examiners, who will be able to whittle down the present backlog by 23,400 applications annually.

Were the Nation not now in the midst of a severe economy drive, we would ask for a Patent Office budget of $25 million in order that the Patent Office be able to reduce and possibly eliminate its progress-crippling backlog.

Gentlemen, the American patent system to date, has had few, if any, articulate and aggressive champions in Washington. We, in the gadget industry, think the time has come for a reevaluation of the whole patent system in this country. Either the American patent system has made priceless contributions to the economy and the advancement of our country and so deserves top priority and consideration; or it has not and should be abandoned. In this day and age, where not only our economy, but the utter physical security of America is dependent upon ingenuity, it seems inconceivable that the leaders of our Nation should give so little heed to the one system which has helped foster and create the fountainhead and reservoir of progress.

PATENT OFFICE AND DEFENSE

In my opinion, it is a fatal blunder for Congress to fail to recognize that in fact the Patent Office is a defense agency and that a strong patent system is indispensable to the Nation's defense. While Congress correctly spends billions for defense, millions for a single bomber, we are here pleading with you for a mere million dollars to help the Patent Office operate more speedily. Yet in the massive backlog of patent applications awaiting action, are many, many applications in which the Armed Forces of our Nation are vitally interested. In private business, backlogs of unfilled orders are delightful; in Government operations, such as the Patent Office, backlogs are not only dangerous, but downright disastrous.

For some inexplicable reason, everybody, everywhere seems to be vitally interested in new gadgets, new products, new processes, new everything; yet there appears to be a very obvious lack of interest in the Patent Office, in Congress, among politicians and political groups, among major corporate commercial organizations, and among the leadership of organized labor generally. Yet, without the products of American ingenuity, our farmers could never feed our people, every American industry would eventually stagnate and die, and the defense of our country would never keep pace with our constantly changing times.

When Congress appropriates billions of dollars for parity support, my people do not fully understand, but they go along because they believe it is best for the Nation. When billions are expended for foreign aid, again our people do not fully comprehend but they go along because it is the way it must be. However, when the Patent Office efficiency is still further impaired and the budget reduced for the sake of a mere million dollars, the small, little manufacturer out in the hinterland doesn't understand and he begins to ask questions.

PATENT OFFICE APPROPRIATIONS

Gentlemen, I could go on and give you a great deal more facts and information, and pile fact upon fact, but let it suffice with this reminder. Out in the grassroots of America, there are millions of Americans, your constituents, who have ideas and inventions. They believe religiously in the principles of the American patent system. Way out there in the hinterland of our country, in almost every State in the Union, there are thousands of very small businessmen who have invested their life savings in making or selling new products protected only by patent applications, not knowing that those patent applications, in themselves, afforded little protection against the patent pirates. Every day of delay that it takes for them to get their patents granted, is costing them money, blood money. In their behalf, in behalf of the millions of American inventors who have neither the time nor the money to come to Washington to tell you their personal tale of woe, we ask you to restore the Patent Office budget to $12,225,000. Anything more than that sum that you earmark for the operations of the Patent Office, will be money very wisely spent, because every dollar spent in making the Patent Office more efficient and more effective, is an investment in the future security and well-being of America.

And as you ponder this request, may we point out to you, that this plea for the Patent Office is not made by any of the major industries, nor by any major corporations, nor by any patent bar associations, nor by any universities and research organizations but by the poor, humble American inventor of whom, thank God, there are millions in this land. Inventors, from whose brains and experience, have come the basic ideas which created patents, patents which created great American industries, and new industries which have created jobs. And so it has always been in American history, that the poor, humble John Does of America, have pooled their pennies to help fight for causes which benefited the whole country. It is these people whom I represent. It is these people, the humble, relatively inarticulate American inventor and small manufacturers and tradesmen, who make this plea to you today in behalf of more money for the Patent Officer. I am merely their voice at this session; and I wish to add, that I am very proud to be their voice before you today.

Thank you for your attention.

Outlawing the Communist Party in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 24, 1954

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a petition signed by 26 of my fellow West Virginians who desire to outlaw the Communist Party in the United States. They believe, as I believe, that communism and Russian imperialism are our mortal enemies, and that we must effectuate immediate measures to eradicate the dangers which confront us lest we lose our liberties. I sincerely hope that this administration and this Congress will take more courageous action than has been consummated in the past in dealing with this menace.

Eugene F. Adkins, South Charleston, W. Va.; Clarence E. Parsons, Dana J. Hoffman, Ashby L. Ballard, Grover K. Rhodes, J. Stanley Ballard, John T. Wilson, Bernard J. Cart, J. L. Estep, Charleston; Lionel N. McKown, Elkview; E. I. Walz, Charleston; Cecil Hill, Nitro; Oscar Smoot, Charleston; Earl Smoot, Chesapeake; James P. Bailey, St. Albans; B. F. Youell, Rand; Earl C. Stewart, Samuel W. Crust, Charleston; James A. Barnette, Belva; Russell Barton, Reed; Guy Watson, Charleston; Kyle W. Dunlap, South Charleston; Leslie R. Peters, Thomas B. Lyon, Charleston; William J. Frampton, Chesapeake; Charles W. Boxey, Charleston, W. Va.

Address of Hon. James P. McGranery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1954

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Congessional Record, I present an address delivered by the Honorable James P. McGranery, a former Member of Congress and colleague of mine from the State of Pennsylvania and recently the Attorney General of the United States, formerly judge of the United States district court, at the commencement exercises at Manhattanville College, a famous college located for many years in New York City and recently moved to my district at Purchase, Westchester County, N. Y. The speech was delivered Monday afternoon, May 31, 1954.

It follows:

With the permission of Your Excellency, Bishop Dargin, right reverend monsignori, reverend fathers, very reverend and reverend mothers, religious of the Sacred Heart, members of the Manhattanville College faculty, honored guests, members of the class of 1954, I count it a distinguished privilege to speak to you this afternoon as you conclude your college life and join the great and gracious procession of Manhattanville alumnae. The academic hoods which you now wear, the diplomas, the degrees which you have received—testify to varied achievements in your study of the arts and sciences.

Yet you are all united in your shared heritage of the tradition of Manhattanville's 107 years, and as co-heirs of the truth in charity: Spiritual legacy of the Society of the Sacred Heart, founded by Saint Madeleine Sophie 154 years ago.

This gift of the beloved and sainted foundress has been etched in the vivid words of Father Charmot:

"In the spirituality of Saint Madeleine Sophie we find already expressed, without any learned pretentions, a theology, a mysticism, a form of sanctity, a plan of education, an apostolic ideal, which after a century and a half kept their own essential character without losing their efficacy." With eloquent accuracy, he comments:

"From the very first, the Society of the Sacred Heart was a contemplative and active congregation, consecrated to education. Devotion to the pierced heart of Jesus Christ and to the immaculate and sorrowful heart of Mary was the soul of its mysticism, of its apostolate and of its missionary impulse."

If a foundress can be said to be the prototype of her daughters in religion, each of whom is marked by a happy individuality—then the statement of Mother Maud Monahan, who stressed her great heart, wide fearless outlook, clear judgment, and gentle humor, awakens a sense of familiarity and recognition; as does the tribute:

St. Madeleine Sophie "Had all the adventurous courage of the knights of old * * * but also the long courage to carry through and endure to the end."

Certainly the society was born in an era of revolution, change, and uncertainty; and it spread from continent to continent while governments and men were in conflict, and despite epidemics, wars, floods, heresies, and religious oppression.

The supernatural marks of its mission and the heroic character of its members dedicated to their apostolate of education have been reflected in the growth of its institutions, in the human monument of the lives of the thousands and tens of thusands of children molded to full maturity.

And Manhattanville College has been called a realization of the spirit of the society, of its international quality, of the whole teaching power stored up in the fourth vow. The religious who have made Manhattanville a great institution of learning—with their scholarly and saintly "endowment of lives" harmoniously blended to the twin scholarship of an inspired lay faculty—may perhaps be symbolized by Mother Grace Dammann of beloved and happy memory.

In the felicitous phrase of your present president, who is esteemed throughout the entire educational world, Mother Dammann "wore her learning lightly, * * * as always she centered education round the individual, and worked for the total development, mental, cultural, and spiritual, of each student." Her "most constant theme was that she had given (the students) the knowledge that they needed to discipline themselves for life, and had taught them to think and to pray."

The president of another college wrote of her:

Mother Dammann "distinguished between principles which are eternal and customs or conventions which are ephemeral in value. I think it was because she was so imbued with these ideas that she understood the modern American girl far better than most people. * * * She distinguished very clearly between the unessential and the essential in her training and placed the emphasis where it belonged. * * * Like all truly great people, Mother Dammann was simple with the beautiful simplicity of the heart of Christ."

Since, from time to time, I had the happy opportunity to see Reverend Mother Dammann and to hear her analysis of contemporary problems—educational, governmental, international—I glimpsed through her generosity of mind, her vision, her warm enthusiasm, her understanding heart—the essentially religious, philosophical, and literary character of the Manhattanville ideal of education.

It is an ideal resting upon singleness of aim and agreement as to principles.

It is an ideal that brings students to a knowledge of "the manifold wisdom of God." It is the essence of the thought expressed in the scriptural advice "that Christ may dwell by faith in your hearts; that being rooted and founded in charity, you may be able to comprehend with all the saints, what is the breadth, and length, and height, and depth: To know also the charity of Christ, which surpasseth all knowledge, that you may be filled unto all the fullness of God." (Excerpt, Ephesians 3, 8–19.)

It is the ideal that is the answer to all the questions of our time, as it has been the answer to the queries of every era.

For, in all humility, I do not approach you today with the thought that I can give you a commitment that this era in which you live is unique—or completely different from every other century and every other time. I shall not tell you of the characteristics of the hydrogen age or the atomic era, unless, in the words of Thomas Merton, I say to you:

"If you are looking for the atomic age, look inside yourself; because you are it. And so, alas, am I."

It is true that modern man knows more about science than did his fathers. That he does not know more about himself, or about living with his neighbor, or about the art and science of government, about justice and truth—is all too evident. Strangely, the splitting of the atom was hastened by fear—engendered by the threat of a war born of hatred. Yet it is our hope that this discovery—now shaped into a weapon of annihilation—may yet be developed into a means of peaceful service to mankind—and it will be: If there is a return to spiritual maturity, if there is a return to love, to truth, to God.

Society as a whole has been termed "a void." For it cannot change until all individuals change. It will change only as each individual changes.

His Holiness Pope Pius XI pointed out that the whole theology of the angelic doctor "has but one end: To bring each of us to intimate union with God."

And his beloved successor, Pope Pius XII, has warned:

"We cannot abstain from expressing our preoccupation and our anxiety for those who, on account of the special circumstances of the moment, have become engulfed in the vortex of external activity so that they neglect the chief duty (of the Christian), his own sanctification. * * * Those who presume that the world can be saved by what has rightly been called the heresy of action must be made to exercise better judgment."

It would be bringing coals to Newcastle or oil to Texas, to point out to you that there is no antagonism between Christian learning and love, on the one hand, and physical science, natural philosophy, metaphysics, or dogmatic theology and external activity need not preclude our hearts from welcoming Christ.

Nevertheless, pragmatism and secularism are preparing fertile places for the germs of atheistic communism. To widen our sympathies without strengthening our vision—is to join the ranks of those who believe that a man must avoid being different from another or risk the accusation of being undemocratic. The passion for conformity has led to a denial of the right to mention God in many of our schools. This misplaced zeal for liberalism has caused many universities and colleges to omit all religious teaching while welcoming to the faculty those who would teach all that is opposed to religion and to truth.

It is a strange paradox that men who boast of their fidelity to the ideals of American democracy, will deny the essential basis of the Christian democratic ideal, namely, the dignity of the individual.

The paradox is most strange in that the pseudo-liberal thereby admits his ignorance of our Nation's beginning and its form. For ours is not a democracy but a republic founded on democratic principles by the early Americans who had studied the scholastics, even as you did here at Manhattanville.

Saint Thomas Aquinas and Saint Robert Bellarmine cofathered the doctrines of the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution, and made possible the beginning of a nation that was to have a unique mission in furthering friendship among men and among nations.

Its mission—and the fulfillment thereof—are in the future. To each of you—even as to each of us—there appears the challenge to duty—the duty of your destiny—of the world's destiny.

All that you have gained in valor of heart and firmness of will, in cultivation and training of mind, in love of truth and justice—on the hallowed campus of Manhattanville—will prepare you for service in whatever vocation you have elected, with God's guidance, to follow. Whether as lawyer or doctor, educator or public servant, in the arts or the sciences, you are ready for whatever responsibilities the future holds. As wife and mother, the family—the vital unit of the Nation—will be your sacred charge. As tomorrow's citizen, the city will be your community to guard. The Nation is in your care. The world's possibility of peace rests with the peace in your heart.

The need of tomorrow is for apostles, not for apologists. And, since an apostle is one who engenders new beings in Christ, by the word of God, the mission of tomorrow is one of love—even as it was more than nineteen hundred years ago.

And so, as I add my congratulations to those of your parents, of the religious, of the faculty members, and of your friends, my wish is that one day it may be said of you—with pronouns altered in gender—as Walter de La Mare said of Chesterton:

"Knight of the holy ghost, he goes his way,
Wisdom his motley, truth his loving jest;
The mills of satan keep his lance in play,
Pity and innocence his heart at rest."

Where Do We Go From Here? and the Communist Control Bill

SPEECH

OF

HON. ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 25, 1954

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, soon the Congress will take up the Communist control bill. Its obvious aim is to break up any bear hug the Kremlin would use to squeeze the life out of America.

There are some who hold that the failure of man to deal adequately with militarism, industrialism, and economic nationalism has encouraged communism to grow from a theory to a conspiracy; and that, as we govern the military, and manage industry and integrate national economies with four moral principles that motivate man for good on this earth, the principles of honesty, purity, unselfishness, and love, then, and only then, will the Communist threat recede and blow away. Others hold differently.

Where do we go from here?

Duell, Sloan & Pearce have put out a booklet entitled "Where Do We Go From Here?" It covers ground which I think will be helpful to the House in its consideration of the Communist control bill, soon to come before it.

Under unanimous consent heretofore granted, I include the booklet in the RECORD:

Where Do We Go From Here?—A Simple Guide to the World We Live in, What Makes It Tick, What To Do About It

Dear Cocitizen and Fellow Sufferer: You may have felt, as we do, that life is uncomfortably like living on a volcano. You never know when the darn thing may go up.

So we decided to see what goes on in this world, what has gone to land us in the present mess, and what we can do about it.

Yours,

Hannen and Cameron.

Many thousands of years ago there was an Ice Age.

And then there was a Stone Age, and in 5,000 B. C. the world entered the Bronze Age, and the Iron Age, and only 180 years ago a man harnessed a power as old as time and ushered in the Industrial Age, and now we are moving into the Ideological Age.

Yes; the ideological age—99 percent of the 2,400,000,000 people alive at the mid-point of this century don't realize this. Which causes much of the trouble, for it gives extraordinary power to the 1 percent who do. You'll only understand what's going on in the world when you understand an ideology. We wonder if you know what is an ideology?

We found out that an ideology is a faith which grips men and nations. It gives a philosophy, a passion, and a plan to change the world; and it creates the force of people to do it.

Ideas are today the deciding factor. The future depends on the idea that grips the minds of the millions. For instance, let's have a look at a couple of specimen ideologies that everyone knows.

You may or may not like these ideas, but you must admit they win people. Specimen No. 1, nazism: One man, Hitler, had an idea. His idea was: One race shall rule. He wrote a book—Mein Kampf. The idea struck a chord in millions of hearts and minds. In a few years a broken-down country became strong enough to challenge the world.

We all know what happened.

Specimen No. 2, communism: One man, Marx, had an idea. His idea was one class shall rule. He wrote a book Das Kapital. The idea appeals to millions who feel the world must be changed and that revolution is the only realistic way of doing it. In varying degrees every country is affected, and now half the world is controlled by those ideas.

No one who lives on this planet can remain unaffected by the ideological struggle, not even in the most remote places.

In every place—each country, each factory, each trade union, each university, each newspaper—materialist ideas reach out to grip men's minds.

Why do top scientists flee to other countries? Why do trusted men pass vital secrets to a foreign power? Why do even government officials from top social and educational backgrounds trot off? Because an ideology has captured their minds.

How an ideology takes over men and nations.

Vishinsky said: "We shall conquer the world, not with atomic bombs, but with our ideas, brains, and doctrines."

In the ideological age the future lies in the hands of those who know how to use ideas to win men's allegiance.

But the Communists haven't even got a seat in Parliament.

"I may have lost my seat in the House of Commons, but the Communists have taken 450 million people in China." (British Communist parliamentary candidate).

"The great issues will be settled, not in the arena of this reactionary Parliament, but by the workers' mass struggle in the factories and in the streets." (Secretary, British Communist Party).

We seem to be spending millions on armaments—I suppose it's the only way to be safe. Today we need not only a gun in our hand, we need an idea in our head and an answer in our heart. After all, nations have been taken over in recent years without a shot being fired. Modern warfare means that nations are out-thought before they are outfought.

You can't defeat an idea by being anti-it, ignoring it, or shooting it. You can only meet an idea with a superior idea.

What is the superior idea? (Slight pause for breath and refreshment while you get a piece of paper and write down what you feel is the superior idea.)

The Nazi idea was: A new order through the rule of one race.

The Communist idea is: A new society through the rule of one class.

The Superior idea is: A new world through the rule of one idea—"it's not who's right, it's what's right."

What's right? How do I know what is right?

There are absolute standards for human society just as there are for engineering.

What sort of a building would result if architect and builder did not employ recognized standards?

It's because we don't apply absolute standards to our living that society is in danger of collapse.

Here are the standards:

Absolute honesty: Honest apology is the highroad to lasting peace.

Absolute purity: A great cleansing force through the nations.

Absolute unselfishness: There is enough in the world for everyone's need, but not for everyone's greed.

Absolute love: If everyone cared enough and everyone shared enough, everyone would have enough.

These standards are the four pillars of a new age.

Yes; but why absolute? Because the world needs an authority everyone can accept. Besides, a standard must be absolute, or it isn't a standard.

Who wants a parachute that almost opens?

Who wants a boat that floats most of the time?

Who wants an egg that is nearly fresh?

But doesn't this sound rather like changing ones's ways?

Yes; it does mean change. But change is the key to the world of today. It's a changing world, and to get along in it you've got to ______ (Write here 6-letter word meaning to adapt yourself to altering world circumstances.)

Everybody wants to see the other person change.

Every nation wants to see the other nation change.

But everyone is waiting for the other to begin.

If you want an answer for the world, the best place to start is with yourself (and your own nation).

How can I change?

"Men must choose to be governed by God, or they will condemn themselves to be ruled by tyrants" (William Penn).

By a miracle of science men can speak by radio to millions. By a miracle of the spirit, God can speak to every man. His voice can be heard in every home, every business, every government. When man listens, God speaks. When man obeys, God acts.

It does not matter who you are or where you are. Accurate, adequate information can come from the mind of God to the minds of men who are willing to take their orders from Him.

"This is the revolution which will end revolution by changing human nature and remaking men and nations" (Frank Buchman).

God gave us 2 ears and 1 mouth: Why don't we listen to Him twice as much as we talk?

It's worth thinking over: Am I part of the cure or part of the disease in the world?

Remember, you can't make a good omelette out of bad eggs.

How do I begin? Take pencil and paper. Write down your thoughts. They may seem ordinary, but be honest—absolutely. You may have things to put right—well, how else can you build a new world?

Honesty: What about money? Taxes? What I told the family? Everything?

Purity: Do I live on the get or on the give?

Unselfishness: Do I put the other fellow first? All the time?

Love: Anyone I hate? Dislike? Or just don't care for? Why?

(Is the world the way it is because I am like this?)

You don't think it's necessary to change? You think you can take all that's coming? So did the dinosaur.

"This tough guy ruled in ancient days,
  But one thing he forgot:
He failed to alter with the times—
  Today he just is not."

The fact is that—

Human nature can be changed—that is the root of the answer.

National economies can be changed—that is the fruit of the answer.

World history can be changed—that is the destiny of our age.

New men, new nations, a new world. In the age when we've learnt to split the atom we must learn to unite humanity. It's get on together or blow up together.

In any negotiation it's not who's right—it's what's right.

Then industry will make the wealth and work of the world available for all and for the exploitation of none, and the workers will unite the world. This inspired ideology is for everyone everywhere.

It is the ordinary man's opportunity to remake the world.

With this ideology, industry will produce enough for the needs of all; homes will secure the next generation from chaos; armies will give new standards of moral training to their nations; cabinets and diplomats will be totally effective for they will have the power to turn enemies into friends; nations will arise from apathy, disillusion, and division. Renaissance is inevitable. This is our future—and it works.

That's what we found out. And the great thing is that these ideas have been tried out and proved practical in over 100 countries.

Results have been breathtaking. You'll find the same as you put this into action in your home and where you work.

Drop us a line if you want to know more.

Yours,

Hannen and Cameron.

P. S.—Your bookstore has The World Rebuilt, by Peter Howard, which gives many facts, and we recommend it.

You can reach us care of Moral Rearmament.

Eric Johnston Suggests It Is Within Our Power To Cause the Russians To Lower Their War Potential

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 1954

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, last week an outstanding American businessman made a significant speech in New York concerning the use of the American economy as a major weapon in weakening the Russian war potential.

The speaker was Eric Johnston, president of the Motion Picture Association of America and Chairman of the International Development Advisory Board, who is perhaps America's most widely traveled businessman. He has been to Russia twice as an observer and has had the rare opportunity of taking a close professional look at Soviet daily life.

Mr. Johnston, in his speech in New York City on June 9 before the National Association of Direct Selling Companies, strongly advocated a campaign in which the American economy would be used as a major weapon to pressure the Soviet Union into raising its living standards at the expense of its war potential.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I include the text of Mr. Johnston's pertinent speech in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

THE AMERICAN ECONOMY AND THE FUTURE

Today, as a businessman, I would like to talk to you as businessmen. I would like to examine with you the impact of world events on the American economy and the impact of the American economy on world events.

Very naturally, as businessmen in a highly competitive society we have an acute and continuing interest in the future. We try to gauge our markets, to detect trends and factors that will affect our customers and their buying power.

So we eagerly try to peer through the opaque window of the future to see what is in store for us. With warranted concern and concentration we scan such domestic indicators as carloadings, kilowatt production, bank loans, employment, commodity indexes, retail sales and Dow-Jones averages.

As businessmen, we regard the 90 percent farm parity bill, the Federal Housing Act, or the extension of social security in the light of their potential effect on the economic health of our Nation.

* * * * *

However, in our concern over what is going to happen tomorrow, I think that we businessmen are sometimes inclined to overlook or shunt to one side one of the most important factors in our business undertakings. It is a force that may not affect the plans of mice, but it can change the plans of men.

We want to balance our national budget and lower taxes; we seek to avoid inflation, to save for our old age in the assurance that the dollars we save will have a stable purchasing power. We would like to earn steady and adequate incomes, to own our own homes unencumbered, to achieve peace of mind—but all of our hopes can be dashed and smashed by this neglected factor over which we do not have control and which no domestic business indicator can accurately foretell.

I am, of course, talking about what happens overseas. All sorts of people, policies, and programs all over the world affect our Nation; the fate of a beleaguered garrison in a remote steaming jungle affects our lives; so can a street riot in a far off land or even a budget debate in a distant capital.

What happens in a public square in Sicily may have far-reaching consequences in a private home in Cicero. Ali Baba can make himself felt in Alabama. A pocket veto on the other side of the world can hit our pocketbooks here.

* * * * *

If we had full control over the factors affecting our economy we would undoubtedly be less apprehensive about what tomorrow might bring.

In America, we have the makings of a contented society. * * *

The fruits of our labor are incomparably sweet and our material rewards are without parallel in history. There are no bequests of cowardice in the American heritage and there is nothing in our song or story that begets hopelessness and despair.

Yet despite all these advantages and bounties, we are in danger of becoming the world's foremost worrywarts, a Nation of fussbudgets, fussing while we budget and budgeting while we fuss.

It is not the pressure of living in a highly competitive mass-consumption economy which is responsible for all our fussing and all our budgeting. In a stable world, we would be perfectly capable of meeting our own needs and solving our own problems in our own way.

No; it is an outside world in ferment that really puts the pressure on us, that hits our economy hard. A good deal of that ferment is caused by a potent brew of virulent nationalism and abject poverty, and there are professional conspirators at work stirring the brew. They realize, perhaps better than we, what an effect it can have upon our way of life.

* * * * *

To make this ugly truth even more unpalatable, let me say bluntly that the one foreign nation above all others which influences our economy is the same one which directs an international conspiracy against us. I am referring, of course, to the Soviet Union.

* * * * *

The Kremlin's impact upon us is negative. We take counteractions to thwart Soviet measures, but the point of order, or disorder, that I would like to raise, Mr. Chairman, is this: Would we take those expensive countermeasures if we did not believe the Kremlin menaced us? It seems clear that we would not.

It is not too much of an exaggeration to say that the Kremlin can cause the American Congress to appropriate funds for our defense more readily than our own Joint Chiefs of Staff can.

Knowing that the Russians are developing newer and deadlier weapons of war, could we dare do less? In fact, does it not become our vital objective to outdo the Communists no matter what the cost?

If the Kremlin can force us to rearm, just look at the expense they can put us to. Once we could build a plane for $100,000 or so. Now a modern jet bomber runs into the millions. We used to fire a shell for a few dollars. Now it costs us several thousands of dollars just to propel one rocket.

Compared to the costs of building up our defenses and striking power today, the armament programs of the last World War were basement bargains. Programs to maintain peace or to wage cold war do not come cheap nowadays, either. Expenditures for such undertakings are staggering.

* * * * *

The policies of Moscow can affect the policies of American businessmen, inducing them to build up or cut down inventories, to buy or sell with an eye on the future.

Is there any doubt that the Russians could cause us to impose controls and ceilings once more—could force us to ration and stockpile, by going to war with us or threatening to do so?

Even a Communist arms shipment to a little state like Guatemala has widespread repercussions in our society. It is only a small sample of the impact the Soviet world has upon us.

Suppose we refused to counter the aggressive measures of the Communists, would we then be the complete masters of our own economy, our own fate? There are some Americans who believe we would.

Would we be safe if we withdrew from the the rest of the world? What would happen if we did? Well, for one thing, we could reduce our national expenditures and our Federal taxes by billions of dollars. Why, we could even balance our budget, at least, for a few sweet weeks.

Along with it, however, would we not have to lower our standard of living? Wouldn't the loss of foreign markets and foreign sources of supply for needed raw materials affect our economy drastically?

There are some of us who want to shrug off the rest of the world. They are disillusioned and irritated because we have given away something like $60 billion since the end of the last World War and do not seem to have earned as many fast friends abroad as they think we should have.

* * * * *

The trouble with this line of thought, it seems to me, is that even though we tried to dismiss the rest of the world, the rest of the world would not be prepared to dismiss us.

One thing is sure—withdrawal to our own frontiers would not give us control over our own economy or our own destiny. It takes no prophet to predict that the Soviet Union would gladly fill any vacuum we chose to create by retreat.

With the infinite patience Communists possess, they could surely take over the rest of the world, bite by bite, and, after digesting it, turn to us for their next meal. They could organize the production capacity of all Europe. They would exercise a virtual monopoly over most of the strategic materials of the world.

* * * * *

Aware of this peril, would we not have to prepare for the ultimate defense of our homeland which could prove to be the decisive battleground?

That preparation in itself would call for enormous expenditures by our country. So, in the long run, wouldn't the Communists have an influence on our spending policies and therefore on practically all of our economy anyhow?

No; I am afraid that isolation would not make us complete masters of our own economy. We could buy time that way, but in the meantime we would fuss and budget, fidget and flutter, waiting for the showdown.

Let us examine another possibility. There are others of us who think we might settle with Russia now. Is there any chance that we could persuade the Soviet Union to be sweet and reasonable? Could we demonstrate that it would be to their interest as well as ours to work out some form of modus vivendi?

* * * * *

Certainly as matters now stand there seems to be little prospect of finding modus vivendi. We have tried this before and failed. In the past decade, we made great concessions to the Soviet Union in the hope that she would learn to trust us and live in a peaceful world with us. It did not work.

With hindsight, at least, we can detect some reasons why we failed. I am persuaded that the Communists have a greater feeling of insecurity than we do. While this cannot be fully proved, there are indications that this is so.

Moscow has furnished us plenty of evidence that the Communists do not have sufficient confidence in their way of life to feel that they can live side by side with the democracies indefinitely. Their system cannot stand open and honest in comparison with ours. They seem to be fearful that if their subjects could make a free comparison, they might eventually try to overthrow the Communist regimes.

I believe that Communist aggressiveness in the main springs from insecurity, not from strength. Underneath the surface of bold talk and bolder actions, lies a feeling of inferiority and therefore of insecurity. It is recklessness born from nervousness.

There is another approach to our rivalry with world communism which some Americans think is the answer to our problems—denunciation. Apparently those who practice it exclusively believe that we can check communism by calling it names, by just vilifying it. So far as I know, nobody ever got rid of an infection by merely cussing it out. Denunciation by itself is shrill, not shrewd. It, too, is a symptom of nervousness and insecurity, and it will not solve our problems.

If then none of these methods would be effective against unwelcome impact from abroad, what can we do? Is there no way to reduce unhealthy outside pressures on our economy?

I have done some reflecting on this subject and I believe there is a way. The best defense is still an offense, so why shouldn't we use the entire American economy as a weapon to put counterpressure on those who are putting pressure on us?

By the American economy I mean a combination of our resources, skills, experience, and our system of turning them into human assets. Were we to use this powerful combination as a major instrument of our foreign policy, I suggest it would give us the best chance we would have at this time of effecting some semblance of peace.

The prospects for some kind of living arrangement with the Soviet Union, it seems to me, will depend very largely on how effectively we can use the American economy to limit Russia's ability to wage sustained modern warfare.

The Soviet Union has by its actions and policies demonstrated that it can cause us to lower our peace potential and I submit it is within our power to cause the Russians to lower their war potential.

By a conscious and dedicated effort to help others achieve the kind of rewards that an economy like ours yields, we can demonstrate to the people of the Soviet Union the superiority of our system in terms of their personal lives.

Our aim ought to be to compel the Kremlin in self-defense against popular unrest in their domain, to bolster their own civilian economy at the expense of the Soviet war machine.

* * * * *

I suggest it can be effected by using the American economy along three broad avenues—tempo, trade, and demonstration—the advanced tempo of technological and scientific improvements, the stimulation of the whole range of trade and the demonstration of the superiority of the product of our economy.

I propose that we embark on an open and vigorous campaign to force the Communist regimes to give their people higher living standards or risk greater popular unrest, that we try to compel them to give their enslaved subjects economic aid, so to speak, by doing our concentrated best to help raise living standards everywhere else.

If we can goad the Kremlin to do this in self-defense, we might help to reduce the fervor and fever of the Communists for world domination. The better life would make it more difficult for Communist regimes to drive their people into dangerous and destructive adventures.

At the same time, such a diversion from heavy industry and armaments involving as it would men, money, and talent, could well have the effect of reducing the Soviet war-making potential. To the extent we can force the Russians to cut back their war industries, we can reduce their pressures on us and therefore the military expenditures they have compelled us to make.

The first approach in our campaign to force the Soviet Union to lower its war potential, is tempo, technological tempo. We must compel the Soviet Union to enter a race with us, not in armaments but in the translation of scientific and technical advances into human benefits.

In the days ahead, we shall see startling technological developments which can be turned to enormous peacetime advantage.

* * * * *

Atomic power is already in our hands. With it we will be able to reverse an old industrial pattern. Instead of men seeking power sites and locating there, packaged power can seek out men, causing factories to spring up and industry to flourish where even now there is little hope for such a development.

In the not-too-distant future, our scientists will be able to convert sea water into fresh water and when they do, we may be able to make deserts bloom and Marxist doctrines wither.

It would have to be our firm resolve that we would keep so far ahead of the Russians in living standards that they would have to spend more and more of their time, energy, and resources just trying to catch up with us to prevent unrest within their own domains.

But, and this is something we tend to overlook, we would fall far short of the mark if we limited ourselves to making economic improvements only in our own country. If we did not offer a helping hand to other freemen, we would only be inviting further envy and bitterness on which the Communists would be quick to capitalize (if such a word can be applied to Communists).

I do not advocate sharing our wealth with others when we give them a helping hand. We have done more than enough of that. Besides, they might regard that form of help as ransom from the frightened rich. They might well regard themselves as mere spectators and nonparticipating beneficiaries. That kind of program at this stage would do little more than assure us of permanently poor relatives.

What we need to do is make greater efforts to share and foster our system of creating new wealth. This brings us to the second method of influencing the Kremlin to weaken its war potential—the stimulation of the whole range of trade, primarily among the world's free nations.

By trade, I mean the entire complex of economic relations that exists among societies. It embraces not only the voluntary exchange of commodities, but skills, knowledge, and capital as well.

We must place a new accent on trade among free nations. It must not be limited to the static distribution of old wealth, but must put accent on the dynamic creation of new wealth, not just here in the United States, but especially abroad wherever it is welcomed. We must help others do for themselves what we do for ourselves. They will appreciate it more; they will accomplish more.

We must become economic evangelists, promoting the best features of our system where they are adaptable elsewhere. In doing so, we need not impose our culture on others.

There is place and there is space for many fine cultures in civilization but if we concentrate on helping to spread the healthy human consequences of our unparalleled production and our equitable distribution, we will find it possible to promote common understanding and acceptance of some values of vital importance to free and democratic societies everywhere.

But—if we are to make maximum impact on the Soviet economy with our own economy, we will have to demonstrate its superiority to the bureaucrats of communism as well as to the people in their grip. Open defections and covert conversions are what we are after. Aroused conscience and increased appetite in the Soviet world should be our aim.

To get our accomplishments across, we not only must do what we say, but say what we do. We must translate our achievements into other free peoples' attainments and these in turn must be made meaningful to the subjects of the Soviet Union.

This means that by every possible channel and in every available form, we must convince the people behind the Iron Curtain that not only do we lead a better life but that its blessings would be within their grasp also if only their Communist masters would permit them to earn and enjoy these blessing themselves.

We have seen striking evidence of our ability to influence Soviet economy in recent months. Surely, Malenkov's decision to devote more of Russian production to consumers goods can be traced to some of our activities. The politburo was compelled to take a tack from its almost exclusive heavy industry and armaments course to bolster the Soviet civilian economy.

Malenkov and company were not indifferent to the East German revolt last year, brought on largely by the progress being made in American-supported West Germany.

Turkey's striking headway is touching off popular dissatisfaction in neighboring Bulgaria. Until recently she imported wheat. Now she is exporting wheat.

Her coal fields have been opened up. Paved roads are replacing oxcart trails. There is prosperity in Turkey, her people are living better and these developments have not escaped the notice of her troubled Communist dominated neighbors in the Balkans.

Likewise the results of American aid in Greece are causing dissatisfaction in nearby Communist Albania.

* * * * *

It is of vital importance to our security and our very survival that we find a successful method of meeting Communist rivalry head-on, right now.

It will avail us little to hash and rehash the mistakes of the past decade. We must concentrate on the decisive 10 years before us. These next 10 years will be the big decade. The fate of civilization in all probability will be decided during this crucial period.

The time to act is now. Our destiny is upon us; we dare not fail it. Never before in history has the fate of the human race been so precarious. Never before has that fate depended more on one people.

To the end that America can marshal her might, her talent and her energy for the showdown that is sure to come in the big decade, I urge that a program be shaped that will raise our sights, our aims and our targets.

Let us look to management, labor, and education to tap their talent and make it available for such a program around the world; let us invite our philanthropic foundations and charitable institutions to underwrite the expenses of such talent; and let us call upon our Government to work with both in the areas where its cooperation is needed.

Let us give the American economy a new look—a new look across the sea. Let us give it a fresh transfusion of public support, of industrial partnership and Government cooperation. To get it going I urge a call for a conference of management and labor representatives, of foundation and Government officials this summer to map out a program to pursue this objective.

Let us encourage nations that want to work with us for decision in the big decade, to spell out their aspirations in programs which will have targets and deadlines, aims and objectives. Let their governments commit themselves to their people. Let their people dedicate themselves to the programs.

In that way, and only in that way, can free men of goodwill put the Communists on the defensive. In that way, and only in that way, can we assume leadership in the big decade. It is our only hope for a peaceful resolution of the critical conflict of our times.

Food Surpluses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. SPESSARD L. HOLLAND

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 24, 1954

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Surpluses Plus Surpluses," published in the Christian Science Monitor of June 22, 1954.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SURPLUSES PLUS SURPLUSES

Paradoxically enough, one of the problems of the American people today is that they are a long way from starving. The distance is so great, in fact, that the Federal Government is having trouble finding places to store surplus foods. If you should see corn bulging out of old airplane hangars or wheat seeping from abandoned movie theaters, don't be surprised.

The Government already has $2 billion worth of wheat alone tucked away. Some of it will be given away or used for foreign aid. But more will be bought. For that's the law. And Uncle Sam is constructing storage facilities for 100 million bushels more. Wheat acreage was cut by 20 percent last year, drought and other vicissitudes hit several growing areas. But American farmers are expected to produce this year 100 million bushels above 1 year's normal consumption needs—to add to the year's supply already on hand.

It has just been announced that an additional 13 percent cut in acreage is being ordered. At the same time the Government is supporting wheat prices at $2.52 a bushel. And millions of bushels are produced for less than $1 a bushel. Does sound daffy, doesn't it? And even taking into account the special marketing problems and the uncertainties which beset farmers, taking into account the hardships of less efficient producers—it is daffy.

There is danger it will become still daffier. Vastly freer use of cheaper chemical fertilizers—a farm revolution that has barely begun—promises perfectly fantastic yields in the years ahead. And with political pressures demanding that the Government guarantee a living even to inefficient farmers, there will be no incentives for them to shift into other fields while efficient growers pile up ever larger surpluses. Politicians have encouraged farmers to think that the wartime bonanza could go on forever.

The price-support legislation was supposed to insure adequate food supplies in years when millions of men and acres were out of production. It was properly set up on an emergency basis—to expire after hostilities ceased. In 1948 Congress passed a law to ease the supports down on a flexible basis. But twice this plan has been suspended under election-year pressures.

The House Agriculture Committee has voted again to suspend operation of the flexible provisions due to go into effect in January. The argument for this course is that acreage and marketing restrictions will master the surpluses—while holding up the prices.

We don't believe it will work—not in the face of present and potential productive capacities. But if it did it would do so on an artificial subsidy basis, with controls tightening and broadening to other crops and the incentives of a free market destroyed.

That also is the objection of millions of farmers—and of President Eisenhower and Secretary Benson. They wish to try the flexible plan. Even with that and with the "setasides" designed to take current stocks off the market the surplus problem will be bad enough. Why make it worse with continued rigid price supports?

Explanation of REA Income and Cost Figures

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANCIS CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 24, 1954

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, under leave to extend my remarks I should like to insert in the RECORD a letter received from the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Association, on June 8, 1954.

His letter is in response to one I had written transmitting an inquiry from Mr. George P. Roth, of Box Elder, S. Dak., relative to a possible difference in figures between the report released by the Department of Agriculture on realized cost of agricultural and related programs and the financial information in the REA annual report for 1953.

The Administrator's letter suggests that no discrepancy exists and that the confusion results because of misunderstanding as to the basis used.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
RURAL ELECTRIFICATION
ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., June 8, 1954.

Hon. FRANCIS CASE,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR CASE: In response to your letter of May 19, 1954, we have prepared the following information for your use in replying to a request from Mr. George P. Roth, of Box Elder, S. Dak.

There is no conflict between the report released by the Department of Agriculture on realized cost of agricultural and related programs and the financial information in the REA annual report for 1953. They do not purport to show the same thing, being based on different concepts of costs.

Both of these statements are correct:

1. On an accrued income and expense basis, pursuant to regulations governing business-type operations, the lending operations of REA have resulted in a net income from the inception of the program through June 30, 1953, of $45.5 million,

2. On a net realized cost basis, the operations of REA have resulted in a net realized cost (not loss) of $99.8 million for the same period.

Before the release of the Department's statement, there had been considerable confusion and a wide variety of conflicting statements as to the "cost" to the Government of price supports and other agriculture programs. The purpose of the Department in preparing its report was to develop factual, objective, comparable data for all programs of the Department. In preparing any financial statement, the basis to be used must first be determined. The Department felt it necessary to determine what one basis would most accurately reflect the actual cost to date of each of the many activities of the Department. Obviously the Department could not show some programs on one basis and other programs on another, since this would result in figures which were not comparable. And, even though accrued income and expense information is available for some programs, such as REA, it would be very difficult if not impossible to accurately report all programs on that basis. The basis used by the Department has the advantage that it can be easily explained, and that anyone applying the same accounting concepts to the same financial data will arrive at the same conclusion.

The treatment of the REA lending program illustrates the Department's method:

1. From the total loan fund advances (checks issued to borrowers) was subtracted the total repayments of principal, year by year.

2. The gross cost of this money to the Government was then computed, using the interest rate on the total public debt at the end of each year.

3. From this gross cost was subtracted the interest payments actually received from REA borrowers in that year.

4. This difference is the net realized cost or gain. For all the years since the beginning of the program, this net realized cost totals $99.8 million. This is, in other words, the difference between the interest cost of the lending program, at the rate on the total debt, on the interest payments received in cash.

On the other hand, REA's reports are developed pursuant to regulations covering Government business-type operations. We include as income interest payments actually received in cash, plus the accured interest receivable as of June 30, 1953. Accrued interest receivable on that date amounted to about $85 million, of which about $82 million was "deferred" interest resulting from the practice of deferring payments during the first 5 years of a loan.

As to interest expense under the same regulations, REA reports only the interest actually paid or due to RFC and the Treasury. This excludes interest on over $140 million in appropriated loan funds, for which REA pays no interest. Also, the rate of interest charged to REA differs from the rate on the total public debt, which was used by the Department.

We hope that we have clarified any questions that may have arisen concerning the two reports. We would be happy to supply any further information which you may require.

Sincerely yours,
FRED H. STRONG,
For Ancher Nelsen, Administrator.

Farm Production Controls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 24, 1954

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "With Subsidies Go Control," published in the Wilmington (Del.) Morning News of Wednesday, June 23, 1954.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WITH SUBSIDIES GO CONTROLS

The new farm production controls announced by Secretary of Agriculture Benson are the strictest ever. Not only has he decreed that wheat acreage for 1955 shall be cut 12.7 percent from 63 million acres to 55 million, and called for a farmers' referendum to approve rigid marketing quotas to enforce planting goals; he has invoked 2 new devices to keep the land not planted to wheat from being used to produce other surpluses.

One of these devices is the so-called cross-compliance requirement, under which farmers must stay within Federal allotments for all crops under control in order to be eligible for price supports on any one crop. The other, the total acreage allotment, means that farmers whose allotments call for a total reduction of more than 10 acres in allotment crops must stay within an overall figure in order to be eligible for price supports. Allotments are now planned for cotton, tobacco, peanuts, and sugar crops in addition to wheat.

This is stiff medicine for what ails the Nation's agriculture and many farmers are going to be hit in the pocketbook. But it must be obvious to farmers who grow these surplus crops, and even to their professional friends in Congress, that the Government can't let this problem get any worse. Our surplus crops now represent an investment of $6,500,000,000 in public funds. When this year's wheat crop is harvested the Nation will have a 2-year supply on hand. Spending more money to create still more unwieldy surpluses, which must be stored at considerable expense, just doesn't make sense.

Secretary Benson deserves credit for courage, all the same, and it is possible that Congress will overrule him. Congress last year set aside the formula that would have required a cut in wheat acreage from 78.5 million acres to 55 million—it set the figure at 63 million. It might do something of the same kind again. Note that Representative HOPE, chairman of the House Agriculture Committee, has said that these controls will strengthen the farm bloc's determination to continue high rigid price supports.

In actuality the present state of affairs is in large measure the result of high rigid price supports. The new tight controls are a powerful argument for the administration's program, which calls for flexible supports. Farmers should see the handwriting on the wall of the wheat storage bin—it says that those who want Government subsidies must submit to Government controls.

Rural Electric Cooperatives and Atomic Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 24, 1954

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I herewith include a resolution adopted at the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association in Miami, Fla., on January 14, 1954, urging Congress not to amend the provisions of the Atomic Energy Act which prohibit private patents on atomic-power developments. The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED AT NRECA ANNUAL MEETING, MIAMI, FLA., JANUARY 14, 1954

ATOMIC POWER

Whereas the rural-electric systems during 1953 purchased or generated over 15½ billion kilowatt-hours at a total cost of approximately $121,700,000; and

Whereas in many areas the systems are paying excessively high costs for their wholesale power supplies and do not have adequate supplies of wholesale power to take care of future growth in loads; and

Whereas the people of the United States have invested over $12 billion in the atomic-energy program, the benefits from which should accrue to the people: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we urge the Congress and the Atomic Energy Commission to continue the development of atomic power by the Federal Government and to consider the needs of the rural-electric systems in such development and also invite their active participation and cooperate with them in such development on a partnership basis; and be it further

Resolved, That we urge the Congress not to amend the provisions of the Atomic Energy Act which prohibit private patents on atomic-power developments, but instead insist on the use of nonexclusive licenses for the development and production of atomic power as provided in the act so that atomic-power development will be considered a part of the public domain and available to all the people.

Suffocation in Iceboxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, June 24, 1954

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, about 76 children have suffocated in iceboxes in the last 6 years throughout the United States.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Tale of a 4-Year Old," published in the Celina (Ohio) Daily Standard of recent date, which discusses this very important subject.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TALE OF A 4-YEAR-OLD

A 4-year-old boy went to Highland Park to visit his 3-year-old cousin. His aunt sent them out to play with the admonition not to leave the yard. For, you see, she's the worrying kind.

But, for boys of that age, yards are made to go out of. Prison walls may contain wily oldsters. But no genius has devised a fence to hold in boys of 3 and 4.

So the tots gleefully journeyed forth out of the yard and into the great forbidden world. Their little legs carried them all of the way to the porch of a clubhouse.

Now they had no business going onto that porch. Any lawyer could have told them that they were guilty of trespassing. But, if the boys knew it was wrong to go onto that porch, that only sharpened the need to explore it.

On this porch was an ice box. It's a very handy gadget for the club when they are having parties. They put their refreshments in it. But there was no party now. It stood empty and unused.

But count on boys to find a use for things other people are not using. The 4-year-old climbed inside. A cozy hiding place. The 3-year-old slammed shut the door and went about his business. Clearly his cousin didn't want to play with him anymore.

Other women would have let the children be at their play. But, as we said, auntie was the worrying kind. She had hardly turned the boys out to play until she was looking for them. She found her boy but no sign of her nephew.

So she had her boy take her to his cousin. Her heart stopped beating as she threw open the door. But there was her nephew smiling and happy. It had been a grand adventure.

Since auntie was the worrying kind, she called the doctor. He told her the boy was all right. But he said they were lucky the boy had not gotten scared in the dark and started to cry and struggle. He would have used up the oxygen and died.

So the 4-year-old is not dead. He owes his life to two exceptional circumstances. One was that his aunt was the worrying kind and went looking for him much sooner than many women would have. The other is that he did not get scared and use up his oxygen.

But for these two fortunate circumstances, he would be dead and the whole community would be up in arms about unused ice boxes being out where children can get at them. We think the county should be up in arms anyway.

Must we wait for a child to die here before we get alarmed? Seventy-six children have suffocated in this country in the last 6 years because adults were too careless and indifferent to check on their unused ice boxes.

Two children ages 3 and 4, suffocated in an unused refrigerator in Connecticut yesterday.

Everyone should take it upon himself to make certain he has no ice boxes out where children can get at them. But not everyone will. The hazard these thoughtless people create is a community concern. We have every right to organize a countywide search for these child traps.

And we owe it to our children to do it immediately.

DISTRIBUTION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

To the Vice President and each Senator 100 copies; to the Secretary and Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, each, 25 copies; to the Secretary, for official use, not to exceed 35 copies; to the Sergeant at Arms, for use on the floor of the Senate, not to exceed 50 copies; to each Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress, 60 copies; to the Clerk, Sergeant at Arms, and Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives, each, 25 copies; to the Clerk, for official use, not to exceed 50 copies; and to the Doorkeeper, for use on the floor of the House of Representatives, not to exceed 75 copies; to the Vice President and each Senator, Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress there shall also be furnished (and shall not be transferable), 3 copies of the daily RECORD, of which 1 shall be delivered at his residence, 1 at his office, and 1 at the Capitol.

PRICE OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

The Public Printer is authorized to furnish to subscribers the daily RECORD at $1.50 per month, payable in advance.

Remit by money order payable to Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C.

Appendix

Foreign Policy Guide

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 25, 1954

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, in Chicago, before the Mart Hall of Fame, the former and distinguished President of the United States, Mr. Herbert Hoover, made a most excellent speech outlining a foreign-policy guide. I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Text of Hoover Address Before Mart Hall of Fame—Outlines Foreign Policy Guide

I would be remiss if I did not at once state to this representative group of merchants that our magnificent distribution system has had a large part in building the highest standard of living for a nation ever known to mankind.

I could observe that my life has been periodically spent resisting the wiles of merchants in a frantic effort to balance my budget. In other words, I have been compelled to restrict my standard of living below your beguilements.

MEETS OLD FRIENDS

It is a privilege to be in company with General Wood and former Ambassador Joseph Kennedy, who sponsor this occasion.

My association with General Wood began in the First World War, when he was quartermaster general and I was food administrator. His friendship has continued over these 38 years—in bad as well as good times.

Mr. Kennedy and I served and fought alongside on the first congressional commission on organization of the executive branch of the Government, and he is today serving again on the present second commission. General Wood served on the task force of the first commission, and is serving again with the present commission.

The general and I have long been associated in the work of the Boys' Clubs of America. He is a director, William E. Hall, the president. I am the chairman.

LAUDS WOOD AND KENNEDY

In his effort General Wood has given outstanding leadership to that organization in Chicago. And in this connection, I will tell you a secret—Mr. Kennedy has just contributed $25,000 to this work in Boston.

Several of you who are present are serving today on the task forces of the Commission on Organization of the Government. And several of you served on the task forces of the first Commission.

The first Commission accomplished much in decreased cost and increased efficiency in the departments. But that first Commission was restricted in making recommendations as to policies of the Government. This time the Congress enjoined us to cover this field. The law, however, contains a special reservation that we shall not apply our activities to the judiciary or the Congress.

REMOVED ROADBLOCKS

The previous Commission secured the removal of roadblocks which held up internal reorganization of the departments and agencies. Today the heads of the different agencies are each diligently placing their own houses in order.

Our present Commission has therefore generally limited its activities to matters involving more than one agency with their duplications and overlaps. Just as an indication, I may mention that 41 agencies of the Government deal with medical matters. Twelve of them deal with the weather.

We are still in the study stage in the second Commission. Some 200 leading citizens are serving with us on 24 task forces or subcommittees.

I am confident that the recommendations of this Commission can show the way to balance the Federal budget and stop this spiral of inflation. That is, provided we can overcome the roadblocks and are not forced into war.

DISCUSSES DELINQUENCY

One of our rising national problems is juvenile delinquency. Some discussion of it is warranted here because not only General Wood and Mr. Kennedy and I have a joint interest in the boys' clubs, but there are several of you who are also in this service.

Of the many agencies in the country devoted to this problem of delinquency, the boys' clubs have an important part. In this organization we are concerned with pavement boys—the boys in our slum areas whose only outlet after school and on Saturdays, Sundays, and holidays is the streets.

Over the whole country, we have over 380 of these clubs in 252 communities, with approximately 360,000 self-starting boys.

These clubs are not a paper organization. They are as solid bricks and mortar as any man's club and would today cost upward of $120 million to replace. In them we provide constructive joy, health, occupational, and moral guidance.

BOYS SEEK ADVENTURE

Together with his sister, the boy is our most precious American possession. The normal boy can seem to be a child of iniquity, yet he makes a great nation.

The whole world is new to him. Therefore, he seeks adventure, discovery, and great undertakings. He must spend much time, if he is to expand, in the land of make-believe.

This normal boy is endowed with a dynamic energy and an impelling desire to take exercise on all occasions. His primary instinct is to hunt in a pack and that multiplies his devices.

But the normal boy has a primitive instinct and takes to competition and battle. In the days before our civilization became so perfect, he matched his wits with the birds, the bees and the fish.

He cannot find battle with animal or plant life in zoos or parks. If he doesn't contend with nature, he is likely to take on contention with a policeman.

ADVOCATE SPORTS

The fine qualities of loyalty to the pack can be turned to sports, where the spirit of fair play is the greatest moral force outside religious faith. Sport is not so good on the pavements. For here the pack turns to the gang. And here we make gangsters and feed jails.

This Boys' Club organization has proved one of the most effective preventions of delinquency—always excepting mother. Some years ago in a certain tough district in Chicago, over 80 percent of the boys in the district were in the hands of the police during the year. A few years after the completion of a club, the delinquency percentage dropped to 12 percent.

As to physicial benefits to the boys, I might mention that the national rate of W–F's was over 30 percent in the last war. A canvass of 200,000 alumni of Boys' Clubs showed only 4½ percent. And they fought and died bravely.

CLUBS AID MILLIONS

Great editors, great musicians, great sculptors, and five major league baseball players were started in the channels of this organization. And today millions of boys from these clubs are solid patriotic citizens of our country.

Due to the indefatigable efforts of General Wood and others in this work, Chicago slums are proportionately better served by the Boys' Clubs than any other city in the country. For here there are 21 clubs with 11,000 boy members.

But the American people are in far greater trouble than teen-age delinquency or reforms in our Federal establishment.

I do not need to describe the center of world conspiracy from which our international dangers arise. And our difficulties are not limited to the Communists. They arise also from a lack of unity among the free nations in dealing with these difficulties.

UNDERSTANDING NEEDED

I have no intention of speaking upon specific foreign policies. Our disunities with the Communists are easy enough to appreciate, but our relations with free nations require more understanding.

To discuss these problems objectively will not make the cold war any hotter. And it may illustrate that this is a time for patience and forbearance.

1. We must realize that there are wide differences in racial inheritances, economic, and political objectives in each of the free nations. They come down from centuries. Also among them are age-old dislikes and fears.

2. It must be realized that military alliances or peacetime collective action can endure only as long as there are common objectives and purposes among the participants.

3. Our people must realize that the interests, objectives and policies of nations constantly shift with this rapidly changing scene.

The last 9 years offer abundant proof of the rapidity of shifting national policies. In this short period, the policies of the United States have shifted, as witness our reversal of attitudes toward Russia, Germany, and Japan.

A-BOMB PLAYS PART

4. We must realize that the atomic bomb and the steady growth of Communist military strength have contributed to shift the policies of some of the free nations.

5. We must realize that the Communist members of the United Nations have paralysed our hoped-for protection from military aggression through that organization; and that the United Nations is weakened in this major purpose by lack of full unity among the free nations.

6. Our people should realize that many of the free nations of the world, in despair of protection by the United Nations from major aggression, have been forced into a multitude of military alliances. There are also groups present today determined to maintain their neutrality in any major conflict.

7. We must realize that some of our military allies are faltering in the march. That hesitation again arises from shifting interests and objectives with the changing scene in the world.

OLD CONCEPTS GONE

8. Our people should realize that with these alliances, groupings, and shiftings, the whole concept of preservation of peace by collective action against an aggressor through the United Nations has gone by the board—at least for the present. We are now in the presence of age-old balances of power, power politics, and ancient forms of diplomacy.

9. Our people must realize that in dealing with these gigantic problems of today we must have patience, tolerance, and understanding of these differences of interests and objectives of the free nations.

10. Through this terrible labyrinth our Government must pilot our foreign policies. We cannot expect miracles. Freemen must hold to the right to disagree with any policy of the Government. But especially in foreign affairs, support should be the watchword, until issues of deep conscience arise. And moderation is a good watchword even then.

Someone said the world is at the crossroads. My belief is that it is a clover leaf junction.

SAYS U. N. HAS VALUE

Eleventh. In appraising the forces in the world we should not conclude that the United Nations should be abolished. It furnishes a place with electronic equipment where nations may discharge their batteries of the evil things which they think about each other in five languages all at once.

But, seriously, this institution has proved of value in pacific settlement of disputes among secondary nations. It has contributed to the spread of scientific knowledge, to philanthropic and public health measures. These activities form a tenous road to more unity of free nations, and we should cling to any hope they may provide.

Twelfth. Above all, we cannot abandon the ideal that someday, somehow, unity for peace can be built in the world. Nor can we abandon the hope that some time the free nations who believe in God will mobilize against Red atheism and human slavery.

If, inside or outside of the United Nations, the free nations could unite, they have many potent moral, spiritual, and even economic weapons at their disposal besides military alliances.

GREAT SPIRITUAL FORCE

Thirteenth. In these shifting shapes in the world we must realize the vitality of a great spiritual force which we call nationalism.

The fuzzy-minded intellectuals have sought to brand nationalism as a sin against mankind. They seem to think that infamy is attached to the word "nationalist."

But that force in the world cannot be obscured by denunciation of it as greed or selfishness—as it sometimes is. The spirit of nationalism springs from the deepest of human emotions. It rises from the yearning of men to be free of foreign domination, to govern themelves. It springs from a thousand rills of race, of history, of sacrifice and pride in national achievement.

Every nation has laid its dead upon the altar of its country. These died with their national flag before their eyes and their national hymns upon their lips. The pride of race has swelled from their suffering and sacrifice.

MEANING OF AMERICA

In our own country does not the word "America" stir something deeper within us than mere geography? Does not the suffering and the sacrifices of our forebears who fought for our independence flash in our minds with every mention of that word?

Was it not our independence which gave the most expansive release to the creative spirit of mankind in all history? Was it not the release of intellectual and spiritual freedom on this continent that gave the moral strength and the self-reliance which penetrated our plains and forests?

Nationalism does not mean isolationism from the common interests of nations. We have ourselves proved that. Just as we have valued our own independence, we have fought for the independence of other peoples.

And equally do these emotions flow wide and deep in all free nations. Within them and their religious faith is their spiritual strength. It sustains their resolution against aggression and domination.

CAN DEFEND SELVES

Nationalism cannot be abandoned if civilization is to last among freemen. And we can have some hope that slumbering nationalism in the satellite countries will awaken to throw off the Moscow yoke as it has in Yugoslavia.

14. And from all this, our people must realize that our own right arm plus some deterrents unhealthy to the aggressors are our major reliance for our defense.

And these strengths are no weak reliance. With the magnificent officers and men in our defense establishments, with our genius and our productivity, we can defend ourselves.

Fair Dealers Still Man the Civil Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER

OF IOWA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 25, 1954

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Fair Dealers Still Man the Civil Service," written by Representative THOMAS E. MARTIN, of the First District of Iowa, and published in the Saturday Evening Post of June 26, 1954.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FAIR DEALERS STILL MAN THE CIVIL SERVICE

(By Representative THOMAS E. MARTIN, Republican, Iowa)

On June 28, 1934, the late President Roosevelt issued an Executive order which removed civil-service protection from all 177 employees of the national soldiers' home at Johnson City, Tenn. In their places were appointed deserving Democrats. Three years later, in November 1937, a second Executive order placed the new appointees under the protection of civil service of which their predecessors had been deprived.

This episode is typical of how the spoils system worked. By means of 72 laws and countless Executive orders, New and Fair Deal employees were blanketed in their jobs.

Of the personnel heads of Government departments and agencies who decide today who shall be hired, fired and promoted under civil-service regulations, 45 are appointees of Presidents Roosevelt and Truman. Six who were appointed by Presidents Coolidge and Hoover are still in their jobs. President Eisenhower has been able to name just three of these strategically placed officials.

The consequences is that, when President Eisenhower or his Cabinet members and agency heads ordered across-the-board job cuts, the New Deal-Fair Deal personnel authorities naturally sacrified the Republicans first. Of the handful of applicants for whom the Republican National Committee has succeeded in getting jobs, some bounced back a few days later, their positions eliminated. In some cases the jobs were recreated and filled with Democrats.

The truth is that, because of the way the civil-service system has operated, we have a thin layer of Republicans at the top of the Eisenhower administration, and below them a mass of New Dealers and Fair Dealers in secondary policymaking jobs. The result is that Republican policies are frequently sabotaged or perverted out of recognition.

Philip Young, Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, reported to Congress on January 13 of this year that, of some 2,400,000 Federal employees, 193,574 have been granted civil-service status noncompetitively.. He migh have added that many others took no more than an oral test to confirm them in jobs which they acquired in the mushrooming Government agencies of the Roosevelt-Truman era. Probably not over one quarter of our civil-service employees have taken what our British cousins would regard as real competitive examinations.

Today, for the first time in American history, we have an administration which annot even hire its own policy personnel. A vigorous move by the Eisenhower administration to fill 800 key policy jobs has thus far failed, so well-protected and tenacious are the New and Fair Dealers who hold down the jobs.

I am utterly convinced that the American people are being fooled if they think they have a true civil service. Some corrective legislation is imperative. One of the hottest issues in the 1954 campaign may be the need to end the perpetuation of the discredited New Deal and Fair Deal policies in our Government.

Address by Charles Abrams at 23d Annual Meeting of the National Housing Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 25, 1954

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, some weeks ago there took place in Washington an annual meeting of the National Housing Conference. This fine organization has been working for many years for the improvement of housing conditions and housing standards. Its meetings, as well as its activities, have in the past been significant and constructive.

At its last meeting one of the highlights was a speech by Mr. Charles Abrams, of New York City, one of the most eminent authorities in the housing field and a renowned legal expert. Mr.

Abrams delivered a speech on the legal implications of a recent Supreme Court action involving the question of segregation in public housing. Mr. Abrams himself is opposed to segregation in public housing, as I am, Mr. President. He was the attorney of record in a notable case bearing on this subject—Dorsey against Stuyvesant Town. Against this background, Mr. Abrams at the National Housing Conference delivered a speech analyzing the legal implications of the Supreme Court's recent action in the case of Banks against Housing Authority of San Francisco.

I ask unanimous consent that the thoughtful analysis by Mr. Abrams be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Address by Charles Abrams at the 23d Annual Meeting of the National Housing Conference, Hotel Statler, Washington, D. C., June 7, 1954

Considerable confusion has arisen over the meaning of recent decisions handed down by the Supreme Court of the United States on segregation in schools and in housing. Senator Burnet R. Maybank, one of the stanchest supporters of public housing, has, for example, stated that because of a Supreme Court decision of May 24, 1954, it is now impossible for him, "believing in local government, to support any public housing." Though the issue was smothered in the Senate, traditional opponents of the public-housing program are preparing to emphasize the civil-rights issue in the hope that they might still alienate enough votes to bring about the program's defeat.

This repeats the history of the public-housing fight of April 1949 when, as the lobby investigation now discloses, the savings and loan lobby proposed to push a housing measure with a civil-rights rider attached to it in order to alienate southern support. For this reason the precise meaning of the decision to which Senator Maybank refers must be carefully analyzed.

The decision referred to is *Banks* v. *Housing Authority of San Francisco*, in which the Supreme Court refused to grant what is known as a writ of certiorari. This, in simple terms, means that the highest Court saw fit not to review the decision of a State court in California. That State court had previously ruled that the San Francisco Housing Authority could not openly exclude the Negroes as a group from public-housing projects and relegate them to separate areas.

The holding when rendered in California was neither a revolution nor a revelation. It should be no surprise that a person refused access to a public accommodation on account of his race or religion has a personal right to claim a violation of his constitutional rights. This has nothing to do with the school decision but reflects the law in the racial zoning cases which has been on the books since 1917.

However, when the Supreme Court spurned the San Francisco housing authority's plea to uphold its policy the American press, with the school segregation cases still hot news, put the denial of the certiorari on its front pages as a major event.

The San Francisco decision was handed down as one of a package of 6 decisions. In 3, the court remanded the decisions to the lower courts asking them to reconsider their decisions in face of the school segregation decisions. Two of these cases involved the question of segregation in a university, and 1 discrimination in a public theater. Simultaneously, however, the court refused to hear the 3 other cases, 1 of which involved discrimination in a municipal golf course, another involved discrimination in education, while the third was the San Francisco housing case. The fact that the housing case was neither accepted, affirmed, modified nor remanded, should have ben sufficient notice to an informed press that the Supreme Court did not approve or disapprove the housing case. Yet the New York Times in a two-column front-page story headlined the decision as "Negroes Win New Victories in Six High Court Bias Cases." Other newspapers did likewise and a general confusion has resulted.

Failure by the Supreme Court to accept review is no affirmance of a lower court decision. In the life of the average mortal no news is good news. In the case of a newspaper, no news is bad news. But in the case of the Supreme Court no news is no news. Failure to review means nothing. The Court has emphasized this over and over again until it has become its most tiresome dogma.

In the case of *Maryland* v. *Baltimore Radio Show* (338 U. S. 912) Justice Frankfurter said:

"The sole significance of such a denial of a petition for writ of certiorari need not be elucidated to those versed in the Court's procedures. It simply means that fewer than four members of the Court deemed it desirable to review a decision of the lower court as a matter of sound judicial discretion. * * * A variety of considerations underlie denials of the writ, and as to the same petition different reasons may lead different Justices to the same result. This is especially true of petitions for review on writ of certiorari to a State court. Narrowly technical reasons may lead to denials. Review may be sought too late; the judgment of the lower court may not be final; it may not be the judgment of a State court of last resort; the decision may be supportable as a matter of State law, not subject to review by this Court. even though the State court also passed on issues of Federal law. A decision may satisfy all these technical requirements and yet may commend itself for review to fewer members of the Court. Pertinent considerations of judicial policy here come into play. A case may raise an important question but the record may be cloudy. It may be desirable to have different aspects of an issue further illumined by the lower courts. Wise adjudication has its own time for ripening. * * * Inasmuch, therefore, as all that a denial of a petition for writ of certiorari means is that fewer than four members of the Court thought it should be granted, this Court has rigorously insisted that such a denial carries with it no implication whatever regarding the Court's views on the merits of a case which it has declined to review. The Court has said this again and again; again and again the admonition has to be repeated.

"The one thing that can be said with certainty about the Court's denial of Maryland's petition in this case is that it does not remotely imply approval or disapproval of what was said by the Court of Appeals of Maryland."

This doctrine was reasserted in 1953 in *Brown* v. *Allen* where the Court reiterated, "We have frequently said that the denial of certiorari 'imports no expression of opinion upon the merits of a case.'" It repeated it in at least three other cases—*House* v. *Mayo* (324 U. S. 42, 48); *Hamilton-Brown Shoe Co.* v. *Wolf Bros. & Co.* (240 U. S. 251); Cf. *Ex parte Abernathy* (320 U. S. 219).

Again in *Rosenberg* v. *United States of America*, the Court complained:

"Misconception regarding the meaning of such a denial persists despite repeated attempts at explanation. It means, and all that it means is that there were not four members of the Court to whom the grounds on which the decision of the Court of Appeals was challenged seemed sufficiently important when judged by the standards governing the issue of the discretionary writ of certiorari."

A reading of the San Francisco case which the Court refused to review will show that the case did not involve solely a constitutional issue but embraced a number of other issues, some of them procedural, such as the right to mandamus and other technical questions. Anyone familiar with the Court's practices knows that the Court is not prone to accept for review State court decisions which involve other than pure constitutional issues.

There are several curious bits of irony in the current misconception that refusal to review is an affirmance of a lower court decision. One is that the lower court in California actually respected *Plessy* v. *Ferguson*, which the Supreme Court a few days earlier in the school segregation cases openly disaffirmed. If a refusal to review is to be construed as an affirmance, then the Supreme Court has now readopted *Plessy* v. *Ferguson* and implied that the separate but equal doctrine is good law again.

Manifestly this is nonsense. Manifestly, too, the Supreme Court simply rejected this decision, as it has rejected thousands of others which it thought were not worth reviewing.

Another piece of irony is that in 1950 the same Supreme Court refused to review *Dorsey* v. *Stuyvesant Town*, a New York Court of Appeals decision which held by a 4-to-3 vote that racial discrimination could be practiced in the selection of tenants for a publicly-aided urban redevelopment project. The New York court had held that because the legislature intentionally refrained from imposing any restriction on a redevelopment company in its choice of tenants the company could therefore have the right to exclude Negroes. I was counsel in that case, I hope the holding will be ultimately overruled, but neither I nor any other lawyer could honestly state that the Supreme Court of the United States in refusing to grant certiorari approved that decision. If the Court's refusal to hear the San Francisco case can be taken as meaning that a publicly aided project has no right to discriminate, than the Stuyvesant Town case may be interpreted as meaning that it may discriminate.

Lawyers and laymen might as well realize that in the modern temper of the Supreme Court not only must due process be due but the issue must be due as well. And until it is due, a refusal to review is of no consequence whatsoever, the newspapers to the contrary notwithstanding.

Unfortunately, the Supreme Court has no public relations staff to teach the press and public the niceties of judicial procedure or tell them more explicitly than it has what denial or certiorari means. The Court can expect, however, that legislators be aware of the meaning of these certiorari decisions and not give them an importance they don't have.

The minority housing problem is involved with two separate aspects:

One is the problem of simple discrimination in housing. In this simple sense, it refers to an unfair or an injurious treatment of a person or group deprived of rights or privileges extended to others.

I believe that Senator Maybank and other Senators from the South would be the first to protest such discrimination, and have. It is not a regional issue or one of States rights, but a plain act of human decency. The fact is that while Negroes represent 10 percent of the population, less than 1 percent of FHA housing has been accorded to them. Though nonwhites are four times as overcrowded as whites and though the amount of substandard housing in which they live is six times as great, virtually no Government-insured housing loans have been made to them.

This form of discrimination is the principal form of housing discrimination against which minority groups and social groups have been protesting and for which they have been attacking the discriminating Federal agencies.

Discrimination in this sense, however, does not exist in public housing and never has in the South. The South has given three times as much public housing to Negroes as to whites. The charge of discrimination in this primary sense must be laid mainly at the doorstep of Federal administrative agencies operating in private home-building and lending operations.

The second aspect of discrimination is more complex and is involved with segregation as a form of discrimination. Oddly, in private housing there is less segregation in the South than there is in the North. Whites and nonwhites often live in the same areas. On the other hand, there is a growing segregation taking place in the North represented by suburban development in which nonwhites are being excluded from whole new neighborhoods, while not even alternative segregated housing is being provided for them.

Simultaneously a number of northern cities have provided by statute against discrimination and have in many cities through their own local initiative integrated whites and nonwhites successfully in public projects. It has been a remarkable demonstration. But it has been done through local choice and is not the consequence of Federal legislation or judicial interpretation. The Public Housing Administration requires an equitable distribution of housing, cooperates with and guides local authorities in their problems, but enforces neither segregation nor nonsegregation.

It may be argued that the school decisions apply to public housing. There is no question that the school decisions have broadened the meaning of discrimination. Doubtless, if the occasion arises and the weight of sociological evidence demonstrates the danger of segregation in housing as in schools, the Court, when, as, and if the issue becomes ripe and important, may extend the school decision doctrine to housing projects. But the northerner and southerner who in public housing have always had a common bond and a common aim to remove the blight disease and death that are the slums' concomitants, should realize that at the present juncture the issue of segregation in public housing is irrelevant and premature.

If the time comes when by Executive order or Supreme Court decision, segregation is forbidden in public housing projects throughout the country, it would be tragic indeed if Congress chose to cut off appropriations for the needy as a consequence. It would be even less logical than would be the curtailment of appropriations for our defense because the Armed Forces had ruled against segregation. For the decision to accept public housing remains with the locality. When and if it is held that there may be no segregation in public projects, there is no obligation on the part of any locality to accept the subsidies or to build those projects. No Southern legislator can justly claim that in the public housing program a pattern of segregation is being imposed upon him which his constituents are in no position to reject. By the same token, he will hardly demand nationwide segregation as a condition for his approving a public housing program for the Nation as a whole.

On December 13, 1946, a program of basic principles and practices was adopted by a committee of the national housing conference headed by Catherine Bauer and composed of representatives from northern and southern housing authorities. That both Northern and Southern housing authorities were able to agree on the principles and procedures emphasizes that the issue is not insoluble.

The main points of that program were that more land and living areas should be made available to minorities, that there should be more houses fairly distributed, that maximum progress should be made toward balanced neighborhoods rather than toward geographic standardization by class or race. The net progress in housing was listed as greater in the South than in the North, and I believe that trend has continued. The report might indeed be brought up to date. But essentially it has given North and South a basis for understanding that there is a fundamental need for shelter for all people—minority and majority alike. I cannot emphasize too strongly that the issue of discrimination in housing is presently involved mainly with the question of whether a minority of the American population is being almost entirely deprived of shelter it desperately needs. This is a form of discrimination which the South has always been the first to decry, which in its firm support of the public housing program it has always tried to eliminate and on which all men of good conscience can find common bond.

Upstream Flood Prevention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 25, 1954

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, one of the most encouraging indications that the Nation's water problems will be solved is the widespread public interest in the matter. When the American people embark on a concerted and determined effort to find the answer to any problem, they may be depended on to achieve results.

A case in point is the growing interest in upstream water control. An editorial in the June issue of Soil and Water magazine, official publication of the Texas soil conservation district supervisors, offers this program as a challenge to soil conservation districts.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UPSTREAM FLOOD PREVENTION THE NEXT STEP AHEAD

Since the inception of the soil conservation district program in Texas 13 years ago, many Texas landowners have put their land in what is approaching the ideal condition, insofar as it's humanly possible and remembering that conservation is never really completed, but they are still subject to the ravages of erosion by cloudburst, against which no individual is able to stand alone.

Since it is estimated that 75 percent of the total flood damage in the United States occurs on small upstream watersheds there is certainly cause for additional emphasis in going one step further in eliminating this waste of topsoil and property which seldom ever makes front page headlines.

The need for going one step further, after a man has his own land under control conservationwise, is becoming obvious to many people. In fact, many close observers of the conservation picture as it is unfolding believe the small watershed flood prevention program is the next step ahead in Texas and throughout the Nation. It is the natural next step a man wants to take when he gets his own land in shape and has time to look up from his work and realize the problem of ultimately complete conservation is broader than one man can take alone.

This is not to say that the small watershed flood prevention program must wait until all the land in a given area has been conserved, although individual farms and watersheds are inescapably tied together. Small watershed protection without individual farm protection of course is impractical, and individual farm protection is often impossible without watershed protection. Both programs work together, and while up to now most of the emphasis has been on individual farms, the time is now at hand, not to lessen the emphasis on the individual but to broaden the emphasis to include the upstream of creek size watersheds.

It is a great challenge to the soil conservation districts to further this program, and the challenge is another testimonial to the wisdom of being organized into a State association and also into a national association. The attainment of the small watershed program takes more than the organized efforts of the people living in one watershed; it will take the united effort of landowners throughout the country, for the problem is nationwide.

Low Prices Won't Cure Farm Surplus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GUY M. GILLETTE

OF IOWA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 25, 1954

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Low Prices Won't Cure Farm Surplus," which was published in the Council Bluffs Nonpareil of June 21, 1954.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LOW PRICES WON'T CURE FARM SURPLUS

Lower farm prices will not solve the food-surplus problem, says Wallaces' Farmer and the Iowa Homestead substantially.

Prices of farm products would have to go very low to reduce production and increase consumption, substantially.

Drastic price reductions would break many farmers. Businessmen who deal with farmers eventually would be hit almost as hard.

Surely, the American people haven't forgotten what happened in the 1920's and 1930's.

The recent lowering of the butter price guaranty hasn't had such effect on butter production. The surplus is still piling up.

The same thing will happen if the 90-percent parity guaranty on corn, wheat, and other basic farm products is cut.

The surplus may be even bigger. Results would be serious because the prosperity of the Midwest and eventually of the whole country, depends upon good prices for corn and wheat.

Farm price cuts will bring disaster but they won't cure the farm-surplus program. Other methods must be devised.

The first effort should be to stimulate greater consumption. We have millions of people in the United States who do not get enough meat and milk products for good health. There would be no surplus food, except wheat, if all our people were fell fed.

The United States subsidizes producers. Direct subsidies to consumers probably wouldn't cost any more and would benefit all concerned.

This could be accomplished through food stamps and production payments on perishable products. Such measures would have the advantage of strengthening all the people through better nutrition.

Wallaces' Farmer and Iowa Homestead asserts farm-product surpluses except wheat, will disappear if all of the American people get the food they really need.

We are of the opinion that it is possible to devise new uses for surplus wheat, corn, cotton, rice, and peanuts.

We should store a year's supply of the basic farm products to assure an abundance in the years when crops may be short.

In the meantime, let's help people eat our food surpluses, even if it costs a few hundred million dollars a year.

Don't forget the population is increasing at an unprecedented rate. By 1960 we may have shortages instead of surpluses.

Let's not break the farmer and the country by letting farm-product prices fall below the cost of production—as we did in the 1920's and 1930's.

An Analysis of the Policy of Unity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, June 25, 1954

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on the subject An Analysis of the Policy of Unity, delivered by Dr. Shane MacCarthy, of Georgetown University, a member of the board of trustees, and national chairman of Basic Research Corp.'s advisory board for Catholic educational institutions.

I think this address should be read by every Member of Congress very carefully because it goes into the question of international unity as a cure for communism.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN ANALYSIS OF THE POLICY OF UNITY

(Address at Fordham University by Dr. Shane MacCarthy, of Georgetown University, member of the board of trustees and national chairman of Basic Research Corp.'s advisory board for Catholic educational institutions)

Today the word "unity" is being bandied about by many. These proponents suggest unity as a goal to cure all national and international current ills. Because of the prevalence of such views we are indeed justified in analyzing for a few moments this concept to test its strength or its frailty. Unity may be discussed as one of two brands: That which is superficial, and that which is deep and thorough.

SUPERFICIAL UNITY

The superficial brand of unity is somewhat loose. It's a linkage or a plus sign between nations. It's a balancing of powers, still identifying the powers as individual nationalities, and mark you, it speaks of "nations" rather than of "people." For example, today we are looking for votes of confidence in foreign countries, to achieve a unified front between such places and ourselves, seemingly unmindful of the fact that approvals obtained by small margins are indeed shallow. They are no more than paper endorsements, crust without substance. Endorsements obtained now—just for the moment—with all the pressure only on the present are short-visioned. They are myopic sanctions, if they do not consider what is going to happen over the long haul. Looking toward today is insufficient if we claim to possess and deep consideration about tomorrow. Lastly, in the superficial category of unity is that which is opportunistic—based solely upon the forcing and pushing of fear.

THOROUGH UNITY

Now the deep and thorough brand of unity is very tight. It's a cross blending—a fusion. It speaks of individuals and people rather than of nations, and it's made in recognition of all considerations that go into the complex of life which we refer to as society. For example, it considers religion, customs, mores, cultures, education, the political and economic systems. This is quite different than merely talking of allies which word connotes purely the military concept.

METHOD OF ATTAINMENT

How then can unity of any brand be achieved? The superficial kind may be found by pressure politics, by expenditures of moneys, by cunning international maneuvering or by fear. If this is the product we seek, should we not ask whether it is worth the price of time, of money, and of energy which go into its making. The deep or thorough brand of unity demands a different approach, coming from the proving ground of patience in planning, and what is more important still, patience in maintenance and in accomplishment. There is no magic, short answer to the attainment of this kind of unity. And the results cannot be expected in mere months, maybe not in years. Perhaps the centuries of the future will be the closest guess that we can hazard as needed for the forging of thorough unity between people and races.

RESPONSIBILITY OF THE WEST

The burden is on us of the West—to take and then hold the initiative—yes, to hold that rudder with firmness as we unfold successive policies in achieving our principal aims. Therefore—

First, there must be a blueprinting of principles by us, which means dynamic and overt assertion of goals based on the supremacy of the individual. We should remember that this is not just a point of salesmanship. This is a strong, unchanging, unswerving, and deep-seated concept. The individual means the person with body and soul, possessing what the state does not possess, because the state has no soul. But the Communist Party line cuts across nations. It goes toward groups of people, calling them the masses, and as such it does have a general and good appeal. This plural approach is not at all as powerful as what we possess when we recognize and realize what our system should and can give to the singular individual person in any society, east or west, north or south, black or white, in any segment of the globe.

Second, these announced principles must not be the pronouncements of a segregated category known as the government. The strength must come from the underpining, from the understanding by the people that this is not a superimposed concept, cudgeled or forced from above, but rather a sincere expression by responsible chosen officials of goals that will aid in the achievement of material happiness, always in the recognition of the spiritual destination, the ultimate destination of human beings.

Third, part of this necessary system, or shall we say scheme, is to protect this long, arduous, and yet very human process when we know that international gangsterism is today on the prowl. This demands military strength. There is no conflict between the long-range prescription for peace and the might of arms to protect principle action.

REALISM IN OUR METHODS

How far should we go toward seeking this principle of unity? What do we actually seek to unite or to unify? Is the policy of total unity realistic for a democracy? Is it healthy for the continuance of the Christian democratic way of life which we speak about so frequently? Such fundamental questions should be placed under the lens of close and critical examination before others say that we have a slavish adherence only to words and too often, we can be criticized for such. If we do not apply certain norms our process is challengeable. If unity means, for example, coalition, then in the world of the moment we should pause before allowing ourselves to be drawn into any unqualified endorsement of a government that brings into a unit and attempts to give a facade of strength of Communist and non-Communist segments working together under the guise of the common good. This is like asking God Himself to be tolerant of evil to the extent that He will walk arm-in-arm with the devil down the pathways of time. This false coalition concept, therefore, is not the unity we seek unless we are reconciled to live only for the moment not realizing that inevitable and certain doom is in the offing. Hence, when contradictory concepts of life exist, their mutual incompatability as between communism and democracy is not erased nor eradicated by merely placing them under a canopy of so-called unity.

To have a oneness that will contain the inner cement of binding power, there must be at least a similarity, broad or narrow, liberal or conservative, in the basic philosophy, in the principles and goals of those who seek to weld their efforts for mutual benefits. Even then, however, our procedures must ever be bracketed with the admonition of not going too far. In achieving unity we may get an academic victory and lose more important parts of our democratic system. Our strength, after all, is in our freedom to differ. Our boast is in our checks and balances, not only between the different parts of government, but between rural and urban policies, management, and labor, industry and government, and yes, again, liberal and conservative. Eliminate such differences, and we have the nugget of totalitarianism. If every time the legislative body turns the rope the executive body must hop and skip. If the legislative body must sing whenever the executive plays a tune, we may have unity, but we do not live democracy.

Why do we tolerate the view that we may differ within this country? It is referred to an indigenous difference, but we should have a unified policy for the outside. This is the unification in what is termed our bipartisan foreign policy. Politics do not stop at the shorelines of the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans, nor at the Canadian and Mexican borders. Our dealings with foreign nations will not benefit if they get the impression that we adopt a front of velvet oneness for them to hear and to see which they know cloaks deep differences about the very problems we are discussing with them. If, therefore, frankness is paramount, confidence will be the inevitable byproduct even if sincere differences are still present. Here then is the key to this concept of unity, summarized in one single word, "confidence." Chancellor Adenauer of Germany recently expressed these aims when he told us that he had the answer which he felt would benefit other nations. He called it the need for constant educational exchange of persons between nations to achieve proper understanding between people. Nationalism in and of itself is not wrong. Nationalism cannot be drowned in a shallow puddle of words like strategy and tactics. Adherence to native customs need not impede this element of mutual understanding to which Chancellor Adenauer referred. Well indeed might we translate this into other terms meaning again confidence on Christian principles. Without this, military might is nil. Without this ingredient, economic strength is fragile. Without this factor, political leadership is just a phrase of two words signifying nothing. In a word, therefore, to achieve thorough unity between nations, the answer today is the same as it was 2,000 years ago, and it will be the same 2,000 years hence. It was the answer given on that first Christmas morning, because we must find and retain goodwill between people for unity between nations.

Joint State-Federal Forest Fire Prevention Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 25, 1954

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the Tyler (Tex.) Telegraph, published in the heavily wooded area of east Texas, recently carried an editorial salute to Smokey, the symbol of the joint State-Federal forest fire prevention program.

This program, so important to Texas and the Nation, is proving exceedingly effective, as the editorial points out. I ask unanimous consent that the Tyler Telegraph editorial be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

One statistic was released by the United States Department of Agriculture that everyone in the United States, and particularly here in the woodlands of east Texas, can take pride in.

The USDA says that there were 18 percent fewer forest fires last year than there were in 1952, and the lowest number was recorded in this Nation in 1953 since the last year of wartime restrictions on travel—1946.

The total for last year was 154,160 fires.

Most of the credit for this important gain in woods fire safety is credited to a cute, chubby young fellow in a forest ranger's hat—Smokey Bear.

Smokey is the familiar symbol of the joint State-Federal forest-fire prevention campaign started 12 years ago. Smokey started out as a poster boy when he was a cub.

As he has developed through the years, so has the prevention program's use of him. This past year saw special licenses issued for promotion of Smokey Bear educational toys, clothing, and other items, all stressing forest-fire prevention.

The extension of Smokey's duties has proved to be a very valuable addition to the campaign, the Department said.

Before the campaign, in which the State of Texas takes an active part, started in 1942, the 5-year average for forest fires was 210,000 a year. The 12-year campaign thus has resulted in a reduction of almost 30 percent in number of fires, based on 1953 figures.

The 154,160 fires recorded in 1953, however, show that there still is plenty of room for improvement. Trees are an important money crop in the east Texas area as they are in many parts of the Nation. Reductions in numbers of forest fires and the extent of fire damage to our woodlands means untold thousands of dollars in potential timber and pulpwood saved.

Here in east Texas, it is good to hear of Smokey Bear's success so far. And when everyone familiarizes himself with the imaginary little bear's advice for forest-fire prevention and lives up to it, forest fires will be of little economic importance. By far the largest majority of such fires are man-caused.

Segregation in the Public Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 25, 1954

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, Mr. John H. Fischer, superintendent of schools in Baltimore, delivered on June 14 an excellent and thoughtful address in regard to segregation in the public schools, and the steps necessary for accommodation to the Supreme Court decision.

I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Address by John H. Fischer, Superintendent of Schools, Baltimore, Md., to the Teachers of the Baltimore Public Schools, June 14, 1954

My fellow teachers, only the most urgent reason could justify calling you to an extra meeting in this busy final week of the school year. I think you will agree that what brings us here today is of the greatest importance. What I want to discuss with you is the recent action of our board of school commissioners eliminating racial segregation in the Baltimore public schools at the beginning of the next school year.

It would be better for us to talk about this in a conversational fashion, but the size of our staff denies us that pleasure here. I have no alternate, therefore, but to lay before you some of the major implications of this action for us as teachers, and to invite you to discuss the subject freely among yourselves in your respective schools, or with any of us on the central staff.

Without fear and without subterfuge our board has met its responsibility. Paraphrasing the words of Robert E. Lee, we cannot now do more than our duty, we shall not want to do less.

The cases in which the Supreme Court handed down its historic decision of May 17 were before the Court for about 2 years. There was much speculation, as you well know, upon the probable decision and yet it appears extremely doubtful that any student of American history or culture could have been truly surprised when the decision was finally read.

What happened in Washington on the 17th of May 1954 was not unusual for America. The whole course of our history as a nation is marked by such actions, actions which one by one have destroyed barriers that stood between the ordinary man and a richer life.

Those of you who know well the history of democracy will recall how the prophets of doom warned against everyone of these forward steps. In advance of each one, our ancestors were assured by the viewers-with-alarm that it would undoubtedly lead to the most awful consequences. And each time a strengthened people proved them wrong.

It was so when each shipload of optimists set sail for the New World.

It was so when we determined to separate our colonies from the British crown.

It was so when property qualifications upon voting were removed.

It was so when manhood sufferage was adapted, when child labor was outlawed, when compulsory school attendance was instituted, when slavery was abolished.

And always there have been the satisfied sustainers of the status quo.

In the present instance they are represented by those of both races who say, "But why should be not continue to provide equal separate education? After all, have we not done quite well under that doctrine?"

Listen, if you will, to the words of Court; a court frequently divided in its decisions, but in this one, unanimously decisive:

"In approaching this problem, we cannot turn the clock back to 1868 when the amendment was adopted, or even to 1896 when Plessy against Ferguson was written. We must consider public education in the light of its full development and its present place in American life throughout the Nation.

"Today education is perhaps the most important function of State and local governments. Compulsory school attendance laws and the great expenditures for education both demonstrate our recognition of the importance of education in our democratic society. It is required in the performance of our most basic public responsibilities, even service in the armed forces. It is the very foundation of good citizenship.

"Today it is a principal instrument in awakening the child to cultural values, in preparing him for later professional training, and in helping him to adjust normally to his environment. In these days, it is doubtful that any child may reasonably be expected to succeed in life if he is denied the opportunity of an education. Such an opportunity, where the State has undertaken to provide it, is a right which must be made available to all on equal terms. * * *

"Segregation of white and colored children in public schools has a detrimental effect upon the colored children. The impact is greater when it has the sanction of the law; for the policy of separating the races is usually interpreted as denoting the inferiority of the Negro group. A sense of inferiority affects the motivation of a child to learn. Segregation with the sanction of law, therefore, has a tendency to retard the educational and mental development of Negro children and to deprive them of some of the benefits they would receive in a racially integrated school system.

"Whatever may have been the extent of physchological knowledge at the time of *Plessy* v. *Ferguson*, this finding is amply supported by modern authority. Any language in *Plessy* v. *Ferguson* contrary to this finding is rejected.

"We conclude that in the field of public education the doctrine of separate but equal has no place. Separate educational facilities are inherently unequal."

In an editorial published the day after the decision, the New York Times pointed out that the Constitution and the Bill of Rights can be hard masters. What the Times might have added is that these are masters of our own creation. From our earliest days as a nation we have set down from time to time in historic documents the high principles by which we mean to govern ourselves. Often these statements have run ahead of our usual behavior but they remain our deliberately established goals and our own freely chosen standards.

It is when we became aware that our daily conduct is inconsistent with these statements of purpose that we begin to rise above our past. It is on these occasions that the American dream comes more nearly true for more Americans.

In one of these pivotal chapters of American history we are now privileged to become active participants. To a greater degree than most historic events, the abolition of segregation in public schools will affect the daily lives of individuals. Because it has to do with long-established patterns of association, it will raise questions with emotional overtones. To ignore these aspects of the problem would be unwise and irresponsible.

Being teachers and, therefore, students of human behavior, we need to understand these things, and, being human, we must view our own attitudes with as much objectivity as we can muster. As instructors of children and leaders of community thought, we must be sensitive to the anxieties which exist, and we should prepare ourselves to be of the greatest possible assistance in clarifying misunderstandings and providing reassurance.

Let me review some of the questions that are being asked, and let me give you such information as I can bearing upon them.

1. Will the school system be reorganized to integrate all schools?

The answer to that question is "No." There will be no such reorganization. All of our present policies for admitting or transferring pupils will remain in full effect, except that no child shall be denied entry to any school or class because of his race. The designation of white and Negro schools will, of course, be discontinued, because every school will now receive children of both races. But no effort will be made deliberately to transfer children of either race for the purpose of mixing schools. We have had the last of placing children anywhere for racial reasons. Hereafter every child will be dealt with strictly on the basis of his educational requirements and in terms of his best development.

The division of colored schools will cease to exist, but no one now associated with that division will suffer any loss of status because of this administrative change.

2. Will there be a large number of pupil transfers in September?

There should not be. Because of the long-standing policy of our board and our city government, Negro and white schools in Baltimore are operated according to equal standards. In the construction of buildings and their maintenance, in the professional examination of teachers, in the allocation of funds for books and supplies there have been no racial distinctions.

It is no secret that we have many crowded schools, or that most Baltimore children attend school in buildings that are about as old as the homes in which they live. But this statement applies to children of both races. Where a nearby school offers advantages to any pupil, white or Negro, over the school he now attends, and the parent requests a transfer, the request should be granted. But only in rare instances should a young child be sent far from his home to another school.

At the secondary or vocational level, distance is less important, but in such cases a pupil in the middle of a 3-year program should be transferred only where it is clearly advisable for him to do so.

3. Will teachers or other staff members be discharged as a result of the new policy?

Again, the answer is "No." As in the past, vacancies which occur in the future will be filled with a scrupulous regard for relative merit. There will be one eligible list for each type of position. Whenever a vacancy occurs, 1 of the applicants of the 5 standing highest on the list will be selected for employment. As in the past the specific requirements of the position and the total qualifications of each available candidate will determine who is assigned. Whether we are dealing with teaching positions filled by transfer or initial placement, or promotional positions filled by selection by the board of superintendents, no one will be discriminated against because of his race. Nor will his race entitle anyone to preferment over another who is better qualified.

4. Will children be required to attend particular schools?

No, and again I refer to our present policy. Baltimore does not insist that any child attend the school in whose district he lives. Of our 175 school units only about 25 or 30 which are badly crowded are districted. In these cases, children living within a prescribed area have the right to attend the districted school and others are excluded. But if a child living in any district wishes to attend elsewhere, he may do so if the school of his choice is not itself districted and if there is a good reason for transferring.

No secondary school except Garrison Junior High School is now districted and every other one is accordingly available to any qualified student.

As population changes occur additional schools may have to be districted, and if this happens, the regular policy will apply. No child will be deliberately assigned to any school because of his race.

5. The question perhaps most frequently asked is, "Will it work?"

The only guide we can have for the future is our experience of the past.

At the staff level we have been working for many years in groups assembled without regard to race. In workshops, in committees, in staff conferences of all kinds we have helped and complemented each other. In the Public School Teachers Association, the Teachers Union, the Principals Association, integration has been the pattern for many years. In our staff we know it has worked.

In many of our schools Negro and white pupils have visited each other to exchange assembly programs, to engage in debates, to discuss common problems. This has worked.

For several years, the Junior Red Cross has conducted summer workshops in which white and Negro pupils have worked and played side by side with pleasure and profit. This has worked.

Here at Poly, Negro boys were admitted to the "A" course in 1952. The faculty and student body decided at the outset that there would be in this school only one class of boy—the Poly boy. The Negro students, now some 40 of them, participate in every phase of school life. Has it worked? The first boy is scheduled to graduate next June. You might ask him or his white classmates who refer to him as a "good guy."

In our adult-education program for a number of years, without headlines or fanfare, Negro and white students have studied in the same classes, and within the month, in this very building, we have organized an adult center in which the faculty and the student body both include white and Negro members, in about the same proportions as our total school population. And this is working so well that the viewers-with-alarm couldn't have been more wrong.

But, some say, what about the parents? How will they react? Since 1947, when our Coordinating Council of Parent-Teacher Organizations was formed, it has been a unified group. Established on the basis of councilmanic districts, the executive board of the council has included every year men and women of both races. Has it worked? The record of the council's acomplishments is proof enough of its success.

Will it work? Review, if you please, every activity of our school system for the past 15 or more years in which Negro and white children, adult students, or staff members have been associated. You will discover that, without exception, every one has succeeded.

In response to such facts as I have given, some will say that these experiences have occurred on too small a scale to be conclusive. They may not represent the general reaction. Many of us think that, on the contrary, these experiences do in truth represent the general reaction of pupils, teachers, and parents. There is abundant evidence that good will and good sense are widely distributed among our people and that these qualities are characteristic of both our races.

To be sure, there are a few white persons who see no good in any Negro and a scattering of Negroes who look with distate or distrust on every white person. Such people are a small minority among us. Both their number and their influence are happily on the decline. I doubt that there are any in our teaching staff. Certain it is that such people would feel uncomfortable and unwelcome in this group.

Jacques Barzun in his delightful new book, God's Country and Mine, says, "The first thing that democracy must be is inclusive." We may add that he who would serve as a teacher in a democracy must be broadly inclusive not only in his sympathy but in his appreciation of the good in all manner of men.

When our schools face such a mission as the one we are now assigned, I value more than ever the knowledge that ours is a great army of volunteers. Of our own choice we have enlisted to serve all our people and the cause of education. We are, therefore, entitled to share the quiet pride that only the volunteer may feel.

We are in many ways a fortunate group. We teachers enjoy priceless blessings, despite whatever problems we face. Ours is a happy task for every day we deal with youth and growth and enlightenment. All that we do is founded upon faith and hope and love. The love of truth, the love of learning, the love of children, these are great forces with which to work.

There is no doubt that the world could be transformed if only their power could be fully unleashed. More than most men and women, we are in a position to use that power.

Walter Hines Page was thinking in this vein a half century ago when at a normal school commencement in Athens, Ga., he said:

"It is a shining day in any educated man's growth when he comes to see and to know and to feel and freely to admit that it is just as important to the world that the child of his neighbor should be trained as it is that his own child should be. Until a man sees this he cannot become a worthy Democrat nor get a patriotic conception of education; for no man has known the deep meaning of democracy or felt either its obligation or its lift till he has seen this truth clearly."

There are many reasons why I take pride in my 24 years of membership in this staff. And the response which so many of you are making wholeheartedly and voluntarily to the enormous new responsibility now placed upon you has added to this sense of great privilege which I feel. I know that in many faculties plans are being made to receive graciously new pupils and staff members of the race not now represented in your school. By chance on Friday, I saw a copy of a letter addressed by the principal of one of our schools to his faculty. This happens to be a white school, No. 10–10A, and the principal is Mr. James Carroll. But the tone of the message so well reflects the spiirt of our entire system that I want to read it to you and with it to conclude my remarks and this meeting:

"It is probable the addition of Negro teachers and pupils to this school will be an established fact next September.

"The adjustment problem may well be a simple one if you prepare yourself and your class for the change. Knowing all of you as I do, I am certain the problem will be simple with us.

"For my part, I shall receive every teacher and every pupil on terms of perfect equality.

"I shall give the Negro teacher or the Negro child no special favors because of his color, nor shall I withhold any privilege or right from him because he is Negro.

"I shall remember that the same God made both of us—that he put my mind inside a white skin—that except for the accident of birth my mind might well have been covered by a colored skin and the mind of my new helper or pupil might have been placed inside the white skin.

"My stepson found the Negro boys who fought in Korea beside him to be first-class fighting men who neither asked for nor received special favors. He learned that the colored skin received enemy bullets with the same bravery that the white skin received them.

"The tax collector accepts (demands) money from the colored hand as from the white.

"Segregation in the schools has ended. Let us make the transition in this school a smooth transition. Let us be proud of ourselves next June."

More Bucks for the Bang

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 29, 1954

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, many of us have been pointing out that administration budget reductions in military appropriations have been dictated by political considerations rather than the requirements for national security.

Many of us have been pointing out, with what has of necessity been too much frequency, the fallacy of such slogans as "more bang for the buck" and New Look.

Now we find that the development of new weapons, which admittedly give us more bang, will also cost many more bucks, so that the technological advancements are a justification for more appropriations rather than an excuse for politically inspired cuts.

No less an authority than Gen. William M. Hoge, our commander in Germany, has joined the long list of military experts who are warning of the dangers of the "cheap war" theory.

General Hoge's views are reported in an article published by the Washington Star in its issue of Tuesday, June 22. I include relevant portions of this article as a part of my remarks:

More Bang for Taxpayer's Dollar, But—

(By Norman Lindhurst)

Heidelberg.—America's top military leaders in Germany believe that the push-button era of atomic warfare is going to cost the United States taxpayer a lot more—instead of less—for defense.

American generals on this cold war battlefront feel that the taxpayers are being misled on the real implications of the New Look in United States national defense.

It may be that the taxpayer will get "more bang for a buck," say the generals, but in the long run he is also going to have to pay many more bucks. The officers explain that the cut-rate theory of national defense overlooks the fact that the Soviets, too, are rushing the development of atomic weapons.

Hence, any atomic war, as the generals see it, will be a two-sided atomic display. And while the winner probably will be the side that produces the most bang, it also probably will be the nation that makes the greatest expenditure for military might.

Such an analysis of why warfare is getting more expensive instead of cheaper is being advanced openly today in Germany by the top military command. The men who must exploit the new wonder weapons fear that the effectiveness of the new arms may be considerably curtailed unless false ideas of economy are dispelled at the outset.

Gen. William M. Hoge, top American officer in Germany, said in an on-the-record discussion recently that "The individual soldier today is of greater importance than ever before," he went on. "We keep hearing that the new weapons will make it possible for us to reduce the size of armies, but there is absolutely nothing to prove that this can be done in any marked degree."

Combat commanders in Germany believe further that the administration is going to have to live with the old balanced forces theory of defense, despite its fiscal unpopularity.

* * * * *

General Hoge not only rules out the possibility of substantial reduction in the size of the Army, but warns that the training of soldiers to handle atomic weapons will be far more expensive than schooling for conventional warfare.

"The new weapons mean that almost every soldier must be a specialist, and it takes time and money to train specialists," the general explained.

The American commanders predict that the employment of atomic arms will rocket defense costs many ways—as evidenced, for one thing, by the experiments the United States Army in Europe is carrying out on the tactical use of helicopters on a wide scale. American tacticians forecast the development of transport helicopters able to move troops and supplies into battle rapidly.

Once the helicopter comes of age, an army would need literally thousands of them—and that too is going to cost money. General Hoge, who was a corps commander in Korea, remarked, "We accomplished some amazing things in Korea with helicopters, but what we did there is only the beginning."

General Hoge also believes that atomic warfare will involve the expenditure of a vast amount for the development of new equipment not directly related to the wonder weapons but necessary to get maximum effectiveness from them. He explained:

"While the more publicized of modern weapons developments have been the 280-millimeter cannon, the 'Honest John' rocket and the 'Corporal' guided missile, development in virtually all other phases of our weapons and equipment has had to keep pace with nuclear weapons.

"It is probable that any atomic war would be a two-sided war. We then need the mobility of the 280-millimeter gun, and our ground forces will also need greater mobility, greater protection and more devastating firepower per man and unit, regardless of size."

General Hoge said that such equipment to supplement atomic weapons is being developed. Full-track armored personnel carriers, "virtually immune from ordinary artillery fire, will carry armored infantrymen into combat. Infantry divisions are getting the equivalent of two battalions of medium tanks, and new communications equipment—lighter, more versatile and effective over much longer ranges—is on the way.

"We must give much thought and planning to a system of logistics which is flexible and fast, capable of operating in a two-sided atomic fight," the general observed.

"Our combat transportation systems with their loads of supplies must fall into the pattern that a rapid, highly mobile war will dictate. It is precisely for this reason that we have proceeded so rapidly in the development of helicopter and Army light aviation.

"Army aerial supply in its modernity is capable of prodigious feats. With a new type of parabolic parachute, we are now able to drop heavy equipment and gasoline. We are even able to drop 105-millimeter artillery pieces. All this is part of the pattern and a part of the team which includes nuclear weapons."

Nuclear weapons, conclude the top officers here, breed not only more nuclear weapons but a host of new nonnuclear weapons besides—for which the taxpayer will have to foot the bill.

Use of Postage-Free Franking Privilege

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS
OF DELAWARE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, June 24, 1954

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an editorial entitled "Congressman Sam Really Yorty Be Ashamed," published in the Cleveland Plain Dealer on Saturday, June 5, 1954.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Congressman Sam Really Yorty Be Ashamed

Congressman Samuel W. Yorty, Democrat, California, must have figured he had a dandy when he sent out under his postage-free franking privilege 4,108,500 copies of a speech he made in the House.

The Republican congressional campaign committee in Washington was not slow to point out that the mailing broke all records for size, and that at a cost of 2.9 cents a letter, the cost to taxpayers was $119,146.50.

Further computations, by us, disclose that the taxpayers shelled out $94.86 plus per word for the 1,256-word speech entitled: "Let's Build a Better America."

No one, certainly, can take issue with the title—we're all for building a better America. But whether Mr. Yorty's deathless prose was worth $94.86 plus per word is another matter.

We go right along the line with the California Congressman when he says: "Certainly we know we must preserve for our children the freedom and liberty which was won and preserved for us by former generations of Americans"—but it has a strangely familiar sound, and besides, it cost the taxpayers $2,371.50 plus.

The Congressman's statement: "History teaches that only the strong and the brave can remain free," is patently true, and would be cheap enough at $1,138.32 plus if it hadn't been said so many times before.

The statement: "We are a comparatively new nation—still less than 200 years old" (also at $1,138.32 plus) is not exactly startling news, nor is the fact that "Wherever we look, opportunity challenges our imagination"—(cost to taxpayers $664.02 plus).

The line: "We truly have nothing to fear but fear itself" has a familiar ring, but it's probably a bargan at $853.74 plus.

Who can argue against such pious thoughts as these : "Education is the very foundation of democracy. * * * We need a real highway-construction program. * * * We need hospitals. * * * Many of our people need improved diets. * * * Old age is still a hazard to too many of our people. * * * We need to fully develop and preserve our natural resources, * * * et cetera, * * * et cetera, * * * et cetera."

Congressman Yorty blames the Republicans for the large mailing of his speech—he hadn't intended to do so in such a grand manner until "the Republicans sent smear material through the mails."

Quite incidental, naturally, is the fact that Mr. Yorty is running for the Senate.

The Cotton Surplus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 25, 1954

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an article from today's Wall Street Journal entitled "Cotton Turnabout," written by Charles N. Stabler, staff reporter of the Wall Street Journal. It contains some very interesting statements with reference to the cotton situation and the prospective dwindling of the surplus, in contrast with some of the other surpluses.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Cotton Turnabout—Huge Surplus of Fiber Now Promises To Drop—Use May Top Output—Exports, United States Consumption Are Expected To Increase—Controls Cut the Crop—But Curbs May Be Stiffened

(By Charles N. Stabler)

Dallas.—Memo to Federal price proppers: Does coping with those growing heaps of surplus commodities get you weary and sick of trying? Then maybe you can refresh yourself with a glance at the changing cotton outlook.

In pleasant contrast to forecasts of new additions to Government hoards of wheat, corn, and other crops, cotton men now see no new surplus of the fluffy white fiber arising from production in this calendar year. There are even clear indications that 1954 production may be less than demand in the year ahead, thus actually lowering stocks left over from previous years. This pile is now enough to keep United States cotton mills running for a solid year.

The prospect of a halt in the cotton pileup, however, apparently hasn't shaken Agriculture Secretary Benson's resolve to order a further cutback in cotton plantings next year. Aiming to whittle the surplus stocks more sharply, his aides are now thinking of a 13 percent acreage trimming for 1955, though they may later decide to soften that cut. And Congress will certainly try to jack up the acreage if Mr. Benson doesn't.

SLIMMEST HARVEST SINCE 1950?

It's still early to forecast the coming crop, of course; the Agriculture Department won't total up planted acreage until next month and the first official production forecast isn't due until August.

But, while recognizing the imponderables of weather, weeds, and boll weevils, many cotton men now make this prediction: Due largely to Federal acreage restrictions, 1954 production should be between 12 million and 12.8 million 500-pound bales. That would be sharply under the 16.4 million bales of the unrestricted 1953 crop and it would be the slimmest harvest since 1950.

These forecasts, of course, could turn out on the low side. They assume that this year's yield per acre will be somewhere near the average of the past 5 years. But if the weatherman continues to smile on cotton fields, some commodity men say, per-acre yields could break last year's record, and the 1954 harvest might go as high as 13.5 million bales.

STILL BELOW CONSUMPTION

But even that would be below expected toal home and export consumption, now turning upward after a decline of several years. Several cotton experts, like Lamar Fleming, chairman of the board of Houston's huge Anderson, Clayton & Co., cotton dealers and processors, have predicted domestic and foreign consumption of United States cotton in the marketing year starting in August, will hit 14 million bales. The comparable figure during the current marketing year, ending August 1, is expected to be 12.2 million bales, according to the Agriculture Department.

"There's no question but what consumption will have to bounce back," predicts the economist for a large cotton-trade association. "The only question is how far we'll bounce." He also is betting on 14 million bales, or more.

The biggest part of the consumption gain is expected to come from expanded exports. Mr. Fleming figures foreign countries will provide a market for 5 million bales in the coming crop year, compared to this season's expected 3.6 million. He allows for normal domestic consumption of 9 million bales, up from anticipated subnormal 8.6 million this season. Some other cotton men split the 14 million into 4.5 million for exports, 9.5 million for domestic use.

EXPORT SPURS

The flow of fiber overseas is expected to be pushed by rising cotton consumption abroad and dwindling foreign supplies—prods that have already made themselves felt. Shipments since last August 1 are now unofficially reckoned at 3.5 million bales, 20 percent more than a year earlier. After lagging behind a year ago from August through January, exports have outrun the 1953 pace each month since January.

But domestic consumption of about 7.3 million bales, from August through May, has been lagging some 10 percent behind a year ago.

Already on hand at the start of the coming market year will be the largest carryover since 1945—some 9.5 million to 9.8 million bales left over from the big 1953 crop and earlier ones. Most of this cotton is Government controlled. It was purchased or taken as security for loans to farmers in order to support an unnaturally high price. If the majority's 1954 forecasts prove even roughly accurate, this stock—and therefore the taxpayers' stake in the surplus—will be substantially reduced.

A $3-BILLION HARVEST

The health of the cotton crop is of considerable importance to farmers in the tier of 16 States across the Southern United States, where some 40 percent of the world's cotton is produced. Last year's crop was worth $3 billion to farmers in this area, the Department of Agriculture figures. Indirectly, of course, the state of the cotton crop is important to users of everything from fire hose and Band-aids to white shirts.

New Monroe Doctrine Against Infiltration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 1954

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, when President Monroe enunciated his famous doctrine, he could scarcely have imagined that it would have new relevance almost six generations later. Yet the fact is that the kind of colonization by European powers upon the North and South American Continents against which President Monroe warned has come into existence on a scale no less important than the type which disturbed him in the early 1800's. If anything, the penetration of the Communist approach to life is even more distressing, because its intangibility makes it difficult to discover and even more difficult to eradicate.

Nevertheless, the nations of the New World have an obligation to their past and to their future to label this hemisphere as off limits for the Soviet colonizers, propagandists, aggressors, and infiltrators. We want no part of the Communist ideology in the New World which was established in the spirit of free speech, the rejection of star-chamber proceedings, the insistence upon the right of habeas corpus, and the traditions of the Bible.

If any of our neighbors in Central or South America are seriously toying with communism, this is the time for all of us to make clear that the Western Hemisphere will not sit quietly by to suffer the fate of central Europe.

Where Is the Initiative?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 24, 1954

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Washington Post and Times Herald for June 25, without comment other than to invite attention to the final sentence:

Where Is That Initiative?

If there is one thing that this administration has hitherto prided itself upon, it is the retention of the initiative in foreign affairs. At one time every speech by either a Cabinet member or a Republican bigwig had such a claim somewhere in it. The claim had indeed become a kind of ritual. However, there has been such a setback to American initiative in the world at large—save, perhaps, for sundry undercover operations by the CIA—that we doubt whether there will be any more pointing with pride for a while. Of course, there is July 4 just ahead. But the red faces hereabouts and the freely expressed chagrin whenever somebody else carries the ball and gets huge American headlines for so doing are too obvious to be ignored. There will be few straight faces left in any audience which hears a return to the old ritual about the magnificent way in which the Eisenhower administration has retained the initiative in the world.

The decline in the American initiative started after Secretary Dulles came back from the Berlin conference which ended February 15. Evidently the Senate Foreign Relations Committee censured him severely. So mortified was Mr. Dulles that, according to Doris Fleeson, tears came into his eyes. There were those who insisted that he thereupon decided to disregard his domestic base and to conduct his diplomacy with more independence. Just the contrary turned out to be true. He went to the Geneva Conference with hardly a word in his system, let alone initiative.

So the Geneva Conference—and the movement of great affairs among nations—has been in progress with Uncle Sam almost on the sidelines. The defeat of our initiative has become almost a rout.

A Day to Remember

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 25, 1954

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article, written by Walter Winchell, which may well become an American classic. It is entitled "A Day to Remember."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WALTER WINCHELL OF NEW YORK

A DAY TO REMEMBER

This is a world of intense anxieties and profound tensions. Consequently, paying homage to the supreme fortitude and bright glory represented by Memorial Day seems almost an ironic absurdity. When some nations have the unlimited capacity to destroy and the uncontrollable ambition to conquer—solemn tributes to those who volunteered the last full measure of devotion for peace—suggest a taunt rather than a hope. Nevertheless, this enduring reverence for our honored warriors is one of the Nation's most compelling attributes. This national salute has an inspiring musical quality—like the sound of muffled drumbeats. The fearful vision of a world in ruins is mercifully superseded by the towering faith and valor of Americans whose sacrifices have been shaped in the image of a great democracy.

The meanings of our memorial are subtle and manifest as well as personal and national. They are represented by a country's vast natural resources and potential power. A lavishly endowed Nation washed by oceans and warmed by faith. They are exemplified by the grandeur of our historical accomplishments—the vigor and vision of pioneers. They are illustrated by constitutional privileges, wheat-laden fields, or Broadway's glittering canyon. They are personified by the serene dignity of children reciting the pledge of allegiance. They are everlastingly symbolized by extraordinary deeds of little-known Americans. It is a day to remember that freedom has never been gained without sacrifice nor preserved without courage.

This is a time to rededicate ourselves to the knowledge that this Nation represents a true miracle. It was fused by the common determination for liberty and united by the invincible partnership of hope and valor. Many Americans endured incredible hardships while being sustained by idealism. The aspirations of the Mayflower compact, the challenging concepts of the Declaration of Independence, the brilliance of the Bill of Rights—encompass a proud tradition motivated by respect for human dignity.

The tyrants arrive and depart—and return again. There are times when it seems easier to succumb to cynicism than cling to hope. However, there is firmer logic and security in constantly renewing our pledge to the aspirations of those who served as a national shield—and strive to measure our devotion by the extent of their allegiance. Every schoolchild knows of the immense contributions by the minutemen. Of equal importance and validity is being aware of what they relinquished. Some were wealthy who surrendered material abundance for the burdens of arduous duties. Many exchanged personal security for bitter peril. They traded the serenity of farms for the pitiless torture of battlefields. They sacrificed almost everything for a hope. But they never surrendered their conscience.

This is a time to remember that progress rarely flourishes in the sun. It survives and surmounts recurring storms. Our pioneers subdued a wilderness and carved a civilization while men of little faith contended it could not endure. The war of independence lacked the unanimous support of colonists. The Constitution motivated a turbulent public controversy. There are compromises in the Declaration of Independence. And there are many in the world today who deride the Ten Commandments.

Progress has been achieved, despite the fearful and the vicious. And despite natural catastrophes and widespread indifference. Occasionally, advances are the result of gradual education. More often it is the consequence of a bitter victory. Tragically, the milestones of decency are tombstones of gallant fighters.

Peace is a word which exists in all languages. Peace, unfortunately, is presently almost nonexistent in every nation. If the future is the lengthened shadow of the past—then past agonies have ominous echoes. It seems almost a thousand years ago that this Nation was engaged in a tortuous struggle with the Axis. In retrospect, Hitler and Mussolini almost take on the aspects of fictional characters. About 13 years have passed since the fateful Pearl Harbor attack—without 24 hours of global peace. China, Greece, Malaya, and Korea have been ravaged by war. Today it is Indochina. A former ally is now our foremost enemy. Some of our foes have become friends we cannot trust. Communism has gained a beachhead in this hemisphere. The strongest allies are having difficulty maintaining friendship. Diplomacy has become an interminable battle of propagandists. Nations have forgotten that there cannot be justice without respect, progress without friendship, and amity without unity.

There are, of course, still appeasers among us who foolishly propose to rescue liberty by offering concessions to its foes. Their quest for peace means surrender to threats. And there are men of despair who limit the capacity for human cooperation—since their minds are bounded by ancient tribal frontiers. Obviously, our warriors failed to gain the ultimate triumph: Universal peace. But the measure of their victory is the enduring strength of our liberty.

The titanic monuments tyrants erect to themselves inevitably survive their tyranny. But a democracy's most impressive monuments are carved in flesh and blood. The freedom in the heart of a child is more permanent than all of Stalin's statues.

This is a time for Washington to remember that the fury of its political conflict is not as meaningful as the thunder of the international crisis. Radioactive dust is mightier than political mud. And far more terrifying. This is the age of the hydrogen bomb with its seemingly irresistible power. Its overwhelming destructive force is beyond the power of words or the calculations of statistics. Words do not breathe and statistics do not bleed. Russia has enslaved one-fourth of the world and one-third of its population. What this means in terms of terror and plunder, what this means in terms of men, women, and children—cannot be conveyed by a television camera or solved by the most astute cross-examination.

The final cries of American fightingmen have always been protests against tyranny. Weapons become obsolete and maps are changed. But the principles involved remain constant: The issue between freedom and despotism was as clear at Bunker Hill as it was in Korea. Courage is now as essential to national survival as it was at Valley Forge. The faith of America is beyond the ravages of time. It is the source of our national legacy and the mainspring of our national life. It goes from one generation to another and from heart to heart. Freedom cannot be measured in days or years. The spirit has no calendar and the soul cannot tell time. The fight against Benedict Arnolds continues. Sacrifices of Yankee Doodlers in the 18th century made possible privileges Americans defended in the 20th. The road from Concord extends into every Main Street. This is a day to remember America's torchbearers who light the way—and warm our hearts.

Anti-Intellectual Fever

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 25, 1954

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, the highly responsible and conservative newspaper, the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin, published on June 9 a very interesting editorial commenting on certain aspects of our immigration law.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial, entitled "Anti-Intellectual Fever," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ANTI-INTELLECTUAL FEVER

Anti-intellectualism has not yet become a familiar word in a world which thinks and talks too much in terms of "isms." Yet it represents a fairly familiar state of mind. Many people are suspicious of brains and resentful toward those who use them. They call thinking persons by names which are not intended as compliments, such as "highbrow," "long-hair," or "egghead."

This is a symptom of anti-intellectual fever, a disease particularly prevalent in the United States, according to a professor of the University of California who addressed the International Congress of Psychologists in Montreal on Monday. Dr. Edward C. Tolman went out of his way to thank Canada for offering hospitality to the attending scientists, and confessed himself "shocked that the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act has made the holding of such international scientific congresses almost impossible in the United States."

The act, together with the anti-intellectual attitude of many Americans, sets up a screen, if not an iron curtain, to keep out thinkers whose cerebrations may be tainted with communism and other dangerous doctrines. But the psychologists meeting in Montreal come from 35 countries, and 11 are from the Soviet Union.

By a terrific effort in toleration and interpretations of the law a Russian chess team will be allowed to enter New York on Thursday, with the best Soviet player mysteriously missing. It has never been settled, however, whether the chess type of intellectualism is dangerous.

Let Atom Splitters Alone

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, June 25, 1954

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an editorial entitled "Let Atom Splitters Alone," condemning the proposed Atomic Energy Commission contract for a steam plant, appearing in the Memphis (Tenn.) Press-Scimitar of June 22, 1954.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Let Atom Splitters Alone

Last January, the President refused additional funds to the TVA for new electric power generating facilities. He said "arrangements are being made to reduce, by the fall of 1957, existing commitments of the TVA to the Atomic Energy Commission by 500,000 to 600,000 kilowatts."

This, he went on, "would release the equivalent amount of TVA generating capacity to meet increased load requirements of other consumers in the power system and at the same time eliminate the need for appropriation funds from the Treasury to finance additional generating units."

We weren't exactly enthusiastic about this proposal; but we could see it might be a reasonable way to meet increasing TVA power needs.

Now Mr. Eisenhower has set in motion by a presidential order, a scheme which some persons are presenting as carrying out the budget message proposal. But, in fact, it does nothing of the sort. What this order does is endanger our greatest national defense enterprise.

Mr. Eisenhower has ordered the Atomic Energy Commission to sign a contract with Middle South Utilities, Inc., and the Southern Co. for purchase of 650,000 kilowatts of power to be pumped into the TVA grid at Memphis. The new plant of the two private utilities is to be built on made land in West Memphis, Ark., an area once inundated by a great Mississippi River flood.

Three of the five members of the Atomic Energy Commission oppose the contract. They point out that the AEC has no power needs either at Memphis or West Memphis. The closest AEC facilities are at Paducah, Ky., where the atomic plant is served by both a private power company and the TVA.

Thomas Murray, the AEC Commissioner chiefly responsible for the fact that a private company is serving AEC with power at Paducah, is one of those who opposes the contract the President has ordered. He told the joint congressional Atomic Energy Commission that through the contract the AEC is being used as a vehicle to supply expanding power needs of the Memphis area. He said he could not see how this contract is in the interest of the atomic program.

There apparently is no present intention on the part of AEC of canceling its power contract with TVA at Paducah. Thus, the new power it is to buy is not intended to reduce TVA's commitments to AEC, as the President promised in January.

In fact, under the Eisenhower order, as shown by Commissioner Murray's testimony, AEC is being used as a power broker for TVA. And this over the opposition of a majority of the AEC Board.

The Atomic Energy Commission was set up for a very simple and important purpose—important to this country and to all the free world. It was created to produce atomic (and now hydrogen) weapons.

Whatever the legal lights may say, we believe the President—as Commander in Chief—has no right to pitch the AEC into the midst of a bitter controversy over extraneous matters, by requiring it to negotiate and sign the contract with the private companies to furnish TVA with electricity.

President Eisenhower, for the good of our national defense, which is rooted in what we hope is our atomic superiority, should immediately revoke his order to AEC to buy power at Memphis where it has no need for it.

Let the AEC buy power where it needs it, or not at all.

If other agencies need power, let them get it through some other means than the AEC. Let TVA provide its own power.

Let the atom splitters go right on splitting atoms; keep them out of controversities where they have no business.

Are Railroads Essential to National Defense?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FREDERICK G. PAYNE
OF MAINE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, June 25, 1954

Mr. PAYNE. Madam President, on behalf of the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Duff], I aks unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record a copy of the remarks of Mr. James M. Symes recently made in Philadelphia, Pa., at a dinner honoring Mr. Walter S. Franklin, who recently retired as president of the Pennsylvania Railroad Co., and Mr. James M. Symes, who has succeeded Mr. Franklin.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Are Railroads Essential to National Defense?

(Address of J. M. Symes, president, the Pennsylvania Railroad Co., at dinner in Philadelphia, June 23, 1954)

It is only natural that I would feel highly flattered tonight—as I am sure does Mr. Franklin—when such a distinguished group of the country's leaders—from all over the area served by our railroad, and even beyond that, turn out to honor the outgoing and the incoming president of the Pennsylvania Railroad.

Of course, I feel highly honored in having the good fortune to have been selected by our board of directors to succeed Mr. Franklin. The principal reason for my having been eligible for that selection is because of the wonderful support and cooperation I have received from the directors, officers, and employees of the railroad I am associated with in the various undertakings that have been assigned me over the years, plus similar support and cooperation from my many friends and business associates throughout the entire area served by our railroad. For that I am sincerely grateful. I can only hope that I will be able to carry on in my new assignment as did my 12 distinguished predecessors, 2 of whom are here tonight, Mr. Martin W. Clement and, of course, Mr. Walter S. Franklin.

I am also extremely happy to start tackling the challenges that always accompany an appointment of this kind. I am going to talk this evening, and briefly, about a subject that not only confronts the railroad industry, but, of more importance, our country as a whole.

The subject of my discussion will be Are Railroads Essential to National Defense? That seems like a perfectly silly question because I am sure the answer is perfectly obvious to nearly everyone. But sometimes it takes silly questions to create constructive thinking and arouse action. Before discussing the matter of national defense, I have one observation to make. Nearly everyone gathered in this room tonight is a railroader. Aside from your own specific job, I think you will agree with me that you know more about railroading than any other business. That is only natural. If you did not actually work for a railroad as a youngster, you would watch the trains go by; you would steal a ride on them; you would be a passenger. So you were a part of the railroad and it has been part of your daily life. Because of this, you know an awful lot about us. You know what makes railroading click, at least you have some very definite ideas on the subject. But too many times we know so much about certain matters that we defer doing anything about them, and that is one of the troubles of our industry today. The public knows too much about the physical aspects of railroading and, because of this, take it for granted that the railroads will take care of the economic aspects themselves. But we can't entirely take care of ourselves and, again, one of the principal reasons is because you know too much about us. So, one of our principal objectives is to see that America's business leaders not only know what makes the railroads click but, of more importance, what actually causes the click, so that there will be a fully informed public opinion regarding it.

Now as to national defense: Ever since World War II the importance of defense has quite properly been a major consideration in this country. We did not come out of a wartime economy into a peacetime economy. We have an intermediate stage to contend with—a defense economy. Defense, as we know it, involves two very important considerations. Of first importance—defense is to prevent war, and, of second importance—to insure full protection in the event it is not prevented. So there have been many kinds of defense arrangements set up in this country—to insure an adequate protection for our people in the event of war—and, on the whole, I think we will agree a mighty good job has been done, particularly as it pertains to actual production and planning for quick production if and when needed. But I sometimes wonder if sufficient consideration has been given to the importance of transportation in the overall picture? Defense production is absolutely worthless unless the output can be transported to the point needed. So it would seem that one of the cardinal principles of a sound defense program would be promotion and encouragement of a peacetime transportation system in our economy that protects to the fullest defense and wartime requirements.

I know that would be the business-like solution to a problem of that kind. But it sometimes seems that just the opposite is being done—and here is why I am of that opinion.

Most of us here tonight are familiar with the events of World War I. All of us are familiar with the events of World War II. During World War I the railroads were about the only transportation agency we had—and they were required to perform practically all of the service to meet civilian and wartime requirements. Following World War I—through the twenties and thirties—other forms of transportation moved into the field in a big way, and I am sure we find no fault with that. So when World War II started we had four major methods of transportation in this country—railway—airway—highway and waterway. But what happened to these several methods of transport? It did not take long to find out that the railroads were still the backbone of defense transportation. Within a relatively short time they were called upon to perform over 90 percent of the war transportation service—and, in addition, take care of essential civilian requirements. Why were the railroads called upon to perform this transportation miracle? Because the inherent wartime weakness of other peacetime transport agencies showed up rather quickly under wartime demands. The railroads could provide more transportation and a flexible transportation, with less manpower and with less strategic materials, than most other methods.

You could properly ask—how did the railroads provide facilities and equipment to do this? As I have said, prior to World War I the railroads handled practically all the transportation in this country. So, with the natural elimination of peacetime transportation requirements during that war, there was excess plant and equipment that automatically became available for wartime use. Prior to World War II, due to the depression traffic volume of the thirties, plus the idling of considerable plant and equipment because of other competition coming into the field, the railroads actually had a lot of excess plant and equipment that could be mobilized quickly to meet wartime demands. In short—because the railroads had formerly played such a prominent part in the overall transportation demands of the country, there was a large cushion of facilities between peacetime and wartime requirements to throw against wartime transport needs.

But do we have that same situation now? I don't think we have. It is only natural that total transportation demands are constantly growing as population and standards of living increase. But the railroads have not been participating adequately in that transportation growth. They are actually sharing in less and less of it. I think it is self-evident that from what happened during World War II—when the railroads were called upon to provide a standby service for other transport agencies—that they would be called upon again and for the same reasons if another emergency should exist. But as I have stated, with the continuing transportation growth of the country and the railroads not participating adequately therein, that a cushion of capacity between a peace and wartime economy, so prevalent during World Wars I and II, quite naturally will not be there, certainly not to the extent it was during other wars. So that raises a very serious question— should there be a "moth balling" of transportation during peacetime to insure adequate transportation during wartime—and, if so, who should pay for it? Or conversely—if my premise is correct, and I think it is, does it seem logical that Government should subsidize during peacetime certain segments of transport that cannot meet emergency conditions, and at the expense of weakening a transport agency that is absolutely essential to emergency requirements? Or, would it be better to foster and encourage peacetime use of the transport agency so essential to emergency requirements? I don't think anyone should now rightfully expect the railroads to provide nonused standby facilities for emergency use. To do so would involve a pricing structure so high that we could not hope to maintain a competitive position with our subsidized competitors.

You might think, from what I have said, that I am advocating peacetime subsidy for the railroad industry. I hope I have not left that impression. Instead of that, I am advocating removal of the artificial barriers that prevent the normal full-scale peacetime use of the industry—and about all that is necessary to bring that about is enforcement of the national transportation policy declared by Congress in 1940. It is so simple, short, and understandable that I am going to take about 1 minute to read it to you:

"It is hereby declared to be the national transportation policy of the Congress to provide for fair and impartial regulation of all modes of transportation subject to the provisions of this act, so administered as to recognize and preserve the inherent advantages of each; to promote safe, adequate, economical, and efficient service and foster sound economic conditions in transportation and among the several carriers; to encourage the establishment and maintenance of reasonable charges for transportation services, without unjust discriminations, undue preferences or advantages, or unfair or destructive competitive practices; to cooperate with the several States and the duly authorized officials thereof; and to encourage fair wages and equitable working conditions—all to the end of developing, coordinating, and preserving a national transportation system by water, highway, and rail, as well as other means, adequate to meet the needs of the commerce of the United States, of the postal service, and of the national defense. All of the provisions of this act shall be administered and enforced with a view to carrying out the above declaration of policy."

The transportation policy I have just quoted could be stated in these few words—fair treatment to all—and favors to none. That is all we ask of Government—that the legislators and the administrative agencies actually carry out the promise Congress so eloquently enunciated in 1940, and has so negligently avoided ever since.

I shall cite just a few examples of where we could well have heeded that policy. The St. Lawrence seaway has been authorized, primarily as a defense measure. It will soon become a reality and I don't like to "cry over spilled milk." But its construction was largely advocated as a defense measure—and quite naturally defense does have political appeal—even though that is not my purpose in discussing it tonight. But let's examine the total effect on our future from a defense standpoint. Naturally, this subsidized competitive transportation route that offers something below cost to the user will deprive the railroads of tonnage they have been built to handle—and quite naturally as railroad tonnages diminish, so will the railroad plant and equipment. The St. Lawrence seaway cannot operate the year round because of weather conditions. It could be a sitting duck for attack in the event of war. Actually what is being done is—to substitute an inflexible method of transport that cannot be mobilized where needed and cannot be used the year round—for a flexible method that can be mobilized where needed and used 365 days in the year. If and when such an emergency does arise, it might be found—and perhaps too late—that real defense transportation has been substantially weakened by the substitution of an artificial one. Don't you agree that the declared transportation policy of our Congress should have been given due weight in consideration of this project. But I wonder if it was?

Another threat involves two of our great natural resources—the coal and railroad industries. The dumping of import residual oil into this country is displacing production and transportation of millions of tons of coal. It also almost guarantees oil shortages and gasoline rationing in the event of submarine warfare. In the event of war we all know from past experience that more coal, and the transportation of it, will be urgently needed. But, again, can the railroad industry or the coal industry—both operating within the framework of our free enterprise system—be expected to provide facilities and equipment for this standby service for emergency use? I think what is being done here should likewise be examined in light of our transportation policy.

You would naturally expect that a declared transportation policy of Congress would have some effect on regulatory processes under which transport agencies are required to operate, but certainly little or nothing has been done to actually strengthen transport through regulatory procedures. The Interstate Commerce Act was enacted into law 68 years ago and we have been working under it ever since. At that time the railroads had developed into a huge transportation plant—and were enjoying almost a complete monopoly in that field. No other agency could hope to compete with their service or their pricing of the service. So to correct the abuses that were creeping into this industry, as result of monopoly, and properly so, this Interstate Commerce Act was enacted into law—and we have been working under it with but too few amendments ever since.

But conditions have completely changed. With the advent of automotive, air, and water transportation, the railroads were confronted with competition for practically every passenger and pound of freight they carried. The monopoly of the railroad industry was over. The concept of the Interstate Commerce Act was to protect the public interest under conditions then existing. Because of the change in conditions, without adequate changes in regulation, we now find the procedures and administration of the Interstate Commerce Act actually retarding the industry, and at the same time not fully protecting the public interest. When an industry that is in position to provide mass transportation of people and goods at a lower full cost than any other transportation agency can ever hope to attain, and notwithstanding this economic advantage is losing its position in the transportation field, it certainly is in the public interest to change this trend.

So again we find that where you would naturally expect to see the beginning of carrying out the declared national transportation policy of Congress (through changed regulatory procedures) that practically nothing has been done about it in 14 years. Don't you think Congress should properly say to agencies of Government dealing with transportation: "Here is what we want done; it is up to you to see that it is done. If you can't do it under the act as now written, come in here with the necessary amendments so that it can be done." I am sure that is the way business would handle a problem of that kind. I hope I am not misunderstood—that I am criticizing the Interstate Commerce Commission. I happen to know most of the members of that Commission. They are an intelligent group of men and are dedicated to their public duties, and of necessity must work extremely hard and under very trying conditions. But they are hampered by existing rules and by some of the things that have been done in past years. So I am not criticizing the Commission. I am advocating that the Interstate Commerce Act be amended to meet present-day conditions—and in that way I am sure the duties of the Commissioners will be somewhat simplified.

I will endeavor to say in just a few words what has already taken most of my time this evening. We all agree that America's program to develop a defensive strength, so great that no aggressor dare challenge us, is a sound one. Transportation is vitally essential to this program—and should not be overlooked. The railroads have demonstrated that they are the only dependable overland transportation in case of war and only 10 years ago demonstrated this essentiality by moving over nine-tenths of all military materials and personnel. They cannot maintain their ability to reproduce that great task if much of the normal traffic is diverted to subsidized competition in peacetime. We are not seeking rail subsidy in peacetime to protect defense requirements. In lieu of that, we are asking for the opportunity to maintain our strength in both a peace and wartime economy. It can be done by enforcement of the transportation policy of the Congress of the United States—and it is important that transport be reexamined quickly so that all of the many ramifications involved will be given appropriate consideration.

I suppose, by saying that, I may be accused of being a pessimist insofar as the future of the railroads is concerned. But actually the opposite is true. I am a real optimist for the future of the railroad industry in this country. We have not had a truly normal situation in our country for a good many years. I am hopeful that what we are now going through is a transition period headed toward normalcy. Transport, in its many phases, has been developing rapidly with too little planning of its ultimate future. There is room for every transport agency in this country and I am sure they will eventually fall into their proper economic places, thereby insuring an adequate transportation system, designed to economically and efficiently meet the demands of commerce—whether they be peace, defense or wartime demands. So, again, I am optimistic as to the future of the railroads, because I am positive that an informed public will see to it that the railroads and other forms of transportation fall into their natural and true economic position in our normal economy—and not, because of subsidies and abnormal conditions, be forced into artificial positions.

How To Carry Out a Plan—Good GOP Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 1954

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, Uncle Sam's plan to help our allies through technical assistance is in the hands of Harold Stassen, Chief of our Foreign Operations Administration. This week, the FOA signed a 3-year contract with the University of Maryland covering work to be performed in British Guiana, and additional agreements are being executed with Washington State College and Texas A. and M.

Under these agreements, the colleges will send out staffs composed of highly trained agricultural specialists, housing people, social workers, engineers, surveyors and reclamation men. Funds for development of the areas will be provided largely through the countries directly involved. In the case of British Guiana, the United Kingdom will be paying out some $25 million for overall development of the area.

Working with the universities represents an intelligent use of skills with potential long-lasting results beyond the immediate projects. British Guiana is a particularly sensitive area in view of the recent efforts of Communists to influence opinion adversely to American and British interests there. All told, 25 universities now have short-term contracts with FOA, and the 3-year program should be a long step forward in carrying out work of the utmost importance to our country's future relations with our allies.

Nationwide Mail Fraud at Alabama State Penitentiary at Atmore

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 25, 1954

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article which appeared in the Chattanooga Times of April 23, 1954. The post office inspector in charge of Tennessee, Mr. A. E. Helmick, revealed this situation, and the article which should be read by all.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ATMORE PRISON CENTER OF RACKET DEFRAUDING KIN OF MISSING GI'S

(By Marion Coleman)

The nerve center of a nationwide mail fraud, described by A. E. Helmick, post office inspector in charge of Tennessee, Alabama, and Mississippi, as a vicious and inhuman racket preying on the loved ones of dead or missing servicemen, has been uncovered by area postal inspectors—in the Alabama State Penitentiary at Atmore.

Helmick announced uncovering of the racket yesterday.

Six long-term prisoners already have been definitely identified with the scheme, which has been operated from the Alabama pen throughout all parts of America, bringing added heartbreak to fathers and mothers, sisters and brothers, sweethearts, wives, and friends of men who have been listed as killed or missing in the Korean fighting.

Here's how the racket works:

The prisoners obtain the missing persons lists or the advertisements placed in the American Legion Monthly and other veterans publications by relatives of servicemen reported killed or missing in action in Korea, in which requests are made for information from anyone who might have been with the soldier when he was killed or was first missed.

A letter is then written by a prisoner to the intended victim, in which he claims to be in contact with the missing or dead man, that he was not killed or captured, but went absent without leave or was accused of killing someone, that he stowed away on a ship and now is hiding in the Southern United States. The letter states that the soldier's name and whereabouts cannot be told, but that he needs money to obtain necessary medical attention, needed clothing, or payment of a fine so that he may be released.

The letters begin in various ways, including "Dear Mom," and signed "Your loving son," or "Dear Sis" or Susie or Mrs. Smith. Always the letters explain why they are being written by someone else. Some say they are the soldier's former chaplain and "if it is known that I am doing this I will lose my job, which I can't afford because I have a wife and two children." Others say they were the soldier's "buddy, and I'm writing because he can't use his arm." Inspector Helmick said one of the letters turned over to him yesterday was written in red ink, and started out, "Dear Mother."

But in each instance an appeal is made for money. Sometimes no sums are mentioned in the first letter, but in subsequent correspondence if the victim responds—and they do, Helmick said.

"Naturally a distressed family will grasp at straws in such a situation," he said. "In many instances money has been sent."

Directions are given the victims as to how to send the money, usually to hide it in food or clothing packages.

Almost all the letters show a rural route return address—Atmore, Ala. That address is the State pen. Some of the prisoners have the money sent to their relatives in their home town. They sign fictitious names or the names of fellow prisoners who are in solitary confinement. If replies are sent to the latter, the racketeer intercepts the letters at mail call, which men in solitary are not allowed to attend.

Helmick said the letters are sent mostly to distant parts of the United States, where people are not likely to know that Atmore is the site of the State pen. But some parents rush to Atmore—from places as far away as New Mexico. One mother from across the country arrived in Atmore firmly convinced that her son was there. The prison warden had to take her all over the prison and let her look for herself to see that it had all been a dreadful hoax—that her son was not there.

Many complaints have been referred to Helmick, not only from private citizens who received such letters, but also from American Legion headquarters and other veterans' organizations. One woman who turned in a letter which asked for $300 to help her husband had been officially notified in March 1953 that he had been killed in action, his body had been returned for burial in May 1953, and had been positively identified by the family doctor and close relatives. That letter helped officials to uncover the racket headquarters. It has been operating for several years. Since officials determined that the letters were coming out of the Alabama prison, officials there have cooperated in catching as many of the perpetrators as possible. Inspectors working on the case said the prison officials believe their recently adopted methods have stopped the scheme as of about April 1. The postal agents, however, apparently are not so optimistic, and urge that any evidence that the scheme is still in operation be reported promptly to the nearest post-office inspector or directly to Helmick in the post office building here in Chattanooga.

"We are still getting complaints," he said. "We want to break it up completely, and letters should be reported immediately."

Prison officials have reported punishment of those on whom the crime has been pinned definitely. They have explained efforts made to prevent such letters from going out, but indicate that most of them are mailed by visitors who take them surreptitiously from the prisoners on Sundays.

Now the prisoners are searched before they enter the visiting room as well as when they leave it. But there are other ways. Some of the men work on prison farms or get trusties to mail letters for them.

Most of those who've been caught are long-termers and have little to fear beyond loss of privileges. Most of them welcome being transferred from the State to Federal prison, officials say, but in most cases the United States district attorneys have not wanted to prosecute, feeling the State sentences now being served are more severe.

Nobody knows what the prisoners do with the money they have stolen from distressed families of men who have given their lives for their country, Helmick said.

Atomic Progress Is Moving Fast

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 17, 1954

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, nothing is more fascinating to experts, public officials, and the community at large than reports of atomic development. Everything that we had read years ago in the Sunday supplement speculation on the potential power of the atom has suddenly moved into the news columns. Suggestions that atomic powerplants may be available for private homes in a few years have stirred the Nation's imagination.

No less dramatic is the work being done in auxiliary fields related to the use of atomic energy. The production of glass stronger than lead, new metals whose names were almost unknown outside of the trade and scientific journals a decade ago, and experiments in chemical compounds have combined to make the years ahead seem like an adventure worthy of Alladin and his lamp.

There are now some 30 nuclear reactors at work throughout the Western World, and no one can be sure of the number available in the Communist-dominated Iron Curtain countries. On our side of the curtain, these reactors are being used to produce salutary materials, radioactive isotopes for medicine and research being the most notable and best known.

The race today seems to be almost incredible in its perplexities. In the last analysis, the question seems to be whether or not mankind will create a world in which the atom can be used to make a better life for everyone before it is used to blow us all to kingdom come. We are praying for the former alternative and do not believe that the latter will ever occur.

Question of the Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 22, 1954

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, does anybody still watch TV mornings and afternoons?

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

Code of Laws of the United States

Title 44, Section 181. Congressional Record; arrangement, style, contents, and indexes.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the Congressional Record, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the Congressional Record semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

Title 44, Section 182b. Same; illustrations, maps, diagrams.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the Record without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the Congressional Record the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily Record as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided*, That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the Record with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the official reporters of the Congressional Record, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the Record shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the Record issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the Record for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the Record of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the Record shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the Record style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the Record.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the Congressional Record any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided*, That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix, but this rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided*, That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the Congressional Record.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the Congressional Record Appendix the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed.

10. *Official reporters.*—The official reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the Congressional Record by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this restriction shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. The Public Printer or the official reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the Congressional Record which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Illustrations.*—Pursuant to section 182b, title 44, United States Code (as shown above), requests for authority to insert an illustration in the Record should be submitted to the Joint Committee on Printing through the chairman of the Committee on Printing of the respective House in which the speech desired to be illustrated may be delivered. Illustrations shall not exceed in size a page of the Record and shall be linecuts only. Copy for illustrations must be furnished to the Public Printer not later than 12:30 o'clock p. m. of the day preceding publication.

13. *Corrections.*—The permanent Record is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided*, That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further*, That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. The money derived from such sales shall be paid into the Treasury and accounted for in his annual report to Congress, and no sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

E

I

IN T

Mr.
10th o
of the
for re
of Hea
success
were fo
of the
pacitat
throug
cussing
Health
Institu
Blindn

As I
witness
behind
every c
tial wo
shortag
signific
confirm
medical
good fo

A fe
K. Va
United
at Cha
out th
palsy,
eases i
Meter'
pressiv
tion of
give i
follows

Mr. C
bral pa
kind, is
and on
physica
extensi
so vast
search
concern

In a
qualifie
care, tr
lacking
problem

We
anyone
regard
ment.
babies
every
Americ
as a r
fought
more t
out th
palsy.

Fortu
this c
nonpro
in 194

Appendix

Cerebral Palsy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1954

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, on the 10th of June I made a plea on the floor of the House for higher appropriations for research in the National Institutes of Health which I am glad to report was successful. The increases I requested were for research into the cause and cure of the major diseases that kill or incapacitate so many millions of our citizens throughout the Nation each year. In discussing the programs of the Institutes of Health, and particularly the National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Blindness, I remarked:

> As I probed into the testimony of each witness and ascertained the facts that lay behind the budget presentations, I found in every case significant areas in which essential work was not being done because of a shortage of funds, and, at the same time, significant areas of research progress which confirmed my belief that the investment in medical research is good economy as well as good for the American people.

A few days later, on June 15, Mr. Karl K. Van Meter, executive director of United Cerebral Palsy, made an address at Champaign, Ill., in which he spelled out the problem in terms of cerebral palsy, one of the most devastating diseases in the neurological field. Mr. Van Meter's address was so vivid and so impressive that I commend it to the attention of my colleagues and urge that they give it their fullest consideration. It follows:

> Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, cerebral palsy, one of the oldest enemies of mankind, is likewise one of the least understood, and one of the most expensive of all major physical ailments. Its ramifications are so extensive and its destructive potentialities so vast that a tremendous amount of research is necessary to enlarge our knowledge concerning the problem.
>
> In addition, both existing facilities and qualified trained personnel for diagnosis, care, treatment, and education are woefully lacking. Practically every aspect of the problem requires exploration and expansion.
>
> We know that cerebral palsy can strike anyone, of any age, at any time, without regard for race, economic status, or environment. With unrelenting regularity, 10,000 babies are born cerebral palsied each and every year—1 every 53 minutes. Many American servicemen became cerebral palsied as a result of wounds received while they fought for freedom. It is estimated that more than half a million Americans throughout this Nation are afflicted with cerebral palsy.
>
> Fortunately, something is being done about this condition. United Cerebral Palsy, a nonprofit membership corporation organized in 1949, is a nationwide organization devoted to a united attack on cerebral palsy. Its humanitarian work is supported by voluntary public contributions. Its officers and board of directors serve without compensation of any kind. National headquarters are at 369 Lexington Avenue, New York City.
>
> As you may know, the program and budget of United Cerebral Palsy were reviewed by a special panel of the National Budget Committee which is sponsored by Community Chests and Councils of America, Inc., and the National Social Welfare Assembly, Inc. This committee was set up to provide an orderly medium through which national-agency program plans and requests for support can be channneled to local communities. The National Budget Committee has approved United Cerebral Palsy, a member agency, in a report to the Comunity Chests and Councils of the Nation.
>
> Realizing the broad scope of specialties and services required to establish a total program for the cerebral palsied, United Cerebral Palsy and its affiliates have worked diligently toward preventing duplication of existing facilities. When the National Institute for Neurological Diseases and Blindness was being written in United States Public Health Law 692, cerebral palsy was specifically stated in the law as being one of the health conditions covered. This was accomplished in part as a result of the efforts of United Cerebral Palsy.
>
> This action was a testament to the foresight and sagacity on the part of members of both Houses of Congress, who last year voted $4,500,000 for research on neurological conditions. This year there is every indication that this appropriation will be substantially increased.
>
> This is intelligent, long-range thinking. For, while there is no known cure for cerebral palsy, medicine and science have proven that many cerebral palsied have average or superior intelligence, and that practically all the cerebral palsied can be helped in some measure through adequate diagnosis, treatment, care, and education.
>
> It is our hope that continuing research may lead to ways of preventing many cases of cerebral palsy and to better forms of care and treatment. Research studies and projects are now being supported by United Cerebral Palsy to the extent of half a million dollars a year. It is hoped this amount will be substantially increased as time goes on.
>
> What is cerebal palsy? In the words of United Cerebral Palsy's medical director, Dr. Glidden L. Brooks, cerebral palsy is a complex and highly variable disturbance of function which is the outward reflection of damage to the brain. The most important reflection is disturbance of motion, although other functions mediated in the brain may be affected.
>
> The brain—to give a somewhat oversimplified description—is made up of nerve cells. Each nerve cell has long strands which, somewhat like wires, connect it to numerous other nerve cells, and by way of the cranial nerves and the spinal cord to all parts of the body, such as muscles.
>
> The majority of these nerve cells are arranged in layers around the outside of the brain, and different centers of the brain control different parts or functions of the body.
>
> Collections of nerve cells in other parts of the brain are important in helping to stabilize, coordinate, and otherwise influence this control by adding impulses to the whole "brain message" which starts in the cerebrum and ends with the performance of a body function.
>
> According to Dr. Brooks, a significant fact about nerve cells is that, once destroyed, they are not replaced. Thus, when any part of the brain is damaged, the bodily functions associated with that part of the brain are permanently impaired unless other parts of the brain can be trained to substitute for this function. In addition to functions of motion, activities of the brain which have to do with sensation, or indeed with power to reason, may be affected by injury to the nerve tissues.
>
> Just what this impairment may be depends on the location of the damage, the number of cells destroyed, and many other factors. Such damage can be caused by any type of injury, or by failure of the brain to develop before birth.
>
> Most adults have learned as children to eat, walk, talk, and perform countless functions of everyday living quite naturally and almost automatically. This is possible because nonhandicapped people, early in childhood, establish delicately balanced control of their muscles so that they work together smoothly and efficiently. A person with cerebral palsy has suffered damage to the mechanisms which provide this delicate control; therefore, as a child, it has been impossible, or, at best, painfully difficult for him to learn to do even the most simple acts which the rest of us take for granted.
>
> The appearance of a person so afflicted too often leads the uninformed observer to the conclusion that the cerebral palsied individual is feebleminded. This affords an unthinkable injustice to the large numbers of cerebral palsied individuals who are intellectually normal or superior. It is true, of course, that a sizable number of cerebral palsied individuals do have less than normal intellectual capacity. In the past, individuals have been mistakenly placed in the feebleminded group because they had unrecognized disturbance of perception. They were deaf, they were partially blind, or had other deep-seated difficulties in seeing the world as the normal person sees it. When these difficulties are recognized and compensated for, the stigma of feeblemindness has been lifted.
>
> Today United Cerebral Palsy and its affiliates are dedicated to an intensive effort to help the cerebral palsied to take their rightful places alongside their more fortunate brothers and sisters—part of the never-ceasing struggle to preserve our freedom and the concepts we hold dear. For now, more than ever before, America's youth must be strong.
>
> United Cerebral Palsy affiliates—both State and local—are devoting their energies and resources to assisting the cerebral palsied in their communities by (a) establishing clinics and treatment centers; (b) training physicians, therapists, and teachers; (c) securing educational advantages; (d) setting up recreational centers; (e) expanding existing facilities; (f) operating vocational and employment services for adult cerebral palsied; (g) providing parent education; (h) supplying transportation to and from clinics, schools, and treatment centers, in addition to many other services.
>
> The goal of the national affiliation of united cerebral palsy is 553 affiliates, organized in the 48 States and Washington, D. C. It is reasonably expected that this goal may

be achieved by September 1956. At the present time we have 253 affiliates in 43 States.

These affiliates are organized in communities with a population of 50,000 or more for the purpose of rendering the maximum possible service to the cerebral palsied. It has been deemed advisable to organize groups in communities of this size. It is the realization by those in United Cerebral Palsy that our final common goal must be maximum care in each community. From experience we have learned that some of our various affiliates throughout the country have rendered as many as 30 different services to the cerebral palsied. We have established as a goal for each of our affiliates a minimum of 20 services for each community. It is our feeling that from a service point of view this goal can and should be achieved by each community affiliate of united cerebral palsy within a reasonable period of time.

One of the oldest affiliates of united cerebral palsy is United Cerebral Palsy of New Yory City, Inc. It was established in 1946 by a small group of parents drawn together by the common need and desperate desire to help their children crippled with cerebral palsy. In 1952 the New York City community contributed $762,000 for the cerebral palsied. In its report to the community, issued several months ago by this affiliate, it is shown that 89.8 percent had been spent on its program, 2.4 percent for general expenses, and only 7.8 percent for fund-raising expenses.

Cognizant of the great aid that can be made available to the cerebral palsied by public agencies, united cerebral palsy affiliates throughout the United States work closely with many State departments of health, education, social welfare, and mental hygiene. They have activated existing laws, supported revisions and new recommendations to correct outmoded programs, and assisted these departments in obtaining increased appropriations.

The United Cerebral Palsy affiliates work closely with other private agencies interested in the cerebral palsied. They cooperate financially and administratively with such groups as the Grotto, Elks, National Society for Crippled Children and Adults, Catholic Charities, etc., to maintain outpatient clinics, workshops, diagnostic centers, etc. In many communities the money raised by the local affiliate of United Cerebral Palsy is used for grants to existing facilities in hospitals, schools, and rehabilitation centers.

One of our major projects for 1954 is the expansion of program services. This is being accomplished with the aid of the National Program Services Committee, with representatives from each of the State affiliates. Various subcommittees of the program services committee are working on specific aspects of program, such as problems of the mentally retarded cerebral palsied, parent programs, operation of diagnostic and treatment centers, recruitment and training of personnel, recreation and camping, rehabilitation—residence schools, mechanical aids.

It is estimated that in the United States there are 200,000 children afflicted with cerebral palsy and 350,000 adults. We are all aware of the fact that life expectancy in the United States, even in the case of permanently disabled persons, ranks highest in the world today and that medical standards and techniques in medical research in this country are outstanding. These crippled persons can live as long as you and I. We are informed that many live to the age of 60 and some to 70, even to 80.

Assuming that 10 percent of the adults are self-supporting, the remainder, numbering 315,000, require at least $600 a year for their maintenance, a total of $189 million a year.

On the other hand, if these 315,000 could be rehabilitated and made employable, even at the rate of $1,000 a year, the difference from an economic standpoint would be over half a billion dollars.

I am sure that all of us here today realize that this is not purely a medical problem. Cerebral palsy affects the national economy and should be treated accordingly. The difference of half a billion dollars in our economic structure must be the concern of those who guide our destinies in this great Nation.

Freedom for Enslaved Baltic Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1954

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, as the Communists seek to spread their influence and expand their hold on more countries throughout the world, many groups are endeavoring to focus attention on the methods used by the Russians for illegal seizure of many of the smaller nations, as a warning to those countries which are still free and can protect themselves, and also in an effort to secure the release of those countries which were incorporated into the Russian fold against their wishes.

Last week a meeting was held in Baltimore by representatives of the Estonian, Latvian, and Lithuanian Councils in further protest to the seizure of these countries by the Russians. Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert a resolution adopted at this meeting.

Members of the special committee appointed to investigate the Soviet seizure of the Baltic and other eastern European countries are now in Europe to gather further information on this subject, and I hope that the facts they bring back will be helpful to the United States and to the United Nations in their efforts to free these countries from their Soviet rulers.

The resolution follows:

At a meeting held June 15, 1954, at the Lithuanian Hall, 851 Hollins Street, Baltimore, Md., protesting the illegal incorporation of the Baltic States by the Red army into the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, representatives of the Estonian, Latvian, and Lithuanian Councils unanimously adopted the following resolution:

"Whereas as a result of the imperialistic illegal invasion by Soviet Russia the Baltic Republics of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, were overrun by the Red army on June 16 and 17, 1940, and occupied by the Soviet forces against the will and desire of the people and their duly established governments; and

"Whereas the economic, social, and political life was destroyed, and religious life suppressed; and

"Whereas the extermination of the people of the Baltic Republics was initiated in June 1941 to assist Moscow's imperialistic plans; and

"Whereas for the Baltic nations under Soviet rule the upholding of civil rights and liberties is now extinct and physical survival is the dominant factor because of the annihilation perpetrated by the Soviets; and

"Whereas the recent hearings and investigations by the House of Representatives Baltic Committee under the chairmanship of Hon. Charles J. Kersten, of Wisconsin, exposed once more to the free world the Soviet continued annihilation practice in the Baltic States; and

"Whereas the extermination of nations must cease: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That we convey to the House of Representatives our deep appreciation for the creation of the Baltic Committee; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That we endorse the House of Representatives expansion of the Kersten committee's field of investigation to other Soviet occupied countries where the practice of annihilation exists; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That we appeal to the President of the United States and Department of State, at future peace for Europe conferences that the question of removal of Soviet occupying forces in Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania be placed on the agenda; and be it finally

"*Resolved*, That copies of the resolution be submitted to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, Maryland Members of both Houses of Congress, the Governor of the State of Maryland, the United States representatives in the United Nations, the mayor of Baltimore, the diplomatic and consular representatives of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania in the United States and the press."

Anthony J. Miceika,
Chairman, Lithuanian Committee.
R. Ise,
Chairman, Estonian Committee.
Igors Blosfelds,
Chairman, Latvian Committee.

The Fifth Amendment Should Not Shelter Communists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 14, 1954

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, there is a strong sentiment in the country against communism in its many nefarious forms. It is a sad fact that this monster shows its slimy head in many unsuspecting places. I am sorry that we have in the Federal Government many employees who are not true Americans.

I have often thought that a true, genuine American has absolutely no trouble with his own mind or conscience when the matter of his Americanism is brought up. I have always felt that any person employed by the Government should always be ready and willing to discuss and explain to his superiors, or to a court, or to a lawful committee what he has been doing for the Government, and what information he has learned in connection with his work with the Government.

I have been shocked at the many instances where Federal employees sought to hide behind the fifth amendment to the Constitution.

The language in the fifth amendment behind which they seek to hide is, as follows:

> No person * * * shall be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself.

Of course, if a Federal employee is questioned about matters that are outside of his Federal employment, and purely personal, and he in good conscience believes he might incriminate himself, he would be entitled to the protection of the fifth amendment. However, a Federal employee who defiantly refuses to answer a question about his work with the Government throws himself upon to a suspicion that he is not willing for his superiors to know just what he has been doing in his position with the Government. Such an individual should not be permitted to hide behind the fifth amendment. Such an individual should be immediately separated from his service with the Government. With regard to his retirement annuity when he is discharged in this manner he should be paid a sum equal to the total amount paid by him as contribution toward such retirement annuity, plus any accrued interest attributable to such contributions.

I felt so strongly about this matter that, a short time ago, I introduced a bill in Congress numbered H. R. 7381. This bill expresses my views, and, I think, will express the views of all loyal Americans everywhere. This bill is pending before the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee. I appeared before this committee a few days ago and presented my arguments in favor of the passage of my proposed legislation.

This bill, H. R. 7381, reads as follows:

> *Be it enacted, etc.*, That any officer or employee of the United States who refuses to testify upon matters directly or indirectly (1) relating to his office or employment or (2) relating to any relationship he might have with any foreign government, in any proceeding wherein he is a defendant or called as a witness, upon the ground that his answer may tend to incriminate him or compel him to be a witness against himself, or who refuses so to testify on such ground when called by a grand jury or any standing or select committee of the Senate or House of Representatives, or any subcommittee of such a committee, or any joint committee of the Congress, shall be immediately separated from his office or employment and shall forfeit his right to a future retirement annuity based on service in the Government of the United States, and be disqualified from holding any other public office or employment in the Government of the United States.
>
> Sec. 2. If the right to a future retirement annuity is forfeited by any officer or employee of the United States under this act, there shall be paid to such individual a sum equal to the total amount paid by him as contribution toward such retirement annuity, plus any accrued interest attributable to such contributions.

Antinarcotic Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1954

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I should like to include a letter which I recently addressed to Capt. Edward Page Gaston, at his request, relative to H. R. 565, the bill which I have introduced in an effort to strengthen our laws with regard to traffic narcotics. I am also including the abridged comments some of my colleagues have directed to the chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, to Mr. Gaston and to others interested in this subject. Mr. Gaston is national commander of the Patriot Guard, Inc., 1775 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. This organization is actively engaged in a movement to suppress the distribution of harmful narcotics. Mr. Gaston has had a great deal of international experience, since he was formerly attached to the American Embassies in Germany and Mexico, and has had much to do with the United Nations.

Following are some statements commending him for services rendered:

General Eisenhower's commendation:

> The Army will always be grateful for the splendid services you performed during the First World War for the American prisoners held by Germany, and I appreciate the opportunity to express our lasting appreciation.

Former President Hoover:

> I have a fine recollection of our previous association.

The New York Times:

> Captain Gaston's work in Germany and Belgium among the prison camps and battlefields will be long and gratefully remembered.

I recently wrote to my congressional colleagues as follows:

> One of the grave criminal and moral problems facing our Nation is the astounding increase in the use of narcotics by our teenagers.

DOPE SALES TO SCHOOLCHILDREN

During the 82d Congress I introduced the first bill to try to correct this problem by imposing extremely severe penalties upon those individuals who peddled narcotics to teen-agers. I believe that the time is overdue for a full hearing by the Ways and Means Committee of this entire matter.

To another correspondent, I wrote:

> We have been shocked during the past days by the news that narcotics are being sold to school children. There is no criminal so despicable * * * the police department and the district attorney of New York would welcome this law.

Mr. Reed of New York, chairman of the House Committee on Ways and Means, wrote:

> My bill, H. R. 5561. * * * It is too early to predict what action will be taken on this measure, but I hope it will be favorable.

This bill is now law.

THE AMERICAN LEGION ACTS

Mr. Patten, of Arizona:

> Two of the bills introduced by me were at the request of the national American Legion as a result of their rehabilitation conference here in Washington.

Mr. King of California:

> My office has received many letters and telegrams of encouragement from all over the Union in support of the antinarcotics bill I have introduced.

Mr. Sheppard, of California:

> I am specifically interested in seeing that extreme, severe penalties are applied to those who peddle narcotics to our teenagers. They should receive the same type of treatment as one who commits the overt act of first-degree murder.

ALONG THE MEXICAN BORDER

Mr. Moss, of California:

> I am very much in favor of strong legislation to curb the narcotic traffic.

Mr. Hiestand, of California:

> There is great unanimity (in favor of the bill) except from a few of the legal experts, who agree in the principle involved of stiffening the punishment, but feel we may have overstepped the mark. * * * I think we will have to change the bill around.

Mr. Hosmer, of California:

> The epidemic of narcotic addiction among teenagers, particularly in southern California, but in all the States along the Mexican border, is serious.

HEARTBROKEN PARENTS

Mr. Bennett of Florida:

> Request that these bills be set for prompt hearing.

Mr. Lantaff, of Florida:

> I have had a great deal of correspondence on this matter with many heartbroken, distracted parents of teen-agers who have fallen into the habit * * * which is rapidly causing the ruination of the lives of many of our youth.

Mr. Matthews, of Florida:

> An attempt to secure passage of legislation which would severely penalize people who sell narcotics to teen-agers.

FIVE HUNDRED LETTERS FROM CHICAGO

Mr. McVey, of Illinois:

> I have had more than 500 letters from my district (Chicago) manifesting an intense interest in the passage of the measure which I have sponsored. * * * It is my hope that the good people * * * who are interested in getting a bill before the Congress will press the Committee on Ways and Means for a hearing on the bill which I have proposed, or some other measure that will deal a decisive blow to this dreadful menace.

SELLERS LIABLE FOR DAMAGES

Mr. Miller of Kansas:

> No one is more opposed to the sale of narcotic drugs to the youth of the land than I am. * * * A part of that penalty should be that the seller should be held liable for any damage arising out of the use of the article sold.

Mr. Robsion of Kentucky:

> The subject is of great importance.

Mr. Boggs, of Louisiana:

> Herewith copy of Public Law 255 of the 82d Congress which I sponsored.

This bill is now law.

Mr. Small, of Maryland:

> I recommend that Federal hearings be held at the earliest practical date.

Mr. Bentley, of Michigan:

> A full hearing * * * on the question of the use of narcotics by teen-agers and the matter of imposing penalties on those who peddle this despicable traffic.

Mr. Blatnik, of Minnesota:

> I am happy to write the Ways and Means Committee to urge a hearing on this legislation.

Mr. Bolling, of Missouri:

> I am in hearty accord with your avowed objectives. * * * I will certainly support it on the floor of the House.

Mrs. Sullivan, of Missouri:

It demands the most thorough investigation.

UNSCRUPULOUS NARCOTICS PEDDLERS

Mr. Miller of Nebraska:

I am hopeful that the other States of the Nation who do not have law of this kind. * * * will use my bill as a pattern for effective legislation in their States.

Mr. Williams of New Jersey:

I am particularly concerned about these unscrupulous individuals who live off peddling narcotics to teen-age children.

Mr. Belcher, of Oklahoma:

It has been my thought for quite some time that penalties for these crimes shall be more severe; therefore I hope that you will explore the entire subject.

Mrs. Kelly of New York:

This is a grave matter which threatens to become more serious if legislation is not enacted to correct it immediately.

TO CORRECT THE GROWING MENACE

Mr. Keogh, of New York:

Any steps that are taken to accomplish this objective are most worthwhile.

Mr. Buckley, of New York:

Which would strengthen our laws * * * and correct this growing menace.

Mr. Bosch, of New York:

Asking that hearings be held on this subject at the earliest possible date.

Mr. Edmondson, of Oklahoma:

I am most vitally concerned in this matter and intend to push the measure to the best of my ability.

Mr. Wickersham, of Oklahoma:

Impose severe penalties upon individuals peddling narcotics to our teen-agers.

Mr. Chudoff, of Pennsylvania:

It is needless to say what narcotics is doing to the children of America, and I sincerely hope that this Congress will * * * list this matter for a hearing without further delay.

Mr. Kelley of Pennsylvania:

My interest in such legislation * * * will have my support for his bill.

TEEN-AGERS BEING RUINED

Mr. Rhodes of Pennsylvania:

Requesting a full hearing to be held on this matter as soon as possible.

Mr. Lovre, of South Dakota:

Almost daily in the newspapers we read stories of teen-agers involved in the narcotics traffic. Minds and bodies of these youngsters are being ruined by these depraved and insidious people who supply the narcotics.

Mr. Staggers, of West Virginia:

The seriousness of the situation in our country.

Mr. Mollohan, of West Virginia:

My grave concern about the use of narcotics by the teen-agers of this country. * * * to schedule hearings on this question at the earliest possible date.

Mr. Neal, of West Virginia:

The committee will serve the country well by its investigation.

Mr. Davis of Wisconsin:

You are doing a good work in calling the attention of Congress to this legislation.

SIMILAR ACTION BY SENATORS

Similar bills have been introduced in the Senate, and it is my hope that something will be done early in the next session of the Congress to remedy a situation which has reached alarming proportions in many sections of the Nation.

Those desiring copies of the various antinarcotic congressional bills and general literature, free, may apply to Captain Gaston.

Do We Want To Hamstring Trout Fishing?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1954

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following:

DO WE WANT TO HAMSTRING TROUT FISHING?—TROUT-LABELING BILL S. 2033 AND H. R. 4201

Our commercial trout growers are being slowly strangled. If we don't save them we will seriously hurt our national trout fishing recreational program enjoyed by millions of anglers in 43 States.

Our growers, by supplying trout to private anglers and both trout and eggs to States, render a service unobtainable elsewhere.

Specifically, they are caught in a double squeeze. To protect trout fishing against growing fishing pressure, our States have enacted many laws, i. e., reducing the season to approximately 3 months, limiting the catch and number in possession, et cetera. These laws have proportionately restricted the stocking market of our growers. And now their table market, built up to supplement the stocking market, is being taken from them by foreign competition using unfair trade practices.

Imported table trout have a minimum price advantage of 40 cents per pound. But to overcome the superior quality of domestic trout, these foreign trout are dishonestly represented and substituted for domestic trout. This unfair competition has left our growers completely hog-tied competitively.

This situation is the direct opposite to our principles of fair trade. Even if our growers were not rendering invaluable service to our trout anglers and State fish commissions, it would be a rank miscarriage of justice not to stop these unfair trade practices.

Passage of the bill would restore some measure of competitive equality to our growers other than price. Defeat of the bill leaves them hog-tied and completely at the mercy of their competitors. It also puts congressional approval on these dishonest trade practices.

The bill does not in any way restrict the importation of foreign trout but, by requiring honest labeling, stops the deception. We urge you to do everything in your power to help get this bill enacted by the House this session.

THE NATIONAL BOARD OF UNITED
STATES TROUT FARM ASSOCIATIONS.

P. S.—If you want more details see our 2-page summary. The bill is endorsed by the United States Senate (passed similar S. 2033 unanimously); Izaak Walton League of America, William Voigt, executive director; National Wildlife Federation, Carl Shoemaker; Outdoor Writers Association of America, Michael Hudoba, director; Sports Fishing Institute, Dr. Eschmeyer, executive vice president; Field and Stream magazine, Ben Wright, vice president; Outdoor Life magazine, William E. Rae, editor; Sports Afield magazine, Michael Hudoba, Washington editor; fish and game divisions of many States; Johnny Mock, editor, All Outdoors, the Pittsburgh Press, president, Brotherhood of the Jungle Cock, junior fishing movement, honorary president, Pennsylvania Outdoor Writers, past president, Outdoor Writers Association of America.

The First Step Off the Agricultural Death March

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1954

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include an article in today's Boston Post which I think is worthy of the widest possible reading, and I commend it especially to the attention of those of my colleagues who represent consumer constituencies and who still feel contrained to oppose the Eisenhower-Benson agricultural plan. It is an article by John O'Donnell in his always readable column Capitol Stuff and is as follows:

CAPITOL STUFF

(By John O'Donnell)

WASHINGTON, June 27.—To every American who eats three meals a day and to every wage earner who pays a Federal income tax, this week's upcoming battle on Capitol Hill over the administration's farm program is more important than all the diplomatic palaver dished up at the high level foursome of Eisenhower, Churchill, Dulles, and Eden.

The worst that the global thinkers can come up with at the present moment, is an effort to make tasty diplomatic eating out of a dish of international crow and humble pie.

But the farm bill now before Congress is something immediate and to the point. It touches the cost and quality of your bacon and eggs for breakfast, a chicken sandwich and glass of milk for lunch, and the steak or stew for dinner back home with the family and children.

Furthermore, to every nonfarming city dweller, this measure hits directly at his income tax. The legislation's long-range objective is to wind up the present insane expenditure of one quarter of a billion a year of taxpayer's money which we're now paying for the storage of those farm products we're ordered Uncle Sam to buy because we can't eat them at home and can't sell them abroad.

On top of this, it will end the national idiocy of telling a farmer from the wheat belt that we will dip into the Treasury to pay him a guaranteed $2.40 a bushel for wheat which costs him less than $1 to raise—a pious Government idea which naturally impels the Kansas or Dakota wheat grower to tear his land apart to raise more wheat, which in turn causes the top soil to blow away and which in turn hikes the tax payments of the nonfarming American because he has to kick in for relief to the man-created dust bowl.

POLITICS INVOLVED

Now here is the point where that ole devil politics raises its ugly head—all of the Representatives and one-third of the Senators know that they have to risk their political necks next November. Those boys who have a loud, bellowing, angry farm vote in their districts or States (and was there ever a time in the Republic when the farm vote wasn't the loudest, most ornery group in the Nation?) have taken a runout powder on the administration and joined ranks with the old-line Fair Dealers of the Truman administration, whose farm thinking was dictated by the very leftist former Secretary of Agriculture Brannan and Truman's double-dome economic mediator in the White House, Leon Keyserling.

So this is what's happened, and the developments may turn out to be the most important political move than any other during the Eisenhower administration.

Ike's Secretary of Agriculture, Ezra Taft Benson, sent to Congress the administration farm bill. It's Benson's handiwork and a good job.

It's the first step which makes sense in the long path we will have to follow to get off the agricultural death march which started with New Deal's Bubblehead Wallace's proposals. FDR's Wallace, aided and abetted by such assistants as Alger Hiss, Rex "I'll make over the world" Tugwell, and the other characters of that time, came up with the idea of killing the little pigs and plowing under the cotton, all with the vague and fuzzy-brained idea that if everybody stood on Brooklyn Bridge and threw half their cash into the East River then everybody would be wealthier because there won't be so much money and so a dollar would be worth more. Dollars are symbols but pigs and cotton are basic wealth of nature. Henry never got that through his head. Ike inherited the Wallace-Brannan madness and Benson came up with the first honest, tough, and courageous solution; a gradual one, but good.

BENSON IDEA SOUND

The Benson proposal, if passed by Congress—and it comes up on the floor this week—is designed to end the high, rigid Treasury supports fixed for such key, but strangely grouped, farm products as wheat, corn, rice, peanuts, and tobacco. These get 90 percent of parity O. K.'d to the farmer by the Government. The reason you have got this strangely assorted group of political priority foodstuffs is that the linking of the five basic commodities enables the southern Democratic Congressmen interested in tobacco, peanuts, and rice to join up with the normally Republican Congressmen from the Midwest interested in wheat and corn and so, by working together, whipsaw any administration into agreeing to kick in to their ever-complaining sons of the soil.

Instead of the fixed supports which the farmers have been accustomed to, the Benson idea is to make the cash aid flexible and gradually get down to the commonsense idea of producing a commodity to square with the ancient law of supply and demand.

H. R. 1227

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1954

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I include as part of these remarks a petition signed by citizens of Portland, Oreg., in my congressional district, with reference to H. R. 1227, as follows:

> We, the undersigned, believing that the cause of total abstinence can be served by the reduction of advertising of alcoholic beverages over radio and television urge that our congressional representatives help bring the Bryson bill (H. R. 1227) from committee and support it by their vote. This bill would prohibit the transportation in interstate commerce of alcoholic-beverage advertising in newspapers, periodicals, and its broadcasting over radio and TV. We also request that you present the petitions to the House and to have a note made of them in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.
>
> Ward L. Haines, Charles G. Ellis, Floyd A. Geil, Max R. Burg, Beatrise I. Benham, Virginia M. Smith, Nettie M. Cook, S. L. Hanson, Melvin W. Kenworthy, Willard M. Hayne, Marie H. Haines, Eugene W. Hill, Ava R. Hill, Effie Douglas, Allen Hadley, Kenneth M. Williams, Marjorie O. Hadley, Louise Gillen, Charles A. Beals, Grace H. Butler, Grace M. Nickerson, Massey G. Miller, Ida M. Morgan, Dora E. Pilat, H. S. Morgan, L. A. Oeder, Emil G. Oeder, E. H. Wright, R. A. Hoffman, Mrs. Earl Kincheine, Mrs. Jean Smith, Effie Messenger, Catharine Winters, Sally E. McCoy, Mrs. J. M. Van Rassum, Portland, Oreg.

Wheat Acreage Quotas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1954

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, some time ago I received a letter from a dairy farmer in my district relative to a letter he had received from the country agricultural stabilization and conservation committee regarding wheat acreage quotas. He asked, Is this the United States or Russia? I immediately took the matter up with the Department of Agriculture and they replied giving me the procedure in this wheat program in a 3½-page letter.

It would appear to me that every farmer, if he is to comply with the requirements of the agricultural program, will necessarily have to have a secretary to keep him informed and handle his correspondence on these programs because he certainly could not operate his farm and live up to the requirements as set forth in this letter which pertains only to wheat.

I have concluded that Secretary of Agriculture Benson has reached the point of weariness and exhaustion, and intends to administer and enforce the laws on production and controls that were enacted by the Democratic administration, which I understand former Secretary of Agriculture Brannan did not invoke.

It is my opinion that Secretary Benson fully realizes that if he does enforce the laws that are on the books, and with which I am not too familiar, the American farmer will certainly have his fill of restrictions and regulations that compel him to spend most of his time complying with the laws.

This letter indicates bureaucracy at its worst. If any Member has the time to read what Assistant Secretary of Agriculture Ross Rizley has written, it will give him some idea of what the farmer has to comply with.

If these laws are enforced, as I believe Secretary Benson intends them to be, it will be no time until the farmer will be asking that they be repealed and give him relief from bureaucratic control under which he is now trying to farm.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D. C., June 11, 1954.

Hon. L. H. GAVIN,
House of Representatives.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN GAVIN: This is in further reply to your letter of May 25, 1954, enclosing a copy of a letter from Mr. Roy C. Sanford, Franklin, Pa., and a copy of a letter dated May 19, 1954, which Mr. Sanford received from Sarah Best, office manager for the Venango County Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation (formerly Production and Marketing Administration) Committee, concerning the 1954 wheat marketing quota program as it applies to his farm.

The Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, provides that when wheat acreage allotments are in effect, the county allotment shall be apportioned to all wheat farms in the county on the basis of the past wheat history, the tillable acres, the crop rotation practices, and the type of soil on the farm, and further, the topography of the land in the farm. Farm data were collected from producers in order that proper apportionment of the county allotment could be made by the county ASC Committee among farms within the county. Any farm for which the producer refused to furnish data, data for such farm was obtained from neighbors or other available sources by the county committee, or if such data were not available, an estimate was made by the committee. Every attempt was made to obtain reliable data so that such farms would obtain their just share of the county wheat allotment.

When the acreage allotments for all wheat farms in the county were determined, a notice of the farm allotment was sent each producer. If the producer was dissatisfied with the allotment for his farm, he could appeal within a prescribed 15-day appeal period for a review of the allotment for his farm. A producer who refused to give data for his farm to the farm reporter could furnish the data for his farm during the appeal period, and if it differed from that obtained from other sources or from the estimates, if the data were estimated, and found to be authentic, a redetermination of the allotment for his farm was made. In fact, at any time that a producer who refused to furnish the basic data for his farm later determines to cooperate with the program and furnishes the data, a redetermination of the wheat acreage allotment for his farm will be made.

When wheat acreage allotments only are in effect, a producer who does not wish to cooperate in the program may seed wheat in excess of his allotment and be free to market his wheat without penalty except that he would not be eligible for price support. Every producer, whether he participates in the program or not, is affected and benefited by the price-support provisions of the program and the acreage adjustments in wheat made by his fellow farmers.

When wheat-marketing quotas are in effect, such as they are for the 1954 wheat crop, a producer on whose farm the wheat acreage exceeds the larger of 15 acres, or the wheat allotment for the farm, will have an excess acreage of wheat and be subject to marketing quota penalties. He may avoid penalties by utilizing the excess acreage while in the green stage for green manure, cover crop, hay, pasture, or silage and not have such acreage count against the 15 acres or the allotment, whichever is the larger, provided he designates such acreage to the county committee and completes such practice not later than the date set for completing such practices in the county in which his farm is located.

If the producer does not utilize the excess wheat acreage on his farm as described above, the farm will have a marketing excess which will be subject to marketing-quota penalties.

The farm-marketing excess is determined by multiplying the acreage in excess of 15 acres or the wheat allotment, whichever is higher, by the normal yield for the farm, and is expressed in bushels. The producer on any farm with a farm marketing excess cannot market any of the wheat produced on his farm without penalty until he has taken care of the excess wheat in accordance with wheat-marketing quota regulations for 1954. The term "market" is in the broad sense and includes wheat fed in any form to poultry or livestock, as well as wheat disposed of by sale, barter, etc. (See p. 2 of the 1954 wheat-marketing quota regulations for the full meaning of this term.)

In order to avoid or postpone paying the penalty on excess wheat, a producer may store the excess on the farm, posting a bond or depositing money in escrow to cover the penalty with the treasurer of the county committee, or he may store it in a warehouse and deposit the warehouse receipt with the treasurer, or he may deliver it to the Secretary, following instructions from the county ASC committee.

If the producer stores the excess wheat as outlined above or donates it to the Secretary, he will receive a marketing card permitting him to market the remainder of his wheat without penalty.

If the producer pays the penalty on the excess wheat to the treasurer of the county committee, he will receive a marketing card with which he can market all the wheat produced on the farm without further penalty.

The penalty is fixed by law at 45 percent of the parity price for wheat as of May 1 and for 1954 the rate computes to $1.12 a bushel.

If the producer stores the excess wheat as indicated above, he may be authorized by the county committee to release excess stored wheat in a subsequent year in an amount equal to the normal production of the number of acres he underplants the wheat allotment for the farm in such year (normal production of the underplanted acres is the number of acres planted to wheat under the allotment multiplied by the normal wheat yield for the farm), or by the amount that the actual wheat production on the farm in a subsequent year is less than the normal production of the wheat allotment for the farm in such year. On the other hand, if marketing quotas should not be in effect on the 1955 crop, excess wheat stored may be released from storage without penalty after the termination of the marketing year for the 1954 crop of wheat, or June 30, 1955.

Under existing legislation, whenever the supply of wheat as of July 1 exceeds the normal supply by more than 20 percent, marketing quotas must be proclaimed not later than July 1 for the crop produced in the next succeeding calendar year. Between the date of proclamation and July 25, a referendum, by secret ballot, of farmers who will be subject to quotas, shall be conducted to determine whether such farmers voting in the referendum favor or oppose such quotas. If two-thirds of the farmers voting favor such quotas, marketing quotas shall be in effect on the next succeeding crop of wheat; if more than one-third oppose such quotas, a proclamation suspending such quotas shall be made before the effective date of such quotas.

Through the wheat referendum, whenever wheat marketing quotas must be proclaimed because of the supply situation, wheat farmers who would be subject to the quotas have a voice in the matter and may either reject or accept marketing quotas. For the 1954 crop, 87.2 percent of the farmers voting in the referendum voted in favor of marketing quotas.

If wheat marketing quotas are proclaimed for the 1955 crop of wheat, farmers subject to quotas will have an opportunity to reject or accept such quotas by voting in a referendum which by law must be held before July 25, 1954.

If the producer on a farm prevents measurements from being made to determine the wheat acreage in excess of the wheat allotment, the farm marketing excess shall be the total number of bushels produced in 1954 on the farm.

A thorough examination of the contents of the letter Mr. Sanford received from Sarah Best, office manager for the Venango County ASC Committee, reveals that the letter was in order and that Mr. Sanford was merely being informed how the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and the 1954 wheat marketing quota regulations apply to his operations concerning the production of wheat in 1954 on his farm.

We are enclosing two copies each of the 1954 wheat allotment and 1954 wheat marketing quota regulations for your further information, and have marked certain paragraphs which apply to Mr. Sanford's case.

Sincerely yours,

ROSS RIZLEY,
Assistant Secretary.

Dan Kurzman Reports on Situation in Southeast Asia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK T. BOW
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 28, 1954

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I feel that recent broadcasts on Ray Henle's Three-Star Extra by Dan Kurzman were of such interest that it would be proper to bring them to the attention of all Member of Congress.

Dan Kurzman served for 3 years as Middle East correspondent for the National Broadcasting Co. He has interviewed most of the top figures in the Middle East and north Africa, including Prime Minister Mossadegh, of Iran; Foreign Minister Sharett, of Israel; the Grand Mufti of Jerusalem; "strong man," Colonel Shishakly, of Syria; Foreign Minister Koprulu, of Turkey; Count de Hautecloque, Resident General of Tunisia; General Cuillaume, Resident General of Morocco, and many others.

Mr. Kurzman recently returned to the United States from his Middle-Eastern assignment after completing a round-the-world tour which took him through Spain, Morocco, Algeria, Libya, Afghanistan, Pakistan, India, Ceylon, Malaya, Thailand, French Indochina, Hong Kong, and Japan.

He visited some of the most isolated and backward areas in these countries, crossing the wild, almost roadless desert lands of Afghanistan in a primitive mail truck, exploring the upper Himalayas in Kashmir and along the Tibetan border on a donkey and driving the length of the jungle-covered, terrorist-ridden Malayan Peninsula in an armored jeep.

He was graduated from the University of California and has a degree from the Sorbonne in Paris.

Mr. Kurzman has reported in the Paris Bureau of the International News Service, and now is writing articles on Asia for the Wall Street Journal, the Toronto Star, and other publications.

Recently he made a series of broadcasts on the situation in southeast Asia for Three-Star Extra, NBC.

Mr. Kurzman should be congratulated for his clear and informative coverage of this important subject. His broadcasts follow:

THREE-STAR EXTRA, JUNE 16, 1954
(By Dan Kurzman)

On the basis of my extensive tour of Indochina and southeast Asia, I have come to this conclusion: Our Government's concern that a Communist victory in Indochina would imperil other nations in the area is well founded, but exaggerated.

Indochina itself has not by any means collapsed yet. And if the French can win the battle of the Red River Delta now shaping up in north Vietnam—and they have about an even chance of doing so—Indochina may indeed be saved. If the delta, with its huge population and rice riches, does fall, however, the chances are that the rest of Indochina will go, even if American troops are sent to the rescue. This is true, despite the fact that only Vietnam of the three Indochina states has a large pro-Viet Minh following. Indeed, in the other two states, Cambodia and Laos, the people are violently opposed to this Communist-led organization. One Cambodian peasant, I shall never forget, begged me to take his family to America before the Communists took over the country.

But even if the Reds get all of Indochina, there is no certainty they will get the rest of southeast Asia. They would probably hesitate to gobble up Burma, which has all but destroyed her native Communists in a civil war for fear of kindly resistance in neighboring India. And it would be quite a jump to the Indonesian and the Philippine Islands in the Pacific.

But certainly Malaya and Thailand would be hard pressed if Indochina fell, though conditions in Thailand provide few elements on which communism can feed. There is no history of foreign colonialism and no hunger there. I don't think I ever saw happier, more satisfied people than the smiling Thais working in their ricefields and relaxing in their sampans, which picturesquely crowd the winding canals of the capital city of Bangkok. But the government is extremely corrupt and disunified, offering the Reds an excellent opportunity to take over by coup d'etat, or by invasion from the outside—if the invader were willing to risk going to war with the West.

Malaya, which borders on Thailand, would be a tougher nut to crack. For the British, who control this country, have done a magnificient job of cleaning out the Red guerrillas and winning the confidence of most of the people. But, as one British officer told me, "If Indochina and Thailand fall giving the terrorists access to large-scale supplies from China, we'd have to burn down ever square mile of the Malayan jungle to beat them. What a nightmare."

The danger is that this and other nightmares might come true. But it is important to remember that the Communists would face sizable difficulties and serious risks trying to make them come true.

THREE STAR EXTRA, JUNE 17, 1954

(By Dan Kurzman)

In deciding whether or not to send American troops to Indochina, the Government should take into consideration the nature of the war going on there. It is not simply a clash of armed forces, but of minds. And not all the soldiers and guns in the world can save Indochina, and especially the state of Vietnam, from communism unless the tide of that psychological battle turns.

Why is Vietnam in grave danger of disappearing behind the Bamboo Curtain? Not because of the lack of French manpower, but because Ho Chi Minh's Communist-led Viet Minh has won the confidence of most of his people.

And Ho hasn't had to feed them Marxist dialectics to do this, either. All he has done is to suggest: "Let's kick the French out."

The French, belatedly realizing this, have just agreed to grant Vietnam complete independence, but this action may have come too late.

The attitude of many Vietnamese was reflected in an incident that happened some time ago when I visited a French outpost in north Vietnam. A report came in that three French soldiers had just been killed nearby. Some peasants had shot them with rifles they had hidden in haystacks. The Viet Minh Communist win over peasants such as these by playing up anti-French nationalism until the troops move in. Then, many are sent to indoctrination schools where, after learning to read and write, they are saturated with Red dogmas. They emerge as tailor-made fanatics willing to die for Ho Chi Minh.

There are, of course, a good many who escape the Communist phychological net, realizing they've been tricked. For instance, one man I met, now a high official in the Vietnam Government, once operated an indoctrination school in Viet Minh territory.

"I now realize that I must support the French," he told me, "or we'll have to bow to masters much worse. But do you think many of the people realize that? Even I often doubt whether I'm really fighting for my own country," this official said.

Now that France has finally agreed to let the Vietnamese fight for their own country, perhaps something can still be salvaged from the struggle for the mind, and in turn, from the war of the fortresses.

But as of now if American troops went in as allies of the French, they would probably be greeted by most people not as liberators, but as so many more white masters.

THREE STAR EXTRA, JUNE 18, 1954

(By Dan Kurzman)

With the Communists threatening to take over Indochina, the United States needs friends in Asia now more than ever. For any south Asian military alliance that might be setup would be next to useless if the Asian people are not convinced that we really want to be their friends and not just to use them for our own political and military purposes.

How, then, is the United States doing in winning these people over to our cause? The answer is: We could be doing a lot better. We are depending too much on flag waving, anti-Communist literature and Voice of America broadcasts which are not very effective in this non-Communist part of Asia, for two reasons:

Firstly, only a minute percentage of the people here can read, and even fewer can afford the luxury of a radio. And in any case, there is no electricity in the mud or thatched huts whose inhabitants are precisely the poverty-stricken Asians we must win over.

Secondly, these people are not interested in, and indeed often resent, hearing about how wonderful life is in America. And they resent no less foreigners telling the what kind of political system is best—particularly when those foreigners are still associated with the colonial past.

The United States Information Service libraries are to be found in the most obscure cities, but their usefulness is limited. They are frequented, of course, only by the relatively few Asian literates.

How can we reach the people in the mud and thatched huts? One way is by the proper administration of United States technical aid. I shall never forget the wondrous smiles that lit up the faces of a group of Indian peasants as they were being shown how to operate a tractor by an American technician. That one technician was worth a thousand pamphlets or broadcasts.

He didn't have to give these people any political pep talks. He was showing, not telling, them what America is made of. But point 4 technical aid in itself is not enough; the men who make it work—like the one I have mentioned—must become part of the life of the people they are helping if these people are to have confidence in them and, through them, in the United States.

Only those who would be willing to live simply and without an army of servants should be considered for these positions. In the long run, these shirt-sleeve diplomats—as they have been called—are probably more important in the struggle against communism than all the armies that could be sent to the area.

Speech of Judge J. M. C. Townsend, Court of Appeals of Georgia, Made to the Kiwanis Club of Dalton, Ga.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENDERSON L. LANHAM

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1954

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, with leave to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I am including an address made to the Kiwanis Club, of Dalton, Ga., in June of this year by Judge J. M. C. Townsend, of the Court of Appeals of Georgia.

Judge Townsend is an able and conscientious public servant, and I am glad that he has given his consent to the introduction of his speech into the RECORD. It follows:

In a recent issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD I read a speech delivered February 23, 1954, on the floor of the House of Representatives of the National Congress by the very able Member, Hon. E. L. FORRESTER, of the Third Congressional District of the State of Georgia, a part of which was devoted to the effect of treaties and private agreements made by the President of the United States and the construction given these documents by the Supreme Court.

To say the least, Mr. FORRESTER's speech contained startling information and caused me to write him to the effect that every citizen should inform himself of the facts pointed out therein. Pursuant thereto, I proceeded to make an independent investigation regarding this subject, and what I found caused me to realize that the liberty of the American citizen as guaranteed in the Bill of Rights of the Constitution of the United States is in jeopardy. I found that as far back as 1920 the Supreme Court had held that a treaty properly made and ratified under the provisions of the Constitution of the United States could nullify a provision of the Bill of Rights in the Constitution. That case involved a contest by the State of Missouri of the right of the Federal Government to regulate the shooting of migratory birds within the boundaries of the State of Missouri, under an act of Congress which the State of Missouri contended was in violation of the 10th amendment of the Constitution of the United States. The Supreme Court held that the act of Congress was unconstitutional as being offensive to the 10th amendment, when passed in the first instance, *United States* v. *Shauver* (214 Fed. Rep. 154); *United States* v. *McCullagh* (221 Fed. Rept. 288). Thereafter a treaty was made and properly ratified with the proper Canadian authorities regulating the shooting of wild geese in Canada and in the several States of this Union. When the case thereafter came to the Supreme Court of the United States it was decided in *Missouri* v. *Holland* (252 U. S. 416) in effect that since treaties, as well as the Constitution, are a part of the supreme law of the land, that the treaty in question superceded the 10th amendment to the Constitution and authorized a regulation of migratory game within the borders of the State of Missouri notwithstanding the fact that the Act of Congress seeking to do this same thing was in violation of the 10th amendment. This established one principal that is dangerous to the liberty of every American citizen, that is, that treaties made with foreign powers by the President of the United States and ratified by two-thirds of the members of the Senate present, in conformity with the provisions of the Constitution of the United States relating to treaties, may override the Constitution of the United States. Such a treaty may override any provision of the Constitution of the United States. If such a treaty can override the 10th amendment to the Constitution of the United States, it can override the 1st amendment to the Constitution of the United States. Indeed, it is recalled that in the recent steel seizure cases (*Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co.* v. *Sawyer* (343 U. S. 579)), three justices of the Supreme Court of the United States dissented, holding that notwithstanding the provisions of the fifth amendment to the Constitution of the United States guaranteeing in substance that property shall not be taken except by due process of law, the President of the United States, as the head of the executive branch of the Government thereof, might nevertheless under the authority of the United Nations Charter, a treaty, and the North Atlantic Alliance, a treaty, seize the property.

This means that by treaty life, liberty, and property which the fifth amendment guarantees will not be taken except by due process of law may nevertheless be taken. The fact that a majority of the Court held that the steel industry could not be seized does not necessarily mean that a majority of the Court is now prepared to take an opposite view to that taken by the Court in the Missouri case. The majority could just as well have considered that this particular treaty could not have that effect. What greater danger could confront the American people than for it to be within the power of one man, the President, and a small group of United States Senators constituting two-thirds of the Members present, to take the life, or the liberty, or the property, of any American citizen without due process of law, merely by entering into an agreement with a foreign country by the terms of which this may be done? The Supreme Court of the United States, however, has not stopped merely with constitutionally made and ratified treaties. Private secret agreements sometimes made on foreign soil have been given the same legal effect as treaties made pursuant to the Constitution, which includes ratification by two-thirds of the Senators present. This has been held in *Etlimar Societe Anonyme* v. *U. S.* (106 Fed. Supp. 191); *U. S.* v. *Pink* (315 U. S. 203); *U. S.* v. *Belmont* (301 U. S. 324); *B. Altman & Co.* v. *U. S.* (224 U. S. 583), and other cases, notwithstanding the fact that there is no constitutional authority for the making of such an agreement, and no logical theory upon which such an agreement could be held to be a treaty within the meaning of the Constitution of the United States regarding that subject.

People are presumed to know the law. Citizens are chargeable with knowledge of the law. Ignorance of the law is no excuse for its violation. It is, however, impossible and there is no means by which a citizen can learn the contents of a secret agreement made by the President of the United States with a foreign power. Such agreements have, notwithstanding this fact, been held to have the force and effect of law. In case of its violation on the part of a citizen, ignorance thereof is no excuse. Caligula was regarded as one of ancient Rome's greatest tyrants. When he came into the full bloom of his power, the practice had long been to write the laws and statutes of Rome on the walls and columns of the city. They were written at the base so that people in passing along the streets could pause and read the law and thereby familiarize themselves with its provisions, in order that they might make better and more law-abiding citizens. Caligula had these laws chiseled off the base of the columns and written in fine print at the very top, where no citizen could read. The laws were changed. Caligula's plan was to trick the citizen into violating the law in order that he might work gruesome and whimsical punishments for violations of laws on the part of citizens because of their ignorance of the law. The people of ancient Rome, however, had a distinct advantage over the citizen of America. They could procure a ladder and climb to the top of the walls and columns and there read and familiarize themselves with the contents of the law. It was a method available to them by which they might inform themselves. Not so with the American citizen. There is no way under the sun by which he can find out what the law is, so long as it is based on a secret agreement made between the Chief Executive of this country and some foreign power, probably on foreign soil.

When the Constitution of the United States was being proposed by its framers in Philadelphia between the years 1787 and 1789, it was finally decided that the document would not include a bill of rights; that laws could be enacted that would protect the citizen from his public servants which would be adequate for this purpose. At that time, Thomas Jefferson, who took no part in the Constitutional Conventions, was an emissary to France. He wrote that since the document contained no bill of rights, he was opposed to its adoption. The people throughout the original 13 States were loathe to suport its adoption because it failed to contain a bill of rights. They were thinking of what a recent government headed by King George III of England had done to them. They wanted to be sure that no other government could do that. The result was that outstanding men who took part in the Constitutional Convention—such men as George Washington, John Jay, Alexander Hamilton, James Madison, and others, wrote articles, caused handbills to be distributed, made speeches, visited State legislatures, and otherwise supported the adoption of the Constitution, at the same time promising that if it was adopted a bill of rights would be appended thereto and proposed for amendment immediately. This was done. In 1791 the Bill of Rights consisting of the first 10 amendments to the Constitution became a part of that great document. Every war that has been fought by this country since the adoption of the Bill of Rights has been fought to keep it in the Constitution.

We say these wars have been fought to preserve our way of life. What is our way of life? The right to a free speech, a free press, freedom of religion, protection from our public servants, assurances that life, liberty, and property will not be taken except by due process of law. If Russia has such a document, its dictators have ignored its provisions. In Russia there is no free speech. In Russia there is no free press. The officers of the Government of Russia can trample upon the rights of the citizens. What is the difference between Russia and the United States? Every difference by which we exercise and enjoy an advantage over the people of Russia is created by and inherent in the Bill of Rights.

I have always labored under the false impression that there were only two ways by which the rights guaranteed in the Bill of Rights could be taken from the American people. If the American people wanted to give up those rights, they could, in the manner provided by the Constitution, cause it to be amended so as to delete these rights from that document. I knew this would never happen. The people would never voluntarily relinquish those sacred gems of liberty. I knew that if ever a force sufficiently powerful should overthrow the Government of this country, that that force would set up a government of its own, and that thereby the Bill of Rights, as well as the whole Constitution, would be destroyed. But it never occurred to me that the Constitution could be destroyed by a treaty made by one man and ratified by a small group of men. The President of the United States, the Senators of the United States, and the Supreme Court of the United States, are under oath to support and uphold the Constitution of the United States. When a President makes a treaty with a foreign nation in conflict with any provision of the Constitution of the United States, he has violated that oath. When a Senator votes to ratify a treaty which is in conflict with a single provision of the Constitution of the United States, such Senator has violated that oath. When the Supreme Court renders a decision preferring such treaty over a provision of the Constitution of the United States, and in conflict therewith, every member of the Supreme Court voting for that decision has violated that oath.

The Constitution provides for three branches of government, the executive, the legislative, and the judicial. The executive is made amenable to the people. The President must be elected every 4 years. The legislative is amenable to the people. The Members of the House of Representatives must be elected every 2 years. They cannot ever be appointed. The only way they can occupy a seat in that great body is by election by the people whom they serve. The Senators are elected every 6 years.

The third branch, headed by the Supreme Court of the United States, is amenable to no power on the face of this earth. They are amenable only to God after death. A part of the first provision of the constitution of the State of Georgia reads as follows: "Public officers are the trustees and servants of the people and at all times amenable to them." The Supreme Court heads up the third and most powerful branch of the Federal Government and should also be amenable to the people. I propose amendments to the Constitution:

First, a provision that the supreme law of the land be, first, the Constitution and its amendments; second, the acts of Congress; third, treaties, and that no private agreement shall be considered a treaty unless ratified as provided in the Constitution.

Second, that the Constitution of the United States be further amended so as to provide also, as does that of the State of Georgia, that public officers are the servants and trustees of the people and at all times amenable to them. It would have a wholesome effect on all the public servants of the people of the United States of America if there was written into the Constitution that they are servants of the people and at all times amenable to them. Public servants need to be reminded of this fact in order to avoid a mental leaning toward dictatorship coupled with the power bestowed with a commission to hold office.

Third, I propose that the United States be divided into judicial districts and that the Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States be elected by the people of that judicial district to serve on the Supreme Court of the United States for a stated term. In this way all the branches of Government and all the public officers therein will be servants of the people and at all times amenable to them.

Without this, the liberty of the American people is in grave danger. If the Supreme Court can do away with one stroke of the pen with the 10th amendment to the Constitution of the United States as it did in the case of *Missouri* v. *Holland* in 1920, and as it reiterated in the segregation cases recently, it can do away with the 1st amendment. It could, by recognizing a treaty to that effect, do away with a free press; do away with freedom of speech; do away with freedom of religion. If the 10th amendment can be done away with, and the 5th amendment can be done away with, then so, also, can the 1st amendment be done away with.

The people of America must be forewarned of the danger of the loss of their precious gems of liberty, so gallantly defended against every attack by its young men on the field of battle.

Views of Commonwealth Club of San Francisco on McCarran-Walter Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEROY JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1954

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including a poll taken by the Commonwealth Club of California on the McCarran-Walter Act. This poll not only tries to obtain from the membership their views as to the retention of the act as it is, but also their views on various features of the McCarran-Walter Act. The poll is being printed with this extension of remarks, and I think the membership of the House would be very much interested in reading it.

The Commonwealth Club has been in existence for over 50 years. I believe it to be the most unique club of its kind in the entire Nation. The club has been addressed by practically every President of the United States from the days of Theodore Roosevelt.

The club studies all kinds of governmental problems, ranging from municipal problems to problems of the National Government. These studies are made by sections which correspond to subcommittees of our various House committees. The section makes a detailed study of the problem submitted to it and then makes a report to the club on its findings. This report consists of discussions pro and con on the report of the section. In that way the club and its members are able to make balanced decisions as they have heard both sides of the problem and its various facets.

To me that kind of a poll is the most authentic as it represents the considered judgment of those who voted, based on fact and discussion.

Here follows the poll:

VOTE OF COMMONWEALTH CLUB OF CALIFORNIA

Results of membership ballot, tabulated June 2, 1954, taken following circulation to all Commonwealth Club members of attached issue of the Commonwealth containing report of club's immigration section summarizing all viewpoints pro and con:

1. (a) Do you favor amending the McCarran-Walter Act as to existing immigration quotas?[1] Yes, 540; no, 605.

(b) Should the McCarran-Walter Act be amended by eliminating quotas based on national origins and permitting immigration up to the authorized grant total quota of 154,657 without respect to nationality?[1] Yes, 332; no, 812.

(c) Should the McCarran-Walter Act be amended by permitting unfilled quotas of one nation to be used by immigrants from another nation, up to the authorized grand total quota of 154,657?[1] Yes, 457; no, 685.

2. (a) Should immigration preference be based upon the immigrant's intellectual and physical capacities? Yes, 966; no, 174.

(b) Should any such system be (check one only):

(1) Subject to national origins quotas, as now provided under McCarran-Walter Act?[1] 741.

(2) Without regard to national origins? 400.

3. Should the McCarran-Walter Act be amended to give, as a matter of right, to persons claiming citizenship but residing abroad, a hearing if denied letter of entry? Yes, 976; no, 181.

4. Should the immigration law continue to permit arrest and search of suspected illegal entrants without a warrant? Yes, 765; no, 467.

5. (a) Should the provision for cancellation of naturalization for fraudulent representations, regardless of length of citizenship, be repealed? Yes, 253; no, 926.

(b) Should the provision for cancellation for naturalization if citizen within 5 years becomes a member of subversive organization be repealed? Yes, 154; no, 1,016.

6. Should a 5-year statute of limitations apply to:

(a) Deportation cases? Yes, 281; no, 851.

(b) De-naturalization cases? Yes, 305; no, 808.

7. (a) Which should be the primary consideration in our immigration policy (check one only):

(1) Welfare of the United States? 1,136.

(2) Welfare of the immigrant? 27.

(b) Can the welfare of both be safeguarded in the same immigration policy? Yes, 913; no, 224.

---

[1] Nations having quotas over 1,000 are Great Britain and Northern Ireland, 65,361; Germany, 25,814; Ireland, 17,756; Poland, 6,488; Italy, 5,645; Sweden, 3,295; Netherlands, 3,136; France, 3,069; Czechoslovakia, 2,859; Russia, 2,697; Norway, 2,364; Switzerland, 1,698; Austria, 1,405; Belgium, 1,297; Denmark, 1,175. Grand total present possible immigration by quota, all nations: 154,657. The quota act originally went into effect in 1924, with quotas prorated on a percentage basis to each country according to the national origins of the United States population. In subsequent amendments, the 1920 census was taken as the basis for these percentages.

Association of Washington Cities, Representing Some 245 Cities of the State of Washington, Endorse Policy of New Approach to Our National Parks in the West

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1954

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, the following resolution was adopted by the recent statewide convention of Washington cities in Spokane concerning the development of Mount Rainier National Park. It should be brought to the attention of the Members of Congress:

Whereas the members of the Association of Washington Cities, representing some 245 cities of the State of Washington, are fully aware that Mount Rainier is the greatest single scenic attraction—draws tens of thousands of tourists and visitors each year to the State of Washington; and

Whereas the tourist industry is the third largest contributing factor in the economy of Washington State and in full realization of the fact that these tourists' expenditures within the State directly benefit every city within the State of Washington through the medium of the collection of additional taxes, both State and local in nature; and

Whereas it is universally recognized that the overwhelming majority of the people in the State of Washington are eagerly awaiting a more enlightened and modern approach to the operation of Mount Rainier National Park so as to permit its use on a year around recreational basis by the people of the State of Washington and the Nation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the 1954 annual statewide convention of the Association of Washington cities, meeting in Spokane, Wash., on June 11, 1954, does hereby petition Secretary of the Interior Douglas McKay to direct the National Parks Service to initiate new policies and a new program relative to Rainier National Park so as to accomplish the following forthwith:

(1) Year around maintenance on the Paradise Valley road so as to permit the year round access of the public to Paradise Valley. Furthermore, that completion of the Stevens Canyon Road be accomplished at the earliest possible date thereby permitting access more readily to Mount Rainier by the populations of eastern Washington.

(2) The initiation of policies to permit the construction of permanent uphill transportation facilities for use by summer tourists and sightseers and winter-skiing and outdoor-sports enthusiasts.

(3) The early development of modern overnight hotel, lodge, or cabin accomodations to serve the ever-increasing number of visitors and tourists to Mount Rainier National Park both summer and winter.

In conclusion, be it respectfully brought to the attention of the Honorable Douglas McKay, Secretary of the Interior, that the members of this association of Washington cities endorse the policy of a new approach to our National Parks in the West and the recreational areas within the National Parks developed under close control and supervision of the National Parks Service with the rest of the National Park areas in each instance being continued in the wilderness state for utilization by those conservation groups, mountaineer groups and other similar groups. The enactment of this type of policy will permit the use of our National Parks in the West by all members of the public in contrast to the present practices and policies which actually restrict their successful use by relatively small numbers of our State and National populations.

National Electrical Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1954

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, as scientists develop the means to utilize atomic power, it is not a case of replacing electricity. It is not a case of off with the old and on with the new or the king is dead, long live the king.

All the headlines today regarding atomic research and its peacetime potential cannot diminish the value of man's harnessing electrical energy and our continuing and increasing use and need of this great resource for better living.

I have today introduced a joint resolution before this body to designate the third week in October as National Electrical Week. The resolution authorizes and requests the President of the United States to issue annually a proclamation setting aside this week in recognition of the important contributions made to our way of life by all segments of the electrical industry, and to help make all Americans aware of the outstanding role played in our lives by electricity.

But these are not the only purposes behind such a proclamation.

The coming of electricity created new problems which have been solved, but which need continual policing. Bad wiring in homes, resulting in fires, and improper use of electrical equipment, resulting often in severe and permanent personal injuries, are some of the consequences of abusing this faithful and helpful servant.

To understand electricity we must know about it, and to know about it we must make certain basic rules of treatment available to all who use it. This, to my mind, is the outstanding reason for a period of recognition, understanding, and learning about our great assistant. It seems to me only one of the obligations we owe ourselves as a result of the benefits we receive from electricity.

Three States figure prominently in the history behind the introduction of my resolution—Michigan, Illinois, and Washington. One organization, the International Association of Electrical Inspectors, and several fine individuals, including Capt. Stephen E. Sanislo, of the Seattle Fire Department, also deserve mention for their efforts in promoting safe and sane use of electricity.

In Washington and Michigan successful electrical safety campaigns have been conducted. The success of these campaigns to impress the public with the details of safe dealing with electricity led to a movement to bring the dream of a National Electrical Week to reality, under the sponsorship of the International Association of Electrical Inspectors. This association, meeting in Chicago for its silver jubilee last September, enthusiastically endorsed the program. It has been my privilege to frame and introduce the appropriate legislation.

Mr. Speaker, there should be no controversy over this resolution. National Electrical Week will stress five major points:

First. The importance of electricity in our everday life.

Second. That electricity, when properly installed, used and maintained, is the safest method known for producing light, heat, and power.

Third. That the quality of the service rendered by electricity depends on adequote wiring, design, and installation.

Fourth. The importance of the national electrical code in achieving electrical safety.

Fifth. The importance of inspection by proper authorities at regular periods.

These are the objectives of National Electrical Week. I am confident the Congress will agree that they are indeed worthy.

The Air Training Command

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1954

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, in the June 19, 1954, issue of the Army-Navy-Air Force magazine there appeared an enlightening article written by Lt. Gen. Robert W. Harper, commander of the Air Training Command, United States Air Force, explaining the operations of that command.

As I informed the House on Wednesday, June 23, General Harper retires from active duty on June 30, next. He is one of the most efficient and able officers in the Armed Forces. His retirement will be a definite loss to the Air Force. The Nation is fortunate, however, that our Armed Forces are made up of many men of the same high caliber as General Harper, and are fitted to carry on the great work of their predecessors.

I again extend to General Harper an expression of my high esteem and great admiration for him as an officer and as a gentleman.

The article, above-mentioned, follows:

The Air Training Command

(By Lt. Gen. Robert W. Harper, USAF, commander)

In the United States Air Force, as in industry, it has been found that there is no substitute for formal instruction at functional schools. The huge task of training Air Force personnel falls on the Air Training Command, largest single command in the Air Force.

From its headquarters at Scott Air Force Base, Ill., the ATRC stretches across the country from east to west, north to south. Its 42 bases conduct training courses which run the gamut from cooks and bakers to qualified jet pilots. With the exception of schools of the Air University, all formalized individual training in the Air Force for everyone from the newest and youngest airmen to seasoned general officers is the responsibility of the Training Command.

In order to keep a close control over the training, ATRC is divided into three Training Air Forces. The Technical Training Air Force is under the command of Maj. Gen. Eugene L. Eubank, with headquarters at Gulfport, Miss. It operates 7 large technical schools, 2 basic military training schools, and 1 air defense school.

Waco, Tex., is the headquarters of the Flying Training Air Force. Under the command of Maj. Gen. Gabriel Disosway, FTAF supervises the operation of 24 flying schools. These schools take the raw aviation cadet through his training until he earns his coveted silver wings.

The Crew Training Air Force, under the command of Maj. Gen. Charles F. Born, has its headquarters at Randolph Air Force Base, Tex., and operates eight combat crew schools. It is in these schools that the graduate pilot is molded into an efficient crew member ready for combat.

The impressive box score compiled in aerial combat over Korea was directly traceable to superior training of combat crews. We are far behind the Iron Curtain countries in total manpower—therefore, we must fight quantity with quality. Right now we are ahead in skilled, and potentially skilled, manpower. We must stay ahead.

Personnel who are intimately concerned with the future and present planning policies of the ATRC are not at all concerned with keeping it the biggest command in the Air Force. The size will continually fluctuate according to Air Force requirements. The continuing emphasis at the top levels, and it prevails throughout the command, is to keep the quality of the training at the peak. I like to say, "We'd rather be good than big."

When the ATRC was born in July of 1943, the job description for the Commanding General, Training Command, stated that he "will be responsible for the training of individuals in the techniques of aerial gunnery, bombing, navigation, aerial observation, and piloting military aircraft (including gliders), and in mechanical, technical, administrative, and associated subjects to meet the proficiency standards established by the Commanding General, Army Air Forces; for the administration of the basic training program; and for the administration of the aviation cadet preflight program, the AAF college training program, and the training of individuals at civil-contract schools under his jurisdiction."

Basically, the mission of the Training Command hasn't changed since then, but the ever-growing complexity of modern combat equipment makes for training problems today that were barely imagined 10 years ago.

Vast strides in development of new aircraft and electronics equipment, new concepts of aerial warfare, our own vulnerability to aerial attack via the top-of-the-world routes, and the tremendously increased requirements for ground support are all adding to the immense problems of training a modern air force.

In a little over 10 years of operation, the ATRC has reached many significant training milestones.

Item: 250,000 pilots, 51,000 navigators, 47,000 bombardiers, and over 2 million technicians in the World War II years.

Item: In 1950, with the beginning of hostilities in Korea, the ATRC was called upon to expand from a small, peacetime nucleus into a full-powered training organization without sacrificing quality. During fiscal year 1951 the command came through with 2,100 pilots, 3,575 navigator-bombardiers, 300 instrument-pilot instructors, 50 fighter gunnery instructors, 80 Air Force helicopter pilots, and 139 liaison, and 103 helicopter pilots for the Army Field Forces. In addition, the command turned out 124,350 technicians and 635 nonrated Air Force officers.

During fiscal year 1953 the ATRC expanded to over 300,000 people with 42 bases, 4 headquarters, and a mobile training group operating at locations all over the world. Reduced personnel requirements have caused a reduction in numbers, but the quality of the finished product remains high.

The Training Command is continually conducting research to improve the training courses. Just as industry changes with new requirements, so does the Training Command. New equipment, new concepts, new requirements—all are contributing to drastic changes in the training program. But the changes are careful and studied ones—changes which will turn out a jet pilot, a jet mechanic, or a clerk-typist who is even better prepared than his brother airmen of yesterday.

The United States may not have the biggest Air Force, but it must have the best. That is the challenge.

Un-American Activities Committee Hearings in Seattle, Wash.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1954

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, in connection with my remarks to the House today, I wish to include in the Record an editorial which appeared in the Seattle Times of June 21, 1954. I commend it to the reading of my colleagues:

Alerting the Public Without Hysterics

Seattle has had the fortune to witness at close range a congressional investigation conducted on the high-minded level which invariably should characterize an action of the Congress of the United States. The Un-American Activities Committee of the House of Representatives, in the course of its Seattle hearing, demonstrated to this community that a congressional inquiry into Communist subversion can be carried on without bitterness or innuendo, rancor, or injustice, for specific purpose and with constructive result.

The Velde committee's hearing here brought to light the methods which communism pursues to penetrate the life and activities of a community, its organizations and its institutions. It disclosed the extent to which these subversive efforts have succeeded and how, in important instances, they have failed. It clarified for Seattle citizens the nature of the ever-present danger and put them on vigilant guard against the insidious infiltration of hidden subversive forces into strategic areas of political, industrial, and economic enterprise.

The committee produced evidence of subversion of which many had been fully aware, but it went on to uncover hitherto unsuspected pockets of the Communist conspiracy in a locality which undoubtedly is a major target for Communist ambitions in this country. While serving the larger purpose of exposing the Communist threat to the national security, it did the people of this particular area the great favor of informing them of what has been going on right around them over the years.

It is notable that the inquiries of this congressional group left behind no wake of disunity and mutual recrimination, except the natural indignation of good Americans provoked by treachery and treason, and the inevitable clamor of counterpropaganda from Communists themselves and their fellow travelers. In that respect, the Seattle hearing stands in sharp contrast to the McCarthy-Army squabble in the Nation's Capital, which has served to disrupt the unity of thought and purpose of the American people beyond any episode in the Nation's recent history, without the compensation of constructive result whatsoever, as far as now can be foreseen.

Communism is an issue on which the people of this country, fundamentally, are in almost universal accord, with the exception of the comparatively few who have betrayed their heritage. To misuse this issue for personal, political, or vindictive advantage would be in itself an indefensible betrayal of the national purpose.

The Velde committee functions in pursuit of its constitutional prerogative of seeking facts upon which to base remedial legislation. It has no other objective. Thereby it is acting in the best interests of the people of the United States, without political, partisan, or political motive. That is precisely the service a committee of the Congress should perform.

This high-minded and dignified approach to the foremost problem confronting this country today has renewed confidence in the efforts of Congress and of the Federal Government to preserve the country's free institutions from their present jeopardy.

Monroe Doctrine Is Still Sound

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 28, 1954

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, Texans have an especially acute sense of the vital importance of our relations with our neighbors in Central and South America. They realize, from generations of immediate contact, that the nations of the Western Hemisphere must live together in a spirit of mutual trust and support.

This awareness was expressed clearly and lucidly last Thursday by the Dallas Morning News, one of the leading newspapers in my State. In an editorial entiled "Monroe Doctrine Is Still Sound," the newspaper presented an excellent summary of the motives behind the resolution which was agreed to in the Senate on Friday.

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

MONROE DOCTRINE IS STILL SOUND

Senator Lyndon Johnson's call to Congress Tuesday means simply that the Monroe Doctrine be restated in up-to-date terms. It means, too, restating the Truman doctrine in the narrower but vitally important terms of the Western Hemisphere.

When the Monroe Doctrine was enunciated (with, oddly enough, the instigation as well as the blessing of the British Prime Minister and the protection of the British fleet), it was intended to aline the new-won independence of every American Republic in a policy of self-government free of European colonialism and rapacity. At the moment there was no question that the burden of maintaining the principle would fall upon this country. In that sense only was the Monroe Doctrine a United States of America project.

Central and South American nations have in the meantime grown to greatness. Today the exclusion of foreign hegemony from the many American Republics is a matter for all, not for this country alone. But the principle of the Monroe Doctrine is as sound now as when it was made. Today when Latin America recognizes that our resolution, however selfish, is not aggressive and is as much in hemispheric as national interest, the Guatemalan situation raises the issue sharply and clearly. That is what Senator Johnson meant in asking his colleagues to go on record on a new version of the far-from-shopworn theme. It is simply, the Americas for the Americas.

The Russian or Communist infiltration of Guatemala may differ in appearance from an armed invasion by conquistadores. But it differs not at all either in intent or in effect. The Kremlin has already made a new Poland out of Guatemala. It must not be permitted to capitalize further and must be excluded from its present position.

The existence of United Nations may militate against this essential doctrine. But, if this should prove true, the Western Hemisphere would have to abandon U. N. U. N. Charter provisions legalize mutual defense measures against aggression. This will, in the probable opinion of a U. N. majority, prevent such a veto as the Soviet threatened last week, from blocking the necessary mutuality in preserving intact the integrity of the three republican Americas.

Cheers for Flatley High

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PORTER HARDY, JR.

OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 28, 1954

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, I call to the attention of the House an editorial which appeared in the Norfolk Virginian-Pilot on June 17. The editorial very appropriately commends Capt. James H. Flatley, commanding officer of the naval air station at Norfolk, for his sponsorship of a novel educational program.

It may be that other naval and military installations could profit by a similar undertaking, and I want to add my words of congratulation to Captain Flatley for this excellent work. The editorial follows:

CHEERS FOR FLATLEY HIGH

Flatley High School at the Norfolk Naval Air Station is unofficial as far as the Navy is concerned and has no formally recognized status as an educational institution. Yet this year more than 400 Navy enlisted men have received high-school diplomas, or their equivalents, from various State departments of education for courses taken in this school. Before the year has ended, some 600 students will have been graduated in a sense just as acceptable—educationally speaking—as if they had received their diplomas in an accredited high school on some tree-shaded street in their hometowns.

The standards of Flatley High meet general accrediting standards. Students who graduate from the naval air station's unofficial high school pass general educational level tests that are uniformly applied in the States, or acceptable to State departments of education, and they are prepared to go on to higher education.

This purely voluntary high school at a naval installation is a result of a flair for education possessed by Capt. James H. Flatley, commanding officer of the naval air station. A combination of correspondence courses is used under a plan of supervised and cooperative study. But some special courses are employed to serve both individual and group needs. The students are volunteers, and so are the instructors. There are 14 well-qualified instructors on the staff and 21 in reserve. The school meets alternately on Tuesday and Wednesday nights. The instructors as well as the students give their time to the cause of education.

This special-activities, leisure-time program (as it might be called) makes for a better Navy by filling in the blank spaces in the education of enlisted men. It raises morale and esprit de corps. It is all over and beyond the call of duty and deserves some rousing civilian cheers.

Bay State Coast Offers Fine Salt Water Fishing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL

OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 28, 1954

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an article entitled "Bay State Coast Offers Fine Salt Water Fishing," published in the Boston Post of Sunday, June 27, 1954, relative to fishing opportunities in Massachusetts and New England.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

BAY STATE COAST OFFERS FINE SALT WATER FISHING

For the best all-around salt water sport fishing, Massachusetts is indeed hard to beat. Hundreds of varieties are waiting to be taken along 1,800 miles of coastline, and thousands of fishermen and women will be there to take them right up to late fall.

There's the bluefish—fightingist game fish, pound-for-pound, abounding in our waters. There are giant tuna, marlin, swordfish, and the wily, ever-prized striped bass—all worthy battlers.

If you want to know where to go, what equipment, lures, and bait to use, look at the handy fishing calendar the Post is publishing today as a public service.

It was compiled by the Massachusetts Development and Industrial Commission and tells you everything you need to know. It tells "where, when and how," for the entire coastline.

Folks will be using every means to get out on the water. They'll be fishing from private boats, craft of all types and sizes, from docks and piers, from jettys, from rocks and the surf.

That surf fishing, for blues and stripers, is the top attraction along Cape Cod beaches.

Few people know it, but there is also excellent fishing to be had using fresh water tackle along the Cape. While the boys with the heavy tackle are going after the big ones, you can cast 25 and 30 feet from shore in East Dennis, for instance, and haul in many a baby striper and baby bluefish. They put up a surprisingly strong fight. Try sea worms on them.

Another thing about salt water fishing: you can do it at night. Bridges, inland Cape waterways and the beaches are thronged almost everynight throughout the season. They're all there, men, women, and children—after stripers and blues and whatever else they can hook. They may have different methods, but all are agreed that it sure is a lot of fun.

Here is the fishing calendar:

Where, when, and how to fish

Species	Location	Season	Baits and lures	
Striped bass	Whole coast—For details on hot spots, surf casting beaches, rivers, see special section.	May through October	Sea worms, eels, eel skins, squid, herring; jigs of all types, plugs, spinners, spoons, flies.	Casting with light tackle, fly casting, casting from boat, surf casting, trolling, plug-chumming.
Giant tuna	Ipswich Bay, Cape Cod Bay, Provincetown.	Late July through September.	Whole mackerel, other bait fish, squid; large feathered lures.	Trolling or chumming. Heavy tackle only.
School tuna	South of Cape Cod, off Nantucket Island, Buzzards Bay.	do	do	Trolling or chumming, medium tackle.
White marlin	Nantucket Sound, south of Martha's Vineyard and Nantucket.	do	Mullet, mackerel, cut baits; feathered lures.	Trolling; medium tackle.
Swordfish	Northeast of Cape Ann, Gloucester, Nantucket Sound, south of Martha's Vineyard, Nantucket.	July and August	Mackerel, menhaden, mullet, herring, squid; all either whole or cut.	Trolling, heavy tackle.
Bluefish	All waters south of Cape Cod and islands, Outer Cape Cod beaches; occasionally north of Cape Cod.	August through September.	All smaller fish; jigs, spoons, small plugs, spinners, streamer flies.	Fly or bait casting tackle, boat-rods, surf casting.
Snapper, bluefish	Waters south of Cape Cod, river mouths, coves, bays.	do	Spinners, spoons, streamer flies, small plugs.	Fly or bait casting tackle.
Benito	South of Cape Cod, outer Cape Cod waters, Martha's Vineyard, Nantucket.	Late July toSeptember	Any small bait fish, small mackerel, crab or clam bits, sea worms, squid, small jigs, spoons, plugs, streamer flies.	Fly and bait casting tackle light boat-rods.
Pollock	Provincetown, Manomet, Plymouth, north to New Hampshire line.	May to October; best runs May and September.	Plugs, wet and dry flies, jigs, spinners, spoons, feather lures; almost any bait.	Still fishing, casting from boat with surf, bait or fly rod.
Squeteague or weakfish	Cape Cod Bay, Nantucket Sound, outer Cape Cod waters off rapidly shelving beaches, deep bays, estuaries.	Late June through September.	Minnows, shrimp, sea worms, shedder crab, squid, plugs, spinners, spoons, small jigs; feathered lures, flies.	Still fishing, float fishing, chumming, surf casting, fly and bait casting, trolling.
Mackerel	Whole coast	July throughSeptember.	Small bait, fish, crab or clam bits, sea worms, squid strips, small jigs, spoons, spinners, streamer flies, plugs.	Trolling, chumming, fly and bait casting.
Tautog or blackfish	Whole coast; rocky bottom inshore bays, harbors, jetties, beaches, breakwaters.	May to November	Crabs, clams, all shellfish; rarely on artificials.	Still fishing, surf casting, boat fishing.
Seabass	Cape Cod and south; rocky shores, rocks in water less than 15 fathoms deep around wrecks.	Mid-June through September.	Crabs, shrimp, clams, menhaden, sand ells.	Still fishing.
Scup of porgy	Cape Cod Bay, outer Cape Cod waters from 2 to 20 fathoms, prefer sandy bottom.	May through October	Clams, sea worms, shrimp, crab claw, squid bits.	Still fishing from boat, pier, breakwater; fly rod gives best sport.
Winter flounder	Whole coast; shoal water, usually sandy bottoms.	Year round	Clams, sea worms, squid bits, shrimp.	Still fishing from boat, pier, and breakwater.
Summer flounder or fluke.	Whole coast; best fishing south of Boston.	Mid-June through September.	Live minnows, clams, squid bits, shrimp, small jigs, spinners, feather lures, fish-deep.	Still fishing from boat, pier, breakwater, deep trolling, surf casting.
Whiting or kingfish	South of Cape Cod; inshore, often run into fresh water, prefer sandy or hard bottom.	May to October	Shrimp, crabs, clams, sea worms, minnows, small jigs, spoons, feathered lures, spinners.	Still fishing, surf casting, boat casting or trolling, chumming.
Cod	Whole coast; deep water; run inshore during late fall and winter.	Year round	Take almost any bait	Still fishing; surf casting with fish finder rig.
Haddock	North of Cape Cod	May to November	do	Still fishing from boat.
Shad	Brackish and fresh water at river mouths; Connecticut River north to Holyoke Dam.	April through June	Flies, spinners, small shiny lures. garden hackle with spinner.	Fly and bait casting; chumming, still fishing after spawning.
Smelt	River mouths along whole coast	Best late fall and winter; move offshore in spring, summer.	Sea worms, shrimp, minnows, clams, small red flies.	Still fishing from boat, ice fishing, fly casting.

Compiled by Massachusetts Development and Industrial Commission.

Johnson Resolution Reaffirms United States Ban on Foreign Interference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 28, 1954

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the Houston Post, one of the most widely read and quoted newspapers in my State, has presented an excellent summary of the resolution which we adopted in this Chamber by an overwhelming vote on Friday.

In an editorial the Post pointed out that this resolution aims at both peace within the Americas and the defense of the Americas against external aggression. It also points out that the defense of the Western Hemisphere is not a partisan issue but an issue upon which all Americans can unite.

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Houston Post of June 24, 1954]

JOHNSON RESOLUTION REAFFIRMS UNITED STATES BAN ON FOREIGN INTERFERENCE

Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON, of Texas, offered a concurrent resolution in the Senate Tuesday which seems destined to become a historic pronouncement of the first magnitude. It declares the sense of Congress "that the United States should reaffirm its determination to prevent interference in Western Hemisphere affairs by the Soviet Communists and take all necessary and proper steps to insure that the Organization of American States take direct and appropriate action to prevent any further Soviet interference in the affairs of the states of the Western Hemisphere."

In offering the resolution, Senator JOHNSON backed up the United States position in the United Nations that the Guatemalan trouble is a matter to be considered by the Organization of American States and not one to be meddled with by Russia, through the U. N. or otherwise. "Whatever the future may hold," he declared in a speech to the Senate, "the fighting in Guatemala does not now endanger world security. The issue is properly one for consideration by the American States." He also pointed out that no question of interference by the United States in the domestic affairs of another American country is involved; that the only question is one of external aggression.

Senator JOHNSON is minority leader in the Senate. Hence his resolution signifies that the American position in the U. N. is not a subject of argument between our political parties, but is that of both Democrats and Republicans.

Adoption of this resolution will add a new chapter to the story of the doctrine that Western Hemisphere countries are not to be subjected to aggression by outside powers. The first occasion for the announcement of that doctrine, like the occasion for the JOHNSON resolution, was provided by Russia.

In 1821, Czar Alexander I issued a ukase prohibiting fishing and navigation by others than his subjects within 100 miles of the Pacific coast of North America from the Bering Straits southward to latitude 51. In 1823, the American Government, headed by President James Monroe, denounced the Russian ukase and asserted that "the American continents are no longer subjects for any new colonial establishments." Later in the year, the better known form of the doctrine was contained in President Monroe's December 2 message to Congress. This was called forth by the threat that the so-called holy alliance, of which Russia was the strongest member, would overthrow independent governments established in former colonies of Spain in the New World.

The original Monroe Doctrine was strictly unilateral. Its successor is an often expressed understanding among all the countries of the hemisphere. This all-American doctrine aims at both peace within the Americas and their defense against external aggression.

Texans generally will agree with the language of the JOHNSON resolution and will be proud that a Senator from their State has made this contribution to American unity and to American history.

The So-Called McCarthy Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH E. FLANDERS

OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 28, 1954

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD sundry editorials, as follows: one entitled "Not a Party Matter," from the New York Times; one entitled "Joe McCARTHY Versus the GOP," from the San Francisco Chronicle of June 17, 1954; one entitled "If This Be Senility," from the Minneapolis Tribune of June 13, 1954; one entitled "What's the Verdict on McCARTHY?" from the Des Moines Register of June 20, 1954; one entitled "Contempt of the Senate," from the Christian Science Monitor of June 17; and one entitled "Lowering the Curtain," from the Washington Post of June 14.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of June 25, 1954]

Not a Party Matter

The moves within the Senate to protect itself and the Nation from further abuses of Mr. McCARTHY's power are serious moves, seriously intended. Before the end of this session the McCarthy issue in some form or another ought to come to a vote, no matter what Messrs. KNOWLAND and LYNDON JOHNSON, respectively, may think is smart politics at the moment.

The impetus given to the movement to curb Mr. McCARTHY by his recent television performance has taken two general directions in the Senate. One is the direct attack, the effort to remove him from the committee chairmanships that he has so obviously disgraced. The other is the indirect attack, the effort (which has been going on for years) to establish general and uniform rules of fair procedure for all Senatorial committees. These two are not contradictory. We are in favor of both.

Resolutions to carry out both purposes have been referred to a subcommittee of the Rules Commitee, presided over, unfortunately, by Senator WILLIAM E. JENNER of the McCARTHY wing of the Republican Party. But the other members of this subcommittee are Senator CARLSON, of Kansas, considered in the early days of the Eisenhower administration one of the President's closest confidants, and Senator HAYDEN, of Arizona, who had served on the 1952 investigating subcommittee before which Mr. McCARTHY would not appear.

Senators JENNER, CARLSON, and HAYDEN are to begin hearings Monday on the proposed code of committee procedure. It is in itself a great gain for the Senate to undertake hearings on a matter that has met a stone wall of resistance for so long. Much has already been said and written on the subject; and in both House and Senate some individual committees have adopted satisfactory rules. It should not be too difficult to draft a code before the end of the session.

Nor should it be too difficult for the three Senators to come up with a decision on the propriety of removing Mr. McCARTHY from his chairmanships. This would not be the first time in the history of the Senate that such a wholesome event had occurred. In any case, the important point is that before adjournment, the Senate as such be given an opportunity to vote on Mr. McCARTHY's fitness to continue in the position of high responsibility to which the Senate—and the Senate alone—has elevated him. This is no longer a party matter, but concerns every Republican and every Democrat who values the good name of the Senate of the United States.

[From the San Francisco Chronicle of June 17, 1954]

Joe McCarthy Versus the GOP

The Republican leadership in the Senate has done the President and the Republican Party a disservice by shunting aside Senator FLANDERS' motion to strip Senator McCARTHY of his committee chairmanships.

The arguments upon which Senate Majority Leader KNOWLAND attacked the proposal are, first, that it violated established procedure in the Senate, and second, that any free-swinging floor fight on the issue might block the Eisenhower legislative program.

The first argument is not valid; there have been previous instances when the Senate has disregarded the seniority custom to remove a committee chairman.

The second assumption might be correct; we don't know. But in view of what is at stake the Senate leadership should have supported the FLANDERS' proposal regardless.

For McCARTHY is clearly determined to press relentlessly his campaign of harassment against the administration. He has already laid out a program of attacks upon additional executive department agencies that will keep him busy all summer and fall. And he has said, practically in so many words, that if this embarrasses the GOP or the President, that's just too bad.

You don't butter up a man like McCARTHY. You knuckle to him or you block his bid for personal power.

The way to block him, and to bring unity back to the Republican Party, is by following FLANDERS' proposal to strip him of the authority that he wields so arrogantly in the name of the Senate. We suggest those Republican Senators who have their party's—and the Nation's—welfare at heart consider with utmost care the consequences, giving final sanction to another season of McCARTHY marauding. The legislative program—vital as it is—can be repaired at a later time. McCARTHY's knife-job on the Republican Party would be a very long time mending.

[From the Minneapolis Tribune of June 13, 1954]

If This Be Senility

When Senator FLANDERS, Republican, of Vermont, attacked Senator McCARTHY 2 weeks ago on the floor of the upper House, McCARTHY suggested that FLANDERS was the victim of "senility."

Friday the Senator from Vermont was on the attack again. The stern New England conscience which had twice led him to denounce McCARTHY and his methods was beginning to pinpoint the issues and to search for some definite test by which McCarthyism might be made to stand or fall.

In the course of his speech FLANDERS—

Demanded that the Senate strip McCARTHY of his committee chairmanships until he purges himself of contempt and answers charges made against him last year by a three-man subcommittee.

Repeated the six questions asked by that committee—questions bearing on the political morality and financial integrity of McCARTHY.

Recalled that McCARTHY had refused to testify before that subcommittee, even though the Senate had confirmed its jurisdiction in the matter by a vote of 60 to 0.

Answered McCARTHY's cry of "smear" by saying: "There is this about a smear. It can be removed by a dry-cleaning process which involves a vigorous application of the truth. That process the Senator was unwilling to apply. The smear remains. Of course, there are some character discolorations which are not smears. They may be the outward evidence of inward corruption."

This is laying it on the line, Vermont fashion. This is getting directly to the heart of a great moral issue, New England style. This is a courageous demand on the Senate from one of McCARTHY's fellow Republicans to face up to the Wisconsin Senator's insolent challenge to its authority in connection with the Hennings subcommittee.

If this be senility, we can only say to the senile Vermonter: Give us more of it. Give it to us often. Give it to us as your stern New England conscience dictates. The Senate, senile sir, has far too little of it.

[From the Des Moines Register of June 20, 1954]

What's the Verdict on McCarthy?

There may be an old deserted-house atmosphere around a lot of television sets for a few days, but the most avid followers of the McCarthy-Army hearings and certainly the public at large welcome the end of this nauseating chapter.

As a nation we have come through it without coming apart at the seams. That should be reassuring to those who have worried considerably about the effect of the hearings on the public state of mind both here at home and abroad.

It has left a dirty brown taste in our mouths. We revolt at the thought that the character who mixed up the potion in the first place has a legal right, handed him by the voters of Wisconsin, to keep right on mixing his vile brew for another 4½ years.

At the same time a great many Americans, we believe, are now far better equipped than they were before to recognize the dangers and the subtle mechanics of emotional, hysterical witch hunting and irresponsible demagoguery.

We may be on the way out of a sickening state of fear and suspicion if Americans are more capable of distinguishing witch hunting from sincere and orderly efforts to guard, not only the Nation's security but also the personal rights which are the cornerstones of our strength and existence.

The charges and countercharges that have been hurled back and forth have been no more than vehicles for dramatizing the issue at stake.

That issue from the very beginning has been: Is the Nation's security and well-being served or endangered by permitting the junior Senator from Wisconsin to continue wielding his uncurbed powers at the risk of destroying the traditional pattern of orderly government, the fundamental concept of personal liberty and justice and the constitutional balance of power and responsibility between the legislative, administrative, and judicial agencies.

Senator McCarthy has been seen by millions, first hand and for what he is: a clever and adroit exploiter of half-truths, sly accusations, prejudices, suspicions and name-calling.

Regardless of what the Mundt committee concludes with respect to who threatened or who pressured whom and how, The Register hopes and believes the public has arrived at its own verdict with respect to the main issue.

As the Register sees it, that verdict calls for the swift and certain removal of Senator McCarthy from the chairmanship of the Government Operations Committee and its investigating subcommittee.

It calls for a clear and forthright statement by the Republican policy committee of the Senate disclaiming any endorsement of, or responsibility for, his words or actions.

It calls for determined steps to curb and regulate all committee powers and procedures in a manner that clearly defines the responsibility of the Senate itself and its exercise.

It calls for the creation of a responsible joint congressional committee, authorized and instructed to work in harmony and cooperation with the administrative agencies of government and with the President on problems of internal security.

It calls for party leadership, strong enough and wise enough, to expose phonies and fakers for what they are before they get the idea that they are bigger than the Senate, the House of Representatives, the President, or the Government itself.

[From the Christian Science Monitor of June 17, 1954]

Contempt of the Senate

For an ordinary citizen, refusing to answer questions put by a Senate investigating committee is not a healthy business. Usually he is labeled a "fifth amendment Communist" or cited for contempt—or both. But for a year and a half the Senate has allowed one of its own members to flout the serious questions asked by a committee it had specifically authorized to investigate his fitness to sit in the Senate.

This committee, the subcommittee on Privileges and Elections, on the basis of an extensive inquiry into certain unusual financial transactions by the Senator, asked him six main questions:

1. Whether funds collected by him to expose communism were diverted and used to his personal advantage?

2. Whether he used his position on the Senate Banking and Currency Committee to obtain a $10,000 fee from the Lustron Corp?

3. Whether his activities "in behalf of certain special interest groups, such as housing, sugar, and China, were motivated by self-interest?"

4. Whether he had violated the Corrupt Practices Acts?

5. Whether he had violated tax and banking laws?

6. Whether he had used close associates and relatives to secrete commodity and stock speculations for ulterior motives?

One would have expected a United States Senator to be anxious to clear up any questions deeply touching his honor. Instead this Senator called the committee "dishonest" and declared it had no jurisdiction. When the Senate upheld the integrity of the committee and its jurisdiction by a 60-to-0 vote he still refused to answer. The committee did not subpoena him, but on 6 occasions invited him to testify.

These questions do not constitute wild and reckless smears. By examining bank accounts, correspondence, and the testimony of witnesses the committee (composed of 2 Democrats and 1 Republican) decided the evidence justified asking the Senator to explain. The unanimous report of the committee did not declare (as the Senator often has about others) that because the Senator refused to answer he was guilty; it simply reported the evidence.

This report (with exhibits it covers 400 pages) was made on the last day of the last Congress, and received very little attention in the excitement of the shift in party control in Washington. This neglected report is the basis for the statement of Senator Flanders that Senator McCarthy is in contempt of the Senate by reason of his refusal to answer. The Senator from Vermont is insisting that the Senate require the Senator from Wisconsin to answer or take disciplinary action against him.

Senator Knowland, majority leader, has called Senator Flanders' move a mistake, and Republican leaders may bottle it up in the Rules Committee. It is argued that it would impede President Eisenhower's program. But is this really so? We see no reason why the Senate should not before adjournment take a day or two and face this ultimately inescapable issue. It has too long dodged responsibility for the conduct of its committees and their chairmen. Here is a question which fundamentally concerns not only its responsibility but its honor.

Regardless of party allegiance, regardless of one's views on the Army-McCarthy controversy, regardless of opinions about different methods of hunting Communists, it seems to us that any citizen can endorse the final conclusion of the bipartisan committee that made the investigation. It was that "this is a matter that transcends partisan politics and goes to the very core of the Senate body's authority, integrity, and the respect in which it is held by the people of the country."

[From the Washington Post of June 14, 1954]

Lowering the Curtain

The Republican decision to bring the Army-McCarthy hearings to an abrupt end this week will thwart or at least impair the one genuinely useful public service which these hearings can render. No one could have thought from the beginning that so prejudiced a body as the McCarthy subcommittee could render a really impartial judgment on the guilt or innocence of Senator McCarthy and the members of the Army secretariat. As the hearings developed, the most that could have been hoped for was a full exposure to the American public of Senator McCarthy's character and conduct and of the manner in which he has employed the investigating power conferred on him by the Senate.

But this exposure is bound to be blurred by the subcommittee's failure to hear such witnesses as Donald Surine and G. David Schine. The story is incomplete. The phony FBI letter continues to be unexplained. Mr. Schine's New Year's Eve remains a mystery. These are matters perhaps trivial in themselves yet not without real significance in an assessment of McCarthyism. They may not do much to prove that the McCarthy staff pressured the Army improperly or that the Army blackmailed the McCarthy committee; they may not show who faked the FBI letter. But they are elements vital to a full public understanding of the situation.

It may be that in the next few days Senator McCarthy will give fresh indications of his cruelty and recklessness. But it is unlikely that his testimony, even under shrewd cross-examination, will contribute anything to a resolution of the specific issues before the subcommittee. For the truth is that a congressional investigation affords a very poor forum for the trial of specific issues. Its techniques and procedures are well suited for the illumination of broad, general problems. But only the procedures of courts of law—only what we have come to understand as due process of law—are adequate to the difficult task of assessing individual guilt or innocence of particular charged offenses.

Senator McCarthy's turn as a witness has already served to show how ill-suited a congressional hearing is for the determination of individual guilt or innocence. The Senator answers questions only when some whim moves him to do so. More often, he makes speeches, strikes atttitudes, or delivers pronouncements—as when Mr. Jenkins on Thursday asked him to identify a chart recording the long-distance phone calls made by Messrs. Cohn and Schine to General Reber, and the Senator declared that as chairman of the Government Operations Committee he would soon launch an investigation into the profligate manufacture of charts. No one reminded him that he was there as a witness testifying under oath and not as the chairman of the Government Operations Committee.

Even if the subcommittee had a chairman much more stern and impartial than Senator Mundt it would be impossible to keep so unruly a witness as Senator McCarthy on the beam. Only the strict procedures of a court, fortified with the power to cite recalcitrant witnesses for contempt—a power which this particular senatorial committee is unlikely to invoke against Senator McCarthy—could effect a real determination of the charges and countercharges in this case. One valuable lesson to be learned from the Army-McCarthy investigation is the impropriety and invalidity of legislative trials.

Senator McCarthy himself has been the most egregious conductor of legislative trials. He has used the investigating power conferred on him by the Senate not to investigate but to try individuals and punish them by publicity for conduct which is not criminal but which he considers unpatriotic. He has amply demonstrated his unfitness for the chairmanship of a powerful and important Senate committee. Senator Flanders' proposal that Mr. McCarty be removed from this chairmanship gives the Senate a splendid opportunity to curb a dangerous evil and to observe its own best traditions.

Dulles Advised To Curtail Guatemalan Envoy's Activities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT P. MORANO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1954

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I wish to insert the text of a letter which I forwarded to Secretary of State

John Foster Dulles this morning. This is a matter of grave import which takes on added significance with the tumultuous struggle for control of the Government in Guatemala:

JUNE 28, 1954.

Hon. JOHN FOSTER DULLES,
Secretary of State,
Department of State,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Certain information has reached me from Mr. William R. Scott, export sales manager of the Remington Arms Co., Inc., in Bridgeport, Conn., and an active member of the Latin American Council on Foreign Relations.

He informs me that Mr. Alfred Chocano, Guatemalan Chargé d'Affaires in Washington, "was expelled from Nicaragua as a Communist."

I suggest that you look into this matter. If this information on the basis of your investigation is found to be factual, then it would appear to me that Mr. Chocano should be immediately notified by the appropriate authorities that he is persona non grata. In other words, in good old Americanese, he should be given his walking papers.

Pending the investigation, it is my belief that Mr. Chocano's activities and travel should be properly curtailed and limited.

I would appreciate hearing from you regarding this matter.

Sincerely,

ALBERT P. MORANO,
Member of Congress.

Our Civil Liberties Need To Be Advertised, Not Apologized for, to Rest of the World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN D. JOHNSTON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 28, 1954

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Our Civil Liberties Need To Be Advertised, Not Apologized for, to Rest of the World." published in the Anderson (South Carolina) Independent of June 26, 1954.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR CIVIL LIBERTIES NEED TO BE ADVERTISED, NOT APOLOGIZED FOR, TO REST OF THE WORLD

How the United States of America, with a form of government offering individual civil liberties unmatched anywhere in the world, has been placed on the defensive in this respect is a matter the historians will puzzle over.

Communist propagandists have been so successful, for example, in selling the colored peoples of the world the idea that racial persecution is a full-time occupation with Americans that the United States Supreme Court is moved to abrogate the liberties of millions in order to offer mythical "equality" to other millions.

The Reds have taken the word "segregation" and used it to advantage. Why have we not made useful propaganda of the caste system that exists under communism, the total absence of civil liberties under Red regimes, the fact that colored people in the United States have more liberty in one day than colored people under the Red banner enjoy in a lifetime?

What are our civil liberties? The Friends of Public Schools of America furnished them in this outline:

1. Right of the writ of habeas corpus.
2. Protection against the passage of bills of attainder and ex post facto laws.
3. Equality before the law by forbidding the creation of a titled class by prohibiting the Federal Government from granting titles of nobility.
4. Right of speedy public trial in case of accusation of crime before an impartial jury at the place of commission of the crime.
5. Freedom of religion, press, speech, assembly, and petition.
6. Right to keep and bear arms for the national defense.
7. Protection against the unlawful quartering of troops.
8. Right to grand-jury indictment before trial for a crime, and to be confronted with witness, and to have the compulsory process to obtain witnesses and the assistance of counsel to establish innocence.
9. Protection against unreasonable searches and seizures.
10. Protection against self-incrimination in any trial or the giving of testimony.
11. Protection against being twice placed in jeopardy of life or limb for a single crime.
12. Protection against cruel and unusual punishments and excessive bail.
13. Right to just compensation for any property taken for public use.
14. Right to trial by jury in civil case.
15. Protection against being deprived of life, liberty or property without due process of law.
16. Protection against the impairment of the obligation of contracts by the States.
17. Equal protection of the laws.
18. Guarantee of a republican form of government in the State in which a citizen resides.
19. Protection from slavery and involuntary servitude except as punishment for crime.
20. Protection from abridgement by the States of the privileges and immunities of citizens of the United States.
21. Right to hold public office under the United States if the citizen meets the statutory and constitutional qualifications.
22. Right to freedom of entrance into and exit from a State.
23. Protection from domestic violence and foreign invasion.
24. Protection from the abridgement of the right to vote by a State on account of race or sex.

Those are our 24 basic liberties.

No other people can match the list.

No other form of government can afford to offer such liberties.

These are the American civil liberties that need to be advertised, not apologized for, to the rest of the world.

St. Louis Newspaper Guild Foresees Threat to Freedom of the Press in Trend Typified by Wiretapping Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 28, 1954

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, for the information of the Members, I would like to submit for the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a very thoughtful letter I have received from the president of the St. Louis Newspaper Guild, CIO, Mr. Jim Woods. The letter follows:

ST. LOUIS NEWSPAPER GUILD, LOCAL 47,
AMERICAN NEWSPAPER GUILD, CIO,
St. Louis, Mo., June 14, 1954.

Mrs. JOHN B. SULLIVAN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN SULLIVAN: The executive committee of the St. Louis Newspaper Guild, which is an organization of over 1,000 newspaper workers, living in Missouri and Illinois, has asked me to inform you of its strong opposition to any form of legislation to legalize wiretapping.

Our union is unalterably opposed to communism or any other subversion of our American concept of democracy. We do not believe that the way to fight these forces of evil is by adopting their methods.

Under communism or any other form of totalitarianism, the individual is without privacy or rights. On the other hand, the very basis of our democracy is the protection of the rights and privacy of the individual.

We believe that we have far more to lose than to gain by driving an opening wedge into the right of individuals to privacy in their homes and conversations. It should be of small comfort to us that we might trap a few subversives by such methods while subverting the resistance of our citizens to infringements on the right of the individual to privacy.

Those who would weaken our basic American traditions of democracy on the grounds of security would lead us step by step away from those very rights we seek to keep secure. Today the police state might extend only to our private telephone conversations, but tomorrow a degree of control of the press might be found necessary, and so on down the road to totalitarianism.

We hope that you will use your influence to prevent any growth of favor for such legislation.

Sincerely,

JIM WOODS, *President.*

Toward the Plebiscite

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK T. BOW
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 28, 1954

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I have pending before the Rules Committee a resolution creating a select committee to study and survey the relationship between the Federal Government and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

The newspaper El Mundo, published in San Juan, P. R., is one of the world's leading newspapers and without doubt is the best versed in our Latin American and South American relationships. The president and general manager of the paper, Angel Ramos, has been recognized many times for his contribution to inter-American relations.

There appeared in El Mundo on June 18, 1954, an editorial which clarifies some of the misconceptions regarding the status of Puerto Rico and establishes further evidence of the need of a survey as suggested in my resolution. If the resolution cannot be considered during these closing days of the 83d Congress, it should be high on the agenda of the 84th Congress.

A translation of the editorial is as follows:

Toward the Plebiscite

In an article in the current edition of Foreign Affairs, whose Spanish version in the writer's own words we published yesterday, Gov. Luis Muñoz-Marín reiterates assertions which we consider unfounded and which cause us, as Puerto Ricans, serious concern.

The article is a political argument endeavoring to present the Commonwealth (Free Associated State) as the permanent and ideal solution of the political status of Puerto Rico. Rather than a plea in favor of the Commonwealth, it is an eulogy of that political status which Governor Muñoz-Marín holds is the only one considered, demanded, and cherished by the great majority of the people of Puerto Rico.

Among other things, the Governor asserts that "81 percent of the voters of the island have declared that they do not ask independence." And further on, "the country is not for statehood—federated statehood that is—by 84 percent of the vote."

As he unfolds his argument, Mr. Muñoz-Marín takes pains to continue to give the impression that Puerto Rico has already rejected the formula of statehood, so as not to pay Federal taxes, and also that of independence, so as not to lose free trade with the United States.

Mr. Muñoz-Marín insists in establishing the legend that we have had some sort of a plebiscite and that our people have deliberately and willfully rejected both statehood and independence.

This assertion (this legend), if it is believed in the United States, and if, through repetition by a person in a position of authority, like the Government, gains acceptance among many of our people, may bring countless difficulties and harm to our country, in its political development toward a proper and worthy life.

That is why we feel compelled to refute it today, as we refuted it some time ago, and as we shall continue disproving tomorrow, if this falsehood were to be repeated, jeopardizing our political future.

The truth is that there has been no plebiscite, no referendum, neither directed by our legislators nor provided for by the Congress of the United States.

No plebiscite was the balloting over Act 600 and over the constitution of Puerto Rico, for at all times before that balloting the people were advised that Act 600 and the constitution left the way open to any of the two classical solutions of the status, and even to others.

And it was Mr. Muñoz-Marín himself who said this to the people and who now wants us to believe that those ballotings meant a rejection of statehood and independence.

In fact, many of those who favor statehood and some who favor independence voted for both measures (Act 600 and the constitution). And these people belong to the three political parties now in the island.

Also, among those who did not go to the polls, to vote on Act 600 and the constitution, because they looked upon these as temporary measures, there were surely many who would have gone to the polls and cast their votes, one way or the other, had they belived, or had they had any reasons to believe, that the insular political status was being decided in a permanent way.

It is not the same to vote or to abstain from voting over some temporary arrangements as it is to assume the responsibility of rejecting a definite political solution.

On the other hand, one cannot regard as a plebiscite the general elections that have taken place later, for in them the voters have not responded to the question of political status, but only to party preferences, personalities, governmental projects, and the like. Within Mr. Muñoz-Marín's own party there are voters who are for statehood or for independence, who follow their leader because of party discipline, but who would stand for one or the other solution, if they could vote freely in a plebiscite, not bound to party lines.

We do not know why Mr. Muñoz Marín should fall down to twistings of history when he is quite able to use an unimpeachable procedure to try to prove his political argument.

Let the Puerto Rican voters freely select, away from party divisions, between statehood, independence, and the commonwealth with its future developments.

Let there be a plebiscite in which the voter, in full conscience and deliberation, knows that he is binding his own future and the future of his sons and of all his descendants.

Thus, and only thus, we would have to accept the people's decision, even if it were to follow the way of the commonwealth as a definite form of government, which, in our opinion, would be a mistake.

Let the country have a really democratic chance to select with open eyes and a clear understanding of the consequences in all cases.

On the other hand, we do not see why the Governor repeats in Foreign Affairs the same line of reasoning which we had already refuted, to the point where he had to acknowledge very recently that the ways to statehood and to independence are still legally open, and that if another party comes to power there may be a change of direction in the policy over the status.

The article in Foreign Affairs is very ably written, and we are afraid that it may give the wrong impression of our situation to those who are not very well acquainted with our political history.

That is why we wish to state once more, for the benefit of Puerto Ricans and continentals, that Puerto Rico has rejected neither statehood nor independence, nor has it bound itself to follow for keeps the way of the free associated state.

East Texas Cities Work Together To Develop Water Resources

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 28, 1954

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the people of Texas are getting together to attack our water problems on a cooperative basis. A significant case in point may be seen in the recent meeting of representatives of three east Texas cities to discuss development of the area's water resources on a cooperative basis.

A brief report of the meeting was recently published in the Daily Times-Herald of Dallas in the form of a special dispatch from Athens, where the meeting was held. I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Athens, June 24.—Development of east Texas water resources on a cooperative basis and for joint benefit of the areas affected loomed ahead Thursday following a meeting by representatives of Athens, Tyler, and Dallas at the Cherokee Club here.

Melvin Sisk, Tyler Chamber of Commerce manager, said the group "recognized the water resources problem as the most important facing east Texas, and had agreed to work closely together for the mutual benefit of all concerned."

Mayor R. L. Thornton headed the Dallas delegation to the meeting, with the group planning an on-the-spot look at possible supply sites in east Texas.

W. G. Vollmer, chairman of an advisory committee to the Dallas City Council, was another leader of that city's delegation.

The Cherokee Club meeting was held Wednesday night and those attending the conference said the various watersheds of the area were discussed together with estimated amounts of runoff water available.

Tyler's delegation, in addition to Mr. Sisk, included Z. J. Spruiell, chairman of the city commission; Wayne Whittington, president of the chamber of commerce, and others.

Among the group representing Athens was Charles Hawn, chamber president; R. E. Cross, chamber manager, and T. D. Evans and A. P. Smith, bank presidents.

Jesuit Editor's Answer Concerning Termination of Relationship Between Federal Government and Indian Tribes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1954

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, on June 1, I inserted in the Appendix of the Record a communication from the Reverend Francis J. Corley, S. J., of St. Louis, an outstanding Jesuit editor, whose magazine, Social Order, discusses and explores many of the most pressing social problems facing us today as a people and as a society. On June 14, I inserted in the Record a letter from the Honorable A. L. Miller, of Nebraska, chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, giving the history and the background of these activities. This letter was an answer to Father Corley's remarks.

Today, I wish to include in the Record a letter Father Corley has written me in which he expresses his gratitude to Congressman Miller for the great courtesy and painstaking care with which he has discussed Father Corley's remarks. The letter is as follows:

Institute of Social Order,
St. Louis, Mo., June 21, 1954.

Hon. Leonor K. Sullivan,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Congresswoman Sullivan: It was good of you to send on a copy of Hon. A. L. Miller's letter concerning the background of efforts to terminate trust relationships between the Federal Government and Indian tribes of the continental United States. Congressman Miller's review of our treatment of the Indians and of the difficulties under which they have lived since the advent of the white man, while brief and selective, suggests both the inequities of which we have been guilty and the efforts we have made somewhat to redress the injustices.

I sincerely hope that you and he will both believe that I raised no question about the integrity or the sincere good will toward the Indians on the part of himself or the other members of the two subcommittees. The evidence of the hearings on more than one of the so-called termination bills certifies to those qualities. But however admirable their good will, it is still justified to question the wisdom of the method they have chosen to resolve the present situation.

These gentlemen are confronted with an extremely difficult problem and one largely not of their own making. The problem of the American Indian is historical. In part, the treatment accorded the Indians was an almost inevitable result of the tremendous expansive westward thrust of a rapidly growing nation. Even if greed and ruthless disregard of human decency had not overwhelmed the Indians, the slower, natural spread of the American people would eventually have accomplished the same result, albeit in somewhat more humane fashion. The Indians were simply pushed onward by violence, trickery, and occasional honest negotiation until, beaten and subdued, they were gathered in pitiful moraines at the unwanted edges of civilization.

The treaties and the system of quasi-wardship under which the Indian tribes began their reservation existence, as one by one they were subjugated, were probably the most satisfactory solution to the problem at the time. But it was clearly a temporary policy, and it was recognized as such so early as 1865. Not only was the treaty-wardship system a temporary policy; it was one that could not stand up before human greed. When the unwanted edges of civilization were discovered to have value—resources of lead, or zinc, or iron, or timber, or water, or agricultural worth, or oil—or, possibly, uranium, treaties and honor crumbled before the onslaught of the white man's manifest destiny. Through two centuries the Indian has been robbed by ruthless violation of treaty after treaty.

We thought the matter was settled in 1833, when most of our American Indians were herded onto the "great American desert." President Jackson magnanimously announced soon after: "The pledge of the United States has been given by Congress that the country destined for the residence of this people shall be forever secured and guaranteed to them." But soon it was discovered that the "great American desert" was actually the immensely rich central plains parts of which today constitute your and Congressman MILLER's congressional districts, with fabulous potentials of mineral and soil. Again, as so many times before, Indians were compelled to run before the avalanche of landhungry whites, and the home that was "perpetually secured and guaranteed to them" was callously ravaged.

The treaty-wardship system was temporary, not merely because the whites would destroy their solemn pledges but also because, as Congressman MILLER points out in in his letter, it was recognized as early as 1865 to be unsatisfactory. But the tragic fact is that we have continued that policy of expediency for almost 90 years after a Senate committee report urged the Congress "to surrender as soon as practicable the control of Indian affairs within every State to the State authorities." And 90 years later we are little closer to civil autonomy for individual Indians than we were then.

The reason for our present situation is partly the attitude of backing and filling which has characterized congressional handling of the Indian question. Long periods of neglect have been broken by sporadic attempts at solution by dissolution: solve the Indian problem by dissolving all ties with the Federal Government. Meantime the ward program, which could only keep the Indians in civil and cultural minor staus, has dragged on.

Congressman MILLER would doubtless agree that the tenor of the 12 bills introduced in the present session of Congress differs from the legislative attempt to terminate Federal-Indian relations in, for example, 1923, chiefly in that the present bills attempt to handle the situation piecemeal rather than in a single, comprehensive statute. The fact that the Indians are little better prepared today for termination than they were at the time of the earlier attempt is at once a commentary on our unfortunate long-term Indian policy, an argument against passage of the present set of bills, and a poignant demonstration of the imperative need for careful revision of our present policy. Termination might be feasible today if the abortive attempt of 1923 had been followed by a constructive policy of preparation and progressive relinquishment of Federal supervision. Unless some informed congressional leaders set about the task of formulating an intelligent program leading to orderly tremination, our descendants will be haggling about these same unhappy affairs a generation from today.

It is evident, I think, that we are all agreed that the wardship under which the tribes have lived since consummation of the Indian treaties, however useful and even necessary it may have been at the outset, should long ago have been modified. But it does not follow that the modification should take the form of abrupt termination.

At this point, I think I owe Congressman MILLER an explanation of the expression in my letter to which he takes exception; namely, my assertion that the action of the present Congress is "abrupt and secretive." I definitely think it is abrupt; there has been no such orderly preparation for termination. The term "secretive" requires a bit of explanation. * * * It came as a distinct shock to learn, on May 18, that some, at least, of these bills were on the Consent Calendar and that one of them had been passed 8 days earlier. I was alarmed at the prospect of these important bills slipping through by unanimous consent.

I hope I may be permitted to note, in further justification of my letter, that the term "swindle" was in no sense whatever attributed to Members of the Congress. I firmly believed at the time—and still do—that some Members of Congress, and particularly the members of the subcommittees of both Houses, are sincerely convinced of their position in pushing for termination, but I also believe (1) that action on the termination bills at this time would be ill-considered, (2) that termination would put many Indians at the mercy of swindlers, (3) that we, as a people, cannot countenance this, if only because our former policies toward Indian tribes have contributed significantly to their present cultural retardation.

Obviously, this does not mean that past inept policies should be continued. But, by the same token, it gives us no warrant for sudden and unprepared termination of all protective relationships with persons whom we have kept in a position of dependence. Perhaps we can wash our hands of the Indian problem by "termination," but we cannot thus wash it from our consciences or from the American scene.

In this connection, I would like to refer to a remark by Senator FERGUSON in the extremely brief debate on S. 2670 (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 100, May 10, 1954, p. 5913). The Senator said:

"I have a feeling that one of the reasons why people have been saying that the Indians have not been able to take care of themselves as citizens is that the Indians have been under the domination of the Government as wards of the United States. I believe they would be better off to have their freedom the same as other Americans have. I think they would then immediately begin to become educated in our ways of life and soon become qualified to be citizens."

What Senator FERGUSON and the termination bills propose is to inject the Indians into the full stream of American life without even the educational preparation afforded to aliens seeking citizenship. When we reflect that most aliens have been participants of cultures as complex as our own and that they are, consequently, better equipped with the social, economic, and political skills necessary for modern social living than are our Indians, we can realize somewhat more clearly how disastrous the proposed termination policy may be. Unquestionably, the Indians, after termination would "then immediately begin to become educated in our ways of life * * *" Their education would be a bitter and crushing experience, and the human cost of such potentially catastrophic methods of education threaten to be tremendous.

In his letter Congressman MILLER refers to the inhuman and unjust treatment accorded other subject ethnic groups by other dominant nations. I freely admit that our treatment of the Indians in recent decades has not been so inhuman as the instances he cites (even though at an earlier era it was we who taught them, for instance, the art of scalping). So far as I know, in fact, there has been no physical mistreatment of our Indians since the termination of the Indian wars. At the same time there has been serious injustice in the assignment of tribal lands and the exchange of miserable range or bad-lands areas for the rich agricultural and mineral territories which some Indian tribes had formerly inhabited. And there has been steady dereliction of duty through generations in dragging on the unhappy trust status, when we should have been working intelligently for its orderly dissolution. And we are now seriously considering the graver fault of welshing on the duties and walking out on the problems that are solely of our making. I am sure the Congressman does not cite the faults of other peoples as justification for our own.

I have tried to make clear that I agree, by and large, with Congressman MILLER's analysis of our past policies and of the present position of our American Indians. In this respect I do not overlook either the unhappy state of civil and human rights in some Indian tribal jurisdictions or the miserably apathetic condition of some Indian groups. Furthermore, I see nothing wrong with resistance to the proposed legislation because of apprehension. If I understand the Congressman's expression rightly, I think that would describe part of the basis for my position quite accurately. I oppose the proposed legislation partly because I believe that a serious and historical point of equity is threatened and partly because I am persuaded that enactment of the legislation would, in many instances, lead to unfortunate results. Apprehension is, I submit, warranted. And I shall continue to be apprehensive until some more carefully considered program of preparation and gradual release, formulated as the result of investigation, thought, and study by qualified persons, is made part of our termination policy for Indian groups.

My opinion remains substantially unchanged that termination bills are not the solution to the problem. There should be a searching investigation that will determine not only the degree of acculturation which individual tribes and subgroups have attained but, more important still, the means by which retarded groups can be brought up to a cultural level that will make full-citizen status a genuine benefit for the Indians and the rest of our people rather than a continued source of trouble and hardship.

May I ask you to express my gratitude to Congressman Miller for the great courtesy and painstaking care with which he has discussed my remarks.

With kindest personal regards, I am,

Faithfully yours,

Francis J. Corley, S. J.

Puget Sound Naval Shipyard Sets Speed Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 28, 1954

Mr. MAGNUSON. Madam President, some time ago there was published in the Congressional Record a pledge by the workers of the Puget Sound Naval Shipyard at Bremerton, Wash., that they would exert every effort to speed the conversion of the aircraft carrier *Franklin Delano Roosevelt*, now in drydock at Puget Sound.

I take this occasion to congratulate the workers on the splendid job they have done and are doing.

They went right to work, and quickly, more quickly in fact than ever has been done before, removed the armorplate of the carrier through a new process, a full 5 weeks ahead of schedule.

Not satisfied with this showing, the workers promised there would be no letup in the efforts of the crews working on the conversion job and said they expected to have the completed job ready for final inspection weeks before it was expected it could be done.

It is a record of which the workers at the Puget Sound Naval Shipyard should be proud, and undoubtedly already sets a pace which other shipyards will have to meet whenever it becomes necessary to modernize other fighting ships.

In this connection, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an article entitled "*Franklin Delano Roosevelt* Worker Morale Batting 1,000 Percent," appearing in the Salute, a publication by the Puget Sound Naval Shipyard, Bremerton, Wash., for Friday, June 11, 1954.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

"Franklin Delano Roosevelt" Worker Morale Batting 1,000 Percent—Success of Armor Plate Removal Puts Conversion Ahead 5 Weeks

Attention taxpayers, Navy Department, and all of its ships at sea: PSNS is serving notice that its pledge of a record-shattering conversion job on the *Franklin Delano Roosevelt* is not to be taken lightly.

Stopping the skeptic cold in his tracks, production action suited to the word has already manifested itself in the dramatic success of a new procedure in armorplate removal, the completion of which last week jumped the $40 million modernization job a full 5 weeks ahead of schedule.

And there's no reason to believe this upsurge of waterfront and shop activity will lessen in tempo in the forthcoming weeks and months. Lending credence to this observation is the terrific enthusiasm of Lt. Comdr. E. J. Bloom, *Franklin Delano Roosevelt* ship superintendent.

The commander was not spare in letting his feeling run the gamut of optimistic expression:

"I've seen nothing before like the present spirit shown to date on the *Franklin Delano Roosevelt* * * * to me, the individual worker morale is at the highest peak I have known on a conversion job.

"Master Walt Bruns' riggers seemed to catch fire almost from the moment they started on the plate removals and believe me, the shop 11–26 multiple force of shipfitters, chippers and calkers, burners and drillers were crowding them all the way."

Lieutenant Commander Bloom went on to explain that the armor-plate job was done on a split-shift basis to take advantage of as much daylight as possible and thereby assure maximum safety to the workers.

One shift went on at 4 a. m. in the morning knocking off at 12 noon to be followed up by the next force which worked until 8 p. m.

"You know," Lieutenant Commander Bloom said, "I heard it bandied about that the two shifts were all but taking bets on which one could drop the most plates in the least time * * * but don't quote me."

The *Franklin Delano Roosevelt* superintendent thought that the removal of the sponsons would be completed by today thereby allowing rip-out work to get under way in full swing.

* * * * *

True, the *Antietam* was the first Navy carrier to sport the angle addition, but the deck was added without the many modifications that accompanied the *Shangri-La* job which includes elevator changes, the rearrangement and finishing-off of spaces below. The canted deck was installed on the *Antietam* on more or less of a trial basis, subsequent testing more than justifying the deck's addition to other conversions.

Before winding up on the *Shangri-La*, not to be overlooked is the immediate laying of steel decking on the flight deck's landing area.

The *Lexington*, currently about 18 percent completed, has her new blisters, a new bow and the beginning of her canted deck as production gains to date. Island modifications are under way as is the enlarging of her gas tanks. There are at this time about 2,100 men working on CVA–16 jobs, ship and shop.

Conference Report, Defense Appropriations, Construction of Senate Amendment

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN W. HESELTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 24, 1954

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, this particular amendment, as I understand it, is a floor amendment offered in the other body. It was inserted after the chairman of the Senate subcommittee received a letter from the Defense Department, which is in the Record for June 17, pointing out that because Congress stated its intent that no money in the Post Office Department appropriation bill should be used for payment of commercial air transport of military mail between the United States and foreign countries, the Defense Department should be authorized to make payments for this purpose.

The Deputy Comptroller of the Defense Department stated:

> A quick review of the authority to reimburse the Post Office Department or to hire commercial carriers for this purpose indicates that the Department of Defense does not have authority to make such payments for the transportation of this personal mail.

During the consideration of the conference report on the Post Office appropriation bill on May 19, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Canfield], chairman of the subcommittee, said this at page 6473:

> Mr. Speaker, may I also say with reference to an inquiry just propounded by the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Heselton], asking if there are any funds in the Post Office appropriation for the new fiscal year for the payment for commercial air transportation of military mail by the United States and foreign countries, the answer is in the negative. There are no funds for this purpose in this bill. The Post Office Department delivers mail to the various APO offices in our country, such as New York and San Francisco, and the responsibility from there on rests with the Defense Establishment.

This amendment as it appears in here I think might be distorted through a misconstruction. Usually military mail tendered by the Defense Department or by the Post Office Department to commercial carriers would have to be paid for at the rate set for the Post Office Department by the Civil Aeronautics Board. In the Atlantic run, for example, this restriction in the Senate amendment might be thought to mean that the Post Office would have to pay prevailing rates set by the Civil Aeronautics Board at 85 cents per ton-mile and the Defense Department would have to reimburse the Post Office Department at that same rate of 85 cents per ton-mile. However, I understand that a number of offers have been made to the Defense Department for daily service on the European Channel at rates of only 25 cents per ton-mile. Use by the Defense Department of commercial air carriers at this low rate instead of the high rate, on the European Channel alone at present volume, would save the Defense Department approximately $8,000 per day. Certainly that would be an important and highly desirable economy.

I sincerely trust the conferees feel as the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Canfield] and I felt, that this matter had been clearly established as sound policy in the Post Office Department bill.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HESELTON. I yield.

Mr. SCRIVNER. This section became necessary due to the action which we have taken in separating subsidies for mail. When that arose there was no provision for the carrying of the air mail to and from the service men scattered throughout the world.

This is merely authorization to the Defense Department to use available funds for that purpose under agreements with the Post Office Department; and, of course, we expect the Post Office Department to get this mail carried in the most expeditious manner and at the lowest possible rate of pay.

Mr. HESELTON. Also, Mr. Chairman, you would expect the Defense Department to do the same thing.

Mr. SCRIVNER. And, of course, under existing law which the Post Office Department would have to comply with. But I still believe, as the gentleman from Massachusetts has expressed, that it can be done at a reasonable rate.

Mr. HESELTON. I should add in fairness that there may be some of the routes where there is simply not enough mail to compensate for a special service at the low rate, but on the Atlantic run particularly there is adequate quantity to justify the low rate and I am anxious that any doubt be cleared up now.

Mr. SCRIVNER. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for raising the question so it could be cleared up on the floor.

The Tomahawking of Bonneville

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 28, 1954

Mr. MAGNUSON. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record a succinct, factual article entitled "The Tomahawking of Bonneville," written by Richard L. Neuberger, a member of the State Senate of Oregon, and published in the Progressive magazine for July 1954, regarding the matter which has just been discussed on the floor of the Senate this afternoon.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Tomahawking of Bonneville

By Richard L. Neuberger

Portland, Oreg.—Few Government agencies have done so much for an American region as the Bonneville Power Administration has done for the Pacific Northwest. It generated electricity to light farms. It made possible the only time when the Northwest's gain in industrial payrolls exceeded the national average. It increased the use of power in nearly every home in the States of Washington and Oregon. In one mighty leap, it brought the essential lumber business from the age of the donkey-engine to the age of kilowatts. And, during Bonneville's first decade of operation, the region it served experienced the greatest population gain of its entire colorful history.

Today, the agency that accomplished all this is in virtual ruins. The zeal and spirit of its staff have been shattered. Key employees have resigned or been fired. Bonneville appropriations have been gutted. The authority of the agency, has been curtailed. Essential transmission lines have been sold at bargain-basement rates to private utility companies. The preference clause, by which Bonneville received orders from Congress to serve primarily, the general public, has been so whittled down through executive decrees that it is now the utility corporations which get preferential treatment.

"Where once we planned for a better, brighter Northwest," said one Bonneville engineer, "all we do now is read light meters."

Yet the original Bonneville Act, passed 16 years ago, was designed for the development of the Northwest's vast power resources in the interest of all the people. Far-sighted men—Senators Norris of Nebraska, Bone of Washington, McNary of Oregon, La Follette of Wisconsin, Representative Pierce of Oregon—had a part in its drafting.

This original Bonneville Act, put on the statute books with President Roosevelt's signature, has never been changed. How, then, has the whole purpose of the agency been distorted? By what route has the present administration circumvented Congress to transform Bonneville from an agency devoted to public benefits into an agency, catering to special and private benefits?

The formula is important for the American people to know, because the present regime may try it elsewhere in the control of other natural resources. The technique is to change personnel, cut funds, and issue executive orders.

In April of this year Secretary of Interior Douglas McKay, former Governor of Oregon, gave a vivid demonstration of the technique. He signed an order revoking the authority of Bonneville to be the marketing agent for all projects, now or hereafter constructed in the drainage basin of the Columbia River. This meant that Bonneville's staff no longer could advocate the erection of a dam like Hells Canyon, on a site craved by the absentee-dominated Idaho Power Co. If Bonneville is not the marketing agent for these projects, the preference clause will fail to apply—and a recent article in the business section of the New York Times reported that elimination of the preference clause has become the chief goal of the private power companies. The language of the Bonneville preference clause explains why the companies welcome any Executive order which modifies it:

"The Administrator shall, in disposing of electric energy, give preference and priority to public and cooperative agencies * * * and to organizations of citizens not organized for profit but primarily for the purpose of supplying electric energy to their members as nearly as possible at cost."

But new Executive orders might call for compliant officials. Trus, the faces at Bonneville had to be changed, too.

Dr. Paul J. Raver, former chairman of the Illinois State Commerce Commission, became Bonneville's Administrator in 1939. When he arrived in the Northwest, the average number of kilowatt-hours of electricity used per customer in the region was 1,467 and the prevailing price for each kilowatt-hour was 2.55 cents. By 1953 the average usuage per customer was 5,632 kilowatt-hours, and the toll for each kilowatt-hour was 1.34 cents. During this period the output of the Bonneville Power Administration soared from 1,099,000,000 kilowatt-hours to 16,381,000,000.

II

This Government operation was a colossal financial success during Raver's tenure; in those years Bonneville collected $315 million in gross revenues. This added up to a surplus of nearly $100 million after all operating expenses had been paid and after that portion of the dams allocated to hydroelectricity had been amortized over a 50-year repayment schedule, at interest of 2½ to 3 percent.

One might think this performance by Raver deserved continuation. But after McKay became Secretary of the Interior, reports constantly filtered out of Washington that Raver's days as Administrator were numbered. Raver had urged construction of Hel's Canyon Dam as a Federal undertaking, and this made him anathema to certain power corporations.

McKay never asked directly for Raver's resignation because the Administrator had a wide following. But some of the McKay policies were intolerable, and Raver left the agency he had built. He now is superintendent of Seattle's municipally owned city-light system.

In place of Raver, McKay named Dr. William A. Pearl, 60, of Washington State College. The new Administrator seen flew his flag and, so far as public power was concerned, it contained only a skull and crossbones. Pearl had been on the job less than 2 weeks when he expressed his approval of abandoning the great Hells Canyon damsite on the Oregon-Idaho boundary to the Idaho Power Co. The Administrator made up his mind even before some of his own subordinates had testified on the engineering facts at issue in the controversy.

During its years of expansion and progress, the Bonneville agency had aggressively sought additional dams on the Columbia, the continent's greatest power waterway. Power companies resented this Federal yardstick which compelled them to hold down rates. Indeed, the leading private utilities in the Northwest had confidently predicted, in a 1946 report aimed to stop further Government power projects, a surplus of 950,000 kilowatts for the region by 1950. The report had its influence on Congress, although it turned out to be wrong.

By 1950 the Northwest, far from having a surplus of kilowatts, was caught in a desperate shortage. The utilities had sold the region short. Their propaganda had been decisive in blocking Hells Canyon and other needed projects. Nevertheless, Under Secretary of the Interior Ralph Tudor, principal McKay henchman in the knifing of the Federal power program, announced in December 1953: "Bonneville will no longer push for development of power resources, which shall be left more to agencies both public and private of the communities concerned." By removing the National Government from the field of power development, Tudor was virtually inviting the utilities to take over.

In such an atmosphere, the tomahawking of Bonneville was inevitable.

When a public utility district or rural-electric coop negotiates with Bonneville for energy today, it does so individually, but the private utilities in the region bargain as a group. As a result, Bonneville rates to the power companies actually are lower than to the public agencies, although the law still orders Bonneville to give preference and priority to public agencies.

Farmers' coops now pay Bonneville approximately 3.5 mills for each kilowatt-hour of juice; public power districts pay 2.9 mills, and the private utilities 2.2 mills. Bonneville can cancel contracts with public agencies by giving advance notice of 18 months. Power companies must receive 4 years' notice. Moreover, Bonneville no longer accepts utility responsibility with respect to its public contracts. This means it does not guarantee extra power to take care of the normal growth of these systems—a grim matter for rural coops with no generating sources of their own.

Between 1939 and 1948, the low-cost power sold by Bonneville helped to bring about a 329 percent gain in manufacturing payrolls in Oregon and Washington, as contrasted with a national gain of 264 percent. This reversed the usual trend in a region which has lived by exploiting raw materials rather than processing finished products.

Although the States of Oregon and Washington still desperately need more employment, Bonneville has committed 1,500,000 kilowatts of future power to the private utilities. These agreements specify that the power cannot be sold to any new industry using more than 10,000 kilowatts. Nor can existing industries be allocated that amount of energy. Public agencies also must accede to these limitations. Payroll expansion has thus been chocked off in the Northwest.

When the Republicans came into control of the National Government last year, the piecemeal dismemberment of the Bonneville grid network began. First to be severed was the strategic line from Redmond across the high Oregon uplands to Klamath Falls. This 230,000-volt backbone transmission artery, partly constructed and partly consisting of equipment on the ground, was sold to the California-Oregon Power Co. for cost—about $5 million. The matter was not even broached to Congress.

The deal took place in the cozy precincts of the Senate Interior Appropriations Subcommittee. Before the public realized what was up, the transfer of the line from the Government to the utility corporation was settled. Secretary McKay collaborated with Oregon's old guard, Senator GUY CORDON in expediting the transaction.

Both men heralded the private sale as a magnificent "break" for the taxpayers. A short time later, the California-Oregon Power Co. was granted a 16 percent rate increase by a McKay-appointed utility commissioner at the State capital, and the taking over of the Federal line was one of the reasons necessitating this huge boost. Not only are light-users at Klamath Falls paying out of their pockets for the line, but the company controls the system, thus assuring itself a continued monopoly by keeping public power out of the area.

Reduced appropriations also have played a substantial role in the handcuffing of Bonneville. Senator WAYNE L. MORSE, Oregon's spectacular Independent, has shown that the Eisenhower budget reduced the previous Truman budget allocations for Bonneville, and the Republican Congress has failed even to grant the Eisenhower requests. The cuts have hit particularly hard at the power-marketing section, which helped to plan the vital aluminum industry and to urge construction of Hell's Canyon. These activities did not please the power companies.

III

I have been familiar with the Bonneville agency since it began. During most of its life, it was full of men and women who, following Horace Greeley's advice, wanted to grow up with the country. Today, most of these people have lost their zeal. Their fires are banked. Some are terrified. Many of the ablest technicians are scattered far and wide. Many Northwesterners are worried. They realize low-cost power is the region's only hope for further development, because the Northwest lacks oil and coal and natural gas. Tumbling water is the sole industrial fuel.

Indignation over the whittling down of Bonneville is so prevalent in the Northwest that the Republican National Committee rushed McKay to Oregon recently for a $2,500 radio and TV show defending his policies. McKay pulled a bunny out of the hat in the form of advocating Libby Dam on the Kootenai River in Montana. He didn't tell his listeners three things: (1) that Libby cannot be constructed until prolonged negotiations are completed with Canada over the flooding of land in British Columbia, (2) that the Eisenhower administration tried to scuttle the Libby project in 1953 by having it specifically deauthorized by Congress, and (3) that Libby Dam is proposed in the same Army engineers' 308 Report, which McKay has totally rejected with respect to the high Federal dam at Hell's Canyon.

This spring E. B. MacNaughton, lifelong Republican and chairman of the board of Portland's First National Bank, reviewed for the annual convention of Oregon lumbermen what had happened to Bonneville. "I can't understand Douglas McKay," said McNaughton. "It's a pity. He seems to have forgotten he ever came from the West."

Support for Administration's Farm-Price Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1954

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, there is appended hereto article from the New York Times of June 28, 1954:

PRICE SUPPORTS IN AMERICAN MYTHOLOGY

(By Edward H. Collins)

The administration of President Eisenhower has been in office now for a little less than a year and a half. A year and a half is not a very long span of time; yet in this brief period the administration has already proved that it possesses one very important attribute. It has demonstrated that it isn't easily frightened by the kind of slogans and superstitions that are the bugaboo of the timid politician.

The administration may be said to have served notice to this effect first in connection with price controls. Had the President accepted the advice of politics-conscious price control authorities, the American free-price system would still, no doubt, be limping around on crutches. But Mr. Eisenhower had his own theory about how the price problem should be tackled. In the Washington of January 1953, that theory must have seemed either highly eccentric or preposterously naive.

At any rate, the new occupant of the White House promptly shattered a generation of precedent by taking the case out of the hands of the politicians and handing it over to the economists. The diagnosis was unanimous. Aside from an incipient neurosis, they agreed, there was nothing wrong with the patient that couldn't be accounted for by its prolonged and unnecessary reliance on crutches.

TRIMMING THE BUDGET

In the case of the budget the administration was to demonstrate again that, while there was no way it could avoid inheriting the problems of its predecessor, it drew the line at accepting the latter's evaluation of those problems or its prescriptions for solving them.

In introducing his original budget for fiscal 1954, Mr. Truman declared: "The recommended estimates reflect our constant effort to adjust expenditure programs to make sure they are at the minimum level consistent with our national objectives."

But the new administration, it was soon clear, had definite ideas of its own as to just what constituted a serious effort "to adjust expenditure programs to national objectives." It was not long before the results began to be visible. By August, expenditures had been cut back from the originally estimated $77.9 billion to $71.4 billion. The January, 1954, revision saw them reduced further to $70.9 billion, and it now looks as though the final figure might be in the general vicinity of $70 billion—a reduction of nearly $8 billion.

SUPPORTS AND SUICIDE

Despite the vote of the Senate Agriculture Committee on Thursday, there is good reason to believe that before many weeks have passed we may see another of the "self-evident truths" of the politicos relegated to the limbo of discredited superstitions. That is the theorem, which the farm bloc has sought diligently to popularize, that for the administration to abandon high, rigid price supports would be to commit political suicide.

The rigid price-support program has never been defensible on economic grounds, and not even President Truman's own economic advisers pretended that it was. And now, with the evidence steadily piling up before its eyes, even the public is beginning to realize the enormity of this calculated assault on common sense.

It is also beginning to understand, at long last, that this is not a farm policy in the sense that it is a policy from which all farmers benefit, but a policy conducted for the benefit of a strongly organized minority in the upper farm income brackets, at the expense of the many in the lower brackets.

These are the considerations that have compelled advocates of rigid supports to fall back on the present appeal to the fears of the politically timid. This campaign derives from a very simple formula. It is 1 part bluff and 1 part plain, old-fashioned misrepresentation.

In a recent issue of The Wall Street Journal, Albert Clark assembled statistics on the coming midterm congressional elections, which added up to a complete refutation of the farm bloc's slogan, of rigid price supports or political self-destruction." It showed that (1) almost all the Republican seats in the House that could be classified as doubtful were in nonfarm areas where the high price support label would be a liability rather than an asset; that (2) most of the doubtful Democratic seats were also in the urban category, and (3) that States that produced the basic crops (the theoretical beneficiaries of high-level supports) either were traditionally Democratic States or were States whose Republican Representatives could be dislodged only by a major political upheaval.

So much for the bluff part of the formula. Now a word about the other ingredient in this concoction—misrepresentation. The whole campaign rests to a large degree on what purports to be a valid syllogism, which runs as follows:

(1) President Truman's surprise reelection in 1948 was made possible by the farm vote; (2) the President symbolized the issue of high price supports versus flexible supports; (3) therefore, the smart thing to do is to string along with rigid price supports if you want to be elected.

To understand how the advocates of rigid supports have got as much mileage as they have out of this spurious argument, it is necessary to face up to one obvious fact about the American public, however disillusioning this may be. That fact is that political party platforms are not regarded by the public as must reading. Otherwise, it would have known that, unless Mr. Truman was running on some other party's platform in 1948, he was running on a platform that committed him, under specification number one of farm policy, to a permanent system of flexible price supports.

Texas Ranchmen and Bankers Work Together for Soil Conservation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 28, 1954

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, landowners and bankers in Texas have become accustomed to working together in the cause of soil conservation.

Recently, the Texas Bank & Trust Co., of Dallas, one of our progressive banking institutions, and the Menard Soil Conservation District, attended a bankers' range field tour, and the bankers had an opportunity to hear at first hand the ranchman's view of soil conservation.

A report of the field tour is published in the June issue of Soil and Water magazine, official publication of the Texas Soil Conservation District supervisors. I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It's not often that a group of ranchmen get to lecture to bankers. But they got their chance recently at a bankers' range field tour on the John M. Treadwell ranch near Fort McKavett.

About 110 people attended the field day, sponsored jointly by the Texas Bank & Trust Co., of Dallas, and the Menard Soil Conservation District. An estimated 25 percent were bankers or bank directors from widely scattered parts of the west Texas range country.

Several ranchmen speakers, all of them supervisors in various soil conservation districts, gave the ranchman's viewpoint on soil conservation.

H. C. Noelke, Jr., of Sheffield declared:

"Too much of the range's wealth has been mined and placed in the bank. It may look good on the bank books, but how will it look to the next generation?"

Noelke, widely known as a breeder of registered Rambouillet and Corriedale sheep, said sheep and cattle breeders already have developed livestock that have a much greater potential production than they can obtain on ranges of the rundown condition most common nowadays in west Texas.

O. B. Harkey, ranching 6 miles southwest of San Saba, stressed the value of range management in flood control.

"In my lifetime," he declared, "I've seen six major floods on the San Saba River. However, my grandfather was one of the earliest settlers there, and for forty-odd years he never knew of a flood in that country. The floods have come since 1900, along with depletion of the range."

In its original native condition, he asserted, the range in the San Saba River watershed absorbed the rainfall and prevented accumulation of enough runoff water to create floods.

Fred T. Earwood, Sonora ranchman and wool warehouseman, said the value of careful range management really came home to him when he first began work as a wool warehouseman 24 years ago. He said he found that invariably the overstocked ranch produces the poorest clip of wool, unless the ranchman has done an expensive job of livestock feeding.

"We send American boys to fight for this land, and at the same time we as its custodians are allowing it to wash and blow away," he declared.

John Royal, Menard ranchman, said many people erroneously consider soil conservation districts to be part of the Federal Government.

"They are not Federal agencies," he said. "They are as much a part of the State govment as the county commissioners' court and the school board."

Treadwell's ranch is a splendid example of the results of moderate stocking. Although it has had below-normal rainfall the last several years, it has retained a very good stand of grass. Treadwell concentrates mostly upon winter use, grazing by old-crop lambs, which are sold in spring. His ranch is very lightly stocked through the summer growing season.

And many bankers used to seeing ranges as bare as a linoleum-covered floor really got an eyeful of green grass there.

Democracy and Educational Ideals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1954

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by His Excellency the Honorable Gaganvihari L. Mehta, Ambassador of India to the United States, at the 80th commencement of Fisk University, May 31, 1954:

Mr. President, graduates of Fisk University, ladies and gentlemen, I am sensible of the high privilege of this invitation to deliver the commencement address at your university. I have been to several educational centers in this country and have had the honor of meeting their authorities and students and of addressing them. I appreciate all the more the honor done to me by your university which has made an outstanding contribution to higher education in this part of the country. Let me at the outset offer my congratulations to the graduating class of the year on the successful completion of their studies and wish you all a bright and fruitful career in the future. In an effort to make myself familiar with various aspects of life in this country, I visited Harlem some months ago and brought back vidid recollections of the kindness which was shown to me by its residents; your courtesy and cordiality have made my visit to Fisk University, so far as I am concerned, another memorable occasion.

This is a historic occasion as well, because I come here at a time when, through a momentous decision, the Supreme Court of the United States has decided to end segregation in American schools. The echoes of this judgment have reverberated not only across this vast country but also throughout the world, and have generated forces which will have far-reaching effects. The intimate connection between a democratic ordering of society and educational ideals has always been recognized, but it is significant how this forms the kernal of the judgment which the nine judges of the Supreme Court pronounced. "Education," said Chief Justice Warren, "is the very foundation of good citizenship. Today, it is a principal instrument in awakening the child to cultural values, in preparing him for later professional training, and in helping him to adjust normally to his environment. In these days it is doubtful that any child may reasonably be expected to succeed in life if he is denied the opportunity of an education. Such an opportunity, where the State has undertaken to provide it, is a right which must be made available to all on equal terms." This weighty pronouncement has an import far beyond the immediate issue. It translates into practice the ideal of social equality, which is the foundation of democracy.

I believe it was James Russell Lowell who once observed that the destiny of America was practically settled when it was decided to make education in this country not only common but compulsory. What we see today is a direct consequence of that revolutionary process. Once again, an educational ideal is gradually working toward social and economic equality through the conscience of an awakened nation.

And yet, unfortunately, customs are known to fight stiff rearguard action; they die hard, and, aided by the inertia of human nature, blunt the edge of reforms and impede progressive legislation. Caste systems, whether based on social order as in this country or on so-called religions precepts as in my own, do not disappear merely because they have been legally outlawed; they change because their injustice and iniquity stand exposed and make it difficult for people to accept them any longer. This does not mean that legislation has no value, for good laws do help social reform and by means of punitive sanctions break down the resistance of the reactionary and the pusillanimous. They also give momentum to the ground swell of revolution which keeps working silently in all societies.

Perhaps I can illustrate this point by an example from my own country. The constitution of India which was adopted in 1950 provides for abolition of the age-old practice of "untouchability." This was the culmination of a long and arduous crusade of Mahatma Gandhi during which he stressed that we could not claim freedom from foreign domination and exploitation if we ourselves practiced the same humilitating tyrannies on the less privileged members of our own community. The so-called "untouchables" now occupy positions of importance such as ministerships in the Federal as well as state governments; they are equal and honored members of our legislatures and national services. They are free to enter temples and clubs and schools and places of common resort, from which they were till recently barred. Legislative and administrative measures are being taken in regard to education and Government service so as to help them make up for lost opportunities. And yet, in spite of all that we are doing to root out this evil, I do not claim that "untouchability" has been banished from India; it still lurks in several places; it still has allies in irrational prejudice and threatened privilege and unreflecting conservatism. But the Government of my country is determined not to give it any quarter and our Parliament has under consideration legislation which specifically details offenses against the citizens' right to freedom of worship and association, and makes any exercise of ostracism in these spheres punishable by heavy fines or imprisonment or both. All this shows that the first successful battle in the domain of social reform does not necessarily insure a final triumph; the initial assault has to be followed by much hard and patient work and the victory of law which is the victory of reason has to be strengthened by education, public opinion, and cooperaitve endeavor. The struggle for freedom and equality, for sweetness and light, for tolerance and harmony, is an unending struggle which gives point to the observation that the history of the human race is the "martyrdom of man."

Democracy demands for its maintenance eternal vigilance; such vigilance is essential not only in the sphere of government but in the sphere of ideals and of moral values as well. As an ancient country, we know only too well that nations do not continue to exist without effort on peaks of civilization once achieved; they slide down into the darkness of the valley and have to begin the painful ascent over and over again. Take the field of education, in which our traditions are as old as our recorded history. In the Vedic times a child was supposed to have a symbolic "second birth" when he was initiated into knowledge by his preceptor. Our ancient teachers conducted school in slyvan surroundings under the spreading branches of shady trees. The beauty, the simplicity, and the auterity of this tradition for a subtropical country like India was realized by Poet Tagore when he revived it by establishing his well-known outdoor university called the Shantineketan. In ancient days pupils stayed in the houses of their teachers for a period of 12 years, which were considered sufficient for a knowledge of the basic texts; to obtain a complete mastery, they often spent their whole lives in the ashrams of their preceptors. There were neither fees nor examinations, and women had the same facilities for acquiring knowledge as men.

In ancient India schools for elementary education were established in the villages and were generally attached to places of religious worship. In course of time, and under the impact of Buddhism, great universities were established in India whose fame was known through the the civilized world and to which scholars, braving unimaginable hardships, came from all parts of Asia. Between the 4th and the 11th centuries, A. D., we had universities at Taxila, Mathura, Nalanda, Valabhi, Jagaddala, Mithila, Nadia, Odantapuri, and several others. Of these, Nalanda, because of the full accounts left by Chinese scholars who studied there, is perhaps the most famous. Established around the 4th century, and, therefore, antedating Padua, Paris, and Oxford by several hundred years, Nalanda had attained in the 5th century a schlastic preeminence unusual in its own day and rarely excelled since then. Its majestic buildings, constructed out of the endowments of merchants and kings, were, some of them, 6 stories high, and housed a total of 8,500 scholars and 1,500 members of the faculty. You will appreciate that they had achieved an enviable teacher-pupil ratio. Hiuen Tsang tells us that a hundred different subjects were taught to as many different classes every day and that not only was no fee charged from the alumni but they were also given, free of charge, clothes, food, bedding, and medicine. On top of it all, the affairs of the university were managed democratically by the entire body of the students.

But more important than the mechanics of its operation were the ideals this education sought to achieve. One of our ancient sayings proclaims, "True learning is that which liberates"; that is, it frees one's mind in pursuit of the true, the good, and the beautiful. Through an intimate and pervasive contact between the teacher and the student, the education aimed at the formation of good habits and the perfection of character. One of the ancient texts puts the matter succinctly by saying that "the teacher by drawing the pupil within himself as in a womb gives him a new birth." Although, because of the physical circumstances of the age, memorizing and a strict intellectual regimen were undoubtedly a part of this system, it went beyond the mere attendance at lectures and advocated meditation, reflection, and the self-realization of truths learnt in the class as indispensable elements of a complete education. It addressed itself more to the principles of knowing, to the roots from which all knowledge sprang, than to mere objective content of that knowledge. It took within its ambit not only the facts of life but also the great fact of death, which the pleasure-loving materialism of our age invites us to shun and to forget. It was eager to understand the total content of reality and to study man against the backdrop of eternal values. While the world of objects was important and had to be mastered, the inner self was even more important and beyond that was the ideal self which had to be realized through a long process of meditation and devotion. Thoreau who was deeply impressed with ancient Indian thought observed:

"The sublime sentences of Manu (the Hindu lawgiver) carry us back to a time when purification and sacrifice and self-devotion had a place in the faith of men, and were not as now a superstition. The laws of Manu are a manual of private devotion, so private and domestic and yet so public and universal a word as is not spoken in the parlor or pulpit in these days."

The fundamental aim of this education was to enable men to discover the deeper meaning of existence and to achieve an inner harmony of self rather than merely attain wordly success through wealth and power. Men and women revered those who pursued knowledge and practiced austerity and sacrificed possessions, and their purity and moral excellence inspired their numerous disciples and followers.

Through the vicissitudes of our history, we have unhappily lost many of these high ideals, and yet, as a great writer has remarked "in the parliament of the present, every man represents a constituency of the past." The leaders of modern India, notably Mahatma Gandi, have made us conscious of our ancient heritage, and through a unique national movement brought home to us the supremacy of mind over matter, of the soul over the body, and of truth over falsehood and expediency. I do not wish to suggest that we have successfully lived up to these ideals and principles. Indeed, that has not been the case anywhere in the world. In a poignant cry in Bernard Shaw's St. Joan it is asked, "Must then a Christ perish in every generation for people who have no imagination?" Again and again, we have to draw inspiration and derive strength from the thinking and teaching of great men and women whose lives shine through ages. This is all the more necessary now when the physical powers of man seem to be outstripping his moral sense and when weapons of war are becoming so terribly destructive that we must either reconquer ourselves or perish. For, as Asoka, the great Indian Emperor, proclaimed, "the only real conquest is the conquest of self." We must firmly believe that rationality, tolerance, understanding, love are more effective and enduring than prejudice, hatred, fanaticism, and violence. If moral values are abandoned by those who say that they believe in freedom, then even if totalitarianism is defeated, we shall have been left spiritually bankrupt.

I revert to our educational program which would be of interest to you as evidence of our earnestness for national reconstruction. Our literacy at present is not more than 20 percent and we are acutely conscious of the need to educate our unlettered but by no means unintelligent millions. Although we have 30 flourishing universities, 100 research institutes and 900 colleges of higher learning, they are by no means enough to meet the needs of our people. The situation regarding schools is even worse, because our existing facilities can cope with only 40 percent of our children in the age group 6–11 and 10 percent in the age group 11–17. There is, of course, a great shortage of trained teachers and of school buildings as well. Our educational system is not diversified and is heavily weighted toward academic instruction. There is little provision for vocational training and for technological studies. But we are trying to overcome these difficulties by concentrating more on technical training and by diversifying the educational system. Our Constitution requires that within 10 years of its commencement, free and compulsory education should be provided to all children up to the age of 14. You will, therefore, see what a herculean task we have set ourselves.

In our 5-year plan of economic development, we have provided $83 million for our educational development, but this sum is far from adequate for our needs. A large part of the contribution must, therefore, come from the people themselves. If I had time, I could tell you many inspiring stories of how voluntary labor and eager self-help have been responsible for setting up many school buildings in our community-development projects which aim at refashioning life in India's 560,000 villages. We are, at present, concentrating on what we call basic education at the elementary stage, where, according to a pattern set up by Mahatma Gandhi, instruction is grouped around and carried through one of the basic crafts. This has striking similarities with what is known as life-centered education in this country. We are also laying emphasis on the education of women, on the education of adult illiterates, through what we call social education and, in particular, on the education of the economically backward classes and of our hill tribes. In short, as in this country, we are acutely conscious of the fact that the framework of democracy requires the widest possible dissemination of education.

It is the deep, almost religious, faith in democracy and progress in this country which places a continually growing emphasis upon the right to equal opportunity. For, it is incompatible with democratic ideals to divide a community into the ignorant many and the cultivated few. The strength and vitality of democracies lie in their institutions ceaselessly striving for social justice. Underprivileged millions of the world cannot be regarded as free and responsible citizens so long as they remain in their present condition of poverty and illiteracy. And education is fundamental to this work of building a society "nearer to our heart's desire" wherein we have to relieve the misery of the masses and yet preserve the freedom of the individual. The warning uttered by H. G. Wells several years ago was never truer than today, "Human history becomes more and more a race between education and catastrophe."

Resolution Adopted by the Annual Meeting of the Gas Appliance Manufacturers Association for Transmittal to Jerome K. Kuykendall, Chairman of the Federal Power Commission, and to Douglas McKay, Secretary of the Interior

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK WESTLAND

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1954

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, June 18, the Federal Power Commission issued a certificate of public convenience and necessity to the Pacific Northwest Pipeline Corp. to construct facilities for the delivery of natural gas to the Great Pacific Northwest. This action was based upon testimony presented during 192 days of public hearings before that body, followed by submission of briefs and oral arguments by various principals and interviewers.

Because of its extreme importance to the economy of my district and of the entire State of Washington, this action has been widely hailed by its citizens. I therefore am happy to insert the following resolution passed by the Gas Appliance Manufacturers Association for transmittal to Jerome K. Kuydendall, Chairman of the Federal Power Commission, and to Douglas McKay, Secretary of the Interior, in the Record:

Whereas it has been proved by the degree of gas industry expansion in recent years that the public wants natural gas for domestic, commercial, and industrial use and has adopted it for these purposes wherever the fuel has been made available; and

Whereas the investing public has supported the gas industry enthusiastically in view of its opportunities and achievements in expansion and public service; and

Whereas extension of the natural gas system to the Pacific Northwest is long overdue; and

Whereas the Federal Power Commission has under consideration applications for permission to supply this area; and

Whereas a large segment of the gas appliance manufacturing industry has long since made its plans with Northwest expansion in mind, even to the extent of expanding its plant and personnel facilities in that area; and

Whereas the essentiality of natural gas service in the Pacific Northwest has been as clearly established as it was in other areas which are now being served with Commission approval: Be it hereby

Resolved, That the 19th annual meeting of the Gas Appliance Manufacturers Association, recently assembled in Chicago, respectfully petition the Federal Power Commission to give favorable consideration to applications filed with it for the right to extend natural gas pipelines from Canadian or domestic gas fields.

Mayor Kennelly, of Chicago, Stresses Vital Importance of Calumet-Sag

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1954

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it cannot have escaped attention that every Member of this body from the great State of Illinois, including the distinguished majority whip, Mr. Arends, and the eminent dean of the minority delegation, Mr. O'Brien, has signed a resolution petitioning immediate action on the Calumet-Sac Waterway development Also among the signers are the only Member from Illinois on the Committee on Public Works, Mr. Kluczynski, and the chairman of the Rules Committee, Mr. Allen. This petition has been presented to President Eisenhower and the Director of the Budget, both of whom expressed sympathetic interest.

Identical bills for a $5 million appropriation for an immediate start on a project vitally essential to the welfare of the Nation have been presented by the three Members, representing both Democratic and Republican affiliations, from the area most directly affected.

The paramount importance of the development to Chicago and the entire Middle West is stressed in a statement by Mayor Martin H. Kennelly, of Chicago, which I am extending my remarks to include. Mayor Kennelly's position not only as the chief executive of the second largest city of America but also as one of Chicago's most successful businessmen should commend his remarks to the thoughtful attention of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle.

Mayor Kennelly's statement follows:

REMARKS MADE BY MAYOR MARTIN H. KENNELLY TO THE PRESS ON THE INSPECTION TOUR OF THE CAL-SAG PROJECT ON WEDNESDAY, JUNE 23, 1954

No public works project now under consideration is of greater importance to Chicago and the midcontinent area than the Cal-Sag Channel project. For, as the long-sought St. Lawrence seaway approaches reality and ambitious plans are outlined for the port of Chicago, it becomes obvious that the bottleneck formed by the Cal-Sag Channel must be eliminated.

Until Cal-Sag has been widened and modernized, industrial expansion in the Chicago area cannot go forward as it should. This means a definite limitation of job opportunities and a brake on growth of trade and commerce. Therefore, I find the present enthusiastic and forceful drive on behalf of Cal-Sag vastly encouraging.

I rejoice in this impulse that has been given the Cal-Sag project by the wholehearted cooperation of labor, management, civic organizations and bipartisan congressional support behind the dynamic leadership of the civic-minded Cal-Sag Waterways Development Committee.

I find this doubly gratifying since the city of Chicago has neither the machinery nor the means to tackle this job that is so critically important to our city and its continued growth and prosperity.

Under such circumstances, I can but express my gratitude and pledge my full support to the members and directors of the committee that is so ably coordinating the wide demand for constructive action on Cal-Sag. And, at the same time, I declare Cal-Sag to be one of our primary civic projects and urge all leaders of industry and finance to give their strong and generous support to this magnificent program.

Mr. Speaker, I am further extending my remarks to include a recent release of the Cal-Sag Waterways Development Committee, as follows:

The Cal-Sag Channel project was today classified by Mayor Martin H. Kennelly as of paramount importance to Chicago and the Midcontinent area.

Heading a tour of inspection of Cal-Sag organized by the Cal-Sag Waterways Development Committee, Mayor Kennelly said: "Until Cal-Sag has been widened and modernized, industrial expansion in the Chicago area cannot go forward as it should. This means a definite limitation of job opportunities and a brake on the growth of trade and commerce."

Commenting on the Cal-Sag Committee's constructive program of education Mayor Kennelly said, "I rejoice in the impulse that has been given the Cal-Sag project by the wholehearted cooperation of labor, management, civic organizations, and bipartisan congressional support behind the dynamic leadership of the civic-minded Cal-Sag Waterways Development Committee."

"Under such circumstances," the Mayor continued, "I can but express my gratitude and pledge my full support to the members and directors of the committee that is so ably coordinating the wide demand for constructive action on Cal-Sag. And, at the same time, I declare Cal-Sag to be one of our primary projects and urge all leaders of industry and finance to give their strong and generous support to this magnificent program."

Chairman Henry E. Seyfarth, of the Cal-Sag Waterways Development Committee, expressed his gratitude for the Mayor's statement. This statement, Mr. Seyfarth said, is of paramount importance since this inspection tour of Cal-Sag is no routine matter. For, we have in attendance on this trip, representatives of practically every labor and civic organization and of all industry in the area. Mr. Seyfarth also pointed out that this statement from Mayor Kennelly came on the heels of the presentation to President Eisenhower and the Bureau of the Budget of the resolution signed by every member of the Illinois delegation in the House of Representatives petitioning action on Cal-Sag. Thus, he said, the Mayor's forthright statement shows how vitally necessary the Cal-Sag project is on every count. This statement will undoubtedly give added encouragement to the powerful cooperative organization of labor, management, and civic organizations which has found its full expression in the Cal-Sag Waterways Development Committee.

Mr. Hoover on Deficits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1954

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, the Daily Times, published at Mamaroneck, N. Y., recently carried an editorial entitled "Mr. Hoover on Deficits." Under permission of the House, I insert the editorial in the Congressional Record:

MR. HOOVER ON DEFICITS

There is gratifying news from Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey. He predicts that in addition to the $7 billion cut in the present fiscal year's budget, we will be able to make a further cut in the next fiscal year of an additional $5 billion. Thus we find Eisenhower campaign promises blossoming into fruit.

Speaking upon the same occasion as Secretary Humphrey was former President Herbert Hoover. Worth remembering is that Mr. Hoover characterized as a delusion "the John Maynard Keynes shell game that no matter how much the public debt may be, it does not matter because we owe it to ourselves." That was the ridiculous, deceptive thesis advanced by the New Deal when our tax and debt burdens almost broke our backs. It was not even a good alibi.

"That theory," continued Mr. Hoover, "includes the idea that the debt never needs to be paid off. But it ignores the pain resulting when the old, and especially the young, paid income tax for interest on the debt. Twenty-odd years of deficits and consequent inflation have produced an economic pain which the followers of Lord Keynes did not diagnose, for the purchasing power of money has decreased by one-half."

When Mr. Hoover thus refers to the "twenty-odd years" of the New Deal and the Fair Deal, we contend his phraseology is accurate. Very odd, indeed.

Speaking along the same lines last month in Washington to the American Society of Newspaper Editors, Mr. Hoover has said:

"Obviously, 1 of 3 things must happen from a Federal budget deficit. The deficit must be met by decreased Government expenditures, which hurt the feelings of some pressure groups; or by levying more taxes, which hurts most everybody's pocket nerves; or it must be met by the Federal Government's borrowing the money. The borrowing alternate is where the eternal damnation comes in.

"Take a short look at what has happened from our national experience of 23 years of deficit borrowing—with 2 exceptions. Our Federal debt has increased to $275 billions from $19 billions. The interest on this amount alone is almost twice the whole cost of Government of 23 years ago.

"Currency in circulation has increased from $4½ billions to over $30 billions. Government revenues, which are mostly taxes, have increased from $3½ billions a year to over $65 billions. The consequence of all this is that the cost of living has increased by about 80 percent.

"By taxes through the front door and rising prices through the back door, a family requires an income of $3,700 a year to give the same standard of living that an income of $1,500 a year would buy 23 years ago. And the purchasing power of all pensions, savings-bank deposits, and income from trustee securities has been reduced by more than one-half amid millons of tragedies."

That is what the New Deal and the Fair Deal did to us in the economic field. And it is away from that long record of deficits that Secretary Humphreys and President Eisenhower now lead us.

House Committee on Un-American Activities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK WESTLAND

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1954

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to call the attention of this body to a letter I received the other day, which is one of many that has come to me as a result of the hearings recently conducted by the House Committee on Un-American Activities in Seattle, Wash.

The general tenor of all the letters I have received is the same as the following one, which was addressed to me by Mr. Albert H. Keppler, a well known and highly respected businessman of Seattle:

Yates, Riley & MacDonald,
Seattle, Wash., June 17, 1954.

Hon. Jack Westland,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Congressman Westland: I have been in regular attendance at the hearings of the House Un-American Activities Committee under the chairmanship of Congressman Velde, that are being held here in Seattle.

On Wednesday, June 16, 1954, the committee in regular session voted to recommend that a witness, namely George T. Starkovich, be cited for contempt of Congress.

Never have I seen more patience on the part of any duly constituted authority than has been exercised by the distinguished members sitting on this committee throughout the entire procedures here in Seatle. They have leaned over backward and tolerated more insolence than any prudent men might be expected to do. But the conduct of the subject witness, in spite of this, was more than an outrage and insult, not only to the Congress but to all decent Americans.

I strongly urge you to vote in support of the recommendation for citation when it comes before the House of Representatives.

May I also express to you my deep regard, respect, and admiration for each and every member of the Velde committee. They are dong a wonderful job.

Sincerely,

Albert H. Keppler.

Forty Years Ago Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1954

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, at the opening of our session today I observed that this is the 40th anniversary of an act of assassination 5,000 miles from our shores that was followed by two World Wars and the sacrifice of over half a million American lives.

After listening with rapt interest to the pending debate on the mutual security bill, I wish to return to the subject. There is a relation between the dastardly deed of June 28, 1914, and the debate in this Chamber on June 28, 1954.

The "ifs" in history are as the "ifs" of individual lives. If 40 years ago today reason and religion had erased the maniacal passion from the mind of Garvo Princip, a Serbian student whose name then was known not to one person in all the United States of America, would we today have under consideration a measure for defense involving billions of dollars?

In 1914 Woodrow Wilson was President of the United States and the Secretary of State was William Jennings Bryan whose lecture The Prince of Peace was quoted in every American home as the vocal blueprint for what the world was to be forever in the future. He was the great pacifist of the period. Newton Baker was then mayor of Cleveland and next to William Jennings Bryan in eloquence and power his was the voice of forever peace on earth, good will among men.

EUROPE'S RACE OF ARMS

We seemed so far, far away from Europe. Our newspapers and our magazines commented from time to time on the race of arms in which Germany, France, and Great Britain were contestants. Occasionally the newspapers and the magazines would print figures showing the cost to the three nations in pursuing this race of armaments, and we in the United States thought how foolish they were and what better use we were making of our money in pursuing the ways of peace.

Mr. Speaker, given time the rivalries and the differences among the governments of Europe might have been worked out. That surely must have been the hope of the leaders of those governments exactly as it is the hope today of our leaders and the leaders of other governments participating with us in negotiations for peace and meanwhile the program for mutual security. But an unknown Serbian student, a man who had not figured in any of the calculations, a man without power, fired two shots from a pistol.

I am moved to say that this is a thought which we should not brush aside. When passion is in the air a riotous and unreasoning mob may gather. There is no real danger until the first blow is struck. Until the first blow there is no concert of action. The leaders are held back by a sense of caution or a reluctance to turn a demonstration into an explosion in which they themselves and their cause may as likely be blown up. Then the most insignificant member of the mob strikes a blow and the situation is out of control.

Forty years ago today the news came to us of the assassination at Sarajevo, Bosnia Herzegovina, and the death of Archduke Francis Ferdinand, heir to the throne of Austria-Hungary, and his wife, Countess Sophie Chotek.

It seemed to us then so far, far away. It was a time long before Lindbergh had spanned the Atlantic in an airplane. It was at a time when travel by railroad in most areas was regarded as dangerous if the speed exceeded 30 miles an hour.

BAKER, SECRETARY OF WAR

So we went about our affairs, William Jennings Bryan's great oration on the Prince of Peace continued to mark the path of life as we envisioned it forever in our great United States. Newton Baker, as mayor of Cleveland, continued to glory with justifiable pride in his renown as the great pacifist. Little did he glimpse the quick progress of destiny that would bring him within 2 years on the resignation of Lindley M. Garrison to the office of Secretary of War.

Mr. Speaker, it chanced that on the morning of his appointment and during the first hour of his incumbency of the office of Secretary of War that I was in his company. We were old friends, members of the same college fraternity, and he had requested me to fill some speaking appointments for him that he had made, not knowing of the sudden turn that was to come to his career.

I joked with him about a pacifist being Secretary of War. He then told me that President Woodrow Wilson had sent for him. He had read of Garrison's resignation but any thought of that circumstance having a connection with his summons to the White House was furthest from his mind. He said that when he entered the executive office and there had been the usual salutations, the President bluntly said to him "I am naming you as my Secretary of War." He said it took him some time to realize that the President was not indulging in a bit of pleasantry. Newton Baker remained as Secretary of War to carry us through the first world conflict, a great and renowned pacifist who carved his name imperishably on the roll of war.

AMERICA REMAINS TRANQUIL

Events in America after the assassination of 40 years ago moved rapidly on the domestic level. Seven thousand delegates to the International Sunday School Association met in Chicago and paraded down Michigan Avenue singing Onward Christian Soldiers, in their crusade to wipe out the liquor traffic.

In West Virginia a few days after the assassination in Bosnia the State went dry, and that was the big news in West Virginia.

Theodore Roosevelt, exploring the jungles of Brazil, had discovered the River of Doubt; and the Nation was concerned whether he had been too strenuous in the jungles and had impaired his health.

In Paris Mrs. Potter Palmer gave a reception for a duchess and among the guests was the Infanta Eulalia of Spain who 20 years before had snubbed Mrs. Potter with the remark that "I will not meet the wife of an innkeeper."

People in Chicago were much more interested in that item than the story of an assassination that was destined to bring on the loss of a half a million American lives and to the United States of America the great and grave responsibility of world leadership.

FORTY YEARS AGO TODAY

In the Chicago Sunday Tribune of June 27, 1954, the magazine section, Richard Blakesly in a most interesting article entitled "Forty Years Ago World War I Came to Chicago," says:

> That Sunday (St. Vitus Day, it was) was the turning point in American history, but few, if any, had reason to suspect it. It was just another normal Sunday morning in Chicago; owl cars rattled along their lonely routes carrying their usual quota of weary night workers home; lights flickered in the Loop's all-night restaurants; the roysterers were leaving their clubs and cafes; the milkmen and newspaper carriers were just stirring. But most of Chicago was sleeping a carefree sleep.
>
> And why not? There was an Army of 95,468 men and 59,651 in the Navy—all volunteers. The public debt stood at a little over $1 billion. Under the newly enacted Federal income-tax law a married man had an exemption of $4,000.
>
> Today, 40 years after Sarajevo and two world wars—the last one costing America 393,131 killed—our troops are scattered over Europe, Asia, and Africa. Although at peace, we are conscripting men for military service; income taxes are at wartime highs, and billions are being spent for protection in case world war III breaks out.
>
> Who would have dared to prophesy—just 40 years ago—that 2 shots fired 5,000 miles away were destined to twist and make turbulent the placid, comfortable future Chicago and the rest of America confidently believed to be their destiny?

WAR DRAWS NEARER TO US

Slowly we were becoming involved. I was in Canada at National Algonquin Park when England was at war, and Canadian young men were going overseas for battle. Americans then were not popular in Canada. The Canadians felt that it was our war as much as their war and we were holding back. Woodrow Wilson hoped to the very last to prevent our involvement.

I, then lieutentant governor of Illinois, was in a box when he made his great historic speech in Orchestra Hall. It was one of the great orations of all time and a masterpiece of diction. Joe Tumulty told me afterwards that the speech was entirely extemporaneous, that Woodrow Wilson for a half hour remained looking out of the window on the train approaching Chicago, then jotted down a few notes on an envelope, and that was the sum total of preparation for a speech which was as matchless in its diction as it was eloquent in its delivery.

CHALLENGE TO US TODAY

Mr. Speaker, I repeat what I said earlier in the day, the challenge to this generation is to end war and to assure the permanent peace. It was the challenge to the generation of my young manhood, but the destiny in store for that generation of young men and for the succeeding generation of young men was in the zone of war. The thought that this 40th anniversary day must leave with us is in the danger that ever lurks in the act of a minor individual in a climate of dynamite to plunge all the world into chaos, suffering, and ruin.

On June 28, 1914, two systems of European alliances, engaged in an armament race, needed by the shots fired in a Bosnian town, of which most of us had never heard, to set off a world conflagration, continuing after a lapse into a worse world conflagration. Let us hope—and let us fervently pray—that the conferences of statesmen now taking place will result in such a constructive glance into the pages of history that there shall be no repetition of patterns.

Address of Hon. Harry F. Byrd, of Virginia, in Washington, D. C., Before the National Council for Community Improvement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD H. REES

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1954

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday evening, June 24, I had the honor of being a guest at a banquet meeting of the National Council of Community Improvement. The meeting was at the Mayflower Hotel in this city. It was attended by leaders in industry, in business, in education, and in other fields, including government executives and Members of Congress.

The address of the evening was delivered by that great American, the Honorable Harry F. Byrd, the distinguished Senator from Virginia. I am honored to have secured permission to include this fine constructive speech in the Record:

For those of us who have labored in the Congress against waste and extravagance in the Federal Government, it is encouraging to see leaders gathered here, representing the National Council for Community Improvement, who are working on behalf of preserving Federal solvency and our democratic form of government.

I know of no more worthy objective than to give your time as citizens to fight Federal paternalism and to help to return to the States the taxes and functions which have been usurped by the Central Government. Creeping paternalism is just as bad as creeping socialism, as the end result is the same—the destruction of the principles of our free government. Unless you go to the record the average citizen cannot realize how far we have already gone on the road to paternalistic government. In the last 21 years, the length of my service in the Senate, the Federal aid to the States has been increased to three billions annually and now embraces 50 separate and distinct programs.

This does not include, exclusive of social security, any annual payments to individuals of one billion three hundred million in 36 programs.

Day by day in the administration of these programs the Federal Government is extending its control over our local and private affairs by demanding certain procedures with which the localities often do not agree but must agree in order to receive the Federal grants.

Always we must remember that power follows the purse and, the more the Federal aid, the greater the authority of the Federal Government is over local affairs. The Supreme Court decision which abolished segregation in the public schools has already given a new impetus to the movement for Federal aid to public education. The last bastion of States rights and individual liberty lies in the education of our children. Federal appropriations to public schools followed by the inevitable Federal control will strike a fatal blow at the grassroots of our democracy.

Federal-dominated schools will certainly mold our thinking along paternalistic lines and may instill in the hearts and minds of our youth strange doctrines and isms which would not likely occur with our public system under local control. Throughout my Senate career I have fought and I will continue to fight against the dangers of federalized education.

When we consider what we call paternalism, it is well to study a bill recently introduced in Congress by one of the most outstanding and ablest Members of that body, my colleague, Congressman Howard W. Smith, of Virginia. This is a short bill, and I will read it to you:

> "A bill to establish rules of interpretation governing questions of the effect of acts of Congress on State laws
>
> "*Be it enacted, etc.*, That no act of Congress shall be construed as indicating an intent on the part of Congress to occupy the field in which such act operates, to the exclusion of all State laws on the same subject matter unless such act contains an express provision to that effect. No act of Congress shall be construed as invalidating a provision of State law which would be valid in the absence of such act, unless there is a direct and positive conflict between such act and such provision, so that the two cannot be reconciled or consistently stand together."

We must always remember that we of this generation are merely the trustees for generations to come. We must start now and do all within our power to prevent this continuing unnecessary concentration of power at Washington.

To achieve Federal economy, a first task of Congress is to expose to the public waste and extravagance. When this happens, public opinion forces the administrative agencies of Government to present more reasonable budgets to the Congress.

A second task of Congress is to see to it that the fiscal machinery of the Federal Government is tightened, both in the legislative and executive branches. It is the duty of Congress to scrutinize the administration's budget request with scrupulous care and to challenge vigorously every proposal for new basic legislation requiring fiscal commitments.

Let us remember that the thing most inflated in America today is the Federal Government. Big government costs big money. It must be cut down. Cutting Federal expenses means a smaller government and less danger of paternalism.

If Congress is to preclude further deficits, it must have the support of taxpaying citizens who have to pay the bill.

Despite reduction of a quarter of a million civilian Federal workers since the Korean war peak, there are still well over 300,000 more Federal workers than there were in the pre-Korean war level.

The Eisenhower administration is to be highly commended on tightening and improving its budget presentation. It is a creditable record by the Federal administration that the expenditures in this fiscal year will be $6 billion less than in the previous fiscal year.

In the fiscal year beginning July 1, the administration expects a further reduction of from $4 billion to $5 billion. Entrenched public spending is most difficult to change, but a good start has been made. However, much more must be done before our Federal economy is on a sound basis. To reduce taxes on borrowed money, as we have been doing, just does not make sense.

If the citizens want the Federal budget balanced, they must demand it constantly. Their demands must be specific and forceful. Citizens can appear before Congress far more often than they do in order to take a more active position against specific spending. Again and again streams of persons appear before the congressional committees requesting money. Few indeed are those who appear in opposition to spending money.

Citizens can and must think of Federal spending in terms of national interest and stop pushing spending programs of local interests or of the spending lobbies.

In all of my public career, beginning with my service as Governor of Virginia, I have opposed public debt unless it is essential. Pay-as-you-go financing is far better. We, of course, all know that in time of war or great emergency we must borrow and spend whatever is necessary for our security, but let us always remember that any debt, even though it may be necessary, is most undesirable.

I was amazed the other day to see a statement made by an economist attached to one of the committees of Congress that there is no harm in a great public debt and that our budget need not be balanced.

We, of course, all remember the talk that went around when we started our spending orgy—that a Federal debt makes no difference so long as we owe it to ourselves. Such an argument is utterly fallacious, although we, of course, recognise that a debt owing to the people of America is some better than a debt owed to other countries. There is a very distinct difference, as we all know, between a public debt and a private debt. In the case of a private debt, it can be liquidated and ended, but in the case of a public debt, it can only be liquidated by disastrous inflation or by national repudiation, either of which would destroy our form of government.

Let us, for a moment, see what has happened to us resulting from the debt of $275 billion that we now owe. This debt is equal to the full value, by Government statistics, of all the tangible property in America—all the land, all the buildings, machinery and equipment of all kinds. On this debt we are now paying a yearly interest equal to 10 percent of our gross receipts from taxation; that is to say, we could reduce all taxes by 10 percent if we did not have this interest to pay.

Now, let us see the effect of this debt from an inflationary standpoint. The figures I give you come from official sources. In the period between 1940 and 1953, the Federal Government spent $240 billion more than it collected in taxes. Practically in direct ratio the purchasing power of the dollar declined in proportion to this deficit spending.

I call your attention to these facts: Beginning with the 100-cent dollar in 1940, there was a decline of 5 cents in the value of the dollar in 1941, and then in the 2 years of 1942 and 1943 the value of the dollar declined by 15 cents, and in those 2 years we expended $80 billion in excess of revenue. Another year, between 1946 and 1947, the value of the dollar went down 9 cents, and we then expended $22 billion in excess of revenue.

Today the purchasing power of the dollar as compared to 1940 is something less than 52 cents.

We can gloss over this as we please, but any country that loses one-half of the purchasing power of its money in a period of 13 years should certainly take serious warning. I think that most of us can agree that while other factors are involved, yet deficit spending is one of the most important elements in any inflationary trend.

The $275 billion direct debt is not by any means the complete obligations of our Government. We have contingent liabilities of nearly $200 billion. There is no way of knowing what this contingent liability may be in actual losses, but, as the years go on, it is certain to be very substantial. In the housing field alone the Federal Government guaranteed $35 billion. Here is how some of these contingent loans are worked:

Under section 608 (multiple family), one company formed by three people who invested only $30 each received a windfall of $600,000 out of guaranteed loans. This was done by overappraisal.

Another company in Brooklyn, composed of two stockholders, invested $50,000. The project cost $25,000,000 and the amount of the FHA loan was $30,000,000, giving a windfall of $5 million.

Another invested $1,000 and had a windfall of $1,300,000.

In Virginia 1 company of 7 people invested $1,000 and received a loan of $500,000 in excess of the cost of the project.

In Virginia 2 people invested $51,000 and received a loan of $416,000 in excess of cost.

In Virginia 7 people invested $1,000 and profited $496,000. Loans not made on cost. Some day the United States Treasury must meet some of these losses.

In January I had Clyde Powell, Assistant Administrator for Rental Housing, section 608, in my office.

On April 20, Coleman Andrews testified as to huge losses in taxes before the Senate Committee on Banking. Powell claimed protection of fifth amendment.

This is certainly 2 and perhaps 3 strikes against him. The case has been submitted to the Attorney General.

All of us must sacrifice something in the difficult days ahead. We must cease asking the Federal Government to do things we should do for ourselves. We must put Santa Clause in the deep freeze, both at home and abroad.

Centralized power and purse breed a sinister political philosophy which scorns frugality, efficiency and integrity; which attaches no importance to waste, debt or financial amorality; which advocates indefinitely the political formula of tax and tax, borrow and borrow, spend and spend, elect and elect, and which has no scruples against using public money to influence political decisions.

You may not believe it, but for all the vast Federal bureaucracy to which is entrusted so much of our freedom and treasure, there is not a single civil service regulation against waste of money or materials. To me, deliberate waste is a dreadful thing, and public waste is the most dreadful of all, because it is a breach of trusteeship. There is nothing so difficult to contend with; nothing so utterly demoralizing and ruinous. In public affairs it is easy to start and hard to stop. Much of the present deficit is due to waste.

Two angles to deficit spending: One is, when does insolvency approach? The other is the element of inflation.

We have the highest taxation we have ever known and a high general prosperity, yet no present prospect exists to balance the budget.

The very base of all we have in free government is our fiscal solvency. Without it, we could not maintain our democratic form of government. Without it, we could not have military preparation unless we had a totalitarian government such as Russia. Without the solvency of the American dollar, we would enter an age of international darkness. It is the only currency that everybody, everywhere in the world has confidence in.

Those who willfully or otherwise would destroy American solvency would destroy the freedoms of people everywhere.

Today we are at peace; that is to say, that while we must maintain a massive military organization, we are not at war. This period of crisis may exist for many years. We must live with it, and we must adapt our financial affairs to it.

The direct road to fiscal suicide is to continue to reduce taxes and add the loss to the public debt. What happens? If we reduce taxes and borrow the money to do so, you start paying annual interest which continues perhaps forever.

This fine audience needs no definition of free enterprise from me.

It is the system which, in the relatively short span of 160 years, has brought us from the impotency of 13 un-united colonies to our present position of world leadership. I do not concede that it should be scrapped for socialism in welfare state clothing which never brought greatness, happiness, or security to any nation.

The American system has developed individual freedoms under constitutional democracy to the fullest measure ever known to man. It is the system which supplies the incentive to every American to start at the bottom and rise to the top.

It has enabled us with only 6 percent of the world's population to outproduce the rest of the world combined. It is the system which produces steel, the prime requirement for military defense, at a rate of more than 2 tons for every 1 produced by the rest of the world—at a rate of more than 4 tons to every 1 ton produced by Russia.

I challenge the would-be Socialists to offer a practical substitute for the American system's capacity to hold Russian world aggression at bay.

Our free-enterprise system is the greatest deterrent in the world today to Russian aggression. It is our first line of defense. Our Armies, Navies, and Air Forces are merely tools through which the strength of this system is applied in war.

Our competitive enterprise system must rest upon a solvent government free of socialistic tendencies.

There has never been a time when we should exercise greater wisdom in mapping our course. We should tighten our belts for the long, hard pull ahead. Until world conditions change it would be tragic if we did not maintain an adequate world military power. We must keep ahead of Russia in military invention and scientific progress. This I believe we are doing. Our Air Force must be overwhelming as compared to Russia's. We must continue to control the seas. Our Army must be adequate. All of us know this and all of these things can be done, within our ability to pay if we are judicious.

Here is what I think we must do if we are to preserve our solvency and the value of our money:

1. Balance the budget by reducing spending.

2. Do not lift the existing debt ceiling of $275 billion. This is more than enough for us to owe.

3. Reduce taxes after reducing expenditures, but do not reduce taxes when necessary to borrow.

4. Short of a national emergency, there can be and should be a moratorium in all new spending programs until the Federal Government is showing an actual surplus.

To implement this program, we should do the following:

1. Provide for a single package appropriation bill as a substitute for the 12 appropriation bills we now have. This would clarify our appropriation procedure. Already passed Senate.

2. Staff facilities of Congress for reviewing budgetary proposals can be much improved.

3. Data obtained by outside commissions like the Hoover Commission can be used more effectively by Congress.

4. The use of carryover funds now amounting to about $60 billion can be reduced and the whole budgetary machinery greatly simplified.

5. The President can be given the right to veto individual items in appropriation bills. This has recently been favorably reported by the Senate. Judiciary Subcommittee.

Without American solvency there would be no deterrent to communism abroad. In the existing circumstances it is no exaggeration to say that there is literally nothing on earth more important than the preservation of the fiscal and moral integrity of the Federal Government of the United States of America, and the freedoms upon which our Republic was founded.

Alarm Sounded Against Onassis-Saudi Arabian Oil Monopoly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 23, 1954

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, at long last I am glad to see that widespread notice is being taken of the monopolistic oil agreement entered into between Mr. Aristotle S. Onassis and the Saudi Arabian Government. After a great deal of prodding, the terms of this far-reaching contract have now been made public. What is reputed to be the complete text of this oil-tanker agreement has been published in an article in the New York Journal of Commerce, dated June 22, 1954, and clearly establishes the existence of an unfair monopolistic contract in violation of normal trade procedures. A New York Times story of June 23 corroborates and emphasizes the untenable aspects of this agreement which militates against American interests.

In identical letters which I directed to the Secretary of State and Foreign Operations Administrator on May 18, 1954, I called attention to a situation involving a monopolistic oil tanker agreement between Mr. A. S. Onassis and the Saudi Arabian Government which had come to my attention. I stated that operations under this agreement might seriously damage American interests and I requested their views on this subject. With reference to any funds to be requested by the administration for Saudi Arabia and other Arab States in the mutual security bill, I asked whether the monopolistic concessions granted under this agreement should in any way affect the administration's request for funds.

Under date of June 3, 1954, I received a response from Assistant Secretary of State Thruston B. Morton, which, in summary, indicated that the Department had not been able to obtain an authentic text of the agreement but had expressed to the Saudi Arabian Government this country's concern over an agreement which appears to constitute unwarranted discrimination against American shipping interests. Mr. Morton advised that the whole matter is receiving most careful study and that every effort would be made to protect the legitimate interests of American enterprise which may be affected by the agreement. With respect to the mutual security bill and funds which may be requested under it, Mr. Morton added that the amount of funds contemplated for Saudi Arabia is of extremely modest proportions and, in view of our close relations with Saudi Arabia, the financial assistance is consistent with and in support of United States policy objectives in the Middle East.

Under date of June 9, 1954, Foreign Operations Administrator Stassen replied to my letter and reported that full discussion had been held with the State Department. His expressed position was consistent with that of the State Department and he stated his belief that any withholding of the small amount of aid for Saudi Arabia would hinder rather than further American interests.

Following the protest which I issued publicly on May 18, 1954, and the identical letters which I directed to the Secretary of State and the Foreign Operations Administrator on that date, I note that the United States Government has filed a formal protest with the Saudi Arabian Government, according to the Journal of Commerce article. The protest reportedly points out that the exclusive agreement between Mr. Onassis and the Saudi Arabian Government is in violation of concessions that the Arabian American Oil Co.—known as Aramco and consisting of four major American oil companies—has with the Saudi Arabian Government. Also this contract may be violative of international law, particularly since the agreement contains terms of boycott against a friendly nation, the Republic of Israel.

Under the terms of the agreement, all oil companies presently having concessions in Saudi Arabia will be required to carry their exportable petroleum and petroleum products from Saudi Arabia to foreign countries by the Saudi Arabian Maritime Co., Ltd., which is owned exclusively by A. S. Onassis and his associates. The only exception, apparently, is that the Arabian American Oil Co. which now holds a huge petroleum concession, could continue to use those of its tankers which were engaged in carrying Saudi Arabian petroleum prior to December 31, 1953. Moreover, the monopolistic agreement permits Mr. Onassis to charge freight rates well above the current market for long-term tanker charters. Doubtless, American consumers will pay the added charges.

The original monopolistic agreement, reportedly concluded at Jedda on January 20, was amended on April 7 by a secret addendum in which Onassis reputedly pledged that no Jew should have any interest in any of these companies, directly or indirectly, and assumed an obligation that his company would have no dealings with the Republic of Israel.

The result of this negotiation is expected to assure King Saud—who is in effect "Mr. Saudi Arabia" and who is actually in tyrannical control of that country—of a new annual revenue reported to be $50 million a year. As a result of this pact and its potentialities, King Saud is reported to have assumed new financial obligations in the Arab world and has projected plans to bolster the general Arab League campaign against Israel.

Undoubtedly Onasis will try to extricate himself from his difficulties with the American Government by offering to make deals of various sorts. He may agree to modify his monopoly for the benefit of certain countries or companies on the principle of divide and conquer. He may even graciously allow the American oil companies to keep their present share of tonnage in return for their complaisance with respect to the rest of this pernicious agreement. I hardly think it is necessary to warn the American oil companies against entering into any such agreement with a man whose conspiracies are adverse to the freedom of international trade and to the foreign policy of the United States. I urge once again that the United States State Department and the Foreign Operations Administration actively and vigorously review this unpalatable and monopolistic agreement. It militates against the best interests of our national security, our traditions of free trade and fair play, and our time-honored guaranties of justice and equity to friendly countries and the American consuming public.

Warning to Investigators

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 24, 1954

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to direct to the attention of our colleagues the following editorial which appeared in the June 11, 1954, issue of the Brooklyn Eagle:

WARNING TO INVESTIGATORS

Never has there been a more graphic demonstration of the unfairness and danger of using paragraphs lifted out of a full context as a basis for sweeping conclusions than was made evident in the House committee hearings on tax-free foundations.

Thomas H. McNiece, associate research director of the committee, had the embarrassing experience of describing anonymous quotations as following the Communist line when he occupied the witness chair. It developed that the sentences were part of three papal encyclicals. As a Protestant, Representative WAYNE L. HAYS, Democrat, of Ohio, said he wanted to emphasize that the Catholic Church "has been one of the greatest bulwarks against communism throughout the world." Mr. HAYS, a severe critic of the methods employed by the committee, was the interrogator.

Sentences picked at random from public utterances of individuals frequently present an utterly false picture and this fact should be remembered by anyone who participates in a probe of any kind. Opinions reached are wholly unreliable unless the entire text is studied.

Mr. McNiece hastened to add that the committee staff was careful to avoid lifting quotations from context that might give them a false connotation. But while his assurance should be accepted as sincere there remains a telling point which must register in the minds of congressional investigators.

The Need To Know

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1954

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, there is an article in today's issue of the New York Times, Monday, June 28, 1954, as follows:

NEW SECRECY IN ARMY—STAMP "FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY" ADOPTED FOR SOME PAPERS

WASHINGTON, June 27.—The Army has acted under the new Defense Department directive authorizing secrecy for information stamped "For official use only."

First of the services to issue orders based on the directive, it has sent out a circular carrying two warnings.

One is that "Official information which does not require classification in the interests of national defense" will bear the new classification stamp and "disclosure of information in this category in public news media is prohibited."

The other is that material bearing such a stamp will be disseminated within the Army and among other Government agencies on a "strictly need to know basis."

Neither the Defense Department nor the Army contends that documents bearing the "official use only" stamp contain actual military secrets of value to an enemy. The stamp promises to become a substitute for the former "restricted" stamp.

In the House, on Thursday, May 13, 1954, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 6188, I spoke as follows:

TOP SECRETS

(Mr. SIEMINSKI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, my observation has to do with top-secret clearance. Whether a man is cleared or not cleared, in itself, does not reflect on his loyalty as a citizen.

His right to see classified materials should include a need to see them or to know their contents. If that point is recognized, I feel there will be little concern about documents dealing with citizens and their reputations.

The entire security program, including that of the armed services, is maintained to protect the rights of the people. Through the handling of it, we do not want to destroy the rights of citizens they, the armed services, are maintained to protect.

It sems to me that the above step taken by the Army is most timely and certainly in the right direction. I trust that similar progress along this line will continue not only in the military but in our civil functions as well.

A Good Good-Neighbor Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 23, 1954

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by me in the Le Perroquet suite of the Waldorf Astoria Hotel on Friday, June 25, 1954, upon receipt of the Eloy Alfaro Medal of the Fundacion Internacional Eloy Alfaro, of the Republic of Panama:

I am deeply aware of the honor being bestowed upon me by His Excellency Eusebio A. Morales, Ambassador of the Republic of Panama. I shall ever cherish the decoration—the Medalla de Eloy Alfaro. It shall serve to remind me and mine and all of us assembled here, of the good works of Eloy Alfaro, soldier, statesman, educator, humanitarian, and martyr.

Eloy Alfaro was President of Ecuador from 1895 to 1901, and again from 1906 to 1911. As President, he gave his unswerving devotion to all good causes. His ear was attuned to the soft, sad music of humanity. He always followed the precepts of the Prophet Micah, "to lova mercy, do justice, and walk humbly." He recognized that justice is the bread of any nation, because people hunger for it. He set up a judicial system in his native state of Ecuador that has been emulated by many political entities of Spanish-Indian origin. He advanced the literacy of his nation by expanding her schools and colleges and other institutions of learning. He recognized that knowledge and truth will set men free. Like that other great liberator and hero of the Americas, Simon Bolivar, Eloy Alfaro believed in the dignity of man and his inalienable rights; and believed that governments are not for the few at the expense of the many. Both gave to bigotry no sanction, to intolerance no support, to tyranny no comfort. Both desired, as did the Prophet Isaiah, that each man should "sit in safety under his own vine and fig tree and there shall be none to make him afraid." They were both nonconformists. They shunned the status quo. They believed in progress, and they knew too that revolution is sometimes the handmaiden of progress and that it is necessary at time to rebel against tyrants who oppress the poor and lowly. They wanted the Americas to move forward.

Eloy Alfaro fought the totalitarianism of his era. He once said: "There is no redemption without sacrifices; these are the solid bases for progress." Disraeli put it another way: "You cannot make revolutions with rose water."

Sixty-four years ago, in 1890, there was convened in Washington the Conference of American States. The Pan American Union doubtlessly stemmed from this conference. Eloy Alfaro had the proud distinction of masterminding this confederation. He firmly believed in Western Hemispheric solidarity, and the union of American republics was to him a cherished desire. He sparkplugged, in 1906, the International Conference at Mexico City, where the United States and six other Pan American nations assembled to "discuss and decide questions relating to the progress and well-being of the American states, based upon justice and fraternity." He was an apostle of Pan Americanism. Although a native of Ecuador, he was a citizen of the Americas.

Eloy Alfaro's unflagging service to his own country was extended beyond its confines, and earned for him unbounded admiration. He sought the reconstruction of a greater Colombia. He sought to reestablish the Republic of Bolivia.

While exiled from his native Ecuador and resident of El Salvador, the Central American Republics of El Salvador, Guatemala, and Honduras (themselves once a confederation of states with Nicaragua and Costa Rica), were about to war against each other. To avoid such fratricidal holocaust, Alfaro, using his friendship with the three presidents of the quarreling republics, and uniting with leaders of Costa Rica and Nicaragua, brought about the setting up of an international assembly which resolved all difficulties, and brought amity and accord without recourse to arms. His efforts for peace yielded him worldwide fame. Once again, the idea of American unity triumphed.

Eloy Alfaro sympathized with the good people of Cuba in their spasmodic revolts against the brutal and bloody tyrannies of the captains-general sent out of Spain with absolute powers over the island. He pleaded time and again with the Queen Regent of Spain to rescue and help her hunted and hounded Cuban subjects.

This great man, like Lincoln before him, met the assassin's bullet. His political enemies put an end to a life of usefulness and service to humanity. Monuments to his memory, and replicas of his gentle features, abound throughout Pan America—in Chile, Ecuador, Colombia, Costa Rica, Nicaragua, Cuba, Panama, Haiti, Puerto Rico, and in our own country in Florida, Nebraska, Washington, D. C., and Virginia.

During his enforced absence from Ecuador, Eloy El Alfaro often visited Panama. It was a strategic location for one with Alfaro's burning vision of uniting the Americas, since Panama lies between the two continents and is an ideal place for liaison. That is also why Panama was selected as the headquarters of the Eloy Alfaro International Foundation. Panama, through which flows one of the world's greatest arteries of trade, is united with us with indissoluble bonds of respect and friendship. We salute the Republic of Panama, and ask you, Mr. Ambassador, to present our compliments to your President, the Honorable Jose Antonio Remon, and convey to him through you our good wishes for his continued good health and happiness.

Not far from Panama, in Guatemala, a sort of opera bouffe, but nonetheless crucial and critical "war" is raging. The Guatemalan fracas between the forces of the rebels, under Castillo Armas, and those of the Communist-controlled Arbenz government must give us pause. Arbenz and his henchmen have become the willing agents and tools of the Kremlin. Unfortunately, Guatemala is, in the language of Alfaro, a land where many exist for the benefit of the few who rule. That condition is grist to the Communist mill.

It is beholden for the United States, as it would be for Alfaro if he were alive today, to consider what are the true barricades in Guatemala, or any other country of the Americas, where grinding poverty, abysmal illiteracy, and exploitation of the defenseless exist, against these incentives to "creeping communism." The battle cannot be won by bullets alone. Ideas are more important. Ideas like those embodied in the Declaration of Independence, Lincoln's Gettysburg Address, the four freedoms of Franklin Delano Roosevelt, and the Bill of Rights of Jefferson. Such ideas are on the march in all the Americas.

Economic aid to this backward country of Gautamala, plus technological assistance are both of tide-turning importance. We must realize at long last that Gautamala and other Latin American countries are arousing themselves from their somnolence, inertia, and indifference to their fate. These lands, underdeveloped, these people, undernourished, are waking up. They are realizing (and we should too) what Alfaro taught, namely, that poverty and tyranny are not inevitable. The siren song of communism is the invitation to slavery, not independence.

We have, since the end of World War II, neglected Latin America. We took too much for granted. That vast area has been too long disregarded. We must show these neighbors of ours to the south, that we are their real friends and will help them with moneyed grants-in-aid and capital investments for the advancements of their industry, trade, and agriculture. This must be done on a humane and democratic basis. At the same time, we must be alive to the threat of Communist footholds in the Americas. This is our new Monroe Doctrine. Undoubtedly, such a program will be on the agenda of the Eisenhower-Churchill meeting.

But we can only stem and destroy Communist infiltration into Guatemala or elsewhere with intelligent assistance. That need not be military exclusively. In order to banish peonage, to still the voice of the demagogues, we must emphasize and cater to the needs of the downtrodden. The solution does not lie in mere doles but in diversifying economies, development of projects for urban and rural populations, plus more realistic trade policies. We must be generous in lending Guatemala the services of our scientists and engineers. We must share our skills and technologies. We cannot expect Latin America to jump at our command. Merely to shout: "Pan America" or "Hemispheric solidarity" will not suffice.

I am also deeply sensible of the honor bestowed upon me by the life membership in the American International Academy, an entity set up to promote pan-American arts and sciences, letters, culture, and refinements. I shall do all and sundry to further those worthy objectives. The roster of honory members and dignitaries associated with the academy is impressive and betokens a rare and important agency for the good of pan America.

Finally, I accept with extreme pleasure, honorary life membership in the National Council of Business and Professional Men, and testify to my warm friendship for Mr. Herman A. Bayern, a worthy leader in the worthy cause served by this organization.

President Rhee Cites Free-Enterprise Goals of Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1954

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, subsequent to my introduction of House Concurrent Resolution 219, designed to assure that American relief funds hereafter voted for the Republic of Korea will be so used as to create in that country an economy based on free, competitive enterprise. I received a letter from President Syngman Rhee dealing with this broad subject.

In his letter, Dr. Rhee outlines the steps which have been taken and which are contemplated to further private enterprise in the Republic of Korea. At the same time he also explains some of the difficulties involved.

Because of my great admiration for this Korean patriot, and to assure the fullest possible consideration of the facts and views set forth by President Rhee, I include, under leave to extend my remarks, this letter from the President of Korea:

KYUNG MU DAI, *May 6, 1954.*

The Honorable PAUL W. SHAFER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN SHAFER: I write this letter with the sincerest desire on my part to set facts straight about our philosophy of government. You have been a stanch and understanding friend of Korea and its cause. Often I recall the many valiant efforts you have made on behalf of Korea, particularly when I was fighting for our independence. It is needless to say that we are all appreciative of your cooperation and assistance.

Recently, House Concurrent Resolution 219, which was introduced by you, came to my attention. Knowing your reputation as a sincere, capable, and fairminded Representative I feel certain that the facts I am about to put down here will be helpful to you.

As for the declared purpose of your resolution—to create a national economy based upon the rights of private property and free competitive enterprise—it is fully acceptable. I quite agree with such a goal. However, I wish to point out that it would be completely untrue to imply that the Republic of Korea is a socialistic state with a government of monopolistic ownership of industry.

The Republic of Korea Government believes wholeheartedly in the principles commonly recognized as the basis of the free-enterprise system. My belief in this was made clear last January in an interview granted Mr. Mac R. Johnson and printed in the New York Herald Tribune. I declared myself then, as I would now, unequivocally in favor of free enterprise and again I assure you that we are all working diligently to hasten the day when private business will be able to shoulder its full responsibilities in Korea. Let me cite the facts to support that statement.

After V–J day in 1945, American occupation forces took over properties the Japanese had owned and operated in Korea. The occupation authorities then turned over title to these properties—a vast majority of which had been appropriated or stolen from the Koreans during the preceding four decades—to the Republic of Korea Government. This lawful transfer was accepted without question by the Japanese Government as a provision of the instrument of unconditional surrender and of the Japanese Peace Treaty, although since then the Japanese Government has attempted to reclaim title to these properties and even has requested indemnities for damage done to them during the recent fighting caused by the Communist invasion.

The young Republic of Korea Government immediately tackled the tremedous task of operating these industries while trying to divest itself of their ownership. Through a land reform program which helped tenant families become property owners and which provided the former owners with compensating Government bonds they could hold to maturity or utilize for industrial investments the twofold purpose was accomplished. Some venture capital was realized.

The Government of course tried very hard to encourage private industry. Where funds were lacking, responsible individuals who could put up half or even less of the risk capital were granted Government loans for the remainder. These loans could be repaid from profits. In many cases properties were auctioned off after the Government had helped to get the wheels of production rolling.

This program is continuing but its completion was seriously delayed by the Communist invasion. Furthermore the setback suffered through destruction of many factories which were just getting into the black has seriously impaired Korea's economic recovery and slowed the divestment of properties still under Government management. We are pursuing this long-range plan and I do hope you understand this.

Further to elaborate the factual situation regarding the Korean economic condition you undoubtedly know that for more than 7 years Korea has been receiving aid funds from various United States agencies. This it must be kept in mind was money appropriated to help Korea get on her feet after the Japanese occupation and the subsequent war-wrought devastation. Yet in all this time virtually nothing of permanent nature has been achieved. Still in the planning stage are powerplants, fertilizer factories, cement plants, mineral development, land reclamation, and many other capital goods projects.

But the saddest thing of all is that much of the money appropriated to help Korea economically was unspent and we were told that this was the case because consumer goods manufactured in Japan were not available. My dear Congressman SHAFER, as you will readily agree, the money was appropriated to help Korea and not Japan. To rebuild Japan's industry and make Korea dependent on Japan for her daily needs would be to sentence Korea to an economic serfdom similar to the total enslavement of the first half of the 20th century.

In recent weeks Korea has obtained the right to express her views on how aid funds should be spent through a joint chairmanship of the Combined Economic Board. We intend to see that the American taxpayer's money designated for Korea's rehabilitation is actually spent for that purpose.

However, the Republic of Korea Government has no authority to handle a single dollar in aid funds. I mention this because of allegations that we are handing out this money to build up Government monopolies to the detriment of private business. As soon as business concerns under our control are rehabilitated, they are turned over to private business through public auction, or through other open and aboveboard methods.

There are, of course, some Government monopolies in Korea, such as the tobacco and tungsten mines, which are carryovers from the Japanese economy. Because tungsten is a vital strategic material, we must make very sure that it does not fall into the hands of the Communists in any way, shape, or manner.

To be considered by the next National Assembly of the Republic of Korea, which will be elected this month, are several constitutional amendments designed to restrict state ownership and encourage private enterprise and foreign investment. These amendments initially were submitted to the current session of the assembly, but were withdrawn by the Government because of technical questions of language and preoccupation with the coming election in May. We are quite confident that the next assembly will be composed of public-spirited men and women who are susceptible to the will of our people, and we feel certain that the measures will receive favorable attention.

You may remember that the various provisions of the present Republic of Korea Constitution were drafted with the advice of the American experts. Our young Republic scarcely can be blamed for accepting the counsel of responsible rerpesentatives from an older and far more experienced democracy. It is also a fact that the laws which were in effect in Korea at that time were based upon the Japanese codes, stemming from Emperor worship and that these codes prohibited foreign private investment. The Japanese tried to implant the idea that only thus could Korea be saved from foreign land grabbers. Fortunately, however, our constitution, like that of the United States, can be amended and through the amendment process we shall alter those provisions which appear to be detrimental to the perfecting of the system of free enterprise.

Naturally you can understand why I would object to any implication or suggestion that Korea, the country which has been foremost in the relentless battle against communism, subscribes to the principle of statism. My fear is hat if your resolution is accepted and passed, the net result will be a discriminatory one, because it might deprive Korea of American aid funds. At the same time it would permit the distribution of aid funds in certain countries where Communist influences are great. But of course I shall refrain from making such comparisons. It is enough to say that Korea's blood has flowed freely in the fight against communism and for the freedom and dignity of the individual and that we stand ready and eager to make our sacrifices for permanent liberation from the menace that still hangs over the heads of all freemen.

I have set forth these facts with respect to your resolution. Please feel free to call upon me with any questions that you may have. I assure you that they will be answered honestly and frankly in the knowledge that you are a conscientious public servant, eager to do your duty and, at the same time be just as concerned with avoiding any injustice.

Yours sincerely,

SYNGMAN RHEE.

The National Debt Limit Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1954

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under permission of the House, I insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial titled "The National Debt Limit Again," which was published in the Daily Times, of Mamaroneck, N. Y.:

THE NATIONAL DEBT LIMIT AGAIN

It was almost 10 months ago that Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey and the Budget Director were greatly concerned about the $275 billion limitation on our national debt. At that time both declared the Government would not be able to meet its obligations falling due in the remainder of 1953 without additional borrowing power.

Said Mr. Humphrey at that time: "I think if this country didn't pay its bills, if the veterans' payments weren't paid, if goods were delivered and not paid for, if we had to call up somebody and say 'Don't ship anything because we can't pay for it,' I think it might just cause near panic."

Well, Congress didn't raise the limit and we appear to have survived 1953 without any panic.

By mid-December, however, the debt was up to $274.4 billion, within $600 million of the statutory ceiling. And so, in January, President Eisenhower renewed the request for lifting the limit.

"It is not prudent," said the President, "to operate the huge business of the United States Government in such a straitjacket as the present debt limit."

Again, last Thursday, Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey warned that it is "absolutely necessary" that the debt limit be raised before Congress quits work this session and returns home for the political campaigns. But Senator BYRD, of Virginia, Treasury watchdog, says he will fight just as vigorously as before to block the proposed raise in the ceiling. Now, in mid-May, it may be noted, the debt subject to limitation is down to $270.5 billion. However, we face the prospect soon of a $10 billion borrowing.

Obviously, the attitude of those in Congress who oppose the Treasury's request is that if the borrowing margin be kept small there is less chance of any waste or extravagance. Against this, however, is the admitted fact that our Government and its costs of operation are steadily growing.

Somewhere, between the two divergent viewpoints, there must be a compromise, a joint meeting of the minds, so that both economy and efficiency are to be served.

And Congress should effect that decision before it quits this year.

Parity for Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 28, 1954

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, five times in the past 3 months, I have introduced resolutions showing that businessmen in Montana favor maintenance of farm price supports at at least 90 percent of parity.

To date, I have introduced such resolutions signed by 1,328 businessmen, in 21 Montana towns.

The most recent resolutions I have received follow:

Being as the State of Montana is a majority agricultural State, the undersigned businessmen of this city of Forsyth, Mont., feel that it is most imperative that we work side by side with those attempting to maintain a farm program which will enrich and develop the agricultural activities wherever they are a major industry or source of livelihood.

In view of the above conclusions, we, the following businessmen of this city—

"*Resolve*, That we go on record opposing any effort on the part of any Congressman, the Department of Agriculture, or any agency for attempting to disrupt the stabilization program, effecting all farm commodities; we further

"*Resolve*, That Congress not only maintain 90 percent of parity but shall try to establish 100 percent of parity for all farm commodities. We do not favor any tendency toward flexibility of farm supports, but urge Congress to maintain a production control program, which is necessary in order to have stabilized price support; we further

"*Resolve*, To favor a genuinely sane and sound economic program, which shall be based on industry, security, and individual initiative;

"We further urge all business groups in other cities of this State as well as those of other agricultural States to go on record favoring similar resolutions."

BUSINESSMEN OF FORSYTH, MONT.

Ralston Texaco products, Tom Ralston; implement dealer, A. W. Kamhoot; hardware, W. L. Tarske; lumber, Loyd Burt; garage manager, F. O. Shaw; Forsyth Motors, L. E. Trove; Koester Chevrolet Co., Paul H. Koester; Marshall Wells, George A. Kuch; Yellowstone Pharmacy, A. E. Olson; Forsyth Drug, Mrs. Harry Collins; Elks Cafe, George B. Jason and John H. Smith; groceries, C. J. Wetsch; Gambles store, V. Polzin; Carter Oil products; A. L. Sample; Hotel "Howdy," John B. Snedher; Conoco station, Robert E. Mogen; locker plant, Ray T. Wood; machine shop, G. E. Ferguson; oil products, V. East; International Elevator Co., B. Wall; drygoods, W. S. Heine; the Hub, C. K. Johnson; Jack's Super Market, J. E. Clifford; Weber Electric Co., C. A. Kalness; Beals Furniture Co., W. E. Beals; filling station, George Kay; saw filing, Fred Friedrichsen; Clark Hardware Co., Ray Clark; Wallin Mercantile Co., A. B. Coate; Tepee Motor Co., R. E. McKeever; Roxy Theater, F. Haust; James K. Cope, M. D.; jewelry store, Ed Weamer; hardware, Harry Cornwell; C. E. Phillips, D. D. S.; attorney at law, H. V. Beeman; Mobile Service, Claude Morgan; Johny's Texaco, John A. Morgan; Front Street Service, Charles E. Yonkaitis; Willie's Standard Service, Willie Benner; Joseph Hotel, Dom deSocio; Elk Horn Motel, Mr. and Mrs. Floyd E. Dowlin; Forsyth Implement Co., John Hanson; Sawyer store manager, Eddie Heinrich; lumber, J. W. Cates; Tip Top Gift Shop, Leona Clark; Joseph Cafe, Frances Duaese; Olson's Barber Shop; V. & R. store, Bud Paronto; store manager, R. K. Wagner; Bill's Barber Shop; Jim's Barber Shop; real estate and insurance, George Tillett; Richard A. Whitney, M. D.; Rosebud Floral Shop; H. S. Degnan, D. D. S.; insurance, F. R. Cox; Beauty Nook, Elsie C. Murphy; insurance, Everett Redeen; Snappy Service Laundry, F. C. Fish; attorney, Russel K. Fillner; mayor, R. H. Kerr; Redmond Cafe, D. V. Redmond; Farmers' Coop Oil Co., Herbert Polley.

BUSINESSMEN OF WINNETT, MONT.

Sumner R. Clark, Clark's Pay & Save; A. J. Anderson, Montana Hardware & Lumber Co.; Hugh C. Grove, Northern Hotel; W. P. Dunlap, Dunlap's Auto Service; Mr. and Mrs. O. W. Wise, Wise's Cafe; Clarence R. Saylor, barber shop; Mr. and Mrs. Norman Carr, Smoke House Cafe; W. G. Britzuis, Britzuis' Garage; W. R. Erdmann, Gusher Bar; E. R. Stauffaçher, Commercial Hotel; B. T. Myers, Bar; F. W. Herweg (with reservations on some items), Herweg's Cash Store; Lloyd Berg, Lloyd Berg Motors; Otto H. Seust, Town Tavern Bar; Kenneth Cole (with some reservations), Cole's Service Station; W. L. Livingston (with reservations), Water Well drilling contractor; C. V. Allen, City Service Station; Earl Fleharty, Rimrock Theater; R. G. Glatz, Winnett Times; Floyd R. Hill (with reservations), Frigidaire dealer; V. A. Koetitz, Montana Elevator; E. E. Sult, Smitty Bar.

BUSINESSMEN OF RICHLAND, MONT.

H. A. Dahl, F. U. Elevator; M. B. Hylland, International Elevator; Edward Zelenka, oil and hardware; George N. Equwill, general store.

BUSINESSMEN OF GLASGOW, MONT.

Paul R. Friedl; L. J. Baker; Valley Improvement Co., by Everett Cabarett; Russell St. Clair; A. G. Strom; E. D. Benson; E. T. Gallagher; Arthur Smith; R. A. Keneski; Ivan Tichenor; John Shepherd; Glenn A. Miller; G. A. Bertsch; George Allen; A. V. Krusee; R. H. Chambers; Sam Allie; Royal M. Schott; Theodore M. Parker; Glasgow Standard Service, Tom E. Rodgers; E. H.

Stedtfeld; Pat Brandenburg; Henry Mohr; Jon Papazian; G. M. Lindberg; Clifford Combs; LaVerne Trang; Elmer Hall; Joe Chouinard; Farmers Union Grain & Feed Co.; Farmers Union Oil Co.; Elaine's Shop; Vegge Motors; H. & S. Furniture-Clothing Store, M. J. Swanson; H. R. Bjorklund & Son; Willason Radio Service; C. L. Benson; R. P. Rundle; Art Kotaki; Ken Rathbone; Duain Bowles; F. S. McIntyre, Jr.; J. A. Holland; James O. Christenson; Gordon T. White; Elmer Culver; Dave Bogut; Pete Wagenhal; The Elite Shoppe; City Cafe; C. J. Carney; Floyd Scott; Roy A. Jerome.

Mr. Speaker, I also have heard from one businessman who has changed his mind since he signed the resolution. Here are the letter and the enclosure:

CONTINENTAL OIL CO.,
Forsyth, Mont., June 15, 1954.

The Honorable LEE METCALF,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. METCALF: I am attaching a copy of a letter sent to my customers and other people of Rosebud County which is self-explanatory.

I would appreciate your reading it in order to clarify my position in regard to pending farm legislation.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

VIC EAST.

CONTINENTAL OIL CO.,
Forsyth, Mont., June 14, 1954.

To My Customers:

In the June 10 issue of the Forsyth Independent appeared a petition sponsored by a group of farmers and circulated among the businessmen of Forsyth having to do with the present farm-price support legislation now pending in the United States Congress, and particularly favoring the existing 90–100 percent parity support program on agricultural products.

The writer now finds himself in the embarrassing position in that this petition was hastily read and signed without giving full consideration to all that it might imply and without full knowledge of the text of the petition and the merits of the divergent agricultural support programs.

The matter having been called to the attention of the writer, he now finds it necessary to make apology for his haste in allowing his name to appear in support of a program about which he had insufficient knowledge upon which to render a well-founded decision.

I am now, and always have been, for a good, sound agricultural program. The present program, without question, has to some degree served a useful purpose, but I doubt that if anyone will argue that it is perfect, for the reason that after all these years of operation many segments of our agricultural industry continue to experience distress.

While it is a question as to how much, or how far, or if any Government support should be carried, and how applied, I am certainly against any efforts to force controls on any segment of the agricultural industry who feel they can get along without such controls, feeling that the less we have of government in any business the better. It has certainly always been my policy that anything to further the good of agriculture in Rosebud County will have my wholehearted support, provided that the whole of the industry is given equal consideration, rather than to permit one segment to profit at the expense of another. I am hopeful that the present Congress may find the way to improve the lot of all, but do not feel I should be a part of any pressure group.

VIC EAST.

A Letter to My Constituents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL, JR.

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 28, 1954

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter to my constituents:

JULY 6, 1954.

MY DEAR CONSTITUENT: As the 83d Congress comes to a close and I leave as the American delegate to attend the fourth annual session of the World Conference of Parliamentarians in London, I am dropping you a note highlighting the things that I have done during this session.

I have missed only one vote of importance this year and that was due to my being with the Emperor of Ethiopia.

I have maintained 3 full-time offices in New York and Washington and handled 7,000 cases and recovered $55,000 in money for constituents.

I have introduced every single civil rights bill.

I have maintained very close contact with the White House and, humbly, shared in advising. More has been done in the field of civil rights than at any other time in our Nation's history.

This is part of my record as a full-time fighter for the rights of all people during the 83d Congress, drawn only from the Nation's press:

"Successfully urged White House to abolish segregation in veterans hospitals." (Associated Press, February 8, 1953.)

"Revealed shocking agreement between former United States Assistant Attorney General and the New York City Police Department to prevent the FBI from investigating police brutality in New York City." (World-Telegram, February 19, 1953.)

(As a result, a special committee of Congressmen was appointed. They handed in a unanimous report assessing the blame. Today we have new leadership in the police department of New York City.)

"Segregation in the Veterans' Administration hospitals was ended last week after protest from Congressman POWELL." (New York Amsterdam News, February 28, 1953.)

"Only Member of the United States Congress to say that Paul Robeson lied when he stated that Negroes would never fight Soviet Russia." (New York Daily News, March 7, 1953.)

"Testified that there was a housing shortage and tried to get Federal rent controls continued." (Mutual Broadcasting System, March 12, 1953.)

"Requested President Eisenhower to abolish segregated schools on Army posts." (He did.) (Kansas City Plaindealer, April 10.)

"Urged White House to deny Federal space to the District Bar Association because of its lily white policy." (Washington Post, May 8, 1953.)

"Representative POWELL played the major part in obtaining more money for Howard University and Freedmans Hospital." (New York Times, May 23, 1953.)

"Congressman POWELL saved the undergraduate school of Howard University by his action on the floor of Congress." (Dr. Mordecai Johnson, president of Howard University.)

"Segregation to go, Ike assures POWELL." (New York Daily News, June 11, 1953.)

"On June 11, 1953, President Eisenhower wrote POWELL 'We have not taken and we shall not take a single backward step. There must not be any second-class citizens in this country. This is a hard nut to crack, but we are going to crack it.'" (Washington Times-Herald, p. 33.)

"After lunch at the White House with the President of the United States and a conference with the Secretary of Agriculture, Congressman POWELL was able to have the sugar quota of Puerto Rico increased, thus alleviating the unemployment in that island." (La Prensa, June 26, 1953.)

"Congressman POWELL is considered one of the most courageous leaders and fighters for Christianity and human rights in the world." (Pittsburgh Courier, June 27, 1953.)

"POWELL informed Congress yesterday that Eisenhower, within the next few days, will set up a little FEPC for all firms doing business with the United States Government." (Washington Post, July 3, 1953.) (This he did, establishing Government Contracts Compliance Commission.)

"Orchid to Congressman POWELL for his attacks on America's pretenses in the Halls of Congress." (Pittsburgh Courier, July 4, 1953.)

"Helped city postoffice workers in move for better conditions and higher pay.' (New York Times, October 26, 1953.)

In January 1954 was American representative at the Sesquicentennial of Haiti.

"Representative POWELL urged the State Foreign Commerce Committee to report favorably his bill forbidding racial segregation of interstate passengers on any form of transportation." (Chicago Defender, February 7, 1954.)

"The House Labor Committee overwhelmingly approved an amendment to the Taft-Hartley Act which would prevent unions from barring anyone because of race, religion, or national origin. The author of the amendment was Representative POWELL." (Baltimore Sun, March 11, 1954.)

Received civil rights award for 1953 from the American Jewish Congress.

"As the results of POWELL's investigation, United States Army has agreed to abolish segregation in the cadet mess detachment at the Military Academy at West Point." (Washington Post, March 21, 1954.)

"Representative POWELL is to be complimented for his exposé of top administration officials who are undermining Eisenhower's antisegregation position." (New York Courier editorial.)

Due to POWELL's protest Secretary of Navy Anderson abolished all segregation in the United States naval shipyards in the South and abolished segregated messmen divisions in the United States Navy.

Cooperated with Mary Church Terrell in successfully abolishing segregation in public facilities in the District of Columbia.

Worked with Gerald Wagner in Washington, D. C., theaters in successfully abolishing segregation in movie picture houses in the Capital.

In reference to the Supreme Court's decision abolishing segregation in the public-school system in America, Representative POWELL said "this is democracy's shining hour; this is communism's worst defeat. Communism cannot succeed when democracy works." CBS–TV, NBS–TV, ABC–TV, Dumont–TV, and New York World Telegram.

"As guest of His Eminence, Cardinal Spellman and Senator Jack Kennedy, Congressman POWELL shared in dedicating the Catholic Youth Center of Harlem." (Jet magazine.)

Was the host to His Majesty, Emperor of Ethiopia; His Honor, the Prime Minister of Jamaica, Mr. Bustamante; His Honor, the Prime Minister of Nigeria, Dr. Azikwe.

My staff in Washington and in New York, as indicated on this letterhead, is available at all times to help you with any problem that you might have. Feel free to call upon us.

Ever sincerely, your full-time fighter for the rights of man,

Adam Clayton Powell, Jr.

Baltic Committee Resolution Condemning Soviet Practice of Genocide and Enslavement in Baltic States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 17, 1954

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to include a letter forwarded to me under date of June 12, 1954, by Dr. Vaino Riismandel, chairman of the Baltic Committee of Washington, D. C.

The letter follows:

Baltic Committee of
Washington, D. C.,
Washington, D. C., June 12, 1954.

Dear Sir: I have the honor to submit the following resolution unanimously adopted by citizens and residents of Estonian, Latvian, and Lithuanian descent, assembled this day at Pierce Hall, Washington, D. C., to commemorate the first mass deportation of citizens from Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, perpetrated by the Government of the Soviet Union on June 14, 1941, and to raise our voice in protest against the continuous practice of genocide in, and the Soviet occupation of, the Baltic Republics:

"Where as the Soviet Union has arbitrarily occupied, and established Communist regimes in Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, and continues to enslave the peoples of these democratic republics; and

"Whereas the date of June 14, 1941, marks the beginning of Soviet mass deportations of citizens from Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania to slave labor in remote districts of the Soviet realm, with the ultimate aim of extinguishing them as nations; and

"Whereas the Government of the United States has refused to recognize the 'incorporation' of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania into the Soviet Union and is steadfastly continuing recognition of their lawful diplomatic representatives in this country; and

"Whereas the investigations of the special committee, which was created last year by the House of Representatives on the initiative of Representative Charles J. Kersten, of Wisconsin, have established beyond doubt Soviet Russia's flagrant violation of all international treaties, which she had voluntarily entered into with the Baltic Republics, and her violent contempt for the human rights of the Baltic peoples; and

"Whereas the Senate of the United States has passed on April 29 a resolution, introduced by Senator Paul H. Douglas, of Illinois, endorsing the refusal of Presidents Roosevelt, Truman, and Eisenhower to recognize the Soviet conquests of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia and condemning the notorious disregard for fundamental human rights and liberties in countries under Soviet domination: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That we, here assembled in prayerful mourning for the victims of Soviet aggression and genocide in the Baltic countries, vigorously protest against the continuous practice of genocide and enslavement of the Baltic peoples by the Soviet regime; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That we respectfully request the Congress and the Government of the United States to initiate an investigation of Soviet violations of international treaties and human rights in the Baltic States by the General Assembly of the United Nations, with the aim of achieving the withdrawal of Soviet occupation forces from their territories; and be it finally

"*Resolved*, That we express our sincerest gratitude to the people, the Congress and the Government of the United States for their resolute support and encouragement of the Baltic nations' struggle for regaining their liberty, and that we pledge our unequivocal support to America's leadership in the fateful fight of the free world against totalitarian Communist aggression."

Faithfully yours,

Dr. Vaino Riismandel,
Chairman.

Missing Man: The Foot Patrolman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1954

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I desire to call attention to the remarks I made on the floor of the House a few days ago, concerning law enforcement in the District of Columbia.

In this connection, I wish to include a statement from Mr. Owen Harris, of Baltimore, on the subject of the Missing Man: The Foot Patrolman.

The article follows:

The Missing Man: The Foot Patrolman

Ever since the advent of the patrol car or cruiser these missing men have been on a gigantic joyride in most large and small cities in these good old United States. When first introduced, the patrol cars were surely not meant to take the place of these traditionally honest and faithful missing men, who pounded their respective beats not once on the shifts but numerous times always on the lookout to prevent crimes. Yes, pounded them so often and so regular they got to know all of the people, ordinary citizens as well as the criminal element so much so that they were nicknamed "flatfoot" for their honest efforts. That name is gradually dying out as the patrol-car men are making a weak effort to take their place. These new cars were without an argument a great and necessary addition for the police the country over in the apprehension of criminals. They, however, cannot replace the footman who formally got over his beat not once but often, even using a change of schedule each night to pass certain places on his beat to confuse the criminal. If a place was cased previous to a robbery or holdup, the criminals had to figure this good, honest cop in their plans, hence it was almost 100 percent preventative. The patrol-car operations take up to 200-percent effort and manpower in the apprehension of criminals with very little prevention. In reality they are a tipoff to the criminal while cruising around. How many major and minor crimes are actually being committed as the patrol cars are passing or in the very close vicinity can ever be recorded? Think of the footman manpower loss, by the high percentage of minor complaints covered by these cruising footmen as emergency calls. These calls could very easily be taken up with the forgotten man on all three shifts direct from the complainant. The footman on his beat is the most important man on the police team to prevent crime. For years now we have police officials, State and Federal, together with newspapers, radio, television, etc., suggesting ideas to cut down on the ever-increasing crime waves. None have accomplished a decent percentage in the reduction of crime in general. Why not at least try the return of the forgotten men. The law of average is bound to show a decided drop in the percentage of crimes with these men pounding their beats regularly on all three shifts.

Owen J. Harris.

Not for Wisconsin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1954

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to insert in the Congressional Record an editorial from my hometown newspaper, the Marshfield News-Herald, under date of June 25, 1954. My district is in the heart of Wisconsin's dairyland and produces more milk and cheese than any other congressional district in the Congress. I believe the editorial in the Marshfield News-Herald sums up very well the feelings of a majority of the dairymen I represent:

Not for Wisconsin

We have been asked what yesterday's rejection of the administration's flexible farm price support program by the Senate Agriculture Committee means to Wisconsin farmers. While we certainly lay no claim to knowledge of things agricultural or legislative, we think it is fairly obvious that adoption of the committee's recommendation to continue Federal price supports on basic commodity crops at 90 percent of parity for another year would be a severe blow to Wisconsin farmers.

We fully understand that many farm people in our area are displeased with the attitude of the Eisenhower administration as it concerns the problems of the dairy farmer. We too, were displeased when dairy supports were slashed to 75 percent of parity early this year, although we realized that it was economically unsound to continue them at 90 percent and that Wisconsin's dairy industry would have been ruined if the Government had continued to subsidize its inefficient competitors at that rate.

The current action of the Senate Agriculture Committee, however, is not to be confused with the issue of dairy price supports—it deals only with price supports on wheat, cotton, corn, rice, peanuts, and tobacco. Wisconsin, we might mention, derives 1 percent—that's right, 1 percent—of its farm income from the sale of these crops, or rather, the three which it can produce. Our farmers don't grow cotton, peanuts, or rice, and very little tobacco. Neither do they sell much wheat or corn.

The committee vote on the extension of high price supports for the 6 basics was 8 to 7 and we can understand why the 4 southern Senators in the majority voted as they did. Income from the 6 crops, or some of them is concentrated in 9 Southern States. The only other States which derive the major share of their farm income from the basics are Kansas, North Dakota, and Montana. Naturally Senator Young, of North Dakota, who is on the committee, voted with the southerners. Why Thye and Humphrey, of Minnesota, and Mundt, of South Dakota, went along, we don't pretend to know. We hope they know.

Chairman Aiken, who is from Vermont, predicted yesterday that the Senate would not go along with the committee's decision when the time comes for that body to vote on the question.

This seems like a reasonable assumption when it is considered that the majority of the States receive more than half of their cash farm income from the sale of products not included among the favored six crops. More than a third of the States receive over two-thirds of their farm income from the sale of such commodities as meat animals, poultry, eggs, fruits, which are not benefited by the committee recommendation.

Marshfield's Representative Melvin Laird pointed out to us recently that the House Agriculture Committee was doing Wisconsin no favor when it gave support to a similar proposal for the 6 basic commodities while recommending only 75 percent supports on dairy products, which it would have raised to 80 percent during the period from next September 1 to April 1, 1955.

He explained then that 56 percent of cash farm income in the United States comes from meat animals, dairy products, and poultry products. Here in Wisconsin we are painfully aware that part of the cost of producing these commodities is represented by feeds which in turn come from some of these very crops under which the 2 congressional committees want to place price support props of 90 percent of parity.

For that reason continuance of 90 percent rigid supports for the 6 basic crops, as recommended by the Senate committee yesterday, not only fails to give any consideration to the problems of the dairy farmer with his huge capital investment and his production costs—it would guarantee the continuation of high feed costs and diminishing returns to the dairyman.

That is why we say that, no matter how the individual Wisconsin farmer may feel about Federal price supports, flexible or rigid, he can find no comfort in the action taken by the Senate Agriculture Committee yesterday, and can only hope the Senate itself will reverse this 8 to 7 decision of its committee.

God as Chief Justice of the Universe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELIZABETH KEE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 28, 1954

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, under the unanimous consent of my colleagues, I insert in the Appendix of the Record a very fine talk made recently by the distinguished judge of the Mercer County Criminal Court, the Honorable Walter Vergil Ross, of my home city of Bluefield, W. Va.:

The basic and underlying distinction between our courts and communism is the fact that we recognize God as the Chief Justice of the Universe. That recognition does not prevail in communistic countries.

Most of you, at some time or other, have been in our courts as a witness, spectator, litigant, juror, or in some other capacity.

Before a juror is permitted to serve he is required to take an oath or affirmation, both of which conclude with the words "so help you God." An oath or affirmation is required of each and every witness. The same applies to the lawyer, the judge, the clerk, the court reporter, and the bailiff. The form varies, of course, to fit the different categories or offices, but the oath or affirmation must be taken before we can proceed with the trial.

Why? Because experience has demonstrated that a reminder of the fact that an ever-present and living God is witnessing our acts and words serves as a guide and beacon light toward the paths of truth and justice.

A person who first gives utterance to a dying declaration need not be sworn, because our courts hold that the solemnity of the occasion obviates that necessity. When a man stands at the brink of his own grave, realizing that death is imminent and that he will shortly pass from this earthly sphere into eternity and face his Maker, he would have the most impelling reason to tell the truth without bias or prejudice.

I don't know what a Communist looks like. I have never knowingly seen one. But I do know that the greatest motivating influence for right and justice springs from a belief in God. Without that faith and belief there is no solid foundation upon which truth, right, justice, fairness, love, and compassion can be built.

Without that faith and belief your life on this earth, and your hope of peace hereafter, rest upon fallacies as insecure and capricious as the shifting sands of the sea.

Without that faith and belief the finer things of life become bedimmed and obscure, and fast fade into the realms of oblivion.

Our courts believe the only way to find truth, right, and justice is by the guiding hand of God. We believe in that, and we have faith that He will guide us. We call upon Him to see, hear, and witness our efforts. And in doing so we are not ashamed.

We approach our duties in a spirit of humility, realizing the fallibility of man, and trusting that God, in his infinite wisdom, will give us the vision to see, and the strength to do the right.

Our courts are open to the public, where you and all the world may hear and see. In our land the accused must be confronted by his accusers upon their promises before Almighty God that they will tell the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, while the Communists indulge in secret sessions of inquisition.

Who, in all the world, save and except the inquisitors themselves, really know what took place in the secret sessions of the Communists at the so-called trial of Laverentia Beria, and his reported execution thereafter?

Are they ashamed to let their people know the method and manner of their trials? Are they afraid to let the whole world know what actually took place? Were their methods so unfair and revolting that they dared not make a full and complete disclosure to the civilized world?

We can only surmise.

To our way of thinking, shame and degredation hold sway and run rampant when God is denied.

When Communists deny the divinity of God, and undertake to usurp His powers, then the properties, the liberties, and the lives of mankind are imperiled beyond the scope of human imagination.

Congress' Duty: End Farm Price Gouge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL C. KING
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 28, 1954

Mr. KING of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the Record, I include an editorial from the Philadelphia Inquirer entitled "Congress' Duty: End Farm Price Gouge."

The editorial follows:

CONGRESS' DUTY: END FARM PRICE GOUGE

The sound, constructive effort of the Eisenhower administration to free the Nation from the costly and wasteful burden of high rigid farm price supports will come to a head in the House of Representatives this week, and shortly afterward in the Senate.

In both bodies the Committees on Agriculture have ignored the President's proposal and voted to recommend another year's extension of the rigid support system, binding the Government to buy wheat, corn, cotton, peanuts and rice at 90 percent of parity.

They voted, in effect, to continue high food prices for American dinner tables, high costs for taxpayers. They voted to encourage indefensible overproduction and the piling up of huge—and useless—surpluses.

These committee actions represent the stubborn determination of the farm bloc to maintain the glaring evils of the rigid support system. Their recommendations reflect a hard-boiled political attempt to deal with a problem that is of vital concern to all Americans, including farmers.

In the House both Republicans and Democrats who have the interests of the country at heart should set aside the committee proposal and put through the administration program for flexible supports to vary, as needs prescribe, between 75 and 90 percent. When the time comes, the Senate should follow suit.

The committee actions have been interpreted as snubs to the President and to Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson.

They were "snubs" for all the people of this country who have to buy food and clothing and pay taxes. And the time is overdue for their interests to have full consideration in Congress.

Does the Eisenhower farm program aim to wipe out reasonable aid for American farmers? Not a bit of it. Under flexible supports basic farm commodities will continue to be bought by the Government. The supports would move up to encourage production during times of low farm output and move down to discourage plantings in times of excess production.

There's the essential and important feature of this plan: it will hold down needless over-production, which high rigid supports foster. So long as those high supports prevail, over-production is inevitable.

We have got to get rid of the immense surpluses we already have. And that's almost a superhuman task. We have got to halt the sinful loss and waste, such as we've seen in stored butter. And we've got to have farm aid geared, to some extent at least, with the idea of giving housewives a better break on prices than is possible under the current high support plan.

The President's farm policy deserves the support of Members of Congress of both parties. It is a sincere attempt to solve a gigantic problem in which Secretary Benson, notably, has gained stature by his sturdy courage in seeking to further a farm program that would serve the interests of all the people. He has stood our against threats, bullying, cajolery—all sorts of pressures—and bravely but with good humor has held firmly to what he believes in.

For far too long the farm program has operated to the disadvantage of millions of consumers. It has meant the shocking paradox of enormous accumulations of food and fiber along with unyielding high prices.

Solution of that must be removed from the crude political arena in which it has too often been left. Republicans should support the President unless there are grave reasons for disagreeing with him. And in this case there are none. Democrats in Congress should stand by Mr. Eisenhower and his farm program because it is a wise program, in the best interest of the Nation.

We hope that in both House and Senate that interest—the real interest of America—will prevail and that the shameful waste and inequity of Government-rigged high prices will become a thing of the past.

Woman Suffrage Legislation Came Close to Failure in Tennessee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD H. BAKER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1954

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following article written by Mr. E. E. Patton and published in the Knoxville Journal, May 30, 1954:

WOMAN SUFFRAGE LEGISLATION CAME CLOSE TO FAILURE IN TENNESSEE

On the first Thursday in August of 1920, Hon. Albert H. Roberts was renominated by the Democratic Party of Tennessee for the office of governor. He immediately called an extra session of the legislature at meet on August 9. He set out in his proclamation all of the features on which the legislature might act in the special session. The legislature, in extraordinary session can act only on those items set out in the message issued by the governor. This message included 142 items for action.

Section 2 of his message: "To fix the legal status of women."

Sec. 3. "To prescribe the qualifications of women for suffrage, including the imposition of a poll tax, to provide for their registration and to enact such legislation as may be necessary to this end."

The first woman suffrage convention was held in 1848 and for the next 70 years this question was agitated in and out of Congress. In order to amend the Constitution of the United States it is necessary for the House and Senate to adopt a resolution by a two-third majority in each House; refer it to the State which must be ratified by three-fourths of the legislatures or conventions.

The proposed amendment adopted by the House and Senate in 1918 is very short:

"The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex.

"Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation."

When the Tennessee legislature met on August 9, 1920, 35 States had ratified this proposed amendment, giving women the right to vote. One suffragette said they had always had the right but had been denied the privilege of voting.

FAVORABLE ACTION

On August 13, the Senate took favorable action on this proposed amendment. There were 25 votes in favor of the amendment; 4 against; 2 present but not voting.

The people advocating favorable action on this civic feature were aware of the fact that the House of Representatives was divided almost 50–50, and their attention was directed to the House. Hon. Seth M. Walker was Speaker of the House and he was a very brilliant man, but he made one serious blunder. He moved to table the resolution and the vote stood 48 to 48. Then a vote was taken on the passage of the resolution.

Walker left the chair and had Representative Overton preside. The House and Senate Journal does not give the exact happenings at that time. Speaker Walker was in the main aisle, near the entrance when the vote was taken which resulted in 49 votes for the resolution and 46 against, lacking 1 vote of a majority necessary to adopt the resolution.

There have been many versions of the happenings and the claim has been made more than once that some certain Member of the House was solely and wholly responsible for the passage of that resolution. But that is misleading; in fact, untrue.

HOUR OF DESTINY

Speaker Walker held his hand high, walked toward the speaker's chair and shouted: "Mister Speaker, the hour of destiny has arrived. I change my vote from nay to aye and move to reconsider." That motion carried and this gave him physical possession of the resolution for three calendar days. The next morning enough of the House members had gone to Alabama to break the quorum. However, the Tennessee Secretary of State and the Governor certified to the United States Secretary of State that the resolution had been adopted. It was fought out before the Supreme Court but the action of the governor and secretary of state was upheld.

If Speaker Walker had kept his seat or if he had kept his utterance sub voce, this resolution would not have been adopted by the Tennessee legislature and the women of America might not have been permitted to vote in 1920.

To show how close a movement may be to failure and yet succeed is illustrated by this session or the legislature. One representative from a west Tennessee county had serious sickness in his family. He said he would remain and vote if he could get a special train to take him home and arrive about the time of the regular train.

A member of the State senate was going over to the house to watch the controversy. Senator McKellar and former Senator Luke Lea were holding a conference in the main corridor. They asked this senator if he knew where former Senator Newell Sanders was. He informed them that he was in the gallery at the left of the speaker's stand. They courteously asked if he would get Senator Sanders down there. He was a director in some of the railroads and they felt sure that he could arrange for the special train.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED

This was done and the resolution was adopted. No one of the 49 who voted for this resolution deserves any more credit for its adoption than anyone of the other 48. To make this claim is hypocritical bragging and claiming credit for something to which he is not entitled.

History should be written truthfully and carefully and proper credit should be given to those who are responsible for good deeds and those who are guilty of crimes or misdemeanors should suffer the proper penalties.

On page 367 of the Senate and House Journals of the special session of 1920 will give the names of the 49 who voted for this resolution, supplemented by the vote of Speaker Walker after he had changed his vote from nay to aye. It also gives the names of the 46 who voted against the resolution.

But this action had some strange things in official life. There in the corridor stood Senator Kenneth McKellar talking with former Senator Luke Lea, whom McKellar had defeated for the senatorship and then former Senator Sanders; 2 Democrats and 1 Republican, but all 3 enlisted in the fight for women suffrage. Events like that don't happen every day.

The International Situation and Military Preparedness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DEWEY SHORT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1954

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following address delivered by me before the Machinery and Allied Products Institute at its anual Washington conference on Friday, June 25, 1954:

ADDRESS ON THE INTERNATIONAL SITUATION AND MILITARY PREPAREDNESS BY THE HON. DEWEY SHORT, UNITED STATES REPRESENTATIVE FROM THE STATE OF MISSOURI, CHAIRMAN, HOUSE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE, FRIDAY AFTERNOON SESSION

Mr. CHARLES STEWART. Ladies and gentlemen, we turn now to the broad international situation and military preparedness. I think it is unnecessary to spell out the problems that exist in that broad area. Your speaker is an expert in the field of military preparedness. He is known as a great legislator, recognized as one of the more foreceful orators in the Congress, and an active spokesman for military preparedness, and one of the most broadly educated men in public life today, and finally, and most important, a man with a genuine, well-recognized sense of responsibility for the welfare of this Nation. I think you will detect all of these qualities in the Honorable DEWEY SHORT, Member of Congress from Missouri, as he addresses himself to the subject of the international situation and military preparedness. It is a privilege to have you with us, sir, and I take great pleasure in introducing you at this time. [Applause.]

Representative SHORT. Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, I spoke in New York last night before the Barium Steel Corp., out at Luchow's, and did not get much sleep, and just arrived here a few minutes ago. I am glad to meet with representatives of your great organization because truly we are living in the machine age.

There are three material things that any country or nation must have in order to win a modern mechanized war—steel, rubber, and oil. Because Russia at this moment, according to the best intelligence we have, does not possess any one of these materials or items in sufficient quantity to conduct a prolonged global conflict, I do not anticipate any immediate overt action on the part of the 14 wise and cool mad dogs in the Kremlin. With all of her satellites Russia last year produced approximately 35 million tons of steel, one-third the output of the United States alone. Steel, of course, is basic not only in wartime but in time of peace. You gentlemen come from widely diversified geographical locations of the United States. I like to think that we can have prosperity with peace and that we do not have to depend upon war or the spilling of blood in order for us to have full employment and to enjoy prosperity.

When you think of the railroad shops, the shipyards, the airplane factories, the household goods, the office equipment, the plate steel in construction that is used in our daily lives, I do not think that we should try to gear our domestic economy to wartime output. Essential as you gentlemen are in time of peace you are absolutely indispensable in time of war and, in your lifetime and mine, this generation, we fought two world wars and the Korean conflict, skating on thin ice today with a cloud of uncertainty hanging over our heads, no one knowing what tomorrow might bring. For that reason it is all the more necessary that representatives of your great industry gather together to think over the problems that not only confront your particular industry, and there are many allied ones, but to think of the welfare of our Nation. Russia does not have the steel today though she gained a lot of it in Mukden and Darien and Port Arthur in Manchuria after we sold Nationalist China down the river promising them faithfully at the Cairo Conference that that vast territory with its great manufacturing and industrial potentiality would be returned at the end of World War II. But we surrendered it, turned it over lock, stock, and barrel to "good old Joe." They have a lot of steel; they are increasing their industrial output.

You have to have not only steel that is basic, you have to have rubber. America is a Nation on wheels. We came dangerously near losing World War II after the fall of Malaya when the forts at Singapore could shoot only in 1 direction and the Japs came from behind and took it over after sinking 2 British battleships. The hottest spot in the world perhaps at this particular moment is Indochina, Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia, and if Indochina falls, Burma, Thailand, Malaya, Indonesia, will likely fall like tenpins. I do not know what will happen to the Philippines, Formosa, and Japan. When that great section of southeastern Asia goes under, the rice bowl, the breadbasket which controls not only tin but rubber, perhaps our defense line will be pushed from Japan, Formosa, and Okinawa and the Philippines back to Alaska, Hawaii, and the Panama Canal; that is dangerously close when boys fly from Los Angeles to New York in 3 hours and 45 minutes.

Russia does not have the steel or the rubber at this moment, but the rattlesnakes in the Kremlin are no dumb bunnies. They will have to have not only steel, they will have to have rubber and oil. Korea yesterday, maybe Indochina tomorrow, and Iran next year. But if she can continue to nibble and grab and encircle the peoples on her vast periphery as she has done since 1945, less than 10 years in which she has grown from less than 200 million people until today she dominates or controls more than 800 million people, almost a third of the world's population, she will achieve her objective—domination of the world. Iran, Iraq, Kuwait, Saudi Arabia—if she can get the steel, if she can get the rubber, if she can get the oil, then you can really start worrying.

A day or two after his confirmation by the United States Senate, Uncle Charlie Wilson, "Engine Charlie," of General Motors, paid me a courtesy call. I told him, "Mr. Wilson, I feel highly flattered and honored that you would come to my office to see me, sir."

He said, "You shouldn't because the executive and legislative have to work as a team."

I said, "I think the President, the Congress, and the American people are most fortunate in getting a man of your broad vision, long successful business experience, to accept one of the most onerous and burdensome and responsible and powerful jobs in all the world next to the Presidency of the United States—a job that forced one man to leap out of a window, another to develop ulcers, and a third one to resign. Mr. Wilson, you have been president of the greatest corporation on earth, General Motors, employing 486,000 people, doing an annual volume of business of $7 billion, but that is peanuts, sir, compared to what you have now."

Imagine a hillbilly jenny driver from the Ozarks talking to the president of General Motors and the new Secretary of Defense in such fashion. But the bigger men are the finer men and the more understanding they have, and he lighted another cigarette as we visited, and I said, "Sir, instead of employing fewer than a half-million people, you have 5 million people now working for you—3½ million in uniform and 1,280,000 civilians—more civilians in the Department of Defense in January of last year than in all the other branches of the President's Cabinet—State, Treasury, Interior, Post Office, Commerce, Labor; and instead of doing $7 billion worth of business a year, Mr. Secretary, we spent the year before you took your oath of office more than $50 billion, an incomprehensible sum of money, almost twice as much as our national debt at the end of World War I, $26 billion. Fifty thousand millions of dollars, more money than the 22 largest corporations in this country, not only General Motors, but Ford, Chrysler, United States Steel, Monsanto, and all the rest of them—call the roll."

It startled him a bit. You know and I know that living in this age of peril, and that is what it is, the President stated it well, not an hour or year but an age of peril with the uncertainties and anxieties that hang over our head, we must in spite of high taxes and the enormous costs build up and maintain our military might.

Of course, at the close of World War II we were foolish and stupid, as we have always been at the close of any war, in demobilizing our forces and letting them go to pot. Our national defense? The mamas were very eager and anxious to get their boys home. It was politically popular in spite of the warning of just a little handful, half a dozen of us in the Congress. In spite of the warning we were demobilizing too many too soon, and we let it all go by the board, and it took Korea as a stimulant to bring us to our senses, to get back on the track.

This year, at the end of this month, about a week from now, we will spend not $54 billion as in the previous year but about $42 billion, and that is a lot of dough. We appropriated $29 billion for the next fiscal year 1955, but we will actually spend $37 or $38 billion. You know and I know we can't forever carry that onerous burden. Of course, it is cheaper than defeat. Those of you, like myself, who have gone from Ludwigshafen down the Rhine to Stuttgart, Mannheim, Frankfurt-on-Main and Koin through the Ruhr,, to Dusseldorf, Essen to Bremen and Hamburg, Berlin, Dresden, and back to Halle and over to Karlsruhe, Augsburg, and Munchen, not to mention the other places saw the wreckage and the shambles that the Third Reich was. I had hoped and prayed after spending a year in Heidelberg and Berlin more than a quarter of a century ago I would never witness such devastation, but when I went to Japan in 1947, the following year, Yokahama, Tokyo, Kobe, Osaka, not to mention Hiroshima and Nagasaki, all the cities of Japan with the exception of Kyoto, as all the cities of Germany with the exception of Heidelberg, an old university town of only 80,000, with no military value, absolutely burned up and blasted to bits. We know the price of defeat.

I have taken only these 2 or 3 minutes not to inform but to remind you of the absolute necessity of building up and maintaining our military might to make this Nation invincible and invulnerable to attack on land, sea, and in the air. We have to maintain, as long as there are brigands abroad and aggressors in this world, such a state of readiness. But let no one kid himself for a moment that the military is the only prime aspect of our national defense; we must make certain and sure that we keep things in proper balance and equilibrium.

You cannot have military might without preserving your economic strength. The battle line can never be stronger than the home front. We want security but we must have it with solvency. A bankrupt nation never licked anybody and never will, and Lenin wrote and Stalin reiterated, and Molotov knows it well. Their fond hope was that the United States, like every capitalist country, would spend itself into bankruptcy, hoping for an economic collapse, with widespread unemployment—divide and conquer. In other words, raise class against class, race against race, let America knock herself out by her own profligacy. Why should they attack or fight when they have been winning every battle of the cold war without firing a shot or losing a man. If she can engage us in sideline wars on her vast periphery, Korea yesterday, Indochina today, Iran tomorrow, if she can siphon off our wealth in economic and military aid to all the nations of the world, an America with her vast resources, inventive genius and technological know-how cannot forever carry the rest of the world, 160 million of us.

It is closer to Washington from Leningard than it is from Leningrad to Vladivostok. We have 3 million square miles. They have eight. They outnumber us and time is on their side. We have to not only build up and maintain a superior Air Force, the greatest Navy on earth, which we have, not necessarily the largest Army but a highly trained, mobile, hard-hitting Army, equipped with the latest weapons, but that is where the New Look comes in from our wonderful present Joint Chiefs of Staff under the chairmanship of Admiral Radford, one of the smartest men I have ever met in or out of uniform. Our only hope for victory or chance for survival in this atom and hydrogen age is not by matching man for man with the hordes on the Asiatic continent, we shall survive or win any other conflict because of the superiority of weapons and the superior skill of the men who use or man those weapons.

Therefore, each one of you in this room is just as great a soldier and just as necessary as any man in uniform on the battlefield, because today the men at the front are really safer than the old men, women, and helpless children in our large populous centers. Every admiral and general with whom I have talked, and I have talked to them for a long time, from Douglas MacArthur through Malin Craig, Charles Summerall, George Marshall, Ike Eisenhower, Omar Bradley, and even down to Ridgway, I do not care whether it is the Army or whether it is Nimitz or King or Halsey or Vandergriff or Cates or Lem Sheppard, without detracting one bit from the glory and heroism of the men and whomen who fought on land, sea, and in the air, all of them will tell you that the one thing that brought ultimate victory to the allied powers over the Axis was America's industrial might and productive capacity. It saved the battle of Britain and it saved the battle of Stalipgrad because it was in the mines, the forests, factories, and on our farms we produced the food and fiber, the sinews and weapons of war to feed, clothe and equip 12 million men and women and our Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force, and Coast Guard, and do not forget those boys. In peactime they are under the Treasury, in wartime they are of course under the Navy. It was the civilian population as well as the men at the front that produced this food, and Napoleon said that an army fights on its stomach. It is that sector of our Nation that produced the fiber, that produced the weapons that brought final victory. So each one of you is a great soldier.

You are in the machinery and allied products. You manufacture the tools and it takes tools to make machines, and you cannot do it overnight. It takes time. We have to build up and maintain our military might. We have to maintain and preserve our economic strength. The two are married, one and inseparable, and when you divorce them both will die.

There is another factor and that is the psychological propaganda which is by no means the least. This cold war of ours is not only a contest between armies and navies and air forces, not only between the economic strength of nations and more than the atomic bomb or the hydrogen bomb, it is America's industrial might and our productive capacity that has deterred more than anything else an attack from the enemy. But in addition to military might and economic strength, it is an ideological war, it is a war for the minds and souls and hearts and consciences and allegiances of men. You cannot preserve or continue a wornout, dismoded, discredited colonialism, regardless of what nation might wish to preserve or maintain it. What do slaves care about democracy and communism when they are thinking only of a bowl of rice, a loaf of bread, and a shirt on their back? You have to be realistic and you have to be practical. I am sorry we do not have a Syngman Rhee and a ROK army in Indochina today. They are wavering and they will go to either side, and if a popular election were held, I am afraid it would go overwhelmingly against Bao-Dai. You have to give the natives the freedom and independence that we ourselves enjoy or they have nothing to fight for.

An idea is the most powerful weapon on earth, it can be the most dangerous weapon on earth. As a man thinketh so is he. It is not only sound gospel, it is sound common sense. As a nation thinketh, so goes it. The only way you can overcome a bad idea is with a better idea. The only way you can defeat a false philosophy, if we don't fall before it crashes, is with a better philosophy of life. An idea, our psychological warfare, the weakest link in our whole chain of defense, and we are paying more attention to it now, our psychological warfare in years gone by has been pitifully and woefully weak. You have to have your heart in a fight. You have to have an idea and an ideal for which men are willing to lay down their lives. It is an ideological war in which we are now engaged. Maintain your military might, preserve your economic strength, but do not lose sight of your ideals and do not under-estimate the power of an idea. You cannot shoot an idea with a rifle. You cannot stab it with a bayonet, you cannot destroy it with an atom bomb. Truth though crushed to earth will rise again, and as old Dan Webster once said in that famous murder trial, "Murder though it hath no tongue will speak with most miraculous organ."

Gentlemen, you are engaged in a business that is very essential to our domestic peacetime economy. In giving us radios and televisions and electric irons, washers, sweepers, you add to our comfort, we absolutely could not get along without you in time of war. I am sure you have had a good conference. I hope you shall continue to have one. I do not want to trespass upon your time, and I have other engagements, but for these few brief minutes I am glad to meet with you, and the only reason I came, to tell you the truth, was through my good friend Freas Long here. I refused your invitation, much as I appreciated it, but the demand on our time is great, and when you are chairman of the Armed Services Committee that is spending two-thirds of all your money, and then have some pipsqueak back home file against you in a primary, as happened to me [applause], and carry on with the measly salary we get to maintain a home in your district and one in Washington, flying back and forth every weekend, that costs you a couple of hundred bucks, and if I did not go before groups as I did last night to make a little money on the side I would not stay here. I am not soliciting, but I have open hands here if anyone wants to contribute to my campaign, it will certainly be welcome, and I can use it.

No; all joking aside, we are living in very trying, troublesome times. It has been my good fortune and great pleasure to have spoken, I think, in every Republican district, most of the Democratic, and God knows a lot of Democrats come to my rescue when a lot of these half-baked Republicans forget me. I do not know what we have today, but we will not go into that. All I want to do is to urge you as a hillbilly from the Ozarks, from southwest Missouri, a little boy who went bareheaded, and barefooted until he was 14 years old, and they used to have to chase me with bloodhounds to put shoes on me, all I want to do as a fellow American, whoever you are, wherever you are from, or whatever your particular corporation or industry is, is to realize we are all Americans. The enemy may think that they can divide and conquer; I do not think they can do it. I am No. 8 in a brood of 10 kids. I was a little slow in arriving, but I finally got here. I was not born under Henry Wallace or they would have knocked me in the head or plowed me under. [Applause.] I got here and I am glad to be here, this America of ours. It is worth fighting for, it is worth dying for, and, like so many of you, I volunteered with my brothers, but even more important, it is worth living for, and if we live for it and do our duty as good citizens, perhaps we will not have these great international crises, world conflicts.

I am glad I was born and live in a nation where a poor backwoodsman, born in a log cabin, with the ground for a floor, coonskin for a window, who gained all of his knowledge by the flickering light of an open fire, could by his rugged honesty, his sterling patriotism, his love for God and country, and for his fellow man, could rise from obscure origins and humble beginnings to the highest office in the gift of a great free people, and only here in the United States could you produce an Abraham Lincoln.

I am glad to live in a country where a poor newsboy, selling newspapers on the train out of Detroit, could work through the day, toil far into the night, not depending upon a check from Washington or a handout from Uncle Sam, a government subsidy or a bounty, but who, through his own efforts, could invent a gadget that would reproduce the human voice and the incandescent lamp to light up the world. Only here in America could you produce a Thomas Edison. I walked by his old workshop down at 14th Street and 5th Avenue in New York last Friday. It made me grateful.

I am glad to live in this country where a poor mechanic setting up a workshop in a woodshed, studied and worked instead of running to the post office to see if that letter or check from Washington had arrived, but rather who toiled through the day and far into the night, and who had the confidence of his neighbors and friends who loaned him a little money, and it was Henry Ford that pulled us out of the mud and put us on wheels and transformed the whole system of modern transportation in this country. Only in America could you have a Henry Ford.

Let us maintain our military might on land, sea, and in the air. Trim the fat, eliminate the waste, avoid overlapping and duplication of effort. Be sure you do not cut into the muscle or break a bone. Maintain our military might, painful as the cost is. Be sure you do not overstep or overextend yourself by attempting to take care of every Hottentot from Zamboanga to Zanzibar. Preserve our economic strength, carry on your psychological or propaganda war with better ideas and higher ideals than the enemy's philosophy that is rooted in a crass, diabolical and sordid materialism. We shall then win.

I shall be with you. [Applause.]

Mr. Stewart. It was a great privilege to receive your reminder, sir, and we are also privileged to have you joined on the platform by a great contributor to the capital goods industries whom we are proud to find a great friend of yours.

I think that it would be an imposition to ask the Congressman to remain for questions. He has taken time from a very busy schedule to be here today. We gratefully appreciate it, and we wish that on another day when your schedule is not as heavy as it is today you may be back with us. Thank you very much. [Applause.]

Republicans Make Joke of Civil Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1954

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the attention of the House has been called recently to the publicized statement of the Mount Pleasant Journal, of Westmoreland County, Pa., my congressional district, to the effect that the present acting postmaster would not be named permanent postmaster because he is a Democrat—this, in spite of the fact he is a seriously disabled and crippled World War II veteran, and stood No. 1 on the civil-service eligible list as the result of the competitive examination.

With your permission, Mr. Speaker, I am inserting herewith the editorial from the Mount Pleasant Journal:

Republicans Make Joke of Civil Service

It is very easy to see why Congressman Kelley has brought the Mount Pleasant post-office appointment case to the floor of the House. For many years he has diligently labored as a committee head for the handicapped and disabled war veterans. When the local postmaster vacancy occurred back in September 1952, the Democrats were still in power. Had he played politics he would have appointed an active member of his party. Instead he singled out a physically handicapped war veteran whose life had all but been ruined on the battlefield in France. A young man whom he felt deserved this small recognition for the years of untold suffering and a ruined life as a result of his service to his country.

Congressman Kelley didn't ask if the disabled veteran was a Democrat or a Republican. His only question was as to his physical and mental fitness. Both have been proven in the able manner in which he has performed the duties as postmaster during the past 18 months. His ability was again demonstrated when he took the civil-service examination in competition with 8 or 9 other applicants and attained first place by outscoring them all.

The action of the local, county, and State Republican committees to ignore the top man on the list together with the fact that he is a disabled war veteran should cause grave concern to members of both political parties, not only in Mount Pleasant, but all over the Nation. It is the beginning of a pattern that can only be stopped when they are roundly defeated at the election polls from the local to the national level.

Statement of Principles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DEWEY SHORT

OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 28, 1954

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, in my judgment, the American people voted for a change in 1952. I regarded my own relection to Congress as a mandate to help give them that change. I have worked to that end. The change has not been as fast or complete as I have wanted it.

Insofar as I have felt that the policies of the Eisenhower administration contributed to this much-needed change, I have supported them—and will continue to do so.

I have supported the administration's economy measures and tax program as the basis of sound national prosperity. I have supported administration efforts to strengthen American military defenses, particularly through air power and improved weapons. I have supported administration proposals designed to restore constitutional government and fiscal sanity. I have supported administration efforts to strengthen private enterprise and reduce the encroachments of big government. I personally aided these efforts in the successful fight to authorize sale of the synthetic rubber plants to private enterprise at a fair price. I voted for the St. Lawrence seaway project which, under President Eisenhower's leadership, has finally become an assured reality. I have supported any move which gave promise of a firmer and more realistic foreign policy and have especially commended the President's pledge to recognize the congressional authority to declare war.

On the other hand, insofar as I have felt that administration policies have failed to accomplish the much-needed change or have continued the discredited Truman-Acheson program, I have opposed those policies—and will continue to do so.

What I believed to be wrong in 1952, I still believe to be wrong in 1954. I will not embrace or support policies I have consistently opposed over the years merely because they ostensibly have new sponsorship. More often than not, they have been foisted upon the present administration by holdover bureaucrats of the Fair Deal days.

I have opposed—and will continue to oppose—the giveaway of American resources, tax funds, and manpower to unreliable, fair-weather allies who seek continued handouts from Uncle Sam but direct their policy of appeasement only to America's enemies.

I have opposed—and will continue to oppose—any jungle wars for American fighting men which can only bleed this Nation white. But once in war we should fight to win it.

I have opposed—and will continue to oppose—scattering American forces throughout the world.

I have supported, insofar as opportunity has afforded—and will continue to support—the Bricker amendment. I believe it is absolutely necessary to have a constitutional guaranty that the Constitution cannot be nullified by treaty provision of executive agreements.

I have opposed—and will continue to oppose—subjecting American servicemen to the courts and judicial processes of foreign countries, where rights guaranteed all Americans by the Constitution are jeopardized or destroyed.

I have long advocated—and continue to advocate—complete severance of diplomatic relations with Soviet Russia. Events have tragically confirmed my belief that recognition of Russia has always exposed this country to infiltration of spies, enemy agents, and Soviet secret police under the guise of diplomatic personnel.

I believe that the starting point of a truly firm foreign policy is the complete refusal to do business with Communist nations. I believe the bulk of our diplomatic failures of the past 20 years can be traced to our recognition of Soviet Russia, a nation which has built up its own military might with secrets and materiel we have lost or given to the Communists.

I have supported—and will continue to support—congressional investigations of Communist subversion and infiltration. Whatever improvements may be possible in such investigative procedures, these congressional investigations are the one safeguard available against Executive indifference to this Communist peril and the one principal means of public knowledge and understanding of this threat.

We all recognize agriculture as our basic industry and that dairying comprises the most important segment of it. I firmly believe that dairy products should be supported under the same system as basic commodities. It is manifestly unfair to force the dairy farmer to pay inordinately high prices for grain and feeds supported by high fixed Government subsidies at the same time he has his milk, cheese, and other dairy products sold on a lower flexible scale.

Actually, the basic crops—wheat, cotton, corn, rice, tobacco, and peanuts—account for only about 23 percent of the Nation's total farm income. Yet nine-tenths of the $6.5 billion committed to price-support operations is tied up in these basic commodities.

During 1953 Missouri farmers received $705 million for their livestock and livestock products while crops returned only $310 million. This works a distinct hardship on our Missouri farmers because only 14 percent of Missouri's farm income is supplied by the so-called basic commodities. No one branch of agriculture should be favored over another.

It is necessary for the prosperity of the Nation that labor-mangement relations be harmonious in that each should recognize the rights of the other. I have always worked toward this end. The Taft-Hartley law is fundamentally right and basically sound, and I agree with President Eisenhower that workers in any union should be free to decide for thesmelves whether or not they should go on strike, instead of being browbeaten and threatened by some high-salaried labor boss.

Much remains to be done if the American people are to have the change for which they voted 2 years ago. Because of rigid New Fair Deal laws ruthlessly passed when few Republicans were in Congress and because the Republicans lack a working majority in both the Senate and the House under the present administration, it has been difficult and next to impossible to have the quick turn-over in patronage which all good and loyal Republicans want. The most powerful leaders in Congress, as well as the freshmen Members, young and inexperienced, face this same problem. Any honest Member will tell you this.

Election of a Republican Congress is imperative if the principles and program of the Eisenhower administration are to be carried forward. It will be carried forward faster when we get rid of hold-over New Fair Dealers. And for heaven's sake do not elect any so-called Republican New Dealer.

In spite of the powerful machine built up by the New Fair Deals over 20 long years, much progress has been made in the year and a half this administration has been in power. Taxes have been reduced, Government expenditures cut enormously—216,243 jobs eliminated at a saving of $851 million a year—important social legislation enacted, a highway program of great value adopted, increased funds voted for REA and rural telephones, more funds given to our Agriculture Research and Extension Service, Communists and subversives have been routed out of the Government, and the Washington mess largely—though by no means completely—cleaned up.

I pledge my continued efforts to build up and maintain America's military might, to preserve her economic strength, and to increase her intellectual and augment her moral and spiritual power.

And, of course, I also pledge to continue the courteous and efficient services to the people of the Seventh Missouri district, which I and my office staff have always given in the past. To serve the people of our great district without regard to their political affiliations has always been our motto. That policy will be continued.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

PRINTING DOCUMENTS AND REPORTS

Documents and reports of committees with the evidence and papers submitted therewith, or any part thereof ordered printed by Congress, may be reprinted by the Public Printer on order of any Member of Congress or Delegate, on prepayment of the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 162, p. 1940).

The

IN T

Mr
that
prese
build
tion.
On
New
home
mans
a re
servi
one o
Galla
stanc
diplo
Re
burgl
ten
whicl
and
ship
his p
Repu
Mr
sent
print
as a
Th
was
as fo
MANS

Beh
a par
dence
huma
The
made
more
the ve
home
which
Mou
shrine
are a
ton,
that
each
have
It i
as im
Ameri
One
becau
Ameri
comfo
ica at
The
New C
ty.
Gal
the T
cates
the fr

Appendix

The Albert Gallatin Mansion Friendship Hill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 29, 1954

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I feel that every American is interested in the preservation of our historic sites and buildings as shrines of patriotic inspiration.

One such place is Friendship Hill, at New Geneva, Fayette County, Pa., the home of Albert Gallatin. This historic mansion, built in 1789, stands today as a reminder of Gallatin's distinguished service to the Nation. Unquestionably one of the most brilliant men of his time, Gallatin's fame rests securely on his outstanding achievements in public finance, diplomacy, and statecraft.

Recently the Sun-Telegraph, of Pittsburgh, Pa., published an editorial written by its city editor, J. Alex Zehner, which outlines Gallatin's patriotic career and calls for the preservation of Friendship Hill as an everlasting memorial to his part in building the greatness of our Republic.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Zehner's editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MANSION OF PATRIOT-GENIUS TO BE LOST AS UNITED STATES SHRINE?

(By J. Alex. Zehner)

Behind each abiding principle which forms a part of the American creed, kind Providence has seemed to provide a dramatic human personality.

The stories of the lives of these men who made our history somehow seem fresher, more real, and personal when we tread on the very ground on which they trod, visit the homes in which they lived, see the tools with which they worked.

Mount Vernon, Monticello, Arlington, are shrines which inspire Americans because they are actually the former homes of Washington, Jefferson, and Lee. It was fortunate that all three of these magnificent homes, each of which reflects a different personality, have been and always will be preserved.

It is tragic that some other, and really just as important, homes and mansions of famous Americans are going to be lost to posterity.

One of these which should be treasured because it dramatizes the life of immigrant American who sacrificed fame, position and comfort in Europe to help forge basic America at the time of the Great Revolution.

The home is that of Albert Gallatin at New Geneva, near Uniontown, Fayette County.

Gallatin, Thomas Jefferson's Secretary of the Treasury was typical of the true advocates and fighters for the establishment of the freedom and dignity of man.

This young Swiss aristocrat, when offered a commission in the Hessian mercenary through the influence of his equally aristocratic grandmother, declined with a historic six-word statement. He declared:

"I will not serve a tyrant."

For this stand Susanne Vaudenet Gallatin, the grandmother, slapped his face.

And so deep was his fervent devotion to freedom that this college-age youth turned his back on family and friends and came to America to join the army of the Revolutionary colonies.

The Hessian Army was on the other side.

Gallatin wanted to live as a Swiss-American gentleman and businessman on a 700-acre estate near Uniontown, but his adopted country's need for his talents inspired him to serve not only as Secretary of the Treasury, but also as a diplomat, statesman, legislator, peace advocate, and a financial genius.

Only by quirks of fate and the recurring activity of private citizens has Gallatin's unique mansion, known as Friendship Hill, been saved this long.

Now privately owned, as it always has been, it is kept available to its many visitors through the activities of a group of patriotic citizens known as the Friendship Hill Association.

Some of those who believe a private or governmental agency should purchase and maintain Friendship Hill as a Gallatin memorial are bewildered by the spending of millions to build synthetic duplicates of just such historic buildings while this authentic shrine of national interest and importance remains practically neglected.

Friendship Hill, it seems is a most important symbol now to those who see the necessity for keeping alive the axiom that a nation, to live and prosper, must remain solvent. It was Gallatin, who in 1801 stepped in as Secretary of the Treasury when our young nation, with 6 million population, was struggling with a national debt of $83 million.

With a philosophy that "expenses must not overwhelm income revenues" he applied his financial skill and genius until by 1812 he had reduced that debt to $45 million and had dug up the $15 million for the Louisiana Purchase. He insisted that during times of peace and prosperity the Treasury must show ample surpluses to be applied to the orderly reduction of the public debt and thus prepare to cope with any emergency that might arise.

It was Gallatin's influence in fiscal affairs, many students of finance believe, that enabled this Nation to become the present treasury of the free world.

Just as important to our national peace and stability was Gallatin's work as a diplomat. That endeavor led to the Treaty of Ghent, the international agreement which seems to have brought peace for all time between Britain and the United States.

His other contributions to the country he adopted and loved are legion, but even all of that would not necessarily make Friendship Hill a unique shrine if it were just a great mansion which a rich man had an architect design for a great estate.

Friendship Hill is an unusual place, old and picturesque, yet fresh and filled with much to remind Americans who visit it today of the unusual Swiss youth who lovingly planned and built it, originally for a bride who lived only a few months. The later additions to the place, planned in hope that his second wife and other relatives would enjoy the place as he knew he could, can be studied as one hears about the tribulations involved.

Busy with affairs of the Nation, Gallatin returned to the place in 1823 to see how his son Albert Gallatin II was getting along with supervising the construction work from stone being quarried on the place.

All of the woes of a man whose dream house has threatened to become a nightmare are contained in a letter he wrote at that time from New Geneva to one of his daughters.

It reads:

"Our house has been built by a new Irish carpenter, who was always head over heels and added much to the disorder inseparable from building. Being unacquainted with Grecian architecture, he adopted the Hiberno-Teutonic style; so the outside of the house, with its porthole-looking windows, has the appearance of Irish barracks, whilst the inside ornaments are similar to those of a Dutch tavern."

But son Albert apparently was not bothered too much about details which bothered the home-loving father, who continued:

"The grounds are overgrown with elders, ironweed, stinking weeds, laurel, several varieties of briers, impenetrable thickets of brush, vines, and underwood amongst which are discovered vestiges of old asparagus, and new artichoke beds, and now and then a spontaneous apple or peach tree.

"As to Albert, he has four guns, and a pet colt, smaller than a jackass, who feeds on the fragments of my old lilacs and alhea fintex.

"His own clothes adorn the parlor and sitting room in the old brick house; for the frame house is partly occupied by the Bufile family, and partly encumbered by various boxes and a billiard table—the pockets of which are made with stockings."

But despite an apparently unappreciative family and the burdens of state which kept him so often "on the road," Gallatin completed his dream house. History records how he entertained Lafayette and a thousand guests one afternoon on its spacious lawn when the great French hero of the American Revolution came to Uniontown on his triumphant last tour of America.

Surely a history appreciating America can find a way to make this shrine as imperishable as the stone which Gallatin quarried in his Pennsylvania hills.

Perhaps we can live, love, and prosper without the physical symbols, but many Americans should be inspired to paraphrase the 51st chapter of Isaiah when they visit Friendship Hill and murmur in benediction:

"I have looked at the rock from whence we were hewn."

Understanding at Last

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1954

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, everyone knows of the splendid work which is done at Carville, La., in the treatment of Hansen's disease. However, due to ignorance and superstition, many are still reluctant to come in contact with those unfortunate people who have had this disease. It was with a warm feeling that I read the editorial and article which appeared in the Times-Picayune New Orleans State, which tells of the opportunity given to a former leprosy patient, Johnny Harmor., by one of the leading citizens of Vacherie, La., Ernest A. Becnel. It is to be hoped that more people will follow the generous attitude of Mr. Becnel and the other citizens of Vacherie in affording former leprosy patients the chance to live normally.

The editorial and article follow:

Understanding at Last

Many have been the laborers and small has been the return, but at long last it appears that those who have toiled for understanding about the once-dread disease called leprosy can start looking for a harvest.

Johnny Harmon can testify to that. For Johnny Harmon had leprosy—or Hansen's disease, as the doctors like to call it now, at the leprosarium at Carville. Now cured, he is living a normal life in Vacherie.

Johnny Harmon has a business. He has friends. The people of Vacherie do not shun him. They come to him for their photographic work. They chat with him across the fence. They accept him.

Harmon decided he would not try to hide the fact that he was a former patient at Carville. He told some of the people of Vacherie and they told others. But no one was shocked. There was no panic.

All they asked was:

"Did they discharge you from Carville?"

Typical of the reaction in Vacherie to Horman's affirmative reply was that of elderly Ernest A. Becnel:

"We got faith in the doctors at Carville and if they discharged him that's good enough for us."

So the world takes another step forward. Modern drugs in recent years have made arrest of the disease a modern miracle. But restoration of the patient to good health even then did not solve the problems for after he was well again there was nowhere to go.

The medical people and the sufferers from the disease had a fight on their hands as difficult as that of finding the proper kind of medication. People insisted on believing in the age-old unfounded taboo against leprosy patients. They refused to put credence in doctor's statements that the disease was only slightly contagious; that a patient could be restored to health; that once restored he would not be at all dangerous to his fellow man.

The campaign seemed hopeless. But now—at last—the fight for understanding seems to be making progress.

Vacherie Citizens Accept Former Carville Patient—Starts Anew After Hansen Disease Is Cured

The little town of Vacherie, La., has given Johnny Harmon the privilege of calling the town his home.

Johnny was uncertain when he came to Vacherie in April that the town would welcome him. It is a small community of a few hundred persons about 45 miles north of New Orleans on the Mississippi River, and you don't have secrets in a place like that.

But he went to elderly Ernest A. Becnel, one of Vacherie's leading citizens and a spokesman for the community. He told Becnel he had been in Carville leprosarium for 15 of his last 19 years, 7 of them as a patient with Hansen's disease.

"Have you been discharged from Carville?" Becnel asked. Johnny replied he had.

Becnel says "We have faith in the doctors at Carville, and if they discharged him that was good enough for us." Becnel told the other people of the town, but they felt the same way—if he was discharged he was O. K. with the townspeople.

Hansen's disease is known by most people by the name of leprosy. The disease has meant banishment and shame for its victims from biblical days until only recently.

COMIC STRIP NOTES FLIGHT

Johnny Harman knew this when the doctor at Carville told him, 4 months ago, that he ought to leave the leprosarium and start life anew.

He knew that people of today were often still afraid of the disease and might prevent him from leading a normal life. "Rex Morgan, M. D." a comic strip which appears in the New Orleans States, had recently told the story of a former Carville patient, Jim Hartley, who with his family nearly met tragedy because of ignorance and superstition of the people in a town where they tried to settle.

But Johnny Harmon decided to try.

While in Carville he had used the name "Johnny Harris" and was the institution's official photographer. But when he set out for his former home in Hankamer, Tex., he had decided to use his real name.

In Texas he tried to get his old job back, a job as draftsman with the State highway department. But he failed and came back to Louisiana.

Johnny's wife, Anne, is still a patient at Carville, and his two children were living in Vacherie, his wife's home. So Johnny decided to try to settle down in the little town and be near them all.

OPENS PHOTOGRAPH SHOP

With what money he had managed to save at Carville, he opened a small photography shop, the only one in the town. Now he is putting in a full day in the laboratory and looking forward to his daily visits with his children and his weekly visits with his wife.

Johnny Harmon says he used to like to take pictures when he was a child, "and when I went to Carville, I started taking pictures of patients and developing them."

Soon he had all the work he could handle, and the patients were paying him for his work.

When Johnny first went to Carville he tried to conceal his identity and told nobody but his father where he was. "I didn't let any of the neighbors know—I even changed my name."

Some of the patients go even further than that, Johnny said. "They don't speak to anybody, and many don't even go out of their rooms."

Most of them feel like they are never going to leave the leprosarium, he says, and those who know they will know they may be ostracized—people may have nothing to do with them—wherever they go.

"I guess you can't blame them," Johnny says.

When he went to Carville, Johnny was treated with chaulmoogra oil, the only known treatment for Hansen's disease at that time.

NEW TREATMENT USED

He was discharged in 1938 and went home, but in 1942 he found the disease had been reactivated.

Johnny Harmon went back to Carville, wanting to die.

But by that time another method of treating the disease had been found—the sulfa drugs. These proved effective, and in 1946 Johnny was discharged again.

But he decided to stay in Carville and continue to operate his photography business. He and his wife lived in a house he had built himself on the hospital grounds.

"I didn't want to leave for a long time. You never get over your experience in Carville," he said. "You can't. So you feel like you don't ever want to leave."

TOWNSPEOPLE AT SHOP

Most people in Vacherie still don't know Johnny very well. They know who he is, and they know about his years in Carville.

Johnny has been a busy man since he went to the little town. "I've been invited out," he said, "but I never have time to go. I work here in the shop from the time I get up until I'm just too weary to stand up at night. And besides, it wouldn't be much fun without Anne."

But Johnny isn't lonely—the townspeople come to his shop. Kids parade in and out of his little house constantly, fascinated by his laboratory. And customers like to come into the shop and talk over picture-taking problems.

Hansen's disease left Johnny unmarked except for a slight depression between his left thumb and first finger.

Last April Johnny proudly took part in the 46th annual convention of the American Leprosy Mission, Inc., in Dallas, Tex. "I was asked to speak," Johnny says, "and I was official photographer for the convention."

Texas Adjutant To Head March of Dimes in State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 29, 1954

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, our Texas Adjutant General, who is also commanding general of the Texas National Guard, is a busy man. Yet Maj. Gen. K. L. Berry, Adjutant General of Texas and distinguished military man, has agreed to increase his services to our State by accepting the State chairmanship of the 1955 March of Dimes.

A news story telling something of the career of General Berry, and explaining why he is willing to add to his duties, has been published in a number of Texas newspapers. I ask unanimous consent that this story as it appeared in the Paducah (Tex.) Post be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the story was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Maj. Gen. Kearle L. Berry, adjutant general of Texas and commanding general of the Texas National Guard, has accepted the State chairmanship of the 1955 March of Dimes in Texas.

In accepting the post General Berry said: "Having been a prisoner of war for 40 months, I have some idea of the feelings of people who are prisoners of an iron lung. It took an all-out war to get myself and the other released—so let's mount an all-out attack against polio."

Robert J. Smith, of Dallas, volunteer State director of the March of Dimes campaigns in 1953 and 1954, praised the acceptance of General Berry of the annual fund-raising campaign. "Although we made great progress in Texas during those 2 years in which I was privileged to lead the campaigns, I anticipate even greater advances in 1955. In General Berry you have a man who, by his everyday work, is interested in the well-being and safety of Texans. I wish him every success and stand ready to assist him in every way possible."

With the polio incidence in Texas rising to a figure almost double the 1953 total for this time, General Berry feels that early organization for the coming campaign is most important. "We must plan, we must practice, we must smooth every rough edge so that when we set the March of Dimes into motion we will be certain that it will be one of the greatest," he stated. "Even though the national foundation is on the right track, we can't let ourselves become overconfident. Fighting polio is worse than fighting a war—we can't see our enemy."

Holder of the Combat Infantry Badge, the Distinguished Service Medal, the Silver Star, and the Purple Heart, General Berry served with distinction as commander of the 1st Division of the Philippine Army in the Pacific theater. With the fall of Bataan he was made a prisoner of war, and was held in camps in Luzon, Formosa, Kyushu, and Manchuria. Returning to the United States in October 1945, following his release, he served in various posts until his retirement from active service on June 30, 1947.

Appointed adjutant general of Texas in May 1947, he was reappointed in 1949, 1951, and 1953. As commanding general of the Texas National Guard, he directs military activities for many thousands of servicemen on a year-round program.

The Vice President's Speech on Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GUY M. GILLETTE
OF IOWA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, June 29, 1954

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an editorial entitled "Isn't It Wonderful?" which was published in this morning's Washington Post.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Isn't It Wonderful?

Vice President Nixon's campaign speech on foreign policy discloses either very little knowledge or very little scruple. "The Acheson policy," he told a Milwaukee audience, "was directly responsible for the loss of China. And if China had not been lost there would have been no war in Korea and there would be no crisis in Indochina today." He had the forbearance not to blame Dean Acheson for the trouble in Guatemala, the Mau Mau uprisings, and the sudden recalcitrance of the British; but he might just as rationally have thrown these in.

The Vice President seems to subscribe to the prevalent view that China, a continental land mass embracing some 400 million human beings and one of the world's oldest cultures, was an American province or colony to be retained or given away in accordance with the preceding administration's whim. China was, in fact, in the grip of a titanic nationalist movement not to be quelled or even measurably exacerbated by anything done in the United States. China was lost by the Chinese—to some other Chinese.

Mr. Nixon's extravagance is unlikely to further the bipartisanship in foreign policy which he and President Eisenhower so often bespeak and so desperately need if some of the wild men of the Republican Party are to be kept from dragging the country into neoisolationism. Nothing quite so flagrantly or meanly partisan has been said since Mr. Nixon himself said some time ago in homage to Secretary Dulles: "Isn't it wonderful, finally, to have a Secretary of State who isn't taken in by the Communists?"

ADA Denounced for Foreign Policy Attacks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 29, 1954

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, many of us in the House have watched with growing concern the attacks of some groups upon the foreign policy of this country. Some of these attacks have been so irresponsible as hardly to be worth serious consideration. One of the most persistent groups in hamstringing any reasonable foreign policy is made up of the Americans for Democratic Action, more commonly known as ADA.

Frank R. Kent in the Washington Sunday Star has done an excellent job of analyzing this group and its position. The article is herewith appended in full:

ADA Denounced for Foreign Policy Attacks—Writer Says Partisan Group Is Unfair to Eisenhower

(By Frank R. Kent)

In these days the amount of voluntary advice as to what he should do in the matter of foreign policy being given to President Eisenhower is so varied, voluminous and vociferous that it is difficult to see how a man can stand up under it. Perhaps the reason he does not falter is because a great deal of it never reaches him.

It comes from all quarters of the country, from both parties, and often from people who know so little about the facts that it is amazing they should have views at all—much less the temerity to advance them. The interesting thing is that the less they know the more dogmatic seem their assertions. A distinct exception to this is John Cowles, president of the Harvard Alumni Association and also president of the Minneapolis Star and Tribune. Recently Mr. Cowles made a thoughtful speech at the Harvard commencement in which, as a result of a lot of travel in the Far East, he ventured to express some opinions.

Mr. Cowles' remarks have been widely publicized, but slight attention has been given to an exceedingly sound and modest paragraph in the conclusion of his speech. In this he says, "Obviously, no man who does not have access to the reports of the Central Intelligence Agency, the State Department and the Joint Chiefs of Staff should be too dogmatic as to what we should or should not do." It should be said right here that this admission that Mr. Eisenhower, whose sources of information include not only the three which Mr. Cowles admits he himself does not possess but a good many more to which the President alone has access, is the only such admission that has come from any critic of the administration's conduct of foreign affairs.

Yet the fact is that Mr. Cowles has a great deal more right to speak on this subject than most other private citizens. Not what he says but the way he says it is in striking contrast to a group which calls itself Americans for Democratic Action but is generally referred to as the ADA. This organization claims to be "nonpartisan." It is about as nonpartisan as Speaker Joe Martin. It is composed almost exclusively of pro-New Deal, pro-Fair Deal, pro-Roosevelt and pro-Truman Democrats. (Its honorary chairman is Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt. Its cochairman is Arthur Schlesinger, the Stevenson speechwriter. Chairman of the executive committee is Robert R. Nathan, a New Deal economist. Among its vice chairmen are Francis Biddle, the former Roosevelt Attorney General. Others include the gay and garrulous Senator Hubert Humphrey, of Minnesota; the aged and somewhat embittered Senator Herbert Lehman, Walter Ruether; the slippery young head of the CIO; Representative Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., now capitalizing his father's name by running for Governor of New York, and Senator Wayne Morse, of Oregon, who, though elected as a Republican, bolted the Eisenhower ticket in 1952 and now calls himself "independent.")

Certainly, no member of this group is in position to have access to the reports of the Central Intelligence Agency, the State Department or the Joint Chiefs of Staff. But that does not prevent this group from dogmatically proclaiming its opinion. At a recent meeting it denounced Mr. Eisenhower's policy in Asia as "improvised, vacillating and contradictory." It then proceeds to tell the President what he should do. "We should," it proclaims, "help the free Asian nations to give all their people a stake in their freedom, peace and well-being worth defending."

With equal vacuity, the ADA continues to assert that no military steps should be taken without the full cooperation of the free Asian nations and that these should at once be put in position "to make independent political decisions." Further, says the ADA, "new governments when established should be guaranteed by the United Nations against aggression and sufficient economic aid should be provided under United Nations auspices for full economic reconstruction of the area." At no time does the ADA mention what such a course would cost, where the money would come from, how these nations could be solidified into such an arrangement, what the Communists would be doing while we are trying to get them together or what facts the President, Mr. Dulles and his advisers may have which they do not.

Instead, they blithely go ahead in their irresponsible way to tell General Ike that everything he has done or plans to do is wrong and that they have the real solutions. (It seems rather silly when you read it. But then, as one observer of politics says, "considering who they are, what else can you expect?" Well, that is a good question. Actually they are an extremely partisan, propaganda organization working toward the renomination of Mr. Stevenson, who is often just as vague—but not quite so dogmatic.

Monopoly Within the Radio and Television Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY R. SHEPPARD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 29, 1954

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, on several occasions I have brought to the attention of the Congress the seriousness of the monopoly of the radio and television network chains and the drastic effect these monopolies have on the public interest, convenience, and necessity of our people.

An alarming number of our radio stations have had to discontinue operation and many now are operating in the red because of the control these radio network chain monopolies have on the entire economic aspect of the industry, such as the rates stations charge for their broadcasting time, and determination of when, what, and who shall broadcast or rebroadcast radio programs, to say nothing of the complete dominance of the control of public opinion through the news commentators of the network radio chain monopolies.

Many radio stations have brought the seriousness of this situation to my attention in the past and, in turn, I have called it to the attention of my colleagues through the medium of the floor as well as by the introduction of legislation before the House of Representatives designed to regulate these radio network chain monopolies.

For the past week the Senate, through its Subcommittee on Communications of the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, has been holding hearings on the plight of the ultra high frequency television broadcasters. These hearings have shown that many ultra high frequency television broadcasters have invested between one-half to two million dollars each in the construction and operation of their television stations. Many of the pioneers of the new ultra high frequency television channels had to shut down their stations and cease their television broadcasting because they could not get the high quality programs of the national radio or television sponsors for their stations.

In the closing or discontinuing of nearly 100 of ultra high frequency television stations within the last few months, millions of dollars worth of ultra high frequency television equipment in the hands of the public has been made useless to the purchasers. As the result of the united efforts of these ultra high frequency television operators the seriousness of this grave situation was forcefully brought to the attention of the Senate which has resulted in hearings now being held by the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. The Senate hearings have clearly pointed out that the Federal Communications Commission, through the medium of "quicky" television grants, put many ultra high frequency television stations off the air. These television broadcasters were virtually forced off the air by the FCC through the unfair advantages given these "quicky" very high frequency television stations over their competitors, the ultra high frequency television stations, such as granting the very high frequency stations transmitting powers which allow these very high frequency stations to cover as high as 3 to 4 times the area of the ultra high frequency television stations, and as a result of this and other competitive advantages the ultra high frequency television stations were put out of business.

In these Senate television hearings it was pointed out by testimony of Commissioner Fried Hennock of the FCC how the Commission, over her most strenuous objections, gave illegal "quicky" television grants to applicants who filed complicated merger television applications with the FCC. These "quicky" television applications were filed with the FCC exactly at their closing time of 5 o'clock on Tuesday afternoon, and then the FCC promptly granted these applications at 10 o'clock on Wednesday, the next day, without the Commissioners ever having a chance to look into these complicated applications to determine if the grant to the applicant would be in the public interest. In fact, it was impossible for the FCC Commissioners to know anything about the merger applications at the time the Commissioners were voting on them. May I say that these Senate hearings have clearly pointed out that Commissioner Hennock refused to be a party to such illegal "quicky" television grants and she is to be greatly commended for her fight to uphold the principles for which the FCC was created, those basic principles being to control monopoly within the radio and television broadcasting field and to protect the public interest, convenience, and necessity in granting these public domain radio and television channels to broadcasters which the Commission has failed to do.

One of the basic facts brought out in the testimony at the Senate hearings given by the television broadcasters who have been put out of business was that the network monopolies made it impossible for them to obtain the expensive, high-quality programs of the major television advertisers and sponsors. These ultra high frequency television broadcasters almost unanimously testified to the fact the networks are monopolies and there is a definite need for their control by the Government the same as the Government now controls the radio and television stations.

Almost all of these station operators have testified they are in favor of a Senate bill, S. 3456, introduced by Senator Bricker, of Ohio. Senator Bricker's resolution calls for legislation which would regulate the radio and television network chains by the FCC.

As a result of the complaints registered with me by many broadcasters and as a result of my careful study of the network monopoly situation, I am also convinced that if we are to have a complete fully competitive radio and television service for our people these network chain monopolies must be regulated by the FCC in the same manner that the Commission now regulates the thousands of radio and television stations in this country.

Also, I am of the opinion that any person who spends large sums of money to sponsor a radio or television program should have the full use of his program and that the FCC, no other person, radio or television station should be allowed to withhold the rebroadcasting of that sponsor's program if the sponsor so desires to rebroadcast it to the American people.

It is with these thoughts in mind that I have introduced two resolutions—H. R. 9700 and H. R. 9701—which were essentially introduced on two previous occasions. It is the purpose of these bills to prevent, to the greatest extent possible, any monopoly within the radio or television industry from operating contrary to the public interest, convenience, or necessity.

Need and Soundness of Oil Depletion Allowance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 29, 1954

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, in the comprehensive tax bill now being considered by the Senate, the Senate Finance Committee, in my judgment, very wisely and justly recommends the continuation of the 27½ percent depletion allowance for oil production.

In the June 24 issue of the Amarillo (Tex.) Globe-Times there appeared a very good and sensible editorial on this subject, which I commend to the reading of every Member of the Senate. I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

OIL INDUSTRY AID

In spite of the annual clamor against the allowance of 27½-percent-tax credit to oil operators, generally known as the depletion allowance, the Senate Finance Committee has again voted approval of the concession.

That committee, which is making a strenuous effort to produce a general tax bill which is fair to everyone, didn't o. k. the depletion allowance because it wishes to throw special favors to the oil industry. Some of the Congressmen, and others, who oppose the allowance would have you think so, however.

The concession was made because the oil industry is one of the relatively few in this country that is forced to take risks to continue in business, and to keep the country secure. Searching for oil is one of the biggest gambles anyone can take—for business or for pleasure.

The great majority of wildcat wells turn out dry and useless, although they cost much more than a well drilled in proven territory. Many wells have been drilled which cost more than $1 million only to wind up as just another hole in the ground.

Men take such risks because of the profit incentive, just as they engage in more conservative businesses. But they could not afford to operate if the production of the one well out of 8 or 10 drilled was taxed at the same rate as profits in less speculative enterprises.

Congress after Congress has heard complaints that they were playing up to the oil concerns in accepting the depletion allowance. But the same groups have made their decisions after plowing through the expense records which prove that 27½ percent is fair and just—to the operators and to the public.

Wetback Bills

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LOUIS E. GRAHAM

OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 29, 1954

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced two bills, each of which I believe to be essential legislation for enactment during the current Congress if the Government is successful to repel what is virtually an invasion of the country by Mexican wetbacks.

As you know, in the past several years thousands of Mexican nationals have entered the United Stats for farm employment in accordance with the provisions of the Migrant Labor Agreement of 1951, revised, extended, and improved in 1954, between this country and Mexico. However, many thousands of illegal migrants have swarmed into the United States without complying with any of the controlled conditions established and supervised under the migrant-labor agreement. These aliens are commonly denominated wetbacks since almost all make their entry by crossing the Rio Grande. The term has stuck despite the actual fact that most of them effect their crossings without wetting their backs at all.

The wetback constitutes the most serious enforcement problem which faces the Immigration and Naturalization Service of the Department of Justice. The Attorney General has recently pointed out that 85 percent of the deportations effected in the last fiscal year were accomplished at the Mexican border, and over 98 percent of the 885,391 voluntary departures during the same period occurred at that border.

Particularly significant with respect to the wetback problem are three alarming considerations. First, the volume of the wetback traffic has been increasing in almost incredible proportions. In fiscal 1940 there were approximately 7,500 apprehensions in the Mexican border districts. In 1954 the figure will reach about 1 million. Second, no longer are the wetbacks content in our agricultural areas. They are migrating in vast numbers to our cities and other urban communities, seeking and obtaining employment in trade and in industry, and creating serious social and economic problems in the areas in which they settle. Third, the illegal entry of these hundreds of thousands of persons serves as a potentially effective channel for the entry and departure of subversives and persons of similar bent.

It seems to me that the attack on this problem must be two-pronged. Unpleasant consequences must attend the illegal migrant so as to discourage him from entering the United States illegally. Likewise, unpleasant consequences must attend those who knowingly assist and encourage these persons by providing employment opportunities or transportation. The bills I have introduced today are aimed at developing an effective means of meeting the second phase of the problem.

H. R. 9731, entitled the "Illegal Employment of Aliens Act of 1954," would prohibit persons or organizations from offering employment, employing, or paying wages to any alien known by them, or concerning whom they have reasonable grounds to believe, to have illegally entered the United States within 3 years prior thereto. No criminal penalties are prescribed because it is intended and expected that the prohibitions will be enforced by way of injunction proceedings, followed, if and when necessary, by criminal contempt proceedings.

H. R. 9732, the proposed Illegal Transportation of Aliens Act of 1954, supplements the first mentioned bill and other pertinent immigration laws by providing for the forfeiture of any means of transportation used in transporting aliens in violation of section 1324 (a) (1) or (2) of title 8 of the United States Code.

The House and Parity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLARENCE E. KILBURN

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 29, 1954

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, I insert herewith an editorial from the Watertown Daily Times, Watertown, N. Y., of June 26, on the farm bill. The Watertown Times is the biggest newspaper in the heart of the dairy country in northern New York. The editor has studied the dairy situation for years and followed the situation closely. I hope the Members will read this editorial:

THE HOUSE AND PARITY

Following the 8 to 7 Senate committee vote on rigid parity, the House Agriculture Committee has voted 26 to 2 in favor of continuing rigid supports. The Department of Agriculture wants flexible price supports, and this House committee vote was a clear indication that there will be a fight of major proportions when the voting occurs on the farm legislation in both the House and the Senate.

The basic commodities are supported at 90 percent of parity right now, and this law will run until December 31. The administration policy is to permit this law to expire and then have a flexible parity program. This, however, is a congressional election year and Congressmen on the Agriculture Committee indicated clearly that they are not going to participate in dropping the parity support payments at this time.

There are 6 basic crops, but only 5 of them are causing any concern. Wheat, cotton, corn, peanuts, and rice are the five. In each one of these crops there is a surplus, and the farmer, if he cannot sell the crop at an equitable price in the market, can receive 90 percent of what has been determined is a fair price by turning the crop over to the Government. The sixth crop is tobacco. There is no worry, however, about tobacco because there is no surplus.

The House bill considers dairy products, even though it is not one of the basics. In that instance, the support price for the next year is recommended at 80 percent instead of the present 75 percent. The dairy problem and parity differ somewhat from the other crops because the dairyman must feed grains supported at 90 percent of parity while he gets for a small portion of his milk a price that is supported now at 75 percent of parity. In other words, the dairyman must pay high prices for feeds because of the Federal supports, but he does not get a similar support when he sells his dairy products.

The real unfairness to the farmer was that his parity was cut on the first of April on the theory that the parity for all would be cut next January 1. Now it appears that the parity for all will not be cut next January 1, and the dairy farmer is thus a whipping boy in the differences between the Agriculture Department policy of flexible supports and the congressional policy of rigid supports.

Benson in Iowa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRED MARSHALL

OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 29, 1954

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following editorial entitled "Benson in Iowa" from the June 19 issue of Wallace's Farmer and Iowa Homestead. The official figures from Secretary Benson's Department of Agriculture are here contrasted with the statements from the Secretary.

BENSON IN IOWA

Have Iowa farmers quit raising hogs in order to sell corn to the Government?

You'd get that idea from Secretary of Agriculture Ezra T. Benson's Iowa speeches around June 1.

Benson told Iowa people that the present farm program had encouraged farmers "to produce corn and wheat for storage * * * rather than for meat, eggs, and other livestock products."

Let's look at Iowa hog production. What do the figures show?

Iowa farmers produced over 19 million hogs for market in 1953. Only four times in history has that total been exceeded.

The years when last year's hog production were exceeded in Iowa were 1943, 1950, 1951, and 1952. The total in 1950 was only slightly over the 1953 total.

The 19 million hogs produced in Iowa last year was 7 percent above the 10-year average.

And for this year—1954—the Iowa hog production total promises to bounce right up near former records highs despite corn price supports.

The Secretary should know that drought had a great deal to do with reduction in hog totals nationally. For example, 1953 spring pig crop in the South Central States was 32 percent below 1952.

Figures on hog production used here are from Benson's Department of Agriculture.

And there are more figures there to prove that meat production has gone up, not down, in this period when so-called high price supports were in effect.

Meat production in 1953 exceeded that of any peacetime year. Consumption of red meat per person at 154 pounds was highest since 1908.

Price supports at present levels have not made Iowa farmers quit raising hogs as Benson implies. Neither have they cut national production of meat and livestock products.

The World Remembers June 17: Address by George Meany, President, The American Federation of Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1954

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an address by George Meany, president of the American Federation of Labor, given over CBS recently, which appeared in the American Federationist in the June 1954 issue. The American Federationist is the official monthly magazine of the American Federation of Labor. The article, The World Remembers June 17, follows:

THE WORLD REMEMBERS JUNE 17

As long as people are ready to die for a great cause, that cause can never die. One year ago the workers of Eastern Germany showed that the cause of human liberty is far from dead behind the Iron Curtain. With bare hands, naked fists, and iron spirit they battered the towering walls of fear built around them by their Russian oppressors.

June 17 will forever remain an inspiring landmark in the annals of man's uphill battle for human dignity, decency, and liberty. The historic events of June 17 and the fortnight following did more to wipe out the shame of nazism and restore the honor and good name of the German people than anything else that has happened in Germany in the last decade.

That day did more for the unification of the German people in freedom than all the peace conferences held in the last 10 years.

That day has meant more for the liberation of the various peoples behind the Iron Curtain than all the diplomatic pacts and promises made since Communist imperialism replaced the Nazi-Nipponese Axis as the gravest peril to world peace and freedom.

That day gave mankind a chance to get the real meaning of the phony New Look of post-Stalin Russia. Its soul-stirring events sharpened the struggle inside the Kremlin ruling clique and played a decisive role in the doom of Beria.

On this memorable day the workers of Eastern Germany became the dedicated banner-bearers in their nation's fight for freedom and justice. That is the role to which we of the American Federation of Labor and liberty-loving labor of every country, creed, and color have dedicated ourselves.

In the test of sheer physical strength, Communist brute force won the day. In any clash between the armed and the unarmed, the physical outcome of the struggle is a foregone conclusion. The heroic German workers knew this better than anyone else. Yet they challenged the massive array of Russian troops and tanks and in so doing risked everything they had. But they demonstrated to the entire world their undying hatred of Communist exploitation, speed-up and dictatorship.

By showing that they were no longer afraid, the East German workers took the edge off the most dreaded of all Communist weapons—fear of the Red terror. Once people begin to lose fear of a dictatorship, then the despots face real resistance and a growing threat to their system. This is just as true in slave labor camps as in occupied countries. It holds true for Lithuanians, Ukrainians, and Russians as well as for Germans.

The East German revolt had its repercussions even in bleakest Russia itself. The news of its occurrence had an electrifying effect on the huge Vorkuta coal mining concentration camps, located in the 68th parallel region west of the Urals, infamous for its cruel climate and notorious as an example of man's inhumanity to man. Inspired by this news, more than 100,000 slave laborers, sentenced to dig coal for Leningrad and the Russian war machine, lost their fear. They too revolted. They went on strike. They forced their Communist oppressors and exploiters to ease somewhat the unbearable conditions. For the first time since the Communists robbed the Soviet peoples of all their democratic rights and liberties, scores of thousands of workers came into their own, though only for a brief spell.

The totalitarian tyrants know only one answer to the rising spirit of freedom. More firing squads. More crowded jails. And still more deportations. More terror in the factories. This is the vigor and vision in which the Communists always excel. This wanton savagery will only strengthen the victims' determination to re-form their lines and prepare for another day—for the day when they will be stronger and when they will get far more help from the ranks of freedom beyond the Iron Curtain.

No new minister of justice, like the depraved dispenser of Communist vengeance, Hilde Benjamin; no new chief of the secret police, like the notorious gunman, Ernst Wollweber, can ever efface from the memories of liberty-loving mankind the immortal services rendered to the cause of human decency and freedom by the courageous workers of East Germany.

The revolt of the East German workers has exposed fully the ugly faces of communism and filled the civilized world with disgust and horror over what goes on behind the Iron Curtain in Europe and Asia.

The biggest lie in all history is the fantastic claim that Communist Russia is a country dedicated to the welfare of the Soviet worker and a friend of world labor. Communist Russia is now the world's most inhuman regime. Thus, under orders from its masters in Moscow, the so-called Socialist Unity Party of East Germany has voted to increase the work norms in East Berlin and throughout the Soviet Zone by 7 to 15 percent. Right now there are over 19,000 German workers laboring as slaves on agricultural projects, in Siberia, Kazakhstan, and in the Ural and Volga regions. Already 490 of these enslaved German workers, many of whom were sentenced to such forced labor as punishment for their militant strike activity last June, have died because of overwork and undernourishment.

Through such slave-labor projects the Kremlin plans to win its own "battle for bread" and prevent the shortage of bread in Russia from taking on famine proportions. This is the way Moscow is trying to break the strike of the Soviet peasants who are sick and tired of their backbreaking labor netting them only acute shortages of the necessities of life.

Momentarily, Soviet brute force has triumphed. But the spirit of revolt in the ranks of East German labor has not been stamped out by the heavy boots of the Russian Red army. Only a few days ago, in the uranium area of Oberschlema, Auerback, and Schneeberg, the rebellious discontent among the miners frightened their overseers so badly that the Soviet Zone Ministry of Interior had to rush heavy reinforcements of so-called people's police units into this mining district.

Moreover, this Soviet "triumph" had exposed the so-called East German Democratic Republic as a miserable fraud—a wretched regime imposed on the people by a foreign power. The real and exclusive authority in eastern Germany continues to be Russian not German; it is the sworn enemy of the German people, the mortal foe of the workers and farmers. Moscow will fool no one with its recent grant of so-called sovereignty to East Germany. This "sovereignty" is a sham and a fraud aimed at helping the totally discredited quisling regime to regain some of its lost authority.

Through this clumsy maneuver, Moscow is seeking to cover up its guilt for defeating every effort of the western democracies at the Berlin Conference to obtain the national unification and full sovereignty of the German people in freedom.

Yes, June 17 has provided additional crushing confirmation that within the Soviet orbit national freedom and sovereignty are utterly impossible.

The people's democracy of the Soviet zone is government by fear, force, and fraud. The Communist dictatorship cannot jump over its own dark shadow. It continues to deny the people their rights and liberties and to depress mercilessly their standards of life. No day goes by without at least 300 East Germans fleeing their homes to escape the inhuman oppression and terror rampant in this Red "paradise."

To the embattled workers of Germany, to all the people of Europe and Asia under the yoke of Communist totalitarianism, we say: June 17 has not been in vain. Being overwhelmed in one battle does not mean the loss of the war for human freedom and full national independence.

On this day of inspiration and remembrance, all of us outside the Iron Curtain—regardless of race, color, or creed—should vow to translate our deep sympathy with these fighters for freedom into living solidarity, into ever greater support of their cause which is also our cause.

We of the A. F. of L. have already provided solid aid for these men and women of indomitable spirit.

In prompt response to the appeal of American labor, our Government last year generously aided the victims of the strike-breaking Russian army of occupation. We are counting on even greater support by our country in future similar tests of strength anywhere behind the Iron Curtain.

And today the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions (ICFTU), with which the A. F. of L. is affiliated, is rallying its more than 50 million members to provide a sustaining fund for the East Germans and all other fighters for freedom behind the Iron Curtain.

Since this Communist pogrom against labor was perpetrated, Russia has applied for membership in the International Labor Organization (ILO). We challenge the Kremlin to support the ICFTU proposal now before the U. N. to have the ILO investigate the policies and grievances which led to the East German revolt and its brutal suppression. Yes, I now challenge the Russian Government to let this body find out why so many workers and farmers were shot or imprisoned and deported to slave-labor camps. The world is entitled to know what Communist "people's justice" really is.

Since the Kremlin warlords and their apologists and apostles are boasting about their readiness to coexist with the free world, let them permit the ILO to make a first-hand survey and shed some light on the Soviet Zone "law for the protection of internal German trade" and the "law for the protection of people's property." These so-called labor laws have served as the legal cover for unceasing terror against workers not able to fulfill the speed-up norms and for the arrest of farmers convicted for their inability to deliver the compulsory quotas. Let the ILO get all the facts.

We strongly urge our Government to have its representatives in the ILO and our country's delegation to the U. N. rally the greatest support for favorable United Nations action on the ICFTU proposal.

Today we do even more than honor the memory of martyred men and women. Today we pay our warmest tribute particularly to the youth who have disdained Nazi and Communist indoctrination and have dedicated themselves to the promotion of human dignity and the honor and freedom of their nation.

Today we heartily salute the Austrian labor movement and the freedom-loving Austrian people for their courageous spirit of independence in the face of Moscow's mean and stubborn refusal to grant to them even an unjust peace treaty. No amount of Communist verbiage can hide the fact that this shameful Soviet course is motivated primarily by the Russian warlord's determination to continue occupation of strategic positions from which they could more easily launch aggression against disarmed peoples yearning for national liberty, human freedom, and peace.

Finally, let me pay the respects of the A. F. of L. to the German workers on both sides of the Iron Curtain and to their great free and democratic labor federation. We pledge ourselves to redoubled efforts for promoting the unification of Germany in peace and freedom, the restoration of its full national sovereignty and territorial integrity, the return of the German people to their rightful place in the community of free and democratic nations devoted to the protection of peace and the advancement of human liberty and social justice.

Do We Want Rubberstamps?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1954

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I submit herewith an editorial from the June 24, 1954, issue of the Hampton (Iowa) Chronicle, one of the outstanding newspapers published in the congressional district which I have the privilege to represent.

The editor of this newspaper and author of this editorial, Mr. Tom Purcell, is one of the oldest and most active Republicans in the State of Iowa. Following is his editorial which, understandably, I heartily endorse for personal reasons as well as in the hope that it will remind others that to maintain a free, representative government, the first obligation is to serve the will of the people:

DO WE WANT RUBBERSTAMPS?

We notice the Life magazine is out with an article in which it criticizes Congressman H. R. GROSS, of Waterloo, for not supporting more of the so-called Eisenhower programs. It may be that because President Eisenhower appointed the wife of the publisher of Life magazine to the big ambassador job over in Italy it is his way of coming around to show a little far fetched appreciation, which would seem to be a joke to the public.

In fact some of these programs which GROSS voted against are not Eisenhower programs, they are department-head programs promoted mostly outside of the White House and by some Newdealers still on the job in Washington, and they are mostly put out under the guise of an Eisenhower program.

How about the Benson farm program, it surely cannot be said that Eisenhower promoted that one. It surely cannot be said that he proposed the raise in postal rates which would cost the people of Hampton at least $15,000 more annually, and the citizens of a town like Waterloo over $100,000 annually. Not if President Eisenhower knew the fact that the postal department is not running behind if the various Federal departments paid their own postage bills.

Why doesn't the Post Office Department really give the public the facts, instead of putting up the preposterous stall that the Postal Department is running behind, and then wanting a very small minority of the public, the common man if you please, to pay the whole bill?

We could go on and on and give instances of where Congressman GROSS and other midwest Members of Congress voted against proposed bills which were not a vote against Eisenhower personally, but against the very things which the public by a large majority opposes and objects to. The Republicans claimed there was too much rubberstamp business under Roosevelt and Truman. Do we have to keep it up, if that is what you call it?

And why is so much pressure put on Congressmen at this time who do not subscribe to this rubberstamp business? The Iowa Congressmen and the Midwest so-callled farm bloc voted for the McNary-Haugen farm bill which Coolidge vetoed, and did you then hear any complaint from the people of Iowa? Of course there might have been some complaint from the eastern industrialists like the Life magazine millionaire publisher and the Wall Street crowd, but none from farmers.

Using the Atom for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1954

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I herewith include an article by Marquis Childs which appeared in the June 29, 1954, issue of the Washington Post. The article, United States Lags in Use of Atom for Peace, follows:

UNITED STATES LAGS IN USE OF ATOM FOR PEACE

(By Marquis Childs)

Within 2 years, and probably within a year, Communist China will have an atomic pile capable of producing fissionable material. That is the prediction of officials who have access to top intelligence reports.

This does not mean that China will at the same time have the power to make atomic bombs. Triggering U-235 in a bomb is a complex process calling for a high degree of technical skill. But since the West has consistently underestimated the capacity of Soviet Russia in the atomic field, there can be no complacency so far as these reports are concerned.

Communist China has given the project the highest priority, pooling all resources of science and technology in a country with only a limited development in these fields. It is being directed, according to these same intelligence reports, by Bruno Pontecorvo, one of the atom scientists who fled from England to take refuge behind the Iron Curtain. Pontecorvo, who disappeared in October of 1950 after saying he was going on a vacation with his family, is an outstanding physicist.

This information is like a lightning flash in a dark sky, indicating how swiftly the world is moving into the atomic age and above all in peacetime use of the atom. The swiftness with which the transformation is going forward has made many Americans fear that this country will lose the lead maintained thus far in atomic development.

Those with classified knowledge unavailable to the public believe that the race is on and that unless America takes certain steps quickly we shall lose the opportunity to show the world, and particularly the underdeveloped areas, how the atom harnessed for peace can transform the globe. What has been said so often is now being repeated with far greater urgency—it is "either or." Either this new force, which is almost unlimited in its potentialities, is harnessed for peace, or it is unleashed for a war that will destroy virtually all that man has built thus far.

This urgency is deeply felt and often expressed by Robert Le Baron, chairman of the Military Liaison Committee to the Atomic Energy Commission. William C. Foster, president of the Manufacturing Chemists' Association and former Deputy Secretary of Defense, has been speaking with something like a crusader's zeal for a plan under which the United States would lease fissionable material in a form capable of being utilized in small reactors to supply light and power where no other resources are available. These small package reactors are already being developed for the Army for use near the front. Each one can provide light and energy for industry for a community of 15,000.

The United States has a large stockpile of fissionable material, far more than could conceivably be needed for military purposes even if the hydrogen bomb had not been developed as a more potent strategic weapon. Use of a small portion of this stockpile to develop power in Asia and the Middle East could not even remotely jeopardize America's security in the view of those who have dealt most intimately with the Nation's atomic resources.

In fact, if the peacetime uses of this great storehouse of energy are not more actively promoted, other nations are likely to seize the initiative and provide the kind of leadership which this country is so preeminently qualified by reason of resources and technical skill to take. Either Great Britain or Soviet Russia soon will be in a position to do just this.

In this country an atomic power station is being built at Pittsburgh by the Duquesne Light Co. in cooperation with the Atomic Energy Commission. The target date for production of power is 1958. The company has put up $5 million and a site, with the Commission estimating that Duquesne's total contribution in one form and another will mean a saving of $30 million to the Government.

Foster, who succeeded Paul Hoffman as the Administrator of the Marshall plan, sees such a project as a new phase of the economic cooperation which turned back the rising tide of communism in Europe. It would avoid the disadvantages of a giveaway, being based on a low-cost, pay-as-you-go principle.

Never before in recorded history has such a choice been put before mankind. It is a choice between limitless destruction and limitless plenty.

It's Up To You

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1954

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the San Diego Bulletin of June 11, 1954:

It's Up To You

One of the most-talked-of subjects currently making the rounds in military circles is the titled "Womble Report," which was submitted in the form of a memorandum to the Department of Defense on October 30, 1953.

The Womble Report, so named after the senior member of the committee, Rear Adm. J. P. Womble, Jr., United States Navy, delved into the problem of why a military career has become increasingly unattractive to young Americans.

In compiling the report, the Womble committee examined hundreds of letters from active and retired military personnel along with those from the general public and concluded something had to be done immediately if the military service expects to attract and hold capable personnel.

The current trend indicates that unless some drastic measures are taken, and taken soon, the Armed Forces will soon lose prominence as a first-rate military organization because of the lack of skilled technicians. First-rate equipment must be operated by first-rate personnel in order to put the United States in the position of a stabilizing influence to halt world aggression.

Senior military men are well aware of the problem and are rightly concerned about the American public's seemingly complete disregard to such an important issue. Under the pressure of various business groups, Congress has steadily decreased the benefits to which a military man is entitled.

Because world commitments have burdened military personnel with undue hardships, particularly lengthy family separations, the Womble committee urged that all duty stations be reviewed and the less essential ones be eliminated. It further recommended that the services restudy deployments and develop plans to improve permanency; allow families to travel together when possible; and insure adequate housing.

The pay problem has long been a thorn in the side of the military and they have consistently been the last on the Federal payrolls to receive any increases. The base pay has not kept pace with the cost of living and is currently about 8 percent below par. This, along with the continual threats to incentive-hazardous duty, and sea and foreign duty pay, have caused many a military man to feel that his contract with the Government is being violated.

Traditional compensatory benefits have been, and still are being reduced. Acting under pressure of the American Medical Association, the number of doctors who might care for servicemen's wives and children has been reduced at hospitals. In most cases, the money a serviceman could formerly save by buying in his own exchange is practically nil.

During the last 10 years there appears to have been a concentrated program by elements of business, legislative, and public media groups that has set out to destroy the professional corps of the military services by making a career so unattractive that no first class young American would willingly undertake it for a lifetime service.

The Navy, for example, had a reenlistment rate prior to World War II which ran in the middle 60 percent. Today it is running less than 12 percent. According to Navy officials, the fiscal year 1955 will see a turnover of nearly one-third of all the personnel in the Navy. It will be interesting to note how many will try for one more cruise. Of the 216,000 enlistments scheduled to expire it is estimated 64,000 will reenlist. The rest of the vacancies will be filled by new enlistments. A big training load—but the Navy is looking forward to a rise in standards and discipline.

Those who don't reenlist can look forward to receiving $2,500 to $4,000 worth of pay and educational benefits if they so desire. Those who ship over for 4 years receive $240.

What can the men who choose to make the service a career do about this rank injustice?

Many military men recall the recent issue of closing the commissary stores. They also recall the cry that went out from the services and the attainment of public recognition. The public was informed and in turn brought pressure to bear on our Nation's governing powers.

The job then of every military man, in addition to his military duties, is to keep the public informed of the activities of his service as an instrument of national security. He can start with his immediate family. He can tell of his service's problems to his civilian friends. He can make use of his voting privileges.

What story can he tell?

Possibly the best is one taken from a recent speech by Rear Adm. George C. Dyer, Commandant of the 11th Naval District. In speaking to the women's division of the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce he said in part:

"The kind of a Navy or Army that you will have in a future war will depend on the quality of the personnel who man the services on a long-term basis.

"Second-rate quality can and will bring us out in the second position in any war with a first-rate power.

"The second position in war is the loser."

Texas Flood Focuses Attention on Water Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 29, 1954

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, people in the far western part of Texas and across the Rio Grande in Mexico are today suffering the effects of the worst flood in the history of the river.

Rainfall of as much as 22 inches within 24 hours has been reported.

Once again we have brought sharply home to us the disastrous effects of the recurrent cycle of too much water and not enough water from which Texas, and many other States as well, long have suffered.

The record crests of water in the Rio Grande point up sharply the need—which I have often mentioned in this Chamber—of cooperative action by the Federal Government, State governments, local governmental units, and affected landowners in striving for a long-range solution of this problem.

It is a problem that, for the sake of our future, we must solve.

In order that the nature of one aspect of the problem may once again be stated, I ask unanimous consent that a story from this morning's New York Times on the Texas flood be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the story was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Rio Grande Swept by Its Biggest Flood

Del Rio, Tex., June 28.—The Rio Grande's greatest flood boiled down the river tonight in the wake of rains that ranged up to an unofficial 22 inches in the Southwest's ranch country.

Twelve thousand persons were reported homeless at the Mexican border city of Ciudad Acuna, Mexico, across the river from here. At least 12 drowned at Ozona, Tex., a ranch town 120 miles to the north, where 5 bodies were recovered and 2 persons were missing.

Although record crests rose in the gorged Rio Grande, the border river itself was not expected to take any lives.

But along the Pecos and Devil's Rivers, which empty into the Rio Grande and the usually dry draws in the sheep and ranch country north of here, it was different.

Sirens screemed, church and schoolbells rang, and much of Ozona's population turned out to sight-see as the water in Johnson's Draw, which cuts through the middle of the town of 2,885 persons, rose higher.

The State Civil Defense office in Austin reported 52 vials of typhoid serum were being flown to Ozona. Portable water purification units also were being sent in.

Texas Ranger Max Westerman said at Del Rio that the 12,000 homeless at Ciudad Acuna had been evacuated into the hills. The State Red Cross sought to determine if the Mexican Red Cross needed help in feeding and sheltering them.

TWO HUNDRED AND SIXTY-SIX TAKEN FROM TRAIN

United States Air Force helicopters completed today evacuating 266 passengers from the Southern Pacific streamliner Sunset Limited at Langtry, Tex. They also evacuated a number of motorists stranded in the little west Texas town, where Judge Roy Bean once held court in his saloon as the only law west of the Pecos.

The helicopters are now available to carry food across the border river if it is needed and clearance can be obtained from the Mexican Red Cross.

Ominous clouds continued to hover over the hilly, gully-marked wild country just below the foothills of the Big Bend Mountains.

The heaviest rain, an unofficial 22 inches, was reported by F. M. Wood, Jr., who ranches between Langry and Dryden, Tex. He said it fell in the 24 hours ending at 7:30 p. m.

Other unofficial reports—there are few United States Weather Bureau stations in this lonely ranch country—included 8.50 at Loma Alto, between Del Rio and Sonora, Tex. Langry had 11 and Sheffield to the north had 13 inches.

The weather bureau forecast record crests at Eagle Pass, Laredo and every other point downstream from here.

The river already had broken its old record here by 7 feet. The crest already had reached 42 feet here, and 1 million cubic feet of water a second boiled past town. That much water flowing that fast in the Rio Grande, normally a sleepy stream that can easily be waded, was unheard of until today.

The weather bureau at Brownsville said there was nothing on the records to compare with this flood—and the only comparison forecasters could make would be with legends about a great flood in 1835.

Taxes on Union Pensions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM J. GREEN, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1954

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following resolution adopted by the Philadelphia Typographical Union, No. 2, Philadelphia, Pa.:

Whereas the International Typographical Union has practiced benevolence and fraternalism for over 100 years; and

Whereas the International Typographical Union has paid over $100 million in pensions to its sick and superannuated members; and

Whereas the International Typographical Union pioneered in creating pensions for members unable to work because of age or disability; and

Whereas over 9,000 retired printers and mailers depend upon ITU pension payments for the necessities and little comforts of life; and

Whereas in 1934, and for 20 years thereafter, the Department of Internal Revenue considered ITU pensions charitable and therefore not taxable; and

Whereas this year the Department of Internal Revenue has officially ruled pensioners must include ITU pension payments received as taxable income when computing their income taxes for 1954; and

Whereas neither the national budget nor the scales of justice can be balanced by taxing this necessary income of our pensioners, who hope to spend the closing years of their lives in peace, free from the obligation which they had borne for many years: Therefore be it

Resolved, That Philadelphia Typographical Union, No. 2, at its regular union meeting, go on record as protesting the discriminatory, uncharitable, and unfair ruling made by the Internal Revenue Department which places taxes on union pensions; and be it further

Resolved, That the officers of Philadelphia Typographical Union, No. 2, cause copies of this resolution to be printed and sent to the President of the United States, to Members of both Houses of Congress, to the executive counsel of the International Typographical Union, to the Typographical Journal, to the Pennsylvania Federation of Labor, to the Eastern Pennsylvania-Delaware Typographical Conference, and to the Central Labor Union of Philadelphia.

Adopted unanimously by Philadelphia Union, No. 2, on May 23, 1954.

Sinclair L. Muir,
President.

Everyone Now Ratifies New Deal Social-Security Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1954

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I herewith include an article entitled "Social Security System," which appeared in the June 28, 1954, issue of the Trainmen News, the official weekly publication of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen:

SOCIAL SECURITY SYSTEM

Eighteen years ago when the New Deal drove social security through Congress, there were cries from outraged conservatives in both parties that the country was trembling on the brink of socialism.

Now, the House of Representatives, by the overwhelming vote of 355 to 8, has passed a bill strengthening the social-security system and efforts will be made in the Senate to strengthen it even more.

What is the meaning of this astonishing about-face on the part of both the Republican Party and a considerable number of conservative Democrats?

Two things can account for the change in climate:

The great body of American workers, for whom in times past old age meant living with relatives or going to the poorhouse, have discovered that this doesn't have to happen. No matter how inadequate today's benefits may be, social security has opened the way to an even better system.

American businessmen for the most part have discovered that social security not only is good for their individual business but for the economy of the country as a whole. Only the most reactionary of businessmen would undermine or destroy it as they have tried to do this year.

The result is that only a handful of men in the House dared or even wanted to vote against a better social-security system.

The bill which is now before the Senate Finance Committee accomplishes a number of things for which organized labor has long been fighting.

It covers between 9 and 10 million Americans who previously had been excluded. These include farmers, some farm workers, and nearly all professional workers except doctors and State and Government workers not covered by pension systems.

It increases benefits moderately; the maximum individual benefit increasing from $98.50 to $108.50 while the maximum family benefit increases from $168.75 to $200.

It raises base annual pay on which taxes and benefits are figured from the first $3,600 to $4,200, thus taking into account today's higher wage scales and the need for higher benefits.

It enables pensioners to earn $1,000 a year without loss of benefits as compared with the present $75 a month.

While top labor leaders look upon the House bill as a step in the right direction, they believe that further improvements should and must be made.

One area in which the House bill is weak is that it does not provide for disability insurance as do other pension systems, including the railroad retirement system. Thus, if a worker becomes ill, he is dependent on whatever private benefits his employer may see fit to grant him. Actually, there are many millions of workers who face economic disaster if illness strikes them.

Both Senators Herbert H. Lehman, Democrat, of New York, and Hubert H. Humphrey, Democrat, of Minnesota, are planning to fight for disability insurance when the bill comes to the Senate floor.

Other improvements to be sought are including doctors under social security and increasing the base level on which the system operates from $4,200 to $6,000.

Who Are Our Allies, if Any?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL B. DAGUE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1954

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that I am not alone when I confess to a feeling of frustration as I undertake to square British protestations of friendship with those acts which seem to play into the hands of the Communists and further their ends.

In yesterday's news we find Churchill saying, in effect, that Britain will be on the side of freedom when final decisions must be taken. May I suggest that they implied the same thing when they were on the way to Munich, and they seem never to learn that the road of appeasement is a tortuous detour around both freedom and peace.

The evidence is quite clear that from the start President Eisenhower and Secretary Dulles wanted no part in the Berlin meeting which led to the Geneva fiasco, and it was only out of deference to Churchill's insistence that we were drawn into those discussions which did so much to elevate the Chinese Reds to their present arrogant position. The simple fact remains that Britain ran out on us at Geneva; and they, together with the vacillating French, must be charged with scuttling a conference that should have concluded on a note of firmness toward aggressors instead of exalting them to a position of equality with peace-loving nations.

The theme of most of Churchill's arguments seems to center in his rejection of the notion advanced by most Americans that the Russians cannot be trusted and will not cooperate with peaceful efforts. Where, I ask you, in all of their long record of infamy and doubledealing can you find one instance where they have kept their word or honored a solemn treaty?

The present backing and filling on the part of those whom we have trusted and upon whom we have bestowed our gifts leads in only one direction, and that is toward the seating of the Chinese Reds in the United Nations. Those appeasers insist that we are being naive in refusing to recognize Communist China as a great power. Of course, we recognize them as a great power of evil, but we can see no more benefit to the free world in recognizing them than was gained when we recognized the U. S. S. R. back in 1933.

Constantine Brown, in his article in yesterday's Evening Star, has evaluated the situation quite clearly, and we are on notice to stand firm—even to the point of withdrawing from the U. N.—if we are not to abrogate our long record of refusing to deal with murderers and cheats. I commend his logical conclusions to the American people in hopes that it will strengthen their determination not to be led further along the highway of the appeasers:

CHINA ILLUSION FADES—BRITISH LEADERS REPORTED EMPHASIZING BIG U. N. MAJORITY FAVORS SEATING REDS

(By Constantine Brown)

Any illusion President Eisenhower and Secretary of State Dulles may have that this country could block substitution of Red hina for Nationalist hina in the United Nations is reportedly fading away.

According to information preceding the arrival of Prime Minister Churchill and Foreign Secretary Eden in Washington they meant to make it clear that under present world conditions, Communist China is certain to obtain an overwhelming majority when the matter is brought before the U. N. Assembly in the fall.

The unpleasant truth is that with the exception of the Philippines, Turkey, Pakistan, and maybe half a dozen Latin American Republics no other U. N. member is likely to sustain us, despite the fact that Red China continues to be an aggressor.

The administration now can either swallow the pill gracefully after token resistance and a few speeches pointing out the immorality of such a move or walk out of the international organization if its attempts to block the move are unsuccessful. This can be done only by Congress cutting off the appropriations for maintenance of an American delegation at the U. N.

It is safe to say that the top policymakers in the executive have not made up their minds what to do. There are some advisers to the White House and State Department who would rather swallow the pill without any sugar coating than see this country leave the so-called world peace organization. They argue and have on their side a wealth of statistics to show that a step in that direction would mean the isolation of this country.

These men and women say that in the complex world in which we live a policy leading to an isolation from our friends and allies would be suicidal. Their arguments are said to be listened to attentively by President Eisenhower and Secretary Dulles, who are both on record against Red China's admission to the "peace loving" nations organization.

The reported arguments of Prime Minister Churchill and Secretary Eden that the U. S. S. R. and some of her satellites are already U. N. members, hence we might just as well have the whole pack and caboodle with us are said to have made some, though slight, impression on our President.

But while there are some frightened counsellors in the Government who fear isolation more than anything else, a vast majority of Members in Congress are determined not to permit the U. N. to be sullied by the presence of the Chinese Communists. They can prevent this by refusing the administration the necessary sums to allow our representation to carry on.

The bipartisan leadership which intends to put up the fight is composed of men known for favoring America's cooperation with foreign countries. They are all supporters of the foreign-aid program, of the NATO, and every other kind of cooperation with the peoples across the Pacific and Atlantic and the sister republics in Latin America. They cannot be described by any stretch of imagination as isolationists as this word was being used before the war and is still used as a smear by some propagandists.

But, say these legislators, America's isolation is inevitable if the allies and friends we have helped immeasurably since the beginning of the world crisis in 1939 insist now on parting and going all out to appease communism.

If all the declarations of unity, sympathy, and cooperation of the past have been only "cupboard love" it is high time that we know where we stand with these peoples.

If the mere prospect of some juicy trade with the Communists can induce most of our Western allies to change their policies and try to coerce us to follow them we might just as well take serious notice of this factor. If tragic circumstances were to force us to come to a showdown with the Red enemies who are bent on the destruction of this country we need not fight alone—even if the West abandons the common cause. We can still reckon on the Turks, Pakistanis, Spaniards, Filipinos, South Koreans, and with less certainty on the Japanese to stand by us in difficult times.

We have lost our "interested" friends (those who relied principally on the American pocketbook) to some extent because of our wavering foreign policies. We talked too much, spent too much, and never acted with determination coming from realization of our strength. We pleaded with Western allies to be kind enough to accept help "to help themselves so that they can help us."

Congress, since the days of the last Democratic administration, has drawn the line insofar as Red China is concerned. It will not stand for the recognition of the Peiping regime as it will not stand for substitution of the Communist Chinese for the Nationalist Chinese. And these days when the legislators are more sensitive than ever to communications from their constituents, their stand reflects the overwhelming sentiment of the American people.

If the choice is now between being forced by our allies into an isolated position or to disregard principles for which we have fought and bled and spent hundreds of billions of dollars, there is no doubt that Congress will choose the former. And it is hard to conceive that the Executive would disagree.

Problems of Military Personnel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 29, 1954

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, a prominent Texas newspaperman, Robert W. Akers, editor of the Beaumont Enterprise, recently devoted his daily column to a thoughtful and provocative discussion of the reasons for the lessening appeal that a military career holds for officers and enlisted men.

Mr. Akers makes some points which needed to be made. His observations are well worth the attention of all Members of Congress. I ask unanimous consent that his column be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

It's Like This

(By Robert W. Akers)

West Point had 1,000 vacancies in the Cadet Corps for the new term—largest number in the history of the Academy.

An alarmingly high percentage of graduates are resigning after serving out the brief active-duty requirement.

The Air Force is losing officers to civilian employment at a perilous rate. Reenlistments have dropped to a ridiculous low and officer candidate school applications are far below the total needed to maintain an adequate officer corps.

All of this represents a tremendous loss of money to the taxpayers, aside from the actual danger in which it places the Nation at a time of world crisis.

Why this growing unpopularity of service to the country as a commissioned officer in the Armed Forces? Why the flight from the enlisted ranks?

It goes back to a pennywise, pound-foolish concept of economy and of political thinking forced on Congress by pressure groups.

Army pay has always been low, but for those making a career of military service there have been compensating factors. These were summed up in the feeling that the Army takes care of its own.

Service families lived in a world apart because they lived dedicated lives. They gave up the social world of the civilian and accepted a social and economic existence peculiar to the Regular Army, or Regular Navy or Regular Air Force.

This existence included adequate quarters or allowance for quarters, medical and hospital care for the whole family, schooling for children, a partial exemption on taxes, buying at a commissary, travel allowances.

Taken all together these benefits just about made an officer's financial position equivalent to that of a man with comparable training and experience in private business.

Cries against socialism, Government in business, pampering, and special privilege have pushed Congress into canceling just about all the inducements that were keeping families in professional military service.

From $25,000 to $50,000 is spent training a West Pointer or an Air Force officer and then he quits the service just as soon as regulations will permit. The taxpayers lose money by the millions.

Higher pay isn't the whole answer. Actually, the tradition of the Army being a community unto itself means much more to those who are making a career of the service than larger paychecks.

Professional military men are devoted to a cause and morale depends on the feeling that in the world in which they live—apart from the civilian world—they are being decently cared for and that they are able to look out for each other.

The officers isn't the only one who must have this reassurance. His whole family is in the Army and they feel—or want to feel—that they're just as much a part of the service as he is.

They live apart because they're either on a military post or in a housing area adjoining it, but it's good to know that in this separate community the Army provides the stores and markets.

Social life is restricted because living apart and transferring often they have little opportunity to build up a circle of civilian friends. What they do want is the knowledge that in their own social sphere they have the convenience of clubs, recreation centers, and theaters provided by the Army.

With no chance to have a family doctor in the civilian sense, they do expect that the Army will look out for them through complete medical care.

It's all these things—for generations a part of professional military life—that are being cut out.

Clear beyond the question of more pay is the fact that our Armed Forces are losing a feeling of common purpose when they're told, "Here's a higher salary; you're on your own; forget that business about the Regular Army being a dedicated community unto itself."

A lot of money has been saved in cutting out the fringes of regular military service, but infinitely more money is being lost in resignations of servicemen and the fading of esprit de corps.

Farm Price Supports: H. R. 9680

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1954

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the House is soon to vote on H. R. 9680, and because of the general interest in the development of a sound farm program, I am submitting, under leave to extend my remarks, a letter, together with a resolution, which I received this morning from Mr. Herbert W. Voorhees, president of the New Jersey Farm Bureau:

New Jersey Farm Bureau,
Trenton, N. J., June 28, 1954.

Re Farm price supports in H. R. 9680

Hon. Peter Frelinghuysen, Jr.
Washington, D. C.

Dear Congressman Frelinghuysen: We know that you are interested in the opinion of New Jersey farmers on the important question of the level of farm price supports. This issue is before you now in H. R. 9680 (sec. 101).

New Jersey farmers are in favor of flexible price supports. This position was taken by the voting delegates at our annual meeting last November. A copy of the resolution developed by the delegates is enclosed. The first paragraph of this resolution summarizes the feeling against high, rigid supports—"high, fixed farm price supports on the basic commodities have encouraged uneconomic production, caused very large expenditure of tax funds and required the imposition of arbitrary production controls on agricultural production."

You will recall that this position was stated at our annual congressional get-together at the Congressional Hotel on February 4, 1954. At that time, there were over 100 farmers representing their county boards of agriculture. As you know, the county boards are the county units of New Jersey Farm Bureau, and the New Jersey Farm Bureau is part of the American Farm Bureau Federation. The American Farm Bureau Federation includes 48 State farm bureaus and the Puerto Rican Farm Bureau. There are more than 1,500,000 farm families in the American Farm Bureau Federation.

The policies of the State and National organizations were started in the communities and counties and developed through local meetings where farmers got together to decide. Each farm family which is a member had a chance to vote its opinion and vote on policy. Across America 597,985 people attended 23,299 meetings and formed the policy of the American Farm Bureau. The enclosed New Jersey resolution was taken to the American meeting and was a factor in developing the AFBF position on price supports.

Briefly, we oppose any extension at all of 90 percent farm price support because:

1. High, rigid supports guarantee agricultural surpluses.
2. It is not economically sound for farmers to continue to produce for Government storage. They must produce for consumer demand.
3. Nationally the 6 basic crops only make up 23 percent of the cash farm receipts. In New Jersey, they only make up 2 percent.
4. Controls—marketing quotas, allotments, permits, etc., are inevitable with too much production.

We strongly urge your support in preventing any extension on any conditions of the 90 percent levels of farm price supports.

Sincerely yours,

HERBERT W. VOORHEES,
President.

REALISTIC FARM PRICE SUPPORT PROGRAM

High fixed farm price supports on the basic commodities have encouraged uneconomic production, caused very large expenditures of tax funds and required the imposition of arbitrary production controls on agricultural production.

The operation of this program has made more serious the basic problem of agriculture, that of keeping farm production in line with market demands.

The New Jersey Farm Bureau believes that the peculiar nature of the agricultural economy too often results in farm prices that are so low as to severely jeopardize the efficient farmer's ability to remain in business. The producers of the basic commodities are particularly affected by this condition because of the very inelastic demand for their product.

The New Jersey Farm Bureau expresses its vigorous opposition to present high rigid price-support program and recommends in its stead a flexible farm price support program. The flexible program will, in times of very poor prices, encourage the efficient producer to adjust his production to demand but at the same time not force him out of business.

This program should provide for price supports at levels ranging from 60 to 80 percent of modern parity depending upon the supply-demand relationship of the crop to be supported.

The Farm Bureau recognizes that the current production pattern of some agricultural commodities is so out of balance as to prohibit the immediate application of this program to these crops. We therefore recommend the gradual lowering of supports on these corps until these crops are in reasonable supply-demand adjustment.

The intent of the program we have recommended is to eliminate entirely the need for Government production-control programs. We recognize that these control programs are an essential evil under the high rigid support program and that they may also be necessary during the transition period to flexible supports. Farm Bureau will insist that as long as these acreage control programs remain in effect that the acres removed from production of price-supported crops be required to be placed under a soil-improvement program, or planted to a soil-conserving crop or planted to a crop specified by the USDA as in need of greater production.

Effective American Advertising

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1954

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following editorial from the Pilot, Boston, Mass., June 26, 1954:

A GOOD WORD

"The heartbeat of industry—the pulse of liberty." This sounds like a pretty big order for any group, but it will be recognized at once as the theme of the Advertising Federation of America which has been meeting in Boston. If it is big and if it is expressive, if it is dramatic and if it is hopeful—it is typical of American advertising. What is also typical of it is that it is effective.

From time to time, like many others, we have had our own little piece to say about the American advertiser; when he has shown bad taste we have not been slow to point it out. It is certainly not out of place at this time to say something about the thousand and one things that stand on the credit side. It is the simplest of all things to stand on the sidelines of any affair and wait until someone fumbles before making a judgment, but a judgment made on these terms is not a valid overall consideration.

Actually we must face the fact that most of the characteristics that are a part of the success story of America are the precise same qualities that keep the advertising business on the go. Inventiveness and the ability to create new ideas for example is certainly one of the reasons for the technological preeminence of our country and this is also the very lifeblood of advertising. It is almost impossible to measure the extent that the standard of living in America, the highest in the world, has been affected by the medium of advertising. It is all very well to speak of the multimillion dollar business angle of the advertising profession, but it is actually meaningless to consider this apart from the consideration of what this advertising does for business generally, for industrly, and for the general prosperity.

Some people will say at this point that advertising, as it is currently practiced in America does represent our country, but in its very worst features. It is clever, slick, witty, rich—in fact plush; it is also false, unrealistic, in bad taste and totally without realistic appeal. In short it is tawdry and soulless. This kind of a charge is unfortunately too easy to document to be thrown out without a hearing. No one appreciates more than those in the profession, however, the lapses which have dogged its progress, but not enough people realize how sincere are the efforts of alert and able men in advertising to make this a thing of the past.

Sometime someone will measure over against the banalities and the trivia that have found a place in some modern advertising, the unrecorded miles of space that have been given freely to good causes. Very few men in business or the professions can turn to a record as impressive as that set up by the men in advertising in the support of all good causes—religious, secular, recreational and community. This represents money in the advertising profession, just as it does in any other, and it is to the credit of advertising men that they have never sought to take public bows for their high philanthropies.

When we set out to judge a large group, as in advertising, it is very easy to judge only by what we remember, and we are inclined to remember the sensational and the shocking. A sober and reasoned view will be quite different. It will see earnest, eager, hardworking men striving to invigorate the life of industry and to encourage at the same time every worthwhile project in American community life. This deserves a good word all around.

In the Middle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED MARSHALL

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1954

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following editorial by the distinguished farm writer, Mr. Alfred D. Stedman, from the St. Paul Pioneer Press for Sunday, June 27. Farmer administration of farm programs has been a basic principle of our great gains of the past two decades. Mr. Stedman rightly asks some pointed questions about what is happening to this principle today.

IN THE MIDDLE

(Alfred D. Stedman)

A resounding spectacle was the rise of the steel frame of the Minnesota Mutual Life Insurance Co. building one block from here. Machines clattered. Hammers rang. Concrete poured. Higher and higher into place a towering crane swung the steel girders. Crowds gaped at the mighty deeds of the two giants, labor and industry.

But suddenly all was stopped by a strike. Then for a month until settlement, no clatter, no movement, no work. Thus, here and elsewhere, organized labor dramatized its power in influencing wage income. Why should farmers care?

Well, the organized power of industry and labor was one fact leading to creation of the Federal farm programs in the 1930's. For as big business and big labor met their problems with organization, the unorganized farmers found themselves in the middle. Again and again, farm costs were lifted by settlement between the giants in steel, autos, transportation, coal, food, construction, and other lines. The farmer's share of the consumer's dollar fell, as it has been falling again now.

So Congress afforded large segments of agriculture the chance to organize also. Through the Federal farm programs, if voted by two-thirds of producers, farmers at least could avoid swamping themselves in rugged individualism.

And now, in the light of the plain economic facts of life, there arises a point of wide concern. The organization chosen by Congress as the foundation of farm programs was the elected farmer committee system. Committees of three farmers elected by their neighbors in each county and each community or township run the programs locally.

Thus it follows that any move in Washington which weakens this farmer committee system refuces the programs' chances of success. And it reduces also the opportunity of farmers to prosper equally with organized business and labor.

By and large, these committees have worked hard, faithfully and well. Some obvious mistakes have been made. But what human organization has made none?

Of the changes in election rules announced June 15 by Secretary Benson, farmers generally welcome several. Especially liked is the use of representative boards to insure impartial elections. But at two points, the changes are being widely questioned as hobbling the committee system.

Why, for one thing, should officers of general farm organizations be barred from membership on community committees especially? Mr. Benson says it is to prevent domination by private groups. But township leaders of these organizations are likely to include the most interested and qualified farmers in the small communities. Why should freedom to elect such committeemen be denied?

And why especially should community committeemen be limited to three 1-year terms? No doubt as argued this will hasten committee turnover and broaden farmer representation. But for a committeeman to become thoroughly familiar with the complicated programs takes time. Experience alone seems a strange reason for disqualification.

Perhaps the changes reflect a Washington aim to lead farmers away from reliance on their programs. But where is the evidence farmers will need organization any less in the future? Business and labor aren't forced to depose local staffs at short intervals. Why should farmers be?

These farm program committees are busier now than ever. Farmers in referendums show no wane of interest in their programs. Couldn't they be allowed equal freedom with other American groups to man their organization? A look up the street at the effects of organization in labor and industry seems enough to raise doubts about the wisdom of hampering the farm committee system of organization.

The McCarthy Hearings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 29, 1954

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "McCarthy Hearings," written by me and published in the New York Journal-American of June 22, 1954, giving my views regarding the McCarthy hearings.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MCCARTHY HEARINGS

(By Hon. HERBERT H. LEHMAN, of New York)

The hearings are over, and we must all await the report, or reports, that will be made by the committee presided over by Senator MUNDT.

While it would not be appropriate for me to comment or speculate on the possible findings of the Mundt subcommittee in regard to the specific issues and charges considered by that subcommittee, there are some aspects of the recent spectacles on which I can comment and concerning which I feel very deeply.

It is worth noting, in the first place, that the whole character of this inquiry was an anomalous one. In a sense, it was a case of a committee investigating itself. I felt in the beginning—and I still feel—that it would have been better to have a different committee, a special committee, investigate the charges and countercharges.

BASIC ISSUES IGNORED

My chief feeling in regard to the hearings is that the most basic issues were never really gone into. There is a danger that they will be overlooked and forgotten.

To my mind the most basic issues are not those represented by Private Schine, or Army Counselor Adams, or Secretary Stevens, or Committee Counsel Cohn. Nor do the really basic issues consist of what Senator MCCARTHY did or did not do about getting a commission for Private Schine; the preponderant issues involve all of what Senator MCCARTHY has done to the Congress and the country during the past 4 years, and especially during the past 2 years while has been chairman of the Government Operations Committee and of the so-called Permanent Investigating Subcommittee.

All of us want to fight communism at home and abroad. All of us are opposed to treason and traitors. All of us, as individuals, and the Government, through its appropriate branches, must relentlessly and increasingly fight communism and seek to frustrate treason. The question is how to do this. I am strongly opposed to the methods of Senator MCCARTHY. These methods are completely ineffective against the Communists and highly dangerous to all the rest of us.

INCIDENTAL REVELATION

Some of Senator MCCARTHY's methods, techniques and attitudes were clearly brought out for the first time in the course of these hearings. But unfortunately these aspects were not regarded as the subject of the inquiry. They were revealed almost incidentally.

I am referring, of course, to the whole complex of what has been called McCarthyism of which Senator MCCARTHY is the chief architect and exponent.

It is in response to the whole range of his improper activities that I have introduced a resolution into the Senate calling for his removal as chairman of the Government Operations Committee and of the investigating subcommittee. Regardless of the specific findings on the specific charges before the Mundt committee, Senator MCCARTHY should be permanently removed as committee chairman.

If there is one lesson which has been brought home to the American public, as a result of the McCarthy hearings, it is the need for a uniform and mandatory fair code of committee procedure in the conduct of congressional investigations.

How To Use Surplus Dairy Products

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. IRVING M. IVES

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 29, 1954

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unamious consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of an address entitled "How To Use Surplus Dairy Products," delivered by Mrs. Margaret K. Taylor at the surplus commodity luncheon of the summer conference of the Federation of Women's Republican Clubs of New York State, Inc. The address is comprehensive and full of commonsense, and is deserving of the serious consideration of all who are interested in the dairy industry.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I assure the distinguished Senator from New York that I shall read the address, because the big problem we are facing is how to obtain sufficient consumption of the surplus. There is no over production; we are faced with an underconsumption of dairy products. So I am delighted that the Senator from New York has requested that the address be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New York?

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW TO USE SURPLUS DAIRY PRODUCTS

(By Margaret K. Taylor)

The public is more familiar with the purchase of large stocks of dairy products by the Government than with any other operation of the United States Department of Agriculture. Mere mention of the 388 million pounds of butter in Government storage brings a flood of cartoons and stories by columnists, commentators and those who like to write letters to the editor.

The administration is most concerned about the dairy surplus because dairy products are perishable. They are the only perishable commodities upon which price supports are mandatory. Also there is no control by Government over production. The public is interested primarily because it dislikes having good food purchased with tax money spoil in storage. This is particularly true in respect to butter which, in many instances, consumers use sparingly because of its price.

As of May 31, 1954, the latest figures available from the USDA, the estimated stocks of price supported dairy products on hand were butter, 388,019,662 pounds; cheddar cheese, 304,162,775 pounds and nonfat dry milk solids, 243,764,136 pounds.

For the past 21 years, producers of perishable farm products have received substantial benefits from Government-price supports and consumers have also benefited from more stable supplies of these products than would have been produced and marketed without farm price supports and surplus removal programs.

The first price-support program for perishables was authorized by Congress in the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933. The purpose was to stabilize from year to year prices for expanding agricultural industries. In 1941 a need was felt for greater production to meet wartime demands, and mandatory price supports were authorized by Congress under what was known as the Steagall amendment. Wartime price-support legislation expired in 1948 but several acts of Congress since that time have affected the Government price-support program for milk and other perishables.

The Republican-controlled 80th Congress extended supports for milk and its products for 1 year in the Agricultural Act of 1948. The Agricultural Act of 1949 passed the next year by a Democratic-controlled Congress, provided mandatory supports at such levels between 75 and 90 percent of parity for milk and butterfat as would assure adequate supplies of dairy products. This type of price support, which gives the Secretary of Agriculture the power to set the level of support, is known as flexible price support. In the Agricultural Act of 1949, in the case of dairy products, it is mandatory upon the Secretary to set the levels. This is done once a year sometime between January 1 and March 30.

Both the Agricultural Act of 1948 and the Agricultural Act of 1949 provided for flexible supports for other price-supported commodities. However, the provisions for flexible supports were made inoperative in 1948, 1949, 1950, and again in 1952 by amendments requiring the extension of mandatory rigid supports of 90 percent of parity for the basic commodities. The so-called basic commodities are cotton, wheat, corn, tobacco, rice, and peanuts. Also, from 1949 until April 1954 the flexible scale of price supports for dairy products was not permitted to operate, the top level of 90 percent having been rigidly held by both Secretary Brannan and Secretary Benson. This is in part responsible for the large Government-owned stocks.

In addition to the agricultural acts mentioned the Foreign Aid Act, the Foreign Assistance Acts and others too numerous to mention have dealt with the disposal of surplus products.

Under the farm program of rigid prices, surplus stocks have been accumulating. They now stand at an all-time record level and seem certain to go higher.

What are some of the reasons for the surplus?

Production of milk in the United States has increased at a more rapid rate in the past 18 months than in any similar period. There are several factors responsible for this situation: (1) Increased production of milk per cow due to improved methods of production such as gradual improvement of dairy stocks, better quality and seasonal distribution of pastures, better crops and improved methods of harvesting; (2) unusually favorable weather conditions for the past two winters; (3) increased number of cows due in part to reduced culling of dairy herds because of relatively low beef prices and the incentive to keep low producing cows on account of profitable rigid support prices.

In the face of this increased production there has been a decrease in exports and a decline in consumption. Since 1945, the consumption of fluid milk and cream has dropped 12 percent or 47 pounds per capita. Consumption of butter has fallen from 10.8 pounds per capita to 8.6 pounds, the equivalent of 45 pounds of milk.

If we look back to 1940, the butter picture is more alarming. Per capita consumption has been cut in half since that time. This is due, in part, to Government regulations and controls which robbed the dairy farmer of some of his traditional markets and turned them over to less costly and uncontrolled substitutes.

On February 15, 1954, Secretary Benson announced a reduction in the level of support for manufacturing milk and butterfat from 90 percent to 75 percent of parity, thus recognizing, for the first time since its inception, the flexibility of the dairy price-support provisions of the law. This was necessary because the law says that the Secretary must set the dairy support price between 75 and 90 percent of parity at a level that will assure an adequate supply. In the light of the oversupply the level of support could not legally be fixed any higher for the new marketing season.

Under the flexible price plan, price supports are lowered when surpluses exist, and theoretically the resulting lower price to consumers stimulates consumption. The current retail price of butter should now be about 10 percent lower than the price a year ago, with somewhat smaller decreases in prices on other manufactured items.

During April and May 1954, under the reduced support price, the Government purchased 59,147,116 pounds of butter. So it is obvious that a 10-percent reduction in price alone will not be enough to stimulate an adequate consumption of butter. The Commodity Credit Corporation also purchased 31,672,192 pounds of cheddar cheese and 117,236,777 pounds of nonfat dry milk solids in the same period.

Success of the Eisenhower program for dairying is based largely on two factors—greater flexibility and increased domestic consumption.

We cannot do anything about the flexible versus rigid support discussion unless perhaps we advise our Congressmen that we are supporting the Eisenhower-Benson dairy program. We cannot do anything about surplus dairy products in the hands of the Government, because they are not available to us. We can help the administration by preventing accumulation of more dairy products now in surplus. This can be done through point 2 of the Benson program—increased domestic consumption.

What are the prospects of success?

The figures on anticipated production of milk for the current year indicate that production will be the highest in the 30 years for which records are available. In the first quarter 1.3 billion pounds more milk was produced, or 5 percent above production during the first quarter of last year. Also with the consumption of fluid milk and cream per person in the winter of 1954, not much different from a year earlier, a large part of the increase was channeled into the production of butter, cheese, and nonfat dry milk solids. These are the three dairy items purchased by the Commodity Credit Corporation to achieve the support levels for manufacturing milk and butterfat. In spite of reduced support prices for dairy products the amount of milk production is at an all-time high, and the Government continues to add to the surplus stocks.

On the brighter side there are figures that would indicate that the flexible price plan will bring the desired results if given time. Large as the purchases of butter and cheese appear to be they are 50 percent less of cheese and 8 million pounds less of butter than was purchased during the same months of last year. The consumption of butter and cheese under the lower price program are relatively and actually greater. During this transition period from unworkable rigidity to more flexibility, while the Benson program is being given a chance to operate, we must increase consumption to take care of the current production of milk.

This is June Dairy Month and one of the greatest promotions ever conducted by producers, processors, and distributors of dairy products is under way. The United States Department of Agriculture has announced the No. 1 aim in its overall dairy program to be increased consumption. How to use surplus dairy products is a widely discussed subject.

I have worked on price stabilization, surpluses, and other problems related to dairying for the past 12 years, and it seems to me that less Government regulation and more commonsense is the answer to many of the troubles. Housewives could take over this job of removing the surplus and succeed. All they need is a few facts. Facts of how and facts about why.

Talking about milk production in terms of billions of pounds and the per capita consumption in pounds of whole milk equivalent is very confusing. In order to give you a specific plan for using dairy products in surplus I have reduced the figures published by the United States Department of Agriculture into more familiar terms. I spent hours on the computations because I couldn't believe the first answers could possibly be correct. But they were accurate and are as correct as figures can be based upon estimates.

Here, then, are the figures used to produce the qoutas necessary for you and each member of your family to use in excess of the amount of dairy products you are now consuming in order to prevent a surplus this year. The estimated milk production for 1954 is 124 billion pounds as compared with 121 billion pounds produced last year. Three billion more pounds. However, the population of the United States, according to the figures used by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, is up 3 million; 161.3 million people as compared with 158.3 million last year.

To utilize all the milk which farmers are expected to produce in 1954, each civilian would have to use about 750 pounds of fluid milk equivalent as compared with last year's rate of 689 pounds. This is only 61 more pounds of fluid milk equivalent per person this year than last. By "fluid milk equivalent" is meant an amount of butter, cheese, ice cream, or any other dairy product, equal to a given number of pounds of fluid milk.

The 61 pounds of milk equivalent for a year reduced to a week's quota in terms of butter, cheese, and fluid milk is as follows: Two-tenths ounce of butter and three-tenths ounce of cheese and a little more than one-half pint of fluid milk. Do you realize how little is two-tenths ounce of butter? Divide a quarter-pound stick of butter into 20 pats; that is at the rate of 80 pats to a pound; 1 such pat is equal to two-tenths ounce.

If you would like to consume your part of the surplus by taking it all in fluid milk, a little more than 1 pint increase each week would do it, or, if you prefer the manufactured products, 1 ounce more of butter a week or 2 ounces more of cheese or the equivalent of 1 pint of whole milk in ice cream or any of the other dairy products would practically turn the surplus into a deficit. That is your quota for each week in excess of what you usually eat. Unbelievable, isn't it?

An interesting part of a campaign to use more dairy products is the accumulation of good new recipes. With this in mind, I asked Mrs. Irving Ives if she had a favorite recipe she would like to send to you. Without hesitation, she said, "Yes; the recipe for my husband's favorite lunch." Before giving you quantities, I should explain that Welsh rarebit has always been a favorite with Senator Ives, but at present he is on a low-sodium diet so this recipe contains salt-free ingredients. It will be excellent for persons on a similar diet and also good for those worrying about extra pounds, for unsalted animal fat contains only the natural sodium in milk and is the best fat for humans.

The recipe: Put into the top of a double boiler one-half pound low-sodium cheese cut in small pieces (I use Nielson's low-sodium cheddar-type cheese from Wisconsin), 1 tablespoon sweet butter (no salt), dash of cayenne, 1 teaspoon dry mustard, one-fourth teaspoon sugar, 1 teaspoon cornstarch, one-eighth teaspoon egg-cheese herb blend. Melt cheese slowly over hot water, but do not boil. Gradually add one-third cup beer. Stir until well blended. Serve on toast (I use low-sodium (salt-free) toast). Sprinkle with paprika and serve at once.

Mrs. Ives said she would be interested in knowing of a New York State Cheddar cheese with low sodium content for, as she said, "We don't want our loyalty to our own beloved State challenged."

Finally, why should we be interested particularly in the dairy surplus? Because (1) the welfare of the entire Nation depends upon a stable, prosperous agriculture. Town and city people are dependent upon dairy farmers for their most staple and valuable foods. Dairy farmers depend largely upon these consumers of dairy products for their livelihood; (2) dairy surplus products are costly for the Government to buy, costly to store, and they face spoilage sooner or later because they are perishable; (3) New York State ranks second in cash farm income from milk. Dairy products are vital to our prosperity as well as to our diet.

So while eating more dairy products we will be improving our personal health, developing an important industry, reducing taxes, and helping the Eisenhower administration solve the dairy problem.

Proposed New Powerplant Near Memphis, Tenn.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN D. JOHNSTON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 29, 1954

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Anderson (S. C.) Independent of June 27, 1954, relating to the powerplant proposed to be built by the Dixon-Yates syndicate near Memphis, Tenn.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AS A TAXPAYER, YOU'VE BEEN ORDERED BY IKE TO BUILD A POWERPLANT FOR A FEW TYCOONS

A private power syndicate, composed of a few tycoons, wants to build a new $107 million powerplant near Memphis, Tenn. This group is known as the Dixon-Yates syndicate.

Ironically enough, although operating under the banner of "private enterprise," these individuals do not wish to risk their own money on the project. They want the Federal taxpayers to foot the bill.

This group went to Washington. They said they wanted:

1. To use the Government's credit to build the plant.

2. To secure an expensive contract with the Atomic Energy Commission to pay off the bonds.

Then, of course, within the next few years they would own the plant outright and reap rich profits from a project built with your tax dollars. You get nothing for the use of your money.

What happened when this bold request was laid before the powers that be?

President Eisenhower ordered that it be done at once, and he issued the ukase in the sacred name of "free enterprise." We assume that in this case this means that these fellows are to get for free a powerplant, thanks to a little political enterprise.

This kind of thing—dipping into the public Treasury to line the pockets of a favored few—is common during Republican regimes, but it must come as a shock to the disciplery to find the great moral crusader the leading light in a deal that would make the old Teapot Dome gang turn green with envy at the legal finesse.

The AEC doesn't need the power from the proposed plant. AEC has an excellent and economical contract with TVA, which was built with public funds and which still belongs to the people of the United States.

This scheme can be regarded as the first step in the plan to make TVA ripe for future "giveaway" to a few individuals at a few cents on the dollar.

From the standpoint of the Dixon-Yates syndicate, the present scheme makes Santa Claus look like Scrooge. They expect to put up equity capital of 5 percent of total cost of the plant, something like $5,850,000. Ordinarily, private utility financing calls for 40 percent equity capital, in this case about $46,800,000, and 60 percent bonds.

But with Ike giving them a 25-year contract with AEC, the Dixon-Yates outfit will get by with 5 percent equity capital and 95 percent in money borrowed on Government credit.

Now for the kicker: The contract with Dixon-Yates will cost the AEC (and thus the taxpayers) $3,600,000 a year more than the TVA contract. This will amount to more than $90 million over the 25-year period. What is more, it will represent a contribution by the taxpayers to Dixon-Yates, thus handing this private group a $107 million installation for, at most, only $17 million.

An effort will be made by conscientious Congressmen to block the President's order. As Representative HOLIFIELD puts it, the plan calls for a free ride for the utilities at the end of which the private utilities will own the automobile paid for by the taxpayers.

This is the great moral crusade the Republican Party is giving the United States.

Let's Save Those Boats

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1954

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, during the summer months privately owned passenger ships carry tourists and commercial travelers to and from the Territory of Alaska in very large numbers. In 1952, for example, during the period from June 1 to September 30, there were 13,000 passengers going north and 13,000 passengers traveling south between Alaska and continental United States.

During the other 8 months of the year, however, there are not enough passengers to economically justify continuation of private passenger service to Alaska. Counting both Canadian and American traffic, the summer months keep seven vessels carrying passengers to and from Alaska; in winter there is not enough passenger traffic to keep even one vessel running.

About a year ago the one private shipping company that serves large and small Alaskan ports alike, Alaska Steamship Co., of Seattle, announced that it would discontinue carrying passengers during the winter months and would limit its winter operations to the carriage of freight. The crisis was averted when the Military Sea Transport Service found it feasible to farm out the transportation of some of our service personnel and their families for 4 months, so Alaska Steamship Co. was able to continue its passenger operations for another year. Unfortunately, this proved to be only a temporary solution.

Now every city and town in Alaska is again faced with partial or complete isolation. This threatens bankruptcy to the stores and small businesses to whom the tourist trade means the difference between profit and loss. If there is only water freight service to Alaska, there will soon be no need for other than seasonal freight service. In time then, since out-of-season layup costs absorb any profit made during the active months, almost every Alaskan community except those near large defense installations would lose all water service.

This is the situation facing the great and vitally important Territory which many of us want to see achieve statehood.

I have asked various parties, including the Alaska Steamship Co., for an answer to the problem. No one seems to have a sound solution. Selling its passenger ships may resolve the company's worries but it would only complicate and aggravate the crisis in Alaska, and would leave the public interest in an even worse mess.

As I see it only 2 or 3 alternatives exist. One solution might be the operation of Army troop transports by a private company, on a charter or general agency basis, to haul not only troops and their dependents, but also commercial passengers and tourists. Secondly, a reduction in MSTS service, letting private enterprise contract for the amount eliminated thereby, may be an answer.

A last resort, it seems to me, is Government operation.

Meanwhile, for the information of the Congress, I offer an editorial from the June 18, 1954 issue of the Alaska Weekly, concerning the situation:

LET'S SAVE THOSE BOATS

What is so hard to understand about this problem of maintaining passenger-ship service between Seattle and Alaska is the reason such a relatively few persons seem concerned enough to even bother trying to do something about it. The problem is serious—critical, in fact. Unless a solution is found, and soon, both Seattle and Alaska will suffer beyond repair.

And yet, except for a pitifully few Seattle businessmen, there seems to be a universal apathy toward the problem. When an emergency meeting was called Monday by the Alaska division of the Seattle Chamber of Commerce only a handful were in attendance. Those present showed a profound awareness of what it will mean to Seattle if Alaska Steam goes out of the passenger business. And they intend to see what can be done.

It is clearly evident, however, this is a problem that cannot be solved without the combined and energetic support of everyone who will be affected, both in Seattle and Alaska. Alaska Steam cannot do it alone; that has been amply demonstrated. Seattle cannot do it alone, either. This is a unique situation which cries out for a combined, militant effort by Alaska and Seattle together.

The cold fact is that there is no economic justification for continuing passenger service for Alaska. No business can operate successfully only 4 months a year. Alaska Steam has tried it against impossible odds, and too long. The only reason it still operates its passenger vessels is that the company realizes, just as everyone else, that these ships perform a vital service to many Alaskan communities above and apart from their role during the tourist season. Which is to say the passenger service in recent years was operated in the spirit of altruism, nothing else.

If that were the whole story, Alaska Steam would be fully justified to suspend permanently its passenger service. But it isn't the whole story.

Alaska cannot do without these ships. The many small communities along the western and southeastern coast would become virtually isolated if these vessels were to suspend their regular calls entirely, especially during the winter. The line's freighters would still make their stops, true, but only to discharge cargo. The many who, for one reason or another, refuse to fly in Alaska would find themselves unable to travel to the States except those who reside at ports served by Canadian vessels.

There is the serious matter of what effect loss of these ships would have on the growing and increasingly lucrative tourist business. There is no argument here. The tourist industry would die aborning. And Alaska cannot afford the loss of approximately $10 million annually which tourists spend in the summer months. This figure represents a direct expenditure. It is known that this money turns over some seven times before it dissipates into the national economic stream.

Growing Alaska no more can afford the loss of this contribution to its economy than it can the loss of its fisheries.

Everyone knows this. Everyone knows there is a crisis in the passenger-ship department of Alaska Steam. And certainly everyone knows this is one problem which cannot be permitted to die on the vine. The stakes here involve the future of Alaska and effect seriously Seattle business and the city's waterfront—which is sick and getting worse.

The time is growing short. The time to wake up is now. This is a top priority matter of concern to every Alaska chamber of commerce, of every community, civic organization and governmental administration. And this calls for direct action by the entire Seattle Chamber, not only its Alaska division.

If all concerned band together, study the problem together, and join in a vigorously cooperative effort to act upon their conclusions there's a chance the vital Alaska passenger traffic will be continued.

Red Timetable for World Conquest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1954

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following radio address I delivered on WORL, Boston, Mass., Sunday, June 27, 1954:

An amazing memorandum has come to the attention of the Congress.

It is a copy of the Red timetable for world conquest that was carried to Moscow by a top Chinese Communist in March of 1953. How the United States got possession of it cannot be revealed for obvious reasons, but this new program for world revolution is believed to be authentic.

Spokesmen for our State Department and for the armed services, first disclosed it to the Foreign Affairs Committee of the United States House of Representatives meeting in executive session.

Responsible officials in our Government regard it with the utmost seriousness. In view of the fact that this administration is reluctant to tell the American people the international facts of life that must be faced eventually, I believe that this secret blueprint of Communist plans to take over the world should be given the widest publicity.

Here it is in condensed form.

1. Asia to be the immediate goal: Under the present circumstances, any vigorous action in Europe, such as internal revolution, effective infiltration, or intimidation into inaction or submission, is now impossible. More forcible measures may bring about a war. In Asia, on the contrary, such tactics will yield an abundant harvest.

2. World war to be temporarily avoided: There is no assurance of victory because of the higher rate of industrial production and larger stockpile of atomic weapons on the part of the capitalist countries, incompletion of antiatomic defenses of the industrial areas and oil installations in the Soviet Union, and the immaturity of China's agricultural and industrial developments. Consequently, we have to, until we are certain of victory, take a course which will not lead to war.

3. Diplomatic offensive: The United States must be isolated by all possible means.

Britain must be placated by being convinced that there is a possibility of settling the major issues between the East and the West, and that the Communists and the capitalist countries can live in peace. Opportunities for trade will have a great influence on the British mind.

In the case of France, her war-weariness and fear of Germany must be thoroughly exploited. She must be made to feel a sense of greater security in cooperating with us than with the western countries.

Japan must be convinced that rearmament endangers instead of guaranteeing her national security, and that, in case of war, the American forces distributed all over the world cannot spare sufficient strength for the defense of Japan. Re-armament is, therefore, an expression of hostility toward her potential friends. Her desire to trade will offer great possibilities for steering Japan away from the United States.

4. Military preparedness: As a final goal, there should be in east and southeast Asia (after these are liberated) 25 million well-trained men who can be immediately mobilized. These men are to be held in readiness for emergency. They will achieve two purposes. On the one hand, they will force the capitalist countries to keep on increasing defense expenses until economic collapse overtakes them. On the other hand, a mere show of force, when time is ripe, will bring about the capitulation of the ruling cliques of the countries to be liberated.

5. The Korean war: The important reason that we cannot win decisive victory in Korea is our lack of naval strength. Without naval support, we have to confine our operations to frontal attacks along a line limited by sea. Such actions always entail great losses and are seldom capable of destroying the enemy. In March 1951, I suggested to Comrade Stalin to make use of the Soviet submarines in Asia, under some arrangement that the Soviet Union would not be apparently involved in the war. Comrade Stalin preferred to be cautious lest it might give the capitalist imperialism the pretext of expanding the war to the Continent. I agreed with his point of view.

Until we are better equipped for victory, it is to our advantage to accept agreeable terms for an armistice.

6. Formosa: Formosa must be incorporated into the People's Republic of China because of the government's commitment to the people. If seizure by force is to be avoided for the time being, the entry of the Chinese People's Government into the United Nations may help solve this problem. If there should be serious obstacles to the immediate transfer of Formosa to the control of the People's Government, a United Nations trusteeship over Formosa as an intermediary step, could be taken into consideration.

7. Indochina: We shall give the maximum assistance to our comrades and friends in Indochina. The experiences we have had in Korea should enrich their knowledge in fighting for liberation. The case of Indochina cannot be compared with that of China. In Indochina, as in Korea, there is serious intervention of the capitalist bloc, while in China there was nothing so direct and vigorous. The experiences in Korea tell us that so long as there is foreign intervention, and so long as we have no naval support, military operatoins alone cannot achieve the objective of liberation.

The military operations in Indochina should be carried out to such an extent as to make the war extremely unpopular among the French people, and to make the French and Americans extremely hateful among the Indochinese people. The object is to force the French to back out of Indochina, preferably through the face-saving means of an armistice. Once foreign intervention is out of the picture, vigorous propaganda, infiltration, forming united fronts with the progressive elements in and outside the reactionary regimes, will accelerate the process of liberation. A final stroke of force will accomplish the task. Two years may be needed for this work.

8. Burma, Thailand, Indonesia, and the Malay Peninsula: After the liberation of Indochina, Burma will fall in line as a good foundation has already been laid there. The then reactionary ruling clique in Thailand will capitulate and the country will be in the hands of the people. The liberation of Indonesia, which will fall to the Communist camp as a ripe fruit, will complete the circle around the Malay Peninsula.

The British will realize, under these circumstances, the hopelessness of putting up a fight, and will withdraw as quickly as they can. We expect that the whole process will be completed on or before 1960.

9. Japan and India: By 1960, China's military, economic, and industrial power, will be so developed that with a mere show of force by the Soviet Union and China, the ruling clique of Japan will capitulate, and a peaceful revolution will take place. We must be on guard against the possibility that the United States will choose to have war at this moment. She may even want the war earlier. The defensive and offensive preparations of the Soviet Union and China must, therefore, be completed before 1960. Whether we can prevent the United States from starting the war, depends upon how much success we have in isolating her, and how effective is our peace offensive. If the war can be averted, the success of our plan of peaceful penetration for the other parts of Asia is almost assured.

In the case of India, only peaceful means should be adopted. Any employment of force will alienate ourselves from the Arabic countries and Africa, because India is considered to be our friend.

10. Arabic countries and Africa: After India has been won over, the problems of the Philippines and the Arabic countries can easily be solved by economic cooperation, alliances, united fronts, and coalitions. This task may be completed in 1965. Then a wave of revolution will sweep over the whole continent of Africa and the imperialists and the colonizers will be quickly driven into the sea. In fact, this powerful movement may have been under way much earlier.

With Asia and Africa disconnected with the capitalist countries in Europe, there will be a total economic collapse in western Europe. There capitulation will be a matter of course.

11. The United States: Crushing economic collapse and industrial breakdown will follow the European crisis. Canada and South America will find themselves in the same hopeless and defenseless condition.

Twenty years from now, world revolution will be an accomplished fact.

If the United States should ever start a war, she would so so before the liberation of Japan, the Philippines, and India. The courses of action in that event, are outlined in the memorandum on military aid.

There, in a nutshell, you have the Chinese Communist version of the plan to take over the world.

It was drawn up by Mao Tse-tung, and it was delivered to the Kremlin 1 year ago last March.

Since then the deteriorating pattern of events in Indochina proves how this design is succeeding. You may recall that the blueprint stated, and I repeat it, "the object is to force the French to back out of Indochina preferably through the face-saving means of an armistice."

That is exactly what is happening according to schedule.

The Russian Communists may have a somewhat different plan for other areas, but the object is the same, to subjugate the world, step by step, through a variety of pressures. The final one, breaking the will to resist.

What is our counterplan to halt Red aggression? It will have to become more effective to win.

The Watch Tariff Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT W. CRETELLA

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1954

Mr. CRETELLA. Mr. Speaker, some time ago I received in my mail a statement issued by the Clock Manufacturers Association of America with offices in my district at New Haven, Conn., which explained the cause of the plight of the watch and clock industry in this country.

To me the facts contained in this statement are indeed alarming and it is just another indication of the complete obliteration of an industry which was active, thriving, and prosperous at one time in our economy. I can speak with some authority on this matter having once been an employee of the New Haven Clock Co., at which time thousands of men and women were gainfully employed. Today that same clock company is just a shadow of its former self with a greatly increased personnel and actually on an existence from day to day.

It is unfortunate that we should so see our industries disrupted and doomed by foreign inroads and it is high time that we give serious consideration to our many millions of Americans who have contributed so much to our economy, but who are today imperiled by cheap foreign imports.

I was so impressed with the facts contained in this statement that I take pleasure in submitting it for incorporation in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for study by my colleagues. It follows:

THE WATCH TARIFF CASE: FACTS VERSUS PROPAGANDA

What is happening to the American watch industry?

The United States Tariff Commission has sent to the President a report which is generally understood to recommend that tariff reductions on watches be canceled because of the serious injury caused to the American watch industry by an evergrowing flood of imports. This is the second time in 2 years that the Tariff Commission has recommended relief to the domestic watch industry.

Again, as in 1952, foreign watch producers have boldly launched a vigorous propaganda campaign with the United States Government and throughout the country in an all-out effort to prevent adoption of the Tariff Commission's recommendations. The watchmakers of Switzerland, speaking for the Swiss watch cartel, have published statements and pamphlets which obscure, instead of revealing, the basic facts of the case.

WHAT ARE THE FACTS?

This is what has happened in the American watch market since watch tariffs were drastically reduced in the 1936 trade agreement with Switzerland:

In 1935 the last year before tariffs on watches were reduced, 21.2 percent of the wrist watches sold in the United States were foreign made. In 1953, 69.8 percent of the wrist watches sold in the domestic market were imported.

There were 13,367,000 watches imported into the United States in 1953. This vast tide of imports saturated the market; it exceeded by 1,711,000, or 14.7 percent, the number of movements imported during 1952; it exceeded by 4,859,000, or 40 percent, the number of movements imported during 1950; it exceeded by 10,529,000, or 370 percent, the average number of movements imported during the 5-year period 1936-40 which the Commission used as a base period in its 1952 report; and it exceeded by 12,165,000, or 1,012 percent, the number of movements imported during 1935, the last year prior to the reduction in duties under the trade agreement with Switzerland.

Swiss manufacturers pay wages which average only about one-third the wages paid to American watch workers. The result is that today there is growing unemployment in the domestic watch industry. Without an adequate tariff both American watch workers and American watch manufacturers suffer a serious and unfair disadvantage.

After extensive investigation the Tariff Commission has twice found that the domestic watch industry is being seriously injured by imports, and that the 1936 tariff reductions should be withdrawn. This action is specifically authorized by the escape clause which is part of the trade agreement between Switzerland and the United States.

MORE FACTS

Is the "escape clause" more than mere sham? It must be invoked if the domestic watch industry is to be spared complete destruction.

Of most critical importance is the essentially of the American watch and clock industry to our national security. Testifying before the Tariff Commission on February 11, 1954, Lt. Gen. Levin H. Campbell (retired), Chief of Ordnance during World War II, had this to say:

"Having the watch and clock industry as a going industry, equipped with the necessary plants, the necessary know-how, the trained people; it is of very, very great value to this country as a backlog and a safety for a rapid reaching of production in that particular item (mechanical time fuzes)."

CLOCK MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA, INC.
NEW HAVEN, CONN.

(Borg Products division, George W. Borg, Corp., Delavan, Wis.; Chelsea Clock Co., Chelsea, Mass.; General Electric Co., Bridgeport, Conn.; General Time Corp., New York, N. Y.; William L. Gilbert Clock Corp., Winsted, Conn.; Hershede Hall Clock Co., Cincinnati, Ohio; The E. Ingraham Co., Bristol, Conn.; Lux Clock Manufacturing Co., Waterbury, Conn.; New Haven Clock & Watch Co., New Haven, Conn.; Sessions Clock Co., Forestville, Conn.; Seth Thomas division, General Time Corp., Thomaston, Conn.; Telechron department, General Eelectric Co., Ashland, Mass.; United States Time Corp., Middleburg, Conn., Little Rock, Ark., Abilene, Tex.; Westclox division, General Time Corp., LaSalle, Ill.)

Unite for Polish Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM J. GREEN, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1954

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address entitled "Unite for Polish Freedom," presented by Frank N. Piasecki, before the 33d annual convention of the Polish American Citizens' League of Pennsylvania, Adelphia Hotel, Philadelphia, April 25, 1954:

Americans of Polish descent are especially familiar with the tragedy of Poland and of other countries dominated by Communist power. While we live in a land of freedom of thought, freedom speech, and freedom of religions, Poland continues to be a battleground on which a vicious attack has been mounted against its freedoms. Church leaders are persecuted and subjected to terror and death; religious orders are being abolished.

The Polish farmers are being driven into state-controlled collective farms, "Kolhozy." The workers are being herded into state-controlled organizations and forced to work quotas that drain them of their last physical resources and lower them to the level of beasts of burden. The scholar and the scientist are not allowed initiative or freedom of thought but must think and act on the basis of dictated rules. The patriot is hunted like an animal, the lover of freedom is dragged to the gallows.

The immediate physical horror of life in a communistic state is not the greatest danger. The greatest danger is the gradual destruction of truth and the effect which this destruction of truth has on the mental and spiritual growth of new generations. Under the heel of Communist oppression, there is a gradual deterioration of the normal human sense of values. Truth and even life itself begin to lose their proper proportions. Everything that is human is crushed to make way for the monster, the hideous conspiracy of communism. As the remaining free thinkers of Poland are physically eliminated, and as the new generations are infected with the scientific spread of communism by the Russians the problem of restoring freedom becomes more difficult and urgent.

I need not go any further on the tragic conditions of Poland. Regardless of whether we are Democrats or Republicans, regardless of whether we are workers or executives, regardless of whether we are of American descent or whether we are recent immigrants, we all share the same mighty objective—freedom for Poland—"Wolnoscdla

Polski." But the question is, what should we do about it?

Are there some of us who personally feel that hope for free Poland is gone? Let us reexamine ourselves. Consider the position of our own country, these United States, in the days of its struggle for independence against the largest military nation in the world of that time. Did our forefathers lose hope and give up the fight because of seeming impossibilities? Did lovers of freedom like Pulaski and Kosciuszko hestitate to risk and sacrifice their lives and fortunes because the odds against liberty looked forbidding? No, they and many others kept hope and alive and translated that hope into that effective action which brought freedom to these shores. They left us a heritage of freedom, bought with their lives. Ever since that time, Americans and Poles alike have fought to preserve that freedom—are we giving up now? Can we fail to share this heritage of freedom with those who look to us for hope?

The 30 million people of Poland look to the United States as the bulwark of their hopes for freedom. Privileged to have freedom ourselves, we must use this freedom to do more than just hope. We must act, and act effectively. We have a moral obligation as Americans, to give moral and physical support for the present, and a program that will lead to Poland's freedom in the future.

This is our obligation not only as Polish Americans, but as Americans. Freedom for Poland and all the other suppressed countries and people behind the Iron Curtain, is a basic objective of America's battle against communism.

There are over 6½ million Polish Americans in the United States; about 850,000 in the State of Pennsylvania alone. This is a large number of people and one that is potentially capable of being very powerful. I say "potentially capable of being powerful" because no group—no matter how large in numbers—can really be powerful unless it shares a common objective, is unified in its approach to that objective, has a strong and practical program, and actively prosecutes that program according to a plan.

We Polish Americans cannot gain freedom for Poland by physical force. Poland can become free only by 1 or both of 2 ways: Action within Poland itself to bring about a change and/or action by the free world to bring about a change. This means that we have two vital tasks to perform. We must constantly provide hope, encouragement, and stimulation to the persecuted people of Poland. At the same time we must keep the United States and other powerful countries of the free world active in planning the restoration of freedom to the captive countries. Both of these are giant tasks and both require the support of millions of other Americans, in addition to the full support of us 6½ million Polish Americans.

There is a great deal of Polish American activity. Believe it or not, there are over 70 national Polish American organizations in addition to countless local ones throughout the country. How much of that activity is directed to freedom for Poland? How effective is the activity which is aimed in that direction?

Before we Polish Americans can expect other Americans and other free peoples to join the cause of freedom of Poland, we must strengthen our own house. We need to have the leaders of the nationwide Polish American organizations united together in a group that will be recognized by our United States Government as the representative spokesmen for the majority of Polish Americans. During World War II, Poland's Government-in-exile furnished a noble example of unity and devotion to a common cause. The people within Poland and the Poles on the outside combined their efforts in a fight for the common good. Dedication to the cause was the order of the day; selfishness was a rare exception.

Today, again, we must improve our efforts toward unity of Polish American organizations and a unity of effort toward the freeing of Poland.

First. There must be overall coordination of the collection and administration of funds for relief in Poland, for moral support of the suppressed Poles, and for activity toward the eventual freedom of Poland.

Second. There must be properly planned activity to emphasize the contributions of Polish culture to the United States and to the world so that others will share our interest in Poland and its freedom.

Third. We must continue to maintain the fullest cooperation with the United States Government, in a unified form, so that private and Government activities toward the relief and freedom of Poland will follow the most effective pattern.

Fourth. Unity of Polish-American action must be extended to include unity of the exiled Polish political organization and action.

This unity of Polish-American activity first requires a unity of all the many Polish-American organizations. I submit that we consider the formation of a United Council of Polish-American Organizations, the membership to be composed of the executive heads of reputable national Polish-American organizations and charged with the responsibility of coordinating and unifying the Polish-American effort.

There are so many important activities toward freedom of Poland that need to be under taken that the need for those activities in itself should be sufficient challenge for unity of action. Aside from physical relief and assistance to our friends and relatives in Poland, most of these necessary activities fall under the heading of public relations—public relations to build and support the morale of suppressed people behind the Iron Curtain, public relations to get other Americans interested in freedom for Poland, and public relations to stimulate our Government and other countries of the free world to do everything appropriate toward the eventual freedom of Poland.

In short, we have a tremendous selling job to do—a job of promoting freedom for Poland, to victims of oppression in Poland itself, to our fellow Americans, and to the free world in general. In the first category—supporting the morale of people in Poland—we should take the fullest advantage of all the expert tools at our disposal.

Radio Free Europe is one of the most effective of such tools and justifies our fullest support. Radio Free Europe is an American enterprise supported by private citizens—millions of them. Radio Free Europe is people talking to people. Its broadcasts are delivered by fellow nationals of the listening countries. Poles speak to Poles, Czechs and Slovaks speak to Czechoslovakians, Hungarians to Hungarians—bringing them the truth, bringing them new hope, and nourishing the will to freedom.

Our second challenge—securing the interest and support of other Americans as well as Polish Americans—is the one in which we probably have been most sadly lacking. We can expect other Americans to be interested in the plight of Poland only if other people are fully aware of the contributions that Poland has made to American and world culture and freedom. We do too much talking to ourselves. We must do more talking to others; and in doing this we must put our best foot forward.

The contributions of the Polish people to freedom, to music, to the arts, to literature, and to science are tremendous. Yet little of this is known and appreciated by others than Polish Americans. We should sponsor exhibitions of Polish art, not just for viewing by Polish Americans but attractively presented to the general public. We should sponsor concerts of Polish music by the leading American symphonies.

We cannot be content with only past Polish contributions to culture and science. It is essential that we develop to the highest the talents of all young Polish Americans and Polish immigrants who have the basic ability to add further laurels to the intellectual history of the Polish people. We must provide scholarships, guidance service, and moral and financial encouragement to all of our youth who give promise of being capable doctors, engineers, artists, musicians, and other professional people. We must keep the flame of Polish culture and knowledge alive outside the Iron Curtain or otherwise it will become sterile.

One of the biggest challenges, to unified Polish-American action is unity of Poland's exiled political organization. A strong, unified free Polish political body is not only essential as a symbol of the Polish people's burning will for freedom, it is also essential to attain and maintain that freedom. In other words, it has definite functions to perform as well as being an inspirational symbol. The free Polish political body has four essential functions to perform:

1. It must assert and reassert the objective of freedom for Poland.

2. It must be expert, and must be regarded by others as being expert, in stimulating and guiding both internal and external activity toward the regaining of freedom.

3. It must be solid, unified, competent government in exile, available to govern a free Poland at any time. This is essential if we are to get the support of other nations, and it is urgent in this explosive world where the need for a competent government may come with little advance notice.

4. This political organization must be capable of, and devoted to, the establishment of true freedom and democracy when it is given the opportunity to govern a liberated Poland.

The effort and the expenditures, both in dollars and in human lives, which the free world is devoting to the battle against communism are tremendous. If the battle for freedom is won but true freedom is not maintained in the countries released from captivity, it is highly doubtful that the people of the free world will support such a mighty effort a second time. It is therefore urgent and imperative that the exiled Polish political organization be unified, be competent, and be devoted to the restoration and maintenance of true democracy.

Poland's Government in exile during World War II was inspirational; and Polish emigre political activities must continue to inspire confidence, trust and sacrifice. As time and effort shape the free Poland of tomorrow, there can be no place for fruitless factional fights. It is encouraging to us to know that both the Polish Government in exile and the political council of independent parties recognize this—encouraging because it provides Poles in exile with a united front capable of bringing hope and faith to the persecuted people of Poland. The strongest force among Poles in the free world is that of the Polish Americans, 6½ million strong, prosperous and inspired by the freedom that is America's. It is our duty and obligation to maintan a unity of free Polish political activity.

We, here in the United States, have the opportunity to select representatives who reflect our social, economic, and political views. We have the power to replace these representatives when they stand anew for election if we feel that they have not adequately reflected our beliefs and policies. As the largest free Polish community in the world, we Polish Americans also have the power to demand—and get—a free Polish political organization that is unified and reflects the true political views of free Poles.

But we must take first things first, and the first thing is a unity of Polish-American activity. My challenge to you tonight is that we implement a representative united council of Polish-American organizations—a central council that will direct the combined political strength, the combined financial support, the combined effort and activity, to develop the full potential energy of the Polish-American community. The blending of such unity is not easy; but the need is clear and urgent.

Polish-Americans, Poland is not yet lost—"Jeszcze Polska Nie Zginela"—let us all unite in the inspiring battle for freedom.

Let Polish freedom live—"Niech Zyje Wolna Polska."

The Oppenheimer Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 29, 1954

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, on Friday last I offered for printing in the RECORD an article from Time magazine entitled "The Oppenheimer Case," which I am informed by the Public Printer, will make silghtly more than 2½ pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, at a cost of $212.50. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE OPPENHEIMER CASE

In its 992 pages of fine print, the Oppenheimer case transcript contained ample evidence to show why the Atomic Energy Commission's personnel security board reached a 2-1 decision that Physicist J. Robert Oppenheimer's security clearance should be revoked.

Basically, Oppenheimer's cas was what he had outlined in his earlier, eloquent statement to the AEC (Time, June 14). He had been a "fellow traveler," an active Communist fronter from late 1936 until around 1942, but all that was behind him. He had been a loyal citizen, working hard for his Government ever since he went to work on the atomic bomb in 1942. To support their case, Oppenheimer's lawyers had called in an impressive list of character witnesses. Notable on the list were men who had worked above Oppenheimer, including some who had a measure of responsibility for what he did, and they expressed broad-gage opinions. Among them were:

New York Banker Gordon Dean, Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission in 1950-53. Dean had suffered some doubts about Oppenheimer's "very unpleasant early associations," but finally had concluded that the physicist was "a man of complete integrity * * * a very devoted man to his country."

Vannevar Bush, Director of the United States Office of Scientific Research and Development during World War II, now president of the Carnegie Institution. Bush had "complete confidence in Oppenheimer's loyalty, judgment, and integrity." But he would not presume to prejudge the case before the board.

Dr. James B. Conant, United States High Commissioner for Germany, former president of Harvard University. Conant still subscribed to a statement he had made about Oppenheimer in 1947: "A more loyal and sound American citizen cannot be found in the whole United States."

Dr. Norris Edwin Bradbury, professor of physics at the University of California, who was selected by Oppenheimer as his successor at the Los Alamos atomic project in 1945. Once a graduate student under Professor Oppenheimer at California. Bradley had found his old teacher "extremely helpful and cooperative," and "completely loyal to his country." He did not think that Oppenheimer had done anything to slow down development of the hydrogen bomb.

Gen. Leslie R. Groves, vice president of Remington Rand, wartime head of the Manhattan project, who had appointed Oppenheimer director at Los Alamos in 1943. Groves was cautious. Oppenheimer had done a magnificent job at Los Alamos, but "you must remember that he left my control shortly after the war was over." While Oppenheimer "did not always keep the faith with respect to the strict interpretation of the security rules," neither did other leading scientists.

When he appointed Oppenheimer, he was aware that there were suspicions, but he was not aware of all the derogatory material in the Atomic Energy Commission's bill of particulars for this hearing. If he had to make the same decision again, under the same conditions, he would appoint Oppenheimer. "In general, my policy was to consider the fact that the man was already in the project, and that made it very questionable whether I should separate him, and also whether I should separate him under what might be termed unpleasant conditions, because then you never know what you are going to do to him. Are you going to drive him over to the other side or not?"

A PIECE OF IDIOCY

Despite the array of testimonials, the record contained evidence that clearly gave the board majority serious doubts about Oppenheimer as a security risk. In the list of witnesses against J. Robert Oppenheimer, the most effective was J. Robert Oppenheimer himself. His testimony showed that he had lied repeatedly in the past about important security matters. What he said in the hearing caused the board to comment, mildly enough, that Oppenheimer was even now being less than candid.

The most telling example of Oppenheimer's past capacity for untruths was drawn out in cross-examination about his relationships with his good friend Haakon Chevalier, a linguist who was once a professor at the University of California. Chevalier was, by Oppenheimer's own testimony, a fellow traveler and quite a Red. Oppenheimer's story about a key incident with Chevalier was brief enough.

"Security Board Counsel ROGER ROBB.[1] Would you begin at the beginning and tell us exactly what happened?

"OPPENHEIMER. Yes. One day * * * in the winter of 1942-43, Haakon Chevalier came to our home. It was, I believe, for dinner, but possibly for a drink. When I went out into the pantry, Chevalier followed me or came with me to help me. He said: 'I saw George Eltenton [a Russian-trained scientist] recently.' [He said that] Eltenton had told him that he had a method * * * of getting technical information to Soviet scientists. He didn't describe the means. I thought I said. 'But that is treason.' I'm not sure. I said anyway something. 'This is a terrible thing to do.' Chevalier said or expressed complete agreement. That was the end of it. It was a very brief conversation."

But the full story of the incident was not so brief. Not until the next August—more than half a year after the incident occurred—did Oppenheimer say anything about it to security officers. And when he did, by his own testimony, he "invented a cock-and-bull story." Among the several officers he admitted lying to were General Groves and Col. Boris T. Pash, an Army counterintelligence officer.

"Security Board Counsel ROBB. Did you tell Pash the truth about this thing?

"OPPENHEIMER. No.

"Question. You lied to him?

"Answer. Yes.

"Question. What did you tell Pash that was not true?

"Answer. That Eltenton had attempted to approach three members of the project * * * through intermediaries. * * *

"Question. So that we may be clear, did you discuss with or disclose to Pash the identity of Chevalier?

"Answer. No.

"Question. Let's refer for the time being to Chevalier as X.

"Answer. All right. * * *

"Question. Didn't you say that X approached three people?

"Answer. Probably.

"Question. Why did you do that, Doctor?

"Answer. Because I was an idiot.

"Question. Is that your only explanation, Doctor?

"Answer. I was reluctant to mention Chevalier * * * no doubt somewhat reluctant to mention myself.

"Question. But why did you tell him that Chevalier had gone to three people?

"Answer. I have no explanation for that except the one already offered. * * *

"Question. Did you tell Colonel Pash that X had spoken to you about the use of microfilm?

"Answer. It seems unlikely. You have a record, and I will abide by it.

"Question. If X had spoken to you about the use of microfilm, that would have shown definitely that he was not an innocent contact?

"Answer. It certainly would.

"Question. Did you tell Colonel Pash that X had told you the information would be transmitted through someone at the Russian consulate?

"(No reply.)

"Question. Did you?

"Answer. I would have said not, but I clearly see that I must have.

"Question. If X had said that, that would have shown conclusively that it was a criminal conspiracy, would it not?

"Answer. That is right.

"Question. Did Pash ask you for the name of X?

"Answer. I imagine he did.

"Question. Don't you know that he did?

"Answer. Sure.

"Question. Did he tell you why he wanted it?

"Answer. In order to stop the business * * *

"Question. And didn't you know, Doctor, that by refusing to give the name of X you were impeding the investigation?

"Answer. I must have known that * * *

"Question. Why did you go into such great circumstantial detail about this thing if you were telling a cock-and-bull story?

"Answer. I fear this whole things is a piece of idiocy. I'm afraid I can't explain why there was a consul, why there was microfilm, why there were 3 people on the project, why 2 of them were at Los Alamos * * *

---

[1] A onetime (1931-38) assistant United States attorney in Washington, Lawyer Robb, 46, was hired by the AEC in February to handle the Oppenheimer case. A Yaleman (1928), Robb is associated with the Washington law firm of Bingham, Collins, Porter & Kistler, is a vice president of the District of Columbia Bar Association.

"Question. Isn't it a fair statement to say, Dr. Oppenheimer, that, according to your testimony now, you told not one lie to Colonel Pash but a whole fabrication and tissue of lies?

"Answer. Right. * * *"

While the whole "cock-and-bull story" had a ring of the past in it, Oppenheimer's association with the Red-tainted Chevalier did not. He testified that when he was in Paris last December, he and Mrs. Oppenheimer saw Mr. and Mrs. Chevalier on two occasions, had dinner with them one evening.

A BETTER SUMMARY

In his defense against the charge that he delayed the development of the hydrogen bomb, Oppenheimer was also a bad witness for himself. In the past he had maintained that he, as chairman of the General Advisory Committee to the AEC, had not opposed the hydrogen bomb. What he was against, he insisted, as a "crash program" to build the bomb in a hurry, with very high priorities which he felt might interfere with A-bomb production. But he ran into difficulty as Security Board Counsel Robb cross-examined him.

"Robb. Doctor, is it a fair summary of your answer * * * that what the GAC opposed in its October 29, 1949 meeting was merely a crash program for the development of the Supper [the H-bomb]?

"Oppenheimer. Yes, I think it would be a better summary to say we opposed this crash program as the answer to the Soviet atomic bomb.

"Question. What did you mean by a crash program?

"Answer. On the basis of what was then known * * * a commitment be made to build this thing irrespective of further study and with a very high priority, a program in which alternatives would not have an opportunity to be weighed * * *

"Question. Doctor, isn't it true that [you wrote] the report of the GAC?

"Answer. I wrote the main report. Yes.

"Question. Isn't it true that the report of the GAC and the annex to which you subscribed unqualifiedly opposed the development of the Super at any time?

"Answer. At that time.

"Question. At any time?

"Answer. No, at least let us say we were questioned about that in a discussion with the Commission, and we made it clear that this could not be an unqualified and permanent opposition * * *

"Question. Didn't the annex to which you subscribed say in so many words: "We believe a super bomb should never be produced"?

"Answer. Yes, it did.

"Question. Do you interpret that as opposing only a crash program?

"Answer. No. It opposed the program."

On the question whether the GAC was unanimous in its opposition to the development of the hydrogen bomb, Dr. Oppenheimer had additional difficulty.

"Robb. Now I have a note here, Doctor, that you testifed that there was a surprising unanimity, I believe that was your expression, at the GAC meeting of October 29, 1949, that the United States ought not to take the initiative at that time in an all-out hermonuclear program. Am I correct in my understanding of your testimony?

"Answer. Right.

"Question. In other words, everybody on the committee felt that way about it?

"Answer. Everybody on the committee expressed themselves that way.

"Question. How many people were on the committee?

"Answer. There were nine on the committee. One man was absent in Sweden.

"Question. Who was that?

"Answer. Seaborg [Dr. Glenn T. Seaborg, professor of chemistry at the University of California].

"Question. So you didn't know how he felt about it?

"Answer. We did not * * * He was in Sweden, and there was no communication with him.

"Question. You didn't poll him by mail or anything?

"Answer. This was not a convenient thing to do."

Later that day Counsel Robb pulled that testimony out from under Dr. Oppenheimer.

"Robb. You testified that you had no intimation from Dr. Seaborg prior to the GAC meeting of October 29, 1949, as to what his views on the subject were. I am going to show you a letter * * * dated October 14, 1949, addressed to you, signed 'Glenn Seaborg,' and ask you whether you received that letter prior to the meeting of October 29, 1949.

"Oppenheimer. I am going to say before I see it that I had no recollection of it * * *.

"Question. All right, Doctor. You told this board this morning that Dr. Seaborg did not express himself prior to the meeting of October 29, 1949.

"Answer. That is right. That was my recollection.

"Question. Was that true?

"Answer. No, that was not true."

In his letter Dr. Seaborg had said that he "would have to hear some good arguments before I could take on sufficient courage to recommend not going toward" a thermonuclear program. He noted hat Dr. Ernest O. Lawrence, director of the radiation laboratory at the University of California, was already proposing to get the program under way. If the GAC were asked to comment on the proposal, he wrote, "It seems to me clearly we should heartily endorse it." Despite this sharp exception to the GAC's "unanimous" stand, Dr. Oppenheimer originally had said that he did not recall the letter.

AN ODD POINT OF VIEW

Among many scientists Oppenheimer is held in high esteem, and even awe. Yet a number of his colleagues came before the security board, in answer to subpenas, and testified against him. Among them was Dr. Luis Alvarez, professor of physics at the University of California, who was on the staff at Los Alamos during World War II (he helped develop the detonating mechanism for the atomic bomb). In September 1949, after the Russians exploded an atomic bomb, Dr. Alvarez and Dr. Lawrence decided to push for development of the H-bomb. Nearly all of the scientists they reached were enthusiastic and anxious to get the program going, Dr. Alvarez testified. He expected Oppenheimer to be enthusiastic, too, because during World War II Oppenheimer had been anxious to get on with thermonuclear resarch. But in 1949, in the face of the Soviet threats, he found Oppenheimer opposed.

"Counsel Robb. What did he tell you?

"Alvarez. He said he did not think the United States should build the hydrogen bomb, and the main reason he gave for this * * * was that if we built a hydrogen bomb-then the Russians would build a hydrogen bomb, whereas if we did not build a hydrogen bomb, then the Russians would not build a hydrogen bomb. I found this such an odd point of view that I don't understand it to this day * * *

"Question: You testified that you talked to various individuals about your plan and the plans of others for the development of the thermonuclear weapon in early October 1949. Is that right?

"Answer: Yes, sir.

"Question: At that time these individuals were enthusiastic for going ahead with it. Is that right?

"Answer: That was my very strong impression.

"Question: To your knowledge, were those conversations in advance of any talks that these people had with Dr. Oppenheimer?

"Answer: I think that is so, sir * * *

"Question: Subsequently these people changed their views. Is that right?

"Answer: Quite drastically, yes.

"Question: Did you learn at that time whether in the interim they had talked to Dr. Oppenheimer.

"Answer: I am sure that in the interim they talked with Dr. Oppenheimer, because the interim extends until now."

Later, Dr. Alvarez was questioned by Dr. Ward V. Evans, professor emeritus of chemistry at Loyola University of Chicago, a member of the security board (also later was the one member to vote for restoring Oppenheimer's clearance).

"Question: Do you think that Dr. Oppenheimer had considerable power with men like Conant, Bush, and Groves?

"Answer: I don't think power is the right word. Dr. Oppenheimer is certainly one of the most persuasive men that has ever lived, and certainly had influence. They respected his opinions and listened to him.

"Question: Looking by hindsight, do you think he showed good judgment in the fact that he opposed this bomb in the light of present conditions?

"Answer: I think he showed exceedingly poor judgment. I told him so the first time he told me he was opposed to it. I have continued to think so. The thing which I thought at that time was the overpowering reason for building the hydrogen bomb was [that] if we did not do it, some day we might wake up and read headlines and see pictures of an explosion such as we saw a month or so ago, only this would be done off the coast of Siberia. I felt sure that this would be one of the most disastrous things that could possibly happen to this country. I thought we must not let this happen."

ELEMENTS OF THE MYSTIC

Wendell Mitchell Latimer, professor of chemistry at the University of California and associate director of the university's radiation laboratory, painted the same picture as Dr. Alvarez. Dr. Latimer wanted to move ahead with thermonuclear development right after the Russians exploded an atom bomb in 1949.

"Robb. Do you recall whether you talked to any other scientists * * *?

"Latimer. Yes * * * I talked to everybody I could * * * I tried to build up pressure for it * * *.

"Question. What was the reception to your suggestions received at that period of time? I am speaking of the time 2 or 3 weeks after the Russian explosion.

"Answer. It was favorable, I would say. We met practically no opposition, as I recall.

"Question. Will you tell us whether or not that situation changed?

"Answer. It definitely changed.

"Question. When?

"Answer. Within a few weeks. There had been a lot of back pressure built up. I think primarily from the Advisory Committee [the GAC].

"Question. Did you ascertain the source of any of this opposition?

"Answer. I judge the source of it was Dr. Oppenheimer.

"Question. Why?

"Answer. You know, he is one of the most amazing men that the country has ever produced in his ability to influence people. It is just astounding the influence that he has on a group. It is an amazing thing. His domination of the General Advisory Committee was so complete that he always carried the majority with him, and I don't think any views came out of that committee that weren't essentially his views * * *.

"Question. Would you care to give the board, sir, any comments you have upon the basis of your knowledge of Dr. Oppenheimer, as to his character, his loyalty, and his associations? * * *

"Answer. That is a rather large order.

"Question. I know it is, Doctor.

"Answer. His associations at Berkeley were well known—the fact that he did have Communist friends. I never questioned his loyalty. There were elements of the mystic in his apparent philosophy of life that were very difficult to understand. * * * A man's motives are just something that you can't discuss, but all his reactions were such as to give me considerable worry about his judgment as a security risk."

CONFUSED AND COMPLICATED

The sharpest blows any scientist struck at Oppenheimer came from Dr. Edward Teller, the physicist who developed the H-bomb. In 1942, he said, Oppenheimer was all for thermonuclear experimentation. But after Germany and Japan were defeated, he used his influence strongly against it. As a result, there was little progress until the Oppenheimer advisory committee's recommendation was overruled by President Truman in 1950.

"Robb. Doctor, let me ask you for your opinion as an expert on this question. Suppose you had gone to work on the thermonuclear in 1945 or 1946—really gone to work on it. Can you give us any opinion as to when in your view you might have achieved that weapon, and would you explain your opinion?

"Teller. It is my belief that if at the end of the war some people like Dr. Oppenheimer would have lent moral support—not even their own work, just moral support—to work on the thermonuclear gadget, I think we could have kept at least as many people in Los Alamos as we then recruited in 1949 under very difficult conditions. I therefore believe that, if we had gone to work in 1945, we could have achieved the thermonuclear bomb just about 4 years earlier."

On the question of Oppenheimer's loyalty and security, Dr. Teller had well-defined views.

"Teller. I do not want to suggest any [disloyalty]. I know Dr. Oppenheimer as an intellectually most alert and a very complicated person, and I think it would be presumptuous and wrong on my part if I would try in any way to analyze his motives. But I have always assumed, and I now assume, that he is loyal to the United States. I believe this, and I shall believe it until I see very conclusive proof to the opposite.

"Question. Do you or do you not believe that Dr. Oppenheimer is a security risk?

"Answer. In a great number of cases I have seen Dr. Oppenheimer act—I understood that Dr. Oppenheimer acted—in a way which for me was exceedingly hard to understand. I thoroughly disagreed with him in numerous issues, and his actions frankly appeared to me confused and complicated. To this extent I feel that I would like to see the vital interests of this country in hands which I understand better, and therefore trust more. In this very limited sense I would like to express a feeling that I would feel personally more secure if public matters would rest in other hands."

In addition to the doubts created by Oppenheimer's stand on the hydrogen bomb, the board heard that there was serious concern about his attitude toward detection of atomic explosions in Russia. Air Force Maj. Gen. Roscoe Charles Wilson, who held research and new weapons assignments during and after World War II, testified that Oppenheimer opposed detection devices to such an extent that "the overall effect was to deny the Air Force the mechanism which we felt was essential to determine when this bomb went off." As a result of this and other actions by Oppenheimer, General Wilson testified: "I felt compelled to go to the Director of Intelligence to express my concern over what I felt was a pattern of action that was simply not helpful to national defense."

A UNIQUE SCOPE

The testimony ranged all the way to those who bluntly questioned his loyalty. David Tressel Griggs, professor of geophysics at the University of California at Los Angeles, new weapons consultant for the Air Force during World War II, told the board: "I want to say, and I can't emphasize too strongly, that Dr. Oppenheimer is the only one of my scientific acquaintances about whom I have ever felt there was a serious question as to their loyalty."

The most direct attack on Oppenheimer's loyalty before the board came from William Liscum Borden of Pittsburgh, assistant to the manager of the Westinghouse atomic-power division, who was executive director of the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy from 1949 to 1953. He testified that he had written FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover a letter last November, expressing opinions that he still holds. Said his letter:

"As you know [J. Robert Oppenheimer] has for some years enjoyed access to various critical activities of the National Security Council, the Department of State, the Department of Defense, the Army, Navy, and Air Force, the Research and Development Board, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Central Intelligence Agency, the National Security Resources Board, and the National Science Foundation. His access covers most new weapons being developed by the armed forces, war plans at least in comprehensive outline, complete details as to atomic and hydrogen weapons and stockpile data, the evidence on which some of the principal CIA intelligence estimates is based, United States participation in the United Nations and NATO, and many other areas of high-security sensitivity.

"Because the scope of his access may well be unique, because he has had custody of an immense collection of classified papers covering military intelligence and diplomatic as well as atomic-energy matters, and because he also possesses a scientific background enabling him to grasp the significance of classified data of a technical nature, it seems reasonable to estimate that he is, and for some years has been, in a position to compromise more vital and detailed information affecting the national defense and security than any other individual in the United States. * * * As chairman or as an official and unofficial member of more than 35 important Government committees, panels, study groups and projects, he has oriented or dominated key policies involving every principal United States security department and agency except the FBI.

"The purpose of this letter is to state my own exhaustively considered opinion, based upon years of study of the available classified evidence, that more probably than not J. Robert Oppenheimer is an agent of the Soviet Union."

Among the factors which led him to this conclusion, Borden wrote, were Oppenheimer's long record of close Communist associations which survived the Russian-Nazi pact of 1939, his financial contributions to Communist causes, his false statements to security officers, his stand on the H-bomb.

Counsel for Oppenheimer declined to cross-examine Borden, on the ground that what he had submitted was not evidence but his own conclusions. On that point Security Board Chairman Gordon Gray agreed, asserting that the Board "has no evidence before it that Dr. Oppenheimer * * * has been functioning as an espionage agent."

THE PUZZLED BANKER

The Board majority's view was more nearly summed up in Counsel Robb's cross-examination of John J. McCloy, Board chairman of the Chase National Bank, former (1941–45) Assistant Secretary of War, who was one of the character witnesses on behalf of Oppenheimer.

"Robb. As far as you know, Mr. McCloy, do you have any employee of your bank who has been for any considerable period of time on terms of rather intimate and friendly association with thieves and safecrackers?

"McCloy. No; I don't know of anyone. * * *

"Question. Suppose you had a branch bank manager, and a friend of his came to him one day and said: 'I have some friends and contacts who are thinking about coming to your bank to rob it. I would like to talk to you about maybe leaving the vault open some night so they could do it,' and your branch manager rejected the suggestion. Would you expect that branch manager to report the incident?

"Answer. Yes.

"Question. If he didn't report it, would you be disturbed about it?

"Answer. Yes.

"Question. Let us go a bit further. Supposing the branch bank manager waited 6 or 8 months to report it; would you be rather concerned about why he had not done it before?

"Answer. Yes.

"Question. Suppose, when he did report it, he said: 'This friend of mine, a good friend of mine, I am sure he was innocent, and therefore I won't tell you who he is.' Would you be concerned about that? Would you urge him to tell you?

"Answer. I would certainly urge him to tell me for the security of the bank.

"Question. Now, supposing your branch bank manager, in telling you the story of his conversations with his friend, said: 'My friend told me that these people that he knows that want to rob the bank told me that they had a pretty good plan. They had some tear gas and guns, and they had a car arranged for the getaway, and had everything all fixed up.' Would you conclude from that it was a pretty well-defined plot?

"Answer. Yes.

"Question. Now, supposing some years later this branch manager told you: 'Mr. McCloy, I told you that my friend and his friends had a scheme all set up, as I have told you, with tear gas and guns and getaway car, but that was a lot of bunk. It just wasn't true. I told you a false story about my friend.' Would you be a bit puzzled as to why he would tell you such a false story about his friend?

"Answer. Yes, I think I would be."

The majority of Gordon Gray's security committee wound up feeling about Oppenheimer the way McCloy felt about Roger Robb's hypothetical bank manager.

Shipment of Foreign-Aid Cargoes in American Vessels

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1954

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following telegram:

Washington, D. C., *June 28, 1954.*

Hon. Edith Nourse Rogers,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

The entire American maritime industry and other national groups need your support of amendment to H. R. 9678 to be offered Tuesday or Wednesday this week by the Merchant Marine Committee to provide, as in all prior similar legislation, that 50 percent of foreign-aid cargoes shall be shipped on American vessels at reasonable rates and to the extent practicable.

American Merchant Marine Institute.
Association of American Steamship Owners.
Pacific American Steamship Association.
Committee of American Steamship Lines.
Conference of American Maritime Unions (AFL–CIO).

A Personal Legislative Report to the People of North Dakota

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OTTO KRUEGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1954

Mr. KRUEGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the Record, I include the following:

Otto Krueger in Washington—Separating the Wheat From the Chaff

Washington, D. C.—Last year I sent you a report on the activities of the 1st session of the 83d Congress. You were so kind to me in your praise of the report, I felt it advisable to report to you on the happenings as the 2d session nears a close.

Being a Member of Congress is not an easy job, but it is a very gratifying one if you enjoy helping people and I do. Many of the things I am about to discuss with you do not give you the help I think you are entitled to. It looks now that we can celebrate the Fourth of July with a package farm bill on its way that will handle some of the problems we are facing. Congressman Hope tells me the bill will be out on the floor of the House this week. I have always followed the affairs of the Agriculture Committee, and, of course, have continued to do so very closely. The bill will definitely come out with a provision for the extension of 90 percent of parity for a year. You folks may also have a chance to consider the merits of a two-price system. Personally, I would like to see controls on the basis of bushels rather than acreage, with a minimum of redtape for the farmer to contend with, but I know the House Agriculture Committee has spent many months of long hours in the preparation of this bill. I have talked with many of the members of the committee personally, and I know they, in their hearts, are hoping the same thing I am, that the bill will pass. I think it will receive the approval of Congress. The one thing I can assure you is that the extension of high parity will receive the approval of Otto Krueger.

Seriously, friends, can anyone justify huge imports in oats, barley, and rye and then ask the farmer not to plant any of these crops in his diverted acreage if he wants to qualify for price supports? I fought Canadian imports last year, and will continue to do so when it penalizes America's farmers. Nor do I feel justified in cutting millions at home to spend billions abroad. Some assistance to our allies is necessary to combat communism, promote peace, and help put their economy on an even keel, but not at the risk of wrecking our own.

One of the most important decisions made in the 83d Republican Congress was one that gave the American taxpayers some relief that they certainly deserved. I have not made a lot of promises or pledges for the purpose of getting votes. You all know I am not built that way. But in all humility, I must admit that I was proud when Congressman Halleck, majority leader of the Congress, slapped me on the back, and said, "Otto, I appreciate your help in giving the American taxpayers a reduction in their tax burden."

The 83d Congress has been interested in those programs that helped maintain a strong economy. In order to assure this strength being maintained and even strengthened, vocational agriculture funds and agriculture research funds have been increased. The school-lunch program, which you are all familiar with, has been continued and in the new farm bill will include some of our surplus dairy products. The REA and RTA programs are important to all of us. Here again my close association with the conferees makes it possible for me to assure you that ample funds will be given to proceed with improvements and necessary expansion.

I feel we should be strong defensively in order to protect our precious heritage of liberty and freedom, but I am opposed to war and shipping our boys overseas to fight in foreign wars. Over 30,000 servicemen lost their lives in the rice paddies of Korea. I saw actual combat, but the war I fought in was declared by Congress. That's why I was so pleased to hear the President state that if war was declared, Congress would declare it. Many a mother in this country doesn't even have a grave to drop her tears on. If the issue of sending our boys to Indochina comes before the Congress, Otto Krueger will raise his voice in a loud and resounding "No." Veterans do not make wars. But those who are injured suffer the consequences. Those of us who fought and but for the grace of God might have been wounded can appreciate the moral obligation our great country has to every veteran with a service-connected disability. For this reason, I have insisted that every veteran who had service-connected disabilities be provided with a hospital bed and excellent medical care when he needs it.

Since the 83d Congress has not yet adjourned, I cannot give you as detailed a report on its activities as I would like to. Some time after adjournment date, you will receive a complete report. After making your usual thorough evaluation of the report, I would appreciate receiving your opinions on it.

American Prisoners of the Chinese Communist Forces in Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1954

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I wish to include a resolution which I have received from the city council of Boston. This resolution has my unqualified endorsement. I am deeply grateful to the Boston City Council for their splendid expression, and I commend it to the attention of my colleagues here in the House of Representatives:

Whereas 944 soldiers of the United States are now prisoners of the Chinese Communist forces in Korea, many of these men, highly trained technicians skilled in the handling of the latest and highly secret instruments of war; and

Whereas of this number, 27 men are residents of the New England States and have not been heard from by officials of the United States, or their families, since their entry into the Korean area; and

Whereas it has been stated by the United States military authorities that they are confident that these 944 men are still held captive in the hands of the Communist forces; and

Whereas it is the sentiment of the public that every possible step should be taken to effect the release of these men; Therefore be it

Resolved, That the members of the Boston City Council in meeting assembled, desire to urge all Members of the New England delegation in the United States Senate and the House of Representatives to initiate and carry out an organized effort to demand of the highest authority of our administrative and military branches to bring into being immediately whatever effort, or action, necessary to accomplish the release of these New England citizens and soldiers who have imperiled their lives to serve our country; and be it further

Resolved, That it is felt by the Boston city council that any action, no matter how drastic, is worthwhile and necessary to erase this blemish and insult to the honor of our country; and be it further

Resolved, That the members of the Boston city council desire to commend the Boston Post and its reporters—Clark Nichols and Joseph McLaughlin—for the untiring efforts to bring about the accomplishment of this worthy and humane undertaking, which, up to the present time has apparently been abandoned by all others except the American Prisoners of War Association.

In city council June 21, 1954, adopted.

Attest:

Walter J. Malloy,
City Clerk.

Unemployment Climbing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1954

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I enclose herewith for the information of the Members of the House a report on labor-market trends in the East St. Louis, Ill., area.

This report is issued for June 1954 by the Illinois State Employment Service. It shows a climb in unemployment not only indicating a loss of employment of 2,250 from May 1953 but indicating a loss of 700 above the March 15 level of this year.

At the risk of being dubbed a prophet of doom, may I say that I view these figures with alarm. The administration cannot very well adopt an ostrich-like attitude regarding the climb in unemployment. It is a very serious matter and the administration should be making plans to deal with it instead of criticizing everyone who calls attention to the danger of an economic recession.

The report follows:

East St. Louis Area Labor Market Trends, June 1954

SUMMARY

The impact of production curtailment in the metals industry forced employment in the East St. Louis area[1] down by 75 at the 92 reporting firms during the 60-day period ending May 15. Seasonal employment rises in commercial fertilizers, 200; stone-clay-glass, 175; roofing mills, 100; plus scattered gains totaling 100 in other industries were unable to offset the drop of 650 in metals. The May 1954 employment total of 22,433 in these 92 reporting firms was 2,250 less than the May 1953 figure. Job opportunities have decreased materially during the past 60 days, and unemployment climbed to 6,200, approximately 700 above the March 15 level. New hires will be limited for the next 2 months as almost all major firms have a pool of laid-off workers, with callback rights, to draw from. Some 600 to 700 high-school graduates and returning college students will tend to swell the already heavy unemployed group. Manufacturing employment is expected to level off at current figures and generally remain stable there. Potential construction expansion could raise nonmanufacturing employment to a somewhat higher level than is anticipated at the present time.

Nonagricultural employment in the East St. Louis area. (For reporting establishments only)

Item	Number of establishments	May 1954		March 1954		May 1953	
		Total	Female	Total	Female	Total	Female
Total	92	22,433	3,598	22,518	3,264	24,677	3,698
Manufacturing	38	17,098	2,175	17,321	1,859	18,995	2,238
Nonmanufacturing	54	5,335	1,423	5,197	1,405	5,682	1,460

MANUFACTURING CONTINUES TO DROP

The closing down of a foundry and cutbacks at another metals plant accounted for all of the losses in the manufacturing field. Total manufacturing employment fell by 225 in the past 60 days. On the favorable side, stone-clay-glass rose 175, and petroleum coal (roofing mills) increased its work force by 100. Seasonal demand for beverage bottles and construction material was responsible for the production upturn in these establishments. Commercial fertilizers at the peak of its spring production season added 200 to its payrolls. Small scattered gains and losses at other manufacturing plants resulted in the net gain of another 100.

NONMANUFACTURING RISES SLIGHTLY

Pacing a very modest pickup in nonmanufacturing employment, construction edged upward by 50, retail trade rose 50, and government establishments also reported an increase of 50. This nonmanufacturing rise is attributed chiefly to seasonal factors. In Government establishments, the need for temporary workers during the vacation period was the major reason for the increase. The remaining nonmanufacturing groups showed little or no change except transportation which reported a drop of 25. With no large building projects in progress within the city, many construction workers are traveling to adjoining areas for jobs, where several subdivision development have been started.

EMPLOYMENT CHANGES FROM 1 YEAR AGO

Total employment at the 92 reporting firms decreased 2,250 below the May 1953 level. Manufacturing industries dropped 1,900, while nonmanufacturing lost 350. Only two major industrial groups experienced employment gains during the past 12-month period: Stone-clay-glass, 150; and meat packing, 275. The most drastic loss occurred in primary metals, 1,150; followed by construction, 200; rubber, 100; wholesale-retail trade, 150; and printing-publishing, 50. In addition to those listed above a fabricated metals plant moved out of the area during 1953 creating the permanent loss of another 250 jobs.

UNEMPLOYMENT CHANGES FROM 1 YEAR AGO

Unemployment moved upward sharply above the estimated employment decline in the area. The jobless total on May 15 was 6,200 (including 1,300 women). East St. Louis residents employed throughout the Greater St. Louis metropolitan area, and caught in layoffs, swelled the totals to a considerable degree. Likewise, laid-off persons coming back home from other areas further increased the unemployed pool. This increase in unemployed workers has been confined almost exclusively to the male sex.

LABOR SUPPLY

The current labor supply is ample for any known or foreseeable needs that may occur during the coming several months. In addition, the labor force will be augmented by 600–700 students who will enter the labor market in the next few weeks during school vacations.

EMPLOYMENT OUTLOOK

Based upon information provided by local employers in the reporting program, employment will continue on a gentle decline during the next 60-day period. Heavy seasonal layoffs in the commercial fertilizer industry coupled with the pessimistic employment forecasts in the metals industry preclude the possibility of any overall employment rise during the next 2 months. Almost without exception every major firm in the area has a pool of laid-off workers, with callback rights, to draw from before making any new hires. This condition poses a serious employment problem to the returning college students seeking summer work. Industrial job openings for vacation workers are practically nonexistent this year. Construction projects are smaller in size this year and scattered over a much wider area requiring the workers to travel greater distances to the job site. The overall outlook for the area is for a leveling off in the downward employment trend, with some degree of stabilization at about present levels being attained by midsummer.

---

[1] This area includes the city of East St. Louis, and consists of the following townships in St. Clair County: Canteen, Centerville, Stites, East St. Louis, and Sugar Loaf.

Frank Meyer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GERALD R. FORD, JR.
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 29, 1954

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, from September 1953 until June 1954 Frank Meyer, a teacher in the public school system of Grand Haven, Mich., was a member of my office staff in Washington, D. C. This excellent arrangement was part of Frank Meyer's fellowship project which was sponsored by the Ford Foundation. Although he received no compensation as a member of my staff, he worked long and hard on the many difficult tasks which he tackled, and we gave him the toughest so that he might see firsthand the problems presented to a Member of Congress.

In addition to the work in my office, Frank Meyer literally covered the Nation's Capital interviewing top Government officials in the legislative, executive, and judicial branches. He attended innumerable committee hearings, many sessions of the House and Senate, and a number of meetings of top Government boards and agencies. Weekly Frank wrote a most informative and interesting column for the Grand Haven Daily Tribune, his hometown newspaper. In addition the wonderful Meyer family, six in all, searched out and took in all of the superb historical and beautiful sights in the Washington area.

I commend the Ford Foundation for sponsoring this most worthwhile fellowship project, and I congratulate Frank for his intelligent and conscientious approach to his program. My staff and I were delighted to have him with us, and thank him for his most helpful aid and assistance.

As a part of my own remarks, I include the last of Frank Meyer's weekly columns in which he summarizes his views. It follows:

CAPITAL REFLECTIONS

(By Frank Meyer)

This is the 40th and final article in the series called Capital Reflections. As we leave Washington and reflect upon the year's experience, certain truths stand out more strongly than ever. I want to mention a few of these.

The vast majority of public officials, both elective and appointive, are conscientious, hard-working public servants trying to do what is right. I have been impressed with the ability, the fairness, and courtesy of these men and women. There are always exceptions, and those are the ones who make the news.

This experience has renewed my faith in our American democratic system and in those men and women who give it life. It is of little value to believe in our system on one hand and on the other to maintain that "politicians are rotten," or that "bureaucrats are ruining the country."

If our system is to remain unchallenged in this country, our citizens must avoid cynicism and fear and the fatal error of excusing something as "politics" or of ridiculing officers as "politicians." Senator MORSE, speaking in Philadelphia recently, said that "Americans have come to accept crookedness in politicians, and as a result they are terribly crooked; they are rotten."

ELEMENT OF TRUTH

There is an element of truth in his reason for the difficulty. Voters will get what they expect in their officers, and the officers will reflect the character of their constituents. In a democracy the people get the kind of government a majority of them want.

Accepting public officials as human beings, let us support them when they are right and try to change them when they are wrong; but to condemn them as unsavory characters, never. If I could make one plea, it would be for an increased faith in our leaders (of all parties) and for a popular insistence that they keep the public trust inviolate.

This may appear to be Pollyanna thinking and inappropriate in view of some recent events. But faith, hope, and charity must abide in the social and political realms as well as in the religious if we are to survive. This country is greater than any man, any conflict, any crisis. Men and crises come and go, but the nation goes on until God deems otherwise.

It is also important to remember that this Government is a republic rather than a pure democracy. This simply means that once a man is chosen to office, it is his responsibility to search out the facts and make wise decisions in order to achieve the greatest good for the greatest number. He is not a robot merely to intone the demands of any group, no matter how large.

This often requires him to be a conciliator and to effect compromises. He may be stoutly reprimanded by some for sacrificing his principles, by others for being spineless, and by others for being stubborn. Yet the essence and core of the democratic system is compromise.

It is the task of the public official to listen to all the demands of all the various persons and groups, and then to come up with some solution to the problem which will be the least harmful or the most beneficial. This often is extremely difficult, and the person who can do it is worthy of highest honor.

MAGNITUDE OF PROBLEMS

I was further impressed with the magnitude of the problems before many officials in Washington. One can be more tolerant, less critical, and more inclined to withhold judgment when he gets a little insight into the complexity of today's social, economic, and political questions.

It must follow, therefore, that a trained and disciplined mind is more essential now than ever before. The education of all our people must be vigorous and continuous. This comes only by hard work and serious intentions, based upon a firm moral and spiritual foundation. We must understand the philosophic basis of our democracy, and the duties and responsibilities which accompany liberty and freedom.

Vice President Should Curb His Partisan Attacks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM J. GREEN, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1954

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Philadelphia Inquirer of June 29, 1954:

VICE PRESIDENT NIXON SHOULD CURB HIS PARTISAN ATTACKS

Vice President NIXON, who apparently has a weakness for occasionally saying the wrong thing at the wrong time, has done it again.

His speech in Milwaukee on Saturday night contained a number of intemperate remarks that were conducive to nothing so much as promoting division.

In declaring that the alternative to the reelection of a Republican majority in Congress this year would be "something far more radical," the victory of a Democratic Party controlled by left-wingers, he was adopting the pattern of Senator MCCARTHY's "20 years of treason" indictment.

To lump all the Democratic leaders together as left-wingers is as indefensible as accusing them all of being traitors. The Republicans have no monopoly on patriots. There is surely nothing radical or left-wingish about such eminent Democrats as Senators Russell and Byrd and George, or Governor Lausche of Ohio or Governer Byrnes of South Carolina, to name a few.

Mr. NIXON accomplishes nothing by such vindicative partisanship except to stir resentment. His behavior is in particularly poor taste because he is supposed to serve as Vice President for all Americans, not merely that portion of them who happen to be members of his political party.

He chose to make his Milwaukee appearance the occasion also for a lecture on foreign affairs. At the very moment that the President of the United States and the Prime Minister of Great Britain were trying to negotiate a policy of united action in the Far East, the Vice President was publicly emphasizing just about every point of difference between the two nations in that field.

His outgivings on international relations have proved embarrassing to the administration before, as in the case of his celebrated off-the-record speech in which he gave encouragement to a policy of armed United States intervention in Indochina.

It might be well if the Vice President were to leave pronouncements on foreign policy to the President and the State Department, and to leave displays of ward politics to ward politicians. He should use his high office to promote unity, not disharmony and partisan conflict.

The Administration's Farm Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. HERLONG, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1954

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following discussion of the administration's farm program between RICHARD M. NIXON, Vice President of the United States, and Ezra Taft Benson, Secretary of Agriculture, over the American Broadcasting Co., 10:35 to 11 p. m., Monday, June 28, 1954:

The VICE PRESIDENT. My fellow Americans, President Eisenhower has asked Secretary of Agriculture Benson and me to talk frankly with you tonight about something that is of vital concern to every citizen. It involves our food supply, and we all must eat; it involves tax dollars, and we all must pay; it involves the sound future of all agriculture, which is one of the very foundations of a strong America.

Our problem is this: Our warehouses are near the bursting point with $6½ billion worth of farm surplus. The Government has surplus wheat in Victory ships anchored in the Hudson River. We have surplus dairy products in storage all over the country. It is costing our taxpayers $700,000 a day merely to pay the rent bill to store these surpluses—$250 million a year just to pay the rent. Why, that's more than three times as much as our Government spends on all agricultural research which has meant so much to us all, and every day we must make room for more surplus, and there's no relief in sight—unless we follow the President's recommendation to Congress and change our course.

It's a long story of how the Government got in so deep—big question is, Shall the Government get in deeper and deeper? Wouldn't you say that was a fair statement, Secretary Benson?

The SECRETARY. Yes, Mr. Vice President. Because our present farm laws move farm produce into storage instead of stomachs. The present farm program is unfair to both farmers and taxpayers, and that's why the administration has asked Congress to correct the faults in the law. Question is: Are we willing to face that fact squarely and correct these faults before it is too late.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That brings up something I want to make crystal clear right now. The administration has been told many times that it is bad politics to bring up this farm program change during an election year. But we submitted the administration's farm program to Congress because farmers and farm leaders said it was right for America.

The SECRETARY. And on that, Mr. Vice President, I'd like to say that the administration's farm program came from a cross-section of all America. It is the result of mobilizing the best brains of all agriculture over a year of intensive study. All major farm organizations representing about 4 million farm families participated in our study. Five hundred scientists—leaders of the 48 agricultural colleges—farmers, farm leaders, and legislators from all over the country all made their contributions to the administration's farm program.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It has been suggested that this farm program represents a radical change. Actually the administration's program is based on similar principles to the one which both Democrats and Republicans agreed upon 6 years ago. I know because I was a Member of the Congress in 1948 and 1949.

But before we go further, let me say that our farmers and ranchers have a marvelous record of progress. In the short space of 15 years, they have increased output of food and fiber almost 40 percent. This has been a tremendous achievement—the result of much hard work. Their hard work has meant a higher income for farmers—but also cheaper food for us all. Our wages and salaries will buy more steak today, more eggs, more milk than can be bought any place in the world for the same amount of labor.

The SECRETARY. Here's a good example of that, Mr. NIXON: A Russian must work 120 minutes to buy a pound of beefsteak. That's 2 hours. But the American industrial worker earns his pound of steak with only 24 minutes of labor—in one-fifth the time. So we certainly have all benefited by the farmers hard work, and productivity. Our prime concern is that we not undermine agriculture as the present farm program threatens to do, that we not slow down this farm progress.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Mr. Secretary, I think it is important that we all understand how our Government came into possession of all this farm surplus.

The SECRETARY. To answer that we must go back to the early days of World War II, when we desperately needed more food for ourselves and our allies around the world. But farm machinery, fertilizer, and labor was scarce. And the farmer was already working from sun-up to sun-down. Yet our country needed more food than had ever been produced before.

So Congress quite wisely said: "We'll guarantee you certain prices if you'll increase food production. Stimulated by the heavy wartime demands prices rose in many cases far above the support levels.

The VICE PRESIDENT. And farmers responded magnificently as we all know.

The SECRETARY. That's right, Mr. Vice President. But then came the end of the war. We stopped all-out production of army tanks. We stopped all-out production of munitions and ships. But we didn't put a stop to all-out production of surplus food. Price incentives to get more wheat, more cotton, and more peanuts were continued.

Farmers reacted naturally enough. They continued to go all-out to produce. Price, in America, is a powerful incentive.

The Vice President. And that, ladies and gentlemen, is why today your Government has $6½ billion invested in surplus farm products—an all-time high. It's jumped more than $2½ billion in 1 year—and it's still increasing.

I want to say right here that this Administration has carried out to the letter the promise President Eisenhower made to farm folks 2 years ago. He said then that we had a moral and legal commitment to carry out price supports at 90 percent of parity through 1954.

That we have done and will do.

But the time has come to change this wartime policy which has brought on these surpluses, which has lost us some of our markets, which is undermining all of agriculture.

Mr. Secretary, would you sketch briefly some of the faults of our farm price program?

The Secretary. In the first place, these high supports apply to only a small percentage of our 5½ million farmers. For example, the six basic farm commodities are: corn, wheat, cotton, tobacco, rice, and peanuts. It is significant that just 3 of these crops—wheat, corn, and cotton products—account for more than 80 percent of our total investment in price supports. And all 6 of the basic crops produce only 23 percent of all farm income. Why, our livestock farmers alone produce 29 percent of the total farm income—more than all of the basic crops put together. But livestock men get no price supports—they don't want them. Our poultrymen produce 12 percent of the total farm income. But poultrymen get no price supports—they don't want them. Fruit and vegetable farmers produce 10 percent of the national farm income. But they get no price supports—and don't want them.

The Vice President. So if you raise hogs, you have no Government price supports. But if you raise peanuts, honey, or tung oil, then you do have Government price supports. Isn't that a fact, Mr. Secretary?

The Secretary. That's right. It adds up to the fact that a total of 56 percent of all farm products are not under farm price supports of any kind.

Iowa, for example, gets only 8 percent of its farm income from basic farm commodities under price support. Wisconsin gets only 1 percent of its farm income, New York State only 2 percent, and many States less than 1 percent of their farm income from these basic commodities.

The Vice President. Another thing that concerns us all—is that the present farm program is unfair to the small farmer.

The Secretary. You're right, Mr. Vice President. It shows how very difficult it is to write legislation on farm supports to be fair to all. Actually, high price supports help the big farmer most—the small farmer least. For example, the average cotton loan in Mississippi is only $372. But the largest cotton loan is $1,269,000.

The Vice President. Another thing that bothers me is that our wartime policy of high supports is losing our farm markets. It's hurting our farmers.

The Secretary. Butter is a good example. Butter has been supported at a price higher than many housewives were willing to pay. They have learned to use other fats at a lower price.

It's almost a similar story with cotton. Maintaining cotton prices above the world market has encouraged other countries to grow more cotton. And so some of our export market has been lost.

The Vice President. And once a market is lost, it is very, very difficult to get back, as everyone knows. I'd like to present another question on this high price support program. Is it fair to the taxpayers? During the war, yes, of course, it was sound. But a perpetuation of a wartime price policy that encourages farmers to produce surplus food which the Government then must buy with taxpayers' money to store away unused, with danger of spoilage. Ladies and gentlemen, does that make sense to you?

The Secretary. Another weakness of the present program is that it takes little account of the radical changes in our eating habits. For example, the average American eats far less starchy foods today—far more meat, eggs, dairy products, and fruits and vegetables than a few years ago.

Yet today we have a farm program tied to another generation—it encourages raising grain to sell to the Government, rather than for livestock feed.

Our farm programs should change as conditions change. For example: Horses are today selling for only 13 percent of parity. Wouldn't it be ridiculous to support horses at 90 percent of parity to keep the harnessmaker in business?

The Vice President. High price supports mean a multitude of strict Government controls—and I've met few farmers who favor that.

The Secretary. That's right, Mr. Vice President. Yet, under the present law I have just been forced to order more controls—in this case, a further reduction in wheat acreage for 1955. But even this reduction is far short of what it would take to bring supplies in line with demand. At the same time, we've had to make sure that land taken out of wheat cannot be put into any other crops except grass and hay. For example, if we allow the wheat and cotton farmers to plant idle acres to corn or vegetables that obviously would disrupt the markets of farmers already specializing in those crops.

These controls are not to my liking. I do not believe that Government should tell the farmers what they can and cannot raise, what they can and cannot sell. And that's one reason I'm so strong for the administration's program. Because it will lead us away from controls.

The Vice President. But right here I must make it very plain that there is a great part of the farm program which everyone agrees is right and proper. Our research and extension service has created millions of dollars of new wealth for Ameirca. There is no argument about farm research—it has meant more plentiful food for all, and more income for farmers. And everyone is for a soil-conservation program for that is safeguarding the natural resources that are the very foundation of America. There is no controversy here.

What we are talking about is the wrong kind of farm price support programs—programs which affect only 23 percent of our total farm income. These wartime price support programs served a useful purpose during wartime but are as out of place today as ration coupons.

There are many false ideas about farm price laws—ideas which have been repeated so often they're accepted as economic truth. Mr. Secretary, will you enumerate these false ideas which must be emphasized again if we are to think clearly on this farm problem.

The Secretary. False idea No. 1 is that farm price support legislation has made farmers prosperous. That is not true. Cannot be true. Farm prices were actually higher in the first year of the great depression than they were in 1939—7 long years after legislators had thrown every law in the book at the farm problem trying to raise farm prices. In 1939—7 years later, remember—farm prices were only 77 percent of parity. Farm prices didn't start going up until 1940.

The Vice President. And it was war and inflation—not farm laws—which caused farm prices to go up. War, and inflation that comes with war caused all prices to go up; but go on, Mr. Secretary.

The Secretary. False idea No. 2 is this: Price supported crops are higher than those that are not supported. Actually the reverse is true. Farm products not supported by Government have sold for higher prices on an average than those that were supported.

Take hogs for example. Two years ago hok prices declined sharply. There was some demand at that time that the Government step in and support hog prices. But this was not done. So what happened? Very promptly farmers reduced hog numbers, and just as promptly hog prices started moving up again. Today hogs are selling at well above parity, and the Government didn't have a thing to do with it except the Government stayed out of the hog business. The farmers did their own adjustinpg.

False idea No. 3 is that supporting the prices of a few commodities helps stabilize all agricultural income. That is not true. The basic farm commodities under price support are only 23 percent of the national farm income, and that is sort of expecting the tail to wag a big dog. Another thing: A big share of these so-called basic commodities are cotton and tobacco—not food. Isn't it sort of silly to claim that supporting the price of cotton helps stabilize the price of pork chops? Or that tobacco affects the price of watermelons?

False idea No. 4 and one that has been giving much emphasis is that "Farm Legislation can guarantee farmers a fair share of the national income." And that is, of course, untrue.

The Vice President. Ladies and gentleman, I would not be honest with you unless I stressed this fact. Farm legislation alone cannot guarantee farmers a fair share of the national income. I'm sure Secretary Benson and I both agree our farmers can do far more for themselves than the Government can ever do for them. But this is true. Farmers and city people prosper together. Farmers are prosperous when the Nation is prosperous. Records of the past 150 years show this is true. And as President Eisenhower has said many times: This administration is pledged to do all in its power to insure the continued prosperity of this country on a sound basis.

The Secretary. Mr. Vice President, in talking with farm folks, I've often heard them start their conversation with the phrase: "The thing that scares me," and they go on to say that what they want in a farm program is protection against such drastic price drops. At the same time, their very flexibility helps hold markets which rigid supports can destroy as we have seen.

The Vice President. Of course, Mr. Secretary, this is a rather unsettled world today. Some folks think we should have emergency stockpiles. I certainly agree on that and want to say that our reserves are already more than adequate to meet any emergency. And I'd say that the way to prepare yourself for an emergency is to be strong, to keep strong. What we propose is a farm program which actually puts our farmers in a stronger position to meet any emergency that arises.

After we've squarely faced the issue and stopped the avalanche of surplus—then, and only then, can we reasonably expect to liquidate our hoard of commodities. And these surpluses are not insoluble. Our nutritionists say that if every person in the United States ate as well as he should, our surpluses would disappear almost overnight. Isn't that a challenge to the imagination? Here we are, a country noted for our ability to sell anything. Should good food then be so hard to sell—when there is the need, and we have the money to buy?

The SECRETARY. And that brings up another thought to keep in mind. Our surpluses may be only temporary.

Our population experts predict that in another 10 or 15 years we'll need all our agricultural production. For the long pull certainly the future of agriculture is most bright.

The VICE PRESIDENT. So it is only in this interim period that we're faced with this surplus problem. My hope is that in trying to solve it, that we do not get ourselves in a straitjacket, all wound up in a maze of bureaucratic controls where the Government must come out on farms to tell farmers what they can raise and what they can sell. Or another danger * * * that we ride blindly on to an inevitable clash between town and country—something that would hurt agriculture for a long, long time.

Some Members of Congress have said: "Let's extend these high rigid supports, just 1 more year."

My friends, in all honesty I must say that we're in this mess because we've refused to face the facts. For the last few years we've been extending these high rigid supports for just 1 or 2 more years. But for the administration or the Congress to support continuance of a program which will pile up surpluses and result inevitably in the destruction of millions of dollars worth of food would be the height of irresponsibility.

The SECRETARY. I would like to say, Mr. Vice President, that many farmers have been led to believe that this administration is proposing sweeping changes which would cut farm income. That is not true. These proposals were developed for sound farmer-operated programs to safeguard agriculture without regimentation. A sound method for shifting patterns of production without loss of the basic protections to which agriculture is entitled. A program that would permit us to do the right thing at the right time.

In short, this is a moderate course—a system of flexible price supports which both Republicans and Democrats in Congress agreed was a good thing in 1948.

The VICE PRESIDENT. And how well I remember that, Mr. Secretary. The administration's farm program is based on the same principles as the bipartisan legislation of 1948-49—a program that both Democrats and Republicans endorsed in their political platforms. A program supported by every major farm organization in the country. A program approved by overwhelming majorities of both parties in Congress.

The SECRETARY. It is interesting, Mr. Vice President, that our very detailed studies of last year have developed the same basic conclusions reached by Congress 6 years ago. And now this whole question is again up to Congress. Actually, I believe we would have a better farm program, after January 1, with no new legislation at all, rather than with an extension of 90-percent supports. This, however, would strip farmers of some of the protections contained in the administration plan. We don't want that to happen. The farm surplus situation is too serious.

The VICE PRESIDENT. I agree with you completely, Mr. Secretary. It is so critical that we must deal with it now. And, in conclusion, I would like to repeat these few words from the President's recent report to the Nation. He said: "Many have told me that it would not be good politics to attempt solution of the farm problem during an election year. The sensible thing to do, I have been told over and over, was to close my eyes to the damage the present farm program does to our farmers and the rest of our people and do this job of correction next year.

"Now, I want to make this one point clear.

"In this matter I am completely unmoved by arguments as to what constitutes good or winning politics. And may I remark that though I have not been in this political business very long, I know that what is right for America is politically right."

Ladies and gentlemen, I believe we are fortunate that we have a President who has the courage to do this job now. Does the rest of America? I am confident that the answer given by the American people through their Representatives in Congress will be "Yes" and that the President's program will be approved.

Salute to New England

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1954

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article from the current issue of the Iron Age.

The recognized importance of New England's metal-working firms to the United States economy recently compelled editors of the Iron Age to take a close look at the many advantages that attend the location of a new plant in the New England States. The results of their findings are reported in the following special study, Salute to New England, which appears in the Iron Age, the national metalworking weekly:

New England is undergoing an industrial transition, with metalworking emerging as the backbone of the economy, according to the Iron Age, national metalworking weekly.

This is one of the major conclusions drawn from an extensive study of the six-State area by the publication. The study is to be published June 24.

Changes in the region's manufacturing employment have been dominated by contractions in soft goods (largely textiles) and more than offsetting expansion in metalworking (hard goods). This is especially true since 1947.

What keeps New England an eminently going concern is its 24,000 manufacturing plants—up 50 percent in number since 1939—its million and a half industrial workers, and its $4 billion manufacturing payroll.

With 2 percent of the country's area and 6 percent of its population, New England has nearly 10 percent of its manufacturing employment. In its vast complex of manufacturing activities metalworking is dominant, accounting for 44 percent of the region's total manufacturing employment.

At the end of the first quarter of 1954 metalworking employment stood at 640,300—about 3½ times the employment figure of New England's textile industries, for generations the area's economic mainstay.

And in 1954, for the first time in a century, a single segment of New England metalworking toppled textiles from its position as the region's largest single employer. In March employment of 182,000 in nonelectrical machinery led all manufacturing industries in the area.

A penetrating analysis of the area's research shows that New England's research facilities top the Nation. This is a vital asset to industry. But manufacturers are not yet taking full advantage of available research facilities outside their own companies. And their own research should be raised to improve their competitive position.

In response to a survey by the Iron Age, New England machine-tool builders overwhelmingly testified that the area is a good location for their plants. Over 75 percent of them have recently achieved new tool developments, and over 65 percent have diversified their business by manufacturing something other than machine tools. Freight advantage of producers in other areas is not a serious problem with most New England machine tool builders. Reason most often given is quality of their products resulting from high skills of labor.

The most precious resource of New England is its people. The skills of generations have built a reputation for quality goods. And the skillful, well educated, stable workforce is today the area's strongest lure for industry.

About 13 percent of the resources of all United States financial institutions are in New England. In addition the area has pioneered in State and community development corporations, which have boosted industry expansion.

Special opportunities for industry are to be found in electronics, electrical machinery, medical equipment, special machinery, instruments, chemicals, plastics, cement, paper.

Heart of the Nation's brass mill industry is still in the Naugatuck Valley where it started in 1802. About 42 percent of United States brass-mill production takes place in New England plants.

Statistics in the study verify New England's industrial leadership and high standard of living. They show that New Englanders depend more heavily on manufacturing, that they earn more, spent more and save more than the average of all Americans.

New all-time records are being set in contract construction, indicating present growth and faith in the future of New England.

What's Happened to Independence Day?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD H. REES

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1954

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under permission approved by the House, I am including an interesting editorial entitled "What's Happened to Independence Day?" This editorial is written by a distinguished American, a well-known author, and editorial writer, William L. White. He is editor of the Emporia (Kans.) Gazette. I am pleased to submit this editorial which, in my judgment, contains material that is food for thought, especially at a time when consideration is being given to the celebration or commemoration of Independence Day:

What was Washington's army like? I could not have seen it. But I can quote someone who did.

The year was 1924, the Fourth of July, and the little old lady sitting with me on the porch of her home in Emporia, Kans., was my grandmother, then in her middle 90's, and living largely in her past, rather than with us in the comfortable Coolidge administration.

A firecracker down the block reminded her that in her childhood there had been none, nor even any Fourth of July picnics. Instead, all gathered on the green of her New York State village in their Sunday best, the little girls in starched white, to hear the Declaration read by one of the old soldiers, in his cracked, reedy voice. But when she was about 10 years old, the last of them died.

After that, the Declaration was read by one of the younger veterans of that second war.

Now, this was confusing. An old soldier to me was a Civil War veteran. Even in 1924, a few of them, then in their upper 70's, had ridden that morning in carefully polished sedans at the head of our Emporia Fourth of July parade.

Yet, their war (I knew) had been fought when my grandmother (born in 1830) was a grown woman. When she was a child, most of our old soldiers were yet unborn. So——

"Which old soldiers were they, Grandmother, when you were 10 years old?"

My grandmother never had thought I was very bright. Now she looked at me sharply.

"Why, the men who had fought under General Washington—who else? And from the way they read the Declaration, we could see that they were still angry at the things King George had done, and wanted us, in our time, to understand why they had to take up arms against him. Then, when the reading was finished, one of the younger veterans from that second war (this could only be 1812: The Mexican War was yet unfought) would touch tinder to the cannon. And we children would always stop up our ears for the terrible noise it made. But in those times, we had no firecrackers. They came much later."

Nor in 1840, when Grandmother was 10, did they have any Fourth of July traffic jams, nor any toll of holiday drownings at beaches. Yet, they had something which is missing today. They could hear George Washington's men recite, with great earnestness, that document which had sent them forth with muskets to make us free. Bunker Hill, Valley Forge, and Yorktown were, in my grandmother's childhood, no farther back in time than are Manila Bay and San Juan Hill from today's children. Small wonder that she always respectfully called it Independence Day and never the Fourth of July. Would you call Christmas the Twenty-fifth of December?

In losing her respect, we may have lost much else. Take even that Declaration that they reverently read—pick it up out of the swamp of sun-tan lotion, holiday hot dogs, and hamburger catsup into which we have let it sink. Here is prose from the pen of Thomas Jefferson, as edited by Franklin and Adams—measured words which, in stately beauty, are worthy to rank with the Apostles' Creed. Here are noble English plus high reasoning, fused by the heat of stern times into a litany of freedom.

Time was when, if a schoolboy knew those words by heart, it was held to be all the sociology he needed. They still say more, and say it with far more beauty, than shelves of texts on government. Yet, of today's schoolboys, how many can repeat even all of its opening sentence?

Likewise with our flag. All those old veterans of General Washington's Army had been born under another, and had then watched the birth of their own. They remembered when their own Continental Congress had first designed it; when some Philadelphia woman had stitched up the first true copy of it; they had then fought behind it, and, now that they could live in freedom under it, they handled it, on Independence Day, with more loving pride than had it been gold brocade.

In those days, there was no American home, however humble, that could not scrape together the silver and coppers to buy a flag to fly on Independence Day. How many flags will you see, draped across the picture windows of today's modern homes on our Fourth of July? And, if the old flag is now a little out of style, what does this mean?

Aren't we losing something?. For any faith (either in religion or in freedom) can endure only so long as it honors its martyrs, respects its symbols, and remembers its creed. Small wonder that those who would destroy our freedom begin by mocking its symbols and creed as "flag-waving Fourth of July oratory." Yet, if we heed that mockery, forget our past, and dishonor that litany of freedom which meant so much (as my grandmother remembered) to General Washington's earnest veterans, what can America hope to become, other than a formless mob, shambling listlessly after pleasure on what was once honored as "Independence Day?"

For the men who fought under that earliest general (who now looks out at us from Gilbert Stuart's portrait—keen-eyed, stern of jaw, and firm of mouth), the Declaration was freedom's holy litany, and Independence Day as solemn a time as Good Friday or Easter.

Dare we let them mean less?

Our National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1954

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under consent to revise and extend my remarks, I wish to present herewith an address by Adm. Arthur Radford, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, before the national convention of the American Red Cross, Los Angeles, Calif., on June 16, 1954. I have read this speech with interest and feel it will be similarly read by all:

COLLECTIVE ACTION IN ASIA

(Address by Adm. Arthur Radford, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff)

Mr. Harriman, members and friends of the American Red Cross, it warms my heart to come before this assembly, and thank you in person for your splendid contribution on behalf of the welfare of our Armed Forces. Undoubtedly, one of the major contributions to our Armed Forces welfare, both in World War II and since, has been that of the Red Cross.

As you realize, a military commander always is sensitive to the well-being of his command. That is part of his business and he lives with it. For many years now, and in particular for the past 12 years, I have been trying to thank the American Red Cross, and to tell them how grateful I am for their work with the soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines in my commands.

Unfortunately, the mere expression of thanks cannot convey all the depth and meaning I intend. I am confident that this feeling of gratitude is one which I share with many fellow countrymen. The Red Cross has done much for the good of the Armed Forces and for the good of the country.

At the Government rally in February for this year's Red Cross campaign, I said: "This is a reflection of one of America's strongest traditions * * * the tradition of community teamwork." I say it again here because tonight I would like to emphasize the importance of teamwork and collective action in our national-security affairs.

Teamwork is essential. Among freemen it should be a universal rule of conduct. It has never been more important than it is today. I hope that we will always work for it and endeavor to achieve it to a greater and greater degree.

So grave are today's events, however, that all of us should strive to understand them and, if possible, determine their significance for our national security, our freedom, and our future life. Are the borders of free nations fortified with determination and resolution, or can those borders be erased by the floodwaters of an international despotism which wash in upon us to submerge whole countries at a time?

COMMUNIST MENACE

At the beginning of this year President Eisenhower warned in his state of the Union message that "American freedom is threatened so long as the world Communist conspiracy exists in its present scope, power, and hostility."

Today the threat seems even more intense. There is no need to deal in vagaries and ambiguities about it. In essence we are confronted with the diabolical enmity of international communism, supported by the power position of the men in the Kremlin.

In certain respects, the Soviet leaders enjoy a competitive advantage. For example, through repression they can speak with a single voice. They can control natural resources, mobilize manpower, adjust finances, and promote conspiracy. Within wide limits, they can marshal great amounts of political and psychological pressure, or great military power, by squeezing it out of the masses under their domination.

In addition, they can continue to create situations which pose to us courses of actions, all of which are unpleasant, or which have definite disadvantages for us. They are expert at creating and exploiting issues and conducting cold war. The threat is not a short-term threat, nor is it exclusively a military threat.

The military aspects of the Communist threat are the most easily recognized and the most accessible. We know that the Soviets have military strength, great natural resources, and a powerful industry. We know that the Red forces are aggressive and that they can attack in any direction. They can and do conduct aggression by proxy—as in Greece and in Korea—utilizing the forces of some satellite suffering Soviet domination. And, what is of grave concern to all, the Soviets now have nuclear and thermonuclear devices.

But the other Communists threats to peace and freedom are not always so easily recognized, nor so readily understood. These are the sinister and devious operations in the political, economic, scientific, psychological, and spiritual fields of human endeavor. In many ways, these other threats are the more dangerous. They are war by means of diplomacy, money, ideas, sabotage, subversion, and politics.

Within the short space of 15 years, communism has amassed under its control five times its population prior to World War II, and millions of square miles of land complete with resources. Whole countries have been dragged behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains.

There is a lesson for us here. The lesson is this: In a world menaced by power-hungry aggressors, there are certain positions and issues which free nations must show themselves willing to defend with firm measures; diplomatic measures where possible, and military measures if necessary when all others have failed.

ASIA

At this moment, the immediate target of Communist aggressor forces is Asia. Specifically it is southeast Asia, but their objective encompasses the whole of the Far East. The fight is now in Indochina. Who is there to say that it will not be in Thailand next—and then perhaps in some other country?

Asia is much more than an area of faraway places with strange sounding names. It is the world's greatest land mass, and the world's greatest congestion of population. Potentially, it is the world's greatest source of raw materials. Unfortunately, it is currently the world's most explosive area.

In Asia, as elsewhere, Communists are operating according to their worldwide scheme of international imperialism and the colonialism which it embodies. First, there was intrigue, subversion, and infiltration. Then there were the Red Chinese forces attacking their Chinese brothers of Nationalist China. Next, there were the North Korean forces invading and attacking their Asiatic brothers in South Korea. Now there are the Red-controlled Viet Minh forces of Ho Chi Minh, aided and abetted by Red China's support, attacking to seize and dominate the states of Laos, Cambodia, and Vietnam. The pattern is: Aggression on the installment plan.

Red China obviously is empire-bound, seeking not so much an Asia for Asiatics as they claim, but seeking instead what might be called a Red Asia for Asiatic Reds. They want all of Asia incorporated into a Red Asia, one that is a basic part of the long-term Communist dream of one big Red world.

Southeast Asia has significant military and strategic importance. It has naval and air bases. It is both a source of raw materials and an important market. It is astride the best sea and air routes between the Pacific and south Asia, and it is the gateway to south Asia and Indonesia.

In my view, Communist control of southeast Asia would constitute a security threat to India, Australia and New Zealand, the Philippines, Japan and indeed to the entire western Pacific area, including the offshore island chain from Japan on the north through Indonesia on the south. Its repercussions on situations in other parts of the world, including Europe, would be almost beyond calculation.

NATIONAL SECURITY PLANNING

Today's conflicts and strifes, of course, are not always military. Communists are adept at waging war with words of diplomacy, with economics of production and resources; and with attacks on our social, educational, industrial and spiritual institutions. To counter them all, it is difficult at best to know which actions should be adopted, and when they should be taken.

The key to all our military planning is found in our national policy. Under our system of government, the national policy decisions are made by the civilian heads of our Government. This is wise and as it should be. It is traditional and in keeping with what Presdent Eisenhower has referred to as "the necessary and wise subordination of the military to civil power."

Basically, national policy is determined and set forth by the President and his National Security Council. It is the function of the Joint Chiefs of Staff to advise the President, the National Security Council and the Secretary of Defense on military matters. Accordingly, the Joint Chiefs of Staff develop and recommend the military strategy, and the military implementing actions necessary to carry out national policy.

In other words, the country looks to the Joint Chiefs of Staff to see that the military plans of the United States are prepared to meet the challenge of an enemy. These plans must provide for the coordinated action by each of our armed services, and take advantage of the capabilities of them all. While such plans are based primarily on military factors, they must also take into account a wide range of political and economic factors and must consider the most advanced developments in modern science.

We have seen mankind wring from science some amazing technological advances. We have witnessed generations of scientific developments compressed into something less than a decade. As a result, the age-old military barriers of time and space, and oceans, and ice-caps, have been wiped out in many respects.

Accordingly, all nations live in a smaller world by the scales of time and distance. They are more vulnerable to their enemies, and more accessible to their friends. Yet, the world seems further apart in social and political concepts than ever. It is most unfortunate that divergences and conflicts between nations have not been reduced materially.

It is true that today we live in a nuclear age. This too has special meaning. It means the evolution of atomic plenty and mammoth destructive power, and it also means the evolution of atomic power for peace. Either way, and both ways, it staggers one's imagination. It must be taken into account in our national security planning.

It is my personal belief that developments in the nuclear field can be a great power for the good of mankind if the peoples of the world so will it. Nuclear power can be the servant of man, and a service to peoples everywhere. Given half a chance, it can be used to protect life, instead of just destroying it.

COLLECTIVE ACTION

Under present-day circumstances, with the advent of this nuclear power, with aircraft faster than sound, and in the face of continuous Communist encroachments upon other nations, the situation is theateningly serious. The stakes are high. Shall mankind be free, or shall he be enslaved?

A problem having thus been stated, you have the right to ask for a solution. Actually, indicated in my opening remarks my own recommendation: namely, teamwork—a greater amount of effective teamwork and resolute collective action. Collectively, we can make this a better world in which to live.

By pooling our resources—material, human, and moral—we present a united front. While there must be certain enlightened limitations on the extent to which any nation contributes material and human resources, there are no limitations on the etxent of its moral contribution. Regardless of a nation's size, each should be expected to contribute to collective action against an aggressor, 100 percent of its moral strength.

Of course, free nations can be, and often are, diverse in their approach to today's tight, tense world problems. Not all of us view the world in the same light, or through the same eyes. We speak with multiple and varied voices in formulating our opposition to communism. This makes it possible for Communists to continue their efforts to create disunity, and thereby to attempt to weaken us.

Even so, the free nations are bound together by common ideals and objectives. For example, all of us are concerned with the protection and preservation of freedom. Thus, we have a common purpose: to meet a common threat of annihilation. Whether we realize it or not, the national security problems of one are the concern of all. Together, we face a dictatorship which has no time limit for the accomplishment of its objectives, and which needs no logic or reason or moral purpose to guide its actions. Thus, the need for collective cooperation should be apparent.

Traditionally, the United States has rejected the role of an aggressor. Characteristically, our military organization is called the Department of Defense, not a department of aggression, not even a department of war. And within the framework of freedom, our military purpose is not to wage war, but rather it is to deter aggression and to prevent war. When we talk about war, we do so because we hate it, and do not want it. What we really want is peace and security; and our effort for peace and our effort for defense are mutually complementary.

Basically, all free nations share this same purpose. As has been stated by our Secretary of State, national security will not be achieved in isolation. Militarily, most free nations recognize this. Security can best acquired by steady cooperation, one with the other, each group with its neighbors.

This requires a common devotion to the principles of a free system. It requires a common determination to cooperate unreservedly in working for it. Knowing that a self-imposed military inferiority is an invitation to aggression, it requires us to collectively maintain our military strength indefinitely over the long-term future. We must keep our determination and our resolution to have that strength which is able to counter effectively against any aggression.

Perhaps you have noted the emphasis I give to the qualities among nations of "determination" and "resolution." These two ingredients are manifestly essential to a successful and secure community. Yet you cannot buy them on the open market, or serve them on a silver tray. Instead, these qualities must come from within the hearts and minds of peoples themselves.

Up to a certain point, every nation has certain choices in the actions which it can use to preserve its way of life. Demosthenes spoke of this three centuries before Christ. It was 348 B. C. and Philip of Macedon had just seized and destroyed the city-state of Olynthus as part of his plan for the domination of Greece, when Demosthenes said:

"It is shameful to say afterwards, 'Who would have thought that this could happen? We really ought to have done this or that, and not done the other.' The people of Olynthus could mention plenty of things today which if they had foreseen in the past, would have saved them from destruction. So could all the other peoples who have been eliminated. But what is the use? While the boat is undamaged, then is the time for sailor and helmsman and all on board to show unceasing vigilance and prevent anyone from upsetting it, either purposely or accidentally. But when the sea has overwhelmed it, all effort is in vain."

This seems like good advice. Who would have thought that in the short space of 15 years, Central Europe would be divided, China would have become Communist, and Red forces would invade the Republic of Korea, and now Laos and Cambodia? Where will the floodwaters of Communist colonialism be stopped? We can, and undoubtedly shall, hope for the best; but at the same time, we must keep ourselves prepared for something much less—perhaps for even the worst.

Certainly this is not the time for free nations to do nothing. Nor should we go jogging along, just hoping for something better to turn up. It is true that the negative always seems an easier path, since it holds that nothing should be done. But difficulties sometimes will fade away when confronted with positive action.

As for the perils which now confront free Asian and southwest Pacific nations, their military situation could be improved materially by an effective southeast Asia collective security arrangement. Positive collective actions by countries which have vital interests in that area would help prevent further Communist empire building in that part of the world. Such actions would help pave the way for building that peaceful world which is the aim of free societies everywhere.

United States foreign policy is determined by the recognized national authorities on foreign policy. These authorities have stated and restated that a Communist southeast Asia would be a grave threat to many; that it should not be passively accepted, but met by unity of will and, if need be, unity of action. Whatever policy our Nation's recognized authorities announce, the military will support, as always.

Today, "the ramparts we watch" encircle the globe in the form of treaties and mutual defense arrangements. By these arrangements, free nations demonstrate their global concern for their vital interests, and the conclusiveness with which the issue between tyranny and freedom has at last been joined.

We shall not find the pathways to peace by retreating from danger. Danger must be faced boldly, courageously and unitedly before it explodes into a world conflagration. Resolute collective action and determined teamwork can bring us through our present perils. With such teamwork and eternal vigilance, our way of life, our standard of living and hopes for the future can surely continue strong, free, and unafraid.

Reserve Board Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 24, 1954

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I believe the following editorial which appeared in the June 23, 1954, issue of the New York Times should be of interest to our colleagues and especially to the members of the Banking and Currency Committee:

RESERVE BOARD POLICY

The Federal Reserve Board has just taken a fresh step to implement its stated policy of maintaining a condition of "active-ease" in the money market. It has announced a general reduction in the percentages of reserves that member banks of the system must maintain against their demand and time deposits. The schedule, which will go into effect gradually, calls for these changes in requirements against demand deposits: New York and Chicago banks from 22 percent to 20 percent; Reserve city banks (banks in most other large cities) 19 percent to 18 percent, and country banks (noncity member banks) from 13 percent to 12 percent. In the case of time deposits the proposed reduction, from 6 percent to 5 percent, is uniform for all banks.

It is estimated that the Reserve Board's action will have the effect of releasing some $1,555,000,000 in cash reserve. This increase in reserve is sufficient, it is further estimated, to provide for a potential $9 billion expansion of loans and investments "as the economy enters the season of rising credit needs." Among the demands facing the money market in the second half of the year will be Treasury borrowing amounting to about $10 billions. In addition, this is the time of year when private concerns and individuals also step up their borrowing to finance the marketing of crops and to build up inventories in preparation for the fall and holiday trade.

There are two questions that the inquiring reader might be inclined to ask about this latest move on the part of the Reserve Board. One of these is: Since the same result (increasing bank reserves) could be achieved by the use of open market operations (the purchase by the Reserve of Government securities) why did it elect the method it used? The other is: Why the differential of 1 percent between the reduction in required reserves for New York and Chicago banks as against the other banks?

The Reserve Board, of course, doesn't volunteer an explanation, except in the broadest terms, for the nature and timing of its actions. There are certain negative reasons, however, that suggest themselves in answer to the first question. One is that, with Reserve holdings of Governments already of a general magnitude of $25 billions, the Reserve might wish to avoid adding unnecessarily to its portfolio. As for the narrowing of the spread between the Chicago-New York bank requirements and that of other member banks, this, one suspects, is evidence of a facing up to the fact that great changes have occurred in the Nation's banking structure over the years.

The New York and Chicago banks, arbitrarily classified as central reserve city banks in the Reserve Act, have always been compelled to maintain higher reserves than banks in other cities on the theory that they were the repositories of the bulk of the surplus funds of out-of-town banks. It seems fair to assume that the present Reserve authorities, who narrowed this differential a year ago from 4 percentage points to 3 and have now reduced it to 2, are giving recognition at last to what has long been an obvious discrimination against the New York and Chicago banks. If that assumption is true, one can only say that it is greatly to their credit.

Military Construction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 7, 1954

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend and revise my remarks, I present a carefully prepared letter from Maj. Gen. S. D. Sturgis, Jr., Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army. This letter has special reference to certain functions handled by the Army engineers for another branch of the Department of Defense, and I think it should be read by every Member of Congress. The letter is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF ENGINEERS,
Washington, June 25, 1954.

HON. OVERTON BROOKS,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. BROOKS: I have just read the testimony given at hearings before the Committee on Armed Services, House of Representatives, 83d Congress, 2d session, on H. R. 8726, "A bill to authorize certain construction in military and naval installations, and for other purposes."

Pages 4437 through 4442 thereof contain a discussion between members of the committee and Maj. Gen. Lee B. Washbourne, representing the Department of the Air Force, on the Government costs incurred by the Corps of Engineers as the major construction agent in the prosecution of the Department of the Air Force public-works program.

I feel that it is extremely important for you, a long-time supporter and stanch friend of the Corps of Engineers, to be given the facts in the matter of Government costs.

I am particularly disturbed over the possibility that some of the members may not have been afforded a completely clear understanding of the answers to that part of the questioning which was based on the presumption that the Corps of Engineers charged the Air Force some percentage of cost for doing work for the Air Force. This presumption, as you know, is completely in error. The Corps of Engineers does not charge the Air Force a penny for doing Air Force construction, or for buying Air Force real estate. On the contrary, the Air Force receives tremendous benefits and economies from the services made available to it by the Department of the Army, both at departmental level and in the field. The Department of the Army budgets for its departmental organization, for the pay of the Army, and for the management and direction of the Air Force's design and construction provided under the common-servicing principle by the Department of the Army and the Office of the Chief of Engineers in Washington. This is not to say that these services are free of "cost," for obviously there is cost; but they are free of "charge" against the Air Force, because the Department of Defense, following the mandate of the Congress in the Unification Act, has assigned the responsibility for providing these supporting functions, among others, to the Department of the Army and the Corps of Engineers. These responsibilities, therefore, are legally part and parcel of our mission to the same extent as any other job assigned to the Corps of Engineers.

The situation is different with respect to the actual projects in the field, where the work is done under the cross-servicing principle; but here again there still is no fee charged against the Air Force for design and construction of a project or for the procurement of real estate. With the exception of the pay of the officers in charge of construction, which is paid from appropriations for the pay of the Army, the Air Force budgets for their projects and provides the money with which we accomplish them. Certainly it costs to do these things, but we do not charge a fee for our services. The procedure, in effect, is this: The Air Force says to us, "We want certain facilities in a certain place at a certain time; here is the money; under the law and the regulations of the Department of Defense, the Corps of Engineers is responsible for doing this for us upon request; it is your job."

When we receive such a directive from the Air Force, it then becomes my responsibility to provide what the Air Force has ordered, with the same dispatch and economy as anything ordered by the Department of the Army or any department of our Government to which the services of the Corps of Engineers have been or might be made available. Adverting to a remark on page 4441 of the record of the hearings, the Corps of Engineers does not "use another man's money a little more freely than their own." We have no money of our own. All of the moneys made available to us are public funds, regardless of the agency which defended the requirements before the Congress, and it is my purpose now, as it has been the purpose of each of my predecessors throughout the 179 years of the Corps of Engineers' dedication to the public service, to expend these funds judiciously.

In the light of the foregoing, I am particularly distressed to observe the questioning on that same page 4441, which leaves the impression that the Corps of Engineers receives a 6-percent fee on the acquisition cost of land and therefore would have no interest in what the land cost; and on page 4438, where it is implied that the Corps of Engineers takes money as reimbursement, or as an indirect appropriation, out of Air Force funds. It is only fair, I believe you will agree, to admit that construction costs money; but to ascribe wrong to an action merely because it is based on national policy which is different from tradition, in the absence of other reason, is not supportable. The very point of reimbursement for divided utilization of individuals which was pressed in the questioning, illustrates one type of situation which is a basis of savings, that is, the use of the limited numbers of specialists available, on more than one program. As you know, it is fundamental with the Corps of Engineers to utilize by transfer, reassignment and division of duties, the services of all of our responsible people so that the greatest benefits to the Government may be derived without duplication of organizations.

For your convenience I have had the following summary prepared which will permit a comparison of the costs of performing Air Force projects with the costs of performing all military construction work completed by the Corps of Engineers in the Continental United States during fiscal year 1953:

Item	Air Force only	All military projects
	Percent	*Percent*
Engineering	1.8	1.6
Supervision and inspection	1.5	1.7
Overhead	2.0	2.0
Subtotal	5.3	5.3
Architect-engineer contracts:		
Title I	.6	.9
Title II	.1	.4
Total	6.0	6.6

Again, for emphasis, these are not fees charged, but costs of doing the work. This summary shows that the 6-percent figure for Air Force projects is less than the figure for all military-construction projects performed by the Corps of Engineers. The summary also shows that the costs which we incur in administering construction contracts are not limited to those which are commonly called burden or overhead. The greater portion is required by the engineering work which is necessary in designing the jobs according to the requirements of the using agency, and the supervisory and inspection work which is necessary to make sure that the contractor adheres to the plans and specifications. These are things that are a definite part of the construction costs even though they may be incurred by our own forces rather than a contractor. This leaves an extremely small percentage of 2 percent for overhead costs, which you will understand naturally fluctuates depending upon the volume of work. I am constantly seeking every feasible means and exerting every reasonable pressure to reduce overhead costs even further.

I inclose a copy of a recent letter from Mr. John M. Ferry, Special Assistant for Installations to the Secretary of the Air Force, which indicates Air Force understanding and accord on the engineering costs for Air Force construction reflected in the foregoing figures.

The record of the hearings also contains references to the possibility of the Air Force being authorized to perform its own engineering and construction. It is understandable that the Department of the Air Force might wish to direct and supervise its own construction. However, the disadvantages to the Department of Defense and to the Nation as a whole would far outweigh any selfish advantages to be derived from such a scheme. The principles of common servicing and cross servicing, which are based on the national policy, are applied by the Department of Defense in many areas. For example, the Tactical Air Command, as one of the major commands of the United States Air Force, furnishes tactical support to Army ground units, just as the Department of the Army with its Corps of Engineers furnishes construction support to the Air Force, not only building airbases but all the installations on the line of communications from the ports to the forward airbases and Army frontline units. Surely, it is unthinkable that there be 2 separate construction forces to build 2 pipelines, 1 for the Air Force and 1 for the Army, 2 railroad systems, 2 road nets, 2 ration depots, and the like. As you no doubt are aware, the very creation of a separate Air Force was based on the consideration that there would not be such logistic duplication, exorbitantly and needlessly adding to cost and to demand for our limited engineering skills and manpower.

The Department of the Army and the Corps of Engineers have wholeheartedly and unwaveringly supported the principles of common and cross servicing since their inception, and will continue to support them in the interest of the Nations economy.

The foregoing information is made available to you for such use as you may desire. Knowing your long support of unification of the Armed Forces, I feel confident that you will accept this letter in the spirit in which it is written.

Sincerely,

S. D. Sturgis, Jr.,
Major General, USA,
Chief of Engineers.

Interference in Western Hemisphere Affairs by the Soviet Communists

SPEECH

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1954

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I have some observations to make on this resolution from the background of some boyhood years spent in Central America. I was a schoolboy in a public school in Nicaragua when Great Britain had given some offense to the dignity of Nicaragua and my schoolmates joined in gatherings of older Nicaraguans clamoring for war with Great Britain.

Once an American gunboat had bombarded this Nicaraguan port on the Caribbean and I was shown by my Nicaraguan schoolmates an old unexploded shell that remained from that bombardment. As a boy I conversed with a member of a distinguished Nicaraguan family who as a youth had served in the Nicaraguan army of liberation under Gen. William Walker, who had come to Nicaragua at a time when great financial interests in the United States were dealing unfairly with the Nicaraguan Government in payments for the privilege of conducting a profitable interoceanic trade through the San Juan River from the east coast to the promising gold fields of California.

It was at a time in the late years of the old century that serious trouble had developed between the United States of America and Great Britain over Britain's claim to sovereignty over the eastern coast of Nicaragua. In that crisis my father had been sent to Nicaragua as the personal representative of President Grover Cleveland. As a boy I accompanied him. At the time Great Britain was maintaining in royal style in Jamaica King Clarence, reigning sovereign of the Carib Indians. Britains claimed that the Carib Indians had rightful claim to the entire eastern coast of Nicaragua.

When Britain sought to exercise its claim of sovereignty through a proclamation issued in the name of Great Britain by the Vice Consul at Bluefields, Nicaragua, a gentleman named Hatch, Nicaragua responded by arresting British Vice Consul Hatch and sending him in handcuffs to trial at Managua. Great Britain's response was the sending of warships to Bluefields and a threatened bombardment. It was then that President Grover Cleveland intervened, and war with Great Britain was threatened. At about this time also was the matter of Britain's claim, which she refused to permit to go to arbitration, to certain parts of Venezuela.

Later there was dispute between Nicaragua and Costa Rica over the boundary lines, and President Cleveland, on request of those Republics, dispatched as the arbiter General Alexander, who had commanded the Confederate artillery at Gettysburg. Among the treasures of my memories are the recollection of my experience as a boy privileged to accompany General Alexander, then in my boyish eyes so recently after the Civil War an outstanding heroic figure, in survey of the territory in dispute between Nicaragua and Costa Rica.

All of this was many years ago. General Zelaya then was President of Nicaragua. The Sacasa family was then as now a prominent family in Nicaragua, and one of its distinguished members was the head of a household at San Juan del Norte. I have said that this was long ago, but the family lines and the traditional sentiments I doubt have changed.

There was then a general feeling among Nicaraguan people that the United States was a big neighbor with a big stick. There was some justification for this feeling. For instance, there was the mahogany concession which had been extracted in some manner and over which a gentleman, as I recall his name now, Baker, and I am talking only from memory of many years ago, and under which there was cut down by natives and carried away the richness of the mahogany growths of the eastern coast of Nicaragua. Later, and when I had grown to the estates of manhood and was far removed in years from those earlier scenes of my boyhood as a pupil in a public school in the free port of San Juan del Norte, our country pursued a policy of dollar diplomacy.

Then came President Franklin D. Roosevelt. Of all the great services that President Franklin D. Roosevelt rendered to his country and to the world none was of greater value than the building of true hemispheric solidarity. The United States of America, under his inspiration, ceased to be the big neighbor with the big stick. Instead it became in the hearts and minds of the people of Latin America the big neighbor with the big and understanding heart. The scars of past eras were effaced. Real and enduring hemispheric solidarity was attained.

Mr. Speaker, that solidarity is essential to our security. I do not know, nor does anyone in this Chamber, what the future may have in store in dangers arising in other parts of the world, but as long as the Americas present a united front there are no dangers that we cannot meet with positive assurance of our safety.

Once this solidarity is weakened, or exists only in the pretense and not in the spirit, our security is jeopardized and our future is uncertain.

The people in the smaller Republics are as humanly sensitive as the people in our own country. We have no right in the United States to interfere in the domestic affairs of any foreign country, and especially is it the part of folly to do anything which will occasion the thought in the smaller American Republics that we are attempting to dictate to them in matters which concern them exclusively as nationals of those Republics. In my committee, Banking and Currency, I argued against a provision in certain proposed legislation that would have given to the United States of America the responsibility of guaranteeing the stability of government in a sister Republic. To my mind that amounted to interference in the domestic affairs of a sister Republic.

I have read carefully the resolution that we are now considering. I am supporting it for a reason which I wish to make clear. If it were a resolution praising or condemning the government of a sister Republic I should have to consider whether that were within our rightful domain or whether it were a matter within the exclusive determination of the people of that nation. But this resolution covers something which is of concern not only to the United States of America but to every country and to every government on the American hemisphere. It is a re-affirmation of the Monroe Doctrine.

The Soviet Government has exercised its veto on the proposal to submit an American hemispheric question to the jurisdiction of a council of the States of the American hemisphere. In other words the Soviet Government is challenging the right of the states of the American hemisphere to settle problems that concern only the American hemisphere. The Soviet Government, in short, has challenged the Monroe Doctrine. To that challenge there can be but one response.

In December of 1895, when Great Britain in the matter of Venezuela had openly defied the Monroe Doctrine, President Grover Cleveland summoned the Congress of the United States into a special session. Great Britain then was Mistress of the Sea and in a sense ruled the world. Yet President Grover Cleveland said in his address to Congress that if Great Britain refused to recognize the Monroe Doctrine, and I quote his exact words:

> It will in my opinion be the duty of the United States to resist Great Britain by every means in its power as a willful aggression upon its rights and interests.

He continued:

> In making these recommendations I am fully alive to the responsibility incurred and keenly realize all the consequences that may follow.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me refer to the Monroe Doctrine as defined by President Monroe himself. I am quoting now the exact words of President Monroe defining the Monroe Doctrine as accepted by President Grover Cleveland at the risk of war with the then all powerful Great Britain:

> We owe it therefore to candor and to the amicable relations existing between the United States and those powers to declare that we should consider any attempt on their part to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety.

At the present time, Mr. Speaker, we are waging a cold war. It is a cold war between two ideologies. It is a cold war that has resulted in the loss of many precious American lives in Korea. I do not know that cold war is the proper term, but that is what it has been called. It is a conflict between two systems. Certainly it has been and is exactly that. Here let me again quote President Monroe:

> We should consider any attempt * * * to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety.

Mr. Speaker, there can be only one answer to the veto of the Soviet Government to a proposition to refer a problem exclusively in the jurisdiction of the American Republics under our time-honored Monroe Doctrine to a jury of the American states. I shall support this resolution with the reservation that by so doing I am not commiting myself, and I am certain that my colleagues do not intend so to commit themselves, to any interference of any sort or nature in the domestic affairs of a sister American Republic.

The Monroe Doctrine is an essential part of American foreign policy. Our position today is unchanged from that in the days of President Monroe and the later days of Grover Cleveland.

The GI Bill, Signed by President Franklin D. Roosevelt June 22, 1944, Left Lasting Imprint on the Lives of Millions of American Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1954

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, because of the controversy, which has arisen through the ill-advised action of some Republican politicians pressuring the Veterans' Administration to "doctor" one of its official press releases, I ask unanimous consent that the original press release involved in this matter be inserted in the RECORD. The Veterans' Administration, through its information service, had issued for release in Tuesday's newspapers, June 22, 1954, a statement regarding the 10th anniversary of the GI bill of rights. It very appropriately set out in that release that the GI bill of rights was signed into law by President Franklin D. Roosevelt on June 22, 1944. It contained excerpts from the statement made by President Roosevelt as he signed the bill in 1944.

Politics reached a new low when some Republican leaders, apparently feeling that all Government agencies should now be regarded as subsidiaries of the Republican National Committee, complained to the Veterans' Administration because it very properly used the name of President Roosevelt in its press release. This, of course, is another example of how the Republican Party would rewrite American history to suit their own political objectives.

However, facts cannot long lay hidden, and no amount of pressure from Republican politicians can change history or rewrite it to suit their own plans. It will always be a historic fact that the GI bill of rights—the first time veterans were so recognized by a grateful country—was enacted into law with bipartisan support during a Democratic national administration by a Democratic House of Representatives and Senate, and that it was signed into law by the great Democratic President, Franklin D. Roosevelt, 10 years ago on June 22, 1944.

Under leave to do so, I herewith include with my remarks the original press release issued by the Veterans' Administration:

> The GI bill, a law that has left its lasting imprint on the lives of millions of veterans and on America itself, reached its 10th anniversary today.
>
> The law, signed by President Franklin D. Roosevelt on June 22, 1944, contained three major benefits to help veterans in readjustment to civilian life.
>
> One was a program of guaranteed loans for homes, farms, and businesses. It still is in force. Another, education and training at Government expense, is approaching its end. The third, readjustment allowances for periods of unemployment already has faded into history.
>
> On signing the GI bill in 1944, the President said, "this law gives emphatic notice to the men and women of our Armed Forces that the American people do not intend to let them down."
>
> But veterans have not let down the American people either, according to statistics released today by the Veterans' Administration.
>
> Through the GI bill, World War II veterans have become the best educated group of people in the history of the United States.
>
> Because of their training, they have raised their income level to the point where they now are paying an extra billion dollars a year in income taxes to Uncle Sam.
>
> At this rate, GI bill-trained veterans alone will pay off the entire $15 billion cost of the GI education and training program within the next 15 years.
>
> Through the GI loan program, veterans have proved themselves to be among the best financial risks in the country.
>
> With the help of GI loans, they have become America's largest single group of home owners. Therefore, they pay more real-estate taxes to States, cities, and counties than any other group of equal size.
>
> During the past 10 years, a total of 3,600,000 veterans—1 out of every 5 men and women who served in World War II—obtained VA-guaranteed and insured loans valued at $23.5 billion.
>
> The United States Government stands behind $12 billion of the amount, in the form of VA guaranties and insurance.
>
> Home loans accounted for the 90 percent of all GI bill loans obtained by veterans—or 3,300,000 for $22.8 billion. Farm loans numbered 66,000 for $256,000,000; business loans, 213,000 for $575 million.

The average veteran used his GI loan to buy a substantial, middle-priced home—neither a crackerbox nor a mansion.

A recent VA survey disclosed that 60 percent of GI homebuyers paid between $10,000 and $15,000 for their homes. Thirty percent paid under $10,000; 8 percent, between $15,000 and $20,000; and 2 percent, over $20,000.

Veterans' record of repayment is unmatched, VA said.

Over the past decade, 650,000 GI loans, amounting to $3 billion, have been repaid in full.

Defaulted loans—on which VA has made good the guaranteed portions to private lenders—number only 32,000, or less than 1 percent of all loans received by veterans.

Turning to GI-bill education and training, VA revealed that more than 7,800,000 World War II veterans—half of all who served during the war—trained under the GI bill over the past 10 years.

Of the total, 2,200,000 attended colleges and universities; 3,500,000 went to schools below the college level; 1,400,000 took on-the-job training; and 700,000 enrolled in institutional on-farm training, a combination of classroom work and practical experience on the farm.

Included in the below-college total are 150,000 veterans who were given the chance to learn to read and write in accelerated grade-school classes for adults.

America's veterans have trained for nearly every occupation at which man earns his living. As a result, VA said, the GI bill has helped fill the Nation's reservoirs of trained manpower, dangerously depleted right after the war.

Among the veterans trained were 450,000 engineers, 180,000 doctors and nurses, 113,000 scientists, 243,000 accountants, 107,000 lawyers, 36,000 ministers representing all major religious faiths, 17,000 writers and journalists.

Also 438,000 television and radio repairmen, 711,000 mechanics, 383,000 construction workers, 288,000 metalworkers, 138,000 electricians, 83,000 barbers and beauty culturists, 83,000 policemen and firemen, 45,000 bakers and meatcutters, 61,000 printers and typesetters, 76,000 dressmakers and tailors, and hundreds of thousands of others in many fields.

The VA cited a number of studies indicating that the GI bill has helped raise both the educational and income levels of veterans, as well as those of the Nation.

According to a Census Bureau study, the average male veteran today has completed high school and has gone ahead for some college. On the other hand, the average male nonveteran, in the same age bracket, has been able to finish just a little more than 2 years of high school.

One reason for the difference in educational achievement, the Census Bureau states, "has been the advantage of educational privileges under the GI bill."

Another survey, also conducted by the Census Bureau, showed that in 1947 the median income of male veterans between 25 and 34 years of age was only $2,401. That same year, the median income of nonveterans in the same age group was higher—$2,585.

Six years later, the median income of veterans rose 51 percent, to $3,631. Nonveterans' income, over the same period, showed only a 19 percent increase to $3,065.

The Census Bureau said: "The higher incomes of these veterans may reflect the combined influence of the increase in work experience and the higher level of education which veterans have achieved as compared with nonveterans."

Attributing only part of the increased earnings of veterans to the GI bill, those who have had GI training will be paying approximately $1 billion more each year in Federal income tax. Or, within the next 15 years, they will have paid for the entire program.

VA recalled its experiences in administering the GI bill readjustment allowance program for unemployed veterans.

During the life of the program, VA said, nearly 9 million veterans drew allowances totaling $3.2 billion for unemployed and $600 million for self-employment, during periods when self-employed veterans were netting less than $100 a month.

Only 900,000 veterans, or 10 percent of the total, exhausted their full rights to this benefit.

The average veteran was on the readjustment allowance rolls for only 6 weeks.

VA files are filled with case histories of veterans who successfully make the leap from military to civilian life with the help of GI bill benefits.

In Stephens, Ark., Floyd T. Bryan, ex-Navy veteran, obtained a GI business loan from a bank so that he could buy a bank in a small community where oil had just been struck. Since that time, Bryan's bank has made loans to hundreds of other veterans. "They're the best business on my books," he says.

In Topeka, Kans., Douglas K. Counsellor, former Army Air Force corporal, used two GI bill benefits—on-the-job training and a business loan—to establish a successful auto fabric business. After completing his training, he decided to buy out the firm in which he had trained. He did so with a $4,000 GI business loan.

In New York City, an Army veteran, Floyd T. Gould, is now at work at Brookhaven National Laboratories, performing vital basic research in atomic energy.

Coming out of service in 1946, Gould tried working in a laundry; then selling soap from laundry to laundry; then studying typing so that he could try for a job as a clerk; then television repair. None of these was successful.

He came to the VA and applied for vocational counseling, in preparation for enrolling in training under the GI bill. Counseling tests and interviews revealed that Gould was excellent college material; furthermore, that he had a natural bent for science. So he entered college. He won his master's degree and is about to acquire his Ph. D., in atomic physics, with brilliant grades. Also, because of his scholastic record, he was able to obtain the important research post at Brookhaven.

VA said the 10-year-old GI bill has been a program for World War II veterans only. Its achievements belong entirely to America's generation of World War II veterans—now averaging the middle thirties, with memories of wartime years growing a little dimmer as each year goes by.

A new GI bill was enacted in 1952 for veterans on active duty after June 27, 1950, the date of the outbreak of hostilities in Korea. This law, too, provides benefits similar to those which were obtained in the original GI bill—education and training, GI loans, unemployment pay.

But it's too early to measure the accomplishments of this new GI bill, VA said. More time must elapse before its full impact on veterans, and on the Nation, can be evaluated.

Whose Tariff Barriers?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1954

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to insert in the Record an editorial from the Wisconsin State Journal, of Madison, Wis., under date of June 22, 1954. The Wisconsin State Journal is the official newspaper of our State.

The editorial follows:

WHOSE TARIFF BARRIERS?

To hear the talk in some quarters, you'd think that the United States is the only country mean enough to impose tariffs and duties on imports.

Trade not aid is a fine slogan, and we're all for it. Not all the barriers to an easy exchange of goods are on this side of the Atlantic, however, as many an American businessman knows.

And while United States industry has had something of a slump in the last year, both European production, and Europe's imports from this country, have taken a nosedive.

The reason isn't hard to find. American postwar aid has helped to modernize their factories (with which we could complete in an earlier day because of greater efficiency) to the point where their lower wage scales mean lower prices.

And most of the Western Europe nations have tightened their import control: by higher tariffs, special taxes, import quotas, or restrictions on money movement.

Few nations overseas, in fact, worry too much about promoting international trade through lower tariffs on items they produce in quantity.

For example, the United States import duty on foreign cars is 10 percent. Thousands of cars from England, France, Italy, and West Germany are sold here.

But Germany has a 30 percent duty on imported cars, plus a 6 percent tax. Italy charges 35 to 45 percent, depending upon horsepower.

In England, the government levies a 33 percent duty on the delivered price—and then slaps on a heavy sales tax to boot.

Reciprocal trade agreements, aimed at wider mutual trade benefits, have been a lively topic since the late Cordell Hull first promoted them in 1935.

Interest in them dropped after the war, when there was plenty of world market for everything America could turn out, even if we often furnished the money to pay for it.

Now, with competition abroad on the increase, Americans can hardly be blamed if they insist on getting a few breaks for their own exports before getting too generous on tariff cuts.

Editorials of Mutual Interest From the American Federationist

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1954

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following from the current issue of the American Federationist, by Mr. George Meany, president of the American Federation of Labor:

THE NO-RAIDING AGREEMENT

With the signing of the no-raiding agreement by 65 A. F. of L. unions and 29 CIO unions, having an aggregate membership of more than 10 million workers, the labor movement is returning to its basic traditions of peace, good will, and fraternity.

Let us remember that the ranks of labor were not always divided; that, in fact, the original purpose of the trade-union movement was to unite and solidify our forces so that labor's maximum strength could be exerted in forging ahead toward greater progress for American workers and greater strength for the Nation itself.

Thus, the no-raiding pact does not inaugurate a venture into new fields but is actually the first step away from the detour of disunity and back toward the main road of unity.

A civil war has been going on in organized labor for 18 years, since 1935. The no-raiding agreement is a cease-fire. It provides a truce period during which we hope it will be possible to negotiate in an atmosphere of peace the terms of an agreement that will merge the American Federation of Labor and the Congress of Industrial Organizations into a single, united labor movement.

The no-raiding pact represents a completely voluntary program. But its results are bound to prove so beneficial that undoubtedly a substantial number of unions which have not yet subscribed to it will soon realize the advantages of doing so.

It is a thoroughly practical device. The record shows that the raiding that has taken place in the past, extremely costly as it has been, brought no appreciable gain to either side in the long run. Therefore, no union has anything to lose by signing the no-raiding agreement. On the contrary, it will enable the participating unions to save the time, money, and energy they have been wasting in fighting each other and free them to concentrate on the big job of organizing the unorganized.

The no-raiding agreement is not a closed document. It remains open to further signatures. All A. F. of L. affiliates will soon receive copies of a pamphlet giving the full particulars of the pact, documented with its entire background history. Furthermore, a special subcommittee of the joint A. F. of L.-CIO unity committee will stand ready to help any union to iron out any differences which may stand in the way of its participation in the agreement.

It is our hope and conviction that eventually all unions affiliated with both federations will join in making the no-raiding agreement a success.

FOREIGN POLICY CONFUSION

It is no exaggeration to state that the international situation—meaning the hope of maintaining world peace—has greatly deteriorated.

On day we are told by the leaders of our Government that the defense of Indochina against Communist aggression is vital to our own national defense. A few days later we are told by the same leaders that we might as well write off Indochina and concentrate on saving the rest of free Asia.

Before the Geneva Conference the American public was informed that the free nations had agreed on a united stand against the Soviet bloc. Within a week it became apparent even to the most casual headline reader that the Kremlin had succeeded in splitting apart the Allied nations and in sowing the seed of appeasement in fertile soil.

If the public is confused by these discouraging developments, it is because our foreign policy has become confused, haphazard, and chicken-hearted.

The aggressive aims of Moscow cannot be blocked by bluff and bungling. We need, above all else, a firm, clear, consistent, and courageous foreign policy.

The executive council of the American Federation of Labor has suggested the broad outlines for such a foreign policy with respect to Asia. It calls for these major steps:

1. Immediate convocation of a special session of the United Nations General Assembly to mobilize maximum world support for ending the war in Indochina, safeguarding its territorial integrity and helping its reconstruction.

2. Free elections in Indochina so that its people can gain national independence and have an increased incentive to defend their freedom. We should impress upon Britain and France the urgency of ending colonialism wherever it still exist since Communist subversion can gain no headway where people enjoy freedom and natural independence.

3. Our Government should take the lead in building a Pacific Alliance for the defense of peace and freedom which would include all nations willing to join it, within the provisions of the U. N. Charter for regional defense organizations. Congress should grant President Eisenhower standby authority for implementing the Pacific Alliance.

Only when the Communists realize we mean business will they be deterred from engaging in further aggression.

It will not be an easy task to safeguard peace. But the cost and the difficulties of preventing war are as nothing compared with the awful tragedy of having to fight another world war for the preservation of human freedom.

SOCIAL SECURITY GROWS

The House of Representatives has given an overwhelming bipartisan vote of confidence to the basic soundness of the social security system by the adoption of H. R. 9366, providing for an expanded and improved old-age and survivors' insurance program.

The increased coverage and the higher benefits were long overdue. In fact, the improvements voted by the House fall short of what we think can be done and should be done. But they do mark a substantial step forward.

Even more important in the long run, the vote in the House constituted a smashing blow to the big business lobies which have been working their heads off to destroy the basic insurance principle of social security and put benefits on a dole basis.

It is up to the Senate now to do at least as well by the people of the United States as the House.

FIRST ANNIVERSARY

The free world joins in observance of the anniversary of the heroic uprising against Communist despotism begun by the workers of Eastern Germany a year ago June 17.

We can never forget the picture of workers throwing stones at armored tanks and fighting bayonets with their bare fists.

Desperate as it was, the uprising cannot be considered futile nor even at an end. It is still going on in the hearts and minds of the oppressed workers enslaved to the Soviet war machine. A year ago the first gesture of defiance in East Berlin spread within hours throughout Eastern Germany and in neighboring Iron Curtain countries such as Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and Rumania. It took mass executions, wholesale jailings, and emergency reinforcements of Russian troops to quell this unarmed revolt.

The events of June 17 and thereafter proved once and for all that workers who have once enjoyed freedom will never submit to the tyranny of communism. It proved that communism can survive only by forcible suppression of the will of the people.

Free labor is generously contributing funds to supply relief to the survivors of the uprising and to the families of the victims. On this anniversary, we should resolve to discharge an even higher duty—to stand ready, when the time is ripe, to help those still imprisoned behind the Iron Curtain to throw off their chains and regain their freedom.

HANDS OFF TVA

It is regrettable that President Eisenhower did not see fit to reappoint Gordon Clapp as Chairman of the Tennessee Valley Authority. Under Mr. Clapp's administration, the TVA made tremendous progress in its service to the Nation and to the farmers, businessmen, and workers in the vast region which has been benefited in so many ways by its operations.

Of special interest to labor is the fact that Mr. Clapp helped to establish and develop at TVA one of the finest systems of labor-management cooperation in existence anywhere.

By dispensing with Mr. Clapp's services at TVA, the President has raised two suspicions—first, that partisan politics was allowed to dictate his decision and, second, that the whole character of the Tennessee Valley Authority may be changed by turning over its power facilities to private operation and exploitation.

This is a danger to which the entire Nation—and labor especially—must be alert. There must be no giveaway of TVA.

Address by Hon. Carmine DeSapio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1954

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include herewith an address by the Honorable Carmine G. DeSapio, Democratic national committeeman from the State of New York and Democratic leader of New York County.

These remarks were delivered by Commissioner DeSapio at the luncheon meeting attended by the entire New York State Democratic congressional delegation on June 28 at the Congressional Hotel. At that meeting, which was presided over by Senator HERBERT H. LEHMAN, short statements on Democratic policy in the coming national and State campaigns were expressed by National Chairman Stephen Mitchell, New York State Chairman Richard Balch, former Secretary of the Air Force Thomas Finletter, former Director of the Economic Cooperation Administration and former Ambassador Averill Harriman, Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., and Emanuel Celler, the dean of the New York congressional delegation.

Mr. DeSapio's address follows:

My good friends, our meeting today is very important to the welfare both of the people and of our party, and I very much appreciate your presence here. We will hear discussions, this afternoon, of the major problems and issues which confront our State and our Nation, and I am sure that you will want to express your views as this meeting progresses. It is hoped that these discussions will crystallize in our own minds the approach we must take in the coming elections, as well as solemn reaffirmation of the principles and philosophies of the Democratic Party.

There is little question that we have the right to confidence and optimism as to the results this November. People everywhere are quite disillusioned with the failure of the Republican national administration to lend effective leadership and to advance a constructive program for the vital, pressing issues of the day.

In our State, of course, we find a thoroughly disillusioned electorate, but no longer confused and now able clearly to discern the hoaxes which have been perpetrated upon them during 12 years of corruption and maladministration.

The mere anticipation of success, however, will not secure victory. We must work; we must fight; we must energetically and zealously present to the public all of the constructive facts as to our policies, our heritage and our program.

It is not enough for us to take comfort in the division which exists in the Republican Party. It is, rather, incumbent upon us to show the people how our party, united, strong and determined, is willing and ready to assume the enormous responsibility of leadership during these critical times.

Yes, we are strongly united. We will offer to the people of New York State, this year, a strong Democratic program and a strong Democratic Party. We are united on party policy. We are united on party platform. We are united in the determination to nominate the best qualified persons for political office * * * candidates whose records and backgrounds make them the most qualified for public trust.

Indeed, my friends, we stand united. And we stand, always, firmly on principle. We must not, for a split instant, either waver in our support of what is right, nor compromise our belief in what is just. Much more important than winning the election—or any election—is winning and retaining the confidence of the people, and winning and maintaining, for our State and Nation, strength, integrity, and the character of true democracy.

You represent the greatest State in the country here in the Nation's Capitol. You are the voice of the Democratic Party and you have seen, at the very site of our National Government, the urgent need for returning Congress to the people. You are candidates for reelection this year. It is upon you whom our party depends, to a great extent, to bring before the voters the message of Democratic tradition and belief on the one hand, and the record of Republican deceit and ineptitude on the other.

This year we must forget—because the times cry for strength and vision and leadership—this year we must forget that there is any such thing as a "safe Democratic district." We have more than the need for gathering votes. More important, we have the responsibility for undertaking the greatest public educational program in the history of our country. And I ask that you conduct your campaigns with the utmost fervor and with limitless activity, that you may help the people fully to understand the issues which confront us. If you distinguished legislators will bend every effort in this direction, we will have an informed electorate. And we can look with pride upon the historical truth that an informed electorate is a Democratic electorate, and one which inevitably returns a peoples' victory.

The Democratic Party, like our country, is on the brink of a new era in government. So long as we continue to stand dedicated to public service and to the public welfare, so long can we continue to look with confidence and with faith to Democratic victories and to ever greater mandates for leadership—leadership always in the public interest.

Thank you very much.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. The money derived from such sales shall be paid into the Treasury and accounted for in his annual report to Congress, and no sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

Code of Laws of the United States

Title 44, Section 181. Congressional Record; arrangement, style, contents, and indexes.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the Congressional Record, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the Congressional Record semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

Title 44, Section 182b. Same; illustrations, maps, diagrams.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the Record without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the Congressional Record the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily Record as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided,* That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the Record with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the official reporters of the Congressional Record, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the Record shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the Record issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the Record for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the Record of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the Record shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the Record style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the Record.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the Congressional Record any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix, but this rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the Congressional Record.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the Congressional Record Appendix the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed.

10. *Official reporters.*—The official reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the Congressional Record by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this restriction shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. The Public Printer or the official reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the Congressional Record which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Illustrations.*—Pursuant to section 182b, title 44, United States Code (as shown above), requests for authority to insert an illustration in the Record should be submitted to the Joint Committee on Printing through the chairman of the Committee on Printing of the respective House in which the speech desired to be illustrated may be delivered. Illustrations shall not exceed in size a page of the Record and shall be linecuts only. Copy for illustrations must be furnished to the Public Printer not later than 12:30 o'clock p. m. of the day preceding publication.

13. *Corrections.*—The permanent Record is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

Edu

IN T

Mr
day
an ac
ers e
La C
sent i
Recor
The
was o
as fol
Educat

It is
fine ga
I sho
lems o
the sh
supersc
I sho
great s
to fulfi
I kno
not edu
ject. I
rest of
to help
post-wa
Comi
myself,
on the s
of our y
citizens,
But i
and abr
much t
on adde
in the sc
fortunat
vances i

Why i
cation is
precisely
tlefield o
What
battle of
tle explo
in Indoc
But vi
the globe
ceeding
but none
The ba
in school
the bloo
and Haip
tle will b
by steel.
Yes; ri
ing in fu
and poste
out south
continent
North Afr

Appendix

Education for America's Responsibilities in a Shrinking World

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 30, 1954

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, last Monday night it was my privilege to deliver an address before an assembly of teachers engaged in summer school studies in La Crosse, Wis. I ask unanimous consent it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EDUCATION FOR AMERICA'S RESPONSIBILITIES IN A SHRINKING WORLD

It is a great privilege to appear before this fine gathering of La Crosse citizens.

I should like to talk to you about the problems of America's international relations in the shrinking world of the atomic age, the supersonic speed world of the hydrogen era.

I should like, in particular, to refer to the great significance of education in helping us to fulfill our supreme responsibilities.

I know that those in this audience who are not educators will bear with me on this subject. I think that they will realize, as do the rest of us, that proper education is the key to help answer many of our problems in the post-war world.

Coming as I do from a family of teachers myself, I have always felt particularly deeply on the significance of molding well the minds of our young people, the minds of tomorrow's citizens, tomorrow's leaders.

But in this age of great challenge at home and abroad—in this age when there is so much tension and anxiety—education takes on added significance; education, especially in the social sciences where progress has unfortunately lagged so seriously behind advances in the physical sciences.

THE GLOBAL BATTLE OF IDEAS

Why is education so vital? Because education is concerned with ideas, and that is precisely what the great struggle on the battlefield of the world is concerned with—ideas.

What we are witnessing today is an epic battle of contrasting ideologies. This battle explodes at times in bloody warfare, as in Indochina, Malaya, and Guatemala.

But virtually in every country throughout the globe, this warfare is right now proceeding along more subtle, more intangible but nonetheless just as critical lines.

The battle of ideas on farms, in factories, in schools may not appear as dramatic as the bloody battle for the Red River delta and Haiphong and Hanoi, but the latter battle will be won or lost as much by ideas as by steel.

Yes; right now, the battle of ideas is rising in fury—with pamphlet and broadcast and poster and by word of mouth—throughout southeast Asia, throughout the vast subcontinent of India, in the Middle East, in North Africa, in the heart of Africa, throughout Central and South America, in Europe and elsewhere.

It is a battle between the idea of man as the helpless serf of an all-powerful state, as against the idea of man who is governed with his own consent and for his own well-being.

It is the idea of man of inviolate dignity, man as the child of God—as against the idea of man as an adding machine digit to be added or subtracted—or as a clod of clay which can be tossed about and trampled by the state.

It is basically the age-old clash of freedom versus slavery.

FACTORS WHICH BLUR THE BATTLE

But there is more to it than that. Because if the issues were so clear cut and simple—between good and evil—we would not find approximately a third of the world attracted in various degrees to the concept of neutralism.

In this epic battle, there are certain complicating, blurring factors. They are factors which have caused many men and many nations—of good will and democratic devotion—to refuse thus far to take sides.

First, there is the factor of nationalism—which blurs men's eyes—nationalism particularly of the peoples newly emerged to sovereignty. They are often bitterly resentful of decades and centuries of experience as colonies of Western powers. Many of these people have been so preoccupied with grievances of the past that sometimes, they are unable to perceive either of two trends: (a) The welcome trend of the Western powers in granting sovereignty in orderly transition to colonial peoples ready for freedom; or (b) the ominous trend of the mighty new Goliath—the new imperialism of communism—an imperialism of evil so vast, as to dwarf anything which has ever been experienced on this planet.

(2) Then there is the factor of war weariness, coupled with pacifism.

The lifeblood of Europe and of parts of Asia has been spilled in two costly world wars and in civil conflicts.

Peoples everywhere hunger for peace. Many men and women have been fooled by oft-repeated Communist peace slogans, by Mr. Picasso's "peace dove." They have been fooled by the Communist warmongers into believing that it is the West rather than the Kremlin which is heedless of the dangers of war. The reverse is the case; it is Malenkov and Company who play so cavalierly with lighted fuses.

(3) Then, there is the factor of racialism, or resentment against the white man for grievances, real and imagined, dating back long periods.

(4) And finally there are the widespread factors of want and privation, illiteracy and disease and undernourishment.

Because of these factors, many underdeveloped peoples have become so concerned with the sheer struggle of day-to-day survival, the struggle to feed hungry bellies, and educate untutored minds, that they have tended to ignore the overall danger of communism. Sometimes, they even credit to communism a desire to end these conditions of which I have spoken, a desire it does not in the slightest possess.

Add all of these factors together—nationalism, war weariness, racialism, privation—on the present world scene, and you see why we have been encountering some of the difficulties which we have experienced.

And so, because of these and other reasons, we need truly educated, truly understanding minds in America today more than ever before.

And by educated minds, what do I mean?

THE TRULY EDUCATED MIND

I do not mean the individual who has simply attended elementary school, high school, and higher institutions. I do not in particular mean America's 6.7 million college graduates.

True education is not reckoned by the cumulative total of years spent in classrooms and the number of degrees received.

You and I have known many a man and woman—perhaps our own parents—who may have lacked in formal education, but who were schooled well in the university of life and who were real seekers of truth.

That is what the genuinely educated man or woman seeks—truth and light.

The educated mind, too, must be an open mind. It must be a mind which tries to get the facts first, rather than jumping to conclusions. It is the mind which tests ideas against the facts and the evidence which it carefully compiles.

It is the mind which is not obsessed by fixed, preconceived notions—notions which so color its observation that it is unable really to hear and unable to see.

It is the mind that recognizes that change is the dynamic order of all things, that nothing is static, that much of the world is in flux and ferment, and that old ideas, old solutions—while they should not be automatically abandoned—may have become obsolete.

The true educated mind is a mind which respects other minds. It welcomes diversity of opinions; it respects other people's viewpoints; it is willing to see ideas clash in the marketplace of opinion, with the soundest ideas triumphing. It does not believe in combatting the totalitarianism of communism by the totalitarianism of fascism, but rather by the vital principles of a constitutional republic.

The educated mind despises bigotry, intolerance, and baseless suspicion.

THE VALUES OF THE EDUCATED MIND

Then, too, let us recall what was said by Herbert Spencer, "Education has for its object the formation of character."

That is what we need most of all. The educated man is really the man of character, the man who has been trained to live by sound values.

What are those values? They are the values which Western civilization has passed down to us—the ideal values of human conduct: Honesty, fairness, justice, diligence, charity, mercy, love.

These are the qualities—some cynics may mistakenly call them old-fashioned—which we desperately need in the modern world of today. These are the qualities which will help bring progress where there has been backwardness, stability where there has been chaos, light where there has been darkness, consistency where there has been hypocrisy.

AMERICA IS THINKING CLEARLY ON WORLD RELATIONS

The truly educated mind rejects synthetic thinking. It rejects false thinking.

And I should like to cite to you, my friends, certain specific samples of false thinking—so-called isolationists and related thinking in the international sphere.

Fortunately, this type of thinking, which I shall describe, is not representative of the American people as a whole. Indeed, as time goes on, it represents fewer and fewer Americans.

Fortunately, the American people are thinking straight and clear on foreign policy. Every public-opinion poll demonstrates that fact.

The American people have thought through their new responsibilities, as the leader among nations. The American people are neither shirkers nor idlers nor dreamers, but rather realists.

They know that in this atomic age, no nation can live unto itself alone; isolation is not only a fantasy; it is suicide.

They know that the only chance to achieve the security of America is for America to do her part in helping to achieve the security of the world.

They know that for a wide variety of reasons our destiny is interlocked with the destiny of our allies and other free peoples.

They know that we need our allies.

We need their spiritual support; we need their technical know-how, their factories, and skilled manpower; we need the products of their mines and farms; we need the defense efforts of their armed services; we need their strategic bases.

They, in turn, need us, and so their thinking people and thinking leadership desires continued teamwork. That is why, later this very week, we of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee will report the new mutual-aid bill, a strong measure to sustain the bulwarks of the free world.

But there is a brand of uneducated, synthetic thinking which ignores the type of facts which so clearly justify that and other bills.

FOUR PATTERNS OF SYNTHETIC THINKING

Characteristic of this school of opinion are certain expressions which some of you may have heard. They include four types of expressions:

The first comes from the smug ignoramus—he is exactly that—who says, "Let the rest of the world go Communist. Who cares? We can still be secure."

The second comes from the reckless jingoist: "Let's solve this whole problem by dropping a few atomic bombs."

The third comes from the arrogant bully: "Let's order our allies to do this or that. Let's show them we're boss—or else."

Finally, there is the expression by some few fearmongers and hatemongers to the effect that there is some "mysterious plot, some cabal, to get us into war and to shed American blood." "The United Nations," they mutter darkly, "is part of the sinister conspiracy; so is NATO; and so is every other instrumentality which the free world has devised for collective security."

REFUTING THE PHONY THINKERS

All 4 of these types of expressions, all 4 patterns of thinking, are utterly false and unworthy of any intelligent American.

As for the smug ignoramus, the facts of the matter are these: The fate of the free world depends upon America, but she is not so strong as to stand alone, nor does she want to stand alone without friends and without allies.

America knows that if the Soviet Union chews up the rest of the world—piece by piece, then America herself will be in mortal peril, because the balance on the world scale will have been tipped completely against her.

As for the jingoists, who casually speak about dropping atomic bombs—without provocation or thought or consultation—but as a so-called panacea, their views are obviously completely unrepresentative of any thinking segment of America. Their views are completely at variance with the views of the United States Government.

Our Government deplores war and will move mountains to avoid war. Our Government knows that you cannot destroy an idea with bullets and bombs. You can only destroy an idea with a superior idea.

Our Government is aware of damage which has already unfortunately been done by the vicious smear propaganda campaign which has painted the United States as an alleged mass-killer of helpless peasants. That smear propaganda was baseless and it will remain baseless.

America knows that if world war III might ever come, there would be no victor. Our Government knows too, that a reckless action could start a chain of events which might lead inevitably to war.

That is why America is determined to keep a firm grasp on the situation. It is determined, while avoiding timidity or appeasement, to avoid a chain reaction which could, uncontrolled, lead to a global conflagration.

Our Government knows that the capacity for massive instant retaliation as Secretary of State John Foster Dulles so carefully expressed it, "is the principal deterrent to world war III." But America will never use that capacity, unless the Soviet Union will have cast a die as to leave us no alternative.

And what of the third synthetic thinker, the bully? It is a fact that the bully may be trying to achieve a sound objective—with high motives, but he tries to do it utterly in the wrong way.

The United States does not presume to dictate to any other people. And there is no self-respecting people which will take dictation.

Our way is to lead by example, by inspiration, by factual presentation of arguments of enlightened self-interest. The Soviet way is to dictate, to order, to boss, to punish the slightest deviation "from the line."

We will not shrink from presenting the facts as we see them and from speaking strongly and forthrightly, but we will not order or bully.

And finally, as to the fear-mongers and the hate-mongers, they represent only a tiny bigoted minority, which completely unsuccessfully has tried to pit American against American. Contrary to their wild charges, there is no plot, there is no cabal to get us into war or to lose our sovereignty through the U. N., or any other means.

No man deplores war more than the great man who occupies the White House. He has seen war at first hand. He has commanded brave young men who made the supreme sacrifice. He is the father of a boy in the service. He will leave no stone unturned, so that neither American boys, nor Russian boys, nor English or French boys die in a world war III—if we can possibly avoid it. He will strive to preserve America's sovereignty but always in a manner consistent with worldwide collective security needs.

These, then, are four of the patterns of phony thought by the synthetic thinkers.

Against them we must mobilize the sound thinkers of America—so as to dispel falsehood with fact, darkness with light, misrepresentation with truth.

THE CRUCIAL DIMENSION OF TIME

But, I should like to go on and list other characteristics of the educated mind.

The educated mind is a mind which recognizes that we operate always in the ticking dimension of time.

To do the wrong thing at the right time may be as bad or worse as to do the right thing at the wrong time.

There is a time and place for everything. There is a time in history when men are presented with a unique opportunity to achieve progress which they might not otherwise be able to achieve for centuries.

The fact of the matter is that now is still such a time.

Now is a time when men can clinch victories for the cause of collective security which men have struggled thousands of years to attain.

Great forward steps have been taken in postwar Europe, notably in the establishment of the European High Coal and Steel Community. Great leaders have arisen:

Churchill of England, Monet, Bidault, Schumann of France, De Gasperi and Scelba of Italy, Yoshida of Japan, Adenauer of Germany, and many others, too numerous to mention. These are men who while in a position to do so or even when out of office have perceived the opportunity which history has given to them and to their people to help banish the scourge of war, the nightmare of insecurity.

DEMAGOGS AND CARTELISTS

But meanwhile, boiling up beneath these great leaders is a ferment of reaction against the progress of postwar years.

Boiling up is an ugly combination of narrow-minded, supernationalism on the political front and (notably in the defeated areas) revived cartelism on the economic front.

On the one hand, the supernationalist desires to sever the ties which have been reestablished between ancient enemies, like Germany and France.

On the other hand, the cartelist who, like as not is also a supernationalist, despises free enterprise and desires to turn back to the economic dark ages.

He wants a few monopolies to stifle competition and control production and distribution—a few monopolies interested, not in raising the standards of living, not in creating mass markets, but in selling a small amount of goods at a high price.

He is not interested in advancing the cause of social justice, in correcting inequitable tax structures; in strengthening democratic institutions; he is only interested in the greedy pursuit of power, and often he prefers a totalitarian framework in which to operate.

Thus, in many of these countries, demogogery is rising up against statesmanship, and economic feudalism is contesting with the forces of economic competition and progress.

If we redouble our efforts and if our allies redouble their efforts, we may yet stay and defeat these dangerous forces.

EDC SHOULD BE RATIFIED

But time is running out. The European Defense Community has been awaiting ratification for a long time. There have been all sorts of excuses and alibis to try to justify delay in ratification, particularly in France.

We, of course, can well understand the problems of a nation like France which has bled so severely in two world wars and in the Indochina conflict. So, too, we are not unappreciative of the problems of our friends in Italy; actually, our record of generosity, our record of teamwork has proven our awareness of the internal parliamentary problems of these and of our other allies.

But history does not accept excuses and alibis.

Mankind is at a crossroad. We have an historic opportunity—through EDC and similar efforts—which our children and our children's children may not have, an opportunity to bring unity where there has been strife, security where there has been fear and doubt.

This is a time for statesmanship. It is a time for action. John Foster Dulles and Walter Bedell Smith went to Geneva; patiently, ably, they conferred and negotiated with friend and foe of freedom, exploring every possible avenue. But at Geneva the Reds once again proved their deviousness, their stalling, their "divide and conquer" tactics. So now is a time for allied unity. It is a time for selflessness.

Unfortunately forces of disunity, of selfishness, are rising everywhere in Europe—the provincial concept of every man for himself even at the expense of having his neighbor go down.

But the tragedy of the situation is that no man or nation can save himself or itself if he or it permits his neighbor to go down. "We must all hang together or we will hang separately."

These are the facts of which the educated mind is aware, but there is something else of which that mind is aware, and it is this:

WE MUST BUILD LEADERS

The greatest resource in all this world is not gold or other minerals nor weapons of steel. It is men—human beings. We can no better serve our future than if we help to raise a new generation of leaders and of sound thinkers.

Part of the reason the Communists have been relatively so successful during these last 37 years has been that from the outset they started to train their leaders.

Their schools graduated wholesale cadres of agents, Russian and foreign agitators, provocators, spies, conspirators, particularly the men who would be the future Communist Party secretaries in countries throughout the world.

Today in every country in which they have a foothold—in France, in Italy, in India, in Asia—they are training masses of future leaders. Thai Communists, for example, who they hope will some day take over Thailand; Indian Communists who they hope will be the Lenins and Stalins and Malenkovs of tomorrow's India.

The question is, Will we of the free world also help train adequate leadership? Will we care for the young—will we support the United Nations International Children's Fund as I believe we should and must?

We will give aid to the educational and related forces of the free world so as to develop leaders who will strive for progress and who will combat communism?

Will we strengthen or will we emasculate the vital International Information and Exchange Program? Will we further strengthen the United States Information Agency, or will we, as we have periodically done, "rip that agency up by its roots every few months to see how well the plan is growing?" (I don't believe we will. That agency has made splendid progress under Ted Streibert and we've got to give it a chance, including the necessary funds, with which to do still better.)

The exchange of students, of professors, of scientists, of cultural, economic and agricultural experts is a particularly valuable feature of our program; it should be strengthened.

The salvation of the free world is in the leaders of the free world, and I am not thinking only of governmental leaders.

I am thinking of leaders at the grassroots, leaders in communities like La Crosse or Karachi or New Delhi or Paris or Rome or Bonn, and leaders in towns and villages that you and I may have never heard of. I am speaking of humble parents who lead by training their children well in the ways of freedom and devotion to God. I am speaking of schoolteachers who lead by planting sound ideas in the minds of the young.

FREE MAN MUST TAKE HIS STAND

Finally, my friends, I should like to refer to one other quality of the educated mind. It is this: the educated man recognizes that there comes a time when free men must take their stand, when men must set aside their books and their resolutions and their talk, and must move up to the firing line in defense of all that they hold dear.

War and bloodshed are the very opposite of what the educated mind seeks. Why? Because education means building and war means destroying.

But there were educated men in 1776, who recognized that they either had to take their stand or the Thirteen Colonies would forever be vassals to a foreign crown.

And I submit that the educated thinkers of today have a responsibility to point out to the American people that we must join our allies in manning the firing line or there will be no education, no civilization as we know it in the world of tomorrow.

ASIATIC PACT ESSENTIAL

The leaders of the United States Government are hard at work at this very moment in formulating what they hope will be the basis for an Asiatic pact. That pact is imperatively necessary.

The Communists are not particularly impressed by big talk, by a repetition of mere conferences and resolutions and words, as important as they are as preconditions to action.

They are very much impressed by the number of fighting divisions which we and our Allies can put in the line—now, tomorrow, next year—and by the spirit of those divisions.

They will be impressed by the degree to which the native peoples can be armed and equipped and whether native armies prove willing to fight eagerly, enthusiastically in defense of their own birthright against Communism.

European powers cannot save Asia from Eurasian Communism. It is the peoples of Asia which basically, must save themselves from that threat—internally or externally.

We are willing and eager to give them assistance, but they must evidence the same burning desire which the brave people of the Korean Republic displayed in sacrificing in defense of their own sovereignty.

If we are to build an Asiatic pact, the United States must be prepared to make certain commitments. That means American fighting forces to help man the lines. In making those commitments we will take a risk, but if we make no commitments whatsoever, we will take an infinitely worse risk.

If you go out and battle a fire, you risk getting a few burns. But if you sit back in your house and wait until the fire expands and comes roaring up to you, the chances are that you will not only be burned, but that you and your dear ones will perish.

ADEQUATE PUNCHING POWER NECESSARY

And if we are to fight this fire, we must have the military wherewithal—the punch—to do so. The President of the United States, in conjunction with his highest military advisers, has determined certain "force levels" which they, as our foremost experts, feel are adequate to meet present and foreseeable needs—and in a manner consistent with our budgetary abilities. I have—with faith in them—voted for these force levels.

I state very frankly, however, that many of my colleagues and I do have some doubts about the adequacy of these force levels. We question whether the Army and Navy in particular are or soon will be in a position to meet the type of contingency which may arise in south Asia and in other bushfire areas.

If further evidences confirm our doubts, I feel sure that the necessary appropriations would quickly be granted to increase our wherewithal. And I feel certain that the able, quick-acting President of the United States would be in the forefront of such an effort.

Meanwhile, it is my hope that we will continue to strengthen America here at home. I trust that we will continue to build our economy still stronger.

Tax revision and reform are on the way. A vast expansion and modernization of the social-security system is forthcoming. Vital new public works, better schools, highways, housing, hospitals are a-building but still not fully proportionate to meet our needs, I may say.

In any event, we are not allowing our concern with international problems to prevent our making progress here at home.

CONCLUSION

I have reviewed my friends, some of the responsibilities, the challenges which confront the people of our land.

As I stated earlier, education is not a matter of spending years in the classroom. It is what we take out of the classroom and out of life—the values that are implanted in our minds, the habits of clear or muddled thinking, of tolerant or bigoted views.

We, of Wisconsin, are rightfully proud of our educational system. As you and I know, still more must be done to improve it and strengthen it, as we know, it will be done.

Seeing you educators here today and seeing the other fine folks of this grand community strengthens me in my confidence in the future.

"This time and every time," as Ralph Waldo Emerson said, "is a very good time, if we but know how to use it."

I am sure that we will use it well in the interests of this generation and of those who will follow after us.

Red Chinese Will Eventually Sit in the United Nations—Britain and France Not Opposed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 15, 1954

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an article by Mr. Constantine Brown in which he indicates that a majority of the nations favor seating the Chinese Reds in the United Nations.

The article follows:

[From the Washington Evening Star of June 28, 1954]

CHINA ILLUSION FADES—BRITISH LEADERS REPORTED EMPHASIZING BIG U. N. MAJORITY FAVOR SEATING REDS

(By Constantine Brown)

Any illusion President Eisenhower and Secretary of State Dulles may have that this country could block substitution of Red China for Nationalist China in the United Nations is reportedly fading away.

According to information preceding the arrival of Prime Minister Churchill and Foreign Secretary Eden in Washington they meant to make it clear that under present world conditions, Communist China is certain to obtain an overwhelming majority when the matter is brought before the U. N. Assembly in the fall.

The unpleasant truth is that with the exception of the Philippines, Turkey, Pakistan, and maybe half a dozen Latin American Republics, no other U. N. member is likely to sustain us, despite the fact that Red China continues to be an aggressor.

The administration now can either swallow the pill gracefully after token resistance and a few speeches pointing out the immorality of such a move or walk out of the international organization if its attempts to block the move are unsuccessful. This can be done only by Congress cutting off the appropriations for maintenance of an American delegation at the U. N.

It is safe to say that the top policy makers in the executive have not made up their minds what to do. There are some advisers to the White House and State Department who would rather swallow the pill without any sugar coating then see this country leave the so-called world peace organization. They argue and have on their side a wealth of statistics to show that a step in that direction would mean the isolation of this country.

These men and women say that in the complex world in which we live a policy leading to an isolation from our friends and allies would be suicidal. Their arguments are said to be listened to attentively by President Eisenhower and Secretary Dulles, who are both on record against Red China's admission to the "peace loving" nations organization.

The reported arguments of Prime Minister Churchill and Secretary Eden that the U. S. S. R. and some of her satellites are already U. N. members, hence we might just as well have the whole pack and caboodle with us are said to have made some, though slight, impression on our President.

But while there are some frightened counselors in the Government who fear isolation more than anything else, a vast majority of Members in Congress are determined not to permit the U. N. to be sullied by the presence of the Chinese Communists. They can prevent this by refusing the administration the necessary sums to allow our representation to carry on.

The bipartisan leadership which intends to put up the fight is composed of men known for favoring America's cooperation with foreign countries. They are all supporters of the foreign aid program of the NATO and every other kind of cooperation with the peoples across the Pacific and Atlantic and the sister republics in Latin America. They cannot be described by any stretch of imagination as isolationists as this word was being used before the war and is still used as a smear by some propagandists.

But, say these legislators, America's isolation is inevitable if the allies and friends we have helped immeasurably since the beginning of the world crisis in 1939 insist now on parting and going all out to appease communism.

If all the declarations of unity, sympathy, and cooperation of the past have been only "cupboard love" it is high time that we know where we stand with these peoples.

If the mere prospect of some juicy trade with the Communists can induce most of our western allies to change their policies and try to coerce us to follow them we might just as well take serious notice of this factor. If tragic circumstances were to force us to come to a showdown with the Red enemies who are bent on the destruction of this country we need not fight alone—even if the West abandons the common cause. We can still reckon on the Turks, Pakistanis, Spaniards, Filipinos, South Koreans and with less certainty on the Japanese to stand by us in difficult times.

We have lost our interested friends (those who relied principally on the American pocketbook) to some extent because of our wavering foreign policies. We talked too much, spent too much, and never acted with determination coming from realization of our strength. We pleaded with western allies to be kind enough to accept help to help themselves so that they can help us.

Congress, since the days of the last Democratic administration, has drawn the line insofar as Red China is concerned. It will not stand for the recognition of the Peiping regime as it will not stand for substitution of the Communist Chinese for the Nationalist Chinese. And these days when the legislators are more sensitive than ever to communications from their constituents, their stand reflects the overwhelming sentiment of the American people.

If the choice is now between being forced by our allies into an isolated position or to disregard principles for which we have fought and bled and spent hundreds of billions of dollars, there is no doubt that Congress will choose the former. And it is hard to conceive that the executive would disagree.

Gladewater, Tex., High School Choir Entertains Hospitalized Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 30, 1954

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I recently had the pleasure of welcoming members of the Gladewater (Tex.) High School Choir to Washington. On a tour from Texas to New York, the choir performed in a number of veterans' hospitals.

The value of their tour is brought out strikingly in an article published in the Gladewater Daily Mirror, which quotes some of the grateful letters received from veterans by Mr. Ken Bennett, choral director of Gladewater High School.

I ask unanimous consent that the article from the Gladewater Mirror be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Gladewater High School Choir returned home minus medals and a large amount of clothing but with happy hearts because each member felt that he or she had in some way helped to brighten the days for veterans hospitalized in hospitals on the east coast.

Today members of the choir are being rewarded for the efforts they put forth on the recent trip to New York and back. Letters are arriving each day from veterans' hospitals where the choir performed, expressing appreciation for the fine job done by the local musicians.

Gladewater is proud indeed of the choir, which is recognized as one of the outstanding groups in Texas. We are all proud of the trip this group has just completed; we are all thankful that students such as these represent our school and our town when away on trips. They are a credit to any school or any community for they have learned the proper way to conduct themselves at home and away from home.

Bouquets go out to students, chaperons, choral parents, Director Ken Bennett, and everyone who had any part at all in making the trip successful and possible.

So that we may all realize better what the trip made by our talented musicians meant to veterans in various hospitals, a reprint of parts of some of the letters received by Bennett and the choir follows:

'The program which you presented on June 5, 1954, at Walter Reed Army Hospital certainly provided a pleasant evening for the patients. The activity as well as your approach to patients, warm and friendly, made for wholesome recreation in the hall." (Walter Reed Army Hospital, Washington, D. C.)

"The staff and the veteran patients of our hospital wish to express to you and your choir their sincere appreciation for the splendid program which you presented here at the Jackson VA center. The excellence of the program by the Gladewater Swing Choir, in spite of a long and tiring trip, and the poise they displayed is certainly a credit to your direction and to the community from which they come. Your program was enjoyed very much by all our patients who were able to attend, and they have asked that we extend you a cordial invitation to visit our hospital again at any time you find it possible. This project of offering wholesome entertainment to our hospitalized veterans is certainly a worthy one and we hope that you may continue to train and take on tour such a fine group of young singers in the years to come." (Veterans' Administration center, Jackson, Miss.)

"On behalf of the patients at this hospital, we wish to express our gratitude to you and the members of the a cappella choir for the most interesting program they provided here. We have heard many fine comments from the patients with reference to this program, and we desire very much to have your group return if they are ever in this vicinity. It was very thoughtful of you to make this fine entertainment available for our patients." (Veterans' Administration Hospital in Salisbury, N. C.)

"We wish to thank you and your excellent choral group for your visit to our hospital. We always knew that Texans did things in a big way, and your group of singers sustained the reputation you Texas people have. We even forgot the heat in listening to the wonderful singing of your boys and girls. We hope that you had a safe trip home; but just know that if you ever want to leave Texas, our patients at this hospital will welcome you with open arms. Thank you very much for a wonderful evening's entertainment." (Atlanta, Ga., Veterans' Administration Hospital.)

"It is seldom that we have any opportunity to hear and appreciate such a wonderful group of voices as your choir. Our patients were unanimous in their praise for your group. We are sincerely grateful to the principal of Gladewater High School for including our hospital on your tour." (Veterans' Administration Medical Teaching Group Hospital, Memphis Hospital.

Is there anything we could add?

Mr. Truman's Illness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VERA BUCHANAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 30, 1954

Mrs. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include in the RECORD the following editorial entitled "Mr. Truman's Illness," from the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette of June 29, 1954, which, I am sure, expresses the sentiments of all the Members of this House:

MR. TRUMAN'S ILLNESS

Only a few days age the Nation's press pictured former President Harry S. Truman gaily banging away on a piano at a convention of musicians. Now it is a shock to learn that he has taken a turn for the worse following emergency surgery on June 20.

It is difficult to picture the former President as being critically ill. That is not the Harry Truman that the Nation knows.

Americans think of him as a chipper and seemingly indestructible citizen against whom neither time nor care has made much progress.

While it is distressing to know that Mr. Truman is in a serious condition, there are good reasons to hope that he will soon be up and about. For one thing, this is the first critical illness in a life that has spanned 70 active years; he has taken good care of himself and has always enjoyed robust health. For another, longevity seems to run in the family; his mother lived to be more than 90.

Most encouraging of all, Harry Truman isn't easily put down. He has been in tight spots before and a fighting heart has seen him through. If courage is now a decisive weapon against an unaccustomed foe, there can be little doubt of the outcome. It is our earnest hope that the former chief executive will soon again be at his debonair best, preparing his memoirs, going ahead with plans for the Truman Memorial Library, and taking an occasional fling at politics.

Address by Philip B. Perlman Before the Chicago Hebrew Immigrant Aid Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 23, 1954

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a comprehensive summary of the situation with regard to immigration legislation, as contained in a very fine speech delivered on June 13, in Chicago, by the Honorable Philip B. Perlman, former Solicitor General of the United States, when speaking under the auspices of the Hebrew Immigrant Aid Society.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

You paid me a high compliment by requesting me to come here today to speak to you on the occasion of your annual conference. I accepted the opportunity you gave me so that I could congratulate you on your continued interest and achievements in work for the betterment of mankind, and also so that I could review with you current conditions and hopes for the future.

* * * * *

When the commission appointed by President Truman in 1952 to study the problems of immigration, naturalization, and citizenship arrived at the point where we began to assemble the facts and recommendations to be incorporated in the report, we decided to label our work "Whom we shall welcome," a phrase taken from a statement made by George Washington in 1783, in which he said: "The bosom of America is open to receive not only the opulent and respectable stranger, but the oppressed and persecuted of all nations and religions; whom we shall welcome to a participation of all our rights and privileges, if by decency and propriety of conduct they appear to merit the enjoyment."

Hias, ever since it was established, has been working to preserve the policy outlined by George Washington, the first President of the Republic. That policy encouraged millions to come to America from all parts of the world. The immigrants and their descendants helped build the United States into its present position as the leader of the free peoples of the world. Our Constitution, our Bill of Rights, and our laws gave full participation of all our rights and privileges to those who were worthy. But as the country began to fill up, as the pioneering days came to an end, and as great centers of population were established, old fears and hates and prejudices, always latent, and some new ones, began to emerge. The need for reasonable restrictions on immigration—restrictions designed to protect the health, the safety and the general welfare of the Nation—began to be used as a cloak for restrictions based on race. The movement gained impetus after the turn of the century, and the Immigration Act of 1917, provided, among other things, a literacy test, and established a so-called Asiatic barred zone.

In 1924 Congress enacted a comprehensive immigration law, putting into effect the system of admissions based on national origins, the system which has served to stifle the application of the principles under which this Nation grew and prospered and won the admiration and respect of men and governments of good will everywhere. More and more discriminations and restrictions were added as the years passed, until in 1952 Congress passed over President Truman's veto the McCarran-Walter Immigration and Nationality Act, supposed to be a codification of all previous laws on immigration, on exclusion and deportation, on naturalization and citizenship, but which is in reality a codification of the fears and hates; of discriminations and prejudices which had been brewing in the minds and hearts of many who fail to inform themselves or to grasp the significance of the facts of life in this modern world.

The McCarran-Walter Act of 1952 was followed by the still more disgraceful so-called Refugee Relief Act of 1953. This act was billed as part of the great crusade, the New Look, the dynamic program of the new national administration. It was supposed to be a sample of kindness, of generosity, of brotherly love, to meet emergencies which the McCarran-Walter Act left untouched. It was enacted into law on August 7, 1953, and during the following month I made an address on the subject in Baltimore City, in the course of which I said (and I am quoting from that address):

"The Refugee Relief Act of 1953, despite the benefits it will confer on some people in need of assistance, is in many respects the most discriminatory, the most restrictive, and generally the worst piece of legislation on the subject ever enacted in the history of this Nation. Under the guise of extending a helping hand to the victims of war and the aftermath of wars, the Emergency Relief Act of 1953 gives full play to outrageous and indefensible prejudices, detrimental to our way of life at home, and destructive of our efforts abroad to provide leadership for the free peoples of the world in the quest for peace and security. So far from attempting to eliminate or minimize any of the unworthy features of the McCarran-Walter Act, the Refugee Relief Act of 1953 expressly adopts the discriminations and the other abuses of the McCarran-Walter Act, and then adds new ones, so drastic in scope as to destroy the hopes of many who have been dreaming of a safe haven in the United States.

"President Eisenhower must know that the emergency immigration legislation proposed by him, although inadequate and weak in many respects, was so mangled in the House and in the Senate, and finally in the conference committee of both Houses of Congress, as to bear little resemblance to what he thought was advisable. The President asked for emergency legislation to rescue within a period of 2 years a total of 240,000 refugees, expellees and escapees, and to afford essential relief from surplus population problems in Europe (Italy, Holland, and Greece). This meant additional immigration at the rate of 120,000 annually for the 2-year period. The program was to be carried out by an administrator appointed by the President. As finally passed, the act reduced the number from 240,000 to 209,000 (not including 5,000 aliens already in the United States as nonimmigrants, and whose status is to be adjusted). At the same time, the 2-year period for admissions was extended to about 3½ years. This means that, during the life of the program, the number authorized is at the rate of about 58,000 annually, or less than one-half the annual rate proposed by the President.

"It should be noted that under the McCarran-Walter Act, provision is made for the issuance of about 154,000 visas annually, but due to the national origins system of selection not more than approximately seventy-two or three thousand are normally issued. This means that the additional number provided for by the Refugee Act of 1953, described by Senator WATKINS and others as a fine and generous measure by the United States, does not, by a wide margin, even absorb the unused immigration quota visas authorized by existing law."

That is what I said about the so-called Refugee Act of 1953 in September of that year. On the day before I said that The Sun, a daily newspaper in Baltimore, printed a long article by one of its Washington correspondents, Robert W. Ruth, under an eight-column caption entitled, "First Aliens To Be Admitted Under New Law in October or November." The article contained an interview with R. W. Scott McLeod, administrator of the State Department's Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs, named by Congress to be in charge of the refugee relief program. Mr. McLeod is the same official later criticized for making a tour to deliver political speeches for the Republican National Committee. He is also the official relieved of responsibility for personnel matters in the State Department, but he still retains his authority over security matters and over consular affairs, including the administration of the refugee relief program.

Mr. McLeod was reported in the Sun as saying, "we are certain that by next spring we will be rolling ahead full steam." In the fall (1953) issue of Rescue, the publication of HIAS, there is a group picture including Mr. McLeod, and a statement by Mr. McLeod in which he said: "The first few months will be required for administrative preparations. With these now about complete, I am confident that we will start the issuance of visas in December, and by early spring we should be rolling ahead at a very fast pace."

I told all this to Baltimore HIAS in March, in early spring. Now it is late spring, on the brink of summer. More than ten months have passed since the law went into effect.

As of this week only 48 persons had entered the United States under the Refugee Relief Act of 1953. Of this number 18 are orphan children, so that only 30 adult persons have arrived. But that is not all. Of the 30 persons who have arrived, 27 are Italians and 3 are Greeks, and all of them are persons with special priorities under the immigration laws, who would have been admitted in a short time without the Refugee Relief Act of 1953. Of the great mass of refugees, expellees and escapees, without special priorities granted because of relatives already here, not a single one has yet been admitted. Not even one.

That is why I said that the Refugee Relief Act of 1953 is a fraud on the American people. The administration of the act seems to be worse than the act itself. And both are a fraud, too, on the thousands who were led to believe that the United States would extend a helping hand to them. They are all just where they were when the act went into effect, except those who have died or have been removed elsewhere.

These facts are known to the President, and to Congress, but nothing yet has been done to remedy the situation. There is a report that 713 visas have been issued, but it is also reported that when and if these visas are honored it will be found that they, too, were issued mainly to persons with special priorities, and that total is a mere drop in the bucket as compared with the 120,000 annually asked by the President, and the average of 58,000 annually allowed by Congress.

But to return to the McCarran-Walter Act, which, as I have pointed out on other occasions, embodies a complete reversal of the policies through which this Nation surpassed all others in strength and wealth, and reached the highest standard of living ever enjoyed by any people in all history. At the very moment when we have become the chief hope of all free people for protection from the menace of communism, and the chief hope of liberation for those enslaved behind the Iron Curtain, at that very moment in history when we need and must have the confidence and cooperation of our natural allies in the great struggle now underway—at that very moment we adopt measures such as the McCarran-Walter Act, a law that one would expect to find in a totalitarian country, a police state, but not in the United States of America.

A few weeks ago Mr. Walter Van Kirk, executive director of the department of international justice and goodwill, National Council of the Churches of Christ, in an address before the 81st annual forum of the National Conference of Social Work, pointed to some of the discrimination written into the McCarran-Walter Act, and quoted the Manchester Guardian, one of the leading British newspapers, as saying: "Nothing has done more to spread distrust of American intentions and to mock all American fine words than the impertinences inflicted on foreigners under the McCarran-Walter Act."

And then, said Mr. Van Kirk, "we wonder why we are losing friends in Europe and Asia. At a time when the President and the Secretary of State are striving to create a mutual-security system in Europe which will have the effect of bridging some of the chasms by which Europeans in times past have been divided, the Congress superimposes upon that continent its own lines of division between those Europeans deemed by our lawmakers to possess cultural refinements denied other Europeans. At a time when the President and the Secretary of State are striving to build a bridge of understanding and goodwill with which to span the chasm between Asiatics and Americans and thereby tear down the wall of partition between east and west, the McCarran-Walter Act causes to be drawn upon the Asian world a vast triangle of racial prejudice and discrimination."

* * * * *

I assume you are interested in knowing what is being done to wipe out the disgrace of the McCarran-Walter Act, and to attempt to restore at least a measure of sanity to our immigration laws. It is now certain, and I regret to say it, that you can expect nothing during this session from either the President or the Congress. The same elements that had sufficient power to pass the McCarran-Walter Act in 1952 over President Truman's veto are in control, even stronger than then. The President has made no effort to keep his campaign pledge to support legislation to revise the McCarran-Walter Act. On the contrary, the mild suggestion he made to Congress at the first session of the 83d Congress to study the act, which had already been studied over and over again, was dropped in this session.

A group to draft a revision was formed during the first session of the 83d Congress under the general supervision of Senator LEHMAN and the chairmanship of Mr. Julius Edelstein, his administrative assistant. It required about 8 months' of intensive work to produce a complete new code—a revision of all the immigration and citizenship laws. The job was done by volunteers—lawyers, college professors and instructors, and experts in the field. It was offered to the President but he wasn't interested.

It was introduced toward the end of the first session, referred to the Judiciary Committee, and there it stays, unmentioned by the President and held prisoner by a hostile Congress. It is necessary to have hearings on that bill, to take testimony, to have it analyzed and studied, and to campaign for its passage. Those hearings should be held during the period after this Congress adjourns in July or August and before the 84th Congress convenes next January. You can help to get that part of the work done. You can pass appropriate resolutions and send them to your Senators—Senator DIRKSEN is a member of the Senate Committee in charge of the bill—and to your Congressmen. And you can write letters to them, and ask your friends to use whatever influence they may have with Senator DIRKSEN to persuade him to approve early hearings on the bill to revise the McCarran-Walter Act. Whatever information you may need about the proposed bill will be given you on request to Senator LEHMAN or to Mr. Edelstein.

* * * * *

The McCarran-Walter Act and the so-called Refugee Relief Act of 1953 pile barrier upon barrier against the admission of those who arrive from Europe and Asia at the normal ports of entry. But while the laws are being rigidly enforced at such ports, tens, even hundreds, of thousands of aliens illegally cross the Mexican border annually, or if they cross legally many remain illegally. The failure for years to face this problem seems due to the desire of influential landowners in certain southern States to profit from cheap labor, and that failure serves to point up the extent of the hypocrisy which underlies the fears and prejudices responsible for the McCarran-Walter Act and the wholesale restrictions and discriminations of the so-called Refugee Relief Act of 1953.

* * * * *

Illinois is fortunate in being represented by one of the greatest Senators of our time. He is PAUL H. DOUGLAS, now concluding his first term, and a candidate to succeed himself. He has, by his forthright position on every public question, endeared himself to every right-thinking person in the United States. There is no more devoted, hardworking, conscientious and intelligent person in public life today than Senator DOUGLAS, of Illinois. His great speech against the McCarran-Walter Act on the floor of the Senate is still remembered by those who banded together to make that losing fight, and who know that sooner or later they will succeed. The country needs—and you personally need—PAUL H. DOUGLAS, of Illinois, in the Senate of the United States. We simply cannot afford to lose him, and I hope all of you will work for his reelection. Senator DOUGLAS will continue to be a leader in the effort to eliminate racial prejudices from the law and from the administration of the law. The evil forces responsible for such legislation as the McCarran-Walter Act are opposed to him. His victory will help in their ultimate defeat.

A nationwide educational campaign to acquaint the people with the facts and issues involved in immigration and citizenship laws and policies is an absolute necessity if this Nation is to win its way back to its traditional place as the champion of the oppressed and persecuted. Such a campaign was conducted successfully on behalf of the Displaced Persons Act, which brought nearly 400,000 immigrants to this country during the period from 1948 to 1952. It is believed that a more intensive campaign is necessary to make revisions in the existing codes.

I am glad to be able to tell all of you what certainly some of you already know—and that is that the organization of a National Citizens Committee on Immigration and Citizenship is underway. Welfare organizations of many denominations are sending their representatives to the meetings that are being held in New York City, and other great bodies, including the foremost labor organizations are joining with the religious groups and individuals planning the movement. HIAS is represented and so is USNA, with which you are consolidating. A subcommittee on structure of the organization is formulating a plan for a permanent body; and a subcommittee on principles is drafting a statement of the reasons for the formation of the committee, and how it is proposed to accomplish its objectives. And, of course, there will be a finance committee to raise the necessary funds.

I hope this outline has not been too long, with too many uninteresting details. I have assumed the risk of holding you perhaps from the more pressing business of the conference, and I have tried your patience because I believe sincerely that the discriminatory features of our immigration and citizenship laws are part of a pattern of discriminations and restrictions enveloping in various ways native-born citizens as well as naturalized citizens and aliens alike. The President's so-called employee security program, applicable to Federal employees, is an example. It is a program through which insecurity, injustice; and inhumanity are being imposed upon selected victims. And the use of such so-called security programs is spreading to private employments, beginning with industries engaged on Government contracts. Under such programs accusations without substantial proof may result in suspensions without notice and without pay, and compel those accused to suffer under presumptions of guilt. Despite the fine and lofty sentiments expressed by officials in high places, the sad fact is that the menace of infiltration by communism, instead of being met by education, and by penalties imposed after hearing and judgment in accordance with the accepted tenets of due process of law—that menace, dangerous as it is, is being used to create hysteria, to spread suspicion and fear, and, through disunity, to curtail the freedoms, the liberties, the privileges, and immunities of the American people.

We do not suffer, as President Eisenhower has tried to indicate in speaking of the Tennessee Valley Authority, from creeping socialism. There is, there can be no such thing in free, democratic America, and nobody, not even the President, should indulge in such demagogery. What we do suffer from at the moment is creeping McCarthyism, which has in it the seeds of a totalitarian dictatorship.

Despite the somewhat gloomy picture I have presented, I do not despair of the future. Neither do you. Our country has weathered such storms before. It will do so again. When the shouting and tumult of congressional investigations die away, when demagogs are shorn of opportunity to capture newspaper headlines, the goodness and the strength of the American people will be reasserted; the chains of discrimination and restriction on the rights and liberties of the people, now being forged by those who lust for power, will rust and crumble, and you and your fine organization—HIAS—will play its full part in helping to speed the arrival of a happier day.

A Sketch of Mrs. Luce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT P. MORANO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 30, 1954

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an editorial column by Margaret Latrobe, which appeared in the Bridgeport Post on June 29. This column contains a candid, human analysis of our Ambassador to Italy, Clare Boothe Luce. Although I do not thoroughly agree with the author's contention that Mrs. Luce is not popular and beloved either at home or abroad, I do find very interesting the astute reasoning which Miss Latrobe follows to explain why our talented Ambassador is envied by many the world over. I think Miss Latrobe has, in simple yet eloquent language, captured much of the soul of Clare Luce in this brief article.

The article follows:

MRS. LUCE'S PRESTIGE TOPS ON DIPLOMATIC TOTEM POLE

(By Margaret Latrobe)

Greed has an ugly price. Grasping and covetous folk never realize happiness from their acquisitions. A far uglier toll is exacted from those who though not greedy, have the unlucky fate of possessing great talent, money, good looks and power—too much of everything we lack. They are the ones who suffer, and through no fault of their own.

Clare Boothe Luce is one who comes to mind in this category. Blessed with unusual brilliance of mind, startling beauty and a very startling bank account, her prestige is tops on the diplomatic totem pole. Playwright, speaker of wit and perception, formidable in politics, she is also a thoughtful and dedicated churchwoman. Henry Luce, the publisher, adds inevitably to his wife's enormous influence.

But is she popular, beloved? No. She has too much. Envied and disliked at home, respected and disliked abroad for the same reason. Is she to blame? Not in the least. But the fact remains—we have made Clare a national boo-boo. Unfortunately and unfairly, but still a boo-boo.

A subtle factor operates in the minds of ordinary people, a factor which resents the "too much." Although we plain folk demand leaders, we also insist upon the "hard won" element in a leader's success.

This factor says, "Don't make it look too easy! Don't rub it in, kid, or we'll hate you for your superiority!" Failing to see heart and humanity in a leader, we exact our toll.

I doubt that there is another woman in America who can surpass Clare Boothe Luce on any plane of public endeavor. How many have worked hard and longer, serving this country?

As a young girl she was marked as a "comer" by influential observers. But the great gifts they observed have worked against her. Clare Luce's misfortune, one which may defeat her eventually, is that she had too much and used it too effectively.

Wealth, particularly, is resented by those without it. When Mrs. Luce's home was robbed it couldn't have been a modest little cottage—it had to be the Waldorf Towers. The thief didn't take her modest gold wedding band—it had to be a heavy hunk of ice valued in the thousands. Who cared, except to resent her owning such jewelry?

Her wit has been called caustic, maybe. Or perhaps unusually honest? Her political ambition has irritated some who may have had similar ambitions of their own. Well, where do her talents best fit—in politics or canasta?

Perhaps in disparaging her unusual abilities we have missed the human, genuine Clare Luce. With all her gifts, she has known the bitterness of failure, the need for courage, the seeking and longing—human things all. She has known the unutterable grief of losing a child. She has wept, even as you and I, and has turned to the One we must all turn to one day.

Let's give Clare a break, I think she would gratefully and humbly accept it.

The Farm-Support Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DOUGLAS R. STRINGFELLOW

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 30, 1954

Mr. STRINGFELLOW. Mr. Speaker, the farmers in the State of Utah, with minor exceptions, are completely in accord with Secretary Benson's recommendations for a flexible farm-support program. I believe a letter which I have received from Mr. Frank G. Shelley, executive secretary of the Utah State Farm Bureau Federation, is an excellent summation of the views of the farmers in my State; and, therefore, under leave to extend my remarks, I include this letter in the RECORD:

UTAH STATE FARM BUREAU FEDERATION,
Salt Lake City, Utah, June 26, 1954.
Hon. DOUGLAS R. STRINGFELLOW,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE STRINGFELLOW: It appears that the battle has finally opened in Congress to determine whether or not we are to have a continuation of high support prices for agricultural products, or whether a flexible plan is to be put into operation. Obviously, the Agricultural Committees of the House and Senate are recommending a continuation of the high-support program.

As you are aware, Farm Bureau has given a great deal of attention to this matter and feels that there is a lot at stake in the decisions to be made. We feel, however, now that there has been sufficient experience with the high-support program to make its weaknesses obvious, there seems to be two possible courses ahead. One is to set into operation a plan similar to that approved about 5 years ago by Congress for flexible supports, which should allow for adjustment of production somewhat in line with demand. The other is for a very high degree of control by the Federal Government.

It is obvious that controlled production of certain crops only shifts the production to others and in no way effects a solution. If Congress continues to be determined to maintain high supports, regardless of the fact that the products produced by such a program cannot be sold, then the only alternative seems to be rigid control of acreages, which must apply to all crops. We feel that this is not a satisfactory solution because it would be extremely difficult to administer, would be very expensive, and in the long run would break down completely under its own weight.

We believe, with Ezra Benson, that farmers are entitled to a reasonably good return for their labor and investment. We are confident also with him that high prices act only as an immediate stimulent. It leaves the patient infinitely worse off after the effect of the stimulant is worn off.

We believe that the substantial, thinking farmers in Utah are sufficiently practical to realize the futility of a continuation of the high-support plan.

We fully realize that your position on these matters has been sound. It is highly important, however, that vigorous activity in Congress in support of Secretary Benson's program be carried out. We feel also that it is our responsibility to keep you advised of the attitude of the majority of the farmers in this State. There are, of course, a few extremists who make a far greater noise in proportion to their numbers than the stable well thinking group.

Very truly yours,
FRANK G. SHELLEY,
Executive Secretary.

Always Time for a Change

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. McCARTHY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 30, 1954

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Jerome G. Kerwin, from the Commonweal of July 2, 1954:

ALWAYS TIME FOR A CHANGE

(By Jerome G. Kerwin)

The American passion for the written law as a solution to any problem lives on. From Aristotle to the present, great political philosophers have emphasized the importance of the customs and disposition of the people as fundamental determinants in any commonwealth. Better a spirit of law abidingness than a proliferation of laws—that has been their message. In Plato's Republic the heart of justice he is describing is restraint and balanced judgment, which would seem upon reflection to be primary elements in the makeup of citizens of a democratic republic. But in place of these elements, which should be almost instinctive in a democratic citizenry, we often put our faith in the inflexible, detailed regulations of the statute books.

If this tendency exhibited itself merely in the multiplication of provisions in ordinary law, which is easy to repeal, and is frequently intended to be ephemeral, it would be unfortunate enough. Yet even in this instance we forget that any law is general in its nature; equity requires that relief must be found for the exceptional case through judicial or administrative tribunals. But our weakness for solution by the detailed law goes beyond even this and extends to fundamental, or constitutional, law, and this is dangerous.

One of the first doctrines of constitutional law is that it is a kind of law that sets down general principles upon which all other laws and all governmental institutions are erected. It provides for conditions in the long run. In so doing, constitutional law must have the character of flexibility to meet changing conditions as they develop in the history of States. As the Supreme Court once said of the interstate commerce clause of our Constitution, it extends in its operation from the horse with its rider in stagecoach days to the most modern means of communication.

Owing to the fundamental character of constitutional law, no simple majority may bring about its change; only through a complicated procedure may it be amended. As a compilation of general principles, it is a protection for our most cherished rights and institutions; as a detailed accumulation of directions for all conceivable emergencies, it is a legal straitjacket, inviting repeal, amendment, and revision almost yearly.

Most of our State constitutions illustrate the dangers which flow from our penchant for confusing constitutional law with statute law. These documents take hundreds of pages to list hundreds of diverse provisions; their framers have taken nothing for granted. Our modern complicated social, political, and economic life is written on every page. So we find provisions on the regulation of corporations; on the "dark continent" of our confused county governments; on everything a city can, cannot, and must do, including a description of city governments and the power of their officials; on the operation of the State government, with provision for the salaries of officials, the meetings of the legislature, the passage of legislation, and what is expected of the governor; on the operation of the courts, their structure, personnel, and procedure. All this spells out the inescapable conclusion that we have little faith and confidence in the persons we choose by popular suffrage, and more than a little doubt as to the intelligence of the sovereign people.

Our Federal Constitution, by constrast, has been a model for wise statesmen to contemplate and imitate. Outside of the first 10 amendments, which for all practical purposes may be considered part of the original document, there have been 12 amendments in the 165 years of the life of the Constitution. One of these provided for the adoption of the "noble experiment" of prohibition, and another provided for its hasty and unlamented departure. With the exception of this lapse into the bizarre, the amendments for the most part fall within the legitimate bounds of the subject matter of constitutional law. The Constitution has served us well because its framers realize that omniscience in foreseeing the march of future events is not granted to mortals. In the years since then, the generality and flexibility of its provisions have been our salvation.

The temptation to multiply details in the provisions of the Constitution has always been with us, as witness the thousands of proposed amendments submitted to Congress since 1789. In recent years the temptation has taken a political turn—everything done by the previous administration that one dislikes should be prohibited forever after. If this becomes a national habit, we are in for a form of constitutional debauch.

Already one restrictive amendment has been adopted, providing that no President may serve more than two terms, no matter what may be his qualifications, the circumstances of the times, or the popular will. Recently we have been treated to "the great debate" on the Bricker amendment, which would have deprived the President of a fundamental power belonging traditionally to the head of every nation on earth.

Now another ill-begotten child is laid on our doorsteps: the Butler amendment. With a speed not common in the United States Senate, this amendment received a two-thirds majority before most people were aware of its existence, with the vote in the end 58 in favor to 19 against. (Perhaps the McCarthy-Army hearings or the grave international crisis caused the Senators to place all other questions in a second-class category.) Before being placed before the legislatures of the States, the proposal must receive a two-thirds majority in the House.

This latest effort to amend the fundamental law has its roots in the late President Roosevelt's proposal to enlarge the Supreme Court by legislative act, something which lies within the competence of Congress. The proposal was made in 1937 and defeated in the same year, long before Senator BUTLER appeared on the congressional horizon. But it evidently made on Mr. BUTLER a lasting and alarming impression, and one that has not been lessened by the definite defeat the proposal suffered. He has therefore proposed as amendments to the Constitution that—

1. The number of Justices on the Supreme Court be fixed at the present number of nine.

2. That judges shall be compelled to retire at the age of 75.

3. That Congress shall not have the power of limiting the appellate power of the Supreme Court in matters ordinarily coming within the jurisdiction of that Court.

Take the third proposition first. The Constitution now provides that the Supreme Court shall have original jurisdiction in cases affecting Ambassadors, other ministers, and consuls, and those in which a State shall be a party. The Congress has no power to add to or subtract from this power. Congress does have the power to regulate the appellate jurisdiction of the Supreme Court. The proposed amendment seeks to set limits to the congressional power as it affects this appellate jurisdiction of the Court.

Here is a case where flexibility is definitely required. True enough, as things now stand, Congress could evidently reduce the appellate jurisdiction of the Court to a nullity. If one thinks only in terms of extremes, however, it is also true that Congress could refuse to appropriate 1 cent for the executive department. What we have here is another example of the way a certain type of mind seeks to have everything spelled out in detail, to the destruction of all beneficial discretionary power; future generations will have to be satisfied with what the midtwentieth century gives them.

There would seem to be no compelling reason for the second part. Some years ago a book was published called Nine Old Men, referring, of course, to the Supreme Court. Sporadically some citizens get worried about the longevity of our justices, but this has never become a matter of general concern. A judge may now voluntarily retire at full pay at the age of 70, a special invitation, as it were, to retire if he feels the weight of his years. Yet, with the ever-increasing life-expectancy, who is to say what a person's powers will be at 75? Justice Holmes was not without his wit or his wits at 90. In the Butler proposal we have an example of amendment of the Constitution to provide against a most rare contingency—a senile judge who does not know what is good for him when leisure at full salary is put within his grasp.

The first proposition is the most noteworthy. The Constitution leaves the size of the Supreme Court to the discretion of Congress. The size of the High Court was originally set at 6 and has been fixed at 9 since the Grant administration. The framers knew that it would be folly to set a fixed figure, for no one could tell how much business the Court might be called upon to handle in the future. Senator BUTLER, moved by fear of "court-packing" and the ghost of a former President, has decided that no matter how much business the already over-burdened Court might have in the future, 9 men will have to handle it. In order to forestall a possible evil his amendment would hamstring the Court.

This fear of discretionary power has been the prime factor behind the overloading of our State constitutions. Considering the number of places in the Federal Constitution about which similar fears might be entertained, every good citizen might well pray that the fear-complex does take up permanent residence in Washington.

Senator BUTLER judges wisely: the Supreme Court may be enlarged. It is far behind its docket now. Many able students of the law would increase the number to 12 or 15, dividing the Court into 3 sections, each hearing certain types of cases. This would be following the precedent of the high courts of Britain and France. There is nothing particularly revolutionary in the suggestion that the Court might well be enlarged, nor is there anything sacrosanct about the number 9.

There is a lesson to be learned from the Butler proposal. We must not as citizens continually look to the law to save us from our errors in picking the wrong men. If we insist upn hedging about with restrictions the powers that able men may rightly use as the times require, we shall no longer get the able men. Power and responsibility go together.

Why Eisenhower's Ohio Supporters Must Back Bender for Senator

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. HALLECK

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 30, 1954

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, among the many congressional election contests now underway, there is none of greater national interest than the contest in Ohio for the seat in the United States Senate which was vacated last year by the untimely death of the late, great Senator Robert A. Taft.

I have here an illuminating and significant article on the current status of the Ohio contest, written by the distinguished editor, columnist, and political commentator, Mr. Philip W. Porter, and published June 25 by the Cleveland Plain Dealer, one of America's greatest and most influential newspapers, whose editor is Mr. Wright Bryan, a nationally outstanding journalist.

Mr. Porter is a recognized authority on the Ohio political scene. He has been a member of the Plain Dealer's editorial staff for 32 years, and during that period has held a number of important posts, including that of political editor. He presently is Sunday and feature editor, and his regular column has tens of thousands of loyal readers.

During World II Mr. Porter served under General Eisenhower in Africa, England, and France, and at war's end was honorably discharged with the rank of lieutenant colonel. He was one of the first writers to advocate the Republican nomination of General Eisenhower for the Presidency.

While the Plain Dealer's traditional political policy has been independent Democrat, it opposed the third and fourth terms for President Roosevelt, the candidacy of President Truman, and many New Deal and Fair Deal policies and practices, and supported General Eisenhower for President.

In Mr. Porter's article he emphasizes the importance of a Republican victory in the Ohio senatorial contest to the Eisenhower administration, an importance that is underscored by the fact that President Eisenhower will go into Ohio to speak in behalf of the candidacy of Congressman GEORGE H. BENDER, who is serving his seventh term in the House of Representatives, where he has given the Eisenhower policies and program 100-percent support.

Mr. Porter writes that if Eisenhower supporters "still like Ike, and want to help him, they've got to be for BENDER. If they vote for his Democratic opponent, former Mayor Tom Burke, they'll be voting to set up a hostile machine against Ike in the Senate, in which the northern Laborite-New Dealers will return to some committee chairmanships. It's that simple.

"And if Ike faces a hostile majority in Congress next year," Mr. Porter predicts, "you can lay odds it will be most difficult to get him to run again in 1956. And without Ike as candidate in 1956, the Republicans, divided as they are, haven't got a prayer. Not another soul is in sight who can inspire them with the same confidence."

Mr. Porter forecasts that President Eisenhower's personal participation in the Ohio campaign will be a tremendous lift to BENDER and the other Republican congressional candidates; in my opinion, it will amount to much more than a tremendous lift—it will insure an overwhelming Republican victory in Ohio.

Under unanimous consent, I now insert Mr. Porter's article in full in the Appendix of the RECORD:

EISENHOWER BACKERS HERE MUST SUPPORT BENDER IF THEY STILL LIKE IKE

(By Philip W. Porter)

Political interest is at a low ebb right now, but behind the scenes some first-class worrying is being done, and should be done, about a problem: How to transfer the still-strong independent support of President Eisenhower into a vote for BENDER for Senator and for other Republican candidates.

The Citizens for Eisenhower movement, red-hot in 1952, is being rebuilt nationally, but there's little organized life in it around here. Right after the victory in 1952, the amateurs dropped out. GEORGE BENDER, the local chairman, though a Taftite, became a completely sure vote for Ike's program in the House. George Humphrey, the Cleveland business wheel who had masterminded Republican fund raising for years, became Secretary of the Treasury, and Ike's right-hand man. There seemed nothing to quarrel about; all were in the same bed.

There was always, however, a lack of enthusiasm for BENDER among Ike fans, and some even supported Bill Saxbe in his recent hopeless race. But now that BENDER is nominated, has the publicly announced blessing of President Eisenhower, and the strong support of Humphrey, there is no practical alternative for the Ike supporters.

MUST BE FOR BENDER

If they still like Ike, and want to help him, they've got to be for BENDER. If they vote for his Democratic opponent, former Mayor TOM BURKE, they'll be voting to set up a hostile majority against Ike in the Senate, in which the northern Laborite-New Dealers will return to some committee chairmanships. It's that simple.

And if Ike faces a hostile majority in Congress next year, you can lay odds it will be most difficult to get him to run again in 1956. And without Ike as candidate in 1956, the Republicans, divided as they are, haven't got a prayer. Not another soul is in sight who can inspire the same confidence.

The logic is inescapable. But there are signs that just yet, some of the Ike backers haven't quite reasoned it through. By October, it probably will be spelled out clearly for them. A visit by Mr. Eisenhower to this area will be a tremendous lift to BENDER and the other Republican congressional candidates—and Ike has promised to come.

The situation is complicated by the fact that BURKE has some personal popularity in the Cleveland area. He never ran in the suburbs, and he never ran against a really strong candidate in Cleveland, so no one can tell for sure how he'll do this time. BENDER has run in the suburbs and run strongly.

CUYAHOGA IS VITAL

What happens in Cuyahoga County will be vitally important. BENDER, to win, has got to do no worse than split the vote here; he should carry downstate Ohio without much trouble. The city of Cleveland is normally Democratic, and habituated to voting for BURKE; so BENDER has got to carry the suburbs (and that means the Eisenhower independent vote) strongly to offset it.

BURKE has sensed that he has got to appeal to Eisenhower supporters or he won't get off the ground, so he has been trying it through a cute maneuver: He strongly criticizes the Republican Congressmen for not enacting Ike's program. This carries the implication that he, BURKE, would do a better job of putting the program over. In his votes so far, however, he's done no such thing (except for public housing). He voted with all the Democrats to kill Ike's Taft-Hartley Act revisions. He announced before a labor group here recently he was in favor of the $800 income tax exemption, which Ike has opposed strongly as unbalancing the budget. As time goes on and the going gets tougher toward the close, you can expect him to follow the Democratic line more and more.

The job of the Republicans now is to saturate and anoint the converted BENDER with Eisenhower fragrance and to isolate BURKE as a long-time pro-Truman, pro-Stevenson Democratic partisan.

Advertising: Federal Jurisdiction and Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 30, 1954

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following address by Mr. Daniel J. Murphy, Director, Bureau of Anti-Deceptive Practices, Federal Trade Commission, which Mr. Murphy delivered at the luncheon of the Federal Communications Bar Association on June 22, 1954:

Advertising, as an American institution, is a highly developed technique. From simple and humble beginnings, it has grown to fabulous and complicated proportions. The growth and development of advertising is inseparable from the growth and development of American industry; its production, distribution, and consumption. Because of its enormous expenditures and its creation of mass demands, advertising today is a terrific integrating factor in the social and economic life of America. Fifty years ago, the national expenditures for advertising, consisting largely of newspaper and magazine advertising, amounted to approximately $95 million a year; in 1952, national advertising, geared to a vigorously expanding economy, cost over $7,200,000,000.

The advertising technique during the years of this expansion has materially changed its character. Years ago, when truth conflicted with sales, outright falsehood was resorted to. There were no standards of ethics or effective legal restraints. The prevailing trade practice was caveat emptor and to reward deception. The patent-medicine manufacturers, the first organized national advertisers, were enjoying a harvest. Flagrant deceptions to catch the consumer's dollar were resorted to. You could buy an advertised positive cure for almost any disease known to man or beast.

At the time of President Eisenhower's inauguration the Washington Post, on January 20, 1953, printed a facsimile of a full-page advertisement which appeared in the Washington Post the day Grover Cleveland took office as President in 1885. There is no doubt that the ad was entirely without the President's consent. Yet it had the appearance of a handwritten, Executive proclamation. It uses the President's name, but it carefully avoids a Cleveland signature. Cleveland was known to enjoy a drink occasionally. He is represented in this advertising as endorsing Duff's Pure Malt Whisky and endorsing it as a cure for practically everything. A veritable patent medicine. The price, incidently, was $1.25 for a sample quart, or you could purchase 6 quarts for $6.

Other advertisements in the papers of the period indicate a similar lack of advertising ethics and a predominance of all-embracing claims for the product offered.

The danger and deception of this type of advertising was recognized by many publishers. As a result, many articles appeared in leading magazines, exposing the dishonesty of many advertising claims. The articles did much to crystallize public sentiment in favor of Federal regulation. In 1906 the Food and Drug Act was passed; in 1914 the Federal Trade Commission Act was enacted.

When present standards of advertising and business ethics are compared with those in existence 50 years ago, it seems almost incredible that the highest concepts of responsibility on the part of business to the consuming public as now exist were possible of achievement. We like to think that the Federal Trade Commission has made a contribution to this improvement in advertising.

Over the years there has been a tremendous improvement in advertising. The outright lies in advertising are now quite rare. We do have some.

A recent advertisement of a perfume claimed its use would enable every married woman to make her husband obey her every command; make him come home at night and help her; that it had the power to make men obedient slaves; to make men leave their wives and sweethearts and do whatever the user wanted them to do.

Sometimes you get advertising claims for products that are false, per se; for example, medicinal preparations advertised as cures for cancers, diabetes, epilepsy, and other diseases for which there is no known cure; claims that a product will prevent baldness or grow hair in arid soil.

Today, generally, a more subtle technique is used; I think that most business executives are opposed to it. I refer to the so-called twilight-zone copy which does not come clean with the truth but relies upon half-truths, false innuendos and deceptive stratagems. Many forms of misrepresentation are so subtle that the consumer, exercising his own faculties and initiative, cannot determine whether he is being deceived or not.

The Federal Trade Commission has the widest jurisdiction of all Federal regulatory bodies over advertising. Other Federal agencies have restricted jurisdiction over advertising—limited to single commodities or particular media. The jurisdiction of the

Commission, by contrast, is general—extending to all media and with few exceptions to all commodities.

Aside from specific statutory exemption such as banks, common carriers, air carriers, those subject to the Packers and Stockyards Act—there are some cases in which the Commission's jurisdiction and that of other Federal agencies may to some extent be concurrent.

For example, the Securities and Exchange Commission has jurisdiction over advertising of securities, and the Federal Trade Commission no longer exercises jurisdiction in this field.

The Alcohol Tax Unit of the Treasury Department, under the Federal Alcohol Administration Act, controls the advertising of spirituous beverages and the Federal Trade Commission cooperates by supplying to the Treasury Department ads taken from its survey concerning such beverages.

The Post Office Department issues fraud orders stopping delivery of mail to persons who have used the mails to defraud. The Federal Trade Commission maintains close liaison with the Post Office Department to assure that there will be no unnecessary overlapping or duplication of effort in cases where both agencies might have jurisdiction.

The Federal Communications Commission has no direct control over advertising, but indirectly may prevent fraudulent or deceptive advertising to some extent by virtue of its control over the use of obscene language, lotteries, and the granting and renewal of licenses. Copies of complaints and cease and desist orders in Federal Trade Commission antideceptive practices cases are regularly furnished to the Post Office Department and the Federal Communications Commission for their information pursuant to agreement between the agencies.

I have been asked by your president to comment on the Federal Trade Commission's survey of advertising. Since 1929 the Commission, through one or more of its divisions, has maintained a continuing survey of published and broadcast advertising. It was confined originally to newspapers and magazines. In 1934 it was expanded to include radio commercials, and since 1939 has also covered mail-order catalogs. In 1948 TV broadcasts were included.

The primary objective of the survey was to detect advertisements containing false and misleading statements and representations in order that investigations could be made and cases instituted with the view of correcting such practices in their incipiency regardless of whether any outside complaints were received. Experience indicates that false advertising has been used in many instances over a considerable period without any complaint being made to the Commission by any source at all.

There is no law regulation which compels publishers and broadcasters to supply the advertising material. It is obtained on a cooperative and voluntary basis through requests sent periodically to the sources of this material. Excellent cooperation through the years has been received from the publishers and broadcasters.

The survey now includes the commercial portions of all broadcasts over the four leading radio and television networks, a sampling of local raido and television continuities, and a broad coverage of magazine and newspapers. Sample issues are obtained from 302 magazines and 504 newspapers. The continuities from local radio and television stations include 2,365 local radio stations and 111 local television stations. Mail order catalogs are sent in regularly by the leading mail order companies.

The advertising examiners, upon reviewing the material received, select and set aside those advertisements which appear to contain questionable claims and representations and thus warrant further study and attention. These ads are then reviewed by the legal staff and investigations are started where it appears that some action is warranted inthe public interest. The number of ads so selected has constituted about 4 percent of the total examined during each year the survey has been aperated. During the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, 550,663 separate advertisements were examined and 23,645 were set aside. From the advertisements so set aside, 84 cases of false and misleading advertising were instituted.

Studies of the different media as sources for questionable advertisements indicate that the radio and television network broadcasts have produced the highest number of marked advertisements, with newspapers and magazines being the next best source. Local radio and television scripts rank third, mail order catalogs being the least productive of all media examined. As a result of these studies, greater emphasis has been placed on the review of the radio and television network material with a corresponding reduction in the review of mail order catalogs.

In addition to being a source of new actions, it has been found over the years that the survey serves other useful purposes. The advertisements set aside provide an inexpensive method of checking on compliance with outstanding orders, stipulations, and trade-practice rules and provide a readily available cross section of the advertising being used in particular industries at any given time.

Allow me to close with just a few words re television advertising. This new intimate media of television, as you know, has had phenomenal growth and development. When the war ended there were half a dozen television stations; now there are approximately 400 or more. By 1946 there were about 10,000 television sets in use; in 1952 there were about 16 million sets in use. Just imagine—in excess of 150,000 percent. You remember in 1950 the American Television Manufacturers' Association endeavored to stimulate this avalanche by inserting in more than 1,000 newspapers advertisements designed to shame parents into buying television sets for their children. This ad had an old-fashioned ring. It created universal disapproval. We acted immediately to stop such advertising and obtained a promise that there would be no further resumption of it. Television is the salesman's dream. Instead of one foot in the door, he is right in the living room. Advertising and the profits derived from advertising are responsible for the astounding growth of the television industry. It is no doubt the most powerful and most effective medium for mass merchandising ever devised.

The responsibilities of television as a guest in the home in connection with advertising matters is well recognized by the television code of the National Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters.

The Helicopter and Civil Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL HINSHAW

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 30, 1954

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by the Honorable Val Peterson, Federal Civil Defense Administrator, before the American Helicopter Society, Inc., at the Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C., on Thursday, June 24, 1954:

THE HELICOPTER AND CIVIL DEFENSE

Civil defense and the helicopter have a lot in common—far more than you may first realize.

1. The need for civil defense has developed from a military situation because our military defenses cannot stop an enemy attack on this country once it is launched. The helicopter got its initial impetus as a military vehicle and proved in Korea that it could serve many useful purposes.

2. Civil defense, because it is not the traditional way of defending ourselves, has suffered from a great deal of skepticism and lack of imagination. The helicopter, because it is not a traditional fixed-wing aircraft, has suffered from a good deal of the same skepticism and lack of imagination for its uses.

3. Both the helicopter and civil defense are modern answers to modern problems and they have been working hand in hand since civil defense got underway several years ago. Both have revealed new possibilities for civilian survival under atomic attack.

Civil defense and the helicopter have a great future ahead of them as working partners in the business of civilian preparedness. As a student of history, military aviation and the problems of this air-atomic age, I think I can say to you without fear of contradiction that both civil defense and the helicopter are here to stay. How successful they may prove to be, independently and as partners, will depend primarily on our doggedness in supplying pioneer leadership and imagination.

I am here tonight not just as a Defense Administrator but as a man who loves flying and who takes it seriously. More importantly to this gathering, I have the honor of being a helicopter pilot, as many of you know. I started flying helicopters both as a hobby and as an adjunct to my job as Civil Defense Administrator.

Right after I took office, I had the opportunity of witnessing several practical demonstrations of the use of the helicopter in civil defense. Long before the dust had settled, I made up my mind that civil defense and I and the helicopter were in business together—not just as a whim but as a practical necessity.

The helicopter industry is a fast-growing business, just as civil defense is on its way to being a fast-growing business. I know you are going to have a lot less trouble creating bigger markets and public acceptance than civil defense has had.

Let me explain the reasons for that before we take a look at the expanding partnership of the helicopter and civil defense.

The crying need for adequate defense of the civilian population in this air-atomic age was barely recognized in official Washington circles as late as 5 years after the first atomic bombs gutted Hiroshima and Nagasaki. The FCDA was established by law less than 4 years ago. By contrast, your industry has had the jump on us for at least a decade.

Within the past year President Eisenhower has told us, the American people, in clear and simple language of the threat we face and just what we must do about it. Last December, he told the mayors of the Nation's target areas that "for the first time in history cities have become principal targets for any enemy seeking to conquer our Nation." Earlier, in his historic address before the United Nations, he warned that our cities would be hit once the enemy had launched an attack—despite our most powerful defenses.

One of the major answers to our national survival if the enemy hits us with hydrogen and atomic weapons is a practical, modern civil defense program.

An adequate civil defense program, as I see it, can only be measured by our civilian readiness to meet at home the destructive effects of weapons which now exist in the hands of a possible aggressor, or are likely to exist in the foreseeable future. By any realistic standard we do not now have enough civil defense preparedness to compensate for the increasing vulnerability of our cities. Because of rapid new weapons developments, of which the world is well aware, civil defense is making progress but losing ground in face of that growing threat.

Upon release of official Government information on the Operation Ivy test, it became apparent to the people of America that 1 H-bomb could literally gut any one of our major cities. The AEC Chairman, Adm. Lewis Strauss, confirmed this after witnessing one of the recent thermonuclear tests in the Pacific. He told the President's press conference that 1 modern H-bomb could—and I quote—"put a city out of commission but not level it." In reply to the question, "any city?" he added, "any city."

This top-level confirmation of the increased power of hydrogen weapons has made it plain to most Americans that civil defense is now more vital, rather than less vital, if we are to survive an enemy attack on our cities.

A review of the dangers that confront us today, and the new civilian preparedness measures needed to counter them, will make clear why civil defense is more important now than ever before; and why we must have it if we are to help keep the peace—or failing that, to survive atomic attacks on this country and carry on the war to a successful conclusion.

We have certain knowledge that the enemy possesses today a growing stockpile of atomic weapons, which will be bolstered with hydrogen weapons. We know further that the enemy now has within his capability the means of delivering these weapons, whether atomic or hydrogen, to any major city in the United States.

There has been some debate as to how many enemy bombers would get through our military defenses and be able to hit our cities with nuclear weapons if an attack were launched today, next year, or several years from now. We are gratefully aware that our Armed Forces are working intensively to build up the military defenses of the continental United States.

Regardless of the size or swiftness of that buildup, however, we civilians must also face the grim reality outlined by the President: There is no complete military protection against enemy attack on our cities, once that attack is launched.

That is why, in the President's continental defense program, there is recognition of the need for an accelerated civil defense program as an integral and critical part of the total program for the continental defense of the United States.

The grave and urgent problem confronting our civilian authorities at all levels of government is: What improved civil defense preparedness measures can be taken now, and in the near future, to minimize the effects of an all-out enemy attack on our country?

The most important of these new preparedness measures is intensive planning for mass evacuation of our populations from target cities before an attack. This kind of dispersal or evacuation can function properly only if three factors are present:

1. Adequate warning time.

2. Adequate State, county, and local civil-defense organizations, geared to meet the evacuation problems of mass feeding, mass care, etc.

3. An informed public that has actually been trained in the evacuation drills from their cities.

There has been some editorial reaction based on exaggerated reports on the current Pacific weapons tests to the effect that—

1. Civil defense is now outmoded or useless, and earlier plans for civilian protection against the A-bomb must now be thrown out the window in view of these bigger weapons.

2. Mass evacuation is either impossible to carry out, once the advance warning is available, or it is a defeatist program and should never be tried.

Let me answer these false conclusions in order:

1. On August 21, 1953, following the announcement of the Russian hydrogen bomb test, I made the following public statement: "The hydrogen bomb is a finite weapon. It has definite limitations. The basic guidance which civil defense has given the American people for self-protection and for organized civil defense is still valid. The disaster created by a hydrogen bomb would not be a different kind of disaster—but a larger one. The citizen's means for survival—against nuclear weapons of any size—is learning and living civil defense. Now we must prepare a bigger and better civil defense much sooner than many realized would be necessary." What was true then is true now, and will continue to be true in the future.

2. In June a year ago, I began urging publicly that our States and cities start planning for evacuation and public tests of evacuation.

In the face of the increased destructive capacity of hydrogen bombs, planned evacuation of our cities—as a new dimension in civil defense—now becomes an urgent necesisty. We recognize that evacuation of people from our large cities poses staggering problems requiring careful analysis and intensive leadership by civil authorities in each of the target areas.

The fact that evacuation is difficult or inconvenient, however, does not detract from the equally evident fact that we must have planned evacuation or millions of Americans will die unnecessarily in the event of attack. Our program for planned evacuation was endorsed by the National Security Council only after the most searching study of the alternatives. There are none that offer comparable promise of mass survival.

Nor do plans for evacuation nullify or eliminate prior civil defense measures. Evacuation adds a new dimension, a new mobility to civil defense in the interest of saving lives. Evacuation is not running away just for the sake of running. It is a calculated method of personal dispersal for greater security, so designed that the lives and skills as of many Americans as possible may be saved to restore production and carry on the war.

There, in brief, is the civil defense problem that you and I had better face up to.

I am certain that the helicopter can and must play a major role in our plans for the evacuation of our target cities. Traffic control will certainly be a vital part of any successful evacuation, whether by foot, or by vehicle, or by a combination walkout-rideout plan, such as was used so effectively last week during a test evacuation of the downtown area of Mobile, Ala. In Mobile some 70,000 people were successfully dispersed from a 480-block area by this method.

Helicopters have proven their value in peacetime traffic control situations over our major cities. What we will need for the evacuation of our one-hundred-and-ninety-odd target areas are many hundreds of helicopters to keep civilian traffic moving swiftly to the areas of safety. We do not have anywhere near this number of helicopters available today.

One of the major means of cushioning the shock of an enemy attack on this country is an adequate program of emergency information. Our program now relies mainly on the Conelrad system of emergency broadcasting, plus emergency editions put out by our daily papers, as well as person-to-person communication by our warden system. The new information medium that we need for mass panic prevention and control calls for the use of helicopters, operating over a wide area, for the dissemination of civil defense instructions and survival information to large groups of people before and after the attack.

We have actually tested the feasibility and the audibility of this method of giving the public instructions over our own headquarters in downtown Washington, in cooperation with the District civil defense authorities. The system works. The problem now is to make it work better, and on a wider scale in every target city in the country. But we can't use this technique effectively until there are many, many more commercial helicopters available for civil defense use throughout the Nation.

With the cooperation of companies in the industry, we have had actual test demonstrations of the use of the helicopter in rescue work at our National Civil Defense Training Center at Olney, Md. These tests included lowering rescue teams to the tops of tall buildings which were inaccessible by normal means and the flying out of casualties from the tops of such buildings.

These special tasks for the helicopter do not include the accepted forms of helicopter usage as already established and proven either in Korea combat or in the peacetime applications of the whirleybird. Those uses will be just as valuable to civil defense in peacetime disasters as in time of war.

In May of last year we put out our initial circular to the civil-defense authorities of the Nation on the uses of the helicopter in civil defense. In this circular we urged further exploration with helicopter by State and local authorities in order to increase civil-defense operational effectiveness. The primary emphasis in this helicopter bulletin was on (1) transportation, (2) rescue, (3) reconnaissance, and (4) communications.

A month later I had a gratifying demonstration of the value of the helicopter to civil defense in combating natural disasters, for which our agency also is responsible in the Federal Government. I surveyed the tornado-stricken areas of Flint, Mich., and Worcester, Mass., from this flying command post and came away with a far better knowledge of the extent of the damage than I would ever have received by making my survey from the ground.

While this was my first personal experience in the critical need for helicopters in disaster work, it is hardly new—witness their extensive lifesaving work in last year's floods in Holland and in the earthquakes in the Greek islands.

Many of us have come to think of the helicopter as a jack-of-all-trades. Since the civil defense program, in peacetime or in war, must be prepared to meet operational problems as complex as those with which the military must deal, we have more than a passing interest in the future of the helicopter, both militarily and commercially.

There is no question that the military is rapidly expanding its use and its needs for the helicopter. I sincerely hope that a program can be worked out so that some of the military aircraft would be temporarily available at the outset of war to local civil defense authorities; at least, until such time as the planes have to be brought into active combat duty. But this would only be a stopgap measure.

I also believe that both the military and civil defense forces would profit from a program which would concentrate military reserve training squadrons of helicopters near many of our critical target areas. These Reserve squadrons might well devote a portion of their training to civil defense exercises and to civil defense duty with the local authorities.

For an air-minded nation such as America, the current numbers and uses of nonmilitary helicopters are far too limited even from an ordinary commercial standpoint. From a civil defense standpoint, there will never be enough helicopters available in the next decade to meet anywhere near the minimum civil defense requirements at the Federal, State, and local level should our Nation come under enemy attack. That is why I agree wholeheartedly with the Civil

Air Policy Report of the President's Air Coordinating Committee. That report states in bold type: "In future consideration of subsidy support for these services, the board should give appropriate weight to the value of such services to Civil Defense."

Under the heading "Airline Services," the report rightly states, "Federal subsidy support of these services, which the CAB has justified to date by their value to the commerce, postal service, and national defense may now also be justified in terms of their potential value to civil defense efforts."

I am not going to quote you facts and figures to back up that claim. You have ample statistics from Korea and other fighting fronts to bear out the rescue, communications, and transport value of helicopter operation over tough terrain, under battle conditions.

There is ample proof at hand that we have just begun to tap the operational possibilities of the helicopter in civil defense. Hardly a month goes by that we don't have practical evidence of a new and promising use of the helicopter in this business of civilian preparedness.

Last week was a good example. During the national civil defense test exercise—"Operation Alert"—our Agency actually used borrowed military helicopters for the fast transportation of executive personnel and dispatches between our two emergency command posts outside of Washington.

If war should come, many officials of the Government would have to reach their emergency posts by helicopter. The military, of course, would have such planes available. The civilian agencies for the most part would not. I assume that military helicopters would be fully occupied in their own command duties. The rest of Government, including the Federal Civil Defense Administration, would have to requisition such commercial helicopters as were available. I need hardly tell you that such availability is almost in the minus category right now.

That in essence, is our problem today—a great need—and few helicopters to meet it. I am sure that the helicopter industry will be able to focus the necessary emphasis on this overriding civilian need in this period of transition. I assure you the support of every civil defense director in the country toward that end.

Thank you.

Ten Touchstones of True Patriotism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. McCARTHY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 30, 1954

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the Members of this House this article, listing and explaining 10 marks or standards for judging the true patriot:

[From America of July 3, 1954]

TEN TOUCHSTONES OF TRUE PATRIOTISM

(By Robert C. Hartnett)

"Patriotism," Sam Johnson once said, "is the last refuge of a scoundrel." As great a patriot as Theodore Roosevelt acknowledged that Johnson was right—but only, of course, partly right. For the caustic critic of cant was speaking only of the abuse of a great moral virtue.

That virtue is the well-ordered love of one's country and of his fellow citizens. The fact that a virtue may be used to cloak a vice in no wise destroys the luster of the virtue. True love between a man and a woman is a virtue, even though the vice of mere sexual infatuation often masquerades as true love.

The fact remains that all of us have to exercise care in deciding what attitudes are patriotic and what are distortions of that noble virtue. The commemoration of Independence Day offers an occasion to suggest the following norms by which to distinguish true from bogus patriotism.

1. The true patriot seldom labels himself a patriot. He has an exalted idea of what the virtue of patriotism demands of him. He has an acute realization of how far he falls short of his own ideals. He applies to himself the words of our Lord to His disciples: "When you have done everything that was commanded you, say, 'We are unprofitable servants.'"

2. The true patriot embraces under "love of country" everything that preserves and promotes its moral and material, spiritual and temporal character. He tries to diminish the evil and build up the good in his society in every way possible; he does not limit his patriotism to the kind of conduct that makes people popular as patriots, such as buying Government bonds.

Whatever makes his country more pleasing in the eyes of God increases its perfection as a corporate moral person, elicits the potentialities of its citizens for moral achievement, finds him on its side. He understands patriotism sub specie aeternitatis, that is, as a large part of the moral universe in which our Creator has placed us for the purpose of working out, in the medium of time, our eternal destiny. He therefore sees patriotism as part of the Christian order, the dynamic plan by which God's human creatures freely, intelligently cooperate in fulfilling the divine intentions for mankind.

3. The true patriot keeps his eye on the common good, properly conceived, of his local community, of his State, and of his Nation. His conversation is colored by such concepts as the common good and social justice. These ideas influence his judgments about such controversial issues as public housing, old-age pensions, unemployment compensation, and public relief. He is concerned about the lot of the poor, the physically and mentally ill, the unemployed, the underpaid. He thinks a lot in terms of human needs—the human needs of people of all classes, colors, and creeds. He is what people call civic minded, but in a deeply moral, even religious, way.

4. The true patriot sees his own country and all other countries as members of the family of nations, united by the indestructible moral bonds of a common human nature and a common human condition. He knows that God, the Father of all, has created the material goods of this earth for the good of all His human children, as means by which they may be helped to attain their divine destiny. He knows that, under divine providence, the method of distributing these goods is grounded in the natural right of private property as regulated by individual States. But he also knows that the exercise of property rights must be accommodated to the international, as well as the national, common good.

So the true patriot does not whine about high taxes if they are necessary to achieve the divine purpose of all material wealth. He is disturbed in conscience when his fellow citizens sneer at foreign-aid programs as Operation Rathole, as if the beneficiaries were rodents instead of human creatures made in the image of God. He wants his country to accept whatever moral responsibilities good sense judges it to have for the political, economic, social, cultural improvement and security against aggression of the human race as a whole.

He is never the first to complain when tariffs are somewhat lowered to give other peoples a chance to improve their lot. Nor is he quick to restrict immigration from areas overcrowded with underfed, ill-clothed, and shelterless fellow humans. And he doesn't bravely denounce international communism at chamber of commerce luncheons, but cry bloody murder at the very thought of having his son sent to Korea or Indochina to oppose Red aggression on the battlefield.

5. The true patriot defends the rights of every person. He has only one set of principles of justice, which he applies to everyone. The fact that a fellow citizen of his was once a Communist does not, in the eyes of a true patriot, strip such a person of his human nature and the natural and legal rights recognized as belonging to all persons in his society.

In meting out justice he is not governed by likes and dislikes but by the norms of right and wrong. If need be, he is willing to become unpopular because of his attachment to fundamental principles. In fact, he would find it odd if such attachment never involved him in criticism from others.

6. The true patriot upholds constitutional government and the rule of law. He knows that laws and even constitutional provisions can involve serious inconveniences and sometimes injustices. He is prepared to bear with them up to a point in order to preserve orderliness in public affairs.

He is not opposed to the orderly revision of governmental procedures. But he is impressed by the soundness of the principle expounded in the Declaration of Independence: "Prudence, indeed, will dictate that governments long established should not be changed for light and transient causes." He opposes the violation of laws, or collusion with such violation, when means are readily available of changing the laws (if need be) through constitutional procedures. He patiently stands by the principle that governments should rule through laws rather than the will of individual men, in accordance with the ancient Christian standard of immunity from the arbitrary.

7. The true patriot tempers his zeal in order to avoid imputing unpatriotic motives to his fellow citizens unless their conduct leaves no alternative. He does not brand them disloyal for having reached conclusions or made decisions different from his own. "In a republic," declared that most ardent apostle of Americanism "Teddy" Roosevelt, "to be successful we must learn to combine intensity of conviction with a broad tolerance of difference of conviction."

He keeps a conscientious rein on even his suspicions about the loyalty of others. In doubtful cases he keeps his mind open, lest he commit the sin of rash judgment. He follows the principle Lincoln propounded when he himself was accused of religious infidelity: "I believe it is an established maxim in morals that he who makes an assertion without knowing whether it is true or false is guilty of falsehood; and the accidental truth of the assertion does not justify or excuse him."

He regards the accusation of disloyalty to country as being the gravest charge, in the temporal order, of which a man can be made the object. Hence he takes it to be a grave matter of conscience to require convincing evidence before he gives assent. His integrity keeps him from accepting secondhand, without scrutiny, judgments made by others who, he has reason to fear, might not be so scrupulous about stigmatizing their fellow citizens as he feels he must be.

8. The true patriot devotes himself to the public good as far as his time and talents allow. He knows one cannot be a true patriot from the sidelines. When causes need his support, he supports them. He is not content to complain. He acts.

His Excellency Bishop Charles F. Buddy, of San Diego, Calif., in his recently published The Thoughts of His Heart (Paterson, N. J.: St. Anthony's Guild), reprints the challenge he made to a Catholic college graduating class:

"You have often been advised to keep out of politics because it is corrupt. It is corrupt because men who have had the advantages that you have had failed in their civic duty. If you find politics corrupt, go in and clean it up. Give freely of your time and talents from the precincts up to national levels. When crooked politicians attempt to operate, expose them * * *. At least get into the scrimmage."

This is the voice of realistic, practical patriotism.

9. The true patriot counts the worth of his contributions to his country in terms of what they cost him in time, money, efforts and convenience. He does not complain that he "works 2 days a week for Uncle Sam" as if that were on the face of it too high a price to pay for membership in a society which carries the heavy burdens ours carries. He calculates his country's demands on him, not according to their size, but according to their necessity. If he has to pay high taxes, he knows it is only because his stake in his country is so high. The "little patriot," too, gives willingly of his modest means when he realizes that the safety and peaceful progress of his country and of mankind cannot be bought cheap.

10. The true patriot, finally, encourages patriotism in others in every way he can. He gives credit to everyone who is doing a good job wherever he is: the factory worker, the farmer, the housewife, the businessman, the teacher, the doctor, the lawyer, the clergyman, the public or private employee. He recognizes the dignity of their functions and how much the well-being of his Nation depends on their being well done.

He will not condone wrongdoing by anyone, because it weakens the foundations of our society. What he admires most is character, solid achievement and public-spirited dedication. He opposes evil-doers in every line: subversives, chiselers, grafters, calumniators, "confusionists," mere vote-seekers, the money-mad, the pleasure-mad—all who tear down instead of building up the fabric of a strong society. Even work shabbily done he regards as unpatriotic because it lowers the standards of what his people could accomplish.

One may agree or disagree with the touchstones here suggested. But should not every American have worked out for himself some standards by which he decides whether or not the attitudes and modes of conduct he is asked to adopt are really patriotic?

Patriotism, loyalty, and their opposites are occupying everybody's mind today. The least each of us can do is to refine our ideas about this noble virtue. For false notions of patriotism are abroad, based on jingoism, nationalism, selfishness, and (though one hesitates to employ an overused term) a rather unanalyzed fear. We cannot overcome the very real dangers to which we are exposed unless we rethink the ideals for which we stand.

Aristotle defined the state as a phratria, a "brotherhood." He was right: the bond of citizenship, a common patriotism, is love—love of country and love of our fellow citizens. If we keep that love right-ordered, we shall not go far wrong in the way we strive to be patriotic.

Veterans' Hospital at East Orange, N. J.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. T. MILLET HAND

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 30, 1954

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, I have received an interesting letter with an attached memorandum from Anthony J. Volpe, which among other things speaks highly of the operation of the Veterans' Administration hospital at East Orange, N. J.

Mr. Volpe is not only a badly disabled combat veteran, but is doing a great job as veterans service officer of Cape May County, N. J., and his experience with the Veterans' Administration and Veterans' Administration hospitals lends weight to what he says about the facilities at East Orange.

The letter and memorandum follow:

CAPE MAY VETERANS' BUREAU,
Cape May, N. J., June 9, 1954.

Congressman T. MILLETT HAND,
House Veterans' Affairs Committee,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HAND: It is with extreme pleasure that I forward you the attached personal report of Veterans' Administration hospital, East Orange, N. J.

I have been a patient there for some 6 weeks to date and am still hospitalized there for further surgery. In my observations there, I am very grateful of the wonderful medical and surgical care I have received, and this report will bear out in detail exactly how I feel personally and officially, in my capacity as county service officer. I would appreciate very much if you would have the attached report placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that your colleagues in the Congress of the United States may be able to see from a first hand witness why we have fought so very very much for the East Orange Veterans' Administration Hospital. I am personally humbly proud of the part that I have played in securing the Veterans' Administration hospital at East Orange. I believe that my report will bring a message to the Members of Congress, unto the House of Veterans' Affairs Committee, in which it will show a definite proof of the need, the benefit, and the overall necessity of such a facility in our State of New Jersey. My report has a twofold purpose such as: (1) To instill into the minds of the Congressmen both pro and con insofar as the veterans' hospital facilities are concerned, just how wrong or how misled some people can be in which they advocate curtailing veterans' hospital facilities; (2) it will also show to the Members of Congress that there is an ever-increasing need through normal attrition for additional veterans' hospital facilities and services.

With kindest regards,

ANTHONY J. VOLPE,
County Service Officer.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION HOSPITAL,
East Orange, N. J.

Since early April 1954 the undersigned has been a patient at the East Orange Veterans' Administration Hospital, and as a patient and an official of veterans affairs, I have had the privilege and the opportunity of observing first hand what the VA hospital is, what it does, what it can do, its efficiency, its need, and its overall necessity to the veterans of the State of New Jersey and surrounding areas.

I have personally been a patient in many Government and VA facilities during the past 8 years, I have seen both good and bad insofar as services are concerned; and I have, since being in official capacity, reported on various officials and facilities. To begin with the East Orange VA hospital is an excellent facility and is adequately and strategically located in an area where many tens of thousands of veterans reside. The location of the hospital itself demands recognition, not only because it is located in a quiet residential area very easily accessible by bus or by other modes of transportation. When I first reported for hospitalization I was met downstairs in the admissions office and I received my very first favorable impression of the personnel of VA Hospital, East Orange. Being an amputee I was very courteously assisted and was saved many steps by the personnel, who went out of their way to secure the necessary forms and information in clearances rather than have me, as a patient or a potential patient, go from one office to another for the necessary formalities of admission. When I reported to ward 4D I was met at the elevator by the nurse on duty, who welcomed me to ward 4D. I was then assigned to ward 4A temporarily, and there again I was met by the ward nurse, who also welcomed me to her particular ward. This impressed me and it seemed to me quite unusual although it was very very nice to be met by the ward nurse and welcomed to the particular hospital facility. Speaking of nursing, I honestly believe that the nursing staff of the East Orange hospital is one of the best I have ever encountered in my wide experience with periods of hospitalizations. I find that the nurses are not only efficient, but they are very courteous and will do anything within their power or their capacity to make your stay in their particular wards as happy and as comfortable as possible. There is an air of efficiency as you wander from ward to ward, or from different services in the hospital. It seems that everyone there has a job to do and does it without any bickering or without a series of questions and that impressed me very very much at the onset.

The hospital aids, as they are called at the Veterans' Administration hospital, East Orange, are immaculately dressed in white, they know their job and they know it well. I understand that they receive class instructions right there in the hospital regarding the care and maintenance of patients and equipment. I have met, since I have been at the hospital, some of the finest professional men I have ever encountered. Of Course the first 4 weeks of my hospitalization have been in the eye ward, that is 4D and while in 4D I underwent surgery for the removal of a tumor pigmentation of the iris of my left eye. The surgeon, a Dr. Moskovitch, is not only a fine surgeon but a gentleman. I find that the other physicians and surgeons of ward 4A and 4D are the same caliber of personnel. Another unusual feature about these particular physicians is that they come in on Sundays and holidays and Saturdays, anytime at all, to change the dressings of their patients and to find out about the welfare of their patients. This is unusual, especially for a Government facility, and words cannot really express how a veteran feels when he receives such courteous and efficient attention while hospitalized in such a facility as the East Orange VA Hospital.

At present, I am home on leave for approximately a week and upon my return to the veteran's hospital at East Orange, I will undergo more surgery, this time orthopedics on some war wounds of my right leg. I have met the orthopedic staff at the hospital and have sat in consultation with them regarding my case. I noticed that there was a genuine interest in my well-being and to further promote that interest, the hospital deemed it necessary to call in civilian consultants; I had at one time, in the orthopedic consultation room, at least five physicians and surgeons. That to me, had a very important and very favorable action on behalf of a veteran patient primarily because he receives a qualified opinion of one or more than two physicians and surgeons in that particular field.

As an observed, personally and officially, in conclusion I can honestly state that in my experience here I find one reservation which cannot be completely satisfactory and it can, I am sure, be easily corrected. Although the hospital grounds cover a considerable area, with well-surfaced drive, their parking facility regulations do not permit the parking of vehicles privately owned by patients. This generally and basically is correct and requires regulations; however, there are exceptions made for paraplegic veterans confined here. I believe that the exceptions should include amputee veterans as well as paraplegic veterans, primarily because both these two type of disabled veterans were recognized by the Federal Government and by applicable public laws wherein free cars were granted to these veterans because they were unable to use bus and train modes of transportation.

ANTHONY J. VOLPE.

The Problems of the Cargo Air Carriers, by Robert W. Prescott, President, Flying Tiger Lines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR ENGLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 30, 1954

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, recently Robert W. Prescott, president of the Flying Tiger Line, Inc., which is the largest all-cargo air carrier in the world, made a comprehensive statement before the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of the United States Senate on the problems of the cargo air carriers. He not only discusses with clarity and good sense the position of the air cargo carrier in domestic and foreign transportation, but makes specific suggestions as to the principles which should control legislation to insure the growing strength of the air freight industry. Because of its completeness and clearness, I am inserting his entire statement in the RECORD:

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, my name is Robert W. Prescott. I am president of the Flying Tiger Line, Inc., with headquarters in Burbank, Calif. My company is the largest all-cargo air carrier in the world. We are operating pursuant to a certificate of public convenience and necessity issued for a 5-year period by the Civil Aeronautics Board in 1949, permitting us to engage in the common carriage of property only. We are not, nor do we have any ambition to carry passengers as a common carrier. Our certificate does not permit us to carry United States mail or air express. However, we are presently engaged in the carriage of passengers under contracts with the military and we are carrying agricultural farm laborers under a contract with the British West Indies Labor Organization, an agency of the governments of the British West Indies. These passenger activities are pursuant to exemption orders issued by the Civil Aeronautics Board.

We were the largest supplier of airlift to the Air Force on the recently concluded Tokyo airlift. We have a large-scale maintenance facility which at the present time is reworking and upgrading a number of Air Force aircraft under contract with the Air Force.

We are about to merge pursuant to approval of the Civil Aeronautics Board with Slick Airways, Inc. Slick likewise is operating pursuant to a certificate of public convenience and necessity issued at the same time and for the same period as was the one issued to my company. Applications for the renewal of both certificates are now before the Civil Aeronautics Board.

MODERNIZATION OF REGULATORY SYSTEM NEEDED

On the basis of the past record, the Flying Tiger Line, Inc., upon Slick being merged into it, will fly almost one-half of all the air freight flown with the United States. We shall operate a fleet of 53 aircraft. In its past fiscal year Flying Tiger business grossed in excess of $25 million and Slick in excess of $14 million. We have grown steadily since our inception in 1945, and we are optimistic about our rate of growth in the future. But our optimism is tempered by our realization that there must be vital changes in the regulatory system for air transportation if we are to continue to operate without subsidy—if we are to survive at all.

I have given you this extremely brief thumbnail sketch of our business history so that the committee may see our activities and our problems and our position in regard to legislation in perspective. In regard to S. 2647 let me say we are opposed to this bill on two counts. First, it has provisions which we believe will retard and impede the growth of air transport. An examination of the record in these hearings to date indicates that the undesirable proposals have been ably pointed out to the committee by various industry witnesses who have preceded me. It would be repetitious and a waste of the committee's time for me to retrace the ground already covered.

A second and more important reason for our objection to this bill is what it fails to propose. In view of Senator BRICKER's recent public statement that he did not anticipate enactment of any civil aeronautics legislation at this session, but did hope to compile a very full record as a basis for the Congress to grip the problem at its next session, it seems both timely and appropriate that I use these few minutes to give you the story of the air-cargo industry—where we have been, where we are going, and the sort of regulatory climate we require to endure and prosper.

STORY OF AIR-CARGO INDUSTRY

In 1949 the CAB crossed its fingers and issued experimental certificates to 4 property-only carriers. One has died, 1 appears to be an incurable invalid, and the remaining 2, Flying Tigers and Slick are merging. A fifth, Riddle Airlines, was certificated 2 years later. These latter 3 carriers—soon to become 2—now are the domestic airfreight industry.

A certificate is both a privilege and a mandate. We were told to take our blueprint into the practical laboratory of competition and hard knocks to see if we could perfect and make useful a new transportation service. The CAB stipulated that the experiment was not to cost the taxpayer 1 cent. It hasn't. We have succeeded even in the face of the rough, tough competition of the passenger carriers who have freely used their mail traffic and subsidy rights to wage a competitive battle for airfreight.

The experimental period of 5 years is about over. We are again before the Board for renewal of our certificates. We are bringing with us a lot of experience, some very definite findings and some very firm convictions. We are far wiser coming out than we were going in. From a practical point of view we believe, with all modesty aside, that we know more about this airfreight business than any other company in the world. We think we have demonstrated that there is a place in the air for an airfreight industry but we are convinced that an airfreight industry can be successful only as a full partner in the national air transportation program.

CIVIL AERONAUTICS ACT BASICALLY SOUND

When the 1938 Civil Aeronautics Act was passed, the Congress ordered the CAB to foster a growth pattern in air transportation that would be responsive to the needs of the commerce of the United States, the postal service, and the national defense. This was and still is a very sound frame of reference. I believe that the airfreight industry's performance and our future role in the air-transport system should be tested against these legislative requirements.

AIRFREIGHT ESSENTIAL TO COMMERCE

Let us first consider our contribution to the needs of commerce of the United States. The experience of both ourselves and the passenger carriers engaged in airfreight movements demonstrates that the airfreight business is entirely different from the air passenger business. In the first place, airfreight is more interested in the calendar than it is in the clock. So long as we guarantee first or second morning delivery, the freight cares little whether it leaves the dock at 9 o'clock or at midnight, but it does insist largely upon traveling at night. Freight planes therefore usually sleep in the daytime and work at night—just the reverse of passenger planes.

Our cargo planes, as I have already indicated, are carrying approximately half of the airborne freight of the country. It is our main source of business. On the other hand, for the year 1952, all the scheduled combination airlines as a group realized 2.16 percent of their revenue from flying freight. For 1953, American Airlines, by all odds the largest and most active passenger carrier engaged in the freight business, realized approximately 5 percent of its revenue from freight. Thus the domestic passenger airline industry, 16 years after passage of the act and 25 years after it was born, is still spending over 95 percent of its effort and attention to the passenger field. It is even more obvious where their real interest lies when you realize that during the 16-year period hundreds of millions of dollars have been paid to the passenger air carriers as subsidy. My point is that if a carrier were capable of doing both the passenger and the freight job, it would have been done long ago.

The question of whether or not the speed advantage of air should be available to things as well as people is so unarguable that I will not take any time proving the point that airfreight provides a large bonus to the commerce of the United States and has become an indispensable part of this commerce. When production and distribution become geared to air transit times on a large scale, as they inevitably will, all manufacturing and inventory planning would be thrown into hopeless confusion if the service became suddenly unavailable. So I ask you please to accept as a fact my statement that airfreight does meet the test of essentiality to the commerce of the United States.

Once recognized as a vital contribution to the air commerce of the Nation, the airfreight industry must be granted regulatory rights that will enable it to prosper.

Before going on to consider that regulatory rights should be accorded this new segment of the air-transportation industry it would be well to consider its contribution to the national defense and its ability to contribute to the mail service of the country.

AIR CARGO CARRIERS IN NATIONAL DEFENSE

The role of the airfreight carriers in the national defense can be demonstrated simply by a look at the record. In 1947, even before its certification, the Flying Tiger Line operated a 50-plane airline across the Pacific for the Air Transport Command. Since 1949 our contract operations for the Defense Department in connection with the Berlin airlift, the Korean war, and the military buildup, together with the carriage of materiel on our regular common carriage freight service constitutes, I believe, the largest single air transportation contribution to national defense of any airline under the American flag. I, in no sense, mean to imply criticism of any other carrier's contribution. I do wish the point to stand clear and sharp that the all-cargo carrier by design and by the very flexibility of its operation is more quickly adaptable to the pop-up type of military requirement than is the passenger carrier, whose schedule is rigid and who is in actuality serving communities rather than shippers.

The need for the cargo carrier in national defense planning is increasing. It is obvious in the darkening visibility of world affairs our civilization cannot afford the burden of widely deployed armies and their supporting supply depots. We must adopt, and are adopting, a philosophy and a practical method of centrally locating our military forces and their logistics support and we are depending upon rapid and adequate mbility to put them in the right place at the right time.

This military posture depends absolutely upon adequate air transport. The expense of keeping in being a large enough fleet of modern transport aircraft capable of carrying cargo rather than passengers to meet defense emeregncy needs would be enormous unless this fleet can to some extent earn its keep.

If the military acquires the planes it will have burdensome operating costs added to burdensome capital requirements. The air-cargo industry, however, can to a large extent solve this problem; and our free-enterprise system, if allowed to freely operate, will pay the bill. Remember, that due to the versatility of the cargo aircraft and the flexibility of the all-cargo operation, we have far more short-notice value for military support than does the passenger aircraft or the passenger operation. Therefore, anything that is done by the Government to make our industry strong also strengthens our national defense.

MAIL BY AIRFREIGHT

Now as to the air cargo carrier and the post office.

Since 1947 we have gone on record many times advocating that bulk mail be moved by airfreight at airfreight rates. We believe the Postmaster General would tell you that the current experiment now flying the first-class mail at cargo rates was largely due to our efforts in this direction. To date we have been excluded from participation in this program, even though the CAB made a finding, following notice and hearing, that it was legal for us to participate and despite the fact that on three occasions the Post Office Department has gone on record with the CAB requesting that our services be made available. There are many valid reasons why the airfreight schedules, flying at night, are peculiarly adaptable to moving this nonpriority mail which has been accumulated during the day. It is inevitable that this experiment will become a permanent thing and that it will be broadened to include parcel post. There are substantial monetary economies to the Post Office Department inherent in the whole plan, as well as the obvious speed-up in communications for the public.

It is readily apparent that the airmail and air parcel post is but another type of cargo. In fact it is the cargo with the lowest cost to the carrier. There is no sales expense, there are no pickup and delivery problems, there is no credit risk. Sometimes we wonder if the strange reluctance of the CAB to have us carry mail at the same rate we charge for other cargo may have its origin in the natural embarrassment of asking someone to work for you alongside of one to whom you have in the past paid far more than you are now called upon to pay for the same work.

We have been standing in line a long time and we will continue to do so. Airmail by cargo carrier must come either by action of the Board or by action of the Congress making Board action mandatory. For us it is not only a problem of furnishing low cost service to the post office but one of economic survival. The passenger carriers are loading their cargo planes with a mixture of low rate cargo and high rate mail—the higher the mail rate the lower the cargo rate they are able to quote. The low rates for cargo are offset by mail pay and by subsidy for the passenger carriers. In the face of such competition the cargo carrier is ultimately doomed.

GOVERNMENT SUBSIDIZES COMPETITORS

Before leaving this subject, we should make our position on subsidy crystal clear. We have steadfastly taken the position that subsidy and mail pay should be two distinct things, and should be separated by legislation. But mail pay should be ascertained on a realistic basis. It is incomprehensible to us that the so-called compensatory airmail rate of 45 cents a ton-mile can be held to be shorn of subsidy. When a plane will carry a ton of coach passengers for 45 cents, a ton of air express for 35 cents, and a ton of cargo for 17 cents, it seems completely obvious that 45 cents for mail, which does not have to be found, handled, fed or coddled, has a large measure of built-in subsidy.

In this connection, the Postmaster General's summary for 1952 is most eloquent. To the domestic carriers only, he paid $68 million for only 68,714,690 airmail ton-miles. His cost was 99 cents per ton-mile. If this mail had been flown at the first-class mail by air rate of 18.6 cents, he would have saved $56 million. Of the $68 million, the local service carriers, admittedly subsidized, received $20 million. If you consider only the mail carried by the so-called nonsubsidized carrier the savings would still run into tens of millions of dollars. So in spite of the repeated propaganda that the domestic trunkline system is subsidy-free except for Continental, Colonial, and Northeast, there are still millions of dollars in mail payments which are actually subsidy.

If the cargo carrier is to survive and make his proper contribution to the country's transportation system, he must be permitted to share in the mail cargo traffic on an equal basis with passenger carriers. He must have access to this large volume of cargo, but more important, he must be on an equal competitive footing with the passenger carrier operating cargo planes.

The airfreight industry therefore now comes to you, the Congress, for a review of the regulatory system under which it operates. The major problem of airfreight is the regulatory problem. Our personal relations with the Civil Aeronautics Board are extremely cordial. But the Board has always considered that, we not being born to the purple, are fated ever to be an uneasy tenant in the crowded house of aviation.

On page 2723 of the April 8 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD appear the following remarks by Congressman HARRY R. SHEPPARD:

"What is the Civil Aeronautics Board doing to foster the all-cargo airlines, this relatively new and extremely important segment of our air industry? I will tell you what they are doing.

"I have investigated this matter in quite some detail and have found beyond question that the Civil Aeronautics Board has imposed every restriction, inhibition, and difficulty imaginable on these all-cargo carrying lines. They have made it as difficult to operate as is possible."

Mr. SHEPPARD has pinned the tail on the donkey, and I have quoted him because he has said it with far less word-mincing than I would have dared.

Now to be specific on a couple of things: (1) The air cargo business is the old chicken-and-the-egg proposition. Great volumes of traffic will appear if the rate is sufficiently low. A low rate is only possible by using modern, efficient aircraft. These aircraft cost upward of a million dollars per copy. Obviously, with your right to do business limited to a few years—or in our case, a few months, it is extremely difficult to secure financing. We must have a permanent certificate or we will simply spend all of our time trying to pull ourselves up by our bootstraps.

Point No. 2: We are competing with the large transcontinental passenger carriers. We concede that whenever they have excess cargo capacity on their combination aircraft we cannot match their cost for small package-type freight. However, when they operate all-cargo aircraft they now are entitled to load the airplane not only with 17-cents-per-ton-mile freight, but with 35 cents express and 45 cents mail. They therefore have more dollar revenue for a given shipload than do we, and they can subsidize their cargo operation from their passenger profits, compensatory mail pay, or even from subsidy.

DUAL RATES FOR COMPETITORS

The passenger carriers have successfully maintained a dual-price structure for airfreight itself. They have consistently maintained a rate structure for points where they are not competitive with all cargo carriers higher than the rate structure for the competitive points. Thus the airfreight moving between points not served by the cargo carriers have joined mail, air express, and straight subsidy to support the competitive operations of the passenger carriers engaged in the airfreight business.

We spent much of 1953 trying to obtain an adjustment in airfreight rates to reflect the increased costs of operations. The transcontinental combination carriers refused to move. We finally secured an amendment to the Board order setting minimum rates. This the big airlines violently opposed. Under the revised minimum rate order we proposed an upward adjustment which the big airlines forced us to cut. The rate we tried for was even below the rate level maintained by the big airlines for their noncompetitive points. The rate we were finally able to get in the face of the adamant competition of the big airlines is still substantially below the rate structure for noncompetitive points. If we are to have a stable and successful airfreight industry no double standard of this character should be permitted by either the Congress or the Board.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Considering the various problems I have presented we recommend that the Congress in any new legislation should make provisions that will hasten and insure the full scale development of airfreight which will make its great contribution to the civilian commerce and to the post office while at the same time vastly strengthen our military potential. The amended Civil Aeronautics Act should at least do the following:

1. Apply the same set of rules to all competitors engaged in the same class of business. If the combination carriers are to be permitted to carry airfreight, then we must be permitted to carry exrpess, mail, and parcel post, all cargo items.

2. Remove from the act the legislation which requires the administrative body to certificate an airline for mail carriage before that line can be eligible for subsidy. The act in its present form spells out three justifications for governmental assistance

to the air-transport industry: The national defense, the postal service, and the commerce of the United States. Yet it restricts giving help to any but those serving one of these needs, the postal service. It would be just as logical to say in the act that no carrier may be entitled to governmental help unless he has a contract with the Defense Department. In this respect I would like to make it very clear that my company is not here on your doorstep asking for a Government handout. We want, and intend to get, equal treatment by the Government with our competitors. Since our competitors have the right to subsidy, we also want that right. If we can get that right we believe we can stop some of the insidious practices, such as rate wars and service wars that our competitors have served on us for the past 7 years, in trying to bankrupt us. We believe we can stop these unfair competitive practices with the right to subsidy for two reasons: (1) Once our competitors realize they can't bankrupt us with these tactics they will likely stop wasting money trying. (2) If they don't come to that sensible conclusion, we would have on our side the CAB to compel them to stop it. Under today's conditions the CAB has complete responsibility for the economic stability of the mail-carrying airlines. They have absolutely no responsibility to a line such as ours which is not mail-certificated, but whose proportionate contribution to the national defense and the commerce of the United States has been proved over the past few years.

The cargo carrier in the experimental period now drawing to a close has demonstrated its contribution to the Nation. We have no quarrel with the local service carriers but certainly it is a greater contribution than that of the local service carrier. The cargo carrier should be given equal status with its competitors, the trunk combination carriers.

3. Recognize that the Government is not only the regulator of the air but is also the largest single shipper. Equal access to Government shipments should be accorded the air and the surface carrier. No restrictions favoring surface carriage where air carriage is competitive should be permitted. Military shipments should utilize civilian airlift to the maximum where costs by civilian carrier is less than that of military aircraft; inasmuch as the civilian carrier stands ready at all times to become an arm of the military in time of emergency the buildup of civilian carriers is the cheapest means of building military might.

If new negislation adopts and implements these principles, we can foresee a revolution in the air. The airfreight industry will grow great and strong. The commerce of the United States, the postal service, and the national defense will be well served.

I am grateful, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, for this opportunity to present our views on what should be done insofar as the airfreight industry is concerned.

Isn't It Wonderful?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 30, 1954

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following comment by Elmer Davis, which was carried in the Letters to the Editor column of the Washington Post and Times Herald for June 29:

NIXON AND ACHESON

The Vice President is holding out on us. He says that Acheson's policies are responsible for the loss of Indochina. Why doesn't he add that this is the same Acheson that shot Lincoln?

ELMER DAVIS.

WASHINGTON.

Soviet Air Raid Would Paralyze Nation, Kill 9 Million, Atomic Writer Says

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK M. KARSTEN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1954

Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include the following review of an article by Dr. Hornell Hart, of Duke University, which was published in the Washington Post and Times Herald under date of June 28, 1954:

(By Nate Haseltine)

A Soviet air raid, now or any time within the next 3 years, would bring national paralysis and extinction of this Nation.

The summation of doom appears in an article by Dr. Hornell Hart, Duke University sociologist, in the June issue of the Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, out today.

Documented by calculations of present and future atomic-bomb strength of the Soviets and resistive measures in this country, the article concludes that Soviet air raids over the United States this year or in 1957 could:

Blast the heart out of the financial world in the cities in which 90 percent of the crucial records, money reserves, bookkeeping equipment, skilled personnel, and executive knowledge and ability of American banking are located.

Cut off the Nation's vitally needed coal supplies by knocking out the cities in which 75 percent of coal is wholesaled, by strategic bombing of coal-carrying railroads, and by blasting the major terminals and intersections of all the leading railroads.

Destroy or isolate the petroleum products needed to operate auto trucks and cars, diesel locomotives, and oil-burning electric plants. This would be done by bombing the wholesale centers, the major refining centers, the pipeline terminals, and the shipping ports.

Paralyze the Federal Government by obliterating Washington, D. C., as far south as Alexandria, as far north as Chevy Chase, and beyond the city limits to the east.

Immediately kill, in the projected 1957 raids, 9 million persons of the 30 million population within the target cities, injure 11 million others, and render additional millions of the survivors homeless.

"Each of these 5 aspects of catastrophe," sociologist Hart noted, "would reinforce each of the other 4."

CUMULATIVE EFFECTS

Their cumulative effects, he concluded, would paralyze transportation, bring on food famines and starvation, disorganize the Nation's economy and financial system, and kill national and key leaders of the target cities.

"The lack of coal and oil products," the author noted, "combined with the blasting of major railroad, trucking, and air centers, would largely paralyze transportation so as to handicap immensely the efforts to deal with any of the five aspects.

"Lack of fuel combined with blasting of generating plants, of trunk powerlines, of telephone, telegraph and radio facilities, and of newspaper plants in the leading cities might be expected to cut out the great bulk of electric current in the disaster centers and to reduce communication to a small fraction of its normal volume.

"This would further handicap attempts to deal with each of the aspects of the catastrophe.

"Lack of transportation and destruction of local warehouses might be expected to bring an immediate famine of food—not not merely in the disaster areas but all over the country. * * * Our farms would swiftly and largely be paralyzed if their supply of gasoline was cut off."

NO RECOGNIZED AUTHORITY

"The obliteration of the National Government, combined with the destruction of emergency staffs in the target cities, would leave the country with no recognized authority to take the lead in meeting the crisis on any of the five fronts.

"The destruction of our financial world would disorganize the Nation. * * * The killing and injuring of key personnel in our 25 leading cities would in itself tend to paralyze the Nation, and would intensify each of the other disaster aspects."

Professor Hart, admitting that the outcomes of his hypothetical-raid damages are dire enough, appended an author's note to the published article—pointing out that his calculations were concluded in early February.

Since then, he pointed out: (1) The AEC announced on March 1 the explosion of a deliverable hydrogen bomb of between 12 and 14 megatons (million tons of TNT's explosive force)—almost twice the power which the scientists had anticipated; and, (2) the Russians have demonstrated publicly their possession of a huge jet-powered intercontinental bomber capable of delivering hydrogen bombs into target areas in the United States.

AREA INCREASED THREEFOLD

These developments could mean, he said, that blast area damages could be raised by more than three times his previous calculations.

In his calculations, which he said were based on leaked information and educated guesses, the sociologist said that by now (June) Russia has enough bombs to blast 10,640 square miles (if all bombs reached targets).

By June of 1957, he estimated, the blast area damage would be 6½ times as great, or 68,500 square miles.

He further calculated, by estimations of the protective effects of present and foreseeable measures of defense (attack planes shot down, radar warnings, population and industrial dispersions, and bombproofings) that any Soviet all-out attack would reduce the United States to a level of national paralysis.

The margins of surplus destructiveness, he wrote, are so great that the essential conclusions of the analysis appear to be valid.

In an editorial in the same bulletin issue, the recognition of the need for mass evacuation of endangered populations was termed "a first step toward realism in civil defense, but not the last step needed."

LONG-RANGE RADAR SCREEN

The editors advocated creation of a long-range radar screen and other installations for increasing the warning time.

"The dispersal of the targets," the editorial noted, "will be the most effective and permanent deterrent (to ambitions to attack United States). Preparation for mass evacuation of cities is urgent and necessary.

"The concept of mass evacuation in emergency is directed at meeting the danger of an all-out attack on America in the not-so-distant future * * * its plans are geared to the danger of one multiple target attack, a single-blow, all-out onslaught on all American cities.

"It is assumed that if we manage to save most of the city population at this critical juncture, no repetition of the attack will be possible after American retaliatory action."

In his article, Professor Hart listed, in descending order of importance, such Soviet targets here as (1) United States and allied strategic bombing bases, including our super flat-tops; (2) our National Capital; (3) population centers; (4) coal and oil sources; (5) crucial transportation centers and resources; (6) electric power resources; (7) financial centers, and (8) repair facilities.

ESTIMATES OF BOMBS

For his immediate hypothetical atomic attack on the United States, he figured Russia would use 8 atomic bombs against New York City; 4 each against Washington, D. C., and Chicago; 2 each against Detroit, Los Angeles and Philadelphia, and 1 bomb apiece for 17 other American cities. His A-bomb standard would be 1 of 100,000 tons of TNT explosive force, capable of blasting out an area of 25 square miles.

The A-bomb dropped over Hiroshima, Japan, during World War II, released an explosive force equal only to that of 20,000 tons of TNT. Thus, Dr. Hart's standard bomb for the Russian attack would be five times as powerful as the first A-bomb ever used for destruction. Hydrogen bombs, which are triggered by A-bomb explosion, have been reported to be 600 times as powerful as the Hiroshima weapon.

Concerning proposals to reduce the damages of nuclear raids, Dr. Hart noted that the death of the Nation could be avoided or prevented in only two ways. These are by prevention of the launching of nuclear attack, or by reducing the damage of the attack, should it come.

PROPOSALS TO REDUCE DAMAGE

Proposals for the latter include radar and other detection of the attacking force, a buildup of armament defenses, dispersion of industries from urban areas, building underground bombproof shelters and evacuation of whole populations on danger's alert.

Because of the present and future destruction potentials, Dr. Hart calculated, detection and interception of enemy planes, now, might knock down 30 percent of the attacking force; and perhaps 50 percent by 1957. Dispersion, which he likened to "matching a sleeping tortoise against a racing automobile," would be virtually ineffective, he reasoned.

The Duke sociologist said, in effect at least, that air raid shelters were outmoded with the advent of nuclear explosions. They could well prove to be death traps and tombs, rather than savers of lives, he said.

Of evacuation of populations, he asked: "How could the evacuated populations even be kept alive, if the raiders succeeded in their purpose of paralyzing transportation and communication, creating anarchy, and starving even the unbombed cities?"

Avoidance of nuclear attack by preventing the launching of such attack was not in his province to discuss, he noted.

Lt. Gen. Robert W. Harper, United States Air Force

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 30, 1954

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, the retirement from active duty of Lt. Gen. Robert W. Harper, United States Air Force, becomes effective today, June 30, 1954.

Bob Harper has done a great job for the Air Force in my hometown of Belleville, Ill., but he has been doing a great job for the Air Force for a long time. I just happen to know more about his last assignment because I was in a better position to observe. And I know that I speak for all my fellow citizens in Belleville when I express admiration for his work as commanding general of the Air Training Command, and regret at his imminent departure from our community. Community relations between an Air Force base and a busy city could nowhere be better than at Scott Field and Belleville—and that state of affairs is due to Bob Harper more than to any other single person.

Just to refresh my memory I looked up the assignments Bob Harper has had since he was graduated from West Point in 1924, and commissioned in the Infantry. A year later he transferred to the Air Corps. There was not much flying being done in those days, so in the free time he had after he had learned to fly, he studied law, and was admitted to the Texas bar before he was transferred to his next assignment.

I think that industry was typical of the man—he was always preparing for something that might happen, and when it did happen he was ready. By the time World War II began, his capabilities had been recognized at Air Corps Headquarters, and he was Assistant Chief of Staff for Operations. By March 1943 when he was made Assistant Chief of Air Staff for Training, his silver eagles had been traded for a star. When I think of the great job he did in that capacity I think the promotion was only an incidental reward. He must have taken a great deal of satisfaction in knowing that he had directed the training of personnel of the greatest Air Force in the world. Those who pay greatest tribute to him are the ones who were trained by him. Even down at trainee level, GI's knew who General Harper was, what he stood for, and what he expected of them.

During those discouraging days after V-J Day, 1945, when training was all but abandoned in the Air Force and the muscle had been cut from the bone, General Harper must have been glad that he was not around to endure the heartbreak. He was over in Germany, as Director of the Armed Forces Division of the Office of Military Government.

He came back to this country in May 1947, when the debacle of demobilization was over and the Air Force had reached its lowest point, down from 2,314,000 men on V-E Day, 1945, to 303,614 as of May 31, 1947. Since then we have been building up in an attempt to recover the strength we ought to have maintained all along, and Bob Harper has played an important part in the buildup. He spent a year as commanding general of the Air Transport Command before it was merged in the Military Air Transport Service. He spent half a year as commanding general of the Air University. And when he retires he will have spent almost 6 years as commanding general of the Air Training Command, first at Barksdale, but mostly at Scott.

These have been busy years for him and for the Air Force. There have been continual visits to the 42 bases of the ATRC to keep constant check on the training and retraining of personnel, to keep the Air Force in the state of readiness it must maintain today.

Bob Harper has a remarkable memory for faces and an uncanny ability to pick the right man for the right job. He is a model of what a general and a leader of men should be, kind always, but stern when necessary. I have been told countless times that the officers of his command and the civilians who have aided in carrying out the training mission love him for his fairness, his understanding of their problems, and his respect for the essential dignity of every human being whom he meets.

Bob Harper will be missed when he ends his active service. One wonders who his successor will be and how he will fill Bob Harper's shoes. He will be missed at Belleville, though he has made an impression on Belleville that will make the community disposed to give a warm welcome to his successor. We will miss him here on Capitol Hill, too. The Armed Services Committee had gotten used to having Bob Harper in charge of Air Force training, and we liked to know he was on the job.

With him on it we knew how the job was being done.

Use Your Head

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. H. ALEXANDER SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, June 30, 1954

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, on June 13, President Harold W. Dodds, of Princeton University, delivered an outstanding baccalaureate address to the class of 1954. It is entitled "Use Your Head." I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

USE YOUR HEAD

By long tradition at Princeton it is the privilege of the president to have the last word to each senior class through the means of the baccalaureate address. The theme of my remarks is Use Your Head. It is not a text taken from the Bible but there is nevertheless theological authority behind it. It is a timely one; for the value of using one's head, even the right to use it, is being challenged as rarely before in our history.

As you usually hear the phrase "use your head" it is a colloquial form of rebuked invoked when an argument has waxed hot and come to a dead end. Then as a clincher to silence further disputation one disputant may curtly exhort the other to use his head.

But it is not in this low context that I ask you to consider my theme this morning. What I propose is that we lift this inelegant injunction out of the colloquial setting I have described and refine it into a philosophy of life. I shall argue that you should use your heads, even at the risk of being typed as an intellectual—or worse, an egg head.

We might as well face it. A democracy such as ours pays but grudging respect to intellectuals per se. The man who has a good head and exercises his right to use it is not apt to win many popularity contests on the strength of his brains alone. Take the field of politics, for example, which is a fair sample for there Vox Populi is Vox Dei. There are, of course, men with excellent and incisive minds to be found participating actively and fruitfully in public affairs; more than the public generally assume. Yet, if intellectual excellence is not pieced out by warmer and more winning qualities which arouse greater enthusiasm among the voters, it alone does not make friends and influence people on election day. When Woodrow Wilson was running for the Presidency his scholarly background was a favorite campaign weapon against him; hostile cartoonists habitually portrayed him in academic cap and gown, often with a schoolmaster's rod in his hand. Few Americans, except perhaps a limited number of pure Scottish strain, will support the schoolmaster stereotype with their votes.

The issue regarding the place of the intellect, the role of the trained and penetrating mind, in human affairs is as old as the hills. One might think that, with the facilities for higher education which we in America enjoy these days—represented by 1,800 colleges and universities—the issue would have been settled before this. But such is not the case. We have not yet really decided whether civilized people are to think with their minds or with their blood, as Hitler boasted for the Germans when he was at the height of his power over that tragically misguided nation. True, no American is prepared to state the alternative so crudely as Hitler did; but there are some who would force us dangerously near to his philosophy. It will be the duty of each of you who have had access to a good college education to resist this philosophy to the end of your lives; in short to use your head yourself and to help sustain a society where all who want to think are free to do so.

As I intimated a moment ago, it is a curious paradox that it should be necessary to defend the right to think in a nation which has poured so much faith and economic wealth into formal education on a democratic basis as has the United States. Yet this same Nation exhibits an habitual coolness to learning. It was America and not one of the backward nations that coined the derogatory term "egg head."

The tensions and fears of the moment have for a good many people transformed this customary—more or less native—distrust of the intellectual person into positive hostility. I am only an amateurish, catch-as-catch-can psychologist, but it does seem as if America were suffering a form of anxiety neurosis. I read in the paper recently that anyone these days who finds himself well balanced and happy should see a psychiatrist, or at least be ashamed of himself if he has not begun to worry. I beg of you, if you are not conscious of being specially unhappy, please do not now begin to worry just to be in style. Undoubtedly the reason why the intellectual has been particularly picked out to be a species of whipping boy and smeared as an egghead, and why in the minds of some vocal and influential people he has become America's No. 1 danger relates to a pretty widespread anxiety. Indeed so absorbing has become our state of jitters about communism, and so slight our confidence in the ability of our own criminal administration to cope with subversion and treason, that many seem willing, even eager, to discard our slowly attained and bitterly earned ethical and legal code of civil rights, including the Ten Commandments.

Now it is true that in times of shooting wars the urge to repress discussion and close ranks in the interest of the self-preservation of the whole society is reasonable. Under such circumstances the need to do so is obvious; it is a natural protective response to the herd instinct for survival. But I do profoundly challenge that we should build a long-haul plan of action against world communism on the sole basis of an instinct we share with animals and thereby neglect to utilize the power to reason.

This is not an appropriate time to send civilian brains to the doghouse. Nor is this the moment for America to reverse her field; to abandon her time-proven sources of strength fed by freedom of healthful dissent, and muzzle the thoughtful person, even if he is an intellectual. (Of course, it is not necessary to explain to you that we except completely the treasonable sort of dissent which a commitment to conspiratorial and immoral communism entails.)

The point is that the times call for a new knowledge as never before. We require all the courage and idealism we can muster, but alone they are of no avail against the modern weapons of tyranny—and you will understand that the weapons of tyranny are not limited to conventional military materiel. Had our knowledge of other nations of the world been greater, had our views been based less on old worn out knowledge and attitudes, our psychological warfare over the past decades would have been more successful and our world position stronger today. This is surely no time to slow down our pursuit of knowledge or to be guided by partial or faulty knowledge masquerading as common sense.

A characteristic thing about new knowledge is not only that it is difficult to acquire, it is also downright painful for most of us, not excluding entirely college professors and students in universities. If you want to keep young strive to retain that sort of a curious mind that produces a good senior thesis. Unfortunately the mass of the population lose early in life childhood's avid, if annoying, zeal for asking questions. The great barrier to new knowledge, more of a road block perhaps than a muscle-bound mind or simple mental laziness, is that it upsets one's peace of mind.

"God offers to every man," said Emerson, "the choice between truth and repose. Choose which you please you can never have both." In other words, if you wish to be as happy as a clam, avoid being curious. But think twice before you choose this kind of happiness; from a human standpoint the clam follows a very dreary existence. As a matter of fact the truly happy people are not the uncurious; they are those who live life to the full by preserving their zeal for increasing the scope and grasp of their intellects. If you are willing to risk the pain of new knowledge you will be repaid many fold by the release of human energy and satisfaction that discovery will bring you.

But knowledge, essential though it be, is not enough. The advice to use your head entails more than accumulating and cataloging knowledge. Knowledge is but the corridor to something even more difficult to acquire; namely, wisdom. "Knowledge comes," wrote Tennyson, "but wisdom lingers."

The widely publicized Kinsey reports may increase knowledge, although the scientific methodology employed and conclusions reached are matters of dispute among scholars. All their tables and charts do not add up to wisdom. They don't tell us what to do about sex even for the sake of our enduring selfish happiness, let alone the happiness of others under the Golden Rule. For the wisdom which makes for happiness the reader of the Kinsey reports must refer to other sources, and he had better make sure that the sources to which he turns encompass more than statistics. The true function of learning is to be a good servant of wisdom; split off from wisdom it can destroy us. The ultimate justification for the rich extracurricular activities which Princeton, like most American colleges, maintains is that they supplement the pursuit of wisdom through learning by the pursuit of wisdom through personal experience. It is a serious and arrogant error for one to assume that knowledge, however vast, spells wisdom in regard to the complex interrelations of life.

The elements which transmute knowledge into wisdom are our beliefs. One of our professors of psychology describes the difference between knowledge and beliefs as follows: "Knowledge is an intellectual affair that we can somehow demonstrate, make public and pass on to others through the use of words, experiments and figures. Beliefs, however, are feelings of which we become aware if we take the time to pay attention to them. Beliefs are intensely personal, not public like a fact or figure. And beliefs are hard to put into words unless one is a gifted poet or prophet."

To this I would add that while beliefs are most eloquently expressed by poets and prophets you do not need to be one to have beliefs. We all have them, and act on them. One's beliefs are an expression of his standards of values, of the level of personal excellence which he has set for himself. The way by which men develop beliefs, as distinct from crude emotions is through contemplation, meditation, leisure for revery in a busy world much enamored these days of its own busyness, observation, experience, and finally through prayer.

The lesson to be drawn from all this is this; when you use your mind, use all of it, not merely that segment which deals with knowledge, cold reason in its narrow sense.

Part of the cloud under which intellectuals find themselves in the popular mind today has been due to a few very vocal and fluent writers whose beliefs led them at a certain point to renounce their office of intellectuals and quit thinking, oblivious to the fact that above all else it was their duty to continue to think through to the end both their knowledge and beliefs. In the generation between the two World Wars, various authors who enjoyed a wide following (probably most of you have read some of their writings) and who willingly answered to the appellation "intellectual," painted, in the words of Elmer Davis, "an almost unrelieved picture of a nation in process of dissolution." But the Nation refused to dissolve; and later in World War II "some who had spent their lives proving that the United States was not worth fighting for went out and fought for it like anyone else." Their early mistake is obvious. Their proud unwillingness to examine critically the adequacy of their knowledge and fully to test their beliefs led them to stop thinking too soon. In doing so they "alienated themselves from the world around them," in favor of their own little, artificial self-made worlds. Thereby they fell into serious error.

This was particularly true of a naive few who, blind to the cruelties and inhumanity of the Soviet rules, allowed themselves to be seduced by the mystical pseudo-science and the false humanitarian enticements of international communism. The trouble with these was not that they were intellectual; their trouble was that they were not intellectual enough. When exposed to the pretensions of a revolutionary ideology they evaded a thorough examination of their beliefs. They neglected the totality of data essential to solution of their problem, a totality which includes beliefs as well as knowledge.

We build the foundation and superstructure of belief through faith. Here, in conclusion, I arrive at the deep significance of these baccalaureate exercises and why they take the form of a religious service in the chapel.

In this scientific age, many people are apt to be frightened away by the idea of faith. Yet nothing could be more unreasonable than to deny its place in daily life; in one form or another we practice it every waking hour. We can analyze intellectually the elements which constitute justice, right, beauty, truth, but when we respond to their influence (as we do all the time) we do so under the compulsion of faith. Consider our attitude toward science, for example. We have a tremendous faith in its inexhaustible possibilities for conferring greater and undreamed benefits upon mankind. But our expectation of human betterment through science is an expression of faith that science will continue to discover new laws, new riches, new power over nature and even over ourselves. This could (I don't say it will) turn out to be but a mood of the moment, a mistaken act of faith. Seventy-five years ago physicists felt no such confidence as we possess today; many were sure that their subject had become virtually a closed book. So much was known, they felt, that little was left to investigate. But only a few years later this complacency toward Newtonian physics, in itself a manifestation of faith, was exploded sky high, as Einstein and others began to challenge it and ask embarrassing questions.

Man requires a deeper, more ultimate faith than he will find in a laboratory to satisfy his universal divine thirst for something that will not perish. Of course, an intelligent man's faith must be reasonable; it will recognize that science has elucidated much that once was left to priests, soothsayers, or diviners to explain and will doubtless elucidate more. But the answer to the final question of all, one that no sane man can evade, why we are here on this earth and where are we going remains forever in the realm of faith.

Personally I can find no reasonable acceptable basis for faith other than in a religion which rests on the premise of the existence of a supernatural Divine Person with whom we establish contact. Man's ceaseless struggle to improve the quality of his living is in response to his unquenchable faith in an ultimate supernatural ordering of the universe and his deep desire to be in tune with the Divine personality whom he calls God.

St. Paul's familiar definition of faith is still the best. It "is the assurance of things hoped for, the conviction of things not seen." Without such a faith a man's life is spent spinning around in a circle. Eliminate it and there is left no purpose to his journey, no reason for beginning it, and no destination at the end. It is reasonable to seek for the purpose of that journey, in faith in an unseen permanence which in our innermost souls we know to be God. Such a faith gives meaning to knowledge. It is the beginning and end of wisdom.

In the long perspective of the years to come you who graduate Tuesday will, I submit, realize, that you gained from Princeton more understanding of the nature not only of knowledge but of wisdom as well, than you can identify now. For it is of the nature of things that a young man acquires the deepest resources of mind and spirit as by-products of the day's work; by osmosis from the environment about him. While you were studying your academic subjects you were gaining more than specific knowledge.

My plea is that, as you enter a world in which the demands of your daily work and the constant pressures of life can so easily engulf you, you will not cease to grow in knowledge, yes, but in wisdom as well.

Youth Employment Service in Wichita Falls, Tex.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 30, 1954

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I have received from Mr. Lester Fritz, a prominent oil producer and businessman of Wichita Falls, Tex., and lieutenant governor of zone 2, district 6, Sertoma International, information about the establishment of a youth employment service in Wichita Falls, which I consider of much importance and widespread interest.

Mr. Fritz writes me that from December 10, 1953, when this employment program for youth was started, until June 23, 1954, some 574 young people have applied through the agency for employment, 308 have been referred to jobs, and 200 have been placed in jobs.

I ask unanimous consent that the story of the Wichita Falls Youth Employment Service, as sent to me by Mr. Fritz, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

YOUTH EMPLOYMENT SERVICE: WICHITA FALLS PLAN

In the latter part of November 1953, a representative of the Sertoma Club of Wichita Falls, Tex., contacted the local office of the Texas Employment Commission regarding the establishment of a youth employment service in this community. After the then existing plan of YES was explained, the discussion centered on a cooperative arrangement between the Sertoma Club, the Texas Employment Commission, and the local high school. The dean of boys of the local high school quickly recognized the value of such a cooperative program, having in the past experienced difficulty in placing students in jobs because of lack of facilities and personnel. Organizational plans were then initiated for immediate operation of the program.

A youth employment service committee was organized which included all members of the Sertoma Club, a representative of the Texas Employment Commission local office, and the dean of boys of the local high school. The committee decided on the following plan of action:

A. Sertoma Club:

1. Would be the coordinating unit.

2. Would conduct and coordinate all publicity of the program.

3. Would contact employers to solicit acceptance of the program.

B. Texas Employment Commission:

1. Would be the single clearing house in the community for acceptance of job openings, applications from students, and selection and referral of youth to jobs.

2. Would furnish the total facilities and personnel necessary to accept applications, select, and refer youths to jobs.

3. Would select and refer youths on the sound basis of qualifications, education, aptitude, work experience, and physical fitness.

4. Would furnish labor market information, conduct employment counseling, and administer proficiency and aptitude tests when needed in the selection and referral process.

C. The local high school:

1. Would interest the students in the cooperative program by explaining the workings of the program, the responsibilities of the students, and the desired results in terms of gainful employment.

2. Would from the student body supply the workers to fill the job openings.

3. Would advise students on an individual basis of entering part-time work in terms of school workload, grades, and other factors where employment might affect school attendance and progress.

4. Would assist the program in any other way deemed necessary.

When conceived, the plan was for summer vacation jobs since Christmas seemed too near to allow adequate time to effectively promote the program for the Christmas rush jobs. Some Sertoma Club members felt that immediate action would serve to give all of the organizations needed experience, make any needed changes in procedure, and promote the program to both youth and employers. The committee agreed that the desirable results of such a proposal would overshadow any undesirable consequences; therefore, the program was officially put into operation on December 10, 1953.

The explanation of the program to the students by the high school dean of boys was highlighted not only with enthusiasm but also with practical suggestions readily understood by students. Those students desiring jobs began placing their work applications with the local office of the Texas Employment Commission. These work applications were processed by interviewers specifically assigned to serve these youths.

The Sertoma Club divided the business section of the community into blocks and assigned two members to each block to contact all business firms and solicit their cooperation in the program. Two representatives of the Texas Employment Commission who regularly visit local employers in promoting job openings placed emphasis on yes in succeeding visits to employers. Radio stations donated free time for spot announcements during the first week to give impetus to the program. The keynote of the program came from a popular local attorney. A Sertoman, while publicizing the program over the three local radio stations when he declared that "a busy boy is a happy boy; a busy girl is a happy girl. Happy boys and girls do not develop into delinquents.

The results of the program for Christmas jobs exceeded the expectation of the committee. Fifty-six girls were placed as sales clerks, gift wrappers, and cashiers. Seven boys were placed as grocery stock clerks and checkers. The committee thought that there would be no further demand for the program until summer; however, the employers of the Christmas workers were so highly pleased with the youths' work that they requested the youths to work during the Easter season. At the start of the second semester of high school, the school officials requested assistance from YES in finding job opening for students entering distributive and industrial education. This request was quickly filled with job openings in excess of the school's needs. These results definitely proved the need for operating the program on a continuing basis with special emphasis when seasonal conditions create the greatest demand for young workers.

From the initiation of the program on December 10, 1953, to April 19, 1954, over 300 youths had made application for jobs; 244 had been referred to employers; and 135 had been placed in employment through the Wichita Falls YES. It is believed by the committee that 300 to 350 placements will be made during the coming summer months. The YES in Wichita Falls having been planned and operated on sound, cooperative basis is proving to be of invaluable service in helping youth to help themselves. It is a good thing to help youth; its value is enhanced and multiplied when youths are helped to help themselves in developing into good, useful citizens.

Newspaper Comment Concerning Renomination of Hon. Margaret Chase Smith, of Maine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FREDERICK G. PAYNE

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 30, 1954

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record various editorial comments appearing in Maine newspapers regarding the recent renomination of the senior Senator from Maine [Mrs. Smith].

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Bangor Daily News of June 23, 1954]

The Voice of the People

Once again the voice of the people has made itself felt, although silently, by way of ballot.

In some instances the verdict was rendered by scanty margins, in others more decisively, and in one crushingly.

That one was at the top level. It saw Maine's senior Senator, Margaret Chase Smith, renominated by a ratio that can be described only as annihilating.

So-called experts may analyze to their hearts' content the figures that will be but the steppingstone to returning Mrs. Smith to the United States Senate for another 6 years. The nonexisting McCarthy influence will have its inning; so will the poor timing by her opponent.

We prefer the more direct approach. Mrs. Smith won because she polled in excess of 90,000 votes; Mr. Jones lost because he polled only 18,000. Mrs. Smith polled her total because 90,000 preferred her to Mr. Jones; Mr. Jones polled his total because 18,000 preferred him to Mrs. Smith. Since 90,000 is more than 18,000, Mrs. Smith won. As simple as that. Mrs. Smith is to be congratulated on her victory. May the next 6 years reap abundant fruit.

[From the Rockland Courier-Gazette of June 22, 1954]

A Splendid Vote of Confidence

Yesterday's primary election proved beyond question the loyalty of Maine voters to Margaret Chase Smith, their senior Senator. It also showed the depth of understanding possessed by Mrs. Smith of the character and pattern of thinking of her fellow citizens of Maine.

From the beginning of the campaign to unseat her Mrs. Smith maintained a position of dignity and good taste. She has long believed her duty placed her at her desk in Washingon and there she was to be found except for weekends. She refused to make any recognition of the attacks made upon her and wisely avoided being embroiled in the smear campaign over television, nor did she go junketing over the State making political speeches.

The actual campaign in her behalf was of only 1 week's duration, conducted by warm friends and well wishers in every corner of the State. It was carried on with dignity, and no smallest sign of vilification. Rather it was a campaign of invitation for all to come to the polls on the 21st and vote for Mrs. Smith if they felt so inclined.

The result was this splendid vote of confidence.

[From the Lewiston Evening Journal of June 22, 1954]

The Voice of the Turtle

Political spring went out with the primary elections yesterday.

Waters will run deep until September 13, the day of reckoning.

The contest that had the Nation agog resulted in what was expected—United States Senator Margaret Chase Smith defeated Robert L. Jones by a lopsided, crushing majority.

Maine likes Senator Smith. That affection isn't confined to Republican ranks.

Among the multitude of congratulations, Mrs. Smith received today was one from President Eisenhower.

She conducted a fastidious campaign of sound tactics. She withstood temptation to hit back at young Jones. She held her tongue and fire.

What prompted Jones to get into the contest is still a mystery to Maine. Mrs. Smith said on primary eve that he was "a plant" by Senator Joseph R. McCarthy as whose apostle Jones came to be regarded.

Maybe he was just a young man out of a job, taking a flier.

[From the Lewiston Daily Sun of June 23, 1954]

The Primary Results

The whole town's talking about the Jones boy today, but mainly because of the shellacking he received at the hands of Senator Margaret Chase Smith in Monday's State primary.

In a healthy vote of about 115,000, she won nearly a hundred thousand votes, leaving young Jones far in the rear. Her margin of over 5 to 1 was larger than most observers anticipated.

How to interpret the result is partly a matter of guesswork. Undeniably she is both a capable and popular Senator, with an organization able to rally tremendous support on short notice. Jones' campaign was poorly organized and not well financed. He took a line that was jingoistic, isolationist, and pro-McCarthy, in that he never repudiated the Wisconsin Senator. But one might get onto shaky ground by saying that the election result showed that all but a few Republican voters of Maine are strongly internationalist and have no use for McCarthy and his methods besides. McCarthyism, fear of war, hostility to foreign aid, all are probably stronger here than the vote would indicate.

At least it is safe to say that McCarthy, who brought Jones here hardly 6 months ago, praising him in two public appearances, can hardly take any comfort from Mrs. Smith's victory.

The vote in this county produced few surprises, unless the elimination of Louis Jalbert and Roger Dube from political life can be called that. Representative Hale was renominated in the First District, and James Oliver, of Portland, will face him in September as the Democratic candidate. The controversial Foster Tabb fell by the wayside as sheriff candidate in Kennebec County, and that is a minor upset.

It is impossible to tell yet whether the Democrats cast a larger total vote for their candidates than ordinarily; up in Franklin County, however, they ran out of Democratic ballots in Strong, and there are instances within the county indicating renewed interest. The big test will come in September, and after a lull imposed by the vacation season, both parties will swing into high gear.

[From the Portland (Maine) Press-Herald of June 23, 1954]

Woman With a Record Beats Man Without a Program

Outside Maine they are saying it was a body blow to Senator McCarthy's prestige. Politicians and pundits continue to insist on this interpretation.

Inside Maine they are saying it was a simple victory by a qualified candidate over an unqualified one. The facts insist on this interpretation.

It's all in what kind of glasses you use to view the conclusive thumping Senator Margaret Chase Smith gave her Republican challenger, Robert Jones, in the Monday primary election. Leaders of the Republican National Committee look at it through lenses tinted with thoughts of strategy and tactics in the fall campaigning. Already cool toward McCarthy as a nationwide campaigner, they will make the most of Senator Smith's enmity toward Senator McCarthy and inform fellow Republicans that the Senator from Wisconsin has been cut down to size by Maine voters.

It was not McCarthy who was cut down to size. It was Jones who was cut down. It was Jones who built his own shallow nest of votes by failing to wage a robust and stimulating campaign.

Senator Smith ran on her record of liberal Republicanism. It consists, among other things, of hundreds of Senate votes, none of which she could hide even had she so desired. Liberal Republicanism, in Senator Smith's case, is pretty much middle-of-the-roadism, a political outlook agreeable to a great majority of Maine voters who as a rule have no truck either with reactionary rightism or radical leftism. The record was there. Maine approved.

As for Jones, he turned out to be a man without a program. He spoke in general terms of Americanism and Republicanism, vague philosophies to which his opponent has equal claim. He labeled his opponent as a "do-nothing" Senator, but failed to produce evidence enough to make it a convincing issue. He called Senator Smith an "internationalist," and here, it seems to us, he skirted the fringes of a valid cause. Senator Smith is an "internationalist," if one uses the term to describe those who support the United Nations, believe in courting allies through some form of foreign aid, and seek ways and means of fighting communism in lands far from our shores.

There is an opposite view, held by many honest and intelligent Americans. It is that the United Nations has utterly failed in effectiveness, that foreign aid has failed to win allies and succeeded in wasting millions of good American dollars, and that it is a foolhardy policy to try to fight communism in Korea, Indochina, Italy, and Greece, when we should be shoring up our own anti-Red battlements.

It is a matter of opinion on which candidate Jones could have built a provocative issue, had he so chosen. For some reason he did not so choose. No woman with a record as public as Senator Smith's is immune to political attack. She has been in the front lines too long to be politically "safe" at every turn. Candidate Jones disappointed his friends and surprised his opponents by not ferreting out weak spots and firing hard at them. The above-mentioned "internationalist" stand of Senator Smith's, although not a weak spot in the eyes of Maine voters, is an example of an area of presumed disagreement between Jones and Smith which Jones failed to capitalize on. Others could be named.

One is enough, however, to point up the major reason why Senator McCarthy was not the major factor in Senator Smith's wide margin of victory, and why Jones is today a defeated candidate in his own right. It boils down to a case of discriminating voters selecting a Senator with a sound record over a would-be Senator without a sound program.

[From the Lincoln County News of June 24, 1954]

MARGARET DOES IT AGAIN

Standing on her record and staying on her job—Margaret Chase Smith has done it again. She has won for herself the richly deserved recognition which will give her 6 more years in the Senate to serve the State of Maine and her country.

The Esters from Houlton and I, the only Maine people on this N. E. C. trip were eager to hear the results of Monday's primaries. But, and this is what proves the tremendous following Senator Smith has nationwide, so were many, many of the 350 who are traveling together and were in Washington on Monday night. Friends and acquaintances, who only knew I came from Maine, in large numbers and from practically every State in the Union have been asking for the last 5 days, "How is Mrs. Smith going to make out? I do hope she'll win, she is so valuable in the Senate," or words to that effect.

There was great disappointment too that she would not be available for the dinner on Tuesday night honoring President Eisenhower.

It was with joy that I listened to the radio report from here in Washingon proclaiming a 5-to-1 victory. Congratulations to our lady Senator from Maine and to the State of Maine. We are always proud to have supported her since the first announcement that she would run for the House.

Modernizing the Monroe Doctrine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 30, 1954

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the San Antonio Light has endorsed strongly the resolution which the Senate passed last Friday reaffirming and modernizing the Monroe Doctrine. The editorial states in forceful terms that "Soviet Russia should be told that the line is drawn and no further interference in American affairs will be tolerated."

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be inserted in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

SERVE THE WARNING

Lyndon B. Johnson, of Texas, Democratic leader of the Senate, has introduced a resolution that rings with commonsense.

The Johnson resolution would put Congress on record in a warning to the Soviet Union to stay out of this hemisphere.

It would reaffirm the Monroe Doctrine (which this country forfeited to assume a world-leadership role) and serve notice that we will deal with hemispheric problems first through the Organization of American States rather than the United Nations.

Johnson does not have in mind only Guatemala. That is the most obvious point of Soviet infiltration, but elsewhere as well international communism is "seeking to establish a beachhead in the Americas."

Soviet Russia should be told that the line is drawn and no further interference in American affairs will be tolerated.

Such a resolution, backing up Ambassador Lodge's stand in the U. N., would add force to our position and strength to our friends and allies in Latin America in dealing with the threat of Communist infiltration.

Retirement of James A. Hagerty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. IRVING M. IVES

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 30, 1954

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an editorial appearing in today's New York Times entitled "Jim Hagerty Retires." I, too, desire to pay tribute to one of the great newspapermen of modern days for whom I have a genuine affection and deep respect, and to wish for him all that is best in health, happiness, and success through many years ahead.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

JIM HAGERTY RETIRES

One of our favorite newspapermen turns in his typewriter tonight, retiring after 55 years of reporting and a third of a century on the Times. James A. Hagerty has made his byline one of the most respected names in American journalism and a cherished feature of this newspaper by the fairness, the objectivity, the integrity, the reliability with which he wrote the news of politics and government. He knew the Presidents of the United States from McKinley on. He knew New York's governors, its Members of Congress, this city's mayors, its aldermen, its party bosses. From the Bull Moose days he covered the national political conventions, rode the presidential campaign trains.

He was first with the most on many page 1 stories, of course. It is a well-established legend that the safest way to avoid being scooped on politics was to cover Hagerty. He is and always was a modest, even diffident, man, with a fabulous memory and a disdain for modern substitutes for legwork. He pretended sometimes to use the telephone, but the sound of his bellowing voice roaring through the newsroom made you wonder why he bothered with dialing, or whether he really did. He never wrote a story—or played a bridge card—without careful meditation and deliberation. There was no meanness, pettiness, no malice in him.

Sometimes it seemed that there was a conspiracy among politicians and public officials to be nice to Jim. They were always calling him to give him the news first, as a respected confidant. He never broke faith, and it paid off handsomely, just as the copybooks say it should. We suppose they will keep on calling him, at home, because his sound political judgment has made him an oracle sought out by leaders and political writers far and near.

We shall miss "Old Jim"—an implausible title granted some years ago to distinguish him from his son, who has a job somewhere down in Washington—and never so much as on election nights. It sometimes seemed as though Jim Hagerty could look at early returns from a ward in Manhattan and tell how things were going in Kansas. It looked like magic. But it was simply that, as a reporter, he knew his "beat." A great newspaperman, Hagerty. We wish him the best of everything.

Result of the Poll of the Seventh Indiana District on the Situation in Indochina

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 30, 1954

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, the war in Indochina becomes more serious, and the possibility of the United States becoming actively involved in that conflict is being generally discussed. In order to ascertain the opinions of the people of the Seventh Congressional District of Indiana as to possible action in the Indochina situation, I mailed a questionnaire throughout the district to each address. The returns on this poll were very happy. Although the ballots were mailed out six weeks ago, returns are still coming into the office. The questions asked and the percentages for the answers are as follows:

	Yes	No	No opinion
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*
1. Do you favor sending American troops into Indochina for combat?	8.1	88.7	3.2
2. Do you favor the United States encouraging, with aid and equipment, other oriental anti-Communist armies, such as South Korea or Nationalist China, to enter the fight in Indochina?	57.9	37.4	4.7
3. Do you favor sending American soldiers merely to train the friendly Indochinese troops?	42.3	52.5	5.2
4. Do you favor continued aid of arms and equipment from the United States to Indochina?	61.8	33.9	4.3

The results of this poll were not broken down into groups as to age, occupation, sex, or economic status. Practically all of the ballots were signed. Many of them were signed by "Mr. and Mrs." and some were signed by groups. From an acquaintance with many of the people signing the ballots, I can state that returns came from all age groups, many occupations, both sexes, and those of widely varying economic status. Getting involved in Indochina would affect everyone in my district—the boys drafted to go, the funds required to support the action, the foodstuffs and production that would be required. There seems to be no need for any breakdown in considering opinions on these questions; the problems are common to all.

The results show overwhelming opposition to sending American troops into Indochina.

A large percent of the people who answered the questions added remarks because they did not feel they could answer such questions with a simple "yes" or "no." A Congressman can fully appreciate the difficulty of having to say "aye" or "nay" when there are so many qualifying features that he would choose to add before casting his vote for an overall appropriations bill or any complex legislative measures. When the questionnaire was formulated, it was obvious that it would be most difficult to phrase any question concerning the situation that could be answered simply by "yes" or "no," without long and involved explanations. Too many explanations might influence or detract from the number of returns that would be received just as would too many questions. Therefore the poll was limited to four questions, stated as simply as possible.

There is no question that the people of the Seventh District are in favor of a strong, free, and peaceful country. However, some 88.7 percent believe that sending American troops into Indochina would not contribute toward this end. The thinking on the last three questions does not show such a pronounced trend. Only slightly more than half of the ballots, 57.9 percent, favored encouraging with aid and equipment, other oriental anti-Communist armies to enter the fight in Indochina. More than half of the ballots, 52.5 percent, did not favor sending American soldiers merely to train the friendly Indochinese troops. The explanation was often given that in so doing we could so easily get involved ourselves. A larger percent 61.8 percent, favored the continued aid of arms and equipment from the United States to Indochina.

It was interesting and enlightening to read the additional remarks. Regardless of the answers, the remarks written on the ballots or letters attached in no instance showed any friendship or tolerance toward communism or Communist aggression. The difference in answers was due to a variance in reasoning as to how best to handle the situation in order to make and to keep the United States strong and free.

While no actual count was taken and no attempt was made to classify the remarks, I should like to give the gist of the comments and to quote typical remarks. A majority were interested in an Indochina that would be free of French colonialism. "If a way can be found to aid the people of Indochina without at the same time upholding the French or any other form of imperialism, I would be very glad to see the United States do all that can be done." "Yes; if France will guarantee to give Indochina absolute freedom."

Many who answered "Yes" to the first question said, "Let's stop communism before it consumes us," or "I think our Government is appeasing when it should be demanding action," or "We will have to deal with Russia, so don't wait for them to get any more powerful."

Of the many that did not favor sending American troops into Indochina, they expressed themselves thus: "Please keep our boys on this side." "I don't believe in sending our boys over to foreign countries to be killed." "We accomplished nothing in Korea, what more would we accomplish in Indochina?" Don't waste wealth, manpower, and effort where we can't win." "Let's not rush to put out someone else's fire while our own house is burning down." "See that our own people get aid needed before sending any more across the water." "Let's follow Washington's advice and steer clear of entangling alliances with foreign countries." "I believe the time has come to revalue our entire policy and as rapidly as possible to retire within our bases and build good will in our own hemisphere." "Help others to help themselves but don't do their work for them."

There are those who would favor assisting as a part of a United Nations action: "I am in favor of our helping by joining with the U. N., but not alone." "I favor the United Nations sending troops to any part of the world where there is an uprising against the basic freedoms of mankind." "We are opposed to war and urge negotiations and reconciliation through the United Nations."

In many letters a religious fervor was evidenced: "War is wrong." "War has never solved any problem." "Send them the Gospel and the Bible which teaches that all men are brothers." "The only hope of the world is a movement back to God." "I do not have sufficient understanding of world affairs to answer these questions, but I am praying that you and the others in leadership of our Government may answer them right."

In addition to expressions concerning the Indochina situation, many remarks were given on foreign affairs and local governmental problems. The answers and the returns showed a deep and careful consideration of the questions, thoughtful analysis of problems, and in many instances, refreshing and practical solutions that came from sound spiritual, economical, and practical thinking. I spent many hours reading and deliberating the suggestions. I shall take them into consideration continuously in future legislation. I am more firmly convinced than ever that the people of southern Indiana represent the true American way of life that has made us the greatest nation.

Editor's Letter: A French Farmer Had $1,000

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD H. VELDE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 30, 1954

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD. I include the following item from the Pekin (Ill.) Daily Times of June 26, 1954:

THE EDITOR'S LETTER

(By McNaughton)

A French farmer had $1,000. That was in 1944. He had it hid in the barn.

A French Government man came along and told him he ought to take that $1,000 out of hiding and loan it to the Government. "It's the patriotic thing to do," said the Government man. French are patriotic.

So the farmer got the $1,000 from its hiding place where he had been putting his hard-earned savings. He was slow to do it. He had worked hard for it. But he was patriotic. So he bought a $1,000 French Government bond with his $1,000.

Within 6 years, the value of that $1,000 bond had dropped to $180. His savings were gone—gone by the acts of his own Government.

Recently Louis Quitman came in to see me. "Will you help me sell some United States Government bonds?" he asked.

"I might," I replied, "but some years back I certainly would not." Then I told him that some years ago I loaned my Government enough cash to buy seven Ford automobiles. They gave me back enough to buy 2½ Ford automobiles. Millions did that—millions of poor people.

So about all I can do for Mr. Quitman (who is working for the U. S. Treasury) is to say to you: If you believe our Government is going to hold the value of the dollar firm, it is O. K. to buy a United States bond; but if it looks to you like a group would get hold of the Government who believe in reducing the value of the dollar, do not buy United States bonds. Don't get it into your head that rich men only are hurt when the dollar is damaged.

Forty-three million people have savings bonds alone, not to mention those holding other kinds of Government bonds. Every person who has a savings bond, or life insurance, or a dollar in the bank, or a pension is hurt when his Government cheapens the dollar. That's one of the ways in which the cheaper politicians of France have all but destroyed their nation.

The Farm Parity Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 30, 1954

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times of June 30, 1954:

ONE YEAR MORE

Congress is now faced squarely with the issue of rigid, high-level farm price supports versus flexible price supports for what, by a curious aberration of nomenclature, are invariably referred to as the Nation's six basic commodities. This group includes rice and peanuts. The rice crop, at around $265 millions, accounted for less than 1 percent of all farm cash receipts last year, and peanuts, at $150 millions, accounted for approximately one-half of 1 percent.

Anyone who wasn't familiar with the history of this controversy might be led to believe that in proposing a system of flexible supports for this group of commodities (so that production might be encouraged when supplies were subnormal and discouraged in times of serious oversupply) the administration was treading some new and dangerous path of experimentation. The fact is, of course, that flexible supports were established policy before the outbreak of World War II. In those days, moreover, the range of support levels was not from a minimum of 75 to a maximum of 90 percent, which was provided in the (Democratic) Agricultural Act of 1949 and which is now urged by the administration. In those days the maximum support level was 75 percent and the minimum was 52 percent.

But not the least of the many evils of war is that all too often it creates powerful vested interests in legislation passed purely for emergency purposes and that when the time comes to revert to programs and procedures suited to peacetime conditions it requires the strongest possible leadership and a strongly aroused public opinion to force those enjoying such wartime subsidies to give them up, regardless of the harm they may be inflicting on the economy as a whole and regardless of the ultimate dangers they hold even for the group or groups most directly concerned.

That is what has happened in the case of 90 percent price supports. When these were introduced to insure maximum wartime production their temporary nature was clearly recognized, but as a special concession to the farm bloc in Congress the law provided that these emergency supports should be retained for 2 years after the war's end, on the theory that this would give the producers time to adjust to the return of peace. But Representative Hope and his like-thinking colleagues have never had the slightest intention of permitting a return of flexible supports so long as they could prevent it. They have now succeeded in putting off that in evitable day by their plea of "1 more year" until today we have no less than $6.5 billions worth of surplus commodities backed up in the hands of the Government and hanging over the market as an ominous and continuing price depressant.

The 2 years that Congress generously allowed for adjustment of the highly favored section of agriculture to return to the ways of peace have now stretched to 8; we are further away from the goal of readjustment than we were in 1948, and Mr. Hope and his associates are again talking about "compromising" by postponing the inevitable "1 more year." That would not be a compromise; that would be surrender. And we don't believe either the administration or the public is in any mood to let Mr. Hope dictate a peace in this fight.

St. Lawrence Seaway Opens Great New Opportunities for 16th Congressional District of Michigan—A Long-Sought Goal Achieved

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN LESINSKI, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 30, 1954

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the hopes and dreams of many citizens of the 16th Congressional District of Michigan, which I have the honor to represent, were realized recently when the Congress passed and the President signed the St. Lawrence seaway bill.

For me, particularly, it was the culmination of years of wholehearted support for this legislation. For we will soon see, I trust, a greatly enlarged volume of ocean trade coming right to our doorsteps in Detroit.

I believe that my congressional district will probably gain more from the construction of the seaway than any other district in Michigan. It will also bring problems—problems related to growth and expansion and the continued modernization of our schools, water and sewage systems and other facilities.

When the waterway becomes a reality and ocean commerce increases substantially, the needs for docking facilities will also increase, as will the whole tempo of our economic life. Of course we cannot become a port of New York with only a 27-foot channel, but we will, nevertheless, experience a great traffic in smaller vessels for which such a channel will be adequate.

In the legislative work in connection with the passage of the seaway bill, I was genuinely happy to serve with the bipartisan group of Michigan Congressmen who devoted so much time and effort and years of hard work, to this great accomplishment. Congressman Dondero, as chairman of the House Public Works Committee, was in a particularly strategic position to advance the bill, and did so with great ability. Congressmen Rabaut and Dingell, with their many years of experience in the Congress and their extremely wide circle of personal friends among the members of both parties, were also outstanding contributors to the final victory. All Members from the Detroit area united in this fight, and we had the support and help of Congressmen from many other areas, including some areas which would not benefit directly from the seaway, although they will benefit as will all America through the aid this seaway will give to our national defense potential.

I personally want to thank all those Members who have helped in our drive for this great project. I can assure them, Mr. Speaker, that it will mean more prosperity in the future not only for the Detroit area and for all others touched by this seaway but for the whole country.

We in the Detroit-Wayne County area look forward to the era of great expansion which this seaway portends. We look back on 50 years of dramatic progress and expansion based on the automobile industry. Our progress in these past 10 years has been truly phenomenal. We expect now to see that continue, with expanded ocean commerce and the widespread ripples that will make across our whole economy.

Uncle Sam's New Weapon Against Swindlers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 24, 1954

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article which appeared in Parade on June 20, 1954. It follows:

UNCLE SAM'S NEW WEAPON AGAINST SWINDLERS

(By Jack Anderson and Fred Blumenthal)

Washington, D. C.—Not long ago, Joseph A. Whelan, a "fast buck" artist with a fast spiel, was interested in a contract to repair the North Bergen, N. J., post office. Twice before—in 1942 and 1947—Whelan had been caught chiseling Uncle Sam. So this time he hid behind a fictitious firm, the Surrey Construction Co. That, Whelan felt, should keep his past from catching up with him.

But it didn't. Three months later, one of his aliases cropped up in connection with the contract. The name was checked against a confidential blacklist, and his true identity was traced through a cross-index. The endorsement on the Surrey Co. check was compared with Whelan's handwriting. They matched—and the result was a fraud case against the three-time chiseler.

The Whelan story, from secret Government files, indicates what gun-shy Uncle Sam is doing to combat the 5-percenters, influence peddlers, and grafters whose chicanery first rocked this Capital 5 years ago. The story is repeated several times a week as petty cheats and chiselers try to dip into Uncle Sam's wallet.

Right after the influence scandals, the Government began installing a complex cross-indexing system containing more than a quarter of a million names—those of the unsavory characters who have tried to bilk the Government in the last 10 years. Every bid on a contract over $25,000 is checked against this list, called the refer list.

If your name is in this businessmen's rogues gallery, the listing alone isn't enough to scotch your next bid for Government work. But the bid will be scrutinized under a magnifying glass and your sales talk taken with a grain of salt.

For really big operators, Uncle Sam keeps another list—the "debarred list." A swindler caught in a fraud attempt may be sentenced to this list for 5 years or more. He is banished from all Government work for that period. Then he reverts to the "refer list," but all his bids are marked with a warning tab.

The cross-index also prevents swindlers from simply changing the target of their frauds. Once, a contractor could cheat the Army, then step across the Pentagon corridor and pull the same trick on the Navy. Now all bids are cleared through the General Services Administration, which keeps the master file.

ECONOMY-MINDED BOSS

That puts it under the scrutiny of Edmund F. Mansure, a former Chicago businessman with a passion for economy. For instance, he collects paper clips, turns them over to his secretary with the reminder: "The Government spent $286,307 for paper clips last year." As the Government's housekeeper, he does most of its shopping, buying everything from mouse traps for the White House to firecrackers for Alaskan Eskimos (who call them "No. 1 Doggone Salutes" and use them to scare wolves away from reindeer herds).

"In a business where you deal in billions of dollars' worth of contracts a year," Mansure says, "you've got to expect to be the target of every swindler, 5-percenter, shark, and separator in the world." (A separator, by his definition, is "a character who separates his clients from their money.")

In charge of keping the "separators" away from Uncle Sam's door is rotund, poker-faced Baron Shacklette, director of a worldwide network of plainclothes agents who keep an eye on projects where the taxpayers' money is being spent. You might find them in Thailand, checking on a bribery attempt; in France, looking over a procurement swindle;

in South Korea, examining a surplus-property transaction.

Besides adding swindlers' names to the Washington blacklist, the GSA tries to make sure no Government purchasing office anywhere in the world will deal with them.

"When we catch someone," Mansure says, "the name goes into the cross-index. At the same time, we flash bulletins to every Government purchasing office in the world with a full report of the swindle and alert them against doing business with such people."

"People try to cheat the Government every day," Shacklette adds. "Some go for it in a big way, others on a smaller scale." Here are just a few of the tricks, large and small, nipped by his men:

A Government-owned sawmill was stolen in Tennessee. Shacklette's agents investigated, found it in Mississippi.

At a midwestern Army base, two Federal officials were cut off in the middle of a phone conversation over a private Government line. Agents found that thieves had stolen the cable while they were talking.

On a routine checkup of an empty Government-owned building, an agent heard a noisy commotion in the rear. He walked around to investigate, caught a gang of crooks in the act of carting away the sides of the building.

An enterprising businessman, who had a cost-plus contract with the Government, counterfeited 1,000 canceled bus tickets in an attempt to pad his expenses.

And at a tin-and-copper stockpile in New England, agents nabbed eight employees who had been slicing up ingots and lugging them out in their lunch pails.

THEY WATCH STOCKPILES, TOO

One of the most important—and most difficult—jobs Shacklette's agents handle is keeping an eye on the Nation's stockpiles of critical materials. As Government shopping agent, Mansure is buying up billions of dollars' worth of industrial diamonds, sapphires, platinum, manganese, tungsten, and other crucial items. They are stored in 318 secret locations—and that's what make the agents' job so tough.

One hiding place, for instance, is along a much-used railroad track. Tons of precious manganese are built right into the roadbed.

"All we did was cover it with grass," says Mansure with a sly smile. "Sometimes the best hiding places are right out in the open."

Critical materials figured in an international racket which occupied the agents' attention most recently. In order to spur United States mining companies to look for tungsten—vital to jet engines and power tools because of its high melting point—the Government has added a $40 bounty to every 20-pound unit of domestic tungsten found. This makes the Government price $63, as against $23 in the open market.

The slick smugglers figured out that they could sneak in Mexican-mined tungsten, pass it off as American mined, and reap a profit. They set up an airlift between Mexico and Arizona.

A couple of months ago Federal undercover men learned of seven smuggling flights, went to an airstrip outside Tucson, Ariz., and nabbed James H. Fleming and Edward O. Mestan with 2,000 pounds of smuggled tungsten. Fleming and Mestan went down in the Government blacklist and agents set out to round up the rest of the gang.

Not all the names of persons investigated pop up in the Government blacklist, however. In fact, the GSA sleuths under Shacklette's direction have a record of working just as hard to protect the innocent as they do to convict the guilty. One of their most fantastic cases, which had agents criss-crossing Europe to track down leads, involved an innocent American Army officer.

The affair began when 2 scheming Scotsmen, William Graham and Lewis Gordon, teamed up on a deal to sell 720,000 pounds of tungsten a year to the United States for stockpiling. Their source of supply, Graham and Gordon claimed, was a tungsten mine in Spain. The United States sent its procurement chief in Europe, Gen. Thomas B. Wilson, from London to Spain to look over the mine.

GSA SLEUTHS PROTECT THE INNOCENT, TOO

General Wilson sized up the mine, came to the conclusion Graham and Gordon couldn't possibly deliver such an enormous amount of tungsten in a year, and notified Washington. Then he flew back to London and forgot about the incident. But Graham and Gordon didn't.

A year later, they swore out affidavits that Wilson had met with them privately in the Montestorial Bar in Madrid and demanded "a cut from any business that might result from the contract negotiations." It was a serious charge, and it might have meant the end of Wilson's Government career. But Shacklette's men conducted a painstaking investigation and found two sizable holes in the Graham-Gordon story:

At the time of the alleged shakedown in the Montestorial Bar, General Wilson was miles away, being fitted for a suit.

And Gordon, himself, was playing chess many blocks from the bar where the meeting was supposedly taking place.

That wasn't quite enough for the sleuths, however. They added the clincher in London, when a mysterious Spaniard named Rafael Durán visited Gordon in Room 622 of the Cumberland Hotel. Neither man knew that Room 624 was occupied by GSA men.

The agents recorded enough of the conversation to convince themselves that the bribe charge was a phony. Then they picked up Gordon and confronted him with the evidence. He broke down and confessed that the whole plot was aimed at squeezing money out of General Wilson, who was completely innocent.

Because of international complications, however, the Government couldn't prosecute either Graham or Gordon, so both went free. Graham went back to Glasgow to practice law. Gordon headed for Spain, where the United States is spending millions of dollars to construct new air bases.

But if Gordon expects to cut himself in for a share of this jackpot, his deal won't get any further than the confidential blacklist in Washington.

These Are Harsh Words

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1954

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Army, Navy, Air Force Journal of June 26, 1954:

THESE ARE HARSH WORDS

Assistant Defense Secretary John A. Hannah, who soon leaves the Defense Department to return to full-time duties as President of Michigan State College, gave a masterful presentation at the Quantico Conference on the need to make military service more attractive. This is a subject on which he speaks with authority and conviction. Addressing the star-studded meeting, Dr. Hannah minced no words.

"Wars and defense are not for amateurs; it takes professionals, and good ones, to man our defenses and plan our operations adequately, and we have been losing good men by the hundreds of thousands for a wide variety of reasons," the Pentagon's top manpower official declared.

He spoke forthrightly on the many reasons why top-notch men are leaving the service. He told what has been done to alleviate the problem and what yet remains to be done. He put the blame variously, as he saw the particular situation justified—on the Defense Department, Congress, the Services themselves, the citizenry as a whole.

Then obviously intent on driving home his message, Dr. Hannah labeled the lack of adequate housing for service families as a "black mark against the record of the American people." The inadequacy of medical care for dependents, particularly the families of men who are on duty overseas, "verges on the callous and inhuman," he asserted.

These are harsh words. They come, however, only after long and searching study of a critical problem and they come from a distinguished citizen who, departing the Pentagon, has only one thing to gain: more effective defense for his country. "Unless military service can attract the best of our men and women and keep them satisfied with the life they lead," said Dr. Hannah at Quantico, "we cannot begin to have the stamina and morale and spirit which are at the heart of any real security."

Supplementary Benefits for Recipients of Public Assistance Under Social Security Act Programs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR A. KNOX

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 30, 1954

Mr. KNOX. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill to provide supplementary benefits for recipients of public assistance under Social Security Act programs through the issuance to such recipients of certificates to be used in the acquisition of surplus agricultural food products. I wish to include herewith my remarks pertaining to this proposed legislation.

Today I have introduced in the Congress a bill to provide supplementary benefits for recipients of public assistance under our Social Security Act programs.

This bill could well be known as the Surplus Food Certificate Act, since its purpose is to provide supplementary benefits for individuals receiving assistance under the programs of old-age assistance, aid to dependent children, aid to the blind, and aid to the permanently and totally disabled, and at the same time to provide for increased domestic consumption of surplus agricultural food products by establishing a program under which the monthly benefit payment to such individuals will be supplemented by the issuance of certificates which may be transferred to retail food product dealers in exchange for surplus agricultural food products at prevailing market prices, and which shall be redeemed at face value by the United States Government upon presentation of the certificates to an authorized person.

Now the term "surplus agricultural food product" means an agricultural commodity specified in an announcement made by the Secretary of Agriculture which is in a form suitable for human consumption and includes any food products processed or manufactured in whole or substantial part of any such commodity.

The bill does provide that the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed, for the purposes of this act, to determine and announce each month the agricultural commodities with respect to which supplies exceed domestic demand to such an extent as to depress the market price below the parity price.

The bill is carefully drafted to provide that each individual receiving assistance or benefits for any month under a program of old-age assistance, aid to dependent children, aid to the blind, or aid to the permanently disabled, shall be entitled to receive as supplementary benefit for such month an amount equivalent to $10 in surplus-food certificates, and definitely provided for in the bill.

The provisions of the bill would be administered under the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. The bill provides that the Secretary shall provide for the preparation of surplus-food certificates for issuance to individuals eligible to participate under the provisions of the bill.

The bill also provides that the surplus-food certificates shall be distributed by the Secretary to the State agency makig payment to individuals under the program referred to in section 5 of the bill, and further provides that the Seceretary shall prescribe such rules and regulations relative to the eligibility of any individual receiving such surplus-food certificates and will also provide that the Secretary shall provide for the redemption, through the cooperation of banking institutions throughout the Nation, of surplus-food certificates. For such purposes he shall designate banking institutions which shall be authorized to accept such certificates from sellers of food products at retail.

The bill also provides that the Secretary may advance moneys to the banking institutions, where such action appears necessary, to provide funds for the redemption of surplus-food certificates. Such advances shall be accounted for by such banking institutions at least monthly. Or the Secretary may contract to pay banking institutions designated to receive surplus-food certificates a charge for the services rendered.

The bill also provides that the Secretary may from time to time issue such rules and regulations as he deems necessary or proper in order to carry out the purposes and provisions of the act.

Now the criminal provisions provide for anyone who would falsely make, alter, forge, counterfeit, or cause or procure to be falsely made, altered, forged, or counterfeited any such surplus certificates, a severe penalty, the penalty being a fine of not more than $5,000 or imprisonment for not more than 10 years, or both.

I request early consideration of this bill by the Congress to bring some relief to the recipients of public assistance.

Insight Into Thoughts of a Loyal American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 30, 1954

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter which I have received from Mr. Val R. Lorwin.

I think it is a timely and extremely well written letter giving an insight into a loyal American's thoughts. This should be especially interesting in view of the fact that the writer was under indictment for disloyalty. It was only after many years of courageous fighting and bringing forth the true facts that his name was completely cleared.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHICAGO, ILL., *June 3, 1954.*

Hon. ESTES KEFAUVER,
United States Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR KEFAUVER: You have indicated to friends of mine that you were considering the introduction of a private bill to have the Government repay me the costs of preparation of my defense against an indictment for false statements, an indictment which was properly although belatedly dismissed at the Government's request May 25, 1954. I appreciate the concern for justice from which your suggestion springs. My own preference, however, would not be for the introduction of such a bill. If this sounds strange, please let me give you my reasons.

First, because I have not borne most of the costs of the defense preparation myself. I did bear the financial costs of a long fight to clear my name against loyalty-security charges which were essentially the same as those of the criminal indictment. But after my indictment was announced in December 1953, hundreds and hundreds of people—friends, acquaintances, and many strangers—offered their help in preparing the defense.

These people knew that the fight of any American against false accusations is the fight of all Americans. The Government cannot repay them any more than I could. To begin with, I do not know the names of many of those who gave help. More, the help they gave was in many cases far greater than financial. It was the gift of time and moral support and many more offers to testify in open court than we could possibly have used in even a lengthy trial. It was the gift of courage and patriotic principle. The help came not only from the purse but from the heart and the integrity of Americans who love their country too much to see it commit an injustice.

Second, the hurt is only incidentally financial when our Government wrongfully attacks a loyal and truthful citizen. The hurt is to the whole public service when even one Government employee is falsely attacked on charges of communism. The remedy is not in dollars but in a firmer, unwavering justice toward all Americans, including Government employees and former Government employees.

To the individual there is no way of restoring several years of his own and his wife's life, or the unblemished reputation which even the Government's admission of error can never make quite clean after headlines have screamed an indictment baseless and fraudulently obtained.

The individual's best hope of compensation is that his experiences will help to improve the processes of justice in the handling of loyalty programs and the prosecution of cases of any type by the Department of Justice.

Those who in the legislative and executive branches of government have responsibility may examine the place of the anonymous informant in the loyalty-security program. They may well ask whether there is any place for the informant who hides his name and face, when there is no question of national security or secrecy of FBI processes, but simply because the informant is so cowardly and un-American as to be afraid to face a fellow-American he has accused. They may ask whether some means can be found whereby the cost of defense of a Government employee officially found loyal and trustworthy after having to face charges may be assumed by the Government as one of its now-normal expenses of administration.

They will also seek, I am sure, to have the Department of Justice assume the responsibilities which are uniquely its own, and take no cases to a grand jury which it has not sifted carefully. There can be no justification for allowing a prosecutor to go before a grand jury to indict a man who has already demonstrated that he is not only not guilty, but even affirmatively innocent beyond a reasonable doubt of the same charges.

They may seek to better protect the integrity of grand jury deliberations from the overzealous or even fraudulent efforts of the occasional prosecutor unworthy of his high trust.

These are some of the questions which suggest themselves to one who hopes that a 4 years' fight to establish the truth will not have been in vain for others and for the Nation. I want to say again how grateful I am to you for your interest, for you know that America will remain a great nation only if it is a just nation.

Respectfully yours,

VAL R. LORWIN.

One Thousand Protest Red Tyranny in Lithuania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 17, 1954

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I should like to include at this time an article appearing in the Worcester (Mass.) Telegram on June 14, 1954, describing a protest meeting against Soviet tyranny which took place in the town of Shrewsbury, Mass. The article follows:

ONE THOUSAND PROTEST RED TYRANNY IN LITHUANIA

SHREWSBURY.—More than 1,000 Worcester County residents of Lituanian descent gathered in Maironis Park yesterday afternoon for a mass protest against Soviet tyranny in the Baltic States.

They heard Vaclovas Sidzikauskas, of New York, chairman of the Committee for a Free Lithuania, call on the United States to use its influence to end Russia's armed occupation of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia.

Other speakers were Mayor O'Brien and Anthony J. Miller, Worcester attorney.

RESOLUTIONS

The meeting passed resolutions to:

1. Condemn Russian occupation of the Baltic States since July 15, 1940, Soviet atrocities, deportation of populations, and destruction of democratic forms of government.

2. Thank the United States Government for its support of the Lithuanian cause for freedom and for refusing to recognize annexation of the Baltic States by Russia.

3. Ask the United States Government to do what it can to secure restoration of the Baltic States "as enunciated in the Atlantic Charter."

Copies of the resolutions will be sent to United States officials, according to Joseph K. Shaloviejus, chairman of the Lithuanian Aid Society, which sponsored the mass meeting on behalf of all Lithuanian groups.

Cochairmen were Alexander Kuzmickas and Lionginas Leknickas.

Hands in Northwest Power Pot

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 30, 1954

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an editorial entitled "Hands in Northwest Power Pot," from the Wenatchee Daily World of June 19, 1954.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

TWENTY-SIX HANDS IN NORTHWEST POWER POT

If you can keep a level head in all this confusion, then you just don't understand the situation, someone once said.

That's undoubtedly the case in regard to the Pacific Northwest power picture, where even the most astute person is bewildered by the increasing number of agencies engaged in some phase of the planning, construction, generation, regulation, and transmission of electric energy.

Some, like Dr. Paul J. Raver, of Seattle City Light, claim that the confusion has been purposely created to allow the "private power crowd," as he calls it, to move in and take over. Others, such as Secretary of the Interior McKay, say with a straight face, that it constitutes a policy "which will definitely and finally end the piecemeal programs that have retarded the proper development."

In letting the facts speak for themselves, it is only necessary to list the agencies one by one to show what a hodgepodge of intermingled and overlapping hands there are in the power pot. Count them—26 of them.

1. Northwest power pool: Voluntary joining of private power companies, Seattle, Tacoma, and the Bonneville Power Administration, to coordinate their technical operations.

2. Pacific Northwest Utilities Conference Committee: Comprised of private power companies and Seattle.

3. Columbia Basin Inter-Agency Committee: Voluntary committee of four Northwest governors and representatives of Federal agencies involved in resource development who exchange information.

4. Columbia Interstate Compact Commission: Authorized by Congress to allow five Northwest States to draw up a compact on resource development.

5. Corps of Engineers: Federal agency engaged in construction of multi-purpose projects, predominantly navigation and flood control, but involving power production.

6. Bureau of Reclamation: Federal agency engaged in construction of irrigation and multiple-purpose projects, often involving power production.

7. Bonneville Power Administration: Federal agency distributing and marketing Federal power, once involved in planning for future needs.

8. Federal Power Commission: Federal agency which issues permits to construct projects, regulates rates, sets up bookkeeping standards, otherwise exerts great influence.

9. Private power companies: Generate and market power produced by themselves or distribute Federal power.

10. Public utility districts: Market, and in some cases generate, power in individual counties.

11. Rural Electrification Administration Cooperatives: Distribute energy to rural customers.

12. Municipalities: Distribute, and in some cases generate, power for distribution to urban customers.

13. Washington State Power Commission: Has regulatory powers, may build projects on its own and otherwise enters the power picture.

14. Pacific Northwest Governors Power Policy Committee: Comprised of four governors and many representatives of private utilities, Federal agencies, and publicly owned utilities, does engineering studies through an engineering committee.

15. Puget Sound Utilities Council: Combination of Seattle and Tacoma City Light, Chelan and Snohomish PUD's, and Puget Sound Power & Light, engaged in area planning.

16. Pacific Northwest Power Co.: A wholly owned subsidiary private power company established by five northwest companies to build storage projects on Clearwater River and collaborate under the "partnership" program.

17. Washington State Municipal Power System: Contractual entity established by five PUD's to develop Priest Rapids Dam.

18. Operating Agency No. 1: Organized under State power commission law and comprised of 17 PUD applicants and 7 city applicants. Approval by State commission is still pending.

19. Columbia-Snake River Public Power System: A contractual entity of six southern PUD's seeking power development.

20. Columbia Power Commission: Northwest regional organization recommended by the Northwest Public Power Association, Washington Public Utility District Association, and others as corporation to finance construction of power projects.

21. Pacific Northwest Field Committee: Coordinating group of Department of Interior agencies, including Fish & Wildlife Service and other agencies affected by power development.

22. International Joint Commission: Comprised of representatives of Canada and the United States to solve international problems involved in river development affecting both countries.

23. State regulatory bodies, fish and game departments, agencies like Columbia Basin Commision, units of Government for Washington, Utah, Wyoming, Nevada, and Oregon, such as the Department of Conservation and Development in this State.

24. Hoover Commission: A Federal agency studying policies of resource development, having great effect on Pacific Northwest problems.

25. Cabinet Committee: Announced by Secretary of the Interior McKay as having been appointed by President Eisenhower "to coordinate work of existing bureaus."

26. Senator CORDON's amalgamation of private and public agencies: An Oregon combination to be formed to build the Dalles Dam solely for Oregon power supply.

How many more agencies will be created before we get the action we once had in resource development is anybody's guess. In the meantime, if anyone set out to create confusion, such as Dr. Raver contends, they've done a masterful job of it.

The Armed Forces Reserves and National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARK W. THOMPSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 30, 1954

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, my attention has just been invited to an address by Col. William W. Stickney, a Reserve officer in the United States Marines, delivered before the national convention of the Reserve Officers Association on June 16, 1954. Proper training and employment of the Armed Forces Reserves is an essential part of our defense program. Too frequently those who write a Reserve plan are members of the Regular Establishment whose knowledge of Reserves is limited and frequently academic.

The Defense Department has some plans for the future Reserves. Colonel Stickney's address gives you the reaction of an experienced Reserve officer to the proposed new program. His thoughts should be helpful to every Member of Congress.

I have a keen personal interest in Colonel Stickney's reactions partly because they were brought to my attention by Maj. Gen. Melvin J. Maas, former Member of Congress, and now a retired Marine Reserve; and partly because Colonel Stickney distinguished himself as Director of Marine Corps Reserve, a position which I myself once had the honor of filling.

I commend the article to your careful consideration:

In my attempt to find a subject upon which to speak I found that most of the topics which would be of great interest to you are either classified, illegal, prohibited, or just plain against policy.

As you know the so-called New Look, as it pertains to the Reserve structure, has been long under study by all of the services, the Department of Defense and, presently, by the National Security Council and the President of the United States. As a result of all this study, it is expected that the President will, at an early date, submit to Congress important recommendations concerning Reserve manpower and the future structure of the Reserve components of all services. However, discussion of the details of these plans are presently not permitted. In fact, I find myself somewhat in the position of the late humorist, Robert Benchley, when he was an undergraduate at Harvard.

It appears that Benchley was, at the time, taking a course in international law which was not too much to his liking, and he was stumped completely when this question appeared on a mid-term examination: "Discuss the arbitration of the international fisheries problem in respect to hatcheries protocol and trawl procedure as it affects the point of view of (1) the United States, and (2) Great Britain."

After due consideration, Benchley answered as follows: "I am a trifle hazy in this fisheries business about the point of view of both the United States of America and Great Britain. I propose, therefore, to discuss the question from the point of view of the fish."

While I will not admit that I do not know the point of view of the military on this new Reserve structure, I must admit that I am restricted in talking about the matter due to policy and security reasons. I propose, therefore, to discuss the general question from the point of view of the "fish," in other words the Reserves themselves. You are well aware that we, the Reserves, are, in fact, the "fish" in this instance.

In order to fully understand present thinking as it pertains to our Reserve forces, the individual reservists, and our citizens in general, we must first consider the present world situation, and, the policies of the regular Armed Forces.

The United States has never, in its history, faced a more dangerous threat than that posed to us by the leaders of the Soviet Union.

Soviet leaders would be content to await the inevitable if we attempt to maintain forces so large as to insure our eventual economic collapse.

For this reason it has been decided that we will, and we presently are, developing a sturdy military posture which can be maintained indefinitely over an extended period of cold war.

This includes the adjusting of the balance of United States forces so as to fit into the larger system of collective allied forces, with greater emphasis on United States airpower which is superior to that of any other nation.

Such planning does not, however, subscribe to the thinking that the ability to deliver massive atomic retaliation is, by itself, adequate to meet all our security needs.

It should be self-evident from the forces we intend to maintain that we are not relying solely upon air power.

The present overall program is built upon the concept of the long pull vis-a-vis immediate readiness. However, it takes into account all of our advantages, it brings into play our long suits, the use of modern weapons, strong air and naval power as well as our ability to create and produce weapons in all fields. In other words, it is our postion that to attain and maintain selected United States forces of a sturdy military posture is our most effective contribution to a balanced collective strength of a free world.

However, all of this will be for naught unless we have, along with it, a highly mobile, offensively equipped and strategic Reserve; a Reserve that is constantly in a high state of combat and operational readiness and spearheaded by a Ready Reserve that is, in fact, ready. The force in readiness concept of the Marine Corps must be extended to all forces. The Reserve components, to be a true Reserve must possess all the characteristics of mobility and flexibility.

Secretary Wilson and Admiral Radford, as well as both Houses of Congress, have made it known that any cuts in the Armed Forces must be augmented by improved readiness of the Reserve components; that the budget for reserves will be increased as the reserves receive greater emphasis, and that the Reserve forces program has been assigned the highest priority by the Department of Defense.

I have tried to paint you a picture of the background of our problem, but it is only the background—the clouds, the sky, the trees, the outward manifestations. The real heart of the picture, the real problem is the reserves, and that heart, that problem, is yours and mine and all other thinking citizens of this great Nation.

We know that in a democracy such as ours, the regular forces can only be a shield, can only man the outer ramparts, can only ward off the initial thrust. By this I mean no offense to our Regular forces; within them we have many great leaders and valiant hearts but it is the very nature of our Government and economic structure to maintain a small protective shield and to create and build a large reserve to fight and win our wars. That is, and always will be, our tradition.

I believe it to be manifest that this Nation cannot survive without a strong and virile reserve. I also believe that it is the duty not only of the reserves themselves, but of every citizen as well, in and out of uniform, to build that reserve and give it every nourishment necessary to its health. There are those who have said we have failed, but they say not why. If this be so, idle criticism is not what we need. Nor are bodies and weapons our only requirements. What we need first and foremost is good old American pride and patriotism. And what is more, we know that pride and patriotism cannot be subsidized; it cannot be bought and paid for in the market place. Dollars will hedp but you cannot build a reserve on drill pay alone nor upon lip service at a bargain. Let us look at the record of events during the past decade and see where we find ourselves today. Let us face our problem, good or bad, fairly and forthrightly.

As a basis for this discussion, it should be remembered that under the current laws, assuming that present service levels are maintained, and that the draft is continued at approximately the same rate, we will have by 1960 a "Ready Reserve" of over 6 million men. That is a much greater ready classification than we will in fact need. To maintain or call such a Reserve would greatly affect civilian economy and the labor support of any military effort.

It is, therefore, imperative that adjustments be made in our present system of Ready Reserve procurement, civilian specialists, and labor requirements. The question then presents itself—what and how will these adjustments be made so that this Nation can successfully meet any and all emergencies that may arise, maintain the most efficient military establishment, and, at the same time, be in balance with the required civilian support, skills, and know-how? As was stated in the Appley report, "The proper distribution of men with critical skills will be one of the decisive factors in determining the strength of the Armed Forces and the adequacy of civilian support of military operations. Our resources of highly trained manpower will probably be the ultimate limiting factor in our capacity for mobilization.

What we need right now is a dramatic revival of the spirit of 1776. There can be no room for a what's-in-it-for-me attitude. We need young men who say, "Does my country need me? Am I ready to fulfill that obligation?" That's the way our fathers felt—and that's the attitude we need so sorely in these perilous years.

You may say that this is pretty strong language, but I believe that it is high time for strong language, strong thinking, and forceful action. We cannot outguess this situation. If the first guess is wrong, it may be our last as well. You may, and justifiably, say that this does not apply to the officers in this room. However, I believe that it is the duty of all members of this association, pursuant to your own precept, to enlighten others of our present situation and our probable future.

Now, let us look to the east and see what we find over that distant horizon. The following is a brief summation of what Field Marshall Montgomery has to say of Russia's rising military might. He states that while the Soviet ground forces have remained fairly constant in recent years, nonetheless, significant changes have been made in favor of increased mechanization with sturdy and efficient modern equipment. Sixty-five divisions of the present establishment are tank and mechanized divisions. Moreover, the rifle divisions have been provided motorized equipment; they also now have organic tanks and additional artillery. Thus, the mobility and firepower of all Soviet divisions have been increased through the introduction of improved weapons and equipment.

The U. S. S. R., Eastern Germany, and the East European satellites today have over 6 million men under arms. Approximately 4.5 million of these are in the ground forces. A high state of preparedness is maintained by a rigorous training program.

The number of satellite divisions has almost doubled since 1947, bringing their total to about 80 divisions.

The U. S. S. R. has a ready-made spearhead for a rapid advance into Western Europe. This spearhead is composed of 22 Soviet divisions in Eastern Germany, (the bulk of these armored divisions with nearly complete complement of tanks and self-propelled guns. Behind this spearhead there are an additional 60 Soviet divisions located in the Eastern European satellite countries and western U. S. S. R. (This does not take into account satellite divisions.)

Their mobilization system is exercised periodically to insure its effectiveness, and by M 30 (30 days after mobilization day) the Soviet and satellite ground forces could number 400 divisions.

The numerical strength of the Soviet air forces in recent years has been constant, having been stabilized at about 20,000 aircraft, but the rapid increase in the Soviet air potential is illustrated by the rate of changeover to jet aircraft. In 1951, about 20 percent of their fighters were jet types. By early 1954, almost all of their fighters were jet types.

A similar development has occurred with respect to their light bombers. In early 1951, jet light bombers had not been introduced into operational units. By 1954, well over two-thirds light-bomber forces were jets.

In the medium-bomber category, the Soviet has doubled, since 1951, the number of TU–4s (similar to the United States B–29) in operational units.

Still newer types of jet fighters have recently appeared. Newer types of medium and heavy bombers, including jet models, also have been observed.

The development of a comprehensive aviation-training program has been one of the most significant contributions in the Soviet postwar program to improve the capability of Soviet air power.

The program for airfield construction is still in progress, with attention recently being directed to fields with very long runways. In the past 3 years the Soviets have about tripled the number of major airfields in Eastern Europe which will accommodate jet fighters.

In the past the combat value of the satellite air forces has not been significant. In 1951 their aircraft were obsolete. By 1954 the numerical strength of the satellite air forces had been doubled, with nearly half being jet fighters. Their facilities were improved and training had reached a fairly satisfactory standard.

The growing complex of airfields throughout Eastern Europe, the aircraft control and warning systems, and antiaircraft artillery dispositions of the Soviet bloc are rapidly becoming capable of providing an effective air-defense belt along the western perimeter of the U. S. S. R.

Since the end of World War II, the Soviet armed forces have improved their potential for the use of airborne troops and weapons.

The principal naval threat is the Soviet submarine capability. The Soviet Navy has over 300 submarines in service, of which about half are large or medium oceangoing types. The current large-scale naval construction program lays emphasis on the continued production of large oceangoing submarines.

Soviet submarine stockpiles, considered together with a considerable air and naval minelaying capability, constitute a growing threat, particularly against the lines of communication of allied command Europe.

Full credit must be given the Soviet bloc for having developed a strong capability in the special fields of atomic, chemical, and biological warfare, as well as in the field of guided missiles.

The Soviet economy has maintained a level of military production sufficient to provide equipment and supplies for the Soviet and satellite forces and still pursue a program of stockpiles.

To illustrate the magnitude of their total equipment stockpile, the Soviets have more than enough tanks, mortars, and antitank guns for some three-hundred-odd Soviet divisions. Their stockpile of field artillery and antiaircraft artillery is several times that required to supply those divisions. Annual production of these items is continuing at a sizable rate.

I have taken the time to give you this Soviet picture for two very definite reasons. First, I believe every citizen should be made keenly aware of what is going on behind that so-called Iron Curtain. And, secondly, just as Justice Holmes took judicial notice of the fact that a man and woman do not go to a hotel room to say their paternosters, so we should take military notice that a nation does not build this vast military machine for the sake of spending money.

What does all this mean to us? It means, in plain language, that the Soviet bloc is preparing for war, just as Hitler and Japan prepared for war while we watched and did nothing. Fortunately, we were granted time before our last effort to prepare ourselves to fight—that I fear will not be granted again. If war comes again it will be fast and furious. We must be ready to meet it as and when it strikes, and we must be ready to fight here at home as well as abroad.

Just as the best defense is an offensive action, the best deterrent of war is to be so well-prepared as to prevent any enemy from taking the risk of involvement.

We know that we cannot maintain large standing forces and that we must depend largely upon our Reserve components. What most people do not realize is that modern war is total—that it involves every branch of our national life. It is not enough that we have strong military forces, plus a strong military Reserve. We must have a strong Nation. We must remember that all phases of the national war effort are interdependent from the factory to the front line. The Nation at war is a team—the Navy, the Army, the Air Force, the Marines, the Coast Guard, the workers in industry, the civil defense—all are members. Each member has a vital part to play. Working alone, the individual member can achieve little. The team, as a whole, can achieve victory.

A nation at war is a fighting unity. Within the ultimate unity of a nation at war there are various components of the national effort, each of which has a unity in itself. There is the war of production, fought in the factories. There is the war of civil defense, fought by those in our air-raid precaution groups, the ambulance service, the fire service, the man in the street. Each of these is closely interrelated with the others to make up the ultimate unity of the national war machine.

Regardless of this, important though it may be in the overall picture, wars and battles are won by fighting and in no other way. The services of the land, sea, and air must be combined into the one unity of an efficient fighting machine. While the operations of each service are interdependent in their concerted effort, they are as separate as the fingers of the hand in their individual needs and requirements. Only as each of the fingers are strong can the palm endure and receive its strength. But, just as true, without a strong palm there can be no concerted or combined effort—each complements the other.

It follows that there must be a national will to fight and the determination to see it through to the end, come what may. The building up in peacetime of a strong national character is of supreme importance.

Now, as never before, real and rapid preparedness is of the first priority. This Nation must organize itself as regards its manpower and its production, so that it can transfer easily and quickly from a peacetime economy to a war production effort, take any emergency in its stride and ride out the storm. If this is done and done now, it will gain the initial advantage of any struggle. If this is done we can win. If it is not done, God help the American people.

In addition, we must make a very serious study of what future wars will mean and how we will fight them. It is of little use to superimpose new weapons on World War II organizations, and then try to work out the tactical changes involved—we have tried this before and know it will not work. We have some way acquired a very bad habit of fighting each successive war with the tactics of the one preceding.

Any suggestion that the introduction of atomic and thermonuclear weapons is not going to effect the organization of our forces and the tactics of warfare is nonsense. We must examine our organizations and reevaluate our equipment, so that we may find the changes required in this atomic age.

Nonetheless is this needed in our Reserve components and our present system of procuring and training our Reserve forces. The old method has proven itself to be out of date.

To successfully fight any war, we need the following essential requirements:

First, we must have outstanding regular peacetime forces, up to strength and ready at all times to act as our shield without any mobilization procedure.

These forces must be trained and equipped in the highest degree. They must be mobile, hard-hitting, offensive troops with esprit de corps and very highly disciplined. I say "very highly disciplined" advisedly. Somehow in our effort to be equitable we have lost track of the highly important subject of discipline. You just cannot wage a successful war without instinctly disciplined troops. These are the troops and the commanders who have got to stand firm in the face of the horrors and the terrors of the opening clashes of air atomic war. They will stand firm only if they are highly trained and highly disciplined.

Secondly, we need Reserve forces, well organized, capable of being mobilized in echelons in depth, and each echelon receiving sufficient training in time of peace to insure it is ready in fact and fit to fight offensively or defensively as and when it is needed.

Thirdly, these forces, Regular and Reserve, must be backed by a sound logistic and movement organization which must exist in peace to the degree necessary to insure success in the opening week of war.

And, lastly, we must have a sound civil-defense organization in each State, Territory, and large metropolitan area.

For these reasons, I strongly contend that it is our solemn duty to do everything humanly possible to help affirmatively in the building of a strong, flexible, and sturdy Reserve with the will to fight anywhere and everywhere that need may arise.

But, first and foremost, it is my considered opinion that what we need most is a strong and forthright educational program for our citizens, as to the present position of this great Nation, that it is the greatest and strongest nation in the world, and that as such it is incumbent upon us to lead the free nations in our struggle for peace and the preservation of all freedom-loving people. This preservation of freedom will largely depend upon our efforts in this direction. In our success may well depend the success of the world and government as we understand it. In our failure may well depend the failure of world democracy. These are not idle words, but fundamental truths for which our forefathers have fought and given their lifeblood to preserve. So let it be known that these ideals and our very existence is in peril. To maintain them we need the full loyalty and wholehearted support of every American citizen. If America is worth living for, it's worth fighting, if not dying, for as well. I cannot express too strongly the great need of new and powerful concepts in the thinking of the American people if this Nation is to survive. The concept is plain and the need is great.

Most Mindszenty Persecutors Are Either Dead or Missing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 30, 1954

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I submit for inclusion in the RECORD the simple narrative written by Ritchie McEwen, of the North American Newspaper Alliance, which appeared in the Washington Star of June 26. It is dated at Vienna, Austria, the point of origin, as of June 23.

If it is correct and substantially true even in part, this is proof to the world that retribution is certain and that God's vengeance shall be visited upon the persecutors of His church and exacted to the last possible degree. The executioners and torturers of the priesthood of God shall pay here and hereafter even unto their offspring. So beware ye criminal and depraved minds of communism wherever you may be, for your days are numbered and a full measure of justice is assured.

The article follows:

MOST MINDSZENTY PERSECUTORS ARE EITHER DEAD OR MISSING

(By Ritchie McEwen)

VIENNA, June 23.—All but 2 of the 25 persecutors of Hungary's Cardinal Mindszenty have either met their death, await trial on capital charges of treason, or have simply "vanished." Of the remaining 2, 1 is confined in a Russian insane asylum, and the other is a badly frightened fugitive in Western Europe.

Because he adamantly refused to come to terms with the Communist government, the aged cardinal was arrested in October 1948, and examined for 6 months by Communist police specialists, assisted by two Soviet doctors to force from him a confession.

In February the following year, the white-haired cardinal, visibly weakened and in ill health as a result of his "examination," stood trial at Budapest and was convicted and sentenced to life imprisonment on charges of espionage.

CHURCH TRACES FATE

The fate of the cardinal's persecutors has been revealed by Catholic authorities in Vienna, who have been painstakingly keeping track of their whereabouts ever since the trial.

1. Gyula Osko, who arrested the cardinal, was shot down by frontier guards while attempting to flee across the Austrian frontier.

2. Gyula Decsi, Cardinal Mindszenty's examining magistrate and judge, who later became Hungary's minister of justice, was arrested last year on the same charges of espionage as his former victim.

3. The police colonel named Biedermann, who took a prominent part in the examination of the cardinal, died suddenly under mysterious circumstances in the canteen of Budapest police headquarters.

4. Laslo Szulner, the expert who produced the incriminating documents used by the prosecution during the trial, died in Paris soon after successfully escaping to the West.

HANGED AS SPY

5. Laszlo Rajk, Minister of the Interior at the time of the Mindszenty trial, and who was responsible for organizing the stage setting, was hanged as an "American spy."

6. Janos Kadar, his successor, and also one of the cardinal's examiners, also was hanged after facing trial on similar charges.

7. Sandor Zoeld, who personally directed the cardinal's torture, committed suicide after first killing his family.

8. Istvan Riesz, Minister of Justice at the time of the trial, was later arrested. He was found suffocated in his cell a few weeks later.

DIES IN CAMP

9. Ferenc Donath, who led and organized the "popular outcry" against the primate, died recently in a Romanian forced-labor camp.

10. Professor Kaftanov, the chief Russian doctor who administered a truth drug to the cardinal, is now in a Russian asylum, where he has been for 2 years as a patient.

11. Dr. Blaukop, his assistant, and a Russian citizen, was found burned to death in his bed.

The 13 secret police agents involved in the arrest, examination, and subsequent trial of the Hungarian cardinal have all mysteriously vanished from their homes, according to the church authorities. Their whereabouts and fate are unknown to their friends. And there is still one frightened man at large somewhere in Western Europe.

Serving the Health of Wisconsin and the Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 30, 1954

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have prepared a brief statement with regard to another outstanding forward step by the University of Wisconsin in contributing to the health of the people of my State. I include in the statement comments on the health and well-being of the American people as a whole. I ask unanimous consent that my statement and the other material be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW HORIZONS IN TREATMENT OF THE ILL—STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

Looking through the current June 15, 1954, issue of the Wisconsin Alumnus magazine, the official publication of the Alumni Association of the University of Wisconsin, I was pleased to note a writeup of a great new diagnostic center which has been established on the University of Wisconsin campus.

This center will be, as the article describes it, "a symbol of the State's intensified health approach to mental hygiene, and will provide concentrated, specialized, detection services."

It has always been my feeling that man should have long since devoted more attention to the study of the mind, the study of the laws of the mind's health and well-being, just as he has given so much attention to the study of the human body.

We are only beginning to study the mind. We are only beginning to perceive the laws of man's spirit. We are beginning to understand the importance of a wholesome outlook, a healthy viewpoint, the importance of faith and confidence and good cheer. We are beginning to understand how wrong thinking can injure the body, how wrong thinking can prove man's undoing. As Job said in the Book of Books, "The thing which I have feared has come upon me."

In order to assure right thinking, religion, medicine, and every other constructive force plays a vital and interrelated role.

I append now the article from the Wisconsin Alumnus, to be followed by the text of a splendid editorial which appeared in the Friday, June 25, issue of the Milwaukee Journal.

[From Wisconsin Alumnus magazine of June 1954]

CAMPUS IS SITE OF STATE'S DIAGNOSTIC CENTER

New strategy in Wisconsin's battle against mental illness and other forms of maladjustment soon will be introduced, with completion of the $1,200,000 diagnostic center on the university campus.

The 76-bed short-term psychiatric observation hospital is a symbol of the State's intensified health approach to mental hygiene and will provide concentrated, specialized detection services.

Dr. Leslie A. Osborn, director of the Wisconsin Psychiatry Institute in the UW Medical School and of the mental hygiene division in the State department of public welfare, said the center is part of the expanding program to care for, treat, and rehabilitate Wisconsin's psychiatric patients.

The center operates under the administration of the department of public welfare, but is staffed by University of Wisconsin medical faculty. It will function like other university medical institutions, and in addition to clinical activities, research and training will be important roles.

"The training aspect is particularly important," Dr. Osborn said. "We can't provide adequate psychiatric care, nor promote successful mental health programs, without an adequate supply of trained professional personnel."

The diagnostic center will give special attention to the beginnings of trouble, the psychiatrist said. Consequently much of the emphasis in its work will be on children and the entire second floor has been designed for youngsters. Accommodation for 2 children has been provided with 2 day rooms and rumpus rooms.

Fifty single rooms have been included in the building for adults. Men will be housed on the fourth floor. This floor also has a gymnasium-type rumpus room with the addition of class and conference rooms.

Heart of the building is the first floor, with offices for professional interviews and studies, play therapy, class and conference rooms, medical examinations, and consultant staff. This floor also houses the administrative personnel of the division of mental hygiene.

The basement will house a small laboratory and drug room, an electro-encephalogram laboratory; occupational therapy space, and a library. It will also contain a kitchen and cafeteria, and services for the 70 nonmedical employes.

Although the building is designed to accommodate 76 patients, provision is made for the addition of three more floors if expansion is necessary.

Construction of the diagnostic center began in September 1952 following agreements on details by the University of Wisconsin board of regents and the State board of public welfare. The project was authorized by State legislation passed in 1943.

"It is extremely significant that the State of Wisconsin should have foreseen the desirability of the health approach in psychiatry at a time when the medical profession generally was just waking up to the need of preventive and early diagnostic facilities," the director said.

[From the Milwaukee (Wis.) Journal of June 25, 1954]

STATE READY TO START NEW WORK AT DIAGNOSTIC CENTER

A hopeful new chapter in the care and treatment of Wisconsin persons committed to the State department of public welfare—particularly the children and young people with extreme personality and behavior problems—will shortly begin at Madison. The State diagnostic center is now being occupied by the division of mental hygiene. Toward the end of July it hopes to receive its first patients.

The center is a wholly new institution for Wisconsin, although the need for it was foreseen a dozen years ago and serious planning began in 1944. Its superintendent will be Dr. Leslie A. Osborn, who already fills the twin roles of director of psychiatry at the university and director of the mental hygiene division.

Physically, the center is a modern, functional building with a capacity of 76 patients. Offices and treatment facilities are grouped on the main floor. Quarters for children, men, and women are on the upper three floors. Food service, recreation space, and utilities are in the basement.

The site of the $1.2 million building is on the University of Wisconsin campus adjoining the Wisconsin general hospital. The location will permit a sharing of staff between the center and university. The general hospital's medical facilities will be immediately available. Medical students will observe proceedings at the center, and it is hoped that psychiatrists and other professional people who are in such demand everywhere will be attracted to Wisconsin by the new facility.

As first conceived, the center was supposed to examine all persons committed to the welfare department, except those sent to the State mental hospitals. Actually the limited bed capacity will not permit such an undertaking. The thinking that evolved as the center was planned and then constructed was that the patients who needed diagnosis most would be accepted by the center for study and a recommended course of treatment or handling. Such patients might include, for example, a frustrated and bitter child from the child center at Sparta, or a disturbed and delinquent boy from the boys' school at Waukesha.

The newness of the undertaking and the need to organize the staff and work out procedures will require the center to work slowly. A grave concern is that there may be a rash of commitments. For the center to be overloaded with patients at the start might prevent it from fulfilling the high hopes held for it.

An excellent building has been provided and part of the staff has been assembled. A blacklog of cases is available at the various institutions and in some foster homes. With careful study the expectation is that the complicated problems of these patients may be cleared up so that they can become well adjusted, productive, self-supporting citizens rather than State charges.

Contribution of Menninger Foundation

As the Alumnus pointed out, no research institution can, of course, do the job unless it has adequate trained personnel.

Reading these articles brought to mind America's indebtedness to those sources which contribute to the pool of trained personnel capable of understanding and treating the human mind.

One such source—a great training center in our Midwest neighbor State of Kansas—is famed throughout the world for its contributions. It is the Menninger Foundation, of Topeka.

There are few, if any, psychiatric centers in the United States or elsewhere which have not been enriched directly or indirectly—by the contributions of the world-renowned foundation.

In a recent booklet, entitled "For Better Living in a Better World Through Mental Health," the foundation described certain of the background facts including the inspired origins of this great nonprofit medical organization. For more than three decades, under a famous father and his two equally famous sons, Charles, Karl, and William Menninger, the foundation has been blazing new trails in understanding and treatment of the problems of the mind.

I have selected certain excerpts from this brochure. I think that they serve as a revealing supplement to what is being done in the University of Wisconsin and in other States of the Union.

From my own State, incidentally, Mrs. Carl W. Eberbach and Mr. Walter Harnischfeger serve on the board of governors of the foundation. Here in the District of Columbia and in other areas of the Nation, leading citizens contribute generously in their service as governors of the foundation.

Here in the District, too, I might note, a vital new Mental Health Society is already making its constructive influence felt in this important general field of mental hygiene.

I point out in conclusion, that recently America's 1954 National Mental Health Fund Campaign was successfully carried on under the able direction of Fleet Adm. W. F. Halsey, USN, retired.

Excerpts From Brochure of Menninger Foundation, Topeka, Kans.

The greatest victory over disease is yet to come. While we have learned to lengthen the life of the human body, we have not yet defeated the illnesses which attack the human spirit. This final victory, when it comes, must give to all who participate in it the deepest and most enduring satisfaction.

The disordered spirit shows itself in subtle ways—the youngster who steals, the bright boy who fails in school, the skilled employee who is an habitual absentee, the young woman who has had five husbands and as many divorces.

It accounts for 60 percent of lost jobs and 70 to 80 percent of accidents. Behind every alcoholic, every crime, every suicide is a story of maladjusted personality.

In our public and private hospitals the mentally ill make up a population greater than that of the city of Pittsburgh and fill more hospital beds than the victims of cancer, tuberculosis, heart disease, and all other physical illnesses combined; the burden of their care requires a third of the budget of many of our States. Outside of hospitals the mentally ill number, at the least estimate, 10 times the amount of those within; scarcely a family has escaped.

Yet, just as mental illness is America's greatest health problem, mental health can be its greatest asset. Mental health means "the adjustment of human beings to the world and to each other with a maximum of effectiveness and happiness—not just efficiency, or just contentment, or the grace of obeying the rules of the game cheerfully. It is all of these together. It is the ability to maintain an even temper, an alert intelligence, socially considerate behavior, and a happy disposition."

In industry mental health can mean greater harmony, less employee turnover, more efficient production; in the classroom mental health can mean increased ability and desire to learn; in national defense mental health can mean less selfishness, better citizenship, more will to win. To each of us mental health can mean better living in a better world. This is the meaning of the Menninger Foundation.

THE MENNINGER FOUNDATION

The Menninger Foundation is a nonprofit professional organization dedicated to the conquest of mental illness and the improvement of mental health. It is a training center for psychiatric personnel and a research center where specialists of many fields are seeking to learn more about the hidden workings of the human mind, to find the roots of mental illness and to find surer means of curing and preventing it. Its hospital and clinic for adults, and its school and clinic for children, are pilot plants where new techniques of treatment—developed by research—can be tested and refined.

The Menninger Foundation owes its existence to the vision of a Kansas family doctor. It was in 1908, after a visit to the Mayo Clinic, that Dr. Charles Fredrick Menninger dreamed that his young sons should be doctors and that together they would establish the Menninger Clinic. In 1919 his dream came true, but in a rather different way than he had first expected. The newly born Menninger Clinic adopted the specialty of psychiatry.

In those days psychiatry was even less well understood than today. Mental hospitals were asylums. The mentally ill were insane. Psychiatric aides were guards and bughousers. It is said that polite ladies blushed at the mention of Freud, and most people felt that a good licking was the best cure for neurosis. Psychiatrists going into private practice in big cities like New York, Chicago, and Los Angeles were finding it hard going. The Menningers were warned that failure or—at best—State hospital jobs awaited them in Topeka.

Yet, however unrecognized, the need was there. Before long the flow of sick, unhappy individuals was greater than Dr. C. F. and his psychiatrist sons, Karl and William, could handle in their downtown Topeka office. They recruited a staff. With the help of friends in the community they bought and remodeled a farmhouse on the edge of town, built two small hospital buildings, added offices, a medical library, craft shops, and recreation therapy buildings for patients.

Since the Menningers and their associates had little money, just faith and ideas, they improvised facilities as they went along: a barn, a hamburger stand, and a gas station were hitched together to become an attractive office building; a two-car garage was remodeled as the headquarters of the nursing staff; and old stable was dressed up to make a canteen and recreation hall for patients. If there was any profit left over after taking care of their patients, the group invested it in more staff, in a new research program, in the training of another psychologist or psychiatrist.

In 1941, the Menningers and their associates established the Menninger Foundation, a nonprofit institution in fact as well as in spirit. A charter of incorporation was issued, authorizing the Menninger Foundation to accept tax-free gifts for research, professional education and the treatment of needy patients. Within the following few years all of the properties—land, buildings, books, furnishings and equipment—of the Menninger Clinic were turned over as gifts to the Menninger Foundation, governed by a board of trustees later supplemented by a board of governors.

Today, the Menninger Foundation employs about 370 persons, more than one-third of these professionally trained. Its expenditures exceed $2 million annually. Through its alumni and its publications, the fruits of its work have reached into many parts of the world.

THE PSYCHIATRIC COMMUNITY

To understand the Menninger Foundation one must know the psychiatric community of which it is the core. A radius of 3 miles encompasses a group of institutions and clinics which make Topeka one of the psychiatric centers of the world. These 7 institutions care for more than 3,500 patients and are staffed by about 75 psychiatrists, 35 clinical psychologists, and 45 psychiatric social workers, in addition to neurologists, neurosurgeons, general surgeons, internists, pathologists, adjunctive therapists, nurses and many other specialists. All of these institutions are administratively independent of one another, but are affiliated with the Menninger Foundation through the Menninger School of Psychiatry. Collaborating as a unit, they train nearly 100 psychiatric residents, 25 internes and residents in clinical psychology, 20 trainees in psychiatric social work, and additional students in psychiatric nursing, adjunctive therapy, marriage counseling and other related disciplines.

TRAINED PERSONNEL: THE BIGGEST BOTTLENECK

At some time in his life, one member of every fifth American family will be a patient in a public mental hospital.

This member of an American family will probably stay in that hospital for at least 4 or 5 years, and there is 1 chance in 5 he will never leave. Unless he is an exception, he will find indifferent custody instead of intelligent treatment. Instead of nurses, he may have guards. He may never see a doctor. One State's governor said that "Our cows get better care."

Why is this so? If it is true that from 70 to 80 percent of psychiatric patients can be cured—even within the present limits of knowledge—why are hundreds of thousands of Americans spending years, even lifetimes, of bleak despair as the helpless and hopeless wards of our tax-supported hospitals?

The plain truth is that there is a critical shortage of the professionally trained people whose job it is to treat these mentally ill and restore them to their communities. According to the American Psychiatric Association there are today less than 7,000 physicians practicing psychiatry in the entire United States, though the minimum requirement—to meet only the most urgent needs—is for 20,000. Yet scarcely 400 complete training each year. Professional workers in related specialties are in equally short supply.

The plight of patients in our hospitals is perhaps the most dramatic need. But there are others—of more far-reaching implications. Once let industrialists fully awaken to the potential application of psychiatric principles to personnel problems, once let educators catch a greater vision of what psychiatric knowledge can do in the classroom, once let more lawyers and jurists seek psychiatric help to combat divorce, delinquency, and crime—and there would be a demand for psychiatric services many times greater than the present supply.

PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION AT THE MENNINGER FOUNDATION

The training of psychiatric personnel is an important function of the Menninger Foundation. The Menninger School of Psychiatry provides 3-year training to approximately 100 physicians at a time. Likewise important is the training provided for clinical psychologists, psychiatric social workers, adjunctive therapists, marriage counsellors, and others.

Through the Topeka Institute for Psychoanalysis, advanced training in psychoanalysis has been available since 1942. Approximately 45 candidates are enrolled in the programs of the institute, which is the only one in the United States whose faculty is composed primarily of men and women who are devoting full time to psychoanalytic training and research.

Child psychiatry is another field of advanced training provided at the Menninger Foundation. In the entire United States there are only a few hundred psychiatrists specially qualified to deal with the emotional problems of children.

Plans are being crystalized and financial support sought for a program of advanced training in administrative psychiatry: the task of organizing and directing large-scale treatment programs in clinics, hospitals, prisons, and reformatories requires capabilities not developed by the treatment of individual patients.

The need for trained personnel in mental health is so great that no institution, however large, could do the whole job. Therefore the Menninger Foundation not only trains personnel but develops educational methods which can be used elsewhere to increase the scope and improve the effectiveness of psychiatric training. The Menninger School of Psychiatry was a pioneer in the change from the "apprenticeship" type of training for psychiatrists to the "graduate school" program. This new approach, with its organized curriculum and careful rotation of clinical assignments, not only permitted a 20-fold increase in the Foundation's own training programs, but has been a significant influence in the nationwide expansion of psychiatric education since World War II. It has become standard practice in training centers throughout the country.

Foreign Affairs Committee Repudiates the Suggestion in Eden's Speech in Commons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 1954

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article by Edgar Ansel Mowrer. The letter sent to the President by 12 members of the Foreign Affairs Committee repudiating the incredible Eden proposal that the free world not only accept Communist gains, but in fact guarantee them, has now been signed by 22 members of the committee. The mutual-security program was based on the assumption that it was helping to build a coalition of free nations that will stand unitedly against Communist aggression. If some countries like Great Britain are not willing to oppose Communist imperialism, then the program does not make sense as far as they are concerned.

Britain Would Guarantee Red Thieves Their Loot

(By Edgar Ansel Mowrer)

If any good comes out of the recent Eisenhower-Churchill talks, it should be credited to members of the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

Last Thursday, when word of Anthony Eden's amazing speech to the House of Commons reached Washington, only 14 of the 30 members of the House Foreign Affairs Committee were in Washington. The committee had just finished preparing a favorable report on a 3½ billion foreign aid bill requested by the President.

Most of them had uneasily gone along with Secretary Dulles' policy of not intervening in Indochina unless in the company of both France and Britain, with the aim of winning, not negotiating. They favored an alliance for united action in case of further Communist aggression in southeast Asia.

Yet here was Britain's Foreign Secretary calmly flattering Red China's Minister Chou En-lai, insulting (by omission) the American Secretary of State, and proposing a nonaggression pact with Red China:

GUARANTEE THIEVES

Some commentators seem not to have grasped the meaning of such a pact. It is not primarily that it would require diplomatic recognition of Red China by the United States (since you cannot exchange signatures with a government you do not recognize).

It is that the free nations would, in exchange for a pledge of no more Communist aggression, guarantee the present frontiers of communism along the edges of territories they have stolen by violence.

In other words, the free world would promise, say, not to take advantage of a revolt in Red China in order to recover the lost part of Indochina, the lost part of Korea, and/or giant China itself, from our sworn enemies. The murderous thief would be guaranteed the possession of his booty by friends of the people he had robbed.

CHOOSE DETACHMENT

Such is quite literally the aim of British foreign policy in Asia. The British believe that one must choose between opposing Red China or trying to detach it from Red Russia. They have chosen the latter.

If this means fortifying the thief, well, so much the worse. Meanwhile, the detachment policy offers—they think—opportunities to British traders and that lessening of tensions desired by Winston Churchill. Later—if British or Commonwealth interests are threatened—it will be still time to organize armed resistance around American power and productivity.

This is not a policy of cowardice. It is a policy of naked, though shortsighted, national egoism, the same policy followed by the British back in the twenties and thirties when they stupidly built up Germany.

President Eisenhower blew his top when he heard the kind of proposals Churchill and Eden were bringing to Washington.

HOLD BACK AID

But 12 of the 14 members of the House Foreign Affairs Committee did better. They drafted a message to the President informing him that unless the United States tossed any proposal to guarantee Communist frontiers into the ashcan, they would cut down or hold back all further United States military or economic aid, thus tying the President's hands.

This message—which reminds one of the famous United States Senate roundrobin that killed American participation in the League of Nations back in 1920—undoubtedly strengthened the President's will to resist the siren voices of his British visitors. It may have killed the British proposal once and for all.

NP Hospital Need in Massachusetts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 30, 1954

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following self-explanatory letter I have received from Mr. John P. Powers, quartermaster-adjutant, department of Massachusetts, Veterans of Foreign Wars, concerning the urgent need of another NP hospital to take care of the many NP cases in Massachusetts:

Department of Massachusetts,
Veterans of Foreign Wars,
Boston, Mass., June 25, 1954.

Hon. Thomas J. Lane,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Congressman: For many years the Veterans of Foreign Wars in Massachusetts tried to convince the Veterans' Administration and the Congress that another NP hospital was needed to take care of the many NP cases in Massachusetts, forced to be confined to State institutions because there was insufficient room in the VA facilities to care for them, even though they were service-connected cases and had the right to be confined to a VA hospital.

A few years ago the Congress and the Veterans' Administration were finally convinced; the people of Brockton supplied the necessary land, and eventually buildings were put up to house the NP cases. A year ago it was dedicated, and since it was dedicated, it has been nothing but an empty shell with vacant rooms and corridors, and yet we in Massachusetts still have hundreds of service-connected NP cases confined to State institutions and the Veterans' Administration continues to pay the State for their hospitalization. An empty hospital in Brockton, built for the purpose of taking care of NP cases and the Veterans' Administration and the Congress continually talking economy yet refusing to use the Brockton hospital for the purpose for which it was built.

The Department of Massachusetts Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States at the meeting of its executive council, on Saturday, June 19, very definitely expressed its views and voted to inform you, as a member of our congressional delegation from Massachusetts, that the time has come when doubletalk about veterans' hospitalization must cease and the Congress and the Veterans' Administration must open up the NP hospital in Brockton and fill the rooms which were built for that purpose with service-connected NP cases now confined to State institutions.

The Veterans' Administration tells the Congress that they don't have sufficient money to maintain the hospital, but it seems that they have sufficient money to pay the State of Massachusetts for the hospitalization of these patients who rightfully belong in the VA facility.

How much longer must this continue? Your reactions to these conditions and your intention of clarifying the same will be deeply appreciated by the council of administration, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, department of Massachusetts.

Sincerely yours,

John B. Powers,
Quartermaster-Adjutant.

The Penalty of Leadership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 28, 1954

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, leadership has always been a lively topic.

Forty years ago, in the January 2, 1915, issue of the Saturday Evening Post, there appeared an advertisement entitled "The Penalty of Leadership," which, it seems to me, must have helped set in motion the inspiration behind the drive that helped to produce the United States which the world beholds today.

That men must have ice in their veins in matters dealing with leadership, the above-mentioned article clearly develops.

Under unanimous consent, as of possible interest to the House, it is cited below:

The Penalty of Leadership

In every field of human endeavor, he that is first must perpetually live in the white light of publicity. Whether the leadership be vested in a man or in a manufactured product, emulation and envy are ever at work.

In art, in literature, in music, in industry, the reward and the punishment are always the same. The reward is widespread recognition; the punishment, fierce denial and detraction.

When a man's work becomes a standard for the whole world, it also becomes a target for the shafts of the envious few. If his work be merely mediocre, he will be left severely alone; if he achieves a masterpiece, it will set a million tongues awagging.

Jealousy does not protrude its forked tongue at the artist who produces a commonplace painting. Whatsoever you write, or paint, or play, or sing, or build, no one will strive to surpass or to slander you, unless your work be stamped with the seal of genius.

Long, long after a great work or a good work has been done, those who are disappointed or envious continue to cry out that it cannot be done. Spiteful little voices in the domain of art were raised against our own Whistler as a mountebank, long after the big world had acclaimed him its greatest artistic genius.

Multitudes flocked to Bayreuth to worship at the musical shrine of Wagner, while the little group of those whom he had dethroned and displaced argued angrily that he was no musician at all.

The little world continued to protest that Fulton could never build a steamboat, while the big world flocked to the riverbanks to see his boat steam by.

The leader is assailed because he is a leader, and the effort to equal him is merely added proof of that leadership.

Failing to equal or to excel, the follower seeks to depreciate and to destroy, but only confirms once more the superiority of that which he strives to supplant. There is nothing new in this. It is as old as the world and as old as the human passions—envy, fear, greed, ambition, and the desire to surpass. And it all avails nothing.

If the leader truly leads, he remains the leader. Master poet, master painter, master workman, each in his turn is assailed, and each holds his laurels through the ages.

That which is good or great makes itself known, no matter how loud the clamor of denial. That which deserves to live lives.

Resolutions of Baltic States Freedom Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 30, 1954

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following resolutions unanimously adopted by loyal citizens and residents of Estonian, Latvian, and Lithuanian descent, assembled on June 13, 1954, at Town Hall, New York, N. Y., to observe solemnly the 13th anniversary of the mass deportations from Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania by the Government of the Soviet Union and to mark the 14th anniversary of the brutal and unprovoked aggression of the Soviet Union against the independent Baltic Republics:

Whereas the Soviet Union has arbitrarily occupied and established Communist regimes in Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania and suppressed their freedom; and

Whereas the rulers of the Kremlin, after having occupied the Baltic States, began there a regime of terror, mass arrests, and mass murders, and as June 14, 1941, marks the beginning of the Soviet mass deportations of citizens from Latvia, Estonia, and Lithuania to slave labor in remote districts of the Soviet realm, with the ultimate aim to exterminate and to forestall the national struggle for freedom and independence; and

Whereas the Government of the United States has refused to recognize this "incorporation" of Estonia, Lithuania, and Latvia into the Soviet Union and continues recognition of their lawful diplomatic representatives in this country; and

Whereas the investigations of the Baltic Committee, which was created in 1953 by the House of Representatives on the initiative of Representative Charles J. Kersten, has established beyond doubt Soviet Russia's flagrant violation of all international treaties, which she had voluntarily entered into with the Baltic Republics, and also her disregard for the human rights of the Baltic peoples, and

Whereas the Senate of the United States has passed on April 29, 1954 a resolution endorsing the refusal of Presidents Roosevelt, Truman, and Eisenhower to recognize the Soviet conquests of Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we, here assembled in prayerful sorrow for the victims of Soviet aggression and genocide in the Baltic countries, solemnly and vigorously protest against these acts of flagrant aggression and these inhuman practices of the Soviet Union; and be it further

Resolved, That we respectfully request the Congress and the Government of the United States to initiate an investigation of Soviet violations of international treaties by the Assembly of the United Nations, and of the crime of genocide perpetrated in the Baltic States, with the object of pressing for the withdrawal of Soviet occupation forces from their territories and be it finally

Resolved, That we express our sincerest gratitude to the people, the Congress, and the Government of the United States for their resolute encouragement to the Baltic peoples in their struggle for liberation, and that we pledge our full support to the United States in the fateful fight of the free world against totalitarian Communist aggression.

Baltic States Freedom Committee,
Valdis Ignats, *President.*
Mrs. Alice Frey, *Secretary.*

Roots and Wings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, June 30, 1954

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record, a sermon delivered by Dr. Julius Mark, senior rabbi of Temple Emanu-el of New York City, entitled "Roots and Wings."

There being no objection, the sermon was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Reform Judaism has made many notable contributions to Jewish life. Of these perhaps the most beautiful and most meaningful is the confirmation service, which was established to emphasize the principle—nonexistent in the bar mitzvah ceremony which was limited only to boys—of the equality of the sexes in the house of God. Both girls as well as boys were to participate in this ceremony of dedication and consecration to the ideals of our faith. The festival of Sh-vous was chosen for confirmation day, because it recalls, in Jewish tradition, the anniversary of Matan Torah—the "giving of the law" at Mount Sinai, crystallized in the Ten Commandments. The first confirmation in America was held in Temple Emanu-el, then located on the lower East Side on Grand and Clinton Streets, in 1846, just 108 years ago.

The consecration service, on the Sabbath preceding confirmation, is a more recent innovation in manq reform congregations, including our own. It is a service dedicated to hallowing the parent-child relationship through family worship. The parents of the members of the confirmation class are invited to join their children at this service as a concrete expression of the truth of the slogan adopted by RIAL—Religion in American Life—namely, "Families that pray together, stay together."

In recent years we have become conscious and gravely concerned over the continuing disintegration of the home, the most precious of all institutions and the most essential to the very survival of democracy in America. We are profoundly disturbed, in these trying times, over world reconstruction, over saving mankind from communism, and over the dire threat of atomic destruction. Now, it is well to be concerned with these momentous problems—to inform ourselves about them, so that we may be able to face them intelligently—but, when all is said and done, my friends, there is very little that the individual can do about them.

There is one area, however, concerning which each of us can do a great deal, but which, unfortunately, we tend to ignore. I have reference to the home—the home, which is the basic institution of any democracy. If the home is sound, America is sound. If the home is sound, Judaism is sound and meaningful in the lives of children as well as parents. The success of our democracy as a way of life is ultimately reflected and gaged by its success in the home, and the quality of family life will, in the final analysis, determine the quality of our national life.

How secure can the home of a nation be if divorce has increased to the point where 1 out of every 3 or 4 marriages ends in separation? How strong are the foundations of a nation wherein juvenile delinquency has increased to staggering proportions? Mr. Bertram M. Beck, Director of the Special Juvenile Delinquency project, sponsored by the Children's Bureau of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, recently declared that 10 years ago most juvenile delinquents came from the slums of cities, but that today delinquency is no longer a revolt against poverty, but that it has spread from the slum neighborhoods to what are known as better sections of the community. In New York City, Mr. Beck pointed out, gang warfare and criminal vandalism have been a real problem in recent years, not in the slums, but in the so-called middle- and upper-class residential areas of the city. He warned that a youngster reared in an atmosphere of corruption, materialism, mechanization, and utter confusion as to fundamental moral and spiritual values has very little to sustain him.

It is evident that the juvenile delinquent is usually the product of a home, whether in the slums or in the better neighborhoods, whether it be a home already broken or still existent, that manifests evidence of a lost reverence for basic religious mandates, the first and most pathetic victims of which are inevitably the children. The emotional patterns of the child's life are developed in the home. Only the secure family, firmly founded upon basic religious loyalties, can raise children whose conduct will insure the social stability of the Nation. And the primary responsibility of strengthening the home lies not with the church or the synagogue or the school—which can act only as cooperating agencies—but with the parents in the home.

In Jewish life, the home has always been regarded as a sacred institution; as being in no wise less sacred than the house of God itself. Children were looked upon as heaven-sent, as the most priceless of all possessions. One of the rabbis even went so far as to say: "A childless person is accounted as though he were not even alive."

Now children, on the other hand, were constantly reminded that their foremost duty was to honor their parents. Our ancient teachers declared that the fifth commandment—honor thy father and thy mother—is the most important of all. And honoring meant not only respecting and sustaining one's parents, it meant obeying them—obeying them without question.

Now, today, no parent in his right mind expects his child to obey his command as though it were law. If we parents would have our children honor us, we must try to deserve to be honored by making every effort to understand them, to win their confidence, to find more time to spend with them, to do all within our power to prevent them from feeling rejected because their parents are too busy. We make the greatest mistake of our lives, my friends, when we believe that we are doing our duty to our children when we provide them with the best of material things in life, with the best of housing, and of clothes and of schools, by overindulging them, with the result that they become selfish, inconsiderate, and ill-mannered. Do you recall the tremendous interest that was evoked several years ago by the play Edward, My Son? This was due to the encouraging fact that many parents, identifying themselves with the well-meaning but overindulgent father, began to ask themselves wherein they had failed in the rearing of their children.

I must confess to you that before I became a father I was much more impatient with children than I am now. When a child came late to religious school I would blame the child. And then I began to realize that in 9 cases out of 10 it was not the child's fault—it was the parents' fault.

When a child is inattentive or does not prepare his lessons or is resentful toward temple worship I found that in most instances—there are, to be sure, exceptions—the parents were like that.

Thus, I became more and more patient with children and less and less patient with their parents. The selfishness, the willfulness, the snobbishness, the concern with outward appearances rather than with inner adjustment which I found in some children are almost always the reflections of similar traits in their parents.

In his famous book, So Little Time, John Marquand presents his leading character, Jeffery Wilson, as being crushed by the haunting sadness, experienced by so many parents in our day, of seeing his son go off to war. Stricken by guilt feelings, he is overwhelmed by the realization that he has given so little time to his son. After saying goodby to him, the father walks up Fifth Avenue, here in New York, his heart filled with painful regrets that he has been with his son so little that he hardly knows him. And now his son has grown to manhood and is in the Army. He thinks about the ephemeral nature of life, the rapidity with which time passes, the involvement in matters that have only superficial significance when he approaches St. Patrick's Cathedral and enters the great church (of course, he might have walked 15 blocks further north).

And there, at last, in the quiet of the sanctuary, he becomes aware of the only reality which abides, though all other things change, the only power which is timeless and eternal. All at once this parent, whose entire life had been engrossed in the business of making a living, recognized that he had failed in the more important business of making a life. Oh, yes, making a living is important, but it is hardly worthwhile to devote all of our time to it if it denies us the companionship of our children and robs them of our love.

Monday is confirmation day when all of us, whether we have children in the class or not, may well give thought to the tremendously important fact of turning the hearts of the parents to the children and the hearts of the children to the parents. And since the Ten Commandments are central in the confirmation service, may I suggest what might be called the ten commandments for parents of modern times:

First. Be loving to your children. Make them feel that they are wanted. Psychologists are now beginning to point out what our fathers and mothers discovered centuries ago, namely, the importance of love in a child's life. The finest thing that we can do for our children is to win their confidence, so that they will naturally unburden their hearts to us. Love is essential in every successful parent-child relationship.

Second. Don't expect impossibilities of your children. Many Jewish parents insist that their children must always be at the head of their class, whether they are intellectually and emotionally capable of being at the head or not. Too many parents bring unhappiness to their children through their insistence that the youngsters must make up for their parents' own failures. Such parents may deny it, but they are really looking for victories, rewards, and satisfactions for themselves rather than for their children.

Third. Never deceive your children. You won't succeed in that deception anyway. I tried it. I know. It will only cause your children to lose respect for you. The Talmud declares: "A person should never tell a child that he will give him something and not keep his promise, because he thereby teaches his child to tell lies," which leads to the

Fourth commandment for parents: Keep your promises. If it is a reward, give it. If it is punishment, inflict it. A child soon discovers whether your threat or your promise is an idle one or whether you are in earnest.

Fifth. Correct your children's shortcomings early: "In the beginning," declared an ancient Rabbi, "sin is like a spider's web; but it soon becomes like a cable." Moral evil is like physical evil. Just as disease is treated in childhood to prevent serious complications later, so faults are more easily corrected in the young than in the old.

Sixth. Never exaggerate to them the values of material things. Children of the rich are no less unfortunate in later life than are children of the poor. Early in life, the child of well-to-do parents should be taught that money is a good servant, but a harsh master. You render your child a mean disservice when you suggest, by word, or deed, or even the expression on your face, that he, the child of well-to-do parents, is superior to his classmate, whose parents are in humbler circumstances.

Seventh. This, too, is important. Do nothing and say nothing that you would not want your child to do or say. "The talk of children in the street," declare the ancient rabbis, "is the talk of their fathers and mothers at home." Your child can have little respect for his school, his teachers, his rabbis, his house of worship, his faith, his associates, if he hears you make unflattering remarks about them. If parents only knew how vital and decisive in the lives of their children are the examples which they set.

The story is related of the rabbi who, looking through a window, saw a father and son, both under the influence of strong drink, reeling in the gutter. "I envy that father," said the rabbi to his son. The son could hardly believe what he heard, so great was his astonishment. "But father, how can you say that?" asked the son. And he replied, "Because that man has succeeded in his ambition to have his son like himself. That is why I envy him. See to it, my boy, that the drunkard does not have better success with his son than I shall have with mine."

Eighth. Show no favoritism among your children. The quarrels, the jealousies, the hatreds which sometimes mar happy family life frequently originate in just such a practice. The rabbis of old were sharp in their criticism of Jacob because of the favoritism that he displayed toward Joseph as over against his brothers. Whereupon they declared: "A father should never make distinctions among his children."

Ninth. Make your house a home for your children. Nothing on earth can take the place of a happy, loving, harmonious home. A home in which love prevails conditions the child in his own social relationships. Oh, yes; juvenile delinquents come out of the slums. But remember, some of the outstanding citizens of our city and of our government also came from the slums. But inevitably it was shown that they were fortunate in the kind of homes from which they came though the neighborhood was definitely inferior.

Given a home in which love and consideration on the part of parents toward one another reigns supreme, where father and mother are devoted not only to their children, but to one another, the chances are that however hard life may toss your son or daughter in the surging onrushing waves of experience, he or she will swing back to the ideals and influences experienced in that home. The most precious memories which inspire all of us as we go through life are those which are associated with our childhood homes. As parents, we should consciously seek to create such experiences for our children.

Tenth, and finally, religion. Hard, rugged, down-to-earth experience has taught many a modern parent the bitter lesson of what may happen to a child when he is robbed of what is in reality his birthright as a human being—the knowledge and love of as well as the participation in religious experiences. Children are naturally, gloriously, wholeheartedly religious. Many become cynical as they grow older because of the lack of knowledge on the part of parents that it is important to set the example for their youngsters. Children are early awakened to the mystery of life and the quest for God. We who fail to guide them intelligently and patiently in the quest deprive them of inner serenity, inner courage, and a wholesome, satisfying philosophy of life.

Our religion not only teaches us and our children the ethical principles of honor, virtue, love, and forbearance but inspires us with the heroism of our past and courage for the future. And if we meet with misunderstanding or prejudices as we walk along life's highway, a lofty, satisfying, immovable faith will immunize us and our children against the corruption of diseased minds. Our faith is not only our strongest weapon. It is our strongest shield, our buckler, our defense.

Do not make the mistake of sending your children to worship. Go with them. You will discover that as your children grow older they begin to have other interests. They have experiences which they share with other children. They have this time for you. You can play ball with your children while they are small, young, but as they grow older they do not want to play ball with you. They want to play baseball with people who can do a better job. But there is one experience that you can share with them for a long time to come. It is the experience of worshiping together in the House of God. "Families that pray together stay together."

What is the finest and most lasting bequest that we can leave to our children? Hodding Carter in his book, When Main Street Meets the River, quotes a very wise woman who once said to him, "There are only two lasting bequests that we can hope to give our children—roots and wings."

And they can be grown—these roots and wings—only in the home. Amen.

Mutual Security Act of 1954

SPEECH

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1954

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 9678) to promote the security and foreign policy of the United States by furnishing assistance to friendly nations, and for other purposes.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the remarks of our friend the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Harrison], of course, strike a responsive note in everyone's heart. It would be so nice if we could do the sort of thing he proposes.

He is perfectly right, that a situation might develop in southeast Asia where not a cent of this new money would be used; but that would be an almost unbelievable catastrophe for the United States, for it would be because that whole area had gone over to the enemy; and its manpower, and its resources, and its strategic bases for Russian submarines on the Indian Ocean and in the southwest Pacific would all be in the hands of the forces that are dedicated to our destruction.

This authorization was voted last year to be used just in Indochina—or the Associated States, as they ought to be called now, because they are no longer 1 French colony but 3 independent countries, Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia. Everybody knows the unfavorable developments in Vietnam and in fact in that whole portion of the world and recognizes that things could get steadily worse for a time. Anyone who looks at the map must realize why that very fact means this year we need to authorize the appropriation to be available on a flexible basis for the defense of the whole area, to use in whatever ways and places will be most effective.

Surely, the loss of one engagement, even though it be a very important engagement, does not mean that we are going to follow the advice of some who seem to be suggesting that we should scuttle and run or surrender to the enemy. We have got to find effective ways to build strength in that part of the world. The purpose of the funds is to hold in the free world as much as possible of southeast Asia and the western Pacific. That includes the Philippines and Japan, in case anyone has forgotten.

I hope that the members of the Committee of the Whole have examined the figures on page 18 of our committee report where the populations of these various Far Eastern countries is outlined in detail. What do the figures there mean? They mean that the thing the Communist world already has most of is boys; the thing the free world has fewest of is boys. Are we going to turn over to the other side pretty nearly one-third of the people of the world—potential producers and consumers, but also potential soldiers—by telling them in advance by the action proposed here today that since things look bad, we are going to quit? We wish the situation might have been different but since it seems to be going from bad to worse, we intend to withdraw our support. On the contrary, I think we must make every effort to save as much as possible of that part of the world.

For many long years I have warned on every possible occasion about the seriousness of the Communist expansion in China, Korea, and southeast Asia. But there is no reason for those who would not pay attention then, to become panicky now.

I am not as pessimistic about that part of the world as some are who until a few months ago refused to be as alarmed as the facts deserved. If we would just get it over to the people in Asia that they can count on Uncle Sam, I think you would quickly find far greater strength there than you witness today.

When we were in Burma last fall we talked with a member of the government, a very intelligent and alert young official, who said: "You folks do not like our position of neutralism." He volunteered the observation. We would have got around to the subject sooner or later and asked him about it, but he brought it up himself. He said: "We have an 800-mile border with Communist China. We have 19 million people, Communist China has 450 million. We have an army of a few hundred thousand; Communist China has 4½ million. How," he asked, "can you expect us to stand up and defy Communist China right across the border when some of your allies half way around the world insist that you accept Communist China? We cannot resist them, if the West is going to embrace them."

I did not have any good answer.

One reason some of those countries are weakening today is because they are not sure of us; and the gentleman's amendment if passed would indicate that there is reason not to be sure of us.

I came back from two trips to Asia last year with about five main impressions.

First. Many of the people living there are more keenly aware of the nature of communism and its objectives than many here are.

Second. They are afraid of it, because they know it will destroy the newly won independence for which they fought for scores, even hundreds of years. They do not want to lose it.

Third. They want to be on our side because they know that offers their best hope to retain their precious freedom.

Fourth. With the exception of the Philippines, in every one of those countries we found a haunting anxiety, or at least uncertainty, as to the clarity and the constancy of American purpose and American policy. They are afraid that we will go to some conference, and Molotov or Chou will make a big proposal that looks like a "settlement" and promises to give peace and security to us in the West; and that we will buy it, no matter what it does to them.

Fifth. They know that we in the West have the power, but they also know we do not as yet have the will and the unity. They know the Communists have the will; they do not as yet have the power. Probably this whole world struggle depends on who gets first both the will and the power.

Mr. Chairman, unless we want to commit suicide, we cannot in my opinion, adopt these proposed gestures which would not save money, but would weaken our allies, weaken our security, and thus cost us more money for our own defenses. Much of Asia will crumble once it becomes convinced the Communists are going to win. We must not take any action that would justifiably give the impression that we are resigned to the continued successful advance of the Communists. That would be the way to war, not to peace.

I hope the gentleman's amendment will be defeated.

hat they
ink you
trength

fall we
govern-
t young
not like
volun-
ld have
or later
brought
ave an
China.
munist
ave an
Com-
ow," he
and up
across
es half
at you
cannot
to em-

ies are
re not
mend-
there

ia last
ssions.
there
ure of
than

cause
y won
nt for
ey do

le be-
best
dom.
Phil-
tries
least
the
and
that
Molo-
posal
rom-
is in
, no

West
y we
the
have
the
orld
both

om-
ion,
hich
eak-
and
own
able
nu-
not
bly
ned
of
the

ent

Appendix

Purchase of Lead and Zinc for the National Stockpile

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 30, 1954

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement I have prepared relating to the directive issued by the Office of Defense Mobilization for the purchase of lead and zinc for the national stockpile, and in this connection a statement by Mr. Otto Herres, chairman of the National Lead-Zinc Committee, entitled "Does the United States Need a Mining Industry?"

Mr. CLEMENTS subsequently said: Mr. President, on yesterday, the junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] requested unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement he had prepared relating to a directive issued by the Office of Defense Mobilization for the purchase of lead and zinc for the national stockpile, and also have printed in that connection a statement by Mr. Otto Herres, chairman of the National Lead-Zinc Committee, entitled "Does the United States Need a Mining Industry?"

Mr. President, the statements exceed the limit, under the rule, for printing matters in the Appendix of the RECORD without a statement of cost from the Public Printer. Such a statement has been received; we now find that the cost of printing the statements in the Appendix of the RECORD will be $212.50.

I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding the additional cost, the statements be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR ANDERSON

On February 16, 1954, a special committee, headed by Senator DWORSHAK, and of which I was a member, met with the President in regard to the serious condition of our lead-zinc industry in the West. We made some recommendations to the President, among them being that a stockpiling program should be started to give temporary relief to the lead-zinc industry until some permanent remedy to their problem could be worked out. The President directed the Office of Defense Mobilization to work out a program, and under a directive dated June 7, 1954, the ODM directed the General Services Administration to purchase lead and zinc for the national stockpile. So far as I can determine, no price was announced and the General Services Administration was limited to a "secret" price which was below the market. This was not the kind of program we had in mind, and of course the General Services Administration was not able to purchase lead and zinc. The Office of Defense Mobilization saw that this was not going to be effective, and on June 16, 1954, they put out a new directive which would authorize the General Services Administration to make its purchases of lead and zinc for the stockpile at the market price. This did not help any because many of our lead-zinc mines were closed and could not open on account of the market price being too low to enable them to operate.

During the time that has elapsed since our meeting with the President, the Tariff Commission completed its studies of this situation, and on May 21, 1954, made some recommendations to the White House. It is my understanding that the Tariff Commission recommended unanimously to the President that relief from this situation be granted under what is known as the "escape clause" of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. No action has been taken on the recommendation of the Tariff Commission; our lead-zinc mines are still closed, and many of them are filling up with water and never will be opened again.

The statement of Mr. Otto Herres on June 29, before a conference of western Senators explained this problem so clearly and points out so very well the remedies necessary to correct the situation, that I present it for printing in the RECORD so that those who have not had an opportunity to read the statement may do so.

DOES THE UNITED STATES NEED A MINING INDUSTRY?

(Statement of Otto Herres, chairman, National Lead and Zinc Committee; vice president, Combined Metals Reduction Co.)

Only 3 years ago the Government was calling on the mines of this country to expand production of lead and zinc, urgently needed for defense purposes and essential industries. Today the lead-zinc mining industry is struggling to survive a flood of imports priced below the average cost of domestic production that threaten its very existence.

The Tariff Commission, after one of the most comprehensive investigations ever made of an American industry, on May 21, 1954, recommended unanimously to the President that relief from this deplorable situation be granted under the escape clause of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act.

It is the understanding of the industry that the State Department strongly opposes the Tariff Commission recommendation and prefers to obtain the Nation's supply of metals and minerals from friendly foreign countries. In some instances the amount of friendship involved may be open to question. However, informed opinion is that the State Department influence against the domestic industry will prevail at the White House, regardless of the merits of the case unless Congress, and Members of the Senate in particular, take steps to see that the welfare of the domestic industry receives consideration.

It may be essential to import some metals and minerals to supplement domestic production and to fill our stockpiles for defense with materials in which we are deficient. But the Nation still must look to its own reserves for the major portion of its mineral supply. All of the studies and reports of materials resources policy by Presidential commissions, national resources boards or foundations interested in promoting foreign trade must come to this conclusion for one reason or another, but principally self-preservation for the Nation.

National security requires a healthy mining industry with ample productive capacity and experienced working forces. Our protection is industrial strength.

DISCRIMINATORY PRACTICES

But the lessons of the war and postwar rearmament years, it seems, are sometimes forgotten. Discriminatory practices favoring foreign purchases of metals and minerals for stockpiling have been reported. And Government agencies in some instances seem to believe that it is preferable to supply our needs from foreign mines at the expense of the domestic industry.

Zinc is coming to our stockpile from Peru and lead from Africa. We are buying copper to aid Chili and tin to help Bolivia. Why not give some consideration to the unemployed lead-zinc miners of the United States? Twice during the past 12 years the country has suffered from a shortage of zinc because of policies destructive to the domestic industry.

STATE DEPARTMENT POLICIES

The record shows that for years the State Department by ill-considered action has been committed to opening our markets to free competition with goods produced far below our wage levels and living standards. When World War II came there was a shortage of metal. And again during the Korean emergency the experience was repeated.

Soldiers were returned from the Army to work in the metal mines of the West during World War II.

And what has the State Department been doing during these critical times to protect the domestic metal production essential for national defense and security? The State Department has been carrying on a program for financing expanded foreign production of metals and negotiating tariff reductions under the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act in preference to protecting domestic production.

Unfortunately, the same difficulties of shortages and abnormally high foreign prices on the basic metals, and the same hardships from restrictions on consumer use are likely to be suffered again when the next great crisis arises, unless the mines of this country are permitted to operate and develop the ore reserves needed for future production of metal essential to national defense.

State Department officials contend that when a sufficient number of American mines have been wiped out prices eventually will come back to 15 cents a pound for lead and zinc because of decreasing supplies. By that time many once thriving mining communities will be deserted and many families will have lost their homes. Is that good American policy?

Large corporations can protect themselves by moving to foreign fields and receive United States Government assistance in their efforts to produce profitably when metal prices drop too low to permit profitable operation under our wages and living standards. But where does that leave workers and their families and the smaller independent companies and their stockholders?

Small independent mining companies unable to obtain financial support because of the depressed prices of zinc and lead are being forced out of existence. Some of the better mines are passing into the hands of large corporations that are able to hold on at a loss until foreign imports have virtually eliminated competition by pricing much of the domestic industry into bankruptcy. Is it the Government policy to liquidate small business in this country?

SAVING THE WORLD

Washington has been so engrossed in recent years with trying to save the world that problems here at home are forgotten. The State Department proposes to finance expanded production for all of the backward and undeveloped areas of the world where land and labor are cheap and take payment in metals, minerals and other raw materials. When raw materials come into a country where they already are produced in substantial amounts and create an oversupply the effect can be only lower earnings or unemployment for workers engaged in the industries affected. The price of a commodity is determined by the value of the excess of supply over demand.

The mineral policies of the State Department over the past 20 years have been responsible for metal shortages during 2 wars of this period and price instability that has been harmful to producer and consumer alike. No effective protection is available to the domestic mining industry against the dumping of metals on our markets from low-wage countries that have devalued their currencies. And no safeguard of consequencies has been available to the consumer against shortages in times of heavy demand, or excessive prices on foreign metals during periods of shortage.

FINANCING COMPETITION

The American taxpayer has been called upon to finance competition which is putting industries essential to our national security out of business. His money has gone toward the purchase of such metals as lead and zinc at high world prices by other nations, later to be released and depress our markets. Mines are standing idle in the United States and workers are unemployed because of currency devaluation and the socialistic methods used by foreign governments in the purchase and sale of metals.

Bad policy has put the mines in the fix they are in. The fault does not lie with the lead-zinc industry of the United States. The situation has been brought about by devaluation of the pound and other currencies, American aid programs and over-stimulation of foreign production by high prices when United States mines were restricted by means of price controls.

The Senate of the United States has taken cognizance of the situation and accordingly has directed an investigation and study to be made of the accessibility of critical raw materials for the national defense. The purpose of the investigation is to recommend measures that will encourage and assure the availability of adequate supplies for the expanding needs and security of the United States.

Concerned over the evidence of serious injury, the Committee on Finance of the United States Senate on July 27, 1953, and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives on July 29, 1953, each by unanimous resolution requested the Tariff Commission to institute a general investigation of the domestic lead and zinc industries, including the effect of imports of lead and zinc on the livelihood of American workers. Testimony in this investigation was heard by the Tariff Commission concurrently with the escape clause investigation requested by the industry. After a very comprehensive study the Commission submitted a complete and detailed report to the committee of Congress on April 20, 1954.

TARIFF COMMISSION INVESTIGATION

Virtually the entire lead-zinc mining industry of the United States with the exception of companies engaged in foreign mining activities presented positive and indisputable evidence to the Tariff Commission in a hearing held in Washington, D. C., November 3-6, 1953, to show conclusively that the mines of this country have been seriously injured and domestic smelters have been forced to curtail their production because foreign lead and zinc are flooding our markets at less than the cost of domestic production. That the mines were suffering serious injury was unquestioned. The facts are clear and were freely acknowledged by all appearing before the Commission. The question for the Commission to decide became not whether the mines were injured but rather what steps should be taken to preserve an industry important to national defense and essential to the civilian economy. The Commission on May 21, 1954, unanimously recommended to the President that the industry should be afforded escape clause relief.

EXCESSIVE IMPORTS

The report of the Bureau of Mines on the Zinc Industry in the United States in 1953, states: "Domestic mine production of recoverable zinc fell off during the year, owing largely to low prices brought about by heavy imports. Output for the year was 535,000 tons compared with 666,000 tons in 1952. * * * Imports established an all-time high; the total—743,000 tons (zinc content)—was greater than domestic mine production for the first time on record. Domestic consumption of slab zinc was 978,000 tons, or 15 percent above the comparable figure in 1952, and a new high."

The Bureau of Mines report and the Census Bureau statement of lead and zinc imports for the year 1953 reveal the deplorable outlook for United States mines unless some action is taken to restrict the excessive tonnages of foreign material flooding our markets.

A worker from the Oklahoma zinc smelters stated the case to the Tariff Commission in these words:

"We are faced with curtailment at a time when the consumption of zinc and zinc products is at the highest peacetime level ever known in these United States. This is a serious situation with our people."

The record for the past few years reveals the serious deterioration that has taken place. For the year 1951, United States mine production of zinc was 681,000 tons. Imports of zinc metal, ores and concentrates amounted to 391,000 tons. For 1953, mine production has dropped to 535,000 tons and imports have increased to 743,000 tons. Both United States mine and smelter production are continuing to decrease because they are unable to compete with imports offered at less than the average cost of United States lead-zinc production.

The outlook is somewhat as follows for zinc:

Slab zinc supply and demand for the United States

[Short tons]

	1951	1952	1953	1954
United States consumption	934,000	852,000	[1] 975,000	[2] 825,000
Imports, ore and metal	391,000	563,000	[1] 743,000	[3] 743,000
Difference	543,000	289,000	[1] 232,000	82,000
Unsold slab zinc end of year	21,901	87,100	[1] 180,843	[4] 209,828

[1] Preliminary.
[2] Estimated.
[3] 1953 rate.
[4] May 31, 1954.

It is evident from the above tabulation that if zinc imports are allowed to continue at the 1953 rates this year, lead-zinc mining in the United States will soon be finished as an industry of consequence. Unsold zinc on hand and imports at the 1953 rate, amounting together to some 952,000 tons, are sufficient to take care of the entire prospective demand for slab zinc in 1954 of some 825,000 to 875,000 tons with some 100,000 tons to spare.

Production of zinc from United States mines has dropped from an average of 60,000 tons per month during the first 6 months of 1952 by one-third to 39,000 tons during the corresponding period this year. Employment at the mines has decreased in the same proportion. Imports for the year to date are coming at the rate of 48,200 tons a month (zinc content).

The lead outlook is somewhat similar, particularly because much of the mine production of lead comes from complex lead-zinc ores. The difficulties of one metal seriously affect the other. And the question becomes, Is an industry which is essential to national defense and security expendable to the cause of freer trade?

NATIONAL PROSPERITY

The Nation's prosperity during the year 1954 was reflected in a heavy demand for metals and minerals. Mineral production valued at $14 billion exceeded all previous years. Slab zinc consumption was at an all-time high of about a million tons. But strange as it might seem, in the midst of this booming activity production of zinc from the Nation's mines dropped to the lowest tonnage since 1938. Many mines were forced to close and unemployment rose throughout the year. Mining communities became deserted and small business suffered.

Had the lead-zinc mines reached the have-not stage frequently and often fervently predicted by the Washington planners? On the contrary new mines were being developed from one end of the land to the other; from Virginia, Pennsylvania, and Tennessee in the East, to Idaho, Washington, and New Mexico in the West. This was the response of the mining industry to the Government's urgent request only a few years earlier to the mines to expand production of zinc for national defense and civilian needs at the time of the Korean emergency.

IMPORTS CAUSE DEPRESSION

What then brought depression to the mines in such prosperous times? The answer is found in another record for the year. Imports of zinc in ores, concentrates, and slab form reached a new high of some 743,000 tons. Foreign supplies far in excess of requirements flooded our markets in the absence of adequate tariff protection causing unemployment and distress for many mining communities throughout the Nation.

This is not a new experience for the American people. When supplies are plentiful and production is expanding, foreign materials from low-wage countries flood our markets. Prices drop, production becomes unprofitable, and workers lose their jobs. But when a shortage exists in the United States and foreign materials are needed, world prices are high. When we needed more zinc and lead during 1951, foreign prices became exorbitant and imports were low. Today we are short of coffee and the price moves up to all that the traffic will bear; mercury prices reach new highs.

LIQUIDATING DOMESTIC MINES

Excessive tonnages of foreign zinc were thrown on the markets of the United States at prices as low as 9¼ cents a pound or less, earlier this year. Lead, now 14 cents a pound, reached a low of 12 cents during 1953. Competent studies of the cost of producing lead and zinc in various parts of the world, based on costs reported by the more efficient foreign producers, indicate that prices should stabilize at around 15 cents a pound for these metals. Why then should zinc now be selling at 11 cents a pound in this country where wages and living standards are the envy of other lands? Perhaps the answer may be supplied by State Department officials who oppose any solution for the present predicament of the domestic lead-zinc mines. Their contention is that when a sufficient number of American mines have been wiped out by prices below the cost of domestic production the prices of lead and zinc will return to the more reasonable level of 15 cents a pound because of decreasing supplies. And then obviously the well-financed foreign producer who now sells zinc in this country at a loss can take over our markets and regain his losses as prices move up.

What encouragement for the future is offered the American worker and his family when it is made clear to him that the State Department favors buying metals and minerals from "friendly foreign nations" in preference to protecting his means of livelihood? Or as the Paley commission would have it, that the United States must reject self-sufficiency as a policy and go for the lowest cost acquisition of materials whenever secure supplies may be found. What incentive is there for the prospector and the small operator to find and develop the new mines needed for the future welfare of this Nation if small business has no protection against the unfair competition of low-wage imports and devalued currencies?

INDUSTRIES FLOURISHED

The lead and zinc mining industries of the United States under adequate tariff protection from the early years of the Republic until about the beginning of World War II flourished and became the largest in the world. The mines brough new wealth to the Nation and provided metals that manufacturing might prosper and furnish employment for many workers.

Certainly the national interest requires that the effect of the foreign-trade policies of the United States on our domestic economy should be given at least the same weight as increasing benefits for foreign producers. No great contribution to world peace and prosperity will result from changes that lead to displacement of American workers and injury to our essential industries.

EXCESSIVE IMPORTS

Imports of zinc in ore and metals in June 1954 amounted to 84,257 tons and in July to 85,212 tons. By comparison, United States consumption of zinc metal in June was 85,859 tons and in July 73,031 tons. Enough zinc was imported to close down every lead-zinc mine in the country.

Notwithstanding excess tonnage available for use from domestic production in 1952, imports of slab zinc in 1953 doubled, increasing from 115,000 tons in 1952 to 230,000 tons in 1953, and caused unemployment in the smelters of Illinois and Oklahoma and mines throughout the country.

Approximately 315,000 tons of foreign lead and 300,000 tons of zinc imports ordinarily are sufficient to supplement supplies from domestic sources if protection is afforded to maintain a healthy mining industry in this country. During 1953 some 743,000 tons of zinc and approximately 563,000 tons of lead were imported—more than twice our needs.

Approximately one-fourth of all the workers employed in the lead-zinc mines of the United States lost their jobs during the past year and the number continues to increase. In some districts wages have been reduced and living standards lowered in an effort to compete with imports from low-wage foreign areas.

TARIFFS LOWERED

The tariffs on zinc ores and metal have been lowered by the State Department under successive reciprocal trade-agreement negotiations to six-tenths and seven-tenths of 1 cent a pound, respectively, and on lead ores and metals to three-quarters of 1 cent and 1$\frac{1}{16}$ cents a pound. These duties afford no protection of consequence against low-wage imports and devalued currencies.

It is plainly evident that when more than double the tonnages of lead and zinc we need are imported and offered at prices below the cost of domestic production, the consequences can be only disaster for an industry essential to national defense and security.

Is it in the public interest to permit an industry which is the largest of its kind in the world, and which is essential to national defense and security, to be priced out of existence by a flood of foreign lead and zinc offered at less than the cost of domestic production? The President has stated that a strong domestic mining industry is vital to national security and the continued prosperity of the country.

PROBLEMS OF SURVIVAL

If the domestic lead-zinc mining industry is to compete with the low level of foreign prices and continue to supply the major portion of national requirements it must become adjusted to the lower price level or be priced out of existence.

This would mean reduction of wages and selective mining of only the higher grade portions of ore deposits. Is reduction of wages and wasting natural resources better Government policy than furnishing adequate protection to an industry important to the security and economy of the United States? The alternative is increased dependence on foreign producers for essential metals and an unemployment problem at home.

The effect of the reduced duties on the domestic industry was obscured by shortages and scare buying during the Korean emergency and the recurring crises of the war and postwar years. Now with the return of competitive conditions in world trade the serious consequences of the concessions have become apparent. Wars and great emergencies nullify the effects of traiff reductions. But in the aftermath of war, inflation and tariff reductions have served to make the problems of the domestic mining industry more difficult.

SUGGESTED REMEDIES

Opponents of tariff relief for the domestic lead-zinc mines, acknowledging the need of a remedy for the serious situation which prevails, suggest the use of subsidies to support the mines and provide employment. But subsidies are not the cure for excessive imports. There is ironic humor in the thought of aiming for freer trade and ending up with a regimented economy. But then only in the United States is a nation that gives consideration to the protection of its workers and industries considered open to criticism.

STOCKPILING PROPOSALS

On March 26, the President authorized the Office of Defense Mobilization to establish new mineral stockpile objectives. Additional stockpiling of lead and zinc will provide temporary relief if handled on a substantial scale. But unless imports are controlled by adequate tariffs, or by quotas on lead and zinc in metal form, the effect eventually will be to support and encourage continued overproduction all over the world. The domestic market will be turned over to foreign producers at the expense of the American taxpayer who will have to stand the stockpiling expense as long as his pocketbook holds out.

The administration's long-term stockpiling program appears likely to prove very disappointing. The President's authorization on March 26, 1954, stated: "Acquisition of metals and minerals will take place ordinarily at such times as the Government decides that purchases will help to reactivate productive capacity and in other ways to alleviate distressed conditions in connection with domestic mineral industries that are an important element of the Nation's mobilization base."

But purchases were long delayed after being authorized and probably will prove to be too small to be of any great consequence without restrictions on imports. Without such restrictions it would appear that anyone who thinks the stockpiling program is going to help the American lead-zinc miner is in for a sad disillusionment. The net effect thus far has been to reduce the price of lead one-fourth cent per pound and to depress zinc sales. In New Mexico zinc properties of some of the most efficient mining companies in the world have been made idle by the excessive imports. Now that the stockpiling program has proved disappointing, unless favorable action is forthcoming on the Tariff Commission recommendation for escape-clause relief, it seems impossible for the mines to reopen. Similarly, in Utah, the large lead-zinc smelter and mill of the International Smelting & Refining Co. will cease operating on July 10.

The question to be decided is whether or not, in the interest of national security, the mining of such essential metals as lead and zinc in this country is an industry worth saving from destruction by imports. Or are we to be forced to compete with the living standards and wages which prevail wherever the cheapest supply of raw materials can be found?

METALS FOR SECURITY

In these uncertain times the availability of metals and minerals adequate for the expanding economy and security of the United States is a matter of grave concern. Experience has shown that it is not wise to become dependent on foreign sources of supply. In case of war it is dangerous. Twice during the past 12 years the country has suffered from a shortage of zinc during an emergency because of policies destructive to the domestic industry. Our growing population will require larger tonnages of metals in the future. These will prove much more costly if the American producer is forced out of business by excessive imports. Prices for imported materials are high when we no longer are able to compete.

We all long for a peace that will save mankind from going further into a third world war. But another stake we have in the contest is the wealth, resources, and living standards of the United States of America. And destroying much of an industry essential to our national security will serve no good purpose toward the prevention of war.

Section 6 (a) of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951, as amended, states:

"No reduction in any rate of duty * * * shall be permitted to continue in effect when the product on which the concession has been granted is, as a result, in whole or in part, of the duty * * * reflecting such concession, being imported into the United States in such increased quantities, either actual or relative, as to cause or threaten serious injury to the domestic industry producing like or directly competitive products."

As to the pending action by the President on the lead-zinc escape clause case, the Journal of Commerce in an editorial on June 1, critical of some cases brought before the Tariff Commission, offers the following comment:

"This is not to overlook the purpose of the escape clause itself nor to question for a moment that relief should be granted where the need for it can be demonstrated on the basis of complete and convincing data.

"To deny access to this relief would be a flout of the law."

Thousands of miners and millmen who have been thrown out of employment because of the foreign metals flooding our markets in the absence of adequate tariff protection, and hundreds of communities throughout the country are hoping anxiously for favorable action by the President on the Tariff Commission recommendation for their relief which has been at the White House since May 21.

They are looking to Congress to exercise its constitutional responsibility for the welfare of the American people.

Isn't It Wonderful—Wonderful for the President To Have Democratic Support To Put Over His Program?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 1, 1954

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to note that had it not been for the support of a majority of the Democratic Members of the House, President Eisenhower would have failed to have secured approval of an important part of the administration's foreign policy program—the Mutual Security Act of 1954.

While the Vice President was sowing disunity, Democrats were offering cooperation to the administration in a very tangible form in sufficient votes to save the President's foreign policy program. More Democrats than Republicans supported President Eisenhower and more Republicans than Democrats opposed the administration's measure.

On this very important legislation to enable the President to obtain a strong foreign policy, 141 Democrats alined themselves in support of the administration's request and only 108 Republicans, although they have a majority of the membership of the House, gave their help. Seventy-eight Republican Members opposed the President on this issue while only 47 Democrats were in opposition to him.

Is it any wonder then that responsible administration leaders are concerned over the irresponsible utterances of some people high in the administration?

Under leave to do so, I include herewith an interesting article referring to this matter, written by Doris Fleeson, which appeared in the Washington Evening Star of today. It follows:

POLITICS AND THE PRESIDENT—EISENHOWER'S DEFENSE OF NIXON ON ACHESON SPEECH LIKENED TO ONE WHO HATES SIN BUT LOVES THE SINNER

(By Doris Fleeson)

President Eisenhower has refused to turn his back on Vice President Nixon.

The President was reminded at his press conference that the Vice President has been warming up the McCarthy version of history with Dean Acheson as the villain, and what did he think of that.

General Eisenhower used rather a lot of language to make it clear that while he himself would not say that Mr. Acheson lost China, the reporters weren't going to get him to excommunicate Mr. Nixon. The Vice President, he said warmly, is a fine fellow and he is not headed for any White House woodshed.

The Eisenhower policy of hating the sin but loving the sinner was a spectacular failure when tried fairly recently by the same Dean Acheson. However, the President stuck stubbornly to it, even while admitting that the Vice President normally is kept in full touch with the thoughts and policies of the administration.

Democrats are indignant over the Nixon speech which came as their support was being sought for the Eisenhower negotiations with the British Prime Minister and Foreign Secretary. If Mr. Nixon is to apologize, however, he will have to do it on his own, the President indicated.

Within an hour the same Democrats were furnishing the President the winning votes for his $3.37-billion foreign-aid bill. In fact, more Democrats than Republicans supported it. The tally: 141 Democrats, 118 Republicans and 1 Independent for, 78 Republicans and 47 Democrats against.

It is always difficult to tell when political situations of this kind arise—and they are becoming increasingly frequent—what the President has in mind.

Perhaps he feels that so long as he himself takes a lofty position, the minority has no right to complain. He has repeatedly insisted that his program is the issue. He has told Republican National Chairman Hall not to use Senator McCarthy in the campaign, and he has stated his abhorrence of Senator McCarthy's methods.

When his field is reversed by the party's active campaigners, he merely restates his own position, often somewhat irritably.

Whatever his reasons, he is now faced with a condition and not a theory. That condition is that the practical politicians, both Republicans and Democrats, expect the campaign to be waged along the lines of the Nixon speech and are preparing themselves accordingly.

This helps to explain the problems the administration program faces in the closing months of Congress. Democrats are steeling themselves for a rough campaign and they will be increasingly uncooperative except in foreign policy where anger has not yet overridden their devotion to the principle of collective security.

Unemployment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1954

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include in the Record the letter sent yesterday to the President of the United States, Members of Congress, and selected officials of the executive branch of the Government, by Mr. John L. Lewis, president of the United Mine Workers of America, Mr. Dave Beck, president of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen, and Helpers of America, and Mr. David J. McDonald, president of the United Steelworkers of America.

This letter expresses concern in regard to the potential encroachment of communism during a period of economic decline, and it offers a number of recommendations for increasing employment at the present time.

While some of these suggestions are highly controversial, I am certain that all of us are in unanimous agreement regarding the necessity for eradicating unemployment and poverty.

Just 2 days ago, I participated in a discussion at the White House on this very problem. Everyone, from the President down, is determined to revive industry in the depressed areas, and we are not going to be satisfied until all of our people have permanent assurance of their God-given right to earn a living.

Meanwhile, the contents of this letter, contributed by three outstanding labor leaders, will provide interesting thought on the course that we are to follow.

The letter follows:

United Mine Workers of America; United Steelworkers of America; International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen, and Helpers of America,

June 30, 1954.

Hon. John P. Saylor,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Saylor: The economic decline and spreading unemployment in our Nation is a danger that must no longer be ignored.

A joint conference of the United Mine Workers of America, the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen and Helpers of America, and the United Steelworkers of America, representing 3 million American workingmen and women in the great basic industries of coal, steel and trucking, respectfully call upon you and your associates in Government for action now to halt the economic decline that threatens our free way of life.

To allow the economic machinery of the most productive industrial nation in the world to slow down further is to play directly into the hands of international communism.

Our democratic system is on trial for its life. If we permit reduced earnings, and unemployment to continue there will be a return to the chaos of the early 1930's, America cannot stand another economic sickness such as that and still maintain public order in the Republic.

Our fight against communism in primarily an economic fight. The tyrants in the Kremlin now look to the day when their predictions of economic ruin in America will bring this great Nation to its knees.

The present danger cannot be wished away by "hopes" and economic doubletalk. There are more than 4 million persons unemployed in our land. Thousands of these idle workers already have used up the funds they are presently entitled to under unemployment compensation laws. They have no money left with which to feed, clothe and house themselves and their families. They demand jobs. Instead they are offered predictions of possible economic improvements sometime in the future. Such talk falls on their ears as empty phrases.

This spreading unemployment is the greatest threat to the continuation of freedom and democracy that exists in the Republic today. It is time to stop it before it is too late. The Government has the tools with which to act under existing legislation.

Let the Government act.

Let the Governmen act to create aggressive trade and export policies as an effective foreign weapon in the fight against communism and to protect the American standard of living.

Let the Government act to wipe out the Taft-Hartley abomination so that American labor may once more be free to act effectively.

Let the Government act to implement the Employment Act of 1946 to bring back maximum employment, production, and purchasing power.

Let the Government act to construct new and improved highways, new housing, new schools, hospitals and similar public works that will offset this declining situation.

Let the Government act to promulgate a national fuels policy in the interest of national security so that our basic coal industry will be ready at all times to produce the fuel upon which the Republic is dependent for its industrial might both in peace and war.

Let the Government act to bring a return to full production in our great steel industry, 40 percent of whose workers are now idle or working less than 40 hours a week.

Let the Government act to stimulate employment in our vital vehicular transport industry by utilizing the trucking industry as a prime hauler of the mails within the zone of 300 miles, thus providing better service at less cost to the taxpayers.

Let the Government act to put purchasing power back into the pockets of the working people through lower personal income taxes.

Such actions by the Government would be practical, workable measures to stop the economic decline. Employment and living standards must be increased constantly to meet the needs of our growing population, our increasing work force and our everexpanding technology.

Such actions would be in the interest of all the American people. And they would be in the interest of the other free nations of the world. For without a strong and prosperous United States of America freedom and democracy cannot survive in the world.

We present these proposals to you, the responsible officials of our Government, respectfully and in the spirit of cooperation that must prevail among all segments of our society. We urge that all other Americans, through their organizations, join in endorsement of the actions proposed herein.

Very truly yours,

JOHN L. LEWIS.
DAVE BECK.
DAVID J. MCDONALD.

Van Nuys Chamber Progress Report Describes 53 Projects

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOSEPH F. HOLT

OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 1, 1954

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I should like to insert into the RECORD an article appearing in the Van Nuys News of Sunday, June 6, 1954, which shows the phenomenal growth of the San Fernando Valley, and the hub of that area in particular—Van Nuys:

VAN NUYS CHAMBER PROGRESS REPORT DESCRIBES 53 PROJECTS

Progress report of the Van Nuys Chamber of Commerce for 1953 was mailed today to nearly 700 members of the local business organization. Featuring an attractive picture of the Valley Municipal Building on its cover, this comprehensive report lists 53 major projects either completed or materially advanced through the efforts of the Van Nuys chamber in 1953.

Among the impressive achievements of the chamber during the past 12 months, attention is directed particularly to the following: the lowering of Van Nuys Boulevard; completion of the Pacoima Diversion Channel; the beginning of storm drains along Van Nuys Boulevard; further widening of Victory Boulevard, at the east-west approaches to Van Nuys.

REFERS TO MILESTONES

Also, progress in the solution of the local parking problems; the development of additional industry with its valued payrolls; and a marked increase of services by the chamber to its members on every business and professional level.

In a foreword to the members, Van McWhirter, president during 1951-53 refers to these and other accomplishments as "milestones of community growth and progress, the benefit from which will be felt by local businessmen and residents for many years to come."

In addition to the written content covering all phases of the chamber's operation during the 12-month period from March 1, 1953 to February 28, 1954, this report contains, also, the most complete collection of statistical material ever assembled and put in printed form by the Van Nuys Chamber of Commerce.

FIGURES SHOW CLIMB

Graphically presented in a series of illustrated charts and graphs, these figures reflect the tremendous business and population growth that has taken place both in Van Nuys and in the San Fernando Valley since 1940.

Comparative figures for 1953, 1950, and 1940 covering a number of important local business factors are shown below:

	1953	Percent increase or decrease over:	1950	Percent increase or decrease over:	1940
Population:					
Van Nuys	103,748	+62.8	63,693	+411.1	20,208
San Fernando Valley	548,288	+25.1	438,150	+252.7	155,433
Building permits:					
Number	29,773	−3.2	30,760	+146.7	11,506
Valuation	$225,454,918	+53.7	$146,657,731	+1,210.3	$17,205,654
Bank deposits	$81,201,191	+59.3	$50,972,811	+965.9	$7,617,705
Bank depositors	71,182	+41.8	50,191	+385.9	14,649
Postal receipts	$1,099,143	+60.4	$685,044	+953.5	$104,328
Postal savings	$830,266	−25.2	$1,110,776	+313.2	$268,891
Airmail	$165,848	+140.7	$68,591	+2,788.6	$5,776
Freight cars forwarded	3,099	−34.2	4,716	+7,737.5	4
Freight cars received	14,702	−26.7	20,065	+2,852.2	498
Public utilities, Valley Division:					
Electric services	168,000	+33.9	125,383	+468.8	22,533
Water services	130,215	+38.4	94,082	+288.7	33,494
Gas services	138,700	+36.1	102,600	+364.6	22,067
Telephone units	45,967	+57.7	29,147	+627.2	6,321
Average calls per day	259,220	+61.4	160,560	+500.7	26,778
Van Nuys school enrollment:					
Elementary	14,652	+86.5	7,854	+306.9	2,136
Junior high	6,231	+90.3	3,274	+361.2	1,351
High school	3,303	+49.6	2,207	+191.7	1,132
Junior college	2,738	+181.1	974	(¹)	(¹)
Employment office report:					
Placement applications	15,286	+9.8	13,918		
Placement of workers	8,101	+10.4	7,335		
Unemployment claim:					
Payments	22,073	−19.9	27,566		
Cash payments	$1,673,814	−40.8	$2,830,931		
Real estate sales, multiple division, valley real estate board:					
Unit sales	2,852	+224.8	878		
Dollar value	$38,682,760	+216.1	$12,236,479		
State department of motor vehicles:					
Automobile:					
Registrations	178,519	+22.1	146,132		
Drivers licenses	53,296	+1.7	52,396		

[1] Not in operation.

Unemployment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 1, 1954

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I believe every Member of the House received a letter from three great labor leaders this morning.

Because our mails are extremely heavy right now it might well be that this letter could be overlooked by some, and I therefore call it to your particular attention. I think those of us who represent the workers of America will consider carefully the proposals it presents.

One of the signators, Mr. Dave Beck, is a constituent of mine. After years of close observation I can say, authoritatively, that Mr. Beck is a keen student of economics, a strong advocate of the free enterprise system, and a man who consistently urges high production and industrial prosperity in order to make possible good working conditions and pay standards for working people.

Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 29, 1954

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the St. Marys (Pa.) Daily Press of Monday, June 28, 1954:

FOREIGN AID

The ticklish subject of foreign aid is now before the House for debate, a monetary sum involving more than $3 billion, which you and you and you have to pay out of your earnings without any assurance one red cent will ever be paid back to reduce your tax burden.

Prior to and following World War II this Nation expended the sum of $60 billion in foreign aid—and what do we have to show for it?

The contempt of the titular leaders of England, scorn from France and minor respect from some other countries who benefited from American generosity.

Foreign Minister Anthony Eden, representing a land that today without American intervention would be under German control, only a few days ago showed his disrespect for Uncle Sam by proposing a South Asian Treaty Organization that would include Communist countries within its orbit.

He wanted it patterned after the Locarno pact of 1921 in which all European countries, Germany included, agreed to outlaw war as a means of settling international disputes. The world is judge of how efficient that pact turned out to be.

Yet Mr. Eden, refusing to go along with Secretary of State Dulles on a solid defensive pact among Asian nations threatened by the spread of communism, made his sugfestion without any prior consultation with Washington.

Italy has been given but a small amount of foreign aid as compared with some of her neighbors, yet she is more friendly to America today than some of those who hit Uncle Sam's purse much harder.

Turkey, recipient of few American dollars, comparatively speaking, and Western Germany, helped but little, are among the stanchest friends this country has across the Atlantic.

The rest take our money and treat us with contempt. And don't think this has not sunk into the American mind.

When Mr. and Mrs. America see what shabby treatment has been accorded us in view of the vast amount of money dished out, they are fed up on the idea of trying to buy friendship over the bargain counter.

Every penny that wings its way across the Atlantic comes from the pocketbook of American wage earners, who have had no more to say about how their tax money shall be spent than the man in the moon.

They have been told they must make sacrifices to insure European stability—yet when America suggests Europe band together in a defensive unit, England drags her feet, France, the first nation to bring up the idea, defeats a cabinet willing to go along with the plan, Americans begin to see red and want some concrete guaranties in return for the money they are dishing out.

Prior to our entry into the Second World War, one of the most monumental mistakes of all time, and after we have become a belligerent, we gave Russia $11 billion in foreign aid, to say nothing of the ships, the tankers, the planes, artillery, weapons of all kinds, providing her with the help to defeat Germany, and in turn built her into today's menacing power.

We have been generous to a fault. Too much so for our own good as history in the making today readily proves.

Mutual Security Act of 1954

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1954

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, June 30, I offered an amendment on the floor to the Mutual Security Act of 1954. Since we were so rushed for time, I had less than a minute to explain the purpose of my amendment and, of course, in that time I could not adequately cover the subject. I feel that if I had had time, the additional six votes necessary to carry this amendment would certainly have been obtained. I feel this because I can see no legitimate objection to inclusion of my amendment in the bill.

The amendment would do one simple thing. Under existing personnel policies in Government, the Civil Service Commission overviews the applications of merit and career principles to all Government employees in the United States. Abroad we have the Foreign Service Act of 1946 which governs personnel policies of the State Department overseas. There is one large loophole—overseas appointments of the Foreign Operations Administration. Here, it is charged, we have a large grab-bag for spoils system appointments. My amendment would simply have taken the provision of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, which prohibits political tests in appointments, and would have applied it to nonpolicy appointments in the Foreign Operations Administration abroad.

My distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS], extended his remarks in the RECORD yesterday to indicate that one objection to my amendment would be that it would put the Foreign Operations Administration in the Foreign Service. I disagree on this point, as my objective was simply that one particular provision of the Foreign Service Act should apply to the FOA, not that FOA should be brought under the Foreign Service. As Mr. VORYS stated, this would, of course, not touch the vast bulk of top policy jobs in FOA, which should be available to the group representing the administration's point of view. Sixty policy positions would not be touched by my amendment. In addition, 16 mission chiefs would also not be touched by my amendment. It is my view, however, that by and large the rest of the overseas personnel of FOA should certainly be governed by merit and career principles for appointment, rather than coming under the spoils system.

I am particularly concerned about the technical assistance program. Under the act which has now passed the House, the Administrator of FOA can use the technical assistance program as a political grab bag. The fact that he has been doing this has been charged by many people who should know. To mention but one source, I quote Jerry Kluttz, a recognized authority on what is going on in government, who said:

> The Foreign Operations Administration has required political clearance for even stenographers and clerks. * * * Reportedly, most appointments and promotions in that agency must have the prior O. K. of the patronage dispenser there.

May I recall to the Members that the operation of the great American assistance program abroad has always been conducted in a bipartisan fashion. When the ECA was first set up, President Truman appointed as its head a Republican, Mr. Paul Hoffman. Under Mr. Hoffman and successive administrators, through Mr. Harriman, the operation of the agency was conducted on a very bipartisan basis. The appointment of people abroad was done with almost no consideration for partisan politics. As a matter of fact, a great many of the top mission chiefs abroad were Republicans and a great many top staff people elsewhere were Republicans. I am sure we will all agree that this procedure of appointing outstanding Americans, regardless of their political affiliation, is the correct approach to the administration of this American-aid program, providing economic, military, and technical assistance to aid our friends and allies to move forward in their economies and in their defense structures.

As a member of the International Operations Subcommittee of the Government Operations Committee I have been concerned about the application of proper career principles to FOA. I do not believe FOA should be the loophole for spoils system entry into the Foreign Service. Under the bill we have now passed, the Director of FOA may appoint anyone he chooses to go abroad on staff positions or technical assistance projects. It is possible for these appointees to apply for lateral entry into the Foreign Service of the State Department. This loophole is so large you can drive a truck through it. The inclusion of my amendment in the law would have had the effect of removing the spoils system stigma which now plagues FOA. The career principle contained in my amendment is identical to that which applies to the Foreign Service of the State Department. I see no reason why it should not be applicable to the same kinds of appointments in FOA.

Mutual Security Act of 1954

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. HARRISON

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1954

Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, among 125 other Members of this House, I cast my vote against the Mutual Security Act of 1954, or, as I prefer to call it, the foreign-aid bill.

My vote was cast thus, not as a demonstration of willful desertion of the Eisenhower program, but rather for some very fundamental reasons that bear upon principles in which I firmly believe.

I believe that my support of the Eisenhower program this year has been reasonably solid. Congressional Quarterly placed me in a tie for first place, with 91-percent active support of the Eisenhower program. Only 2 other States—both of them, like Wyoming, with only 1 Member in the House—have attained so high a percentage.

However, I do not want to be tagged a rubber-stamp Congressman, and when my beliefs do not coincide with an administration program—be that administration Republican or Democrat—I intend to follow the dictates of my conscience. This was the case with the foreign-aid bill.

I do not regard an ill-fitting suit any better simply because a different tailor tries to sell me the same old thing.

I have looked upon foreign aid with a very critical eye ever since I came to Washington to represent the people of Wyoming. My critical view was not assumed because I do not believe in helping others less fortunate than ourselves. To the contrary, I do believe that the United States should extend assistance to other nations; but I believe also that decisions to offer aid should be predicated upon certain basic factors.

One of the factors is our own Nation's ability to send dollars abroad in ever-increasing numbers. We should consider that our own national debt is a staggering $270 billion—dangerously near the legal limit, beyond which the administration already has asked that a new and higher limit be placed. This request has been approved by the House but no action has been taken by the Senate.

I mention the magnitude of our present national debt simply to call attention to the United States inability to continue indefinitely sending dollars abroad with little or no hope of having them returned, if we are to keep our own financial house in order or in any semblance thereof.

If this country's financial structure should collapse—and make no mistake that this conceivably could happen—then we would be in no position to help anyone, even ourselves. And I question very seriously whether any other nation on the face of the earth could—or would—lend a helping hand to the extent that would be necessary to rescue us.

This, then, is my first fundamental reason for voting against the huge foreign-aid expenditure proposed by this year's authorization bill: The belief that we should not spend the United States into bankruptcy, toward which continuation of foreign aid on an almost unlimited scale is a major step.

In determining which nations should share, and to what extent, in distribution of dollars from Uncle Sam, I believe close attention should be given to the very attitudes of these other nations. I do not mean by this merely the individual nation's attitude toward the United States, although I view this as an important factor. I mean the individual nation's attitude toward self-help, toward real determination to make the best possible use of aid funds, toward the basic elements which supposedly bind together the few countries remaining in what we loosely term the free world. I mean also the individual nation's degree of willingness to actively participate in the global search for peace and freedom among all the world's peoples. I mean the individual nation's willingness to cooperate with the rest of the free world in this search.

It has become more and more apparent, in very recent years, that sufficient attention has not been given these things. I am at a loss to know definitely just what sort of standard has been the guide for those who have planned the multitude of programs which have ridden along under the general category of foreign aid. Certainly, in many cases, little or no attention has been given to the things I have detailed here. Example after example could be cited in this respect.

Lack of coordination among the administrators of the various programs, and lack of positive direction from year to year have resulted in a sort of crazy-quilt pattern of foreign-aid projects and programs.

It is not to say that there have been no small bright spots in the pattern, places where aid extended by the United States has shown healthy results. These bright spots are even brighter because of their comparative isolation among a maze of dismal failures.

Much of this failure can be blamed upon neglect of the things I have just mentioned. More careful attention to the proper direction of available aid funds, I believe, could have made successes out of a great many of the failures.

This is my second fundamental reason for voting against this year's bill: I dislike piling failure upon failure when discretion and care in planning could reverse the trend. I believe in gaining knowledge from history for guidance in the future; in the past we have failed miserably to learn anything from our earlier mistakes.

Much as I would like for this country to be in a position to extend all-out aid in unlimited quantities to all the free world, this, of course, is not possible nor will it ever be. But even should such a situation prevail, I still believe that the American taxpayers should have first claim upon benefits derived from their own money.

Right at this very moment, Mr. Speaker, my own State of Wyoming is suffering from severe drought conditions. The drought itself is not present all over the State, but there are numerous areas where drought is a very real and a very serious problem which demands immediate attention. This situation existing in parts of the State, naturally its effects are reflected in the economy of the entire State. The effects are felt beyond the borders of Wyoming, in nearby States, and even in Washington, D. C. Reductions in collectible taxes because of drought destruction of taxable property, wherever such destruction should occur, is of personal concern to every taxpayer because it means he will have to pay more taxes to make up for the loss.

Despite the urgent need of Federal assistance by drought-stricken Wyoming ranchers and farmers, the Federalf Government has not yet been convinced of the neecssity for immediate action from the Federal level. Yet the Federal Government is willing to authorize expenditure of another $3.5 billion for assistance in foreign lands, some of it to alleviate the very conditions which now exist in Wyoming.

The Wyoming situation could be multipled many, many times on a nationwide basis. Some of our people customarily are in dire need of assistance in providing the very sustenance of life. They could use more help than already is available. Our schools are overcrowded and much more could be done in this regard with some of the more than $62 billions which have been expended for foreign aid in the past 7 years.

This is a third in my list of reasons for voting against this year's bill: Place first things first, and in my way of thinking our own people should receive priority consideration when funds are available for assistance, rather than trailing along at the end of things.

From a military standpoint, there is grave doubt that our foreign aid expenditures have strengthened the free world on anywhere near a dollar-value-for-dollar-spent ratio. Despite our more than generous outlays in strictly military assistance, we have failed to halt or even contain communism.

Some of the very nations receiving great amounts of military aid from the United States in dollars and materials have fallen to the Reds, and our taxpayers' resources have gone with them. A great deal of the cause can be credited to apathy and a mismanagement on the part of those individual nations; some of it to the lack of discretion on our part, which I mentioned earlier. We seem to have done a much better job of displaying materialism than we have of demonstrating an inspiring leadership for right and justice, guided by inner spiritual zeal for our basic principles. This, I believe, has taken its toll in foiling United States efforts to attract nations to our side.

From a strictly military or defense viewpoint, it seems to me, we should assume a somewhat selfish—self-enlightened seems to be the polite term—position. This is the only direction from which it is possible or sensible to regard the defense aspect of our overall foreign policy which includes foreign aid. And even in assuming a seemingly selfish position, it is not entirely so. For the same reason that the United States should not spend itself into bankruptcy, the United States must remain militarily strong—for the potential defense not only of our own country but for other nations as well.

It is quite unrealistic to try and separate absolutely economic and military strength. One contributes to the other in many ways. Thus, economic strength makes possible military strength. One is not enough; we must have both here in the United States, for self-preservation and for defense of what remains of the free world.

Recognizing the necessity of military strength, and remembering that the National Guard has served as our first in line among defense units in many emergencies at home and abroad, it makes little sense to me that some of the so-called foreign-aid funds could not properly be channeled to this activity. Most certainly, without National Guard units—some of them from my own State of Wyoming—we would have been cut to even smaller ribbons than we were in Korea. If our National Guard units did not contribute gallantly to foreign aid in Korea, I am sadly mistaken.

Along with other domestic needs for additional funds, the National Guard should occupy a top-priority spot, in my opinion.

This is still another of my reasons for voting against this year's mutual security authorization: We cannot afford to neglect in any degree our own defense forces, particularly on the local level. It is from this local level that the National Guard springs to our Nation's defense whenever the need arises. For the strengthening and expansion of the National Guard system some of the foreign-aid funds could be used to very good advantage for new armories, more and better equipment, more effective and expanded recruitment.

These few reasons I have given, Mr. Speaker, seem to me good and sufficient for voting the way I did on the Mutual Security Act of 1954. These few reasons, Mr. Speaker, are by no means the only ones I could mention. I could, for example, point out specific instances of past and present foreign aid programs which have formed the basis for my opinions and which would pose still more questions and give opportunity for further reasons for being critical of the entire foreign aid theory as it now operates.

I want to mention briefly just one more, all-inclusive reason for my negative vote. This has a very direct relationship to all the others I have given in the foregoing paragraphs, and all the foregoing contribute to it. It is simply my belief that we should stand back and take a long, close look at what we have been doing, what it has accomplished, and where we want to go in the future, insofar as foreign aid is concerned.

Proponents of no-holds-barred foreign aid will argue that to take the time for a reexamination of this nature would hamstring the programs. This is completely inaccurate. Debate in the House on the bill brought out that there is somewhere between nine and ten billion dollars of unexpended, unobligated funds available to these programs from previous years' appropriations—enough for current operations during some 23 months. Certainly within nearly 2 years' time this Nation could examine its foreign-aid activities to some extent; enough at least, to have the answers to some of the vital questions.

I believe, therefore, that we should reexamine these programs. We should reexamine our own financial position and our financial ability to continue these programs in their present all-embracing scope. We should reevaluate the attitudes of recipient nations. We should reexamine our own defenses, particularly in the cities and towns and villages across the Nation where local boys meet a few times each week, giving of their time and talents in the event they may be needed quickly to defend their own homes. We should reexamine our own domestic conditions and our own peoples' needs.

In short, Mr. Speaker, what is the hurry? Let us take another look at this thing and see if these foreign aid programs are really the kinds we need and can afford.

Setting the Record Straight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1954

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, I believe that the report by the Army Times Vet Letter on the handling of Veterans' Administration appropriations will serve to set the record straight and provide a basis for understanding the curtailment in Veterans' Administration operations now under way as a result of budgetary cuts:

Sick patient: Surgery performed on Veteran's Administration's fiscal year 1955 appropriations bill by House-Senate conference committee doctors last week left agency in worse shape than preoperative weakness as nonantispetic hands of chief surgeon Representative JOHN PHILLIPS, Republican, of California, left infection in wounds which threatens to spread through rapidly sinking patient.

Acting Deputy Administrator I. C. Palmer, second in command to VA Administrator Harvey Higley, warned that enough life blood drained from appropriations bill to force closing of substantial number of regonal offices—50 to 100 contact offices—fire a minimum of 1,000 regional office employees by July 31 of this year.

Unless adrenalin supplied quickly in form of supplemental appropriation to restore part or all of $4,250,000 carved from VA's general operating expense by conference committee, which VA has not yet summoned strength to ask for, fund cut will have disastrous effect on agency's service to veterans at a time when workloads are increasing at a rapid rate.

Palmer bluntly warned Congress that inadequate $167,672,000 voted by Congress for general operating expenses will require VA to proceed as rapidly as possible with the consolidation of activities and workloads at regional offices, or to reduce materially the number of regional office locations, also require closing some 50 to 100 VA contact offices throughout United States resulting in shift of personnel in substantial numbers at a time when this agency is faced with the tremendous problem of gearing operations to process these loads in order to provide adequate service to veterans.

House conferees, led by PHILLIPS, were successful in trimming more than half of $8 million added to general operating expenses by Senate, but even $171,922,000 voted by upper chamber represents the absolute minimum that will be needed for fiscal year 1955, Palmer said, adding if workloads continue to increase it is probable that sum would prove inadequate to properly service this tremendous workload.

Fund cut has ramifications throughout entire veteran benefit structure as firing of 1,000 or more employees would add to existing GI loan backlog which VA admits has delayed veterans in home plans, has caused delay in the construction program throughout the country, whereas $344,000 reduction in travel funds would seriously hamper regional offices in supervision of Korea GI bill and Public Law 16 training programs.

Closing of up to 20 of 70 regional offices originally planned for 1955 calendar year (V–L, April 23), but unless $4.2 million reestored, VA may proceed quickly with proposed consolidation of workloads plan knock off smaller regional offices in doing.

Palmer's veiled threat will not go unnoticed by Congress in election year may prod Congress into action as soon as VA announces locations of contact offices and/or regional offices to be closed which always evokes heated protests from congressional delegations affected.

Palmer held out another warning, said PHILLIPS' appropriations subcommittee suggestion to review all running awards for compensation and pension purposes will not be completed during coming fiscal year because personnel will not be available to continue this review unless fund cut restored.

VA has not yet issued reduction-in-force notices to 1,000 regional office employees facing ax by July 31, actually cannot fire them by that date since Federal workers dismissed through no fault of their own must be given 30-day notice, but if agency follows through with threat every regional office in the country would be affected by this reduction.

Agriculture Act of 1954

SPEECH

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 1, 1954

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 9680) to provide for continued price support for agricultural products; to augment the marketing and disposal of such products; to provide for greater stability in the products of agriculture; and for other purposes.

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Chairman, the House is considering one of the most complex and controversial bills of this session. So much has been written and said, indeed, that it would seem to me a Member from a nonagricultural district would be at a loss to know what the real facts are. So skillfully have fact and fiction been interwoven that I find it difficult, even in my own case, to keep them separated. Moreover, the farm problem is not one problem, as has been so frequently emphasized by our chairman. It is a combination of many problems, some phases of which are in opposition to others, or, if not, in competition at least.

The farm problem is not a new one. It has been with us in one form or another since our country was first colonized. Nor will any legislation passed by this Congress solve it; we can only hope to approach a solution.

Your Committee on Agriculture has spent many months holding hearings, not only here in Washington, but throughout the country. These hearings have been illuminating to me and, I am sure, to all committee members. Permit me to say that the real value of these hearings came during periods of informal discussion when attending farmers really let their hair down. My remarks today will be in the nature of an endeavor to bring to you in brief fashion an analysis of the problem, with special attention given to the problems peculiar to the Midwest.

Legislation dealing with the farm problem is of an evolutionary nature, as it is with most major problems, citing social security, labor relations, and tariff-making as examples. The present status of those enumerated does not satisfy many of our people, nor all Members of Congress, but the status does represent as best attainable a meeting of minds. This does not necessarily mean that in the future, changes will not be made to conform to a newer concept brought about by the ever-changing aspects of our economy. We are even now revising the Nation's social-security program.

I deem it appropriate first of all to discuss those factors which brought about this farm legislation. They obviously are so numerous that in my brief time it will be impossible to touch on all of them. A general statement summing up the factors is relatively simple—we have an agricultural production capacity capable of producing more of many foods and fibers than we can use at home or sell abroad.

Some of our major commodities are dependent upon an export market to take a sizeable share of their annual production. Cotton, wheat, and rice fall in this category. But we are almost 95 percent self-sufficient as a nation so we cannot have a large export market as the British can for example. Since we cannot sell abroad unless we likewise buy abroad, this means that there is a scramble among those depending upon exports for their portion of the foreign dollar. There is then selling competition among various segments of our farm economy.

Those who can visualize a greater prosperity with an expanding foreign market clamor for greater imports, while those whose products would be hurt by such an expansion plead for fewer exports. All of you have heard debate on this subject from the well of this House. I might cite an example of this situation within my own district; indeed, within one city. In this city, where many lawn mowers are made, their manufacturers are being hurt by imports, while nearby another manufacturer makes makes bus bodies with a high potential outlet for the export market if only trade restrictions were relaxed.

Much has been made of the loss of our foreign markets within the last few years, especially with respect to wheat and cotton. Actually our production of these commodities has been increased since World War II not during it, to meet the demands occasioned by the Marshall plan and its successors. Now that there is no longer the need for economic aid overseas, the demand has dropped to a level comparable with pre-War II. It was relatively simple for the Congress to cut off appropriations for seending food and fiber to needy and friendly people abroad, but the problem of coping with a productive capacity geared to supplying these demands remains with us.

Unfortunately, there is no sign of immediate relief on this score, so the most apparent solution is to cut back acreage to meet market requirements. The question that faced Congress a year ago was: Should we order a drastic cut-back in 1 year or should we make it a more gradual one? We decided on the latter course. This year will mark the second of acreage reduction and it may be that even greater cuts will be necessary in order to bring production in line with demand. It is generally recognized by those who have studied the problem that no scheme of price supports will work until supply is brought in approximate line with demand.

We can bring production into line with present demand, not easily, but it can be done. A problem remains with regard to the surpluses we have accumulated. It is easy to look back to the events of the past 2 or 3 years when these surpluses were accumulated and reflect on what might have been. Former Secretary Brannan could have invoked controls on wheat and cotton then and we would not have them in surplus. At the time, however, it looked as if the Korean war might spread into a worldwide conflagration. Fearing that it might, he not only withheld controls but instead encouraged greater production. World war III did not come, a fact for which we all are thankful.

Secretary Benson is presently taking about the only step he can take and he has met an unhappy situation forcefully. Drastic steps are being taken to bring production in line with demand. He has had such authority from previous acts and while his actions will not be popular in certain areas, it would seem there remained no alternative.

Under provisions of S. 2475, passed recently by the House, we are proceeding to set up an aggressive and practical plan for disposing of at least a portion of our surpluses abroad. This plan has had a trial run during the 1954 fiscal year and has proved successful. This plan will in no way displace goods marketed abroad through the usual commercial channels and it is hoped will enlarge our markets abroad where many of these commodities are needed.

Title II of the bill now being considered takes additional steps toward surplus disposal. This is the so-called set-aside program. It is aimed principally at disposing of surplus dairy products, wheat, cotton, and vegetable fats and oils. With a portion of the above-named surpluses earmarked, the Secretary—Benson—will have authority for disposal through the school-lunch program, the armed services, veterans' hospitals, and other nonnormal outlets.

Because of rather drastic acreage reductions in certain commodities, we will and do have the problem of the use to be made of acres diverted from their normal production. While in some instances there are few if any alternate uses for these acres, in most instances they could be so diverted as to cause undue hardships for the producers of nonsupported commodities and thereby aggravate the overall problem of surplus production. Provisions are made in title IV so that the Secretary will have authority to use a percentage of the funds of the soil-conserving program—ACS—to insure that these diverted acres will be placed in soil-conserving crops with modest incentives to help relieve the shock to the individual farmer's cutback.

The new farm bill also provides for a long needed improvement in our use of agricultural attachés who are stationed in most American embassies abroad. It will bring these attachés, who incidentally have been selected because of special background training such as county agents, within the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Agriculture instead of the Secretary of State. It was my own observation while traveling in Europe in 1949 with my committee that these attachés were not really serving agriculture as they could and should. These men should be assisting our Department of Agriculture in enlarging our markets abroad through their understanding efforts.

Debate upon the price-support features of the bill has attracted most attention. Great emphasis has been placed upon surpluses of certain commodities, particularly wheat, cotton, and dairy products. Dairy products have come in for major criticism, chiefly because they are perishable while wheat and cotton are not.

The dairy problem is a most difficult one for two reasons in addition to the fact that the surplus is perishable. One is that there are no controls over the production of milk and none appears practical. The second is that milk is almost in the category of a necessity. Most of you will recall the furor, almost panic that prevailed in New York City some time ago when that great population center was without milk for even a few days.

The area serving a given city—often termed a milkshed—tries to plan its production schedule to provide customers enough milk during the low-production months of the year, which are in the winter. But consumers use about the same amount of milk in the spring as they do in the winter. In the spring, when the weather is favorable and grass is excellent, the same cows that produced enough for the demand then produce a surplus.

The processors—that is, bottlers and distributors—must figure some way of handling the overflow. It is at this time that their operation interferes with those dairy plants that buy milk entirely for making cheese, butter, and so forth. The surplus milk is converted to ice cream, but when this outlet is exhausted there are only two byproducts to dispose of the remainder—cheese and butter.

The severity of winter also can make a difference in the production at low production time. The last two winters were mild, so that this also increased the surplus. The low cattle market of the last 2 years delayed the usual culling of low-producing cows, adding to the other surplus producing factors. The remarkable fact is that with all these factors, the surplus has amounted to only about 4 percent of normal consumption.

The reduction of the support price from 90 to 75 percent has not had much immediate effect upon supply. It has lowered the cost of these products to the Government but it has also brought additional hardship to the dairymen who, as a group, are probably the poorest paid segment of our agricultural economy. A self-help program has been suggested but as yet is about the only remedy offered and it may not work.

In any event, our city consumers will continue to have their daily supply of whole milk. This must be our primary consideration. As previously stated, this bill does make rather drastic provisions for the Secretary to dispose of the dairy surpluses to the needy, armed services personnel, veterans' hospitals, and others who would not be consumers otherwise.

Some comments I have heard here are distressing to me. It seems the favorite approach of those opposed to the bill is to portray the farmer as an individual selfishly demanding an unreasonable share of the national income; as a person utterly devoid of conscience who is demanding a fat income at the expense of the city consumer. I have heard the farm program declaimed on the basis of the fact that the declaimer knows a farmer who had an income of $10,000, or he knew a farmer who drove an expensive automobile. Such detractors have abandoned reason and commonsense to persuade themselves of the propriety of their stand on an emotional basis.

Actually most farmers resent the necessary regulations inherent in a price-support program. They accept the regulations even as many of their city cousins accept regulations because the alternative is worse.

If I might be pardoned a personal illustration, let me cite the case of our own foster son, who is doing the farming on our family farm in Indiana. Last December, Dick came to visit with me one Sunday morning. He came to talk not about our individual farm problem but about the farm program. This was an unusual experience for us believe it or not.

Dick started out by asking me whether farmers would not be better off if all farm programs were discarded. He explained that he grew weary of defending the farmer every time he went to town and was accosted by his friends there. He was tired of being accused of being a parasite on the Government. The advantages his city relatives enjoyed such as the wage-hour law, unemployment insurance, social security, regulated rates for railroads and communications were—in their opinion—of no importance or consequence or at least nondebatable.

I asked Dick how long he thought he could survive with his market unprotected, buying all the things necessary for the operation of the farm—things produced by labor whose rates were guaranteed. He replied that if the farmer made such a concession it would be his idea that all other segments of our economy should make similar concessions. I had to explain to him that such a step would not happen. His final answer then was that in that case a farm program to protect the price at which farmers must sell should also be protected. I relate this incident because it is typical of many of the statements and opinions offered to me. Farmers just do not like controls and will accept them because they know that the alternative would be much worse.

During recent weeks I have frequently heard the charge made that less than one-fourth of the income from products of agriculture are actually attributable to the so-called basic commodities involved in the support program. While this is technically true if you consider only the cash sales, there are other factors which should be taken into consideration. First of all, corn, the most valuable of all commodities of a crop nature, is not sold as a cash crop except to the extent of about 20 percent. As I will show later it is marketed through livestock, in fact is the backbone of the industry. A floor under corn places a floor under livestock and will raise the income percentage to a much higher figure. An additional factor often overlooked is another phase of the farm program, the marketing agreements. These marketing agreements are more or less arbitrary price-fixing arrangements which apply to fluid milk and certain vegetables or fruits. Add all these features and you have a total of price-supported income which approaches three-fourths of all farm income. I am not complaining but let us be fair and set the record straight. There is a definite relationship between farm income and the income of industrial workers. Following is a table setting forth this relationship. If we persist in driving the income of the farmer further down, the consequences are apparent. The farmer's income is already out of line.

Farmers' cash receipts and income of industrial workers

Year	Cash receipts farm marketings [2]	Production worker payrolls [1]
	Millions	*Millions*
1929	$11,299	$10,920
1930	9,050	8,936
1931	6,369	6,864
1932	4,735	4,680
1933	5,308	4,972
1934	6,314	6,240
1935	7,074	7,488
1936	8,356	8,424
1937	8,819	10,296
1938	7,703	7,800
1939	7,819	9,360
1940	8,332	10,608
1941	11,675	15,288
1942	15,486	22,464
1943	19,358	30,888
1944	20,377	32,136
1945	21,383	27,456
1946	24,564	25,272
1947	29,706	30,576
1948	30,207	32,760
1949	27,944	30,264
1950	28,328	34,944
1951	32,799	40,560
1952	32,373	42,120
1953	30,975	45,864

[1] Annual payroll computed by using payrolls for 1941-51 as given by U. S. Department of Commerce in Statistical Abstract 1953 as 100 and adjusting with Bureau of Labor production payroll index 1947-49=100. Average industrial payroll 1947-49, $31,200,000,000.

[2] Cash receipts for marketing of farm products. Bureau of Agricultural Economics.

THE CASE FOR CORN

Corn is the most valuable—in terms of dollar value, at least—of all crops produced in the United States. The term "basic" as it has come to be applied in the various agricultural price support programs of recent years is a technical one and refers to certain commodities which are granted additional consideration with regard to price-support policy. Corn is technically a basic crop and a real basic crop as well. It is the foundation of our livestock industry. While about 80 percent of corn is fed to livestock on the farm or area where it is produced, the remaining 20 percent becomes a factor in the processing and industrial phases of our economy. The on-the-farm value of our annual corn crop is approximately $5 billion.

There are several factors which should be given consideration in determining a long-range price-support program for corn. The following are some of them:

CORN IS A DOMESTIC PRODUCED AND CONSUMED COMMODITY

Corn is unique among our farm crops, at least our major one in this respect. Wheat—the next most valuable crop—depends upon domestic consumption to use about one-half of our present average annual production. Cotton, while not an edible commodity but a basic one, is also dependent upon foreign or export demand for use of a sizable percent of our annual production. The export or foreign demand for both wheat and cotton has dropped substantially in recent years and this fact is the principal reason these commodities are being held by the Government through their purchase price support program in surplus quantities.

Very little corn is imported and a very small percentage is exported so that it is not dependent upon an uncertain and varying demand abroad for its use. This fact alone has caused corn to be less of a problem than most of our major farm products.

CORN ACREAGE IS STEADILY GOING DOWN

Within the past 45 years—since 1909—there have been ups and downs in the corn acreage, but the trend has been steadily downward since 1932. The year 1932 was the highest within this period when we had 113 million acres. The depression years were high acreage years, for it was during this period that farmers were trying to meet their fixed costs by greater and ever greater production. By 1944 the acreage had dropped to 95½ million acres. Since then the acres have continued to drop until 1953, when it had dropped to 81½ million. Estimates for 1954 show another half-million drop. Production to meet the needs of the livestock industry has been adequate because of better seed varieties—hybrid—better equipment, and more know-how.

WEATHER CONDITIONS ARE THE YIELD DETERMINER

Corn is grown in 44 of the 48 States but 4 States, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, and Iowa produce half of the average crop. The influence of weather on corn production is demonstrated by an example. The smallest crop in recent years was 1947 when the yield was 2.3 billion bushels, while the largest was in 1948 when it was 3.7 billion. Both yield results were due almost entirely to weather conditions. In 1947 the acreage was 85 million acres while in 1948 it was 85.5 or an increase of five-eighths of 1 percent.

CORN IS A MULTIUSE CROP

While about four-fifths or 80 percent of the corn crop is fed to livestock on the farm or immediate area where it is produced, the wide variety of uses gives it considerable flexibility. This flexibility has made for stability both to the corn producer and feeder as well. There is considerable fluctuation from year to year in the consumption of corn. About one-half of the corn crop is fed to hogs. Hog production runs in cycles usually from 5 to 6 years. When hog prices are high production is usually low and vice versa. An example of how the normal economic cycle works will illustrate. In 1948 as previously stated we had a high corn yield. Hog production however, was in the lower phase of the cycle. The surplus corn went into storage. As hog production increased during the following 3 years, the reserve supply was drawn from storage and consumed. We are now passing from the low-production-high-price phase of the hog cycle and our reserves of corn are again high. As the hog production cycle expands this reserve will disappear. Thus the corn support and storage program has helped the corn grower by stabilizing the price from year to year. It has helped the feeder by providing a dependable supply. And it has served the ultimate consumer by providing a better and more stable supply of food from livestock sources. By stabilizing the price and supply of corn a floor has been placed under the livestock industry.

MARKETING QUOTAS ARE IMPRACTICAL FOR CORN

In the case of most basic farm commodities, the supply can be regulated by both acreage allotments and marketing quotas. When a commodity such as wheat is produced in surplus quantities, the succeeeding crops can be controlled by both acreage allotments and marketing quotas. This provides an effective method for controlling production. In the case of corn, however, marketing quotas are not practical. The reason—less than one-fifth of the crop ever goes through a commercial marketing channel. In certain sections of the corn belt, corn is grown as a cash crop and sold for commercial use. In these areas the corn acreage can be controlled because a loan from the Commodity Credit Corporation—CCC—can be denied unless acreage allotments are observed. Since this is the corn that might glut the commercial market and thus disrupt the market for all the crop the present system works effectively in actual practice although it might not seem so as a matter of theory.

CORN HAS NEVER BEEN A PROBLEM CROP

Much has been spoken and written in the past few months about the problem of surpluses, but the fact has often been overlooked with respect to this most valuable of all crops. The present law has been in effect with modifications since 1938 or 16 years. During that period corn has not been a problem. The program has, however, worked effectively to support the livestock industry and helped to stabilize the farm income of the Middle West which is sometimes termed "The Breadbasket of the Nation." The price-support program for corn has served to place a floor under competitive crops within the commercial corn area. Canning crops, as an example, are indirectly supported since the contracting agent—canner—offers a contract which will place such a crop in a favorable competitive position.

FLEXIBLE PARITY AS APPLIED TO CORN

Numerous suggestions have been made with regard to the price-support program as it affects corn. The Department of Agriculture has recommended a variation of approximately 25 cents a bushel as a device to control production. Since a study of the statistics which I have set forth previously shows that weather alone can and has caused a fluctuation of 50 percent in yield and that the average over the years is about right, there would not be too much to be gained by such a device in my judgment.

MODERNIZED PARITY FOR CORN

The present basis for parity is the cost during the 1910–14 period of producing corn translated into modern prices the farmers have to pay. However, there has been substantial improvement in recent years in the methods of production. As a consequence the time required to produce a bushel has dropped significantly. More expensive equipment and land is, however, involved. Taking these factors into consideration the cost has dropped about 10 percent from 1910–14 base period. This is a factual not a policy proposition and I think should be acknowledged. I would therefore endorse the application of the modern parity formula as it would apply to corn. This would drop the support price from $1.60 to $1.45 per bushel.

SUMMATION

First. Corn is not an export or import problem.

Second. Corn acreage is steadily going down; corn prices are not stimulating artificial production.

Third. Weather is the determining factor in the production of corn.

Fourth. The use of corn gives it great flexibility, giving the law of supply and demand an ample opportunity to operate.

Fifth. Due to the fact that four-fifths of the corn crop is used on the farm and never goes into commercial channels, marketing quotas are impractical. While this provision is in the present law it is unworkable—agreed to by all authorities—and is deleted from the bill under consideration.

Sixth. Corn has not been a problem crop. In other words, the present law has worked effectively.

Seventh. Attempting to control production by a price variable would not work since weather exercises far greater control than most any artificial device.

Eighth. Modernized parity should be adopted for corn, thereby using a realistic figure for the average cost of production.

A Program for an Expanding Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 1, 1954

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have an address which I delivered to the full employment conference held in Washington, D. C., on May 11, 1954, printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, OF MINNESOTA, TO THE FULL EMPLOYMENT CONFERENCE, WASHINGTON, D. C., MAY 11, 1954

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I consider it a privilege and a challenge to address your conference this afternoon. I am also well aware of the intriguing possibilities that you anticipated in having both the Secretary of the Treasury and myself speak to you from the same platform on the same afternoon. Secretary George Humphrey and I had the occasion recently to talk to each other on the telephone about the confusion that plagues both of us as a result of the similarity of our names. I know that I speak for him when I say to you that we are not related either biologically or politically. I want to make it clear, however, that I have an extremely high regard for him and his abilities. He is one of the most able men in the administration.

Now, let me get down to the issue. You are meeting here today because you are concerned about unemployment and about certain dangers to our economy. I have agreed to come and talk to you today because I am likewise troubled by certain signs on the economic horizon. I have certain suggestions to make to you and to the American people about how we can meet successfully the dangers to our economy. I believe that if we intelligently look at the facts, face and recognize the prevailing economic developments, we can then effectively solve the problem.

So that we may better understand each other, let me lay down certain basic attitudes of mine which may serve to clarify my position.

First, I am not just an economic McCarthy. Or to put it another way, I am not just antidepression. I am more so proprosperity, proprogress. Therefore, in my remarks to you this afternoon, I shall not limit myself with merely citing current economic developments and the amazing economic progress of our economy in recent years. Nor shall I rest my case upon the mere outline of measures by both Government and private enterprise which if adopted would stop the decline and result in holding our own in the year 1954. We need more than an antidepression policy. The law of this land, the Employment Act of 1946, states as our national objective that we keep the economy moving forward at "maximum employment, production, and purchasing power."

Therefore, I underscore the importance of directing our thinking toward the realization of an expanding economy, not a retreating or static one. It is not good enough, nor is it at all comforting to me to read that 1954 will not be more than 5 percent below 1953. This statement within itself admits the loss of approximately $17 billion in gross national product, without taking into account the productivity growth factor of approximately 4 percent per year, or the sharp increase in our population of over 2½ million the past year. A 5 percent decline in 1954 from the levels of 1953 with the productivity growth factor included actually means approximately $30 billion loss in gross national product.

The real problem that confronts us is can we, as we move farther into a peacetime economy, maintain maximum employment, production, and purchasing power, or are we going to permit a so-called leveling out process—readjustment, economic dip, slump, or whatever you wish to call it—which may very well engender a spiraling depression.

The American economy will not stand still. It either goes ahead or goes back. There is no such thing as a static situation, particularly when you have a growing country and increasing population, and continuous new developments in science and technology. All of our thinking on matters pertaining to our economic system must be related to and conditioned by the knowledge of the fantastic developments in science and technology here in America and abroad. The issue is growth or stagnation, and this issue was clearly understood when the Congress in the Employment Act of 1946 called upon the Council of Economic Advisers to set forth, in its annual economic report, the levels of employment, production, and purchasing power needed to carry out the policy of the act. Despite the mandate and directive of the Employment Act, the President's recent Economic Report, while a masterpiece of statistical analysis and economic reporting, did not set these levels or targets. The report devoted a good deal of attention to the problem of preventing a depression in 1954. But I regret to say it did not set forth the levels of employment, production, and purchasing power necessary to meet the criteria of maximum employment, production, and purchasing power.

Here is the area of disagreement between myself and the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Humphrey, representing the Eisenhower administration. In fact, here is the difference between the Republican philosophy and the Democratic philosophy. You may recall that when the Employment Act of 1946 was debated the original title was the "Full Employment Act." At the insistence of the Republicans, the word "Full" was stricken from the title. Fortunately, however, the act does lay down the responsibility upon the Council of Economic Advisers and the President to set levels and targets for maximum employment, production, and purchasing power. It is to this goal that I direct my attention.

Now for a brief discussion of economic trends and developments in recent years only as a means of background in order to document the realization of goals for the future.

The brilliant and renowned economist, Dr. Alvin H. Hansen, professor of political economy at Harvard University, testifying before the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, February 16, 1954, had this to say:

"In the 4 years 1950, 1951, 1952, and 1953, we lifted the level of output of goods and services by $73 billion, calculated in terms of constant (1953) dollars. This was a spectacular achievement for which it would be difficult to find a parallel. It was achieved, as everyone knows, under the powerful stimulus of massive fiscal operations of the Government. Yet the public debt rose in this 4-year interval by only $18 billion. The disposable income of individuals (i. e., income after taxes) increased by $36 billion, in terms of constant dollars. The liquid accumulated savings of individuals increased by $41 billion. In this interval we added 4,716,000 new units to our stock of urban houses, employment rose by 3,200,000, and the aggregate investment in new producers' plant and equipment reached the massive total of $140 billion. Over and above the rapidly expanding military production, the output of civilian peacetime goods reached unprecedented levels."

He further went on to say the expansion of the last 4 years was a solid growth which left the economic strength in sound financial condition and in good balance. To this the economic report gives further substantiation. Dr. Hansen underscores the fact that unemployment in the last 3 years averaged only 2.7 percent. Then, I pose the question which I think is the issue before this assembly. Is there any good reason why we could not now move on up to our full potential in 1954, 1955, and 1956, just as we did in 1950, 1951, 1952, and 1953? It should be noted that in the years 1950 through 1953, the gross national product increased by an average of over $18 billion a year. To be sure, past experience based on growth in workers productivity and in the labor force suggests an annual increase of not less than 3½ percent per year in the total output of goods and services. The rate of growth from 1950 through 1953 was slightly in excess of the well-known 3½ percent long-run trend. I have cited the observations of Dr. Hansen because his testimony is generally accepted as being the concensus of eminent and informed economists. The emphasis upon a growing economy, upon maximum production, full employment and increased purchasing power is our declared national policy and it is the duty and responsibility of government and industry to do everything within their power to achieve these goals. It is just these things that are not being done. In fact, the recent economic report fails to heed the mandates set forth by the Congress to promote maximum employment, production, and purchasing power. Instead, reference is made to a "reasonable measure of stability in the overall level of employment and income" (p. 7). And again, a page or so later, one reads of maintaining "employment at a high level."

This, I suggest, is a considerable toning down of the mandate laid down by the Congress in the Employment Act of 1946. The failure of the economic report to set forth feasible and realizable goals which the American economy is capable of achieving may well be the Achilles heel—the soft spot in our economic armor, or as one economist has put it: "Until these targets are set forth as indeed is explicitly required in the Employment Act, we are in no position to know haw far we fall short of our potentials. This is but another way to say that mere expansion of production or a moderate increase in employment such as we have recently witnessed may very well leave us with a rapidly growing volume of unemployment and with total output far below our potential and the actual requirements of an expanding economy. In statistical and economic terms what I have said, if applied to the year of 1954, means that with a 5 percent drop in this year's gross national product, we would be $30 billion below our potential. This is $30 billion lost and gone, irretrievable. Just think that $30 billion could mean to the American people, to the Federal budget, to the taxpayers.

We hear a great deal about the cost of government, the large expenditures of our Government and the heavy taxes. May I suggest that while all of these facts cause great concern to the American people that it is nothing short of shocking that there seems to be so little concern about the loss of income through failure to realize the possibilities of our economic development, or the fantastic cost of recession and depression.

Leon Keyserling, former Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisors, in a recent address in Denver, Colo., submitted some interesting and revealing economic data concerning the 12 years from 1929 to 1940. Measuring his statistics in current price he had this to say: "Our national output in those 12 years was $635 billion less than it would have been if we had maintained a prosperous and growing economy, and that was a loss of more than $50 billion a year. We lost 85 million years of employment. This loss averaged about 7 million man-years of employment a year."

Mr. Keyserling's analysis is based upon the declared national policy of our Government—namely, the maximum employment, production and purchasing power each year. Yes, we lost $635 billion in production of homes and food, tools, automobiles, education. We lost about twice the cost to us of World War II in goods. These matters of production and employment are the throbbing realities of our economy and these are what we have lost whenever we have gotten into a state of mind where we are seemingly little concerned about so-called slight downturns in the economy, readjustments, slumps, dips, etc. I suggest that we try to translate these words into economic facts and then into the realities of life—what it means in terms of jobs, income, production, homes, schools, and the necessitites of life.

Enough of history and general economic philosophy. We are meeting here today on May 11, 1954. What are the current economic facts? What has been happening in our country in recent months? Why should people meet in Washington to discuss full employment? Why are economists busily engaged in careful study and analysis of the current economic situation?

The answer is quite simple. There are signs on the economic horizon which cause thoughtful people to be concerned. The facts are unmistakably clear. The American economy has been in recent months and still is in a recession. Now let me make the record clear by saying that we are not in a depression. We are, however, witnessing and experiencing the first danger signals of the economic storms. This economic downswing has been under way for the past 6 or 7 months. Millions of Americans today are experiencing the painful reality of layoffs, job hunting, lower incomes, reduced business profits, falling production in sales and economic insecurity.

What I have said to you does not qualify me as a "Republican security risk," or a prophet of "gloom and doom." It may, however, entitle me to claim that I have done my economic homework. I suggest that the slogan makers of this administration and the public relations experts be put in a Democratic deep freeze for awhile and that the responsible officials of this Government turn to the economists and come to grips with the economic realities. A political catch phrase is no substitute for an economic program. With an estimated 17 percent drop in gross national production from last year's level and a $30 billion drop in potential gross national product, I suggest that the political hucksters be sacrificed for the political economists.

These facts can no longer be dodged or denied. Within the past month there have been signs of a leveling off, but these factors in themselves are discouraging and dangerous because as a result of seasonal influences we should be spurting forward during these months and not just leveling off. The so-called leveling that has taken place today is a danger signal that we face more drastic declines tomorrow.

There is no inevitability about recession. There is no inevitability about the idle machines and the wasted man-hours, the emotional pangs and anxieties. We can stop the recession and we can avoid a depression. We can do so, however, only if we recognize the danger signals and act—not just talk—to solve our problems.

A review of all our experience makes it clear that Government cannot do the whole job. Under our traditions we would not want Government to do the whole job, even if it could. Responsible free enterprise and responsible free government are both essential to our progress and well-being as a people. It is the responsibility of government, however, to take the initiative in restoring the economy to a fully healthful condition. Government leadership and sound Government policies are an imperative priority. The longer these policies are delayed or postponed, the greater lag or time gap between the actual demand for goods and the full employment level on production, the harder the task of restoring full employment and production, and the more difficult it will become for business to do any part of the job.

Therefore, I call upon our Government to undertake action which will not only correct the current economic dislocations, but even more important, action which will insure continuing economic growth for our Nation and expanding economic opportunity for our citizens. The best way to help our business and to keep it free, competitive and progressive, is for business and Government to join hands in helping to create the expanding markets which will enable business to expand. Only by maintaining a full economy can we really protect the American economic system from the hardships and the misfortunes which have propelled from some other peoples along the road toward the inflexibility and staleness of economies controlled and ordered from the top.

Let us start this analysis with the facts.

1. Production of goods and services is down $12 billion since last year. The country stands to lose nearly $30 billion as a result of this decline.

2. Wages and salaries of factory workers are down $6 billion in the past year.

3. Production jobs are down nearly 8 percent.

4. Total unemployment, counting involuntary part-time workers and temporary layoffs is up to nearly 8 percent of the labor force.

5. The average workweek is below 40 hours for the first time in 4 years.

6. Net income to farm operators is down 5 percent in the past year with further declines in prospect—down 13 percent since 1951.

7. Retail sales of farm equipment and machinery is down 17 percent. The farm-parity ration is down to 90 percent as compared to the monthly average of 100 percent in 1952.

8. Steel production is down 31 percent of capacity. This reflects the drop in the production of automobiles, farm machinery, electrical appliances, and other durable goods as well as cutbacks in defense.

9. Business is planning to cut its annual rate of spending for new plants and tools by $2 billion less than last year.

10. Business failures during the first quarter of 1954 are up by 39 percent over the first quarter of 1953.

The April 21 report of Dun & Bradstreet on March business failures reads as follows:

"The third monthly increase in a row lifted business failures to 1,102 in March, 19 percent above the February level. Failures were half again as numerous as a year ago and at the highest level for any month since May 1941.

"Failures of automobile dealers reached a postwar peak, while more casualties occurred among furniture and appliance stores than in any other month on record."

While these declines in the economy take place, prices to the consumer remain sticky and hover around a record high. The latest figures I have show a consumer price index of 114.8 as compared to the all-time high of October 1953 of 115.4. This a drop of only six-tenths of 1 percent.

These are statistics and most people consider statistics to be dull, but these statistics, my friends, spell nearly 3,500,000 unemployed people going around looking desperately for jobs. These figures mean an additional 1½ million people only partially employed. This is not a depression, but it is an unfortunate tragedy to those directly affected. This is not a depression, but it is a hardship to millions of families in the cities and on the farms, and is doing serious injury to countless numbers of business enterprises of small and moderate size. This is not a depression, but it spells anxiety and useless economic and human waste.

Many economists tell us that full-scale depressions are a thing of the past because of the built-in safeguards created by the New Deal and the Fair Deal. But be that as it may, there is no reason why millions of American families need to suffer the anxiety of small depressions or "healthy readjustments." There is no reason why millions of Americans in any year should suffer tens of billions of dollars of loss through nonproduction of goods and services which could contribute to an abundant life.

There is no reason why the American free-enterprise economy which is the best economy in the world should not provide a full and abundant life for every man, woman, and child in our society. This can be done through a partnership of Government and business. This can be done if a responsible government will live up to its responsibilities.

These are the facts. Yet, to these facts some of the administration spokesmen say that the economic decline so far is not severe, and that there is no cause for alarm or concern. But even if the facts are turned around so as to mean that the economic decline is not severe, or will not go much further, or is ready to level off, it is my considered opinion that there is real cause for alarm and a real need for our Government to act.

It will give us little comfort to try to compare the current economic dip with the 1949 economic slump. Much has happened between 1949 and 1954. The large backlog of demand, our plant and machinery, housing, durable and semidurable consumer goods that were present in the period from 1945 to 1950 no longer exist. For the 8 years, we have been filling the war created deficiency. Then, too, consumer debt was much lower 5 years ago, permitting a substantial increase in expenditures financed by consumer credit. Consumer debt is now at record levels in relation to income. To be sure, people hold now, as they have in all of the postwar years, large accumulated savings, but we must remember that over 40 percent of the American families have no savings. Thus, everything considered, the situation today is not fully comparable with either the immediate postwar period of 1945 to 1947, or the economic recession period of 1949. Add to this the sharp decline in Government expenditures, the major effect of which will make its impact on the economy in 1955, and it is plain to see that the free economy standing by itself cannot be relied upon to generate adequate demand to absorb existing production, much less to create new productive capacity and new jobs. In short, the economy cannot be relied upon to generate its own steam not aided by Government. What I have said is underscored by the facts as presented in the recent economic report.

The great economic challenge we face is not a temporary one. The need to find jobs for American people is not just one that faces us today because of the decline in consumer purchasing power. The need to find jobs for the American people is one of the most serious economic problems we face because we are in the midst of a new and greater industrial revolution. To be satisfied as some administration spokesmen seem to be because we have only suffered an economic decline which they say is slight is to be blind to the economic realities of the American system. Not only dare we not suffer a decline, but it would be an economic catastrophe if we were satisfied merely to level off at the current level of industrial activity. To be satisfied with merely maintaining existing levels of the economic activity neglects the first law of life of the dynamic American economy—the law of growth. Growth is the essential part of our economic health. Growth is essential if we are not to suffer from economic stagnation.

Under ordinary circumstances the gain in American technology and productivity every year means that a worker and a farmer can produce more for every hour that he works. Each year, therefore, under normal circumstances we must find more jobs even if our population remains static. In recent years we have had the added complication of a growing population which means an ever-growing labor force and an ever-growing need to find still more jobs if our economy is to function fully. The economists say this means that our total national production ought to grow every year by about 4 percent in order to keep up with our needs. To merely stand still in our production records, therefore, is to be moving backwards. We must grow by 4 percent in order to stand still.

Now what does this mean in dollars and cents? Let's take the first quarter of 1953 and compare it to the first quarter of 1954. It means that in the first quarter of 1954 our total national product was at the annual rate of about $359 billion. This is to be compared with an annual rate of $364 billion a year ago—or a decline of nearly $5 billion, or more than 1 percent. This is at a time when we should have grown by more than 4 percent. This means that we were about $20 billion short this year.

Now what does $20 billion short mean? It means an unemployment figure of 3½ million plus an additional under-employment figure of another million and a half. This means that unless we begin to do something quickly we may have 4½ million unemployed by the end of the year, and maybe 5½ million unemployed a year from now.

What else does this waste of $20 billion mean? It means enough wealth to replace 2 million slums with decent housing. It means enough wealth to cover more than 20 times the total cost of farm price supports from the very beginning of our farm price support program.

But even these figures do not tell the whole story. They tell us that we must grow and become stronger just to hold our own. But there is a second industrial revolution taking place in the United States presenting even greater problems that we must face.

Within the last few months I have had an opportunity to examine a number of newspaper stories from the Wall Street Journal and other business magazines. I have learned that we are on the threshold of technological developments the like of which can drastically revolutionize American industry.

Let me give you a few illustrations:

1. Let us begin with a simple one and take the process of stuffing olives. It is today possible for one machine to pit an olive, slice the pimento into strips, pick up the strips, and stuff them into the olive at the rate of nearly 180 per minute.

2. It is now possible for a coal digging machine to drill, cut, blast, and load coal in a single operation, which will require only one-half as many men to work in the mines of the United States. It is estimated that by using these machines, coal mines can

produce coal 10 to 15 percent cheaper than under present methods. One machine called the continuous coal mining machine, once it is set up underground, cuts and loads a mine car of coal in 1½ minutes. Under average working conditions, it take one miner one-half day to do this job.

3. They have even gone to the point of developing a robot machine which performs the function of the human brain as another step in making man feel unnecessary.

Another brain computes one company's employment retirement program with a sinble operator in one week; the machine does the job that ordinarily would take four people 3 months.

4. The Wall Street Journal for September 25, 1953, reports one industrialist as saying: "In certain industries, such as petroleum refining and chemical processing, we may have automatic factories in only a few more years." The same article reports an expert as saying: "The average refinery which would employ 800 people without instrumentation would employ 12 people were instrumentation utilized to the fullest extent now possible."

5. A new automatic radio assembly is now ready to produce a thousand radios a day with only 2 workers needed to run the line. This production schedule would formerly require a labor force of 200.

6. The Wall Street Journal for March 23, 1954, reports as follows, after an interview with some of the automobile manufacturers: "When they are asked how many men the new machines can do the work of, auto company executives are inclined to shudder."

7. Even in small industry, the robots can work to displace workers. The Wall Street Journal for April 2, 1954, reports that a small midwest maker of aluminum cups now has a machine which needs only one part-time operator to do the work of 55 men with present machines. This saves the manufacturer 4 cents a cup, or $640 per 8-hour day. Yet, the machine costs only $60,000.

Another small-business man is now using a machine which manufactures evaporating coils for air-conditioning equipment at the rate of 150 an hour, with 1 man at the controls. This compares with the rate of 50 an hour for 4 workers doing much of the task by hand. These machines cost anywhere from $7,000 to $11,000 each.

What does this mean? It does not mean that we are opposed to technological progress. It does mean, however, that we insist that the American Government and the American society take steps to meet the threat to working men and women implicit in these technological advances. This calls for imagination, planning, retraining, intelligent research for the proper use of leisure time, increased adult education, and a whole series of programs designed to adjust our society to our new industrial revolution.

These figures and these stories need not frighten us. They should challenge us. They should make clear to us the great potentialities for a more blessed and abundant life. These machines can be used to serve man and to free man. In order for that to take place, however, we need a constantly expanding economy. Instead of being adjusted backwards, our economy should be propelled forward.

I am not interested at the moment in trying to assess the blame for the mistakes of the past. You are well aware of the fact that since February 1953, I have been warning the American people and the American Government that the "scarce money"—"hard money" policy it was pursuing would lead to economic difficulties. I have been warning that the administration's willingness to cut down the income of the farmer would have serious economic repercussions that would be felt throughout the economy. My colleagues and I have been protesting the many evidences of "false economy" which seem to have imprisoned the administration in the rigid shackles of its contradictory campaign pledges to the American people.

Our economy is today failing to gear its production, price, wage, and employment policies to the needs of an expanding economy. It is clear if we are to learn from the lessons of the past that neither private enterprise nor government alone can do the job. If we wait too long even the combined resources of private enterprise and government may not be able to swing the balance in time to avoid serious hardships, but if we act now to stimulate private investment and to stimulate government activity we can achieve full production and full employment.

Our first task is to increase consumer purchasing power. Present productive capacity has outstripped income consuming ability. The immediate job to be done is to stimulate sales through increased purchasing power. At the same time as we increase consumer spending which obviously stimulates business investment, we should also make every effort to increase business investment which will further create employment and stimulate consumption.

I know that there is a big argument as to which came first, the chicken or the egg? As far as I am concerned, American enterprise and American Government should set forth promptly and vigorously toward a balanced and coordinated program to raise both investment and consumption at the same time. But, the initiative must come from the Government.

I. Taxation: The fiscal and tax policy of our Government can be the most powerful and effective instrument for a stabilizing and expanding economy. Just as tax policy can be used to curb inflation, so it can be used and directed to counteract recession and deflation. We must learn the important lesson of a flexible fiscal policy. Tax laws should not be designed only for the purpose of obtaining revenue for the Federal Treasury. Tax laws, both in application and administration, must be constantly measured in terms of their desired effect upon the prevailing economic conditions.

The President's Economic Report took note of the importance of our tax and fiscal policy. The tax proposals designed to stimulate capital outlays on plant and equipment are indicative of the Government's realization of the importance of tax policy as it relates to economic stability and growth. There is a strong case for accelerated depreciation, but may I suggest that such a proposal should be used to combat recession. The Treasury proposal on accelerated depreciation will have the effect of intensifying the booms and the depressions. One could expect business firms to take advantage of accelerated depreciation during the years when profits are high, thereby reducing the tax liability. It appears to me that if accelerated depreciation is to produce added investment in capital plant it should be limited to the depressed years, or the years below normal business activity. In this manner it could serve as a stimulus to investment when most needed to promote stability and expansion.

It appears to me that the administration tax proposal on accelerated depreciation is far too rigid for such a dynamic and volatile economy. It may well aggravate our problem rather than correct it. One of the other major tax incentive devices outlined by the administration, apparently designed to stimulate business investment, is the so-called tax relief for stockholders. The Secretary of the Treasury in his testimony before the Joint Committee on the Economic Report argued that the so-called double taxation of dividends has resulted in industry being forced to raise almost three-fourths of its investment funds from borrowing. In other words, the sale of common stock dividend producing stock, according to the argument of the Secretary of the Treasury, has been retarded and depressed because of the so-called double taxation on dividends. The Secretary makes a strong argument, but in light of the facts of our economic history, his argument just does not stand the test of careful analysis.

In the 6 years from 1922 to 1927, years in which our tax laws were exceedingly favorable to corporations and stockholders, only 28 percent of new investment capital came from stock issues and approximately three-fourths of all capital came from borrowing. These figures are almost identical with the figures quoted by the Secretary for recent years. Despite all the changes in the tax laws, the much heavier corporate tax and personal income tax on both stockholders and corporations as compared to the 1920's, business investment practices have changed very little. The truth is that much of corporate business expansion is financed out of retained earnings. The ration of corporate debt to corporate assets today is much lower than in the 1920's, despite Secretary Humphrey's claim of the need for tax relief for corporation stockholders in order to stimulate business investment.

The reason is that corporate profits have been highly satisfactory, in fact, very high indeed. In the last 8 years, we have invested over $240 billion in new producers' plant and equipment. Government tax policy has not curbed investment, nor has it curbed reasonable profits. In fact, both investment and profits have reached all-time highs during this period. It appears to me that what affects capital investment more than anything else is consumer demand, and it is the consumer demand picture that needs our careful consideration. It is purchasing power that needs to be increased and stimulated.

Therefore, we must channel Federal income-tax reductions to lower income groups to stimulate consumer spending. This should be done by increasing personal income-tax exemptions from $600 to $800 a dependent. This can also be done by lowering the rates of taxable income on lower income groups and further reducing excise taxes. It amused me, incidentally, to read recently an item in the Wall Street Journal to the effect that the administration was expecting the excise-tax-reduction bill which Congress passed a few days ago to help meet the problem of recession. I was amused because I recalled that it was the administration that opposed the passage of that bill in the Congress. Now, they are attempting to take credit for it.

These tax reductions for the lower-income groups to increase consumer spending can take place without too much net cost to the Treasury by closing tax loopholes and thereby raising more than $4 billion which are today lost to the Federal Government every year.

II. The second part of a full-employment program must be to liberalize credit and lower interest rates by at least one-fourth to one-half percent on FHA and VA home loans, on crop-support loans and farm-housing loans, Export-Import Bank loans, and small-business loans.

The tight-credit, hard-money policy inaugurated by the Eisenhower administration in the winter of 1953 more than any other single factor is responsible for the downturn in our economy. It set in motion economic forces that not only increased the cost to the taxpayer for managing the public debt—an increased cost of approximately $300 million this year—but also a substantial increase in the cost of financing of new construction, along with consumer and durable goods in private industry. This incredible fiscal blunder provided a bonanza for a few bankers and investment companies and a Pandora's box of trouble for thousands and thousands of small investors, businessmen, farmers, and workers throughout the Nation.

The best evidence as to the incredible foolishness of this tight-credit, hard-money policy is the now complete about-face of the administration in promoting an easy-money, loose-credit policy.

I charge here today, as I have on the Senate floor again and again, that the Eisenhower administration has committed one of the most tragic and colossal monetary and fiscal blunders of all time in its so-called refinancing program of the public debt. This one act threw the bond market into a topsy-turvey condition, upset the investment plans of thousands of business firms and State and local governments, and caused a great uncertainty in the money and credit market.

III. Our Government should begin to accelerate a public-works program to provide schools, hospitals, health facilities, roads, water and sanitation works, airports, dams, irrigation, river and harbor development, a radar defense system, civil-defense facilities, and other similar projects.

IV. We need to build 2 million homes next year. The Government should stimulate the construction of 135,000 units of low-cost public housing. It should also encourage low interest and long time credit, private construction, farm home construction, urban redevelopment and slum clearance.

V. An effective program for economic prosperity must restore farm income by maintaining price supports at levels no lower than last year. We need not worry about the accumulation of any food surplus resulting from such a program since there is no such thing as "surplus" when there are hungry people at home and abroad. We should instead use our imagination to effectively utilize our stores of food and more equitably distribute them.

VI. Minimum wages should be raised to at least a dollar an hour.

VII. Social security payments and old age assistance payments should be substantially increased.

VIII. We should provide unemployment insurance to meet the immediate hardships being faced by millions of Americans. This can be done by extending coverage, providing Federal reinsurance for States with low reserves and by establishing a Federal standard of payments which would guarantee a minimum of 50 percent of an individual's weekly wage when he is unemployed for a period of at least 39 weeks.

IX. We should increase social security benefits and expand its coverage so that our senior citizens may have some measures of economic security and stability when they can no longer participate in the working force.

X. Finally, an effective program for full employment and world prosperity would intensify world trade through reciprocal trade agreements, credit extension, investment and technical assistance.

This 10-point program is an essential program if we are to meet the needs today and tomorrow for the American people. It will cost money. Critics will say that we should not adopt the program simply because it does cost money. Such criticism is unwise and unreasonable. The cost of this program is but a small portion of the cost to the American people which would result from not adopting the program and facing the risk of economic hardship and dislocation. This is, indeed, a cheap investment for full employment.

The program I have just presented to you is a moderate but essential program to maintain economic stability. If our economic growth could be made to continue as it should we would achieve a $500 billion economy by 1960. What would this mean? This would mean the following to the American people:

Seventy million jobs.

A minimum $4,000 a year standard of living.

An overall increase of 40 percent in this Nation's living standards.

An average weekly wage of $100 for production workers. (It is now a little more than $71 a week.)

An increase in farm production of 20 to 25 percent, with plenty of markets for the increased production.

An annual business investment rate of from 80 to 90 billion dollars, with annual corporate profits before taxes of about $55 billion. (Last year corporate profits, before taxes, were about $44 million, and with lower tax rates in 1960, profits after taxes would be even greater.)

These goals can be realized. They will be realized if we show imagination, courage and willingness to face facts. They will be realized if we have a determined body of public opinion that demands full employment and the maximum utilization of our economic resources. They will be realized because there are groups like this conference meeting throughout the Nation demanding action by their Government. I congratulate you for holding the conference. I thank you for inviting me to participate in the conference.

Code of Fair Investigating Committee Procedures

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 1, 1954

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, on Wednesday, June 30, I testified before the Senate Rules Committee in behalf of Senate Resolution 256, a proposal for a mandatory code of fair play—of fair procedure—for investigating committees.

I ask unanimous consent that my prepared testimony be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR LEHMAN IN SUPPORT OF A CODE OF FAIR INVESTIGATING COMMITTEE PROCEDURES BEFORE THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

Mr. Chairman, I am here in support of Senate Resolution 256, a proposal for a code of fair investigating procedure, of which I am a cosponsor and which I helped draft. There is also pending before your committee Senate Concurrent Resolution 64, of which I am also a cosponsor along with Senator MORSE. In fact, Senate Resolution 256 supersedes Senate Concurrent Resolution 64 as far as its sponsors are concerned since Senate Resolution 256 combined what we thought were the best elements in Senate Concurrent Resolution 64, as well as in a number of other pending resolutions, and also introduced some new ideas and notions which the 19 cosponsors of Senate Resolution 256 developed in the course of a prolonged drafting effort.

At this point, Mr. Chairman, I should like to introduce into the record of these hearings and submit for the consideration of the committee a perfected version of Senate Resolution 256—perfected as to language and certain technical points which I have not had the opportunity to check with the cosponsors of Senate Resolution 256, but which I urge upon this committee should it see fit—as I hope it will—to consider reporting out Senate Resolution 256.

Mr. Chairman, you have already had 2 days of hearings on the subject of rules of fair procedure for investigating committees. As I understand it, you will have quite a few more days of such hearings. This subject has struck a veritable gusher of public interest. The developments of the past 2 years in regard to committee investigations has inspired in the general public, as well as among legal experts and students of the congressional process, a deep and unshakable conviction that there must be enacted—and there must be enacted immediately—a uniform mandatory set of rules governing the conduct of investigating committees and defining the rights of all parties in interest, including (1) the rights of the chairmen of committees; (2) the rights of the members of committees; (3) the rights of witnesses appearing before committees; and (4) the rights of individuals and institutions adversely mentioned in committee hearings. There is also in question the right of the public to observe committee proceedings, through television and otherwise, and finally and above all, the right of the committees of Congress to conduct investigations.

Mr. Chairman, there was a certain Member of the Senate who rose to national prominence through his chairmanship of an investigating committee—not an unusual phenomenon. This particular Senator whom I have in mind headed a committee which conducted a series of investigations which certainly rank among the most useful in recent times.

When that Senator retired from the Senate and gave up his chairmanship of that investigating committee, he said: "In my opinion, the power of investigating is one of the most important powers of Congress. The manner in which that power is exercised will determine the position and prestige of the Congress in the future."

That fairly well known quotation is from the then Senator from Missouri, Harry S. Truman, who stepped from the chairmanship of the Truman committee into the Vice Presidency of the United States, and then into the White House itself.

Harry Truman—and I have been praying for his speedy and complete recovery from his present illness, as I am sure all of us, regardless of party, are doing—knew the vast extent of the congressional investigating power, and of its uncharted limits. He knew that to abuse that power was to run that terrible danger which abuse of power always brings—reaction and consequent restriction on any, including the beneficial, use of power.

As of today, in my judgment, the abuse of the investigating power by certain committees and certain committee chairmen—not only over the past 2 years but over the past 20 years—has now resulted in a reaction which may, unless we act quickly and wisely, result in a complete paralysis of the vital investigating powers of Congress. It can result in a lasting damage to the whole legislative process. Already, Mr. Chairman, in my judgment, the prestige of Congress, in the Nation and in the world, has suffered blows from which we will not easily nor soon recover.

The investigating power of Congress, and the complaints concerning its abuse, are by no means new. Both have a long history.

The first congressional investigation took place in 1792, 162 years ago. It was an inquiry seeking to fix responsibility for the defeat of the forces of Gen. Arthur St. Clair by the Indians of Ohio. In the same year Congress undertook to inquire into Alexander Hamilton's financial affairs. In 1818 there was an investigation into the conduct of the Seminole War in Florida.

Since the founding of the Republic, there have been about 600 different committee investigations. The great majority of these have been during the last 30 years, although congressional investigations were not lacking either in number or sensationalism in the years following the Civil War, during the administration of President Ulysses S. Grant.

The power to investigate, in pursuit of legislative ends, has long been established as one of the fundamental powers of Congress. We certainly recognize it today as one of the most essential.

But the power to investigate in order to obtain the information on the basis of which to legislate—has been expanded, from time to time, to inquire just for the sake of inquiring—to arouse public opinion, and, in very recent years, to expose. The legal justification and constitutional basis for the power to investigate for the purpose of exposing, and for no other purpose, is not so well established. Indeed, some legal experts question that authority and that power. But I am not an expert nor a constitutional authority. I would not wish to argue the point.

As far as I am concerned, as a Member of the Senate, I would like to see the Congress have, enjoy, and wisely use a broad range of investigative power. I hope that power is never hedged in by rigid judicial restrictions. But that can happen, according to constitutional experts. And it is the most likely to happen if Congress abuses its power, and puts to the legal test the extremes of its investigating power.

Mr. Telford Taylor, who is an outstanding expert and authority on the legal aspects of congressional investigations, has described what he calls the "illusion of investigative omnipotence." I commend a study of this thesis, which is to be found in the winter, 1954, issue of the Notre Dame Law Review, to the members of this committee, and to the Members of Congress generally. Mr. Taylor predicts that the courts may 1 day establish some very clear limits on the exercise of the investigating power.

I, myself, would rather see the Congress, by the exercise of jurisdictional restraint, and by the promulgation of appropriate rules, such as are being considered by this committee, establish its own metes and bounds, and thus avoid the establishment by court edict, of limits on our investigating power.

Now when I speak about the investigating power, I am not referring to our individual or collective power to inquire, but rather to the power to compel testimony, to require the presence of witnesses and records, and to punish those who decline to attend upon our inquiries, to answer proper questions and to produce records upon our proper order.

That is a power which Senate investigating committees did not have until 1859, although the House had it as far back as 1827. Our early statesmen were not so sure that this power should be vested in committeees at all, and when the rule granting this power to House committees was voted on by the body, it was passed by, 102 to 88, after a very warm debate.

I have cited this historical background of the power to compel testimony because we, today, are inclined to take it for granted, as an inseparable part of the committee function. During a long period of our history, congressional committees did not have this power. Today we should be sober and judicious in our use of it.

Originally the power of congressional committees to investigate was conceived solely as the power to inquire into the conduct of the Executive branch of Government, and of the qualifications and conduct of Members of Congress. In regard to investigating the Executive branch of Government, the investigating power was conceived as another check and balance against possible usurpation or misuse of power on the part of the Executive.

We have, until today, steadily extended and expanded the limits and the concept of the investigating power. Today no one remembers or knows what the limits are. The concept of its meaning and purpose has experienced a tremendous inflation.

And here is the rub. The zeal of congressional committees to investigate has collided with the rights of the people, as set forth in the Bill of Rights of the Constitution. When that Bill of Rights was drafted and fixed into our Constitution, I doubt that its drafters anticipated the necessity of protecting the rights of the people against congressional investigators.

There are many prohibitions in the Constitution against the passage of legislation restricting the rights of the people.

"Congress shall pass no law," says the Constitution again and again.

But nowhere does the Constitution specifically protect the people against the encroachments of congressional investigating committees. It was not anticipated that congressional investigating committees would collide with and threaten the rights of the people—the individual rights of individual citizens.

There are, however, many individual rights which, certainly by clear implication, may not be violated even by congressional investigating committees, although those rights have, in fact, been grossly violated by such committees in the recent past.

Now, the question is: Are we going to wait until the Supreme Court finds it necessary to step in and protect the rights of the people, or are we going to discipline ourselves and establish rules which will fully and adequately protect the rights of individuals called before congressional investigating committees, individuals who are adversely affected, in their lives, liberty, and pursuit of happiness, by such congressional committees?

Now, when I speak of the rights which have been and are being violated by congressional investigating committees, I am referring to all kinds of rights, some explicit in our Constitution, and some implicit in our legal traditions.

I would list, among these rights, the following: (1) The right of privacy: the right to be secure against unreasonable intrusions, search, and seizure; (2) the right of a free press, free from restraint or intimidation; (3) the rights of free petition, assembly, and association; (4) the right to speak freely without fear of punishment or legal restraint; (5) the right to hold private opinions—political, economic, or religious—without undue intrusion or any punishment, by law, or by the agents of government, direct or indirect; (6) the right to have one's reputation safeguarded against libel and slander; (7) the right to be considered innocent until proved guilty; (8) the right, when on trial, to be represented by counsel of one's own choosing; and when in the position of a defendant, to have all the protections which our laws and legal traditions have erected to assure fair play, and an equalization of the power of the individual against the power of government.

I say that all these rights, in greater or lesser measure, have been violated by one or another, or several congressional investigating committees, on one or more occasions. Some of these rights have been repeatedly, insistently and flagrantly violated.

It was the chairman of the House Un-American Activities Committee who, in 1948, told a protesting witness who was demanding certain rights:

"The rights you have are the rights given you by this committee. We will determine what rights you have got and what rights you have not got before this committee."

Mr. Chairman, that statement, on sober reflection and evaluation, is a shocking one. But it is tragically true. It is shocking to think that any American citizen, regardless of who he is, can be hailed before a congressional committee, placed under oath, knowing that any answer he might make to a question can lead to a charge of perjury or any question he might refuse to answer, to a charge of contempt, and to be told that he had only such rights, to protect himself, as the committee might choose to give him.

That, to my mind, is a police state, not a democracy, not a land devoted to the ideal of freedom for the individual, and of equality, under law, for every individual.

But what the chairman of the Un-American Activities Committee said in 1948, is, for all practical purposes, unfortunately true. There are no clear and uniform and generally recognized rights assured to individuals who appear before congressional investigating committees.

I am aware that some committees have rules of their own. I am aware, for instance, of the rules of the Internal Security Subcommittee, headed by you, Senator JENNER. Those rules are not only better than none but better than most. Yet in my judgment they fall short of the mark of adequacy, in protecting the rights of the people.

Moreover, Mr. Chairman, I am sure that you recognise as a matter of legal principle, that rules, to be fair, must be uniform. The same fundamental rules must apply to the Internal Security Subcommittee, to the McCarthy committee, and to every other committee and subcommittee of the Senate when it undertakes to conduct an investigation and exercises its power to compel testimony.

Mr. Chairman, as we all know, the courts of our land have the authority to declare invalid and unconstitutional laws enacted by us when they violate the basic rights of the people. I am sure the courts can and will also act, in the end, to curb investigations conducted by us, if we continue to violate the rights of the people.

It is a fact that members of the press have been called before investigating committees in an attempt to intimidate and to smear them. This is a violation of the freedom of the press.

It is a fact that individuals have been served with subpenas and ordered to be present on a day certain at a place certain, without setting forth the subject of the inquiry, or the specific matters on which they are to be required to testify.

It is a fact that subpenas have been used by investigating committees as substitutes for warrants of arrest, to compel the presence of individuals, and to subject them to third-degree interrogation, not by committee members, but by committee employees, not in open or even executive hearings, but in the offices of the committee employees.

It is a fact that witnesses have been publicly accused, without proof, of the most heinous offenses including treason, without any kind of presentment or the submission of evidence, but merely on the basis of the personal judgment or prejudice of committee chairmen or individual committee members.

It is a fact that numerous individuals have been irreparably damaged in their reputations, have lost their jobs, and have suffered untold physical and mental hardship, as a result of unsubstantiated charges made in the course of committee investigations.

It is a fact that American citizens have been called before committees, both in executive and in public session, and subjected to trial by ordeal, with all the weight and power of Congress arrayed on one side, while the witness has had none of the protections or safeguards to which he would be entitled in a court of law.

I could go on and on, Mr. Chairman. There is no need of it. You are going to have many witnesses before you. I do not need to make the whole case.

I am aware, Mr. Chairman, that investigating committee hearings are not and cannot be court proceedings. Congressional committees cannot transform themselves into judicial bodies. There are no adversary parties in a congressional hearing even though some investigating committees do characterize some witnesses as "hostile" and others as "friendly." I do not know what that means.

Congressional committees, by their very nature, lack the judicial temperament and the judicial soul.

But we can and must establish rules which give witnesses appearing before congressional investigating committees an equivalent protection to that which defendants and witnesses receive in court, the assurance of fair play and uniform treatment.

We can protect the reputation of citizens appearing before congressional committees, and insure against unjustified defamation and disgrace, by assuring every witness his right to present his side of the story.

We can and must permit the witness to have the advice and assistance of counsel of his own choosing, to help protect his rights and his reputation.

We can permit a witness, against whom adverse evidence has been submitted, to cross-examine those who make the charges, and to compel the attendance of other witnesses who can help refute the charges and allegations made.

You may be interested to know that in past years the right of cross-examination was frequently granted to witnesses before congressional investigating committees when charges were made against such witnesses. In the Teapot Dome hearings before a Senate investigating committee, counsel for Attorney General Harry Doughtery conducted an active cross-examination of those who made the charges of bribery and malfeasance against Harding's Attorney General.

I am told that there have been many other instances preceding the present era.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, we must insure that congressional investigations and congressional investigation committees are democratically conducted, with full power and full responsibility reposing in the committee or subcommittee as a whole, not solely in the chairman. The committee members must be given assurance of full participation in all decisions, and charged with a proportionate share of the responsibility for those decisions.

All the rights and protections which I have enumerated, and many others, are contained in Senate Resolution 256, which is pending before you, and of which I am cosponsor.

I will not undertake today to justify all its provisions. I believe that every aspect of this resolution will be covered in the course of these hearings by one or another of the many witnesses who will appear before you. I will be glad, of course, to answer any questions which you may have concerning this resolution, which I believe is the best of those which have been introduced.

I call your attention, for instance, and briefly, to section 8, which provides for a means of supervision and enforcement of the rules therein provided. In my judgment this is an essential part of any effective set of rules.

Nor should this responsibility be placed in any standing committee which itself conducts investigations. The enforcement group should be a group of Senators democratically chosen to discharge this function, and newly elected in each new Congress. Only in this way will it have the prestige and authority necessary for its high purposes.

I believe, Mr. Chairman, that we should conduct our investigations as openly as possible. There should be no one-man subcommittees. There should be as few executive sessions as possible consistent with the need to safeguard the rights and reputations of witnesses compelled to appear before such committees and consistent with the requirements of national security.

In general, I subscribe to that now-forgotten slogan of the presidential campaign of 1872, "Open doors. Less whitewash and more fumigation."

My purpose, Mr. Chairman, is to protect the investigative powers of Congress. I do not wish to see that power misused, abused, or discredited.

In my State, back in 1907, we passed a law known as the Moreland Commission Act. Many kinds of investigations can be better conducted by such a commission than by a legislative committee, in my judgment. Occassionally, of course, we do get a whitewash.

But there are some investigations, urgent and essential ones, which only a congressional committee can adequately conduct. Let us save that ability and that authority. Let us protect ourselves against ourselves. Let us approve Senate Resolution 256, a set of rules of fair play designed to facilitate and not to obstruct the power of congressional investigation.

The Late Honorable Joseph R. Farrington

SPEECH
OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 21, 1954

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, there are some words in our language that we do not use easily. One of them is the word "nobility." It is not given to us to know many persons who fully deserve that word to describe their character.

Joe Farrington was one who eminently deserved and merited it. He was a good man, a truly noble man. He was possessed of good commonsense, remarkable industry and the forceful drive we think of as belonging to the Yankee. But he had lived in Hawaii long enough to have absorbed the gentle spirit and manners of the peoples of the Pacific. As much as any man I have ever known of any of the races which have so many distinguished representatives in his beloved Hawaiian Islands, he himself in his own person embodied the finest in the various cultures which have developed around the Pacific basin and converge on the Hawaiian Islands in its center.

But along with what a man is—and that is his highest accomplishment, as has been said repeatedly here today—goes the record of what the man does. Eloquent tribute has been paid to the singleness of purpose with which this man worked to get statehood for the Hawaiian Islands, but it was not primarily or solely due to his devotion to the Hawaiian Islands. Joe Farrington was a man of still larger vision. He saw that the struggle of the ages is taking place in the Pacific between the peoples of the white races and those of the nonwhite races. The last time I talked to him was only last week standing behind the rail over there. He said, "How much more time do we Americans think we have?" That is as near as I ever recall hearing him say a word of frustration at the many and long delays. It was not personal frustration. He trembled for his country as he saw it fiddling while Rome burned. Which way are the two-thirds of the people of the world who are not Caucasians to go? He know that Hawaii is one of the focal spots where that question will be answered. He knew that his duty was far more than to get statehood for this one group of islands. That effort was only a part of his loyal, thoroughgoing Americanism; his duty to his country; his concern for the survival of the civilization of which he and you and I are trustees. He was motivated by his vision of the total struggle, not just his proper concern to get a change of status for the people who had elected him to serve their interests.

Along with the nobility of personal character and the breadth of vision that gave him greatness was the dedication the man had. We see all sorts of people in public life, but there are few, if any, who have demonstrated greater and more singlehearted dedication to the causes that he felt were most important. He was a man of wealth. He did not need to slave as he did. Yet along with his main concern, in the legislative field, of winning statehood for the islands, Joe Farrington did as much for human beings and gave more time to bills for the relief of individuals—I will not say as much; I think he did more than any 2 or 3 of us in Congress. In the Hawaiians there is such an intermingling of blood and races and nationalities that it is often impossible to decide to what jurisdiction or country or quota a man or woman or child belongs from the standpoint of his race and his ancestry. So the immigration or property or personal rights of hundreds of them have to be handled by private bills to get equity and justice. Joe, I think, introduced far more of these bills and carried them through to successful passage than anybody that has ever been in the Congress. He sometimes said, "They may think I am going overboard for Asians and peoples of other color, but it is because they are human beings who have no other recourse. Here are persons who have no chance to get their prized American citizenship or their immigration status clarified unless I put in the bills and get them through the Congress."

He was selfless. I suppose the final test of any man's patriotism is his willingness to give his life for his country Joe Farrington never left the field of battle, although he was mortally wounded. Thrice stricken down to my knowledge, he continued to fight. We will not soon see his equal again.

When I was a boy in Sunday school it seemed to me too bad that Moses never got into the Promised Land. It seemed kind of unfair, having led his people out of Egypt and through the 40 years in the wilderness, that he, himself, was denied more than a glimpse of the Promised Land. Sitting here today, I had that same feeling regarding our departed colleague—a feeling of it not being right that Joe Farrington did not get to see the Hawaiians become the 49th State of our Republic. But he knew it was coming because it is right, and I am sure that no greater tribute can be paid to him by those of us who knew him well and mourn his passing than for us to carry through quickly to fruition this which was his life's crusade.

Our deep sympathy goes to his devoted wife and partner in his work and to his family.

Holifield Praised for Stand on Atomic Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR ENGLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 30, 1954

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, the Sacramento Bee, which is one of the outstanding and leading newspapers of the Nation, has written an editorial praising our southern California colleague, Congressman CHET HOLIFIELD, for the wisdom and leadership he has demonstrated in the current argument over the President's directive to the Atomic Energy Commission ordering that body to contract with privately owned companies for power for the Atomic Energy Commission's operations in Tennessee. Congressman HOLIFIELD is performing a service to the Nation in the careful and able analysis he is making of current policies affecting atomic energy and public power.

I include for the RECORD the Sacramento Bee editorial of June 22, 1954:

PRESIDENT'S AEC DIRECTIVE IS BLOW AT PUBLIC POWER

Taxpayers, whether or not they favor the public development of power, have a right to ask some serious questions regarding President Dwight D. Eisenhower's strange directive to the Atomic Energy Commission ordering that body to contract with privately owned companies for power for the AEC's operations in Tennessee.

The question is one which involves dollars and cents as well as principle.

The President's right to issue such a directive, especially when a majority of the members of the AEC are opposed to the deal, has been challenged by Congressman CHET HOLIFIELD, Democrat, of California.

But beyond that is the claim of the California Congressman that buying the power from private sources during the 25-year life of the proposed contract will cost the Government at least $90 million more than if the energy were purchased from the publicly owned Tennessee Valley Authority.

The President's arbitrary and unprecedented order came at a time when Congress was considering appropriations for expanding the TVA's power output to supply Memphis customers.

Government money will pay for the steam plant for the privately owned utilities with which the AEC has been ordered to contract for power.

Not only will the contract be costly for the taxpayers but it also can be expected to prejudice present and future TVA requests for appropriations. More than that, it is an entering wedge for the ultimate dismantling of TVA as one of the great public projects in the world.

How different is this directive from the President's campaign words delivered in Memphis in 1952:

"Certainly there would be no disposition on my part to impair the effective working of TVA. Our goal should be to work out river basin development the way the people of the region want it done."

Those were praiseworthy words, indeed.

But soon afterward the President nullified them by calling TVA an example of creeping socialism.

Then he allowed the appointment of Gordon Clapp, the able Chairman of the TVA Board, to expire without reappointing him.

Now comes the directive for the AEC contract.

On top of that, who was appointed to head the Government task force to study power development in the South but Ben Moreel, whose record and the records of his associates on the Commission are against public power?

The heat, indeed, is on TVA. And the irony of it all is that the project which has been accepted throughout the world as a model of regional developments financed with American economic aid may be the target of a fierce battle at home to wreck it.

Independence Day, 1954

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 30, 1954

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following editorial from the current issue of the National Tribune-The Stars and Stripes:

INDEPENDENCE DAY, 1954

Two hundred years ago on July 4, 1754, Col. George Washington suffered defeat in a battle at Fort Necessity, which was near what is now Uniontown, Pa. The veteran of the Fench and Indian War retired into his own country with the honors of war, drums beating, and colors flying, but with a heavy heart beneath his buckskin coat. That battle was doubtless still fresh in his memory 22 years later on July 4, 1776, when there was adopted in the old State House in Philadelphia the Declaration of Independence, and while Gen. George Washington led the infant American forces against the British with whom he had earlier fought.

On the coming Sunday the people of our country will have no thought of the colonial defeat on the Pennsylvania border, but they will mark the 178th anniversary of the declaration by the Continental Congress that this would be a free and independent Republic no longer alined with Mother England. They will review the policies that were spelled out in Philadelphia when our founders severed themselves from the dictation of King George III, and when they began the march down a long road to absolute freedom. Our people can, if they will, recall the sacrifices of millions of patriots who have given of their souls and bodies to maintain their liberties through the ages and who by those sacrifices have pulled our America up by its bootstraps and have placed it in the enviable position of leadership it now holds among all free nations of the world.

The war veterans of the United States think it well to remember the costs of independence through the past 178 years as we near the anniversary of its winning. This country has come a long way during those years. Its menfolk have fought a half-dozen major wars and many scores of thousands have given their lives to preserve the freedoms then declared. Literally millions of others have suffered grievous wounds in the cause of liberty. The price in economic loss can never be totaled, and yet, on Independence Day, 1954, this Nation stands again with its back to the wall struggling for survival against even greater evils represented in totalitarian communism. And, as we mark the country's founding, we confer with others in discussions that may well spell victory or defeat for the principles that gave it birth.

As times have changed, so has the thinking of all too many of our citizens. That vaunted independence that has been so long the bulwark of our strength is giving way to a dependence upon others who are weaker than we. With the development of means of transportation, the world has shrunk, and with the unfolding of international relationships, our problems have multiplied. Thousands upon thousands of our people, whose concern was once based on a maintenance of nationalism, have become proponents of internationalism as a means of securing peace in a troubled universe and, since establishment of the United Nations with self-preservation as its goal, have sworn themselves to a loss of sovereignty and a divided allegiance as the way to utopian rectitude. Instead of congratulating themselves on the inherent blessings of freedoms that have never for a moment been stifled, a multitude of Americans are shedding crocodile tears in the fanciful fear that their liberties are in danger. Lawyer and priest, doctor and industrialist, farmer and toiler lead a movement striving for an alleged individual independence that entertains little regard for the common good, and they pray to false gods for relief from a self-denial and responsibility that tends to wreck a tried and true form of government and relinquish it in favor of dependence upon aliens and systems of living that have since the beginning of time led to jealousies and hates which have meant wars and more wars.

It is perhaps sheer coincidence that as we are about to celebrate our independence, official Washington is host to British Prime Minister Sir Winston Churchill and Foreign Minister Anthony Eden. It is easy to be critical of those policies of 178 years ago which caused us to fight for our freedom from English rule, policies also of self-preservation that look to colonialism and world trade as a lifeline to self-sustenance. Great Britain suffered greatly in two world wars during our time, which, had they been lost, would have occasioned great trials for our own people. On the other hand and even though we may have been motivated by self-defense, the British Empire would have fallen but for our help. It would be a tragedy indeed if under present strains we were to part company with Britain, but much hinges upon the outcome of the Washington conferences. This country presently is carrying the principal burden of holding the free world together in a period of cold war. Fully 80 percent of the entire costs are being borne by the American taxpayer, and, while we spend our way into bankruptcy, the British diplomats are presumably attempting once more to help themselves through another crisis by means that are totally unacceptable to us. We are asked to enter into a southeast Asian Locarno, similar to the pre-World War II affair in Europe which Hitler accepted only to violate at will. Churchill and Eden propose this in order to be able to continue trade relationships with Red China and Soviet Russia. It appears to organized veterans that we can rely no less on the word of a Malenkov or a Chou En-lai than on a Hitler, and that this country is today being asked by Britain to give up the independence won from her on July 4, 1776.

We plead guilty to knowing all too little about the wiles of diplomatic procedures, but it would seem to us that gratitude alone should prompt the British to tie in with this

Nation in one final effort to avoid catastrophic suicide and that our people themselves should recognize approaching disaster and think less in terms of world union and more in self-defense alliances. The weight of American manpower and the influence of its productive wealth have twice pulled the British chestnuts out of the fire. Containment of communism has been our lot almost alone to the tune of $200 billion and the end is not in sight. American lives and money have saved Great Britain and most of continental Europe. We have freed the Philippines, saved what is left of Korea, placed crutches under Japan, bulwarked the balance of free lands throughout the world, and have prevented the Pacific from becoming a Red lake. We have made certain so far of preserving the general peace in the Americas, and even now face the need of preventing the finding of a Soviet foothold on this hemisphere. Because Britain has marked time and temporized, we have lost face at Geneva and our task of establishing world amity has been made the more difficult. It is well, we think, to so appraise the national position at a time when we mark the declaration of our independence.

Great Britain, and for the matter of that, most other nations have their own policies of independence. The United States has its policy, much as we have been dragged by the nose into international commitments. Most of our troubles today can be attributed to a desire to compromise for the benefit of all of our friends, but we repeat that our own brand of independence does not contemplate appeasement of the enemy nor a further weakening of defenses against totalitarian aggression. This country has distressed itself irreparably in its efforts to save the other free peoples of the world. The independence it earned nearly 200 years ago is now almost unrecognizable. It will be lost entirely unless we reconsider our position in world affairs. It seems to us that we have given enough and that instead of sucking our blood longer, our friends, if we have any, should furnish us a few transfusions by cooperating with us in our plans to save them and ourselves from extinction. We believe, in all events, that these are thoughts that are worthy of earnest consideration as we approach Independence Day, 1954.

General Harper Says Goodby to Air Force—Retiring Commanding General of Air Training Command Played Big Role in Success of Berlin Airlift

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1954

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I herewith include an article which appeared in the St. Louis Globe-Democrat on June 27, 1954, entitled "General Harper Says Goodby to the Air Force":

GENERAL HARPER SAYS GOODBY TO AIR FORCE—MUCH-DECORATED COMMANDING OFFICER OF AIR TRAINING COMMAND, WHO PLAYED BIG ROLE IN SUCCESS OF BERLIN AIRLIFT, PLANS TO PRACTICE LAW AND FISH

(By C. K. Boeschenstein)

Lt. Gen. Robert Wells Harper, 53, is retiring next Wednesday as head of the world's largest known air training command, to settle down in Harlingen, Tex. (population 23,339), where he will practice law, grow flowers and go fishing.

The United States Air Force will salute General Harper and his 30-year military record with ceremonies on the ground and in the air, starting at 3:30 p. m. Wednesday, at Scott Air Force Base—the general's headquarters for 43 training bases under his command.

During most of World War II, in the Korean conflict and since, General Harper is the man who has been responsible for the training of all air crewmen and technicians for the United States Air Force.

At the start of his military career, he put his faith in airpower and Billy Mitchell. After World War II his negotiations with the Russians established air corridors into Berlin, made possible the Berlin airlift that thwarted the Communists' food transportation blockade.

At Scott he has been famous for punctuality, personality and personal interest in the welfare of his men.

Getting a head start on reveille, he arises at 4:30 or 5 a. m., often the first man up on a base, breakfasts on coffee and fruit juice; takes an inspection tour of the base, where he happens to be, at dawn. During the day he doesn't allow laggards to slow his fast start. Even flight guests, arriving belatedly at the field, have on occasion found the general had taken off without them.

In air training, where the only certainty often seems to be change, General Harper has worked for stability and an organized plan. Similarly, with military precision, he has organized his own life, to retire to the practice of law while he is young enough to enter a new profession. He was admitted to the Texas bar after studying law at night when he was a young officer in San Antonio.

He marshals his reasons for going to Harlingen thus: It's near the Rio Grande and Mexico (he loves Mexican food); it has a semitropical climate where he can raise a garden (including gardenias) the year round; it's 15 miles from salt water fishing; it's a progressive city, where he expects to take an influential role in civic affairs and, not forgetting the old life, it's near an airbase.

Mrs. Harper, an artist, is the former Margaret Weber, born in St. Louis and reared in San Antonio. Their daughter, Joan, is a student in dramatics at the University of New Mexico. Capt. Robert McCully, of the Air Force, is the General's stepson.

LATE BILLY MITCHELL WAS BIG INFLUENCE ON HARPER

In leaving the Air Force Training Command, General Harper expresses the view that the size of the Air Force is "a good compromise between the military and the economy of the country"; its training program "well developed for quick expansion in case of emergency."

He was born in Seattle, Wash., grew up in nearby Harper, Wash., named for his father, who was a brick manufacturer. The future three-star general attended Seattle High School and St. John's Military Academy, Delafield, Wis. World War I helped turn him toward a military career.

He was graduated from West Point in 1924, served 1 year in the infantry, then went into the Air Corps. Why?

He says he felt the Air Corps provided "greater opportunity to contribute to military advancement and security of the country. I came to the conclusion future security of the country was in the air." This was in the days of baling-wire biplanes.

It was also the year (1925) Brig. Gen. William (Billy) Mitchell was court-martialed on charges of insubordination, he criticized his superior officers for failure to develop the Air Corps.

The court-martial found Mitchell guilty. He was reduced to the rank of colonel and was buried at an air center in San Antonio, Tex. A year later Mitchell left the service but never gave up his fight for a great air arm for the United States and a Cabinet Department of Defense with separate Army, Navy, and Air Departments. He died in 1936.

Harper acknowledges that Mitchell was "the determining influence in my going into the Air Corps. I used to meet him in San Antonio when it was like cutting your throat to be seen with him. I thought he was right all the way through. I've lived to see him vindicated." (After Mitchell's death, his rank of general was restored by act of Congress, the Congressional Medal of Honor was awarded posthumously.)

HOLDS DECORATIONS FROM MANY ALLIED NATIONS

Harper's training of millions of flyers in a Nation that had been caught unprepared for war's air age, has won him recognition not only in the United States but in allied nations, too, many of whom send their air cadets to the United States for instruction. The Chinese (Nationalist) Government decorated him with the Order of the Cloud and Banner; the British with the rank of Honorary Commander; the French with the Legion of Merit; the Greeks with the Royal Order of the Phoenix; Yugoslavia, Brazil, and France have bestowed Command Pilot Wings.

But the honor that impressed Harper the most came in September 1944, when he left the top training position (Assistant Chief of Air Staff for Training) to go overseas as United States Chief of the Air Division, Allied Group Control Command.

On the way to the plane for the trip overseas, he was told to report at once to Gen. Henry H. (Hap) Arnold, then Chief of the Air Force, in his Pentagon office. When General Harper arrived, General Arnold pinned on his chest the Distinguished Service Medal. Another United States award to Harper: Legion of Merit with Oak Leaf Cluster.

Two years after going overseas, Harper became Director of the Armed Forces Division of the Military Government of Berlin—hot spot of the cold war.

In this post he set the stage for the success of the Berlin airlift (Operation Vittles) and formed a friendship with a Russian general that was to have a cryptic end.

Air corridors into Berlin were supposed to have been established by the Potsdam Peace Conference. But when General Harper was told by the Russians, "Your boys are violating the air corridors by flying out of them," he found there were no corridors.

So the Group Control Council went to work and established air corridors. General Harper explained, "You've got to have everything down in black and white with the Russians. Then if they can't find some way to misinterpret it, they will observe it."

As a result of the agreement, when the Russians blocked other means of transportation to Berlin, the United States airlift brought food to Berlin. Harper added: "The air corridors were the ones we worked out. That's my contribution to it. I had nothing to do with the operation of the airlift itself."

HOW HE STOPPED 2 A. M. CALLS FROM SOVIET GENERAL

The Russian representative on the Group Control Council was a General Koutzevalov. He and General Harper soon became friends. Often they would go on hunting and fishing trips together, sometimes to the former estates of Goering and Goebbels. Harper had learned Russian and Koutzevalov, a linguist, knew English, so they took turns using each other's language.

One of the Russian's habits, though, almost wrote finis to the friendship. This was his habit of calling General Harper on the telephone at 2 or 2:30 a. m. To Koutzevalov it was just the prime of the evening, as sounds of music and dancing indicated.

The Russian general would ramble on apparently unmindful that he had aroused Harper from sleep. Harper decided he would have to do something about it so he told Koutzevalev that if he called again in the early hours, Harper would call him at 7 a. m. when Koutzevalov would be asleep. The Russian was undeterred with the warning. So Harper did call him at 7 a. m. and after that the 2 a. m. calls stopped.

Koutzevalov was recalled to Moscow and assigned to a military school 2 weeks before General Harper was to go to Moscow for a foreign ministers' conference. Koutzevalov had felt he might be disciplined for his friendship with General Harper but this didn't occur when he was in Berlin.

He wrote General Harper an exuberant Russian letter noting that the American's birthday anniversary (November 9) was on the same day as the Red revolution. He wished him "good health; the best of success in your work; the blessings of happiness, freedom and independence of our people."

The Russian general had told Harper to look him up in Moscow. But a United States major friend of Harper's bet him $100 he would never see Koutzevalov. The major won the bet.

General Harper was shadowed the whole time he was in Moscow and was given the "brush off" when he tried to get in contact with Koutzevalov. He has heard nothing of the Russian general since.

Harper says, "Russians have no comprehension of democracy as we understand it. Although they use the word profusely, to them it means communism."

IT'S THE LITTLE EXTRAS IN LIFE THAT COUNT

The retiring head of the Air Force Training Command has never sought to be a martinet. He commented: "If two ways of doing work accomplish the same objective, I believe in the easiest and happiest way. I have never wanted a man to feel as if I'm sitting on top of him, waiting for him to make a mistake. There is no progress without mistakes."

To him, the Air Force is like a fraternity, banded together by a feeling of loyalty. It isn't money that is the important thing—it's position—being held in high respect among fellowmen.

Although Harper rates United States airmen as the best in the world, he adds, "training is hard for many youths today because they lack motivation—the strength and drive to go through. It may be physical but more often it is mental." He attributes this to the uncertainty of the world today; also lack of training and discipline in the family.

He told of an airman who complained to his commanding officer that he didn't know what he was getting into when he went into the Air Force and asked the officer "to get me out of here." The officer had taken no action about this, when he met the airman several days later. The officer asked how the airman was getting along and if he still wanted to get out. The airman told him; "I'm staying. I took a look at myself in the barber shop mirror and I decided I'd be ashamed to show my face at home."

Harper has told his subordinates, "Never misrepresent the Air Force or its training; know the life of an airman and answer every question about it. If you can't answer a question, refer it to headquarters."

The general's welfare program has been based on his theory that "it's the little extras in life that count." He says not just the airmen but his military family should be happy and content in the service. Some of the little extras at Scott: Base beautification program, wide variety of recreation, including golf course and outdoor swimming pool.

The retiring boss of the Air Training Command advises young men: "Determine what your career is going to be. Then do everything to make the best of it. Every job you are given, do it well. If the little job is well accomplished, when the big job comes along it will be well accomplished, too.

"Little jobs may seem below your dignity but that is not the attitude to take to make a success of your career. On the stage there is a saying: 'There are no little parts, only little actors.' It is very true in the military today."

General Harper who has believed in air power ever since the days of Billy Mitchell, says aviation's future is unlimited. "Every time a barrier is reached, it's conquered." Use of jets, he thinks, will become universal for training, fighting, commercial flying.

Better Housing for America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 1, 1954

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an address which I delivered at the national housing conference annual banquet on June 8, 1954.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Address by Hon. Hubert H. Humphrey at the National Housing Conference Annual Banquet, June 8, 1954

Mr. Chairman, friends of the national housing conference, I hope you will allow me a moment to reminisce before I present to you my message for the evening. Ten years ago I was preparing myself to run for mayor of my city. I had been a professor of political science and was now determined to put my theories and teachings into practice. One of my first projects in preparing to enter practical politics was the study of housing needs of our community in the city of Minneapolis. It was in those not-so-long-ago early days of my political career that I came to know Lee Johnson and the wonderful people who today compose the national housing conference. There is no hesitation at all in my voice as I say that the national housing conference more than any other single group was responsible for the community spirit and growing public acclaim for an effective governmental program to meet the housing needs of our Nation.

I consider it a great source of personal satisfaction that we were not only able to make progress in Minneapolis, but that after I arrived in the Senate during the 81st Congress I had the opportunity to cosponsor and vote for the Housing Act of 1949, the most monumental step forward in the field of housing legislation in the history of our Nation.

The Housing Act of 1949 pledged our Nation to the proposition that every American family had a right to a decent home and a suitable living environment. The Congress declared that the maintenance of high residential construction was necessary in order to insure continued full employment and the steady growth of our national economy and our high standard of living.

Those principles are as applicable today as they were in 1949—only more so.

The Housing Act of 1949 was predicated upon estimates of housing needs submitted to the Congress. These statistics indicated a need for more than a million and a quarter new homes every year. In spite of short-sighted criticisms of that figure as being impractical and visionary, the building industry and the local housing authorities with the help of the Federal Government built 1,400,000 new dwelling units for the year following the adoption of the 1949 act. This was an all-time record and nearly 40 percent more than the preceding year.

The entry of the Federal Government into the housing industry helped improve housing conditions for the American families and helped improve economic conditions for the American home building industry. The home building industry was never so successful, never so strong, and never so profitable as in the year following the adoption of the 1949 act.

Unfortunately, the progress we were making was interrupted. The Communist attack upon Korea brought with it American rearmament and inflationary pressures which compelled our Government to reduce the production of homes and to increase the production of war plants, planes and ammunition. As a result of great controls on private housing and budgetary controls on public housing, residential building was reduced to 1,100,000 units by 1950.

This period of housing retrenchment has proved to be very costly to the American people. It has been costly not only because of the fact that millions of Americans remain without adequate housing, but it has been costly because the period of retrenchment allowed those who lack vision to gain strength and mobilize in the Congress. The low-cost public housing program was badly crippled as a result of budget cutbacks last year. This means that when we should have produced 1,500,000 or more homes last year, we only built 1,100,000 homes.

Even more serious, however, is the fact that this new low level of construction has been accepted by the administration as a reasonable goal for our economy. For the administration to state as a goal that we want to build only 1 million homes next year is indeed to be moving backwards. We are being asked to be content with a 25-percent decline from the construction levels of 4 years ago. We are asked to stabilize residential construction at a low level.

Such a permanent cutback is not a program for America. It is a program rather for the timid, the tired and the short-sighted. This is a program of depression. It is a program of unemployment for 300,000 or 400,000 workers who should be employed in building new homes. This is a program for the perpetuation of the housing shortage and for maintenance of high prices.

We have suffered from a revival of know-nothingism in this country, and now we have a new political philosophy of do-nothingism. Let us pray that this is not a prelude to a new 1929. Let us never forget that housing construction reached a peak in 1925, from which it declined unnoticed to the collapse of 1929.

We need some form of parity in residential building. It should establish the level of production required to provide homes for our new families, to replace our slums, to maintain full employment in building, and to provide for a rising standard of living. The national housing conference has just completed a study of housing need which provides such a measure. That study concludes that we now need to build 2 million homes a year to meet the national objectives adopted in 1949.

Two million new homes are required each year to house the American people decently. A million homes will be required to accommodate new families, to permit undoubling, and to provide a reasonable vacancy rate. A half a million new homes are required each year to replace dwellings which are destroyed or demolished by fire, windstorm, by highway construction, and by public building and other public actions.

But if we were only to build 1,500,000 homes we would never eliminate our presently substandard homes. There were 15 million substandard homes in the Nation in 1950. Ten million of these must be replaced. If we spread the job over a 20-year period we would have to replace 500,000 substandard homes a year. We can do that job only if we are building 2 million homes a year. At present rates of building, the number of substandard homes is increasing, not decreasing. We are losing the battle for better housing.

There is another reason why we need to build 2 million homes a year. We need to do so to sustain our economic growth. During the postwar years our production expanded rapidly, at a rate of about 5 percent each year. This meant that each year we produced from $10 billion to $15 billion more than we did in the previous year. In the last half century our productivity has increased by an average of more than 2 percent per year. Residential construction is an important element in this growth. When home building lags, the economy fails to expand as rapidly as before, and all of us lose.

In years of rapid economic expansion residential construction has accounted for over 4 percent of our gross national product. In 1950 it was 4.4 percent. Today it is nearer 3 percent. This year our economy is not expanding. We will not produce an extra $10 billion in wealth and income. We will be lucky to produce as much as we did last year. That extra production of an expanding economy could have resulted in the construction of a half a million or a million additional homes. If we can continue to expand our economy at a steady rate, we can build 2 million and more homes a year without spending any more of our income for housing than we have in the past. If we fail to do so, we invite economic stagnation or worse.

So much for housing needs.

The Housing Act of 1949 was a monumental act of Congress because of its vision with regard to the problem of housing. The act also authorized a slum-clearance and urban-redevelopment program of tremendous significance to the growth of our Nation and to the health of our people.

In the 5 years since the 1949 act was adopted the program has resulted in the planning of some 2 million projects, of which about 60 have actually received Federal loan or grant contracts.

In projects actually started, less than 50,000 slum dwellings will be cleared. During these past 5 years it is estimated that 500,000 dwellings have been destroyed by other actions, natural and manmade. But during the same years 1,500,000 dwellings probably deteriorated to the point where they warranted clearance.

We would have to replace 200,000 dwellings per year just to replace homes when they become 100 years old. In short, during these 5 years we should have cleared from 1 million to 1½ million homes just to keep up with current obsolescence. We did clear 50,000. Again we are losing the battle of slum clearance. Slums are accumulating much faster than they are being cleared.

One of the major reasons for this slow development of the slum-clearance program, and there are many, is the problem of relocation. Communities are unwilling and often unable to demolish homes in the midst of a persistent housing shortage. Until families in slum areas can be relocated in decent homes promptly and without hardship, the slum-clearance program cannot reach proper volume. Nor can we engage in wholesale campaigns of code enforcement, rehabilitation, or what is now called renewal without adequate vacant and decent dwellings available to the families to be displaced and at rents they can afford.

Most of the new housing which is being built consists of higher priced homes. Even the cheapest of the housing currently produced sells or rents for prices which are far beyond the reach of average families. From half to two-thirds of our population cannot afford new housing under conventional financing with governmental aid. This is especially true of those who will be displaced by any program creating slum conditions.

To relocate families now living in slum areas we need large supplies of low-rent-public housing and even larger supplies of new private housing at prices within the reach of middle-income families. Thus, slum clearance and redevelopment is dependent upon the construction of an adequate supply of new housing.

We must, therefore, develop a program of home building which will achieve our major purposes:

1. It must double the present volume of residential building.

2. It must provide new homes for all income groups, high income, middle income, and low income.

3. It must provide new homes which are open to all races and creeds.

4. There must be assurance that the required levels of construction will be maintained for many years.

The first element in any such program is the construction of an adequate volume of low-rent-public housing. Only public housing can serve the needs of low-income families. The Housing Act of 1948 authorized the construction of 810,000 public housing units, at a rate of up to 200,000 per year. In the last 5 years less than 200,000 public housing units have been put under construction. The immediate task is the removal of appropriation road blocks so that we can speed the construction of public housing at the rate of 200,000 units a year.

In addition, I believe that it is clear that public housing will fail to achieve its purposes unless the program is modified in certain important respects.

There must be an end to barren and institutional-looking projects.

There must be a lot of experimentation with single homes, smaller projects, and better design.

Much more attention must be given to housing for aged couples and single persons.

Real attempts must be made to mix public and private housing to avoid the creation of large unnatural areas of low-income families.

The income limits in public housing should be raised to permit continued occupancy of families who otherwise would be forced to return to slums.

The second major element in a comprehensive housing program is the development of a new system of aids for the middle-income families. We cannot move forward with slum clearance, or rehabilitation, we cannot expand housing production, and we cannot stabilize building unless we can develop means for building a very large volume of new homes for the 12 million or more middle-income families. There incomes are too high for public housing and too low for new private housing. There is little evidence that the private economy has made any progress in this field in recent years. Almost all of recent construction has served higher income families, and the market for such families may well be approaching saturation.

The middle-income housing bill of 1950 offered one approach to this problem. Its major feature was debated in the Senate and narrowly defeated. That bill would have established a Government mortgage lending institution to make long-term low-interest rate loans for cooperative and nonprofit housing for middle-income families. Its principles represent a beginning in the search for adequate means for housing middle-income families.

But we need a program to provide for all families of all incomes in the gap between public and private housing. We will probably never achieve an adequate volume of construction in this field until we are able to harness the energies and initiative of not only cooperatives and nonprofit organizations but also of local public agencies and private builders.

What I am suggesting is that we must utilize the full resources of public credit to assure the construction of middle-income housing. We should use private resources to the greatest possible extent, but they may be unable to fully meet the need. Current studies suggest that Government-aided loans with interest rates approaching the cost of money to the Government may be necessary to do the job. If that is so, then we should not hesitate to recommend and adopt such a program.

We need such a program now, to house our people and to sustain our enomic growth. We need it to assure the construction of one-half million or more additional homes each year for middle-income families, for families relocated by slum clearance and other programs, for the millions of veterans who have been unable to acquire homes under present systems of aid, and for minority group families who are unable to obtain new housing today.

Such a program must produce rental housing for those who want and need it, and sales housing for those who want and need it. It should produce single homes and apartments It should utilize private initiative. It should be organized in such a way as to asist in the comprehensive development of our metropolitan areas and rural and farm communities.

Finally, it is clear that improvements are needed in our systems of aid for higher priced homes. Some of these systems have tended to serve the few at the expense of the consumer. These distortions must be corrected. These programs have failed to provide adequate credit at reasonable rates in many rural areas and smaller communities. They have resulted in too little protection for the homeowner, and inadequate security against changes in jobs and income. They have failed to provide an adequate amount of rental housing construction. Surely improvements can be devised for our system of aids to private housing to further expand conventional construction and eliminate these past deficiencies.

In any such enlarged housing program we must also face a number of other problems which have been neglected in past housing legislation and administration.

Experience with urban redevelopment has demonstrated that many of our central city areas are too densely populated for decent living. Before these areas can be cleared and rebuilt, many of these inhabitants must move to suburban areas, where space is available for new housing. All too often the slums are in central cities and the vacant land needed for relocation housing is in the suburbs. To solve these problems we need metropolitan planning and metropolitan housing action We have made a number of pious resolves to face this question, during the last two generations, but we have done little indeed.

The whole question of decentralization for purposes of national defense must also be faced. If anyone in a position of responsibility knows what can or should be done on this point he has not told the Nation. Now that we have developed a bomb which can wipe out whole cities, should we continue to build homes in areas which may be the target for such bombs? Can we not plan our metropolitan areas for defense and national survival? Again some affirmative national policy and progress is long overdue.

The present financial formula for slum clearance appears to be workable as long as we are clearing away slums at an experimental rate. But if we start to clear slums at a rate equal to their annual growth, we will assuredly find that local governments cannot raise the required matching grants. Our urban redevelopment program will require some overhauling in this respect if we are serious about the eventual elimination of slums from American communities.

Similarly, our communities have not been fully able to keep up with the construction of streets, water and sewer facilities, and other local facilities for new residential areas during the postwar period. They have not had the resources to meet the school needs of these areas. If we are to double housing production, we will need a much more adequate program for the planning and construction of community facilities to serve new residential areas.

I am happy to note that the housing bill now before the Congress provides some funds for the advance planning of local public works. This program was started more than 10 years ago, but it has been allowed to languish. The administration now contends that the program should be reopened to provide a public works reserve as a hedge against unemployment. But the amount of public works proposed to be planned is only $600 million. This is about 1 month's supply of local public works at the current rate. It is not enough to take care of a 10-percent decline in public works construction or a 2-percent decline in construction generally. We need a reserve of public works, but not a 1-month reserve or a 2-month reserve. We need a 2-year reserve, and we should have it.

If we are to embark upon an adequate program of housing, it is clear that we must deal with some of these problems of coordination and planning. To do that job we should have a Department of Housing, with a Secretary of Housing. The Secretary of Housing should be the representative of American communities in the Cabinet of the President. The bankers are there, industry is there, the farmers are "represented," labor was there, and even the States are represented, but not our cities, which account for half of our people. Such action is needed to give housing adequate representation and influence in the Government of the United States, and to achieve the degree of planning and coordination needed to serve the public welfare.

In conclusion, our present housing program is too little and too late.

We need 2 million homes a year. We are getting half of that amount.

We need a slum-clearance program that clears slums at least as fast as they are created. Our present program is clearing them at about a tenth of the rate at which they are expanding.

We need housing for families of every income group. Our present program serves only about the upper income third.

We need a lot of community facilities, a 2-year shelf of public works. We have a shortage and a 1-month shelf.

In short, we have a 50-percent program in housing volume, a 10-percent program in slum clearance, a 30-percent program in housing for all income groups, and a 5-percent program in community facilities.

In all of these fields we should have 100-percent programs, programs large enough and complete enough to utilize the skills and resources of the American people. Large enough and complete enough to build a decent home in a suitable living environment for every American family.

That, ladies, and gentlemen, is my housing program for the American people.

Thank you.

VA Figures Show Few Chiseling United States on Hospital Care

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDMUND P. RADWAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 1, 1954

Mr. RADWAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer for the RECORD an article which appeared in the Buffalo Evening News of Thursday, June 24, 1954. I want to call attention to the House that this is not a handout from the Veterans' Administration but is the impartial digging out of facts and figures on the part of a diligent reporter who, I believe, has set the record straight. The article follows:

VA FIGURES SHOW FEW CHISELING UNITED STATES ON HOSPITAL CARE

WASHINGTON, June 24.—There just aren't many war veterans chiseling the Government out of free hospitalization they should be paying for.

This conclusion could be drawn from figures made public today by the Veterans' Administration after 6 months' experience with new stringent regulations that require vets to provide detailed information on their financial status when they apply for free hospital care.

Last November 4, after controversy over charges that hundreds—perhaps thousands—of veterans with non-service-connected ills had been gouging the Government by lying about their inability to pay for private hospitalization, the VA began asking this type of prospective patients five key questions, to back up the regular requirement of a statement that they lack financial resources.

NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

They were asked to swear to the value of all real and personnel property, amount of cash and ready assets, mortgage indebtedness, if any, average monthly expenditures, and average monthly income.

Then they were reminded of the possible consequences if their sworn statements turned out to be untrue:

1. Forfeiture of all future veterans benefits.
2. Criminal prosecution for perjury.
3. Civil suit by the Government to recover the cost of the free hospital care.

After 6 months of experience with this procedure, the Veterans' Administration said: "It has had no significant impact on applications or admission rates."

VA said it had received 218,426 applications from vets with non-service-connected ailments for free hospitalization between November 1, 1953, and April 30, 1954.

Only 388 applicants refused to fill out the financial statements and were refused hospitalization VA said.

JURY THROWS OUT FIRST CASE

Another 88 who had filled out financial statements voluntarily decided after doing so that they should not accept free VA hospital care.

The remaining 217,950 filled out the statements under oath, were found to be qualified and are either hospitalized now or are awaiting their turn for an empty bed, VA said.

Subsequently, more thorough investigation turned up about 20 cases during the 6-month period which were sent to the Justice Department for possible legal action.

A Justice Department spokesman said one of these had been presented to a grand jury, which "no billed" the veteran. Three others now are in the hands of United States attorneys for presentation to grand juries, and the rest are under study in the Department.

APPLICATION LIST DIPS

To substantiate its contention that the new regulations had no significant impact on applications or admissions, VA made these points:

1. Total applications for hospitalization during the 6 months ended April 30 were 461,494, compared with 466,967 in the same period a year earlier. These figures include both non-service-connected and service-connected cases. VA maintains no regular statistical breakdown between the two types.
2. The average daily patient load in VA hospitals during April was 112,121. Awaiting admission were 20,750 qualified applicants, all with non-service-connected ailments. VA had 120,000 beds, not all of which were staffed.

MEDICAL GROUP PLEASED

A year ago, when VA had 118,725 beds—some of them not in operation because of staff shortages—the patient load was 96,788 and the qualified waiting list 21,000. Two years ago the patient load numbered 97,000 and the waiting list 22,879.

The American Medical Association, which has expressed concern about a continued policy of providing free hospitalization for veterans, expressed gratification at the VA's experience with its new administrative policy.

"This indicates that the veterans, when they know what the facts are, don't ask for free hospitalization to which they're not entitled," a spokesman said. "The American people are honest and our veterans obviously are just as honest as the rest of the population, if not more so."

The 50–50 Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 1, 1954

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, no group has a more immediate interest in the maintenance of an adequate American merchant marine than the mariners who "go down to the sea" in our United States-flag ships.

Their reaction to proposed legislation affecting the future of American shipping is deserving of and receives thorough consideration by the Congress and its various committees.

I ask unanimous consent therefore to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Seafarers Log, official organ of the Seafarers International Union, Atlantic and Gulf District, AFL, of June 25, 1954.

It is entitled "Constant Vigilance: The Permanent 50–50 Bill," and emphasizes the union's espousal of the 50–50 principle on all seven occasions in recent years, when this provision has been added to foreign assistance and military aid bills.

"It would be hard to overestimate the importance of 50–50 to United States shipping and to the livelihood of seafarers," the editorial declares.

Together with the members of the Seafarers International Union, I sincerely trust that the permanent 50–50 bill will be enacted into law.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Constant Vigilance: The Permanent 50–50 Bill

Seven times in the past few years, ever since the first Marshall plan bill was proposed, the SIU has been in the thick of the fight for the 50–50 principle. Each year, a new battle has been fought on this issue in Congress and each time the 50–50 principle has been preserved in the fact of the fiercest kind of opposition. The result has been that United States ships have carried, each year, 50 percent of all Government-financed cargoes.

If, at any time during these years, a 50–50 amendment had been defeated it would most probably have been the death of the principle. But now, for the first time, there is a good chance that the United States will adopt the 50–50 idea as a permanent part of this Nation's maritime policy. A bill to that effect has already been passed by the United States Senate. It remains for the House of Representatives to act favorably on the measure and to send it to the President for signature into law.

It would be hard to overestimate the importance of 50–50 to United States shipping and to the livelihood of seafarers. The constant vigilance of the union on this score, through the years, has paid off in the past and will do so in the future.

Guided Missile Warfare Would Be Global Suicide

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 1, 1954

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include herewith an editorial entitled "Guided Missile Warfare Would Be Global Suicide," which appeared in the June 8, 1954, issue of the Park City Daily News, of Bowling Green, Ky.

The editorial is as follows:

Guided Missile Warfare Would Be Global Suicide

When the first atom bombs were dropped near the close of World War II, mankind was stunned. But amid the shock and clamor, a few voices were heard pointing out that this was not, in the technical sense, really a new weapon. It was just a big bomb, albeit a staggering one.

Guided missiles, said these voices, were something else. Rocket or jet propelled missiles hurtling at supersonic speeds between continents were a genuinely new invention. They promised, in theory at least, a striking arm no conceivable piloted air force could match.

Neither we nor the Soviet Union have been idle on either the A- and H-bomb fronts or in the guided missile field. The recent series of United States tests in mid-Pacific brought American development of the H-bomb to frightening pitch. We know, too, that the Russians have exploded an H-bomb device.

Yet, horrifying as the prospect is that these developments offer, the real possibility of intercontinental warfare featuring guided missiles with atomic or hydrogen warheads is even worse. And, according to a recent report by the columnists Joseph and Stewart Alsop, that possibility has been greatly enhanced.

They contend that the advance in H-bomb techniques, involving a much wider area of central target destruction, brings much closer the day of effective devastation by intercontinental rockets. The principal difficulty up to now has been their probable inaccuracy, since with only atomic warheads the total destruction area would be much smaller and the likelihood of missing targets far greater.

Whether or not it is true, as contended, that the Russians have made substantial progress in guided milles, we can all understand the intense necessity for keeping up in this field ourselves. There can be no comfort in an H-bomb stockpile if the Soviet Union should one day gain the capacity to destroy our cities without sending a plane aloft.

The meaning of intercontinental war with H-bomb rockets is almost beyond comprehension. We are told by our experts we could not stop more than 30 percent of the enemy's giant bombers in raids delivering the nuclear bombs. Our chances of intercepting missiles traveling at supersonic speed are believed far smaller.

Since such missiles might be launched from relatively small sites, we might find it exceedingly difficult to attack the rocket launchers at their source and thus snuff out the enemy assault. If an enemy had marked superiority in rocket weapons, the devastation visited upon us might be so tremendous we could never get our plan of massive retaliation founded on bomb-delivering conventional aircraft into operation.

Our course is clear. We must have equality or superiority in guided missiles. We must let the Soviet Union know, in a general way, what we have. For we do not want them blundering into a campaign of mutual annihilation through ignorance of our power to strike back.

The power of hydrogen explosives combined with the ability to lift that force across the oceans to unseen targets represents just about the ultimate in warfare. We and all our friends must do all we can to make the whole world understand—including the Communists—the insane futility of the global suicide this portends.

A Glorious Fourth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELIZABETH KEE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 1, 1954

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I should like to include an editorial from my hometown newspaper, the Bluefield Daily Telegraph, of Bluefield, W. Va., for June 30, 1954. This very fine editorial entitled "A Glorious Fourth," follows:

To Americans today, the Fourth of July should be an occasion for rededication to the spirit that created this Nation. Whether it is that is open to some question. Certainly, it is not easy to strike so deep a note in a nation of 160 million people with any festival, any celebration.

Who would say that this holiday, formerly the favorite national holiday of the American people, has come close to it in recent years?

The attitude of the American people was different in former years—and the difference is reflected in the casual manner in which this day is referred to compared to the florid forensics of earlier times. The most common appellation is "the Fourth of July." Occasionally it is referred to as "Independence Day."

But in an earlier generation, Americans who were not ashamed to flaunt their love of country and their pride in the rising young Republic, laced their name for it with rapture. For them it was "the glorious Fourth."

Why glorious? A generation that rarely speaks of glory must ask first of all what the founders of the United States meant by the word. The answer is clear: The Fourth of July was sacred to the freedom won with the blood of patriots in the War of the Revolution. It stood for the steady wisdom of statesmen, the unbounded courage of soldiers, the endless sacrifices of plain men and women. It stood for the triumph of the ideals set forth in ringing terms in the Declaration of Independence.

Americans still hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are born free and equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these rights are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, and that to insure these rights governments were instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed. But we have lost something of the almost ecstatic faith that was once American.

That is a good thing for Americans to think about on Fourth of July, 1954. True, our ideals have been perverted in many countries and used to enslave men instead of make them free. But the passionate conviction of the dignity of man and his right to liberty is still alive. The most powerful despotism in history cannot stop it forever—perhaps not for long. If Americans hold true to that faith and the cause of freedom this too will be a glorious Fourth.

The Forgotten Majority

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 1, 1954

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following editorial from the Standard-Times, New Bedford, Mass., of June 28, 1954:

The Forgotten Majority

The Agriculture Committee of the House of Representatives, after several hours of closed debate, has approved a measure which would extend for another year the high, rigid price supports on six basic crops. The vote was 26 to 2 in favor of continuing to support, at 90 percent of parity, the so-called basic crops of corn, cotton, wheat, rice, peanuts, and tobacco.

Parity is a Federal standard designed to give farmers a fair return on their products in relation to the costs of the goods they must buy.

Representative Clifford R. Hope, Republican, of Kansas, committee chairman, said the measure was "the best possible bill that could be secured at this time." The obvious question which comes to mind is, "The best possible bill" from whose point of view?

Certainly it is not the best possible bill in the view of the President or the Secretary of Agriculture. President Eisenhower has opposed strongly rigid price supports; he has made it clear he seeks a more flexible system to obtain production adjustments that will eliminate the present costly surplus situation. Specifically, he has asked for a sliding-scale program, ranging between 75 and 90 percent of parity, and Secretary of Agriculture Benson has indicated consistently his approval of this method of approach.

Certainly, it is not the best possible bill from the standpoint of the consumer. Rigid artificial supports hold up the prices he must pay for food, regardless of whether demand decreases, supply increases, and his purchasing power goes up or down. Rigid supports foster an economic vacuum, in which protected products and their prices bear no relationship to any other aspect of American economy. They encourage overproduction, eliminate the healthy competition of free enterprise and, as in the instances of butter and eggs, fill Government warehouses with unused foodstuffs priced so high no one will buy them.

The American public would be proportionately healthier if it had eaten the eggs and butter the Government now holds in storage. Fully as important, the American economy would be healtheir.

The people who pay the bill for this artificial farm price structure will disagree with Congressman Hope. Taxpayers know it would be pleasant for businesses if all could be subsidized so they would make money whether or not anyone bought their products; but it would wreck the national economy.

Apart from those who derive their income from production of the six basic crops, and apart from those Members of Congress who hope farm-belt ballots will return them to office in November—who else thinks this is the best possible bill?

Fourth National Academy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 1, 1954

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include herewith an editorial entitled "Fourth National Academy," which appeared in the June 22, 1954, issue of the Owensboro Messenger, of Owensboro, Ky.

The editorial is as follows:

Fourth National Academy

The Foreign Service, often called the first line of defense, will get its own academy for the education and training of its Foreign Service officers, though it won't be under one roof like the military academies at West Point, Annapolis, and the new Air Force school. Instead, Foreign Service "cadets" will be drawn from students who finish their second college year, but their schooling will be at the country's expense as juniors and seniors.

This recommendation, to bring new blood into the Foreign Service by providing 470 training scholarships for upper classmen who will immediately pass into the Foreign Service after passing their examinations, is the most radical change proposed by a committee headed by Dr. Henry W. Wriston, president of Brown University, for the recommendation of the State Department and the Foreign Service of the United States.

The plan also envisages the integration of some 1,300 Foreign Service officers with 1,440 State Department officials and 1,200 members of the Foreign Service staff corps into an expanded Foreign Service and revitalizing it through training at the Foreign Service Institute, much as the War College keeps the military abreast of the latest developments in strategy, tactics, and weapons. The plan should encourage better talent to come into the Foreign Service, increase its prestige, and develop national sentiment by nationwide recruitment.

Tomorrow's Millionaires

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES W. TRIMBLE
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 1, 1954

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, Sally Ann Putnam, of 5606 Collins Lane, Fort Smith, Ark., 14-year-old daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Ed Putnam, is one of the brightest young people in our State. Here is the graduation address which she gave at the graduation exercises of her ninth-grade class, May 28, 1954. To me it is an inspiring example of the Christian outlook; and, coming from one so young is certainly a challenge to us all. We are proud of Sally Ann and her classmates. We hear so much of juvenile delinquency that this thoughtful address comes like a breath of fresh air. Our young people are still all right.

The address follows:

Tomorrow's Millionaires

(By Sally Ann Putnam)

Ours is a land of 160 million people, bound together in the adventure of living, embarked upon the exploration of the future, bound together by a love of freedom. This is a world of enterprise where the imagined better living is never impossible of attainment.

When the Founding Fathers established our Nation, they searched the records of the ages to discover what kind of world men had hoped, dreamed, and lived for through centuries. This discovery still lives in seven immortal words: Life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

If we live the life I shall tell you about it will bring liberty and happiness.

By conscious thought, direction, emotion, and training one can improve his whole reaction to life. Thoughts and emotions that are good to live with can be selected just as conscientiously and deliberately as old china is gathered, or quaint foreign silver, or oriental rugs, or delightful books, or precious jewels.

One can conscientiously select and choose the thoughts with which he will live, and which are going to determie the color he presents to the world and to himself. One cannot altogether determine what shall he put in his mind in the course of a day, but it is part of every person's business in life to determine what shall stay in his mind, and to decide that only that shall stay which makes his life advance definitely to something larger and finer.

Everyone has a kingdom. Your kingdom is your inner being, the kingdom of mind and soul. To build this kingdom of life involves finished thinking, asking questions, pressing past the easy stopping places. It involves thinking the entire length of the line from end to end. It includes hindsight, foresight, and insight. To direct life in this way is to direct it creatively.

Life offers no greater pleasure than that of surmountng difficulties, passing from one step of success to another, forming new wishes and seeing them gratified. He that labors in any great or laudable undertaking has his fatigue supported by hope, and afterward rewarded by joy.

There are usually two things which every individual wants out of life. He wants to feel satisfaction with life as an experience with himself as a personality.

He also wants success: Most people think of success as the achievement of reaching the top of the business world, or the top of some other field of work and making a large sum of money, but what is success? To develop the soul in greatness; that is success. To build up a personality of value, a personality that is brave, pure, true, beautiful, and strong; that is success. To choose the highest for one's aim, and be true to the great aspiration through all the stress and strain of life; that is success. An ambition that is never satisfied with what has already been attained but strives on for a still greater fulfillment of life; that is success.

What? You've already lost interest? Griping about what a hard life you've had? You can't see anything but failures on the road ahead?

Listen. Another sign of success is to learn to laugh. A good laugh is better than medicine. Attend to your own business; few people can do that well. Say kind things; nobody ever resents them. Avoid hasty remarks; they cause much of the world's troubles. Stop grumbling; see some good in the world and keep the bad to yourself. Hide aches with a smile; nobody is much interested anyway. Learn to laugh; it pays.

So count your assets. How will you live your life today? If you have a clear conscience and are healthy; if you have three good and true friends and a happy home, if your heart has kept its youth and your soul its honesty—then you are one of tomorrow's millionaires.

Winthrop Children Participate in Salk Polio Trials

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 1, 1954

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following splendid editorial from the Winthrop Transcript, Winthrop, Mass., June 24, 1954:

A Richly Deserved Tribute

We noted with no little pleasure this week that the 680 Winthrop children who participated in the recent Salk polio trials are to be treated next week at parties in their respective grammar schools.

Not that an ice cream and cake treat comes anywhere nearly adequately rewarding these tots for the part they played in the test of the new serum, but it is at least some recognition of the fact that they willingly offered themselves in this necessary and, perhaps, momentous test.

True, there was no risk involved since the vaccine was thoroughly tested for its safety, but undoubtedly many participants and their parents undertook the tests with some mental reservations. And how many of us, even adults, relish an injection, even of the simplest sort?

This fact alone should win for the 680 test volunteers a sincere vote of thanks from each and every one of us.

And should these Salk vaccine trial unlock the door to the eventual cure of poliomyelitis, the entire world and all generations to follow will have just cause to venerate the names of this brave little army of volunteers.

Embattled Farm Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. RHODES
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 1, 1954

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted by unanimous consent, I wish to extend my remarks and insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following article which appeared in the June 14, 1954, edition of the Freeman entitled "Embattled Farm Prices":

The Federal Government is supporting prices of basic farm commodities at 90 percent of parity to help win the war. What war? Why, World War II against the Axis Powers, of course—Germany, Japan, Italy. The idea is—to use a phrase popular when hostilities started—that "food will win the war and write the peace." Therefore, we must have lots of food; to do that, we must guarantee high Government price supports in order to encourage production.

Do you think World War II is over? Do you think Soviet Russia is no longer an ally and Japan, Italy, and West Germany no longer enemies? Have the soldiers of that war come home, gone to school, married, had children? Well, maybe so. But the war goes on for the congressional farm bloc. It is fought in every little Washington foxhole; legalistic blood flows copiously as the heroes march relentlessly out of the cloakrooms. It is an endless war, a desired war, a war which holds up the price of food.

This is no exaggeration. It is part of the historical record. We did not get Government price supports at 90 percent of parity until we entered the war, and those supports were expected to go off soon after the war ended.

The parity concept was first employed in the Second Agricultural Act (1938) as an aid to agriculture somewhat similar to the unemployment-insurance device used for urban workers. But the support, varying with different crops, was well under 90 percent. Then came World War II and the Anti-inflation Act of 1942.

A bitter battle developed in Congress over this act. Farm bloc representatives wanted to get the cost of farm labor included in the computation of parity prices, a move which would have meant higher price ceilings. The Roosevelt administration fought this agrarian drive. At the showdown a compromise was effected—the farm bloc withdrew its cost of labor agitation and the administration agreed to boost the price-support level to 90 percent. The bill pointedly stated such rigid high supports were to continue until only 2 years after the end of the war.

High, rigid support levels should have expired December 31, 1948. But they didn't. Instead, Congress passed the Agricultural Act of 1948 which continued the 90 percent support level on basic crops until June 30, 1950. After that, said Congress, we'll put in a sliding scale of supports—when our supplies are small, we'll raise the supports; when our supplies are excessive, we'll lower the supports. The scale was from 60 to 90 percent of parity.

Next came the Agricultural Act of 1949. That kept the 90 percent of support level but provided that, in 1952, the sliding scale would go into effect—from 75 to 90 percent of parity, not 60 to 90 percent as in the 1948 act. This 1949 measure included the cost of labor in computing parity—that precise point on which the farm bloc had compromised in order to get 90 percent of parity supports back in the early World War II days.

At the start of 1952 former President Truman, who knew an election year when he was in one, came out for repeal of the sliding scale provision. And, in July, he received and signed a bill which again pushed back the year for introduction of the sliding support scale—until 1955. He rejoiced over the maintenance of the 90 percent support level, saying it "should help greatly to assure high farm production." It did, devastatingly.

The results are appalling. Raw materials pile up, unconverted into finished goods. Storage costs to the Government mount daily. Prices remain high. There is enough wheat piled up under Government price supports to provide the average American family with 1,000 loaves of bread; there is enough corn to provide 4 months' supply of pork and pork products; there is enough cotton to make 88 shirts or 72 housedresses for each family. And, in order to maintain the program, the farmer is restricted in the amount of land he can plant to such crops as wheat and corn.

Throughout this sorry history one fact is clear: Congress has acknowledged the principle of sliding scale support prices, but invariably put off the day they should go into effect—first to 1950, then to 1952, and finally to 1955. Thus there has been a kind of academic recognition of the fact that World War II is over, but a resolute reluctance to take off the uniform.

Rescissions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 1, 1954

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following table showing rescissions effected to date in connection with appropriation bills for the fiscal year 1955 in the amount of $1,057,100,000.

This table is, of course, supplemental to the table appearing on page 8945 of the RECORD showing reductions in appropriations in the amount of $1,465,780,812:

Rescissions, 1955 bills

Defense:	
Procurement and production, Army	$500,000,000
Stock funds:	
Army	300,000,000
Navy	200,000,000
Marine Corps	25,000,000
Air Force	25,000,000
Total stock funds	550,000,000
Total defense	1,050,000,000
Independent offices:	
Housing and Home Finance Agency, defense housing	$4,500,000
Veterans' Administration:	
Soldiers' and sailors' civil relief	500,000
Vocational rehabilitation revolving fund	400,000
Total Veterans' Administration	900,000
Total independent offices	5,400,000
Interior:	
Bureau of Reclamation, construction and rehabilitation, Missouri Basin project, Missouri diversion unit	1,700,000
Total	1,057,100,000

A Progress Report on Spanish-American Cooperation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS S. GORDON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 1, 1954

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following report by our Ambassador to Spain, the Honorable James Clement Dunn, that appeared in the Department of State Bulletin of June 21, 1954.

I believe it gives an accurate summation of facts concerning Spanish-American cooperation:

A PROGRESS REPORT ON SPANISH-AMERICAN COOPERATION

(By James Clement Dunn, Ambassador to Spain [1])

One year ago, shortly after my arrival in Spain as Ambassador, I had the pleasure of being with you here in this industrial and shipping metropolis of Spain, the beautiful city of Barcelona, and had the privilege of addressing this unique and outstanding organization, the American Chamber of Commerce in Spain.[2]

Since then, I have learned from personal observation a great deal concerning your constructive activities, not only here in Barcelona, but also in Madrid, Seville, Bilboa, and Valencia.

It is a source of satisfaction to me as an American that, among approximately 4,000 members, 90 percent are Spaniards, and I am honored as an American that so many important Spanish businessmen participate in the American Chamber of Commerce in Spain.

I also should like particularly to compliment the American Chamber of Commerce in Spain on its excellent publication, Spanish-American Trade, which, with its handsome color photographs and its many informative articles in both Spanish and English, is a thoroughly worthwhile magazine devoted to international commerce.

When I spoke with you last year, the Governments of Spain and the United States were still engaged in negotiations with re-

---

Footnotes at end of speech.

gard to the establishment of a new relationship between each other. On September 26 were signed the military and economic agreements betwen Spain and the United States,[3] and since then we are embarked on a path of joint cooperation mutually desired by both countries. Among the lasting effects of these agreements of direct interest to the American Chamber of Commerce is the path they open for greater association between the Spanish and American people and the possibility of increased trade and closer business relations.

ALLOCATIONS UNDER ECONOMIC PROGRAM

From time to time during the past months, I have taken advantage of opportunities such as this one tonight, to make a brief progress report on the work that has been accomplished in the carrying out of this new relationship between Spain and the United States. I am gratified to be able to state to you that we are moving steadily ahead in both the economic and military programs.

A short time ago it was announced that the final determination of the broad categories recommended to the United States Foreign Operations Administration for allocation of funds under the economic program had been completed. These recommendations have had constantly in mind the objective on the part of both the Spanish and United States authorities involved of accomplishing the greatest good for all of Spain and its people.

The funds devoted to economic aid totaling $85 million will be devoted to financing imports into Spain of a multitude of things that are regarded as of primary importance to the overall economic development of the country, as well as to the provision of technical assistance in various forms. It is hoped that this technical assistance will not only provide an exchange of knowledge in scientific, technical, and industrial methods and techniques that will have an immediate and favorable impact on the economy, but will provide a sound basis for the long-range continuing economic development of the country.

Perhaps I can give you a better understanding of how this year's $85 million will be used if I try to give you a general picture of what these funds are intended to accomplish in the various segments of the Spanish economy to which they will be devoted.

For instance, the largest single general category of expenditures will be industrial raw materials. Almost $31 million will go to finance imports of such vitally needed materials as nonferrous metals, cotton, steel products, ferrous scrap, crude rubber, sulfur, etc. Increased production is the key to lower prices and higher living standards, and all of these raw materials, together with others that Spain will be providing from her own resources, will go into Spanish industrial production.

Agricultural production is likewise expected to benefit from the program, and about $8½ million has already been programed for agricultural machinery and equipment of various kinds. These imports will include: machinery for land reclamation and irrigation projects and certain well-drilling equipment; tractors, and other land tillage and harvesting machinery for the farmer; as well as some equipment in connection with reforestation programs.

The importance of providing a larger and a steadier supply of electric power to Spanish industry and Spanish homes is apparent to all. Approximately $12½ million will be devoted to this purpose. Five million dollars of this amount will provide equipment and materials urgently needed to get certain existing powerplants or power installations now being constructed into full production at the earliest moment. The balance of approximately $7½ million is to be devoted to the financing of certain completely modern thermal powerplants in key locations in Spain.

The Spanish railroads are to receive approximately $11 million. This program of rehabilitation and modernization will provide a wide range of material and equipment and should be of great benefit to those portions of the transportation system to which it is applied.

The steel industry, the products of which play so important a role in any economy, is to receive aprpoximately $8 million, about half of which will go toward increasing production of steel products, largely sheet steel and tinplate, to both of which categories Spain now has to devote substantial amounts of her foreign exchange earnings.

Spanish coal mines are to be assisted in their program of modernization by the provision $2 to $2½ million for urgently needed equipment. It is expected that this investment will result in a sufficient increase in coal production to more than pay for itself in a very short time by reducing the necessity for coal imports.

The Spanish highway program, and the extensive hydraulic works programs, so essential to Spain's water supply and irrigation plans, will together receive about $5 million in heavy construction equipment.

The cement industry is another essential element in the economy and will receive approximately $4 million. About half of this sum will be devoted to the provision of machinery and equipment to increase the efficiency and production of existing Spanish cement plants, and the balance will provide a new plant of the most modern design.

Various factories important to the defense of Spain, as well as to the civilian economy, will be provided with machine tools to the amount of $1 million; and Spain's civil air transport will be assisted in its plans for safe and efficient service by imports of about three-fourths of a million dollars in ground control equipment.

It is expected that the first phase of an intensive program of technical assistance will require about $1 million of this year's funds.

OFFSHORE PROCUREMENT

Besides the above program of direct aid under immediate consideration, there is also the opportunity now being developed for Spain to participate to an increasing degree in the offshore-procurement program. This program, generally speaking, is designed to assist the economies of friendly Western nations by allowing them to participate in supplying various items for military use in the defense of Western Europe. Contracts negotiated under this program are to be paid for in dollars and in this way will benefit Spain's foreign-exchange situation as well as increase its industrial potential to the extent that Spain participates in the program.

A Spanish firm obtained last year 1 contract in the amount of $2.8 million, and there are now under active consideration bids of other Spanish concerns for further contracts totaling a considerably larger amount. For instance, already, according to recent news from the United States military headquarters in Germany, Spain is about to receive an additional contract for nearly $2 million worth of munitions.

Incidentally, in line with this same program, Spain has furnished the American Army Quartermaster Corps during recent months fresh fruit and vegetables worth nearly $500,000. Such a hopeful start gives us a reasonable expectation that Spain will continue an increasingly successful participation in this important economic development.

Cooperation between Spain and the United States does not stop with the fulfillment of these commitments. Recently, the 2 Governments arrived at an understanding whereby Spain would be able to obtain approximately 300,000 tons of wheat, to be paid for in pesetas, which in turn would be spent in Spain by the United States Government to defray part of the cost of base construction and other United States expenses in Spain.

Of the greatest interest, however, is the matter of trade. I honestly believe that there is no part of United States foreign economic policy which has been given such painstaking study during the past year as that of trade. A month ago an important trade mission interested primarily in agricultural commodities visited Spain for 4 days, examining carefully different phases of United States-Spanish trade. They were cordially received by the Spanish Government and by the businessmen they met in Spain, both in Madrid and here in Barcelona. This trade mission left no doubt about the importance the United States attaches to the need for the United States to increase its imports as well as its exports. This emphasis on their part is in complete harmony with President Eisenhower's message to Congress on this subject delivered on March 30,[4] in which he not only stated that it was in the national interest to obtain the highest level of trade as well as the most efficient use of capital and resources, but recommended to the Congress that it enact legislation which would renew the Trade Agreements Act and allow for further reduction of tariffs pursuant to negotiations; that customs simplification legislation be enacted; that the present Buy American laws be modified; and that other steps be taken to make it easier for the United States to import. Moreover, the President just last week, in his proclamation of World Trade Week, declared that "the growth and prosperity of the nations of the free world depend to a significant degree upon the continued expansion of the exchange of their goods and services in world markets."[5]

EXCHANGE PROGRAM

A most useful byproduct of the new relationship between Spain and the United States is the exchange of visits by leaders in the fields of both commerce and defense. Recently the Minister of Commerce, Don Manuel Arburua, that very able and distinguished gentleman who is with us here tonight and who has had a long and fruitful association with this Chamber, made a most successful visit to Washington as well as a tour of business and industrial centers throughout the United States. I am sure that the associations he formed there will contribute substantially toward the development of trade prospects for both Spain and the United States.

Likewise, the Minister of Air, Gen. Gonzalez Gallarza, has just had a most useful official visit which included conversations with his American military colleagues as well as an inspection of important American military sites.

We look forward this fall to the visit of the Minister of Agriculture, Don Rafael Cavestany, in connection with our important mutual interest in the field of agriculture. Just as it has been most helpful for prominent Americans to come here and learn at first hand about Spain, so is it to our mutual advantage that distinguished Spanish leaders should exchange views at first hand in Washington and become closely acquainted with the United States.

With regard to the military agreements, I am glad to report that we are making steady progress. Equipment for the Spanish armed forces—army, navy, and air—continues to arrive and, as the program develops, should substantially increase the defense effectiveness of Spain. Early this month, the people of Barcelona saw some of the latest type of jet training planes unloaded in the port en

---

Footnotes at end of speech.

Footnotes at end of speech.

route to Talaveral la Real. The program for the construction of military facilities is also gaining momentum. It is expected that the time-consuming planning and design stage will be sufficiently far advanced by this summer to permit the actual construction of certain of the projects to be started in early autumn. The managing contractor firm which was selected late in January has made its preliminary engineering, equipment, and organization studies, and its representatives have been in Washington recently to consult with the Department of Defense. The first construction will be at Zaragoza and Torrejon by midsummer. As you know, the maximum practical use will be made of the Spanish construction industry as well as Spanish labor, always with due regard for the necessities of the Spanish economy.

In closing this progress report which I have been privileged to make to you tonight, I wish to emphasize, and to ask you to take with you, a conception of the long distance we have traveled along the path of the new Spanish-American relationship established since I spoke with you last year here in Barcelona. Viewed day by day, we often tend not to realize the advance we have made. The understanding between Spain and the United States is no fly-by-night or hastily conceived policy. It is a partnership carefully considered and entered into in full faith by two sovereign peoples, each with high respect for the other and a confident knowledge that both fully comprehend the nature and intent of the foreign aggression which menaces the free world. In carrying out the agreements reached last year, we have already established a spirit of cooperation that augurs well for the future. By increasing our military and economic strength, we not only contribute to oun own security but also to that of the Western World and to the attainment of world peace.

---

[1] Address made before the American Chamber of Commerce at Barcelona, Spain, on May 25.

[2] For text of Ambassador Dunn's address of June 16, 1953, see Bulletin of June 29, 1953, p. 913.

[3] Ibid., Oct. 5, 1953, p. 435.

[4] Ibid., Apr. 19, 1954, p. 602.

[5] Ibid., May 24, 1954, p. 801.

The Eagle or the Oyster?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD H. REES

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1954

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent granted me by the House, I am enclosing a short editorial from Service Magazine entitled "The Eagle or the Oyster?" It is written by Mr. Merle Thorpe. Mr. Thorpe recently retired as editor of the Nation's Business after having served for 30 years with that magazine.

The editorial follows:

For a people—

Who elect opportunism rather than opportunity, who dream of security rather than success;

Who believe political charity is a virtue;

Who mock the frugal and plunder the thrifty;

Who adopt the rule that if I don't succeed you are to blame, that what you have is as much mine as yours;

Who contend that property is a shameful sign of success;

Who whimper that failure is the nobler cause; well-being is wicked; prudence, out of date; sacrifice, silly—for such a people a fitting emblem is the oyster.

For a people—

Who faced nature in the raw, with privation the rule and hardihood a virtue;

Who endured defeat, disease, and disaster for a hundred years in order to get a foothold on the eastern seaboard, the while with one eye on the interior, a no-man's land, a cockpit for settling international rivalries and private grudges, disputed by wild animals and wilder redmen;

Who sacrificed thus for a belief in the worth and dignity of the individual;

Who believed that economic freedom was as important as political freedom;

Who substituted "In God we trust," for the Old World motto "In government we trust";

For a Nation built by men who dedicated their lives to acheve the realization of these beliefs.

I give you, fellow citizens, the eagle.

The Bryson Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 1, 1954

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include in the Appendix of the Record a petition from the city of Alexandria, Va. The citizens who signed this petition urge support of the Bryson bill, and at their request I ask that they be so recorded.

The petition follows:

We, citizens of Virginia, urge passage of bill H. R. 1227, to ban advertisement of alcoholic beverages from interstate commerce both in public and common or private carriers, and over the air.

We feel that passage of the bill and enforcement of the act will give better protection to our homes, insure greater safety on the highways, and will help to make our Nation strong.

Rev. O. L. Harrup, Everett W. Reeves, Carlton D. Bennett, Mary E. White, J. L. White, Cola C. Kent, Mr. S. C. Burnell, Jr., Dorothy E. Burnell, Joan Elaine Morris, Janet L. Raynes, Mary V. Hardbower, Mary Katherine Harrup, Wendell C. Hodges, Charles E. Priest, William M. Posey, Mrs. Harry L. Penn, Rev. Harry L. Penn, Mr. Marvin L. Deitz, Mrs. Marvin L. Deitz, Mrs. Edward Christine, J. Thos. Allen, L. Roy Hawkins, Mrs. Harvey Fox, Mrs. Esther Raynes, R. L. Raynes, Josephine M. Rose, Gordon G. Rose, Patricia A. Posey, Phoebe E. Rau, Edith Bayer, John Bayer, Violet Reeves, Mae Fear, W. E. Fear, D. W. McCulley, Mrs. D. W. McCulley, E. T. Priest, C. F. Gardner, H. B. Gardner, A. W. Schuh, Mrs. L. R. Hawkins, Mrs. Evelyn Schuh, Mamie A. Garner.

Ethel I. Hodges, Miss Patricia Rawlett, Miss Mary E. Inscac, Mrs. Kathryn Bowsher, Mrs. Esther Harrup, Mrs. Ruth Thomas, Miss Ruth Shiflett, Liz Luter, June E. Sutherland, Elmer E. Sutherland, Harvey W. Fay, Mrs. R. E. Patterson, R. E. Patterson, Mrs. A. S. Lester, J. C. Gill, Bettie Gill, Mrs. Elizabeth Liner, J. E. Liner, Mrs. Mabel Roberts.

Mrs. Annie Tynee, John M. Potter, Edward M. Christine, Dorothy Potter, Mrs. Annie Dubarg, Florence M. Sills, Mrs. Paul Posey, Mr. P. L. Posey, Mrs. G. E. Walker, Mr. James Caloffard, H. E. Fuller, Mrs. Frances Barnett, Mrs. George S. Eckels, Mr. G. S. Eckels, Mrs. Roberta J. Priest, Mr. R. E. Fuller, Jr., Mr. Louis D. Hawkins, Mrs. Evelyn Hawkins, H. T. Brarch, Newton Shrum, Mrs. N. K. Shrum, Mr. Jesse E. Rawlett, Mrs. Jesse E. Rawlett.

Manpower: The Air Force's Headache

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 1, 1954

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I herewith include an article entitled "The Air Force's $2,000,000,000 Headache," which appears in the July 1954 issue of Air Force, the magazine of American airpower:

MANPOWER: THE AIR FORCE'S $2,000,000,000 HEADACHE

It happened in an advanced electronics course at Keesler Air Force Base, Miss. An airman was making himself quite a reputation as a brilliant student. The instructor supervisor, a major, came by one day to see for himself.

"You seem to have a genius for electronics," the major said after watching the airman for a while and asking him a few incisive questions.

"You've got a real future in the Air Force."

"Maybe so, sir," the airman replied "but I'm getting out as soon as my enlistment is up."

The major shook his head in resignation. "I suppose one of those civilian firms has already got to you," he said, referring to a practice among some manufacturers of keeping tabs on promising students and offering them jobs as soon as they can leave the service.

"No, sir," the airman retorted emphaitically. "I'm going back to selling real estate."

This case highlights many of the elements in the manpower problem the Air Force faces in the coming months. In fiscal year 1955, beginning this month, USAF expects to lose almost 200,000 people. The great majority are at the airman first class and staff sergeant level, skilled men who cannot be replaced overnight.

This represents the biggest exodus from the Air Force since the demobilization stampede of 1946. By particularly unfortunate timing, it occurs at the same time that the Air Force labors, under austere financing, to build our air strength to a point which will raise the odds on our national safety and lend authority to our international commitments. Yet this loss of skilled men and their replacement by individuals of lesser capabilities reduces the combat effectiveness of the Air Force.

The Air Force operates on a 4-year enlistment for its airman personnel, and it was just 4 years ago this month that USAF got the green light to expand its 48-group Air Force to mount the air war in Korea and strengthen our air units at home and on overseas bases.

Now with the Korean battles ended, or at least dormant, and with the Air Force not actually engaged elsewhere in a shooting war as of this writing, the first of the 1950 enlistee crop is eligible for discharge. Indications are that some 90 percent of this group has decided to get out of the service.

The task of minimizing the inevitable damage to the Air Force is shared by all its major commands. But the one primarily responsible for refilling the ranks with individuals as well prepared as they can be to take over the jobs of those who are leaving is the Air Training Command. This month ATRC observes its 11th anniversary, the appointment of a new commander, and assumption of a new mission.

ATRC was born on July 7, 1943, with the merger of the AAF's Technical and Flying Training Commands. Its new commander, fourth in its history, is Lt. Gen. Charles T. Myers, just back from the Northeast Air Command, who takes over this month following the retirement of Lt. Gen. Robert W. Harper, ATRC's commander since October 1948. ATRC's new mission is to take charge of all Air Force recruiting. (As of July 1, the Army-Air Force Recruiting Service was split up, although Air Force and Army continue to share joint examining and processing facilities.)

In terms of personnel strength, number of aircraft, and physical inventory, ATRC is USAF's biggest command. Its strength, currently in excess of a quarter million, consistently runs from 25 to 30 percent of the USAF total. It has 5,500 operational aircraft, of which some 2,200 are jets.

This considerable investment is the inevitable result of ATRC's mission to fill the Air Force's need for skilled personnel. It costs from $3,000 to $15,000 to give an airman formal training—most of it only to the apprentice level—and from $25,000 to $75,000 to train combat-ready pilots, observers, and other air crew members. It is with these figures in mind that Air Force Secretary Harold E. Talbott has, perhaps conservatively, placed the Air Force's loss in skills alone this year at about $2 billion.

What can the Air Force do to cut this loss? The obvious answer is to get more airmen to reenlist. If this could be done, the individual skill level would rise and, with only a small turnover each year, the training requirement would be considerably reduced.

In approaching this objective, USAF has attuned itself to the gripes of departing airmen and is seeking to make Air Force life more attractive and rewarding. Secretary Talbott has plunged into a vigorous defense of fringe benefits and an attack on shortsighted or unthinking actions at all levels of command which give cause to legitimate complaints.

But it will not solve the problem exemplified in the electronics genius who would rather sell real estate. Some personnel experts, while they applaud the Secretary's determination and praise the salutary effect it will have in handling of airmen, believe he has set for himself and the Air Force an impossible, frustrating task. No matter what the Air Force does to make service life more attractive, they believe new gripes will appear to replace the old ones.

In substantiating this view, they point to opinion polls which showed that a big segment of the American public was never sold on the principles of our intervention in Korea, and an even greater percentage is opposed to our getting involved in Indochina. In short, the public is not convinced, as the President and the Joint Chiefs of Staff appear to be, of the urgent necessity to develop and maintain a global Air Force, ready for immediate action.

In wartime no one, in uniform or out, argues about fringe benefits. Now, however, it seems almost everyone weighs the pros and cons of service in terms of personal gain instead of in terms of the serviceman's contribution to national defense. We are not in a war now, but there is every reason to believe that if war comes it will come on extremely short notice or none at all. In that event, the decisive air phase will be fought in a matter of days, or hours, with the men then in uniform. Hence the military's determination to build our strength-in-being and to keep alert.

To put this point across to the American public is far from simple, for Americans are weary after 15 years of war and crisis, and disillusioned that despite sacrifices of men and resources, we seem no closer to a peaceful world than before. But until the point is well understood, by men in the military establishment as well as by the general public, the Air Force will continue to experience difficulties in gaining and keeping qualified men.

In this national climate, characterized by a civilian economy that offers almost unlimited job and career opportunities, too many intelligent and enterprising youngsters—the ones the Air Force has and would like to hold—consider uniformed service restrictive and a waste of time.

They would rather sell real estate, or make refrigerators, or build roads than participate in what they visualize as a series of dry runs against a day whose catastrophic possibilities they would rather ignore, and they envy their civilian counterparts who have avoided or minimized their service tours.

It is no secret that among the Air Force's volunteers are many who chose the Air Force blue to lessen the danger of being shot at, and to acquire skills useful in civilian life rather than those valuable primarily on the battlefield. This, they felt, was worth the 4 years they would have to serve as Air Force volunteers rather than the 2-year tour as draftees. In one survey conducted during the Korean war, the USAF found that more than 60 percent of its volunteers chose the Air Force only as an alternative to less inviting military service. Now that the Korean war has ended, a higher percentage of American youth is willing to wait for the draft and a 2-year tour, gambling that we won't be involved in another shooting war during that period.

This choice of alternatives exists even among many aviation cadets, traditionally a select group who volunteer both for the Air Force and for flying training. The attrition, or washout rate, which normally runs from 20 to 25 percent, has gone above 50 percent in a recent class. The classes filled by AF-ROTC graduates who volunteered for flying training in order to qualify for commissions this spring may show an abnormally high attrition rate, too.

Normally these new lieutenants will spend almost a year in pilot training, followed by a 3-year active-duty tour, or 4 years in all. But many of them have discovered that, if they are eliminated from flying training, they are entitled to keep their commissioned status and yet are required to serve only 2 years on active duty.

FlyTAF has records on some AF-ROTC graduates who have developed a fear of flying after only a few minutes of dual instruction. Others have discovered physical defects that they withheld or ignored in earlier exams to qualify for commissions.

Those who take advantage of this loophole probably don't consider themselves unpatriotic or dishonest. They justify their actions to their own satisfaction and perhaps that of their friends on the basis that the Air Force wasn't entirely fair with them in its unilateral action to revise the AF-ROTC contract as they understood it.

The last-minute deal arranged between USAF and the Air National Guard to commission the rest of the 1954 AF-ROTC class who would otherwise have gone into service as airmen third class may also affect the attitude of those who applied for flying training in the belief that this was the only way they could get commissioned EAD. USAF has refused to permit them to accept the ANG agreement in place of flying training.

Worried about the high cost of high attrition, ATRC is seeking means to plug this loophole, possibly by having eliminees reduced to airman third class, but this would undoubtedly cause a new flood of criticism, particularly since it is often difficult to determine genuine reasons for elimination from simulated ones.

These are the circumstances under which ATRC takes on its newest mission, that of recruiting airmen, WAF, and aviation cadets for the Air Force. Despite the headaches in store, ATRC sought the job and accepts it readily because it is convinced that the recruiting function is an essential step in its job of preparing individuals for Air Force careers.

In its intra-command language, ATRC prefers the term selection to recruiting, which is indicative of the approach it would like to use with prospective airmen. Armed with up-to-the-minute information on priorities in each of its 200 training courses, ATRC's recruiters will theoretically seek out individuals qualified for training in the higher priorities; in any event, they will be unlikely to promise new recruits training in a field they know to be of relatively low priority. The result should be a smoother, better integrated reception for new Air Force personnel.

Under present conditions, however, this concept appears to be a luxury well beyond USAF's means. In fiscal 1954, with a recruiting goal of 100,000, USAF came up short by about 4,000. This year, even if ATRC "selects" every recruit it can lasso, it faces an almost impossible goal of more than 190,000, or an average of about 16,000 a month.

USAF recalls with bitter humor the men it lost early in 1953 when the administration's budget retrenchment forced a cut in recruiting quotas to 3,000 a month at a time when, according to the late Gen. Hoyt S. Vandenberg, then Chief of Staff, the USAF could have acquired 12,000 a month. The men it was forced to pass up then would be eagerly welcomed now, but by now most of them are irretrievably lost, having been swallowed up in America's tight manpower market.

What are the alternatives? Either the USAF will have to get along with fewer men, which, under present austerity standards, means sacrificing the 1957 goal of 137 wings, or—for the first time since World War II— it will have to resort to the draft.

Since 137 wings comprise a rock-bottom Air Force in the view of the Joint Chiefs, the draft seems the only alternative. This will relieve the pressure on one element of ATRC only to magnify it many times in its training programs.

But here at least ATRC is on familiar ground. In its 11-year history it has never had an opportunity to settle down to a predictable future. The result is that it has the experience and the confidence to adapt to constantly changing needs.

During the period of the Korean war ATRC not only expanded from 19 to a peak of 43 bases, but it achieved almost a complete turnover in its training programs to keep pace with United States Air Force's modernization. As an example, Sheppard Air Force Base, Tex., where ATRC trains mechanics for conventional aircraft, soared to a strength of more than 20,000 early in 1951. Today Sheppard's reciprocating aircraft courses are down almost to skeleton strength while Amarillo Air Force Base, Tex.—reopened in 1951 as an offshoot to Sheppard to train jet mechanics—is running close to capacity.

"ATRC is organized, staffed, and equipped better than ever before in its history," said one top staff officer in Washington recently. "They can't overcome entirely the loss of skill the Air Force faces this year, for skill is a combination of training and experience. If training alone could do it, we'd have no problems there. It's in the experience factor that we'll be hurting."

If its recruiters reliver 4-year men, ATRC need make only minor changes in its programs to turn out men qualified to fill apprentice level jobs throughout the United States Air Force. It is also prepared to assist other commands in speeding the upgrading of airmen through on-the-job training and special instructions by means of mobile training units.

These latter techniques will inevitably be expanded in the coming year because budget considerations will limit ATRC's formal training load to about 60 percent of new men entering the service. The remaining 40 percent will be assigned from basic training directly to helper level duties in operating units where on-the-job training will be provided to bring them up to apprentice and senior skill levels.

If, however, the United States Air Force must turn to the draft to meet its requirements, ATRC has ready at least two alternatives. The first is to offer formal technical training to 4-year-enlistment men only, funneling draftees directly from basic training to operating units for on-the-job training. Should some draftees later desire to enroll in tech courses, they would presumably have to agree to a 4-year enlistment first.

The second alternative, one which ATRC is already contemplating for some of the more complex career fields and those with high training costs, is to shred out the courses to train students only in certain phases of the field. For example, where it now takes 22 weeks to train an all-around electronics technician, ATRC would split the course into two or more sections of from 8 to 10 weeks each, which would turn out graduates qualified in only those phases of the work. One disadvantage of this plan is that two or more men would have to be assigned in teams to maintain the equipment. Another is that each shred-out skill would have to be identified with an additional letter or digit in the airman's AFSC, which would multpiply classification and other problems.

The advantages, of course, are that an individual could be trained at less cost and in shorter time, giving USAF more time to use his abilities. Another advantage noted by one ATRC officer is that civilian industry might not be as eager to entice away from the Air Force an individual trained in only part of a skill.

Whatever the restrictions that may be built into its activities, ATRC is confident that it has the know-how to work out ways to meet USAF's training needs.

In many other ways, too, ATRC is better prepared for its mission. As a result of a long and insistent campaign, it is now in on the earliest stages of development of new aircraft and equipment, both to remind designers and manufacturers that new materiel must be capable of being operated and maintained by individuals of average intelligence, and also to prepare training courses to teach the operation and maintenance of the equipment.

Both of these measures are more and more essential as the USAF progresses deeper into the electronic-supersonic air age. Until we develop hermetically sealed mechanisms that will function properly for the life of the equipment, we must rely on the average American youngster to maintain them. This youngster is capable of developing a high degree of skill in his job, but only if he gets a thorough background in it. Lead time in training is growing longer and longer. ATRC will have to start early if the Air Force is to have people available when the new materiel goes into operational use.

To keep pace with modern design of combat equipment, ATRC—working with the Air Research and Development Command and various manufacturers—is helping to develop training devices which make full use of American ingenuity to demonstrate the theory and techniques of handling our newest air weapons. What Ed Link pioneered in the way of flight simulators is now being duplicated for all aircrew assignments, and, in addition, special devices are being developed to cut through problems of troubleshooting and maintenance. These devices are also entering other fields of training in skills needed back of the flight line.

A good many problems remain to occupy the talents of ATRC's new commander. The instructor skill level isn't what it should be. ATRC still has need for more combat-experienced noncoms to teach in its tech courses—a problem it has pretty well licked in its flying and combat crew training courses.

In collaboration with ARDC's Personnel and Training Research Center at Lackland Air Force Base, Tex., ATRC continues to work on basic research designed to improve the ways in which it transfers information from instructor to student, and to seek more effective means to make people efficient.

To assist him in unraveling difficult problems, General Myers may call on his civilian advisory board, made up of 24 outstanding leaders in the fields of education, business, and industry, under its chairman, Dr. Samuel N. Stevens, president of Grinnell (Iowa) College. This board, which includes six committees to study and comment on aspects of ATRC's mission, was organized by General Harper. It is now preparing recommended solutions to problems presented to it by General Harper and his staff at its first joint meeting in April.

Despite its size, ATRC has a relatively small headquarters staff, numbering about 800 officers, airmen, and civilians. They are housed at Scott Air Force Base, Ill., one of ATRC's technical training bases, about 20 miles southeast of St. Louis and not far from 1 of the 3 recommended Air Academy sites at Elsah, Ill., near Alton.

From his headquarters in Yount Hall, named for the late Lt. Gen. Barton K. Yount, ATRC's first commander, General Myers and his staff exercise only policy and planning supervision over the command. Operational aspects are directed by ATRC's three Training Air Forces—FlyTAF, commanded by Maj. Gen. Gabriel P. Disosway, at Waco, Tex.; TechTAF, led by Maj Gen. Eugene L. Eubank, at Gulfport, Miss.; and CrewTAF, whose combat training specialists are under Maj. Gen. Charles F. Born, at Randolph AFB, Tex. The chart on pages 40–41 shows this organization in detail, together with the bases of each TAF.

This is the organization developed in the early days of the Korean emergency. "Training makes the difference," General Vandenberg often said in referring to our successes in the Korean air war, and ATRC has adopted that phrase as its unofficial motto. This accolade might lead to a complacent attitude about its training responsibility. ATRC prefers to regard it as assurance that it is on the right track and that it can carry on with full confidence in evolving still more effective techniques to prepare young Americans for Air Force careers.

Flag Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 1, 1954

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, Flag Day exercises were held at Independence Square in Philadelphia on Monday, June 14, under the auspices of the Philadelphia Flag Day Association, of which Judge Francis F. Burch is president. I was present on this occasion to receive the annual Leopold C. Glass citizenship award, and I was much impressed by the fine patriotic address of my good friend Brig. Gen. A. J. D. Biddle, and appreciate the permission granted to have it included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It follows:

ADDRESS BY BRIG. GEN. A. J. D. BIDDLE, SPECIAL ASSISTANT TO THE CHIEF OF STAFF, UNITED STATES ARMY, AT THE FLAG DAY EXERCISES, INDEPENDENCE SQUARE, PHILADELPHIA, PA., JUNE 14, 1954

We are gathered together here in this historic spot to honor our country's flag.

In honoring that flag—the symbol of our Nation—we are honoring our Nation itself. Even more profoundly, we are rededicating ourselves to uphold the ideals for which America stands. These are the ideals of truth, of justice, of individual liberty, of equality, of human dignity.

It is true that these ideals antedate the settlement of our country by many centuries. But throughout its existence, America has championed these foundations of human liberty. It has done so in spite of difficulties and dangers, in spite of the sometimes grievous cost.

As the history of nations goes, our history is a comparatively short one. But it has known its share of struggle. In fact, looking back over our Nation's past, it is the struggles, the crises, and the conflicts which most readily come to mind.

While we as a people stand for peace, not conflict, it is a good thing to remember our Nation's struggles. A nation's measure is not taken in its reaction to the even tenor of untroubled times. It is only in its reaction to challenge that any nation's true character, its essential quality, can be tested and proved with validity.

This very spot where we are gathered this evening serves as an eloquent reminder of the great deeds of our forebears. Independence Hall was the scene of the very birth of the United States as a separate political entity. This city of Philadelphia has known occupation by a hostile army. It has known battles in its outskirts. Not far from here, at Valley Forge, the Continental Army established a record of endurance and persistence which has rightfully become an epic of heroism and stamina.

Similarly, our flag recalls to our minds the many scenes of combat over which it has waved, the courage and self-sacrifice it has inspired, the challenges our country has met, the obstacles which have been surmounted, the perils which have been survived during the 178 years of our national existence.

Our history shows beyond question that we are a dedicated people, proving devotion to our ideals with deeds and sacrifice. Mere lipservice to a set of principles, however high-minded and noble, is not dedication. Dedication is the firm and unflinching adherence to principles in the face of difficulty and danger and trial.

Too frequently one hears our way of life pictured in terms of its many material advantages. I do not suggest that material advantages are undesirable or unimportant. But they are fruits, not roots. They are an effect, not a cause.

The cause is of the spirit. It is our basic conception of freedom and equality, together with our determination to implement that conception. It was not the high standard of living or the assembly line of volume production that created the United States or raised it to become a great force for good throughout the world. It was spiritual inspiration, stamina, and determination which enabled the people of our country to strive, as only free people can strive, to win independence, to protect that independence against the many dangers which threatened it, and to make an even better land for their successors to live in. Only those confident of the equality of opportunity, only those whose rights are founded on spiritual values, could be inspired with the initiative to work for better things.

That is why it is essential that we unceasingly make conscious efforts to guarantee those spiritual values. Such efforts constitute the greatest possible obstacle to any who may seek domination over their fellow men.

The danger to human freedom from power-mad, evil forces is by no means an empty one. It is a danger which has emerged repeatedly throughout history. But there is reassurance in the fact that there have invariably been men, dedicated to the right and determined to uphold it at whatever the cost, who have stood firm against the threat to liberty.

Such a threat, affecting the chance of peace and stability throughout the world, exists today. It is posed by men whose number is small but who are masters of vast strength, men who are chasing the chimera of world conquest.

They strive to achieve their wicked objectives in many ways.

In Korea and Indochina and Malaya, they have ruthlessly employed massive physical force against any who dared oppose them.

They have subtler, more insidious methods as well. Preying upon the fears aroused by their great military strength and their unmistakably sinister intentions, they try to sow dissension and suspicion among the peoples whom they have singled out as their victims. Their weapons are not limited to the rifle and the machinegun, the cannon and the atomic bomb. Their weapons include misrepresentation and falsehood and half-truth. With these, they would turn neighbor against neighbor, friend against friend.

It is not a new technique, but against people who allow themselves to fall victim to their doubts and misgiving, it has been an effective one. Fifteen years ago, in Poland, I saw this technique in operation. It was the tool of a different demagogue, a different aggressor, but its object was the same. I saw then how Nazi Germany played upon the fears of the nations of central Europe, sapping their ability to resist effectively when the Panzer columns began to roll. Later I saw this same technique at its eroding work upon France. I can tell you that wherever this evil tool is used, its greatest single ally is fear. For fear is the breeding ground of suspicion and mistrust. It preaches the text of surrender, of spineless acquiescence. It leads to the abandonment and denial of all the qualities which elevate and ennoble human life.

Where there is determination, there is no need for truth to fear falsehood, for liberty to fear tyranny. In Poland and France and wherever the dread blight of Nazi totalitarianism spread, there were men who, undismayed by their enemy's strategy of terror, rose up to defy and throw off the rule of their oppressors. The forces of freedom in the world today are not helpless. We possess means to counter the menace, great though it is. We have great material resources capable of being converted, if need be, to military uses. And since it is true that strength is only as potent as the ability and will to use it, if the need arises, our reservoir of spiritual strength endows us with a capability which is even more important than material resources. For that capability stems from the firm conviction that human beings are and of right ought to be free, from the unshakable belief in the dignity of the individual, in equality before the law and equality of opportunity, in liberty and justice for all.

Those are the qualities, the principles, the virtues if you like, which are symbolised in our flag.

We cannot, of course, rely solely upon our latent potentials, either material or spiritual. To meet the dangers of our time, as our forebears met the dangers of their own eras, we must develop our strength in both the material and spiritual senses. In some respects, the task which faces us is harder than any tasks which faced them. But if our responsibilities are greater, our resources are likewise greater. We have, after all, the added benefit of the record of their deeds. Thus each generation passes on to the next still deeper wells of inspiration.

We are, in fact, mounting unceasing guard against the inroads of tyranny. As a nucleus against possible future need, our Government is maintaining the largest armed forces in being which we have ever possessed except in time of war.

We do not stand alone in defense of the great cause of freedom. We have stanch allies who are ranged beside us. The combination of resources which has come into being has intensified our capabilities to defend against aggression and has contributed significantly to the security of the United States itself.

The collective security which has been developed is an instrument of enlightened self-interest. The bulwark against possible Communist aggrandizement which American forces have helped to erect in Europe and in the Far East helps to protect the territory of our allies, and it protects our own territory as well.

If aggression should occur, it is obviously to our national advantage to meet it as far as possible from our own shores. It is true that in this day of intercontinental bombers and mass-destruction weapons, the United States is within reach of air attack. But one of our great assets is in our outlying bases, from which our air forces can intercept and counter such attacks if they should be launched. At the same time, to retain these bases we must be able to defend them against the ground attack which an enemy, knowing their value to us, could surely be expected to direct against them. Thus, our forces overseas are direcely contributing to our security here at home.

It was my privilege to serve for a time at the Supreme Headquarters of the Allied Powers in Europe, the military organ of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. There I had the opportunity to work with the representatives of many great freedom-loving and democratic nations. I can say without reservation that the spirit of cooperation, of dedication to the common cause prevailing in that organization represents to me one of the soundest bases for hope in these difficult times.

The degree of alertness which we have developed is not being achieved without effort on the part of the American people. At times we find it necessary to subordinate personal plans and hopes to the common good so that we can meet the common need. But because Americans know that the material sacrifices we may make serve the interest of the spirtual welfare which is the root and foundation of our Nation's good, those sacrifices are not begrudged or shirked.

Americans have never begrudged or shirked their responsibilities and their duty when called upon—as they have been called upon more than once throughout our history. Our flag is a reminder of the fact that our people have not sought the easy way, that they have placed right before convenience.

In the record of Bunker Hill and Valley Forge, of Lundy's Lane and Lake Erie, of Buena Vista and Chapultepec, of Fort Sumter and Gettysburg, of St. Michiel and the Meuse-Argonne, of Bastogne and Anzio, of Corregidor and Okinawa, of Chipyong-ni and Heartbreak Ridge, there is a common denominator. That common denominator is indomitable courage and unflinching determination.

Nothing is free, and nothing worthwhile is cheap. From our forebears we have inherited a priceless birthright of freedom and justice and equality. We must fulfill the trust which has been passed on to us. We must preserve this heritage and pass it on to our successors, not only unimpaired, but enriched.

It is a challenging responsibility which faces us. But as a token of our great past and as a symbol of the eternal values of the spirit which it symbolizes, we have in our flag a promise for the future, not only of the United States but of humanity.

Inspired by the deeds of the courageous men and women who, under that banner, have gone before; armed with the ideals for which our Nation stands; and strong with the determination to uphold those ideals regardless of the personal cost, we can look to the future with courage and confidence.

Hospitalization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 1, 1954

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, substantial public service has been rendered our people over the past 14 years by one "Bill" W. H. M. Stover, resident of the District of Columbia and of Virginia. Attention is respectfully directed to the evidence recorded in the following excerpts taken from four documents of which he is the author.

In his capacity as president of Leadership Training Institute of the District of Columbia, he sponsors the Dale Carnegie and other leadership training courses in the District of Columbia and parts of nearby Virginia, Maryland, and West Virginia. His speech and human relations school with headquarters in the Dale Carnegie building at 14th Street and Pennsylvania Avenue NW., is one of the Nation's finest, in the field of adult education.

In his capacity as president of National Hospitalization, Inc., a Maryland Mutual, he heads one of the oldest hospitalization insurance companies in the business. As a direct result of his 14 years of association with this mutual company, and his pioneering experience with its District of Columbia fraternal predecessor company, he is one of the best informed accident and health insurance men in the industry today.

When Mrs. Oveta Culp Hobby caused H. R. 8356 and S. 3114 to be introduced into the House and Senate, in an effort to provide better and more adequate accident health insurance for our people, Bill Stover immediately volunteered his services without compensation.

Under date of March 25, 1954, he wrote Mrs. Hobby as follows:

> It has fallen to my lot, inadvertently perhaps, to contribute much to the early development and the sum total of our present knowledge and experience on the subject of prepaid medical and surgical hospitalization insurance.
>
> I hereby offer to serve as a member, or as a consultant, strictly on a voluntary and uncompensated basis. I want no pay. I wish only to serve. I believe sincerely that

> I can make some small contribution to the good work you seek to authorize through your bill. Please call on me if I can be of service without compensation. I shall gladly cooperate, testify or otherwise aid you, or the committees, on Capitol Hill.
>
> You may be interested in the attached treatise entitled "Hospitalization, the New Social Security." It was written in March 1941. As I read it today, it appears more profound, more basically true and more comprehensive than it did when I wrote it 13 years ago. (A copy also has been forwarded to the Senate and House committees holding hearings on your bill.)

Quotation is here made from that article written for Mr. B. C. Forbes, 13 years ago:

> Hospitalization is a comparatively new but rapidly expanding type of modern insurance. It seeks to provide for the unexpected, unbudgeted, and almost inevitable expense of hospital confinement resulting from accident or illness. So popular has hospitalization become that more than 5 million persons already are said to have provided this coverage for themselves and loved ones. Undeveloped, misunderstood, misrepresented, and abused, hospitalization has continued its rapid march to the fore until it is established today as a practical and fundamental necessity in every good insurance portfolio.
>
> In the early stages it was conceived as providing for those in the low-income brackets only. This misconception has long since been dispelled. Nothing is farther from the true facts today. Hospitalization, as it is being sold today provides for the executive, the professional man and the laborer alike—not only they, but their families as well.
>
> Hospitalization is rapidly reaching its place in the sun. The day is not far distant when, regardless of status in life, the man without such protection will be in the minority. That day cannot come too soon in America. When it arrives, one more great public service to humanity will become an accomplished fact. Meanwhile this writer pledges a life of service to help develop a national consciousness for the need of this popular development—hospitalization.

When public opinion and the press became rather hostile and abusive toward insurance people generally, Stover came to their defense in 8 pages of testimony prepared and delivered on April 15, 1954, to the Senate District Committee.

In his testimony he said:

> Defense is made of the insurance salesman, the insurance executive, and the health-insurance companies, all of which recently have been in the not-too-favorable limelight.
>
> Are all insurance people dishonest? Of course not. Yet, one could readily get that impression from the blanket indictments now being loosely made. With the bad publicity which accident and health-insurance people are now receiving, one might suppose that all insurance agents are deadbeats, crooks, and thieves, and that all insurance company officials are frauds, fakes, and swindlers.
>
> The truth is that men and women are the same the world over, whether they're in business, in politics, or in the professions. And furthermore, they don't change when they enter the insurance business. Most men of character are motivated by high principles and a reasonable code of ethics. And no one industry has a corner on citizens of integrity, truthfulness, and uprightness—any current philosophy to the contrary notwithstanding.
>
> Insurance companies are just as legitimate as banks. Insurance executives are just as ethical as bankers. Most legitimate insurance companies are manned by executives of character and reputation, just as are schools, and churches, and railroads. These men are subject to as much or more scrutiny and regulation. They operate within the law, as do their brother industrialists. They serve the community just as do the doctor, the lawyer, the butcher, and the baker, and with as much honor.
>
> Insurance salesmen are honest men. The insurance men I have known have been very high-class citizens. Generally speaking, they are just as honest, personable, and trustworthy as the representatives of any other commodity. Usually, the insurance man is more careful not to mislead, misstate, and confuse. He's under more painstaking personal sales supervision than salesmen in most industries. He sells a written contract. His misdeeds are readily uncovered. His commodity is subject to rigid State and Federal supervision, with severe penalties for violation.
>
> So I believe that your insurance agent generally is as honest as you are. He has your code of ethics, plus the insurance laws, to keep him straight. Generally, he's a typical businessman, of good character and reputation, worthy of the confidence of the business public which he serves.
>
> Insurance agents aren't all saints. By the same token neither are all policyholders lily white. In fact it has been my experience that the fraud factor in health insurance, abounds not so much among insurance agents, as it does among those holding or seeking health insurance policies.
>
> We're all vulnerable, and/or guilty, so let's face it. It's a known fact that we Americans are prone to consider any insurance company as fair prey for whatever the tariff will stand. Every day some pedestrian gets brushed by a car fender, goes home, gets into bed, and asks for $10,000 damages. Let a car fender get scraped, and watch the otherwise very ethical citizen, start immediately thinking in terms of repainting the car, adding a new top and having a motor overhaul, all at the expense of the insurance company. We're all guilty to some degree. There seems to be little ethics involved. The man who would not steal a dime, many times will try to mooch from the insurance company. And frequently he has little conscience on the point.
>
> Hospitalization is a relatively new industry. It has had its share of growing pains. Insurance department officials have had to learn and grow with the industry. Mistakes have been made, and for the most part, rectified. And in most instances, these were understandable, honest mistakes. This is the course of progress.
>
> Real putrefaction has existed, and still exists, today. Where the insurance department superintendent has knowingly and maliciously used his high office to harass, persecute, coerce, and destroy small pioneer health insurance institutions, there still is work to be done. And the quicker the job is accomplished, the better for all concerned.

In Stover's letter of testimony dated April 27, 1954, addressed to Senator ALEXANDER SMITH, chairman of the Senate Labor Committee, and to Congressman CHARLES A. WOLVERTON, chairman of the House Interstate Commerce Committee, he wrote as follows:

> In connection with these hearings you may wish to give consideration to the two primary problems with which any prepaid health insurance program is confronted, namely, age and hospital charges.
>
> Age is the first problem. Most hospital insurance plans deny benefits, in whole or in part, to persons in the higher age brackets. Just when they need it most, they are cut off by most companies.
>
> Persons are automatically canceled from participation in most health insurance plans at age 65. Some even cancel the contract at 60. And this practice isn't limited to profit-making companies selling individual contracts. Group contracts, including so-called nonprofit groups, are guilty of this inequitable treatment of our more mature citizens.
>
> There are a few companies which do not take such drastic steps. The policies of these companies, take into account the increasing hazard of increasing age, and adjust the indemnity and premium rates accordingly.
>
> The national hospitalization policy is such a contract. The new executive policy pays $15 per day for 90 days if the insured is confined to a hospital under the policy terms. Or if the insured elects to buy double indemnity coverage, then he merely doubles his premium rate and gets double the indemnity, or $30 per day for 90 days. He pays $35 per year single indemnity or $70 for double indemnity.
>
> In the national policy no one is ever excluded from participation because of age. He may join the plan at any age. After the policy is in force for 5 years, it becomes noncancelable. Thereafter, he may retain his protection so long as he lives and pays his premiums when due.
>
> The national policy pays an indemnity of $210 per week at any age. It provides, regardless of age, additional benefits including ambulance service at $20 per trip, $50 in case of nonhospital confining accident, one annual medical examination and one dental treatment at $10 each, and if he should meet with death accidentally his estate benefits by $2,000. And in case of maternity, the married female is provided with a flat $200 of indemnity for hospital and nursing expense.

Stover goes on to point out that the second health-insurance problem has to do with hospitals:

> The real health problem today is the high cost of hospital accommodations. The charge for a hospital room in most hospitals is so excessive that a long hospital confinement for the man of average income is practically impossible without charity or bankruptcy, or both.
>
> In 1940 a private hospital room was available for $4 per day. Rates are so increased today that the same room sells for $12. A private-room rate of $18 per day was recently announced by Freedman's Hospital, our local hospital for colored. The better private hospital rooms usually run $20 per day, plus extras. Anything less than $30 per day is inadequate to pay for hospital confinement and the services of a physician or surgeon.
>
> It is suggested that any investigation of health-insurance problems should very profitably embrace a study of why hospital charges are so very high and how this serious situation can be remedied. This is the real health-insurance problem. Any other problems are mere symptoms.
>
> We know that nursing care and other personal services are costly. We know that operating expenses have greatly increased. We know that modern hospital equipment costs real money and soon becomes obsolete. But why should the average hospital bed cost $20 per day in a small-town hospital like Havre de Grace, Md., for example? Why is this so, when you still can get a hotel room for $4 to $15, or get a fairly decent room with meals for $8 to $15 per day at the seashore or mountainside?
>
> There appears to be several possible solutions. In any event, a study of the hospital room rate structure might throw some light on the subject. Find a solution to the almost

prohibitive hospital room rates, and the health-insurance problem will almost solve itself.

One possible solution is suggested for consideration. Encourage hospitals to establish a better ward service with greater privacy. This could readily be done through provision of more and larger hospital areas, or wards. Individual canvas or other drapes around single beds, over iron rails, in canopy fashion, would give almost complete privacy, even in wards.

This arrangement would necessarily lack some conveniences and refinements, but it would, at least, assure that the average person needing hospital treatment could afford clean, safe hospital service.

One passenger rides on the pullman car at extra fare, plus surcharge for pullman seat. In the next car his neighbor rides in a chair-car for approximately one-half the amount. They both get to their destination in good shape. The only difference is the degree of service required. Why not do the same thing in a hospital?

It has been my lot to be associated for years with one of the little pioneer companies in the hospitalization field. Much of the classified experience in the field was established in our shop. Cost statistics and premium rates were established, as a measuring stick for the industry generally, during those initial days of trial and error operation. There were no classified figures and no established precedent. So we blazed new trails. Sometimes it was costly. Frequently there were headaches. But we forged ahead and paved the way for the present sound national health insurance contract.

If any little experience which we may have gained through the years of trailblazing can be helpful to your committee, please call upon me. Be assured of my willingness to serve, in any way that we may.

Unfair Cuts for Library of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 1, 1954

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following editorial from the Chelsea Record, Chelsea, Mass., of Tuesday, June 29, 1954:

FALSE ECONOMY

Economy on the Government level is much more than indiscriminate reductions of expenditures. Essentially, it requires wise spending and sound investments. Both these ingredients are lacking from the House of Representatives decision to cut the Library of Congress budget by $1,250,000.

The Congressional Library, established in 1800, ranks today as one of the greatest in the world. In the last 10 years alone, private individuals have donated personal papers and historic documents worth $6 million to the Library, which is widely used by scholars and laymen as well as by Congressmen and their research workers.

Despite the fact that demands upon the library are constantly increasing, the House voted to cut not only proposed increases in its budget but operating expenses as well. This means that the Library will have to cut back some of its present, and even profitable, operations.

The catalog card service, subscribed to by most libraries throughout the Nation, brought in a net profit last year of $1,037,000, which was paid to the United States Treasury. Its budget was slashed by $308,000. The Copyright Office turned over to the Treasury some $865,300 it collected in fees. Funds for this department were reduced by $100,000. Library salaries, already low, will have to remain at their present levels, meaning that some personnel will be forced to resign, because of the budget cuts.

This is not true economy, but rather a political gesture. Most Congressmen assume that their constituents are not concerned over the fate of this national library, one of America's greatest storehouses of culture. It is not true economy in view of the millions of dollars spent on porkbarrel legislation, or in view of the fact that the farm price support program costs more in one day than is spent by the Library of Congress in a full year.

Congress' Duty: End Farm Price Gouge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 1, 1954

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me the editorial appearing in the Philadelphia Inquirer of June 28, 1954, entitled "Congress' Duty: End Farm Price Gouge," is very appropriate to the present discussion, and I appreciate the permission granted to have it included in the RECORD. I am firmly in opposition to the high surplus, high price-support program, and I am supporting the 82½-percent amendment.

The editorial follows:

CONGRESS' DUTY: END FARM PRICE GOUGE

The sound, constructive effort of the Eisenhower administration to free the Nation from the costly and wasteful burden of high rigid farm price supports will come to a head in the House of Representatives this week, and shortly afterward in the Senate.

In both bodies the Committees on Agriculture have ignored the President's proposal and voted to recommend another year's extension of the rigid support system, binding the Government to buy wheat, corn, cotton, peanuts and rice at 90 percent of parity.

They voted, in effect, to continue high food prices for American dinner tables, high costs for taxpayers. They voted to encourage indefensible overproduction and the piling up of huge—and useless—surpluses.

These committee actions represent the stubborn determination of the farm bloc to maintain the glaring evils of the rigid support system. Their recommendations reflect a hard-boiled political attempt to deal with a problem that is of vital concern to all Americans, including farmers.

In the House both Republicans and Democrats who have the interests of the country at heart should set aside the committee proposal and put through the administration program for flexible supports to vary, as needs prescribe, between 75 and 90 percent. When the time comes, the Senate should follow suit.

The committee actions have been interpreted as snubs to the President and to Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson.

They were "snubs" for all the people of this country who have to buy food and clothing and pay taxes. And the time is overdue for their interests to have full consideration in Congress.

Does the Eisenhower farm program aim to wipe out reasonable aid for American farmers? Not a bit of it. Under flexible supports basic farm commodities will continue to be bought by the Government. The supports would move up to encourage production during times of low farm output and move down to discourage plantings in times of excess production.

There's the essential and important feature of this plan: it will hold down needless overproduction, which high rigid supports foster. So long as those high supports prevail, overproduction is inevitable.

We have got to get rid of the immense surpluses we already have. And that's almost a superhuman task. We have got to halt the sinful loss and waste, such as we've seen in stored butter. And we've got to have farm aid geared, to some extent at least, with the idea of giving housewives a better break on prices than is possible under the current high support plan.

The President's farm policy deserves the support of Members of Congress of both parties. It is a sincere attempt to solve a gigantic problem in which Secretary Benson, notably, has gained stature by his sturdy courage in seeking to further a farm program that would serve the interests of all the people. He has stood out against threats, bullying, cajolery—all sort of pressures—and bravely but with good humor has held firmly to what he believes in.

For far too long the farm program has operated to the disadvantage of millions of consumers. It has meant the shocking paradox of enormous accumulations of food and fiber along with unyielding high prices.

Solution of that must be removed from the crude political arena in which it has too often been left. Republicans should support the President unless there are grave reasons for disagreeing with him. And in this case there are none. Democrats in Congress should stand by Mr. Eisenhower and his farm program because it is a wise program, in the best interest of the Nation.

We hope that in both House and Senate that interest—the real interest of America—will prevail and that the shameful waste and inequity of Government-rigged high prices will become a thing of the past.

James A. Farley: The Political Temperature

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. DONOVAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 1, 1954

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Sidney Fields, from the Sunday Mirror of June 20, 1954:

JAMES A. FARLEY: THE POLITICAL TEMPERATURE

At the age of 8 James A. Farley made his political debut by carrying a torch in a Bryan-For-President parade. He's since weathered a multitude of campaigns, from running for town clerk of Stony Point, his home town in Rockland County, to managing presidential campaigns. Today, at 66, he's a respected elder statesman with a rare political wisdom. This fall New Yorkers will elect a governor and the Nation will elect a complete Congress and one-third of the Senate. So it seemed natural to talk to Farley about the current political temperature.

"President Eisenhower still retains his great popularity," Farley said. "But there's the big question whether he'll be able to transfer that personal popularity into Republican votes in the coming elections. No party in power has ever done it before."

We were talking in his office at the Coca-Cola Export Corp., of which he's board chairman. It's a busy, cluttered office: A desk piled with papers. A dozen wire baskets, all filled, lining the window sills. Tables crowded with pictures of his three children and grandchildren, and famous people. Farley got up from his desk, stretched his trim six-foot-two frame, and searched his mind for an answer when I suggested that the President's popularity and problems were in a knockdown fight with each other.

"There's unemployment," he nodded. "There's a farm problem loaded with political implications. Secretary of Agriculture Benson is doing a constructive job, but we have one set of surpluses and are piling up another while trying to keep farm prices high. And finally the Republican-controlled Congress hasn't yet passed an adequate housing bill for areas where it's desperately needed. All these things can have a serious affect on November votes."

WHEN POLITICS COME SECOND

But however Americans vote, Republican or Democrat, Farley feels they'd all like to see the President's program successful because of what it means to our way of life. When necessary Americans make partisan politics secondary.

"But that doesn't mean men active in political life should remain silent," said Farley. "They should offer constructive criticism."

Would Farley break his silence about his availability for the governorship? He simply would not discuss it. Yet, he cannot be deaf to all the talk about it. He may be the only potential candidate who could win. Mayor Wagner's position is obscure; Franklin Delano Roosevelt, Jr., wants the nomination, but no divorced man has ever been elected Governor of New York.

Anyway, for business reasons Farley may not want to be governor. He's doing all right. For a former bookkeeper he's doing great. At 66 he has the vigor of 36. His father, a brickmaker, was killed by a horse when Farley was 10. His mother, left with five sons, opened a grocery store with the last few dollars she had. He worked around the store, and in a brickyard, and played first base on semipro teams. Those were his beginnings.

A man with an incredible memory for names, faces, places, and details about people, he is always agreeable, always useful. His most outstanding characteristic is his complete honesty. He's never broken his word. At confirmation he took two vows, not to smoke or drink, and he's kept them to this day.

A natural-born politician, he rose from obscure political jobs in Rockland County to be Postmaster General and a presidential confidant—until his break with Roosevelt over the third term, now barred by law. But he's always kept his hand on the political pulse of the Nation.

"World leadership has been thrust upon us whether we like it or not," he said. "I just pray to God every day that President Eisenhower and those around him will have the leadership we need. But in spite of what appears to be a gloomy picture, I'm not too pessimistic. I've the utmost confidence and faith in the capacity of American people to develop leaders when they have to."

MORE VITAL THAN THOSE HEARINGS

Every generation of Americans usually feels its problems are greater than those of the generation that preceded it. This generation, plagued by two World Wars, forgot the bloody conflict between the States that almost shattered the Union. But the generations that followed the Civil War never had to face such spectacles as the Army-McCarthy row.

"There's no doubt that the hearings have been detrimental to the Republican administration," Farley said. "But whether the results will be carried over to the coming elections I don't know. They may be overshadowed by fear of depression, or war. Such fears are more important in elections than interparty fights."

If the far eastern crisis gets worse it will help the Republicans because of the natural American inclination to rally behind their leaders in times of crisis. In 1941 there was a growing antagonism toward FDR; many Americans did not wish to get involved in war. Yet after Pearl Harbor everyone rallied around him in a remarkable display of unity.

"We put together the greatest war machine in history," Farley said. "Kids who never saw an ocean or a plane became sea captains and pilots. And we supplied half the world. Any generation of Americans who can do that once can do it again. But with these new atomic weapons," he paused and shook his head, "I pray to God they will never have to."

Faith in Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. GWINN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 1, 1954

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, I have long know the difficulties of describing the dangers of socialism and communism in the abstract. The digestion of theory of government divorced from demonstrated fact in a factual age is tough exercise. People the world over will not believe that a fire is hot until they or someone like them is actually burnt.

During the Second World War certain private citizens did get burnt by English socialism; in fact they died from it.

I believe the following editorial is a most moving and graphic exposition of how socialism and communism operate; it should certainly be recognized by our own people in agriculture as the handwriting on the wall:

FAITH IN FARMERS

(By Thurman Sensing)

During the Second World War, George Walden, of Itchen Stoke, in Hampshire, England, was ordered by an agricultural committee to plow up his 5 acres of land. He refused to do so, saying no additional production could be achieved in that way.

The agricultural committee ordered him off his land. He refused. He barricaded himself in his cottage and prepared to defend himself. Tear gas was used against him. He fired on the police. He was killed.

That was in wartime. Excuses might be found, though we doubt it. Here was an Englishman defending his castle, the traditional right of all Englishmen, high or low.

Then the Socialists came into power in Britain at the end of the war. They made permanent by law the autocratic power assumed by the government during the emergency of war. They passed the Agricultural Act of 1947. This act provided the penalty of dispossession if the owner of land did not comply with the controls set up to govern agriculture.

The Agricultural Act of 1947 is still in effect in Great Britain, even though the Conservatives are back in power. It is hard to unscramble the egg. It is hard to get over the dope habit. But there is a fight going on over there to do away with the act. Those making the fight say it is time the rights of property were restored; that in these rights reside the basis of all civilization.

But, say the authorities whose responsibility it is to administer the act, if the farmers are to have the benefits of guaranties and assured markets they must farm their land to accord with authorities' ideas of what is good husbandry.

This little story about George Walden is just one more incident in the age-old struggle between the state and the individual. It carries within it a great lesson for all those who believe in the cause of freedom.

The main point of the lesson, of course, is that the argument of those who administer the Agricultural Act of 1947 in Great Britain is unassailable—that if farmers are to receive benefits from the Government, then they must farm their land as the Government directs. It is still quite true that he who pays the piper has the privilege of calling the tune.

Traditionally, the farmers of the country, of any country, are the most down-to-earth (no pun intended), realistic, and self-reliant of all the people. They have always, as a class, been in the forefront of those who oppose governmental oppression.

But in recent years, the farmers, like all other groups, have been seduced by governmental aid. They have traded their birthright of individual action for a mess of Government price supports. And this is not only true in other lands, it is true in our own land.

Still, it is to be believed that the farmers in this country now have a realization of the slavery to which this procedure has been leading them. It is to be believed that the farmers as a whole are again ready to take the lead in throwing off this slavery; that they are willing to forego the assurance of a Government market at a fixed price for the right to control their own land. It is to be believed that the farmers still have faith in themselves and that the people generally can have faith in the farmers.

The outcome of the present struggle between rigid price supports and flexible price supports will tell the story.

It will tell whether the rank and file of the farmers (Government reports show that price supports have mainly helped the big, mechanized farms) want to depend on the Government or want to depend on themselves. It will tell whether the individual Members of Congress are seeking the welfare of the whole country or the votes of its people. It will tell whether the Chief Executive has the courage of his convictions or is swayed by party considerations. Finally, it will tell whether the people generally want to control their Government or want their Government to control them.

Farm Price Supports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON CANFIELD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 1, 1954

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following telegram from George E. Stringfellow, president, New Jersey Taxpayers' Association, expressing opposition to the rigid 90 percent support program:

Trenton, N. J., *June 29, 1954.*

Hon. Gordon Canfield,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

In your consideration of price support feature of omnibus agriculture bill, we, along with large segment of New Jersey agriculture, urge support of efforts to move Government away from rigid 90 percent support program and the tremendous waste it has built up in unmanageable surpluses. New Jersey Taxpayers Association 1954 program, in behalf of all taxpayers, calls for "reduction or elimination of Federal subsidies to State and local government business and agriculture."

George E. Stringfellow,
President, New Jersey Taxpayers' Association.

Juvenile Delinquency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 1, 1954

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record a very notable address delivered on June 28, 1954, by our colleague the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Hendrickson], chairman of the Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, before the Secretary's Conference on Juvenile Delinquency, sponsored by the United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Why Are We Losing the Fight Against Juvenile Delinquency?

(By Senator Robert C. Hendrickson, chairman, Senate Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee)

Madam Chairman, Mrs. Hobby, and friends, gathered here today, I believe, is more experience and knowledge relative to the problem of juvenile delinquency than has ever before been brought together. This is an auspicious gathering. Yet we can bring to this conference neither pride in past accomplishments nor optimism for the immediate future for we are leaders in the war this Nation is losing against juvenile delinquency. Nor have we yet developed a strategy which promises to turn the tide of battle. This can be a momentous conference if we can here propose such strategy. Certainly you, the leaders, have demonstrated the qualities necessary for successful battle. In the face of perplexing difficulties you have not only carried on the fight but you have also maintained the faith and confidence in your fellowman which is fundamental to democratic social action. The challenge facing us today is not to find new courage or faith, but to devise a plan for action worthy of those qualities.

On March 4, 1953, I introduced a resolution in the Senate calling for an investigation of juvenile delinquency in the United States. The introduction of that resolution and the subsequent action of my colleagues in authorizing a subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee to conduct that investigation and again in renewing its mandate on January 27, 1954, reflected a deep concern about the increasing threat of juvenile delinquency to this Nation's youth. It did not reflect any extensive or expert knowledge of the problem. On the contrary, I realize in retrospect that I was more than a little naive about it. Indeed, had I then recognized the real breadth and complexity of juvenile delinquency, I am not sure that I would have had the temerity to undertake the task.

Our subcommittee is composed of my distinguished colleagues, Senator Langer, of North Dakota; Senator Kefauver, of Tennessee; and Senator Hennings, of Missouri, an essentially nonpartisan group. During the 9 months of our legislative life the subcommittee has, through inquiry, direct testimony, and questionnaires, tapped professional and lay opinion from coast to coast. A large number of real experts, persons whose knowledge is based upon rich experience in research or operational activities in this field, including a number of persons in this audience, have appeared before the subcommittee to share their knowledge with us. We respect and value their contribution. To date we have heard from 274 witnesses; made first-hand investigations of juvenile delinquency problems in certain local communities, conditions contributing to those problems, and services designed to resolve them. We are also studying certain matters which may contribute to juvenile delinquency and probing specific forms of delinquent conduct. We are vitally interested, for instance, in nonsupporting fathers; the influence of certain mass media materials; runaway youngsters, and adolescent drug addiction.

Our assignment is still far from completed and the subcommittee will pursue a variety of future activities before drawing up a final report and recommendations. However, I welcome the occasion which this meeting provides to pause in the midst of a heavy responsibility and try to summarize certain dominant impressions I have gained in our 9 months of work. And it will come as no surprise to you, ladies and gentlemen, that these impressions give rise to more questions than answers.

I am impressed, first of all, by the obvious disparity between what is known about juvenile delinquency and what is done about it. To be sure, our knowledge of human behavior is still far from an exact science, but it does seem to me that we know more than our approach to the problem of delinquency reflects.

We know, for example, that delinquency rises out of society's failure to meet children's normal emotional and physical needs on the one hand, and failure to protect them from baneful community influence on the other. We would all agree, I think, that our knowledge is not sufficient nor our tools so well developed as to enable us to protect all children from damage. But both our knowledge and tools are well enough advanced to know that neither mere repression nor one new playground is ever the answer to a community's problem. And yet, such a narrow, exclusive approach all too often seems to characterize our attack upon the problem of juvenile delinquency.

And such a narrow, too exclusive, approach to the problem is not restricted to a few scattered local communities. It occurs in many States and may sometimes characterize even national efforts to control delinquency and crime. Again and again, during our 9 months' work, I have asked myself why this is so. Here, as elsewhere, I do not pretend to have the whole answer.

And, I am sure that I say nothing new or startling to you when I observe that we have failed in large part to get even our own elementary understanding of the problem over to the man on the street. The response of the man on the street to juvenile delinquency—a response unconditioned by real understanding of the problem—is either to strike back at the offender, to meet aggression with aggression or, since these are juveniles, to spearhead an altruistic drive to do something good for children—something to keep them out of trouble. The first response is a wholly natural one; the latter highly civilized and socially desirable. But even the latter response will not go far in meeting the problem unless resulting action is based upon real knowledge. Surely as you come together for this 3-day conference to consider how to better meet the challenge of juvenile delinquency, you will wish to devote attention to the need for more effective dissemination of existing knowledge.

The need for the dissemination of two kinds of knowledge. On one front we must move—and move rapidly—to get the vast amount of present day know-how to the workers on the firing line. As I have said, we know far more about the causes and treatment of juvenile delinquency than we utilize. Can we not devise the ways and the means to get this accumulated knowledge into the hands and minds of those who are doing the day-to-day job? On the second front, we must move and move just as rapidly—to translate into easily understandable terms the broader significance of our knowledge so that the man on the street can readily grasp all the ramifications and will not seek the easy one solution—the ready-made scapegoat.

It may seem incongruous to say that there is lack of public understanding of the problem of juvenile delinquency in view of all that is written and said about it. But may I give you still another impression? It is this—we seem to be more skilled in sounding fire alarms in this field than in putting out the fires. The American people are alarmed about the rising incidence of juvenile delinquency. They should be. Newspapers are filled with accounts of vandalism, brutality, gang wars—yes, even murders—committed by young persons. Calls for action have been sounded by thousands of speakers. But haven't we fallen pitifully short in providing the base of knowledge, leadership, and guidance necessary to channel aroused public concern into positive, direct action? Isn't there even some danger in shouting fire too loudly to a crowd which doesn't know just how to get out of the burning building? I believe so.

Let me use the District of Columbia as a specific example of that danger. Considerable publicity about the misdeeds of juveniles here has resulted in many demands to "get tough." One result of these demands was the introduction of legislation in the United States Congress which would remove from the juvenile court its authority to waive certain cases to the criminal court and place this power in the hands of the United States attorney. This would result, its exponents assume, in more juveniles being waived to criminal courts. Agitation for this change has utterly ignored the fact that in the District of Columbia our criminal courts have less available to them in terms of treatment resources than our juvenile court. But forget treatment, we are urged. The more serious older offenders are not children but adults who should be punished. This appeal to blind reliance upon punishment to reform ignores everything we have learned about human behavior since the dawn of the social sciences.

Of course, publicity given the problem of juvenile delinquency in the District of Columbia has brought forth some gains. But I emphasize that it has also brought negatives in its wake. Surely in our cries of "fire" we must at least calculate the dangers of stimulating negative action unless and until we are in a position to provide more effective leadership.

But failure to develop a more effective approach to the problem of juvenile delinquency does not grow solely out of failure to employ what is known. And since my own primary interest here is to look toward the creation of a united and therefore more effective front against juvenile delinquency, I would like to conjecture a bit further about certain other factors which may hinder such forward movement.

As the subcommittee approached the task of assembling a staff, I quickly learned that there appeared to exist in this field, even as in the legislative one, certain vested interests. From the realms of persons interested in the problem of juvenile delinquency, the subcommittee received conflicting advice. We were told both to rely primarily upon social workers for guidance and to avoid them like a plague. Some sociologists depreciated the potential contributions of psychiatrists, and some educators felt that balanced guidance to the subcommittee could come only from within their own profession. Certain lawyers and judges seemed to feel that the approach of all the above professions was marked with a certain unrealism about the problem.

Such cleavages are not inherent to these professions. Today our staff includes lawyers, social workers, sociologists, and educators. These staff members have available to them and regularly call upon psychologists and psychiatrists for consultation.

From this experience I draw the obvious conclusion that teachers, judges, psychiatrists, social workers, representatives of the press, and just plain citizens can work together cooperatively and harmoniously to seek more effective ways to prevent delinquency. Isn't this a common enemy?

And let me say how pleased I am to note that, as evidenced by this meeting, the Children's Bureau and others of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare also believe in and utilize what might be called the multidisciplinary approach to the problem. Many persons here today have also helped the subcommittee in its work. I am happy to be able to recognize among such persons representatives of institutions, juvenile courts, national private agencies, probation departments, research projects, and citizen groups. Each such group, Madam Chairman, has an invaluable role to play in such a review and planning function as this conference is expected to serve.

Still another factor barring the development of a more effective approach, and a most significant one, is the very nature of our common problem. I refer to the tremendous scope of its myriad causes. We all know that a youngster's behavior is shaped not only by the nature of his relationships to parents, siblings, peers, and adults at large but also by the cultural influences which surround him. All of these factors commingle in so complex and subtle permutations that the development of adequate and workable plans for either research or social action presents, at least to your subcommittee a baffling problem.

In terms of social action, how can we develop an approach of proper breadth, one which embraces a sufficient number of the factors, and, at the same time, avoid the kind of diffusion of effort which dissipates energies without yielding much in the way of discernable gains.

Recognizing, then, the dangers of too much diffusion and the need for sufficient focus to develop an effective attack, I still feel that our approach more often tends to be too narrow than too broad. To some extent, at least, we seem to become victims of our own specialities. We tend too much to see our own primary field of interest as containing all answers to the problem. The social worker in his drive to improve social services may overlook the values of better law enforcement and more effective legislation. The playground leader may give scant heed to the need for additional teachers or juvenile-court workers. Police may omit attention to the community's need for expanded social or mental health services. Because of the normal and natural specialized interests which we each develop, we are in danger of formulating our action on less than what we know.

The majority of existing delinquency projects, I believe, fail to pay adequate heed to cultural influences. We all know, for example, that very direct relationships exist between the behavior of adults and that of juveniles. The morality of a community cannot be divided into two parts—one juvenile and one adult. Adult society contributes to juvenile delinquency in many ways—sometimes knowingly and sometimes ignorantly. And we also take large risks with our children by exposing them to influences which, although imponderable in terms of the individual child, would hardly seem desirable in the mass. Let me illustrate. Our subcommittee has been looking into the production, distribution, and effects of crime and horror comics upon children.

How many of you here today ever examined these so-called comic books? Frankly, I had not prior to our investigation and I, therefore, approached this phase of our work with some apprehension lest we go astray. But let me request that you read a crime-and-horror comic if you have not done so. They are filled—yes, packed—with every form of vice, sadism, and violence. At 10 cents per copy, our children can devour tales, illustrated in gory detail, of murder, arson, rape, burglary, extortion, kidnaping, and every other crime in the book. In these books half-rotted corpses rise from the grave to pillage and murder. Vampires go forth each night to drink the rich red blood of children. This is the literary diet of revulsion systematically fed millions of our children each month.

And why, ladies and gentlemen, are such materials produced for children? Because they sell and for no other reason? It is a matter of money—big money. Gross revenue from the crime-and-horror-type comic alone an estimated $20 million annually. How do the publishers of this material justify their action? Show us, they say, a single man in the penitentiary whose crime resulted from reading one of our comics and we'll quit publishing them. Now, we are all sophisticated enough to know that neither the total problem of juvenile delinquency nor the behavior pattern of an individual can be anchored to a single cause. If this be what we must show before taking social action against conditions unhealthy to the law-abiding development of children, we may as well give up the ghost now.

Majority opinion among psychiatrists, sociologists, social workers, and other representatives of the behavior sciences seems to hold that such materials are, as a minimum, damaging to at least some children. Few, if any, would say that they serve a useful purpose for any child. In the face of such opinion, why are we who are trying to combat juvenile delinquency so little concerned with this and similar matters detrimental to children? Why are our voices so seldom heard in protest? Some of you are better equipped to answer these questions than I. Have we become so sophisticated that we are somehow ashamed to crusade for decency, for virtue? Do we fear that to single out one factor for attack would obscure the total problem? Is it that our extensive knowledge and understanding of the complexity of casual factors paralyzes our ability to speak up against something that is bad simply because we know it isn't the whole of what is bad? Do we perhaps tolerate the one who suggests evil because we know that if a child has the right kind of relationships to parents and other persons that he will resist the suggestion?

If these be the tempters, let us resist them. The prevention of disease involves not only strengthening the organism but control of the transmission of disease. To ignore the transmitters of juvenile delinquency leaves little basis for effective action other than in the direction of strengthening family life. Now I do not in any way criticize the fundamental value of movement in that direction, but I protest limiting ourselves to action on a single front. There is no inherent merit in subjecting the strengths imparted through sound parent-child relationships to the stress and strain of negative forces which can be controlled.

I have said that the morality of a community canont be divided into two parts. We know, for example, that there is a relationship between a child's concept of law and order and adult attitudes as evidenced in evasion of income taxes, the fixing of traffic tickets, and the simple instructions to a child to tell the bill collector that mama is out when she is at home. That adult attitude, a product of many forces, may even relate to the revolt and rebellion against authority which marked the very founding of this Nation. But developing research capable of measuring such relationships, if any, has thus far defied our ingenuity. Perhaps it is the absence of measurable, clear-cut relationships which make efforts to uplift community morality halting and uncertain.

Perhaps this is one reason why we who have undertaken to do something about juvenile delinquency are sometimes too hesitant to speak out against situations and conditions which may be detrimental, even exceedingly detrimental, to children and youth. And may I say, and emphatically, that we tolerate too much in the way of such situations and conditions. A little moral indignation might be good for the situation as well as for our souls.

These conditions, ladies and gentlemen, do not consist solely of adult actions which may contribute to some child's delinquency as, for example, the production of questionable reading materials. Nor do they merely include the added factor of illegal or immoral adult example. It goes still further.

In virtually every community of this land there are adults who profit from the systematic demoralization of youth. The boy who strips parts from a car must find a buyer and the usual buyer is not another juvenile but an adult fence. The teen-ager looking for a thrill through alcohol, marihuana, or narcotics buys these items not from another young teen-ager but from an adult pusher. The easy cash which may lure the adolescent girl into prostitution comes not from a school boy but once again from an unscrupulous adult with money to spend.

Nor are these adults only an occasional tavern-keeper, junk-yard proprietor, or service boy on a weekend pass. Professional criminals have also organized to prey upon and exploit our children. Commercialized prostitution often operates to pull young girls into the trade. Youth represents the best potential customers for underworld narcotic markets. The production and distribution of pornographic materials represents large-scale and organized vice, and, once again, this filth is aimed squarely at youth as its primary market.

Ladies and gentlemen, in organizing an integrated attack upon juvenile delinquency we cannot, must not, overlook the heavy contribution to the problem made by adult action, adult crime—even organized vice and crime.

In the course of my remarks thus far, I have referred to the need for development of a united, common front for a broad scale attack upon the problem of juvenile delinquency. This would involve, in my opinion, the creation of a means or mechanism capable of bringing our desired efforts into increasing concord. I have no ready-made plan to place before you, but the search for such a plan represents today's challenge to this field.

Mrs. Hobby has described the supplementary budget which she has requested for the Children's Bureau. The subcommittee's interim report, issued March 1, 1954, recommended an expansion of the consultative services provided by the Children's Bureau in relation to juvenile delinquency. I have not yet had an opportunity to examine the proposed plan in detail, but I am glad to note that prompt action is being taken in the right direction. I hope that this step may result in enabling the Children's Bureau to provide more of the kind of guidance needed to keep our social action on the right track.

But the achievement of this goal will not permit us to relax with the comfortable feeling that now the problem is met. Recognizing the diverse root of delinquency, we know that action is required on a broader front than that consisting of services rendered by any one bureau or agency of the Federal Government. We must not settle here for the "one new playground" concept. We all know that our schools play, or at least could play, a crucial role both in preventing delinquency and in readjusting the maladjusted child. I include here not only what the teacher can do within the classroom but the special services which can be channeled through the school system. The provision of more extensive and adequate mental health services through community clinics, juvenile courts, schools, institutions, and other agencies represents an absolute must in our battle against juvenile crime. Certainly it is vital that the services of both the Office of Education and the National Institute of Mental Health be made effective parts of our united front.

Still other Federal bureaus and agencies are involved too. The Department of Justice through its bureaus and units is concerned with the suppression of adult crime which, as I have already pointed out, contributes so heavily to juvenile delinquency. It is also charged with the care, protection, and treatment of juveniles violating Federal law. Neither should we forget the potential contribution to prevention which can be made through properly designed and administered programs of aid to dependent children, vocational rehabilitation, and control of child labor.

These agencies, ladies and gentlemen, are Federal, and may I make it clear that I do not believe that the Federal Government can do the whole or even a substantial part of the needed job. During the course of the subcommittee's hearings I have repeatedly reiterated my belief that both prevention and treatment of delinquency represent reponsibilities which fall primarily upon local and State government. You here who represent State and local government are and should be assuming that primary responsibility. The proper role of the Federal Government is not to take over that responsibility but rather to strengthen your hand in discharging it, and to furnish inspired leadership wherever possible.

But governmental agencies neither exercise nor wish to exercise any preemptive rights to action in this field. And, ladies and gentlemen, the combined efforts of government, local, State, and Federal, will not suffice to meet a problem that is imbedded in the fabric of day-by-day family and community life. A proper functioning of the family unit and the healthy integration of these units into the community depends upon a large variety of factors. And not the least among these is the extent and way in which each of us either assumes or fails to assume responsibility for the well-being of his fellow man.

Here today at this conference, the presence of representatives of private agencies and organizations offer mute but compelling testimony of how we as a free people do voluntarily associate ourselves to further the common welfare. The "do-gooders" so frequently, ladies and gentlemen, represent not the bane but the salt of the earth.

May I emphasize that the problem of juvenile delinquency can never be resolved without full use of the full measure of these voluntary groups and agencies which have their roots in and reach virtually every community in our Nation. Through these organizations and agencies, our sense of civic and moral responsibility is not only fulfilled but enlarged and promoted. Government provides a certain basic framework of laws and services necessary to the common good. But the mortar, the filling, the binding, is provided through voluntary action. In the planning of a united front to stem the tide of delinquency both voluntary and governmental efforts must be brought into coordinated partnership.

The National Probation and Parole Association, the Child Welfare League of America, the Family Service Association of America, the National Association for Mental Health, and the National Education Association represent but some of the voluntary agencies providing pertinent professional services on a national basis. Civic, religious, and professional organizations too numerous to enumerate here stand ready to join, indeed are already involved, in this crusade.

Those planning this conference have planned well. Here they have brought together key representatives of both governmental and voluntary agencies and organizations which I have mentioned. And if it be within the province of an invited speaker, Madam Chairman, to raise a question with this uniquely chosen group, then it is this—do we have the ability, the ingenuity to here devise, or at least suggest, a mechanism capable of creating and maintaining a common front against our common enemy?

In raising this question I know that you will appreciate that I am not speaking of just another committee. The needs in this field do not call for a common fire alarm, but for a way—a means through which we can agree upon goals, maintain a balanced attack, recognize and reconcile our differences to the end of effectively coordinating our mutual efforts, both now and as expanded efforts come into being.

To be effective, this fighting front against juvenile delinquency must be united. But unity alone, essential as it may be, is not enough. To be effective, the front must be as broad and all-encompassing as the dangers we face. A fighting front which contains gaps which permit enflankment is worse than useless. For, if we do not seek to close all the gaps we delude ourselves into thinking that we are doing all we should be, when in truth we are not. Thus, if we set up a fighting front only in the area of social services for children, or only in respect to education, or only in the field of mental health, or only with regard to law enforcement, we will not have established an all-embracing mechanism to do the job. We must include every cause and every contributing factor as our broad enemy. And, having thus broadly defined the enemy, we should marshal our every resource to defeat him.

Juvenile delinquency, now riding rampant throughout our countryside, is a challenge to the very sinews of our future existence. Not even the Communist conspiracy could devise a more effective way to demoralize, disrupt, confuse, and destroy our future citizens than apathy on the part of adult Americans to the scourge known as juvenile delinquency. We must declare war on this destroyer of youth with every force at our command.

So may I ask each of you as you meet together during these 3 days that you be bold and imaginative in your thinking, and that divesting yourselves of other purposes you most earnestly seek a means of developing and maintaining the common front essential to winning the war we are in danger of losing. To our God and our country we each of us owe this solemn obligation.

Vice President Nixon Gives Country Preview of Republican Campaign Line

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 1, 1954

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to do so, I include with my remarks a very enlightening article written by Mr. Lowell Mellett, which appeared in today's issue of the Washington Evening Star:

We Will Also Hear About Yalta—Vice President's Speech Indicates Line To Be Followed in This Congressional Campaign, and That Reminds Us—

The situation in east Asia being less than satisfactory, our young Vice President has indicated the line to be followed in the congressional election campaign, now underway. The blame for everything that has gone wrong and for everything that may yet go wrong is to be laid at the door of Dean Acheson, former Secretary of State. Mr. Nixon, speaking for the administration, made this clear in a carefully prepared speech Saturday evening in Milwaukee.

The situation in Europe is likewise less than satisfactory. So we may expect to hear throughout this campaign the familiar cry of Yalta. The blame for Europe's plight will be laid at the grave of former President Roosevelt. This being a certainty, it may be of interest to recall the views expressed by Republican leaders at the time of the signing of the Yalta agreement. I quote from a column written at that time:

"In the United States Senate the Republican leader, Senator White, of Maine, rose to say: 'I feel a great work has been done.' And Vandenberg, of Michigan, the party's leader in matters of foreign policy, said, 'It is far the best that has issued from any major conference.'

"In New York City an extraordinary thing occurred. Republicans had gathered to pay homage to Abraham Lincoln and listen to former Governor Bricker rehash some of the speeches he had made during his campaign for the vice presidency. Herbert Hoover, one-time Republican President of the United States, was called to his feet. He told the audience of the agreement reached at Yalta by President Roosevelt, Marshal Stalin, and Prime Minister Churchill.

" 'I believe,' he said, 'it comprises a strong foundation on which to rebuild the world.' And he added, 'It is fitting that it should have been issued to the world on the birthday of Abraham Lincoln.'

"According to the papers there was applause 'from every section of the audience'—an audience that included former Republican Vice President Charles G. Dawes; the widows of three Republican Presidents, Mrs. Calvin Coolidge, Mrs. Theodore Roosevelt, and Mrs. Benjamin Harrison; and the widow of a recent Republican candidate for President, Mrs. Wendell Willkie.

"Governor Dewey, of New York, was not heard from immediately. He appeared to be waiting for a Gallup poll report or its equivalent before committing himself * * *

"From the President's consistent supporters in his own party there was quick approval, of course. But causing the day to be truly memorable, there was equally quick approval from some who have not bothered much to support the party's leader in the past.

" 'A fine start,' said Senator Byrd, of Virginia, and Senator Tydings agreed that the statement of the Big Three would 'contribute immeasurably to the welfare of the entire world.'

"And the press. * * * Whatever the papers had been saying about the President and Churchill and Stalin the day before, all was forgiven when the big news came. It was not completely unanimous, to be sure, but the sour notes were few and feeble.

"To make American satisfaction complete, Berlin was heard from. Discussing what he termed the 'Yalta-hate program,' the Nazi radio commentator admitted that effective unity had been achieved by the allies and with it the failure of German hopes for dissension. He attributed this unhappy state of affairs to 'the driving power of the Jew'."

Forgotten now, that's how it was 10 years ago.

Time for Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. GWINN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 1, 1954

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a brief statement in support of House Joint Resolution 123, which was introduced by me in this session of Congress. The statement represents the position of the American Progress Foundation, 1540 North Highland Avenue, Los Angeles 28, Calif. This organization is made up of patriotic Americans dedicated to the proposition that constitutional government cannot survive if vast Government undertakings are in competition with private enterprise. The American Progress Foundation has been very active in the struggle to preserve capitalism in the United States on the theory that only a strong capitalistic America can provide our people with all their needs while at the same time protect them from the alien ideologies of socialism and communism.

The statement follows:

TIME FOR ACTION

(By Willis E. Stone)

In 1952, when it appeared that there was an opportunity for change and candidates spoke convincingly of a return to basic constitutional principles, the greatest vote in history was recorded.

The change our people expected has not materialized. It is true that Americanism has scored a few minor victories, such as the sale of the federally owned barge lines, but it is equally true that some of the wildest and most reckless socialistic schemes have made tremendous advances.

These grim truths are forcing more and more people to the unpleasant realization that we cannot depend on politicians and bureaucrats to diminish their power or deprive themselves of the earnings of our people. If the evil practices of socialism and communism are to be outlawed, and the traditional concepts of Americanism reestablished, we must do the job ourselves.

This year we have a powerful weapon which is perfectly adapted to the task. It is the proposed 23d amendment, supported by the resolutions of more than 6,000 organizations, approved by the Illinois Legislature, and now pending in Congress as House Joint Resolution 123. It provides that "The Government of the United States shall not engage in any business, professional, commercial, financial, or industrial enterprise except as specified in the Constitution."

This proposal offers us the best chance we ever have had to find out where our candidates stand in the cold war between Americanism and socialism.

Everyone of us should take a very active part in the compaigns this year. Each of us, either as individuals, or through our organizations, can require each candidate for State or Federal offices to declare his position on this basic question of public policy.

It is proper that we should also know exactly what each candidate proposes to do for or against this proposal which is soon destined to come before the Members of Congress and the State legislatures for action.

Requiring our candidates to declare themselves on this issue will, for the first time in a quarter of a century, establish principles upon which we can vote with some assurance of performance.

In this way militant citizenship can elect public servants pledged to a definite course of action, insuring the rapid adoption of resolutions by the State legislatures demanding that Congress either submit this proposal to the States for ratification or call a constitutional convention for that purpose.

This same militant program carried on by all our people, can insure the necessary two-thirds majority in both Houses of Congress to initiate this proposed amendment and send it to the States for ratification.

In this way government would be restored to the business of governing. It would end the extravagant socialistic experiments which have reached such fantastic proportions during the last two decades.

The growth of socialism is demonstrated by the fact that the taxes which were much too high in 1932 have been multiplied 25 times in 20 years. The manipulators of Government have borrowed, in our name, more than $12 billion per year average during the same 20 years, building a fantastic national debt which we some day must pay.

It is unbelievable that we have become so highly socialized in these few short years. We can, however, reestablish basic Americanism by now outlawing the practices of socialism with this proposed amendment.

The sale of the properties and facilities of the 88 Federal corporations to the American people could cut the national debt by 20 percent, cut the cost of Government by 45 percent, and increase the take-home pay of the American people by 11 percent.

Such are the rewards for good citizenship—and now is the time for action. Now is the time to ask all your candidates how they stand on the proposed 23d amendment, House Joint Resolution 123.

The Commonsense of "Neckyoke Jones"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 1, 1954

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, under leave to extend my remarks, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article that was written by Mr. F. H. Sinclair, of Sheridan, Wyo., for the December 1953 issue of the South Dakota Stock Grower, official publication of the South Dakota Stock Growers' Association.

Mr. Sinclair writes under the pen name of "Neckyoke Jones," and his language is in a ranch vernacular all his own, but quite understandable.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NECKYOKE JONES WRITES

DERE SECRETARY RASMUSSEN: "It's about time for the ol' feller with the white whiskers to be slippin' down the chimbley," I says to my ol' pardner, Greasewood lasts nights, "an' you better be given some thort to pickin' me up a good Christmus present, somethin' expensive." What are you a bureycrat, or mebbe a mushroom farmer who is lookin' fer supportin' prices which will keep him in the way of livin' he is accustomed to?" he snorts, grinnin' like a chessy cat. "You are contributin' taxes to buy flapers fer the Ayrabs an' bubbles gum for the Pattygonians," I comes back at him right snappy, "an' it's about time you was spreadin' your charety somewhat closter to the home range. You know some Christmus presents has been sent to people aroun' the world that don't know Christmus from the Fourth July—an' ol' Sandy Klauz ain't any better knowed than William McKinley is in Alabama."

"The trubble is with you," he rummynates, "is that you are bein' tooken over by modern thinkin'. Now when you was a younger, Christmus was a time of good cheer when you got a pair wristlets which was knitted by Grammaw, an' Pappy brung you home a apple an' a orange, an' mebbe a pair of cordroy pants which you could wear fer a cupple yeas an' then they'd fit little brother.

"I kin remeber well what Christmus was like in them days. They didden have no raddios blarin' out songs an' they was no Sandy Klauzes on the corners wearin' cotton batten whiskers. A kid in them days was supposen to be satisfied iffen he got a croshayed muffler—But today he wants a six-cylinder hunnerd horse power car with autymatick ways to even raise the winders."

"Speakin' of presents," I warbles ignorin' his talk," what would you like most fer Christmus?" "Well sir," he sez, "I ain't give it much thought—but I seriously think that fer a Christmus present I'd kinda like to see some of these here taxes cut down. We was told that they would be. An' I don't mean just the federul taxes, but it seems like some of these here State taxes could be whittled down withouten hurtin' nobbody's feelin's. Another Christmus present would be layin' off of makin' a politckel football outen Commies in the govinment, in the schools, the movies, the unions and in the churches. Iffen they is Commies in these outfits, the thing to do is to dip them an' git 'em out, withuten no more bellerin' an' pawin'. We want 'em out—so they ort to git 'em out withouten wastin' no more time. This here Harry Bridges, fer instunce. Accordin' to what I read this here feller was supposed to be dehorned and deported 5 or 6 years ago—an' now we hear that he is still callin' strikes an' runnin' things out on the west coast. I dunno nothin' about him, but apparent he ain't popular in some direckshuns.

"Another thing we'd kinda like for Christmus is the parin' down of throwin' dollars at every country in the world. Your Unkle Sammey could learn a lesson or two from some of the bankers who does financin' in the livestock bisness. He'd be a doggone side tougher to do bizness with, iffen he'd work with them bankers fer a spell.

"They is another thing which folks would like, an' that is to pull back the Americun soljers we got sprawled all over the world map. We got 'em patrollin' in Pershey, Japan, Koree, Italy, Germany an' all points east and west. Iffen you are tryin' to make friends with other countries, they ain't goin' to feel too warm every time they look outen the winder they see some American soljers prowlin' around. We wouldn't like it ourselves to have German or French or British troops stalkin' around our towns like they owned the place, partickler when they are gittin' money that sounds awful big to some of them furriners, an' our boys ain't too tight about blowin' it when they want somethin'. It ain't exackly a way to make frens. Besides it'd be better havin' Americun boys at home, learnin' to do somethin' useful. They ain't enough Americum soljers in any one place to fight off a flight of doodle bugs, if things really got started.

"I think most Americuns would think it a awful nice Christmus present iffen the boys in Washinton would try to stop mindin' everybody's bizness all over the world, an' let the other feller mind his fer a spell. It might be nice to jest try it out—an' see how it worked. Maybe Americuns is so smart that no other country kin git along withouten havin' a bunch of Americun bureycrats, livin' high, an' tellin' 'em how they had ort to run their places—but we ain't had too much success here at home with bureycrats—an' it's kinda a shame to wish 'em off on unsuspectin' furriners.

"I'd kind regard it as a purty nice Christmus gift iffen we could kinda get back to usin' a little horse sens, iffen the unions would kinda give a little thought to the nashinul economy and try to git prices down within reason insted of high jackin' everybody an' everything to git more money. A man ain't entitled to be paid more than he contributes to the genrul scheme of things. Iffen he is a ditch digger he is worth just so much—an' you cain't make him worth more by strikin'.

"It'd be a awful nice Christmas present if folks would git over thinkin' the government could see to it that everyboddy could have prosperity by passin' a law, supportin' things at prices they ain't worth or by the goviment buyin' up all surplusses an' lettin' 'em rot. It'd look more like Amercuns are as smart as they pretend to be. Them is just some of the things I'd like fer Christmus presents."

Doggone me, Secretary Rasmussen, it looks to me like Greasewood ain't goin' to git much in his Christmus stockin'. Nevertheless, we wish you an' your office force, the officers an' all the members of the South Dakoty Stock Growers Association a might good Christmus an' a doggone good New Year.

Yure fren,

NECKYOKE JONES.

Economic Conditions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 1, 1954

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, the following letter signed by John L. Lewis, president of the United Mine Workers of America, David J. McDonald, president of the United Steelworkers of America, and Dave Beck, president of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen, and Helpers of America, is of more than ordinary importance to all of us.

There is no one better qualified to interpret the deteriorating economic conditions of the country than these men, the heads of three great labor organizations in America.

They are to be commended for taking the initiative in directing the attention of Members of Congress to the grave situation that exists.

The letter follows:

UNITED MINE WORKERS; UNITED STEELWORKERS OF AMERICA; INTERNATIONAL BROTHERHOOD OF TEAMSTERS, CHAUFFEURS, WAREHOUSEMEN, AND HELPERS OF AMERICA,

June 30, 1954.

Hon. GEORGE P. MILLER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MILLER: The economic decline and spreading unemployment in our Nation is a danger that must no longer be ignored.

A joint conference of the United Mine Workers of America, the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen and Helpers of America, and the United Steelworkers of America, representing 3 million American working men and women in the great basic industries of coal, steel, and trucking, respectfully call upon you and your associates in Government for action now to halt the economic decline that threatens our free way of life.

To allow the economic machinery of the most productive industrial Nation in the world to slow down further is to play directly into the hands of international communism.

Our democratic system is on trial for its life. If we permit reduced earnings, and unemployment to continue there will be a return to the chaos of the early 1930's. America cannot stand another economic sickness such as that and still maintain public order in the Republic.

Our fight against communism is primarily an economic fight. The tyrants in the Kremlin now look to the day when their predictions of economic ruin in America will bring this great Nation to its knees.

The present danger cannot be wished away by hopes and economic double talk. There are more than 4 million persons unemployed in our land. Thousands of these idle workers already have used up the funds they are presently entitled to under unemployment compensation laws. They have no money left with which to feed, clothe, and house themselves and their families. They demand jobs. Instead they are offered predictions of possible economic improvements sometime in the future. Such talk falls on their ears as empty phrases.

This spreading unemployment is the greatest threat to the continuation of freedom and democracy that exists in the Republic today. It is time to stop it before it is too late. The Government has the tools with which to act under existing legislation.

Let the Government act.

Let the Government act to create aggressive trade and export policies as an effective foreign policy weapon in the fight against communism and to protect the American standard of living.

Let the Government act to wipe out the Taft-Hartley abomination so that American labor may once more be free to act effectively.

Let the Government act to implement the Employment Act of 1946 to bring back maximum employment, production and purchasing power.

Let the Government act to construct new and improved highways, new housing, new schools, hospitals and similar public works that will offset this declining situation.

Let the Government act to promulgate a national fuels policy in the interest of national security so that our basic coal industry will be ready at all times to produce the fuel upon which the Republic is dependent for its industrial might both in peace and war.

Let the Government act to bring a return to full production in our great steel industry, 40 percent of whose workers are now idle or working less than 40 hours a week.

Let the Government act to stimulate employment in our vital vehicular transport industry by utilizing the trucking industry as a prime hauler of the mails within the zone of 300 miles, thus providing better service at less cost to the taxpayers.

Let the Government act to put purchasing power back into the pockets of the working people through lower personal income taxes.

Such actions by the Government would be practical, workable measures to stop the economic decline. Employment and living standards must be increased constantly to meet the needs of our growing population, our increasing work force and our ever-expanding technology.

Such actions would be in the interest of all the American people. And they would be in the interest of the other free nations of the world. For without a strong and prosperous United States of America freedom and democracy cannot survive in the world.

We present these proposals to you, the responsible officials of our Government, respectfully and in the spirit of cooperation that must prevail among all segments of our society. We urge that all other Americans, through their organizations, join in endorsement of the actions proposed herein.

Very truly yours,

JOHN L. LEWIS.
DAVE BECK.
DAVID J. MCDONALD.

Mr. Speaker, I, for one, stand ready to cooperate with these men and any others who seek to keep our economy virile and expanding and thus prevent the scourge of depression.

Things Are Bad, Things Are Good

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 1, 1954

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include an editorial entitled "Things Are Bad, Things Are Good," appearing in the Washington News of June 21, 1954, which shows the uncertainty and confusion in Washington created by the present Republican administration:

THINGS ARE BAD, THINGS ARE GOOD

We don't know what to think.

Last Saturday, after a high-level, mostly hush-hush, meeting of the country's military command at Quantico, Va., reporters were permitted to quote the ominous remarks of two very authoritative authorities.

One was Donald A. Quarles, Assistant Secretary of Defense in Charge of Research and Development. He said our technical position (militarily, that is) as compared to the Russians isn't as good as it was a year ago. The Reds are gaining on us.

"Our margin of advantage has narrowed," he said, "and we must face the sober inferences to be drawn from these facts."

Adm. Arthur W. Radford, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, drew a dark picture of Communist gains in Asia, asserted that the Russians have forces which can attack in any direction, and solemnly warned that all there is not a short-term threat. Which means it is a long-term threat.

Rather grim stuff.

But yesterday Mr. Quarles' and Admiral Radford's boss, Defense Secretary Charles E. Wilson, said the United States is keeping up a 2- to 3-year lead over the Russians and he didn't know that the gap is narrowing exactly.

Something didn't jell at Quantico.

It doesn't jell in Washington, either.

The Senate is to vote this week on a bill revising the income-tax law. Various taxpayers will be relieved in assorted ways to the tune of about $1,500,000,000 in lost Government revenue.

Democrats in the Senate are critical of these revisions, especially one which partly does away with double taxes on dividends. They plan to propose a substitute which would boost the personal exemption of each individual taxpayer by $100.

That would add another couple of billions or more to the Government revenue losses. Congress cut sales taxes about a billion last winter.

The Government had a deficit of more than $9 billion last year. It will be short another $4 billion at the end of this month. Next year's deficit can go anywhere from $3 billion to $6 billion or $7 billion.

So, according to our military leaders, things are pretty bad, or they are pretty good, depending on who is talking. Financially, the Government is in the hole, but we're still cutting taxes.

Then we hear of another Defense Department official who told a Senate Appropriations Committee there is $2 billion in the Army budget the Army doesn't need—but the money was left in for public psychology.

We think the best thing that could happen to the public psychology would be for the boys to get together and get their facts and appraisals straight.

Commercial Treaty Between the United States and Venezuela

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 1, 1954

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I have received from Mrs. Elizabeth Auvert Eason, of Little Rock, Ark., a letter enclosing an editorial written by Rodolfo A. Auvert, publisher and editor in Maracaibo, Venezuela. I ask that the letter and translation of the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the letter and translation were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

LITTLE ROCK, ARK.,
June 17, 1954.

Hon. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT,
Senator, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I have taken the liberty to translate and enclose, an editorial from the Venezuelan newspaper Diario de Occidente, for which I am a columnist.

The editorial, on the Commerical Treaty between the United States and Venezuela, was written by Mr. Rodolfo A. Auvert, editor and publisher of the newspaper.

I believe you will consider interesting the opinion of a prominent Venezuelan newspaperman and businessman, on a subject of equal interest to American and to South American.

Very respectfully yours,
MRS. ELIZABETH AUVERT EASON.

ON THE COMMERCIAL TREATY BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND VENEZUELA

(From an editorial by Rodolfo A. Auvert, publisher and editor, in Diario de Occidente, Maracaibo, Venezuela)

An American Senator, MALONE, Republican, of Nevada, recently asked for the cancellation of the commercial treaty signed in 1952 between the United States and Venezuela unless the restrictions it imposes upon the importation of (American) agricultural and textile goods will be removed.

Senator MALONE's plan is another manifestation of those forces that are active trying to influence American public opinion, and Members of Congress in favor of the approval of the Simpson law—a law that would restrict the importation of Venezuelan oil in favor of the independent production of American oil.

Technically, Senator MALONE's plan appears to be logical and just. Is he not asking solely for reciprocal trade? If Venezuela wants the United States to buy her oil, she should in turn allow the United States to sell her its agricultural and textile goods without restrictions. Superficially, the question is a simple as that. However, there are many more factors involved:

Firstly, how could a nation like Venezuela, with 5 million people, with its agricultural and textile industries still in their infancy, be expected to develop her industries against the unrestricted competition of a country of 161 million, with the most developed and powerful agricultural and textile industries in the world? That is exactly the core of the matter.

Let us quote some statistics: Our consul general in the United States, D. E. Paez, in a recent speech before the Exporters Club in New York, gave the following account: In 1943 Venezuela brought from the United States $43 million. In 1953 Venezuela bought $850 million. There is besides, the inversion of American capital in Venezuela about $3 billion. Are not those impressive numbers satisfying enough to the United States?

Today the Latin-American countries buy from the United States with $2 what in the near past they used to buy with $1.

The main cause of the great rise in American prices is due to the high wages in the United States. The high American wages are one of the wisest measures created against social convulsions. While social injustices in Italy, France, in our Latin America—as has been most tragically demonstrated lately in the case of Guatemala—engendered drives that have led the masses to open their arms to the brutal Communist tyranny, the wise distribution of wealth in the United States has contributed to maintain public order and public liberties.

We most eagerly recognize the nobility and wisdom of such a system. But by the same token we insist that the high standard of living of the American people is paid by all of those who buy American products. To illustrate this point, let the Venezuelan remember what they paid 20 years ago for an American shovel and what that same shovel cost them today. And that can be applied to everything the United States exports today.

In a wider scope, let us remember one of the truths learned in the last decades, that it was foolish economically to try to keep some countries in a backward stage, as mere producers of raw materials. Recognizing such mistake, has not the United States expended lately many millions trying to help those backward countries, in order to create new markets for the ever expanding American industry?

There is then an economical justification in the United States helping Venezuela's infant industries to achieve a footing of their own, without having to battle the overwhelming American competition. And finally and not less importantly, is not the United States interested in helping other countries, including Venezuela, to improve their economies in order to be better equipped to fight the social conditions that breed communism?

Some Sobering Thoughts on July 4th

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS S. GORDON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 1, 1954

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following article that appeared in the Polish American Congress Newsletter entitled "Some Sobering Thoughts on July 4th":

TWO REVOLUTIONS: THE AMERICAN IN 1776 AND THE BOLSHEVIK IN 1917—A COMPARISON

As we observe our Declaration of Independence on July 4th this year, it may be well to dwell for a moment on some thoughts which should be uppermost in our minds on that nationally observed holiday: one of them, our own revolution in 1776, and the other, the Bolshevik revolution in 1917. Let us look into the latter first.

There is not much argument on the question that the revolution was almost necessary in Russia to overthrow the Czar and oppressive despotism. However, the Red rulers who followed the Czar imposed their own brand of despotism and oppression on the people—they did not grant the freedoms, or the rule of the "proletariat" so glowingly pictured by the Bolsheviks—before the revolution.

REVOLUTION SOVIET STYLE

It was presumed that, for a while at least, a strongarmed-ruler was needed and justifiable to establish the new socialistic order, as many people might show an aversion to it, and resent such untried and untested ideas of government. However, it was believed, that time would heal all wounds, order be restored, and the Communist "paradise" would materialize.

Of course, students of the new godless philosophy realized and knew full well that the hoped for millenium for the common man just could not come to pass. It was based on the laws which are odious to man, they denied him the dignity so prized by man who was made to the image and likeness of God. Man had to become a mere chattel of the state, and all concepts of democracy, as the free world understands it, went out the window. Those who dared to differ in thought and practice were unceremoniously—or by the process of the notorious Soviet trials—liquidated—to use a term which stands in Soviet Russia for murder or worse. Such was the order established by the self-styled champions of the common man—and it is growing in ferocity daily. Only the Iron Curtain prevents us from getting all the true details.

REVOLUTION—AMERICAN STYLE

Now let us turn to 1776 and the American Revolution. Here, too, was a rebellion against oppression. Not all Colonists were sympathetic with the radical move, and for that era of kings and monarchs it was a most radical move. Democratic forms of government were mere dreams of sentimental idealists.

But the Founding Fathers of this new Government stated in the Declaration of Independence the self-evident truths: That all men are created equal—that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights—that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. And they meant every word of it.

England was defeated and the new order was put into operation. It was not easy or as simple as that. But no Iron Curtain was erected to keep the rest of the world out, though the colonists were aware that the first steps of the infant democracy were bound to be awkward and stumbling. They were sure, however, that the new order was based on the natural laws and privileges of man, on the eternal laws of God. All of us who are even vaguely familiar with American history know the rest of the story.

And so here we are, the most powerful, the most influential, and the richest country under the sun—and, incidentally, the most charitable toward all nations, without regard to race, creed, or color—with no thoughts of aggression or designs against any nation in the world.

Not everything in this order even now works perfectly, but we are on the right road. We are grateful to Almighty Providence we never needed machineguns or wholesale murder to bring this about.

No, we did not think in those early days of such a thing as the Iron Curtain to keep other nations out, but we started with a standing invitation to the rest of the world to come in, to help us share the natural riches with which this Nation was blessed.

No wonder intelligent American workers of all skills and trades shun the Red menace of communism like a dreaded disease. The liberties they enjoy here will never be pawned for the reign of terror raging among the rich and poor alike over so much of the globe dominated for these many years by the bloody despotism of Communist Russia.

A. J. L.

The Bills Should Move

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1954

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Navy Times of June 26, 1954:

THE BILLS SHOULD MOVE

There are 3 bills before Congress, similar only in that each has a dubious aspect, but all three are so important that the 83d Congress should enact them before it adjourns, if at all possible.

Most important of these is the dependents' medical care bill. We have asserted that this bill is fatally defective in its exclusion of the Coast Guard. The House Armed Services Committee has advanced the further criticism that some provisions in the measure are too vague. Both these objections should be promptly cured and this vital measure be passed.

The defect in the reenlistment bonus bill is not in the bill itself, but in the services' failure to sell what is intended to be a career-incentive to the men involved. The Senate Armed Services Committee quite properly interrupted its hearings on this bill to ask what the men concerned thought of it.

Now we do not mean that a military service should be run by popular vote. That is the way not to run a military service. But a bill whose sole reason for being is to spur reenlistments should not be brought forward if its effect will be not to spur reenlistments.

Navy Times has not, so far expressed an opinion on the reenlistment bonus bill. We do so now.

We think it is a necessary bill and should be enacted.

But it won't be an effective bill if the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard don't sell it to their enlisted men. For there have been a number of criticisms of the bill from ranking career men. Although these men lose nothing by the bill, they stand to get nothing. And they will see some men far junior to them in service, and often junior grade, pocket larger reenlistment bonuses.

They don't like that.

They must be convinced that their reward for rank and service comes with every payday, with their preference for quarters, their equity in retirement, and the like. They must be convinced that a sizable bonus, offsetting available veteran benefits, is essential for that special group of men just finishing their first (and to a lesser extent, their second) cruise, men not yet converted into careerists.

Yes, the new bonus plan has discriminatory aspects, but it is dictated by the immutable laws of the market place.

The third bill has not yet been introduced but it should be. It is the State Department's request that Congress consent to the award of a number of decorations which have been hanging fire now for as many as 8 years.

The first such request was introduced, got as far as a House Armed Services Committee hearing, then was ditched. The next try was through the Foreign Affairs Committee, but that committee, throughout the 82d Congress, refused even to introduce the bill. Now a new try is being made through Foreign Affairs.

The objections in the past have been twofold: First, Congress was asked to allow service personnel to wear a number of decorations from Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Argentina. Secondly; Maj. Gen. Harry Vaughan, military aide to former President Truman, was on the list for seven awards.

As to the first, defense's plea was that these awards from Iron Curtain countries were made by former, friendly regimes. This, of course, was no argument at all—unless defense was proposing that the recipients wear large placards attesting the date of award. It will be recalled that at the beginning of World War II, American servicemen did not debate the conditions under which they had received German and Japanese decorations, but removed them.

The proposed new bill now properly omits the Polish and Czech awards. It retains the Argentine awards, and the awards to Vaughan.

Whether these should be approved by Congress is a matter for Congress to decide. After all, the reasons for the constitutional ban on acceptance of a foreign honor without consent of Congress is intended to give the legislators the say about who is to get foreign awards and to which governments our citizens may be beholden.

The conferring of such power entails the obligation to use it. Congress owes it to the many servicemen whose awards are not in question and the many friendly countries with which we have been exchanging awards to make a prompt decision on these disputed points, one way or another, and pass the bill.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

PRICE OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

The Public Printer is authorized to furnish to subscribers the daily RECORD at $1.50 per month, payable in advance.

Remit by money order payable to Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Printing and binding for Congress, when recommended to be done by the Committee on Printing of either House, shall be so recommended in a report containing an approximate estimate of the cost thereof, together with a statement from the Public Printer of estimated approximate cost of work previously ordered by Congress within the fiscal year (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 145, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on Printing, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

DISTRIBUTION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

To the Vice President and each Senator 100 copies; to the Secretary and Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, each, 25 copies; to the Secretary, for official use, not to exceed 35 copies; to the Sergeant at Arms, for use on the floor of the Senate, not to exceed 50 copies; to each Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress, 68 copies; to the Clerk, Sergeant at Arms, and Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives, each, 25 copies; to the Clerk, for official use, not to exceed 50 copies; and to the Doorkeeper, for use on the floor of the House of Representatives, not to exceed 75 copies; to the Vice President and each Senator, Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress there shall also be furnished (and shall not be transferable), 3 copies of the daily RECORD, of which 1 shall be delivered at his residence, 1 at his office, and 1 at the Capitol.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Frank Brodie is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

PRINTING DOCUMENTS AND REPORTS

Documents and reports of committees with the evidence and papers submitted therewith, or any part thereof ordered printed by Congress, may be reprinted by the Public Printer on order of any Member of Congress or Delegate, on prepayment of the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 162, p. 1940).

Appendix

The Bituminous Coal Industry: Its Position, Problems, and Areas of Possible Relief

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 2, 1954

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, on June 29 a delegation composed of Members of Congress and representatives of the bituminous coal industry visited the White House for a conference with President Eisenhower.

The congressional delegation included Senator John S. Cooper, Kentucky, and Representatives Richard M. Simpson, Louis E. Graham, Leon H. Gavin, John P. Saylor, and James E. Van Zandt, all of Pennsylvania; and Representatives Will E. Neal, West Virginia, and William C. Wampler, of Virginia.

The following statement describing the coal industry, its position, problems, and areas of possible relief was presented to the President and was the subject of discussion during the 30-minute conference.

We in Congress who represent the bituminous coalfields were very much impressed with the President's willingness to consider the problem and his declaration of intention to appoint a high-level committee to study the subject.

Following is the statement presented to President Eisenhower:

The Coal Industry: Its Position, Problems, and Areas of Possible Relief

I. COAL IS VITAL

(a) To the economy of the United States.

Coal is produced in about 28 States. The physical volume of output is huge. It employs hundreds of thousands of people directly and many more indirectly. It is a substantial customer of the railroads and furnishes the most profitable traffic hauled by them. It, and its employees, constitute a large market for the products of farms and factories, outside of the coal fields. In many States, such as Pennsylvania, West Virginia, Kentucky, Ohio, Indiana, and Illinois, coal is the base of the economy of very large areas. Without a substantial market for coal, many of these areas cannot exist except as a wilderness.

Coal supplies important needs. It makes possible our steel industry, which, in turn, makes possible our oil and gas industries, and all steel-using industries. It supplies fuel for many huge powerplants generating electricity. It furnishes chemicals which are processed into thousands of everyday necessities. It furnishes steam for many industrial and commercial establishments. It furnishes steam for many industrial and commercial establishments. It warms millions of homes. It can be converted into gas for use in homes and factories. It can be stored cheaply in huge piles at the point of use. It exists in large quantities and its reserves guarantee it a long life compared to low reserves and short lives for oil and gas. Per dollar of value, it supports more persons than any other fuel industry. In short, it is a necessity which this country cannot do without.

(b) To the defense of the United States.

Coal is essential to the production of our most important munitions of war. They require steel, which requires coal. Aircraft engines, tanks, ships, trucks, guns, shells, landing field mats, steel rail, bridges, bulldozers, jeeps—all require coal. The liquid fuels in ships, aircraft, and motor vehicles come from wells drilled with steel rigging, pipe and machinery, transported in steel pipes or tankers, refined in steel refineries, and delivered in steel trucks. The use of steel, and of coking coal, expands sharply during war, but coke ovens, blast furnaces, coal mines, coal cars, freight engines, etc., cannot be built quickly during war and then only at the expense of other uses.

Coal also provides the power for electric utilities and for vital industrial plants, and is used extensively for heating of homes, schools, buildings, and factories.

Coal must also, in time of war, take over the markets supplied by residual oil. Imported residual oil disappears when war comes and utilities, industries, commercial establishments, and other users of residual oil must change to coal. The same is true to a lesser extent with respect to heating and diesel oils, which rapidly become scarce when war comes. During the last war coal expanded its output by more than 50 percent without Government subsidy, by attacking coal lying near the surface with stripping shovels. But the big reserves of easily mined strip coal are no longer available and the time lag in expanding coal production will be much longer next time. The country simply cannot reduce capacity too much without running grave risks.

In brief, this country cannot fight a war of any duration without a developed and functioning coal industry able to take over the war load without delay.

II. THOUGH THE MOST EFFICIENT IN THE WORLD, COAL IN THE UNITED STATES IS AN ACUTELY SICK INDUSTRY

(a) Energy market is increasing sharply.

The market for energy is growing rapidly. It is growing at a more rapid pace than the increase in population. The use of mechanical energy is an index to productivity. The outlook is for continued increases.

The energy market includes liquid fuels used in internal combustion motors. Coal is normally not competitive with such liquid fuels. However, excluding liquid fuels from the energy markets, the growth of the remaining energy market is spectacular and all projections point to continued growth.

(b) Percentage supplied by coal is decreasing; production has dropped by one-third.

If coal retained its share of the energy market in which it should be competitive, the production of coal would be steadily increasing. Unfortunately coal has not held on to its percentage of the energy market. The percentage of the market supplied by coal has been steadily decreasing and at a rate much faster than the increase in the total use of energy.

Since 1948 coal production has dropped over 200 million tons, a quantity of vast size. This is about one-third of the peak production of recent years and more than one-half of the current production.

The markets lost by coal have gone to hydroelectric power, largely Government financed, petroleum and natural gas. There is an immediate threat of invasion of the energy market by a new competitor—atomic energy.

(c) Many mines are closing, with losses to owners, employees, local communities, and the public generally.

The results are everywhere apparent. Many mines are being abandoned. Unemployment and hard times have appeared in the coal-producing regions. Employees of skill and ability are being discharged. Idle men are everywhere, buying has dropped, collections are difficult, unemployment claims mount, and the relief load overwhelms Federal and local facilities. More and more miners' dwellings are vacant and are rapidly deteriorating into firewood. In short, an acute depression has reared its ugly head. The monetary and social costs are catastrophic.

The damage is not confined to the immediate coal-producing areas. Other areas of the Nation are hurt by the reduced consumption in the coal-producing regions of food, clothing, furniture, autos, gasoline, mine supplies, explosives, electricity, and other goods and services.

(d) Railroads are suffering from loss of coal traffic.

Coal has always been the most profitable traffic hauled by railroads. The declining volume of coal moving by rail has caused a sharp drop in the revenue from freight handled and in net operating income. But when coal output declines, other traffic likewise declines. Railroad men are discharged from repair shops and maintenance-of-ways forces, empty coal cars and freight cars are stored on idle tipple tracks. The basic transportation system of the country is adversely affected by anemia of revenue-paying freight.

III. AREAS OF POTENTIAL GOVERNMENT HELP

(a) Foreign:

(1) Limit imports of foreign residual oil.

Imported residual oil is doing great harm to the coal industry. The damage is felt most directly in the steamplants along the Atlantic seaboard.

It is not contended by the coal industry that all of its troubles can be blamed on the importation of foreign residual oil. The dieselization of railroad locomotives has taken a very profitable market from coal in the amount of 100 million tons annually, or 20 percent of the normal annual output, and there is little that the Government can do to restore this market. Also natural gas has replaced coal in many industrial, commercial, and household uses; and the coal industry does not expect the Government to plug up the pipelines in order to help coal. But there is no compelling necessity for this country to continue to import ever-increasing quantities of residual oil, when the effect is to deprive coal of a market it sorely needs.

The effects of competition from foreign residuals are felt through the country, as coal which would normally serve the steam plants on the Atlantic seaboard is offered in the inland markets. These markets are already adequately served by other coalfields which cannot serve the seaboard plants.

The steam sizes eliminated from the seaboard markets are the very small sizes which are produced simultaneously with coarse sizes as part of the mine run output. If the small sizes cannot be sold, then the coarse sizes, for which there may be a market demand, will not be produced. The loss of markets for the small sizes reduces the supply of coarse sizes and raises the price thereof. The coarse sizes then become more vulnerable to oil and gas competition. For every ton of small sizes produced a ton of coarse sizes is simultaneously produced. Therefore a loss of 25 million tons of steam sizes means a total potential loss of 50 million tons of all sizes.

The oil importers say that this country needs to import residual oil to meet a shortage in this country. The answer to this argument is that it is not so.

Domestically produced residual (whether produced from domestic or imported crude) is adequate in quantity to serve the needs of those domestic consumers who cannot efficiently use coal. And if the domestic demand for residual should increase beyond the supply, domestic refineries can, by adjustment of their plant processes, increase the output of residuals.

Coal producers have not asked for an increase in tariff rates on imported residual oil because such residual oils are a waste product from inefficient refineries and are customarily sold at fixed differentials under the equivalent price of coal. Therefore, tariff rates, unless prohibitively high, will not reduce the supply, but will only reduce the price going to the importer.

Nor have coal producers asked for any limitation on the quantities of foreign crude oil brought into this country to be refined in domestic refineries. Domestic refineries are efficient and are trying to get maximum production of high-priced products. They do not engage in the destructive competition offered by imported residuals.

It should be recalled that during World War II the supply of foreign residual oil suddenly disappeared and coal was compelled to take over and supply the users of residual oil, which it did without causing the shutdown of a single oil burning steam plant. This performance could not be repeated because a large part of the increased output of coal during World War II came from strip mines and easily stripable coal has been largely exhausted. This country cannot afford to take the risk of shutting down the large public utility plants generating electricity for vast metropolitan and industrial areas because of lack of fuel.

If the exclusion of foreign residual oil is impossible of attainment, and alternative means to the same end is a subsidy on freight rates to the big consumption points on the seaboard.

Other countries are extremely solicitous of the welfare of their domestic coal industries. It is odd indeed that in the United States this basic industry should be considered either as expendable or as a standby industry, to be called on only in cases of extreme national crisis.

(2) Aid more efficient refining of Venezuelan oil which will reduce residual output.

The bulk of imported residual oil omes from Venezuela and from refineries located in the Dutch Antilles which process Venezuelan crude. While Venezuelan crude averages heavier in gravity than domestic crude, and therefore will normally produce a greater percentage of residual from the same refining processes, yet it is shockingly inefficient. The residual yield, according to most recent Bureau of Mines figures, is 63 percent of total refinery production. The yield in domestic refineries is now less than 19 percent and it is steadily declining. With equivalent refining processes, the yield of Venezuelan residual should be about 25 percent. But the refining processes actually used are largely skimming processes.

The Venezuelan Government wants more efficient refining in Venezuela of crude produced in Venezuela. But the refiners are dragging their feet. Undoubtedly, the fear of expropriation on unfair terms is the cause of this reluctance.

More efficient refining would benefit everybody and would reduce waste of a great natural resource, oil, which is relatively short on reserves. The United States has a tool at hand for meeting this problem in the form of a guaranty of investments in Venezuela and in the Dutch Antilles in improved refining facilities. This tool is used for other industries and there is no reason why it should not be used in this situation. Ultimately it would largely solve the problem of reducing the supply of residuals for importation into this country.

The oil importers and the Department of State both contend that it would be hurtful to our foreign trade if quota restrictions should be imposed upon imported residual fuel oil. It has been stated that Venezuela in particular, would be adversely affected and would, as a consequence, be less friendly to this country and would buy less manufactured products from this country.

When the extreme prosperity of Venezuela is contrasted with the acute depression now prevalent in the coal fields of the United States, one may wonder whether such an argument has any relevance. It may be pointed out that Venezuela has a population of only about 5 million people and that at least 5 million people in the United States are directly or indirectly dependent upon the prosperity of the coal industry. As to numbers of people affected there is certainly a standoff.

Therefore, if a choice has to be made between the protection of the domestic coal industry and the protection of the wasteful refining of Venezuelan oil which is imported into this country, it would seem that the domestic coal industry has the preferable right in its claim for protective action by the United States.

(3) Require European governments to remove import restrictions which discriminate against United States coal.

American coal can now be laid down in European ports at a delivered price lower than the price for European or British coal One would assume that the volume of American coal exported to Europe would increase. Instead, it has dropped appreciably. The reason is that various kinds of currency and license restrictions have been imposed which effectively bar American coal.

We can of course object to any restrictions which keep out our coal when we have no restriction on coal imports in this country. But, a more forcible objection can be made to restrictions of European countries which purport to deal alike with exporters from all countries but which in fact discriminate against American coal. For example, West Germany is currently denying licenses to import American coal. But, American coal is going to West Germany by subterfuge. A West German importer will arrange for a shipment of American coal to move to the Netherlands. Upon arrival an import license is issued showing the coal to be of Dutch origin and it then moves in the original vessel to a West German port. The German importer makes a substantial margin which the American exporters would be glad to pass to the West German consumer if they could deal directly. This kind of discrimination is especially obnoxious and cannot be founded on any desire to protect the West German coal producers.

The United States can use its good offices to object to such discriminatory restrictions and to procure the removal thereof.

(4) Guarantee market for foreign currencies paid for United States coal.

Some countries do not buy American coal, even though it is cheaper, because of difficulty in obtaining American dollars. This problem has faced other depressed domestic industries and it has been met by guarantee by the United States of a market, at a fixed price, for the foreign currencies taken in payment for United States coal. Such a market is maintained for foreign currencies received for agricultural products exported by United States producers. No reason is apparent here why a similar guaranteed market should not be maintained for exporters of American coal.

(5) Limit imports of Canadian natural gas—support S. 1287 (Hunt bill).

Immense natural gas fields are being developed in western Canada, particularly in Alberta and Saskatchewan. Such gas will shortly be piped to eastern Canada. Spurs from the pipeline will run into markets for coal. The Hunt bill, S. 1287, is designed to limit such importation. Enactment of the Hunt bill would furnish a substantial protection of their existing markets for domestic coal producers. The executive branch should support the enactment of such bill.

(6) Carefully appraise financing or aiding foreign coal developments.

As a matter of policy in building up friendly countries, the United States has furnished funds and experts for the purpose of aiding foreign coal developments. The success of such work is detrimental to the exportation of American coal. The time has come for the United States to consider whether it prefers to continue its program of development of foreign coal reserves at the expense of the welfare of the domestic coal industry.

(7) Limit inimical effects of St. Lawrence seaway and similar projects.

The St. Lawrence seaway is now assured. In a few years, ocean shipping will come into the heart of the industrial United States where large quantities of coal are used. The lake market is essential to the continued life of many of the important coal-producing regions. But, the seaway will also bring into this territory foreign crude oil and fuel and heating oils, which will deliver at prices coal cannot meet. Thus, this long-sought development will definitely harm the coal industry.

The Government has a moral obligation to see that the general benefits of this improvement are not purchased at the expense of a small part of the economy. Cheap fuel and heating oils from abroad should be denied entrance to the Great Lakes, if they will reduce production of coal below the minimum necessary to preserve the Nation's safety and welfare.

(8) Subsidize the building and operation of colliers for use in foreign trade.

This Government has for many years subsidized the building and operation of merchant shipping engaged in carrying passengers and general cargoes in foreign trade. It also subsidizes the construction of tankers handling oil. But it does not subsidize the construction or operation of colliers.

The Government should extend its subsidy policy to colliers. By so doing it will greatly aid the coal industry in developing foreign markets for coal now closed to it because of the lack of efficient colliers and because of the lack of stable freight charges.

(b) Domestic:

(1) Protect coal from excessive natural gas competition.

The use of natural gas has expanded rapidly in the past and continues to expand. It has taken markets previously served by the coal industry, and the losses sustained by coal from natural gas competition are extremely large. The fact is that natural gas is cheaper in many market areas on a heat equivalent basis than either coal or oil. Considering the advantages inherent in gas, it should sell at a higher price on a heat equivalent basis than either coal or oil.

The maintenance of such low delivered prices has built up the demand for gas at a rapid rate, which of course will mean a much earlier exhaustion of the supply than would be the case if gas sold at competitive levels.

The policy of the United States, therefore, should be to take such steps as would bring the delivered price of gas up to levels where it would compete on a fair basis with the price of coal and of oil.

If this policy should be placed into effect, some changes in the Natural Gas Act will be required. They would be designed to permit producers to sell gas to the transmission companies at market levels without interference from the Federal Power Commission, to accord to transmission companies the current market value of gas produced by them when fixing rates at which such gas would be resold, to encourage the States to adopt conservation measures in connection with the production of natural gas, and to require the Commission to take into consideration the welfare of the coal and oil industries and the railroads in granting applications for certificates of public necessity and convenience in the building of new lines or in enlarging the capacities of existing lines. Government policy should also be directed to applying natural gas to those uses to which it is most peculiarly adapted so that uses which can just as well be served by more plentiful coal should be preserved to coal. Transmission companies have been financed on extremely thin equities and Government policy could insist upon more equity money for the protection of the integrity of the investment. Safety in construction and operation of pipelines and the promotion of underground storage fields (but in such manner as not to present hazards for coal mines and other underground operations) are subjects in which the United States should be interested.

The basic policy to be served is that of conservation of both gas and coal.

If the course of action suggested with respect to gas is not acceptable, another means to the same end would be to subsidize freight rates on coal so that coal could be delivered to points of use at prices competitive with the delivered price of natural gas. The total amount of such a subsidy would not be large in terms of the total current budget and it could be reduced as the price of gas rises.

Precedent for this suggestion exists in Canada. Besides imposing an import duty of 50 cents per ton on United States coal, Canada also subsidizes freight rates on Canadian coal up to $2.50 per ton, thereby giving its coal producers $3 per ton advantage in competing with United States coal in Canadian markets.

The United States has not announced a policy of opposition to these handicaps imposed by Canada on United States coal, and is, therefore, free to adopt the same policies if it wishes so to do.

(2) Require use of coal, where available, in Government buildings and installations in the United States and overseas.

The United States is itself a large consumer of coal in installations owned or operated by the Government both in the United States and overseas. As a consumer, the United States can exercise its own choice as to fuel. It should give consideration to the adoption of a policy of favoring the coal industry in all Government buildings and installations, where coal is available. A notable example of the lack of a fixed policy of this sort may be seen at Oak Ridge, Tenn. The AEC plant at Oak Ridge is located in the heart of east Tennessee coal field and can be served both by rail and truck-delivered coal. It can store its supplies of coal so as to be protected against every reasonable emergency. Yet it is consuming large quantities of relatively scarce natural gas as boiler fuel. This simply does not make sense.

Doubtless many other instances of similar character could be found if a survey of Government buildings and installations were made.

(3) Sponsor policies to limit freight rates on coal.

The delivered price of coal is made up of the price charged at the mine plus the cost of transportation to market. It is not infrequent for the freight rates on coal to exceed the mine price. In all cases, the freight rate is a very large element in the total delivered price. In recent years the freight rates on coal have been steadily increased in various general rate increase cases before the Interstate Commerce Commission. The coal industry has fought every single increase on the ground that, if effected, the markets for coal would be reduced and the quantities of coal handled as revenue freight by the railroads would be reduced. Unfortunately, the predictions made have been realized. Coal is the most profitable traffic ordinarily handled by railroads. It is believed that it should be the policy of the United States to limit increases on freight rates on coal permitted by regulatory bodies such as the Interstate Commerce Commission. Certainly, the losses incident to handling passengers and short-haul traffic should not be imposed on coal. The revenue needs of the railroad should not be paramount to the needs of the coal industry. (For further discussion see appendix A.)

(4) Finance research to promote use of coal.

One method of aiding the coal industry is to find new profitable uses for coal. Such uses, of course, come as a result of expensive research. The coal industry operates on such a low profit level that it cannot afford to finance expensive research projects. The United States has done some research but has recently reduced the funds supplied for this purpose. An enlarged research program worked out in cooperation between the Government and the coal industry and directed to the finding of new and profitable uses for coal, would appear to be needed.

(5) Reexamine official lending policies to promote use of coal where feasible.

The Government is engaged in many different fields in lending money. In making loans, it frequently stipulates conditions. It should give consideration to the adoption of conditions which would require the use of coal where feasible.

The Government should also examine existing rules for the purpose of eliminating regulations which discriminate against coal. For example, the rules of FHA concerning the valuation of properties for loans guaranteed by the Government have given higher valuations to houses and buildings heated by natural gas or oil, than to those heated by coal. These rules should be changed. (For detailed statement showing the heavy burden placed on bituminous coal to subsidize passenger traffic of railroads, see addenda hereto attached.)

The operations of all other Federal agencies should be examined critically to see whether there are other discriminations which could be removed by executive determination.

The Government could also influence the use of coal through the exercise of discretion in other fields. For example, granting of emergency amortization to industrial plants could be conditioned upon agreement that the plants use coal where feasible.

(6) Where Government enters the picture, make sure that coal is considered in determining costs at points of consumption.

Coal producers view with alarm competition arising from the expenditures of tax moneys. Such competition has frequently arisen in the past from Government-financed hydroelectric projects. Many such projects have been built for the purpose of producing power, although allegedly built for the purpose of controlling navigation or floods. Certainly there is no excuse for the Government to finance hydroelectric projects in cases where coal can produce electricity at a lower cost. Experience has shown that many hydroelectric dams do not produce firm power. Moreover many of the dams will fill up and become useless after a period of years.

It is understood that the policy of the present administration is to turn back the generation of electric power at both hydro plants and steam plants to private industry. This is a policy which the coal industry heartily applauds.

(7) Government attitude on consolidation of producing companies and selling agencies.

The coal industry is characterized by a multiplicty of producing and selling units. There are literally thousands of different producing organizations and selling agencies. The competition between them is fierce and intense. In times past the Federal Government has advocated a program of mergers and consolidations of coal-producing companies, so that the producing and selling units would be stronger financially. But while advocating such consolidations and mergers in one breath it has, by administration of the antitrust laws, discouraged them. The United States should seriously consider the adoption of changes in administration policies and in the antitrust laws, which would have the effect of encouraging physical consolidations and mergers, as well also as consolidation of selling agencies without physical merger or consolidation of producing properties. There are ample statutory precedents on the books which could provide the guides for such changes in administrative policies and laws.

(8) Discontinue Government spending to develop commercial steam plants fueled by atomic piles.

The Government is pouring billions of dollars into development of atomic and thermonuclear weapons. The AEC has recently sponsored the construction of steam plants fueled by an atomic pile to generate electricity. The purpose of such development is to use atomic fuel in place of conventional fuels. If it is successful, as some experts freely predict it will be, coal will suffer another attrition of its markets. Public-utility steam plants generating electricity represent 1 of the only 2 growing markets now available to coal. It will be a travesty if the coal inindustry is now deprived of such market as a result of Government-sponsored research and development.

It may be asked, What is there about fissionable material which makes it much more desirable as a fuel than existing conventional fuels? Why should the Government sell it at less than cost to commercial powerplants? If it greatly reduces the labor which now goes into the mining and transportation of existing fuels, where will that labor find employment?

What will happen to the coal mines and to the railroads which will be needed when, as, and if the next world war comes along? What big saving will actually be achieved by the substitution of atomic energy for the energy derived from conventional fuels? And, after all, is not uranium produced in the United States a relatively scarce fuel when compared to the tremendously abundant reserves of coal? From a point of view of conservation, is it more important to preserve coal than uranium?

The coal industry doubts if adequate consideration to these questions has been given by the United States. It respectfully urges that they be considered. The coal industry cannot look forward with pleasure to its destruction as a result of its Government's deliberately adopted policy.

(9) Possibility of establishing regular channels of communication between the coal industry and Government at Cabinet level.

Other industries have developed good channels of communication between themselves and various branches of the Federal Government which affect their operations. A notable example is the oil industry. The oil industry has long maintained established channels of communication with the Department of the Interior and the industry and the Department have worked hand in glove for years. The same thing is true between the oil industry and the Department of Commerce and the oil industry and the Department of State. The cooperation between the Department of State and the oil industry, particularly the major companies, is so close that it is difficult, at times, to tell whether a communication written by the Department of State originated with a Department official or an oil industry official. At any rate, they speak with one voice.

The coal industry does not hope to be able to attain a status of association with governmental bodies equal to that of the oil industry. However, it believes that there should be regular channels of communication between the industry and various branches of the Government. These could take the form of advisory groups appointed from the coal industry who could meet regularly with the Secretary of the Interior, with the Secretary of Commerce, and with policymaking officials in the Department of State.

Such an advisory group existed several years ago between the coal industry and the Department of the Interior. It was dissolved with the statement its legality was questionable. Apparently coal has a different legal status from oil, because the oil advisory group has continued in effect ever since and no question as to its legality has been raised. If there is any question of legality of such advisory groups appointed from within the coal industry to confer with various departments of Government, they should be removed by congressional enactment at the request of the executive department.

IV. CONCLUSION

The Government should formulate and announce a policy to encourage the use of coal, specifically designed to maintain a production of at least 450 million tons per year.

The Government should have a fuel policy based upon considerations of national defense, conservation of limited resources and the economic wellbeing of the country as a whole and of its important segments. It is believed that when such a policy is formulated, it would declare that coal is entitled to retain its share of the energy market and to participate in the growth of that market and that various activities of the Government should be shaped to bring about that end.

Reduced to quantities, such a policy would require the maintenance of an annual production of not less than 450 million tons of bituminous coal.

APPENDIX A

Passenger deficits of the United States railroads now exceed their fixed charges by a wide margin. In the period 1941–52, inclusive, the carriers have reduced their annual fixed charges through debt retirement, refinancing and reorganization by approximately $178 million. During the same period the passenger deficit has increased $417 million. Some salient figures on this situation are shown below:

Year	Fixed charges (millions)	Passenger deficit (millions)	Percent of net railway operating income absorbed by passenger deficit
1941	$620	$226	19
1946	471	140	18
1948	425	560	36
1949	421	650	49
1950 [1]	428	616	40
1951	420	682	42
1952	442	643	37

[1] Excluding back mail pay applicable to prior years. ICO Statement M-125.

To overcome these passenger deficits, shippers of carload traffic are severely penalized by a high level of freight rates. In other words, the passenger deficit is subsidized by other users of the transportation system. The burden of providing this subsidy lays heavily on the bituminous coal industry. This is so because the bituminous coal industry ships more tons of carload freight than any other commodity. In 1952, even in the face of the long steel strike, which materially reduced the demand for coal's transportation, bituminous coal accounted for 25.2 percent of all the originated carload revenue traffic on the United States railroads. Not only is bituminous coal the largest contributor in tonnage volume to the passenger subsidy, but, also due to the high level of their rates, measured as against their cost of transportation, they are making the highest contribution above cost (with one exception) of any of the major commodity groups. From figures contained in ICC statement No. 3–52, Dr. Ford K. Edwards, of the NCA, prepared the following statement which he introduced in evidence before the ICC in Docket Ex parte 175.

Commodity group:	*Percent of revenue dollar representing contribution over cost*
Bituminous coal	29
Products of mines, exclusive of bituminous coal	16
Animals and products	20
Products of agriculture	28
Products of forests	29
Manufacturers and miscellaneous	47

The effect of coal's contribution to the passenger deficit is more amazing when viewed in the light of the percentage which its freight rate bears to its final delivered value as compared with the other important commodity groups; for example:

Commodity group:	*Percent total rail revenue is of destination value*
Bituminous coal	36.5
Products of mines, exclusive of bituminous coal	23.2
Products of forests	3.2
Products of agriculture	2.9
Animals and products	1.3

The next largest user of railroad transportation, measured by volume of tons of originated traffic, is iron ore. But in the case of ore they make no such contribution to the passenger deficit as does bituminous coal. Coal moves in large volume to lower Lake Erie ports to be transshipped by vessel to points beyond. Coal also moves in large volume to North Atlantic tidewater ports to be transshipped by vessel to points beyond. The same cars, crews, tracks, and motive power which transports the coal are used in the reverse direction to move ex-lake iron ore and ex-tide iron ore back to the inland furnaces. Two examples will suffice to show that ore is making little if any contribution to the passenger subsidy.

Coal rate:	*Gross ton*
Johnstown, Pa., to Baltimore, Md., (outside cape rate)	$3.47
Iron ore rate:	
Baltimore, Md. (ex-tide), to Johnstown, Pa	2.31
Coal rate:	
Pittsburgh to Erie, Pa. (for lake transshipment)	2.75
Iron ore rate:	
Erie, Pa. (ex-lake), to Pittsburgh	1.76

(All of the above rates subject to Ex parte 175 increases.)

It seems apparent that bituminous coal is not only subsidizing the passenger deficit, but is also subsidizing the steel industry to provide it with lost-cost iron ore.

Section 15a (2) of the ICC Act provides:

"In the exercise of its power to prescribe just and reasonable rates the Commission shall give due consideration, among other factors, to the effect of rates on the movement of traffic by the carrier or carriers for which the rates are prescribed; to the need, in the public interest, of adequate and efficient railway transportation service at the lowest cost consistent with the furnishing of such services; and to the need of revenue sufficient to enable the carriers under honest, economical, and efficient management to provide such service."

Ever since the enactment of this section of the act, the ICC apparently has given more consideration to the managerial discretion of the carriers in their contention for higher rates than they have "to the effect of rates on the movement of traffic." The continuing round of ex parte cases since 1947 attests to this fact.

There is, however, another duty upon the ICC as enacted under the National Transportation Policy (Sept. 18, 1940; 49 U. S. C.)—

"To provide for fair and impartial regulation of all modes of transportation. * * *

"To recognize and preserve the inherent advantage of each. * * *

"To encourage the establishment and maintenance of reasonable charges. * * *

"All to the end of developing, coordinating, and preserving a national transportation system by water, highway, and rail, as well as other means, adequate to meet the needs of the commerce of the United States, of the postal service, and of the national defense."

One of the surest ways to preserve the rail segment of our national transportation system is to restore a large volume of bituminous-coal movement to the rail carriers. This can be accomplished by a reduction in the cost to the consumer of the delivered price of coal. This can be most readily accomplished by a reduction in the rail-transportation cost to consumers where bituminous coal has been displaced by foreign oil and natural gas. This could be accomplished by the payment of a subsidy to the railroads sufficient to permit a lowering of the rail freight rates in the critical areas.

The payment of subsidies, directly or indirectly, to promote the national economy is nothing new. Farm price supports, drought relief, flood-control programs—all are direct subsidies to certain segments of our population—but all in the interest of the national economy.

Getting a little closer to the transportation problem, we find that the Federal Government is spending or preparing to spend billions of dollars on dredging of harbors—building break walls—installing radar reflectors; channel buoys; lighthouses; lakes and dams on the inland waterways; the St. Lawrence seaway. All of these projects are denominated navigation aids. All of them are a subsidy to the transportation agencies able to take advantage of such expenditures. The granting of a subsidy to the rail carriers for the maintenance of a healthy coal movement certainly presents no new concept of one means of carrying out the national transportation policy.

The modus operandi of putting into effect and carrying out such a policy presents no particular problem. The Dominion of Canada, in pursuance of a national-fuel policy, has had a system of subsidies, to aid the bituminous coal industry, in effect for over 25 years.

As an example, quoted below is an excerpt from the order in council (P. C. 3253, June 11, 1952) covering subsidies granted to encourage the movement of Nova Scotia coal:

"The board is hereby authorized to extend financial assistance in respect of the movement of Nova Scotia coal to points in the Provinces of Quebec, Ontario, and Newfoundland for use by consumers other than the railways by the payment of a sum of money in respect of each shipment in an amount to be determined and calculated as follows:

"Where Nova Scotia coal is transported wholly by rail to points in the Provinces of Quebec and Ontario the assistance may be made by payment to the railways of an amount equal to 45 percent of the freight rate applicable to the respective shipment or the sum of $2.50 per net ton, whichever is the less."

During the Canadian fiscal year 1952–53, out of a total production in the entire Dominion of 16,948,000 tons of bituminous and lignite, 2,406,000 tons, or just under 15 percent, moved on subsidized rates. The average subsidy was $2.47.

Reserve Program Vital to Defense of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 2, 1954

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, a weekly newspaper in the town of Brownfield, Tex., recently published an editorial which summed up succinctly and convincingly the necessity of maintaining a strong reserve program in our preparedness setup.

In the best tradition of weekly newspapers, this editorial approaches the problem from a local point of view, showing how the service of men within the community of Brownfield ties in with the important nationwide program.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial from the Brownfield News be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

With about 60 Terry County National Guardsmen now training at North Fort Hood this seems an appropriate time to call attention to the draft-reserve program.

Taking first things first, we commend those men who have shed their mechanic's overalls, carpenter's aprons, farmer and businessmen's clothing in exchange for khaki cotton and helmet liners. These men attending field training are doing their best to perform their mission.

And what is that mission? It is to maintain a ready reserve for an emergency. These 2 weeks climax a whole year of 2-hour once-a-week drills. They've done their classroom and drill-floor work. But that is only the first step, comparable to the football team's skull practice. It is only in field training that they can run through their various plays and learn to function—and to fight, if it ever becomes necessary again—as a team.

The employers also deserve praise, particularly in those firms making up deficiencies between Army and regular pay to their men and still not charging them vacation time. Their contribution to defense is also important.

And as the years go by this will become an even more common event because changes are in order for our national defense plan.

We look for the draftees to eventually serve only 6 months of active duty and thereafter attend regular drills and summer training with the Guard or in Reserve units.

These men would be obligated to do this with strong regulations making enforcement easy.

Through this program a vast ready reserve could be maintained without suffering the tremendous annual loss of manpower the services now suffer.

In speaking of the Reserve program we should point out that Brownfield also has an Air Force unit that meets for weekly drills. By belonging, former Air Force men accrue financial benefits, promotions, learn of late air developments and have the personal knowledge that they are fulfilling a patriotic obligation.

Senator Lyndon B. Johnson recently cautioned that America stands in a perilous position and that the boundary between peace and war is mighty thin. A strong reserve is a necessity in the preservation of our American way of life.

Growing Up in the Present World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, June 24, 1954

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an address on the subject Growing Up in the Present World, delivered by our able former colleague, Senator Graham, of North Carolina, on the occasion of the 50th anniversary luncheon of the National Child Labor Committee, notwithstanding this address is one-half page over the ordinary limit on insertions and will cost $212.50 in all to publish.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Growing Up in the Present World

(Address by Mr. Frank P. Graham, on the occasion of the 50th anniversary luncheon of the National Child Labor Committee, April 21, 1954, Hotel Commodore, New York, N. Y.)

The National Child Labor Committee is now 50 years old. It is a maxim that those who forget those on whose shoulders they stand will do little worthy to be remembered. High on the honor roll of our remembrance today are the names of those noble spirits, Edgar Gardner Murphy, Felix Adler, Samuel McCune Lindsay, Florence Kelley, A. J. McKelway, Owen R. Lovejoy, David F. Houston, Wiley H. Swift, Homer Folks, Countenay Dinwiddie, Lewis W. Mine, Edward C. Lindeman, and today's chairman, Ernest Johnson, Madam Vice Chairman Mrs. Richard J. Bernhard, Sol Markoff, James Myers, and lastly the able administrator and dedicated spirit, Gertrude Folks Zimand, and all those associated with them who across a half century have made this committee a vital force in helping to emancipate millions of children, defenseless children, and to recognize the dignity and promise of the lowliest child and to establish the child at the center of the promise of America. They are now all enrolled in honor, as one of the waves of the successive waves of pioneers who have given substance to our hopes as they engaged in subduing a continent to their relentless wills in making America to the pattern of their unresting dreams.

After the pilgrims of faith, the conquerors of a continent and the builders of an industrial civilizaton, there came the social pioneers on new frontiers of an unmastered civilization with their restless concern for the conservation of natural and human resources and for the life, liberty, better social conditions and equal rights of working men and women and the equal opportunity of their children in whom was to be lost or saved the heritage and hope of our American dream.

In recollection of the founders and the work of the pioneers, we should also for present perspective and future projection of our work recall both our ancient spiritual heritage and modern economic forces which gave birth to and made necessary humanitarian movements of the 19th century out of which, at the beginning of the 20th century, came the National Child Labor Committee and its purposes and work for 50 years.

THE SPIRITUAL AND HUMANE HERITAGE OBSCURED IN THE SMOKE OF THE INDUSTRIAL REVOLUTION

Prophetic of the purpose and spirit of the Child Labor Committee was the life of a child 2,000 years ago who "grew in wisdom and stature and in favor with God and man." When the Child became a Man, He said for all time, "Suffer the children to come unto Me and forbid them not, for of such is the kingdom of Heaven." Nineteen hundred years later and every year for 50 years thereafter the National Child Labor Committee has sought to forbid them not and to prohibit those who would prohibit the children to grow in wisdom and stature and in favor with God and man. The spiritual worth, human dignity, equal freedom, equal opportunity of children was obscured for a time in the competitive drives, economic theories and spreading smoke of the industrial revolution.

ADAM SMITH, JAMES WATT, AND THOMAS JEFFERSON EXPRESS THE NEEDS AND SPIRIT OF A REVOLUTIONARY AGE

It was not a mere coincidence that Joseph Black, the great physicist and proponent of the pure theory of latent heat to become dynamic in the expansive power of steam, James Watt, his laboratory assistant, who mechanized this pure idea and became the inventor of the steam engine, and Adam Smith, the economist and interpreter of the theory of laissez faire, were at the same time all on the staff of the University of Glasgow a strategic city of commerce and industry at the beginning of the industrial revolution. It was a part of the spirit and trend of an age that Adam Smith's Wealth of Nations and Thomas Jefferson's American Declaration of Independence were published to the world in the same year, 1776.

The American, French, and industrial revolutions were all vital parts of a revolutionary age. The industrial revolution with the philosophy, the liberty of the individual and the dynamics of the freedom of enterprise, overturned the monopoly of guilds and the mercantilest regulations of the state. Economic enterprise was liberated from old restrictions on production and old obstructions to trade and found wider markets for larger production in the freer exchange of goods in many parts of the world. The American Revolution, by the commitments of the Declaration of Independence, and the French Revolution, by the Declaration of the Rights of Man, were fought for the freedom, equal opportunity, and dignity of all people.

The industrial revolution with its power engines for expanding production and distribution, made possible the abundance by which the freedom and equality promised by the American and French Revolutions could be fulfilled. Yet the great engines of industrial enterprise and the mechanisms of finance and capitalism in the 19th century, as they proceeded in power across old and new continents with all their potentialities for more abundant production and fairer distribution, actually widened the gulf and made vaster the inequalities between the new privileged groups and the disinherited millions of men, women and children whose work sustained the new industrial structure but whose wages and conditions of labor and life were held or driven down in the then unregulated and ruthless competitive struggle for survival, profits and power.

CHILDREN AND THE LAISSEZ FAIRE PHILOSOPHY

The theories of a mechanistic self-balancing universe, held in place by gravitational and other universal laws of nature and nature's God, and the theories of the automatically self-balancing and self-correcting economic system, adjusted true by the laws of supply and demand and other universal laws of nature and nature's God, it was held, gave something akin to natural and divine sanction to the system of free enterprise to be regulated, not unwisely and harmfully by the state, but wisely and beneficently by the dynamics of production and exchange in the free markets of the world.

We recall the social history of the industrial revolution still vivid with pictures of little children in the 18th and 19th centuries working long hours in in coal mines and factories, and other even smaller children at home without the care of their mothers because the mothers as well as the fathers were compelled for survival to work at low wages for long hours. We recall the economic and political philosophy which sanctioned this exploitation of men, the mothers of children and the children themselves. It is too simple an explanation to say that the owners and managers were altogether heartless in their grasping for profits and power when they themselves were also in some part the victims of a philosophy which rationalized their inhumanity as a by-product of their more abundant production and service to humanity.

Obscured in the smoke and profits of a rising industrial production, with its overall beneficent potentialities, and submerged in the laissez faire theories of economies and politics, with their emphasis on the unrestrained liberty of the individual and the values of unrestrained competitive enterprise, was the Judaic-Christian spiritual conception of the Fatherhood of one God and the brotherhood of all people as the children of God. Forgotten as children of God and future citizens of a nation were the little children whose impoverished homes and long hours of sunless work in mines and mills were stunting the bodies as temples of the spirit, undermining the stock of the British people at the time of their leadership in the modern world.

THE HUMANITARIAN REFORM MOVEMENTS

Against the inhuman consequences of unrestrained, unspiritual, and impersonal economic forces, a few religious, labor, industrial, social, and political leaders began to speak out as voices crying in the wilderness of the new industrialism. Military leaders concerned with the deterioration of the bodies and spirit of British soldiers joined in the demand for social reforms. After social surveys and bitter battles, factory legislation began the regulation of hours of work and the ages of working children. Economic theories confronted with social conditions yielded to humanitarian reforms. Social reforms, the labor movement, the women's movement, universal education and universal suffrage became the necessary, saving, and humane parts of the industrial revolution. The humanitarian movements of the 19th century recovered the conceptions of the Judaic-Christian-Graeco-Roman-European-Britsh-American spiritual and humane heritage and emphasized the fact that the American and French Revolutions were fought not only for individual liberty but also for the equal freedom, opportunity, and dignity of all people, including industrial workers and the children of the poor.

As the power engines, with both their beneficent and tragic consequences, moved on from their island home in Britain to their new continental homes on both sides of the Atlantic, the battles for enlightened humanitarian reform had to be fought all over again in the countries of western Europe and in the American States, first in New England and last in the old South. In the old South, where human slavery made one of its last stands in the modern world, industrialism made fresh beginnings on virgin soil.

In the mind and heart of Edgar Gardner Murphy, of Alabama, was born the idea of a National Child Labor Committee. In the South were lessons in the tragedies of the old slavery and hopes in the opportunities of the new industrialism for a friendly folk between the Potomac and the Gulf, in a pleasant land under a Southern sun, to build a fairer civilization than yet had characterized the history of industrialization in Europe or America.

Instead, the shibboleths of human liberty, which came flaming from the soul of Thomas Jefferson in behalf of disinherited people in the early years of the 19th century, were turned against the equal opportunity of the forgotten millions in the 20th century. The theory of States' rights, long an historic bulwark against the rise of a national dictatorship and in Jefferson's hands a political sword for the defense of the liberty of the individual against the alien and sedition laws and against plutocratic power, became the instrument of slavery, then of corporate power and economic exploitation, and in our time the cover for a new isolationism. With all its valid and functional values in the balanced American structure of local and Federal power, the theory of States' rights in stages of the American historical transition from a comparatively local agrarian and handicraft economy to a more dynamic industrial society, became the instrument of a regional economy based upon plantation and slave labor, and then after the overthrow of slavery it became the buckler and shield of an industrial society based on the corporation and machine labor, and has been the powerful defense mechanism of the resistance to humanitarian legislation, to the conservation of natural resources, to the equalization of opportunities in suffrage, labor, health, and the education of children, and full national participation in world affairs in the days of America's great opportunity for leadership in the world.

As the mills and factories moved into the waste places and climbed the hillsides in the Piedmont South, which potentially creative power for raising the standard of living, one of the several movements in the Nation to have the Federal law sponsored by the National Child Labor Committee prohibiting child labor declared unconstitutional came from the Piedmont South.

In spite of many social advances, in spite of the new nationalism of Theodore Roosevelt, the new freedom of Woodrow Wilson and the establishment of the League of Nations after the First World War, children in the second and third decades of the 20th century were growing up in a world over which hovered the threats and shadows of depression, fear, and war.

HUNDREDS OF MILLIONS OF PEOPLE TURNING AWAY FROM AN UNFULFILLED DEMOCRACY TO THE PROMISE OF TOTALITARIANISM OF THE LEFT AND THE RIGHT

Hundreds of millions of people in the world were turning away from the promises of freedom and democracy to the promises of totalitarian dictatorship. Many and complex causes prepared the way for, and many diverse factors entered into, the rise to world power of the modern totalitarian states. Not the least of these causes was the failure of an unfulfilled democracy to satisfy some of the basic needs of the human body and some of the highest aspirations of the human spirit.

Democracy had provided equality of suffrage but not equality of opportunity; the freedom to worship but not the right to work; the freedom of assembly and the right of collective petition but not the freedom of the self-organization of workers and the equality of collective bargaining; corporate privilege but not agricultural parity; and political liberty but not social security against the hazards of modern society. The democracies, in general, with their dominant position, and America, in particular, with its unparalleled possession of the resources of abundance, presented to the world many disillusionments in the midst of which children were growing up—the insecurity of peace in a world of armaments, poverty of farmers in a world in need of food, loss of farms and homes in a society largely based on homes and farms, poverty, and dependence of men and women after lives of faithful work, injustice to Negroes and to other racial and religious minorities, oligarchiac corporate manipulation of stockholders, regimentation of workers, wide misinformation of consumers, the use of the historic documents of human freedom in behalf of economic power over the freedom of human beings, vast unemployment in the midst of universal need, hunger amid plenty, child labor and sweatshops in the midst of unemployment, and disillusionment and despair in a world of youth and opportunity. The old political liberties and social drift of a more static framework were found tragically insufficient to meet the vast economic changes, the financial crisis, and the deep human needs of our dynamic modern society.

AMERICAN REFORM MOVEMENTS OF THE THIRTIES WITHIN THE FRAMEWORK OF FREEDOM

American democracy in the 1930's under a bold leadership set about to preserve the precious liberties of worship, assembly, speech, the press, suffrage, and lawful process for person and property, regardless of creed, race, color, or economic position, and to enlarge the historic Bill of Rights to include, as basic to them all, a new bill of rights: Proposals for more equal educational opportunity for all the children in all the States; provision for farmers as equal partners in our then lopsided economic society; for equality of bargaining power through the organization of workers, the cooperation of farmers, and the information of consumers; for the right to work and decent terms and conditions of the working life; for higher levels of social security to lift the levels of human liberty; for American participation in international cooperation for peace, and security against the hazards of an unorganized world community in which wars and depressions anywhere involve people everywhere; for intelligent production as a way of abundance and decent consumption as a way of life; and for a more abundant distribution of the good life as the basis of real business prosperity; for all people the fulfillment of the ideas of the American Revolution and the humane potentialities of the industrial revolution; for the more equal freedom and opportunity of all people.

REACTIONARY COUNTERREVOLUTIONS AND DICTATORSHIPS RESISTED BY FREE PEOPLES

With the resumed march of the democratic revolution begun in 1688, 1766, 1789, in its great march around the earth came the countermarch of two reactionary totalitarian revolutions. With the Fascist revolution came the Second World War, and with the expansion of the Communist revolution the cold war, and with the aggression of the police state came the Korean war. The United Nations, with its hopes that the international cooperation which had won the Second World War would carry on and win the peace, found itself confronted with a divided world, the cold war, the hydrogen bomb, new alarms and confusions of people and insecurity of children in all lands.

THE PRESENT NEED FOR NATIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMS IN THE INTEREST OF CHILDREN

In the interest of children, to whom the world always potentially belongs, the people of the United States need to develop without Federal controls programs for the children of America, and the United Nations needs to develop without international controls programs for the children of the world.

In these days of a receding economic security, broken homes, inadequate housing, much juvenile delinquency, social hazards of the children of migrant workers and wetbacks, and the unequal opportunities of children for health and education, voluntary associations of a free people such as the National Child Labor Committee, undaunted by rampant fears and smears, need to organize public support in America for increased social security, Federal aid for more adequate housing, more Federal aid for adequate medical care, and intelligently coordinated, private-public, local-State-Federal programs for more aid to the States for more equal educational opportunity for all the children in all the States.

A free people whose heritage and hope of freedom are in the equal opportunities of their children are not to be deterred by the misplaced cries of "States' rights" and are not to be frightened by the false cries of communism raised against every movement to deepen the meaning of America for all Americans and to extend freedom and opportunity to the people in rural areas, to the children of the disinherited in all areas, and to the children of migrant workers. These are not less important certainly than migrant birds. The Federal Government rightly appropriates millions for the welfare of migrant birds but little for migrant children, many of whom live in crowded trucks and unsanitary shacks with little school and home life in their tender plastic years.

THE CASE FOR FEDERAL AID TO THE STATES FOR SCHOOLS WITHOUT FEDERAL CONTROL

For example let us, in the interest of children, examine one proposal, the case for Federal aid to the States for schools without Federal control which was inaugurated by the National Child Labor Committee in 1910 led by John Dewey, Owen R. Lovejoy, William H. Kilpatrick, John Finley, and others. In many States inadequate school budgets skimp provision both for expert supervision of instruction in the elementary schools and for supervision of school attendance under the State laws. Large numbers of children of school age are out of school from lack of supervision, without wholesome recreation in congested areas and are at work before their time. School budgets in many States need a Federal supplement quite small in comparative amount, just about a battleship, but large in comparison values to the children and to the future of America.

The largest number of children in proportion to population are in the areas with the least proportion of wealth. The people in some Southern States who pay the highest tax rate for the education of their children are below the national average in school expenditures per child. If some States put their whole general budget into the public schools alone—not a thing into legislatures, courts, police, or what not—they would still be far below the average for the Nation. A considerable proportion of the children, who, in their nonproductive years, are a charge on the school budget in the poorer States, migrate, in their creative years, to richer States to become producers of wealth in those already richer areas of industry, commerce, and finance. Federal aid, and there is the crucial test of the sincerity of our democracy, is the only way to provide more equal opportunity for all the children in all the States. In the Federal structure of States and the Nation the only way educationally to recognize the dual nature of our constitutional Federal structure is to provide Federal aid to the States for the schools and this can be done without any undesirable Federal control, in line with the wishes and traditions of the people, for the sake of the children and the country. A comparative meager proportion of the support of the schools by Federal supplement is long overdue for the training of children who are to become citizens not only of the States but also of the Nation, whose freedom and equal opportunity are invested in the schools for all the children in all the States.

The movement for Federal aid to the States for schools, unfortunately for the children of America, has been submerged by other interests. The issues of religion and race can be resolved in this advancing democracy on the basis of our religion and our Constitution and should not block the movement for the Federal aid to the States for the schools, so indispensable to the more equal opportunity of all children in all States. The principle of not having Federal control of the schools under the constitutional dual structure of the States and the Nation, leaves to the States, with all due regard for separation of church and state, the question of auxiliary services to children as children. The issue of segregation is now in the hands of the courts and will, we believe, provide the basis for a fair and progressive solution.

Upon Federal aid to the States largely depends not only equal educational opportunity in all the States but also the fairer and larger fulfillment of the programs of the National Child Labor Committee, the local school boards, the State departments of education, professional associations and the parent-teachers associations, for a richer liberal curriculum, more adequate salaries, better teaching, more adequate school buildings, full school attendance, continuation in high school, expert supervision, vocational guidance, health education and expert counselling in the transition from school to work or to college. Studies made and programs projected by the staff of the National Child Labor Committee, and highly prized by school boards and educational leaders, need for their fulfillment, Federal aid to the States for the schools without Federal control.

Opposition to Federal aid to the States for the schools is in effect opposition to these programs for which the committee and the schools are enthusiastic in their cooperation. Opposition to Federal aid to the schools, as I see it, is in effect opposition to the only way that we can provide more equal educational opportunity for all children in all the States.

The National Child Labor Committee, which joined with the National Education Association and other voluntary associations in launching the original Federal aid program early in the 20th century, needs on its 50th anniversary to lead again in cooperation with educational and voluntary associations in the resurgence of the movement for Federal aid to the States for the schools as a principal source of our democracy and the hope of freedom in an imperiled world.

THE HOPES OF CHILDREN IN THE HOPES OF THE UNITED NATIONS

The equal opportunity of children on the farms and in the cities, in the slums and in the wealthiest suburbs, behind the sand dunes and in the remotest mountain cove, whether immigrant or native, Christian or Jew, white or colored, are the substance and the hope of our not quite dead American dream. Children in the Americas, Europe, Africa, Pacific-Asia, and on islands far and near, are a basic part of the faith and hope of the United Nations with its programs for decreasing poverty, hunger, illiteracy, and disease.

The United Nations' International Children's Emergency Fund is history's greatest mobilization of the concern of the world's people in behalf of scores of millions of their forgotten children. No human beings have more at stake in the purpose, work, and hopes of the United Nations than the children, East and West, upon whose little feet walk the hopes of the future in their human pilgrimage to awful destruction by war and the evil in man, or to the high destiny of the children of God who "made of one blood all the nations of men to dwell on the face of the earth."

As I close may I express here the hope, as a part of our rededication of the National Child Labor Committee, that our America, which was the home of a great faith and the haven of heretics in the days of its infant weakness, shall not become now the stronghold of a great fear and the great smear in the days of its vast power but rather may this voluntary association—and I pray God that the time will never come when Americans in fear of some future smear will be afraid to join voluntary associations for the equal opportunity of all people and their children—and all those who join hands in its spirit and in its free voluntary enterprises as a very basic part of the freedom of America itself strive to make America become a land in which there will always be the freedom to struggle for freedom, where our Nation is made stronger by the robust struggles of freedom and our life is made richer by the vigor and variety of the differences of the people, where we seek to achieve a democracy without vulgarity, an excellence without arrogance, where the answer to error is not terror and the response to a difference in color and race and creed and economic status is not discrimination, intimidation, or exploitation. Where and when men are free, the way of progress is not subversion, and respect for the past is not reaction, and the hope of the future is the freedom of all people to struggle for a noble America in a freer and fairer world. And may our people of this yet young republic, in possession of the most abundant resources across this vast continent, heirs of all the races, religions, colors, creeds, and hopes of mankind, rise to the responsibility of our power and the opportunity for our greatness to give fresh hopes to the stricken peoples for food and freedom, and to organize justice and peace across the earth.

In 2,000 years may be hear a voice say, above all the tumult, and fears of these times, "Suffer the little children to come unto Me and forbid them not, for of such is the Kingdom of Heaven." May we in His Spirit, as we stumble forward, ever press forward together in the eternal adventure toward one world neighborhood of human brotherhood, through a more effective cooperation of nations, in a more adequate United Nations and a more inclusive collective security, freedom, and justice and peace and the fatherhood of one God and the brotherhood of all the people.

Like Children

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1954

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, for too long on foreign policy, we have followed the thinking and the advice of New York and other eastern seaboard cities which depend for their existence upon the charges they make for the services they render the people of the Midwest. The larger part of these charges are for services for handling foreign trade—goods shipped in and out through their ports and financial transactions with other countries.

The thinking of the people of the East is naturally international. Apparently, they give little consideration to the thought and the activities of the people of the Midwest. We in return, perhaps do not see clearly their viewpoint nor the reasons for it. Being closer to mother earth, realizing almost daily, that we live, prosper, and are happy because of what we dig out of the dirt, or, if you prefer, the soil, and manufacture, we cannot see their viewpoint which seems to be that not only our happiness and our prosperity but our national existence depend upon pleasing, gaining the approval and support of the people of other nations. In my opinion, the more than $119,301,997,500 which we have sent abroad as of today, has failed to bring either sincere friendship or wholehearted support of our present foreign policy. France, which has received $4,945,000,000, will not follow Dulles' recommendations.

Britain's representatives are here today expressing their determination that she will not back the policy of Dulles and the internationalists with military support. Churchill and Eden insist that we can, and must in some way, get along with Russia. Or we can fight alone.

Each and every one of the nations we have so generously aided, in support of whom so many hundreds of thousands of our men have suffered and thousands died, will today, as in the past, follow the course which to it seems for its own best interests.

It behooves us to remember that today, as always in the past, self-interest guides the activities of all other nations.

Imposing our views, our thoughts, our way of living, by war upon the communistic world is an impossible task.

Let us disregard the urging of our seaboard friends, of the profiteers, of the internationalists, of the sincere but mistaken dreamers, discontinue bleeding ourselves white, turn to a policy of efficiently and economically building our own national defense; think and act first to make our own country strong, self-reliant, prosperous, and secure.

A Plan for Highway Safety

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 2, 1954

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a plan to cut down the number of accidents on our highways which are killing and maiming more of our citizens than have been lost in all the wars in which we have been engaged. The following plan was submitted to the President's National Highway Safety Conference by one of my constituents as an idea that may well be worth studying as a means for gaining greater safety on our highways:

The PRESIDENT'S NATIONAL HIGHWAY SAFETY CONFERENCE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I take this opportunity to inform you and the safety-minded people assembled in Washington of a new approach to reducing the death and injury toll on our highways.

I propose a graduated Federal tax on speed. The tax rate would vary as the square of the speed of the vehicle. Any engineer or physicist knows that if the speed of an automobile is doubled the chances of death are not doubled but are four times as great. Add to this the increased probability of accident at high speed due to decreased driver control and it is evident that the chances of death and serious injury are much more than four times as great.

Speeds up to 50 miles per hour would be tax exempt. For speeds exceeding 50 miles per hour I suggest the formula: Tax per mile equals $(V^2-1500) + 10^{-5}$ where V is in miles per hour velocity.

Between 50 and 60 miles per hour the tax would range from $0.010 to $0.021 per mile, between 60 and 70 miles per hour the tax would range from $0.034, between 70 and 80 miles per hour it would range from $0.034 to $0.05 and between 80 and 90 from $0.05 to $0.06 per mile.

A few among the wealthy might disregard the tax and speed anyway, but they would be very few out of the total number of drivers.

Most people are "thrift minded" and would therefore cut their speed in order not to be taxed. Some would accept a small tax but not a large tax and therefore would cut their speed from the 60–70 miles per hour range down to the 50–60 miles per hour range. Thus, this system is essentially a self-imposed governing system. It will do the same job as a mechanical governor but will allow the driver complete control of his car and the great safety factor of fast acceleration in emergencies such as may occur in passing.

How is all this to be done? I, or any competent mechanical engineer can quickly supply a number of simple mechanisms which would record the number of miles driven at various speeds or speed ranges. Better still, a mechanism could be designed which would give a continual integration of tax for speeds over 50 miles per hour according to the formula suggested or any other practical designated formula.

These devices would be inserted between the speedometer cables and speedometers of all operating vehicles. The speedometer cable would have to be sealed at both ends by a Federal seal to prevent anyone from disconnecting the device or tampering with it.

Once each year, the owner of the vehicle would drive it to the local Federal agent who would read the dials and determine the tax. In the case of the continual integration type, the device could be calibrated to read directly in dollars and cents to simplify procedures. This could be done at the same time as a mechanical inspection of the vehicle, which has been adopted in some States (New Jersey, Massachusetts, and others).

Not only would this system reduce the death rate but it would be a great source of sorely needed revenue for the Federal Treasury.

(A great host of our people would be for such a system because they themselves never or rarely exceed 50 miles per hour. Others would gladly accept an incentive to lower their own speed habits. Therefore, I do not believe it would be difficult to sell this idea to the American people.)

There are approximately 45 million automobiles and 9 million trucks in operation in the United States at the present time. Taking 10,000 miles as an average yearly mileage traveled by the average motorist, if he drove 1,000 miles between 50 and 60 miles per hour the tax would be about $15. If he drove 500 miles at speeds between 60 and 70 miles per hour it would cost him another $13. If his total mileage between 70 and 80 miles per hour was 300 miles he would pay an additional $13. The remaining 8,200 miles would be tax exempt because they were miles driven under 50 miles per hour. This hypothetical driver would thus pay $51 for his excessive speeding. Multiplying the number of cars in operation by $50 results in a revenue of $2,250,000,000 annually.

By reducing his speed to a safer range he could easily cut his tax in half. This would greatly contribute to automotive safety but yet would bring in a revenue of $1,125,000,000 not to mention the millions of dollars in hospital bills saved, doctors and nurses released for other work, paydays earned and reduced insurance rates which would be made possible. More important than money is the physical and spiritual well-being of thousands of our people involved in accidents each year. Many people, even young people, are confined to wheelchairs for the rest of their lives, and some as a result of their physical impairment to dull their spiritual outlook which is even worse.

Every avenue must be explored, and there are many which will contribute to highway safety. I have explored this one and am convinced it is sound.

Respectfully,

RUSSELL SOLHEIM,
Senior, Mechanical Engineering.

Complications in Indochina Foreseen for United States, Britain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT H. BOSCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 2, 1954

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith the following editorial entitled "Complications in Indochina Foreseen for United States, Britain," which is of timely interest to all of us concerned about the future of this Nation and the free world:

COMPLICATIONS IN INDOCHINA FORESEEN FOR UNITED STATES, BRITAIN

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON, July 1.—Uneasiness over what's going on in Indochina seems to be increasing as suspicions are voiced here that maybe there is a deal on between France and Red China concerning the evacuation of certain areas in southeast Asia. Also rather vehement speeches have just been made by Senator KNOWLAND, of California, Republican majority leader, and by Senator PAT MCCARRAN, of Nevada, Democrat, denouncing any idea of admission of Red China into the United Nations, which they suspect may be part of a deal involving French support for that step in exchange for better terms for France in Indochina.

Both hypotheses are declared by French officials here in Washington to be baseless. As one of them explained it, why would any French general withdraw his troops before an armistice is signed, especially when negotiations at Geneva between the military men and the diplomats have by no means been concluded? It was stated that obviously the withdrawal from certain parts of the rich delta area by the French is a strategic retreat and means only that a narrower perimeter will be established that can be more readily defended hereafter.

COMPLICATIONS FORESEEN

The situation is by no means stabilized. On the contrary, it presents possible complications for the United States and Great Britain, for, if the French find themselves unable to defend the area to which they have retreated and if they feel compelled later to accept adverse terms in an armistice, the Paris government undoubtedly will once more ask for American and British military aid before resigning itself to the acceptance of the Communist proposals. In other words, America and Britain may have to share in part the blame for the debacle.

There is some dispute as to what really has happened in recent months between the United States and France with reference to official discussion of military intervention. The State Department's version is that the French Government never formally asked for aid and that the United States outlined the conditions for such aid which, in effect, called for an internationalizing of the war in Indochina and for a vote of confirmation by the French Parliament as well as written requests by the goverments involved that America come in.

The French version is that no government can ask formally for aid or promise an action by Parliament, that the meaning of the French diplomats who presented the matter informally was unmistakably clear and that the conditions set forth by the United States were unacceptable. Some day when a white paper is issued on the subject, it will be interesting to examine the documents on both sides and see what led to the misunderstanding.

As for the military withdrawal, this, it is authoritatively declared by French spokesmen, was decided upon several weeks ago when General Ely flew to Indochina on a special mission and that what's happening now is a consummation of the program adopted by the Laniel-Bidault government in Paris in May.

The issue of admission of Red China to the United Nations is not one that the French would raise, because they know how sensitive the American Government is on that subject. Rather, it is suggested that revival of the discussion now is a result of the Churchill-Eisenhower talks which some British newspapers have linked with the possibility of a change in the Washington government's attitude. But there is no change coming.

THREAT TO QUIT U. N.

Republicans as well as Democrats in Congress are united against admission of Red China into the U. N. If any government on the Allied side in Europe wants to press for admission for Red China and succeeds in persuading the Security Council to replace Nationalist China with Communist China, the end result will be action by Congress withdrawing from further participation by the United States in the U. N. So European governments which may be anxious to placate Red China might better consider whether it is worthwhile to swap a Communist membership for an American membership.

Nothing could contribute more bitterness to a political controversy inside the United States—and it could affect appropriations for foreign aid and world policies in general—than a decision by our allies to take Red China to their bosoms notwithstanding the 140,000 casualties in Korea and the persistent refusal of the Comminists to recede in the slightest from their course of aggression. It would indeed be the beginning of the end of such prestige as the U. N. retains in America. The best information available here is that no government in Europe among our allies is seriously considering any such step at this time. It certainly can hardly have any connection with what's happening in the negotiation of an armistice in Indochina.

L. M. "Nick" Gensman, Pioneer, Dies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 23, 1954

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend remarks, I include an article from the Lawton Constitution, Lawton, Okla.:

L. M. "NICK" GENSMAN, PIONEER, DIES

Loren M. "Nick" Gensman, 76, pioneer Lawton attorney and political figure, died of a heart attack at 12:35 a. m. today in his home at 901 A. He had been in failing health about 3 years.

A resident of Lawton since the opening in 1901, Gensman's colorful career was highlighted by his election in 1920 to the United States House of Representatives. Defeating Elmer Thomas in the GOP landslide that year, he became the only Republican Congressman ever to serve this district. He was defeated in the 1922 election.

Born August 26, 1878, in Andale, Kans., Gensman attended the University of Kansas and was admitted to the bar February 6, 1901, in Douglas County, Kans.

It was while a student at Kansas University that he met Lucia Van Cleef, whom he married April 6, 1904, at Perry. The future Mrs. Gensman was studying and teaching music at the university at the time the couple became acquainted.

Gensman was among a wagonload of pioneers who arrived in the Lawton area about 2 weeks before the city was opened to settlement on August 6, 1901.

He opened his law office here immediately following the opening, and served as Federal referee in bankruptcy from 1902 to 1907.

His next venture in politics came in 1918 when he was elected county attorney for one term. Following completion of his term in Congress, Gensman confined his political activities to helping lead Republicans in this area.

He conducted his law practice, with some time devoted to investments and other business interests, until ill health forced his retirement last year.

A member of the Oklahoma and Comanche County Bar Associations, Gensman also belonged to Lawton Masonic Lodge, No. 183, and the Guthrie Consistory.

Survivors, besides his wife, include a brother, L. K. Gensman, 1313 Euclid, and several nieces and nephews.

Funeral services will be held at 3 p. m., Friday, in the Lawton Funeral Home Chapel, Rev. J. J. Stowe, Jr., pastor of First Methodist Church, officiating.

Masonic graveside rites will be conducted in Highland Cemetery by members of the Lawton Lodge.

Gensman was one of the most colorful of Lawton's early day citizens and he was often referred to as the "salt of the earth" by his many friends.

Proud of his pioneer background, Nick enjoyed reliving the earlly days typical of this vicinity and usually joined in the annual birthday festivities by donning western togs and growing a beard.

His early day habit of rolling his own cigarettes with wheat straw papers stayed with Nick through the years and his homespun talk and tales of the pioneer period endeared him to many friends and acquaintances.

As the time of his retirement approached, Nick did little in the way of legal practice but he continued to maintain an office downtown to retain contact with his old friends, many of whom paid frequent visits to his office to spin yarns of yesteryear.

He was always a welcome visitor around the cafe coffee tables and his dry humor and rich memories were a source of pleasure for those on hand.

Informing the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDGAR A. JONAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 2, 1954

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, June 29, the Chicago American published an editorial relating to the comments made on June 17 in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by Congressman LEO E. ALLEN, of Illinois, on an article which had appeared in the Saturday Evening Post.

Because of the attention that the article attracted, we might presume that most of Mr. ALLEN's colleagues, like myself, read the Saturday Evening Post article, which undoubtedly prompted the Congressman to insert his own remarks in the RECORD. The editorial stresses the importance of what Mr. ALLEN had to say about the service the press gives the American people.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the editorial entitled "Informing the People":

INFORMING THE PEOPLE

We don't think we've ever read a more accurate or more gracious estimate of the service the press gives the American people than the one Representative LEO E. ALLEN of Illinois inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD last week.

"We Americans," said Mr. ALLEN, "are the most literate and best-educated, best-informed people on earth. Without detracting from the outstanding accomplishments of our schools, much credit must be directed to our press, the daily and weekly newspapers as well as the magazines and periodicals which have pioneered in the dedicated task of bringing news and truth and knowledge to the people.

"The printed word is ever available to us all—rich, poor, young, and old. We can be assured of well-written, factual, informative articles and news stories. I trust the publishers and editors will long continue their policy of bringing truth and knowledge to our people."

Mr. ALLEN, with his deep understanding of the worth of the service the press gives the people, naturally appreciates the need for letting the press carry truth and knowledge to the largest possible numbers of Americans.

And he is in a position to help the press do it. He is chairman of the Rules Committee, which decides what legislation should go before the House for consideration, and in what order the various measures shall be presented.

Last February the House Post Office Committee approved a bill to increase postal rates by $245 million a year, including a boost of $15 million a year in the cost of mailing newspapers and magazines. This bill is now in the hands of the Rules Committee, awaiting action.

Last week a bill providing salary raises for postal employees to the amount of $200 million a year was aprpoved by the House Post Office Committee. It also goes to the Rules Committee.

Democratic Members of the House have said, on and off the House floor, that some Republican leaders plan to have the pay increase bill and the postal rate increase measure put before the House for consideration at the same time, giving the Members to understand that if the rate raises were defeated there would be no action on the pay raise.

We hope Representative ALLEN, as head of the Rules Committee, will do everything within his power to prevent this plan from being carried out.

And we hope also that he will oppose the passage of the rate increase bill.

The added cost probably would put some publications out of business and it would penalize them all in their work of keeping the American people the best informed in the world.

Much as we believe in Government economy, we think depriving Americans of information and enlightenment is too big a price to pay for reducing a postal deficit. The post office is not a business with an obligation to earn profits; it is a public service.

The Case of Pvt. Richard Keefe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT H. BOSCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 2, 1954

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following article by John O'Donnell, which is of interest to every American who has a son or relative serving with the Armed Forces of the United States in a foreign land:

(By John O'Donnell)

WASHINGTON, D. C., July 1.—Remember the case of Pvt. Richard Keefe, the American GI who went a. w. o. l. in France, got plastered, stole a taxicab, and wound up doing a 5-year stretch in a tough French pokey? He is the first American in uniform to be tried in a foreign court, found guilty by a foreign judge, and sentenced to a foreign prison while wearing an American uniform.

It never happened before in our history and it couldn't have happened now except for an executive agreement with a White House O. K.—the type of decision which would be knocked out by passage of the Bricker amendment to the Constitution. The amendment would curtail the power of any President and his State Department to make such deals with foreign countries.

The case of Keefe, a Maryland draftee, is now before the United States court of appeals here in the District and, we hope, will move up to the Supreme Court for final decision. A group of distinguished officers—Lt. Gen. P. A. Del Valle, United States Marine Corps, retired; Gen. Claire Chennault; Gen. Bonner Fellers, of the old MacArthur command; Adm. Leland Lovett, now of the VFW.; and others—are striving to knock down this first example of turning United States servicemen over to foreign courts for trial and punishment. Their organization is the Defenders of the American Constitution and the lawyer handling the Keefe case is Lt. Col. John H. Coffman, United States Marine Corps, retired.

Last January this reporter talked to many persons about the Keefe case, read all available information, and wrote a column on the subject for this paper.

Six months passed and then a letter arrived from Assistant Secretary of Defense H. Struve Hensel.

Hensel wrote to the News and to Generals Del Valle, Fellers, etc., that this writer was wrong on nine major points. Now we have before us a reply to Hensel by Keefe's lawyer, Colonel Coffman.

SAYS THE POINTS ARE SCARCELY FACTS

Writes Colonel Coffman: "You list in your letter some nine specific points reported by Mr. O'Donnell which you say are factually incorrect. First, let me say that the Department of the Army has been reluctant to disclose the facts of the case and any factual inaccuracies in Mr. O'Donnell's column would largely be due to that failure to disclose. It should also be pointed out that your nine points, called facts by you, include conclusions of law and differences of opinion between you."

Then Coffman takes up the Hensel points seriatim. Points 1 and 2, concerning which Hensel said, "this is untrue," were that Keefe had been sentenced to solitary confinement and hard labor.

To which Coffman replies: "Information from Mrs. Keefe was that her husband was in solitary confinement. Information received by her after her petition for habeas corpus was filed just prior to January 5 last was that her husband had been moved to a better penitentiary, was no longer in solitary confinement. It would seem that Keefe would either be in solitary confinement or required to perform hard labor."

Making his point three, Hensel wrote: "O'Donnell implies that Keefe was subject to possible exile to a French penal colony."

To which Colonel Coffman replies: "The letter dated December 1, 1953, addressed to Mrs. Keefe by the Department of the Army, says: 'The maximum punishment under French law for the charge under which the men were charged is life imprisonment and banishment to a French penal colony.' Mr. O'Donnell's implication appears to be correct."

MINOR OFFENSE? IT'S MATTER OF OPINION

Point four my Hensel: O'Donnell states that the offenses which Keefe committed would have been minor offenses under American law. This is untrue."

Reply by Colonel Coffman: "This is a personal opinion."

Point five by Hensel: "O'Donnell states that the NATO treaty placed American servicemen under the jurisdiction of local civilian police. The truth is that American servicemen were subject to French jurisdiction long before the NATO treaty was even conceived."

Reply by Colonel Coffman: "This is a conclusion of law and the matter is now before the United States Court of Appeals. The published opinion by a United States court on this point reads: 'The right of a nation to exercise authority over its forces while in a friendly nation was early recognized by the United States Supreme Court.'" He concludes: "Thus, Mr. O'Donnell's conclusion is based upon a court decision and yours is not."

Hensel, point six: "O'Donnell states the treaty made American sercivemen in NATO countries subject to local jurisdiction for the first time in our hisory. This is untrue."

Coffman in rebuttal: "O'Donnell's conclusion appears more correct than yours in light of case quoted above. Furthermore, if your conclusion is correct, why were not some servicemen, out of the millions who served abroad in World Wars I and II so tried and confined?"

Hensel, in his points 7 and 8, disputes details of how Keefe and his companion took possession of the taxi.

Coffman in rebuttal observes: "You state as a fact that they performed certain criminal acts. This highlights the injustice of this Keefe case. Neither you nor anyone else have any right to convict an American, within American jurisdiction, of any crime or state as a fact that he committed a crime unless and until such American has been found guilty under American court procedure and by Americans."

And to Hensel's charge that O'Donnell was wrong in stating that the treaty made it possible to inflict cruel and unusual punishment on American servicemen found guilty by certain local courts in Africa and the Middle East, Coffman replies:

"Under your statement (that any country where our troops are stationed shall have jurisdiction over them) Mr. O'Donnell's statement would appear to be correct on your own premise."

Representative Andersen's Stand Is Correct

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD O. LOVRE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 2, 1954

Mr. LOVRE. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I include herewith an editorial regarding one of our most active and hard-working colleagues. This editorial was written by Fred C. Christopherson and appeared in the Daily Argus-Leader of Sioux Falls, S. Dak. The editorial follows:

REPRESENTATIVE ANDERSEN'S STAND IS CORRECT

H. CARL ANDERSEN, Tyler, Minn., has represented Minnesota's Seventh Congressional District in the United States House of Representatives since 1939. He is chairman of the House Agricultural Appropriations Subcommittee. His district consists of a tier of counties bordering upon South Dakota.

Representative ANDERSEN favors a price support law guaranteeing farmers 90 percent of parity. In this, he is in agreement with the stand taken by Dwight D. Eisenhower, at Kasson, Minn., and Brookings, S. Dak., during the 1952 presidential campaign.

This puts him at odds, of course, with the flexible price support plan presently backed by the Eisenhower administration. And it has also brought him some criticism from a Republican Party convention in his district.

Why ANDERSEN should be criticized by members of his own party for standing firm on 90 percent parity is puzzling.

After all, he's only trying to help the Republicans keep the promises they made to the American farmer 2 years ago.

To justify his own position, ANDERSEN recalls that Candidate Eisenhower said "the Republican Party is pledged to 90 percent price supports and is pledged even more than that to helping the farmer obtain his full parity, 100 percent parity, with the guaranty in the price supports of 90 percent."

It is assuredly no more than right that the Minnesota Congressman should back up this statement and pledge by the Eisenhower administration.

ANDERSEN is no obstructionist. He is loyal to his party, and the last thing he wants to do is embarrass President Eisenhower. He has made clear that he agrees with the Chief Executive on 80 percent of the administration's program.

If anything should be questioned, it should be the attitude of the district convention which adopted a resolution supporting the proposals for a flexible price support law, as opposed to legislation that would assure 90 percent of parity.

Supreme Court on Segregation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT T. ASHMORE

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 1, 1954

Mr. ASHMORE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following speech recently delivered by Hon. A. G. Kennedy, probate judge of Union, S. C.:

The Supreme Court's decision holding that segregation of the races in tax supported schools is unconstitutional was made by a court which was not guided by former court decisions, constitutional law, or good sense. The decision was purely political and not for the betterment of either the white or colored schoolchildren and students affected. The decision, instead of easing race tensions and strife, will increase both. The Communists, their backers, and haters of the white people of the South, the NAACP and unscrupulous politicians hoping to get the Negro vote in Northern States where the Negro blocks are the balance of voting strength all approve this decision.

We of the South have only two logical courses to follow in solving our problem, and it will not be choosing between good and evil, but rather taking the choice of two evils. If we submit to the degradation intended and imposed upon our civilization by the Supreme Court, then we will accept nonsegregation, which means eventually amalgamation of white and black races which will be race suicide for the white race in this country and possibly for the world. If we discontinue the operation of schools and colleges supported by taxes, then the education of our children will be seriously impaired for some time. I believe that the temporary impairment of the education of our children is by far the lesser of the two evils. It is better to have education and school facilities crippled than to destroy our civilization. Those who have not lived where the negroes and whites are in equal or nearly equal numbers or the blacks outnumber the whites are not competent to prescribe a course of action. I assume that the intelligent members of both races in the South want what is best for their respective people.

Mixing the white and colored children in the schools will most seriously adversely affect both groups, cause friction, contention, and strife to such an extent that neither the whites nor the blacks will be helped. Both groups will be frustrated.

What is the remedy? The State legislature can enact legislation which will convey the publicly owned and operated white schools and institutions of learning to white educational associations or societies, and the colored schools and educational institutions to colored educational associations. The State and counties could then continue furnishing textbooks free to the individual students as is now done. Aid in the way of direct grants or loans to needy individuals and worthy students could legally be provided. When the State ceases to assume the responsibility for education, then religious organizations and others will rise to the necessities of the occasion. The fact that the Negro politicians and those whites who are seeking their favor are demanding immediate change of the schools, without giving time for an orderly change, shows that they are not as much interested in the education of the Negro as in his exploitation. I believe if you had 200 children, 100 whites and 100 blacks, to attend the same school mixed together, they would accomplish less attending 10 months of school than if the school was operated for one-half of the time as a segregated school.

There is much criticism of the educational methods in both the elementary schools and the institutions of higher learning, some of which is not without foundation. Educational opportunities and more facilities, buildings, equipment, transportation, and even free lunches have been provided at public expense during the last 25 years. Many observers report that educational efficiency has not been maintained. A wide range of subjects is being taught without attaining proficiency in any of them; thoroughness is not required. Juvenile delinquency has increased among high-school students, in spite of the claims that education will prevent delinquency.

If parents had to sacrifice and deprive themselves and their children of some of the luxuries and nonessentials in order to send them to school, it is not unreasonable to assume that both the children and their parents might be benefited and they would be made to see that going to school is not just a frolic. Most students who have to work their way through college do more while in college and after than those who make no personal sacrifice to obtain an education.

If there were no schools operated by tax money there might not be as many attending school, but those who did would do a better job, for those worthy students would not be hindered by a crowd that goes to school to frolic and just because their parents have money to waste on them, and find that it is cheaper to send their children to college than maintain them at home. I believe in 5 years the readjustment from State-operated schools and colleges to other methods of providing education for our children will afford all with better training and preparation than if nonsegregated schools were put into operation.

The people of South Carolina will continue to have schools and all those who are worthy of an education can and will get one if we are not given $1 from the Federal Government. It will cost no more money, probably not as much, and the education will meet the needs of the youth when provided by industrial communities and other organizations and by individuals and the students themselves.

The people of South Carolina can show to the rest of the world an example of white and colored people being helpful to each other and at the same time both races being educated without going to the same schools. I think it would do both races good to learn to depend upon themselves rather than the Government for everything.

I should like to say a word of encouragement to those who cannot go to college. What one does after leaving college and what one uses his talents and money for is more important than what school he attended or how much money he may earn. It is what one does and where he goes, rather than where one begins and who he thinks he is.

The two outstanding members of the colored race in America were Booker T. Washington and Dr. George Washington Carver. Both were born slaves and had to work for and go hungry to get an education.

Andrew Carnegie, one of the most successful men of America came as a foreigner when 12 years of age to this country and worked in a cotton mill as a bobbin boy at $1.20 a week. He founded colleges, libraries, and devoted his entire fortune for the benefit of mankind. He never went to college. John D. Rockefeller was raised on a New England farm and never finished high school, yet he has founded and aided numerous schools and financed scientific and other research organizations that have been of untold benefit to mankind all over the world and provided gainful employment for millions of people. John Henry Ford never went to college, yet he put the automobile in reach of millions of Americans and provided employment for unnumbered thousands. George Washington, the father of our country did not have the equivalent of a high school education by today's standards, yet he and his followers taught the King of England and the British Empire a lesson in how to treat her colonies. Abraham Lincoln taught himself and earned a living by hard work and his successor, Andrew Johnson, a great statesman and constitutionalist was taught to read and write by his wife after they were married. Thomas A. Edison, whose inventions are too numerous to mention, the electric light and many household, industrial, and scientific appliances are the product of his brain and he never went to college. The Wright brothers, the inventors of the first heavier than air airplane which was launched at Kitty Hawk, N. C., were operating a bicycle repair shop in Dayton, Ohio when they began their experiments. Neither of them ever went to college. Luther Burbank, the greatest plant breeder and practical botanist and horticulturist of all time never attended more than the village school, but he produced the seedless cherry, the thornless rose, and many other useful and ornamental plants, fruits, and vegetables. I could mention many others who have contributed much to the betterment of humanity who never went to college.

One thing these men all had was the ability to work hard and long. They thought more of their work and the welfare of others than of themselves. Millions of people are receiving benefits and blessings derived because such men provided for them. I do not intend to discredit education, for every one of us daily are blest with things made possible by college men and scientists who have attended institutions financed by men who never went to college. Not one of these men would have failed or refused to go to college if he had the opportunity.

I have mentioned these men to encourage those who might feel that if they do not attend college or have some rich relative or friend to help them that they are doomed to failure. I beg any such to remember the saying, "Man in his weakness is a victim of circumstances, but in his strength is the maker of circumstances."

The Panama Canal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 2, 1954

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to call attention to an article appearing in a recent issue of Human Events in which the editor, Mr. Frank C. Hanighen, comments on a series of cracks in the rock banks of the Panama Canal which he believes threaten blockage of the waterways of the canal. If the situation is as Mr. Hanighen points out in his article, I feel this matter deserves some consideration. The article follows:

PANAMA CANAL

The recent disastrous slide at the Panama Canal emphasizes the dangers of too much military bureaucracy. For a number of years the Governor of this vital area has been a military figure—usually a general from the Army engineers. The astounding fact is that as far back as 1938 cracks were observed in the facings to the Canal and experts then predicted that unless they were taken care of a slide was practically certain. A decade later Gen. J. C. Mehaffey of the Army engineers then serving as Governor of the Panama Canal Zone made one of the few reports on the canal. His report made no mention of those dangerous cracks which today have materialized in a landslide so critical that some experts fear it may yet block the whole canal. Thus for some 17 years a military bureaucracy in the Canal Zone has apparently done nothing to avert this disaster which was warned against as far back as 1938.

During this period another example of inefficiency occurred which has been too little known. Under the administration of Maj. Gen. Glenn E. Edgerton, the "third locks" project was started. This project had been drawn up under the preceding administration in when General Edgerton was, in effect, chief assistant to the Governor. After scooping out a tremendous cut the project was finally suspended after some 75 millions had been poured out. This uncompleted project is derisively referred to as the "third locks blunder." Back of it was an ambitious plan to convert the Canal into a seagoing waterway. The ultimate cost of doing this would run into many billions. For several years Congressman Thomas Martin, Republican, Iowa, has sponsored a bill which if passed would probably result in making the existing canal thoroughly efficient at a cost of less than $750 million, but business interests with their eyes on the lush contracts that would result from a sea level canal are still striving to put over this big boondoggle on the taxpayer.

Faith and Admiration for the Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT H. BOSCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 2, 1954

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Speaker, as we approach the celebration of the Fourth of July we are all reminded of our wonderful heritage of a free Nation, and our heart goes out to those people throughout the world who do not know this freedom. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith a letter received by me from Dr. Walter Becher, secretary general, member of the Bavarian Landtag, who expresses his great faith and admiration for the Congress of the United States:

Arbeitsgemeinschaft zur Wahrung
Sudetendeutscher Interessen,
München, June 29, 1954.

Hon. Albert H. Bosch,
United States Representative,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Representative Bosch: I should like to express to you, on behalf of the Sudeten German expellees, all our best congratulations to July 4, the American National Independence Day.

With deep, vital interest, we follow the great fight being led in America, when your people are awakening to the Communist danger and, as once on July 4, are again regaining their freedom. This development which started 2 years ago, cannot but lead to a full victory for the cause of freedom, first in America, then in the rest of the world.

In the Congress of the United States we see the real leadership of America. On July 4, we should like to convey to you all our best wishes for the great American people, for you personally and for the great work and leading part you are representing in this great war for freedom.

We are sending you our best wishes also for the forthcoming elections and our prayer that God may bless your great work in the future.

Yours very sincerely,
Dr. Walter Becher,
Secretary General, Member of the Bavarian Landtag.

The Preservation of Our American Heritage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. GWINN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 1, 1954

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following response and address of Dr. Joseph B. Cavallaro, chairman, board of higher education, at the testimonial luncheon given in his honor by the Special Citizens' Committee at the Hotel Astor, New York, Sunday, October 18, 1953:

THE PRESERVATION OF OUR AMERICAN HERITAGE

I do not know if there are words adequate to express what I feel at this moment. May I just say that I am greatly honored and deeply touched by this tribute which I prefer to regard as a tribute not to me alone but to a cause—the cause of freedom—which all of us cherish and which we are determined to defend.

Here in this gathering we have a cross-section of America. Here are men and women from various walks of life, representatives of many organizations, of different religious and political beliefs, yet sharing common hopes, aspirations, and ideals. We are drawn together by faith in our country and what it stands for in this troubled age. Perhaps never in its history has the need for such faith been greater than it is today.

At our gates and in our midst stands the enemy seeking to destroy the very ideals, institutions, and principles that have made America great among nations. International communism, as every informed person knows, is determined to undermine and destroy those freedoms which dignify the human being.

To me, it is both amazing and tragic that the enemy has received encouragement and aid from Americans or those who profess to be Americans. Especially has this been true in intellectual circles. There is abundant evidence that the Communist conspiracy is working to corrupt our writers, our teachers, our journalists and our clergy. How successful it has been remains to be seen. But the greatest danger of all, it seems to me, is the threat to our youth, for to them belongs the future and the future of our country.

The agents of this international conspiracy would take from us our sons and daughters and reduce them to faceless, soulless slaves of materialism. Surely, any informed and loyal American must see in this conspiracy an utterly stupid, alien, primitive and degrading movement, completely lacking in the true understanding of man. For is it not simply crass ignorance to deny man's spiritual nature? And is it not debasing to deprive him of his self-respect and dignity? What can such a movement offer our youth? What material and spiritual gifts can it bestow which we do not have and cannot provide?

It is with both pride and humility that I think of what this land of ours has meant to me and to millions of others. To our shores have come individuals from every part of the universe, representing every race and religion, and holding different economic, political and social viewpoints. And yet all of us, from the earliest to the most recent arrivals, share in a great heritage. More than anything else it is the schoolroom that has contributed to our appreciation and understanding of this heritage. We have learned that such concepts as equality of opportunity and freedom of conscience are not empty phrases. Here they are the creed by which we live and work and worship.

I believe that the time has come when we must pass from a mere defense against the inroads of communism to a positive assertion of our faith. It is not enough to fight against the enemy; we must be prepared to fight for a cause. Whether we are conservatives or liberals, Jews, Protestants, or Catholics, there must be in this heritage of ours a common set of beliefs, principles, and values which draw us together as Americans. We need to understand them; to reaffirm them; to protect them at all costs. We must not fail those who paid the supreme price to maintain this heritage.

If we are to promote and defend our institutions, ideals and principles, we must give more thought to our schools and colleges. In the long run, the strongest bulwark against communism or any other threat to our way of life will be an informed people. It is not enough, however, to spend more money and to provide more buildings. We should take a greater interest in what is taught in our schools and colleges. I am not suggesting that we usurp the prerogative of experts in curriculum matters, but I do feel that we have the right to expect that our public institutions of learning should neither undermine nor neglect such knowledge as is essential for our existence as a free nation.

In this connection, I would like to suggest that every effort be made to promote the study of American history. While this suggestion has been made before by many individuals and groups, and some years ago by the New York Times, I believe it has particular significance in our fight against Communism. Knowledge of the past should create a deeper appreciation of our heritage and a better understanding of our present problems.

I do not believe that we should be unduly concerned lest such knowledge uncover past mistakes and weaknesses. Our history should be revealed as it developed, in the interest of truth. We ask only that it be taught by honest, loyal instructors, who should be accorded freedom to investigate, criticize, and interpret. In other words, true academic freedom, which is freedom with responsibility, should be preserved.

As it is my belief that ignorance of our history contributes to the success of alien propaganda, so I am convinced that its study will go far to offset this danger. Hence, it would not be asking too much that such study be required of all students in tax-supported schools and colleges. Surely, we have the right to expect of those who will be leaders, who one day will control the destinies of our Nation, that they have a knowledge of its development. If we are to safeguard our heritage, we can no longer remain complacent or indifferent. Too much is taken for granted.

We did not achieve our present leadership in economic, technological, or world affairs without sacrifice and struggle. What we have we owe in large measure to past generations. Our indebtedness to the many thousands who gave their lives to protect our inheritance is greater than we can repay. By what better means can our youth acquire understanding of all this than by the study of our history? And having acquired this understanding, may we not hope that they will be better equipped to resist the efforts of Communist agents to destroy our system of government and our way of life?

I readily admit that my faith in America, my appreciation of its heritage and my hope for its future, is a simple one. I pretend to no expert knowledge. I do not breathe the rarefied air of some of our intellectuals. Mine is but the viewpoint of a layman; I am proud of it. I honestly believe it is the viewpoint of most Americans. You will be interested to know that at a meeting a few days ago of the American Council on Education, congressional investigations were denounced as a threat to intellectual freedom, thereby disagreeing with Drs. Gideonse, Gallagher, and Jansen. At the same time, however, the council endeavored to formulate a program to do their own housecleaning of subversives.

We should not hesitate to proclaim our beliefs merely because they will arouse criticism in certain quarters. In proclaiming them we are acting in the spirit of our heritage. We do not deny others the right of free expression, provided they comply with the law. Should we who wish to preserve the blessings this Nation offers us, who see in communism a sinister conspiracy bent upon their destruction, should we be less articulate in asserting and defending our own convictions? I am certain that if the truth is known about ourselves and what communism has provided and can offer, we have nothing to lose.

We know that our governmental system and our way of life may fall short of our ideals in certain respects. But we have enough good sense to realize that given the conditions under which any system must operate, the difficult and manifold problems of a technological age, and the frailties of man, the perfect society is likely to remain a utopia. Moreover, we are aware that no people or nation has a monopoly of all the good things in life. We should not feel that because we have a high regard for our country, others must necessarily follow in our footsteps. After all, we are what we are, and considering the youth of our Nation, we have accomplished much. Hence in our present struggle against communism and for our survival as a free people, let us face the issue openly but not boastfully. I am sure that we will not suffer by comparison when we point to our achievements.

Those who are concerned with the education of our youth realize that communism is not the only problem. There is, perhaps, a greater problem resulting from the increasing secularization of life in the Western World. Far too many of our citizens regard progress in terms of material achievements only. The moral and spiritual values associated with religion, which produced our Western civilization, are neglected or excluded altogether. We are aware that religion no longer exerts the influence it once did in education, business, industry, and politics. The prevailing attitude seems to be that religion is something apart from these major activities and should have no place in them. Indeed, there are some who look upon secularism as a philosophy or a way of life.

I am sure that all of you know that in referring to secularism, I am merely restating what by now is a rather old problem. It has been developing since the close of the Middle Ages, and has many causes—economic, political, and cultural, including the rise of modern science. This century has witnessed a rapidly increasing secularization of life in all parts of the world. To what extent it is possible to stem the tide, to revive an appreciation and understanding of moral and spiritual values, particularly in our schools and colleges, is difficult to say. Yet we must face this problem, for unless we instill in our youth a sense of spiritual values there can be no true progress, no enduring foundation for our culture, and no real greatness for our Nation.

It is a problem for us all—Jew, Protestant, and Catholic, and one which the Christopher movement has tried to meet by alerting our citizens to a sense of personal responsibility in restoring to the marketplace the spiritual truths upon which this Nation was founded and without which it cannot survive.

The failure to inculcate in our youth a sense of spiritual values, to teach them what they are, their purpose, their place as individuals, the meaning of life and death, has brought a decline in ideals, loyalties, value judgments, and appreciation of sacrifice for the common good along with a scorn for the past and an indifference of the future. Though religion is the main source of moral and spiritual values, it is regarded as a stranger in many of our schools, as unimportant, irrelevant, and even dangerous. Too many of our teachers believe that progress can be attained only by secular means. But this indifference or neglect of religion, the neutral attitude of so many teachers in questions of right and wrong, their reluctance to hold convictions, the view that religion is a private matter which should not intrude upon the minds of the pupils, is not consistent with sound educational principles. It overlooks the simple facts that religion provides the highest moral sanctions for our behavior, that it is an inseparable part of our culture and of our American heritage. It is just as truly an aspect of our daily lives as politics, business, or industry.

If it is the responsibility of our public educational system to give the students a complete understanding of their cultural background, then religion cannot be denied recognition. This does not mean that our public schools and colleges should propagate religious dogmas. It does mean, however, that we should no longer be tolerant of secular philosophy blut should see in religion an integral part of our culture, a major aspect of life, and the faith of the majority of our people. If we are to plan wisely for the future, we must create in the minds of our youth a better understanding of what religion means and increase their contacts with it.

Our fight against communism cannot be won by intellectual cynicism and indifference, but only by drawing upon the ideals and values which we find in our cultural heritage. I believe that we would do well to adopt as our creed the two convictions expressed by Time magazine in its 30th anniversary issue of March 9, 1953:

1. "That God's order in man's world includes a moral code, based upon man's unchanging nature and not subject to man's repeal, suspension or amendment."

2. "That, as Supreme Court Justice Douglas said 'We are a religious people whose institutions presuppose a Supreme Being' and that American history cannot be understood or correct policy formed except with recognition of that fact. It follows that equality before the law is based upon each man's dignity in God's sight; that political liberty is based on the soul's freedom to accept or reject the good. * * *"

Our problem, therefore, is not merely a negative one of opposing communism or secularism but the positive responsibility of taking stock of our heritage, of capitalizing on our assets, of learning from the wisdom of the past, to the end that we may rediscover and reaffirm the spiritual ideals and values without which we cannot hope to remain a free people.

Columbia River Development Brings $12 Million Plant to Central Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 2, 1954

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by me and an attached newspaper article, both relating to a major development on the Columbia River, in central Washington.

There being no objection, the statement and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MAGNUSON

When we public-power enthusiasts from Washington, Oregon, Montana, and Idaho urged this Congress over the course of the last 20 years to develop the Columbia River by a series of hydroelectric, irrigation, and navigation dams many skeptics called us dreamers and insisted our area would remain a land of sagebrush, coyotes, and gophers. "You will never be able to use that much power" we were told. But we did use it and need more.

I have heard just such expressions made on the floors of the House and Senate and it really gives me a lot of personal satisfaction to point out now that those great river developments are paying immense returns.

For years, especially during the last world war, aluminum produced with Columbia River power, gave the United States its air superiority, it made possible that great airplane manufacturing company, Boeing. It produced materials for the atomic bomb and it turned sagebrush into prosperous farms that produce much of the wheat, vegetables, and meat that is eaten by our citizens.

And now comes the latest development in the use of our great waterway. It makes possible the construction of a $12 million chemical plant at Walla Walla, Wash., beside the great lake created by McNary Dam. That lake makes possible transportation of materials, fuel, and labor needed in constructing the huge plant of the Columbia River Chemicals, Inc., which will produce fertilizer and industrial materials.

The city of Walla Walla, the Pacific Supply Cooperative, the Columbia River Chemicals, and the Fluor Corp., Ltd., announced June 17 that contracts to construct the plant had been signed between the companies and the Walla Walla port district. The port district takes in a large area, that makes an ideal site for manufacturing plants. The site of the new plant is at Attalia, which is 28 miles northwest of Walla Walla. It is served by three transcontinental railroads, river barges moving up and down the Columbia, and a major highway.

We advocates of full development of the great river believe that this will be only the first step industrialization of the river. We expect that other forward looking firms, seeking an ideal place for their factories, soon will follow the Columbia River Chemicals in selecting sites along the Columbia's banks.

There they will find cheaper transportation, cheaper power, nice homes for their workers, and a bustling, energetic community to greet the newcomers.

Preliminary plans indicate it will require about 500 workers to construct the plant, expected to be in operation next year, and that it will require some 200 to 300 employees to operate it. The Port Commission is going to construct dock, rail, and harbor facilities that are expected to cost about $325,000.

That is another development that we sagebrush dreamers foresaw for the future. Our dreams continue to come true.

This should forever beat down that opposition which would prevent full utilization of the advantages of the Columbia River.

I attach to the statement a news story from the Walla Walla (Wash.) Union Bulletin of June 23, detailing the announcement of the new plant.

TWELVE MILLION DOLLAR INDUSTRY SET HERE

A $12 million chemical and fertilizer plant, to begin production of several products late in 1955, will be constructed on the Columbia River near Attalia, 28 miles northwest of Walla Walla.

This will mark the first major industrial development on lands held by the Walla Walla County port district.

Alan F. D. Short, general manager of the Columbia River Chemicals, Inc., and W. D. Ray, chairman of the county port district, made the joint announcement Thursday.

The Fluor Corporation, Ltd., contracting and engineering firm of Los Angeles has been awarded a $12 million contract to begin construction this summer of facilities for the chemical concern to operate the plant.

Authorization for construction of the plant was granted by the Office of Defense Mobilization Board in Washington, D. C., Wednesday under permit No. EA–TANC 27771.

The port district's Attalia site is served by river barges, three transcontinental railroads, Union Pacific, Northern Pacific, and the S. P. & S. and a major highway.

It was announced simultaneously that Pacific Supply Cooperative, with main offices in Walla Walla, will be the major marketer of anhydrous and aqua ammonia, urea, ammonium sulfate, and urea-ammonia nitrogen solutions for agricultural purposes, which the facility will produce.

Pacific Supply Cooperative maintains branches throughout Washington, Idaho, and Oregon, and will handle all agricultural products of Columbia River Chemicals except those destined for export.

Industrial grade urea will be distributed by MacKenzie & Feimann, of Vancouver, British Columbia, and Seattle.

Capacity of the plant will be 160 tons of anhydrous ammonia daily, 110 tons of urea and 140 tons of ammonium sulfate. Of this total, 50 tons of anhydrous ammonia and 15 tons of urea will be for industrial use.

Besides Short, who will be general manager, W. B. McRae is president of the board of the new organization.

Principals of Columbia River Chemicals are planning an early meeting in Walla Walla to complete details and open the way for negotiations for construction.

During construction the Fluor Corp. will employ approximately 500 men and an estimated 200 to 350 will be required for operation and maintenance of the plant when full production is reached.

The synthetic ammonia plant will be designed to generate hydrogen from bunker C fuel oil for combination with nitrogen from the air to produce anhydrous ammonia. Specially designed barges will transport the bunker C fuel oil on the Columbia River.

The plant also will be designed to utilize natural gas as raw material as soon as it is available in this area.

The urea plant will be the first in the West and will produce both fertilizer and industrial grades. Raw materials for urea production are anhydrous ammonia and carbon dioxide a byproduct from the synthetic ammonia plant. Besides its value in fertilizer production, urea is used as a bonding material in paint.

The ammonium sulfate operation will produce sulfate for fertilizer application. Raw materials required in this process are anhydrous ammonia and sulfuric acid.

Ray and other port commission members William Vollmer and William Falconer, hailed the announcement as one of the most important this region has seen.

Ray said the port commission will construct docks, rail and harbor facilities at an estimated cost of $325,000. Present plans call for bids to be called for this phase of the work as soon as detailed engineering plans can be completed by N. W. Haner & Associates, port district engineers.

The chairman said that the lease completed last week with Army engineers in Washington, D. C., made it possible for this industry to utilize port district land and will open the way for other industries.

McRae, president of the corporation, expressed his appreciation for the work and cooperation of Ray and his commissioners, Herbert G. West, executive vice president of Inland Empire Waterways Association; Charles Baker, of Pacific Supply; Al McVay, the chamber of commerce; and Harley Allen, port district attorney.

Message From Chancellor Adenauer to Citizens of Fredericksburg, Tex.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 2, 1954

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, it will be recalled that a few months ago a group of German parliamentarians visited this country. During the course of their stay in America, they paid a visit to the town of Fredericksburg, Tex., a sound and progressive community with a large percentage of population of citizens of German extraction.

The citizens of Fredericksburg recently received from Chancellor Konrad Adenauer an expression of appreciation for the message sent by them to the people of Germany.

I ask unanimous consent that this letter from Chancellor Adenauer, that great leader of free Germany, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as published in translated form in the Fredericksburg Standard.

There being no objection, the message was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Konrad Adenauer, Chancellor of Germany in a letter addressed to the citizens of Fredericksburg through Mayor William Schroeder expressed his Nation's appreciation for the greetings sent him via the German Government officials who visited here in March.

"Your greetings," Chancellor Adenauer wrote, "which you and your fellow citizens sent me on the occasion of the visit of the members of the German Bundes tag have made me very happy and I extend the same greettings to all of you.

"I thank you for your words of appreciation regarding the success of our efforts in rebuilding wartorn Germany. I wish not to neglect, however, to recognize the very effectual and far-reaching help rendered in this respect by America, which has been a large factor in our recovery.

"The constantly improving and growing proportion of friendship with the nations of the free world and in particular with the people of the United States, strengthens our confidence that we may be able to continue the rebuilding of the Bundes Republic (free Germany or West Germany) and it also tends to give those of our people behind the iron curtain the strength necessary to endure the present hard times, and the hope for a reunion with free Germany in peace and liberty."

The greetings Chancellor Adenauer refers to were written by Alfred Petsch, with Mayor Schroeder, County Judge Victor Sagebiel, Chamber of Commerce manager, William Petmecky, and Chamber of Commerce president, C. M. George, joining in signing them in behalf of the community.

The greetings were unanimously adopted in a resolution presented at the luncheon honoring the German parliamentarians and carried to Chancellor Adenauer by them.

End of Debt Near for South Dakota

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 2, 1954

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, about 20 years ago the State of South Dakota had an experiment with socialism under, I hesitate to say, a Republican governor. The experiment plunged the State into a $60 million debt. The State tried a great many experiments which the New Deal tried about 20 years later, with the same results, except that the debt incurred by the American taxpayers ran into the billions, whereas the debt to the citizens of South Dakota ran to about $60 million.

Since this loss, our State officials have concentrated on ridding the taxpayers of the debt. Under the able administration of a series of Republican governors, the debt has been gradually liquidated. Beginning under Les Jensen, and continued under other able governors—Harlan Bushfield, M. Q. Sharpe, George Mickelson, and our present Governor, Sig Anderson—the payment of this debt has been the No. 1 problem of the State administration.

All South Dakotans are proud of the record, and of the fact the debt will be totally wiped out in another 30 days. South Dakota can point the way for other State administrations in the matter of running government on a sound, businesslike basis.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a news story entitled "End of Debt Near for South Dakota," from the June 27, 1954, issue of the New York Times.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

END OF DEBT NEAR FOR SOUTH DAKOTA—STATE WILL REDEEM LAST OF ITS RURAL CREDIT BONDS BY AUGUST 1—VENTURE BEGAN IN 1917

PIERRE, S. DAK., June 26.—South Dakota, after whittling away at a staggering $60 million of rural credits-farm loan debt since 1917, will be one of the few States without general obligation bonded debt by August 1.

The State which in 1926 was saddled with the highest per capita State debt in the Nation will start advertising soon in the press that it is calling in its rural credit bonds. Some of them are being paid off 5 years ahead of maturity.

Payment of the $9,156,000 in principal and interest for the last of the bonds will write the end to a story of a State in business, taking the State out of debt for the first time since 1917.

A political faction known as the Nonpartisan League put the State in business. The league maintained that, by eliminating the middleman, the consumer could pocket the difference and its doctrine was winning converts by the thousands.

To combat the inroads of the league Republican leaders offered the people a constitutional amendment removing the $100,000 debt limitation and also setting up a rural credits lending agency.

The electorate approved in 1916.

The State began the business of lending money on farms and ranches. It issued $47,500,000 in bonds at an average interest rate of 5.3 percent.

It also spent $185,000 to purchase and equip a lignite mine at Haynes, N. Dak., In 1919 it entered the hail-insurance business. In 1924 it entered the cement business.

All of the ventures have failed except the cement plant which has a virtual State monopoly.

The coal mine was sold in 1934 for $5,500.

The 1941 legislature appropriated $263,000 to get the hail-insurance venture out of the "red" before it was liquidated.

"No rural-credit enterprise could have been started at a more inopportune time than 1917–1919," Attorney General M. Q. Sharpe wrote in a report after an investigation in 1932. That was when land values and agricultural commodity prices reached their peak (1917–1919), only to retrograde to the lowest prices in the history of the State, his report said.

"Those things contributed to the failure, but the principal causes were political infection, catering too much to vote-getting policies and cheap, shallow, superficial statesmanship," the report held.

Mr. Sharpe, who later became Governor, declared the State's failure in business enterprises should emphasize the lesson that "the State keep out of private business."

The Atomic Energy Commission and the Power Fight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 2, 1954

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the June 22 issue of the Knoxville News-Sentinel concerning the outrageous proposed contract for AEC to be plunged into the power business.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KEEP AEC OUT OF POWER FIGHT

Last January, the President refused additional funds to the TVA for new electric power-generating facilities. He said "arrangements are being made to reduce, by the fall of 1957, existing commitments of the TVA to the Atomic Energy Commission by 500,000 to 600,000 kilowatts.

This, he went on, "would reduce the equivalent amount of TVA generating capacity to meet increased load requirements of other consumers in the power system and at the same time eliminate the need for appropriating funds from the Treasury to finance additional generating units."

We weren't exactly enthusiastic about this proposal; but we could see it might be a reasonable way to meet increasing TVA power needs.

Now Mr. Eisenhower has set in motion by a Presidential order, a scheme which some persons are presenting as carrying out the budget message proposal. But, in fact, it does something else instead. What this order does is to involve our greatest national defense enterprise in the endless fight over public versus private power.

Mr. Eisenhower has ordered the Atomic Energy Commission to sign a contract with Middle South Utilities, Inc., and the Southern Co. for purchase of 650,000 kilowatts of power to be pumped into the TVA grid at Memphis. The new plant of the two private utilities is to be built on "made" land in West Memphis, Ark., an area once inundated by a great Mississippi River flood.

Three of the five members of the Atomic Energy Commission oppose the contract. They point out that the AEC has no power needs either at Memphis or West Memphis. The closest AEC facilities are at Paducah, Ky., where the atomic plant is served by both a private power company and the TVA.

Thomas Murray, the AEC commissioner chiefly responsible for the fact that a private company is serving AEC with power at Paducah, is one of those who opposes the contract the President has ordered. He told the Joint Congressional Atomic Energy Committee that through the contract AEC is being used as a vehicle to supply expanding power needs of the Memphis area. He said he could not see how this contract is in the interest of the atomic program.

There apparently is no present intention on the part of AEC of canceling its power contract with TVA at Paducah. Thus, the new power it is to buy is not intended to reduce TVA's commitments to AEC, as the President promised in January.

In fact, under the Eisenhower order, as shown by Commissioner Murray's testimony, AEC is being used as a "power broker" for TVA. And this over the opposition of a majority of the AEC board.

The Atomic Energy Commission was set up for a very simple and important purpose—important to this country and to all the free world. It was created to produce atomic (and now hydrogen) weapons.

Whatever the legal lights may say, we believe the President—as Commander-in-Chief—has no right to pitch the AEC into the midst of a bitter controversy over extraneous matters, by requiring it to negotiate and sign the contract with the private companies to furnish TVA with electricity.

Presdent Eisenhower, for the good of our national defense, which is rooted in what we hope is our atomic superiority, should immediately revoke his order to AEC to buy power at Memphis where it has no need for it.

Let the AEC buy power where it needs it, or not at all.

If other agencies need power, let them get it through some other means than the AEC.

Let the atom splitters go right on splitting atoms; keep them out of controversies where they have no business.

Address of Hon. Russell Long, of Louisiana, at the Banquet Honoring Chief Justice John B. Fournet, of the Louisiana Supreme Court, on the Occasion of His 20th Anniversary as a Member of the Court, Held in Alexandria, La., June 26, 1954

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 2, 1954

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address:

Mr. Toastmaster, Chief Justice Fournet, my friends of the bench and bar, ladies, and gentlemen; I know that I speak for the members of the bench and bar of this State, for our Louisiana congressional delegation, when I express our appreciation that we have had Chief Justice John Fournet serve us on our highest court for the last 20 years. I know also that I speak for that great mass of the citizenry of this State who have a reverence for law and order, and who innately admire integrity, courage, ability, and fidelity to purpose.

To me, this unprecedented gathering of the judges and lawyers from all this State, who have come here tonight with the single purpose of paying tribute to our chief justice, speaks more eloquently than any words. Those who have come, many from distant points of the State, to join in this spontaneous tribute, are unmistakable evidence of the great respect that we all have for our chief justice.

We know Chief Justice Fournet as a man of rare attainments, one whose career is both interesting and unique.

Let me briefly sketch the life of our friend and honored guest. John Baptiste Fournet was born at St. Martinville on June 27, 1895. He was the first born of the 10 children of Louis Michel Fournet and Marcelite Gauthier, both of whom are still living and now reside at Lafayette, La. He is a real son of Creole Louisiana, the descendant of a distinguished southwestern Louisiana family. His great-grandfather, Valsin Fournet, was a civil and political leader in that section for many years. One of his uncles, A. V. Fournet, was a former state treasurer of Louisiana, and another, Gabriel Fournet, was a judge of the district court in Lake Charles, La.

Justice Fournet has had rich experience in many phases of Louisiana life. He had been a teacher, a lawyer, and a distinguished State official before he became a justice of the supreme court 20 years ago. When we recall that he is still a young man today, we can appreciate how early he held responsible positions and how well he prepared himself for the vital task of interpreting the laws of the State in terms which mean most—the understanding of how the law should be applied to human problems.

John Fournet graduated from Louisiana State Normal College, which we now know as Northwestern State College, in 1915. For the succeeding 2 years he was principal of the Morganza High School in Pointe Coupee Parish. He then entered law school at LSU and obtained his degree with distinction in 1920, being President of his graduating class.

Immediately upon admission to the bar, he began the practice of law and continued to practice until he assumed his duties as an associate justice of the supreme court. For a short time he practiced in his native town of St. Martinville and thereafter in Baton Rouge and Jennings.

For 4 years, from 1928 to 1932, he represented Jefferson Davis Parish in the house of representatives and during the entire period he was the speaker of the house. In 1932 he was elected lieutenant governor, serving until January, 1935, when he donned the robes of the judiciary.

He had been elected for a 14-year term in the fall of 1934. By the time this term had expired, he had achieved such stature that he was unopposed in his bid for reelection for an additional 14-year term. As we all know, upon the retirement of the distinguished former chief justice, Charles A. O'Neill in September 1949, John Fournet became chief justice, the 11th to hold that life.

The first chief justice of the supreme court was George Eustis, appointed in 1846 under the provisions of the 1845 State constitution. Although there had been a supreme court since 1812 the earlier court had had only appellate jurisdiction over civil cases involving more than $300 and no chief justice was designated. One of Eustis' successors, Chief Justice Merrick, speaking at New Orleans, had this to say of Judge Eustis:

"At the time the supreme court was organized, and many years afterward, from 40 to 90 cases were all it was called upon to decide during its session in this city. At the period to which I refer, its business had increased to between four and five hundred cases. What learning, therefore, was required of a court composed of only four judges to meet the exigencies of the public business may be imagined when it is considered the judges were without any sufficient leisure for the investigation of authorities, except those cited, and were compelled to rely in a great measure on their previous reading, or see the business of the court increase until it should overwhelm them with its hopeless accumulation. It is a sufficient praise to Judge Eustis to say that he, with the assistance of his able colleagues, was equal to the occasion."

Without dissent of anyone and with the understatement of Judge Merrick, we can certainly say of our present chief justice that he is indeed "equal to the occasion."

We may also well refer here to the burden of the court at the present time.

Judge Fournet has already played his part in the work of the court during Judge O'Neill's brilliant and long tenure. Judge Fournet has given the court sound leadership and guidance since ascending to the high post of chief justice. It is particularly a happy thought to know that Judge Fournet possesses just those characteristics of flexibility and progressive thought which assure us all that the law will continue to be developed into the new patterns made necessary by our ever-changing modes of life.

We can say of him what a former colleague once said of the late Chief Justice of the United States Fred Vinson. "He typified to the highest degree humanly possible what a gentleman should be: 'One who can disagree without being disagreeable.'"

Chief Justice Fournet is characterized by his forthrightness, and he can never be called timid when he tells the bar of Louisiana what he considers their shortcomings and their responsibilities. In an excellent address last year in this same city, he said:

"There is nothing about which I feel so deeply and which has given me so much concern as the bar's complete unawareness, or complacent apathy, with respect to its responsibility of creating among our people a broader understanding and appreciation of the function of the judiciary in our triumvirate of government and the necessity that it be spearheaded by a fearless and independent judiciary.

"The efficiency and fairness of our administration of justice is being debated now in the councils of the world, and the democratic process is on trial before all people, both at home and abroad. Its success or failure will lie at the door of the legal profession more than any other, for you, with us, belong to that group destined to be the custodian and upholder of all of those rights and privileges that in our day constitute peace, order, and good government."

John Fournet has been in the forefront of those who are aware of the need for the bar to use progressive and modern techniques in its program. Most of you already know of his influence and assistance in the establishment of the public-relations work of the Louisiana Bar Association.

While he is one of the stoutest defenders of the law in its many phases and of those who work in it, he is realistic and ever ready to acknowledge faults. His high-minded concept of the law as a force for good in an imperfect world serves to remind us all of the noble concepts of our profession.

Survival of our democracy demands that our judiciary be able, honest, and conscientious. It also requires that our judges, especially those on our highest courts be fearless. Our forbears have wisely left us standards by which we shall measure our actions in the future. They have placed limitations upon the power of the unreasoning majority to save us from our own madness, our prejudices and our feares. Among our precious heritages are our freedoms of speech, press and religion. Our protections, of persons and property are broad and thorough. Yet all the precious guaranties of our Federal and State Constitutions are worthless unless our judges have the courage to uphold them when the minority needs them the most. If the group relying upon such protections were not in the minority, our constitutional protections would not be needed in the first place. A majority can take care of itself in a democracy.

Most of us must realize that a justice on the court of the last resort has a greater duty than merely that of seeking to find a precedent or near precedent. In deciding hard cases he should look to the ultimate justice and the final consequences of his decision. He should interpret and expound our laws and our Constitution that they better serve their purpose.

Sometimes it is a court's duty to hand down an unpopular decision. During our history, some of the most controversial and unpopular decisions have proved to be those which have most nurtured and preserved our Nation and our fundamental freedoms.

The decision in *Marbury* v. *Madison*, for example, was perhaps the most unpopular of its time. There were cries throughout the country that the court should be abolished or its members impeached for their affrontery in assuming the power to strike down an act of the Congress. Yet history has proved that the logic of the decision was correct. That decision cured what could have otherwise been a fatal defect in our form of Government. It saved the Constitution from the violent abuse for political advantage. It preserved the rights of citizens and the rights of States. It kept our Federal Government within its proper limits, at least it did for 100 years.

The courage of John Marshall may well have saved our Government. The true merit of such men is seldom fully appreciated by their contemporaries.

Whatever any acquaintance of John Fournet will say of him, they will all agree that he possesses the extreme limit of human courage both physical and moral. It has been demonstrated time and again.

If there is a man in Louisiana who cannot be intimidated, I would say that John Fournet is that man. This opinion is not of recent origin with me. From the days of my early teens I can recall hearing my father speak of John Fournet as one of the most steadfast and courageous men he had ever known.

Judge Fournet's decisions have shown an inclination to brush aside technicalities to get at true issues. They have demonstrated a reluctance to remain hidebound by tradition when justice demands a departure from a rule which could not in conscience seem intended for an exceptional case to which precedent would have it apply.

As a former speaker of the house of representatives and as a former lieutenant governor, John Fournet has an enviable understanding of the relationship of the judiciary to the legislative branch of our Government. He realizes that the people of our State never intended to give unfettered power to the legislative and executive branches. His decisions have on occasion struck down unconstitutional statutes. On occasion he has played a leading role in striking down a constitutional amendment for failure of its sponsors to comply with the constiutional requirements essentials to the valid adoption of an amendment to our constitution.

John Fournet has weathered his share of abuse from those who have desired an outcome different than that upon which the court decided. In view of the partisan feelings connected with much controversial legislation, it is to be understood that many among us, particularly the press, are oftentimes overly eager to decide some cases for themselves. This is bad enough in itself—none of us have the right to prejudice the outcome of litigation. However, all too often there are those who, having decided a case for themselves, heap abuse upon the court for not agreeing with the view of those partisans who had closed their minds on a subject long before the case was argued by counsel.

John Fournet has been victimized on occasion by unfair abuse. He has borne it with silence and forbearance. Never has he complained; he has kept his head while others were losing theirs. He will never regret this. In time even the most enthusiastic advocate of a losing cause comes to see merit in the views which prevail.

For all the heartaches and tribulations of service on a court from which there is frequently no appeal, John Fournet has never complained; he has taken in stride both the pleasant and the adverse.

During John Fournet's service on the supreme court he has been consulted and he has played a part in the inauguration of a new criminal code and a new set of revised statutes. During his service as chief justice, we can expect to see the writing and adoption of a new Louisiana Constitution. It is fortunate that our State shall have the benefit of the experience and wise counsel of our chief justice in whatever constitution is adopted. In any event, upon John Fournet will fall the burden of shaping and interpreting the new fundamental law of our State to make it meet the needs and preserve the liberties of its people. As one who best understands our old constitution, the chief justice will be admirably equipped to resolve in the ambiguities of the new one.

Chief Justice John Fournet, in your 20 years of service on the supreme court, you have done much to give life and force to our laws. I express the hope, echoed, I am sure, by every man and woman in this room, indeed by every good citizen of this State, that the virility of mind and the strength of body which are yours may be given to you for many years to come. We pray that there may lie before you many more years of unselfish service to your people; so that we who in the past have been the beneficiaries of your wisdom, of your industry, and of your fearless devotion to duty may be still further enriched by your labors.

Texas 4-H Girl Makes Outstanding Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 2, 1954

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, many of the young people of Texas have marked up truly outstanding records in their work as members of 4-H Clubs, Future Farmers of America, and Future Homemakers of America.

In a recent issue of the Fort Worth Star-Telegram, Tom Milligan, farm writer for that great Texas newspaper, told the story of the accomplishments of Ruth Barnes, one of the Nation's top 4-H Club girls. I ask unanimous consent that this inspiring story be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ARLINGTON, June 26.—Ruth Barnes, a veteran of 8 years in 4-H Club work, has received another honor to add to the long list of awards she has won.

Ruth, 18, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. R. T. Barnes, of the Dalworthington Gardens community near here, was named 1 of 4 winners in the Nation of a $300 college scholarship. The scholarship was given by the International Minerals & Chemical Co., with the award being made by R. I. Gilliland, district sales manager at Fort Worth.

The award is given on the basis of past work in 4-H and the applicant has to take an intelligence test to qualify.

TO RICE INSTITUTE

Ruth says she will enroll in Rice Institute at Houston this fall. She graduated this spring from Arlington High School, being named salutatorian out of a class of 150. Her average was 95.7.

Awards and recognition for outstanding work in 4-H, Future Homemakers, church work, and other high-school activities that Ruth has won are almost too numerous to list.

Among the 4-H awards, Ruth has distinguished herself in many types of demonstrations and contests. She has been Gold Star girl for the county, president of the girls countywide 4-H Club, vice president, secretary, and treasurer of the Pantego 4-H Club, won the Danforth Award for Tarrant County for her leadership activities, named girl of the month by the Fort Worth Farm and Ranch Club, and won many other awards and ribbons for other activities.

SCHOOL AND CHURCH

The work in 4-H didn't keep Ruth from taking active part in her school activities. She was valedictorian of the eighth grade, coeditor of the high-school annual this year, member of the student council 2 years, in the National Honor Society for 2 years, class officer for 3 years, in Future Homemakers work for 3 years, served as area secretary of FHA for 1953-54, and member of the Quill and Scroll, international society for high-school journalists.

Ruth hasn't neglected her church either. She is a member of Woods Chapel Baptist Church, has been church secretary for the past year, and was president of her Sunday school class for 1 year.

Ruth's beauty has received the proper recognition this year. She is one of the five finalists in the Miss Arlington contest. The winner will compete later for the Miss Texas title.

Ruth won't be the first member of her family to attend Rice. Her father graduated there in 1928. He now works for the Post Office Department in Fort Worth.

"Among the many people who have helped me along the way, my parents head the list. Extension agents that I trained under included Mrs. Gayle Roberts Wilson, Mrs. Winifred Stewart, Mrs. Emma Blocker, and, more recently, Mrs. Jean Ham," Ruth said.

She plans to study medical technology at Rice.

Displaced Workers, Industrial Shut-Downs, and the Challenge to Rebuild

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1954

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, it is said laws are passed to protect man from the shortcomings of man. This goes for speed limits, traffic lights, and stop signs. The question is, How long can enterprise remain free in the wake of layoffs and industrial shutdowns? Where we do not allow a hotrod to barrel down the road in disregard of traffic rules, we seem not to have a prompt and profitable answer to an industrial shutdown and the displaced workers it leaves, except, perhaps, the answer involved in the challenge of a community to rebuild.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to cite two items below on this problem of industrial shutdowns, displaced workers, and the challenge to rebuild.

The first item is an editorial from today's July 2, 1954, issue of the New York Times; the second item is from the Appendix of the RECORD under date of June 2, 1954.

I hope these materials will be helpful to those who are studying this problem, which, to my mind, seems to be shaping into a national crisis equal in importance to housing, rehabilitation or price supports:

[From the New York Times of July 2, 1954]

INDUSTRIAL SHUT-DOWNS

The decision of the Alexander Smith Carpet Co. to close its Yonkers plant threatens 2,200 residents of that city with a loss of their jobs and its merchants with a drop of almost $2 millions a year in their customers' purchasing power, except insofar as the displaced workers can get other jobs. This is only a single case, which happens to be close to home. There have recently been many others. For example, between 1947 and 1953 employment in the Utica textile mills dropped from over 10,000 to 3,000 as one mill after another closed down, to go south or quit business altogether.

We Americans deeply prize our economic freedom. Just as we allow a new company to enter any lawful business anywhere, without the by-your-leave of any Government agency, so also do we not put restraints on an old company from withdrawing from a business when it ceases to make a profit. But a close-down that causes such widespread dislocation as the Yonkers case becomes a community concern; and, when it is one of many others elsewhere, we face a serious national issue.

We have neither sufficient knowledge nor the inclination to say whether or not the Smith company is wise in shutting down; but we do believe that, in a situation such as this, a company has a special obligation to explore every conceivable way of reducing costs so as to be able to make a profit. Also, it is to labor's interest to cooperate in that effort and to management's interest to welcome labor's help. Increasing productivity—through better methods, better machines, greater skills and effort—has been the growth factor of our burgeoning economy. It can often bring a dying firm to life. But it isn't always as easy as that. For example, in the Smith situation a southern town built a plant with the proceeds of a bond issue and made it available to the company for a rental far less than northern market rates.

When all measures fail, however, and a big firm is forced to close down, much can be done to soften the impact of the change. In Utica, for instance, the local chamber of commerce, with the enthusiastic cooperation of city officials, the Industrial and Commerce Commissioners of the State and also a special Community Action Committee of 22 leading citizens, met the lay-off of 3,000 textile workers 2 years ago as they would have dealt with a conflagration—as a challenge to rebuild. New industries were found for the abandoned plants and new employment for displaced workers, trained in new skills for which local firms loaned instructors and even the machinery used in the training.

This is surely the American way to meet a crisis. Yonkers will do well to follow the Utica example if the old carpet plants finally close their doors.

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 2, 1954]

TIDE WATER OIL CO., OF BAYONNE, N. J., MAY WELL BE A PACE SETTER IN GRANTING EMPLOYEES TRANSFER ACCOMMODATIONS

(Extension of remarks of Hon. ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI, of New Jersey, in the House of Representatives, Wednesday, June 2, 1954)

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, reports have it that the Tide Water Oil Co., of Bayonne, N. J., plans to pull up stakes and locate elsewhere.

The move will put many skilled and devoted employees who have lived, talked, eaten, and slept nothing but Tide Water all their lives out of work.

The question is, Will Tide Water rise to the mark and grant those of its workers who wish to follow it transfer accommodations? This means a job in the new location for every qualified employee who makes the move. It means, too, keeping bread on the table of the worker's family.

Free enterprise? Sure. Industry in the United States can move anytime it likes, and it does not have to tell anyone why. It can slip into a community, spawn its profits, and then move on.

This is a request for the Tide Water Oil Co., Mr. Speaker, to become a pace setter in granting employees whom it would otherwise leave flat transfer accommodations, to give them jobs in Tide Water's new location.

Do I hear someone say "No"? Why not? Going to a cheaper labor market, getting a better tax break? You may, for a short while. But Uncle Sam eventually catches up because the people you leave flat who cannot get work start collecting unemployment benefits, thus setting in train a series of local, State, and Federal aid measures. Some call this socialistic. Others say that you have socialism only when Uncle Sam pockets the profits or polices production. Tide Water is too smart to think it can kid itself long on that score. Oil people get good Federal tax breaks.

Free enterprise? Of course.

If Tide Water gives everyone the lift it can, it will have a pleasant hayride.

Tide Water Oil Co. is too smart to allow the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey to outpace it too long in the field of worker-transfer accommodations.

It is our earnest desire, Mr. Speaker, that the Tide Water Oil Co. may continue to operate with as many of the skilled and steadfast citizens of Bayonne on its payrolls as possible. Long may both prosper.

Patricia McAuley's Winning Flag Day Essay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 2, 1954

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following essay written by Patricia McAuley, of Winthrop, Mass., which appeared in the Winthrop Sun, Winthrop, Mass., on Saturday, June 26, 1954:

THE AMERICAN FLAG

(By Patricia McAuley)

(Following is the essay, The American Flag, which won the award as the best Flag Day essay in the contest which is sponsored annually by Winthrop Lodge of Elks, written by Patricia McAuley, of 34 Undine Avenue, Point Shirley, and read by her at the Elks Flag Day exercises.)

Long ago there was beautiful land of great forests, sparkling lakes, and fertile plains that stretched for miles on end, where great herds of animals roamed at will. But amid all these wonders, and despite the tribes of red-skinned people who lived there, it was a lonely land.

As time went by groups of white-skinned people came and with wonder the land saw these people kneel down, kiss the ground, and say, "Thank Thee, O God, for guiding us to this beautiful land."

Amazing events happened during the following years but the most inspiring of all was the appearance of a banner with 7 red and 6 white stripes, with 13 bright blue stars on a field of white. True, there had been flags before, but this was a beautiful flag and it carried an important message. Every blue star represented one part of the land's surface. Each part was called a State. Whenever a new State was formed and admitted to the Union of the United States of America, a new star was added to this flag.

The land soon learned that June 14 would henceforth be the flag's birthday. These stars and stripes began to appear everywhere. The land saw a small bloody banner clutched in the hand of a dying soldier. It saw little children with hands upraised saying, "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America." It saw rows of flags in a place called Arlington Cemetery. It saw the flag-draped casket of a boy called the Unknown Soldier. This boy represented every one of the land's dear children who had fallen in battle. Sad places or happy places, the American flag was always there.

Soon there was 48 stars on the American flag, each star representing a State with its own independence, jurisdiction and boundaries, but dependent on its sister States for strength and security. Yes, these people had found a security and happiness that was unbelieveable. They could speak and think without fear. Wherever they went the American flag was a symbol of kindness, friendship, love, and a unity that comes only when a people have worked and played together; laughed and cried together; and fought and died together to help build a better place in which to live.

I will never be lonely again, thought the land. This American flag represents a people who have a great ideal, the American ideal of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Whenever I hear the words, "Oh, say does that Star-Spangled Banner yet wave, o'er the land of the free and the home of the brave" I am sad thinking of the sorrow and strife that is behind this American flag but, too, I have a happy feeling that while sorrow may come again and again, these people of the United States of America will work, with the help of their God, to help build a better world.

I, too, shall have a very special birthday each 14th day of June. I am a humble land; I am a proud land; but I am a united land. Wherever the American flag is, I am. I am the American flag.

It Would Not Have Happened Had Dies Committee Been Heeded

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN DIES

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 2, 1954

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, since World War II communism has cost the United States thousands of lives and billions of dollars, and the end is not in sight. No one can predict the outcome. There may be another world war far more destructive and devastating than any war in history.

This situation was caused by the failure of the United States to grasp the fixed purpose of the Kremlin to conquer the world and to understand the tactics employed for the accomplishment of this purpose. On January 3, 1939, the Dies committee unanimously submitted its first report to the Congress and the executive department. Among other things, the committee found:

> We have shown that communism is a worldwide revolutionary movement aiming ultimately at the setting up of a world union of Soviet Socialist Republics. This is a proposition which is beyond dispute. It is substantiated by voluminous literature of the Communists themselves.
>
> In this plan for world revolution the Communists have omitted no country or people as too small or insignificant to command their attention. They have, on the other hand, taken the logical position of concentrating their attention upon the richest and most populous countries of the earth. Among these the Communists recognize the United States of America as the foremost. The Communist's conquest of the earth will be far less than complete until it has conquered America and destroyed our free institutions.
>
> It follows logically from the Communist International's plan of world conquest that every possible tactic, device, maneuver, and intrigue would be employed to gain such an end as the communization of America. These tactics, devices, maneuvers, and intrigues are both boldly open and patently subtle, both violent and insidious. The tactics and maneuvers for revolutionary ends are the meat and drink of a Communist. They are the very air he breathes.

If our Government had heeded this finding of the Dies Committee, it would not have made enormous concessions to Russia at Yalta and Potsdam. It was these postwar concessions which enabled the Soviet Union to emerge from a third-rate power to the status of a world menace.

Another cause of the Communist menace was the theft by Communists inside our Government of our military, diplomatic, and scientific secrets and the influence which these same Communists exerted upon our foreign policy. If we could have retained these secrets, such as the A-bomb and the H-bomb, as well as many others, it would have been a long time before Russia could have acquired them and thereby neutralized the tremendous advantage which the exclusive possession of these secrets gave us. Long before these secrets were stolen, the Dies committee named the Communists on the Federal payroll and urged their discharge. In its report filed on January 3, 1939, the Dies committee found:

> The Communist Party has penetrated the Government itself, with the result that some Communists hold key positions in Federal agencies and projects.

In the report of the Dies committee dated January 2, 1943, are the following findings:

> Since the committee's creation in 1938, there has come to its attention from time to time the presence in the Federal Government of high-salaried employees who were prominently and definitely identified with communism and its front organizations. Many of these cases were promptly called to the attention of the President, the Congress, and the departmental head concerned by either the committee or its members. At this point, the committee would like to cite a number of examples where this procedure has been followed.
>
> On October 25, 1939, the committee made public the names, positions, and salaries of some 563 Government employees located in Washington, D. C., who were members of the American League for Peace and Democracy. In three reports which this committee has made to the House, it has found the American League for Peace and Democracy to be a Communist-front organization. * * *
>
> Pursuant to this request, the committee on October 17, 1941, sent to the Attorney General the names of 1,124 Federal Government employees who were members of organizations which this committee had found to be subversive. These membership lists had been obtained largely by subpena and have been identified and authenticated by the officials of the organization involved. All of the committee's files were immediately made available to the Attorney General and his investigators, who were charged with carrying out the mandate of Congress as contained in this act.

Thus, it will be seen that before World War II the Dies committee had furnished the executive department with the names of several thousand Government officials and employees who belonged to organizations which the committee and the Attorney General had found to be Communist controlled and subversive. Included in this list were the names of Alger Hiss, Harry Dexter White, and

Harold Glasser. These people were kept on the Government payroll for at least 10 years after they were exposed, and the theft of our military, diplomatic, and scientific secrets was made possible because of their presence on the Federal payroll. Furthermore, these Government officials greatly influenced our foreign policy in favor of Russia.

Another cause which contributed to Communist successes was the failure of our Government to deport and exclude Communist aliens. In 1932, my bill to deport and exclude Communist aliens passed the House of Representatives but was stymied in the Senate by the liberal bloc headed by Senator La Follette. At that time, there were only 20,000 Communists in the United States and 90 percent of them were aliens. If my bill had become a law, these Communists would have been deported and the thousands who came after 1932 would have been excluded. The Communist conspiracy would have been nipped in the bud.

In the committee's report filed on January 3, 1939, is the following finding:

> The committee received considerable evidence of the activities of Communist, Nazi, and Fascist aliens in the United States. It does not seem that these aliens experience any difficulty in entering the United States or remaining here after entrance. A large part of un-American activities is inspired and carried on by these aliens. * * *
>
> The committee believes that it will be difficult to ever cope with un-American activities and propaganda in this country so long as the Department of Labor follows its present policy with reference to deportation. The laxity with which the Department of Labor deals with alien agitators would be unbelievable if we did not have before us the most convincing proof. * * *
>
> We further believe that greater care should be exercised in permitting aliens to enter the United States to the end that aliens who believe in or advocate communism, fascism, and nazism will be excluded.

In the committee's report filed January 3, 1940, we recommended:

> The mandatory deportation of aliens who advocate any basic change in the form of our Government; the enactment of legislation to stop all immigration from foreign countries that refuse to accept the return of their nationals found under American law to be deportable from this country.

Another cause of Communist strength and success in the United States was the infiltration of labor unions and seizure of control. Through these labor unions Russia was able to wield great political influence. These unions had the balance of power in some areas. In its report filed January 3, 1939, the committee found:

> The Communist Party is boring from within labor unions on a wide scale, seeking to dominate or wreck the unions for purposes that are alien to the interest of organized wage earners. It deliberately projects violence in labor disputes for the purpose of training a revolutionary group in the tactics of civil war. It seeks to sabotage and cripple our economy on every possible front, with the view to its profiting by the resulting economic crisis.

In its report filed on January 3, 1940, the Dies committee found:

> On the basis of the evidence submitted, we find Communist leadership entrenched in the following organizations: National Maritime Union; United Cannery, Packing, and Allied Workers; Federation of Architects, Engineers, Chemists, and Technicians; Fur Workers International Union; International Longshoremen and Warehousemen's Union; Transport Workers Union; United Office and Professional Workers' Union; American Communications Association; United Electrical, Radio and Mechanical Workers of America; and the United Furniture Workers of America.

We called upon the CIO to expel these unions from their organization. Ten years later the CIO took this action. We asked that these organizations be denied any right under the National Labor Relations Act.

Another cause for Communist success in the United States was the infiltration of educational institutions. In its report filed January 3, 1939, the Dies committee found:

> The Communist Party is unusually active in our schools, both openly and subtly insinuating its propaganda into the minds of students.

In its report dated January 3, 1941, the Dies committee recommended as follows:

> Withold all Federal financial support from any educational institution which permits members of its faculty to advocate communism, fascism or nazism as a substitute for our form of government to the student body of these educational institutions.

If this recommendation had been adopted, educational institutions would have been compelled to expel Nazis, Fascists, and Communists from their faculty. This would have struck a telling blow at the Communist conspiracy.

After my bill to deport and exclude Communist aliens was stymied in the Senate, instructions went forth to all Communist aliens to become naturalized. Therefore, in the Committee's report dated January 3, 1941, we recommended as follows:

> We recommend that the statutory period during which citizenship papers can be revoked under existing law be extended to at least 10 years.

If this recommendation had been followed, our Government could have revoked the citizenship papers of Nazis, Fascists, and Communists and deported at least 90 percent of them.

A contributing cause to the growth of the Communist conspiracy in the United States was the ease with which Communist agents were able to travel to and from the United States. In its report dated January 3, 1945, the committee recommended:

> Due to the fact that the Committee has discovered that many members of foreign-controlled organizations have traveled on American passports which have been fraudulently obtained, the committee feels that the statute of limitations should be extended from 3 to 7 years. This is made necessary because of the unusual difficulty in apprehending those who resort to the use of fraudulent passports within the period of 3 years.

The most important recommendation made by the Dies committee during the seven years of its existence was the recommendation contained in the report of 1941, that foreign-controlled political organizations be outlawed. It reads as follows:

> The enactment of legislation to outlaw every political organization which is shown to be under the control of a foreign government. As long as these organizations have a legal status in the United States, it will be difficult for any agency of the Government to deal with them. We now know that they furnish the legal apparatus for the operations of saboteurs and the windowdressing for espionage. The committee believes that legislation can be worked out to outlaw such organizations, and that this will in no sense constitute a violation of the Bill of Rights since such legislation would only affect organizations controlled or directed by foreign countries.

Mr. Speaker, had this recommendation been adopted in 1941, the Communist conspiracy would have been dealt a death blow. In its 1939 report, the committee found:

> The Government, by use of the provisions of the wartime legislation, drove the Communist Party underground, where it remained in an illegal status until 1924, when the repeal of the war measures and the consequent halting of Government activities by the agents of the Department of Justice permitted it to reappear. The Communists came more and more into the open until today they flaunt their revolutionary activities throughout the country. Since 1925 the Department of Justice has had no power, no authority, or no funds from the Congress to investigate Communist propaganda or activities. During the period that the Department of Justice had actual authority, the Communist Party was driven underground where it could not function successfully. Just so long as the agents of the Department of Justice were active, the movement remained comparatively stationary and innocuous. At the present time the Communist Party of the United States is thoroughly and highly organized, nationally and locally, and is extremely active.

Eventually Congress must pass my bill to outlaw the Communist Party and its subsidiary, auxiliary, and frontal organizations, because there is no other way to crush this criminal and treasonable conspiracy.

Mr. Speaker, before concluding this speech I would like to read a few excerpts from my book, The Trojan Horse in America, which was published in the early part of 1940 by Dodd, Mead & Co. On page 354 I said:

> It should, however, be stressed that the Government itself has played an important role in the growth of Communism by providing Communists with jobs and opportunities for recruiting members and fellow travelers. There are few subversive organizations in America which cannot produce letters of endorsement and encouragement from prominent Government officials.

On page 362 I said:

> These leftwingers are scattered throughout the Government service and occupy key positions which enable them to oppose any efforts to combat the fifth column. * * * Until they are removed from their positions, we may expect at best only halfhearted and ineffectual action.

On page 363 I said:

> The issue is before the President. He must take the initiative in performing this necessary task in the interest of adequate preparedness.
>
> The President cannot supply the leadership on which our national security rests until he inaugurates a thorough and a genuine housecleaning in Government service. This is the plain truth and to deny or avoid it may prove fatal in the end.

The President must surely realize by this time that his leftwing followers in the Government are the fountainhead of subversive activities.

Whether or not we can develop courageous leadership in this country remains to be seen. It depends upon an awakening of the people. The totalitarian psychology of Communism and Fascism has taken root in the minds of many of our people. It must be eradicated before the Nation is prepared to defend itself against the assault of totalitarianism.

Conditions Refute Secretary Weeks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 2, 1954

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylviana. Mr. Speaker, here is some revealing information contained recently in an issue of the A. F. of L. News-Reporter.

This is apropos at this time because of the controversy being waged currently about agriculture. It also points out the decline in business activity generally, with the resulting unemployment increasing.

If something is not done soon to prime business, I fear we are going to be in a bad way.

With your permission I am including herewith this editorial:

ACTION SPEAKS LOUDER

Sinclair Weeks, Secretary of Commerce, says he is "optimistic" about current business conditions because economic indexes are favorable "all the way along the line."

The facts are that more persons were unemployed last month than in any May during the past 10 years. One out of 12 American workers is unemployed or working only part time.

Just this month, 31 industrial centers were added to the list of areas of substantial unemployment—those having 6 percent or more of their labor force without jobs. The total now stands at 123.

Total wage and salary payments are declining at the rate of more than $12 billion a year, Secretary Weeks' own Commerce Department report that personal income in the Nation declined in April, the latest date for which figures are available, for the sixth straight month. His department also estimates that businessmen will continue to cut their spending for new plants and equipment through the third quarter of this year. If accurate, the estimate means businessmen will have reduced their capital outlays in every 3-month period since the third quarter of last year.

The Agriculture Department reveals that farmers received 4 percent less for their crops and livestock during the first 5 months of 1954 than for the same period a year earlier. The net income of Class 1 railroads—those with at least $1 million of business a year—in the first 4 months of this year declined by $34 million from a year ago. The Studebaker Corp. announces 8,000 employees are being laid off this week, the eighth closedown this year. Officials said slow retail sales are to blame.

And meantime, the Federal Government's debt has risen by some $5½ billion in the last year.

It cannot be forgotten that the same members of the Eisenhower "team" who see business getting better soon are the same ones who said last January that unemployment would level off at 2½ million. Instead, it jumped to more than 3.3 million in March and has stayed there.

What the Nation wants is less talk and more action.

Operation Youth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 2, 1954

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, a couple of weeks ago, along with my colleague, the Honorable FRANK OSMERS, of New Jersey, I had the pleasure of addressing the program entitled "Operation Youth" at Xavier University in Cincinnati. I found it a most inspiring occasion.

I am including herewith a brief statement which I know will be of interest to the Members about this splendid work being done by Xavier University:

Operation Youth, sponsored by Xavier University on its campus each June in Cincinnati, Ohio, is a program designed to sell America to the youth of America.

There is a great deal said, here in the United States, about the infiltration of communism and other non-American ideologies into the minds of our American youth at the high-school and college level. Much is said about combating these insidious influences, but not enough is actually done in a positive way about selling America to our young Americans.

Five years ago, 1950, Xavier University accepted as a challenge the prospect of doing a service in this field. A program was initiated under the guidance of Reverend James F. Maguire, S. J., president of Xavier University, dedicated to selling the ideals of American citizenship and democracy to American youth. In 2 of its first 4 years, 1950 and 1953, the program was awarded special recognition by the Freedoms Foundation, Inc., of Valley Forge, Pa.

Operation Youth is a 1-week program each June, in 1954 June 12 to 18, inclusive. The 1954 program was attended by 288 young men, high-school age, mixed races and creeds, from an area embracing 9 States and the District of Columbia.

In order to understand the type of program that is offered to the young men attending Operation Youth, it is necessary to point out the particular type of boy who attends the program. By far the greater percentage of the boys, perhaps 90 percent, do not pay their own way but come to Xavier University by benefit of scholarships underwritten by such civil and fraternal organizations as the Knights of Columbus, Kiwanis, and even a community volunteer fire department. In 9 cases out of 10 these scholarships are awarded on the basis of school work and leadership in some local high school. As a result of this scholarship policy, the attendance at Operation Youth is largely made up of the top 1, 2, or 3 boys from many high schools throughout the Midwest.

The whole program is intellectually geared for high-school boys of the highest scholastic caliber. The content of each day and even of each talk is carefully planned to challenge the intellectual capacities of these highly selected boys and to demonstrate to them that the fundamental principles upon which our American political and economic life is based are a logical consequence to the basic truths of God and consistent with the nature He has implanted in each member of the human race.

Initial talks deal with such fundamental political concepts as liberty, rights, duties, and responsibilities in a democracy. The philosophical basis especially of inalienable rights is especially emphasized—that liberty, for instance, is not the same as license and that it can be an inalienable right only if understood as a necessary means to a God-appointed end. From the text of the Declaration of Independence it is demonstrated that government has only such rights as are delegated to it by the people—and not the people only such rights as are granted them by the State. In brief, the opening sessions sound the tenor of the entire week's program, demonstrating that those American political truths which we hold to be self-evident—the equality and inalienable dignity of all men in the eyes of God—are completely dependent upon our heritage of Judeo-Christian philosophy and theology.

Throughout the week each day is given over to sessions on one or the other key principle of our American way of life. The following subjects are the basis of discussion: World organizations in the atomic age; National, State, and local government relationships and responsibilities; the historical function of political parties; protection and regulation of free enterprise; opportunities in public service; and responsibilities of an individual in democratic community life.

Facets of each subject are presented twice, evening and morning, to the entire Operation Youth assembly by business, civic, and political leaders who are experts in their respective fields. After the dual presentation, the membership is broken into smaller groups, presided over and directed by professional discussion leaders, where the young men are encouraged to express their own views and convictions in the light of the presentations made earlier.

Afternoon field trips complete the program for each day. Visits to a session of the Cincinnati city council, to public utilities and to industries are arranged in order that the young men of Operation Youth may see first hand the actual operation of the elements essential to our American political and economic life.

A public meeting is scheduled during Operation Youth Week. Business and professional leaders as well as representatives of organizations sponsoring young men to Operation Youth are invited to witness the young men in action. (This year the public forum featured a discussion of political parties. Hon. HALE BOGGS, Congressman from Louisiana, spoke on "Why I Am a Democrat" and Hon. FRANK OSMERS, Congressman from New Jersey, spoke on "Why I Am a Republican.") Following the formal presentation, a lively question and answer period followed.

In the course of the week the young guests of Xavier University are given an opportunity to further their own practical and political experience. Political parties are formed about popular leaders who are selected from each of the discussion groups. Platforms taking a stand on live National and State issues are developed. Campaigns are waged, political organizations formed. By the end of the week a complete slate of popular candidates is elected to political office. These young men are allowed to preside over the closing sessions of the program.

It should be mentioned that the complete supervision of all the personal details incidental to the smooth functioning of Operation Youth is in the hands of Xavier University administrators and key members of the faculty. A group of 15 to 20 young college men handle the organizational problems involved in the friendly yet strict supervision of the high-school students participating in the program.

Operation Youth is a program which teaches young men the basic truths and blessings of American life by having them "live America" for 1 week at Xavier University. The administration of the university feels that it has in small part answered the challenge of our times by developing a program as enjoyable as it is educational, a program to sell America to the youth of America.

The Significance of Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 2, 1954

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following strong, sincere, and truthful statement by Mr. James A. Campbell, national president, American Federation of Government Employees, which appeared in the current issue of their publication the Government Standard:

A Proud and Glorious Heritage

(By James A. Campbell, national president AFGE)

Amid the popping of firecrackers, the droning oratory at county fairs and carnivals, the bumper-to-bumper chain of autos leaving the hot city for the cool lakes and seashores, let us not forget the meaning of the holiday we celebrate this Fourth of July.

When the leading figures of the rebellious colonies pledged their "lives, fortunes, and sacred honor" to found a free and independent nation, they were indulging in no idle oratory. In the eyes of many, they were placing the hangman's noose around their necks; for who with any sense would have thought that the powerful British Empire could be fought to a standstill by farmers with muskets and pitchforks?

"We hold these truths to be self-evident," Thomas Jefferson wrote and the Liberty Bell proclaimed: "That all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

"That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed.

This is a proud and glorious heritage that has been passed on to us. It has been the source of our strength as a nation and as a people.

There are countries in the world where the civil servant exhibits the arrogance of power, the rudeness of unchecked authority.

There are countries, too, where the Government employee is ever fearful, the bearer of tales and rumors, trusting no one, trusted by no one, weak pawns of a ruthless political tyranny.

In this country, where the purpose of government is the welfare of the Nation and its citizens, Government employees are the servants of the people, entrusted to carry out the policies and programs authorized by law.

But Government employees are also Americans, with the rights and privileges, as well as the obligations, of free men and women. Thus we can speak out freely and without fear to our elected representatives, we can organize for our mutual interest and the common good. Thanks to our courageous forefathers, the Government we serve demands of us neither the arrogance of Prussian officialdom or the fearful subservience of Communist despotism. May we never forget the significance of Independence Day.

The Administration Is Calloused to the Unemployment Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 2, 1954

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the shadow of unemployment is hanging ominously today over the whole American scene—and, equally important, over our foreign policy, too. It is no longer just "a problem" among many but one of the most serious problems affecting the United States and our position in the free world.

Today, more than a third of all of the major industrial areas of the country—including the Pittsburgh-Greensburg area—are on the list of distressed communities with "very substantial" unemployment. Only 16 have what is described as a "balanced labor supply" and not a single one—not even the areas of intense aircraft and atomic energy development work—has a labor shortage.

The worst aspect of this situation is that no responsible economic experts foresee any significant upturn in the near future. The Secretary of Commerce, Sinclair Weeks, talks confidently of better business and more prosperity some time, "soon," but a concensus of top economists in the country sees only a little improvement as we continue pretty much along the same levels of today.

When we compare statistics with previous years, 1954 looks in many respects like a pretty good year. But what the comparisons with previous years fail to indicate is that our population has been expanding steadily, but jobs, incomes, and prosperity are not keeping pace.

So what we have now—despite many optimistic statistics comparing things with other years is a less-than-full-employment economy rather than the kind of full employment we stated was our national objective when we passed the Employment Act of 1946.

A little improvement in the current situation is not enough. What we need is a full-scale attack on recession, a real and effective drive against unemployment. Unemployment means lowered purchasing power, which in turn means lowered business sales, which in turn means even less production, which in turn means even more unemployment. It is the source of a vicious economic cycle.

The recent report on the Greensburg labor market coincides with the rather gloomy picture everywhere. We see predictions of stability in employment at the current level for the next several months. Stability at the current level means no new jobs, while we have, at present, unemployment of over 8 percent with 2,500 boys and girls graduating from 20 high schools and academies in the Greensburg-Jeannette-Latrobe area..

Most of our distress in the Westmoreland County area and the surrounding portions of the Pittsburgh labor market area can be traced to the decline in automobile production and steel production. And those declines can be traced to reduced purchasing power among the people generally, all through the country.

Taking Pennsylvania alone, these are the areas of mass unemployment: Erie, New Castle, Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, Reading, Scranton, Williamsport, Altoona, Clearfield-Dubois, Indiana, Johnstown, Kittanning-Ford City, Pottsville, Sunbury-Shamokin-Mt. Carmel, Uniontown-Connellsville, and Wilkes-Barre-Hazleton.

The last 9 in that listing all have unemployment of more than 12 percent.

Only Allentown-Bethlehem, Harrisburg, Lancaster, and York among all the business centers of the State are outside the distressed category, and even they have what the Labor Department calls substantial unemployment.

In view of these circumstances, it is no wonder that many of us have been pleading with the Eisenhower administration day in and day out to get behind proposals for stimulating new purchasing power among the people, such as a great public-works program along the lines of my bill, higher tax exemptions, better unemployment-compensation benefits, a higher minimum wage, and other measures for getting cash into the hands of people who aren't buying today because they can't afford to. The administration so far has indicated it just can't be bothered.

Under permission to extend my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I am also including herewith a letter signed by the president of the United Mine Workers of America, Mr. John L. Lewis; the president of the United Steelworkers of America, Mr. Dave Beck; and the president of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen and Helpers of America, Mr. David J. McDonald, which substantiates my earlier remarks.

The letter follows:

United Mine Workers of America;
United Steelworkers of America; International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen and Helpers of America,
June 30, 1954.

Hon. Augustine B. Kelley,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Kelley: The economic decline and spreading unemployment in our Nation is a danger that must no longer be ignored.

A joint conference of the United Mine Workers of America, the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen and Helpers of America, and the United Steelworkers of America, representing 3 million American working men and women in the great basic industries of coal, steel, and trucking, respectfully call upon you and your associates in government for action now to halt the economic decline that threatens our free way of life.

To allow the economic machinery of the most productive industrial Nation in the world to slow down further is to play directly into the hands of international communism.

Our democratic system is on trial for its life. If we permit reduced earnings and unemployment to continue there will be a return to the chaos of the early 1930's. America cannot stand another economic sickness such as that and still maintain public order in the Republic.

Our fight against communism is primarily an economic fight. The tyrants in the Kremlin now look to the day when their predictions of economic ruin in America will bring this great Nation to its knees.

The present danger cannot be wished away by hopes and economic double talk. There are more than 4 million persons unemployed in our land. Thousands of these idle workers already have used up the funds they are presently entitled to under unemployment compensation laws. They have no money left with which to feed, clothe, and house themselves and their families. They demand jobs. Instead they are offered predictions of possible economic improvements sometime in the future. Such talk falls on their ears as empty phrases.

This spreading unemployment is the greatest threat to the continuation of freedom and democracy that exists in the Republic today. It is time to stop it before it is too late. The Government has the tools with which to act under existing legislation.

Let the Government act.

Let the Government act to create aggressive trade and export policies as an effective foreign policy weapon in the fight against communism and to protect the American standard of living.

Let the Government act to wipe out the Taft-Hartley abomination so that American labor may once more be free to act effectively.

Let the Government act to implement the Employment Act of 1946 to bring back maximum employment, production, and purchasing power.

Let the Government act to construct new and improved highways, new housing, new schools, hospitals, and similar public works that will offset this declining situation.

Let the Government act to promulgate a national fuels policy in the interest of national security so that our basic coal industry will be ready at all times to produce the fuel upon which the Republic is dependent for its industrial might both in peace and war.

Let the Government act to bring a return to full production in our great steel industry, 40 percent of whose workers are now idle or working less than 40 hours a week.

Let the Government act to stimulate employment in our vital vehicular transport industry by utilizing the trucking industry as a prime hauler of the mails within the zone of 300 miles, thus providing better service at less cost to the taxpayers.

Let the Government act to put purchasing power back into the pockets of the working people through lower personal income taxes.

Such actions by the Government would be practical, workable measures to stop the economic decline. Employment and living standards must be increased constantly to meet the needs of our growing population, our increasing work force, and our ever-expanding technology.

Such actions would be in the interest of all the American people. And they would be in the interest of the other free nations of the world. For without a strong and prosperous United States of America, freedom and democracy cannot survive in the world.

We present these proposals to you, the responsible officials of our Government, respectfully and in the spirit of cooperation that must prevail among all segments of our society. We urge that all other Americans, through their organizations, join in endorsement of the actions proposed herein.

Very truly yours,

John L. Lewis.
Dave Beck.
David J. McDonald.

H. R. 9020, Compensatory Rates and Pensions for Certain Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. HARRISON
OF WYOMING
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 2, 1954

Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, on June 25 I directed a letter to the House Rules Committee requesting early consideration of H. R. 9020, a bill to increase compensatory rates and pensions for certain veterans.

My letter to the committee was prompted not only by my own belief that the bill in question should be accorded hearing and debate by the full House but also by the widespread interest in the measure expressed by Wyoming people.

During the past several weeks I have received numerous letters, postal cards, and telegrams in support of H. R. 9020. Only this morning, in the first mail delivery, I received 11 letters on the subject from 1 community alone and a telegram from a second Wyoming city.

The 11 letters were from Lovell, Wyo., and came from officers and members of Robert Boyd Stewart Unit No. 11 of the American Legion Auxiliary. Earlier, I received numbers of similar letters from residents of other communities in my State. I add this comment simply to show, Mr. Speaker, that insofar as Wyoming is concerned, the interest in H. R. 9020 is not concentrated in just 1 or 2 sections.

As I told Chairman Allen of the Rules Committee, I believe his group should report the bill because it "is deserving of consideration by the House, where the bill may stand or fall upon its merits as viewed by the Members."

European Defense Community Pact

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 2, 1954

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following editorial from the Christian Science Monitor of Wednesday, June 30, 1954:

Opportunity Extended

Chancellor Adenauer continues to win time for the West in Europe. But it would be foolhardy to assume that the opportunity for security and a more united Europe will continue forever.

The Chancellor put his political prestige squarely on the line in the state elections in North Rhine Westphalia, including the Ruhr industrial area, by making this an announced test of his international policies. These center about adherence to the European Defense Community Pact as a means of bringing its companion agreement, the German peace contract, into operation.

In the voting in Westphalia Dr. Adenauer's Christian Democrats came out first with 41 percent, though this is a decline from 49 percent last September. Part of the loss was to the Social Democrats, who demand unification rather than EDC, but a greater part of it was to the Free Democratic Party, with which the Christian Democrats in Westphalia now must form some coalition.

Were this situation transferred from a state parliament to the federal Bundestag, the situation would be difficult for friends of a pro-American and profederation policy. The Free Democrats, though they began with a program of free enterprise which sounded attractive, have first become conservative to the point of reaction, then have been taken over to a disturbing degree by hard-bitten German nationalists who now are campaigning for diplomatic recognition of the Soviet Union and increased trade with the Soviet bloc. Thus, although the Communists have lost out as such in recent German elections, the prospect of collaboration between them and certain industrialists is not pretty.

Meanwhile, emissaries from the Mendes-France government in Paris are on their way to Bonn to plead for some modification of the EDC treaty which would involve reratification if not renegotiation in West Germany and the three Low Countries. If this is the sole hope of gaining approval by the French Parliament, then the effort must be made thus to obtain French participation. But unless Paris ratifies soon, the door to a unified European defense and a maximum of security for France may have closed.

Commencement Address Delivered by Hon. John E. Fogarty, Second District, Rhode Island, at North Kingston High School, June 16, 1954

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 2, 1954

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, a short time ago I enjoyed the honor of addressing the graduating class of North Kingston High School in Rhode Island. I was deeply impressed by the bright, alert appearance of the members of this graduating class and I came away from those commencement exercises with renewed confidence in the future of our country.

I spoke to the young men and women who are leaving high school this year about a subject which is close to my heart. I suggested to them a course of action in which I sincerely believe—one which I feel confident will do a great deal to promote a better aura of understanding among all the peoples of the world—and one which will enrich our culture by bringing to our own land the finest things that young people can learn abroad.

Under unanimous consent, I include the address to which I have referred in the Congressional Record:

I recall vividly the day on which I attended the commencement exercises which marked my graduation from high school.

I remember well my hope that the speakers on that great day would not be too profound, but brief.

I would not be profound—even if the occasion called for it—that I can assure you. I can also assure you that I shall be brief.

So, to the subject at hand.

I must, with your permission, call to your attention again, the fact that this is commencement day. We who are a bit older than you young men and women realize that today marks not the glorious conclusion of a course of studies in this high school—but the actual commencement of the pursuit of knowledge.

What you have achieved, really, is the end of the beginning in your quest of knowledge of the world in which you live—and the peoples who people the world in which you must live and die.

I wish I could bring myself to indulge in pious platitudes about this world of yours—and truly it is yours—to do with what you will. But, honesty compels me to talk of serious things.

In your civics classes you learned that there are certain risks which attend all efforts to make our country secure—secure in an economic sense, in a political sense and in a military sense.

It seems to me that you should be conscious today, primarily, of two great risks which you now run. One is the risk of living. The other—the risk of dying.

This world is made up of many and varied types of peoples—types of governments—types of cultures.

With every one of them you have a most serious concern. You should plan to expend your best efforts in learning as much as is possible about all these peoples, and governments and cultures in order that you may live in peace and contentment with them. I would recommend to you—to as many of you as is possible—that you spend some time in studying abroad. For those of you who cannot attend a university in some other country, I would urge that you read and examine all the material you can obtain about the peoples of other lands.

If you will do that, you will at one and the same time be helping to chart a course for a peaceful world and you will be preparing yourselves for fruitful careers in many fields of endeavor—the sciences—the avenues of interntional and domestic commerce—and what is probably today's most vital area where knowledge of the facts is absolutely essential, positions in public life.

I could point to one outstanding example where there is a crying need for young people with knowledge and intelligence. I refer to the field of medical research. Here your possibilities are limitless, and I am sure you have been told in school that the present level to which medical research has developed is due to the contributions of no one country, or one segment of our society. Medical research thrives only with the interchange of discoveries and the exchange of knowledge.

I urge you to run this risk of living—of living boldly—having the courage to consider yourself as a member of a world community of people—being determined always that you will be a contributing member of this world community.

If you will consider this recommendation—and I assure you I make it most seriously—I am confident that you will minimize—if not completely eradicate—the risk of dying on some foreign strand—far from home and family—among people you don't know, whose language and culture you don't understand and whose form of government, to you, has been of no concern.

I think first you must abandon complacency. There was a time when it was within the realm of reason that a high school graduate would spin out the remaining years of his life in the community in which he was raised. Then it was generally considered quite sufficient to be concerned only with the interests and affairs of that community. But that day is long since passed. So you can no longer, even if you wish fervently to do so, confine your attention to what happens from day to day in your own home town.

But you can't possibly appreciate the many developments in this most complex of all possible worlds unless you know and understand the factors which bring those developments about—and one of the principal factors is people.

I think we in the United States have too many self-appointed tutors. They are the commentators and columnists and authors who would establish for us—all the norms we appear to need for a successful and intelligent life.

We have the financial page of the New York Times, the summary of day-to-day events in the Wall Street Journal, Drew Pearson, Walter Lippmann, and others.

They present to us, in capsule form as it were, all we need to know about the society of which we are members. And what is the result? The result is we make no decisions of our own. We are too prone to accept the capsulized, if there be such a word, presentation of the so-called facts from the columnists and the commentators, and we sit back in sublime contentment and await the decision which we are sure will be forthcoming from our favorite expert or editorial page.

With this attitude I find fault. I charge you, young men and young women who will most certainly dominate the stage upon which tomorrow's drama will be performed, to be bolder than we have been—I plead with you to learn at first hand the facts upon which your decisions must be made. I beg of you—don't permit your generation to be decimated because you lacked the information, the understanding, upon which to base sound conclusions. To put it bluntly—my plea to you—on the day which marks your commencement of the search for knowledge—is—don't let others do your thinking for you. Be diligent in your personal search for the truth.

You have a right to ask, "How can I go about this search for all the facts?" There is a specific recommendation I would make. Let me put it this way.

Several years ago in Singapore I talked to a young man who had attended Leland Stanford University in California. During a summer vacation he had gone as far east as Chicago. That young man, employed by an importing firm in China, impressed me as a man who had learned to know the United States, even though he had seen only a small part of it.

I learned that he had been influenced, before going to the United States, by the arguments that the growth of communism in China was in reality nothing more than a movement for agrarian reform. Because of his contacts with American students and their families, he was brought to realize that it was in fact communism on the march and he grew to despise these most miserable merchants of unwanted ideas.

I talked one day to a young man in Bonn, the capital of the West German Republic. He was attending the university there, and as an exchange student he had spent one term at Loyola University in Detroit. He amazed me with his appreciation of the United States. He had grown up under the Nazi system and because he knew no other, he had accepted that system as ideal. His year of study in the United States—his association with our young people—demonstrated to him that government could function better when citizens made decisions based upon their own knowledge—than when all the rules of society were directed by the power which considered itself omnipotent—and enforced its decisions with the lash and the concentration camp.

I would be the last person in the world to deny to you the thrilling happiness which is yours today, as you wait eagerly to depart this hall—and receive the congratulations which you have justly earned. But I would not be honest to myself and to you for that matter—if I did not point out that here is also a moment of sadness.

Today you leave this institution forever. These hallowed grounds—grounds which you have helped make hallowed—are yours no longer. They now belong to those who are your juniors. Don't desecrate these structures in which you studied. Promise yourselves today that you will do more with the knowledge you have acquired here than those of my generation were able to do with the knowledge they acquired while in school.

In a moment or two you and I will part company. When and where we shall meet again no one knows. I am proud of you, believe me. I have always been fond of this town in which you grew up and this high school from which you have graduated. I would like to leave you with one thought which you might remember.

When I was in school, I recall, I read the ringing declaration of a great American who said, "Westward the course of empire makes its way." I recall also hearing another great American declaring that the eastern frontier of the United States is the Rhine River between Germany and France.

I would say to you now—in this moment which marks your great triumph—there are no horizons today. There are no borders—no boundaries—west or east—which provide you with any guarantee of security—or even safety.

One last thought, and I am finished.

Not by accident—but by deliberate design—I have not yet mentioned the name of your school—the name of your town—the name of our State, which I love so much.

I have done this in the hope that I can impress upon you the fact that it is of the utmost importance that you plan now to know the world in which you live. You cannot afford the luxury of looking with interest only on life in North Kingstown.

Your world is much—much smaller than was the world your parents contemplated when they left high school. What happened in far-off Tibet was not considered an American problem when your father received his high school diploma.

Today whatever happens in Paris, Pakistan, or the Malayan Peninsula, in the area of political, commercial, or military operations, will affect each of you in some way.

So I say to you go abroad—study abroad. Your Government encourages studies in the universities of foreign countries. Just last week, we in the Congress, provided funds for the operations of one of the Federal agencies charged with a portion of this responsibility. There are other Government agencies—and private organizations—interested in the same subject. You should explore all these possibilities.

I contend that to know people is to understand them and their problems. I wish it were possible for you to know all the peoples of this world of ours, so that you could understand them and they could understand you.

If the young men and women of your generation will explore this field to its fullest possible extent, I am convinced that your children can safely run the risk of living in a world community where the creatures of God enjoy a mutual understanding.

They won't have to run the risk of reddening the beaches of foreign lands with the very lifeblood of the youth of America.

High Rigid Support Price for Certain Agricultural Products Is a Detriment to Farmer and Consumer Interests

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 2, 1954

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, for a long time the Government has been required to buy great quantities of wheat, corn, cotton, peanuts, and rice to support the price of these commodities to the producer. This has resulted in certain conditions that have resulted adversely to the consumer and the Government. For instance there is today in storage quantities of wheat, corn, cotton, dairy products and tobacco to the value of over $6 billion. This vast expenditure by the Government for the purchase of the commodities I have enumerated, is not the only expenditure that has been necessary to maintain the price of these commodities, but, in addition thereto is the cost of storage that amounts to $700,000 per day. All of this results not only in increased taxes to our people but also increases the cost of living to them.

President Eisenhower, while not unfriendly to the necessity of the farmer having a fair return for his products, yet, is of the opinion that the rigid controls that require the maintenance of price for the favored farm products, under the law as it has been for several years, is neither right or just to all the farmers of the Nation nor to any of the consumers. The law as it is selects only a few crops, such as I have mentioned, and helps only the farmers who produce them. The farmers who are interested in diversified crops such as we have in New Jersey are not helped by the present farm program, nor, the one now under review by the pending legislation before us.

Instead of this unfair system of farm aid the President, through his Secretary of Agriculture has submitted a more flexible plan in place of the rigid plan now in force. It is a well-considered plan. It is entitled to the support of Congress. It does no injustice to the producers of the so-called basic crops and does do justice to the consumers.

It is time something is done to reduce the cost of living. While this bill in itself will not accomplish this purpose, yet, it is one of the steps that must be taken if the consumer is to obtain any degree of relief, and other farmers not within the present farm program, and, citizens generally are not to be required to sustain such an unfair system by paying increased taxes.

On last Monday morning, June 28, 1954, the Philadelphia Inquirer, in an editorial entitled "Congress' Duty: End Farm Price Gouge," has clearly, logically, and forceably set forth in detail the reasons that justify the adoption of the President's program instead of that reported by the Agriculture Committee of the House. Therefore, I include a copy of the editorial as part of my remarks. It reads as follows:

Congress' Duty: End Farm Price Gouge

The sound, constructive effort of the Eisenhower administration to free the Nation from the costly and wasteful burden of high rigid farm price supports will come to a head in the House of Representatives this week, and shortly afterward in the Senate.

In both bodies the Committees on Agriculture have ignored the President's proposal and voted to recommend another year's extension of the rigid support system, binding the Government to buy wheat, corn, cotton, peanuts, and rice at 90 percent of parity.

They voted, in effect, to continue high food prices for American dinner tables, high costs for taxpayers. They voted to encourage indefensible overproduction and the piling up of huge, and useless, surpluses.

These committee actions represent the stubborn determination of the farm bloc to maintain the glaring evils of the rigid support system. Their recommendations reflect a hard-boiled political attempt to deal with a problem that is of vital concern to all Americans, including farmers.

In the House both Republicans and Democrats who have the interests of the country at heart should set aside the committee proposal and put through the administration program for flexible supports to vary, as needs prescribe, between 75 and 90 percent. When the time comes, the Senate should follow suit.

The committee actions have been interpreted as snubs to the President and to Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson.

They were snubs for all the people of this country who have to buy food and clothing and pay taxes. And the time is overdue for their interests to have full consideration in Congress.

Does the Eisenhower farm program aim to wipe out reasonable aid for American farmers? Not a bit of it. Under flexible supports basic farm commodities will continue to be bought by the Government. The supports would move up to encourage production during times of low farm output and move down to discourage plantings in times of excess production.

There's the essential and important feature of this plan. It will hold down needless overproduction, which high rigid supports foster. So long as those high supports prevail, overproduction is inevitable.

We have got to get rid of the immense surpluses we already have. And that's almost a superhuman task. We have got to halt the sinful loss and waste, such as we've seen in stored butter. And we've got to have farm aid geared, to some extent at least, with the idea of giving housewives a better break on prices than is possible under the current high support plan.

The President's farm policy deserves the support of Members of Congress of both parties. It is a sincere attempt to solve a gigantic problem in which Secretary Benson, notably, has gained stature by his sturdy courage in seeking to further a farm program that would serve the interests of all the people. He has stood out against threats, bullying, cajolery—all sorts of pressures—and bravely but with good humor has held firmly to what he believes in.

For far too long the farm program has operated to the disadvantage of millions of consumers. It has meant the shocking paradox of enormous accumulations of food and fiber along with unyielding high prices.

Solution of that must be removed from the crude political arena in which it has not often been left. Republicans should support the President unless there are grave reasons for disagreeing with him. And in this case there are none. Democrats in Congress should stand by Mr. Eisenhower and his farm program because it is a wise program, in the best interest of the Nation.

We hope that in both House and Senate that interest—the real interest of America—will prevail and that the shameful waste and inequity of Government-rigged high prices will become a thing of the past.

Another editorial on the same subject that is forceful and conclusive appeared in the Evening Bulletin, of Philadelphia, Pa., issue of June 28, 1954. It is entitled "A Consumer Defeat." It reads as follows:

A Consumer Defeat

By the very comfortable margin of 26 to 2 the House Agriculture Committee has approved a measure which would continue rigid high-support prices for basic crops for 1 year. There is nothing original in this action. Twice before lower and flexible supports were slated by law to go into effect. Both times Congress relented and allowed high supports to continue when the time came to end them.

A promise to end them in the future costs Congressmen no votes and does consumers no good. To fulfill the promise in an election year might do considerable political damage in areas where the farm bloc is strong.

That not all farmers want this expensive and wasteful policy continued can be seen from the two votes cast against the present bill. They came from Congressman Karl C. King, a Republican, and a commercial vegetable grower in Bucks County, and from Congressman Paul B. Dague, Republican, who represents the rich farm area of Lancaster County. These Pennsylvania Congressmen bespoke the feelings of many eastern farmers.

The House committee took this action in defiance of the President's request at a time when bumper crops threaten to overwhelm the storage facilities of the Nation. Wheat has already done so and favorable conditions for an exceptional corn crop in the Middle West may well provoke a similar situation.

Yet despite all this plenty, food prices took a sharp jump upward in the most recent report of the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Fortunately the action of the House committee is not final. The House itself must vote and then the Senate. The President is expected to exert pressure in support of his sane program. He has a big stick in his veto power because if he kills this extension of high-price supports they will automatically end in accordance with the law now in force. There is still a chance the consumer will get a break.

Realizing the substantial and worthwhile reasons that justify the adoption of President Eisenhower's program, it is my intention to vote for the adoption of his plan as an amendment to the bill now before the House. I hope and expect it will be adopted as it would be beneficial to all of our people.

Development of Warrior River Headwater Reservoirs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL ELLIOTT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 24, 1954

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, ever since I have been a Member of Congress I have directed a great deal of my efforts toward obtaining development of the Warrior River headwaters. This project would include the building of the New Hope Dam on the Sipsey River in Walker County, Ala., the Dorsey Creek Dam in Cullman County, Ala., the Smith's Ford Dam in Blount County, Ala., and the addition of hydroelectric power at existing lock and dam 17, and at lock and dam 13, when built.

The United States Corps of Engineers and all interested State and Federal agencies have approved the project. Only the approval of the Bureau of the Budget is needed before the Congress can be requested to authorize the work.

The construction of these facilities would help trade and industrial development in Alabama by providing an improved waterway and more electric power. It would have important soil-conservation effects. It would prevent floods at Cordova, Northport, and other towns. Of great immediate importance is the fact that this construction would be of inestimable value in helping relieve the serious unemployment in the Seventh Congressional District of Alabama.

Mr. Braxton B. Carr, executive vice president of the Warrior-Tombigbee Development Association, is a leading exponent of the full and complete development of the river.

On June 1, Mr. Carr explained exactly what is involved in this river development program before the Water Resources and Power Task Force of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government. His statement was so clear, and explained the matter so thoroughly, that I am anxious to make it a matter of public record by including it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. Braxton Carr's statement follows:

STATEMENT OF WARRIOR-TOMBIGBEE DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATION BEFORE THE WATER RESOURCES AND POWER TASK FORCE OF THE COMMISSION ON ORGANIZATION OF THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH OF THE GOVERNMENT, JUNE 1, 1954, AT CHATTANOOGA, TENN.

I am Braxton B. Carr, executive vice president of the Warrior-Tombigbee Development Association. The association is a nonprofit, nonpolitical, educational organization whose sole purpose is to stimulate and convey public support for the development and utilization of the water resources of the Warrior-Tombigbee River Valley in Alabama, including Mobile Bay into which the river empties.

The Warrior River has its beginnings in principal tributary streams in Walker, Winston, Cullman, and Blount Counties in north Alabama. The Tombigbee River, which arises in northwest Alabama and northeast Mississippi has its confluence with the Warrior in west central Alabama at Demopolis. The Warrior-Tombigbee Waterway traverses or adjoins 14 of Alabama's 67 counties. These 14 counties contain 27 percent of the land area of the State of Alabama; 40 percent of the State's population; and 35 percent of Alabama's manufacturing facilities which employ 42 percent of the State's industrial workers.

The Warrior-Tombigbee Waterway is a Federal navigation project comprising 467 miles of channel with an authorized depth of 9 feet and width of 200 feet. The project extends from the mouth of the river at Mobile Bay to the head of navigation on the Locust Fork of the Warrior at Birminghamport and the head of navigation on the Mulberry Fork at Sipsey.

The inland waterway connects the rich coal fields of north Alabama and the industrialized Birmingham district with Alabama's gulfport city of Mobile, which affords import and export access for oceangoing shipping as well as access to the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway.

Recognition of the importance of the Warrior-Tombigbee Waterway parallels the settlement of Alabama. French settlers found their way to the site of Demopolis, Ala., by using the river. One of the factors which influenced them to choose this site for their homes was the availability of the river as a line of communication and transit. Demopolis was incorporated in 1821. At about that same time, 130 miles upriver, settlers were choosing another river site for the city of Tuscaloosa, Ala. That site was considered choice because it was at the head of navigation on the unimproved Warrior-Tombigbee which could be negotiated for about 6 months of the year.

Interest in these and other communities for having the river improved for navigation developed in 1850 and by 1860 had crystallized into a concerted movement. In 1871 the United States Congress gave its approval to the project by authorizing work to proceed under the United States Corps of Engineers to canalize the river below Demopolis for navigation purposes. Various piecemeal authorizations followed until in 1902 Congress merged the project under one authorization act covering the whole river system of the Warrior-Tombigbee Waterway in Alabama from the mouth of the river at Mobile Bay to the present head of navigation on the two primary tributary forks. Officially the project is known as the Black Warrior, Warrior, and Tombigbee Rivers, Ala.

The United States Corps of Engineers completed the first three locks and dams in 1895. By 1915 the Corps had completed a series of 18 locks and 17 dams, opening the entire waterway to navigation at a construction cost of $9,112,039.35. In 1940, the first three locks constructed were replaced with a single lock and dam, adding $4,450,873.50 to the construction expenditures.

Today the 280-foot long by 52-foot wide lock chambers are obsolete in size. Some are rapidly deteriorating. Most of the dams were originally designed to provide a 6-foot channel for keelboats and packet boats, but have had crest boards and caps added to provide additional height. They too are obsolete. Many of them are of timber-crib construction. Some have reached advanced stages of deterioration.

In spite of these obvious handicaps and others, the waterway continues to be a useful instrument of the economy of the State of Alabama, as well as the Nation.

Twenty-two companies, the majority of them small businesses, operate barges on the river system, moving commerce today at the rate of between 3 million and 3.5 million tons annually, with 5 million tons annually in sight within the next 3 or 4 years if projected improvements are continued. Principal cargoes moved on the river consist of limestone, petroleum products, coal, iron, and steel manufactures, logs, iron ore, and concentrates, sulphur, pulpwood, sugar, oyster shells, clay, earth, sand, and gravel. Today's conception of full utilization of the water resources of the Warrior-Tombigbee valley goes far beyond the conception held by Alabama leaders who first sought development of the river in 1850. They sought only an avenue of transportation and communication.

Today's business, industrial, and civic leaders throughout the Warrior-Tombigbee Valley, concentrating their efforts through the Warrior-Tombigbee Development Association, recognize a whole new set of economic benefits inherent in water-resource development. Navigation still provides one of the paramount benefits to be derived from a waterway such as we have in Alabama. But the benefits go far beyond navigation. These additional benefits all of which complement development for navigation are within themselves of such long-range importance that they alone might very well constitute the basis for conservation and utilization development of a waterway such as Warrior-Tombigbee.

Rain falls in the Warrior-Tombigbee watershed in a bountiful 55 inches annually. The purposes which this water serves, the water deficiencies, and the growing and ultimate water needs all delineate the new concept of water resource development values held by the people of Alabama and particularly of this river valley.

Even with the blessedly abundant 55 inches of annual rainfall, there are periods of prolonged drought in the valley. The character of the river contributes to intensifying the ill effects of these drought cycles. The principal tributary forks and the main stream of the Warrior as far south as Tuscaloosa, Ala., flow through deep, narrow gorges. At Tuscaloosa the river abruptly enters a wide plain area which continues to the Gulf of Mexico. Water from storm rainfall is discharged rapidly from the mountainous upper reaches. At Tuscaloosa the rapid discharge spreads over the wide flood plain, causing an estimated annual flood loss in business, residential and farm properties of approximately $1 million. Not only do the floods, which occur on an average of 2½ times a year, create actual damage, but they also pose a constant threat which precludes full utilization of some of the richest farmlands in the valley.

The obvious need exists for water control structures which will trap and withhold from the stream sufficient water from storm rainfalls to eliminate major flood damage and eliminate the constant threat to farmlands; control which will store for use in drought periods the overabundance of water from these same periods of storm rainfall.

The existing condition of high-flow, low-flow periods on the river creates a complex series of interconnected problems which eventually must be solved if industry and commerce in the Warrior-Tombigbee Valley are to be given the opportunity afforded by water resource development to continue normal growth, prosperity and expansion of production and services.

Jasper, Ala., with a population of 8,500, is the principal city of Walker County. The county has a population of 63,000. Traditionally Walker County's economy has been keyed to coal mining. The county still has great reserves of fine coal, but like other mining areas her economy has suffered to such an extent that Walker County's unemployment situation has been nationally spotlighted as critical. The Mulberry Fork of the Warrior River flows across Walker County. Without this means of economical water transportation it is doubtful that Walker County would have a single commercial coal mine left in operation. Local leaders as well as national leaders agree that the ultimate solution of Walker County's economic situation lies in creating employment through additional diversified industry. One of the first problems an industry encounters in seeking to locate in Walker County is that of water supply. Jasper and many of the county's smaller towns depend on the Warrior River for their water supply and in periods of drought their relatively small but vital needs are jeopardized. With modern industry's great appetite for water as a raw material, Walker County is handicapped in efforts to resolve her economic problems and will continue to be handicapped until steps are taken to conserve for use the available water supply which comes to the area of the Warrior-Tombigbee watershed.

To some degree the situation that exists in Walker County repeats itself again and again throughout the river valley.

Birmingham draws her principal domestic water supply from another watershed, but is dependent upon the Warrior-Tombigbee watershed for her industrial supply now and in the future. Birmingham's industrial water is supplied from Inland Lake which is fed by Blackburn Creek, a tributary of the Locust Fork of the Warrior River. Inland Lake now supplies 60 million gallons of water daily, which is the maximum that can be safely taken from that source. So in effect Birmingham is now out of industrial water for all practical purposes of major industrial growth and expansion.

Tuscaloosa, Ala., a city of 46,000 population, has 111 industries which employ 8,200 persons in manufacturing jobs. Several of these industries are heavy users of water. Their plants were built on the banks of the Warrior River to take process water from the river. They take it at the rate of 50 million gallons a day. In periods of extreme drought these industries are forced to shut down operations for lack of usable water.

Local action as well as statewide action has been initiated and is being continued to clean up the pollution situation which has attended the growth of population and the growth of industry and commerce all along the waterway. However, nothing short of action punitive to a degree that would not be tolerated would ever completely relieve any heavily industrialized river system of some measure of pollution from municipal and industrial wastes. While progress is being made toward alleviating pollution at the source, the Warrior-Tombigbee will continue to have a pollution problem as long as we have extreme low flows and extreme high flows in the river. In extreme low-flow periods the wastes which pollute the waters pile up behind the navigation dams. Quickly rising flash floods which follow storm rainfalls flush out the wastes which have collected. The situation which exists today is a public health menace attested to by Alabama's public health officials. It is a menance also to fish and wildlife. It poses a constant threat to the oyster industry in Mobile Bay. Stabilization of water flow in the river system is as essential to an adequate solution to this pollution problem as is better control of disposal of wastes at their source.

Low flows are so extreme at times that no water flows across the navigation dams on the river. The 9-foot navigation channel does not exist at such times. The Warrior-Tombigbee barges, which average 500- to 600-ton capacities are loaded light by from 100 to 200 tons each at such times and navigated precariously event then. With operating costs unchanged and payloads lightened under such conditions, barge operators lose revenue.

Floodwaters also create unusual conditions on the Warrior-Tombigbee which affect navigation adversely, more so than on the average navigable inland waterway. Because of the wide, shallow channel and the low banks in the 250-mile reach of river between Jackson, Ala., and Tuscaloosa, quick-rising floodwaters coming on the heels of drought have a tendency to build up shoals. Because of the fast runout of water from the river, unless sustained rains come to keep up the water level until the United States Corps of Engineers can dredge out the shoals, navigation suffers. In June 1953, an instance occurred which demonstrates the point. A prolonged drought was followed by a short period of heavy rainfall, then drought set in again. In spite of emergency dredging by the United States Corps of Engineers, navigation was brought to a standstill for 11 days for lack of water over the shoals built up by the short flood period.

In describing the characteristics of the Warrior-Tombigbee Waterway and thereby delineating features which show the river system is not now fully serving the purposes which we recognize that a river such as we have should serve in our present economy, we do so only to suggest to this task force that we have in this river system a water resource worthy of development under recognized standards to meet recognized needs of general public benefits. It should be borne in mind that the system of locks and dams now in place on this waterway were built for the sole purpose of canalizing the river for navigation. They were built under a program conceived in 1870 and initiated in 1890. Packet boats and keelboats carried the commerce on the inland waterways in the era which this system of locks and dams were built to serve. That they are inadequate to meet today's requirements is no reflection upon their builders. Modern achievements in the development of towboats and barges for the movement of commerce on the inland waterways have largely come about since the building of this system of locks and dams.

It should also be borne in mind that the techniques of full surface water resource conservation, control, and utilization which are practiced today have largely been developed since the building of the system of locks and dams on the Warrior-Tombigbee was completed in 1915. No water control measures have ever been put into effect on this river system except for the system of navigation dams.

We have reached a period of economic growth and development in the United States where the value of available water resources is fully recognized. Any appraisal of such resources on a national scale as well as a local scale must inevitably conclude that the water resources of the Warrior-Tombigbee River Valley in Alabama are among the most valuable underdeveloped assets of their kind in America today.

In appearing before this task force to cite the underdevelopment of this waterway, the problems its poses, and the need for full development, it is not the purpose of the Warrior-Tombigbee Development Association to attempt to assign to a Federal agency or to various Federal agencies the direct responsibility for accomplishment in minute detail of final development for full utilization of this resource. We recognize the final responsibility and insist upon the final responsibility of local governments and local citizenry to meet their share of development in relation to purely localized problems and needs as they may arise.

But we support the basic concept inherent in the body of our national policy since the earliest days of the United States to the effect that our navigable inland waterways are of such universal importance that their development and their use should be fitted into a national concept. Therefore, the basic development should be handled by and within the national framework, taking into account at all times the local needs in relationship to the national policy.

With that as our basic premise, the Warrior-Tombigbee Development Association, representing through membership and association a large segment of the business, industrial and civic leadership of the river valley, respectfully recommends to this task force that the job of further developing this waterway be left in the hands of the United States Corps of Engineers. An examination of the Corps of Engineers' principal inland waterway projects shows that construction work on the existing Warrior-Tombigbee project was started by the corps in 1887. This project is one of the earliest inland waterway projects undertaken by the Corps of Engineers for improvements for navigation under a comprehensive plan for the entire waterway. That the development job was adequate in serving the purpose for which it was conceived and executed is demonstrated, we believe, by the fact that dams built of wood over 50 years ago are still standing and still serving beyond their original purpose.

The argument is advanced that the development features on the Warrior-Tombigbee are not adequate to meet today's needs for utilization of the great resources we have. We have advanced that argument in this presentation and we expect to continue to advance it. But the advancement of that proposition should not be construed as criticism of the United States Corps of Engineers as the agency of the Federal Government charged with the responsibility of planning, constructing and supervising the building and use of basic structures for water-resource development. We recognize the operating policy which in effect denies to the Corps of Engineers any decision of its own to initiate projects for inland waterways development. Any criticism for the failure to have the development of Warrior-Tombigbee keep abreast of progress in development which has been made on other waterways properly belongs to the people of the river valley.

Not until 1951 was there any concerted action by the people of the river valley to bring about a reappraisal and a redevelopment of the river system. Recognition by the people of Alabama and by their representatives in the United States Congress of the inherent benefits to the growth and progress and prosperity of the region through development of the full resources of the waterway brought about a request to the United States Corps of Engineers to formulate plans for a comprehensive program of redevelopment and additional development. Congress implemented the request by giving the Corps the necessary authority to proceed with studies beyond the limits of the existing navigation project.

The response by the Corps of Engineers has been swift and thorough. Three years after the beginning of a concerted effort in Alabama to develop the river system to meet present and projected needs, the Corps of Engineers, with the finest possible cooperation from every level of command, has formulated such a comprehensive development program. The program contemplates replacement of 13 of the present 40- to 50-year-old small locks and low dams with four modern navigation facilities. This will leave in use two of the present navigation facilities, giving a total of 6 locks and dams instead of the present 15. One of these new projects started in 1949, is about 80 percent completed with closure of the dam scheduled in August of this year. A second project will be started this year provided the Congress gives final approval for funds. The third project is at a stage where final plans can be completed in less than a year. Initial planning has been done on the fourth project.

The full program contemplates construction of three dams in the headwaters of the Warrior River, creating storage reservoirs behind the dams. These headwaters dams and reservoirs will serve to regulate the flow of water in the river, giving a stable flow in excess of 2,000 cubic feet per second, thus eliminating extreme low-flows and extreme high-flows and conserving the average 55 inches of rainfall for maximum use for navigation and for maximum use for industrial and domestic purposes along the entire reach of river.

Further use of the impounded water is contemplated by initial hydroelectric installation in the three headwaters dams to generate a total of 196,000 kilowatts, with the future addition of another 80,000 kilowatts planned in one of the headwaters dams. Stabilization of flow will allow installation of units to generate 45,000 kilowatts in the uppermost navigation dam on the river, and installations to generate 40,000 kilowatts at dam No. 13 when it is rebuilt as a replacement for four of the present navigation facilities. The plan provides for the generation ultimately of 361,000 kilowatts of energy.

The three headwaters dams and reservoirs also will provide, between the maximum power pools and the spillway crests, 1,609,000 acre feet of storage for the control of floods, which would be equivalent to a total of 42.5 inches of run-off from the three drainage areas totaling 2,104 square miles above the dams.

Stabilized flow will be measurably helpful in alleviating the present pollution problem.

The water recreation areas, created as a by-product, will be accessible to approximately 800,000 people who do not now have such sites within the same area.

The headwaters development program will make possible a coordinated program of fish and wildlife conservation, as well as soil and timber conservation.

It will do much to open new industrial sites and provide new job opportunities in many categories.

Authorization exists for the proposed new navigation dams and locks.

The proposals to build the three headwaters dams with hydroelectric installations and to install hydroelectric units in existing dam No. 17, and new dam No. 13 when constructed are combined in the Upper Warrior River Basin report prepared by the Mobile District Office of the United States Corps of Engineers and approved by the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors.

The Chief of Engineers in April 1954, submitted this report for comment to the Governor of Alabama and five Federal agencies. Their approval, as well as the approval of a sixth Federal agency, is required before the Chief of Engineers can submit the report to the Secretary of the Army for transmittal to the Congress for authorization of the projects.

The number of State and Federal agencies and their departments concerned with specific phases of water resources development in this project is indicative of the great diversity of interests served and in our opinion of the safeguards set up to insure sound planning to obtain maximum benefits from a great natural asset.

For the State of Alabama, the State planning board at the direction of the Governor has already given the report enthusiastic approval, indicating concurrence from the State's conservation department, public health service, and geology department.

The Chief of the Area Development Division of the United States Department of Commerce, commenting for his Division and the Coast and Geodetic Survey, has approved the report.

In the United States Department of Interior the report has been studied by the Assistant Secretary for Water and Power, by the Bureau of Mines, by the Southeastern Power Administration, by the National Park Service, by the Fish and Wildlife Service, and by the Geological Survey.

In the United States Department of Agriculture, the Deputy Administrator for Soil Conservation has reviewed the report.

In the United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the report is being checked by the division concerned with water supply and water pollution.

The Federal Power Commission has examined the report.

The sixth and final Federal agency which will review the report before it is ready to go to the Secretary of the Army is the Bureau of the Budget.

Favorable action by all of these agencies is required before this proposal can be presented to the Congress as a basis for asking authority for the United States Corps of Engineers to proceed with definite planning.

Congressman Carl Elliott, of the Seventh Alabama Congressional District, and representatives of the Warrior-Tombigbee Development Association conferred with key officials in each of the Federal agencies concerned except the Bureau of the Budget at the time they were studying the Upper Warrior River Basin report. All officials with whom conferences were held indicated a keen awareness of the need for water resource conservation and development in the Warrior-Tombigbee Valley and without exception or reservation indicated their personal approval as public officials of the plans devised and submitted by the Corps of Engineers. In the conference with officials of the Soil Conservation Service recognition was given to the need for the type of headwater dams planned by the Corps of Engineers, and the suggestion was advanced for supplementing the water-control work of these dams with additional small control dams such as are now being employed in projects of the Soil Conservation Service. The suggestion was not made with any indication of a desire to substitute the small-dam control method for the Corps of Engineers' high-dam control system, but strictly as a desirable complementary control.

The Warrior-Tombigbee Development Association, representing a large segment of the people immediately concerned with use and development of the river system, has worked closely with the United States Corps of Engineers during the development of the comprehensive program outlined in this statement. It is the opinion of the association that the Corps of Engineers has fully explored the needs for development and the potentialities offered by the great resources which we have. It is the further opinion of the association that the comprehensive program formulated by the United States Corps of Engineers for this river system meets present and foreseeable requirements insofar as we have progressed in water resource conservation and use at this time. The association endorses, supports, and expects to work continuously for accomplishment of the objectives of this program.

We commend the Corps of Engineers for the corps' thoroughness in projecting a comprehensive program for the Warrior-Tombigbee Waterway and the dispatch with which the program was formulated when the need for it and the public interest in it was demonstrated. The Corps of Engineers' experience over the 130-year period in which it has been engaged in the building of facilities to put to better use the water resources of this Nation is unmatched in any other single establishment. Undoubtedly that experience has contributed immeasurably toward the development of the particular river program in which this association is interested as well as to numerous other programs for comparable waterways. The multiple problems to be solved and the multiple benefits to be derived from full development of the Warrior-Tombigbee Waterway offer a project in which every segment of the population of Alabama has an interest and in which almost every agency of the Federal Government which is engaged in natural resource development has an interest. The diversity of interest is fortunate because it insures the best possible planning and development. We in Alabama consider it fortunate also that the United States Corps of Engineers is the agency directly charged with the continuing responsibility for planning and executing this program. The corps has had 75 years of experience in dealing with this particular waterway.

The indicated approval of the Federal agencies which have an interest in the Corps of Engineers' upper Warrior River Basin proposals indicate that they share this association's support of the progress of work and planning.

It is our understanding that one of the Federal reorganization proposals now under consideration contemplates divorcement of the United States Corps of Engineers from water resources development. We respectfully suggest to this task force that such a divorcement undoubtedly would retard accomplishment of the program now under way for the development of the Warrior-Tombigbee. No question has been raised in any responsible quarter for the desirability for accomplishing this work of river development as planned. No question has been raised as to the efficiency of the Corps of Engineers in handling the program to its present limits of accomplishment and planning. No valid substitute appears at hand for the long years of efficient service rendered and experience gained by the United States Corps of Engineers on this project and undoubtedly on many similar and allied projects.

In reference to allied projects, we should like to call to the attention of this task force the Mobile Harbor project. The ship channel in Mobile Bay, planned, dredged, and maintained by the United States Corps of Engineers since the project's original authorization in 1826 is an important link for the southeastern area of the United States, and particularly for Alabama with world commerce. The port of Mobile has gained a position as one of the first 10 ports of importance in the Nation.

Exports and imports hold to a close balance. The Alabama State docks system offers facilities for handling and storing materials which are probably unmatched by any other single operation on the gulf. Bulk material handling plants at Mobile have a capacity equal to the combined facilities of all other gulf ports. The shipbuilding and ship-repair facilities at Mobile are by far the most extensive on the gulf. Mobile has the only United States Air Force facility located on a deepwater channel.

Through Mobile Bay barge transportation is interconnected between the Warrior-Tombigbee Waterway and the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway which interconnects the great Mississippi River system.

The existing Mobile ship channel project provides for a 36- by 450-foot channel over Mobile Bar and a 32- by 200-foot channel in the bay. The project depths and width are considered inadequate to meet present and projected needs for shipping using the port. The Corps of Engineers, after extensive studies made over a period of years, has prepared a report proposing to deepen and widen the channel to 42 by 600 feet over the bar and 40 by 400 feet in the bay. This proposal is now before the Congress for authorization.

We respectfully suggest to this task force that the Warrior-Tombigbee Waterway and the Mobile ship channel projects are basic resource development projects and that on their merits are deserving of speedy accomplishment in the national interest, and further that they can best be accomplished within the existing framework of such programs.

Survey of Texas County Discloses Information on Farmers' Economic Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 2, 1954

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, a survey recently was conducted by Texas Agricultural and Mechanical College of the economic status of farmers in a typical Texas county.

The facts brought out by this survey are interesting and informative, and might well have the effect of guiding Members of the Congress in their approach to farm problems. I ask unanimous consent that a report of the survey, as released by Texas A. & M. College, be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

How economically sound is the average Texas farmer? What plans does he have for old age and how many have definite plans for retirement?

Answers to these and other questions were sought recently in Wharton county in a survey designed to check the economic security of the State's farmers. Wharton was selected because of its variety of physical, economic and social conditions and is described as a representative Texas county.

Principal crops grown are cotton, rice, corn, grain sorghums, hay and alfalfa. Truck crops, livestock and poultry contribute substantially to farm income. Dairying is a growing enterprise.

The net worth of 257 farm operators interviewed ranged from "debts greater than assets" to well over $30,000. Fifty-six percent had a net worth of less than $10,000. And 42 percent fell in the less-than-$5,000 class. Seventeen percent were worth less than $1,000 and, in this group, one in three indicated debts greater than assets.

The study, initiated by Texas A. & M. College cooperating with the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, United States Department of Agriculture, is reported by William G. Atkins and Joe R. Motheral, assistant professor of the Department of Agricultural Economics and Sociology and USDA labor economist, respectively.

Education was directly associated with net worth, the survey revealed, as was race and nationality background.

Insurance is not widely used by Wharton County farmers as protection against death or disability. Nearly one-third of all farmers had little or no insurance. The majority of the larger policyholders were found in the 35- to 44-year-old group. Those 55 and over carried the least insurance.

Relatively few farmers in Wharton County had ever discussed economic security with their wives and other family members. Too, families in the weakest financial positions had given least consideration to their economic future. More than half said they had made no real progress toward saving for old age. Those having accumulated assets believed their farms would be their chief source of income in later years.

Only 12 percent had made positive plans for retirement, 10 percent had given retirement a little thought and the remaining 78 percent had given little or no thought to retirement. About three-fifths of all farmers indicated they did not plan to retire.

Only 1 operator in 5 had discussed with his children, even casually the possibility of their participating in some plan to provide for the parents in old age. One farmer in nine desired to live with his children upon retirement and 3 out of 4 wanted to stay on a farm.

A combination of financial interests in farmland, livestock or farm improvements, plus one or more types of nonfarm holdings, was the most common saving or investment. Sixty percent of the farmers checked reported this combination and the proportion increased with net worth.

More than half the farmers interviewed in Wharton County had some income in 1951 from nonfarm sources. Off-the-farm work, oil and gas royalties or rentals and nonfarm investments were the prime sources of additional income.

Eighty-three percent of the operators expressed general approval of old-age and survivors insurance, 10 percent disapproved the program and the rest took no position on the question.

Cash savings among regular hired workers were rare. Thirteen percent had no assets while the main type property owned by the others was an automobile or truck.

Forty-seven percent had a life or burial insurance policy, the survey indicated. Of the 10 percent attempting to save, most averaged no more than $5 or $10 a month.

Public Laws 389 to 396, Inclusive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 17, 1954

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent I am extending my remarks to include my reports to my constituents covering Public Laws 389 to 396, inclusive, as follows:

Twenty-ninth Report on Legislation of the 83d Congress

Dear Friend: As I write this the Congress is driving hard to meet the adjournment target of August 1. Sessions in the House have been starting early and running into the evening. Despite this, it is pure optimism to count on the end coming before mid-August.

Here are the laws enacted since my last report:

PUBLIC LAW 389

H. R. 3704, District of Columbia Corporation Act:

This gives to the District of Columbia a modern statute regulating the organization of business corporations. You will be interested in learning that it is patterned after the business corporation law of Illinois even though its author is O'Hara of Minnesota (member of the District Committee), and not O'Hara of Illinois, who merely voted for it.

It replaces an obsolete and inadequate act of 1901. The old law required a majority of directors of a District corporation actually to be citizens of the District. Since 1901 Washington has mushroomed into the suburbs, all in nearby Maryland and Virginia. Became more and more difficult to fill a directorate because of this restriction on the right of the director to make his own determination of where he wished to live in the Washington area.

PUBLIC LAW 390

H. R. 2512, Purchase of Public Lands for Homes:

Under the Small Tracts Act of 1938 heads of households or citizens over 21 could lease or purchase surveyed public lands in tracts of 5 acres or less for home, camp, health, convalescent, recreational, or business sites. Public Law 390 broadens the act of 1938 (1) by removing the age limitation (a returning veteran should not be banned because he is under 21), (2) by extending its provisions to worthy civic, Philanthropic and religious groups and associations, (3) by permitting the lease of tracts in unsurveyed areas (in Alaska only 1½ percent of the land has been surveyed) and (4) by including in the area subject to the application of the act 2½ million acres of timberland in Oregon. In the case of the timberlands, however, small tracts may be leased, not sold, and cannot be used for any purpose detrimental to the use of the whole area for sustained yield timber management.

PUBLIC LAW 391

H. R. 2974, Indians of California:

In 1928 the Government started the enrollment of Indians who then were living in California and whose ancestors lived in California in 1852. By 1933 the roll was completed. There were listed 23,586 names.

Then in 1948 Congress called for another enrollment, this time of children living in 1948 and born after 1928. Some 10,000 names showed up on this roll.

In 1950 Congress increased the class eligible for enrollment and authorized a per capita payment of $150 to each enrollee who was living on May 24, 1950. The per capita payment is from the $5,024,842 judgment money (102 Ct. Cls. 837) on deposit with the United States Treasury to the credit of the Indians.

Public Law 391 extends the time for the Secretary of the Interior to complete the tabulation and distribution until June 30, 1955. His trouble is in finding how many on the 22-year-old roll were living in 1950. There are no adequate vital statistics to help him out.

PUBLIC LAW 392

H. R. 7061, adoption law for District of Columbia: This rewrites the law of the District of Columbia governing adoptions. It contains a statement of policy taken from the Maryland law and recommended by bar associations.

PUBLIC LAW 393

H. R. 7062, children placement in family homes: Another District of Columbia measure, rewriting the law of 1944 regulating the placement of children in family homes.

PUBLIC LAW 394

House Journal Resolution 508, memorial to Gandhi: This extends for 5 years the time in which the India League of America (or other designated organization) may erect in the District of Columbia without cost to the United States a memorial "testifying to the wisdom and leadership of Mohandas K. Gandhi."

PUBLIC LAW 395

H. R. 7554, pay for nonworkdays: When the President by administrative order closes the Federal offices for a special occasion, Government workers paid on an annual or monthly basis suffer no loss of pay. But the Comptroller General has ruled that he has no right to pay for time off the employees paid at hourly, daily, or piece rates. Public Law 395 quite properly puts all employees on the same footing. Hereafter none will lose pay when relieved or prevented from working by the President's administrative order.

PUBLIC LAW 396

House Joint Resolution 243, one nation under God: This is the law amending the oath of allegiance to the flag by adding the words "under God" so as to make it read: "one nation, under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."

House Joint Resolution 243 was introduced in the House by Congressman Louis Rabaut early in 1953. Many months later a similar resolution was introduced in the Senate. Late in 1954 the proposal suddenly came to wide public attention. In 1 day I received over 1,000 letters from men, women and children in the 2d district. The total was the largest mail I received in the 83d Congress on any subject. I responded by introducing House Joint Resolution 514, thus becoming 1 of 17 House sponsors.

The Senate actually passed the measure a day or so before the date already scheduled for House action. But when the Senate resolution reached the House for concurrence the Rabaut measure (with 17 House sponsors) was substituted. The Senate graciously accepted the substitution. Rabaut is a Democrat, congressional leadership and control are Republican. It spoke well for the spirit of fairness among Members of Congress, regardless of party affiliations, that the honor of authorship was given to the Member who was the father of the legislation and whose resolution was the pattern for the others.

Public Law 396 is important at this moment in our history by stressing the difference in philosophy from the communistic system with which we are in conflict. Our American Government is founded on the concept of the individuality and the dignity of the human being. Our Declaration of Independence states that all men are created equal and endowed by their Creator with inalienable rights.

As early as 1892 the Supreme Court ruled that "this is a religious Nation." In 1951 the Court reaffirmed this, saying: "We are a religious people whose institutions presuppose a Supreme Being."

It was during the Presidency of Abraham Lincoln (1864) that Congress directed the inscription "In God we trust" on our coins. It was at Gettysburg in 1863 that Lincoln made the first use of the term, "this Nation, under God."

Public Law 396 does not violate the first amendment to the Constitution because it recognizes a distinction between religion as an institution and a recognition of the sovereignty of God.

Cordially and sincerely,

BARRATT O'HARA,
Member of Congress.

Hospitality, Inc.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. T. A. THOMPSON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 2, 1954

Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, true hospitality is an art in its most appreciated form. We of Louisiana have many ways of promoting congeniality. One definite asset to us is our ability to take the greatest advantage of the coffee pot in brewing out of the bean everything that coffee has to offer. The article below, offered by my very good friend, Mr. Claude Morgan, of Claude Morgan & Associates, publishers of Louisiana's Deep South, should be most interesting to the many people who are not so fortunate as we in the land of hospitality and good coffee:

HOSPITALITY, INC.

Nowhere in the world is hospitality a career as it is in the Deep South country of Louisiana. The essence of this prevailing spirit is coffee. Coffee is the symbol of understanding everwhere throughout this territory. It starts the day with the wake-up cup and with the bedtime cup it closes the day's activities. It is the stirrup-cup that sends the hunters out on the chase. It greets the coming and speeds the parting guest. It is the traveler's welcome home at journey's end. Its bouquet inspires the poet. Its taste warms the cockles of the heart. It is both an everyday joy and a high-day-holiday potion.

It is the medium of exchange of ideas at home and in the market place where its uses have been brought to the highest point in the business as well as the social life of the region. Around the coffee tables in the cafes dispatch of business is the order of every man's day. For the ladies there is the coffee party, a morning affair originating in the Teche country and from there developing into a social function of importance throughout the Nation. The old law of the afternoon tea obtains for the coffee party—"giggle, gabble, gobble, and git." To the guests the heavenly brew, served in dainty cups with perhaps a finger of cinnamon toast, a tiny biscuit or other bit of pastry, is truly the cup that cheers and women feel a morning well-spent that has been devoted to a gathering of this kind.

Visitors from far parts fall victim to this form of entertainment very readily and always threaten to take the idea back home. They must be cautioned to remember that the brewing of coffee is one of the fine arts. It must be dripped slowly in a French drip coffee pot and the finished product must conform to the standard set by Talleyrand who insisted that it must be black as the Devil, hot as hell, pure as an angel, sweet as love; or, to use his own language: "Noir comme le diable, Chaud comme Le'enfer, pur comme un ange, doux comme l'amour."

Disaster Relief Program of the Red Cross

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK IKARD

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 2, 1954

Mr. IKARD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

THE AMERICAN NATIONAL RED CROSS,
Washington, D. C., June 25, 1954.

To: Chapter chairmen.
From: E. Roland Harriman.

Since the June 1954 national convention in Los Angeles and as a result of my report to the chapter delegates assembled there, some confusion has arisen concerning the disaster relief program of the Red Cross. This letter is intended to clarify this matter for our chapters.

The Red Cross is obligated by law under its congressional chapter to render disaster relief whenever and wherever in the United States a disaster occurs. The Red Cross has carried out this obligation for over 70 years and will continue to make available its total resources to disaster-affected communities. The Red Cross relief funds are expended first for emergency assistance to individuals and families, but the largest portion is used for long-range rehabilitation to assist the disaster victims, beyonds their own resources, to again become self-sustaining members of the community. The yardstick the Red Cross uses in giving this relief is the disaster-caused needed of the sufferer, not the replacement of his disaster-caused loss.

The Red Cross never asks for reimbursement or repayment from any community or individual receiving disaster relief. All it has asked is that the individual family use its own resources and that the affected community right from the time the disaster strikes do what it can to assist in aiding its own people in the total job to be done.

For over 70 years the Red Cross has met this responsibility in this way and in so doing has earned the confidence and support of the people and of the communities. These have given generously in times of disaster and during regular annual campaigns.

Recently a new concept of disaster relief has evolved that represents a serious departure from these established relief practices. This new concept envisages the establishment and use of local disaster funds in disaster-affected communities separate and apart from the Red Cross. These collateral funds are usually applied for relief purposes over and above that given by the Red Cross and after the Red Cross has completed its job. These funds are frequently distributed on the basis of the total loss suffered by an individual rather than the need of the individual for help in the essentials to permit him to resume his self-supporting activities in the community. In some instances a part of these collateral funds are channeled through the Red Cross, thus participating to some extent and right from the start in the total job on the basis of need.

Obviously, this change in concept presents a serious problem to the Red Cross and one about which the chapters should be informed because they, in the final analysis, are responsible for raising all funds expended by the Red Cross. Much of the burden of carrying out disaster operations and raising disaster funds falls upon the chapters. If this new concept of disaster relief continues to grow, it will make the chapter job extremely difficult or impossible because it is doubtful whether any program of relief based on the replacement of loss can ever be supported by voluntary contributions.

Because I believe the national organization has the responsibility of keeping chapter leadership fully informed on questions vitally affecting the ability of the chapters to carry on their charter obligations, I reported to the National Convention as follows:

"However, there is a fund raising problem which requires our full and immediate attention. Developments in recent disaster operations make it necessary for the Red Cross to return to its previous practice of conducting special campaigns when disasters strike. The American people have supported the Red Cross disaster programs because they have been in sympathy with our policy, our sound policy, of meeting basic needs and basic needs alone. We have expended the funds given through Red Cross generously but prudently, and we have never asked for more than was necessary to do the job at hand. We have never considered that the public wishes us to act as an insurance company and replace disaster losses on the basis of loss.

"Largely due to our reluctance in recent years to go before the public in special appeals, the generosity of the public, lacking a point of focus, has been scattered among various local funds and organizations. Now I'll say this: When a community wishes to spend disaster funds raised by its own citizens in its own way, it has every right to do so. But first things come first.

"In Flint, Mich., when the tornado hit last June, Red Cross immediately moved in to meet the needs of the sufferers. We spent nearly $600,000 contributed by all the country. Meanwhile a committee in Flint solicited funds and received over $900,000. Not one cent of this was turned over to Red Cross to meet needs. On the contrary, after Red Cross finished its job, all that money was distributed to people over and above what they had received from Red Cross—irrespective of whether they could have taken care of themselves from then on in whole or in part. Communities that don't help themselves in the total responsibility of a disaster can scarcely expect in the future to be recipients of nationwide generosity.

"This kind of situation has also happened elsewhere and has convinced us of the wisdom of emphasizing special disaster fund appeals for the Red Cross."

I have made no statements in my report or in any press release or news conferences that—

1. In any way questioned the integrity of those responsible for collecting or administering these collateral disaster funds;
2. Indicated any request for repayment or reimbursement of money spent by the Red Cross for disaster relief purposes by any community or individual;
3. Questioned the right of communities to collect these collateral disaster funds and to expend them for whatever purposes they desired.

In some instances news stories have failed to convey the intent of my report to the convention and have carried statements that confused the issue under discussion.

Regardless of this, I am satisfied that the press by placing this issue before the public has contributed to an understanding of the problems and to a better appreciation of the disaster relief program of the Red Cross.

This experience points up the necessity of all chapters having working agreements with city officials, local agencies, the press, radio and TV, and other news media to assure full understanding, cooperation, and interpretation when disasters occur.

I trust that you will find these facts helpful to your understanding of this matter.

E. Roland Harriman.

The Empire State's "Main Street"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1954

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted by the House, I present for insertion in the Congressional Record an editorial which appeared in the Daily Times, Mamaroneck, N. Y., titled "The Empire State's 'Main Street' ":

With appropriate fanfare and trappings, the first link of what will soon be the longest toll highway in the world will be opened to public use tomorrow. It is the 115-mile stretch of the New York State Thruway between a point near Utica and another point south of Rochester.

There will be the traditional ribbon-cuttings, a cavalcade of State and municipal officials, engineers and contractors, press and radio, all topped off with a dedicatory speech by Gov. Thomas E. Dewey. To him more than any other individual, the credit for this stupendous highway undertaking must be given. Others had talked about it, but it was Governor Dewey who translated the dream into a right-angled ribbon of reality of steel and concrete across the face of the Empire State.

This is upstate's observance, for the central part of the State. Later will come the day for Buffalo, and for Albany and Syracuse, and last, unfortunately, for Westchester. Then we shall have our spot in the sun, when the Tarrytown-Nyack bridge across the Tappan Zee is completed and cars will roll from it down through our beautiful Saw Mill Valley into the metropolis.

It is difficult, even as close as we are now to completion of the near-billion-dollar project, to visualize the effects which will result from this 427-mile main thruway, with spurs eventually bringing the total mileage to 564, including our own New England Thruway here in Westchester.

Certainly the thruway will have a tremendous effect upon all of us here in Westchester.

We have already noted rising land values, new industrial projects, and proposed housing developments along the right-of-way. In fact, these benefits are not limited to the immediate proximity of the superhighway. For the thruway will be within easy driving distance of any point in the county, and consequently the opportunities which it opens can be anticipated anywhere in Westchester. As our parkways opened Westchester after World War I to rapid, substantial growth, so we may logically expect an even greater result from this new, modern thoroughfare.

Governor Dewey has summed this up aptly when he says:

"It will be of great service to more people than any highway ever conceived."

There must not be overlooked the incidental benefit accruing from easing of congestion on present Westchester roads. Lifting a large traffic burden from these, the thruway will make such existing highways of better local service, thereby offsetting to a degree the need for an expansion of these roads at local expense. And large corporations with upstate or New York City factories will find it even more convenient to locate their administrative headquarters here in Westchester because of the shortened travel time to their plants.

Most of all, this brings western and central New York much closer to Westchester. It wipes out the lack of fast cross-river transportation for our county.

In fact, it puts Westchester squarely upon the main street of the Nation's largest State. The economic and social consequences will in time be momentous.

Foreign Aid Mirages

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 15, 1954

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the more I consider the foreign-aid program, the more I am convinced that we are spending American taxpayers' money without justification.

As part of my remarks, I am including an editorial from the Wall Street Journal entitled "Foreign Aid Mirages," and this editorial is quite pertinent at this time:

FOREIGN AID MIRAGES

When the United States embarked on its postwar foreign aid programs, this newspaper saw little reason to suppose they would end on schedule or in any foreseeable future. They didn't end on schedule and their sponsors no longer talk about termination dates.

Much has changed, of course, in the 6 years since the Marshall plan began. Economic aid has become largely military aid. Under the present administration a greater emphasis is placed on Asia than on Europe.

Nor are those the only changes of emphasis. The other day the President made the assertion—all but unprecedented in recent Washington history—that there is some element of truth in the statement that dollars cannot buy minds and that the United States cannot support the world. And in advocating passage of his $3.5 billion aid program, on which the House is to begin debate today, Mr. Eisenhower observed that it represents a reduction of 40 percent in 2 years.

These modifications in the approach to foreign aid are desirable as far as they go. But despite the reduction in volume, no end to these global programs is in sight. And despite the President's "element of truth" remark, they are still based largely on the old assumptions—that it is the obligation of the United States to pour money all over the world, and that doing so helps win or hold allies.

These assumptions are as false today as they were 6 years ago. No nation has an automatic obligation to support other nations. Yet the reduced program now proposed calls for new appropriations of $900 million for Europe, $570 million for the Near East, Africa and south Asia, nearly $1.8 billion for the Far East and the Pacific. Whom are we not supporting?

As for winning friends, the record is clear enough. After 40 billions or so of such aid since the war, anti-Americanism is more prevalent than ever before, from Britain to Indochina. Where is the good will, or even the strengthening of anticommunism, we were to have gained?

But, it is objected, the situation is different now; the aid is mostly military; it is in our immediate national interest to help arm the nations that have not yet succumbed to communism. There is an element of truth in that, but what is not always said is that the good of military aid can be as much a mirage as that of economic aid.

Consider Indochina itself. For four years we have been devoting a great deal of money to that war, lately a billion or more a year. The chances are very good that it will all have been for nothing.

And if that happens, it will not be just the fortunes of war. It will be because the obvious prerequisities for effective military aid were lacking and because no one apparently bothered to inquire whether they were present. This Indochina program was begun and is still being continued with no realistic assurance of military victory, and with almost no support from the native people.

Perhaps, being in so deep, we have no choice but to continue that particular program for the time being. But it illustrates how the old, false assumption underlying economic aid—that if you just pour in enough money you will get the desired result—can have wasteful and even disastrous results when translated into the military field. Would our national interest have been worse served if those Indochina billions had been spent on our own defense?

In his foreign aid message President Eisenhower said "Surely this is clear: during periods when the contest is hardest, we must not falter." Unfortunately it is also clear that there will always be some kind of crisis to justify indefinite continuation of foreign aid.

This administration has done well to reform some aspects of these programs. But it has not yet faced up to the fundamental questions of whether it is right or useful to continue them interminably. As one Member of Congress said the other day, the time has come for a complete reappraisal. It is, in fact, long overdue.

Rice: Tasty, Thrifty, Nutritious

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. T. A. THOMPSON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 2, 1954

Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, much has been said on this floor about farm commodities and their uses. It is truly said that we in the rice growing areas must export 60 percent of the rice we raise. This is necessary only because knowledge of those in the United States who reside outside the rice growing areas is so limited as to its preparation. If properly cooked, rice is a most delicious, pleasing, and nutritious part of the meal.

In order to share our knowledge and to open up new eating adventures for many, I wish to make available to all several of the better recipes that have been developed by those who know rice best. These recipes appeared in the 1954 edition of the publication, Louisiana's Deep South, published by Mr. Claude Morgan, of Claude Morgan & Associates:

RICE: TASTY, THRIFTY, NUTRITIOUS

SHRIMP JAMBALAYA A LA LOUISIANE

Make roux of 1 tablespoon fat, 1 tablespoon flour. Then add one-half cup chopped onion and let cook in the roux until the onions are withered. Then add 1 clove garlic minced fine, 1 cup canned tomatoes, one-half cup water, 1 green pepper chopped fine, one-half teaspoon salt, more if desired, one-fourth teaspoon red pepper, one-fourth teaspon thyme, 1 tablespoon Worchestershire sauce.

Let these ingredients come to a boil for 5 minutes. Then add 3 cups of cooked rice, 2 cups cooked peeled shrimp. Stir slowly for 10 minutes on a low fire. Pour into a buttered casserole. Sprinkle over the top one-half cup grated cheese and 2 tablespoons parsley. Place in oven at 350 degrees for 15 minutes. Serve hot.

RICE AND CRABMEAT CASSEROLE

One-half cup butter or margarine, one-half cup flour, 2 cups milk, 1 cup crabmeat, 1 cup cooked rice, 4 hard cooked eggs, chopped, one-fourth cup finely chopped onion, one-half cup finely chopped parsley, 1 teaspoon salt, one-half teaspon pepper, one-fourth cup bread or cracker crumbs.

Melt butter or margarine in a saucepan. Add the flour and blend thoroughly. Gradually add the milk and continue stirring until the mixture thickens. Add the crabmeat, rice, eggs, onions, parsley, salt, and pepper to this sauce. Mix thoroughly. Place in a greased casserole. Cover with the crumbs. Bake in a 350 degree F. oven for 30 minutes.

This receipt makes seven generous servings.

RICE PUDDING WITH PINEAPPLE-CRANBERRY SAUCE

Two cups cooked rice, 2 cups milk, 2 eggs, slightly beaten, 1 tablespoon cane sugar, one-half teaspoon vanilla, 1 cup pineapple juice, 1 cup can sugar, 2 cups fresh cranberries.

Combine rice, milk, eggs, sugar, and vanilla in a 1-quart casserole. Place the casserole in a shallow pan in hot water. Bake in a 350-degree F. oven for about 1 hour or until a silver knife comes out clean when it is inserted into the center of the custard. Chill the custard. Cook pineapple juice and sugar together for 5 minutes. Add the cranberries. Cook 5 minutes longer. To serve: top with the sauce which may be either hot or cold when served over the custard.

This recipe makes six servings.

STEAMED RICE

One cup rice, 2 cups water, 1 teaspoon salt.

Wash rice thoroughly in several waters. Drain. Add rice to cold salted water and bring to a boil. Reduce flame to simmer and cook for 20 minutes or until grains are soft but firm. Do not stir. To prevent sticking to pan, lift from time to time with a fork.

DATE AND NUT RICE PUDDING WITH HARD SAUCE

Two cups cooked rice, 2 whole eggs, 1 cup chopped dates, one-half cup chopped pecans, one-half cup sugar, 2 cups milk, one-quarter teaspoon nutmeg, 1 teaspoon vanilla, 2 tablespoons melted butter, pinch of salt.

Combine and beat well the milk, eggs, butter, sugar, vanilla, nutmeg and salt. Mix in cooked rice, dates and nuts. Pour into a buttered mold or casserole and set in a pan of hot water and bake in a moderate oven at 350 degrees for 1 hour. Remove from the mold and serve warm with the following hard sauce: Beat until soft 5 tablespoons butter, then add 1 cup of confectioners sugar. Cream until smooth and add 1 teaspoon vanilla, one-quarter teaspoon nutmeg and 1 egg yolk. Cream all of this well and chill. Serve on warm pudding.

CREOLE CHICKEN STEW

Four tablespoons olive oil, 2 onions diced, 1 cup tomato pulp, one-third cup pimientos finely chopped, 1 button garlic, finely chopped, one-half fried chicken (disjointed), one-half cup peas, one-half pound uncooked rice, 1 cup canned corn, dry pack, I teaspoon saffron, 1 teaspoon salt, 2 cups good stock, one-third teaspoon cayenne pepper, I tablespoon finely chopped parsley.

Cook onions and garlic in oil, add tomatoes, corn, peas and seasonings. Lightly brown chicken in fat, then add to other ingredients. Cook in covered iron vessel or bake in casserole 1 and one-half hours in moderate oven, adding more liquid if necessary.

The Record Speaks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1954

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under permission of the House, I insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD two editorials which were published in the Daily Times of Mamaroneck, N. Y., on May 19, 1954, one titled "The Record Speaks," and the other headed "United on Segregation, Too":

THE RECORD SPEAKS

There is a growing criticism within Democratic ranks of the foreign policy of President Eisenhower. That, we assume, is to be expected on the eve of what promises to be the most bitterly contested congressional election in years. We had hoped that the bipartisan support pledged in this field of foreign relations would be continued. However, we must accept things as they are.

For those who are captious or critical of the President's program, we suggest that it is the result which counts and not the means whereby that result is achieved.

To become specific, whatever forebodings we may have, whatever alarms we may feel, we are still out of shooting wars and under the President we achieved a difficult peace.

By contrast, remember the half-century record of the opposition party which now criticizes the President:

World War I, Woodrow Wilson.
World War II, F. D. Roosevelt.
Korean war, Harry S. Truman.

If we have the choice, we will take, every time, the policy of Dwight D. Eisenhower which has kept us out of war in preference to the policies of the opposition which have written in blood the record above.

UNITED ON SEGREGATION, TOO

The decision of the Supreme Court of the United States on Monday, banning racial segregation in our public schools, should not excite any great surprise. It was as inevitable as our progress in other fields of human endeavor and human brotherhood.

That even the bitter-end proponents of segregation expected the Court decision is apparent in the steps taken in advance in such States as Georgia and South Carolina. There is no need, then, to make a Hollywood production out of the matter. There will be, we confidently predict, no mass riots, no bloody conflicts, no heads rolling in the streets.

Instead, after a period of readjustment which will be shortened if calmness and judicial temperament predominate on both sides, we shall have 17 States of the Union following the same path toward racial equality of opportunity which 31 other States took years ago. We shall then be "United" States again on a fundamental issue which for too long divided us.

In this connection, we might note parenthetically that if the event possesses political implications, this unequivocal recognition of the equal rights of a minority came under an administration which had pledged itself to work toward this end. Previous administrations had done the same. But under President Eisenhower the promissory note was cashed. Where under F. D. Roosevelt and Harry S. Truman there had been lip service, under Dwight D. Eisenhower there was performance.

We suggest that tolerance and patience are the virtues most needed at this time. Immediate resentment which has flared up in a few sections of the Deep South was to be anticipated. But we do not believe that the angry voices of a few political spokesmen represent the true sentiments of that section. There will not be a second secession.

The South will, we are sure, accept the inevitable, perhaps grudgingly here and there, probably not graciously anywhere. But, nevertheless, we expect in all certainty eventual compliance with the implementation terms of the decision which are to be taken up by the Court in the fall. That patience will be required is indicated by the fact that this decision itself came only after 3 years upon rulings by lower Federal courts handed down in 1951. We must not expect a miraculous readjustment overnight.

We believe, therefore, that the question now before the Nation is not: "Will the Court decision be obeyed?" but rather: "How best may the Court decision be put in effect?" That issue, coming again before the Court in October, should engage the serious consideration of all patriotic citizens and officers of the Government.

There are involved important questions of socialogy, of economics, of ingrained habit approaching the weight of tradition. There are physical properties to be considered, the existing and the needed school plants; there are the teachers to be thought of, those of both races, whose employment must be guarded; and most of all, there is the question of what is going to be in the best interests of both white and Negro schoolchildren in a trying period of readjustment for both.

Only through united effort, through calm, dispassionate study, can these serious problems be satisfactorily solved.

The best brains and the kindest hearts on both sides of Mason and Dixon's line must be enlisted in the effort.

George Washington's Counsel to His Countrymen Warns of Danger in House Joint Resolution 527 and House Joint Resolution 528

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 2, 1954

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am extending my remarks to include my statement to the House Judiciary Subcommittee holding public hearings on House Joint Resolution 527 and House Joint Resolution 528, as follows:

TESTIMONY OF HON. BARRATT O'HARA, OF ILLINOIS, BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY, SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 1

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am BARRATT O'HARA, representing the Second Congressional District of Illinois. I appreciate the opportunity graciously given me to participate as a witness in the public hearings of your distinguished committee on House Joint Resolution 527 and House Joint Resolution 528.

I have read and studied carefully the two resolutions. I have sought to find in them some suggestion (1) of something necessary to be done in the national security and the public welfare, (2) of something that was not being done under existing laws and instrumentalities, and (3) of something that properly and more efficaciously could be done by vesting despotic power in one man, not chosen by the people in a popular election, but an appointee recommended by service and servility to a political party. I could find no suggestion of anything meeting these three factors.

We have strong laws against treason, sabotage, espionage, criminal, subversive acts. We have the FBI, of which we all are proud, and other policing bodies to expose, to run down and to arrest those in violation. We have a system of good courts to accord to all accused of crime a fair and impartial trial and to mete punishment to the guilty. Moreover we have an alert citizenry, and this includes the responsible labor leadership and labor rank and file of our country.

No free people travel the road to despotism with their eyes open. It is the history of other countries of the world, and within our times of Germany under Hitler and Italy under Mussolini, that the eye-opening has come after the end of the road to despotism had been reached and liberty was gone.

What is proposed by these resolutions is to give to one man, the creation of a political party, the arbitrary power of life or death over any labor union, any church, any fraternal, business, or civic organization.

Whether this is something wholesome and to be desired in the climate of our American democracy, or whether it is the siren song of Scylla and Charybdis at the end of the road of despotism, I leave for answer to the father of his country, George Washington.

I am quoting now from Washington's Farewell Address:

"The alternate dominion of one faction over another, sharpened by the spirit of revenge natural to party dissension, which in different ages and countries has perpetuated the most horrid enormities, is itself a frightful despotism. But this leads at length to a more formal and permanent despotism. The disorders and miseries which result gradually incline the minds of men to seek security and repose in the absolute power of an individual; and sooner or later the chief of some prevailing faction more able or more fortunate than his competitors turns this disposition to the purposes of his own elevation on the ruins of public liberty.

"Without looking forward to an extremity of this kind (which nevertheless ought not to be entirely out of sight), the common and continual mischiefs of the spirit of party are sufficient to make it the interest and the duty of a wise people to discourage and restrain it."

What Washington feared might come to pass, and against which he warned in the strongest language at his command, was the gradual development of our democracy into a despotism by the concentration of unchecked power in the hands of one man, or a group of men answerable only to themselves or to a political party. He was not referring to the legitimate functions of a political party as an instrumentality through which citizens of kindred philosophies and intellectual and material interests might act in concert in making their voice heard in matters of government. It is clearly apparent that his warning has applicability in the present instance.

Under the guise of serving the national interest it is proposed to vest in the Attorney General an absolute power far and beyond any power that has been given to the judges in our courts.

In my own State of Illinois, and I think elsewhere it is pretty generally the rule, it is mandatory on the judge to grant a petition for a change of venue when accompanied by an affidavit in proper form that affiant has good reason for believing the court to be prejudiced.

Suppose in the case of a labor union or any other organization the Attorney General actually was prejudiced. His prejudice might stem from the participation of such organization in a political campaign in opposition to the candidacy of the source of the Attorney General's appointment. It might stem from anticipation of opposition in a forthcoming campaign upon which was dependent the Attorney General's continued tenure of office. Suppose this prejudice were not merely a matter of suspicion or of conjecture, but also subject to proof by competent evidence, or even openly acknowledged, the Attorney General under these resolutions nevertheless could proceed to pass judgment on one against whom he was known to hold biased and unfriendly feeling.

In the administration of American justice the accused is assumed innocent until guilt is proved beyond a reasonable doubt. He is assured of a fair and impartial trial. The trial judge must be of mind entirely unbiased and without personal interest of any nature in the outcome of the trial. Have we reached such a stage in our national life that we must abandon everything in American justice so dear and sacred to many generations of our people?

I am very sure, Mr. Chairman and my colleagues on the committee, that in the proposal of these resolutions there does exist the danger which George Washington foresaw many long years ago and against which he did all in his power to warn us.

In the 165 years since the establishment of the office we have had 60 Attorneys General. We have had good and outstanding Attorneys General, some who were thought by some to have been questionable, some who were indifferent. At the best and at the worst it has been an office predominantly political in its character.

When the so-called wiretapping bill was before the House I said in my remarks:

"Does any Member of this body desire to place within the jurisdiction of this essentially political office the power to say who shall be permitted to talk in privacy with his own wife and his own children over a telephone line for which he has contracted and for which he pays?"

The House in its wisdom refused to give to the Office of the Attorney General such arbitrary and unchecked power. The attitude of the American people supportive of the position of the House was reflected in editorials in the newspapers of the United States from coast to coast.

Now it is proposed to give to this essentially political office the power of life and death over every labor union, every church, every fraternal organization. It is a grab for political power, bypassing our courts and our time-honored customs, that in its boldness stands without precedence in our national history.

The passage of these resolutions would be the establishment of a precedent which, again quoting the words of Washington, "must always greatly overbalance in permanent evil any partial or transient benefit which the use can at any time yield."

As to the proposition here presented of one man, entrenched in a political office by virtue of his service in active politics, being vested with such large and despotic powers, George Washington's counsel in opposition is as crystal clear as the ringing of a bell. Against such a proposition he would say, as in his famous farewell address:

"A just estimate of that love of power and proneness to abuse it which predominates in the human heart is sufficient to satisfy us of the truth of this position."

Mr. Chairman, I have profound respect for the great Judiciary Committee of the House, composed as it is of members whose eminence on the bench and at the bar before their election to this body was long established and recognized. I appreciate sincerely the courtesy and the honor you have shown me by listening to my remarks. I feel so deeply on the subject we are discussing because it seems to me to strike at the very spirit and purpose of our Government. I hope that the committee in its wisdom will render another great service to our democracy by turning thumbs down on a proposal to place above the law the power of one man, however wise and well motivated that man might be.

An Opportunity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 2, 1954

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, while attending the hearings of the Committee Investigating Communists Aggression in Europe, I had an opportunity to visit Geneva, Switzerland, and meet some of the participants in the recent International Conference. I also attended a day's hearings of the International Labor Organization Convention at Geneva. I had the opportunity to meet one of the delegates to the ILO Convention and learn something about the position of India and our international problems.

The following editorial by H. R. Snyder, of the Gary Post-Tribune, sets out some facts and recommendations that are very practicable pertaining to our relations with India:

AN OPPORTUNITY

In connection with the foreign-aid program, there has been some disposition in Congress to penalize India because its Prime Minister, Pandit Nehru, declines to take a stand toward communism which closely matches the American view.

We have no patience with Nehru's attitude, but any sort of punitive action on our part would be more than shortsighted.

India's teeming millions are a rich breeding ground for communism. The country's intellectual leaders have put a sharp watch on neighboring Red China to observe how its radical communizing experiments work out.

We and our western friends have a golden opportunity to win India permanently for democracy—and perhaps ultimately for the West—if we can demonstrate the superiority of our way of life over that offered by the Communists.

The way to do this is not to tell Indians what they must think, but to show them how democracy and a free economy can work to their advantage.

That is the purpose of the point 4 program with its assistance to agriculture, to community development, to health and sanitation and the like. That program deserves in Congress the support President Eisenhower and FOA Chief Harold Stassen are now asking for it.

The Harrison Amendment, H. R. 9680

SPEECH

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 1, 1954

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 9680) to provide for continued price support for agricultural products; to augment the marketing and disposal of such products; to provide for greater stability in the products of agriculture; and for other purposes.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Chairman, I would be less than honest with the Committee if I did not state that I am in no sense an expert on farm legislation, but I do claim some knowledge of and training in the field of logic. I have listened with a great deal of attention to the debate yesterday and today and must say that logic has played little or no part in much that has been said. Those who are in favor of rigid price supports point out that there is unemployment in the agriculture equipment manufacturing industry, that the farmers economically are not in good condition, and yet they propose to continue the price-support program which has produced these economic difficulties. One would think that those advocating the continuance of 90 percent of parity price support were advocating a new program to cure ills which had been created by some different program.

As for myself, I can come to no other conclusion than that those supporting the present program are blindly doing so because of some belief that it has political value but knowing full well that the 90-percent-parity-price-support program had its inception as a war measure and has now long outlived its usefulness.

The charge has been made by many of those on my right that the flexible-price-support program is one which flexes the prices and fleeces the farmer. If that now be true, then they must assume responsibility for originating the plan.

In support of this conclusion I would like to quote an editorial from the New York Times of Saturday, July 19, 1952, and may I call attention to the fact that the New York Times is a Democratic paper:

DEMOCRATIC FARM POLICY

If there had been any question as to what the fashion was to be in farm policy at the 1952 Democratic convention it would seem to have been removed by the President yesterday. For yesterday Mr. Truman gave his approval to legislation embracing the newest design from the sketchbook of his Secretary of Agriculture, a design which, as the fashion writers would say, features high and rigid supports—90 percent of parity for basic farm crops.

Hitherto, administration policy has consistently repudiated rigid price supports as completely unsound economically—which, it might be added, makes that conclusion virtually unanimous.

"The Government's long-range program to support farm incomes at a reasonable level," said the President's Economic Report to Congress in January 1947, "must be kept flexible * * *."

Again in 1948 Mr. Truman told Congress: "I emphasize the need for keeping support levels flexible."

In January 1949, the President's Council of Economic Advisers, in its annual report to the Chief Executive, was even more emphatic on this point, declaring:

"Rigid systems of support * * * can only lead to rigid systems for restricting output that violate our tenets of economic freedom."

Just by way of rounding out the record, here is what the Democratic Party platform said in 1948: "We pledge our efforts to maintain continued farm prosperity. * * * Specifically we favor a permanent system of flexible price supports for agricultural products."

The idea of a 90 percent rigid level of support was introduced as a wartime measure, and was to have been terminated automatically 2 years after hostilities were over. Congress has succeeded in extending the postwar transition period from year to year, however, and now the President, despite the administration's public record on the issue, has given his blessing to legislation which would extend rigid wartime supports through 1952. The provision, he now finds, is "a valuable addition to our agricultural legislation, which has been so important in maintaining a strong and stable farm economy."

This approbation by the President of the notoriously unsound device of rigid controls contrasts strikingly with the things he had to say about it only 2 years ago. In April 1950, in a memorandum to Congress, Mr. Truman said of it:

"It is costly, and it piles up unmanageable surpluses at the same time that it maintains artificially high prices for agricultural products."

No one could have stated the case against rigid price support more simply and with greater economy of words. Unfortunately it is necessary to add that no one could have stated it for a poorer reason. For, unhappily, Mr. Truman's arguments against the high price-support policy which he now professes to regard with such admiration was not a preface to a plea for flexible support but to a plea for a device that would have been not only more costly but even more insidious. We refer to the Brannan plan. Now that the country has refused to have anything to do with the latter, Mr. Truman apparently is prepared to settle for the next worst thing.

Realities Join United States and Britain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 1, 1954

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, we have many grievances against Great Britain. We do not like her trade with or her recognition of Red China. Nor do we relish the emphasis upon business as usual which seems to dominate the thinking of British statesmen. There seems to be an attitude of tolerance of hostile ideologies which makes John Bull an appeaser in many American eyes and does nothing to promote English prestige here in America.

Yet, despite our differences of viewpoint, the recent meeting of Churchill and Eisenhower points up the common bonds which unite the interests of Britain and the United States. In the last analysis, neither of our countries can flourish in a world of dissension and conflict. We both want peace, where the Communist nations seek war. We can, together, muster tremendous military strength on the seas and in the air.

The Eisenhower-Churchill statement looks for ultimate general and drastic disarmament, including the use of atomic weapons, pledges our agreement not to recognize any unwilling subordination of sovereign states now held in bondage, and agrees to joint efforts to forward self-government for countries whose people desire such independence.

Whatever is to come of this statement of principles will be determined in large measure by events, but we must not lose sight of the fact, that whether we like it or not, American and British interests in the long run are basically compatible.

Nothing but Money

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 1, 1954

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend and revise my remarks, I include an editorial from the Shreveport Journal of June 30, 1954 entitled "Nothing but Money." This is an excellent editorial; and I, therefore, am placing it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

NOTHING BUT MONEY

There are many aspects of this Nation's postwar housing program which puzzle and perturb us.

For instance, as we understand it, the Government, in order to encourage new home construction, exempts owners of older homes from payment of income taxes on any profits they might make through the sale of the older houses, provided that proceeds from the sales of the older homes are invested in new homes within a specified time. In other words, a home owner may sell his home at a profit of eight, ten, or twelve thousand dollars above its original purchase price, and, if he reinvests in a new home costing as much or more as he received for the old, he can forget about the tax on his profits. Normally, he would be expected to pay taxes of from $2,000 to $4,000 or more on an income of eight to twelve thousand dollars—this much even if he had no other income.

Actual profit on the sale of an older home could well entail an amount greater than just the excess above the original purchase price. The real, total profit could be figured with greater accuracy by taking into account the amount of rent, if any, saved by the homeowner.

While this plan of encouraging new-home construction may seem commendable, why are its benefits extended solely to people who already own homes? If the Government can forgive a homeowner several thousand dollars in income taxes simply because he is buying a new home, then why shouldn't an individual who has fifteen or twenty thousand dollars in hard-earned and hard-saved cash be given a rebate of income taxes on as much of his savings as he will invest in a new residence?

After all, the citizen who has nothing but money needs a home more than does a citizen who already has one home, but wants another one. On top of this, any time any citizen is excused payment of taxes on any portion of his income, the taxes on the incomes of other citizens necessarily are increased. It is incongruous, but true, that nonhomeowners who are striving to own residences are paying increased taxes in order to make it easier for established homeowners to sell their residences at a tax-exempt profit and move into more sumptuous domiciles.

The nonhomeowner, of course, might be entirely a victim of circumstances. Had he not spent several years overseas in the early forties—risking his life to save the homes of other citizens in the United States—he might by this time have become a homeowner himself.

One veteran who, rather than go into debt for 20 or 30 years, has shunned the Government's easy-credit lure, told us recently he has accumulated several thousand dollars by working and saving steadily for the past 6 years and that he would like to make a substantial downpayment on a home. He doesn't think the Government owes him anything, and he doesn't want the Government to give him anything, either—not even easy credit. Logically, he doesn't think the Government owes anybody else anything, either, and he's a little tired of seeing homes he would like to buy being snapped up by other citizens who are excused taxes on portions of their incomes. To him, income is income, and all of it should be taxed. Otherwise, he feels, he should be given a rebate of income taxes on the downpayment for his home.

We think this veteran has a point. And, of course, any nonveteran in his position would have a point, too.

Scandals of Fair Deal Era Are Still With Us

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 1954

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, when a change takes place in our national administration, it gives the "out's" a chance to look over the picture, check the books, and find out what has been going on. Plenty has.

The conviction of our former Commissioner of Internal Revenue on charges of cheating Uncle Sam of more than $90,000 in taxes from 1940 to 1950, gives us some idea of shenanigans in high places. The gentleman in question served as our United States Commissioner of Internal Revenue from 1944 to 1947 and had formerly been the collector in charge of the Brooklyn-Long Island area.

At the same time, we have discovered that the man who was formerly the top officer of the Federal Housing Administration had been arrested eight times for such offenses as embezzlement, larceny, bad checks, and disorderly conduct. The FBI submitted a report on the whole record to the Civil Service Commission in 1941, but the file is missing. Other charges indicate that the FHA was party to a regular stunt in which builders received sums far in excess of actual costs of construction and kept these amounts as "windfall profits." Tenants in these structures paid rents based upon the total amounts, of course.

When some historian writes the history of the 1930's and 1940's he is going to have plenty of material for a real life "who done it."

British Leaders Making It Increasingly Difficult for American Friends to Support Them

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 2, 1954

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

TALKS OFFERED OPPORTUNITY TO SET BRITAIN STRAIGHT

(By Edgar Ansel Mowrer)

Certainly it can be said that Britain did its best to make the Anglo-American weekend conference a failure. The chief instrument was Mr. Eden's last Wednesday speech to the House of Commons.

Labeled by him an "account of the Geneva Conference," this speech was actually three things—an ultimatum to the United States concerning southeast Asia, a mendacious account of Britain's broken promises to the United States, and an attempt to force the Secretary of State out of office.

SPEECH UNIQUE

Between allies, this speech was unique in diplomatic history. Over the postwar years the United States has by gifts and loans made it possible for Britain to exist as anything but third-rate power. It has continually defended shaky British positions in countries like Egypt and Iran and it has consistently been let down by Britain in the Far East.

Now this British Government—as bent on appeasement as the Conservative Chamberlain Government of 1938—wants the United States to sign a mutual agreement with the Communists in Asia guaranteeing the frontiers of their stolen territories, as the price of "united action" in defending what remains of free Asia.

Mr. Eden repeated his previous lie about Britain's April promise to discuss "united action" with the United States, not at some remote future date, but right away. Churchill himself worked on the communique in the presence of United States representatives. The truth is, when India objected, mighty Britain once more supinely bowed to Nehru.

GUNNING FOR DULLES

Finally, by his nauseating praise of Vyacheslav Molotov (coupled with a kind word for Under Secretary Bedell Smith and no mention of Secretary Dulles), Mr. Eden was clearly gunning for the Secretary of State by showing how little Britain thinks of him.

All in all, an astonishing performance. Many in Washington felt that upon reading the text of Mr. Eden's speech, President Eisenhower should have telephoned Prime Minister Churchill and told him he would be unwelcome in Washington.

Yet, on the whole, it was perhaps better to let the British come over for some "plain speaking" and let them have it right from the shoulder. For by all odds the American people are tired of one-way association with an ally upon whom they can rely only to defend that ally's interests—and never their own.

Yet regardless of the outcome of these talks, the question remains just why the British Government dared to treat its ally and benefactor in this contemptuous manner.

BRITISH LINE

The answer, in my judgment, can be found in two facts. First, in Asia ever since 1945, the United States has followed a British line. The British saw the triumph of communism in China with equanimity. The British wanted the Korean war called off without victory, and got that. The British now want Indochina divided (even if presumably to be lost later) and are in process of getting this.

Why should they now not demand a reciprocal guaranty" of Communist grabs in Asia simply by making such a United States guaranty the price of their precious support?

For Britain has in the United States the strongest, most effective international lobby ever seen. Beside it, the so-called China lobby is peanuts.

Ever since 1945, any American in authority who has proposed a policy displeasing to Britain has been attacked at home by other Americans, vilified and eventually overridden. The recent attacks upon Admiral Radford, Chief of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, were just a prelude to today's effort to "get Dulles."

SEIZE OPPORTUNITY

Must we Americans ~~stand for~~ this? Naturally not. This British visit has been—I repeat—a marvelous opportunity to tell our British ally where to get off. For though a rupture of the alliance with Britain would hurt us, it would leave Britain at the mercy of the U. S. S. R.

The United States has 2 or 3 alternatives to submission to London. Britain's only alternative to alliance with the United States is submission to Moscow.

H. R. 9680: Who Gets It?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1954

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the consumer pays well for his food.

The individual farmer, the independent grocer, or food store owner does not become a millionaire. Yet, there is a wide spread between the cost, f. o. b. the farm, and the trip down the alimentary canal.

When the farmer receives $1.50 for his wheat, the price of bread to the consumer remains the same as if he were receiving $2.15.

When the cattle raiser receives 18 cents a pound, steak remains the same as if he were getting 30 cents a pound.

The farmer does not get it. The stock raiser does not get it. The grocer does not get it. The consumer pays it. Who gets it?

Hoover Commission Opposes Maximum Efficiency for TVA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 2, 1954

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, the Hoover Commission task force is conducting hearings with regard to the TVA, and the chairman of that task force has made a statement indicating he had no reason to feel the Commission should support the President's preelection campaign promises to operate the TVA at maximum efficiency.

This statement by Admiral Moreell is merely in line with other pledges and promises that have not been carried out with respect to TVA.

In this connection, I desire to have included in the Appendix of the RECORD the following editorial from the June 4, 1954, issue of the Nashville Tennessean entitled "The Admiral's Merely in Step."

In this connection, also, Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a well-written article by Mr. Thomas L. Stokes, syndicated columnist, which appeared in a recent issue of the Washington Star, entitled "Agents of Private Utilities Would Destroy TVA."

The editorials are as follows:

[From the Nashville Tennessean of June 4, 1954]

THE ADMIRAL'S MERELY IN STEP

Adm. Ben Moreell went to unnecessary lengths trying to explain why the Hoover Commission task force he heads has "no reason to feel we must support" President Eisenhower's preelection promises to keep TVA at "maximum efficiency."

As the erstwhile seaman labored the point during the group's hearings at Chattanooga, "This task force * * * is an agency of the legislative branch of the Government, and we are not under the jurisdiction of the executive branch."

Theoretically speaking, that is correct. In actual fact, however, the new Hoover Commission cannot be so neatly severed from the executive branch. After all, its Chairman, former President Hoover, was named to the body by President Eisenhower, and it is this former Republican Chief Executive who has set the tone for the whole study.

But there is no more need to challenge this point than there was for Admiral Moreell to raise it in the first place.

It would have been far simpler and far more realistic if he had just been frank enough to say that his group certainly felt no compulsion to take Mr. Eisenhower's campaign pledges on TVA into account when the President himself had so freely repudiated them.

"Maximum efficiency" was a promise that seemed to come easily enough to the Republican candidate when he was seeking votes in the TVA area. But it has long since been relegated to the category of empty campaign oratory by the President, who in the intervening months has attacked the Authority as socialistic, denied it adequate funds to expand its production facilities, and deprived it of the services of an experienced and dedicated chairman.

In backing away from any responsibility for the President's promises of yesterday, therefore, Admiral Moreell was but following the example of the author of those promises. And regardless of who the task force professes to be answerable to, the effect is the same.

[From the Washington Star]

AGENTS OF PRIVATE UTILITIES WOULD DESTROY TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

(By Thomas L. Stokes)

WASHINGTON.—A ghost sits figuratively at the side of President Eisenhower as he ponders selection of a successor to Gordon Clapp, who retired as TVA Chairman recently after 30 years of service in that agency.

The ghost is the late Senator George W. Norris, of Nebraska, who had more part than anyone in the creation by Congress of that great hydroelectric, conservation, and resource-development project in the Tennessee Valley—a project that has done so much for Tennessee and neighboring States. So much, too, for the people of the whole Nation as a yardstick in production of cheap power that has forced down utility rates and spread electricity widely. It also has become a model, now followed elsewhere in our country and abroad, for utilization of water resources for the benefit of all the people.

CITING THE TVA ACT

We may imagine the late Senator calling the President's attention to certain sections of the TVA Act of May 18, 1933, which were inserted at the Nebraskan's suggestion. He looked far ahead, knowing the devious means by which the TVA might be weakened or destroyed in future years. One means might be through a chairman who might destroy the great project from the inside. The Chairman, who is designated by the President, is one of three board members. So Senator Norris took care of that in section 2 (H), which reads:

"All members of the board shall be persons who profess a belief in the feasibility and wisdom of this act."

In short, the Chairman must be for it, and not give mere lip service.

Section 6 of the act says:

"In the appointment of officials and the selection of employees in said corporation, and in the promotion of any such employees or officials, no political test for qualification shall be permitted or given consideration, but all such appointments and promotions shall be given and made on the basis of merit and efficiency."

The chairmanship, then, cannot be a political plum.

THE FIELD IS NARROWED

With these restrictions, the field is narrowed for the President—which explains the delay in filling this most important post. How closely he is watched, the President learned a few days ago. At a news conference, in listing qualifications he is seeking in a chairman, he included a philosophical approach to TVA that agrees with his own. Immediately, from the Tennessee Valley area and from the Senate, he was reminded of the requirement in the law that the chairman must believe in TVA. The Tennessee Valley has been skeptical about the President's views and beliefs since he classified TVA as an example of "creeping socialism."

In other agencies, including the Federal Housing Administration and important regulatory commissions, chairmen have been installed who had demonstrated by their past records that they were not entirely in sympathy with the aims of those agencies. But there was no law, as in the case of TVA, to prevent their appointment.

HE CANNOT ACQUIESCE

In following the law as regards TVA, which the President naturally is expected to do, he cannot acquiesce in the wishes of private power interests. They would like to "pack" TVA by appointment of a chairman who would be amenable to their purpose of slowing TVA development and expansion. Thus they would hope eventually to kill it off and take it over themselves.

But, while checkmated in the chairmanship if the President follows the law, the utilities are busy along many fronts in their campaign to weaken and, if possible, destroy George Norris' great dream. The campaign is highly financed. For example, the National Association of Electric Companies, the lobby for the electric utilities, reported expenditures last year of $547,789. Its director here, Purcell Smith, proudly includes reductions of TVA appropriations in the last session of Congress among his achievements.

Cutting appropriations is part of the utilities' pattern for devitalizing TVA. Thus they can stop the construction of additional facilities, chiefly steam plants, that are so sorely needed to meet the constantly growing power needs in the Tennessee Valley area—not only for the Government and its atomic-energy installations, but also for the people and private industries. The utilities then would move in to supply the power themselves—at higher rates, of course. Thus, gradually, they would circumscribe the area and nullify TVA as the "yardstick" it has been so successfully—in fact, too successfully for the private power interests.

"Beautiful Upon the Mountains" Is a Great Speech by Ralph Keller, of Minnesota

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 2, 1954

Mr. HAGEN of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, just recently I had the great privilege and opportunity of listening to an outstanding speech given by Ralph W. Keller, secretary of the Minnesota Editorial Association, Minneapolis, Minn. The speech was given at the banquet at the Shoreham Hotel here in Washington, D. C., on June 22.

Among the distinguished guests were the President of the United States Dwight D. Eisenhower, many Senators and House Members, and other distinquished Federal officials. Also on hand were the hundreds of editors of small weeklies and dailies throughout the United States.

Mr. Keller in a way indicted the newspaper profession and charged it with some failings. However his talk also answered any and all critics of the newspaper profession in a most able and proper manner.

I think it is one of the finest speeches I have ever heard and the great applause given the speaker at the conclusion of his speech indicated it was well received by the large audience present. In fact, President Eisenhower himself referred to many points in the speech when he followed Mr. Keller with his own outstanding and excellent remarks.

I think Mr. Keller's speech is so outstanding that I am inserting it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that it will have a wider audience. The speech was entitled "Beautiful Upon the Mountains," and it follows:

In a broadcast message not many weeks ago the President of the United States said, "In this country public opinion is the most powerful of all forces."

The most powerful physical force known to man is nuclear reaction. This force is equally capable of good or ill, depending, of course, upon the intent of its users. Even so with the force of public opinion. Enlightened, informed, it is a powerful force for good. Uninformed or misinformed public opinion can be an equal force for evil—the destructive, devastating force that marches across too many pages of history—a frightful force that many of us here have seen thrice loosed upon a hapless world.

Only a few days ago the President, in another broadcast, commended the anniversary theme of a great American university: "Man's right to knowledge and the free use thereof."

It is to this universal right to knowledge—the essential need for and value of an informed, enlightened public opinion—that I would for a few minutes direct your thinking. First by talking "shop" with my esteemed newspaper colleagues, then by talking "turkey" to our distinguished friends in Government.

On this same Columbia occasion the President praised the steadfast adherence of one of his illustrious predecessors, Thomas Jefferson, to two fundamental principles of freedom: the need for newspapers to disseminate information, and faith in the assurance of the gentle Galilean that "Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free." It might be noted in passing that neither Congressmen nor editors are given any priority on truth: the promise is to an impersonal and universal "ye."

Now how are we to learn the truth? How can 160 million far-scattered citizens find the truth? How shall we recognize it when we do find it?

Public opinion can be informed only by having the facts; we gain enlightenment, approach the truth, only by seeing, discussing, comparing, evaluating, all of the facets of every issue, whether that issue be township roads or foreign policy. This process involves every one of the cherished freedoms enumerated in article 1 of the amendments to the Constitution of the United States: religion, speech, press, assembly, and petition.

Full and free discussion involves the right to assemble peaceably, to speak freely, and to petition constituted authority, mundane or divine. There we have four of our sacred freedoms in action. But essential to the most effective assembly, speech, and prayer, is information—the right to know that, rests squarely upon and revolves forever about the fifth freedom, a free press.

It is hardly necessary to define to this august assemblage a free press, yet, since it obviously means many things to many persons, it may not be amiss to reappraise our concepts.

Free press, first of all, is not a vested right of any publisher, or publishers' organization. It is not the privilege of any individual to take pictures in a courtroom, televise congressional hearings, report mishaps in the armed services, probe individuals and departments of government.

Free press is, however, the inherent and everlasting right of the people who foot the bill to see these courtroom pictures, hear these official proceedings, learn what happens to our boys in uniform, know what their public servants are doing. Nor is free press only the right—it is the duty of free citizens to be informed about society, commerce, and government.

Free press is yet more. It is the right of enfranchised taxpayers to choose the media through which we prefer to see and hear and learn: to select our own radio and TV channels, buy our favorite newspapers and magazines, read the books of our choice.

In these rights and duties of American citizens is America's free press rooted. From them arise sacred obligations and sublime opportunities to perpetually challenge editors and broadcasters and book publishers.

It follows that those of us who give life and substance to the free press are charged with a grave and solemn responsibility. Let us, then, ladies and gentlemen of the press, consider for a moment how we of the fourth estate are meeting that responsibility.

"How beautiful upon the mountains are the feet of him that bringeth good tidings, that publisheth peace." So spake that wise and fearless Hebrew shepherd, prophet, statesman, Isaiah the son of Amos. I think he would have made an influential and inspiring editor, this ancient crusader. Listen to some more of Isaiah's personal paragraphs:

"Therefore my people are gone into captivity, because they have no knowledge.

"Come now, and let us reason together.

"I have not spoken in secret.

"Now go, write it before them in a table, and note it in a book.

"The people that walked in darkness have seen a great light.

"Wisdom and knowledge shall be the stability of thy times."

Ages ago the feet of the sun god were beautiful upon the mountains bearing warmth, health, and cheer. So, too, the fleet-footed courier who sped homeward the stirring news of faraway victories and discoveries. The public bulletin boards of Babylon, Thebes, and ancient Rome, the bell-ringing criers of medieval towns, were messengers with feet ever beautiful upon the mountains to benighted peoples hungering for information.

All these traditional bearers of tidings but yesterday in the calendar of eternity culminated in the swiftest, most effective messenger yet to serve mankind: That modern phenomenon, that lusty and prolific descendant of Johannes Gutenberg, the newspaper.

Practically all of the learned professions antedate journalism. Many, I suspect, are wealthier. Yet none of them—and I am not unmindful of the teacher, the preacher, and the lawyer—not one of the professions, possibly not all of them together, exceed in influence the press.

Now, my colleagues of the fourth estate, dare we be proud of that influence? Is it as great as it could be? Is ours as good an influence as it should be? Does it reach the young and old, the tolerant and the intolerant, the prejudiced and the unprejudiced, with fair and impartial impact? Nor am I asking only the Star and the Post here in Washington, the New York Times, the St. Paul Dispatch, the Minneapolis Tribune. The question is equally significant to the Canyon City Record, the Rock Rapids Reporter, the Woodhaven Leader. The nature of newspaper influence concerns not only the great national and international media with feet upon earth's high and distant mountains. It is even more vital to those messengers who run the local courses, whose feet are intimately meaningful upon the hills of home.

Let us ask ourselves frankly and answer honestly, how good is our news coverage? Of course we record the storms, the weddings, the accidents. But are we telling our readers about the earnest helpful sermons in our local churches, the inspirational talks at Lions and Kiwanis meetings, recent additions at the library, new trend-marking developments in local agricultural and marketing practices? Do we permit careless headlines to mislead hasty readers? Are we guilty of inaccurate leads that give a wrong impression of the facts in a story? Do we ever permit the advertising columns to interfere with complete and accurate news reporting?

And what about news pictures? Are we doing with camera, plate, and imagination what television and facsimile will take away from us if we limp along in the comfortable rut of tradition and smug self-satisfaction? Improved modern techniques impose upon the Press the self-same obligation that devolves upon teacher and preacher, doctor and architect, to keep abreast of the times in their respective fields. Let us not hobble our courier with indifference or false economy.

Is the influence of our newspaper helped or hindered by our typography? Are our typefaces, format, make-up attractive? Is our presswork any better than the blurred images we sometime ridicule on the infant TV? I wonder how long it has been since any of us made any specific effort to improve the physical appearence of our product—and thereby enhance its influence.

We hear recurring charges of "a one-party press." Yet the only issue on which our 10,000 weekly and daily newspapers have ever been found anywhere near at one is neither party politics, farm prices, nor postal rates. Our one common objective is more advertising!

So let us look into the influence of our advertising columns. Which is our higher aim, to sell goods for our advertisers or space in our newspaper? To bring plenty to our readers, or to our own bank account? Have we done all we can, or anything at all, to make our advertisements more neat, readable, appealing? How hard do we work to make the messages of our advertisers interesting, informative, credible? How carefully do we screen the users of our space for honesty and reliability? Can our readers patronize our advertisers with the same confident assurance with which they call on the family physician, or sit down in their church pews Sunday and midweek?

Nor should we overlook legal advertising: public notice, stepchild of greed and waif of expediency. We are wont to set legals in the smallest hairlined face on the premises, make them up like gerrymandered precincts, hide them way like Captain Kidd's gold—then clamor for more at higher rates.

How often do we attend or adequately cover town, village, utility, school, county, welfare mettings, at which taxes are levied and public funds expended? Most of us are likely addicted to the practice revealed in recent Texas and Minnesota surveys, "If they won't pay for publishing the minutes, to heck with the meeting." Which is hardly a persuasive approach to public officials from whom we ask a freer flow of information and advertising.

Newspapers worry quite a bit about help, too. Yet the record is pretty clear that we treat the human factor about as cavalierly as legal notices. I wonder what any one of you may have done recently to make any member of your staff glad that he works for you. What do we do to imbue our employees with genuine, sincere, deep-rooted pride in their profession? How long since an eager school kid walked into your plant, as I did into Frank Wilder's out in western North Dakota many years ago, and said with reverent awe, "I'd like to be a newspaperman. Can you give me a job?" A long time I'll wager. And I'll further wager that you blame today's kids, the times, your contemporaries, perhaps even the Government—everything but the real hitch, the unattractiveness of your own shop and your own product.

Still measuring the length of our strides upon the mountains of public opinion—the degree of enlightenment we afford "the people who walk in darkness," let us take a close look at our editorial pages—or at the sorry grave of lost leadership where the editorials ought to be. Are you among the mute majority who lack the time, the white space, the mental discipline and moral fortitude to evolve and pursue an editorial policy? This lazy indifference, this cowardly preference for the easy unchallenged course, does more to cripple the feet of newspapers upon the mountains of influence than all the malicious missiles our worst critics ever hurled. Think what we could do for farm, home, and highway safety. Mourn with me over our dereliction in the currently appalling epidemic of parental delinquency and juvenile vandalism.

You are afraid to be wrong? Then you are too timid to run a good newspaper. You have an unpopular viewpoint? So have the preachers, but the churches haven't been closed. You might win but few issues? The object of editorials is not to win arguments, but to stimulate and perpetuate the discussion of which democracy is born and on which it is nourished.

Nor is our influence strengthened by submitting to the soul-searing pressure to put ever more paid linage before more and still more paid subscribers. Too many of us confuse mere bulk with reader interest, size with influence. Quantity is so much easier of achievement than quality.

Now, while our newspaper friends with characteristic optimism appraise and approve each his own operation, attributing to his contemporaries all the shortcomings we've noted, let us turn to our guests. Having glimpsed a few of the problems, obligations, and aspirations of the free press, let us now attempt a quick appraisal of public and official attitudes toward the struggle of the press to stay free, and to fulfill its mission to a free people.

We first encounter the disturbing fact that, no matter how perfect our newspapers, they cannot always tread the high places shod only with good news.

News is a relative term, rarely absolute good or unequivocal bad. That the thermometer has gone to 18 would be awfully good news after a day or two at 35 below, but awfully bad news to a chap with several vines of ripe tomatoes in the backyard. The bad news that Uncle Hezekiah has been gathered to his fathers is sometimes mitigated by the extent of those possessions uncle was unable to take with him.

No matter how many times we've heard it, no report is really news until we have the complete, accurate, corroborating printed details to read for ourselves and refer back to as we wish, which satisfying personal scrutiny, incidentally, is why it seems unlikely that radio and TV will supplant the newspaper as a news medium.

Now what do the newspapers do about all this?

They print it as they find it, the good and the bad, the uplifting and the depressing, many things many readers don't like, some things the editor himself doesn't like.

In striving to completely and accurately record today's turbulent passing parade, we newspaper people are alarmed at the implications of Indochina, Guatemala, Geneva; uneasy at the perpetual threat of the Kremlin; sometimes dubious about the goings-on on Capitol Hill. We find ourselves at a loss to reconcile public doles with our traditional concept of independent enterprise in both trade and agriculture. We contemplate in mild astonishment a paternal Government punishing with equal severity and enthusiasm, on the one hand violators of the price-fixing Fair Trade Act, and, on the other, violators of the antiprice-fixing antitrust laws.

We wonder at the complacent inconsistencies of Government at all levels continually bespeaking newspaper support of countless so-called good causes, while persistently withholding all manner of significant information in every field of public activity, from drainage ditches and school salaries to atomic development and international commitments. We marvel at the wry militry psychology which insists upon shielding our people, who in one generation have faced the casualty lists of three major wars, from the devastating news that some of our boys sometimes fall short of selective service physical requirements.

But what we newspaper people really find difficult to accept, and impossible to understand, are those governmental vagaries which confront us, on the one hand, with constantly climbing costs, and on the other with multiplying restrictions on our earning power.

Statute and departmental directive subject us to ever-rising wage levels, ever more liberal fringe benefits, increasingly difficult apprenticeship requirements, and the inflated prices of artificial shortages, while steadily mounting mail distribution rates help finance our Post Office competition as envelope printers and bill peddlers.

Then these wounds are salted by meddlesome governmental units persisting in efforts to curtail statutory public notice of all kinds—by banks, school districts, welfare boards, and most other money-spending public agencies. Curtailments which not only impair newspaper revenue but impinge heavily upon the right of taxpayers to full and frequent accounting.

Finally, the salt is cruelly rubbed in by State and Federal lawmakers who insist upon laying on advertising the clammy hand of regulation.

The first amendment is riddled by continuing efforts to bolster tottering codes of professional ethics, obliterate price tags, and placate highly vocal minorities of visionary reformers with State and Federal laws restricting, regulating, and even prohibiting many forms of advertising.

Only a few evenings ago the President of the United States reminded a radio audience that "the founders of the Republic feared only misguided efforts to suppress ideas."

How many misguided lawmakers would suppress the idea of free markets and open competition; would abrogate the right of free American citizens to use their own God-given intelligence, make their own character-forming decisions?

Is the judgment of our people so unsound, have public fiscal policies so warped our sense of values, that we can't be trusted to study and compare price schedules for ocular examinations and eye glasses? Has our moral fiber grown so flaccid that we mustn't be exposed to printed pictures of beverages and tobacco products—commercial items legitimately manufactured under Government license, produced and distributed by wage-earning tax-paying voting citizens, openly displayed in business buildings on public thoroughfares, and subjected to enormous taxes in support of our schools, hospitals, and public works?

This protective zeal would even deny us the privilege of judging for ourselves the validity of interest rates promised by tax-paying financial institutions duly licensed and regularly examined by that same Government which we presumably blind and impotent voters create and maintain.

These rampant regulators would rob numberless honest business men and women of the humble right to cry their wares in the open market places of the Nation. Continuing efforts to legislate professional monopolies and give statutory protection to secret price cartels seem, to us who work under constant antimonopoly surveillance and in the midst of the open display of competitive prices, strangely incompatible with our antitrust laws and the principles of free competition on which our mighty economy is based.

This whole restrictive philosophy is diametrically opposed to the recent declaration by our Chief Executive that "wherever man's right to knowledge and the use thereof is restricted, man's freedom in the same measure disappears." Man's right to know is no less basic and essential in the market place than in governmental council chambers. Any theory or doctrine to the contrary is doubly dangerous to a free press and a free people. First, because legislative restriction on any type or form of legitimate advertising discourages the full and free employment of this potent stimulant of commerce and prosperity. Second, because legislative control of newspaper policy and revenue in one instance portends eventual control of all policies and all revenues, and the inevitable demise of a free press.

Nor is advertising actually unrestricted. The public, however careless or credulous, is not at the mercy of unscrupulous charlatans. High standards and rigid codes have been set up by the honest professions, by numberless better business bureaus and trade associations, by our own newspaper organizations. Practically every State has fraudulent advertising statutes, fully endorsed and carefully observed by the newspapers. And overall, with watchful eye on advertisers and media alike, stand the Federal Trade Commission and the Federal Communications Commission.

May we not then accept the fact that newspapers, whatever their virtues and their imperfections, are not the architects but only the faithful mirrors of our times? Mirrors in which we see reflected all the touches of elegance and perfection, all the faults and foibles, that make the human race what it is—the human race.

We may not like what we see. But that does not impugn the mirror. Nor absolve the editor from keeping it clean and polished and sharply focused. Public aversion to the bitter truth does not justify dilution or distortion in any word, phrase, or degree. Yet for stanch refusal to omit, color, or distort, newspapers are criticized, maligned, subjected to public castigation and official regulation.

Some of us have faced a completely impersonal, wholly relentless mirror the morning after—have stood aghast at the sagging folds of a stubbly chin, drawn lips and sallow cheeks, the eye-bags packed for a long journey and the eyes too tired to follow. But do we turn out the light and break the mirror? Would that help? Of course it wouldn't, and we don't do any such silly thing. Matter-of-factly we set about repairing the damage, using that same uncompromising mirror to check the results and measure our progress.

So the inevitable question must be asked, Do the newspapers have to uncover and write and reflect in word and picture all of the manifold phases of the kaleidoscopic life forever unfolding about us—the sordid as well as the stimulating, the jaded with the jubilant?

Well, suppose you had a magic mirror, a selective reflector. On those gruesome mornings—after this timid inoffensive little mirror would be wholly oblivious to the growth of your beard and the bulge of your eyes. You would take a smug look, and sally forth. But your appearance would not be improved.

Such inocuous unrevealing mirrors have, from time to time, been turned upon county contracts and school board finances, State funds and Federal procurement practices—upon the Commodity Credit Corporation and the Federal Housing Administration. But nobody learned much. Selective reflection failed to reveal the whiskers of irregularity until the beard of calamity had grown.

How much better a complete and accurate look the first time. Irregularity does not bear inspection. Corruption does not flourish in the bright light of publicity. Nor is there authority for assuming that half truths will make us even half free. Or that our economy can exist half slave and half free, any more than could our Nation.

Obviously, a selective mirror is as bad as no mirror. Vain as we are, male and female, I doubt that we look in the mirror so much to see what is right about us as to assure ourselves that nothing is wrong. So with our printed mirrors of life. We can't hope to see only good reflected until we live only good. And we must see to improve.

When a vain or faint-hearted public loses the courage to face up to an accurate reflection of the life we lead; or, far worse, if our badgered and misunderstood writer and commentators ever lose the courage and the integrity to keep the mirrors free and impersonal, truthful and accurate in merciless detail, then indeed must freedom falter and civilization pause. Unshaven progress will sprout the beard of inertia, incentive grow pallid, the smooth coiffure of culture be touseled and disheveled.

No more than individuals can be at their best without mirrors can freedom survive without a free press.

American freedoms have brought forth a mighty system of free enterprise, nurtured on open competition and unfettered advertising. A system that feeds, clothes, and arms our own and many other peoples on a fabulous scale. A system built not alone on vast material resources, nor solely on superior knowhow.

One other mighty tool we have, practically unknown anywhere else in the world—almost wholly exclusive to these United States. With all of its faults, problems, and handicaps, we still have our vigorous, ubiquitous, grassrooted free press. Time forbids a technical survey of the numerous features wherein our newspaper structure differs from that of every other nation. One instance will suffice: Had our courageous and intrepid Argentine neighbor, the ill-fated daily newspaper La Prensa, been supported in its preeminence by several thousand smaller daily and weekly buttresses, it would not have been so prominent and vulnerable a target—indeed, might well have withstood the assault of autocracy. If any one of you, my friends, is ever tempted to exalt some of our own journalistic giants and underrate our hometown weeklies, just remember that the big ones rise impregnable from a firm, loyal, and steadfast base of many small ones.

In this farflung free press lies the secret of American vigor. Thousands of free and independent newspapers constitute the Samson locks of our national strength. Let them be shorn by official decree or public apathy and America's might, like Samson's is gone.

The advertising columns of our newspapers stoke the roaring fires of mass production, grease the far-stretched routes of distribution, and lead the American people to ever new heights of living.

The news columns, with their folksy personals and social notes, have made us friends and neighbors from coast to coast and from border to border.

Whatever their shortcomings and imperfections, our newspapers have made the feet of America, upon the cold forbidding mountains of fear, bold with a deep-rooted mutual understandig. They have made the feet of our people, upon the dark mountains of intolerance and suspicion, firm with a steadfact mutual confidence.

Informed, enlightened, and inspired by a free press, mankind will yet walk with feet unfettered and beautiful upon the mountains of eternal peace.

Question of the Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 1, 1954

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, where will the Commies go next in Latin America?

How Close Were We To War?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 2, 1954

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, by far the most illuminating analysis of the Far Eastern situation that I have read since the coming to America of Sir Winston Churchill appeared in the Christian Science Monitor of June 26, 1954.

Joseph C. Harsch, the writer of the article in the Christian Science Monitor, states:

> The power of initiative had been in their (President Eisenhower and Secretary of State Dulles) hands up through the early weeks of April. They had considered the idea of going to war with the new power of eastern Asia.

Mr. Speaker, I am very deeply interested in Mr. Harsch's statement that in the early weeks of April the President and the Secretary of War were considering going to war in Asia. We in the Congress were not informed, at least the rank and file of Members. But in Chicago a voice did speak out. An editorial by John S. Knight in his newspaper, the Chicago Daily News, of April 10, 1954, so profoundly impressed me that on April 14, 1954, I asked unanimous consent and was granted 5 minutes in which to alert the House to Mr. Knight's warning that war was on our doorstep.

On April 24, 1954, Mr. Knight spoke again. In an editorial in the Chicago Daily News of that date he said:

> If the President, the Vice President, and Secretary Dulles are men to be believed, the United States will be messed up in an Asiatic war before the year is out.

I was so satisfied that Mr. Knight knew what he was talking about, and that he was going all-out in an effort at the 11th hour to stop what he knew already had been decided upon, that again on April 26, 1954, I asked unanimous consent to address the House. I said:

> John S. Knight is of such journalistic stature and his forecast of war within the year 1954 so positive in its wording that I am reading into the RECORD the entire editorial in the Chicago Daily News of Saturday.

Judging from Mr. Harsch's statement that I have quoted, Mr. Knight did know what he was talking about. It is not unlikely that his alerting of the American public to an existing danger was a large contributing cause to the abandonment of any war plans then in the making.

Mr. Harsch continues:

> Had they (President Eisenhower and Secretary of State Dulles) taken that fateful step, they today undoubtedly would be the leaders of a Western military alliance moving into battle with the forces of Mr. Chou along the eastern borders of his realm.
>
> But in late April, Washington turned away from the course of war.

The dates are significant. In the early weeks of April when war was all but decided upon Mr. Knight's editorials appeared. In late April, when the editorials had had time to sink into the minds of the American people and to produce repercussions, Mr. Harsch reports that the war plans were abandoned.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Harsch's article in the Christian Science Monitor is of such interest at this time that, by unanimous consent, I am extending my remarks to include it in its entirety, as follows:

CHOU RISE PARALLELS GENGHIS KHAN EXPLOITS

(By Joseph C. Harsch)

WASHINGTON.—All the world is a stage, Shakespeare once observed, and this week beyond question the most important single actor upon it was Chou En-lai, of Communist China, Premier of the newest great power on earth.

Only 5 years ago Mr. Chou was just a leader of a ragged revolutionary force living in the caves of Yennan, a source of concern to the chancelleries of the world, but to most people little more than the leader of one of those semibandit, seminomad bands which from time immemorial have roamed the barren plateau lands which lie between the Great Wall of ancient China and inner mountains of Asia.

This week the story of the rise of Mr. Chou reached a fabulous climax. History never repeats itself precisely, but it presents some fascinating parallels. Mr. Chou has exploded onto the pages of history with the same speed and dazzling scope, and has come from the same place of origin, as the other greatest conqueror out of Asia, Genghis Khan. The ruthlessness of Mr. Chou's methods parallels that of Genghis. But the direction of his advance has been different, and he has traveled farther.

TOPS GENGHIS' TRAVELS

Genghis' power never reached beyond the gates of Vienna. This week end Mr. Chou was received respectfully in the capital of India after having traveled from Bern, in the heart of old Europe. Bern was the place where the Premier of France had recognized Mr. Chou as the new lord of Eastern Asia and conceded that a mere European power, with its base between the Rhine and the English Channel and a population of only 50 million persons, no longer could attempt to maintain a military position on the southern flank of the new Chinese empire.

And as the Oriental-Cheshire smile of Mr. Chou moved into the audience chamber of Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru in New Delhi, the four principal leaders of the respectable old world of the West gathered at the White House in Washington to attempt to reconcile their future policies to this explosive new reality of a troubled world.

There must have been similar scenes in Western Europe when Genghis Khan's hordes were plunging over the Carpathians and roaming over the Polish plains.

WEST'S LEADERS BAFFLED

Then, as now, the leaders of the old West found it difficult to reconcile their attitudes and unite their forces and their policies in the face of this vast and startling new phenomenon of history.

Sir Winston Leonard Spencer Churchill and Anthony Eden entered the White House in Washington almost at the moment Mr. Chou was sitting down to his talks with Mr. Nehru in Delhi. They came not to rally the world for war against the new lord of Eastern Asia, but to argue that while Mr. Chou had risen with the speed of Genghis Khan, he was not a man of unlimited ambition like Genghis.

Prime Minister Sir Winston Churchill and Foreign Secretary Anthoy Eden were speaking not just for Britain, but also for Western Europe. In the fuller sense they came to explain what they had done and to try to persuade a baffled, bewildered and unhappy

American leadership that what had been done had been done for the best.

The fact was that President Eisenhower and Secretary of State John Foster Dulles had been remote spectators of vast events over which they had lost control. The power of initiative had been in their hands up through the early weeks of April. They had considered the idea of going to war with the new power of Eastern Asia. Had they taken that fateful step, they today undoubtedly would be the leaders of a western military alliance moving into battle with the forces of Mr. Chou along the eastern borders of his realm.

WAR ROLE REJECTED

But in late April Washington turned away from the course of war. From that moment Britain and France took matters into their own hands. If the United States was not going to lead in war with the new China, then they of the old West would see what they could do to make a peace with the new China.

Whether they would succeed remained to be seen, and it depended upon whether Mr. Chou is a modern Genghis Khan, or a different breed of conqueror. However, since Washington, in fact, had rejected the course of war at this stage, there was no alternative in the eyes of Sir Winston, Mr. Eden, and the French but to try the alternative course of an attempted settlement.

This they had done in the final days before the twin meetings of this week end in New Delhi and in Washington.

The new Premior of France had made his peace with Mr. Chou at Bern. He had accepted the military pact of French defeat in northern Indochina. He agreed, in substance, to withdraw French armed forces from northern Indochina.

London had followed this move promptly by Mr. Eden's proposal for a Far Eastern Locarno; that is, for an agreement between the contending forces of Asia on a line of demarcation between their orbits of influence. So far as London and Paris were concerned, Mr. Chou was already, in fact, the master of Eastern Asia and they were doing their best to come to terms with him. Western Europe was negotiating directly with Eastern Asia.

One of the most fabulously interesting things about these fabulous developments was that Moscow seemed to have lost control over events on the eastern side as much as Washington had on the western side. Mr. Chou did not return from his triumph at Bern by way of Moscow. He went to New Delhi. At least Sir Winston and Mr. Eden had come to Washington to report and to try to explain to their friends and allies. Mr. Chou had bypassed Moscow to make his own adjustments with India.

Whether Moscow was as disgruntled over the events of the week as Washington, the West did not know. The West could know that it had something in common with the Soviets. The time had passed, at least momentarily, when Moscow and Washington spoke for their respective parts of the world. Both had been pushed aside by the two parts of the world which had business to do directly with each other. Moscow and Washington were not the leaders of the two camps, or the spokesmen. They were associates who were advised, after the event, of what had been done. One could only speculate hopefully about relations between Washington and the men of London and Paris.

DIFFICULT POSITION

The weekend meeting at the White House was bound to be difficult. No more than Moscow is Washington accustomed to the role of spectator. Mr. Dulles had prepared for the occasion a bill of particulars against Britain. He went into the meetings thoroughly irritated over a whole series of situations in which he felt that the British had prevented him from achieving his purposes. He even had proposed a limitation of the Anglo-American alliance.

As the week ended, the immediate question was how and to what degree Washington would reconcile itself to the fact that France and Britain were negotiating a peace between Western Europe and Eastern Asia.

The longer question was whether such a peace would be consummated, and kept. There, the answer rested with Mr. Chou. He could have a peace. But if he failed to accept and to respect that peace, then the events which reached their climax over this weekend would, of course, be reversed. In that event, the initiative would return to the hands of Washington, and it again would face the choice of war, or another withdrawal before the new rising power of the new China.

As of today, there is not the slightest doubt that Mr. Chou has taken his place as one of the four great wielders of power in the world. This is no longer a two-power world as it has been since 1945. It is a four-power world made up of the United States, the U. S. S. R., Western Europe, and China.

New Jersey Leads in Civil Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES R. HOWELL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 2, 1954

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, the State of New Jersey in 1953 led all the 48 States in the fight against religious and racial discrimination, according to a joint report issued by the American Jewish Congress and the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.

I regard New Jersey's top rank in this field with a certain amount of personal pride because I introduced the original FEPC bill in New Jersey as a member of the State assembly in 1944. However, there are still great problems to be solved in the civil-rights field both in New Jersey and the Nation. In New Jersey this is particularly true in the housing field, where group discrimination remains. Nonetheless New Jersey's civil-rights law has been praised for its effectiveness in the fields of employment, education, and public accommodations. We can be proud of the record to date, but we must remain aware of needed progress yet to be made.

I include in the RECORD an editorial on this subject from the Newark Evening News of June 17, 1954:

CIVIL-RIGHTS LEADER

Less religious and racial discrimination was evident in 1953 than in prior years. Progress throughout the United States has been slow but clearly perceptible, and New Jersey led in the fight against intolerance, followed by New York, Connecticut, Massachusetts, and Rhode Island, with fair-employment laws that are effectively enforced. This is the considered opinion of a 189-page joint survey by the American Jewish Congress and the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, representing groups that in the past have principally been subject to intolerance.

In this State, however, they report that there is group discrimination as to housing, particularly in large new developments. But the State's civil-rights law is praised for its effectiveness in the fields of employment, education, and public accommodation. Despite greater willingness to accord the Negro the suffrage in the South and ampler opportunities generally for good jobs, the report finds that throughout the country "consideration of race, religion, and national origin still dominates the thinking of most employing officials and many trade unions."

Bright spots of the year were that not a single lynching or clandestine killing was due to protests against group injustice, and that only five homes newly occupied by Negroes were damaged, as against double that number in 1952. The Supreme Court decision outlawing segregation in the public schools was hailed as a "first step" toward equality. Perhaps the executives of the two organizations are a little too optimistic in feeling that the American people will "conform their practice to established law and policy, whatever their personal attitudes may be." Ultimately they will, in all probability, but the situation in a dozen States is such that abolishment of segregation will be a time-consuming process.

Courage Held Lacking in Election Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

Friday, July 2, 1954

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Evening Star of July 1, 1954:

COURAGE HELD LACKING IN ELECTION YEAR—TAX AND FARM ACTION SEEN AIMED AT VOTERS

(By Gould Lincoln)

In this election year, the voice of the "group" is loud in the land and the courage of too many legislators is slim. This is more and more manifest as important elements of the Eisenhower program enter final stages of enactment—or nonenactment—on Capitol Hill.

Most recent samples are the votes in the House Committee on Agriculture on the farm bill, and in the Senate on the omnibus tax bill. On the first—the farm bill—the majority of the committee, including Republicans, has turned its back on the President and his Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Benson. It voted overwhelmingly to retain the rigid 90 percent of parity price supports of the existing law and scuttled the President's flexible price support principle. The farm bloc is triumphant so far, although some of the largest farm organizations have gone along with the President. The votes in the committee were to continue a system which has cost the Government more than $6 billion in price support, and which will continue to roll up vast surpluses for which the Government has been able to find no use. The President, on the other hand, is backing a plan which will curtail and put an end to these surpluses.

FARMERS SEEN ISSUE

A reporter at the President's most recent conference put a finger on the fears of Republicans in Congress when he asked if the President believed that the Republicans lost the House in 1948 because of the farmers' dissatisfaction with the GOP flexible price support proposals. The President said he didn't know; that he was not a political analyst at that time, and was not sure why the Republicans lost that election.

But the President did not back away from the flexible price support program, which he has made his own. On the contrary, he said if there was anything further he could do to win approval of that program, he would be glad to do it. He has spoken often and loudly in its support. And, indeed, it may be expected that the White House—which means the President—will exert every pressure it can to prevent the extension for another year of the rigid price supports—under which farmers grow surpluses merely to be paid for by the Government.

The President said he wasn't quite sure whether the high, rigid price supports kept up the price of food to the consumers—but whether they did or did not, they were keeping up the prices which the Government had to pay—out of the pockets of all the taxpayers—for surpluses it has been unable to handle, and which are ever increasing.

TAX AMENDMENTS BEATEN

At a time when the country needs revenues, great revenues, to pay for national defense, an important tax revision bill, which has been needed for years, was threatened with amendment which would decrease revenues by hundreds of millions and perhaps billions of dollars. And why? Because it's an election year. Because Democrats evolved a proposal to increase personal income tax exemptions to a degree that more than 5 million taxpayers would go entirely off the income-tax rolls.

In the House this proposal was defeated by a narrow vote. But when the tax bill was presented to the Senate, in the form it came from the House so far as personal exemptions were concerned, some of the Republicans weakened, although they had been assured by Democrats who believed in fiscal responsibility, they would help defeat the so-called George amendment, offered by Senator GEORGE, of Georgia, Democrat, to increase exemptions.

They forced the leadership to come forward with a watered-down version of the George amendment. They feared the Democrats would go to the country with an argument that the Republican tax law gave some relief to owners of securities from double taxation now imposed, and did not provide for further tax cuts for the wage earner. Incidentally, the wage earner, like all the other taxpayers, received a 10 percent tax cut earlier in the year.

The Republicans wanted a chance to go home and tell people they voted for a tax cut for the wage earners, too, and not merely the coupon cutters—so-caled by the Democrats. They got their chance, and were defeated in a narrow Senate vote. Then the Senate, by a narrow vote, turned down the George amendment. The upshot was a victory for the Eisenhower administration. It leaves fearful Republicans in position to claim they did vote for tax exemptions—and the critical Democrats ready to shout to the housetops that they alone are the true friend of the wage earner.

Maybe the administration will win, too, on the farm-price supports, despite the group shouting.

Democrats Attract Risks—GOP Repels Them

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 1954

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, one of the simplest, sharpest facts of political life emerges from the recent Oppenheimer story. It is about as clearly established a proposition as you can get outside of Euclidean geometry and it is this. The Democrats attracted "risks" to Federal payrolls as molasses attracts flies. Leftwingers, Communists, fellow travelers, and "peculiar" intellectuals migrated to Washington wholesale from 1934 to 1948. They left the top spots in 1953. Republican leadership repelled them.

When you think through the list and recall Remington, White, Hiss, you are just scratching the surface. These were people who were in the limelight. There were scores of others just below the high ranks, and Whittaker Chambers' famous book, Witness, hints at long lists in the lower echelons of treason. Dr. Oppenheimer's ouster by the Atomic Energy Commission serves as a reminder of this truth.

Our country is engaged in a tremendous struggle for world leadership, perhaps for our very existence. This is not a time to be playing mental games. Scientists who believe that their discoveries are "international," who think that their judgment can be substituted for the views of the majority of our people, are in danger of assuming responsibility for decisions which have not been entrusted to them. The Democratic Party has shown a shocking indifference to its affinity for "security risks." The Republicans intend to remain allergic to them.

Some Sobering Thoughts on July 4

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 2, 1954

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to commend to the attention of the membership of this body the following article written by Mr. A. J. Lukaszewski, editor of the Polish American Congress Newsletter, and entitled "Some Sobering Thoughts on July 4."

On this occasion of the 178th anniversary of our Independence Day, our thoughts stray back to 1776, and we attempt to compare the conditions and problems of that period to those of our own times. We recall with pride and amazement the handful of brave men who rebelled against tyranny and proclaimed the birth of a new nation. And we may ponder for a moment about the wondrous way in which the infant Nation, conceived by them, grew and prospered until it became the leading power of the free world.

At the same time we may wonder with apprehension about the things which lie in store for us in the days ahead. We are confronted today with problems whose gravity finds no parallel in our history. Since those problems spring primarily from the attitudes and actions of Soviet Russia, it is well for us to reflect on the manner in which that country was reorganized after the revolution of 1917, and on the direction in which it has traveled since that time. Mr. Lukaszewski draws this parallel in his article, and I believe that this comments and observations merit our careful consideration.

The article follows:

TWO REVOLUTIONS, THE AMERICAN IN 1776 AND THE BOLSHEVIK IN 1917: A COMPARISON

As we observe our Declaration of Independence on July 4 this year, it may be well to dwell for a moment on some thoughts which should be uppermost in our minds on that nationally observed holiday: One of them, our own revolution in 1776, and the other, the Bolshevik revolution in 1917. Let us look into the latter first.

There is not much argument on the question that the revolution was almost necessary in Russia to overthrow the Czar and oppressive despotism. However the Red rulers who followed the Czar imposed their own brand of despotism and oppression on the people—they did not grant the freedoms, or the rule of the proletariat so glowingly pictured by the Bolsheviks before the revolution.

REVOLUTION SOVIET STYLE

It was presumed that, for a while at least, a strong-armed ruler was needed and justifiable to establish the new socialistic order, as many people might show an aversion to it, and resent such untried and untested ideas of government. However, it was believed, that time would heal all wounds, order be restored, and the Communist paradise would materialize.

Of course, students of the new godless philosophy realized and knew full well that the hoped for millenium for the common man just could not come to pass. It was based on the laws which are odious to man, they denied him the dignity so prized by man who was made to the image and likeness of God. Man had to become a mere chattel of the state, and all concepts of democracy, as the free world understands it, went out the window. Those who dared to differ in thought and practice were unceremoniously, or by the process of the notorious Soviet trials, liquidated, to use a term which stands in Soviet Russia for murder or worse. Such was the order established by the self-styled champions of the common man—and it is growing in ferocity daily. Only the Iron Curtain prevents us from getting all the true details.

REVOLUTION AMERICAN STYLE

Now let us turn to 1776 and the American Revolution. Here, too, was a rebellion against oppression. Not all colonists were sympathetic with the radical move, and for that era of kings and monarchs it was a most radical move. Democratic forms of government were mere dreams of sentimental idealists.

But the Founding Fathers of this new government stated in the Declaration of Independence the self evident truths: that all men are created equal—that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights—that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. And they meant every word of it.

England was defeated and the new order was put into operation. It was not easy, or as simple as that. But, no Iron Curtain was erected to keep the rest of the world out, though the colonists were aware that the first steps of the infant democracy were bound to be awkward and stumbling. They were sure, however, that the new order was based on the natural laws and privileges of man, on the eternal laws of God. All of us, who are even vaguely familiar with American history know the rest of the story.

And so here we are, the most powerful, the most influential and the richest country under the sun—and incidentally the most charitable towards all nations—without regard to race, creed or color—with no thoughts of aggression or designs against any nation in the world.

Not everything in this order even now works perfectly, but we are on the right road. We are grateful to almighty providence we never needed machine guns or wholesale murder to bring this about.

No, we did not think in those early days of such a thing as the Iron Curtain to keep other nations out, but we started with a standing invitation to the rest of the world to come in, to help us share the natural riches with which this Nation was blessed.

No wonder intelligent American workers of all skills and trades shun the Red menance of communism like a dreaded disease. The liberties they enjoy here will never be pawned for the reign of terror raging among the rich and poor alike over so much of the globe dominated for these many years by the bloody despotism of Communist Russia.

A. J. L.

In Memoriam: Joseph Rider Farrington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL M. LeCOMPTE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 2, 1954

Mr. **LeCOMPTE.** Mr. Speaker, the congressional committee appointed by the Speaker to attend the funeral of our beloved colleague, Hon. Joseph Rider Farrington, has returned from its mission. There is sadness in our hearts that this untiring representative of the Territory of Hawaii was not permitted to see the fruition of his long endeavor for Hawaiian statehood.

The island peoples will long mourn his loss, and many beautiful tributes to his memory have been made. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I ask particularly to include the eloquent address of J. Garner Anthony, a prominent attorney in Honolulu and a close personal friend of Joe and Betty Farrington:

IN MEMORIAM: JOSEPH RIDER FARRINGTON

(Central Union Church, Honolulu, T. H., June 27, 1954, J. Garner Anthony)

Throughout these islands people high and low have spoken in praise of Joe Farrington. The press the country over, his colleagues in the Congress, the executive and judicial branches of government, and even the President himself have joined in the accolade. Everywhere our flags are lowered. There is little that I can add but I will try to give some measure of the man, his character and ideals, his triumphs and disappointments, and what he means to Hawaii and the Nation.

He was of sturdy New England stock, attended school at Punahou, and after graduation went to the University of Wisconsin, where he studied journalism and graduated in 1919. No doubt it was at Wisconsin that he acquired the social, political, and economic ideals that left their indelible mark on his character and charted his future.

Upon leaving Wisconsin he served his apprenticeship as a reporter in Philadelphia and Washington and returned to Hawaii to devote himself to the Star-Bulletin. Later he took the place of a distinguished father as head of that newspaper when the latter became Governor of Hawaii. It was a natural evolution that turned him to political life.

One characteristic of Joe Farrington which finds its counterpart among great Americans of the past was his faith in the good sense of the common people on any public issue. He insisted that, if the facts were made clear, the ordinary man would usually reach the right answer. His political philosophy was, to use a shorthand expression, a liberalism in the finest tradition of his party. He recognized the validity of change as a vital and necessary process in our democracy. For this he was, at times, criticized by some of his friends, which complaints he received with an outward calm and credited them to a lack of understanding of the problem or the immaturity of his critics. It is significant that today they join in his praise.

It is unnecessary here to recount his many contributions to the Hawaii scene. Indeed, I will mention only two; both public offices which he filled with distinction: Senator from Oahu and Delegate to the Congress of the United States since 1942. His conduct of the office of Delegate from Hawaii leaves a record that will last so long as free government exists.

He was elected in the fall of 1942 less than a year after Pearl Harbor. The newly elected Delegate went to the Congress representing a Territory whose government has largely been supplanted by the Army. He made it his business to remedy that situation with all due speed consistent with the paramount interests of the Nation. The vindication of his position is history.

With the close of hostilities he turned to the central objective of his political life—statehood for Hawaii. He introduced legislation in the Congress and then began the tedious, heartbreaking, daily, incessant, time-consuming task of bringing that issue to a vote. Investigations, hearings, reports, charges and countercharges, all thrown in his path as roadblocks to his goal. With all of this he never neglected the innumerable demands of the people back home whose problems flooded the Delegate's office. He was never too busy to give himself to the stream of people from home visiting the National Capital. To them as well as to his colleagues in the Congress he was the living symbol of Hawaii nei.

In 1947 he saw his legislation pass the House of Representatives only to die in the Senate. This year he moved it closer than ever to success. He died at his post in his struggle for Hawaii's cause just as a soldier on the battlefield. He laid down his life for Hawaii.

Some of Joe's characteristics above all others were his personal charm, grace, and culture. He loved people and they loved him. These qualities made him a man apart. No one could talk with him 5 minutes without falling under the spell of his frank and warm spirit. He could walk into any gathering, whether it be at Aala Park or at the British Embassy in Washington and be at home. His presence breathed the spirit of Hawaii, his integrity, sincerity, and devotion to his public trust were self-evident testimonials to the truth and validity of his ideals. No wonder that thousands throughout the land, at home and abroad, do him homage. I have often wondered whether we here at home have fully appreciated our chief spokesman.

When a great tree falls, the landscape seems strange. So when a noble man dies, life for us who remain seems strangely vacant but the race must go on to the end. There is no surcease in the struggle for the ideal for any of us until we are finally gathered to our Father's home. At the grave of our beloved friend let us not end in sorrow for our tragic loss, but rather with the contagion of his bouyant courage let us rejoin the fight.

"Death makes no conquest of this conqueror
For now he lives in fame though not in life."

Final Tabulations of 1954 Legislative Questionnaire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES R. HOWELL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 2, 1954

Mr. **HOWELL.** Mr. Speaker, during each of my 6 years as a Member of the House of Representatives, I have conducted a legislative questionnaire in the Fourth District of New Jersey. In 1949 the questionnaire was mailed to approximately 6,000 residents of Mercer and Burlington Counties, and returns were received from 2,150. The 1954 questionnaire was sent out to about 35,000 Fourth District residents, and returns were received from 3,850.

My constituents have given me fine cooperation in this project during the past 6 years, and I am grateful to those who took out time to complete and return the questionnaire. For my own part, I have always found the questionnaire to be a valuable means of understanding the nature of opinion within the district. I would recommend use of a questionnaire to all Members of the House as a means of achieving a mutually satisfactory point of view between Congressman and constituents on important issues.

The results of the 1954 questionnaire follow:

1. Increase postal rates on following to put Post Office on self-supporting basis: (a) First-class mail (letters): Yes, 46 percent, or 1,626; no, 54 percent, or 1,928. (b) Second-class mail (newspapers): Yes, 75 percent, or 2,676; no, 25 percent, or 886. (c) Third-class mail (circulars): Yes, 89 percent, or 3,346; no, 11 percent, or 417.

2. Have United States Steel pay part of cost of deepening Delaware River Channel to 40 feet: Yes, 80 percent, or 2,947; no, 20 percent, or 712.

3. Continue program of Federal loans to build public-housing units for low-income families: Yes, 73 percent, or 2,798; no 27 percent, or 1,027.

4. Change Taft-Hartley labor law in following way: (a) Give greater rights to employers: 22 percent, or 749; (b) give greater rights to workers: 22 percent, or 736; (c) repeal completely: 16 percent, or 538; (d) leave as it now stands: 40 percent, or 1,346.

5. Believe the program of Federal support for farm prices should be: (a) continued at present level: 20 percent, or 765; (b) continued, but at lower level: 55 percent, or 2,062; (c) discontinued completely: 25 percent, or 934.

6. United States should join with Canada in construction of St. Lawrence seaway: Yes, 84 percent, or 3,174; no, 16 percent, or 608.

7. United States join with other nations in pooling some nonmilitary atomic data to initiate peaceful uses of atomic energy: Yes, 75 percent, or 2,852; no, 25 percent, or 954.

8. Strengthen United Nations into a limited world federation without authority in domestic affairs: Yes, 72 percent, or 2,631; no, 28 percent, or 1,023.

9. Favor the new United States military policy of main reliance on atomic weapons and air power and less on ground forces and conventional weapons: Yes, 67 percent, or 2,351; no, 33 percent, or 1,180.

10. Change Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act and tariff laws to (a) permit more trade between United States and other countries: 78 percent, or 2,913; (b) permit less trade

between United States and other countries: 4 percent, or 141; (c) leave as it now stands: 18 percent, or 669

11. Favor proposal to increase salaries of Congressmen, Senators, and Federal judges: Yes, 67 percent, or 2,441; no, 33 percent, or 1,206.

12. The three problems most frequently mentioned as facing the country now are (1) disapproval of the tactics and effects of McCarthyism; (2) concern with unemployment and the threat of recession; (3) opposition to United States armed intervention in Indochina.

Lt. Gen. Robert W. Harper, United States Air Force

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 2, 1954

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, on June 30, 1954, Lt. Gen. Robert W. Harper retired from active duty in the United States Air Force. At the time of his retirement, he was serving as commanding general of the Air Training Command.

As commanding general with headquarters at Scott Air Force Base, Belleville, Ill., General Harper won the admiration and respect of the civilian population not only in the St. Louis metropolitan area but through the State of Illinois. He did one of the finest public-relations jobs for the Air Force that possibly could have been done. He created a feeling of friendship for the Air Force among the civilian population which, in my opinion, will be lasting and redound to the benefit of the Air Force.

One of our colleagues in the House had the privilege and the pleasure of serving in a staff function under General Harper during World War II. While I was able to appraise General Harper's leadership from observation as a Member of Congress in whose district the headquarters which he commanded was located, Representative FRANK CHELF, of Kentucky, is able to appraise the general's great ability from the standpoint of one who has known him as a superior officer and later as a close personal friend.

The citizens of Belleville, Ill., paid tribute to General Harper on his retirement with a public testimonial banquet on the night of June 30. Congressman CHELF's high regard for Bob Harper is expressed in a telegram which he directed to Brig. Gen. A. M. Minton, Chief of Staff of the Air Training Command, to be read at the testimonial dinner.

Under leave to do so, I herewith include with my remarks Congressman CHELF's telegram in tribute to General Harper:

JUNE 29, 1954.

Brig. Gen. A. M. MINTON,
Chief of Staff, Headquarters Air Training Command, Scott Air Force Base, Ill.:

Sincerely regret inability to be present at farewell dinner honoring my very dear friend, Lt. Gen. Robert Harper, on his retirement from the service, but I am recuperating from surgery. Bob has the affection, admiration, and respect of every person whose good fortune it has been to serve under him or with him since he was commissioned a second lieutenant. His devotion to duty, his love of the service, his honesty, integrity, and great ability cause him to stand out on the military horizon like the Washington Monument as a landmark of just what an excellent military career ought to be. It makes me a little sad to know that the time must come, through the ordinary course of events, that men of his caliber, indomitable will, courage, and leadership must retire because, frankly, the Nation and the Air Force can ill afford to spare them. While I hate to see Bob and Peggy leave the service, nevertheless, I am happy for them that the time has come when they shall be permitted to enjoy the fruits of their labor in their chosen home down old Texas way. I was one of those who had the good fortune to serve on Bob Harper's staff during World War II. Had I not been retired for physical disability I honestly and sincerely believe that I would still be with him, whether he liked it or not. I join with all of you loyal and devoted friends who are present in saluting a great American, and an outstanding general of the Air Force. May God bless you, Bob, and your family with long life, good health, and much happiness.

FRANK CHELF,
Member of Congress.

Mutual Security Act of 1954

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 30, 1954

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, we have lately deliberated and voted upon one of the most important and far-reaching pieces of legislation ever to be brought before this body, the bill, H. R. 9678, to promote the security and foreign policy of the United States by furnishing assistance to friendly nations and for other purposes.

In supporting passage of this bill, I felt that the temper of the times in the world today demanded that positive measures be adopted to meet positive dangers. That the earth is today in a state of great upheaval, no one will deny, I am sure.

It is easy to stand by, to carp and criticize efforts that are made by others to improve and to assist in improving the international situation. All that is required for that type of stand is a loose tongue and an idle mind.

It takes a little more wit, and often a great deal more courage to offer affirmative recommendations in dealing with a program which long ago has proved its worthwhileness and its merit.

For many reasons we have found it to be proper and necessary to make available to many countries of the world the funds and material with which they might resurrect themselves from the dismal aftermath of wartime destruction and lift themselves from the limitations of their own national and regional underdevelopment.

Some say that we are motivated by reasons of self-preservation. Some say we have a moral duty to do so. Some feel that economic considerations of an overriding importance have made such activity a prime necessity.

The reasons are many, and they are not uncomplicated.

The fight against communism continues unabated. In many of the fringe areas of the world there are agencies operating to subvert authority, by whatever means are at hand, to the end that the dictates of the Kremlin be foisted and thrust upon an unwilling people. It is difficult to preach freedom, liberty, or religion to a man with an empty stomach. It is folly to attempt to educate him when his family lacks sufficient to wear or on which to live. And it is negligence to overlook these things.

Much of the money authorized in this bill will be directed to military expenditures. A smaller, but equally as significant, part is to be turned to economic assistance. Both are vital to the continuance of a free way of life and to the arrestment of any shift in the delicate scale of power balance.

Many nations in many sections of the world will receive moneys under this bill. As an investment, we could not do better. As a deterrent to world conflict, it is the wisest thing we could do. And as the leaders of the free nations it is an obligation which we must meet, no matter how difficult it might seem.

Countries who will be the better for this happening will be the peoples of India, West Germany, the Chinese Nationalists on Formosa, Turkey, Greece, Spain, Israel, Yugoslavia, Pakistan, Thailand, Japan, and South Korea, among others. And we shall benefit also, tangibly and intangibly.

Because of the uncertain situation in the Far East, and the attendant difficulties experienced there, there is a certain amount of flexibility in the bill, so as to allow us to meet any changing circumstance in the military-political pattern as it unfolds there. We cannot allow ourselves to be strapped under conditions which might be harmful to the best interests of our allies and to our own security.

In this time and in this year of 1954, we must meet, as we have always met, the challenge of forces which seek to enslave the world. In times of stress, our friends are our most important asset. As important as they are to us, so too are we to them. We should ever strive to cement and strengthen the bonds of amity which exist between the nations of the world and us. It is my belief that this bill takes 10-league strides in that direction.

As never before, the distressed countries of the earth need our help, if not, as in the case of some, by material assistance, then by the moral support which may be extended by the vote of confidence as expressed in passage of this bill. Others desperately need the assurances, military and/or economic which this measure will make available.

It is my sincerest hope that the Congress will see fit to buttress the cause of international friendship and self-help, which passage of this bill will so effectively accomplish.

Heads of State and Dignitaries From Many Foreign Lands Have Visited the TVA, a Symbol of Progress in America—Let's Not Now Put Up a "No Visitors" Sign at TVA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 2, 1954

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, the visitor's register at the Tennessee Valley Authority reads like a "Who's Who of the World"—that is, such was the situation prior to January of 1953. Since then, dignitaries of note, with a limited exception, have not been directed to the TVA.

This leads to the question: "Has a 'No Visitors' sign been put up at the TVA?"

From the time of its inception, the TVA has been one of the spots in our country most eagerly sought out by representatives of foreign countries visiting in the United States. The TVA has traditionally received critical and intensive study by both private and governmental organizations from throughout the civilized world. Hundreds of persons annually have gone to the TVA each year with the sole purpose in mind of seeing TVA in operation and endeavoring to understand its purposes and its achievements and its contribution to a better, more prosperous society and economy. Visitors to our country from abroad have traditionally exhibited great interest in the TVA which has become a symbol of progress in America throughout the free world.

After seeing the TVA in operation, these visitors have obtained ideas and progressive inspiration for their own countries—which are, in most cases, hungry for advancement and progress, a blueprint for realizing many aspirations for a better life.

The visitors from foreign lands to the TVA area have included—

Queen Juliana and Prince Bernhard, of the Netherlands, in April 1952.

Ambassador and Mrs. Eban of Israel, in May 1953.

Muhammed Khuda, Minister of Defense, of Pakistan, in December 1952.

Ambassador and Mrs. Feridun C. Erkin, of Turkey, in October 1952.

Admiral Renato Guillobel, Secretary of the Brazilian Navy, in September 1952.

Former Prime Minister Hans Hetoft, of Denmark, and Ambassador Henrik de Kauffmann, of Denmark, in July 1952.

Prime Minister David Ben-Gurion of Israel, in May 1951.

Prime Minister Joseph Pholien, of Belgium, in April 1951.

President Gabriel Gonzales Videla, of Chile, in April 1950.

Dr. Franz Bluecher, Vice Chancellor of West Germany, in February 1950.

Prime Minister Pundit Jawaharlal Nehru, of India, in October 1949.

President Enrico Gaspar Dutra, of Brazil, in May 1949.

Right Honorable Hector McNeil, British Minister of State, in April 1949.

The Khan of Kalat, Ruler of Kalat, Pakistan, in April 1949.

Prince Charles, Regent of Belgium, in April 1948.

The Egyptian Minister of Public Works, in July 1947.

President Miguel Aleman, of Mexico, in May 1947.

And many others.

It is my information, Mr. Speaker, that those who prepared the itinerary of visits in this country failed to include the TVA for Emperor Haile Selassie, of Ethiopia, upon the occasion of his recent official state visit to the United States.

And further, Mr. Speaker, I may observe also that while their Majesties, King Paul and Queen Frederika, of Greece, visited from coast to coast during their recent official visit to our country, their itinerary did not include the TVA.

Also noted, Mr. Speaker, was the fact that the President of Turkey on his recent official visit to the United States, was not included among the visitors to the TVA.

Were these distinguished visitors routed around TVA, Mr. Speaker? The answer seems obvious—certainly obvious in the light of the dearth of foreign visitors to this area in recent months.

Let's not permit a "no visitors" sign to be put at the portals of the TVA.

Boost Service Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1954

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Army, Navy, Air Force Journal of June 19, 1954:

"BOOST SERVICE BENEFITS," SAYS SECRETARY OF DEFENSE WILSON; AF SECRETARY TALBOTT TELLS HOW TO DO IT

Defense Secretary Charles E. Wilson on June 16 told the graduation class at the Naval War College, Newport, R. I., that military personnel be given "an increased feeling of security by improving personnel policies and administration of them."

The Pentagon chief said "We must have sound incentives for improvement, including fair compensation in the broadest sense, which includes all service benefits. * * * We are actively working on these problems in the Pentagon, and I believe some substantial prograss has been made."

Speaking almost at exactly the same hour as Mr. Wilson, Air Force Secretary Talbott said:

"The second principal cause which constitutes more than 50 percent of the problems which are causing our people to get out of the service are problems internal to service administraiton and management. The problems themselves are too many to enumerate here; but they cover the operation of our clubs, post exchanges and commissaries, the lack of delegation of authority, the attitudes of some commanders, the frequent moves of our people, and even the frequency of payday.

"Our people in this report asked for simple things. They asked that PX's and commissaries be kept open during a portion of off duty hours and not closed for inventory on paydays. They asked if they could not be paid twice a month. They asked to be given proper warning for a change of station move so they could make provision for their families. They asked for protection from gouging and other problems associated with attempts of local landlords to exploit them.

"The cure to our first cause of unrest—the improvement of pay and the restoration of traditional rights and privileges—is something that must be taken up by Congress. Congress is well aware of our problem. I think that they have stopped any further encroachments. However, I have found that legislation many times moves slowly, and the restoration of our old rights, which are in reality broken promises, will require a matter of years.

"The second cause—the problem having to do with our own internal administration—is your problem and my problem. I want to appeal to you to consider your personnel and their management as the most valuable resource we have in our inventory. It is distressing to see personnel policies rigidly applied, or as it has been aptly stated, policies being used as an excuse for not thinking. I am sure that all of you will agree with me that loyalty must extend downward as well as upward. If we will only treat our men and women as human beings rather than so many numbers, we will then be able to do much to correct our own problems and to retain more and more our experienced personnel as career servicemen.

"A correction of these personnel problems will, I am sure, cause a big upswing in our reenlistment rates. The doubling of our present rates with the resulting retention of our highly trained and skilled airmen, not to mention our officers, will be worth billions of dollars to our country. In addition, we will have an improvement in our operational efficiency, which because of its impact on maintaining the peace in the world has a value impossible to assess in dollars."

The Development of Parliamentary Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT CROSSER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 2, 1954

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Speaker, in compliance with the request of members of the Democratic steering committee of the House, the chairman hereby submits a memorandum setting forth the procedure which he suggests should be followed by the committee in discharging the duties which, in the nature of things and by express direction of the Democratic caucus, the committee is required to perform.

Before proceeding with a discussion of the functions of the committee and presenting a short outline of the procedure which it would seem proper to follow, there is submitted a brief statement explaining not only the propriety and wisdom of providing for a regular course of action and for the adoption of definite rules of procedure, but to show also the absolute necessity for such action.

Every government, according to the claims of those who control it, desires only the welfare of the people. In the United States reference to the subject of government is seldom made without at the same time stressing the fact that this is a government by the consent of the people—or as Jefferson said: "Governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed."

No responsible person in this country disputes the soundness of the principle that the will of the people should prevail. The problem confronting students of government has been to provide the mechanics, proper and necessary, for the purpose of giving effect to the abstract principle of self-government.

Thomas Jefferson understood the logical necessity of establishing in the people absolute control of public policies and had complete confidence in their capacity for self-government. He indicated, however, great anxiety lest the power of the people to determine the policy of Government should be either lost or seriously impaired.

The reason for his apprehension was that Jefferson was not only the great champion of human rights, devoted to the principles of democracy, but was also the profound scholar in public life.

He, therefore, knew the history of the human race and was familiar with the numerous painful struggles of people throughout the world in their effort to establish and maintain governments which would assure them a reasonable measure of justice. He noted how invariably, elsewhere in the world, those exercising governmental power, had shaped their courses not for the welfare of the people, but according to what they believed to be for their own personal advantage.

Our parliamentary system had been based, in large measure, on the principles of the English parliamentary system and being familiar with the history of the English Parliament's long and almost futile struggle to become the recognized agency for the determination of governmental policies, Jefferson was fearful lest control of Government by our people should be lost.

After reviewing some of the episodes in the history of the English Parliament and also of the Parliament, it is surprising, in view of Jefferson's sound political philosophy and knowledge of history, that he was not more apprehensive as to the development and continuity of truly democratic government in the United States.

The recital of even a few of the occurences in the struggle of the Parliament for complete legislative power will show the reason for Jefferson's fears and the necessity for express provision for the fullest possible measure of direct and absolute control of governmental policies by the people. Experience and study had convinced him that the exercise of the right of popular control never would be assured if it were dependent on mere implication or assumption instead of express statement.

The supporters of unexpressed authority almost invariably are disposed to insist that the benevolence and graciousness of those exercising power over the people, are sufficient assurance that liberty and justice will be enjoyed by all those effected by the exercise of such authority. This is not true. Fallible human nature, not the ill will of the individual, generally leads to the use of governmental power in such a way as is calculated to serve what the exerciser believes to be his own special interest.

Only by the definite and express statement of principles, in documentary form, by the undoubted majority of those subject to the power of government, is it possible to avoid disregard of principle and consequent ill feeling between those exercising governmental power and those subjected to such authority. When rules are absolutely definite and recorded, few, if any, of those having any power of government would feel any offense about insistence upon the true administration of the same.

Some of the above-mentioned experiences of the English and British Parliament, in its hard struggle for true legislative power, which were due to the lack of express definite statements of the rights of the people and of Parliament, are discussed in the following quotations from standard authorities.

Taswell-Langmead's English Constitutional History, at page 392, states:

> In the Parliament of 1572 no opposition was shown, but at its next meeting, in February 1575–76, a speech of remarkable boldness in defense of the liberties and privileges of the Commons was delivered by Peter Wentworth, member for Tregony in Cornwall: "Sweet is the name," he said, "of liberty, but the thing itself a value beyond all inestimable treasure. So much more it behooveth us to take care lest we, contenting ourselves with the sweetness of the name, lose and forego the thing."
>
> "In the last and preceding session," he continued, "I saw the liberty of free speech so much and so many ways infringed, and so many abuses offered to this honorable council, as hath grieved me; wherefore I do think it expedient to open the commodities that grow to the prince and state by free speech. Without this it is a scorn and mockery to call it a Parliament house, for in truth it is a school of flattery and and dissimulation. Two things do great hurt here: one a rumor which runneth about the House, 'Take heed what you do; the Queen's majesty liketh not such a matter; whosoever preferreth it, she will be offended with him.' On the contrary, 'Her Majesty liketh of such a matter; whosoever speaketh against it, she will be much offended with him.' The other is a message sometimes brought into the House, either of commanding or inhibiting very injurious to the freedom of speech and consultation. I would to God, Mr. Speaker, that these two were buried in hell; the King hath no peer or equal in the Kingdom, but he ought to be under God and the law because the law maketh him a king."
>
> Wentworth was committed to the tower because of his speech.

On page 394 of Taswell-Langmead's English Constitutional History it is stated:

> As soon as the House reassembled (February 1587), Peter Wentworth submitted to the Speaker, for the purpose of being read to the House, a series of questions, of which the principal points were: "Whether this House be not a place for any member freely and without controlment of any person, or danger of laws, by bill or speech, to alter any of the griefs of the commonwealth? Whether honor may be done to God, and benefit and service to the prince and state, without free speech? Whether there be any councils beside Parliament, which can make, add to, or diminish from, the laws of the realm? Whether it be not against the orders of this House to make any secret or matter of weight, here in hand, known to the prince or any other? Whether the Speaker, or any other, may interrupt any member in his speech in this House, or rise, when he will without consent of the House? Whether the prince and state can continue, stand, and be maintained without the Parliament, except by altering the government of the state?"
>
> For these queries (which the Speaker declined to read to the House), Wentworth was again committed to the Tower; a fate which Cope and those members who had supported his motion also shared.

In the same volume by Taswell-Langmead, at page 394, appears the following statement of facts:

> At the opéning of the Parliament which met in February 1593, the Speaker having made the usual request of liberty of speech, received (from Queen Elizabeth) for answer: "Privilege of speech is granted, but you must know what privilege ye have: not to speak every one what he listeth, or what cometh into his brain to utter; your privilege is 'Aye or No.'" On the first day of the session the undaunted Peter Wentworth, together with Sir Henry Bromley, another Member, delivered a petition to the Lord Keeper desiring the Lords to be suppliants with the Lower House to her Majesty to entail the succession of the Crown, for which they had already prepared a bill. For this boldness they were summoned before the council and committed to prison. A few days later, Morice, the attorney of the court of wards, introduced a bill to reform the practice of the ecclesiastical courts, especially in the matter of the oath ex officio. The Queen immediately sent for the Speaker who on his return informed the House that "She wondered that any would be of so high commandment as to attempt a thing contrary to that which she had so expressly forbidden. Her Majestry's present charge and command is, that no bills touching matters of State, or reformation in causes ecclesiastical, be exhibited. And upon my allegiance (the Speaker's) I am commanded, if any such bill be exhibited, not to read it." Not content with this general reprimand, Morice, himself attorney general, was arrested in his place, committed to prison, deprived of his office in the court of wards, and disabled from practising as a barrister.
>
> * * * * *
>
> It was in the Parliament of 1601 that the opposition which had, during 40 years, been silently gathering and husbanding strength, fought its first great battle and won its first victory. The conflict arose concerning the enormous abuse of monopolies. Under cover of the loosely defined prerogative possessed or assumed by the Crown of regulating all matters relating to commerce, the Queen had taken upon herself to make lavish grants to her courtiers, or patents to deal exclusively in a multitude of articles, mostly common necessities of life. Coal, leather, salt, oil, vinegar, starch, iron, lead, yarn, gladd, and many other commodities were in consequence only to be obtained at ruinous prices. The grievance was first mooted in Parliament in 1571, by a Mr. Bell; but he was at once summoned before the council, and returned to the House "with such an amazed contenance, that it daunted all the rest." After the lapse of 26 years the Commons ventured, in 1597, to present an address to the Queen

on the same subject, to which she replied, through the lord keeper, that she "hoped her dutiful and loving subjects would not take away her prerogative; which is the choicest flower in her garden, and the principal head pearl in her crown diadem; but would rather leave that to her disposition, promising to examine all patents and to abide the touchstone of the law." In spite of these fair words, the abuse, far from being abated, rose to still greater height. So numerous were the articles subject to monopoly, that when the list of them was read over in the House in 1601, an indignant Member exclaimed, "Is not bread amongst them? Nay, if no remedy is found for these, bread will be there before the next Parliament." A bill for the explanation of the common law in certain cases of letters patent was introduced by Mr. Laurence Hyde, and was debated with unprecedented warmth for 4 days. The ministers and courtiers, who endeavored to support the prerogative, were overborne by a torrent of indignant and menacing eloquence. The populace openly cursed the monopolies, and declared that the prerogative should not be suffered to touch the old liberties of England. Seeing that resistance was no longer politic, or even possible, Elizabeth with admirable tact, sent a message to the House, that, understanding that divers patents which she had granted had been grievous to her subjects, some should be presently repealed, some superseded, and none put in execution, but such as should first have a trial, according to the law, for the good of the people. Robert Cecil, the secretary, added the more direct assurance that all existing patents should be revoked, and no others granted for the future. Overjoyed at their victory, the Commons waited upon the Queen with an address of thanks, to which she replied in an affectionate and even apolegetic tone. "Never since I was a queen," she told them, "did I put my pen to any grant but upon pretext and semblance made to me, that it was both good and beneficial to the subjects in general though a private profit to some of my ancient servants who had deserved well. * * * Never thought was cherished in my heart that tended not to my people's good."

Black's The Reign of Elizabeth, on page 177, states:

> A striking testimony to the relatively humble position it occupied is furnished by the fact that in a reign (Elizabeth's) of 44½ years the total time spent in parliamentary discussions was only some 35 months.

In a note on the same page of Black's The Reign of Elizabeth, the author states:

> It (Parliament) had not even obtained full control over its own elections, controversies in regard to which were in many cases dealt with by the council (appointed by the Crown).

From Black's The Reign of Elizabeth, on page 179, the following is quoted:

> "It is in me and my power," said Elizabeth to the speaker in 1593, "to call Parliaments; it is my power to end and determine the same; it is in my power to assent to or dissent to anything done in Parliament."

On page 193 of The Reign of Elizabeth, by Black, in discussing monopolies granted by the queen to her favorites, there is the following statement:

> As Francis Bacon pointed out, "The queen as she is our sovereign, hath both an enlarging and restraining power. Wherefore * * * I say again and again, that we ought not to deal, to judge, or meddle with Her Majesty's prerogative."

Sir Robert Cecil, the Queen's secretary, is quoted on the same page, last above mentioned, as saying:

> Let me give you this note, that the time was never more apt to disorder and make ill interpretation of good meaning; I think those persons would be glad that all sovereignty were converted into popularity.

In Cheyney's History of England, at page 275, it is stated:

> It is of interest to note that the Queen used the expressions "this Parliament" and "Parliament's" * * * she hardly conceived of Parliament as a permanent institution. There was not in her view a coordinate branch of the government known as Parliament. * * * In the Parliament of 1597 she had expressed the judgment * * * that freedom of speech does not permit a Parliament to frame. * * *
>
> A state of government as to their idle braynes shall seeme meetest. She sayeth no king fit for his state will suffer such absurdities.

As indicating the attitude and claims of King James I there is submitted the following quotation from Taswell-Langmead's English Constitutional History, at pages 407 and 408:

> At a time when the growing spirit of freedom, the general diffusion of knowledge, and the revived study of Greek and Roman authors had caused a republican tendency to manifest itself in Parliament, and among the people, this * * * King (James) * * * was constantly asserting, in the most offensive form, the novel and monstrous theory of his divine right to absolute and irresponsible sovereignty. The doctrine had already been advanced by him some years before in Scotland, in a treatise on the True Law of Free Monarchies. Adopted by the hierarchy and the courtiers, the theory of divine right was later on elaborated into a system by Filmer. * * * "It was gravely maintained that the Supreme Being regarded hereditary monarchy, as opposed to other forms of government, with peculiar favor; that the rule of succession in order of primogeniture was a divine institution, anterior to the Christian, and even to the Mosaic dispensation; that no human power, not even that of the whole legislature, no length of adverse possession, though it extended to ten centuries, could deprive a legitimate prince of his rights; that the authority of such a prince was necessarily always despotic; that the laws, by which, in England and in other countries, the prerogative was limited, were to be regarded merely as concessions which the sovereign had freely made and might at his pleasure resume; and that any treaty which a king might conclude with his people was merely a declaration of his present intentions, and not a contract of which the performance could be demanded."

Not only did King James oppose the efforts of Parliament to exercise its right as the lawmaking authority of the realm, but he also undertook to control the courts. In the matter of commendams the King had a representative named Bilson sit in court to report what was done. Quoting from Taswell-Langmead, at pages 428 and 429:

> Bilson reported that the counsel for the plaintiffs, besides arguing the special points of the case, had disputed the King's general prerogative to grant a commendam. Hereupon James directed the Attorney General Bacon to write to the chief justice, ordering him and the rest of the judges not to proceed to judgment until they had spoken with the King. Coke shortly replied that if it was wished that the other judges should receive the information just given to him, Bacon had better write to them himself. This was done; but the next day, the judges, as if nothing had happened, proceeded with their arguments. On the day following, they despatched a letter to the King, signed by all the 12, informing his Majesty that, as they were unanimously of the opinion that the attorney general's letter was contrary to law, they felt bound by their oaths to pay no attention to it, and had accordingly proceeded with the case on the appointed day.
>
> The King, who was then at Newmarket, returned answer that the present case was one which concerned not merely the interests of private persons, but in which he himself was to all intents and purposes a party; that delay was necessary in order that he might lay before them his own case, and that the oath not to delay justice was not meant to prejudice the King's prerogative; and concluded by commanding them, of his absolute power and authority royal, not to proceed further in the cause till they should hear his pleasure from his own mouth. On his return to London, the 12 judges were summoned before the King and his council. James personally expatiated upon their misdemeanors both in substance and in the form of their letter certifying him merely what they had done, instead of submitting to his judgment what they should do. He told them it was their duty to check those advocates who presumed to argue against his prerogative; that the popular lawyers were the men who, ever since his accession, had trodden on his prerogative in all parliaments. * * * As soon as he had concluded, all the judges fell upon their knees and asked pardon for their error. But Coke, though he joined in demanding pardon, entered on a justification of their conduct, reiterating his opinion that the postponement required by the King was in fact a real delay of justice, contrary to the law and their oaths. At the desire of (King) James, the Lord Chancellor Ellesmere and the Attorney General Bacon then delivered their opinions, which were directly opposed to that of the chief justice.
>
> The following question was then put to the judges, 1 by 1: "Whether, if at any time in a case depending before the judges, His Majesty conceived it to concern him either in power or profit, and thereupon required to consult with them and that they should stay proceedings in the meantime, they ought not to stay accordingly?" All except Coke, fearful of offending the King, to whom they owed all their future prospects of professional advancement, promised to act in future according to the royal wishes. But from Coke no other answer could be extracted than that, whenever such a case should come before him, he would do what was fitting for a judge to do. The noble conduct of the chief justice on this occasion has deservedly obtained for him the admiration of posterity. Rather than prostitute the independence of the judicial bench to the arbitrary interference of the King, he showed himself ready to sacrifice, for conscience sake, the high position to which his own merits had raised him. Within a few weeks he was censured by the council and suspended from his office, and not long afterwards, in November 1616, received notice that he had ceased to be chief justice.

Following the reign of James I, King Charles I was even more arrogant in his attitude toward Parliament. Taswell-Langmead's English Constitutional History, at page 449, says:

> Charles opened the session (1627–28) with a proud and threatening speech. "There is none here," he said, "but knows that common danger is the cause of this Parliament, and that supply, at this time, is the chief end of it. * * * Every man must now do according to his conscience; wherefore, if you (which God forbid) should not do your

> duties in contributing what the state at this time needs, I must, in discharge of my conscience, use those other means, which God hath put into my hands, to save that which the follies of some particular men may otherwise hazard to lose. Take not this as a threatening (for I scorn to threaten any but my equals), but an admonition from him that, both out of nature and duty, hath most care of your preservation and properties."
>
> The Commons were not at all disturbed by this menacing language. They at once resolved themselves into a committee of grievances to consider "the liberty of the subject in person and estate." The principal matters discussed were: (1) Illegal exactions under the name of loans; (2) the arbitrary commitment of those who refused compliance, and especially the recent decision of the King's bench remanding Sir Thomas Darnel and others upon a habeas corpus; (3) the billeting of soldiers on private persons; and (4) the infliction of punishment by martial law. After passing resolutions "That no freeman ought to be imprisoned or restrained by command of the King, or the privy council, or any other, except for lawful cause expressed in a lawful warrant; and that the ancient and undoubted right of every freeman is, that he hath a full and absolute property in his goods and estate; and that no tax, talliage, loan, benevolence, or other like charge ought to be commanded or levied by the King or his ministers without common assent of Parliament," the Commons applied to the Lords for a conference, in order to agree on a petition to the King for a declaratory conformation of these liberties.
>
> The King tried hard to satisfy the Commons by offering his royal word not to arrest anyone without just cause, or a simple confirmation of the Great Charter and the other ancient statutes in favor of liberty. But Sir Edward Coke warned the House to proceed by bill. "Was it ever known," he said, "that general words were a sufficient satisfaction for general grievances? The King's answer is very gracious; but what is the law of the realm? That is the question. I put no diffidence in His Majesty; but the King must speak by record, and in particulars, and not in general. Let us put a petition of right; not that I distrust the King, but that I cannot take his trust, save in a parliamentary way."
>
> The petition of right was then drawn up by the Commons.

To show also the extent to which the membership of the United States House of Representatives had become legislatively helpless, I cite Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives, volume VI, page VI, as follows:

> Under Speaker (Joseph) Cannon. Entrenched behind the power to appoint committees, with authority to extend or refuse control of the floor, sitting as chairman ex officio of the Committee on Rules, and exercising the right to count a quorum or declare a motion dilatory, the Speaker became an arbiter from whose decisions in chambers there was no appeal.

So autocratic was the power of the speakership that contemporary historians characterized the office as "second in power only to the Presidency" or considered the Speaker of the House as "more powerful than the President of the United States."

Quoting from Fuller's Speakers of the House, page 269:

> This system in reality made him more powerful than the President of the United States. Without his consent and assistance, legislation was practically impossible. The President might recommend, but the Speaker dictated, legislation. He not only decided what legislation should be permitted but he even shaped the form of that legislation to conform to his own personal ideals.

Let us now consider what was said by the American champion of human rights, the great authority on democracy, Thomas Jefferson.

In order to assure the continuous evolution of democracy Jefferson considered it necessary that the mechanics of government should be such as to make it possible at any time for formal action on the part of the people, to assure adoption or rejection of policies in accordance with the will of the majority rather than to compel the people to plead for or against such policies with public officials whom they may have placed in power.

Under the Federal Constitution, direct control of lawmaking by the people is not, of course, possible.

Jefferson constantly stressed, however, the necessity for having laws and procedure which would make sure that legislative action and the administration of law would be in accord with the will of the people. By the United States Constitution all legislative power is vested in the Congress. Policies favored by the people may be made effective only through the action of Congress. It is true, of course, that the people elect the Congress but there is no legal power by which the people can force the Congress to enact laws carrying into effect policies desired by them.

It is important, therefore, that processes of legislation should be so devised and established as to assure as far as possible true responsiveness by members of Congress to the will of the people.

Indicating his belief in the greatest possible degree of direct control by the people, Jefferson in a letter to John Taylor, May 28, 1816, said:

> Indeed it must be acknowledged, that the term "republic" is of very vague application in every language. Witness the self-styled republics of Holland, Switzerland, Genoa, Venice, Poland. Were I to assign to this term a precise and definite idea, I would say, purely, and simply, it means a government by its citizens in mass, acting directly and personally, according to rules, established by the majority; and that every government is more or less republican in proportion as it has in its composition more or less of the ingredient of the direct action of the citizens.
>
> The further the departure from direct and constant control by the citizens, the less has the government of the ingredient of republicanism.

Jefferson in his letter to John Taylor said also:

> We may say with truth and meaning, that governments are more or less republican as they have more or less of the element of popular election and control in their composition; and believing as I do, that the mass of the citizens is the safest depository of their own rights, and especially that the evils flowing from the duperies of the people are less injurious than those from the egoism of their agents, I am a friend to that composition of government which has in it the most of this ingredient.

In a letter to Samuel Kerchival on July 12, 1816, Jefferson said:

> Governments are republicans only in proportion as they embody the will of their people and execute it.

Prof. Frank Parsons, in his book entitled "City for the People," says:

> Jefferson believed in direct legislation (though that expression was then unknown) and tried to get it into the Virginia constitution.

Speaking of the concentration of power even in a number of official hands, Jefferson in his notes on Virginia, said:

> It will be no alleviation that these powers will be exercised by a plurality of hands, and not by a single one. One hundred and seventy-three despots would surely be as oppressive as one. Let those who doubt it turn their eyes on the Republic of Venice. As little will it avail us that they are chosen by ourselves. An elective despotism was not the government we fought for, but one which should not only be founded on free principles, but in which the powers of government should be so divided and balanced among several bodies of magistracy, so that no one could transcend their legal limits, without being effectually checked and restrained by others.

Before submitting suggestions as to procedure to be followed by the Democratic steering committee, let me call attention to facts which unequivocally require the committee to perform the duties indicated in said procedure.

Members of the steering committee of the majority party of the present House have been elected (not appointed by anyone) by the Democratic Members of the House from the respective steering committee zones.

This policy was first adopted in 1933 in order to make possible the expression of the sentiment of each zone through the member of the steering committee elected by the Democratic Members of the House from such zone.

When, therefore, the people of any zone state to their representatives their views as to policies of government, the steering committee member for such zone is then informed by his colleagues from such zone as to the attitude of the people in regard to such policy. The committeeman is then according to the principles of democracy required to present the proposed policy to the membership of the steering committee for proper consideration and action.

On January 19, 1943, the Democratic caucus of the 78th Congress adopted the following, to wit:

> *Resolved, further,* That the said committee (steering committee) shall be the policy making committee of the House.

Policy is defined in Webster's New International Dictionary as follows:

> The settled method by which the government and the affairs of a nation are or may be administered.

The word, "steer" is defined in Webster's New International Dictionary as follows:

> To direct the course of; to guide, to govern.

In the light of the action taken by the Democratic caucus and in view of the meaning of the terms "steer" and "policy," the unavoidable conclusion is that the Democratic steering committee of the House, in order to carry out the duties imposed upon it by the Democratic caucus, the Democratic steering committee of the House should determine the program for the House. Unless the committee may "direct the course of" procedure it cannot "steer" in the true sense of the word, nor may it determine the policy of government unless it provides the "method by which" the affairs of the Nation may be administered.

Any compliance, therefore, with the directions of the Democratic caucus, requires the determining of the program of the House by the steering committee. Even more important than this, however, is the fact as already pointed out in the previous discussion that it is the only way by which even an approximate approach to effective initiative on the part of the individual Member of the House may be made possible and, therefore, the only way in which under our constitutional system, the will of the people may make itself immediately felt in the legislative branch of the Government.

The chairman proposes the following procedure:

First. Weekly meetings of the Democratic steering committee and such other meetings as the chairman on his own initiative or upon the request of five members of the steering committee shall call.

Second. At least once a week, not later than Friday, the steering committee shall stipulate the matters to be considered by the House during each of the days of the following week.

Third. If emergency requires such action, a subcommittee of the steering committee, numbering five members including the Speaker and the Democratic leader of the House, may rearrange the program in order to meet such emergency. A meeting of the total membership of the steering committee may, however, exercise the right of review and change such program to the extent it may decide if it considers such action necessary.

Fourth. Any action of the steering committee shall be, of course, always subject to approval or reversal by the Democratic caucus, when assembled according to the rules of the said caucus.

Fifth. The question has been asked as to what would be the function of the House party leader under the plan of procedure above proposed. The answer is that the leader would be the parliamentary expert and the strategist to carry out as far as possible the program of the steering committee.

H. R. 9680: The Effect of Diet on Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 2, 1954

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, America seems to be going on a diet. Diets call for less calories. Bread, cake, potatoes, butter, cream, sugar, and many other agricultural products high in calories usually appear on diet lists to be taken in greatly reduced quantities. The same applies to alcohol and tobacco.

Have we given consideration to what extent dieting has affected the market for agricultural products?

Ike Embarrassed by Budget Miscues

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 1, 1954

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following article by Ray Tucker, whose column appears daily in the Brooklyn Eagle, speaks volumes. It appeared in the June 30, 1954, issue:

IKE EMBARRASSED BY BUDGET MISCUES

(By Ray Tucker)

Bureaucratic blundering in the Budget Bureau, which is the Eisenhower equivalent of the Roosevelt brain trust, has been responsible for recent inconsistencies and policy reversals that embarrass the White House. The budgeteers, who number many New Dealish hangovers, have given the President wrong advice, although he must share some blame.

It was Budget Director Rowland R. Hughes, for instance, who ruled that Alger Hiss must receive eventually his $700-a-year pension, despite the circumstances behind his conviction. To assume such a legalistic attitude in the face of the Stevens-McCarthy sensations signifies almost incredible stupidity, which Eisenhower and Congress had to repudiate.

In even more important matters involving grave questions of national security, the bright young men in the bureau have made such highly questionable decisions that they were reversed by the White House, Congress, and the National Security Council.

The Budget Bureau's responsibility lies in the fact that all major matters of policy, especially when they involve expenditures of money, must be cleared through this agency. Hughes consults so regularly with Eisenhower that the voice of the Budget is the command of the White House.

Budget informs Congress and all executive agencies whether proposed legislation or action is or is not compatible with the administration's program, usually in writing. F. D. R. started this system of centralized control and clearance, and Ike has continued it for want of a better check. It also comports with his chain-of-command ideas.

UNIMAGINATIVE EXPERTS

The budgeteers, however, rightfully attribute some responsibility to the White House. They try simply to apply Ike's general economic and political philosophy—private enterprise versus Government expansion, Federal economy, a balanced budget—to specific problems. But they practice neither flexibility nor imagination. And they are political babes in Washington.

In proposing that the Atomic Energy build a steam plant and sell power to TVA customers, they were simply seeking to prevent TVA from becoming a vast utility system instead of the Federal waterpower project it was supposed to be. TVA now derives more than 30 percent of electricity from steam plants. The figure will reach 60 percent if the present trend continues.

To check such a movement into the field of private industry is a definite Eisenhower pledge. But the unimaginative and nonpolitically minded budget experts made no attempt to explain or defend the action in popular and nontechnical language.

From both the engineering and financial angles, they have a plausible and substantial defense for interchanging AEC-TVA power. But, again, they were too legalistic and bureaucratic.

POUND-FOOLISH POLICY

In the case of the famous Government-built tin smelter at Texas City, Tex., the budgeteers persuaded Ike to adopt a penny-wise and pound-foolish policy. He recommended on their advice that the plant, which is operated under lease by Dutch interests, be closed down. Basic idea was to save money and get the Government out of the smelting business.

But this smelter happens to be the only one on the Western Continent that can process low-grade ores from Bolivia. With Indochina tin supplies threatened, we may have to depend on Bolivia as a source of supply, as we had to in World War II.

A resolution reversing the Budget Bureau's proposal, sponsored by Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON of Texas, was adopted unanimously by the Armed Services Committee and by the Senate. House passage is certain because of favorable committee action. As in the Hiss case, Ike now admits that the original Hughes recommendation was a bad mistake.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Printing and binding for Congress, when recommended to be done by the Committee on Printing of either House, shall be so recommended in a report containing an approximate estimate of the cost thereof, together with a statement from the Public Printer of estimated approximate cost of work previously ordered by Congress within the fiscal year (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 145, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on Printing, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. The money derived from such sales shall be paid into the Treasury and accounted for in his annual report to Congress, and no sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

Address by Hon. Theodore R. McKeldin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DeWITT S. HYDE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 6, 1954

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include a speech made by the Governor of the State of Maryland, the Honorable Theodore R. McKeldin at the Montgomery County division of the American Cancer Society at Rockville, Md., on June 26, 1954:

What wonders we could develop for the advancement of humanity, if our cold war with rival nations were a race of armaments against the dread diseases which still defy the skill of our physicians and surgeons and the knowledge of our scientists.

Under the pressure of war and threats of war, our savants of the laboratory—aided by untold millions of dollars—forced from the tiny atom its secret of the ages and harnessed its massive power for the destruction of human life.

What pressures do we need to inspire the same concentration of time, skill and money to solve the awful riddle of cells gone mad within the human body?

What incentive is required for an all-out effort of medical science to control this destructive force in human tissues—tissues so much better known than the fissionable materials from which atomic power is released?

What sense of urgency must call for a Manhattan project, or its equivalent, to solve the mysteries and end the tortures and terrible mortality rate of cancer?

I realize that many devoted medical men and women and other scientists are devoting much of their lives, and, in many instances, their own funds toward winning this fight.

The American Cancer Society and its various branches are doing a magnificent job in keeping high the public interest, encouraging the medical profession and providing funds for cure where possible, alleviation when feasible, and for continuing study and research.

These volunteer efforts are most praiseworthy and commendable, and, under the circumstances, their accomplishments have been great.

But no one knows better than the medical profession and the leaders of the Cancer Society that the efforts, the time and the funds are all too meagre.

This is a public problem—a national problem—indeed, an international problem.

When the scourge of Communist tyranny moved against the people of South Korea, we immediately began using millions of men and millions of dollars to stop it in its course.

The scourge of cancer is attacking every day in Korea, in England, in Russia and China, in all the world including our own United States of America.

But where is the big, all-out project to halt it in its horrible course?

Where are the billions of dollars to finance this Manhattan project—to coordinate the studies and the findings, the progress and the hopes, the trials and the errors—in thousands of laboratories, hospitals, and medical centers across the length and the breadth of the land?

I congratulate and commend your fine organization for what you are doing here today. These crusade awards and this generous fellowship symbolize the hope and constant struggle of the American people toward far happier, healthier living.

With this fellowship for a young Maryland doctor to take advanced study in cancer at Yale goes our sincere prayer that his work may be fruitful of new steps toward our conquest of this dread ailment.

But let us offer our petition, too, that this $5,000 and others like it shall be seen in high places as but tokens of that which is the real need—a full-scale operation research to eliminate the scourge of cancer and end forever the fear it incites in the people of the world.

And, finally, let us direct our hopes and our prayers to hasten that glorious day when the energy and the skill of science throughout the world may be turned from the sullen task of devising more efficient means of dealing wholesale death, and channeled into paths of progress for the betterment of human health and the advancement of civilization.

Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 6, 1954

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, the Santa Fe New Mexican has been following very carefully the Oppenheimer developments. It has, in general, supported the position of the Los Alamos scientists who have felt that Oppenheimer has been "miserably rewarded" for his services to the Nation.

The New Mexican has a large circulation among the scientists and technicians who work on the mesa at Los Alamos where so much of our atomic- and hydrogen-bomb history has been made. The paper has had an unusual opportunity to become familiar with opinions there. Its editor, Robert McKinney, took the time to go carefully through the many long pages of testimony and evidence in the Oppenheimer matter. For that reason his editorials in the New Mexican on Wednesday, June 30, with reference to the Oppenheimer case are of importance to the country, and I ask to have them printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUNT LACRIMAE RERUM

Does J. Robert Oppenheimer meet the special loyalty test for the American citizen who serves his neighbors in the most sensitive areas of our national survival?

Not because of the individual but because of the fundamental issues involves, no greater question has ever come before the jury of American opinion. Yesterday the Atomic Energy Commission declared Dr. Oppenheimer a security risk.

Regretfully, this newspaper concurs with that finding.

Our regret is not because our final judgment, in the light of the final record, compels us to reverse our previous editorial position. Our regret is not entirely for the lonely genius who now stands ostracized by his Government and exiled from his life work. Nor is our regret solely for the many of that generation of Americans who, reaching maturity during the depression, joined together in liberal organizations in their struggle for freedom from want. Nor is our regret wholly for the confraternity of scientists whose quest for the secret truths of nature is impeded by demagogs in many lands.

Our heartsick regret is that whole nations of hundreds of millions of people, nations who have just been allies and therefore potential friends, have in less than a decade become deadly foes. In this tragedy of nations there are many individual tragedies, among them the pitiful and sudden task of choosing between loyalty to those near and dear and loyalty to country. In many lands men are stood before firing squads; in this country great careers are wrecked at their peaks. These are the things of tears.

Beyond doubt, Oppenheimer confused loyalty to his personal friends and loyalty to his country. Much of the derogratory information produced against him was old stuff. The military and the AEC had studied it and, after careful consideration, had not canceled his security clearance. During the course of World War II, Oppenheimer was indispensible. Those who worked with him believed that a man "who protects the secrets he has in his hands and head has shown essential regard for the security system," regardless of the associations he may have had when Fascist Germany was our foe and Soviet Russia our ally. Indeed, who now holds it against the harried physicist that Mrs. Oppenheimer was the cousin and once the fiance of Nazi General Keitel?

But the important result of the current hearings was to bring out significant information of character and associations hitherto unknown to the AEC and presumably unknown to those who testified as character witnesses in his behalf. Prior to these proceedings the derogatory information had never been weighed on the basis of sworn testimony. Much was established as fact which previously had been only allegations.

All those who testified in the inquiry were assured that their testimony was in confidence and privacy. But after Oppenheimer released excerpts to the press and after one AEC Commissioner lost his copy of the proceedings on a train, it was decided to publish the 992-page transcript.

For 3 days the editors of the New Mexican have been reading these 992 pages at forced draft. Much of the record is still censored for reasons of security. Perhaps we will never know all the facts before the board. But we were shocked by the naivity and stupidity of the Chevalier incident, which continued until last December. We were stunned by the intellectual dishonesty of the Peters incident. We were outraged by Oppenheimer's mendacity, right up to May

1954, in the Weinberg, Lomanitz, and Seaborg incidents.

The New Mexican concurs with the AEC majority opinion that "Dr. Oppenheimer has consistently placed himself outside the rules which govern others. He has falsified in matters wherein he was charged with grave responsibilities in the national interest. In his associations he has repeatedly exhibited a willful disregard of the normal and proper obligations of security."

NOT INDISPENSABLE

Two main thoughts must be considered in evaluating the decision of the Atomic Energy Commission to deny J. Robert Oppenheimer access to the Nation's vital nuclear secrets. Each subject must be viewed in light of the other.

First, how valuable is Oppenheimer to the successful continuance of our present high-geared nuclear program?

Testimony before the Gray committee reveals that Oppenheimer's contributions to the atomic program diminished sharply after the war. He resigned his Los Alamos post and became Chairman of the General Advisory Committee for the AEC. Subsequently he left the GAC, and, until suspended last December, had worked only 6 days in 2 years for the AEC.

Athough called upon frequently by his colleagues for scientific advice in sensitive fields, the tenor of remarks by AEC officials and those who testified in his behalf emphasizes that his assistance was not vital. He was judged not the indispensible man.

Second, in view of the fact that Dr. Oppenheimer's talents are not considered vital to our nuclear program, can the United States afford to take the slightest risk with a man whose patriotism may be unquestioned, but whose naive approach to everyday life conceivably might result in transmission of vital secrets to Russia?

That Oppenheimer has been indiscreet is a matter of record. We have no guaranty that such actions would not be repeated with graver consequences in the future. Under these circumstances it appears that the Atomic Energy Commission had no alternative but to affirm the withdrawal of Oppenheimer's security clearance.

Such action, taken against a man who has contributed so tremendously to our Nation's well-being and scientific advancement, could be construed as an unnecessarily harsh judgment, reflecting the Nation's lack of gratitude for a longtime loyal public servant. Admittedly it is inhuman. But we are in an unhuman world, brought down upon us by ourselves.

Cultural Accomplishments of Houston, Tex.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 6, 1954

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, we Texans are very proud of the phenomenal growth of our great cities. During the past few decades, they have shot up at a great rate, multiplying in prosperity and becoming great centers of finance and industry. They are also cities that have grown in culture and in contributions to better ways of life.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the Houston Chronicle of June 29 summing up the cultural accomplishments of the city of Houston.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IN ADDITION TO OIL, BANKS, ETC., HOUSTON'S CULTURAL FRONT IS EQUALLY AS IMPRESSIVE

When most businessmen take an inventory of Houston's might, they talk in terms of the city's fantastic construction programs, of oil, banks, chemicals, manufacturing, and fabricating.

They puff up with typical Texas pride at the accomplishments of the port of Houston, of the vast street construction programs, the super highways.

They are justified in doing so.

But there are those among the million population due to be reached Saturday who'll tell you that greater Houston's cultural front is equally as impressive.

EVIDENCE EVERYWHERE

The evidence of cultural growth is found at every turn.

The Houston Symphony Orchestra, the Museum of Fine Arts, the Allied Arts Association, the Museum of Contemporary Arts, the Museum of Natural History, Hermann Park Zoological Gardens, the San Jacinto Museum of History, and the Houston Public Library touch the lives of thousands daily.

The public library is the outgrowth of the Houston Lyceum, chartered by the State legislature in 1848, more than a century ago.

But it wasn't until 1899, 7 years after the city government took over the society, that an appropriation was made from public funds for its support. The amount was $200 per month.

CARNEGIE DID IT

It remained for Andrew Carnegie to make possible a building.

In 1902, the cornerstone was laid for the library, financed with a $50,000 gift from Mr. Carnegie.

Today, Houston has its central branch, 7 units scattered over the city, 9 circulating centers and 2 bookmobiles. In 1917, there were 19,647 registered borrowers. Today, there are more than 98,000 registered borrowers.

Houston's Symphony Orchestra has kept pace with this area's development. Records show that more than 200,000 annually hear the orchestra in its subscription concerts, student concerts, free "pop" concerts and free summer park concerts.

DONORS INCREASE

The increase of donors to support the orchestra is as fantastic as Greater Houston's growth. Six years ago, 300 citizens contributed to the maintenance fund. Today, there are 3,400 donors who contribute about half of the orchestra's $400,000 operating budget.

The Museum of Fine Arts, outgrowth of the Houston Public School Art League founded in 1900, opened its building in 1924.

The building was erected on a site provided jointly by the George Hermann Estate and Mr. and Mrs. J. S. Cullinan. At the time the building was opened, it was known as the Houston Art League. Its name was changed a year later.

ONE HUNDRED THOUSAND VISITORS

More than 100,000 visited the museum last year, to view permanent collections valued at more than $3 million.

The museum is more than a treasure house of art. The program includes art classes for children and adults, and gallery tours, movies, musical programs, and lectures.

The San Jacinto Memorial Monument and Museum of History, founded under the leadership of the late George A. Hill, Jr., was built with Federal and State funds in 1936-39 to commemorate the heroes of the Battle of San Jacinto, which won Texas freedom from tyranny.

SELF-SUPPORTING

Located on the battlefield where Gen. Sam Houston's forces won freedom, the monument and museum are operated as nonprofit, educational organizations. They have always been self-supporting.

Scores of other cultural organizations, designed to stimulate creativeness and keep Texas' rich heritage alive, thrive in the midst of industrial growth more readily noticed.

Former Ambassador Nathaniel P. Davis Becomes a News Columnist

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 6, 1954

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I am very proud to have as one of my constituents the distinguished former American diplomat, Ambassador Nathaniel P. Davis. Ambassador Davis is now retired from the Foreign Service. His last post was as chief of the American diplomatic mission in Hungary, where he was very helpful, among other things, in securing the release of William Oatis, the celebrated victim of a police-state trial.

Ambassador Davis now makes his residence in Glens Falls, N. Y., and has become a leading member of the community there, participating in numerous civic and educational activities. Among other things, Ambassador Davis has become a columnist, writing regular essays for the Glens Falls Post Star. They are sparkling and informative commentaries on State, national, and international events which deserve a much wider circulation than the Glens Falls Post Star affords.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a typical one of these columns, full of both whimsy and good international sense, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PEN SKETCHES

(By Nathaniel P. Davis)

Guatemala is in the news again, and I am afraid is going to be there a good deal more in coming months. There seems to be no doubt that communism is well on the road to overt control in that little country. Not that any important percentage of the people of Guatemala are Communists or have any idea of what communism is; but because social, economic, and political conditions there are the stuff of which Communist dictatorships are made, and it is pretty clear, even to the casual observer, that international communism is trying to make the most of its opportunities.

Ever since the Central American Republics won their independence from Spain, Guatemala has been ruled by a series of dictators, mostly ruthless, cruel men whose motives were lust for power and wealth. The only popular support they sought was among the large landowners who could exercise a greater or lesser degree of influence over their employees and tenants. The real basis of power has always been the armed forces. So long as the army was loyal to the dictator, and so long as he could prevent his enemies from acquiring arms of their own, he was secure in the presidential palace, barring assassination.

The latest of this breed was General Ubico, who ruled for a dozen or so years between the great depression and the latter part of World War II. Ubico was an interesting character. He maintained order in the country, kept official graft within reasonable bounds, insisted on the scrupulous observance of contracts, and introduced many reforms in the Government services directed toward greater efficiency. Up to this point he might be called a benevolent despot. The other side of the coin is that he was completely unscrupulous as to methods for attaining his ends, ruthless and bloody in suppressing opposition or even criticism, and interested in the welfare of the common people only to the extent that their prosperity and contentment served to enrich himself and his friends. Personally, he could be gracious and charming despite a vanity so childish that it was funny to outsiders who could not be made to suffer from it.

I happened to be in Guatemala on Ubico's birthday some years ago while he was at the height of his power, and because of the position I occupied at the time was invited to the parties. I say parties, for the festivities lasted 3 full days, with an elaborate fiesta at the palace each evening. The last was the most elaborate of all. There were 167 generals in attendance, not counting the President, who, of course, was the general of generals. As there were about 5,000 men in the army, the proportion of generals seemed generous. The rank of general, of course, carried with it certain pay and perquisites that made it attractive to men of influence in their localities whom the President found it useful to have on his side.

The setup was fine for the President's friends and supporters, but was less attractive to people he did not like or who did not like him, and was entirely unacceptable to those with a sincere interest in the welfare of the country as a whole. So there were many dissident groups, each with its own reason for thinking it was time for a change. Under the dictatorship normal political activity was impossible, and there was no freedom of press or assembly, so the opposition groups were reduced to plotting Ubico's overthrow by revolution. Finally, as usually happens in such situations, the opposition groups managed to get together and succeeded in winning a part of the army to their side. The revolution won, and Ubico was forced to leave the country. The property he had accumulated while in office was confiscated, and he died a few years later in New Orleans practically penniless.

The victorious revolutionaries were a heterogeneous lot, the one thing they had in common being their desire to get rid of Ubico. How the Communists made use of this situation will be discussed in a later column.

Racial Segregation in Public Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN D. JOHNSTON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 6, 1954

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I hold in my hand a letter written by Robert J. Gantt, entitled, "The Court's Decision," referring to the decision of the Supreme Court with reference to racial segregation in public schools. The letter was published in the Spartanburg, S. C., Herald under date of July 2, 1954, and, in my opinion, expresses the thoughts of the majority of the citizens of my State on this subject. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

THE COURT'S DECISION

EDITOR OF THE HERALD:

When a thought I deem vital to public interest registers in my mind, I am not satisfied till I get it out of my system, for such consideration as it merits.

In common with the millions of the South, I was staggered by the decision of our Supreme Court upon the question of racial segregation in our public schools, and reading the ruling of the Court awoke the chain of thought, that there are but two, and can be but two fundamental philosophies of government on this earth:

First: A government dominated and controlled by the people being governed, by the will of the people, such as was established when the people rebeled, threw off the domination of British colonial control, issued a Declaration of Independence, framed a constitutional Government by the States, and gave birth to Americanism.

Second: A centralized governmental control under which "power and authority" was held and handed down to the individual citizen by a supreme power, under which the individual citizen is deprived of his liberty by a central sovereignty, and his freedom is made subordinate to its decrees. Its the same whether we call the controlling power Fascist, Socialist, or Communist.

There is no middle ground—a citizen is either a freeman or is dominated by centralized governmental control.

That is no question, but that upon the organization of our Federal Government that danger of centralization was seen and appreciated by our leaders. It is recorded that upon the completion of the work of framing our Constitution, someone asked Benjamin Franklin, "What kind of government have you given us?" and he replied "'A Federal Union' if you can keep it." The fight of Patrick Henry of Virginia and Luther Martin of Maryland against the adoption of the instrument, and the writings of Madison and Hamilton are worth reviewing.

The speeches of Charles Pinkney, Thomas Jefferson, our own Legare, McDuffie, Haynes, Calhoun are worth reading. And since the Civil War the works of Ben Hill, Alexander Stephens, Jefferson Davis, Henry Grady, and others.

I followed closely the proceedings of the McCarthy committee hearings to fully awake to the truth: that under a Constitution that distinctly divided our National Government into three branches—legislative, executive, judicial—a committee of the legislative branch did not hesitate to preempt executive and judicial prerogatives, and in violation of every rule of legal procedure, even without indictment or written charges even in their absence arbitrarily tried and held out as culprits, free citizens of a free republic.

Following in its footsteps, our Nation's judicial department, ignoring the recorded decisions of the court, disregarding every vestige of State rights guaranteed under our Constitution, upon sociological, psychological, psychiatric reasoning, in the absence of enacted law, invades the fundamental rights of the individual citizen of the South—to choose his own associates—passes a judicial decree that would destroy the social order of every State in the South.

Again, in Indochina there is a yellow people fighting for their freedom from colonial domination by the French, just as our folks rebelled against the colonial domination of Great Britain, and our "free Nation" would draft its youth, descendants of Revolutionary sires, and send them to Indochina's jungles to aid in holding the Indo's in French subjection.

Again, this same Central Government that weeps briny tears over the condition of the free Negroes of the South holds in abject subjection the American Indians from whom it wrested their heritage of lands, and denies the yellow Chinese even access to our shores.

If I still have freedom of thought and speech, may I voice the thought that while we are so valiantly fighting communism abroad, it would not be amiss for our National Government to look under the bed at home and see if it is not fostering totalitarian ideals and principles far more dangerous to our freedom than any promulgated from Moscow or Stalingrad.

I have lived long enough to have the memory of my childhood and youth tarnished by Federal reconstruction, by racial discord, and I will not in my declining years be subjected to the same oppressive treatment without registering an appeal to our Federal Government for a return to fundamental Americanism and the abolition of every vestige of communistic methods by our great Central Government.

ROBERT J. GANTT.

JUNE 30, 1954.

National Airlines, Inc., Pension Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 6, 1954

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record a newspaper article entitled "NAL Will Pay Pensions Based on Living Costs," which was published recently in the Miami Daily News.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

NAL WILL PAY PENSIONS BASED ON LIVING COSTS

A striking new type of pension plan, the first ever established to maintain the standard of living of employees after retirement notwithstanding changes in the purchasing power of the dollar, has been adopted by the National Airlines, Inc., it was announced today by G. T. Baker, NAL president.

The new plan, which provides benefits geared to the cost of living, is expected to attract the widest attention in financial circles and among employee relations experts, and undoubtedly will serve as a prototype for many other companies seeking to meet the problem of inflation as it affects retired employees.

Joint authors of the program, which has been designed to meet the desires of National Airlines, are the National City Bank of New York, which will act as trustee, and Alexander & Alexander, Inc., of New York, consulting actuaries to NAL.

The new plan will remain permanently up to date, since benefits are tied to a 24-month moving average based on the Consumers Price Index published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics. Each unit of pension credited to each employee during his active career with National Airlines is adjusted at retirement in the same proportion that this cost of living index is changed since the unit was first credited, but in no event by more than 7½ percent for each year during the intervening period.

After retirement the position will be checked each 6 months and the amounts of individual pensions will be adjusted as follows:

If the then current cost-of-living figure is more than 105 percent of the pensioner's cost-of-living base figure, the pension will be increased by a percentage equal to the difference. Conversely, if the current cost-of-living figure falls below 90 percent of the pensioner's base figure, the retired employee's pension will be reduced by a percentage equal to the difference. If the current cost-of-living figure is between 90 percent and 105 percent of the base figure, the pension will be payable in its original amount.

The Aims for Peace in the Middle East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 6, 1954

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, very recently our distinguished colleague, the distinguished senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], delivered a speech on the problems confronting American policy in the Middle East. The address was delivered at an Israel bond dinner in Dallas, Tex., on June 25, 1954. The Jewish News, a weekly publication, published in Detroit, Mich., carried an editorial entitled "The Aims for Peace in the Middle East," commenting on the thoughtful remarks of the Senator from Wisconsin delivered in Dallas, Tex.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial commenting on Senator WILEY's speech be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE AIMS FOR PEACE IN THE MIDDLE EAST

Wisconsin's Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, in an address at an Israel bond dinner in Dallas, Tex., offered this assurance on the question of the arming of Arab States by the United States:

"We of the United States can and will do our part. We must help provide reason and objectivity. But we must not and will not supply matches to blow up the fused powder kegs of war. No arms in particular must be recklessly and prematurely given which might wreck the already shaky peace of the Middle East. The greatest care must be exercised so that not a single bullet or gun in arms aid is used for purposes of aggression."

This is an encouraging statement. But it must be accompanied by more definite action than has been shown until now as a guard against putting matches to powder kegs.

As matters stand today, the Arab States can very easily divert weapons provided them for defense purpose for use against Israel. This aggravates the serious dangers in the Middle East which has enormous opportunities for expansion but whose peoples instead are compelled to arm for self-defense. Israel, instead of devoting all her energies to the economic upbuilding of the country, is forced to retain a strong army whose personnel must be provided with weapons.

It is fortunate that the men in Senator WILEY's position understand the issue. The Wisconsin Senator, in his address in Dallas, "spoke of peace to the 'people of peace' " and paid Israel this compliment:

"I speak of the people fulfilling today the ancient Biblical prophecies of a land redeemed and a people saved—the people of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, the people who first brought to mankind the knowledge of the all-knowing, all-seeing, all-powerful Creator, the one God, incorporeal, just, and merciful.

"This is the 'people of the Book,' the holiest Book of mankind—the people who have never forgotten that 'from Zion shall go forth the law'; from out of Zion was to go forth the message—as it has gone forth—to fill mankind anew with the glory of God and of God's children.

"In Zion, on ground sacred to mankind's three great religions—Judaism, Christianity, and Islam—is being redemonstrated the heights which the human spirit can reach in building, in creating, in developing."

The peace referred to by the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee is possible only in an area where there is economic security. Israel strives for it and seeks to influence her neighbors to work in the direction of amity and cooperation. This can be achieved not through armament but through disarmament. It can be attained in building, in creating, in developing. Working together, Israelis and Arabs can turn the deserts of the Middle East into garden spots. Let this be the aim of all men of good will, especially of Americans who refuse to tolerate unsavory political schemes of those who, like the Arab effendis, seek to perpetuate the poverty of the fellahin for the sake of the retention of their own powers. There can be an end to the powers of the exploiters, who seek war, by averting economic crisis in Israel and by assuring the cooperation of Israelis and Arabs.

Award of Pulitzer Prize for National Defense Editorials Written by Don Murray

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STUART SYMINGTON
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 6, 1954

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, recently Mr. Don Murray, editorial writer of the Boston Herald, was signally honored by the selection of his editorials for the Pulitzer prize for distinguished editorial writing.

This highest honor that can come to a newspaperman was given to Mr. Murray in recognition of his series of editorials on national defense which appeared last year in the Boston Herald.

Because these editorials made a significant contribution to the national security of our country, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an article which appeared recently in the Boston Herald.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Boston Herald of May 4, 1954]

HERALD EDITORIALS WIN PULITZER PRIZE—SERIES BY DON MURRAY, 29, HELPED RESHAPE NATIONAL DEFENSE POLICY

The Boston Herald on its fourth Pulitzer prize for distinguished editorial writing yesterday for a series of editorials on national defense written by Don Murray.

The Herald's total of Pulitzer prizes for editorials became double the number of any other American newspaper with the announcement of yesterday's award. At 29, Murray became one of the youngest men ever given the coveted award.

The scope and import of Murray's editorial work which won the prize was revealed in comments of Robert B. Choate, publisher of the Boston Herald, in submitting the editorial series to the prize committee.

"The survival of the free world, of course, depended on defense decisions. But so did the size of our budget, the nature of our industrial society, our foreign relations, the plans of our youth. * * *

"To find out what all these developments meant, to discover the problems which needed resolution, to lay bare the alternatives and reveal the course of decisions which were being made, our editorial writer (Murray) who specializes in this subject traveled to Washington and to other cold war command posts. He talked to generals and civilians; studied speeches, documents, books, and papers; spent many hours in conference with experts in Congress, in colleges, in laboratories and business offices, in the Pentagon, and in the field.

"These editorials were the subject of interest and controversy across the country. Reactions came from many sources; for example, high praise from a California Congressman and bitter attack from a New York Congressman. We were quoted in the United States Senate and, more important, on street corners. We feel that these editorials had some effect on the development of this Nation's military policy, which underwent a revolutionary change during 1953."

WOLLASTON NATIVE

A World War II paratrooper, Murray visited all major United States Army and Air Force installations and cruised with a Navy air task force in collecting field information for his series of more than 100 editorials.

The $1,000 which accompanies the honor will be put to immediate use by Murray in buying materials for his long-term project in remodeling and redecorating his home at 10 Orchard Street, Wellesley Farms. As a hobby, he has been doing all the sanding, refinishing, and painting himself. He also paints in oils for relaxation.

A native of Wollaston, where his parents, Mr. and Mrs. John W. Murray live, at 11 Chester Street, Murray attended North Quincy High School and Tilton Junior College in New Hampshire before entering the Army in the spring of 1943. He served 30 months in the 17th and 82d Airborne Divisions, seeing action in France and Germany and during occupation of Berlin.

BIG CITY AWARD

After the war, he entered the University of New Hampshire and graduated in February 1948, an English major. Immediately after graduation he joined the Herald as an office boy and after 11 months became a reporter on the city staff. In December 1951, he joined the editorial writing staff.

Other awards won by Murray include a 1951 Associated Press Big City News award for a story on crowd reaction as a man stood on a Boston hotel roof contemplating suicide, and the National Board of Fire Underwriters' Gold Medal for outstanding public service for a series on the need for a fire code.

A frequent contributor to magazines, Murray's latest article, "How To Knock the Reds off Balance," will be published in the May issue of the Saturday Evening Post. It is a story of the Harvard Russian Research Center.

Murray is married to the former Miss Minnie Mae Emmerich, of Cambridge. They have a daughter, Anne, 4 months.

In 1950 he did postgraduate study at Boston University where he now teaches "Press and World Affairs" in the journalism division. His book reviews appear on the Suday Herald book page and at intervals on the editorial page of the Monday edition of the Herald.

Other Boston Herald editorial writers who have won the Pulitzer Prize are Frank W. Buxton, 1924; F. Lauriston Bullard, 1927; and John H. Crider, 1948. Frank Cushing, Boston Traveler photographer, won the Pulitzer Prive for news photos in 1948.

Secrest, New FTC Member, Was Coal Miner in Youth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 6, 1954

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, President Eisenhower made an excellent choice when he appointed Representative Robert Secrest to the Federal Trade Commission. Bob, my neighbor, is a real American—honest, sincere, a hard worker, and one who added honor and dignity to the roll of Congress. His service to his country, his family, and to his constituents is one worthy of highest praise. Best of luck to you and your fine family, Bob Secrest, in your new endeavors.

Mr. Speaker, I have included an article written by the Associated Press relative to Congressman Secrest:

SECREST, NEW FTC MEMBER, WAS COAL MINER IN YOUTH

WASHINGTON.—When Representative Bob Secrest was a lanky 6-foot 2-inch 16-year-old, he worked in a coal mine near Senecaville, Ohio.

The year was 1920. The Democrats were trying to elect former Ohio Gov. James Cox to the Presidency.

"I used to listen to the miners praise Jim Cox," recalled Secrest a few days after President Eisenhower nominated him to the Federal Trade Commission.

"Cox, as Governor, had gotten through some wonderful legislation for the coal miners. So, since Cox was a Democrat, I decided I was a Democrat, too.

"I was the first member of either side of my clan to be anything but a Republican, and that goes back to the American Revolution."

The decision, as it turned out, was a good one. Secrest's district—the 15th in southeastern Ohio—naturally takes to Republicans, but sent him to Congress for eight 2-year terms.

Since the Civil War, Secrest and the late George White, of Marietta, former Ohio Governor, have been the only Democrats elected to Congress from the 15th District.

Outside of Federal judgeships, the Secrest nomination for FTC Commissioner is probably the best patronage job obtained by Senator John Bricker and other Ohio Republicans since the Eisenhower administration came in.

Oddly, it went to a Democrat because it had to be a Democratic appointment.

The job, starting in September, is for 7 years. It pays $15,000 a year, the same as Secrest receives as a Congressman. But, as he points out, it doesnt' require all the added expenses of a Congressman.

"Also," he says, "I don't have to campaign every 2 years, with all the worries and expenses."

What is the political philosophy of 50-year-old Bob Secrest, whose job as Commissioner will be to help police fair-trade practices of American business?

"I'm a conservative," he says, "but not blindly conservative."

A glance at his legislative record shows that Secrest has voted with both Republicans and Democrats. As he puts it: "I judge each issue on its merits."

For example: Historically, Democrats favor low tariffs. Secrest has always wanted them high. The Fair Deal went in heavily for aid to Europe. Secrest consistently opposed this.

On the other side, Secrest has voted for broadened social security, the Tennessee Valley Authority (but not when the legislation called for steam-plant construction) and anti-holding-company laws.

"I'm 100 percent for private ownership," he says. "That's one reason I've been so strongly against communism because it would mean state ownership of business."

For Ohio Democrats, the Secrest nomination must be, politically speaking, disappointing. It removes from their small congressional delegation (only 5 out of 23) one of their toughest campaigners.

Bricker's office made it plain that this was an important byproduct of the nomination—the increasing odds in favor of a Republican gaining Secrest's seat in the fall.

Even a vote getter like Gov. Frank J. Lausche couldn't win one of Secrest's counties in 1950. Secrest won them all—Guernsey, Monroe, Morgan, Muskingum, Noble, Perry, and Washington.

In 1952 Lausche won in Secrest's district by 1,126 votes; President Eisenhower's winning margin was 25,043; Secrest's was 27,959.

Recent Talks Between Prime Minister Churchill and President Eisenhower

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 6, 1954

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the recent talks between Prime Minister Churchill and President Eisenhower constitute one of the most important events of recent times.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record a penetrating analysis made by the Dallas Morning News of the problems which were before the conference between the two leaders.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

RED PROBLEMS FACE LEADERS

Dwight Eisenhower and Winston Churchill, talking internationally today, have two convincing arguments for their consideration. With only one dissenting vote, the Federal Senate Friday passed the Lyndon Johnson resolution which reaffirms the intent to keep Communist governments out of the three Americas by all means available. But a few days earlier, Congress had received the sharp mandate of almost 1 million American signers to maintain exclusion of Red China from the United Nations. This second warning carries to yet another international conversation. It needs to be heeded at New Delhi, where Nehru and Chou En-lai are discussing the relationships of India and Red China.

The Caracas resolution, which the Johnson move reaffirms, was not an academic move when it was made in March of this year. The signatories understood then how far Kremlin tentacles had reached into Guatemala and were probing elsewhere. It is probable that most of the American republics understand that action must be decisive.

These events are likely to be uppermost in the Eisenhower-Churchill discussions. But it is by no means a simple matter for either leader to formulate a policy on which the future of Britain and this country as well as of all Europe can be based with certainty.

In part the decisions must be military. In part, agreements must be made as to trade. Uncertainty in the EDC support of France and Italy enter into any final conclusion. The $64 question centers on the ultimate policy in southeast Asia now that the French grip is being prized loose and the Pacific island areas are threatened by the Red march.

Through the whole series of questions runs the Red line that must be faced.

Admitting Aliens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 6, 1954

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, this morning there appeared in the New York Times a very interesting letter under the headline "Admitting Aliens." The letter was written by Mr. Irving M. Engel, one of the great lawyers of New York, and an outstanding civic leader. I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

ADMITTING ALIENS—RECENT SENATE ATTACK ON McCARRAN-WALTER ACT REPORTED

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

On June 23 the Senate considered a bill, S. 2862, sponsored by Senator McCarran, of Nevada, providing for admission on a nonquota basis of 385 Basque sheepherders. This special legislation was expected to pass unnoticed and in a routine manner, as had happened in the previous two sessions of Congress. The unexpected flurry of floor debate that ensued merits public attention. Unfortunately, the press passed this incident by utterly unnoticed.

The interesting debate which occupies several pages of the Congressional Record was provoked by a number of cogent and provocative questions posed by Senator Herbert H. Lehman, of New York. Although he indicated his intention to vote for the bill, and while he did not question the legitimate needs of the sheepraising industry, Senator Lehman challenged the consistency of Senator McCarran in pressing for such special legislation with his position on the McCarran-Walter Act, which codifies the basic immigration law of the land, and of which he was author and chief defender.

Senator LEHMAN noted that the immutable principle of the McCarran-Walter Act is that immigration into the country must be based on the presumed national origin of the alien in question. The act breaks down the total allowable annual immigration into rigid ironclad subquotas. Because of this inflexible discriminatory system thousands of cases of human tragedy and heartbreak occur constantly, worthy and deserving relatives being denied admission because they have been born in a country with an oversubscribed quota.

LABOR SHORTAGES

Accordingly, Senator LEHMAN asked of Senator MCCARRAN, who did not even deign to be present to defend his bill: "What about the American citizens who have mothers and fathers, grandparents, brothers and sisters, foster-parents or foster-children in Italy, Greece, Norway, Portugal, Turkey, Hungary, and Czechoslovakia? Are they not deserving of the same consideration as the sheep of Nevada?" He went on to cite the economic needs of New York State and other States for skilled and unskilled men and women, tailors, shoemakers, engineers, scientists, watchmakers, diamond cutters, vegetable growers, and lumberjacks. Would Senator MCCARRAN, he asked, "raise his voice in behalf of special bills to admit some Swiss watchmakers, some Czech tailors, some Greek goatherders, some Italian farmers, and some Polish bootmakers in a nonquota status?"

Referring further to the Mexican wetback problem, Senator LEHMAN called attention to the millions of persons coming into this country illegally from Mexico without the slightest examination or scrutiny. He charged that the defeat of proposals offered by himself and others in Congress for a sufficient appropriation for the Immigration Service to enable it to put a stop to this illegal movement, and for the enactment of sanctions against those who knowingly employ illegal entrants, was led by some men who have selfish interest in illegal immigration into this country for the purpose of obtaining cheap labor * * *.

Although he did not mention these men by name, it is a matter of record that some of the most ardent proponents of the McCarran-Walter Act have been instrumental in blocking efforts to deal with the Mexican wetback problem.

RESTRICTIVE LAW

Senator LEHMAN further attacked the McCarran-Walter Act, and particularly the national origins system, as contrary to the ideals, principles and traditions of the United States. He criticized the sheepherders bill as intended to get around the restrictive provisions in this act for the benefit of one small group and one region of our country.

Citing the campaign pledges of President Eisenhower for revision of the McCarran-Walter Act, he criticized the administration for having made no move in this session to bring up, or to urge the consideration of, this vital subject. * * * He commented ironically on the fact that only a trickle of refugees had thus far been admitted under the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, and observed that it may be that more aliens will come in under the pending bill for the relief of the Nevada sheepherders than under the administration's bill for the relief of all the refugees, escapees, persecutees, orphans, and surplus population in Europe and Asia.

Finally, Senator LEHMAN, supported by Senator HUMPHREY, called for congressional hearings on the manner in which the McCarran-Walter Act was operating and particularly to consider the bill sponsored by him for revision of that act.

IRVING M. ENGEL,
President, The American Jewish Committee.

NEW YORK, *June 29, 1954.*

Memorandum on Foot-and-Mouth Disease

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 6, 1954

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a joint House resolution in an effort to prevent the illegal disposition of a herd of Charollais cattle now located at Lafayette, La. I direct your attention to the provisions of this resolution and hope that it will meet with the favor of this body.

In order that the situation may be understood by all of you I am submitting to you for your examination a memorandum on foot-and-mouth disease in relation to the Charollais cattle described in my bill, and which memorandum was submitted to the Department of Agriculture by our former colleague in this body, James Domengeaux, who represented the Third Congressional District of Louisiana with distinction for so many years. Following is the memorandum:

The Secretary of Agriculture issued an order, effective September 1, 1952, declaring all of Mexico free of foot-and-mouth disease, thereby permitting entry of cattle in compliance with the regulations contained in BAI Order 379. The border remained open from such date to May 23, 1953, during which time 255,703 cattle from Mexico were permitted entry under said order. (It is denied, notwithstanding the statement of Dr. M. R. Clarkson, Deputy Administrator, Agricultural Research Service, at the meeting of May 3, 1953, in the office of Hon. True D. Morse, Under Secretary, that the regulation prevented the entry of cattle from certain southern States of Mexico because of the foot-and-mouth disease. This is incorrect and we insist that Dr. Clarkson cannot present regulations in substantiation of his statement.)

Under section 92.31 of said order, cattle intended for importation from the Mexican States of Tamualipas, Nuevo Leon, Coahuila, Chihuahua, Sonora, Durango, and the Territory of Vaja, California, shall be allowed, provided the importer delivers to the inspector in charge at port of entry, in writing, an application for inspection of cattle for future entry.

The Charollais cattle, although originally from the State of Pueblo, Mexico, were brought and remained for a period of over 120 days before entry, in the State of Coahuila, Mexico, where they were kept in small corrals, fed a balanced diet, and sprayed every 15 days. (See affidavit of former owner, Henri Gilly, executed before United States consul in Paris, France.)

Under a provision of the quarantine acts, when livestock have been in a country from which they are shipped to the United States more than 60 days, they are classified as livestock of that country. Accordingly, we contend that section 92.31 applied.

On November 17, 1952, in compliance with the requirements of section 92.31, Alphe A. Broussard directed a written application to John R. Alexander, agent, BAI, at port of entry, post-office box 1102, Del Rio, Tex., as follows:

"We desire to import 64 Charollais cattle for breed purposes from the State of Coahuila, Mexico. These cattle consist of 40 females, aged 2 months to 4 years, and 24 bulls, aged 6 months to 5 years. An early inspection date would be much appreciated." (See copy of letter attached to petition presented to Judge Ben Rice, left with Mr. Morse.)

The cattle remained on the Mexican side of the border awaiting legal entry. During this time some of the cattle were inspected and bled, and found free of any contagious infectious diseases around January 6, 1953, near Villa Acunna, Mexico, by Drs. A. A. Holbrook, A. C. Parker, and J. R. Alexander, officials of the Bureau of Animal Industry, Department of Agriculture, United States Government.

Regulations provide that cattle from Mexico are to be accompanied by a proper certificate of a salaried veterinarian of the Mexican Government, showing that they have been inspected, found free from evidence of communicable disease, and that as far as it has been possible to determine, they have not been exposed to any such disease.

The cattle were spot-checked and bled by Dr. Madrigal Magellon, chief veterinarian doctor, Central Office, Mexico. The certificate, dated January 2, 1953, shows that the cattle were free of disease. (See photostatic copy attached to petition for mitigation and remission presented to Customs.)

Dr. Flavio Altiere Sarubbi, Chief of Hygiene and Feeding, Central Office, Mexico, among other things, charged with the responsibility of reporting health conditions of cattle in Mexico, certifies that the Jean Pugibet herd, belonging to Henri Gilly, and sold to Alphe A. Broussard, has been free from infectious, contagious disease since 1943. This certificate is dated January 9, 1954. (See copy of certificate attached to petition above referred to. See also statement of Gen. Harry H. Johnson, codirector for U. S. Department of Agriculture, in foot-and-mouth eradication program in Mexico.)

Broussard substantially complied with B. A. I. Order 379, requiring that he obtain proper certificate of an official veterinarian of the Mexican Government showing cattle to be free from communicable disease.

Cattle were brought into the United States during the period from January 20, 1953, through April 20, 1953, when there existed no ban imposed by the United States on the importation of Mexican cattle from any part of Mexico, because of foot-and-mouth disease.

It was during this time that 255,730 cattle were imported from Mexico into the United States.

Had a permit to export the Charollais herd from Mexico been obtained from the Mexican officials, under the circumstances, it would have been proper for the United States Customs and Agriculture Department officials to issue a permit to import the Charollais cattle into the United States in the same manner that the 255,730 cattle were allowed to be imported from Mexico into the United States during the period of time when the foot-and-mouth embargo was lifted; that is, during the period from September 1, 1952, through May 23, 1953.

When the Mexican border was closed to further importation of cattle on May 23, 1953, there were still 27 head of Charollais cattle belonging to Broussard at the border which had not been brought into this country. These 27 head of cattle are still in Mexico.

It is contended that since the Charollais cattle were brought into the United States during the period of time when all of Mexico was declared free of foot-and-mouth disease, that the Department of Agriculture could not upon seizure in Louisiana of the cattle order the slaughter of them. That the Department of Agriculture cannot now legally recommend to Customs the slaughter of the cattle, and to make such recommendation knowingly without legal sanction would be improper.

Had any of the Charollais cattle been brought into the United States during the existence of the foot-and-mouth ban, and while the border was closed to importation of cattle, under the existing regulations, the Department of Agriculture was required to slaughter all of the Charollais cattle upon sizure, however, since the border was open to importation of cattle, and Mexico was declared free of foot-and-mouth disease when all of the Charollais cattle were brought into the United States, slaughter of the seized cattle was, then, as well as now, unauthorized by existing law.

The Charollais cattle had been in the United States for over 15 months near Lafayette, La., by seizure of Customs, and under quarantine by the Louisiana Livestock Sanitary Board. The quarantine from June 1953, when the cattle were first seized, until October 25, 1953, was not enforced. Thousands of people during this period were allowed to enter the premises where the cattle were kept. The cattle during this period were in charge of Charles Broussard, son of Alphe A. Broussard. The Louisiana Livestock Sanitary Board, nor BAI, had at that time considered the situation dangerous because no employee of either agency aided in the enforcement of the quarantine. Since foot-and-mouth virus is spread by people, to have allowed them to trample the premises where the Charollais were kept, was in violation of every known regulation and precaution recommended and employed by Agriculture.

"Next to infected animals, human beings are considered the most important factor in the spread of the disease" (foot and mouth). Farmers' Bulletin No. 666, Department of Agriculture, page 16.

The cattle have been under supervision of Government and private veterinarians. The Bureau of Animal Industry, United States Department of Agriculture, through its veterinarians and inspectors, have inspected and examined the cattle weekly, and also every 28 days since June 1953. At no time have any symptoms of foot-and-mouth disease, tick fever, or other contagious diseases evidenced themselves.

From the time when the Charollais cattle were brought into the United States, to date, they have continuously commingled with other cattle of the United States and Louisiana origin, never subjected or exposed to animals suspected of foot-and-mouth infections. When the Charollais cattle were first brought to Louisiana on Broussard's ranch in Vermillion Parish, they were pastured with over 400 Louisiana cattle. In May 1953, 17 adults and 5 calves were pastured on a ranch near Newellton, La., with over 1,000 Louisiana cattle. In March 1953, 3 bulls from this herd were pastured near Sulphur, La., with a large number of Louisiana cattle. Afterward all of the Charollais cattle, excepting the 3 bulls, were pastured under quarantine with other cattle of Louisiana origin near Lafayette, La., where they are presently located.

The commingling of the Charollais cattle with Louisiana cattle, as above outlined, actually constitutes one of the principal tests in determining the existence or nonexistence of foot-and-mouth infection of cattle and of the premises where the suspicious cattle pastured. The authority for this statement is found in Farmers' Bulletin No. 666 of the United States Department of Agriculture, prepared by specialists of the BAI, and by Mr. John Mahler, formerly Chief of the Bureau, and Mr. Jacob Traum. On page 19 thereof, under subtitle "Testing Infectivity of Premises and Restocking," we find the following statement:

"In order to determine that premises, after slaughter of infected and exposed animals and other cleaning and disinfection, are free from the virus, the premises are tested by officials who place a few animals on them after 30 days from the date of completion of disinfection. Such restocking, however, is practicable only if no active infection is present in the locality. Frequently inspection of these animals is made, and if they remain healthy, further restocking may be conducted gradually. As a further safeguard, inspections of new stock are made at regular intervals."

In the pamphlet prepared by the United States Department of Agriculture, BAI, under direction of Mr. B. T. Simms, formerly Chief of Bureau, entitled "Instructions for Employees Engaged in Eradicating Foot-and-Mouth Disease," on page 31 thereof we find:

"The inspection of the test animals should commence 48 hours after they are placed on the premises and be repeated every 48 hours for 10 days, after which semiweekly inspections should be continued to the end of the 30-day test period, when the owner may be allowed to restock gradually. Weekly inspections should be continued regularly during the 60 days following the 30-day test period. At the end of 90 days from the date the test was commenced, provided no disease has appeared, the premises may be released from quarantine."

PERIOD OF INCUBATION AND/OR INFESTATION OF FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE

The following is quoted as authority from Farmer's Bulletin, No. 666, United States Department of Agriculture, BAI:

Page 2 thereof: "Foot-and-mouth disease may attack the same animal several times."

Page 5 thereof: "The diagnosis of foot-and-mouth disease is not, as a rule, difficult when the disease is know to exist in the vicinity."

Page 2 thereof: "The period of incubation—that is, the time between exposure of an animal to infection and development of the disease in that animal—is variable, usually from 3 to 6 days. The disease, however, may appear in 24 hours, or in exceptional cases, not for 18 days or even longer."

Page 16 thereof: "There are conditions which may exist in the field under which the virus may remain active for 1 or 2 months and even longer."

It is affirmed by Broussard that application to the Bureau for permission to bring the Charollais cattle into the United States was not denied. Broussard did apply and correspond with the Bureau in September and October 1952 for the purpose of bringing 38 head of cattle from Puebla, southern Mexico, into the United States. These were Charbray cattle and not the Charollais herd. The department denied this application, not because these cattle came from an area where foot-and-mouth disease may have existed, since the Secretary had declared that all of Mexico was free of foot-and-mouth disease, but because they came from an area where cattle tick existed. (See correspondence between Broussard and C. L. Gooding, in charge, Inspection and Quarantine Division, dated September 8, October 23, 1952.) The Bureau has in its file communications between these people other than the above which definitely indicates that these cattle could be brought into the State of Texas only after a quarantine period of 15 days on the border, under the provisions of section 92.34.

Broussard was denied permission, upon proper request, by the Louisiana Livestock Sanitary Board, through its veterinarian, B. F. Wheeler, which opinion was approved by the Animal Research Service, Animal Quarantine Branch of the United States Department of Agriculture, to have said cattle examined by competent specialists. The stated reasons for this refusal was because an examination by persons unofficially connected with the quarantine was inconsistent with the purpose of the quarantine. This is indefensible in view of the fact that no effort was made to enforce the quarantine for many months after the cattle were seized and thousands of people were allowed to walk in and around the premises where the cattle were kept. It is contended by Broussard that the reason why an examination of the cattle was refused is because it can be established that the cattle are free of foot and mouth disease. (Attached photostatic copy of telegram from B. F. Wheeler, State Veterinarian.)

It is contended that the case of *C. A. Richard* v. *James E. Manahan*, Collector of Customs, Civil No. 1341, United States District Court, District of Columbia, is a precedent for the return of the Charollais cattle to Broussard by Customs. In this instance eight head of cattle were returned into Vermont after having previously strayed into Canada when the border was closed because of the foot and mouth disease. The Broussard case differs from the Richard case in that the Canadian border was closed because of the foot-and-mouth disease, when the Richard cattle were returned to the United States, while the Mexican border was opened to importation of cattle from Mexico, and the Secretary of Agriculture by Order 379 declared all of Mexico free of foot-and-mouth disease, when the Charollais cattle were brought into Louisiana. In the Richard case the Department of Agriculture did not object to the recommendation of Customs that the animals be returned to Mr. Richard.

It is affirmed that the Department of Agriculture does not have the authority under existing law or regulations to order the slaughter of the Charollais cattle, or to effect their removal from their present location; therefore any recommendation to Customs for their slaughter or removal to another country, or elsewhere, is without legal authority.

The Great Senator From Nebraska

SPEECH

OF

HON. A. FERNÓS-ISERN

RESIDENT COMMISSIONER FROM PUERTO RICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 2, 1954

Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN. Mr. Speaker, the flags at half-mast at the Capitol indicate, most properly, that the passing of Senator HUGH BUTLER, is mourned most deeply, by the entire Nation. The State of Nebraska has again suffered a great loss. The noncontiguous areas of the Nation, in which the Senator took such great interest, also must suffer this loss very deeply. For many years benevolent effects and advancements, largely the results of his statesmanship, will be felt in those areas. Senator BUTLER personally visited all of the overseas areas of the United States, observed at firsthand their problems, and then did his best to solve or help solve these problems as he saw them.

As chairman of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, Senator BUTLER felt a great responsibility to the United States citizens, resident many thousands of miles away.

As to the people of Puerto Rico in particular, those I represent, I must say that they have lost a true and constant friend in the passing of the great Senator. He took an interest which seemed almost personal in obtaining for them the full self-government so necessary for the dignity of man and which they now enjoy in the Commonwealth.

In the 80th Congress, Senator BUTLER introduced and sponsored in the Senate, legislation to permit Puerto Rico, for the first time, to elect its own Governor. In the 81st Congress, Senator BUTLER was an active sponsor of what became Public Law 600 which authorized the organization of a constitutional government by the people of Puerto Rico, and in the 82d Congress, he helped obtain Senate approval of the constitution of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico which resulted in the creation of the Commonwealth.

The whole world has focused attention on the creation of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico as one of the most promising and inventive political creations in history. It is no wonder that Puerto Rico's heart is heavy today.

But he interested himself not only with the bigness of things. I recall how distressed he was with a tiny hospital in Charlotte Amalie, St. Thomas, V. I., and how he worked that the people of that little community might have better hospital facilities. Yes; the people of Puerto Rico have lost a dear friend as have the people of Hawaii, Alaska, the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific—as have the people of Nebraska—as have the people of the entire United States.

Senator **Butler** was a kind and quiet man; albeit he was a tower of strength in the United States Senate. When I arrived in Washington by the end of 1946, to fill the unexpired term of my predecessor, Congress had already adjourned; so it was not until the 80th Congress that I really had the opportunity to work with the Members of Congress and with the Senate. One of the very first friends I made here, a solid one upon whom I was to lean heavily during the ensuing years, was Senator **Butler**. He was never too busy to consult on a matter important to Puerto Rico, nor to help all he could. He never once failed the people of Puerto Rico. He never once failed me. During my absence from Washington, the great Senator was as available to members of my staff as he was to me.

I think I have never known a kinder person nor a stronger one. I feel deeply a personal loss, although I know that Senator **Hugh Butler**'s monuments are many, and that his light will shine eternally in the sunlit fields of Nebraska, in the blue waters of the Caribbean, in the woodsy wilderness of Alaska, and the golden sands of Hawaii—and throughout the hundreds of islands in the great Pacific.

The Late Honorable Joseph R. Farrington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 6, 1954

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I was shocked when I learned of the untimely death of my friend and colleague, Joe Farrington. As the Delegate from Hawaii Joe, as he was affectionately known to all of us, served his people with honor and high distinction. He gave his very best for principles he thought right; he was honest, sincere, and one whose loyalty and integrity could not be questioned. The House has lost an able and honored Member. To Mrs. Farrington and the other members of the family we extend our deepest sympathy. You have lost a faithful and loving father and husband and we have lost a loyal friend. Our Nation has lost a great American. May God give you guidance in the days ahead.

The Man From Texas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LLOYD M. BENTSEN, JR.

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 6, 1954

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Speaker, the Alsop brothers, syndicated newspaper columnists who know whereof they speak, have paid high tribute to the ability of our minority leader in the Senate, **Lyndon B. Johnson**, of Texas. Because their column in the Washington Post of Monday, July 5, is fitting tribute to Senator **Johnson**'s outstanding record of party leadership and bipartisan support, I seek permission to include it in the **Congressional Record**:

MATTER OF FACT—THE MAN FROM TEXAS

(By Joseph and Stewart Alsop)

As the Congress goes into the home stretch this month it is already clear that this melancholy session has ruined some reputations, severely damaged a good many others, and really made only one. The man to make a serious reputation this year is **Lyndon B. Johnson**, of Texas.

The professional investigators may be better known to the television audience than the Senate minority leader, but the big, tough, ambitious, long-headed, energetic, and enormously hard-working **Johnson** has been saluted by **Harry F. Byrd**, of Virginia, as "the best leader I've seen in the Senate." And that is good enough for the man from Texas.

Johnson is interesting in several different ways. For one thing, by his work, he illustrates all too clearly the fullness of President Eisenhower's bad luck with his own party.

If the Republican performance in Congress even slightly resembled the Democratic performance, as organized and directed by **Johnson** and wily, courageous **Sam Rayburn**, the Eisenhower administration would already have the kind of coherent, powerful record of accomplishment that its leadership deserves.

On at least two occasions, where the President's policy happened to coincide with Democratic views, **Johnson** has stepped in to rescue Mr. Eisenhower from defeat by his own party on really major issues.

One such issue was public housing. The House Republicans gutted the provision of cheap housing for lower income groups. A considerable number of Senate Republicans were ready to defy the leadership and go along with their friends in the House. But **Johnson** organized his Democrats to give the President about what he wanted.

Another issue was foreign trade. It is not generally known, but the hard old chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, **Dan Reed**, was actually playing with the idea of letting the Reciprocal Trade Act altogether die this year, on the ground that his committee had no time to deal with it. Then one of **Johnson**'s Democrats, Senator **Albert Gore**, of Tennessee, slyly offered the Clarence Randall trade program, including a 3-year extension of reciprocal trade, as a Senate amendment to the tax bill.

That meant weeks of debate on the tax bill in the Senate, a probable Senate victory for the Randall program, and other unpleasantness for Representative **Reed**. With great haste, the 1-year extension of reciprocal trade was reported and passed in the House. If the President had chosen to rally the Eisenhower Republicans in the Senate, they and **Johnson**'s legion would have been able to transform the 1-year extension into the bill the President really wanted.

Johnson's intervention in these two issues was partly conviction, partly politics, of course. But it was not politics at all when **Sam Rayburn**, speaking for **Johnson** as well as himself, went to President Eisenhower some months ago to say that if there were hard and unpopular things to be done in the defense and foreign policy fields, the President could count on Democratic support.

Johnson and **Rayburn** are symbols indeed of the opportunities that the President has thus far neglected, to work with a large majority group of moderate men in both political parties, and to leave the anti-Eisenhower Republicans yowling and withering somewhere out in right field. It is an opportunity Mr. Eisenhower may yet take at the next session, if his present discontent with his own party in Congress continues unabated.

Lyndon Johnson is interesting, too, in the sense suggested by Senator **Byrd**'s characterization. Congressional leadership is one of the most important and least understood arts that make the wheels of the American Government go round. It involves everything from the exact knowledge of which Capital beer joints are patronized by the Senators who like beer (when they have to be rallied for a vote), all the way to a truly surgical knowledge of that most complex of all subjects, senatorial human nature.

Johnson's skill as a leader has been demonstrated during this session in an indisputable manner. From a purely technical standpoint, there have been few more astonishing feats in Senate history than **Johnson**'s feat of inducing the most conservative southerners to vote solidly with the liberal northern Democrats, to send the Taft-Hartley Act back to committee. That one required Johnson's talking personally and at length to every single member of his party in the Senate.

The unanimous Democratic vote on the Taft-Hartley amendment in turn revealed another aspect of **Johnson**'s success—his success in uniting the two wings of his party so that Senator **Walter F. George** is now busily indorsing Senator **Hubert Humphrey** for reelection. And the way the **McCarthy** issue has developed has also proven the astuteness of **Johnson**'s political judgment (much criticized by the northerners as being unprincipled, which perhaps it was) in wanting to leave that issue to the Republicans.

Johnson is no knight in shining armor. He is an able, practical politician, who does not believe in demogoguing when the doors are closed, and serves his party's interests as well as his country's. But **Johnson**'s objective, a moderate and united Democratic Party, neither Dixiecrat nor New Dealish, is certainly not a contemptible objective. And in these days when the Congress has virtually abandoned legislating in favor of investigating, the emergence of a prime legislative chieftain of the tradtional American pattern is a cheering event, even if he comes from among the Democrats instead of among the Republicans.

An Injustice Corrected

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ERRETT P. SCRIVNER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 6, 1954

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, my attention has been called to an article appearing in the July 1954 issue of Service, written by Merle Thorpe, known to newsmen the country over.

This article, which deals with the subject of depletion allowance, follows:

NEVER UNDERESTIMATE THE POWER OF A CARROT

(By Merle Thorpe)

There is sore need today of a better understanding of the depletion provision in the tax law and, indeed, of what makes American business tick. It is more than an academic question. As our industrial processes become more and more complex, the people who rule in this country, not understanding, are apt to strike out blindly.

H. G. Wells once expressed it this way, "I greatly fear for western civilization and particularly for the United States. It will be a race between education and catastrophe."

And Owen D. Young, a great business statesman, said 25 years ago:

"Only one danger confronts us. The future electrical development of the United States is bound to be enormous. No one can prevent it, and all must profit by it. The danger is that the growth of our industry will outrun public understanding; that people will see and fear our size without understanding our service."

How prophetic. Not understanding, the people responded to the hue and cry of "power and light companies are bleeding the people white," and as a result, political agencies produce today nearly one-third of the kilowatts produced in the United States.

Josh Billings expressed this phase of the national danger in his own inimitable way when he said, "It ain't that the people are ignorant, it's that they know so much that ain't so."

Secretary Morgenthau confirmed the observation of Josh Billings; when he left the Treasury he described the depletion tax provision as "an iniquitous special privilege."

Greater confirmation of the lack of understanding comes from Oregon's Senator who threatens to "vote against Oklahoma drilling dry holes at the expense of the people of Oregon."

President Truman announced pontifically, "This allowance goes on and on, year after year, even though the original investment in the property has already been recovered tax-free."

(Allowance, by the way, is a bad semantic. It is not a monthly check sent to a boy at college; it is a recognition of an inequity which was unwittingly included in the income-tax law.)

Yes, it goes on year after year, and in the 28 years of its operation, it added to the country's wealth by the discovery of 60 billion barrels of crude oil.

Secretary of the Treasury Snyder confirmed Wells, Young, and Billings, when he asserted, "The reduction of the depletion allowance would tend to reduce windfalls while protecting incentives for exploration."

This takes the prize for double-talk. A "windfall" means winnings, and since winnings are the incentives for exploration, how can you reduce the winnings and still protect the incentives.

But it was left to the head of the Office of Price Administration to reach the height of abysmal ignorance of an economic situation. Appearing before a congressional committee, he observed that it was an impoverished science that permits an industry to continue to drill dry holes. The wells that are going to be dry should not be drilled, he said with official "ipse dixit."

One cause of this lack of understanding is that in the game of finding oil we hear only of the winners—not the losers. I shall not venture into that unhappy subject of the losers. It has been said that most wildcatters die broke. I don't think it has been that bad—but a sound economist, Dr. Carruthers, of Cornell, after a long study of the question, came to the conclusion that more money has been put into oil production than has ever been taken out of it.

Perhaps the most intellectually tricky of all the criticisms of the oil producer's tax rights is the charge of double privilege. The oil producer, according to this argument, is allowed to charge off depletion, tax-free, and then, in addition, to charge off intangible drilling costs, tax-free. This is assailed as double privilege or double deduction.

It is not a privilege, but a correction of an injustice to a group of citizens which the writers of the income-tax law overlooked, and which later Congresses sought to rectify.

Down Their Throats

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT E. JONES, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 6, 1954

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I wish to include the following editorial which appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald on July 6, 1954:

DOWN THEIR THROATS

There are several ways in which the administration can fail to exert the kind of leadership necessary to obtain support for its program. One is by choosing not to take positive issue with demagogues who distort its program and alienate legislators whose votes are needed. Another is by trying to ram a questionable measure through by administrative subterfuge, without permitting discussion on its merits.

Surely the attempt of the administration to reintroduce private power into the TVA area by a "quickie" contract must be classed in this latter category. There is a respectable argument, as this newspaper has acknowledged, that the status of the Tennessee Valley Authority ought to be reassessed, and that additions to the Federal budget for new TVA steam plants would not be desirable now. But instead of arguing in this vein the administration sought to make the private contract a fait accompli before congressional committees had a chance to investigate. Now it is disclosed that the utility company favored by the Atomic Energy Commission, under the President's order, had not even seen specifications for the west Memphis plant when it made its April 10 proposal—a shocking situation. There are indications that another group which held out the possibility of a lower contract price may have been discouraged from bidding.

This is the sort of thing that, had it occurred under a Democratic regime, would have united the Republicans in a roar of righteous outrage. It is producing much the same reaction in the TVA area, and if the administration is looking toward its political fences it can scarcely afford to ignore the protest. If there is merit in the administration position, it would not harm the project to delay it long enough to focus congressional scrutiny. But if the whole affair is the shoddy deal it appears to be, the wisest and most courageous course would be for the administration simply to withdraw it and admit a mistake.

Rebating—A Pernicious Disease

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 6, 1954

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks I include an enlightening editorial, Rebating—A Pernicious Disease, appearing in the July 1, 1954, issue of the Insurance News of Boston, Mass.:

REBATING—A PERNICIOUS DISEASE

Rebating is still a widespread practice. It is a disease which has become pernicious. It drives many young men out of the insurance business. We have in mind the case of a young man who recently entered the life-insurance business and on his first case was told by his client that his previous agent always returned 30 percent of the premium. Our young man had the character to refuse, and thus lost the case. He remained in the business, but had to turn to accident and health and hospitalization instead of sticking principally to life for his income.

This is not fair to the industry, the youth, or the economy of the country. We in the insurance business know that the sale of life insurance is a great deal different from the sale of most commodities, particularly insofar as the many hours spent creating prospecti and studying the financial structure and economic obligations of the particular prospect.

The companies, which have all the statistics available to them, have arranged a commission scale based upon fair-value return to the salesman and making it more profitable to the efficient and able man.

To permit rebating is to make it impossible to bring into the industry the high type and efficient man the profession requires. The law on this subject is very clear. We need no immediate legislative acts, but we do, however, need an awakening by the insurance men and the public so that we will recognize rebating to be what it really is—a criminal and immoral method of doing business—and this applies just as much to the agent or broker paying the rebate as to the buyer of the insurance who accepts the rebate.

The Insurance News feels that in discussing this subject we are performing a service to the public as well as the industry since it follows that any insurance agent who will do a dishonest act in the form of rebating will also be dishonest in his other transactions both with his companies and with his insureds.

It has been suggested that the wording of a policy can be so construed to mean that unless the premium has actually been paid in full, the contract is void. Perhaps if the public was made more conscious of this interpretation this fact might act as a deterrent to the suggestion and acceptance of rebates.

In a discussion with the insurance commissioner, the Insurance News has been assured that in any instance where evidence is brought to the attention of the insurance commissioner the licensee will be dealt with summarily and a deputy commissioner will be assigned to hear the case.

The insurance business is a good, dignified business. Massachusetts is a great insurance center and in view of the fact that the insurance industry is to a very large extent the backbone of the entire economy of this country, it behooves all of us in the industry to guard against any illegal or immortal practices which may creep in. The vast majority of insurance men do business in a very ethical manner. We must not permit the few to injure the reputation of the many. Let's remember the story of the lean calf.

Communist Penetration of the Western Hemisphere

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 6, 1954

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Tyler Morning Telegraph which I think sums up very well the feelings of the people of my State on the question of Communist penetration of the Western Hemisphere.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JOHNSON RESOLUTION

The United States Senate has gone on record warning international communism to keep its hands off the Western Hemisphere, and the House is expected to follow suit at any moment.

The Senate passed Friday with only one dissenting vote a resolution framed originally by Texas' Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON. As it was passed, the resolution reads as follows:

"It is the sense of Congress that the United States should reaffirm its support of the Caracas Declaration of March 13, 1954, which is designed to prevent interference in Western Hemisphere affairs by the international Communist movement, and take all necessary and proper steps to support the Organization of American States in taking appropriate action to prevent any interference by the international Communist movement in the affairs of the states of the Western Hemisphere."

The warning, of course, is aimed at Russia in relation to the insurrection in Guatemala, where anti-Communist elements have arisen against the Communist-infiltrated government of President Jacobo Arbenz.

The resolution as introduced by Senator JOHNSON referred directly to the Soviet Union and urged "direct and appropriate" action. The final draft was changed to refer to the "international Communist movement," which would include Red China and other Soviet satellites, and "direct and appropriate" were changed to "necessary and proper" to make sure that there would be no implication that the United States Government was being asked to take direct military action in Guatemala.

The effect of the resolution will be to give the Eisenhower administration the backing of Congress in whatever moves must be made to combat communism in Latin America.

It is a restatement, not only of the Caracas Declaration, but also of the 131-year-old Monroe Doctrine, established when European powers were seeking to overthrow republics set up in former Spanish possessions.

Guatemala wanted the United Nations Security Council to look into its troubles, so that they can rely on Russia's veto to keep their own country's skirts clean.

Other Latin American nations and the United States, however, wanted the dispute submitted to an investigation by the Organization of American States, a subdivision of the U. N. which, by the U. N. and OAS charters, should first review any disputes in the Western Hemisphere.

The Security Council Friday night turned down Guatemala's bid affirming the charters of the two organizations.

Now it appears that Guatemala will cooperate with the OAS in an investigation.

The United States stands ready to cooperate with the OAS—the Senate resolution, though it has no power as a law, made that principle clear.

We want the mess cleaned up and the fighting ended. We also want this hemisphere free of Communist-dominated governments. The two aims are not incompatible if swift and decisive action is taken.

Be Sure To Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 6, 1954

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, a day of decision will be election day, November 2, 1954. It is the duty of every qualified voter to exercise his franchise and prove to the world that Americans value their right to take part directly in the election of Government officials and in the management and control of our Republic. The number of ballots cast will demonstrate to the world how much we value that privilege and will emphasize that the American form of government marches forward with determination, vigor, and strength. Everyone should carefully analyze the candidates to determine whether or not they believe in the philosophy of government that has made America a great Nation. Every candidate should make known his position on the issues confronting us, and also make known his record, both civilian and military. My record, a record of service with a service record, is the basis on which I seek reelection. My record is public and I invite your investigation. I am opposed to any program leading us down the road to socialism and communism; I oppose the Federal Government assuming powers which rightfully belong to the people back home; I oppose socialized medicine, unnecessary Federal expenditures, and will continue to strenuously oppose graft and corruption. We are winning the greatest battle of all time in preserving our form of government, restoring real stability in our domestic and our foreign affairs, and giving us all what we hope and pray for, a lasting peace. This program calls for outstanding leadership, honesty, integrity, careful planning and judicial administrating of the law. Be sure and vote Tuesday, November 2.

To Republican Leaders

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY W. WIER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 6, 1954

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an article written by Jack Kyle, national legislative representative, the 1902–14 Philippine Command Committee—Justi'tia Omnibus—Washington, D. C., and published in the National Tribune—the Stars and Stripes of Thursday, July 1, 1954.

The article is as follows:

TO REPUBLICAN LEADERS

GENTLEMEN: Although since Lincoln's time your party has often proclaimed, affirmed, and reaffirmed that this Republic is irrevocably committed "to care for him who shall have borne the battle and for his widow and orphan," the few surviving combat veterans of 150 particular engagements find it necessary in this year of 1954 to present this remonstrance.

On July 4, 1902, President Theodore Roosevelt proclaimed the Philippine Insurrection to be at an end in certain islands of the Philippines, but he specifically provided that the then existing hostilities in other sectors of the islands should continue. Indeed, those hostilities did continue until late in 1913, during which time there were 5,000 casualties and 60,000 square miles of the Philippine Archipelago were pacified. Gentlemen, the veterans who took part in those hostilities received the same campaign medal that was awarded to those who served prior to July 4, 1902.

In accordance with American tradition and with the unqualified approval of our people in 1920, the Congress undertook to pension all those who had served in Philippine hostilities without reference to dates of service, but it is a matter of record that soon after the enactment of a pension law for that purpose—and while your party was in power—those who took part in the engagements after July 15, 1903, were held to be ineligible for pensions under the said law.

To correct that injustice, however, and after an adequate public hearing, the Veterans' Affairs Committee of the House, on June 20 of last year, unanimously reported H. R. 5380 and strongly recommended the bill's enactment into law. The Republican Party has failed to permit that bill to be brought up for debate and a vote.

For a long time now, H. R. 5380 has been bottled up in the House Committee on Rules, this in spite of the fact that the chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs has twice asked that a rule be granted for the bill's consideration. And while the Committee on Rules thus maintains death-line silence, your humble remonstrants are going to their graves. Indeed, gentlemen, it is well known to the Republican leadership that the average age of these veterans is now 78 years; that they are not entitled to hospitalization, medical care, burial allowance, or even flags for their caskets. By what appears to be deliberate inaction, the Committee on Rules, upon which you have seated no less than three former chairmen of the Republican National Committee, is daily nullifying the fervent wish and desire of the appropriate legislative committee to extend a small measure of eleventh-hour justice to this most worthy group.

Does the Republican leadership now consider H. R. 5380 to be unwise legislation? If so, was it unwise last year when the Committee on Veterans' Affairs reported the bill favorably by unanimous action? Was it unwise in 1944 when every Republican in the House of Representatives voted for a similar bill for the same purpose?

Would this bill break the Treasury? The cost would be less than $800,000 a year—less than the carrying charge on any one of numerous foreign-aid obligations.

Would the bill create an undesirable precedent? Not at all. The legislative committee thoroughly explored that possibility and arrived at the unanimous conclusion that no precedent was involved, but if this bill is not enacted, a shameful precedent will have been established. If it is not passed, for the first time in this Nation's history the Congress will have subscribed to the ridiculous proposition that it is proper to pension one small part of a combat veterans' group while denying pensions to the remainder. Surely that is not what Lincoln had in mind when he stressed the obligation of this Nation "to care for him who shall have borne the battle and for his widow and orphan."

Time is of the essence, gentlemen, and it is wholly within your power to facilitate this small measure of justice.

Jack Kyle,
(For and on behalf of the 1902–14
Philippine Command Committee).
Washington, D. C.

Reenlistment Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 6, 1954

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following article from the Army, Navy, Air Force Register of June 26, 1954:

Reenlistment Problem

Department of Defense officials and commanders of troops have been gravely concerned, for many months, over the declining reenlistment rate of military personnel having from 3 to 6 years' service. In some branches of the Armed Forces, this decline is rapidly depleting the group of professional noncommissioned officers and specialists upon whom large sums of money have been expended in their training. They form the backbone of combat units.

Many reasons have been advanced for men deciding against reenlistment and making the service a career. According to Adm. Arthur W. Radford, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the following are some of the more important ones:

"Overseas deployment and lack of family housing have necessitated frequent periods of lengthy family separation. Take-home pay has not kept pace with the cost of living. Compensatory benefits, traditionally utilized by the services to supplement modest pay, have been substantially reduced. These include primarily: medical care, housing, purchasing facilities, and an attractive plan for retirement. As a result, military personnel are unable to maintain a standard of living which is sufficiently attractive to act as an inducement to remain in military service and accept its inherent disadvantages. These events have taken place during a time when the trend in civilian industry has been in the opposite direction. Pay is lucrative in industry, particularly in the technical skills utilized by the military services. There has been a remarkable improvement in the benefits afforded to civilian workers. As a result, the military is unable to compete with private industry."

There is pending before the present Congress a number of measures designed to correct the conditions set forth above. Bills calling for increased medical care for dependents and a large family-housing program are among those in this group.

Perhaps the most attractive measure in connection with the reenlistment of men who have been trained in the military sciences is one which is designed to provide a much larger incentive in the form of a reenlistment bonus than is now authorized. The bill, now before the Senate Armed Services Committee, links the bonus payment directly to the pay grade of the individual and therefore offers more to the higher graded critical specialists among the enlisted personnel of the uniformed services. The Senate bill is designed to provide the greatest incentive for the first termer and the largest financial reward for the longer period of reenlistment.

Congress must take action on these problems before adjournment if the Members are really concerned about the welfare of the Nation's defenders.

Peaceful Coexistence—Peaceful for What and Existence for Whom?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 6, 1954

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, a writer once said:

> There are no colors so contrary as white and black, nor elements so disagreeing as fire and water, nor anything so opposite as men's thoughts and their words.

What is a vitally interested American public to draw from the statements made by our President and his esteemed visitor from the British Isles at the close of their recent long-weekend conference on foreign affairs?

Are we expected to swallow the hook, and sinker, with this line about "peaceful coexistence" between the free world and the Soviet Union?

As much as anything we hear today coming out of the Kremlin, this phrase, although perhaps not mean to do so, is a restatement of the party line.

In my judgment, peaceful coexistence doesn't represent American thinking on the subject, nor is it a realistic approach to the question under any circumstances.

In line with my thinking on the matter, Mr. Speaker, I wish to include in the Record at this time an editorial from the Boston Post of Friday, July 2, entitled "He Bought It."

It is interesting to note that this newspaper was an ardent supporter of the President at one time.

The article from the Boston Post follows:

He Bought It

When Great Uncle Winnie popped in from England for his "family conference" he was toting a Communist line of goods which has Moscow's approval at the moment—the old peaceful coexistence pitch.

President Eisenhower, who has had previous experience with Great Uncle Winnie, should have been wary of the foxy old boy, but he wasn't. And it appears he bought the peaceful coexistence line. Unless he was merely joking at his press conference—and it appears his sense of humor languished and died long since—he said that the hope of the world lies in peaceful coexistence with the Communists, but added that he wouldn't be a party to any agreement that makes anybody a slave.

What was wrapped up in Great Uncle Winnie's peaceful coexistence package? At the very least it contains full diplomatic recognition of Red China and the betrayal of Nationalist China, admission of Red China to United Nations and the ousting of Nationalist China, resumption of trade with both Red China and the Soviet Union, plus all the satellite nations and the nourishing of what the Communists are pleased to call cultural relations—which means another influx of Soviet agents into the United States.

The fact that President Eisenhower sweetened up his coexistence statement with the postscript that he wouldn't be a party to making anyone a slave doesn't alter the fact that implicit in this peaceful coexistence scheme is almost complete surrender to Soviet schemes.

No corroboration is needed for the fact that President Eisenhower bought what Great Uncle Winnie had to offer, even though it is against all the wishes of the American people who care about their country.

We can't coexist peacefully with the Soviet Union under any circumstances for any longer than it takes to get a signature down on whatever worthless scraps of paper may implement this fantasy. Peaceful coexistence is a phrase coined by Malenkov, hawked by all the Communists, including the Daily Worker, and now, surely to the American people's astonishment, being presented to them by their President.

Even the most foggy-headed and purblind oneworlders didn't dream that Great Uncle Winnie would succeed in his peaceful coexistence pitch. But the day after he departed we have our President accepting it, with only the very slightest reservations.

Save Money

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 6, 1954

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to have been the author of two bills considered major bills of the Eisenhower administration. One, the Highway Act of 1954, referred to by the majority floor leader, Congressman Charles Halleck, on June 22, and H. R. 6342, known as the lease-purchase bill. The Government is now renting 31,000 post-office buildings and 6,500 properties other than post offices throughout the country with no provision for eventually acquiring title of them. H. R. 6342 enables the Federal Government to acquire post offices and Federal buildings under lease-purchase contracts. When needed, buildings will be constructed to meet Government specifications but by private enterprise. In other words, private funds can be used to construct buildings necessary for Government operations and the Government will pay for them in the way of rent and become final owners in a reasonable period of time. This legislation will allow private capital to become operative, will give employment and save millions of dollars for the taxpayers of our country. I thank the leadership of the Congress for assisting me in having this legislation passed.

New Jersey Needs Additional Hospital Beds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 6, 1954

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, there are times when some misinformed or uninformed individual expresses the opinion that there is no need for additional hospital beds. The claim at times is also made by organizations that are national in scope. Individual members of such at times echo and reecho the claim that no necessity exists. It is astounding that such organizations, directly related to health, and, any of their members would be willing to advance such a claim. A claim that is so far from the truth. To be so careless with the truth can be for no other reason than selfishness and a desire to put personal and financial welfare above the general welfare of their fellowman.

The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has held hearings on the subject of health in all its different aspects, including need, cost and the types and kinds of methods utilized to provide more general opportunity to obtain health services, and, at less cost to the average citizen than at present. These hearings, covering a period of months, leave no doubt that a need exists for increased health facilities of every kind and character. And, likewise the need to provide all such health and hospital facilities at a price that makes them obtainable by citizens of low income. In fact the cost has become so great that the cost of prolonged illness is a burden even to those who are above the area of low incomes, and, above the average income. The testimony before the committee from witnesses well informed, as well as the numerous communications received by the committee leave no doubt of the need.

As an illustration of the need that exists for additional hospital beds, and other health facilities, in my own State of New Jersey, I include a report recently issued by the department of institutions and agencies, bureaus of hospital surveys and plans. It is as follows:

HOSPITAL CONSTRUCTION NEWS

NORTH ARLINGTON HEALTH CENTER

The officials of North Arlington conducted groundbreaking ceremonies for the local public health center on June 12, 1954. The health center was approved for participation from Hill-Burton funds in the amount of $14,280. The total estimated cost of the project is $35,700. The North Arlington Health Center marks the first health center approved for participation in the Hill-Burton program in New Jersey. Although the project is small, the plans indicate provision for expansion in the future.

HOSPITAL CONSTRUCTION FUNDS

The House of Representatives approved $75 million for the current Hill-Burton program in the 1954–55 budget. This fiscal year commences July 1, 1954. Although the matter is still pending before the Senate, all indications are that favorable action will ensue. If the $75 million is appropriated, it will be substantially more than was recommended by President Eisenhower in his budget message to Congress. The message requests was $50 million for current hospital construction activities.

If $75 million is appropriated by Congress for this next fiscal year, it will mean that New Jersey will be able to meet all of its current commitments to approved projects and have approximately $250,000 avaliable for allocation to new activities.

In addition to the above, the Wolverton amendments to the Hill-Burton Act are receiving favorable consideration. However, action on the bill is still pending, and while prospects appear bright, nothing conclusive can be reported.

If the amendment passes, the total Hill-Burton appropriation will be $135 million.

REVISED STATE PLAN

Preliminary figures have been prepared for the annual revision of the State plan for the construction of hospitals and health centers.

The estimated hospital beds which still need to be built in New Jersey are presented below and are shown in comparison with hospital bed estimates for the previous year:

Estimated bed need

Fiscal year	General Hospital	Mental hospital	Tuberculosis hospital	Chronically ill
1953-54	7,897	5,971	117	8,663
1954-55	8,415	5,931	----------	8,960

PENDING HOSPITAL CONSTRUCTION

There is a considerable backlog of pending hospital construction in New Jersey. Eighteen hospital boards indicate by plans and applications that they propose construction programs costing approximately $28,839,598; 29 hospital boards in the early planning stages indicate that they are considering programs which willl cost $4,6499,000. This indicates pending construction, on which estimates have been made, totaling $93,338,598.95.

This is not the entire story, for there are 38 additional projects being proposed on which cost estimates have not been determined as yet. In all, there are 85 pending projects in this State which probably will exceed $125 million in cost.

Apparently, hospital boards throughout the State are feeling the impact of population growth reported in our September 1953 News Letter. The estimated bed needs in the annual revision of the State plan are premised on current population figures. They do not take into consideration the anticipated population growth which will require additional hospital and other facilities.

However, the report of the pending hospital construction seems to indicate an increasing awareness on the part of hospital boards that expansion and replacement of their facilities must keep pace with growing demands.

It is a hopeful sign that the estimated hospital bed needs, mentioned in the preceding item, eventually will be met within a reasonable degree.

Notwithstanding the above facts and figures, issued by the New Jersey Department of Institutions and Agencies, establishing the need for additional hospital beds in New Jersey, an effort is being made by certain interests to defeat legislation I have introduced—H. R. 7700—the purpose of which is to provide a method by which individual doctors, groups of doctors, and health organizations can more easily procure the necessary funds to construct additional hospitals and health facilities. This is but a sample of the length to which some will go to deny to the people those facilities that are so necessary to care for our sick and injured. These interests call it "undesirable and unnecessary." Is it? I leave the answer to those who are in need of the facilities the bill seeks to provide.

Exposing the Plot Against the Service Pay Raise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 6, 1954

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Army Times of July 3, 1954:

EXPOSING THE PLOT AGAINST THE SERVICE PAY RAISE

The attempt by the Reserve Officer Association, and others, to add a military pay raise to the pending civil service pay increase is, in our opinion, praiseworthy but foredoomed to failure.

We have in the past expressed ourselves as favoring a military pay raise. It did not seem then that it would ever be necessary to defend present military pay scales as compared to those of classified Federal civilian employees.

After the publication last week of the Defense Department tables, allegedly camparing military and civilian take-home pay, however, the fallacies in that table must be pointed out.

That the table is based on false assumptions, that it is patently designed to lend the official weight of Defense Department figures to congressional opponents of a military pay increase, that it is loaded against the military in its manner of presentation, cannot be doubted. But these things must be demonstrated, not merely stated.

We will begin with the last of three points, the table. This was prepared in the office of Defense Comptroller W. J. McNeil, in response to a letter from Senator HOMER FERGUSON, Republican of Michigan. It compares the take-home pay of classified employees with that of military personnel drawing flight pay as well as with the vast majority who draw no flight pay.

The inclusion of flight pay in this table and of those drawing flight pay as a special class is entirely uncalled for. Flight pay is hazardous duty pay. It is given in recognition of the fact that flying involves risk of life over and above that of ordinary military service. Such special pay, as also parachute pay, diving pay and other types of hazardous duty pay, must be considered as a special bonus to those qualified to receive it and not a part of take-home pay for purposes of comparison with that of civilians.

The sole excuse that we can see for including this group is to provide additional propaganda for opponents of a service pay raise.

The table shows military take-home pay to include not only base pay, adjusted to reflect length of service, but also quarters allowance for both bachelor and married officers, subsistence and an allowance for services and benefits.

The table does not, however, make any deductions for certain expenses and sacrifices which are an essential part of military service.

By including quarters allowance and subsistence, the assumption is implicit that all soldiers receive these allowances, may then shop around for quarters, pocketing any savings that they can realize. In fact, both enlisted personnel and many bachelor officers draw no allowance. They must take Government quarters, whether or not they are equal to civilian quarters available for a like sum. This applies also to married personnel.

With respect to subsistence, somewhat the same factors apply.

The added compensation that the table alleges the military draw in terms of commissary benefits, medicare, clothing, and job transportation also is based on the assumption that all the military benefit equally. Fact is that they do not.

Many have never bought at a commissary store. Medicare for themselves is available to all military personnel. But it is not available to their dependents. Nine months' wait for dental care drives many to civilian dentists. Civilian physicians are called in when home calls are needed. Lack of medical facilities in many areas force the military to depend on civilan sources of medical care for their families.

A charge of $6 for civlian counterpart clothing fails to recognize that most large civilian firms, under pressure from labor unions, have assumed the expense of special clothing required by the job. In the military, supply of such special clothing—like the field uniform—ought not to be charged to take-home pay. And though job transportation is supplied enlisted personnel, most bachelor officers must get themselves to work.

In the table, classified bachelor civilian personnel do better than bachelor military personnel. But married military personnel are alleged to get more take-home pay than do comparable civilians.

This allegation is based on the assumption that there are no additional costs to the military when married. This, of course, is nonsense. Most military people must look forward to maintaining dual residences for long periods of their careers. They must allow for breakage of household goods when moving according to service needs, not their own.

Well known is the saying that "2 moves equal 1 fire."

These costs of moving, separation, travel for dependents are not deducted from military pay. Unless they are, the comparison is false.

Reason for this falsity is to be found in the military life itself.

Classified civilian employees are not, in the main, called on to make frequent moves. They are not separated from their families.

More than this, they work for 8 hours a day, draw overtime, except in the highest positions, if they work late. The soldier is on call—at work that is—24 hours a day. He deserves extra consideration for that.

Few civilian employees make a contract, when they take a Federal position, to die when ordered to do so. But this is implicit in the job of every military man.

The soldier may not quit. If he does he is tried, probably jailed. The civilian employee can walk out on the job whenever he wishes, without punishment of any kind.

It seems to us that a quarters allowance, subsistence, benefits, are small things to pay a man who is available to work 24 hours a day, who is a captive employee, the location of whose home depends on the caprices of national requirements, who must spend much of his career separated from his family, who is available to die at any time. The married general who draws the maximum in additional benefits gets less than $250 a month above base pay. Unless life is valued lightly, this seems a small price to pay.

The assumption that military and classified civilian grades are comparable gets no support in the legislative history of either the Career Compensation Act or in civil service bills. By assigning the pay grade of a civilian employee that fits the requirements to that of a military employee, any argument can be supported. Figures will do the bidding of the special pleader on either side, if properly juggled.

Why this was done by Mr. McNeil and Senator FERGUSON is only a matter of conjecture. At this time, the administration is supporting a civil service pay increase has turned down a military pay raise. The table could support that. It could also be designed to kill off, in the name of economy, military pay proposals for years to come.

McNeil and those in his office have frequently expressed themselves in opposition to a military pay raise. Whether they made their opportunity or simply took it the hearings do not disclose.

But a critical analysis of their table does demonstrate a basic dishonesty in its composition, its assumptions and its presentation. It seems fair to extend this dishonesty in considering the motivation behind the table's preparation.

Fourth of July Prayer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 6, 1954

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following inspiring Fourth of July prayer offered by Rev. Dr. Bernard Braskamp, Chaplain of the United States House of Representatives, for broadcast on the Voice of America and the Mutual Broadcasting System:

Almighty God, who art the supreme ruler of the universe and the guiding intelligence in the life of men and nations, we thank thee for this great day in the history of our beloved country, conceived in sacrifice and dedicated to liberty.

May our hearts expand with feelings of pride and patriotism, of gratitude and devotion as we contemplate and reflect upon the sacred significance of that immortal document, the Declaration of Independence, wherein the Founding Fathers stated in verbal form their inner faith and deepest conviction.

Grant that this may not only be a day of commemoration but of renewed consecration as we again highly resolve to join all the members of the human family in a sincere endeavor to hasten the dawning of that blessed time when the nations of the earth shall live together as a commonwealth of free men, enjoying a peace that is honorable, just, and righteous.

Show us how we may give the spirit of independence that larger geographical and numerical expansion which is inherent and regnant in the lofty ideals and principles it proclaims.

Humbly and penitently we are beseeching Thee that our hopes and aspirations for a finer social order and nobler civilization may soon be fulfilled and all mankind shall be united in the bonds of a strong and abiding fellowship of friendship and fraternity.

Hear our prayer in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

Tennessee Valley Authority Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT GORE

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 6, 1954

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address about the TVA program delivered by Mr. Paul R. Christopher, of the CIO, at Chattanooga, Tenn., on June 1, 1954.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

My name is Paul R. Christopher. I am the regional director of the National Congress of Industrial Organizations for region IV, covering the States of Tennessee, Kentucky, North Carolina, and Virginia. The CIO, from its inception, has been one of the most vigorous supporters of the TVA program. More than that, the more than 6 million men and women in our organization see in the TVA a philosophy and ideal that we can embrace with wholehearted enthusiasm, not only as it applies to the valley of the Tennessee River but also, in its basic concept, to the general development of our power and water resources throughout the entire Nation.

While the CIO can only reject as totally false the present administration's repetition of the long-discredited charge of the private power companies' propaganda lobby that the TVA is "socialism," I nevertheless want to take this opportunity to publicly commend President Eisenhower for his action last week in establishing a new Cabinet committee on water resources policy. In his letter setting up this committee to make an extensive review of the water supply, conservation and use of water throughout the Nation the President said, "The conservation and use which we make of the water resources of our Nation may in large measure determine our future progress and the standards of living of our citizens. * * * If we are to continue to advance agriculturally and industrially we must make the best use of every drop of water which falls on our soil, or which can be extracted from the oceans." We in CIO agree completely with these statements.

The so-called "water problem" is not limited to the United States but is worldwide in scope. One of the major reports to be presented at the forthcoming general session of the United Nations Economic and Social Council will be that on "Development and Utilization of Water Resources" prepared by U. N. General Secretary Dag Haamarskjold. This report cites a number of "inescapable trends," which it says, "call for full knowledge of all water resources, surface and underground, and for management of water resources to derive the maximum benefit from available supplies." It points out that "Both in developed and underdeveloped areas there are many cases where present capacities of waterworks are, or will soon become, inadequate, and this inadequacy acts as a sharp deterrent to economic growth." Hammarskjold cites the recent survey by the President's Materials Policy Commission (the so-called Paley Commission) which estimates that by 1975 industries will use two-thirds of all sweet water, and water supply will be the main determining factor for industry in the United States. The U. N. Secretary-General advocates action to meet this worldwide problem at the national, regional, and international levels, and suggest that, as a first step, "each country would be well-advised to set up a 'water board' comprising representatives of all the relevant government and municipal bodies concerned, and of industry, transport, agriculture, utilities, etc." While the creation of the Cabinet committee on water resources policy, which is made up of the Secretaries of Interior, Defense, Agriculture, Commerce and Health, Education and Welfare, as well as the Director of the Budget Bureau, falls far short of the kind of committee envisaged in the U. N. recommendation, the CIO applauds the President's action as at least a first step toward the creation of a more representative body called for in the U. N. Secretary-General's report. We urge this task force to weigh further the wisdom of recommending the creation of such a body, and urge that spokesmen for organized labor, as well as industry and agriculture, be included in its make-up. Labor's concern with all aspects of the water problem is historic and, since its interest in finding a proper solution is just as vital and immediate as that of any other segment of the economy, affording it an opportunity to participate in shaping national water policies is only commonsense as well as common justice.

American labor has always been concerned with the constant improvement and development of American industry, upon which it depends for its existence. This Nation's industry in turn has been able to reach unprecedented achievements only through the constantly increasing productivity of American labor. The CIO since its creation has been committed completely to the fostering of an ever-expanding economy, an economic society in which our ever-growing industry, agriculture, and labor divide up more and more of the fruits of wise and efficient use of capital and more productive labor for the common benefit. Our organization, therefore, has a direct concern with helping industry find the solution to any problem which threatens to hamper or curtail its future development. Any other course would be inimical to the interests and welfare of our members.

The appearance of the CIO before this task force results from our awareness of the serious problems this Nation already faces from the lack of adequate supplies of both water and power. As the Paley Commission pointed out, during World War II plans for building at least 300 industrial or military establishments had to be abandoned or modified because of inadequate water supply, and the pinch will continue to grow sharper in the next quarter century.

If, then, the individual activities carried on by the TVA are not new Government undertakings, what are the things about TVA that make it so much more effective than past efforts along these lines and thus distinguish it from past practices? There are at least three main differences from prior Federal action which set the TVA apart and which are basic to its concept:

First, the TVA program is developed and carried out in partnership with State and local agencies, who assume the major responsibility for planning and carrying out the Valley development program. This places the program in the hands of people and agencies close to the people and subject to their local control and direction. If the present administration is really sincere in its announced philosophy of wishing to turn the development of power over to "local" agencies, it should have no quarrel with the TVA, which has carried this principle of Federal administration in partnership with State and local agencies further than any previous Federal activity.

Second, the TVA is a Federal autonomous agency with authority to make its decisions directly in the region where the problems exist without first clearing them through Federal departments in Washington. Since the TVA vested as much responsibility as possible in persons located as close as possible to the area and people affected, this, too, carried forward the present administration's professed objectives of fostering local control.

Finally, in the TVA program, a single Federal agency, for the first time, was given responsibility for assisting in the total development of all resources in a region, instead of having such authority divided (as in the past and as is still the case with most of the Federal Government's water, power, and other resource development activities) in several specialized Federal departments and agencies in Washington.

The concept of regional planning and development along TVA lines thus inevitably involves consideration of factors other than water and power, with which this task force is primarily concerned. If the TVA has taught us any lesson, it surely is that dams cannot be built for purposes of either water control or power without also vitally affecting such other factors as navigation, flood control, malaria control, recreation, stream sanitation, fishing, forestry, agriculture and industry. And since each of these other factors, in turn, affects the factors of water and power, this task force cannot properly reach sound conclusion with respect to its area of responsibility without taking these other resources into account.

Our national needs in the years ahead demand that programs for the full development of our resources proceed without delay and at top efficiency. In the area of this task force's other concern, the Paley Commission findings on the Nation's energy supplies are even more startling. They point out that the remaining reserves of gas and oil known to exist in the United States are not equal to the demands of the next 25 years and that waterpower, even in 1950, supplied only about 25 percent of the electricity this country consumed. "Even if the best remaining sites are vigorously developed during the next 25 years," the Commission concluded, "hydropower will do well to continue to contribute this percentage to the expanding energy stream." The following table from the Paley Commission report on materials policy shows the great expansion of power which will be required by 1975 to meet the expected growth in the American economy:

	1925		1950		1975	
	Kilowatt-hours	Percent	Kilowatt-hours	Percent	Kilowatt-hours	Percent
Thermal power (in billions of kilowatt-hours)	59	69	288	74	1,100	[illegible]
Hydropower (in billions of kilowatt-hours)	26	31	101	26	300	[illegible]
Total	85	100	389	100	1,400	[illegible]

Note that our Nation will need 3.8 times as much additional steam power as we consumed in 1950, assuming that there also will be almost three times the amount of hydropower available. This means that every reduction of power potential which takes place, such as, for example, the recent cuts in appropriations for the TVA, will curtail the future growth of American industry and employment. Organized labor's concern here is thus immediate and vital. The simple facts are that, in the face of our growing population and the need to increase the gross national product, any delay in developing our power potential points directly to job curtailment and ultimate economic disaster. Moreover, as the above table shows, even with complete and most efficient development of hydroelectric facilities, the percentage of electricity obtained from this most economical source will fall from 26 percent in 1950 to 22 percent in 1975. The higher power costs which this falling percentage inevitably will bring about also are of real concern to every American consumer.

CIO's differences with the Eisenhower administration power policies result from these fundamental considerations. In the first session, the administration and the Republican-controlled Congress acted directly to seriously curtail the Nation's future power supply from Federal hydroelectric sites. Out of a total of 22 Corps of Engineers power projects, with total planned capacity of 5,658,000 kilowatts, the actions taken in the first year of the Eisenhower administration eliminated 3 with a capacity of 397,000 kilowatts and slowed up the other 19 by cutting appropriations from $326 million requested by President Truman to $215 million, a slash of 34 percent. Many of the projects delayed by these cuts are already under construction, and the reduction in funds will delay by years the delivery of power that is already needed to meet shortages. The result is an unnecessary slowing up of our industrial expansion and the creation of an economic situation that can only lead to growing numbers of unemployed citizens. We have seen this same false economy repeated by the Republican 83d Congress in this second session in the votes on funds for the TVA.

The slick propagandists who write the trick slogans and false charges against TVA which seem to have so much weight with the party in power have been unable to mislead the people of this valley region. They are overwhelmingly behind the TVA program and the reasons for their support lie in its great success and accomplishments. From one of the most backward regions in America, they have seen this great river valley transformed into one of the most important production areas of America.

So much emphasis has been placed in recent months upon the public power aspects of the TVA operation that the value of other phases of the TVA program tends to be overlooked.

The benefits that have resulted directly or indirectly from the TVA program in the Tennessee Valley have added materially to the economy of the region, so that an area once more or less accurately described as the No. 1 economic problem of the Nation has become a region in which spendable income gained more than in any other region of the Nation except a group of west coast States, as revealed in a study produced by Fortune magazine.

The myth that the industrial development in the Tennessee Valley (which has been at a much more rapid rate than the national average) took place at the expense of development in other regions rests on the false notion that our country has gone as far as it can go—that all we can do is divide up an unchanging total of wealth, and when one region gains, another region loses by an equal amount.

Per capita income in the Tennessee Valley has increased 400 percent since TVA, whereas the national increase has been around 290 percent in the same period. Jobs in manufacturing in the valley grew 72 percent from 1929 to 1950.

Income in the valley in 1952 was $5.9 billion, which was $1.65 billion more than it would have been if the income in the valley had increased no faster than the national average.

By the same token, the valley people are paying an increasing share in income taxes of the Nation. Whereas in 1933 the people of the States paid but 3.4 percent of the total; in 1952 the payments from these same 7 States was 6.2 percent—almost double the proportion of 20 years before.

From an economic standpoint, it was a remarkable coincidence that just at the time the farm labor began to leave the farms for factory jobs, the TVA advent, causing new industries to spring up, began to provide industrial jobs. At the same time, development by TVA of high-analysis nitrate and phosphate fertilizers speeded up the switch from row crops on valley farms to cover crops and an animal husbandry, with farm mechanization and electrification also making it possible to handle farm production without as many hired hands as before.

How the economy has changed in 20 years is indicated by the fact that whereas agriculture heretofore provided 23 percent of the jobs in the area and industry 15 percent, today manufacturing provides 20 percent of the jobs and agriculture only 13 percent.

Opportunities for jobs in wood-using industries of the valley have been greatly enhanced through the activities the TVA initiated with State and county agencies, in a field in which some 43,000 are engaged in an industry yielding some $300 million annually, but which, with proper management, could eventually increase to three times that size, and provide jobs for some 200,000 persons.

Whereas in 1942 few if any forest holdings were operated on a sustained yield basis, with scientific management, there are now 285 forest management demonstrations established throughout the valley area. Reforestation has greatly enhanced the future prospects of the wood using industries. In the past 20 years some 212,000 acres have been reforested in the valley region with the planting of some 250,000,000 seedlings raised in TVA nurseries.

The recreational developments in connection with TVA lakes have also added materially to the economy of the region, as the following figures quickly indicate: During 1953 there were 29.7 million person-day visits to TVA dams and lakes. The value of recreational facilities and equipment rose from $38 million in 1952 to $43.7 million in 1953, and an increase of 243 percent over 1947. Gross income to dock operators, fishing camps, etc., was nearly $5.4 million in 1953, compared with $5 million in 1952. Employment in the recreational industry also showed a gain, going to 1,060 man-years in 1953 compared with 1,030 in 1952.

The advent of the TVA lakes has proved a great tourist attraction which has brought millions into the valley States each year, and the total continues to grow year by year.

TVA has not been operating with dictatorial powers, but rather on a basis of negotiation and cooperation with States, counties and municipalities of the area. By such cooperative methods, the farms and forests of the valley have been largely cured of erosion and eroded lands restored. By cooperation with citizens and rural agencies, electric power is distributed at a low cost.

TVA has built up a working partnership between unions and management in the TVA. In the past 11 years, for example, 38 union-management committees have been established and they have made an impressive record. More than 5,000 proposals and ideas have been received, and 78 percent of the ideas considered have been adopted. Almost half of these proposals related to ways of doing something better, quicker, cheaper, or easier. By this method the TVA and the unions have tapped a veritable mine of knowledge, commonsense and ingenuity. Such practices have resulted in significant savings through the years in the construction, operation and maintenance of TVA facilities.

It is the Nation as a whole, and not just the Tennessee Valley, which benefits from the TVA achievement. Not only does the increased annual income of the area bring large increases in tax revenues into the Federal Treasury, but the purchasing power of the people of the region has increased so that a new market has been opened and producers in all parts of the country have benefited. More than 10 times as much electricity is used in the region as was used in 1933, which reflects the vast amounts of electrical equipment—most of which is manufactured outside of the region—that has been sold here. The contributions which the TVA has made to our national security and defense are also well known—without the TVA's supply of electricity our development of atomic energy at Oak Ridge and the essential supplies of aluminum for planes and of chemicals for munitions would have been long delayed. Estimates of the flood damage which the TVA dams have prevented in Chattanooga alon eamount to more than $41 million since 1936. Moreover, the investment of the Federal Government in dams, generators, and heavy transmission systems has been bringing in a return of more than 4 percent each year since 1939, and this surplus has been used to build new facilities, retire bonds, and make direct payments into the United States Treasury. The TVA is expected to return amounts sufficient to repay entirely the outstanding balance furnished by the Treasury in less than 40 years' time. This investment itself has been spent, not solely in the Tennessee Valley but throughout the 48 States and the District of Columbia. The total costs of manufactured and processed articles and raw materials purchased outside of the Tennessee Valley just under the TVA procurement program alone have amounted to over $886 million.

Respect For Our Elders

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1954

Mr. HAGEN of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, in our concern for taking on the problems of all the people of the world, we have showed a decided lack of respect for the elder citizens of America. As we send billions of dollars to foreign countries, our own old people are not getting enough money to live on. Instead of entering the sunset of life in a spirit of peace and security, many of these people must face the haunting fear of a constant struggle to maintain the barest sort of existence.

These are our senior citizens, those whose contributions of yesterday have built the great Nation of which we boast today. Is their reward to be that they are cast aside, forgotten, ignored, cast a few miserly crumbs in an attempt to silence their pleas for justice? Not as long as I am a Member of this Congress.

I have always supported legislation for adequate and fair pensions for our old people. I have voted to increase old age benefits; to increase the coverage and payments of social security; I have worked unceasingly to bring about a better pension system and have cooperated with the Townsend movement to gain recognition and support for their improved plan and their suggestions to make the present social security more workable and beneficial to the older folks of our country.

What are the problems faced by the aged? They are many, but the basis for all their problems is that they simply do not get enough money to live on. They need better housing, more adequate medical and hospital care, more income to meet the ever increasing cost of living. These problems can all be solved if persons reaching 65 are assured of regular payments sufficient for modest American standards of living and of financial protection against the unpredictable emergencies.

I shall continue my fight for the right kind of pension program which guarantees sufficient income for our old people to be able to enjoy the fruits of their productive lives. This is their due for the great contributions they have made during their days of work and productivity. This is the respect we owe our elders, to assure them that we appreciate them and what they did toward the building of a greater and more prosperous America.

Respect for our elders means that their welfare must come ahead of concern for people in other lands, many of whom are only waiting the opportunity to help destroy America. Let us begin our good works at home by taking proper care of America's senior citizens. There is no question about being able to afford it; we cannot afford failure in seeing to it that the old people of America maintain their self-respect, their love of country, their reward for services well done.

Farm Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT RAINS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 6, 1954

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Speaker, it is difficult for me to understand the attitude of the Republican leadership in supporting an amendment to abolish the mandatory 90 percent of parity on basic commodities. In the first place, it is in strict violation of campaign promises made by the Republican candidate for President in 1952. This reduction in mandatory parity support for the basic crops comes at a time when the net farm income of the farmers of this country has declined 7.5 percent from 1952 to 1953, and at a time when the parity ratio declined from 100 in October 1952 to 88 in June 1954. Also, the total value of farm real estate in March of this year is 6 percent less than in March of last year. United States exports of agricultural products in the past year have declined at an alarming rate; cotton exports, for instance, declined from 862 million bales in 1952 to 517 million bales in 1953, or about 40 percent.

The retail figures on farm equipment sales, which is a good barometer of the financial position of the farmer, were 17 percent less in 1953 than in 1952. Already the agricultural segment of our population is suffering from a depression, and yet this administration seeks to break the mandatory 90-percent formula, with the certain attendant result that farm prices will fall even more rapidly. In the light of the alarming figures which I have given, as to the sad plight of the American farmer today, with falling income and falling prices, we are faced with the paradoxical situation of everything the farmer buys being at the highest price in the Nation's history. If there ever was a time when the farmer needs some assurance of at least a reasonably fair price for his product, it is now, and yet, this administration seeks to cut from under him the only prop for a fair price, the mandatory price support legislation.

There are those who are misguided and uninformed, who seem to believe that the farmer is waxing in great prosperity because of the high price of food and fiber products. This is not true. For instance, the cotton which goes in a $7.50 white cotton shirt today brought the farmer little more than 35 cents. The watermelon on today's market in Washington which sells for $4 brought the farmer in Alabama only 50 cents. This same divergence in price between what the farmer receives and the consumer pays is evident in almost every item. The farmer does not get the high prices which are paid by consumers today, and he is in the most difficult financial circumstances of any producer in the Nation. Why make his condition worse?

I am unable to understand how those who profess great faith in, and appreciation for, the American farmer and for his great contribution to America, can pose as his friend and at the same time reduce, by legislation, his chance for a reasonable income from his toil and his investment. The American farmer is often referred to as the most individualistic and independent of our people. He is slow to wrath, but I have the firm conviction that if this Republican farm bill is enacted into law, the administration now in power will regret it.

At a time when big business of every type is receiving the most favorable kind of treatment at the hands of this administration, it seems to me unfair and unjust to shackle the American farmer with legislation which will reduce even further his already too low income.

Threat to the Air Force

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 1, 1954

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend and revise my remarks I present an article appearing in the Reader's Digest which I have read with much interest. The article is as follows:

THREAT TO THE AIR FORCE

(By Francis and Katharine Drake)

The help is walking out on our most strategic service, the Air Force. Top-flight, superlatively trained men are quitting in droves. This year alone, 200,000 have left to take civilian jobs. In the past 2 years, the reenlistment rate has fallen as low as 15 percent in some units. The Strategic Air Command has lost 25,000 men and 4,500 officers this year, including some key atom-bomber crews. It is no secret that some of our newest planes have been grounded for lack of skilled mechanics to keep them in the air.

The cost to the taxpayer of this loss of personnel is little short of fabulous. Secretary of the Air Force Harold Talbot estimates that a 50-percent increase in reenlistment would save more than $2 billion a year. The cost of training an officer pilot—exclusive of pay, food, depot maintenance, and purchase of aircraft—runs from $28,700 for a troop-carrier pilot to $68,000 for an all-weather fighter pilot. This includes pay of instructors, cost of special equipment, gasoline, etc. It averages out to more than $50,000 for each new pilot replacement trained.

This shocking situation is of critical importance to the safety of our country and the peace of the world, for as long as our Air Force preserves its power of "instant and massive retaliation" at a peak of quality, war is unlikely and American families can sleep in peace. Let anything imperil this quality and it becomes everybody's business to find out what the trouble is and to get it fixed as soon as possible.

The authors of this article have recently completed a tour of the major airbases which guard this country—a journey undertaken to piece together an answer to this crucial question: Why are airmen leaving their jobs at such an alarming rate, turning their backs on an Air Force they have built into the finest in the world?

The picture that has emerged from hundreds of interviews points to one basic cause: The airmen are walking out because they are not willing to have their families endure the privations forced on them by recent economy drives.

The public is largely in ignorance of these privations. It still believes that service people not only are well paid and exempted from paying income taxes but that they also enjoy the benefits of free housing, food, education, transportation, and free medical and dental care. Nothing could be further from the truth.

Military paychecks have remained static while living costs have gone up and up. All the extra benefits have been reduced or canceled. Today military men cannot support their families on their pay while they are alive and must leave their widows unprovided for when they die.

A leading example is Mrs. "Hap" Arnold. Her husband, a five-star general, gave 40 years of his life to building the Air Force we have today. He was its chief throughout World War II and he worked himself to a death from heart failure. His widow now receives a pension of $68 a month. In her midsixties, Mrs. Arnold sells real estate for a living. Her case is not one to inspire younger people to a lifetime of similar devotion.

Because family predicaments lie at the base of the whole problem, and because many people visualize the United States airman as a romantic figure streaking across the skies at speeds faster than sound, suppose we look at him from a new angle—as a family man with a wife and children to support.

An Air Force family averages something like this, whether the head of it wears a major's leaves or a master sergeant's "rockers": Mr. Airman is 29, graying, wiry, tense, abstemious, serious. Mrs. Airman is a year or two younger, lively, self-reliant, the sort of girl who can do—and does—everything from laundry to house painting. Children, three, sometimes more, are unusually well disciplined. Home, simple, spotless, rather sparsely furnished. In short, a family like millions of others in America.

At night when the kids have turned in, Mr. and Mrs. Airman tackle the same problems that perplex other parents: Rent, grocery bills, schooling, illness, taxes. But on top of these they have three headaches that do not affect civilian families.

First: Home may be somewhere else next week. (One master sergeant's family has lived in 54 houses in the last 7 years.) There is no warning. Just when the furniture has been settled in, orders may arrive instructing Mr. Airman to move from Maine to California, from Texas to Oregon, from the United States to Japan or Germany. Children are snatched from school, a moving van backs up, and home, with all that it stands for, must be created all over again in some other place.

Second. Mr. Airman must guard America night and day; the telephone may summon him at any instant on a long and possibly dangerous mission. He may be gone for days or months. His destination is always secret. Whatever the emergency, if the house burns down or the family is hospitalized, there is no way of getting in touch with him. There is no admitting that he is away, either. If a stranger calls up, even a 4-year-old has been schooled to say: "Daddy's in the shower." It might be an innocent call. It might be Security, checking a family's discretion. It might be an enemy agent seeking the whereabouts of an atom bomber.

But instability and danger are a part of Air Force life, accepted as the price of maintaining the Nation's safety. It is the third headache which is at the bottom of the present walkout. This is the fact that Mr. Airman's employment contract is subject to constant change without notice, and always to his disadvantage.

Service people, unlike civilians, are not paid solely in cash. The cash has always been small—about a third of what the man could earn on the outside. In the past the balance was largely made up by the fringe benefits of free housing, the right to buy clothing, goods, and groceries cheaply at base stores, adequate travel allowances for moves, a tax deduction of $1,500 a year to enable him to lay something aside for the future, and free medical and dental care for his family. The man devoted his lifetime to protecting his country. In return, the country protected his family.

Today the fringe-benefit part of his pay has been so cut, changed, or canceled altogether that his security has gone. Since 1940 the cost of living has doubled, and industrial take-home pay has more than doubled. But military pay has in effect been reduced. The $1,500 tax reduction has been canceled, medical care for dependents has almost gone, commissary advantages have been reduced and are now threatened with elimination altogether. Foreign-duty pay has also been stopped, and even flying pay (a monthly compensation to all on flying status) is threatened. These actions, most effected by last-minute "riders" tacked onto appropriation bills, have been outright breaches of contract.

While airmen face increasing distress for their families within the service, the offers of industry become progressively more tempting. An electronics sergeant earning $216 a month is offered a firm contract for $450 on the outside. An overworked crew chief with 10 years' experience finds he is getting less per hour than the unskilled woman worker who painted the number on the tail of his plane. His commander, one of the top pilots of the Nation, is approached by an airline offering three times the pay for one-third the work.

One encouraging fact exists, however. No industrial contract can offer a man the inspiration that comes from serving his country. Of all the hundreds of airmen interviewed, not one wanted to quit. Not one wife wanted her husband to give up the Air Force. Our fliers did not choose their profession merely for financial reward; most admit that they would prefer to stay in—if the Government would again make it possible for their families to enjoy some modest degree of security.

The measures required to bring this about are not difficult. They are not costly. In fact, Congress now faces an extraordinary opportunity to strengthen the efficiency and morale of our Air Force and to save the huge sums annually wasted in training replacements.

The first measure that need congressional study is the proposal to raise the reenlistment bonus. As it is, the Government tells a skilled airman that it will cost some $50,000 to train his replacement, then offers him $160 to reenlist. If the bonus were given a real boost, say to $1,000, many young men would reenlist, and the Government would still save 50 times its investment.

The second measure would be to restore the $1.500 tax deduction, which would have the effect of adding several hundred dollars a year to the airman's take-home pay.

The third would be to work out a system of special pay for special skills.

Pay alone, however, will not cure the emergency, for unless the public accepts a big raise in taxes, military pay can never match that of industry. The cure can be achieved far more cheaply by restoring certain services and privileges. These would cost the Government little in comparison with the present $2 billion a year retraining cost:

Medical care for dependents. This has always been part of the military contract. Both public and enlistees assume that it is provided today; but the numbers of Air Force doctors, nurses, hospitals, and facilities are hopelessly inadequate to supply it. When men are sent on long missions they hope that their wives and children will be looked after in their absence. Too often they find that the system fails when it is most needed. Each base has heart-wringing tales. A young bride, husband off on 3 months' temporary duty, awoke doubled with pain. She grabbed a coat, got a lift to the base hospital. There she was left, frightened and unattended for 4½ hours, undergoing a miscarriage in a waiting room. A baby with a temperature of 105 degrees was kept waiting for 7 hours and died of polio. A little boy was picked up unconscious, bleeding from a gash in his head. The mother telephoned the hospital, which could give no appointment for 2 weeks. Its advice was: "Give him some aspirin." The child became delirious, a civilian doctor was summoned. Diagnosis: Compound fracture of the skull.

Prenatal care is hit or miss. Some doctors are first class, others lack experience in obstetrics. The mother is rarely examined twice by the same doctor. There is no telling who will be on hand for the delivery. Anxiety works up to a crescendo when labor starts. The husband is frequently off on a mission. The hospital, even at bases with 8,000 families, can take only a limited number of deliveries a month, first come, first served. Too often the answer is: "Sorry—full up." Even when a base bed happens to be vacant, the mother goes into a miserably crowded 20-bed ward.

Air Force doctors, overworked to the last man, are the first to apply the word "heartbreaking" to the care of dependents. At Carswell Air Force Base, Tex., there are only 13 doctors to care for 14,000 people. At March Air Force Base, Calif., there are only 23 to care for 20,000 souls—all dependent on a ramshackle hospital built in 1931 as a 50-bed unit.

The basic cause of this medical mess is that the Air Force has only recently become an independent service. Most of its bases are far from the hospitals it relied upon when it was part of the Army. It is no longer allowed to pay for civilian doctors and hospital care. Mr. Airman is forced to call in this care and pay for it out of his own pocket. His cash pay is so low that he is almost always in debt to doctors or relatives.

The most economical solution has been blueprinted by the Moulton Commission, which recommended a group medical scheme, similar to those used in industry. Under such a scheme civilian doctors would be called in when base facilities are unavailable. The cost would be borne 90 percent by the Government, 10 percent by the servicemen. If this plan were enacted into law, it would at once ease one of the most serious burdens on family life in the Air Force.

Insurance. Every serviceman, married or single, receives $10,000 of free Government insurance. This amount was fixed in 1917—long before the advent of the high-speed, dangerous jets. To supplement it today's flight crews generally spend their entire flying pay, after taxes are deducted, to buy additional insurance at high-hazard rates from private companies. This means another cut in the cash available for groceries. One way to cure this hardship would be to double Government insurance, in line with the doubled cost of living.

Housing. Free housing is supposed to be a part of service pay. But today there is very little of it. At Fairchild AFB, Wash., only 1,100 families out of 7,570 can secure base housing; at Randolph, Tex., 1,000 out of 8,000; at Ellington, Tex., 5 out of 4,000. These ratios are common throughout the country. The service people who cannot live on base have to buy or rent civilian houses. For this the Government pays a "quarters allowance," which is a fixed sum, irrespective of locality. In most places, however, actual civilian rents are $25 to $50 a month more than the allowance. The difference comes out of the family budget—another cut in pay.

A modest start has been made toward remedying the military housing shortage, but so few base houses are available that there are some 300 applicants for every one. A raise in quarters allowance would enable thousands of families to stay in the Air Force and the Government would make money on the deal. If for example, the quarters allowance of a skilled man were raised by $50 a month, it would take 80 years before this sum equaled the cost of training his replacement.

Travel allowances. The revolutionary new equipment of the jet atomic age now requires that Air Force personnel attend incessant school and factory courses. When a man is ordered on such temporary training duty his ration allowance of $1.20 a day is withdrawn from his family and he is paid a flat amount per diem, which is supposed to defray the entire cost of the trip. But no one can find room and board at the prices fixed by the Government. The airman must make up the difference from his own pocket.

Again, Air Force life involves numerous changes of station for the whole family. The Government contract undertakes to pay the cost of moving, but in one of the recent economy drives the weight allowance for household effects was cut almost in half. Families can no longer furnish a home with the amount of furniture transported free by the Government; they must either sell part of it for what they can get or transport it at their own expense. There is a current saying in the Air Force: "Three moves and you are broke."

Another pinch comes during the journey itself. Only 2 children per family rate a travel allowance, and those under 6 rate none at all. With husbands ordered on ahead, the job of transporting babies, pets, suitcases to a new base that may be 3,000 miles away falls on the wife. She must go the cheapest way, but not even by resorting to coast-to-coast bus, overnighting in cheap motels or tourist cabins, sponging on friends, sleeping three in a bed or even on car cushions is it possible to break even.

Surely, it would be only fair to give our servicemen allowances which cover actual moving costs.

Commissaries and post exchanges. Many believe that service people can buy the best of everything dirt cheap at Government stores, and thus need less cash than civilians. This is not true. In the past the Government did buy in bulk, sold close to cost, and the savings to servicemen were traditionally part of their pay. Post exchanges were also permitted to accept special orders—furniture, household goods, etc.—at cut rates. All this cost the Government nothing and the savings were vital to service families.

Today Washington lobbies, representing competing civilian stores, have succeeded not only in getting a surcharge added to commissary prices but in having stocks drastically restricted. There have been cases of local politicians forcing up the commissary prices of milk as such as 8 cents a quart.

Post exchanges are now forbidden to accept special orders of any kind and stocks have been restricted. (For example, they may no longer sell clothing for children over 6, a real deprivation for families.) It is now proposed to close the stores altogether, in order to force service families to buy in town.

The Government is thus faced with two choices: it can either close the base stores and admit that the Department of Defense can be pushed around by any lobby, or it can live up to its contract with the men who defend our country. The first choice would cause even more airmen to quit in humiliation and disgust. The second would restore to service families what is rightfully theirs and would cost the Government nothing.

This year the Air Force must enlist 200,000 men to replace those who have quit. But replacement is not a simple matter. It takes more than 2 years to train a competent electronics man or jet-engine mechanic; it takes 5 years to teach a man how to maintain a radar bombsight; 5 to 10 years to train atom-bomber crews. When an airman quits, all this expensive education is a total loss to the Air Force, and to the taxpayer.

And what about officers? Of the 125,000 now serving in the Air Force, 100,000 are Reserves who have the legal right to tender their resignations at any time. Thousands did so in 1953, and resignations are still flooding in. Many of these veterans are the most experienced pilots, navigators, and engineers in the world. How are they to be replaced? Applicants for officer candidate school have dropped from 3,450 to 500 this year, and the rate of applications from 100 a week to 8.

The present emergency is acute on three counts. Our national power to avert war is suffering a shocking fall in efficiency. Our national pocketbook is suffering a tremendous drain—at least $2 billion a year to train replacements. Finally, there is the uneasy conviction that our national word has been broken, and to some of our finest citizens.

On every count—honor, national safety, economy—it is urgent that we keep the men we have and restore to them the military pride that makes the difference between mediocrity and greatness. It is imperative that we preserve the power of instant and massive retaliation on which the safety of our country depends.

Opinion Poll Report for Cambridge, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 2, 1954

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a partial report on the results of a questionnaire which I mailed early in April of this year to the residents of the district which I represent here in the Congress of the United States.

My purpose in conducting such an opinion poll during my first term here in Washington was not only to enable myself to better represent the people of my district but to acquaint them personally with some of the vital issues here in Washington.

The number of returns, and the interest displayed, have been most gratifying. I feel that the poll has been mutually beneficial. Following is a copy of the letter which accompanied the questionnaire, and the tabulated results for Cambridge, Mass.:

UNITED STATES
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR NEIGHBOR: As your Representative here in Washington, it would be invaluable for me to have the opinions of the people of our congressional district on matters which are vital to all of us.

I realize that you elected me with the expectation that I would always exercise my own best judgment in arriving at a decision as to how the vote for our district will be cast. It is a responsibility and a privilege which I welcome, and I hope that I shall always merit your trust and confidence.

If I had available a cross section of the views of the residents of the 11th Congressional District, and also any comments they might have on any given subject, it would help in clarifying the issues and reaching a truly representative decision.

Attached is a questionnaire on a group of subjects. I will be indebted to you if you will answer them, and also give your views in the spaces allotted. You need not add your signature if you would prefer not to do so.

Each of the questionnaires returned will be read by me personally, and a tabulation will be made. I shall appreciate your cooperation and assistance, and I am looking forward to your response.

With every good wish,

Sincerely,

THOMAS P. O'NEILL, Jr.,
Member of Congress.

	Yes	No	No opinion
FOREIGN POLICY			
1. Do you approve of the present method of handling our international relations?	296	572	276
2. Do you believe that the United States Government should continue our foreign-aid program?	573	374	196
3. Do you feel that we should continue military aid to foreign nations?	725	307	111
4. Do you favor the continuation of economic aid to foreign nations?	669	273	201
5. Do you support the point 4 program (supplying technical assistance, manufacturing know-how, and management skills to underdeveloped nations to help them help themselves)?	899	208	302
(a) Do you believe this program should be reduced?	219	479	445
6. Do you believe that Russia should be permitted to remain in the United Nations?	491	446	206
7. Do you believe Communist China should be seated in the United Nations?	170	815	158
TARIFF POLICY			
1. Do you support the present methods of handling tariffs?	261	356	528
2. Do you believe that foreign goods should come into the United States regardless of the effect that it may have on the American worker?	158	756	229
3. Do you understand the present Government method of handling tariffs?	400	434	309
STATEHOOD			
1. Do you favor conferring statehood on—			
(a) Alaska?	745	193	205
(b) Hawaii?	723	148	272
TAX POLICY			
1. Do you believe that the Federal Government should spend more money than it receives in income?	148	798	287
If opposed, which of these steps would you take—			
(a) Keep taxes high?	242	297	604
(b) Cut domestic spending?	230	376	537
2. Do you feel taxes should be cut more than they already have been?	388	424	331
3. Do you support an increase in the exemption for dependents?	718	184	241
4. Do you favor cutting income taxes across the board percentagewise?	351	520	272
5. Do you believe in more exemption for dividends and other unearned income?	195	652	296
6. Do you support exemptions to cover expenses for college educations?	582	457	104
7. Do you favor an exemption for the first $1,500 of retired income?	89	872	182
SOCIAL SECURITY, HEALTH, AND WELFARE			
1. Do you believe that the present 2 percent social-security tax on the employee should be maintained?	701	170	272
2. Do you believe it should be returned to 1½ percent?	159	735	249
3. Do you support an increase in old-age assistance benefits?	712	159	272
4. Do you favor an increase in the death benefits under social security?	582	207	354
5. Do you believe that hospitalization, sickness, and accident insurance should be covered by Federal law?	332	490	321
HOUSING			
1. Do you believe that more low-cost housing should be built by the State and Federal Governments?	526	400	217
2. Do you believe these should be multiple-unit dwellings?	229	456	458
3. Do you feel they should be in 2-family units?	226	454	463
LABOR LEGISLATION			
1. Are you in favor of raising the minimum wage?	719	241	183
2. Do you feel this would be helpful to New England insofar as competing with the Southern States is concerned?	458	388	297
3. In your opinion could small business afford an increase?	491	172	480
4. Do you believe that the Taft-Hartley Act is fair to management and labor?	343	480	320
(a) Would you favor outright repeal?	129	638	376
(b) Would you favor changes through amendments?	549	216	378
5. Are there sections of this law which you feel are oppressive to workers?	457	251	435
6. Are there, in your opinion, sections which are oppressive to small business?	274	320	549
ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY			
1. Do you understand the questions involved in the St. Lawrence seaway?	639	366	138
2. Do you feel that the construction of the seaway would hurt employment in our area?	481	296	366
3. Do you believe the St. Lawrence seaway would hurt the future economy of the New England area?	411	389	343
VOTING AGE			
1. Do you believe that persons who are 18 years old should be given the right to vote in national elections?	422	571	150
LOCAL ISSUES			
1. Do you believe the port of Boston should have more Federal assistance?	721	103	319
2. In your opinion, is the Federal Government treating New England fairly on the policy of defense cutbacks?	115	514	514

The Blackbird of Disaster

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 6, 1954

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, at a time when our international relationships are both critical and complicated, I believe that it is time for both the Congress and the public to get into perspective a few hard facts of recent history.

In order that it may be helpful, under unanimous consent, I insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Willis J. Ballinger, the Blackbird of Disaster, as printed by Human Events of June 30, 1954:

THE BLACKBIRD OF DISASTER

(By Willis J. Ballinger)

Now that Sir Winston Churchill is again officially on our shores, there is a side to his glamorous career that might well be examined. If, as someone has remarked, there is no such thing as a cheap politician, there are able scholars and observers—both here and in England—who are certain that he will go down in history as one of the most costly politicians of all time.

Actually there have been two Churchills on the public stage, and the captivating popular talents of the one have obscured and kept too long in the shadows the failure and menace of the other. One is Churchill the supreme orator, polished man of letters, unexcelled raconteur, delightful epigrammist—the colorful figure with his inevitable black cigars, masterful platform presence, and magnetic vitality. The other is Churchill the politician, whose decisions have been so monotonously calamitous as to pin on him the sobriquet, "the blackbird of disaster."

Although Churchill once exclaimed that he was not put in office to preside over the liquidation of the British Empire, those who have been keeping track of the political Churchill are certain that no one has done more to promote that end, and that his consistent genius for political blundering has been the decisive factor in reducing England to a second-rate power with an even more dubious future. These critics are also persuaded that no foreigner has ever exerted a more baneful influence on the fortunes of the American people.

1. The first major and costly step in the decline of England was her participation in the European war of 1914. Churchill, a member of the British Cabinet which took England into that war, was all for it. He regarded Germany as a dangerous military and commercial competitor of his country—a monster, therefore, to be crushed as menacing civilization. Top historians have long established that the European conflagration of 1914 was not the unique responsibility of the Kaiser, by any means. They place German responsibility for the outbreak secondary to Russian mobilization incited by French intrigue. The French wanted to recover through war with Germany the Provinces of Alsace and Lorraine while the Russian landgrabbers wanted Constantinople—an age-old objective of Russian foreign policy. Revisionist scholars contend that England could have prevented war by putting pressure on both France and Russia.

But she sat by until Russian mobilization had forced Germany to strike in self-defense. Then she rushed into the war on the trumped-up emotional plea that she had an obligation to defend Belgian neutrality—a plea that has since been conclusively exploded. Did not England, during the war, force King Constantine of Greece from his throne for insisting on the neutrality of his country? But the British pretense fooled a lot of Americans into believing that England's motive for going to war was idealistic and selfless.

Publication of the secret treaties of the Allies revealed their scarcely idealistic incentive for the conflict—territorial aggrandizement (an old story in European politics). England received as her share of the loot an area of some 1 million square miles—about one-third the size of the United States. Now Churchill was a fervent believer in that school of British patriotism which regarded territorial aggrandizement, by whatever means, as the hallmark of British growth and greatness. His father before him had declared in Parliament that British acquisition of India "more than all our colonial dominions has raised in power, in resources, in wealth, and in authority this small island home of ours far above the level of the majority of nations—has placed it on an equality with—perhaps even in a position of superiority—over every other empire either of ancient or modern times."

But World War I blew to bits an established liberal-conservative order in Europe—one that had made astonishing progress along sound lines of moderation and pragmatism. Today, that seems nostalgically a sane world when "red was only a color and Hiss was only a sound." World War I gave communism its opportunity in Russia and unleashed destructive forces of totalitarianism everywhere in the Old World. But striking England at the very heart of her national vitality was the burial of more than a million British soldiers—the flower of her youth—in Flanders' fields. From this staggering biological blow England, even under the best circumstances, needed a long convalescence.

2. World War II shattered the once powerful world influence of England. After that conflict, the English had to part with India, and give up their influence in Afghanistan, and their economic power in China. Their oil was in danger in Iran, their persuasive guidance in Arabic countries was greatly diminished and the ultimate loss of the Suez Canal loomed. Many may hail the disintegration of the British Empire, but one must observe that its collapse opened wide the door for Russian imperialism, a far more terrible imperialism. Sadly stripped of her former global influence England emerged from the war with many markets permanently lost, a lower domestic standard of living—and, worse yet, under the shadow of a colossal Russia toward whom she has had to increasingly bend the knee. These catastrophic consequences of World War II on England can be charged directly to Churchill, say his critics.

After Churchill became Prime Minister, Hitler and Stalin collided in 1941. England could have gotten out of the war in that year with very favorable terms from Hitler (as the Hess mission proved) and let the totalitarian powers battle themselves to exhaustion. But Churchill refused. Why was he so bent on war? Prof. Charles Tansill, the eminent American historian, offers one explanation. While he was still a minister in the Chamberlain Cabinet (1939–41) after England had entered the war, the gist of one of his numerous cablegrams to Roosevelt was "Should I become Prime Minister of Britain, you and I could control the world."

British Captain Grenfell, in his masterful work, Unconditional Hatred, says that Churchill believed Germany to be the world's "pest," that if Germany could be crushed and kept crushed the world would at once become peaceful and remain so. Grenfell shows the falsity and tragedy of this myth which had enslaved Churchill's mind, and points out that Churchill's thesis was promptly disproven when Germany was defeated and the Russian "bear" stood up on his hind legs with bared teeth.

3. During the war Churchill's critics charge that he retrogressed from just a blundering politician into virtually a political Mephistopheles "whose conscience ceased to be his guide and become his accomplice."

England had gone to war with Hitler in 1939 because of two solemn pledges to protect Poland's prewar boundaries. But, at Tehran and Yalta, Churchill took the initiative in sanctioning Russian acquisition of one-half Polish territory and allowed the rest to fall under Russian control through a puppet government.

At Potsdam, Churchill approved extension of the boundaries of this puppet Poland, an act which uprooted some 14 million persons of German ethnic origin from land they had occupied for centuries and confiscated their property, a decision denounced by Historian William Henry Chamberlin as "one of the most barbarous acts of history." Some 2 million people are estimated to have perished in this vast territorial surgery, either murdered by the Russians or dead of hunger, cold, and starvation.

At Yalta, the use of slave labor of German war prisoners was sanctioned—a reversion to one of the most savage practices of antiquity. Churchill was, of course, at Yalta, and today hundreds of thousands of German war prisoners are pitiful slaves in Russia.

At Teheran, Churchill took the initiative in betraying General Mihailovich, the anti-Communist pro-West leader, and Yugoslavia to the Moscow-trained Tito. After the war Tito announced a break with the Kremlin and (with liberal handouts from our Treasury) professes to be an ally of the free world. Astute observers, however, question the genuineness of his break with Stalin and whether he would really fight Russia.

At Quebec, as John T. Flynn puts it, "the Morgenthau plan to ruin Germany after the war which had been prepared by a Communist agent in our Government (Harry Dexter White) was forced on Churchill with a bribe of $6½ billion of postwar aid to England." A part of this plan, subsequently carried out, called for a division of Germany in accordance with Russian plans. In agreeing to a division of Germany, Churchill—by this one act alone—may have sealed the doom of Western Europe and his own country. Without German legions, NATO is hopeless.

But today German leaders fed up with French rebuffs to their offer to rearm, indignant over French intentions to retain the Saar region (German for centuries) and seeing little hope of reunion with their kin in Eastern Germany are beginning to look to Russia for achieving this end. And Russia's opportunity is there. By permitting West and East Germany to reunite, scaring off the French in the Saar, Russia could afford to treat Germany decently in return for all-out German industrial cooperation to raise standards of living in Russia (her most pressing problem). Backed by German military power and German technical proficiency the Kremlin could insure its domination of Western Europe—a domination which England could not withstand.

Was Churchill forced to do what he did at Teheran, Quebec, Yalta and Potsdam? In betraying Poland and Yugoslavia Churchill himself took the initiative. At Quebec he took a "bribe" for sanctioning the partition of Germany.

Did the Russians scare him into what he did by threatening a separate peace with Germany? Such a peace was highly unfeasible. But the Russian threat could have been easily turned back on the Russians—because Germany would have been happy to surrender to the British, to deliver up Hitler and his Nazis without hesitation and at a time (says the British historian Grenfell) when German troops could have kept the Reds out of East Germany and other vital areas. But Churchill by subscribing to Roosevelt's "unconditional surrender" formula, tied his own hands.

Was Churchill intimidated by Roosevelt into fattening up the Kremlin? If he was, one would expect him to say so honestly in his memoirs. But in his memoirs he says of Roosevelt: "I conceived an admiration for him as a statesman, as a man of affairs and as a war leader. I felt the utmost confidence in his upright character and outlook, his love for his own country and his respect for its Constitution."

4. Since 1952, when he returned to power in England, his critics say Churchill has progressively emerged as "water boy" for the Kremlin. His Government continued its recognition of Red China, permitted British merchants to trade vigorously with our enemy in the Korean war, championed admission of Red China to the U. N., forced us to accept armistic terms in Korea practically dictated by the Reds, and thereafter, as spokesman for his administraiton declared England's intention of trading as much as possible with all Communist countries and urged that we end our trade embargo with Communist countries.

Only last year the aging Winston said that the United States should think up more agreeable things to do for the Soviets. He also declared that he believed Russian satellite states were indispensable to the military security of Russia—a judgment of doom for their enslaved peoples which Senator Taft attacked before he died. And now, recently at the Primrose Club in London, Churchill intoned: "Britain wants the USSR (Russia) to play a proud and splendid role in guiding humanity."

Sir Winston has paid us a visit with the frightening purpose of advising Eisenhower on how best to tie Downing Street and the White House still closer together. Scholars who have contemplated the above records of the political Churchill—the "blackbird of disaster"—are wondering if he will live just long enough to drag us down in ruin as he has his own people through his formidable talent for political blundering.

The Country Editor Is the Shock Absorber for the Community

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER ROGERS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 6, 1954

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the weekly newspapers of this Nation are entitled to a tremendous amount of credit for the great job for democracy that they have done. There are many editors in my district who are entitled to high acclaim. One of my constituents has taken the time to write a letter about one of these editors, to wit, "Honest Bill" Miller, who publishes the Spearman Reporter at Spearman, Tex. I want to insert this tribute in the RECORD so that it may be available to all:

THE COUNTRY EDITOR IS THE SHOCK ABSORBER FOR THE COMMUNITY

The responsibility of a newspaperman never ends. Socially, legally, and intellectually, he has to be a close observer to run a paper, to say nothing about pleasing all the people. If he prints the news as it is he stands a chance of making some people mad. If there is the least loophole left in his statements he stands a chance to be sued. Where there is a matter of opinion on the grammatical construction of sentences somebody will call his hand on his English. In fact, to salt, pickle, preserve, and run a newspaper to suit everyone, it just cannot be done. Some people that did not know anything about a paper will say if they could not put out a better paper than some editors they would quit. A newspaperman has to be casehardened on criticism and warmhearted on wise and helpful suggestions that are for the common good of all. I have always found editors very easy to approach, and openminded on the problems that confront the public. The editors are for the best interests of the people. They want to stay on the progressive side of life. Small papers wield a great good in the town and community in which they try to give both sides of the question on what is right or wrong.

Now watch my story, and I will prove to you that you cannot any more do without the newspaper in a thriving and progressive town that you can the school and the church. If you want to find out what is going on in any town, the first thing you will do is to consult the paper. The paper always gives a general idea of what is going on in any town. The reader can come to some conclusion as to what kind of a town it is by the general run of what is in the paper. Those that inform themselves on what is going on in the community always read the home paper. My wife scans the home paper for news just the same as she does a letter from a friend to find out what is going on in the community. The home paper is a good way for us to get acquainted with our neighbors. If the editor has the hearty cooperation of those who read his paper, and give him a boost when they see some striking editorials in it, it would increase the efficiency of the paper.

The editor is a referee in homes, between the family, and his paper settles many things, when the husband says a thing is one thing and the wife says it is another, on time, dates, places, and so forth. The paper is the final judge, that settles the argument, and gives a final decision, for both parties are forced to be governed by the decision of the paper. Bill is the peacemaker, for even those that have their dates and places mixed up, when and where the baccalaureate sermons will be preached. We, as husbands, should take off our hat to old Honest Bill when we have won our point, on dates by remembering what the paper said about when entertainments would take place. It is worthy many times the price of the paper, to convince your wife you are right by not saying one word, by just pointing your finger at the last and final word that proves you are right. I have never won an argument by arguing with my wife and this is the experience of all married men. Amen. I have kept down an argument by pointing my finger to the one who is an authority on what is in question in the community paper. Bill, I am adding these statements in full measure, so that married men and women can be protected on questions where there is a doubt that would cause a crossfire and a backfire on things, that the paper has already settled forever.

The editors of papers give the births, deaths, weddings, socials, the political news, and the business in the towns. You can watch the paper and do your shopping in stores where the bargains and courtesy is extended to you with dignified service. Any merchant will bear testimony to this, have a sale and see how the people will flock in. Watch the people follow the crowds. It pays to advertise. That lets the people know where they can buy or where they can sell what they want to get rid of. The paper is the hub of the center of the business district. They go to the paper to get firsthand information. The paper gives them their direction where they can find what they want. The paper is the best friend the businessman has to help him give his customers what they want. The customers need this same friendship to help them do their shopping. The papers give you the different churches in town and their hours of worship. The church would be at a loss if they did not have the paper to inform the people on when and where they are having services. The schools would be like a ship without a sail, without the paper to inform the people on the social activities of the school, as well as the business of what the school is doing in the community.

The courthouse could not run their business if it was not for the paper to report what is happening in the community. Have lawsuits and watch the people bury their faces in the paper to see what the outcome was.

I am going to give the people the lowdown on good old Honest Bill. You know more about Bill than I know; but if you don't, watch my story and you will learn all I know about him. I have read his paper ever since I came to Spearman. You may think I have taken a long shot with a sorry gun, but you watch my story regardless to what you may think or say, about what I have to say about Honest Bill, he will say I have hit the bulls-eye, and rang the bell, on the honest truth about him. He looks on both sides of the question fairly and squarely. That is score one. Now I have a spring board to make a high dive off into deep water. I may drown or come out at the mouth of the river but if I am never heard of any more, you will never forget what I think of my good friend Bill Miller. I want to say this goes with the staff that works with him and makes it possible for us to enjoy the news of the community. I have never seen Bill in a stew he never fusses and fumes about things that he cannot help. He is good natured, and considerate of the feelings of others. Bill is liberal to give free space to any and all worthy causes that should be put before the public.

Bill has made it possible with his hearty cooperation for me to send out the gospel to the four corners of the earth. Fathers have told me that their sons in Germany, wrote and said, "They have enjoyed a sermon from home by the efforts I have put forth to print them in the paper." I have a good long letter from a friend in Korea, saying "I have enjoyed your sermon in the paper and it is swell. I am passing it around in the barracks to my buddies." Bill has his part in preaching in a foreign land to soldiers who are away from home, fighting to help to protect and preserve the democracy that our forefathers fought, bled, and died, to establish and protect it from the enemies that would destroy it and put the yoke of bondage upon a free people's necks.

When the war clouds were hanging low, and there was only two ways to get soldiers, the selective draft, and to volunteer. Bill put the call of his country before he did his business and he as willing to sacrifice the comfort of home life and telling his family goodby he volunteered into two World Wars. It is not the rank of Bill's promotion that is important as the call on his heart string to send him out to defend free America, and see Old Glory float over the land of the free and the home of the brave.

He knew that this Government could send him anywhere ind that his blood was as liable to be shed on a battlefield as any other soldier in the Army. That was not Bill's thought that took him to the Army, he thought it would be better to die for freedom than to live in slavery at the hands of the merciless people that would put the iron yoke of bondage on a liberty loving people's neck and make slaves out of them.

I know what it is to hear the bugle call, you can get him up and you can't get him up. And hear the corporal, sergeant, lieutenant, or captain say, "Fall out; get in line; attention"; and go down the line and give demerits, for things that we would have never dreamed of. I know what it is to walk a post with a soldier standing by with a gun, with the point of the bayonet toward my back. I know what it is to be on a drill field and march with good step of a soldier. I know what it is to stand in line for chow and I know what it is to be on hikes that will make your legs weary and to look and stand at attention and see the captain give two quick moves up in the air with his hand and we would break the speed limit coming into headquarters. I am saying all this to let you know what it meant for Bill to walk out of his business and be deprived of the home life with his family and show his colors, by being a red-blooded American to prove to the world; America first at any sacrifice to Bill. Any soldier boy will testify to the fact it is not a picnic to go to the Army and be deprived of all liberties in a civilian life. This article will give you a bird's-eye view of the cross section of the ups and downs of civilian and Army life that Bill has experienced in a period of a quarter of a century. The Constitution for the United States has been defended by the brave soldiers that were willing to suffer any of the deprivation and hardships in life to keep American free from fear and defeat of our enemies. The Monroe Doctrine will be protected by the loyal Americans as long as we stand together in love for our country. Amen.

It is useless for me to go into Bill's hobbies; his sports are hunting and fishing. We have all read his stories. Bill always says it rains when he goes fishing. We have had a 5-year drought. If Bill has missed a year going fishing I would like to know when it was. He always gives some mighty big fish stories. That can be expected of any fisherman. Don't blame Bill for printing what all fishermen tell when they come back off a fishing trip. This is natural and can be expected of any fisherman; if he could not come home all pepped up and excited and tell of the length and weight of the big fish that got away, he just as well to have stayed at home. Fish stories never hurt anyone. In fact the public always expect them. They would be disappointed if they did not give something thrilling and exciting after they came back off a fishing trip. Bill is capable of taking care of himself on all the big fish he has caught. You have the same privilege of using your own imagination on any fish story that any fisherman tells. Nobody is hurt regarding lies any one tells about the big fish he has caught. Nobody believes it anyway.

I will close by saying we all love our country editor; if we don't, we should, for he appreciates and loves all of his friends. My wife could not keep house without the Spearman Reporter.

These remarks come from me without Honest Bill's solicitation.

J. H. NICHOLS.

Houston, Tex., Reaches Population of 1 Million

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 6, 1954

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, in the July 5 issue of Newsweek magazine there appears a special report on the city of Houston, Tex., describing its tremendous growth in recent years. Last week Houston celebrated the arrival of its one millionth citizen.

This growth of Houston is symbolic of the recent growth of the whole State of Texas. For many years past the rate of population increase in Texas has been substantially higher than that for the Nation. At the same time, per capita income in Texas has been rising at an encouraging rate.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, and I commend it to everyone as an example of how American frontiers are developed by men of vision and courage.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GREATER HOUSTON: ITS FIRST MILLION PEOPLE—AND WHY

Fly to Houston, fly past the long stretch of prairie flatness, then see it suddenly, this surge of a city scraping the sky looking like a splash of tomorrow.

Or come by boat, come up this dredged channel 50 miles from the sea, past piers unloading raw rubber from Malaya, whisky from Scotland, motor scooters from Italy, cuttlefish bones from North Africa—piers handling more tonnage than any other deep-sea port outside New York.

Or drive into Houston at night, drive along oversize highways flanked by factories as brilliantly lighted as night clubs—the billion-dollar industrial power that pushes forward the fastest-growing big city in the country.

STEEL SKELETONS

Then walk down Main Street, walk anywhere and see the steel skeleton of some newborn building, see stores so plush they would seem striking even in Hollywood's Beverly Hills, see this city where dreams are poured into concrete, shaped into hard fact, then expanded like a rubber band.

Biggest dreamer of all is a tall, white-haired man with sharp, friendly eyes, 80-year-old Jesse Holman Jones, warmly known here as "Mr. Houston." Somebody once described Jones as "a town pump full of courage." This much is certain: Without Jones, Greater Houston this week could not celebrate the arrival of its millionth citizen; without Jones, the city skyline might look more like some soft small bumps.

Jones has an aerial map of Houston's downtown with his buildings numbered, 33 of them, and they're among the biggest. When the panic of 1907 swept the country, Jones borrowed money to build 3 10-story buildings to put new heart in the town. When oil companies seemed unsure where to headquarter, Jones persuaded Texas Oil and Gulf to come to Houston, built buildings especially for them, and started Houston in becoming the country's oil capital. It was also Jesse Jones, first chairman of the Harbor Board, who pushed through a request for $3 million to dredge the channel and give the city a wide-open window to the world.

GROWING, GROWING

"I always said that someday Houston would be the Chicago of the South," said Jones, "and it is. Railroads built this town, the port made it big, cotton and cattle kept it rich, oil boomed it, and now we're the chemical capital of the world. Growing, growing, growing, that's Houston."

Jesse Jones came here as a young orphan boy with nothing but pocket change, made his millions in lumber and real estate, went to Washington on the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, later became its chairman and then Secretary of Commerce under President Roosevelt, now publishes the Houston Chronicle.

"Putting up buildings is a slow way to make money," said Jones with a wry smile, "but I've been at it a long time. Now, if I had put my full time in oil, why then I'd really be rich."

What Jones means is that while he's a multimillionaire, he's still not a rich millionaire. And that's not a joke.

This is the city where 72-year-old Hugh Roy Cullen donated around $175 million to assorted civic projects, and announced an unexpected $2.25 million gift to the University of Houston after they scored a surprise football victory. Cullen explains his huge gifts by saying: "My wife and I are selfish. We want to see our money spent during our lifetime so we may derive great pleasure from it."

This is a city of big money—more money per man than any other city in the country. Where else would you find a housing development offering furnished one-family houses for $110,000?

That doesn't mean that Houston suburbs have car pools of Cadillacs. But it does mean this: It means that Houston is a city the depression forgot. That's because it's surrounded by the richest 200 miles of raw materials in the world, riches that have attracted huge industrial complexes. That means Houston workers not only work but have a wider choice of jobs, jobs that pay more money.

And how did Houston get that way?

DOLLAR AN ACRE

Some overenthusiastic citizen said Houston was the city that had to be. That's not true. Houston was just a muddy piece of land near the shallow, sluggish Buffalo Bayou back in 1836 when Texas won its independence from Mexico, and its main claim to fame was its closeness to the historic San Jacinto battlefield. That was the promotion pitch for two New York real-estate men, John K. and Augustus C. Allen, who bought up the land for a dollar an acre. But even 20 years later a Mississippi doctor wrote his wife: "Houston is a small city possessing but little interest. The difficult navigation to and from the place will ultimately leave it to die out." (The doctor instead settled in the Texas town of Pittsburg which now has a population of about 3,142.)

It took the Southern Pacific Railroad to prove the doctor wrong. Southern Pacific has been Houston's biggest employer for the past 100 years and still is (current payroll, about 7,000). Not many years later the Houston Chamber of Commerce talked about their town "where 18 railroads meet the sea." The boast of a sea outlet was then just a dream, but a dream that never died.

MUD AND ALLIGATORS

Flat-bottomed boats worried their way up the bayou a hundred years ago—overhanging branches ripping their topsails, shifting mud shoals, and alligators all slowing their trip. They came because boats always come where the cargo is, and cargo here was cotton. Even back in 1868, some 150,000 cotton bales moved out of Houston's port. By the time the new port opened in 1915 the total had reached some 4 million bales.

"I brought in the first big ship, the steamship *Dorothy*, with a cargo of coal," said Capt. Walter L. Farnsworth, now retired, a sprightly small barrel of a man, who looks and acts at least 20 years younger than his 76.

This was his first trip down the channel since then and he was looking and remembering. "Over there was a cemetery," he said pointing to a knob of land now full of factories. "They must have moved it to straighten the channel. And see that sugar and molasses plant, that was all red clay. And when we got into port they had to tie up our lines to trees, and took 8 days to unload our cargo. It's all a little hard to believe now."

It is hard to believe. Houston now handles 45.5 million tons of cargo a year worth $2 billion, and more ships pass through here than through the Panama Canal.

It's not just a channel—36 feet deep, up to 400 feet wide—it's an avenue of industry with 150 major plants, everything from steel to synthetic rubber, and the 38 chemical plants alone are worth a billion dollars. It's a magnet and a gateway; a concentration point for cotton going all over the world.

"Put cotton on a curve and you can see a slight per capita increase, you can see that it's still a million bales a year," said cotton expert Lamar Fleming. "We ship a half million bales to 30 foreign countries. Why the lint alone has a money value of $165 million. Just remember that cotton opened this port."

But if cotton opened it, oil pressured its progress at high speed. This is the biggest oil port in the world.

The 19 counties in the Houston area produce more than 410,000 barrels a day from over 9,050 wells. And the refinery capacity here is almost twice that. Humble Oil &

Refining Co. alone has one-eighth of the reserve oil of the United States.

BLACK-GOLD BUSINESS

Houston's big boom wasn't only oil, it was the big business that follows oil—refineries, pipeline companies, oilfield equipment. And it was the oil that made the millionaires.

"But oilmen aren't all millionaires," said multimillionare R. E. "Bob" Smith, a big broad man with a head of thick gray hair and a warm smile. "Gosh durn, I could stand at any street corner and pick lots of them out and I'll bet some of them would be glad to take a job firing up a boiler." Smith once headed Houston's Good Neighbor Commission, now directs the city's civil defense and still passes out programs to the congregation each Sunday at the Methodist Church, greeting all his friends with: "You all right?" Right now, Smith is pushing an idea of storing oil in some of our depleted fields for reserve.

The controlled oil wells no longer gush; the gas fields no longer burn.

Not too many years ago you could ride through a Texas oilfield and read a newspaper at night from the bright light of burning gas. Gas then was the waste you couldn't give away.

Now gas is the sixth largest industry in the United States, edging close to oil and coal as a main fuel for power. Five major gas lines are headquartered in Houston, and pipelines pressure it all over the country.

PETROCHEMICAL POWER

Gas isn't only power, it's a raw material for the petrochemical industry.

Petrochemical is a word that meant nothing to Houston 14 years ago; today it means more than $2.5 billion. That's the petrochemical plant investment in the gulf coast area around Greater Houston—and that represents an estimated 85 percent of the Nation's total petrochemical plants, some 90 producers of basic chemicals turning out 200 different products. These chemical products "pickle" steel, keep your toothpaste from drying out, produce penicillin, nylon, and the antiknock in your gasoline. Then these's polyethelene, the squeeze bottle plastic, almost all of it concentrated here—by 1955 they expect to produce 600 million pounds of it a year.

Here's why Houston is the country's chemical capital:

It's got everything these plants need: Salt, sea water, water transportation, sulfur, cheap fuel, and shirt-sleeve weather 10 months a year.

EXPANDING HISTORY

"We had people hunting all over the country for plant sites and we just never found anything to equal this place," said Dow Chemical's boss here, Dr. A. P. "Dutch" Beutel, who has done everything for Dow from design engineer to pipe-shop superintendent. "And don't forget one of the big things this area's got—it's got the 15 top chemical companies in one place and that means we feed each other. And we're all expanding. That's our whole history here: Build a plant, then enlarge it, then enlarge it again. Here is a growth without limit."

You believe this when you visit Dow—the first big chemical company here, and still the biggest. Its a huge forest of brilliantly painted pipes and you have to look at it with your imagination.

How else can you actually believe that here they make metal out of ordinary sea water? You see pumps suck in water from the sea, mix it with the milk of lime made from oyster shells, drain it in huge outdoor tanks, then it's boiled, purified, dried, split by electricity, and poured out as molten magnesium metal, lightest of all structural metals.

Most of these chemical companies are pushbutton places—Dow, Carbide and Carbon, Monsanto, du Pont—but they still hire some 40,00 people. Typical of Dow's 5,600 employees is Jim Miller, a junior engineer in the research and development section.

"I tell you this is a young man's country," he said. "Great scott, I'm in charge of a pilot plant, and do you know how old I am? I'm only 22. In fact the average of the top brass here is only 43. I tell you I'm working with the future."

But Houston's future isn't only chemicals—it's things like cap pistols, products made from local raw materials.

CHANGING SPIRIT

"We make some 750,000 cartridge-loading cap pistols a year," said 39-year-old Tally Nichols who started Nichols Industries, Inc., on a financial shoestring and a $10 lathe. "I use zinc and plastic in my pistol. I get the zinc here, but they ship the plastic in tank cars up north somewhere for finishing. Someday, and someday soon, that whole process will be done right here. You know why? Because here we don't believe that just because it was all right for poppa then it's all right for me. There's a spirit of change here."

You feel that same sense of change when you talk to young James D. Sartwelle, Jr., who follows his father's footsteps as head of the stockyards.

"I just can't see why we should pay freight to ship our cattle to the feed lots of the East and then pay more freight to bring back the meat. There's no reason why we can't feed and fatten our own. There's no reason why we should have to import a half million pounds of pork a week when we can breed what we need. And we ought to have tanneries and other factories here to use the end products of cattle. And we will. Down here this is a crusade in a raw new idea, but we've got people believing in it now."

One of the believers is big, broad-shouldered, 48-year-old A. William Schild, who left the heating and ventilating business in 1948 to buy a ranch. "It was a rundown place and they told me I couldn't have cattle here, but last year I had 300 head and I fattened them on my own peanuts and corn. And they told me this wasn't corn country, but last year I got 70 bushels an acre. Sure it takes more time, more investment, maybe more gamble to feed your corn to cattle and sell your corn on the hoof and walk your grain to market—but it's only common sense because we've got our own market here, we've got a million people to feed."

This million is but the beginning. Some citizens say that Houston is a city that hasn't jelled yet—and they mean that its final form is still in flux.

SKYLINE CHANGER

"I came here 20 years ago," said skyline changer Kenneth Franzheim, "and there were only 25 architects here then—now there are 250, and they're all busy. I tell you this is a frontier."

Perhaps the most famous of the Franzheim buildings is the $18 million Foley's, the country's first windowless department store (which also features a separate 5-story garage for customers). Ultramodern Foley's is Houston's only complete department store besides Sears, Roebuck, and that's because Houston, with its billion-dollar retail trade, is mostly a city of slick speciality shops—like Sakowitz's.

Downtown Houston has been shifting south during the past years, filling in the empty spaces between the heart of the city and the $21-million Shamrock Hotel, about 5 miles from downtown center, built by wildcat oil millionaire Glenn H. McCarthy.

Close to the Shamrock is Houston's new pride, a 163-acre medical center that has grown so fast and so rich that it already has a national importance. It's unique in its diversity—4 huge general hospitals plus 2 children's hospitals, the Baylor University College of Medicine, the $10 million Anderson Hospital, 1 of the most modern cancer clinics in the country. Upcoming soon is the University of Texas Dental College built around the use of color TV.

VOLUNTEER TV

Houston believes in all uses of TV—it has a complete TV setup in its air-conditioned jail, and it sponsored KUHT, the first educational TV station in the country, which operates with a lot of volunteer student help at the University of Houston.

"You can call Houston a cultural oasis of the Southwest," said 37-year-old KUHT director, John C. Schwarzwalder. "We've got 3 live theaters, an excellent symphony orchestra, a first-class choral group, and 2 art museums. Of course, you still can't call it a violin and candlelight town. Hubert Mewhinny of the Post said it was more a whisky and trombone town."

William P. Hobby, former Governor of Texas, now publisher of the Houston Post (his wife Oveta Culp Hobby heads the Federal Health, Education, and Welfare Department), has another description of Houston: "This town was born with a big kick, and it's been kicking ever since."

Some of these kicking ceremonies take place this week when the hustling chamber of commerce goes all-out in a week-long celebration for its observance of "M" Day, July 3, the day Houston becames the first metropolitan area in the South or Southwest to reach the magic million. It will be a week of parties, parades, projects, and all kinds of contests. And some time after midnight July 3, the first baby born will be honored as the 1,000,001st citizen.

MILLION MAGIC

That honored baby probably won't be the second child of Herbert and Ava Jean Mears, although they expect it anytime. But the Mears baby will be typical of something else. The magic of the new million is that they are from everywhere, pulled in by the promise of the city. Herbert Mears came here from New York some 3 years ago, married a lovely local girl, and settled down as a draftsman for Humble Oil & Refining Co. During summers he directs an art school at the Contemporary Art Museum, and his own fine, sensitive paintings have been widely exhibited and widely praised.

"I'll never forget that first night I came here," he said. "Somebody took me to a huge outdoor party and here were these dozens of strangers treating me not only as a gentleman, but as a friend. And it's the same at Humble where I work. It's such a big company, you'd think I'd be swallowed up, but I know hundreds of people by their names and hundreds more by their faces, and they're friendly faces. And that's what sold me on this city. It's a special warmth, a special spirit, and that's why I'm never leaving here. That's why Houston is my home."

Toward Better Balanced Farming

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DOUGLAS R. STRINGFELLOW
OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 6, 1954

Mr. STRINGFELLOW. Mr. Speaker, today Secretary of Agriculture Ezra T. Benson will be delivering a speech at Warsaw, Ind. I have received an advance copy of his address and find it most stimulating and revealing as the Secretary discusses national policies which give rise to our huge surplus commodities and outlines the remedies we must take to correct this situation.

Secretary Benson also pays a very deserved tribute to our distinguished majority leader, Mr. CHARLES A. HALLECK. I recommend that all my colleagues read this speech for a better understanding of our farm problems:

> It is a real pleasure to participate in this farmers' day celebration which is a part of your observance of the 100th anniversary of the city of Warsaw and Kosciusko County. Here in this great farming and industrial State of Indiana you recognize the interdependence of agriculture and business. You have learned at firsthand that a stable and prosperous agriculture is essential to the well-being of the entire economy.
>
> It is encouraging to know of the cooperation of the Indiana Farm Bureau, the Grange, and businessmen generally in making farmers' day such a huge success. I am happy to see so many farmers and representatives of farm organizations in this audience. And, speaking of representatives, I would like to say a word about one of the best, your own Representative CHARLIE HALLECK.
>
> As you know, this is a sort of anniversary for him, too. During 1954 he is rounding out his 20th year of service to the people of this district and the Nation. As majority leader of the House, he is working tirelessly and effectively for the Eisenhower administration's program. I am proud to serve on the same team with him.
>
> This centennial marks a period from which the United States has emerged as the most productive nation on earth. In these last hundred years we have undergone an almost complete industrial and agricultural revolution.
>
> Just as our forefathers conquered the wilderness that was once America, so are we today pushing back the frontiers of science. The steam engine and the horse, which supplied much of the power a century ago have largely given way to electrical power and diesel and gasoline engines. Today we stand on the threshold of the age of atomic power. If this latest of man's great discoveries does not destroy us—and I have faith that it will not—the way will be opened for radical changes in scores of such widely separated fields as agriculture, transportation, heating, and medicine.
>
> Yes, we have come a long way in these last hundred years. Yet the newspapers back in 1854 featured headlines which have a familiar ring today. They told of war and rumors of war. Then it was Crimea; now it is Indochina.
>
> The burning issue then was slavery. Abraham Lincoln was just emerging into national prominence. One hundred years ago to this very day, the first Republican slate of candidates was endorsed at a convention Jackson, Mich.
>
> Now, as then, the great issue of the day is slavery. Two diametrically opposed philosophies are fighting for the allegiance of man. Eternal principles are involved. Liberty-loving people fear communism as people anciently feared the plague. Involved are both our love for democracy and our Christian loyalty. Communism is not merely an economic program. It is a total philosophy of life, atheistic and utterly opposed to all we hold dear as a great Christian Nation. Be not misled. It can happen here. But it must never happen here.
>
> These are perilous days. But, however discouraging the outlook may be at times, a review of our own history makes it abundantly clear that we have had to face momentous decisions before and somehow the inner strength of our people, fortified by an unswerving faith in God, has carried us through every crisis. I am confident that we can and will meet the stern tests which lie ahead. God is at the helm. This Nation came into being under His inspiration to the Founding Fathers. This is my faith. This is a choice land with a great destiny.
>
> Because our very national existence is at stake, the more urgent problems of the day are concerned with the basic issue of war or peace. Yet we must not overlook—and this administration is facing positively—a variety of problems which directly affect us on the home front. One of these is the farm situation.
>
> Since the peak of the Korean war early in 1951, farm income has fallen sharply. The parity ratio, which weighs prices received against prices paid by farmers for goods and services, had dropped from 113 in February of 1951 to 94 when this administration took office a year ago last January, a decline of 19 points in 23 months.
>
> Declining exports and diminishing demands for some farm commodities which were highly essential to our war efforts created this generally lower level of agricultural prices. At the same time, the costs of machinery, labor, fertilizer, and other items which farmers must buy have remained at or near their peak levels.
>
> This cost-price squeeze hurts. It is hurting farmers day in and day out. Certain provisions of our present farm program which were supposed to help the farmers, actually have an opposite effect. High, rigid support prices on the Nation's basic feed grain, corn, have worked to the disadvantage of many farmers in areas such as this, where poultry, eggs, hogs, cattle, and dairying provide by far the largest part of agricultural income.
>
> Artificially high supports for the basic commodities in the face of declining demands have resulted in continued production at levels far above current market demands. The result is back-breaking surpluses of such crops as wheat and cotton and the necessity for more stringent production controls than most farmers will wish to live with year in and year out.
>
> Today Commodity Credit Corporation either owns outright or has under loan and purchase agreement farm products valued at approximately $6½ billion. This total has increased by more than $2½ billion during the last year. It is probable that requirements for price supports on 1954 crops, together with requirements for carrying investments in prior-year crops, will considerably exceed $9 billion.
>
> Earlier this year Congress increased CCC's borrowing authority to $8½ billion to permit the agency to carry out price-support operations directed by law. Last week we were forced to ask for a further increase—to $10 billion—to meet these anticipated needs.
>
> It is costing us about $30,000 per hour—$700,000 per day—one-quarter of a billion dollars a year—just to pay storage charges on the Government's holdings.
>
> As we accumulate these vast surpluses of certain commodities we are in effect borrowing from tomorrow's markets. We already have a full year's supply of wheat on hand as we harvest this year's crop. The same thing is true of cotton.
>
> Because wheat is an important, though by no means the most important, crop here in Indiana, I would like to discuss this special problem a bit further. It illustrates the seriousness of following an emergency program long after the emergency has passed.
>
> The story of expanding wheat acreage goes back to the First World War. As prices rose to more than $2 per bushel between 1913 and 1919, some 21 million additional acres of wheat came into production—much of it marginal land in the Great Plains area.
>
> Shrinking export demands and years of drought later resulted in the retirement of a large part of this acreage from wheat production. Much of it was returned to grass. Total wheat acreage in the United States was actually a bit lower when World War II erupted than it was in 1914.
>
> Wheat plantings jumped from 53 million acres in 1942 to 78 million in 1947, as average prices climbed from $1.10 per bushel to $2.29. Again the big increase came in the marginal land of the Great Plains. In some of the "dust bowl" counties of western Kansas and eastern Colorado, wheat acreage doubled and trebled. In one county it actually skyrocketed from a mere 5,000 acres in 1939 to 365,000 acres in 1952.
>
> These were the "dust bowl" counties of the mid-1930's. The area reverted to this "dust bowl" status again last year.
>
> High wartime wheat prices encouraged the huge plow-up of marginal land. High, rigid price supports have tended to keep this acreage under cultivation during recent years. Altogether, we estimate that about 8 million acres in half a dozen States should be returned to grass.
>
> High prices and high-price supports have encouraged expanded wheat acreage in other areas, too. For example, in Illinois the 1953 wheat acreage was 51 percent above the 10-year average. In Michigan it was up 46 percent; in New York 36 percent.
>
> There is an economic law which admits of no exception: If prices are supported above market levels for any length of time, production is stimulated and consumption is retarded. Consequently, surpluses pile up. Then production controls must follow.
>
> Price support at a rigid, high level therefore should not be considered by itself. It is but 1 leg of a 3-legged stool; the other 2 legs are "surplus disposal" and "production control." A stool will not stand very long on 1 or 2 legs. It needs all three.
>
> The abnormal wartime and early postwar conditions were such as to obscure this vital principle. As a result of the insatiable demands of that period, market prices were usually above support levels. The levels of price support were raised higher and higher, but still the market took all that was produced and asked for more. Price support seemed marvelously effective. Surplus disposal and production control were not needed. The illusion grew that the farm program could stand firmly on one leg only—price support.
>
> Now we see this was an error. We see it was the abnormal demands of war—not price support—that made for high prices. And we see that continued supports at a high, rigid level lead us inevitably into surplus disposal and production control programs.
>
> Nowhere is this better illustrated than in the case of wheat. Supported at 90 percent of an outmoded parity, wheat is now in such huge supply that if we did not harvest a single bushel from this year's crop we would still have enough for next year's needs.
>
> The first leg of the farm program stool was price support at a high, rigid level. The second leg was not fashioned when the first one was nailed on but it had to be fitted inevitably. This was surplus disposal. During this present marketing year we have been paying, out of the Public Treasury, a subsidy of 43 cents a bushel in order to move American wheat into the export market. In addition, about one-third of our wheat exports is moving under various foreign-aid programs. Even so, our supply increased by more than 300 million bushels during the past 12 months. It is expected to increase another 125 million during the year ahead.
>
> The first leg of the stool, price support, was generally welcomed by farmers. The second, surplus disposal, though necessary, was less welcome. It has not prevented an increase in our surplus stocks.
>
> So we fitted the required third leg to the stool, production control.
>
> For 1954 crops, controls are mild. The law was changed to reduce the impact of production curbs. Farmers were left free to grow other crops on the acres diverted from

wheat. With these mild controls, wheat supplies continued to increase. Not only that, but the acreage of feed grains, soybeans, flaxseed, and special crops increased on the acres diverted from wheat. This is manifestly unfair to producers of these other crops.

This next year we are being driven reluctantly to stiffer controls. What must a farmer do in 1955 to qualify for price support on wheat?

He must stay within his wheat-acreage allotment.

If he is diverting more than 10 acres from basic crops, he must stay within the allotment for every other basic crop produced on his farm. In addition, he must stay within a total acreage allotment, which means that he cannot use acres diverted from wheat for the production of oats, barley, rye, soybeans, or any other of a long list of crops produced for market.

These restrictions still will not fully protect producers of livestock and special crops from the spillover production on diverted acres. The regulations are in the interest of taxpayers and producers of unsupported crops. Actually, they do not give complete protection to any of these groups.

Thus, we finally have three legs to hold up our farm program stool. The production control leg is still a weak one, despite the fact that we have strengthened it. This leg may need further strengthening if the stool is to stay upright, distasteful though production controls are both to those who are subject to them and to those who administer them. Of course, farmers have an alternative. They may avoid production controls by electing to forego price supports.

The higher we make the farm program stool, the stronger we must build the legs—all three legs. Never forget that.

Market prices are to farmers much as the thermometer is to a doctor. The thermometer tells the doctor about the physical health of his patient; market prices tell the farmers about the economic health of their commodity.

What is the market price of wheat now trying to tell farmers?

That supplies are burdensome and production should be reduced.

That world agriculture has recovered from the devastation of World War II.

That the world needs our wheat less than formerly.

That costs of wheat production have declined as compared with other costs.

That consumers now desire less wheat products per person than formerly, and more livestock products.

That in certain areas wheat should be used for feed as well as food.

High, rigid price supports for wheat do not permit market prices to register this needed information with farmers.

A doctor could fix his thermometer so it would always read 98.6 and conclude therefrom that his patient was well.

Similarly, wheat farmers can have their prices fixed at 90 percent of an outmoded parity and conclude therefrom that all is well with their commodity.

Price supports have an important place in American agriculture, as I have said on innumerable occasions. But these supports should be at levels which will help relate supply and demand. They should be based on a parity computation which takes account of important changes in supply and demand relationships which have occurred during the past 40 years.

Price supports should provide a solid floor under farm prices but they should not be used for price fixing. And our emphasis upon various commodities should change as conditions change. For example, horses are today selling for only 13 percent of parity. Yet it would be ridiculosis to support the price of horses at 90 percent of parity to keep the blacksmith and the harness maker in business.

Wheat is one of four especially favored commodities. Parity for the basic crops is figured on either the old or the modernized basis, whichever is higher. We are supporting the price of wheat at 90 percent of old parity, but this is 106 percent of modernized parity. Even modernized parity, based on a 10-year moving average, is relatively high for wheat since the price of wheat during the past 10 years has been boosted first by unusual wartime demands and then by high supports.

Wheat producers made an important contribution to the postwar recovery and political stability of our allies. They should have help in making the adjustment to the lower demand for their commodity. But the help should be such as to assist in this adjustment, not further postpone it.

Flexible price supports, based on modernized parity, will help make this adjustment. They will not make the adjustment quickly or easily. There is no quick remedy. But I am sure that the solution does not lie in prolonging the very program which is largely responsible for our difficulties.

Indiana farmers have been in the forefront of the move to produce commodities for which there are current market demands. Agriculture here is widely diversified. Your soil is fertile. Your farmers have a greater opportunity than those in many other States to shift the emphasis from one product to another as market conditions change.

Corn is truly your basic commodity. But you market most of it in the form of hogs, poultry and poultry products, fed cattle, and dairy products. Although corn is currently supported at 90 percent of parity, none of these end commodities, with the exception of dairy products, receives price supports of any kind.

What is more important, livestock and poultry producers have indicated generally that they do not favor a system of price supports for these commodities. You will remember the cattle caravan that assisted me in Washington—a pressure move to force supports on live cattle. Efforts of a few years ago to support egg prices ended in disrepute. Since the termination of this program both prices and consumption of eggs have increased.

Actually, only 23 percent of cash receipts from farm marketings over the Nation comes from the six basic commodities. Fifty-six percent comes from products which enjoy no price supports at all; the remaining 21 percent from crops already under flexible supports.

Indiana farmers derive only 15 percent of their cash marketing receipts from the so-called basics. Sixty-one percent comes from products not under supports of any kind.

Yet it is the basic commodities which capture virtually all of the headlines in the debate over this administration's farm program recommendations. Most of the opposition to the President's program is directed against that section of the present law which places the basics under flexible price supports beginning next January 1.

These changes would be moderate. For tobacco, supports would be continued at 90 percent when marketing quotas are in effect, which is always. The President's proposal to set aside up to $2½ billion worth of surplus commodities would lift large quantities of wheat and cotton out of our current supply calculations. This would result in a level of support for these commodities in the upper range of the 75 to 90 percent variation permitted under the flexible system.

Certainly these are gradual changes. But at the same time they are important ones—important because they would point our farm program in the direction we must take, toward better balanced production, toward greater reliance upon the economic forces of supply and demand, and eventually toward greater freedom of action by farmers in making their own management decisions.

This needed change of direction cannot be overemphasized. Billy Sunday, whose name is well remembered here, used to say that he would rather be 1 foot from Hell and headed away from it, than 25 miles away and headed toward it.

There are two ways for a farmer to know what to produce. He may study market prices and determine for himself which crops should be most profitable. Or he may have the Government tell him what to grow. I like the first alternative and so do most farmers.

The theory of flexible price supports is based upon varying production incentives with market needs. If farmers kept supplies within manageable proportions, allowing for normal carryovers, the level of price support would always be at or near 90 percent under the flexible system.

There is nothing new or revolutionary about flexible price supports. As I have indicated, we already have them on commodities which produce about 21 percent of farmer's cash income. The platforms of both major parties endorsed flexible price supports in 1948. Republicans and Democrats in Congress voted overwhelmingly for the Farm Acts of 1948 and 1949 in which flexible supports were made a part of our permanent agricultural legislation. Every major farm organization favored them at that time, as did former President Truman and his Secretary of Agriculture.

In this connection, however, we must never lose sight of the fact that Government support prices—rigid or flexible—don't necessarily mean high farm prices. Despite 90-percent supports, wheat and corn are currently returning only about 80 percent of parity to farmers in the market place.

Our real goal—the stated goal of President Eisenhower—is not to give farmers some arbitrarily fixed percentages of parity through Government loans but rather to help them achieve full parity in the marketplace. As I indicated earlier, Indiana farmers have been emphasizing production for the market, rather than for Government storage. The result is that farmers' cash marketing receipts in this State are running more than 12 percent higher than a year ago, while for the Nation as a whole there has been a slight decline. Farmers here are getting about 100 percent of parity, as an average, in the marketplace.

Department of Agriculture estimates show that cash marketing receipts of Indiana farmers during the first 4 months of this year totaled $361 million, against $321 million for the corresponding period in 1953. For the same 4 months, farm income was higher than a year ago by $39 million in Illinois and $23 million in Ohio.

Agricultural income this year is generally higher in those States where nonsupported livestock and livestock products account for the greater part of farmers' marketings than it is in the States which depend most heavily upon production of the 90 percent supported so-called basic commodities. To me this indicates that our present agricultural program has been assigning to high, rigid price supports a function which they cannot successfully perform; that of maintaining farm income at a high level.

At the same time, this administration has carefully avoided making a political football of farm legislation. The welfare of agriculture should be a matter of bipartisan concern, since it affects all of us.

We have proceeded in the firm belief that if all of the facts are made available, the people of this Nation will arrive at the right decision. And as President Eisenhower said in a recent address, "What is right for America is politically right."

I cannot believe that continuation of the program under which the prices of basic commodities have been steadily declining for 3 years offers any solution to the problem. Government supports can never be a substitute for fair market prices anymore than an unemployment check can take the place of a job. Our programs of the past have placed more emphasis upon building storage space for surplus commodities than upon developing new markets for them.

This administration is seeking to reverse that emphasis. We are vigorously promoting sales of farm commodities abroad. We are seeking to ease trade barriers, currency restrictions and other roadblocks which keep our products from some markets. Through an expanded program of research and education, we are constantly seeking new uses and expanded outlets for agricultural products.

The future of American agriculture is bright. There is real opportunity for young people who choose agriculture as a career. Rural America has always been one of the greatest bulwarks of our form of Government. Throughout history, many of our great leaders have come from the farms and in the years ahead this Nation will continue to draw upon the strength of rural America.

The next hundred years will present their serious challenges just as have the last hundred which we look back upon here today. I have an abiding faith in the ability of the American people to meet these new problems as they arise. With the help of God, we shall continue to build a stable, prosperous, and free America.

Disposal of Obsolete Military Supplies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ERRETT P. SCRIVNER
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 6, 1954

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, during and after each war the question always arises as to what we should do with surplus as obsolete equipment, ammunition, and supplies of all sorts.

A timely and interesting discussion of scrap and surplus appeared in the May 1954 issue of the Reserve Officer. The author is Col. W. S. Whitehead, United States Army Reserves, who writes with a background of experience.

That article follows:

If There's a Next Time

(By Col. W. S. Whitehead, U. S. Army Reserve)

When Gen. Douglas MacArthur sought to arm and equip a stopgap reserve of 75,000 Japanese troops immediately after the Communist invasion of Korea, he was informed by Washington that it would take 18 months at the minimum to fill his modest requirements. And when our troops in Korea needed supplies and equipment desperately in order to maintain a foothold at the perimeter, their requirements for the most part were supplied not from regular military stocks but from the now historic rollup operation which had been established in Japan by the Far East Command.

That tremendously successful operation was a gigantic task undertaken to rebuild all types of weapons which had been discarded in the Pacific islands after the last war. They had been retrieved and shipped to Japan for repair and rehabilitation, specifically for use in those faraway areas. General Ridgway has been reported to have remarked that without this activity we never would have been able to remain in Korea. The project first came to my attention during a tour of the Far East in the late summer of 1951. It no doubt will forever stand as a monument to the ingenuity and perseverance of those expeditionary forces that had a part in effecting its establishment and operation.

As a result of the too rapid demobilization demanded by our people after World War II vast inventories of military type property were left without sufficient funds for their proper maintenance and preservation. This was done in the interest of what was then referred to as economy, but which now might be termed false or short-lived economy.

In 1947 the then Chief of Army Supply and Procurement publicly stated that large quantities of material held for mobilization reserve would become surplus due to excessive deterioration which was bound to result from its storage without proper and adequate maintenance. He pointed out that under the proposed budget the Army could meet only 55 percent of its maintenance requirements for work on wheeled vehicles and 67 percent of maintenance requirements on first-line aircraft. He warned that by accepting the proposed severe cuts for the maintenance of equipment, the Army would deplete its assets thus necessitating their replacement at a later date through the procurement of new assets. Thus, his prophetic words came to pass, and that by mid-1950 when, with what turned out to be a full-fledged conflict on our hands, we literally had to resort, initially at least, to junk piles in the Pacific for our weapons of war.

Of the 3 major conflicts in which this country has been involved even during the writer's lifetime, each 1 has caught us in an unprepared state. If we are to speak softly but carry a big stick then we must have a mobilization reserve always in readiness. The premium we will probably be forced to pay in the form of continued high taxes to assure this status, will have its salutary effect. If the enemy would strike again, and currently there is no evidence to the contrary, we really want to be ready to retaliate in 3 hours. Furthermore, if there's a next time it should be remembered that there will be no junk piles in distant lands to turn to as a source for immediately-required war materiel.

In late March of 1950 the writer was engaged as a consultant by the Management Committee of the Office of the Secretary of Defense. The duties were to head the task force concerned with effecting the disposal of surplus personal property. This assignment lasted for a period of 5 months and was a most turbulent one.

The first memorandum report which our group prepared for the committee was entitled "Surplus Personal Property Disposal" and was dated May 1, 1950. It contained the then most recent dollar value of inventories of each service, with separate totals showing the vast amount of unserviceable, obsolete, unclassified and unidentified property in each service. The report pointed up the tremendous repair and property disposal tasks that were ahead if the inventories were to be purged of this nonissuable property. It also contained suggestions for streamlining and consolidating the separate disposal operations of the services in certain localities for the purpose of effecting economies and expediting this responsibility.

There were a number of projects undertaken by the task force, some of which met with success and others with only mediocre acceptance. The military departments at that time had not embraced the idea of a Department of Defense Management Committee breathing down their necks. As a result, some of the actions undertaken and sponsored by the committee were accepted by one or more of the services with a tongue-in-cheek or lipservice attitude. The Committee's determinations obviously carried great weight initially, but by the time the actions got to the staffs for implementation many seemed to have a different version as to how they were to be carried out. Thus, there resulted a lot of footshuffling and sidestepping of the issues concerned.

There is one committee determination that that should be dealt with here primarily because it clearly proves the above point and, moreover, concerns a subject about which we have heard much during the the past year—ammunition. Upon receipt of the inventory reports from the services, those who reviewed them were shocked at the amount of ammunition that was listed as being unserviceable and unclassified. Out of the total dollar value of that item of supply reported to be on hand at depots in this country, about 35 percent thereof fell in these two categories.

Because of the technicalities involved in connection with the disposal of imperfect ammunition, some bare explanations might be provided before getting into the subject. In March 1948 a Presidential proclamation was issued forbidding the sale to non-bona-fide organizations of arms, ammunition and implements of war which had been determined surplus by the military. It was provided, however, that such property could be sold if it were sufficiently demilitarized to preclude its reconditioning as usable or salable materiel. This restrictive action had been engendered because of attempts on the part of a few to illicitly export certain surplus weapons, and from an international relations standpoint a tightening-up move was highly desirable.

In military parlance, demilitarization means to dissemble, break or cut up surplus implements of war so that there remain merely the basic components. In the case of ammunition such an operation produces components consisting of powder, brass or steel, copper and lead. These components under normal conditions are disposed of separately for the scrap value of their basic material contents. However, the Stockpiling Act which was enacted in 1946 forbade Government agencies from selling certain raw or partially processed materials, including scrap material whose basic content consisted of copper, brass and lead. Certain minimum amounts thereof were required by the Munitions Board to be reported to the General Services Administration for essential use in a war emergency and to be stockpiled on Government reservations.

During 1947 through 1949 the Department of Army had been authorized by Congress to expend between $22 and $25 million each year from proceeds received from sale of scrap and salvage material for expenses in connection with the transportation, demilitarization, and preparation for sale or salvage of other worn-out military supplies and equipment. This authority therefore provided the funds to conduct a large-scale demilitarization operation and the Army had elaborate plans to do just that. However, copper, brass, and lead scrap were high-priced items compared to steel scrap, and since they were required by law to be stockpiled most of the anticipated proceeds for this revolving fund never materialized. In short, the fund received insufficient money from scrap and salvage sales to conduct a large-scale demilitarization operation. As a result, the demilitarization program was stopped before it really got started.

In a memorandum to the management committee, dated June 9, 1950, details concerning the above were brought to their attention. It was pointed out that the military had immediately available over 600,000 tons of ammunition for demilitarization. It was therefore urged that the Munitions Board (then a part of the Office of Secretary of Defense) should grant relief to the services from reporting all small arms and artillery cartridge brass scrap for 1 year. It was planned as an alternative to sell such material to smelters as scrap, place the proceeds in the demilitarization revolving fund, and earmark the new brass ingots produced by the smelter for purchase by the military. It was pointed out that this operation would produce about 76,000 tons of strategic nonferrous and 287,000 tons of ferrous scrap. The proposed program, based on the then current scrap market prices, showed that the Government would receive about $10 million to purchase new brass ingots which it sorely needed and at the same time clean its shelves of residual property which was costly to store and handle.

On June 23, the management committee approved the recommendations contained in the memo of June 9. But no sooner had this been recorded than the Munitions Board representatives claimed such action was inconsistent with established policy and advanced other reasons for disallowing, none of which, however, were well founded, from a practical standpoint. On July 21, our group forwarded a further memorandum to the management committee in which it was pointed out that a known total potential of 2,300,000 tons of ammunition was available for demilitarization and set forth therein the actions to be taken step by step to accomplish the recommendations in the memo of June 9.

This was a tremendous tonnage of ammunition and even to the professional, such an amount is almost unfathomable. Yet, with this staggering quantity of material involved and the need for desperate, deliberate, and aggressive action, the Board failed to go along with the recommendations. To this date the writer has never been able to ascertain the identity of those primarily responsible for having defeated the project or their reasoning in the matter.

Congressional appropriation hearing records dated from 1946 through the spring of 1950 are replete with information as to the actual condition and amount of ammunition the Army then had on hand. In the spring of 1946 for instance, the Army Chief of Ordnance testified that of the 6 million tons stored in this country valued at $4.6 billions, there was no requirement for about 20 percent of that amount and that plans were underway to break down the excess and sell the various components as scrap. Of the total tonnage involved it was further testified to that 40 percent thereof had been stored outdoors and had deteriorated in 1946 to the extent that renovation over a period of years was considered necessary to make it suitable for firing.

Even General Eisenhower as Chief of Staff of the Army had a basic interest in this situation. In June 1946, he pleaded with the Senate Appropriations Committee for $12,500,000 to be used for the demilitarization and rehabilitation of ammunition seriously affected by conditions under which it now exists. He said, "We would very much like to get the $12,500,000 which was removed by the House so we can go ahead with this program."

In 1947 and 1948 Army representatives told the House Appropriations Committee that their Service had 8 million tons of ammunition which they valued at $8 billion. In 1949 the same Committee was informed that this item of supply in the Army's inventory was valued at $4 billion. In 1950 it was reported that its ammunition inventory was valued at $7.5 billion.

There is no immediate explanation for the wide fluctuation of values placed on this item except that the greater figures probably included that which we retained overseas, while the lesser figures represented holdings in this country alone. In any event, this bad situation of having these large amounts of imperfect ammunition on hand up to and through event of the Korean incident explains to a large extent why our boys didn't always have as much ammunition as they thought they should.

The story of ammunition as a basic item of issue no doubt parallels situations which existed during this period in other major items of supply. The fact remains that much of this nonissuable type property still occupies space in the military inventories. Recently the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government stated, "It is roughly estimated that the surplus and obsolete property of the Federal Government at the end of 1952 exceeded a cost of $25 billion." This situation of late has been accentuated.

In the past 10 years our military spending program, in the most part, has produced surplus property with an acquisition value in excess of $55 billion, a cost which, for comparison, is equal to about 20 percent of the Government's legal debt limit. The great amount of surplus and obsolete property plus the ineffective operational procedures employed in dealing with the problem has assumed a complexity which requires remedial action. This fact was evidenced in the recent statement of Treasury Secretary Humphrey: "The worth of our military defense program must be measured not simply by its cost but by its wisdom—for billions of dollars, wastefully or unwisely spent, or production schedules frozen to produce obsolete weapons, would spell spectacular and fatal folly."

A White House committee which studied global propaganda last fall informed the President that "there is no reliable evidence that the recent changes in the Soviet regime and in Soviet tactics involve any change in the basic Soviet objective of a Communist world controlled by the Kremlin. In the face of this Soviet drive, the United States and allied nations must continue to strengthen their military capabilities until it is possible to perceive with clarity that the Soviet Union is unwilling to risk all-out war, and has abandoned its goal of world domination. * * *"

The industrial mobilization policy of this administration embraces the broad base concept and calls for filling any gaps in the Nation's industrial requirements for an all-out war, together with the systematic maintenance of those war production supplies and equipment when not being used. Some similarly strong position is required to be adopted with respect to those military items of supply which remain on hand with the advent of a cease fire if we are to maintain a ready reserve.

The judicious policy concerning military appropriation requests adopted by the administration requires as a counterpart an equally judicious policy which will eliminate the wasteful and deceitful practice of retaining in stock vast amounts of surplus military property. There must be no repetition of what happened after World War II days, if we are to remain strong militarily and justly maintain our position in world affairs.

Christianity and Patriotism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL T. CURTIS

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1954

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I wish to extend my remarks with a very timely statement entitled "Christianity and Patriotism" by John F. Streng, pastor of St. John American Lutheran Church, Beatrice, Nebr., a sermon preached by him on July 4. I commend it to the Congress and to all who read this RECORD. It is as follows:

CHRISTIANITY AND PATRIOTISM

On the exposition grounds of the Chicago Century of Progress stood a stately white building, trimmed in red, blue, and gold. It was known as the Hall of Religion. Over the spacious entrance was a huge stone into which the builders had chiseled the words: "Righteousness exalteth a Nation." The architect of that edifice certainly struck the keynote to America's religious life. Would that he had completed God's admonition: "but sin is a reproach to any people." Millions read the inscription and pondered it. It was a silent, forceful reminder to every citizen and foreigner that the Christian religion has a foremast place in institutions of this country. True, a bird's-eye view of the exposition grounds made Religion Hall dwindle among gigantic skyscrapers dedicated to the progress of man. Yet it stood in the center and statistics say that the greatest number of visitors passed through it. Conscientious and far-sighted planners had wisely placed God's word into an advantageous position.

Independence Day wakens memories of freedom and patriotism. We need more than rabble-rousing flagwaving and a few parades. America is in danger. Family picnics and fireworks have their place, but today's world situation calls for alert citizens. America calls herself a Christian nation, although only one-half of her people embrace Christianity. Thus the church must work relentlessly to spread the gosepel of Jesus Christ from shore to shore. By means of thorough Christian education, mission work, endless literature, dignified constructive advertising, she can draw the attention of the passerby. In psalm 33 the author says: "Blessed is the nation whose God is the Lord." Wisely spoken. Thousands of years ago the living God alone could get order out of chaos, and establish peace among a jealous people, and restore the Ten Commandments to national respect. Two thousand years after the psalmist spoke, St. Paul gave his pupil, Timothy, sound advice on patriotism. Another 2,000 years have elapsed since Paul's day. God and government still live. Today is the proper time to emphasize Christianity and patriotism again. The church has always advocated separation of church and state. She teaches that government shall never dictate church doctrines, nor that church shall control the political economy. The Bible says that government is ordained of God and that citizens shall be subject to the authorities that rule well. If you were to ask 10 American citizens at random what Independence Day means, how it originated, how long America has been free, and what the Declaration really declares, the answers might be a surprise.

If our fathers, who gave their blood that life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness might be more than a pious phrase or shibboleth, could see the trend today, would they consider it to have been worth the price? They were patriots in every sense. Patriotism is defined as "devotion to one's country." To this day millions believe those words sincerely. Under God, our Nation has become the envy of the world, the haven of millions, the beacon of Christian decency. Many sincere citizens eagerly proclaim the divine blessing of freedom and liberty for all. Nor do they hesitate to warn family and community of the grave and great dangers seeking to undermine our peace and prosperity.

What has Christianity to do with patriotism? St. Paul tells student interne Timothy what he thinks. First, he indicates to the eager young disciples that a Christian ought to pray for his government. There can be no patriotism of the true type without religion. No Christian can live without praying. Either God is Lord of all, or Ruler of nothing. The Christian is a member of both the Kingdom of God and the country in which he lives. He also knows that the Bible admonishes: "We must obey God rather than men." He knows that Jesus says: "Render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's, and unto God, the things of God." So the Christian is vitally interested in good government, in those who are the chosen representatives at the seat of government, in peace, health, order, honor, good friends, trusty neighbors, and the like. He knows that when he prays that God will give our leaders wisdom and courage and strength. He is praying for the welfare of the Nation. The patriotic Christian citizen, who is devoted because God loves the whole world, will invoke God's blessing upon all. St. Paul catalogs supplications, prayers, thanks, intercessions as most important. These should be made for all in authority. In keeping with that decree our church prays every Sunday for all in authority, especially the President of the United States, the Governor of this Commonwealth, and all our judges and magistrates.

Hundreds of fervent prayers are offered today in chapels, churches, and cathedrals and on other sacred soil and shrines. Pulpits and platform and picnic grounds becomes centers of united communication with God. People have been stirred by world events.

We cannot ask God for a conditional patriotism, or a prejudiced national pride, or a selfish democracy. They are neither patriotic nor Christian. They are not an ideal for our children. We must dedicate ourselves to foster good will among men. Patriotism always grows and glows when the leaders are imbued with the spirit of God. God alone grants wisdom to rule after His good pleasure to the maintenance of righteousness and to the hindrance and punishment of wickedness. It is a sad commentary on American life to hear people sing: "Our Father's God to Thee," and then listen to a withering denunciation of parties in or out of power pointing with pride and prejudice at mistakes of others.

To pray aright we need remember the prinples a Christian patriot must subscribe to in daily life. St. Paul briefly describes an ideal peaceful nation and government in these words: "That we may lead a quiet and peaceable life in all godliness and honesty." There is the foundation of Christian virtue and virility. Blessed indeed is the nation that builds on these memorial stones.

Blessed are the citizens who respect these divine measures. Such government needs but few laws, because its citizens are eager to live right and lead godly lives. It is no gain to know a man's political leanings without establishing the principles he stands for. If he doesn't advocate sound, Christian government he is not a good citizen. This does not mean that government is wrong because it does not agree with his ideas. But a government not built upon eternal principles is not worth saving. Our sacred rights shall not perish so long as God's place is secure in American history and development. Righteousness is the first fruits of godliness and honesty. To be a patriotic Christian citizen means more than casting an annual ballot or waving the stars and stripes. A quiet and peaceable life contributes more to national stability than agitation to subversive movements.

St. Paul sets the pattern for the patriot. His own life as martyr will live forever because God exalted him. What did Christ have to do with the pagan Roman Government of His day? He obeyed every law of His day that was divinely justifiable. He told His disciples to do the same. He was the greatest patriot ever to walk the earth. He must be our pattern. When we recognize the place of government in our life and national welfare and international progress as did Jesus, we shall not be involved in foreign entanglements or international intrigue.

The loyalty of Jesus Christ knows no national boundaries or barriers. It embraces heaven and earth. God's word is eternal; it outlasts every constitution or resolution adopted by man. Lawmaking depends upon lawbreaking. And the latter takes place only where people wilfully object to others' rights and selfishly demand what they will not grant to others. Our highest allegiance is to the King of Kings. He has saved our Nation in the day of crisis. He has founded, at the foot of the Cross on Calvary, a democracy of unselfish service on the basis of love and mercy. It has endured for centuries in spite of persecution and prosperity. If we keep close to the Lord of Hosts not a single problem facing us will remain unsolved. As we place our trust in God, our faith in men, under God, shall be reestablished. God and His eternal rights can never be an incident in history. Governments are made and ruined by men. God rules forever. Amen.

An American Medical Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 6, 1954

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, there is no challenge that comes to one, who is in a legislative position, that can be more thrilling in comtemplation and fulfillment, than the opportunity to do something that will prove worthwhile to his fellowman.

Such an opportunity presents itself in the form of legislation that has for its objective the care of the sick and injured, and, the construction of hospitals, mental and chronic, as well as of a general character; the providing of diagnostic and treatment centers, nursing homes, rehabilitation facilities for the handicapped, and all other types and kinds of facilities designated to alleviate the condition of those who are ill, and restore them to health and strength, or at least lessen their pain and anguish. Such a challenge transcends in importance that which accompanies any or all of the usual legislative opportunities to be of service.

The jurisdiction of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce is wide and varied. There is no committee of Congress that has a more general jurisdiction. It deals with the many activities that taken together assist so materially in making the achievements of this Nation so outstanding. Its legislative jurisdiction covers our great systems of transportation on land, in the air, and waterborne in our coastal and inland waterways; securities and exchanges; interstate power, scientific development; communications by telephone, telegraph, cable, radio, and television; fair trade, public health and other subjects. Important as each may be in their own particular field of activity there is none in my opinion, that approaches in importance that which deals with the health of our people. And, I confess that in all the many years that I have been privileged to serve on this great committee, and of which I am now chairman, there is no work of the committee that has such an appeal to me as that which relates to the public health. The work of the committee in this field of its activity is neither partisan or limited to a particular few. It is general in character. It applies to all our people regardless of financial worth, with no barrier as to color, creed, or national origin. What could be more thrilling than to work in this great field of human endeavor? What could be more challenging?

It has been a privilege to have had a part in the work of the committee during the years when great strides have been taken by the committee in providing the means that would make possible additional hospitals and other types of health facilities for our people; to provide research centers in mental health, cancer, heart, and other diseases that are so devastating; and, to promote scientific research into the causes and cure of conditions that result in chronic disorders that handicap and preclude activity in the usual and normal ways of life; and, to find ways and means of promoting the general health and well-being of our people. To accomplish these things is a never-ending challenge.

During, this 83d session of Congress, the desire to accomplish, and, the fact of accomplishment, has not diminished. Under the leadership of President Eisenhower and Oveta Culp Hobby, Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, there has been advancement along every line of endeavor in the field of health. The President in his state of the Union message laid down in strong and emphatic words, the principle that the Federal Government, in conjunction with the several State governments, has a duty and a responsibility to do everything possible to promote and improve the health of our people. And, subsequently in what has been termed his health message, the President laid down the details of his program for providing additional and expanded health facilities for all our people.

This program of the President called for diagnostic and treatment centers, general hospital construction, hospitals for the chronically ill, nursing and convalescing homes, and rehabilitation facilities. All of this to be done by the use of Federal funds, matched with State funds, and, in addition thereto, the appropriation of Federal funds to assist the several States and local municipalities in carrying on institutional work in the treatment of mental cases, tuberculosis, and the numerous other activities of a similar kind. But, in addition to all of this, the President's program also included a method by which a broader and more comprehensive method of health insurance would be possible and at a cost that would be within the means of the low-income group. And it is also hoped that in addition to this splendid program that the Congress will also enact a bill that provides for a Government guaranty of loans made to individual doctors, or groups of doctors and organizations, as an incentive to create new and additional hospital and health facilities for the use of our people.

With a program such as this, that seeks to provide the necessary facilities together with the fine service that is characteristic of our medical profession, we can look with pride upon it as an American health program that has avoided socialization of medicine and has constructed a system that is entirely within the American concept of free enterprise.

I take pride in our accomplishment. It brings a feeling of satisfaction in the knowledge that it is something that is worthwhile in promoting the welfare of our people. It encourages to press on to higher achievement.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

Code of Laws of the United States

Title 44, Section 181. Congressional Record; arrangement, style, contents, and indexes.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the Congressional Record, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the Congressional Record semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

Title 44, Section 182b. Same; illustrations, maps, diagrams.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the Record without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the Congressional Record the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily Record as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided*, That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the Record with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the official reporters of the Congressional Record, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the Record shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the Record issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the Record for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the Record of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the Record shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the Record style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the Record.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the Congressional Record any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided*, That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix, but this rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided*, That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the Congressional Record.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the Congressional Record Appendix the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed.

10. *Official reporters.*—The official reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the Congressional Record by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this restriction shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. The Public Printer or the official reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the Congressional Record which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Illustrations.*—Pursuant to section 182b, title 44, United States Code (as shown above), requests for authority to insert an illustration in the Record should be submitted to the Joint Committee on Printing through the chairman of the Committee on Printing of the respective House in which the speech desired to be illustrated may be delivered. Illustrations shall not exceed in size a page of the Record and shall be linecuts only. Copy for illustrations must be furnished to the Public Printer not later than 12:30 o'clock p. m. of the day preceding publication.

13. *Corrections.*—The permanent Record is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided*, That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further*, That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Printing and binding for Congress, when recommended to be done by the Committee on Printing of either House, shall be so recommended in a report containing an approximate estimate of the cost thereof, together with a statement from the Public Printer of estimated approximate cost of work previously ordered by Congress within the fiscal year (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 145, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on Printing, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

DISTRIBUTION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

To the Vice President and each Senator 100 copies; to the Secretary and Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, each, 25 copies; to the Secretary, for official use, not to exceed 35 copies; to the Sergeant at Arms, for use on the floor of the Senate, not to exceed 50 copies; to each Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress, 60 copies; to the Clerk, Sergeant at Arms, and Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives, each, 25 copies; to the Clerk, for official use, not to exceed 50 copies; and to the Doorkeeper, for use on the floor of the House of Representatives, not to exceed 75 copies; to the Vice President and each Senator, Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress there shall also be furnished (and shall not be transferable), 3 copies of the daily Record, of which 1 shall be delivered at his residence, 1 at his office, and 1 at the Capitol.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the Record.

Appendix

Statement of United States Policy Before International Labor Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 7, 1954

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, in these days when clear-cut assertions of America's unalterable opposition to Communist doctrines is so desirable, it is especially heartening to note the outspoken declaration of the United States representative, William L. McGrath, to the International Labor Conference, just concluded in Geneva, Switzerland. In a forthright presentation of the refusal of our Nation to compromise with principle on the basic issues of freedom of association and of liberty, Mr. McGrath, a leading industrialist of Cincinnati, Ohio, and employer delegate of this country, enunciated American doctrine in a most commendable manner. I ask unanimous consent that his statement be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The challenging of the seating on committees of so-called employer delegates from seven totalitarian countries is in effect a challenge to the right of these countries to remain members of this organization.

We have in the past sidestepped the facing of this issue. The time has now come when we must face it squarely.

The ILO was founded upon the principle of tripartite representation. Its basic structure assumes, and its constitution states, that each country will send delegates representing government, workers, and employers.

The ILO constitution, in its preamble, emphasizes "recognition of the principle of freedom of association."

The 1946 report of the Conference Delegation on Constitutional Questions cites, as one of the essential principles of the ILO, "the freedom of employers' and workers' delegates to represent their constituents without government instructions or interference and to speak and vote freely without government control."

The ILO concept, from the very beginning, was that employer delegates to this body should represent free associations of free employers, and worker delegates should represent free associations of free workers—by contrast to government delegates, who represent only government.

It was the fundamental intent of the ILO that three divergent points of view, bearing upon problems common to all three groups, would thereby be brought forward and debated. Out of such debates, out of full and frank discussion of areas of disagreement, there would be developed common ground upon which a requisite majority could agree. Upon such mutual understanding progress could be made.

This method has worked out in practice for 35 years. After the League of Nations died, the ILO remained. Why? Because of the inherent strength of tripartite representation, which embraces three elements, three great social forces, which are paramount in a free society.

It is my firm conviction that our remarkable record as a continuing international body is due to our tripartite composition, as defined in our constitution. And it is the tripartite structure of this body that is being threatened today.

The time has come for plain talk. The fact is, and all of us know it, that delegations from Soviet nations are not tripartite, and cannot be tripartite.

How can there be a "free association of employers" in Russia? There are no free employers in Russia. Government is the employer. Therefore a so-called employer delegate from Russia is in reality nothing but another Government delegate. Calling him by any other name does not alter that fact.

Are there free associations of workers in Russia? Let me quote briefly from the ILO publication entitled "Cooperation in Industry," published by the ILO in 1951. According to this document, Lenin labeled trade unions a "school for communism."

An article in a leading Russian trade union review stated—and I am quoting our own ILO textbook:

"The Communist Party teaches that the success of our work depends upon the selection of suitable officers both from the political point of view and from the point of view of capacity and efficiency."

Speaking of central trade union councils in Russia, our ILO publication points out that the activities of the central trade union councils "fall also within the competence of the parallel agencies of the Communist Parties * * *; the prime mover in relation to any action taken being, in fact, the Communist Party."

Is there any doubt in your mind that in Soviet countries trade unions are dominated by the employer, which is the government, in violation of the principles of freedom of association?

Is there any doubt in your mind but that a so-called workers' or employers' delegate from a Soviet nation is merely a mouthpiece of government?

Let us look briefly at the voting record within the ILO.

During the last 5 years there have been 62 record votes on the floor of this conference.

In all of these votes, as listed in the provisional record, not once has a workers' delegate or an employers' delegate from Poland or Czechoslovakia voted contrary to the vote of the government delegate.

In every case, the delegates from these nations have voted as a bloc—and furthermore, in every case the votes of Poland and Czechoslovakia were identical.

Does not this clearly spell out the situation before us? The seven nations whose employer delegates have been challenged have a total of 28 votes—28 votes, none of which in fact represent workers or employers; 28 votes, all of which in fact represent government; 28 votes, all of which represent the Communist Party.

What will remain of the tripartite nature of this body, if we admit a solid block of 28 votes none of which represents free workers or employers, and all of which are under the direct dictation of the Kremlin?

I charge that the purpose of the attempted reentry of Russia into the ILO is that of disrupting this organization and using it as a springboard for Communist propaganda.

Unless steps are immediately taken to preserve the status of the tripartite structure of this organization as originally conceived and practiced for so many years, it is my intention to recommend to my Government, to my nominees and to the employers of the United States that they refrain from sending future employer delegations to this conference.

Shipping Industry Facing Two Perils

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 7, 1954

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Shipping Industry Facing Two Perils," written by Harry C. Kenney, staff correspondent of the Christian Science Monitor in New York, and published in the Christian Science Monitor of July 1, 1954.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SHIPPING INDUSTRY FACING TWO PERILS

(By Harry C. Kenney)

NEW YORK.—Two ominous business and economic storms are brewing on the horizon for the American shipping industry and up to now no course has been charted around or through them.

These two perils consist of:

1. While the United States merchant marine is now in good shape, in 10 years or so practically the whole merchant marine will be obsolete because no new ships are now being built for replacement.

2. The shipbuilding industry has about collapsed from the lack of orders.

With the exception of some warships, United States shipyards have not received a single order for the construction of an oceangoing vessel for private United States flag ownership and operations in the last year and a half.

Backlog of orders in shipyards have shrunk to a point where nearly all ships will be completed within the next few months. All the while shipyards are losing vital technical and design personnel such as draftsmen and loftsmen.

Officials of Bethlehem Steel Co. told this reporter that Bethlehem, which has 50 percent of the Nation's building capacity, has no new construction in sight. The company also expects to close 1 or 2 yards and put others into repair operations.

Bethlehem is reported to have made offers to build tankers and cargoes at cost just to keep the yards going and retain valuable personnel, but there have been no takers.

There has not been a "big worry in this country about the lack of shipbuilding because there are hundreds of Liberty's and tankers anchored in several ports around the United States. But the shipping industry is constantly telling the Government that these ships are now noncompetitive and will be even more so in the 1960's, and what once was considered to be a good merchant marine will disappear overnight. Even now they are "model T" ships with limited use from a military standpoint.

FEDERAL POLICY CITED

What is the Federal policy in regard to the merchant marine? Is it a good one? The answer to this is in a quote from the Merchant Marine Act of 1936:

"It is necessary for the national defense and development of its foreign and domestic commerce that the United States shall have a merchant marine—

"1. Sufficient to carry its domestic waterborne commerce and a substantial portion of the waterborne export and import foreign commerce of the United States and to provide shipping service on all routes essential for maintaining the flow of such domestic and foreign waterborne commerce at all times.

"2. Capable of serving as an naval and military auxiliary in time of war or national emergency.

"3. Owned and operated under the United States flag by citizens of the United States insofar as may be practicable, and

"4. Composed of the best-equipped, safest and most suitable types of vessels, constructed in the United States and manned with a trained and efficient citizens' personnel.

"It is the declared policy of the United States to foster the development and encourage the maintenance of such a merchant marine."

IMMEDIATE ACTION NEEDED

If these objectives are to be attained immediate action is declared necessary by not only private shipping interests but by the United States Government. The Department of Commerce recently prepared a report on maritime subsidy policy in which it reviewed the maritime policy of the 1936 Merchant Marine Act and concluded that the basic national maritime policy is sound and should be maintained.

Among the recommendations for definite action is the need for launching an orderly, planned shipbuilding program with emphasis on replacement during the next 10 years. Also, to encourage operators to take positive steps to replace ships so that block obsolescence will be avoided.

A requisite is the expansion of research and development programs aimed at (a) increasing efficiency on ships and shoreside, and (b) improving defense capabilities of active and laid-up ships.

There is a need for promoting more efficient use of shipboard labor through cooperation of government, shipowners, and labor unions. This should be aimed at stabilizing labor costs which are responsible for most of the operating-differential of aid-granted United States-flag vessels.

The Commerce report also saw the need for maintaining a reserve fleet of sufficient number of ships in ready status to meet estimated deficiencies in the active commercial fleet in event of mobilization.

There is a current need seen for studying methods of strengthening the domestic segment of the merchant marine, this to include:

(a) Improving cargo handling facilities, (b) developing specialized carrier types, (c) revoking operating certificates in case of nonuse, and (d) repealing provisions of the Panama Canal Act which now prevent certain groups from operating vessels in coastwise trade.

MAJOR RCOMMENDATIONS NOTED

The Committee of American Steamship Lines which represents the 15 major passenger and dry cargo steamship lines, has spent a great deal of time summarizing the Commerce Department's review of the maritime subsidy policy. It found that some of the major recommendations of the report included:

1. The need for the Government to increase insurance from 90 to 100 percent of the amount of ship mortgages or loans, thus encouraging the use of private financing in shipbuilding.

2. A construction revolving fund operated by the Maritime Administration for use in connection with construction, ship conversion, betterments, research, and development should be set up.

3. Sell existing ship mortgages to establish a ship construction fund.

4. Authorize accelerated depreciation for new ships in order to encourage replacement programs.

Since the Commerce Department report was issued several Congressmen have taken steps to put the Department's recommendations into effect through legislation. Bills are now pending on shipbuilding, a tanker trade-in-and-build program, and private financing and ship mortgaging. The bulk of these bills will be considered in the next Congress.

The Palatka (Fla.) Post Office

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. D. R. (BILLY) MATTHEWS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 7, 1954

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, in the Eighth Congressional District of Florida we have a first-class post office of which I am very proud, and I wanted to put a few remarks in the RECORD about this splendid post office. The post office at Palatka, Fla., has just achieved a 100 percent rating at the annual inspection by the Post Office Department on June 3.

Postmaster Mark H. Shaw and his entire staff are to be congratulated on this outstanding achievement. I understand that a 100 percent rating for a first-class post office is very rare, since the inspector checks some 119 items which touch every phase of the operations and conduct of the office. As far as I know, the Palatka post office is the only first-class office in Florida, with but one exception, to receive a perfect rating in recent years. One other Florida office achieved a 100 percent rating several years ago, but at a time when a postal inspector was in charge during an interim between a change of postmasters. The Palatka post office was rated 100 percent on all of its operations, and also had a 100 percent rating on the building itself.

This is certainly a distinguished and noteworthy achievement, and I wanted to publicly congratulate Postmaster Shaw and every employee of this office. I have always thought that this was a most efficient and outstanding post office, and I am glad to see official recognition given. The personnel of the Palatka Post Office has set a standard which is in keeping with the highest traditions of our postal service.

Older Workers in Textile Industry Need Improved Social Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 1, 1954

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following testimony on behalf of the Textile Workers Union of America, CIO, before the Senate Committee on Finance, by Mr. Solomon Barkin, director of research, TWUA:

OLDER WORKERS IN TEXTILE INDUSTRY DESPERATELY NEED IMPROVED SOCIAL SECURITY LEGISLATION

Immediate action is required to assist the tens of thousands of older textile workers who are today, and in all sections of the country, losing their jobs through mill liquidations or the discriminatory lay-offs designed to rid nonunion mills of their older employees. Unfortunately many of these persons have lost their jobs in areas of chronic and growing unemployment where alternative jobs, even for younger persons, are scarce. In areas where there are jobs, employers are discriminating against older applicants in the current surplus labor market. Few textile companies provide private pensions for the aged persons who have lost their jobs so that they must fall back exclusively upon their own resources and the Federal old-age and survivors benefit program for their support. When these fail they will have to depend upon outright public assistance after having served their industry and employers faithfully for several decades.

Adequate Federal pension programs are a minimum to which these industrial veterans are entitled. Having been scrapped by a callous industry which refused in collective bargaining to create private pension programs and by employers who have fired them to make room for younger persons, the minimum that these workers should receive is a satisfactory Federal pension program to assure them existence in health and decency. We therefore urge the Federal Government to correct the heartlessness and miserly disregard for the older worker exhibited by the private managements in the textile industry by liberalizing the benefits under the present Federal security program.

HIGH PROPORTION OF AGED WORKERS

The effect of the current drastic contraction in the textile industry is being felt particularly by the older workers because this industry has an unusually large proportion of mature and middle-aged employees. Mill liquidations and reductions in employment are most severe in the areas with the oldest work populations. The latest study of the ages of workers establishments covered by the old-age and survivors insurance shows that the proportion of male workers 65 years of age and over was 5.2 percent in textiles as compared with the average for all manufacturing industries of 2.7 percent.

There were no manufacturing groups other than apparel and leather products which could boast of as large a proportion of older male workers. Only the finance, insurance, and real-estate industries among the major classifications of jobs had a larger proportion of male workers 65 years of age or over. The proportion of women workers 65 years of age and over was in textiles 1.3. (Anna Bercowitz, Age of Workers in Covered Employment: Industry Differences, 1949, Social Security Bulletin, Apr. 1953, vol. 16, No. 14, p. 4.)

TEXTILES IS A HIGHLY DEPRESSED INDUSTRY

The current recession has seen the volume of unemployment in the United States grow to a total of 3,305,000 in May 1954. The total will continue to increase through the coming months. In the textile industry we have had a drastic shrinkage of jobs since the peak of February 1951. Production worker employment then stood at 1,269,000; in February 1952, the total was 1,100,000. By May 1954 employment had declined to 971,000, a net reduction of 298,000. But this figure understates the actual turnover which has most adversely affected older workers.

There is widespread chronic and prolonged unemployment for many workers in the industry. This has contributed to the increase in the number of distressed communities. In the May 1954 report, the United States Bureau of Employment Security classified 4 textile communities in the 7 major areas suffering from "very substantial labor surpluses" with 12 percent or more unemployment (Lawrence, Mass.; Providence, R. I.; Altoona, Pa.; and Wilkes-Barre and Hazelton, Pa.).

In January 1954, when the proportion of the civilian labor force which was unemployed averaged 4.9 percent for the United States as a whole; the proportion of idle workers in most textile communities exceeded 7 percent. The following are representative of unemployment rates in textile areas:

Massachusetts:

State and area:	*Percent of Civilian Labor Force Unemployment, January 1954*
Fall River	7.8
Lawrence	23.6
New Bedford	9.4
North Adams	8.2
Rhode Island: Providence	([1])
New Jersey: Paterson	6.1
Pennsylvania:	
Altoona	10.7
Scranton	12.1
Wilkes-Barre-Hazleton	12.7
North Carolina:	
Asheville	8.4
Durham	9.3

[1] Over 8 percent.

Source: Bureau of Employment Security.

SHRINKAGE PERMANENT

The shrinkage in employment in the textile industry is for the most part a permanent one. At least 75,000 workers have lost their jobs in plants which have been permanently closed. A special tabulation of the number of closed mills in the yard and weaving divisions of the textile industry, which normally employ 63 percent of the total, indicates the following number of reported mill closings by year and the normal employment of these mills. While the greater number are located in the northern States, many are to be found in the southern region and in other geographical localities.

Year	Mills liquidated	Normal employment
1950	40	4,000
1951	50	8,000
1952	75	26,000
1953	65	21,000

Many factors have contributed to the displacement. Probably most significant has been the technological changes which have reduced the requirements for workers per unit of output and shifted demand from the high to the low input divisions. New machinery has made possible automatic processing of materials at higher speeds and with larger packages. Processes have been telescoped and material handling reduced through new plant layouts and mechanical contrivances. The shift from the woolen worsted processes to cotton methods of handling long staple yarns and the introduction of new synthetic yarns have eliminated many older divisions employing high proportions of people.

EMPLOYMENT DECLINED WHILE OUTPUT INCREASES

A dramatic illustration of the impact of the rising productivity upon textile employment is afforded by a comparative study of employment in the textile industry as compared with that in the apparel and finished textile goods industry, which is the primary consumer of textile products for nonindustrial uses. While textile employment has declined from 1929 to date by 18 percent, employment in the apparel industry has risen by 58 percent. Productivity has also risen in the apparel industry. This disparity is a crude measure of the extraordinary effect of productivity on employment. Another equally telling measure is the fact that textile employment declined between 1948 and 1953 by 15 percent in face of a rise in broad woven fabric output of 4 percent.

The distress in the textile industry is so severe and its ill effects so pervasive as to warrant a national investigation. While employment in manufacturing industries declined by 6 percent between February 1951 and May 1954, the drop in the textile industries has been 23 percent.

IMPACT OF SLUMP ON OLDER WORKERS

The old workers are the chief sufferers from mill liquidations. They have the greatest difficulty in finding new jobs when the mills in which they have been working—frequently for several decades—shut down. The skills which they have acquired over the years are largely wasted as there has been little transferability of skills from the textile industry to the industries which are growing in textile areas. Indeed, the recruitment policies of the firms which are expanding militate against the employment of former textile workers because of the emphasis on hiring young people. As a result, thousands of able-bodied men and women are being relegated to a new industrial scrap heap.

The insurmountable obstacles faced by older workers seeking employment as a result of technological displacement or plant shutdowns are indicated in a number of surveys conducted in recent years on the experience of the labor force of liquidated textile mills.

BLOOMFIELD, N. J.

In July 1947 the Oakes Mill in Bloomfield, N. J., was closed permanently and the union surveyed 132 of the former employees a year later to determine their experience in obtaining employment. While 63 percent of the workers had found some job during the year following the mill's closing, only 6 percent of the workers aged 65 and over had been so fortunate. Moreover, while 44 percent of the workers were still employed on the date of the survey (July 31, 1948), none of the 65-and-over group had retained his job.

ESMOND, R. I.

In May 1948 the Esmond Mills in Esmond, R. I., was liquidated, and a union survey of 628 former employees in November 1948 revealed that while 48 percent of the workers were able to obtain a job in the half-year following the mill's shutdown, the proportion of successful jobseekers dropped sharply after the age of 50; in the 40–49 bracket, 56 percent had obtained a job; 30 percent in the 50–59 class; 26 percent in the 60–64 class; and only 15 percent in the 65-and-over category. Similar disparities were indicated in the distribution of former Esmond Mill workers who were employed as of November 30, 1948; while 39 percent of all workers were employed, only 15 percent of the 65-and-over group had a job. (Table 1.)

In 1952 the staff of the Committee of New England of the National Planning Association conducted studies of the post-liquidation experience of employees of two textile mills. The report of the committee is currently in the process of publication. It will show that there was little transference of skill levels among those who were able to find jobs. With regard to one of the plants studied (a New Hampshire woolen and worsted mill) the committee found that 13 percent of the labor force withdrew from the labor market after losing their jobs, most of these being older workers, particularly women past 60 years of age.

DISPLACED TEXTILE WORKERS NOT ABSORBED

A study currently underway by the Bureau of Business and Economic Research of Northeastern University in Boston has resulted in the interviewing of 756 workers from 3 liquidated mills in New Hampshire and Massachusetts (1 in Fall River and 1 in Lowell). William H. Miernyk, director of this study, has reported the first findings as follows: Displaced textile workers are generally not being absorbed by the "growth" industries. "New industries evidently are filling jobs with newcomers in the labor market instead of with displaced textile workers, according to the bureau's findings," reports Business Week, March 6, 1954. "In Lowell, younger male workers found new jobs, but those over 45 years of age still were largely unemployed after a year. In New Hampshire, 2 years after the shutdown, almost a third of the 200 laid off in the woolen mill were still out of work."

OLDER MILLS ARE ONES THAT CLOSE

In 1954 the Stehli & Co. mill in Lancaster, Pa., was closed permanently, throwing 500 workers out of their jobs. Like most mills that have been liquidated in the recent period, it had been in operation for many years and its labor force included a large proportion of older workers. While male workers 65 years and over comprise approximately 5 percent of the industry's male labor force, the proportion of this age group in the Stehli mill amounted to more than 10 percent. This is indicative of a condition which is prevalent among many of the older textile mills. A very high proportion of their workers are of advanced age. The obsolescence of the older mills has resulted in a high rate of liquidations among these mills and this has displaced many thousands of workers over 65 years of age. Adequate social security benefits are needed to alleviate the distress of these workers.

The above report of the committee of New England concludes that "job displacement as a result of the liquidation or migration of a mill or factory is particularly hard on the older worker. If a worker past 50 years of age can continue at this present work, he may have many years of productive and remunerative employment left to them. If he loses his job, most employers will be reluctant to hire him. He may be barred from productive work at a relatively early age and he may be forced to accept such casual employment as comes his way or to withdraw from the labor force entirely." The problem of the older worker is so serious that the committee of New England urges strongly a "modification in employers' attitudes toward the hiring of older workers."

But this change of heart has not taken place and in the present loose labor market there is little likelihood of sympathetic consideration of older persons. As members of the marginal labor group, they will carry the greatest burdens of unemployment. After years of faithful service to American industry they are rightfully entitled to a Federal pension of adequate amount.

DEPENDENCE OF TEXTILE WORKERS ON SOCIAL-SECURITY BENEFITS

To thousands of older workers who have been displaced in liquidated textile mills, the old-age benefits offered by the Federal social-security program represent the sole means of support for themselves and their families. The average earnings of textile workers are among the lowest in the scale of manufacturing industries. Thus, in 1953, the average hourly earnings of textile workers were $1.37, compared to an average of $1.77 for all manufacturing industries. Consequently, few textile workers' families will be found among the 69 percent of the Nation's spending units which have accumulated liquid assets. Certainly very few of the top 30 percent of America's families which have liquid savings of $1,000 or more are textile workers.

Unlike the employees in most organized mass-production industries, few textile workers can rely on private pension plans to supplement their social-security benefits. The following proportions of the production workers in the major industry branches are covered by private pension plans of even the most modest types.

Cotton mills	10.6
Synthetic textiles	6.0
Woolen and worsted mills	13.0

Source: Bureau of Labor Statistics.

It is evident from the above that only about 10 percent of the industry's workers enjoy private supplementation to the Federal old-age and survivors insurance. The bulk of the workers must, therefore, rely on the Federal program to provide them with a decent standard of living in their old age. They have earned such standards by dint of their many years of hard work. It would be a gross injustice to deprive them of adequate social-security benefits in an era of growing productivity and rising standards of living.

TABLE I.—*Percentage distribution of 628 former Esmond workers by age and experience in obtaining work from date of layoff to Nov. 30, 1948*

Esmond workers experience	Total number	Age groups						
		Under 20	20 to 29	30 to 39	40 to 49	50 to 59	60 to 64	65 and over
Number of persons	628	25	75	145	156	136	50	41
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Obtained no job	52	36	45	34	44	68	72	83
Obtained a job	48	64	53	66	56	30	28	15
1 job	41	52	45	54	52	26	20	15
More than 1 job	6	12	8	10	4	3	4	-------
Number not specified	1	-------	-------	1	-------	1	4	-------
No answer	-------	-------	2	1	-------	-------	-------	-------
Presently employed	39	60	43	52	44	24	28	15
At 1st job	32	48	31	43	40	21	20	15
At 2d job	5	12	5	8	3	2	4	-------
Not specified	2	-------	7	1	1	1	4	-------

TABLE II.—*Old-age and survivors insurance recipients in selected textile areas as of the end of the year, 1950–53*

	1950	1951	1952	1953	Percent change to 1953	
					From 1950	From 1952
Massachusetts:						
Lawrence	5,700	6,900	7,800	9,000	57.9	15.4
Lowell	5,000	6,000	6,800	8,400	68.0	23.5
New Bedford	8,500	10,300	11,600	13,400	57.6	15.5
Fall River	5,800	7,100	8,000	9,200	58.6	15.0
Rhode Island:						
Woonsocket	2,800	3,400	3,900	4,400	57.1	15.8
Providence	18,800	22,900	25,700	29,700	58.0	15.6

Source: Social Security Administration.

At the eighth biennial convention of the Textile Workers Union of America held in Atlantic City, N. J., the first week in May 1954, a resolution was unanimously adopted urging that the Congress enact legislation whose terms would be similar to those contained in the Lehman-Dingell bill (S. 2260). On behalf of the 300,000 members of the Textile Workers Union of America, we strongly recommend a much liberalized social security program.

Winchester Englebert Reynolds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 7, 1954

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, one of the first officials that I met when I came to Congress was Winchester Englebert Reynolds, who is affectionately known to all as Bert. My admiration and respect increased daily as I became closely associated with him. He is one of great ability, one whose honesty and integrity cannot be questioned, and one who will tell you the facts regardless of whether or not you are in accord. For many years, Bert Reynolds has had a responsible position in this great Government and has had under his control the spending of hundreds of millions of dollars for Federal buildings. Even with all this vast responsibility, Bert was alway willing to stop and give you the benefit of his experience and guide you in a way which was honest and right. Bert Reynolds was one public official who truly believed he was a servant of the people and considered it a public trust. I am hoping that in his retirement he will remain close to those who know him and need his counsel. I join with his many friends in wishing him many years of relaxation and happiness.

A Tribute to Our Former President, Harry S. Truman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 7, 1954

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, the following tribute to our former President, Harry S. Truman, appeared in the Des Moines Register of Friday, July 2, 1954.

It was my privilege yesterday to spend a few minutes with Mr. Truman and I am happy to report that he seemed much improved and in fine spirits.

OVER THE COFFEE

(By Harlan Miller)

For a long time it was fashionable in some circles to sneer at Harry Truman, or to speak patronizingly of him. I hasten to disassociate myself from this juvenile, silly attitude, while he's still alive.

I'd rank him among our 10 greatest American Presidents in his own cocky, homespun inimitable American way.

I'd planned to fly down to Kansas City for a chat; I never got acquainted with him. What makes this average American tick? It isn't easy for a President to be brilliant in the midtwentieth century as things explode all around us. But I totaled his 12 triumphs with a pencil; they amaze me.

He once lost his temper with a music critic who made fun of his daughter's voice. My daughter has kept her musical aspirations, if any, a secret from me; but I'd resent it if anybody made fun of her voice. And he seems to be suffering from penicillin allergy, which once gave me a bad year; my sympathy flows out to him.

What do the third-highball Saturday night statesmen expect of a modest average American in a double-breasted suit? I don't think history will sneer at Truman. Out of his inner agony and his debonair courage he made a dozen decisions which will still look formidable 50 years from now.

1. Truman pulled the trigger for the Hiroshima bomb, one of mankind's toughest decisions to save 100,000 American lives.

2. He helped shore up our potential allies with billions in unpopular military aid.

3. He saved Greece from Communist onslaughts at is frontier and restored an ally.

4. He bolstered Turkey until her fierce warriors became our southeast bastion.

5. Under him the Berlin airlift set Russia back on her heels for the first time after the war, and stiffened Western Germany.

6. With the help of bold liberals in France and the Catholic Church in Italy he helped save Western Europe from the Reds.

7. Truman ordered manufacture of the H-bomb over the cries of scientist Oppenheimer.

8. During his regime we encircled Russia with a loop of bomber bases and aimed our Stategic Air Force at the Kremlin.

9. Despite opposition at home he negotiated successfully with Spain for bomber bases.

10. When the Reds chose Korea for their first experimental attack with arms, he promptly intervened.

11. When General MacArthur (a great hero) became a prima donna and defied his Commander in Chief, Truman gritted his teeth, fired him.

12. Somehow, for 7½ years he managed to avert the third great war when Americans were betting on it.

He didn't act alone; but he was responsible.

I don't care whether a man wears a sport shirt or a double-breasted coat or plays the piano, that's an impressive list. Some of his decisions may turn out to have been mistaken. But each time a decision had to be made and he made one. The opposite decision might have been a mistake too. These 12 stand up. A policy is better than no policy.

Maybe what impressed Americans more than anything else was his plucky, defiant campaign in 1948 against an able Republican who would probably have been a topnotch President.

I've long been an Ike man, but that doesn't blind me to Harry Truman's historic virtues. In American history he was a delightful surprise. An average American, he was sometimes impulsive, hot-tempered, cocky; even dapper and off-the-cuff, his critics said, but he rose to heights.

If it's true that Harry Truman was just an average American, then we're mighty lucky he turned out so well, and that average American character stands up so inspiringly in a crisis.

If there are millions like Harry, we're even luckier.

As this is written he's still ill and in danger. I'm sure a majority greater than 1948's wishes him well, and wants him around a long time, so we may perhaps find out what makes such an average American tick. We need both Truman and Hoover.

Mesa Verde Park, Colo.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL

OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 7, 1954

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, not only is the Christian Science Monitor one of our truly fine agencies of information on the events of the day but it also has fine information on travel and recreation. One such article I wish to call to the attention of the Members for it deals with Mesa Verde National Park out in southwestern Colorado. Here, preserved by the dry and healthful air, are the cliff dwellings of an Indian civilization which existed from about the Christian era to the 13th century at which a prolonged drought apparently forced them to abandon not only their dwellings but their culture and way of life. This rare treasure house is strictly a must-see in any western trip.

The article follows:

INDIAN RUINS SEEN FROM ROAD—MESA VERDE PARK GIVES VISITOR VIEW OF ANTIQUITY

(By B. L. Busch)

If you'd like to step back into a strangely peaceful and remote civilization, Mesa Verde National Park is for you.

Located in Colorado's southeastern mesa country (not far from the unique spot where 4 square corners of Colorado, New Mexico, Arizona, and Utah meet), Mesa Verde National Park sprawls over more than 51,000 acres of a flat top green table, high above the surrounding countryside.

Dense piñon, juniper, and pine forests, browsing deer, and far-flung vistas are appealing enough, but Mesa Verde's principal attraction is its spectacular ruins—cliff dwellings, pit houses, and pueblos.

Indians lived here from about the beginning of the Christian era until the thirteenth century, when they were probably driven away by prolonged drought. From relics still being dug out of the ruins, we know these prehistoric Indians progressed from simple people who knew nothing about pottery, bows, and arrows, or even houses, to an advanced group who built huge community dwellings from stones laid in adobe mortar, hunted, grew a variety of foods, and made beautiful cloth and jewelry.

COUNTLESS RUINS

No one knows for sure how many cliff dwellings there are in Mesa Verde. In the 20 large chasms and countless smaller side canyons, there are hundreds of caves, and in almost every one is a ruin. Excavations have been continued gradually since 1908, 2 years after Mesa Verde was made a national park, and the surface has hardly been scratched, literally.

Since the Indians deliberately chose the most inaccessible caves for their dwellings (most of them entered only by ropes or ladders), today's visitors to Mesa Verde get their best views by standing atop opposite canyon walls and looking down on these primitive apartment houses. During the summer season, sightseers have a choice of several tours which lead into the ruins themselves for first-hand closeups and colorful explanations by well-versed Park Service rangers. All tours begin at park headquarters, and are arranged for variety—both as to what you'll see and hear, and the amount of walking or climbing necessary.

If you prefer to explore on your own, the service has planned well for you, too. The widely separated ruins have been linked by two drives of 7 miles each, skirting the main canyon rims. At numerous vantage points, you'll see signs marked "View," and a few easy steps from your car take you to where you can clearly see ruins. These "View" points are well stocked with descriptive exhibits.

LARGEST GROUP

Perhaps the best known park features seen from these drives are Cliff Palace, largest of all the ruins, and Balcony House. Spruce Tree House, the best preserved large cliff dwelling, is located cross canyon behind the museums.

Besides guided tours (on foot, by car caravan, or lodge bus) and auto trips you can take on your own, it's possible to explore the park on horseback. Saddle horses can be rented by the hour, or if you prefer a longer trek, pack trips of 3 days or more can be arranged.

Extensive picnic areas and a free campground where you can use your own sleeping bag, tent, or trailer are all maintained by the Park Service. Other accommodations offer everything from wooden-floored tents to a lodge and de luxe housekeeping cabins.

The park is a complete city in itself, with gift shop, post office, grocery, and filling station. To help you understand the ruins, and so you can easily picture what life here was like seven centuries ago, free evening campfire programs feature lecturing experts, and both an archeological and a natural history museum are available.

Mesa Verde is open the year around, but winter snows sometimes make driving hazardous on the one road leading up 20 winding miles from the main highway (U. S. 160). Overnight accommodations and daily schedules of activities are available only from May 15 to October 15. Fee for an auto permit is $1, with trailers costing an additional dollar. Nearest rail connections are at Grand Junction, Colo., to the north and Gallup, N. Mex., to the south. During the summer, there is bus service from Durango, Colo., twice daily.

Puerto Rico and the United States, Their Future Together

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. A. FERNÓS-ISERN

RESIDENT COMMISSIONER FROM PUERTO RICO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 7, 1954

Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend and revise my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include the first part of an article by Luis Muñoz-Marín, the Governor of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. This article appears in the July 1954 issue of Foreign Affairs, an American Quarterly Review.

I am sure that the Members of Congress, many of whom helped to make the creation of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico possible, will be interested in reading what Governor Muñoz-Marín has to say in this very fine article:

PART I. PUERTO RICO AND THE UNITED STATES, THEIR FUTURE TOGETHER

Puerto Rico needs to be "placed" afresh in the United States mind—placed not just geographically, but economically, culturally, and juridically, so that the deeper political meaning of its relationships can be seen in new and correct perspective. Puerto Rican affairs have been moving full steam ahead. The island is no longer a liability but a credit. It also is beginning to loom a little larger than its mere geographical size would indicate because it is beginning to contribute to the outside world—especially to the United States—something that is valuable and scarce today; understanding and goodwill. Because of all this Puerto Rico has become politically interesting in eyes that until recently passed it over as geographically invisible.

To bring the picture into focus, the following facts must be established at the start: Puerto Rico is not asking for statehood. Puerto Rico is not demanding independence. Puerto Rico is dead set against colonialism. In other words, Puerto Rico is developing a new pattern of political freedom.

The island is a political mutation—perhaps a cultural mutation too—unique in the

American system, whether by "America" one means the United States or the hemisphere. It is a Latin American country composed of good citizens of the United States. How good they are as citizens is shown by their record in Korea, where a large percentage of casualties were Puerto Ricans, and by the fact that most Puerto Rican soldiers are volunteers. It is shown by the quick and effective way in which the people and the Government of Puerto Rico came forward to refute Communist propaganda that depicts the United States as an "imperialist colonial power." It is shown by the fact that 81 percent of the voters of the island have declared that they do not ask independence. It is shown, finally, by the vigor with which both people and the government repudiate the handful of Nationalist fanatics that occasionally fire real bullets into the real world from the bastions of their utter fantasy.

How Latin American a country it is, is shown by its basic Spanish racial stock and creole population, its Spanish language and literature, its production of fine Spanish poetry, its rural folkways, its folk-wisdom and the fact that it is not for statehood—federated statehood, that is—by 84 percent of the vote. Its position as a cultural frontier makes it a community of obvious use to the cause of freedom: apart from doing its duty to itself, it can advance understanding throughout this part of the world. There is no place south of Florida and the Rio Grande where the American from Maine or California feels more at home. And Puerto Rico is chosen by many Latin Americans who are exiled from their own countries as a residence well suited to the spirit of a free man. A great republican poet of Spain, Pedro Salinas, who spent 2 years teaching at the University of Puerto Rico, wrote in his will (many years after leaving the island) that he wanted to be buried in Puerto Rico. Gabriela Mistral, the Chilean Nobel prize winner, has said that Puerto Rico is the land where the stranger feels most at home.

The people that have given to others this gift of themselves have had a tough time economically. They have been whiplashed by poverty, almost defeated by a sense of hopelessness; and now they are having what some observers consider an almost miraculous awakening.

Puerto Rico has always been very poor. As its population increased by leaps and bounds through the 19th and 20th centuries it became a place a little land, few natural resources, crowds of people. For a while the population growth was sustained by gradually bringing uncropped land into use. As the United States regime on the island got under way, the sugar industry expanded tremendously to supply the tariff-protected market of the United States—a free market for Puerto Rico almost from the very beginning of the relationship. The increase in production brought by this and other—but very few other—developments did not do much more than increase the numbers of the poor. It added somewhat to the size of the middle class, however, and brought upon the scene the first few millionaires. Such improvement as there was in the standard of living of the general population resulted mainly from the greater attention paid to education and public health.

Puerto Rico did have the great free market in the United States, and it did not have to pay Federal taxes. It could not hope to reach even the most modestly decent standard of living without drawing upon these two advantages; yet until the 1940's neither imagination nor energy was applied to using them—except for the benefit of sugar. But in the late thirties and early forties there was an awakening. A people that had been floundering in hopelessness began swimming towards the shore. Hope, indeed, became one of the natural resources of the people, and dedication to the salvation of the country an attitude not too unusual. Voters stopped selling their votes. Compliance with political pledges began to be something that could really be demanded of successful candidates for office. And there began to be a feeling that there was strength in the people that made hardship a training for abolishing hardship, rather than an illustration of the need to bow to ineluctable fate. The idea that something could be done by workers and businessmen and farmers and political leaders and teachers besides waving for help from a raft lost at sea began to catch on.

At least one of the causes of this great release of democratic energy was the fact that the incubus of the uncertain political status of the island was lifted off the public mind for the time being. For years the controversy over the contrasting objectives of independence and statehood had throttled economic and social thought—and political thinking also—for both the older and the newer generations. Both abstractions were inimical to the solution of Puerto Rico's many other problems. So the perennial issue presented to the people was tantamount to asking them the following obscure question: "What is your favorite way of preventing the solution of the vital problems of Puerto Rico?" With independence the free market would disappear. With statehood the Federal tax collector would appear. But the premise was that aside from independence or statehood there was only the indignity of colonialism. Would you choose to eat your bread in shame or proclaim your dignity in hunger? The burden that that choice, assumed to be inexorable, put upon the soul of a decent, kind, and proud people, cannot easily be exaggerated.

The Popular Democratic Party, which came on the scene in 1938 with an economic and social program, realized that the vital day-to-day problems that Puerto Rico faced could not be tackled so long as this question of political status divided all economic and social groups. The new party therefore declared, early in the electoral campaign of 1940, that it would not consider the question of political status an issue in the elections. It would not interpret votes cast in its favor as a mandate either for independence or statehood, but would take votes cast for the party simply as support for its specific economic and social proposals. To the degree that the dilemna of independence versus statehood was obsolete, this was realistic; although in another sense it was artificial, since the principles and relationships on which a people base their political freedom are of real spiritual as well as economic importance to them. To make the dilemna entirely obsolete a new kind of political pattern, based on economic and cultural realities as well as on human dignity, had to be created.

Many continued to argue that only by choosing one kind or the other of political status could the question be removed from political life. We of the Popular Democratic Party agreed that a choice would have to be made, but it need not be limited to those two alternatives. Some of us had begun to see that neither independence nor statehood would be an adequate expression of the Puerto Rican people, so that although it was true that the best way of ending the controversy over status was by solving it, the familiar dichotomy offered no solution, economically or culturally. Economically, there would inevitably remain the question of payment of Federal taxes if statehood were chosen, and the question of the loss of the free market if independence were chosen. Cultural problems were no less difficult in this narrow framework, because of the different heritage and traditions of the Puerto Rican people, easily assimilated when they got into the great melting pot, but not as a solid group in their densely populated homeland. And independence was contrary to a deep current of nonisolationist feeling—which is also a cultural fact—that runs through Puerto Rican history; Puerto Ricans are capable of believing in almost any kind of free political expression of the brotherhood of man.

Thus the decision to detour around the roadblock of political status seems to have released the energies of the people—young and old—and to have turned them upon the achievement of the deep if less dramatic freedoms gained by self-reliance, education, security, economic fairness, administrative skill, productivity. Eventually, it brought forth the political inventiveness Justice Frankfurter had called for many years before when he said: "One of the great demands upon inventive statesmanship is to held evolve new kinds of relationship so as to combine the advantages of local self-government with those of a confederated union. Luckily, our Constitution has left this field of invention open."

On the platform of "No political status now; let's get to work on everything else," the popular Democratic Party won the elections of 1940, the first in which it had participated, by a very slight margin in a three-cornered contest. In 1944 it triumphed by a large margin in a two-sided contest. In 1940 it had been supported by 38 percent of the voters; 64 percent supported it in 1944.

By then the economic program was well under way. There was, and still is, a big job to be done, but the modern instruments to do it with had been fairly well developed. An ambitious beginning had been made in industrialization, with five Government-owned factories, not because the Government wanted to go into the manufacturing business, but because private capital, with very few exceptions outside of sugar, did not seem to want to. Electric power had a model management organization and was increasing at a good rate. The landless jibaro (countryman) was receiving his parcel of ground and with it freedom from the servitude of a squatter on another's land, and from some small part of his great poverty. A flexible minimum-wage law had been put into operation. The 8-hour day was a reality. Water was about ready to be supplied to town and country on an islandwide basis, instead of by tiny local aqueducts. New agricultural patterns, on an experimental commercial scale, were planned. This began to be successful only later. A low-cost housing program, largely on Federal-guaranteed credit, was trying to make dents in the slums. Health was improving, life expectancy increasing. Up to date planning, budgeting, accounting, and civil service procedures had been established and were in continuous process of improvement.

The result was that, though it had been realistic to keep the question of status dormant as a political issue in 1940, it was no longer realistic to avoid it by 1945. It was not possible to insist that a civilized people, with a western tradition and a well-defined cultural pattern within that tradition, should permanently ignore the question of where they stood in the world, and on what moral basis; or that they could without detriment to their self-respect permanently recognize the validity of laws unauthorized by them, or the control by others of the policies that they might wish their government to follow. Obviously, the people of Puerto Rico, ruled by executives—no matter how able some were—appointed without reference to their will, by local laws subject to veto by that executive, and by multiple laws of Congress remote and not responsible to their democratic authority, could not consider—no matter how fair that Congress had practically always been—that the question of status had been more than temporarily ignored.

But what political status? A creative job, and a tough one, was ahead for Puerto Rico. A political form had to be developed to fit the economic facts, the cultural realities, the free and yet nonnationalistic ideals of the people. It also had to meet the legitimate economic and military interests of the United States, as well as the broader interests implicit in the relationship. It had to demonstrate to the world the significance and sincerity of the attitude of the United States in its dealings with this underdeveloped, civilized, and fredom-loving community of the Latin world in the American hemisphere.

I have sought to make plain the truth that throughout its history, Puerto Rico has been neither separatist nor assimilist. It was never so in Spanish times; and what it was then it is now. It endeavors to keep its own personality, its collective sense of itself, and it retains its loyalty to a broader political system, which is also, as I have indicated, a way of being loyal to a conception of the brotherhood of man. The position can perhaps be described as autonomist, as distinguished from both separatist and federalist.

Out of this tradition the commonwealth status evolved, the base and seed of it contained in Act 600 of the 1950 Congress, which fully recognized the principle of consent and approved that principle in a compact subject to agreement by the people of Puerto Rico. This status was originally a Puerto Rican creation, then it became a joint enterprise undertaken by the Congress of the United States and the people of Puerto Rico—imperfect in detail, as any first attempt at an arrangement must be which requires the agreement of a busy Congress and a remote electorate—but sound in principle, full of the sap of growth, destined to bring still a greater credit both to the big country and the small island.

The most significant aspect of the new status lies in the recognition that the arrangement is indeed founded on the principle of consent, expressed by a compact in the form of an act of Congress subject to the approval of the people of Puerto Rico at the polls. Another basic characteristic is the concept of association as distinguished from the historical idea of union, so far as States are concerned, and of possession, so far as unincorporated Territories are concerned. It embodies association with the United States, not union among the States. These are the characteristics that clear the status of the former colonial character of "territory" or "possession."

The St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT CROSSER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 7, 1954

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the Record, I include the following radio address delivered by me on radio station WSRS:

To answer some good friends who have asked me to comment on the offensive statement that has been made while I was in Washington, which is "Crosser refuses to state his views regarding the St. Lawrence proposition and secretly opposes it," my answer is that the statement has no basis in truth. The person who originated the misrepresentation is guilty of deliberately saying what he knows is not true.

Every student of public affairs knows, of course, that there are persons who will promise to vote either yes or no in regard to any and all bills, if they believe that it will help them to secure what they want, regardless of injustice to others.

No honest representative, however, who endeavors to conduct himself according to proper standards of statesmanship, would promise to vote either yes or no on a bill, before it is in its final form and no longer subject to amendment. Sometimes a bill is so changed by amendments that the author of the bill, himself, is compelled to vote against the bill bearing his name and the number.

The fact is that I have during many years most earnestly insisted that in order to develop and promote the commerce of our country, we should have the most complete and efficient system of transportation facilities, including all modes of transportation.

What is known as the present Interstate Commerce Act was the work of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, of which I have long been a member, and of which I was chairman during the last 4 years of the Democratic administration. That committee spent many months listening to the statements by experts representing all modes of transportation.

The act consists of 65½ pages of printed matter. From section 1 of the act, containing the statement of purpose, I quote the following important language, to wit: "all to the end of developing, coordinating, and preserving a national transportation system by water, highway, and rail, as well as other means, adequate to meet the needs of the commerce of the United States, of the postal service, and of the national defense."

That declaration of policy has been highly praised by experts of all the different modes of transportation. I am pleased to say that I had an active and important part in the enactment of that legislation. In my discussions in the House of Representatives, I have often explained that transportation is the circulatory system of commerce.

It is, of course, always proper for a Member of Congress to state his views as to a principle. As already shown, I have always not only advocated, but as a committeeman I have worked for, the most complete and adequate system of transportation, and that means all modes of transportation, including transportation by water, highway, rail, and air.

Any transportation route and way by water, either along the St. Lawrence or any other outlet to the ocean, that is just to the American people, and in accordance with existing treaty arrangements between Canada and the United States, will receive my support.

The Change in Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN R. DAVIS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 6, 1954

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, June 26, Vice President Richard M. Nixon addressed over 3,000 Wisconsin Republicans at a fund-raising dinner at Milwaukee. The speech also reached a large television and radio audience. It was obvious that those who attended were very favorably impressed, and I personally heard many favorable comments from those who saw and heard in absentia.

Some excerpts from the Vice President's talk have been quoted by political columnists and noisemakers as the basis for cluck-clucking complaint. I have asked permission to insert the address in full, Mr. Speaker, because I believe it was a masterful, affirmative presentation. If some people smart under the few words of criticism contained therein, it may well be because the criticism is so well deserved.

The address follows:

I wish to congratulate the Republican organization of Wisconsin for the magnificent success of this dinner. Considering the population of the area from which your attendance comes, this is the biggest and most successful fund-raising dinner ever held by any party, any place, any time, in the United States. You have furnished the most dramatic proof possible that Wisconsin Republicans will be united, strong, and victorious this November.

That brings me to my subject for this evening. How can the Republicans win the Congress this November? To me, the answer is simple. We will win in 1954 if the people who voted Republican in 1952 believe that they are getting what they voted for.

What did they vote for? A number of things: They were fed up with the leadership of the previous administration; President Eisenhower symbolized new leadership; all summed up what they wanted and what they voted for was a change.

Did the people get the change they voted for?

I am sure that many of you have heard people grumble, including, surprisingly enough, some Republicans, "There has been no change. We might as well have the Democrats back as the present administration." Therefore, I would like to talk tonight about the great changes for the good of America which have been made by your Republican administration in Washington.

Let us consider first what, in my opinion, was one of the major issues on which people indicated they wanted a change—American foreign policy.

To those who say there has been no change, let's look at the record.

What was wrong with the policy of the previous administration?

It was a policy characterized by weakness and surrender of principle at the conference table.

It failed to recognize that the danger from Communist aggression in Asia was just as great as in Europe.

It failed to recognize that Moscow-inspired and controlled revolutions, like those in China and in Indochina, constituted Communist aggression of the most dangerous type.

What were the results of this policy? Here is what we found when we came into power in January of 1953:

In spite of the fact that we were spending record amounts on military preparedness and foreign aid, we found that in our efforts to be strong everywhere, we weren't strong enough anywhere.

The free world had lost 600 million people to the Communists in 7 years without the Russians losing a single soldier in combat.

We were engaged in a war in Korea which had cost us almost 150,000 casualties and there was no end in sight.

The war in Indochina had been going on for 6 years with no plans to bring it to an end.

To sum it up bluntly, the Acheson policy was directly responsible for the loss of China. And if China had not been lost there would have been no war in Korea and there would be no crisis in Indochina today.

The question then is: "Should those responsible for getting us into our present troubles be trusted to get us out of them?" The answer in November 1952, was an emphatic "no." I believe it will be "no" again this November.

Let us look at the changes which have been made. The Eisenhower-Dulles policy is based soundly on these fundamental principles:

Communism is a world threat and it is just as important to stop it in Asia, South America, and the United States as in Europe.

Communist directed and controlled revolutions constitute imperialist aggression and a threat to the whole free world. Such aggression when it occurs should be met by united action where possible; it can be prevented only by associating ourselves with the aspirations of people for independence, equality, peace, and economic progress.

A policy of weakness leads to war. The only language the Communists understand is a policy of strength and firmness. To carry out this policy we adopted a new military program which provides that when overt aggression occurs we will place our primary reliance on our massive mobile retaliatory power to be used at our discretion against the major source of the aggression whenever or wherever it occurs.

These are the basic policies. What have been the results?

The United States has a better defense for less money.

Foreign aid has been cut by $2,500,000,000 in 2 years. The Korean war has been brought to an end. The chance for overt aggression across a border, as in Korea, has been reduced to a minimum because of the Communist fear of direct retaliation.

We are building alliances in Asia, in South America, in the Near East, and in the Pacific to supplement those we have in Europe.

As Secretary Dulles has said: "We do not look upon the conference table as a place where we surrender our principles, but, rather, as a place for making our principles prevail."

We saw this policy in action when Secretary Dulles and Under Secretary Bedell Smith came back from Geneva without giving to the Communists at the conference table what our fighting men had denied them on the battlefields of Korea.

By their leadership, President Eisenhower and Secretary Dulles are making it clear to the world that the Communists, and the Communists alone, are blocking the road to peace. At Berlin, at Geneva, at Caracas, in the United Nations, the responsibility for aggression has been placed squarely where it belongs—on the men in Moscow and Peking.

I would not have you believe that the problems we face in the field of foreign policy are all solved. We are confronted by the most ruthless, deadly enemy ever to threaten the free world.

But of these things we can be sure:

The policy of the past, of weakness, retreat, and compromise, if continued, would have inevitably led America down the road to war or surrender, or both.

Our policy of strength and firmness is the only one which can lead to the great objective of this administration and of the American people—peace without surrender.

To carry out that policy I believe that in President Eisenhower and Secretary Dulles the United States and the free world have the two men best qualified by experience and temperament to lead us to victory without a war.

On the basis of the record there is no question but that we can go to the people in November and show them clearly that there has been a change in our leadership and our policy in the field of foreign relations, a change which the great majority of our people, Democrats and Republicans alike, will agree is in the best interests of America's security.

Let us now turn to domestic policy. Why did the people want a change in this field?

Here is what we found when we came to power in January 1953:

For 20 years the people of the United States had not had prosperity and peace at the same time.

Taxes were at an alltime high.

Inflation was unchecked, and the value of the dollar was going down every day.

Controls still shackled the economy and instead of moving to get rid of them the previous administration was advocating even more. For example, in his last state of the Union message, President Truman asked the Congress to provide for the continuation and expansion of controls on the economy; a compulsory health insurance program to socialize the medical profession; the Brannan farm program aimed at controlling the farmer and socializing agriculture; increased Federal domination and control of power and irrigation projects.

To top it all, we inherited a Federal spending program which, if continued as recommended by the Truman administration, would have added $40 billion to the national debt in the 4 years of the Eisenhower administration. This in turn would have meant higher taxes, higher prices, and more controls for all Americans.

This is what we inherited. Now what are the changes?

Most important, there has been a basic change in philosophy. When this administration came to power we had to make a critical policy decision. How can we have prosperity in peacetime in the United States?

The jobs and goods which create prosperity can come from 1 of 2 sources—from Government action or from private enterprise. When they come primarily from Government action we have a Socialist economy. When they come primarily from private enterprise we have an American economy. This administration has unequivocally chosen the American way.

In carrying out that philosophy, this is what we have done in just 1½ years: Controls have been removed from the economy; $13 billion has been cut from the Truman budget; inflation has been stopped; taxes will be reduced by $7.2 billion, the largest dollar tax reduction in America's history.

The purpose of these actions is to create a sound base for a dynamic economy of plenty in the American tradition rather than a static economy of scarcity in the Socialist tradition.

We recognize the necessity and propriety of Government action in some fields but we contend that what the Government does should supplement rather than supplant what individuals can do better for themselves.

In accordance with this principle, the Eisenhower program includes:

A billion-dollar highway program.

A housing program encouraging maximum private construction and ownership at the lowest possible cost and relying on public housing only where necessary.

Power irrigation and public-works projects like the St. Lawrence seaway which will increase the national wealth but with this basic difference from the projects sponsored by the previous administration—Federal help should be provided where necessary to construct such projects but once constructed there should be a maximum of State and local, rather than Federal, control.

A farm program based on these sound principles: We can't have national prosperity without farm prosperity. A program that piles up surpluses and depresses the market is not good for the farmer nor good for the country. Any sound farm program must emphasize primarily not partial paper parity but 100-percent parity in the market place. We believe that we can accomplish this objective by our program which is designed to reduce surpluses, reduce controls on the farmer and develop new markets for the farm products. There are those who may say, "Put this new farm program off. It's too controversial and bad politics in an election year." But for the administration or the Congress to support continuance of a program which will pile up surpluses and result inevitably in the destruction of millions of dollars worth of food would be the height of irresponsibility.

I am confident that the great majority of the American people will agree with the President when in supporting his farm program he said, "What is good for America is good politically."

Finally, we recognize Government responsibility to help the individual meet the problems of adversity. That is why our program includes raising social-security benefits and extending coverage to 10 million people not now covered; extending unemployment insurance to 6 million people not now covered; a health-reinsurance program based on the voluntary rather than the compulsory principle and providing in effect that everyone who wants health insurance should be able to get it, everyone who needs it should be encouraged to get it, no one should be forced to take it against his will.

I have outlined some of the basic features of our domestic program. I think you will agree that not only have changes been made but that the new program is based on the sound principles of the Republican Party.

I realize that there are some who may not like one feature or another of this program. I have heard some of the critics complain, for example, that the Eisenhower domestic program is too liberal. But let us consider the alternatives.

The choice is not between this program and something more conservative. The choice is between this program and something far more radical.

If the Republicans lose the Congress in 1954 and the Presidency in 1956, who takes over? The ADA left-wingers who will control the Democratic Convention in 1956.

The victory of James Roosevelt and Robert Condon in the California primary symbolizes the alternative—a Democratic Party which is the helpless captive of two types of men—one without principle, the other fanatically dedicated, but both welded together by a common determination to socialize basic American institutions.

In my recent trip around the world, I visited several countries where the Socialist system has been given a trial. I can assure you that the productive, free economy of the United States is the hope and envy of the world.

This is no time to lose faith in the American system. The Republican Party has always championed that system. This administration believes in it. Our program is designed to give it a chance to work. I am confident that the people want us to do just that.

What other changes did the people vote for in 1952?

I believe that if there is one thing certain about the election of 1952, it is that it constituted a vote of no confidence in the previous administration's will or ability to deal effectively with Communist infiltration in the United States. Why was this the case?

The previous administration failed to recognize the seriousness of the Communist danger.

When cases involving Communist infiltration in the Government were brought to their attention their tendency too often was to cover up rather than to clean up because of their fear of political consequences.

They failed to heed the warnings of J. Edgar Hoover and the FBI. Had they done so, the Communist conspiracy would never have been able to have done the damage that it did to the United States.

The Hiss and Harry Dexter White cases were direct results of these failings.

What changes have occurred under the new administration?

If there is anyone in the United States who because of recent controversies on this issue has an honest doubt as to whether this administration is handling the problem more effectively than its predecessor, I say let's look at the record of accomplishment since January 1953: 41 Communist Party leaders convicted of conspiracy to overthrow the Government, 20 additional Communist leaders indicted, 7 newly arrested, 62 new organizations added to the Justice Department list of subversive groups, 2 convicted for espionage, 16 convicted for making false statements to the Government, 3 convicted for perjury, 93 subversive aliens deported, 128 subversive aliens excluded from the United States, 349 new deportation proceedings and warrants for arrest issued against subversive aliens, 25 denaturalization proceedings against naturalized citizens as subversives, over 2,400 security risks removed from Federal employment and more in this category being removed every day.

To the millions of Americans who recognize the internal Communist danger and want something done about it, I say that the Republican Party can be justly proud of the record of this administration in attacking and destroying the Communist conspiracy in the United States.

And with the passage of the President's legislative proposals dealing with subversive activities, our law enforcement officials will be given new legal weapons with which they can deal a blow to the Communist conspiracy in the United States from which it will never recover.

Why have we succeeded in dealing with this problem where our predecessors failed?

Because we recognize the danger.

Because we have nothing to cover up and nothing to hide.

Because this administration cooperates with J. Edgar Hoover and the FBI 100 percent.

The difference in attitude between this administration and its predecessor in dealing with the Communist conspiracy is strikingly illustrated by an event which occurred this week. On September 13, 1950, the Truman administration asked the Congress not to pass legislation which would deny a Federal pension to Alger Hiss. On Thursday President Eisenhower threw the great weight of his influence and that of his administration behind legislation which would deny a pension to Hiss or to anyone in the future who is convicted of such a crime.

The people of the United States can be completely confident that this administration has the will and the ability to protect American security without compromising American principles.

There is one other basic change which has occurred which I should like to mention. It is a very important one but it is one which we too often take for granted.

There is a new climate in Washington—and I don't mean the Washington weather, it's as bad as it ever was—I mean a new moral climate.

Two years ago you couldn't pick up the paper without reading about another Washington scandal. Compare the previous administration, in which toleration and cover up of corruption in high places and low was the rule rather than the exception, with this administration which from top to bottom is carrying out the President's directive that dishonesty, disloyalty, and inefficiency will be rooted out wherever it is found.

Every American can with pride hold up the President of the United States to his children as a man who has faith in God, faith in America and who has brought dignity and respect to the highest office in the land.

In November 1952 the American people voted overwhelmingly for a change in national leadership. The record is clear that not only has there been a change but that the change is one which is in the best interests of the great majority of our people.

And now I would like to talk frankly and bluntly for a moment to those of you who have worked so long and so hard for the Republican cause.

I believe that every Republican can be proud of the honest, efficient, and loyal leadership the Republican administration, under President Eisenhower, is giving the country today. I believe his leadership and his program deserves our unqualified and dedicated support.

I know we have our differences. In a two-party, as distinguished from a multiparty system, there must be room for differences of opinion among members of the same party. I would not attempt to minimize those differences in our own party or in the other party for that matter.

But if the Republican Party is to stay in power the voters must be convinced that it is capable of leading. A party which is torn by dissension and strife inevitably loses the confidence of the people. If the Republican Party is to continue to be a great party, its members must be united on fundamental principles which transcend the differences we have. Fortunately, our party's philosophy is based on such principles.

All of us should emphasize less—the differences we have among ourselves, and more—the fundamental, basic differences between the philosophy and performance of our Republican administration and that of its predecessor or its potential successor.

Our party's future and our country's future are at stake. If we believe in the principles of our party let us join together in giving our Republican President what he deserves and what the Nation needs; a Republican Congress which will support his program.

The Tycoon Who Looks Like a Cardinal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE L. HAYS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 7, 1954

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article, The Tycoon Who Looks Like a Cardinal, by Mr. G. Ward Price, published in the London Daily Mail of June 15, 1954, as one of a series, They Are Your Brothers, the Men of Empire.

In his article Mr. Price describes the role of Mr. Cyrus S. Eaton, of Cleveland, in the development of Canada. Mr. Eaton is a leading citizen of Ohio, and I take pride in this recognition given him in a prominent British newspaper.

The article follows:

THE TYCOON WHO LOOKS LIKE A CARDINAL

(By G. Ward Price)

With a population less than one-third of that of the United Kingdom and less than a tenth of that of the United States, the people of Canada are tackling the problem of developing their national assets on the grand scale. If they fail they keep a stiff upper lip—but when they succeed their efforts are richly rewarded.

Her capitalists, scientists, and engineers plan and operate in a big way. The risking of great financial stakes and the painstaking exploration of vast territories are the custom of the country.

TEAM SPIRIT

One of the first things I, as a visiter, noticed was the team spirit that pervades these great Canadian enterprises. When the millionaire financing a venture arrives in his private airplane to inspect the work he calls the foreman by his first name and is addressed by him in the same way without either party finding such familiarity unusual.

Typical of the rich men who are extracting the hidden wealth of Canada is Mr. Cyrus S. Eaton, who is becoming the greatest ironmaster of North America.

"Despite the growing use of plastics and light metals," he told me, "iron is the key to the future of Canada." He added that the Dominion will soon produce £150 million worth a year.

FIRST LUCK

Cyrus S. Eaton was born 70 years ago in the Canadian village of Pugwash, Nova Scotia, where his father was a farmer and also kept the village store.

Young Cyrus was brought up to be a Baptist minister. One of his uncles already held such a position, and numbered among his congregation the richest man in the world—John D. Rockefeller.

The first stroke of luck in the young theological student's life was to meet this multimillionaire, who took a fancy to him and offered him a post in one of the many companies he controlled. Ten years after entering the oil emperor's employ Eaton, when only 27, was worth close on £1 million.

Since then, as banker, tire manufacturer, controller of public utilities and mine owner, he has become one of the financial Titans whose wealth is lavishly employed in the development of his native land of Canada.

His latest undertaking is to extract what is ultimately expected to prove 1 billion tons of ore—60 percent of it iron—which lay under a lake known as Steep Rock, 15 miles long, 4 miles broad, and 50 feet deep.

A characteristic consequence of this successful enterprise has been to expand the population of the nearest village of Atikokan, Ontario, from 300 to 20,000.

LAKE RUNS OUT

The prospecting of Steep Rock cost £7 million. When the presence of the deposits was confirmed Eaton started driving a 2,000-foot tunnel upward through the solid rock under the lake. When the shaft was under the middle of the lake it was blown up, and the water ran out, leaving the orefield to be mined.

Cyrus Stephen Eaton himself looks more like a cardinal than what Canadians call a "tycoon." He is an exceptionally handsome man, with snow white hair, blue eyes, clean-shaven face, and the figure of an athlete. He neither smokes nor drinks.

It is perhaps surprising on that side of the Atlantic that his favorite pastime should be riding to hounds. He gave me a well-informed explanation of the difference between the American-bred Virginian foxhound and the British type he imports from the Shires. He breeds shorthorns on two large country estates.

It was a typically bitter day of the Canadian winter when I had lunch with Mr. Eaton.

"I never go south to Florida, like so many people do in the winter," he said. "It's too enervating. I take my winter holiday on the slopes near the St. Lawrence, teaching my 10 grandchildren to ski." He has 2 sons and 5 daughters.

UNUSUAL OFFICE

One of the impressive elements in Mr. Eaton's surroundings is the magnificence of his office, which fill the top floors of a skyscraper. They are paneled in English oak, and the lounge, where visitors are received, is a reproduction of an Elizabethan manor hall, with minstrels' gallery complete.

It was built in England, taken to pieces, and shipped across the Atlantic.

Eaton intends to have under his control two sources of iron ore. One of them, at Steep Rock, will ship its output to the United States. The other field is on the shore of Ungava Bay in northern Quebec Province. "You can walk for 110 miles on surface iron ore there," Mr. Eaton told me. There is abundant electric power obtainable from the rivers that flow into the channel leading into Hudson Bay. The advantage of the Ungava Bay location consists of a deep-sea harbor with a natural frontage that remains open half the year.

In competition with the Ungava enterprise is a new company formed to work an iron-ore concession in northern Quebec.

TOO MUCH CAUTION

These are mighty enterprises, made possible only by the bold use of capital. Mr. Eaton, himself ready to make great bids for fortune's favors, does not think highly of the spirit shown by others.

"Canada is held back by extreme caution," he says. "She should embark on a bold course of expansion. She needs more highways and electric power. Her resources, human and natural, are an ideal combination for an unprecedented era of prosperity."

Besides finance, the development of a huge country like Canada calls for a steady supply of robust and intelligent labor.

"There is never any difficulty in getting labor for the North," I was told by Mr. C. D. Howe, the Deputy Premier, to whom much credit is given by his fellow Canadians for the eagerness with which he promotes public works.

Immigration seems to be the only rapid form of economic aid for Canada. The Dominion receives about 170,000 new settlers a year, most of them coming from Germany, Holland, and Italy.

Benefits of the Free-Enterprise System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. FALLON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 7, 1954

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, patriotic Americans such as Charles P. McCormick, of Baltimore, have represented this Nation in the past at the International Labor Conference. Currently our official delegation includes Mr. William L. McGrath, a leading industrialist of Cincinnati, Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the most timely address expounding the benefits of the free-enterprise system and the opportunities of individual initiative in this country. This outline of the American way of life was delivered by Mr. McGrath at the plenary session of the International Labor Conference at Geneva, Switzerland:

I was much impressed by the emphasis which the Director General, in his report, placed upon technical assistance. As you know, the United States employers have from the beginning supported this phase of the program of the ILO—and it is in this field that we can perhaps be of the greatest help toward the primary objective of the ILO; namely, raising the standard of living the world over.

We in the United States are very much aware of the fact that our culture has been transplanted from the many different countries in which the forebears of our population originated. In literature, art, music, religion and philosophy, we are, to a large extent, merely the inheritors of the ideas and traditions of our ancestors, who came from the four corners of the world to populate the United States.

But meanwhile, we in our country have built up a civilization, a culture of our own, you might say, which has largely grown out of the benefits of technological development—a culture which has to do with mechanization, quantity production, development of mass markets, all of which has resulted in making available comforts and conveniences to larger and ever larger numbers of our people.

While you might consider this development to be essentially materialistic, I say to you that it has improved the well-being of our people in countless nonmaterialistic respects. Our people as a consequence of their higher and higher standard of living, have more and more time and facilities available to them to engage in educational, recreational, and cultural pursuits, which in turn contribute to greater and greater improvement in their physical and, more importantly, their spiritual well-being.

I think, therefore, that we might define the objective of technological development as that of assuring better things to more people at lower cost. And this brings me back to the subject of the contribution which I think the United States, on the basis of its experience, may make on behalf of that objective.

I want to explain to you today what we in the United States call the technique of "creating consumer demand"—or, to use simpler words, getting more people to want to buy the things we make.

Orders for the things we make mean production, payrolls, and a higher standard of living.

How do you get more orders?

There are, in the main, two groups of products.

The first group consists of the things that people must have in order to live. Among there are food, clothing, and shelter.

The second group consists of the things that people want, over and above the necessities of existence.

In the United States the major share of our business and our employment is occupied with making things that people want, rather than what they actually have to have. We have learned that there is no limit to human desires, and that upon them can be built a limitless volume of production, jobs, and payrolls.

This did not happen overnight. Originally the United States was an underdeveloped country. Less than 100 years ago a large share of our people still lived in one-room log cabins. What took place in our country since then can take place now in nations whose economy is today in transition from subsistence farming to industrial production.

What happened was, as we filled our basic needs and began to make the things that people wanted above their needs, that we began to realize the benefits of operating under the free competitive system.

Under this system, the company that gave the best values to the public kept its business, the company that failed to give good values lost its business. In our country there are no artificial restrictions which protect the high-cost producer. To survive he must lower his cost and improve his product; or if his product becomes obsolete, he must find a new one. Progress in business is a result of giving more people more and better things in return for what they are paid for a day's work.

Competing companies strive to get business away from each other by offering a better product at a lower price. But price was only part of the story. How about purchasing power? We began to realize that to gain broader markets it was not enough just to offer better values. We would also have to pay higher wages so that our people could afford to buy the things they helped to make.

Thus, it is inherent in our system, under which freedom of competition makes monopolies well-nigh impossible, that greater productivity in selling things must go hand in hand with greater productivity in making things, and that, as ownership shares the fruits of higher productivity among its customers and its employees (as well as itself), the purchasing power of all three economic groups is improved and the standard of living of the total population rises in the process.

In the old days a manufacturer, making a certain product, built it the way he thought it ought to be built, found out what it cost to make it, added enough to his cost to represent a substantial profit, and thereby arrived at the price, and then set out to sell it. He sold whatever number would sell at that price.

But how about the customers? How many were willing and able to buy at that price? And was it the kind of product they wanted?

Under the spur of competition, manufacturers in the United States awakened to the fact that it is the customer, not the manufacturer, who determines the market, and that the place to start is with the customer.

Let's assume, for example, that a company is going to bring out a new model of a motorized bicycle.

As its first step, the company makes a survey to determine what sort of a motorized bicycle people prefer, and how much are they willing to pay for it.

Out of this will be developed an estimate that if the company will make a motorized bicycle of a certain general design, to sell within a certain price range, the annual sales volume will probably reach a certain figure. But just what is the right design and the right pirce?

Here is where the arithmetic of volume comes into the picture. Should the company figure on a large profit margin per sale, thereby raising the price and reducing sales volume? Or should it figure on a low profit margin, thereby reducing the price and increasing the sales volume?

What we have learned in the United States is that highly satisfactory profits can be earned on low profit margins. You don't make money, in a competitive economy, by keeping the price up and making a big margin of profit per unit of sale. You make more money by cutting your price to where you have a small margin of profit, but increasing your volume of sales. In short, the better you do for the customer, the better you do for yourself.

I would like to back up that statement by just a few figures. In my own company—we make home heating furnaces and home cooling equipment—our margin of net profit, last year, was less than 3 cents on each dollar of sales. The average annual net profit earned by industries in the United States over the last 10 years is less than 4 cents per dollar of sales.

Now let's go back to that motorized bicycle company.

As a result of their market survey, they determine the price at which they are going to sell their product, and design a product on which they can make a modest profit margin at that price, provided they sell a large enough volume. Volume is imperative because costs are based upon quantity production.

How big a volume must they sell, in a year, to make what they consider a fair profit?

Let's say the answer is 100,000 units. This figure then becomes their sales quota for the year. They must sell 100,000 units. How do they go about it?

They do it by advertising, by merchandising, by selling.

The job is that of making people want that motorized bicycle. The company has gotten the price down to where people are able to buy.

This is what I mean by creating a market out of human desires—a market that means jobs and payrolls.

Every day somebody invents something new or better, that people want. Can it be sold? The answer is probably "Yes," if you can get the price down. Well, you can get the price down if you can create enough demand so that you can use the techniques of volume production.

Take television as an example. When television first came out in the United States a set cost over $300. But merchandising and advertising went to work on the public imagination until hundreds of thousands of people wanted television. That made possible mass production on a competitive basis. The result is that today you can get a better television set for about $175. When television sets cost $300 or more they made only a small number per year and the industry employed a mere handful of people. Today the industry manufactures about 3 million sets a year and employs nearly 400,000 people.

That is an illustration of how persuading people to want something—something, mind you, that they didn't really have to have—has added to productivity and employment as well as the standard of living.

You may say that the United States has television because it is richer. I say that the United States is richer because it developed and sold television. It created a great industry out of an invention and human desires.

Now the rest of the world is as prolific as the United States in inventions—in fact, Europe is ahead of the United States in many scientific discoveries. And people the world over have human desires.

Can this principle of creating production and payrolls out of human desires be applied all over the world? I think it can by adapting to your circumstances the techniques which we have proved by experience in the United States.

I am glad to report that a start has been made in this direction.

Under the auspices of the United States Foreign Operations Administration, the Council for International Progress in Management is recruiting teams of marketing executives—men who have gained such experience in their own businesses—to discuss the techniques of creating consumer demand with businessmen in other countries.

Several of these teams have already participated in seminars on this subject in various European countries at the invitation and request of local long-established business organizations. It is significant that these marketing teams returned with the conviction that Europe has, within the borders of its various countries, markets whose potentials have barely been tapped.

Nearly 100 management men from the United States have participated in the program of the Council for International Progress in Management, through more than 20 teams in 9 countries. One interesting comment has been that, to repay its debt to Europe for the industrial revolution, the United States is now giving Europe the benefit of its discoveries in terms of today's marketing revolution.

You may say, "This idea of creating markets is all very well for the United States, but it couldn't be done in my country."

While I appreciate that there may be countless obstacles of tradition and attitude to be surmounted, my belief is that a sincere reappraisal of your price, your wage, and your profit relationships, and a determined willingness to bring them into more equitable alinement for the general good, will generate results that will amaze you. May I respectfully call your attention to the fact that, in the United States, the workers in industry constitute the biggest market for its products.

Once you can establish a market by making people want something you can furnish at a price they can pay, you have greater productivity, higher payrolls, and a rising standard of living.

This method requires, however, three conditions for its successful operation:

First. A competitive economy.

Second. A sincere belief in the desirability of giving the consumer the most you can for his money.

Third. A conviction that employees are your best customers.

In conclusion, gentlemen, I would like to state again, as I have in past years before this conference, that I think we can accomplish far more by the interchange of ideas than we can by the passing of conventions. Progress in the standard of living arises primarily from better employer-employee relations, better production methods, better marketing methods, better utilization of new techniques, and above all, a fuller development of human understanding. None of these objectives can be achieved by legislation. Only when freemen of labor and management aggressively support the principles of a free economy can we move forward to a bright future for everyone.

It is my hope that all of us working together, knowing that we all have something to learn as well as something to pass on to others, will strive to maintain this organization not as an international parliament but as a world forum in which we can exchange our ideas to the mutual benefit of all of us. On this basis I consider the ILO one of the world's greatest potential forces on behalf of improvement of the standard of living, mutual understanding among countries, and world peace.

Congressional Responsibility

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL B. DAGUE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 7, 1954

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, one of the most gratifying developments under the Eisenhower administration has been the recognition of the separation of the three branches of Government, with particular emphasis on the recapture by the Congress with the definite approval of the President, and after being used by the White House as a whipping boy for some 20 years, of its rightful place as coequal with the Executive in our Federal Government.

To deny to the Legislature the right to check on the administration of the laws it has enacted would be to ignore congressional responsibility for seeing that the statutes are changed or repealed as the conditions may demand, and to fail to check on the acts of those appointed to administer the law would be a clear avoidance of its duty under the Constitution.

Notable instances where the executive branch failed in its responsibility to keep its house in order are had in the Teapot Dome scandal and the treason of Alger Hiss and in both cases the Congress had to move in to protect the public interest. All of which does not imply that there should not be a reasonable restraint placed upon both the executive and the legislative branches to insure the fullest cooperation and to avoid those public displays which becloud the issues. The following editorial taken from the current issue of the Saturday Evening Post explores at greater length the question of congressional responsibility:

IT IS THE DUTY OF CONGRESS TO CHECK ON EXECUTIVE PERFORMANCE

One matter which deserves more careful consideration than it received during the hurly-burly of the McCarthy-Army hearings is the relation between the executive branch of the Government and Congress, particularly when an executive department is under congressional scrutiny.

President Eisenhower's justifiable refusal to permit the Senate committee to have access to "conversations or communications or any documents or reproductions concerning such advice" has been elaborated by some opponents of Senator McCARTHY to mean that the executive department has no duty to explain, or even reveal, its acts to congressional committees under any circumstances whatever. Obviously, since the functions of the executive include the execution of laws passed by Congress, it is nonsense to assert that Congres may not inquire into the proficiency with which the executive is carrying out its duties. To say otherwise is to defend a dictatorship by the executive branch.

As Woodrow Wilson once expressed it: "Quite as important as legislation is vigilant oversight of administration; and even more important than legislation is the instruction and guidance in political affairs which the people might receive from a body which kept all national concerns suffused in a broad daylight of discussion."

The present difficulty in reestablishing this important interrelation between the branches of the Government is to some extent due to the fact that Senator McCARTHY became chairman of a Senate investigating committee. C. Dickerman Williams, writing in the Freeman magazine last year, declared that "the combination of Senator McCARTHY and an investigating committee has led a large section of public opinion to identify him with congressional investigations in general. The consequence has been that distrust of Senator McCARTHY has now turned against all congressional investigations in the field of Communist influence."

The Senator, by openly inviting employees in the executive branch to come to him with reports of subversive activity in their departments, is largely responsible for the equally unreasonable view by liberal critics that such employees should never, under any circumstances, report subversive activity except to their superiors in the department. It will be recalled that the first move by Whittaker Chambers was to give the Hiss story to Assistant Secretary of State Adolf Berle, who in turn communicated it to the late President Roosevelt. The result was that Roosevelt took no action. The exposure of Hiss was brought about by a congressional investigating committee.

Certainly the prosecution of Harry Daugherty, Harding's Attorney General, the exposure of the Teapot Dome scandal and the more recent cleanup of the Internal Revenue Bureau could never have happened if Congress had been denied the right to investigate what was going on in the executive departments. President Eisenhower's directive takes account of this necessity, declaring that departments and agencies must provide information "relating to any matter within the jurisdiction of the committee."

Obviously, orderly administration would be impossible if every conference and conversation within the executive departments were immediately made available to Congress and the public. The drawing of the line between the necessary power of Congress to investigate and the use of this function in a decorous and restrained manner is, of course, a difficult matter.

There will always be attempts by overzealous congressional committees to drag out more information than they need to accomplish their legitimate purposes, and there will always be resistance by executive bureau and department heads to demands for even the most necessary information. In the last analysis, Congress should have the benefit of the doubt. The disservice which Senator McCarthy, as well as his left-wing and liberal enemies, has done is to remove this important constitutional question from the realm of sober debate and to reduce it to an irrelevant exchange of personalities and unparliamentary billingsgate.

"Now I Feel Wars Don't Just Happen"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY W. WIER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 7, 1954

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include an article from the Midland Cooperator by Roger Wenzel, of Hilbert, Wis., entitled "Now I Feel Wars Don't Just Happen."

The article is as follows:

WISCONSIN YOUTH LIVED WITH GREEK FARMERS AND REPORTS: "NOW I FEEL WARS DON'T JUST HAPPEN"

(By Roger Wenzel)

There is a lot of talk of how we can prevent wars.

Two years ago, I believed wars cannot be prevented. I have changed my mind.

Why? Because I spent 6 months in Grece. I went there on a youth exchange called IFYE, the International Farm Youth Exchange.

I lived, worked, and shared daily experiences of Greek farm life.

This is the reason I changed my ideas about war.

Now I feel wars don't just happen. They are caused. They are caused by fear, and fear is nothing more than ignorance.

It seems all things are that way—that which we do not understand, we fear.

Man feared lightning until he learned what it is and how to control it. I once feared bumble bees. I ran when they buzzed. Now I know approximately when and why they will sting me, and I do not fear them anymore.

Living with people of other lands—as I lived with Greek farmers last summer—helps overcome ignorance and fear. It helps us understand each other.

The youth exchange plan brings about 150 farm youth from 40 nations into our farm homes in nearly every State. Also 125 farm youth of our country work in other countries each year.

This is not a government program. It is sponsored by the nickels and dimes of rural youth all over America.

This program of IFYE is designed for understanding. Understanding other people by living with them, working with them, sharing in their joys, their fears and their problems.

Many of the things other people see about America do not leave a good impression. Our tourists, soldiers, magazines and movies continuously are leaving impressions.

If they leave any impression in common, it is that Americans have money to burn.

If you could compare wages of our soldiers with the Greek soldiers', who don't get enough to keep them supplied with cigarettes, you would see what I mean.

Everywhere we heard comments that warmed our hearts and made us realize that this program was promoting peace.

A lady in Syria told one of us, "If America would send fewer dollars and more boys and girls to live with us, it would do more good."

Across Greece we heard that "America sends us lots of dollars but when we get real, live Americans, then America must be really interested in us. That lives after the Marshall aid, point 4, and all the rest are used up."

I'm not saying our aid should stop. Rather, an exchange of young men and women should be increased.

When 125 American exchangees gathered on their way home, each had one thing in common to say for the country he visited and for America—"America is the best country in the world, but the country I visited is the second best."

This reveals at least one thing—when you get to know a people, you love them.

You find that America doesn't have everything. What is best for us isn't always best for the next country.

We can be proud of our skyscrapers and big things we have. But there are also things that need not be big to be worthy. Not all of us have the same set of material values.

We need to learn that whether we live in America, Germany, China or Greece, we are still created by the same God. We even have basically similar problems.

When we learn that all men are our brothers and become a family of nations, then we will beat our swords into plowshares and our spears into pruning hooks.

Address by Hon. James A. Farley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 7, 1954

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following address by Hon. James A. Farley at the dedication of the junior-senior high school at New City, N. Y., on June 27, 1954:

Perhaps it is somewhat venturesome for a man of my background to speak on education. All of you probably know that I was actively engaged in politics for over 35 years. Fewer know that I have been engaged in business through those years, except during the 7½ years I served in the Cabinet. Most people associate me with business only for the past 14 years. No one associates me with education. As a matter of fact, I did not associate myself with it too long. My training in the three R's was in the Grassy Point Grammar School and the Stony Point High School. All in all, I had 13 years of school including high school, and 9 months in a business college. Most of my education came in the school of life. Because my rating in that school has not been without honors, I feel qualified to speak about education in the world of change.

It may be trite to say we are living in a world of change, yet the ebb and flow of events is such that the truths, concepts, and theories of the law of God and the law of man are under calculated attack from men of sinister minds, who grasp power by spreading the disaster-laden doctrine of secularism. A confused and uninformed public opinion makes a nation the ready prey of desperate demagogs. A confused and misinformed mind endangers the soul.

But there can be no despotism and no men of vast power where there is freedom—freedom of worship, freedom of speech and of the press, freedom of criticism, freedom of assembly, freedom against unreasonable search and seizure, freedom of work, freedom to own property, and freedom to act as free men.

Education based on our heritage of freedom and justice is the foundation of any permanent peace for the world—and education rooted in the laws of God, makes for happiness and enlightenment.

Our heritage is one of freedom under law. This freedom can be and is taught well in our public schools. I believe most sincerely that there are few scoundrels in the teaching profession. However, there is not a little confusion within some of our academic halls. Some would have freedom under the law as a license under the law. They forget the laws of God.

Teachers of the world are the stonemasons of world peace. They are patiently building the foundation of lasting peace. They cannot build without the mortar of love and understanding which comes from knowledge of the laws of God. The social and economic problems which must be solved in this country and abroad before a just and lasting peace is assured are staggering in their scope and complexities. Yet progress is coming every day if only in thinking and planning in our classrooms.

Everyone in the teaching profession must take pride in knowing that he or she is a link in the chain of progress. The work of the teacher in combating ignorance and prejudice never dies, for he trains the minds of those who battle these ancient foes of mankind, and he trains the minds of those who will train future champions down through the ages. Man owes everything to his ancestors and his teachers. It is fitting that both should train him in the way of the Lord, for freedom under the law is at its noblest when it is freedom under God.

We cannot have freedom without religion. There is no freedom without religion. There is no freedom among animals, but only the brute law of survival of the fittest. Without religion man is no more than a brute. Our first President recognized that religion is the soul of the Nation. In his Farewell Address, George Washington said, and I quote: "Of all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, religion and morality are indispensable support * * * and let us with caution indulge the supposition that morality can be maintained without religion. Whatever may be conceded to the influence of refined education or minds of peculiar structure, reason and experience both forbid us to expect that national morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principle. It is substantially true that virtue or morality is a necessary spring of popular government."

Unfortunately we have a cancerous doctrine on our body politic. Secularism is its name. There are those who would have us believe that the only school where democracy is safe is the school from which God and the things of God are excluded. They would make the law of man supreme.

This school building is another example of the great progress which we are making to this country and this State in providing for our children fine physical surroundings in which to get an education. But we must never forget that building and grounds and equipment are the incidental, not the principal part of education. They are the frame and not the picture. The case, not the contents.

True education is a matter of the mind and spirit. It is earnest teachers and wholesome children and cooperative parents. It is the lessons that count.

We in New York State can take pride in our schools and in the quality of our education, and in the spirit and training of our teachers.

We have provided for the entire Nation a standard to be lived up to and an example to follow. We are living proof of what a State can do without direction from above or below in building, operating, and maintaining an educational system.

Education is the means by which the lessons taught by the experience of the past are given to the present and the future. It is a business of sharing with our children what we have learned from our elders and from our own contacts with the world which we have passed through.

Of course, as we all know, children do not always take for gospel truth the words of their parents. Sometimes I think that children become wise, perhaps overwise in their own day and generation and feel that the experience of the past is merely the useless teaching of the elders. However, as those children go out into the world they may well find that what we have learned the hard way might better be taken from us by word of mouth than to be taken by them through the hard knocks of experience.

But we parents have a great opportunity to assist in the process of education by cooperation with teachers. The teachers are those who are skilled in transmitting to the children the lessons that we know out of our own experience.

Another thing that is essential in education is that as society becomes more complex, as the number of people increases, and as the size of our cities grow, education must keep pace with these new conditions. That means that the need for formal planned education becomes greater and greater. There was a day when, as one educator put it, it was enough to have a student at one end of a log and a great teacher at the other. I grant that education without great teachers is not education at all. But there must be more organization now than when those of us who have passed the middle span of life went to school. I for one am amazed at the difference in education and particularly in the opportunities offered between the present and those days back there when I went to grade school at Grassy Point and then on to high school in Stony Point. I am not complaining. It was sound education and it served me well. But the children of this day are facing an infinitely more complex world than I faced 45 or 50 years ago.

As I see it, there are certain essential qualities that all teaching must have if it is to be in a true sense education.

It must be free of dogma, and it must be free of dogmatic assumptions and arbitrary definitions. By that I do not mean that there are not solid and important lessons that must be learned by diligent application and that do not change with the years. But in the true sense education is the freeing of the mind to reach out and search for truth on its own account.

Next, education must be humane, in the sense that it teaches people true consideration for the rights of others. It ought to teach people to live in society with other people and exercise toward them the kindness and the consideration that ought to characterize a good neighbor in every walk of life.

Next, education must be useful. I do not mean merely that education ought to teach nothing but the means of making a living. That is essential too. But to be truly useful education must give the student a broad grasp of the realities and a capacity to understand the outside world in all of its complex manifestations.

Next, I believe that education ought to teach true Americanism. By that I mean that, after our God, and our parents and our children, the Nation comes first. The teaching of Americanism consists of teaching the great truths that America stands for, freedom of religion, freedom of thought, freedom of speech, freedom of communications of all sorts. It must teach that our form of government, created out of the wisdom of the ages, is for us the best form of government. It must teach that, despite our consideration for the fact that we are living in a world of neighbors, we shall not be good neighbors if we do not look to the preservation of our country, its prosperity, its solvency, and its strength.

Education must also teach good citizenship. It must teach children what they owe to their communities, the State and the Nation in the way of observance of the law, in the way of participation in active political affairs, in intelligent voting, and in every conceivable effort to become well informed about the great issues of our time.

But above all, education must build character. For character is the basic factor upon which our civilization is built. Included in that expression are truthfulness, industry, and personal responsibility, as well as consideration for others and obedience of the law.

Our educational system is so constructed in this country that it is possible for those who wish to combine religion with education are privileged to do so. It is, however, so constructed that within what we call the public schools there shall be no observance of any specific religious belief or ceremony. However, in the last analysis it is possible for all schools to teach character, and character is, of course, a form of religion expressing itself in human conduct.

I would say finally that if I were a teacher I would avoid giving children any idea that all will be well despite what they may contribute. I would teach that all will in the future be exactly what they choose to make it. If they neglect their duty, if they are something less than industrious, if they count on the Government to support them without effort on their own part, they will find that the very basis of free civilization will crumble away.

For the individual is the basic factor in society. He can make it to be what he will.

No doubt this warning is unnecessary here—in this community which is so truly characteristic of the American way of life. But we must be ever alert and prepared to protect that way of life.

Buy American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 7, 1954

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following editorial from the Boston Post, Boston, Mass., July 5, 1954:

Buy American

Although British manufacturers had submitted the lowest bids for the construction of two hydroelectric transformers for dams in the Northwest, the Army turned these bids down and awarded the contracts to an American manufacturer. The Army officials explained that the differential between the British bids and the American bidder was small and that under the "buy American" policy of the administration the contracts were given to the American bidder.

There was quite an outcry in Europe last year when the Army acted similarly in rejecting European bids for the same type of equipment and we were criticized as not living up to the informal agreement of "trade not aid." But on a sound business basis we have good reason to give the contracts to our own manufacturers where the difference in price is small. In the first place we have several million persons now unemployed, and who, if they were employed, would be paying income taxes which alone might well offset the difference in price. Secondly, the American manufacturer would have to pay about one-half of his profits on this job in corporation taxes. Adding in all these factors, therefore, we probably get the work done at less net cost than if the foreign manufacturer were allotted the contracts.

What We Desperately Need Is Another Syngman Rhee in Indochina

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 7, 1954

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial, which appeared in the June–July 1954 issue of the Korean Survey, is from the pen of Dr. Robert T. Oliver, a member of the faculty of the Pennsylvania State University, State College, Pa.

Dr. Oliver is an expert on Korean affairs and wrote the editorial from the midst of the Geneva Conference, where he spent 2 months as an observer.

United States Foreign Policy in Flux

One of the effects of the conferences at Berlin and Geneva has been to emphasize the urgent need for that agonizing reappraisal of American foreign policy which had earlier been forecast by Secretary Dulles. It has become painfully obvious that our policy has been based upon hypotheses which are no longer tenable. For instance:

1. Our policy no longer can be directed toward preserving the peace, but must hardheadedly be focused upon winning the war which is already upon us.

At Berlin and Geneva the Communist empire has made absolutely manifest the fact that it intends to push forward relentlessly toward its goal of global conquest—and it has demonstrated that it has powerful resources with which to work. The war is not only already begun but it is already far advanced.

There still remains a question as to whether the war may soon cease to be cold and become hot. So long as the Communist empire can continue its steady and inexorable advance without subjecting its own heartland to any military dangers, the Kremlin strategists obviously will continue their cold war tactics. Russia coldly and finally intends world conquest. If we incline to permit her to achieve her aim, piecemeal and at small cost, she will not change the rules or the methods. The result, as Senator KNOWLAND acutely phrased it, is that the United States is well on the way to becoming a global Dien Bien Phu—isolated and eventually helpless.

2. Our policy no longer can be dominated by the aim of maintaining our Western World alliance, if by so doing we allow ourselves to be led nearer castastrophe.

This does not mean we should pull back into an impregnable continental Gibraltar. In this age of transoceanic bombers, there is no such sanctuary. What it does mean is that we no longer dare let our global war decisions be dictated by our European allies.

EDC appears to be dead. Nato is demonstrably no longer a strong hope of defense. France has drifted into military and diplomatic helplessness. Her failure in the last war to stand against Germany and her surrender of Indochina to Japan are only pale forecasts of the totality of her helplessness to resist Russia's hydrogen bombs. Italy is already almost neutralized by the strength of its own internal Communist Party.

There remains England. Our strongest international concept has been the absolute necessity of Anglo-American solidarity. To preserve it, we let England dictate a policy of refusing to win the Korean war. We have gone a long way to meet England's demands for conciliation of the Kremlin—only to find these demands sharply increasing the more this policy proves increasingly futile.

England is forced toward neutralism because her location and compactness render her helpless against the hydrogen bomb. For this reason her aid as a fighting ally is greatly minimized.

It is fallacious to reason that the present is simply a reversal of 1914 and 1939. Then the United States remained neutralist for a period, while England fought; but we came in when our intervention was necessary to avoid England's defeat. But the essential fact is that our entrance into World War I and II was sufficient to turn the tide. From a relatively remote and secure base, without destruction to our own homeland, we could bring enough force to bear to determine the result. England may not be able to participate in another war without being utterly destroyed. Knowing both these facts, she will, in all likelihood, remain apart from war if she has the choice to do so. It is this knowledge, not senility, which accounts for the phenomenal change in the Churchillian spirit.

Moreover, the fact that England would find it difficult to participate in war makes her not less but more determined to try to dominate the "cold" one. She has little alternative to convincing the Kremlin that there is no need to drop hydrogen bombs on the British Isles. What remains for us is to shake ourselves out of our historic habit of subordinating our own policies to those of England.

Our aim should not be to break with England, but to provide a positive leadership which England must follow—and which will benefit England itself, even though its situation persuades it to follow a path toward neutralism. Above all, the partnership between the United States and the active parts of the Commonwealth—Canada, Australia, and New Zealand particularly—must be strengthened.

3. Rather than devoting our main endeavors to trying to prevent the war (which is already far advanced), we should be concentrating every resource to win it.

Our efforts to prevent the war include the building of a defensive community in Western Europe—which analysis shows cannot be used for defense in hot war, though it certainly does play a significant morale-building role while the war remains cold. Partly our defensiveness consists of developing the deterrent power of retaliation—which may (or may not) persuade Russia to avoid the dropping of bombs on American cities, but which does not prevent the kind of tactics used by the Kremlin in Korea and in Indochina. Actually, while we are making every effort to revise our military strategy to meet the requirements of hydrogen bombing, Russia continues her devious methods of infiltration, subversion, psychological pressures and satellite attacks. Thus far even our own possession of the hydrogen bomb has proved to be a Soviet asset, for it has convinced us in the free world that we must not, at any cost, resist the advance of global communism to the extent of getting into a shooting war with Russia.

Winning the war against Communist imperialism requires that we develop allies who are not only willing, but are able to help us. Specifically, our great need is to strengthen and encourage such allies as the Republic of Korea. By all means it was a tragic blunder for us to have refused to win that war—which was admirably suited to a limited and decisive victory, precisely what the cold war calls for.

We need to bend every effort to encouraging the Korean spirit among such other peoples as those in Indochina. The Middle East and Africa are other areas in which it is safe to predict there will be more Koreas and more Indochinas. Since Russia will assuredly continue to whittle away at every vulnerable spot on the globe, our great and transcendent effort should be to strengthen the Syngman Rhee spirit in the areas of manifest danger.

This is not at all beyond our power to achieve. What is needed above all is to convince first ourselves and then the "little peoples" who are bound to be the successive targets of Kremlin attack that our policy no longer involves subordinating their necessities to the demands of Western European nations.

CONCLUSION

What is suggested in this memorandum is indeed an agonizing reappraisal. It calls for a radical and far-reaching departure from the present foundations of our foreign policy. What we may expect is that great reluctance will be exercised in making a change of orientation that is so fundamental. It is far easier to continue to improvise tactics based on old assumptions.

Secretary Dulles has had the vision and the courage to declare that a genuinely new base for American foreign policy is required. Let us hope that, the need having been declared, the reappraisal will not be long delayed. Time marches swiftly in this age of speed, and the loss of even a few months will cost us a very high price. The simple fact is that unless we lead the way—exerting a dynamic leadership ourselves along a tenable path and not being guided by the neutralism of Europe—the free world cannot mobilize its effective resources for successful defense.

Courage and the ability to see into the heart of tangled problems are old American virtues. They never were needed more than now.

Kudos to Lucey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 7, 1954

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the New York World-Telegram of Friday, July 2, 1954:

KUDOS TO LUCEY

"Paste the name of Col. Carlos Castillo Armas in your hat," began a dispatch from Charles Lucey in Guatemala more than a month ago.

Col. Castillo Armas was a practically unknown Guatemalan then in exile in Honduras. But he came on to lead the anti-Communist forces in revolution against the pro-Red regime and today stands ready to take over leadership of a new government pending free elections.

As the 12-day civil war simmers down we pause for a bit of station identification and to say a grateful word for Charles Lucey, whose dispatches to the World-Telegram and Sun and other Scripps-Howard newspapers have kept us on top of the hot Guatemala news for 5 weeks.

Charley's early spotlighting of Castillo Armas was typical of his keen reporting from the outset. Able reporter that he is, Charley picked up the story and ran with it—out in front. Pardon us if we lift a hat to a good job and a highly estimable coworker.

Time for New Declaration of Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL B. DAGUE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 7, 1954

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, history repeats itself over and over again and we have once more reached that point where as a Nation we will have to examine our position in the light not only of the threats of our enemies, but also of the defection of our so-called friends. It is doubtful if our forebears of 178 years ago were faced with a harder decision than that which we may shortly have to make, but as they refused to compromise their rights as freemen or appease those who would enslave them, even so will we have to accept the same lonely role which the signers of our Declaration of Independence elected for themselves.

If we are to be wholly honest, we will have to confess that the present situation cannot be divorced from the vacillation and lack of firmness with which we approached the problems of China and Korea, when it was popular to allow England and France to dictate our foreign policy. And while there is admittedly no useful purpose in raking over the past, it is simply silly to deny that a lack of positive policy with reference to all-out help to Chiang Kai-shek and all-out war in Korea has led to our present situation. Firmness in those rare instances when we exercised it in Greece and Turkey paid off handsomely and there is nothing to cause us to conclude that it is still not the best policy.

In the light of Britain's scuttling the Geneva Conference and Eden's subsequent disavowal of previous commitments on SEATO his recent visit to this country with Churchill is an insult to our intelligence. And their determination to ignore the lesson of Munich and the unrelenting aggressiveness of the Reds displays either naivete or bullheadedness or both.

It has been my firm opinion that the greatest mistake this Nation ever made was in 1933 when we recognized the U. S. S. R. And in the light of the overt acts on the part of the Reds—their aggression in Korea, in Czechoslovakia, Poland and the Balkan States—it makes little sense that we should continue to deal with them as we have been wont to do with peoples who honor their treaties and commitments. I have found no one except those who speak in generalities who can define a single instance in which we have had any benefit from maintaining diplomatic relations with such international pariahs.

Isolation is a hard word and the record will show that we have tried to play the role of good neighbors, as the expenditure of upward of $40 billion on our so-called allies since World War II will especially attest. It must follow, then, that if after an "agonizing reappraisal" we have decided that we have been pushed into withdrawal from the United Nations coincident with the admission of Communist China to that body, it will come only upon the realization that our former friends have found it more to their advantage to do business with thieves and liars and murderers than with honest men.

Perhaps Constantine Brown's article which appeared in the June 30 issue of the Washington Evening Star will furnish additional facts to support this conclusion. I commend it to your careful attention.

CAN WE COEXIST?—RUSSIAN PEOPLE VIEWED IN NO POSITION TO RESPOND TO OFFER OF A FRIENDLY HAND

(By Constantine Brown)

Age, a speech impediment and indications of fatigue have changed little of the winning personality of Sir Winston Churchill, the greatest statesman of the century.

Despite his charm and the esteem in which he is held, he has not been able to win the administration to his favorite theme: Be tolerant and extend a friendly hand to the Reds.

His expressed hope is that once the Russian people themselves discover the charms of movies whose script is not the result of political thinking by a Kremlin-appointed official; that once the Russian people discover the charms of bets on football games or possibly a racetrack; that once they learn to play golf and find out how to relax, the present Communist system in the U. S. S. R. may undergo a radical change.

Sir Winston should know better than any one else that communism is not a political creed but an unprecedentedly ruthless dictatorship.

The Kremlin in the last 30 years has been given more than one chance of coexistence with the West. But during these years communism, instead of mellowing, has become more virulent.

It was Britain's Government and not ours which helped and subsidized the counter-revolutionary moves of the various Czarist generals. There was a wave of just indignation in Britain when the Bolsheviks murdered in cold blood the British naval attache stationed at Petrograd soon after Lenin became the head of the Russian Government. And a younger Churchill was in the foremost ranks of the British crusades against the godless Communists. But as the emotional indignations over the Bolshevik crimes began to wear off with time, Britain reappraised its policies. She was among the first great powers to recognize the Red regime. Then as now the motive was the chance of some juicy profits from trade exchanges.

Even the evidence of a Red plot in the late twenties—the famous Zinoviev letters—against the British system caused only a short-lived flurry in official British circles. The recognition of the U. S. S. R. was suspended for a short time. But it was renewed when influential business circles forced their government to gloss over that "childish incident."

We are now witnessing the same pressure on the Conservative administration of Britain to shut its eyes to Red crimes and resume intensive trade with China and Russia.

For 15 years after the Reds overthrew the Czarist regime the United States refused to be persuaded to recognize the murderous Reds although all major powers in the world had done so. And so long as we stood firm in that decision America remained internally healthy. Communist cells were organized in secret in this country. We had in the early twenties long-haired parlor Bolsheviks. But they were only boring and not harmful to security.

Great calamities, such as the last war, change the internal complex of all participants. Social changes always follow long bloody wars. And while such changes are occurring peacefully right now in the remaining free countries of the world, the Kremlin grip on the great Russian masses has not been relaxed in the slightest. Quite the contrary; according to little bits of information trickling out, the Soviet's hold on their enslaved peoples is greater than ever. This is facilitated by the fact that the new generation of Russians knows nothing except the "blessings" of the Marx-Lenin-Stalin doctrine and of their Kremlin-regimented existence.

These are the reasons why Sir Winston's pleas to allow another 25 years of experiments in co-existence with the Muscovites have fallen on deaf ears in Washington.

We tried hard and at great cost to co-exist with the Communists during the war. We coddled and pampered them. We gave them greater latitude than we gave our best and most tried Western allies. The result has been that the more we yielded the more exacting our present enemies became.

Nobody in this country is sufficiently demented not to recognize the dreaaful consequences of another war. But we are being pushed—not only by our enemies but also by our friends—into a position in which we have to choose between liberty and death. Our hope to avert another world catastrophe lies now only in a show of strength.

Think Back to Erin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 7, 1954

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include an appropriate editorial, Think Back to Erin, appearing in the Boston Traveler of July 1, 1954. Certainly the principle of self-government and a "nation now divided against its will" applies with special force to Ireland.

As the Traveler editorial well said, referring to Prime Minister Winston Churchill:

To be consistent he should have extended the policy statement by two words: "Ireland excluded."

Churchill, as a keen student of history and so well experienced in world affairs, knows, or ought to know, that the unification of Ireland is only a matter of time.

Circumstances and conditions, not men, determine these questions. Individuals can only delay.

If Prime Minister Churchill means what he said in the joint statement on policy, he would take the necessary steps for all of the people of Ireland to pass upon the question of unification of Ireland.

The editorial follows:

THINK BACK TO ERIN

When Winston Churchill speaks to the world, one never knows what to expect.

He is equally adept at brilliance, belligerence, bombast, or baloney.

The joint statement on policy that he signed with President Eisenhower in Washington this week is an excellent example of Churchillian balderdash, appealing in sound but limited in meaning.

A vision of the green hills of divided Ireland comes to mind as we read through the text of that statement:

"We uphold the principle of self-government and will earnestly strive by every peaceful means to secure the independence of all countries whose peoples desire and are capable of sustaining an independent existence.

"As regards formerly sovereign states now in bondage, we will not be a party to any arrangement or treaty which would confirm or prolong their unwilling subordination. In the case of nations now divided against their will, we shall continue to seek to achieve unity through free elections supervised by the United Nations to insure they are conducted fairly."

That's what the man said.

In case he's forgotten, we remind him of a Parliamentary election for all Ireland, held under the auspices of the British Army in December 1918.

The vote was 79 to 26 in favor of a united and independent republic.

Even in the nine counties of Ulster, a majority of those elected favored the republic.

So Britain took 6 of those 9 counties and set up Northern Ireland, and that was the last all-Ireland election on record.

Of those 6 northern counties, Tyrone and Fermanagh today consistently favor a united Ireland. So do broad areas of the remaining 4, but they can't whip the gerrymander that holds them in its beak.

Churchill has signed some brilliant statements in the course of modern history, but this wasn't one of his inspired moments.

He has gone on record in support of the very principles that Britain ignores or denies in her dealings with the Irish.

To be consistent, he should have extended the policy statement by two words: "Ireland excluded."

H. R. 9709—Proposed Amendments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AIME J. FORAND

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 7, 1954

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following amendments, which I intend to offer to H. R. 9709:

AMENDMENTS TO H. R. 9709 PROPOSED BY MR. FORAND

Page 2, after line 9, insert the following:

"Sec. 3. (a) Effective as of July 1, 1956, section 1603 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code is hereby amended by redesignating paragraph (6) as paragraph (8) and by inserting after paragraph (5) the following new paragraphs:

" '(6) The maximum weekly compensation payable under such law shall be an amount equal to at least two-thirds of the average weekly wage earned by employees within such State, such average to be computed by the State agency of such State on July 1, 1956, and on July 1 of each succeeding year on the basis of the wages, including the amounts excluded therefrom under section 1607 (b) (1), paid during the last full year for which necessary figures are available;

" '(7) The weekly compensation payable to any individual shall be (A) the maximum weekly compensation payable under such law, or (B) an amount (exclusive of any compensation payable with respect to dependents) equal to at least one-half of such individual's average weekly wage as determined by the State agency, whichever is the lesser;'.

"(b) Effective as of July 1, 1956, section 1607 of the Internal Revenue Code is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

" '(p) Benefit year: The term "benefit year" means the period prescribed by State law, but not in excess of 52 consecutive weeks, for which an eligible individual may receive weekly unemployment-compensation benefits.

" '(q) Base period: The term "base period" means the period prescribed by State law beginning not prior to the first day of the fifth full calendar quarter beginning prior to the benefit year.

" '(r) High quarter wages: The term "high quarter wages" means, in the case of any individual, the amount of wages (as defined by State law) paid to such individual in the calendar quarter of the base period for which his total wages were highest.

" '(s) Average weekly wage: The term "average weekly wage" means, in the case of any individual, the amount of wages (as defined by State law) paid to such individual during the period used for determining his compensation for a week of total unemployment (1) in case the period used is the calendar quarter in which such individual was paid his high quarter wages, divided by 13; or (2) if some other period is used, divided by the number of weeks, during the period used, in which he performed services in employment (as defined by State law).' "

Renumber the sections of the bill which follow accordingly.

AMENDMENTS TO H. R. 9709 PROPOSED BY MR. FORAND

Page 2, after line 9, insert the following:

"Sec. 3. Effective as of July 1, 1956, section 1603 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code is hereby amended by redesignating paragraph (6) as paragraph (7) and by inserting after paragraph (5) the following new paragraph:

" '(6) Compensation shall not be denied to any eligible individual for any week of total unemployment during his benefit year by reason of exhaustion or reduction of benefit rights or cancellation of his wage credit until he has been paid unemployment compensation for not less than 26 weeks during such year. For purposes of this paragraph, the term "benefit year" means the period prescribed by State law, but not in excess of 52 consecutive weeks, for which an individual may receive weekly unemployment-compensation benefits;'."

Renumber the sections of the bill which follow accordingly.

Expansion of Markets for Farm Products

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CECIL M. HARDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 7, 1954

Mrs. HARDEN. Mr. Speaker, one of the pressing problems facing American agriculture today is to find new markets for the products of our farms. We are all familiar with the mounting surpluses piling up in Government warehouses and this Congress already has passed legislation designed to help move those surpluses. But the long-range need is to provide expanded markets.

If we are going to expand our markets for farm products, at home and abroad, on a continuing basis, we must have more research pinpointed to specific problems. We must learn where the markets are, discover the best selling points, and concentrate on them.

Agriculture today must fight for consumer attention and consumer dollars. What do consumers want in agricultural products? They want quantity, quality, good nutrition, and attractive price. But they also want variety, convenience, eye appeal, and taste appeal. It is high time that agricultural used more of the legitimate want-creating techniques employed so successfully by other segments of the economy. Americans throughout the land know about the "pause that refreshes"—television viewers can tell you the beverage that made Milwaukee famous—and TV fight fans know the answer to the query, "What'll you have?" But they do not think about a delightfully refreshing cool glass of milk when they hear it.

The small white turkey is a success because it gives housewives what they want. Conversely, cotton has lost most of its tire cord market because it has been outreached and outpromoted by rayon and nylon.

Our domestic markets for agricultural products are still only partly tapped. In a recent year the average urban family ate 2.4 pounds of meat per person, per week. But 1 family of 5 that same year ate less than 1½ pounds per person, per week. Three city families out of 10 consumed less than a pint of milk or its equivalent per person, per day. One-third of the families were using less citrus fruits and tomatoes than they needed. Thirty percent of the families were using fewer than 5 eggs per person, per week.

Good dietary standards recommend more of these foods than those families were consuming.

There are a good many research projects already under way to find new and expanded uses and markets for agricultural products. Work on cotton has shown that the fiber can be made resistant to mildew, rot, and heat. It can be made flame resistant and water repellant.

Utilization studies of wheat are showing us how to make more profitable uses of wheat straw in industry. Studies have also been made on preventing bread from going stale and to determine protein quality and content in wheat.

There are many new industrial uses for corn. It is used in the mines, the steel plants, the chemical factories, in explosives, textiles, and airplanes. It has helped give us dacron clothing.

Research on soybeans has also produced many new outlets, such as adhesives, resins, and paints. During the war, when imported oils were cut off, research found the way to improve soybean oil for human use.

We are working hard to find new outlets for peanuts. A new salad oil has been developed that remains liquid in a household refrigerator. A new fiber has been produced from peanut protein.

Research is underway to produce feeds from vegetable and fruit wastes. Marketing research is developing new packaging methods, better storage, transportation freezing, and other processes.

Research is finding uses for milk by-products as raw materials for industry.

Frozen fruit concentrates have developed a whole new industry in the past few years. Now our chemists have found a way to make orange powder which, by the addition to water, becomes a tasty, nutritious juice. Good progress is being made to develop stable and palatable forms of milk, both dried and concentrated. Dried or concentrated whole milk—with a fresh-milk taste—might do for the dairy industry what frozen concentrates have done for the orange grower.

All in all, the results of our stepped-up research program are heartening. But much remains to be done if we are to meet our goal of moving food into stomachs, rather than into storage, and of finding expanded markets for our fiber products.

We know our farmers can produce the finest products in all of agriculture, in quantities more than sufficient for our own needs. It is incumbent on us, therefore, to find markets to use this great production at prices which insure a healthy, dynamic American agriculture.

Expanded research is the answer. I am happy to be able to report that this administration is meeting the challenge.

United States To Buy Mercury for Stockpile

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 7, 1954

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record a very interesting article, published in the Wall Street Journal of July 7, dealing with the Government's program of stockpiling.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

United States To Buy Mercury for Stockpile; Trade Asks: Where, How?—Agency Would Pay Less Than Market Price; Seeks More Than United States, Mexico Produce

The Government announced a 3-year program to buy 200,000 flasks of domestic and Mexican mercury at a ceiling price of $225 a 76-pound flask.

Dealers in mercury, or quicksilver, were puzzled over where it would come from. They noted the silvery liquid metal is now worth $280 a flask in the New York market, and contended the Government announcement would either be quite futile or have a tendency to tighten further an already extremely tight market.

The United States is now producing quicksilver on an annual basis of only 14,000 to 15,000 flasks. Mexican production is at an annual rate of around 15,000 flasks.

Thus the two countries combined have a potential production of about 30,000 flasks yearly or 90,000 flasks for the 3 years when the Government would buy 200,000 flasks. This, the trade added, would be a good trick if it could be done. Also, they noted, United States industry is now using quicksilver at an annual rate of 52,000 flasks, which is supplied by domestic producers. Yugoslavia, Canada, Italy, Japan, Mexico, and Spain. Spain and Italy are the world leaders in production of mercury. Peak United States production was 51,000 flasks in 1942.

Italian and Spanish mercury yesterday was offered to United States importers at $270 f. o. b. home ports.

Edmund Mansure, director of the General Services Administration, did not specify the purpose for which the liquid metal would be purchased beyond noting that the program will broaden the mobilization base of the metal and increase its supply for defense and industrial purposes.

Government officials declined to comment for security reasons when asked to say if Atomic Energy Commission requirements are responsible for the $45 million mercury purchase program. The recent sharp price increase in mercury has been blamed on plans for increased use of the liquid metal as a circulating medium in atomic reactors.

The quicksilver would go into the Government's stockpile of critical materials. Purchases for the strategic hoard are directed by the Office of Defense Mobilization, while GSA is the actual procuring agency.

Mr. Mansure said the United States will buy domestic mercury through the end of 1957, or until 125,000 flasks have been purchased, whichever comes first.

In addition, he said the GSA will buy mercury produced in Mexico, duty paid, through the end of 1957, or until a total of 75,000 flasks have been purchased, whichever occurs first. The GSA's buying price is $225 a flask for each program. In the case of the Mexican program, however, Mexican producers would have to absorb $19 a flask duty in selling their output to the United States. Mr. Mansure said purchase depots for the mercury will be established in the western part of the United States.

The GSA chief said additional purchases of mercury may be made from time to time from specific foreign producers, particularly those in Canada.

"The Government does not at present intend to make any market purchase of mercury at prices in excess of the $225 guaranteed purchase price," Mr. Mansure declared.

A GSA spokesman said United States Mercury output last year was approximately 17,000 flasks. Total world production in 1953 was about 160,000 flasks.

Address by Hon. Theodore Francis Green, of Rhode Island

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN

OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 7, 1954

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, on Sunday, July 4, it was my privilege to join with the citizens of Rhode Island in dedicating and marking the graves of former Governors of my State.

Ceremonies were held in many cemeteries in Rhode Island and at Newport I delivered the address at the dedication.

I ask unanimous consent to have this address printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Mayor Sullivan, Mr. Taylor, Senator Murray, Mr. Gildea, officials of the Newport city government, members of the armed services and Newport civic organizations, fellow citizens, today we join with citizens of our State in other places, in identifying and properly marking the graves of former Governors of Rhode Island. Not only in Rhode Island are exercises such as this being conducted, but also in other States where the remains of a few former chief executives are interred. It is quite remarkable that here in Newport cemeteries lie the remains of 23 former Governors of our State. In the Coddington Cemetery across the way are buried six of them. All of these men served their State with honor, and history records their accomplishments and endeavors. Many held office before we declared our independence, and others during the hectic days when our country was fighting to achieve it. Still others served during those trying days when we were fighting to preserve it and for our very existence as a Nation. It seems appropriate from this large number of governors to commemorate one as a representative of them all, and one has been chosen who is buried in Coddington Cemetery and who was the first chief executive to bear the title of governor, William Coddington. He was a friend of Roger Williams and was first elected with the title not of governor but of judge. Born in Lancashire, England, in 1601, Governor Coddington was a man of fortune and position who came to Boston in 1630. In Boston he served as a judge with Dr. John Clarke later organized a new colony in the vicinity of New York. It was Roger Williams who induced both Judge Coddington and Dr. Clarke to locate on Narragansett Bay and it was soon after he established himself on the island of Rhode Island that he was elected the first judge of Newport. Later he was elected the first governor, holding office from 1640 to 1647. He died here in November 1678.

Governor Coddington was a devout follower of Roger Williams the founder of our State and believed in his principle of complete religious liberty. He was a broadminded and beneficent gentleman of sturdy character whose work was dedicated to establishing here in Rhode Island a colony where respectable citizens could reside without fear of being molested by the British Crown.

I love Newport and the whole island of Rhode Island. I am glad to be taking part in this dedicatory exercise of marking the graves of Governor Coddington, and the other 22 governors buried here. There naturally come to mind the graves elsewhere of other governors of Rhode Island, among whom are several of my own ancestors. I think especially of the grave of my direct ancestor, Gov. William Greene of Warwick, buried in the family graveyard on the Greene farm there. Perhaps I may say a few words about him, since his record is, I think, unique. He was an able and a very independent Yankee. After being elected governor in 1743, his independence aroused so much opposition that after 2 years they elected Gov. Gideon Wanton in his place. However, after 1 year of the latter, the people decided they had made a mistake and reelected Governor Greene. Again after a year, in their vacillation they reelected Governor Wanton. Again after a year, they returned to their first love Governor Greene. This third time he stayed 7 years in office, when he was again retired and Gov. Stephen Hopkins was elected in his place, but lasted only 2 years, and Governor Greene came back for the fourth time into the office of governor, which he held until his death in 1758. So he really served as governor 4 separate times for a total of 11 terms, a record which, as I said before, is, I think, unique, a monument to a Rhode Islander's spirit of independence and to political success in spite of it.

We in Rhode Island are the beneficiaries of the endeavors of our early governors. These men had various views and, with their interest, training, education, and background, representing many political philosophies, they were an inspiration to their fellow citizens and made magnificent individual contributions to the forward progress of our State.

Although I have spoken in particular of Governor Coddington and Governor Greene, I realize that when we recall the numerous patriotic acts in the history of our State, it is both difficult and unfair to single out any one or two governors for particular praise. A recital of their acts of patriotism, however, should stimulate us to follow their example. Rhode Island has always been independent. It was the general assembly of the colony of Rhode Island, acting on the advice of its governor, which adopted the resolution of independence and which widened the breach between our colony and its mother country.

Nowhere did the love of civil liberty manifest itself more clearly than here in Rhode Island, the birthplace of religious liberty. It was our general assembly which adopted the first resolution denying the right of any other power to levy taxes upon this colony. It was a governor of Rhode Island who alone refused to take the oath to support the Stamp Act. Here in Newport the citizens committed the first overt act of violence by destroying the British sloop *Liberty*. Later in Providence the citizens occasioned the first bloodshed by burning the British schooner *Gaspee*.

Our Governors all had a part in these historic events of our State and country. A review of their patriotic, independent acts arouses our admiration. It was acts such as these which finally led to the Declaration of Independence which we celebrate today.

Over the years there has been from time to time local interest in locating and caring for some of the graves of the former Governors of our State. However, no concentrated, organized effort was made until the State graves registration committee was named in accordance with an act of the Rhode Island Legislature. It took initiative, time, effort, and foresightedness to carry out this program of locating and identifying all the graves of the former Governors of our State. Mr. Ralph Mohr, a former State commander of the American Legion and chairman of the State graves registration committee and his assistants at headquarters and in the various cities and towns, deserve the heartfelt thanks of all the citizens of our State for their successful efforts culminating today at the various cemeteries in Rhode Island and elsewhere.

As a student of history I can well imagine the painstaking search of records which was required in order to establish definitely the true location of the graves of some of our Governors. The dedication of these graves today with the placing of these new markers should serve as a lasting reminder, that we should take proper care of them and give devoted respect to those who held the highest office within the power of the citizens of our State to grant, and whose sturdy character and inspiration have led us here in Rhode Island to be good, conscientious, patriotic American citizens. May the inspiration of their example help us to be their worthy successors.

History of Veterans of Foreign Wars as Related to History of Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 7, 1954

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record a very interesting article entitled "It Happened 40 Years Ago," written by B. R. Nee and published in the Veterans of Foreign Wars magazine for June 1954. The article deals with the history of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, as related to the history of the State of Pennsylvania.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

It Happened 40 Years Ago

(By B. R. Nee)

Just as Pennsylvania has played a dominating role in the dramatic history of America for more than 250 years, the Quaker Commonwealth has also been closely identified with the fascinating history of the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

In war and in peace, from the days of William Penn, the Quaker State has done much to foster William Penn's ambition to lay the foundation of a free colony for all mankind.

Wherever you go in Pennsylvania you rub elbows with history. You see old houses whose gray walls have watched the changing scene for three centuries. Here the foundations of this country were laid; here those foundations were preserved at Gettysburg. Here the First and Second Continental Congresses met. Here the Declaration of Indepence was written and adopted. Here the Constitution of the United States was written and made the law of the land. Here three cities—Philadelphia, Lancaster, and York—served as capitals of the Nation. Here stand Fort Pitt and Fort Necessity, where 200 years ago this July George Washington fought his first major engagement with the enemy. Fort Ligonier and Bushy Run battlefield, and many other historic sites, tell eloquent stories of events prior to and during the French and Indian War and the Revolution.

Here, too, is Valley Forge, where Washington's army went through a terrible winter of starvation for the cause of liberty. At Valley Forge one can look into the tiny room that served as Washington's headquarters. It was in this room that Washington, General (Mad Anthony) Wayne and Lafayette planned the strategy that produced victory for the Continental Army. When the cause of the colonists seemed so hopeless, it was here at Valley Forge where Washington issued the order "Put only Americans on guard tonight."

The affinity between the Quarker State and the VFW can be traced back to the early days at the turn of the present century. The Philippine Insurrection, which followed the Spanish-American War, ended on July 4, 1902, by Presidential proclamation. In the early 1900's the greatest volunteer army in the history of the world had been completely demobilized. The some 200,000 men who had served in Cuba, Puerto Rico, the Philippines, in the Chinese Boxer Rebellion and on the high seas, had returned to their homes to become civilians again.

Anxious to preserve the bonds of comradeship that had meant so much when they were in uniform they did what the veterans of all wars have always done—and will probably continue to do. First, they joined their respective regimental or divisional societies. Some were content with company reunions at frequent intervals. In various parts of the country veterans who had served together in specific areas of the world joined in forming societies. Some of these were started as local or State groups, to affiliate subsequently with veterans in nearby States.

In the West the Colorado Society of the Army of the Philippines (founded in 1899) formed the nucleus of a nation-wide organization known as the National Society, Army of the Philippines. The name was adopted at a meeting in Denver, held in August 1900, and recognized as the first national encampment of that body.

In Ohio and Pennsylvania veterans who had served either in Cuba or the Philippines, or in both areas, decided to call themselves the American Veterans of Foreign Service. By pure coincidence, the Ohio and Pennsylvania groups adopted the same name. In 1905 these two groups held a joint convention in Altoona, Pa., and merged under the same banner.

In 1913, at a meeting in Denver, the National Society, Army of the Philippines, and the American Veterans of Foreign Service decided to consolidate their forces. For temporary purposes the new organization took the name "Army of the Philippines, Cuba, and Puerto Rico."

Following a referendum vote of its individual posts, the Army of the Philippines, Cuba, and Puerto Rico adopted the name "Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States."

Although 8 or 10 various names were mentioned, the records show that only 2 other names were formally proposed and rejected—The Veteran Army and Navy of the United States and the Veteran Army and Navy of the Republic. The latter was probably suggested by the prominence of the Grand Army of the Republic.

On March 28–29, 1914, one of the "splinter organizations" previously identified with the American Veterans of Foreign Service (eastern branch) met in Philadelphia. The delegates endorsed the amalgamation plans formulated at Denver by action of the National Society, Army of the Philippines and the American Veterans of Foreign Service.

The dates for the first annual encampment in Pittsburgh, Pa., under the name of the "Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States" were fixed for September 14–17. It was at this first annual encampment when the amalgamation agreement was formally endorsed and accepted by former members of the Army of the Philippines, the American Veterans of Foreign Service and the Army of the Philippines, Cuba, and Puerto Rico.

Pennsylvania also has another hold on VFW affections for historic reasons, Pittsburgh was the scene of the first national convention of the Ladies Auxiliary to the Veterans of Foreign Wars. The initial meeting of the wives, sisters, mothers, and daughters of the delegates attending the first VFW national encampment, was called to order by Commander in Chief Rice W. Means.

Fifty ladies were present when Mrs. Means was selected to serve as president pro tempore. Mrs. Margaret Armstrong, Pittsburgh, was named secretary. At the close of the Pittsburgh series of meetings, Mrs. Margaret Armstrong was elected to serve as the first national president of the ladies auxiliary.

To oldtimers in the VFW, the 55th National Encampment in Philadelphia, August 1–6, 1954, holds all the allure of a sentimental journey. The very fact that the first formal meeting of the organization under the name "Veterans of Foreign Wars" was held in Pittsburgh 40 years ago, is also certain to stir the emotions of many younger VFW members.

For countless thousands of VFW members, of course, the historical setting of the 1954 national encampment also suggests a perfect family vacation opportunty. For any child of school age, a sightseeing tour through Pennsylvania adds up to a graphic, visual education in American history.

Nestled in the Pennsylvania hills are hundreds of improved recreational areas. Great networks of highways and railroads permit recreational travelers and vacationists to reach the vacation spots of their choice—with a minimum of discomfort or delay. Pennsylvania's famous turnpike, 327 miles long, extends from the Ohio line to King of Prussia, near Valley Forge. This breathtaking ribbon of concrete passes through incomparable regions of scenic beauty.

Although Pennsylvania ranks among the highest in population, with more than 11 million inhabitants, it is a land of constantly changing panorama. It has great industrial cities and also thousands of communities that are typical of small-town America. It has areas of wilderness that provide some of the finest hunting and fishing in America, and many other forms of recreation for countless numbers. For example, 1,070,000 natives of Pennsylvania bought hunting licenses during the year ending June 30, 1952. Simultaneously, 30,000 nonresident hunters sought permits to hunt wild game in the hills of Pennsylvania. The Keystone State also has its wonderful fishing streams and lakes, more than enough to entice the 700,000 Pennsylvania citizens who bought fishing licenses in 1952.

From the sandy shores and sparkling waters of Lake Erie to picturesque Delaware Water Gap, "gateway to the Poconos," Pennsylvania's largest resort area; to the Pine Creek Gorge or Pennsylvania's Grand Canyon near Wellsboro, to the Keystone State's highest point, Mount Davis, near Meyersdale; through the Blue Ridge Mountains and the Appalachians, to the Ligonier Valley and the Bedford area; to Conneaut Lake and Eagles Mere and Cambridge Springs and Mount Summit—across the State from east to west and from north to south, whatever your vacation desires may demand—Pennsylvania can provide it.

Golf courses and tennis courts are plentiful wherever you turn. Lake and mountain resorts cater to your every wish. Cabins and camp sites are available if you like to rough it. Trails invite you to either riding or hiking over mountains that lose themselves in a blue horizon. Water sports are paramount in crystal lakes, clear streams, and artificial pools.

Pennsylvania is truly a vacationland for the family where every member can have a wonderful time. In evidence of this fact, there are more than 300 organized summer camps for boys and girls in the Keystone State.

If there is one particular type of vacation a VFW member prefers, there's a place in Pennsylvania that is the answer to his prayers. Furthermore, this year he will enjoy the chance to bring his visit to the Quaker State to an exciting climax when the 55th national encampment takes the spotlight in Philadelphia this summer during the week of August 1-6.

Chairmanship of the Committee on Government Operations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH E. FLANDERS

OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 7, 1954

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two editorials and a newspaper article. The first is entitled "Flanders and the Next Act in McCarthy Drama," and is from the Durham (N. C.) Herald. The second is entitled "Ousting Chairmen," and is from the Evansville (Ind.) Press. The third is entitled "Contempt for United States," and is from the Machinist, the organ of the machinists' union.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection——

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, although I do not expect to object if I obtain an answer to a question I wish to ask, let me say that the Senator from Vermont knows that I am in sympathy with the objective of his resolution which—unfortunately, I think—was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration; but I have not had an opportunity to read the editorials and article he has mentioned, and I wonder whether the Senator from Vermont has checked them in connection with the application of rule XIX.

Mr. FLANDERS. I do not carry in my mind just what rule XIX is; I do not have a head for figures. Would the Senator from Oregon mind telling me what that rule is?

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from Vermont has a pretty good head, Mr. President. I wish to know whether there is in the editorials or the article any language that reflects upon any Member of the Senate, because in recent months I have noticed a growing tendency, it seems to me, for Senators to ignore the purposes of rule XIX, which requires that no Senator shall insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any material reflecting upon another Senator or upon a State.

Mr. FLANDERS. I have read the editorials and article, and I feel that I can give assurance to the Senator from Oregon that there is nothing in them that comes under rule XIX, as I remember it. If the Senator from Oregon wishes me to do so, I shall refresh my memory on rule XIX; and if I find anything dubious in connection with the matter, I shall rise and say so.

Mr. MORSE. Let me state that I raise this point irrespective of the particular colleague who might be involved; but as a friend of the Senator from Vermont, I call his attention to the existence of the rule.

Mr. FLANDERS. I accept the suggestion in the same spirit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Vermont?

There being no objection, the editorials and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Durham (N. C.) Herald of June 24, 1954]

FLANDERS AND THE NEXT ACT IN MCCARTHY DRAMA

The next act in the McCarthy drama which dominates the domestic stage depends upon the persistence of Senator FLANDERS. About all to be expected of the hearings of the Army-McCarthy controversy is that "somebody lied," as if anyone who watched the proceedings on television or listened to them on radio or followed them in the newspapers isn't already well aware of that.

Senator FLANDERS, Republican, of Vermont, insists that his resolution to remove Senator MCCARTHY from his committee chairmanships isn't going to be buried in the Rules Committee. He has promised further action July 15 if MCCARTHY by that time hasn't answered the questions concerning his financial affairs which he failed to answer 2 years ago.

Although the Senate is loath to discipline its Members, it has on occasion done so. The extremes to which MCCARTHY has gone may influence a majority of the Senate to discipline him. MCCARTHY has reflected discredit on the Senate by his conduct, and there may be enough Senators who resent that to call him to account.

The leadership in the move to discipline MCCARTHY is properly coming from his own Republican Party. The Democrats are wisely keeping in the background, though they should act, when the time comes, with a sense of responsibility to the Senate and to the Nation.

Senator FLANDERS must continue to take the initiative if his resolution is not to remain buried in the Rules Committee. The chairman of that committee, JENNER, of Indiana, is one of MCCARTHY's closest friends in the Senate. He may be depended upon to use all his influence as committee chairman to prevent either the Flanders or the Lehman resolution (both have the same objective) from coming to a vote.

Persistence on Senator FLANDERS' part can produce results. He is not likely to be encouraged by either his party leadership in the Senate or by the administration. But by managing his resolution shrewdly, he can bring the issue into the open and air the McCarthy finances before the Senate and before the Nation. As bad as it is to lose any more legislative time this session over MCCARTHY, Senator FLANDERS may be able to render a notable public service by showing the people more clearly the nature of MCCARTHY and McCarthyism.

[From the Evansville (Ind.) Press of June 21, 1954]

OUSTING CHAIRMEN

(By Peter Edson)

WASHINGTON.—Republican Senator RALPH E. FLANDERS, of Vermont, raised a fine point in urging that Senator JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY be stripped of his committee chairmanship if he does not clear himself of charges involving his personal finances.

The Senate has removed committee chairmen at least five times in its history. So there are precedents for this action.

In 1837, following the election of Andrew Jackson as President, the Senate itself voted to remove Henry Clay as chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee and Daniel Webster as chairman of the Finance Committee.

Boes these men had opposed Jackson and his policies. President Jackson was, of course, the originator of the political spoils system, mistrusting entrenched power and believing in rotation in office.

Clay and Webster were replaced by two of his own followers in a purely political move.

In the second instance, the Democratic majority caucus of the Senate took the action. This was in 1859, when Stephen A. Douglas was removed as chairman of the Committee on Territories. The reason was that Douglas opposed the policy of President James Buchanan, though both were members of the Democratic Party.

In Gen. Ulysses S. Grant's second administration, the Republican caucus this time took similar action by removing Charles Sumner as chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee.

The reason given was that Sumner did not speak to or meet socially with the President and his Secretary of State, Hamilton Fish. This made it impossible for him to carry on his duties.

Getting down to more modern times, in 1924 the progressive Republicans were able to block the appointment of Senator Albert B. Cummins of Iowa to the chairmanship of the Interstate Commerce Committee. He was an old guard Republican.

Though his appointment had been decided on by the regular Republican caucus in the Senate, the insurgents refused to ratify on the Senate floor.

They were able to force a floor vote for three candidates. In the election, Senator E. D. "Cotton Ed" Smith, of South Carolina, won, though he was a member of the minority Democratic Party.

By still another procedure, the Senate Military Affairs Committee in 1941 forced its chairman, Senator Robert R. Reynolds, of North Carolina, to stand aside and allow his duties to be performed by the ranking Democratic member, Senator Elbert D. Thomas, of Utah.

Senator Reynolds was accused of having had close relations with Nazi Germany. This was the era of preparations for World War II. Senator Reynolds was not in sympathy with these moves. He was not fired. The Senate committee just took his job away from him, leaving him his title.

These precedents indicate there is a wide variety of methods by which a Senate committee chairman may be removed or stripped of his powers. There is no law or Senate rule governing the selection of committee chairmen.

But there are long-standing customs and traditions, which have almost the force of Senate rules, and which would be difficult to upset.

These practices are based on the seniority system. Once a Senator is appointed to a committee, he can remain as long as he is in Congress, unless he seeks appointment to another committee, and his seniority entitles him to bump a junior member. Members of committees are ranked according to their years of service. The senior member automatically is designated for chairmanship unless he is chairman of another standing committee.

Ever since 1846, it has been Senate practice to make committee appointments by 2 committees on committees—1 for each party—made up of party leaders. These submit their lists to the Senate for approval as a matter of form.

In only one instance—the case of Senator Cummins, cited above—have the lists been questioned or overruled. But the power of the Senate to remove a chairman or change a membership is believed to be inherent.

Prior to 1846 the Senate elected all committees and committee chairmen by ballot. The members got their rank by the number of votes they received. This practice led to abuses in political trading for the choicer assignments.

All congressional reform efforts to do away with the seniority system and choose committee chairmen on a merit basis have failed.

[From the Machinist of July 8, 1954]

Contempt for United States

A showdown battle is underway in Washington this week to determine if one Senator can set himself up as more powerful than the United States Senate itself. If so, then the orderly process of the legislative branch of Government, as devised by the framers of the Constitution, is to be replaced by jungle law.

For nearly 3 years, Senator Joseph R. McCarthy has been in contempt of the Senate. Six times since October 1951 he has disdainfully refused to appear before a Senate subcommittee inquiring into his fitness to serve as a Senator. By a vote of 60 to 0, the Senate affirmed the right of the subcommittee to question Senator McCarthy's political morality and his financial ethics. Senator McCarthy's reply was typical. He branded the subcommittee members as "dishonest" and "doing the work of Communists."

Contempt for the Senate by Senators does not carry a jail sentence or fine, like contempt of court does for private citizens. The subcommittee could not force Senator McCarthy to appear before it under subpena, as it can private citizens. However, the Senate can vote to strip McCarthy of his posts as chairman of Senate committees.

CHARGES AGAINST SENATOR M'CARTHY

The charges against Senator McCarthy are sordid. They range from income-tax violations down the line to petty chiseling. Senator McCarthy owes an explanation of this last charge to his friends and supporters. Ever since he came into prominence, it appears, Senator McCarthy has been receiving bank checks in small amounts—$1, $5, $25—from patriotic but misguided people who mailed in money, urging that it be used to fight communism. Apparently these people were not aware that the Senate appropriates money generously to finance McCarthy investigations.

The Senate subcommittee wanted to ask Senator McCarthy, among other things, how these checks were used and whether any of these funds were diverted to his own personal use.

Senator McCarthy's refusal to talk has prompted Senator Ralph E. Flanders, of Vermont, to bring the issue to a head. Senator Flanders made it clear last week that he intends to fight to a finish his battle to bar Senator McCarthy from his committee chairmanships unless the Senator from Wisconsin answers the Senate's questions. The Senate will be asked to take action on the Flanders motion before Congress adjourns. July 31 is the target date for adjournment.

CLIMAX NOW SHAPING UP

So the showdown battle is coming to a fast climax. It is not a matter of party politics. It is a battle of principles. Senator Flanders is a Republican, as is Senator McCarthy. So are many of the Senators who earlier voted 60 to 0 giving the subcommittee the right to examine Senator McCarthy's fitness.

If McCarthyism is allowed to run rampant, not only the integrity of the United States Senate is threatened. The rights and privileges of all free Americans, all unions, and all other organizations which disagree with the methods of McCarthyism are at stake.

Contempt for the United States Senate is contempt for the United States, contempt for all of us. It is vitally important that all of us take 5 minutes and two 3-cent stamps to write both our Senators to strip Senator McCarthy of his chairmanships if he does not answer the questions asked him. Senators will act if they are sure we are behind them. It is up to us.

The Farm Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 7, 1954

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record a letter on the farm program, written by H. S. Casey Abbott, and addressed to Henry R. Luce, editor in chief of Life magazine.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

June 21, 1954.

Mr. Henry R. Luce,
Editor in Chief, Life Magazine,
New York, N. Y.

Dear Sir: I have read your editorial referring to the farm program in your issue of June 21. Never since this program started in 1933 have I read and attempted to digest a more dishonest and unfair article, or one which showed more of a complete lack of knowledge of the subject on which you were apparently writing. In order to refresh your memory as to your point in encumbering the Government with debt and monetary loss, I beg to call your attention to the fact that in the fiscal year 1953 the loss in handling second-class mail, presently magazine and newspapers, in the Post Office Department amounted to $231 million. Moreover the accumulated loss in the Post Office Department since the end of World War II, a period of approximately 8 years, has now reached the staggering total of $3,800,000,000. I have been told but cannot state it as true, and your comptroller will have to verify the amount, that the Luce Publications of which you are a part, gain to the extent of $10 million a year, not in net but in gross income because of the existence of this postal subsidy from the Government. Thus, Mr. Editor, I do not think you are in a position to strike blindly out at another segment of American business without first putting your own house in order.

Now as to the farm program. During practically the entire course of the Truman administration we were on the verge of war with Russia. The surpluses which we had disappeared very rapidly during the Korean war and the failure to carry out the entire program as set down by law conceivably was because of the fact that with impending war it was felt that surpluses would be a handy thing to have around. These surpluses were inherited by the Eisenhower administration, and where they were once declared to be an asset by the Truman administration, they were immediately declared to be a liability by the Republicans. One item which you writers continually miss or ignore in the farm program, as set up, is the fact that the program calls for price supports under a formula originating out of the situation which existed from 1909–14 at which time the index figure of industry and farming each stood at 100. This formula is supposed to give the farmer equity in value for his farm dollar in his purchase of industrial products. With that end, acreage allocations which you have completely ignored, are supposed to control in large measure the productive capacity in any one of the six basic crops and should, in any of the years when acreage allocations are applied and accepted by the farms. As additional surplus occurs it is thrown into the normal granary pool and reallocations are made, cutting down the acreage in that particular crop and creating a void in production to be filled out of the normal granary.

The above is tremendously important because price support without acreage control can only lead to unwieldly surpluses and also to the exhaustion of our greatest national asset, so far as the farmer is concerned, and that is the fertility of our soil. The above item has been completely ignored in your editorial and in practically every comment which I have read since the Republicans came into power.

Again coupled with acreage allocation comes soil conservation, which calls for laying out land or for converting land to soil-building crops, reforesting, regrassing, and releveling, in many instances, in order to hold the fertility of the soil in the bank, so to speak, for the future generation of America. Thus, a rounded-out plan with the above items in it—and they certainly are in it as written originally—calls for price support to give the farmer equity in purchasing power; calls for acreage controls to hold production within the reasonable needs of the Nation and for export; calls for conservation to in large part keep the farm force busy, maintain the fertility of the soil, and actually better our agricultural position for future generations. This was intended to complement acreage control and make the burden easier for the farmer to bear because of Government payments for conservation work.

What have been the results, Mr. Editor? In 23 years the farm income has risen from a low of $7 billion to a high of $35 billion. During the war the farmer, because of his teaching under soil conservation and his learning under restricted acreage how to get the most out of an acre of land in production, was able with 1½ million fewer men on the farm to raise sufficient food to feed 15 million men under arms, all of the men in industry, and at the same time provide a tremendous amount of food for export to our allies. The loss of the Government in this 23-year period for conducting this school has been $1,100,000,000, but I beg to call your attention to the fact that this is divided into 2 categories: The loss on basics—the 6 crops which you so readily decry in your editorial and which amount to 42 percent of our farm production in America—has been only $20 million; the balance of loss, amounting to $1,080,000,000, was all in nonbasics. Of the above amount, $708 million was lost where the support was mandatory according to law, but where the Secretary of Agriculture could vary the support at his discretion from 75 percent up to 90 percent of parity; $372 million was lost in crops where the Secretary could, at his discretion, put supports on, but they were not mandatory. Thus, the loss in basics, $20 million, was comparatively unimportant relatively, but that investment on the part of Government was of tremendous significance because of the following: During the 23 years with the increase in income boosted from $7 billion to $35 billion, there can be no question in my mind, or your mind, but that the farmers paid into the Federal Treasury of the United States in the form of Federal income taxes over $50 billion. This, Mr. Editor, is a very good return on a $1,100,000,000 investment. This does not reflect additional benefits which accrued to the Nation.

The farm family carries on its back a family and a half in the immediate rural area in which it exists. Thus, 12 million on the farm are supporting 18 million, and the 18 million, in turn, are reaching into the cities for supplies, cars, etc., and they provide the basis for an operation which unquestionably occupies in large part the working capacity of at least one-half of our population. The major freight on our railroads is food and fiber going to market in its raw state and going back to the people in its completed State. Our prosperity means the ultimate prosperity of everyone. No one can deny that we have witnessed months and months of farm prices going down and the index of the retail prices of food going up. Did you ever figure out the reason, Mr. Editor, or the cause? It is very easy, but it is not the fault of the American farmer. Remember, sir, that we have production costs also. Our farms, our food and fiber factories, are the most essential operations in America. We can easily get along without your publication for many months and that is the product of your brain. I wish that you would try for a period of 1 week to get along without food and fiber, which is the product of my brain, and in the production of which I am so bitterly criticized by you for receiving some of the benefits of Government—a source from which I might say your industry has profited from greatly ever since the inception of the postal service in America.

If you wish to be honest you will not demand of us that we go back to flexible parity which is the control of price by the amount of farm surplus on hand. That is the old story so far as we are concerned. If the supply increases 2 percent the price goes down 2 percent. The only answer I as a farmer have, and I have been one for 40 years, is to produce more per acre by the use of fertilizers or any means at my command, because I have many fixed costs which cannot be reduced as can the price of my product. Because of the very nature of my business, I must sell at wholesale and buy at retail. I must buy in a sellers' market and sell in a buyer's market, I must face up to the weather hazards as they come, and the price which I receive for my products is the all important factor. All that we get under the fixed parity formula is a price which gives us 90 percent of economic justice with the industrial producer; 75 percent of parity which is supposed to be the low point in the flexible parity program is 75 percent of what we are entitled to out of the national economy for our products. Try to sell your publication Life for 75 percent of your present price structure and see where you come out, and remember, sir, that my costs are just as fixed as yours are and also that my product is much more important in American life than yours is. I can say only this for you people in the publication business. You have done a great job of conveying information and educating the American people and I hate to see an editorial page of a great publication like Life, with its ability to sway the public mind, contain an editorial of the kind which I have just read. This, I consider unfair, biased, and prejudiced to the enth degree, with no answer contained therein except be sure that the farmers get less money for their products. This, in the face of the well-known fact that in order to hold a business together one must produce cheaper, which is impossible in this case, or more per acre for the dollar of production costs. Thus, flexible parity is hoist by its own petard.

In the promotion of the flexible parity program, Allan Kline has gone far afield from the thinking of Ed O'Neill, the man who built the American Farm Bureau Federation, and who is one of the fathers of the farm program. Secretary Benson, in his St. Paul speech in February of 1953, where he called upon the American farmer to stop leaning on government and assert his rugged individualism, started the downward trend in not only farm, the farm price structure, but the downward trend which we have witnessed for the past 11 months in every industry not connected with defense in America. There is no question but what with those statements he uttered the prelude to the President's repudiation of his promise to the farmers of 90 percent of parity made in Minnesota and 100 percent of parity repeated in Dakota. We realize that these were political promises made during a political campaign, but many farmers voted for President Eisenhower because of those promises, and the repudiation on his part of them, even with the support of Secretary Benson, can do his administration no good.

To get back to figures as to expenditures by the Federal Government in behalf of various elements of America, there have been in the past 23 years the following expenditures: $1,100,000,000 for price supports, $4,200,000,000 on consumer subsidies, $45,600,000,000 spent on business reconversion, tax amortization, and airline subsidies.

As long as we have expenditures such as the above, and as long as we have regulations of freight rates, privilege for public utilities, franchise for various endeavors, Government assistance in large part establishing the wages of organized labor, all of which can be capitalized by industry in its various forms, it becomes mandatory that the farm segment of the American picture also be aided by Government. The farmers have never requested a subsidy. They have asked for a working plan of acreage allocations coupled with banking facilities in the form of loans based on parity price, which cannot be furnished by private banks, a normal granery to absorb surpluses and deal them out to fill the void which will be created by reduced acreage allocations, and a price which will give our dollar approximately the same purchasing power as the industrial dollar.

That is our story, Mr. Editor, and I as one farmer will stand on it. The law of supply and demand went out of the American picture with the protective tariff, franchises, and Government assistance in various categories to other forms of industry. A managed supply, which is what we ask for, to meet demand at a fairly even price structure, is all that the farmers are asking out of the American economy.

Very truly yours,

H. S. CASEY ABBOTT.

William Sterling Cole, Class of 1925

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DEAN P. TAYLOR

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 7, 1954

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by Paul S. Jacobsen, class of 1927, Colgate University, honoring Hon. W. STERLING COLE, of New York, to the degree of doctor of laws:

WILLIAM STERLING COLE, 1925

WILLIAM STERLING COLE, Phi Beta Kappa of the class of 1925, was elected to the United States Congress in 1934. He has served continuously in the House of Representatives since that time, and with the recent reorganization of our congressional districts he has become our new neighbor. Wise in judgment of sound national policies, this representative of the people has stood courageously for honesty and for economy in government, even when the tide seemed to be running against him. The trust and confidence of his colleagues in Congress has sent him abroad on critical missions of observation and inspection, and he has repeatedly filled responsible committee positions, culminating in his chairmanship of the critically important Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

Since April 1, 1953, when he was appointed chairman, he has worked vigorously for a well-armed America. Nevertheless, he has been fully aware of our need to develop atomic power for peaceful industrial use. His great statesmanship is nowhere better revealed than when, speaking before Colgate alumni this spring at the 135th anniversary dinner in New York, he said "We shall flout all the lessons of recorded history if ever we come to believe that the steel of armaments—even nuclear armaments—can be a permanent substitute for spiritual armament."

Learning of the honor Colgate is about to confer, no less a personage than President Eisenhower prepared a personal message in which he says: "'STUB' COLE has powerfully influenced the course of American defense planning for the past 15 years. He has richly earned this high honor and with you I am happy to salute his service to our country."

Time magazine described this leader in public affairs as "short, grey, and handsome." Today we would add to that: "Courageous, Christian, and honest." "STUB" COLE has brought a new hope to us all and a new honor to the alma mater he served so well for 6 years as alumni trustee. I present him, Mr. President, that he may be admitted to the degree of doctor of laws of Colgate University.

PAUL S. JACOBSEN, 1927,
Chairman, Department of Political Science, Colgate.

JUNE 14, 1954.

I Pledge Allegiance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 7, 1954

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the Atheneum Club of Atlanta, Tex., sponsors an annual oration contest among local high-school students devoted to the theme, Defenders of Democracy. More than 50 orations were entered this year. Mildred Coulter, a member of the graduating class of Atlanta High School, won first place and was awarded a $25 Government bond.

I ask unanimous consent that the winning oration by Miss Coulter, entitled "I Pledge Allegiance," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the oration was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one Nation indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."

How many times have people repeated this? How many have meant it? How many know what it means?

There are several people who know what it means—the Unknown Soldier lying in the grave, the returned prisoner of war, and the many soldiers who fought for their country. These men pledged allegiance to their country and they kept their pledge. These men know.

There are still others who would like to know—the man behind the Iron Curtain, the small Korean child without home or mother, and the Korean prisoner of war who has had just a taste of freedom and would like more of it.

I know what it means, and you know what it means, but are we doing everything possible to keep our Nation "indivisible, with liberty and justice for all"? Now is the time when we should be making that pledge every day. We will soon be of voting age; we will decide the fate of our country. We must pledge allegiance to Old Glory; we must keep that pledge so that "government of the people, by the people, and for the people shall not perish from the earth."

"Communism," what an ugly word. Communism is seeking to destroy this freedom-loving land of ours. Communism creeps and crawls like some lurking monster waiting to prey upon an innocent victim.

In our schools there are many teachers and professors who are Communists. You may ask, "Aren't teachers required to take a non-Communist oath?" Yes; but to a Communist the truth means nothing. Besides active teaching in public schools, private schools, and church schools, from kindergartens to colleges, they run some schools outright. There are actually Communist schools in America. Here are the names of some taken from the Congressional Record:

Jefferson School of Social Science, Walt Whitman School of Social Science, People's Educational Center, Abraham Lincoln School, and many others. Some of these schools are named for very famous Americans. This is, of course, a front, a typical Communist propaganda lie.

There are also many Communist youth groups, designed to lure loyal young Americans with attractive titles such as: American Youth Congress, American Youth for Democracy, American Student Union, American Youth for a Free World.

The names of these are also taken from the Congressional Record.

Earl Browder has said: "We Communists do not distinguish between good and bad religions, because we think they are all bad." When Communists seek to destroy our country, it is logical that they would try to destroy the churches, the backbone of our Nation. Lenin, leader of the Communist revolution in Russia in 1917 and founder of the Red government in Russia said, "Down with religion. The spread of atheistic views is our chief task."

Do you realize that there are now more Communists in the United States than there were in Russia at the time they overthrew the government? J. Edgar Hoover has testified that, "In 1917 when Communists overthrew the Russian government there was 1 Communist for every 2,277 persons in Russia. In the United States today there is 1 Communist for every 1,814 persons in the country."

Communism is aimed at you, right between your eyes. Communists want your mind, your body, your home, and your freedom, even your freedom to think for yourself. If the Communists take over this country, you will be only a tool in their hands.

Perhaps you smile at the thought of the Communists taking over America. William Z. Foster, head of the Communist Party in the United States, has sworn, "When a Communist heads the Government of the United States—and that day will come just as surely as the sun rises—the Government will not be a capitalist Government, but a Soviet government, and behind this Government will stand the Red army to enforce the dictatorshnp of the proletariat."

You must pledge allegiance to your country; you must keep that pledge, and, above all, remember to keep the Constitution of the United States in one hand, and commonsense in the other—it is up to you.

Criticism of the President's Order in Relation to a Power Contract

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 7, 1954

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an article entitled "Eisenhower Order Criticized; Forcing of AEC To Sign Contract With Private Utility Called Unprecedented Use of Executive Authority." The article was written by Doris Fleeson, and was published in the Washington Evening Star of June 18, 1954.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Eisenhower Order Criticized—Forcing of AEC To Sign Contract With Private Utility Called Unprecedented Use of Executive Authority

(By Doris Fleeson)

In an unprecedented exercise of Presidential authority, President Eisenhower has ordered the Atomic Energy Commission to sign a 25-year contract with a private utility for the production of power to be distributed through the Tennessee Valley Authority. He also ordered TVA to cooperate.

The AEC does not itself need the power. It is getting all it wants and needs at a fair price from TVA.

At least two AEC commissioners informed the White House and have now said publicly that such use of AEC's contracting power is incongruous * * * awkward * * * unbusinesslike and a handicap to AEC in the execution of its sober and exacting principal mission. A Commission majority is against it.

That the AEC had no disposition to take the rap for the controversial arrangement is shown by the fact that the President had to order it to make the contract.

Great issues are involved in the story as it unfolded at a tense hearing of the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy yesterday. They are so great that the obvious questions of whether the contract is provident and wise and what it does to TVA—important as they are—must take second place.

The President is shown attempting to enforce his power policy at second hand through an independent agency. Has he that right?

Of all the independent agencies, the one chosen deals with the most crucial, far-reaching and secret activity of the Government. Is it wise to inject it into a largely irrelevant matter?

AEC is already in the throes of embittered controversies over the rights and actions of its chairman, Lewis Strauss, and the security of its best-known scientist, Dr. Robert Oppenheimer. Is it good administration to toss another divisive problem into the boiling pot?

Atomic energy policy is at a legislative cross-roads with the congressional committee trying to shape a more flexible law so that a broad base for peacetime use of the atom may be more quickly achieved. Is a single power project worth upsetting the orderly progress of this legislation?

What is almost the most astonishing aspect is that the President, so reluctant to cross Congress or even one Member of it, should intervene so arbitrarily with the pet agency of Congress.

Every legislative safeguard that could insure bipartisanship was thrown about it. The joint committee, under Republican and Democratic chairmen alike, has prided itself on acting as a nonpolitical board of directors to AEC. The President's order was unexpected, and to some, shocking.

The joint committee has known for some time about the private utility effort to utilize the AEC's power to make 25-year contracts. It is known as the Dixon-Yates proposal and involves a group of utilties in the TVA area.

Last April 16 two of the dissenting commissioners, Dr. Henry Smyth and Eugene Zuckert, wrote their trenchant reasons for opposing it to the Budget Director. The letter from the Director of the Budget, conveying the President's orders to proceed, is dated June 16. Senators are pointing out bitterly that the President waited until after the AEC appropriation bill was on his desk for signature. They are looking for and expect to find another means of making their views known.

Two Reasons Why Red China Issue Has Come Up Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. ALEXANDER SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 7, 1954

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an article entitled "Two Reasons Why Red China Issue Has Come Up Now," written by David Lawrence, and published in the New York Herald Tribune of July 6, 1954.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Today in Washington—Two Reasons Why Red China Issue Has Come Up Now

(By David Lawrence)

Washington, July 5.—The big mystery in world affairs today is not that the British Government wants to see Red China admitted to the United Nations, but why the issue was raised at this time.

There is nothing new in the British or American positions. Everybody has known for some time that London favors the move and that Washington opposes it. Then why has the matter been given such widespread publicity at the moment, giving rise as it has to formal statements by the Republican leader and Democratic leader of the Senate reiterating the American opposition? It is no answer—as Representative McCormack, Democratic party leader in the House of Representatives, expresses it—that Congress is taking the "initiative" away from the executive branch of the Government. To say this is to ignore the true situation, which is that the Department of State was gratified to have the Senate leaders proclaim their views publicly. For the State Department couldn't, in the very nature of things, say anything except in the privacy of diplomatic channels, and this wouldn't get very far toward swaying public opinion either here or abroad.

Actually there wasn't much time given in the Churchill-Eisenhower conference to the discussion of the problem of admitting Red China to the United Nations. It was mentioned only briefly and didn't have the importance of even being made a topic on the agenda.

BEST EXPLANATION

What, then, was back of it all? The most plausible explanation may be derived from these two points:

1. The British position historically is to play the role of "broker" between the two nations in conflict with each other. Probably there isn't the flimsiest idea in London that the wishes of the United States with respect to keeping Red China out of the U. N. would be rejected by two-thirds of the members of the United Nations Assembly. But by sticking to the Red China side, the British and perhaps the new French Cabinet become the friends of the Peiping regime. This could mean a whole lot in East-West trade negotiations and other diplomatic moves and could even cause the Moscow Government to make concessions to the British and French. The result, therefore, might bring benefits to the British and French without any substantial harm being done to the objective sought by the United States. For Red China would be kept out of the U. N. anyhow.

2. It is conceivable that London and Paris are totally unaware of the depth of feeling in the United States about Red China's aggression. To talk about the United States withdrawing from the U. N. if Red China is admitted may really become academic. For if the U. N. did admit Red China, its prestige would sink so low in the United States that the absence or presence of the United States delegates in the U. N. would be meaningless. Once an organization tears up its own pledged word and makes of a treaty a scrap of paper, there is not much use worrying about how many meetings the American delegates would attend thereafter.

For the truth is, 40,000 American boys are dead today because they were asked by their Government to repel aggression in Korea. They gave their lives to what they were told was a great cause—the united action of the United Nations. That organization, moreover, passed in February 1951 a solemn resolution declaring Red China the aggressor. Nothing has happened since to punish the aggressor. Because military forces were not permitted to accomplish that purpose, moral force alone remained the best means of ostracizing from world councils the government that had perpetrated the crime. Now moral force is collapsing, too.

WESTERN CAPITULATION

Nobody here has any quarrel with the people in China but only with the war criminals in Peiping. To accept these evil men as brothers is to tell the people of all of Asia that the West is capitulating. It would mean that South Korea might then be strangled by Communist infiltration from Red China unless she decides to fight for her life. A resumption of fighting would bring new complications for the United States. Japan would be frightened, and the chance to build an army there for far-eastern defense would be impaired. Admission of Red China, indeed, might set off a series of happenings that could bring on a general war. It is a dangerous step. That's why the Congress of the United States is speaking out frankly and bluntly now, and the State Department is not in the least disturbed by such plain talk.

Likewise, there is another meaning conveyed. If ideals are to be trampled on for the sake of expediency and appeasement, it may be hard to convince the American people that its soldiers should go to Europe to fight a third time. The support of the American people should be more important to the British and French Governments than appeasing the Red China regime. Maybe it will be after the debate is over.

Ten-Year-Old Texas Girl, Margie Hill, Is True Heroine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 7, 1954

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, a 10-year-old Texas girl in a small central Texas community called Dale recently performed an outstanding act of heroism in rescuing her four younger brothers from a fire that almost certainly would have resulted in death for them.

The girl's name is Margie Hill. The story of her heroic act was published recently in the Austin American in a special dispatch from the community of Dale. I ask unanimous consent that this moving story be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the news story was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Margie Hill is a little girl with an engaging grin and 10 tightly braided pigtails.

You might never guess she is a heroine. But she proved her courage in a most convincing manner a couple of weeks back by rescuing her four small brothers from a fire that would have meant certain death for all of them.

It was late in the afternoon of June 16 on the family farm near this tiny central Texas community. Margie, who is 6 years old, had been left alone for a few minutes to take care of the other youngsters—Willie, 5, Louis Eugene, 4, Carl Frederick, 2, and the baby, Cary Lee, who is 1.

The children's father, Edmund Hill, was at work, and their mother had left on an errand to a neighboring farm.

The boys had measles and were confined to the house, but Margie was playing in the yard. The afternoon was hot but peaceful until suddenly Willie came tearing out the door.

"Margie, Margie, come quick," he shouted.

Presumably, the little boys had been playing with matches. Their mother suspects the fire started that way.

Margie dashed into the bedroom and found a box of shoes and all the clothes on fire. Only inches away was the bed in which little Cary Lee was asleep.

Margie weighs only 40 pounds, and the baby, a husky child, must weigh at least 25.

"I jerked and pulled until I got him off the bed, and then I carried him outside," Margie recalls.

She also got the three others outside—and not a minute too soon. Within a short time the entire house was ablaze, and it burned to the ground before help could arrive.

Margie's troubles were not yet over. Carl Frederick had decided, for some reason of his own, to go back inside. She snatched him back. Then, stopping to count noses again, she started running.

"We ran all the way over to grandmother's," Margie recalls. "I was scared."

Mrs. Hill came back just in time to see the small frame house go up in flames. It was too late to try to get help from town. The fire had destroyed not only their home, but all their possessions—their clothing, furniture, the car and a wagon.

"And some of my little chickens got burned up, too," Margie added.

Temporarily, the Hills are living with relatives on a farm nearby. Edmund Hill is working on construction jobs in Austin, hoping to get enough money to rebuild his home. The little boys are recovering from the measles, and Margie is recovering from a bad fright.

Almost as proud of the young heroine as her parents are the two teachers in the small St. John's Elementary School, where Margie will be in the second grade this fall. The teachers, both Austin residents, are Mrs. M. A. K. Bailey, principal, 902 East 13th, and Mrs. O. N. Dibrell of 1208 East 12th.

Mrs. Bailey calls Margie an "exceptionally smart pupil," and remembers that she won the outstanding reading award in the school this year, completing eight texts and supplementary readers.

Questioned about school, Margie admitted shyly that she won the award. With equal embarrassment, she admitted that she may have helped save her little brothers.

"But I sure was scared," she said.

One Hundred and Nineteen Thousand One Hundred and Forty-six Dollars' Worth of Campaign Mail

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 7, 1954

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an editorial entitled "One Hundred Nineteen Thousand One Hundred and Forty-six Dollars' Worth of Campaign Mail," published in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of June 7, 1954. The editorial relates to the mailing of franked material by Representative Yorty, of California.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

One Hundred and Nineteen Thousand One Hundred and Forty-six Dollars' Worth of Campaign Mail

A terrific record for abuse of the mail-franking privilege under which Congressmen can send out free mail apparently has been set by Representative Yorty, Democrat, who hopes California will elect him to the Senate this fall.

According to the Republican congressional campaign committee, Yorty has mailed 4,108,500 copies of a speech which he had inserted in the Congressional Record of May 12. The previous record is said to have been around 2 million copies of a Congressional Record insert. Mailing of Yorty's insert is estimated to have cost the taxpayers $119,146.

A reading of the speech, entitled "Let's Build a Better America," reveals it is pretty much of a routine chamber of commerce speech. It denounces dictatorships and demagogs and advocates more hospitals and better roads. It declares that "education is the very foundation of democracy" and points out that "the air age has reduced the relative size of our spinning globe." And, of course, it gets around to taxes: "True, taxes are a staggering burden, but they are high mainly because of defense costs."

The outstanding thought brought to mind by this speech is that those staggering taxes are not likely to get much lighter with fellows like Representative Yorty spending $119,146 of the taxpayers' money to tell his constituents what he told them in that speech.

Relation Between Rising Business and the Stock Market

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 7, 1954

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record a very interesting article entitled "Stocks and Business Drift Farther Apart," written by John W. Love, and published in today's Washington Daily News.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

STOCKS AND BUSINESS DRIFT FARTHER APART

(By John W. Love)

A rising stock market, Commerce Secretary Weeks observed recently, is good for business. President Coolidge said the same thing years ago. It can also be said that rising business is usually good for the stock market.

The two ought to be moving together, stock market and business volume, but for most of the last year we have been seeing their curves wider apart.

It's time for a change in one or the other. Not since 1927, except during the war, has the gap between been widening so long. Unnatural behavior shows up in war, though, and probably we should expect some of it in semipeace.

The notion that the business decline has come to an end is getting almost universal agreement. Upsurges in business don't usually occur in midsummer, but it can stop going down. The volume seems likely to hang around present levels until September.

NEAR HIGH POINT

If the stock market continues upward at its recent pace, it will be reaching the high point of historical 1929 before the summer is over. That would, indeed, present a phenomenon, a memorable market boom mounted upon rather indifferent business activity.

If the summer of 1929 were to return under such conditions, we might suspect the winters of the 1930's could not be far behind. Speculation has by no means run so far, nor has credit stretched as they did a quarter of a century ago, but there still would be room for a market collapse. It would be pretty likely to occur if business activity picked up noticeably and then failed to make the grade, after all.

Investors would suddenly stop and think of the prospect of a Democratic Congress and what it would do if unemployment persisted up to November on the order of 3 million or so.

Several forces can be discerned in the strength of the stock market. One of them is the long-term revaluation of shares, the recapitalization of dividends, a sort of new era like the one we thought we saw in the spring of 1929.

FEAR INFLATION

Another is the returning fear of inflation. Contrast the stock market's behavior this year with that of the first Eisenhower spring. In 1953 we were going to have sound money, even hard money, and the market sank for 8 months. Then that expectation gave way to the opposite. Republican hopes for an early budget balance faded.

The belief is even expressed lately that the Republicans can no more balance the budget than Democrats can, that the American public will never again permit it to be balanced, and that inflation is more or less permanent. As permanent as the annual increase in wages, of which it is partly cause and partly effect.

Then there is the grim outlook in Southeast Asia and other places. In such circumstances, many a man wonders anew if he ought not to put more of his savings into shares of tangible things, less of them into dollars. The chances of any fundamental change taking place in our time seem to diminish month by month.

Douglas Fights for Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 7, 1954

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an editorial which appeared in the July 3, 1954, issue of the Illinois State Register, of Springfield, Ill., paying tribute to the splendid activities of our colleague, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Douglas], in behalf of the Illinois farmers and the farmers of America.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

DOUGLAS FIGHTS FOR FARMERS

Though the Senate late yesterday rejected a vital farm amendment to the administration's huge tax bill offered by Illinois' senior Senator Paul Douglas, the drama reflects the deep sincerity and tremendous energy with which Senator Douglas has been, and is, fighting to aid the farmer economically.

The defeated amendment provided that a farmer might deduct in 1 year, in computing his taxable income, the cost of new farm machinery up to 25 percent of his gross income from farm operations.

The amendment was offered to stimulate purchases of farm machinery, improve farm operations, and to increase employment in hard-hit implement plants of Illinois and other States. It carried a 2-year time limit.

Douglas did win one important battle for the farmer. Thursday night, he and Senators Humphrey, of Minnesota, and Gillette, of Iowa, won passage of a joint amendment authorizing deduction of up to 25 percent of gross income of expenses incurred by farmers in building grain storage bins and cribs on their own farms.

Elsewhere in this issue is a statement made by Senator Douglas. He has been consistent in his fights for farmers' rights through the years. This is the type of aggressive, faithful public service he will maintain in the future.

Eisenhower Program Gains Ground Steadily

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. ALEXANDER SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 7, 1954

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an article entitled "Eisenhower Program Gains Ground Steadily," written by Gould Lincoln, and published in the Washington Evening Star of July 6, 1954.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

THE POLITICAL MILL—EISENHOWER PROGRAM GAINS GROUND STEADILY—EIGHTY-THIRD CANNOT BE LABELED A "DO-NOTHING CONGRESS"

(By Gould Lincoln)

President Eisenhower's persistent and reiterated demands for the enactment of his legislative program are bearing fruit. He has insisted that the program is in the interest of all the people; that it is the work of the best brains in the country after consultations with all interested groups. It is the progressive and dynamic program for which he has contended and upon which he and the Republicans, if the President has his way, will wage their campaign for victory in the congressional election next November.

With the Fourth of July holiday back of it, Congress, under the leadership of Speaker Martin and Majority Leader Halleck in the House, and Senator Knowland, of California, and Senators Millikin, of Colorado, and Saltonstall, of Massachusetts, in the Senate, is driving to a completion of its labors by July 31—with every prospect of success. When adjournment is had, no longer will the Democrats be able to claim that the 83d Congress has been a "do-nothing Congress."

TWO ITEMS NEAR FINISH LINE

Two cornerstones of the Eisenhower program are on the way to completion. One, the omnibus tax bill, has been passed by both House and Senate, and the differences will be ironed out in conference. Representative Reed of New York, chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, under whose leadership this monumental piece of legislation was drafted, expressed satisfaction that the Senate had passed the measure "in pretty good form." He predicted that when the bill comes from conference it will be improved. The desires of the administration for a measure that would give relief where it was needed, would correct many inequalities, and at the same time not reduce revenues too drastically, have been carried out—a signal victory for the President.

The second vital measure is the farm bill, which has been passed by the House providing a flexible system of farm price supports ranging from 82.5 to 90 percent of parity. The administration had asked for a range of 75 to 90 percent. The House measure is a compromise. The main thing, however, is that the rigid price supports, 90 percent of parity—under which huge surpluses have rolled up—were knocked out. Chairman Aiken of the Senate Agriculture Committee is hopeful that when the bill is acted upon in the Upper House it will be possible to make the range of flexible price supports 75 to 90 percent. In the end, the victory will be an Eisenhower-Benson victory.

The Republican leadership insists that during the rest of this month Congress will enact a social-security bill extending coverage to millions of citizens, a bill to extend further unemployment insurance, some of the administration's bills to aid in running down subversives, atomic-energy legislation, and a number of other measures of importance.

IMPRESSIVE RECORD

The record of the Congress during its present session has been impressive already. It has put through the St. Lawrence seaway bill, a project that hung fire for 20 years. It saved the taxpayers about $1 billion in reduced excise taxes. It has reduced Government expenditures by billions of dollars, and at the same time has provided for national defense, getting a dollar's worth for each dollar expended. It has succeeded in bringing along, well along toward enactment, its foreign-aid proposals.

Two items in the President's program have, for the time at least, been lost. The first is a bill to amend and improve the Taft-Hartley labor law. The submission of FEPC amendments by Senators Ives, of New York, Republican, and Lehman, of the same State, Democrat, made it possible for opponents of any legislation to line up southern Democrats to vote to recommit the bill. It was recommitted. The second item was the President's proposal to give the vote to 18-year-olds, a constitutional amendment, which was defeated. By the extension of reciprocal-trade legislation for 1 year, the President has held the line in free trade.

The legislative record of this Congress is all the more amazing when it is recalled that the Republicans have had a razor-edge lead in the House, and during much of the time have had 47 Senate seats to 48 Democratic seats in the Senate. The recent death of Senator Hunt, of Wyoming, Democrat, changed the party lead in favor of the Republicans, because a Republican acting governor was able to appoint a Republican to Senator Hunt's seat. Steadily but surely the President and the Republican leadership, aided sometimes by the Democrats, have moved the program along. One reason, the program contained items that were of real benefit, and necessarily had support of a majority of Congressmen.

The CIA Inquiry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 7, 1954

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, supplementing my earlier remarks in connection with the Hoover Commission's projected study of the Central Intelligence Agency, I am submitting 3 additional editorials on this topic; 1 entitled "Intelligence Key To Security" is from the Newark Star Ledger of July 6, 1954; 1 entitled "Mark Clark's Job as a Fact-Finder" is from the Passaic (N. J.) Herald-News of July 6; and the third entitled "The CIA Inquiry" is from the New York World Telegram of July 6, 1954:

[From the Newark (N. J.) Star Ledger of July 6, 1954]

INTELLIGENCE KEY TO SECURITY

The announcement by ex-President Hoover that he has named Gen. Mark Clark to study the Central Intelligence Agency on behalf of the Hoover Commission naturally calls to mind the furor over Senator McCarthy's charge that the agency has been infiltrated by Communists.

The CIA is the successor to the Office of Strategic Services, the supersecret branch of the Armed Forces that functioned during the last war. It is Senator McCarthy's reasoning that pro-Communists were welcomed, perhaps quite properly, by the OSS during the war because Russia was then our ally; since the CIA has taken the place of the OSS, he reasons, the pro-Communists from the OSS have been able to infiltrate into the CIA.

This is plausible, but not factual. Unfortunately, it is hardly possible to subject the CIA to investigation by a congressional committee without risking the total destruction of the value of the CIA.

The gathering of intelligence is an industry that cannot be subjected to the same standards as normal, open pursuits. If the CIA had to be prepared to defend its every act and its every contact it could not venture to seek the confidential information that is its only cause for being. Yet it is apparent that the very life of the Nation may some day depend upon the reliability and extent of the information that can be obtained about the enemy.

The Hoover Commission presumably will not seek to question any of the CIA's sensitive secrets, but will content itself with a broad study of the scope and efficiency of the agency with a view to eliminating duplication and rationalizing the powers of the agency.

If the CIA is to be effective, it is essential that the inviolability of its secrets be firmly demonstrated. Our friends and contacts throughout the world should be convinced that when they give information to the CIA, they can rely completely on whatever representations have been made to them.

[From the Passaic (N. J.) Herald-News of July 6, 1954]

MARK CLARK'S JOB AS A FACT FINDER

Herbert Hoover had a world reputation as an administrator and statesman as long ago as 1914 but no one ever regarded him as a smart politician.

Something that happened over the weekend calls for a reappraisal of the public's estimate of Mr. Hoover's political sagacity. Announcement that the Hoover Commission on Government Reorganization will study the structure and administration of the Central Intelligence Agency, using Gen. Mark W. Clark as director of a task force that will make recommendations on the supersecret CIA and other kindred foreign activities, had the rousing effect of a bases-loaded home run.

Senator McCarthy has been itching to have a go at the CIA which, he insists, is infiltrated by Communists and fellow travelers who were transferred wholesale from OWI to the State Department at the end of the war. By showing that the Fort Monmouth radar laboratories were loaded with fifth amendment Commies and bad security risks, the Senator succeeded in raising grave doubts about CIA, even though Allen Welsh Dulles, younger brother of the Secretary of State, is Director of that Agency.

The Hoover-Clark inquiry makes a McCarthy investigation unnecessary. It prevents another nasty scrap between two groups of Republicans.

Mr. Hoover is the elder statesman of his party but he isn't a member of the White House inner circle. He can't be accused of attempting a Pearl Harbor or Tydings whitewash. He is closer to Douglas MacArthur than to Dwight D. Eisenhower.

Mark W. Clark was a member of the Eisenhower command team in north Africa but in the grim game of Army politics he was not one of the favorites. His promotion was slow and well earned. When assigned to the Far East as United Nations commander in Korea, that war was all but lost, prompting him to say, "The score was exactly no hits, no runs, and more errors than any scorekeeper would have the heart to tally." In writing his memoirs, From the Danube to the Yalu, he called it a war we might have won.

Such a man, working under Herbert Hoover's direction, can be trusted to submit an honest report on the CIA.

[From the New York World Telegram of July 6, 1954]

THE CIA INQUIRY

The proposed study of the Central Intelligence Agency by the Hoover Commission is a sensible move, and the choice of Gen. Mark Clark to head the project is especially appropriate.

If Senator McCarthy got loose in the CIA, the results would be as calamitous as the free wheeling of a bull in a china shop. For the CIA necessarily deals in fragile wares—highly secret and sensitive matters vitally important to the security of the Nation. What Senator McCarthy could do to the whole CIA setup, under the guise of searching for Communists, is dreadful to contemplate.

Granted that the supersecret agency could do with a little more supervision or at least a checkup of its reputedly costly administration, it is still a field that should be closed off to any blunderbuss expedition. For one thing, the CIA cooperates intimately and profitably with the intelligence arms of dozens of our allies. This cooperation would evaporate the minute Senator McCarthy started spilling secrets, little or big, and the door would be closed to us on much that constantly goes on in the nether world of intrigue and conspiracy.

General Clark, who is no stranger to secret missions and interallied cooperation in two wars, should be highly suitable for the delicate task involved. And the reputation of the Hoover Commission for wisdom and integrity of its previous governmental studies should be warranty enough of whatever recommendations it may have concerning the CIA.

Senator Douglas' Leadership in Behalf of the Rural Electrification Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 7, 1954

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an excerpt of the minutes of the regular meeting of the board of directors of the Association of Illinois Electric Cooperatives be inserted in the Appendix of the Record. The minutes incorporate a resolution in support of the efforts of our distinguished colleague, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Douglas], to strengthen the REA program. It was a pleasure and a privilege for me to be associated with Senator Douglas in these efforts to increase the REA loan authorizations by $35 million. The Senator is indeed one of the most effective REA leaders in the Congress.

There being no objection, the excerpts from the minutes were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

A memo from Clay Cochran, economist of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, was presented. This memo outlined the amendment to the Agriculture appropriations bill, adding $35 million in electric-loan funds to the authorization for REA for fiscal 1955. The memo specifically outlined the support that Senator Douglas gave in introducing this amendment to the Senate. On motion duly made by Welsh, seconded by Albers, and unanimously carried, the following resolution was adopted:

"Whereas the testimony of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association legislative committee and the NRECA officials requested more new REA loan funds for fiscal 1955 than had been recommended by the Agricultural Appropriations Subcommittee; and

"Whereas Senator Paul H. Douglas, of Illinois, offered a successful amendment in the Senate, June 2, 1954, to increase REA loan authorizations by $35 million: Now be it

"*Resolved*, That the board of directors of the Association of Illinois Electric Cooperatives commends Senator Douglas for his leadership in behalf of the rural-electrification program; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That this board expresses the appreciation of the 134,000 farm families in Illinois which it represents to Senator Douglas for his loyal and vigorous support of a program that has brought so many benefits to rural America."

Board of Directors, Association of
Illinois Electric Cooperatives.

Springfield, *June 17, 1954.*

Proper Study of CIA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 7, 1954

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, on June 23 I introduced H. R. 9660, a bill authorizing the establishment of a nine-man Presidential commission to make a survey of the foreign intelligence activities of this country, and to report its conclusions to the President and the Congress.

On July 4 it was announced that a task force of the Hoover Commission is to be established to study the Central Intelligence Agency and other kindred foreign intelligence activities. This was gratifying news, since such a task force presumably will accomplish what I was seeking in H. R. 9660. I was also pleased to learn that the new task force, which will consider matters of the greatest importance and sensitivity, is to be organized by a man of the stature and ability of Gen. Mark W. Clark.

I enclose herewith 2 editorials regarding this new inquiry, 1 from the New York Times of July 6 and the other from the New York Herald Tribune of the same date:

[From the New York Times of July 6, 1954]

Proper Study of CIA

The appointment of Gen. Mark W. Clark to head a task force of the Hoover Commission in a study of the Central Intelligence Agency is a good beginning for a proper inquiry. Former President Hoover's group has rendered invaluable service in previous studies of executive organization. General Clark, with his experience in overt and covert intelligence work, is well suited to conduct the kind of inquiry which the topsecret nature of CIA's operations demand. If, on the other hand, Senator McCarthy publicly examined what he says is "Communist infiltration" of the Agency, untold damage to the country could result.

Senator McCarthy has been most anxious to avoid discussing the report that two of his own consultants do not have Federal security clearances. But ever since CIA Director Allen Dulles refused to allow him to question the Agency's personnel without adequate safeguards a year ago, McCarthy and his aides have displayed unmistakable zeal to conduct just the sort of sensational investigation they relish most. This might involve public identification of CIA agents. It could expose the Agency's secret methods of operation. Friendly intelligence services abroad might end their cooperation if such information were thus compromised. The reports on hostile activities upon which our Government planners rely, as well as the physical security of many American and foreign nationals, would be endangered.

The President's clear wish to protect CIA from sensationalism has never included the thought that it should be above all inquiry or outside supervision. Like atomic energy, foreign intelligence is a field involving executive policy, vast in scope and requiring large expenditures. Senator Mansfield, of Montana, and others have long urged the sort of close liaison between Congress and the CIA that a joint congressional committee, like that on atomic energy, could provide. Whatever the findings of the Hoover Commission, it appears certain that thoroughness and discretion, rather than reckless headline hunting, will be its methods.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of July 6, 1954]

Study, Not Investigation

After a considerable number of charges and countercharges, some of them irresponsible, the correct approach to some of the problems of our Central Intelligance Agency has been announced. A taks force of the Hoover Commission will study the agency's structure and administration. This task force will be headed by Gen. Mark Clark. Its findings will naturally be referred to the Commission, which is authorized to transmit recommendations to Congress.

Our major intelligence arm obviously cannot operate as the major attraction of a television circus. It cannot be harassed to make a political holiday. Its security, in its very nature, must remain inviolate. It has one of the biggest and hardest jobs to do in our history. There is no rhyme or reason in making that job harder.

Nevertheless, this agency has operated without effective scrutiny for several years. Some of its work has obviously been good. Some of it doubtless could have been better. If the charge that it has been massively infiltrated is to be dismissed as a play for headlines, there should be a sound, sober, and responsible basis for the dismissal. If there are opportunities for such infiltration, they also should be studied and remedial measures should be taken.

General Clark is no stranger to the field of intelligence operations. He has been in the thick of them. He is no novice bursting into an unfamiliar field in an effort to uncover scandals. He is a responsible and patriotic citizen whose purpose must be to help, not hinder, the smooth functioning of a vital arm in our defense. His choice for this task is a good one.

Similarly, the Hoover Commission has gone about its work with a steadfast seal, but a calmness of approach that has survived many differences of opinion and judgment. It is not partisan. It is a factfinder, not a combined prosecutor and judge. It has the confidence of all of those Americans who are familiar with what it has done.

Equally important, we may be sure that this task force will have an acute sense of what can and should be made public and what should not. This is no field in which recklessness can have a part. If changes are recommended, they will be the result of genuine study, not spurious investigation.

The Whitten Rider

SPEECH
OF

HON. JAMIE L. WHITTEN

OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 7, 1954

(Mr. WHITTEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include therewith a statement.)

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this moment to extend into the Record a condensed statement of my testimony in connection with the Whitten rider. Actually this is Public Law 257 of the 82d Congress, section 1310. I think that clearly I was able to show the committee that within the limits fixed within the rider the Commission has authority to do most anything it wishes to meet individual problems.

Those Members who have discussed this matter with me I hope will look at today's Record, for you will see there a statement of why the rider was first written; a statement of what the Commission can do under the rider, and further absolute evidence that the Commission can, if it wishes, do everything it says it wants to do under the terms of the rider. Instead of that, the Commission is demanding that Congress repeal all controls.

I hope you will read this matter in the Record.

The statement follows:

Condensed Statement of Testimony of Congressman Jamie L. Whitten Before Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

SECTION 1310, PUBLIC LAW 257, 82D CONGRESS, THE SO-CALLED "WHITTEN RIDER"—WHY WE HAVE IT

The records of the Civil Service Commission show that during World War II the average grade in all Government was upped more than one full grade. At $400 per position, that means an extra annual cost now of more than $800 million each year for positions in the classified service alone.

At the time the Whitten rider was written, the Commission was continuing to call examinations, establishing registers, and filling jobs permanently, while millions of our young men were in the service and unable to even take the examinations. Only by writing the rider and thereby forcing an agreement were we able to get the Commission to hold such jobs open. At that time if an employee was called into military service his job was filled permanently behind him and only by writing the law were we able to stop that practice.

What can be done under the Whitten rider?

The Whitten rider authorizes several hundred thousand more permanent appointments than the Civil Service Commission has authorized. It sets a limit for the whole Government and not for each department or agency.

The Whitten rider authorizes more permanent employees than Mr. Young, Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, says would be possible under his proposed plan.

There is nothing in the Whitten rider to prevent Mr. Young putting his proposed plan into effect now.

The Whitten rider calls for temporary appointments only as it may be necessary to stay within the total number of permanent employees we had September 1, 1950.

Since the rider was passed the total number of permanent employees has never been up to the ceiling and the number is now several hundred thousand below that ceiling.

The Civil Service Commission is now authorizing permanent reinstatements, where the employee is out not more than 1 year and where he is out because of a reduction in force—and it is the Commission which limited the time and the basis of being out.

The Civil Service Commission can authorize permanent promotions now even when such promotion would increase the total number in that grade in that department or agency—if the department head shows the need for such addditional job on a permanent basis and the Civil Service Commission authorizes a permanent appointment to it.

The Civil Service Commission is even authorized to make exceptions to the provisions of the rider in meritorious cases and to prevent hardship.

The Civil Service Commission is given a mandate by the rider to keep promotions on an orderly basis and is called on to preserve the average grade and salary. In meeting these objectives the Commission is given the widest latitude to meet individual cases or individual problems of departments and agencies.

The Commission can do now what it says it wants to do—and it can do it under the terms of the Whitten rider.

Leave

Notwithstanding misleading headlines, the Whitten rider has nothing in the world to do with leave.

Retention

The retention system is set up by regulations of the Civil Service Commission. It is the Commission which sets up the various categories and the order of priority within the requirements of law as to veterans' preference.

The Whitten rider does not modify, repeal, change, or mention retention.

The various indefinite, temporary-indefinite, and so forth, classifications set up by the Commission apparently were set up to place such employees in the retention category that the Commission wished them to be in.

If the Congress were to direct that all employees be made permanent right now, under the Whitten rider, the Commission would presumably put them in the same retention slot they are now in, for the Commission put them where they are now.

Cases of veterans have been cited by the Commission. In every instance the effect complained of was because of the spot such veteran was in in the retention system—and the Commission put him there for its own reasons.

The Commission flatly demands before it will act even to do what it says it wants to do, that the Congress must repeal all limits on total number of permanent personnel in Government.

The Commission demands that the Congress must repeal all legal requirements for service before promotion. Even though the law makes an exception where an examination is taken or there is a two-grade jump to the next job line.

The Commission demands that the Congress must repeal all requirements that the employee's job be held for him while he is in service.

The Commission demands that the Congress must repeal all requirements of law that the Commission and each department report annually the average grade and salary in each department and agency, for that is what the Whitten rider requires, and the Commission demands outright repeal.

The price is too high. The Commission knows the price is too high. It makes me wonder if the Commission really wants the rider repealed particularly since the Commission has been unable to point out a single change needed in the rider to enable it to meet individual problems. The Commission apparently had rather claim it can't, than to give the reasons it won't.

I attach a copy of the rider. I hope you will read it—and if you see a single change which you think is needed in order to enable the Commission to act to meet any problem you can think of, let me know.

Now, if what you want is to make the Commission do what it can but won't do, then what you want is another rider. I can appreciate your feelings on that, for that is the reason for the first rider. The Commission would not act.

I can say that the Whitten rider is sound without any false pride. Contrary to reports, this rider does not represent the views or efforts of one man alone. Section 1310, Public Law 257, of the 82d Congress, the so-called Whitten rider, represents the best ideas of the staff of the Appropriations Committee and of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, of Mr. MURRAY—then chairman of the latter committee, and myself, based on years of experience in dealing with Government, its personnel, and its costs.

It was written jointly, and before finally passed, was gone over with the Civil Service Commission, and their every recommendation for authority to meet individual cases and problems of individuals and agencies and departments in line with maintaining average grade and salary was incorporated in it.

The Whitten rider is a law carefully prepared on which a rule was obtained. It has had the unanimous support of every member of every conference to which it has gone.

The name "Whitten rider" was given to it by the Civil Service Commission, and they did not do that to make me popular, but to put the heat on. When it was written, each department and agency was doing to suit itself, and headed on the road toward all generals and no privates. We are paying out each year $800 million extra for what happened then. This Commission seems to want to return to that situation, and that, perhaps, is because those who really run the work of the Civil Service remain substantially the same.

In conclusion, there has been and is no individual benefit to me. There is considerable satisfaction, for the law is sound.

It is sound to have a limit on the total number of permanent employees of Government. It is sound to demand that we stick to the present level of grade and salary. It is sound to provide for orderely promotion unless an examination is taken. It is sound to hold a job for an employee called to military service. It is sound to require annual reports on grade and salary. And the professional staff of the Appropriations Committee estimates the rider saves half a billion dollars a year. Those who pay the taxes, and that includes Federal employees, can certainly use that annual savings under present conditions.

SECTION 1310 OF THE SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION ACT, 1952, APPROVED NOVEMBER 1, 1951 (PUBLIC LAW 253, 82D CONG.)—"WHITTEN AMENDMENT"—AS AMENDED BY SECTION 1302 OF PUBLIC LAW 375, 82D CONGRESS, APPROVED JUNE 5, 1952

SEC. 1310. Immediately upon the enactment of this act and until termination of the national emergency proclaimed by the President on December 16, 1950:

(a) The Civil Service Commission and the heads of the executive departments, agencies, and corporations shall make full use of their authority to require that initial appointments to positions in and outside the competitive civil service shall be made on a temporary or indefinite basis in order to prevent increases in the number of permanent personnel of the Federal Government above the total number of permanent employees existing on September 1, 1950: *Provided*, That any position vacated by a permanent employee called to military service or transferred to a national defense agency shall not be filled except on a temporary or indefinite basis. All reinstatements and promotions in the Federal civil service shall be made on a temporary or indefinite basis, and all permanent employees who are transferred from one agency to another shall retain their status as permanent employees in the agency to which transferred at the grade or basic pay level of their permanent positions in the agency from which transferred. All appointments, reinstatements, transfers, and promotions to positions subject to the Classification Act of 1949 shall be made with the condition and notice to each individual appointed, reinstated, transferred, or promoted that the classification grade of the position is subject to postaudit and correction by the appropriate departmental or agency personnel office or the Civil Service Commission. All transfers of permanent employees made on a temporary or indefinite basis since September 1, 1950, shall be changed to a permanent basis as of the effective date of this act: *Provided*, That such employees shall retain their status as permanent employees in the agency to which transferred at the grade or basic pay level of their permanent positions in the agency from which transferred: *Provided further*, That any agency may promote any employee permanently to a position if such promotion will not increase the number of employees holding permanent positions in the grade of such position in such agency above the number in such grade in such agency prior to September 1, 1950: *Provided further*, That permanent promotions may be made to any position in a category for which the Civil Service Commission authorizes permanent appointments under the terms hereof.[1]

(b) The Civil Service Commission shall facilitate the transfer of Federal employees from nondefense to defense activities and encourage the retention of employees in defense activities, and shall provide reemployment rights for permanent employees in the activities from which such employees are transferred.

(c) The Civil Service Commission shall make full use of its authority to prevent excessively rapid promotions in the competitive civil service and to require correction of improper allocations to higher grades of positions subject to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended. No person in any executive department or agency whose position is subject to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, shall be promoted or transferred to a higher grade subject to such act without having served at least 1 year in the next lower grade: *Provided*, That the Civil Service Commission for positions in the competitive service and the head of the employing agency for positions outside the competitive service may by regulation provide for promotions of two grades in 1 year (1) to positions not higher than GS–5; (2) to positions not higher than GS–11 which are in a line of work properly classified under the Classification Act of 1949 at two-grade intervals; (3) to positions in the same line of work when the employee has completed a training period under a training program approved by the Civil Service Commission for positions in the competitive service, or approved by the head of the employing agency for positions outside the competitive service; and (4) of an employee of the agency concerned when there is no position in the normal line of promotion in the grade immediately below that of the position to be filled: *Provided further*, That this subsection shall not apply to any case involving an employee who is within reach for appointment to a higher grade position on a competitive civil service register, or is eligible for appointment, in accordance with a regular appointment system or procedure established prior to September 1, 1950, to a higher grade position outside the competitive Civil Service,[3] or being advanced up to a grade level from which he had been demoted or separated because of reduction in force, or being advanced to a grade level not exceeding that for which he had previously established eligibility as required by the terms hereof: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding the provisions hereof, and in order to avoid undue hardship or inequity, the Civil Service Commission, when requested by the head of the agency involved, may authorize promotions in individual cases of meritorious mature.[3]

---

[1] As amended by section 1302 of Public Law 375, 82d Congress, approved June 5, 1952.

(d) From time to time, but at least annually, each executive department and agency shall (1) review all positions which since September 1, 1950, have been created or placed in a higher grade or level of difficulty and responsibility of work or in a higher basic pay level, (2) abolish all such positions which are found to be unnecessary (3) with respect to such positions which are found to be necessary, make such adjustments as may be appropriate in the classification grades of those positions which are subject to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, or in the basic pay levels of those positions which are subject to other pay-fixing authority. Not later than July 31 of each year each department and agency shall submit a report to the Post Office and Civil Service Committees and Appropriations Committees of the Senate and House of Representatives concerning the action taken under this paragraph, together with information comparing the total number of employees on the payroll on June 30 and their average grade and salary with similar information for the previous June 30, and each annual and supplemental budget estimate shall include a statement comparing the average grade and salary provided for in each item of appropriation or fund allowance therein with similar figures reported for the two previous periods.

---

[3] As amended by scection 1302 of Public Law 375, 82d Congress, approved June 5, 1952.

Commencement-Day Address at Medical College of Virginia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 7, 1954

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD, an exceedingly able address made by the Honorable Samuel M. Bemiss, an outstanding citizen of Virginia, on the occasion of the commencement at the Medical College of Virginia, on June 1, 1954.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A very great Roman, at the end of a period known to history as the Pax Romana, lamented the monotonous and meaningless rhythm of the world. Seventeen hundred years later Lord Macauley, viewing a little more of the accumulated experiences of mankind and with a firmer faith in his destiny, recorded in the introduction of his history of England his conviction that no one with a knowledge of the past is justified in taking a disconsolate view of the future. In the seeming security of the Roman Empire, growing agnosticism of its citizens and complacency because there were no more worlds to conquer, Marcus Aurelius saw only monotony, a static society boring itself to death. I shall take my stand under Macauley's banner and discuss briefly a small segment of our colonial history and the development of that social and political consciousness which produced the Virginia bill of rights, and invite you who have eyes to see and senses to perceive to join an amateur historian in a firm belief that your vibrant world stands on the threshold of the most abundant life which man has ever known.

The period I refer to was one replete with meaningful events which the wise could interpret and which the foolish did resist; the story of a practical people seeking practical solutions to their daily problems and finding a new concept of human rights and the dignity of free productive labor. It was the period of the final obliteration from the Western World of the doctrine that there was a divinity that doth hedge a king and the vanishing of the pale ghost of Anglo-Saxon feudalism.

Macauley's history is coincident with the development of our Nation. It starts after the death of the great queen, and as Fuller prettily observed "the end of that generation of men God set up which began and expired with Elizabeth like a suit of clothes made for her and worn out by her." They, the sparkling source of the stream of events which planted on these shores the genesis of a new man. They, the spiritual and intellectual fathers of those ethical ideals which became the foundation stones of a new government. Raleigh had convinced Elizabeth that the nation who controlled the seas controlled the wealth of the world. He, with Howard, Drake, and the great captains of the era, had destroyed Spain's sea power. That militant divine Richard Hackluyt had become the great press agent of adventure, and Shakespeare had taken static electricity from the spare and yardarms of the *Sea Venture* and created with it the delicate Ariel, flaming amazement everywhere. The world was young and all its fields were green. The land which Grenville had described as the goodliest under the cope of heaven beckoned to the brave, the adventurous, the free spirits, even as it did to the oppressed and unwanted peoples of the Old World. The stage was set for the great adventure. To supply the players and put them in motion, the English merchants had providentially invented a new instrument—the syndicate, the joint stock company—and so the curtain rises. The prelude had been written by the Elizabethians, certainly some of it at the Mermaid Tavern. Tradition has it that this first great gentleman's club was organized by Raleigh and Marlowe and that they gathered to themselves Spencer, Hackluyt, Bacon, Shakespeare and such a company that caused Beaumont to exclaim, "What mighty works have we witnessed at the Mermaid." Certainly the great minds of London must have sought to join that stimulating society.

But I wander, forgive me. I started out to argue that the rhythm of the world is neither monotonous nor meaningless and to subscribe to a very great man's statement made under the stress of the battle of England that "Blind is he indeed who cannot see the hand of destiny in the events of these days."

Our drama opens on a spring day in the year 1607, when Sir Christopher Newport, admiral of the fleet, experienced navigator, naval fighter who had lost one arm in battle, sailed his little well-integrated band of serious minded, contentious, ambitious men, 107 of them, up Powhatan's great river, moored his ships to trees and deposited his company on a mud flat. They were a select company, all brave men; instruments of providence, if you please. They had brought three marvelously small ships across a tempestuous ocean. Most of them had specialized abilities, many had served in the wars in the low countries and on the seas against the Spanish, but none had had experience in combating a new enemy, the summertime disease which lurked in the swamps of Tidewater, Va. By autumn 47 percent of them were dead. The survivors were possessed of most extraordinary energy and determination. On the council, serving under a royal charter and under royal direction, were Bartholomew Gosnoll, probably the ablest of the lot, who died early of disease; John Martin, as determined and contentious as any, son of the Lord Mayor of London, veteran of every available fight, by profession a lawyer and metallurgist; John Ratcliffe alias Sicklemore, who was murdered by the Indians; John Smith, a cartographer who arrived in chains and who, according to Percy, "* * * had begged in Ireland like a rogue, without a license"; Edward Maria Wingfield, a discipliarian "* * * who had never turned his face from danger"; Gabriel Archer, George Percy, younger brother of the Earl of Northumberland, and Kendall, whom the others hung. Until 1609 they failed in possibly every material purpose except the mapping and charting of the Virginia coast. In a larger field, their failure resulted in the government and management of the colony being turned over to the Virginia Company, which had organized the original venture as a business enterprise for profit. This first failure is most important. The company was organized on a joint stock basis and the shareholders met in London regularly to vote for officers and otherwise participate in the company's affairs. Thus, consciously or unconsciously, the English merchants, inventors of the company, supplied the design for a new form of government which was to shape the Western World. In Stuart, England, a protest was voiced against the democratical principles of the company, but in Virginia a precedent was furnished for the popular election of the House of Burgesses, that of a government dependent on the consent of the governed.

It is true that the Spaniards had been there before and at the general location of present day Newport News had celebrated mass. They had built a mission in 1572 within a few miles of the present College of William and Mary. Newport found a lad near the falls of the James in 1607 with yellow hair and whitish skin. But he who kissed did not live to tell.

Opechanconough, alias Don Louis, or some of his relatives providentially for subsequent first gentlemen of Virginia and in particular for the hierarchy of our established church, eliminated the Spanish. A relief mission came up the James a few years later, but finding none of their countrymen, hung a few Indians from the yard arms of their ship and sailed away, leaving the Indians on the peninsula with unpleasant memories and reasonable cause to greet future arrivals of white men with volleys of arrows. Their records lay buried or scattered until recent years. Had this Spanish mission to Virginia succeeded, one might speculate on the development of North America and in retrospect at least perceive the hand of destiny molding a new man and shaping a new nation.

So Virginia's early story is that of a homogeneous people, industrious, determined, ambitious, who looked to the wealth of the productive good earth for their independence and their dignity. Smith was bearing witness in London that "no one is entitled to a place in Virginia, he must make his own." The colony's roots were in the soil and here we find cardinal principles which succeeding generations adhered to and which, at a later date, become integrated in the character of the American people. Lured by prospects of independence and urged from every pulpit, stage, and forum, Englishmen flocked in numbers to Virginia. Early the servants exceeded in numbers the landowners and proprietors. John Pory wrote in 1619 that "the chief wealth of the planters consisteth of servants." In general, the servant or redemptioner bound himself to his master for a 5-year period. At the end of this period of service he received land, usually 50 acres. Those who survived the rigors and dangers of the new country and the exactions of thrifty masters became useful citizens, in their turn masters, and not infrequently their descendants took their places among the prominent colonial families. John Carter instructed his executors "to buy a man servant brought up in the Latin school for his son, Robert, who shall constantly tend upon him and teach him his books either in Latin or English and keep him from doing evil." The colonists looked to the Mosaic code for precedent and justification for this system of human bondage and they fuond it abundantly. It will be recalled that John Hawkins, with the profitable backing of Queen Elizabeth, had engaged in the African trade "in order to raise the Negro to salvation through servitude," and had not Jacob acquired two wives and a flock of pied sheep as an indentured servant?

But I wander again. It must be emphasized that the Virginia Colony was a business enterprise, that its men and women, acting in the unfolding drama, were in fact practical people seeking practical solutions to their everyday problems. By and large they were businessmen. They needed peace with the hostile natives to establish their businesses—largely their plantations and the tobacco industry—but also a glass works, an iron foundry, fisheries, products of the forest, etc. What were they to do? The old world furnished many a royal precedent for such a situation and opportunity was at hand in the person of a fair prisoner, the King's daughter. Samuel Argall and John Martin had purchased Pocahontas from some collateral relatives for a copper kettle, and John Rolfe, enrolled in the census of the colony as gentleman, had recently been bereaved of both daughter and wife. He was lonely and the damsel was truly not without charm. In the vernacular of this day, the setup was a natural, and so John Rolfe married the girl. On their famous honeymoon on the good ship, *Treasurer*, he could write with confidence and contentment that "every man in Virginia is sitting under his vine and fig tree enjoying the fruits of his labor insofar as he has earned them."

By 1619 the colony had grown. Plantations and hundreds were scattered along the great river from the bay to the falls. Their problems were not always identical. A respectable and profitable commerce had been developed with the mother country. Problems of government were becoming complex. The plantation owners were shareholders in the Virginia Co. They had a voice in its affairs. So, it appeared very logical and just that they should have a voice in the management of the domestic affairs of the colony. The practical solution lay in a structure similar to that of the company. The freeholders of each plantation or hundred chose two burgesses to meet at Jamestown and function separate from, but with the council, in the government of the colony, and thus, the first freely elected law-making body in the Western World came into being, a parliament of free people. It is interesting that this first free election was also a contested election. The burgesses from Martin's Brandon were denied their seats because of a clause in Martin's Patent exempting him from any obligation to observe the laws of the colony, save only to defend it from its foreign and domestic enemies. In this case it was decided that the possessor of special privileges had no right to govern others. The burgesses from Ward's Plantation were questioned because Ward did not have a full and proper title to his land. They were, however, seated because they were permanently attached to the land, a phrase which reappears in George Mason's Bill of Rights 150 years later. The drama is unfolding. In the first 12 years of the life of the colony a new and permanent institution of government is established and two fundamental principles were enunciated which were to become a part of our formal Constitution.

In 1625 James revoked the charter of the Virginia Co., but it had grown old and the degenerate diseases of age sapped its strength and usefulness. It had done its work. It had planted the seed of a new nation; and, perhaps unwittingly, indicated a plan for its development. The unheralded events of this period are significant in retrospect, and the thoughts and aspirations of the actors are found again integrated in our national character. James was still a feudal king. Spiritually and intellectually the great leaders among his subjects were moderns. The die was cast, the battle lines were drawn. Virginia was to be governed for the next 150 years (with the exception of the period of Cromwell's ascendancy) by royal governors, but for the same period the House of Burgesses was to assert and defend the principle that civil government rested on the consent of the governed until the principle (founded on the collective experience of mankind) became the cornerstone of the American Constitution. As Henry replied to the French Herald before Agincourt, it might be said of the colonists, "We would not seek a battle as we are, nor as we are we will not shun it. Go tell this to your royal master."

There are some lines in Beaumont and Fletcher's Sea Voyage that illustrate the conflicting aspirations which came to a climax with Bacon versus William Berkeley. The royal governor might assert, "Slaves, it is in our power to hang ye"; and the colonist leaders might reply, "Very likely, 'tis in our power then to be hanged, and scorn ye." And so the moving finger moves on. Bacon died and Berkeley hung some of his followers. But "Those upon whom the Tower of Silom fell, think ye that they were sinners above all men that dwelt in Jerusalem?"

Bacon was not the crude frontiersman, uneducated and fundamentally rebellious, as the contemporary Royalist would have one believe. He was of the English gentry, relative of the great Sir Francis, educated, and at least the spiritual inheritor of the character, courage, and sense of human dignity of some great Elizabethans. He personified that determination that under the law a man should be entitled to enjoy the fruits of his labor. He had planted the seed of the principle he represented in fertile ground. Time was needed for its sturdy development, and so Bacon left the scene. In 1632 the colonists invented, of necessity and convenience, the next great agency of government, the county court. Because of the difficulty and dangers of travel and the remoteness of some of the plantations from Jamestown, these courts were established to administer local affairs and settle local disputes. Very rapidly they assumed most of the functions of government—administrative, executive, as well as judicial. Here the great and influential men of the county sat as justices, and here the aspiring young man could attract the attention of the great. Here was the door to a political career. Here was nurtured that social and civic consciousness which marked the great debates of the 18th century and characterized the formal instruments of our Government. In the development there arose a natural aristocracy of the plantations, an aristocracy which required that its members earn and justify their positions by diligence in domestic affairs and service in public affairs. The courts presided over by the landed gentry were instruments of that dominant society, but justice was their purpose and justice they administered. Almost every great Virginian of the colonial period served as a justice. From the courts he advanced to the house of burgesses, to the council, or to broader fields of usefulness. Their importance cannot be overestimated as early proving grounds for the great Virginians, who at a later date were characterized as the Virginia dynasty and who played a dominant part in the constructive separation from the mother country and the foundation of a new nation. The great conservatives who could not be stampeded by the abstract equalitarians, by Tom Paine, and Citizen Genet, the so-called age of reason and events on the Continent, were instruments in a great design for the orderly evolution of nations and men, instruments in the development of that social and political consciousness which has made this the greatest of nations. If I may quote an observation of Emerson's, "Men appointed by Heaven to stand for a fact, before they were appointed by the people." And so I come to the end of my address. The meaningful events which I have touched on are simply straws in the firm current of our progress. They indicate a direction and a destiny. View them with faith and honor the actors; the practical seekers for practical solutions, your wise ancestors—for most certainly the land which thou seest is given thee.

Georgetown University Forum on Genocide

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 7, 1954

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, on June 10, the Georgetown University Forum, which regularly presents highly educational and stimulating radio programs on topics of national and international interest, presented a discussion on genocide, a subject which is especially close to my heart. Participants in the forum were Prof. Raphael Lemkin, who is generally identified as the author of the Genocide Convention; Dr. George A. Finch, an eminent legal expert and a lecturer at Georgetown University Law School; and Dr. Lev Dobriansky, a professor at Georgetown University, and an outstanding expert on genocide.

Mr. President, this is a subject which merits much more attention than it has been receiving in recent months. I regret very much that the administration has failed to fulfill its obligation to push for the approval of this convention.

Mr. President, only this year, I believe, the United Nations General Assembly unanimously adopted a resolution urging upon every member the ratification of the Genocide Convention. The United States cast its vote in favor of this resolution. Yet the administration is doing nothing to implement that resolution. The Genocide Convention is lying dormant in the Foreign Relations Committee. This, in my judgment, is a betrayal of faith. In my judgment, it is a sign of compromise and surrender to the neoisolationist elements in our country who are opposed to all international covenants providing for the common assumption of common obligations.

Mr. President, the obligation to prevent and punish the crime of genocide is an obligation which we should gladly assume. It would aid us immeasurably in pressing the worldwide struggle against Soviet terror and repression. It would surely help to restrain the mass murders, enslavements, and tyrannies which now are being practiced behind the Iron Curtain and perhaps elsewhere.

We must resign ourselves to the fact that in the absence of firm and forthright leadership on the part of the administration, there is no prospect of getting any action on the Genocide Convention in this Congress. I hope that in the forthcoming congressional elections there will be widespread discussion of this issue, and that when the next Congress convenes in January, an insistent demand will be made for Senate approval of this all-important convention.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a transcript of the June 10 discussion on genocide, held under the auspices of the Georgetown University Forum, to which I have already referred, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the transcript of the forum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GENOCIDE: FACT AND CONVENTION

Mr. WARREN. Genocide: Fact and Convention, is the topic for the 394th consecutive broadcast of the Georgetown University Radio Forum, another in a series of educational and informative programs from Washington. The Georgetown University Forum was founded in 1946.

This is Matthew Warren speaking by transcription from the Raymond Reiss Studio, on the campus of Georgetown University, historic Jesuit seat of learning in the Nation's Capital.

Today's discussion will be Genocide: Fact and Convention. The participants are Prof. Raphael Lemkin, author of the Genocide convention; Dr. George A. Finch, Department of Law, School of Foreign Service, Georgetown University; and Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, professor, College of Arts and Sciences, Georgetown University.

Transcripts of today's broadcast are available. Send 10 cents to cover the cost of printing and mailing, with you name and address to Georgetown University Forum, Washington 7, D. C. Please mention also the subject matter of the transcript desired.

Genocide is a new work for an old crime, namely, mass murder. You have seen it frequently in news items and magazine articles. Tonight we propose to explain just what it is, what is being done about it. Professor Lemkin, what is genocide?

Professor LEMKIN. Genocide is the destruction of nations, races, religious and ethnic groups. It is an international crime. It is already a law as introduced to a special committee, called the Genocide Convention. I was responsible for having created this concept, this word. I would like to acknowledge here the great help which was given to me by the Carnegie Endowment and Dr. Finch, present here, in having helped me to publish a book which has contributed to the success of the genocide concept. Out of Washington in 1943, when the book was published, came this word "genocide," and the idea of genocide made a long way to the Nurenburg trials and to the United Nations. By now the convention, the genocide pact is accepted by 44 nations, which represent together a population of half the population of the world. More than 1 billion people are now protected by the Genocide Convention—by the convention which says, "Do not destroy nations, races, and religious groups—and if you destroy them, you are committing an international crime and you are responsible to the world."

Mr. WARREN. Do those 44 nations include the United States?

Professor LEMKIN. Neither the United States nor England; but they include China, France, Italy, Canada, Mexico, Brazil, Turkey, South Korea, and many other nations.

Mr. WARREN. Thank you, Professor. Dr. Finch is one who has testified with regard to genocide in the United States Senate and who has helped in the origination of this pact. Would you give us your impression of the meaning of "genocide"?

Dr. FINCH. Before I do that, Mr. Warren, I would like to pay tribute to the work of Dr. Lemkin in originating the concept of genocide as an international crime, and in his indefatigable work in propagating that idea up to the present time. I am happy that in the early days I was able to assist him in the publication of his work which was entitled "Axis Rule in Occupied Europe," in chapter 9 of which he developed the theory of genocide. As he said, that work has been of great value since its publication. In fact, the War Department subscribed for 3,000 copies and sent it to our officers overseas in occupied Europe for their guidance in rearranging the laws of those countries to eliminate all traces of genocide in their national legislations.

It happens that I am a member of a committee of the American Bar Association to which was referred this Genocide Convention when the approval of that association was asked for it. We found that the convention had certain constitutional obstacles which should be removed before we ratify it. I was one of three members of the Bar Association which appeared before the subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations and pointed out those obstacles. As a result of that appearance the convention still resides in the files of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. Now, briefly, the convention, instead of being directed to the activities of government, of complicity of governments in carrying on these diabolical activities against their groups, is directed to individuals and really sets up a code of common criminal law. The position of that sort of a convention in the United States is very different from what it is in most other countries. We have a unique constitutional provision which says treaties shall be the supreme law of the land—anything in the State laws or constitutions to the contrary notwithstanding. So that when a treaty here is ratified, it becomes the law of the land without any legislation by the Congress or by the State legislatures. That treaty of the Genocide Convention is drawn in such terms that if ratified as a treaty, it will transfer a large portion of our criminal law from the jurisdiction of the States, where it now resides, on to our constitutional system, to the jurisdiction of the Federal Government and thus upset the balance between State and Federal Government under our Constitution. It will eventually, if the hopes of the convention are carried out, transfer some of that jurisdiction to an international court of justice. It is true there is no such court in existence now. It is being drafted with the assistance of the United States delegates by the United Nations. One of these days we may expect to see a draft convention for an international criminal court sent up to the Senate alongside the Genocide Convention for ratification by the Senate. It is for those reasons that the Senate has held up our ratification due to the advice of the American Bar Association, which devoted a large amount of time to the examination of this convention in detail, and after debate upon all sides it took what I think was a very sound position with reference to the impact of such a convention upon our constitutional law.

Mr. WARREN. Before we go into the discussion of some of the things that you have said, I see that Professor Lemkin is eager to say something here. I wonder if, first, we might call on Dr. Dobriansky?

Dr. DOBRIANSKY. Concerning this matter of genocide and its conception, I think one has to always keep in mind the historical context in which genocidal activity, as defined here by Professor Lemkin, has emerged and has been executed. If we keep this in mind, and see the close correlation, in fact, the intimate parallel, between totalitarian development of government and genocidal activity in the form of mass murder, mass killing, and I would say even deportations of large masses of peoples in various countries, whether for reasons of politics, economics, military strategy, or otherwise, leading to their dispersion over a wide area, as, for example, in Soviet Asia, we then have definitely the historical context of genocide.

When we look at the evidences of it, I, for one, although I am not a legalist, just being an average American concerning this matter, as many of you are, find absolutely no qualms of conscience or of thought with respect to this constitutional argument. Let's look at some of the evidences. We are all acquainted with genocide as committed by the Nazis during the 1930's and in the 1940's. Their genocidal activity was aimed at the Jewish populations not only in Germany but also in other East European countries which nazism invaded. The intent there was unmistakable, the annihilation of the Jewish people. When you look into the Soviet framework, and even for that matter keep in mind its entire historical background, where genocide, although it wasn't called so at the time, was really an institutional facet of Russian conquest and imperialism, again you find this predominant totalitarian strain.

Now, the Soviets, as many of their predecessors, have committed innumerable acts of genocide, not only specific acts but I would even say continuous acts. They have eliminated the Ingrian nation. They have also eliminated many of the republics which continued up until the end of World War II, the Volga-German Republic, the Chechens, the Ingushi, some of the Greeks on the Kerch Peninsula. They have also wiped out completely the integral cultural and institutional sinews that make up a nation, such as churches, religious bodies. You find that among the Ukrainian Catholics; you find that now being perpetrated in Poland and elsewhere. They committed a man-made famine during 1932–33, wiping out up to 5 million people in the Ukraine. They continue their deportation processes at this moment, leading to the deportation of millions from the Baltic States, in Poland, and many of the other satellite states, all of these peoples being dispersed throughout the vast and broad reaches of Soviet Asia. All of this contributes to the undermining, in fact, to the destruction of nations. Then, furthermore, if we look into Soviet literature and the manner in which they extoll the objective of creating a new Soviet nation, a sort of amalgamation of all conquered peoples, you could then begin to appreciate the nature and character of genocide.

Professor LEMKIN. I would like to answer several very important points which Dr. Finch has made. I will take them up in order. Dr. Finch stated that the convention directs itself toward individuals but not toward governments. This is correct because criminal responsibility is a psychological and moral concept that must rest with the individual. There is no collective responsibility in criminal law. The Hague Convention prohibits collective fines. In the Middle Ages you used to organize trials of cities. But it was exactly Pope Innocent IV who proclaimed the principle of individual criminal reseponsibility. Later on the doctrine of criminal law developed along the lines of individual criminal responsibility. Dr. Finch, I think, is not completely correct if he says that the convention does not apply to governments. It does apply to governments, but through members of government. You cannot put the government in jail. You cannot hang a government. You cannot shoot a government. But you can punish members of governments who carry out a policy of government. In this respect the convention meets completely with the high requirements and just requirements that Dr. Finch has so ably presented here.

Question number 2, the problem of treaties—let's be exact about it. There are 2 kinds of treaties: 1 kind of treaty is called the self-executing treaty, meaning a treaty which acts directly upon the citizens of the country without the necessity for Congress to enact enabling legislation. These treaties are dangerous because the Nation is immediately bound by international agreement and there is no link between the treaty and the population. We don't like this type of treaty. I agree with Dr. Finch that these treaties should be taken care of by the Bricker amendment or other amendments. But the Genocide convention is a different one. The Genocide convention is exactly that type of convention that Dr. Finch would like to have—a convention which says in article 5 that every ratifying power would introduce domestic legislation. It means a conventionable act if ever applied in the United States only through domestic law, accepted and introduced according to the American Constitution. Now, in addition to that, Dr. Finch knows and everybody knows that a treaty which deals with crime, like the Genocide convention, cannot act in the Nation until the Nation has introduced penalties, and there are no penalties in the Genocide convention.

Therefore, the Genocide Convention cannot become binding as international law, as the law of the land without a statute introduced by the United States Legislature, by Congress. Congress has the right to do it not because of the treaty but under article I, section 8, of the Constitution, which reads, "Congress shall have the power to define and punish piracies and felonies committed on the high seas and offenses against the law of nations." This is a very liberal provision and it fits completely the Genocide Convention like a shoe fits the foot—namely, that the Congress has the right to define international crimes, and genocide is an international crime. Now, you ask me why? To wipe out a religious group, to wipe out a nation, is as important as to sink or rob a vessel under piracy or to drag a woman into prostitution, which is international crime, or to spread narcotics. What is more important for the moral, cultural, human point of view, to destroy a nation or a religious group or to sink a vessel? This problem is without any doubt. Therefore, the Genocide Convention is constitutional, moral, religious. It fits all the requirements of every decent man. Let me be frank about it. I think if there are some difficulties in the Genocide Convention, it is because the convention was confused with another project of the United States—with the Human Rights Draft Covenant, which covers half of the problems of every nation—FEPC, immigration, labor, whatnot, everything is there. Of course, the Genocide Convention then became confused in the eyes of the Senate with the Human Rights Draft Covenant. Dr. Finch will forgive me but his committee, in introducing material on the Genocide Convention, introduced at the same time in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD material on human rights and genocide together. This didn't help to clarify the issue. Goethe said once that a definition is separation, like a chemical process. You have to divide one material from the other. Therefore, also internationally and constitutionally, in every type of thinking we should keep strictly to definition. The Genocide Convention does not suffer under any constitutional limitations, and let's not degrade the American Constitution to the position of a false witness in this case; because if there are political implications, let us say that, but let's not invoke the Constitution on that.

Mr. WARREN. Let's see if I understand this picture now to this point. First of all, the United States has not ratified this convention or pact, as we may call it, probably because of certain constitutional problems, as Dr. Finch has pointed out. Would these problems include the fear that another nation having ratified this, such as Russia, might have a hand in controlling the United States or our own problems?

Dr. FINCH. That is one of the fears, Mr. Warren. I would like before I discuss that feature to answer partially Mr. Dobriansky, in which he referred to the more or less political aspects of this subject. The original definition of genocide which was adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations included political groups as well as ethnical, racial, national or religious groups. That political group was left out of this Convention. It is now limited to national, ethnical, racial or religious groups, as such. That means that the nations behind the Iron Curtain can take action against members of these so-called protective groups by persecuting them not as such but as political enemies of the state. For instances, the great groups of Jews who were removed from European Russia and sent to Siberia were not removed as Jews, as members of that race, but as being security risks for the safety of Russia in case of another war. The persecutions of the Catholics and the Protestants in the satellite countries are not because they are members of religious groups, but because they are regarded as enemies of the state. The same way with the propertied class who are not included at all. The Kulaks, for instance, were liquidated, not because they were Kulaks or a propertied class but because under the Russian theory people who held those views were enemies of the state. In that aspect, I think the Convention was drawn to suit the ideological concept of the Soviets.

To come to the second point, as to the application of this Convention to persons, it says persons charged with genocide shall be tried by a competent tribunal of the state in the territory in which the act was committed or by an international tribunal. How can anybody conceive that in Russia, in Soviet Russia, a Russian court can try and punish a Russian official who is carrying out this state policy by direction of the Kremlin. It is inconceivable that the Convention can have any such effect in Russia. Now, as to the question of self-executing treaties, I agree with Professor Lemkin as to some treaties being self-executing and others not, but the Convention defines these crimes. It says, "killing members of the group, causing serious bodily or mental harm to members of the group, deliberately inflicting upon the group conditions of life calculated to bring about its physical destruction in whole or in part, imposing measures intended to prevent births within the group, principally transferring children of the group to another group." No law of Congress could define those things with any more detail or definiteness than those definitions give. It is our view that this Convention would be self-executory without any further legislation by Congress. Moreover, Dr. Lemkin is talking merely about the criminal penalties when he talks about Congress having the power to define. There is also a civil liability which would attach to anybody violating this Convention.

Mr. DOBRIANSKY. I would like to reply to some of the remarks made by Dr. Finch. In the first case, the convention is not as he portrays it—something drawn up to suit the ideological position of the Soviets. On the contrary, the proper way of looking at it is to conform with the realities behind the Iron Curtain which some of the representatives of the ABA seem to refuse to understand. The fact is that no matter what group you belong to, whether racial, national or an ethnic group, and regardless of the reasons involved, the Soviets regard any type of their activity, including genocidal activity, as political in nature. The additional fact that we must recognize is that there is no political group behind the Iron Curtain—organized political group—which receives acceptance, other than the Communist Party.

Now, the second point concerns the tribunal. I think it is perfectly hypothetical and almost aridly academic when Dr. Finch speaks of a Soviet tribunal trying someone in the Soviet Union for genocidal perpetration. Certainly, anyone operating on the level of mass murder would be doing so in behalf of and according to the orders and commends received from the Soviet government. In conclusion, I simply want to say that I have listened to Mr. Rix, Dr. Finch, Mr. Schweppe, and others during the hearing and even read some of their works beyond it, and I can't help but be impressed that we are needlessly inserting legal technicalities into an issue where they simply do not belong. Genocide, if properly interpreted, which does not mean lynching, which does not mean individual murder, which can easily be covered by homicidal laws here in the United States, but mass murders on the level of paralyzing nations, paralyzing religious and racial groups toward the point of complete annihilation, such acts of genocide certainly are inconceivable within the framework and in the environment of the United States. If you should have that case within the United States, and we do have our Constitution as it is worded now, then I think it is obvious to anyone that that Constitution would have only nominal significance and no longer any functional sigificance.

Mr. WARREN. Thank you, Dr. Dobriansky. We will have to consider your remarks in summary. We have a couple of minutes. I would like to have each one of you gentlemen summarize your remarks. First, Professor Lemkin.

Prof. LEMKIN. I would like to state that the convention itself is not self-executory. A special subcommittee of the Foreign Relations Committee, headed by Senator MCMAHON, after the hearings, had decided so. After having heard the ABA and all the experts, it decided that the treaty is not self-executory.

They decided against the point of view of Dr. Finch, although the point of view of Dr. Finch's presentation was very able. The subcommittee's point of view is shared by Charles Fahey, by Robert Patterson, also very prominent lawyers, and by the Department of Justice. So the problem is extremely clear, in my opinion. There are no penalties in the Genocide Convention and, therefore, the convention cannot be applied without a special law.

Dr. Finch. I would like to say, Mr. Warren, that the question of whether or not a treaty is or is not self-executing must ultimately be decided by the courts. A committee of Congress cannot decide that; neither can we. It is our opinion that this convention would be self-executing. In conclusion, I would like to say that I am very glad to hear Dr. Lemkin say if we had such a constitutional amendment as the Bricker amendment, these questions would not arise. I heartily agree with that, and I am a 100-percent supporter of the Bricker amendment for that reason.

Dr. Lemkin. I did not say that.

Mr. Warren. Thirty seconds, Dr. Dobriansky.

Dr. Dobriansky. Recently the Soviet Government ratified the Genocide Convention. To me that was a most outrageous event from the viewpoint of an American and from the viewpoint of the American Government assuming moral leadership in the world today. Many of you listeners will probably be confronted by this problem, perhaps in the next congressional session, where the Genocide Convention might well be taken up, and you will have to make a decision in that respect.

Mr. Warren. You have attended the weekly discussion program of the Georgetown University Radio Forum, broadcast of which was transcribed in the Raymond Reiss Studio on the campus of historic Georgetown University in Washington, D. C.

Our topic for discussion today, Genocide: Fact and Convention. Our panel: Prof. Raphael Lemkin, Dr. George A. Finch, Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky.

We Should Expand Our Assistance to the Physically Handicapped Because the Record Shows They Make Excellent Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 11, 1954

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I should like to include an excellent article concerning our physically handicapped persons, entitled "The Employables," written by William P. McCahill, executive secretary, President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped, which appeared in the May 1954 issue of the Eagle, the outstanding magazine published by the Fraternal Order of Eagles.

The article follows:

THE EMPLOYABLES

(By William P. McCahill, executive secretary, President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped)

Unmistakable signs of a great tomorrow for America's physically handicapped men, women, and children can be seen everywhere.

Like some American programs which have been slow in gathering momentum, the national move aimed at obtaining greater job equality and opportunity for qualified handicapped workers has snowballed in the past 10 years.

Guided by the President's committee of civilian volunteers, the "Employ the Handicapped" movement has been backed by governors' committees in all States and Territories and sparked by countless communities and civic organizations including the FOE, which has earnestly backed the program since is origination.

The move has resulted in savings of billions of dollars at all government levels, and it has brought about the creation of goods, products, and services unlimited in number. In addition, and more important, hundreds of thousands of individual and family lives have been saved.

In spite of the tremendous progress which has seen over 2½ million placements of the handicapped by public employment services in the past 12 years, the Office of Defense Mobilization reported a shocking fact: At the height of the Korean war, an extra 2 million men and women could have been rehabilitated and employed had the effort been made.

On a 40-hour week, 50 weeks a year, those unemployed would add 4 billion man-hours of labor to the national total. In time of war or emergency this could spell the difference between victory or defeat. In peace this productive labor could greatly assist in raising living standards, here and abroad, and help assure continued peace and an expanded economy.

But this picture of despair is rapidly changing, as the casual observer notices. He sees in early May a selected few thousand citizens travel to Washington as summoned by the President to work on a program designed to prevent and cut down disabling accidents at work places. For 3 days the experts, engineers, publicists, businessmen, and lay leaders will outline a program aimed at reducing the staggering total of 2 million industrial accidents annually.

Other thousands of dedicated citizens also are called to Washington to confer on the problem of preventing crippling, disabling, and killing accidents on the streets and highways.

The observer read of a 3-day exposition late in April in Washington which featured 50 exhibitors who proclaimed their success in rehabilitating and employing the handicapped. Too, he sees the Veterans' Administration, the Civil Service Commission, the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation, large and small employers alike, providing daily tasks for the handicapped.

Evidence of the program at work in cities around the Nation can be seen. In Milwaukee, the friends of the late Frank Greenya have posted an Eagle award in his name in connection with an annual scholarship contest, an essay contest on employment of the handicapped.

In Wisconsin's capital, Grand Worthy President Bob Hansen, vice chairman of Governor Kohler's citizen committee, lends his special touch to the frequent deliberations of a powerful group of leaders united in a modern crusade for the fellow who asks only opportunity, not charity.

Irate Miami citizens contact their elected representative as a result of economy cutbacks in the employment service which harm the city's fine record of placing handicapped workers. Recently Miamians pushed forward a special project for employing cardiacs and in 1 month found jobs for more than 3 dozen.

The American Medical Association's Congress on Industrial Medicine in Louisville devoted the honored spot at their banquet to a presentation of a signed plaque from President Eisenhower to the physician in this country judged most deserving of reward for his services to the handicapped. In another 18 communities doctors received lesser national awards for substantial efforts in this area.

In Cleveland local citizens learned that the chairman of the President's Committee, Vice Adm. Ross T. McIntire, Medical Corps, United States Navy, retired, would be attending a convention there next July and within a few hours organized a gathering that will bring together hundreds of the city's most prominent industrial, business, labor, and civic leaders to honor the admiral at that time for his work.

Even in the Nation's Capital, a serious group of public-spirited people stood up in the District Building a few months back to take an oath to long and faithfully discharge their duties as members of a new commissioner's committee on employment of the handicapped.

In this same Washington, a veteran of two world wars, who since has lost his eyesight, received an international citation from one of more than one hundred Goodwill Industries scattered across the country. The man, Marine Maj. Gen. Melvin J. Mass, has held many responsible positions since losing his sight. He has been a Minnesota Congressman for 10 years, was named vice chairman of the President's Committee by the President himself, was elected vice president of the Blinded Veterans' Association, and was elected national commander in chief of the Military Order of the World Wars, probably the most rank-heavy professional guild of service officers in the world. He was also elected chairman of the board of the Marine Corps Reserve Officers Association.

Now these happenings may seem like straws in the wind to the uninformed but the wind has assumed gale force and the straws build mountainous haystacks.

If you tune in your television set some day, chances are you'll see and hear either a local or national show, spot or station break announcement emphasizing the thesis that it's good business to hire the handicapped.

A television show, As You Can See, recently won for its star, blind Helen Tullis, the Gold Mike award of McCall's magazine given annually to the most outstanding American woman in radio and television.

Each year, keeping in mind the magic in awards and dramatic citations, the President's committee selects some five national groups to honor with its distinguished service certificate similar to the one presented the FOE at its Minneapolis convention a few summers back.

Too, governors' committees issue a few dozen awards to employers each year and citations to individuals and organizations. Community groups also give thanks through awards and citations. Always the cause of the hadicapped worker is advanced another stride forward.

There is much encouragement behind statistics such as the one that 60 percent of World War II's blinded veterans are working. That is fine, but it is just as discouraging to note that 40 percent are not.

In turn, it is splendid to read about the Government Printing Office having great success hiring epileptics, but what about the thousands of employers who would rather hire an able-bodied thief than a man who admitted to grand mal or petit mal seizures?

There are only some 40,000 unemployed disabled veterans registered with the public employment offices today, but there was a time when 40,000 soldiers, sailors, airmen, or marines could have tipped the scales on any land, sea or air battle in history.

Actually there are millions more. Birth causes only 2 percent of disabilities. Work accidents net another 5 percent and all other accidents, an additional 5. The rest are caused by illness and disease. This means that almost every man, woman, and child in this country is a candidate for disability.

In his state of the Union message, the President mentioned the importance of rehabilitation of the disabled, saying, "the program for the rehabilitation of the disabled especially needs strengthening, although it returns each year some 60,000 handicapped individuals to productive work." He then promised a more detailed discussion which he delivered later in his health message:

"There are now 2 million disabled persons who could be rehabilitated and thus returned to productive work. Under the present rehabilitation program only 60,000 of these disabled individuals are returned each year to full and productive lives. Meanwhile, 250,000 are annually disabled.

"We should provide for a progressive expansion of our rehabilitation resources, and we should act now so that a sound foundation may be established by 1955. * * * Our goal in 1955 is to restore 70,000 disabled persons. Our goal for 1956 should be 100,000. By 1959, with gradually increasing State participation to the point of equal sharing with the Federal Government, we should reach the goal of 200,000 rehabilitated persons each year."

With this astonishing goal before their eyes, the professionals and their volunteer amateur friends have set their sights on the near horizon which will mean for us and for our children, a greatly increased opportunity to live successfully despite the unforeseen handicaps which the future may bring.

Through all this planning, this community effort, this drafting of a brighter tomorrow, some 7 to 8 million handicapped men and women now working on meaningful jobs, bend their every effort to the job ahead.

An American Medical Plan Against Socialized Medicine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 7, 1954

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, the American Medical Association has been on record as against socialized medicine for many years. Its opposition to such can be well understood and appreciated. But, unfortunately there are times when the association expresses opposition to plans, methods, or programs as being socialistic in character when there is no justification for the charge. In fact it would seem that anything that is new or different from what has been the usual practice is looked upon by it as socialistic. Consequently, the cry is set up, "Beware, it is socialized medicine."

This attitude in the opinion of many, including physicians who are members of the association is all wrong. You can cry, "Wolf, wolf," so often when there is no wolf that it finally ceases to be a cause of alarm or danger. This is the reason that so many members of AMA have become disgusted with the manner in which its executive officers have conducted its affairs in opposing every effort that has been made by well intentioned persons in seeking to find ways and means for the average person, particularly the low-income group, to meet the rising cost of medical and hospital care. Everyone knows that a long-term illness or one that requires hospitalization for any extended period, is such a financial burden that it just about wrecks the average family.

It is my opinion that this condition creates an obligation upon the American Medical Association to find ways and means of meeting the situation and avoid the financial catastrophe that is the result in the average home. The recognition of such an obligation is particularly necessary if socialized medicine is to be defeated.

As an old political leader in our State of New Jersey once said, "You cannot beat somebody with nobody." The same is true of fighting principles you consider wrong. "You cannot beat socialized medicine with nothing." You must have something to beat it. I think it is a recognition of this principle that causes so many well meaning and thoughtful physicians to take exception to the tactics used by those who assume to speak for the entire medical profession in opposing everything that is suggested to lessen the financial burden of medical care. For instance no one looks upon insurance against fire as an evidence of socialization. It is merely a recognition that the contributions of all, in the form of premiums, make possible the payment of the losses to the few who have had a disastrous fire. The same principle underlies all the prepayment methods adopted by Blue Cross, Blue Shield, Kaiser Foundation, HIP of New York City, the several labor organization plans, as well as all other types of health plans.

Without further enlargement of my views on the subject, I include as part of my remarks a very interesting and instructive article appearing in the June 15, 1954, issue of the magazine Finance, written by Sam B. Lyons and entitled "That Controversial Kaiser Foundation." It reads as follows:

THAT CONTROVERSIAL KAISER FOUNDATION—DESPITE CHARGE OF "ASSEMBLY LINE MEDICINE," IT CONTINUES TO GROW

(By Sam B. Lyons)

Six months ago this week, in Washington, industrialist Henry J. Kaiser appeared as a witness before the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

There were no kleig lights, TV cameras, points of order, or intracommittee squabbles. The occasion, rating minimum mention in the daily press, was the resumption of hearings on "methods available to groups and individuals to protect themselves against the costs of illness and, particularly, prolonged or catastrophic illness." Under discussion was the Kaiser Foundation Health Plan, a broad program of prepaid medical, surgical, and hospital coverage.

Certain phases of the plan have drawn the fire of, among others, the American Medical Association and various local medical and insurance groups. Some of its critics have labeled it sugar-coated socialization, and assembly line medicine. They charge that many of its members were pressured, notably by their labor unions, into signing up.

Proponents retort that it is "a private enterprise solution" to the recurrent complaint of inadequate medical care. They say that "it would make socialization of medicine unnecessary and—by making it unnecessary—impossible." And they add that the plan's current rapid rate of expansion is "limited only by ability to provide facilities and the services of groups of doctors fast enough to keep up with public demand."

Whether you are for or against the plan, there's no brooking the fact that it—or some form of it—seems here to stay.

On the national scene, New Jersey's Representative CHARLES A. WOLVERTON, chairman of the House committee conducting the hearings, has introduced a bill to provide Federal mortgage-loan insurance to stimulate investment of private capital in the construction of self-supporting hospitals and other medical facilities, and to facilitate the extension of voluntary, prepayment health plans providing comprehensive medical and hospital care. Admittedly, some parts of the measure are based on KP health plan principles and experience.

Out on the west coast, where the plan had its beginning some 20 years ago, the evidence is even more convincing. At the moment, it has an estimated 450,000 members—an increase of 100,000 in the past 12 months. Foundation facilities include 35 hospitals and clinics in four Western States, stretching from Portland and Vancouver to southern California. In addition, the foundation sponsors two institutes of physical medicine and rehabilitation, which conduct the Nation's largest nongovernmental program dedicated to the neuromuscular rehabilitation of children and adults physically handicapped by various types of paralysis.

The foundation is a nonprofit charitable trust established by the Kaiser family. Its health plan really started during the digging of the All-American Canal across the California-Arizona desert, when workers on that remote project clamored for some form of medical protection. Dr. Sidney Garfield organized a group of doctors to meet the demand, and the workers—Henry Kaiser's among them—anted up 5 cents a day from their wages to help meet expenses.

The plan enjoyed several refinements with the advent of Grand Coulee Dam. Henry Kaiser and other contractors on that 4-year project built the necessary facilities, and coverage was broadened to include the workers' families. With the coming of World War II and the ascendancy of the Kaiser empire, plan membership boomed to 180,000, and it stayed at or near that figure for the duration.

Postwar shrinkage of Kaiser enterprises dropped the total to 40,000. Then, Henry Kaiser recalls, former shipyard workers and others who had learned of the plan demanded that it be made available to the general population. At present, its members comprise a cross section of the public—employees of industries, stores, offices, transportation, military works, and university faculties; dependents of such employed persons; and families enrolled on an individual rather than group basis.

At last report, these were the plan's monthly membership fees, based on a group of 25 persons or more where a payroll check-off is in effect. (Where collections are made otherwise, each monthly rate is 40 cents higher). Subscriber only, $4.30; subscriber and one family dependent, $7.60; subscriber and two or more family dependents, $9.50.

In return, members receive doctors' services as required, in the home, place of employment, and/or hospital; 111 days of hospital care without charge for each illness or injury, its recurrences and complications; operations; routine and special duty nursing; laboratory and X-ray services; physical therapy; emergency services; and drugs and medicines without charge during hospitalization. There are, as in most group plans, small supplemental charges for certain additional services. Exceptions include certain congenital conditions, mental illness, suicidal injuries, contagious diseases, and alcoholism.

According to Henry Kaiser, the health plan works because of four basic principles:

(1) Prepayment: "This is the old principle of the well helping pay for the sick; the house that doesn't burn down paying for those that do." (2) Group practice: Independent groups of doctors organize their own "independent, private enterprise partnerships," and contract with the Health Plan to provide members with professional services. (3) Well-planned, integrated facilities. (4) Preventive medical care: Members are encouraged to choose one doctor as their personal or family physician, in order to maintain a close doctor-patient relationship, and to take periodic health examinations and receive treatment for illnesses in the early stages.

Henry Kaiser is the first to concede that "the prepayment principle alone is not enough." He adds: "But when all four principles are combined, far more medical care can be provided within the people's reach and means."

WHERE IT GOES

All funds from members' payments go to compensate the doctors' partnerships; to build and equip hospitals; to operate existing, self-sustaining hospitals; to provide hospital charity care, scientific research, and medical and nursing education; and to cover Plan administration.

Considerably more than 500 doctors are now connected with the plan, on a full-time or part-time basis, or as special consultants. A probationary term of two years on straight salary is followed by "junior" and "senior" partnerships. Their incomes are said to "compare favorably with averages for physicians in areas in which they practice," and the reported "top" is some $40,000.

The visiting layman to San Francisco sees the plan through a vista of concrete, steel, glass, and chrome—specifically, the latest Foundation hospital to be completed under its current $10 million construction program. As is the case in the Foundation's 13 other hospitals up and down the west coast, most of the new building's innovations were worked out by Dr. Garfield, medical director of the Foundation. With the possible exception of Philadelphia's Lankenau Hospital, there is probably not another hospital like it, in terms of ultra-modern equipment, operating efficiencies, and departures from tradition.

Henry Kaiser believes that similar installations could and should be made available to the general public in other parts of the country.

"It has been proved," he told the Wolverton committee, "that hospitals can be made a sound, privately financed investment. They do not have to resort to customary charity appeals, or subsidies. * * * I recall that when I sought the first bank loan to build hospital facilities to meet the critical health needs of shipyard workers, the bankers said that they 'wouldn't loan a dime on a hospital, because hospitals are such money losers.' I had to arrange guaranties to underwrite the first loans. But subsequently financial institutions have recognized the sound of self-sustaining basis of our foundation hospitals, and guaranties of our hospital loans are no longer required. * * *

"The investment of approximately $1 billion, entirely through private funds, could finance the building of medical centers in every part of the country, providing hospitalization for * * * 30 million Americans and their care by 30,000 doctors. These facilities could pay for themselves and be completely self-supporting."

The witness expressed confidence that "our vigorous financial institutions can rise to the need and opportunity and can supply the necessary private capital." But he noted also that such institutions have invested an estimated $44.2 billion in FHA- and VA-insured loans, and he added:

"Since the insurance stimulation has worked so effectively and soundly in unleashing such enormous home building, I respectfully suggest that your committee may desire to study how the Congress could apply the FHA- and VA-type insurance for private investments, to make more medical care and hospitals available at low cost to millions of people."

TWO QUESTIONS

In researching this article, Finance encountered two recurrent queries: (1) Is it Henry Kaiser's ambition to make the foundation's health plan, as such, a national proposition, endorsed by Congress? (2) At what point will the plan level off, or slow down its present rate of growth?

The first reply can be found in Henry Kaiser's testimony:

"Unequivocally, we favor the principle of making available to the doctors of this country insured loans to encourage the flow of private capital into needed facilities. * * * We have clung tenaciously to the hope that doctors themselves will take the lead in providing the private initiative solution to the people's health needs. We certainly do not envision the nationwide effort, reaching into every area, as a task for the Kaiser Foundation health organizations. Our sole interest is in seeing more health care provided to the people at costs within their means."

Reply No. 2 comes from Hale Champion, of the San Francisco Chronicle, in his recent series of excellent articles on the foundation health plan:

"They [the Kaisers] don't know where it will stop.

" 'It just depends on the need,' says Henry Kaiser, Jr., administrative assistant of the Kaiser Foundation. 'When the doctors of this country take care of the need for good, comprehensive medical care at a reasonable cost, we won't grow any more.'

"California doctors are fully aware of the challenge implicit in those words. A group of southern California doctors provided one answer recently when it won a union of 17,000 members away from the Kaiser plan by offering comparable benefits and a free choice of physicians, but at higher rates. Another answer is being provided by the Palo Alto Clinic, and still other answers are in various stages of development in the Alameda-Contra Costa County area, where the Kaiser plan has its greatest strength.

" 'Good,' says Henry J. Kaiser. 'That's what we want, that's what we're after. More power to them.' "

Extension of Time for Initiating Training Under Public Law 550, Korean GI Bill of Rights

SPEECH

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 6, 1954

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this is the third consecutive time this bill has been called on the Consent Calendar. This bill passed as a World War II measure without a single objection. There was not a single vote against it. The same bill passed 2 years ago without a single vote in opposition. I think this is the kind of bill that should come up on the Consent Calendar. It is only an extension of the Korean GI bill on which there was not a vote cast against it 2 years ago.

Shipyards Not Ready for Emergency

SPEECH

OF

HON. CHARLES R. HOWELL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 6, 1954

The House, in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, had under consideration the bill (H. R. 9252) to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to provide a national defense reserve of tankers and to promote the construction of new tankers, and for other purposes.

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, the coastline of New Jersey was carpeted with oil during much of World War II. The beaches of the resort towns were thick with this gooey and sticky mixture of oils, tars, and other material floating in from torpedoed tankers and merchant ships. The loss of life along our coastline was frightful as one after another of the slower tankers was picked off by enemy submarines and set ablaze.

That experience has made all of us in New Jersey particularly conscious of the need for modern tankers fast enough to elude enemy submarines and to stay with fast-moving convoys and get their cargoes to their destinations in time of war. Every time we walked along a beach or the shoreline of New Jersey during World War II we could see the evidence of failure on the part of another tanker to make its destination and we could only guess at how much loss of life had accompanied this failure.

The bill before the House today is a reasonable and logical means of helping to modernize our tanker fleet for both peacetime and any war emergency situation. Owners of these older tankers which now constitute the bulk of our private tanker fleet can trade them in, if the ships are in good condition, and get a fair and reasonable allowance toward the purchase of a new, modern, fast tanker.

I hope that private enterprise in the shipping industry will take advantage of the opportunities provided under this bill to modernize their tanker fleets, particularly since any extra speed built into the new vessels for national defense purposes—speed beyond the normal needs of the owner—will be subsidized by the Federal Government.

If this plan works, it should mean some additional and very badly needed employment in our shipyards. They are at present in a distressed situation. Many of them are virtually closed down. In time of emergency, this situation would be extremely dangerous. The chief of the Navy's bureau of ships declared recently that our shipbuilding industry is not ready for any emergency and that commercial ship construction is approaching the vanishing point, with the Navy presently being virtually the sole source of support for this industry.

And the Navy's construction programs, according to Rear Adm. W. D. Leggett, Jr., "cannot alone support an adequate defense nucleus of operating shipyards for both the naval and merchant types" of construction.

The tanker trade-in program authorized under this bill is limited in scope and cannot begin to provide the shipyard construction work we require to get our yards back in efficient production and to maintain a reservoir of skilled personnel for future emergency needs.

We need a whole lot more than this bill. The Navy's own budget on ship construction has been cut back much too far, and at the wrong time.

IDLE CAPACITY THREATENS WHOLE ECONOMY

I was particularly interested, Mr. Speaker, in the weekend report by the National Planning Association on the danger which faces our whole economy by virtue of the existence of so much idle capacity and idle manpower. This association, which is a nonprofit study group of well-known bankers, economists, businessmen and labor leaders, said that unless we increase our annual rate of production of goods and services by about $25 billion a year we will be sliding backwards and heading into real economic difficulties. It emphasized that when our economy stands still productionwise—and that is just what we have been doing—we are actually losing ground and sowing the seeds for mass unemployment. Part of the reason for this is that we are increasing our labor force by about a million persons a year.

In our shipyards, there have been no new orders in over a year. In this situation the Government has stood aside, maintaining a hands-off policy but meantime scolding the private fleet operators for not ordering more new ships.

Their hesitancy to place new orders seems to be in keeping with a caution which pervades most businesses today, and this is most difficult to understand. We were told in 1952 that a Republican administration would generate confidence in American business—the confidence to expand. And yet the whole history of this administration appears to have been characterized by a lack of confidence on the part of business. We find we are not even using existing capacity. Obviously with idle plants and idle facilities, business is not going to engage in any rush to build new facilities. We have got to show that there is demand for the products and services of business and industry—effective demand based on mass purchasing power. In the 20 years of Democratic administrations since the last depression that is the one lesson we learned: That is, that if people have the wherewithall to buy, demand will be generated and business will have all the confidence in the world to expand its facilities to meet this increased demand.

Our shipping industry has been going downhill because our economy has been going downhill. This bill, to encourage the modernization of our tanker fleet, will make it worthwhile for owners of obsolete tankers to trade them in on new models and get fast, modern ships in their place. But we have got to follow through by getting our whole economy back into high gear; otherwise this bill will be nothing more than a pious gesture.

A Full and Complete Program of Aid to Our Physically Handicapped Is a Sound National Investment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 17, 1954

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, when we were recently considering the appropriation bills for Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare Departments, I felt it my duty to support the amendments, under the vocational education and rehabilitation provision, to increase the appropriation to $23 million and remove the restrictive language which had been inserted in the previous year's bill. As you know, both of those amendments were approved and included in that measure.

The United States is rehabilitating about 65,000 people each year, but there are approximately 250,000 capable of being rehabilitated. When rehabilitated, these people go from the welfare and relief rolls to the rolls of the taxpayers. Actually, it can be scientifically proven that over the long run, the rehabilitation of our handicapped citizens does not cost anything. The returns to the Treasury in taxes from their employment will repay Federal and State governments every dollar it cost to rehabilitate them.

It is obvious, therefore, that assistance to our handicapped people is a sound national investment and contributes immeasurably to the general welfare. Consequently, when we come, in the near future, to consider the scheduled administration bills to augment our present Federal aid to State vocational rehabilitation for the physically handicapped, I earnestly hope this House will exercise the most conscientious deliberation to provide a complete and adequate law.

The suggested respective committee bills have some basically good features in authorizing worthwhile new types of rehabilitation service and further personnel training opportunities. However, these are not sufficient to deal adequately with the complicated human and economic problems of the physically handicapped.

In my conviction, amendments should be adopted to coordinate the thirty-odd-Federal agencies having responsibility for various parts of the handicapped program and additional funds provided to help the handicapped find work after they have become fit themselves to work. Also, an advisory council, to administrate the program, should be set up, consisting of representatives of labor, industry, the farm interests and the handicapped themselves.

It is only logical, if we insure the training and rehabilitation of more handicapped persons, then we should also increase the personnel and services designed to specifically aid the handicapped in being placed in suitable employment. The authorities tell us that there are now less than 100 persons in the country today who are qualified in that field.

I understand the above amendments will be offered to the measures brought out on the floor, and I shall exhort the Members to unanimously approve of them. We cannot afford to be pennywise and pound foolish in this problem. If we accept the principle that it is in our own national interest to help the handicapped, then it is only practical wisdom to insure the enactment of a full and complete program to do the job in its entirety.

Testimony Relative to the Establishment of a Code of Fair Committee Procedure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1954

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement submitted by me to the Committee on Rules and Administration of the United States Senate July 7, 1954:

> The adoption by the Congress of a code of fair committee procedure has become a necessity. At stake is the investigative power of the Congress itself. During most of the discussions around the subject, the rights of witnesses have received the greatest emphasis. What has been lost sight of is the damage that is being done to this vital function of Congress itself by the absence of a uniform code of investigative procedure.
>
> As the respect for the findings of Congressional investigative committees diminishes, to that degree is the investigating function of Congress vitiated. This, in turn, destroys the possibility of proper and effective legislation. It breeds indifference to Congressional exposure of executive wrongdoing.
>
> The formulation of a code applicable to all committees is no more than the articulation of good common sense. As statutory law defines moral behavior to which decent instincts subscribed long before it was written into the law, so a code sets forth standards known to and adopted by most of us long before the cry arose that the Congress itself place formal curbs about its investigating committees.
>
> There have been both justified and unjustified accusations of the abuse by committees of their investigating powers. Because the procedures have been loose and individualized, it has become most difficult for the people to understand the merits or otherwise of these accusations. It is in this that we find our greatest necessity for the adoption of standards.
>
> The investigative instrument is a delicate and complex one. It involves at times balance of powers among the three branches of Government. It enters, at times, as yet undefined areas of constitutional law. It in-

vades rights of witnesses unprotected by such boundaries as our courts have accorded every witness before them. Since the investigating committee, therefore, treads so sensitive a path, and since, for good reasons or bad, it is subjected to never-ceasing criticism, the investigating committee for both the protection of its own vital operations and the rights of people before it, should in all good sense welcome the adoption of a uniform code.

It is not enough to say that this committee is good or bad, for the very vagueness of the accusations serve only to impede. A code of fair committee procedure would make the criticism detailed, concrete, and would hold the accuser and the accused accountable in unmistakable terms. It is time we got out of this morass of generalized, packaged criticism, which is choking the sense out of public appraisal of the investigating function of Congress.

We find now that investigating committees of Congress are neither on the offensive or defensive. It is not my contention that the adoption of a code would put at rest all questions concerning the conduct of an investigation. It is, however, the first big step toward the clearing of the atmosphere.

It cannot, of course, eliminate abuses; it can, however, curb them. For those who have so abused the powers accorded them by their position as committee chairmen or members, a code cannot give them the morality they lack; it can only give them the road blocks.

A code, however, that is cumbersome and unworkable would be far worse than none. A code of fair committee procedure should include the following:

1. It should safeguard against a one-man committee whenever there is a compelling of testimony by use of the subpena.

2. The issuance of subpenas should be made only with the consent of the majority of the committee.

3. The right of witnesses to effective counsel should be guaranteed, including the right of counsel to address the committee.

4. Majority consent to the revealing of testimony taken in executive session. Portions of the testimony should not be given out of context.

5. No witness shall be forced to testify before television or broadcasting apparatus.

6. A witness should be advised within a reasonable time of the nature of the evidence he will be called upon to give.

7. A witness who has been adversely affected by testimony given before a congressional investigating committee should be given the opportunity to be heard.

8. No hearing shall be held away from Washington without majority consent of the committee.

I submit, however, that the enactment of a code of fair committee procedure in and of itself would not suffice in the one area which has given rise to the greatest amount of criticism, and that is in the area of the investigations of subversive activities in the United States. In May, 1953, I introduced a joint resolution to establish a joint committee on subversive activities. I am pleased to see that before you is a similar bill, Senate Joint Resolution 157, introduced by Senator Hendrickson. I emphasize now, a year later, the reasons for the introduction of this legislation.

We are dealing, when we investigate subversive activities, with material that carries within itself the impetus toward sensationalism. It is headline stuff, whether the Members will it so or not. It is within this area that we need most a sense of proportion as well as a centralized, concentrated, and rational approach. In the area of the investigation of subversive activities, we see not only duplications of staff, moneys appropriated for the same purpose to a variety of committees, a rivalry among committees working in this area, but also the use and re-use of identical witnesses, the appearance and reappearance of the same names. It is an unhealthy waste of money, motion, and energy, a retracing of steps gone over so many times, and a dissipation of the results of such mighty laboring.

We have seen the process of one committee nibbling at one facet and another nibbling at another facet, and often committees nibbling at the same tidbit together. This is to minimize the importance of the work to be done in this area, and this is to deprive it of vigor and thoughtfulness. A joint committee on subversive activities can best see the picture and see it whole. It is, gentlemen, the shortest distance between two points—the direct line from inquiry to effective action. The present existence of multiple committees with presumably the same objective finds us running around in circles.

If this is a serious question, then most certainly it merits the most serious of treatments. We have established a joint committee with reference to atomic energy matters. We have done so with respect to economic policy. Since this is the area (subversive activities) which has proved most controversial in domestic quarters, we must approach it sensibly and responsibly, directly, and rationally. Factually, it is in this area we find that the investigative power of Congress has been brought into question and subjected Congress to ridicule. One of my constituents has told me that in watching the activities of the various committees investigating subversive activities he has felt like a spectator at a ping-pong game.

In establishing such a joint committee on subversive activities, giving it exclusive jurisdiction insofar as the Congress is concerned, to make investigations of all subversive activities, we would at last make much sense in an area that heretofore has created greater disunity, aroused more passions, brought forth more confusion and bitterness than any other one single topic you can name (including taxes, Korea, and China). Were it a subject of passing interest, we could perhaps hope that time itself would bring it into proportion and clarity. Since, in the state of the world as it is today, it is a continuing subject, we need to invest it with the greatest care and thoroughness we can give it within the framework of our Congress.

I ask you to consider this proposal most thoroughly. The adoption of this proposal, together with a code of fair committee procedure, would, I submit, in the end strengthen the work of Congress, preserve its investigating powers, and keep the Congress master of its own house.

1953 Soil Conservation Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN R. DAVIS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 6, 1954

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, a year ago I read into the Record the annual report which Wisconsin's State conservationist, M. F. Schweers, had sent to district supervisors of the Soil Conservation Service in our State. The report led to many inquiries and favorable comments, so under permission to extend my remarks. I want to include the 1953 report, which I received recently.

During the past year, the Soil Conservation Service has undergone reorganization, as my colleagues know, and one of the regional offices which was discontinued was that at Milwaukee. Much of the work of the regional office was transferred to the State office. The annual report shows that some Wisconsin districts in 1953 exceeded accomplishments made during 1952, which heretofore had been our most productive year in soil and water conservation history. A number of districts requested more help than the Soil Conservation Service could provide, which officials see as a healthy and challenging situation.

One event of the year gained national attention, the State and national soil conservation field day and plowing matches held in Eau Claire County, with over 60,000 persons in attendance.

Mr. Schweers' report for 1953 follows:

United States
Department of Agriculture,
Soil Conservation Service,
Madison, Wis., June 2, 1954.

To: Soil Conservation District Supervisors.
From: M. F. Schweers, State Conservationist.
Subject: Acknowledgment of your 1953 SCD annual reports.

"Where a plow can't go
And a scythe can't sing
A tree should grow."

We begin this annual letter to you with this bit of poetic philosophy. It appeared in the Dun County soil conservation district supervisors' report for last year. We are told that this verse was written by an old Danish pioneer in Sawyer County, Soren Uhrenholdt, who in 1947 was honored by our State for a half century of outstanding forestry conservation. Its spirit typifies the basic purpose of our joint efforts—the use of each acre of agricultural land within its capabilities and its treatment according to its needs for protection and improvement.

1953 ANNUAL REPORTS INTERESTING AND INFORMATIVE

We thoroughly enjoyed reading the narratives received thus far. All but a few are in. We were pleased to see that a large percentage of your reports were mimeographed. We hope that district cooperators, agricultural leaders, and others who received copies get as much pleasure and information out of these annual messages as we do. They give us a picture of your accomplishments, your problems, your ideas for surmounting them, and your plans for attainments in the succeeding year.

A CHALLENGE

We all derive a tremendous amount of satisfaction from work well done. Evidently 1953 accomplishments were most satisfactory in the 67 soil conservation districts of Wisconsin. We are never really satisfied and, of course, our work is nowhere near completed * * * the fact is, it poses a continual challenge for us. This philosophy is particularly well stated in the annual report of the Rusk County district supervisors who tie the future in with the present:

"The challenge, as we see it, is being brought by falling farm prices. We must educate those who are just getting started in the program so they will not abandon their practices in a panic of false economy. We must sell those who are not in the program on its soundness and value. With the aid of cooperators who are already realizing cash dividends as a result of their practices, we must demonstrate that the soil conservation district program is vital and necessary to the continued prosperity of every citizen. We must develop a sense of the future and a desire for long-range planning on the part of our farmers."

1953 ACCOMPLISHMENTS

The weather, as you so well stated in your reports, sets limits on work and production. In contrast to 1952, when an ideal fall was conducive to making it the best layout year in the history of Wisconsin's soil conservation districts, the extremely dry season last year hindered construction work because of dry-hard soil conditions. The question of whether seedings would survive the winter caused farmers to hesitate to plow in strip crop lines and undertake other practices in old meadows. And the financial picture for agriculture caused many farmers to be cautious in laying out cash for rental of heavy equipment. Despite these limitations, accomplishments as you stated were highly creditable.

We do not maintain detailed records on such items as improvements in land use; increased farmer purchases of needed liming and fertilizing materials;. improved rotations; etc. However, these basic factors are considered in discussions with the farm family leading to the development of a farm-conservation plan and in following it through to completion.

Our field personnel made over 14,000 personal calls on soil conservation district cooperators in 1953. During these visits our men help farmers improve their conservation plans and arrange for accelerating the application of practices on the land.

The Service also collaborates with and assists district governing bodies, the Agricultural Extension Service, and the State soil conservation committee in planning for and carrying out educational and informational programs in the field of proper land use and soil and water conservation.

AGRICULTURAL CONSERVATION PROGRAM

In a number of reports you expressed sincere appreciation for the contribution made to District activities by the agricultural conservation program (ACP).

To those not familiar with this particular cooperative undertaking we shall briefly explain it. Up to 5 percent of a county's ACP funds may be used to reimburse the SCS for assisting farmers in determining the need for; site selection; and the installation of permanent type practices. These must have been approved for specific farms by local county agricultural stabilization and conservation committees. We also certify as to whether completed measures meet ACP specifications. The Service utilizes the funds thus earned by employing additional part-time help during the heavy spring and fall layout seasons. Farmer contracts made in connection with this program have lead to increased numbers of SCD cooperators.

During 1953, 53 counties executed 5 percent ACP-SCS agreements. Total funds involved was just less than $60,000.

SCS REORGANIZATION

The year 1953 saw a reorganization of the Soil Conservation Service. The principal change involved the discontinuance of regional offices.

We also acquired a new chief with a new title. He is Administrator Don Williams. Mr. Williams is a career employee of the Soil Conservation Service. He succeeded Dr. Robert Salter, who transferred to the Agricultural Research Service as head of soil and water conservation research.

In discussing the significance of the change in the Service organization, Mr. Williams has this to say:

"By giving the State conservationist more responsibility for program decisions, the work in soil conservation districts can be harmonized with that of other programs that operate on a State basis.

"With increased delegation of authority to State conservationists, there will be greater flexibility in adapting service resources to fit local problems within the State."

We are pleased to report to you supervisors that Wisconsin is fortunate in having acquired two of the top regional technicians to complement our staff. They are Engineer Arthur Kowitz and Fred Prange, soil conservationist. Both of these men have been working in Wisconsin as zone conservationists.

The Washington and State offices have taken over many business management functions formerly performed by regional offices. On April 26, 1954, we went on our own.

The Soil Conservation Service still maintains the cartographic unit and an engineering and watershed planning staff at Milwaukee. Also available to us are several field specialists located throughout the the Corn Belt States.

WATERSHED PROTECTION PROJECTS

Leadership in the United States Department of Agriculture's watershed-protection program has been assigned to the Soil Conservation Service. It is a Federal-State-local effort in harnessing runaway waters and in keeping our irreplaceable soil resource at its home base.

The west fork of the Kikapoo River in the Vernon and Monroe County soil conservation districts is one of 62 pilot demonstration projects set up throughout the Nation. According to the Vernon County district supervisors, the farmers in the valley are receptive to the plan. They have already laid a good conservation foundation of upland practices. Over 50 percent were soil conservation district cooperators before the program got under way.

One of the primary purposes of the watershed protection program is to accomplish projects that farmers and local people are unable to finance themselves. Federal moneys are appropriated in the national interest for maintenance of a productive agricultural plant.

Wisconsin has become one of the leaders in the watershed movement through farmer organized, farmer directed organizations. Your district reports are highly enthusiastic about your going watershed associations, the new ones, the prospective ones. This attitude is nicely summed up by the Monroe County district supervisors; who say:

"The watershed approach to the problems of soil and water conservation are daily assuming greater significance in our conservation program. It provides a means by which groups of farmers may work together for a common cause and also receive a maximum of assistance from all available agencies and groups."

According to your reports most district governing bodies have investigated the possibilities of watershed organizations. You have reviewed the joint memorandum sent you on this subject by the State soil conservation committee, the Agricultural Extension Service, the Wisconsin Conservation Department, and the Soil Conservation Service.

In this release each of the agencies indicates the types of assistance it is in a position to make available through districts to watershed associations. Many districts have taken advantage of the opportunities outlined in this release.

COOPERATION

Comment noted most frequently in your reports concerns the excellent cooperation existing between various groups and agencies in Wisconsin's soil conservation districts. Example of those remarks are "fine spirit of teamwork," "success largely credited to the splendid cooperation from all," and so on.

Of private agencies, credit goes to banks for having done the most outstanding job in promoting SCD activities. Their assistance in sponsoring conservation work, such as awarding trips to contest winners, heightened interest and pointed up the value of conservation. Banks, of course, are interested in this work because they wish their community to be prosperous. And basic to this prosperity is soil and water conservation.

Increased development of and interest in the neighborhood spirit is most gratifying. This is especially noted in your reports on watershed associations.

A typical example of the ever-increasing interest by sportsmen in conservation is that of the four rod and gun clubs in the St. Croix County Soil Conservation district. They bought a tree planter, hired two men and a tractor to operate it, then rented it out to farmers at cost, or less than cost—at $8 per thousand trees planted.

Also evident was the cooperation of the highway departments in assigning motor patrols and other heavy equipment to district governing bodies for rental to farmers for the construction of terraces, diversions and waterways. So much demand was shown for them that several districts reported difficulties in scheduling layout during the peak season.

We could go on and on enumerating your commendations to the many agencies that are contributing to the affairs of your soil conservation districts. We shall sum it all up by saying that their efforts are fine and appreciated and that cooperation is outstanding. And, in this connection, a lot of credit goes to you district supervisors for having provided leadership and guidance in making this all possible.

EDUCATION

In our opinion Wisconsin continues to top the Nation in the field of youth education in soil and water conservation. From your reports students are consistently being taught conservation in the schools, particularly in the seventh and eighth grades. This all has come about because of the solid interest and support of county superintendents of schools.

The number of students who were given instruction and firsthand experience on tours, etc., is in the thousands—2,500 in one district, 700 in another, and so on. The number of 4-H conservation projects undertaken increased in practically all districts.

Air tours were also popular. Ten districts reported holding them at some time during the year. Most districts commented on the effectiveness of the tours in revealing good and bad management of soils.

Several districts are getting their feet wet in television. You are realizing that this affords an unusual opportunity to spread the good word among farmers and city people. However, we gather that radio and newspapers could be used to still greater extent than they have been.

The grassland contest sponsored by the Agricultural Extension Service, with other agencies and industry cooperating, is proving high in interest and valuable in effect. In the Dane County district over 1,200 farmers were enrolled last year. We are pleased to note that the vast majority of the winners are soil conservation district cooperators.

The attention of many Wisconsin people, who are otherwise not directly interested in conservation, was attracted by the State and National soil conservation field day and plowing matches held in the Eau Claire County district last summer.

The field day, of course, put the national spotlight on Wisconsin. Over 60,000 people were on hand for the national event. In addition to the competition more people became interested in soil and water conservation and group action was exemplified by the fine cooperation of the several farmers whose units were involved in the big show. It was appropriately called Operation Watershed.

Another event of national import, but not so widely heralded, was Coon Valley's 20th anniversary celebration involving parts of the Vernon-Monroe-LaCrosse County districts. This 92,000-acre watershed was the first soil erosion control demonstration project in the country. This old project means a lot to many of us who got our start in soil conservation back in the early thirties. Dr. Hugh Bennett, the first Chief of our Service and soil conservation missionary extraordinary, came back for the picnic celebration. We took the old Chief on a trip in the LaCrosse area and with a tear in his eye he said, "I have never seen such a concentration of soil conservation over such a large area in my life."

AREA MEETINGS OF SUPERVISORS

Supervisors' comments indicate a growing interest in and real benefits derived from the indoor program-luncheon-field trip type of meetings. Most areas are holding them semiannually. The best evidence of their success is the fact that supervisor attendance is running from about 75 to 98 percent and getting even better each time.

Reference was also made in many reports to the value received from the State meeting of soil conservation district supervisors. This has been an annual affair sponsored by the State soil conservation committee and held in Madison in connection with Farm and Home Week.

FUTURE

The future of conservation in Wisconsin looks good. Your work plans for 1954 are ambitious and commendable. It is inspiring to read them. You are apparently using all sources of aid available, and using your SCS men to maximum advantage. That, of course, is as it should be.

The conservation snowball is rolling. As more and more farmers put these essential practices to work on their farms, more and more farmers get the chance to observe their effect on both land and incomes. The success of a soil and water conservation program is directly dependent upon farmer interest, understanding, and enthusiasm. We can only deduce from your reports, then, that the program in Wisconsin can be nothing but a success if we continue to work as we have this past year.

THANK YOU

Extending personal regards and thanking you for the many courtesies and fine cooperation you have extended to all of us in the Soil Conservation Service, I am,

Sincerely yours,

M. F. SCHWEERS,
State Conservationist.

Let's Keep Our Promises

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 7, 1954

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from this week's issue of the National Tribune. I hope that the Members of this House will read this article, which is another argument for action upon bills that have been reported from our Committee on Veterans' Affairs:

LET'S KEEP OUR PROMISES

As this is written, the 83d Congress is clearing the decks for final adjournment, and by the time our comment reaches the majority of our readers, only 3 weeks of the congressional session will remain. For the reason that general elections will be held in November and the political control of the legislative branch of the Government is at issue, there will be no question about any special session unless, of course, some unexpected national crisis should arise. Obviously, therefore, the veterans of the country are beginning to worry about pending legislation that is of great concern to them.

Having been observers of legislative processes for a great many years, we are not unduly alarmed by the delay in consideration by the legislators of those measures that are to benefit the veteran class. It has not been at all unusual in closing sessions of the Congress that bills relating to the Nation's former servicemen and their dependents have brought up the tail end of the procession, but time is now really growing short and we would not enjoy seeing veterans' legislation fail at the last minute without making one final effort to persuade our friends at the Capitol of the justice of our requests. At the moment it is noted that the appropriations to run the various Government agencies for the next fiscal year are completely out of the way, the leadership is picking up loose ends in both House and Senate in the attempt to enact as much as possible of the controversial administration program, and even the powerful Rules Committee of the House is passing out for debate on the floor resolutions for the consideration of lesser measures, that, although they are of importance to some segments of our population, have no great bearing upon the welfare of the people. There is time left, of course, for veterans' legislation—or there would be, if only the Representatives had to act on it—but the fact that veterans' legislation so far put through in the second session of the 83d Congress is at a minimum and for the reason that the Senate must also discuss unfinished veterans' bills before they can become law, these remaining 3 weeks shrink to a point that we feel we must make one more open plea for speedy action.

Several pieces of veterans' legislation are on the House Calendar. In the nature of things, even though some of them have already been passed over by request of the "official objectors" of the House of Representatives, most of them should pass when the calendar is called this week or 2 weeks from now. There are, however, two bills for which special rules action has been sought. One is H. R. 5380, seeking pensions for certain United States veterans who fought in the Moro Provinces between 1904 and 1914, and there is the far more important bill, H. R. 9020, requesting cost-of-living pension and compensation increases for other war veterans and their dependents. We have received reasonable assurances that both will be considered by the Rules Committee, probably this week, and that both will be passed out. It is when they are approved for debate that causes us our only concern. Time is really getting to be of the essence.

No real argument need be made for the Moro veterans. They are old; there are few of them; the cost would be negligible; the House committee is simply repeating its request to do justice to those who fought a real war 50 years ago in the Philippines, and we look for a favorable report from the House leaders because we know they desire to be fair. We argue for H. R. 9020 again only because it does cost money and for the reason that this happens to be an administration sworn to effect economy in Government. We are convinced also that both Republicans and Democrats in the Congress respect their given word and they would not wish to violate promises they have made publicly. That is why we would repeat here a few of those promises, and we say "repeat" for the reason that we have reminded the solons of them before.

If any Members of either House or Senate have the slightest doubt that this legislation will be approved by the White House, may we remind them that President Eisenhower last December said at the Executive offices that "this administration is one that believes in keeping its promises," and that the beneficiaries included in H. R. 9020 are those of whom the President said in January "the country owes so much." What the bill does—and all it does—is provide a reasonable adjustment in compensation payments to help disabled veterans and their widows and orphans meet their bills.

Let us just once more here quote from campaign pledges. In the summer of 1952, out in Chicago, the GOP adopted a veterans' plank in the party platform which stated, "Active duty in the Armed Forces of the United States of America constitutes a special service to our Nation and entitles those who have so served to aid and compensation in return for this service." The Republican Party further said it would adjust veterans' payments fairly and adequately to meet changes in the cost of living and otherwise assist them. A few days later the Democratic convention adopted its platform in the Windy City and promised "To advance the welfare of all men and women who have seen service in the Armed Forces." We do not quote both planks in full, but the above is not taken out of context, and the complete platform statements are very readily available for study. H. R. 9020 does not attempt to equalize payments fully with price increases, but it does make a reasonable attempt at adjustment, and some 3½ million war veteran beneficiaries, including their dependents on the rolls, are confidently expecting this Congress to keep its promises. The measure costs only $232 million for the first year of operation, and, be it remembered, over 2 million of these pensioners are in what we term the service-connected class, the veterans having incurred their disablements in actual service and their widows and orphans having lost their loved ones in war or as a direct result of war.

Let us go just one step further and quote General Eisenhower more specifically, just to remove any lingering fears that might be entertained by the more reluctant Congressmen. The President wrote to this editor in October 1952, when he was a candidate for office. He wrote in direct reply to a question seeking his stand on veteran welfare, and said: "As has been clearly stated in the Republican platform, adjustments of compensation and pension payments must be made from time to time with the changes in the cost of living. This responsibility I shall never overlook." H. R. 9020 had not been introduced at that time, but costs were rising and if the bill had then been on the calendar, there could have been no question of the support of the Chief Executive. There is none now.

As stated above, we look for early approval by the rules group of the two bills under consideration, but they must go over to the Senate in time for agreement also. While the tax bill is out of the way, social security changes about agreed upon, and other major matters pretty well in hand, the Finance Commitee has a lot of work to do besides consider veterans' bills, and many key members have other important committee assignments which do not permit of frequent meetings of those who must pass upon these and the other veterans' bills that are still to be enacted. Somewhat reluctantly—and parenthetically—we note that one of the principal enactments as yet incomplete is the multi-billion-dollar foreign-aid bill. Our veterans have not made much of a ruckus during the 6 weeks since most of their relief legislation has been reported, and they are uneasy now only because of the time element. We are doing everything we can to tell all veterans and their loved ones that Congressmen do not go back on promises freely made. All we ask of the gentlemen of the Rules Committee is to get busy so we cannot be accused of ourselves making misstatements of fact.

Excerpts From Addresses Made on the Floor of Congress by Hon. J. Harry McGregor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 7, 1954

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, as long as it has been my honor to represent the 17th Ohio District in the House of Representatives, I have endeavored to voice the opinions of the people on the floor of Congress.

To learn these views I have tried to keep in constant touch with my constituents through personal meetings held annually at the courthouses of each county in the district, through personal letters, and through annual questionnaires.

Under consent to extend my remarks in the Record, I include excerpts of various speeches I have made, and one made by the majority floor leader, Congressman Halleck, in order that the people of the district may know my position on national issues.

If anyone desires to find these remarks in full, they are printed in the Congressional Record on the dates indicated:

EXPENDITURES AND DEBT

July 31, 1953:

Mr. Speaker, I do not want to criticize anyone, any Member of Congress or the administration, for voting for or advocating the increase of the debt limitation. Congress is to blame—let we Members of Congress assume that responsibility and not try to blame anyone else for our present financial position. The Federal departments cannot spend the money unless we authorize and appropriate it. I simply want to state to the people it is my honor to represent my reasons for voting against this increase.

Increasing the debt limitation means that the Congress will have more money to spend and this money will come from borrowing which must be paid by increased taxes. For several years I have been calling attention to what might be taking place and it was time for us to stop all expenditures except those which were necessary and essential.

If you will check my record you will find that I have voted against billions and billions of dollars of expenditures and you will also find I have not voted for appropriations or expenditures of money that would total, over our receipts, in excess of our present debt limitation. The records will show that I have voted against many billions of dollars of appropriation which would have kept us under our present debt limitation of $275 billion.

I am of the opinion that we conservatives who do not believe in nonessential spending are still in the minority in Washington and in this Congress. Maybe we are wrong in our position. If I would vote for the increase in the debt limitation, I would simply be giving more money to that same group of spenders for them to spend, as they have been doing in the past, and that would force additional taxes to be put upon the people. Perhaps I am behind the times and in the minority, but I cannot see my way clear to furnish the money to those who want to increase taxes and continue unnecessary expenditures.

For the sake of the record, may I call to your attention some statements I made within the last few years on this subject which appear in the Congressional Record on the dates shown. This same position I have maintained since I have had the honor of representing the 17th District of Ohio in the Congress.

June 5, 1951:

Mr. Speaker, the American people are taking a terrific beating because of the extravagant Government spending which means higher and higher taxes for the already overburdened taxpayers of our Nation. * * * But there is a tremendous waste all along the line in our Federal Government, and it must stop. The strictest economy must be practiced by those handling public funds to halt unnecessary expenditures. * * * The time has long past for we who are elected by the taxpayers to take matters into our own hands and really do something about economy in our Government for the benefit of our country and our own constituents.

January 18, 1952:

Mr. Speaker, the condition of the world today demands that we spend enormous amounts for our defense program which means that in order to not have tremendous increases in taxes we must cut down and stop the unnecessary expenditures * * * we can only have what we can afford. There is no such thing as free money. * * * So the time has arrived for us to tighten our belts by being willing to do without that which we do not absolutely need.

June 27, 1951, during a debate on an appropriation bill, I stated, and I quote:

I am definitely opposed to any expenditures, either civilian or military, that are not necessary. * * * the taxpayers are heavily burdened and no expenditures should be made on any projects regardless of whether or not they are in our own districts, that are not essential and absolutely necessary to our war effort. Let us forget selfish interests and remember that unnecessary expenditures lead to increased debt and higher taxes and will destroy the freedoms for which our boys are fighting. Economy should begin at home.

March 18, 1952:

The Treasury Department estimates that the interest on the national debt alone, starting in the new fiscal year next July 1, will cost the taxpayers $6,150,000,000. This is nearly twice the cost of all Government expenditures 25 years ago. It is time for all of us to stop and think.

April 10, 1952, during the debate on the civil functions bill:

I feel the civil-works program should be subservient to the defense needs of the Nation and I do not believe we should begin any projects unless they are of an emergency nature during this critical period, and where it seems essential for tremendous expenditures to be made for the war effort.

April 28, 1952, during the debate on appropriation bills when the President was demanding that the Congress reinstate $6 billion which had been deducted from the President's budget, I said:

Congress should stand by its guns even in the face of the threat of the President "that he will keep the Congress in continuous session until January if we do not appropriate the money he wants."

May 26, 1952, during the debate on the foreign-aid bill I said and I quote:

The problem confronting us was whether or not we could afford to continue to send money to foreign countries without jeopardizing our own economic and military position.

BUDGET REDUCTION

February 16, 1954:

Mr. Speaker, the people of our country are recognizing that we are living up to our campaign promises. Figures show that Ohio's share of the last Truman budget would have been $4,951,800,000.

Under the Eisenhower budget, Ohio taxpayers would pay $4,139,360,000, a reduction of $812,440,000. This figures out to be $623 for every man, woman, and child in the State based on the 1950 census figures, under the Truman budget as compared with $521 under the Eisenhower budget.

This means, Mr. Speaker, that we are, as of now, making an average saving of $102 per individual per year. I am of the firm conviction that we can do better than this, but a saving of $102 for every man, woman, and child in the 17th Congressional District, as well as our State, certainly merits the consideration of all.

TAXES REDUCED

March 23, 1954:

Mr. Speaker, for the first time in more than 70 years a complete codification and revision of the Internal Revenue Code was passed by the House of Representatives. Savings to American taxpayers as a result of this measure, if it also passes the Senate, will amount to $1,300,000,000. Of this saving, $778 million is for individuals and the remainder, $612 million, is tax relief for business.

Space does not permit a complete review of the bill. It should be pointed out, however, that corporation taxes, originally scheduled by former Congresses to be reduced to 47 percent on April 1, are to be continued at the rate of 52 percent for another year, thus making it possible to reduce many personal taxes for the average person. Such matters as permitting additional deductions for medical expenses; allowing a $600 exemption to a widow or widower to pay for the care of children while the wage earner is employed; granting parents the right to a $600 exemption for an employed child under 18 and students over 18 so long as the parents provide 50 percent or more for the support of the child, giving foster children the same exemptions as blood-related or legally adopted children; exempting the first $1,200 of income of retired schoolteachers and public employees; and a host of other good and helpful provisions—all designed to correct inequities and benefit the average person.

The approval of the section easing taxes on retirement income credit means a saving of $125 million to all retired people, including schoolteachers, firemen, policemen, and civil servants. This allows them to exempt $1,200 of retirement income.

Also of much interest to me was approval of the section giving aid to farmers to the tune of about $10 million annually. The bill allows deductions up to 25 percent of farm income allowed for soil and water conservation expense. Another important saving will come to those who are entitled to include depreciation of machinery, including farm equipment, in their income-tax reports. This will mean a saving to individuals of about $75 million.

CREDIT WHERE CREDIT IS DUE

Since the Eisenhower administration took over, the total tax-cut program has brought savings to American taxpayers of $7,300,000,000. Of this amount individuals received an overall tax saving of $4,700,000,000. The tax savings surpass any previous total in the history of Congress.

EXCISE TAXES

The excise-tax-reduction bill passed by the House on March 10 saves taxpayers an additional $912 million annually. Under this bill, as approved by the House, the savings to the people in the several categories are estimated as follows:

Item	Former rate	New rate	Savings
	Percent	*Percent*	*Millions*
Telephone, telegraph, etc	25-15	10	$360
Transportation of people	15	10	95
Admissions	20	10	175
Club dues, initiation fees	20	10	19
Furs	20	10	20
Jewelry	20	10	100
Luggage, handbags	20	10	40
Cosmetics	20	10	55
Sporting goods	15	10	2
Mechanical pens, pencils, and lighters	15	10	4
Electric light bulbs	20	10	20
Cameras, films, etc	20	10	15
Pistols, firearms, ammunition	11	10	1
Leases of safety deposit boxes	20	10	5
Total savings to taxpayers			912

Yes; the Eisenhower administration is hewing closely to its pledge to the American people. There is economy in Government and there will be more. The irresponsible "tax and spend, spend and tax" days are gone. We are on the road to solvency again.

SOCIAL SECURITY

May 24, 1954:

Mr. Speaker, the Ways and Means Committee is now considering amendments to the social-security law. I have today asked them to carefully consider the provision making it mandatory for doctors, dentists, and farmers to participate in the social-security program.

In this free country of ours, I feel these people have the right to decide if they want to be covered by Federal social security, and not be forced by law to participate in a retirement program.

This is a free country. Let us keep it that way.

Today, I requested that the committee give serious consideration to protecting the retirement systems now in effect in Ohio, which include policemen, firemen, public officials, school teachers, and others. I firmly believe the Federal Government should not interfere with present retirement programs.

I am wondering what will happen to the teachers' retirement fund in Ohio. We do not want to jeopardize this group by forcing them under Federal regulations and denying them their rights under their own retirement system. This same applies to police and firemen, and other employees covered under State and municipal plans.

CONTROLS

June 9, 1953:

Mr. Speaker, I am of the firm conviction that there is not such a thing as standby controls that is not a serious threat to the economy of our country. Labor, farmers, industrialists, white-collared workers, and all of us would we working under a strain fearful that tomorrow would bring governmental controls. The people of this Nation have made us a great United States because of freedom of thought and freedom of activities and I join with many who have said the "less Federal controls the better off we will be." It is time we return to those basic principles of our great Republic and give our farmers, industrialists, and laboring men, and all other segments of our society, an opportunity to work and earn a living for themselves and their families without Federal interference.

PROTECT AMERICA

June 9, 1953:

Mr. Speaker, we must make a definite choice between American workers, including all segments of our society, and the workers of foreign countries as to whether or not we are going to allow products brought in from foreign countries to take from the American people their means of livelihood.

It seems to the writer that it is very unfair that we are taxing the American people and sending the money to foreign countries, as well as equipment, then allowing the products of that money and equipment to be brought into this country in competition with the production of the good American people.

We cannot continue, Mr. Speaker, to compete with low-wage areas of the world and maintain our standard of living.

June 11, 1954:

Mr. Speaker, I am in accord with the basic idea of reciprocal trade, but I am definitely opposed to any program that penalizes certain portions of our economy and advances others. It is unfair for certain industries and certain farm commodities to absorb the shock of imports and world trade. This legislation affects all Americans, the farmer, the workingman, and the consumer. In my opinion, it will determine whether we go forward to a higher standard of living with a higher standard of wages, or whether we will be forced into another depression or recession, which will mean lower standards of living for all of us. The passage of this bill simply means a continuance of the present foreign trade program and will close many industries, including the pottery, glassware, cycle industry and certainly it will do tremendous harm to the farmer and our economy in general. There is no possible relief for our people in this legislation. This bill comes to us under a gag rule, which allows no amendments and which means that we have to either accept or reject it as written by one committee of this Congress. Excepting a few instances, I am not in accord with such a procedure. I believe that this bill should be amended to allow Congress to retain the authority to establish certain standards of guidance, so the people, business, labor and agriculture will know what to expect. I believe this bill should be amended so that we can definitely establish a procedure for the peril-point provision to be operative. This will be a stop, or, at least a slow clause, which will help protect the American workers, farmers, and industrialists from low-wage-rate goods imported into the United States from foreign countries. The peril point, properly enforced, would prevent glassware, tableware, pottery, Russian furs, Red Chinese dried eggs, and other farm and industrial products from being sold in the United States cheaper than they could be produced here. We all believe in reciprocal trade, but let us make sure that it is reciprocal, taking into consideration the welfare and living standards of our own people.

VETERANS

June 17, 1953:

Mr. Speaker, as a veteran, and I feel that I am joined by at least 300 other veteran Members this legislative body, and practically all of those who are not veterans, when I say that is is certainly not the intent to, in any way, jeopardize the veterans' program. But, I do say, and I think I am joined by the others, that we want the redtape and inefficiency cut out of the Veterans' Administration so that the veterans can have the service and consideration that rightfully belongs to them. Many of us are of the opinion that money appropriated to the Veterans' Administration has not been used in an efficient manner and I am personally calling upon the Veterans' Administration to fire those individuals who are not giving courteous treatment, efficient service, and dollar value for dollar received.

I have many, many letters citing the discourteous treatment that our veterans are receiving and it is time that we have a house cleaning in the Veterans' Administration.

I have always supported, will support this legislation, and will continue to support legislation that will give to our veterans the treatment and consideration which they so rightfully deserve. The veterans have fought to retain our freedoms and certainly we should give them a sufficient amount of money so that they may receive medical and hospital treatment to which they are entitled.

PEACETIME DRAFT

June 14, 1954:

Mr. Speaker, on April 29 I introduced what is now known as House Resolution 521, the intent of which was to bring an end to peacetime draft and form the basis for a vounteer professional military establishment.

Peacetime draft, the present system of making up the strength of the Armed Forces, is inequitable, expensive, and inefficient. My resolution, Mr. Speaker, directs the Committee on Armed Services to make a full and complete investigation of the pay, allowances, and so-called fringe benefits endeavoring to work out a program calculated to attract volunteers to a military career. This investigation would have two principal objectives: First, to provide benefits for military personnel approximately equal to those which could be obtained in civilian life and, second, to attract career personnel into the Armed Forces in numbers sufficient to maintain them on a volunteer basis except in time of war. This procedure would provide our country with professional armed units which would be familiar with up-to-date and modern weapons that are being developed from year to year. In this way, those reaching service age would have the opportunity of selecting a military or civilian career. The program would save money, give adequate defense, and go a long way in preventing economic disruption.

M'GREGOR HIGHWAY BILL

From speech of Congressman Charles Halleck, majority floor leader, June 22, 1954:

Mr. Halleck. Mr. Speaker, on May 6, 1954, President Eisenhower signed the McGregor bill, officially designated as the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1954.

This legislation, enacted by the Republican 83d Congress, reflected the deep concern of the American people arising from the deficiencies in the Nation's road system.

Our people wanted a modern road system in keeping with the progress of a growing Nation. The Republican Congress and the administration has provided them with tools to help build that kind of a road system, one that will bring the Nation's antiquated highways up to the standards necessary.

As finally signed into law, the Federal Highway Act authorizes expenditures of $966 million in each of the fiscal years 1956 and 1957. This, for the first time in history, allocates for road construction in your home town and mine, on the farm-to-market roads our busy farmers travel daily, and on the highway between States so necessary for defense, almost all of the taxes collected from the people on gasoline and motor oils.

It gives all States a greater degree of administration control over their own roads included in their Federal-aid secondary system. They have the right under this law to specify the kind of planning, design, and construction for their secondary roads, including farm-to-market roads, which their own State highway departments consider necessary. This means there is no longer the unnecessary interference from the Federal Bureau of Public Roads. Under the highway construction law which the President has praised so highly, county, township, and State officials are now able to use their Federal funds on secondary roads without rigid adherence to Federal specifications which often in the past have prevented the construction of needed roads in many sections of our rural area in the Nation.

This legislation corrects a basic neglect on the part of previous administrations to recognize the fact that this is an expanding Nation, with a growing economy, and with a people moving forward to a busier and better life.

First. It authorizes the Secretary of Commerce to turn over to any State highway department on request full jurisdiction over the engineering and construction of farm-to-market roads.

Second. It improves and enlarges authorization for our national system of interstate highways, allowing our States on a 60-40 matching basis to complete the road nets vital to our security.

Third. Most important of all to many communities, the new Highway Construction Act provides for the transfer of funds between primary, secondary, and urban roads, providing the flexibility necessary to meet needs which may vary from State to State.

This is a truly modern Highway Construction Act, geared to the needs of our people. It is a workable system, containing provisions which many of us have known to be desirable for years. Our very security may be at stake; a fact President Eisenhower and the Republican Congress recognized at the outset.

Our people will recognize the improvements by comparing the Highway Act of 1952 to the McGregor Highway Act of 1954, now signed into law by our Republican President.

SAVE MONEY

July 6, 1954:

Mr. McGregor. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to have been the author of two bills considered "major bills of the Eisenhower administration." One, the Highway Act of 1954, referred to by Majority Floor Leader Congressman Charles Halleck on June 22, and H. R. 6342, known as the lease-purchase bill. The Government is now renting 31,000 post office buildings and 6,500 properties other than post offices throughout the country with no provision for eventually acquiring title to them. H. R. 6342 enables the Federal Government to acquire post offices and Federal buildings under lease-purchase contracts. When needed, buildings will be constructed to meet Government specifications but constructed by private enterprise. In other words, private funds can be used to construct buildings necessary for Government operations and the Government will pay for them in the way of rent and become final owners in a reasonable period of time. This legislation will allow private capital to become operative, will give employment and save millions of dollars for the taxpayers of our country. I thank the leadership of the Congress for assisting me in having this legislation passed.

BE SURE TO VOTE

July 6, 1954:

Mr. Speaker, a day of decision will be election day, November 2, 1954. It is the duty of every qualified voter to exercise his franchise and prove to the world that Americans value their right to take part directly in the election of Government officials and in the management and control of our Republic. The number of ballots cast will demonstrate to the world how much we value that privilege and will emphasize that the American form of government marches forward with determination, vigor, and strength. Everyone should carefully analyze the candidates to determine whether or not they believe in the philosophy of government that has made America a great nation. Every candidate should make known his position on the issues confronting us, and also make known his record. My record is public and I invite your investigation. We are winning the greatest battle of all time in preserving our form of government, restoring real stability in our domestic and foreign affairs, and giving us all what we hope and pray for, "a lasting peace." This program calls for outstanding leadership, honesty, integrity, careful planning, and judicial administering of the law.

Be sure and vote Tuesday, November 2.

Libby Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WESLEY A. D'EWART
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 7, 1954

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, one of the most important projects in the continuing development of the Columbia River is the Libby project in northwestern Montana. It is a project that not only will supply a large amount of electric power, but will also provide downstream benefits of great importance to the entire basin program. Recent developments, however, threaten this project.

In January 1951 the Government of the United States filed an application with the International Joint Commission under article IV of the Boundary Waters Treaty of January 11, 1909, requesting approval of the construction and operation of the proposed Libby dam at mile 212.8 on the Kootenai River in northwestern Montana, such approval being neceessary because the reservoir created by the dam would extend into Canada and result in inundation of land in the Province of British Columbia and possible injury to certain private interests in that Province. Construction of the Libby dam was authorized by the Congress in title II of Public Law 516, 81st Congress, approved May 17, 1950. The application was withdrawn by the United States in April 1953 pending further study of a site for the structure.

On or about May 22, 1954, the Government of the United States filed with the International Joint Commission a new application requesting approval of the proposed Libby Dam on the Kootenai River at a different site—mile 217.0—about 15 miles upstream from the town of Libby, Mont., and 4.2 miles upstream from the site of the proposed dam authorized by the act of May 17, 1950.

In all cases of this type coming before the Commission and considered and approved by the Commission since it was organized more than 42 years ago, the measure of the indemnity which the country building the dam is required to pay, has been the amount of injury or damage suffered in the other country, and invariably the indemnity has been paid in money. This procedure and practice has resulted in great benefits to Canada in certain important cases. No Canadian interests have ever been required by the Commission to pay indemnity in terms of electric power; nor has the Commission ever failed to approve an application filed by Canadian interests.

CANADIANS WANT POWER

When the United States filed the first Libby application in January 1951, however, an effort was made by Canadian interests to have the Commission estimate the downstream power benefits which the United States might obtain by building the Libby Dam entirely at its own expense, the purpose of such Canadian interests being to have the Commission determine the indemnity in terms of electric power by giving consideration to such downstream benefits.

In other words, the Canadians wanted the Commission to base the indemnity in the Libby case not on the injury sufferred in the upper country—Canada—as required by the treaty, but rather on the benefits which the United States might obtain by building the dam wholly at its own expense.

The intent of the Canadians in this regard became a matter of public knowledge when the Canadian plans were revealed at length in newspaper reports. In exchange for the inundation of some 40 miles of inaccessible river canyon, the Canadian Government was preparing to demand from the United States a block of power from the Libby project up to 25 percent of the total generating capacity. The Canadians were endeavoring to establish an entirely new principle, basing their claims not upon the damage done by inundation of this inaccessible region in the Dominion, but instead upon the benefits gained by the United States from the construction at our expense of the Libby Dam.

As a matter of fact, the Canadians have proposals for the construction of several powerplants on the Kootenai and Columbia Rivers within Canada, downstream from Libby, which would be greatly benefited by the construction of Libby and would be of doubtful economic feasibility without the benefits of the upstream storage and stream-flow regulation that Libby project would provide.

At the time I called attention to this unprecedented demand from our neighbors to the north, and pointed out that we should refuse to negotiate on any such terms and that the treaty under which the negotiations were authorized could not be interpreted to permit payment of indemnity on this basis or in anything other than money.

PROPOSED DIVERSION

This proposal has since been allowed to lie dormant, but it is apparent that it is not forgotten, and the Canadians have now introduced a new bargaining weapon.

At a recent meeting of the Joint Commission, the Canadian members handed the United States members a document entitled: "A Report of the Benefits to Canada of Diverting a Part of the Kootenai River Flow to the Columbia River."

Paragraph 2, part 1, of the study states that—

> Such a diversion is possible because of the proximity of the two streams at Canal Flats, at which point they are about 1 mile apart and occupy the same valley, but flow in opposite directions.

Paragraph 4 reads:

> The diversion of Kootenai River waters to the Columbia in the vicinity of the headwaters may be represented, insofar as head for development purposes is concerned, by an approximate gain of 572 feet for Canada and an equivalent loss for the United States, modified to the extent that head developments are economically possible in both countries.

A glance at the map will show that there is a possibility of accomplishing the plan herein described. The Kootenai, rising in Canada over 100 miles north of the boundary, flows for several miles past the headwaters of the Columbia, the Kootenai flowing south while the Columbia flows north. A diversion here would cut off the Kootenai, adding all of its waters to the Columbia, and leaving only an insignificant watershed for the present Kootenai as we know it in Montana.

This proposal is a serious threat to the Libby project, and as such is of great concern to the United States members of the International Joint Commission, and to all of us who are endeavoring to develop the great resources of the Columbia Basin. Every possible step must be taken immediately to protect the interests of the United States.

It appears that in spite of the great benefits given Canada in the past by the United States members of the International Joint Commission, the Canadian members, in the Libby reference, are not willing to deal in a like spirit of fairness and equity. They have indicated this, first, by their unwillingness to settle for damages incurred by Canada because of construction of Libby Dam, as provided under article VIII (3), in a historically fair and equitable payment for damages, and second, by the threat to divert the Kootenai River flow to the Columbia River in Canada, thus eliminating the possibility of developing the Libby site in Montana.

FIRM STAND NEEDED

The time has come for a firm stand by the United States members of the International Joint Commission, in dealing with Canada in matters concerning the Kootenai River and, I might add, any other references presently under consideration by the Commission.

In this connection, I want to commend the present Acting Chairman of the International Joint Commission, Mr. Roger B. McWhorter, for his diligent and untiring efforts in behalf of the interests of the United States. Mr. McWhorter has done an outstanding job for our country, even though he has not been able to devote full time to the Commission. He has been ably supported by the other member of the Commission, Eugene W. Weber.

The President has announced the appointment of Gov. Len Jordan, of Idaho, to fill the vacancy on the Commission caused by the resignation of former Senator A. O. Stanley. Governor Jordan will take up this important work as soon as his term as Governor of Idaho is completed.

Governor Jordan is an able and energetic man, well-versed in the problems of resource development and especially in the development of the Columbia Basin, of which Libby project is an important part. His appointment is a source of pleasure to me, and I am confident that he will prove himself to be a vigilant and capable defender of the United States in the development of boundary waters. Certainly, the conduct of the Canadians in the Libby reference and in the Waterton-Belly reference demonstrates how badly we need a full complement of energetic and aggressive United States members on this vital international Commission. With Governor Jordan, Mr. McWhorter and Mr. Weber, I am confident we can expect that our interests will be safeguarded.

Brownell Investigates Brownell

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1954

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to direct the attention of our colleagues to the following article by Joseph and Stewart Alsop, authors of the column Matter of Fact, which appeared in the July 4, 1954, issue of the New York Herald Tribune:

MATTER OF FACT

(By Joseph and Stewart Alsop)

BROWNELL INVESTIGATES BROWNELL

No less than three of the Justice Department's paid informers and witnesses are now being investigated for possible perjury, and by one same Justice Department that employs them.

In the circumstances, three is a very high figure. Since July 1, 1952, approximately 50 persons have received payment for serving as political informers or witnesses. But of this total, only 12 have received payments in excess of $1,500. Only these 12 qualify as fairly regular and professional practitioners of this highly peculiar and novel line of government work.

All three under investigation are in this select professional category. Thus a quarter of the political informers and witnesses the Justice Department has used most regularly are now being investigated as possible perjurers. And two of the three are the top earners.

No. 1 is Paul Crouch. Crouch is being investigated because of sharp conflicts in his own sworn testimony in Government trials. In the last 2 years, Crouch has received $9,675 from the Justice Department, or just under $420 a month. In one of his last jobs before taking up his new trade, Crouch was earning 85 cents an hour from an airline in Texas.

No. 2 is Manning Johnson. Johnson is being investigated because of his testimony in the loyalty case of Dr. Ralph Bunche, the eminent Negro leader and American official of the United Nations. In the last 2 years, the Justice Department has paid Johnson $9,096, or just under $400 a month. The department does not know of any other work Johnson was doing until 2 weeks ago, when he got a job as an insurance salesman.

The third man being investigated, Leonard Patterson, is another of Dr. Bunche's accusers. He stands about in the middle of the top 12 professionals, having received $3,775, or about $160 a month, during the last 2 years. When not informing or witnessing, Patterson drives a hack in New York.

These men and others like them are kept in a special group by the Justice Department under the label of "consultants to the Immigration and Naturalization Service." Some persons having this classification, notably Dr. Louis Budenz, accept no payment for their services. Those who take money are paid $25 per diem, plus certain additional per diem in lieu of subsistence, plus cost of transportation to the informing or witnessing point.

Payments are almost always made from the funds of the Immigration Service, even when the payee is appearing in court, for instance, for the Justice Department criminal division. Although the payments are not large, it can be seen from the three cases noted that they are often quite large enough to be meaningful to the recipients.

The practice of putting political informers on the Government payroll, which has been regularly denounced as pernicious and dangerous since the time of the Roman historian Tacitus, is a part of the Truman mess inherited by the Eisenhower administration. It is one part of the mess that has quite markedly not been cleaned up as yet. It raises certain obvious questions of great, long-range importance in any free society.

First, those of the informers and witnesses who mainly live by this new trade, or importantly supplement their incomes by it, have a clear financial interest in being used as much as possible. As ex-Communists, their characters are clearly suspect. What happens when they have told all they genuinely know, but still want to maintain their incomes from the Justice Department?

Second, Manning Johnson has testified under oath that he would lie under oath if directed to do so by his present employers. He said this to explain a false denial, also under oath, that he had become a Justice Department informer. Yet it is disquieting.

Again, Paul Crouch testified, with utmost particularity, in the current Smith Act trial in Philadelphia, about a certain David Davis whom he had specifically and repeatedly denied ever knowing in the second Bridges trial in 1949. If Crouch's first testimony was truthful, where did he get all the facts, and they probably were facts, that he poured out in his second testimony? In short, just what is the Jusitice Department relationship to these persons?

Finally, Attorney General Herbert Brownell's right hand is now, in effect, investigating what his left hand has been doing. Great departmental interests are fighting on the side of the left hand. Is this sound practice?

At the Crossroads

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT B. CHIPERFIELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 7, 1954

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wall Street Journal of July 6, 1954:

At the Crossroads

Reports from Washington yesterday tell of growing concern over the disunity the Red China issue is creating between America and its allies.

This disunity is underscored by Britain's apparent determination to support Communist China's admission to the United Nations and by what amounts to a demand from both the majority and minority leaders of the Senate that the United States withdraw from the United Naions if Red China is voted in.

If the Knowland and Johnson statements seem to some extreme, they nonetheless call attention to the likelihood that Red China will be admitted at least to the General Assembly, regardless of the United States attitude. And they raise the question the American people must answer: What does the United States do then? The more the people think about that question, the less likely are they to decide it emotionally, in a moment of pique.

This newspaper has long cautioned against an attitude that never, under any circumstances, should we recognize Red China or approve its entry into the United Nations. At the same time we believe the administration's opposition to admission in the circumstances now obtaining is correct. Indeed, the validity of this position has been strengthened—both on moral and practical grounds—by recent events.

The moral argument against admission is that Red China is an unreformed aggressor. Since Korea it has not modified, but intensified, its career of aggression. The practical argument against admission is that it would enhance the prestige and power of Communist China and so facilitate its further direct or indirect aggression. It is in the United States' interest to check that growth, not augment it.

Only in the event, not now foreseeable, that Red China demonstrates a change of conduct and intent should the United States sanction its becoming a member of the United Nations. Yet it is precisely in the absence of such demonstration—indeed, in the midst of Communist China's career of aggression—that America's allies and enemies will press for admission. If they succeed, the question becomes: Can the United States longer sanction the United Nations?

But the question is even larger than that. The United Nations in itself is an ineffective instrument, but many regional alliances, such as NATO, into which the United States has entered, are said to have their legal basis in the United Nations Charter. Withdrawal from the United Nations might require the reexamination, perhaps the renegotiation or abrogation, of those alliances.

Such a reexamination is inevitable in any case. For what the dispute over Red China means is that many nations with which this country is allied have policies toward communism that are radically different from our own. It is time to consider whether alliances so founded can achieve what the United States believes to be their purpose—defense against communism.

An assessment of that scope, however, requires time and cool heads. It would be unfortunate, and a mark of immaturity, if the United States were to pull out of the United Nations in a huff simply because we did not succeed in keeping Red China out.

The value of pronouncements like those of Senators Knowland and Johnson is that by alerting us to the decisions we will have to make, they give us time and calm in which to make wise decisions.

As Senator Johnson says, our basic foreign policy is at the crossroads. Because of our allies' attitudes, we may have to choose a road not lately traveled. But let us make sure we have examined all the roads before we do.

Adenauer to France

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 2, 1954

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following editorial from the Washington (D. C.) Evening Star of July 6, 1954:

Adenauer to France

Chancellor Konrad Adenauer of West Germany has minced no words in his radio interview calling upon France to stop dragging its feet and ratify the European Defense Community Treaty in its present form—without any new effort to modify it with amendments or reservations.

In taking this position, Dr. Adenauer has moved to head off maneuvers in Paris to effect a number of changes in the treaty before ratification. Pierre Mendes-France, the new French Premier, has indicated that he is in favor of such changes in order to make the EDC palatable to some of its bitterest foes in the National Assembly. But the West German leader has left no room for doubt that his Government is vigorously opposed to any action along that line.

There is good reason why Dr. Adenauer should feel this way. After all, the EDC has already been ratified by 4 of the 6 signatory powers—his own country, plus Belgium, the Netherlands and Luxembourg. To become an operating reality, the project now needs only French and Italian parliamentary approval, and if France—the originator of the idea—acts affirmatively, Italy will almost certainly follow suit. However, if the National Assembly in Paris votes for amendments at this stage, the treaty will be subject to protracted renegotiation of a kind that could make it a thoroughly dead letter.

Accordingly, with the support of Belgium, the Netherlands and Luxembourg, West Germany—speaking through Dr. Adenauer—has appealed to France to avoid modifications now and to lose no more time in ratifying the pact as it stands. In the Chancellor's words, it would be "completely unthinkable" to expose the project to possible extinction through French revisions that would require the reopening of exhaustive six-nation negotiations. As he has put it, the imperative thing is to complete ratification without further delay, leaving proposed changes to be discussed and acted upon later.

It may be that the French will turn a deaf ear to all this, but they have had a fair warning from Dr. Adenauer. For he has made clear that the West Germans are going to insist upon becoming fully sovereign and independent, at an early date, either as partners in the EDC and its supranational army or as nonmembers of that organization—a free people who would in the latter case inevitably have to develop the kind of national military establishment which France professes to fear but which would not exist if the European Defense Community were brought into being.

In these circumstances, especially because both Britain and the United States endorse Dr. Adenauer's view, the French would be well-advised to ratify the EDC this summer. Certainly, if they fail to do so, if they insist instead on basic changes requiring renegotiation, our own country will be obliged to reappraise and recast its policy in a way that will hardly enhance France's position vis-a-vis a West Germany that clearly deserves to become independent as a strong and essential ally of the free Atlantic world.

Ireland's Role in America's Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 7, 1954

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article from the current issue of Columbia, published and printed monthly by the Knights of Columbus:

Ireland's Role in America's Defense

High on the list of our difficulties with the Soviet Union is Communist insistence on maintaining a partitioned Germany and a partitioned Korea, with more of the same proposed for Indochina. Yet, if one of our statesmen urges Comrade Molotov, say, to suggest to his partners in crime that such partition is wrong and ought to be abandoned, the poor man invites an embarrassing experience. Comrade Molotov could righteously suggest that our gentleman go roll his hoop and come back after he had persuaded one of our prominent allies to abandon a partition which it perpetrated and maintains and which has existed much longer than the situations we deplore in Germany and Korea.

This is not to imply that Comrade Molotov weeps for the Irish, who are not among his best friends, but he would have at least a propaganda point, for Ireland has been partitioned since 1920 and the partition was hardened as recently as 1949. The story is long and, to those sensitive to injustice, depressing; perhaps even the little of it that can be told here will be enough to indicate that it affects and should interest more than the people of Ireland and those of Irish descent, wherever they may be.

After World War I, Ireland, being a country of literal-minded and unimaginative people given to taking statements of high idealism at their face value, applied the principle of self-determination of small nations to herself. Her elected deputies met in Dublin and set up a National Parliament. This Parliament elected a Goverment and Ireland became a Republic by the open and democratic processes which are so revered, in time of need, by the mighty of the earth.

Ireland's act of self-determination, however, was not applauded by Britain as an achievement of one of the war aims of the conflict in which hundreds of thousands of Irishmen had enlisted and suffered casualties twice those of Belgium. The British Government, instead, declared Ireland's elected Parliament an unlawful body and loosed the Black-and-Tan invasion and reign of terror. The Irish, it must be said, did not merely turn the other cheek; they got in a few licks themselves in the unequal fight.

Public opinion, especially in the United States, was deeply moved and American citizens sent generous aid to the embattled Irish Government. The British Cabinet perceived that a decision achieved by force alone would win such glory as a heavyweight prizefighter might gain by beating up a good, game bantamweight. Something had to be done—something that would have the appearance of fairness and even magnanimity. So the idea of the partition of Ireland—not a new notion—was dug up and dusted off and the late and lightly lamented Lloyd George, in the fall of 1920, proposed his "Bill for the Better Government of Ireland."

The effect of the bill was to cut off 6 of the 9 counties in the Province of Ulster, set the area up as "Northern Ireland" (although part of "Southern Ireland" is further north) and equip it with a separate Parliament. You wonder why all the Ulster counties were not taken into the partitioned area? Three were excluded from "Northern Ireland" because they could not be gerrymandered in the interests of the Tory Party, as have been the six kidnapped counties, to insure Tory and British control. The people of Ulster have never voted in favor of partition. The boundaries of the election districts within the six captive counties have been so thoughtfully drawn that in many constituencies a lesser number of Tory votes elects more representatives than a great number of Nationalist votes.

This devious and obviously contrived setup was analyzed in an article in Columbia, May 1949. Every "Northern Ireland" election since partition took place proves that Britain intended the separated area to remain under her rule and her occupation not for a short time (as her statesmen pretended to Ireland's national leaders) but always.

The result of this slick operation has been the development of a nice little, tight little Tory happy family with a vested interest in the maintenance of the status quo under which it controls the Government, the judiciary, the civil service, the police force, and enjoys the perquisites thereof. Among the inconviences suffered under the Tory regime by members of the Nationalist party are subjection to house search without warrant, arrest without charge, detention without trial, penalties for displaying the tricolor of Ireland or speaking the Irish language, denial of public housing facilities and of gainful employment. In brief, life behind the "Tory Curtain" in Ireland bears a certain resemblance to life behind the "Iron Curtain" elsewhere for those not of the ruling party.

There has been no time when the partition would be supported, in an honest plebiscite, by more than 2 of the 6 captive counties. After 29 years of this precarious partition the British Parliament, in 1949, took steps to sew up the bag tighter. Parliament passed the "Ireland Act," which provided that the consent of the Northern Parliament must be obtained before reunion of Ireland can take place. This stipulation is roughly equivalent to requiring the consent of a small band of successful burglars before permitting their victims to reclaim the property stolen from them. It effectively denies the people any voice or vote in the matter. And the same "Ireland Act," by the way, declares that Nortehern Ireland is British territory.

So much for partition as it affects the Irish people. Why should Americans—beyond those owning racial ties—be concerned? Here are some answers.

Irish ports and airfields control Atlantic shipping lanes. To defend Western civilization against attack, control of the Atlantic is essential. Ireland's harbors, modern airfields and troop-training areas comprise a great naval and military asset. Partition of a small nation by a stronger nation violates the principles which the United States has defended in two world wars. Interference by Great Britain in Irish affairs constitutes international aggression as defined by the United Nations pact and is, therefore, a menace to America's efforts for world peace.

Because of partition, Ireland's facilities were withheld from American troops in World War II. Although unofficially in sympathy with the Allied cause, official neutrality was the only course open to Ireland so long as British occupation troops continued to exercise control of any part of Irish soil in defiance of the Irish people. Neutrality was Ireland's protest against partition. For the same basic reason, Ireland has not signed the Atlantic Defense Pact since each signatory to the pact must accept the status quo for a period of 20 years, Ireland's signing would be acceptance of the principle of British ownership of Irish soil.

These are considerations which indicate that the enforced partition of Ireland is of serious import to the American people. Fortunately, there is available to us a means of giving effective expression to our views. What is known as the Fogarty discharge petition (H. R. 19) is now pending in the House of Representatives. The text of the bill, introduced by Congressman John E. Fogarty, of Rhode Island, follows:

"Whereas the House of Representatives, 65th Congress (1919), third session, by House Joint Resolution 357, duly passed a resolution declaring that the people of Ireland should have the right to determine the form of government under which they desired to live; and

"Whereas the maintenance of international peace and security requires settlement of the question of the unification of Ireland; and

"Whereas 26 of the 32 counties of Ireland have been successful in gaining international recognition for the Republic of Ireland which has, as its basic law, a constitution modeled upon our own American Constitution: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That it is the sense of this House of Representatives that the Republic of Ireland should embrace the entire territory of Ireland unless the clear majority of all the people of Ireland, in a free plebiscite, determine and declare to the contrary."

What is needed now—and promptly, since Congress will soon adjourn—is additional signatures by Members of Congress to have the petition taken from the Speaker's desk and brought before the House for its consideration. As noted here before, in another connection, many bills are presented to Congress and Congressmen are busy people; a bill of much merit may be overlooked in the shuffle. A short note from you to your Congressman, asking him to sign the Fogarty discharge petition will be of great value. A strong expression of American public opinion is needed to right a long-standing injustice and, by bringing about a united Ireland, to add another powerful element to the common defense against the Communist enemy.

Old Acheson Boy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1954

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, let us give credit where credit is due. I believe the following editorial from the July 2, 1954, issue of the Washington Evening Star to be most apropos:

OLD ACHESON BOY

The report that John E. Peurifoy, our Ambassador to Guatemala City, gave something more than a diplomatic shove to the ousted Arbenz government must have been read with considerable interest in Washington. For Mr. Peurifoy was a member of what Senator McCarthy used to call the "old Acheson crowd" in the State Department.

According to the Wisconsin Senator, this "crowd" was guilty of harboring Communists, shielding Communists, and in general selling out the interests of the United States to Communists at home and abroad. Mr. Peurifoy, Under Secretary of State in 1950, was specifically accused by Senator McCarthy of protecting a State Department employee with a known Communist background.

Something must have happened, however, to this dangerous leftwinger from South Carolina who got his start in Washington as an elevator operator some 18 years ago. For Mr. Peurifoy, according to the Associated Press, played a determined and important role in putting the skids under the pro-Communist Arbenz government, thereby cleaning out the only important Communist beachhead in this hemisphere.

It seems fair to suggest that when it comes down to the real business of fighting communism, this is considerably more of an achievement than anything which can honestly be credited to Senator McCarthy. Indeed, this line of thought might even be carried a step further. Perhaps the incident is one which suggests that we would be better off with more old Acheson boys like John Peurifoy and fewer Senator McCarthys.

Our Place in the U. N.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES R. HOWELL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 7, 1954

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the Newark (N. J.) News of Tuesday, July 6, substantially represents my position on the subject of withdrawing from the United Nations:

OUR PLACE IN U. N.

Even if he were capable of making good on it, Senator Knowland is premature with his threat to take the United States out of the United Nations if Communist China gets in.

The Senator undoubtedly is right in anticipating renewal of the move to seat the Peiping regime in the General Assembly this fall. He may be right in the belief that Britain and France are being strongly tempted to support the move. But it is too soon to concede that both these allies will abandon the moral position they have maintained.

Nor is it certain that if they were to do this it would guarantee a victory for the Reds. The effect of such a switch would be influential, but the United States has potent arguments and might still be able to prevent a two-thirds vote to substitute Peiping's agents for the Nationalist representatives of China.

The Chinese Reds still stand branded by U. N. as aggressors in Korea. They stand indicted for the black atrocities against our boys and those of our U. N. allies. They are still guilty of trying to shoot their way into the U. N. They have made no move to atone or to purge themselves. They cling to Korean territory and have refused to make a just peace.

It is hardly conceivable the world will accept them on this basis. Nevertheless, talk of quitting the U. N. if it should is ill-advised. It does not befit a mature people. As Senator Fulbright suggests, we can't pick up our marbles and refuse to play if denied the right to make the rules.

We destroyed the League of Nations by not going in, and the Second World War resulted. Now we cannot think of destroying the United Nations by pulling out and retiring into isolationism. That would be a repudiation of our world leadership and would constitute a bloodless victory for the Reds by destroying our influence in the world.

We oppose the seating of Communist China in the U. N. and will fight to keep it out. But if Peiping should be seated over our opposition, our place in the organization would be more than ever essential. And, with our help, the U. N. would still be a great instrument for peace.

954

on as
For
iated
rtant
pro-
ereby
unist

omes
com-
f an
hon-
In-
n be
ident
d be
s like
Mc-

L

VES

e fol-
N. J.)
tially
ect of
tions:

good
e with
out of
na gets

in an-
at the
ly this
f that
trongly
is too
es will
main-

do this
e Reds,
e influ-
ent ar-
event a
agents
China.
ded by
y stand
nst our
They are
vay into
o atone
to Ko-
make a

rld will
ess, talk
l is ill-
people.
n't pick
denied

s by not
resulted.
ing the
retiring
repudia-
uld con-
Reds by
rld.
mmunist
o keep it
ted over
organiza-
essential.
d still be

Appendix

Address by Hon. Carroll Reece, of Tennessee, at Gettysburg, Pa., July 4, 1954

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. S. WALTER STAUFFER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 8, 1954

Mr. STAUFFER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech delivered at Gettysburg, Pa., on July 4, 1954, by the Honorable CARROLL REECE, Member of Congress from the First District of Tennessee. I hope that the Members of this House will read this speech:

I

It is an honor and a high privilege to have the opportunity of being your guest at this celebration at Gettsburg today. It is an honor for three reasons:

First, Gettysburg and its traditions symbolize the highest and best in America's history.

Secondly, it is an honor to be in the home of a man who symbolizes the highest and best in America's national life, a man who is established "prosperity with peace" at home and who is contributing so much through his able leadership for "peace through strength" toward free government throughout the world, President Dwight Eisenhower.

Thirdly, it is a pleasure to be here in the district of a Member of Congress who symbolizes the highest and best in the American Congress, a man who has gained for himself a position of high respect and confidence of his colleague, my friend, the Honorable WALTER STAUFFER.

This is the 178th Fourth of July since the American Colonies declared their independence and the 91st since the battle of Gettysburg.

It has always seemed odd to me that most of the discussion of freedom in the United States seems to take place on the Fourth of July.

The rest of the year we seem to be busy with other matters.

The other day, looking through some papers on the subject of freedom and government, I ran across an old saying which goes something like this: "Only men who have freed themselves can be really free."

It seems to me that this is more than a play on words: it holds an important meaning for us today.

It means that free men who have always been free—who have never known bondage—are likely to place inferior considerations and advantages above the cardinal principle of freedom, while the man who has fought his way out of bondage the hard, bloody way will never allow any inferior considerations such as convenience, security, luxury, or even discouragement to tempt him into appeasing the tyrant or surrendering the most precious of his possessions—his personal liberty.

II

We Americans of the 20th century are about nine generations away from Bunker Hill and Valley Forge.

This is a long time—about 180 years.

A nation of people can do a lot of forgetting in that length of time.

The penalties of freedom—and there are very definite penalties to freedom—constitute a burden both spiritual and economic that many a tired and weary man is willing to lay down at the feet of an all powerful government in exchange for rest and security.

It is only when the terrific magnitude of the loss is realized that proper perspective can be reestablished in the mind of a free man who tired of his freedom and sold his birthright for a mess of potage.

In my opinion, one of the most important principles of behavior that could be instilled in American youth is to regard the heritage of freedom which he secured from his ancestors, not as his to give away, but as his to protect, develop, and pass on to his children, inviolate and intact.

III

Much has been said about America's obligation to help the world find its way out of the present darkness and we in America certainly have done our share, not only in providing moral support and inspiration under the leadership of President Eisenhower, but in providing material assistance.

The type of American help that is usually considered most important to the rest of the world is economic and military aid to our allies, and no one can gainsay that America has failed to do her share in providing economic and military aid to our allies; because, during the World War II period from the fiscal period of 1941 through 1945 we gave to foreign countries and peoples a total of $59,800,000,000 in American funds.

In the postwar period from 1946 through 1953 we have given in foreign aid in one form or another, another $59,200,000,000.

During the present year up until May 15, we have given another $4,200,000,000.

This makes a grand total of more than $119 billion we have given in aid to other countries.

In addition to this, we have extended yet thought the world banking and monetary funds another $3,300,000,000.

If interest on this money should be added, and we have had to borrow it all, it would make a grand total of $131 billion.

I'm not saying that this should not have been done, I'm pointing out what we have done in material aid to assist free government throughout the world. I think however all can agree the time has come for a reappraisal.

Although economic and military aid are important considerations, I believe there is another one that must be given first place—namely, infiltrating the enemy with the inspiration to become free.

A superb weapon in the hands of a man without moral determination and without a master plan for his own salvation is always an inferior weapon.

A mediocre weapon in the hands of a completely dedicated person becomes a superior weapon.

Let's take a look at this inspiration and see the stuff of which it is made.

To do this we should start in Convention Hall in Philadelphia at the time our Nation was founded.

Most events that take place in the world are repetitions of events that happened many times before, but the thing we are discussing that happened in Convention Hall in Philadelphia, when the final draft of the United States Constitution was approved, had never happened before at any time, anywhere in the history of man.

A free people had formed a government and had told that government what privileges and rights it was to have. It was established upon the principle of individual liberty and opportunity.

They said that no government has any proper authority over its citizens except what the citizens give to the government.

Their reason for this was extremely simple and absolutely beyond contradiction.

They said that all rights came from God and were vested in the individual; that government existed only for the convience and security of the citizen.

The Communist totalitarian concept that all power resides in the government and that the government relinquishes only certain rights to the people is repugnant to every provision of our Constitution and every instinct of the American people. The American people do not belong to a government. The American Government belongs to the people, and the people belong only to God.

Amazing as it may sound, no body of citizens had ever before assumed this revolutionary premise.

As a matter of fact, in Europe it would not have been a sensible statement because in most countries the kings and emperors claimed to be agents of God and claimed the right to interpret His intentions.

Therefore, for a European of the 18th century to say that all rights stemmed from God was practically the same as saying that all rights stemmed from the king, which completely canceled out the statement.

IV

When the Founding Fathers formulated the rights of the American citizens, they were not content to just declare them—they made certain of them.

They devised a scientific political system of divided powers that would insure the maximum degree of protection of personal liberties compatible with national defense.

They divided the powers between the Congress, the Executive, and the Supreme Court, any one of which could act as an effective check against conspiraces or attempted tyranny.

They also made it extremely difficult for the people to bring about any change in their Constitution.

This is probably as important as any other facet of our Government and shows tremendous wisdom on the part of the statesmen who laid down the conditions of self-government in America.

These men were not country bumpkins just because some of them wore buckskin clothes; they were superb scholars and experienced students of political science, and they had a clear insight into the past mistakes of the various societies that had attempted unsuccessfully to be free.

One of the most common of these mistakes, they knew, was the impulsive changing of the framework of Government to meet temporary aggravating problems.

But the Founding Fathers knew that no temporary problem, regardles of its severity, was worth the risk of making a mistake which could not be unmade.

They, therefore, required that any change in the United States Constitution would have to be made through a process that would involve a long period of time, with the knowledge that most suggested amendments would never become law because by the time for ratification, the problem would have disappeared.

▼

This simple story which most Americans know so well can be our key weapon against the Communist world.

Nothing equals the power of an idea, not even a hydrogen bomb.

The question is, how do ideas spread?

Most of them spread through the process of imitation—we see somebody we admire, we notice the principles on which he operates, and we try to become as he is.

We can't force other nations to be like America; we must make them want to.

And that can only be done by living in a manner that will assure their admiration and respect.

To do this we must maintain and exercise our freedom, regardless of the trials and tribulations that may beset us.

If we must fight, or maintain continuous readiness to fight, we must do so in the posture of freemen.

We must prove to the world that freedom is always the best policy.

There are in our midst men and influences working against this policy—some imported intellectual saboteurs and some homegrown varieties.

They tell us that individual liberty is old fashioned: They even tell us that God, the source of individual liberty, is old fashioned.

Against these sophistries we need moral courage and devotion to the fundamental principles of human freedom.

Any suggestion that involves the surrender of personal liberty is a bad suggestion, regardless of its merits.

The trick of the enemy is to get us to accept a false premise and then capitalize on our confusion.

We must never depart from the right premises of freedom.

Freedom is a natural state of man.

Freedom is not given to man by man: It is given to man by God.

Freedom is not the best policy just some of the time; it is the best policy all of the time.

This is the foundation for the kind of behavior that can touch off the world revolution against communism.

It is an American secret weapon, first demonstrated on July 4, 1776.

We must continue to demonstrate it in such a way that it will reach and inspire the rest of the civilized world.

The war against communism may be fought on the battlefield, but it will be won or lost in the hearts of men.

Reciprocal Trade—Oklahoma With Arizona

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 8, 1954

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, a week ago I addressed the House of Representatives on the subject of Oklahoma—My Home.

What I had to say then had to do with headlines in the press which blazoned, "Film Musical Oklahoma To Be Made In Arizona." In this talk, I noted the decision of producer Arthur Hornblower to put his company on location in Arizona because, in his own words:

> It (Oklahoma) doesn't look enough like the Oklahoma of 1907 any more. It has too many oil wells, airplanes, and people.

In the opinion of many, my reasoning completely demolished the Hornblower argument.

The Hornblower incident is only one in a series of incidents in which Hollywood has told both the States and the United States "where to head in."

I propose to reverse this process. I propose to give some suggestions to Hollywood from Washington.

Scores of Hollywood stars have portrayed Congressmen, Congresswomen, and Senators. Other scores of Hollywood stars have taken the roles of Presidents. President Andrew Jackson has been a favorite film subject. President Truman was a voice on the screen in Call Me Madame. Actor-producer-director Robert Montgomery gives advice to President Eisenhower.

It is not amiss, therefore, for me to give advice to Mr. Hornblower.

Back in 1899, the great playwright, Augustus Thomas, wrote a stage play. One of the young actors who was a member of the original cast of the Chicago premiere of that play was Mr. Lionel Barrymore who took the part of Lieutenant Young, 11th United States Cavalry.

The name of that play was Arizona.

My advice to producer Hornblower is that he should reissue the play Arizona as a motion picture.

My further advice to Mr. Hornblower is that he should pass up the State of Arizona as a site for filming this production; and that he, instead, choose my State, Oklahoma.

My reasons? Arizona doesn't look enough like the Arizona of 1899. It has too many cities, too much irrigation, and not enough cactus.

Such a step would be true reciprocity. The Oklahoma and Arizona delegations in Congress would be satisfied. Perhaps, it would even meet the approval of the Committee on Intergovernmental Relations.

Mr. Speaker, if Hollywood can whimsically produce Oklahoma in Arizona, I see no possible objection to Hollywood's further exercising its whim by producing Arizona in Oklahoma.

Withdrawing of Diplomatic Recognition of Government of the Polish Peoples Republic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TIMOTHY P. SHEEHAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 2, 1954

Mr. SHEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, this week marks the beginning of the 10th year of our recognition of the new Polish Provisional Government of National Unity set up by the Soviets, about which the citizens of the United States were officially notified at 7 p. m., July 5, 1945.

In announcing this diplomatic recognition, President Truman stated that the establishment of this provisional government in Poland was an important and positive step in fulfilling the decisions regarding Poland reached at Yalta and signed on February 11, 1945. The President had received written confirmation from Mr. Edward Osobka-Morawski, Prime Minister of the Polish Provisional Government, that the new Polish Government had recognized the decisions of the Yalta Conference on the Polish question, and would hold free elections in Poland. Just so that there may be no misinterpretation of President Truman's position on this matter, the following is the letter written by Mr. Truman to the Polish Prime Minister:

His Excellency EDWARD OSOBKA-MORAWSKI,
Prime Minister of the Polish Provisional Goverment of National Unity, Warsaw, Poland:

I am gratified to learn from your message to me transmitted through your Ambassador at Moscow that the Polish Provisional Government of National Unity was established on June 28, 1945, in conformity with the Crimea decision. I am pleased to note that Your Excellency's Government has recognized in their entirety the decisions of the Crimea Conference on the Polish question thereby confirming the intention of Your Excellency's Government to proceed with the holding of elections in Poland in conformity with the provisions of the Crimea decisions. The Government of the United States fo America therefore on the basis of its assurances given at the Crimea Conference hereby establishes diplomatic relations with the Polish Provisional Government of National Unity. I have chosen as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Poland Mr. Arthur Bliss Lane, whom I have instructed to proceed to Warsaw as soon as possible.

Accept, Excellency, the assurances of my highest consideration.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

On pages 9 and 10 of the original protocol of the proceedings of the Crimea Conference, the following statements were agreed to regarding Poland:

> A new situation has been created in Poland as a result of her complete liberation by the Red army. This calls for the establishment of a Polish Provisional Government which can be more broadly based than was possible before the recent liberation of the Western part of Poland. The Provisional Government which is now functioning in Poland should therefore be reorganized on a broader democratic basis with the inclusion of democratic leaders from Poland itself and from Poles abroad. This new Government should then be called the Polish Provisional Government of National Unity.
>
> M. Molotov, Mr. Harriman, and Sir A. Clark Kerr are authorized as a commission to consult in the first instance in Moscow with members of the present Provisional Government and with other Polish democratic leaders from within Poland and from abroad, with a view to the reorganization of the present Government along the above lines. This Polish Provisional Government of National Unity shall be pledged to the holding of free and unfettered elections as soon as possible on the basis of universal suffrage and secret ballot. In these elections all democratic and anti-Nazi parties shall have the right to take part and to put forward candidates.
>
> When a Polish Provisional Government of National Unity has been properly formed in conformity with the above, the Government of the U. S. S. R., which now maintains diplomatic relations with the present Provisional Government of Poland, and the Government of the United Kingdom and the

Government of the United States of America will establish diplomatic relations with the new Polish Provisional Government of National Unity, and will exchange ambassadors by whose reports the respective governments will be kept informed about the situation in Poland.

It would be redundant for me to detail here the Communist-controlled Polish Provisional Government's complete disregard of the terms of the Yalta agreement. It is common knowledge to all of us that the new Polish Provisional Government was not organized on a "broader basis with the inclusion of democratic leaders from Poland itself and from Poles abroad." The Soviet masters did not maintain their pledge to hold "free and unfettered elections as soon as possible on the basis of universal suffrage and secret ballot."

As in the case of our diplomatic recognition of the U. S. S. R. by President Roosevelt in 1933, the Communists again failed to keep their word and violated their pledged agreements.

I believe it is necessary that we in the United States delay no longer to prove to the world that our sense of national morality and righteousness precludes our further negotiating or entering into agreements with governments which have so consistently and flagrantly failed to honor and respect the terms of their every agreement.

We must show the people of Russia and the people of Poland that we do not respect the Communist masters who have enslaved them, and it seems that the only way we can positively show our moral strength is by withdrawing our diplomatic recognition of those regimes whose actions have so clearly shown the worthlessness of their written or spoken word.

In America we have millions of people who have migrated from Poland, and many more millions of their direct descendants who hope and pray for the day when Poland will again be a free nation and its yoke of Soviet tyranny will be lifted. We can bolster immeasurably the hope and confidence of these loyal fellow citizens in the ultimate freedom of Poland by withdrawing our diplomatic recognition from the Communist Government of Poland, now officially termed the Government of the Polish Peoples Republic, which has failed to honor the expressed terms and conditions upon which United States recognition was originally based.

Accordingly, I have today introduced the following resolution:

Whereas the present Government of the Polish Peoples Republic has failed to live up to its expressed agreements on which the United States based its diplomatic recognition of that Government, then known as the Polish Provisional Government of National Unity, on July 5, 1945; and

Whereas the present Government of the Polish Peoples Republic is in no way representative of the majority of the Polish people or the democratic government envisaged in the decisions of the Crimea Conference on the Polish question: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the House of Representatives of the United States that the Government of the United States of America should withdraw forthwith its diplomatic recognition of the present Government of the Polish Peoples Republic.

The Informers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STUYVESANT WAINWRIGHT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1954

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, the first step to a police state is to set up a spy system. That spy system must supply the regime with adequate information on a man's personal life, his thoughts, and his political activities. This is one of the most viscious evils to arise in the Soviet orbit, her satellites, as well as in the Fascist—Nazi nations of the past decade.

Today's New York Times has a clear and concise estimate of the situation, striking at the evils of an "informer" system. I present it, Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of the Members who may have missed it in today's paper:

THE INFORMERS

On the first page of this newspaper yesterday a dispatch from Washington began: "The cult of the paid informer is growing in the Federal Government." The process of informing is—as Justice Holmes once said of the not-unrelated art of wiretapping—a "dirty business." The tatletale of childhood becomes in adult life the gossip, the keyhole-peeper, the tipster, the informer, the agent. Paid or unpaid, it is a distasteful occupation, and one that does not become well a free society. It implies accusation without proof, defamation without responsibility. Yet there always have been and there always will be informers, and it is not too much to say that no police agency on earth has ever operated successfully without them.

The informer who notifies the Treasury Department that Mrs. X is trying to smuggle from Europe a $10,000 diamond ring may be interested in enforcement of the customs laws only to the extent that he receives a share of the fine as his reward, but he is actually performing a public service. The informer who gives the Bureau of Internal Revenue a lead that uncovers the effort of Mr. X to cheat the Government out of $100,000 in income taxes may be doing so only to vent his spite against Mr. X; but it is the Government and therefore the people of the United States who are the gainers.

The real problem of the informer arises not in this sphere but rather when questions a man's personal life, of his thoughts, opinions or political activities are under scrutiny. Here is where employment of the informer may become dangerous to individual rights and liberties. The informer smacks of the police state; and we think that most Americans instinctively shrink from his use. It is reasonable to suppose that the professional, paid informers, such as those on the rolls of the Justice Department, who can be said to make their living at this game, feel the necessity of continuing to produce if they are not to give up their lucrative occupation.

Informers undoubtedly have their uses in uncovering elements of the Communist conspiracy; but it is essential that they be employed with the greatest judgment and discretion. Some informers have been caught in direct contradictions of testimony that smell strongly of perjury. If the Justice Department feels it essential to use informers in the conduct of its anti-Communist prosecutions under the law, it has the unmistakable duty to follow up relentlessly any indication that they may not be telling the truth. As the law-enforcement agency of our Government, the Justice Department has a primary obligation to maintain its own integrity and that of its agents.

Checking on the CIA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 8, 1954

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit two additional editorials dealing with the proposed survey of our foreign intelligence activities by the Hoover Commission. One editorial entitled "Checking up on the CIA," is from the Washington Evening Star of July 7. The other entitled "Protection Against Democracy," is from the Boston Herald of July 6:

[From the Washington Evening Star of July 7, 1954]

CHECKING UP ON THE CIA

The decision of the Hoover Commission to review the "structure and administration" of the Central Intelligence Agency through a task force headed by Gen. Mark W. Clark offers a reasonable and promising way in which to obtain an objective check on this sensitive Government operation.

Since its creation, the CIA has operated without the normal scrutiny of either Congress or the public. Its appropriations have been scattered through supply bills in such a way as to keep secret the amount of funds made available. Not even the number of its employees has been publicly stated. The congressional appropriations committees have contented themselves with only a nominal breakdown on needs of the agency. It is understandable that this should be so for an agency that operates in the shadowy zone of international intelligence.

Nevertheless, as a Government agency supported by public funds and, in a sense, representing the American people and an area of their interest in world affairs, the CIA should not be wholly and permanently removed from some form of inspection or cross-checking. To attempt this through a congressional committee inquiry, with public hearings, would create obvious risks. The CIA deals, for example, with the intelligence agencies of 30 to 40 friendly governments, but on a basis that the information, the identity of agents and even the identity of the governments will not be talked about openly. Certainly if the workings of the CIA were to be paraded through a set of public hearings its effectiveness would be seriously endangered, if not destroyed.

The Hoover Commission has not, of course, operated in such fashion. And in this case, the former President has taken particular pains to select as the director of his task force a professional military man who has had long and intimate acquaintance with all the problems of espionage, intelligence, and security. In accepting the assignment, General Clark said that he felt the job is "important to the welfare of the country." Mr. Hoover's announcement that the remaining personnel of the task force will be named later indicates that General Clark probably will have a free hand in selecting people who are qualified to appreciate the uniquely delicate nature of this particular job. Allen W. Dulles, CIA director, says that he welcomes the inquiry; it is being launched under favorable auspices and the results should be constructive.

[From the Boston Herald of July 6, 1954]

PROTECTION AGAINST DEMOCRACY

The Central Intelligence Agency's many defenses, its high walls of secrecy, make it vulnerable—vulnerable to democracy.

The CIA simply cannot open its doors to examination by the people. It cannot defend itself from political attack or justify its personnel, policies, or expenses in the press or on the floor of Congress.

While the Atomic Energy Commission must keep some technical secrets, the CIA must keep just about everything secret. The revelation that Oppenheimer worked for the AEC did not give away any secrets but the mere identifying of people as CIA personnel could destroy our whole intelligence operation.

Senator McCarthy has declared that there are Communists in the CIA. He is properly alarmed, as are many Americans, at the thought. If the CIA has been infiltrated we have suffered a major defeat in this not-so-cold war.

But there is no way to examine the CIA in public to find out if his charges are true without undermining the Central Intelligence Agency more than the Communists could.

Perhaps there are Commies in the CIA. But perhaps they are on our side, counter-counter agents, for example. The mysterious world of international intrigue is not easily revealed. And if it were we would be the loser for we must certainly be dealing with Reds somewhere, buying information or people.

The operations of a global intelligence agency can hardly be a businesslike operation. Duplication in some areas must be maintained. Some projects cannot be closely coordinated or supervised. Gambles are many in terms of people, their reliability and survivability.

We have been very fortunate in having men like Gen. Walter Bedell Smith, a tight, tought administrator, and Allen Dulles, an experienced intelligence operator, at the head of this Agency. There are many indications they have run a tight shop.

Still, it is against our philosophy of government in the United States to have any agency operate without supervision. In addition to administrative control centered in the Presidency, we need other checks on the CIA.

Perhaps one can be a special joint congressional committee, like the Atomic Energy Committee, to act as a watchdog. Perhaps we can afford to take that chance, hoping that we get Senators and Representatives on it who can put country before politics and perform that almost impossible congressional trick of keeping the mouth shut.

Certainly one fine solution is the special Hoover task force which is going to study the CIA. Gen. Mark Clark, a fine officer of broad experience and high integrity, has accepted the chairmanship of that task force. That is very good news.

Perhaps we have found the way to keep democratic control of the Central Intelligence Agency without letting democracy destroy it. We hope so, for the CIA is the first line of defense to the free world. Unless we know what the enemy is going to do in an atomic war, before he does it, we may never have a chance to defend ourselves.

Lovre Stood Firm

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. CARL ANDERSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 8, 1954

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, in my capacity as chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for Agriculture, I have had occasion for the past years to observe the fine work of my neighbor to the west, the Honorable Harold Lovre, of South Dakota. The attached editorial from the Huronite and Daily Plainsman of Huron, S. Dak., justly compliments Congressman Lovre upon his hard and consistent fight in behalf of agriculture. We need more men like Harold Lovre in Congress. The editorial, dated Sunday, July 4, reads as follows:

LOVRE STOOD FIRM

South Dakota's Representative Harold O. Lovre not only stood firmly in favor of 90 percent of parity price supports the past week but forthrightly spoke against his own administration's flexible support plan and fought it vigorously. South Dakotans will remember and applaud Lovre.

He pointed out that he had campaigned in favor of 90 percent parity, just as did Eisenhower. The difference was, Lovre kept his campaign promise.

Lovre also cited the 13 percent drop in farm income the past 2 years, as reported by the Joint Committee on Economic Reports.

The undoubted purpose of the new so-called flexible plan is to lower prices. The theory is that this will discourage production. As this newspaper has outlined with statistical detail several times, that theory is entirely false. When prices go down, all a farmer of a basic crop can do is raise more bushels. That's the history of it as Department of Agriculture yearly statistics prove clearly.

The other thing lower prices probably will do is to force some farmers out of farming.

Lower prices and fewer farmers can hardly be looked upon as a means of strengthening the national economy.

Pointing Up the Charge of Mr. Nixon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH F. HOLT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 1, 1954

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I should like to insert into the Record an editorial which appeared in the Los Angeles Times on July 2, 1954:

POINTING UP THE CHARGE OF MR. NIXON

The Democrats in Washington have been complaining bitterly at the remark by Vice President Nixon in his recent Milwaukee speech that the Democratic Party is a "hopeless prisoner" of two types of individuals: One, men without principle, and the other, fanatics devoted to socialism.

But Senator Homer Capehart, Republican, of Indiana, seems to have found proof of the "men without principle" part of the charge in the career of Clyde L. Powell, ousted last April as director of the rental-property mortgage division of the Federal Housing Administration.

When Powell applied for his Government post he signed a declaration that he had never been arrested or convicted. When questioned before the committee regarding his activities, Powell took refuge behind the fifth amendment, saying that his testimony might tend to incriminate him; and he declined comment on a showing that the FBI had reported numerous arrests on charges including larceny, embezzlement, and bad checks.

Senator Capehart also produced evidence that two FBI reports on Powell, detailing his record, had been removed from the files of FHA in 1941 and in 1948.

Powell's lawyer did not help his client with the public by telling the committee it had no right to try Powell and that Powell was under no requirement to help the committee prove anything. There may be no requirement but there is an obligation upon every citizen to assist Congress in performing its duties, by giving it information it requests.

The committee, of course, is not trying Powell or anybody else, or pretending to. But if Powell cannot, for fear of incrimination, tell the committee about the workings of the FHA, he furnishes ground for suspicion out of his own lips.

As for another Democratic complaint against the Vice President, that he referred to the Truman-Acheson foreign policy blunders and endangered a bipartisan foreign policy, President Eisenhower in his press conference gave a blanket O. K. to the Milwaukee utterances. And he reminded the questioners that the Vice President, as an elected official, has a degree of independence not possessed by members of the Cabinet and does not have to clear his foreign policy speeches with Secretary Dulles.

If the Democrats are going to base their foreign policy attitude on whether kind words are spoken of them and not on the national effect of the policy, they are taking a shortsighted course.

Farm Purchasing Power and Automotive Production

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN LESINSKI, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 2, 1954

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 9680) to provide for continued price support for agricultural products; to augment the marketing and disposal of such products; to provide for greater stability in the products of agriculture, and for other purposes.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Chairman, in preparing to vote on the farm bill, the House has been under strong pressure from the administration to reduce substantially the level at which the Government will support farm prices. It is the position of this administration that the program which has been in effect since World War II to assure a fair return to the farmer and to maintain the farmer's purchasing power and standard of living is costing us too much money and that we should therefore reduce these benefits.

This may sound good in some of our urban communities where the people are being told that lower support prices for the farmer will mean lower food prices in the stores, and perhaps lower taxes. Neither of these things is necessarily true.

As a matter of fact, farm prices have been falling steadily at the farm level ever since this administration took office. Farm income has followed suit. Farmers are getting, on the average, about 10 percent less purchasing power from the crops they sell than they did all through 1952 or for any year since the war. At the same time, food prices to the consumer are at or near record levels and have not followed farm prices downward. In other words, when prices go up at the farm level they also go up in the grocery store, but when they go down at the farm level—and they have been down substantially ever since the end of 1952—they do not come down in the grocery stores. High food prices are not the farmer's fault. He is not getting them. He is getting mighty little for the crops he raises in comparison to the prices he has to pay for the things he buys and that is why the thing we call the parity ratio—that is, the relationship between what the farmer gets for his crops and his cost of operation and cost of living—is at only about 91 percent. It went below 100 percent right after the Republicans came into power and it has steadily fallen ever since so that all through 1953 and so far in 1954 it has been down around 91 or 92 percent. If we lower farm supports and reduce the degree of protection we give the farmer against bankruptcy prices, the evidence shows that it will hurt the farmer terribly without necessarily helping the consumer at all.

KEEPING THE FACTS COVERED UP ON PRICE SPREADS

Here we have voted down a proposal from those of us on the Democratic side to incorporate in this bill provision for an investigation of the spread—the steadily increasing spread—between farm prices and consumer prices on such things as milk, and so on. Apparently the Republicans do not want the public to know where these extra profits go.

Now, why should I, Mr. Chairman, representing an urban district and not a farm district, stick my neck out by voting for higher support prices for the farmer than this administration recommends? Of course, I recognize that attempts will be made in my district to use this vote in an attempt to prove that I am against the consumer, which anyone in my district who knows anything about my record would certainly recognize as being ridiculous. On the other hand, it is supposed to be smart politics not to stick your neck out at any time, and particularly on an issue which is not familiar to the people in your own district.

In my case, however, I think the people of my district want me to vote for those things which I think will best serve them and their economic welfare. And just from looking at the record of automobile and truck and tractor production and sales, it is obvious to me that I would be very poorly serving my district—the greatest automotive center of the world—if I were to vote here for a further decline in farm income.

The record shows, Mr. Chairman, that since early in 1953 car and truck production has followed downward pretty much directly in line with the downward trend of farm prices and the parity ratio.

Everyone in the Detroit-Wayne County area knows, Mr. Chairman, that the farmers are among our best customers. While we would all like to see lower food prices in the grocery stores—and, I repeat, there is no evidence that lower price supports for the farmer as provided in this bill will mean lower food prices in the grocery stores—we do not want to see the farmer pushed to the wall and driven out of the market for the things that we produce in our automobile and truck and tractor factories. I am alarmed at the extent of unemployment in our area now. I am fearful that a further reduction in farm income will mean more unemployment in Wayne County. I cannot vote for a measure deliberately intended to reduce the farmer's return for his crops at a time when the farmer is already in a desperate squeeze.

Therefore, I have no choice in representing the interests of my constituents and their economic welfare and their jobs and their incomes but to support the recommendations of the overwhelming majority of both the Republicans and the Democrats on the House Committee on Agriculture. The members of that committee are close to the problems of the farmer and aware of the farmer's needs. When they tell me that the farm economy is jeopardized and that a reduction in price supports will further depress farm income, I will follow their recommendation on this bill.

The Arab-Israeli Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 8, 1954

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a copy of a letter addressed to our Secretary of State, Mr. Dulles, by the United Zionists-Revisionists of America, regarding this great concern over the Arab-Israeli problem. This letter, which follows, asks our State Department to reconsider and reevaluate the entire American policy in the Middle East. The points of argument in favor of such reconsideration and reevaluation are of sufficient interest to warrant a reappraisal of our foreign policy in this area of the globe.

The letter follows:

UNITED ZIONISTS-REVISIONISTS
OF AMERICA,
New York, N. Y.

Mr. JOHN FOSTER DULLES,
Secretary of State,
State Department,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: It is with satisfaction that we learned of your assurance, given to the Israeli Ambassador, that the United States Government values highly the friendship of the State of Israel. As Americans and Zionists, we firmly believe that this friendship is mutual because it is rooted deeply in the hearts of the peoples, and that it is in keeping with their best interests. At this time, when the United States is undertaking to stem the tide of worldwide Communist imperialism, it is reassuring to know that our Government views Israel as a nation whose position is of importance in the alinement of forces defending the freedom and peace of the world.

However, we deem it our duty to convey to you the profound uneasiness engendered by the recent policy of the State Department toward the Arab States. Specifically, we refer to the supplying of arms to Iraq and the attempt to win the cooperation of the other Arab States with the objective of building a defense-line against Soviet aspirations in the Middle East. We must view such a policy as highly illusory and fraught with danger to the security of the United States and its democratic allies.

The record of the Arab States, in war and peace, indicates that they can hardly be considered of real military and political value. However we might wish it otherwise, they cannot be trusted as allies or friends in time of need. These States are not guided by the same democratic principles and way of life which we of the Western World cherish, and which are our main strength in the struggle against totalitarian communism. The danger of a Communist thrust into the Middle East is so imminent that we cannot afford to waste our strength and resources on building defense positions in Arab quicksand.

May we remind you, Mr. Secretary, that during the last war with the Nazi enemy, the Arab States had their sympathies and hopes in Hitler's camp.

Iraq virtually stabbed Great Britain in the back in her most perilous hour, despite the fact that Great Britain had been her benefactor and ally, and it was Great Britain which fought the Ottoman Empire, freed Iraq and gave her independence.

When Mussolini's Fascist hordes invaded Egypt, together with the Nazi Panzer divisions, the Egyptian Government did not lift a finger to defend that country's independence and to join the Allies in the fight against the totalitarian onslaught. Instead, they conspired with the invaders and the British were compelled to use force to prevent betrayal.

The spokesman for Arab nationalism, the former mufti of Jesusalem, although appeased and coddled by Great Britain, made his wartime headquarters in Berlin, from whence he sought to rally the Arab world to oppose the Allies and support Hitler. Today, the mufti is again active in the Arab countries, unleashing his hatred against the Western World.

There is no firm and determined anti-Communist and proallied attitude on the part of the quickly shifting Arab regimes. There is no crystalized public opinion, no democratic tradition, no realization of the impending danger, no feeling of solidarity with the West. To place reliance upon the Arab States is like leaning on a broken rod.

We realize the need for the United States to build up a dam against the wave of communism. It would be, however, highly unreasonable to expect that the Arab States can be cemented into such a dam. The martial record of the Arab armies in recent years proves conclusively that their military value is of very slight consequence.

In their onslaught on the hastily improvised, poorly armed and untrained Israeli defense forces in 1948, the Arab aggressors—superior in arms and training, and outnumbering them 5 to 1—displayed such weakness that there is every reason to believe that no amount of American weapons will be able to convert them, within the foreseeable future, into a military force of real value.

In the final analysis, the strength of an army lies not only in its equipment, but in the purposefulness and integrity of its leadership, and in the spirit, devotion and determination of each soldier to fight for his cause. The Arab military machinery obviously does not possess these qualities. Why, then, waste good American money and valuable military equipment on vain attempts to achieve an impossible goal?

You will remember that President Eisenhower, in his speech before the Committee for Economic Development, in Washington, on May 20, uttered a profound truth when he stated: "Now, everyone knows that no security force is any good at all unless it is one of fine morale, belief, and conviction."

There can hardly be any doubt that for many years to come no Arab army, no matter how magnificently equipped, would be able to withstand, or even to delay, an attack by Communist troops. Any Arab State so attacked will be quickly overrun, and American equipment will inevitably fall into the hands of the enemy.

May we suggest, Mr. Secretary, that our State Department stop appeasing the unappeasable Arab politicians, whose power is extremely evanescent, anyway. We ask you to reconsider the entire American policy in the Middle East with a view to establishing a realistic defensible position there against Soviet encroachment.

In addition to considerations of spiritual kinship between the mightiest and smallest democracies of the free world, we beg you to take into account also the realistic value of Israel's industrial potential in peace and war.

Israel, with its young, valiant army, its fervent devotion to the ideals of democracy and freedom, should be integrated, not merely with words, but with deeds, into the ranks of the allies to defend the Middle East against a potential Soviet attack.

An Israeli military force of 10 to 12 divisions, if properly outfitted with the most recent developments in the military field, can be America's most effective first line of defense in that region.

It is to America's best advantage to take into account the industrial and technological potential of the State of Israel. In World War II, the then embryonic industry of that country played a decisive role in the defense of the eastern Mediterranean, and the continuing growth of Israeli industry is a factor which cannot be overlooked.

In the ideological struggle between the free and the enslaved world, the voice of Zion, in the land of the Bible, the cradle of religion, which gave the democratic world the human values by which we are inspired and live, will add strength to the democratic camp in its fight for the dignity of man, for justice and liberty.

Respectfully yours,

LEO WOLFSON,
President.
JOSEPH L. BEDER,
Executive Chairman.

The United Nations As an Instrument for the Maintenance of Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY

OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 8, 1954

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement by Mr. Ghulam Husain, of Pakistan, to the World Veterans' Federation, on June 11, 1954, in Washington, D. C.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I have requested the council to consider during its present session an item that was not originally on our agenda. I have done so because I believe that this item is of a particular importance to all those who, like myself, believe that the United Nations is an important instrument for the maintenance of peace, indeed the best one we now have.

As an Asian and a national of a member state of the United Nations, I want to draw the attention of the World Veterans' Federation to the anomaly that exists at present in the United Nations' Security Council where, in accordance with the present rules and agreements, Asia is not properly represented.

Here Mr. President, I would like to go back a little in history and to review what happened only 9 years ago in San Francisco. When the charter of the United Nations was drafted its article 23 provided that the Security Council shall consist of 11 members, 5 of which, the great powers, are permanent. This article then states and I quote: "The General Assembly shall elect six other members of the United Nations to be nonpermanent members of the Security Council, due regard being especially paid in the first instance to the contribution of members of the United Nations to the maintenance of international peace and security and to all other purposes of the organization and also to equitable geographic distribution."

This last part of the sentence, relating to the geographic distribution of the nonpermanent members of the Security Council was, in 1945, the object of an understanding among the great powers. Five geographic, or I should say geopolitical, regions were then established: Western Europe, Latin America, the Middle East, the British Commonwealth, and Eastern Europe. According to this agreement, the 6 nonpermanent seats were to be distributed in the following manner; 2 seats for Latin America—the other 4 regions receiving 1 each.

Such understanding was possible at that time because Asia as yet did not exist as a separate political entity. In fact, India, Burma, Indonesia, the Philippines as well as my own country, had not as yet achieved independence in 1945. Today the situation is of course entirely different. But the San Francisco understanding is still in force.

Consequently, whereas my own country and India can be members of the Security Council and indeed have occupied Security Council seats—as members of the British Commonwealth—neither Burma nor Thailand nor Indonesia nor the Philippines can become members of this most important organ of the United Nations concerned with the maintainance of peace and security.

In other words, a country like the Philippines which valiantly fought in World War II for the principles later embodied in the Charter of the United Nations, a country which then rose to the defense of these principles when the Korean aggressors defied the charter, a country which participated actively in the drafting of the basic document of the United Nations and which gave to the U. N. General Assembly one of its most effective presidents, General Romulo, this country is still excluded from participation in the work of the Security Council.

It is particularly vexing that in 1954 when Thailand submitted to the Security Council an important question affecting the security of southeast Asia, it is particularly vexing to see that among the present members of this body there is no Asian to take part in the vote.

I do not think that I have to elaborate much longer. I believe that my colleagues will be as eager as I to eliminate this anomaly and injustice, a reminder of a situation which has long ceased to exist, namely of the times when the major countries of Asia were not yet fully independent.

That is why I venture to submit to the council the following draft resolution with the hope that it will be unanimously endorsed by all present around this conference table:

"The council of the WVF;

"Noting that since the end of World War II Asia has emerged as an important independent political entity of the world;

"Noting further that Asia is not properly represented in the Security Council of the United Nations;

"Recalling that the Security Council is the main permanent organ of the United Nations for the maintenance of peace and security;

"Believing that the Asian countries members of the United Nations have a right to be represented among the nonpermanent members of the Security Council which should be elected, according to the charter, on a basis of equitable geographic distribution;

"Noting that the understanding arrived at in San Francisco by the great powers did not include the Asian countries in the geopolitical regions then established;

"Calls upon the responsible powers to revise this understanding so as to make it possible for the nations of Asia, members of the United Nations, to occupy their rightful place in the Security Council."

Qualifications for Chairmanship of Congressional Committees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. RALPH E. FLANDERS

OF VERMONT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 8, 1954

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, on yesterday afternoon Mr. Clifford P. Case, Republican candidate for United States Senator from New Jersey, issued a statement in which he analyzed the qualifications for chairmanship of committees of the House and Senate. In the statement he made some references which would be personal insofar as a Member of this body is concerned.

Mindful of the suggestion made yesterday by the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] that we should be careful about rule XIX, which in paragraph 2 reads:

> No Senator in debate shall, directly or indirectly, by any form of words impute to another Senator or to other Senators any conduct or motive unworthy or unbecoming a Senator.

I looked through the statement with considerable care. I am convinced that it does not in any way infringe rule XIX. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the statement be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

From: The headquarters of Clifford P. Case, Republican candidate for United States Senator.

Clifford P. Case, Republican candidate for United States Senator from New Jersey, today issued the following statement:

"As a Member of the United States Senate I shall vote against continuing Senator MCCARTHY as chairman, or as a member, of the Committee on Government Operations or of any other committee with similar functions.

"Congressional investigations have contributed greatly to a wider realization of what communism is and the total threat which it poses to our country and our way of life. And such investigations have performed a vital service in uncovering Communist infiltration and subversion in government and in our society. I am fully aware that this is so and of the difficulties and frustrations experienced by congressional committees and others in their efforts to combat subversive activity and infiltration and of the incredible naivete of many otherwise intelligent people, some of whom even today fail to understand or refuse to admit the existence or seriousness of the problem. I am aware also of the skillful way in which the Communists themselves have attempted to discredit all efforts, whether by congressional committees or otherwise, to expose their activities and of the way in which many well-intentioned citizens have unwittingly played the Communist game.

"The dangers are real, they persist and will continue. Our vigorous efforts to combat them must also continue by every effective means, including that of congressional investigations. Such investigations will continue effectively under leadership other than that of Senator McCarthy. And I am convinced that our total effort to meet and defeat the menace of communism will be strengthened when the distracting and divisive effect of his participation is removed.

"My conclusion rests on two broad grounds. The first has to do with the relations between the legislative and the executive branches of our Government. The second has to do with the relations between the legislative branch, and its investigating committees, and the people.

"Wisely, the framers of our Constitution created our National Government with three great branches and allocated separate powers to each. This separation of powers is an essential bulwark of our individual liberties. But it also presents great difficulties.

"It is obvious that our Government simply could not function if the executive departments and their personnel were subjected to constant unjustified harassment and attack by congressional investigating committees. Yet, where there is reason to suspect the existence of serious dereliction which cannot be, or is not being, remedied by the executive branch itself, the most searching scrutiny by Congress is not only proper but mandatory. On this point the lesson of the Hiss case will not soon be forgotten.

"The difficulty of the problems presented by the separation of powers can be reduced by an improvement in the rules governing congressional committee investigations. I have long been a sponsor of legislation for this purpose and I am glad to note that the prospects for favorable action in this direction are better than they have ever been before.

"But, at best, procedural improvements can do only a part of the job. In many situations precise lines of demarcation between the executive and legislative authority would be difficult, if not impossible, to draw. And it would be unwise—and even dangerous—to attempt to lay down hard and fast rules limiting the scope of congressional investigations in all cases which might arise. Much latitude must necessarily be left to Congress and its investigating committees. Our ultimate reliance has to be upon the exercise of sound judgment and restraint by the members, and especially the chairmen, of such committees.

"The members and chairmen of congressional investigating committees must, of course, be fully aware of their responsibility to investigate and expose dereliction in the executive departments and unswerving in their determination to fulfill that responsibility. They must be equally aware that the unwise and unrestrained exercise of their power can do incalculable harm to the effective functioning of our Government. Senator McCarthy, in my opinion, has shown that he lacks this awareness to a degree which disqualifies him for such service.

"The second ground for my conclusion is equally fundamental.

"Our free society can exist only so long as its individual members feel secure. They must be confident that in their dealings with each other and with the state they will be treated fairly and their vital interests will be protected.

"Whenever any substantial number of individuals lose this confidence, internal unrest and disunity will weaken the basic structure of the society to which they belong. And, in these times, no society in which such lack of confidence persists is likely very long to remain both independent and free. We must, therefore, see to it that our society continues to be one in which the individual citizen feels secure. This has many implications.

"It means that our political system must continue to be one in which the individual citizen can accept the result of an election with composure, confident that no matter which party wins it offers no threat to what he regards as his vital interests. It means that the individual citizen must be able to rely on his Government to protect him from harm at the hands of his fellow citizens by adequate and honest police and through a system of courts and juries which will apply impartial justice under law. It means that the individual citizen must have confidence that the necessary and broad powers of Government in all its branches will be exercised with restraint and in a fair and decent way and not in ways which will unnecessarily invade his privacy, destroy his standing with his fellow men or otherwise do him harm.

"There is, perhaps, no situation in which, unavoidably, the individual citizen is more at the mercy of those in authority than when he becomes the subject of a legislative committee investigation. For here the great constitutional safeguards developed over the centuries afford him relatively little protection.

"Until recently this was not a matter of general concern. Few people knew anything about legislative committee investigations and fewer still ever imagined that such investigations could in any way affect them.

"This is no longer true. No topic is of wider interest and more and more people are beginning to wonder whether they might not some day be obliged to face an investigating committee and how they would be dealt with if that should happen. It has, therefore, become acutely important that congressional committee investigations be conducted fairly and with due regard for the rights and interests of the individuals involved and that the public as a whole should have confidence that this will be done.

"To this end improvements in the rules and procedures governing congressional committee investigations and safeguarding the rights of individuals in connection therewith will be of substantial help. As indicated earlier, I have long urged such action and it is gratifying that progress along this line now seems assured. But, here also, procedural reform can provide but a partial remedy. Even the best procedures which can be devised will not sufficiently protect the rights of individuals unless the members and chairmen of congressional investigating committees exercise their broad powers with wisdom and restraint.

"It is, I think, not open to question that large numbers of our people, including practically all members of many important groups in our national life, have become convinced that congressional investigations under Senator McCarthy are reckless and unfair; that they are not objective but dominated by the purpose of proving the truth of preconceived ideas; and, what to many people is the most disturbing of all, that they are conducted in a manner calculated to gain support by appealing to the emotions of the people rather than to their reason.

"As a result, when our country is faced with its greatest crisis, and unity and confidence in each other and in our Government and its leaders are essential to our survival, Senator McCarthy has become a deeply divisive force. It seems clear that this is not a transitory phenomenon. Every day the people become more deeply divided, the feelings on both sides more bitter and more violent. There is, I believe, no solution possible so long as Senator McCarthy remains either as chairman or as a member of the Committee on Government Operations or of any other committee with similar functions."

Statement of United States Senator H. Alexander Smith on Vice President Nixon's Recent Address in Milwaukee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH F. HOLT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 1, 1954

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I should like to insert into the Record a statement by United States Senator H. Alexander Smith, Republican, of New Jersey, on Vice President Nixon's recent address in Milwaukee:

Statement by United States Senator H. Alexander Smith, Republican, of New Jersey, on Vice President Nixon's Recent Address in Milwaukee

Washington, D. C., July 7.—The recent address by Vice President Richard M. Nixon in Milwaukee on June 26, on the subject of our foreign policy, raises some serious problems with regard to the past and present handling of America's Far Eastern relations.

To me, the questions raised by these problems are timely and fundamental. They have a direct bearing on the present issue of the admission of Red China to the United Nations.

Four years ago on August 14, 1950, four Republican Senators, then minority members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, issued a statement analyzing postwar events which led to the Korean war. Signers included Alexander Wiley, Bourke B. Hickenlooper, and Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., now United States representative to the U. N., and myself. We came to this inescapable conclusion:

"Our far eastern policy * * * consistently temporized with and capitulated to the ruthless demands of the Communists, dominated by Moscow. Under it the Kremlin was, in effect, given a green light to grab whatever it could in China, Korea, and Formosa. This was never a bipartisan policy. It was solely an administration policy."

Today, as we are reaping the bitter harvest of those years when "we were persistently led to believe that Chinese communism was only a great agrarian reform movement," it well behooves the American people to restudy the lessons of past foreign policy failures under previous Democratic administrations.

Although some Democrat leaders have professed much distress over recent criticism of those previous Far Eastern policies, the very urgency of these present times makes this reappraisal most important. Knowledge of past mistakes will be of inestimable usefulness as we seek honorable means of halting the Communist flood that was unleashed in the late 1940's.

We contended then and still contend that an intelligent bipartisan foreign policy has never meant that past blunders should be ignored or covered up. Even in global affairs, experience is a great teacher, though a ruthless one. So the harsh lessons we have learned between Yalta (where the betrayal of free China began) and Korea (where 33,000 Americans paid the price for that error with their lives) must never be forgotten.

It would be failing our obligation to the people of the United States—perhaps suicidally—to close our eyes to something perceived so clearly 4 years ago.

What we learned then, at such a price, was that a foreign policy based on weakness and relying on bad judgment leads only to disaster. In the years from 1945–49 we saw 600 million of our potential allies vanish behind the Iron Curtain.

Four years ago, in our statement, we declared: "We shall not sleep peacefully at night until our Government's policy is based on the full realization that world domination by communism is still the goal of the Kremlin."

Fortunately, although the peril is still vast, we now have an administration which understands the true nature of that menace. As Vice President Nixon said at Milwaukee on June 26:

"Communism is a world threat and it is just as important to stop it in Asia, South America, and the United States as in Europe."

And he added:

"By their leadership, President Eisenhower and Secretary Dulles are making it clear to the world that the Communists, and the Communists alone, are blocking the road to peace. At Berlin, at Geneva, at Caracas, in the United Nations, the responsibility for aggression has been placed squarely where it belongs—on the men in Moscow and Peking."

Saga of a Weekly Newspaper in Texas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 8, 1954

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the Bandera Bulletin, a weekly newspaper published in Bandera, Tex., recently observed the 10th anniversary of its establishment.

That occasion was of importance, naturally, to the editor and publisher of the paper, Mr. J. Marvin Hunter, eminent Texas historian. It was important also to the readers of the Bandera Bulletin. But the importance of the Bulletin's birthday, in a very real sense, extends far beyond them.

The weekly newspaper is a peculiarly American phenomenon. In its week-to-week chronicle of the comings and goings, the births and deaths and marriages, of everyday Americans, it typifies in many respects what we mean when we speak of our way of life. It is for this reason that I ask unanimous consent that the birthday editorial of the Bandera Bulletin be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

This week the Bandera Bulletin enters upon its 10th year of existence. Its first issue appeared July 13, 1945, a plain, homely little weekly of four pages, printed in the back room of the Frontier Times Museum in the small plant which we had been using for the publication of our monthly magazine, Frontier Times. The old Bandera New Era, which we had sold nearly 10 years before, was still being published, but within a year it folded up, and left the Bulletin the only newspaper in Bandera County. It continued to grow, and we added new machinery and equipment, and in 1947, erected the present building on upper Main Street, and today our printing plant is one of the best equipped establishments in this section of the State. We have tried to keep abreast of the progress and development of Bandera, and are proud of what has been accomplished in the past 10 years. We intend to keep moving forward. Before another 10 years passes into history we hope to chronicle many new improvements in the town and county, such as incorporation of Bandera, more paved streets, greater public-school facilities, a major north and south highway through the county, more farm-to-market roads, a number of factory industries, a 50-percent increase in population, and many other things that will contribute to Bandera's growth and prosperity. During our 34 years in the newspaper business in Bandera we have predicted and worked for many things which we have lived to see materialize. We intend to continue to work for better things for Bandera.

Appeal to America for Trieste

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 8, 1954

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, Mr. Luigi Scala, grand venerable of grand lodge of Rhode Island, Order Sons of Italy in America, has sent me a very interesting article entitled "Appeal to America for Trieste." This article is very timely, and I think will be of interest to the Members of Congress.

I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

APPEAL TO AMERICA FOR TRIESTE

In this period of apparent calm, it is well to consider the question of Trieste. As Italians we are, of course, interested parties; but, as educators, we are trained to examine questions objectively.

The attitude of American newspapers in general, and in fact, the French and—even worse—the English newspapers, reflect Italy's lack of a good press. America harbors a smaller measure of ill-feeling against Italy than most of the other countries. We do not think, for example, that America has any hidden purpose regarding Trieste. We do not think that she intends to create a new and dangerous Austria behind Italy's back in order to keep her attention riveted on her Alpine frontier, so that she will not look too covetously toward the Mediterranean and Africa.

FEW FRIENDLY VOICES

Why, then, have we heard so few friendly voices from America? Is it, perhaps, because American public opinion has not been sufficiently informed about Trieste, partly because of our unskilled publicity and partly because we have believed it is unworthy of us to have to demonstrate something which appears to us to be so obviously true? Or is it because of your fear that the stand taken by the Italians about Trieste might compromise the defensive arrangements for Western Europe? Is it due to the lack of sensitivity on your part regarding questions of nationality, not found in your history, while we have been born and bred in them? Or is it the result of your viewing and measuring political questions by very broad geographical and ideological standards, such as: "Question of the Pacific" or of Asia or of Europe; question of a free world; or of the four freedoms, or of the rights of the individual? Compared to these, the fate of a twopenny city placed at the end of a tiny sea, contended for by two riotous neighbors, appears to you as a matter of no consequence. Because of this, it may happen that the party speaking louder and with more braggadocio, threatening thunder and lightning, might be declared to be in the right and the other party in the wrong.

HISTORY

The problems of the world are many and diverse, each requiring to be measured by a standard of its own, one which must perforce take into account the merits of the case in the abstract, as well as its background, its history and the people's sense of justice. When we mention history we do not intend to go back to ancient Rome which set up colonies on the eastern side of the Adriatic, from Aquileia to Spalato, molding those populations to her own image as regards language, form of government, and monuments, thus creating a permanent bond between them and the Italian peninsula. This was apparent in later centuries when, on both shores of the Adriatic, there flourished the same type of civilization, based on the regime of city-state, and the two shores of that sea lived in an uninterrupted, peaceful relationship, embracing trade, culture, and the people themselves. In the end, the peoples of the opposite shores of the Adriatic, with the exception of Trieste, rallied under the Republic of Venice, gaining as a result her protection against the Slav pirates who infested that coast. They remained under Venetian rule until 1797, when victorious Napoleon first gave Venice and all Venetian lands to Austria in exchange for Belgium and Lombardy, and later on combined them in what he called the Italian Kingdom.

As for Trieste, she had fallen under Austria through Hapsburgic intrigue since 1381, but, in spite of this, Trieste grew as she was born, that is, Roman and Italian. In 1815, at the Congress of Vienna, Austria, supported by England triumphed and collected the inheritance of Venice. However, during the struggle of the Italian Risorgimento which followed and brought about the independence and political unity of Italy, Italians continued to look to these Venetian lands as an integral part of the Italian nation, to be freed from Austrian domination.

When in 1861 and 1866, after the war with Austria, the new and free Kingdom of Italy was constituted, there remained in Austrian hands the cities and regions on the other side of the Adriatic, giving immediate rise to the problem of their redemption. Thus, they became known as the unredeemed Italy. The irredentist movement dedicated to an Italy united within its ethnical and natural boundaries gained ground, and grew ever stronger from 1866 onward, especially after Austria, with a view to counteract the Italianity of unredeemed Italy, began to favor the Slavs and encourage their tendency to emigrate from the mountains and from the countryside toward the cities and the coast.

IRREDENTISM

The irredentist movement had its center in Trieste, which was, in a sense, the capital of "unredeemend Italy." A dynamic and militant city, it proclaimed itself unremittingly Italian also in sentiment and will. It was living the same spiritual life as Italy. Its newspapers ignored Vienna and knew only Rome. When in 1915 Italy entered World War I against Germany and Austria, thousands of men from Gorizia, Trieste, Istria, Fiume, and Dalmatia crossed the frontier and joined the Italian Army; hundreds of them died on the battlefield, and those who were taken prisoners died on the gallows. Some names, as those of Nazario Sauro, of Capodistria; Francesco Rismondo, of Spalato; Scipio Slataper and Guido Stuparich, of Trieste; are engraved in the hearts of Italians as heroes of the Risorgimento. The Italians felt and fought that war on the Allied side, a war which lasted 4 years and cost Italy 600,000 dead and untold wealth. The first and main objective for the Italians was and still is Trieste, both for itself and as the representative city of all Istria and Dalmatia.

As a matter of fact, the Italian nationality of Trieste and of Venezia Giulia was recognized by the English, French, and Russians, who in April 1915 in the Treaty of London, provided that Gorizia, Trieste, and Istria and part of Dalmatia should return to Italy. And, in October 1918, lined up on the Piave River, 57 Italian divisions and 3 small French divisions, 3 British divisions, and 1 American regiment crushed the Teutonic Empire.

The Italian nationality of those regions was recognized by President Wilson himself, although he was against the secret treaties which had been stipulated before American intervention in Europe, and listened sympathetically to the propaganda of Yugoslavian exiles—but, at Versailles, Wilson himself proposed the partition of Istria in two, of which the eastern should have gone to the then created Yugaslavia and the western, including Trieste, to Italy; but finally he agreed to no partition but that the whole of Istria should be assigned to Italy.

ITALIANITY LONG RECOGNIZED

Now, then, American friends, how can you expect a nation worthy of its name to forget its ancient and modern history, intensely lived for over a century, consecrated by so much blood and sealed by international agreements? To touch Trieste is, for Italy, the same as to touch Milan or Turin or Rome or Palermo.

Italy, after the last world war, powerless and divided by factions as she was, endured all. The loss of her state sovereignty; that of her African provinces, that of her natural boundaries on the western and eastern Alps. But when the destiny of Trieste and of the free territory was questioned, all Italy protested. She began to protest when the Tripartite Declaration made by the three powers in 1948 had become a dead letter; and that Tito, who had occupied and who was governing the remainder of Istria and the major part of the free territory of Trieste or Zone B, was intensifying his policy of denationalization in that zone, and through terror was forcing the evacuation of the districts populated by Italians.

She protested when she saw that the Anglo-American decision of October 1953, intended to transfer immediately their military and civil powers in Zone A to Italy remained on paper. She protested with an even more unanimous and painful voice when she saw the civil police of Zone A stain with blood the streets of Trieste, violate churches and private residences, make hundreds of arrests and set up criminal proceedings only because the people of Trieste, on the occasion of the celebration of the 1918 victory of Vittorio Veneto, also an allied victory, decorated the city hall with the Italian flag.

American friends, please allow us to say it: in all this affair, tragedy mixes with comedy, a comedy which is a reflection on the western powers who appear to be intimidated. It strikes also at the great principles which the great powers asserted and defended even with war. Where do freedom and democracy go when no account is taken of the feelings and of the will of those Italian populations, even where they form a compact mass living within Italian boundaries, and when the western powers seem bent to appeasing a Communist government who until yesterday was tied up with Stalin?

BULWARK AGAINST COMMUNISM

What sort of defense of western civilization is being set up by making the way to the west easy for that incoherent Balkan world, a mixture of breeds and of religions with loose ethnical and geographical frontiers, poisoned by internal hatreds and far from being deaf to the natural call of pan-Slavism? As against that world, Italian Trieste and Venezia Giulia are frontier cities and regions standing not between 2 states, but between 2 worlds, between 2 civilizations. To maintain them Italian is fully in the interest of the West. If they fall, a barrier will fall. The whole of Europe which from the Baltic to the Adriatic is with great effort striving to defend herself against the Slav tide, that is, at this time, from communism and Russian imperialism, and has already lost much ground, would disastrously lose even more hallowed ground.

Italy joined the Atlantic pact spontaneously and without asking for anything, in order to save, along with peace, western civilization, which is also Christian civilization, from the threat of communism and atheism. She faithfully expects that Americans give peace with justice to their Italian friends.

(Rome, Italy, Alberto De Stefani, professor of political economy and finance at the University of Rome; former Minister of Finances; Gioacchino Volpe, professor of modern history at the University of Rome; Guido Po, admiral; commander of naval division in the war 1915–18.)

The Worth of American Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 8, 1954

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, as inspiring an expression of faith in America and confidence in the American people as I have ever read was published in the July 3 issue of the Texas Catholic, a Dallas, Tex., newspaper.

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial, entitled "The Worth of American Life," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The main body of life in the United States is sound. Most Americans have well regulated and disciplined habits. The work of America is a great work, the most productive the world has known. There is virtue in the constant good-will of most Americans.

OPPORTUNITY

All that the average American wants is the opportunity to work, to enjoy his home and moderate recreation.

RICH PRODUCT

So rich is the product of the quiet workers of America, whether they be corporation executives in high towers or those who stand beside machines, that a great many parasites and scalawags are able to splash around in the profits earned by the steady and industrious people. The considerably large minority of the unethical make the headlines and receive so much publicity that the impression is made of an undisciplined people.

NOT PRIDE

Most Americans are not proud, they do not want their names in the society columns. They are happy in modest homes; they are moderately acquisitive but not what might be called covetous. Despite the lurid pictures in magazines and the movies, and a high divorce rate, most Americans live in tranquil domesticity together. They like to eat and drink well, but they are not a gluttonous people, as were the ancient Romans and some modern Orientals. They are slow to anger en masse and in their relations with their neighbors. They do not envy the rich, and they enjoy work.

GOOD SENSE

The majority of the American people has good sense. Wise men would leave these steady people alone. Unfortunately some extroverts with no appreciation of the good roots of American life are trying to disturb them and by introducing European totalitarian ideas in economics to plow under a civilization which has produced such good fruits of abundant living.

Conviction of Joseph D. Nunan, Jr., for Income-Tax Evasion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 8, 1954

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an editorial entitled "Nunan Convicted," published in the Chicago Daily News of July 1, 1954. This editorial justifiably lauds the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] for the very excellent work he has done in the investigatory field.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NUNAN CONVICTED

Conviction of Joseph D. Nunan, Jr., for income-tax evasion climaxes a sorry chapter in the history of the Internal Revenue Service. Congressional and grand jury charges ranging from criminal offenses through borderline influence-mongering to plain incompetence on the part of some higher-ups were an important part of the "mess in Washington" that aroused voters in 1952.

Scores resigned or were fired and a number were indicted. Former collectors of such major districts as St. Louis and Boston were convicted of corrupt practices. .

But the case of Nunan, who was Internal Revenue Commissioner from 1944 to 1947, will most enrage the taxpaying millions. He was the top tax collector who cheated on his own taxes.

He was convicted of failing to report, in a 5-year period through 1950, additional income that would have made his total tax bill $291,523 instead of the $200,437 he actually paid. The counts of the indictment included one of evading some $33,000 in 1946, when he was Commissioner. Further evasion was charged in 1947 when he resigned to practice law.

Nunan's defense was that unreported sums were accounted for by his wife's inheritance and other assets put in cash in the early 1930's and not redeposited until the late 1940's. It was offset, in the juror's minds, by evidence of huge legal fees. Many of these were in tax cases which have further attracted investigators' interest. One bit of evidence was his failure to list an $1,800 election bet paid him by check.

Nunan faces a stiff sentence and fine. There have been far larger examples of tax cheating, but Nunan's former position makes his deed especially unforgiveable. His later use of his special knowledge in private practice, while unfortunately all too common, did not help his case.

The taxpayers are under debt to the congressional investigators, notably Delaware's Senator WILLIAMS, Republican, and a House subcommittee, who sparked much of the exposure, and to new administrators who have striven hard to remove the stigma.

So are the great majority of honest and courteous Internal Revenue employees who have suffered indirectly while doing their unappreciated jobs well.

The American Heresy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 8, 1954

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, the fine address which follows was delivered June 14, 1954, at the commencement exercises of Kenyon College, Gambier, Ohio, by the editor of Harper's magazine, Mr. John Fischer. The survival of freedom, itself, may well depend on our achieving in the United States the maturity Mr. Fischer discusses so well:

The American Heresy

Perhaps I had better begin with a confession. I have never made a commencement address before. Worse yet, I have never even heard one. When I was graduating from college, jobs were scarce; and I left the campus as soon as my last examination was finished, in hope of sneaking a brief lead on the ravening horde of job-hunters. As a result, I missed the terminal oratory. Until now, I had never felt that loss very keenly.

I understand, however, that a commencement speech is a highly stylized art form, almost as rigid in its conventions as the sonnet or the television commercial. Indeed, Dr. Chalmers has told me that virtually all such talks can be summarized in nine words: "Gentlemen, we are living in a time of crisis."

No doubt this observation is true; but I question whether it is news to any of you—and I hope you will forgive me for neglecting this traditional theme. Mankind always has been living in a state of crisis, ever since he first tried to take a dry cave away from a saber-toothed tiger; and presumably he always will. Trouble, in fact, is our natural habitat. That is what makes life such a precarious and exciting business—and since this surely is something which each of you already has discovered for yourself, I shall not remind you of it today.

Instead, I would like to talk about a theological question which has interested me for a long while. As you perhaps have noticed, every editor is a frustrated preacher; and since many of you are heading for the ministry, I hope this matter may have some interest for you as well. It might be described as the American heresy. It is a sin of which nearly everybody in this country is guilty, without knowing it; indeed, I suspect that you have never heard it mentioned in any of your college courses. And unless we learn to recognize it, and to repent in time, I am convinced that we shall be inviting a fearful punishment.

This native American heresy is nicely set forth in a little sign which used to hang on the walls of many military installations during the last war. It read: "The difficult we do today; the impossible will take a little longer."

This motto expresses an attitude toward the world which is—so far as I know—uniquely American. No other nation shares it. We alone assume that all problems can be solved; that every story has a happy ending; that the application of enough energy and good will can make everything come out all right—and in a hurry.

In view of our history, this assumption is natural enough. As a people, we have never encountered any obstacle that we could not overcome. The Pilgrims had a rough first winter, but after that the colony flourished. Valley Forge was naturally followed by Yorktown. Daniel Boone always found his way through the forest. We crossed the Alleghenies, and the Mississippi, and the Rockies with an impetus that nothing could stop. The wagon trains got through; the pony express delivered the mail; in spite of Bull Run and the Copperheads, the Union was somehow preserved. We never came across a river we couldn't bridge, a depression we couldn't pull out of, a war we couldn't win. So far, we have never known the tragedy, frustration, and sometimes defeat which are ingrained in the memories of all other peoples.

So it is only natural that when we encounter a new problem, we assume automatically that it can be solved pretty quick, if only we try hard enough. Just pour in enough manpower, money, and bulldozers and we can lick it. As Adlai Stevenson recently pointed out, we even carry this habit of thought into the realm of foreign affairs. If one diplomat can't come up with the answer, fire him and hire another—or better yet, hire 10. And if that doesn't do the job, many Americans conclude that there can be only one explanation: treason.

For all these reasons, it is easy to understand how we have acquired this cheerful and rather engaging approach to life. It would be dangerous, however, to condone it—or so it seems to me. For it is fundamentally an un-Christian attitude. It ignores the problem of evil; it is loaded with arrogance and pride; and so long as we cling to it, we shall never be able to face the tasks ahead of us realistically.

These chores just ahead of us—the assignments which your generation must handle—are new ones, quite different from anything in our previous history. You are, I am sure, fully aware of them. You know very well that the United States is being forced to carry troublesome and unwanted responsibilities in many distant reaches of the globe; and undoubtedly you are painfully conscious of the cost, in terms of taxes and anxiety and your own military service. The point I am trying to make is that we cannot hope to handle these new tasks effectively, unless we purge ourselves of our American heresy. We need, first of all, to learn a little cold-eyed humility. We need to recognize that our capabilities are limited; that there are some problems which cannot be solved quickly; and that we must acquire a new virtue which has never been popular in this country—the virtue of patience.

In fact, it might be useful for us to remember that many of the really hard problems of the world never get solved at all. They are merely superseded by other problems. For example, the conflict between Moslem and Christian, which dominated world politics for some 300 years, was never resolved; it merely became submerged in the newer and more urgent problems of the Renaissance, the age of discovery, and finally the industrial revolution. The same was true of the Hundred Years War, which also started as a conflict between two ideologies—in this case, Protestant and Catholic. The underlying issues were never solved, because they are fundamentally irreconcilable; but they did cease to preoccupy the minds of men when nationalism and class conflict began to emerge as more pressing issues. (Before the Hundred Years War finally petered out, curiously enough, a Catholic cardinal was organizing the Protestant League, and a Protestant general was leading the armies of the Holy Roman Empire. The struggle had been transformed from one of religious ideology to one of national ambition—a result which no one could have foreseen in the beginning.)

It is at least conceivable that the ideological conflicts of our own time will defy solution in similar fashion, but will be replaced by other issues of a kind which at this moment we cannot even guess.

We can make a reasonable guess, however, at the shape of the world we are going to live in. The outline can be sketched quickly with a few simple figures. They add up to the basic arithmetic of our future—but for some strange reason they are not very widely known, even in the universities. Here they are:

The United States has slightly more than 5 percent of all the people on the globe. It uses about 50 percent of all the world's output of raw materials. It makes about half of the world's manufactured goods—and, roughly, enjoys about half of the earth's wealth.

The other 95 percent of all human beings get along on the remaining half. They don't get along very well. There is only about 1 acre of food-producing land for each of the 2½ billion people now crowding this planet; but it takes more than 2 acres to feed a person adequately. (Not well, just "adequately.") That means that a lot of people are hungry most of the time—but not as hungry as they are going to be.

Every day the world acquires about 55,000 additional mouths, which immediately start squalling to be filled. In other words, the net increase gives us the equivalent of a new city about the size of Cleveland Heights every single day of the year. As a consequence, the population of the earth has doubled in the past century. At the present rate it will double again in 92 years. Meanwhile, the good farming land in most areas is wearing away pretty fast; relatively little new land can be brought into production, and then only at heavy cost.

Clearly this is not a stable situation. The hungry 95 percent outside our borders are not likely to be content indefinitely to split up the wealth of the planet on 50-50 terms with the 5 percent of us who are inside. And as their piece of the planet gets more overcrowded, we can hardly expect them to starve quietly—not while the grass looks so much greener on our side of the fence.

So America can look forward to living under pressure. Even if communism had never been invented—if Marx had never been born and Russia did not exist—the pressure would still be great. (You can watch it, any time you like, along the banks of the Rio Grande where wetbacks by the hundreds of thousands push across the border from Mexico in spite of the patrols.)

To put it bluntly, we are already living under siege. We shall probably remain under siege from now on for as long as anyone can foresee. If the Communist assault should miraculously vanish—as of course it won't—we can look for new pressure to develop almost immediately. From Asia, most likely, since that is where the surplus population is building up most explosively. I happened to be in India during the great famine of 1943, when something like a million and a half people starved to death—literally in the streets and by the roadsides. I saw many thousands of others who managed to survive, but who had never once enjoyed a full belly in all their lives. It would not surprise me, therefore, if India might someday become an aggressive nation just as China is today, pushing out blindly for space to accommodate her spiraling millions.

As for us in America, we can expect to live from now on in much the way that besieged people have always lived. We will keep up a strong garrison. We will spend a large part of our wealth on arms. We will try to reduce the pressure a little by feeding the hungry hordes outside the walls. (The Romans called this tribute to the Goths and Huns. We call it UNRRA or the Marshall plan or foreign aid or point 4.) If we are smart enough, we can keep some allies. If we will let them, our diplomats may be able to divert the pressure for quite a while and to keep potential enemies from ganging up on us.

But we cannot reasonably expect them to produce a permanent settlement within our lifetimes. The arithmetic is all against them. Even the wisest statesmen can hardly hope to negotiate peace with the explosion of world population which is now well under way.

Now those of you who have been studying biology might well point out that nature always finds a way—usually drastic—to restore the balance whenever any species outgrows its feeding grounds. The theologians among you might even argue that it is an example of divine providence that mankind should invent atomic weapons at just the moment of history when overpopulation threatens to become intolerable. I am reluctant, however, to accept these grim arguments. On the contrary, it seems to me that despair is an even more deadly sin than the American heresy we were discussing earlier. The two of them are, it seems to me, closely related evils. It is fatally easy for any one who believes in quick and easy solutions to lapse into black despair whenever the expected happy ending does not arrive on schedule.

We have seen this happen repeatedly in our recent history. In 1918, for example, we fought a war which we hoped would make the world safe for democracy; and President Wilson propounded a league of nations which was supposed to make future wars unnecessary. Probably the great majority of Americans believed in those months that the difficult was being done immediately, and that the impossible would be accomplished in just a little while. We soon found, however, that the granite facts of life did not yield so readily to our moral bulldozers; and then, in disillusionment, we withdrew into a sulky isolationism—with consequences which all of you know.

Again, at the end of World War II, we indulged in another binge of overconfidence. This time it was the United Nations which would quickly set everything right; and in our exuberant self-assurance, we disbanded our armies and prepared to live happily ever afterward. Once more we were disappointed; and now once more the voices of disillusionment and despair are rising throughout the land. They insist that we junk all of our new international machinery because it has failed to work miracles overnight; they demand a search for the traitors who must have betrayed our dreams; and they denounce our allies, because these ungrateful foreigners sometimes show a disconcerting tendency to place their own interests ahead of America's. Thus it is that our special heresy of great expectations leads naturally to the sin of despair; and like every sin, this one carries its own kind of punishment—as we cannot help but notice every time we open a newspaper.

Because I am a perennial optimist, I am reasonably confident that in good time we Americans will outgrow our heresy. We are still a young nation; and perhaps this is one of those adolescent troubles which will disappear with maturity. In youth, everything appears to be almost within our grasp, ready to yield to an impetuous and confident attack; and by the same token, every setback and frustration seems to be a tragedy.

In the middle years, however, there comes a day when we must admit that all of the shining goals we set for ourselves will not be so easy to reach—and that some of them may never be reached at all. At this point there is always a temptation to give up—to scoff at the ideals which now seem so elusive, and to resign oneself to a life of golf, highballs, and comfortable cynicism.

Fortunately, most people reject this kind of surrender. Instead, they manage somehow to acquire a view of the world which is neither impetuous nor cynical. Perhaps a little ruefully, they revise their wall motto so that it now reads: "The difficult may take a long while; the impossible rests with God." And then they keep on trying, with patience and good cheer, in the face of all discouragements.

If individuals are able to make this adjustment to maturity, it does not seem unreasonable to hope that a nation may do it too. And once we have recovered from our American heresy, we may be surprised to find how often—in the very long run—the difficult does get accomplished; and sometimes, perhaps, the impossible as well.

The Vice President Speaks the Truth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 8, 1954

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave given me, there is included herewith a letter that I have addressed to the Vice President, Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON, in comment on his outstanding speech in Milwaukee in properly assessing the responsibility for the great losses we have suffered in the Asiatic sphere. The letter in full is as follows:

JULY 6, 1954.

The VICE PRESIDENT,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR DICK: My heartiest congratulations to you on your great speech of June 26 at the Wisconsin State Republican affair in Milwaukee.

In your speech you laid down what is the real Republican position. What pleased me most perhaps was the forthrightness and directness with which you charged the Democrats with the responsibility they must bear in the great losses we have suffered in the Asiatic sphere.

It is particularly right that the Democrats be assessed with their failures and that the people know the truth because, if this is not done, we may, through political error or because we lack political vigor make possible a reestablishment of political control that can only bring more disservice and also more tragic developments for this country of ours. By properly defining and stressing the Democratic history, we are doing not only what is right but what is absolutely necessary so that our people may not again be led into political error.

Yours sincerely,
STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN.

Something About the Other Countries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 8, 1954

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, under title of "United States Asks Little in Return for Generous Gifts," Reporter and Lecturer John Morley has written remarks which serve to sharpen our inquiry into the matter of our overseas expenditures. His article follows:

Each time I return from a trip abroad I hear it said here that "the United States should try to understand the world and other people." My considered retort usually is that it's about time that the rest of the world tried to better understand the United States for a change. I believe we have done most of the understanding for too long a time already.

We have tried to understand the world to the tune of over $100 billion—a hundred billion dollars, that is, since World War I. This sum is unprecedented in world history. From World War I to World War II we have canceled out debts to our allies of over $15 billion, with more cancellations on the way. During World War II we gave our allies gifts, under the title of "Lend-Lease," of over $50 billion and received in return less than $8 billion. Of this sum, Russia got over $13 billion and paid back about $2 billion in reciprocal lend-lease. The balance is lost, so far as payment is concerned.

Since the end of World War II over $31 billion has been distributed under the Mutual Defense Assistance authority, Foreign Economic Aid Act, and what is known as the Technical Cooperation Act, with Uncle Sam doing most of the cooperating. These figures do not include other hidden contributions, such as the agreement on tin, through which more millions will then be paid by United States consumers in order to stabilize the price on the world market, mostly for the benefit of the outside world. Since we buy most of the tin, we will pay most of the artificial premium agreed upon by the rest of the world.

In addition, the United States, through its Treasury and private contributions, has paid out billions more for disaster relief, war relief, and every form of international calamity, to friend and foe alike.

UNITED STATES EXTREMELY GENEROUS

It is argued by some that most of our financial aid has been ostensibly for military purposes. Which means, to defend free people against the encroachments and enslavement of Communist atheism. We can see little difference as to what use these billions were put to by our allies. The fact is that the United States taxpayers are out this huge sum of money and are now paying interest on a $275 billion debt of their own with no end in sight.

It would have been better, of course, if this huge financial aid could have been spent for tractors, housing, food, and health. Others say that this financial aid helped to defend the United States, too. Of course it did. But they make it sound as though it were an imposition that this stupendous sum was expected to help the United States somewhere along the way.

Substantial portions of our economic aid were diverted to lick poverty, hunger, disease, illiteracy all over the globe, as a weapon against communism, which thrives on chaos and hopelessness. This aid served United States interests by bolstering nations with important strategic materials, frequently the target of Communist conspiracy. All this is a form of understanding the rest of the world.

UNDERSTANDING A TWO-WAY STREET

It is unfortunate that the careless methods of our financial aid made us vulnerable to the common impression that we bribed our way around the world. In some cases our generosity has backfired, because we got people used to handouts and when they had to be curtailed, resentment set in. This is usually the case, whether you're dealing with relatives and friends, or with nations.

Nevertheless, the time comes when we reach the bottom of the barrel and scraping beyond that point is likely to wear out a hole and ruin the barrel itself for any future use. And besides, it has become apparent in this declining United States market that some sort of Marshall plan for Americans might not be out of order. Certainly a Marshall plan for new schoolhouses and better salaries for teachers and public servants might benefit all of us at home, not to mention some real reductions to backbreaking taxes in every category.

In plain language, the United States has done enough for the time being. It has expended its wealth and its manpower and its blood upon the altar of understanding of less fortunate nations. It has helped its friends and rehabilitated its foes. It has made a most ambitious effort to an honorable understanding with Russia, both in direct money gifts and indirectly through the United Nations special agencies to which Russia contributed little or nothing. It is not good sportsmanship for the British press and the French press and the Italian press to call us "Uncle Shylock."

Our position is not without error. We have pushed our way around a little bit. But it is the height of magnanimity to give away so much and ask for so little. In our financial sacrifices we might have appeared to want a little more credit for the generosity from those receiving it. If this has created resentment abroad, then let it be said that for $100 billion the world could very well afford to endure this defect in the American character.

Why I Could Never Be a Communist

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARGUERITE STITT CHURCH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 8, 1954

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Congressional Record, I wish to insert proudly the following statement made by Pete H. Green, a sophomore in the Evanston (Ill.) High School and at present a volunteer member of my staff:

I could never be a Communist because the Soviet system substitutes the authority of the State for the dignity of man; because it suppresses freedom of expression for conformity; because it supplants incentive with complacency; above all, because its concept of godless atheism challenges the spiritual foundation of our Republic.

The statement, in answer to a question, "Why I could never be a Communist," won fourth place in the recent Damon Runyon national contest.

Our Unsound, Dishonest, Inequitable Social Security Setup

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NOAH M. MASON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 8, 1954

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following statement made by Albert C. Adams, chairman, committee on social security of the National Association of Life Underwriters, to Senate Finance Committee, concerning H. R. 9366, 83d Congress, 2d session:

I am Albert C. Adams, of Philadelphia, chairman of the committee on social security of the National Association of Life Underwriters, representing a membership of nearly 60,000 life insurance agents in this country. On behalf of our entire membership, I wish to acknowledge our appreciation for this opportunity to present to your committee our views regarding the administration's social security bill, H. R. 9366.

In your deliberations on this important bill, we ask that you give careful consideration to the position of the life underwriters in America. We feel that we are entitled to this consideration because of our record.

We call at hundreds of thousands of homes, offices, shops, and business establishments each week to sell life insurance, collect premiums, service existing policies, and arrange for loans to policyholders and for the payment of death claims. Collectively, the life underwriters of the country serve 90 million policyholders and their dependents. We perform a service vital to the people and essential to the growth and progress of our country.

The millions of premium dollars that we collect and turn over to our companies become part of vast funds which, after payment of contractual benefits to policyholders and their dependents and those expenses necessary for operation, flow back into the Nation's economic blood stream in the form of mortgages, both farm and city; railroad, utility, and industrial securities; and, equally important, obligations of the Federal, State, and local governments. You gentlemen are well aware, I am sure, of the fundamental part that these funds play in the life of the community and of the need for their continued flow to finance the growth of the Nation's industry, provide jobs, create taxable income and property, and assure the continued expansion of our economy.

The sale of life insurance and the collection of the premiums paid by our policyholders thus comprise a basic operation for the creation of vital industrial and job opportunities in this country, while at the same time guaranteeing to individual purchasers that they and their families will have security against the hazards of premature death of the breadwinner and the economic ravages of old age. This flow of money also creates a cushion for our policyholders against temporary financial embarrassment because they are able to borrow—with no questions asked—their share of the fund which they have created, to be restored by them at their convenience. Many homes and businesses have been saved by timely policy loans when no other form of credit was open to the borrowers, as is usually the case in life's financial crises.

I am confident that all of you gentlemen have observed the benefits of life insurance. I am sure that you all know of cases where it has financed an education, saved a home, or been used as a basis for business credit, as it has for countless people. We hope that this direct statement will increase your appreciation of our business and the agent's place in it, and will result in your sympathetic consideration of the great concern over the threat to our future, and to the future of our business and our country, which we see in the bill now under study.

People will not be inclined to buy security from us if the Government appears to give it away in larger amounts, at today's low tax. This unnecessary competition constitutes a clear invasion of the market for private life insurance. In this connection, we particularly call attention to the fact that the biggest increases proposed by H. R. 9366 would go to people in the highest earnings classification. These people have the financial ability and have demonstrated willingness, by their purchases of life insurance, to take over for themselves where social security should leave off—at the minimum needs level. There is absolutely no need for the Federal Government to invade this market.

Furthermore, the liberalization of these top benefits will make it increasingly difficult for the new agent to gain a foothold in our business. The problems in this phase of the business are already at an all-time high. It has not been possible to expand the sales force enough in recent years to prevent a decline in the percentage of the consumer's dollars going into life insurance. For example, we note that the proportion of total money income put into life insurance decreased from 3.8 percent in 1949 to 3.5 percent in 1952. This decline parallels the 1950 and 1952 liberalizations of social-security benefits.

The continuation of this trend for another generation will mean that only those presently established agents writing larger amounts of life insurance will remain in our business. Production will fall off and the attrition of old business by death, maturity, and surrender will lead to the gradual liquidation of the life-insurance companies.

We can see no other result if social-security benefits are raised as each Congress competes with its predecessor, whereby increased liberality becomes the test of its interest in the public welfare. What it will do to the people and to the country we can only surmise, but we know that eventually the program is going to be very costly because it is impossible to provide the substantial benefits promised for mere token taxpayments. Moreover, with ever-increasing thrift required by law, by means of a tax on payroll instead of through individual initiative, we believe that the effect on the life-insurance business which we have just outlined will follow as a matter of course.

We have seen benefits raised substantially in 1950 and again in 1952, and we are now faced with this bill calling for even more substantial benefit increases. Can life insurance continue to live if this accelerating trend continues? We question, very seriously, that it can.

With present benefit commitments of the OASI program already greater than the total of all life insurance in force, a substantial portion of our market has already been absorbed. The proposed increases would cut off another large segment, and we cannot help but wonder where it will all end. To whom can we sell security if the Government makes everyone secure? Will life insurance be able to retain its field personnel and to fill the gaps caused by normal turnover, retirements, and deaths? These are serious questions. We see no satisfactory answer to them unless a halt is called to this practice of increasing social-security benefits every election year.

We should like to add that if the idea were to become accepted that OASI is as good as life insurance and that it can be provided at a lower cost, we believe that the citizens of this country would be victims of a superstition that has no basis in fact. The increased benefits that you are now considering may, according to Government experts, eventually cost as much as 11.46 percent of payroll, or $27.6 billion a year, provided there are no further increases. (This estimate, by the way, is based upon the assumption of a continuing high employment level. A decline in employment would, of course, increase the indicated cost even further.) Obviously, if this comes to pass, the payment of these benefits will have to be based on the uncertain premise that Congress will be willing to vote the necessary, but always unpopular, tax increases and that the public will be able and willing to pay them on top of Federal, State, and local income, property, wage, and sales taxes. Thus, there exists an atmosphere of uncertainty that advises extreme caution in the assumption of commitments difficult of fulfillment, which stands in sharp contrast to the demonstrated performance of life insurance for more than a century. We do not believe that it would justify the irreparable damage which the bill would cause to the life-insurance industry. Would it not be wiser to coordinate social security with life insurance than to have social security destroy our business?

If benefits are to be increased at this time, we recommend that the increases be made only at the lower end of the wage scale, where the need is obvious and where the ability to make personal provision for security is limited. The merit of this recommendation is self-evident, and we strongly urge its adoption.

In coming before you today, gentlemen, we ask no special favor, no subsidy, no taxpayers' money. We ask nothing from the American people but the right to serve their best interests for the long run. For ourselves we ask only the right to live.

May we urge you to hold the line and to attempt only those measures which are economically feasible for our Government and good for the free-enterprise system which has given America its vitality, integrity, and stability. To a man, our organization will fight to protect our American way of life. By the same token we will oppose any program which is inflationary in character or financially unsound in its implications.

JULY 1, 1954.

The Girl Scouts, the United Nations, and Our Own Constitution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TIMOTHY P. SHEEHAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 2, 1954

Mr. **SHEEHAN**. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Robert Le Fevre, news editor of station WFTL–TV, Fort Lauderdale, Fla., is the author of an article entitled "Even the Girl Scouts," which contains some very interesting observations.

One of the most startling observations made by Mr. Le Fevre is to the effect that the Girl Scouts describe a merit badge which requires a knowledge of the United Nations, but nowhere among the merit badges did he find one that required the Girl Scouts to memorize part of the Declaration of Independence or a statement from the Constitution.

Mr. Le Fevre's article is as follows:

EVEN THE GIRL SCOUTS

(By Robert Le Fevre)

I received an invitation from the Broward County (Fla.) Girl Scouts, signed by the president, inviting me to speak at a Girl Scout Council meeting. "If you can speak for us," the letter said, "the selection of the topic would be left to your discretion * * *. I think something about Americanism or citizenship on a nonpolitical level would be interesting."

I accepted the invitation and prepared a speech on American citizenship. Then came rumors that somebody in the Girl Scout Council questioned the advisability of my speaking at the meeting. I had been known to make critical remarks about the United Nations on radio and television, and it was feared that I might do so on this occasion. The fact is, my speech made no mention of U. N. However, I refused to have my speech censored and the invitation was withdrawn. This incident stirred up in me a curiosity about the Girl Scouts. I got hold of the Girl Scout Handbook, copyrighted in 1940 by Girl Scouts, Inc. Nothing in this book gave me a clue to the reason for the cancellation of my speech. The Constitution is given due place in the handbook, and a full page is devoted to the American Bill of Rights. Then I looked into the edition of the handbook put out in September 1953, and that told me: The Bill of Rights is missing from this second edition and there is no itemized listing of the Constitution.

Digging further, I found four pages in it devoted to an explanation of one world and the United Nations. On page 228 it says: "'We the people of the United Nations * * *.' This implies that every citizen of the United States of America is included in the United Nations."

This, of course, startled me. There are no citizens of the United Nations, as far as I know. Gary Davis, who renounced his American citizenship, found that out to his sorrow; he is now a man without a country. The statement that every citizen of the United States is also a citizen of some other body is a bit exaggerated, to say the least.

I also learned, on page 228, that "this also implies that every person will do his or her best to help the United Nations succeed." But many patriotic Americans feel no urge to make the United Nations succeed; some even hope and pray that the United States will someday get out of that body.

And again on page 228, "It is the only world organization set up to iron out the different viewpoints of nations, and that has authority to do so." There is considerable question, and it is a matter of supreme political controversy, whether or not the differences which exist between the various nations can be ironed out. Further, the U. N. has no autohrity to do any such thing; if it did, it would have already superseded the Constitution of the United States, a point which ardent one-worlders and backers of the U. N. insist is not so.

On page 229 the handbook says: "The United Nations has drawn up the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. This document contains a statement on the rights the people of the world should have. It is much like out own Declaration of Independence and Bill of Rights. It starts with the words: "All human beings are born free and equal. It is one of the finest pieces of work accomplished by the United Nations."

This unqualified recommendation of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights is subject to serious misgivings. The handbook states unequivocally that this document contains a statement on the rights the people of the world should have. Let's see.

Article 14 of the declaration says that a person who is persecuted in one country has the right to move to another country, frontiers notwithstanding. But there is an exception: An individual prosecuted for a nonpolitical crime does not have this freedom of movement; it is a privilege reserved for individuals guilty of political crimes. Thus any Communist would have the right to move to another country regardless of his activities or extent of his guilt. An individual guilty of high treason, sabotage, espionage, any type of betrayal, is specifically excluded from punishment and could claim asylum in every country subscribing to the declaration.

Article 17 says that every person has the right to own and hold property. Several of the separate States in the United States have laws which prohibit certain foreign nationals, including enemy aliens, from owning property. If this article 17 were validated by treaty, the property laws of these States would be abrogated. Are we willing to destroy the sovereignty of the States?

Article 23 in the declaration states that every person has the right to work for a just wage in healthy surroundings. But it does not say who is to decide what is just—the employer or the employee; or is the government to decide in every case what is just? And what are "healthy" surroundings?

Article 24 says that every person has the right to reasonable working hours with time to rest and paid holidays. What about the poor employer who cannot afford reasonable working hours with time for rest or paid holidays? Is he going to be permitted to close up business when he is exhausted? And who is to decide what is reasonable, the working individual or some international committee? The article does not say whether the leisure time is to be paid for by the consumer or the taxpayer.

Article 26 says that every person is entitled to an education, but it does not say who is to provide the education or where the money is to come from. Presumably education would be furnished by the state, but there is a grave question as to whether a state can be trusted with the matter of education. Isn't the example of Russia and other totalitarian countries, notably Germany under Hitler, proof that when education becomes the tool of the state it becomes propaganda?

Article 26 goes so far as to say that every person has the right to enjoy the better things of life. What are the better things of life? And what is enjoyment of them? Nowhere are these matters of taste or discernment discussed or even mentioned.

Article 28 says that every person has the right to live in a land where all these rights are considered. This being the case, most of us should move to Russia, for the Universal Declaration of Human Rights as it has been adopted by the U. N., follows very closely the pattern of the Russian Constitution, which calls on the government to furnish most of these things to the people.

But getting back to the handbook of the Girl Scouts, this publication has the temerity to say that the Universal Declaration of Human Rights is much like our own Declaration of Independence and the Bill of Rights. Nowhere in history could two more divergent viewpoints be expressed than those of the

Declaration of Human Rights on the one hand and the Bill of Rights and the Declaration of Independence on the other.

The Declaration of Independence proclaims our separation from Britain and indicates that we are a free and independent people. The Bill of Rights is a listing of certain prerogatives inherent in the individual, as a creature of God, and specifically prohibits the government from interfering with them.

The Declaration of Human Rights, on the contrary, declares that no nation is independent of another, that in fact, all nations are interdependent, and that it is the responsibility of the States to provide for the people every conceivable human need and desire. These appear to be the "rights" the United Nations Declaration would guarantee to us. Hence, the endorsement in the official handbook of the Girl Scouts, edition of 1953, indicates that the organization is not in line with the American tradition.

The handbook says on page 204: "The League of Women Voters of the United States is a nonpolitical organization." This is untrue. The League of Women Voters of the United States is an organization aimed at political action. It is designed to influence women voters in the interests of supporting candidates and measures which the directors of the league decide should be supported. The history of this organization is that almost without deviation it has supported causes and persons on the left of the political center. Yet the Girl Scout Handbook recommends this organization and advises the young girls to go to it for political guidance.

A counterpart of the League of Women Voters is another organization of women called Pro America. It is also political in purpose, and is notably right of center. If the Girl Scout Handbook were fair and impartial, it would recommend both of these organizations and reveal the political stand of each. Nowhere in the handbook is any mention made of Pro America.

From pages 220 to 223 inclusive, the handbook emphasizes prejudice by setting up a chart of questions for the girls to answer. One question suggests that when discrimination is practiced by members of one race toward members of another race, prejudice against races is multiplied. The chart encourages members of certain races and countries—specifically the Chinese, the Negroes, and the Italians—in thinking that they are looked down upon by Americans, that Americans have been unfair toward them. The questions suggest that the Girl Scout who does not associate freely with all members of all other races, regardless of their individual merit, is morally deficient.

Page 347 of the handbook is an endorsement of socialized medicine, and it advocates the World Health Organization of the United Nations, to say nothing of the United States Public Health Service. But, socialized medicine is another highly controversial issue; the Girl Scout Handbook takes the collectivist side of it.

The merit badges issued to deserving Girl Scouts and called "My Community," "My Country," and "International Friendship" represent questionable viewpoints. For instance, the "My Community" badge emphasizes the idea that we are dependent upon a number of governmental agencies for our comfort and protection. While it is true that a number of both Federal and local agencies have entered into the business of protecting us and comforting us, these matters remain controversial. It might be a more American approach to teach the Girl Scout self-reliance, rather than dependence on government. Certainly, self-reliance is a greater virtue than dependency on the community.

The "My Country" badge is propaganda for government projects, such as public housing, reforestation, and agricultural experiments, all of which have socialist implications. And in the 1953 edition of the handbook, free enterprise is held up to ridicule. By an odd and illogical agglomeration of words, the Girl Scout learns that free enterprise is similar to "stereotype," "prejudice," "autocratic," that free enterprise is indeed an "attitude" rather than a system of economics, and that the attitude is an unhappy one that could unfavorably affect the Girl Scout's troop or the Girl Scout's country.

The "World Neighbor" merit badge described on page 428 in the 1953 edition calls for the scout to memorize a part of the United Nations Charter, and the "One World" merit badge described on page 431 calls on the scout for a choral speaking piece taken from the U. N. Charter. To win either of those badges the Girl Scout must sing paeans of praise for the U. N. Nowhere among all of the merit badges did I find one that required the Girl Scout to memorize part of the Declaration of Independence or a statement from the Constitution or the Bill of Rights.

After reading this handbook (and other Girl Scout publications) I knew why the invitation to speak at the Girl Scout Council was withdrawn. And I knew that I should hereafter advise all American mothers to discourage their girls from joining that organization, until it stops the U. N. and world government propaganda and becomes what many think it is, a real American organization.

The Uncomfortable Secretary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 8, 1954

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Uncomfortable Secretary," which was published in the Wall Street Journal.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE UNCOMFORTABLE SECRETARY

When Secretary Humphrey closed his books for the fiscal year ending June 30 he found that his Treasury owed some $270.8 billion. Since the debt ceiling fixed by law is $275 billion, this means that the Treasury's new borrowing power now amounts to $4.2 billion.

Mr. Humphrey thinks this is not enough. He wants Congress to give him right away the authority to borrow an additional $15 billion, lifting the Federal Government's debt ceiling to $290 billion.

The prudent Mr. Humphrey has not suddenly turned profligate. There has been no unexpected expansion in the administration's spending plans. The additional deficit for the next 12 months is still expected not to exceed $2.9 billion, and with the continued success of the administration's economy efforts may be even less.

Well, if the Secretary already has authority to borrow $4.2 billion and his anticipated deficit for the year is only $2.9 billion, you may wonder why he feels it necessary to ask for $15 billion of additional borrowing power.

The Treasury's official answer is that most of its revenue for this fiscal year will come in the second half (that is, in the first half of the calendar year 1955) while the need for cash to pay the bills will go right along uninterrupted. Thus, the argument runs, the Treasury will need more than $4.2 billion in extra cash to tide it over until the spring tax flood.

This is the same argument the Treasury made last year. And when the protestations of Senator BYRD stopped Congress from raising the debt ceiling then, there was even talk of a "busted" Treasury and the need for a special session of Congress before Christmas. But nothing of a dire nature happend at all.

The arithmetic of the argument is not much more persuasive this year. The Treasury ended the year with a higher debt but it also ended it with more cash in the till. The cash on hand in the general fund June 30 amounted to $6.8 billion. This sum coupled with the $4.2 billion of new money which the Treasury can still borrow makes a total cash fund available of $11 billion.

Now, as Senator BYRD was again quick to point out, an $11 billion cushion ought to be enough for any of the probable shocks the Treasury will have to meet in the fiscal year although it will not provide much margin of comfort.

And comfort is the real—and perfectly understandable—reason for the Treasury quest for more borrowing power. No matter how carefully you figure the arithmetic there is, of course, always the possibility of an emergency and anyone with the job of paying the bills likes the comfort of a more-than-tidy cash balance. There is no question that between now and next January the administration is going to have to keep close tab on its expenses if the Treasury is to get by on its present allowance.

But there is nothing wrong with that, and it is certainly not an argument for raising the debt ceiling at this time. And while we sympathize with Secretary Humphrey's discomfort, we don't think he expects to be comfortable anyway as long as the debt is going up, not down.

Run for the Exits, Men

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 8, 1954

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the New York Post of Tuesday, July 6, 1954, on the closing of public hearings by the Special Committee To Investigate Tax-Exempt Foundations.

This editorial is but one of many published in leading newspapers throughout the United States in support of the vigorous position taken in this investigation by our friend and colleague, Hon. WAYNE L. HAYS, of Ohio, as ranking minority member of the special committee.

The editorial follows:

RUN FOR THE EXITS, MEN

Since May 10, former GOP National Chairman CARROLL REECE has been using congressional money to run another GOP sideshow. Ineptly disguised as a public investigation of the tax-exempt foundations, Representative REECE and some colleagues have been trying desperately to promote the notion that the Rockefeller and Ford Foundations, and others, have been undermining the Republic.

This spectacle might have been laughed off Capitol Hill weeks ago if the TV cameras had been turned on it. But the foolishness went on and on, steered by a staff that made

Roy Cohn and Private Schine look like responsible men.

In its desperate search for a headline or two, the committee even got trapped into detecting subversion in the works of Dr. Kinsey as well as two Papal encyclicals dated 1891 and 1931.

An able and conscientious Democrat, Representative WAYNE HAYS, of Ohio, let the Republicans climb out on limb after limb and sawed them off with deadly regularity almost daily.

When HAYS proposed, for instance, that the committee explore the works of H. L. Hunt's Facts Forum, the Republicans exploded and shed their last trappings of impartiality.

Now REECE and his colleagues have finally faced the facts of their disaster. Recognizing that the only political pickings to be had by continuing this folly would accrue to the Democrats, they voted to call the whole thing off.

In announcing his show was folding, REECE refrained from the charge that he had been lured into a trap by Clark Clifford. Instead he blamed the whole thing on Representative HAYS. He charged the Ohio Democrat with interrupting testimony and vigorously cross-examining witnesses. As is well known, there is only one investigator on Capitol Hill who is permitted to carry on this way, and he has been out of town for weeks.

So we'll have to face it. The Ford Foundation and the Rockefellers will remain poised at the Nation's jugular all summer long.

Excerpt From American Legion Magazine July 1954 Editor's Corner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN DIES

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 8, 1954

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article:

We hope that the people who occasionally write to complain that we are antiliberal had the opportunity to hear or read J. Edgar Hoover's speech before the 63d Congress of the Daughters of the American Revolution. Discussing the danger threatening us from within, the head of the FBI said:

"Otherwise respectable, seemingly intelligent persons, perhaps unknowingly aid the Communist cause more effectively than the Communists themselves."

And that's about it. The trouble does not come from true liberals, who want no part of a collectivist state and violently oppose any and all collectivists. J. Edgar Hoover used the correct term in calling the troublemakers pseudoliberals, who conceal themselves in a cloak of respectability. Mr. Hoover made another comment worth remembering:

"Whenever one has dared to expose the Communist threat, he has invited upon himself the adroit and skilled talents of experts of character assassination."

This sums up neatly all you need to know to understand a lot of what you read and probably even more of what you hear.

Joining many other notables who rushed to the defense of Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer, the atom-bomb man, Earl Browder dashed off a lengthy letter which was published in a New York newspaper on April 29. In it the former boss of the Reds in this country described the commie business in the 1930's and up to 1945 when William Z. Foster succeeded him.

Describing how "the best people" were chummy with the Reds, Browder said:

"In fact a rather free association with Communists in daily life was taken for granted by the dominant trend of public opinion. There was, of course, an active minority [this definitely makes the American Legion a minority group—Editor] which strenuously fought against this dominant trend but its fate is illustrated in the person of its most illustrious spokesman, MARTIN DIES, who was literally laughed out of Congress and into oblivion when he tried to expose the subversive associations of screen actress Shirley Temple.

"In those days Communists exerted a powerful and perversive influence. * * * At election time their support was sought by candidates and factions in both major parties. * * * Communists were asked to speak at universities not despite but because they were Communists. * * * Government officials, church leaders, scientists, doctors, lawyers and judges collaborated freely with the Communists. * * * In politics, of course the main weight of Communist influence was thrown behind Roosevelt."

Since Browder is telling all, it's too bad he didn't tell the truth about that Shirley Temple episode which, he says, caused DIES to be hooted out of Congress. The fact is that DIES did not call Shirley Temple anything. On August 22, 1938, Dr. J. B. Matthews testified before the Dies committee, showing how the commies used prominent Americans and often got them to sign statements when they had no idea what they were signing. As an example, he told how the French Communist newspaper Ce Soir in its then recent first anniversary number had featured greetings from several movie stars, including Shirley Temple. But Matthews had prefaced his remarks with this sentence:

"I am not trying to make these persons' names stand out in any odious manner whatsoever."

When it comes to the commies you may be sure that anything you say is going to be used against you. And it doesn't particularly matter how carefully you say it.

Puerto Rico and the United States: Their Future Together—Part II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. FERNÓS-ISERN

RESIDENT COMMISSIONER FROM PUERTO RICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 8, 1954

Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN. Mr. Speaker under unanimous consent to extend and revise my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include the second and final part of an article by Luis Muñoz-Marín, the Governor of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, which appeared in the July 1954 issue of Foreign Affairs, an American quarterly review.

This second installment of Gov. Muñoz-Marín's article continues with the description of the structure of the Commonwealth, and of the significance of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico:

PUERTO RICO AND THE UNITED STATES: THEIR FUTURE TOGETHER—PART II

In internal structure the Commonwealth is, in some ways, like a State of the Union and in some ways quite different. It originates in a compact. It makes and can change its constitution within the terms of the compact, which includes applicable principles of the Constitution of the United States. It is republican in form, as defined by custom in the United States and by theory at least in most of the countries of the hemisphere. It provides for separate legislative, executive, and judicial branches, all arising from the sovereignty of the people; legislative faculty to override executive veto by a two-thirds vote, judicial review, periodic elections, a modern bill of rights. The constitution can be amended by a two-thirds vote of the legislature and subsequent majority approval by the electorate. Members of the supreme court are designated by the governor and senate for life, subject only to impeachment by the legislature, and the membership of the court cannot be increased or decreased except by concurrence of the three branches, the court itself proposing the change and the legislature approving it by a law which requires the signature of the executive. There is a federal court, with substantially the same jurisdiction as the Federal courts in the States, and appeals from the Commonwealth courts can be taken to the Supreme Court of the United States essentially as in the States.

In several other ways commonwealth—Estado Libre Asociado, Associated Free State in the official translation approved by the Constitutional Convention—varies markedly from the status of the federated States. No taxes are collected for the benefit of the Treasury of the United States. There is no voting representation in the Federal Congress but rather a Commissioner accredited before the Department of State who has a seat in the House of Representatives with all the privileges of a member excepting the vote. Much Federal legislation, with the indicated exception of tax legislation, takes effect in Puerto Rico as in the States, but the Congress is not under obligation to extend the application of any law to Puerto Rico, including, of course, grants-in-aid that are financially beneficial to the island. (Congress as a rule generously does make such laws applicable in most cases.) A last and profound differences is that while federated statehood is irrevocable, commonwealth status can be changed—we know that, morally, it will never be changed for the worse—although not unilaterally because of the nature of compact and the principle of consent.

May it be assumed that this relationship, created to free Puerto Rico from the statehood-independence straitjacket, is a permanent one? Unless by permanent we mean frozen, I say it is and should be permanent. If it freezes, if it doesn't grow according to its own nature, it may not be permanent.

Let us consider how it may grow. The principle of consent is one of its basic elements. It is present today in two forms: generic consent such as that given to Federal laws not dealing with taxation, including, sight unseen, future laws; and specific consent such as that given by the people of Puerto Rico through their elected legislature to each law of the Commonwealth. The generic consent was given when the people went to the polls several years ago and voted to approve Act 600 of the United States Congress, the language of which fully recognizes the principle of consent and is imbued with the intention and nature of a compact.

The vast majority of the people are generally satisfied with this distribution of their consent as of now. They are the generation of voters that went to the polls and gave that consent. As time goes on it will probably be found that the area of general consent will seem altogether too broad to those that did not participate in the voting, and even to some that did: that will depend on the manner in which the outline of applicable future or even past Federal legislation may jibe or clash with the Puerto Rican pattern. Also, I believe, time will tend to show that the extension of much of that legislation to Puerto Rico is unnecessary to the basic idea of association as distinguished from federated statehood. Under those circumstances it would appear that the reason for such ample delegation will be less understood as the voting generation which gave approval to it at the polls diminishes and recedes into the past.

At the proper time an evaluation could be made of what Federal functions, instrumented by what kind of Federal legislation, are essential to the fact of a permanent association based on common citizenship, and what functions are not essential. The criterion should be that of the greatest possible self-government. The basic points of association could be spelled out in an act of Congress agreed to by the Puerto Rican electorate, as now; all other Federal functions and legislation could be extended to Puerto Rico at the Commonwealth's own request, or with its own specific consent in each instance. Obviously Congress would not be understood to have obligated itself to extend requested legislation.

It is not too simple a problem to work out in detail, but it is far from being an impossible one. Instances of the kind of Federal functions which probably could not be left to specific consent but would have to be agreed to permanently, as of the essence of association, would be minimum wages, quota arrangements, common defense, political treaties. An instance of Federal legislation running to no purpose in Puerto Rico that could be of interest to the United States would be the Labor Relations Act.

The general principles of this associated statehood recognize that this is a time for getting together and not for pulling apart; that where important cultural differences exist, such as language and historical background, the smaller unit should not participate in the government of the larger one, nor the latter wish its laws to rule in the former unless agreeable locally in each case, or contained in the basic instrument of association as essential to its nature. Thus there would be not only "no taxation without representation" (as now) but also no legislation without representation—and without disturbing the composition of Congress. Taxation, after all, is not the only thing in the world that may require representation for legitimacy.

This is the potential of Commonwealth. From the United States and Puerto Rico viewpoints, Why not statehood? Why not independence? Legitimate questions both.

What the United States thinks of statehood for Puerto Rico can be easily gathered from the record of the Hawaii-Alaska debate which took place in the Senate last March. Statehood for Puerto Rico was definitely not favored by the opponents or by the advocates of statehood for Hawaii and Alaska. The reason given was explicit—different historical and cultural background. Puerto Rico, which is not asking for statehood, would as a State have 2 Senators, 6 Representatives. No Senator wanted that. Puerto Rico agrees. As between having influence of that kind on United States policy in general and having complete authority, within the terms of association, in fact and in potential growth, over its own policy, it chooses the latter. We would not do so if we were Oklahoma, Arkansas, Delaware; but being Puerto Rico, we enjoy more real liberty that way.

Puerto Rico in its upsurge is an exemplification of the fine spirit of freedom in which the United States can deal with civilized people of different origin in their homeland. If Puerto Rico were nationalized as a State within the United States, a large segment of local policymaking would shift to Washington, where a handful of Puerto Rican Congressmen would contribute slightly to a general policy. The olive in the Martini would become a drop of bitters or a shade of vermouth.

And why not independence From Puerto Rico's viewpoint I have perhaps touched sufficiently on the subject. Free trade with the States has become a basic need for an economy developed for a half century on that premise. There is also Puerto Rico's traditional nonisolationist sense of freedom. And there are the pride and affection that Puerto Ricans feel regarding the citizenship that they have lived with for 37 years, defended in war and honored in their practice of democracy in peace.

From the point of view of the United States there are military and commercial reasons—Puerto Rico buys $500 million a year from the States—but probably such reasons are not nearly as important as the fact that Puerto Rico is today an eloquent indicator of the good faith of the United States.

There is a long-range United States interest expressed in the chosen relationship that is greater than either of those two interests. Puerto Rico has become a small but effective engine of understanding of and good will for the United States. Hundreds of technical assistance students, engineers, administrators, labor leaders from all over Latin America, Asia, Africa are with us every day, watching how things get done, acquiring a first-hand knowledge of how admirably the two great cultures of America work together in terms of freedom, respect, common citizenship, economic achievement. There is also a constant flow of distinguished men of letters, political leaders, teachers, journalists from Latin America and other regions who come to see what goes on. No matter how sincerely a man may have been bemused by propaganda aimed against the United States, the things that he sees in Puerto Rico and the realization that on 5 occasions within 6 years our people have voted overwhelmingly against independence, against statehood, against colonialism and in favor of this joint experiment in statesmanship—this constitutes a massive answer to that propaganda. In this connection, the creative relationship that has been worked out between the American Union and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico is an eloquent manifestation of a goodness and a greatness in the spirit of the United States.

Speculators Flock To Buy Cheap Cotton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. SMITH

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 8, 1954

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include an article from the June 18 issue of the Cotton Trade Journal, describing the situation now existing in the Matamoros area of Mexico. This is an illustration of what could happen to cotton growers in this country without adequate protection:

SPECULATORS FLOCK TO BUY CHEAP COTTON

(By Art Geiger)

MATAMOROS, MEXICO, June 14.—A horde of speculators is swarming into this richest of Mexican cotton-growing zones in an effort to snare a sizable portion of the bumper crop about to be harvested.

Local bankers and leaders of the Mexican Cotton Association confirm the phenomenon but see no ready way of stopping them. They predict the carpetbaggers will walk off with up to 50,000 tons, which would normally fetch 120 million pesos ($10 million) but which they will snap up at bargain prices.

The victims of the cut rate are more than 6,000 small growers in the Matamoros district whose limited resources do not enable them to survive a waiting period between delivery of their crops and payment.

SELL TO LENDER

Under the credit system prevailing here, growers applying for loans usually agree to sell their cotton to the lender—and to no one else. Even most growers agree this is generally a wise provision. For one thing, it has proven an effective method of preventing losses that might occur if growers were given a free hand in accepting offers, regardless of price.

But the bankers, too, admit it has its disadvantages. Normally the grower receives the value of his crop, less the amount of his loan and interest, in time for the next planting. In some cases, however, lending institutions are hard put to meet all the demands upon them until the buyers in turn pay them for the product. At times, this may result in a lapse of 2 or 3 months until the grower receives his money.

In the case of loans extended by private banks, credit unions, and reputable cotton firms, there is usually no difficulty. For obvious reasons, their debtors are apt to be men of a certain amount of substance for whom the relatively brief delay does not constitute a serious inconvenience.

But for the vast majority of those who have to depend upon the government farm and Ejidal banks, it is frequently another story. These banks were organized to aid growers without capital, and it is conceded they do a good job in the circumstances Together, they are responsible for financing 72,000 of Matamoros' 250,000 cotton hectareage. But it is obviously a tremendous task to keep a close watch over such a vast holding, which offers the further complication of being split into 10-, 12-, and 20-hectare lots operated by some 6,200 growers whose economic condition does not permit them to wait any time at all for their money.

Here is where the speculators come in. Mexico is a land of free enterprise. There are little or no restrictions on the sale of cotton except those freely entered into by the grower. All a speculator needs is an ample supply of cash and a truck and he is in business. Usually he can drive his truck into the farm of these hard-pressed growers and haul off as much cotton as his car can carry—often obtained at pitifully low prices and without the necessity of risking a cent in financing production. The sellers are left with their debts and a small margin to show for their pains.

The Green River Valley Development Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 8, 1954

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, today the Owensboro Inquirer, of Owensboro, Ky.; the Owensboro Messenger, of Owensboro, Ky.; the Park City Daily News, of Bowling Green, Ky.; the McLean County News, of Calhoun, Ky.; the Henderson Gleaner and Journal, of

Henderson, Ky.; the Sebree Banner, of Sebree, Ky.; the Messenger, of Central City, Ky.; the Greenville Leader, of Greenville, Ky.; the Green River Republican, of Morgantown, Ky.; the Times-Argus, of Central City, Ky.; the Ohio County Messenger, of Beaver Dam, Ky.; the Ohio County News, of Hartford, Ky.; jointly published "the Green River Valley Celebration Special." The editors of the above-enumerated newspapers in an editorial carried in the masthead of this special celebration edition, stated as follows:

> In collaboration with the Green River Valley Citizens League, Inc., this special is in gratitude and recognition of action by the national administration and the Congress to initiate the first project (lower Green navigation) of the overall three-pronged Green River Valley development program. More importantly, this special is to accentuate the fact that the Federal Government is now generating and will increasingly generate huge blocks of coal-steam electricity at costs far greater than possible in the Green River Valley—if and when we obtain flood control water storage as provided in other valleys to eliminate costly cooling towers and related facilities. Without this regulated water supply from proposed reservoirs the Green River Valley will not be industrialized and the entire valley will continue as a vast chronic labor surplus area. The benefits of flood control to bottom-land farmers will be tremendous. Essential also is modernized navigation in the upper valley and the minor watershed projects by the Department of Agriculture must be continued and expanded. This issue is factual and the various authors are prepared to support their presentations under oath with ample proof.

The Green River Valley Citizens League, Inc., was organized at Central City, Ky., on September 28, 1951. James R. Hines, of Bowling Green, is the president of this organization; Albert P. Harding, of Central City, is executive vice president and secretary; J. Morton Williams, of Beaver Dam, is the treasurer, and the honorary president is C. A. Reis, of South Carrollton, Ky. The board of directors is composed of James R. Hines, Albert P. Harding, J. Morton Williams, W. C. Sumpter, Fred E. Massey, R. A. Demunbrun, Dr. W. H. Washburn, John Q. Adams, Homer Boyd, I. G. Reynierson, Landon Wills, Chester A. Hope, Edward Delker, James Hayes, W. A. Moore, J. E. Wood, Roy Morton, J. T. Turner, Byron Royster, Harry Wheeldon, and Harry Scott.

Due to the combined efforts of the outstanding newspapers hereinabove listed, and the Green River Valley Citizens League, Inc., development of the Green River Valley in Kentucky has finally started. The citizens of the Green River Valley appreciate the efforts of the Congress of the United States, and I only wish it were possible for me to include all of the articles carried in the Green River Valley Celebration Special praising the Congress of the United States, the Commonwealth of Kentucky, and all of those who have assisted in the development of the Green River Valley.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an article written by the Honorable James R. Hines, of Bowling Green, Ky., the president of the Green River Valley Citizens League, Inc., which is a part of the Green River Valley Celebration Special, with same entitled "Current Congress Can Spare $800,000 for Valley."

The article is as follows:

CURRENT CONGRESS CAN SPARE $800,000 FOR VALLEY

(By James R. Hines, Bowling Green, Ky., league president)

Is there any good reason why the current session of the Congress should not vote a lump sum of $200,000 for fiscal 1955 starting next July 1 to initiate construction of Rough, Nolin, Green, and Barren Reservoirs as a single project? After showing how Uncle Sam is actually losing money day in and day out by the lack of these projects, Honorary President Reis of the league in another article herein asks similar questions which to me are the most important now that lower navigation modernization is underway.

This takes the writer back to the very embarrassing position in which he was placed in February 1953 when the Louisville district engineer in his report on the overall project stated: "The cost of the improvement (above Green River mile 103) would be in excess of the benefits to be realized." Nothing could be more damaging to the efforts of the Green River Valley Citizens League, Inc., in my hometown of Bowling Green located at the head of navigation on Barren River. This needs early correction and I am sure that with this understanding of my personal position Senator COOPER—with the fine cooperation he has had from Senator CLEMENTS, Congressman GREGORY, and Congressman NATCHER and will continue to have—can without any question obtain the aforesaid $200,000 for the purposes stated before this Congress adjourns.

Even so this further favor to the Green River Valley will not match the so-called Green River 5-year plan adopted by our league officers in November 1953, as follows:

Lower Green River navigation reconstruction	$17,000,000
Rough River Reservoir	7,600,000
Nolin River Reservoir	12,840,000
No. 2 Green River Reservoir	7,175,000
No. 2 Barren River Reservoir	18,460,000
Upper Green River new locks 3 and 4	500,000
U. S. Department of Agriculture subwatershed project	-----------
Total over 5 years, averaging $12½ million yearly	63,575,000

This will provide the Green River Valley a fair share of funds currently spent on inland waterways and compensate for no funds spent in our valley over the last 20 years.

For fiscal year starting July 1, 1954:

Funds to start lower Green River navigation reconstruction.

Funds to start Rough River Reservoir construction.

Funds for planning and designing No. 2 Barren River Reservoir.

Funds to continue USDA North Fork Rough River subwatershed project.

Funds to continue USDA Lincoln-Casey Counties subwatershed project.

In other words we have fallen far short of the $12½ million average this year because $800,000 and $4,800,000 has been appropriated for fiscal 1954 and 1955, respectively, plus the two small amounts for the USDA projects.

Tremendous Coal Supply in the Valley—Reserves Are Huge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 8, 1954

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an article written by the Honorable C. A. Reis, of South Carrollton, Ky., honorary president of the Green River Valley Citizens League, Inc., which appeared in the Green River Valley celebration special of July 8, 1954. Mr. Speaker, C. A. Reis is one of the outstanding citizens of the Commonwealth of Kentucky, and is known as the founder of the Green River Valley Citizens League, Inc., and one of its most ardent supporters. This article is entitled "Tremendous Coal Supply in the Valley—Reserves Are Huge."

The article is as follows:

TREMENDOUS COAL SUPPLY IN THE VALLEY—RESERVES ARE HUGE

(By C. A. Reis, South Carrollton, Ky., league honorary president)

In our March 20, 1951, report to the Louisville District Army Engineers the following was included with reference to exhibit C:

PROVEN AND INFERRED RESERVES

Exhibit C gives complete data as to proven and inferred reserves, while exhibit D covers the quality and potential use of these reserves. From a description of the zones as per paragraphs 1a, 1b, 1b1, and 1c, it should be apparent that, for example, the truck or tram mines-to-barges zone does not mean that the coal flowing from tipples in that particular zone would absolutely move to the barges by truck or tram, because such coal could move by overland conveyor to good advantage, as we point out in 1b1. The railroads could, in the heat of competition, take such business. Hence, the zone lines merely serve as a basis for estimating the cost of the transportation, rather than the final form of same. Furthermore, in 1a it is stated that the underground coal reserves have no direct bearing on zone location, because the location of the surface facilities (tipple) of a mine determines the zone and automatically the transportation costs of the coal to barges, since all coal passes through said surface facilities regardless of the zone in which mined. For these and other reasons, it will be noted that substantially exhibit C duplicates in many places the reserves as the zones progress from each side of the river; for example, the truck- or tram-zone figures include those for the directly-from-mines-to-barges zone, and the same is true as to the overland-conveyor zone, including reserves for the two zones nearer the river, viz, the truck-tram and directly-to-barges zones. Then, too, the railroad zone takes in the other three. In the end the final total of 13,652,140,000 tons represents all of the reserves, proven and inferred, for all of the zones. In further explanation, if, for example, a tipple is, say, 2 or 3 miles from the river and in the said directly-from-mines-to-barge zone, it is certain that mine would take coal from the reserves of the adjoining truck or tram zones. In other words, the underground reserves would not respect any artificial zone lines set up nor any particular transportation cost to barges excepting as determined from the tipple through which the mined coal may be dumped.

ONLY WITHIN 400 FEET DEEP

The proven reserves are those within 400 feet vertically from the surface and within 1 mile horizontally from a test hole, shaft, slope, exposure, outcrop, or other opening. No seam less than 30 inches thick is included.

The inferred reserves are those subject to the usual conservative limitations that can be explained to any experts you select to check these data.

Much private information of a confidential nature, in addition to public information, supports these calculations of reserves. The private data, if need be, can be disclosed confidentially to responsible Federal Government agents. On this account no map is furnished, although a highly confidential map has been prepared as a basis for these estimates and said map is included in aforesaid private data.

LESS THAN 30 INCHES THICK NOT INCLUDED

The seams less than 30 inches thick are of economic importance but not included in these reserves. The tonnage in same could be tremendous. In time this thin coal will be mined automatically by machines now in development; furthermore, extraction by gasification is looming on the horizon. This thin coal is a potential reserve of importance.

As to the life of the total reserves of 13,652,140,000 tons, on the basis of 70 percent recovery, there would be minable reserves of 9,556,498,000 tons. The largest yearly production for the entire western Kentucky coal field (1946) was 20 million tons; hence, we have here a life exceeding 450 years, not including the minus-30-inch-thick coal. The percentage of recovery is constantly rising by reason of new methods and technique, as witness strip mining and the application of continuous underground mining.

If anything, the enormous reserves described here more than remove any doubt as to the existence of far more than the required amount of coal in the ground to justify the desired navigation improvements.

There is little or no comment to be made as to exhibit D covering quality excepting to say that the quality of the coals involved is such as to qualify same for an extremely large growth demand forthcoming for steam-electric generating and coal-oil synthesis.

The aforementioned zones are shown on the general map in this issue.

Owensboro Sees Key Turned With Start on Locks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 8, 1954

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an article entitled "Owensboro Sees Key Turned With Start on Locks," written by Larry Hager, of the Owensboro Messenger-Inquirer, of Owensboro, Ky. At this point, Mr. Speaker, I would like to state that my good friend Larry Hager is one of the outstanding young newspapermen in my congressional district, and is the son of the Honorable Lawrence W. Hager, the owner and publisher of the Owensboro Messenger and the Owensboro Inquirer, of Owensboro, Ky., who has for a great number of years aided and assisted in the development of the Green River Valley. This article was carried in the Green River Valley Celebration Special which was published on July 8, 1954.

The article is as follows:

OWENSBORO SEES KEY TURNED WITH START ON LOCKS

(By Larry Hager, the Owensboro Messenger-Inquirer)

Almost daily one reads of other areas making extreme efforts to improve their economic well being, but seldom have we heard of a more deserving area for development than the Green River Valley. This section meets two prime requisites which demand consideration.

First, and most important, there are rich natural resources which rest underground abutting the Green River. Secondly, employment in the valley is critical, conforming with present governmental policy which allows tax benefits in the relocation of industry.

Both of these points would seem of prime importance to our Congressmen and industry, which is following a trend of dispersion.

The moving of industry is serving a twofold purpose. Most important, it is serving an economic interest to the companies which are spreading their facilities, and, second, it is serving as a defense measure. The latter need arises from the ability of foreign powers to bring war to our thickly populated industrial centers.

The development of our Green River Valley fits in perfect with the building up of the Ohio River Valley, which many are beginning to realize is taking on industrial proportions resembling the Ruhr Valley.

The Green River Valley is known to hold enormous coal deposits. The establishing of a steel plant in Owensboro has enhanced the value of low-grade iron ore in the region. These two resources, not counting oil reserves known to be in the area, are good reasons for development of this rich valley which can complement industry already spread along the Ohio.

Two of America's greatest defense projects, the atomic and hydrogen bombs, find sustenance in the Ohio River Valley. Coal which is used in the generation of electricity for atomic plants at Waverly, Ohio, and Paducah, Ky., are fed from coal from this region. Coal available along the Green River could furnish the steam generators delivering power for these plants with an economical source of fuel.

The resources of this rich valley have been enhanced by the recent action of Congress enabling the building of a new dam on the lower reaches of the Green River. This is, however, only a beginning of the realization of tapping the real wealth in the valley.

This start is encouraging, for it will open a new avenue for heavy trade for which the valley is suited. With this beginning other projects of flood control, watersheds, and soil conservation are bound to follow. This will help the valley not only industrially, but agriculturally.

Certainly the new projects of navigation for Green River have begun to turn the key to unlock the door which has hidden this rich valley from the industries which can put the area's resources to economic uses. We hope the Government will continue with the remaining portions of this project, in order to increase the wealth and strength of our great Nation, and to open new opportunities of employment to the people of the Green River area.

The Civilizations Always on a River

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 8, 1954

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an article written by Landon Wills, the distinguished editor of the McLean County News, of Calhoun, Ky., entitled "The Civilizations Always on a River," which appeared in the Green River Valley Celebration Special of July 8, 1954. Mr. Speaker, Landon Wills is a young, aggressive, outstanding newspaper editor of my congressional district. He is a member of the board of directors of the Green River Valley Citizens League, Inc., and has always been a strong advocate for the development of the Green River Valley.

The article is as follows:

THE CIVILIZATIONS ALWAYS ON A RIVER

(By Landon Wills, editor, McLean County News, Calhoun)

Every great civilization has been built around an important river.

This principle of history has been visibly repeated in the valley of the Green River.

The river brought the first settlers to the lower valley. John Rowan—pioneer, lawyer, Senator, later master of My Old Kentucky Home—tells how the river brought his family to Fort Vienna, on a hill overlooking the river. It was on May 11, 1784, that his family arrived at what is now the site of Calhoun. The Rowans, along with Henry Rhoads and John Hanley, were among the first settlers in the lower Green River Valley.

Just as they came by river, so the river continued for 150 years to be the life of the valley. Settlers came down the Ohio and then up the Green to settle, bringing their stock and simple tools with them. As the country was settled, the river was the only effective transportation for passengers and goods. First the flatboats, then the packets plied the Green, carrying in the drummers and everything they sold to supply the valley's residents and business. And carried out the dark tobacco, hogs, cattle, railroad ties, hoops, staves, handles, and shingles. Even the mail was carried on the boats—in some cases on a faster schedule than it is now carried by train and bus.

Then, the river was almost an unmixed blessing to the valley. For when the rains fell, the well-wooded hills in the upper valley caught and held the water, allowing it to drain away gradually. And in the valleys, heavy stands of timber covered thousands of acres of sloughs, swamps and lowlands, where the water that came from the hills back of them filtered through, slowly, before reaching the river.

But men sought to clear the land for crops. First, the timber was cut, and shoved into the river during the spring rises, so it would float down, somewhere, out of the way. There was no thought of saving or using the timber. W. T. Hull, who owns a farm at dam No. 2 on Green, says that his grandfather thus floated away timber from this farm that would be worth a million dollars today.

Brownsville Is a Gateway to Mammoth Cave

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 8, 1954

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an article written by Mr. R. A. Demunbrun, of Brownsville, Ky., which appeared in the Green River Valley Celebration Special of July 8, 1954, entitled "Brownsville Is a Gateway to Mammoth Cave."

Mr. Speaker, the Edmonson News, of Brownsville, Ky., published by my two good friends, Perry Meloan and Jack Meloan, has always supported every project pertaining to the betterment of the Green River Valley. Mr. Demunbrun writes a weekly article which is carried in the Edmonson News, and is one of our outstanding citizens in the Commonwealth of Kentucky.

The article is as follows:

BROWNSVILLE IS A GATEWAY TO MAMMOTH CAVE

(By R. A. Demunbrun, Brownsville, Ky., league board member)

"And the promotion of the Mammoth Cave National Park * * *" is quoted from the constitution of the Green River Valley Citizens League, Inc., as one of its objectives. The major portion of the league efforts have been concentrated on the badly needed improvements of flood-control water storage and navigation, both of which are indirectly related to the promotion of Mammoth Cave National Park.

Brownsville has become one of the gateways to the Mammoth Cave National Park. Thousands of tourists cross the river at Evansville to come this way every summer and they are forced to travel 15 miles over Kentucky Highway 70 between here and Morgantown that has only a loose rock surface. When the tourists stop here for cave information, they complain about this stretch of road. Then from here along an 11-mile stretch to the center of the park they still have to travel a gravel road.

ROAD MUST BE BLACK-TOPPED

This road should be black-topped. Tourist trade is a big item in our State's business. If we make the means of travel more pleasant we can still bolster the tourist trade.

Edmonson County lost 40,000 acres to the national park and I think the citizens here should be given a little more consideration in the tourist trade and travel. We are really a poor county since we lost the tax money from the 40,000 acres. Money earned from the tourist trade would bolster our financial status some at least. This year our school terms are going to be cut to 8 months instead of 9 because we do not have enough revenue to operate the full-length term.

The truth is that the Federal Government ought to give assistance to Edmonson County as it has to other counties around Government reservations. While the league board has never passed upon this improvement it does sem worthy of their approval as an important part of the overall Green River Valley improvement program. Of course, there are a number of highway associations in back of highway development but this should not deter the league from supporting a most important project in the valley and especially so in view of the fact that the authorized Barren, upper Green, and Nolin Reservoirs will require added highway facilities.

As chairman of the League's Mammoth Cave National Park Committee this article seems in order from its author.

Shocking, But True

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 8, 1954

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, our allies should not underestimate the unanimity of the American people in opposition to Red China.

Following is an editorial from the New York World-Telegram and Sun of July 8, 1954:

SHOCKING, BUT TRUE

President Eisenhower's statement that he and 95 percent of the American people are completely and unalterably opposed to admitting Red China to the United Nations in the present situation should clarify the American position abroad on this highly controversial issue.

Until the President's forthright statement, many critics of American foreign policy, particularly in Britain, seemed to assume that opposition to a Communist-appeasement policy was confined to certain Members of Congress.

For instance, the Manchester Guardian, usually sound and dispassionate in its editorial expressions, has declared in a blistering attack that recent congressional speeches "have almost closed the door on intelligent policies in Europe or Asia." The Guardian went on to say that Senate leaders had taken a line of "no negotiations with Communists, no admission of China to the United Nations, and no more help for Western Europe unless the European Defense Community (treaty) is ratified."

This is a distorted summation of the Senate's attitude because there have been no objections to negotiations with the Reds when any real purpose could be served by such negotiations. Nor has there been any disposition to withdraw American financial support from Western Europe.

The proposal is that military assistance funds be withheld from France and Italy until they ratify the EDC Treaty, which is not unreasonable, since this money has been advanced on the theory that those nations would ratify the treaty. Why should they continue to get this money when they are failing to keep their end of the bargain?

Only on the issue of Red China has the Guardian accurately stated the Senate attitude, which also is the American attitude. And on that issue there is no room for compromise. For if the British have forgotten their own and the 140,000 casualties the United States suffered in Korea, while fighting under the flag of the United Nations, the American people have not.

The Chinese Communists want Formosa, not only because it is a rich and productive island, but because in the possession of Chiang Kai-shek and his Nationalist Army it is a threat to their future. If American protection were withdrawn from Formosa it eventually would fall into Communist hands. But so long as Chiang can count on American supplies he is a deterrent to Red aggression because of the ever present threat that he may return to the mainland at any time the Communist regime becomes preoccupied by adventures elsewhere.

For the United States to adopt Britain's negative attitude toward Asian communism would be tantamount to abandoning all of Asia to the Reds, and the United States is not prepared to do that. There isn't anything new about this attitude. The surprising thing is that the British find it so difficult to understand. Apparently any opinion of ours which differs from theirs is so shocking as to be quite incomprehensible.

Resolution by West Memphis (Ark.) Jaycees in Support of Private Business Enterprise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. C. GATHINGS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 8, 1954

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, free enterprise built America to be the strongest Nation on the face of the globe. Today, I received a telegram incorporating a resolution adopted by the West Memphis (Ark.) Junior Chamber of Commerce. These civic leaders constitute one of the largest and most active Jaycee organizations in the State of Arkansas. This group of young businessmen is rendering yeoman service to the city of West Memphis and to the State. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the full text of the resolution sent me by West Memphis Jaycees and commend it to this House as being in keeping with the principles which were enunciated by the Founding Fathers of this Republic:

WEST MEMPHIS, ARK., *July 8, 1954.*

Hon. E. C. GATHINGS,
House of Representatives:

Following is resolution adopted by West Memphis Jaycees:

"Whereas there exists in this Nation an undesirable trend toward the centralization of power in our National Government to the hurt, destruction, and detriment of State and local government; and

"Whereas the creed of the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce states that we believe that economic justice can best be won by freemen through free enterprise; and

"Whereas there exists today in the Congress of the United States a controversy between free enterprise represented by many Members of both Houses of Congress and the executive branch of our Government, and those advocating the expansion of Federal control through Federal ownership of power facilities to the detriment of the vast majority of the people of the United States of America; and

"Whereas the West Memphis Junior Chamber of Commerce, an organization of young men typical of the young men who signed the Declaration of Independence which created this magnificent country of ours, after due consideration of the facts involved in this controversy, do hereby deplore the usurpation of power by the Federal Government which is inimical to the best interests of our people and of good government, Federal, State, and local, and will tend to ultimately place in jeopardy our American way of life: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the West Memphis Junior Chamber of Commerce in open meeting assembled on this 7th day of July 1954,* That this organization hereby strongly recommends to the Congress of the United States that this debate be resolved quickly and resolutely in favor of the proponents of private power as represented by the Dixon-Yates group who have presented a proposition, approved by the President of the United States, which is to the best interest of all."

Respectfully yours,

WEST MEMPHIS JAYCEES.

United States Rejects Idea of a Deal With Communist World Conspiracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 8, 1954

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, coexistence means to the West a halt in cold war, but to Communists it is only a maneuver to strengthen their position in preparation for inevitable war.

Following is an article from the New York Times of July 4, 1954:

UNITED STATES REJECTS IDEA OF A DEAL WITH COMMUNIST WORLD CONSPIRACY

(By C. L. Sulzberger)

PARIS, July 3.—The three greatest powers have all pledged themselves to peaceful coexistence, but the world, from Vietnam to Guatemala, remains as nervous as ever and the most costly arms race in history continues.

One reason for this lies in semantics, the science of meaning. When President Eisenhower and Prime Minister Churchill spoke of coexistence last week they implied something quite different from what Mr. Malenkov, the rotund Soviet Premier, has in mind.

By coexistence they meant peace. They meant a halt in the cold war and recognition that different ideological systems can live together at ease without necessarily clashing.

But this is not what Moscow understands by "peaceful coexistence." The vocabulary of Soviet dialectics is something very special and its usage of such words as "peace" or "democracy" has highly totalitarian connotations.

To the trained Communist, coexistence has the plain implication of armed truce leading toward inevitable conflict. It is a temporary phase before the final showdown, a showdown in which victory is to be gained by communism either through a succession of revolutionary grabs or through outright war. The war would be fought—and coexistence ended—when Moscow judged the proper moment had come.

ACCORDING TO TROTSKY, STALIN

In early Soviet days Leon Trotsky, the famous revolutionary who is now in disgrace, hinted at this kind of coexistence when he invented a temporizing policy of "neither peace nor war." His arch enemy, Stalin, first used the precise word in 1927. He told a Bolshevik congress that temporarily, until they had an upper hand, the Soviets should base their policy toward capitalist lands on "admitting the coexistence of two opposed systems."

It has always been clear that Soviet realism envisions an ultimate fight for world paramountcy. In 1920 Lenin wrote: "As long as capitalism and socialism exists, we cannot live in peace." (By "socialism" Lenin meant "communism").

Stalin used to speak of delaying the inevitable war with capitalist countries only until "revolution ripens in Europe or until colonial revolutions come fully to a head."

These revolutions are not merely designed to achieve freedom for colonial peoples but to swing them into the Soviet fold. Indochina is a case in point.

To pursue such aims Moscow uses peace as a dynamic force rather than an ideal. Only the Communists ever thought of a "peace offensive." They have outlined a specific "strategy for peace." Their doctrinal liturgy refers to "a continuation of revolutionary peace policy by other means."

The phrase, of course, deliberately rewords Clausewitz' famous definition of war.

PEACEFUL AGGRESSION

The Soviet formula for peaceful coexistence is to preach peace while preparing for or practicing aggression. Thus, Moscow poses as the champion of disarmament yet at the same time maintains 175 divisions and, together with its satellites in Europe alone, keeps 6 million soldiers in uniform.

In contrast to this ominously cynical view of coexistence the West proposes vague theories. In a Britain increasingly horrified by the power of thermonuclear bombs, pacifism has strongly revived. This factor naturally encourages Sir Winston Churchill to seek a deal with Moscow making happier coexistence possible.

But his hopes appear based upon the thought that the world can be divided into ideological blocs insured against each other by overlapping treaties. These would be modeled upon the famous Locarno Pact of 1925, designed to guarantee the peace. Unfortuntely, the Locarno method failed dismally.

However, the United States rejects this kind of coexistence. It is indignant at the thought of any deal that would perpetuate enslavement of foreign peoples by the U. S. S. R. It places scant reliance upon any form of pact with Moscow, looking back upon the Kremlin's long list of broken promises. But Washington has yet to come up with a useful substitute arrangement.

In effect what the United States now dislikes in the British theory for coexistence is its own policy of containment. This, under the previous administration, sought to keep the Soviet empire from expanding anywhere and assumed that some day the Communist system would be destroyed from within by its own inherent weaknesses.

Washington views are today more dynamic. They aspire toward the liberation of nations now within the Soviet orbit. But the means of accomplishing this liberation have yet to be defined. The United States seeks to weaken the Communist bloc by various forms of embargo and it endeavors to gain the initiative in the cold war by threatening massive retaliation against aggression.

The trouble with this policy is that to a degree it is founded on bluff. The bluff was called in Indochina, where communism expanded. Furthermore, a tough United States attitude must be consistent in all its elements if it is to impress friends and foes. It appears incongruous to have the State Department urging allies to new risks while the Pentagon reduces its Army from 20 to 17 divisions.

OUTLOOK FOR FUTURE

Unfortunately, it should be clear to western statesmen, idealistic goals cannot be realized now. Disarmament under fair supervision, abandonment of the international Communist conspiracy, and free movement across frontiers of people and ideas are simply not going to come about for a long while.

The monolithic Soviet system is founded upon rigid discipline and insulation from the outside. Its spirit of enforced sacrifice is based upon confidence that it will prevail ultimately in the world. Only a vigilant period of truce can prove that this is wrong.

Therefore the West must prepare for an indefinite era of uneasy armistice. That is the only type of coexistence now possible, but such a condition is not without historical precedent. For decades precisely the same situation prevailed between Ottoman Turkey and the strongly Catholic Austro-Hungarian Empire.

Peace in our time will probably mean continuation of the present kind of wary coexistence. This requires, to use Churchill's own words, that democracy "press forward with plans for collective defense."

Such life insurance is made essential by Russian military strength and Russian political aspirations, and the problem is not new. Even Karl Marx wrote in 1867: "The policy of Russia is changeless. * * * Its methods, its tactics, its maneuvers may change, but the polar star of its policy—world domination—is a fixed star."

East Arkansas Dedicates Soil Laboratory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 8, 1954

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from Rural Arkansas magazine for July 1954:

EAST ARKANSAS DEDICATES SOIL LABORATORY

With Assistant Agriculture Secretary J. Earl Coke as the principal speaker, the University of Arkansas dedicated its new Eastern Arkansas Branch Soil Testing and Research Laboratory at Marianne June 10. The laboratory, located at the Cotton Branch Experiment Station near Marianna, will serve 26 east Arkansas counties.

The rest of the State will continue to get soil sample tests at the main Experiment Station laboratory at Fayetteville.

The branch laboratory at Marianna will be supervised by Richard Maples, a member of the Argonomy Department formerly stationed at Fayetteville. In addition to providing soil-testing service, the Marianna staff will conduct outlying fertilizer research in cooperation with farmers of the area.

Mr. Coke told a large crowd of Delta farmers that America's modern farms are geared to producing more crops than can be sold profitably in present-day markets.

In his speech delivered at the dedication of the soil-testing laboratory, the USDA official said:

"We have to face the fact that our farms—tooled up for war production—are now capable of producing more cotton and other crops than we can sell profitably in today's markets. The question before us is, How shall we use this land and equipment, and our labor, to give us a return on our investment this year and next—and in the years ahead?"

Other problems Mr. Coke listed were (1) the serious cost-price difficulties that demand still greater efficiencies in farm production; and (2) the tremendous loss in potential production through crop hazards, such as plant and animal diseases, insects, weeds, and bad weather.

"We must solve these problems—and soon," Coke warned. "How we solve them will help determine the shape of our agriculture for years to come.

"But these are not the whole farm program," the speaker continued. "Too often our preoccupation with immediate problems tends to obscure the facts. For example, solution of price support and acreage allotment problems would not solve everything overnight. We will make a great mistake if we fail to deal with the very foundation of any farm program, agricultural research and education. We need new fundamental facts to build up our reserves of knowledge. And we need to reduce the time lag between the finding of new knowledge and its application on the farm."

The Assistant Secretary declared that the drive on the part of farmers to try new ideas is one of the powerful dynamics of agricultural research. He cited many examples of how progressive farmers had adopted new ideas, materials, and equipment to overcome the forces that normally work against a successful farming operation. He said modern farming is becoming more complex every year, and that farm people are looking more and more to the Extension Service for counsel and advice.

Mr. Coke began his talk with a tribute to the late Romeo Short, Monroe County farmer and agricultural leader who died suddenly last month.

Red China Disqualified for U. N. Membership by Its Own Lawless Actions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 8, 1954

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the New York Times of July 8, 1954. The editorial demolishes the arguments advanced in some quarters for admission of Communist China into the United Nations. It is not arbitrariness on the part of the United States which disqualifies Red China, but its own behavior in brazen disregard of the principles on which the U. N. is founded which totally disqualifies it.

The editorial follows:

Red China Does Not Qualify

President Eisenhower has invoked the full political and moral authority of his office as head of the United States to beat back a mounting international drive for admitting Communist China to the United Nations. As was to be expected, he does not endorse, and in fact deprecates, the unwise effort of a bipartisan congressional bloc to commit the United States to an automatic withdrawal from the United Nations if the Peiping regime should be voted in. But he plainly and forcefully expresses his unaltered opposition to admitting Communist China under present conditions, and on this score we feel certain that he voices the sentiment of the great majority of the American people.

The United States is, of course, only one member of the United Nations, an organization which, according to its charter, is based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all its members, now numbering 60. And the President clearly indicates that the United States does not propose to dictate to that organization. But the United States has both the right and the duty to make its views known and to fight for their adoption with all the means at its disposal, including, if possible, the veto. It has this right and duty not only because of its special interests and commitments in Korea, Japan, Formosa, and the Pacific, now threatened by the Communist advance, but also because the admission of Communist China under existing circumstances would mean both a moral disaster to the United Nations and a change of its character so drastic as to defeat the principal purpose for which it was created.

The admission of Communist China is usually advocated on the grounds both of principle and of expediency. The principle invoked predicates the "universality" of the United Nations and calls for the admission of all nations, irrespective of their qualifications, to what is conceived to be merely a forum for debate and pacific settlement of international disputes. The arguments of expediency assume that the Chinese civil war is over, that the Peiping regime controls the mainland, and that it is therefore opportune both to recognize it and to admit it to the United Nations in the hope of making it more peaceful, expanding trade with it and perchance detaching it from Soviet tutelage.

The latter arguments ignore the fact that the Chinese civil war can scarcely be considered ended so long as there are two variously recognized Chinese governments, each bent on the destruction of the other. And just how effectively and permanently the Peiping regime can control the mainland in view of the reports of Chinese unrest and continuing guerrilla warfare is still at least an open question.

But quite apart from such practical considerations, the Peiping regime excludes itself from the United Nations so long as it violates the principles established by the United Nations as a condition of its existence and defies those functions of the United Nations which make it much more than a debating society and establish it as the supreme enforcement agency for the maintenance of international peace and security and the suppression of aggression. One of the first of the United Nations principles is that membership is open only to peace-loving states which accept the obligations contained in the charter and refrain form the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity and political independence of any other state. And the enforcement functions bestowed on the United Nations, which distinguish it from the ill-fated League of Nations, empower it not only to make decisions for the suppression of aggression binding upon members and nonmembers alike, but also to employ for that purpose either its own military forces, if and when they are created, or to call on its members to supply such forces.

It is evident, therefore, that Communist China could be admitted to the United Nations only by a cynical disregard of these principles and by an abrogation of its supreme peace-enforcement functions beyond any possibility of reviving these functions for later application. For Communist China has patently failed to qualify as a peace-loving state. It has openly engaged in outright aggression in Korea, in defiance of, and actually at war with, the United Nations, and it has been formally condemned as an aggressor by the United Nations. What is more, it is still at war with the United Nations, preventing it from carrying out its proclaimed objective of establishing all Korea as a unified, independent, and democratic state. To admit Communist China under such conditions would be tantamount to a United Nations surrender which could open the floodgates to new aggression and more war.

Wage Scale Discrimination in the Memphis, Tenn.-Ark., Area

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. B. CARROLL REECE

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 8, 1954

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, a labor situation has developed in the Memphis, Tenn.-Ark., area that should have immediate attention by the appropriate authorities.

This is a cotton area, where large numbers of unskilled laborers are employed. There has been importation of Mexican labor under the Migratory Labor Act, as cotton choppers and pickers, and other types of work in connection with the planting and growing of cotton.

There is also employed a large number of local citizens, most of whom are Negroes.

It is my understanding that the Mexicans are paid on the basis of 50 cents an hour. The local labor, most of whom, as I have said, are Negroes, being paid on the basis of 30 cents an hour.

It is impossible to understand this discrimination.

Of course, I do not feel that 50 cents an hour is too high. I do not think it is, but I think the local laborers should be paid the same scale as the Mexicans and I shall request the Department of Labor to investigate and see that this situation is remedied and that our local labor is treated fairly.

Truce, Poem by Tilghman Paca

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 8, 1954

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, a constituent, Tilghman Paca, of Englewood, Colo., an ardent advocate of world peace, has paid an eloquent tribute to peace, entitled "Truce." He says:

> A new sense of human living is being born all over the world, and our simple efforts are more far reaching than we dare imagine.

I hope he is correct, but the evidence is lacking. I ask unanimous consent to have his great poem printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the poem was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Truce

When God uttered His pronouncement
Heart with happy heart conferred.
Friend and foe and passive neutral
Knew the meaning of His word.
Not a lip presumed translation,
Each in willingness concurred.

Moss and mold and virgin wildwood,
Sea, and desolated plain,
Grandsire, dame, and guileless childhood,
Felt life's vesper peace again.
Through their primitive endowment
Sensed its blessing would remain.

Where the palm trees touch the Tropics,
Where the mountains kiss the sky,
Where the sea bird seeks seclusion,
And the eager eaglets fly,
Mutely came God's declaration,
None to question, none deny.

Sacred mystic hallowed moments,
Holy as unuttered prayer,
Hearts of men yield true concordance;
For God's presence meets them there.
Men absorb God's pure intention:
Men with God His motives share.

—Tilghman Paca

Conflicts of Interest That Militate Against Collective Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 1, 1954

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the Wall Street Journal, in a timely editorial, has pointed out that the activities in the Security Council of the United Nations is evidence that the purposes of that organization are not necessarily consonant and may not always be reconcilable, with United States interests.

Mr. Speaker, we find today that the rest of the world including our allies, are prepared to admit Red China to membership in the U. N. The American people overwhelmingly are opposed to any such move and I believe will continue to oppose it.

The editorial in question follows:

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The activities in the Security Council Sunday are further evidence that the ostensible purposes of the United Nations are not necessarily consonant, and may not always be reconcilable, with United States interests.

In the first place, the Soviet Union vetoed a proposal to refer the Guatemala uprising to the Organization of American States. In the course of the discussions United States delegate Lodge told Soviet delegate Tsarapkin to stay out of the Western Hemisphere—a warning to trans-Atlantic powers as old as the Monroe Doctrine.

But the Soviet Union is already in the Western Hemisphere. It is not only that it has established footholds in a number of Latin American states and has all but captured the Government of Guatemala, to which it gives important military and diplomatic aid. The Soviet Union is in this hemisphere also through the United Nations.

The practical effect of the Soviet veto will not be great. But the fact that the Soviet Union could veto an action originating from Communist infiltration of Latin America suggests how far the United Nations has carried the United States from its traditional policies.

In the second place, the Security Council unanimously called for a cessation of hostilities in Guatemala and the withholding of aid to either side by United Nations members. Now it is possible that a government set up by the Guatemalan insurgents would be no better than the present one; perhaps we have here just another Latin American struggle between military factions which reflects but little the feelings of the populace and in which communism is not the fundamental issue.

But it is a fact that the present government is strongly pro-Communist. And it is a fact that the insurgents profess to be strongly anti-Communist. It is a further fact that it is not in the interest of the United States to have Communist or pro-Communist governments in Latin America, while it is very much in the Soviet interest to have such governments there.

Accordingly the Soviet delegate voted for the United Nations resolution which, if carried out, would ensure the failure of the anti-Communist uprising. The United States joined in that vote. We do not suggest that the United States should actively aid the uprising, especially in view of the lack of clarity surrounding its background and motivations, but we see no reason either why the United States should vote for a resolution which has the effect of giving aid and comfor to Guatemalan and Soviet Communists.

On the same reasoning the United States would presumably have to vote for a ceasefire if the North Koreans should revolt against their Communist government, if the East Germans should rise against their Communist government, or if men anywhere should rebel against tyranny. That is, indeed, a long way from the ideas on which this nation was founded.

The deeper trouble is that the United Nations cannot of its nature serve equally the opposing interests of two great power blocs. One or the other must suffer. And Sunday's session, revealing the extent to which the United Nations permits the Soviets to meddle legally in the Western Hemisphere, is a sharp reminder that it is sometimes the United States interest that suffers.

Address of The Honorable Joseph W. Martin, Jr., of Massachusetts, at the 34th Annual Convention Banquet of the New England Zionist Region, Hotel Bradford, Boston, June 20, 1954

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 1, 1954

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, my attention has been called to a forceful and penetrating address delivered by our distinguished Speaker at the annual convention banquet of the New England Zionist Region held on June 20, 1954. Under leave to extend my remarks, the address follows:

I am glad to come to Boston to address this convention of the New England Zionist Region. I feel at home here. In this audience I see many who have been my personal friends for years and many who are my neighbors. More than that, we have worked together in a common cause. Indeed, I believe that I have been an ardent friend of your movement for more years than some of you who are sitting here today. I regard myself as a pioneer in the historic effort which brought about the establishment of the State of Israel in 1948.

For almost half of my life—for more than 30 years—I have believed that the Jewish people had a right to reconstitute their own commonwealth in their ancient homeland. I consider that this has been an historic undertaking.

In the Congress of the United States, we write a little bit of history every day. Some of it is history that will make little or no impression on the future. It will, inevitably, find its way into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and some of it will make the headlines of the day. Much of what we do and say each day will quickly be forgotten. Future historians will discard it as trivial and insignificant. But some of the events which we help to shape will endure in the annals.

When the story of our day is finally written objectively, I have no doubt that the rise and restoration of Israel will be registered in the archives as one of the monumental achievements of our generation.

I am glad that I was able to play some part in it.

The Zionist program became a part of American foreign policy back in 1922 when a Republican Congress adopted the Lodge resolution supporting the Balfour Declaration. I was not a Member of that Congress, for I came to Washington a few years later. But throughout my service in the national legislature, I was actively associated with this undertaking.

In 1944, I testified before the House Foreign Affairs Committee, urging adoption of a resolution which reaffirmed our 1922 declaration. The following year, I personally sponsored a similar resolution in Congress, along with the late Senator Taft and others.

Three years later, the people of Israel finally won their struggle and achieved their independence. They attained that goal partly because our Government supported it, partly because the United Nations, speaking for world public opinion, recommended it, and mostly because the Jewish people in Israel, with the moral and material assistance you generously gave, had the tenacity and courage to proclaim their state and to fight to defend it.

In the next few years, the people of Israel kept their promise. They threw open their doors, and in a magnificent and unheralded program of rescue, they gave sanctuary to more than 700,000 immigrants in need of a homeland.

It was impossible for Israel to do this without help, and, indeed, it was clearly the obligation of other free peoples to offer their cooperation. Accordingly, in 1951 I was glad to introduce a bill in Congress to give Israel the necessary financial assistance.

In this, I was associated with a man whose leadership I deeply respected, and whose untimely death last year cost the American people a wise statesman and a courageous defender of freedom. I refer to the late Senator Robert A. Taft, who was always in the front ranks of those who believed in Israel's cause. At the same time, on the other side of the aisle, there were also many stanch friends of Israel, and my good friend and colleague, JOHN McCORMACK, joined in the introduction of a similar resolution.

Congress responded favorably, and made substantial provision for Israel in the mutual-security program of that year. It has done so in each succeeding year, and I am confident that Congress will again vote aid to Israel and other countries in the Middle East in the mutual-security program that has been recommended by the administration for the coming fiscal year.

I review the past not to establish my qualifications as a friend of Zion. I do not believe that is necessary, particularly here in my native New England. This recital has another purpose. It is to record that American friendship for Israel is a bypartisan policy, consistent, and unchanging.

Friendship for Israel was not a tactic devised by any one party which happened to be in power at the time Israel came into being. The promise that we would help to establish the Jewish State was made by a Republican Congress, and the fulfillment of that promise—in a Democrat Congress—was supported by our party at every crucial moment in the succeeding 30 years. It will continue to be supported.

Friendship of Israel is not a partisan affair, because it rises out of the sentiments of the American people who are bound to Israel by ties of history—by cultural tradition, religious conviction, and a common respect for human dignity and freedom.

I make these observations not because I seek credit for the Republican Party. This is not the occasion for a political address.

We helped to bring Israel into being. We helped this little country to receive and resettle hundreds of thousands of refugees. We will continue to help Israel to solve its economic and financial problems no less generously than we have in the past. We are committed to help Israel to safeguard its sovereignty and independence because we believe by doing so we can also help the whole free world.

What we have been trying is to get the Arab States to understand that our friendship for Israel does not in any way imply a lack of friendship for her Arab neighbors.

We cannot accept the view that our support for Israel is an act of hostility toward the Arab States. We have been generous in our assistance and support for the Arab peoples. We have helped them to win their independence.

We are at this time helping them to develop their economies so that they may raise the levels of living of their peoples. We have contributed substantial sums to the United Nations program to finance relief for and, more important, resettlement of the Palestinian Arab refugees.

While we continue to be the warm and vigorous friend of Israel's development and survival, at the same time we want the Arab world to understand that we actively seek the understanding and good will of the Arab peoples and that we are ready to help them to strengthen their economies and their free and democratic institutions. I repeat, these objectives are not incompatible.

In his state of the Union message to Congress in January, President Eisenhower described our policy in the Middle East in a brief passage. He said:

"In the Middle East, where tensions and serious problems exist, we will show sympathetic and impartial friendship."

That statement meant what it said.

It meant that we shall strive earnestly to be the sympathetic friend of all the peoples of the Middle East, that we shall not permit ourselves to be deflected from this course by intra-regional conflict, that we shall work tenaciously to bring peace to the region.

Let it be emphasized—peace is our major objective in the Middle East. It is a prerequisite to any worthwhile development and it is essential to an effective defense system.

We have no preconceptions on the nature of the peace settlement. We are the partisans or advocates of no plan. On the other hand, we shall offer our judgment when asked in the settlement of disputes that arise in a faithful attempt to weigh each issue objectively and on its merits. We do not believe that a settlement can be imposed from above.

Our major interest is to encourage the Arabs and Israelis to sit down and talk out their differences as reasonable men can and must do, without external pressure or coercion.

This may take time, but we will not be deterred from our course. We may not attain our objective today or tomorrow, but we shall continue to work for it because we are convinced that men of reason can reach an understanding. And there are men of reason in both Israel and the Arab States.

Within recent months, we have become alarmed over the rise in the number of border incidents along the frontier between Israel and Jordan. There have been unpleasant signs that tension has been mounting between these embattled countries.

Yet I am not a pessimist. I believe that these tensions can be reduced and that peace can eventually be won.

A little more than 2 years ago, my good friend, Leonard Hall, who is now the chairman of the Republican National Committee, and I stood on a high hill on the southern part of Jerusalem overlooking the old city.

We saw the Tower of David and the settlement of Yemin Moshe, which nestles down in the ancient valley just outside the old city. It was the first Jewish settlement in New Jerusalem.

From that vantage point, we could see the barbed-wire fence which separates Jordan from Israel. Less than 50 yards from us, we watched a member of the Arab Legion talk across the picket fence with a sentinel of the Israel Army. The two exchanged cigarettes and matches. They had a long and friendly conversation.

It seemed to me that this incident could be duplicated in a thousand different places along the Israel-Arab frontier if we only might overcome the postures of hostility which have hardened and become so fixed. I was led to hope by what I saw that peace might soon be attained. That is why, to me, it is a source of the greatest regret that this has not been achieved in a friendly agreement at the conference table.

Nothing can be gained by a refusal to negotiate; those who block all efforts to bring about direct talks fail to grasp the realities. And it means so much both to the Israelis and the Arabs that they dwell in peace and harmony to enjoy the happiness and prosperity that can result.

If I am confident about Israel's future, it is because I carry in my memory indelible pictures of Israel's progress.

Len Hall and I alighted from our plane at the Lydda airport around 5 o'clock in the morning, just about the time the sun was beginning to rise in the Jordan hills. We were met by sleepy-eyed officials of the Israel Foreign Office and our own American Embassy, and we drove through little villages of tents and huts on our way to Ramat Aviv, a hotel in the northern suburbs of Tel Aviv.

On the way, we were struck by the large number of people who were on the roads headed for work at that early hour. It was my first impression of Israel—people going to work while most of the neighborhood slept.

The following day, I saw three more vivid pictures of Israel. We stood at the top of Mount Carmel on that winding road which overlooks the Port of Haifa. There was a magnificent vista of a new city, a city of industry and beauty. I told Len Hall that I have never dreamed that Israel had made such progress. It had come a long way from the congressional resolutions.

The fine words and phrases which we had been uttering in legislatures and Congress had become gleaming white concrete buildings, steel structures and, most significant, a will to work and achieve.

In the distance we saw the new factories rising on the bay, and we felt that some day this would be the great industrial center of the entire Near East. Here was initiative and industry and growth, appealing strongly to those of us who have been raised in the American tradition.

On that same day, just a few miles away from Haifa, we visited a kibbutz, an agricultural settlement where pioneers live in complete cooperation, sharing the work and sharing its yield. I confess to you that I would not want to live the life of self-denial which these settlers have imposed upon themselves. Yet I can well understand that in a country like Israel, where milk and honey have long since ceased to flow, where lands have been eroded by centuries of neglect and have become rocky and desolate, it would have been impossible to reclaim the soil by individual effort. The cooperative became essential. And here is the highest kind of cooperative because it is voluntary. It is not imposed by government or by dictator. It is commanded by self-abnegation.

Not far from that settlement we were permitted to visit one of the Israel Air Force's training centers. We saw young men and young women learning to become fliers and ground crews for Israel's military forces under a system of universal military training which summons every member of the community to the national defense.

Here were the elements which have contributed to make Israel a stronghold—the industrial workshop in Haifa, the complete cooperation in the agricultural settlement, the dedication to defense.

I learned more about these attributes of Israel in my talks with its wise and courageous Prime Minister, Mr. David Ben-Gurion, and other Israel officials. And at the end of my visit to Israel, I felt some satisfaction, for legislators are not always privileged to witness the vindication of their position.

We came away from Israel understanding the optimism of its people. We felt that here was a country and a people in which America was investing wisely and productively, for these people gave not the slightest sign that they would falter or tire.

If there is one people in history that symbolizes survival in adversity, it is the Jewish people. Surely Israel is a glowing expression of the will to live and to overcome the greatest difficulties and the bitterest hostilities.

Our confidence in Israel's capacity to meet its problems and to progress toward their solution has been justified.

The testimony of the administration to Congress shows that Israel has been making a striking economic advance. Her exports have jumped. Her agricultural and industrial production have increased, and as a result she has been able to reduce imports. She is on the way to economic independence. She needs less help from us than she did 2 and 3 years ago. But she still needs help, and I hope that my colleagues in Congress will agree with me that she will get it. For here is a fine example of what happens when American assistance is given to people who need it and who know how to make the best use of it.

Each year since World War II, Congress has been confronted with requests for large appropriations to assist and strengthen our allies. There has been some criticism of these expenditures, and in fairness, it must be admitted that some of it is justified.

Some of this criticism is based upon the fact that we have not made as much progress in the fulfillment of the purposes of the program as we would like and because many believe some of our allies do not carry their full share of the load.

In the past there has been considerable boondoggling with these funds, and this is a practice we can no longer afford to tolerate.

We must insist on the use of these funds for the real purposes of the program. That is to help other peoples of the world who, like ourselves, are trying to resist the onward march of communism. The intent is to help people to help themselves.

Last year there were some who may have been deceived by the so-called Communist peace offensive and who may have felt that we could now afford to reduce our program, lower our guard, and thus bring about reductions in expenditures which we would all favor if it were safe to do so.

I do not believe that anyone today has any illusions about Communist tactics and objectives. All of us, I think, are agreed that we must not falter at this crucial time. We must continue to make substantial expenditures for our own defense, and at the same time we must assist those whose interests are identical with ours. If we should prematurely discontinue our aid and encouragement to those outside of the Iron Curtain it would aid the cause of communism.

That general statement applies to the Near East as well as to every other part of the world.

If we voted to give generous assistance to Israel within recent years, it is not merely because we wanted to help that country resettle the refugees who came there. It is because we believe that the people of Israel have demonstrated that they believe in freedom, that they are ready to fight for it, and that they can be counted upon as stanch defenders of the free world in an hour of crisis.

These are difficult days for the United States and for the nations who are determined to be free. It is our duty to rally and aid the friendly nations of Asia and Europe. With this our goal, we first must keep America strong. The United States must maintain its military resources at their utmost strength, not because we want war, but because we know now the Communists understand only strength. There must be no more concessions to the Red rulers who have enslaved millions upon millions behind the Iron Curtain. Their crafty scheming is all too apparent now.

Our next goal is to rally those whose desire for freedom is as ardent as that of the people of our own land. There are many nations who are not being taken in by the false propaganda coming from the Red capitals behind the Curtain. We must lead in uniting these liberty-loving nations.

The evil and lying propaganda of the Communists has not deceived the people on Formosa, those in South Korea, the Philippines, Thailand, Japan, Yugoslavia, Greece, Turkey, and Pakistan. With these allies united in the common cause, a fighting force would come into being that could not be crushed by any enemy.

With the free world united in the cause of peace and freedom for all, we will not fail, and peace will be assured. The Soviets will not attack a strong free world because they know it will mean their own destruction.

There have been dark days, many of them, in the years and centuries gone by, but when the sun rolled away the clouds, the just and right cause has always been triumphant.

I do not despair. I have supreme faith that the freedom-loving nations, by uniting, can achieve liberty again for all mankind.

Congressional Investigations and the Right to Receive Restrictive Data

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 15, 1954

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks, I am including an article by Mr. David Lawrence which appeared in the Washington Star for yesterday, which clearly points out the right of congressional investigating committees to receive restrictive data from the executive department. It will be recalled that during the hearings in the McCarthy-Army affair, that many challenged the right of congressional committees to receive this information. Mr. Lawrence has cited a Federal decision supporting the right of Congress to this information.

The article follows:

RULING CLARIFIES McCARTHY ISSUE—1936 OPINION CITED IN DEFENDING SENATOR FOR OBTAINING RESTRICTED DATA FROM EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT

(By David Lawrence)

Absence from the country during the McCarthy-Stevens hearings did not permit a study of the testimony at the time by this writer, but an examination since of the many comments made in letters and public statements concerning the constitutional rights involved in a portion of the controversy leads to the impression that there is a widespread misunderstanding as to what is the settled law of the land concerning the relations of the Executive and the executive branch of the Government.

The rather widely publicized theory that a United States Senate committee would be doing something illegal if it obtained from an employee of the executive branch of the Government information which the employee himself is forbidden to disclose, and used the data—was demolished by the United States Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia. It was never overruled by the Supreme Court of the United States.

Judge Groner, who spoke for a unanimous court of appeals in November 1936, noted in his opinion that the Federal Communications Commission and the Senate committee investigating lobbying had been accused of conspiring to violate the provisions of the Constitution relating to unlawful search and seizure and to the freedom of the press. What was at issue was an order served on the Western Union Telegraph Co. to produce messages passing between the head of a group of newspapers and some of his associates in other cities. It was asserted by the telegraph company that the messages were confidential and that it would be a violation of Federal law to disclose them. But the FCC ordered it done and the messages were turned over to Hugo Black, then Democratic Senator from Alabama, who was chairman of the Senate's investigating committee and who not long afterward was appointed to the Supreme Court of the United States by the late President Roosevelt. Justice Black is a member of the high court now and as a Senator would not have knowingly committed an illegal act.

Judge Groner ruled that the telegraph company should not have surrendered the messages for the purpose of any disclosure of their contents and that the FCC, while having a right to examine them, did not have any right to transmit them to the Senate committee. The court of appeals said:

"We are of the opinion that the resolution adopted by the commission, under which its agents took possession of the telegraph company's offices and examined wholesale the thousands of private telegraph messages received and dispatched therefrom over a period of 7 months—for the purpose of securing to the Senate committee knowledge of the contents of the messages—was without authority of law and contrary to the very terms of the act under which the commission was constituted."

But when it came to defining the rights of Senator Black or his investigating committee, the United States Court of Appeals held that the courts were without power to interfere. It said:

"The prayer of the bill (of complaint) is that the committee be restrained from keeping the messages or making any use of them or disclosing their contents. In other words, that if we find that the method adopted to obtain the telegrams was an invasion of appellant's legal rights, we should say to the committee and to the Senate that the contents could not be disclosed or used in the exercise by the Senate of its legitimate functions.

"We know of no case in which it has been held that a court of equity has authority to do any of these things. On the contrary, the universal rule, so far as we know it, is that the legislative discretion in discharge of its constitutional functions, whether rightfully or wrongfully exercised, is not a subject for judicial interference.

"The Constitution has lodged the legislative power exclusively in the Congress. If a court could say to the Congress that it could use or could not use information in its possession, the independence of the legislature would be destroyed and the constitutional separation of the powers of Government invaded. Nothing is better settled than that each of the three great departments of Government shall be independent and not subject to be controlled directly or indirectly by either of the others."

So the case boils down to the fact that while a President of the United States may forbid any employee in the executive branch from furnishing information to Congress and may fire the employee with or without giving any reasons, this does not mean that a Senator or Representative—who encourages an employee to risk his job by furnishing information to Congress in violation of the orders of his superior—is himself necessarily involved in any violation of law.

The court went further and said that even if information unconstitutionally acquired is disclosed in debate or discussion, the Senate committees cannot be enjoined against its use. But at the same time the court, expressing the pious hope that Senate committees wouldn't damage the rights of the citizens by such use, admitted it was only a hope—not a means of legal coercion.

Opinion Poll Report for Somerville, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 2, 1954

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I wish to include a partial report on the results of a questionnaire which I mailed early in April of this year to the residents of the 11th Congressional District of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

My purpose in conducting such an opinion poll during my first term here in Washington was not only to enable myself to better represent the people of my district but to acquaint them personally with some of the vital issues here in Washington.

The number of returns, and the interest displayed, have been most gratifying. I feel that the poll has been mutually beneficial. Following is a copy of the letter which accompanied the questionnaire, and the tabulated results for Somerville, Mass.:

United States
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Neighbor: As your Representative here in Washington, it would be invaluable for me to have the opinions of the people of our congressional district on matters which are vital to all of us.

I realize that you elected me with the expectation that I would always exercise my own best judgment in arriving at a decision as to how the vote for our district will be cast. It is a responsibility and a privilege which I welcome, and I hope that I shall always merit your trust and confidence.

If I had available a cross section of the views of the residents of the 11th Congressional District, and also any comments they might have on any given subject, it would help in clarifying the issues and reaching a truly representative decision.

Attached is a questionnaire on a group of subjects. I will be indebted to you if you will answer them, and also give your views in the spaces allotted. You need not add your signature if you would prefer not to do so.

Each of the questionnaires returned will be read by me personally, and a tabulation will be made. I shall appreciate your cooperation and assistance, and I am looking forward to your response.

With every good wish.

Sincerely,

THOMAS P. O'NEILL, Jr.,
Member of Congress.

Sommerville questionnaire

	Yes	No	No opinion
FOREIGN POLICY			
1. Do you approve of the present method of handling our international relations?	216	396	205
2. Do you believe that the United States Government should continue our foreign-aid program?	362	285	170
3. Do you feel that we should continue military aid to foreign nations?	462	221	134
4. Do you favor the continuation of economic aid to foreign nations?	437	230	150
5. Do you support the point 4 program (supplying technical assistance, manufacturing know-how, and management skills to underdeveloped nations to help them help themselves)?	570	124	123
(a) Do you believe this program should be reduced?	179	368	270
6. Do you believe that Russia should be permitted to remain in the United Nations?	278	360	179
7. Do you believe Communist China should be seated in the United Nations?	89	622	106
TARIFF POLICY			
1. Do you support the present methods of handling tariffs?	123	173	521
2. Do you believe that foreign goods should come into the United States regardless of the effect that it may have on the American worker?	74	489	254
3. Do you understand the present Government method of handling tariffs?	188	376	253
STATEHOOD			
1. Do you favor conferring statehood on—			
(a) Alaska?	653	115	49
(b) Hawaii?	669	99	49
TAX POLICY			
1. Do you believe that the Federal Government should spend more money than it receives in income?	132	603	82
If opposed, which of these steps would you take—			
(a) Keep taxes high?	195	245	377
(b) Cut domestic spending?	539	98	180
2. Do you feel taxes should be cut more than they already have been?	328	270	219
3. Do you support an increase in the exemption for dependents?	491	124	202
4. Do you favor cutting income taxes across the board percentagewise?	367	319	131
5. Do you believe in more exemption for dividends and other unearned income?	155	539	123
6. Do you support exemptions to cover expenses for college educations?	360	294	163
7. Do you favor an exemption for the first $1,500 of retired income?	322	115	180
SOCIAL SECURITY, HEALTH AND WELFARE			
1. Do you believe that the present 2-percent social-security tax on the employee should be maintained?	497	156	164
2. Do you believe it should be returned to 1½ percent?	156	497	164
3. Do you support an increase in old-age assistance benefits?	620	108	89
4. Do you favor an increase in the death benefits under social security?	140	497	180
5. Do you believe that hospitalization, sickness, and accident insurance should be covered by Federal law?	241	402	174
HOUSING			
1. Do you believe that more low-cost housing should be built by the State and Federal Governments?	375	327	115
LABOR LEGISLATION			
1. Are you in favor of raising the minimum wage?	531	156	130
2. Do you feel this would be helpful to New England insofar as competing with the Southern States is concerned?	449	163	205
3. In your opinion could small business afford an increase?	433	171	213
4. Do you believe that the Taft-Hartley Act is fair to management and labor?	83	441	293
b. Would you favor changes through amendments?	595	74	148
5. Are there sections of this law which you feel are oppressive to workers?	506	237	74
6. Are there, in your opinion, sections which are oppressive to small business?	449	261	107
ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY			
1. Do you understand the questions involved in the St. Lawrence seaway?	489	156	172
2. Do you feel that the construction of the seaway would hurt employment in our area?	253	344	220
3. Do you believe the St. Lawrence seaway would hurt the future economy of the New England area?	253	344	220
VOTING AGE			
1. Do you believe that persons who are 18 years old should be given the right to vote in national elections?	245	449	123
LOCAL ISSUES			
1. Do you believe the port of Boston should have more Federal assistance?	547	147	123
2. In your opinion, is the Federal Government treating New England fairly on the policy of defense cutbacks?	148	505	164
Name			
Address			

Public Laws 397 to 403, Inclusive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 17, 1954

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent, I am extending my remarks to include my report on recent legislation made to my constituents, as follows:

THIRTIETH REPORT ON LEGISLATION OF THE 83D CONGRESS

DEAR FRIEND: Continuing my report to you on the laws passed by this Congress and the part you played in their enactment by the votes you delegated me as your agent to cast in your behalf:

PUBLIC LAW 397

House Joint Resolution 481; memorial to Simon Bolivar: In 1949 Congress authorized the acceptance within a 5-year period of a statue of the great South American liberator, Simon Bolivar, as a gift of Venezuela. Domestic disturbances within that country delayed work on the statue. Public Law 397 extends the time another 5 years. The capital of the United States is rich in memorials to the great and noble. That of Simon Bolivar will be an appreciated addition.

PUBLIC LAW 398

H. R. 356, Railroad Retirement Act dual benefit provision: Public Law 398 comes as a boon to many retired railroad workers who had suffered a dimunition of income by reason of the so-called dual benefit provision written into the Railroad Retirement Act by the 82d Congress.

The act of 1951 (82d Cong.) made a distinction between workers who had creditable service before 1937 and those with creditable service after 1937 by providing that those who had creditable service before 1937 could not receive annuities under both railroad retirement and social security systems.

This is how it worked: An annuitant entitled to $129.80 a month (the average payment under the Railroad Retirement Act) and $40 a month under social security actually received $89.80 a month despite the fact that he had made his required contributions to both funds. He was penalized, not benefited, to the extent of the social security for which he had paid. Some 30,200 annuitants and 10,500 wives were affected. Severe hardship resulted in many instances.

Public Law 398 rights the injustice by repealing retroactively the dual benefit provision of the 82d Congress. Hereafter all retired railroad workers will receive their full annuities plus whatever they are entitled to under social security.

I am informed that everyone except possibly the railroad managements (they match the employee's contributions to the fund) is now entirely satisfied with the legislation. The nonoperating brotherhoods at first were fearful that the legislation would adversely affect the fund's actuarial soundness, later joined with the operating unions in its support.

In casting your vote for the bill I had in mind that it is hard enough in these days of high costs for annuitants to get by, and furthermore, a man is entitled to what he pays for, whether it is insurance or bread.

PUBLIC LAW 399

H. R. 2828, Menominee Indians: This is important legislation at a time in our history when it is essential to the maintenance of our world position that all racial segments of our population have equal enjoyment of the opportunities and dignity of first-class citizenship.

Public Law 399 provides that on December 31, 1958, the Menominee Indians in Wisconsin will be removed from Federal guardship, thereafter to stand on their own feet like all other Americans. Meanwhile there immediately will be distributed $1,500 per capita payments among the 3,150 members of the tribe from some $10 million the Menominees have on deposit in the United States Treasury. This deposit includes $7,650,000 paid by the Federal Government in satisfaction of a 1951 judgment in the Court of Claims.

I think you will approve of my contribution of your vote to the passage of this measure. (1) It seemed to me unfair to keep the descendants of the first Americans in the ignominy of being wards, especially in instances where they have given clear evidence of their competency to handle and protect their own affairs. Keeping the Indians in an inferior status would be used by our enemies to jeopardize our acceptance as a friend by all the many races of the world. (2) Making $1,500 per capita distributions now will save the taxpayers $200,000 a year in interest which existing law requires the Government to pay on Indian deposits in the Treasury. I thought the $200,000 well worth saving.

I was pleased to learn from the committee report of the fine record of the Menominees. The reservation (235,000 acres, largely timberland) is worked by the tribe, which owns and profitably operates a large logging and sawmill business. Most of the tribe members are employed in this enterprise. It is likely that when the Federal guardship ends the tribe will organize a corporation and continue to run the business as other Americans do when joined in a corporate venture.

PUBLIC LAW 400

S. 251, docket fees: Attention Federal lawyers: a default judgment is a "final hearing" in the meaning of section 1923 (a) of title 28, United States Code, entitling winning counsel to docket fees of $20. Public Law 400 clears up the point.

PUBLIC LAW 401

S. 1399, national forest lands in Arizona: On the completion of the Roosevelt Reservoir in the national forest lands area of Arizona a number of buildings used during construction were sold to the Salt River Valley Water Users Association. Public Law 401 authorizes the sale to the association of the remaining buildings, the proceeds to apply on the erection of a new forest ranger station nearby. A practical arrangement.

PUBLIC LAW 402

S. 1823, veterans as homesteaders: This places Korean war veterans on the same footing as World War II veterans in the matter of meeting the residential requirements of the homestead law. Their war service up to 2 years is to be credited as actual residence on the homestead. Public Law 402 also extends the veterans preference right to apply for public lands (due to expire September 27, 1954) another 5 years, and properly removes the restriction that the veteran must be 21 years old. The House passed the bill by consent.

PUBLIC LAW 403

S. 3096, doctors in enlisted grades: Section 4 of the 1953 Doctors Draft Act (see my Rept. No. 6) provided for the appointment of draftees to commissioned ranks commensurate with professional education and experience. The Court of Appeals, Fourth District, held this made mandatory the discharge of the draftee failing to qualify for a commission.

Public Law 403 reestablishes and legalizes a former practice by specifying that any inductee who fails to qualify for, or to accept, a commission may be utilized in his professional capacity (physician, dentist, veterinarian) in an enlisted grade or rank.

Now that Korea is over, the Doctors Draft Act (admittedly discriminatory) should be repealed as quickly as the welfare of our enlistees will permit. The proper approach is to make the service sufficiently attractive to career professionals so that there will be no necessity of resorting to a draft applicable only to one group.

Cordially and sincerely,

BARRATT O'HARA,
Member of Congress.

A Limited Partnership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 1, 1954

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am including at this point an editorial that appeared in the Wall Street Journal entitled "Limited Partnership":

From most current comment you would think the Anglo-American alliance is rapidly crumbling and that its only hope is the personal meeting scheduled between President Eisenhower and Prime Minister Churchill.

The assumption appears to be that it is normal for the United States and Britain to see eye to eye on everything, and abnormal for them to differ. In fact, the reverse is closer to the truth. The two nations have a natural identity, or even a similarity of interests only in rather limited spheres.

Both countries are based on free political institutions and therefore in theory both oppose encroachments on freedom in the world. But it is a big jump from that abstract premise to the conclusion that the two can or should agree on policies everywhere and under all circumstances.

For instance, it might seem that Britain would share the United States interest in European integration, considering the geogrpahy involved. But it doesn't. It has declined the leadership in European economic, military, and political cooperation that many expected, and that role has fallen to the United States.

The reason for British hesitance is that its historic external interest was not Europe but Empire, and that is still the case even though the Empire is now a shrunken Commonwealth. Empire and Commonwealth, moreover, gave Britain a historic stake in the Orient but, again, it is not the same stake as America's.

Thus this country finds China in its western backyard, whereas to Britain China is literally the Far East. Partly because of this geographical difference, Britain never developed the kind of affinity for the Chinese that the United States did, and in consequence it could view the Communists' conquest of China with greater equanimity.

On the other hand, India, with which this country has had comparatively little contact, is still the focus of Britain's Asian policies. These geographical and historical differences between America and Britain are bound to show, and they recently have—as, for example, in the British determination to negotiate with the Communists before setting up the Southeast Asian defense alliance the United States wanted right away.

Elsewhere there are other divergences created by geography and history, and there are important economic and cultural differences between the two nations as well. It becomes clear, therefore, that the trouble is not that Anglo-American relations have deteriorated but that too much was expected from the alliance in the first place.

This notion that the two countries should have common policies for every area and situation is fairly new, deriving from the World War II partnership. It was an attempt to impose a kind of conformity in an idealistic impression that this could be done even where the foundations of conformity were lacking. Like all such attempts it could not be wholly successful.

As the London Daily Mirror recently commented, "the astonishing fact is not that Anglo-American relations are so bad, but that they are not worse." Undoubtedly Mr. Eisenhower and Sir Winston can help improve them in the forthcoming talks.

But the best hope of reinvigorating the partnership in the long run is to recognize its natural limitations. A limited partnership may not appeal to idealists, but it is more likely to be effective where it can operate and less likely to cause dismay that it can't operate everywhere.

More Lambasting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 8, 1954

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, you have often heard the expressions: "How silly can you get?" or "How ridiculous are some people?" The New Orleans Times-Picayune in its recent issue of Tuesday, July 6, comes about as close to giving the proper answer as anything I have read recently.

The editorial was inspired by the most recent of the silly and ridiculous actions of the Civil Aeronautics Board in connection with the futile attempts of Eastern Airlines to establish a direct route between New Orleans and Mexico City.

This travesty on good judgment and commonsense has long ago passed the amusement stage and has become tragic in its implications and ramifications.

George W. Healy, Jr., editor of the New Orleans Times-Picayune, well sums up the situation in these most pertinent observations in the editorial entitled "More Lambasting":

MORE LAMBASTING

New Orleans took another air-bomb in the midsection with the Civil Aeronautics Board's decision to facilitate proceedings involving nonstop airline service, New York to Mexico City, over this city.

Bilateral negotiations with Mexico still supposedly are being conducted looking to New Orleans-Mexico City service, with this city either a stop or a terminal. Recently Mexican Government representatives manifested decided interest in this long-overdue, supremely natural communications provision. Without it, detours into Texas are the only means available for New Orleans-Mexico

City flight. Detours to New York for that purpose are, of course, out of the question—except, perhaps, in the minds of those New York-and-vicinity commercial interests that from time immemorial have sought to get New Orleans bypassed in long-range communications.

A New York-New Orleans-Mexico City service, on the other hand, taking the natural great circle route, would satisfy the needs of New Orleans, Mexico, and efficiency.

The issue of making permanent the authority granted American Airlines to fly nonstop, like Air France, from New York to Mexico City, will figure in the hearing (not yet dated) set by CAB. This means abandoning an AA stop at Dallas and changing the route to a more direct one, via New Orleans. If Dallas lost her "stop," it would mean nothing to her not to be "flown over." To New Orleans, to be flown over without ever having got the "stop" or service that reason dictates, adds affront to injury.

Still more of this last comes with Eastern Airlines' decision to get into the nonstop game. This involves apparent abandonment of a once-promising New Orleans-Mexico City flight project. It also involves a revival or revalidifying of this old permit, solely to effect New York-Mexico City flights (nonstop). The application says in effect that "if we had this (old) permit, or regain it, it would be used for nonstop purposes."

Pan-American also has a nonstop application. Presumably it also involves flying over New Orleans. All these applications have been consolidated for joint hearing by CAB, with dissent only by Commissioner Josh Lee. They all want to fly over New Orleans, according to the face of the applications, but not stop here.

The bridesmaid who never became a bride had it easy compared with the Crescent City. New Orleans was at one time, at least, "engaged," and still has hopes the engagement will go through. There must be some way in which reason may fly in the face of absurdity in this matter. So far it's been vice versa.

The Responsibility of the CAB to the All-Cargo Air Carriers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR ENGLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 2, 1954

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, in regard to the appropriation for the Civil Aeronautics Board and for payment of subsidy aid to the passenger-carrying airlines, a great deal has been said heretofore to justify the appropriation regarding the great need and importance of granting this Government aid to the passenger airlines in order that we might maintain adequate civilian air support available to the military when needed for national defense, and that we might also be assured of adequate airmail service for the Nation.

I feel that this is a most appropriate time to bring to the attention of the Congress that a relatively new and extremely important segment of our air industry, developed by an able group of young veterans of World War II, the nonsubsidized all-cargo airlines, actually made the largest contribution to the recent Tokyo airlift of any segment of our air industry during the Korean hostilities; in fact, these nonsubsidized cargo carriers flew more than 55 percent of the entire tonnage moved by our civilian airlines during this emergency.

Furthermore, one of these all-cargo carriers, the Flying Tiger Line, Inc., now the largest cargo air line in the world, has offered to carry mail for the Government without subsidy at about one-third of the minimum service rate now being paid by the Government for the carriage of airmail. Although their applications have been pending for many months, no action has as yet been taken by the Civil Aeronautics Board. On the other hand, the passenger air lines have been permitted by the Board to compete with the cargo lines in the freight field, with their competition subsidized by supplemental revenues from mail, express, passengers, and actually also by Government subsidy aid.

Under the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, the Civil Aeronautics Board has the responsibility for the encouragement and development of an air transportation system properly adapted to the present and future needs of the foreign and domestic commerce of the United States, of the postal service, and of the national defense. Nowhere in the Civil Aeronautics Act is the Board's responsibility limited to the development and encouragement of passenger air lines alone. In the declaration of policy by the Congress, it was intended that all worthwhile segments of civil aeronautics be encouraged in their proper and adequate development by the Civil Aeronautics Board, and subsidy aid was provided for by the Congress merely as one of the means whereby the Civil Aeronautics Board might assist in maintaining adequate air transportation required for the commerce of the United States, the postal service, and the national defense. Nowhere in the Civil Aeronautics Act is it suggested that the interest of the Civil Aeronautics Board in the development of adequate civil aviation be limited to those air lines who receive subsidy aid or who are made eligible by the Board to receive such Government aid.

During the past year a study of Federal aviation policies has been made at the request of the President of the United States by his Air Coordinating Committee. A report entitled "Civil Air Policy" was made by the Committee on May 1, and on May 26, this year, the President adopted the report "as a guide in future consideration of questions related to the subject of civil aviation and in making recommendations to Congress." I quote briefly from portions of the report regarding air cargo:

> The potential value of a healthy and expanding air-cargo industry to our economy and national defense has become increasingly apparent. A quickened industrial pace, combined with the national need to utilise our resources more efficiently, promises to make the movement of cargo by air as essential as the established need for air carriage of persons and mail.
>
> Proper growth of the air-cargo industry will provide, in addition to economic benefits, a civil air-cargo fleet forming a substantial security asset in the event of national mobilization.
>
> The further development of the air-cargo industry, with particular emphasis on all-cargo services, is in the national interest and should be encouraged.

The President's Air Coordinating Committee report continues on at some length regarding the national importance of the cargo airlines and makes a number of recommendations as to ways in which Federal agencies should encourage the development and maintenance of a healthy cargo industry by expanded use of civil cargo airlift, by granting all-cargo carriers certificates of longer duration to enable them to obtain adequate financing, and so forth. It would be certainly consistent with the President's civil air policy, as well as with the intent of Congress as expressed in the Civil Aeronautics Act, for the Civil Aeronautics Board to permit all-cargo carriers of proven worth and stability, such as the world's largest all-cargo carrying airline, the Flying Tiger Line, Inc., to carry such cargo as express, parcel post and mail, which come rightfully within the category of property or cargo, which these airlines are especially equipped to handle.

Recently on May 18, Mr. Robert W. Prescott, president of the Flying Tiger Line, Inc., testified before the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of the Senate regarding the curent status of the all-cargo airlines. Mr. Prescott's statement is, in my opinion, extremely worthwhile and I believe will be of considerable interest to Members of the House of Representatives—it was placed in the Appendix of the Record on June 30, 1954.

While we are being asked by the Civil Aeronautics Board for millions of dollars in appropriations to enable them to carry out that part of their responsibility for the maintenance of services by the passenger airlines, I take this opportunity to remind the Board and to call to the attention of the Congress that the Board also has a responsibility under the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 for fostering and maintaining a healthy air freight industry, which has become essential to our economy and to the national defense by such action by the Board as will reflect equitable treatment for this segment of the aviation industry under existing law and existing executive policy.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the Congressional Record is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Frank Brodie is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the Record at $1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. The money derived from such sales shall be paid into the Treasury and accounted for in his annual report to Congress, and no sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

Appendix

George Washington, General of the Armies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 9, 1954

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, some time ago I introduced a bill to establish the rank of George Washington as General of the Armies.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record a very interesting broadcast by Col. Charles R. McGovern, of Pittsburgh, who is not only a great historian, but has also been a very fine soldier. I believe that the broadcast by Colonel McGovern should have the very serious consideration of all Americans who are interested in the history of our country and in the proper placing of General Washington as an officer of the Army of the United States.

There being no objection, the text of the broadcast was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Ladies and gentlemen, the Battle of Fort Necessity, which took place in western Pennsylvania's forest lands on the 3d of July 1754, marked the first defense action of the American Colonies in the fight for control of the forks of the rivers here in what is now Pittsburgh.

On the 28th of April 1954, Senator Edward Martin, of Pennsylvania, one of the greatest exponents of American history and a former Governor of the Keystone State, introduced legislation for the final establishment of the rank of George Washington as "General of the Armies," the title to date from the 15th of June 1775 and to become a law before July 3 of this year of 1954, when the people of Pennsylvania and the Nation will celebrate the bicentennial anniversary of the Battle of Fort Necessity, near the present site of Uniontown.

It would now appear that the action of General Martin is simply to reconfer upon George Washington, the equivalent rank within the Army of the United States that he held within the Army of the United Colonies, and from the original date of rank in 1775, since, obviously, the United Colonies and the United States became one and the same.

Washington's rank would thus be senior to all other Generals of the Armies, past, present, or in the future. This is as it should be.

The official birthday of the United States Army, historically and properly, is June 14, 1775, when it was the Army of the United Colonies.

Senator Martin's recent remarks on the Senate floor were in part:

"That there would be no more fitting time to finally establish the rank of General Washington than on the occasion of the anniversary of the first combat battle in the western wilderness of this State, which will be celebrated by representation from the British, French, and Canadian Governments, and the varied armed services of the United States.

"Washington victoriously led American troops in the War of the Rebellion under the rank and title of 'General and Commander of the Army of the United States and of all forces under arms or to be raised at the time.'

"General Washington resigned that commission on the 23d of December 1783 and returned to his home in Mount Vernon to celebrate the first Christmas Day there in 7 years. He was elected President of the new Republic and took office March 4, 1793. Refusing to consider a third term, he issued his farewell address to the Nation on the 17th of September 1796.

"His semiretirement was not to last long, as a war with France was threatening.

"President John Adams became deeply concerned and asked General Washington if he would accept appointment again, this time to command the Armies of the United States.

"The Congress of 1798 authorized the raising of a provincial army in view of the situation existing at that time, and which empowered the President to appoint a Commander of the Army, who, being commissioned as lieutenant general 'may be authorized to command the Armies of the United States, as Commander in Chief.' And on July 4, 1798, the appointment after being accepted by Washington was promptly confirmed. All of this of course, at that time, was in preparation for a war with France, which did not take place.

"In the following year as our fledgling Nation continued to grow stronger, men began to reflect upon a permanent, Military Establishment, and Congress on March 3, 1799, provided that 'a commander of the Army be appointed and commissioned under title of "General of the Armies of the United States" and the existing office of Lieutenant General' was to be abolished. But General Washington died December 14, 1799, 9 months after the act was passed. And the title had not been conferred on him.

"Historians have offered many reasons why President Adams delayed to honor the intent of Congress, but perhaps the answer is best found in an opinion by the then United States Attorney, dated August 24, 1855, indicating, in his opinion that the Cabinet and the President, were not altogether in agreement on the nature of the possible war, and even differed on this very point of the military title of the person to command the Army—President Adams preferring 'Lieutenant General' instead of 'General of the Armies of the United States,' which, in his view, touched, if it did not encroach, upon the constitutional functions of the President, or at least, on his vanity.

"Five months later, on the 14th of May of 1800, Congress passed an act authorizing President Adams to suspend any appointment to the office of General of the Armies of the United States, with the explanation of 'having reference to economy and the good of the service.'

"Two facts thus stand out in bold relief:

"First. Washington's title and rank during the Revolutionary War in which our Nation won its freedom—was 'General and Commander in Chief of the Army of the United Colonies and of all forces raised for that war.'

"Second. Washington's rank and title in the United States to which he was appointed in anticipation of a war with France was that of Lieutenant General and Commander in Chief of all the Armies raised or to be raised in the United States.

"The word 'Chief' seemed to stick in their craws.

"Washington's combat rank and title as our leader in the War for Independence of the American Colonies was conferred on him by a Nation not yet born, but which was fighting its way in the world.

"His second, and certainly least important title, seems to be the one that found its way first into the record books, because it was the title conferred upon him by the newborn United States, which by that time, had a Constitution.

"On the list of officers of the United States Army, General Washington holds rank only as lieutenant general because his rank of General and Commander in Chief of the Army was under the United Colonies, as directed by the Second Continental Congress.

"It goes without saying that the time has long since passed when the Nation, which Washington so nobly and heroically helped create by force of arms, should confer upon him the equivalent rank and title to that which he held as Commander in Chief of the Revolutionary War.

"The rank and title of 'General of the Army' has since been earned and conferred upon 8 men, namely, Grant, Sherman, Sheridan, Marshall, MacArthur, Eisenhower, Arnold, and Bradley, while the rank and title of General of the Armies has been earned and conferred upon 1 man only Gen. John Pershing."

In April of 1754, Col. George Washington was at Wills Creek with three companions, on his march to Fort Redstone, in western Pennsylvania, when the news of the surrender at the forks of the rivers here by Ensign Ward reached him.

After a consultation with his officers he determined to advance and on the 9th of May reached Little Meadows where he learned the French commander contreceuer was reenforcing his men at Fort Duquesne and had French spies throughout the Monongahela Valley bribing the redmen.

Colonel Washington arrived at Great Meadows on the 27th, where he met Christopher Gist at his cabin on this spot, and Gist informed the young Colonel that a party of French scouts had stopped at his inn the day before and that evening, Half King then encamped about 6 miles off from Gists had called to warn him that the French were near Washington's camp.

Washington then left with his men to join the Indian chief. The night was dark and the rain coming down in torrents causing delay in reaching the Indian camp where a council was held at sunrise and spies sent out. They discovered the French lurking in an obscure spot surrounded by rocks.

A disposition was then made for an attack with the English on the right and the Indians on the left approaching in single file. The French, on their approach ran to arms and an engagement took place. The firing lasted only a short time when the French surrendered. Their leader Jumonville was killed and 22 were taken prisoners. One French soldier escaped taking news of the fight to Fort Duquesne, which was Colonel Washington's objective in that first military engagement of his career. He then returned to Great Meadows and threw up a fortification to which he gave the name of Fort Necessity. And then he proceeded to cut a road through the wilderness to Gist's plantation.

From the 1st of May until the 1st of July of that year preparations were made at Fort Necessity to meet the French from the Forks and measures taken to strengthen the post.

On the 3d of July Washington received an alarm of an approaching enemy.

The attack took place at 11 o'clock in a downpour of rain that morning, and kept up until 8 o'clock in the evening when the French sent word to Washington to have an officer come to treat with them.

Captain Van Braam being the only man able to converse in French brought back terms of capitulation which he translated to Colonel Washington by flickering candlelight in the still dripping rain. And proved to have been mistranslated.

Washington and his men then hastened back to Wills Creek where Fort Cumberland was erected.

The French and Indian War in America and the Seven Years War in Europe was the culmination of the Great Meadows campaign in Pennsylvania in 1754 resulting in maps of three continents being changed and moving the Frenchman, Voltaire, to issue his famous phrase: "A common shot, fired in the backwoods of America, was the signal that set all Europe ablaze."

Young Washington entered western Pennsylvania when only 22, as the vanguard of a force under Gen. Joshua Fry, and placed in command by Governor Dinwiddie at Colonel Fry's death.

Next week end, July 3 through the 4th, Americans will gather on the site of old Fort Necessity which has been restored for the occasion by the National Park Service.

General Martin, a distinguished soldier himself, in his motion, pointed out that the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, were all created in the Keystone State, at Philadelphia, the birthplace of liberty in America, and the cradle of the United States. It is altogether fitting and proper then, that this action to place in proper perspective, and to give historical continuity to the rank and title of George Washington, our first commanding general and our first President of the United States, should take place in this year of 1954, on the occasion of the 200th anniversary of the decisive battle of Fort Necessity.

There could be no more fitting period to establish for all time, the primacy of General Washington on the rolls of the United States Army.

Good night folks.

Comment by Hon. Homer Ferguson, of Michigan, on Vice President Nixon's Address in Milwaukee on Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. ALEXANDER SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 9, 1954

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement prepared by the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] commenting on the recent address in Milwaukee by the Vice President.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HOMER FERGUSON, REPUBLICAN, OF MICHIGAN, ON VICE PRESIDENT NIXON'S RECENT ADDRESS IN MILWAUKEE

As chairman of the majority policy committee of the Senate, and as member of the Foreign Relations Committee, I feel compelled to take cognizance of complaints by certain Democrat leaders concerning Republican criticism of Asiatic foreign policy as practiced by Secretary of State Acheson during the Truman administration.

Vice President NIXON summarized our reasoned view of that policy in his Milwaukee speech of June 26, when he said: "It was a policy characterized by weakness and surrender of principle at the conference table. It failed to recognize that the danger from Communist aggression in Asia was just as great as in Europe. It failed to recognize that Moscow inspired revolutions, like those in China and in Indochina, constituted Communist aggression of the most dangerous type."

The Vice President added that foreign policy, under President Eisenhower and Secretary of State Dulles, perceives this global nature of the Red menace and is meeting it positively through a program of strength and firmness.

We have entered an extremely delicate period of international diplomacy, in which the future of the free world very likely hangs in the balance. We must not make any mistakes.

Therefore, it becomes a matter of utmost importance to look back, carefully, and discover where United States foreign policy went wrong in the past. In this, we are not questioning the motives of our predecessor administration's foreign relations, but the methods and, of course, the sorry results. In 7 short years such policies contributed to the loss of 600 million persons to communism, helped lead us inexorably into the Korean war, and encouraged Red China to fan the flames of the Indochina conflict.

We are told by certain Democrat spokesmen that bipartisan foreign policy is endangered by blunt criticism of past blunders. That is wholly untrue.

Instead, it would be a senseless ostrich attitude to ignore yesterday's failures in the light of today's terrible challenge. Unless we do keep those errors firmly in mind, we are apt to fall into the same global trap—so cleverly baited by Communists who talk peaceful coexistence, but who give no factual evidence of good faith.

I know the Eisenhower administration intends to continue to deal from strength, not weakness, and desires bipartisanship in the development of our foreign policy.

Must One Retire?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER F. GEORGE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 9, 1954

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Must One Retire?" published in the Christian Science Monitor of July 8, 1954. This is a very pertinent editorial on the social-security bill, which will be before the Senate shortly.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MUST ONE RETIRE?

This newspaper a number of times has objected to provisions of the Social Security Act (as now repeatedly amended) which tend both to push people into retirement and then to limit their productiveness. We have ventured also that there ought to be some areas of the national economy where people could be allowed to take responsibility for their own financial security.

Is there not some way to permit voluntary participation or nonparticipation in old-age insurance at least by some categories of workers or of self-employed? The experts say "No" because of what they call adverse selection. That is, many would tend to remain out of the system during their younger years when they would be contributing to the necessary reserves but decide to come in later when the problems of age appeared more imminent.

The fact that old-age benefits now are paid at flat rates instead of being based partly on length of coverage removes any incentive to start participation early. In this framework the social-security staff sees no middle course between compulsory coverage and complete exclusion.

In the case of the medical profession, its spokesmen have convinced the House of Representatives that physicians and surgeons should be omitted entirely on the grounds that they seldom retire from practice and hence would reap relatively limited benefits from inclusion. The Washington office of the Christian Science Committee on Publication has pointed out that this is equally true of Christian Science practitioners and has asked their exemption from compulsory coverage.

There are other professional people also whose services grow in value with experience and whose greatest usefulness may be realized after the conventional retirement age of 65. This includes architects, lawyers, ministers, educators, and writers, and is true of many in skilled trades as well.

The extension of coverage pending before the Senate Finance Committee would work a hardship on these people because it would force them either to retire—often forfeiting years of greatest usefulness—or to lose benefits for which they had been compelled to pay. Social security is still in need of review to discover ways of encouraging rather than discouraging usefulness in longevity. Until that is achieved, some are obliged to request omission rather than coverage in seeking to make their greatest contribution to society.

Independence Day and the Indians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 9, 1954

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter to the editor, which appeared in the Great Falls Tribune of Monday, July 5, 1954, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. This letter contains a very eloquent appeal by an Indian woman of Montana for a fair deal for the Indians. I recommend it to my colleagues, in the hope that it may soften their hearts in considering the many Indian programs now being brought before Congress for consideration.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Letters to the Editor

Dear Sir: On Independence Day the words "Land of the free and home of the brave" are words that are in the minds and hearts of most people in the United States. Especially are Montana Indians thinking about them. In fact they are praying at the sun dances against the kind of independence that is being forced on the Flatheads and was forced on the Menominee Tribe 2 weeks ago when their regular per capita payment bill was tricked into full termination.

The Indians heard some pretty strange things at the Montana University Institute about freedom and independence for Indians. One Bureau man said to a Flathead, "You want to keep those peculiar treaties that make you the aliens that you are."

The tribe gave $300 of tribal funds to the institute but somebody told them, "Don't you dare to bring up termination." Miss Lewis from Washington, D. C., told everybody there, "The Indians must change."

It seems lots of people, even President Eisenhower, are talking as if there was some crime in being a ward of the Government. After all, a ward just means you are a member of a tribe that has a special claim against the Federal Government. Every ward Indian that I know tells me the reservation is one place in Montana where an Indian can call his soul his own, where he can walk with his head up. He walks on his own soil.

Of course, since I am only an Indian woman and incompetent, I am not supposed to understand how it is that you can be made free without asking your consent to the terms. But being a woman, I worry about something else, that home of the brave. We used to hear real rousing speeches on the Fourth of July. Will anybody hear about termination this year? I doubt it.

Maybe the men are not afraid. It could be they just do not know what goes on. Mrs. Thumm says that last week the Indian Bureau was voted out of its health services. This week Congress will cut off the agriculture and extension service. They lop off one Federal arm at a time and one tribe at a time.

I guess the men are choked down with this 1954 kind of freedom. History tells us that when the first people came to America, the first thing they did was fall on their faces and kiss the earth at Plymouth Rock. Then they fell upon the necks of their hosts, the few Indians that were on hand, and they've been there ever since.

Now they have a stranglehold with their termination propaganda. If an Indian says he is against it, they tell him he is unpatriotic because he does not want to go out on his own and pay taxes. That is one thing that will shut an Indian up right now, to be told he is unpatriotic—with our war record. If he says he is for it, he knows that terminating the tribe and its resources means he will have no backing to make good on his own. Who will give him the credit he needs to pay his taxes?

Maybe it will have to be up to the Indian women. We ought to start a letter-to-Mamie campaign so she can tell Eisenhower the complete story about this Indian freedom. She should know that the way they are doing this thing the women and children will suffer from a terminated reservation. We can't make it without the Federal Government. A few of us have made it, maybe, but not whole tribes. Chief Little Shell's people, who were terminated out of North Dakota, my own tribe could not make it. Some of them on Hill 57 are trying yet to get a foothold. None of us wants to see other tribes deprived of freedom of choice. Thank you.

Mrs. Emma Koliha,
Montana Chippewa, Great Falls.

Espionage and Sabotage Act of 1954

SPEECH
OF

HON. DeWITT S. HYDE

OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 8, 1954

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 9580) to revise and extend the laws relating to espionage and sabotage, and for other purposes.

Mr. HYDE. Madam Chairman, this bill, H. R. 9580, incorporates the provisions of the three bills introduced at the request of the Attorney General. These bills which are incorporated in this one bill are part of the administration program to strengthen internal security and to aid us in our defense against those who would destroy us by subversive activities.

Title I of H. R. 9580 incorporates fully the provisions of H. R. 8749.

The Attorney General has submitted that in view of the technological advance made in scientific research, the possibilities of sabotage by radioactive, biological, or chemical agents have been greatly increased. The sabotage statute as it is presently worded is not geared to keep pace with our technological advances, therefore certain changes in definitions are necessary. These changes in definitions are incorporated in this bill.

As far as title I of the bill is concerned, that is primarily what is done, namely, to make certain changes in definitions to bring the statute up to meet modern technological advances. For example, section 101 of title I adds to the definition of "war material" and "national-defense material," the words "air" and "water" and to the definitions of "war utilities" and "national-defense utilities" the word "air" has been added; also war utilities and national-defense utilities have been redefined to include airfields, airlanes, and fixtures or appurtenance therto, which, strangely enough, are not in the present statute.

"National defense material" is amended to conform with "war material" in that "forage and forest products and standing timber" have been added to the definition of "national-defense material."

Section 102 of title I provides for the applicability of section 2153, title 18, United States Code, not only in time of war but also in time of national emergency as declared by the President or by the Congress.

Section 102 also recognizes the possibility of bacteriological warfare by including within it the provisions making it a crime to contaminate or infect war material, war premises, or war utilities.

Section 103 makes the sabotage laws effective in time of national emergency as well as in time of war.

Section 2154 of title 18 of the United States Code is by this bill amended by section 103 to make a crime the construction in a defective manner of war premises or war utilities, in addition to war material. Thus it is proposed to make it a crime wilfully to construct in a defective manner an airbase.

Section 104 adds conspiracy provisions to sections 2155 and 2156 of title 18 of the United States Code. In other words, the new provision here is the crime of conspiracy to commit these acts of sabotage as well as the commission of the acts themselves.

Mr. GROSS. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HYDE. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Section 105, I assume, would apply with equal force to the operator of an industry we will say making munitions or barbed wire, both of which were found to be defective, and I think deliberately so, during the last war; the provisions of that section would apply with equal effect to the operator or owner of a manufacturing plant as well as to workmen; is that true?

Mr. HYDE. Oh, yes; to anyone who is guilty of attempting to injure or interfere with or to obstruct the national defense by sabotage in a plant which has been defined as a national utility or as a national defense premise.

Mr. GROSS. What change has there been in the penalty?

Mr. HYDE. There is no change here in the penalty, not in title I.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HYDE. Title II of the bill incorporates the provisions of the original bill, H. R. 9021, and is designed to increase the penalty for peacetime espionage and to correct the deficiencies in sentencing there. That is the title about which the gentleman from New York [Mr. Celler], just spoke to the House.

Mr. CELLER. The present statute of limitation on peacetime espionage is 10 years?

Mr. HYDE. Yes.

Mr. CELLER. This would remove all statute limitations on espionage?

Mr. HYDE. That is right.

Mr. CELLER. I am not opposed to the bill. I made these observations in passing concerning the penalty with reference to peacetime espionage.

Mr. HYDE. I would like to say to the gentleman from New York that I have a lot of sympathy with the gentleman's point of view. As a matter of fact, one of the difficulties of our society is attempting to define the proper punishment to fit a crime. I might add that we already have in the atomic energy law provision for the death penalty in case of peacetime espionage. It may be that the death penalty is not right in any case, under any circumstances, but it just so happens that our society is at present still struggling with the problem, and we are struggling with that problem as much in connection with this subject as any other.

Mr. CELLER. With reference to atomic energy, you have situations quite different in the facilities than are embodied in this bill. I would not say that those facilities in this bill rise to the importance of atomic energy. Would not the gentleman agree that that is so?

Mr. HYDE. Yes, I would, because that deals with any attempt to communicate any information to a foreign country which would injure the United States. In effect, any person who is engaged in such activity is indirectly thus dealing in murder.

Mr. CELLER. Yes. But there are specific references to "document, writing, code book, signal book, sketch, photograph, photographic negative, blueprint, plan, map, model, note, instrument," which makes the crime very broad.

Mr. HYDE. No. I think the gentleman is aware of the fact that the terms of that particular section—which are not new, incidentally—have been defined by the Supreme Court in several cases, which court decisions justly limit the meaning of those to the intent that Congress intended for them, namely, to protect us in the national defense.

Mr. HALE. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HYDE. I yield to the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. HALE. Glancing over this bill hastily, I fail to find any provision in any section that makes the death penalty mandatory.

Mr. HYDE. The death penalty is not mandatory.

Mr. HALE. It is death or imprisonment for any terms of years or for life. Is that correct?

Mr. HYDE. That is correct.

Mr. HALE. So that it would seem that juries would not be deterred by the death penalty because it is not mandatory?

Mr. HYDE. I would not think that they would be deterred in view of the fact that it is not mandatory.

Mr. BAILEY. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HYDE. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. Section 104 reads in part:

> Whoever, with intent to injure, interfere with, or obstruct the national defense of the United States, willfully injures, destroys, contaminates or effects, or attempts to so injure—

And so forth.

Mr. HYDE. That is the conspiracy section.

Mr. BAILEY. I would like to ask the gentleman if it is his opinion that if you had an economic strike in progress at one of the defense industries and some Government property was destroyed, that that would be covered by that particular section there, and would the penalty apply.

Mr. HYDE. No. You have to bear in mind that it would have to be a conspiracy to violate section 9, and it must be to interfere with and obstruct the national defense of the United States. If it was an ordinary economic strike, there would be no charge such as the gentleman suggests.

Mr. BAILEY. But there might be some Government property destroyed, and I wonder whether that would be broad enough to invoke the penalty involved here.

Mr. HYDE. No; I think not.

Mr. CELLER. Madam Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, on page 10, we have these significant words beginning in line 4:

> Whoever, in time of war, with intent that the same shall be communicated to the enemy, collects, records, publishes, or communicates, or attempts to elicit any information—

And so forth. You may remember that some time ago a Chicago newspaper—I think it was the Chicago Tribune—publicized the fact that the Navy had cracked the Jap code. While it was true that the publisher of that newspaper was not certain of his facts, he made that statement, and I understood, of course, that this was during time of war, but suppose that had happened during time of peace. Could that editor of the newspaper be haled before the court?

Mr. HYDE. No; in the first place, the section the gentleman read applies only in time of war. If such a thing similar to it, should happen, that would come under subsection (a) of section 201. That section has been well defined by the Supreme Court of the United States so that the danger to which the gentleman refers would not arise.

Mr. CELLER. And it must be to the injury of the United States, even though under subsection (a); is not that correct?

Mr. HYDE. That is correct.

Mr. CELLER. And that would be a question for a jury, would it not?

Mr. HYDE. Yes; in a sense it would. But whether or not it had violated this statute, the language of subsection (a), section 201, means what has been defined by the Supreme Court, so that there would be no danger of an innocent newspaper report being construed as being an intent to injure the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CELLER. Madam Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. HYDE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CELLER. What about writers, commentators, who gather a great deal of statistics; naval, military, statistics on logistics, and so forth; they might publish them and come within the toils of the statute. That might be a question for a jury to determine whether or not they had the intent to aid the enemy.

Mr. HYDE. I think in view of the Supreme Court decisions, two of them, on this very section, that there would be no danger of such an interpretation being put on the statute.

Mr. GRAHAM. If the gentleman will yield to me, in the case of *Gorin* v. *United States* (312 U. S. 19), on that very point, it is set out that intent to injure the United States must be proved.

Mr. HYDE. That is correct.

Mr. POFF. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. HYDE. I yield.

Mr. POFF. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD immediately following the remarks of the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HYDE].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HYDE. Madam Chairman, under title II, it is proposed to make espionage a capital offense irrespective of whether it was committed in time of war or in time of peace. It brings it within the purview of title 18, United States Code 3281, which provides that an indictment for a capital offense may be found at any time without limitation. In other words, as has been said, the effect of that would be to remove the statute of limitations on peacetime espionage.

Title III of the bill incorporates the provisions of H. R. 9023 and proposes to repeal certain sections of the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended, and substitute therefor a separate registration statute unconnected with the Foreign Agents Registration Act, and which will require the registration of those persons who have knowledge of or have received an assignment in the espionage, counterespionage, or sabotage service or tactics of a foreign government or a foreign political party, without regard to any present agency status of such persons.

The Attorney General has told us this:

> Since the registration provisions of the Foreign Agents Registration Act make it clear that only those persons who presently or hereafter act as agents of foreign principals are required to register, persons who are agents of foreign principals by definition, but who are not currently acting as such, are not so required. Hence, persons with knowledge of or training in the espionage, counterespionage, or sabotage service or tactics of a foreign government or political party, who have not since the enactment of section 20 (a) acted as foreign agents, appear to be under no obligation to register.

This section will put such persons under an obligation to register.

Mr. DOYLE. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HYDE. I yield.

Mr. DOYLE. I notice that there is no definition in either wartime or peacetime of the term "defense activities." That is in line 9, page 2, and elsewhere. I am wondering why there is no definition of defense activities, as long as the death penalty, for instance, is involved.

Mr. HYDE. The death penalty is not involved in the title to which the gentleman refers.

Mr. DOYLE. I notice on page 3, line 16, the reference to associate nation is limited to wartime. Why does not that definition also cover peacetime?

Mr. HYDE. I suppose because there might be some difficulty in determining who was an associate nation in peacetime.

Mr. DOYLE. There is included a reference to NATO nations, in another part of the bill. Would they be considered associate nations? I am asking the question sincerely, because I think it is important.

Mr. HYDE. As far as I know—I do not know whether I am entirely accurate on this or not—the only reason I can think of at the moment would be the difficulty of determining who was an associate nation in peacetime.

Mr. DOYLE. In other words, the committee had no intent of including any member of the United Nations as an associate nation?

Mr. HYDE. Not under this language.

Mr. CELLER. If the gentleman will yield, I understand the Department of Justice has sent down to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAHAM] an amendment as to the very question the gentleman from California has raised just now, namely to include associate nations in there at that very point.

Mr. HYDE. I would have to see what the Department's intention was as to that.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HYDE. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. In title II, section 202 refers to the matter of espionage in time of either peace or war. On the preceding page, 8, you are referred to a status which might be considered neither war nor peace, that is, where an emergency has been declared by the President. In that event, would the gentleman construe that under title II to be in war or peace? What I want to know is, Suppose there is an emergency declared by the President which is short of war and there is espionage under title II, would that be espionage in time of peace or war?

Mr. HYDE. Subsection (a) of section 201 of title II applies in time of either peace or war.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. It would be espionage under (a) but not under (b)?

Mr. HYDE. That is right.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. If during the Korean emergency it would be punishable under (b)?

Mr. HYDE. Under (b) it would be in time of war.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. So espionage committed when we were fighting in Korea would not be punishable under (b)?

Mr. HYDE. Any act set out in (b) would not be punishable unless we were officially in war.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Does not the gentleman think the penalty should be just as severe in the case of Korea as in time of war?

Mr. HYDE. I think that is covered by section (a), if the gentleman will examine it carefully.

Texas Citizen Asks Equalization of Compensation Rates for Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 9, 1954

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I have been requested by a Texas citizen, Mr. Lonnie F. Roberts, of Denison, to insert in the RECORD a letter he wrote me with respect to compensation rates for disabled veterans.

I accordingly ask unanimous consent that the letter from Mr. Roberts be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Every time there is a disaster in the service, like the tragedy aboard the U. S. S. *Bennington*, where many are killed and disabled, the number of dead and injured provokes headlines and stirs the public to the awareness of the dangerous calling of men serving their country in "peacetime" as well as in war. Many victims of the U. S. S. *Bennington* tragedy died, and those disabled will suffer as much as did the men who died and were injured on the battlefield. However, our President, Congress, Veterans' Administration, and a few others think they do not suffer as much and they have discriminated the rates of compensation between these veterans. By way of comparison, the service-connected veteran of the peacetime service who is totally disabled receives $138 per month, while a veteran totally service connected who served during a period of war receives for the same degree of disability $172.50 per month, making a discrimination of $34.50.

There is no basis for this great discrimination among service-connected veterans. Congress should equalize these rates as soon as possible and not say by action that one veteran is better or more important than another who is service connected. This unjustified discrimination started sometime after World War I.

After the U. S. S. *Bennington* disaster or any other peacetime disaster the press and many others start shedding crocodile tears and write big editorials how they feel and how terrible the tragedies are. However, if they would point out to the Nation the fact that these men will not get the same rates of compensation as veterans who served during a period of war, they would render a great service to these men who will suffer many years after the tragedy. Let us truly help these service-connected veterans and urge our President and Congress to enact legislation that will really help our veterans regardless of what the Veterans' Administration or anyone else may say concerning this matter.

Yours very truly,
LONNIE F. ROBERTS.
DENISON, TEX.

Thoughts at One of Freedom's Shrines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 9, 1954

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Thoughts at One of Freedom's Shrines," written by Mr. R. L. Duffus and published in the New York Times magazine on Sunday, July 4.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THOUGHTS AT ONE OF FREEDOM'S SHRINES—ON VIEW AT WASHINGTON, THE DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE, THE CONSTITUTION, AND THE BILL OF RIGHTS VOUCHSAFE US A MOMENT TO SEE AS THE FOUNDING FATHERS SAW

(By R. L. Duffus)

WASHINGTON.—There is one place in Washington, perhaps above all others, that is good to come to in a time of stress and doubt. It is not the Capitol, nor the public rooms of the White House, nor even the Lincoln Memorial, though it comes closer to inspiring the reverence that the memorial enforces upon all of us. It is the Archives Building in the great triangle where Pennsylvania Avenue and Constitution Avenue approach each other. It is a particular room in the Archives Building. It is above all a particular spot in that room where the original copies of the Constitution, the Declaration of Independence, and the Bill of Rights are on exhibition.

These documents have had a physical history that makes one marvel that they survived at all. They were hastily removed from Washington when the British came there during the War of 1812. They were neglected. They were exposed to sunlight. Indeed, their survival and the survival of the little Nation of three or four million people for which they were created seem like part of the same miracle.

No one has to come here, of course, to read the words. Anyone can open the nearest reference book and read that noble language: "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal"; "We, the people of the United States, in order to * * * secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity," or "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech or of the press."

But in these documents there is something more than words. They have the value of a symbol. Like a flag carried in parade, they send one's pulses beating. What though the ink has faded and the parchments themselves are less legible than the facsimiles—that is not important.

These relics, because of the hands that have touched them, the long dead, famous hands that wrote on them when they were new and the ideas they contained were fresh and marvelous and had to be fought for—these cannot be copied. This is reality. Washington, Franklin, Jefferson—the giants of the older days, looked at this actual parchment and ink. Today we stand for an instant of time in their places.

What the beholder must realize as he looks and ponders is that history is not something in books. It is, as it is made, the acts of living men. It is a record of a past uncertainty and peril.

Consider this Declaration. It was not issued in a moment of victory but in a moment of danger. When the signers pledged to each other "our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor." They did so with the full knowledge that if they clung to their honor, as they were sworn to do, they might have to yield up their fortunes and perhaps their lives. The English Government of that day was not tender with what it considered treason and the Declaration, any way one viewed it, was treason to the government of George III.

Or let us take the Bill of Rights. The fury of war had passed for the moment. But the survival of the Union under the old Articles of Confederation or under the Constitution that had just been formulated in Philadelphia was not certain. The country was torn by jealousies and suspicions. New England did not trust New York and the Middle States. The South was far removed and the manner of its life was almost foreign to the northerners.

Moreover, the Revolution of 1776 had stirred up a political turmoil and left some doubt as to what were the rights of a citizen in the United States. The Fathers of the Constitution meeting in Philadelphia had been intent on creating a machinery of government that would work. But they had left out a few guaranties that the farmer on the land, the artisan in his shop and particularly the independent-minded citizens living on the frontier and pushing ever westward thought were necessary. The Bill of Rights, taken largely from a document of the same name in the Mother Country, was a belated attempt to hold the States together and persuade the citizens thereof to accept a Federal Government. This immortal bit of parchment was not written in ink but in the blood of the martyrs, in the sweat of free men resolved under God to remain free.

These three documents thus are the evidence of men's intelligence, of men's hopes and of men's courage. It is not irreverent to say of them that they are a kind of secular altar in the presence of which we are glad to take off our hats and to meditate. One cannot say that this is the emotion of every visitor, for they are now coming at the rate of 250,000 a year, the old and the young, the thoughtful and the thoughtless.

Yet there is no doubt that they are impressed, as they move slowly up a step or two and look into the cases where the Constitution, the Declaration and the Bill of Rights are guarded and preserved. Here are school children led by their teachers, boys and girls filled with high spirits but silent for a moment. Here are young lovers walking hand in hand, and perhaps—especially when the boy is in uniform—thinking of a coming separation. Here are married persons with their children. Will this little girl of 4 or 5, holding to her mother's hand, remember? Perhaps the mood of reverence will make an impression on her critical mind. There are gray-haired couples who walk slowly and carefully up and down the steps.

The accents tell of all America from the woods of Maine to the bayous of Louisiana and the California seacoast—an America almost unknown when the Declaration, the Constitution, and the Bill of Rights were written down. Yet it is the words in these documents that have made them all citizens of 1 country, children of 1 tradition and 1 legend, followers of a common heritage and a common hope.

Perhaps as the visitors turn away their eyes fall upon the bright flags of the Nation and of the States blossoming at the end of the room. These are not battle flags, but perhaps they remind the visitor that battles were required, that men had to die, before the brave words were made good. No, history is not easy. One realizes this here in this room and in the almost visible presence of the spirits of those who made the Nation.

There are other documents, some in the exhibition rotunda, to fill out the story. We see the letter in which Washington accepted the command of the Continental armies in great distress lest his abilities and military experience not be equal to the extensive and important trust. We see the Articles of Confederation in Perpetual Union which worked so poorly that they had to be superseded within a decade by the Constitution. We read the Ordinance for the Government of the Northwest Territory, including the famous provision that slavery should be forever forbidden in that area.

All this is merely a sampling of the country's written history. In the corridor around the rotunda are photographs and other exhibits of the Federal records of the States; they tell of battles and struggles, of far distant Territories coming into the Union, of the lesser acts that are necessary in order to carry out the purpose of the greater.

Most of us will have to take on faith the hundreds of thousands of cubic feet of documents that are contained in the main stacks, shelves, and storage space of the great Archives Building. History can be majestically expressed in a declaration, but it is expressed, too, in a little bundle of papers, one of hundreds, on which long ago a company officer of the Union Army wrote out the last muster roll of his company. It can be expressed, too, in the original journals of the Continental Congress, in certain consular reports, in the records of western Army posts long since abandoned and in the logs of forgotten ships which once carried the Stars and Stripes gloriously to sea.

One may pass once more across the stillness of the rotunda and stop for another few minutes to look at the Declaration, the Constitution, and the Bill of Rights. One comes out with an increased faith that this Nation, having hoped so much and achieved so much, having endured so much, cannot, in Lincoln's own words, perish from the earth. The country cannot indeed be saved by documents. It can, however, be saved by the spirit that the documents express. It can be saved by a knowledge of the story the documents have to tell, deep in the hearts of the people.

The McCarthy Hearings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAT McCARRAN
OF NEVADA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 9, 1954

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, the New York Daily News of Wednesday, June 30, carried an editorial which quoted from a letter written by Mr. William Loeb, president and publisher of Associated Newspapers, Inc. I think both the editorial and the letter merit the attention of the Senate, and I therefore ask unanimous consent that this editorial may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OMINOUS ECHO FROM THE McCARTHY HEARINGS

Following is the full text of a letter in the current Editor and Publisher newspaper trade journal. It was written during the McCarthy-Cohn-Schine-Stevens hearings that excited the Nation for 36 session days.

"If newspapers, weekly magazines, and radio commenators are going to smear Senator McCARTHY, as they have done without any regard for the truth, then I see no particular harm, and nothing improper, about Senator McCARTHY characterizing a Washington paper as 'the Washington Daily Worker,' especially since the managing editor of that paper has recently published an attack on the Federal Bureau of Investigation, full of errors and incorrect statements."

SLANTED REPORTS

"At a hearing of his committee, over which McCARTHY presided in Boston last year, a reporter from this newspaper was present. According to his on-the-spot report, the facts of the occasion bore no resemblance at all to the wire stories that went out, as usual, slanted against McCARTHY.

"When the publisher of a well-known western newspaper puts out mimeographed instructions to his staff as to how to smear McCARTHY, I think it illbehooves the press to point their finger at the Senator from Wisconsin.

"I agree completely with James F. O'Neil, former national commander of the American Legion and present editor of the Legionnaire, and former city editor of my Manchester Union Leader, when he says that the American press is suffering a severe decline in the opinion of its readers, who are now able to compare, by television, the actual facts of what is happening at the McCarthy-Stevens hearings in Washington with the one-sided, unfactual reporting that they are receiving in so many of their newspapers.

"The vicious slanting of the news against McCARTHY by a number of newspapers has now become more than a moral sin. It has become darned bad business because the customers are catching these newspapers at it.

"Historians may well regard one of the strangest phenomena of this age, the fact that rich publishers of great newspapers have been led around by the nose, like so many bubbleheads, by some very astute Communists and pro-Communists who have penetrated their staffs. Without the millions of dollars of investment necessary to create a great metropolitan newspaper, they have had all the beenfits of selling their Communist line to the American people.

"Unfortunately there are not only Washington 'Daily Workers,' but there are a number of 'Daily Workers' gathered throughout the United States.

"WILLIAM LOEB,
"President and publisher, Associated Newspapers, Inc., Reno, Nevada."

The Daily Worker is, of course, the principal press organ of the Communist Party in the United States.

We are reprinting the Loeb letter because we think that from some newspapers' point of view it is the most ominous single echo yet to be heard from the McCarthy hearings. We also think that any newspapers which the shoe, described by Mr. Loeb, fits would be well advised to do some rather earnest soul searching.

JUST GIVE THE FACTS

News of the hearings was, as Loeb charges, slanted outrageously by some papers whose managements hate McCARTHY and allowed themselves to be carried away by the notion that the end justifies the means. The end in this instance was to ruin McCARTHY politically and drive him out of public life. This, though McCARTHY only wants to save Americans and their press from the death-in-life that is communism.

What these papers did was to betray the cardinal principle of newspaper journalism: that it is the newspapers' prime duty to give the readers all the facts in the news columns that space will allow, and confine expression of each paper's management's opinions to the editorial columns.

P. S.—The News intends to stick to a policy which it has followed since its first day of publication (June 26, 1919), and which has been largely responsible for its not inconsiderable success to date.

That policy is to print the news as she breaks, and keep the paper's own opinions, prejudices, preferences, and hopes out of every column except this editorial column.

Time for Reappraisal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL J. ERVIN, JR.
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 9, 1954

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very thought-provoking editorial entitled "Time for Reappraisal," which was published in the Greensboro Daily News of Greensboro, N. C., July 7, 1954.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TIME FOR REAPPRAISAL

In a dispatch from Washington Bruce Jolly discussed three signs of a shift in congressional thinking about United States foreign policy.

One was the nearly unanimous vote against the President's foreign-aid bill for the fiscal year by the North Carolina House delegation. Such Representatives as Charles Deane, Herbert Bonner, and Harold Cooley, who have been in the forefront of the support for the Marshall plan, firmly opposed the President's $3,368,608,000 bill. (It got House approval by a vote of 260–125).

Several questions were bothering North Carolina Congressmen. One was the effectiveness of the foreign-aid program; another was the foreign-policy split between the United States and its Allies; still another was dismay over the general conduct of foreign policy since the Eisenhower administration took office.

Two later developments emphasized this thinking in Congress: Republican Senator Knowland's threat of resignation if deterioration in Indochina brings another effort to let Red China shoot her way into the U. N.; and Democratic Senator Lyndon Johnson's call for a reappraisal of United States foreign policy.

These events reflect the serious state of affairs in the conduct of United States foreign policy. The Eisenhower administration got its uneasy truce in Korea (fulfilling a campaign promise) but it did not nearly end the crisis in Asia; Chinese troops which had been focused on Korea were moved southward, and the result today is a demoralized French Army rapidly retreating on every front in Indochina and a triumphant extension of Communist dominion. In Europe the paralyzed French Government has not ratified the European Army Treaty; the result is restiveness in Germany and a dissolving morale on this side of the Iron Curtain. Elsewhere we are successfully overthrowing a pro-Communist regime in Guatemala, but their are potential soft spots in the good-neighbor policy and in Africa.

What is the matter with our foreign policy? Were these crises preordained regardless of which party took office in 1952? How can we get out of the mess which began as massive retaliation and now approaches massive disintegration?

We agree with Senator Johnson that the time is ripe for a reappraisal of foreign policy. We have been ignoring too many facts of life recently. Among them are these: (1) We no longer have a monopoly on A- or H-bombs; (2) the British Isles and Western Europe are at the mercy of A- and H-bombs in Russian hands, and their foreign policy is reflecting it; (3) we cannot work toward solvency at the expense of military security; (4) bipartisanship in foreign policy will never grow out of accusations such as "20 years of treason"; (5) the way to win friends for the United States is not alone through handing out money but by adopting policies which appeal to the hearts and minds of potentially free people around the world.

The Phillips Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 9, 1954

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the June issue of the Tipro Reporter, published in Austin, Tex., by the Texas Independent Producers and Royalty Owners Association, contains a pertinent comment on the recent decision of the Supreme Court in the Phillips case.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

History shows that a nation begins to decay when its courts become political-minded and start trying to make laws as well as interpret them.

The United States Supreme Court is accused of doing just that in the Phillips case. In a 5-to-3 decision, the Court in effect authorized the Federal Power Commission to ignore the law of the land and regulate wellhead prices of natural gas later going into interstate commerce.

Politically it was a fine idea, and the consumer comment reaching the ears of the five Justices making up the majority is enthusiastic for the most part. After all, there are only a few thousand gas producers and royalty owners, and more than 12 million families now heat their homes with gas. But the destruction of a great principle—that of the separation of powers—is incalculable, and public confidence in the Nation's highest tribunal cannot but have been diminished. For though one may enjoy temporary fruits of such a decision, or think he does, he is certain—if he is wise—to wonder in his heart whether the next time the courts encroach on the legislative branch he may not be among the injured minority.

"This is clearly a case of the Supreme Court trying to write the law of the land as well as interpret it," declared President Woodward, "since the Natural Gas Act specifically provides that FPC regulation 'shall not apply to * * * the production or gathering of natural gas.' It appears now that nothing short of a new and emphatic congressional reaffirmation of this mandate can halt FPC price regulation at the well."

Justice Tom Clark, in a sharp dissent, declared the majority action was "contrary to the intention of Congress, the understanding of the States, and that of the FPC itself. The FPC is thereby thrust into the regulatory domain traditionally reserved to the States."

Senator Robert S. Kerr, author of a bill to clarify exemption of independent producers and gatherers from Federal regulation which was vetoed by President Truman, said the ruling "plainly is a case of legislation by the judiciary."

Senator Lyndon Johnson declared that Congress must "take the necessary steps to assure ourselves that it is Congress, not the Supreme Court, that makes our laws."

The decision reverses a finding of the FPC itself, which decided after earlier starting the whole controversy that it had no such legal powers. Legislative history surrounding the Natural Gas Act of 1938, which created the FPC and authorized it to regulate interstate commerce only, shows clearly that no such wellhead price regulation was intended. The entire industry, including State regulatory authorities, supported the act on assurances that it would not be used to excuse this usurpation of State authority over independent production and gathering.

Even Justice William O. Douglas, customarily an advocate of extending Federal controls, joined with Justices Clark and Burton in protesting this writing of law by the courts. "The question is whether sales of natural gas by an independent producer at the mouth of an interstate pipeline are subject to regulation by the FPC under the Natural Gas Act of 1938," he said. "This is a question the Court has never decided."

He said even though "there is much to be said from the national point of view for regulating sales at both ends of these interstate pipelines," such "regulation of the business of producing and gathering natural gas involves considerations of which we know little and with which we are not competent to deal." He was conceding that Congress not only was constitutionally the appropriate body to decide the issue but in a better position to get the facts.

Espionage and Sabotage Act of 1954

SPEECH

OF

HON. WALTER ROGERS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 8, 1954

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 9580) to revise and extend the laws relating to espionage and sabotage, and for other purposes.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Madam Chairman, this amendment is really very simple. It deals with the penalty in a law that has been written to deal with espionage and sabotage. As this law presently reads, the punishment for acts of sabotage committed during time of war or national emergency would be punishable by not more than 30 years' imprisonment or not more than $10,000 fine, or both. Certain acts of sabotage, occurring at any time, would be punishable by not more than 10 years' imprisonment or not more than $10,000 fine, or both. My amendments merely provide a means by which the court can, but is not required to, give any punishment, including death or life imprisonment. These amendments merely expand or enlarge upon the authority of the courts to deal with offenders in meting out punishment.

I served as a district attorney and I have also represented defendants in criminal cases in both the State and Federal courts, and I think I am qualified to weigh this matter. I have deep and abiding faith in our jury system and in our judicial system, in spite of some recent decisions.

But be that as it may, we are here talking about people who will indulge in acts to destroy this country and everything we stand for. Yet we limit the punishment that may be meted out to those people in some instances to 5 years, in some instances to 10 years, and in some instances to 30 years. This amendment does not say that everyone who violates this law shall be put to death, but it does provide a means whereby the courts of this Nation can deal with these criminal acts when they are called upon to deal with them. Their hands will not be tied and if the circumstances warrant the defendant can be given the death penalty.

Mr. WALTER. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I yield.

Mr. WALTER. The jury would not have anything to do with any sentences in any crime defined under these sections.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Of course, the gentleman is right about that; I should have said courts. If I said juries, I apologize. I was thinking in terms of Texas State courts.

Mr. CELLER. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CELLER. As I understand, what the gentleman does is step up the penalty to death in all of the titles, titles I, II and III, or 10 years in prison. It is the alternative in every case.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. My amendments affect title I. They merely provide a means whereby if the circumstances warrant a person can receive the death penalty. The situation I have in mind is simply this, that there is no reason why a court should not have the right to give the death penalty. If a person goes out and contaminates a water utility that is connected with a defense plant, that could result in untold damage and death to many people there should certainly be a penalty to fit the crime.

Mr. CELLER. Does the gentleman think there should be the possibility of a death penalty for violation of a rule or regulation promulgated by the Attorney General?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. That is a debatable question.

Mr. CELLER. It would be possible under the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. No. I do not think so, as my amendments have to do only with title I. As to the rules or regulations situation, I do not think the rules or regulations should have the same effect as law. That is a subject that is very complex, that you could debate for hours. I think we have gone entirely too far in permitting administrative agencies to make rules and regulations.

Mr. HYDE. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HYDE. The gentleman has not offered that amendment to title III, it is just to title I?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. It is just title I, that is correct.

Mr. HYDE. So it does not come in the rules and regulations business about which the gentleman from New York is concerned?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. No, it does not. It is only to title I. It merely provides a means by which that penalty can be exacted. In the State of Texas a man can receive the death penalty for robbery with firearms. Maybe he does not even pull the trigger, maybe he does not even get anything of value, but he can go to the electric chair. Still, that same man could do something to try to destroy this Government, and under this law what would he get? At most he would get 30 years. After all is said and done we are dealing with a proposition that has to do with the perpetuation of our way of life and I think the court should have the authority at least to give the death penalty or to give a long term of years as punishment for acts deliberately committed in an effort to destroy us and to defeat our country.

Mr. CELLER. For clarification, as I understand it, the gentleman's amendment applies only to title I and not to titles II and III?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. That is right.

Opinion Poll Report for East Boston, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 2, 1954

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a partial report on the results of a questionnaire which I mailed early in April of this year to the residents of the district which I represent here in the Congress of the United States.

My purpose in conducting such an opinion poll during my first term here in Washington was not only to enable myself to better represent the people of my district, but to acquaint them personally with some of the vital issues here in Washington.

The number of returns, and the interest displayed, have been most gratifying. I feel that the poll has been mutually beneficial. Following is a copy of the letter which accompanied the questionnaire, and the tabulated results for East Boston, Mass.:

UNITED STATES
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR NEIGHBORS: As your Representative here in Washington, it would be invaluable for me to have the opinions of the people of our congressional district on matters which are vital to all of us.

I realize that you elected me with the expectation that I would always exercise my own best judgment in arriving at a decision as to how the vote for our district will be cast. It is a responsibility and a privilege which I welcome, and I hope that I shall always merit your trust and confidence.

If I had available a cross section of the views of the residents of the 11th Congressional District, and also any comments they might have on any given subject, it would help in clarifying the issues and reaching a truly representative decision.

Attached is a questionnaire on a group of subjects. I will be indebted to you if you will answer them, and also give your views in the spaces allotted. You need not add your signature if you would prefer not to do so.

Each of the questionnaires returned will be read by me personally, and a tabulation will be made. I shall appreciate your cooperation and assistance, and I am looking forward to your response.

With every good wish,

Sincerely,

THOMAS P. O'NEILL, Jr.,
Member of Congress.

Questionnaire

	Yes	No	No opinion
FOREIGN POLICY			
1. Do you approve of the present method of handling our international relations	659	986	115
2. Do you believe that the United States Government should continue our foreign-aid program	1,225	486	149
3. Do you feel that we should continue military aid to foreign nations	1,066	303	391
4. Do you favor the continuation of economic aid to foreign nations	1,082	402	216
5. Do you support the point-4 program (supplying technical assistance, manufacturing know-how, and management skills to underdeveloped nations to help them help themselves)	1,546	36	178
6. Do you believe that Russia should be permitted to remain in the United Nations	778	598	384
7. Do you believe Communist China should be seated in the United Nations	282	1,230	248
TARIFF POLICY			
1. Do you support the present methods of handling tariffs?	277	846	637
2. Do you believe that foreign goods should come into the United States regardless of the effect that it may have on the American worker?	350	1,162	248
3. Do you understand the present Government method of handling tariffs?	671	637	452
STATEHOOD			
1. Do you favor conferring statehood on—			
(*a*) Alaska?	1,342	174	244
(*b*) Hawaii?	1,308	204	248
TAX POLICY			
1. Do you believe that the Federal Government should spend more money than it receives in income?	1,234	211	315
If opposed, which of these steps would you take			
(a) Keep taxes high?	491	423	846
(b) Cut domestic spending?	598	318	844
(c) Cut military spending?	385	421	954
2. Do you feel taxes should be cut more than they already have been?	596	741	423
3. Do you support an increase in the exemption for dependents?	1,128	491	141
4. Do you favor cutting income taxes across the board percentagewise?	424	984	352
5. Do you believe in more exemption for dividends and other unearned income?	526	950	284
6. Do you support exemptions to cover expenses for college educations?	1,124	458	178
7. Do you favor an exemption for the first $1,500 of retired income?	1,230	282	248
SOCIAL SECURITY, HEALTH AND WELFARE			
1. Do you believe that the present 2-percent social security tax on the employee should be maintained?	1,232	352	176
2. Do you believe it should be returned to 1½ percent?	350	880	530
3. Do you support an increase in old-age assistance benefits?	1,094	316	350
4. Do you favor an increase in the death benefits under social security?	984	408	368
5. Do you believe that hospitalization, sickness, and accident insurance should be covered by Federal law?	809	775	176

Questionnaire—Continued

	Yes	No	No opinion
HOUSING			
1. Do you believe that more low-cost housing should be built by the State and Federal Governments?	1,298	248	214
2. do you believe these should be multiple-unit dwellings?	491	705	564
3. Do you feel they should be in two-family units?	424	773	563
LABOR LEGISLATION			
1. Are you in favor of raising the minimum wage?	1,055	422	283
2. Do you feel this would be helpful in New England insofar as competing with the Southern States is concerned?	774	457	529
3. In your opinion could small business afford an increase?	668	564	528
4. Do you believe that the Taft-Hartley Act is fair to management and labor?	598	740	422
(*a*) Would you favor outright repeal?	318	984	458
(*b*) Would you havor changes through amendments?	984	247	529
5. Are there sections of this law which you feel are oppressive to workers?	914	493	353
6. Are there, in your opinion, sections which are oppressive to small business?	668	318	774
ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY			
1. Do you understand the questions involved in St. Lawrence seaway?	740	384	636
2. Do you feel that the construction of the seaway would hurt employment in our area?	384	705	671
3. Do you believe the St. Lawrence seaway would hurt the future economy of the New England area?	422	669	669
VOTING AGE			
1. Do you believe that persons who are 18 years old should be given the right to vote in national elections?	704	914	142
LOCAL ISSUES			
1. Do you believe the Port of Boston should have more Federal assistance?	1,115	253	392
2. In your opinion, is the Federal Government treating New England fairly on the policy of defense cutbacks?	284	632	844

Please use the back page for additional comments on any of these subjects and any other issues in which you are particularly interested.

Name____________________

Address____________________

Mr. Churchill's "Appeasement"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 30, 1954

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, Winston Churchill would be the first to deny that he is preaching appeasement, but the word, harsh though it is, seems to be the most direct and accurate description of this policy toward communism. Cloak it as he may behind his great eloquence, the fact emerges from the verbiage. What he has counselled amounts to a coexistence program in which the West sits still and behaves quietly while the Soviet world drives relentlessly ahead on its program for world conquest.

In 1927 Joseph Stalin declared that coexistence of the two opposing systems, the capitalism of the West and his communism, should be regarded as a temporary intermediate step until the Soviets had achieved control. Every Communist theorist has emphasized the belief that no peace is possible so long as communism and capitalism exist as competitors. If Mr. Churchill believes that there is anything in the present order of things to alter the Communist line, he should be reminded that Stalin always regarded war with capitalism as inevitable and was prepared to postpone it only until Europe is ripe for revolution or colonial revolutions have come completed to a head. What happened in Korea and in Indochina comes, in the Red view, under the category of these colonial revolutions.

To speak in terms of co-existence without constructive steps on the part of the Western World to prevent this process from running is to advocate suicide for our own civilization. We cannot buy that.

Items for the Political Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 30, 1954

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, finds of the House Judiciay Committee on its look-see into what happened a few years ago make interesting reading. For example, the reports indicate:

First. The State Department under Dean Acheson impeded the grand jury's investigation of the infiltration of alleged subversive United States nationals into the U. N. staff.

Second. In the Justice Department, the former Deputy Attorney General under the Truman regime permitted a peculiar income-tax deal in a case involving a criminal tax prosecution.

Third. Similar favoritism was evident in another criminal charge involving mail-fraud indictments which were dismissed by the Justice Department without adequate justification.

Fourth. Grand jury indictments in a series of income-tax cases in Tennessee looked like political high pressuring.

If anyone thinks these are political findings, the record is there to read. More than 50 out of 100 witnesses called before the Federal grand jury on the question of subversive penetration of the U. N. staff pleaded the fifth amendment in refusing to answer questions.

Flood Control on the Ohio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN S. COOPER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 9, 1954

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Urgent Regional Problem," relating to the flood-control problem on the Ohio River, published in the Cincinnati Enquirer of July 8, 1954.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

URGENT REGIONAL PROBLEM

Over the years, we have heard a lot about the rehabilitation of various regions of the country. The valley of the Tennessee River has been made over in a remarkable way in the last generation. Large areas in the West have been turned from desert into highly productive farmland by major irrigation projects. The St. Lawrence Valley and the whole Great Lakes area have a brighter future as a result of the decision of Congress to proceed with the deep-channel waterway.

All of these are valid regional projects because they hold benefits for the Nation as a whole, in addition to the more obvious benefits they offer to the regions directly affected. Precisely the same thing applies to the Ohio River and to the modernized dam system under consideration.

Ours is not a problem of generating electric power. We live close to the Nation's richest deposits of high-grade coal. We have no need for irrigation, in an area of usually adequate rainfall. It is a navigation problem. But it is an important one.

For many generations, the Ohio was the principal East-West artery of transport between the eastern seaboard and the entire West. It lost ground to canals and railroads and highways for quite some decades. But as the volume of bulky freight traffic grew with the industrialization of the country, the Ohio came into its own once more. Today it is absolutely vital to the economic health of a vast region from Pittsburgh to the junction with the Mississippi.

Navigation on the Ohio is maintained by nearly 50 dams. Most of them are antiquated, and some are in perilous condition. And there are far too many of them, so close together as to be a continuous handicap to river traffic. We need a score of high-level dams to replace more than twice that number of obsolete structures. And in the stretch from just below Cincinnati to a point near Pittsburgh, three new dams are very urgently needed, to make a sound beginning of the full program.

This is not a neat package. It is not a gaudy scheme for any Ohio River Authority, offering flood control, irrigation, power, and navigation in a dramatic facelifting for the region. But it is a sound, practical program, geared to the real needs of a thriving valley, a valley that pays its way on the books of the Federal Government and asks no subsidies that its tax payments do not cover with plenty to spare.

Senator JOHN SHERMAN COOPER, of Kentucky, has been working earnestly and effectively to get funds from Congress for this minimal program. Senator JOHN W. BRICKER is in a strong position to help, and he is helping. And there are others, in House and Senate alike, who are talking up the fight for the urgent needs of the Ohio Valley. We are grateful for their efforts, and we urge them not to relax.

The claims of this area may not be as dramatic as those of western deserts that need water or those of lake ports that want to be seaports. But they probably will show a greater benefit to the national economy in relation to the national economy in relation to the money involved.

Reintroduction of Private Power Into the TVA Area

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 9, 1954

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Down Their Throats," published in the Washington Post of July 6, 1954. This editorial deals with the proposal of the administration to reintroduce private power into the TVA area by a "quickie" contract.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DOWN THEIR THROATS

There are several ways in which the administration can fail to exert the kind of leadership necessary to obtain support for its program. One is by choosing not to take positive issue with demagogs who distort its program and alienate legislators whose votes are needed. Another is by trying to ram a questionable measure through by administrative subterfuge, without permitting discussion on its merits.

Surely the attempt of the administration to reintroduce private power into the TVA area by a "quickie" contract must be classed in this latter category. There is a respectable argument, as this newspaper has acknowledged, that the status of the Tennessee Valley Authority ought to be reassessed, and that additions to the Federal budget for new TVA steamplants would not be desirable now. But instead of arguing in this vein the administration sought to make the private contract a fait accompli before congressional committees had a chance to investigate. Now it is disclosed that the utility company favored by the Atomic Energy Commission, under the President's order, had not even seen specifications for the West Memphis plant when it made its April 10 proposal—a shocking situation. There are indications that another group which held out the possibility of a lower contract price may have been discouraged from bidding.

This is the sort of thing that had it occurred under a Democratic regime would have united the Republicans in a roar of righteous outrage. It is producing much the same reaction in the TVA area; and if the administration is looking toward its political fences, it can scarcely afford to ignore the protest. If there is merit in the administration position, it would not harm the project to delay it long enough to focus congressional scrutiny. But if the whole affair is the shoddy deal it appears to be, the wisest and most courageous course would be for the administration simply to withdraw it and admit a mistake.

Justice Department Action Against Communists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. IRVING M. IVES

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 9, 1954

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the column by Peter Edson, entitled "It's Slow Going," which appeared in the June 30 issue of the Washington Daily News.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I'S SLOW GOING

(By Peter Edson)

Practically every Communist in the United States is under investigation by the Justice Department and FBI. The purpose is to see what court action can be taken.

Communist Party membership is now estimated under 25,000. Five years ago it was over 100,000.

The cases of some 10,000 party members now are under investigation to see if they can be denaturalized. In addition, the Immigration and Naturalization Service of the Justice Department is investigating some 12,000 Reds to determine whether they can be deported.

To speed up this job is the task of William F. Tompkins, former United States attorney for New Jersey, new Assistant Attorney General in charge of a new Internal Security Division of the Justice Department.

Since the GOP came to power 84 Communists have been deported. But 268 more are under final deportation orders. Part of the difficulty is that not even Communist countries will take back their native emigrants.

In a year and a half, the Justice Department has acted against 27 Reds on other grounds. This includes one treason trial, 2 for espionage, 4 for harboring Communist fugitives, 15 for making false statements or false oaths denying party membership on Taft-Hartley law affidavits, 3 for perjury in denial of party membership and 3 fugitives from Smith Act sentences.

The Smith Act cases have struck the hardest blow at Communist leadership. It imposes a maximum sentence of 5 years in prison and $10,000 fine for conspiracy to advocate overthrow of the United States Government by force and violence.

Under this law, 109 party functionaries have been arrested in the past 6 years. Seventy-two have been convicted. Twenty-seven are awaiting trial or are on trial.

In other fields, the war against Communists goes on in a less spectacular manner. As of April 30 the Eisenhower administration had dismissed 429 Government employees as subversives under the President's security order. But there has been no disclosure as to how many of these were actually Communist Party members.

The Subversive Activities Control Board has found the Communist Party to be the agent of a foreign government and has ordered it to register with the Attorney General. But this decision is now pending before the United States Court of Appeals and will probably be carried to the Supreme Court next year.

The $6 million International Workers' Order has also been found a Communist front and ordered to register. Hearings on 2 other fronts have been completed and 2 more are in progress.

Passage of new legislation requested by the Eisenhower administration is the one thing that would do most to speed up the anticommie war in the United States.

Agricultural Act of 1954

SPEECH

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 2, 1954

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 9680) to provide for continued price support for agricultural products; to augment the marketing and disposal of such products; to provide for greater stability in the products of agriculture, and for other purposes.

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, personally I have always opposed Government interference in the farm business. Back in the 1930's my father and I both bitterly opposed the Henry Wallace program of telling you what to plant, plowing up cotton, killing pigs and cattle while people were hungry and ragged. However, the Government embarked upon a program of Government control and Government subsidy. This policy was continued through World War II and since in nearly every field of American endeavor. I believe it would be most unfair to the farmer of today whose income is falling drastically not to support the basic commodities; namely, wheat, cotton, peanuts, corn, tobacco, and dairy products.

I take this position because the Government is subsidizing many businesses. It subsidizes the airlines, foreign countries, and certain publications such as Time and Life magazines. Many industries in America are protected by the Government. Labor is protected by a minimum-wage law and I am in favor of that. The farmer is forced to buy machinery, fertilizer, insecticides, and many other things costing terrific prices because of Government protection of the other segments of our economy. If the farmer in a planned economy such as we have is forced to sell without any protection, many of them would soon go out of business and then the cost of foods to the consumer would really go up.

Falling prices of farm products have not resulted in lower prices to the consumer. For instance, last fall in my district, farmers sold their wheat crop for $1.50 per bushel. In 1948 they received $3 per bushel for their wheat. The same week they received $1.50 per bushel, bread went up 1 penny a loaf. Farmers in my district sold their cattle last fall for 6 cents or 7 cents per pound and steak was selling up to $1 per pound. I sold my cattle last year for 13 cents per pound and have been paying up to $1.30

per pound for steak in Washington this year. If this trend continues, the little farmer will be forced out of business. If farmers gave their products away, these farm products would still cost the consumers terrific prices.

When World War II started, we had a surplus of 13 million bales of cotton. Today we have a surplus of only 7 million bales. During World War II we used up this surplus and urged our farmers to grow more cotton. We are spending billions of dollars to build up stockpiles of guns, tanks, and other equipment against the possibility of war. In order to protect the consumer and our Armed Forces in case of war, we should build up a great surplus of food and fibers.

In the last 20 years the American people have paid only $2 per capita per year to support the entire farm program which includes the Extension Service, the Soil Conservation Service, the Forestry Service, the Agricultural Stabilization Service, and the Commodity Credit Corporation. Yet in these last few years, the American citizens have paid $87 per capita per year to subsidize foreign countries under our foreign-aid program.

Mr. Chairman, we do not find Communists conserving our soil. We do not find Socialists working on our farms and in our forests. History teaches us that almost every President of the United States was born on a farm and yet every year there is a migration from our farms to our large centers of population. If we are to maintain the political philosophy of our Founding Fathers, we must insure that a large segment of our population remain on our farms. I urge this Congress to accept a farm bill that will protect the interest of our entire Nation.

Legitimate Objectives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1954

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the Record, I include herewith the following editorial from the Trainman:

Legitimate Objectives

Life magazine, stanch Eisenhower and GOP supporter, asks if the GOP is trying to commit suicide, and editorializes:

"We never thought we would see the day when the Democrats looked like saviors of free enterprise, but they certainly look that way on this (foreign trade) issue."

Apparently Life's editors were not around in the dark days of 1933 when businessmen pleaded with Democrat F. D. R. to save them. On foreign trade certainly powerful business interests within the GOP have favored tariff restrictions rather than free enterprise.

Free enterprise is threatened by the shortsighted attitude that the profit motive is sacrosanct and must remain untouched by Government. Goverment guaranty of bank deposits ended bank runs, virtually ended bank failures, and saved the free enterprise financial system, although originally it was condemned as socialism and regimentation, a condemnation as stupid as to condemn lifeguards at bathing beaches.

Free injections of morphine and heroin for addicts were proposed to the American Medical Association, on the theory that the evil profit motive of narcotic runners should be destroyed. Selling for profit narcotics that slowly and cruelly murder the human mind and body is probably the most atrocious crime known to man, yet it entails far lighter punishment than murder, which dope selling surely is.

TVA, a nonprofit, Government project, has fabulously served all the people, even the power interests. It is now under grave attack. Let those now conspiring to consign the people's property to private profit interests, ponder that great truth of free enterprise so well stated by Lincoln:

"The ligitimate object of Government is to do for the people what needs to be done, but which they cannot, by individual effort, do at all, or do so well, for themselves."

Dollar Buys Land

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1954.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following article:

Dollar Buys Land—2-Inch Squares Near Anadarko Boost Indians

Stillwater, June 1.—An acre of land near Anadarko may become the world's most valuable acre of open country if a Stillwater man's land-selling scheme is a success.

Wesley K. Wyatt, young insurance man here, is putting the acre on sale at $1 per 2 square inches in what he describes as mainly a promotion for Anadarko as "Indian capitol of the world."

He figures it is possible to gross $3,000,136 off the acre at the $1 per 2 inches price.

Wyatt claims the acre is part of an original parcel of land given to William Conover, Comanche Indian, by the Government in 1901, and is on the site of the Tomahawk massacre of 1862.

It is located 2 miles south of Anadarko on U. S. No. 281, near the site for a proposed Inidan city. Wyatt said he bought the acre from J. M. Jackson, Anadarko businessman, who agreed to sell only on condition it be used to boost the region's history as a tourist attraction.

Wyatt has formed the Redman Land Co., to sell the acre fractions and heads the firm as president. His father, Bill Wyatt of Cordell, is vice president in charge of sales, the Stillwater man said.

Wyatt claims no originality for the scheme. He heard about a Texan who came into the news recently by selling land as a souvenir of his State in a similar way. However, the Stillwater man thinks he has some new wrinkles in his scheme that will put it over.

He plans to begin a national selling campaign soon, offering wholesale lots of the 2-inch square plots to curio shops and other places where tourists spend their money. Advertising will stress the chance to own part of original Indian territory.

A 100 percent legal warranty deed, plus a copy of the original land patent signed by President William McKinley and a car window decal proclaiming "I am an Indian territory land owner" goes with each 2-inch plot, Wyatt said.

A former resident at Cement, near Anadarko, Wyatt said his interest in the land-selling plan is mainly to make more widely known the colorful Indian history of the region.

"Of course, there's the chance I'll make a profit on it, or I may lose my shirt. The first money that comes in will go into a monument of some sort. Taxes are going to take 50 percent of what comes in if I don't put it back into the property," he said.

Wyatt said he has borrowed $1,500 to finance the plan, including the price he paid for the acre, printing of the deeds and preparing sales material. He said a Stillwater printing firm is running off 10,000 copies of the warranty deed to start with. It is a document done in four colors and shows a scene from the so-called Tomahawk massacre.

He said he has turned down several offers, including one for $2,500 cash, for a share in his multi-million-dollar acre.

Promotion for the scheme will get underway June 12 at the National Junior Chamber of Commerce convention at Colorado Springs, Wyatt said. He declared Jaycee organizations have no part in the plan.

Wyatt said Indian lads from Anadarko will appear in full costume at the Jaycee meeting to help boost the first sales. He also said the Anadarko Chamber of Commerce had agreed to go along with the idea and that Tully Morrison, treasurer of Anadarko's American Indian exposition, had given some help in digging out history about the site.

"I've always wanted to do something to boost the history of the Anadarko country ever since I was a boy and lived around there," Wyatt said.

After introduction of the Indian territory land plan at Colorado Springs, a sales force is to start selling it from coast to coast, he revealed. A troupe of Indians will tour the East to help put it over, he added.

Wyatt's first order for 2 inches of Indian territory came in a letter from Mrs. Charlie Wilson, of Anadarko. She wrote she had heard of the idea in Anadarko and wanted to be the owner of plot No. 1.

Let Facts Be Submitted

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 2, 1954

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to insert the following editorial from the Morning News of San Leandro, Calif., in the Congressional Record:

Let Facts Be Submitted

The Western World was in a state of ferment.

Intellectuals of three continents corresponded to relate to each other the great new scientific findings. Radical thinking was the order of the day.

The foundations of old established government were being examined. The inequities and vicious prejudices and rules were being exposed.

The seeds were being sown which were to bear an amazing rich harvest in the next half century.

Life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Liberty, fraternity, and equality. Independence.

Independence in order to create a new and better society of men. Freedom to improve.

In all history, there probably was never more serious and sincere and deep-seated and widespread effort to devise a good government for mankind than there was at that time and in the next few decades to follow. There was never more soul-searching effort to discover honorable means of meetting the needs of mankind.

Such a change. Government to serve mankind rather than a system to serve the best interests of the governors.

These pioneers in new government were not then all honorable and respected men. In the views of the great majority of men in power at the time, they were far from honorable and commanded no respect. If they had not been backed by a growing public sentiment, reinforced by the jealousies of rival powers, and vindicated by military victory—they would have been hanged.

The North American States were not alone in this ferment. But they became the beacon light because they were the first colony in history to win independence from the founders. They were the first to gain their freedom. Their blazing example set off a torrent of revolution which cut off European bonds from most of the 2 Americans in the next 5 decades, and which upset many a throne in Europe.

They said:

"We hold these truths to be self-evident; that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; that to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed. That whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the right of the people to alter or to abolish it, and to institute new Government, laying its foundation on such principles and organizing its power in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their safety and happiness.

"Prudence, indeed, will dictate that governments long established should not be changed for light and transient causes; and accordingly all experience hath shewn, that mankind are more disposed to suffer, while evils are sufferable, than to right themselves by abolishing the forms to which they are accustomed.

"But when a long train of abuses and usurpations, pursuing invariably the same object, evidence a design to reduce them under absolute despotism, it is their right, it is their duty to throw off such government, and to provide new guards for their future security. Such has been the patient sufferance of these colonies; and such is now the necessity which constrains them to alter their former systems of government.

* * * * *

"To prove this, let facts be submitted to a candid world."

High principles alone cannot win freedom, nor can they be dissociated from the human pressures of greed, commerce, jealousy, pride, and power.

Great men and small came to the aid of the embattled colonies, and finally their independence was recognized.

Many expected that the new governments would not last long. They were surrounded by Britain, France, and Spain. Each in its turn considered occupying the new Nation under the real or pretended guise of protecting it from invasion by the other powers. Each talked of "guaranteeing independence" of the inhabitants by taking that independence out of the grasping reach of the others.

The ideal government, of course, was never fully formed, because mankind is not ideal. But no better definition has ever since been given of the aims and purposes of human government than expressed in the Declaration of Independence.

And that high goal has brought the United States of America a form of government which comes ever closer through the years to guarantee of mankind's unalienable rights.

French Welsh on O'Daniel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 1, 1954

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the American people can be thankful that they have in Bangkok, at the present time, a fearless American newspaperman by the name of James G. Lucas. The Scripps-Howard organization is entitled to great credit also for placing Mr. Lucas in an area of the world in which all Americans are interested.

As part of my remarks, I am including an article by Mr. Lucas from Bangkok under date of July 9, in which he points out that Maj. Gen. John W. O'Daniel has apparently been frustrated by the French in its refusal to permit him to train the Vietnamese Army. This is further evidence, as I see it, that the French are about to capitulate 100 percent to the Red Chinese.

The article follows:

Ely Reversed Decision To Let United States Train Natives—French Welsh on O'Daniel Seals Vietnam's Doom

(By Jim G. Lucas)

Bangkok, July 9.—The French have virtually signed Indochina's death warrant by refusing to let Maj. Gen. John W. (Iron Mike) O'Daniel and his American staff train the Vietnamese army unless the United States sends ground forces to fight in Indochina.

This decision—a reversal of an earlier one—was conveyed to United States Ambassador to France C. Douglas Dillon by Gen. Paul Ely after he became supreme commander in Indochina.

I've known about this for several weeks. Only now that I'm out of Indochina and its censorship can it be told.

RELUCTANT APPROVAL

At first the French reluctantly agreed to let the Americans take over training of the Vietnamese native troops. General O'Daniel than exuded confidence. All he wanted was a chance to get going. At that time something might have been salvaged.

Former Commander in Chief Henri Navarre once threatened to resign if the Americans were given such training authority. But after the debacle at Dien Bien Phu he changed his mind. The new decision was announced and arrangements were made for a formal signing of the training agreement.

NAVARRE FIRED

The ceremony never was held. General Navarre meanwhile was fired, and General Ely named to succeed him.

Also, since Dien Bien Phu the French have been eager to draw Americans in to fight alongside them in Indochina. At one time it appeared this might be done. But after a long hard look at the picture, America began to back away.

In Saigon and Paris the French began what we call in our Army nit picking. They raised no serious objection to the Navarre agreement, but nothing ever seemed to happen.

O'DANIEL BURNED

General O'Daniel tore his hair.

"I didn't give up one star to be a quartermaster," he snorted. (He voluntarily reduced his rank to major general when he went to Indochina so he would be nominally under General Navarre.)

General Ely flew out from Paris, showed up at enough besieged points to get his picture taken, and went back to Paris. There he told our Ambassador that General Navarre had overstepped his authority in agreeing to American training aid. American training of the Vietnamese, he said, could be considered only within the overall framework of American intervention.

American officials reacted angrily to what they regarded as a crude form of pressure tactics. Whatever chance there was of our intervention was gone after that. And so, apparently, the last hope of our training a native army.

Without a trained army, what's left of Vietnam after July 20—the French Premier's deadline on ending the war—will be unable to defend itself.

Meanwhile in Saigon and Paris the nit picking continues; and the vital Red River Delta is all but gone.

Congress Charting Middle Road Policies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 30, 1954

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, those Democrats who had looked forward to the 83d Congress as an opportunity for airing their time-worn charges of Republican reaction and medieval attitudes have gained little comfort out of the past week. The tax-revision program sponsored by the administration is conservative, but by no means reactionary. The farm-price-support plan represents a recognition of all sides that the common welfare must be considered primary, and compromises have featured the legislative maneuvering. On foreign aid, the assistance regarded as necessary to maintain economic stability throughout Europe was approved.

These are all victories for the Eisenhower program, but they are also represenatative of the prevailing attitudes of the American people. We are coming to the viewpoint that our own house must be placed firmly in order if we are to meet the responsibilities of our position in the world on a sound basis. The President's characterization of his thinking as conservative on economics and liberal on human problems has come to be recognized as a wise middle course for legislative action.

No one can predict what will happen in the complexities of foreign affairs, but there has never been a better way to proceed in time of turmoil than the method of cautious, carefully considered progress along the middle way.

Question of the Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 30, 1954

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, the Premier of France expects to conclude the Indochinese war this month in a peace with honor. Whose honor? And peace for how long?

Appendix

The State Maritime Training Program in the Postwar Period

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FREDERICK G. PAYNE
OF MAINE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 9, 1954

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a paper delivered before the panel on education, training, and welfare at the 1953 American Merchant Marine Conference by the Honorable Ralph A. Leavitt, chairman, board of trustees, Maine Maritime Academy, Castine, Maine., entitled "The State Maritime Training Program in the Postwar Period."

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE STATE MARITIME TRAINING PROGRAM IN THE POSTWAR PERIOD

(Address by Ralph A. Leavitt, chairman, board of trustees, Maine Maritime Academy, Castine, Maine.)

Mr. Chairman, I was very happy to be asked to give a paper relative to the postwar program of the State maritime academies. I have been very close to this program for 14 or 15 years and, during that time, have developed some very definite ideas regarding the training of merchant marine officers.

When a very young man, in fact, a boy, I had the opportunity to travel on American ships up and down the Atlantic coast. Even then I was getting an impression of the officers on our ships. I remember one ship in particular I traveled on for 18 days with a naturalized Scot as captain, a young American as first mate, an Englishman as second mate, a Norwegian as third mate. I was struck by how illogical it was that we here in America could not find enough American officers to man our own ships.

At the same time, I was much impressed when the British officer pointed out ships carrying the British flag and told me Great Britain was the greatest nation on the seas. At other times the Norwegian mate would point out to me Norwegian ships and tell me that Norway was the greatest nation on the seas. With my heritage of generations of seafaring men, I wondered why we should not have officers on our ships to say that the United States was the greatest Nation on the seas.

TRAINING PROGRAMS SURVEYED

As a steamship agent in Portland for 35 years, I have come in contact with officers of the merchant marines of nearly all the nations that have ships sailing the ocean, and as agent, of course, I have had the opportunity of talking with thousands of captains of many nationalities relative to the type of training they received before becoming officers.

In later years, from these discussions and talks, I came to the sad realization that the reason American ships were carrying officers of other countries was that these men were better trained than the officers of our own country. Once in a while I would find a graduate of one of our schoolships on a vessel, a type of officer I wish could be on all of our ships.

When in 1940 I was asked by the Propeller Club in Portland to head up a committee to make officer training available to young men in the State of Maine whose natural heritage pointed them to the sea, I immediately got in touch with the boards of trustees of the New York State Maritime Academy and the Massachusetts Maritime Academy. They in turn directed me to the gentlemen who ran the schools in Pennsylvania and California.

Through their combined efforts and with the information received from them, I was able to put together a bill which in 1941 passed the Maine Legislature, creating a maritime academy in the State of Maine.

I have been closely associated with the school we created in Maine and have been present at all but 1 or 2 conferences between the directors of those schools and the Maritime Commission, and have missed only 1 or 2 of these Propeller Club panel sessions during the same period. During this period I have learned a lot. I have a few suggestions relative to the postwar operation of the training program of the maritime academies.

CLOSE COOPERATION REQUIRED

My first suggestion is that we try to develop just as close a cooperation between the various schools as possible; that we try to coordinate the curricula at all five schools that are training officers for the merchant marine to a point where the product will have equal standing before members of the marine industry who have to hire these men and the Navy which calls them to temporary or permanent duty.

I believe we should have more conferences, so we can speed a coordinated program. There should not be too much thought in the mind of anybody whether a boy is going to a Federal or a State school. Our entire thought should be toward strengthening our schools and the United States merchant marine. Each school has advantages and disadvantages due to geographical conditions, but each school has weaknesses, too. By working close together we shall be able to strengthen the entire structure of educating officers.

My second suggestion is that we make an effort to contact the maritime unions and try to show them the value of the maritime academies and their graduates. I have made several contacts with union executives and have been encouraged to believe if we can sit down with them and talk over our problems we can find a solution to any antagonism.

The administration in Washington has long held that opportunity should be given to men in ratings to become officers in the merchant marine, and this opportunity certainly has been carried out with a vengeance. Whereas the combined maritime academies have been graduating less than 600 third mates and third engineers a year since 1948, the new licenses issued by the Coast Guard were as follows:

	3d mates	3d engineers	Total
1948	539	676	1,215
1949	346	630	976
1950	452	745	1,297
1951	550	945	1,495
1952	538	1,009	1,547

From this it can be seen that in the last 2 years, although the 5 maritime academies have been graduating 600 officers a year, the Coast Guard has been issuing 1,500 or more new licenses. This does not include upgrading or officers of foreign countries who have become naturalized and have taken their first licenses under their American citizenship at grades above third mate and third engineer. Conservatively, this figure must run into hundreds; I have been unable to get it exactly.

I am not antagonistic to the men who have gone into the merchant marine as ratings receiving licenses. I believe every effort should be made to give them licenses, but only after they have taken correspondence courses or other schooling making it possible for them to attend a maritime academy and complete the course in one of these schools.

I know it will take a long time to carry out such a program, but I shall make it one of my efforts in life to have it a requirement, for a man to obtain a license as a third mate or third engineer, that he be a graduate of this type of school.

FORMAL TRAINING RECOMMENDED

I have talked with some union leaders who have stated they feel we should in some way make it possible for them to send the most promising of their ratings to these schools. There may be exceptional cases, and provisions may be worked out under which up to 10 percent of the officer personnel each year who have gone to sea a good many years and are over a certain age can receive their licenses without going to one of the schools. I do not think the percentage should be much higher than this. This is my own idea; it is not the administration's idea nor the idea (as far as I know) of other people running these schools. I believe ships are altogether too complicated and too valuable to entrust to men who have not had training along formal lines given at these schools.

My next suggestion is that those who attend these schools should have training cruises of 3 months each year on training ships, at least during the first 3 years of their education. After long years the Navy found this was the best way to train, and most other countries who have maritime training systems feel the same about it.

I am convinced a boy can learn more under supervision than he can trying to work out a sea project all by himself. I know this subject is controversial. I believe that after completing the course at the Maritime Academy, the young officer should go to sea 1 complete year on a sea project ending with his writing a thesis, and upon approval of his thesis by the school, he should be given his degree. Until that time, he would be a student serving his internship at sea. As a student completing his studies, he would not be subject to the draft, nor would he perhaps be subject to union rules against his employment, at least aboard ships receiving subsidies from the Government, where they would be beholden to aid the Government in its training program.

If we make provision to take more from the forecastle and graduate 90 percent of the officers needed for the United States merchant marine, according to Coast Guard records we will need to train at least 1,200 new officers a year, which means enrollments will have to be increased 100 percent. This can be done by increasing the enrollment of all present schools or the formation of other schools in other locations.

OTHER STATE SCHOOLS NEEDED

Up in Maine we have under active consideration the doubling of our student body over the next 3 or 4 years. Although the policy of the administration for the past 3 years has been to talk down the formation of schols in other States when they have applied for aid, I believe this policy should be reviewed with the thought of giving other States an opportunity to start schools. It was distinctly against administration policy to start the school in Maine, and only by considerable persistence on the part of Maine people did we overcome this reluctance enough to let us have a school. Other States were not quite as persistent; they still have no schools. I feel very strongly on this.

My last point is that in the education of midshipmen in our scools, we have failed to impress them with the importance of the profession they are entering. We have given them an education which should be the envy of most young men, at a cost lower than most liberal arts colleges. Medical, law, and engineering schools spend a great deal of time impressing students with the responsibility which will be theirs upon graduation.

A merchant marine officer has a high responsibility to his State and to his Nation. To these young men we entrust the heritage of the thousands of seamen who have fought for and won the freedom of the seas. Although the phrase has been almost worked to death, these young men are being trained to be our good will ambassadors wherever the oceans lap the distant shores. They are being trained to carry millions of passengers, and billions of dollars of our produce on the sea in ships which singly cost millions and collectively billions. The safety of these lives, cargoes, and ships depends upon their acceptance of responsibility. Few professional men have so much responsibility thrust upon them so quickly. Engineers do not find themselves in a few weeks entrusted with the construction of million-dollar bridges; for years lawyers are not entrusted with cases involving much responsibility; and it is a long time before medical students work into full responsibility; but the graduates of these schools in almost no time find themselves on the bridge of a ship, with responsibility far exceeding that of most professional men so early in life.

NOT SCHOOLS FOR BOYS

It is an honorable profession, and we should spend much time impressing these midshipmen that it is, and that we are not running these schools for boys, but for young men who know why they are attending the school. A young man desiring to come to one of these schools should come because he wants to become a good officer in the merchant marine or Navy—until he gives up the sea to take a position on shore to further the maritime interests of our country. We who are giving freely of our time and energy without pay to run these schools are not doing it just to run another school, but because we know the American merchant marine needs better officers.

There are two ways to accomplish this. The first is by a more thorough screening of applicants. We must not accept young men in these schools until they have a full realization of the work they are entering upon. I believe the way to handle this is to give applicants sufficient reading material, or at least references to material, which would give them some idea as to the profession they apparently wish to learn. Then I believe they should be given a lecture of considerable length on the responsibilities involved in undertaking this education.

EMPHASIS ON HISTORY

The other method is, after accepting these young men we lay greater stress on the teaching of maritime history—history proving without question that only nations with great merchant marines are ever powerful. Tell them the success of our country in its early history was almost directly traceable to the men who officered and ran our merchant ships. Tell them about the merchant marine of this country, from the launching of the little pinnace *Virginia* up in Maine until the present day. Show how every war we have fought has been won only because our merchant marine made victories possible. Tell them how our industrial greatness is tied to our merchant marine. In other words, build a fire under these young officers, din the importance of the merchant marine into them over and over again. Put a far-away look into their eyes; make them dreamers as well as doers; make them see the great future ahead of them as officers. Give them the spirit of their nautical forefathers who made our country great.

If we can make these young men see the importance of their mission, then, and only then, can we say the maritime academies are fulfilling their mission.

Messages From Transportation Organizations Laudatory of Hon. Edwin C. Johnson, of Colorado

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, July 10, 1954

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, we all felt a sense of loss when our very distinguished and able colleague, the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. Johnson] recently decided to retire from the Senate. His decision marked the end of one of the most notable careers in the history of this body.

Last Thursday, the chief executives of the National Transportation Trade Associations gathered at a dinner in Washington. They expressed their appreciation to Ed Johnson for his 18 years of able service.

Senator Johnson was presented with a brochure containing testimonials from these organizations which represented all phases of the transportation industry, both large and small. In glowing terms, the letters spoke of his work which has done so much to advance the Nation and to keep us strong and prosperous. Those of us who have been privileged to work with him were very happy and pleased to see him so honored.

I ask unanimous consent that the laudatory messages from these transportation organizations be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the laudatory messages were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

In Appreciation to Senator Edwin C. Johnson for His Outstanding Service to the Nation's Transportation During His 18 Years in the United States Senate Representing the State of Colorado

(Expressed by National Transportation Trade Associations, Sheraton-Carlton Hotel, Washington, D. C., July 1, 1954)

American Merchant Marine
Institute, Inc.,
Washington, D. C., June 17, 1954.

Hon. Edwin C. Johnson,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator: We are profoundly grateful to you for the innumerable evidences of your deep interest in a strong merchant marine during your entire distinguished service in the United States Senate. As executive vice president of the American Merchant Marine Institute, Inc., representing a preponderance of American-flag overseas, coastwise, and intercoastal steampship lines, I want to express to you our collective appreciation.

All transportation in and out of the United States is, and will continue to be, grateful for the vision and leadership which you have unfailingly displayed during your many years both as a member and as the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Your grasp of the broad issues involved, your recognition always of the national public interest, and your support for those measures which will strengthen our transportation both within and without the United States, will continue for many years to serve as an inspiration for us in industry and for those who will follow you on the committee. We in industry will long be grateful for the support which you have consistently given.

It is with genuine regret that we learned of your decision to retire from Congress but we extend to your our sincere good wishes for the future.

Cordially yours,

Francis T. Greene.

The American Short Line
Railroad Association,
Washington, D. C., June 15, 1954.

Hon. Edwin C. Johnson,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

My Dear Senator: It was with real regret that I learned of your intention to retire from the United Senate at the close of the 2d session of the 83d Congress.

The interests of the public have always been uppermost in your mind when considering legislation affecting common carriers by rail, members of this association. At the same time you have had an unusual understanding of the problems of the short line railroads and have rendered them many services. You have made our work here much easier. In addition, I am going to miss a personal friend, whose company I have enjoyed, because distance will make it impossible to see you as often as I would wish.

The representatives of the members of the association and all its officers and employees join me in wishing you and Mrs. Johnson a long and happy future in your chosen State of Colorado.

Very truly yours,

Jim Hood.

American Trucking Associations, Inc.,
Washington, D. C., June 21, 1954.

The Honorable Edwin C. Johnson,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

My Dear Senator Johnson: On the occasion of your impending retirement from the

United States Senate I want to take this opportunity of letting you know of the extremely high regard that our industry has had for you personally, and for your unstinting services to the Nation in the 18 years you will have served here.

Both as a member and as chairman of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce during those 18 years we have always found you both fair and understanding as to our problems and those of other forms of transportation. Your extra efforts in championing improvement in both the efficiency as well as budgetary health of the Interstate Commerce Commission are noteworthy.

May I on the part of our industry wish to Mrs. Johnson and your good self continued good health and success when you return to take up life again in your State of Colorado.

Sincerely,

John V. Lawrence,
Managing Director.

The American Waterways
Operators, Inc.,
Washington, D. C., June 16, 1954.

Hon. Edwin C. Johnson,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Johnson: It was with deep regret that the members of the American Waterways Operators, Inc., and I learned of your desire and intention to retire from the Congress of the United States upon the completion of your present term of office.

On behalf of this national association of the barge and towing vessel industry, I would like to express deep appreciation for the many courtesies you have always shown its members and officers while you served as a member and as chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the United States Senate.

In your long service as a member of the Senate Transportation Committee you have been eminently fair and most understanding and appreciative of the problems of the various modes of transport. Likewise, you have always remained cognizant of the interest of shippers and the general public in all transportation.

I also wish to thank you for the many considerations you have shown me personally over a long period of years. You have the association's and my best wishes for many years of continued success and contentment.

Sincerely yours,

Chester C. Thompson,
President.

Air Transport Association
of America,
Washington, D. C., June 16, 1954.

Hon. Edwin C. Johnson,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

My Dear Senator Johnson: Transportation in this country owes a great debt to you for the broad interest you have shown in its many problems. This has been remarkable when one considers how much time a Senator has to devote to the problems of the country as a whole and those of his home State.

We are deeply appreciative of the fact that despite the many calls on your time you have made real and successful efforts to become familiar with the problems of air transportation—problems with which you have lived since Congress saw fit to enact the industry's Magna Carta, the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938. Your intelligent and sympathetic grasp of the subsidy problem and your utilization of outside assistance to study it has been of great value to the industry.

Even though you have not always agreed with the industry, we feel you have appreciated the necessity of continual congressional understanding of the problems of a regulated industry. Because of your intelligent and able sponsorship of air transportation during your membership on the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee since 1937, and as chairman during the 81st and 82d Congresses, we believe your retirement from the Senate of the United States will remove from the Federal Government one of its most enlightened legislative minds.

Sincerely,

Earl D. Johnson.

Association of American Railroads,
Washington, D. C., June 16, 1954.

Hon. Edwin C. Johnson,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Ed: Those of us in Washington who have had the pleasure and privilege of knowing and working with you since you were elected to the Senate in 1936 are exceedingly sorry that the time is approaching when you will soon be leaving the city to return to Colorado.

During your years of service in the Senate of the United States, you have served your State and your country with honor and distinction. As a member and as chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of the Senate you were always constructive and eminently fair in dealing with the important transportation problems of all kinds which came before the committee for consideration.

We in the railroad-transportation industry will always remember with grateful appreciation your unfailing courtesy at all times when we had occasion to appear before you or confer with you. Your constructive record of accomplishment in the Senate is one which should always bring you pleasant recollections of a difficult job well done. Your service in the Senate has been during one of the most trying and difficult times in our country's history, and you are entitled to the gratitude of the American people for the sound and constructive principles which you advocated and supported.

In returning to Colorado, the State you love so well, my best wishes go to you for many happy days in the years ahead.

With kindest regards always.

Sincerely,

Bill Faricy.

Chamber of Commerce of
the United States,
Washington, D. C., June 23, 1954.

Hon. Edwin C. Johnson,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator: It was with mixed feelings that we learned of your intention to retire from the Washington scene. Mixed, because your loss to the Senate will be so keenly felt and because, at the same time, we know that you and Mrs. Johnson are looking forward so much to your return to Colorado.

Your decision having been made, however, we are happy to have this opportunity to express to you our sincere appreciation for the many courtesies you have extended to us as a member and as chairman of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Your willingness to give everyone a fair hearing and to listen to all who might have something to offer; your search for the true facts; the way you have devoted yourself to building a better transportation system for the Nation; not to forget your always pleasant, cooperative and amiable disposition—all have engendered the deepest respect and affection of those especially interested in transportation.

While you will be missed in Washington, we know that you and Mrs. Johnson will be very happy back in Colorado, and, in going, you have our very best wishes for the future we know is in store for you.

Sincerely yours,

Harold F. Hammond.

Committee of American
Steamship Lines,
Washington, D. C., June 16, 1954.

The Honorable Edwin Johnson,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Johnson: Your decision to retire from the United States Senate and to return to your native State of Colorado is regretted by all those in the transportation industry and not least by the steamship industry. While we shall miss your strong and steady voice in the Senate of the United States, we are gratified to learn that your great ability will be available to the State to which you are so devoted.

Both as a member and as chairman of the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, you have conducted yourself with a brand of good judgment, humanity, integrity, and intelligence which has added luster to an already distinguished career.

On behalf of the members of this organization, we extend to you our gratitude and appreciation for your service to the Nation and our sincere hope that you will enjoy health and happiness in your continued service to your State.

Respectfully yours,

Alexander Purdon.

Committee for Pipeline Companies,
Washington D. C., June 18, 1954.

The Honorable Senator Ed Johnson,
United States Senate.

Dear Senator Johnson: Your decision to retire from your senatorial duties creates a vacant chair which will be extremely difficult to fill.

Your record of 18 years as a United States Senator from the State of Colorado will stand as a permanent monument and an inspiration for those Senators who remain and those who will come in the future and are given the tremendous task of dealing with legislation in the regulation of interstate and foreign commerce. In this respect we have observed your approach to your daily work, which has been characterized with a deep sense of its importance to the transportation industry and to the public welfare.

We have been profoundly impressed by the dignity, integrity, and fairness in which you have presided at hearings dealing with legislation affecting such a highly competitive industry as is the transportation business of this Nation. While giving all parties full and complete opportunity to be heard in controversial matters, you have been able to hew to the fundamental proposition that legislation should be enacted or defeated as it best serves the public interest.

The pipeline industry joins with other carriers in wishing you continued success and happiness.

Last but not least, I hope that "Big Ed" will continue his efforts to keep baseball in its enviable place as the great American game.

Respectfully yours,

Gordon C. Locke.

Freight Forwarders Institute,
Washington, D. C., June 18, 1954.

Hon. Edwin C. Johnson,
United States Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Johnson: It is an honor and a privilege to be able to join with the executives and members of the transport trade associations of the country in paying tribute to you upon the eve of your retirement from the United States Senate.

There are not many questions in the realm of public affairs upon which the transportation interests of the Nation can present a unanimous front. I am sure that we agree to a man that transportation owes you a deep and lasting debt of gratitude for your long and tireless years of effort in the cause of an improved American transportation system.

I can speak with particular depth of feeling for the freight forwarding industry. You had an important part in shaping the original Freight Forwarder Act, enacted as part IV of the Interstate Commerce Act in 1942, and in amending that act to conform to experience and necessity. You displayed in the consideration of our problems a fairness, a justness, and an impartiality which stamped you in our regard as a statesman of the highest caliber. In that regard we will always hold you.

As you return to your home State of Colorado we hope that you and Mrs. Johnson will find a satisfaction and contentment that will in some measure reward you for your many years of arduous service to the country as a Member of the United States Senate.

Sincerely,

GILES MORROW,
President.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF
MOTOR BUS OPERATORS,
Washington, D. C., June 16, 1954.

Hon. EDWIN C. JOHNSON,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR JOHNSON: All of us in the intercity motorbus industry are deeply regretful that you have determined not to be a candidate to succeed yourself as United States Senator from Colorado in the forthcoming election. The personal reasons which you assign as the basis for your decision are, of course, sound ones with which no happily married man will disagree. But everyone in transportation who has worked with you and known of your record during the many years you have served as a member and chairman of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce will miss you grievously.

You have worked long and diligently in the interest of a sound and healthy transportation system; you have recognized the vital need for constructive and efficient regulation of transportation; and you have always been most fair and equitable in your treatment of the various branches of transportation, recognizing that, as to all of them, sound economic conditions must be fostered, and safe, adequate, economical, and efficient service must be attained in the interest of our national welfare.

We congratulate and commend you most heartily for the many important objectives in this field which you have accomplished, and sincerely hope and trust that your reward will be an exceedingly happy and prosperous future. This, with the knowledge of the high esteem and admiration in which we all hold you, may be some recompense for your constructive and effective devotion to the cause of transportation and the sound solution of its many complex problems.

With every good wish and our cordial best regards,

Very sincerely yours,

ARTHUR M. HILL,
President.

THE NATIONAL INDUSTRIAL
TRAFFIC LEAGUE,
Washington, D. C., June 17, 1954.

The Honorable EDWIN C. JOHNSON,
The United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR JOHNSON: The word that you had decided not to stand for reelection to the Senate was received as a distinct shock and with great disappointment by those of us in the National Industrial Traffic League who know the unique value of your service to the Nation in matters of transportation. You have established an enviable record during your many years as a United States Senator, and we view the end of your membership in the Senate as a loss to us and even more so to the people of the country.

Nevertheless, we join with others in congratulating you upon years of well-spent effort and in wishing you all good fortune, health, and happiness in whatever path of life you choose to take.

Very sincerely yours,

LESTER J. DORR,
Executive Secretary.

PRIVATE TRUCK COUNCIL
OF AMERICA, INC.,
Washington, D. C., June 28, 1954.

Hon. EDWIN C. JOHNSON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: The announcement of your decision to retire from the Senate was received with considerable regret. Although we appreciate the desire of you and Mrs. Johnson to return to the wonderful State of Colorado, your honored place in the Congress of the United States will be most difficult to fill.

Since transportation is the lifeblood of the Nation's economy, your membership on the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, and especially your chairmanship of that highly important committee, enabled you to make a major contribution to our country's welfare.

Those of us who have had the privilege of following transportation legislation will miss your thoughtfulness and calm and considerate judgment very much.

Our best wishes go with you and Mrs. Johnson for continued health, happiness, and personal satisfaction in all of your future activities.

Respectfully yours,

JAMES D. MANN,
Managing Director.

Address by Hon. Edward Martin, of Pennsylvania, Before Veterans of Foreign Wars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, July 10, 1954

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address I delivered to the Veterans of Foreign Wars, at Harrisburg, Pa.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF UNITED STATES SENATOR MARTIN, OF PENNSYLVANIA, AT A JOINT MEETING OF THE DEPARTMENT OF PENNSYLVANIA VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS, AND THE LADIES AUXILIARY AT THE 35TH ANNUAL ENCAMPMENT, HARRISBURG, PA., THURSDAY, JULY 1, 1954

I am sincerely grateful for the high honor of appearing before this great organization of patriotic Americans.

In this impressive memorial service we rededicate ourselves to the sacred ideals for which our gallant comrades gave their lives on the altar of freedom.

We honor their memory.

We bow our heads in solemn tribute to the heroes who fell in defense of all that we hold precious.

We strengthen our firm resolve that we shall never forget the million Americans who died on the battlefield to preserve our sacred heritage of liberty and independence.

We pledge renewed and increased interest in the welfare of the widows and orphans of our Nation's heroes and in aiding those who must go through life physically handicapped or suffering from illness because of their service to their country.

We who have known the horrors of war pray to Almighty God that our Republic may be spared the death and destruction of another world conflict. We are a peace-loving people. We pray that all nations may be guided on the path of honor, justice, righteousness and peace.

But we must keep ever before us the stern warning that our hope for peace depends upon the heights to which we build the defensive strength of our Republic.

As the first step in our striving for peace we must now—without delay—redouble our efforts to arouse the American people to the dangers confronting our freedom and our way of life.

We must make every loyal American fully conscious of the only threat to our national safety and security—the poisonous philosophy of communism that knows no truth, no honor, no morality, and no God.

America has been called by destiny to world leadership as the stronghold of civilization—the one power on earth that can rally freemen in resistance to tyranny and the destruction of all human liberty.

I repeat, the only threat to peace and progress comes from the unholy Communist ambition to dominate and enslave the world. Already one-third of the earth is held captive behind the Iron Curtain, under the Red flag of Soviet Russia.

The Communists look with greedy eyes upon the last great citadel of freedom—the United States of America—as the final goal of their evil conspiracy for world conquest.

Their attempt to gain a beachhead in the Western Hemisphere followed the same familiar pattern, with lies and treachery paving the way for espionage, infiltration, sabotage, and subversion.

Therefore, my comrades, I say we must never—not for one moment—be diverted from our most sacred responsibility. We must never deviate from our plainly marked path of patriotic duty, and that is to keep America sound, strong, and at peace.

We have suffered the tragedies of two world wars to defend our God-given freedom. We paid a terrific price in lives and treasure to defeat our enemies. We gained great military victories but did not achieve peace. We poured more blood and lives into the battlefields of Korea to defend freedom against Communist aggression but our hope for an honorable peace was shattered by the iron hand of Moscow.

We have learned a great lesson. We know now that military power alone cannot bring peace to the world.

We know that a single hydrogen bomb has more destructive force than all the 2,700,000 tons of explosives dropped on enemy objectives in the 4 years of World War II. I has been stated by an eminent authority that a hydrogen bomb can be made large enough to destroy any city in the world.

We know that in total war, with the terrifying weapons of modern warfare, there can be no victory—only the destruction of all the civilization and culture built up by man's genius through the centuries.

I bring these grim facts to your attention in order to emphasize my firm belief that the time has come for clear thinking and constructive understanding.

As veterans we must take our places in the frontline of the battle to keep America strong. We must take leadership in a crusade to build up to the highest peak every element of our national strength.

Not military strength alone, but the more important tripod on which American defense stands. One leg of this tripod is adequate training and production. The second is economic strength. The third leg is our spiritual attainments.

We must have great production in our mills and factories to provide the things needed by our Armed Forces and the civilian population. We need great production on the farms in order to have plenty of food.

We need more careful conservation of our natural resources—our soil, timber, minerals, oil, gas and water.

We must have a strong and sound economy to keep our workers gainfully employed and to maintain the American standard of living.

We must have a sound and stable dollar to protect the earnings and savings of our people against the destructive force of inflation. More nations have been destroyed by inflation than by guns.

And most important, we must have a great moral and spiritual revival that will rekindle the spirit of religion among every faith and every creed.

If we take our places on the side of God, with faith in the higher power that made and preserved us a nation, we can face the future confident and unafraid. We can have no stronger weapon against communism than the spiritual power of righteousness and obedience to the laws of man and God.

In planning our military power we must remember that it is only one phase of our defensive strength. In recent months there has been strong pressure to upset the budget plans of the Eisenhower administration for national defense. Those who oppose the so-called New Look of more defense for fewer dollars talk about more guns, ships, planes and soldiers.

They advocate an Army of such great size that it could not be armed, equipped and maintained without danger to our national economy.

I have given a great deal of study to this subject and I have reached the conclusion that we should not spread our forces all over the world.

In planning the military defense of our Republic, I believe we should have a highly trained Regular Army of modest size, based here at home. It should have the finest and most modern weapons and equipment. It should have the greatest mobility and the greatest firepower the world has ever known. It should be completely motorized and prepared to move by air and sea to any place where it might be needed.

Our National Guard should be under the control of the States until called into the Federal service. It should be trained by the best and most patriotic brains of the Regular Army. We should have a great Reserve Corps of citizens willing to continue their military training and they must also be under the supervision of the best the Army can provide.

Instead of maintaining a huge standing ground force at tremendous cost, I advocate building an Air Force so big and so powerful that we could have complete supremacy in the air and enough planes to carry our ground troops to any part of the world. With such an Air Force, American jet fighters and bombers, in the event of war, could speedily demolish the Communist lines of communication and could destroy the heart of the Communist military production.

We should build up the world's most powerful Navy so that we and our allies will have complete command of the sea. We should create the world's strongest merchant marine in readiness for the transportation of men and the materiel with which to fight.

I do not agree with those who favor a permanent policy of keeping ground troops garrisoned in foreign lands. That would require a standing army of such tremendous size that its cost could bankrupt our Nation in a short time.

I believe the more practical and effective plan would require that ground troops be provided by the anti-Communist countries of Europe and Asia. That would give us a well-rounded plan of defense when combined with the great air and sea power provided by the United States and our allies.

From its earliest beginnings America has been dedicated to the ways of peace.

Our way of life has always been under attack because the militarists and dictators of the world have opposed our concept of government based on freedom of the individual.

Our ideals of peace have made America the most productive area on earth, even though many other nations had more abundant natural resources. We have surpassed other nations with hundreds of years of background in spiritual and cultural development.

Let us think more of peace and less of war.

Let us get back to the plan of the Creator, standing together in faith, and working for peace through strength, honesty, and loyalty.

Dr. Abba Hillel Silver

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 30, 1954

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Abba Hillel Silver has for more than 37 years been the spiritual leader of the Temple in Cleveland, the largest liberal Jewish congregation in the United States.

He has been actively identified with many social movements of our day. He was an early champion of the rights of organized labor, and one of the first advocates in the United States of unemployment insurance. He served as chairman of the American section of the Jewish Agency for Israel, chairman of the American Zionist Emergency Council, and as president of the Zionist Organization of America. Dr. Silver is regarded as the foremost spokesman of Zionism in the United States. He represented the movement before the Assembly of the United Nations, and is one of the leaders who are responsible for the establishment of the State of Israel.

During the inauguration ceremonies of President Dwight D. Eisenhower on January 20, 1953, Dr. Silver delivered a prayer. He was recently honored in Life magazine as 1 of the 12 leading preachers in the United States.

Dr. Silver is author of several volumes on history and religion, notably his work on Religion in a Changing World and the World Crisis and Jewish Survival. His latest book, Vision and Victory, is a collection of his major addresses during the crucial years prior to the establishment of the State of Israel.

John Gunther, in his book, Inside U. S. A., speaks of Dr. Silver as "the first citizen of Cleveland."

Dr. Silver is a graduate of the Hebrew Union College, and was ordained in 1915. He served as president of the Central Conference of American Rabbis.

He holds honorary degrees from many American universities. In 1948 he received the annual national service award of Phi Epsilon Rho; in 1949 he received the Cardoza memorial award; and in 1952 he received the award of merit of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States. In 1953 he received the annual award of the Zeta Beta Tau.

On June 29, 1954, a triangular parcel of land adjacent to the Temple on the West was dedicated as the Abba Hillel Silver Park. It is altogether fitting that this development, situated in the cultural heart of Cleveland, should be dedicated to this great man who stands for growth and progress and whose ideals are in keeping with the furthering of the interests of the community of Cleveland.

I should like to have reprinted in the RECORD at this point editorials which appeared in the three Cleveland (Ohio) papers honoring Rabbi Silver. The first appeared in the Cleveland Plain Dealer, June 30, 1954:

SILVER PARK HONORS A MAN AND AIDS A CITY

Every Clevelander, whatever his creed, should be happy that abiding honor has been paid to the internationally known spiritual leader of the temple in the announcement that a beautiful vista—the Abba Hillel Silver Park—will be constructed adjacent to the House of God at Ansel Road and East 105th Street.

Dr. Silver's rabbinate here of 37 fruitful years deserved such an honor. But in addition to this, creation of the park is one of the best examples of making a fine environment in a rapidly changing city that has ever occurred in Cleveland.

The plan to buy up properties in the vicinity of the temple to make room for the park will, at the same time, protect the area from the encroachment of a neighborhood which has been running down at the heels.

Thus, instead of fleeing from changing conditions, the temple will stand firm and through this farsighted policy will help to rebuild the entire community, for beauty is catching, and the whole area will benefit.

It is the sort of thing the Illinois Institute of Technology did so successfully in Chicago, as did the Michael Reese Hospital in the same city.

It is a wise, thoughtful, and worthy thing that has been done in honor of a great religious leader.

The second appeared in the Cleveland Press on June 29:

FOR THE COMMUNITY

Throughout his 37 years of service at the Temple, Rabbi Abba Hillel Silver's wisdom, leadership, and inspiration have reached far beyond the limits of his own congregation.

Thus it is especially appropriate that the tribute his congregation has planned for him—a large and beautiful park along Ansel Road—should also be something which the whole community can share and enjoy.

Rabbi Silver has always been a community asset of inestimable value. So, too, will this park, located near the cultural heart of the city, be a community asset of great and enduring value.

And the third was printed in the Cleveland News on June 29:

RABBI SILVER PARK: A FINE TRIBUTE

A surprise tribute of genuine affection for their spiritual leader is the announcement of the Temple's congregation that it is purchasing and dedicating in the name of Rabbi Abba Hillel Silver 3 acres of park near the synagogue. Last night's dinner saluted the work of this outstanding pastor and Zionist leader.

Citizens of all faiths will hail this $735,000 memorial to Rabbi Silver, for he is identified not only as a vigorous and penetrating religious scholar and orator, but a force in all movements for the development of Cleveland's cultural and welfare assets.

The Employment Picture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, July 10, 1954

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, on yesterday I made a short statement for the RECORD relating to some of the rosy looks with reference to employment. In today's New York Tribune there is an editorial entitled "The Employment Picture," which makes the same approach to this subject that I made, and I believe it will be read with considerable interest and profit. I, therefore, ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE EMPLOYMENT PICTURE

Early in June, report the Commerce and Labor Departments, there were still nearly 3.5 million persons in this country without work, which represented an increase of 42,000 since May. More than 62 million were working, nearly a million more than in May, and most of these workers were on farms. Factory workers were putting in an average of 39.6 hours a week in June, a trifle more than the month before. By the end of June, the number of new claims for unemployment insurance dropped about as expected, when seasonal changes are considered, and by the 1st of July they stood at the lowest level since October.

What do the figures mean? The almost insignificant increase in unemployment was only about one-ninth as large as the average increase from May to June of previous years since 1945, and the smallest in 15 years. The long-term unemployed are finding jobs faster than at any time since the slight economic downturn began last fall. The horde of job seekers released in the economy at the end of each school year was nearly offset this year. As is normal in the summertime, many people without jobs were finding them in construction work. Farmers normally get new workers in the summer, too. But with all seasonal factors considered, the downtrend in all nonagricultural occupations appeared to be leveling off.

This generally encouraging picture, however, must be viewed within a long-term frame. Last week the National Planning Association reminded the country that if the present rate of economic activity is maintained, a $25-billion gap would develop between actual production figures and the hypothetical figures which would be required for full employment. The association feels that this would mean that unemployment would double during the year to come if business continues at the present rate.

The only alternatives seen by this distinguished group of businessmen and economists were increased defense spending, which might have to be authorized by a special session of Congress next fall, or additional governmental measures to allow the economy to expand to full employment levels. This view of things seems to be shared by Arthur F. Burns, the president's chief economic adviser, who remarked a month ago that unemployment figures of more than 3 million were definitely intolerable, and that if business should bump along at June levels for another 5 or 6 months, early Government action would be called for.

Texas Rural Minister of the Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, July 10, 1954

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, a respected Texas minister recently was named by the Progressive Farmer magazine as rural minister of the year in my State. He is Dr. E. C. Cargill, pastor of the Park Presbyterian Church in Italy, Ellis County, Tex.

I join in paying honor to this fine Christian gentleman, and ask unanimous consent that a story about him, published in the Dallas Times-Herald, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

An 82-year-old Presbyterian minister has been named Texas rural minister of the year by the Progressive Farmer, a southwide farm magazine, and the Town and Country School of Emory (Ga.) University.

He is Dr. E. C. Cargill, pastor of the Park Presbyterian Church in Italy, Ellis County, for more than 21 years.

Enthusiastic letters to the Progressive Farmer from people in Italy were determining factors in choosing Dr. Cargill to receive the award for outstanding service to his church and community. This is an annual presentation by the magazine.

One letter says: "He is the most respected and loved man in the community. The whole community takes pride in claiming him so long. He is one of those unusual men that no one ever gets around to criticizing."

The story of Dr. Cargill, which appears in the July issue of the magazine, points out:

"Dr. Cargill was born on a farm in Red River Parish, La., in 1872, and his father was a Congregational missionary in the State.

"A product of the rural church he has given his life in service to rural and small-town churches.

"He came to Texas in 1916, serving as pastor in Italy and Forreston churches from 1916 until 1923. In 1940 he came back to Italy and since then has been pastor of the Italy and Avalon churches. He also served the Forreston church from 1940 to 1949.

"Called the community pastor by Italy folks, he rarely misses a school program or activity, is active in the Lions Club, and is past president of the Italy Club. School children are delighted when he plays the harp for them.

"Dr. Cargill has married many a couple, and often hears from couples he married years before. One couple sends him a gift equal in dollars to the number of years they have been married on each anniversary.

"While pastor at Clarendon, Ark., he was sent by his congregation to the World Sunday School Convention in Washington, D. C. He has served as synod chairman of foreign missions for 3 consecutive years, beginning in 1926, and was elected moderator of the Texas synod of the Presbyterian Church U. S. A. in 1933.

"In November 1949, the Italy community held an E. C. Cargill Day to pay tribute to Dr. Cargill and his wife. Sparked by the Lions Club, the occasion was a historic one. Over 700 persons attended.

"He was in ill health then—and eligible for retirement. But then and now he refused to cease work as long as he is physically able to carry on."

The Eisenhower Health Reinsurance Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. HESELTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1954

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce reported favorably H. R. 8356, which implements President Eisenhower's recommendation of a program to improve the public health by encouraging more extensive use of the voluntary prepayment method of insurance.

On Thursday it was announced by the Republican leadership that if the bill was reported it would be included in the program for next week.

Last night Secretary Hobby spoke over the NBC network about the President's health program and particularly as to the reinsurance plan. She made the objectives and the need for the proposal very clear. I am confident that all who will have the opportunity and responsibility of voting on this bill shortly will find the speech most helpful. I am glad to have the privilege of placing it in the RECORD.

Thank you, Mr. President.

Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. Tonight, I would like to talk about a subject of deep personal concern to you: the health security of you and your family.

Health security means the peace of mind that comes with the knowledge that you and your family will be able to pay the costs of medical and hospital care. As a mother, I know that health security lies at the very heart of a sound family life. It is important for you to know that if you or your loved ones should get sick or have an accident, it will be possible to get first-rate medical care without using your savings or mortgaging your future.

We believe that helping individuals meet personal disaster is a proper concern of the Federal Government. Therefore, we want to help you build greater health security. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is responsible for the Federal Government's efforts in this field.

Last January, President Eisenhower, in his state of the Union message, said:

"I am flatly opposed to the socialization of medicine. The great need for hospital and medical services can best be met by the initiative of private plans. But it is unfortunately a fact that medical costs are rising and already impose severe hardships on many families. The Federal Government can do many helpful things and still carefully avoid the socialization of medicine."

In a later message, the President recommended a four-point health program to help meet the needs of the people.

One proposal would help pay for more hospitals for people with long-term illnesses, and for other medical-treatment centers. Another proposal is to rehabilitate thousands more disabled people to happy and useful lives. These two proposals have been passed by both Houses of the Congress.

A third part of the health program would give the States more freedom in using Federal money they are now getting to improve your local public health services. This proposal has been passed by the House.

I want to talk with you tonight especially about another part of the President's program—a plan which would encourage insurance organizations to provide better health insurance.

Bills containing this plan were introduced in the House by Congressman Charles A. Wolverton, and in the Senate by Senators H. Alexander Smith, Prescott Bush, John Sherman Cooper, Ralph E. Flanders, Homer Ferguson, Irving M. Ives, William A. Purtell, Leverett Saltonstall, and Robert W. Upton.

This plan has been reported out by the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee and by the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

This is a new approach toward solving the health problems of the American people. It rejects socialized medicine. It protects your right to choose your own doctor. It is a key part of the Eisenhower program for better health.

Let me illustrate why this plan is a key part of the Eisenhower health program. In 1952, we spent $9,400,000,000 for hospital care, doctors, dentists, nurses, and medicine. Out of this $9,400,000,000 only $1,600,000,000 or 17 percent was paid by health insurance. Although we can never expect insurance to pay 100 percent of the Nation's medical bills, we must all admit that 17 percent is low.

One reason insurance pays such a small part of the Nation's medical bills is that not enough people have insurance. Another reason is that the insurance you now have may not cover enough of your medical expenses. This administration would like to see more of your medical expenses paid by your insurance.

How can this plan help you? It can help you get the protection of good voluntary health insurance.

Just as you insure your house against fire and your car against accidents, you can insure yourself against future medical costs. How many people have this important private health insurance?

Only 8 million people in 1939. But in 1952 92 million. This tremendous growth proves that the majority of the American people look to insurance as a means of paying part of their medical costs. But there are still 63 million persons who have no health insurance of any kind.

Let's talk about the 63 million people who have no health insurance whatsoever. Some of these people probably could not or would not obtain insurance in any event. But what about the rest? Who are they? They are farmers, gas-station operators, carpenters, mechanics, professional people, people who work in small stores, factories, barber shops, and in similar businesses.

Here, is a hospitalization policy that is now available in a midwestern city. It is a good policy as far as it goes. For a family, it costs $65 a year. It provides substantial payments for room and board for 120 days in any hospital. It covers maternity cases. It helps pay for laboratory examination, medicines, and other hospital services. And it provides up to $65 for the treatment of accidents not requiring hospitalization. This is the type of insurance which we would like to see insurance organizations make available to all of you.

We believe that even the very good payments in this policy can be substantially increased, so that the payments will cover more of your hospitals bills. We believe they can be improved to help you get better insurance protection against long-term illness. Now suppose you are one of the 92 million people who do have some kind of health insurance. Let's say you have a policy like the one I described. We would like to see insurance organizations offer, for example, an increase in the number of days of hospitalization paid by your insurance, an increase in the amount paid for room and board; an increase in the payments for special services such as X-rays; and larger payments for accidents.

So you see there is a double purpose in President Eisenhower's plan. One is to help many more of you obtain voluntary health insurance. And two is to help those of you who already have some insurance get better insurance to pay more of your medical bills.

Do we need such a plan?

To answer this, here is the type of letter received from all parts of the country:

"My husband is a farmer, and we live way out in the country. My brother works in a big factory in a nearby city, and he can buy a good health policy for very little money. We've tried to buy that same insurance, but we can't get it because it is only sold to groups of people. Why can't farmers get the same kind of insurance?"

What can this proposal do for that family? Well, this family and neighboring farmers could get health insurance by gathering enough people together to form a health insurance group. The President's proposal could make it easier for such a group to get a good health plan. The farmer's family then could subscribe to or buy a health plan like that of their relatives in the city.

Here is another example—a man who wants better health insurance:

"The company I work for gives me and my family hospitalization. It's nice to have this insurance, but the trouble is it doesn't cover enough. I took my wife to the clinic. She had to have a lot of X-rays and laboratory tests which cost $68. Because she was not a patient in the hosptal, our insurance paid none of the bill."

How can the President's plan help this family? It could encourage insurance organizations to pay for X-rays and laboratory tests, even though it was not necessary for this woman to go into the hospital. For those people who must enter a hospital, payments for each day might be increased.

It is also hoped that better insurance would include greater payments for the care of such long-term illnesses as cancer and heart disease, or better care for more people over 65.

To provide more of you with better insurance, insurance organizations will have to try out new types of policies in which they have little experience. This involves risks. To encourage these organizations to test new plans, a Federal reinsurance service would be established. This new service would share part of the risks with insurance organizations.

Now let me say that this is not a plan to pay your premiums for you, nor is it a Government handout for insurance organizations.

On the contrary, they will have to pay for this service just as you pay premiums for your own insurance policy. This is a plan for the Government to encourage insurance organizations to provide more of you with better insurance.

There are several more facts you will want to understand about the President's proposal. The plan would be wholly voluntary. No one in Washington is forcing you to buy health insurance. What we are trying to do is to make it possible for you to have health insurance if you and your family want it—and at a reasonable cost.

It will not affect the way in which you buy your health insurance. You will still buy it from the company and agent of your choice. Also, I want to make perfectly clear that this proposal would help only those people who can and are willing to include health insurance in their family budget.

The proposal I have just described takes two important steps toward your health security. First, it will help provide voluntary health insurance for many more persons; and, second, just as importantly, it will encourage better voluntary health insurance.

I am convinced that this proposal would bring you and your family more health security and greater freedom from worry about the cost of medical care. Security against overwhelming medical expense in each and every home means a more secure, a stronger America.

Thank you and good evening.

Will Foreign Aid Go on Forever?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 1, 1954

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Hazlitt, of Newsweek, has maintained a real interest in the foreign aid legislation over the years. In the current issue of Newsweek he points out that our policy seems to be that it is America's duty to provide handouts to a number of nations all over the world. A growing number of Representatives and Senators are asking the same question that he does as to whether or not foreign aid will go on forever.

The article in question follows:

Foreign Aid Forever?

(By Henry Hazlitt)

For the last 6 and 7 years a strange performance has been annually reenacted in Washington. The administration in power has decided that it is somehow America's duty to provide handouts to an increasing number of nations all over the world. The administration officials then tell Congress that the money is necessary to bring world recovery, to avert world war III, to fight communism, and to get or keep allies. Most of these contentions have been pure rhetorical assertions. The simple truth is that no convincing economic case was ever put forward in favor of our farflung economic program, and that Congress has never been given sufficient factual data on which to base an intelligent decision regarding the need and size of the military-aid program.

The so-called military-aid program, moreover, is merely another name for an economic-aid program. This is an elementary point, and yet it never seems to get any serious discussion or debate in Congress. The argument for military aid is at bottom an economic, not a military argument. The argument is not that Ruritania needs so-and-so-much defense, but that it cannot afford to pay for its own defense. More precisely, the argument is that while Ruritania needs y plus x millions for defense, it can only dig up y millions of its own, and it is up to us to supply x millions. Yet I have never seen a serious calculation put forward in detail for such a contention with regard to any particular nation, or the totality of aided nations.

If we supply Ruritania with x millions for defense, then Ruritania has more millions to spend than it would otherwise have. Unless we are sure that it spends x more millions on defense than it otherwise would have done (and we can never confidently answer this might-have-been) then it has that many millions more to spend, say, on deficits on its socialized industries, regardless of whether we earmark our funds for military uses.

The $3.5 billion that President Eisenhower asked for this year's foreign-aid program is greater than the $2.9 billion deficit estimated for the fiscal year. If we could save this money we could balance the budget. The President pointed out that part of his proposed funds were for Europe, part for the Near East, Africa, and South Asia, part for the Far East and the Pacific, and part for Latin America. How did we ever get into the position where we thought it necessary to spend so much to support so many? And what, for example, are we now likely to get in return for the hundreds of millions we have poured into the war in Indochina? Would not this money have been far better spent in building up our own defense program?

President Eisenhower this year recommended one good germ idea—that the new legislation should reserve for loans, rather than grants, not less than $100 million of the fiscal year 1955 funds. It would be much better, in fact, if nearly all the aid were offered in the form of loans. International loans are in themselves no more sound politically than international grants. But if we followed, say, something like the practice now followed in private mortgage loans, and offered these funds at, say, 3 percent or less, repayable, beginning immediately, in equal monthly installments over not more than the next 20 years, we could accomplish two substantial results. Having no large sums to repay at anyone time, the foreign debtors could not start plausible complaints about the budget problem or the transfer problem. And there would probably be a surprising shrinkage in the size of funds requested from us.

Funds that a nation or an individual gets for nothing, whether for military defense or any other purpose, are seldom spent with much of an eye to economy and efficiency. Sums that have to be repaid are spent carefully, and only when the spender is convinced they are necessary. Most of the recipient nations can in fact afford to pay for their own defense. By such a shift from grants to loans, we would not only come far closer to getting our money's worth, but far closer to bringing the whole foreign-handout system eventually to an end.

Texan Named President of University of Maryland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, July 10, 1954

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, a prominent Texas educator, Dr. Wilson H. Elkins, president of Texas Western College at El Paso for the last 6 years, recently was named president of the University of Maryland.

The career of this outstanding educational leader was outlined briefly in a recent article published in the Alcalde, magazine of the ex-student association of the University of Texas. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXES EVERYWHERE

Wilson H. "Bull" Elkins, bachelor of arts 1932, master of arts 1932, has been running all his life. As an undergraduate in the University of Texas, he ran so well he was able to garner eight letters in three sports. In political running, he did all right, too, by being elected president of the student body in 1931–32. In the intellectual running, he made top grades, was elected to membership in Phi Beta Kappa, and was chosen to receive a coveted Rhodes scholarship. From 1933–36 he studied at Oxford, where he received his bachelor of letters and doctor of philosophy.

Since he left the university, he has run so well careerwise that he has just been elected as the new president of the University of Maryland. Elkins will assume his new post at Maryland in September. This will give him time to finish his work at El Paso, where he has been serving as president of Texas Western College for the past 6 years. Prior to 1949, he presided over the affairs of San Angelo Junior College for 11 years.

When he goes to Maryland in the fall, Dr. Elkins will find himself running a university with an enrollment of 16,000. His salary at Maryland is reported to be $22,500, which is considerably more than his salary at Texas Western, $12,000. As president of the University of Maryland, Dr. Elkins will be receiving the highest salary paid any official in the Maryland State government.

Elkins succeeds Dr. H. C. Byrd as president of Maryland. Byrd resigned from the presidency this year to run for the governorship of Maryland. Selected from a list of more than 100 prospects, Elkins will be taking to Maryland a background of scholarship, administrative ability, and athletic prowess possessed by few men.

As a student at the university, Elkins first made a name for himself by excelling in the sports of football, track, and basketball. Eight letters were earned by him from 1928 to 1932. He served as a quarterback in football and in 1932 he captained the basketball team. Ed Price, Texas' current football coach, followed Elkins as captain of the Texas basketball team in 1933.

With all his extracurricular activities, Elkins never let his grades and classwork suffer. He plowed through his studies in history and won a Phi Beta Kappa key in 1931 and a bachelor's and master's degree in 1932. To add to his list of accomplishments, he took on tasks in student government. This experience helped him in his race for president of the student body in 1931–32. He was succeeded in his president's position (of the student association) by another well-known Texan, Allan Shivers.

From 1932 to 1933 Elkins served as athletic director of Cisco High School. He gave up the coaching career to accept a Rhodes scholarship for study at Oxford from 1933 to 1936. After his years in England he came back to the University of Texas campus as an instructor in history. It was from his university teaching position that he went to the presidency of San Angelo Junior College, then on to Texas Western, and more recently to the University of Maryland. Born in Medina, Tex., in 1908, Elkins moved with his family to San Antonio when he was very young. From there he attended Schreiner Institute in Kerrville before entering the University of Texas.

Health Reinsurance Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. HESELTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1954

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the probable consideration in the House next week, I believe it will be helpful to place in the Appendix of the RECORD at this time several communications and press releases with reference to H. R. 8356, which was favorably reported Friday by the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

They are:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D. C., March 24, 1954.
Hon. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON,
Chairman, Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This will acknowledge your letter of March 15, 1954, requesting the views of the Bureau of the Budget on H. R. 8356, a bill to improve the public health by encouraging more extensive use of the voluntary prepayment method in the provision of personal health services.

The President in his special health message to the Congress of January 18, 1954, said, "I recommend the establishment of a limited Federal reinsurance service to encourage private and nonprofit health insurance organizations to offer broader health protection to more families." This measure, if enacted, should go far to accomplish the President's objective. The bill is designed to provide reinsurance to cover the special additional risks involved in such broader protection.

I am authorized, therefore, to advise you that enactment of H. R. 8356 is in accord with the program of the President.

Sincerely yours,

DONALD R. BELCHER,
Assistant Director.

PRESS RELEASE OF MAY 17, 1954, BY JAMES C. HAGERTY, PRESS SECRETARY TO THE PRESIDENT

THE WHITE HOUSE.

At the invitation of the President, 17 officials of life insurance companies attended a luncheon conference at the White House today to discuss the administration's pending legislative proposal to establish health reinsurance facilities as a function of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Secretary Hobby and other officials of the Department were also present at the luncheon.

At the conclusion of the conference, the life insurance company representatives issued the following statement:

"During our conference with the President there was a general expression on the part of the life insurance company representatives who were present favoring the general objectives of the bill. We believe the measure is directed toward encouraging and stimulating still further the development and expansion of health insurance services and coverage for the American public through voluntary plans. There was discussion at the conference as to how the bill may be improved. The plan includes many sound insurance principles. We feel that provision in the bill dealing with the utilization of State insurance departments under the plan may be further strengthened in order that they may be used to the maximum extent and that the system of State supervision of insurance should not be limited by Federal activity in any field."

Present at the conference were: Horace W. Brower, president, Occidental Life Insurance Co., Los Angeles, Calif.; Asa V. Call, president, Pacific Mutual Life Insurance Co., Los Angeles, Calif.; Paul F. Clark, president, John Hancock Mutual Life Insurance Co., Boston, Mass.; Frederick W. Ecker, president, Metropolitan Life Insurance Co., New York City; Louis W. Dawson, president, Mutual Life Insurance Co., New York City; W. T. Grant, chairman, Business Men's Assurance Co. of America, Kansas City, Mo.; S. J. Hay, president, Great National Life Insurance Co., Dallas, Tex.; Ralph R. Lounsbury, president, Bankers National Life Insurance Co., Montclair, N. J.; Ray D. Murphy, president, Equitable Life Assurance Society of the United States, New York City; Powell B. McHaney, president, General American Life Insurance Co., St. Louis, Mo.; Clarence J. Myers, president, New York Life Insurance Co., New York City; Adlai H. Rust, chairman of the board, State Farm Life Insurance Co., Bloomington, Ill.

Eldon Stevenson, Jr., president, National Life & Accident Insurance Co., Nashville, Tenn.; Carroll M. Shanks, president, Prudential Insurance Co. of America, Newark, N. J.; Frazar B. Wilde, president, Connecticut General Life Insurance Co., Hartford, Conn.; Claris Adams, executive vice president and general counsel, American Life Convention, Washington, D. C.; Eugene M. Thore, general counsel, Life Insurance Association of America, New York.

John Hancock Mutual
Life Insurance Co.,
Boston, Mass., June 10, 1954.

Re administration health reinsurance plan, S. 3114 and H. R. 8356.

Hon. Charles A. Wolverton,
Chairman, House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

My Dear Congressman Wolverton: We in this company thought that your committee might be interested in our position on the administration's reinsurance legislation.

On May 17, 1954, I joined with other life insurance people, after the White House conference, in favoring the general objectives of this proposed legislation. In subsequent correspondence with the White House and at the request of the administration, I pointed out two areas in which the bills could be improved. First, a provision should be inserted that stated nothing in the bill should limit the jurisdiction of any State or of its supervisory officials over insurance; and, second, it should be made clear that the legislation in no way contemplated the further introduction of the Federal Government in the insurance business, even inadvertently.

Since then we have had the opportunity of examining the modifications suggested by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and I am happy to say that these specific points have been adequately covered. It is our belief that life insurance companies can find in this legislation assistance for their efforts to extend this coverage.

Accordingly, this company wholeheartedly supports the bill to implement the administration's reinsurance legislation.

Sincerely yours,
Paul F. Clark,
President.

Press Release of May 28 by National Life and Accident Insurance Co., Nashville, Tenn.

The relationship between the insurance industry and the Federal Government is one of complete cooperation, both as to the health reinsurance bill now pending in Congress and in approaching the whole subject of health insurance, Eldon Stevenson, Jr., president of the National Life and Accident Insurance Co., of Nashville, Tenn., told members of the Kentucky State Association of Life Underwriters and their guests at a luncheon held today at the Brown Hotel in Louisville.

"We are in thorough accord with the objectives of the bill," said Mr. Stevenson, "and I think it is only fair to say that in some way good is bound to result from these efforts."

Stevenson is a member of a Joint Committee on Health Insurance, composed of 12 top executives of insurance companies, conducting extensive studies of accident and health insurance and also conferring with Government authorities in connection with the proposed program of health insurance. He is also President of the Life Insurers' Conference, an association of some 90 companies operating in the fields of life and health and accident insurance.

Pointing out that personal protection includes both life insurance and accident and health insurance, and that the two types of insurance complement each other in providing protection against unforeseen contingencies, the speaker paid tribute to the field underwriters for their service to the American people, as a result of which 90 million people today own some $304 billion of life insurance, while 5 out of every 8 have some form of voluntary protection against hospital expenses.

In addition, he said, 1 out of 2 people have some form of voluntary protection against surgical expenses and 1 out of 4 against medical expenses, while 2 out of every 3 wage earners have some kind of insurance protection against loss of income resulting from accident or sickness.

Because of the great increase in the public's interest in these forms of insurance, Stevenson said, and because of the social and political significance of plans of this type, accident and health insurance has been made the subject of a number of investigations and has come in for a rising tide of criticisms, some of which have implied that the whole business is a racket seeking to victimize the American people.

"While there has undoubtedly been room for some criticism," he said, "it is unfair to condemn the entire industry. There are some 10 million claims paid every year under accident and health policies and the great majority of these constitute good and satisfactory service, but these do not make the headlines. Many of the complaints result from misunderstandings, and it is our responsibility to do everything we can to avoid these misunderstandings."

To aid in this, Stevenson said, the Joint Committee on Health Insurance has embarked on a four-point program including:

1. Studies of methods to stimulate the expansion of health insurance.
2. General recommendations from the standpoint of the Nation as a whole as to the most effective overall program for dealing with health care costs.
3. Further improvements of the services provided by the insurance companies.
4. An effective program of public education in the use of health insurance.

Connecticut General Life
Insurance Co.,
Hartford, Conn., June 18, 1954.

Hon. Charles A. Wolverton,
Chairman, House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Congressman Wolverton: The county and the insurance industry would be well served, in my opinion, if your committee reports out favorably the administration health reinsurance plan, H. R. 8356.

The subject has had a good deal of study by my associates and we are satisfied that this would be constructive legislation. In addition, it would have the virtue of reaffirming the soundness and desirability of State regulation of insurance as national policy.

Some have stated that the reinsurance authorized by the bill would be little used. This is a premature judgment and one not possible of advance determination. The probability is strong that if this legislation is passed by the Congress, it will be used and will be useful to the country.

Thank you for your consideration of this recommendation.

Sincerely,
Frazar B. Wilde, *President.*

State of New Hampshire,
Insurance Department,
State House Annex, Concord, June 17, 1954.

Hon. Charles A. Wolverton,
Chairman, House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

My Dear Congressman Wolverton: In compliance with the action taken by the National Association of Insurance Commissioners at its annual meeting held in Detroit, Mich., June 7 to 11, 1954, I am transmitting to you a copy of a resolution passed by the association on June 11, 1954, in connection with H. R. 8356 dealing with voluntary health reinsurance plans.

Respectfully yours,
Donald Knowlton,
Insurance Commissioner, State of New Hampshire; President, National Association of Insurance Commissioners.

Resolution of National Association of Insurance Commissioners

"Whereas the executive committee of the National Association of Insurance Commissioners on April 6, 1954, adopted a resolution approving as being meritorious and in the public interest the avowed and declared objective of improving the public health in the Nation but opposing the enactment of H. R. 8356 and S. 3114 (83d Cong., 2d sess.) in the form introduced in Congress and copies of such resolution were transmitted to the congressional committees considering such legislation; and

"Whereas since that time officials of the United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and interested members of this association have, in a cooperative effort, discussed changes in the bills to the end that objections thereto might be met; and

"Whereas certain definite amendments have been proposed which furnish further guaranties against Federal regulation of insurance to which regulation all parties are opposed and officials of the United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare have agreed to consider other changes which further study of the bill may disclose to be desirable; and

"Whereas this association desires to cooperate further to the end that all practical measures for expanding the voluntary health system of this Nation, consistent with the existing pattern of free enterprise and of State regulation be adopted: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That in accordance with this resolution, the president of this association is authorized to appoint a special committee consisting of five members of the association to work with the United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and appropriate committees of Congress and the insurance industry, to accomplish the ends sought by this resolution with power to suggest and approve amendments to legislation now pending in Congress and to approve such amended legislation subject to ratification by the association.

"(a) The president of this association is authorized to transmit copies of this resolution to the interested committees of Congress and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare."

Passed June 11, 1954, by the National Association of Insurance Commissioners at its 85th annual meeting in Detroit, Mich.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Printing and binding for Congress, when recommended to be done by the Committee on Printing of either House, shall be so recommended in a report containing an approximate estimate of the cost thereof, together with a statement from the Public Printer of estimated approximate cost of work previously ordered by Congress within the fiscal year (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 145, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on Printing, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. The money derived from such sales shall be paid into the Treasury and accounted for in his annual report to Congress, and no sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

Code of Laws of the United States

Title 44, Section 181. Congressional Record; arrangement, style, contents, and indexes.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the Congressional Record, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the Congressional Record semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

Title 44, Section 182b. Same; illustrations, maps, diagrams.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the Record without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the Congressional Record the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily Record as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided*, That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the Record with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the official reporters of the Congressional Record, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the Record shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the Record issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the Record for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the Record of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the Record shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the Record style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the Record.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the Congressional Record any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided*, That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix, but this rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided*, That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the Congressional Record.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the Congressional Record Appendix the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed.

10. *Official reporters.*—The official reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the Congressional Record by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this restriction shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. The Public Printer or the official reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the Congressional Record which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Illustrations.*—Pursuant to section 182b, title 44, United States Code (as shown above), requests for authority to insert an illustration in the Record should be submitted to the Joint Committee on Printing through the chairman of the Committee on Printing of the respective House in which the speech desired to be illustrated may be delivered. Illustrations shall not exceed in size a page of the Record and shall be linecuts only. Copy for illustrations must be furnished to the Public Printer not later than 12:30 o'clock p. m. of the day preceding publication.

13. *Corrections.*—The permanent Record is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided*, That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further*, That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

manu-
hed in
s, the
"Mr.
Com-
reafter
h the

Printer
SIONAL
marks
od ex-
when
, That
ngress
) days,
mittee.
either
speech
news-
other
gs, the
ix, but
which
to an
marks:
article
he final
may be

lish in
he full
bcom-
s been

porters
manu-
tter to
l make
r place

matter
nstance
RECORD
to ex-
ript is
g from
cost of
of cost
when
triction
s, tele-
nection
of de-
e legis-
esident
he Vice
s. The
of the
Member
omitted
h is in

on 182b,
above),
tration
to the
gh the
ting of
speech
livered.
a page
s only.
shed to
o'clock
n.
ECORD is
30 days
there-
e Public
, That
session
10 days,
mittee:
of Con-
re than
ist only
d shall
aterial,
r addi-

OLUTIONS

XII, private
roduced and

f of Francisco
ittee on the

f of Bernardo
e Judiciary.

lief of L. F.
the Judiciary.

lief of Klara
ittee on the

ork:
ief of Lemuel
on the Judi-

lief of Anna
on the Judi-

lief of Julius
on the Judi-

lief of George
e Committee

relief of Mr.
to the Com-

sachusetts:
lief of George
the Judiciary.

lief of Helga
on the Judi-

C.

XII, petitions
Clerk's desk

tition of Rev.
s of Melrose,
e Bryson bill,
on Interstate

tion of L. S.
other citizens
tion to outlaw
Committee on

ition of Eliza-
tizens of Cor-
tment of the
Committee on
rce.
tition of the
isors, Buffalo,
ecessary steps
funds and re-
port of Buf-
Public Works.
rge H. Ball,
on, No. 101,
for the relief
International
who through
r of Internal
nsions placed
nuary 1, 1954;
Means.

Appendix

Soil and Water Research Important to West

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRY M. GOLDWATER
OF ARIZONA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, July 12, 1954

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article by Wayne M. Akin entitled "Soil and Water Research Important to West," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. The article is reprinted from Reclamation News, and published by the National Reclamation Association, Washington, D. C.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The following article, headlined "Soil and Water Research Important to West," is reprinted from Reclamation News, published by the National Reclamation Association, Washington, D. C., and is by Wayne M. Akin, president of Western Farm Management Co., of Phoenix, and known throughout the country among farm and ranch owners and operators and by agricultural financiers and economists. Mr. Akin is chairman of the Arizona Interstate Stream Commission. I believe every reader of the Arizona Soil Conservationist will find the views of Mr. Akin substantial and of interest.—D. F. B.)

(By Wayne M. Akin)

The utilization and conservation of our soil and water resources are of utmost importance to the Nation. They have been matters of vital concern to the National Reclamation Association since its inception, and with our rapidly rising population they become increasingly important.

In recent years greater public recognition of the need for soil and water research has become apparent. Since the early forties, there have been mushrooming operation programs for the control of erosion, agricultural conservation practices, and reclamation. In the fiscal year 1954, over $475 million is being spent in conducting operations in this field.

It is commonly recognized that an operation will be effective in direct proportion to the planning which precedes it and that the basic knowledge behind this planning derives largely from research.

CONCEPT IS LACKING

However, an adequate conception of what research means is generally lacking by the public.

The modern concept of soil and water research is that which provides the following basic knowledge:

1. Protecting the land against all forms of soil deterioration.
2. Rebuilding eroded soil.
3. Conserving moisture for crop use.
4. Proper agricultural drainage and irrigation.

In other words, the development of effective techniques for treating the land according to its need for conservation and improvement.

RESEARCH SUFFERS

While the needed action programs have been expanding, what has happened to the soil and water research program? The simplest answer is "Nothing." It has continued at a low level, entirely unsatisfactory even from the standpoint of early requirements. For instance, in the late 1930's, when there was 275 conservation districts, the man-years devoted to SCS research were 201.

In the early 1950's the number of soil-conservation districts had increased to about 2,500, and yet the number of man-years devoted to SCS research went down to 122.

In other words, there was a reduction of the research to service an action program which had increased nearly tenfold in scope. Reclamation programs during this period also have increased, and there probably is no place where soil and water research is more urgently needed than in relation to reclamation.

RIVERTON, SHADEHILL CITED

While the need is great throughout the entire irrigated region, the following two examples point up the urgency of the problem:

Over $18 million of Federal funds have been authorized for developing the Riverton project in Wyoming. Farmers and businessmen have expended millions in addition, endeavoring to develop this land as a permanent and profitable irrigated region. Nevertheless, production has declined rapidly, the whole project is threatened, and little or no research is being done. The solution to the soil and water problems on this project should effectively stabilize it, bring back its productivity, find means to remove the alkali from the area, and establish a permanent and profitable irrigation agriculture. This is an example of one project on which an effective research program would save useless expense and provide the groundwork for stabilizing an important economy.

Shadehill, S. Dak., is another example of a project in which the dam has been built, water is being stored, but land is not being irrigated because of the lack of basic information on soil and water, including the salinity problem. The water in the Shadehill Reservoir is salty, and only through research will it be found whether or not this water of questionable quality can be used to irrigate the dry lands of the area. A meager investigation is now being carried on with insufficient funds. It is estimated 10 or 20 years may be required at the present rate of investigation to get the important answers, and even then many problems will not have been solved. If sufficient funds were available for a concentrated attack on the soil and water problems of this area, it is probable that they could be solved in less than 5 years, and ways and means found as to how best to utilize this land with the quality of water which is available. Until these problems are solved, the present investment in the reservoir and other facilities must go unused or, if they are used, there is the threat of alkali accumulation which could well damage the land permanently as far as agricultural production is concerned.

PROBLEMS POINTED OUT

The soil and water research committee of the National Reclamation Association in 1949 prepared a comprehensive document, which later was summarized in Senate Document No. 98, pointing out the many problems and the tremendous benefits which could accrue from relatively small investment of public funds in soil and water research.

At first, it appears incomprehensible that the action programs required for the conservation and use of soil and water resources could progress to their present state without a corresponding increase for research.

However, it is understandable, since action programs are readily comprehended and the accruing benefits appear more obvious than is true of research.

Therefore, numerous organizations have supported the action programs while few, if any, organizations have effectively supported essential soil and water research.

In the fiscal year 1954, more than half as much money was spent on poultry research alone than was spent for the entire program on our soil and water conservation research. Research with cattle was also much greater than the total appropriation for the soil and water research. The same is true for field crops, horticultural crops and many others. In making these comparisons it is not intended to imply that research for poultry, cattle, field crops, horticultural crops, etc., is not greatly needed nor that the level of research in these fields is even as high as it should be. The comparisons are made merely as a matter of pointing out the lack of support and progress in the field of soil and water research from the standpoint of making available the money required to do the much needed job.

LOSSES ARE HUGE

It has been estimated by a committee of the United States Department of Agriculture that losses due to soil deterioration and flood damage in this country are over $1,502,000,000 per year. In many cases basic soil and water research data are lacking which would indicate methods for the prevention of this deterioration.

It is evident that soil and water research should be strengthened, not by a 10 or 15 percent figure, but to a level commensurate with the economic needs of our country. Senate Document No. 98, in summarizing soil and water research problems and needs of the West, points to the recommended expenditure of $7 million nonrecurring investment in physical plant and an annual continuing expenditure of $8 million. These figures may at first appear large, but it should be borne in mind that they are less than one-fourth the cost of a Navy destroyer and not as much as the cost of one B-36 bomber.

Furthermore, the above figure represent an investment in the vitally needed field of research of less than 1 percent of the annual gross agricultural income from the 17 Western States.

It seems obvious that the National Reclamation Association should assume leadership in the effort to bring our soil and water research into proper balance with our reclamation and conservation programs.

Communist Atrocities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 29, 1954

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I have long admired one of our great Americans, Gen. Mark W. Clark, former commander in chief in the Far East. In his recent work, From the Danube to the Yalu, he gives a graphic picture of the shocking atrocities committed by the Communists. I hope every loyal American will read this documented report of General Clark, and then decide whether Red China should be admitted as a member of the United Nations.

I speak of the artocities committed by the Communists in Korea. I speak of the 10,032 individuals whose murdered bodies stand as mute witness to the savagery of Communist aggression. We have evidence that not just 10,032 but 29,815 murders were actually committed by the Communists, of which 11,622 were your soldiers.

The United Nations Command has been most meticulous and objective insofar as such is humanly possible, in its investigation of the background upon which I base my report. I assure you that the U. N. C. is prepared to furnish documentary evidence of the Communist atrocity record upon your call.

Stunning as it is, this total of 29,815 murders is by no means all inclusive; it does not include hidden atrocities as yet uncovered; it does not include those thousands of reported murders which currently lack sufficient evidence to establish a probable total of victims.

Communist atrocities in Korea have been under investigation since 1950 and are substantiated by the voluntary statements of survivors and witnesses. In many cases, we hold actual confessions of the perpetrators of such war crimes. More than 1,700 open cases—some documented with such statements and confessions, some with actual photographs of victims—are on file in the U. N. Command in Korea. Investigation is continuing, as many new leads are being developed; however, it is improbable that the whole story of Communist brutality will ever be known. In some cases, all victims and witnesses perished.

As the former commander of the U. N. forces in Korea, I will first limit myself to the 11,622 members of the United Nations Command who were slaughtered while defenseless prisoners of war. This is a grim figure. It is based upon terrible facts. I am dutybound to bring this grave account of bestiality to you.

A review of these cases clearly reveals that these atrocities were premeditated. Furthermore, we find the identical criminal pattern in Korea that was evidenced in the Communist massacre of free Poland's officer corps in Katyn Forest. The cold-blooded design manifested throughout 1950–53 suggests that the contemporary Chinese and North Korean Communists received able tutelage from their Eurasian compatriots. In Korea, these calculated killings targeted upon our military personnel were often committed while the individual prisoner's hands were bound behind his back. True to Red design, however, many variations were introduced which would have paled torturers and inquisitors of past centuries. In some instances gasoline was poured over the wounded and ignited by either grenades or matches. In other cases, helpless men were tortured by bamboo spears until God granted merciful death to terminate such continuing agony. Normally, and in the pattern of Katyn, it was a Russian-made bullet in the back of the head that ended the victim's dedication to the free-world cause. Let me cite some specific cases. Bear in mind that such are documented; further, that many witnesses or survivors of these atrocities are now in their respective U. N. homelands. These individuals are ready to recount the stark terror engendered by a Communist scheme of brutality which recognized no limit.

Case No. 218:

On April 10, 1951, on a mountain 26 kilometers northwest of Sunchon, 32 soldiers of the Turkish Army were captured by elements of the 65th Chinese Communist Army. Twenty-five of the uninjured captives immediately were dispatched to to the rear; the remaining seven Turks, on order of the company commander, were murdered. Korean villagers were forced to bury the victims at the place of execution.

Case No. 16:

At dawn on the morning of August 15, 1950, on Hill 303, a platoon of the 5th United States Cavalry Regiment, while awaiting reinforcements, was overrun by the Communists. The captives were then escorted to a nearby orchard where their boots and identification tags were removed and all their personal property stolen. The prisoners' hands were tied behind their backs with either wire or their own bootlaces.

For 2 days, they were kept hidden in ravines during the day and forced to march at night. Suddenly, on the afternoon of August 17, 1950, and without warning, Communist guards opened fire upon these bound victims and then left the scene.

Thirty-four United States soldiers were slaughtered in this massacre—only four men survived. Later in the same day, these men were rescued by a United Nations patrol; photographs were taken, and two of the Communist perpetrators of this crime were captured near the scene. Since this time, Communist prisoners have admitted participation in the heinous act.

Case No. 76:

When the fall of the North Korean capital of Pyongyang to the United Nations forces seemed imminent, the Communists entrained all prisoners of war for movement northward. Men were herded into open gondolas, packed to overflowing, and forced to ride unprotected in the raw October weather. Pneumonia and exposure exacted its daily toll among the weakened survivors. Their comrades conducted burial parties whenever an adequate halt was made. After such inhumane treatment, which extended over a period of 9 days, the train arrived at a railroad tunnel approximately 4½ miles northwest of Sunchon, where it remained inside the mountain all day.

During the early afternoon of October 20, 1950, the starving men were promised their first meal in several days. Communist tormentors took an American major, together with a group of selected prisoners, purportedly as a detail to go to a nearby village to prepare food. None of these prisoners were seen or heard from again. Hours later, the men remaining in the tunnel were informed that food had been prepared for them, and that they were to be conducted in small groups to a Korean house to eat.

Accordingly, the first group of 30 men was removed from the tunnel, escorted down the tracks, and told to hide in an erosion ditch until food was brought. As soon as they had relaxed on the ground their guards opened point-blank fire upon them with Russian-made burp guns and rifles. Those who survived the initial burst of fire were then either shot or bludgeoned individually. Thank God, at least some survived by feigning death, though seriously wounded.

Remaining groups were then brought out and treated in a like manner. In each case the helpless men were slaughtered either while sitting on the ground or standing with empty rice bowls in their hands.

When the United Nations forces overrun the Sunchon area on the following day the bodies of 68 murdered soldiers were recovered. In addition, seven more bodies were discovered inside the tunnel; the corpses of men who had apparently died of malnutrition.

At least 137 U. N. soldiers lost their lives in this atrocity. The evidence is convincing and confirmed. An actual perpetrator was in custody; we hold his testimony. Of overriding concern, however, is the fact that this entire happening should be scored against Red leaders who condone and, at least tacitly, encourage such brutality.

Case No. 693: On April 23, 1951, the U. N. Belgian battalion requested aid from the Royal Ulster Rifles. A battle patrol was immediately dispatched but was attacked by enemy forces after advancing for approximately 100 yards across the Imjin River. The group attempted to withdraw, leaving 10 men to cover the retreat. The men found themselves surrounded and decided to surrender.

They were assembled on a hillside, together with 3 or 4 previously captured Belgians, near the junction of the Hant-Gang and Imjin Rivers, 1 kilometer northwest of Wachon—a point where they were slated to be murdered. Three British and one Belgian soldiers escaped. On May 31, 1951, Belgian U. N. C. forces discovered the bodies of 3 British soldiers and 5 Belgian soldiers. Although these corpses were partly decomposed, it was possible to recognize their features. In a death pattern, so symbolic of Communist brutality, all of the bodies were so grouped as to reveal the grim truth—

all had suddenly been shot down without warning. Two of the British had been shot in the back of the head, one Belgian had been shot or bayonetted in the back.

Case No. 10:

No respecters of either the Red Cross or any symbol of belief in the Almighty, the Communists overran a group of 18 to 20 wounded U. N. soldiers being ministered to by a regimental surgeon, prominently identifiable through display of his Red Cross brassard, and an Army chaplain. None of these individuals was armed. The Communists immediately opened fire, wantonly executing the group with Russian-made rifles and burpguns. The surgeon, although wounded, managed to escape.

Thus far I have presented solely examples of Communist atrocities against military personnel. The rape of South Korea is an even more sordid story. From the results of the U. N. C. investigation, it is estimated that the Communists, in an effort to erase all dissident political elements in this wartorn country, murdered 14,000 defenseless South Korean civilians. In Korea, the pattern of brutality parallels that which the Communists devised and perpetrated in other parts of the world. This extermination of anti-Communist civilians, religious people and governmental officials was manifested in the premeditated annihilation of those South Koreans whose allegiance was to any cause other than that of communism.

As in the case of atrocities against military personnel, the UN command, in coordination with the Republic of Korea, has developed documented case files from which my facts were obtained. The following is just one of the many Korean war crimes cases involving civilian victims which reveals Red methodology underlying the slaughter of innocent men, women, and children without cause.

Case No. 28:

Within the annals of barbarism, the city of Taejon long will be recorded as a monstrous mass extermination site. Countless civilians—some estimates reach as high as the 5,000 mark—as well as 42 American and 17 Republic of Korea Army prisioners, were slaughtered at Taejon in deference to the Communist watchword—political expediency.

During the summer of 1950, following the capture of this city by the enemy, a North Korean "Home Affairs" Department was established with the express purpose of apprehending all persons unsympathetic to the Communist cause, to include those who believed in Christian faiths. This totalitarian type of "security" force then proceeded summarily to arrest prominent business and professional men, together with all persons in the area who had been employees of the Republic of Korea. Each such unfortunate, subsequently was brought to a confession extraction headquarters, paradoxically located in a Catholic mission. The next link in this chain of wanton savagery was the Taejon city prison. Some 150 cells, each of which was packed with from 40 to 70 hapless victims, constituted this North Korean counterpart of Moscow's infamous Lubiyanka Prison. When it became impossible to squeeze additional persons into these cell blocks, the overflow was jammed within the mission confines. Military prisoners were not segregated from those of civil life.

Repeatedly, throughout incarceration, Communist soldiers were granted ready access to these defenseless captives.

When the recapture of Taejon by United Nations forces appeared imminent, the Communists determined that, prior to withdrawal, mass liquidation would be the fate of this prisoner group.

Commencing September 23, 1950, several groups—numbering from 100 to 200 each—were efficiently removed from their cells at night; hands were tied behind backs, and each individual, in turn, was bound to his fellow prisoner. They were then transported to previously selected sites, dumped into open trenches or ditches dug expressly for this purpose, and summarily shot. A check was made to locate survivors, and where found, their skulls were crushed. A light coating of earth was hastily applied to mark the death site.

By September 26, 1950, the Communist police evidently decided that execution tempo must be accelerated if the fiendish purpose was to be consummated prior to departure. Additional trenches were dug in the police station courtyard and a North Korean Army unit was summoned to assist in completing the bloody task. The ambulatory military prisoners were led out in small groups and promptly killed. Several wounded American soldiers were carried out on litters, dumped into the trenches, and either shot or beaten to death. As time ran out on the executioners, the remaining South Koreans were dragged from the prison into the already filled trenches and killed. At the same time, those who had been retained in the Catholic Mission interrogation center were executed as rapidly as possible. When these trenches were filled with bodies, others were slain in the churchyard and basement; many corpses thrown down a well. The perpetrators then fled.

Examination of these bodies revealed that most had been beaten and mutilated prior to execution. Of these thousands of unfortunates, only 6 survived; 3 civilians, 1 Republic of Korea Army soldier, and 2 Americans. Thousands of bodies ultimately were exhumed.

Allow me to lay before you briefly what befell the freemen whom the Communists captured. Purposely I shall keep to general terms. Many of the individual experiences are too sickening to bear detailed recount before an assemblage where moderation and dignity should prevail. I assure you, however, that I am understating, not overstating, what has been reported by repatriated prisoners of war.

From the first days of the conflict, it appeared that the enemy was bent upon reversing all provisions of the international conventions on the treatment of war prisoners. The North Koreans argued to the effect that, since they had not adhered formally to such conventions, they possessed the right and meant to dispense with all humane regard for their captives. What mankind had agreed was right and proper, the Communists maintained was invalid. As individuals, human beings became stark ciphers.

Statements of our personnel returned during prisoner exchange operations provide data for the development of an over-all pattern of Communists' mistreatment of U. N. prisoners. This picture is grim. It is a chronicle of patent Communist refusal to abide by provisions of the Geneva Convention. It stands as an indictment against the Communist commission of atrocities which stagger the imagination of all civilized peoples.

Throughout these affidavits of returning prisoners run the threads of a diabolic pattern of treatment. Many prisoners who participated in the same death marches to internment and were detained at the same prison compounds point out, in eyewitness accounts, identical incident patterns. On the other hand, isolated incidents reported by ex-prisoners, separated insofar as time and place of incarceration are concerned, show considerable similarity in mode of treatment. A summary of the overall pattern of Communist malpractices follows:

Upon capture by Communist forces, the unwounded and walking wounded were herded into marching groups. The seriously wounded were left on the field and often killed either by concentrated small arms fire, bayoneting or a combination of both. In many cases, U. N. personnel carried their wounded buddies. Many marches were made under severe climatic conditions. Communist guards took shoes and other articles of clothing from some of the prisoners. The freezing of feet and hands was commonplace. Prisoners report marching in bare feet until the flesh was ripped from their toes. Little medical treatment, other than occasional and haphazard bandaging, was provided to the wounded. Marches were long, grueling and set at a pace that could not be maintained by the majority of the wounded. Savagely, the guards kept men moving. Stragglers were clubbed or kicked when they fell. Many who could not continue were left along the way to die. In countless instances, Communist guards dropped out to shoot prisoners who lagged behind. Repeated eyewitness accounts testify that prisoners were pushed off cliffs. Out of 700 men beginning 1 such 3-week march, approximately 250 arrived alive at the first camp. A large percentage disappeared on the line of march; so far as is known, these men never were subsequently accounted for by their inhuman captors.

Along another march route, the intermediate disposition post was known as Bean Camp; on still another it was grimly called Death Valley. Here prisoners were hereded into squalid huts. The daily death rate soared. Causes of deaths, as reported by prisoners and accompanying medical officers, included: Lack of medical attention, malnutrition, dysentery, and pneumonia. What little food the Communists provided was substandard; all too often, there was no food at all. To supplement such a meager ration, starving prisoners were desperate to the point of hunting down dogs and other stray animals along the route north.

Once the men arrived at permanent prison installations, conditions were not bettered. At such camps, throughout the winter of 1950, there were no medical facilities, no heat, no blankets. Estimates of prisoners, some of whom were on burial squads, report that approximately 1,600 men died in a 90-day period at one camp alone. Similar conditions and a comparable death rate characterized "life" within other camps. Many of these soldiers, of course, died from malnutrition due to insufficient diet. The inescapable fact, however, is that while these prisoners were being starved to death, Communist jailers were supplied with ample rations.

In the detention of war prisoners, most of our nations have adhered to both the letter and the spirit of pertinent international agreements. We have sought to sustain them in an orderly and reasonably daily existence. Our aim has been to restore them as soon as possible to normal peaceful pursuits.

Not so the Communists. Evidence points to the fact that the Reds want to detain some prisoners indefinitely, either to serve some future dark purpose or, perhaps, to prevent them from exposing what has been done to them. Further, those they release, preferably, must be so altered in personality structure as to preclude their return to normal life with any degree of facility. It is intended that as many of them as possible become focal points of discontent in their homes and communities. Thus they will serve to breed situations which will further the Communist objective of total world domination. Fighting on the battlefront may end, but the war must continue in another guise.

This, I assure you, is not nonsense born of a bad dream. There can be no other explanation of what transpired in the prisoner of war camps of the Chinese and North Korean Communists. Moreover, it bears out what we have been told befell the Germans, the Japanese and other nationalities taken prisoners during World War II; thousands of whom remain unaccounted for and must be presumed either to be hostages in secret captivity or to have been killed unday the rigors of transformation into Communist automatons.

The grim process in the camps, call it what you will, begins with the formation of a suitable psychological atmosphere. This is done by a special staff trained in psychological cause and effect. The men are segregated from their officers, commissioned and noncommissioned, and any within this group who reveal traits of leadership are weeded out. The individual must stand alone, unable to turn to our source of authority except his captors. The word is disseminated that there are informers in the compound, and the individual begins to distrust his companions. Close friendships are prohibited. Family ties are broken, for at this stage of the process letters cannot be written.

The individual, thus isolated, experiences the sensation of great danger. Other men have disappeared. They may have been killed. He may share this fate. The threat of brutal punishment is ever present.

Meanwhile, the prisoner has nothing to do. This inactivity is calculated to enhance his personal fears and sensitize his reception to the next phase. Then indoctrination starts. Participation in a discussion group seems harmless; further, it will dispel the ominous portent of inactivity. The discussion leader, who may be an English-speaking Chinese or North Korean or even a fellow prisoner who has bought privileges by prostituting his soul through collaboration, seems benign and even reasonable. He lectures about the evils of capitalism, the virtues of communism, and the correct way of viewing society. The group then parrots his sloganized guidance in discussion.

As the pace accelerates, this process is sustained to the exclusion of everything else. Repetition follows repetition; the Pavlovian conditioned response pattern is building to a climax. Soon prisoners cannot advance concepts differing from those of the discussion leader. It soon becomes obvious to the prisoner group that receipt of such meager favors as cigarettes, food, clothing, and reading matter—the last of which is always Communist—hinges upon supplying the correct answer. If stubborn, they are punished. Many were hung on ropes by their hands; were crammed into small cages; were forced to stand naked in freezing temperatures and submit to cold-water dousings; were beaten and thrown into solitary, unheated dark holes partly filled with water for long periods of time. When punishment does not serve the Red end, recalcitrant captives are removed from the compound and summarily dispatched to some unknown destination.

With the passage of time, what at first was parroted in order to avoid trouble and obtain favors becomes fixed in the minds of the men. They now believe what they say. They are terrified at the possibility of becoming confused and saying the wrong thing. It becomes increasingly easy to inform on one another. A sense of guilt attaches itself to any failure to inform; with this manifestation, the individual personality change is complete. Some of the men now are ready to inflict the process on others.

We tell ourselves comfortingly that a few weeks in normal surroundings will cleanse the minds of returned prisoners of all that was thus inscribed on them. I want to believe that such is so, but I am convinced that the Communists were confident it would not be so.

I have reported to you on those U. N. prisoners of war who were murdered and upon those who have returned from the unrelenting horror of the Communist prison camps; mention now must be made of those missing members of the U. N. fighting forces whom the U. N. C. believes the Communists still hold.

Within the last month the Soviet Union has released, 8 years after World War II, hundreds of German troops who had been held in the living purgatories of Soviet Siberia. While in Japan, I saw the return of Japanese soldiers and citizens who had been released by the Chinese Communists 8 years after the surrender of Japan.

The U. N. C. has asked the Chinese and North Koreans to account for over 3,000 U. N. personnel that we have reason to believe they still may hold. The Communists replied that the bulk of these men never had been captured at all; the remainder, they claimed, either had been released, were refusing repatriation or had died in captivity. Yet, on September 11, one of their own Communist correspondents, Wilfred Burchett, acknowledged that the Communists are holding an unspecified number of U. N. airmen who they claim were shot down in neutral territory.

How many more U. N. POW's may we expect the Communists to yield, possibly 7 or 8 years from now? And how many may we never see again who will die in the wastes of Korea, Manchuria, Siberia?

Summer Fallow Acreage Allotments

SPEECH

OF

HON. SAM COON

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 2, 1954

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 9680) to provide for continued price support for agricultural products; to augment the marketing and disposal of such products; to provide for greater stability in the products of agriculture, and for other purposes.

Mr. COON. Mr. Chairman, I wish to add my support to section 305 of the bill now before us. This section would direct the allocation to summer fallow wheat farmers a sufficient acreage to prevent a reduction in their allotments any larger than the cut in the national allotment as a whole.

It is important that this section be retained in the bill. It will prevent an unfair discrimination against summer fallow wheat farmers in allotting acreage for the 1955 crop.

Under the methods by which acreage is allotted, many of the wheat producers who follow the summer fallow practice have received larger cuts in their acreage allotments for 1954 than have been received by wheat producers in the same areas who do not summer fallow, or by wheat producers in areas where summer fallowing is not necessary.

Representatives of the wheat industry, both from my home State of Oregon, and from their national organization, have pointed out that these unduly heavy cuts on summer fallow lands would actually be discrimination against good farming methods. They have pointed out also that relatively dry summer fallow wheat lands will grow fewer alternative crops than other wheat lands, especially when the use of diverted acres is restricted, as at present.

It is estimated that between 550,000 and 750,000 acres will be required to adjust this inequity. The national allotment, I believe, is 55 million acres.

According to figures which I have, about 30 percent of the acres planted in the United States in a normal year are in a wheat-fallow rotation. These acres will normally produce, I believe, about one-third of the wheat that is produced each year in this country. The figures show that about 29 percent of the farms in the major wheat producing States are summer-fallow farms.

So this section would prevent possible discrimination against one-third of the wheat industry.

I wish to urge the passage of this important provision of the farm bill.

A Serious Situation Faces the Watch Industry in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 12, 1954

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I desire to call the attention of my colleagues to the serious situation facing the watch industry in the United States.

In this connection, I wish to include a letter from the president of the United States Time Corp., of Waterbury, Conn., together with several interesting facts on the importance of this industry in the field of national defense.

The letter and article follow:

THE UNITED STATES TIME CORP.,
Waterbury, Conn., June 28, 1954.

The Honorable CLEVELAND M. BAILEY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BAILEY: I would like to give you a short story on exactly what is happening to a company whose survival as a watchmaker—after a century—depends upon the decision of the President of the United States. He must make this decision by July 28.

If it were of concern only to our workers and shareholders we would not be writing you. The fact is that if the know-how this company has should be lost, it would do irreparable damage to the defense of this country.

I am giving you the story in a question and answer form which you can read in a few minutes.

Sincerely yours,
J. LEHMKUHL.

THIS IS THE STORY

What is United States time?

It is the United Time Corp., America's largest manufacturer of wrist watches, producing twice as many as any other company.

It was started in 1857 and has made 200 million timepieces—including the Ingersoll, "The Watch That Made the Dollar Famous," the Waterbury, Timex and others.

What has United States Time contributed to national defense?

It is by far the largest maker of defense items in the industry.

During World War II and the Korean war it produced $183 million worth of defense items. These included mechanical time fuzes and many other precision instruments.

What is happening to United States Time now?

Two critical things:

1. It faces extinction as a watch manufacturer because of foreign competition. The tariff has been reduced 58.6 percent by the tariff cut of 1936 and the continuing inflation since then. The imports of our foreign competitors have increased 984 percent. (See chart.) It is simple arithmetic that foreigners with their low-cost labor rates—one-third of ours—can put watches on this market at a price much below ours.

2. The Government has canceled its fuze contracts in the United States of America. We are laying off 2,000 people. We have, at the request of the United States Government, helped the British, the French, the Belgians, and the Italians to make fuzes. Now the United States Government is buying fuzes abroad—while our own workers face unemployment.

What will happen if the reduced tariff rates are allowed to stand?

The American horological industry will cease to exist.

If that happens, the skills acquired over many years will be dispersed and lost.

And if that happens, the Nation will be without a source for the mechanical time fuses and other timing devices needed in modern warfare.

What do the President's tariff advisers say?

The Tariff Commission in 1952 recommended to President Truman the restoration of the 1935 tariff rates. He rejected their recommendation.

On May 28, 1954, it made a similar recommendation to President Eisenhower.

What do the military men say?

They consider the watch industry skills essential to the defense of this country.

For instance, testifying before the Tariff Commission on February 11 of this year, Lt. Gen. Levin H. Campbell (retired), Chief of Ordnance during World War II, had this to say:

"Having the watch and clock industry as a going industry, equipped with the necessary plants, the necessary know-how, and the trained people, is of very, very great value to this country as a backlog and a safety for a rapid reaching of production in that particular item (mechanical time fuses)."

What does United States Time say?

As the country's most experienced watch maker, it says this:

"We were able to furnish the armed services with $183 million worth of timing devices and other instruments because we had a hard core of skilled people who had the unique know-how to do it. A production team of this kind cannot be hired in the market place nor can it be created quickly. It evolves over the years. Once we lose it it's gone."

The Insurance Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 12, 1954

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, the Scripps-Howard papers have been running a series of articles prepared by Mr. Albert Colegrove, of their staff, relating to the actual protection which the American people receive when they purchase some of the many health insurance policies which are currently being offered to our unwary people.

It is, indeed, gratifying to note that as a result of these articles, and others which have appeared in Labor, the Machinist, and other newspapers, of the investigation being conducted by the Federal Trade Commission, and of the hearings which have been had before our Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the State insurance commissioners at last have awakened to the necessity of doing something about assuring our people that they actually will get what they think they are paying for. In the annual meeting of their association in Detroit last week, the State commissioners have created a committee which will draft new laws and regulations to be recommended to the States for adoption in order to clean up this very unsavory situation.

I wish to include in the RECORD the following editorial appearing in the Washington Daily News, Saturday, June 12, which highly commends the State commissioners for this long-delayed action:

THE INSURANCE STORY

Now the ball is rolling. The drive to put a stop to trickery and deceit in accident and health insurance has been given a potent impetus by the State insurance commissioners at their session in Detroit.

The National Association of Insurance Commissioners has agreed to recommend new laws to their States and to write new regulations directed at the "gimmicks" in health and accident policies and advertising.

Previously, seven trade organizations representing the more reputable insurance companies had set up a joint committee to police their own field. Now this committee and the insurance commissioners will combine their efforts.

One way to curb the guys who peddle insurance on the basis of glowing promises and not much more is for the reliable companies to do an even better job of educating the public to what is desirable in an accident and health policy and how to determine whether the premium payer is getting what he buys. This seems to be a part of the new program.

Laws and State regulations necessarily must play a part. Any time a few greedy, loose-conscienced operators start working in an otherwise respectable business, the abuses they practice inevitably lead to laws which regulate all, the honest with the dishonest.

The chiseling minority always imposes a penalty on the decent majority. And there always seem to be enough chiselers to make the laws necessary. That's why we have so many laws.

But if the reputable firms do their job right, they can be as effective as laws in cleaning up such an unsavory mess as was shown up by Albert Colegrove's revealing series of articles in the News and other Scripps-Howard papers last February.

As a result of that series, a congressional committee and the Federal Trade Commission launched investigations, the public poured in thousands of complaints, and the insurance world set up its own organization to weed out these stinky practices.

Now the State insurance commissioners, each powerful in his own right, have joined the cleanup.

We hope there will be no letup.

The Beautiful Green River Can Be a Most Bountiful Stream, Also

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 12, 1954

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, the Henderson Gleaner and Journal, of Henderson, Ky., was one of the 12 newspapers of the Green River Valley which jointly published the Green River Valley celebration special on July 8, 1954. Francele H. Armstrong, editor of the Henderson Gleaner and Journal, in addition to being one of the outstanding newspaper women of Kentucky, has always been a staunch supporter of the development of the Green River Valley. The Green River Valley celebration special carries an article written by Francele H. Armstrong entitled "The Beautiful Green River Can Be a Most Bountiful Stream, Also."

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith this article:

THE BEAUTIFUL GREEN RIVER CAN BE A MOST BOUNTIFUL STREAM, ALSO

(By Francele H. Armstrong)

On the writer's 13th birthday a small group of friends and family boarded a steamboat at Evansville and cruised slowly up Green River to Mammoth Cave, where we lay at anchor for 2 days while the boat passengers visited the world-wonder caverns. Though that is 35 years in the past the memory is as fresh as ever of wooded hill slopes accented with rock outcroppings, winding waters and deep, green coolness of the river's depths.

Sentiment has always wound round the banks of the Green, both in its upstream meanderings, and along the stretches where it touches Henderson County. Farmers have known of its richnesses, deposited in silt in the bottom lands where corn has grown in abundance. Fishermen have probed its waters for the catch, and scenery lovers have camped along its banks for refreshing relaxation.

GREEN RIVER AND GREENBACKS

Only in recent years have we thought of the Green as associated with greenbacks. Perhaps the activities of the Green River Valley Citizens League have brought the shade of green into focus, or perhaps it has been the activity of the Federal governmental leaders, Senator Earle Clements, John Sherman Cooper, ex-Senator Tom Underwood, and Representatives William Natcher and the late John Whitaker, who have pointed to the possibilities for realizing economic benefits from the beautiful Green.

Early reports from planned changes in the upper stream brought Henderson and nearby county farmers to the point of organizing to oppose a proposed raising of the river level in the area where the Green empties into the Ohio. Despite the filling up of the channel with driftwood and silt, it would have meant economic loss to farmers to inundate their land. So thought they, anyhow.

While we were in the midst of trying to understand all the ramifications of the plans for modernizing and streamlining the Green and its tributaries, out-of-State interests were busy buying up coal and mineral rights under the soil which the farmers were trying to protect.

This is an important consideration at this moment because present developments stand to profit the people who have bought up the mineral rights, and to profit the people (mainly the Government), who will thus be able to buy cheaper coal because of reduced transportation costs.

But—

Most of us are still left with the beautiful rather than the bountiful Green. For all practical purposes the widening of locks at Rumsey and Spottsville will mean little to Henderson County except that certain moneys will be spent here by workmen who will build the lock at Spottsville. Lower transportation for coal lying within the valley will not bring us direct benefit.

That is why we of the Gleaner and Journal joined wholeheartedly in this proposal of the Green River Valley League to keep alive the fundamental problem of the Green River Valley, namely, its overall development with a view to attracting added industrial activity. Henderson County has suffered from the shutdown of plants in Evansville and from layoffs in plants there and here. We have suffered from the shutdown of Camp Breckinridge. Merchants and realtors, restauranteurs and hotel managers are deploring the slowdown in business activity. What we need is more industrial expansion. What we are working for is just that.

NOW IS THE TIME

As we sit down to the typewriter to tap off these lines, we are reminded of that exercise in fingerpainting words. Let's all try it.

"Now is time for all good men to come to the aid of Green River Valley. Now is the time. Now is the time."

Get Nixon Campaign

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH F. HOLT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 12, 1954

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I should like to insert into the RECORD the following editorial which appeared in the Los Angeles Examiner, Sunday July 6, 1954:

GET NIXON CAMPAIGN

Leftist and "liberal" commentators and newspapers have ganged up to do a hatchet job on Vice President NIXON.

They are out to get him because of his recent honest and, we think, irrefutable Milwaukee speech blaming the Acheson policy of the previous administration for the loss of China to the Communists and for inviting the Korean war and the present Indochina debacle.

We call your attention to this hatchet plot now, and we will call your attention to it again, for as we understand it the leftists and "liberals" will try to build it into a major issue in the attempt to control Congress in November.

They are incensed because the Vice President marshaled an array of facts that can be answered only by abuse. Let's take a brief look at some of those facts.

Secretary of State Acheson and his leftist underlings such as John Carter Vincent, Lauchlin Currie and John Stewart Service, took a kindly view of the Communist capture of China. They considered it a noble "agrarian uprising" by oppressed farmers and they gave it their support, while sabotaging the cause of Chiang Kai-shek.

Wouldn't you say the Acheson clique contributed to the loss of China? We would.

In January 1950, Mr. Acheson made a speech outlining our Asiatic defense perimeter, in other words tipping off the Communists what we would and would not defend. He excluded Korea and Formosa and thus opened the door for Soviet Russia to push-button the Korean war.

After the Chinese Communist armies entered the war the Acheson policy shackled General MacArthur and wrecked his chance of victory.

From the Korean stalemate the Chinese forces, strong and seasoned, moved to the borders of Indochina and material and advisers moved across.

The result has been Dien Bien Phu, the frustration at Geneva, the retreat of the French from the rich southern delta of the Red River and their abandonment of some four million persons to the Communists.

Communist China has risen to a position of tremendous power, far greater, probably, than her leaders had permitted themselves to hope. This ascendancy places the fate of all Asia in the balance, and the scales are tipped the Communist way.

Would you say Vice President NIXON was speaking other than the stark, unpleasant truth at Milwaukee? We wouldn't.

GOP Delegates Like Ike Better Now Than in 1952

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 12, 1954

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, as a matter of general interest, I am inserting in the RECORD an item appearing in the Chicago Daily News of July 7 which sets forth the results of a poll made by the Daily News of the delegates to the Republican National Convention on the general question of the popularity of President Eisenhower:

GOP DELEGATES LIKE IKE BETTER NOW THAN IN 1952—HE WOULD HAVE BACKING OF 892 OF 1,206, DAILY NEWS POLL SHOWS

(By Charles B. Cleveland)

If the Republican convention were being held today, President Eisenhower would have the backing of 892 of the 1,206 delegates.

This is more than the number who voted for Ike at the GOP convention held 2 years ago in Chicago.

Mr. Eisenhower's popularity is indicated in a poll of the 1952 convention delegates who were asked by the Daily News to evaluate the Eisenhower administration.

Six hundred and twenty-eight delegates—more than 52 percent—replied.

Each day's tabulation showed only minor variations, indicating that the poll hit an accurate cross-section of the Republican leadership across the country.

A projection of the returns indicates that Ike would have 892 votes if the convention were held today.

On the original rollcall 2 years ago Ike had 595 votes to 500 for Senator Taft. Other candidates had 111.

In the final tabulation, with States flocking aboard the Ike bandwagon, Mr. Eisenhower had 845 votes.

ONLY 16 DELEGATES CHANGE MINDS

In the Daily News poll only 16 of the 307 delegates who voted for Ike on the original rollcall said they had changed their minds and would now vote for another candidate.

Failure to back up Senator MCCARTHY apparently cost Ike some of these delegates.

Mr. Eisenhower's racial policy alienated a few southern delegates while the Benson farm program cost him some Midwest support.

By contrast these same policies apparently won Ike as many delegates as he lost, possibly more.

The poll indicated that Senator Taft, had he lived, would still have strong backing.

But with Taft's death, Ike has won over a majority of his followers.

About one-fourth of the delegates indicated they still did not like Ike. One hundred and fifty-one either replied that they would vote for another candidate or rated Ike as only a fair or poor president.

DIRKSEN FAVORITE OF ANTI-IKE MEN

Senator EVERETT M. DIRKSEN, of Illinois, was the outstanding favorite of the delegates who did not support Mr. Eisenhower.

A number who indicated they would not vote for Ike still said they felt he was doing a good job.

About one-fourth of the delegates rated Ike as doing a good or excellent job.

Only slightly more than one-third agreed with criticism that Ike had failed to show necessary leadership.

Criticism that Ike has poor advisers was the most frequently noted.

More than 75 percent of the delegates believe Ike is as popular as he was 2 years ago as the GOP nominee, perhaps more so.

THE FINAL TOTALS IN DAILY NEWS POLL

Here are the final totals of the Daily News poll: Voted for Ike in 1952, 307; voted for Senator Taft, 268; voted for another candidate, 44; delegates dead or whereabouts unknown, 9; would now vote for Ike, 464; would vote for another candidate, 117; no answer, 38.

Breakdown of the votes cast for candidates other than Mr. Eisenhower are as follows: Dirksen, 36; Senator Bricker, of Ohio, 14; General MacArthur, 9; Harold Stassen, 7.; Senator McCarthy, of Wisconsin, 6; Senator Knowland, of California, 6; Earl Warren, 6; Vice President Nixon, 6; Senator Mundt, of South Dakota, 4; Senator Jenner, of Indiana, 3; Representative Joseph Martin, of Massachusetts, 2.

Single votes were cast for Governor Dewey, Senator Byrd (a conservative Democrat), Senator Goldwater, and Senator Morse, independent from Oregon. Others indicated they would not vote for Ike did not specify a candidate.

Replies to the question whether the delegate thought Mr. Eisenhower was doing an excellent, good, fair, or poor job, were: Excellent job, 292; good, 205; fair, 90; poor, 27.

Not all delegates replied to this or some of the other questions.

Answers to, Do you agree or disagree with criticism that Ike has lacked leadership? Agree, 217; disagree, 389.

Response to the query whether Ike is more popular, as popular, or less popular than he was as the nominee, the delegates said: More popular, 120; as popular, 342; less popular, 144.

The Editor of the Spoon River Journal Speaks His Mind

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDGAR A. JONAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 12, 1954

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, Mr. B. J. Grigsby, a prominent and successful businessman of Chicago, Ill., is the editor and publisher of a bulletin entitled "The Spoon River Journal." About once a month Mr. Grigsby gives forth with words and phrases that embody a philosophy all his own. The Spoon River Journal editor usually devotes the pages of his Journal to exploiting and commenting upon subjects that embody reminiscences and personal experiences encountered by the editor during the days of his boyhood which he spent in that sector of Illinois to which he affectionately refers as the Spoon River area.

What Mr. Grigsby may have unintentionally omitted in describing the beauty and charm of the Spoon River country in his Journal is amply supplied and embellished by the poet, Edgar Lee Masters, who edited a series of poems entitled "Spoon River Anthropology."

The Spoon River Journal has imprinted on its front page this motto: "The Editor Speaks His Mind Upon the State of the Nation." In his July 4 edition, the editor demonstrates what obviously is an illustration of his position when he speaks his mind. On page 2 of the last edition of the Spoon River Journal Mr. Grigsby voices his protest regarding a circular reflecting on the Girl Scouts. The following is a quotation taken from the second page of the Journal:

GIRL SCOUTS OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

I think the Girl Scout and Boy Scout organizations are doing the greatest educational and morale-building work in our country. They teach our youth the fundamentals of good citizenry, nature, and helpfulness to one another. Through my own family I have been close to the activities of both the Girl and the Boy Scouts. I have contributed liberally to both and in my book they rank No. 1. I was disturbed recently when one of our readers sent me a circular reflecting on the Girl Scouts. It referred to a defection away from our rudimentary teaching that our Constitution was supreme, and that the headquarters of the Girl Scouts were drifting toward the one world and the United Nations as the world supreme power as against our own United States.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it would be helpful to clarify the situation if I were permitted to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD my own remarks and copies of two letters—one dated May 8, 1954, addressed by Mr. Grigsby to Mr. Leonard Lathrop, director, public relations department, national headquarters, Girl Scouts of the United States of America—and the reply thereto by Mr. Lathrop dated June 2, 1954—which are as follows:

MAY 8, 1954.

MR. LEONARD LATHROP,
Director, Public Relations Department,
National Headquarters, Girl Scouts
of the United States of America,
New York, N. Y.

DEAR MR. LATHROP: Recently a friend handed the writer a copy of Human Events, of March 31, 1954, containing an article captioned "Even the Girl Scouts," by Robert Le Fevre, news director, Tri-County Broadcasting Co., Fort Lauderdale, Fla., in which he criticized severely some of the teachings in the current Girl Scout Handbook relating to certain political statements and to support of the United Nations and other political organizations. He claimed all this to the exclusion of proper instruction upon the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution with its Bill of Rights and subsequent amendments upon which our Nation was and is founded.

Some twenty-odd years ago my wife was a leader in a local Scout troop and took a special interest in Girl Scout camps. My daughter, Miss Peggy E. Grigsby, was a Girl Scout in her youthful days, later active in a local troop, and is now and has been for several years a director in the Girl Scouts of Chicago council. Hence my very close interest in this subject.

At my request my daughter has provided me with copies of the Girl Scout Handbooks, editions of 1947 and 1953, together with a copy of your reply to Mr. Le Fevre under date of March 25, 1954, including two statements approved by the executive committee, May 28, 1953, on (a) the position of the Girl Scouts of the United States of America on cooperation with United Nations, and (b) the position of the Girl Scouts of the United States of America on international relations. I have read all of the above.

First I would like to compliment your organization on the makeup of the handbook. It is written in clear, concise, and simple language, and, just as important, every major point is well illustrated.

As a national organization of all girls it rightly and clearly makes no attempt at prejudice in respect to religion, and it rightly exhorts a feeling of good will toward all people, regardless of nationality, creed, or color (p. 79). And it follows that no teaching should be given a young girl which might be upon any honest and honorable controversial subject which might be contrary to the views of her parents and family. One of the most touchy of these is political party affiliations.

I am very emphatic in my opinion that the political training of Girl Scouts should predominantly emphasize the laws of our country, the United States of America. I appreciate that in a handbook of this character and size this must necessarily be brief, and its amplification should be provided in our schools, particularly our high schools and colleges. Unfortunately, the important course in civil government seems to have lost its place in the curriculum for the present generation. However, I submit that the space you do use in the Girl Scouts Handbook should be devoted to our Nation rather than any other nation or group of nations such as the highly controversial United Nations to whose activities you devote 4 pages (226 to 229).

The only direct reference to the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution of the United States and its associated Bill of Rights is 2 paragraphs, on page 202 of the 1953 edition. In the 1947 edition 3 pages were devoted to these subjects, including 1 entire page to the Bill of Rights. These were deleted in the 1953 edition, apparently in favor of promoting United Nations.

In your letter to Mr. Le Fevre you stated: "We were aware of the fact that the Constitution and Bill of Rights are so widely available that reference to them seemed adequate."

As to availability I would hazard that 50 percent of the Scouts would be unable today to find these in their homes, and a much larger percentage in all the homes of all our citizens. Of course, she could find them in our libraries, but how many would carry it that far?

You state that one of the requirements for the new badge, "My Government," is—"read aloud the Declaration of Independence, the preamble to the United States Constitution, and the Bill of Rights, and explain what these documents mean to you and why they are so important to your country."

That is good so far as it goes, but these are documents which require more than just one reading, just as I am certain you will agree churches repeatedly read and quote from the Bible—not just on a single occasion. The Declaration of Independence is not a constitutional law. It declares in simple and forceful language why our colonial ancestors declared war to rid themselves of oppressive and unfair impositions of the mother country. The Constitution, written after freedom had been achieved, set out the form of government under which the new Republic would live. The Bill of Rights (the first 10 amendments) was a clarification of the personal rights of the people themselves and of the States in which they lived. In any teachings by the Scout leaders this should be emphasized. In fact, some reference might be made as to some of the later amendments, referring to the abolition of slavery, voting suffrage for women, and the fact that the States approved a right for the Federal Government to tax the incomes of business organizations and of individuals including the estates left by the latter.

In the handbook there are some excellent paragraphs on the processes of elections, voting, etc., and that is aptly illustrated in the chart on page 203, "People Are Their Government."

In the third paragraph, page 2, of your letter to Mr. Le Fevre you state:

"It is not within the province of the Girl Scout organization, chartered by the Congress of the United States, to enter into debates on the political points you (Le Fevre) raise. Our country, to which the Girl Scout pledges allegiance, is a member of the United Nations. As long as this is true, the Girl Scout organization supports the policy of the United States. I am enclosing a copy of the Girl Scout official statement on this subject."

(Note.—This is also reiterated in the fourth paragraph on page 226 of the handbook.)

The official statement referred to of "The Position of the Girl Scuots of the United States of America on Cooperation with the United Nations," approved by the executive committee, May 28, 1953, recites that on June 26, 1945, authorized representatives of the United States Government signed the Charter of the United Nations, and, that this action was ratified by our Congress on July 28, 1945, and further that the national board of directors of Girl Scouts of the United States of America at its next regular meeting in the same year by resolution "affirmed its belief in the Charter of the United Nations and will do its part to uphold it."

To my mind this is an extreme partisan position for what is, or should be, a nonpartisan organization to take. The fact that the Girl Scouts of the United States of America was chartered by an act of Congress certainly does not impose the necessity of approving any and all political acts enacted any more than if it were chartered under State law.

Probably more than half our voters today are concerned about our sponsorship of the United Nations, and, the fact that it seems to be used by most of the other members as a means of securing financial hand-outs from Uncle Sam. My personal opinion, and I know many who share it, is that while altruistically the idea is wonderful it was conceived in the hysteria of a successful conclusion to a war of aggression in World War II even thought subsequent events proved that while we won the war we did not win the peace. It is not my desire to inject any argument on that point except to point out that the United States participation in the United Nations is nothing more than our obligations under any treaty or agreement with foreign nations, such as the Atlantic Charter, NATO, EDC, etc. The fact is that the United Nations is trying and has tried to control certain Federal and State governmental rights, by breaching our Constitution. That is the object of the Bricker amendment, viz, to make this impossible. Further, before it is too late, we can get out of the United Nations by the same way we entered it, i. e., by congressional action.

On page 93 of the handbook in the first paragraph it states: "Remember the courage it took the first settlers to establish their homes in America. You can be proud of the beauty of your country, its greatness, and its resources." Therefore, let us remember today that we need courage and fortitude to preserve that for which our forefathers toiled and bled to pass on to us our heritage.

Mr. Le Fevre indicated that your organization supports socialized medicine. I do not find anything in that respect in the handbook. In fact, I believe any fair-minded person would approve of the comments made upon existing Federal, State, and local aid programs as outlined.

Mr. Le Fevre (p. 3 of his letter) refers to the statement on page 204 that "the League of Women Voters of the United States is a nonpolitical organization" and that that assertion was untrue. In your letter you admit this and that it was an editorial error and that the adjective should have read "nonpartisan." I would go so far as to even challenge the latter term. That organization has a definite partisanship for United Nation. I had occasion to go into that matter and wrote an article on the subject of the League of Women Voters of the United States of America in a little paper I write as a hobby, the Spoon River Journal, and I enclose a copy of the issue of December 30, 1952, as a part of this letter.

I wish to state here that I whole-heartedly approve of exchange of international amenities, and, so far as possible international group meetings, with Girl Scouts, etc., in other countries. This is highly educational and promotes international good will.

In this letter unless otherwise stated the page references are to the 1953 handbook. What I have written has been intended to be constructive and my objection is the definite swing in the text of the 1953 handbook from purely United States Government functions to those of United Nations.

I shall be pleased to have comments of your executive committee if they care to make any. I would also say I am not expressing any approval of Mr. Le Fevre's article other than that I am glad he has brought this subject into the open. His personal disagreement with a local branch obviously did not arise with the knowledge of the national headquarters.

Respectfully submitted.

Sincerely yours,

B. J. Grigsby.

Girl Scouts of the
United States of America,
National Headquarters,
New York, N. Y., June 2, 1954.

Mr. B. J. Grigsby,
Chicago, Ill.

Dear Mr. Grigsby: Now that I have returned from California, I want to take time to answer your thoughtful and friendly letter of May 8. We appreciate the interest you have taken in this matter and I want to assure you that your comments have been considered with great care.

We feel as you do that the political training of Girl Scouts should emphasize the laws of our country and believe that material in our badge requirements, particularly in the field of citizenship, makes this evident. For example, in addition to the references to the Declaration of Independence, Constitution of the United States, and the Bill of Rights on page 202 of the 1953 edition which you mention, there are on pages 413, 416, and 420 badge requirements for specific activities designed to bring home to each girl the implications inherent in these documents. I'd like to point out that the "My Government" badge in which some of these requirements, plus many other citizenship activities, are listed is a new badge which makes its debut in the 1953 edition of the Handbook. It was especially designed to point up the sort of experience to which you refer.

The indexes in both editions of the Handbook were not intended to be exhaustive and perhaps this is an error in our planning. For example, the Bill of Rights is listed in the index of the 1947 edition (as an illustration) but no other references to this document are made there. In the 1953 edition there is no mention in the index of the Bill of Rights although there are several references to it in the text and badge requirements. These omissions have been misleading to those who studied the indexes and have certainly caused confusion which might have been avoided had the listing been more detailed.

We may be, as you say, overly optimistic about the availability of the texts of the Constitution and the Bill of Rights. We find, however, that youngsters are very zealous in meeting their badge requirements. Having to look up these basic American documents at school or in the public library in many cases serves as an added stimulus to learning, or so our experience would indicate.

We agree with the points you make in your discussion on the values of repetition, and we have tried to provide opportunities for the kind of fruitful experiences you mention. The pledge of allegiance and the Girl Scout promise, which pledges duty to God and country, are regular parts of troop ceremony; you will note that in the Handbook we emphasize in several places and in different ways discussion of the Constitution, Declaration of Independence, and Bill of Rights so that girls may be helped to learn about and understand the fundamentals of our Republic.

As for the subject of the United Nations, this, as you point out, is one on which there is a wide divergence of opinion. It has seemed to us, therefore, that we should adhere to the policy of our Government in this matter and that nonadherence would tend to inject partisanship, rather than the other way round. Approximately 125 United States organizations, of which we are one, have accredited observer status with the United Nations.

I am afraid we cannot fully agree that the amount of space devoted in the Handbook to the United Nations is disproportionate. The 1947 edition devoted about the same amount of space as is devoted in the 1953 edition. I believe, however, that the editorializing in the 1953 edition was unnecessary.

I am sure you will be glad to know that our cooperation with the League of Women Voters was in the field of nonpartisan citizenship: The league was most helpful in working out the new "My Government" badge which, as you have seen, places so much stress on the responsibilities of citizens in our country and on an understanding of the Constitution, the Declaration of Independence, and the Bill of Rights.

Your letter has been one of the most interesting and valuable of those we have received since Mr. LeFevre's criticism was distributed in Human Events. (Incidentally, I very much enjoyed reading Spoon River Journal.) We appreciate the time and attention you have given and, even though we do not agree that the 1953 edition of the Handbook shows a definite swing to the United Nations, we feel that if such an impression has been given to our friends, we should most certainly scrutinize the book. This we are doing, in full awareness of how misinterpretations and misunderstandings may arise. Your letter has been most helpful and you have our sincere thanks for writing in such careful and thoughtful detail.

Sincerely,

Leonard Lathrop,
Director, Public Relations Department.

Mr. Speaker, it is apparent that Mr. Grigsby is considerably disturbed about the circular that he terms as reflecting on the Girl Scouts. However, it may be presumed from Mr. Grisby's remarks that he is not one to jump at conclusions and to take snap judgment before all the facts have been fully exploited and developed.

To substantiate my belief in Mr. Grigsby's sound thinking and impartial attitude, I again quote his own words taken from the last edition of the Spoon River Journal, which are as follows:

> The situation is not beyond control and can be remedied by proper revision of the Handbook. However, I feel that friends of the Girl Scout movement should know just what is happening. I wish to make it clear that I still believe in the Girl Scouts and will continue to support this meritorious organization. I am quoting my correspondence on this subject with the National Headquarters of the Girl Scouts of the United States of America on what I think is a vital point.

School Construction Legislation Bogged Down

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 12, 1954

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a column written by Malvina Lindsay and published in the Washington Post and Times Herald on July 8. I invite the attention of Members to this column in the hopes it may spur action on legislation to aid States in meeting the great need for school construction:

PACKING THEM IN TO BE EDUCATED

(By Malvina Lindsay)

The most exciting election I remember was one in which my father was a candidate for the school board. The issue was whether the new two-room school building of our rural neighborhood should be single or double story.

Friends became enemies, families were divided in the bitter campaign. My father was a candidate of the single story party. It held that the children would be safer on a ground level, and that such a design would permit future enlargement to meet enrollment needs.

The two-story party wanted a perpendicular effect so that the new brick structure, which was to supplant our one-room frame building, would dominate the landscape from its lofty side, and be seen by envious communities for miles around. No doubt the double story leaders also had in mind an ornamental turret.

The single story party won by a few votes, and thus pioneered for the principle that school houses should be built from the inside out rather than from the outside in.

However, still looming on the American landscape are many monuments to the idea that the children should be fitted to the building rather than vice versa. Some of these, once the pride of their communities, are among the worst firetraps in the 18 percent of elementary schools that a survey by the United States Office of Education has labeled as unsafe against fire.

A typical example is the gloomy three-story brick building with gables, tower, narrow windows, crowding a street corner at some busy traffic intersection, and having virtually no play area. Another type is the once splendid 3- or 4-story white frame structure with imposing belfry replete with huge school bell, and topped by a lightning rod. Some of these tall old bleak buildings date back to the middle 19th century.

Yet outwardly they seem like mansions compared to the ramshackle "little red schoolhouses" in which many children are still attending classes. Many adults who drive past modern, spacious, low-slung, glass-walled school plants often comment on how things have changed since they went to school. Yet in many rural regions children of all ages and grades are still jammed in one-room structures which are heated by potbellied stoves, which have the community dipper, and frequently ventilation by a broken windowpane. (About 52 percent of elementary school children go to one-room schools.)

Children are also attending school in all sorts of makeshift buildings, old residences, flimsy temporaries, in overcrowded buildings where classes must be held in halls and dark basements. City elementary classrooms everywhere are so crowded that it is estimated that only about 1 child in 3 gets a fair amount of the teacher's time.

At the opening of the last school year 300,000 new elementary classrooms were needed. Yet construction continues to lag enrollment, and from present prospects the situation will be worse next fall. Federal legislation to give aid to needy States in their school building programs continues bogged down in Congress.

Ironically, at this time a report on the classroom of tomorrow, the result of a 12-year study by educators and scientists at the University of Michigan, puts the emphasis on light, space, freedom of movement (through flexible furnishings) in the schoolroom environment. The study estimates that 75 percent of the Nation's schools are operating with less than the required minimum daylighting standards.

The Nation's overcrowded schoolrooms offer not only physical but mental hazards to children. Poor lighting and ventilation, danger from fire are supplemented by lack of individual attention from the teacher, by an atmosphere of confusion, interruption, anxiety.

Worst of all, the teacher must become largely a policeman. Discipline rather than learning is necessarily the major concern. Instruction must tend ever more toward rote and regimentation. Neither teacher nor pupil has room or freedom to think, to become creative. Because of this, teachers frequently find their work discouraging, exhausting, frustrating.

Many communities, parents, legislators feel that if they can get the big influx of school children housed in any way possible, educational wants are met. Even yet the Nation is not ready to build enough schoolhouses from the inside out rather than from the outside in.

The Wolf River Watershed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM MURRAY

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 12, 1954

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, the Wolf River Watershed Commission is doing very effective work on Wolf River which rises in Tippah County, Miss., and flows through Benton County, Miss., into Fayette and Shelby Counties, Tenn., and empties in the Mississippi River at Memphis, Tenn. In the area embraced by the Wolf River watershed there have already been 10 subwatersheds organized and 4 other watersheds will be organized this year. Also there have been two pilot plant or demonstration watersheds organized in the Wolf River watershed under the Department of Agriculture, one on Marys Creek in Shelby County, Tenn., and the other on Sand Creek in Fayette County, Tenn., and wonderful work is being done on both of these projects.

The Wolf River Channel is being cleared of trees, footlogs, and drifts. There has been great accomplishments in soil-conservation practices through the activities of soil-conservation districts and the landowners are cooperating in these practices through gully stopping, permanent pasture planting, contour farming, stripcropping, terracing, drainage, tree planting, and other soil-conservation methods.

I am pleased to include in my remarks the report of Mr. Junius Crossett as chairman of the Wolf River Watershed Commission on the upstream work of Wolf River and I hope the Members of Congress will take the time to read this most interesting, constructive report:

REPORT OF WOLF RIVER WATERSHED COMMISSION ON THE UPSTREAM WORK OF WOLF RIVER

(By Junius L. Crossett, chairman)

To: Mr. Charles D. Curran, Task Force Administrator and members of the Task Force on Water Resources and Power Development.

I would like to tell you something about Wolf River, its location and its behavior. Wolf River is located in the western part of Tennessee and the northern part of Mississippi. It rises in Tippah County, Miss., from an area of springs, flows through Benton County, Miss., into Fayette County, Tenn., and Shelby County, Tenn., and empties into the Mississippi River at North Memphis, Tenn. Within the bounds of its watershed it affects the counties of Hardeman County, Tenn., and Marshall County, Miss. Wolf River is 116 miles in length, has approximately 9,960 owners of farms within its bounds, about 460,000 acres of land, and affects about 300,000 people, i. e. counting the north Memphis area.

Approximately 100 gullies and dry creeks empty into the river along its route. Wolf River is also fed along its route by some clear creeks and springs, and in flood stages by numerous dry creeks.

The people owning farmlands or living along Wolf River in Fayette County have realized over a period of years that something should be done to take care of the floods that were washing away the best parts of their land and also destroying valuable hardwood timber in its early growth and larger timber, also. Several attempts were made to do something to take care of these existing facts, and we tried a series of drainage ditches and also tried taxation districts which failed on account of injunctions from people further down the river in Shelby County.

This was expensive to the farmers as the surveys and other expenses had to be taken care of by the people who had petitioned for the drainage districts.

We realized that soil-conservation service was the answer to our problems, and our first attempt to organize a soil-conservation district in Fayette County, Tenn., failed. However, in April 1951, we did succeed in organizing a soil-conservation district in Fayette County, and on June 21 of that year a meeting was called at Moscow with the soil-conservation district board for a tour of Wolf River to study the watershed approach.

In 1952 we had a second annual Wolf River watershed conference at Moscow. These meetings were sponsored by the Moscow Savings Bank of Moscow, Tenn., and in that same year we organized a Green Acres watershed which comprised Burnette Creek, Sand Creek, and Roberts Creek. Also organized that year was Hays Crossing subwatershed which included Lid Creek, Big Sandy Creek, and East and West Grissom Creek.

Also we held a ministers' conference at the Hays Crossing watershed community house. We requested the ministers to deliver from their pulpits at least once a year a sermon on soil conservation and its advantages.

Also a community house was built costing approximately $6,000 without outside assistance, by the people of the Green Acres watershed.

Also organized was a cooperative forest fire-control program which became effective on July 1, 1953.

In 1953 we initiated Wolf River watershed channel clearing, and mile after mile of Wolf River Channel was cleared of trees, snags, bridges, foot logs and, drifts.

We also organized in this same year Wolf River Sportsman's Club at Moscow with the divisions of boating, hunting, fishing, and soil conservation. We also organized Grays Creek subwatershed in Benton County, Miss., and Indian Creek subwatershed in Hardeman County, Tenn.

In these organizations people were asked to, and did, cooperate in conservation practices as follows: Contour farming, cover crops, stubble mulching, strip cropping, pasture development, seeding of pasture, wildlife area improvement, permanent pasture planting, channel clearing, gully stopping, and other practices totaling 27 in all.

We now have in the area embraced by the Wolf River watershed 10 subwatersheds organized and participating in the soil-conservation program. We propose to organize 4 other watersheds in 1954.

In 1953 we were successful in our solicitation of help in this plan by interesting such organizations as the Memphis Chapter of Friends of the Land. Through them was organized the Wolf River Watershed Association and also we had the assistance of the Wolf River Watershed Commission, a commission set up by the various soil-conservation districts. We also had the endorsement of the civic clubs along the river in the smaller towns, the help of the banks along this route and also the merchants.

We have done quite a bit of advertising. The Wolf River Watershed Association, under the very excellent direction of Robert B. Snowden as chairman, has spent approximately $10,000 during the first year in the way of promotion and advertising. Some of these advertisements have been road signs along the roads, announcing the entrance and leaving of the Wolf River watershed area. Also, signs were printed for farmers to advertise their participation. This sign was a metal type announcing that the farmer was cooperating with the Wolf River watershed practices. Each farmer was given a sign of this type after he had participated in at least 3 of the 27 practices set out by the soil-conservation districts.

The banks and merchants along the route have also used many forms of advertisement in keeping the Wolf River watershed before the people at all times.

We have 2 pilot plants or demonstration watersheds organized in the Wolf River watershed area under the act of the Department of Agriculture, 1 being in Shelby County, Tenn., on Marys Creek and 1 in Fayette County, Tenn., along Sand Creek.

I want to tell you more about Sand Creek because it is located in Fayette County which is the center of the Wolf River watershed, and I am more familiar with the works of this pilot plant watershed.

Sand Creek, a tributary to Wolf River, is located in the southeast part of Fayette County, Tenn. Burnette Creek is the principal tributary.

The Sand Creek pilot plant watershed contains approximately 4,300 acres. There are some 30 farms in the watershed. This watershed is about 5 miles long and varies from one-fourth of a mile to 2½ miles in width. Elevations range from 335 feet in the bottom to 500 feet on the ridge above sea level.

Much of the land has been abused by improper land use and poor management. Approximately 30 percent of the land was idle as of January 1, 1954. A large percent of the land is owner-operated.

Approximately 60 percent of this area slopes about 5 percent and has been severely damaged by sheet and gully erosion. Approximately 20 percent of the land has a potential of moderate to high crop yields if properly managed and necessary erosion control practices are applied.

Soil conserving rotations have not been used and there were no water retention systems in the watershed before January 1, 1954.

Pastures are of native grasses and showed very little evidence of proper management. Livestock carrying capacities are very low. The deep gullies (about 10 percent of area) were active, and contribute the sand that is carried to the bottom land.

Approximately 20 percent of the watershed is in bottom land which is subject to flooding.

The sandbar now backed up from the mouth of this creek has caused a large number of acres of Wolf River to go out of production. Land that was cultivated some 15 years ago is now in swamp. Due to flooding, many farmers are delayed in planting their cotton and corn with the result that the cotton crop does not properly mature and the corn crop is often the victim of bud worms. Crop yields are greatly reduced 2 out of every 5 years.

Flooding and sedimentation are common to all bottom land. Conditions have been made worse in certain areas due to individual farmers attempting to solve their own problems without regard to the total problem.

Drainage problems have been created by the excess amount of sand deposited along the banks causing the water to be trapped in the land away from the banks. Crossdrains from small watersheds also have blocked the natural drains.

All the 11 miles of roads in the watershed are dirt roads and contribute heavily to sand and silt problems in the bottoms. The roads are being damaged and, in one case, the road is almost impassible due to the gully along the road ditch. One section of the road across the bottom has been overtopped by water several times (twice since January 1, 1954) with much damage being done to the road.

Stabilization of silt-source area is a problem of most of the upland. Very few of the gullies are stabilized. The gullies are deep with high head overfalls and steep banks. The sand is coming from the deep gullies.

There are a number of snags and windfalls that should be removed from the channel. In many areas the channel is as high as the bottom land.

Control and flood-prevention benefits (only in Sand Creek pilot watershed):

1. Terracing and contour guide strips	miles	95
2. Waterways	acres	130
3. Diversion	miles	9
4. Drainage	acres	475
5. Roadbank stabilization (includes both sides)	miles	18
6. Water retardation structures	do	2
7. Desilting basins	do	125
8. Farm ponds	do	100
9. Tree planting	acres	800
10. Pasture and meadow[1]	do	1,000
11. Channel improvement	miles	5
12. Stream bank stabilization	do	8

[1] Includes seeding, fertilization, and liming.

Planning on individual watersheds started October 1953. Planning and operations on individual farms started February 1, 1954.

The United States Soil Conservation Service and United States Forest Service are working with the Fayette County Soil Conservation District on rendering assistance to individual land owners in this watershed. The United States Forest Service has the responsibility for tree planting and timber management. The United States Soil Conservation Service has responsibility for all plans and establishment of all practices except forestry.

Individual plans: Number of farms, 30; planned, 24; unplanned, 6.

Application	Unit	Needed	Applied
1. Terracing and contour guide strips.	Mile	95	8
2. Waterways	Acre	130	20
3. Diversions	Mile	9	0
4. Drainage	Acre	475	0
5. Road bank stabilization.	Mile	18	.5
6. Water retardation structures.	Number	2	0
7. Desilting basins	do	125	[1] 3, 30
8. Farm ponds	do	100	5
9. Tree planting	Acre	800	[2] 211, 37
10. Pastures and meadows (farmer).	do	1,000	170
11. Channel improvement.	Mile	5	0
12. Stream bank stabilization.	do	8	0
13. Kudzu plantings on gullies.	Acre	200	[3] 62
14. Fencing of pine and kudzu.	Mile	25	10

[1] 3 farmers applied, 30 soil conservation district applied.

[2] 211 acres soil conservation district applied, 37 acres farmer applied.

[3] 62 acres soil conservation district applied.

The six individual landowners who are not yet cooperating with their SCD in this undertaking include absentee owners, a widow without means, and an infirm person.

The following benefits would accrue when this project on this watershed is completed:

1. Reduction in flooding of bottom land would insure a crop almost every year.
2. Yields of crops would increase.
3. Adequate finances could be obtained.
4. Crops could be planted early enough for maximum growth and production.
5. Valuable land now being destroyed by sand would be protected.
6. Road maintenance would be reduced.
7. Farm income on upland would be increased by proper land use. Land now idle is being brought into production to increase the farm income.
8. Swamping along the main stream will be reduced.
9. Any improvements made on Wolf River would be protected.

We believe that in a 5-year period the public cost of protecting Sand Creek from erosion would be as follows:

2 water retardation structures	$59,121
125 desilting basins (small earth dams)	15,000
Tree planting, 800 acres	10,000
200 acres, kudzu planting, fertilization and planting for gullies for road banks	5,000
Channel improvement for approximately 5 miles	8,000
Fence posts and wire to fence pine and kudzu	15,500
Stream bank stabilization	4,870
Salary for workers for 5 years	25,000
Total overall public cost	141,491

On top of this public cost the farmers or landowners would be compelled to expend a similar sum of matching dollars or services.

The above pilot watershed estimate indicates that the total public cost of similar treatment to the whole Wolf River watershed would be approximately 50 times that amount, which would make the total overall cost $7,050,000. If the whole of Wolf River watershed can be taken care of in this manner, we believe that erosion will be permanenly stopped, and that we will have attained permanent flood prevention. It would mean an expansion of the livestock industry in this section, and if we could plant the amount of trees that should be planted in the same proportion as has been planted at the Sand Creek pilot plant watershed, it would be 125 to 150 million pines which would bring in after 15 to 20 years growth a $4 million annual payroll if a pulp mill could be set up in this area.

We believe from experience in this pilot watershed that this is the only way in which to conquer flood control and erosion in the Wolf River area. We would like to have proper snagging and clearing of the channel, as well as the bends straightened and the right-of-way cleared, which work should, in part or whole, be done by the engineers. This would be a benefit and would be cooperating with the work done by the Soil Conservation District and the pilot watersheds. When this is accomplished flash floods and winter floods and erosion will be a thing of the past.

The concept of flood prevention through the method of upstream watershed treatment is a fundamental part of the legislative and administrative philosophy of the Eisenhower administration. The President has emphasized this a score of times. Likewise Secretary Benson has stated that "we must have a dynamic program in soil and water conservation."

In the 60 pilot watersheds now operating as demonstrations, and financed by a special 1953 $5 million soil-conservation appropriation, the people themselves furnish locally the dynamics which the Secretary of Agriculture refers to. Thus the whole program stems from local leadership and local sacrifice and local contributions—in each case contribtuing a sum to match the Government dollars.

We believe that this mutual partnership between the people and their government represents the only sane and sensible approach to the achievement of permanent flood control.

A little child can understand why it is better to keep water where it falls and soil where it belongs, rather than suffering annually $1¼ billion annual flood damage, and spending annually $300 million for the United States engineers to undo the damages of rampant rivers. How much better it would be if the Government continually would lead out with $100 million a year for the treatment of many many pilot watersheds and save that same amount from the $300 million, which in effect "locks the door after the horse is stolen."

The time has come when water itself, the most vital resource, is becoming shorter and shorter each day. Adequate industrial water is one of the most vital assets a city can have. The consumption of water in industry and in agriculture is daily far exceeding the most ambitious estimates of recent years.

The acceptance of the concept of flood prevention by upper watershed treatment is becoming daily more universal. Indicative of this is the passage by the House of the Hope-Aiken bill by three-hundred-odd votes to nothing. This bill provides for a greatly enlarged pilot watershed authorization, and we believe this principle to be one which is sound and should be supported by your committee. This bill is now before the Senate committee, and its only opposition seems to come from the United States engineers.

The concept of this type of conservation must be preserved.

We very respectfully ask your committee to consider a continuation of the pilot plant watershed program which we believe is economical and beneficial in every way.

WOLF RIVER WATERSHED COMMISSION,
JUNIUS L. CROSSETT, *Chairman.*

Breaux Bridge, La., High School Band

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN E. WILLIS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 12, 1954

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a pleasure to call the attention of my colleagues to the presence in Washington today and tomorrow of a talented and popular organization from my congressional district—the Breaux Bridge (La.) High School Band.

I trust that a number of Members of Congress had an opportunity to hear this band in a concert this afternoon on the east front center steps of the Capitol, which was followed by a tour of the Capitol and visits to the House and Senate galleries. We, in Louisiana, and particularly in the Third Congressional District and my home parish—county—of St. Martin, in which Breaux Bridge is situated, are very proud of this band and the honors it has received.

These honors include selection of the band to represent Louisiana at the Lions international convention in New York City where the members won much additional acclaim and attention, playing at the convention in Madison Square Garden, participating in the convention parade, and in other presentations. They have taken part in many events in Louisiana, and this band of 67 young musicians has become widely known.

The citizens of Breaux Bridge, who through various benefit activities, raised the large sum of money necessary to defray expenses of the band on the trip to New York, can feel that their interest and efforts in this connection, and on previous occasions, are amply rewarded by the appearance and ability of this organization, the widespread publicity it has given to its home town and the State of Louisiana, and the excellent musical training afforded these young people.

The band, now en route home from New York, is accompanied by a number of leading citizens of Breaux Bridge, together with other Louisianians. Mr. Leo Delahoussaye, principal of the Breaux Bridge High School, is in general charge of the trip, and the band is under the leadership of Mr. Harry Greig, band director of the music department of the high school.

The band members are: Betty Delhomme, Patricia Balch, Roberta Webre, Jeannelle Gauthier, Shirley Guidry, Beverly Hebert, Jean Nell Broussard, Rebecca Cormier, Joan Guidry, Jo Ann Keterlers, Elaine Pellerin, Patricia Patin, Barbara Broussard, Edward Domingue, Glenda Landry, Gloria Patin, Elizabeth Latiolais, Joy Conrad, Gaynell Guidry, Lydia Rose Guidry, Elaine Mason, Dolores Barnes, Tommy Balch, June Cormier, Mike Morrogh, Emily Hebert, Kerny Broussard, Dickie Hebert, Jeanette Pellerin, Larry Thibodeaux, James Domingue, Donna Melancon, Dorsy Brasseaux, Dalton Broussard, Roland Guidry, Vienna Mae Marks, Horace Guidry, Ray Pellerin, A. P. Dupuis, Dianna Melancon, Curtis Guidry, Betty Jo Young, Jo Jo Guidry, Yvonne Thibodeaux, Jerome Mouton, J. C. Tabor, Burnell Martin, Clifford Hebert, Jason Dupuis, Rufus Hebert, Clifford Mouton, Edwin Hebert, Patsy Green, Faye Guidry, Richard Broussard, Charlene Theriot, P. J. Hebert, Janice Nepveu, Erline Begnaud, Arthur Broussard, Rose Angelle, Irene Delhomme, Judy Thibodeaux, Joan LaRue Hebert, Rochelle Roberts, Dianne Domingue, Russel Peltier.

The chaperones are: Mrs. Harry Greig, John Breaux, Earl Hollier, Mr. and Mrs. Frank Guidry, Mrs. Percy Broussard, Mrs. Claude Guidry, Mrs. Felix Pellerin, Mrs. Dalton Broussard, registered nurse.

Others in the group include: Miss Julie Cormier, Mrs. B. D. Champagne, Marine Guidry, Mrs. Leo Delahoussaye, Miss Louise Castille, Miss Simone Castille, Mrs. Francis Broussard, Miss Linda Conrad, Hemby Morgan, Mrs. Odile B. Clause, Miss Mary K. Clause, Miss Carolyn Clause, Mrs. Whitney Hebert, Mrs. James Thevenet, Mrs. Chester Broussard, Mr. and Mrs. Sanders Delhomme, Jerry Delhomme, Leon Breaux, Miss Laure Lee Dauterive, Mr. and Mrs. Randall Bulliard, Miss Jacqueline Ann Tabor, Mrs. Roger Ketelers, Mrs. H. Guillory, Miss Marry Louise Hebert, Mrs. Percy Cormier, Ricky Cormier, Mrs. Frank Patin, Mr. and Mrs. Harris Pellerin and son Junior, Mrs. Maude D. Dupuis, Mrs. Claude J. Dauterive, all of Breaux Bridge, La.

Mr. and Mrs. J. J. Arceneaux, Opelousas, La.

Mrs. J. E. Narreau, Mrs. James Gauthier, Mrs. Willie Fournet, all of St. Martinville, La.

Miss Isabelle Guidry, of New Iberia, La.

Miss Mary Ann Domingue and Miss Louise Sonniraer, both of Scott, La.

Jimmy Benoit, of Welsh, La.

Mr. and Mrs. Lionel Thibodeaux and Mrs. John Gorr, all of Lafayette, La.

Mr. and Mrs. Terrel Thibodeaux, Lake Charles, La.

Texas is also represented in the group by Mrs. Victor Bush, Miss Patsy Bush, and Robert Bush, of Brownwood.

Major Part of Eisenhower Program Approved

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. S. J. CRUMPACKER, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 12, 1954

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to direct the attention of the House to a factual review of the accomplishments of the Eisenhower administration by Frank R. Kent, veteran columnist for the McNaught Syndicate. Mr. Kent's article for Sunday, July 11, follows:

EISENHOWER'S PROGRAM SEEN DOING CREDITABLY—WRITER FINDS ADMINISTRATION HEADED IN RIGHT DIRECTION

(By Frank R. Kent)

As this session of Congress nears its end a very encouraging demonstration is being given that propaganda does not always prevail against facts. For a good many months now the labor, liberal, and Democratic forces have really drenched the country with preachments and proclamations about the lack of accomplishment by the Eisenhower administration. The President has been depicted as unable to lead his party or the Nation, as a bewildered, feeble and discouraged man incapable of coping with the politicians, unhappy in his job, appalled by the recession in business, determined not to run again

This, of course, is a false picture, but it has been the one his opponents have constantly presented for more than a year. Concededly, while the personal Presidential popularity remains high, this sustained campaign of disparagement has had an effect on many people. It disturbs some of the stanchest of General Ike's friends. The reason is that it is conducted by politicians, journalists, radio and television commentators, and columnists of great skill and experience. Products of the Roosevelt-Truman regimes, they have become the top experts of political propaganda.

FACTS REVEAL EXCELLENT RECORD

Nevertheless, at the moment the anti-Eisenhower propaganda appears to have bogged down and the propagandists seem themselves to be confused and contradictory. What has hit them are the facts. Instead of the President's constructive program having failed, it is now realized that the major portion of it will be enacted before the end of the month. When it is considered that the administration majority in the House is exceedingly slender and in the Senate is so thin as to be nonexistent, this is an extraordinary performance.

It is true that because of the labor lobby and the unfounded fear of labor resentment in the election, he temporarily has lost in his effort to amend the Taft-Hartley Act. Also, he was unable to make good on his promise to confer statehood on Hawaii. But on both these issues he will have another chance in the next session. At this session, however, there is to be listed on the credit side (1) the St. Lawrence seaway project, which every President since Coolidge advocated but was unable to enact; (2) the passage of a general tax bill, which not only reduces a number of taxes but gives our tax system its first general revision in 40 years; (3) extension of the social-security system so as to bring in from 9 million to 10 million more citizens now uncovered; (4) enactment of the administration's foreign-aid measures to which he was committed.

All of these either have been passed or are regarded as reasonably sure of passage before the close. In addition there appears now to be greater than an even chance that the President's farm proposals, abolishing the rigid price supports, which have resulted in unmanageable and exceedingly costly surpluses will pass. Thus the principle of flexible supports has been accepted by the House. At this writing prospects of their acceptance by the Senate are good. Also it seems sure that despite the different views as to the Eisenhower housing proposals there will emerge from the conference committee a fairly sound measure.

EISENHOWER PROMISES KEPT

Add to all this the fact that there has been a steady decrease month by month in the Federal payroll and that while the Federal budget is not yet in balance, the annual deficit is some $6 billion less than it was when the Eisenhower administration took over. In brief, we are going in the right direction. This President has not been able to accomplish everything he promised. No President ever is able to do that even when he has large and controlled party majorities. There always are reasons, political or otherwise, that block a perfect score.

With regard to General Ike, these things can be said: (1) He has not retreated from any promise made in his campaign; (2) he has not been able to redeem them all, but he has tried, and he hasn't lied or ducked or dodged; (3) it is perfectly clear that he has done a great deal. Further, it is clear he will keep on trying. Already the anti-Ike propagandists have begun to change their tune. And some of them have been caught in glaring misrepresentations. For example, a few days ago the noble Adlai Stevenson let go a blast at the wickedness of Republican Senate leadership as exemplified by Senator KNOWLAND in his attitude toward Red China and the United Nations. This he piously deplored as adding to the President's difficulties. He altogether failed to mention that the Democratic leader, Senator LYNDON JOHNSON, of Texas, had endorsed the Knowland position and made it his own. It was not noble in Mr. Stevenson to omit this. It was uncandid and deceptive.

AEC Power Contract

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES RAPER JONAS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 12, 1954

Mr. JONAS of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, in view of the widespread discussion which has arisen over the proposed power contract between the Atomic Energy Commission and a private-utility group, I requested the Bureau of the Budget to furnish me with an analysis of the facts upon which the President based his decision instructing the Atomic Energy Commission to negotiate such a contract. The Bureau of the Budget has furnished me with a statement outlining the basis upon which this action was taken, an explanation of the replacement method now used by the Tennessee Valley Authority in meeting the power requirements of the Atomic Energy Commission, and a detailed analysis of the proposals submitted by the Dixon-Yates and Walter von Tresckow groups.

Because of the general interest in this subject, I believe this material should he made a part of the RECORD and have obtained permission to have it inserted in the Appendix as an extension of my remarks. The material in question is as follows:

BASIS FOR ACTION BY THE ADMINISTRATION TO MEET ADDITIONAL NEEDS FOR GENERATING CAPACITY IN THE TENNESSEE VALLEY AREA

The President's decision to provide for the 1957 expansion of power consumption in the Tennessee Valley area through facilities to be constructed by private enterprise will—

1. Provide for national defense needs, which are paramount.
2. Promote the best interests not only of the people of that area but of all the people.
3. Permit amortization of the cost of the facilities over a 25-year period, thus averting an immediate capital outlay of $100 million and reducing pressure against the ceiling on the national debt.

The President's action, as he stated at his press conference on June 30, 1954, will meet the immediate needs and allow additional time for study of the question as to how the future power needs of the area should be met. The President's statement on that occasion emphasized that the Tennessee Valley Authority would be supported to carry out the purposes written into the law. It is a complete refutation of any suggestion that the present proposal is part of a plan to "dismember" the Authority.

The history and form of the transaction is abundantly clear. The President's decision was taken only after the matter had been subjected to the most careful consideration. The attempts to distort the purposes and effect of the contemplated arrangement cannot change the essential facts. A brief review of the development of the present proposal, and of the considerations which guided the decision, will demonstrate clearly that it is the best possible solution to the immediate problem.

In his message transmitting the 1955 budget, the President stated that arrangements were being made to reduce TVA commitments to the Atomic Energy Commission in order to provide for reasonable growth in industrial, municipal, and cooperative power loads in the TVA area through the calendar year 1957; and that the question of additional generating units for the Tennessee Valley Authority would be further considered in the event these arrangements could not be consummated.

The statement in the President's budget message is an alternative to the proposed construction by the Tennessee Valley Authority of a steam plant at Fulton, Tenn., near Memphis. A significant factor in connection with this proposed steam plant is that the Congress on four separate occasions in the current session and the preceding session has voted down amendments to provide funds to the TVA to start construction.

Further, the construction of the Fulton steam plant by TVA would create the risk of a large block of surplus power if AEC's needs should decline. A shift of part of AEC's requirements to private utilities would spread the risk of disposing of this surplus. Approximately 30 percent of TVA's capacity is committed to AEC and the Government would be in a better position if it could share with private power interests the responsibility for disposing of the surplus which would result if AEC operations were to be curtailed.

The construction of the Fulton plant as proposed by TVA would require the Federal Government to make a capital outlay of approximately $100 million during the next 3 or 4 years, which would serve to increase pressures upon the debt limit at a time when every effort is being made to limit the size of the national debt. An alternative source of power, the cost of which could be amortized over a period of 25 or more years, would reduce the pressure on the debt limit and thus be highly desirable from a standpoint of sound fiscal management.

Further, the Fulton steam plant would be on the periphery of the TVA area, 80 miles outside the Tennessee River Basin. As the President indicated at his press conference, the question whether the Government should continue to construct plants on the periphery of the basin, contemplating delivery of power far beyond the TVA area, involves a major question of public policy which was and is under study by the administration. A feasible alternative to immediate construction of the Fulton plant by TVA would provide time for completing the study of this question.

There was ample opportunity for interested parties to come forth with proposals to supply the Government's needs. Prior to the transmission of the budget message, discussions had been held with the private utility groups presently supplying power to the Atomic Energy Commission, and with representatives of other private utilities. Although the Government issued no formal invitations for bids for its additonal power needs, the statement in the President's budget message received wide publicity in the general press and the trade publications and was a matter of public knowledge, particularly in the Tennessee Valley area. The suggestion that bidding was restricted is entirely without foundation.

The obvious alternative to construction of a steam plant by TVA to serve its needs and those of the Atomic Energy Commission would be to extend the existing practice of having the Commission purchase a substantial portion of its needs from private utilities operating near its Paducah installation. Preliminary discussions with these suppliers soon developed the fact that it would be imprudent to place any further concentration of power supply in the Paducah area because of the difficulty of finding a market for such a large block of power in the event of a decline in AEC needs. Further explorations by AEC indicated that the difficulty of disposing of any such residue of power would be minimized if generating facilities were constructed in the Memphis area. Also, the TVA need is in the Memphis area, rather than at Paducah. Construction of facilities by private interests near Memphis would benefit both TVA and AEC, since any surplus resulting from a decline in AEC needs could best be disposed of in the Memphis area.

In February 1954, the Commission received a proposal from Middle South-Southern utilities for construction of a plant in the Memphis area for power to be delivered to the TVA system for the account of AEC. This arrangement would, as contemplated by the President's budget message, reduce TVA's commitments to AEC and thus permit the Authority to devote more of its capacity to other users. This proposal, however, was believed to involve excessive costs to the Government. After extensive discussions, the Middle South-Southern group submitted a revised proposal on April 10, 1954. It is this revised proposal which the administration approved on June 16 when the Atomic Energy Commission was instructed to proceed with negotiations looking toward the signing of a definitive contract with the Middle South-Southern group. (A detailed analysis of this proposal is attached.)

In comments in the press and elsewhere considerable attention has been devoted to the fact that this proposal contemplates construction of a steam plant at West Memphis, Ark., 200 miles from the Commission's Paducah installation. However, the fact that the proposed plant would be located some distance from Paducah is entirely consistent with the practice followed by TVA in the construction of steam plants to serve the Commission. In many instances these plants are widely separated from the installations of the Commission. For example, funds for TVA's generating plant at Widow's Creek and unit 4 of its Johnsonville steam plant were justified to Congress in 1949 in connection with supplying the needs of the AEC installation at Oak Ridge. Oak Ridge, however, is 200 miles away from the Johnsonville steam plant and 100 miles from the Widow's Creek generating plant.

The practice followed both in that instance and in the present proposal involves the replacement method of power supply, under which power is fed into a large integrated system at locations which bear only an incidental relationship to the locations at which the power is used. No exact relationship is possible because power fed into such a system loses its identity just as water from streams which feed into a lake cannot be identified with a particular stream. (There is attached a statement which explains in detail the replacement method of power supply which is presently used by TVA to meet AEC power requirements.)

Another feature of the proposed contract with the Middle South-Southern utilities group which has received considerable attention is the cost of the proposal as compared with estimated costs if additional generating capacity were to be constructed by TVA. Under the TCA estimates, the annual cost to AEC would be $16,884,000 or for 600,000 kilowatts of capacity. (Although TVA cost estimates have been sufficiently accurate to afford a satisfactory basis for comparison, it should be noted that the proposal for construction of additional generating capacity by TVA would afford no guarantee as to the ultimate cost of power to AEC.) Using TVA estimated costs as a yardstick, the Middle South-Southern proposal would cost the Government approximately $3,685,000 more per annum than the purchase of power from TVA. Of this amount, approximately 70 percent ($2,558,000) constitutes State and local taxes and interest on borrowings which is at a higher rate than interest on money borrowed by the Federal Government. The remainder $1,127,000) is due to additional transmission costs to bring the power across the Mississippi, and to a difference between estimated operating costs. The latter item will be greatly reduced if the sponsors can obtain fuel at Fulton at the same price as TVA, as responsible suppliers have indicated would be the case.

Taxes, of course, will not inure to the benefit of the contractors but will merely reimburse them for amounts which they must pay to the governmental entities involved and which will ultimately benefit the other taxpayers concerned. In fact, the only element of profit in this proposal is the return to the sponsors on their $5,500,000 of equity capital. This would amount to $495,000 annually.

While reported cost is necessarily an important factor, it cannot be the deciding factor in comparing the operations of a Federal agency with a private organization. There are many activities now performed by private enterprise for the Federal Government which the Government, because of its freedom from taxes and its enormous credit resources, could seem to perform more cheaply under a concept that nonpayment of taxes by the Federal Government is a true saving in cost. This concept ignores the consideration that when a commercial-type operation does not pay taxes, it leaves a larger amount of taxes to be absorbed by other taxpayers. If this concept were accepted and it were also considered sound to provide funds through Government borrowing, the Government might propose to take over these activities on the grounds that they would cost less under Government operation. Such action would be contrary to our basic conception of a private enterprise economy.

On May 26, 1954, while the proposal of the Middle South-Southern group was under consideration, another proposal was submitted by a group headed by Walter von Tresckow of New York City. Under this proposal, the group would construct and operate a steam plant at Fulton which would be fully integrated into and become a part of the TVA system.

The von Tresckow proposal contemplates that the Government would acquire ownership of the plant after 30 years, subject, however, to assumption by the Government of liabilities of the contractor which would still be outstanding at the end of that period under the amortization plan contemplated by the proposal. The arrangement would be, in effect, a cost-plus-fixed-fee contract under which the sponsors would receive a flat fee of $4 million for their services. Annual costs to the Government are estimated at a range between $19,346,000 and $22,022,000 as compared with the estimated annual cost of $20,569,000 under the Middle South-Southern utilities proposal. (A detailed analysis of the von Tresckow proposal is attached.)

While the two private proposals are sufficiently dissimilar as to make exact comparison impossible, the von Tresckow proposal is unsatisfactory because the Government would assume the entire risk of any increases in construction costs above those estimated by the sponsors, and the organization to accomplish the work does not exist. On the basis of the very general estimates and the limited information on which these estimates are founded, and because of the lack of definite knowledge that there would be a competent, skillful operating organization, it could not be concluded that there would be any less cost to the Government under this proposal than under the Middle South-Southern proposal; in fact, the von Tresckow proposal could result in substantially greater cost.

On the other hand, the Middle South-Southern proposal is a firm offer with a stated maximum capital cost; the proposed charges are reasonable in comparison with those of TVA when considered in connection with the fact that a private utility must pay State and local taxes and a higher rate of interest than that paid by the Federal Government; and the use of privately generated power will avoid an outlay of approximately $100 million of Federal tax revenues for capital investment over the next several years.

In view of the misunderstandings which have been created by comments in the press and elsewhere in recent weeks, it is important to emphasize the following facts:

1. The major risk will be assumed by the contractors, not by the Government.

2. Power will be made available in the Memphis area—where it is needed—not at Paducah, where it could become a liability.

3. There will be no windfall to the contractors. The additional charges to the Government will benefit local taxing authorities and taxpayers.

4. There is no significance in the location of the proposed plant 200 miles from the AEC installation. This is simply a method of replacing power that TVA itself has used in supplying AEC needs.

5. Interested parties have had ample notice and opportunity to make offers to supply the Government's needs..

6. The rejected proposal was on a cost-plus-fixed-fee basis involving substantial risk and no satisfactory guaranty to the Government.

7. The alternative of construction of a steam plant by TVA has consistently been rejected by the Congress.

EXPLANATION OF REPLACEMENT METHOD FOR MEETING AEC POWER REQUIREMENTS

Under the Dixon-Yates proposal the Atomic Energy Commission would procure power to meet its needs from a privately owned plant which would be located at a considerable distance from the AEC plant for which the power would be purchased.

This is not a new method of supplying AEC loads. It is a practice employed by TVA since 1949 when it began adding capacity to its system to serve AEC. In the past, whenever AEC requested additional power, the TVA has not (except for the initial load at Paducah) added the full capacity requested in the immediate vicinity of the AEC plant requiring the power. Instead, TVA has, with congressional and Bureau of the Budget approval, placed such capacity in its interconnected power system as much as 200 miles away from the AEC load.

TVA, therefore, has been practicing what is now proposed, namely, supplying the AEC requirements by replacement. The following examples, which include the major requests made by the AEC for additional power since AEC began expansion of facilities in 1949, illustrate this point:

The first major expansion of AEC facilities was authorized for Oak Ridge in 1949. To supply power to these new facilities TVA submitted a request to the Congress to build the first two units of the Widows Creek steam generating plant and unit No. 4 of the Johnsonville steam plant. This request was justified on the basis that part of the capacity was needed to supply the increased AEC load. The Johnsonville steam plant is located approximately 200 miles away from Oak Ridge, or a greater distance than the proposed Dixon-Yates plant is from Paducah. The Widows Creek plant is approximately 100 miles from Oak Ridge. The logical conclusion is that TVA located the Johnsonville and Widows Creek units so as to best meet the needs of its system and thus replace power supplied to AEC from plants nearer Oak Ridge.

The next AEC expansion was authorized in 1951 at Paducah; the requirements for it were contracted on a 50-50 basis with TVA and EEI to supply 500,000 kilowatts each. Late in 1952 it again became necessary to expand AEC facilities. TVA was requested to supply an additional 1,030,000 kilowatts for Oak Ridge and 705,000 kilowatts additional for Paducah.

To serve the Oak Ridge load, TVA requested appropriations for the construction of 2 units at Kingston, 2 units at John Sevier, and 2 at Gallatin. The Kingston plant is located adjacent to Oak Ridge, and when completed can be expected to supply all the Oak Ridge additional requirements, even though only 2 of the 9 units in this plant were justified to the Congress for AEC load growth. The John Sevier plant is 70 miles from Oak Ridge, and the Gallatin plant is 150 miles away. Here again TVA obviously planned the additional units at those plants to serve the needs of its system and to replace power which would be supplied Oak Ridge primarily from the Kingston plant.

The TVA Shawnee plant, located adjacent to Paducah, is a similar example. Congress appropriated funds for the first four units of this plant to meet the 1951 AEC expansion, and the location of the plant outside the Tennessee River Basin was justified on the basis that it would be located adjacent to the point of consumption at Paducah. Later, two more units were requested, not for AEC, but for normal load growth. Finally, four more units were requested in May 1952, on the basis of AEC's last request that TVA supply an additional 705,000 kilowatts at Paducah. In addition to the 4 units at Shawnee, TVA also requested part of 2 units at Gallatin to meet the additional Paducah load. Gallatin is approximately 130 miles from Paducah and the power supply for Paducah will not come from Gallatin, but from Shawnee, only 6 miles away. Here, again, is an instance of replacement in that units 5 and 6 at Shawnee, which were justified to supply the load growth in the western part of the TVA system, will be used in part to supply AEC, and a part of the normal growth of the area will be supplied by new generators at Gallatin justified on the basis of AEC added requirements.

The Dixon-Yates proposal to supply 600,000 kilowatts to the TVA system at Memphis, as replacement for TVA power furnished AEC at Paducah, is similar to the several previous arrangements on the TVA system described above. By providing for additional generating capacity at West Memphis to be fed back into the TVA grid in an amount which is necessary to assure delivery of the Commission's requirement at Paducah, this contract can properly be considered as a contract for electric utility service to installations of the Commission.

DETAILED ANALYSIS OF THE MIDDLE SOUTH-SOUTHERN PROPOSAL

On April 10, 1954, Middle South Utilities, Inc., and the Southern Co., as sponsors, submitted to the Atomic Energy Commission a firm proposal to furnish 600,000 kilowatts of firm power for the account of AEC. Under this proposal, a revised version of one submitted to AEC on February 25, 1954, they offered, subject to securing financing on the basis covered later:

1. To form a new company sponsored by Middle South Utilities, Inc., and the Southern Co.;

2. To secure the necessary capital requirements estimated at $107,250,000, by subscribing $5,500,000 or approximately 5 percent equity capital which will bear a return of 9 percent and issuing 30-year bonds to institutional investors for the remaining $101,750,000, or approximately 95 percent, based on an interest rate of 3½ percent.

3. To build a 650,000 kilowatt steam electric station near West Memphis, Ark., and to provide transmission facilities from the sponsors' new facilities to the middle of the Mississippi River between Shelby County, Tenn., and Crittenden County, Ark., including modifications to existing river crossing interconnections between TVA and Arkansas Power & Light Co. and its existing and future points of connection between subsidiaries of the Southern Co., Mississippi Power & Light Co., and TVA; and

4. To enter into a contract with the AEC for a period of 25 years from date of commencement of commercial operation of the first unit with provisions for two 5-year extensions.

The principal provisions of the Middle South-Southern proposal are as follows:

1. An annual base capacity charge, exclusive of taxes, of $8,775,000, subject to variation as follows:

(a) Up or down in case of increase or decrease in actual cost of construction compared with the estimate of $107,250,000 ($165 per kilowatt), with a maximum annual increase of $285,000;

(b) Up or down for changes in cost of fuel from 19 cents per million British thermal units for the fuel component included in the base capacity charge required to keep the plant in operation under no load conditions; and

(c) Upward only for power factor correction of less than 93 percent.

2. An energy charge of 1.86 mills per kilowatt hour subject to adjustments up or down in case of increase or decrease in fuel costs from 19 cents per million British thermal units and for increases or decreases in labor rates based on the 6 months' average hourly earnings of production workers in gas and electric-utility industries as compiled by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, using $1.97 per hour as a base.

3. Reimbursement by the AEC for all taxes, licenses, and fees (State, local, or Federal) paid or payable by the new corporation during the term of the contract except that taxes arising out of the use of facilities for purposes other than supply of capacity and energy to AEC will not be paid by AEC.

4. Cancellation may be made only by the AEC and is provided for as follows:

(a) For TVA to continue to receive and AEC to pay for power at the contract rates during a 3-year notice period. This period should be sufficient to permit TVA, if required, to make other arrangements of meeting the requirements of the Memphis area.

(b) After termination, the company shall have first call on the capacity and will absorb it as rapidly as load growth will permit, but in any event not less than 100,000 kilowatts per year. Costs associated with capacity absorbed by the sponsors will be borne by the sponsors.

(c) Any capacity not absorbed by the sponsors after the 3-year notice period may be assigned to another governmental agency at a price to be approved by FPC.

(d) In the event no capacity is called for during the notice period, the base capacity charge will be reduced by $1,500,000 and proportionately in case of partial reductions. After termination, the base capacity charge less the $1,500,000 will be reduced proportionately to the capacity absorbed by the sponsors.

(e) The total maximum cost of cancellation to the Government, assuming the plant is idle from date of notice of cancellation, is estimated at $40,012,500 plus fair and reasonable expenses payable to third parties.

5. The making of appropriate arrangements by the AEC with the TVA for the receipt by it and delivery to the AEC in kind of power and energy to be supplied as indicated above.

A comparison of annual cost to the Federal Government for power supply delivered to the TVA system in the Memphis area for the account of AEC is attached (attachment 1).

Analysis of the Middle South-Southern proposal from the standpoint of its net cost to the Government, including State and local taxes, as compared with the estimate for constructing a TVA plant near Memphis, shows an annual cost to the Government of $20,569,000 for the private companies' proposal, as compared with $16,884,000 estimated for the TVA plant. The difference of $3,685,000 is due to the following items:

	Amount	Percent of total
State and local taxes	$1, 499, 000	41
Difference in cost of money	1, 059, 000	29
Extra fuel transportation costs	309, 000	8
Difference in operating costs	211, 000	6
Total for Middle South-Southern	3, 078, 000	84
TVA transmission costs	607, 000	16
Total additional costs	3, 686, 000	100

The difference in cost due to taxes is self-explanatory. The difference in cost of money is between 2½ percent for Government borrowing as compared with about 3¾ percent for private financing, at a reasonable rate for the private corporation. These 2 items make up 70 percent of the total difference and reflect the lack by the private group of special advantages available to TVA as an agency of the Federal Government.

The item for extra fuel transportation costs recognizes the possibility of increased costs because the Memphis location is some 55 miles farther from the sources of coal supply than Fulton. However if, as the private group has been assured by responsible suppliers, coal can be supplied for the same cost as at Fulton, this difference in cost would disappear.

The difference in operating costs is due to TVA's estimate that it can operate its plant at a lower cost than the company.

The extra transmission costs are due to higher estimated costs for transmitting the company power from midriver delivery point to the TVA system as compared with transmission of Fulton plant power into the system.

The comparative cost to AEC is shown on a second analysis, comparing Middle South-Southern costs with the cost of power to AEC at Paducah from TVA's Shawnee plant. This analysis is attached (attachment 2).

The annual cost to AEC, excluding taxes, would amount to $18,640,000, compared with $18,036,000 that AEC would pay TVA under the terms of the present arrangement at Paducah for an equivalent amount of power. The difference of $604,000 is more than accounted for by a calculated higher cost of coal at the new plant because of added distance from the source of supply. It should be noted that the new Fulton plant, proposed by TVA, would be in the same area and would have to meet an added cost of coal possibly as great as mentioned above.

TVA has suggested a number of adjustments in both of the above-mentioned analyses which would show higher costs to the Government and to AEC, respectively. However, expert and unbiased opinion is that the comparisons shown are fair and reasonable, and that the adjustments suggested by TVA should not be accepted.

There are several significant considerations in connection with this proposal:

1. By utilizing private utilities, the Federal Government will save a capital outlay of at least $100 million over the next 3 years, the cost estimated by TVA for the construction of equivalent capacity at the Fulton site.

2. The sponsors' proposal is a firm offer with a stated maximum capital cost reflected in the demand charge whereby a ceiling is placed on maximum liability on capital cost to the Government. The sponsors bear one-half of any possible increased cost from an estimated cost of $107,250,000 to $117 million and all the cost above $117 million. In addition, if the plant is built for less than $107,250,000 the Government will share 50 percent of the saving.

3. There is no guaranty as to the ultimate capital cost of a TVA plant, even though that agency has had a favorable construction record in recent years.

4. The proposal provides a guaranty and a real incentive on the part of the sponsors to assure that capital costs do not exceed $107,250,000. Thus, if the cost should go to $117 million, the return on $5,500,000 of equity capital would be reduced from 9 percent ($495,000) to 3.8 percent ($210,000). If the capital cost should exceed $117 million, return on equity capital would rapidly reduce to zero. Thus, the sponsors have a real risk under the proposal offered and a compelling reason to keep capital costs below the estimated cost of $107,250,000.

5. In addition, the plant is not completely amortized at the end of the 25-year contract. There is 24.6 percent of the debt not retired at the end of 25 years so the rate under the proposal does not provide for completely amortizing the plant over the 25-year period.

6. Acceptance of the proposal will help spread the risk in the event of future reduction in the AEC power requirements, which will in 1957 amount to about 30 percent of the TVA power supply.

ATTACHMENT 1.—*Comparison of annual cost to Federal Government for power supply delivered to TVA system in Memphis area (for 600,000 kilowatts of demand and 5.2 billion kilowatt-hours a year)*

ESTIMATED COST OF INCREASING TVA NET CAPABILITY 650,000 KILOWATTS (AT FULTON OR AT FULTON AND JOHNSONVILLE)

Fixed costs: Plant and transmission facilities (interest 2½ percent, 30-year amortization, replacements, insurance, and fixed operating costs)	[1] $7,580,000
Variable costs (fuel cost 18.4 cents per million British thermal units)	[1] 9,304,000
Total	16,884,000
Cost to Government:	
Per year	$16,884,000
Per kilowatt-hour ____mills	3.25

DIXON-YATES PROPOSAL (NEW PLANT OF 650,000 KILOWATTS NET CAPABILITY AT WEST MEMPHIS, ARK.)

Demand charges (interest 3½ percent, 30-year amortization, 9-percent return on equity, replacements, insurance, and fixed operating costs)	$8,775,000
Energy charges (fuel cost 19 cents per million British thermal units	[2] $9,688,000
Total, Dixon-Yates charges	$18,463,000
TVA transmission costs (from point of interconnection at middle of river to TVA Memphis substation)	607,000
Cost to Government (excluding taxes):	
Per year	$19,070,000
Per kilowatt-hour ____mills	3.67
Taxes:	
Arkansas, State and local	$1,499,000
Federal income	$820,000
Subtotal	$2,319,000
Cost to Government (including taxes):	
Per year	$21,389,000
Per kilowatt-hour ____mills	4.11
Less Federal income tax	$820,000
Net cost to Government:	
Per year	$20,569,000
Per kilowatt-hour ____mills	3.96
Additional cost to Government per year	$3,685,000

[1] Distribution of total costs to fixed and variable components made on basis comparable to Dixon-Yates demand and energy charges.

[2] If coal can be delivered by barge to Memphis site of Dixon-Yates, 55 miles downstream from Fulton, at same cost as at Fulton (as assumed by Dixon-Yates), then this cost would be reduced by $309,000.

ATTACHMENT 2.—*Comparison of annual cost of power supply for the AEC Paducah project (for 600,000 kilowatts of demand and 5.2 billion kilowatt-hours per year)*

TVA-PADUCAH CONTRACT

Demand charges	$8,206,000
Energy charges (fuel cost 15½ cents per million British thermal units) [1]	$9,828,000
Total cost, per year	$18,036,000
Total cost per kilowatt-hour mills	3.47

Footnotes at end of table.

DIXON-YATES PROPOSAL

Demand charges	$8,775,000
Energy charges (fuel cost 19 cents per million British thermal units) [1]	$9,688,000
Additional TVA transmission costs	[2] $177,000
Total cost (excluding taxes):	
Per year	$18,640,000
Per kilowatt-hour ____mills	3.58
Taxes:	
Arkansas, State and local	$1,499,000
Federal income	$820,000
Subtotal	$2,319,000
Total cost (including taxes):	
Per year	$20,959,000
Per kilowatt-hour ____mills	4.03
Additional cost per year	$2,923,000

[1] Presently available coal prices were used, with an assumed transportation cost differential of 80 cents a ton (equivalent to 3.5 cents per million British thermal units) between the Shawnee plant and the Dixon-Yates site. Such transportation differential would result in fuel costs in the amount of $1,820,000.

[2] Represents the difference in TVA's annual transmission costs to deliver power from the Fulton and Johnsonville plants ($430,000) and their corresponding costs from the receiving point for Dixon-Yates power ($607,000).

DETAILED ANALYSIS OF THE WALTER VON TRESCKOW PROPOSAL

This proposal was submitted by a group composed of the following: Walter von Tresckow, financial and economic consultant, New York City; Harvey Weeks, New York City; John N. Mitchell; Salomon Bros. & Hutzler, investment bankers of New York City; George H. Schwartz, of Schwartz, Nathanson & Cohen, attorneys, New York City; Zelig Nathanson, of Schwartz, Nathanson & Cohen, New York City; and Robert W. Larrow, of MacNamara & Larrow, attorneys, Burlington, Vt.

This group proposed to form a Tennessee corporation which would finance, design, build, and operate a steamplant with a net capability of 620,000 kilowatts on TVA's Fulton site under a no-risk contract with AEC and/or TVA. Such a plant would be fully integrated into and become a part of the TVA system. The financing would be 100 percent debt financing on 35-year mortgage revenue bonds at 3½ percent interest, with amortization over a period of 30 years, beginning with the sixth year. The design, construction, and operation of the plant would be on a cost basis with no limit on liability of the Government and no risk on the part of the proposed corporation except for a $20-million bond to protect the Government against increases in construction costs from $200 per kilowatt to $233 per kilowatt for a 3-unit plant of 600,000 kilowatt nameplate rating. The Government would bear the full cost of plant construction up to $200 per kilowatt and any costs in excess of $233 per kilowatt.

The Government would pay for power at the rate of 5 mills per kilowatt-hour, and at the end of each year would receive a patronage dividend representing the difference between the 5-mill rate and actual cost of operation, including production, management expense, taxes, interest, and amortization of debt. The group indicated willingness to consider downward adjustment in the 5-mill rate as long as any adjusted rate resulted in maintaining sufficient margin adequately to cover debt service charges. The group submitted an estimate of capital costs ranging from $90 million to $100 million.

As compensation the sponsors would receive a fee of $4 million to be paid during the fourth and fifth year of the contract period, that is, prior to commencement of amortization debt payments. An alternate method of payment was also proposed which would provide for payment of $1 million in the fourth year; the balance of $3 million to be paid at such times during the period of the contract that the Government might suggest, with interest at the rate of 4½ percent per annum on any unpaid balances after the fourth year.

The sponsoring group proposed a contract with AEC for a period of 25 years following the commencement of delivery of power under the contract, and a subsidiary contract with TVA on the same terms as the AEC contract for a period of 32 years from the commencement of delivery of power to AEC, with deliveries under the TVA contract to start at the expiration of deliveries under the AEC contract (at the end of 25 years), or at an earlier date if AEC cancels prior to the end of its contract term.

They further proposed at the end of 30 years to turn over to TVA for $1 the plant, together with all working capital and other assets of the corporation, if at that time TVA will assume all remaining outstanding bonded indebtedness and current obligations. An alternate proposal would provide that the Government, either through AEC or TVA, could in the event of cancellation take title to the plant and also assume all outstanding liabilities of the corporation.

The sponsoring group indicated that a separate management corporation would be organized to operate the plant. They advised the AEC that this management corporation would be staffed with properly qualified individuals. However, they preferred not to divulge the identity of the individuals being considered for key jobs in the management corporation.

The estimates submitted as part of the proposal are based on a plant having net capability of 620,000 kilowatts delivering 4.73 billion kilowatt-hours per year. The group has given a low and high estimated annual cost on this basis, ranging from $17,226,000 (3.64 mills per kilowatt-hour) to $20,957,000 (4.3 mills per kilowatt-hour).

As indicated previously, the von Tresckow proposal is a cost-type proposal with all risk being assumed by the Federal Government, and therefore a direct cost comparison with the Dixon-Yates proposal, which includes elements of risk and limitations on Government liability, is not valid. However, an analysis has been made to outline the possible differences in cost between the two proposals. This analysis is attached (attachment 3).

For purposes of comparability, this analysis is based on provision of 600,000 kilowatts of capacity and 5.2 billion kilowatt-hours per year, an average heat rate over the 25-year period of 9,674 British thermal units and a fuel cost of 18.4 cents per million British thermal units which is TVA's estimate of the cost of fuel delivered to the Fulton site. On this basis the comparative costs range from a low estimate of $19,346,000 (3.72 mills) to a high estimate of $22,022,000 (4.24 mills) as compared to $20,569,000 (3.96 mills) for the Middle South-Southern proposal.

The analysis also shows that annual cost could increase as much as from $20,977,000 (4.03 mills) to $23,653,000 (4.55 mills) due to increased construction costs, as compared to $20,854,000 (4.01 mills) for the Middle South-Southern proposal.

On the basis of the very general estimates and the limited information on which these estimates are founded, and the lack of definite knowledge that there would be a competent, skillful operating organization, it could not be concluded that there would be any savings to the Federal Government under this proposal as compared with the Middle South-Southern proposal.

Following are several significant considerations in connection with this proposal:

1. Complete risk for all cost is assumed by the Federal Government and there is no ceiling on maximum liability except as may be covered by the performance bond previously discussed.

2. The estimates used are quite general and as far as can be determined are not based on any preliminary engineering studies or any firm commitments for fuel supply.

3. Realization of the estimates depends entirely on the ability and skill of the groups who will design, build, and operate. There are no other safeguards to insure reasonable limitation on costs.

4. The essential difference between this proposal and a direct appropriation to TVA is that a capital outlay by the United States of approximately $100 million, the cost estimated by TVA for construction of equivalent capacity at the Fulton site, would not be necessary. Under this proposal the capital would be provided by privately issued bonds at 3½ percent, the full interest and amortization on which, together with a $4 million fee, would be ultimately paid by the Government.

Attachment 3.—*Comparison of cost to Federal Government for power supply delivered to TVA system in Memphis area (for 600,000 kilowatts of demand and 5.2 billion kilowatt-hours per year)*

	Von Tresckow estimate		Dixon-Yates proposal, firm contract
	Low estimate	High estimate	
Federal capital investment required:			
1. For generating plant	None	None	None
2. For transmission lines	$10,156,000	$10,156,000	$9,840,000
Total	10,156,000	10,156,000	9,840,000
Annual cost to Federal Government:			
1. Estimated base cost before taxes	19,196,000	20,922,000	19,070,000
2. State and local taxes	150,000	1,100,000	1,499,000
3. Federal income tax			820,000
4. Total, including taxes	19,346,000	22,022,000	21,389,000
Mills per kilowatt-hour	(3.72)	(4.24)	(4.11)
5. Credit for Federal income tax			820,000
6. Net cost to Federal Government	19,346,000	22,022,000	20,569,000
Mills per kilowatt-hour	(3.72)	(4.24)	(3.96)
7. Possible increased cost (due to capital cost exceeding the estimate)	20,977,000	23,653,000	20,854,000
Mills per kilowatt-hour	(4.03)	(4.55)	(4.01)
8. Sponsors guaranty against further increase	None	None	[1]

[1] Contract guaranty.

Editorial Comment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JEFFREY P. HILLELSON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 12, 1954

Mr. HILLELSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following editorial from the July 6, 1954, edition of the Independence Examiner, Independence, Mo.:

A Hard One To Figure Out

One is inclined to agree with Congressman Jeffrey Hillelson when he said last Saturday "I don't believe that our Government should be spending money outside the United States for employment of other people when it means the possible loss of some jobs in the United States."

He was referring to the recent passage of the $3,338,000,000 foreign aid bill, which he voted against. And the Congressman from the fourth district of which Independence is a part also said he believes the whole foreign policy of the United States should be reappraised.

Congressman Hillelson declared that the offshore procurement contracts, which have been signed by the Department of the Army as a United States agent for production of ammunition in foriegn countries, were one reason why he voted against the Foreign Aid Bill.

This business of setting up plants in other countries and employing persons there to make ammunition is not met with too much enthusiasm, particularly at points in this country where part of the economy of those communities is affected by employment at United States Army arsenals—such as Independence which has such a plant in its own backyard.

The enthusiasm is even less when there has been a lay-off of an estimated 2,000 persons at the Lake City plant because of the curtailment of production of small arms ammunition at all plants througout the country according to the Office of the Secretary of the Army. If there is a great backlog of such ammunition as the Army indicates by cutting the production, then of course there is no point in continuing operations. But, in the face of new contracts for the making of the same or similar types of ammuntion in other countries, as announced, a lot of people, particularly those who have been released from the plants, see red.

That was the case with an Independence woman who saw a news dispatch stating that a $9 million contract for .30 caliber ammunition is expected to be signed soon by the United States Army and 2 Japanese firms. She had just been released at Lake City. Later another dispatch told of contracts being signed with Yugoslavia for production of 104 millimeter and 76 millimeter shells.

Congressman Hillelson went into the matter with the Office of the Secretary of the Army. He was told offshore procurement of ammunition contracted for the fiscal year 1954, amounted to $226 million while deliveries by United States producers for the same period amounted to about $3,200 million. That, the Army spokesman said, indicated only 7 percent of the ammunition procured was offshore.

Answers to questions asked by Hillelson were not conclusive as they were not in the case of Senator Edward J. Thye, of Minnesota, who, last February, asked the Army office to tell him what effect offshore procurement has had with respect to curtailment of production in the United States, leading to extensive layoff of workers. Senator Thye got no answer to this in the first letter he received. The Army spokesman stated that "present offshore ammunition procurement programs, had they been scheduled with producers in this country, would serve only briefly to sustain our present expanded production rate."

Senator THYE tried again, asking specific questions such as, "How many American workers have been displaced by the offshore procurement?" and, "Are offshore procurements being made at the expense of American workers and American manufacturers?" He got a long letter back detailing the whole offshore program, quoting figures above as to amounts spent last year, and stating that "production of ammunition being contracted offshore through the MDAP-Army program is for delivery to, and consumption by, NATO and other Allied forces." It was also said that "Funds used are appropriated for foreign aid specifically and are not part of the Army's regular budget."

As to answers to Senator THYE's specific questions about the affect on employment in United States arsenals—well they weren't forthcoming. This was part of the last letter to him: "Estimates of the numbers of American workers who are affected adversely by MDAP-Army offshore procurement are not available, and if computed would be highly hypothetical."

A lot of mumbo-jumbo as we see it. Senator THYE must have thought so too, for he had all the letters in the exchange spread on the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The Mutual Security Act

SPEECH

OF

HON. BROOKS HAYS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 12, 1954

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 9678) to promote the security and foreign policy of the United States by furnishing assistance to friendly nations, and for other purposes.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, too many people, it seems to me, have come to give unthinking currency to that old phrase "giveaway program" when they refer to our mutual-security operations. This program is, in fact, one which is vital to the defense of the United States of America—just as much as the vast sums which we have shown our willingness to grant freely to our own Armed Forces. The program which we have before us today is complex; it includes a great variety of activities in many different parts of the world. But they are all linked, directly or indirectly, by the contribution they are making, and will continue to make, to the safety of our own country and our own free way of life.

That way of life is challenged in every part of the world today. The immediate form of the challenge varies from place to place; therefore, the defense against it must vary from place to place. But everywhere the ultimate target of the Communist challenge can be seen to be this very Nation of ours, citadel of liberty and enterprise. And, therefore, it is up to us to act to resist the challenge as best we can wherever it rears its ugly head, with whatever means are appropriate in a particular place, with whatever allies we can obtain in a particular situation—before our own country becomes the immediate target of a Communist surge which shall have engulfed the other continents of earth. We in America can count ourselves blessed that that menace is still at long range, that we have some time left to shore up the defenses of the whole free world—defences which constitute the outer bulwarks of our own national security.

And the great virtue of this mutual-security program is that it is so carefully devised to meet the particular dangers which exist in each particular area with the particular weapons—military, economic, educational, psychological—which offer the best prospect, within the prudent limits of our means, to counter those dangers area by area.

We are not putting all our eggs in one basket.

We are not putting all our reliance on the atom bomb to deter communism. We know the Communists can infiltrate areas where we dare not risk using the atom bomb.

We are not putting all our reliance on our own Armed Forces. We know that we do not possess the manpower to police the world.

We are not putting all our reliance on conventional armaments in the hands of others. We know that unpopular governments can be subverted by Communists from within even where the Communists would hesitate or be unable to use direct armed force from without.

We are not putting all our reliance on large-scale economic development assistance. We know that some countries cannot absorb it and that too-rapid social change may sometimes simply throw oil on the leaping flames of communism.

We are not putting all our reliance on technical assistance. We know that the widespread benefits of point 4 cannot in every case improve the situation fast enough to meet the Communist challenge.

We are not putting all our reliance on unilateral American action in these fields. We know that often a particular activity is more acceptable to other peoples if handled through the United Nation, free from suspicion of United States pressure.

So we are presenting to the House a program which integrates these various partial solutions, dovetailing them to the varied circumstances and needs of the free peoples. To be sure, the world situation is still fluid, especially in the Far East. We must leave the administrators leeway to make future adjustments. But the House and the American people should be reassured to know that the authorization now before us has already been subjected to most intensive scrutiny and criticism. The Foreign Affairs Committee held daily hearings for almost three months—twice a day during the last 3 weeks. Every executive proposal for substantial expenditures, in every country concerned, has been minutely examined, both separately and from the viewpoint of an integrated program. The result is a plan of authorization which merits confidence.

My Democratic friends will recognize that this represents the continuation of several programs which our party initiated. And may I say that although there have been times in recent months when Democrats were legitimately disturbed at what seemed to be the hesitation of this administration to grasp the hand of bipartisanship which we have so freely extended—still this particular bill constitutes a fine example of nonpartisan, painstaking congressional activity in which the participants on both sides can properly take pride. Democrats and Republicans alike deserve credit for important contributions to the bill that is before us. Correspondingly, my fellow partisans should avoid the temptation to stand smugly aside and point a finger of scorn at an overseas program which is obviously not succeeding everywhere. We cannot expect it to. As Americans, we can only do our best, and seek to persuade others to do likewise.

The objective is the defense of the United States—to be achieved through a defense in depth—not the kind of a defense which would begin by fatalistically conceding to the Communists the population and resources of half the world. We intend to do our best to work with the non-Communist peoples of the earth to keep them non-Communist—not to attempt to remake them in our own image, not to turn them into semicolonial dependencies of the United States, but to encourage and assist them to be come self-governing and progressive, imbued with national self-respect and determined to maintain a position independent of Moscow and Peiping.

We have suffered setbacks in these efforts. We are suffering setbacks today, mainly in southeast Asia. These setbacks give us cause for grave concern—but surely do not justify any abandonment or suspension of our activities in that area, which is so vital to our whole defensive position in the Far East.

We should take heart from the notable successes which our programs have achieved in other areas of the world—in Europe, in the Middle East, in Korea, and Japan. In all of these places the chances of Communist triumphs in the near future seem smaller than at any time since 1947. The immediate crisis area has been narrowed to southeast Asia. There it may be that we are bound to experience Communist gains as long as neither our own Government nor our allies show the willingness to intervene more actively. But in the apparent absence of a will to do so, this House should at least recognize that the kind of varied, flexible program which we are presenting today goes as far as is feasible to salvage as much as possible from the grasping claws of Asian communism. Half a loaf is better than none—and we ourselves may find it more digestible than the whole loaf of direct intervention.

We must take guard also that we do not allow our frustrations in southeast Asia to undermine the successes we have achieved elsewhere in building situations of growing strength through cooperation with allies and friendly peoples. It is bad enough to lose ground in Indochina without then compounding the evil by tearing apart the Big Three alliance, merely in order to allocate the blame.

I certainly believe that the establishment of a position of strength in southeast Asia—and in Indochina itself—is a vital national interest of the United States. But I also know that whatever happens in that area, we Americans are going to continue to need in many places—and ought to value—the cooperation of those few other great peoples of earth who share with us a long tradition of democratic self-government and adhere to western principles of justice. The very preservation of our civilization in the fullest sense requires a ready interchange of the resources of the Western world—not just the material resources, however indispensable they may be, but also the intellectual, moral, and spiritual resources of the various nations which share our Christian heritage. We will impoverish our minds if we shut our ears to the ideas of our close allies, just as we would impoverish our material capacity to resist communism if we were to isolate ourselves from the great areas of the world. We have got to keep these channels open.

We should remember that it is not much better to shut ourselves off from the advice of our friends merely because of an exaggerated sense of our own righteousness, than it would be to shut ourselves off because of base timidity. Lately the course of events in southeast Asia has led us toward moral and political pitfalls. Many Americans seem to the parading our national piety, and adopting toward friendly but hard-pressed peoples a holier-than-thou attitude, which is of course deeply offensive to them—and which in turn threatens to produce in ourselves an inbreeding of thought that could disastrously blind us to the realities of the world in which we live. Pride, including spiritual pride, "goeth before a fall." It would be well for all Americans to keep this in mind in voicing judgment upon our allies for their reluctance always to go along with us.

We cannot escape our position of world leadership. And wise leadership, like love, suffers long and is kind.

We can still learn from those we lead.

Nor is it we who are doing all the suffering. The principle of mutual security is a principle of proportionate sacrifice for joint defense. The defense burdens individually borne by our allies may not approach ours in dollar totals—but they are being carried by peoples with much lower standards of living than ours, who are eager as we are to improve their standards. In many cases for them to increase their own defense burdens would simply play directly into the hands of the Communists—with the result that the net gain in will and capacity for defense would negligible.

At the NATO headquarters in Paris, a French colonel with decades of service—including World War II and two 3-year tours of combat duty in Indochina—receives no more pay than an American master sergeant. We prosperous Americans need to think a little more deeply about the real meaning of equality of sacrifice whenever we are tempted to bandy about the notion that FOA is a giveaway.

Mr. Chairman, I have had the bright hope—and I have not yet despaired of its fulfillment—that this legislation might be viewed as a symbol of our acceptance of leadership of the peoples of the world who are eager for peace, conditioned by justice and decency; that the positive phases of this great program would be emphasized; and that no one might say, whatever differences as to detail should develop, that we do this grudgingly and only because of the fears and tensions that exist. There are compelling reasons for this legislation, Mr. Chairman. I am firmly convinced that it is in America's interest. The fact that it is also in the interest of others who are still free to determine their own destiny and to build their own structures of government, does not make it less in our own Nation's interest. I believe the day will come when everyone of us who takes this view will recall with satisfaction having had a share in one of the most significant enactments of the postwar period.

Why the Delay?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 12, 1954

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include an appropriate editorial entitled, "Why the Delay?" appearing in the Pilot of July 10, 1954, the official publication of the archdiocese of Boston:

WHY THE DELAY?

The best of legislation very often faces not one but two real tests of its strength. First, a bill is considered and debated before the duly authorized legislators prior to its passage into law; secondly, having been passed, the new legal instrument must weather the administrative trials which necessarily arise in its proper execution. We might in a sense look upon this two-sided struggle of a piece of legislation as a test of its capability to become law and its ultimate operability as law.

All this brings to mind the situation surrounding the Refugee Relief Act which was passed by the Congress last summer and signed by the President in August. What with the discussions and sometimes bitter controversies provoked by the parent law of all immigration, the McCarran Act, it was little wonder that such a bill permitting the admission of 214,000 persons from refugee or overpopulated areas came in for its share of opposition. Now, almost a year after its enactment, the effectiveness of the Refugee Act has scarcely been demonstrated. Up to the present time hardly any visas have been granted under this new law; perhaps as few as 50, according to available figures. The question then comes to mind, why the delay?

Not without some merit has been the explanation in certain quarters that it has taken these many months to set in motion all the details of administration. Undoubtedly, those charged with the management of the act have been hard at work, and it is hoped that in the coming months the processing of applicants for admission to the country will be greatly speeded. On the other hand, it must be remembered that this whole business is not something entirely new. During the years 1948–52 the displaced persons program was in operation, and more than 400,000 people came to these shores. Surely the experience gained at that time, even admitting of present personnel turnover, should facilitate the current program.

In view of the broad scope and ambition of this new act, embracing as it does peoples of the Far and Near East as well as Europeans outside the Iron Curtain, it is evident that bottlenecks have occurred somewhere along the line. Whatever they have been, wherever they have been, in this country or overseas, difficulties involved in the carrying out of this act must be overcome. Time is of the essence; obstacles therefore must be eradicated.

As citizens and as Catholics it is not easy for us to disavow interest in a resettlement program which Pope Pius has referred to on many occasions as the only solution to the problems of many afflicted peoples of the world. Recalling the magnificent achievement under the previous displaced persons acts when over 135,000 persons were resettled by Catholic agencies under the supervision of the War Relief Services—National Catholic Welfare Conference (not exceeded by any of the other 14 sponsorsing groups), we can be sure that our church leaders will not be remiss in following out the present law. It remains then for the individual Catholics to alert themselves to their part in the Refugee Relief Act. This new bill requires assurances by an individual citizen that any person being admitted will have a home, a job, and that there is no danger of his becoming a public charge.

Distressed as we might be by the seemingly quiescent state of the act a year after its passage, may we in no way impede its future progress. Good only until December 1956, this noble and generous assistance on the part of our Government to our less fortunate brethren of the world can stand no further delay. For our part as Catholics we can keep in mind and heart the prayer to Our Lady of the Migrant written by the Holy Father:

"Most Holy Virgin Mary, escort of exiles, who trudge the roads of all the world in search of work and bread, look with compassion upon our situation and bless all who help us." (Pius XII, 1954.)

Elbridge Gerry, Signer of the Declaration of Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 12, 1954

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial published in the Washington Evening Star of Saturday, July 10, 1954. It is entitled "Tribute to Elbridge Gerry."

Elbridge Gerry was a native of Marblehead, Mass., and is the only signer of the Declaration of Independence to have found his final resting place in Washington. It is interesting to note that the term "gerrymandering," which we hear so often in political debate, was derived from his name.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRIBUTE TO ELBRIDGE GERRY

Elbridge Gerry was the only signer of the Declaration of Independence to find a final resting place in Washington. He was a native of Marblehead, Mass., born July 17, 1744. The story of his youth is incomplete, but it is known that he was graduated from Harvard in 1762, joined his father and two elder brothers in the shipping, export, and import trade and was elected to the Colonial General Court in 1772, thus meeting and becoming closely associated with Samuel Adams. A more natural alliance never happened. As events developed John Hancock temporarily was added to the partnership. Matters came to a climax on April 18–19, 1775, at Lexington and Concord.

Gerry also was influenced by Thomas Jefferson, whom he had met in New York as early as 1764. When he journeyed to the Congress in Philadelphia with John Adams late in January 1776 he was an implacable enemy of King George III. Naturally then, he voted for Richard Henry Lee's resolution and the adoption of the Declaration. His work subsequently was more individualistic. He was a merchant and a stern republican. His objection to the Federal Constitution drove him deeper into isolation and left him in a gloomy frame of mind, but his usefulness to his country was by no means ended. He was a member of the XYZ mission to France in 1797–98, Governor of Massachusetts in 1810–12, Vice President of the United States in 1813–14, his term ending with his sudden death on November 23 of the last named year.

The relation of Elbridge Gerry to Washington was that of a father, for it was he who, on October 17, 1783, first suggested in Congress the creation of a Federal Capital in the Potomac region, near Georgetown. Three monuments in his honor exist in the District of Columbia—namely, the shaft erected over his grave in the Congressional Cemetery, his collection of books in the Supreme Court Building, and the phrase "gerrymandering," often used in political debate to connote geographical maneuvering for partisan advantage. The District of Columbia Society of the Sons of the American Revolution did well to honor him on this past Fourth of July.

Opinion Poll Report for Brighton, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 2, 1954

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a partial report on the results of a questionnaire which I mailed early in April of this year to the residents of the district which I represent here in the Congress of the United States.

My purpose in conducting such an opinion poll during my first term here in Washington was not only to enable myself to better represent the people of my district, but to acquaint them personally with some of the vital issues here in Washington.

The number of returns, and the interest displayed, have been most gratifying. I feel that the poll has been mutually beneficial. Following is a copy of the letter which accompanied the questionnaire, and the tabulated results for Brighton, Mass.:

UNITED STATES
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR NEIGHBORS: As your Representative here in Washington, it would be invaluable for me to have the opinions of the people of our congressional district on matters which are vital to all of us.

I realize that you elected me with the expectation that I would always exercise my own best judgment in arriving at a decision as to how the vote for our district will be cast. It is a responsibility and a privilege which I welcome, and I hope that I shall always merit your trust and confidence.

If I had available a cross section of the views of the residents of the 11th Congressional District, and also any comments they might have on any given subject, it would help in clarifying the issues and reaching a truly representative decision.

Attached is a questionnaire on a group of subjects. I will be indebted to you if you will answer them, and also give your views in the spaces allotted. You need not add your signature if you would prefer not to do so.

Each of the questionnaires returned will be read by me personally, and a tabulation will be made. I shall appreciate your cooperation and assistance, and I am looking forward to your response.

With every good wish,

Sincerely,

THOMAS P. O'NEILL, Jr.,
Member of Congress.

Questionnaire

	Yes	No	No opinion
FOREIGN POLICY			
1. Do you approve of the present method of handling our international relations?	391	475	145
2. Do you believe that the United States Government should continue our foreign-aid program?	624	293	94
3. Do you feel that we should continue military aid to foreign nations?	821	139	51
4. Do you favor the continuation of economic aid to foreign nations?	673	244	94
5. Do you support the point 4 program (supplying technical assistance, manufacturing know-how and management skills to underdeveloped nations to help them help themselves)?	898	92	21
(a) Do you believe this program should be reduced?	112	566	383
6. Do you believe that Russia should be permitted to remain in the United Nations?	556	404	51
7. Do you believe Communist China should be seated in the United Nations?	142	828	41
TARIFF POLICY			
1. Do you support the present methods of handling tariffs?	151	344	516
2. Do you believe that foreign goods should come into the United States regardless of the effect that it may have on the American worker?	141	719	151
3. Do you understand the present Government method of handling tariffs?	314	425	272
STATEHOOD			
1. Do you favor conferring statehood on—			
(a) Alaska?	718	162	131
(b) Hawaii?	788	142	81
TAX POLICY			
1. Do you believe that the Federal Government should spend more money than it receives in income?	111	829	71
If opposed, which of these steps would you take—			
(a) Keep taxes high?	212	314	485
(b) Cut domestic spending?	475	141	395
2. Do you feel taxes should be cut more than they already have been?	303	283	425
3. Do you support an increase in the exemption for dependents?	161	759	212
4. Do you favor cutting income taxes across the board percentagewise?	344	455	191
5. Do you believe in more exemption for dividends and other unearned income?	222	526	263
6. Do you support exemptions to cover expenses for college educations?	283	556	172
7. Do you favor an exemption for the first $1,500 of retired income?	819	121	71
SOCIAL SECURITY, HEALTH AND WELFARE			
1. Do you believe that the present 2 percent social security tax on the employee should be maintained?	778	91	142
2. Do you believe it should be returned to 1½ percent?	61	718	232
3. Do you support an increase in old-age assistance benefits?	789	111	111
4. Do you favor an increase in the death benefits under social security?	577	222	212
5. Do you believe that hospitalization, sickness, and accident insurance should be covered by Federal law?	292	608	111
HOUSING			
1. Do you believe that more low-cost housing should be built by the State and Federal Governments?	455	475	81
2. Do you believe these should be multiple-unit dwellings?	172	465	374
3. Do you feel they should be in 2-family units?	170	431	410
LABOR LEGISLATION			
1. Are you in favor of raising the minimum wage?	546	363	102
2. Do you feel this would be helpful to New England insofar as competing with the Southern States is concerned?	435	344	232
3. In your opinion could small business afford an increase?	354	323	334
4. Do you believe that the Taft-Hartley Act is fair to management and labor?	394	334	283
(a) Would you favor outright repeal?	142	536	333
(b) Would you favor changes through amendments?	485	121	405
5. Are there sections of this law which you feel are oppressive to workers?	324	293	394
6. Are there, in your opinion, sections which are oppressive to small business?	263	243	505
ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY			
1. Do you understand the questions involved in the St. Lawrence seaway?	545	233	233
2. Do you feel that the construction of the seaway would hurt employment in our area?	273	374	364
3. Do you believe the St. Lawrence seaway would hurt the future economy of the New England area?	253	394	364
VOTING AGE			
1. Do you believe that persons who are 18 years old should be given the right to vote in national elections?	375	596	40

Questionnaire—Continued

	Yes	No	No opinion
LOCAL ISSUES			
1. Do you believe the port of Boston should have more Federal assistance?	566	172	273
2. In your opinion, is the Federal Government treating New England fairly on the policy of defense cutbacks?	172	496	343
Please use the back page for additional comments on any of these subjects, and any other issues in which you are particularly interested.			
Name			
Address			

History of Texas Good Neighbor Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 12, 1954

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the Texas Christian University Press has just published a history of the Texas Good Neighbor Commission, the organization that, for the past 11 years, has been engaged in furthering good relations between the people of the State of Texas and the Republic of Mexico.

This is an important book about an important work. Under the chairmanship since 1949 of Neville Penrose, Fort Worth oil man and civic leader, the Good Neighbor Commission has accomplished much.

I ask unanimous consent that an announcement from the Texas Christian University Press regarding publication of this history, written by Mrs. Nellie Ward Kingrea, be printed in the Appendix of the Record..

There being no objection, the announcement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The first complete study of the Texas Good Neighbor Commission, published this month by the Texas Christian University Press, has drawn praise from national and State officials.

Written by Mrs. Nellie Ward Kingrea, of Fort Worth, in partial fulfillment of the requirements of her M. A. degree, the 150-page book is a thorough survey of conditions that gave rise to the commission, of its activation and personnel and of its accomplishments and failures through its first decade.

The author, a public school teacher for many years, has gone to scores of original sources, conducted many interviews and weighed the evidence in a thorough manner.

Included are letters, memoranda, reports any many other materials now published for the first time. There is a complete bibliography.

"I feel certain that this history of the commission will further the fine relations we now enjoy with our neighbors south of the border," said Gov. Allan Shivers.

Henry F. Holland, a Texan, now Assistant Secretary of the United States State Department, had praise for the commission.

"The aims of the commission have always had the support of the Department of State and I feel, both as a Texan and in my official position, that the members are to be congratulated on the valuable work done to date," he wrote.

Raymond Moley, of New York and Newsweek magazine said: "It seems to me that under the direction of Neville G. Penrose, the Good Neighbor Commission of Texas has shown the Nation a most sane and workable plan of improving race relations. I only wish that it could apply to all parts of this most controversial subject."

Mrs. Kingrea opens her study with a discussion of the strategic position of Texas in the matter of Latin American relations. She points up the many problems of discrimination, cheap labor, and other areas in which there was, and continues to be, conflict between Mexico and Texas.

Under Gov. Coke Stevenson, the Good Neighbor Commission of Texas was formed by proclamation in 1943. R. E. Smith was named first chairman and Pauline Kibbe the first executive secretary. There was plenty of work to do in the effort to improve conditions and this study takes up the cases in some detail.

The commission's work is studied in three periods: 1943–45 when emphasis was on education and health; 1945–49 when labor problems held the stage; and 1949–53 when local action and public relations were stressed.

Neville Penrose, Fort Worth oilman, became chairman in 1949. Under his leadership, the commission's work has gone steadily forward and much of the material for this book came from his files.

Sebree Hopes the Valley's Program Becomes a Reality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 12, 1954

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, the Sebree Banner, of Sebree, Ky., was 1 of the 12 newspapers of the Green River Valley which jointly published the Green River Valley celebration special on July 8, 1954. My good friends, Byron Royster, mayor of Sebree, and Baxter Melton, editor of the Sebree Banner, have always been staunch supporters for the development of the Green River Valley, and are two of our outstanding citizens. The Green River Valley celebration special carries an article written by the two above-named gentlemen entitled "Sebree Hopes the Valley's Program Becomes a Reality."

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include herewith this article:

SEBREE HOPES THE VALLEY'S PROGRAM BECOMES A REALITY

Sebree's mayor, Byron Royster, is a board member of the Green River Valley Citizens League, Inc., and has supported it from the start, attending a number of its functions, including the lower river inspection last December, along with Senator JOHN SHERMAN COOPER and Congressman WILLIAM H. NATCHER.

Under all of these circumstances, it is obvious that the city of Sebree fully supports the league's program and especially that of flood control and water storage outlined in great detail herein.

Additionally, the Sebree Banner, knowing full well the great opportunities such improvements would make available to all towns in the valley, endorses heartily all the efforts of the league.

From time to time, Sebree's city officials have received inquiries about land in the area from industries considering the location of plants here. Many times such plants have been lost, because of the history of floods and inundation in this area.

There is much acreage in this area very much suitable to the location of industry, because of the labor supply and the ideal transportation facilities available. Sebree, on the main line of the Louisville & Nashville Railroad, now also is on the main north-south highway, route 41. Moreover, it also is served by a major east-west link, highway 56, which seems likely to be improved even more.

Air Spotters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 12, 1954

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an article entitled "Air Spotters Spot Thieves, Fires, Too," published in the New York Times of Sunday, July 11, 1954.

As chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, I believe very strongly in building up our civilian defense. The article deals with the work which air spotters do, not only from the standpoint of security, but also in connection with spotting fires, thieves, and robbers.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

AIR SPOTTERS SPOT THIEVES, FIRES, TOO—CORPS, NOW 2 YEARS OLD, IS 350,000 STRONG, DOING ALL KINDS OF SERVICES

WASHINGTON, July 10.—Two years ago next Wednesday began a continentwide undertaking vital to United States defense.

The Ground Observer Corps, on July 14, 1952, began Operation Skywatch—a peacetime round-the-clock alert against surprise aerial invasion.

More than 250,000 strong today, the corps and its nationwide string of spotter towers are permanent fixtures in "long-haul" defense plans. As a voluntary civilian arm of the Air Force Aid Defense Command, the corps is one-third as big in numbers as the uniformed Air Force itself.

The goal is 500,000 observers to run 19,000 observation posts and 49 filter centers through which reports of unidentified planes would be processed.

RADAR MISSES LOW FLIERS

Why aircraft spotters in the age of radar and superspeed bombers? Because radar can miss aircraft flying at low level, skimming over hills or through valleys. The presence of a civilian spotter at the right place and rght time could save a city.

The fact that more than 305,000 persons have joined the corps shows a "patriotic response to a rather tedious peacetime duty without parallel in our history," said the headquarters of the Air Defense Command, Gen. Benjamin W. Chidlaw, at Colorado Springs, Colo.

The record reveals tales of boredom in the lonely observation towers, but it also shows that the corps has run into excitement entirely apart from its job of watching for unfriendly aircraft. Robbers and fires have been detected from the towers, lost planes have been tracked down and even automobile speeders have been fined.

In Elmira, N. Y., law offenders automatically are taken to the spotter tower if Justice of the Peace Leroy Peterson is not in his office. Squire Peterson will be in the tower, for he takes his skywatching seriously.

So do Mr. and Mrs. Keith Saunders at Springfield, Ill. Their tour of spotting duty fell on their 30th wedding anniversary, so they celebrated on the job.

Joe Durant, a disabled coal miner in Uniontown, Pa., is a man with an uneventful career as a spotter but he figures, no planes these days is good news. Mr. Durant, 48 years old, worked the midnight-to-6-a.-m. shift 7 days a week for 7 months and never saw an airplane.

ONE SPOTTED A TORNADO

Edward Schmuch, 16, of Milford, Mich., became a tornado spotter as well as an aircraft spotter. Standing at his exposed post, he was able to report a twister's progress and tip firefighters on the location of fires in the tornado's wake.

Lt. William James, of the Air Force, thanks Charles Amy, post superviser at Spencer, Idaho, for saving his life. When a fighter plane was reported missing over northern Idaho, the Boise filter center flashed the word and in an hour Mr. Amy had a report from a rancher. Rescue planes found Lieutenant James' downed plane near Kilgore, Idaho, where he had spent a frigid night wrapped in his parachute. He would have died of exposure if not found soon.

The Air Defense Command reports that one of its most enthusiastic spotters is Julius Szakats, 24, of Sioux Falls, S. Dak. Born in Budapest, Hungary, he spent 5 years in a displaced persons camp in Germany.

"I know what it is to lose my country," he told the Ground Observer Corps recruiter.

Texas Soil-Conservation Work Praised

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 12, 1954

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, soil-conservation district workers from the four States of Texas, Oklahoma, Louisiana, and Arkansas met in Dallas last week. A brief report of the opening meeting of the workers, as published in the Dallas Morning News, demonstrates very strikingly the great value of the work being done by the soil-conservation district supervisors.

I ask unanimous consent that the article from the Dallas Morning News be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the news article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Waters Davis, Jr., of League City, president of the National Association of Soil Conservation Districts, called for a stronger job of selling soil-saving work at the opening session Wednesday of a 2-day meeting in the Baker Hotel.

Speaking to about 150 soil-conservation district workers from 4 States—Texas, Oklahoma, Louisiana, and Arkansas—Davis said "the biggest problem soil-conservation workers face today is the same as it was 10 years ago—too few people know what we're trying to do. Most people think we're on the Federal payroll."

Soil-conservation district supervisors are farmers who conduct the conservation activities in a designated district.

He lauded the new Texas dealer-district program, which got its start recently in Dallas. With this program farm-equipment dealers are joining in the effort to sell farmers on the values of soil conservation.

"Too many farmers are telling us that they can't afford soil conservation," Davis said. "I don't think we're trying to sell them enough on the basis of its paying them more than they put into it. I believe all farmers face a tough time, but I know that soil conservation cooperators will not have as tough a time."

Davis also said that the soil conservation organization should appoint a committee to establish conservation practices on public lands.

"The State of Texas has large holdings of public land," he said, "and I believe it is the most beat-up land in the State."

Dr. Charles Whitfield, liaison field man on research between the soil-conservation districts and the Department of Agriculture's Soil Conservation Service, asked district supervisors to report on research needs in the districts. He promptly was told by several district supervisors that research is needed on water intake in the soil and in brush clearing.

One supervisor from Oklahoma said there are 10 million acres of useless timber in his State that needs to be converted into pasture land.

At a dinner meeting, A. H. Settle of the Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co., presented plaques to outstanding district supervisors and farmer cooperators in the four-State area. The winners also will receive trips in December to the company's farm in Arizona.

Winners in Texas were Kaufman-Van Zandt district, A. M. McWilliams, Wills Point, supervisor, and Grady McFarland, Wills Point, cooperator; Pedernales district, Victor Wenmohs, Cypress Mills, supervisor, and Carlos Grote, Johnson City, cooperator; and Brazoria-Galveston district, W. L. Nash, East Columbia, district supervisor, and Berry Miller, Jr., Pearland, cooperator.

We Live Here

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 12, 1954

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, a poem entitled "We Live Here," by Mr. Alfred E. Brighton, of Long Beach, Calif., recently has come to my attention. Because it sets forth much of the basic philosophy of the land we love so well, I am placing it in the RECORD for the pleasure of others who may not yet have read it:

WE LIVE HERE

What is so near and what is so dear
  As speech that is free as the breeze,
And to hear the bell that is tolling
  Sweetly echo through mountain and trees,
Proclaiming that men are born equal
  In freedom to live under God
While they grow in stature and wisdom
  As merchants, or tilling the sod.

Each person may be his own master
  To choose his vocation in life,
Though his father played the first fiddle
  If he chooses, may play the fife.
Where a man who was born in a cabin
  Had not relinquished his claim
On the right to become a statesman
  And enter the Hall of Fame.

Here the chances for gain are not measured
  By where a man made his start,
His size, race, color, or worship,
  But by what he has in his heart,
By allowing the dictates of freedom
  To guide him in all of his ways,
And will not usurp the power
  Entrusted to him on the days
That he was elected to govern
  Our country that will always be dear
To people who are earning their freedom
  Because they are glad they live here.

—*Alfred E. Brighton.*

JUNE 18, 1954.

Cooperative Health Federation of America Supports H. R. 7700 as a Means To Encourage Construction of Additional Hospitals and Health Facilities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 12, 1954

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, it is encouraging to realize that the public interest in the adoption of H. R. 7700, a bill that seeks by appropriate Government loans to encourage the construction of additional hospitals and other health facilities, is steadily increasing.

The need for legislation of this sort has been forcibly and logically presented by our former colleague, Hon. Jerry Voorhis, of the State of California, and now executive secretary of the Cooperative Health Federation of America, with offices in Chicago, Ill., in a statement on behalf of that organization presented to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House. This statement sets forth so clearly the aims and purposes, as well as the need, for this legislation that I have included it as part of my remarks. The soundness of the viewpoint expressed entitles it to the favorable consideration of all who are interested in providing adequate medical care for our people at a price they can pay.

It reads as follows:

STATEMENT BY JERRY VOORHIS, EXECUTIVE SECRETARY, COOPERATIVE HEALTH FEDERATION OF AMERICA, TO THE COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, JULY 7, 1954

H. R. 7700, introduced by the distinguished and able chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, is good legislation. Its declaration of purposes leaves little to be desired from the standpoint of the Cooperative Health Federation of America. Among these stated purposes are:

"To encourage the extension of voluntary, prepayment health plans providing comprehensive medical and hospital care of high quality to the people at reasonable costs within their means.

"To increase the opportunities and facilities by which doctors may associate themselves together in groups, partnerships, and other private initiative arrangements of their own choosing, in order to broaden the distribution of high-quality medical care through general practitioners and specialists working together, making the most efficient use of medical skills, facilities, and equipment, and emphasizing preventive medicine, detection of disease, and early diagnosis."

The Cooperative Health Federation of America stands for exactly these same objectives.

The bill would provide Government guaranty of loans from private financial agencies to voluntary, nonprofit health plans for the construction of physical facilities. It would apply to hospital and clinic construction the same method that has so successfully encouraged the building of homes through the Federal Housing Administration program.

There is no doubt of the need for thousands of additional hospital beds in the United States; neither is there any doubt of the desperate need for the development of more voluntary, prepayment health plans providing comprehensive care to the people. Without them, costs of medical care are beyond the reach of most American families. Such plans have been proven to be the most practical single way of enabling families to pay on a regular budgeted basis for the medical care they need. Group practice, prepayment plans providing comprehensive, preventive, and curative care have reduced the cost of medical care, have provided high-level assured incomes to physicians, have brought physicians into areas where their services were definitely needed, and have sharply reduced the incidence of hospitalization among their subscribers.

But it is no easy task to set up a voluntary, prepayment plan and establish its services. There are a number of reasons for this. But one of the principal ones is the lack of capital for the provision of the physical facilities without which no plan can even get started.

It frequently happens that a group seeking to start a prepayment medical-service plan faces a dilemma like this. If it could secure a considerable number of paying subscribers, it could obtain physical facilities. But until it has the physical facilities, it cannot enroll the paying subscribers. It is probable that in a number of such cases a loan such as those contemplated by H. R. 7700 could resolve this dilemma and enable many plans to become established, and it is certain that such loans would be a critical factor in making possible the expansion and growth of established plans, many of which are today compelled to limit their membership enrollment because they cannot raise funds to increase the capacity of their clinic or hospital facilities.

The use of the device of Government insurance of private loans to nonprofit health plans is sound in principle. Potentially it could make available many times the funds that might conceivably be appropriated directly by the Congress for this purpose.

There are, however, two central questions the answers to which will, we believe, determine the extent of benefit which the Nation will actually derive from passage of this legislation. The first of these questions is, we believe, well answered by the provisions of title II of the committee print of June 28, 1954. For this question is: To what extent will passage of H. R. 7700 actually forward the declaration of purposes of the act and to what extent will its benefits, instead, accrue to inadequate or costly plans conducted primarily for private profit? However, title II of the committee print would earmark $40 million of the contingent insurance liability for the insurance of mortgages covering facilities for group practice, prepayment, health-service plans. This, we understand, would in no way prevent such plans from securing insured loans beyond the amount covered by this $40 million of contingent liability. But it gives definite clear recognition to the prime importance of encouraging the type of health plan on which greatest hopes can rest for a true solution of the problems of medical economics and continuous health maintenance of the people.

The other major question has to do with the interest rate. It appears that for interest payments plus insurance premiums, it is expected that 6½ percent of the principal amount of loans might have to be paid by the borrowers. For a health plan conceived to give service to people and not for private profit, this rate of interest is a very high one. Whether or not large amounts of private money would be available at lower rates, we do not know. But we most earnestly hope so. For unless loans at more reasonable rates are available, some of the most worthwhile plans in the country will find it difficult to take advantage of the benefits of this legislation. Experience alone can answer this question. Presumably if it is found that too-high interest charges are severely delimiting the effectiveness of the legislation, the Congress would consider measures to correct this defect.

In conclusion, the Cooperative Health Federation of America does support H. R. 7700, expresses its sincere appreciation to the author of the bill and to those who have worked with him in its preparation and consideration, and hopes the bill will become law at the present session of the Congress.

Schenck To Confer With Residents of His District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PAUL F. SCHENCK

OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 12, 1954

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, it is my great honor and privilege to represent the people of the Third Congressional District of Ohio here in the Congress of the United States. As their Representative, I have always tried to maintain a close contact personally with them and their opinions on the many important issues confronting us.

The Third District of Ohio is not only the largest one in Ohio and the fifth largest one in the United States, but is also very important from other points of view. Our beautiful Miami Valley has made and is making many outstanding contributions to our Nation and to the world. It is the birthplace and cradle of aviation and within it many important scientific, manufacturing, and agricultural developments are taking place daily. Our citizens are well recognized for their expert and skilled abilities. We have a truly cosmopolitan congressional district because we have all phases of science, manufacturing, and agriculture represented to an unusual degree.

Since becoming their Representative in Congress I have considered it my duty to not only be well informed of their opinions, but also to be of greatest possible service to each and every person in our Third District who has a personal problem with some department or agency of our Federal Government. I, therefore, initiated the idea of holding grassroots conferences throughout the district 3 years ago and have continued to hold them each year during the time Congress is in adjournment. I also opened a full-time Congressional Service Office at 1219 Third National Building in Dayton, where I can confer with people personally at such times as my official duties permit me to return to the district. At all times when it is necessary for me to be in Washington attending to my legislative and other official duties, a competent secretary is in charge of my District Congressional Service Office to assist anyone in the preparation of requests for me to assist them in their personal problems with the various Federal governmental departments and agencies. Thus I have sincerely tried to not only represent the opinions and desires of all the people in our very important Third District to the best of my ability, but I have also made every effort to serve them.

Members of Congress are called upon to deal with legislation covering a vast amount of subject matter dealing with both national and international subjects which affect the lives of each and every citizen to an unbelievable extent. These personal conferences help me to serve them in a much more effective manner.

Again this year I will take time during the period of our official congressional recess to hold conferences with the people of my congressional district in the courthouses and city halls of a number of our communities.

This is the schedule I have established:

Hamilton: Courthouse; September 7 and 8; 9 a. m. to 4 p. m.

Miamisburg: City building; September 9; 4 p. m. to 8 p. m.

Germantown: City building; September 10; 4 p. m. to 8 p. m.

Brookville: City building; September 11; 4 p. m. to 8 p. m.

Dayton: Federal building, room 203; September 13 and 14; 9 a. m. to 4 p. m.

Middletown: American Legion; September 15 and 16; 9 a. m. to 4 p. m.

Oxford: Municipal building; September 17; 4 p. m. to 8 p. m.

It is surprising how much can be accomplished when a citizen and his Congressman can sit down and talk over national and personal problems.

No appointment is needed, and I urge any individual or group to meet with me on the date most convenient to them. With the knowledge thus obtained, I know I will be better able to truly represent the people of my district in the Congress of the United States.

New Evangelical Church President, Dr. Schiotz, Is World Leader

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 11, 1954

Mr. HAGEN of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, in these days of power politics, ruthless ambition, when men everywhere seemingly have adopted the philosophy of selfishness with any means justifying the end, too many have forgotten the simple but powerful lessons of Jesus Christ that true peace comes from "loving thy neighbor."

We thank God there are great men who remember and follow the words and teachings of the Master and who spend their lives in bringing those teachings and practices to others.

Such a man is Dr. Fredrik A. Schiotz of my great State of Minnesota who has just been elected president of the Evangelical Lutheran Church.

Dr. Schiotz counts among his friends people all over the world. In every highway and byway of the earth there are people who know him and love him. I am proud to be one of these. It was my great privilege to attend St. Olaf College at Northfield, Minn., with Dr. Schiotz, and to have been able to continue a friendship which started in those college days.

Dr. Schiotz brings to his new position not only knowledge, but an understanding of God's commands and the teachings of our Lord, an understanding which has made of him a great leader, a great Christian teacher, loved and respected throughout the world.

The following article written by Willmar L. Thorkelson in the Minneapolis Star on June 16 is a news story which becomes a tribute to Dr. Schiotz and his great work and achievements:

NEW EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN CHURCH HEAD HAS FRIENDS ALL OVER WORLD—DR. SCHIOTZ SAYS HE LEARNS FROM DEALING WITH NATIVES

(By Willmar Thorkelson)

The new president of the Evangelical Lutheran Church (ELC) believes he could hitchhike around the world and stay in the home of a different friend every night.

The friends Dr. Fredrik A. Schiotz has made in guiding and directing mission activity and strategy for world Lutheranism include native church leaders and missionaries in Asia, Africa, the Near and Middle East, and Europe.

Others are government officials with whom he has dealt successfully in ticklish negotiations across conference tables in several national capitals.

Still others are needy and dispossessed people he has befriended with church and personal resources, such as refugees in a 350-bed hospital under his supervision in Jerusalem.

The 53-year-old churchman, who in September will move into the president's office in the new ELC building at Fifth Street and Fifth Avenue South in Minneapolis, feels his spiritual thinking has been stretched through his global contacts with people of other national backgrounds and colors of skin.

Intimate contacts with African and Asian natives have acquainted him with the aspirations of these people and have emphasized the opportunity for the Christian church to draw together all men in the unity of Christ.

One of his most dramatic experiences in this connection occurred in Tanganyika, where he was attending a service with a native congregation seated on an earthen floor.

A barefooted old man in dirty clothes rose and handed him a package containing an ebony baton. The man said:

"Here I stand, a black man created by God. There you stand, a white man created by God.

"Here I stand, a black man redeemed by Christ. There you stand, a white man redeemed by Christ.

"In this baton I extend to you, you will see a white spot along the edge. As it is all one wood, so black and white men are one in Christ."

This untutored man, Dr. Schiotz felt, had spelled out a truth of Christianity vividly and succinctly.

To fulfill the responsibilities he has had with the National Lutheran Council and the Luthern World Federation, Dr. Schiotz has regularly commuted between New York and Geneva, Switzerland. His work has made him not only one of the most traveled persons in the 920,000-member ELC, but also one of its most world-minded.

And without doubt he also is one of the church's most prodigious workers.

According to his wife, Dr. Schiotz time and again works all night at his home at Glen Head, Long Island, especially on returning from trips abroad. The reports he prepares after his travels would fill many books each year, if published.

His work piles up at home because he gives so generously of his time to others, his wife explained. "He is the last one to take care of himself," she added. "He just can't say no. He is very sympathetic to need and very approachable."

Before he begins his night working sessions, Mrs. Schiotz prepares a tray of sandwiches and fruit. The food, which she may be awakened to replenish, and the instant coffee which he prepares, provide a series of snacks whenever he becomes too tired to continue. On those nights when he does go to bed, he rolls out in time to catch a 6:25 a. m. commuter train to Manhattan. He is usually the first to arrive at his office.

To aid him in his work, he has a recorder into which he dictates letters and reports. Dr. Schiotz' home office has papers scattered over the floor and notes on every available flat surface.

His homecomings after trips abroad are real occasions, and frequently there is a ball game in which the whole family (Mr. and Mrs. Schiotz, Lois, 22, Nathan, 17, and Paul, 15) participates.

The family is hoping now that they will move back to Minnesota that Dr. Schiotz will take a vacation again. He hasn't had one for years, although he has a cabin near a Bible camp at Menagha, Minn., which he developed while he was a pastor at Moorhead. The last time he did go to the cabin most of his time was spent in preparing reports and in going into town to mail them, the children recall.

Dr. Schiotz is able to keep up his pace because he long ago decided that his "job belonged to God" and he was going to "place himself completely in the hands of God."

Before he did that, he was troubled with poor eyesight and a bad stomach. Now, he will tell you, his eyes are fine and he can eat anything.

This total commitment makes Dr. Schiotz a serene and confident person. It also has stood him in good stead on many occasions.

One occurred in 1948 on a visit to Sumatra during the first police action by the Dutch in trying to place all of Indonesia again under Dutch rule. When the Indonesians rebelled, the United Nations stepped in and a status quo line was set up for an armistice, although the armies were not neutralized.

Dr. Schiotz and Bishop Johannes Sandegren of India were to make an important visit to the Batak church, in republican territory, for the Luthern World Federation. They had received a pass to cross the two military lines, but shortly before they were to leave they were strongly advised by Dutch officials not to go since the armistice had been temporarily abrogated and their safety could no longer be guaranteed.

Reluctant to give up the trip because the Bataks were counting on them so much, Dr. Schiotz asked the bishop what they should do.

"You make the decision," the bishop replied.

At this particular moment Dr. Schiotz grasped at the Biblical promise that "Your heavenly Father knows what you have need of before you do."

This gave him a new sense of release, because he knew, he said later, that even in death God would take care of his needs.

"I said to the bishop, 'I think we better go.'"

When they came to the status quo line, the Batak church leader was waiting to receive them.

"The first thing he did was to have us line up in a circle so the status quo line cut the circle," Dr. Schiotz said. "Behind us was the Dutch frontier guard; ahead was the Indonesian guard.

"The Batak church leader led us in the singing of a hymn, and he asked Bishop Sandegren to lead us in prayer. As I lifted my head, my eye caught sight of the two guards joined in the singing of a hymn—both sides lifted above the animosity of the moment."

This is what Dr. Schiotz feels is the call of the church—to lift us above the sinful animosities of life that so easily divide us.

Before he had gone across the lines, Dr. Schiotz had written his wife, saying he didn't know what was ahead of him but if he didn't return he wanted to thank her for the glorious fellowship they had had together.

Another time in Indonesia he found some bad feeling toward America among the Bataks because of ill treatment relatives and friends were receiving in this country. He cabled his wife, telling her about the Batak colony in Harlem.

She went there with food baskets, put them in touch with proper welfare agencies, and suggested they write back to their relatives in Indonesia.

While the Schiotzes are always doing things for other people, friends find it difficult to do much for them.

If Dr. Schiotz is given an honorarium for some church address, he will often return it with a request it be used for the congregation's building fund or some other worthy project.

At least one church found a way to get around this. It sent the check to Mrs. Schiotz, with a demand that she buy something for her husband with it.

A man familiar with his expense statements says Dr. Schiotz is so conscientious about his stewardship responsibilities that he will buy a $5 meal ticket in arriving in a city where he will spend a few days—so he might save 50 cents for his church.

To make the greatest possible saving, on his trips from New York to Minneapolis, he has frequently flow air coach to Chicago, and then taken a sleeper (at clergy rate) on the train here.

In addition to good stewardship, Dr. Schiotz is also known for his tact and diplomacy.

When he became pastor of a Brooklyn, N. Y., church, he found the congregation divided into two sections: One in Norwegian and the other in English. Although the English section was much larger, the Norwegian one—mostly because of tradition—was using the much larger sanctuary upstairs and not filling it while the English section was crowded out in smaller quarters downstairs.

For 3 Sundays, Dr. Schiotz carefully presented the facts of the situation to the 2 sections, and on the third Sunday said he wanted only the people in the Norwegion section to vote on whether they wanted to move.

If a single person from that section opposed it, the Norwegian services would continue upstairs, he said. The vote was unanimous and Dr. Schiotz's careful preparations prevented any hard feelings.

During his pastorate in Moorhead, a professor criticized him on a point of doctrine. Rather than become angry, he thanked the professor politely and asked graciously whether the professor would be able to go over his sermons in advance. This flabbergasted the professor who had expected an argument.

The same diplomacy served Dr. Schiotz well when he led negotiations concerning millions of dollars worth of orphaned mission property and the question of mission personnel with members of the British colonial office in London and with government officials in Australia, Germany, Israel, and Tanganyika.

The new ELC head was first tapped for responsible church leadership while a student at St. Olaf College, Northfield.

In 1923, on the steps of Old Main there, Dr. Lars W. Boe, then the president, placed a letter in his hand which invited the college to send a representative to Rock Island, Ill., where organization of a Lutheran Student Association of America was to be completed.

"You go," Dr. Boe ordered young Schiotz. He did and was elected the association's first president. But after he returned he found the correspondence and other duties connected with the office so heavy he had to check in his baseball suit.

Giving up baseball in college for a man who is now a fanatical Brooklyn Dodger fan was the most difficult thing he has done—next to seeing the Dodgers lose to the Yanks, he claims.

During one summer at St. Olaf he decided to "make a lot of money in a hurry" by selling (and demonstrating) aluminum ware.

The profits were almost eaten up by the fact the Ford he bought to use in the selling sold for a lot less at the end of the summer than for what he had paid for it.

For 2 years after graduation from St. Olaf he taught English and speech in his hometown high school at Ladysmith, Wis. Then he entered Luther Seminary, St. Paul. He interrupted his training there to travel for a year with the Student Volunteer Movement in behalf of foreign missions.

He and Mrs. Schiotz, the former Dagny Aasen, whom he met at St. Olaf, had planned in college to become missionaries; in fact, it was all arranged that they would be supported by a northern Wisconsin congregation. But because of uprisings in China the church was not sending out any new missionaries at that time.

Instead of becoming missionaries, the Schiotzs took a year out of their Moorhead pastorate and visited mission fields in Japan, China, India, South Africa, and Madagascar.

Following the Moorhead pastorate, he became director of the ministry to Lutheran students on non-Lutheran campuses for the American Lutheran Conference.

Later he was recalled from the parish ministry again (this time from Brooklyn, N. Y.) to direct the work of missions begun by Lutheran churches of Europe and cut off from original support by World War II.

It was perhaps a surprise to some people that the ELC should in 1954 elect as president a man who vigorously supported membership in the World Council of Churches at ELC's 1948 convention—the time when the ELC rejected it by a 2 to 1 vote.

Dr. Schiotz, at a conference following his election, insisting "I never want to be anything but honest," said he stands in the same place with respect to the World Council as he did in 1948.

"As president of the ELC, I shall never hide my personal points of view," he explained. "But I will never use my personal convictions to coerce my church to do anything contrary to majority opinion.

"If the ELC should join the World Council, it would not be because the ELC president has exercised coercion, but because the church has freely expressed the opinion that this is the way it wants to walk."

Naturally some World Council supporters in the ELC hope that Dr. Schiotz can lead it out of its present isolation.

Dr. Schiotz said that outsiders have told him the ELC has a lot of warmth and evangelical fervor and he wants to keep that.

The best way to do that, he continued, is to give it away through the proposed merger with three other Lutheran bodies.

When Dr. Schiotz was nominated for the presidency by Dr. Elmer S. Hjortland, senior pastor of Central Lutheran Church, Minneapolis, it was suggested he would bring these qualities to the office:

"A leader; not a commander."

"A statesman; not a politician."

"One who respects the past but does not worship it, who preserves orthodox integrity but does not worship words and phrases, and who will not confuse change with progress but will lead forward with courage."

"A man with a warm heart and a profound understanding of life."

Leaders spring up under his leadership, Dr. Hjortland added.

After Dr. Schiotz had been installed as president Sunday by Dr. J. A. Aasgaard, the man he is succeeding, he mentioned in his message the debt owed to his parents.

His father, a Ladysmith lumberman who died in 1916, was, he said, "the best Sunday-school teacher I ever had."

His mother, who was present at the installation, had supervised the family "without benefit of any other child-psychology course than that which is provided in the school of the spirit" and he thanked her for it.

He recalled how his mother had met him at the door after he had successfully represented the Ladysmith High School in a speech contest with the warning, "Fredrik, you must not be proud."

"The warning not to be proud can do no more than call us to be alert," Dr. Schiotz said in his installation address. "The New Testament makes it abundantly clear that negative attitudes, the effort to win our way through under the law issues in a sterile humility. The creative Christian graces are freely given whenever we take our stand under the lifegiving promises of God.

"In this moment, remembering my mother's warning from the period of adolescence, I find the necessary help in that notable demonstration of greatness recorded in the 13th chapter of the Gospel of John. Not office, position, or place of service confers greatness, but the service done in Jesus' name—even to the equivalent of washing one another's feet."

BRIEF FACTS ABOUT DR. SCHIOTZ

Here are the vital statistics on Dr. Fredrik A. Schiotz (pronounced Shuts), newly elected president of the Evangelical Lutheran Church (ELC):

Born on June 15, 1901, in Chicago, son of Jacob S. and Stina Schiotz and 1 of 4 children.

Educated at Ladysmith (Wis.) High School; graduate of St. Olaf College, Northfield (A. B.), and Luther Theological Seminary, St. Paul (B. T. in 1930 and M. A. in 1932); also studied at Northwestern and Chicago Universities. Has honorary doctor's degrees from Concordia College, Moorhead; Augustana Seminary, Rock Island, Ill., and the University of Erlangen, Germany.

Pastorates at Duluth, 1930–32; Moorhead, Minn., 1932–38, and Brooklyn, N. Y., 1945–48.

Executive director of student service commission of American Lutheran Conference, 1938–45.

Executive secretary of the commission on younger churches and orphaned missions of the National Lutheran Council and acting director of commission on world missions of Lutheran World Federation, since 1948.

Married to former Dagny Aasen. They have three children, Lois, a June graduate of St. Olaf College; Nathan and Paul, high-school students.

Camp Pendleton Furnishes Combat-Ready Marines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 12, 1954

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, during a recent trip to my district in California I had the pleasure of meeting Maj. Gen. John T. Selden, commanding general of the Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton, near Oceanside, Calif. I was most favorably impressed by the general. He was not only pleasant and personable but generally exhibited the qualities that one expects to find in a military commander of his stature.

This impression of him was verified upon my later inspecting Camp Pendleton itself where the courtesy and efficiency of his staff and the morale of his complement appeared to be of the highest caliber.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article from the Army-Navy-Air Force Journal concerning this fine general and his command:

CAMP PENDLETON FURNISHES COMBAT-READY MARINES

(By Maj. Gen. John T. Selden, U. S. Marine Corps, commanding general)

While the 12-year history of Camp Pendleton, Calif., has been a varied one, its primary mission has remained unchanged since its establishment on March 27, 1942.

The Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton, has the mission of training combat-ready troops for immediate utilization wherever the need may arise.

Transformed by the Second War Powers Act in 1942 from the Rancho Santa Margarita y las Flores into the world's largest Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton covers an area of 126,435 acres. The camp extends inland for 10 miles and stretches 20 miles northward along the Pacific coast from Oceanside to the outskirts of San Clemente. Within its broad expanse are 3 mountain ranges, 5 lakes, and 250 miles of road.

This vast area of hills and valleys, plains and marshes, rivers and seacoast provides every conceivable type of terrain needed for the individual combat training of troops and for the testing of new tactics and equipment.

During World War II over 200,000 marines trained at Camp Pendleton for their amphibious campaigns in the Pacific. The base trained units of the 3d and 5th Marine Divisions and the entire 4th Marine Division.

Since the commencement of hostilities in Korea, more than 215,000 marines have been trained at Camp Pendleton. This figures includes the 1st and 3d Marine Divisions, which were organized and trained at Camp Pendleton, over 117,000 replacements for these divisions and 52,000 others in various specialties (including infantry).

Its vastness is an asset. So large that it must be divided into sub-bases, Camps Pulgas, San Onofre, Horno, Chappo, Margarita, and Del Mar, were known to World War II marines as Tent Camps 1, 2, 3, etc. Their tents have now been replaced by semipermanent and modern buildings.

Each area is complete within itself. Each has its own barracks, instruction halls, mess hall, theater, and exchange. Several have swimming pools, libraries, gymnasiums, bowling alleys, and other recreational facilities.

Camp Pendleton's rugged terrain proved doubly valuable in training Marines for the Korean conflict. The base's mountain ranges duplicated those encountered by the trainee in Korea.

Special training is given marines in attacking villages such as are found in Korea. Even the architecture of the "combat village" is Oriental to further heighten realism for the trainee.

Now faced with training and processing replacements for two Marine divisions in the Orient—the 1st in Korea and the 3d in Japan—Camp Pendleton continues to maintain a busy schedule.

KEY POSITION IN TRAINING

Camp Pendleton occupies a key position in the current training cycle for new marines. After he completes his 10-week recruit (boot) training at San Diego Recruit Depot and a short leave, the young Leatherneck reports to Camp Pendleton.

The 1st and 2d Infantry Training Regiments take him in hand for a month of individual combat training. This is done in the case of nearly every new marine before he is permanently assigned, whether it be to school, to a post, or to a replacement draft for overseas duty.

Camp Pendleton, too, is where all marines going overseas receive their final combat training—indoctrination for the new ones, refresher for the old timers.

To trim them down—and keep them trim—the combat trainees are taken on sweat-producing, muscle-hardening hikes over rugged hills to their instruction sites.

There are facilities for indoor training and there is an inclement weather training schedule. But rarely does the marine spend any time indoors. Much of the instruction is at night. All of it is conducted, insofar as possible, under conditions simulated to resemble those he might encounter later.

Training is up to date and realistic. Not only does the course include training in village combat, but also attack of fortified positions, defense against air attack and small unit and tank-infantry tactics. Individual action at close quarters is stressed. Training emphasizes the individual in combat.

SPECIALIST SCHOOLS

Combat training is not limited to the infantryman. There are certain specialist schools operated on the base as well. The supporting arms training regiment includes such units as a noncommissioned officers school, a tank maintenance school, a field medical training battalion and a tracked vehicle training battalion.

Located in the heart of the base is the staging regiment, an administrative unit that prepares the Leathernecks for overseas duty. Here final details such as dental checks and physical examinations, and clothing and equipment issues and inspections are accomplished.

Directly geared to conditions that are met in Korea or are apt to be encountered in any cold weather operation is the training conducted by the cold weather battalion, a satellite base of Camp Pendleton located near Bridgeport, Calif., in the high Sierras.

The battalion conducts training in the use of cold-weather clothing and in survival maneuver and leadership required in subzero temperatures under simulated battle conditions. Realistic battle conditions are attained through the use of aggressor forces. Replacements for overseas units during the winter months spend a week at the high Sierra site.

TWENTYNINE PALMS

Another distant installation, operationally a part of Camp Pendleton, is the Marine Corps Training Center located at the desert community of Twentynine Palms, Calif.

Here, with an area of 450 square miles of desert and mountain in which to operate, Marine artillerymen and pilots practice their military specialties with maximum freedom of operation.

Also based at Camp Pendleton are units of the Fleet Marine Force, Pacific. Under the command of Brig. Gen. Joseph E. Earnshaw, force troops consists of engineer, reconnaissance, field and AAA artillery, communications, amphibian tractor and combat service units.

In addition to conducting certain of their training on the base, force troops also utilize the facilities of the desert base at Twentynine Palms.

A large naval hospital furnishes medical support for units in the Camp Pendleton area, and during the Korean conflict cared for wounded returning from overseas.

Today—as for the past 12 years—Camp Pendleton stands ready to furnish combat-ready Marines for instant and effective duty wherever they may be needed.

Wisconsin Plan of River Development and Flood Control by Private Enterprise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 1, 1954

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, this Congress and many Congresses before have engaged in controversy as to the use of public funds for the development of rivers and flood-control projects. Billions of dollars have been expended out of the Public Treasury for this purpose. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the Wisconsin plan of river development and flood control is the answer to that problem. Since 1907, private enterprise by and under the direction of the Public Service Commission of Wisconsin developed power and flood-control projects without using 1 cent of the taxpayers' money for that purpose.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am including a news release issued by the Wisconsin Electric Power Co., of Racine, Wis., on this subject:

RIVER AND POWER DEVELOPMENT WITHOUT COST TO TAXPAYERS

The Wisconsin plan of river development and flood control was recommended Monday as a national pattern for consideration by the Federal Government. Grover C. Neff, Madison, spokesman for the Wisconsin Utilities Association, of which Wisconsin Electric Power Co. is a member, told members of the task force on water resources and power, meeting in New York City, that the Wisconsin plan, if used generally through the United States, would result in greatly reduced expenditures by the Federal Government and materially increased tax income to all governmental bodies. Neff is president of the Wisconsin Power & Light Co.

"Through the foresight and activities of its citizens and their representatives in the State legislature, Wisconsin has had for many years a private enterprise program which has caused the orderly development of its natural resources and electric service for its citizens," Neff said. "For nearly 50 years, our river basins have been successfully developed and controlled. Under this Wisconsin plan, river flow is regulated, power dams are constructed, trees are planted in a reforestation program, and recreational facilities are developed.

"All this has been financed through investments of the savings of its people and not by governmental subsidies collected by taxes," Neff declared. "The Wisconsin plan has demonstrated its merit in developing and regulating water resources; it can be successfully applied in other States."

Recalling the first State charter of its type granted in 1907 to the Wisconsin Valley Improvement Co. for development of the Wisconsin River, Neff told of the creation of water storage reservoirs and other developments on the river, all done under supervision of the Public Service Commission. Twenty-one storage reservoirs regulate the river, and 26 hydroelectric plants supply electric power to citizens and industry of the area. A total of 650,000 horsepower is now producing energy from the modest potential capacity of the State's rivers and streams.

A method of development similar to the Wisconsin plan could serve as a pattern for the Nation, Neff said. This Wisconsin program has produced a political climate in which it was possible to develop the Wisconsin River until it has been called the "hardest working river in the Nation." It is estimated that water powerplants in Wisconsin annually pay about $2 million in real estate and ad valorem taxes to the State and its municipalities, and more than $5 million in State and Federal income taxes.

Well-managed water resources are responsible for a large part of the annual influx of tourists into Wisconsin, Neff declared. He said that the State ranked second in the Nation for the number of fishing licenses issued in 1953 (over 1 million), and first in the number of out-of-State licenses issued (about 300,000).

Reforestation is carried on by all major electric companies in Wisconsin who operate hydroelectric plants and have incidental land for planting, Neff told the committee. He told of Trees for Tomorrow, Inc., a nonprofit organization of 5 power companies and 12 Wisconsin paper mills, which has distributed or planted 9 million trees for reforestation and has management plans for 120,000 acres of woodlands owned by private individuals. The plans include insect- and disease-control study, workshops for high-school students, technical and lay organizations, and a summer school for teachers.

Speaking of electric-power development in Wisconsin, Neff reported that private utilities had added to their steam-electric generator capacity at a rate of increase that was higher than that of the electric utilities in the United States as a whole. Under the Wisconsin plan, there has been complete cooperation between all major utilities in the

State for many years. New generating capacity is scheduled on a group basis and maintenance schedules are planned by committee action.

The private utilities of Wisconsin have cooperated whenever possible with REA cooperatives, he said. They have willingly supplied them wholesale power at reasonable rates and have entered into joint activities with them on many occasions.

"The Wisconsin plan has succeeded because the State laws and business climate have allowed private enterprise to develop and flourish under fair rules and adequate local regulations," Neff concluded. "I believe the Wisconsin plan, if used generally throughout the United States, would result in greatly reduced expenditures by the Federal Government and materially increased tax income to all governmental bodies. Furthermore, the Wisconsin plan encourages the free-enterprise development of many projects that some have argued could only be done by Government. The plan is worthy of careful study."

Declaration of Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 12, 1954

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, of all the thousands of words printed and spoken over the past weekend, none has more significance than those contained in the editorial published on July 3 by the Belleville (Ill.) Daily Advocate, a newspaper published in the district I represent here.

Under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I include the text of this editorial, because I firmly believe the writer has caught the spirit of timelessness of this great document:

Declaration of Independence Has New Meaning After 178 Years

Tomorrow we observe the 178th anniversary of the signing of the Declaration of Independence.

Among succinct statements of liberty-loving men asserting their determination to preserve God-given rights it has no equal in history.

It sums up all that King John's barons in Magna Carta at swords point enunciated for that capricious prince and made him agree to in writing and goes further in that it gives life to and extends the principles of unalienable rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness to all men.

The Declaration of Independence is more than a superb bit of literature, although it could stand on that merit alone. It is a statement of principles which has chilled the blood of would-be tyrants and given otherwise weak and obscure men the courage to face apparently insuperable odds and find victory.

It is significant too that the authors of the Declaration of Independence placed their reliance in God and not merely in human strength.

In our times we are witnessing the spread of a new and terrible despotism in the world; a despotism in far too many places triumphant because men fear to oppose it. The men who wrote our Declaration of Independence had quite as much to fear, knew all the hazards, but placed reliance in the strength of their principles.

True, it took a long war to give validity to the Declaration of Independence and make it more than a scrap of parchment. That was a war in which the odds were far too often against us and one which, as in our times of trouble, saw some faint hearts falter. But faith and courage of the majority achieved the end sought.

Every nation in the world today which is ground under the heel of the police state, could find new hope and faith and courage in the Declaration of Independence. So many things, for instance, stated in the preamble apply with the same force as if they had been stated today.

For instance this passage:

"Prudence, indeed, will dictate that governments long established should not be changed for light and transient causes; and accordingly all experience hath shewn that mankind are more disposed to suffer, while evils are sufferable, than to right themselves by abolishing the forms to which they are accustomed. But when a long train of abuses and usurpations, pursuing invariably the same object, evidence a design to reduce them under absolute despotism, it is their right, it is their duty, to throw off such government and to provide new guards for their future security."

How many nations in the world today, to which communism has extended its ruthless materialism, could say the same with equal truth.

As great powers go we are among the youngest, as well as the most prosperous, and perhaps it is fitting that we should bear the bulk of the burden in defense of liberty.

But we need to revert to those principles by which our ancestors were moved when they wrote the Declaration of Independence and to bear in mind that it is our greatest heritage, one which we are privileged to share with all the world, or those parts of the world wise enough to find it acceptable.

Whether the principles enunciated in the Declaration of Independence survive, however, is a matter only our faith and courage can determine.

The National Air Academy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 12, 1954

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, of course, South Carolina would have been pleased had it been selected as the site of the National Air Academy, but I must commend and compliment the committee and Secretary Talbott for the splendid selection of Colorado. Springs. Colorado is one of the most beautiful States in the Union, and is centrally located, easily accessible from all parts of the United States. The climate and recreational facilities in that immediate area are near perfect for the Academy. I congratulate the people of Colorado on being selected for the location of our National Air Academy. Also, Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate Lt. Gen. Hubert R. Harmon, Gen. Carl A. Spaatz, Gen. Charles A. Lindburgh, Dr. V. M. Hancher, Mr. Merrill C. Meigs, and Secretary Talbott. They had a difficult assignment. They performed this job well and deserve the commendation of the American people.

Exploitation at Home and Abroad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 12, 1954

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a letter to the editor of the Washington Post and Times Herald, published on July 7, and signed anonymously by a Venezuelan.

I invite the attention of Members to this letter and the allegations made therein. They appear to be supported by factual data published by our own Department of Commerce.

If these facts, and their analysis, are accurate then I believe the Congress should investigate, and I believe the administration should investigate. It would appear that the oil interests are exploiting the people of Venezuela in order to be able to sell to American consumers a cheap product. In so doing they are not only exploiting Venezuelans—and earning the United States all the ill-will that comes from dollar diplomacy—they are also exploiting between fifty and sixty thousand West Virginia coal miners who suffer from involuntary unemployment because they cannot compete with the cheap residual fuel oil.

The above-mentioned follows:

Poverty and Communism

Your editorial, Poverty and Communism, concerning Latin America, was much to the point and well informed. For this very reason, it was all the more regretful that you should have mentioned the oil companies in Venezuela as a good model of "enlightened policies by American firms" in their dealings with Latin America. Everyone who knows the facts is well aware that these companies represent the apex of exploitative investment. No other American firms working south of Rio Grande has ever found such bonanza.

To show the exceptional position of the oil companies, it seems sufficient to mention the exorbitant earnings they amass while exhausting Venezuela's nonrenewable resource. The figures come from a recent publication by the Department of Commerce, Direct Private Foreign Investments of the United States.

According to the 1950 census, total investments in Latin America, excluding Venezuela, amounted to $3,742 million, from which the net earning after taxes was $421.7 million, or a ratio of 11.2 percent.

In Venezuela the oil companies with an investment of $857.1 million got a net earning after taxes of $219.3 million, or a ratio of 25.6 percent. In the same country, other American firms earned at the ratio of 9.8 percent; with an investment of $135.9 million, they earned $13.3 million.

Brazil and Cuba are the two Latin American Republics that follow Venezuela in amounts of United States investments. Put together, the American firms in these countries have $1,286.6 million, which is almost one-third more than the investments in Venezuela. But the net earnings after taxes made by these much larger investments were almost one-third smaller; the American firms in Brazil and Cuba earned $163.4 million, or a ratio of 12.7 percent.

The oil companies depleting Venezuela's stored sunlight got higher earnings at a ratio of (a) 2.6 times the ratio of other American firms in Venezuela; (b) 2.2 times the ratio of all Latin American investments, excluding Venezuela; (c) 2 times the ratio of all American investments in Brazil and Cuba.

Furthermore, it is necessary to keep in mind that not all the earnings made through the exploitation of Venezuelan oil is shown in these accounts. The companies try quite successfully to cover up the black gold they are mining. Close to the shores of Venezuela, in the Netherlands, West Indies, they have their larger refining installations. With an investment of $296 million they got, in 1 year, $103.5 million in net earnings after taxes. For distribution of the products, fleets of tankers are held by subsidiaries, mainly under the flag of Panama.

The incredible deficit shown in Venezuela's balance of trade is still on the increase: this is what we have to pay for being helped by the oil companies in disposing of our liquid fuel, so much in demand in the mechanized world of today. Our sister republics may wish for themselves our good fortune of having such riches of stored sunlight, but they know better than to envy the way we are defrauded of our wealth.

I am certain you did not know these facts when you thought well advised to confront the American investors in Latin America with what the oil companies were doing in Venezuela. You were turning back the clock. The latter are the ones who should learn from the former how to content themselves with a reasonable profit when the public interest of a country is at stake. In Venezuela, oil deposits are public property; they belong to the Venezuelan people. With that wealth—their principal wealth—they hope to raise their very low standard of living, to eradicate their illiteracy, and to improve their poor health.

VENEZUELAN.

WASHINGTON.

Why I Believe in the American Way of Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT E. JONES, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 12, 1954

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following poem entitled "Why I Believe in the American Way of Life," which was written by my constituent, Miss Shirley McDaniel, who is a high-school student at Sheffield, Ala.:

WHY I BELIEVE IN THE AMERICAN WAY OF LIFE

The right to walk down the street
  Without a trace of fear,
The right to laugh at what I please
  And then to shed a tear,
The right to lie by a stream
  And whittle with a knife,
That's why I believe in
  The American way of life.

To go to the drugstore after school
  To get a bit to eat,
To play a joke on my pal
  That sweeps him off his feet,
To sing, to dance, to laugh, and play
  Without a bit of strife,
That's why I believe in
  The American way of life.

I love to sit and watch and dream
  Of the rainbows over the hills.
I love to plant and watch them grow,
  The golden daffodils.
I love to hear the bluebird sing
  As if she loved her life.
That's why I believe in
  The American way of life.

The chance to be poor and then be rich
  If one will only try,
The chance to become a president
  Or reach any goal so high,
The chance to become a President
  And take her for your wife,
That's why I believe in
  The American way of life.

To be able to worship my God on high
  In the church of my choice,
To be able to sing of His loving grace
  With my weak, untuned voice,
To be able to thank Him for everything
  That He has done for me,
To read the Bible when I want
  And hope for eternity.

The right, the chance, to do all this
  With love and not strife
Are the reasons why I believe in
  The American way of life.

—*Shirley Elaine McDaniel.*

Well-Deserved Tribute to Former Congressman Maurice H. Thatcher, Only Surviving Member Isthmian Canal Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. ROBSION, JR.

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 12, 1954

Mr. ROBSION. Mr. Speaker, one of my predecessors in Congress from the Louisville, Ky., District was Hon. Maurice H. Thatcher, 1923–33. Upon the formal presentation and dedication—on March 31 last—of the memorial monument to Gen. George W. Goethals, chairman and Chief Engineer, of the Isthmian Canal Commission from 1907 to 1914, during the construction period of the Panama Canal, Mr. Thatcher took part in the formal program at Balboa, Canal Zone. The Commission had charge of the work of building the canal.

Mr. Thatcher is the only surviving member of the Commission, and during the years 1910–13, he served as such commissioner and also as head of the Department of Civil Administration—Governor—of the Canal Zone. He and Mrs. Thatcher were in attendance on the indicated occasion as guests of the Canal Zone Government.

In his Isthmian post, Mr. Thatcher discharged his duties with efficiency and fidelity and did much to build up good relationships between the United States and the Canal Zone with the Government and people of the Panamanian Republic. On their recent visit to the isthmus—following a lapse of more than 21 years since their visit in January 1933, while he was yet in Congress—both were received in the Canal Zone and Panama with the greatest welcome and esteem. There were a number of old-timers in similar attendance at the dedication exercises—men and women who had been employed or lived on the isthmus during the canal-construction era.

As the sole surviving member of the Isthmian Canal Commission, Mr. Thatcher constituted an important link with the construction period; and afterwards, during his five terms in Congress, and subsequently, he has done much for the benefit of his fellow old-timers in helping to bring about legislation for annuities and benefits in their behalf, and related matters. Socially, also, he and Mrs. Thatcher, in the years of their Isthmian life, were widely known for their fine hospitality, and their attractive resident in the Canal Zone, at Ancon, was indeed a tropical Kentucky home. In the course of his remarks—which were warmly received by the large open-air assembly at the dedication exercises mentioned, he took occasion to express high praise of all the builders of the great Isthmian ocean link—from the highest to the least, and from the least to the highest—declaring that during the construction period of the canal, the recording angel must have worked overtime in noting the outstanding services of all those who had been thus engaged. In the course of his remarks he presented awards to the two winners of the contests, in the senior high schools and the junior high schools of the Canal Zone, for the best essays on the life of General Goethals. Two student girls were the successful contestants, respectively Miss Mary Abele in the first category, and Miss Carolina E. Zirkman in the second. Each prize was a $25 United States savings bond.

Under leave accorded me, I am including as a part of these remarks news stories which appeared in the Star and Herald of Panama City, during the indictated celebration, as follows:

[From the Panama City Star and Herald of March 30, 1954]

THATCHER MAINTAINS INTENSE PERSONAL INTEREST IN CANAL

Although his direct connections with the Panama Canal were severed over 40 years ago, Maurice H. Thatcher, member of the Isthmian Canal Commission from 1910 to 1913, has maintained his intense personal interest in Isthmian affairs throughout these years.

He and Mrs. Thatcher, who now live in Washington, D. C., will arrive by plane Tuesday afternoon to participate in the Goethals Memorial dedication ceremonies this week. Mr. Thatcher is the only surviving member of the group of men on whose shoulders rested the responsibility for the successful completion of the Panama Canal.

Although he was born in Chicago, Mr. Thatcher is known as a Kentuckian. He grew up in Kentucky and was practicing law in Louisville when he was appointed to the Isthmian Canal Commission after his fellow Kentuckian, Jo. C. S. Blackburn, resigned in 1910. He became a member of the I. C. C. April 12, 1910, and served until his resignation August 8, 1913, during which time he was head of Civil Administration in the Canal Zone.

Mr. Thatcher served 10 years from 1923 to 1933 in the United States House of Representatives from the Fifth Kentucky District. During his service in Congress he devoted his interests chiefly to welfare, public parks, and highways, Pan American and Panama Canal affairs, and to the promotion of domestic and foreign airmail service.

His congressional service is best known on the Isthmus as author of the legislation for the establishment and maintenance of Gorgas Memorial Laboratory in Panama, and for the construction of the ferry facilities and highway which provide the direct traffic link between the city of Panama and the interior of the Republic. The highway and ferry were named in his honor when completed.

The construction of Thatcher Highway and ferry was one of the major public improvements made in the Canal Zone during the 1930's. When Congressman and Mrs. Thatcher visited the Isthmus early in 1933 he was given a warm official welcome by the Republic of Panama.

The City Council of Arraijan voted to give him a plot of ground in that picturesque village as a token of their appreciation for the highway through the town, in addition, a special tour to the interior was arranged in his honor by various Panama organizations. Official and civic organizations participating included the Junta Central de Caminos, Panama Automobile Club, Rotary Club, and the Panama Federation of Highway Education.

High officials invited to attend the public demonstration for the Congressman included President Harmodio Arias and his cabinet, and Governor Julian L. Schley and many Canal officials.

Mr. Thatcher's personal interest in Isthmian affairs has continued since his congressional service. He was one of the principal supporters of the so-called "Old Timers" legislation which provides for an annuity for civilian employees who served during the Canal construction period. He was also the attorney in the test case in which the court of claims ruled that the annuities were not subject to income tax.

Mr. Thatcher is a prolific writer and has been a frequent contributor to newspapers and other publications. He is particularly well known for his poetry, much of which deals with the canal and the people who built it or operate it. Many of his poems and other contributions have been published locally.

The former member of the Isthmian Canal Commission has been the recipient of high honors from many Latin American nations because of his friendship and interest in their progress. Among the honors which have been accorded him is the Vasco Nuñez de Balboa medal in the rank of Comendador from the Republic of Panama, and decorations from both Venezuela and Ecuador.

[From the Panama City Star and Herald of April 2, 1954]

Townsmen at Arraijan Honor M. H. Thatcher—Former ICC Member and Congressman Visits Star-Herald Plant

The Honorable Maurice H. Thatcher, former member of the Isthmian Canal Commission now visiting here in connection with the Goethals memorial ceremonies, was honored yesterday by the people of the town of Arraijan on the Canal Zone border at the terminal of Thatcher Highway.

It was the second time that Mr. Thatcher had been so honored by the people of that Panamanian town who on a previous visit had similarly welcomed him and set aside a lot within the town's limits as their recognition for the many benefits they had received from Mr. Thatcher's efforts while a Member of the United States Congress.

Upon returning from his visit to Arraijan, where he was accompanied by his wife, Mr. Thatcher called at the Star and Herald offices where he was received by members of the management and editorial staff of this paper, with which the canal oldtimer and former Congressman maintained close and very cordial relations during the time of his service here, which were continued uninterruptedly after his retirement from isthmian activities.

Mr. and Mrs. Thatcher were shown around the Star and Herald's plant and expressed themselves as deeply impressed with the progress and development noted since their last visit.

La Estrella de Panama—the Spanish language counterpart of the Star and Herald—on April 1, 1954, carried an editorial which paid high tribute to Mr. Thatcher; and its English translation—as it appeared on the following day in the Star and Herald—follows:

Reunion of Old Friends

In a recent editorial, we discussed the vigorous and extraordinary personality of Col. George W. Goethals, who directed the construction of the interoceanic canal in Panama and was chairman of the Isthmian Canal Commission. In it we set forth the achievement of this man of superlative genius and will, to whose memory a monument has been erected in the Canal Zone.

Today we want to convey a heartfelt greeting to the hundreds of former officials and employees of the canal, who left our shores many years ago to scatter in their own country and who just a few days ago met again under Panamanian skies to pay their tribute of homage to the builder of the interoceanic canal.

Linked to the canal enterprise for a long time through various offices, jobs, and positions, they left our shores, thinking perhaps that theirs would be a permanent absence. Yet, let the unforgettable name of Col. George W. Goethals—so closely linked to their memories—be invoked for the tribute it so justly deserved, and here we have again on Panamanian soil many men whose labor over the years wrote a large portion of the history of the canal.

Among them is Maurice H. Thatcher, who headed the Department of Civil Administration in the early canal days. He has returned to Panama, where he is remembered and loved, to clasp friendly hands and to receive spontaneous expressions of affection, which bespeak clearly that our country has not forgotten his work as a "good neighbor" even in the days when the "good neighbor policy" was something unknown. And like Mr. Thatcher, there are hundreds of former employees of the canal back in Panama to whom we convey our most sincere greeting.

For, having turned the corner of the first century ourselves, having carried in our pages the account of the great canal enterprise, from the first attempt to its successful culmination, there have appeared in our columns the names of Americans who have returned to our country to reminisce over times gone by and to find out for themselves how friendships formed years ago are still in bloom.

May their return to Panama be a pleasant experience for these canal old timers, many of whom we are proud to call our friends. That is our sincere wish. And may they feel that, despite time and the great material changes that they have found, Panamanians have kept faith with them. For all of them—whose names are too numerous to mention, but which are ever in our mind—our cordial greeting and the expression of our lasting affection.

The Star and Herald, by the way, has a lineage of 105 years, dating back to something like 1849 when the construction of the Panama Railroad across the isthmus was begun. It is an outstanding daily newspaper of Central America, and its editorial policy, through the years, has done much to promote good relations between Panama and the United States. It has long been an effective antagonist of communism and has vigorously opposed its infiltration into Latin American countries.

In addition, I include an article which appeared in the Panama Canal Review, the official organ of the Panama Canal Company and the Canal Zone Government, dated April 2, 1954, with reference to Mr. Thatcher's participation in the Balboa ceremonies already mentioned:

Attending the Goethals Memorial dedication ceremonies this week is one of the central figures of the canal construction period and one of the most enthusiastic alumni of the canal organization.

He is Maurice H. Thatcher, member of the Isthmian Canal Commission from 1910 to 1913 and head of the civil administration in the Canal Zone during that period.

Mr. Thatcher is as well known and famous in Panama as in the Canal Zone as Thatcher Highway and Ferry, the link to the interior of the Republic, is named in his honor. He was author of the legislation authorizing the highway and ferry.

He has followed news of the isthmus with intense interest since leaving the Canal Zone over 40 years ago to return to his native State of Kentucky and become United States Representative from the Fifth Congressional District. His lively interest in isthmian affairs was recently demonstrated when he participated in the formal opening of the "50 Years of Friendship" exhibit in the Library of Congress.

Mr. Thatcher, the only living member of the Isthmian Canal Commission, has made his home in Washington, D. C., for many years. He is a poet of note and has written many poems relating to the Panama Canal and the men and women who work for it.

In this general connection it should be noted, also, that in Congress Mr. Thatcher brought about enactment of the legislation establishing the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory in the city of Panama, and maintained and operated by Federal funds. The laboratory is doing splendid humanitarian service in research work, with respect to yellow fever, malaria, and the many other diseases of the tropics—both human and veterinary. Its fame is worldwide. Mr. Thatcher, following his retirement from Congress, became vice president and general counsel of the Gorgas Memorial Institute of Tropical and Preventive Medicine, which has supervision of the laboratory. These services—invaluable in character—he renders without compensation, and purely as a contribution to Isthmian and international welfare.

Then I would add an editorial article which appeared in the Jeffersonian, published in my congressional district, at Jeffersontown, in Jefferson County, Ky., on May 28, 1954; and of which Mr. Carl A. Hummel is editor, and Mr. Thomas R. Jones is publisher. It is one of the best county newspapers in the entire State.

Canal Zone Honors Former Governor

This year, 1954, being the 50th anniversary of the independence of Panama, and of the acquisition by the United States Government of the Canal Zone, celebration rites of these historic events are being appropriately observed. A memorial shaft, to the memory of Gen. George W. Goethals, has been erected and was dedicated on March 31, in Balboa at the foot of the grounds of the Canal Zone Government's Administration Building. General Goethals was chairman and chief engineer of the Isthmian Commission.

Former Congressman Maurice H. Thatcher, from this Kentucky district, was also a member of the Commission, as well as Governor of the Canal Zone. The present Canal Zone Governor, Gen. John S. Seybold, extended to Mr. and Mrs. Thatcher, now residing in Washington, D. C., a formal invitation to visit the Isthmus as guests of the Canal Zone government. Governor Thatcher was one of the principal participants in the ceremonies dedicating the Goethals memorial.

The Thatchers were among other distinguished guests at the dedication to fly from Washington to the Pacific side of the Canal Zone on March 30, making the nonstop flight of 2,100 miles in 8½ hours. Among the other passengers were United States Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, of Wisconsin, and George N. Roderick, Assistant Secretary of the Army, and their wives. Governor and Mrs. Seybold, with other officials met the plane and welcomed the guests.

Ancon, adjacent to the city of Panama, was the first home of the Thatchers following their marriage in Frankfort, Ky., on May 4, 1910.

At the dedicatory ceremonies, Mr. Thatcher spoke and awarded prizes to student girls, winners in contests conducted in junior and senior high schools of the Canal Zone for essays on the life of General Goethals.

Following his tenure in the Congress, Mr. Thatcher was chosen vice president and general counsel of the Gorgas Memorial Institute of Tropical and Preventive Medicine, which supervises the Gorgas Memorial Library. Through the years he has rendered constant and valuable gratuitous service relative to the operation and maintenance of the laboratory.

The ferry across the Canal bears the name of "Thatcher," as well as the highway across the Canal Zone strip, both of which constitute links in the Inter-American Highway System. Many were the courtesies and the honors extended Mr. and Mrs. Thatcher on their visit to the Canal Zone, not only by the Zone officials but by the general public as well, who turned out en masse to greet them and to take part in parades and other festive occasions.

The party returned to Washington from the Canal Zone on April 2, in time to attend, on the following day, the crowning of a Kentucky girl, Miss Frances Mae Fisher, as queen of the cherry blossom festival.

During their recent brief stay on the isthmus, Mr. and Mrs. Thatcher received various courtesies. Thus he was presented with a scroll-letter of appreciation by the Panama Canal West Indian Employees Association, in appreciation of his effective services in their behalf through the years; and a demonstration was accorded both of them by the inhabitants of the town of Arraijan, in the Republic of Panama, in appreciation of Mr. Thatcher's services in Congress, which brought about the enactment establishing the ferry across the Panama Canal at Balboa and the construction of the connecting highway from the western terminus of the canal to the Canal Zone-Panama boundary line. The ferry and highway brought liberation from complete isolation to Arraijan and its residents have been grateful because of this. In January 1931, they presented a lot to him as a token of gratitude. At the recent demonstration, he gave the lot back to the town for use as a children's playground, and pledged a substantial contribution for playground equipment. The municipal officials of Arraijan have named the lot Parque Thatcher.

I am sure that the many friends of Mr. Thatcher—some of them his colleagues in this Chamber, yet serving here—and Mrs. Thatcher, will join me in extending to them heartiest congratulations upon these pleasing honors accorded them; and in wishing them many more years of health, strength, and useful endeavors.

Touching the reference in the Panama Canal Review article to poems written by Mr. Thatcher relative to the Panama Canal, and the men and women who work for it, a conclusion of these remarks may well be made by adding his fine tribute, in verse, to these workers, first published in the Star and Herald in its historic edition in commemoration of the 25th anniversary—August 15, 1939—of the formal opening of the canal to world traffic:

BUILDERS OF THE PANAMA CANAL

(In commemoration of the 25th anniversary of the formal opening)

(By Maurice H. Thatcher)

There were workers great, and workers small—
As judged by rank—in the enterprise;
But glory enough there was for all,
And each was great to seeing eyes.
Let Fame take care that her Scroll be just,
And give to each his meed of praise,—
Else, out of the ashes and the dust,
The Shade of Censure shall upraise.

A laud for the work of the first gold men
Who toiled and wrought and strove, amain,
To dig the ditch. They began it when
Old Yellow Jack, and the blight and bane
Of Chagres Fever, took starkest toll.
They came, enlisted, and ventured all;
And wrestled death, with body and soul,—
To linger, these—and those, to fall.

Another fever filled blood and bone
Of all, throughout. Its currents run
Until, within the stretch of the zone,
The last lone yard of the link was done:—
A fever, absorbing in the fire
Which single zeal forever brings;
A fever which always must inspire
That strength from which great action springs.

From a boundless field from which to choose—
The ablest Uncle Sam could find,—
Were here assembled: steam-shovel crews,
And engineers of ev'ry kind;—
Designers, trainmen, inventors rare;
Dredgers, foremen, mechanics skilled;
Electrical wizards;—and, ev'rywhere,
The art to do what the blue-prints willed.

Whate'er the call, whatever the task,
Each one strove for a single end;
So fair his service that none could ask
Better result, or aught amend.
He reamed the hole, and the bolt sent home;
He mixed the parts, and filled the form;
Into cores he pumped the silt and loam;
And wavered not in sun or storm.

The dirt he hauled from the deepest cut;
Reclaimed tidelands in manner vast;
He "toed" the dams with the huge output
Of spoil of shovel and slide and blast.
He dredged the channels in sea and lake,
And built the bounds of dock and lock;
Upreared the spillways and each intake,—
And planted all on the solid rock.

He lent the sleight of his brain and hand
To do all things the goal required;
All things designed, and each thing planned,
Till naught was left to be desired.
The strengths of nature—both seen and hid—
He put in bonds to do his will;
And today, as then, as they are bid,
They work the wonders of his skill.

For the silver groups—a word or two;
For those of ev'ry race and soil:
Theirs were the humbler tasks to do;
They bore the brunts of periled toil.
In loyal spirit they labored here,
Through all the great, eventful days;
They met all duty devoid of fear,
And earned their bit of deathless praise.

And back of all was the Gorgas Squad,
To hold the bitter plagues at bay;
With stern Hygeia's miracle rod,
Swift were the scourges swept away.
Strange things were done with a sturdy grace,
Until in Isthmia all was well;
Death's haunt became an abiding place
Where the non-immune might safely dwell.

America's mood was here maintained;
All civil functions carried on;
Orderly government ruled and reigned,
And codes to fit all needs were drawn;
And homes were made, and society
Was much the same as the homeland brings;
Here, men and women and children, free,
Lived in the midst of mighty things.

Executives, judges, and Q. M. D.'s;
Teachers and clerks, firemen, police;
Nurses and doctors; and more like these,
Bewrought, each one, his separate piece
Of the finished whole. Their toils, no less
Than those of the workers, "skilled" and "raw,"
Were full required for the job's success:
All were impelled by the selfsame law.

The mountains moved, and the waters rose;
And faith, at last, fulfilled her dream:
Lake, lock, and channel—the whole world knows—
Attest the worth of a hope supreme!
The ships now shuttle from shore to shore:
Up, up, and up—and thence straight on;
Then three times downward—and on, once more—
Into the sunset or the dawn!

All were as one; and they strove and wrought
To shape the passage to the Ind.
In terms of life it was dearly bought;
In money, cheap. The ranks are thinned
By time and death; but the deed they did
Excels all others of like and kind;
Its strength and virtue cannot be hid:
It lives—all tongues and lands to bind!

Unsavory Flavor in Use of Atomic Energy Commission To Promote Administration's Power Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 12, 1954

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I herewith include an editorial which appeared in the June 30, 1954, issue of the Washington Post. The editorial entitled "Explaining Power Policy," follows:

At least some of the furor in the fight over more electric power for the TVA area derives from the fact that the administration's policy has been very poorly explained. The President is seeking to use the authority of the Atomic Energy Commission to conclude a 25-year contract with a private utility sindicate to build a plant and produce power for the TVA area—at a cost to taxpayers estimated at $90 million more than the cost would be if TVA were permitted to furnish the power from its own plants. In the circumstances the administration's position is, in this newspaper's view, untenable. But a better case can be made for a general scrutiny of public power policy than the administration has provided.

There is a respectable argument, for instance, that in a period of consolidation no new major Federal public power projects ought to be undertaken or existing projects expanded until private utilities are given a chance to meet additional power needs on reasonable terms. President Eisenhower spoke somewhat in this vein during the campaign. He emphasized that he was not out to destroy TVA. But last year he pointed to requests for the expansion of Federal expenditures in the TVA region as an example of what he meant by creeping socialism.

In this connection a case can be made that it is in the nature of Federal power projects to grow outward, taking in more consumers, and that a halt has to be made sometime. It also can be argued that additional Federal expenditures for new TVA plants would strain the already unbalanced budget, and that these expenditures can be averted by aiding private firms to furnish the needed power. This is at least a consistent line of reasoning, whether or not one agrees with it.

No one in authority, however, has explained the administration position in the present instance in specific terms, if, indeed, this is the administration position. The move is interpreted as an attack on TVA because this interpretation has not been successfully contradicted. Nothing the administration can say is likely to make the roundabout use of the Atomic Energy Commission to conclude a deal for power in which the AEC is only remotely interested look any more savory. But the administration could do a great deal more to obtain understanding of the application of its general philosophy on power to individual cases. The same sort of confusion that has prevailed over TVA is building up in the Missouri Valley, where local cooperatives have been left in a quandary as to how to obtain their power over the next 25 years.

Soviet Slave Camps Seethe With Revolt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 12, 1954

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, it is obvious for all who want to see that all is not well behind the Iron Curtain. What needs to be done is to step up our psychological warfare and encourage those behind the Iron Curtain to revolt against their masters.

As part of my remarks, I am including a United Press report from Berlin, under date of July 9, which tells the story of a British soldier who has recently been released from a slave camp in Siberia. He reported the underground anti-Communist movement that is surging through the Ukraine has spread to Soviet slave labor camps.

The article follows:

MORE TROUBLE IN PARADISE—SOVIET SLAVE CAMPS SEETHE WITH REVOLT

BERLIN, July 9.—A former British soldier released by the Russians from a prison camp in Siberia reported today the underground anti-Communist movement that surged through the Ukraine has spread to Soviet slave labor camps.

William Piddington, a one-time dare-devil motorcycle rider, said the movement directed by the colorful Stefan Bendera has flared in the dread Vorkuta slave camps in Arctic Siberia.

Despite the terror imposed by Russian guards at the camps, he said, there is more opposition among prisoners than is generally believed in the West.

RELEASED

Mr. Piddington and fellow Briton, Eric Pleasants, former circus strong man, were released by the Russians in Moscow July 3 after spending a total of 10 years collectively in Communist prisons.

They said they met an American author, Jack Hurall, in the slave camp deep in the Ural Mountains.

The two men were allowed to talk with the newsmen for only a few minutes before their train departed for the West early this morning. They were scheduled to reach London Saturday.

Mr. Piddington said he joined the anti-Communist resistance movement in his camp although most of its members were Ukrainians.

"They are against he Reds," he said. "A large number of the Russian prisoners are also members."

Allied intelligence files contain voluminous reports on the Ukrainian "Bendera" underground army which collected its weapons from captured German stocks after the war and attacked Russian Army units.

BATTLE

At one point the anti-Communists fought a pitched batle for several days with Polish Communist forces sent into the Ukraine to flush them out. The Benderas were armed with Russian light tanks and were said to have nearly defeated the Poles.

The mysterious leader of the underground movement was said to have set up headquarters in Munich in 1950 when increasing Communist pressure forced most of his forces to flee west.

There are documented reports that he has continued to send raiding parties behind the Iron Curtain to blow up trains and sabotage the Reds.

Mr. Piddington, who once rode a motorcycle in the "wall of death," was arrested by Soviet tommy-gunners at Marienborn outside Berlin in 1950 when he tried to smuggle himself through the Soviet zone to visit his German girl friend.

British Army sources said Mr. Pleasants was arrested in Dresden while an East German circus after he entered the East Zone illegally to visit a woman.

Both were sentenced to 25 years imprisonment on charges of spying for the British secret police.

Protecting the Nation's Health

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 12, 1954

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, last week the House agreed to the Senate amendment to H. R. 7125 and sent the bill to the President for signature. There was little ballyhoo about it. The radio, press, and television gave it little play.

H. R. 7125 deals with pesticides—not a very interesting subject even though it is used or affected by nearly everybody. The primary purpose of the bill is to protect the public health. It reaches that end by providing that no pesticide may be placed on the market until a tolerance for the product has been established by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Under existing laws, a tolerance need not be established before the product is placed on the market. This is evidenced by the fact that only 1 tolerance has been established even though there are about 40,000 different pesticides on the market.

In other words, no one knew how dangerous those which did not have a tolerance were to the public health.

Under H. R. 7125 we would know and the consumer would be assured that he was not being poisoned unknowingly.

As for the farmer, he will be able to use the pesticide on his product without the fear of having his year's work confiscated as being adulterated or deleterious and injurious to public health by the Food and Drug Administration. Records show that entire crops have been confiscated because the chemical residue was too great.

Industry will be able to assure the farmers that if they use their product according to the directions it will greatly eliminate the losses due to pests. These losses are estimated at over a billion dollars a year.

Besides requiring that a tolerance be established prior to marketing, the bill sets up a workable procedure in establishing a tolerance. Under the present law, lengthy public hearings must be held and too often they have become so long and drawn out that they are not workable. This is borne out by the fact that despite 2 years of hearings, costing millions of dollars, only 1 tolerance was established.

The Select Committee To Investigate the Use of New Chemical Additives in Foods, Drugs, Cosmetics, and Pesticides, of which I was a member, found during the 81st and 82d Congresses that legislation along this line was sorely needed. As a medical doctor, I was a little disturbed with what I learned and was determined that legislation should be introduced to plug the leak in our public health laws.

I am most happy that Congress has passed this legislation and am quite confident the President will soon sign it into law.

The Future of Soviet (and United States) Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 12, 1954

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include an unusually strong editorial of condemnation appearing in the Boston Post of July 9, 1954. This editorial is all the more unusual and significant when it is borne in mind that the Boston Post vigorously supported General Eisenhower in 1952.

The support of the Republican candidate for President was made under new ownership of this great newspaper of metropolitan Boston which has always been refreshingly Democratic in the political field. I hope this newspaper will return solidly to the political family of the Democratic Party, of which political family the Boston Post has been a potent member for many years.

The editorial follows:

The Future of Soviet (and United States) Foreign Policy

(By John Fox)

The late Senator Taft was deeply hurt during the weeks immediately preceding the Republican Convention in 1952 and during those following it. The reason was the freely made allegations by some of the supporters of then General Eisenhower, his principal opponent for nomination for President of the United States, that Taft had tried to "steal" the votes of the Texas and Louisiana delegations to the Republican National Convention. Charges of dishonesty and corruption by Taft were freely bandied about, and there is no doubt that they were a major factor in Taft's defeat. Although such charges seem cheap and tawdry now, the emotional and intellecual shock suffered by the late Senator because of them was so great as to have affected his physical well-being. Some of his closest friends today lay his death to the physical debility that resulted from that shock.

Senator Taft badly needed a rest of soul, mind, and body, so immediately following the convention he went to Murray Bay, Quebec, for a rest. While there he remained silent. His friends, however, were angry, bitter, and resentful. The passage of weeks did not at all lessen those emotions, but, on the contrary, seemed to increase their intensity. All over the Nation friends of Senator Taft were outspoken in laying the blame for what they called unethical and dirty tactics on some of General Eisenhower's campaign associates. Those associates comprise some of the people closest to President Eisenhower today.

The late Senator Taft's friends include some of the most influential and important people in the United States. Among them are United States Senators and Representatives and State governors. Among them are important people in nonpolitical life, bankers, industrial leaders, prominent and respected lawyers, and publishers of powerful newspapers.

Although Senator Taft had made no public mention of it, those closest to him knew that he had placed a letter in the hands of his old friend, Senator CARLSON, of Kansas, who was one of General Eisenhower's principal supporters, and whom Senator Taft trusted. The letter, from its context, stamped Taft as a great man, greater even than he is now remembered. It contained an offer to cooperate in the efforts to elect General Eisenhower President.

Despite Senator CARLSON's best efforts, that letter was never answered. It was not even acknowledged by General Eisenhower's top strategists until Monday of the Labor Day weekend, 1952, by which time Eisenhower's prospects had deteriorated so that he was on the short end of 9 to 5 odds. Acknowledgment of the letter, which acknowledgment was stimulated by desperation, was made by telephone, and its terms were accepted.

The letter simply requested in effect that the rules of decency be observed, that there be no vindictiveness directed against Taft's supporters, and, as was just and honorable, that the supporters of Senator Taft, who had carried on during 20 lean years, be consulted in the matter of high ranking administration appointments.

Whether the promises that were made to Senator Taft were ever kept is another story. We are concerned with the people whom Senator Taft's friends blamed for his defeat, and whom some blame for his death. Some of those people are still among the closest advisers to the President. There is considerable evidence to support the conclusion that either from a mistaken sense of what constitutes good politics, an incredible ignorance of the true nature of communism, or because of an actual feeling of softness toward the Communists, they are responsible through bad advice to the President for the appalling series of diplomatic defeats and military disasters which have overtaken the Nation during the relatively short term of President Eisenhower.

It is no secret at all but a matter of common knowledge that the late Senator Taft's friends hate their old enemies more than ever.

Stormy Events in Guatemala New Milestone for Peurifoy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 12, 1954

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, not only South Carolinians, but Americans everywhere, are proud of the service John E. Peurifoy is rendering to our Nation. His excellent work in the State Department in Greece and in Guatemala is of benefit to the entire free world. Jack Peurifoy's South Carolina forefathers were great patriots who served their State well. Jack is more than living up to his family tradition of public service. The main thing that I personally admire about Peurifoy is that he has a practical, commonsense, realistic approach to the problems of the world. When people abroad come in contact with Jack Peurifoy they see a true representative of the opportunity system that is America's.

The following article is taken from the Anderson (S. C.) Independent and appeared in many newspapers throughout America:

Stormy Events in Guatemala New Milestone for Peurifoy

(By Jack Rutledge)

GUATEMALA, July 4.—An American ambassador seldom carries a gun.

Toward dawn on a hot morning last week, however, there was a lumpy bulge beneath the coat worn by John Emil Peurifoy, United States Ambassador to Guatemala. When he crossed his arms, his fingers touched the edge of the shoulder holster.

He was unshaven and red-eyed from lack of sleep. His tropical whites were wilted and drooping. He had been working without a break for days.

It was nearly 5 a. m.

Since early evening, Peurifoy had been in a private home in Guatemala City, talking with two Guatemalan colonels. The revolution had unseated the Communist-influenced government, and an anti-Communist regime of army officers apparently would soon take its place. But which officers? That was not settled yet.

Suddenly footsteps sounded in the hallway outside.

Three more officers strode into the room. One announced the formation of still another regime, with himself as president.

Peurifoy leaned back in his chair and crossed his arms. His aide, a marine in civilian clothes, edged closer to the Ambassador.

But there was no shooting. Instead, both groups turned to Peurifoy and asked his help in reaching an agreement. He knew all parties, having been called to innumerable conferences in the action-packed days that led up to this climax.

Diplomatically, Peurifoy recommended the Ambassador of El Salvador for this role. However, in the talks that followed, he was called to play a major part and saw them succeed.

The Guatemala story was a large milestone in the career of John E. Peurifoy, career diplomat. But it was not the first.

To go back a bit—

Peurifoy was born in Walterboro, S. C., August 9, 1907. His father was a district attorney. One of his uncles was a judge. Another uncle was a lawyer.

There is a story that in one lawsuit—having to do with a vanished mule—all three Peurifoys were in court at once, as judge, prosecutor, and defense attorney. The family doesn't say how the case came out.

In any event, young John Emil grew up in an atmosphere of law and politics.

The high school annual for 1926, when he was graduated, lists his ambition as "the Presidency of the United States." It describes him as the handsomest and most sarcastic boy in school. He was generally know as "Sonny Boy," and they still call him that when he goes back to Walterboro now.

He was in his second year at West Point when his father died. This event, coupled with his own ill health, caused him to leave.

Thereafter, he sold insurance, worked in a bank, and had a job with a restaurant chain in Oklahoma. But he gravitated, inevitably to Washington.

In 1935, he was running an elevator in the Senate office building at $90 a month.

Not long afterward, he got a job in the Treasury Department ($1,620 a year) and married a pretty fellow employee, Betty Jane Cox, of Oklahoma. On the day the new Mrs. Peurifoy rented a house in the suburbs he telephoned her, "Hold everything, honey," he said; "They just abolished my job."

For several months, he worked in the Botanical Gardens on Capitol Hill, washing flower pots, shoveling snow, and doing manual labor, generally. Then he got a post in the Labor Department.

A month later, he was in the State Department, and there, for nearly 16 years, he has been carving out a career.

At one point, he was Deputy Under Secretary of State for personnel and administration. Part of this work was as a liaison with Congress. He made many friends on the Hill.

Peurifoy is big, dark-haired, square-jawed. He has a relaxed, easy manner about him. He became popular with both Republican and Democratic Congressmen. A Republican Senator once remarked, "Jack Peurifoy is the best lobbyist Harry Truman has."

During the war years, he held a number of key posts, as executive officer of public information, and on the Board of Economic Warfare.

Then in 1945, he drew a tough assignment which brought him sharply to the attention of the top echelon in the State Department. He went to San Francisco to arrange for the conference out of which the United Nations was born.

Among other things, he had to find 5,600 hotel rooms, set up global communications, arrange for translation services, and not least or last, to handle the Russian delegation.

One of the stories of these sessions concerns a party at which Peurifoy, among others, was a guest of the Soviets aboard the Russian communications ship, *Smolny*, in San Francisco Bay.

True to the traditions of his home State, Peurifoy is a moderate bourbon-and-branch-water man. But at the party, he found himself holding a glass which Russian hostesses kept filled to the brim with vodka.

He met the problem by surreptitiously dumping the vodka over the shipside and soberly coming up for more.

A little over a year later, Gen. George C. Marshall became Secretary of State. One of his first acts was to name Peurifoy as Acting Assistant Secretary for administration. There, he performed another difficult assignment, reorganizing the Department in such a way as to establish a clear chain of command from top to bottom.

In 1950, having entered the Foreign Service, Peurifoy was given the rank of Ambassador and assigned to Greece.

For that post, he bought his first formal clothes. Normally, he dresses with complete informality. When he looked at himself in the new outfit, he said to his wife:

"What in the world will I do with these if I lose my job?"

"With your looks," she replied, "I can always hire you out as a butler."

Peurifoy admits he went to Greece with some misgivings. The shooting war with the Communists on the border had ended only a short time before, but the Reds were still strong inside the country. Moreover, the post carried with it the responsibility for administerng European Cooperation Administration operations.

He started his work there with a frank conversation. He told Prmie Minister Sophocles Venizelos:

"I think we will get along better if we talk man-to-man. If I have anything to say to you, I will tell you myself. If any third party says I have told him something I have not told you about the position of my Government, you can ignore it.

"And by the way, my name is 'Jack.' "

. Commenting later, the Omaha World-Herald said:

"It is a rare pleasure to find an American diplomat acting like a plain American."

Some years later, and from an unexpected quarter, other praise came to Peurifoy for his work in Greece. Roy Cohn, chief counsel for the subcommittee headed by Senator JOSEPH R. McCARTHY, was the donor of the good words.

It surprised Peurifoy because, while he was still in Washington, he had clashed with McCARTHY over one of the Senator's initial charges against State Department personnel.

He did not have all clear sailing in Athens, hower.

He was accused of intervening in an election when he came out frankly for a man he thought was the best candidate. And he incurred criticism for suggesting changes in the election laws of Greece. He left Greece in July 1953 with a solid record of achievement. He helped the Greeks in their struggle with the Communists, induced the Government to pass some highly important enabling legislation for ECA, ironed out jurisdictional feuds between the several American organizations then operating in the country.

By this time, a new administration had taken over in Washington.

Peurifoy, an appointee from the previous Democratic government, was first assigned to a minor Embassy. His friends in Congress—from both parties—intervened to get him the assignment in Guatemala. He considers this a victory, even though he knew he was heading into another trouble spot. He went there last January 26.

In one sense, because of the strength of the Communists in Guatemala, it was even tougher than Greece.

Peurifoy soon felt the full blast.

Where Athens had been friendly, he found Guatemala openly hostile to him. Where the Greek Government had been sympathetic, the Guatemalan regime was at the least diplomatically frigid.

Red newspapers began calling him "Perrofoy." The Spanish for dog is perro.

One newspaper even threatened his family in an editorial which said, "watch out for your wife and sons, or something will happen to them." The Peurifoys have 2 sons, John Clinton, 12, and Daniel Byrd, 8.

Peurifoy replied, "I don't scare very easily." However, in the last days of the Arbenz regime, he began carrying a pistol in a shoulder holster.

He saw President Jacobo Arbenz Guzman only once during his first 6 months in Guatemala. After the meeting, Peurifoy remarked, "if he isn't a Communist, he'll do until a better one comes along."

He found the post even more difficult than he expected, but he kept calm. His cool, easy-going manner won the complete respect of the Embassy staff. One of them remarked, "He's not at all like a career diplomat. Hell, you sort of forget he's the Ambassador. He's just all man."

Then the events leading up to the revolution began.

Although the United States stayed in the background to avoid charges of intervention, leaders of both sides consistently turned to Peurifoy for guidance and to act as a contact man.

There were innumerable meetings. Peurifoy went without sleep for days. Finally, the army officers issued an ultimatum for Arbenz to get out. He did, with a final blast at the United States.

The subsequent moiling of various military juntas still kept him on the run with more night meetings. At the moment, the situation appears to have stabilized.

Peurifoy appears to have gaged accurately the end of the Red-tinged regime. Last May, while it seemingly was still firmly in control, correspondents asked Peurifoy if he thought trouble might break out.

"I'm not predicting anything," he said. "But I'll tell you one thing:

"We are making out our Fourth of July reception invitations now and we are not including the names of any of the present administration."

At the big annual reception in the Ambassador's residence today, there will be many new faces among the list of Guatemalan officials.

Area Job Total Drops—Summer Gain Unlikely

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 12, 1954

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, when I picked up my hometown newspaper, the East St. Louis Journal for June 22, I was greeted with a headline: "Area Job Total Drops—Summer Gain Unlikely." I was struck by a number of facts related in the story, which was based upon an interview with C. R. Hughes, manager of the East St. Louis office of the Illinois State Employment Service.

Mr. Hughes said that unemployment in East St. Louis had climbed to 6,200 during May, an increase of 700 over the level on March 15 of this year.

We may recall that March was announced by the President as the month which would be the key to Federal action to relieve the stress of unemployment. March came and went, and now in my hometown, at least—and I do not think we are very much different than anyplace else—unemployment is almost 13 percent higher than it was in March.

The question is, Where is the antirecession program of the administration? Those 6,200 unemployed in East St. Louis, together with other millions of unfortunate would-be wage earners throughout the land have been looking in vain for such a program.

The best they have had were statements, along in mid-March that April would be the month to look at, since a late Easter would delay the hypodermic of the new bonnet trade. Easter has long since passed; we are now in summer, and still there is no program; unless we call the recent easing of credit a program. However, the easiest credit in the world is of little value to a man who has no job, and a hungry family to feed.

There was another very pertinent fact in Hr. Hughes' report. He said new job opportunities were nonexistent, since all local firms had a large backlog of laid-off workers with call-back rights. The 600 or 700 high-school graduates and returning college students were expected by Mr. Hughes to swell the May unemployment total.

This analysis has been made by an employee of the State of Illinois, where the administration is run by the Republicans, so we can hardly kiss off his remarks as the words of a "prophet of doom and gloom." We must accept them as proven facts, and we must accept his analysis as that of one who knows whereof he speaks.

The reference to the lack of new job opportunities is highly significant because it points up the utter fallacy of the view taken by the Secretary of the Treasury, who says he is satisfied with a "second best" year, and who insists that it is not necessary to break records always in order to have prosperity.

What does a "second best year"—which seems to make Mr. Humphrey very happy—mean? It means that a number of persons who were employed in the "best year" are not working. It also means that new members of the labor force—the 600 to 700 referred to by Mr. Hughes in East St. Louis and an estimated 700,000 each year for the Nation as a whole—are denied job opportunities.

We have heard a very great number of words spoken by administration officials, Members of the Congress, and others about the sacredness of the right to work. Of course, these words have always referred to legislation designed to break the back of organized labor. But what about the right to work of these new members of the labor force? Is not that a sacred right; a sacred right which is callously rejected by the smug satisfaction with a second best year?

Our national economy must be expanded by from 3 to 5 percent every year if we are to provide jobs for all those who want to work; and we must provide jobs for them if we are to sell our gross national product. Anything less than such an expansion will mean that the second best year will be followed by a third best, and then a fourth best, and the spiral of unemployment will roll onward and upward to a point where the depression which followed the crash of 1929 will seem like heavenly prosperity.

Unless we provide such an expanding economy, we must admit and accept failure and defeat, not for ourselves but for our way of life and for our system of free enterprise. This we cannot do, for there is another evil system poised and ready to take over if we fail.

I include the article from the East St. Louis Journal as a part of my remarks:

AREA JOB TOTAL DROPS—SUMMER GAIN UNLIKELY

East St. Louis area employment has dropped, with no probability of an upturn during the rest of the summer.

"The impact of production curtailment in the metals industry forced employment in the East St. Louis area down by 75 at the 92 reporting firms during a 60-day period ending May 15," said C. R. Hughes, manager of the East St. Louis office of the Illinois State Employment Service.

Seasonal employment rises in commercial fertilizers totaled 200; in the stone-clay-glass industry, 175; in roofing mills, 100; and scattered gains in other industries, 100. These gains, however, failed to offset a drop of 650 in the metals fields.

The May employment total for the 92 firms reporting was 22,443 or 2,250 less than May 1953.

Hughes said job opportunities have decreased materially in the past 60 days and unemployment has climbed to 6,200, about 700 above the March 15 level. New hiring will be limited for the next 2 months as most major firms have a pool of laid-off workers with call-back rights. The 600 or 700 high-school graduates and returning college students also will tend to swell the already unemployed group.

According to Hughes, manufacturing employment is expected to level off at current figures and in general remain stable. Potential construction expansion could raise nonmanufacturing employment to a somewhat higher level than anticipated.

Hughes said that information provided by local employers shows that employment will continue at a gentle decline during the next 60-day period. Heavy seasonal layoffs in the commercial-fertilizer industry, coupled with pessimistic employment forecasts in the metals industry, preclude the possibility of any overall employment rise in the next 2 months, he added.

Almost every major firm in the area has a pool of laid-off workers with call-back rights, according to Hughes. Industrial job openings for vacation workers practically are nonexistent this year.

Hughes said the overall outlook for the area is for a leveling off in the downward employment trend, with some degree of stabilization near present levels by midsummer.

In Freedom's Progress Promises Build Slowly for Fulfillment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JESSE P. WOLCOTT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 12, 1954

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by the Honorable Louis C. Cramton, former Congressman from the State of Michigan, principal speaker at Howard University's 86th annual commencement, June 4, 1954:

Mr. President, members of the faculty and board of trustees, alumni, distinguished guests, students, and you who now are graduating from Howard University. It has given me a very deep pleasure to return for these few hours to this campus, here to meet a number of friends with whom it was at one time my privilege to consult concerning the development and possibilities of this great university. And that pleasure is intensified by the abundant evidences of progress I encounter on every hand. The men and women here to be given their diplomas may well receive them with just pride in the name of the great university from which they come.

And I am greatly honored by the opportunity here given me to consider with you something of the significance of this event. These newest alumni of Howard University now confront the future. Ambition, zeal, aspirations, determination, courage, self-denial, sacrifice, perseverance, native ability, these have brought you through the college years of training and study to this starting point, this commencement for your lifework, for the building of your careers.

What are those careers to be? This present moment has been made possible by the long past. Your progress has been made possible because of the ambition and sacrifice of many, even in centuries gone, who have developed opportunities of the present in which you have been permitted to share. And the future calls upon you with your trained minds and proven capabilities to give leadership and influence, to play your part in the retention of all present good and to pass it on enlarged to the many who follow.

What of the world into whose activities and responsibilities you now enter? A Christian world. But in that there is a measure of satire. Much of the time the world has been at war—men marching in every land, youth and age—all civilized peoples at war, only the savages at peace—all the economy of peace shattered by the demands for war—the world's people planning, striving to win constantly greater trials of force—men struggling and dying at times in every clime between the poles, in every continent and upon every sea—2,000 years since the Prince of Peace began to lead the world by His philosophy of right and service, of peace. In these years the world has known no peace, has found that right lived by leave of might, that service was by millions not by individuals. Youth, the coming race, have found service was for them under orders as obscure units in vast combinations of might. Youth may well look out upon such a world with questionings.

In such a world, what of the individual? What becomes of one in this world holocaust of Christ's teachings? What do an individual or his thoughts or his ideals or his principles matter in a world where mass force seems to define what the world shall be and how all shall live or die?

This Christian world is not Christian, but it is a world in which the teachings of the Prince of Peace have for these many centuries pointed the way to peace, in which His concern for the individual, His zeal for the welfare of the individual, have blessed the sacrifices, the grandeur of the unending struggle for human freedom, for the fullest recognition of the rights of the individual.

These years of war stress crucial stages in the ages-long conflict between dictatorship—whatever its form, carried on by ruthless aggression, in which the masses have existed only for the purposes of that man or set of men who for the time could dictate—and democracy, human freedom, in which human rights are supreme.

The contest between dictatorship and democracy continues. Under the one the human being is nothing. Under the other, as always the Jewish and Christian religions have taught, the individual, his welfare, is the great objective.

In its beginnings Christianity built all upon the individual and service to and by the individual. You recall the lawyer who stood up and tempted the Great Teacher, saying, "Master, what shall I do to inherit eternal life?"

"Thou shalt love the Lord, thy God, with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy strength, and with all thy mind, and thy neighbor as thyself."

"And who is my neighbor?"

And came the blueprint for the pathway to eternal life. "A certain man went down from Jerusalem to Jericho and fell among thieves and the priest passed by on the other side and the Levite passed by on the other side and the certain samaritan had compassion on him. Thus said Jesus unto him, "Go thou and do likewise."

In that day prejurice had already grown strong and to the Jew, of the superior race, that Samaritan was an outcast whom he would have crowded from the highway as he rode his beast toward Jericho. But the Samaritan placed humanity above prejudice and placed the individual in his God-given place in this world.

For centuries there have been those who would struggle and sacrifice, not for personal power but to promote the cause of human freedom. Lincoln said, "It is the eternal struggle between these two principles—right and wrong throughout the world."

In that old lecture which Conwell gave some 2,000 times he said:

"The most objectionable feature of our national character, and that is self-conceit, an undue appreciation of ourselves, an exaggerated estimate of our achievements, or our inventions, of our contributions to popular comfort and of our place in fact in the great procession of the ages. We seem to imagine that whether knowledge will die with us or not, it certainly began with us. We have a pitying estimate, a tender pity for the narrowness, ignorance, and darkness of bygone ages. We seem to ourselves not only to monopolize but to have begun the era of light. In other words, we are all running over with a Fourth of July spirit of self-content."

It is from the past that we inherit the present and all our glorious freedoms. And our democratic institutions, our principles of government which so fully recognize our rights as individuals, a thousand years of experience, of sacrifice, and struggle has produced them.

Wherever we may trace our ancestry, our family roots, it is in the history of England that we must trace the genealogy of the Constitution of these United States, the Declaration, and all our freedoms.

There were centuries of struggle, mayhap for years below the surface. But some great landmarks mark this great pathway toward human liberty that are worthy of our thought for a few moments, recognizing as they did from time to time the rights of man, even though those rights were not protected. In our study of that past and these proclamations of the rights of man and our appreciation of the fundamental development of government of and for the people, we may well note that the promise in the text of great statutes was frequently not followed by general performance. But there was progress.

In the divisions and struggles which brought to England the Norman invasion and successive racial conflicts there emerged the selfish and avaricious Henry I, fourth son of the Conqueror. His conflict with the barons and the insecurity of his title brought forth his avowed interest in the people.

Nearly a thousand years ago, in 1100, that demagogic king in his coronation oath made pledges that would fulfill the desires of all men:

"1. All the people of Christ may enjoy a true peace under our government for all time.

"2. Interdict all forms of injustice.

"3. In all judicial proceedings advance justice and mercy."

Tolerance in religion, justice for all. Such were the pledges, broader it was to prove in text than in performance.

A century passed, new kings ruled and died and then came John, again with dubious title, respected neither in his time nor by posterity, but forced by the baronage to undying fame by his grant of his Magna Carta, June 15, 1215. On this a nation builded and hoped and hoped and builded.

"No freeman shall be taken or imprisoned or disseised, or outlawed, or exiled, or in any way destroyed, nor will we ge upon him, nor will we send upon him, except by the legal judgment of his peers or by the law of the land.

"To no one will we sell, deny or delay right or justice.

"All persons are to be free to come and go in time of peace except outlaws and prisoners."

Thus under the pressure of the feudal barons came great pledges for all men, for all faithful subjects. Again much broader in text than in performance.

The centuries passed and popular demands for recognition and for protection of rights of individuals developed and spread in the constant pressure for government by the people for the people.

Sir John Eliot, today remembered by no one, one of the many who shared in building the foundations of our democracy, denounced the profligate, destructive favorite of Charles I, attacked royalty's misrule. Thrown into the Tower by the offended royalty, there came the parliamentary sitdown strike, and a king found that only the Parliament could supply his inflated needs for money. Eliot released, the money bills voted, taxes authorized, and Eliot back in the Tower, there to die, and even his body to be shown no respect by a king who was racing with his destiny.

But the centuries had sharpened parliamentary determination, and in this crisis Sir Edward Coke (and it pleases me to know he was then 78) drafted the petition of right, so humble in title but dominant in text and the acceptance of the King came on June 7, 1628.

Eliot and others died, but the petition lived, and its declarations, oft lacking in force, inspired continued growth of government by the people:

"No loan or tax to be levied but by consent of Parliament."

"No man to be imprisoned but by legal process."

Again broader in the text than in performance but the text was undying.

That first Charles beheaded, the years of parliamentary and military government and of Cromwell, a second Charles was restored, lazy, extravagent, pleasure loving, autocratic. But his reign draws glory from the implementing of further protection of human rights by Parliament and accepted by king, the Habeas Corpus Act, living forever and duplicated in every State of our Union. It was in truth termed by Blackstone "another Magna Carta of the kingdom," and "the true standard of law and liberty."

With all the tragedy of struggle in history's progress toward observance of human rights, there is some humor. From Bishop Burnet we have this:

"It was carried by an odd artifice in the House of Lords. Lord Grey and Lord Norris were named to be the tellers. Lord Norris being a man subject to vapours, was not at all times attentive to what he was doing, so, a very fat lord coming in, Lord Grey counted him for 10 as a jest at first, but seeing Lord Norris had not observed it, he went on with this misreckoning of 10; so it was reported to the House, and declared that they who were for the bill were in the majority though it indeed went on the other side; and by this means the bill was past."

Came James II, who in due time was permitted to escape from the country and abdicate. A vigorous Parliament conferred with William of Orange across the channel the military hero and an in-law of the unlamented James. The Bill of Rights of 1689 came into being, "An act declaring the rights and liberties of the subject and settling the succession to the crown."

"This revolution of all revolutions the least violent, has been of all revolutions the most beneficent," declared Macauley.

After 400 years of growth marked by noble but largely ineffective landmarks the parliament of the people had come to real power and authority. They were setting up a king and queen who owed their position to the choice of parliament. That which had at times seemed ineffective had been of great effect. Macauley recited:

"Though it made nothing law which had not been law before, contained the germ of the law which gave religious freedom to the dissenter, of the law which secured the independence of the judges, of the law which limited the duration of parliaments, of the law which placed the liberty of the press under the protection of the juries, of the law which prohibited the slave-trade, of the law which abolished the sacramental test, of the law which relieved the Roman Catholics from civil liabilities, of the law which reformed the representative system, of every good law which has been passed during 160 years, of every good law which hereafter, in the course of ages, be found necessary to promote the public weal, and to satisfy the demands of public opinion."

In this enthusiastic tribute of the historian is the proof, the acknowledgment that progress is progress, even though perfection in operation of the law is not at once reached.

Even so remarkable text was to prove it had more of promise than of performance and the laws which were germs in the panegyric of Macauley were of the future.

England's permanent settlement in America in 1607 and 1620 brought those political gains to this side of the water. The cost of the French and Indian War with its extinction of French power in America brought tension. And the first conference of the Colonies brought the declaration that they were entitled to all the right of natural born subjects in England, thus claiming for America the rights won by centuries of sacrifice, claiming full benefit of those pretentious texts.

And came the American Declaration that all men are created equal, with unalienable right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Here was the millenium for human rights, as to text but even with independence gained, a Constitution adopted because of its promised amendments to set up the Bill of Rights, more of wonderful text, but performance long delayed.

The Revolutionary Congress closed with this solemn injunction:

"Let it ever be remembered that it has always been the pride and boast of America that the rights for which she contended were the rights of human nature."

A government of freemen, under which law was to rule, the written Bill of Rights so inserted in the Constitution by separate action of many States to guard the rights of human nature, was again a text promising so much, the performance of those promises to lag for great struggles in war, in the courts, at the ballot boxes. The freeing of slaves, the guaranty of human rights regardless of race, color, or previous condition of servitude, guaranties we are even now slow to recognize for others as we claim them for ourselves, these all prove that the mills of the gods grind slowly but they do grind exceedingly fine.

Appreciating this human freedom built for us through the struggles of so many centuries this democracy would free Cuba and the Philippines, turn the tide that saved the world for democracy in 1918, help so greatly to prevent the ruthless enslavement of whole nations in the recent years of blood, sorrow and sacrifice in World War II and since, and carry the burden in preventing the engulfment of all in Asia in the paralysis of individuals under the despotism of communistic hordes.

Our highest court by its recent unanimous decision seeking to end classes of citizens in the fundamental field of education, holding that all citizens are alike and under equal protection of the law, has testified to the world that the rights of all are the concern of this Government. A decision that creates no new law, but states with preciseness what the law is and has been. Like many of the great landmarks of history which have guided lovers of freedom from darkness to light, it very possibly is again a text that promises more than the immediate performance. But like them it points the way; and in erecting this newest great landmark of freedom, Howard has made a most distinguished contribution.

One in the past to whom we owe much was Sir Robert Atkyns, who in the days of James II fought the illegal acts of the king, and in his brief, I find this:

"The best men are but men, and are sometimes transported with passion. The laws alone are they that always speak with all persons, high and low, in one and the same impartial voice. The law knows no favorites."

When the laws so speak and rule, men are, in truth, free, human rights live. But in these United States, where so terrible price was paid, we must never forget that when the laws no longer rule and rule impartially, when instead men rule through force, through combination, through privilege, through lazy appeasement of the public conscience, the rights of human nature are no longer safe, the sacrifices for human freedom become tragedy indeed, ultimate loss without reason.

As I have time after time read the immortal words of Lincoln at Gettysburg it has seemed to me that he was not addressing himself to the restless throng gathered there in the chill air of November, but was speaking to all who should come after as he said:

"It is rather for us to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us, that from these honored dead we take increased devotion to that cause for which they gave the last full measure of devotion; that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain; that this Nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom, and that government of the people, by the people, and for the people shall not perish from the earth."

I have been privileged to speak to you, graduates of Howard University in 1954, educated men and women going forth as members of the various great professions to whom our people look so greatly for leadership. It is that leadership which I would have you accept as it comes to you, strive always for the welfare of your communities and give back to America in some measure as your country has given you, that our freedoms may never lessen but ever be made more of realities.

In Time, TVA To Need 600,000-Kilowatt Coal-Steam Generator at Bowling Green

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 12, 1954

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, the Park City Daily News, of Bowling Green, Ky., was 1 of the 12 newspapers of the Green River Valley which jointly published the Green River Valley celebration special on July 8, 1954. My good friends, John B. Gaines, publisher, and J. Ray Gaines, editor of the Park City Daily News, have always been stanch supporters of any and all projects for the betterment of the Green River Valley. The Green River Valley celebration special carries an article written by J. Ray Gaines entitled "In Time, TVA To Need 600,000-Kilowatt Coal-Steam Generator at Bowling Green."

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include herewith this article:

IN TIME, TVA TO NEED 600,000-KILOWATT COAL-STEAM GENERATOR AT BOWLING GREEN

(By Leaguer J. Ray Gaines, editor, the Park City Daily News, Bowling Green, Ky.)

More than a year ago when publicity was first given to the TVA's fight for a 600,000-kilowatt coal-steam electric plant to be located on the Mississippi River at Fulton, Tenn., just north of Memphis at the mouth of the Hatchie River, there was some consternation among the leaders of the Green River Valley Citizens League, Inc., for two good reasons. One is the fact that southern Illinois coal now being loaded in barges at Joppa, Ill., on the Ohio River and at Chester, Alton, and East St. Louis on the Mississippi, would have an undue advantage over coal from the Green River Valley. As at least 2 million tons would be used yearly this is not a prize to be regarded lightly.

SAVING $5 MILLION YEARLY

The other and more important reason, at the time, was that Senator JOHN SHERMAN COOPER of Kentucky, supported the TVA quite stoutly in favor of the said project mainly out of his desire to make sure that the TVA was not throttled in its ability to meet the growth in demand for power. As a consequence a delegation representing both the league and the Bowling Green-Warren County Chamber of Commerce conferred at Washington an May 4 and 5, 1953 with Senator COOPER when League Honorary President C. A. Reis, of South Carrollton, Ky., made an ardent plea for the proposed plant to be located at Bowling Green, Ky., mainly because at least $5 million could be saved there under the cost of generation at the proposed Mississippi River site. These savings would be possible by reason of the fact that it would cost at least $2.25 per ton to rail-barge the coal out of southern Illinois to Fulton, Tenn., whereas coal with a much lower f. o. b. mine cost could be barged on Green and Barren Rivers from McLean, Ohio, Muhlenberg, Butler, and Edmonston Counties to Bowling Green for at most 25-cents per ton. As it requires in a modern plant only 1 pound of coal to make a kilowatt-hour of electricity—it is not difficult to see that the saving would be at least 1 mill per kilowatt hour or $600 per hour on 600,000 kilowatt hours and so on to support the $5 million annually.

After some little debate Senator COOPER grasped the significance of the league's contentions because, obviously, a Senator from Kentucky should not favor the location of a plant of this kind in Tennessee. The subject was also discussed informally with Senator EARLE C. CLEMENTS, of Kentucky, who while being favorable to TVA in general, had not particularly advocated the proposed plant on the Mississippi River in Tennessee. The Bowling Green chamber was represented by former County Judge J. Davis Francis and the league by its president, James R. Hines, of Bowling Green; Capt. Thomas C. Melton, of Morgantown, Ky., league navigation chairman; Albert P. Harding, of Central City, league executive president-secretary in addition to Reis.

All of this resulted in a delegation that called on the TVA at Nashville, Tenn., June 3, 1953. J. A. Bryant, J. D. Francis, and J. H. Barnard spoke for the Bowling Green Chamber of Commerce while Hines, Harding, Reis, and Duncan Hines sat in for the league. Assistant Power Manager for TVA, R. A. Kampmeier, led that group along with other important personages. The burden of the TVA position was that the power must be generated near Memphis because of the huge load building up at that point although the league felt very strongly, and still does, that the TVA always attracts new business when once funds are obtained from Congress for new power plants thus making it somewhat difficult for other areas to compete with TVA. The latter also contended it would be too costly if not out of the question to transmit the power from Bowling Green to Memphis.

The Congress last year and so far this one has refused to provide money for the Fulton, Tenn., project along with other new TVA plants and currently both TVA and the Atomic Energy Commission are negotiating with private capital for the construction of a powerplant near Memphis or Paducah, Ky., for the purpose of taking over some of the TVA load and thus freeing TVA to provide ample power for its other growing demands. All this at the suggestion of the Budget Bureau in order to reduce the budget deficit. Under the circumstances it would appear to be a good guess that the TVA will not build the proposed plant at Fulton, Tenn.

Under all contemplated conditions of growth it is most reasonable to decide that sooner or later TVA will require added coal-steam electric generating capacity and when that comes to pass the representations of the Bowling Green-Warren County Chamber of Commerce and the Green River Valley Citizens League, Inc., should be given serious consideration because, as detailed elsewhere in this issue, the lowest cost coal-steam electricity in the whole wide world can be made in the Green River Valley and it will not be interruptible as is the uncertin hydropower.

The TVA cannot hide behind the excuse that it will be too costly to transmit the power from a plant at Bowling Green which happens to be in or near the center of their transmission system. On the subject of transmission cost we refer to an article entitled "Sweden Becoming One of Most Highly Electrified Nations" in the Courier-Journal of May 9, 1954, under an AP dispatch from Perjus, Swedish Lapland, May 8. From it we quote: "The power generated at Harspranget is transmitted over a 380,000-volt line for a distance of 625 miles to Hallsberg, west of Stockholm. The line, the first in the world to operate at such high voltage, will be extended until Sweden has 1,500 miles of power transmission lines operating at this voltage by 1956." The Swedes don't make mistakes in this matter, so it is not unreasonable for Bowling Green to ask the TVA to take these suggestions into its consideration.

Of course, it is utterly impossible for TVA to consider such a plant at Bowling Green unless it is assured that the Barren River Reservoir will be constructed. In that connection, on May 4 of this year the league wrote to our Representatives in the Congress and it is interesting to quote briefly from some of the replies: Senator COOPER writes, "Certainly your suggestion with respect to the location of the power plant is a good one and I will suggest it to the appropriate Government authorities, knowing that they, too, will want to give it full consideration." Senator CLEMENTS is to the point with "I have long thought that if any more steam plants are built by the TVA, they should be located at the source of the fuel. The electric power can be transmitted much more cheaply than the fuel can be transported." Then Congressman NOBLE J. GREGORY states: "I, too, think that we should have the benefit of steam plant construction, and as I recall, we discussed this in our meeting in Mayfield in December. The construction of steam plants would help in more ways than one and would go a long way toward a solution of our coal problem. When the proposal to build the Fulton plant was first presented I insisted on west Kentucky." Of course, we all know that our own Congressman, WILLIAM H. NATCHER, is without a doubt prepared to support our position.

Cleanliness Is Next to Godliness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDGAR A. JONAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 12, 1954

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, a noted sanitary engineer of my acquaintance in Chicago has written a brochure relating to water pollution in the United States and to insanitary conditions otherwise in every part of the country. Conditions which he believes to be catastrophic in their impact upon public health.

Arthur Gordon, the engineer of whom I speak, has put down on paper in general terms his findings, based on 50 years of research in public health protection, relating to all phases of sanitation throughout the United States.

Because of the importance of this subject to the welfare of the American people, and because of the force and clarity with which he sets forth his findings, under unanimous consent, I insert Mr. Gordon's valuable report in the Appendix of the Record.

Inasmuch, Mr. Speaker, as the context of the report may occupy more space than is specified under the limitations put upon insertions by the rules of the House, I ask further for consent to insert the report in full. The report is entitled "To Educate Those Who Would Rightly Serve Humanity" and is as follows:

The world has progressed by leaps and bounds in the past half century. It has reached the atom age. Plans and projects have been readied, proposing the use of atomic power for industry. Thus from a horrendous means for destruction, something beneficial to the needs of the Nation is being realized.

The free people of our world have been made cognizant of the wonder of our age. It stopped a terrible global conflict. It destroyed two cities. Its big brother can annihilate whole islands, and then some. What a power for destruction. What a power for construction. The use of radioactive material, says science, will advance healing of the now incurable sickness and disease.

We speak of another power for evil. The destroyer that embodies the Four Horsemen of the Apocalypse and leaves room for another 10 stables full of relatives. We speak of this ravage in the softest of whispers. Its power to destroy is even more deadly than radioactive weapons. It has the dubious honor of having put fear of retribution uppermost in the minds of would-be aggressors. Yet we whisper its name because there is a certain amount of filth connected with it. Germ warfare, if you please. What can we do with germs that will enable us to have a more complete progress? That they can be harnessed for destruction is fact. Sanity precludes the use of such a horrible mechanism for disaster. Yet sanity alone does not seem to be enough to arouse public indignation over the germs loosed on them by poor methods of public health protection. Whole nations become educated in a hurry when death becomes imminent for the entire nation. Yet they sit idly by and let unseen microbes tear them to pieces.

If the atomic radioactive material is a cure for cancer, it must be discovered. We still don't know what the cause is. It could well be diagnosed as a result of poor sanitation in many phases. Be reminded that there is such a thing as organic pollution.

Pollution is not new, but it is also a weapon for evil. It finds a way to slaughter more persons than the devastation posed by all means of destruction in World War II.

The American people belie their industriousness. In fact, we have always maintained the attitude of relying upon old methods of prevention when it comes to a tough job. We spend millions each year to have other people find the cure for our ills, polio, cancer, cerebral palsy, and so forth. The scourge of these incurables has been felt by all of us. We have been bombarded by television, radio, newspapers, and magazines. The cure must be found, but by progressive and able thinking.

Now let's get back to filth, germs, and polution. It has been said that "cleanliness is next to godliness." We are not concerned with the soap that will make us beautiful, just how clean it will get us. It is amazing that our basic need for health, cleanliness and sanitation is another of many contributors to pollution after its use.

Pollution, therefore, must be considered a body for evil. It also is a power for good. There is proof that much of the industrial waste has great value from byproduct recovery. This source alone would enable us to feed all of Europe.

In the September 1947 issue of Woman's Home Companion, appeared an article by H. H. Smith, entitled "Foul But You Drink It." A brief forward to this article was prepared by Surg. Gen. Thomas Parran of the United States Health Department, in which he stated, "The increasing pollution of America's waterways is a serious menace to our Nation's health. More than one-third of our entire population depends on surface water for drinking supplies. These same streams also provide food, irrigation, and recreation. Yet into these waterways each day go billions of gallons of untreated domestic sewage and industrial waste, laden with disease germs."

Time magazine, quoting Dr. Abel Wolman, professor of sanitary engineering at Johns Hopkins, "There is hardly a stream in the United States that is not more polluted than it was 100 years ago." Date, November 22, 1948.

While the article next mentioned refers to the South, it should be brought to mind that all of our Nation's rivers are very much alike when it comes to pollution. From Sports Afield magazine, an article, Running Sores on Our Land," "The South's rivers, burdened by burgeoning industry, are slowly dying. The beautiful Shenandoah River is dead below Front Royal, Va. Industrial waste has eliminated all life. People prefer their paycheck 'to a few fish.' They don't give a damn what happens downstream. They don't care if all fish life is destroyed, if property values are wrecked, or if one of the Nation's prettiest recreational rivers has been ruined. A tremendous increase in industrial pollution, adding its toxic effluents to streams already poisoned by southern cities which have always been notoriously lax in the disposal of municipal sewage, is preparing the death blow for old streams." Date, September 1948. In addition to industrial waste, domestic waste, and surface waste, other effluents add to the pollution.

Industry has already spent millions for the elimination of pollution, but the lack of proper equipment, and experience, prevents it from analyzing its own type of pollution problems. Industry will become receptive to a sound program if guaranteed elimination of pollution at the source of their problems. Industry has fought tax and metering of their waste effluents. Under the recommendation of practical experience, any industrial waste which would endanger the city's sewers, sewerage systems, or waterways can be eliminated at the source. At the same time, no amount of revenue created by a municipal taxation can guarantee the elimination of pollution epidemics.

Headline: The Indianapolis News, dated March 15, 1954: "Half of the Shelby People Drink Tainted Water." "More than one-half of Shelby County's 15,400 rural and suburban residents are using contaminated water from private wells. Typhoid and dysentery have been attributed to improper sewage disposal. Sewage disposal in the county was termed a 'growing problem.' * * * No treatment facilities are provided in incorporated areas, and serious pollution incidents have occurred in Blue River, below Shelbyville. Private septic tanks now being installed are inadequate and unsafe. Seventeen restaurants receive no sanitary supervision, and are considered less than good." I know from on-the-spot investigation and research that most communities of this size or less have similarly dangerous pollution conditions.

Biscayne Bay, Fla., covers approximately 80,000 acres. When at normal level, the bay contains some 49 billion gallons of water. As it stands today, the bay receives millions of gallons of untreated raw sewage. This includes commercial, domestic, industrial wastes and an unaccountable amount of polluted surface and storm water.

During the peak vacation season at Miami City and Miami Beach, approximately 15 million gallons of deadly polluted effluent enter into the bay daily. This settles to the bottom of the bay, forming a deadly sludge that kills off all vegetation and oxygen, destroying multiplication of spawning and propagation of billions of pounds of fish food value.

In connection with what has been said above, it might be well to quote from an article by Philip Wylie which appeared in the March 29, 1949, issue of Look magazine, titled "Florida Polluted Paradise." "Twenty years ago when I first saw it, Biscayne Bay was as clear and clean as gin. Today it is the color of mildew. You can see down into it only a few inches. Shoals are appearing in it—shoals of sludge, or of sewage. High tides carry ashore from the bay quantities of stinking offal that sometimes dries out partly—in streets, in lawns, and even in private driveways. People step in—and step around it, sickened."

This bay can become the beauteous gift of God it once was, when proper intelligent and constructive work takes place. Due to the condition of pollution in the bay and its surrounding area, a deadly epidemic is marking time.

While referring to the destitute condition of the bay, similar conditions prevail all over the State of Florida, as an example: At one locality while we refer to fish value, I did not mention the conditon of the shell fish that are in a worse state of destruction, because shell fish, for their propagation, depend upon the bottoms of water bodies.

Here I wish to quote from the Florida Health Notes, volume 39, dated October 1947, as prepared by David B. Lee, chief sanitary engineer, State of Florida, and John C. Patterson, sanitary engineer: "As a direct result of the deadly discharge of millions of gallons of raw or inadequately treated domestic sewage and trade wastes into natural bodies of water, 139,478 acres, or 232 square miles of commercial shellfish growing beds have been condemned by the Bureau of Sanitary Engineering of the Florida State Board of Health."

At this time, I am personally bewildered at the murder of 139,478 acres of shellfish. This is just one little spot of the United States waterways where similar conditions exist. In localities all over the United States, the murder of our natural resources, upon which other nations are also dependent, prevails. May I give credit where credit is due. On big appropriations, State government departments and local hatcheries are doing a great and practical job of raising, hatching, propagating, and replanting our waterways, but all of this great organization and terrific expenditure is as senseless as placing baby animals into bloodthirsty, shark-infested waters.

It is almost childlike to blame industry, or any other American way of life which has to do with problems that are so terrible.

Previously mentioned were a few of the hundreds of incidents that are occuring daily in our Nation. The South was mentioned, as was the Middle West, but the destruction does not stop there. Vast sections of the California coast are not available to pleasure seekers, because of miles of floating debris, and untreated filth. Besides this deadly sludge settles on the bottom, a killer of fish and shellfish life.

The most shocking sight to look upon is that of our great waterways, where once abundant harvests of fish provided us with not only a table staple, but provided for canneries, and one of America's greatest industries for employment and revenue for State, local, and Goverment hatcheries. The growth of this great industry has become stymied and lessened in revenue in many sections of the country in connection with our waterways, whereas our other great industries in America have more than tripled in know-how and American progressiveness.

Lake Erie is a pitiful example of this chaotic condition. In 1947, 13,365,657 pounds of herring were pulled from the lake. In 1951 this figure dropped to 8,594 pounds. This is just one of the species of fish to be found in Lake Erie. Is there a more destructive element in our great America than pollution? Are we going to go on making up codes, and spending huge sums of money? Are we going to go through another 50 years of blind wandering, or are we going to sit down and discuss our problems intelligently?

I am not criticizing departments of Government, State, or local authorities with their many ordinances that have prevailed for over 50 years. Nor am I criticizing the billions in moneys that have gone as expenditures, but facts are now a matter of record, and it is clear that in the last quarter of a century, our public health and sanitary conditions have become threefold in pollution and epidemic conditions.

If it ever gets to the point where we must be totally dependent upon our own resources, our death would be swift, because we have jeopardized our position through our failure to look at the destruction of our natural resources with true perspective.

The progress of science and industry is more than noteworthy. We have fine automobiles from the original clunkers. All the components that go into the makeup of the modern-day vehicles are representative of the advance made in this field. Science applied to the aeronautical system has brought travel to the moon from the dream stage to a near possibility. The field of sanitation has been embroiled in a constant struggle to keep our heads above our own filth. There has been no marked progress in this field.

Another problem must be clarified—one on which I have talked for years. It is responsible for 75 million of our population living under the same primitive conditions that exist in China, Russia, and elsewhere in Europe as pertains to public health protection in all phases of sanitation.

If the great men who founded our country and pioneered our civilization were to look upon the ravage to which we have contributed, they would surely not recognize the land of beauty and bounty that was to become our heritage. They would revile us for our weaknesses, and poor planning, and most assuredly disinherit us for our wanton waste and destruction. It is, therefore, up to us, the present generation, to stem the flow of blood from the heart of our great Nation, to heal her wounded arteries, and leave a healthy America for our future generations. Not only is it our task to tackle this job, but we must also provide our children with the knowledge and means to develop a more healthful way of life.

From the address, "What's the Outlook for Sanitary Engineers?" by Clarence W. Klassen, Chief Sanitary Engineer, Illinois Department of Public Health, presented at the Civil Engineers Centennial Celebration, Chicago, September 9, 1952, "* * * The target objective of the sanitary engineer is to preserve health, but the preservation of health is based on prevention of disease and prevention is a difficult thing to precisely evaluate, for it is measured in seemingly abstract and apparently intangible terms of what does not happen rather than what does.

"The advances in sanitation, which are synonymous with the advances in the sanitary engineering profession, depend in a great measure and resolve around this broadening concept of sanitation and our development of its potentialities."

"Sanitation today offers one of the greatest challenges and opportunities in the field of engineering—the challenge and opportunity to transform the findings of the physical science of engineering into terms of healthful living through improved environment."

The sanitary engineer must learn first the value of water, because water is introduced into almost every phase of sanitation. In America, we use 153 billion gallons per day for every type of consumption, which is more than the combined total of 2 or 3 other nations in the world. It is up to us, not merely to supply the tremendous volume of water required for all purposes, but also the trained research and field men to guard it. Industry uses 24,900,000,000 gallons per day. Some 80 billion gallons per day are used in irrigation. An additional 40 billion gallons are used for miscellany, such as spraying yards, gardens, etc. Approximately 15,300,000,000 gallons of this consumed water is recognized as polluted effluent in our waterways. Approximately 20 billion gallons of solids of deadly polluted sludge are added to the runoff daily. Fortunately for humanity, most of this leads to the ocean, otherwise the tremendous figure mentioned here would have covered the entire world miles high, and all existence would vanish. For the Lord is wiser than man. These figures do not include the suspended polluted tonnage from the air that settles on every mile of our Nation.

One of the new and deadly brothers in partnership with death has arrived in our Nation in all its glory. For example: Earlier we mentioned the A-bomb and its devastation. Think for a moment of the fall of radioactive particles through space many thousands of miles from the point of fission. Think of it raining through air, onto our lakes and streams. The stopping of this curtain of doom at the source is no longer a problem of separation for industry or public. Again may I bring out the desperate need for sensible and practical training for schools and instructors which would enable us to prevent a catastrophe of death which might happen anywhere at anytime.

Atmosphere is the universal sewer and all organic waste must eventually reach it. The engineer is concerned with stopping this type of pollution at the source. As an example, part of the destruction by air pollution shows our annual loss to be about $1.5 billion, or approximately $10 per person. This loss is divided among vegetable damage, building damage (exterior and interior), loss of merchandise, and loss of normal sunlight.

Poisonous fumes and suspended matter have been the cause for major disaster and many deaths. Our entire population is affected by air contaminants. To be specific, one community, Donora, Pa., suffered the loss of 20 persons, and treated 5,000 people who were affected. Other sections of the country have similar conditions. One more example of the many other prevailing conditions: Detroit atmosphere has had 25 metallic elements recorded in varying presence at the rate of 14 micrograms per cubic meter. All constituents of elemental pollution in the Detroit industrial area total out to 472 micrograms per cubic meter.

Recovery of substances prior to discharge is tremendous in its savings for industry. The frightful tonnage of pollution to the square foot of surface area is almost impossible for the human mind to conceive.

Again to water and pollution created by vessels on our navigable waterways. Garbage is dumped from ships and scows alike. Oil slicks are formed, and harmful exhausts add to pollution, as does untreated waste that is permitted to be floated from the ships.

On land, trains add to the devastation by cluttering the rights-of-way with untreated waste and kitchen waste, to say nothing of exhaust fumes and smoke that are added to the airways. There is no limit to pollution. It, therefore, must stand to reason that limitless bounds are presented, and our endeavors to place capable young men in the field must be just as limitless.

After spending a half century in all phases of public health and sanitation by research and field tests, and having realized the essential need for more capable men in this field for just as long a time, many years ago I attempted a plan for setting up a policy for training sanitary engineers in order to meet the challenge at hand, and stop the horrifying conditions that prevail at this time.

I would like to quote here from the History of the Sanitary Engineering Division of the American Society of the Civil Engineers, which was written by Frank W. Jones, member, and presented on September 8, 1952, at Chicago: "There are still too many places for the sanitary engineer to give his allegiance. The need remains for a haven where all phases of sanitary engineering may be harbored and granted recognition."

As I have suggested previously, some of the essential requirements for the student, instructor, and school are:

A. A course in water for drinking, manufacturing, and water processing.

B. Municipal sewage, rural sewage, camp and trailer sewage, Army installations, sewage and water distribution.

C. Industrial effluent waste for treatment and by-product recovery.

D. All phases of air pollution.

E. Separation and filtering equipment.

F. Dairy sanitation and hygiene.

G. Food processing equipment for public-health protection.

H. Public food handling which has many phases of sanitation such as:

1. Examination of personnel daily.

2. Cleanliness of clothing and body at all times. I also suggest the personnel be checked by doctors to eliminate the carriers of disease.

3. Proper rest rooms for male and female, with proper ventilation allowing the proper amount of oxygen.

4. The same type of room for lockers where wearing apparel is to be stored.

5. The proper number of closet bowels and wash basins, urinals and showers.

6. Sufficient change of clean towels and soap must be a part of the daily routine.

7. Complete elimination and prohibition of any or all of sewer gas, or undesirable fumes, vermin, or rodents.

8. Proper inspection of plumbing in employees' washrooms to comply with the localities' highest code or standards.

9. Similar conditions must prevail where food is stored and prepared.

10. All water and waste connections to the washrooms for the public must be examined, tested, and protected under the best signs and ordinances, whether this be a mobile "red-hot" stand or the largest restaurant or hotel in the world.

11. Kitchen, wash and storage room floors must be scrubbed once a day, either before or after the days' activities.

We cannot emphasize the importance of proper plumbing installations too strongly. For example, just one floor drain in the center of a kitchen that has not been properly installed may blow in sewage fumes and change the health element and taste of butter, ice cream, meats, and vegetables which are surrounding it.

The reason for my lengthy explanation on public food handling is that the practical capable sanitary engineer of tomorrow must deal with it in his everyday line of duty. If we neglect to develop this type of man, we must face in one branch of public food handling, 10,000 people yearly who become seriously ill or die from the results of improper food handling. The causative agents that afflicted these people, as listed in Modern Sanitation, April 1954, for the epidemics occurring during 1949 in the United States, are as follows: Dysentery, streptococci, Salmonella, staphylococci, Sal typhi murium, coliform, unknowns.

This, as mentioned above, refers only to public food serving and handling. It does not include epidemics and deaths caused by improper food processing manufacturing.

I. Industrial hygiene and sanitation.

J. Hotels, homes, and other living quarters.

K. School hygiene and sanitation.

L. Hospital hygiene and sanitation.

M. Sanitation for places used for public gatherings, indoors and outdoors.

N. Flood control and sanitation.

1. While we read headlines during the spring and fall about the great floods, deaths, and loss of property, the more serious aftermath (millions of rodents, vermin, and tons of septic tank effluents that run through homes and other living quarters, leaving death in its wake) never receives much mention after the main headlines in the newspapers die away.

O. Flies, mosquitoes, insects, and other dangerous elements surrounding life itself must be controlled. This type of life must have its own environment to exist and multiply. Men have created the environment. I don't want to hamper the minds, nor the patience, of the reader, so I will shorten my written desires for the American public by hundreds of pages.

I am not alone in my beliefs, nor am I without assistance of able men, who, like myself, discovered a need for the true sanitary engineer many years ago. My personal observations in the field have not been piecemeal. They give voice to a lifetime of study and work. There is no definite pattern to follow in the elimination of pollution. Each job presents its own challenge, and is peculiar to the territory and way of life of the community that creates it.

The places I have mentioned are not just horror fiction; they have been personally observed. The slime and filth uncovered herein are not figments of my imagination, intended to stir unrest and create fear. They are an honest compilation of factual reporting, presented for the sole purpose of awakening the need for a more resolute program on the part of educators who must furnish the future sanitary engineers, the need for a more resolute policy in the education of the American people to the disaster which confronts them, the need for better cooperation of Federal Government agencies and interstate bodies, and, above all else, the common ordinary shirt-sleeved approach to industry's problems.

I am certain that all problems of pollution are not insurmountable. Results from my own applications to industrial, domestic, and commercial pollution have been more than favorable to industry and the community it serves. My own success in the elimination of pollution at the source, and the recovery of byproducts, has given me the incentive to tackle problems with which the ordinary civil engineer could not become involved in, because, of necessity, he is assigned to specific types of engineering, due mainly to his restricted education when it comes to the complete public-health protection in the entire field of sanitation.

Any program to be adopted must be broad in every aspect, as well as unbiased, if we are to pull ourselves out of the mess we are in. The men who are to assume positions of responsibility in administering to or for such a program must, by their every thought and deed, be broad and unbiased. Their creed must be that of servants of God, as well as of man, if they are to assume the tremendous task of restoring our air and water as nature meant it to be.

Surely God in His infinite capacity of the Great Healer meant for us to keep our own house in order. The mad rush for hospitals, hospital beds, doctors, and nurses, under such frightful conditions, and the death of so many, is unnecessary.

"An ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure."

After Guatemala

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 12, 1954

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "After Guatemala," published in the July 9 issue of Commonweal, a magazine of national distribution.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AFTER GUATEMALA

The outcome of the struggle in Guatemala is still not clear. The underlying issues are. In them the United States can read an oft-told, still unheeded story.

Guatemala is poor. The pages of its history are marked by exploitation of the peasants and by abuse of power. Workers on the coffee plantations often make less than 50 cents a day. Most of them have never learned to read or write.

That is part of the picture of Guatemala—a land where men work on the coffee plantations in the sun all day, and gladly, in order to make 40 or 50 cents. For decades the gap between rich and poor in Guatemala has seemed unbridgeable. The tragedy is that there have been so few willing to make even an effort.

In a very real way, the free nations in 1954 are suffering because of the sins of the past, and this is as true in Guatemala as it is in Asia. The Communists in Latin America use the United Fruit Co. in slogans designed to arouse the poor but they are able to do so successfully only because the company's past record is made to order for Communist agitation. Today United Fruit pays $2 a day, the highest wage for laborers in the country, and other United States firms in Latin America follow similarly improved policies. But memories of past exploitation die hard, and it will be a long time before these memories die in Latin America.

The Communists in Guatemala are estimated to number only about 2,000, out of a population of nearly 3 million. They hold no seats in the Cabinet. Although the now-resigned President Arbenz was strongly influenced by Communists around him, he is not himself thought to be a party member, Out of the 56 seats in the Guatemalan Congress, Communists held only 4.

Yet despite their numerical insignificance, there is little doubt that the Communists had a dominant part in the Guatemalan Government. One reason they were able to play such a leading role was the scarcity of non-Communist reformers. Although few in number, the Communists were, as always, active and well disciplined. They flung themselves into the land reform program with enthusiasm, doing the tedious fieldwork and carrying out the hard chores no one else wanted to undertake. As a result, before long the Communists were completely identified in the minds of the land-hungry peasant with agrarian reform. In a country where some 2 percent of the population owned 70 percent of the land, this fact gave the Communists an almost unbeatable advantage.

In short, the Communists in Guatemala did what Communists have done many times elsewhere. They took advantage of the situation as they found it. They identified themselves in the popular mind with the social reforms which were badly needed. They worked zealously, while all too many non-Communists either sat idly by or fought needed reforms tooth and nail. If the pattern is a familiar one, it became familiar only because the Communists have found it an almost sure-fire way to success.

At this writing, no one can predict with any degree of accuracy the upshot of the fighting in Guatemala. But certain lessons can be learned which should have been learned before.

The fight against communism remains a two-front war. The fact that this has been said often before in no way lessens its truth. Here in the United States the Communists have lost the battle of ideas. In the universities and in the labor unions, among the intellectuals, and among the workers, communism has no substantial following. In this country the battle of ideas has been fought, and democracy has won. (The United States does not, for instance, have to fear a Communist sweep in the 1954 elections.) Our problem as a nation now is to counter Communist aggression elsewhere, while guarding against espionage at home by a small but dedicated group of party members.

In other countries the battle for men's loyalties has not yet been decided. This is especially true in areas with long histories of economic exploitation, poverty, or colonialism. In such areas the emphasis in the battle against communism will necessarily be different. Armed force may be needed to keep the Communists from violent seizure of power. But it would be foolish to think that the use of such force will provide more than a useful framework of orderly government. Within that framework the task of social reform must go forward.

The industrial revolution is not yet over. Men have learned that it is not necessarily part of the natural order of things for a few to live in comfort while thousands suffer. Because the United States is a rich country and one of the earliest beneficiaries of the industrial revolution, it is often hard for us to see things as men in poorer nations do. Yet if we are to achieve peace, it is essential that we be able to suffer with the children of the laborer on the coffee plantation, sweat with the Guatemalan peasant laboring in the heat of the day, taste a little of the land hunger which he has known for generations. We cannot let our riches insulate us from the world.

The pattern of poverty and exploitation which prepared the way for the Communists in Guatemala is neither better nor worse than that in many other Latin American countries. Local non-Communist leadership must be developed and social and economic abuses met head on. Otherwise, the Communists, marching under the banners of social reform, will capture the leadership of still other nations. If that is allowed to happen, the drama of Guatemala will be repeated on a larger stage. We can hardly say we were not warned.

A Puzzling Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1954

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, Thursday, July 8, the House practically unanimously passed a bill extending unemployment benefits to more than 4 million additional workers not previously covered; 2,500,000 of these were Federal civilian employees; 1,300,000 were workers in firms which have 4 or more employees.

The purpose of the payment of unemployment compensation is to provide a cushion, an economic cushion, for those previously employed, who, through no fault of their own, find themselves without jobs. The purpose is laudable. The objective is to prevent hardship.

However, if unemployment benefits are to be extended to an ever-increasing number and if the payments are to be gradually increased, one, concerned with the economic future of our people as a whole, begins to wonder how long those who have jobs, wages, salaries, or income can continue to contribute to the fund which takes care of the unemployed.

How long can those who are working continue increasingly to contribute toward the support of those who are not? A correct answer is difficult to find.

With the question just put is another: How long shall one thrown out of a desirable, highly paid job, be permitted to remain unemployed and receive benefit payments when a less desirable or lower-paid job is offered?

We in Congress are continually reminded that there is a great deal of unemployment. That to relieve the situation Federal legislation must be enacted, tax dollars appropriated. At the same time, I am advised, through the daily press, that in May some 8,000 electrical workers in Philco plants; 5,200 tool and die workers at Dearborn, Mich.; 4,700 bakery workers in New York; 1,000 rubber workers in Kearny, N. Y.; 2,300 jewelry and novelty workers in Irvington, N. J.; 1,200 steel workers in Ohio and Kentucky; 800 bus and trolley drivers in Indianapolis, Ind., were on strike. Then in June at Ecorse, Mich., 11,500 steelworkers were on strike; in Detroit there was a milk strike involving 3,500 employees and 2,600,000 consumers; 500 phone employees went out at Detroit; 155 phone equipment installers went on strike in Washington, D. C.; rubber workers were out at the Goodyear plants as late as July 8; 4,500 workers at the atomic energy plants were out and there are other strikes throughout the Nation. What I find difficult in understanding is why there should be a claim of unemployment when so many employees refuse to work on jobs which are available.

Do you understand what I am getting at? How can it be said that unemployment—and there always has been and always will be some unemployment—is a present threatening danger which requires Federal legislation and the expenditure of millions of dollars in benefit payments or the creation of Federal jobs when, at the same time, so many are refusing to work at the jobs which are available.

Permit a repetition. How long can those of us who have jobs, be able to continue benefit payments to those who lose their jobs and who will not accept another job which is less desirable or which carries a lower wage or salary?

And another puzzler—if it be true that the wage earner who receives an increase cannot get to the grocery store before a price increase is posted on what he must buy, and, if the Federal Government continues to print additional millions or billions of dollars and puts them into circulation, when will ruinous inflation overtake us?

All We Have To Do Is Say "No"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 12, 1954

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in my extension of remarks, I include an article written by Dorothy Thompson, All We Have To Do Is Say "No," showing the United States has the power in the Security Council to veto the admission of Red China into the United Nations. Last year as a result of an article written by Constantine Brown, the Library of Congress at my request, prepared a memorandum for me on the question which disclosed our country, if it desired, could exercise what is called the double veto in the Security Council and thereby stop the admission of Red China into the United Nations, I inserted this article and the memorandum in the Congressional Record.

The article by Dorothy Thompson follows:

All We Have To Do Is Say "No"—If United States Wishes To Block Red China's Admission to U. N. It Need Only Refuse To Concur in Recommendation

(By Dorothy Thompson)

According to the United Nations Charter, membership is open to "all peace-loving states which accept the obligations contained in the * * * charter, and, in the judgment of the organization, are able and willing to carry (them) out. * * *

"The admission of any state to membership * * * will be effected by a decision of the General Assembly upon the recommendation of the Security Council."

A two-thirds majority of the Assembly is required for the admission of new members, but a decision of the Security Council to recommend requires the concurring votes of all five permanent members—Great Britain, France, the U. S. S. R., China, and the United States. If the United States wishes to block the admission of Communist China it need only refuse to concur in recommending admission. It need not even give a reason, nor make threats, such as that of Senator Knowland, to withdraw. All it need do is say "No."

"Peace loving" is one of those weasel-words with which the U. N. Charter is studded. To get one's case for admission before the General Assembly, a state must pass muster by the five permanent members of the Security Council that it is peace loving, and that there is reason to believe it will fulfill its charter obligations. One of these is specific. It is to refrain from giving assistance to any state against which the United Nations is taking preventive or enforcement action.

The only enforcement action taken by the U. N. was against North Korea—a decision of the Security Council in the absence of the U. S. S. R. Communist China supported North Korea, morally and militarily and justifies the action to this day. Logically, therefore, there is no reason to believe it prepared to accept the obligations defined in the charter. But were Communist China admitted to membership, it would automatically replace the present representation of the Formosa Government on the Security Council, and thus be able to veto any action—or any membership—if desired.

Nothing in the United Nations Charter links admission with the form of government a country enjoys or endures. A member state need not be democratic according to one set of definitions or another.

Nor is the admission linked with diplomatic recognition.

The U. S. S. R. has prevented the admission of Spain, Eire, and Italy, and would certainly ban West Germany. The first two were peace loving enough to stay out of World War II. Eire and Italy are recognized diplomatically by the Soviet Union, and most of the world's states, except the Communists, have opened embassies or legations in Bonn, although West Germany is not yet fully sovereign.

The plain fact is that every U. N. decision has been made according to what used to be called candidly sacred egotism, and according to the national interests of the member states, or what their current governments consider those interests to be.

Delegates of representative governments must, by their decisions, satisfy the often conflicting views of their home parliaments, congresses, and peoples, casting their votes with an eye on domestic politics and on the basic unity of the Nation.

Senator Knowland's threat is unlikely to change the attitude of Great Britain or France toward Red China, but if carried out it would split the United States across party lines into nationalists and internationalists, with American foreign policy largely paralyzed in the interim.

American disappointment in the United Nations is mounting. But this reaction represents, we submit, a revulsion from being initially grossly oversold on the U. N., as a comfortable system of collective security, an idealized substitute for power politics, and the only hope for peace.

This columnist never shared these exaggerated claims. We think the U. N. a useful instrument, within limitations, but, like all political instruments, holding certain dangers.

There was a brief moment when, influenced by highly persuasive apologists, we also objected to the veto right.

But quiet contemplation suggested that in the course of turning fortunes, we might one day be very glad to have it for ourselves.

United States Must Maintain Superiority in Air

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 12, 1954

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I herewith include an article written by Read Adm. Apollo Soucek, Chief, Bureau of Aeronautics, United States Navy, which appeared in the June 1954 issue of Planes. The article, entitled "Admiral Soucek Says Navy Emphasizes Aircraft quality," follows:

Admiral Soucek Says Navy Emphasizes Aircraft Quality

(By Rear Adm. Apollo Soucek, Chief, Bureau of Aeronautics, United States Navy)

Two major problems confront America's strategic planners, the threat of global war, and the threat of small-scale peripheral wars on the borders of the free world.

To meet these challenges, this Nation must have highly organized, flexible military forces.

NATIONAL POLICY

These forces, as a matter of national policy, are not intended to match in quantity the masses under arms in the Communist-dominated world.

If, therefore, we are to be successful in containing the threat to world peace and our national security, we must maintain an overwhelming ratio of qualitative superiority, both in personnel and in weapons.

To this end, the Department of Defense is spending approximately $1.3 billion this year for research and development, in an effort to achieve the technological superiority upon which our national security rests. This compares with $630 million spent in the fiscal year immediately preceding the Korean War.

STRIDES IN SCIENCE

In the past few years, tremendous strides have been made in science, not only in this Nation, but in other parts of the world. As these profound technological changes have occurred, we have been faced with an increased atmosphere of urgency in development of infinitely complex weapons.

This has been particularly true in the field of aeronautics, for which I have a basic responsibility in the Navy.

We are well aware that creative, bold imagination is required to keep pace with our potential enemies in the highly complex field of new aeronautical development. Emphasis on inventiveness and scientific leadership must pervade the military services.

In the creation of naval airpower, the aircraft industry is confronted with a continuing challenge and a great responsibility for development of new and better aircraft, for fulfilling assigned schedules and commitments, and for practicing the most stringent economies in production.

WORLD'S FINEST EQUIPMENT

We believe that the Navy has access to the finest aeronautical equipment that has ever existed. From the operator's viewpoint, the present-day airplane, including its engine, its electronics gear, and its armament devices, is almost unbelievably fine. Very little credit for that can be taken by my immediate organization. Most of that has been developed by engineers and technicians in the aircraft industry.

Because this Nation's security rests on maintenance of our margin of qualitative superiority, it is imperative that the military services and the aircraft industry, working as partners, place increasing priority on this requirement for the world's most modern air arms.

In numbers, the aircraft strength of the Navy is scheduled to remain at approximately the current level over the next few years. Today, we are operating 9,941 aircraft, with more than 3,000 additional planes in logistical support. This aircraft inventory is rapidly being modernized. About 44 to 45 percent of the planes are modern today; by the end of next December, about 65 percent of the Navy's planes will be modernized. By the end of calendar 1956, our modernization will be on the order of 85 to 87 percent.

YEARS OF TENSION

To keep these contemplated force levels equipped with late-model planes over the years of tension which lie ahead will require an annual production for the Navy of between 2,100 and 2,200 new aircraft annually. The cost of such a program will be between $2½ billion and $3 billion per year.

In the creation of these forces, the 823,000 Americans who today constitute the aircraft industry must work in the closest partnership with the military services. We shall depend upon them for a continuation of the pioneering spirit which has led to the present high state of the aeronautical arts in this country.

Section-by-Section Analysis of H. R. 8356, a Bill To Provide for Reinsurance of Health Service Prepayment Plans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 12, 1954

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that H. R. 8356, a bill to improve the public health by encouraging more extensive use of the voluntary prepayment method in the provision of personal health services, under the rule granted today, will probably be brought before the House for consideration on Tuesday, July 13. Because of this fact it seems appropriate that I should submit for the benefit of the membership of the House a section-by-section analysis of the bill.

The bill provides for the establishment of a health reinsurance program in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The short title of the act is "Health Service Prepayment Plan Reinsurance Act." However, it is often referred to as the health reinsurance bill.

The following is my analysis, by sections, of the bill reported to the House from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, July 9, 1954:

ANALYSIS OF PROVISIONS OF H. R. 8356

TITLE I. GENERAL

Section 1, short title of bill.

Section 2, declaration of purpose: "To encourage and stimulate private initiative in making good and comprehensive health services generally accessible on reasonabe terms, through adeqaute health service prepayment plans, to the maximum number of people, (a) by providing technical advice and information, without charge, to health service prepayment plans and to the carriers or sponsors thereof; and (b) by making a form of reinsurance available for voluntary health service prepayment plans where such reinsurance is needed in order to stimulate the establishment and maintenance of adequate prepayment plans in areas, and with respect to services and classes of persons, for which they are needed."

To reaffirm the congressional policy opposed to Federal regulation of insurance, the committee added the following:

"Nothing in this act shall be construed to authorize any action inconsistent with the policy and provisions of the act entitled 'An act to express the intent of the Congress with reference to the regulation of the business of insurance,' approved March 9, 1945 (59 Stat. 33), as amended (15 U. S. C. 1011–1015)." (The so-called McCarran Act.)

Section 3, definitions:

The principal definitions in this section deal with "beneficiary," "carrier," "health service prepayment plan," and "personal health services."

The term "beneficiary" means an individual to whom a carrier, pursuant to a health service prepayment plan, undertakes (1) to pay in whole or in part for specified personal health services furnished to him by others, or (2) to provide specified personal health services.

The term "carrier" means an organization, other than an instrumentality of a State or political subdivision thereof, which is sponsoring or is engaged in providing protection under insurance policies or subscriber contracts, or operating under a health service prepayment plan.

The term "health service prepayment plan" means a plan under which a carrier undertakes to pay for or to provide personal health services to specified beneficiaries or classes of beneficiaries.

The term "personal health services" includes any services rendered to individuals by licensed health personnel or, under the supervision of such personnel, by auxiliary personnel for the improvement or preservation of physical or mental health or for the diagnosis and treatment of disease or injury; the use by such licensed or auxiliary personnel of any and all apparatus or machines designed to aid in the diagnosis or treatment of disease or injury; the provision of bed and board in general or special Hospitals, convalescent homes, nursing homes, sanatoria, or other institutions licensed or designated as such by a State when care in such institutions is prescribed by such licensed personnel; the provision of drugs and machines, dressings and supplies, prostheses and applicances (including eyeglasses), when prescribed by such licensed personnel; and ambulance service.

The definition of the term "carrier" is intended to make clear, in conjunction with the definition of the term "health service prepayment plan" that all kinds of plans using the prepayment method in the provision of personal health services or in payment or reimbursement for the cost of such services fall within the scope of the bill and may be considered for reinsurance. This would include, for example, insurance companies' plans offering protection under insurance policies, corporations or associations, such as the typical Blue Cross plan, undertaking in subscription or membership contracts to provide services through providers of such services (with whom, frequently, the carrier has directly or indirectly a contract or arrangement, in which case the contract or arrangement is considered a part of the plan), and prepayment plans of the direct-service type, such as those offered by medical cooperatives offering personal health services primarily through their own staff and facilities, as well as groups of physicians undertaking to furnish medical care on a prepayment basis.

Section 4, National Advisory Council and other committees: This section establishes within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare a National Advisory Council on Health Service Prepayment Plans, consisting of 12 members appointed by the President. The Council is charged, under section 4 (b), with the duty of advising, consulting with, and making recommendations to the Secretary on matters of policy relating to the activities and functions of the Secretary under the act. Under section 4 (c) the Secretary is also authorized to utilize the services of any member or members of the Council for advisory or consultative purposes in connection with matters related to the administration of the act and may also appoint special advisory committees and utilize the services of any member of such a committee for such purposes. Section 4 (d) provides that members of the Council and of other advisory and technical committees shall receive per diem and travel expenses.

Section 5, consultants: Authorizes use of expert consultants or organizations thereof.

Section 6, utilization of other agencies: In addition to authorizing utilization of other Federal agencies, or of any other publice or nonprofit agency or institution, section 6 provides for utilization of State agencies supervising carriers, especially in determining compliance with requirements and standards prescribed by the Secretary for reinsurance.

Section 7, voluntary and uncompensated services: Authorizes Secretary to use volunteered or uncompensated services of outside individuals or groups.

Section 8, exemption from conflict-of-interest statutes: Provides a limited waiver of certain conflict-of-interest statutes for members of the Advisory Council and for special consultants used in an advisory or consultative capacity.

Section 9, regulations: Authorizes Secretary to promulgate necessary regulations. Prohibits any Federal supervisory or regulatory control over carriers, or over hospitals, other health facilities, or personnel furnishing health services.

Section 10, disclosure of information: With narrow exceptions, disclosure of information gained as result of operation of program is specifically prohibited.

TITLE II. TECHNICAL AND ADVISORY SERVICES

Section 201 authorizes studies and the collection of information on health service prepayment plans, and the distribution of such information as is developed.

Section 202 authorizes appropriations for the purposes of title II.

TITLE III. REINSURANCE OF HEALTH SERVICE PREPAYMENT PLANS

Section 301, authority to reinsure:

Section 301 (a) authorizes the Secretary, subject to the provisions of this title and to such terms and conditions as may be prescribed under the authority of this title, to reinsure carriers with respect to health service prepayment plans if the Secretary, after consultation with the Council, determines that reinsurance with respect to any kind or type of health service prepayment plan upon terms and conditions and at premium rates comparable to those offered pursuant to this title is not available from private sources to an extent adequate to promote such purposes.

Section 301 (b) limits Federal reinsurance to that part of a plan that is not otherwise reinsured.

Section 302, applications for reinsurance:

Section 302 (a) establishes the bases upon which carriers file applications for reinsurance. The Secretary is authorized to require applicants to furnish whatever information may be necessary to evaluate the application.

Section 302 (b) requires applicants to agree to (1) pay reinsurance premiums; (2) comply with applicable State laws; (3) make periodic reports; and (4) comply with reinsurance contract.

Section 302 (c) makes such requirements applicable to renewal applications, except as otherwise specified by regulations.

Section 303, terms and conditions of approval for reinsurance:

Section 303 (a) sets forth broad terms and conditions which the Secretary must take into account in granting reinsurance. After consultation with the Advisory Council, the Secretary may specify by regulation as conditions for reinsurance: (1) The kinds and types of plans eligible; (2) minimum benefits; (3) safeguards against undue exclusions of health conditions or health services, or other undue exclusions or limitations; (4) standards for deductible and maximum liability provisions; (5) waiting periods for benefits; (6) coinsurance provisions; (7) standards for plan provisions with respect to costs and charges of providers of personal health services payable by the carrier, to the extent such standards are necessary to protect the fund against abuses or arbitrary cost increases; (8) standards as to duration, cancelability, and renewability of policies or subscriber contracts; and (9) other policy provisions.

Section 303 (b) requires that regulations prescribed under the authority of section 303 (a) be promulgated only after such consultation by the Secretary with interested groups, including State insurance department officials, as the Secretary deems appropriate.

Section 303 (c) prohibits the Secretary from reinsuring any plan for which the carrier's premium rates are such as to make the plan financially unsound, or any plan with respect to which the carrier's breakdown of its single premium rate, as between reinsured and nonreinsured types of benefit costs, is unreasonable, or any plan if reinsurance of the plan, considered as a whole, would not promote the purposes of the act. In other respects the Secretary would be precluded from setting any standards for the carrier's premium rates.

Section 303 (d) provides safeguards to carriers in the event of changes in the terms, conditions, limitations, etc., prescribed by regulations. Prohibits retroactive regulations.

Section 303 (e) prohibits the Secretary from reinsuring any plan for direct provision of medical or dental services by the carrier through a salaried staff of physicians, surgeons, or dentists in the employ of such carrier, unless control over the practice of medicine or dentistry rests solely in duly licensed members of the professions involved.

Section 304, reinsurance certificate: Section 304 provides that a reinsurance certificate may be granted if: (1) The applicant carrier is operating according to law; (2) there is no reason to believe that the carrier is financially unsound or operating in a manner which does not entitled it to public confidence; (3) the carrier agrees to comply with the terms and conditions prescribed for reinsurance; (4) the plan is sound; (5) the carrier has agreed to the reinsurance premium rate fixed by the Secretary for the plan; and (6) the reinsurance of the plan will promote the purposes of the act.

Section 305: Scope and extent of reinsurance obligation:

Section 305 (a) contains the formula to be used in determining the liability of the reinsurance fund to reinsured carriers. It provides for payment by the fund of 75 percent of the amount by which the carrier's aggregate benefit costs (i. e., "losses" or claims") exceed the carrier's gross premium income reduced by a predetermined and agreed-upon allowance for administrative expenses of the carrier.

Section 305 (b) provides for an analogous formula to be established in the case of direct providers of health services (e. g., health cooperatives, fraternal organizations, or other group practice prepayment plans) and affiliates of such carriers.

Section 305 (c) defines the scope and extent of the reinsurance obligation for plans that include benefits for other purposes than those specified in the definition of "health service prepayment plan" (sec. 3 (e)) (e. g., disability benefits).

Section 305 (d) establishes basis for reinsurance payments to bankrupt or insolvent carriers.

Section 305 (e) provides for regulations dealing with (1) reinsurance of two or more plans offered by a single carrier, and (2) duration of reinsurance of a new or renewal plan.

Section 305 (f) prohibits retroactive application of new or amended regulations to approved plans if such new or amended regulations are less favorable to the carrier than those theretofore in effect.

Section 305 (g) limits the liability of the United States to the amounts actually in the fund.

Section 305 (h) contains definitions of terms used elsewhere in section 305.

Section 306, premium charges for reinsurance:

Section 306 (a) provides for the Secretary to prescribe reinsurance premium rates, varying in accordance with the hazard involved in any particular plan.

Section 306 (b) requires reinsurance premium rates to remain constant during the current reinsurance term, except under certain circumstances.

Section 306 (c) authorizes the Secretary to prescribe the frequency and time of reinsurance premium payments.

Section 306 (d) provides for paying reinsurance premiums into the reinsurance fund.

Section 307, reinsurance fund:

Section 307 (a) creates in the Treasury a health service prepayment plan reinsurance fund.

Section 307 (b) provides for handling payments into and out of the reinsurance fund, including payments of interest and, beginning July 1, 1959, for administrative expenses.

Section 307 (c) authorizes the Secretary, after consultation with the Council, to establish special accounts within the fund.

Section 307 (d) provides for investment of portions of the fund.

Section 307 (e) establishes basis for the Secretary to transfer funds from the different accounts for administrative expenses.

Section 308, advances to the fund:

Section 308 (a) authorizes appropriation of $25 million to capital advance account in Treasury for repayable advances to fund.

Section 308 (b) provides for repayments to capital advance account from income of fund.

Section 308 (c) provides for annual interest payments to the Treasury on advances to the fund, until advances have been repaid.

Section 309, payment of reinsurance claims:

Section 309 (a) makes provision for carriers to claim reinsurance payments, and establishes basis for United States court action if the Secretary denies a claim.

Section 309 (b) provides for interest payments to carriers on unpaid claims.

Section 309 (c) establishes bases for payment of reinsurance claims, including authority to make tentative payments subject to adjustment after final determination of the claims.

Section 309 (d) provides for payment of reinsurance claims when carriers are involved in bankruptcy or insolvency proceedings; it also provides that distribution of reinsurance payments shall be solely used to satisfy claims of subscribers or policyholders under reinsured plans.

Section 310, involuntary termination of reinsurance: This section provides for the Secretary to terminate reinsurance in accordance with provisions of regulations that have been in effect not less than 90 days.

Section 311, actions by policyholders or subscribers: Provides that individual policyholders have no claim against the fund.

Section 312, appropriations: Authorizes annual appropriations through June 30, 1959, for administrative expenses only incurred under title III. (Thereafter, such expenses will be payable from the fund.)

TITLE IV. MISCELLANEOUS

Section 401, legal powers and responsibilities:

Section 401 (a) provides authority to the Secretary to enforce or settle claims.

Section 401 (b) authorizes Secretary to hold hearings.

Section 401 (c) authorizes Secretary to determine the character and necessity of expenditures out of the fund and the manner in which they will be made.

Section 401 (d) establishes jurisdiction of United States courts.

Section 402, accounting and audits: This section provides for an annual budget program like those for wholly owned government corporations, and for annual audits by the General Accounting Office.

Section 403, annual reports: This section provides for annual reports, including recommendations of the Council (with minority views and recommendations, if any).

Section 404, criminal provisions and injunctions:

Section 404 (a) is a declaration by the Congress of the need to circumscribe advertising by reinsured carriers.

Section 404 (b) requires the Secretary to prescribe safeguards with respect to advertising and other representations by carriers concerning reinsurance under the act. It also provides criminal penalties for violations of this section.

Section 404 (c) provides for legal action by the Secretary in respect to advertising.

Section 404 (d) amends the United States Code as it relates to false advertising.

Section 405, appointments above grade GS–15: This authorizes the Secretary to employ not more than 10 persons in grades above GS–15 to administer the reinsurance program.

Section 406, effective date: Provides for effective date 30 days after enactment, but provides for lag period before reinsurance applications are received or considered.

A New Continent for Less Than a Million Dollars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 12, 1954

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, we can take possession of a new continent for less than a million dollar, provided, of course, that, since the Korean war and the diversion in Indochina, Soviet whaling ships and planes have not beaten us to the punch and staked their claims on it.

To our knowledge, no man has seen the new continent in its entirety. No plan has flown across it. No camera maps have accurately outlined its contours.

The new continent has a land mass larger than the United States. It's mineral wealth is reportedly greater than that of any other continents combined.

Strategically, it sits 300 miles south of Cape Horn, across the Drake Strait. It is south of Australia and it is south of Africa. Up to now, one could comfortably assume that South America, Africa, and Australia formed the tripod of the free world, and that so long as they were free, the world would be free.

What would launching platforms for rockets and guided missiles on Antarctica enable an unfriendly power to do to South America, to the United States, to Australia, and to Africa? It could make the sweep of Islam from China to France, through the Mediterranean and across Spain, from the time of Mohammed in 632 to the early Middle Ages, seem like a child's romp.

Once developed by Soviet hands, would the Russians sell the new continent to us as they sold us Alaska? Would they give it up without a fight, especially with morality on their side? The Monroe Doctrine does not apply to Antarctica, only to the Americas, North and South. With a valid claim in their hands in Antarctica, the Soviets could become, almost overnight, masters of the world, strategically, militarily, and economically.

There were those who ridiculed the cost of Alaska to Uncle Sam for $7 million. Others said that $15 million for the Louisiana purchase was theft of the taxpayers' money. There might be those who will hold that the purchase of a new continent greater than Alaska, greater than the Louisiana Purchase, greater than both, plus Texas and the Far West, for less than a million dollars is madcap folly over an ice cap. There might be, Mr. Speaker, but I doubt it.

If the Congress steps on the gas in this session, Mr. Speaker while there is still time, it can claim this continent in the next 2 years for less than a million dollars and do it without gumming the works of the Bureau of the Budget on the $13 million appropriation it plans to trot out in 1957 for approval of the Congress to enable an expedition to take readings of the earth and, the universe from three or four locations in Antarctic. Nice if we can afford the time, Mr. Speaker. But while we gaze at the horizon and cock our ear at the stratosphere and busy ourselves with flying saucers, and the diversions of Korea and Indochina, it seems to me that the realists in the Kremlin, like rattlesnakes in the grass, even now, coil for the lunge at our heel, the heel of the free world—South America, Africa, and Australia.

Soviet whaling ships in Antarctica. Yes. They've been whaling down there since Korea and 1950. Only whaling, Mr. Speaker?

In 1946, the Soviets had over 200 weather stations in the North Pole. We had none. We have nothing in Antarctica today Mr. Speaker. What have the Soviets there? How do we know? I say we can't afford to wait for that Jim Dandy $13 million expedition to come off in 1957 before the people of the United States find out the situation in Antarctica.

The time is now, Mr. Speaker. The Congress cannot flinch. Neither can the Bureau of the Budget nor the White House, nor the Senate.

The Soviets are not asleep. Why should we be? Let us go. Now. In 1954 to Antarctica. The continent is ours for less than a million.

More soon on this situation, Mr. Speaker.

The Duty of France

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 12, 1954

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, there is no question but what the situation in Indochina is very bad. Only within the past few days the French forces evacuated the southern part of the Red River Delta in northern Vietnam leaving the people of that area, largely Christians and strongly anti-Communist to their fate, a terrible fate to countless of thousands of them because of their religion.

While the French high command has stated the retreat from this area is only a temporary measure, and we hope this is so but the probabilities are that it is not a temporary retreat.

When a people of deep religious faith like so many in the area evacuated get under the control of Communists, we know what their fate will be—terrible persecution of all, and martyrdom in the case of many.

We remember the old saying, "a leopard never changes its spots." This can be paraphrased that "a Communist never changes his intent and tactics."

In my remarks, I include an appropriate and expressive editorial appearing in the July 9, 1954, issue of the Catholic Standard, Washington archdiocesan newspaper:

THE DUTY OF FRANCE

The French high command insists that the retreat near Hanoi is only a temporary measure and that the battle is not over. We ardently hope so.

But even if the retreat is only temporary, it is a tragic betrayal of well over 2 million people many of whom are Christians. Particularly tragic is the fate of the Christian natives who rose at the call of the French to fight the Reds knowing that if they failed they would pay with their lives, or worse. They were called to fight even though often they were not given the minimum arms and and munitions to insure a fighting chance against the Reds. The heroic defense of a Catholic seminary, used as a stronghold, in which chairs and furniture were used against submachine guns was evidence of this almost naked defenselessness. Not only the natives but the valiant French soldiers, as those at Dien Bien Phu, have been victimized by the French Government.

While sympathizing with the sacrifices of the soldiers and the French civilians, it cannot be granted that France should be allowed to surrender. France's negligence or ill judgment caused the present debacle and it is primarily up to France to retrieve the situation.

There is good military evidence to prove that surrender is not necessary. The United States observer, Lt. Gen. "Iron Mike" O'Daniels has stated that the situation can be retrieved. And O'Daniels' opinion should be respected.

France, which has given so much to Christion civilization, owes to the world and to Indochina another display of its magnificent courage and inspiration.

Hon. Wayne Hays, of Ohio, Performs Valuable Service on Special Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 12, 1954

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I have been watching with great interest the valuable contribution in behalf of fair play which our collegaue, the Honorable WAYNE L. HAYS, of Ohio, has been making as a member of the special House committee investigating tax-exempt foundations. The Nation owes a debt of gratitude to Representative HAYS for his outstanding work as a member of this committee.

Had it not been for his diligence and his determination to make certain that all facts were brought into the open, much injustice might have resulted from these hearings.

The most important achievement creditable to Congressman HAYS resulted from his exposing to public view how false conclusions are easily reached by the trick of lifting statements out of context and trying to associate these misplaced statements with subversive or unsavory causes.

Under unanimous permission to do so, I include herewith two articles which pay tribute to Congressman Hays for his fine work on the committee and which set forth the manner in which Mr. Hays exposed the trick of lifting statements out of context in order to bring false conclusions.

I include first an article from the June 28 issue of the Trainman News and follow it with an editorial which recently appeared in the Chicago Sun-Times:

[From the Trainman News of June 28, 1954]

Prober Trips on His Own Slick Trick

Washington.—The trick of lifting statements out of context and trying to associate these misplaced statements with subversive or unsavory clauses, got a setback recently when Representative Wayne L. Hayes, Democrat, of Ohio, demonstrated before a House committee that false conclusions are easily reached.

Hays is a member of the House committee holding hearings on tax-exempt foundations such as Ford, Rockefeller, and Carnegie, which have long been entrenched in the culture of the United States as good influences.

Chairman of the committee, Representative B. Carroll Reece, Republican, of Tennessee, and the committee's assistant research director, Thomas M. McNiece, have been out to show that the foundations are helping subversive causes and spreading socialistic ideas, reports the Ohio CIO Council, whose News and Views reported the Hays effort.

Hays submitted three quotations to McNiece and without telling him who wrote the material, Hays asked him to comment.

"All of these are closely comparable to Communist literature that I have read," said McNiece. "They parallel very closely communistic or socialistic ideas."

Then Hays gave him the crushing facts—the quotations were from the writings of Popes Pius XI and Leo XIII.

Hays said that McNiece's comments on the quotations from the Encyclicals of the Popes showed "the danger of lifting paragraphs out of contexts."

Here are the quotations which McNiece said were comparable to Communist literature he has read:

From Pope Leo XIII: "Every effort should be made that fathers of families receive a wage sufficient to meet adequately the ordinary domestic needs. If this was not done social justice demands that reforms be introduced without delay which will guarantee every adult workingman just such a wage."

From Pope Pius XI: he wrote that if workingmen can be encouraged "to look forward to obtaining a share in the land, the result will be that the gulf between vast wealth and deep poverty will be bridged over, and the two orders will be brought together."

Also from Pius XI: "some remedy must be found and quickly found, for the misery and wretchedness which press so heavily at this moment on the large majority of the very poor. Workingmen have been given over, isolated and defenseless, to the callousness of employers and the greed of unrestrained competition."

These words of compassion were smeared as paralleling communistic or socialistic ideas by McNiece.

[From the Chicago Sun-Times]

Reece Propaganda Exposed

We take you now to a congressional hearing room where Representative Carroll Reece is conducting an investigation into America's tax-exempt private foundations.

In a previous investigation in 1952, these foundations were found to be of such welfare to the country that it was recommended further tax advantages should be given to persons who made contributions to them.

Reece was so downcast by this finding that he decided to hold an investigation of his own. He may best be described by the fact that he is a former chairman of the Republican National Committee.

His investigation may best be described by the fact that his committee investigators made up their minds even before any testimony was taken that the big foundations were promoting "collectivism," "socialism," and "mass education."

Now, then, Representative Wayne L. Hays, one of the embattled Democrats on the committee, has been fighting Reece's attempt to use the hearings for propaganda purposes for which they so obviously are intended.

Hays had a chance to expose the propaganda techniques in the course of testimony by Thomas M. McNiece, the committee's associate research director.

McNiece was reading excerpts from Government reports. The excerpts implied that the tax-free foundations were working toward a planned American economy.

Hays interposed to caution McNiece about the danger of reading excerpts out of context, particularly since the reports were by anonymous authors. Could McNiece, for instance, identify the anonymous excerpts Hays handed to him?

The first excerpts spoke of "the callousness of employers and the greed of unrestrained competition." It said that "a small number of very rich men have been able to lay upon the masses of the poor a yoke little better than slavery itself."

The second excerpt said, "If working people can be encouraged to look forward to obtaining a share in the land, the result will be that the gulf between vast wealth and deep poverty will be bridged over."

The third excerpt said that fathers of families must receive a wage sufficient to meet ordinary needs and if this is not feasible then "social justice demands that reforms be introduced without delay which will guarantee every adult working man such a wage."

McNiece read the excerpts and said that though he couldn't identify them he could tell they were closely comparable to Communist literature, and that they paralleled very closely Communist ideals.

The first and second excerpts are from 1891 encyclicals of Pope Leo XIII.

The third excerpt is from a 1931 encyclical of Pope Pius XI.

Guatemalan Triumph Shows How To Kill Red Cancers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT B. CHIPERFIELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 12, 1954

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following editorial from the Daily Register-Mail of July 7, 1954:

Guatemalan Triumph Shows How To Kill Red Cancers

The crushing of Communist and pro-Communist government elements in Guatemala represents a smashing triumph for freedom in the Western Hemisphere.

The 12-day revolution which brought about this result was a weird series of maneuvers in an area of the globe notorious for strange wars and stranger politics.

For days, the rebel forces, led by Col. Carlos Castillo Armas seemed to be fighting a shadow action. Information was scanty, and outsiders concluded after a while that the revolt probably would collapse.

Later it was realized there had been more fighting than could be reported. And when Colonel Castillo's small air force swung into fuller action and was unopposed, the war's complexion changed. Important towns fell to the rebels, and they marched toward the capital of Guatemala City.

Suddenly, the impact of this gathering storm was felt at the palace. The pro-Red regime of President Jacobo Arbenz Guzman resigned and was replaced by a military junta under Col. Carlos Enrique Diaz.

Distant observers were skeptical of the move, fearing a trick by Arbenz. Even the junta's outlawing of the Communist Party failed to convince. Colonel Castillo said the war would go on until the government met rebel demands for the complete crushing of the country's Communist elements.

There followed another palace coup, with another junta headed by tough Col. Elfego J. Monzon, moving in to replace Colonel Diaz. This time the Reds were really given the ax. The action satisfied rebel leaders. And under the auspices of the Organization of American States, a cease fire was arranged.

Thus, though the rebels never put a ground force in the capital and never took more than a fair portion of the country, their persistence, their tiny but damaging air force, and the moral backing given anti-Communist elements by the United States produced the dramatic ouster of the Reds and their sympathizers.

How much material assistance, how much strategic guidance this country might have given the rebels may not be known for some time. Indications are it was not much.

What did count heavily was the presence of American Ambassador John Peurifoy, symbol of the great power to the north. Quietly but forcefully, he lent moral strength to the men who were emboldened to overturn Arbenz and clean out the Communists.

The Communist sore spot in the Western Hemisphere was rubbed out while it was still small. That it could happen as it did must be set down as a minor miracle. But it did occur, and it spells victory. Happily, we were not afraid to use at least some of our weight quickly and effectively.

The need for unflagging vigilance close to home is an obvious lesson from Guatemala. A bigger one may be this: America must use its moral and material power speedily, in the early stages of trouble, if it would really wipe out or check the Communist cancers that arise to infect this globe. In many cases it is now too late; but Guatemala provided instruction for the future.

Iowa Editor Comments on 1 of the 10 Worst Members of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 12, 1954

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Congressional Record, I submit the following editorial from the July 9, 1954, issue of the Traer (Iowa) Star-Clipper, whose distinguished editor, Mr. Harry E. Taylor, is a life-long member of that seg-

ment of the Republican Party, which believes that this Government should first serve the welfare of citizens of the United States:

ONE OF THE TEN WORST?

Life magazine recently named our Third Iowa District Representative, H. R. Gross, as 1 of 10 typical Republicans in Congress who are holding back the Eisenhower administration.

Mr. Gross, and the others named, were said to be guilty of inbred minoriity mindedness, behaving as if a Democrat were still President, and they are duty-bound to oppose him.

Before examining the indictment against Gross in detail it might be well to look at the accuser which sets itself up as a qualified judge of those who are good and bad Republican Representatives in Congress. The publisher of Life magazine is a devout internationalist, one of the powerful group of eastern big business folks who have been working ever since 1940 to remake the Republican Party along more liberal lines, and with a foreign policy that is virtually a carbon copy of the New and Fair Deals. Life was a supporter of the Roosevelt and Truman policies which cast the United States into roles of world Santa Claus and world policeman. The fruits of our world leadership were the sacrifice of the lives of about 400,000 American boys in futile wars in the last 13 years, an increase in our national debt from a few hundred million dollars to a quarter of a trillion dollars, depletion of many of our most valuable resources at an alarming rate, and aiding the buildup of Russian militarism to a point where it is now a perpetual menace to world peace.

The trend in big business for many years has been toward monopoly—eliminating competitors. With the Nation in a state of perpetual wars, hot and cold, since 1941, there has developed in Washington an all-powerful Federal Government which exercises more and more controls over the lives of American business, the farmers, workers and individual citizens. The trend has been toward the development of powerful pressure groups which exert great control over politics, as self-protection against big government.

Big business, which has demonstrated great success in eliminating its competitors, has employed similar technique in managing politics. The way they get what they want is making the two political parties as near alike as possible.

The promoters of this system are able to bring about the nomination of candidates on both tickets whose ideas on foreign policy and on many major domestic policies are virtually the same. Either way the election goes, nationally, these big fellows in the industrial East cannot lose. They have their candidates and their program in both parties now. The voter has very little choice.

The American system of government is based on a 2-party system, 1 in power, the other supposed to be a party of opposition. If the Republican Party is to be tailormade in the image of the Fair Deal, who will furnish the opposition? Of course the sponsors of this system hope that nobody will oppose it, and what little opposition there is will be very weak and can be controlled.

If there were only 10 Republican Congressmen left in Washington who were disposed to oppose this system the outlook for the future of the two-party system in the United States would look very dark indeed. Actually there are a few more, and we are thankful that Mr. Gross is one of them.

If Life magazine had been inclined to be fair in its article, it would have explained that Mr. Gross is not opposed to foreign trade. He is opposed to lowering tariff walls to permit goods manufactured in foreign countries with sweatshop labor, and agricultural products produced by foreign peasant farmers from flooding American markets. He doesn't want foreign-made goods competing unfairly against American manufactured goods produced by high-cost labor, and foreign farm products ruining the market for American farmers whose products can be produced only at high costs. The Republican Party, until recent years, was for protection of the American farmer, small manufacturer and American worker, for as long as this editor can remember. Gross, and many other Republicans of the Third Congressional District, are wondering how the Eisenhower administration, which wants to cut through the tariff walls, is proposing to protect the high standard of living of the American people. What is to prevent high prices, salaries and wages of Americans from sinking to the level of standards of foreign countries, if small American manufacturers, farmers, and workers have to meet this competition?

Some of the big-business people advocating low tariffs to make possible a free exchange of goods between nations, are so big that they have manufacturing plants in foreign countries and are getting the benefit of cheap foreign labor. They would like to lower tariffs to admit their foreign-made products to the American market and undersell the products of American manufacturers whose labor costs are high. But most American manufacturers are small operators, not so fortunate as to have the benefit of low-priced foreign labor. We doubt if very many of the little fellows are crying for free trade.

It is also difficult to understand how low tariffs will help the American farmer, whose products are now subsidized by the Government. With foreign competition, how much higher will the subsidies have to be? It is also rather difficult to understand how low tariffs will benefit American workers. How long will their wages remain high in the face of the competition of European sweatshops?

(Iowa Senator Hickenlooper answered some questions by radio news reporters about United States tariffs on the Forum of the Air broadcast last Sunday. He said the talk that United States tariffs on foreign imports are much higher than foreign tariffs on United States goods is all poppycock. It is just as difficult for United States manufacturers and farmers to export goods and products to foreign countries because of high tariffs as it is for foreign countries to export goods to the United States. In virtually every case the tariffs of foreign governments barring exchange of goods with the United States are just as high and just as discriminatory as those of our Government. This will be news to some people, who have been claiming that if only the United States would lower the tariff barriers, everything would be lovely.)

Mr. Gross, in his letters from Washington published in the Star-Clipper, recently explained why he is opposing the administration's program of flexible price supports. The poll he took of the farmers of our district appeared to indicate rather definitely that his constituents want supports at 90 percent of parity. When the House voted the other day on the administration's substitute measure—82½ to 90 percent of parity—5 of Iowa's 8 Representatives, including Gross, opposed it.

The readers of his letters in the Star-Clipper are also familiar with reasons for Gross' dislike of foreign-aid programs. He certainly has never made any secret of his opposition. Every observing person knows that the avowed object of foreign giveaways—to insure "friends" for the United States when we need them—has not been realized. It is notorious that billions of dollars of our foreign aid has been wasted. Gross points out that about $9½ billion already appropriated by the Congress for foreign aid has not yet been spent, and he saw no reason for adding 3½ billions more in the pipeline now. There are a lot of necessary things that Americans are having to get along without because so much of their tax money is being sent abroad. (When the House voted on the administration's $3½-billion foreign-aid measure last weekend, a large majority of Iowa's eight Representatives joined Gross in voting against.)

The criticism of Mr. Gross by Life magazine sounds almost identical to that voiced during the recent primary-election campaign by his principal opponent for the Republican nomination, James Conroy, of Clear Lake, a handsome, affable young fellow, who waged a vigorous campaign. He took the position that Gross is "against" everything and is obstructing the Eisenhower program. He pledged that if he was nominated and elected to Gross' seat in the House he would back Ike by supporting low tariffs, foreign aid, the "world policeman" foreign policies, flexible price supports for the farmers, and a liberal domestic program.

Gross stayed on the job in Washington and did virtually no campaigning for the primary election. He ran for the renomination on his past record. It is evident the Republican primary voters in the Third District like Gross' brand of Republicanism better than that of Mr. Conroy, who really worked hard to sell himself and his conception of the Eisenhower program. But Gross defeated the liberal Mr. Conroy by a margin of 2 to 1.

Tama County Republicans liked Gross even more than that. The vote in our county was Gross 1,565, Conroy 313, or a margin of 5 to 1.

In the Third District at least, and we think over a larger area, public ideas as to what constitutes a good Republican seem to vary sharply from those which inspired the criticism of the "10 worst Republicans" by Life magazine.

What Is the Responsibility of the Press?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AIME J. FORAND

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 12, 1954

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following transcript of the American Forum broadcast of June 20, 1954:

Announcer. The National Broadcasting Co. presents the American Forum, America's oldest unrehearsed discussion program. Today we depart from our usual format to present a turnabout program with Members of Congress questioning the press. Our interrogators today are Congressman Clarence J. Brown, Republican, of Ohio, Member of the House Government Operations Committee and the House Rules Committee; and Congressman John W. McCormack, of Massachusetts, Democratic whip of the House and member of the House Government Operations Committee. Defending the question, "What is the responsibility of the press?" is Drew Pearson, nationally known columnist and commentator. Now, speaking for the founder and producer of the American Forum, Theodore Granik, here is Stephen McCormick. Mr. McCormick.

Mr. McCormick. Today we have an unusual turnabout program, two veteran legislators questioning Drew Pearson, nationally known columnist and TV-radio commentator; Congressman John McCormack, of Massachusetts; Congressman Clarence Brown, of Ohio. I am sure we ought to have some interesting questions, and, Mr. McCormack, it looks like you have one right now.

Congressman McCormack. Mr. Pearson, the freedom of the press is one of the cornerstones of personal liberty, and properly so, in our country. It is a great constitutional right. Do you agree that the press has the responsibility of preserving and protecting that right?

Mr. Pearson. I do.

Congressman McCormack. And it rests upon the press itself, because Congress cannot pass any laws abridging the freedom of the press. That is correct, isn't it?

Mr. Pearson. That is correct.

Congressman McCormack. Do you think the press has been protecting—assuming that responsibility and protecting that right? And by that I mean, a segment of the press, noticeable and effective?

Mr. Pearson. I would be the first to admit, Congressman, that we of the press have sometimes erred. We have made mistakes. I don't champion all the press. I can look back over my own career and see some mistakes that I have made, but by and large we have tried.

Congressman McCormack. Well, do you recognize or admit the fact that 90 percent of the newspapers of the country in 1952 supported the Republican Party?

Mr. Pearson. Yes, I admit approximately 80 percent, and you may be right about 90 percent.

Congressman McCormack. I mean in 1952. And about 84 percent in 1948.

Mr. Pearson. I would say you are right.

Congressman Brown. Would the gentleman yield?

Congressman McCormack. I have one more question: Do you think that is evidence of a free press, politically?

Mr. Pearson. Well, I would say that those papers had a right editorially to support anyone they pleased but I would say those papers did not have a right to omit news which was unfavorable to the Republican Party and play up news that was unfavorable to the Democratic Party.

Mr. McCormick. Congressman Brown—I am sure that word "Republican," Mr. McCormack, did it.

Congressman Brown. I am a newspaper publisher myself and I disagree a little bit with Mr. McCormack. I question whether that shows a lack of interest in freedom of press but rather shows very good judgment on the part of the press, to support Republican candidates.

Speaking seriously for just a moment, I think we can agree that while editorially a great many of the newspapers of this country, the great proportion of them, did support the Republican candidates in 1948 and in 1952, that the headlines were taken over very much by some of the things that were said and done by the Democratic candidate. There is an old saying in the press that if you will let me write the headlines, why the other man can write the editorials, because the headlines reach the people and have a great impact on them.

I wanted to go into another responsibility of the press question if I might. I would like to ask Mr. Pearson this question: What are the responsibilities of the press in respect to the publishing of secret information and confidential information obtained through leaks from Government employees?

Mr. McCormick. Before you answer that I wonder if I might point out for the benefit of those viewers and listeners who just joined us that we are discussing "What is the responsibility of the Press?" with Congressman John McCormack, of Massachusetts, Congressman Clarence Brown, of Ohio, and Drew Pearson.

Would you like to state the question once again?

Congressman Brown. Yes; I am happy to repeat it. I am asking Mr. Pearson: What are the responsibilities of the press in regard to publishing secret or confidential information that may be obtained through leaks from public officials or public employees?

Mr. Pearson. Congressman, that is a very excellent and very difficult question at the some time. During the war the question was easy to answer because during the war, as you know, we had voluntary censorship where the newspapermen and the newspapers did their best to live up to. The rules were cut and dried and it was fairly easy.

Today, in peacetime, it is different.

Congressman Brown. That was because of censorship, now.

Mr. Pearson. Voluntary censorship.

Congressman McCormack. Yes; but some of them didn't go for it?

Mr. Pearson. There were some cases and notably in the Chicago Tribune where the grand jury was called on one particular case, yes.

Congressman McCormack. That was an important break, too.

Mr. Pearson. It was an important break, yes; you are quite right, but it was voluntary censorship and it was lived up to pretty well. However, to answer what I think your main question is directed at, peacetime judgment of the press, let me direct my answer to that if I can and say that I, as a newspaperman—if I can speak for myself, primarily—have published some documents which are labeled at times, secret. I have tried when I have done that, to take the matters up first with authorized spokesmen for certain Government agencies. To illustrate: I have been criticized on the floor of the Senate by the junior Senator from Wisconsin for publishing——

Congressman Brown. You have been criticized in the House, too.

Mr. Pearson. I stand corrected, I have been, but at any rate in this particular case I was criticized because I published, after the retreat by General MacArthur's army from the Yalu River, I published the fact that his intelligence was in error and I quoted certain texts to prove it, that he should not have gone up there, that there were Chinese up there waiting for him.

Now, before I published that I went to the authorized general in the Pentagon who had to do with military and press information and asked him whether there was any violation of security and he said no, that it was all right to publish it.

Congressman Brown. Now, Mr. Pearson, you have been discussing military information. Of course, I think we can all agree that there is a certain line of demarcation where we must stop in the publication of military information, especially in time of war, or in time of police action. However, what about these cases in time of peace—for instance, information out of the State Department that may be marked "secret" or "confidential"? You have been charged many times with having a sort of pipeline into the State Department. Now, where do you draw the line on publishing that information? Do you think you have the right to publish information of that type out of different governmental departments that is marked confidential or secret or restricted?

Mr. Pearson. First let me say, Congressman Brown, there is a tendency—and I am sure you will recognize it—for any official to stamp secret on almost anything.

Congressman Brown. Now, don't get me on your side. I fought about that myself.

Mr. Pearson. I know you have.

Congressman Brown. I am trying to find out just what your reaction or line is.

Mr. Pearson. That is a good question and an important one. The only way to judge that is try to figure out what is in the public interest. If I told you right now that I had withheld certain information regarding a very important thing that is going on right today, which I don't want to mention, I am sure you would agree with me that the newspapermen had been very discreet not to mention it.

Congressman Brown. And also the Congressmen have been very discreet in not mentioning it.

Mr. Pearson. It is very important and very delicate. But on other occasions when merely the prestige of some State Department official is at stake, and he is wanting to cover up by a secret document, I publish them.

Congressman Brown. You print or fail to print according to what your judgment or conscience tells you?

Mr. Pearson. Not necessarily my judgment alone. Yes, I exercise my judgment, but I also consult.

Congressman Brown. Now, if you do that, if you decide in your own mind through your own judgment and your own conscience whether you have the right or do not have the right to publish some restricted, confidential and secret information obtained through leaks from public officials, then why do you criticize Members of Congress who make public information that they receive through leaks from public officials, that, in their judgment and conscience they believe the people ought to know or the Congress ought to know.

Mr. Pearson. I don't believe that I have.

Congressman Brown. I believe we would disagree on that.

Mr. Pearson. Excuse me, you interrupted me at one place there. I was about to say that I do not exercise my conscience alone but I discussed the matters with public officials and asked them, would this upset any international apple carts or be embarrassing to the Government.

Congressman Brown. Do you just get some of these things from the State Department files?

Mr. Pearson. I have, yes.

Congressman McCormack. Now, let's get back to the responsibility of the press. A matter of 2 or 3 years ago there was a convention held of publishers and one of them made a report of a survey he made in which he stated that in the 1948 elections between 35 and 40 percent of the press of the country discolored the news politically and deliberately so against the Democrats. Do you remember that?

Mr. Pearson. I remember it in a general way, yes.

Congressman McCormack. Would you agree that is a pretty fair percentage, between 35 and 40 percent discolored the news politically in the 1948 elections?

Mr. Pearson. I would say that a percentage did.

Congressman McCormack. Would you say that is assuming the responsibility of the press which is to be fair and free and objective?

Mr. Pearson. No, I would say that was unfair.

Congressman McCormack. So the press has been unfair in that respect.

Mr. Pearson. It has been unfair and I regret to say——

Congressman McCormack. Now, take the Wall Street Journal, do you think the large contributors have any influence on the news columns and also the discoloration and also the editorial policy of some of the papers? Not all by any means but some.

Mr. Pearson. The Wall Street Journal? I doubt it.

Congressman McCormack. The Wall Street Journal resisted it.

Mr. Pearson. May I just illustrate that. The Wall Street Journal published some of the fairest reports on Senator Nixon, now Vice President, during the recent campaign, of any paper in the country.

Congressman McCormack. I am talking about the incidents now with General Motors where they are taking away their advertising because they didn't like something that the Wall Street Journal carried about their future plans, etc., in one of its publications.

Congressman Brown. They broke the secrecy on their new automobiles.

Mr. Pearson. I was not aware of that. I should be.

Congressman McCormack. Do you think that newspapers should employ evaluators of news, rewrite writers, editorial writers, or anyone in a position where they can contribute toward the molding of public opinion, who is Communist or a member of a prescribed Communist-front organization?

Mr. Pearson. I do not.

Congressman McCormack. How can you stop it?

Mr. Pearson. Well, you can stop it by pressure of public opinion. I think that every newspaper is anxious to stop it if they know it anyway.

Congressman McCormack. I say assuming any of them have them in their employ, you think it should be discontinued?

Mr. Pearson. Yes, I do.

Congressman McCormack. And they should have a searching investigation of their own as to the loyalty of those—particularly those having anything to do with the molding of public opinion.

Mr. Pearson. Yes, I do, but I think they do that anyway.

Congressman McCormack. Now take yourself. You are a columnist. Have you been penalized for any of the columns that you have written because some people didn't like what you wrote?

Mr. Pearson. Yes, I have.

Congressman McCormack. Will you state—do you want to state how you have been penalized?

Mr. Pearson. Well, for instance in Des Moines, Iowa, which is a city which has only 1 newspaper, owned by 1 man or 1 family, the articles that I wrote regarding Nixon's personal expense fund a year and a half ago were not printed, were canceled, and when I persisted in writing about his personal expense fund, the column was canceled entirely.

I would like to add something there, if I may, that Congressman Brown mentioned which I think is important: The news in headlines—he made the point, which is a good one, that our newspapers tell the story in headlines. By and large I agree with him, but I would like to cite a difference—an exception. I was on General Eisenhower's train when he was campaigning and was in Omaha before the election and we pulled into Omaha late that afternoon. The Omaha World Telegram published on page 52 a headline, a very minor headline, that Senator Nixon had received a personal expense fund. You could hardly find it in the paper. Earlier that day, the Des Moines Register Tribune, through which city we passed in the afternoon, published it, I think, on page 18 under a minor headline. I am convinced if Eisenhower had seen that and realized the full import of a vice presidential candidate's personal expense fund, his reaction would have been entirely different. As it was, he didn't know until the next morning. The palace guard kept it from him until 3 o'clock in the morning.

Congressman Brown. You will agree that a newspaper publisher has the right to decide for himself whether he thinks a column is worthwhile or not and whether or not, for instance, the predictions in the column or the statements in the column are proper and correct?

Mr. Pearson. This was not a column. This was news carried in the Associated Press.

Congressman Brown. Oh, news only; you are referring not to your own column. I thought you were talking about your column being dropped out of one of the newspapers.

Mr. Pearson. I was, but also——

Congressman Brown. Now Mr. McCormack has brought out, and very ably and very well, something about how the newspapers predicted Republican victory and supported the Republican ticket and so forth and so on.

Now back in 1950, you made a great many forecasts, I remember, in that congressional campaign, and I am just going to take 1 second here. I remember you predicted that Mr. Fromiller would be elected Governor out in Arizona and, of course, these predictions in advance have a great deal of influence on elections, and you and I agree on that, and perhaps sometimes—I don't say in your case but in some cases that I know of I thought they were made by at least a campaign manager, for the purpose of influencing votes. You predicted that Senator Lucas would be elected by a heavy majority over Dirksen. You predicted Senator Thomas would be elected over Bennett in Utah. You predicted that Senator Hickenlooper, Republican in Iowa, would lose, and he won by 87,000 votes. That Senator Millikin, of Colorado, would be defeated; that Senator Dworshak, of Idaho, would be defeated; that Senator Taft might win, but it would be by a close vote, and he swept the State by the largest majority in history.

Now was that bad judgment? I want to ask you just one question: Was that bad judgment on your part, Mr. Pearson, lack of information, lack of knowledge of what was going on, poor reporting, or was it done for a purpose such as suggested by Mr. McCormack, here, on some of the things that have happened in other newspapers?

Mr. Pearson. I am going to make another prediction right now; I am going to predict that I wish I hadn't come on this program.

Congressman Brown. What slipped there?

Mr. Pearson. No, I am delighted to answer that question, and I am also complimented that you made such a study of my predictions.

Congressman Brown. I just happen to remember them. I remember one time you and I meeting in 1946 just between broadcasts, you may recall it, when you told me you thought that Knowland was going to be defeated by the lad who ran against him out in California, the son of the old humorist, Will Rogers, Jr.

Mr. Pearson. Oh, Congressman, I did not. I predicted that Knowland would win.

Congressman Brown. Well, you did later, after you and I talked. I recall very much. I just wonder if you get information from dumb country boys like me, or whether you really get it from people out in the States, and how you got all this information upon which you based these predictions.

Mr. McCormack. Could you keep it brief? Our time is running short.

Mr. Pearson. That is a good question. Let's take Knowland. I called up 5 or 6 people in California before I made that prediction that he would win. I called up the editor of the San Francisco Chronicle, which is a Republican paper. I called the editor of the Los Angeles Daily News, which is the Democratic paper. I called up 2 or 3 other editors in Sacramento, and I finally predicted Mr. Knowland would win, which he did. I can give you another prediction—

Congressman Brown. Wait just a minute. May I interrupt there just long enough——

Mr. Pearson. In 1948 I predicted that Dewey would win.

Congressman Brown. Now, the last time that we were together was in the hallway going onto the elevator in New York, at 14th Street, and at that time you were going up to make the broadcast, and I asked you what you were going to say about California, and you said you though you would predict Rogers would win, and I told you if you did you ought to have your head examined, if you will remember. I went out, got in the car, and started home, and when I turned on the radio you predicted wisely and well that Knowland would be elected because I said to you that afternoon or that evening, why, Knowland would win by at least 150,000, and he won by 255, and you made a good prediction. But I am asking you about me.

Mr. Pearson. I am not going to discount what you told me, but if I told you I thought Will Rogers was going to win, I was kidding you.

Congressman Brown. I have been kidded before and by experts.

Mr. McCormick. Now, on this subject of predictions, a few minutes ago you talked about a big story. Were you talking in generalizations or do you, Mr. Pearson, or do you gentlemen, know of a big story that is about to break and you haven't let us in on it?

Congressman Brown. If we know of it, we won't break it here.

Congressman McCormack. Well, as far as I am concerned, being a Democrat, I wouldn't know because we are not consulted. We are consulted to bail them out when they are in trouble.

Congressman Brown. John, I have heard you make some awfully good predictions. They came true to the sorrow of us, at times.

Congressman McCormack. Do you predict the House will go Democratic next fall?

Mr. Pearson. Yes; I do.

Congressman McCormack. Do you predict the Senate will go Democratic next fall?

Mr. Pearson. No; I don't predict that, yet. I will say the race is going to be very close.

Congressman McCormack. But you have a hunch that it might, I hope?

Mr. Pearson. In the Senate it is going to be 50–50, and I would not want to predict that until the very end.

Congressman Brown. Do you make predictions about what is going to happen to Congressman McCormack and Congressman Brown? That is rather important.

Mr. Pearson. That is an easy prediction. They will be overwhelmingly reelected.

Mr. McCormick. Is this the big story you were talking about earlier, or were you talking in generalities?

Mr. Pearson. Well, I was not talking in generalities, but I would rather not go into that because it would be something that we ought not to talk about.

Mr. McCormick. We have talked about the right to withhold information, too.

Mr. Pearson. I think this should be withheld. I really shouldn't have mentioned that.

Congressman McCormack. I have heard some correspondents, 2 or 3, at Capitol Hill tell me in confidence, Mr. Pearson, that they have instruction from their papers to write along a certain line, what is happening in the debates and so forth, and to write them pro-Republican. Do you think that is right?

Mr. Pearson. There are cases where instructions are sent. There is no question about it.

Congressman McCormack. And the obtaining of news—without regard one way or the other, do you think such instructions should be issued to any man in the gathering and writing of news?

Mr. Pearson. I certainly think it shouldn't be done, and the best papers do not do it. You are right, however, it is done.

Congressman McCormack. In the news columns the papers should report the news as accurately and fairly as possible.

Mr. Pearson. They should, and they should go out to find out what is behind the news.

Congressman McCormack. And the newspaper should be as fair in the disposition of space to both political parties as possible.

Mr. Pearson. That is correct.

Congressman McCormack. Editorially they have their right to determine their own policy?

Mr. Pearson. I think when it comes to space during campaigns that the newspapers are pretty fair. They print the speeches on both sides.

Congressman McCormack. Editorially they have the right to prescribe their own policy.

Mr. Pearson. They do.

Congressman McCormack. Don't you think it is unusual in a big country like the United States, that 85 to 90 percent of the press have one editorial policy, the Republican policy?

Mr. Pearson. I have sometimes said that same thing.

Congressman McCormack. Do you think the big advertisers have anything to do with that?

Mr. Pearson. No, I don't believe so. I don't believe the advertisers do. I think the fact that newspaper publishers gradually drift around to the point where many of them are conservative Republicans——

Congressman McCormack. There is a substantial segment of the press that is what you call the personalized press, owned by an individual or family; is that so?

Mr. Pearson. That is correct.

Congressman McCormack. Do you think they should use their newspapers under the great constitutional guaranty of freedom of the press to editorialize and carry out their own personal views or their hatreds or their likes or their dislikes?

Mr. Pearson. No; I do not.

Congressman McCormack. And yet you know it is being done.

Mr. McCormick. Congressman Brown, I am surprised that you are so quiet.

Congressman Brown. I agree with Mr. McCormack and Mr. Pearson in their positions that the press in reporting news should report it fairly and accurately, and I am afraid, as a newspaper publisher—I want to say this very frankly—there are times when the news has not been printed as accurately or reported as fairly as it should have been. My experience, however, has been a little different from Mr. McCormack's. As a conservative Republican on Capitol Hill I have watched activities in committees——

Congressman McCormack. We are progressive now under President Eisenhower.

Congressman Brown. Well, I am still a conservative, honest-to-God Republican, that is so liberal that I don't want to give the liberty of the American people away and simply won't do it at any time.

Congressman McCormack. Whatever your views are, Congressman Brown, you honestly entertain them and I thoroughly respect them.

Congressman Brown. Thank you very much.

Mr. Pearson. I would like to say also, Congressman Brown's newspapers are very fair.

Congressman McCormack. Do they take your column?

Congressman Brown. No; we can't afford it. It is too high priced.

Mr. Pearson. That is not true.

Congressman Brown. I have had the experience and many other people have had the experience on the Hill of seeing something reported that was written by what I call leftwing and radical newspaper reporters and persons of that stripe on the Hill that you wouldn't know were the same things—that the thing was the same that actually happened. In other words, you could go back to the stenographic record and read it and it wasn't anything like what happened, or the way it was reported in the newspapers. The thing that happened was entirely different. It was misreported. Now, that has been done time after time and I want to say frankly, in my opinion, there is a lot more misreporting or failure to give the accurate facts on news that happens in Congress, on the side of the so-called fringe radical elements than there is the other way around.

Congressman McCormack. We won't discuss that because there are a lot of hate columns written in the newspapers, aren't there?

Mr. Pearson. That is right.

Congressman Brown. I condemn them whether they are against the Republicans or the Democrats or against the liberals or the conservatives.

Congressman McCormack. As a columnist, do you gather news or do you write your own views?

Mr. Pearson. I try to gather news. I sometimes editorialize.

Congressman McCormack. Do you think, as a columnist, you should be governed by the same standards as the gatherers and reporters of news?

Mr. Pearson. Yes, I should.

Congressman McCormack. Are you?

Mr. Pearson. Yes, I am.

Congressman Brown. John, let me ask real quick here, if I may. Do you believe that you and the press have the responsibility to present both sides of a controversial issue?

Mr. Pearson. Yes, we do.

Congressman Brown. Do you give the other side the opportunity to present their side in a controversial issue that appears in your column?

Mr. Pearson. I try to. I come around to see you from time to time.

Congressman Brown. Will you give space to the other side, the man on the other side of the controversy?

Mr. Pearson. As long as they are telling the truth.

Congressman Brown. Well, perhaps they will challenge the question of your truth. There have been a lot of libel suits filed both ways, by you and against you.

Mr. Pearson. There have been some.

Congressman Brown. How many, by the way?

Mr. Pearson. I have forgotten, but one from your colleague in Ohio, Mr. Sweeney. He brought 70 against me, and I won them all.

Congressman Brown. That's a good many. He must have had a good lawyer or a lot of money to spend, I don't know which.

Mr. McCormick. I am sorry, gentlemen, I must interrupt. Our time is up. I wish we had more time. We certainly do thank you, gentlemen, Congressman John McCormack, Democrat, of Massachusetts, and Congressman Clarence Brown, Republican, of Ohio, and Drew Pearson, nationally known columnist and TV commentator, for our discussion today. The Nation's first discussion program, the American Forum, is now in its 26th year, founded and produced by Theodore Granik.

PRINTING DOCUMENTS AND REPORTS

Documents and reports of committees with the evidence and papers submitted therewith, or any part thereof ordered printed by Congress, may be reprinted by the Public Printer on order of any Member of Congress or Delegate, on prepayment of the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 162, p. 1940).

PRICE OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

The Public Printer is authorized to furnish to subscribers the daily Record at $1.50 per month, payable in advance.

Remit by money order payable to Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Printing and binding for Congress, when recommended to be done by the Committee on Printing of either House, shall be so recommended in a report containing an approximate estimate of the cost thereof, together with a statement from the Public Printer of estimated approximate cost of work previously ordered by Congress within the fiscal year (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 145, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on Printing, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

DISTRIBUTION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

To the Vice President and each Senator 100 copies; to the Secretary and Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, each, 25 copies; to the Secretary, for official use, not to exceed 35 copies; to the Sergeant at Arms, for use on the floor of the Senate, not to exceed 50 copies; to each Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress, 68 copies; to the Clerk, Sergeant at Arms, and Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives, each, 25 copies; to the Clerk, for official use, not to exceed 50 copies; and to the Doorkeeper, for use on the floor of the House of Representatives, not to exceed 75 copies; to the Vice President and each Senator, Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress there shall also be furnished (and shall not be transferable), 3 copies of the daily Record, of which 1 shall be delivered at his residence, 1 at his office, and 1 at the Capitol.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized book dealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by book dealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the Record.

I

M
to
tab
Hon
the
New
MAR
pen
esca
twee
cent
wide
the
ther
Th
I a
conve
build
world
in th
Throu
the fi
buildi
ing a
And—
I ho
my sp
ligence
One
Preside
Eisenh
peril."
discuss
I would
tive an
intellig
Actu
fronted
visited
must
civiliza
The
moralit
existen
erected.
Our
truth
suspicio
roots g
mutual
shakes
business
for its
signator
handsha
this gre
live.
To pu
business
It is
each oth
have re
have res
are trut

Appendix

Moral Civilization and Antimoral Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 13, 1954

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a notable address by our beloved Speaker, the Honorable JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., before the Lions' International convention in New York City, on July 9, 1954. Speaker MARTIN has set forth with remarkable penetration and forthrightness the inescapable and unresolvable conflict between freemen who want to build a decent, humane civilization and the worldwide Communist conspiracy dedicated to the destruction of all morality, and thereby of the human values we treasure.

The address follows:

I am proud to come and speak at this great convention of one of the great forces for building a more peaceful and understanding world. I am also proud of my membership in the Attleboro Club of your organization. Through that membership I am cognizant of the fine part this organization performs in building better communities, and supporting and sustaining the more unfortunate. And—

I hope you will forgive me if I borrow for my speech today our slogan, "Liberty Intelligence, Our Nation's Safety."

One of the great man of our times, the President of the United States, Dwight D. Eisenhower, has said we live in an "age of peril." I agree with him. I would like to discuss with you the nature of that peril. I would like to hold it up in its true perspective and examine it in the terms of liberty, intelligence, and the safety of all our nations.

Actually, we of this 20th century are confronted with the greatest struggle that has visited civilization. To understand it we must first relate it to the nature of the civilization that is threatened.

The backbone of our free society is morality. It is the foundation on which our existence and our mode of life has been erected.

Our morality is based on preference for truth over misrepresentation, trust over suspicion and faith over heresy. From those roots grow such things as good will and mutual regard. If a member of the Lions shakes hands with another member on a business deal, if a community issues bonds for its schools or a nation becomes a signatory to a treaty, the validity of that handshake, issue or signature rests solely on this great moral code under which free men live.

To put it in the every-day language of the business world—a man's word is his bond.

It is because of this mutual respect for each other as individuals that communities have respect for each other, that nations have respect for each other. The key words are truth, trust, and faith. Without them our civilization crumbles and our freedom disappears.

Yet today there are forces loose in the world whose sole aim is the substitution of misrepresentation for truth, suspicion for trust, and heresy for faith. These forces can be identified very simply. The constitute the world Communist conspiracy.

Yes, we live in an age of peril, but do we understand the cause of the peril? Do we fully grasp its methods and its aims?

It is a basic axiom of warfare that you must understand the nature of your enemy. Yet here today civilization is under the greatest seige in its history and I am fearful that far too few understand the nature of the struggle.

If I asked anyone in this audience to raise his hand who was opposed to cancer, every one of you would instantly raise a hand. If I asked each of you who is opposed to communism to raise your hand every one of you would raise a hand.

But if I asked each of you, after a moment's reflection, to indicate whether you understood the true nature of cancer, not a hand would go up. And if I asked for the same moment of reflection concerning communism, how many hands would go up?

Perhaps the greatest obstacle we must overcome to grasp the full nature of the Communist conspiracy is our own inability to comprehend that it is the enemy of morality. And being the enemy of morality it is the arch-enemy of our civilization.

How many of us have read the writings of Marx, Lenin, and Stalin? How many of us have grasped the full significance of their cynical contempt for law, their denunciation of religion as the "opiate of the people," and their strict adherence, both in theory and practice, to their basic premise, "any means to the end."

What room is there for truth, trust, and faith in the Communist scheme of things when the entire Communist doctrine is built, operated, and maintained by untruth, suspicion, and heresy? What room is there for goodwill and mutual regard? Where can there be any validity in either the handshake or the treaty? Under communism a man's word is not his bond. It is a weapon to be used only as one of "any means to an end."

The truth of the matter is that communism has no morals. It is amoral; it is antimoral. And unless we understand this we cannot begin to grasp the true nature of communism.

One of the tragedies of our times is the era just expired, during which too many people who should have known better and too many governments which should have known better regarded communism as some advanced form of liberalism, as some vague, new enlightened movement. But thank God that today people more and more are rejecting such nonsense. Thank God that today there are men in the world who grasp the complete moral nature of this struggle.

But as the great illusion dims, as the tragic flirtation with communism ends, how many of us today have taken the pains to correctly inform ourselves on the truth of what occurred during that period? How many hundreds of simple but accurate facts have escaped our knowledge, or worse, have been spoon-fed us in disguise by pro-Communist propagandists who deliberately employed the weapon of untruth?

How many people do you suppose know that it was not the Communists in Russia who threw off the yoke of the Czars by revolution, but the forces led by Alexander Kerensky, an anti-Communist?

How many people do you suppose know that it was the German Government which in 1917 transported the Communist conspirators, headed by Lenin, from their hiding place in Switzerland to Russia to start a Communist counter-revolution because Germany feared the Kerensky government might bring Russia back into the war against the Kaiser's forces?

How many people do you suppose know that having employed an armed insurrection to seize power shortly before the November 25, 1917, elections that the Communists won only 168 assembly votes in a body of 703 deputies in the only free election ever held anywhere in any land seized by the Communists?

How many people know that the Communists, having discovered that the Russian people did not want them, arrested the members of the assembly when they convened in Petrograd in January of 1918 and dissolved the parliamentary body which the Russian people themselves had elected in rebuke to the Communist conspiracy?

How many people know that the Communists have never won a single free election in any land at any time; that where their popularity has been put to test they have always been in the minority?

How many people know that in the last free elections before the Communists took over one government after another in Europe that they never polled more than 31 percent of the vote in any country?

How many people know that in the 36 years in which the Soviet Government has been in power it has broken every single agreement or treaty that it has made with the free nations of the world; that it has used every conference table and every international forum to stall, disrupt and divide those with whom the representatives of the Soviets met?

The list can go on and on. We could talk about the purges, the slave camps, and the planned famines behind the Iron Curtain, and yes, about the treacheries imposed within the boundaries of our free countries by the highly disciplined Communist Parties within those countries.

We could examine the writings of Lenin, Stalin, and the other high Communist functionaries instructing the Communist conspirators not to obey the laws of other lands but to bend them to Communist ends; to cloak themselves with legality only for self-protection until they destroy these very laws themselves.

We could examine the doctrines of the Trojan horse, the transmission belts, the theory of front organizations, the instructions for espionage and sabotage and all the other deceits and trickeries which are the warp and woof of the Communist bible of tactics.

And when you get through with the entire list, the entire history of communism from beginning to end, you cannot find one iota of the democratic process, one smattering of respect for law, a single tenet of morality or a single expression of regard for human liberty.

I ask you: What possible chance is there for coexistence of this outlaw conspiracy alongside a civilization based on truth, trust, and faith, on freedom and the individual dignity of man?

What new liberalism is there here?

What basis is there for the handshake or the treaty when the life of the pact ceases the moment it is made?

On what grounds can we base mutual respect?

Where can we find good will in any agreement reached under such conditions?

To the north of us lies Canada, a nation of 14 million people, who belong to the society of freemen and whose devotion to the moral fiber of our existence is unquestioned.

Back in 1817 an understanding was negotiated with the United States known as the Rush-Bagot Agreement. It was submitted to and ratified by the United States Senate. It provided that neither the United States nor Canada would place ships of war on the waters of the Great Lakes forming a part of the boundary between Canada and the United States.

Now note this: As the feelings of 1776 and 1812 receded and the feelings of mutual respect between the United States and Canada increased this agreement was expanded without any real formal proceedings to include nonfortification of any part of the border between our two countries.

Thus for 133 years Canada and the United States, through employment of a mere piece of paper and a firm handshake have lived in peaceful coexistence without so much as a border guard. Why? Because both nations are firm subscribers to the tenets of truth, trust, and faith. They have given their word and it is their bond.

And let me tell you now that peaceful coexistence between any two or more peoples can only succeed if these vital and moral ingredients exist. If we for one moment return to the tragic illusions and flirtations of other years we shall be only sowing the seeds of our own destruction and an end to civilization as we know it.

We here in the United States enjoy the leadership of one of the great men in history Dwight D. Eisenhower. More than a year ago he laid down the principle from which we must never depart. In effect he said that if the Russians want peaceful settlement of differences, let them demonstrate their good intentions by executing and living up to certain agreements first.

Now there is a practical policy that recognizes the realities of the world situation.

There is a policy that will never permit any aggressor nation—and I include Red China—to blast its way into the United Nations.

There is a policy that will avoid the pitfalls of any so-called Locarno Pack for the Asiatic nations.

I think the President made this abundantly clear only a week ago when he said and said most forcibly (quote):

"I will not be a party to any treaty that makes anybody a slave." (Unquote.)

I have said for years that the Soviet Union and the Communist conspiracy have respect for only one thing in our way of life—that is firmness and toughness. And that includes a strong defense program for not only the United States but all free nations.

It is very well to talk about trying once more, peaceful coexistence, and sitting down again at the conference table, but we have gone to too many conferences in the past, with nothing more than a calfskin brief case, a bottle of ink, and a pious hope, not to have learned our lesson by now.

The peoples of Poland, Rumania, Bulgaria and all the other Eastern European nations who saw the Iron Curtain lowered on them by the stroke of a foolish pen are mute witnesses to the folly of such a course.

What alternatives are there to offer? How can we get the peace that we all want, that we must have? How can we remove the peril that communism represents?

I return to my original premise. The path to the solution lies in understanding of the forces that imperil us.

Just as medical science will never find the cure for cancer until it fully discovers and understands how cancer comes into being and spreads its malignancy, so it is that we will not have the solution to the Communist peril until we fully comprehend its amoral and its malignant tactics.

The trouble in the world today is that we have too few experts and too many who think they are.

We have too many people who think that because they recognize Soviet imperialism they are excused from any study of communism's diabolical methods as a world conspiracy.

The trouble is we have too many people who are willing to criticize those who do understand communism and too few people who are willing to criticize those who do understand it themselves.

It is through such civic organizations as ours, through our veterans groups our labor unions and our churches that a great educational program must be undertaken. The time has come when those among us who were misled in the past should make an honest reappraisal of what they really stand for lest they compound their errors by impeding those who are trying to save not only the free peoples but civilization itself.

Believe me, we have the weapons with which to win. They are:

1. The greatest of weapons—truth.
2. The will to triumph.
3. The moral stamina to succeed.

It is imperative that we supply a missing ingredient, and that ingredient is understanding of the true nature of the struggle we are in.

This battle will not be won by might of arms, nor by a Maginot Line of A-bombs or H-bombs. For I know of no surer way to destroy civilization than to submit it to a third world conflict, this time accompanied by every dreadful holocaust that science can visit upon us.

Let no one think that the will to throw off the yoke has been completely snuffed out behind the Iron Curtain. The riots of East Berlin, Leipzig and Pilsen a year ago, combined with the response to the distribution of the Eisenhower food packages in East Berlin last summer is evidence enough to the contrary.

Given the understanding that we must have, we can turn the tide of this struggle. For then, we can employ our minds in creating weapons of psychological warfare, propaganda, agitation and infiltration to counteract the very same tactics which have proved so successful when used by the Communists.

One man or one government alone cannot win this struggle. It must be a thoroughly informed coalition of all the free peoples and all their governments acting in concert toward one end.

There is a role in this struggle for every one of us. Study and inform ourselves. Urge others to join in the effort. Avoid the diversionary quarrels of those who would turn our heads away from the struggle, whether they do it through their own ignorance or their own design.

Yes, this is truly the age of peril. We must rise to meet its challenge. We can win the struggle if you and I and all of us have the will and the courage to understand what confronts us.

Sons of the American Revolution Hold Special Memorial Services in Memory of the Late Senator Robert A. Taft

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL F. SCHENCK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 13, 1954

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, it is my great honor to be a member of the Richard Montgomery Chapter of the Ohio Society of the Sons of the American Revolution, and an event happened recently which I feel has special significance.

The national congress of the Sons of the American Revolution held in historic Williamsburg, Va., recently, included a special memorial service in loving memory of our late compatriot, Senator Robert A. Taft. The memorial address was prepared and was to have been delivered by my good personal friend and fellow townsman and the immediate past president of our Ohio society, Thomas A. Calhoun. Circumstances beyond his control made it impossible for Mr. Calhoun to attend this national congress personally, and Compatriot Charles A. Jones, secretary of our Ohio society read Mr. Calhoun's address from the Governor's box at the national congress in Williamsburg.

This memorial address, Mr. Speaker, prepared by Compatriot Thomas A. Calhoun is such a fitting and splendid tribute to the memory and outstanding statesmanship of our late friend and colleague, Senator Robert A. Taft, that, under unanimous consent, I include it here following my remarks:

"We have no greater obligation than to preserve, in America, a place where a man may be master of his soul and be free to govern his own government."

Those were the words of our beloved fellow compatriot, the late Senator Robert A. Taft, and they implicitly express the philosophy of his life and work. He lived by thoughts and deeds rather than by years.

Today we honor the memory and mourn the untimely passing of a man whose faithful and distinguished service to our country was rendered so recently that we are still acutely aware of the void which never can be completely filled. The echos of his voice are still to be heard in the Halls of Congress, where his statesmanship and dauntless courage have placed him among the American patriots of all time.

Robert Taft's heritage was a distingushed one. True to his family tradition, he measured up to every duty and met each responsibility with unflinching courage. There was perfection of character in Bob Taft, built on a spiritually controlled strength which supplied him with fortitude, patience, and the power to endure. He was fearless in his leadership and not dismayed by the problems of our day, in a world hungry for hope.

Fear did not win our American independence or carve a land of justice, liberty, and opportunity out of a wilderness. In this American system we ask for men who can wisely guide and direct, men who catch the signs of the times, men who can interpret movements and with sound judgment shape their course. Bob Taft was such a man, ever adequate for his task, anxious to do right for the sake of the record that had implications far beyond the next election. He weighed every subject with an amazing power of intellectual grasp, and out of confused issues he could bring simplicity of plan. Although he often met with misunderstanding and even open hostility, he could be honest without tension and frank without offense.

When men learned to know him they came to love him. They might differ with him but, in his dignity of character and impressive manner, none could fail to respect and admire him. He was a man of incorruptible personal and political integrity. His forthrightness and high moral qualities drew to him the good will of his associates in political life. They believed in him, felt his innate kindness, and confided in his personal honesty. Even though he was at times condemned, it was for such qualities as seem now to have been some of his greatest virtues.

Bob Taft's ambitions were well ordered, and he was happy in the career he had chosen as his life's work, never overlooking those things which were noble and beautiful. He was a happy man, in the close companionship of his understanding wife, Martha, who through the years shared with him his hopes, his dreams, his triumphs, and his disappointments. He was happy in his devotion to his sons, who loved him, and to his grandchildren, who in their youthful dreams must be planning to emulate him.

"The greatest use for life is to spend it for something that outlasts it."

Robert Alfonso Taft has left behind him, to his kindred and to us, the rich legacy of a splendid character and an unsullied record. May his profound wisdom, his courage, and his patriotism serve always as an inspiration and guide to our people, heirs of a great heritage, and trustees of the American tradition to which he gave the full measure of his devotion.

Let Us Build a New World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RUTH THOMPSON
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 13, 1954

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, about a year ago I introduced a bill in the House which would create a Department of Peace in our Government. The Secretary of such a Department would have Cabinet status and would work toward peace and good will throughout the world. No action was taken by the committee, but I am still of the opinion that all the guns, all the tanks, and all the bombs we are building during these hectic times are not going to save us from our enemies at home or abroad.

I firmly believe that our only salvation lies in the fact that we must revert back to the more simple life, and give more thought to that overruling power from which all blessing flow. God, in his infinite goodness, and the teachings of Jesus Christ, his son, are the only answer if we are to survive in these days of universal insecurity.

Last week I was one of 160 Members of Congress who attended a breakfast honoring Evangelist Billy Graham, who has just returned from a preaching trip abroad. His audience was most attentive as he told of speaking to a total attendance of more than 2 million people in Great Britain over a period of 12 weeks. On the Continent, he addressed 300,000 persons more through interpreters. Mr. Graham stated that much of the success of his meetings was due to a spiritual resurgence as the result of World War II and the fear of the atom bomb. Friends, right now is the time to start building a new world. And, we can only build a new world when we discard the old implements of war and put God back into the center of life. Let us do it now, not only for ourselves, but for generations to come.

Mr. Speaker, Evangelist Billy Graham has had a great revelation. And that revelation means much responsibility. He should be supported by the Congress of the United States, and the present administration.

At any cost, let us make this great God-fearing man, and his equally great team, our official ambassadors of good will and spiritual awakening. A miracle could yet happen.

Court Ruling on Segregation Significant for North Dakota Indians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. Y. BERRY
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 17, 1954

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, because of the fact that the segregation issue has created such an issue in this part of the country, I have been asked by John B. Hart, executive director of the North Dakota Indian Affairs Commission, to insert in the RECORD two editorials, one from the Minot (N. Dak.) Daily News under date of May 22 and the other from the Fargo Forum under date of May 23.

I am sure Members will find these editorials of interest.

The editorials follow:

[From the Minot Daily News of May 22, 1954]

BETTER GET UNITED STATES HOUSE IN ORDER

As we understand it, the Supreme Court's ruling on segregation applies only to public schools and only to the separation of Negro from white pupils.

But the principle that segregated schools are "unequal" schools, and therefore unconstitutional, is bound to have far-reaching application eventually.

This principle may be expected to apply to any schools where the segregation in practice is on the basis of race, whatever the race.

In North Dakota, Negroes are almost as scarce as Portuguese, and public schools are not segregated, either for Negroes or any other race. Yet we have schools which are, for all practical purposes, segregated. And they are operated by the United States Government. They are the Government schools on Indian reservations.

These Indian schools are not public schools in the strict sense of that term. The Indian bureau will tell you, besides, that they are not segregated. What the bureau means is that they are not closed to non-Indians. On every reservation, probably, a few white children attend them, but these would be mostly children of Indian bureau personnel. Despite what the bureau may say, however, the North Dakota Commission of Indian Affairs says these Government schools in reality are segregated, and it condemns them in principle as such. The Commission contends that the practically segregated school systems on the reservations are one of the things that are holding Indian youngsters back.

We mention all this just for the record. It deserves to be noted that at a time when one arm of the Federal Government is condemning segregated schools as unequal and unconstitutional, another arm of that Government—the great Department of the Interior—is practicing segregation. And right this minute, it is building new segregated schools in North Dakota.

[From the Fargo Forum of May 23, 1954]

COURT RULING ON SEGREGATION SIGNIFICANT FOR NORTH DAKOTA INDIANS

Last week's decision by the United States Supreme Court declaring racial segregation in public schools to be in violation of the Constitution will have no major repercussions in North Dakota.

While we have no Negro problem—the few that are in the State have always been able to send their children to public schools—perhaps we should add, "So far as we know."

North Dakota's basic racial problem doesn't concern the Negro, but the Indians whose ancestors were here long before the rest of our predecessors arrived. The Indian children also have access to public schools when their families are living off the tribal reservation. It is the Federal domination of the reservation Indians which creates a racial problem in North Dakota.

The solution must be a harmonious integration of the white and Indian populations, and such integration does not occur when Indians are kept segregated on reservations. Nor does integration mean just turning the Indians loose to fend for themselves. Given good jobs at decent pay, Indians can and will improve their own standard of living. In most cases good education is the major stepping stone in this direction.

As to Negroes, the Supreme Court decision does recall that North Dakota has one statute on the books which would probably not pass the constitutionality test. It prohibits the intermarriage of Negroes and whites. The repeal of that law wouldn't instigate a single marriage of that type, and it would be a good idea to get it off the books.

Message From the Government and People of Singapore to the Vice President and Mrs. Nixon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT B. CHIPERFIELD
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 13, 1954

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following message from the government and people of Singapore to the Vice President and Mrs. Nixon:

BRITISH EMBASSY,
Washington, D. C., June 21, 1954.

Her Majesty's Ambassador for the United Kingdom presents his compliments to the

Secretary of State and has the honor to inform him that, in the course of the opening ceremonies on the 1st of June of the telephone service between the United States and Singapore, Mr. W. A. C. Goode, the Colony's Colonial Secretary, requested that messages of greeting and goodwill should be conveyed from the government and people of Singapore to the Vice President of the United States and Mrs. Nixon. Mr. Goode wished the Vice President and Mrs. Nixon to know that their visit to Singapore in 1953 was remembered with pleasure.

2. In addition Mr. Goode asked that a message of welcome should be extended on behalf of the government and people of Singapore to all Members of Congress who might wish to visit the colony. In recent times Singapore had been honored to receive a number of honorable Members of both the Senate and the House of Representatives. It was the hope of all in Singapore that many more distinguished legislators from the United States would find it possible in future years to see something of Singapore and her people.

3. Sir Roger Makins has the honor to request that these messages be brought to the notice of those concerned.

Misconceptions on Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES G. OAKMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 13, 1954

Mr. OAKMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times of July 13, 1954:

MISCONCEPTIONS ON TAXES

In another column on this page we publish a letter from Hyman H. Bookbinder, dealing with the administration's omnibus tax bill. Mr. Bookbinder does not deny that the basic objective of this legislation is a long overdue reform of the whole revenue code. He argues, however, that one of its incidental effects, at least, is to grant a certain amount of relief from taxation to certain taxpayers, and he asks whether this is the appropriate type of relief to be granted in the present situation.

Mr. Bookbinder's letter seems to us to incorporate the principle misconceptions that are responsible for most of the prevailing misunderstanding about this legislation. Not only does he ignore the fact that the pending bill is primarily a reform measure, rather than a relief measure, but by discussing it apart from the rest of the program, he builds up a picture in which the Government, having decided to grant a certain amount of tax relief, picks as the major beneficiaries business and persons deriving all or part of their income from corporate profits.

This picture does not accord with the facts. The first of the post-Korean taxes due to expire after the Eisenhower administration took office was the corporation excess profits tax. The President personally took to the air to insist that this be extended from June 30, 1953, to the end of the year, when this $2 billion relief measure would go into effect simultaneously with the expiration of $3 billions in emergency individual income taxes. Again, the top 5 percent of the standard corporation tax was scheduled to run out on April 1 of this year, but the pending legislation would extend that emergency tax, with an estimated yield of $1.2 billions, for another year, to April 1, 1955.

The fact is that when we consider the changes in tax structure that have taken place and are provided for in the pending legislation we come down to this: For the coming year they add up to a reduction of $7.3 billions in taxes. Of this total $4.7 of the relief goes to individuals and $2.6 billions to corporate business. Actually, the relief to business is $1.2 billions less than these figures suggest, because of the extension for another year of the 52 percent standard corporate tax rate, or $1.4 billions.

Our correspondent asserts that "when fully effective" the Senate Finance Committee's proposed tax reduction would aggregate "over $4 billions." He arrives at this figure, a figure with which he seeks to justify his statement that 80 percent of the benefits of the omnibus revenue bill would represent "tax savings for business" and "special concessions for dividend income," by including $2,345 millions in relief through liberalization of depreciation practices, and by using the figure for partial elimination of double taxation of dividend income for the years 1957 and beyond. Though accelerated depreciation might result in a modest revenue reduction the first year, or even the first several years, in the long run it involves no tax remission whatever.

It is idle, moreover, to talk about the ultimate cost of dividend income relief without knowing what "ultimate" relief is in store for individual taxpayers generally. The estimated revenue cost as originally contemplated was $240 millions for the first year, and $642 millions for 1956. These figures don't loom very large against a total tax reduction program of $7.3 billions.

Dulles Not Always Consistent on Question of Red China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 13, 1954

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Evening Star of July 9, 1954:

DULLES NOT ALWAYS CONSISTENT ON QUESTION OF RED CHINA

(By James E. Roper)

Pity a poor Secretary of State—like John Foster Dulles—who tries to be consistent in a changing world.

Mr. Dulles told a news conference yesterday that because of Communist China's behavior, it should not be admitted to the United Nations. He said the United States, if necessary, can and will use its veto to bar Red China from the United Nations Security Council.

Mr. Dulles put a different emphasis on the case in 1950 in his book, "War or Peace." Mr. Dulles, arguing for changes in the U. N. Charter, wrote:

"We ought to be willing that all the nations should be members (of U. N.) without attempting to appraise closely those which are good and those which are bad. Already that distinction is obliterated by the present membership of the United Nations.

"DE FACTO STATUS

"Some of the present member nations, and others that might become members, have governments that are not representative of the people. But if in fact they are governments—that is, if they govern—then they have a power which should be represented in any organization that purports to mirror world reality.

"If the Communist government of China in fact proves its ability to govern China without serious domestic resistance, then it, too, should be admitted to the United Nations.

"However, a regime that claims to have become the government of a country through civil war should not be recognized until it has been tested over a reasonable period of time."

Mr. Dulles was asked at his news conference yesterday whether he had changed his mind since writing his book. Mr. Dulles said: "Since that was written, there has been the aggression of the North Koreans in Korea. There has been the Chinese intervention in that aggression. There has been the support by Communist China of aggression in Indochina."

STATEMENTS COMPARED

Mr. Dulles' remarks yesterday about a possible veto of Red China make interesting comparison with statements he made at a news conference nearly a year ago on July 28, 1953.

A year ago, Mr. Dulles said the position of the United States had been that a question such as the seating of Red China should not be subject to the veto. He said that since other countries did not agree with us, we would be free to alter our position, but he was very reluctant to see the veto used on questions of that sort.

Yesterday, Mr. Dulles said, "We would invoke the veto if necessary."

A year ago, Mr. Dulles was asked whether he had the votes to prevent Red China's admission to United Nations, Mr. Dulles replied that he did not talk in such mundane terms about the United Nations which, as the correspondent knew, was a very lofty organization.

Yesterday, Mr. Dulles said, "We do not believe that the requisite vote can be found to admit the Communist regime."

A year ago, Mr. Dulles was asked whether he would use the veto as the last resort to keep out the Chinese Reds. The Secretary replied that the correspondent was getting hypothetical.

Yesterday, he was asked substantially the same question. Mr. Dulles replied that the United States would use the veto if necessary.

Almost as a footnote to yesterday's news conference statements on Red China, Mr. Dulles also remarked about the possibility of the United States recognizing the new military junta that seized power from the Communists in Guatemala after a brief civil war.

Said Mr. Dulles about Guatemala:

"We want to feel satisfied that the new regime will be able and willing to carry out its international obligations. If we are satisfied on that point, as I hope and expect we shall be, then we would proceed to recognition."

A Man You Want on Your Side: Secretary of the Air Force Harold E. Talbott

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL F. SCHENCK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 13, 1954

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, honest praise is a credit to any man, and should be given widest possible circulation. Too often the information about public men that appears in the daily press is derogatory or uncomplimentary.

I have in my hands a tribute to the Secretary of the Air Force, my fellow Ohioan Harold E. Talbott, that comes not from an Ohio or a Washington newspaper but from a Colorado newspaper. I personally would like to see this revealing article about a great American given circulation in every State in the country.

Describing Secretary Talbott as the most fabulously energetic civilian head the Air Force has had in a long line of outstanding forceful men, the author, Mr. James Daniel, stresses the fact that Secretary Talbott never takes anybody's word for an important detail if it is humanly possible for him to check on the facts himself. He is thus notable for his accuracy and attentiveness to details and for his energy and his farsightedness. With these virtues, he has been a pillar of strength to the current administration. He has also insured his place in history as a builder of the Air Force.

Secretary Talbott was charged with the responsibility of making the final decision on the selection of a site for the new Air Force Academy in the event the selection committee could not agree. This was a tremendously important decision for him to make, and in his usual thorough manner he did not rely on the word of others but personally inspected and selected the Colorado site. It was a great disappointment to me and the people of the third district of Ohio that our district was not among the three sites proposed by the committee, but had it been, Secretary Talbott would have approached his important decision with the same unbiased, realistic attitude, and would not have allowed his natural interest in his home State to influence his choice. The United States is fortunate to have a man of his stature to direct its growth during this critical period in our history.

With the unanimous consent of my colleagues, I wish to extend my remarks and insert the following article from the Denver Rocky Mountain News of June 21, 1954, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

HAROLD TALBOTT: A MAN YOU WANT ON YOUR SIDE

(By James Daniel)

WASHINGTON, June 20.—Air Force Secretary Harold E. Talbott, who will be in Colorado Springs Monday to personally look over the proposed Air Academy site, is one of those executives who will never take anybody's word for an important detail of a proposed venture if it is humanly possible for him to check out the facts for himself.

And when you say humanly possible and Talbott in the same breath, you might as well say superhumanly possible, for Secretary Harold Elstner Talbott is the most fabulously energetic civilian head the Air Force has had, in a long line of outstanding forceful men.

Earlier this year, somebody totaled up the air miles traveled by "Washington highups" in the preceding 12 months and to nobody's surprise Talbott's 155,000 miles was far and away the longest distance.

All this Talbott traveled just in looking after one part, the air end, of the Government bureau, the Department of Defense. His next nearest rival was Harold Stassen, the foreign aid chief, who put in 78,000 miles and whose job is to look after the world.

BORN IN OHIO

Harold Talbott was born in Dayton, Ohio, in 1888, 1 of 9 children. His father, an engineer, sent him to Yale to take an engineering degree. Upon graduation in 1910 young Harold joined his father's construction company. But by 1915 he was out working for somebody else.

The following year, he got his father to help him form the Dayton-Wright Airplane Co. and 3 years later the Dayton Wright Co. In 1924 he moved to New York and established his own investment company.

From the early 1930's he was active in New York Republican politics, showing a special talent in collecting campaign funds at a time when prying coin to bet on the Republican side of an election frequently looked like a sure way to waste it.

Through his activities he became a part of the inner circle of Thomas E. Dewey advisers. In 1948 he helped raise the funds for the Dewey presidential campaign. At that time he first worked closely with such other Dewey advisers who are now famous as Secretary of State Dulles and Attorney General Herbert Brownell, Jr.

DISPLAYS TALENT

In 1948 and again in 1952 Talbott displayed a farsightedness since considered providential in employing a management firm to study the Federal Government to select the 900 really important policymaking jobs that any new administration would have to chance to make its victory mean anything to the people who chose it.

The 1948 preparation turned out to be in vain, but the one in 1952 enabled the Eisenhower administration to take hold months before it might otherwise have caught on.

When he was appointed Secretary of the Air Force, Talbott was called before the Senate Armed Services Committee and told that some of his investments might come into conflict with his job. Like Defense Secretary Charles Wilson and Army Secretary Robert T. Stevens, he gave them up.

Thereafter, he took off on an air tour of our defenses in Korea—and has been on the go ever since.

HE'S TOP CHIEF

To the Air Force he is a civilian who has stood up for their wishes while playing his role as a member of the larger team. For his attentiveness to details there is the most widespread admiration.

It is typical, aids say, that he was not content with taking at second hand the information on Colorado Springs and the two other sites finally recommended by the Site Selection Commission, but had to send his own engineers and go himself.

Washington is betting that nothing of importance will escape Secretary Talbott's eye. And if you'll pardon a prepositional sentence ending, Washington also firmly believes that Talbott is not the man that anybody is going to pull any wool over the eyes of.

Mrs. Talbott, a charming lady, is no less energetic than her husband. Before her marriage she headed a knitting business. But the newlyweds agreed that one tycoon to a family was a gracious plenty.

So Mrs. Talbott devoted herself to raising two daughters and twin sons and worked off her excess energy in charity fund drives.

Until he got deep in politics, Talbott also kept a string of polo ponies. Jut-jawed, beetle-browed, he could be the original man of distinction. But in steady performance he has proved himself the kind of man you want to have at your side walking through a dark alley and the kind of man you distinctly do not want to encounter there unless your motives were strictly on the up and up.

Republican "Fascist Rule" Blasted by GOP Leader

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK L. CHELF

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 13, 1954

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newspaper article that recently appeared in the Raleigh (N. C.) News and Observer:

REPUBLICAN "FASCIST RULE" BLASTED BY GOP LEADER

(By Valerie Nicholson)

CARTHAGE, July 8.—H. F. Seawell, who as 1952 candidate for Governor polled more votes than any Republican had ever won before in the State, today blasted the "Fascist rule" of the current Republican national organization.

He would not confirm or deny reports that he is thinking of turning Democrat.

He did say, though, that the Republicans in power today could take a leaf from the Democrats' book, and start listening to the people.

He added, "The sorry way they're treating Republicans and Democrats alike in the South is a blow to all our efforts, over many years, to build a real two-party system, just as they seemed at last about to bear fruit."

The Carthage attorney, who was turned down by the Department of Justice for the post of middle district solicitor, despite the unanimous endorsement of the North Carolina Republican leadership, admitted, "I have lost my taste entirely for Republicanism as shown in the attitude of Mr. Brownell."

Having had the backing also of an impressive roster of Democrats from the Governor on down, the North Carolina Bar Association and practically the entire judiciary, he saw Brownell's action as a slap at them, also.

Concerning the report that he will quit the party, he said, "I'm going to do something soon, that's certain. You can say that I have received several thousand invitations to join the Democratic Party. I have not yet accepted any, but neither have I turned any down. I am sitting on the fence."

Reports from Washington at the time of Seawell's turndown several months ago were that he had earned Attorney General Brownell's ire last fall by remarking in a speech, "They would do better in Washington to be putting live Republicans in office, instead of digging up dead Communists." It was an obvious reference to the Harry Dexter White case, broken open by Brownell in a blast at the Truman administration.

Seawell's quips are famous all over the State. Popular as an after-dinner speaker, he lampoons Republicans and Democrats alike, and is credited with having been a leader in keeping interparty relationships on an amicable basis in North Carolina.

This particular quip, though, drew swift retaliation from above. Seawell stressed that it wasn't the job itself that mattered to him now, nor the personal insult of the rejection, but the blow at party prestige and loyalty, and the disregard of the people's will.

"I'm not making any more political speeches. What can I tell young Republicans, for instance, about party loyalty and service, and where it will get them? What can I say as titular head of the party in North Carolina when in Washington I just won't do?

CARPETBAG RULE

"I call it carpetbag rule, just like in Reconstruction days. People of the South then had no more say than they do now about who would hold office. They could express themselves but down from Washington would come some stranger who got the job for reasons pleasing to the politicians, but to nobody else.

"It's the same all over the South. I get the same reports from South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, and Louisiana. Instead of helping us build a two-party system the national Republicans have decided to operate on a no-party system.

"They received a mandate from the people in 1952 but they haven't paid any attention to the people since.

"Look at the office of collector of internal revenue in this State. It was vacated right after the new administration took over. Republican after Republican has applied for the job—good men, too, with fine endorsements. The job's still empty after 18 months, and the last I heard, they were thinking of sending some man down from Indiana." He cited other cases of jobs hanging fire while the people most concerned found that whoever they wanted in the office, they could be mighty sure wouldn't get accepted.

He saw the National GOP organization as running a Fascist-type of government, which ignores the people in the conduct of their own affairs. When you pitch out the people's will and belittle those who have fought the party battles, fascism is what you have left.

"That's what's wrong with the party today. This from-the-top-down thing doesn't work in a democratic government. If the party would listen to the people, they would be able to straighten out most of their muddles.

"The way I feel about it now reminds me of a story I heard of an old man about 1910 who said, 'I'm tired of hearin' about this Halleck's comic. Every place I go, it's talk, talk, talk about Halleck's comic. Reckon I'll go on up to Poatsmif where they don't have no such mess.'

"Maybe I'll be going up to Poatsmif."

A Bill To Change the Name of the Gavins Point Reservoir to Lewis and Clark Lake

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 17, 1954

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill which would change the name of the Gavins Point Reservoir in the States of South Dakota and Nebraska to Lewis and Clark Lake.

I am introducing this bill at the request of the people of my State, including the people of Yankton and the chamber of commerce of that city, the chamber of commerce of the city of Springfield, and others. These cities and chambers of commerce have passed resolutions requesting the change of name because of the fact that Gavins Point has no historical significance, whereas the Lewis and Clark Expedition was a major event in the early history of this territory. Their log marks several important spots from the mouth to the source of the great Missouri River. Their expedition was responsible for the opening up of the great Missouri River Basin, known today as the breadbasket of the world, which embraces one-sixth of the land area of the United States.

It was 150 years ago that this expedition consisting of 33 persons embarked on probably the most extraordinary adventure in American history. This little group, known as the Lewis and Clark Expedition, was commanded by Meriwether Lewis, private secretary to President Jefferson, and William Clark, Army associate of Lewis and younger brother of Gen. George Rogers Clark.

The organization of the Lewis and Clark Expedition was brought about by Thomas Jefferson, whose interests were focused on the Louisiana Territory. Jefferson felt that such an expedition could open up a trade route between the United States and the Pacific, and that it would provide an opportunity for learning much about the geography and biology of the unexplored region.

The undertaking of this assignment involved much responsibility and many great risks. Jefferson outlined the objectives of the expedition, pointing out the necessity of dealing peaceably with the natives and of keeping detailed, accurate records of all observations. It involved surveying and mapping the courses of the Missouri River, studying the mineralogy, climate, geography, botany, and zoology of the country to be explored, and making detailed reports on the ethnology of all of the Indian tribes which might be encountered.

During December of 1803, winter headquarters of the expedition were established near the mouth of the Missouri River. Preparations for the journey were made. The quantity and variety of goods required for the expedition is surprising. The gross weight of food alone was more than 7 tons. Miscellaneous equipment included a blacksmith's forge, a mill for grinding corn, tools, surveying and navigating instruments, medical supplies, tents, cooking utensils, extra clothing, and, of course, ammunition. Also included were trinkets such as beads, knives, ribbons, and so forth, for Indian trade.

Arrangements for departure were finally completed, and on May 13, 1804, the historical adventure began up the Missouri River. The river's current was strong, and the journey upstream was slow. July 4 found the little expedition near the mouth of the Kansas River, and to celebrate the day, rifles were discharged and the campsite was named Independence, now in the State of Missouri.

Each day of the journey brought new wonders and experiences. Physical discomforts were sometimes nearly unbearable. Mosquitoes were a constant annoyance. Part of the journey was made on foot over rough ground infested with prickly pears and cactus. At one time several members of the expedition narrowly escaped drowning when a wall of water came down upon them after a cloudburst and hailstorm.

Unbelievable numbers of wild animals, such as deer, elk, antelope, and bison roamed the valleys and plains. Hundreds of different kinds of vegetation, birds, and fishes were noted. Descriptive records of all observations were kept. Compass bearings, landmarks, principal topographical features, and land surveyance reports were diligently written into a diary day by day.

Fortunately, relations with the Indians were generally friendly, and much time was spent in negotiating peace among the many tribes. It was approximately at the exact site of the present Gavins Point Dam that the Lewis and Clark Expedition held its first meeting with the Sioux Indian Nation. August 26, 1954, will mark the 150th anniversary of this successful council with the Sioux.

This territory which was first explored and platted by this little expedition, was the germ of what is now the greatest area of its kind in the world—the great Missouri River Basin. Because of the importance of this area, and because of the national need of controlling the waters of this great river, we are constructing these large dams in the upper region. It is fitting and proper that the reservoir in connection with the first of this series of dams when traveling up the great Missouri River, should be named in honor of the men who first explored and platted that river—Meriwether Lewis and William Clark.

It is especially fitting that it should be so named in view of the fact that the dam itself is located at almost the exact site of the spot where Lewis and Clark held their first meeting with the representatives of the Great Sioux Nation.

I hope consideration will be given to this request.

The Workshop of Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 13, 1954

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following poem by Elizabeth Ellen Evans:

THE WORKSHOP OF FREEDOM

(By Elizabeth Ellen Evans)

Hello.
Hello, American.
Hello, my father, my brother, my friend.
We've built a land together.
We've sung and spoken and laughed and cried and thought and prayed and died together.
And we've taken an idea that's been around for twenty-five hundred years.
We've taken a word that was only a word and we've made it a way of life.
We've founded a land on the freedom of man.
We started with litle but human dreams and an unfailing will to succeed.
And the world laughed.
The world laughed at our strange idea—that a man might be free to govern himself, to work and to pray and live as his conscience demanded.
The conception was old. It had failed before.
The world knew it would fail again.

But not so the brave little land which was built on the God-given freedom of man.
Not so the new-founded workshop of freedom.
And the world's amusement turned into amazement, for the unique idea succeeded.
This workshop of freedom—
Founded by men with a flame in their hearts,
Built on the soil of thirteen small colonies facing the sea
Her workbenches manned by four million stouthearted settlers, giving their best that they and their sons might stand up as free men—
This workshop of freedom has grown and waxed strong.
The thirteen have become forty-eight.
The four million, increased forty times,
And the best that they gave to the land that they loved has rendered us great among nations.
And their spirit lives on—in the mines and the mills, in the farms and the factories, in the power and the prayer, in the laughter and love, in the friendship and faith,
That have nourished the workshop of freedom.
And American—we made it work.
It hasn't been easy, this building a land.
We've paid for our freedom in young men's lives and in saddened homes and in broken hearts.
For they were the price of the workshop of freedom.
But say that it wasn't worth it?
Walk down the streets of New York and Chicago, of Cincinnati and San Francisco, of Pepperton, Ga., and Roundup, Mont.,
Look in the eyes of the people you meet, and say that it wasn't worth it.
Hear the high, happy voice of a first-grade class singing,
"God bless America, land that I love."
Look up at the face of the great, beloved man who sits in the Lincoln Memorial.
Walk down a city street swept along by the joyful exuberant, heart-warming rush of the last shopping days before Christmas.
See the pride in the eyes of a midwestern farmer on the day that his harvest is done.
Tap your foot to the beat of a Dixie Land band.
Hear the shout of a thousand kids in a football stadium when the home team gets the ball.
See a Star of David and a crucifix and an open Bible side by side.
And you've seen and you've heard and you've felt in your heart the might of the workshop of freedom.
Then say that those lives were wasted that ended to make and to keep America free.
Say that a life is worth living at all without friendship and freedom and faith.
And yet there are men who would take this away.
They stand at the gates to the factories, the entrances to the mines,
And they fill the ears of the men who pass by with their talk of the common man.
But what a short step from their common man to the common slave.
Tell us these things—if you dare.
Is there one other land on the face of the earth where your common man can drive home from his work in a car of his own to a paper to read and a television set.
Where your common man can eat southern fried chicken and chocolate ice cream for his Sunday dinner.
Where his wife can wear nylon stockings and have an electric refrigerator—
And then tell us this, you strangers who think you're so wise—
Can a man be a slave when he speaks and he votes, and the prays as he chooses?
To all who would crumble these freedoms of ours, who would undermine our American way of life, we say—
Show us a hammer and sickle and we'll show you our flag waving high and proud against a cloudless blue sky.
Show us the Communist manifesto, and we'll show you our Bill of Rights.
Show us Malenkov and Stalin and Lenin and we'll show you 33 Presidents, chosen by vote of the people they served, and we'll show you a Man on a Cross.
And they can't argue back, Americans.
There's nothing they can say.
The fires of friendship and freedom and faith have been burning too long in our land.
And as long as they burn—as long as those fires burn fervent and bright—there is nothing those men can say.
Shake my hand, American.
Shake my hand, my father, my brother, my friend.
Take our hands, all you of the earth who are tired and hungry and cold.
Take our hands, you citizens of the world.
Share with us our friendship and freedom and faith.
They will give you a chance to hold your head high.
They will make you a man.
Come.
Let us walk forward, together and free.

Federal Pay Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 12, 1954

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, as the 83d Congress approaches adjournment, I fervently hope we can take action to grant a pay increase to the service men and women, along with the anticipated increase for postal workers and classified civil-service employees. I am currently exploring the possibility of amending the civil-service pay legislation to include the military as well. Equity demands that the largest group of Government employees, the men and women of the armed services, be accorded an adjustment in their pay status.

There can be no question that inadequate compensation is the main contributing factor to the increasing resignations of career servicemen, who simply cannot make ends meet. I have made an extended study of this problem over the past 18 months, and the obvious conclusion is that the career serviceman is a victim of an inflationary spiral that squeezed him as it flattened out. The last military pay raise, in 1949, according to many servicemen, actually resulted in a decrease of from $4 to $12 per month in take-home pay because of adjustments and tax changes made concurrently. The increased cost of living since then is well known to us all.

Certainly the Department of Defense is aware of the need for an adjustment at this time. Air Force Secretary Talbott has made many public statements to that effect, as has Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower, Dr. John Hannah, and many others.

It has been publicly stated that the Secretary of Defense would press for an increase this session, if classified civil-service workers get an increase. Substantial testimony has been gathered to prove the need for a pay increase for classified workers. As a result of the urgings of the Civil Service Commission and many Congressmen, there is every likelihood of positive action in the next few weeks, which will result in an increase for classified Federal employees and postal workers, too.

Recent testimony before the Senate Appropriations Committee by Defense Comptroller, W. J. McNeil, showed a parallel between military and civil-service pay. While there are intimations that the comparisons were unfairly drawn, if we accept them as accurate, we must also accept the fact that an increase in civil-service pay this year will create still another gap between the comparative pay scales.

While I am on this subject, I want to correct a mistaken impression I may have created by inserting an editorial from the July 3 issue of Army Times in the Appendix of the RECORD. The editorial discussed the pay issue and, by inference, suggested that the distinguished Member of the other body, Senator HOMER FERGUSON, Republican, of Michigan, concurred with the attitude of Defense Comptroller McNeil in opposing a pay increase. I did not intend to give the impression that the distinguished Senator agreed with Mr. McNeil. As a matter of fact, he has proved to be a true friend of servicemen during his years of exemplary service in the Senate, and I am happy to state publicly that no criticism of his actions was intended.

On the matter of a pay increase, it seems to me that the Defense Department and Congress should take immediate action to correct these inequities, and to bring the serviceman and his family into the proper economic level in our normal economy.

I have made no effort to stress the importance of maintaining career service personnel. The Womble Commission, Dr. Hanna and many others, have admirably recorded the losses our country and its defensive strength have suffered and will suffer under a continuation of present policy, unless decisive action is taken immediately.

The House will soon be voting on a reenlisment-bonus bill which has already passed the Senate. While in the main this bill has many features that will help solve the reenlistment program, it is by no means the answer to it. It is not a substitute for a pay raise. For one thing, it favors the first- and second-term reenlistments, but does little to improve the economic status of those who have decided to make the military a career and who have already served from 8 to 15 years. It offers nothing to the experienced sergeants and chiefs and the junior officers so vital to our defense setup.

I have tried in many ways to call to the attention of my colleagues the plight of the services today. The need is obvious. Perhaps the best statement that I have seen on the subject is the body of a petition, written and circulated by two Navy wives. Over 500 of these individual petitions have been received by my office and have been forwarded to the proper officials in the Defense Department. In my opinion, this petition is an eloquent challenge to us for action now.

Under unanimous consent, I include this in the Appendix of the RECORD:

GIVE US A CHANCE TO STAY IN THE NAVY

When our husbands joined the Navy they felt there was no better career than in the service of their country.

When we married Navy men we accepted the inherent disadvantages of Navy life; frequent moves, long separations, added responsibility a Navy wife must assume, etc. We were proud of our country, and wanted to instill in our children the same love and devotion.

However, we did expect that after 10, 15, or 20 years of service our husbands would receive sufficient pay for us to maintain at least a decent standard of living and to give our children a few of the advantages a competent civilian could secure for his children.

Over the past several years, the rising cost of living, plus constant reduction of benefits we were promised, plus the lack of any real pay raise, has made a Navy career a choice between serving our country and providing for our children. We can no longer do both.

We respectfully request that you do all in your power to secure the pay raise which is now before Congress, so that more husbands are not forced to make the choice between service to his country and the welfare of his own family.

Unwarranted Political Regulation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 13, 1954

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include the following article written by Msgr. George G. Higgins, entitled "Unwarranted Political Regulations" appearing in the Pilot of Boston, Mass., of June 5, 1954:

UNWARRANTED POLITICAL REGULATION

(By Msgr. George G. Higgins)

Norman Dodd, director of research of the Special Committee of the House of Representatives To Investigate Tax Exempt Foundations, recently made a preliminary report covering his direction of the committee staff for the 6 months' period, November 1, 1953–April 30, 1954. The subject involved is one that ought to be debated freely and fully in the forum of public opinion before the Congress takes any action on it.

Under the terms of House Resolution 217, the committee is charged with the responsibility of answering the following questions, some of which, in our opinion, no agency of Government has a right to ask of voluntary, non-Governmental organizations:

"Have foundations * * * used their resources for purposes contrary to those for which they were established? * * * for purposes which can be classed as un-American- * * * subversive? * * * for political purposes? Have foundations * * * resorted to propaganda in order to achieve the objectives for whcih they have made grants?"

To enable the committee to answer these questions "on the basis of impersonal facts," Mr. Dodd directed his staff to make a study of developments and trends in the field of American education during the past 50 years and subsequently to investigate "the accessory agencies to which these developments and trends had been traced."

OFFICIAL AMERICANISM

On the basis of this preliminary investigation, Mr. Dodd has come to the "tentative conclusion that within the social-science division of education the foundations have neglected the public interest to a severe degree." According to Dodd, grants by foundations have been used for "directing education in the United States toward an international viewpoint (sic) and discrediting the traditions to which it had been dedicated." They have also been used, according to Dodd, for changing school curricula "to the point where they sometimes denied the principles underlying the American way of life."

"It seems incredible," says Mr. Dodd in concluding his preliminary report, "that the trustees of typically American fortune-created foundations should have permitted them to be used to finance ideas and practices incompatible with the fundamental concepts of our Constitution. Yet there seems evidence that this may have occurred."

To borrow the language of Mr. Dodd, it seems incredible to us that he or anybody else should be authorized by an agency of government to pass judgment on the Americanism of voluntary nongovernmental organizations. It goes without saying, of course, that the Congress has a right to investigate tax-exempt foundations to make sure that they are not being used for political purposes in the partisan sense of the word, and that they are not engaging in treasonous or subversive activities.

On the other hand, the Government does not have the right to exercise a form of thought control over nongovernmental organizations by forcing them to operate within the limits of an official definition of Americanism or the American way of life or the public interest. This, it seems to us, would be the beginning of the end of political democracy.

DEBATABLE EVIDENCE

Mr. Dodd's definition of Americanism and the American way of life is ultraconservative. He implies, for example, that the so-called New Deal was a revolutionary movement in the bad (i. e., un-American) sense of the word. Our disagreement with him on this particular issue is, however, completely beside the point. Our criticism of his report has nothing to do with the validity of his definitions or the accuracy of his tentative accusations against specific tax-exempt foundations.

His evidence in support of these accusations is, however, highly debatable in many cases. But even if we could agree with every syllable in his undocumented report, we would still object, on the basis of sound political philosophy, to his or anybody else's definition of Americanism or the American way of life being adopted by the Congress or any other branch of Government, as an official norm by which to judge the political orthodoxy of nongovernmental organizations. This would constitute a dangerous threat to the cause of freedom, including the freedom of religion.

If only for the reason that the Catholic Church is the most important single nongovernmental organization in the United States, American Catholics—including those who may happen to agree with the contents of Mr. Dodd's report—ought to be the first to object to its underlying assumption that Government has a right to formulate an official definition of political orthodoxy.

POLITICAL FREEDOM

A government which would arrogate to itself the right to apply such a definition to secular educational foundations could logically proceed to apply it, in the course of time, to the National Catholic Welfare Conference of the National Catholic Educational Association. As a matter of fact, these and many other Catholic organizations have already advocated policies in the field of international relations and of social reform which would logically have to be condemned as un-American if they were tested by the definition Mr. Dodd has employed in analyzing comparable policies of some secular foundations.

Unwarranted regulation of voluntary, nongovernmental organizations would have to be opposed by Catholics, however, even if there were no danger of its being extended to Catholic organizations. It would have to be opposed, on philosophical grounds, in the name of political freedom.

The freedom of our own tax-exempt organizations is no more sacred than that of the various foundations which are being investigated by Mr. Dodd and members of his staff. The fact that we are not in sympathy with the philosophy and the policies of some of these foundations—for example, the John Dewey Society—should not blind us to the dangers involved in their being subjected to unwarranted political regulation.

Blair Moody Recovering

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 13, 1954

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, inquiries have come to my attention about the health of Blair Moody, once a Senator from Michigan, and again a candidate this year.

I am pleased to report that Blair Moody is well on the road back to the excellent health that marked his long tenure in Washington as a great journalist and as a great Senator.

Blair was stricken with pneumonia while campaigning in Michigan's vast upper peninsula. He was rushed to St. Joseph Hospital in Hancock, Mich., where first diagnosis showed some possibility of a heart problem on top of the pneumonia. Two outstanding heart specialists, however, on thorough checking reported no heart attack and added that he was recovering rapidly from the pneumonia and soon would be able to resume his campaign.

Blair will be released from the hospital very soon and will rest for several weeks. He can then resume his campaign to return to the Senate as a Democratic Senator from the great State of Michigan. I know you all join me in wishing him complete and early recovery from the pneumonia that temporarily interrupted his campaign.

Those many of you who remember Blair Moody as a reporter or as a Senator will recall his prodigious energy in any task to which he set his hand. The medical opinion out of Michigan, I am reliably informed, is that he will return to his campaign, and, we Democrats hope, to the Senate, equally vigorous and energetic in his service to the people.

Obstacles to the Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 13, 1954

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I desire to call the attention of my colleagues to an interesting editorial in the July 8 issue of the Boston Globe concerning the recently authorized St. Lawrence seaway project.

It would appear from this editorial that some of the real obstacles to early construction of the seaway are being brought to light. There are exorbitant dredging costs assumed by Canada which she now wants shifted to become a liability of the United States share of construction. There is also disagreement over toll charges and over security regulations affecting seamen on foreign ships using the American section of the seaway.

In opposing the seaway I charged on the floor of the House that the initial expenditure of $105 million in the seaway legislation would be only a "petty cash" account, and that these extras would in the end cost the American taxpayers hundreds of millions of dollars.

The editorial follows:

OBSTACLES TO THE SEAWAY

Some delicate negotiations, entailing compromises on the part of the United States and Canada, will have to reach successful issue before both countries set to work on the proposed St. Lawrence seaway. That much is clear from the initial talks, just concluded at Ottawa.

But the obstacles besetting the vast seaway undertaking are by no means insurmountable. If the temper shown in the first exchange of views is maintained, there is little doubt solutions will be found for all of them. A major difficulty on both sides seems to be that each country—our own by Congress and Canada by her Parliament—has been bound to a role in the proposed partnership leaving neither much leeway for adjustments. This will require remedy.

Canada, for instance, has been authorized to go ahead and build the seaways herself, on her own side of the St. Lawrence—a project the United States looked upon without disfavor 2 years ago. Now, with our Congress changing its mind after 30 years of blockade, the condition is laid down that the 36-mile canal through the International Rapids must be on our side of the river. But that would ruin a $14 million investment Canada has made on her own canals—and she demands compensation for which the act passed by our Congress makes no provision.

There are other differences. One is Canadian insistence that our immigration law exempt from screening Canadian seamen using the proposed canal on the United States side. Another concerns dredging costs. Behind them all looms the recognized fact that Canada is prepared to build the seaway herself, unless compromises can be found.

This $900 million seaway and power partnership is too important for both countries to make such obstacles to its success tolerable. With patience on both sides they should be eliminated.

Majoring in Minors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DWIGHT L. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 13, 1954

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am including therein a sermon delivered by Dr. Edward Gardiner Latch, who is the minister of the Metropolitan Memorial Methodist Church at Nebraska and New Mexico Avenues in the city of Washington, D. C.

The subject discussed is Majoring in Minors. This is a most timely subject in these bewildering and perilous days when we emphasize the less important things in life in lieu of the vital and major objectives.

Dr. Latch is one of the outstanding ministers, and religious and spiritual leaders in methodism.

The address is as follows:

MAJORING IN MINORS

Tucked away in a corner of the Bible and seldom read is a passage which proves that human nature has been much the same over the years. This passage is a part of a prophet's pronouncement to a king. The pronouncement itself does not concern us but the parable he told to introduce it ought to be of great concern to us. Ahab, the king of Samaria, was returning from battle when a man, standing by the way, hailed him and said "thy servant went out into the midst of the battle; and behold, a soldier turned and brought a man to me, and said, 'keep this man; if by any means he be missing, your life shall be for his life, or else you shall pay a talent of silver.' And as thy servant was busy here and there he was gone."

Here is a man into whose keeping had been placed an important prisoner, a very important prisoner, a VIP. You meet him immediately after he has received this prisoner and you find him engaged at the task of guarding him. He seems to appreciate the honor which has been bestowed upon him.

But when you pass that way later on you find the scene has changed. The soldier is not on guard. When we look about for the very important prisoner he is no longer to be seen. In his place bent down with shame and bound by chains, is the man who yesterday was a guardsman.

"How did all this come about?" we ask. "Were you surprised and overcome? Did the enemy break through and overpower you? Did a strong hand overwhelm you from behind? How is it that this VIP escaped?"

And the man, without looking us in the eyes answers "He did not escape because I was overcome, nor because I was overpowered, nor because I was overwhelmed from behind. He escaped because I was too busy to watch him." "Too busy," we say, "too busy doing what? What task did you find more important than guarding your prisoner?" And the answer comes, "No particular task—I was just busy here and there. As thy servant was busy here and there he was gone."

The king realized at once that this was a prophetic word. I wonder if we can discover the prophetic spirit of this parable today—the parable of a man who has an important thing to do but is so busy doing many little things that the one important thing is not done.

We can take this parable of the prophet from its setting in an ancient battlefield and set it down in the stream of our modern life and make a real case for the claim that here is the source of some of our discontent and disillusionment: here is the reason why the sense of meaning and purpose has so largely gone out of a number of lives: here is the common cause of many of our frustrations and our failures. By failure I do not mean a failure in a business adventure, nor in a career we have chartered for ourselves, nor in the matter of getting an education. I mean failure in the greatest art of all—the art of living—a failure we bring upon ourselves because we are so busy. Busy here and there the great things of life slip away from us. Busy here and there and great books are not read, good music is not heard, a great family life is not cultivated, great friendships are not cherished, a great faith is not nourished and a great character is not developed. We are so preoccupied with trivialities that things that matter most go unguarded and they escape. "As thy servant was busy here and there, he was gone." We major in minors.

Here we are living in the most crucial generation in our human history, when there are great thoughts to think, great causes to be served, great needs to be met, great sacrifices to be made: Yet in our lives we "crowd out the things that matter most by things that do not matter much." We are terribly busy with trifles. We miss one of the primary duties and great privileges of our human existences—giving the important things in life an important place in our lives. We are like buses; we can hold our quota and no more: When every seat is occupied, all standing room taken, and the "car full" sign up in front, whoever hails us next, though he be the most important person in the community, must be passed by. So we go through life like crowded buses passing by great interests, great causes, great needs, and great institutions. Literally we litter up our lives with a lot of little things. All too many of us are majoring in minors.

To get back to this prophetic parable the man did not fail because of a lack of knowledge. He did not fail because he did not know what to do. He knew what he was to do, he recognized his duty, he realized his responsibility, yet in spite of all his knowledge and all his understanding he failed.

Nor do we fail because of a lack of knowledge. True we need to know more, but our greatest need in the realm of living is not primarily more knowledge. Our greatest need is the will and the desire to live up to what we already know. The reason why we are so self-centered, so self-obsessed, so self-absorbed is not because we do not know better, it is because we are unwilling to think better and to choose better and to live better. It may be that we do not always know exactly what it is that we ought to do. If we would only learn to acknowledge God and to become aware of His presence, He will reveal to us what we ought to do and more than that He will give us the grace and the power and the spirit to walk in His way.

This man in the parable did not fail for lack of ability. If he could have said that he was overcome, if he could have claimed that he was overpowered, if he could have told that he was overwhelmed from behind everyone would have understood. But that he could not say, and neither can we. We do not fail in the art of living because of a lack of ability nor a lack of talent on our part. There is ability and talent aplenty in our midst and here in this sanctuary this morning. We know that whatever our failures in life have been they have not been due to a lack of ability nor a lack of talent. Our failure is more an unreadiness to use the ability and talents we possess for higher and better ends. This is the point of Jesus' parable of the talent—it is not a matter of importance how many talents we have, what is of great importance is the use we make of the talents we possess.

His failure was due not to a lack of knowledge nor a lack of ability; it was due to the fact that he was too busy. "As thy servant was busy here and there, he was gone." He was one of those persons who have so many things to do, so many engagements to keep, so many burdens to carry that he cannot do his own duty. You see his difficulty and perhaps it is ours. He allowed the secondary to so absorb him that he neglected the primary. He devoted first-rate loyalties to third-rate causes. Those things at which he was working were undoubtedly good and useful but the trouble with the lesser good is that it often robs us of the privilege of doing the better best.

The sin I fear for many of us is not a sin of the flesh, but one great sin of the spirit—the sin of choosing the second best when the best could be ours; the sin of crowding out that which matters most by that which does not matter much. Dean Briggs, of Harvard, describes a company of Americans whom he saw in Rome. They were on their first visit to this great city. Morning after morning they arose to the opportunity of a lifetime awaiting them—the Forum, the Coliseum, St. Peter's, the Catacombs, and great art—a beautiful city rich in history was at their disposal. And every day they settled down in the hotel for a long morning of bridge. Cries Dean Briggs: "What business has such people in Rome? What business have they anywhere?" Here they were sitting down to cards when they might have been standing up to something that was cardinal in life. They were majoring in minors.

For a moment let us look at one of the problems which confronts our day—that of juvenile delinquency. This, I believe, is primarily a problem of the family. It could be solved and would be solved if fathers and mothers would only learn to put first things first in their relationship to their children, if they would only learn to major in majors in their family life. The trouble with our younger generation is not the younger generation at all, but the older folk. Young people do not need critics as much as they need examples; they do not need advice as much as they need understanding; they do not need to be told what to do so much as to be shown how it can be done. Many parents are so preoccupied with many tasks that they farm out their children to any agency which will take them. They say they do not have time. The trouble with them, and perhaps all of us, is not a lack of time. We have time and we take time for things that we consider essential. The difficulty is that we think some things are more important than the training and the raising of our children. We need now more than ever before to lay great emphasis upon the training and the rearing and the raising of our children. Thus can we meet this problem of juvenile delinquency.

I wonder if this spirit is not at the root of much of the secularism of our day. We are a busy people. We are passionately in earnest about many things. We do a hundred-and-one decent and good things every day. But while we are busy here and there the sense of the presence of God slips out of our lives. Busy here and there we neglect the Sunday school and the church. Busy here and there and we forget to pray and lose our interest in the word of God. Busy here and there and the altar in our homes falls down and our sons and daughters stumble over a broken altar into lives of religious indifference. Busy here and there doing many good things the best things in life slip away from us.

We are like the young painter in a class taught by William Hunt by a lake as the sun went down. Hunt noticed that one artist was spending his time painting the shingles on an old red barn and was paying no attention to the glory and beauty of the evening sunset. This wise teacher standing over his shoulder said quietly, "son, it won't be light for long. You've got to choose between the shingles and the sunset. There is only time for one or the other. What is your choice?"

And that is our choice. For us it will not be light for long and we have to choose—and to choose between the shingles and the sunset. One thing, then, we must learn to do and that is to put first that which is first, to make the primary primary and the secondary secondary: to give the important things in life an important place in our lives. We need to hear again the voice of Jesus, "Seek you first the Kingdom of God and His righteousness, and all these things will be added unto you." If you do this, if you seek first the presence of God and the will of God for your life, then, however obscure your tasks, life for you will end in joy and victory and no longer can it be said of you that you major in minors.

Why Go Back to Geneva?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT H. BOSCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 13, 1954

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Speaker, with all the discussion and confusion with reference to the Geneva Conference and its effect on the Korean peace and the ending of the war in Indochina, I believe that the attached editorial will be of interest to my colleagues:

WHY GO BACK TO GENEVA?

In a sudden reversal of his field yesterday, Secretary of State John Foster Dulles decided to fly to Paris to discuss the Indochina truce negotiations with French Premier Pierre Mendès-France. Those dickerings are going on at Geneva and are expected to result in a disguised French surrender sometime this week.

Mr. Dulles usually knows what he's doing. We hope he knows now. Up to yesterday, he had been refusing Mendès-France's frantic requests to go back to Geneva, or at least send Under Secretary Bedell Smith, to sit in on the truce talks.

It is still undecided whether he'll go from Paris to Geneva. We can't see how the United States could profit from such a Dulles reentry into the Indochina mess.

If Dulles should get mixed up in the settlement expected shortly, there would be at least an implication that the United States was guaranteeing the terms of whatever agreement is reached. There would also, it seems to us, be an implied United States recognition of any government the Reds may set up in northern Indo. That would be seriously out of line with President Eisenhower's recent statement that he would never be party to any treaty which would make anybody a slave.

For these reasons, it looks to us as if Dulles was right the first time, when he hauled out of the Geneva Conference some weeks ago, and that he can only make a bad matter worse by pulling up a chair at that international poker table again.

House Joint Resolution 527

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 13, 1954

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following letter to the chairman of the House Judiciary Committee in reference to House Joint Resolution 527, to provide for the protection of defense facilities, which appears to be an excellent approach to the subject matter. The letter follows:

JULY 12, 1954.

Hon. CHAUNCEY W. REED,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, United States House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN REED: The Congress of Industrial Organizations stands ready to assist in every practicable way in protecting the national security, both from outside aggression and internal subversion.

The CIO, as I am sure you are aware, is firmly committed to a policy of combating communism and every other form of totalitarianism. This philosophy is embedded in the CIO constitution and those of our affiliated international unions. Our record of action is a self-evident demonstration of our hostility toward communism. By expelling, in 1949 and 1950, some 11 unions which were found by the CIO to be Communist-dominated, and by relentlessly combating the Communist leadership of those unions since their expulsion, the CIO has delivered a mortal blow to the efforts of the Communist Party to gain and maintain any substantial foothold in the American labor movement. As a result of these actions, the Communist Party's influence in the labor movement and its control of labor unions are at a low point and they are constantly and rapidly decreasing.

From this successful experience in combating communism, we in the CIO have developed certain clear-cut ideas about effective and ineffective methods of combating totalitarianism in the labor movement.

The bills now under study by your committee, House Joint Resolutions 527 and 528, do not, in our estimation, offer a constructive solution to the problem. We fear that the sponsors of the bills, in their wholesome desire to attack the Communist conspiracy, have unwittingly suggested a program that would do harm to the entire labor movement. Both the CIO and the AFL have voiced objections to House Joint Resolutions 527 and 528 on this basis.

Free trade unions are one of the strongest bulwarks of our democracy. Any effort, whatever the motive may be, that might lead to Government control of trade unions, would play directly into the hands of the Communists and other totalitarians. So long as democratic trade unions are free, they will be responsible. So long as they are responsible, they will strive earnestly and successfully to rid the trade-union movement of Communist infiltrators. * * *

The administration's proposals, written with the purpose of eliminating Communist influence in trade unions and of developing a greater degree of security in industrial defense plants, were drafted and transmitted to the Congress so late in the session that there has been no opportunity to give them the thorough consideration which measures of such far-reaching importance certainly deserve. Approval of these proposals by the Congress would, we fear, do more harm than good.

There are many important questions, involving the role of trade unions, free collective bargaining, job security, the right to earn a livelihood, and our basic civil liberties, that are deeply involved in these bills. To rush through legislation would not only be potentially dangerous to our constitutional rights, but might retard any constructive solution by long drawn-out litigation.

It is our belief that the whole problem of Communist-controlled or infiltrated labor organizations and of defense-plant security requires serious and thoughtful study, not only by the Members of Congress who have the responsibility of legislating to protect our national security, but by the representatives of the public and the labor organizations to whom a solution of this problem is likewise vitally important.

Accordingly, on behalf of the Congress of Industrial Organizations, I propose, for your most serious consideration, the establishment of a bipartisan public commission to undertake a thorough review of this most important problem. This commission should be required to file its report by mid-December 1954, so that the next Congress will have it at the beginning of the session in January 1955. It is our view that such a commission should have representation from the Judiciary Committees of the Senate and House, together with members representing industry, labor and the general public, who would be appointed by the President. In other words, it would be similar in character to the Commission on Foreign Economic Policy or the Commission on Judicial and Congressional Salaries, with such changes in composition as may be appropriate because of the different nature of the subject matter.

It would be our hope that such a commission would devise and recommend enactment of a program which, while respecting individual rights and liberties, would provide every needed protection to our internal security. Such a program would have the support of every patriotic American. Needless to say, such a commission, in its search for a constructive solution, would have the continuous and wholehearted cooperation of the Congress of Industrial Organizations.

I therefore respectfully urge that legislation be withheld pending a commission study of the problem of Communist infiltration of labor organizations and of security in defense plants.

Sincerely yours,

WALTER P. REUTHER,
President.

Adjustment of Pay for Members of the Uniformed Services

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 12, 1954

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

Whereas the cost of living since October 1949, according to the Government Consumers' Price Index, has risen more than 15 percent; and

Whereas the basic pay for members of the Armed Forces and its retired personnel, has been increased only 4 percent during that period; and

Whereas early in 1953 the President, through Secretary of Defense Wilson, appointed a committee, later known as the Womble committee, to look into this matter with a view of raising the attractiveness of military service; and

Whereas the report of the Womble committee recently made public, urges among other things, a cost-of-living increase; and

Whereas there are now several bills before the House Armed Services Committee such as H. R. 1437 and H. R. 7489, calling for adjustment of pay for members of the uniformed services in line with the increased cost of living: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by Southern Arizona Chapter, Disabled Emergency Officers, World Wars, in general meeting this 13th day of February 1954, That a cost-of-living increase in line with the recommendation of the Womble committee report, or the bills mentioned above, be made a part of our national legislative program; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent through channels to national headquarters of Disabled Emergency Officers, World Wars, for such action.

Approved February 15, 1954, at Tucson, Ariz.

O. J. FARNESS,
Commander.
JAMES A. MCGUIRE,
Adjutant.

Knights of Columbus First and Constant Advocates of "Under God" Change in Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 13, 1954

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, quite a large amount of information has come into my hands since the passage of my bill, House Joint Resolution 243, to amend the pledge of allegiance to the flag so as to include the words "under God;" data indicating work done and interest displayed by many civic, religious, and patriotic organizations and individuals who assisted in its successful passage. As you know, this measure became law on Flag Day, and is now enrolled as Public Law 396.

I am happy at this time to insert in the RECORD a letter from the July 1954 edition of the magazine Columbia, official publication of the Knights of Columbus, entitled "From the Supreme Knight's Desk," and written by Luke E. Hart, the supreme knight. The subject of his letter is the "under God" change in the pledge of allegiance to the flag. I have been in contact with Mr. Hart on a number of occasions recently and I find that the information contained in his correspondence as to the devotion of the order in this "under God" addition is correct. Evidence comes to bear that the knights were active in promoting the change since 1951. To them its passage must be very gratifying.

It is my pleasure to insert this fine letter from the desk of the supreme knight:

FROM THE SUPREME KNIGHT'S DESK

DEAR BROTHER KNIGHTS: This is being written on Flag Day.

So much has been said and printed in recent days concerning the addition of the words "under God" in the pledge of allegiance, with so little being said about the fact that the proposal originated with the Knights of Columbus and that it was due to our persevering effort that the amendment was brought about that it seems appropriate that this message should be devoted to that subject.

At a country wide youth rally held on Columbus Day, October 12, 1893, there was recited a Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag, which had been prepared for the occasion by Francis Bellamy of the then popular young people's magazine The Youths Companion.

Of course, a pledge of allegiance to the flag, like a prayer to our Creator, may be in whatever form the person making the pledge wishes to use. But the advantages of uniformity in the pledge particularly as recited at public assemblages, were readily recognized. To this end Congress made the pledge of allegiance, including several amendments that gave strength to it, a part of the public law that was adopted "to codify and emphasize existing rules and customs pertaining to the display and use of the flag of the United States of America."

In other ways our trust in God and our reliance upon divine providence has often been publicly manifested. The framers of the Declaration of Independence acknowledged and acclaimed man's freedom and liberties to be based upon certain inalienable rights as endowed by the Creator, they justified the aspirations of the colonies to the status of an independent nation by the law of "Nature and Nature's God," they called upon the "Supreme Judge of the world" to determine the rectitude of their actions and they pledged their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor "with a firm reliance on the protection of Divine Providence."

The Star-Spangled Banner proclaims our motto to be "in God is our trust."

The beautiful and patriotic hymn "America" likewise proclaims God to be the "Author of Liberty" and "our King."

The purpose of the amendments to the Constitution known as the Bill of Rights was to protect those rights which had clearly been acknowledged to be "God given."

In his Gettysburg Address President Lincoln prayerfully expressed the wish that the cherished hopes to which he gave utterance might be accomplished by "this Nation, under God."

Although the pledge of allegiance has been recited on many occasions and by many millions of people, and although it had been made a part of the public law pertaining to the display of the flag, and although it had become an established feature in connection with the opening of assemblies of every kind and character, it remained for the Knights of Columbus to call attention to the fact that it contained no reference to God or to our dependence upon Him.

At its April 1951, meeting the supreme board of directors amended the pledge of allegiance to the flag to be taken at all fourth degree assembly meetings in the United States by adding the words "under God" after the word "nation," so that the pledge as amended would read:

"I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the Republic for which it stands; one Nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."

Then at its annual meeting in Los Angeles in August 1952 the supreme council adopted a resolution urging Congress to amend Public Law 829 by adding the words "under God" after the word "Nation," and copies of the resolution were sent to the President, to the Vice President (as President of the Senate), and to the Speaker of the House.

In my report as president of the National Fraternal Congress to its annual meeting in Boston in September 1952, I called attention to the omission of all reference to God in the pledge of allegiance, I referred to the use of the words "under God" after the word "Nation" by President Lincoln in his Gettysburg Address, and I recommended that the National Fraternal Congress go on record as favoring the amendment. That was done, and thereafter several State fraternal congresses took similar action.

Then at its annual meeting in St. Paul in August 1953 the supreme council again went on record in favor of the change, and it urged Congress to make the amendment in Public Law 829. Copies of that resolution were sent to the President, the Vice President, the Speaker of the House, and to each Member of both Houses of Congress.

Many favorable replies were received, among them a letter from Senator LESTER C. HUNT, of Wyoming, who said, "I wonder why nobody ever thought of it before."

We desire to express the appreciation of the order to Congressman LOUIS C. RABAUT and Senator HOMER C. FERGUSON, both of Michigan, for having sponsored the joint resolution of Congress amending the public law to provide for the insertion of the words "under God" after the word "Nation" in the officially recognized pledge of allegiance to the flag of the United States of America.

Sincerely and fraternally,

LUKE E. HART,
Supreme Knight.

Just for the record, it must be remembered that there were a number of resolutions to amend the pledge of allegiance in the 83d Congress, the first of which I introduced on April 20, 1953, as a result of a letter from Mr. H. Joseph Mahoney, of Brooklyn, N. Y., exhorting the change. That bill, House Joint Resolution 243, passed the House on June 7, and, at the suggestion of Senator FERGUSON, of Michigan, it was accepted by the Senate the following day. The Senator himself had introduced a joint resolution similar to mine on February 10, 1954, and his support of my bill in the Senate was greatly appreciated.

The Saturday Evening Post Says, the Reader's Digest Says, the Air Force Magazine Says, the American Legion Is Wondering, and So Is the Taxpayer Wondering, About the Air Force Mess

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 13, 1954

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, it is time that this Congress, and particularly the Armed Services Committees of both the House and the Senate, make a thorough investigation of the mess that exists in our Air Force recruiting program. Some time ago I wrote a letter to the Defense Department asking for information on certain phases of the Air Force recruiting program, with particular reference to how it can be reconciled with the Air Force discharge program. The reply was the most evasive document I have ever seen.

For every pilot that the Air Force is lacking at this particular instance, I will give the names of two pilots who wanted to remain in the Air Force but who were summarily discharged.

In one breath the Air Force is yelling to the high heavens that they need more recruits—in the other breath, and almost at the same time, they are discharging officers and personnel by the thousands.

There seems to be no reason or logic in Air Force management, and the taxpayers are the ones who are paying the bill.

To give an idea of what this is all about, I wish to include in my remarks the National Security Newsletter of June 9, 1954, published by the American Legion. A study of this newsletter will show that the House of Representatives and the Senate better take a hand and straighten out this mess or we will not have an Air Force:

MANPOWER POLICIES DAMPEN SERVICE ATTRACTIVENESS

In past months, considerable attention has been focused on one of the major problems of the Armed Forces, that of retaining qualified men as career personnel. Studies have been conducted, speeches delivered, statements prepared, legislation introduced, military pay raises discussed, all aimed at inducing young men to choose the military service as a career.

However, in the commotion, one important factor, which would lend considerable impetus toward retaining these men, appears totally overlooked, that of security of position.

The insecurity with which members of the Armed Forces are faced is best exemplified by the action of the Department of Defense as regards Air Force officers and ROTC students. The Air Force has found itself with a pilot shortage in one instance, only to find a surplus existed just weeks later. This "feast 'n famine" cycle has placed a hardship on career-minded personnel and, in many cases, caused them to seek their future outside the military service.

In August 1953, Dr. John Hannah, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower and Personnel, issued the ultimatum that AF ROTC seniors must sign up for flight training or be washed out of the program. This ultimatum was lifted in October when the critical pilot shortage no longer existed. Those who had signed for flight training were to be commissioned and called ta active duty as Reserve officers.

Latest figures (April) reveal that less than 8,000 of the 11,000 graduating AF ROTC cadets, who previously signed for flying training, will be commissioned. Two thousand of the remaining 3,000 graduates will go on active duty as airmen or will be turned over to selective service.

Last August, during the height of the AF force-out program, it was reported that of the first 6,592 officers released from active duty involuntarily, 2,178 were pilots, some of which were (priority) B-47 crewmen.

In October it was reported that the AF personnel shortage had shifted from one of pilot applicants to one of observer applicants. At that time it was reported that there was a 5-month backlog in the number of qualified pilot applicants.

Just 1 month later, the AF eased requirements for pilot training for civilian high school graduates, dropping the 2-year college requirement for pilot training.

As recently as May 10, Dr. Hannah, in speaking before a group in Milwaukee, Wis., once again rang the pilot shortage alarm when he said "even by lowering qualification standards, it is almost impossible to procure enough young men to meet the demand for jet pilots."

In summary, then, this is about the way the pilot feast-n'-famine cycle has been turning:

In August 1953 we had a serious pilot shortage when AF ROTC seniors were told to fly or be washed out.

During the same month, the AF was forcing out officers, some were pilots (some were B-47 crewmen).

In October we had a 5-month backlog in the number of qualified pilot applicants.

One month later, requirements were eased for pilot training for high-school graduates.

In April, 2,000 AF ROTC seniors, who had signed for flight training, were slated to go on active duty (after graduation) as airmen or be turned over to Selective Service.

On May 10, Dr. Hannah reiterated the need for more pilots.

There is no wonder then, that this year's enrollment in the AF ROTC program was off more than 10 percent. It is understandable too, that the reenlistment rate, month after month, is far below expectations. It is not too surprising either that West Point will have the greatest number of vacancies in its 152 year history when this year's class graduates. It is estimated that the Academy with a capacity of 2,496 may have as many as 1,016 vacancies.

In Dr. Hannah's May 10 speech, he listed what he considered to be the reasons for the unpopularity of service careers:

Failure of military pay increases to keep pace with the rising cost of living.

Constant nibbling away of fringe benefits.

Poor housing for service personnel, especially those with dependents.

Hiring of trained military men by civilian industry.

There is no mention of the hit-'n-miss manpower tactics being forced on the members of the Air Force and its components. The American Legion by its adoption of Resolution 330 at the St. Louis 1953 national convention, recognized and endorsed the need for according various benefits to members of our Armed Forces; nevertheless, we feel that career security is an equally important factor in retaining the best of our servicemen and women in uniform.

Only recently, the necessity for adequate planning and coordination was revealed in the disparity between the funds appropriated in the 1955 defense budget for general, flag and field grade officer positions, and those authorized in the Officer Grade Limitation Act. Under the Officer Grade Limitation Act, the Air Force, for example, was permitted 42,000 field grade and officer positions, whereas the 1955 budget provides funds for only 37,000. The total disparity for all services amounts to 10,000 less general, flag and field grade officers than currently are authorized.

When concern is expressed over the resignations of career personnel, the low reenlistment rate and the need for increased fringe benefits and a military pay raise, our leaders must not overlook the injustice of the unilateral agreement which exists today between members of the Armed Forces and their chosen service. At a stroke of the pen, career personnel are forced out of service, their future. With such a unilateral arrangement, many would-be career officers are seeking their futures in a civilian capacity.

The future security of our Nation may well depend on the present morale and stability of our military manpower policies. If we are to continue to depend on the hard-core Regulars in the event of an armed conflict, we must now establish and practice sound, stable, and attractive manpower policies.

National Park System Needs Help—Right Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 7, 1954

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, it is said that once the American people know what ought to be done, they will find some way to get it done. I think we can test that theory again, and it is being tested again, with regard to our national parks. A proposal to utilize a specific reservation in a national park for a reclamation facility as a key part of a great basin-wide river development plan generated great opposition across this Nation. We are now to see if the steady and unnecessary deterioration of all of our national parks will generate a sufficient reaction to save these recreation areas from insanitation, from decay and from outright destruction.

Along the line of the education necessary, even though some 46 million visits were made last year to the national parks, is an editorial from the Salida Daily Mail, of Salida, Colo. In this timely and pointed editorial, the author utilizes local knowledge and an article from the Saturday Evening Post to dramatize the needs of our neglected park areas. I commend this article to the Members and, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the editorial to which I have referred:

NATIONAL PARK SYSTEM NEEDS HELP, RIGHT NOW

Millions of Americans are back at work today after a perfectly wonderful holiday weekend spent in enjoying the facilities of one of our 180 national parks, monuments, historic sites and recreation areas. This includes places such as Rocky Mountain National Park, and Mesa Verde, in southwest Colorado, administered through the Department of the Interior.

The number does not include the recreation areas, such as those in the San Isabel National Forest, which are the babies of the Forest Service, administered by the Department of Agriculture. The problems are the same.

A recent article in the Saturday Evening Post, entitled "Twenty-four Million Acres of Trouble," outlines the difficulties of the head of the national park system, Conrad L. Wirth. In brief, Wirth's problem—and that of the Forest Service—is keeping up with the demands of the public on the amount allocated by Uncle Sam.

Wirth has the task of administering approximately $4 billion in real estate, including glaciers, volcanoes, geysers, deserts, and caves. He has myriads of curious problems, one of them is keeping 62 sets of prehistoric ruins in a kind of suspended ruination. It costs $8,000 a year to maintain the ruins in Mesa Verde, Colo., according to the Post writer. Wirth figures those at Chaco Canyon, N. Mex., need $65,000 worth of work to put them back in their old, terrible condition.

The national park system also maintains 23 resort hotels and lodges, 4,086 cabins, and 1,511 tents—and this isn't enough to meet the demand. Besides, it has 15,000 miles of road to maintain—and again satisfy the public as to quality.

Wirth admits that some of the camping grounds are pathetically overcrowded. But get this. According to the article, before the war, the biggest attendance was 21 million. Last year it hit 46 million. In 1941 we had $84 million to run the park system; last year, $34 million. Wirth estimates the backlog of needed work—repairs, roads, buildings, additional campsites, etc.—amounts to $600 million.

Again, let us emphasize this refers to just the national park system. The story is the same in the Forest Service recreation areas—just not enough money to meet the demands of the public. Picnic tables, toilets, and roads cost money and lots of it. In spite of the relatively small amount of money spent, the park services are expected to constantly expand and improve the facilities.

The Post article quotes Wirth: "Twenty-three States say travel is one of their 3 biggest industries. The business can't be measured accurately, but it's estimated to run somewhere between 12 and 30 billion a year. It is believed that the parks generate more than $2 billion of this. If so, they are responsible for $585 million which gets back to the States and the Federal Government in taxes. It works out that to $150 million in local taxes in $430 million in Federal."

In other words, the national parks alone bring in $430 million in tax revenues, and yet the Government is spending only $33 or $34 million on them.

What can be done to get more money that we need to keep our parks and recreation areas in good condition? For one thing, we who use them generally could do a better job of cleaning up the place when we are ready to leave. Park service employees spend a lot of time picking up beer cans that could well be spent in improvements.

Perhaps it would be feasible to at least get the Forest Service and the Park Service in the same department of government. Although there is a difference in their work, there is a great similarity and perhaps union of the two would result in more picnic tables and tents each year.

It appears that what the public needs to do most is put on pressure to our Congressmen to allocate more money to the recreation services. If the figures in the Post are correct, and they undoubtedly are, the Park Service and its sister, the Forest Service, sure have got the short end of the stick.

One of the great American prerogatives is to complain to the high heavens and most of us do when we are nicked for admission into one of our own national parks. Collecting a fee at a Forest Service-operated recreation area such as the Cascade campgrounds up Chalk Creek would be virtually impossible. But we would pay a few dollars a year extra in income taxes without too much griping if we knew that the extra amount goes to the development of our recreational facilities and not for some save-the-elephants commission to Africa.

It is a problem that we all need to study carefully if our national parks are to continue to serve the American public (which is becoming increasingly more outdoor-minded) and stand up under the strain.

The American Medical Association and Veteran Hospitalization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 13, 1954

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, recently, Joseph F. Burke, second national junior vice commander of the Disabled American Veterans, himself a badly wounded amputee veteran of World War II, made a talk before a DAV chapter in Long Island that I hope the Members of this House will take the time to read. It brings out so clearly the intensity of feeling these amputee veterans have toward the American Medical Association and its efforts to do away with free hospitalization for veterans. The address follows:

There are times when a man stands on a public platform and feels the need to speak out against an organization. His evaluation of that organization is necessarily tempered because of the realization that the people who make up the membership are not at fault. I am in that situation now as regards the American Medical Association. The American people, or all peoples of the world, for that matter, are indebted to those who follow the Hippocratic oath. Your speaker is certainly one of those. On January 2, 1944, I was wounded on the approaches to Cassino, Italy, while serving my country in time of war. The repair of the left arm wound by amputation was one of the easier operative procedures performed by these masters of the medical profession. With both arms and legs damaged to the extent of smashed bones, torn muscles, and severed nerves, and internal wounds showing a number of punctures of the stomach, liver, lungs, and spleen, it is a marvel to me today that the surgical team of Major Brinker and Captain Moore was able to repair such bodily damage in six exhaustive and intensive hours of surgery. It was their skill and God's will that permits me to address you tonight. I say this not because I am unique, as there are many in this room who know that this is a typical case history of thousands of former GI's. The debt of gratitude I owe these men I will never be able to repay.

And because of my strong feeling against the policies of the American Medical Association the remarks I make tonight reflect only my own personal opinion, and is not to be construed as being the feeling of the national organization of the Disabled American Veterans.

Yet as a veteran, I must speak out against the American Medical Association who professes to represent the thoughts of the entire medical profession. Their expressions of disagreement with the Veterans' Administration hospital program has been injurious to the entire veteran population. The American people, through its elected representatives, has brought forth the finest medical program for veterans, only to suffer attacks on their efforts to care for the war's disabled. As a result, we face a serious curtailment of the Disabled American Veterans program for veterans. We find that by advocating the return of mental and tubercular patients to city, county, and State institutions, under the guise of a reduced tax program, the AMA reveals an immature outlook, since there will be no savings, because these local governments will be charged with too big a burden and the veterans will then receive less than the best of care as intended by our laws. We demand an opportunity to monitor the care to be given our mental and tubercular patients in Veterans' Administration hospitals instead of in city, county, and State institutions which at best would be inefficiently administered, and without any control by the Federal Government. Again where would the savings be in taxes? It would cost just as much for the maintenance and care of these veterans in these lower institutions because they are overcrowded now. This influx of a veteran population would make conditions chaotic with the resultant loss of medical efficiency and proper care to the patient, both veteran and nonveteran.

The Disabled American Veterans will continue to fight any approach of this sort under the guise of tax reduction. We believe that the American people will willingly accept the care of the war disabled and the necessary hospitalization and care of the indigent war veterans as part of the cost of war. Congress recognized this responsibility and provided for it by laws.

It is true in the technical sense that the majority of our hospitalized veterans are admitted for disabilities labeled "nonservice connected." However, honest medical opinion will admit that a "probable relationship" of the post-service disease or debility exists with the veteran's service. So with this aforementioned "probable relationship" who can say that those who experienced the anxiety attached with the hazards of war have not incurred that basic lowered threshold of fatigue and susceptibility which invites illness. Since medical opinion may be altered with the new policy of the AMA, this theory may not stand a professional argument today.

One of the strong points made by the AMA against the hospitalization of veterans was that their investigation disclosed that a veteran earning $50,000, a year was found hospitalized for a non-service-connected condition. Now I ask you, how many veterans today are making $50,000 a year? The argument is unfounded on the surface, and in addition, it was later discovered that the veteran had been, in fact, treated for a service connected condition. A second point made by the AMA against hospitalization was that the Veterans' Administration hospitals harbor an army of alcoholics. Now all of us in this room know the strict rules by which the Veterans' Administration hospitals operate. It is an established fact that a veteran will receive an immediate disciplinary discharge and not be eligible for readmission for 90 days if he displays drunkenness on the ward. This charge simply cannot be true because the regulations do not permit prolonged hospitalization for such a condition. In passing, please let me call you attention to the often expressed opinion of the medical profession that alcoholism is a disease; very often the manifestation of a mental disorder. Does the AMA now say that a disease should not be treated?

The AMA arguments against non-service-connected cases appears to revolve around the issue of ability to pay. Certainly we realize that group hospitalization or insurance plans are available. However, being mainly group policies, they are available to only those whose employment status serves as a prerequisite. The employer or union can insure that the group plans are the best available for the employees and union members. Yet this takes care of only a certain segment of the population. There are private plans available to anyone outside of a company or union, but these are usually so honeycombed with so many clarifying and delimiting clauses that the average policy is not sufficient to meet an individuals need. Ability to pay is a misnomer in many cases even with the above plans which have limitations. The average cost for an operation and hospitalization at prevailing rates, room and board, nursing care, averages $12 a day. Medicines, treatments, X-rays, and doctors visits are all extra. A reasonable figure for 1 month's hospitalization under these conditions would amount to $870 a month. The average head of a family earns $3,500 per year. Where is the ability to pay?

The AMA makes the claim that veterans' hospitalization programs are nothing but socialized medicine. Today we face these continuous increasing cries from one agency or another, "The road to socialism." Crying socialism is no argument since it is an established policy in politics today to label your opponent with an unpopular title. Bipartisan legislation over the years in our State and Nation have caused such things to come into being: social security, Federal old-age benefits, employment compensation, compulsory disability insurance, and Federal aid to education. Is the AMA opposed to these advances and progresses? Then why do they feel that taking care of or insuring the proper health of the veteran segment of the population is another step toward socialism?

Let us look at how the AMA people have benefited under the Government aid. Under the GI bill, how many doctors have increased their knowledge in their chosen field? How many ex-GI's have become doctors under the GI bill? Millions of dollars which have been advanced in this country for medical research has helped the advance of medicine. Was this excellent program socialism? The generosity of the American people, through charitable drives, contributed a great deal of money to medical research on cancer, tuberculosis, heart disease, crippled children's research, and muscular dystrophies. Would the AMA prefer that these necessary moneys be obtained through taxation rather than this support of medicine by the people? Let me give you the benefit of my own experience with the shortsightedness of the AMA.

In World War II, I was one of 50,000 amputees and like everyone of them, my amputation healed and I found myself ready for an artificial arm. I found that since the Civil War, no improvements had been made in the prosthetics devices field. Now mind you, the doctor's job is not finished with the sewing of a stump; he is also responsible for the fitting of the amputee with a suitable limb and insure the ability to obtain some use of the artificial limb. Imagine our dismay when we found that the artificial hand was not expected to perform any function other than to serve as a cosmetic device; to appear two-handed. A heavy cumbersome thing which served better hanging in the closet. The useful device was a heavy hook which was still operated by rubber bands and a heavy cable which proceeded to tear the sleeves out of our clothing. I know the leg amputee had only about three times as many heartaches trying to walk in the crude limbs which served no better than the old-fashioned peg. This was certainly disheartening to the new-born amputee. However, near the end of World War II, the plight of the amputee became evident and a newspaperman, a retired officer who was himself an amputee, and a few other interested people from all walks of life convinced the Government to form a committee on prosthetic research.

This committee was formed by and of members unrelated with the AMA, who failed to encourage the project and refused it help. With the support of Congresswoman EDITH NOURSE ROGERS, the Army and the Navy, the limb manufacturers, this research began. The difficulties were tremendous and each year was a greater struggle for necessary funds from the Congress for its operation. At no time did the AMA offer its help, and it would have been greatly welcomed, and would have been an invaluable aid; yet, what are the committee's results? Its research programs at the Army Prosthetic Research Laboratory, Northrup Aviation Corp., New York University, the University of Southern California, and the International Business Machines produced artificial aids to greet the amputee of the Korean conflict, and all amputees, which were far superior to any available to World War II amputees at the close of the war. This work is still going on today, and as yet AMA as an organization has not contributed one iota toward the program.

I charge that the AMA no longer stands for American Medical Association, but it means to me "against medical advancement." In the Halls of Congress as of this moment, facts against the AMA are being brought out. We know that isolationism as regards to people means that the concern of these people is for the United States itself. But even those people who believe in such a go-it-alone theory, would not go along with the AMA theory of isolationism in medicine. Medical research in other countries beside our own has brought forth many new and constructive theories as regard, for instance, cancer. The AMA is now fighting the introduction into this country of such proven research. I point out to you in passing that Sir Alexander Fleming, an Englishman, was not an American but contributed greatly in the advance with penicillin which has benefited mankind. Sister Kenny, an Australian, whose treatment of polio although proven beneficial from time and time again has yet to receive AMA approval. This hierarchy which speaks for the medical profession in the United States with its dangerous control of medical thinking has done more to retard medical advancement than any uneducated or illiterate segment of our population in their refusal to accept medical treatment over the years. We as veterans and especially in our consideration of disabled veterans, which is the only reason for the DAV to be in existence, that is our creed, that our mission as a disabled American veterans organization is not fulfilled until all our country's wartime disabled, their widows, and their dependents, have been adequately cared for recognize as one of our greatest adversaries those who speak for the AMA. The crucifix of the AMA's making bears not the figure of Christ, but the war's mangled veteran. Since the days of George Washington, it was recognized that the war's disabled became more susceptible to the ravages of disease. We feel that the Veterans' Administration program of care for the hospitalized veteran at times can be improved. On the basis of results today, we know that it is the finest medical program in the country. We have more than 6,300 doctors, 865 dentists, and 13,800 trained nurses. This program of care for the veteran is without parallel in any other nation in the world. The debt of honor has been assumed by the American people with little or no complaint. The veteran himself is a taxpayer and yet the AMA for reasons best known to itself continues to fight the well regulated program of the United States Government. It fights the administration of President Eisenhower on the health program which he has offered to the Nation. I charge the AMA as being against medical advancement because of their own self-centered interests and of dictating to this Nation what the policies of health and welfare should be from their conception and their conception alone. The DAV will continue to fight the AMA on the issues of disabled veterans, and I hope all the people of this Nation will fight those few who speak for the AMA, who resist the health and research programs necessary for the well-being of our country.

Admission of Red China to the United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. ALEXANDER SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 13, 1954

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, in the New York Times of July 12, 1954, on the editorial page, appears a letter to the editor from Dr. William J. Barnes, of Great Barrington, Mass., dated July 8, 1954, on the subject of the admission of Red China to the United Nations. Dr. Barnes explains in some detail his view that the admission of Red China to the United Nations would be almost tantamount to the destruction of the United Nations organization. The argument is so well reasoned and well presented, and the writer is so well informed on the subject of the United Nations that I ask unanimous consent to have the letter published in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADMITTING CHINA TO U. N.—CAPTIVE PEOPLES' LOSS OF FAITH IN UNITED STATES AND U. N. FEARED

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

The writer of this letter has been a consistent supporter of the United Nations since its earliest days. The letter refers to your editorial of July 7 entitled "Red China and the U. N."

The final paragraph of the editorial states: "But the United States must not put itself in the position of attempting to dictate to the United Nations or defying a decision of a majority of its members. For that would not only be contrary to America's own principles; it would definitely end the usefulness of the United Nations and leave the United States isolated and alone."

It occurs to the writer that there is a third body of people which is not so frequently mentioned in news reports nor in editorial comments but who cannot safely be ignored in the decisions of our time. So far as we know this group of people has no formal name or organization. It might be called the Association of Persons Who Believe in Integrity, or the Community of the Discipline of Order.

PEOPLE UNDER COMMUNISM

This group includes men and women within the borders of Russia. It is only reasonable to believe that those of its members who have succeeded in escaping to the West are not the only ones who are nauseated beyond endurance by the disorder in which they are forced to live. In addition, the believing and the living of many millions of people in China who were made of the finest of human stuff cannot have been destroyed. In fact, this quality of life has something to do with the present restlessness all around the earth and must be assumed to be present in every land bordering on every ocean.

It is possible that this group has more solidity of substance even than the United Nations. Its people must be kept in mind when one speaks of "dictating to" or "defying" or "leaving the United States isolated or alone."

It is possible that the defiance of this group might leave the United States irretrievably alone, even if such defiance should keep the form of the United Nations in evidence for a little while. It is possible that the confident support of this group of "believers" is the one thing most needed to give substantial strength to the United Nations or to any effective international effort toward order.

If it should be announced in every land that Red China had been admitted to the United Nations, it would come as a news report to millions of human beings who have seen their fellows seized just because they were decent people, falsely accused and falsely convicted. Among these witnesses would be a great host of "believers," and the meanings they would put into the report might not coincide with some finely drawn explanation which we might offer.

ACT OF EXPEDIENCY

If this news should be interpreted by the "believers in integrity," not only in China but in every land, including our own, as abandonment of integrity in favor of expediency by either the United States or the United Nations, or by both, then it is possible that the abandoners would lose the confidence and the support of the "believers."

Such an effect, in our judgment, most certainly "would not only be contrary to America's own principles; it would definitely end the usefulness of the United Nations and leave the United States isolated and alone," alone without either its own self-respect or the true respect of any believer in decency or integrity anywhere.

To one who has always supported the United Nations, the thought of our withdrawing from it is truly frightening. But the abandonment of this unnamed "community" would appear to be by far the more damaging step.

WILLIAM J. BARNES, M. D.
GREAT BARRINGTON, MASS., *July 8, 1954.*

B-N-G Solution: A Miracle Drug for Burns, Sunburns, Poison Ivy, and Poison Oak Made From the Mung Bean Sprouts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD A. PATTEN
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 13, 1954

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following:

There appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in 1953 a number of insertions in the Appendix from various Congressmen, as follows:

March 16, 1953: Remarks of Hon. VICTOR WICKERSHAM, volume 99, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page A1409.

May 11, 1953: Remarks of Hon. ROBERT H. MOLLOHAN, volume 99, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page A2647.

June 5, 1953: Remarks of Hon. JOHN L. MCMILLAN, volume 99, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page A3405.

July 31, 1953: Remarks of Hon. HAROLD A. PATTEN, volume 99, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page A5168.

I was the last person who made an insertion in reference to this product before Congress adjourned in 1953.

Mr. Speaker, this product was discovered in a Chinese chop suey canning plant under the ownership of Mr. Ben E. Zaremba. This company had been in the Chinese chop suey canning process for over 18 years. In 1944, Mr. Zaremba started trying to can a hog food made from the residues of the Chinese chop suey in 1- and 2-gallon cans. Mr. Zaremba realized that since the meat supply in this country was almost back to normal, there would very likely be a decrease in the sales of the Chinese chop suey which would, of course, be detrimental to his business.

Dr. Joseph Ryankciwicz, Mr. Zaremba's chemist was doing research in regard to a formula for the canning of hog food, and while doing this work there was an explosion in the plant which scalded a number of people. Mr. Zaremba and those present who were not burned had nothing with which to apply first aid except the mung-bean sprouts which had been freshly cut along with the juice in the vats. An ambulance was summoned from the Chicago area and these people were sent to an outstanding hospital and placed under the care of the doctors there. The doctors immediately noticed that there was very little blistering from these burns and that most of the blistering was on those parts of the body that the mung-bean-sprout juice did not reach. They suggested to Mr. Zaremba that this product evidently had a value for the treatment of burns and they should try to develop it. Mr. Zaremba and the chemist returned to the plant and for a period of 1½ years concentrated on trying to discover just what had happened in the accident and why mung-bean-sprout juice was so effective on burns. In so doing, Dr. Ryankciwicz with his biochemical background found that they had stabilized an enzyme in a vegetable product and later on within 6 months they discovered they had stabilized an additional enzyme—both purely through accident. Mr. Zaremba then started making this product, and he put it on the market in 2-ounce bottles having received the approval of the Pure Food and Drug for the label to read as follows: "Ben-Gee, mung-bean-sprout juice for the relief of minor burns, sunburns, poison oak, and poison ivy."

Mr. Zaremba had difficulties during the years of 1947 through 1950 in securing burn tests on this products. He was refused these tests by such Government agencies as the Army, Navy, and Air Corps. He was unable to take it to private laboratories for testing because at that time the facilities for testing products in these private laboratories were so overcrowded that they were unable to guarantee Mr. Zaremba any definite date when they might be able to make such tests.

In 1951, Mr. Zaremba came to Washington with a number of radio people from Chicago. He was introduced to Mr. William Vaughan who at that time was serving as aide to Vice President Barkley. He was anxious to secure the services of Mr. Vaughan to help in the promotion of this product. Mr. Vaughan was not sure that he would have enough time on his off hours, and when he discussed the matter with the Vice President they agreed that even though there might be time, they were not convinced the product had any merit. They also considered the fact that there might be some adverse publicity as had resulted in some other patent medicines. The Vice President advised Mr. Vaughan against taking part in its promotion. Mr. Zaremba was persistent, however, as he had utmost faith in his product. Mr. Zaremba seemed so convinced that Mr. Vaughan could be of great service in the promotion of the product that he sent a large number of samples asking Mr. Vaughan to see that they were given away. Mr. Vaughan was not too interested until a serious burn occurred in his own family. Lacking any medication he immediately applied the Ben-Gee Sprout Juice and was amazed at the results it had on the burn. Mr. Vaughan then thoroughly convinced of the merits of the product, became a crusader giving samples to his friends and telling of its great value. Mr. Vaughan gave samples to many Senators and Congressmen, to employees on Capitol Hill and to the Capitol Physician's Office where many samples were given away.

In August 1951, the Vice President had a rather serious burn on the arm and used the Ben-Gee Bean Sprout Juice. Upon finding that there was no pain after 30 minutes and that there was no blistering and no scar left, and subsequently after having used the medicine on a case of athlete's foot with remarkable results, he gave his approval and permission to Mr. Vaughan to go into this business on a part time commission basis during his off hours. Mr. Vaughan then made a contract with the Ben-Gee Products Co. to be the regional distributor for all States on the eastern coast from Maine to Florida and also for his home State of Kentucky.

Mr. Vaughan proceeded to establish a distributorship company, secured a storage place in Washington, D. C., and received some $20,000 worth of merchandise. Their plan was to go on the market for retail sale in March 1952, but the company making the product was stopped by an injunction obtained by another pharmaceutical company which claimed a similarity of name. This, of course, caused delay as they could not sell the product under the name in question. Mr. Zaremba did not give up but set out to get an approved name and trade-mark that would be agreeable. Mr. Vaughan started to give out the merchandise then in storage in Washington as sâmples to doctors, clinics, and any hospitals which would agree to take them for clinical research.

Mr. Vaughan and Mr. Zaremba felt that if this product could have a fair and full test on burns by one of the branches of the armed service, the results would be such that there would be no question in the minds of the medical profession as to its value.

They worked for several months with this pharmaceutical company which had cooperated with them trying to agree on a name that would be acceptable to all. A year later this company agreed on the new name, which was "B-N-G solution, containing tyrosinase, for the relief of minor burns, sunburns, poison ivy, and poison oak dermatitis; for external use only; manufactured by the Worth Pharmacal Co. Division of the Ben-Gee Products Co., Oak Lawn, Ill."

In February 1953 Mr. Zaremba and Mr. Vaughan began to attain results of their efforts made in the free distribution promotion of this product. There were a number of outstanding publications and newspapers which carried articles on this medicine and various radio commentators made mention of it. There were also, as mentioned above, insertions in the Congressional Record referring to the relief that this product had given to people with burns, sunburns, and skin disorders.

The following publications and radio broadcasts regarding B-N-G solution appeared as follows:

February 3: Radio broadcast of Earl Godwin, station WRC, NBC, Washington.

March 21: Drew Pearson, Washington Merry-Go-Round, appearing in the Washington Post and other papers.

May 8: Arlington (Va.) Daily Sun, story relative to the effect of B-N-G.

May 21: NEA syndicated story by Douglas Larsen, staff correspondent, published throughout the United States by various Scripps-Howard newspapers during May and June.

May 25: Radio station WRC, 11 p. m. news broadcast, Stewart Findley reporting. This broadcast was received on NBC network as far west as Chicago.

June 10: Associated Press story by Frank Carey. Published in Washington Evening Star, page 1, and eventually in more than 800 other newspapers and in some 600 of these papers appearing on page 1. Appeared in such papers as the Glasgow (Scotland) Evening Times and the Korean edition of Stars and Stripes.

June 11: References to the AP story in the morning news broadcast of Claude Mahoney, CBS network, and on numerous other local news broadcasts throughout the United States.

June 13: Washington Times Herald feature story by Don Munson.

June 21: Feature story from Washington by Ed Edstrom in Lousiville (Ky.) Courier-Journal.

June 25: Glasgow (Ky.) Times reprint of Louisville Courier-Journal story with prefatory remarks.

July 13: New York Herald Tribune leading comment in Hy Gardner's column.

July 21: Radio broadcast of Ray Henle, Three-Star Extra—Sunoco.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I would like to call your attention to the fact that on January 6 of this year Congressman Frank Chelf inserted an article in the Appendix of the Congressional Record on page A2, and I inserted an additional article in reference to this product on February 12. Further, on February 17, Senator Kerr, Senator Monroney, and Congressman Wickersham signed a letter addressed to the Surgeons General of the Army and Navy requesting that they test this B-N-G solution as its wide use would increase the market value of the mung bean in their State.

Senator Kerr, Senator Monroney, and Congressman Wickersham also claimed that since Oklahoma was the only State at the present time which could properly grow the mung bean suitable for the sprouts which are used in this medicine, they had had considerable correspondence from the mung bean growers in this State. In reply to their request the Army and Navy answered they would ask the National Research Council Committee on Trauma—the medical name for burns—for permission to test this product. The Navy in a reply to Senator Kerr, Senator Monroney, and Congressman Wickersham requested a meeting in Washington on March 12, with the chemist and a group from the Worth Pharmacal Co., asking them to bring samples and data of medical composition on burns regarding this medicine. This procedure was not followed by the Army. They made their request for the test directly to the National Research Council Committee on Trauma.

On April 16, the Navy Department Bureau of Medicine and Surgery answered the requests made by these three gentleman stating that they were refused permission by the National Research Council Committee on Trauma to test this product on burns for the following reasons: First, because the company which discovered it had no pharmaceutical background and second, because there was not any hospital or clinical data on burn cases where this had been used.

This product is a vegetable product and has no formula, therefore, it cannot be patented. It was made purely through accidental discovery, and I might add that this product contains only 2 percent Thimerosol (methiolate) preservative.

It has been difficult for the company to get this product into hospitals for the necessary data with the position taken by the National Research Council Committee on Trauma.

Mr. Speaker, there have been a number of prominent physicians in the Washington area who have used this product. It has been used on several burn cases where it gave very fine results. One particular case called to my attention is that of an electrician in this area who received a severe electrical burn. This man was burned on both arms up to his shoulders and on both legs from above his knees and to his ankles. He has been very grateful for the results credited to the use of this medicine since his arms, and particularly his hands, are free of scars, and he is left with complete movement of his fingers which was most important to him as his hands were his source of livelihood. The above case has hospital clinical data at a local hospital in Washington, D. C. This clinical data was taken under the supervision of a local physician and anyone wishing to review this report can do so.

Mr. Speaker, it occurs to me that since we are faced with a possible atomic attack and also confronted with suspected sabotage action and with accidents such as the recent one on the aircraft carrier *Bennington*, this B-N-G solution made by Worth Pharmacal Co. should have a burn test made by the Government.

I am told that, if properly conducted, it takes considerable time to run a burn test, and I feel that the best way to carry on such a test would be through the facilities of the Armed Forces. They could conduct these tests more rapidly and thereby hasten the time when this medicine would be available to all mankind.

Mr. Speaker, I have had numerous personal experiences with the use of this product. Since we have entered into the summer months, I have had the opportunity to observe its miraculous results on many types of skin disorders and especially on burns and sunburns. A fact that interests me a great deal is that, to date, there has not been brought to my attention a single case where any harmful effects resulted from its use. I have been informed that no adverse report on the use of the medicine has come to the company's attention even though they have made it widely available through free sample distribution.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, it occurs to me that these facts should be brought to the attention of those in our armed services who have the authority to see that this product is tested, and to the attention of the National Research Council Committee on Trauma which has so far refused permission for these tests claiming it lacks clinical data. I also feel that these agencies should inform the Worth Pharmacal Co. just what must be done in order to have these tests made.

Surely there is an end to the string somewhere, and if found, might lead to the unraveling which is necessary for this product to be tested and made available to the suffering and the afflicted.

Atomic Energy Commission and Subsidized Enterprise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 13, 1954

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include herewith an enlightening editorial which appeared in the East St. Louis (Ill.) Journal a few days ago. It deals with the Atomic Energy Commission's entrance into the field of electric power as a broker.

I question the authority, under law, for the Atomic Energy Commission to enter into this type of arrangement, and I am alarmed over the Commission's action. The independence of this very important agency of government is seriously threatened when it is compelled to enter into such a contract even though 3 of the 5 members of the Commission questioned the wisdom and authority of the Commission to make such a contract.

The editorial from the East St. Louis Journal follows:

Subsidized Enterprise

A chain of events in the last week has done more to define the administration's power policies than all the speeches Secretary of the Interior McKay has made in the last year.

The policy that is emerging is a disappointing one of subsidy.

Last week President Eisenhower ordered the Atomic Energy Commission to sign a 25-year contract with a private-power syndicate set up by two private utilities.

The utilities are going to build a $100 million steam generating plant at West Memphis, Ark.

The plant will feed 500,000 to 600,000 kilowatts into the Tennessee Valley Authority's grid each year. This is to replace power the TVA is furnishing for the new AEC plant at Paducah, Ky.

This arrangement was worked out to prevent further expansion of TVA.

And what's wrong with that? Shouldn't the Government encourage the sort of private enterprise that has made this country great?

It should, but this is not private enterprise. It is subsidized enterprise.

The West Memphis plant would not be built unless the 25-year contract were negotiated. Because the investors have a sure thing, they will have to put up only 5 percent of their own money, borrowing the other 95 percent. If this were not a sure thing, the utilities would have to put up 40 percent of the capital themselves.

In addition, if the Government cancels the AEC contract within 3 years, it must pay the power syndicate $40 million. After 3 years the syndicate also can put 100,000 kilowatts to its own use each year.

Finally, the profits the syndicate makes from its sale of power to the AEC will not be subject to Federal income taxes.

A sweet deal? Yes.

For 20 years private utilities have been decrying the Government's public-power projects and pleading for Washington to let private enterprise do the job.

The West Memphis deal indicates that what the private utilities want is a private subsidy, rather than private enterprise.

If power development must be subsidized, a TVA certainly is better than a private gravy train for private utilities.

Small Business Is the Backbone of American Economic Life; Let's Keep It Strong—The Independent Grocers Alliance Demonstrates the Strength of Voluntary Cooperation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. HILL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 13, 1954

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Select Committee on the Problems of Small Business, I have been impressed repeatedly by the vigor and resourcefulness of the American independent businessman and his ability to blaze new trails in genuine service to the public.

My purpose in planning and guiding the constructive work of our committee has been to make certain that freedom and equality of opportunity are preserved for every type of small business.

Without small business, this mighty Nation never could supply its daily wants and needs. The whole economic life of the United States of America soon would bog down in a quagmire of scarcity and want.

The power and strength of small business in the grocery field is well illustrated by the following article from Time magazine, which tells the story of the very successful, and still growing Independent Grocers Alliance, headed by President Donald Robert Grimes, of Chicago, one of our younger business leaders, who has demonstrated in many ways his stout faith that real service is the firmest foundation for business success. The article is as follows:

In a suburb of Chicago last week, Grocer Marty Garofalo grossed $25,000 in his bustling, up-to-date supermarket. That was quite a way up from the $200-a-week business he was doing in a neighborhood store 4 years ago. The difference: Garofalo had become one of the 5,300 members of the Independent Grocers Alliance, a chain of owner-operated stores that, next to the A. & P., is the world's biggest food-retailing organization.

Last week the chain's President Donald Robert Grimes, 47, announced plans to grow much bigger. By 1963, he hopes to have 10,000 store members, doing an annual business of more than $5 billion, compared with a 1952 gross of $2.3 billion (and A. & P.'s volume for the year ended last February 28 of $3.8 billion). IGA is biggest in volume among voluntary grocer organizations. Second is Red & White Corp., with 7,200 stores, but less than $2 billion gross. Other big voluntary groups: Clover Farm Stores, Inc., United Buyers Corp. IGA retailers are spending almost $9 million this year on 125 new supermarkets and enlargement of existing stores. Next year, another $10 million will be invested in stores.

IGA was conceived in 1926 as the answer to the big national chains, which had captured 30 percent of the retail food market. J. (for Joseph) Frank Grimes, father of IGA's president and a Chicago accountant who specialized in auditing the books of wholesale grocery firms, had been watching the new chains put independent retailers out of business. Why not, he asked, fight the chains with their own weapons—centralized purchasing and hard-hitting merchandising? He signed up 75 stores to try his plan, and in the first year their volume went up 20 percent.

When Don Grimes, a graduate of the University of Illinois, who had served an apprenticeship as an A. & P. store manager, joined IGA, there were 748 stores. He worked his way through several jobs, became assistant to the president after a 3-year Army hitch, and president when his father retired last year.

To get in step with the trend toward supermarkets, Don Grimes, in 1946, set about making complete food markets of IGA stores. Serving what he calls 1-grocer gals (i. e., housewives who do all their marketing in 1 place) required 1-stop stores and 1-source suppliers. He got half of IGA's wholesalers to provide uniform quality meats by ordering directly from packers. He persuaded more than half of them to stock prepackaged fresh fruits and vegetables; started putting out IGA-labeled products. Example: 2 months ago an IGA wholesaler in Champaign, Ill., made a deal with a local dairy to supply milk with a special IGA label. Such mass purchasing helped IGA to cut the price of milk 2 cents a quart to 19 cents and still make a 2-cent profit. Milk sales increased 30 percent.

IGA stores, which have expanded into Canada, run all the way from small stores, which may gross as little as $50,000 a year, to the foodliner, which grosses an average of $90,000 a week. To the central office grocers pay $600,000 a year a dues ($5.75 a month per store) and special service fees. In return they can buy at a low markup (3½ to 4 percent) from wholesalers, get window posters, market information, and help with anything from store budgeting to personnel problems.

IGA offers a member so many services, says Grimes, that "all the grocer has to do is unlock the front door and exercise his gifts as a salesman, a likable guy, and a square businessman." Says successful grocer Garofalo: "I've got supervision and store planning and help. I'm a happy man. I'm thinkin' big."

DAV Has Splendid Record of Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 13, 1954

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, the Disabled American Veterans has, through the years built up a splendid record of service to all disabled veterans. Through its paid staff of trained service officers, themselves disabled veterans, it has rendered invaluable assistance to its members.

Its national legislative office has been of help to Members of Congress in expressing the needs of disabled servicemen.

Its activities in all fields have been a model of integrity and dedicated service.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include an interview with Howard W. Watts, national commander of DAV, published in the East St. Louis Journal of Sunday, July 11, 1954:

DAV CHIEF SAYS HOUSE GROUP ACTION CLEARS ORGANIZATION

"The report of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee giving the Disabled American Veterans a clear bill of health proves how right the American people have been in keeping faith with our organization," Howard W. Watts, of Indianapolis, DAV national commander, was scheduled to tell a group in East St. Louis, Saturday night.

Watts, who lost an arm and suffered other serious wounds in World War II, was to address a meeting of East St. Louis DAV, chapter 24, during installation of officers Saturday night in the Legion Home. Lawrence McGuire, commander, heads the list of new officers.

Watts said Americans understand what the DAV has accomplished and are in support of its goals. He said the support is substantiated by points made in the House committee report based on evidence submitted to the committee during public hearings in Washington, D. C.

Watts said these points included the DAV rendering a valuable service to veterans and continuing to render such service, the DAV national officers being honest, capable and sincere and earnestly working to carry out the mandates of the organization, and the DAV idento-tag project being well-managed, profitable and rendering a real service to disabled veterans and to motor vehicle owners. The idento-tag project is the sending of miniature license plates to motorists to be used on key chains. The tags identify the keys if they are lost.

Watts said the congressional report should be used by the DAV membership as a weapon against the campaign now being waged against the war handicapped. He added that the campaign is fourfold and that first it has taken the form of a smear campaign not only against the DAV but against all veterans' organizations.

Watts said there is a movement afoot to take away Veterans' Administration hospitals for private use, there is an organized effort to abolish disability-compensation assistance for veterans 50 percent or less disabled, and there is a movement to do away with disability compensation for 70 percent of the disabled veterans in the United States.

Watts said that unless the DAV continues to hold the support of the American people and increase its own strength through membership enrollment, its program will be doomed as it was during the dark days of the early 1930's.

During the past 10 years, the DAV has obtained nearly $200 million in benefits for disabled veterans, Watts said. He added that they were obtained by the DAV staff of more than 190 full-time paid, trained national-service officers, themselves disabled veterans.

According to Watts, no organization gives wider publicity to its finances than does the DAV. He said its books are audited annually by a nationally recognized firm of certified public accountants, and that audit is part of the DAV annual Federal corporate report to Congress, and a matter of public record.

Watts said the DAV cost of fund raising is low and the margin of profit for use in its program of assistance to disabled veterans is good. He said that in 1953 it was more than 54 percent.

The national commander said a recent nationwide study shows that the public has given the DAV an overwhelming vote of confidence. He said a large number indicated that the DAV is doing an excellent job and only an almost indiscernible number were at all critical.

The DAV program is fivefold, Watts said. It calls for disabled veterans receiving the finest medical care administered by the VA in the most modern hospitals with adequate bed facilities. It also calls for disabled veterans taking advantage of sound vocational-training programs to prepare them to make a living despite their handicaps.

Watts said the DAV also feels that disabled veterans should be awarded disability compensation based on the degree of disabilities as well as on present-day cost of living. The program also covers job placement.

The Need for Men Sent by God

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WINSTON L. PROUTY

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 13, 1954

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following inspiring baccalaureate sermon of Rt. Rev. Henry Knox Sherrill, D. D., LL. D., D. C. L., New York City, presiding bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States, at the 135th annual commencement, Norwich University, Northfield, Vt., Sunday, June 13, 1954:

St. John I: 6: "There was a man sent from God whose name was John."

God reveals Himself in many ways. He may be found though inpersonally in the world of nature. Who of us has not watched a sunset in the mountains or on the sea, without realizing the truth of the Psalmist's words: "The heavens declare the glory of God and the firmament showeth his handiwork." More precisely nature tells us of an orderly universe and upon this basis the scientist is able to proceed.

The research worker in the laboratory is engaged in the high task of discovering the physical laws of the universe. But God also may be seen in the events of history. There are many things difficult to appreciate in the contemporary scene but as we look back through the study of the Bible or in a broader way through the researches of historians such as Arnold Toynbee in the broad sweep of history we can realize that there is a destiny which shapes our ends, though at times it may well seem to be "rough hewn."

But supremely and more clearly God reveals Himself through personality. It was God's will that the children of Israel should leave Egypt. This was accomplished because there was a man sent from God whose name was Moses. It is God's will that men should not suffer from disease. There was a man sent from God whose name was Pasteur. In a time of crisis in the life of our nation it was God's will that we should remain one. There was a man sent from God whose name was Abraham Lincoln.

No one, I think, can appreciate Lincoln in his quotations from the Bible, his loneliness, his suffering, his magnanimity and withal his determination without an understanding of the fact that he felt himself, with a resulting humility of spirit, to be, as perhaps he would have put it "an agent of the divine providence."

But you and I know this revelation of truth and goodness through personality in our own experience. This understanding has come to us not from abstract theories but in the lives of a mother, father, teacher, or friend. With all the evident imperfections of human nature which we all share, nevertheless this fact abides as a permanent influence in our lives.

But of course for the Christian the supreme revelation of God is to be found in the life of Jesus Christ. In Him we see God as in no other way. He lived and taught spiritual laws as binding as any of the natural laws upon which so much of our existence is built. The life of Christ is either a complete and utter tragedy or else it is a complete assurance that at the heart of the universe unconquerable goodness dwells.

One of the reasons for the sad candition of the world today is that our knowledge and practice of physical laws have so far outrun our understanding of the spiritual. The astounding development of nuclear power is, of course, a classic illustration of this. There is nothing wrong in such power by itself. Indeed it could be no doubt an untold blessing to mankind as it is adapted to peacetime uses.

Mr. Henry L. Stimson pointed out several years ago: "The problem of the atom bomb has not to do with the atom bomb but lies within the hearts of men." To use sanely our awe-inspiring discoveries in the field of science demands an obedience to the laws of the spirit, an obedience ground in the daily life of men as we realize that we are men sent by God.

It may well be that God has omnipotent power. But He has chosen to work His will through man and thus to this extent has limited Himself in giving to us the priceless gift of freedom to choose. We are not automatons or dwellers in a world slave camp. As St. Paul put it "We are laborers together with God." Here is the source of human dignity and worth.

There are so many people who do not grasp the way in which God has chosen to work. They are always saying "Why does God allow such things to happen if there is a God of justice and of mercy?" It reminds me of my mother's description of my brother when he was learning to walk. He would creep as far as possible from her to the other corner of the room, then in trying to stand up, would fall. He would always and accusingly say, "See what you made me do."

We cannot break God's laws, follow our own sweet will and then blame God for the misfortunes which come upon us. Many events in life are beyond our control, but a great number of the present evils in the world must be laid at the door of man himself. In the Middle Ages great epidemics were attributed to an act of God whereas all that was needed was cleanliness and sanitation. What is needed today above all else is men of sanity, heart, and faith, who realize their calling, that they are men sent by God.

It is essential that leadership in the present crisis be exercised by men of intellectual integrity and wide knowledge. The purpose of education at its best is to do far more than to equip a man with particular tools with which to earn a livelihood. A proper education on a college or a university level involves much more than the function of a trade school. I understand that in line with this observation there are scientific schools which are enlarging their courses of study to include greater emphasis upon the study of the humanities.

It is impossible to understand the issues which confront us apart from knowledge of the past because the present is of course a result of previous events. We should know of the European and the Asiatic background. We should understand something of diplomatic history, as well as of conditions in other parts of the world. Particularly, at least to some degree we should be acquainted with the cultures of other civilizations than our own.

We cannot combat the evil of communism without knowing factually what it is, which leads us beyond the question of ideologies into that of economics. We should have an underrstanding as to why communism has made such an appeal to millions of people which brings us to questions not only of politics and of the standard of living but into the realm of psychology.

I have spoken of other nations, but it is essential that we have a knowledge of our own national history. How many know what are the civil rights to which we are entitled under the Constitution? There is much discussion pro and con of the fifth amendment. How many of us know just what it is and why it was originally enacted? All of these matters and many more are extremely important in the exercise of intelligent citizenship.

They are all the more essential today because there exists such a vast amount of expressed ignorance on every side of almost every public question. Prejudice, passion, name-calling, partisanship are altogether too prevalent, including those who by all odds should know better. This is no time for snap judgments based upon reactions to personalities rather than upon cold and solid fact.

A peculiar responsibility in this regard rests upon college and university men, although it must be frankly admitted that passion and prejudice seem to be the possession of no one group within our society. With a man of education, it is not simply a question of what he has learned and upon which he has passed an examination. It is a matter of intellectual integrity, a willingness and a desire to keep on learning. Education is a temper of mind, a sort of divine curiosity, an obedience to the command, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy mind."

However, important as reason and knowledge are there must be also the consecration of those qualities which spring from the human heart. Years ago Dr. Francis G. Peabody, a distinguished Boston physician, declared in an address to a graduating class of trained nurses: "The secret of the care of the patient is to care for the patient."

This advice is peculiarly pertinent in this present day. I am not suggesting a moral flabbiness which tries to escape the responsibilities of decision and of judgment, but rather for a depth of compassion and of understanding. There is a vast amount of bitterness and of hate which simply corrode the individual.

There is grave danger that under the impact of mass suffering we become impervious to human need. We read of millions dying from starvation, of deportation of entire populations, of the homeless and of those in refugee or prison camps, and then we turn perhaps to the sporting page. It is impossible to visualize such a vast amount of pain. Yet it is vitally important that we feel each one of us something of the burden of the tragedy of today. For in the long run peace will not come as the result of force.

I realize as well as any one the necessity of armies, navies, and air forces in the present situation in order that evil transgressors cannot triumph by the same means. But eventually, if there is to be a real peace which is the fruit of righteousness, this can only come through trust and understanding between peoples. Toward the achievement of this goal we must bear a responsibility, for such a relationship cannot be unilateral.

Cruelty and hatred are the results of weakness and of degeneracy, as have been demonstrated so clearly in the past as well as in our own generation in Nazi Germany and in Communist Russia. We must strive to retain a compassion and a great-heartedness which to a large extent have been so characteristic of American life and character at the best.

The thesis of these remarks is that we should consider ourselves as men sent from God, which implies the quality of faith. The life of the spirit seems to ebb and flow in the minds and hearts of men. There are periods which are known as ages of faith marked by great spiritual revival and then the opposite trend will take place. Certainly neither the 19th nor the 20th centuries have been marked by the growth of spiritual power.

But I believe that there are definite straws in the wind which indicate a distinct change. The very pressures of our times have made men think more deeply and prayerfully.

What are the sources of our morality and of our democracy? I believe that they are to be found in faith in a living God who is the Father of all men. Democracy emphasizes the eternal worth of the individual. This to me can be valid as we realize that we are the children of God. The world is in a state of chaos because there is in general no adherence to international law. What is needed is not only law but a belief in a Law Giver in whose sight even the nations are a very little thing.

Take out of our life true religion, justice, mercy, love, and the walking humbly with God and you have destroyed the foundation of liberal education, of works of mercy, of the most valuable and precious aspects of our civilization.

I am talking in terms of broad generalities, but in essence the matter is personal and inward. There is considerable if not complete truth in Dr. Whitehead's statement that "religion is what a man does with his own solitariness." There must be a great company of faithful people, but this must be comprised of those who have initially met this issue within the deep and secret recesses of the human heart and soul.

All of our chaplains in two World Wars have testified to the fact that the average American young man has an abysmal ignorance of religion. This is not particularly his fault; it is an illustration of lack of emphasis upon the life of the spirit in the homes, the school, and college. Just on purely educational grounds without knowledge of Judaism and of Christianity it is impossible to grasp the fundamental bases of our civilization. But I do not propose to attempt at this time an apologetic for the Christian religion.

The fact is that we are faced by an organized force determined to destroy all religious faith. The answer to this cannot be a marginal faith, weak in understanding and in purpose. The times cry out for idealism, courage, unselfishness, truth—the products of a vital and living faith.

The word "security" is heard on many lips, but there can be no security today. What the future has in store for any of us is an unknown quantity. Of only this can we be sure—that there is overwhelming need of men of intellectual integrity, of great heartedness, and of a faith that whatever their lot may be they have been sent by God.

Fifty Million Dollars Spent Annually on Research in Connecticut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANTONI N. SADLAK

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 13, 1954

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, that my district, the great State of Connecticut, holds a unique position in the industrial world is not an accident. It is the result of constant search for better ideas, devoted application to purpose, and the expenditure of funds for continuous research. In confirmation of this, an article entitled "Fifty Million Dollars Spent Annually on Research in Connecticut," written by John J. Egan, labor commissioner of the State, appeared in the monthly bulletin of the State of Connecticut Labor Department for June 19, 1954. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include this informative and interesting story in the RECORD for today:

Connecticut's leading position in manufacturing activities is no accident but is the result of deliberate and planned research. Starting with Eli Whitney's invention of the cotton gin in 1792, a host of other sons of Connecticut have contributed inventions which have been instrumental in bringing about the high state of industrialization, not only in Connecticut but also throughout the country. Then there is Eli Terry, father of the clock industry. Some of the more illustrious of these were Elias Howe, who invented the sewing machine, Linus Yale and his cylinder lock, Samuel Colt and the revolver, Charles Goodyear and vulcanization of rubber, and Christian Sharpe, Charles Parker, John M. Marlin, Horace Smith, and Daniel B. Wesson, all of whom invented various kinds of rifles.

But the cotton gin was not Eli Whitney's major contribution to industry. Rather, it was his introduction of the modern factory system of quantity production and interchangeable parts which he developed in his firearms factory in New Haven and which has greatly influenced the development of this country.

FIFTY MILLION DOLLARS FOR RESEARCH

Industrial research today follows the general objectives of these pioneers—new products, new and improved materials, and new and improved processes. But modern industrial research, as contrasted to the one-man efforts of the past, is big business.

In Connecticut, approximately 5,400 persons are engaged directly in such research activities, and firms are spending over $50 million a year.

The research programs are well coordinated and performed in modern, well-equipped laboratories. In general, the research is a team effort with the individual researcher working on one phase of an overall objective.

In many of the larger research operations, activities are centered in a separate especially equipped building while in small operations, it is carried on as part of other engineering activities. Nearly all Connecticut manufacturing firms carry on some form of industrial research or subscribe to consulting services.

By industry, the highest concentration of research in Connectciut is in electronics, aircraft, and chemistry. To emphasize the importance of this, let us suppose that no new developments were made in these fields by Connecticut firms since, say, 1946 shortly after World War II. The aircraft engines would be obsolete and helicopters would still be in their infancy stage.

RESULTS OF RESEARCH

Instead, Connecticut is the leading industrial State in the country in relation to its population. In defense contracts awarded, Connecticut led the Nation on a per capita basis both during World War II and during the Korean fighting. Since June 1950, this State has received $4,097 million in defense awards, or $2,042 per person, the highest per capita total of any State in the country. Second highest State was Delaware, $1,655; followed by Washington, $1,651; and Michigan, $1,484. Connecticut, with but 1.3 percent of the Nation's population has handled 3.8 percent of its defense needs since Korea.

Another measure of the industrial importance of a State is the proportion of workers who are engaged in manufacturing. In January, 1954, the most recent period for which comparable data are available, Connecticut had the highest proportion, a little better than 1 out of 2, of any State in the country. The number of factory workers was 443,990 or 51.5 percent of the 861,980 total nonagricultural employees in the State. Michigan has the second highest concentration with 51.4 percent.

IN ADJUSTMENT PERIOD

Connecticut, along with the rest of the country, is undergoing an adjustment period following the heavy production during and following the Korean fighting. Soon industry will be catching its second breath and new and improved products will come forth. As time goes on, present products will become obsolete. Our future prosperity will then depend on new products, some of which are now on drawing boards and others not dreamed of yet.

The future of industry in any State will largely depend on the research activity which will produce new or better products. Many of the new developments will center on atomic research. We are fortunate that two of our leading universities, Yale and Wesleyan, are now carrying out classified research projects under grants allocated by the Atomic Energy Commission. Governor Lodge has recently appointed a committee of distinguished New England scientists and statesmen to study the application of atomic energy for practical use in this region. The Electric Boat Co. in Groton has already built the first atomic submarine. Connecticut industry has its eye on the possibilities of the use of the atom in industry, and if past performance is our guide, we can be assured that this State will be in the forefront of research and development in this field.

Fortunately for Connecticut, management is spending many millions for industrial research and this State has workers with the ingenuity and skills to develop and produce the products of the future.

Our Heritage of Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WINSTON L. PROUTY

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 13, 1954

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a speech delivered by my distinguished predecessor, the Honorable Charles A. Plumley, at the bi-State convention of the Vermont and New Hampshire branches of the National League of District Postmasters in Rutland on June 9, 1954:

OUR HERITAGE OF FREEDOM

The late Will Rogers used to say that all he knew was what he "seen in the paper," which, of course, was not totally true. All of us get ideas from what we read in the newspapers. For example, last week I saw that Dr. Carlson, former president of UVM, addressing a graduating class from Cantor State University, told them he "deplores what he calls 'the new four freedoms.' These are 'freedom from toil,' 'freedom from responsibilities,' 'freedom to take it easy,' and 'freedom to do nothing.'" Said he: "We place less and less emphasis on the joy of achievement of joy.

"This is a social problem we cannot evade much longer. Our generation denies what once was a self-evident truth—that only through work does man fulfill himself and realize his latent capacities."

With some reservations, I heartily subscribe to his sentiments, while I also agree with the publicity man for General Electric, who says this week: "It is difficult to write a definition of the American way, but it is easy to find good examples. Here is one:

"Back in the twenties," says he, "there was a stage play about a factory that made mechanical men, who repaid their creators by trying to wreck civilization. The term 'robot' has made people uneasy ever since.

"How smart can a machine be? At General Electric we're beginning to find out. For some years now we've been working with machines that come startlingly close to duplicating the thought processes of men.

"Can they outsmart men? The reassuring fact is just the opposite: they make men even smarter by taking over routine mental chores and freeing men for the creative thinking only human minds can encompass.

"General Electric is using machines with 'electronic brains' in engineering, accounting, and management to speed our most important product, progress.

"A jet engine used to be designed by trial and error. You had to build it first, or a costly model, to find out how it would work. Now, an electronic computer helps solve long and complex jet development problems in advance. In 15 minutes it goes through 8 million mathematical calculations and comes up with an answer that would take a mathematician 7 years. With 'think machines,' engineers can bring you new and better products quicker.

"It used to take 7 days to put together the payroll in one of our plants. Now an 'electronic brain' gets rid of the drudgery and cuts the time to 4 hours.

"In management, 'hunch' is giving way to fact. Electronic data-processing machines can zip through head-spinning statistics on things like market changes, product design factors and income trends to come up with the answers General Electric managers need to make sound decisions, not hopeful guesses. Patterns emerge that make it possible to avoid errors. In time new light may be shed on the reasons for boom and bust. It looks like everyday living might catch up at last with our fantastic progress in science.

"Machines that can read, write, do arithmetic, measure, feel, remember, now make it possible to take the load off men's minds, just as machines have eased the burden on our backs.

"But these fantastic machines still depend on people to design and build and guide and use them. What they replace is drudgery—not people, or General Electric wouldn't be so enthusiastic about them. Because it is people, with their hopes, desires, and jobs, that we depend on for customers. Machines can't dream.

"Don't worry; smart though they are, machines will never be as smart as people. Not while people are smart enough to think them up, smart enough to let them do man's drudging work."

Which reminds me that while all progress is change, all change is not progress. Which also emphasizes there would be neither change nor progress were it not for the freedoms we enjoy, for which lightly as we seem sometimes to prize them or carelessly to guard them, we have our ancestors to thank.

Our ancestors were selected men and women, chosen by life and character for self-reliance in the face of hardship, peril, and the mystery of uncharted seas and lands. Only the strongest hearts enlisted for the great adventure.

After 1776 they were free. Free to choose their own governors, make their own laws, mold their own policies, and destiny; free to criticize their officials; to recall them; even, if need be, to punish them. Free to change, after mature deliberation, the basic Constitution of their Government.

They could stand up as freemen before courts of their own making.

They were free to move from place to place, from one employment to another, from crowded quarters to virgin soil.

They were free to experiment, invent, start their own enterprises, develop new products and industries; free to triple the bounty of the land with machines that replaced serfdom with science; free to end menial labors of the shop or road with mechanical marvels that made almost every worker a technician proud of his skill, his leisure, and his place in his community.

They were free to think and read and say what they wished, so long as they did not injure others; they could practice whatever religion they preferred, and raise a hundred varieties of temples and prayers to God.

They were free to fail or succeed, free to rise from the lowest level to the highest place in wealth, influence, and fame.

Above all, they were free to learn, to absorb the heritage of the race in technical development, morals, wisdom, literature, and art.

It was these freedoms more than anything else, that transformed the earth into unparalleled abundance, made a hundred thousand new tools, invented 10,000 time-saving, wealth-creating processes and devices, lessened labor, multiplied goods, and built an industry that could produce more than all Europe together; that could arm itself, and its allies as well, for victory against powerful enemies on a dozen fronts; and could at the same time maintain a standard of living higher than any other society has ever reached even in the fullness and security of peace.

The United States has survived many bleak periods which must have seemed at their time like the end of the road. As a Nation we thrived on crises and grew stronger, more closely united, more powerful. Thus it is now. Thus it will always be.

One hundred and sixty-five years ago on the 30th day of April, 1789, was consummated a work commenced years before, but not accomplished nor concluded till that day, when the people of what we now know as the United States, those fearless colonists, acting under the deepest sense of responsibility, achieved and completed the most transcendent act involving power that social man in his mortal condition can perform.

The Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States are parts of one consistent whole, founded upon one and the same theory of government, then new in practice, though not as a theory, for it had been working itself into the mind of man for many ages, and had been especially expounded in the writings of Locke.

There are yet, even at this day, many speculative objections to this theory. Even in our own country there are still philosophers who deny the principles asserted in the Declaration, as self-evident truths—who deny the natural equality and inalienable rights of man—who deny that all just powers of government are derived from the consent of the governed.

I speak to matters of fact. There is the Declaration of Independence. There is the Constitution of the United States. Let them speak for themselves.

Thomas Jefferson, third President of the United States first elected by the single decisive vote of Matthew Lyon, Member of Congress from Vermont, when first inaugurated, delivered an oration which contains the best definition of fundamental democracy and the American ideal admittedly ever propounded. Let me quote briefly.

"It is proper you should understand," said he, "what I deem the essential principles of our Government, and consequently those which ought to shape its administration. I will compress them within the narrowest compass they will bear, stating the general principle, but not all its limitations. Equal and exact justice to all men, of whatever state or persuasion, religious or political; peace, commerce, and honest friendship with all nations, entangling alliances with none; the support of the State governments in all their rights, as the most competent administrations for our domestic concerns, and the surest bulwark against antirepublican tendencies; the preservation of the general government in its whole constitutional vigor, as the sheet-anchor of our peace at home and safety abroad; a jealous care of the right of election by the people; a mild and safe corrective of abuses which are lopped by the sword of revolution, where peaceable remedies are unprovided; absolute acquiescence in the decisions of the majority, the vital principle of republics, from which is no appeal but to force, the vital principle and immediate parent of despotism; a well disciplined militia, our best reliance in peace and for the first moments of war, till regulars may relieve them; the supremacy of the civil over the military authority; economy in the public expense, that labor may be lightly burdened; the honest payment of our debts, and sacred preservation of the public faith, encouragement of agriculture, and of commerce as its handmaid; the diffusion of information and arraignment of all abuses at the bar of public reason; freedom of religion, freedom of the press, and freedom of person, under the protection of the Habeas Corpus; and trial by juries impartially selected. These principles form the bright contellation which has gone before us, and guided our steps through an age of revolution and reformation. The wisdom of our ages and blood of our heroes have been devoted to their attainment; they should be the creed of our political faith; the text of civic instruction; the touchstone by which to try the services of those we trust; and should we wander from them in moments of error or of alarm, let us hasten to retrace our steps and to regain the road which along leads to peace, liberty, and safety."

Obviously we have departed divergently from the paths of which our forefathers hewed out of the wilderness for us to follow. So far as disregard of fundamentals is involved, we are on the same road followed by nations long lost in the oblivion of their own selfishness and spinelessness. There can be no successful denial of that statement. It is time for us to get back on those highways which were followed that made us the Nation we were.

We cannot flirt with our own funeral any longer just because we love the parade. We cannot live on the flowers of public beneficence, which will bury us and decorate our graves.

The truth is that as a nation we are risking the loss of our heritage.

Our forefathers laid the foundation of our Nation on the assumption that the citizens would participate in their Government, accepting the responsibility as well as enjoying the privileges of democracy.

We have drifted out to sea and away from this concept. We have been wishing for good government without working for it. Too many of us have left the responsibilities of citizenship and the control of our public affairs to political machines, made up of men whom we would not employ in our own enterprises; whom we would not retain as lawyers, for whose knowledge, ability, and administrative experience we have no respect; and in whose character and integrity we have no confidence.

"If good men won't hold office, bad men will," said Calvin Coolidge.

One of the clearest lessons of history is that a nation declines when its citizens lose their zest for work and become indolent and pleasure-seeking on the basis that somebody other than they pays the bills.

"It stands to reason it ought not be necessary to have to urge men and women in a democracy to vote to protect themselves. But it is." I hold that no nation can remain great unless its citizens are industrious, in their own behalf. Are they? We shall be ruined by the selfishness of those who believe this is a good government in which to live—off somebody else. Alleged social security which makes a loafer and part-time pauper out of an able bodied citizen is a threat, not a panacea, and breeds insecurity.

I recognize that time and conditions inevitably change. While all progress is change, all change is not progress. We see all around us however, mounting evidence that work is increasingly regarded as an evil to be escaped, rather than a blessing to be cherished; a burden to be cast off rather than an opportunity to be of service to others; a malediction rather than a benediction. We cannot accept this philosophy of life and be worthy of our heritage. We should not encourage and induce unemployment under the guise of social security by offering a prize to parasites on the body politic who litter our street corners after payday, the check coming from the workers to pay idlers—They are barnacles on the ship of state—the deserving should be protected. The parasites and barnacles should be compelled to earn their livelihood; we have no good reason to maintain such a class of people at our expense, able-bodied slackers as they are.

Thrift has been defined as "the wise use without abuse of human and material resources." The essence of thrift is to spend less than we earn. We have entirely ignored that principle of late, and altogether.

It was extravagance and moral decay that ruined Rome. Taxation in our country at all levels now takes more than 30 percent of the national income. The Federal debt has now risen to the astronomical figure of around $300 billion. I wonder how long it will take the American people to learn the lesson to be derived from the collapse of the Roman Empire. Will they learn before it is too late? It is high time for us "to regain the road which alone leads to peace, liberty, and safety," before we lose all our liberty.

The 18th article of the Constitution of the State of Vermont, originally article 16 of the Constitution of the State of Vermont, adopted in 1777 (14 years before Vermont was admitted to the Union) significantly reads as follows:

"Frequent recurrence to fundamental principles and a firm adherence to justice, moderation, temperance, industry, and frugality are absolutely necessary to preserve the blessings of liberty, and keep government free." They loved their freedom. We lost most of what they left us.

You sociologically minded, political economists in embryo, please note that "upon every department of such a government" as that of which our ancestors laid the foundation "the people exert an unremitted influence, and stamp on all its measures the impress of their character."

The general diffusion of intelligence constitutes the life of a free government, for "persons and people called upon to act," said the founders, "should become accustomed to think, though ordinarily they cannot possess extended and comprehensive views of other systems of government, they should at least understand their own."

"The whole science of government," said Daniel Chipman, "consists in a knowledge of the practical operation of principles and with the science of government thus understood, the citizens of every free government owe it to themselves and their posterity to become therewith familiarly acquainted," the preservation of their political institutions, depends, under Divine Providence, on themselves.

The people of Vermont are surprisingly ill informed with respect to the history of their State prior to the adoption of the Constitution of 1777; and are unfamiliar with and unappreciative of the efforts of their forebears to establish the State of Vermont which constitutes their glorious heritage.

The truth is, and it is interesting to note that "The history of the government of Vermont previous to the adoption of the Constitution of 1777 is involved in much obscurity. There was no regular government in the State. Everything was unsettled. No social compact existed, nor any bond of union, save that which resulted from necessity, common wants and common dangers; and everything that bore the resemblance of organization was premature offspring of urgent necessity.

On the second day of July 1777, the Convention that framed the Constitution appointed a council of safety to act until the Government was organized. "Under it," says one historian, "the Government was in principle nothing short of absolute despotism. How a people so tenacious of their rights could have submitted to the administration of such a Government evidences no ordinary devotedness to a common cause. However, the exercise by the Council of the dangerous power inherent therein and granted to it seldom exceeded the limits prescribed by a just regard to and for the public safety.

Vermont State papers, accompanying records, and documents, the journals of the Council of Safety, the records of the Council of Censors, the laws absorbingly instructive, and very enlightening to any student of government who wishes to be informed as to how and why governments are formed and do grow. These state papers, models of their land formulated by men educated in the school of experience, pioneers if you please take second place to none of the political documents which came out of the minds of others of their day and generation—masters of English; forensic; positive; declarative; they spoke the language of those who loved liberty, proposed to retain it; were ready to die for it to defend it.

How many people in Vermont ever read these historic documents? Patterns of English prose used by other lovers of liberty; filled with the best thought of those inspired by necessities confronting them; covering complaints against tyranny while defying the tyrant; offering to establish freedom, but not at the price of surrendering a single liberty they enjoyed. Have you read real history as it was made? Not unless you know the truth thereof I have spoken by reading those priceless possessions, not only of Vermonters, but of all lovers of liberty.

I have lived long enough to find out after the Spanish-American War, World War I, and World War II, that there is no peaceful diplomatic solution to our problems. We have always done too much erroneously and too little, right, too late.

Our destiny requires that we should have made and should use our power to accomplish the salvation of civilization. Not to do it, to wait much longer is to inherit a place with the other buried civilizations, some five in number, which never had the intestinal fortitude to sustain and to maintain even the principles for which they stood. Our country is losing its soul.

It is high time we foreswore our sentimentally laudable, but practically unattainable purpose and intent to become the imposer and impressor of our democratic ideologies on all people all over the world. "What does it profit a man if he gains the whole world but loses his own soul?" is still the great question that confronts us. To it there is but one answer, namely, nothing.

The self-seekers, the weaklings, the so-called and would-be liberals, the wild-eyed progressives, the crack-pot fellow travelers who follow or are followed by the commies or affiliated with the parlor pinks, in short, the opportunists in every field dedicated to subversion, perversion, and selfish aggrandizement have swarmed into all activities in which we should have indulged, and taken over our responsibilities everywhere right before our face and eyes. With ears to hear and eyes to see, we have neither heard nor seen. We have perfectly, obtusely, and absolutely been deaf, dumb, and blind as to what has been going on.

Nevertheless, the people of the United States have proved their good will toward their fellow men, even to many who have been their enemies, by accepting the staggering burdens of taxation in order that others who are less privileged could improve their living standards as well as their security. Every dollar of foreign aid given—whether for food or clothing, machinery or technical assistance—comes out of the pockets of the American taxpayers. You cannot find in the recorded annals of history another example or parallel of a whole nation willingly taxing itself to help the less fortunate in other countries with dollars, goods, and technical help in order to bring about a world in which not only the 160 million people of the United States, but all peoples may live in greater comfort and peace.

The American way of life passionately seeks peace. It is a way of life that is demonstrably supported by deeds and not false promises; moreover, a way of life that America does not and should not seek to force upon any country. Yet, nations everywhere can, if they wish, learn from their many million American friends, the world's greatest exponents of risk capital enterprise, what wages and the incentives of profit under a free government, can also do for them.

Unless our Nation returns to the simple but spacious faith that gave us our national character and greatness, we are doomed to extinction, to join the long roll of nations which in prosperity have forgotten the faith which created them and the convictions which sustained them. And unless our public education can return again to these great living truths and without apology can present them as a living faith, I can see no human prospect that our free Republic can survive.

Let those who love America, who cherish its heritage and the God who gave it, gird themselves for one supreme effort to reverse the current, to bring our country and its children back to fundamentals to that kind of instruction which will impart information, stimulate individual thinking, restore the almost lost sense of moral obligation, make them fit for a life worth living. The task is great, but by no means impossible. The damage to this generation has been done by man. It can be repaired by man, if those who would repair it are willing to take the time and use the energy to do it.

We should dedicate our every strength against the gripping curse of communistic larcenists, the blight of those fellow travelers in our schools and colleges, alleged liberals who promote so-called progressive education, guard our liberty, and make sure we turn back those lustful men who would unwisely and subversively undertake to persuade us to close our eyes while they rob us of the things for which our fathers fought in order that we might have a chance to keep our children free.

Jobless Benefits War on Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VERA BUCHANAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 13, 1954

Mrs. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, as one of the cosponsors of H. R. 9430, the Unemployment Compensation Standards Act of 1954, introduced by Congressman Aime Forand, I include in the Record a timely article by Thomas L. Stokes entitled "Jobless Benefits War on Again":

Jobless Benefits War on Again—Truman Proposal Was Defeated Around End of War; Issue Now Revived; State Rights Still Stumbling Block

(By Thomas L. Stokes)

History is repeating itself in Congress on the issue of unemployment benefits.

This takes us back around the end of the Second World War when an attempt was made in Congress, on recommendations of then President Truman, to increase the amount of unemployment benefits and extend their duration under a Federal law that would provide uniform standards for the whole country. It was presented as an emergency measure, to last for 2 years, because of forecasts of Government economists of large-scale unemployment in the transition from a war to a peacetime economy.

Congress, however, refused to comply, defeating the Truman proposal through the familiar Republican-Southern conservative Democratic coalition. Nor did the unemployment emergency develop, and thereafter the issue raised by Mr. Truman subsided.

It is being raised again now and accentuated by current unemployment. The specific occasion is consideration by Congress of that part of President Eisenhower's social welfare program for extending unemployment insurance to cover Federal Government workers and employes of small businesses now exempted. The President also urged uniform duration of benefits of 26 weeks all over the country, the range now being from 16 to 26½ weeks, and an increase in payments to between 60 and 67 percent of the average wage in a State, but not less than 50 percent of the wages of the individual worker. But, unlike President Truman, he recommended that these standards be applied by the States themselves, which have jurisdiction under our existing law, instead of by Federal statute. Secretary of Labor Mitchell sent messages to State Governors week ago appealing for their adoption of the President's recommendations.

Nothing has happened.

Because of the failure of the States to act, and because of the still sizable unemployment, a move was made in the House last week by a Democrat, Representative Forand, of Rhode Island, to write into Federal law on a uniform basis the duration of payments and their amount which President Eisenhower had recommended, but failed to get, in the States. The Forand scale would mean weekly benefits ranging from $32 to $56, varying with the State, as compared with a present range of $20 to $33. He submitted his proposal as an amendment to the administration bill extending unemployment benefit coverage. It was defeated, 241 to 110.

The House thereafter passed the administration bill that extends unemployment compensation to Federal Government workers and businesses that employ four or more persons. About 4 million more persons will be brought under the unemployment insurance system by this measure, which is the first expansion of the law since it was enacted in 1935. Previously, businesses employing less that eight persons were exempted.

The fight to liberalize unemployment compensation will continue in the Senate, which will take up the administration bill later. There Senator Kennedy, Democrat, of Massachusetts, will offer the identical amendment sponsored by Mr. Forand in the House. There, too, will be presented the arguments heard in the House, among them that present benefits, which average less than $25 for the country, are insufficient, and that many workers already have exhausted their benefits during the extended economic "readjustment."

"Not only are payments inadequate," said Mr. Forand during House debate, "but their duration is far too short to carry workers until they are able to find other jobs. At the present time about 40,000 workers a week are exhausting their rights to payments.

"So far this year well over one-half million workers have exhausted their benefit rights."

Again, as in the case of the Truman proposals a decade ago, it was the familiar Republican-Southern Democratic coalition that defeated liberalized unemployment benefits. Against Mr. Forand's amendment were 173 Republicans and 68 Democrats, the latter mostly from the South. Supporting it were 93 Democrats, chiefly from the East and Far West, and 16 Republicans, the latter mostly from the industrial East. However, 8 southern Democrats—4 of them from Alabama—and 8 border State Democrats supported the Rhode Island legislator.

The argument most used, as with the Truman proposals, was State rights. Opponents of a Federal standard insisted that the system must be preserved as a State system with States fixing the rates of benefit and duration.

Unfortunately, economic "readjustments" seem to recognize no State boundaries.

The Framework of Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK C. OSMERS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 13, 1954

Mr. OSMERS. Mr. Speaker, one of my distinguished constituents, J. George Fredman, has prepared a very fine booklet called The Framework of Democracy. Because of the wide interest in patriotic matters among Members of Congress and the general public, I include Commander Fredman's letter to me in the Appendix of the Record:

Jersey City, N. J., *July 6, 1954.*

Dear Congressman Osmers: When the talk about fifth amendment, civil rights, and other related issues became so common, like thousands of other Americans, I sought in bookstores, patriotic organizations, the Library of Congress, and elsewhere to find our fundamental documents between one cover. I was not successful, except as parts of large expensive books. There were, of course, separate pamphlets available with one of the documents, either the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, or the Bill of Rights.

Since there seemed to be such an important need for these documents to be easily and cheaply available to every American—and especially to our youth and our boys in military service—I sat down myself, collated them, and had them printed in a booklet which I have named "The Framework of Democracy."

This is not a profit venture in any sense of the word. I hope these booklets will be distributed in the millions—the more the better—for the enlightenment of the Nation. Through the patriotic cooperation of John A. Bado, head of the Terminal Printing & Lithographing Co., in Hoboken, N. J., I believe this 36-page booklet containing the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, the Bill of Rights, the Emancipation Proclamation, the Monroe Doctrine, the Four Freedoms, and a list of our Presidents can be produced for between 10 and 15 cents a copy.

As a former national commander of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States and national treasurer of the All-American Conference to Combat Communism, I appreciate probably more than most people the necessity for keeping the great American documents alive in the minds and hearts of all.

I know many of your colleagues distribute patriotic mementos from time to time and I hope you will call to their attention the existence of this little booklet The Framework of Democracy. Sample copies and further information can be had by writing directly to me.

Sincerely,

J. George Fredman.

Another Kind of Danger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 13, 1954

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to include an editorial from the July 9, 1954 issue of Collier's magazine entitled "Another Kind of Danger":

Another Kind of Danger

In a Supreme Court decision growing out of an espionage trial during the First World War, Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes coined the phrase "a clear and present danger" to define and delimit the circumstances under which words and, by inference, actions may be considered treasonable.

It seems to us that this famous phrase has been pretty well forgotten by many of our congressional investigators of late, and that it should be remembered. For Justice Holmes' words are capable of a broader interpretation than might be apparent at first glance. And they hold the key which should guide the investigators if their inquiries into communism in the United States are to be conducted intelligently and in the tradition of American justice.

First of all, a clear and present danger does exist. Its focal point is in Moscow, where the decisions and actions of the Soviet leaders dictate America's major diplomatic policies and force upon us a massive military defense program.

Other dangers, clear and present and emanating from Moscow, are to be found in the decisions and actions of the Peiping government, in the aggression in Asia, in the Communist efforts to infiltrate the governments and propagandize the peoples of free countries throughout the world.

And the danger exists in the United States, though the hard-core Communists in this country today are obviously far less numerous and influential than they are, say, in Italy or France. Yet there is a flurry of wild-swinging excitement over communism here which cannot be matched in other free countries where the Red menace is much greater. This excitement is inspired and perpetuated almost wholly by a handful of investigating committeemen in Congress. Rather than eradicating such danger as exists, they are increasing its potentialities by obscuring and confusing the real issue.

One of their non-Holmesian practices is to rake the dead ashes of past Communist associations, real or suspected. The investigators often seem to forget that 1954 is not 1934 or 1944. Twenty years ago the country was in the grip of a depression. A lot of youngsters, jobless or dismayed by the economic turbulence and instability, sought something to cling to. Many flirted with parlor-pinkism. Some embraced communism. But cold statistics show that most of them have long since defected.

Ten years ago America and Russia were allied in the desperate fight against the Nazis. Aid and friendship to the Soviets were virtually official Government policies. Naturally many citizens, with the best will in the world, were moved to join organizations which later proved to be fronts for Communist subversion.

The postwar years, of course, exposed the Moscow-directed conspiracy in all its duplicity, cynicism, and cruelty. Thousands of patriotic Americans must then have learned the facts of Soviet life, and fled from the front organizations or from the party itself. Today it seems reasonable to assume that all that remains of the Communist Party, United States of America, is a relatively small group of zealots and fanatics.

Their intentions are harmful. And those of them who are in positions to do actual harm to this country's safety should be rooted out of sensitive spots. It must be done in the light of a clear and present danger. It is scarcely necessary to neglect legislative duties, to waste time and money, to employ the typically totalitarian methods of innuendo and prosecutor-judge-jury investigation, in order to prove that somebody was a Communist sympathizer 20 years ago, or a friend of the Soviets a decade later.

Yet the only ex-Communists who seem to have escaped unsmirched from the congressional hearing rooms are the name droppers and talebearers who ride the investigation circuit and make almost a profession of informing. Some of their accusations have been patently false. But the life of anyone, innocent or not, at whom they point the accusing finger is never quite the same again. Or at least it is not in today's emotion-charged climate.

It is necessary to remind ourselves once more that the struggle between freedom and totalitarian enslavement is essentially a struggle for men's minds and sympathies all over the world. It is much preferable to fight communism with example and persuasion than with lives and dollars. But do you think that the United States, founded upon the doctrine of the dignity of the individual and the rights of man, has earned many converts to that doctrine abroad by some of the recent inquisitorial shows put on in Washington?

Responsible members of both parties should take measures to quiet the investigative clamor which is a compound of confusion, fear, bad judgment, and a hunt for heads and headlines. It is time that not only Washington but the whole country remember anew that, while subversion is a crime, nonconformity of thinking is not. It is time for an end to the hounding of honestly repentent political sinners—and they are many—whose only misdeeds were an innocent or ignorant brush with leftism in the past.

All of us should take a calm, intelligent, and unfrightened look at the clear and present danger for what it is. Congressional investigations have their proper function, but it is the duly constituted law-enforcement officers and the executive branch of the Government who have the basic responsibility for preserving our free institutions.

Tourism Is Big Business in Texas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 13, 1954

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the June issue of West Texas Today, official publication of the West Texas Chamber of Commerce, is the vacation and travel number of that magazine. It contains information on tourist attractions throughout the State.

Among the material included in this issue of West Texas Today is a report from the Texas Highway Department, showing that recreational travel in Texas has come to be big business. I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Visitors Spent $356,477,218 Last Year

In 1953, Texas played host to 7,573,500 visitors from other States. These visitors spent $356,477,218 in Texas, and Texans spent an additional $414,000,000 on recreational travel within the State border to bring the total cash outlay to $770,477,218.

These figures were compiled by the Information Statistics Division of the Texas Highway Department.

In its tourist industry report for last year, the Highway Department states that the average tourist party consisted of 2.7 persons who spent $7.53 per person per day, stayed 5.5 days, spent $41.42 per individual per visit.

California again ranks number one in the list of States whose citizens travel into and through Texas, with 1,272,300 the count for 1953. Every State and the District of Columbia was represented in Texas by visitors last year, and 137,400 came from foreign countries.

Almost 7,000 came from little Vermont—the last on the list in descending order by number of visitors. Louisiana, with 621,000, was second high and Illinois placed third with 522,600.

Among the many interesting statistics in the report is the revelation that the size of the traveling parties was largest in July, but expenditure per person was at the lowest figure that month while in November the size of the parties was smallest but expenditure per person was highest.

Of all the visitors, 41 percent were making their first trip to Texas, with February claiming a high of 45 percent and November tallying 37 percent.

Your Health, Your Community, and Your Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 13, 1954

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an address which I delivered at the Group Health Institute in St. Paul, Minn., on June 18, 1954.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Address by Hon. Hubert H. Humphrey, of Minnesota, at the Group Health Institute, St. Paul, Minn., June 18, 1954

Thank you very much for the opportunity to meet with you this evening to discuss the health needs of our Nation. The responsibility of the Federal Government to help meet those health needs has been recognized by three successive national administrations. It was Franklin D. Roosevelt who first said that adequate medical care is one of the basic human rights of all Americans. It was Harry S. Truman who sought to implement that principle by submitting a plan for comprehensive health insurance to the Congress. It was most recently Dwight D. Eisenhower who said: "The means for achieving good health should be accessible to all. A person's location, occupation, age, race, creed, or financial status should not bar him from enjoying this access."

The responsibility to meet the health needs of the American people is indeed now an established American policy, and yet our progress has been slow and the price we pay for our inaction is high.

There are four basic problems of health that today face the American society. They are: (1) The high cost of medical care; (2) the maldistribution of medical facilities; (3) the shortage of qualified personnel; and (4) the need to expand research and conquer disease.

Our Nation has made great progress and we can be proud of the accomplishments of modern medicine. Modern public health has today been developed to the point where individuals and nations can be protected against most diseases. At the turn of the century the death rate for the United States was 17 per 1,000. Today it is less than 10 per 1,000. Life expectancy at birth increased from about 47 years in 1900, and is today at an all-time high of more than 67 years.

Doctors tell me that the adoption of modern preventive measures in obstetrics and pediatrics has caused a decided decrease in maternal and infant mortalities. The childhood diseases of children are still prevalent, but they no longer cause the tragic deaths of the past. Fifty years ago, the combined death rate for measles, scarlet fever, whooping cough, diphtheria, and meningitis was 75 per 1,000. According to the latest figures I have available, the rate is now 2.5 per 1,000, or a reduction of about 97 percent.

The status of civilian health in America now can be favorably compared with the level of health in most of the leading nations in the world.

But it would be a serious mistake for us to be satisfied with this record for we are far from realizing the full potentialities of public health. We have not yet conquered disease. There are a great many unsolved health problems. There are still many infectious diseases not brought under control.

Dean of the Harvard School of Public Health, Dr. James Simmons, recently reported that there are more than 2,500,000 infectious diseases officially recorded by doctors—and he was not referring to poliomyelitis. Every year more than a million and half childhood infections are reported. In addition there were about half a million venereal infections. We are far from realizing the full potentialities of what modern medicine can bring to the American people.

We have not yet developed adequate preventive measures for mental diseases. According to experts, one-fourth of the patients in our general hospitals are there because of emotional reactions. Almost 13,000 are admitted to mental hospitals every year. About 3 million children have emotional or behavior disorders. We must extend research to prevent disease of the mind.

The prevention of the degenerative diseases is another frontier. About one-half of all the people who die are 65 years of age or older. Most of these deaths are attributed to some form of heart diseases. Cancer seems to be on the increase. We must further stimulate basic research to discover methods to prevent and conquer cancer and other chronic degenerative diseases.

We have many other health problems in America: nutritional deficiencies, poor housing, pollution of our streams, atmospheric contamination. On top of these problems we face new disease hazard areas from possible atomic or hydrogen attacks, sabotage, psychological or biological warfare. We must prepare ourselves to face these new hazards.

In the face of these growing needs the Government of the United States must have the vision and the courage to come to grips with the problem.

Yet, the administration in Washington insists on cutting down on its budget request to Congress for medical research and hospital and research facilities. This, I suggest, is false economy.

The administration's budget reduced research funds to the Public Health Service by $10 million less than the budget of the Truman administration—and even that budget was inadequate. The Truman budget provided $15 million for the construction of health facilities. The Eisenhower budget provides no funds for construction of research facilities, even though there are today applications on file for projects that would cost $150 million.

As a result of the administration's new budget, it has been necessary for the Public Health Service to eliminate the mobile X-ray units for tuberculosis control even though it is estimated that there are today 8 out of every 1,000 Americans with tuberculosis in some form—more than one-half of these unknown. At any moment there are 400,000 persons with active tuberculosis—150,000 are unidentified. These 400,000 persons are actual or potential spreaders of the disease, and yet your Government cuts tuberculosis-control funds and eliminates the mobile X-ray program.

Let me pursue the tuberculosis example with you for a moment. Is it an intelligent policy? Is it a realistic economy to save a few million dollars from the tuberculosis-control budget in the face of these figures? We have seen the figures that represent the human toll of tuberculosis. But let us look at the dollar cost. Less than $15 million was spent in 1952 in the case-finding activity of X-ray screening. Yet individuals ill with tuberculosis lost an estimated $500 million in income. More than 250,000 Americans of working age were unable to work because of the disease. This lost $40 million to the Treasury in terms of tax revenue which this represents. In addition, about $1½ billion in potential future production was lost due to premature deaths due to tuberculosis in 1952.

True economy, my friends, would be the establishment of a program which eliminates tuberculosis from our society. This is the real way to save money for the American society.

There is much more that I can say about the budget and its neglect of health research. Research funds are sharply being cut in cancer, heart disease, arthritis, and the other afflictions which cause millions to suffer and which cost our Nation millions of dollars in productivity loss.

Research and public health is, however, but one phase of a comprehensive, effective medical program for the American people. A serious and perplexing problem which the American people face is the cost of medical care. Let me say a word about that. In recent days I had an opportunity to learn of a study by the Health Information Foundation, a foundation supported by 165 drug and chemical companies. The study was a nationwide-consumer survey of medical costs and it lasted for 2 years. Their conclusions are as follows:

1. Illness today costs the families of the United States $10.2 billion.
2. Illness today costs the United States Government and private charities $1.8 billion.
3. Only 15 percent of this medical bill to American families is covered by insurance benefits.
4. Eight million Americans are today in debt as a result of the need to meet their medical expenses.
5. Only 41 percent of families earning under $3,000 per year have any insurance at all.

What do these figures mean? They mean that millions of Americans need help if they are going to meet their health needs and if they are going to enjoy the high standards of medical care which modern science can provide.

This is why I have from the first day of my membership in the Senate urged a comprehensive medical program. I want this medical program to be within the traditions of a free society—voluntary, not compulsory—freedom of choice and association. This is why I stand ready at any time to join any Member of the Senate whether he be Democrat or Republican in a nonpartisan effort to help meet the health needs of the American people. Your officers know that I was one of the first in the Senate to openly associate myself with the legislative proposal introduced by Republican Senators Ives and Flanders for a comprehensive legislative proposal to stimulate "voluntary" efforts by the American people to meet their health problems. It is a source of profound regret to me that these Senators withdrew their bill this session as a result of strong pressure * * * exerted * * * by the White House. I also stand ready to join President Eisenhower in any constructive proposal that does not violate the principles of voluntary association that he makes which will take our Nation one step forward toward fulfilling the health needs of the American people.

What must a comprehensive health plan include?

It should recognize first of all a serious shortage in trained qualified personnel. It is estimated that there is a shortage of about 100,000 nurses in the United States. A shortage of 10,000 dentists, and 22,000 physicians. These are conservative figures.

Let me tell you what this shortage means. This shortage means that we are moving backward. One hundred years ago there were 176 doctors in the United States for every 100,000 people. In 1900 there were 158 doctors for every 100,000 people. Today there are 135 doctors for every 100,000 people.

We are short 22,000 doctors. These 22,000 physicians could care for at least 18 million people who today are not cared for or not cared for adequately.

We are also suffering from a severe shortage of medical schools. In 1900 there were 160 medical schools in the United States. Today with a population of more than 160 million people there are only 79 medical schools. Not only must we build new medical schools, but unless measures are taken to help the existing schools we will even have fewer schools in the years to come.

We need a program to train more doctors and nurses and public health officials.

We need a program for financial help to medical schools, nursing schools, and schools of public health.

We need scholarships to stimulate enrollment in professional schools.

We need grants to States to train practical nurses.

We also need a more realistic and effective hospital construction program.

President Eisenhower took note of this hospital shortage and said in a message to the Congress that he wanted to expand the hospital construction program so as to include buildings for the chronically ill, nursing homes for the aged, diagnostic clinics for ambulatory cases, and hospitals for rehabilitation. Unfortunately, however, though the President's health message calls for such an expansion, the President's budget message would even cut the existing hospital program down to one-third of the amount authorized by law—the lowest figure in the history of the program. This at a time when an estimated 800,000 new beds are needed.

There is one other important problem that must be faced if we are to establish a comprehensive health program for the American people. I refer to the present maldistribution of medical facilities in the United States. The United States today has 200,000 physicians attempting to serve a population of 160 million people. Rural communities by the hundreds of thousands now find themselves unable to make use of hospitals and doctors. Rural America does not have the opportunity to utilize the benefits of modern medicine and yet two-thirds of the counties of the United States are predominantly rural. One thousand counties in the United States have no Public Health Service. Approximately 30 million still live in areas without properly organized local health departments. Urban counties have 10 times as many hospital beds, four times as many doctors and six times as many dentists as have rural counties.

It is to meet this need for more effective and wider distribution of medical facilities and it is to meet the need for providing stimulation to voluntary nonprofit organizations offering prepaid health insurance that I have introduced in recent years the voluntary health facilities bill, which is frequently called the cooperative health facilities bill. In the present Congress, this bill, S. 1052, was introduced in February 1953.

The voluntary method of solving our economic and social problems is always the best method in a democratic society. The voluntary method, however, needs encouragement. The voluntary method of helping Americans pay their doctor bills and helping Americans find a doctor is one which our Government should encourage. The process of voluntary association is the essence of freedom. A good government is one which stimulates that kind of association.

That is why I am a friend of the Cooperative Health Federation of America. That is why I am a friend of the Group Health Association in Minnesota. That is why I support the development of voluntary prepaid health service—medical and hospital care.

We can help meet the health needs of the American community by having a whole series of effective and well-operated voluntary health plans throughout America. For these plans to work, however, two prerequisites must be met. First is the need to establish a modern medical office and laboratory which will induce physicians to locate in the community where the citizens need and desire medical service. Second is the necessity to obtain a community pool of funds derived from prepayments which will insure adequate income for the physicians in bad times as well as in good times.

Modern medicine is today complicated. It demands good facilities for our highly trained doctors. When such facilities are not available, it is difficult to induce good physicians to come to a community and practice medicine. In a number of smaller communities and in a number of large ones adequate medical facilities are simply not available; neither are minimum hospital facilities available to care for minor medical and surgical cases.

The Humphrey bill provides that if a group of people in a community where health facilities are inadequate will get together and form a voluntary health plan organization and be prepared to assume the financial responsibility for working out their own problem, then they may apply for low-interest repayable loans to enable them to finance the physician's facilities which their community require.

This is the essence of my bill and is the essence of voluntary association. Its basic aim is to encourage groups of people to take direct responsibility for the solution of their health-care problems.

The successful operation of this bill would attract doctors to areas where they are needed and would make it easier for the American people to pay their medical bills. It would bring health facilities to American people just as the principles of cooperative voluntary association brought electricity to rural America.

Now what are the prospects for effective legislation in this Congress? In this connection I am pleased to report a new, and I think, important development. In past years, as you know, most of our health legislation originated in the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. It was in the Senate that the most extensive hearings were held and I believe I can rightfully say the most intensive attempts were made to investigate the problems involved. In this Congress, however, under the chairmanship of a Republican, Congressman Wolverton, of New Jersey, the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has been conducting since last October one of the most thorough-going studies on health problems affecting the Nation that has ever been undertaken by the Congress. Starting with an analysis of the measures being taken both by Government and the private agencies to find the cause and cure of major diseases, going on to the adequacy or inadequacy of health facilities, inquiring into all the various types of health insurance plans now available to the American people, and ending up with a really serious investigation of new proposals made by men in groups actually providing medical care to large groups of people at prices they can afford to pay, the House Committee has done an amazing job.

Out of these activities Congressman Wolverton has introduced two bills which will be of interest to you. One of these, H. R. 7700, represents what I think you will find to be an interesting proposal put forth by Mr. Henry Kaiser with respect to the financing of local hospitals. It could, of course, apply to the financing of group health facilities such as clinics and diagnostic centers as well.

In brief, Mr. Kaiser contends that his successful group prepayment medical care plans came into being only because he was personally able to underwrite the costs of hospital construction. He maintains that adequate facilities are one essential ingredient in any successful plan, but that it is almost impossible for the ordinary group of doctors or group of patients who want to start a program to secure financing for those facilities. He contends further that his operations have proved that a good group prepayment program offering comprehensive medical services and provided with adequate facilities can pay for those facilities in full in a very short period of time. He points out that whereas in most communities the hospital is always a losing concern, where the Kaiser program has been in operation the hospitals not only pay for themselves in short order but provide funds for the extension of further services. Therefore, Mr. Kaiser has proposed and the Wolverton bill suggests that the Federal Government should reinsure local lending agencies which are willing to advance funds for the building of hospitals and related facilities to prepaid comprehensive plans. Much the same as the Government insured private real estate loans, he would have the Government guarantee loans extended to prepayment groups by local financing agencies.

I consider this proposal to be a constructive, interesting, and stimulating suggestion. The purpose and objective of this proposal, merits support.

A second Wolverton bill, H. R. 6950, is very much based on our voluntary health facilities bill, which I have been discussing with you. It is broader in its terms than our original proposal, but it is essentially sound. Again I say I am prepared to support this legislative approach free from partisan considerations.

Turning now from the House to the Senate, I regret to report that there has not been much accomplished by the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare in the health field during this Congress. Hearings have been held, however, on the President's recommendation to provide "a limited Federal reinsurance service" for insurance companies and other health-insurance plans. In effect, the administration proposes that the taxpayers' money shall be used to reinsure private health-insurance businesses. I do not want to close my mind to this proposal, and I plan to analyze the bill constructively when it reaches the Senate floor for action. Certain questions, however, are immediately apparent to me.

Will the administration propose to use the taxpayers' money to reinsure profit-making as well as nonprofit-making health concerns? Apparently this was their original intent. If this is true, should be taxpayers' money be used to reinsure a health insurance plan that spends 60 percent of the consumer's dollar for overhead and advertising and profits and only 40 percent on medical care, or will the Federal reinsurance be limited to concerns which use not more than 5 or 10 or 15 percent on overhead? What will the Government do about a health-insurance plan which instead of guaranteeing services only guarantees fees? Suppose the plan is sound and is operating satisfactorily even after it expands those services to include catastrophic illnesses. But suppose the men in charge of the plan double the fees to be paid, thereby rendering the plan unsound unless Federal funds are thrown into the pot? Obviously, the administration could not make such a proposal and it would have to have some plan for controlling fees. If so, what type of control? Who is going to do the controlling, and will those controls be acceptable to both the doctors and the patients involved?

These are just a few of the hundreds of really important questions which will have to be answered before we can even consider a reinsurance program.

We need constructive and imaginative legislation to help meet the health needs of the American people. Illness costs the Nation today $30 million a year, which is just about the total take of the Federal income tax. We can only achieve comprehensive legislative program, however, if the American people want it, if the American people ask for it, and if the American people work for it. That is why your meeting is so significant. That is why the very fact of your organization is so vital to the future of American democracy. You represent part of the answer to America's health problems. I wish you many years of success and growth.

Government Competition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK C. OSMERS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 13, 1954

Mr. OSMERS. Mr. Speaker, the Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee, chairmanned by the able lady from Indiana, Cecil M. Harden, has investigated the matter of Government competition with business during the past 2 years. This work has culminated in the introduction of three bills, H. R. 8832, H. R. 9834, and H. R. 9835.

Hearings will be held on these bills before the Government Operations Committee during the period July 14–19. I hope that interested Members of this body will express their interest to the committee.

In connection with the hearings I include in the Record an article which appeared in the New York Times Monday, July 12, 1954:

United States Will Cut Role as Entrepreneur—White House Moving To Turn Over to Private Business Many Federal Enterprises

(By Anthony Leviero)

Washington, July 11.—Federal agencies spend many billions of dollars yearly doing a lot of things, like roasting coffee and building battleships. Now the Eisenhower administration is planning to turn over a lot of these enterprises to private industry.

The plan has some highly attractive aspects. One project heard in Congress would apply all revenue from liquidated capital assets to the reduction of the national debt.

The Federal payroll and budget would be reduced, and tax revenue would be increased by any large-scale reduction of Federal commercial-type services and manufacturing operations.

Private industry could perform most of the operations more cheaply. So say the proponents of this concept, which is making headway in four ways:

1. A Presidential directive is in the drafting stage that would require all Federal departments and agencies to make an inventory of commercial-type operations that might be performed more economically in private hands.

2. A subcommittee of the House Government Operations Committee will begin hearings Wednesday on a bill to establish an antigovernment competition board, and on other measures that would authorize the President to liquidate commercial-type enterprises.

3. The Defense Department already is pioneering the plan. It has completed a preliminary inventory of 13 services and operations of a commercial nature, such as bread baking and laundering, that are being performed by the Army, Navy, and Air Force in 237 defense establishments within the United States. It also has called for an inventory of 18 other operations that could be performed by commercial concerns adjacent to the posts, camps, and stations.

4. The Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, headed by former President Hoover, has set up a subcommittee to study business enterprises in the Defense Department. Joseph B. Hall, president of the Kroger Co., a food chain, has been appointed chairman. He is familiar with the task, being head of a Defense Department committee on the same subject. He also is a member of the Defense Secretary's Committee on Departmental Fiscal Operations.

Comparatively little actual progress has been made in getting the Government out of business, but the plan is in accord with President Eisenhower's philosophy of having the Federal Government do only those things that private industry and local governments cannot do by themselves. Hence some officials expect the movement to gain momentum as the implications of it are better understood.

So far as the Government as a whole is concerned, the concentration on the project right now is in the Budget Bureau. Rowland R. Hughes, the Budget Director, is working on a directive, or Presidential order, that would require all Federal agencies to submit an inventory of their commercial-type services.

This directive would produce a comprehensive survey of an enormous number of enterprises and ultimately would require the agencies to justify their retention of the operations or yield them to private industry.

The proposal still is in the early stages in the Budget Bureau. But as now contemplated, it would spell out a basic policy relating to Federal competition with private enterprise, define "commercial-type activities," set standards for rejection or liquidation of the enterprises and establish in the Budget Bureau the machinery for reviewing the governmentwide program.

In the absence of a comprehensive survey, there is no factual basis for an estimate. But Senator Robert C. Hendrickson, Republican of New Jersey, told the Senate recently that estimates of the sale value of the Government's commercial-type enterprises to private owners varied from $25 billion to $40 billion.

Another estimate is that in the Defense Department alone the gross annual sales of all military commercial and industrial-type operations is about $10 billion.

There is no estimate of the capital investment behind this figure, but the $10 billion sales estimate is of the magnitude of the sales of the General Motors Corp. last year.

Many of the projects under prospective attack had their genesis in depression or war. For instance by 1945, under the impact of the war, there were 101 separate Government corporations with gross assets of $29,600,000,000. About 80 of the corporations are still in existence.

Most of them are looked on with disfavor by the General Accounting Office because it cannot make these corporations repay an illegal or improper expenditure, a power it holds over Government departments and agencies.

Some points of progress already made by the Eisenhower administration are:

Liquidation of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, which has been carried out by the Treasury Department.

Disposal of tin and rubber facilities (but President Eisenhower had to create a new Government corporation to do this).

The New York Naval Shipyard at Brooklyn closed its uniform factory last year, apparently influenced by agitation in some quarters to turn over the whole navy yard, regarded as the largest manufacturing facility in New York State, to private industry.

Coffee roasting in the Armed Forces has been reduced somewhat.

Paint manufacturing has been reduced to a special formula "bottom paint" for ships.

Some sawmill operations have been eliminated.

WATERWAY CONCERN SOLD

One other notable action was the sale of the Inland Waterways Corporation of the Commerce Department to the Federal Waterways Corp., a subsidiary of the St. Louis Shipbuilding & Steel Co., for $9 million.

This progress is only a drop in the bucket, however. The preliminary inventory in the Defense Department is fragmentary, but here are the operations it showed in the 237 establishments:

Aluminum sweating (salvage of aluminum), 9; scrap metal baling, 29; clothing factories, 2; coffee roasting, 5; motion-picture studios, 5; paint factories, 2; rope-making, 1; sawmills, 3; bakeries, 74; clothing reclamation, 6; furniture repair, 3; ice-cream manufacturing, 3, and laundries and dry cleaning, 95.

The Defense Department issued a directive requiring an inventory of these services and manufacturing operations:

Chain, acetylene, automotive repair shops, cafes and restaurants, caustic soda, cement mixing, chlorine, cobbler shops, ice plants, office equipment repair shops, oxygen and nitrogen, power line construction, power plants, tire retreading, tree and garden nurseries, wood preservation, and argon and freon manufacturing.

The problem of divesting the Government of commercial-type operations is not simple, even with an administration that is more than eager to take industry's guidance in implementing its plans.

For instance, the single rope-making plant in the Federal service is in the Boston Navy Yard. It is the famous "ropewalk" established in 1920. When the suggestion was first made that it be given up, Members of Congress from that area rose in protest.

Other operations like bread baking will continue to be done by Federal establishments in remote areas or in places where private concerns cannot do the work cheaper.

However, the project is getting earnest study with the aim of economizing, reducing expenditures, increasing revenue and releasing more military manpower for combat-type assignments.

Strengthening the Bond With Our Western Hemisphere Allies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 12, 1954

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, it is most gratifying to note the action of this Congress in the adoption of Senate Concurrent Resolution 79, providing for the continuance of the Government tin smelter at Texas City, Tex., and requiring a further study of the entire subject.

The Congressional Record and the daily press are filled with words on the subject of how our country can gain friends and keep its allies. In this field of foreign affairs more than anywhere else, actions speak louder than words.

It is the kind of action called for by this resolution that will make friends for us. I agree with our South American friends who urge that this country must do more to back its protestations of friendship.

The continuance of the purchase of tin ore from Bolivia is a positive demonstration of our desire to help our allies in the Western Hemisphere. Such conduct on our part, however, is more than just aid to a neighbor. It is a necessary part of our own defense and our national security. The cost of this program should not be charged to any foreign-aid program. It is an integral part of our own defense program and should be treated as such. At the same time, it helps build up and make stronger our friendly neighbors.

Texas Reforestation Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 13, 1954

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, a recent report by the Texas Forest Service tells of the important and effective work being carried on in reforestation in a number of Texas counties. It is a big program. More than 20,500,000 seedlings were planted in the 1953–54 season.

I ask unanimous consent that the report by the Texas Forest Service be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

College Station.—Newton county, for the fourth successive year, has exceeded all other Texas counties in reforestation, according to the annual summary of tree planting activities released by Don Young, head of the management department of the Texas Forest Service.

A record production of more than 20,500,000 seedlings were planted by Texas farmers, ranchers and forest industries in the 1953–54 season, extending from December 1953 through March of 1954. This represents approximately 100 percent increase over the previous year. The distribution of tree seedlings for the 1952–53 planting season was approximately 10,385,000.

Newton County landowners planted 2,641,300 seedlings this season. Ranked below Newton, other leading counties in the total number of trees planted were Jasper, Cass, Hardin, Polk, Orange, Rusk, Nacogdoches, Tyler, Marion, and Cherokee. Each of the 11 counties planted more than one-half million seedlings.

Cass County farmers headed the list of farm plantings, with 2,053,000 seedlings. More than half of the total 20½ million seedlings were planted by 2,919 farmers and ranchers. This is believed to be a record number of Texas tree planters. In some cases, farmers qualified for ASC payments for planting seedlings.

As a result of an extensive tree-planting campaign in the Cass and Marion County soil conservation district, Cass County, with 304 tree planters, far exceeded all other Texas counties insofar as the number of tree planters is concerned. Marion County, with 107 tree planters, was also a leading county.

The 47 Randall County ranchers and farmers topped the list of west Texas and Panhandle windbreak tree planters.

Most of the tree seedlings were grown in Cherokee County at the 73-acre Indian Mound nursery, operated by the Texas Forest Service, a part of the Texas A. & M. College system. The windbreak seedlings were obtained from Oklahoma. Sixteen different species were planted in Texas, predominantly southern yellow pine. A production of more than 18 million tree seedlings is anticipated for the coming planting season.

Oldham County had one planter, who put out a total of 300 seedlings.

The Golden Years

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 13, 1954

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an article by Mr. Thomas Collins, which appeared in the St. Paul Pioneer Press on June 13, 1954, entitled "The Golden Years." This article has attracted the attention of many of our Minnesota senior citizens. The article grasps the essence and the problems facing men and women when they reach age 65. I commend the article to the attention of the Senate.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

THE GOLDEN YEARS—MORE THAN CASH
(By Thomas Collins)

It is a benevolent land we live in. It is a land that cuddles foundlings to its heart, builds public hospitals to heal the destitute sick, pays for shelters to feed hungry cats.

Perhaps it is time to begin thinking of giving more aid to people past 65. Not just the sick and helpless, but the lonely, the frightened, the abandoned people whose only sin is that they grew old.

If the Federal Government can erect veterans' hospitals and appropriate funds for washing ticks off western cattle, they can help the aged.

It is help beyond the social security program by which the Government now shows its goodness. It is help beyond money that is needed.

Here are the needs:

Most people beyond 65 in this country are abandoned by the three most vital forces in their lives—their families, society in general, and business. This varies in each case, naturally. But in most casse after 65 the family, society, and business want to be bothered less and less. Old people know this but they won't talk about it. Rich old people know it as well as the poor.

This then is the first need—to provide an antidote for abandonment.

The second need is to cure loneliness. People in their late years are the loneliest people in America, due almost entirely to the factors cited above.

The third need is to provide the means whereby older people can be useful. This would call for consultations to determine what the person can do (not to be confused with the usual public-welfare counseling); training; access to laboratories, planetariums and libraries; and finally jobs that fit an older person (instead of the concept that the person must fit the job).

The fourth need is a guaranty of attention and security when health and money are finally gone. Social security tries to provide this.

How can the Government provide these needs?

It could provide them by setting up in each State a Golden Years House, which would be as good as any other name so long as it didn't have the stigma of "home" or "institution" attached to it.

This house would provide living quarters for those who needed a home or wanted one. It would provide the charity that was necessary but its main purpose would be to furnish a rallying point instead of a haven.

It would have consultants who would advise on jobs and careers. It would have experts who would pave the way for the older people to enter schools on the outside. It would have officials—backed by the prestige of the Government—who would open the community's doors of research and investigation. It would have a job placement office.

The house itself would be a center of social intercourse where both the people who lived there and those on the outside would mix and mingle. Square dancing and checkers wouldn't be necessary. The social program instead would consist of teas, films, parties, moderate sports competitions, photo clinics, art exhibits.

Above all, the program would have to have the dignity and prestige that would attract the lonely banker's widow from across town as well as the lonely bachelor with a room down the hall.

To enter the house a person would not have to be committed to go or stay. Nor would the person have to sign away all income and property.

With the billions the Government spends for other things there should be money to rescue the older people of the country from the miserable lives they're having to lead * * * and to reclaim for the country the talents that are now going to waste.

You might mention it the next time you write your Congressmen. There's a good chance he'd think so, too.

Glorified Blackmail: H. R. 9820 and S. 3718 Give New Jersey and Pennsylvania the Green Light To Pick Your Pocket—Motorist Beware

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI

OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 13, 1954

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I trust the Congress will reject H. R. 9820 and S. 3718.

Both bills will no doubt be called up for approval on a sleeper play when few Members are in the Chamber. They could not pass otherwise.

H. R. 9820 and S. 3718 is another one of those gold dust attempts to kid the public. Gold for the money men. Dust for the eyes of the motorist. Both bills, as now written, should be defeated. I will object to their passage.

H. R. 9820 and S. 3718 is another one of those bistate agency deals between New Jersey and Pennsylvania to set toll rates and collect handsome profits from helpless motorists using New Jersey-Pennsylvania facilities. It is a medieval practice. And why Uncle Sam gets suckered into these booby trap consent bills, is difficult to understand.

H. R. 9820 and S. 3718 is glorified blackmail. Not a word in either bill talks about the rights of the motorist. Not a word in either bill assures the motorist that tolls will be flexible, like farm price supports. Not a word in either bill assures the motorist that tolls will be geared to maintenance cost of facilities after debts are serviced and retired. Not a word in either bill guarantees the motorist that he isn't being taken for a sucker in being forced to contribute to profits that will build warehouses and private enterprise facilities that should come from venture and not blackmail capital. Strong words? Sure. But what is so brave and enterprising about these bills? They smack of a lack of a bill of rights for the American motorist.

Were Texas Guinan around today, as she was in the days of the speakeasy, her greeting would, I am sure, reach the ears of every motorist who will be affested by H. R. 9820 and S. 3718: "Hi Sucker."

The Challenge of Our Time

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN S. COOPER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 13, 1954

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] on June 6, 1954, entitled "The Challenge of Our Time." The address was made at the commencement exercises of the oldest municipal university in the United States, in Louisville, Ky.

The fine speech of our distinguished colleague was warmly received.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CHALLENGE OF OUR TIME

(Commencement address by Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY, of Wisconsin, University of Louisville, June 6, 1954)

Mr. President, members of the University of Louisville faculty, honored guests, parents, and most of all, those of you who today receive our homage and best wishes for securing your diplomas from this great university. I deeply appreciate the honor you bestow upon me today. The University of Louisville is a great institution. As the oldest municipal university in our country, it constitutes a landmark in higher education in America. You who have done so much to develop it can well be proud of your solid achievement.

Sometimes those who are closest to an institution like this do not fully appreciate the outstanding job it is doing.

Let me remind my listeners that your liberal arts college for more than a generation has been in the forefront of those colleges and universities which are engaged in the all-important task of redefining the purposes and the values of a liberal and cultural education.

Let me remind you, too, that your professional schools are recognized as among the best in the South. They, together with your schools in the arts and sciences, are sending forth each year a constant stream of well-trained men and women who render splendid service to the Nation.

I am sure that the people of this area will increasingly recognize—and I hope in a very tangible way—the tremendous contribution which the university is making to their cultural, economic, political, and professional life.

NEW FORCES

Now let us turn to some of our world problems. "American foreign policy," remarked a cab driver in Washington the other day, "is just about as unstable as our allies can make it."

I don't care to comment on the accuracy of that statement. I do want to point out, however, that our foreign policy must depend, to a large extent, upon what other nations do and say. It may depend, too, upon certain forces and factors in the world over which we have only limited control.

As I look back at the world at the time of my graduation and compare it with the world of today, it seems to me that this generation must deal with four tremendous new forces which my generation has seen rise.

Two of these forces are physical in nature, and two are moral and spiritual.

On the physical side, we have in the last two decades witnessed first the shrinkage of the world brought about by technology and especially the development of air transportation and telecommunications.

Second, we have seen the power of the atom unleashed—with its potentials for destruction or for peaceful power.

On the moral and spiritual side, we have witnessed the rise of militant communism on the one hand, and at the same time the rise of militant nationalism among the people of underdeveloped areas.

Any one of these new forces in life on this earth, occurring alone, would present a challenge to mankind. Occurring, as they do, in combination they present a crisis. And it is not a crisis of the moment, but of a generation.

It is the problem—and also, the opportunity—of this generation to deal with these forces.

THE CHALLENGE OF FREEDOM

I want to direct my remarks principally to the moral and spiritual challenges we face. First, let me comment on the challenge of freedom—the challenge posed by nationalism which seeks freedom for the peoples of the underdeveloped countries.

Voltaire said: "There is one thing stronger than all the armies of the world, and that is an idea whose time has come."

We have not yet fully realized the immense power behind this idea of nationalism, whose time has come for hundreds of millions of people in Asia, in Africa, and to some extent even in Latin America. This needs emphasizing. The overwhelmingly predominant factor in the minds of these uncounted millions is their desire for independence, their desire to be rid of every last trace of imperialism and colonialism.

Many of these people have achieved this desire. In the period since World War II, well over half a billion people have attained independence. Others have made great progress toward their goal, and are on the threshold of achieving it.

But those who have attained independence are extremely sensitive about it. Those who are not yet free are in a hurry. They demand so much so fast as sometimes to seem reckless to the older nations of the world.

I am sure that this audience will understand these attitudes. Nations mature much like people. We parents know the young are apt to be quick to resent any move on the part of their elders which looks like an attempt to interfere with their lives or to dictate to them—even if it is perfectly innocent, well-meant advice. And nothing makes the young angry so much as an attitude which seems to them to be patronizing or condescending.

They want to lead their own lives, to make their own choices—and, yes, to make their own mistakes—and they are entitled to do so.

It is well for older people to recall their own youthful reactions and mistakes. And it is well for nations to recall their history.

In the last half of the 18th century, the American people were not in the least impressed with the argument that they were not ready for independence. We wanted independence, and we got it. We should, therefore, not be unduly critical of the desires of some nations for what may seem to us to be premature independence. On the contrary, we should take vigorous steps to disabuse colonial and newly free peoples of the notion, which many of them unfortunately have, that we are critical and unsympathetic toward their legitimate national aspirations.

Some of these people do not remember that the United States owes its own freedom to a bunch of rag-tag, outnumbered, part-time soldiers who wanted independence so badly they fought what was then the most powerful country in the world to a standstill.

They do not see the United States as a country which, at the height of its military power, voluntarily, in accordance with a prearranged plan, bestowed sovereign independence on the Philippines.

They see the United States, instead, as an ally of the traditional colonial powers of Europe.

This concept that the United States is imperialistic strikes most Americans as preposterous. We have not taken it seriously. But millions of people believe it.

They wonder if we are willing to include the whole human race, or only Americans, in the magnificent principles of the Declaration of Independence—"that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

They wonder if these principles are for export, or if we are only interested in exporting automobiles, refrigerators, and modern plumbing.

The matter is given added urgency by another of the great historical movements of this generation to which I have referred—the rise of militant communism.

COMMUNIST CHALLENGE

The Communists did not instigate the movement of nationalism which agitates so much of the world. But they are assiduously exploiting it for their own ends, which are, ironically, far more oppressive, far more antagonistic to natural aspirations for freedom and independence, than anything else the world has ever seen.

The cold war has many aspects, but it may very well turn on the crucial point of whether the Communist or the democratic idea captures the imagination and the devotion of millions of people fired with nationalism—the desire to be free.

This is one of the great unresolved questions of our time.

The movement of nationalism is basically a revolt against the past, and the past for half the world's people means hunger, sickness, and grinding poverty under the rule of another power.

These same people are plied daily with massive doses of false Communist promises of independence and a better life under communism.

The truth is, of course, that in the period since World War II, the much-maligned Western Powers have given freedom to over half a billion people while during the same period approximately the same number of people have been enslaved by communism.

On this record alone, one would think the choice would be clear cut. It is hard for us to see how anyone who is free to choose should hesitate in the selection between freedom and tyranny.

But we must remember that millions of people in the world have never enjoyed freedom as we know it, nor have they ever experienced democracy and a genuine opportunity to create a better life for themselves. They are peculiarly susceptible to communism masquerading as a new form of democracy overflowing with promises of land and food for all.

The hydrogen bomb does not help people choose between freedom and tyranny.

We must go far beyond a policy of military containment. An idea cannot be controlled by force.

Many thoughtful Americans are aware that the worldwide struggle between freedom and totalitarianism is being decided in part at least in the human mind. It is essential that our Government take positive, constructive steps that will appeal to the peoples of the world and kindle their enthusiasm for the common cause of freedom. It is not enough to be against communism. To win the cold war we must be for something—something that the masses of people throughout the world also are for.

We have the technical proficiency to move mountains, to fly to the stratosphere, to grow food in the deserts, to develop power from the atom, literally to harness the power of the sun.

And we have the mechanical proficiency to destroy ourselves.

Do we have the moral, spiritual, and governmental capacity to help save mankind from the Communist threat to individual freedom and self-government?

This is the challenge we face.

The Communists seem to be firmly convinced that they have an idea whose time has come. Their faith is based on the conviction that Russian communism will emerge triumphant in the world. They believe that inevitably the social and political forces of world communism will rise while western capitalism is decadent and will go down to destruction and decay. They think that we in the free world have lost some of our deep moral convictions and some of the crusading zeal we once had for the democratic way.

If we who believe so deeply in democracy would devote one-half the energy and show one-half the enthusiasm for our cause that some Communists do for theirs, there would be no question of the outcome.

We must demonstrate, both at home and abroad, the magnificent potential democracy holds for us all. Let us join hands with our neighbors in Asia, Africa, and Latin America and convince them that the future of the human race lies in a free world based on the dignity of man.

With the material, spiritual, and technical aid that we are able to give our friends, we can help them to achieve their rightful destiny with mutual benefits to us all.

This is a tremendous task. It will take courage and imagination and sacrifice perhaps over many years. But I think we are making real progress toward our goal.

COMMUNIST INDOCTRINATION

One of the most tragic problems we face is the fact that hundreds of millions of people are learning history the way the Communists want them to. Their textbooks have been rewritten. They are not being educated; they are being indoctrinated. They have access to no other newspapers and—with some exceptions—to no other radio broadcasts than those originating behind the Iron Curtain. This gives them a warped, one-sided, diabolically false view of history and a completely misleading picture of what is going on in the world.

All this reminds me somehow of the remark a critic once made about August Comte in his later years; that he followed the policy of cerebral hygiene—he did not read any books except his own. Some of us by instinct may be inclined to follow that policy. But we all agree that no man can grow if he doesn't read anybody's books except his own.

The Communists, who desperately fear the competition of ideas in the market place, are carrying on in an intensive way their own special brain-washing technique. They teach the people under their rule that the South Koreans launched a war of aggression against peace-loving North Korea. They tell them that the United States is an imperialist nation and that the North Atlantic Treaty is an aggressive alliance aimed at the Soviet Union.

But the Soviet Union cannot claim that it is struggling for liberty or freedom. Barbara Ward has pointed out that Soviet propaganda day after day speaks of true peace, true justice, true science, and true self-government. It does not speak of true liberty and true freedom. These are unsafe concepts for the Soviet Union. Our struggle is in the most direct sense the struggle of free men against total dictatorship.

As we look at past struggles between freedom and the forces of tyranny, tyranny has always failed. History seems to show that over the long run freedom prevails. Perhaps it is because people supporting freedom can draw upon hidden resources of strength.

Chief Justice Warren has said: "Liberty—not communism—is the most contagious force in the world. It will permeate the Iron Curtain. It will eventually abide everywhere. For no people of any race will long remain slaves. Our strength is in our diversity. Our power is in freedom of thought and of research."

But we are in mortal peril if we seek to rely on historical precedents to assure the survival of freedom.

Our peril is increased by the technological forces which I mentioned at the beginning—the shrinkage of the world and the increased destructiveness of modern weapons.

THE FREE MUST STAND UNITED

No nation today is able to stand alone in the world. It is not only the airplane and the radio which have brought us together. It is also the increasing complexity of our industrial processes which demand even greater quantities and varieties of raw materials from all over the globe.

The peril we face demands that the free stand together whether the free be the new nations of Asia or the nations of the West where freedom was born and nurtured. But we encounter a paradox. On the one hand, technology and the Communist threat are pushing the older free nations of the world closer and closer together in international collaboration. On the other hand, the spirit of nationalism tends to make newly-independent countries suspicious of Western proposals for alliances and for cooperation against aggression.

We ought not be too impatient with their suspicions and their desire to remain neutral. After all, we were in a sense, neutralist ourselves throughout almost 150 years of our history—as long, indeed, as we could get away with it. But the times have now taken on a greater urgency. The countries which have gained their independence in the 20th century do not have the leisure which we enjoyed in the 18th and 19th centuries. No sooner have Asian nations like India and Indonesia gained freedom from 19th century colonialism than they are faced with the much greater threat of 20th century Communist imperialism. I venture to predict that the Indian people will not be able to remain neutral long if communism continues its advance in Asia.

THE FREE MUST BE STRONG

While military strength alone will not win the cold war, the free must maintain their military strength. It is an indispensable ingredient in preventing a hot war. By making ourselves so strong that the Soviet Union will not dare attack us, we buy time in which the intangible, but powerful, forces of freedom can work on our side.

I know that you all wish, as I do, that we lived in a world at peace. Yet tonight hundreds of thousands of Americans will sleep in foreign lands. They are there not because we want war, but because we want peace. We occupy no lands against the will of the people. We are there as liberators or protectors.

There was a time when the strength or weakness of the United States would not have made a great deal of difference to the survival of freedom or justice in the world. Protected by the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans, the United States has always had time in the past to gird itself if danger threatened. Other nations of the world were strong enough to protect themselves—and us—at least for a time.

Today, because of the great advances in technology there is no longer time. We cannot wait until the fire starts to look for a place to connect the firehose.

As I speak to you today, I wish with all my heart that I could assure you that the years ahead would be peaceful and tranquil—that good will conquer evil, that right will triumph in the end.

I cannot give you those assurances.

We have ahead of us a long period in which we have only one assurance. That assurance is that we are in for a lot of trouble.

The forces we have unleashed in the physical realm—the forces and ideas we must face in the realm of the spirit—coalesce. They will not go away or be controlled by wishes and hope. They must be understood and tamed.

Fortunately for our future we know that American democracy invites ideas. It invites boldness. It invites you young men and women to build on the past and explore into the future. Our future would be a dreary one indeed if the men and women coming out of our colleges did not feel, and we did not know, that they can wrestle with and conquer these problems.

As we face the future, it seems to me that our history and experience give us some great truths which must guide our conduct.

COLLECTIVE SECURITY

First. We must hold fast to the idea that together we stand, divided we fall. This is the idea of collective security. Time and again, during my lifetime, aggressor nations, bent on aggrandizement, have been given the green light merely because the democracies failed to stand united in the face of a threatened attack.

If the free nations had spoken with 1 voice 6 months ago, even a country as reckless and as bold as Communist China would have feared the consequences of further intervention in Indochina. Dien Bien Phu would never have happened.

The bald truth is that our power and our influence in the world stem largely from our position as undisputed leader of the great free-world alliance. So long as we retain the support and the confidence of our allies, we can speak with the strength, the authority, and the vitality that flow from true leadership. But when we and our friends are split asunder, the task of meeting the Communist threat is an exceedingly difficult one.

This is another way of saying that we cannot go it alone. It is another way of saying that those who counsel sidetracking our allies and retreating to the New World are advocating national suicide.

The Russians are fully aware of this. That is why Molotov has resorted to every trick in his bag at the Geneva Conference to encourage dissension and disunity among the Western nations.

Whatever we do we must keep our allies with us. We are faced with total danger and halfway measures will not suffice.

INDOCHINA

When I speak of the necessity of allied unity, of the necessity of collective action to meet the threat of Communist aggression, I know some will ask: "What about Indochina?"

My answer is that the time has come when the nations of the free world must take the initiative in bringing the Indochinese situation before the United Nations for appropriate action.

The first purpose set forth in the United Nations Charter states that the organization is "to maintain international peace and security, and to that end: To take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace, and for the suppression of acts of aggression. * * *"

It was only last week that the Indochina problem was put before the United Nations by Thailand. France has claimed that the Communist attacks in Indochina were a domestic matter, and therefore not a problem with which the U. N. should properly be concerned. Whatever the situation may have been a year ago certainly no one can deny today that there is a real threat to world peace and the U. N. ought to be called into action.

The U. N. Charter declares that the peoples of the United Nations are determined "to reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person, in the equal rights of men and women and nations large and small. * * *"

If these are mere words on a scap of paper, then let us ignore the United Nations in this crisis. But if these are principles upon which the free nations of the civilized world agree, then the issues in Indochina should be put on the table.

The people of these states have the right to be informed of the issues. They have the right to determine their own destiny. It is the function, indeed, it is the duty of the United Nations to see that the principles and the purposes of the Charter are not frittered away because nations put expediency above principle.

Some people are afraid to put Indochina before the U. N. because it may weaken the organization. What a concept. We don't keep our muscles strong by not using them. The U. N. will wither and die if we don't give it a chance to meet the kind of problems it was created to handle.

Still other critics are fearful that the Security Council might once again be hamstrung by the Soviet veto and the Indochina question bogged down by inaction.

My answer to that criticism is this: The General Assembly is now geared to take speedy action whenever the Security Council finds it impossible to move. The Assembly can convene in 24 hours and is empowered to handle threats to the peace in an effective manner.

There is one thing that can be done in a relatively short time. The United Nations can—and should—send a Peace Observation Commission to Indochina to make sure that the boundary lines of countries like Thailand, Laos, and Cambodia are not violated by hostile armies. The Commission, if it is to be effective, should be made up of impartial nations, honest in their desire to support the principles for which the U. N. stands.

The presence of such a U. N. Commission in Korea was of inestimable value in establishing the factual basis for U. N. action against aggression there. It might prove just as valuable in Indochina.

Let it not be said that the United States ever participated in bypassing any agency which has the potentiality, if not the certainty, of providing collective assurances for the securing and maintaining of peace.

But we ought not to put all our eggs in one basket. While we press ahead for United Nations action in Indochina, we ought to exert every effort to secure something in the nature of a NATO pact for the Pacific area.

For several years I have urged the conclusion of such a pact designed to protect the independence and integrity of states in that area. But we can't defend people against communism unless they are willing to defend themselves. Fortunately, a number of Far Eastern countries, who have seen with growing alarm the aggressive designs of communism, now realize that they can create a bulwark of strength only by acting together.

History shows us that force begets counterforce. The fall of Dien Bien Phu, viewed as a tragedy now, may well make Asia much more aware of the danger of Communist attack. In my opinion the time may come when the aggressive tactics of communism may compel the great majority of states in the United Nations to demand that it be organized into an anti-Soviet coalition to preserve the free world.

The press reported only last week that India warned Russia that further territorial expansion in southeast Asia would mean a loss of friendship for Russia among the independent south Asian countries. The neutralism of India—and of other countries there—may well give way to a militant defense of South Asia as the Communist leaders, greedy for power, continue to overplay their hand.

But we must not rely solely on the truth that the free must stand together to protect freedom. There is another truth that must guide our conduct.

BIPARTISANSHIP

This is the second of the great truths which are to be found in our history. We must hold fast to the principle of bipartisanship in the conduct of our foreign affairs in order to guarantee that unity which is so essential here at home.

Nothing would please the Communists more than to see our own country split into partisan factions quarrelling and bickering over momentous problems that vitally affect our national security.

Nothing would endanger the Republic more than to have Republicans and Democrats at each other's throats during the coming campaign making political capital of our foreign policy.

This is no time to level charges and countercharges. It is time for the 2 great parties to join hands and work in full harmony for the development of the kind of world in which you and your children can live without the constant menace of total destruction hanging over you.

THE IDEALS OF DEMOCRACY

Third. We must hold fast to the ideals of democracy as the dynamic force in the world that can successfully meet the challenge of international communism. We must reaffirm that the truths enunciated in our Declaration of Independence hold true for people everywhere, and not just Americans. We can never again be indifferent to the loss of human freedom anywhere on this globe. Indeed, we can quite appropriately take for our text in this 20th century, the words of John Donne, written nearly 400 years ago:

"No man is an island, entire of itself; every man is a piece of the continent, a part of the main; if a clod be washed away by the sea, Europe is the less, as well as if a promontory were, as well as if a manor of thy friends or of thine own were; any man's death diminishes me, because I am involved in mankind."

The story is told of the minister who came upon a group of laborers building a cathedral. He asked one man what he was doing. The man replied that he was earning $14 a day. A second man was asked the same question. "I am laying bricks," he replied. The third laborer looked up from his work and said, "I am helping build a great cathedral."

Given our position of world leadership we in the United States must never lose sight of our great objective. We must join together to help build a foreign policy that will enshrine freedom for man in a world at peace. We can build such a foreign policy, stone by stone, idea by idea, if the men and women who contribute to the strength of this Nation know and understand what we do.

But the sands of time are running out. If we are to meet the challenge of our generation we must act with courage and vigor and determination. These are qualities which freemen demonstrate when they are faced with a great crisis.

1776—Primer for Americans—1954

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 7, 1954

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker. At least once a year Americans should review their rights, duties, responsibilities, and privileges as citizens of this great country and what day could be more fitting for this review than July Fourth, the day on which we commemorate the signing of the Declaration of Independence.

The following primer was conceived and developed by Sigurd S. Larmon, president of Young & Rubicam, Inc., and his associate, Thomas W. Lapham, and appeared in the July 4, 1954, edition of the Brooklyn Eagle.

I believe it to be must reading for all Americans:

You live in the United States of America. You are an American.

Real Americans like their country. They are proud of it. They think it is a good place to live in. And they want to keep it good—to keep it getting better all the time.

Why is America the way it is? What makes it a good place to live. The answer is simply this:

Throughout our history most Americans have believed that every person has certain rights and duties and responsibilities.

Americans have believed that there are certain things that people should do, and other things they should not do.

They have also believed in certain things that people are, and are not.

These things that people believe are called principles. This text is an attempt to state the principles of America in simple, primer fashion so that you can understand them, learn them, and remember them.

This is important. It was because earlier Americans believed in these principles and guided their lives by them, that America has grown to be the good place it is.

If all of us learn and remember these principles—if we also guide our lives by them—then we can help to keep America growing better, and better, and better.

And if we follow these principles of America, we can help to make the world a better place to live in, too.

The principles of America are these:

1. Each person is of importance and value as an individual.

This is the cornerstone, the foundation of all our other beliefs in a person's right to live his own life, to speak for himself, to choose and change his leaders.

From it comes our hatred of those "isms" under which the individual has no value or importance as a person, but is only one of many unimportant people who have to live the way their leaders tell them to.

Coming directly from that first principle are two other principles that are also part of the foundation of Americanism:

2. We believe that all men should enjoy personal freedom.

3. We believe that all men are created equal.

It is worth noting that the Declaration of Independence expressed the belief that "all men are created equal." It did not state or imply a belief that men develop equally or have equal ability, or that they should ever be forced to an exact equality of thought, speech, or material possessions.

That would be equality without freedom. Americans have always believed the two should go together.

From the days of the Declaration of Independence and the writing of the Constitution, Americans have known tht even though life, liberty, and other inalienable rights are granted to man by his Creator, they require some protection by man himself.

So in our Constitution and in other laws of our land there are set down principles to protect the rights and freedom and equality of individuals. And these principles play an important part in keeping America a good place in which to live.

4. The right to freedom of speech. This includes freedom of the press, of radio, of motion pictures, of every means by which man may express his thoughts on any subject.

5. The right to freedom of assembly. As we believe in the right of individual action, so we believe that individuals should be free to act together for the benefit of all. This is democracy.

6. The right to freedom of worship. Not only is the individual free to worship as he will, but religions themselves are free and equal, regardless of their size or their beliefs.

7. The right to security of person and property. Not just one, but three amendments to the Constitution (4th, 5th, and 14th) protect against illegal search and seizure, or loss of life, liberty, or property, without "due process of law."

8. The right to equal protection before the law. As individuals are equally important, so laws must apply equally to all, without special privileges for any particular individuals or groups.

9. The right to freedom from slavery. This includes "the right to quit," for no individual may be forced to work for another.

10. The right to petition the Government. The legally guaranteed right of the individual to "petition the Government for redress of grievances" is evidence of the American belief that government is the servant, not the master, of the people.

11. The right to vote for people of your choice. This is the individual's most potent weapon in the protection of his rights and freedoms * * * a weapon that to be effective must be constantly and wisely used.

The principles of America hold that every man has—

12. The right to a good education.

13. The right to live where he pleases.

14. The right to work where he wants to.

15. The right to join and belong to an organization.

16. The right to own property.

17. The right to start his own business.

18. The right to manage his own affairs.

19. The right to make a profit or to fail, depending on his own ability.

There are other, similar rights of individual action which are principles of America, but all of these individual rights may be combined in these two broad principles.

20. Every man is entitled to freedom and equality of opportunity.

21. Every man may earn his living when, where, and how he wants to.

There are also limiting principles. Principles of individual freedom sometimes clash with those of individual equality. Therefore our rights as individuals must be lmited, and those limitatons are themselves principles.

22. The rights of any individual shall not interfere with the equal rights of other individuals. Your right to swing your arms stops where the other fellow's nose starts.

23. The rights of any individual shall not interfere with the welfare of the people as a whole. Freedom of speech does not give the individual the right to shout fire in a crowded theater.

24. Every individual owes obedience to the laws under which he lives. The individual has the right to talk against a law, to work and vote to change that law, but not to disobey that law.

Principles that are patterns of behavior: Many of our principles of individual freedom and equality are guaranteed to us by law.

But we have other beliefs, other general rules of action and conduct that have grown to the status of principles. They have stood the test of time. They have worked. They have become a basic part of the way we live and of the way we look at things.

These principles, too, are foundations of Americanism. They are as true, if not more true, today than they were in 1850 or 1750.

If America stays free, they will still hold true in 2050.

25. Every man shall be judged by his own record. A man's family background, his race, or his religion, is not as important as what that man himself can do, for Americans believe a man must stand on his own feet.

26. Every man is free to achieve as much as he can. We believe that where any boy may become President, where any man may achieve greatness, there is the greatest incentive for every man to do his best.

27. To achieve anything, a man should be willing to work. Americans have always known that you don't get something for nothing, that to get anything takes a willingness to work and to work hard.

28. Achievement also depends upon the ability to do a good job. Add to "willingness to work" the ability to produce results and the combination is the basis for most individual achievement in our country.

29. Every man has the right to a fair share of the results of his work and his ability. Because of this belief, America has not only produced more goods, but they have been more fairly and more widely shared by more people than in any other country.

30. Security is the ability of a man to provide for himself. The only true security for any individual is the opportunity, the ability, and the determination to work and plan and save for his own present and future. Self-reliance is vital to individual independence and personal freedom. No man can be "proud and free" who depends on others for his security.

31. When an individual cannot provide his own security, the responsibility should be assumed by others. We believe that no one should starve, or be without adequate clothing and shelter, so those who have more than their basic needs share the responsibility of providing the essentials of security for those who need help.

32. Every individual must deal fairly with other individuals. Honesty, fairness, and personal integrity are virtues that help free and independent individuals get along with each other without losing their independence.

33. Fair and free competition is a good thing. Americans have always believed that competition among individuals or groups encourages greater effort which in turn bring greater benefits to all.

34. Cooperation among individuals is vitally important. President Eisenhower has said: "The freedom to compete vigorously accompanied by a readiness to cooperate wholeheartedly for the performance of community and national functions, together make our system the most productive on earth."

Principles of individual responsibility: Freedom for individuals carries with it an equal responsibility to use that freedom wisely. Therefore, if we wish to remain free, we must faithfully fulfill our responsibilities as freemen.

35. The individual is responsible for himself and his family. He must protect them and provide for their present and future well-being.

36. The individual has responsibilities to the groups of which he is a part. He must give of his best to his community, his church, his employer, his union, and to every group in which individuals cooperate for their mutual benefit.

37. The individual has responsibilities to his country. He must be an active citizen, interesting himself in local, State and National Government, voting wisely, thinking and speaking and acting to preserve and strengthen freedom, equality, and opportunity for every individual.

38. The individual has responsibilities to the world. Man's horizons have expanded. What happens in the world affects him, and his actions can affect the world. Today, therefore, each man has a responsibility to act and to encourage his country to act, so that freedom and cooperation will be encouraged among the people and the nations of the world.

Most of us are still confident of ourselves and of our country. We do not claim perfection. But we have faith in our ability to move forward, to improve, to grow, to provide more and more individuals with more and more of everything they want and need in life.

If we, the people of the United States, want to have more material benefits, we must believe in and follow these two principles.

39. The only way we can have more is to produce more; and

40. As we produce more, we must make it possible for more and more people to enjoy that which we produce. If we, the people of the United States, want to have a better life, spiritually as well as materially—

41. We must stand firmly for our beliefs, our rights, our principles. Walt Whitman, who once was editor of the Brooklyn Eagle, writing nearly 100 years ago, put it this way:

"There is no week, nor day, nor hour when tyranny may not enter upon this country if the people lose their supreme confidence in themselves. * * *."

There are those who would chip away our confidence so that their special brand of tyranny might creep into America. They must not succeed. So let us ask of every plan, or act, or idea: "Is it with or against the principles of America?"

Ambassador John E. Peurifoy—The Man Who Beat the Reds in Guatemala

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 13, 1954

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the Record, I include the following article from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of July 11, 1954:

AMBASSADOR JOHN E. PEURIFOY—THE MAN WHO BEAT THE REDS IN GUATEMALA

(By Donald Grant)

Historians will be quarreling over the details 20 years from now, but as of today it would appear that what certainly was the most nearly bloodless—if not the first—rollback of communism in history may be credited to a Democrat who was once charged by Senator Joseph R. McCarthy with covering up on communism in the State Department.

The name is John Emil Peurifoy. Up and down the narrow, mountainous and troubled land of Central America he is known as plain Jack Peurifoy.

Almost incidentally he happens to be the United States Ambassador to Guatemala.

Since the job of rolling back communism in the world is only barely begun, and since Jack Peurifoy almost certainly will be playing a prominent part in this titanic task in the future, a close look at the man may be in order. The present report is based on three first-hand opportunities to observe Jack Peurifoy in action—the day he arrived in Guatemala City, last October; just before the Caracas Inter-American conference, last February, and during the revolutions in Guatemala and the subsequent peace negotiations in San Salvador, in recent days. Peurifoy's earlier career also has been studied.

The first step in sizing up Jack Peurifoy is to discard all previous notions of what an ambassador is like.

Think rather of a barrel-chested man of medium height with black hair graying around the temples, but looking much younger than his 46 years. Think of this man dressed in a hounds-tooth sports jacket and slacks, wearing an incredibly gaudy necktie, and a bright green velour hat. Remember that when his jacket is parted a shoulder holster and an automatic pistol is seen bulging from his armpit.

Then put him in the setting of Guatemala City; bombings and blackout. Blackout consists of a Communist henchman pulling the main switch at the powerplant. Then when any candlelight shows at a window or a figure moves on the street a Communist "people's army" guard shoots first and never gets around to asking questions. Intermittent gunfire is heard all night, and the angry whine of bullets ricocheting in the streets.

The night after I arrived in Guatemala City I was caught in the blackout alone with Jack Peurifoy in his office in the United States Embassy. We talked in the dark for maybe 20 minutes. Then Peurifoy grew restless.

"To hell with the blackout," he said. "I want a drink."

The two of us alone groped our way out of the Embassy, barking our shins on chairs, bumping into tables. Outside, the streets were deserted save for distant skulking figures, and quiet except for the occasional rip of a submachine gun.

Only taking the precaution to unbutton his jacket so his pistol would be handy, Peurifoy walked boldly the half block to the American Club. It was locked and appeared deserted, but he pounded on the door until it was opened.

Jack Peurifoy got his drink, and a sandwich.

Ambassador Peurifoy is a man of unlimited courage, a cool head, a clear understanding of the realities and the subtleties of power and the inborn instincts of a master politician in handling people and delicate situations.

He understands that in managing the affairs of men there are only two tools available—force and persuasion. He is not afraid to face squarely the moral dilemma presented to democratic men in this second half of the 20th century: Should we refrain from all force to stop communism, or should we be willing to use force, an evil in itself, to prevent the greater evil of Communist world domination?

By using a maximum of persuasion, Peurifoy believes a minimum of force may do the job. But he is willing to use force when needful, accepting the lesser of the evils.

He believes we may do this and retain our integrity provided we acknowledge frankly to ourselves what we are doing, and provided we keep clearly in mind the ends we serve; the welfare of individual human beings all over the world.

When Peurifoy's secretary came to work for him at the State Department, where Jack Peurifoy had just been named Deputy Under Secretary of State, back in 1947, she had occasion to find out whose side her boss was on the very first day. The telephone rang, and the voice of a poorly educated Negro asked to talk to Secretary Peurifoy.

Miss Frances P. Burton, who is still Peurifoy's secretary, wasn't sure what to do. She went into the inner office and asked her boss.

"We might as well get this straight at the outset," Jack Peurifoy told her. "The big guys can take care of themselves. I'm for the little guys. Put this man on my phone."

Jack Peurifoy has been a little guy most of his life. He grew up in Waterboro, S. C., then a town of about 1,800 population, a sleepy southern village with live oak trees hung with Spanish moss, frame houses, dusty streets. "Sonny Boy" Peurifoy was the orphan kid who grew up somehow, first in one house and then another. His family had been prominent—Norman English, Colonial American—but his mother had died when he was 6 years old, his father before he was 18, after a long illness: Tuberculosis.

"Sonny Boy" started reading the Congressional Record every day at the age of 12 and his ambition was to be a lawyer and run for Congress, but he had to cut his coat to fit the cloth. There wasn't any money for a legal education. The best he could manage was an appointment to West Point—political pull—and he stuck that out for 2 years, only to be invalidated out with pneumonia and a lung spot.

There followed a series of whatever jobs he could pick up. He was a stock clerk in Kansas City, an assistant cashier in a Child's restaurant in New York, and several other things, none of them likely to lead to a diplomatic post.

There was a depression on and Jack Peurifoy was in it. After Franklin D. Roosevelt was elected, Peurifoy went to Washington to try his political pull again. He succeeded in getting a job operating an elevator in the Senate Office Building. Odd times he shoveled snow off the sidewalks in Georgetown.

Nights he attended classes at George Washington and American Universities in Washington. He had his eye on the State Department, for reasons that even now he can't quite explain. He just wanted to be a diplomat.

By 1936 he found a job in the Treasury Department, met a pretty little blue-eyed Government girl named Betty Jane Cox, at a cocktail party, and married her. Then his job was abolished. Jack and Mary Jane Peurifoy both got jobs in a Washington department store.

As he looks back on his career the turning point seems to be October 1, 1938, when Jack Peurifoy finally landed a job in the State Department—as a $2,000-a-year clerk. Eight years later he was Assistant Secretary of State.

You don't go up that fast without making enemies. Jack Peurifoy has his full quota. He tries hard to conceal the cocky confidence that comes so naturally to him, but doesn't always succeed in doing so. Furthermore, President Truman once gave him the job of "desnobbing the State Department." That meant pulling the old school ties off the collars of the blueblooded Foreign Service.

"What a pity," said one of the Foreign Service officers after an interview with Peurifoy, "that the elevator boy from the Senate Office Building is now running the State Department."

Jack Peurifoy has never, in fact, run the State Department, though this is a detail the future may well take care of. Meanwhile, he organized the setup for the San Francisco Conference and made a few friends. Among them was Earl Warren, now Chief Justice of the United States Supreme Court, whose first official act was to swear in Jack Peurifoy as Ambassador to Guatemala.

Before that came Greece. "Butcher of Greece," was the official Communist title awarded Peurifoy on his arrival in Guatemala City. In fact, the shooting was over and the Greek Communist guerrillas on the run when Peurifoy arrived as Ambassador at Athens in 1950. All he did was to stop an intramural warfare between various United States agencies in Greece and reorganize the Greek Government to exclude Communist influence.

At the residence of the United States Ambassador in Guatemala City a large painting of John E. Peurifoy hangs over the fireplace. On one wall is a photograph of His Holiness, Pope Pius XII, appropriately inscribed to Protestant Jack Peurifoy, of South Carolina.

On a small table are inscribed photographs of a member of the Greek royal family and Field Marshal Alexander Papagos, Prime Minister of Greece. The member of the royal family was not uninvolved in the fact that Papagos became Prime Minister, and it is an open secret that Jack Peurifoy was in Athens at that moment. As he looks at the two framed photographs he cannot avoid a nostalgic smile.

Mrs. Peurifoy's picture is not in sight, but she is—a pretty little girl from Little Rock, Ark., still, though 42 years old. Somewhere around is their son, Daniel Byrd Peurifoy, 8 years old, skipping barefoot over the tile floors of the Embassy residence. Another son, John Clinton Peurifoy, 13 is with grandparents in Tulsa, Okla.

Lately Jack Peurifoy has taken up golf. His favorite dinner is fried chicken and rice, and he tends to eat too much for his figure, though the crises in Guatemala City helped that; he lost 23 pounds.

At Embassy staff meetings Peurifoy likes to have people speak up when they disagree with him, though he doesn't necessarily change his mind. He knows what he wants and usually gets it.

When the revolutions were over in Guatemala City, and a non-Communist government fairly safely installed in the palace, Jack Peurifoy got what he wanted: a personal telephone call of congratulations from Secretary of State John Foster Dulles.

How the job was done in Guatemala has been described by this writer in some detail. It was a combination of force and diplomacy—and a leaf or two out of a few dusty old books, including the Prince, by Niccolo Machiavelli and the Seven Pillars of Wisdom, by T. E. Lawrence: Lawrence of Arabia.

When Jack Peurifoy arrived last October he was under instructions to figure out how to break the power of communism in Guatemala. Some 6 weeks later he had a plan all drawn up and sent it to Under Secretary of State Walter Bedell Smith, who in turn took it to President Eisenhower in the White House.

That report recorded, among other things, Peurifoy's conviction that former President Arbenz, of Guatemala, was a Communist—that the government was not only a Communist-influenced government but was a completely Communist-dominated Government. That conviction, it can now be revealed, was based in part on a personal admission by Arbenz to Peurifoy that he, Arbenz, was a Communist, and on the interception of correspondence verifying that admission. Arbenz had a Communist code number—No. 44.

What happened in Washington after President Eisenhower read Peurifoy's report this writer is in no position to know. In Guatemala, however, the wheels began to turn, visibly.

"Washington gave me everything I wanted," was Peurifoy's comment, and he is grateful.

A great many people were involved before the power of communism in Guatemala finally was broken, of course, including a man named Carlos Castillo Armas, leader of the rebel forces invading from Honduras. At the decisive moments, however, it was the personality of Jack Peurifoy which was dominant.

"It is my rule," says Jack Peurifoy, "to speak firmly and frankly and in simple language—and never give up."

Three times in Guatemala City, during the crisis, Jack Peurifoy saw his whole plan collapse. Everyone was exhausted, from tension and lack of sleep. Three times Peurifoy picked up the pieces, forgot sleep and didn't give up.

The first time was when Arbenz fell—but Col. Carlos Enrique Diaz announced he would carry on for Arbenz.

"O. K.," said Peurifoy, pounding the table with his big fist. "Now I'll have to crack down on that s. o. b."

The second time was when the Diaz junta cooperated with the Communist attempt to establish a guerrilla warfare headquarters in one of the Guatemalan provinces, and had to be replaced with a new junta. This writer was not present at that moment, but later Peurifoy's wife said all she knew was that "Jack seemed to be getting ready for a trip through the mountains. He didn't tell me what he was up to, and I didn't ask."

Peurifoy refused to explain. "As it turned out," he said, only, "what I might have had to do wasn't necessary."

It wasn't necessary because the new junta was formed when a group of young Guatemalan officers took matters in their own hands and ousted the old junta while Peurifoy literally stood in the middle, between their opposed submachine guns.

The third time the Peurifoy plan collapsed was when the genuinely anti-Communist junta attempted to negotiate in San Salvador with Castillo Armas, and negotiations broke down on Castillo's demands for all power.

President Oscar Osorio of El Salvador prevented Castillo's return to the front to resume the war until Peurifoy could fly to San Salvador.

"President Osorio," says Peurifoy, "played a major role in bringing about agreement."

Col. Vernon Martin, United States attaché at the Embassy in Guatemala, who was present, has a slightly different version: "It was the force of one man's personality that got the job done—and that man's name is Jack Peurifoy."

Which returns us to the matter of force—and persuasion. Whatever the final total of dead and wounded in the battle for Guatemala, it was the smallest fraction of the cost if Guatemala had been allowed to drift into another Korea or Indochina. The power of communism was broken with a minimum of human suffering.

It is true, of course, that behind Jack Peurifoy's persuasive voice stood the power of the United States—the greatest single aggregate of power in the world. That that physical power was so little used is a measure of Jack Peurifoy's power of persuasion; diplomacy, no matter how unorthodox, was indeed a substitute for force in Guatemala.

Back in 1950, Jack Peurifoy was in charge of State Department organization when Senator McCarthy, at Wheeling, W. Va., accused the Department of harboring 205 Communists. Peurifoy sent McCarthy a wire challenging him to name the Communists. Instead of replying, McCarthy started a series of attacks on Peurifoy—directly and indirectly attempting to discredit him with slurring phrases.

If Senator McCarthy had succeeded, Peurifoy's skill in the fight against communism would not have been available in 1954. And even with that consummate skill the victory in Guatemala was by the narrowest of margins.

Not only were United States forces in the vicinity alerted, but Peurifoy had the very tough decision to make—minute by minute—whether to call for them, and for the evacuation of American women and children from Guatemala, should the use of really formidable force against the Communist government there be necessary. An airlift for this purpose was kept in readiness in Panama all during the crisis.

You can call it a gamble, if you like, but Jack Peurifoy won, and the free world won the first battle against communism in Guatemala. Not the last battle. That, as Washington correspondent Marquis W. Childs points out in an adjoining column, is a battle for the well-being and ultimately for the minds of men in all Latin America and elsewhere in the underdeveloped areas of the world.

A Step in the Right Direction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 1, 1954

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to direct the attention of our colleagues to the following article which appeared in the June 29, 1954, issue of the American Banker:

A STEP IN THE RIGHT DIRECTION

The coming narrowing of the percentage spread between central Reserve city and Reserve city banks' required reserve ratios is a change in what New York City bankers seem to have decided is the right direction. But patently they were hoping for a still better break, for the new schedule of required reserves still puts them at a disadvantage of 2 percentage points behind the Reserve city banks.

The Reserve Board's schedule of reductions in the reserve requirements of member banks will drop the New York and Chicago "central Reserve city" banks' ratios to be sterilized from 22 to 20 percent on demand deposits, while the Reserve city banks' required reserve percentages are cut from 19 to 18 percent.

For that 1-percent narrowing of the gap, shareholders—and depositors, for that matter—in New York banks can be duly thankful, we suppose. It will desterilize about $425 million of the now idle funds of the New York banks and permit them to be converted into earning assets.

We mentioned depositors in this connection because about a month ago at their convention, New York bankers seriously discussed resort to higher service charges as a solution to the problem of increasing expenses of operation and still depressed net earnings. If banks can get more of their depositors' funds into income-producing assets, the pressure for hiking service charges on depositors will be lessened. It is a strange commentary on our banking system that 22 percent of a depositor's checking-account balance has to be kept idle and unproductive for both the bank and him because, in ultimate fact, the Federal Reserve authorities bought too much United States Government paper in supporting the markets for Treasury securities, and have had to freeze up the excess dollars in so-called reserves deposited by their member banks. But the volume of banking activity, the Federal Deposit Insurance assessments, and other operating costs entailed by overswollen deposit funds cannot be kept from inflating member banks' operating costs.

Some small recognition of this aspect of the member banks' problem may be involved in the recent reserve requirement percentage reductions, and the narrowing of the differential between the New York-Chicago banks' burden of idle funds as central Reserve city banks, and the lesser burden which banks in the 50 Reserve cities must tote. However, the inequity is still there, although lessened in degree in that 20 percent less 18 percent leaves only 2 percentage points. Two percentage points, however, represent 10 percent more idle funds in the central Reserve city banks' reserves than is required from the Reserve city banks. We do not believe that in recent years any Federal Reserve spokesman has tried to justify the heavier burden of reserves required from New York and Chicago banks. The law mentions central Reserve city banks, and so these two cities had to be it.

The basic inequities of the reserve requirement situation remain unchanged. We still need legislation which will put interbank deposits on the same reserve basis regardless of geographical location, and give similar treatment to all city banks to demand deposit reserves.

Farm Kibitzing: Federal Advisers Will Offer Individual Farmer Master Plan for Living

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 13, 1954

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, the apostles of freedom for the farmers, after about 18 months putting around have at last forged the chains of slavery with which they will shackle the farmers of the Nation. The "Big Boss Benson" has screamed loud and long about the regimentation and the control of American farmers. Now he is laying on the lash of control, the like of which we have never known before. By one order he has made himself the czar and commissar of every farm in this fair land. His self-made plan for dealing with diverted acres enables him to exercise full and complete control over every acre of American farmland on which the basic agricultural commodities are produced. If any commodity produced on a diverted acre is marketed either directly or indirectly, the farmer will lose all price supports and loan benefits.

So Benson has the farmer in bondage. Even if a farmer has many acres of diverted land, he cannot experiment in an effort to establish a diversified program for his farm. Just what can a farmer do with his diverted acres? Here is Mr. Benson's answer: He can permit it to remain idle; he may summer fallow it; or he may plant it in pasture, hay, cover crops, or green manure. That is all the farmer may do with his diverted acreage. And Benson is exercising this drastic control of American agriculture by an unwarranted interpretation of the intent of Congress. He has read into the law the authority he desires to exercise. To cross compliance he has added total acreage allotment. There is nothing in the law about total acreage allotment. There is nothing in the law about cross compliance. Again I repeat: Benson is bouncing farmers into bankruptcy.

Mr. Speaker, I call attention to a very interesting article which appeared in the Wall Street Journal, on page 1, on July 9, 1954, which follows:

Farm Kibitzing: Federal Advisers Will Offer Individual Farmer Master Plan for Living—They Will Cover Fertilizer Use, Pest Killing, Bookkeeping, Even Raising Children—One Aim: Curb Overplanting

(By Lester Tanzer)

Washington.—Federal farm boss Benson has whipped up a new kind of Federal aid program for farmers. The key ingredient is not taxpayers' dollars but advice—on every subject from irrigation to raising children.

The Republican Secretary of Agriculture thinks mechanical contraptions, soil conservation, insecticides, Federal price supports and planting restrictions have overly complicated rural living. What the modern-day farmer needs, he figures, is a complete master plan, worked out down to the last detail for each farmer with the help of a Government agent dispatched to his doorstep.

SPREADING THE GOSPEL

Sometime this summer Mr. Benson will pass the word for hundreds of Agriculture Department agents to set out in scattered parts of the country, spreading the gospel of planned farming. Precise details have not been worked out. But the outlines of the scheme—billed as a dynamic new program—are contained in a confidential document currently circulating in upper echelons of the Agriculture Department. Officials say the idea is this:

A Government man will call on farmers at their homes, and offer to work out a carefully planned system of farming for the entire farm unit. The whole idea is voluntary; if farmers accept, they will start, with the help of the Government agent, to make a complete inventory of their resources—land, money, and manpower.

They will consider, too, all the off-farm influences, such as national price support programs, the economic outlook in the United States and abroad, export trends. Then they will make up a plan, setting goals not only for farm output but also for family satisfactions.

REDECORATING ANSWERS

The plan will aim to include answers to questions like these: What crops to plant and in what quantity; what fertilizer to use; how to deal with farm pests; what repairs to make on farm buildings or machinery, and how to raise the necessary money; to to keep books and pay taxes; how much profit a farmer should make to be able to afford to redecorate the front parlor or buy a television set or a new refrigerator.

The aim, according to the outline drawn up by Mr. Benson's aides, is a plan "through which the farm family can coordinate the use of various farm and home practices to achieve efficient production, high net income, the improvement of soil productivity, and better living conditions for the entire farm family."

If this sounds like more Federal meddling in rural affairs, the aim is professed to be just the opposite. Mr. Benson's real objective is to hasten the day when farmers will be able to get along without so much Federal price-support aid and without stringent planting curbs. He favors a gradual trimming of price-support levels and increasingly tighter planting controls until record farm gluts have begun to shrink. Meantime, the idea is that if farmers do their planning with a Government expert looking over their shoulder they'll be less likely to overplant crops already in abundance.

This basic aim, officials argue, requires broader planning than it implies. Thus an agent might advise a farmer to shift land from barley to tomatoes if he wants to make enough money to buy the freezer his wife is pleading for. Raising tomatoes, the agent might add, might mean making junior work on the farm in the summer instead of taking a job in town.

Going a bit further, some of the new agents will be women, who are expected to give tips on latest developments in child psychology. They'll also encourage participation in 4-H Club activities.

A MODEST START

The program will begin on a modest scale. To finance it for the fiscal year that started last week, Mr. Benson wrung an extra $8.3 million from Congress in appropriations for the Agricultural Extension Service, a farmer-education program run jointly by the Federal Government and State farm agencies. Working through the extension setup, Mr. Benson will use the extra money to hire 1,000 new county agents and about two dozen Washington policymakers to push the planned-farming scheme.

With this task force, Mr. Benson guesses he'll reach only a fraction of the farming population. But if the plan is successful, he's prepared to ask Congress next year for more money to expand his efforts. Also, the 1,000 new agents will be busy indoctrinating the 12,500 county agents now on the Federal-State payroll so that they, too, can push "farm planning."

The new agents will be divided up among ties" with enough agents to reach every the States. It will be up to each State to decide how they'll be used. Some States may decide to blanket a couple of "pilot coun- farmer that's interested in farm planning. Others may decide to distribute a few "farm plan" salesmen in each county to work with a handful of farmers.

PAMPHLETS, RADIO, TV

Dispensing advice to farmers is not, of course, a new chore for the Agriculture Department. The Extension Service uses pamphlets, radio, and television, and group meetings to bring to rural folk all kinds of information on farm matters, most of it gathered by Agriculture Department researchers and experts at land-grant colleges throughout the country. This service is paid for partly by the Federal Government, partly by the States, and partly by counties.

The trouble with all this, as Mr. Benson sees it, is that it's too indirect and impersonal. He argues, too, that the present setup covers only special topics, without attempting to wrap up all the problems of running a farm into one neat package. That's the aim of the new program for "complete farm and home development," as it's referred to in the policy document now making the rounds of Agriculture Department offices.

The Department plans to go right on for a while "educating" farmers through mass media like radio and group discussions. But after a year or so, the idea is to shift toward ever-greater emphasis on the personal approach now about to begin.

FAMILY FARM THE TARGET

The Department's new program is designed primarily for family farms, those on which the family does the major share of work. Family farms make up the big majority of the 5.5 million farms in the country and turn out over 70 percent of all the agricultural goods sold. The outline of the new program notes:

"On a family farm, the farm business and the home are inseparable. Decisions made on the farm must consider both the effect on the farm operations and on the farm family. This is not true for most other types of business. It is for this reason that the farmer and his family must plan together."

Mr. Benson's aides are sure their scheme will work. It's been tried experimentally in a couple of States with success. A study made in Vermont, according to the Department, showed the income of a dozen farms with intensive Government planning aid was triple that of 12 farms that operated without master plans.

Will farmers accept Mr. Benson's offer? The Department expects a heap of resistance from individual farmers. One farm expert claims the people who have usually gone in for Federal help in a big way are those who have been most amenable to Government suggestions. It's the more conservative rural citizens the Department hopes to reach with its new project.

Mr. Benson isn't inclined to force any scheme down farmers' throats. So his minions have orders to go about their business with some degree of sublety. The Federal planners offer this advice to the agents: "Stress in all activities the relationship of what is being presented to the other decisions and activities relating to the individual farm and home situation, and the interdependence of each decision and action on all the others."

Dr. Billy Graham

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALTON A. LENNON

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 13, 1954

Mr. LENNON. Mr. President, many of my colleagues are personally acquainted with Dr. Billy Graham. He is a native of North Carolina and makes his home in the beautiful mountains of my State. The Charlotte News of July 10, 1954, published a fitting editorial to Billy Graham entitled "Able Ambassador of God and Country." I ask unanimous consent to have this editorial printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Able Ambassador of God and Country

Billy Graham is Charlotte's—probably the State's—best-known native son. In many parts of the world he is a symbol of America, of an integral part of America that many foreigners had not known about before he achieved international stature. It is not that facet of this country represented by the tourist, the GI, or the diplomat. Rather, he is an embodiment of the enduring, upright, God-fearing qualities that have given this Nation one of its greatest sources of strength.

Raised in a Christian home, Billy Graham has gone out from his native land to become an able and articulate ambassador for his God and his country, retaining the while his modesty and proportionate sense of values despite the glare of publicity. He has been the vehicle of a considerable spiritual awakening in Europe, and has helped to instill in high places in Washington, as well as the hinterland, a renewed awareness of the eternal and everlasting.

We welcome him home, and wish him well as he rests before again taking up the burden he has accepted and is carrying so well.

Statement by Allen Called Misleading

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 13, 1954

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Memphis Commercial Appeal of July 5, 1954:

STATEMENT BY ALLEN CALLED MISLEADING—WEST MEMPHIAN CITES REPORTS ON FLY ASH—EDITORIALS ARE OPPOSED

(By James Moore)

WEST MEMPHIS, July 4.—W. K. Ingram, president of the West Memphis Industrial Council and the Chamber of Commerce, said Sunday he is still concerned lest the public be misled by statements made recently about the amount of fly ash a proposed steam generating plant here would emit.

INTEGRITY NOT QUESTIONED

"Maj. Thomas H. Allen, president of the Memphis Light, Gas and Water Division, has predicted that 79 tons of fly ash would fall on Memphis and West Memphis daily from the plant which would be constructed 2½ miles south of West Memphis and about 5½ miles southwest of the Memphis Arkansas Bridge," Mr. Ingram said.

Mr. Ingram said, "We are not questioning the integrity of Major Allen as an engineer but when he issued the statement that 79 tons of fly ash would fall on the two cities we believe he made a mistake in his calculations.

"Having had no experience with steam generating plants we consulted with city engineers in Birmingham and St. Louis, both of which use huge quantities of coal, to get their opinions about fly ash. We were told that neither city is troubled by the ash because of modern methods being employed to arrest the ash at its source.

"To investigate further we consulted with the Coal Producers Committee for smoke abatement with offices in Cincinnati and who maintain laboratories for studies of smoke abatement. We supplied all available figures on the plant.

H. B. Lemmers, chairman of the committee, said in answer to the request:

"I believe I can give you complete assurance that if you design the plant properly including the necessary auxiliaries with which most modern plants are presently equipped your powerplant can operate in any area without committing a nuisance. As a matter of fact your plant can operate with such a clear stack that it will be extremely difficult for the ordinary layman to determine whether the plant is operating or idle.

SINCERE INTEREST

"Our industry has a very sincere interest in this problem since we recognize that we have an obligation to the community and the people in these communities which buy and use our fuel. We can therefore say because of our experience in this field that equipment is presently available that can remove 95 to 100 percent of the fly ash entering the stack. This is brought about by improved auxiliaries, by improved stack design as well as by correct operation but primarily by the installation of collectors which are extremely efficient.

"If, in your plant, such collection equipment and auxiliaries were installed I question whether the city of Memphis will even know that your plant was operating."

Mr. Ingram said the same figures were supplied to engineers of Babcock & Wilcox, of St. Louis, a firm that manufacturs boilers that are used in the type plant to be built here.

Mr. Ingram said, "Ebasco officials, whose company probably will get the contract to build the plant, have assured us every modern facility will be incorporated in the plant to prevent any abnormal flow of fly ash or sulfur dioxide."

Mr. Ingram said the Commercial Appeal did not print certain pertinent statements made by President Eisenhower last Thursday when the President defended his action in ordering the Atomic Energy Commission to negotiate a contract with private utility firms to supply power to the Tennessee Valley Authority was not in keeping with previous policies of the newspaper."

PARAGRAPHS CITED

Mr. Ingram said an Associated Press story carried two paragraphs which he said were not in the Commercial Appeal story.

The paragraphs read as follows:

"Mr. Eisenhower said he had heard complaints from other States that the Government was taking their taxes, building up cheap power in the Tennessee Valley, and enticing their industries away.

"Maybe," he said, "the Government should be building the Missouri River or some other project."

In attacking editorials appearing in the Commercial Appeal recently, Mr. Ingram said: "We of West Memphis have no quarrel with the people of Memphis as we are a part of the greater metropolitan area of Memphis, but feel the citizens of the Memphis territory have not been presented true facts. We feel the plant will benefit both cities in future industrial development and think most Memphians would share our view if properly informed.

"An illustration of the biased attitude of the Commercial Appeal may be found in last Friday's editorials," Mr. Ingram said. "In adjoining paragraphs the newspaper advised the President to seek advice of others on publicly owned power but stated the advice of one expert (Major Allen) was all they needed in regard to the amount of fly ash and sulfur dioxide that would be emitted from stacks of our plant."

GET MORE INDUSTRIES

Mr. Ingram continued: "It is interesting to note that the newspaper did not editorially oppose a private plant proposal for Tennessee made to the AEC by Lucius Burch, of Memphis, and his eastern associates, and we are pleased to know that the AEC had foresight to investigate Mr. Burch's syndicate and turn it down because of the lack of an organization and for other inabilities to build such a plant."

Mr. Ingram said: "We disagree with the theory expressed in an editorial in Saturday's issue of the Commercial Appeal implying that West Memphis would feel the effects of an exhausted $20 million payroll when the plant is completed. We expect to overcome that depression by securing additional industries which the plant will attract."

Down the Home Stretch

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 24, 1954

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial which appeared in the July 7, 1954, edition of the New York Times is most interesting. I commend it to the attention of our colleagues:

DOWN THE HOME STRETCH

With a month, more or less, to go, Congress still has time to complete a modest legislative record despite all the delays and digressions that this session has produced. The regular appropriation bills were out of the way by the beginning of the new fiscal year, which, in view of the history of the last few Congresses, is itself no mean achievement. Now the remaining weeks of the session afford an opportunity for this 83d Congress to end its labors with a sense of accomplishment if not in a blaze of glory.

The record of the present Congress is the record on which the Eisenhower administration has said the Republicans must stand or fall in the November elections. That record must be judged against the program of the administration, and viewed in this light it is a mixed record thus far. The President has obtained and is likely to obtain a good deal less than he asked for, which is certainly no novel experience for Presidents; but he has also obtained or seems likely to obtain somewhat more than many observers had anticipated a few weeks ago. Still with more adept and more aggressive leadership on his own part and that of his party leaders he would probably have come much closer to the bullseye than is now possible.

The principal items of the President's program that have actually become law are the St. Lawrence seaway, the Korean defense pact, Federal aid to highways, continuation of certain excise taxes (though modified by an unwanted reduction in others) and extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act (though in much simpler and more abbreviated form than originally proposed—but not fought for—by the Administration). The principal items that have been specifically rejected are revision of the Taft-Hartley Act and a constitutional amendment to lower the voting age to 18.

The record of this Congress will be written even more clearly in the legislation that is now nearing its final form. This includes the highly controversial bills on tax revision, housing, and farm policy. The first of these is now in conference with a major administration provision to alleviate double taxation on corporation dividends in dispute. The housing bill was sent to conference almost 3 weeks ago, where it still rests with the administration proposal for 35,000 new public housing units a year hanging in the balance against the House preference for none at all. In the debate over the crucially important farm issue in the House the administration again felt it necessary to compromise, but it did manage to retain the principle of flexible support prices. It remains to be seen what the outcome will be in the Senate.

Two other important issues are also nearing completion but are not likely to run into much controversy now. They are extension of social security coverage, which has already sailed through the House (with only two Republicans opposed—shades of the thirties) and the foreign-aid bill, which has also passed the House by a heavy majority. Despite the recent threats of the so-called majority leader, it is difficult to believe that the Senate would now cripple the foreign-aid bill with restrictive amendments designed to tie the hands of the President at this critical juncture in international affairs.

Of legislation that ought to be enacted at this session, Hawaiian and Alaskan statehood is the outstanding example. Revision of the Atomic Energy Act is desirable, but it is doubtful that the proposed relaxation of regulations for exchange of atomic information will be approved. The effort to smooth the way toward private commercial development of atomic power has a better chance.

Various antisubversive bills are under consideration, including some of extremely doubtful value. It is important that each of these bills be given careful study and that none of them be rushed through in the closing days of the session without adequate consideration or without debate. It simply will not do for Congress blindly to pass any legislation so long as it is labeled "anti-Communist"; and the action of the House in insisting—over the Attorney General's protest—on judicial safeguards for the wiretapping bill it passed in April is a hopeful omen that Congress will not be stampeded out of a careful consideration of civil rights.

And as long as the session lasts there will be a chance that the Senate, at least, may adopt general and uniform rules of procedure for the conduct of its own committees. If the session that is now drawing to an end has proved nothing else, it has demonstrated that each House of Congress has a responsibility for its committees, a responsibility that can be neither hidden nor evaded in the coming elections.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

Code of Laws of the United States

Title 44, Section 181. Congressional Record; arrangement, style, contents, and indexes.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the Congressional Record, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the Congressional Record semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

Title 44, Section 182b. Same; illustrations, maps, diagrams.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the Record without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the Congressional Record the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily Record as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided,* That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the Record with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the official reporters of the Congressional Record, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the Record shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the Record issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the Record for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the Record of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the Record shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the Record style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the Record.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the Congressional Record any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix, but this rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the Congressional Record.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the Congressional Record Appendix the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed.

10. *Official reporters.*—The official reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the Congressional Record by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this restriction shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. The Public Printer or the official reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the Congressional Record which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Illustrations.*—Pursuant to section 182b, title 44, United States Code (as shown above), requests for authority to insert an illustration in the Record should be submitted to the Joint Committee on Printing through the chairman of the Committee on Printing of the respective House in which the speech desired to be illustrated may be delivered. Illustrations shall not exceed in size a page of the Record and shall be linecuts only. Copy for illustrations must be furnished to the Public Printer not later than 12:30 o'clock p. m. of the day preceding publication.

13. *Corrections.*—The permanent Record is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Printing and binding for Congress, when recommended to be done by the Committee on Printing of either House, shall be so recommended in a report containing an approximate estimate of the cost thereof, together with a statement from the Public Printer of estimated approximate cost of work previously ordered by Congress within the fiscal year (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 145, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on Printing, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. The money derived from such sales shall be paid into the Treasury and accounted for in his annual report to Congress, and no sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

Stater
ma
Bef
Bu
We

IN

Mr
to ex
inclu
ward
eral
lect
Hous
July
Yo
comn
"Sma
Comi
Wh
shou
that
the
and
segm
cons
medi
there
not
job
disti
exec
Adm
To
well
and
and
of t
cont
be—
Se
vise
and
dut
bus
con
sho
In
of
ove
"
nor
All
nat
hea
wit
I
sio
cer
sm
est
wit
Th
ag
nit
ne
sm

Appendix

Statement of Edward F. Howrey, Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, Before the Select Committee on Small Business, House of Representatives, Wednesday, July 14, 1954

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM S. HILL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 14, 1954

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement of Edward F. Howrey, Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, before the Select Committee on Small Business, House of Representatives, Wednesday, July 14, 1954:

You have asked us to appear before your committee to discuss the general subject of "Small Business and the Federal Trade Commission."

While it may be stating the obvious, it should, perhaps, be made clear at the outset that our job, as we see it, is to administer the trade-regulation laws vigorously, fairly, and independently, with due regard for all segments of our economy, including the consumer, the small-business man, the medium-sized, and the large. In one sense, therefore, the Federal Trade Commission is not primarily a small-business agency. Our job as a law-enforcement agency is to be distinguished, for example, from that of an executive agency such as the Small Business Administration.

To the extent, however, that there is a well-established public policy of protecting and encouraging small independent business and to the extent that vigorous enforcement of the antitrust and trade-regulation laws contribute to that policy, we are—or should be—a vital small-business agency.

So it is that while the Commission supervises the competitive practices of both small and big business, we are fully aware of our duty to make a special effort to protect small business from predatory practices. We have concluded, in fact, that the Commission should have its own small-business program.

In my first public statement as Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission a little over a year ago, I stated:

"Small business has an essential, economic, and human role in American life. All inequitable handicaps should be eliminated so that small firms may grow in a healthy way and compete more effectively with their bigger competitors."

I proposed at that time that the Commission should establish a division to be concerned exclusively with the problems of small business. As you know, we have now established a Division of Small Business within our new Bureau of Consultation. This strikes us as an appropriate step for an agency like the Commission to take in recognition of the important role of small business in American life. From this Division, small-business men may seek advice and information regarding legal matters under the jurisdiction of the Commission.

The establishment of this Division makes the facilities of the Commission readily accessible to small business. One of the complaints of small business has been the mystery and delay which seems to surround their applications for complaint; they say they drop their complaints in the hopper and never hear from them again unless and until a formal complaint issues or the case is dropped. One of the duties of the small business division is to advise small-business men of the status of investigations in which they are interested. In addition, this new Division will explain to small-business men the method of initiating complaints they wish to make regarding the practices of their competitors and, as I have stated, it will provide special facilities for advising small-business men on the laws administered by the Commission.

The Division of Small Business is a relatively small division but by using the facilities of other units within the Commission we think that it can perform a useful function.

Beyond that, however, there have been numerous other developments during my term as Chairman of the Commission which should be of special interest to this committee. These include:

1. We have recently put into effect a reorganization of the Commission designed to increase greatly our capacity and output and to eliminate delays in our procedures. It represents a strengthening of our organization and a streamlining of our procedures so that we can do more effective work. One of its principal effects should be to cut down delays in the disposition of cases. Certainly the complaining party—who may well be a small-business man—and the respondent, as well as the public, are entitled to decisions in cases without undue delays.

Under this revised organization a new concept, that of the project attorney, is being put into effect. The result will be that responsibility for the progress of a case, from start to finish, will be centralized in one attorney. Also, in order to make better use of our investigative and trial personnel, bureaus of investigation and litigation have been established. An agency of our size, with about 600 employees, cannot afford the luxury of two separate investigative and two separate trial staffs.

2. We have now initiated an integrated compliance program, including as a first step a systematic and selective review of more than 4,000 cease and desist orders, 8,000 stipulation-agreements to cease and desist, and numerous trade-practice rules. This program will be administered under our basic policy of encouraging voluntary compliance with the law, backed by vigorous enforcement measures when necessary.

Our integrated compliance program is an effort to correct a grave deficiency in our operation. We found that with respect to most of its orders, the Commission did not know with any degree of certainty whether or not the respondents have continued to be in substantial compliance. It is an effort to answer the complaints of small-business representatives who found that the promise of relief from unfair competitive acts given by an order to cease and desist has too often proved illusory because of inadequate follow-up. This past softness of the Commission in its program of compliance is contrary to our purpose of bringing about a vigorous and fair enforcement of antitrust and related statutes. The correction of this situation has a high priority in the Commission's current program.

3. The Commission has undertaken a program to improve both the initial decisions of our hearing examiners and those of the Commission itself. We have promised to write an opinon in every case to provide more clear-cut guidance to businessmen and their lawyers. Small-business men, in particular, should welcome informative and readable opinions in which legalistic phraseology will be conspicuous by its absence—opinions which tell them what they may do, as well as what they may not do.

4. We recently revised our rules of practice to encourage more widespread use of our consent settlement procedure. This procedure, when utilized, results in the issuance of a cease and desist order which is just as enforceable as one obtained after protracted litigation. At the same time, the procedure results in considerable saving of time and expense to all concerned with much prompter realization of the relief desired.

5. We recently executed a joint agreement with Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Hobby, defining the respective areas of activity of the Commission and the Food and Drug Administration in the field of food, drug, and cosmetic advertising and labeling. This agreement will avoid needless duplication of effort and expense on the part of the 2 agencies, and serve to prevent businessmen from being harassed simultaneously by 2 agencies over the same subject matter.

6. An advisory committee on cost justification, consisting of accountants, economists, and lawyers representing all viewpoints has been appointed and is now working to determine the feasibility of developing standards of proof and procedures for distribution costing, for adoption by the Commission as guides to businessmen desirous of complying with the Robinson-Patman Act.

In our reorganization we have established a Bureau of Consultation. It is within this Bureau that the Division of Small Business will function. Broadly stated, the purpose of this Bureau is threefold:

1. To act in a cooperative and consultative capacity to business, particularly small business.

2. To give informal advice (but not written advisory opinions) in all kinds of matters involving the laws administered by the Commission.

3. To seek voluntary compliance with such laws by means of conferences, stipulations, trade-practice rules, and other types of informal procedures.

As I have already stated, we are committed to vigorous administration and enforcement of all the laws within our jurisdiction, including the Robinson-Patman Act. But it is important that the Sherman Act, the Federal Trade Commission Act, and the Clayton Act, with its Robinson-Patman amendment, be administered as interrelated expressions of the national antitrust policy—not as separate and conflicting statutes. And the Commission should proceed against hard-core violations instead of depleting its limited resources by pursuing peripheral or borderline test cases. We are not in business to test the limits to which the antitrust laws might be applied or extended. We do not propose to concern ourselves with fringe theories such as conscious price parallel, the mill-net theory, and similar matters. In this connection, the Commission should not seek to nullify the McGuire Act, which has the strong support of small business, by the application of unrealistic legalisms or strained statutory interpretation. This act, as you know, exempts from the operation of the Federal antitrust laws, vertical resale price maintenance contracts which are legal under State fair-trade acts.

As I recently told the Texas State Bar Association, we are not so much concerned with whether we are being harder or softer than previous Commissions as with whether we are being stable, clear-cut and effective. We propose to concentrate our efforts on activities which actually mean something to the public, including that vast segment known as small business.

The Commission recently launched a nationwide investigation of the advertising claims being made by concerns in the health, accident, and hospitalization insurance field. This is the first investigation of its kind that has ever been conducted by a law-enforcement agency. The public interest in the project is almost staggering. Hundreds of letters complaining of the practices employed have been received daily by my office.

Another Commission investigation which has recently received considerable comment relates to the iron and steel scrap industry. The charges here involve restriction of channels of distribution in a basic industry in both domestic and foreign commerce, the effect of restrictions upon the amount, sources, and price of scrap available for the production of steel, exclusive dealing, and mergers.

Several months ago the Commission's Bureau of Economics completed its survey of changes in concentration of manufacturing since 1935. This careful, objective job is described in a 153-page report entitled "Changes in Concentration in Manufacturing, 1935 to 1947 and 1950." It points out that while the number of manufacturing companies increased from 200,000 in 1935 to 300,000 in 1950, the 200 largest companies in 1950 accounted for a larger proportion of the value of product of manufacturing industries in that year than did the 200 largest companies in 1935. At every level, beginning with the top five companies, the largest companies in 1950 were ahead of their counterparts in 1935. A greater gain was made by the second 100 largest companies than the first 100. In individual industries the Commission found increases in some instances, decreases in others, as well as numerous industries in which the level of concentration was substantially unchanged.

These investigations, their nature and scope, fairly well indicate the type of activity I feel the Commission should engage in.

I have stated that the Commission should not extend or formulate new per se doctrines under which certain practices are automatically and conclusively presumed to be violations of law, no proof being needed that competition was or might be unfairly injured.

To the extent, however, that Congress or the courts have defined per se violations, we will, of course, enforce the law. But outside of these areas we feel that it is our job to look at all phases, economic, and legal, of each case and ascertain the amount of public interest and injury to competition from a variety of comparative factors. These factors would include such things as economic usefulness, the degree of competition, the degree of market control, the degree of vertical integration, customer freedom of choice of goods and service, opportunities for small competitors to engage in business and prices and profits.

In the approach that I have outlined here, I think that we are reverting to the role that Congress intended us to perform. It must be kept in mind that the Commission was established to supplement the work of the Department of Justice and the courts under the Sherman Act. It was meant to practice preventive law through administrative and regulatory activities as well as by the initiation and conduct of adversary proceedings. The job of prosecutor was vested primarily in the Department of Justice.

Recently I listed at least three characteristics that are needed if the FTC is to work in the manner Congress intended:

"1. There must be sound administration, with strong but fair administrators who are in general sympathy with the objectives and policies expressed in the legislation which they administer.

"2. The Commission should arrive at a decision only after thorough exploration of all factors bearing upon the particular problem.

"3. The heart of the Commission's work, as an expert body, is its fact finding."

As I have indicated, we are undertaking to improve our fact finding methods. This is being done on two fronts. First, the investigative work of the Commission should be improved and expanded. All the Commission's work—its successes or its failures—depend primarily upon the facts which are developed by examiners in the field. In the past, the attorneys in charge of this work have received neither the recognition nor the support necessary for a successful administration of the laws over which we have jurisdiction. We are now taking steps to raise the investigative work to a status equal with that of our other work. The other phase of our fact finding activities, I've already touched upon. That has to do with the issuance of informative and readable findings and opinions with a minimum of legalistic phraseology.

As we see it, therefore, a vigorous application of the antimonopoly and antidiscrimination statutes is an important part of any policy relating to small business. So long as the vigor and fairness of competition is maintained, small-business men will have a fair chance to perform their economic functions and prosper accordingly. They should not want more, and they do not need more to preserve their place in the sun. In a sentence, our objective is to help keep small business strong and aggressive; to protect it from unfair competition and to eliminate all inequitable handicaps.

Perhaps a special word should be said about the Robinson-Patman Act. This is a statute concerning which there has been considerable discussion as to its relative merits and demerits. I don't need to tell this committee that small-business groups, primarily retailers and wholesalers, strongly support it. At the same time there are many who contend that the Robinson-Patman Act is inconsistent with the antitrust laws and is not in the public interest.

Certainly we at the Commission believe in its philosophy and fully recognize our obligation to enforce it.

I have discussed in some detail a number of the changes which have occurred at the Federal Trade Commission since I became chairman, and have also attempted to outline my views regarding some of the problems which we face. I believe you will also be interested in our record regarding cases formally litigated before the Commission. We have attached to this statement a summary of the Commission's record with respect to antimonopoly cases over the past 4 fiscal years. From this statement, it will be noted that during the fiscal year just concluded, the Federal Trade Commission issued a total of 25 antimonopoly cease-and-desist orders (including 14 orders under the Robinson-Patman Act) which is the highest number of antimonopoly orders issued by the Commission in any of the 4 years in question. Similarly, it will be noted that in the last fiscal year, the Commission issued 30 antimonopoly complaints, the most complaints in this field issued during any of the 4 years in question. In addition, during much of the recent fiscal year, the Commission had 100 fewer employees than the high point reached during the period under comparison. I might add that the increased output was not confined to the antimonopoly field, the Commission having issued complaints in 93 antideceptive cases, or 13 more than the highest number issued in any of the three preceding years.

In conclusion, let me state that we have had a year of real progress. I would be the first to concede that we have not accomplished all our objectives, but certainly we have made long strides in what I consider to be the right direction. With the reorganization plan now in full effect, I can predict with confidence that the year ahead will see even greater accomplishments in the interest of the public. And when we are serving the public interest, I am sure you will agree we are also serving the cause of small business.

Complaints issued during fiscal years

1951:	
Sec. 2 (7 also sec. 5)	17
Sec. 3	4
Sec. 5	8
Total	29
1952:	
Sec. 2 (1 also sec. 5)	16
Sec. 3	1
Sec. 5	11
Sec. 7	1
Total	29
1953:	
Sec. 2	12
Sec. 3	1
Sec. 5	11
Sec. 8	5
Total	29
1954:	
Sec. 2 (1 also sec. 5)	12
Sec. 5	17
Sec. 7	1
Total	30

Complaints issued from Apr. 1, 1953 (when the present Chairman took office), to June 30, 1954:

Sec. 2	14
Sec. 5	19
Sec. 7	1
Total	34

Orders issued during fiscal years

1951:	
Sec. 2 (1 also sec. 5)	10
Sec. 5	13
Total	23
1952:	
Sec. 2 (1 also sec. 5) (4 consent settlements)	15
Sec. 5	9
Total	24
1953:	
Sec. 2 (2 also sec. 5) (7 consent settlements)	13
Sec. 3 (1 consent settlement)	1
Sec. 5 (4 consent settlements)	10
Total	24

1954:	
Sec. 2 (3 also sec. 5) (7 consent settlements)	14
Sec. 3	3
Sec. 5 (7 consent settlements)	8
Total	25
Orders issued from Apr. 1, 1953 (when the present Chairman took office), to June 30, 1954:	
Sec. 2 (9 consent settlements)	16
Sec. 3	3
Sec. 5 (8 consent settlements)	10
Total	29

Unemployment Compensation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT W. CRETELLA

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 14, 1954

Mr. CRETELLA. Mr. Speaker, last week action was taken by this House on H. R. 9430. I am in receipt of a resolution which was passed by the Greater Hartford Industrial Union Council with the request that it be treated as a petition and printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I am pleased therefore to submit the resolution, as follows:

Whereas present unemployment compensation payments to insured unemployed wage and salary earners are woefully inadequate as to weekly amount and number of weeks duration; and

Whereas substantial and prolonged unemployment in Connecticut and in Hartford and inadequate unemployment compensation payments have caused increases in expenditures for relief purposes from an estimated need of $35,000 a month (as estimated in the budget) to $50,000 a month now and an increase in the number of persons receiving such relief from 550 one year ago to 754 now, with resulting increased drain upon revenues depleted by slackening business activity and income in the community; and

Whereas the amounts of such unemployment payments in Connecticut range from a minimum of $30 to a maximum of $39 and are limited to 26 weeks, with weekly payments averaging only $27 compared to the average weekly wage in Connecticut of $71.82 (amount of $30 minimum not met because of insufficient credits of earnings); and

Whereas this is far below the average of 50 percent and the maximum of 66⅔ percent recommended to the States last February by President Eisenhower, Secretary of Labor Mitchell, the Federal Advisory Council on Employment Security and the National Conference on Labor Legislation; and

Whereas President Eisenhower, Secretary of Labor Mitchell, and others recommended that the States extend the duration of payments to 26 weeks, but long-term unemployment has resulted in 600,000 insured workers exhausting their rights to payments before being reemployed and such exhaustions continue at the rate of 40,000 a week, making plain the need for an extension to 39 weeks, as proposed in H. R. 9430 and S. 3553, introduced by Representative FORAND, Senator DOUGLAS, 85 other Representatives and 11 other Senators; and

Whereas these companion bills, if enacted by Congress before adjournment, would implement President Eisenhower's recommendations as to amounts of unemployment compensation payments and would extend the duration beyond his recommended 26 weeks, to 39 weeks, and, at presently anticipated continuing unemployment, would get approximately $2 billion a year of additional purchasing power into the hands of insured unemployed workers and their families for instant high velocity spending and distribution throughout our entire economy; and

Whereas the House Ways and Means Committee has recently completed hearings on proposed amendments to the Federal unemployment compensation law and has recommended a bill to the House for passage before adjournment; and

Whereas President Eisenhower, at his June 16 press conference, stated that he has no intention of urging governors to call special sessions of their legislatures to implement his own recommendations, now more than 4 months old; and

Whereas this puts upon the Congress the last hope and full responsibility for action to carry out this vital part of President Eisenhower's legislative program in any way that will mean anything to the unemployed, to our economy, and to the budgets of our States, cities, and other political subdivisions: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Greater Hartford Industrial Union Council, meeting on this 8th day of July 1954, urgently requests our Representatives and Senators to use their influence and good offices to persuade the House Ways and Means Committee and the Senate Finance Committee to adopt and recommend the provisions of H. R. 9430 and S. 3553 so that action in both Houses may be completed before the present Congress adjourns; and be it further

Resolved, That we urge President Eisenhower at this session to make congressional action to implement his unemployment compensation recommendations a must item in his immediate legislative program; and be it further

Resolved, That if either committee fails or refuses to report out favorably the provisions of H. R. 9430 and S. 3553, our Representatives and Senators support appropriate action such as discharge petitions or the addition of the provisions as a rider to other legislation; and be it finally

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to our Representatives, Senators, the President of the United States, the Speaker of the House and the Vice President as the Presiding Officer of the Senate, with the request that it be treated as a petition under the Constitution and, as such, printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Winning Editorial in Nationwide Newspaper Cancer Contest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT B. SCUDDER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 14, 1954

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial, entitled "The Seven Deadly Signs," was published in the Eureka (Calif.) Humboldt Standard on April 24, this year, in connection with Cancer Control Month.

The editorial was written by Col. F. F. Flaherty, managing editor of the Humboldt Standard, and was entered in the third annual cancer contest for the newspaper people of America.

It was adjudged the best among hundreds of editorials submitted by daily newspapers throughout the Nation and was reprinted on July 6 after attaining national recognition.

It is with a great deal of pride that I include with my remarks this dramatic presentation—The Seven Deadly Signs—as a means of saluting Colonel Flaherty and the Humboldt Standard for their outstanding contribution to the cancer control campaign:

THE SEVEN DEADLY SIGNS

"But, doctor, it just started with a little sore that wouldn't heal."

Yes, perhaps so; just a little sore, perfectly inoffensive looking. A little sore, no doubt, which just seemed to start from nothing and nowhere and you don't even remember how it started. But there it is now, the doctor's diagnosis, cancer. And you find yourself trying to explain it to the doctor and rationalize it for yourself.

"But, doctor, it was just a little lump at first."

Yes, it was little lump in a curious spot; in the soft part of the neck (the doctor uses a technical medical term you may not have heard before). You thought maybe you'd been wearing too tight a collar, or something. But, as the doctor says, its cancer.

"But, doctor, there was just a little bleeding at first."

No, you hadn't paid much attention to it; figured nature would take care of it in time. So, again you try to explain and to rationalize. But it's a bit late for explanations or rationalization, for the doctor says, ever so sympathetically, it's cancer.

"But, doctor, it was just a little mole."

Sure, had it a long time; grew up with it in fact. No didn't know such things should be checked for possible malignaucy. Doesn't seem possible it could start from that. You're sure, doctor, it's cancer?

"But, doctor, it just seemed to be a sort of chronic indigestion."

That's right; it didn't seem to go away even though you tried a lot of patent medicines. Should have come in six months ago? Well you know how it goes, doctor; didn't seem too serious although continuously uncomfortable. But cancer—you're sure?

"But, doctor, you see, there was that bad cold last winter; everyone seemed to have it."

Yes, yes, left a sort of hoarseness which wouldn't clear up. Took lots of medicine, gargled; tried almost everything anyone suggested. Went on working? Sure, couldn't stop for a little thing like that. And you say, doctor, there's no doubt it's cancer?

"But, doctor, nobody thinks much about constipation."

Yes, took a lot of laxatives, even some pretty drastic ones. That's right; just felt sort of low and dragged out, you know. No, never had to see a doctor before; come from good, sound stock. That's why this is so hard to understand. Cancer? You're sure? What now?

Well, there they sit in the doctor's private office. Seven of them; seven typical cancer patients. And they've just heard the bad news—cancer. And it seems so strange that it could all start from such seemingly innocent beginnings. But that is just what the doctor is saying, too, and he knows, from long, long experience and from examining so many, many others that this is usually the way that cancer starts—from those small beginnings. And he knows, too, that if they had just reported in earlier, before it was too late, how much difference it might have made. But that, again, is the tragic story of cancer—discovery and diagnosis too long delayed, too little time left for treatment.

And there they stand, also: cancer's seven danger signals. No doubt you've read or heard a lot about them this month of April that now is approaching the end; this period designated as Cancer Control Month. For that, indeed, is one of the major purposes of the cancer control observance: to acqaint the public—you and you and you—with these seven danger signals that warn of the possibility of cancer. And whether or not you heed the signals may mean your life or your death.

Another year will roll around before Cancer Control Month is observed again, and again calling your attention to the seven dread danger signals. You won't, of course, be carrying on the campaign and observance continuously, in the intensified manner of such campaigns and observances. But if you and you and you will but keep the danger signals in mind, and be on the alert for their appearance, you may live to participate in next year's observance. They are seven, remember, and, lest you may have overlooked even one, here they are again: (1) Any sore that does not heal; (2) a lump or thickening in the breast or elsewhere; (3) unusual bleeding or discharge; (4) any change in a wart or mole; (5) persistent indigestion or difficulty in swallowing; (6) persistent hoarseness or cough; (7) any change in normal bowel movements.

Our Enormous Stores

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 8, 1954

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Spirit, Punxsutawney, Pa., of July 9, 1954:

OUR ENORMOUS STORES

(By George E. Sokolsky)

What will the United States do with its store of $3,500,000,000 of agricultural commodities? Even the slightly flexible price support bill, which Secretary of Agriculture, Ezra Taft Benson, has finally got through the House of Representatives and probably the Senate by the time this is printed, will not solve the problem of our enormous stores.

Obviously the United States needs to stockpile minerals and materials which may not be swiftly accessible in time of war, but agricultural supplies in the United States are available annually, and generally in enormous quantities, beyond our necessities. How shall these enormous stores be disposed of? For instance, the United States owns 422,220,000 pounds of butter, 401,982,000 pounds of cheese, 282,530,000 pounds of dried milk, purchased by the Commodity Credit Corporation to support the prices of these commodities. The cost of these items is $492,820,000; what their actual value is no one can say. They may have to be given away for nothing to make room for more price-supported items.

The United States owns 721,166,000 bushels of wheat and 370,979,000 bushels of corn. The cost of these commodities is $2,494,151,000. Practically speaking, our Government has run out of storage space for corn and wheat. Some of it is put in the bottoms of ships that lie in our rivers doing nothing—(the mothball fleet is another story).

Secretary Benson has opposed rigid price supports without rejecting the entire doctrine of Government aid to farmers designed to safeguard them from the drastic operations of the law of supply and demand, which historically has a tendency to reduce farmers to peasants. The American farmer is an equal citizen in a free society.

Essentially, parity means more than its definition in economics; socially it means equality between the farmer and the city dweller; it means that the farmer is to have as good a home; that he is to own his tools; that his children are to have equal opportunity for education. But parity can never mean that food prices for the cities are to be held up unconscionably and that the entire Nation is to be taxed so that God-given food shall rot in warehouses, never to be used, not even as charity for the hungry.

Here is a dilemma of plenty. Usually it has been the opposite, poverty, shortages, hunger have faced a people as a serious problem. In the United States there is no poverty (this is categorically correct by any comparative measurement); there are no shortages of agricultural commodities; there is no hunger. Yet the plethora of agricultural production, this plenty has become a major economic and political problem because no one knows any better what to do with too much than with too little.

In most countries of the world, this paradox is not only not understandable, it is not believed. How is it possible, it might be asked, that a farmer will grow more than he can dispose of? A Chinese or an Indian peasant has enough trouble raising what he needs; a Cambodian peasant in the Mekong River Delta knows exactly where he will sell his surplus rice. All of Asia is willing to buy it. Yet the United States keeps in storage $8,885,000 of rice, which it will not sell because it was not bought to sell. It was bought to support artificially a price for world commodity of which this country consumes comparatively little. There cannot be a rice shortage in the United States and if there were, it would hardly affect the food supply of the American people.

Another curiosity of this situation is that while we hold these enormous stores and while we are producing price-supported agricultural supplies beyond our capacity to consume them, imports of these products are coming into the United States from Europe and Canada to compete with the surplus American product. Not only that, but the principle of price support has been applied politically to some commodities, such as coffee, to support foreign countries indirectly by making it possible for them to sell their wares to the American people at a price that amounts to a tax. Some day when politics are not a factor in this situation, a candidate for a doctor of philosophy will write a thesis on the price of coffee in 1954.

Anglo-American Friendship Is Essential, but There Is Limit to Price

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. HESS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 14, 1954

Mr. HESS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include an editorial written by Mr. A. H. Huneke, the editor of the Western Hills Press, published in Cheviot, Hamilton County, Ohio. This very excellent editorial, which appeared in the issue of Friday, July 9, 1954, voices my sentiments exactly, and I am sure that it expresses the views of the great majority of the people of our Nation. I hope that everyone who has the opportunity to do so will read it.

The editorial follows:

ANGLO-AMERICAN FRIENDSHIP IS ESSENTIAL, BUT THERE IS LIMIT TO PRICE

It has long been obvious to the point of being axiomatic that one of Moscow's major tactical objectives in the cold war has been to split the Anglo-American alliance.

The men in the Kremlin know full well that the union of the English-speaking peoples was the bastion of victory in two world wars. They also realize that something less than full Anglo-American political and military cooperation led to stalemate and virtual U. N. defeat in the Korean war.

It now appears that the Moscow strategy of divide and conquer is closer to realization than ever before following the ill-advised Geneva Conference which served to emphasize before the world the divergence of English and American policy. Antagonism between Secretary of State Dulles and Foreign Secretary Eden, climaxed by the latter's imprudent speech before the House of Commons on the eve of the Churchill-Eden visit to the United States, have served to drive the historic friends and allies further apart.

Reassurances following the Washington meeting that understandings have been reached and differences reconciled have a hollow sound. Reports that Sir Winston is still determined to have his meeting at the summit between Russian, American and English heads of state and hopes to visit Moscow this summer to set up such a meeting indicate that the basic differences still exist.

The average American sees in such a meeting the shades of Yalta where secret agreements secretly arrived at between unprincipled leaders of the U. S. S. R. and shall we say, charitably, gullible leaders of the West materially advanced today's world threat of Communist aggression.

Again and again since that unhappy time, the futility of resorting to sweet reason to check the forays of the Russian bear has been demonstrated. Patient and long suffering though he is, the average American has come to the reluctant conclusion that there is no point in negotiating with an adversary who seeks not peace, but power; who seeks not understanding which must undergird peace, but a discontent and strife which must ultimately lead to war.

The issue of Red China's admission to the United Nations now appears to be the reef on which Anglo-American unity may finally founder. The peril of division between our great nations is very real and English leaders should be impressed that the American people do not regard it lightly, but they should be equally impressed that if the price of maintaining our united front in the face of the Communist threat is abandonment of principle then we are not willing to pay that price.

This is not to say that because of our past aid we are presuming to dictate British policy in this regard. But it is to say that if Eden and Churchill are committed to purchase coexistence with the Russians in the coin of appeasement that failed to buy peace in our time from the Nazis for Chamberlain at Munich, then they should be put on no uncertain notice that the United States of America is not buying.

Preservation of a united Anglo-American front is worth all we have already paid and more in the form of economic and military aid. It is worth every compromise to opinion and tactics, but it is not worth compromise of basic principles. Our English allies, if they value American support and friendship, must be made to understand that American determination not to permit Red China to shoot her way into the U. N. is a matter of such principle.

Public Opinion in 29th District of Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT J. CORBETT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 14, 1954

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, during my years of service in the Congress, I have regularly conducted polls of public thinking on vital national issues in my congressional district. These polls have been in the form of a printed questionnaire, requiring simple yes-and-no answers, mailed to registered voters, regardless of political affiliation, in my district.

Responses to these questionnaires have always been excellent. The tabulated results, which virtually constitute a referendum of the district, have proved of enormous value to myself and to my colleagues in the House.

My congressional district is probably as representative and contains as many varied interest groups as any in the Nation. It has the wealthy, the poor, and the middle class. It has a high concentration of labor, white-collar workers, small business, large industries and some of the finest farm areas found anywhere. It includes a thickly populated section of Pittsburgh, extends to the rural areas, and takes in many large and small towns in northern Allegheny County.

In this session of Congress, I conducted two polls, one in January, immediately after President Eisenhower's state of the Union message; the second has just now been completed. I am including herewith the percentage tabulation results of both polls. I hope they will prove as interesting and informative to other Members as they have to myself.

The results follow:

JANUARY 1954 TABULATION RESULTS

1. Is it better to balance the budget in yearly stages, rather than all at once? Yes, 92 percent; no. 8 percent.

2. The social-security deduction has been increased from 1½ percent to 2 percent. Should this increase be allowed to stand? Yes, 79 percent; no, 21 percent.

3. Do you favor the 10-percent cut in personal income taxes even if it increases the deficit? Yes, 53 percent, no. 47 percent.

4. Should we used our atomic weapons to stop future aggression? Yes, 82 percent; no, 18 percent.

5. Canada seems determined to build the St. Lawrence seaway. Should we join in the project? Yes, 77 percent; no, 23 percent.

6. Do you agree that postal rates should be increased? Yes, 53 percent; no, 47 percent.

7. Should persons 18 to 21 be given the right to vote? Yes, 55 percent, no, 45 percent.

8. Should the Federal gasoline tax of 2 cents per gallon be maintained to aid the highway program? Yes, 87 percent; no, 13 percent.

9. Are you in favor of statehood for Hawaii? Yes, 84 percent; no, 16 percent.

10. Eisenhower's resolve is for a "sounder and safer America." Do you think he is making satisfactory headway? Yes, 90 percent; no, 10 percent.

JULY 1954 TABULATION RESULTS

1. Should any future United States action to stop Red aggression in Asia be limited to air and naval power? Yes, 58 percent; no, 42 percent.

2. Should we encourage the rearmament of West Germany regardless of French objections? Yes, 91 percent; no, 9 percent.

3. Should the Government continue to build low-rent public-housing projects? Yes, 47 percent, no, 53 percent.

4. Who do you think is wrong in the Army-McCarthy controversy? Army, 22 percent; McCarthy, 27 percent; both, 51 percent. (Check one.)

5. Should Senator MCCARTHY's power to investigate Communist activity be terminated? Yes, 50 percent plus; no, 50 percent minus.

6. Would you vote for a 5 to 10 percent salary increase for postal employees? Yes, 68 percent; no, 32 percent.

7. Do you believe there is any danger of a serious depression during the next few years? Yes, 32 percent; no, 68 percent.

8. Would you vote for a reduction of farm price supports? Yes, 85 percent; no, 15 percent.

9. Do you agree that our foreign affairs are being conducted about as well as circumstances permit? Yes, 63 percent; no, 37 percent.

10. Do you believe that war with Russia is an eventual certainty? Yes, 41 percent; no, 59 percent.

11. Do you favor reducing income taxes by lowering percentage rates rather than by increasing personal exemptions? Yes, 59 percent; no, 41 percent.

12. Do you agree that President Eisenhower has been doing a satisfactory job? Yes, 81 percent; no, 19 percent.

Acknowledgment of a Job Well Done: Hon. Lamar Puryear, Sr., Retires After 36 Years of Service to Mississippi

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 13, 1954

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, we have always regarded our form of government as being one of laws and not of men. Basically, that is the foundation of our political society; but, even so, we must recognize that the success of our system of laws depends upon the people who administer them.

With few exceptions, honorable careers of public service are highly unrewarding to the individual—either in personal financial remuneration, or public acclaim for his efforts. Its greatest compensation, perhaps, is in the employee's personal satisfaction at having contributed his bit to the promotion of a free and orderly society.

Because of this, I was very much gratified last week, to see public newspaper recognition given to the retirement of my lifelong friend and neighbor, Hon. Lamar Puryear, Sr., after 36 years as a public employee in Mississippi. Mr. Puryear served his State, county, and municipality in several capacities both elective and appointive; always with distinction, and dedication to public good. His last period of service was in the capacity of assistant to the Honorable Heber Ladner, Secretary of State of the State of Mississippi.

The retirement of any individual career employee from the field of public service in itself, is of little significance—except, of course, to the individual, his family, friends, and office associates. It is symbolic though, of the personal sacrifices in money and effort required for the successful operation of our governments—Federal, State, and local—on the part of our public servants.

I am sure other Members will join me in wishing for Mr. Puryear many years of pleasure and happiness in the leisure of his well-earned retirement; and that this wish go, also, to the thousands of others who, like Mr. Puryear, have devoted their lives and talents to concientious public service.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I submit a newspaper account of Mr. Puryear's retirement, copied from the Jackson, (Miss.) Daily News, dated June 30, 1954:

> Lamar Puryear, chief clerk of the secretary of state's office, retired Wednesday after 36 years of public service.
>
> The 73-year-old lifelong resident of Raymond said, "I'm not retiring because I'm too old, but I'm just moving out to give a younger man a chance."
>
> Friendly, affable and courteous, Mr. Puryear has won the hearts of thousands of Mississippians with whom he has been associated during his long service.
>
> Secretary of State Heber Ladner, on behalf of the staff employees of his office, presented Mr. Puryear with a hansome framed scroll setting forth an expression of appreciation for his loyalty and service.
>
> Ladner said, "In Mr. Puryear's retirement, Mississippi is losing the service of one of the most efficient, courteous and affable public servants that the State has ever had."
>
> A resolution of appreciation cited Mr. Puryear for the honest, conscientious and unselfish service rendered in many phases of governmental activity.
>
> His office employees and other State capitol workers gave him a handsome metal fishing tackle box and a 20-foot fishing pole.
>
> "They fixed me up with a lot of fishing equipment," Puryear said, "and I'm going to spend plenty of time along the banks of the Mississippi or in lakes around this area."
>
> Mr. Puryear has endeared himself to every Mississippi Governor since 1900.
>
> "I've witnessed every Governor's inauguration here since Governor Longino in 1900," he said. He recalled many warm experiences during the administrations of the late Governors Longino, Vardaman, Bilbo, and Johnson.
>
> Mr. Puryear has served as chief clerk in the secretary of State's office since March 1939. Earlier he had served 12 years as a member of Hinds County Board of Supervisors, 8 years of which he was chairman. He also served as chief deputy in the chancery clerk's office at Raymond and 4 years as chief deputy sheriff of Hinds County at the Jackson Courthouse.
>
> He recalled his first State job was in 1912 when he and Homer Casteel, former public service commissioner, met each other for the first time in the office of the State Commissioner of Agriculture Ed Blakeslee. "We were both hired and started to work for the State at that time," Puryear said.
>
> He recalled from his vivid memory the first inauguration of the late Gov. Theodore G. Bilbo as the picturesque study of Bilbo's father. "Bilbo's father stood in front of the Walthall Hotel in a cold January day wear-

ing a bea gum hat, a Prince Albert overcoat and a long white mustache and whickers."

Mr. and Mrs. Puryear have 6 children, 3 sons and 3 daughters.

Like any proud father, he told of one son, Dr. George Porter Puryear who recently called the family by overseas telephone from Japan to advise his parents that he had volunteered for 90-days medical duty with the French forces in Indochina.

Other members of the Puryear family and Charlie Puryear, now in Washington, D. C., with Congressman John Bell Williams, and Lamar Puryear, Jr., a doctor practicing at Hazlehurst. His daughters are Mrs. Margaret Jackson, secretary to the principal at Jackson Central High School; Mrs. Mary Norwood Hamilton, of Raymond, and Mrs. Nellie Hollowell, of Yazoo City.

Mr. Puryear bowed out of public service declaring that Heber Ladner was the finest man I've ever worked for. He also declared that courtesy is my main forte; it doesn't cost a thing and it wins lifetime friends."

A Letter to My Constituents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE S. LONG

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 14, 1954

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., July 14, 1954.

MY DEAR FRIEND: My campaign for reelection to the Congress is drawing to a close and I again ask for your vote and active support on the basis of the type of representation I have afforded our district and Nation. I am proud of my record and I say with humility it is a record of accomplishment—a record that has reflected credit to our district, State, and Nation.

As your Representative in Washington I have practiced economy. I have worked to reduce taxes. I have a bill pending in the Congress now which, if enacted into law, would afford substantial tax reductions for all, especially would it help those in low income brackets. I have remained on the job serving you faithfully 100 percent of the time during my tenure in the Congress. This attention to duty and attendance record are almost unprecedented.

I have made service to my district a guiding principle. I point with pride to my record of giving personal attention to every request for service. There is no service too great or too small for me to undertake for my constituents. This is the kind of service to which you are entitled and the kind of service you will always receive from me. I stand on my record and on that record I humbly ask for your vote and active support.

If you will check my voting and attendance record in the Congress, my record of service to our district, my accomplishments in the field of agriculture and flood control, my defense of our great, competitive, free enterprise system, and my full attention to duty, I believe you will find it to your interest and to the interest of our district to help return me to the Congress. I want your vote and active support and I assure you that I shall continue to remain on the job serving you faithfully at all times and I further promise you that I shall never commit any official act that would cause you to regret having placed your confidence in me.

Election day is near. I will be so grateful to you if you will resolve here and now that you will go to the polls on election day and take a neighbor with you and vote for your friend, GEORGE LONG, who promises to continue serving you faithfully.

With kindest regards and every good wish to you and yours, I remain

Sincerely yours,
GEORGE S. LONG,
Member of Congress.

National Rivers and Harbors Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. SMITH

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 14, 1954

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, under authority granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to submit the report of the resolutions committee which was unanimously adopted by the 41st convention of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress held in Washington, D. C., recently.

The resolutions committee, of which I served as chairman, consisted of one delegate from each State, Territory, island possession, and the District of Columbia. The members gave careful and painstaking consideration to the matters before them, suggested numerous changes in the draft of the resolutions presented to them, and reached unanimous agreement thereon.

This convention, the first to be held since the armed conflict began in Korea, was attended by 319 registered delegates from 43 States, Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the District of Columbia, as well as many others who failed to register, guests, visitors, and so forth. These delegates were from all sections of the country, representing both legislative and executive branches of the Federal Government; State, city, county, and other local governmental agencies and interested groups; commercial, waterway, flood control, and reclamation associations; agricultural, labor, industrial, and trade organizations, and transportation interests; with memberships totaling several millions.

We believe this unanimous expression of representatives of such different interests and pursuits is strong evidence of the general sentiment of the people of the United States concerning the matters dealt with in these resolutions:

REPORT OF THE RESOLUTIONS COMMITTEE TO THE 41ST NATIONAL CONVENTION OF THE NATIONAL RIVERS AND HARBORS CONGRESS, MAY 26, 1954

FOREWORD

For more than 50 years the National Rivers and Harbors Congress has been dedicated to the promotion and development of the Nation's rivers, harbors, lakes, and to its land and water resources generally.

Our efforts in the orderly development of our soil and water resources in the interest of flood control, navigation, irrigation, and all other beneficial uses have been unrelenting in times of peace when such development was compatible with the fiscal situation existent. We have relaxed our efforts in times of emergencies to the extent that only those items which contributed their share to an emergency economy were sponsored.

Now the trend of the times is indicative of the need for full development of our every resource and with that purpose in view we rededicate the National Rivers and Harbors Congress to its historic purpose of sponsoring these developments.

THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGES

We wholeheartedly support the general objective emphasized in the President's state of the Union message on January 7—the building of a stronger America. We support also the principle set forth that it is the common responsibility of Federal, State, and local governments to improve and develop our natural resources as a means of producing that strength. However, our national heritage of resources will continue to require the overall financial and administrative assistance of the Federal Government to a major degree for proper development on a sound economical basis to the end that all may benefit.

In this connection we await with interest the report and recommendations of the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations in regard to State and local participation in these programs and we stand ready to assist this Commission in its important task.

We furthermore support the principle set forth in the President's Economic Report of January 28 whereby the Government must help maintain employment and be prepared to take preventive as well as remedial action respecting economic developments.

We are encouraged by the President's budget message of January 21 wherein he recommends starting new projects or new units or existing projects by the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation. This is as it should be in order that our expanding economy may have the early advantage of cheap water transportation; more electric power for increased production; and more flood protection for our homes, industrial centers, and areas which produce our food and fiber.

PUBLIC WORKS FOR EMPLOYMENT

The ability of our country to grow strong and stay strong stems in part from our ability to provide employment to those who have the will to accomplish. We have had periods of economic readjustment in the past and we can expect the future to present periods when employment of a number of our people may wane. Against such times we can and should plan to provide employment by well conceived and adequately planned public works.

We submit that such well conceived and adequately planned programs cannot await the time when they are needed to provide employment to those who need it; that if we are to serve the best interest of our Nation and its people a backlog of desirable public works projects is indicated now in anticipation of their later need, including programs such as outlined in title 7 of the Housing Act of 1954.

OUR AMERICAN MERCHANT MARINE

The National Rivers and Harbors Congress is proud of the part our American merchant marine has played in the development of our economy in peace and as an essential complement to our military efforts during war and emergencies. Heretofore the requisite number of American-flag vessels have been provided to supply the necessary effort in both peace and war.

Now however, there is cause for concern. A number of problems face this privately owned merchant fleet. No new orders were placed during the past year for any type of large merchant ship. Our national security requires the situation to be otherwise. Some shipbuilding should be underway at all times.

We therefore support the program of the Maritime Administration designed to meet the immediate problem of shipbuilding; the pilot program of conversion of our slow World War II Liberty ships; its program of research leading to the development of more efficient cargo handling gear and to bolster our merchant marine.

We urge the Federal Congress to recognize the need for funds to assist private enterprise in the development and renovation of that important contribution to our economy and support arm of our auxiliary activities—our American merchant marine.

REORGANIZATION AND WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT

We commend the existing agencies of our Federal Government for their excellent work in conserving and developing the vast land and water resources of our country. They have the know how essential to economical administration of the several programs for such development and are of appropriate size.

We maintain that the creation of one large agency empowered to administer all programs would deter orderly development of these vital resources. We subscribe to congressional control as opposed to bureaucratic control.

Furthermore we emphatically restate our unchanging position of opposing any reorganization plan that would have the effect of depriving the Nation of the advantages now gained by having civil functions administered by the Corps of Engineers. The Nation has long since learned to rely on the experience of the Corps in civil functions in peacetime and the application of that experience in military pursuits in time of war. We are proud to be included among those who are desirous of having that reliability continued. We oppose any plan for the elimination of the Corps from American progress in peacetime.

MAINTENANCE OF WATERWAYS

We agree that the maintenance of waterways whose use is no longer economical is not justified. However, there is reason to be deeply concerned over the calculated risks now being assumed on busy waterways. The combined risks of inadequate channel depths; dependence upon tides for depth; deferred maintenance of structures; inadequate harbors of refuge; and dangers to vessels and operating personnel all combine to create a situation requiring immediate scrutiny by the Congress. The large Federal investment in these waterways and the impact their deficiencies have on our economy make it imperative that adequate funds be made available to remedy this serious situation.

SHARE AND SHARE ALIKE

Our responsibilities in the vital field of land and water resources impose an obligation to forewarn the President, the Congress, and the executive agencies of pitfalls likely to be encountered in the development of these programs.

It is apparent to us that inconsistencies between existing law and policy for flood-control projects and that proposed in the Hope-Aiken bills for watershed improvements will create an improper situation. Bureau of the Budget Circular A-47 of 1952 requires a substantial local payment or cash contribution for flood-control projects which have benefits attributable to land enhancement. On the other hand, we note that the Hope-Aiken bills would permit on the farm conservation measures to be applied as a credit against the local share of total cost. We urge that the criteria for these related programs be made consistent in the interest of lessening the Government's share of cost for flood-prevention programs in our watersheds.

Furthermore, flood-control projects require specific approval by the Congress for each location, whereas the Hope-Aiken bills would delegate authority to the Secretary of Agriculture to approve flood-prevention programs. Here again consistency is lacking.

WILDLIFE AND WATER RESOURCES

Wildlife enthusiasts are cautioned that it may be difficult, if not impracticable, to make adequate provision in every case where natural habitats are disturbed by development of our land and water resources to meet the needs of our expanding human population. They must accept the proposition that our present population of 160 million people must be provided for first. Furthermore, the predictions are that the time is not too far away when 200 million people will require food and fiber to an extend exceeding our present ability to produce on areas now available. This situation will require rapid development of additional areas. Admittedly protection of wildlife is a national obligation and every practicable means should be taken to mitigate unfavorable influences upon wildlife. In this connection credit must also be given to the substantial benefits for wildlife that accrue from water-resource developments constructed primarily for other purposes. Other resources must not be subordinated to provisions for wildlife in this vital development.

WATER-POLLUTION CONTROL

The control of pollution in our rivers is a problem which concerns us all from either the standpoint of the health of our citizens or the survival of our marine life. The effect of the discharge of wastes into streams by our expanding cities and industries extends to all who use our precious water. This effect is felt by our public water supplies, fish and marine life, agriculture, recreation areas, and industry. Congress considered it a matter of grave concern and as a menace to national welfare in 1948 when it enacted the Federal Water Pollution Control Act of that year.

We urge the Congress to appropriate adequate funds to the United States Public Health Service to permit it to fulfill its obligations under this law. Furthermore, the authority of that Service should be extended, if necessary, to combat the ever-increasing menace of stream pollution. We believe that many States should strengthen their pollution-control laws.

RESUMPTIONS AND NEW STARTS

We urge the Congress to give top priority to appropriations to resume work on projects which have been started but on which work was deferred by reason of the conflict in Korea. This should apply particularly to those projects where local interests have fully complied with or have given satisfactory assurances that they will comply with the conditions of local cooperation specified in the law authorizing the project.

Furthermore we feel that preferential treatment is proper for those projects already authorized ahead of those now to be authorized.

In this connection we are strongly opposed to a change in conditions of local cooperation once a project has been authorized. By so doing a hardship often results particularly where local interests have bonded themselves, started their share of construction, or made the cash contribution required of them.

THEY INHERIT THE EARTH

We are well aware of the adverse effects the bill S. 3111, if enacted, will have on the 150-odd unregulated carriers on Mississippi-Ohio River system and the Gulf Intracoastal Canal. Our expanding inland waterway traffic needs now and will continue to need new carriers. S. 3111 in effect would deny traffic to carriers in the trade for less than 2 years prior to enactment of the bill. Furthermore expansion of traffic territories within said 2-year period would be denied to all but those who obtained authority in 1940.

This legislation is preferential and the effect on shippers would be to raise freight rates and in turn increase the cost of goods to the consumer.

We urge Congress to consider the many when they consider the few who would benefit from such regulation as proposed in S. 3111 which would imperil untold amounts invested in plants and facilities in reliance upon a firm congressional policy which has now been in effect for 14 years.

INLAND AND INTRACOASTAL WATERWAYS

Our inland and intracoastal waterways have always played an important role in the development of our Nation. We have endorsed the improvement of these essential arteries in the past and will continue to do so in the future whenever and wherever they are economically justified. The economies reflected by such low-cost transportation redound to the benefit of all the people served by them, producer and consumer alike, and will continue to pay dividends so long as the waterways are justified.

Our rapidly increasing population is making more and more demands on our existing waterway system. As our population increase is continuous so should our efforts be continuous to improve and expand our inland waterways to the end that all may benefit in the future as have so many in the past.

This Congress opposes the imposition of Federal tolls on inland and intracoastal waterways.

INTERSTATE COMPACTS

We heartily endorse the interstate compact method for development of river valleys and basins as we feel that this method makes use of our existing agencies in the field of development of land and water resources without violation of the prerogatives of State and local government.

We particularly state our opposition to Senate bill 3325 to establish a Missouri Basin Commission and Compact Board. Such legislation, if enacted, would create in the Missouri Basin a super TVA in another form, but superseding the authority of all or part of 10 States rather than 1. We think this fact is sufficient reason for Congress to reject the proposal.

TIDELANDS

We reemphasize that it is the inalienable right of the several States to be permitted to contribute their fair share to the economy of our Nation through the ownership and proper development of their tidelands. Any move to deprive them of this right is opposed in the interest of continuing the proper development of the valuable resources under these tidal lands within and adjacent to their shores. These rights should be protected and should be subordinate only to the right of the Federal Government to make improvements in the interest of national defense, navigation, and flood control as now authorized or as may be authorized in the future.

My Position on Four Record Votes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDMUND P. RADWAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 14, 1954

Mr. RADWAN. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, July 8, 1954, I was not present, and I take this opportunity to state my position on four record votes which took place on that particular day:

On rollcall No. 97, if present, I would have voted "aye."

On rollcall No. 98, if present, I would have voted "nay."

On rollcall No. 99, if present, I would have vote "aye."

On rollcall No. 100, if present, I would have vote "aye."

Calvert County Tercentenary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK SMALL, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 14, 1954

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to call attention to a noteworthy anniversary being celebrated this year in Calvert County, the fourth oldest county in the Free State of Maryland. Congratulations to the people of Calvert County and to the Tercentenary Committee are especially appropriate at this time, noting that Calvert County reached its 300th birthday anniversary last Saturday, July 3.

Calvert County for three full centuries has been held by its people close to the best traditions of community life and popular free government.

As we count the blessings which have come down to us, we cannot fail to recognize our debt to the people of Calvert County who have been steadfast in their devotion to American ideals of freedom under God.

Very few counties in the United States can celebrate a 300th anniversary. Congratulations, Calvert County.

The Calvert Journal of July 3, 1954, quotes the following original order, which officially established Calvert County 300 years ago on that date:

TERIO DIE JULY 1654.

Forasmuch as the right honorable the Lord Baltimore, lord proprietary of this province by his instructions to the Governor and council here date the 28th of September 1653 hath discharged Robert Brooks, Esq. late commander of Charles County from being one of the council conservator or justice of the peace or commander of any county within this province the Governor hath thought fit for divers reasons relating to the publick good—and doth this day with the advice of the council make void and nullify an Order or Constitution made the 21st of November 1650 touching the erecting some part of the south side of Patuxent River into a county by the name of Charles County and instead thereof doth now erect, make, and appoint both sides of Patuxent River into one county by the name Calvert County, bounded on the south side with Pynehill River or Creeke to the head thereof and from thence through the woods to the head of Patuxent River being the northerly bound of Saint Marys County and bounded on the north side with the Creek upon the western side of Chesopeak Bay called the Herring Creek and from the southerly bound of Ann Arundell County and the Governor this day likewise appointeth M. Rich Collet to be high sheriff of Calvert County aforesaid.

The Calvert Journal also carried the following article, prepared by Dr. Morris L. Radoff, archivist of the State of Maryland, Annapolis, Md.:

Very shortly after King Charles I was beheaded, when Lord Baltimore realized the conflict between Royalist and Puritan factions might well spread to America, he made arrangements to have Robert Brooke, apparently a strong adherent of the King's side, take over part of Maryland. Accordingly, he gave Governor Thomas Stone warrants to have Brooke made lieutenant of the province. He also had a new county, Charles, carved out for him on November 21, 1650. This county of which Brooke was to be commander ran along the south side of the Patuxent going south from what is now Cedar Point, along "the middle of the woods betwixt Patomeek and Patuxent Rivers."

Though Robert Brooke's subsequent fortunes included large manorial grants, he was not as firm against the demands of the Commonwealth, which cancelled Brooke's claim to be president of the council as Lord Baltimore had desired. In 1652, he was deposed as head of the province, and in 1653, as commander of Charles County. Shortly thereafter, September 26, 1653, the order of October 3, 1650, setting up Charles County was abrogated. The stage was set for the creation of another county.

In the area once occupied in part by "Old Charles" there already had been settlements. Chief among the settlers had been Richard Preston. Preston had lived in Virginia before coming to Maryland; there he had held many land grants, given in 1635, 1637, 1639, 1641, and 1646. He had also held office in the Colony. But the stern religious hold of the Virginia Established Church, augmented by harsh methods of the Governor, Francis Berkeley, made life hard for dissidents. Preston, along with the Bennetts, Durands, Lloyds, and others was arrested for failure to attend church. In 1649, when Governor Thomas Stone, of Maryland, offered haven to the Virginia Puritans, they accepted the offer. By 1651 Preston was made commander of the north side of the Patuxent. He had already been granted 500 acres of land, and by July 21, 1651, Preston had been laid out, on the north side of the Patuxent and the south side of Preston's Creek. By 1659, Charles Gift and the Neglect were also held by Preston. With Richard Fuller, Preston went to the Patuxent and not to the Severn River area where the larger group of Puritans settled. By 1652, Preston had become the deputy of Richard Bennett and William Claiborne. He had shown his Puritan feelings in March 1653, by joining in the protest to Cromwell against "Popish officers."

It was not unexpected to find Governor Stone proposing to the council that it "Erect, make, and appoint both sides of Patuxent River into one county by the name Calvert County, bounded on the south side with Pynehill River; and from thence to the head of Patuxent, the northerly bounds of St. Mary's County, bounded on the north by Herring Creek and to the southerly bound of Anne Arundel County."

This was in July 1654; in October, with a few changes on boundary, the name Patuxent was given to the same territory, a name it held until 1658 when the proprietors came back into power with the end of the Puritan regime. Preston was more than the county seat; it was in October 1654, the place where the general assembly met and declared allegiance to Cromwell. Until 1655, when John Hammond was dispatched to Patuxent, Preston kept the archives of the Province. Hammond, a henchman of Stone's, wrote a pamphlet Hammond versus Heamens, in which he spoke of his trip among what he called the sons of thunder in Calvert County.

With the return of government to St. Mary's City, the county rested in peace until Coode's rebellion (1689). Meantime (1669) Richard Preston had died.

The martial spirit aroused by the stirring events of its early history was not failing in the county. Very early in its history men like Ninian Beall, Brooke Baker, Thomas Claggett, and Walter Smith, led or served in the county militia. Regularly organized troops were provided by law before 1700, with Col. Nicholas Greenberry, Maj. Henry Ridgely, and Edward Dorsey serving as commanders, even though they came from other counties. Foot companies and dragoons were set up, and in Calvert County given the right to fly yellow flags, as they did red in St. Mary's, white in Anne Arundel, and green in Baltimore.

The primary object of these troops was to subdue the Indians, although most of those in the county had been Christanized early and were generally submissive. The rangers, of whom John Bigger was the first in the county, were organized to patrol the extensive forest lands.

Calvert County was among the first to show defiance of the Stamp Act, and in the military organization incident to the Revolution provided a notable group of officers, among them Edward Wood, Thomas Cleland, Thomas Trueman Greenfield, Warthan Wilson, Patrick Smith, James Leach, Frederick Skinner, and James Grahame and a full complement of enlisted men. Remote as it was from contact with most parts of the State, the county was little touched by the Revolution or by the War Between the States. It was the War of 1812 which was of real concern to the county and that not seriously until late in the conflict. In 1813 the British had such success with Chesapeake maraudings that they decided on a fullfledged plan to rout the flotilla of the American Joshua Barney which was operating in the Patuxent.

Among their preliminary forays in 1812 had been an attack on the venerable old landmark of the county, Rousby Hall. This structure, once the home of Sir John Rousby, was razed to the ground. An eyewitness of the events of the July 1814 mentions the rage of the British, when a corps of Captain Blackstone's Calvert County rifles was sent against him. In retaliation, the British burned "every house on the land" near the mouth of the Patuxent. The next Sunday when the British troops under Sir George Admiral Cockburn, marched inland, they burned a tobacco warehouse. "They landed a very considerable force and marched to Calvert Court House which with the jail they destroyed." This "dingy courthouse," as it was once described, was the scene of a much greater conflagration when, on March 3, 1882, in the middle of the day, the new Methodist Church, fired by children playing with matches, burned down and with the fire spreading, 14 buildings including the courthouse and the jail, were completely destroyed. The clerk of court, being in the courthouse at the time, saved some of the records but the rest were consumed. The few records saved from the courthouse fire were kept in a nearby building which a few months later was also destroyed by fire. Thus were lost all the documents from 1882 to the beginning of the county, except for those which had by law to be recorded at the capital. Records at Annapolis included copies of all the wills and many other probate records up to 1777; but there was at that time unfortunately, no provision for the central recording of the land records. The abstract system did not begin until after 1784. It is under this disadvantage that a historian of the county must labor.

The troops concerned in Calvert County during the War of 1812 were part of the 31st

Regiment. The principal officers of the 31st were: Michael Taney, Jr., Stephen Johns, William Clare, John D. Ireland, Samuel Hance, and Mordecai Taneyhill, names still familiar in the county.

More than in any other part of the State, the axiomatic statement made about the whole of Maryland applies to Calvert County, that "every plantation was a town." The county was, like every other part of the State in the beginning, run on a tobacco economy. The advantage of Calvert County over other parts of Maryland was its closeness to a waterway, the Patuxent. Few rolling roads, so essential elsewhere, were necessary to get the tobacco barrels ready and on their way to foreign ports. Such circumstances make for small settlements. The total population of the county was 7,000 in 1707, 8,600 in 1790, and 11,900 by 1950.

Even the incorporated towns of the county—Chesapeake Beach and North Beach—are not large. The oldest of these is Chesapeake Beach, incorporated in 1886. Chesapeake Beach, with a population in 1950 of 504, grew chiefly because of its connection with Washington, D. C., by means of the Chesapeake Beach Railroad (1892-1937).

One of Calvert County's chief attractions is the Cliffs, noted ever since John Smith's first sight of them in 1607. Solomons, an island connected by a causeway with the mainland, has a harbor that attracts the interest of every passing yachtsman. The natural setting has made it suitable for large-scale shipbuilding. The *Dewey* and the *George Washington* were among the larger ships refurbished here. In addition, on Solomons Island is the Chesapeake Biological Laboratory, maintained by the State for the study of the marine life of the bay, with ultimate benefit to the oyster and fishing industries.

The three named places are the younger settlements in the county. The older ones are Huntingtown, Prince Frederick, Lusby, and Mutual. Prince Frederick, the county seat, has a population of close to 500. After Richard Preston gave up control, county affairs were carried on at a town on Battle Creek, sometimes called Battletown and sometimes, Calverton. There is now no sign of its existence. The county seat was then transferred to Williams Oldfields, which by 1725 became known as Prince Frederick. As it might be surmised from an account of the fire, all of the buildings of the town date from the early 1880's.

One of the early stops on the post route between St. Mary's City and Annapolis was Huntingtown on Hunting Creek, which enjoyed a brief period of prosperity when Gen. James Wilkinson ran a grist mill there. Tobacco, however, continued, as everywhere else in the county, to be the principal crop. Frequently Huntingtown was attacked during the marauding of the British Fleet.

Near Prince Frederick Michael Taney lived. Taney, who had come to the county in 1660, was the first of a long line of a family, the oldest males of which were always called Michael until 1777, when Roger Brooke Taney was born. He was the man who later, as the Chief Justice of the United States, became famous for his decision in the Dred Scott case. This decision was rendered on May 6, 1857, and had much to do with the hardening of sentiment at the beginning of the war between the States.

Taney is one of several persons from Calvert who was widely known outside of the boundaries of Maryland. George Plater, Governor of Maryland from 1791 to 1792, had many connections with the county. The most distinguished governor of Maryland born in Calvert County was, of course, Thomas Johnson, who served from 1776 to 1779. Joseph Kent, governor from 1826 to 1829, was also a native of Calvert County.

Address by Vice Adm. J. T. Boone at Dedication of Veterans' Administration Hospital, Cincinnati, Ohio, June 13, 1954

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON H. SCHERER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 14, 1954

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the text of an address made by Vice Adm. J. T. Boone, United States Navy, retired, Chief Medical Director, United States Veterans' Administration, at the dedication of the new Veterans' Administration hospital, Cincinnati, Ohio, on June 13, 1954:

As we participate today in dedicating this magnificent hospital that has been erected in your midst, I am particularly moved in mind and spirit. During my tenure of office as Chief Medical Director of the Veterans' Administration, it has been my privilege to witness the opening of many Veterans' Administration hospitals, none of which has stirred me as much as on this occasion. As a mother particularly cherishes and protects the child who is beset with difficulties, so I have espoused the cause of this hospital during these days when the medical program of the Veterans' Administration has been the subject of considerable discussion, regrettably too much of it acrimonious and unsupported factually.

This hospital was conceived in a spirit of amity and good will. It was the unselfish wish of the people of this area that a hospital be erected here to serve the medical needs of the defenders of this Nation's flag. The very ground on which this hospital stands was generously donated by the great city of Cincinnati for that purpose. When it became necessary, several years ago, to reduce somewhat the size of this hospital, your Representatives protested vociferously in the Halls of Congress. No louder voice of protest was heard than that of Congressman Hess who introduced the bill in Congress which ordered that this hospital be provided as a general and medical hospital to serve veterans. I cannot believe that there is now an unselfish waning interest in our people in the medical welfare of their veterans, or any intent to relinquish an obligation toward them that the citizens of this Nation have recognized since early colonial days. Confident in the unswerving will of people of noble character that will not be deterred by those embittered little men who seek to disrupt and tear down, we have maintained our charted course to the ultimate goal of opening this hospital in accordance with the mandate we have received from your elected Representatives in Government.

Standing here, I am inspired and deeply moved in the consciousness that from this renowned city came big and great men, some of whom were national leaders. Among them was a beloved President of the United States who was subsequently Chief Justice of the United States. He was the father of one of the greatest United States Senators. Also, came forth from here an eminent Speaker of the House of Representatives.

On this solemn occasion, let me give you a brief glimpse into what this hospital will accomplish.

It will furnish the veterans of this and the surrounding area the high quality of medical care for which the Veterans' Administration has gained world renown. Those who will enter these portals as patients will be entitled to this service only by provision of law—let there be no confusion on that point. As the doctors and nurses tend their medical needs, as the chaplains administer to their spiritual comforts, as the ancillary forces provide for their necessities, they will be the recipients of the bountiful benefits that can be derived only from the medical-team concept which holds sway in our Veterans' Administration hospitals, a concept and practice that connotes medicine at its best.

Further, this hospital will engage in training and educational activities. Let none question the wisdom of expending time and money for such purposes. A hospital does not do justice to its patients if it does not constantly strive to extend and deepen the learning of its component forces, the doctors, the nurses, the dietitians, the technicians. As this hospital engages in these activities, there will exist here a progressive spirit in the art and science of medicine which cannot and will not be confined within its own walls. It will diffuse to surrounding areas, thus contributing toward the fulfillment of the noble purpose of the medical profession of giving to the people of this Nation the best that medicine can offer.

Finally, this hospital will engage in research activities, delving into the still-shrouded mysteries of man's afflictions. All Veterans' Administration hospitals are research minded, all seeking answers that will benefit their patients—indeed, will benefit all humanity, for the answer to the cure of any veteran's illness is equally applicable to his nonveteran brother. We do not jealously guard, for the sole use of our veteran patients, any miracle of medical science that research may bring forth, but willingly and gladly do we offer to all any medical problems we may resolve.

That this hospital will fully fulfill the purpose for which it was erected there can be no doubt. Its very location will assure that, for it will work closely with the medical college of the University of Cincinnati and other physicians of this community, from whence have come many great men of medicine. I am deeply grateful to the distinguished medical leaders of that noted institution who have so willingly expressed their firm resolve to work with this hospital's staff in the fulfillment of its patriotic mission of comfort and healing. I regret that the dean of the medical school, Dr. Stanley Dorst, is ill and cannot be here with us. He has stood fast and has contributed to the establishment of this new hospital.

In this close collaboration of governmental and nongovernmental medical forces, in the close relationship this hospital will bear to this community, what more appropriate words could I offer than these taken from Holy Writ: "Let us consider one another to provoke unto love and to good works."

May that be the guiding spirit of all who will labor here. Then will the prayers that we lift on high today on this stirring occasion be fulfilled in rich measure.

Already in the Indochina War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 12, 1954

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I am inserting an editorial that appeared in the Milwaukee Sentinel on July 12 entitled "Already In." The editorial points out that we already have a considerable investment in Indochina. The question is, What do we intend to do about it? For myself, notwithstanding this investment, we have no business becoming involved in a war in southeast Asia.

The editoral follows:

ALREADY IN

The great majority of the American people have been hoping and insisting that the United States should stay out of the war in Indochina.

The news that we have already poured $2,200,000,000 into that war already seems to make the question more academic than otherwise.

To that very big extent we are already in.

Since we are committed to the expenditure of another billion dollars in the year commencing on July 1, our part in the Indochinese war is big indeed, and getting bigger.

Americans who are wondering what it has bought us must prepare themselves for some pretty shocking answers.

Perhaps the best answer is found in what it has not bought us.

One of the avowed objectives was the turning back of Communist aggression in Asia, and it certainly has not bought that in the light of the Red victories accomplished and impending.

If the good will of our allies was another objective, the low opinion in which our vital interests and even our basic security are held in France and England attest the fact we do not have any return for our money on that score.

The French are apparently offended because we did not take the whole war off their hands.

The British, confronted by the prospect of American withdrawal from the United Nations if Red China is voted in, are openly supporting if not actually sponsoring the Red Chinese membership proposal, plainly showing their real preference in the matter.

Clearly, we are in the Indochinese war extensively and expensively—but to what profitable purpose is not so clear.

The Tariffs on Watches

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. SMITH

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 14, 1954

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from Mr. Charles P. Taft, published in the Washington Evening Star:

THE TARIFFS ON WATCHES

The Star of July 6 carried an editorial "The Tariffs on Watches" which quoted extensively from remarks attributed to Mr. J. Lehmkuhl, president of the United States Time Corp., makers of inexpensive watches. Mr. Lehmkuhl is reported to have said that his company faces extinction because of foreign competition and because the United States Government has canceled contracts in the United States for time fuses and has placed these contracts abroad. Your editorial states that if this is true, it is quite serious and that it would take a long time to train technicians if it became necessary once more to produce such fuses here.

It is not true that the United States Government has canceled fuse contracts in this country and placed the equivalent contracts abroad. What has happened is that with the end of the Korean war the United States Government has slowed down its purchases of all armament. Obviously, we couldn't keep up the pace of armament procurement in the United States once the hot war stopped. There would be no place to store the output. This reduction in United States Government orders has affected all United States producers, not just the watchmakers. You can't have it both ways; you either have a hot war and fat contracts or a cold peace and smaller contracts.

What the United States Government has done is that, under the offshore-procurement program of the Mutual Security Act initiated in August 1951, it has place orders for the NATO stockpile for whole ammunition in France, Britain, Belgium, etc. As the orders are for complete rounds, they would naturally include time fuses supplied by local manufacturers as component parts. This ammunition is for the NATO arsenal, for the use of our allies and ourselves in a shooting war in Europe.

Should war break out, it is obvious that it is much wiser to have an operating ammunition production line in Europe rather than attempt to supply the ammunition needs of our allies over a long dangerous, vulnerable pipeline of supplies from this country.

Let us look at Mr. Lehmkuhl's contention that his company faces "extinction" because of foreign competition. It is well known that the United States corporation is a leading manufacturer of inexpensive pin-lever watches, not jeweled watches. The United States imports a very small amount of pin-lever watches; almost all our watch imports are jeweled watches from Switzerland priced at over $15. The United States Time Corp. therefore faces little or no competition from Swiss imports and in fact, the domestic pin-lever watch industry undersells, in price, the imported product. Moreover, Mr. Lehmkuhl's company has a virtual monopoly in the production of so-called "character" wrist watches, such as Mickey Mouse, Tom Corbett Space Cadet, Hopalong Cassidy, etc. Competition in this field is simply nonexistent. The position of the pin-lever watch industry is therefore substantially different from that of the jeweled watch industry.

Since the United States tariff on Swiss watches was lowered in 1936, there has been no further change in the tariff. For 18 years American watchmakers have been facing, not the threat of Swiss competition, but the actual competition itself. That competition has been met, in true American fashion, for the United States jeweled watchmakers decided to diversify their products, intensify their sales efforts and meet the competition head on. As a result, 1953 was the biggest year in sales and profits that the three leading United States jeweled watchmakers ever had. Mr. Lehmkuhl's company must be unique in the watch world if he is facing extinction. He certainly would profit by taking a leaf from the jeweled industry's competitive book. The allegations of the United States jeweled watch industry do not stand up under investigation either.

What they are probably suffering from is the current recession in the public buying of expensive watches. Swiss imports were off 25 percent for the first 5 months of 1954 as compared to the corresponding period of 1953 and their orders were running some 40 percent less than last year. United States jeweled watch producers are also behind in sales in what seems to be a general disclination on the part of the public to buy high-priced new watches.

The so-called defense argument of the high-tariff lobby is one to which they always retreat when the going gets tough. It is perfectly true that the precision workers in the watch industry just as those in the machine tool, electronics, and myriad other industries have made and can make a substantial contribution to the production of national defense items. However, in the case of the strategic items which the jeweled watch industry is concerned about, namely, timing devices for fuses, a look at the industry can be instructive. The late Senator Lester Hunt, of Wyoming, made a detailed report of his investigation into the procurement of defense items in which, speaking of the jeweled watch industry, he said: "During the early part of the war (World War II) when the Ordnance Department wanted to get started on the manufacture of fuses, the domestic jeweled watch industry was not interested in getting Government work. However, when the United States Government activated controls on materials, the jeweled watch industry very quickly jumped over."

In addition, Senator Hunt learned the production facilities of the Eastman Kodak Co., engaged in making mechanical time fuses, were "far in excess of the combined capacity of the domestic jeweled watch companies."

Too often neglected in the discussion of the defense aspects of the tariff issue is the fact that our defense rests on the strength of our overall economy and that of our allies and that our economy depends on sales both here and abroad. If we raise our tariff walls so high that our friends abroad can't gain their dollars by selling their products here, then we in turn can't sell them our products and our economy, and ultimately our defense, will suffer.

I am amazed that the Star would lend credence to Mr. Lehmkuhl's arguments without an examination of the evidence. A perusal of a recent speech by an acknowledged authority on our national defense, Mr. Struve Hensel, Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security, would have been most illuminating. Mr. Hensel said:

"It is clearly possible to achieve both our objectives, mutual trade with our allies and an overall strong domestic economy. Our economy is not so frail that it will injure easily. We will not be able to please all of our allies all of the time. We will not be able to satisfy all of our industrialists all of the time. Increased international commerce will inconvenience—and perhaps hurt—some of our industries. It will stimulate others. Our aim must be to maintain overall industrial strength rather than the status quo of each existing industry irrespective of its contribution to our military strength. * * *

"It is hard to believe that the effects of freer international trade will be more revolutionary than the advent of the automobile. No national legislature rushed, with sales taxes or tariffs, to the protection of the bicycle or wagon industry. The transition from a protected economy to a freer economy, particularly when nationally assisted, should be simpler."

CHARLES P. TAFT,
President, Committee for a National Trade Policy.

Contrast Between Forand Bill on Unemployment Compensation and H. R. 9709

SPEECH

OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 8, 1954

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 9709) to extend and improve the unemployment compensation program.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, I am grateful to the gentleman from Rhode

Island, [Mr. FORAND], for making arrangements for me to have my remarks on the Unemployment Compensation bill placed in the permanent RECORD as part of the debate on the bill. A very sad occasion, a death in the family, required my presence in St. Louis at the time the bill came before the House, and thus it was impossible for me to be present for the debate. But I do want the RECORD to show how deeply disappointed I am in the scope of the bill presented to the House under a title which I think is a misleading title, that is, a bill to "extend and improve" unemployment compensation.

This bill will add very few people to the unemployment rolls in Missouri—only those who work in establishments employing from 4 to 8 people and the comparatively few Federal employees in Missouri, about 45,000. The Federal employees should be covered, of course, but I am afraid this bill does very little for any of those who have already lost their jobs because of reductions in force, since no benefits can be paid to jobless Federal employees under this bill until next year.

I am also disappointed in the failure of this bill to increase benefits in any way whatsoever in any State or jurisdiction. The maximum benefits in Missouri today are $25 a week. That is obviously not enough to keep a family going—not with the cost of living in St. Louis, for instance, more than 2 percent higher than it was a year ago and apparently still rising. The latest Consumer Price Index shows an increase of nearly 1 percent in the cost of food from April to May of this year in St. Louis; it shows meat going up in almost every category and many of the fresh, frozen and canned fruits and vegetables going up, even such staples as pork and beans, shortening, margarine, lard, sugar, jelly, and so on, and of course the average retail price of coffee on the Consumer Price Index has reached $1.18 a pound. Not only food, but housing, medical care, personal care, transportation, and some apparel items have been going up.

With the cost of living at about a record level, it is wishful thinking to believe that an unemployed worker can keep his family going on $25 a week.

The Forand bill, which I cosponsored along with more than 80 other Democratic Members of the House, would have done a lot to improve the situation if the House Ways and Means Committee had approved it instead of the inadequate bill it did report out. It would have extended the period of coverage for unemployment compensation benefits to a maximum of 39 weeks, and in Missouri it would have meant an increase in the benefits to a top maximum of about $44 a week instead of $25. The formula proposed in the Forand bill would provide benefits equal to half pay based on a worker's normal wage up to a maximum of two-thirds of the State's average weekly wage. So in Missouri that would mean a benefit of $44 a week for any worker who normally earned $88 a week or more, and half pay for anyone whose normal wage was less than $88 a week. It would also have covered in a whole lot more workers now excluded from unemployment compensation by removing many of the present restrictions on the size of a business firm eligible for coverage. In other words, instead of taking in just those additional workers who are now employed in firms hiring from 4 to 8 employees, it would cover in a total of about 153,000 Missourians who work in small firms employing from 1 to 8 persons.

The reason I am so distressed about the inadequacies of the Reed bill is that St. Louis itself is a distressed community, an area of substantial unemployment. The Department of Labor reports that in March unemployment was estimated at 50,400, or more than double the level of a year ago. The Bureau of Employment Security added that further layoffs were expected in autos, primary metals, ordnance and shoes, and that these would offset the expected seasonal buildup in construction, trade, transportation, and food. We know that thousands of Missouri workers who have been unemployed have used up all of their unemployment compensation benefits without finding new employment. All these things taken together make it obvious that the Congress is not "extending and improving" unemployment compensation in any practical manner compared to the frightful economic problems faced by the families of those who have lost their jobs.

I hope the Senate, in considering this same legislation, will approach it in a much more realistic fashion and really improve unemployment compensation by increasing benefits sufficiently to enable people on unemployment compensation to live decently during this difficult period of recession and readjustment. The Democrats on the Ways and Means Committee, in their minority report, stated this problem concisely and accurately when they said that the majority of the Committee on Ways and Means have given to the people on unemployment compensation not bread but a stone.

The Late Grantland Rice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. GRANT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 14, 1954

Mr. GRANT. Mr. Speaker—

> When the Great Scorer comes
> To mark against your name,
> He'll write not "won" or "lost,"
> But how you played the game.

These words were inspired and left to posterity many years ago by a man who will ever be dear to the hearts of all true sportsmen. In this brief but incisive passage, the dean of American sportswriters captured the real and eloquent spirit of the game of life, whatever the aspirations or rewards might be. It testifies to the American way, the godly way, the way of all true champions.

Yesterday the creator of these words passed on to meet the Great Scorer. While at work in his midtown Manhattan office, Mr. Grantland Rice suffered a fatal heart attack. Today the entire sports world—the "has-beens," the "also-rans," the "immortals," the "champions"—and those countless others who have found pleasure and inspiration in Mr. Rice's work mourn his passing. His death marks the end of a glorious career of sports reporting which had its beginning in 1901 on the Nashville (Tenn.) News at $5 a week. In the last half century no personality surely has contributed so untiringly and influentially to the grandeur of American sports. He typifies an era in sports unparalleled in its impact on American life and institutions. In fact, Mr. Grantland Rice is an institution in himself.

Yet I submit that this grand old man has been much more to his fellow man than a reporter of athletic events. His life's work has transcended the ordinary barriers of human endeavor; it has left a legacy in which we all, however varied our pursuits, might find gratification and peace of mind.

I know of no more fitting epitaph to the memory of this man than that found in his immortal verse, Beyond All Things. In these thoughts you see the man and those attributes which will always be held in deep reverence. Mr. Rice wrote:

> He played the game—
> What finer epitaph can stand?
> Or who can earn a fairer fame
> When Time at last has called his hand?
> Regardless of the mocking roar,
> Regardless of the final score,
> To fight it out, ram blow for blow,
> Until your time has come to go
> On out beyond all praise or blame,
> Beyond the twilight's purple glow,
> Where Fate can write against your name
> This closing line for friend or foe:
> He played the game.
>
> He played the game—
> What more is there that one can say?
> What other word might add acclaim
> To this lone phrase that rules the fray?
> Regardless of the breaks of chance,
> Regardless of all circumstance,
> To rise above the whims of Fate,
> Where dreams at times are desolate,
> Where failure seems your final aim
> And disappointment is your mate,
> Where Life can write in words of flame
> This closing line above the gate:
> He played the game.

Most assuredly Mr. Grantland Rice played the game.

We Play Games in Asia and Europe While Commies Are in Backyard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER ROGERS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 14, 1954

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, out in the Panhandle of Texas there is an up and coming town located on the State line that divides Texas and New Mexico. The name of this town is Farwell, Tex., and it has a weekly newspaper called the State Line Tribune. It is published by an able and fine gentleman by the name of W. H. Graham, Jr. The excellent editorial carried in the State Line Tribune of July 1 of this year, exemplifies the clear thinking of this publisher and contains much food for thought for all of us. Under unanimous consent, I include it in the Congressional Record, as follows:

We Play Games in Asia and Europe While Commies Are in Backyard

Two weeks ago the United States was suddenly reawakened to its responsibility in its own hemisphere—the Americas. Since late in 1945 we have been spending nearly all of our time and money in exasperating efforts to knit first Europe and now Asia into a united front against Communist aggression.

Our efforts have resulted largely in frustration, endless talk, and unfriendliness. The threat of the U. S. S. R. remains a large one, but we are finding out that it is difficult to wake other countries up to this danger. They are tired of war, and want to be left alone more than anything else.

Billions of dollars in American aid have gone to countries through bartering agreements or outright gifts. The European economy has been beefed up to the point where it is now producing the things we would like to sell the countries. This is a strange set of circumstances.

Thousands of American boys gave their lives in Korea to stem Communist aggression. The war against the Reds was largely paid for out of our pockets and homes. Few other countries participated with any zeal in this history-making conflict.

Against this backdrop of sacrifice and patience on our part with people who don't want (or seem not to want) to be helped fight communism, comes an incident in our own backyard. The tiny Republic of Guatemala in Central America has erupted in civil strife, with anti-Communists pitched against Communists.

For a pleasant change, the anti-Communists seem to be getting the upper hand this time, but there is no guaranty that the winning group will make a sincere attempt to establish a democracy if it is successful in overturning the government.

We, as outsiders, cannot settle the internal problem of these small American nations, but we should be aware of the threat that aggression under arms poses to our own safety. Few people realize that the war in Guatemala is only a scant 800 miles away from Florida. A similar distance could be realized if you imagined you were in the Panhandle and they were having a war in Brownsville. It isn't really very far away.

We must pay an increasing amount of attention to the problems of our neighbors in Central and South America. The continent of South America is just now beginning to awaken from a deep economic sleep. It is endowed with many riches in the way of natural resources. Its people are maturing socially. This new area should be knit into the fabric of a strong, friendly, and united America.

Enough Is Enough

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL C. JONES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 14, 1954

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including a copy of an editorial from the Thursday, July 8, 1954, issue of the Dunklin Democrat, published at Kennett, Mo., by Jack Stapleton, Jr., which I believe rather forcibly reminds us of the inconsistencies between the promises and the performances of this administration:

Enough Is Enough

Last Friday, in the United States Senate, an Eisenhower-sponsored tax relief bill was passed.

On the same day, over in the House of Representatives, a compromise farm parity bill was passed, providing, in effect, for flexible price supports on basic crops, including cotton.

Last Friday was not a very happy day for the farmer, the small businessman, the wage earner.

But it was a very pleasant day, significantly, for the Eisenhower administration, big business, large corporations.

The Senate bill provides annual tax cuts amounting to $1,300,000,000 for large corporations, big business and the wealthy. The Eisenhower-sponsored bill fails to mention taxpayers in the lower and middle income brackets, and no tax relief is provided.

The so-called tax cut of last year turned out to be a farce. While cutting withholding taxes on weekly salaries, the Congress also passed an increase in social security payments. Many wage earners, instead of paying less to the Government, ended up paying even more through payroll deductions.

And the Eisenhower administration at last has succeeded in breaking the 90 percent of parity program inaugurated during the 1940's. The House bill, called a compromise in order that the President would approve it, provide for parities to dip down to 82½ percent, at the discertion of the Secretary of Agriculture.

The administration has consistently favored lowering parity supports despite a 13 percent decrease in farm prices during the past 12 months. The administration's insistence of lower parities, coupled with the veiled threat of a Presidential veto, is hardly consistent with the 1952 campaign slogan of 100 percent of parity.

It was during this same 1952 campaign that the slogan "Had Enough?" was used.

After Friday, the answer of farmers, small-business -men, and wage earners, is undoubtedly, "too much."

The Achievement of Freedom—Sermon Delivered in the Chapel Hill Baptist Church, Chapel Hill, N. C., Sunday, July 4, 1954, by James O. Cansler

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL T. DURHAM

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 14, 1954

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following sermon:

Today is Independence Day. It is the anniversary of the occasion when the doctrine was proclaimed to all the world that men have certain liberties simply because they are children of God. Men here have cherished that ideal for these 178 years, and it is our watchword even now. We proudly proclaim that our half of the world is free, and we hold up as a torch for all to see the liberty which we enjoy.

Now we are engaged in what has aptly been called a worldwide civil war, which, in the words of Lincoln, is "testing whether this Nation or any nation so conceived and so dedicated can long endure." The freedom we cherish is in mortal danger. If we are realistic, we will admit the possibility that it may not survive, for the danger is twofold, and it is very, very great.

There are two dangers which beset us. The most obvious one lies in the specter of worldwide communism, which, indeed, is a leviathan that would consume us. But Russo-Chinese communism is not our greatest threat. Our greatest danger lies within ourselves. I think we are more likely to lose our freedom from within—lose it by default—than we are in danger of having it wrested from us by external powers which seek to destroy. The fight for freedom will be ultimately won or lost within your breast and mine.

I speak to you on freedom today, because freedom is, at rockbottom, a religious matter. It has its primary significance there, and our only liberty worth possessing, really, is that in relation to God which makes it possible for us to become what God has in His highest purposes ordained. Thus, I speak on freedom, and state that freedom in its ultimate meaningfulness is that liberty to become what we truly should, and its value to us will be great or small according as it is necessitated by the principles and purposes to which we pledge allegiance.

I

Freedom is as a coin; there are two sides to it. On the one side it can be seen as a negative quality, a "freedom from." On the other it can be seen as a positive quality, a "freedom to." Both are necessary for true liberty. The positive freedom must have the negative in order to be real. The negative freedom must have the positive in order to have meaning. We must understand them both, and differentiate between them or else we will lose the one and the other will not be worth keeping. I would speak on the negative freedom first.

As most commonly seen in America today, freedom is understood as this negative quality; the absence of restraint. "It is a free country," we hear, "I will do as I please." Freedom from restraint in expression of one's self breaks up countless marriages annually. Freedom from restraint with regard to intoxication will claim innocent lives on our highways this very day. Freedom from duty to God, to Nation, to family, to self has left us with but one purpose, to serve ourselves. Conceived so shallowly as emancipation from responsibility, freedom has come to mean the license to secure our own self-centered purposes, and we have the reward such a conception brings. Emancipated from all save ourselves, we have nothing but ourselves to live with or to live for in our aloneness. We have the spurious freedom of one who does not know where he is going or to what he belongs. Elton Trueblood describes it, "Our generation is free in the sense that a ship is free when it has lost both compass and rudder." [1] With our independence we have indeed become independent. We have become independent, self-reliant, critical. We have become isolated, alone, inadequate, afraid. We have a freedom conceived in shallowness, and we therefore hold it in light esteem.

Erich Fromm, the noted psychologist, well describes our plight in his cogent book, Escape From Freedom,[2] and I quote him at length as he says:

"We believe that freedom of worship constitutes one of the final victories for freedom. We do not realize that while it * * * does allow man to worship according to his own conscience, the modern individual has lost to a great extent the inner capacity to have

---

Footnotes at end of speech.

faith in anything which is not proveable by methods of natural science."

In other words, though proud of the freedom to worship, modern man now has not enough faith to make worship possible.

"We feel that freedom of speech is the last step in the march to victory of freedom. We forget that although freedom of speech constitutes an important victory in the battle against old restraints, modern man is in a position where much of what he thinks and says are the things that everybody else thinks and says; that he has not acquired the ability to think and to speak for himself which alone gives meaning to his claim that nobody can interfere with the expression of his thoughts."

Let me paraphrase him in one more instance. We are proud that in our conduct we have become free from external authorities which tell us what we can and cannot do. We overlook the powers of public opinion—the power of the "Joneses"—which are so powerful because in our aloneness and our search for meaning we are profoundly ready to conform to the expectations of others about ourselves, and we are as profoundly fearful of being different.

Thus, being free, we are tightly bound. Being free from restraint, we are not free in any creative sense at all. We are free to say "No"; we are not free to say "Yes." The Navy has a rather cynical but apt expression that well illustrates this point, I think. As you know, big ships cannot always come into shore to tie up to a pier or dock, but often must remain far out in the water. In such cases, the only way to get ashore is by the use of small boats. When a Navy man wants to picture something that he has, yet doesn't have, or to show how he owns something which he is not at liberty to use, he says, "Liberty will commence immediately, but there are no boats." One is free to leave the ship, but he cannot go ashore. He is free from the restraining power, but is not free to do anything with it.

II

The opposite extreme to this negative freedom is the true spirit of freedom wherein its meaning and value rests. Schiller, the German philosopher defines it saying, "Freedom does not mean that everyone can do as he likes, but that he can become what he should."[3] This is not freedom from something. It is freedom to achieve some purpose which is high. Indeed, I see the really meaningful freedom in that liberty granted where noble principles and high ideals dictate activity. Freedom has immense value to one who has some purpose to fulfill, and seeks the liberty to fulfill it. Freedom of speech is important to one who has something profoundy important to say. Religious freedom—the freedom to worship—has meaning to one who has a profound need to worship, and must worship either with the State's permission or without it. Peter and John, in the Scripture which I read from the Book of Acts, were charged by the religious powers that be not to proclaim the Gospel further. They replied, "Whether it is right in the sight of God to harken unto you rather than unto God, judge ye. For we cannot but speak the things which we saw and heard."[4] To them, freedom to proclaim what they felt must be proclaimed—the freedom to fulfill their God given mission—was no empty sounding phrase nor was it something from which they sought escape. It was fraught with meaning because the purpose to which the freedom was to be put was eternally meaningful. Thus, freedom has validity, indeed, it has reason for existence only when it exists to grant opportunity for the attainment of some high goal. It can never be an end in itself; it can only be a means toward an end greater than itself. It exists only to serve a higher purpose.

We Southern Baptists take pride in our freedom from creeds. We are bound by no creedal statements, and that constitutes a part of our heritage in which we glory. But it follows that freedom from a creed has meaning and value only insofar as every person is thereby free to explore the things of God for himself, and free to draw up his own profession of faith in keeping with his own individual experience and the personal guidance of the Holy Spirit. It is not the freedom from creedal statements that is valuable. It is the individual freedom to let one's own religious experience color his personal profession of faith. When we begin to restrict that individuality of faith; when we begin to press for conformity in expression of faith, then freedom from creeds becomes empty, and not worth the cost of maintaining. Isn't preservation of freedom from communism a far greater certainty if we have ideals and purposes of such constraining power that we must, we simply must have the right to fulfill them? If we have a calling to fulfill, and must needs have license to fulfill it, we will not succumb to any threat that takes that license away. If we revoke the license because of the threat to it, we are undone to begin with. Freedom can never be an end in itself. It will be its richest and its best only as it exists to serve a larger and a more creative purpose.

III

In a very real sense, freedom is achieved or lost; it becomes meaningful or meaningless depending on the choices we make. Whether or not we shall be truly free depends upon what purposes we choose to serve. Freedom of choice is no figment of imagination. It is perhaps our one true a priori freedom. We are most free in our choice of masters in this life—in our choosing whom we shall serve. That we will serve something goes without saying. There is within us a psychological propensity to submit to something, and our freedom lies basically in our choice of to what or to whom our submission will be made.

Now, though it appear to be a paradox, I think the Christian meaning of freedom becomes clear. The Christian see perfect freedom possible of achievement only as it is a byproduct of bondage. Freedom in its ultimate meaningfulness springs out of slavery—servitude to the high purposes of God. By commitment to the way of life which God has ordained, one finds the master of his life that is most releasing and most conducive to one's becoming what, from the beginning, he was made to be. Jesus said, "Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free."

That which will free us is dedication to a will and a purpose big enough to draw us out of our self-centeredness, and lend purpose to our life beyond its own narrow visions and its petty needs. That which will free us is the constraining love of God which binds us to Himself while it makes of us that for which we were created. That which will make us free is the trust born of experience that from this love, nothing on earth or in it can separate us. Then and only then shall we be free. And, we shall be free in both regards. We shall be free from all that would restrain us and hinder us in our purposes and in our dreams, and we shall be free to proceed in our Master's will. With meaning where emptiness once prevailed; with purpose where before we have drifted here and there; with a sense of belonging where once we felt alone; with courage and confidence where before reigned fear; and with hope where there had been despair; then we shall be free indeed.

Therefore, I would say to you today; Choose ye this day whom ye shall serve. Your life and your liberty depend on the choice you make. Amen.

Footnotes at end of speech.

[1] The Life We Prize, Harper & Bros., New York, 1951, p. 85.

[2] Rinehart & Co., New York, 1941, p. 105.

[3] As quoted by Elton Trueblood, The Life We Prize, p. 93.

[4] Acts 4: 19–20.

The Persecution of the Catholic Church in Croatia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD L. JACKSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 14, 1954

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

THE PERSECUTION OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH IN CROATIA

The persecution of the church, the destruction of spiritual values, and the trampling on fundamental rights of human beings and peoples are inherent and ingrained characteristics of Communist dictatorship. These inhuman laws were put into practice in Croatia from the very first day of the usurpation of power by Tito and until this date there has not been the slightest change in their essential parts. Nevertheless some writers on the present day situation in that part of Europe, say that Tito in his turning towards the West has abandoned the fundamental doctrines of the Communist ideology and that every day he is getting nearer to democracy. Extending a hand to the West, impelled to by pressing needs and for his own advantage, does not imply a foresaking of Communist principles, nor a rectification of all the violences that have been committed on different persons and peoples.

Tito, his collaborators and exponents both in and out of Yugoslavia speak the truth when, with a clear conscience they affirm that they are Communists and will continue to be so. Tito himself has emphasized this on several occasions, not only in personal interviews with foreign newspapermen but also in his speeches, and hardly a day goes by that some important member of the Communist Party does not write an article reaffirming the same.

Just as present-day Stalinism is firmly founded on the Marxist philosophy arranged by Lenin, so Titoism has its greatest help and ally in the same philosophy with the same modifications, plus a series of new formulae (which refer principally to the relationship with capitalism), which Tito was compelled to make to keep himself in power. All this is fully confirmed by the police system of the Titoist regime, the official propaganda, as well as the atheistic teaching, and the very fact of the existence of Yugoslavia that counts on the discontent of the people, principally Croats; it is obvious from Tito's own words, and from numerous anti-Christian and antinational laws, and from the persecution of the church and the basic liberties.

For it is obvious that atheistic communism will always and until the very end try to destroy the Catholic Church which can never be false to its principles and can never allow itself to be enslaved by any state or regime. That is precisely why the Yugoslav Communists do their utmost to annihilate the Church of Christ in the hearts of those who are under Soviet rule. They deny the spirit and all spiritual values; destroy all traditions and spread terror from the center of power that they have usurped;

fetter without pity all political liberties and trample on the longings of the people, doing their very best to imprison the very soul of the people, deaden it and deform it, and have it completely submitted to their will. Where immorality and lies are legalized; where liberty and the will of the people are in chains; where the rights of conscience and the freedom of education and upbringing are banished; where only one political party has all the advantages; where materialism is adored and everything else denied; where intelligence and the liberty of creation are despised; where laws are ignored and the truth is hushed; there where God is denied and the church persecuted, the ground is being prepared to make it impossible for men to be able to revive within themselves the true and eternal spiritual values.

The Communists are excellent masters in the art of changing the spiritual habits of men and of eradicating all the ties and roots that bind them to the most holy of things; to God, to the eternal salvation of their own souls, to the family, to the motherland, and finally history.

STATISTICAL NUMBERS AND NAMES OF PERSECUTION IN CROATIA

Within the wide field of persecution in Croatia, the thousands of martyrs, the convents destroyed, and prohibition of all Catholic activity in whatever aspect show clearly that Communist terrorism, day after day and before the astonished eyes of the world, fastens inexorably on the people and the Catholic Church in Croatia.

In province of Slavonia in Croatia of 1,244 priests more than 126 were murdered.

In province of Dalmatia in Croatia of 902 priests more than 103 were murdered.

In province of Bosnia and Herzegovina in Croatia of 479 priests more than 129 were murdered.

In the last 10 years the clergy have suffered every manner of deaths; stoning, beheading, quartering, flaying, beating, burning. The following are a few instances:

Rev. Vladislav Kolaric of Kompolje was tortured and murdered in 1943.

Rev. Antun Zilavec of Otocac was whipped in a cellar and finally shot in 1943.

Rev. Zvonimir Milinovic of Ipodstene shot in 1943.

Rev. Josip Pretner of Lic bestially tortured and finally shot in 1943.

Rev. Juraj Mihic, Rev. Ivan Mihalic, and Rev. Ivan Niksic disappeared in 1943.

Rev. Stepan Petranovic of Bribir subjected to unbearable tortures 1945.

Rev. Dragutin Kukolj of Lika murdered in 1945.

Rev. Vladimir Kargacin of Gospic murdered in 1945.

Rev. Mato Buric of Smrika murdered by machine gun in 1945.

Rev. Stjepan Hrzic of Mrkopolj murdered in 1946.

Rev. Martin Bubanj of Susak murdered in 1946.

Rev. Bruno Vernaca of Kosinj murdered in 1946.

Rev. Srecko Blazevic of Pelinje poisoned in hospital 1946.

At Siroki Brieg in Herzegivina, Croatia, 14 Franciscans were burned alive in 1944.

Rev. Branko Kraljevic of Siroki Brieg, blind and 82 years old, murdered in 1944.

Rev. Marko Barbaric of Herzegivina blind and 80 years old murdered in 1944.

Rev. Petar Barbaric of Herzegivina, blind and 83 years old murdered in 1944.

Rev. Leon Petrovic and 6 friars of Mostar tortured and killed in Mostar 1944.

Rev Maximilian Juric of Pag killed in 1945.

Rev. Ivan Ficic of Pag killed in 1945.

Rev. Julije Kozul of Dalmatia killed in 1945.

Rev. Eugen Saturin of Zadar killed in 1946.

Rev. Petar Perica of Dubrovnik killed in 1945.

Rev. Juraj Krecak of Dubrovnik murdered in 1945.

Rev. Marijan Blazic of Gruz killed in 1946.

Rev. Toma Tomasic of Dubrovnik killed in 1945.

Rev. Antun Smith of Dubrovnik murdered in 1945.

Rev. Ivan Brajnovic of Dubrovni killed in 1945.

Rev. Dominik Barac of Sibenik murdered in 1945.

Rev. Simeon Karaman of Dalmatia murdered in 1945.

Rev. Ilija Fomas of Klepci murdered in 1945.

Rev. Kresimir Barisic of Krnjeusa thrown alive in fire of the burning church in 1944.

Rev. Josip Muller of Zagreb, murdered in Rakov Potok near Zagreb 1945.

Rev. Placid Pandjic of Zenica murdered in jail 1945.

Rev. Pavao Bedenik of Zagorje murdered in 1948.

Rev. Josip Vedrina killed in 1949.

Rev. Josip Galic killed in 1949.

Rev. Radovan Jerkovic killed in 1950.

According to the pastoral letter of the bishops of Croatia of October 1945 more than 273 priests had been assassinated, 89 disappeared and 169 sent to concentration camps. Since 1945 the number is double.

It sounds incredible that any free, democratic and Christian country of the world can ally itself with the tyranic, totalitarian and communistic Yugoslavia. It is more than unrealistic to believe that any communistic country (in this case Yugoslavia) will fight on the side of democratic, capitalistic and imperialistic America as Tito calls the United States of America.

The free world still have full confidence in the United States of America and gallant Representatives of Congress and Senate of United States of America believing that justice will be victorious over the inhuman persecution of the Catholic and any church behind the Iron Curtain. As a Croat and loyal American I strongly protest against such a persecution in belief that I speak for millions of oppressed people in my country and other countries behind the Iron Curtain.

Dr. ANTHONY BUTKOVICH.

Amending the Packers and Stockyards Act of 1921

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 14, 1954

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I am, today, introducing a bill to amend the Packers and Stockyards Act of 1921, as amended, with respect to the charging of brand inspection fees. The bill follows the resolution adopted by the National Brand Inspectors conference which was held at Clovis, N. Mex., on June 22.

The principal objective of the proposed amendment is to remove from the application of the act the activities of brand inspection authorities within their own State boundaries. Of course, there are certain exceptions noted.

It is my understanding that the Packers and Stockyards Act is being administered, in some areas, in such a manner as to interfere with the effective administration of brand inspection programs of the States. The bill would amend the act to clearly define the extent of regulatory power of the Federal Government.

In short, this is what the proposed amendment would do:

First. A State agency authorized by State law would be exempt from the act as to inspections within the State.

Second. If there is no State agency authorized by State law, a private agency may be authorized under the act to make inspections.

Third. All inspections by a State agency or private agency outside its own State would remain subject to the act.

Fourth. The State of origin of the livestock has preference to conduct the inspection and must give the purchaser a clearance certificate. If the State of origin does not exercise its preference, the State in which the market is located may inspect.

Fifth. The State agency in which the market is located may inspect cattle coming from outside the State even though the agency of the State of origin has inspected the livestock, but may not charge a fee.

Mr. Speaker, I have a keen interest in this legislation for the Fourth Congressional District of Nebraska which I represent, is one of the largest cattle-producing districts in the Nation. Cattle coming off the grazing area there do not have to be fed as long as cattle coming from other areas.

Located within my district is an area known as the Sandhills. It has an abundance of groundwater and the grass grows very tall. This area has been described by many as "God's own cattle country."

I know my colleagues would be most interested in reading the resolution adopted by the Brand Inspectors and, therefore, I submit it for their information.

The resolution:

Whereas it is believed that some of the existing provisions of the Packers and Stockyards Act and the administrative interpretation thereof unduly hamper the legitimate functions of local State brand inspection authorities; and

Whereas it is believed that the best interests of the livestock industry, in particular, and the Nation in general, will be promoted by certain revision and clarification of said Packers and Stockyards Act: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the National Brand Inspectors Conference, in regular session assembled, at Clovis, N. Mex., this 22d day of June 1954, That said conference favors and urges the enactment by Congress of substantially the following changes in the Packers and Stockyards Act:

1. That brand inspections by any department, agency, or instrumentality of a State, authorized by the laws of such State to inspect livestock as a means of determining ownership, shall not be subject to the Packers and Stockyards Act with respect to inspection within such State of any and all livestock, regardless of the origin or destination of such livestock, except as otherwise hereinafter provided.

2. That in those States wherein no department, agency, or instrumentality of State is authorized by State law to inspect livestock as a means of determining ownership,

private associations may be authorized under the regulations of the Packers and Stockyards Act to make such inspections at posted markets and collect a reasonable nondiscriminatory fee or tax therefor.

3. That all out-of-State inspections remain under packers and stockyards authorization and regulation.

That in the case of livestock shipped directly from one State to a posted market in another State the authorized department, agency or instrumentality of State, or private associations, as the case may be of the State of origin shall have a preferred right to inspect such livestock at such market; provided that such department, agency, instrumentality or association must declare its intention to inspect such livestock by giving notice in writing, to a representative of the brand inspection authority of the State within which such market is situated a reasonable time prior to the time such livestock is offered for sale; and, provided further, that in the event the inspection authority of the State of origin of such livestock elects to inspect such livestock, such inspection authority shall cause to be furnished to the purchaser an appropriate clearance certificate containing positive identification as to description of each animal and showing brands or marks appearing thereon and the location thereof.

In the event the inspection authority of the State of origin fails or neglects to declare its intention or fails or neglects to inspect such livestock after having declared such intention, the authorized inspection authority of the State wherein such market is situated may proceed to inspect such livestock and collect a reasonable nondiscriminatory fee or tax therefor. In no event shall an inspection fee or tax be collected by more than one inspection authority with respect to the same consignment of livestock.

Veterans' Legislation

SPEECH

OF

HON. EDMUND P. RADWAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 13, 1954

Mr. RADWAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Massachusetts for this opportunity and I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that I am happy to be a member of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs of which the gentlewoman from Massachusetts is chairman.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RADWAN. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I would like to say that we have no finer, no more conscientious, no more cooperative Member than the gentleman from New York. He is extremely kindly, extremely able, and always has the interest of the veterans at heart.

Mr. RADWAN. I thank the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

For me, Mr. Speaker, it has been an honor to serve as chairman of the Subcommittee on Compensation and Pensions, and in that capacity I have tried to discharge my obligations to the veterans of this country as well as to the public at large. Our subcommittee worked for a considerable period of time, spent many days holding hearings on various bills which were referred to our subcommittee, all dealing with veterans' compensation and veterans' pensions. As the result of the hearings and to carry out a mandate of that testimony, testimony wherein the various representatives of all the organizations appeared before us and testified on various bills, we produced through our subcommittee an omnibus bill known as H. R. 9020. I think, Mr. Speaker, it is a very good bill. It was unanimously recommended by our subcommittee. It was unanimously recommended by the full Committee on Veterans' Affairs, but unfortunately it has been tied up for some time now in the Committee on Rules.

Some time ago I introduced a resolution in order to precede a discharge petition. I understand that Thursday will be the first opportunity I will have to file a discharge petition on H. R. 9020. I want to announce at this time that on Thursday of this week I shall file such a petition and I invite the membership of this House to sign that petition in order that H. R. 9020 may have its day in this House.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. May I remind the gentleman that the petition will have to be signed extremely quickly. Really the signatures ought to go on in one day if we are going to be able to get the petition up for action in time before adjournment when that apparently is to take place. I know that the gentleman hopes that a rule will be granted actually before the petition is ready; is that not true?

Mr. RADWAN. Yes. I thank the gentlewoman from Massachusetts for her observation. Time is of the essence. I want to say that we have been very patient. I think in all fairness to the entire membership of this House a rule ought to be granted on H. R. 9020. It is really an unfortunate circumstance that I myself as a member of the committee and as chairman of the subcommittee am put in the position of having to file a discharge petition. It is an unfair and an unfortunate circumstance that confronts all of the membership of this House, although I still have hopes that a rule will be granted on H. R. 9020 before the membership of this House is subjected to the discharge petition which I shall file on Thursday of this week.

(Mr. RADWAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.)

Texas Bankers Aid 4-H Club Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 14, 1954

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the progressive bankers in my State of Texas have assumed a position of leadership in such matters as soil conservation, development of water resources, promotion of agricultural activities among boys and girls, and other matters of vital concern to the future of Texas.

Texas banks are currently participating in a fund-raising campaign on behalf of the National 4-H Club Foundation. V. S. Marett, able and forward-looking president of the Gonzales State Bank, has been named chairman of this campaign. I ask unanimous consent that the announcement regarding Mr. Marett's appointment be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the announcement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

V. S. Marett, president, Gonzales State Bank, has accepted an appointment as chairman for Texas banks in a fund-raising campaign on behalf of the National 4-H Club Foundation. The announcement was made by J. W. Tapp of the foundation.

Marett, who will head the bank campaign within the State, is a member of the Federal Reserve Board, San Antonio branch of the Federal Reserve Bank, Dallas. He is a past chairman of the agricultural committee of the Texas Bankers Association and is a member of the land-price group of the agricultural committee of the American Bankers Association. His bank was the first in Texas to employ a full-time outside agricultural man.

The National 4-H Foundation has headquarters in Silver Spring, Md., a suburb of Washington, D. C. It is a nonprofit, non-Government educational organization, established in 1948 to assist the Agricultural Extension Service and the 4-H program in helping millions of boys and girls prepare themselves for happy, useful, and well-adjusted living. The foundation cooperates with the Extension Service and the United States Department of Agriculture and the land-grant colleges and universities in the development of an educational program that is constantly exploring new frontiers of research, service, and training.

Current projects of the foundation include a national 4-H center, the international farm-youth exchange, research in the developmental needs of youth, training in human relations for youth leaders, and an experimental project in public-affairs discussions for rural young men and women's groups.

Chairman Marett has already held one conference with Texas Extension Director G. G. Gibson regarding plans for the campaign and others will be arranged with interested persons before contacts are made on a local basis.

Style: Deceptive and Academese

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD L. JACKSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 14, 1954

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by William Henry Chamberlin from the New Leader of July 12, 1954:

WHERE THE NEWS ENDS

(By William Henry Chamberlin)

STYLE: DECEPTIVE AND ACADEMESE

The future cultural historian of America in the middle years of the 20th century will be derelict in his duty if he does not devote some attention to the phenomenon known as anti-anti-communism. This attitude gained ground as the open expression of pro-Communist or fellow-traveler viewpoints became less popular. There are five main tags of identification for the anti-anti-Communist:

1. While he will sometimes state that he is not a Communist, or even that he is anti-Communist, he will never give any good reason why he or anyone else should be opposed to communism. In his perspective, it is always an entirely imaginary or absurdly exaggerated danger to American security.

2. While virtuously disclaiming any sympathy with communism, the "anti-anti" will always evince strong repugnance to any vigorous criticism of communism and still more to any practical concrete proposal for opposing it.

3. He can be depended on to pull out all stops in attacking any national leader, whether it be Konrad Adenauer, Chiang Kai-shek, or Syngman Rhee, who has been firm and consistent in opposition to communism.

4. By maintaining complete silence about Soviet aggressive actions, the "anti-anti" will try to convey the impression that the danger of war lies in American defensive reactions.

5. Blandly oblivious of the immense militant Soviet Empire, which, by its very existence, is a constant cause of high international tension, the "anti-anti" will always go all-out for negotiations from scratch. It is as if someone had advocated negotiation with Hitler on the basis of recognizing the Nazi Empire as permanent when it stretched from the Volga to the Pyrenees.

Our future cultural historian will probably recognize in the writings of Owen Lattimore and Vera Micheles Dean the best models of anti-anti-communism. The latter recently contributed to the Christian Science Monitor about as slick an example of this technique as one could hope to find. She was describing the low esteem in which the United States is held in India.

Since India has an anti-anti-Communist government, quite probably Mrs. Dean was doing an accurate job of reporting; but one could not but feel that she was repeating with a certain gusto arguments of leading Indian spokesmen which run so closely parallel to her own views. In the view of these spokesmen, constant denunciation of Russia and Communist China as practiced in the United States is both unrealistic in making everything look black or white, and fraught with danger of war, since denunciation, as they see it, is not conducive to negotiations. No suggestion that there is any unrealism or danger of war in Soviet and Chinese Communist denunciation of the United States; no discussion of whether Soviet and Chinese Communist methods of terror at home and aggression abroad deserve denunciation.

Thoughtful Indians, according to Mrs. Dean, recognize the dangers of communism, but they have no use for Bao Dai, Syngman Rhee, and Chiang Kai-shek. They have no desire to see a Communist regime in Indochina, but they don't think the United States should give military aid to France. Always the same picture: Lukewarm disapproval of communism, but red-hot denunciation of anyone who is fighting its armed advance.

Is it really necessary for professors, especially in the field of anthropology and sociology, to express their thoughts in English that, even to a reasonably well-educated reader, seems tortured and abstruse? Lewis Gannett recently raised this vital question in the New York Herald Tribune and offered this example from a book on drinking in American colleges:

"With the knowledge that there are levels of drinking behavior dominated by sociocultural forces, other levels which can be manipulated by guidance and the tools of reason * * * it is possible * * * to develop techniques for a defined purpose."

I noted similar excesses of academese in what was otherwise an excellent book on the organization of the Soviet Union, sound, scholarly, well documented. Were these expressions really necessary:

"The fragmentation of authority at the periphery serves as a guaranty that the Kremlin's manipulatory monopoly will remain undisturbed. * * * The circulation of the party elite has both cohesive and corrosive consequences. * * * While Soviet totalitarianism offers no precise yardsticks by which its political cohesiveness can be measured, the available evidence points to an intermediate range of speculation and surmise."

No one suggests that scholars should write in words of one syllable. But books written in such acadamese run the risk of being limited in understanding to an esoteric few. And this, in the case of a book with valuable content, seems a great pity.

The Echo's Liberalism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 14, 1954

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have published in the Appendix of the Record an editorial from the June 22, 1954, issue of the Park Region Echo entitled "The Echo's Liberalism." I commend the editorial to the attention of the Senate. At the same time I wish to pay my tribute to the members of the board of directors and to the editorial staff of this newspaper for its public-spirited attitude and for its dedication to the community welfare.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Echo's Liberalism

Last Saturday the stockholders of the Park Region Echo, meeting in annual session, adopted by unanimous vote a comprehensive declaration of the aims and principles of this newspaper.

From time to time over the years the question of the Park Region Echo's policies and politics has been discussed on many occasions. Through the years this newspaper has earned a reputation as one of the few liberal newspapers published in the State of Minnesota.

The word "liberal" is perhaps one of the most ambiguous and difficult to define in the English language. In the course of history it has taken on many different connotations.

At this point in the progress of the Park Region Echo, the publishers and stockholders have decided to define those liberal aims and principles which this newspaper seeks.

With this in mind, the following excerpts from the lengthy resolution passed at Saturday's meeting are hereby published. We, the editors, hope that this declaration will help to create understanding and appreciation of the liberal cause for which we stand.

WHAT DO WE SEEK?

In establishing our goal, it becomes paramount that we define those elusive touchstones of liberal greatness which this newspaper must seek.

To begin with, we must recognize that a truly great newspaper must be greater than any one of, or the sum total of, its creators.

Its integrity must rise above the combined consciences of its editors in that, when it speaks, its words are those of someone far wiser, far more reasonable, far more fair, far more compassionate, far more understanding, and far more honest than those men, crippled by human weaknesses and failings, whose task it is to write those words.

A truly great newspaper must seek universal respect, for without such respect its message will reach but a limited audience.

A truly great newspaper must remain unfettered by the leash of any and all special-interest groups.

For to voluntarily embrace the philosophical cause of liberalism is one thing, but to be embraced by the chains of advertiser, publisher, stockholder, political party, particular farm organization, particular management, or labor organization is another.

Few newspapers have escaped such bondage. Few newspapers have achieved true greatness.

In the metropolitan realm the St. Louis Post-Dispatch in our country and the Manchester Guardian in England have done so. In the rural areas only William Allen White's Emporia Gazette stands out as an example.

Here, then, is our challenge. Can we meet it?

THE CHARACTERISTICS OF LIBERALISM

Recognizing that the primary purpose of the Park Region Publishing Co. organization is a mutual desire to recognize, reinforce, and project into the future the liberal traditions of this newspaper, it becomes mandatory that this liberalism be spelled out as clearly and succinctly as it is possible to spell out such relatively intangible characteristics.

The classic definition of liberalism is, "Progressivism that lies between conservatism and radicalism. Disposition to constructive change unfettered by tradition."

In the realm of politics, at least, such a definition might suffice, for it is true that this newspaper's editorial pronouncements have generally fallen within the limits of this definition and it is true that by such definition the Park Region Echo has found itself alined with the political party which most closely subscribes to this position—the Democratic Party on the national scene and the Democratic-Farmer-Labor Party in Minnesota.

It is more probable than possible that this newspaper will continue to find itself sharing the political sentiments of the Democratic Party in the foreseeable future.

But it must be remembered that the definition of liberalism we seek today is a definition which will hold true for as far into the future as we can imagine and as such must not be shackled to any nominal political party.

For it is just as true now as it has been true in the past that the liberal party of today can become the conservative party of tomorrow.

A true and lasting liberalism, as we see it, must incorporate those characteristics which apply equally well in any generation to any field of human activity.

Such characteristics would include:

An inclination to resort to reason rather than to emotion, to respect the right of others to hold opinions different from ours, to look at both sides of every question, and to perceive the degree of truth that lies at either side, to see things in shades of gray rather than in black or white, to seek the truth at all costs in every issue.

A disposition to love rather than to hate, to sympathize with rather than to condemn.

A deep concern for the betterment of the lot of the masses, the downtrodden and oppressed, and the persecuted.

An undying hatred for and an unceasing resolve against the forces of totalitarianism under any name and in any guise.

A dedication to the principles of individual rights and freedoms.

A devotion to the democratic cause.

With characteristics such as these, a truly great liberal newspaper not only finds it possible but, indeed, finds it compulsory to support and encourage American liberal elements in our society which all too often find it difficult or impossible to present their case to the public through the medium of the conservative press.

These elements would, of course, include cooperatives, labor unions, civil-liberty organizations, and groups whose function it is to promote racial, religious, and international tolerance, understanding, and appreciation, when such organizations are known to be loyal and patriotic American groups.

But the very definition of liberalism, as given above, prohibits any in toto endorsement of all or any one of these elements. For the truly great liberal newspaper must at all times be free to praise and to criticize indiscriminately, and when the liberal movement, through the misdirection of any one of its integral parts, falters or errs, it is the responsibility of the liberal press to speak out against such abuses. Only by soul-searching self-criticism will the liberal cause flourish.

By the same token, the truly great liberal newspaper must never hesitate to pay tribute where tribute is due, regardless of whether the commendable was said or done by liberal, conservative, radical, or reactionary.

By strict adherence to these aims and principles, we are convinced that the Park Region Echo can enhance its own reputation, gain universal respect, and, by so doing, deliver its liberal message to an ever-increasing and far more receptive audience.

For War United States Would Need Her Own Merchant Fleet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 14, 1954

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, the Saturday Evening Post in a recent issue carried as its lead editorial a very thoughtful discussion entitled "For War United States Would Need Her Own Merchant Fleet."

While such a conviction has been expressed by a great many military and Government officials, this Saturday Evening Post editorial puts the matter most convincingly, and I am sure it impressed all thoughtful persons who have seen it.

To insure greater dissemination among our citizenry, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

For War United States Would Need Her Own Merchant Fleet

In a current report, the Maritime Administration recommends to Congress a program for maintaining the efficiency of the American merchant marine and American shipbuilding facilities. It would involve about $400 million a year for construction allowances and $60 million annually for operating subsidies.

The plan calls for 60 new ships a year, to be built in American shipyards, which this year will complete 38 vessels. Next year only three are scheduled. Foreign yards, meanwhile, are booming, since it costs about half as much to build a ship abroad as it does in this country. The purpose of the construction allowances is to make it possible for American shipbuilders to stay in business at a reasonable level. Sixty ships a year will insure the replacement of virtually the whole merchant fleet in 25 years, considered a maximum for the efficient life of an ocean-going vessel.

Operating costs amount to around $45,000 a month for the average American ship, as against $24,000 a month for a ship under foreign registry. Since most of this differential arises in higher wage scales for officers and crew, plus better working conditions, it makes a persuasive argument for American-flag operating subsidies. They have been used for many years on selected routes by all maritime nations, including the United States.

Against the policy of supporting American shipyards and American shipping stands the report of the Randall Commission, issued in January 1954. It is said in part: "The Commission recommends that the determination of the active merchant-fleet requirements of the United States for the purpose of the Merchant Marine Shipping Act of 1936 take account of the availability of foreign vessels and of the importance to the balance of payments of foreign maritime nations of their dollar earnings from shipping services."

This boils down to (1) the "dollar gap"; and (2) the idea that foreign shipping can be depended upon as firmly as American shipping, in case of emergency. As for the "dollar gap," it is no longer an important factor, or at least not a critical factor. Recovery abroad, thanks to the Marshall plan and ECA, has progressed to a point where we hear less and less of that once-yawning chasm.

The "availaibilty of foreign vessels" is undeniable in peacetime. In wartime it is no longer something we can count on. Before we entered World War I, we had a breathing spell of 2 years and 8 months. And between September 1939, and December 1941, we had another respite of 2 years and 3 months. In those periods we had a chance to gather our forces, since we were not immediately on the firing line.

That can hardly happen again. Implicit in our worldwide network of defensive alliances, in our United Nations commitments and in the position of "world leadership" which we have assumed is the fact that, in any new world conflict, we would be heavily engaged from the very first day. And little in the history of the past 8 years gives assurance that any new form of the interallied shipping pool, mentioned in the Randall Report, would be at once available to us, as it was in World War II.

The sum of nearly $500 million estimated by the Maritime Administration as the annual expense of maintaining an American merchant marine and American shipyards appears staggering. But Congress must give proper consideration to whether it is not, under present conditions and under proper safeguards, a necessary expense in support of all the commitments we have undertaken. Without a 4-ocean merchant marine, a 4-ocean navy could find itself under an appalling handicap.

Oilmen Are Builders

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 14, 1954

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, a striking word picture of oilmen as human beings and as community builders appears in the July issue of North Texas Oil and Gas Review, official publication of the North Texas Oil and Gas Association. The article was written by S. Leslie King, executive vice president of the organization. The article sets forth facts that ought to be widely known. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. King's article be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The negative side of the oil industry has been stressed so much recently that many people, including some of those within the industry itself, have forgotten that we do have virtues to accentuate. Oliver Wendell Holmes once said, "I find the great thing in this world is not so much where we stand, as in what direction we are moving." This direction can be determined only by an evaluation of the accomplishments of an industry and an understanding of the people who make that industry—what they have done and what they have purposely left undone.

While many of the great dreams and ideas of a higher standard of living were conceived before the middle of the 1800's, the fruition of those ideas and dreams could not be had until mankind found and developed some source of energy that was plentiful, economical, and easily handled by the average man. With the discovery of major deposits of petroleum in the middle 1800's the age of mechanical and industrial development was ushered into our civilization.

Look around you and you cannot fail to realize that by far the majority of things you now accept as commonplace were but dreams a century ago. The majority of articles you consider to be necessities and essentials in maintaining your standard of living would disappear were petroleum and petroleum products suddenly to be taken from your use. The farmer, the laborer, the doctor, the housewife, the manufacturer, and all men would return to the same standard of living as those people had who lived from the death of Christ to the early 1800's. Mankind is carried further along the road of higher civilization and achievement with each barrel of oil that is made available for his use.

Any industry is people. The driller, the accountant, the landman, the secretary, the service station attendant, the geologist, the engineer and all those who make their living from any of the various phases of the industry, from discovery to the sale of the end product, constitute the petroleum industry. By far the majority of these people are of high character and great ability. Few are rich men but the majority are successful because, by their conduct, they have shown that they have recognized the responsibility placed on each man to strive for the highest standard of society that is possible for humanity to attain. They are men who have time and time again proved by their words and deeds that they are not unwilling contributors to the dictates of a higher order of society. These are the men who last year paid 67.8 percent of the business and property taxes levied by the State government in Texas. These are the men who paid 45.2 percent of public education costs and 59.4 percent of the State funds for the blind and dependent children. These are the men who believe that educated minds, using and controlling ideas, will direct the course of civilization. They are men who believe that the hope of the world lies in the proper training and development of our children in every Christian aspect—and they do something about it. Look around you and you will find your friends who constitute the oil industry to be the supporter and worker in your church, your schools, your colleges, your youth programs.

Because of the very nature of their business, the majority of people within the oil industry are optimists. They are free men who fight for freedom for all men, tempered only by the recognition of the rights of others as individuals. They look toward the future with the great enthusiasm and hopes that are found in those who have faith in themselves and mankind. I am proud that I live in an era which produced such men as these, whose direction of movement represents a challenge to all to keep up with them in the fulfillment of their dreams of a greater mankind.

S. Leslie King,
Executive Vice President,
North Texas Oil & Gas Association.

The Growing Monopoly in Advertising and Merchandising on Network Television

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD L. JACKSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 14, 1954

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following article from the Spotlight by Paul Manning:

THE GROWING MONOPOLY IN ADVERTISING AND MERCHANDISING ON NETWORK TELEVISION

(By Paul Manning)

(Editor's Note.—Newspaper writer, columnist; long background of experience in radio and television, both for commercial clients and in public-affairs programs such as those of the late Senator Robert A. Taft and the presidential campaign of President Dwight D. Eisenhower.)

It is apparent that under present conditions, television will shortly become the property of two networks and a relatively few powerful very high frequency TV stations. Testimony about this alarming trend toward monopoly of the Nation's TV channels has been given before the Senate Subcommittee on Communications headed by Republican Senator Charles Potter, of Michigan.

The findings of this committee will be closely followed by industrial, educational, and political leaders throughout the country. For television itself is on trial, and along with it the jobs of many hundreds of thousands of people who depend on the dynamic medium of television for the continued growth and prosperity of factories producing for the American consumer. Network television has proved itself such a potent force in the sale of goods and the establishment of brand preferences, that the question which must be settled by Government action in Washington is whether all American manufacturers will have equal access to television broadcasting, or whether television will continue to become the exclusive sales medium of only a handful of manufacturers.

This grave trend toward monopoly of the Nation's TV channels is also cause for concern by people who realize the danger of having national television under the control of two networks. It gives them almost exclusive access to the American mind. The commentators who reflect one viewpoint have an unchallenged opportunity to mold national opinion. The question is: On whose side?

Quite simply, this monopoly has developed because 2 networks have television outlets in most major markets and population centers, and 2 have not.

The reasons why NBC and CBS have been able to achieve a virtual stranglehold on television broadcasting goes back to the period before television. They dominated radio. Because of that fact, and because the FCC played into their hands with a 3½ year freeze on television station construction, the networks were handed a tailormade opportunity to entrench themselves at the public's expense.

The condition was brought about by an earlier decision of the Federal Communications Commission which did not take into account the long-range social and economic effects of new television policies it laid down.

Television broadcasting began in the portion of the radio spectrum called very high frequency, which was limited to 12 channels. In 1948 it became apparent that 12 channels were not enough to give the Nation an adequate competitive system.

After providing for 108 VHF TV stations in 63 markets, the FCC ordered a halt to new station construction until it could determine what to do. At the time of this freeze 1 station only had been authorized in each of 40 markets. Thus, 40 stations were given absolute monopolies and the opportunity to entrench against future competition. Eleven more cities had only 2 stations. Most of these 62 stations were owned by radio interests affiliated with NBC and CBS.

NBC and CBS gained an almost exclusive franchise in 51 of 63 markets, and an advantage in 8 of the remaining 12, because their affiliates who had dominated these areas for years in radio were granted licenses to also operate as television stations.

The freeze continued for 3½ years, and then in 1952, the FCC announced a plan whereby 70 channels in the ultra high frequency spectrum were added to the 12 now operating in very high frequency.

Ultra high frequency was to be the means whereby a nationwide competitive system could be established,. Instead, it produced economic distress for those who built UHF stations because by that time there were too man millions of TV receivers which could receive only the 12 VHF channels and none which could receive UHF channels. Furthermore, the UHF stations could not get programs from the two big networks which would induce people to spend money for conversion of receivers.

Despite a warning in 1949 by such experts as Dr. Allen B. Du Mont, president of Du Mont Laboratories, Inc., the FCC placed UHF and VHF stations in the same cities and market areas. If this intermixing had not taken place, the FCC plan would have provided a truly competitive television system without monopoly.

But the FCC did intermix UHF and VHF in the same areas. As a result, 75 UHF stations have either gone off the air or surrendered their construction permits. For invariably, UHF stations have been faced with devastating competition. These UHF broadcasters began TV operations without audience or, in most instances, network affiliation. Their failure to attract viewers is directly traceable to their inability to obtain topflight network programing, which VHF stations were already receiving. The result was disaster for these 75 UHF stations.

When VHF and UHF stations operate side by side in the same areas, the following happens:

In St. Louis, which has been served by 1 VHF station and 3 UHF stations, the VHF outlet is prosperous and controls the markets. Most of the audience in the area is equipped to receive only VHF programs on their television sets, and due to the weaker program offerings of the UHF stations, little desire is created to spend additional money to receive UHF programs. One UHF station has recently gone out of business and the two which remain are barely able to keep going. A second VHF station now coming into operation may force the closing down of the remaining 2 UHF operations, making St. Louis a 2-network monopoly.

Again in Buffalo, as in many other cities, one dominant VHF station has forced one UHF outlet off the air. The problem of TV set conversion again prevails. A second UHF station is expecting serious difficulties the moment the new VHF big network affiliate, now under construction, begins broadcasting.

Yet most television experts agree that St. Louis and Buffalo, market areas of more than 1 million people each, can easily support 4 television stations. But they cannot support 2 VHF and 2 UHF broadcasters when both are intermixed in the same cities.

Senator Edwin C. Johnson, of Colorado, senior Democrat of the Senate Commerce Committee, has bluntly labeled the situation an FCC error. He said recently, "This regulating agency made the insane decision to mix UHF and VHF as a child might attempt to mix oil and water."

The UHF station dilemma is also that of the two smaller networks, Du Mont and ABC. Advertisers must have major outlets with assured audiences—those largely controlled by the two major networks. The average owner of a TV set will not spend $25 to $100 to convert to UHF because weak programs do not create the necessary desire. Therefore, UHF stations generally cannot deliver assured audiences because they cannot get the programs from the major networks which will attract viewers. The smaller networks also cannot attract advertisers to produce expensive programs because they do not have outlets with established audiences in most of the major markets.

They must depend on UHF stations to fill out their existing VHF coverage if they are to have national protection.

To manufacturers, it has meant they must largely confine their advertising efforts to the two major networks who have the major share of the national audience. And because there are only a few hours of prime television time each week on these networks, the competition among manufacturers for such time is extreme.

Consequently, the hearings now under way in Washington shape up as a chips-down situation. The manufacturer who receives coveted national time from NBC or CBS gains an almost unbreakable monopoly of the national market only because his competitors can't reach that market by means of television. Less influential manufacturers, aware that continued monopoly can spell life or death to them, require constructive action by the Potter committee which will bring relief from this television monopoly.

The key to American industrial prosperity is the right of a manufacturer to tell people everywhere of his product. Equal access to newspapers, magazines, radio, and television is vital to industrial life. Those who have other advertising mediums available to them, but are denied through existing circumstances access to television, suffer the withering effects of monopoly.

At the present time only 6 markets—New York, Washington, D. C., Chicago, Denver, San Francisco, Los Angeles—have 4 or more very high frequency stations and can be served simultaneously by 4 networks. However, it's not just a matter of being able to telecast in these cities. The two smaller networks suffer a grave programing handicap because programs by the larger networks for a truly national audience have higher budgets and greater quality than those which are created for only a nine-city audience. Yet even such program selectivity in these cities may disappear if present monopoly trends continue and the two smaller networks become weaker. Network programing would then be confined to two networks and American television would move in the direction of British broadcasting where an entire nation must accept the offerings of a single TV channel.

Dr. Allen B. du Mont, president of Allen B. du Mont Laboratories, Inc., in testimony before the Senate Subcommittee on Communications, stated that neither the Du Mont Network nor ABC could survive under the conditions that exist at present.

Certainly, the public policy of the American people is contrary to monopolistic control of industry. No industry is more important to the American people than the field of communications. It is vital to our system of free enterprise that there shall be at least four equally competitive television networks. To bring this about Government action is necessary. The Potter Senate subcommittee should take action to effect a fairer division of station time between the four networks and thereby end monopoly control in television.

Many of our Nation's leaders have frequently quoted Thomas Jefferson to the effect "that the free flow of information was indispensable to the maintenance of liberty."

This must be the guiding principle of those who can effect a solution to the television monopoly. Congress should require—in the public interest—a fair, competitive opportunity for both VHF and UHF stations and for each of the four television networks.

When the printing press was invented, the church took advantage of it for the mass production of the Bible. As the printing press was perfected, newspaper publishing became possible. Our Bill of Rights gave specific protection to the use of the printing press without interference from any source.

When radio came, other interests moved into control. Now, the most powerful medium for mass communication that ever existed—TV—is developing. Through TV, in a few months, an unknown personality can be projected onto the national scene as a dominant leader. Ideas can be promoted through TV as through no other medium that ever before existed.

If it was important that the independence of the press be protected, it is 10 times as important that access to TV be assured, so that all ideas may find expression. The Potter Senate Subcommittee on Communications has been holding hearings on the problems of handling TV so as to break up monopolies and give equal access to all. Its recommendations will go to the Federal Communications Commission and may become the basis of long-time national policy.

It is therefore vitally important that the viewpoint expressed in this Spotlight be brought to the attention of every potential advertiser, every business firm that does not wish to be crowded out of TV by the monopoly of the few networks, all in public life desiring equal access to all major population centers by way of TV, must now exert their influence so that there may be fair and competitive opportunity for four or more networks to exist side by side in the United States.

Need for Closer Industry-Education Relationship, Speech Given by Hugh M. Tiner, President, Pepperdine College, Los Angeles, Calif.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 6, 1954

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, I am pleased to present to your attention and all the other Members of this great legislative body, the text of a speech I personally had the privilege of hearing on May 5, 1954, on the campus of Pepperdine College, Los Angeles, Calif., by the distinguished educator and president of Pepperdine College, Hugh M. Tiner. Said meeting, at which this timely speech was delivered, was attended by approximately 300 leaders of industry, labor, and education in and about the Los Angeles area, and I asked permission of the distinguished educator who delivered this speech that I might be privileged to ask unanimous consent that it be reproduced in our daily Congressional Record. The speech follows:

NEED FOR CLOSER INDUSTRY-EDUCATION RELATIONSHIPS

INTRODUCTION

Mr. Chairman, Congressman Clyde Doyle, representatives of labor and management, and friends of industry and education, by way of introduction I would like to do several things tonight. First, I'd like to welcome you to the campus of Pepperdine College on behalf of the board of trustees, faculty, and students. We feel highly honored to have such distinguished people (labor and management) from our southern California business and industrial community present tonight. Second, I'd like to tell you not only how glad we are to have you here, but to express to you our appreciation for your interest in our industry-education program which we are instituting here at Pepperdine.

Tonight we shall present to you some of our plans for industry-education cooperation in providing the finest type of educational experience for our young people who plan to enter the field of business and industry. Later on Dr. John LeGrand and Dean R. Brooks will spell out in detail some of the ideas and plans which have already been developed. We want you representatives of business and industry to help evaluate these plans and to make suggestions to us on any points you may desire. I have been asked by our industry-education committee to set forth the need for closer cooperation between education and industry.

GENERAL OBSERVATIONS

It seems to me that my introductory statement should include a number of general observations or assumptions, which will serve as a basis for later discussions on more detailed matters. Here are a few general observations.

First, it should be kept in mind that we use the word "industry" in a comprehensive manner. Industry to us includes capital (stockholders), management, labor, and consumers. Tonight in a special sort of way we would like for it to include education also, which is somewhat of a new concept. We are not advocating that industry take over education, but we do believe there should be a closer working relationship between these two great American institutions.

Second, it should be understood that industry is not a "sacred cow." It owes nobody anything. It is an instrument through which each part of the industrial community can make its contribution and gain thereby. Dividends from industry (whether to stockholders, management, labor or education) should be in proportion to the contribution that is being made by that particular segment of the industrial community. We feel that this assumption is a sound basis on which to operate. I am sure all of you, representives of labor and management, will agree with me in this.

Third, it should be made clear that a profitable industry depends on the unstinted cooperation of all segments of industry. Industry must practice teamwork if it is to win the game. This is typical of the American way of life. People from other countries are always impressed with the teamwork in American industry. Successful management seeks the cooperation of all. It attempts to build a "family spirit" in the organization. Good morale in industry depends on all having a spirit of "belongingness." Progressive management has learned that it is much more fun to build bridges of understanding than walls of isolation. It is not only more fun, but it pays dividends in every other way. Capital, labor, and management have a fundamental mutuality of interest; and cooperation, not conflict, should be the dominant characteristic of such relationships. The attention of each group should be constructively centered on the product or service which is the real purpose of the enterprise.

Progressive management, the real builder of future American industry, is portrayed in the following words:

> "Here's to the man who plans things, builds things, makes things,
> Who prates not of wonders of old,
> Nor gloats upon ancestral gold;
> But takes off his coat and takes ahold
> And does things."

When all segments of industry cooperate for the common good great things can be accomplished. Each should be vitally concerned with the welfare of others. What adversely affects one usually adversely affects all, and when one prospers usually all prosper. Each segment has a great stake in the goodwill of the other. All segments of industry are realizing that they must stick together like bananas on the bunch or they will all be skinned one at a time.

Fourth, it should be emphasized that there is a new type of cooperation developing in America which is indispensable to the perpetuation and strengthening of the American system of free enterprise, and that is cooperation and understanding between industry and education. It is unfortunate but true that we have allowed a chasm to develop between education and industry. As Clarence Randall puts it, "We businessmen gibe at the visionary schemes of professors 'who never met a payroll,' and they sneer at the lives of men who worship money."

Both, education and industry, have much at stake in the success of the other. Independent liberal arts colleges throughout America, which type of education I represent, are realizing this fact as never before. I am glad to say that leading industrialists in America are realizing the contributions being made to the American free enterprise system by our independent liberal arts colleges. Certainly there are advantages which accrue to each group through cooperative efforts, because each has much to offer to the other. Each needs to be less critical of the other and more cooperative.

During the past few years I have received hundreds of letters from leading industrialists; I have attended industry-education conferences; I have read articles and books by such American industrialists as Alfred Sloan, Frank Abrams, Irving Olds, Clarence Randall, and others; and I have talked personally with many leading industrialists. In 1952 when I participated on the program of the Congress of American Industry put on annually by the National Association of Manufacturers, I talked with a number of America's leading industrialists. All of these experiences have taught me that the harvest is white—that all are ready for a closer cooperation. I would especially recommend that every group in industry familiarize itself with Clarence Randall's new book, A Creed for Free Enterprise. It was because of this outstanding book that Mr. Randall was chosen by NAM as their Man of the Year in

1952. In concluding his chapter on education and industry he says, "If only the educators and the businessmen could stop goading one another into recrimination, and rejoice together in the great purposes which they share in common, a new partnership could be brought about that would be of incalculable value to our country, and to the civilization which free men everywhere cherish."

CONCERNS OF INDUSTRY AND EDUCATION

Industrialists and educators alike need to face several facts which should be of great concern to both. Let me enumerate a few of these problems which can be solved only through better industry-education cooperation.

First, is the fact that the younger generation are extremely skeptical of opportunities for success for themselves in industry in the future. Who is responsible for this situation? Educators are partly responsible, I suppose, but calamity howlers in and out of industry have done a pretty good job in discouraging youth from going into industry. This is too bad because industry is greatly in need of good leadership. In my college I am slow to ask an industrialist to speak to my students, because very frequently he feels obligated to prove that the world has gone to the dogs, that the day of opportunity is over, and that one is crazy if he contemplates the decision to go into industry. Men speak this way and then expect young people to be enthusiastic about the American system of free enterprise. Leaders in industry, labor and management, must take upon themselves the obligation to do what they can to capture the imagination and the enthusiasms of the youth of America, showing clearly that there are unlimited opportunities for the forward looking, ambitious youth of today. Many young people in college, and even many in industry, have lost much of their incentive. Leaders in industry have a responsibility in helping young people to progress toward something better. The desire to get ahead attitude should be recognized in youth and capitalized on. Our young men who graduate from college like to work under a man like George Boggs, head of the western division of Lincoln and Mercury. This official of Ford Motor Co. inspires his employees, encourages the "get ahead" attitude, and pushes young men into big jobs and makes big men out of them. Nothing gives young people more faith in the American system than the actions of George Boggs and his kind.

Second, industry and education must be concerned about the fact that many young people possess the dangerous attitude that security is the most desirable aim in life to be attained. Such a spirit could be the undoing of our great American system, which calls for individual initiative, the desire to get ahead, and other qualities of character. Unfortunately there is a general tendency among many to lean upon the Government for support in their old age rather than rely on their own efforts to attain independence. Please realize that I am not condemning wholesome social security programs.

Through proper industry-education cooperation young people should be helped to maintain a much more wholesome attitude toward life and their life's work. They should be (1) inspired to personal achievement through having personal contact with interested and open-minded members of the industrial community, (2) impressed with the unlimited opportunities that lie just beyond the horizon, (3) encouraged to learn the value of thrift and to price the technique of saving, and (4) reminded of the meaning and significance of the American way of life, and shown what type of person best fills his niche and accomplishes his task in the American scheme.

The main purpose of education is to train young people in the development of fine character and personality. Education should emphasize a new set of three R's: Reason (the why in education), resourcefulness (the how in education), and responsibility (the who in the educative process). It seems to me that a young person would be on his way toward being an educated person, one who would be in a position to make significant contributions to industry if he had learned to remember 12 things.

Twelve things to remember: The value of time, the success of perserverance, the pleasure of working, the dignity of simplicity, the worth of character, the power of kindness, the influence of example, the obligation of duty, the wisdom of economy, the value of patience, the improvement of talent, the joy of originating.

Third, education and industry should concern themselves with the fact that many young people have very little respect for the industrialist. They feel he is only interested in making money, that he will exploit youth in order to achieve this goal, and that he has little or no interest in the welfare of youth, his fellowman, or anything else but his insatiable desire to accumulate wealth. This is truly a sad situation. A closer cooperation between industry and education, which allows the student to have personal contact with the leaders in industry, could have a wholesome influence upon young people.

Studies made by Young President's Organization, a group of young executives, indicate: (1) The formation of new corporations is on the decline, (2) young people are losing their initiative, and (3) corporations are making it easy for future leaders to be lazy.

The late J. W. Ward, financial editor of the Los Angeles Examiner, in commenting on the Young President's Organization, referred to a 10-point program of the organization designed to overcome the lack of ambition in young people and increase their faith in American industry and industrialists. The organization's objectives are as follows:

1. Protect and strengthen laws which guard individual and property rights.
2. Inspire the individual to personal achievement.
3. Promote self-reliance in the individual.
4. Increase productive potential by encouraging formation of new businesses and individual enterprises within established companies.
5. Encourage risk capital to new ventures.
6. Work for a system of regulations that will provide a healthy climate for business.
7. Foster development and conservation of natural resources.
8. Dramatize the opportunity that lies before us and that is just beyond the horizon.
9. Teach the value of thrift and technique of saving.
10. Emphasize the importance of freedom in America.

Such a program might do a great deal in bringing a resurgence of interest in young people in industry. This would mean a great deal for the future of our American free-enterprise system. It would tend to give it that dynamic quality which it so often lacks today. Closer industry-education relations should have a wholesome influence in this regard.

Fourth, industry and education should realize that each has great resources which should be made available to the other, but which are usually not available due to the chasm between industry and education. There are, of course, exceptions to this. There have been many industry-education cooperative projects put into operation.

Industry can provide lecturers on various phases of business, give personal counseling to students after lectures, make facilities available to schools for visits of teachers and students, provide jobs for faculty during vacation and use specialists in consultative status, provide part-time jobs for students so as to give students work experience, provide scholarships and financial aid to worthy students, and engage in many other industry-education projects.

College professors are always available for in-service training programs in industry such as courses in human relations for supervisors, speech and communication courses for prospective candidates for management, economics courses which give a clear picture of the American system, workshops put on by business administration professors, and many other such services.

There is no doubt in my mind but that both industry and education would profit immeasurably from a program of closer industry-education relations. At Pepperdine College we have drawn heavily upon the resources and facilities of industry in the past. We are now instituting a new industry-education educational program which will begin this fall. It will be a cooperative program. The student will be studying on the campus during the morning and working in an industry or business organization in the afternoon. Educators and industrialists will sit down together with the student and attempt to give him specific training which will prepare him for a specific job in a specific industry. In addition to this the young person will receive a thorough liberal arts training in the college, which is required of all students regardless of the course they are pursuing.

The remainder of the program tonight will be given over to a presentation of the tentative program and an evaluation by you. We shall appreciate your suggestions and constructive criticisms.

History Shows WAVES' Service to Country

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANTONI N. SADLAK

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 14, 1954

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, the Naval Reservist, issued each month and containing news of interest to the Naval reservists continues to be a prized bulletin received by me. In this month's issue I was greatly impressed by a résumé and a history commenting on the WAVES' service to our country. Each Member of the House, as also each Member of the other body of the Congress, is greatly interested in the wonderful work and service given by members of this branch of the Navy. The impressive history will, therefore, be read with much interest and perhaps will emphasize duties and sacrifices which we may have previously taken for granted. With that in mind, under leave to extend my remarks, I include this timely article:

HISTORY SHOWS WAVES' SERVICE TO COUNTRY

In a sense, the WAVES this year are celebrating their 37th, not 12th, birthday. The record shows that, during this time, they have become an essential part of the Navy. The history of women selected for active duty with the naval establishment (exclusive of the Navy Nurse Corps), began in World War I when in March 1917, Secretary of the Navy Josephus Daniels inaugurated the naval reserve program for yeomen (F), later to become popularized as yeomanettes. More than 11,000 yeomen (F) served the

Nation in the First World War, principally in a stenographic capacity.

However, in addition to the purely clerical duties performed by the yeomen (F), others served as translators, draftsmen, fingerprint experts, camouflage designers, and recruiting agents. Five yeomen (F) enlisted in the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery, and served with Navy hospital units in France. Others were stationed at Guam, Puerto Rico, the Panama Canal Zone, and Hawaii, in addition to the United States and France.

Capt. Joy B. Hancock, United States Navy (retired), former Assistant Chief for Women, began her service in the Navy as a yeomanette, and is eligible to wear the Victory Medal of World War I.

All yeomen (F) were released from active duty by July 31, 1919, but as their enrollments had been made for 4 years, they were continued on the rolls of the Navy in an inactive status and received the retainer pay of $12 a year until the expiration of their enlistment, when they were then discharged from the naval service. They were included in all subsequent benefits affecting World War I veterans.

Again, in World War II, the need for women in the naval service to supplement the country's manpower was recognized and on July 30, 1942, the President signed legislation authorizing the enlistment and commissioning of women in the Women's Reserve, United States Naval Reserve.

Within a little more than 2 months, a naval reserve midshipman's school officially opened at Northampton, Mass., with 900 probationary officers and V-9 students; and three enlisted schools were opened—at Stillwater, Okla., for yeomen, at Bloomington, Ind., for storekeepers, and Madison, Wis., for radiomen.

One year later, on July 30, 1943, 27,000 Waves, officer and enlisted, were on active duty in the continental shore establishment. On the second anniversary, 72,350 women were in the naval service. They were filling 10 percent of the jobs in shore establishments within continental limits and were on duty at some 500 shore stations from coast to coast.

In September 1944, an act of Congress permitted Waves to volunteer for service outside continental United States in the American area and in the territories of Hawaii and Alaska. By January of the following year the first large contingent of Waves had reported for duty in Hawaii.

The third anniversary found 86,000 Waves on duty at 900 stations in the United States and Hawaii. This was the peak strength of the women's component during World War II. One year later, after demobilization, approximately 9,800 Waves were on active duty.

At the time the Women's Armed Services Integration Act of 1948 became law on June 12, 1948, the current Wave strength was less than 2,000 officers and enlisted personnel. Within a month, the first Naval Reserve enlisted women were sworn into the Regular Navy.

From that time on, the history of the Waves consists principally of a series of firsts. Peacetime enlistments in the Naval Reserve were opened to women without previous military service, women were authorized to train in the Organized Reserve and the first Reserve Officer Candidate training course for women was opened at Great Lakes, Ill.

More and more Naval Reserve programs became available to women in a pay or nonpay status.

At first, authority for women reservists to transfer from inactive status to the then Organized Reserve units limited them to membership in organized surface divisions selected for training women, communications supplementary activities, military sea transportation companies, electronics companies, and air wing staffs.

Women officers were later allowed to join organized intelligence units and auxiliary ground units (air) and enlisted Waves could be assigned to organized surface brigade and battalion staffs.

Originally limited to men, billets in organized Reserve harbor defense, telecommunications, censorship, and mobilization-team units were offered to women. Enlisted women have been authorized to join organized advanced base groups and women officers may now take part in organized Selective Service units.

In July 1950, the voluntary recall of enlisted women reservists to active duty was authorized and 2 months later, enlisted women reservists in specific ratings were involuntarily recalled to active duty.

Today, women Naval Reservists number about 1,000 on active and 9,000 on inactive duty.

The Waves have traveled a long way during their brief history. Today, in the Navy as elsewhere, they have equality in opportunity, privileges, and responsibility. They have earned it.

American Legion, 23d Congressional District, California, Resolution for Alaska and Hawaii Statehood in 1949

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 6, 1954

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, in the important community of Hollydale, Los Angeles County, Calif., is the distinguished American Legion Post, No. 723, and since there has been pending legislation in the matter of whether or not the Territories of Hawaii and Alaska should, one or both, be admitted to the Union of the United States of America as States, I was recently pleased to have my attention recalled to the fact that way back in August 1949 I received from the aforesaid American Legion at Hollydale, Calif., a copy of an original resolution by said American Legion post, dated August 3, 1949, and which was submitted by Legionnaire Donald Winslow, historian of said post, and which resolution advocated that both Alaska and Hawaii be admitted as States. The text of said resolution follows. And, in order to make the record clear and complete, I am also pleased to herewith present the text of my letter dated August 30, 1949, to said Donald Winslow at Hollydale, Calif. Likewise, I am pleased to present the text of original letter dated September 8, 1949, from Hon. Ernest Gruening, former Governor of the Territory of Alaska, to Mr. Donald Winslow, in which the distinguished former Governor communicates with the legionnaire on the subject matter.

Diligent members of said Hollydale Post, having called their activity in this matter then and now to my attention, I am pleased to present this record for your attention:

RESOLUTION ON STATEHOOD OF TERRITORIES OF ALASKA AND HAWAII

Whereas the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii are necessary for our defense as our western outpost of the United States; and

Whereas in the event of another attack on this country, Alaska and Hawaii will again be among the first areas under attack, their defense will be our defense; and

Whereas in the late war Alaska and Hawaii were not only attacked but became our advanced ramparts in a vast offensive operation; and

Whereas the entry of Alaska and Hawaii into statehood would ease the general, Federal taxload; and

Whereas the population of the Territory of Hawaii is 541,372; and

Whereas the buying power of Hawaii is $677 million, and per capita income is $1,251; retail sales $464 million; and

Whereas the population of Alaska is 94,000; and

Whereas the buying income of Alaska is $155 million; retail sales $85 million; per capita income is $1,600.04; and

Whereas this income will exceed some of our present States; and

Whereas very little has been taken out of Alaska that has gone back for its development; and

Whereas statehood would change that. Congress would no longer, as it has so often in the past, exclude Alaska and Hawaii from beneficial legislation to favor some other section of the country; and

Whereas we can never forget that Alaska commands the aerial invasion routes over the top of the world, and Pearl Harbor, our western sea frontier, is located in Hawaii; and

Whereas the western United States could participate in the development of Alaska, this rich territory with immense resources and almost completely undeveloped; and

Whereas we are spending billions to rearm Western Europe, but nothing for our northern and western ramparts; and

Whereas statehood for Alaska and Hawaii and adequate military preparedness in both Territories should be the first consideration: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That Hollydale Post, 723, American Legion, Department of California, in meeting here assembled this 3d day of August 1949, do hereby go on record as urgently requesting the consideration of the Congress of the United States of America in the admittance of Alaska and Hawaii to the United States as States; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the 19th district and department headquarters.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., August 30, 1949.

Mr. DONALD WINSLOW,
Hollydale, Calif.

MY DEAR DON: That resolution to the American Legion Convention was splendid. Congratulations upon it.

Evidently, you and I think along together a good deal even though we do not get time for communication as often as I would like. I am mailing to you CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for August 16, 1949, wherein you will find on page A5608 my brief remarks saying the very substantial thing which you have given in your very important resolution.

My work is such here that I cannot come home at this time.

Best wishes.

Sincerely yours,

CLYDE DOYLE,
Member of Congress.

TERRITORY OF ALASKA,
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
Juneau, September 8, 1949.

Mr. DON WINSLOW,
Historian, Hollydale American Legion Post, No. 723, Hollydale, Calif.

DEAR MR. WINSLOW: Thanks for your excellent letter of September 4.

Your splendid support of the cause of Alaska statehood is greatly appreciated. We have a battle on our hands which we propose to wage with all the vigor at our command, and I shall not hesitate to call on you when some assistance with Senators and Congressmen will be needed. The American public is overwhelmingly behind statehood for the Pacific territories and the question is now whether Congress will represent public sentiment or not.

Cordially yours,

Ernest Gruening,
Governor.

Address by Hon. Thruston B. Morton, Assistant Secretary of State for Congressional Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHESTER E. MERROW

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 14, 1954

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the Record, I include therein a most excellent address by the Honorable Thruston B. Morton, Assistant Secretary of State for Congressional Relations, before the sixth annual Colgate University Conference on American Foreign Policy, Hamilton, N. Y., Sunday, July 11, 1954.

The address follows:

Address by the Honorable Thruston B. Morton, Assistant Secretary of State for Congressional Relations, Before the Sixth Annual Colgate University Conference on American Foreign Policy, Hamilton, N. Y., Sunday, July 11, 1954

At the outset, I should like to take up a matter of perspective. Columnists, lecturers on world affairs, and officials of Government as well, are prone to discuss policy as though it were subject to precise geographic divisions. You hear references made to our Latin American policy or to American policy toward the Middle East. The users undoubtedly employ this regional approach for the sake of convenience. But, after hearing it for a while, some may be led to believe that there are basic differences in, for example, our Latin American policy and our policy toward the Middle East.

That is not the fact. We have certain well-defined and universal objectives, and we have one policy—a global policy—which is designed to advance us toward those objectives.

At the root, the United States Government has as its primary responsibility the security and welfare of the American people. The position of the administration is that only through a durable and equitable world peace can these objectives be finally achieved. And the basic, global policy evolved is one which is shaped to move us toward this goal.

I believe I am safe from challenge if I state that the peace just described is still over the horizon—far enough over to justify classifying it a long-range aim. That does not mean that we work for it with any less enthusiasm or that our efforts are diminishing in vigor. Quite the contrary. But it does mean that while this Nation and its free allies go forward with the slow, arduous, the costly and infinitely worthwhile task of building a peaceful international structure, we have a corollary responsibility in the interim. Concurrently, we must also prevent a third world war.

Now—most of us will promptly acknowledge the fundamental absurdity of talking of peace in regional terms. Europe and Asia may be completely tranquil, but if there is fighting in the Middle East, there is no peace. And logically, we are willing to apply the same rationale to the interim objective of preventing war. We should then not fail to proceed on the assumption that if an objective is global—the policy formed to achieve it can be of no lesser dimensions.

In theory, very few will dispute this logic. But somewhere along the line, as specific situations develop, it is forgotten or ignored in the tension and strain of the moment and with it is lost all perspective—a loss which could well prove fatal to us and to our objectives.

Let us consider a case in point. In the province of our interim objective of preventing war, we have to contend with one major element, the imperialist drive of the Communist conspiracy. In that conspiracy lies a continuing threat to the peace of the world.

What can be said of that threat? Is it focused on the Far East? Does it loom more menacingly over Europe than over the Middle East? Are the regions of North Africa and the Western Hemisphere spared the attentions of the conspirators?

In each instance, the answer is "No." The men in the Kremlin may have assigned a temporary priority to their expansionist drive in the Far East—but they have not eased pressure on Western Europe. Although the tension in North Africa may not, at this moment, be making headlines, the agents of Communist imperialism are hard at work there trying to exploit the unrest which pervades the area—trying to pervert the cause of nationalism to their own evil purpose. And we have just witnessed a near miss by the Kremlin in an effort to penetrate and manipulate the Government of one of the American Republics—Guatemala.

It is thus apparent that one of the major factors of the Communist threat—and, correspondingly, a major element of the policy we shape to cope with it—is its totality. Certainly, within the limits of our capacity, we should endeavor to meet Communist moves wherever they occur.

But we should be wary of being drawn into a concentrated effort in one locality to the neglect of another. Which brings us back to to the matter of perspective. To oversimplify—in international affairs it is poor policy to rob Peter to pay Paul.

In these terms, I should like to take up with you four items of current interest which relate to the Communist offensive. They are also matters—with one exception—which have the strong emotional overtones which so often have an adverse effect on our vision and our judgment.

Item 1 deals with the vital problem of the defense of Western Europe and the participation of the Federal Republic of Germany in that defense. I believe that most of you are familiar with the conflict here: On the one hand the plain and practical necessity of West German participation in an effective defense and, on the other, the fears of France, and some of the other Western Powers, of German rearmament and a revival of German militarism. France, for example, has ample historical reason for her fears. Three times in less than a century, France has been attacked, overrun, and laid waste by a German army. And the last instance was accompanied by a temporary realization of the nightmare of Europe—an alliance between Germany and Russia. Although we have good reason to believe that present circumstances eliminate any justification of these fears, for the people of France they are nonetheless real.

French leaders themselves advanced a proposal to resolve this conflict. Under the European Defense Community, the Federal Republic would make a substantial contribution to a European army which by its composition, and the nature of the German rearmament itself, would insure against a revival of militarism in Germany.

Although it was initially a French proposal, it is France that has offered the main stumbling block to the adoption of the defense community treaty. Four of the six nations of the proposed community have ratified, but the treaty has yet to reach the floor of the French Chamber of Deputies for debate.

In turn, this presents the United States with a dilemma. As previously mentioned, in the interest of American security we are convinced that Western Europe must have a defense that will deter Communist aggression and which will be strong enough to deal with it should an attack occur. Through the North Atlantic Alliance, we are committed to a participation of this defense and have contributed four infantry divisions to the NATO army. We are also convinced that the defenses cannot reach the required level of effectiveness without the inclusion of troop units from the Federal Republic of Germany. We have therefore strongly supported the defense-community project and have exerted all influence we could properly bring to bear on the French Government to ratify the EDC Treaty.

But we cannot escape the obvious fact that the issue is solely a matter for the French to decide. If they decide to ratify, a great stride toward a secure Europe will have been made. If the French Chamber refuses, the United States, along with Great Britain and the other nations concerned, will have to adjust to this reality.

It would be incongruous to have Germany make a contribution to the defense of Europe without at the same time restoring to her virtual sovereignty. Germany has ratified the Bonn treaties. Should she be penalized indefinitely for a delay which she has not caused? If French ratification is therefore further delayed, consideration will have to be given to finding means of breaking the present deadlock.

In Europe, as elsewhere, the thesis on which we proceed is that collective action alone can check the spread of communism, prevent war, and secure real peace. And when free nations act in concert, they can do so only on a voluntary basis. That is a part of our great strength. Neither the United States, nor any other individual or combination of individual members, can expect to impose its views on the coalition. Persuasion is permissible; coercion is ruled out.

Thus, if the strong Europe, which is so greatly to our interest, is to be created, it cannot be manufactured in the United States. It can only develop out of the determination of the nations of Europe to make the best collective use of their individual resources. Europe can be united by Europeans alone.

When considering the question of France and the European Defense Community, it is difficult to avoid being aware of another free-world problem wherein France is also a pivotal factor. I refer to the struggle of the French Union forces in Indochina against the rebel forces of the Viet Minh, sponsored and supplied by Red China and other Soviet satellites. The covert participation of Peiping in this fight effectively removes it from the category of a revolt and classifies it as a stage of the Communist drive for control of southeast Asia.

As you know, this has been a cruel struggle. Ho Chi Minh, the Moscow-trained leader of the Viet Minh, has masqueraded as the leader of the forces of freedom and independence. He has also succeeded to a degree in exploiting Vietnamese resentment of the colonial status in which they were so long held. This resentment continues to be directed against the French despite the fact that the independence of the three Associated States is now threatened only by the militant efforts of communism to enslave them.

In spite of substantial material assistance from the United States, the French military position has worsened. And Premier Mendes-France is now engaged in direct negotiation with the Viet Minh in an effort to reach an acceptable settlement. At this time, we have no way of knowing whether a settlement can be reached—and if one is reached whether or not it will be acceptable.

However, this much can be safely said. The United States will not become party to any agreement which smacks of appeasement. Nor will we acknowledge the legitimacy of Communist control of any segment of southeast Asia any more than we have recognized the Communist control of North Korea.

In a larger context—in the context of a threat to the independence of all the free nations of southeast Asia—the Communist move on Indochina has an even graver meaning. Thailand, alert to the danger of Communist aggression, asked the United Nations to send a peace observation commission to the area to provide an impartial report on developments there. This Government gave the motion its full support. When it came to a vote in the Security Council, the Soviet Union, exercising the veto for the 59th time, prohibited action.

While awaiting a decision by the General Assembly which convenes in September, the United States is endeavoring to develop—as rapidly as circumstances permit—a collective security system to stem the spread of Communist forces into southeast Asia. We are also prepared to extend all practicable assistance to cooperating governments in defending the area against Communist infiltration and subversion.

Without detracting from the importance of the Communist offensive against southeast Asia, the region is only one of several in the Far East being subjected to Communist pressure. The Republic of Korea, Formosa and Japan alike are receiving their share of Red attention. United States policy is accordingly responsive.

The Republic of Korea and Formosa face substantial Communist military forces. It has been and is our policy to strengthen them militarily and economically. With Japan, the threat posed by Red China's military power is less immediate—due, in part, to the security pact with this country. However, Japan faces grave economic difficulties which Japan's leaders may find difficult to resolve unaided.

Their difficulties can be simply described. Eighty-six million people live in an area the size of the State of Montana. They have few natural resources and despite intensive cultivation of arable land, cannot raise enough food to feed themselves. They are the most highly industrialized nation in the Far East and have always depended on exports of manufactured products to pay for the food, raw materials and consumer goods that they must import.

Japan must trade or starve.

Trade in what markets? Her observance of controls on trade with Communist China rules out a region that formerly was a substantial customer. And markets that Japan formerly had in southeast Asia before World War II have not been fully reopened.

In the light of Japan's position as a northern anchor of our West Pacific defense line—to say nothing of her position as the only industrialized country in the Far East—it is urgent that something be done. The administration is investigating means to improve Japanese participation in free world markets—including our own. The Japanese themselves are working to reopen markets in southeast Asia. Both moves are essential to the development of a self-sustaining and democratic Japan. And if we object to the sacrifice that may be involved, we might consider the alternative—a weak and restive nation increasingly resentful of its dependence on American largess, frighteningly vulnerable to Communist pressure.

Still another phase of the Communist offensive in the Far East is the unremitting pressure of the Soviet bloc to gain admittance for Red China to the United Nations. Although the outcry from various quarters in this country would lead some to believe otherwise, this is not a new Communist push—nor does the American Government believe its chances of success have substantially improved.

In various agencies of the United Nations, members of the Soviet bloc have repeatedly tried to seat representatives of Red China. The issue has been raised over one hundred times. On one occasion was the Chinese Communist seated—only to be unseated shortly thereafter.

Since the last rejection of a Red Chinese delegate, the case against Communist China has been strengthened. To their guilt as a declared aggressor in Korea, has been added their attempt to take over Indochina. They have refused to conclude a peace in Korea and consequently are still at war with the United Nations. At Geneva, the representatives of Red China denounced the United Nations—an action quite in character with their diplomatic deportment during the past 4 years.

As you know, the United States Government is unequivocably opposed to seating Communist China in the United Nations. To the argument that admitting Peiping to the United Nations will bring about a change of heart, we reply that the United Nations is an international organization dedicated to world peace—and not a reform school. Further, our belief in the soundness of the case against Communist China is firm. As I have said, it is a good case and we believe that the membership of the United Nations will respond accordingly.

To complete the circle of Communist expansion, it is necessary to return to this hemisphere—to the Central American Republic of Guatemala where the Communist conspirators attempted to set up a colony in the New World. Their tactics there followed familiar lines: establishment of cells, gaining control of mass organizations as a prelude to infiltration of government. There was one exception. Heretofore, the Communist strategists have confined their efforts at political take-over to areas within the radius of operation of the Red Army. Force or the threat of force—as in the instance of the Czech coup—figured decisively. While, obviously, in Guatemala, the Red Army was not a factor, the element of force was introduced by a shipment of munitions from the Soviet sphere. Had the Communist imperialists succeeded, through purely political maneuvers, in gaining control of an independent government far removed from the center of Communist influence and power, they could rightly have claimed a spectacular triumph.

The background of the attempt to establish a Communist satellite in Guatemala is well known to most of you. Communist agents, under the guise of patriotic progressives wormed their way into the administrative structure of the government. They were abetted to no small degree by a revolutionary situation which, in characteristic fashion, they set out to corrupt. Although their numerical representation in the legislature was small, they controlled it by using the popular front technique. In turn, legislative control enabled the Communists to dominate the judiciary. From this position, they were able to further their inroads into the executive branch, establishing themselves as a kitchen cabinet and moving in on such mechanisms of government as the social security agency, the agrarian reform apparatus and official press and radio—all of which were keys to public influence. As a means to this position of dominance, they infiltrated and won control of mass organizations such as labor unions and peasant groups.

The Organization of American States met in Caracas last spring and took official note of the Communist intervention and declared it a threat to the peace of the hemisphere. The tempo of the movement of the security machinery was accelerated by a move which shocked the hemisphere. Two thousand tons of arms from behind the Iron Curtain arrived on a freighter for the Communist dominated regime. For all who would see, the Communist objective was clear.

If any further evidence of aggressive Communist intentions was needed, the Kremlin's agents in Guatemala were not reluctant to provide it. A reign of terror against anti-Communist leaders and spokesmen in Guatemala was instituted.

In response, the Organization of American States voted to convene the foreign ministers of the Americas to discuss positive steps to wipe out the threat of Communist intervention. But, before the discussions could take place, an army-supported revolt of the Guatemalan people led to the overthrow of the Communist dominated regime.

While we can take comfort in the outcome, we ought also to have had our eyes opened. We like to think of this hemisphere as the well-spring of independence and self-government, as the progenitor of political societies that are the antithesis of Marxist dialectic. And yet we have been witness to a Communist penetration that came perilously close to establishing a Soviet beachhead in our midst.

It seems to me that this proximity of Communist aggression should exert a sobering influence. It should first of all persuade the doubters among us that Communist imperialism is a universal force and that the steps we take to deal with it should be tailored to that pattern. It should also emphasize the harsh fact that no single non-Communist power has the capacity, of itself, to check Communist expansion. And it should engrave on our minds the reverse of the foregoing—that the resources of the free world are ample to turn back any Communist effort, provided they are mobilized for the purpose.

No more than that is needed. And it is likely that no less will suffice.

I feel that it is particularly important that we as a people digest these facts. The responsibility of leadership is ours. This is not to say that if anything goes wrong anywhere in the world that it is our fault—or that it is necessarily up to us to fix it. But it is to say that it is absolutely essential that we play the leader—that we do not let the heat of emotions rob us of our perspective or let impatience force us to act on impulse.

It may be a long and weary game—but we hold winning cards if we but play them right.

Opportunities for the Physically Handicapped

SPEECH

OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 7, 1954

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 9640) to amend the Vocational Rehabilitation Act.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, I am very much in favor of the general provisions of this legislation to expand the program of vocational rehabilitation for the physically handicapped. The purposes of the bill are good ones—to improve the Federal-State machinery for carrying out this cooperative program of retraining handicapped people for jobs in which their physical disabilities do not handicap them, and to increase the size of Federal appropriations which can be made each year under the program.

We have been rehabilitating the handicapped through this program at the rate of about 60,000 a year. When we consider the fact that about 250,000 a year are totally disabled because of disease or accident, it is clear that we are only doing a partial job.

What has been done under Federal and State cooperation, however, has been a good job, and so it is a question of expanding a program which has already proved itself to be a very excellent one.

The goal of this bill is to increase the number of handicapped persons retrained each year from the present 60,000 to 70,000 next year and eventually to about 200,000 a year by 1959. But in passing this authorization bill, which I am sure will be done by unanimous vote of the House, I think we should all bear in mind the fact that we must follow through with the necessary appropriations or this is just meaningless. We are taking on the obligation here that by 1958 the Congress will be appropriating approximately $65 million a year for this purpose which is not quite 3 times as much as we have been appropriating.

Are we going to have the spectacle of many Members voting here for the authorization and then in subsequent years attempting to slash the appropriations to carry out the program proposed in this bill? That has happened in so many cases in the past that I think it is well worth citing as a possibility here.

The job of rehabilitating the physically handicapped is not completed—the battle is not won—just by passing a bill like this. The battle must be fought every year and year after year to make sure there are adequate appropriations.

I am voting for this bill because I believe in it, I believe in its purposes. And since I believe in it, I am frank to say that if this measure becomes law, I will do everything I can in future years to make sure that the Congress lives up to the obligation it assumes in this legislation and does in fact provide the appropriations necessary to carry out the purposes of House Resolution 9640.

Social Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT W. CRETELLA

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 14, 1954

Mr. CRETELLA. Mr. Speaker, while the other body is deliberating the provisions of the social-security bill and is considering the inclusion of professional men into the system, I was impressed by the excellent article written on the subject by my dear friend Hon. David M. Richman, a member of the Connecticut bar.

Mr. Richman has given a great deal of thought and study to this subject and has also discussed it with me on several occasions. As chairman of the social security committee of the New Haven County Bar Association, he undertook to gather a great deal of information which appears to be very pertinent on the subject.

I submit it for the consideration of the membership, and I believe it is an article which is well worth the short time it takes to read:

The article follows:

SOCIAL SECURITY: PRESENT ATTEMPT TO INCLUDE THE SELF-EMPLOYED PROFESSIONALS

(By David M. Richman)

For 19 years self-employed professionals have been excluded from the provisions of the social-security laws (sec. 211 (c) (5)). The administration bill introduced in Congress, known as the Reed bill, H. R. 7199, provides for the inclusion of physicians, dentists, lawyers and other self-employed professionals under the Social Security Act.

The Reed bill includes the following amendments to the present Social Security Act:

(1) The major groups for which coverage is recommended on a compulsory basis are farm operators, self-employed professional groups now excluded, and hired farm workers and household workers who receive at least $50 a quarter cash wages from an employer. Coverage is recommended on a voluntary basis for clergymen employed by nonprofit organizations and for employees covered by State and local government retirement systems except policemen and firemen because of their occupations are considered too hazardous.

(2) The maximum annual earnings on which contributions are based and benefits computed would be raised from $3,600 to $4,200 per year.

(3) Up to 4 years of lowest or no earnings would be omitted in computing the average monthly wage, such provisions to be generally applicable for persons coming on the rolls in the future.

(4) All retired workers would receive a benefit increase of at least $5 and dependents would generally receive proportionate increases.

The present social-security annual payment schedule, designed to keep the system self-supporting is as follows:

	Paid by employee	Paid by employer	Self-employed	$4,200 basis cost to self-employed
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*	
1954–59	2	2	3	$126.00
1960–64	2½	2½	3¾	157.50
1965–69	3	3	4½	199.00
1970 and after	3½	3½	5¼	220.50

These tax contributions go into the old-age and survivors insurance trust fund, which under the law can be used only to pay old-age and survivors benefits and the cost of administering the program. The assets of the fund, which are not needed for current disbursements, are invested in interest-bearing United States Government bonds. Interest on these investments amounted to $400 million in 1953. The interest also goes into the trust fund. The trust fund now amounts to $18.7 billion.

Self-employed professionals like physicians, dentists, and lawyers differ from wage earners and should not be included in the provisions of the Social Security Act, because employed persons generally work until they reach a fixed retirement age of, say, 65, and then cease work abruptly and completely. Physicians, dentists, lawyers, and other self-employed professionals are not forced into abrupt and complete retirement at 65. They usually continue in practice and are generally at the height of their earning power at that age.

The present Social Security Act was designed solely to meet the needs of employed persons and neither its original proponents nor its draftsmen purported to consider the problems of self-employed professionals. This is proved by the fact that the original act and all amendments since have specifically excluded physicians, dentists, lawyers, and other professionals who have been self-employed.

Most physicians, dentists, and lawyers, if they were covered by the present act, would make substantial payments all of their professional lives, only to find at age 65 that they are disqualified to receive benefits because they earn more than $1,000 per year.

It is to be noted that the self-employed professional would pay from 3 percent to 5¼ percent of the maximum ($4,200)—and this may be increased over the years up to $6,000—for a number of years, which would amount to a substantial sum.

Self-employed professionals cannot afford to pay the high rates on the maximum for many years and not be able to participate in the benefits until age 75. From age 65 to 75 they draw benefits if they earn no more than $1,000 annually. If they die, widows cannot draw benefits if under 65. They can only receive benefits for children until they reach 18 years.

WE PROPOSE PASSAGE OF THE JENKINS-KEOGH BILL

The Jenkins-Keogh bill allows a self-employed person to participate in a qualified plan to deduct from gross income each year a limited amount of earned income contributed by him to a restricted retirement fund or paid in as premiums to purchase a restricted retirement annuity contract. He can deduct annually up to $7,500 or 10 percent of earned income, whichever is less, but not more than a total of $150,000 during his lifetime. There is a 5-year carryover of unused deductions.

An individual who has reached age 55 before January 1, 1953 is allowed to deduct an additional amount, so that he may build up an adequate interest in the fund or more than a token annuity. In his case, the normal deduction limit is increased by the lesser of $750 or 1 percent of his earned income, multiplied by the number of years of his age in excess of 55 (as of January 1, 1953).

If a taxpayer contributes to a restricted retirement fund (there must be a corporate trustee), he cannot withdraw his interest in the fund before reaching age 65, unless he becomes totaly and permanently disabled. Though he cannot assign his interest, he has the right to designate one or more beneficiaries to receive any part to which he may be entitled at death. He also has the right to designate his spouse or other dependent as a survivor, or joint and survivor annuitant under the annuity contract that he may receive from the trust.

On attaining age 65 or on sooner disability, he will get back his contributions to the fund plus their accumulated earnings in 1 of 3 ways elected by him: (1) A lump sum, (2) annual, quarterly, or monthly installments over a period of years, or (3) one or more single premium life annuity contracts.

Likewise, if the taxpayer buys a restricted retirement annuity contract from an insurance company, he cannot begin to receive annuity income before age 65 or permanent and total disability. A similar condition applies to refunds, cash surrender, or other money benefits, and the right to assign and designate beneficiaries is the same as that of a participant in a restricted retirement fund.

Like a qualified pension or profit-sharing fund under section 165 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code, a restricted retirement fund is tax exempt. Also, the self-employed individual (or employee not eligible to participate in a qualified plan) pays no tax until he actually is paid benefits. Then, however, he pays income taxes on the full amounts distributed to him periodically from the fund or under his annuity contract when he retires or becomes disabled. If he or his beneficiary gets his portion of the trust fund in a lump sum after it has accumulated for more than 5 years, it is taxed as long-term capital gain.

Besides bipartisan backing in Congress, the Jenkins-Keogh bill has President Eisenhower's support in principle. During the campaign in October 1952 he said: "In 1942 the Government made an important supplement to the Social Security Act by legislation which offered tax advantages to corporations and their employees in the establishment of pension funds (sec. 165 of the Internal Revenue Code). * * * When this legislation was being considered, self-employed individuals were evidently forgotten. * * * I think something ought to be done to help these people to help themselves by allowing a reasonable tax reduction for money put aside by them for their own savings. * * * If I am elected I will favor legislation along these lines."

The Jenkins-Keogh bill—The Individual Retirement Act of 1953—proposes to help physicians, dentists, lawyers, accountants, engineers, and other self-employed professionals put aside part of their earnings for retirement. It would do so by giving them valuable tax advantages now possible only under Treasury-approved pension and profit-sharing plans for employees.

In conclusion, I urge physicians to take a moment from their busy work schedules and to write to their Congressman and Senanators urging that self-employed professionals be not included in the amendments to the Social Security Act, as proposed in the Reed bill, and that all of us favor the enactment of the Jenkins-Keogh bill to give the self-employed professional an opportunity to save for old age and retirement out of current income.

No Trade With Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 13, 1954

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following editorial from the Chelsea Record, Chelsea, Mass., of Monday, July 12, 1954:

GOODS FROM RUSSIA

The American Legion is right in the forefront in protesting against the importation of shipments from Russia to this country.

It strikes pretty close to home when Christmas ornaments from the satellite nations are docked right at Charlestown.

It's fine for the Legion to protest the unloading, but they should go one step further and find out who in this country bought the ornaments and tell them where they get off.

We want no trade with Russia or any Red-controlled countries.

One of the surest and most positive ways of putting and keeping the Communists in their place is not to trade with them.

Firing Awards Review Banned by World Court

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 14, 1954

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting into the RECORD today a news item from the Washington Evening Star of July 13, 1954, which should be of deep concern to the United States Government and its people. I do this as one who has felt that the United States should be a member of the United Nations and do whatever it can to perfect the organization so that it will more nearly be what its creators hoped it would be.

The article states that the World Court has ruled that the 11 Americans dismissed from the United Nations employment for refusing to answer questions before duly constituted United States investigative agencies in regard to alleged subversive activities were entitled to the $170,000 compensation awards made to them by the United Nations Administrative tribunal and that the United Nations General Assembly had no right to consider and possibly reject the awards made.

The first serious question raised is what sort of an organization is the United Nations where creatures of it are not subject to its basic authorities. In other words, how can an organization function intelligently if it has committees, tribunals, or other organizations it establishes over which it has no control. Just where do the United States delegates to the United Nations go to correct abuse and usurpation of authorities of these subsidiary organizations?

I believe it is imperative that the United States find out right now what the procedures are.

The second serious question has to do with the substantive merits of the case. Relying upon the fifth amendment to prevent self-incrimination is certainly a civic right which all Americans want to see preserved. But relying upon the fifth amendment to prevent self-incrimination has nothing to do with the rights or duties of an employee in any specific job. Certainly the failure to testify before duly constituted authorities upon the basic subject of loyalty to one's own society and government is cause in itself for removal from a job where the government is the employer. Loyalty to one's employer is certainly an essential and basic feature of any contract for employment.

Certainly a person disloyal to a member nation of the U. N. or to the U. N. itself is grounds for removal from employment by the U. N. It is time that we all recognized a very basic fact of life. The Comintern when it was established under the aegis of Soviet Russia back in the early twenties is in itself a united nations. Those societies where the political government was not controlled by the Communist Party were to be infiltrated until the political government became dominated by the Communist Party. Until such time, however, that particular society or country was represented on the Comintern by members of the Communist Party from that country. This is a complete united nations organization. The Comintern's name may be changed to cominform, or something else, but its essential structure and operation remains the same and it is in direct competition to the United Nations.

Obviously, any person working for the Comintern or in cooperation with it cannot be loyal to the United Nations. There can be no basis for paying a disloyal employee termination pay or any other sort of pay. As a matter of contract law, wages previously paid might well be recovered because the wages were paid supposedly for honest loyal work.

The same issues involved in the Hiss pension case are involved here. I certainly hope we move ahead to meet the challenge presented to us by the decision of the World Court. I am considering possible legislation which might help to protect the United States Government to a certain degree in this matter. Essentially, however, I think the executive department must act.

FIRING AWARDS REVIEW BANNED BY WORLD COURT

THE HAGUE, NETHERLANDS, July 13.—The World Court ruled today the U. N. General Assembly has no right to review compensation awards made to 11 Americans dismissed from United Nations jobs after United States inquiries into alleged subversive activities.

The ruling, a 9-to-3 decision, rejected a United States claim that the Assembly had the power to reconsider and possibly reject compensation awards made by the U. N. administrative tribunal.

The 11 Americans, dismissed by the U. N. Secretary General after refusing to answer questions before United States investigative agencies, had been awarded more than $170,000 in compensation by the tribunal.

The court said the "U. N. General Assembly has no right on any grounds to refuse to give effect to awards of compensation." The judges who opposed the majority opinion were from the United States, Brazil, and Chile.

Russia's Angry Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 13, 1954

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, we are all familiar with the problems of American farming—problems to which we are giving our earnest attention.

It might be well to bear in mind, however, that the farmers of the Soviet Union have, as we would expect, infinitely worse troubles which make United States agriculture's problems seem small indeed.

An article in the July 10 issue of the Saturday Evening Post by Ellsworth Raymond sets forth the facts on Russia's angry farmers. The article points out that, while American dairymen have enough surplus milk to feed millions of children throughout the world, the Russians have only enough milk for their own children.

I believe that this article will be of interest to my colleagues. I might point out that it is along the lines of chapter 9 of Senate Document No. 69 revised, entitled "Tensions Within the Soviet Union," whose printing I had arranged on behalf of the Foreign Relations Committee.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of Mr. Raymond's article in the Saturday Evening Post be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RUSSIA'S ANGRY FARMERS

(By Ellsworth Raymond)

"Once we had a wooden plow,
And we raised enough to sell.
But we have a tractor now,
And life is a living hell."

So sing Russian peasants, when lights are low and Communist bosses far away. This jingle has never won a Stalin prize, but is a hit tune on collective farms. Soviet music factories forever grind out hymns of rural happiness, hoping each village choir will chant the party line. But peasants prefer their own homespun words. Why sing the praises of a collective which has turned free farmers into impoverished serfs?

Even the closemouthed Kremlin now admits that there is a crisis down on the collective farms. Nine weary years after VE-Day, Russia grows far fewer vegetables than before the war. Grain, sugar beets, and other key food crops barely exceed prewar levels. Yet today's harvest must feed 17 million more mouths than before the war and the Soviet nation is expanding at the rate of 3 million more people each year. One Soviet crop never fails—babies.

Hayfields are bigger than ever before, yet the hay harvest is also below prewar 1940. Like the Russian people, Soviet farm animals eat less than before the war. Why don't the cows and pigs munch grain, the best fatterner of all? Simply because there is not enough to go round. Moscow requisitions so much grain from collectives that farm animals suffer.

All this brings a harvest of death. Many horses and cows are so weak they must be suspended by straps to stand up in their stalls. These feeble wrecks are too weak even to bear offspring. In the Soviet cattle country more newborn calves die than live. Russia today has fewer lambs and sheep than 25 years ago, before collectivization. The same is true of beef cattle and milk cows. Yet there now are 60 million more Soviet people than in precollective times. So most Russian families eat meat just once a week, at Sunday supper. Parents drink no milk, to save the precious fluid for their child.

How can a ruthless police state be a farm failure? The Soviet now has more land under crops than in all Russian history. Most peasants long have lived on collective farms, supposedly under tight Communist control. Even a small collective is a giant farm, with its thousands of acres suited perfectly for mass use of modern machinery. And there are plenty of machines. Ruksia now has 1 million tractors, twice as many as before the Nazi armies crossed the Russian border.

But Marxist mechanical planning always manages to ignore life's vital spark: human dreams. The Communist planner is a city intellectual, abhorring the mud and manure of fertile soil. He never can understand the true love of every peasant for the land. An east European tenant farmer or farm hand has but one goal: to own his own farm. Wealth or fame means little. All that matters is to stand outside his hut, gaze fondly around, and say, "This is my land, and mine alone."

Collectivization was doomed before it ever began. Contrary to Communist propaganda, Russian peasants never visualize a collective farm as a cooperative enterprise for the common good. They simply say, "Once the Soviet state gave us land; now it takes our land away."

Not that the U. S. S. R. private farmer had much to lose. Russian farmers were never prosperous. Before collectivization, an average peasant lived no better than a poor sharecropper in our deep South. Yet the peasants felt free—they hid food to avoid state requisitions, black-marketed much of their crops, and even distilled cheap grain into vodka to bootleg at a high price.

This relatively happy life was rudely interrupted a quarter of a century ago when Stalin decreed farms must be collectivized to pay for military industrialization. A million gun-toting Communists marched out to the farm villages with the class-war slogan: "Rely on the poor peasant, ally with the middle peasant, down with the kulak." So the comedy of errors began. The poor peasants were generally lazy and inefficient. Yet these unsuccessful farmers became the main laborers on the new collective farms. Meanwhile the kulak, who could make his dwarf farm pay, was officially branded a petty capitalist. He lost his hut, livestock, and land to the collective, but was forbidden to join it. Naturally, the kulaks fought like devils.

For several years undeclared war raged in the villages. Even poor and middle peasants had to be forced at gun point into collective farms. Stalin later confessed to Churchill that fighting Hitler was easier than socializing the stubborn Russian peasant. When the war on the peasants was over, the Kremlin had won a Pyrrhic victory. True, most peasants were collectivized. But half of the Soviet's farm animals were missing—the peasants slaughtered them instead of surrendering them to the collective farm. Five million kulaks, the best farmers in Russia, were dead. Soviet agriculture was so badly wounded that it has never fully recovered.

But communism gained what it wanted. Agriculture does pay for Soviet military industrialization. Peasants can no longer bury grain in the ground to avoid government requisitions. Today one big collective occupies the land where many dwarf private farms stood before. State inspectors can easily police a small number of huge farms and make sure that all requisitions are met. One-third of the officials of each collective are armed guards, protecting the harvest from the collective farmers' pilferage until the state takes its lion's share.

* * * * *

For one-half of the total produce requisitioned a collective farm doesn't get a kopeck. This half pays, in produce, for the rental of state tractors and other big farm machines. Why can't a collective own its tractors? The Kremlin will not permit this, because ownership of the machinery means control of the farm. If a collective farm misbehaves, the state machine-tractor station quickly brings the peasants to their knees by simply withholding tractors. So, year after year, the high rent from the collectives pays the full value of the machines many times over—and the state still has the machines.

The second half of the requisition is bought at a fixed low price, often not even covering the production costs. In theory, if the collective has anything left to sell after the double requisitioning, this surplus can be marketed to the public or State at a higher price. In practice, there is rarely anything left.

Obviously a collective can earn little money, yet even this income is taxed. By law, a large sum must also be deposited as collective savings in State banks. Peasants are paid slave wages from the money that remains.

The proved fact is, on the basis of figures published in Soviet technical journals and the press, that a Russian collective farmer makes less in a year than a Soviet factory workers makes in 2 months.

Once a State Department officer asked me, "Why does Pravda print dozens of editorials every spring screaming at collective farmers to sow the crops on time? Are Russian peasants so ignorant that they don't know when to plant their fields?"

Of course the peasants know. For slave wages, they just are not too eager to get out into the fields early.

Fly over any Russian collective in summer and you see colorful proof that peasants can still farm well for profit. Stretching for miles around the village are the brown, sparse, desolate collective fields. But behind each peasant hut is a lush green acre, bursting with foliage. These oases are the collective farmers' personal truck gardens—the last remnant of private farming permitted in the U. S. S. R.

Small as they are, these little plots can be big moneymakers. Garden vegetables are permitted to be sold at the city free market for any price the traffic will bear. City folk willingly pay high for the fresh food, so much more tasty than the monotonous stocks of government stores. To stifle private enterprise, the Kremlin levies heavy garden taxes both in crops and in cash. Even so, peasants earn more money from their private truck gardens than from the total wages the collectives pay them.

* * * * *

Near defeat and the many crises of World War II kept the Kremlin's operatives so busy that they could not police the capitalist-minded peasantry. Unwatched for the first time since collectivization, villagers quietly plowed their gardens deeper and deeper into the collective fields. Although not according to directive, the peasant war effort was truly remarkable. In 4 war years private gardens almost doubled their prewar size.

This rustic joy turned to sadness when Hitler's defeat brought Communist watchdogs back to the farms. No less than 14 million acres of stolen land in the form of private truck gardens were liquidated and once more added to the cooperatives.

Rubbing salt in peasant wounds, Moscow then increased the production norms of field workers, food requisitions, and farm taxes. Old laws forbidding collective farmers to spend more time on their gardens than in communal work were again rigidly enforced. During World War II peasant spirits were buoyed by Moscow rumors that peace would bring the abolition of collective farms. Instead, peace brought more lashes from the collective whip.

* * * * *

Despite grassroots discontent, Soviet harvests at first revived quickly from the devastation and ill effects of war. Postwar Russia was the first nation in all Europe to abandon food rationing. By 1949 many Russian crops were at or above prewar levels. Grain and sugar, surprisingly, became the biggest Soviet exports.

For this success, one would suppose, the Kremlin might have rewarded its long-suffering peasants. But Stalin, instead, promulgated a new plan. All small collectives would merge to form huge communes. Peasants were to be uprooted from their ancestral homes and moved into the barracks of an agricultural city to be constructed on each new giant farm. Soviet propaganda thundered that big collectives were more efficient, and barracks would give peasants the theaters, schools, clubs, and other refinements of urban life.

As events demonstrated, Stalin's plan did not make for greater farm efficiency, nor did it appear to have farmer welfare as a goal. Lost motion resulted because the farmers had to travel much farther to reach the fields. The few villagers who actually moved found the agricultural cities not even built.

The real reason for the collective-farm merger was stronger police control. As a refugee Russian peasant explained to me, "The nearest policeman to my village was in town, 7 miles away. Our collective-farm chairman was supposed to watch us. But what could he do? He was a simple peasant just like ourselves."

There was still another trick up the Kremlin sleeve. Peasants were promised new private truck gardens when they moved into the agricultural-city barracks. But the plots would be smaller, and a long bus trip from town.

The peasants struck back with the sole weapon at their command: passive resistance. Most of them worked less, sat tight and refused to move. Amid the tension of the Korean conflict, Stalin dared not risk a second revolt of the farm villages. Finally, fearing the angered peasants might sabotage 1951 spring sowing, the Kremlin suddenly condemned its own farm policy. Now, Pravda claimed, the very idea of agricultural cities was unsocialist. Though 1 giant collective now existed where every 2 or 3 had stood before, peasants remained in their little old huts and gardens.

The Soviet state retreated too little and too late. Peasant resistance had already created chaos, which endures to this day. Grain, flax and hemp harvests sank from above prewar levels to below. In 2 years one-third of the world's largest flax acreage was abandoned. Cotton crops slumped too. Two million cattle vanished in the same way as during gunpoint collectivization earlier. Half a million cows were lost in 1952 alone. Far from being efficient, the new giant collectives are a monster failure.

Stalin died leaving his heirs the heritage of millions of infuriated peasants and a complete agricultural mess.

Suicidal as it seems, for a long time Malenkov and Company paid little attention to the crisis down on the giant farms. The East German riots, the Korean armistice, hydrogen-bomb danger and the Berta purge crowded village troubles out of Politburo minds. No alarm sounded even when bad weather delayed the 1953 spring sowing, though this doomed a big slice of the autumn harvest to perish under snow. City Russians were promised abundant food, with the Kremlin apparently unconcerned over how foodstuffs would be supplied.

In the fall of 1953, Malenkov and Company finally woke up. Instead of improving after Stalin's death, Soviet agriculture had slumped even worse. Sugar-beet crops—highly important to sugar-starved Russia—declined in the restless Ukraine. Fewer cows grazed on the northern cattle lands than the year before. So small was the Soviet grain harvest that, for the first time in 4 years, Moscow dared not publish even a false crop report.

Though awakened, the men in the Kremlin cannot be said to have come up with a brilliant solution to their problem. To save the situation, they picked the very man who created it, Politburo member Nikita Khrushchev. He it was who first misplanned and then mismerged today's ailing giant farms. Far from confessing his mistakes, Khrushchev blamed them on the hapless state planners, local Communist bosses and farm ministries who had done nothing but obey his own orders.

A proved failure like Khrushchev can scarcely be expected to make 2 kernels of grain grow where 1 grew before. And he does not. The best of his new Communist "plans" last fall were 2 half remedies, both inadequate.

First, collective and truck-garden requisitions decreased, requisition prices increased and garden taxes were cut. These concessions to private profit might have meant peasant incentive, had not Khrushchev admitted they were small. Rash as ever, he publicly predicted that a poor collective farmer would now earn as much as a rich one—the princely sum of $300 per year.

"Don't trust the peasants" was Khrushchev's second miracle cure. He flooded the villages with city Communists, on the theory that they would operate farm machines properly and make sure that collective farmers behaved. No better proof could be found of the ever-widening gulf between the Kremlin and its whole rural population. Why an inexperienced city Bolshevik can possibly farm better than a true man of the soil, Khrushchev did not bother to explain. Nor did he apparently worry how peasants would react when bossed around by uninvited city slickers.

So 2 farm bureaucrats now grow where 1 grew before. Since last fall an army of 200,000 city engineers, mechanics, and agronomists have invaded the Russian countryside.

• • • • •

Though now supposed to visit and advise peasants at least once a week, county political bosses avoid farms like a plague. This is only natural. What do Marxist propagandists know about tilling the soil? Most country political bosses in the Soviet are displaced city ward heelers. Just because he's a loyal Communist, one luckless movie-theater manager whom I knew years ago has been ordered to teach farmers how to farm. These unhappy officials avoid setting foot in a village, for fear mischievous peasants will ask when to plow, how to sow, or other embarrassing questions.

So these unfortunates burrow like moles in their town offices, easing such consciences as they possess by writing directives to farms from a safe distance. Pravda is responsible for telling the world about that fact. Recently Pravda scolded these unlucky officials for their addiction to paper work. One regional government alone plastered its weary villages with an 11-ton blitz of paper orders.

• • • • •

What does the average peasant think of this system of farming by remote control? Despite the Iron Curtain, it's easy to learn. Of the more than 100 million peasants in the U. S. S. R., a mere 17,000 joined the Communist Party in 1953. Three-fourths of all rural party organizations failed to recruit a single new member.

From all available reports, it appears that Khrushchev's back-to-the-farm crusade was predestined to fail. Dismal news from key areas all over Russia has been published in the Soviet's techical journals. * * *

Desperate to save both agriculture and himself, Khrushchev disrupted his already disorganized 1954 spring sowing by launching a new rash program. Out came edition No. 3 of his plan, more fantastic than anything that had appeared before. This spring he exhorted all restaurants, hospitals, army regiments, and even kindergartens to build their own pigpens. Thus, he held, the pork shortage would be communistically solved. Hogs devour kindergarten garbage, then kindergarteners eat the hogs, the plan pointed out. Why collective farms cannot breed enough pigs to feed city children, Khrushchev never explained.

The simplest and most logical farm stimulant is still ignored. Give any peasant a larger private garden and he would till it from dawn to dusk. Naturally, Khrushchev's operatives report these basic peasant desires. But he dare not surrender the Communist principle of collective farms. So 100 million peasants must be driven to embrace a way of life that certainly does not come naturally to them.

Strange as kindergarten pigpens may seem, Khrushchev's new ideas for increasing grain production are even stranger. By his own confession, the greatest Communist power in the world is short of mankind's basic food—bread. Somehow, Russia's grain fields shrank 9 million acres in the last 15 years. So much grain is seized by the government that, for a day's work, a collective farmer now receives less than half the amount of cereals he was paid before the war. After state grain collectors wring out a farm, not enough fodder for the livestock remains. Yet the grain levies do not benefit Soviet cities. Today's urban housewife finds less bread on sale than before the Nazi invasion. The government's grain-export program sees to that. If the Kremlin stopped exporting grain to 10 foreign countries, Soviet country folk, city folk, and livestock could eat more bread and fodder. But Khruschev says that more grain will be exported in 1954 than ever before. Beyond that, huge grain stockpiles will be stored away for war.

How can an already sick Soviet agriculture bear these new heavy burdens? Khrushchev contends he has the answer to that one. Export and stockpile quotas can be filled, yet no one shall go hungry, he insists. Miraculously, the outer edge of the desert will save the day. Millions of Caspian, Siberian, and Turkestan barren acres will yield to the tractor plow and then blossom into golden fields of grain. And who will live in desert tents, eat from chuck wagons, and plow the backbreaking, sandy soil? Mostly city "volunteers," of course. They will show the doubting peasants how to make the desert bloom.

To most agronomists, hastily improvised desert farming would seem a dubious venture.

• • • • •

What will the eventual result of the Soviet's farm blunders be? Hunger, or a new purge? Only time has the answer. Meanwhile the free world should thank its silent ally—the humble Russian peasant—for the role he is playing in fighting for the individual dignity and independence of man. As long as he sabotages communism, the Kremlin will think twice before risking hydrogen war.

Does the American Medical Association Block Medical Advancement?

SPEECH

OF

HON. ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 14, 1954

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, for insertion at this point in the Record, under unanimous consent, are the remarks of a brave and fearless man; grievously wounded in World War II, Mr. Joseph F. Burke returned to America from the battlefields of Europe determined to brighten the plight of the wounded.

Here is his story as told the other day, on July 9, 1954, to the Astoria chapter, of the Disabled American Veterans in Long Island City, N. Y. Mr. Burke, a constituent, is 2d national junior vice commander of the DAV.

The core of Mr. Burke's remarks would suggest that the American Medical Association do its best to keep its muzzle on when it passes through soldier terrain, lest it bite the hand—Uncle Sam's—that has helped it so often; and, as the AMA moves, to be very careful, lest it knock over signs which read "men at work," especially when the work is directed at brightening the plight of the wounded, now and for the future:

AMA: AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION OR AGAINST MEDICAL ADVANCEMENT

(Remarks by Joseph F. Burke, second national junior vice commander, Disabled American Veterans)

There are times when a man stands on a public platform and feels the need to speak out against an organization. His evaluation of that organization is necessarily tempered because of the realization that the people who make up the membership are not at fault. I am in that situation now as regards the American Medical Association. The American people, or all peoples of the world, for that matter, are indebted to those who follow the Hippocratic oath. Your speaker is certainly one of those. On January 2, 1944, I was wounded on the approaches to Cassino, Italy, while serving my country in time of war. The repair of the left arm wound by amputation was one of the easier operative procedures performed by these masters of the medical profession. With both arms and legs damaged to the extent of smashed bones, torn muscles, and severed nerves, and internal wounds showing a number of punctures of the stomach, liver, lungs, and spleen, it is a marvel to me today that the surgical team of Major Brinker and Captain Moore was able to repair such bodily damage in six exhaustive and intensive hours of surgery. It was their skill and God's will that permits me to address you tonight. I say this not because I am unique, as there are many in this room who know that this is a typical case history of thousands of former GI's. The debt of gratitude I owe these men I will never be able to repay.

And because of my strong feeling against the policies of the American Medical Association, the remarks I make tonight reflect only my own personal opinion, and is not to be construed as being the feeling of the national organization of the Disabled American Veterans.

Yet, as a veteran I must speak out against the American Medical Association, who professes to represent the thoughts of the entire medical profession. Their expressions of disagreement with the Veterans' Administration hospital program has beeen injurious to the entire veteran population. The American people, through its elected representatives, has brought for the finest medical program for veterans, only to suffer attacks on their efforts to care for the wars' disabled. As a result, we face a serious curtailment of the Disabled American Veterans' program for veterans. We find that by advocating the return of mental and tubercular patients to city, county, and State institutions under th guise of a reduced tax program, the AMA reveals an immature outlook, since there will be no savings, because these local governments will be charged with too big a burden and the veterans will then receive less than the best of care as intended by our laws. We demand an opportunity to monitor the care to be given our mental and tubercular patients in Veterans' Administration hospitals instead of in city, county, and State institutions which at best would be inefficiently administered, and without any control by the Federal Government. Again, where would the savings be in taxes? It would cost just as much for the maintenance and care of these veterans in these lower institutions because they are overcrowded now. This influx of a veteran population would make conditions chaotic, with the resultant loss of medical efficiency and proper care to the patient, both veteran and nonveteran.

The Disabled American Vetrans will continue to fight any approach of this sort under the guise of tax reduction. We believe that the American people will willingly accept the care of the war disabled and the necessary hospitalization and care of the indigent war veterans as a part of the cost of war. Congress recognized this responsibility and provided for it by laws.

It is true in the technical sense that the majority of our hospitalized veterans are admitted for disabilities labeled nonservice connected. However, honest medical opinion will admit that a probable relationship of the postservice disease or debility exists with the veteran's service. So, with this aforementioned probable relationship who can say that those who experienced the anxiety attached with the hazards of war have not incurred that basic lowered threshold of fatigue and susceptibility which invites illness. Since medical opinion may be altered with the new policy of the AMA this theory may not stand a professional argument today.

One of the strong points made by the AMA against the hospitalization of veterans was that their investigation disclosed that a veteran earning $50,000 a year was found hospitalized for a nonservice connected condition. Now I ask you, how many veterans today are making $50,000 a year? The argument is unfounded on the surface, and in addition, it was later discovered that the had been, in fact, treated for a service connected condition. A second point made by the AMA against hospitalization was that the Veterans' Administration hospitals harbor an army of alcoholics. Now all of us in this room know the strict rules by which the Veterans' Administration hospitals operate. It is an established fact that a veteran will receive an immediate disciplinary discharge and not be eligible for readmission for 90 days if he displays drunkenness on the ward. This charge simply cannot be true because the regulations do not permit prolonged hospitalization for such a condition. In passing, please let me call your attention to the often expressed opinion of the medical profession that alcoholism is a disease; very often the manifestation of a mental disorder. Does the AMA now say that a disease should not be treated?

The AMA arguments against nonservice-connected cases appears to revolve around the issue of ability to pay. Certainly we realize that group hospitalization or insurance plans are available. However, being mainly group policies, they are available to only those whose employment status serves as a prerequisite. The employer or union can insure that the group plans are the best available for the employees and union members. Yet this takes care of only a certain segment of the population. There are private plans available to anyone outside of a company or union, but these are usually so honeycombed with so many clarifying and delimiting clauses that the average policy is not sufficient to meet an individual's need. Ability to pay is a misnomer in many cases even with the above plans which have limitations. The average cost for an operation and hospitalization at prevailing rates, room and board, nursing care, averages $12 a day. Medicines, treatments, X-rays, and doctor's visits are all extra. A reasonable figure for 1 month's hospitalization under these conditions would amount to $870 a month. The average head of a family earns $3,500 per year. Where is the ability to pay?

The AMA makes the claim that veteran's hospitalization programs are nothing but socialized medicine. Today we face these continuous increasing cries from one agency or another, "the road to socialism." Crying socialism is no argument since it is an established policy in politics today to label your opponent with an unpopular title. Bipartisan legislation over the years in our State and Nation have caused such things to come into being; social security, Federal old-age benefits, employment compensation, compulsory disability insurance, and Federal aid to education. Is the AMA opposed to these advances and progresses? Then why do they feel that taking care of or insuring the proper health of the veteran segment of the population is another step toward socialism?

Let us look at how the AMA people have benefited under the Government aid. Under the GI bill, how many doctors have increased their knowledge in their chosen field? How many ex-GI's have become doctors under the GI bill? Millions of dollars which have been advanced in this country for medical research has helped the advance of medicine. Was this socialism? The generosity of the American people, through charitable drives, contributed a great deal of money to medical research on cancer, tuberculosis, heart disease, crippled children's research, and muscular dystrophies. Would the AMA prefer that these necessary monies be obtained through taxation rather than this support of medicine by the people? Let me give you the benefit of my own experience with the shortsightedness of the AMA.

In World War II, I was one of 50,000 amputees and like everyone of them, my amputation healed and I found myself ready for an artificial arm. I found that since the Civil War, no improvements had been made in the prosthetics devices field. Now mind you, the doctor's job is not finished with the sewing of a stump; he is also responsible for the fitting of the amputee with a suitable limb and insure the ability to obtain some use of the artificial limb. Imagine our dismay when we found that the artificial hand was not expected to perform any function other than to serve as a cosmetic device; to appear two-handed. A heavy cumbersome thing which served better hanging in the closet. The useful device was a heavy hook which was still operated by rubber bands and a heavy cable which proceeded to tear the sleeves out of our clothing. I know the leg amputee had only aout three times as many heartaches trying to walk in the crude limbs which served no better than the old fashioned peg. This was certainly disheartening to the new born amputee. However, near the end of World War II, the plight of the amputee became evident and a newspaperman, a retired officer who was himself an amputee, and a few other interested people from all walks of life convinced the Government to form a committee on prosthetic research.

This committee was formed by and of members unrelated with the AMA, who failed to encourage the project and refused it help. With the support of Congresswoman Edith Nourse Rogers, the Army and the Navy, the limb manufacturers, this research began. The difficulties were tremendous and each year was a greater struggle for necessary funds from the Congress for its operation. At no time did the AMA offer its help, and it would have been greatly welcomed, and would have been an invaluable aid; yet, what are the committee's results? Its research programs at the Army Prosthetic Research Laboratory, Northrop Aviation Corp., New York University, the University of Southen California, and the International Business Machines produced artificial aids to greet the amputee of the Korean conflict and all amputees which were far superior to any available to World War II at the close of the war. This work is still going on today, and as yet the AMA as an organization has not contributed one iota toward the program.

I charge that the AMA no longer stands for American Medical Association, but it means to me "against medical advancement." In the halls of Congress as of this moment, facts against the AMA are being brought out. We know that isolationism as regards to people means that the concern of these people is for the United States itself. But even those people who believe in such a "go it alone" thory, would not go along with the AMA theory of isolationism in medicine. Medical research in other countries beside our own has brought forth many new and constructive theories as regards, for instance, cancer. The AMA is now fighting the introduction into this country of such proven research. I point out to you in passing that Sir Alexander Fleming, an Englishman, was not an American but contributed greatly in the advance with penicillin which has benefited mankind. Sister Kenny, an Australian, whose treatment of polio although proven beneficial time and time again has yet to receive AMA approval. This hierarchy which speaks for the medical profession in the United States with its dangerous control of medical thinking has done more to retard medical advancement than any uneducated or illiterate segment of our population in their refusal to accept medical treatment over the years. We as veterans and especially in our consideration of disabled veterans, which is the only reason for the DAV to be in existence, that is our creed, that "our mission as a Disabled American Veterans organization is not fulfilled until all our country's wartime disabled, their widows, and their dependents, have been adequately cared for" recognize as one of our greatest adversaries those who speak for the AMA. The crucifix of the AMA's making bears not the figure of Christ, but the war's mangled veteran. Since the days of George Washington, it was recognized that the war's disabled became more susceptible to the ravages of disease. We feel that the Veterans' Administration program of care for the hospitalized veteran at times can be improved. On the basis of results today, we know that it is the finest medical program in the country. We have more than 6,300 doctors, 865 dentists, and 13,800 trained nurses. This program of care for the veteran is without parallel in any other nation in the world. The debt of honor has been assumed by the American people with little or no complaint. The veteran himself is a taxpayer and yet the AMA for reasons best known to itself continues to fight the well regulated program of the United States Government. It fights the administration of President Eisenhower on the health program which he has offered to the Nation. I charge the AMA as being against medical advancement because of their own self-centered interests and of dictating to this Nation what the policies of health and welfare should be from their conception and their conception alone. The DAV will continue to fight the AMA on the issues of disabled veterans, and I hope all the people of this Nation will fight those few who speak for the AMA, who resist the health and reseach programs necessary for the well-being of our country.

Let Atom Splitters Alone

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 14, 1954

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, there appeared in the Florence Times, of Florence, Ala., an editorial reproduced from the Birmingham Post-Herald, which is a Scripps-Howard newspaper and was one of the newspapers which very strongly supported the Republican ticket in 1952. This editorial is entitled "Let Atom Splitters Alone." It takes up and treats the subject which we have been discussing this afternoon, the proposal to buy extra power for the Atomic Energy Commission from private sources.

It refers to the President's budget message of last year when he said it was proposed to reduce existing commitments of the TVA to the Atomic Energy Commission by from 500,000 to 600,000 kilowatts.

I shall not detail it further, but, in brief, it suggests that that is not the proper way to treat the matter, and it concludes with this statement:

> Let the atom splitters go right on splitting atoms; keep them out of controversies where they have no business.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, and I commend it to the careful reading of all Members of the Senate.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LET ATOM SPLITTERS ALONE

Last January, the President refused additional funds to the TVA for new electric power generating facilities. He said "arrangements are being made to reduce, by the fall of 1957, existing commitments of the TVA to the Atomic Energy Commission by 500,000 to 600,000 kilowatts."

This, he went on, "would release the equivalent amount of TVA generating capacity or meet increased load requirements of other consumers in the power system and at the same time eliminate the need for appropriating funds from the Treasury to finance additional generating units."

We weren't exactly enthusiastic about this proposal; but we could see it might be a reasonable way to meet increasing TVA power needs.

Now Mr. Eisenhower has set in motion by a Presidential order, a scheme which some persons are presenting as carrying out the budget message proposal. But, in fact, it does nothing of the sort. What this order does is endanger our greatest national defense enterprise.

Mr. Eisenhower has ordered the Atomic Energy Commission to sign a contract with Middle South Utilities, Inc., and the Southern Co., for purchase of 650,000 kilowatts of power to be pumped into the TVA grid at Memphis. The new plant of the two private utilities is to be built on "made" land in West Memphis, Ark., an area once inundated by a great Mississippi River flood.

Three of the five members of the Atomic Energy Commission oppose the contract. They point out that the AEC has no power needs either at Memphis or West Memphis. The closest AEC facilities are at Paducah, Ky., where the atomic plant is served by both a private power company and the TVA.

Thomas Murray, the AEC Commissioner chiefly responsible for the fact that a private company is serving AEC with power at Paducah, is one of those who opposes the contract the President has ordered. He told the Joint Congressional Atomic Energy Committee that through the contract AEC is being used as a vehicle to supply expanding power needs of the Memphis area. He said he could not see how this contract is in the interest of the atomic program.

There apparently is no present intention on the part of AEC of canceling its power contract with TVA at Paducah. Thus, the new power it is to buy is not intended to reduce TVA's commitments to AEC, as the President promised in January.

In fact, under the Eisenhower order, as shown by Commissioner Murray's testimony, AEC is being used as a power broker for TVA. And this over the opposition of a majority of the AEC Board.

The Atomic Energy Commission was set up for a very simple and important purpose—important to this country and to all the free world. It was created to produce atomic (and now hydrogen) weapons.

Whatever the legal lights may say, we believe the President—as Commander in Chief—has no right to pitch the AEC into the midst of a bitter controversy over extraneous matters, by requiring it to negotiate and sign the contract with the private companies to furnish TVA with electricity.

President Eisenhower, for the good of our national defense, which is rooted in what we hope is our atomic superiority should immediately revoke his order to AEC to buy power at Memphis where it has no need for it.

Let the AEC buy power where it needs it, or not at all.

If other agencies need power, let them get it through some other means than the AEC.

Let the atom splitters go right on splitting atoms; keep them out of controversies where they have no business. (Birmingham Post-Herald.)

Strong Forces at Work in Washington?—Merchant Marine Forces?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 2, 1954

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, cited below is some recent correspondence from a constituent of Hudson County, who, for 4 years and more, has been trying to persuade the maritime officialdom of Washington to convert Liberty ships to speedier cargo vessels as a step, and a most economical one, toward strengthening our merchant marine.

Mr. Baggerud is a brave and persistent man. He is a man with a message. Maritime Washington knows him as a man who will be heard and who will not give up until proven wrong. Mr. Baggerud intimates that strong forces might be at work in Washington likely to sell Uncle Sam a costlier bill of goods in strengthening the merchant marine than appears necessary. I think Mr. Baggerud's observations noteworthy:

MARINE DESIGN CO.,
Jersey City, N. J., May 20, 1954.

Subject: Conversion of Liberty ships.

The Honorable ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: The undersigned wishes again to call upon you for help with respect to the conversion of the Liberty ships, which the Maritime Administration now is considering, having in mind four ships to begin with.

At first the requirement was 18 knots speed with 8,500 horsepower, which by one source was estimated to cost $2.2 million, while the undersigned, after having discussed the subject both with the Navy and Maritime Administration, in connection with a small yard in this vicinity, estimated the cost to be around $1 million, using the now patented mixed pressure turbine and double bow.

Evidently somebody in Washington had sense enough to oppose the requirement of 18 knots speed for these ships involving such a high cost, since the Maritime Administration recently decided they want a speed of between 15 and 16 knots, which I have advocated for years. Our estimate for this condition is $550,000 with 5,000 shaft horsepower, or slightly higher if 6,000 shaft horsepower is desired, which is impossible to match with any other machinery.

However, I am afraid strong forces are at work in Washington to force the Maritime Administration to use more expensive installations in order to make more money. This is entirely unjustified in view of my proposition. It would be a crime against the country and the taxpayers if they are successful. An influential person may be able to convince the Maritime Administration to use the proposition with the lowest cost, which also is the most advantageous in every respect.

I would appreciate being given an opportunity to see you soon in your office in Bayonne for some further discussion of this subject.

In this connection I would point out that the former Federal Shipyard, in Kearney, could be rented from the Navy for conversion of these ships. It would be an ideal yard, and to great benefit for the shipyard workers living in this vicinity.

I am enclosing a copy of the only letter I have sent to the present Chairman of the Maritime Board, with enclosures, hoping that you will have time to read it. Recently I also wrote a letter to the Honorable THOR C. TOLLEFSON, acting chairman, Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, House of Representatives, and one letter to the Honorable JOHN M. BUTLER, chairman, Subcommittee on Water Transportation, United States Senate.

Respectfully submitted.

MARINE DESIGN CO.
O. J. BAGGERUD.

MAY 14, 1954.

Subject: Conversion of Liberty ships.

Reference: (a) MDCo letter to Maritime Administration dated January 25, 1954; (b) MDCo letter to Maritime Administration dated April 21, 1954; (c) MDCo letter to Maritime Administration dated April 6, 1954.

The Honorable LOUIS S. ROTHSCHILD,
Chairman, Federal Maritime Board,
Maritime Administration, United States Department of Commerce,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: This is to call your personal attention to one proposal for improving the Liberty ships. Ever since the close of World War II the undersigned has spent much time and money in working out a plan for improving these ships in speed, safety, and economy, without going to an unduly high cost. The cost will be considerably less than any other proposition.

It is felt that with the patented mixed pressure turbine, briefly described on the enclosed leaflet, and the patented double bow, the ships will be suitable in every respect for a speed of between 15 and 16 knots as now required by the Maritime Administration, and which we have advocated for years. The double bow will make the ships safer than any other cargo ship with a single bow particularly when passing through mine-infested waters and in ramming of submarines. Both inventions are American inventions.

With this machinery the ships can be operated with a Liberty ship crew, without increase in crew, thus being independent of experienced turbine, diesel or gas turbine engineers, which may be unobtainable in required numbers during an emergency. Even after the war there was a lack of turbine engineers, while veteran engineers with reciprocating engine experience at one time were going idle, because so few Liberty ships were in operation. While improved, the ships will still be reliable in every respect, an example is the liner *Stavangerfjord* [1] mentioned on second page of reference (b). Therefore the ships can be counted on to be the reliable "working horse" of the merchant fleet as they were during the war, but with better efficiency and increased speed so that they may run without a convoy. A listing of advantages is enclosed herewith.

May it be permitted to express the opinion that an all-out steam operated ship should not be converted to diesel, it will be an awkward combination, unless most of the machinery is changed. And then it will be too expensive. While it is perfectly sound to experiment with one gas turbine installation, even after the first one was a failure, it would be disastrous to attempt to mass convert the Libertys into gas turbine driven ships for emergency use. There are enough engineers to confirm that.

Reference (a) contains an outline of proposed modifications to hull and machinery for the purpose of increasing the speed to 18 knots, a proposition now abandoned by the Maritime Administration.

Reference (b) contains the same proposition for a speed of between 15 and 16 knots.

As will be seen from reference (b) the cost is so low that it would pay to convert all the Liberty ships and then sell as many as desired to friendly countries, thus saving the value of the ships and creating needed work for the shipyards throughout the country. For the proceeds new ships of a more modern design could be built, which would be a more economical process than scrapping the ships and using this proceeds for new building.

It is understood that 4 ships are going to be converted to start with, and in view of the advantages of this proposition it is hoped and expected that at least 1 of the 4 will be fitted with this combination machinery and double bow. While 1 turbine maker quoted on both the 8,500 s. hp. and the 5,000 s. hp. combination without reservations, another company refused to quote for reason as indicated in reference (c). No difficulty in this respect is anticipated, however, if the Maritime Administration approves of this proposition.

Both the representative of the yard quoting on the conversion and the undersigned would be pleased to come to Washington for further discussion of this subject.

Respectfully submitted.

MARINE DESIGN CO.,
O. J. BAGGERUD.

Liberty ship conversion to the Baggerud-Liberty system and double bow has the following advantages:

1. It costs considerably less than any other proposition, because it can utilize most existing machinery.

2. No experimentation is necessary, because it is an improvement of the well-known Bauer-Wach system, which was installed in about 1,000 ships during the last 28 years.

3. With its double bow and practically two independent power plants it will be safer than any other cargo ship. If, in a war, the gears are damaged, the engine can run alone, while in an all-out main turbine drive, if the gears are damaged the ship may be crippled.

4. It fulfills requirements as to speed, load, economy, and reliability. As is well known the Bauer-Wach system has shown itself an outstanding performer, mainly due to the dydraulic coupling, which enables the constant torque of the turbine to be "happily married" with the variable torque of the reciprocating engine. This hydraulic transmission is now extensively used in many different applications, also in automotive service.

5. Liberty ship crew can operate the plant, not dependent on turbine, diesel, or gas turbine engineers, which may be impossible to get in sufficient numbers in an emergency. No additional crew is necessary.

6. Can be converted at practically any ship or ship repair yard in the country without drydocking, and in a shorter time than any other proposal.

Any other proposal requiring drydocking could not be converted fast enough in an emergency, due to lack of drydocks needed for more important work.

7. The low cost of conversion makes it possible to sell the ships, even at a profit. They may be sold foreign on the condition that they will be used on the side of the United States in case of war, thus saving the value of the ships and the expense of upkeep and preservation.

The Maritime Commission had this to say about the system: "From a technical standpoint the proposed system for increasing the power of the Liberty ships is entirely feasible."

The Turbine and Gear Branch, Bureau of Ships: "We can see no reason why the system which you have proposed will not be successful."

MARINE DESIGN CO.

JERSEY CITY, N. J.

Give Us Bread

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LISTER HILL
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 14, 1954

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, as all Senators know, our Chaplain, Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, has a column in the Washington Sunday Star each week. The articles appear under the caption "Spires of the Spirit." I always find them helpful and timely. There was one published 2 or 3 Sundays ago which I thought was especially fine and timely, entitled "Give Us Bread." I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPIRES OF THE SPIRIT—GIVE US BREAD

(By Frederick Brown Harris, minister, Foundry Methodist Church; Chaplain, United States Senate)

From untold millions of shrunken cheeks and pallid lips thunders a worldwide broadcast—Give Us Bread. Now that distance, once a wall, is a picture window through which Asia and Africa can see the piled up plenty of America and Australia, a phrase in the world's best known prayer, "Give us • • • our daily bread," becomes a revolutionary slogan.

---

[1] This 36-year-old ship fitted with twin-screw Bauer-Wach units in 1932, after having lost its rudder last year near the American east coast, was able to cross the Atlantic without rudder and without further incidents, due mainly to the excellent maneuvering characteristics of the B-W combination machinery. Fourteen thousand maneuverings were reported, which normally would have taken 5 to 6 years of service. The chief engineer did not think any other machinery would have been able to stand that. Better recommendation for the B-W system could not be had. The captain and the chief engineer were both knighted by the King of Norway.

Half-starved millions now know that the earth, their earth and our earth, produces enough to save all its inhabitants from the slow horror of starvation. And with a cry that ought to rend all hearts they plead, yea and demand, "Give us bread." And bread means just what it says in the petition taught by the Great Galilean. Bread is a symbol of anything necessary for bodily well-being. Often it means land.

In the model prayer of Christianity's founder it is assumed that all the children of the common Father are seated around one ample table. On the arch above the Royal Exchange Bank of London we get a glimpse of that universal table in the words that are there inscribed: "The earth is the Lord's and the fullness thereof." That means that all the good things necessary for life that are on that table belong to Him and to His children. After first praying in the hallowed name for that common Father's Kingdom to come, and for His will to be done, there comes what seems at first to be a very mundane request, "Pass the bread." As in our overstuffed complacency we see and greedily partake of the bread piled up before our own plate and then look down the table and see others, now in plain view, with almost nothing to eat, why does not our overabundance choke us? For we are not taught to say "Give me bread," but rather, "Give us bread."

The Lord's Prayer is full of social dynamite. It is exploding now in violent revolutions of the undernourished and underprivileged all over the world. A number of years ago a missionary left opulent America and went over to the Indian part of the universal table, and there sat where they sat with meager menus. She afterward told, on her return to her native land, that she and her family, together with the native population, for many months had had no bread or potatoes or any other starchy food. One night a motion picture was shown in the village. Included in the program were some American shorts. One of them showed a bulldozer riding over fields of potatoes, turning up the ground and destroying food which could have given life to thousands. She said that an involuntary outburst of horror and indignation from hungry people filled the room. And even now there are multitudes, in certain parts of the world, through absolutely no fault of their own—fathers and mothers—who see their children and older loved ones perishing, knowing that our problem here is to find places to store our bursting surpluses of grain and butter.

No wonder, with one part of that universal table laden high with good things while another part is absolutely bare, a Christlike leader of our own day says he would wish, in the present situation, to add another petition to the Lord's Prayer, for us to offer every day: "Give us this day the brains and the conscience so to organize our economic life that the bread which Thou hast already given us may not rot or be taken out of circulation, but may be distributed to meet the needs of all people."

When the President of the United States was declaring just a few days ago that the words "world trade" are so fraught with significance that, for instance, if Japan, which now lives largely on our dole, loses her only present breakbasket in Asia, she will have to turn to Communist trade even to live, there in the White House he and his economic advisers were hearing the fierce demands from half a world away, "Give us bread—or else."

In order really to offer the Lord's Prayer every Christian should ask for a sanctified imagination. To be intensely interested in what happens to people in New York and callous as to what happens to people in Nippon—to care deeply what goes on in Indiana but to be utterly indifferent as to what fate faces the people in India—is but a sign of spiritual blindness.

George Bernard Shaw, in his Joan of Arc, makes a bishop exclaim: "Must, then, a Christ perish in torment in every age to save those who have no imagination?" How many terribly cruel things are allowed to continue in this world because of a lack of imagination on the part of the people who could hardly endure to see a bird or a dog suffer, much less a man, woman, or child, if such suffering were in the next house, or even in the same town with them? And yet those very people who are so kind and compassionate regarding their own and those near them callously assume attitudes which mean tragedy in the lives of other children of the same Father. How hypocritical it is to prate like Choctaws the well-worn words of the Lord's Prayer if we just interpret them in terms of our own well-stocked iceboxes and our shelves stocked with packages of food and with vitamins, and thus miss the implication of that agonizing cry, which our comfort and comics cannot drown, which now is heard above all other voices: "Give us bread."

The empty promises of communism find lodgment in the empty stomachs of the chronically hungry. Point 4, as it is called, is America's partial answer to the Lord's Prayer. What is being done in a dozen parts of the earth to help people help themselves, with a new understanding of the earth's cultivation, is the most vital thing our Government is now doing about the hunger of the world, which, alas, is being harnessed to the diabolical ideology of Marxism. Our know-how and our show-how can stop communism in its tracks. We can hit communistic world designs harder with bread than we can with bullets.

If, as Christians and Americans, we do not show concern in this day of destiny for the great worldwide outreach for bread we and our democracy will pass forever, as have 19 other civilizations before us. "Give us our daily bread." When the "o" of the "our" symbolizes the whole round world of agony and human need, America will have taken the road over which alone Christianity and democracy can march to their coronation in all the earth. Bread for the seething hosts of suffering humanity is to be the final test of our creed. The final verdict will be: The God who answers by bread, until all His children at a table as long as the earth's circumstances are fed, let Him be God.

President Eisenhower Says: "No One Lost Yesterday Except the American People"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 14, 1954

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, the action of the House, in recommitting to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the bill offered by the administration to fulfill President Eisenhower's plan to provide wider and better coverage of health insurance for our people was a great surprise to observers and Members alike.

It is unconceivable upon any justifiable basis that such action should be taken. The last word on that subject has not been said. Wait until the people find out and understand what was done to them by the action of the House. When they do they will speak in terms that will not be misunderstood. The full effect of their resentment may be felt by some at the elections next fall. If such does occur it will be well for any adversely affected thereby to remember their action in the House yesterday. The words of Abraham Lincoln ring as true today as when he uttered them:

> You can fool some of the people all of the time, some of the people some of the time, but not all the people all the time.

Woe unto those who are unwilling to provide the means that will enable our people to meet the burden of cost incident to necessary medical and hospital care. Today, the burden of providing such in any long-term illness is so great that it means financial disaster to many families, or, a mortgaging of their future.

It is no wonder that President Eisenhower reacted bitterly today to the defeat of his health reinsurance program in the House of Representatives. We are informed by the press that at his conference with them today, he told them this was only a temporary defeat and he would carry the program forward as long as he was in office. This is the fighting spirit of a true soldier who is fighting the cause of the people. This is the spirit that brings final victory. To such a one a setback such as yesterday is never more than a temporary defeat.

It was kind of the President to further say that he did not believe the Congressmen who voted against the proposal could really have understood it. It was characteristic of the charitable disposition that he has toward all. This may be the explanation.

The words of President Eisenhower at the close of his press conference will burn like fire into the minds of the people of this Nation. They were memorable words, unforgettable words, and, words the truth of which cannot be denied, words that will linger with our people, namely, "No one lost yesterday except the American people."

I hope the time is not long until the wrong done is rectified.

As part of my remarks, I include an editorial appearing in today's issue, July 14, 1954, of the News, published in Washington, D. C. It is an editorial that in a few words states the issue. It reads as follows:

Health Reinsurance

> Although Congress has defeated the health reinsurance bill, the Eisenhower administration must not figuratively throw up its hands and say, "Well, so much for that."
>
> People need insurance against calamitous illnesses and disabilities.
>
> They need good insurance—at a price they can afford to pay.
>
> The bill the House defeated aimed to bring that about by setting up a system of Government reinsurance for companies and groups (like Blue Cross) willing to try selling policies more liberal than those now on the market.
>
> The American Medical Association disapproved of this bill. Apparently that carried some weight in Congress. But the AMA's attitude should not determine the issue, because it would not affect physicians except to enable more of their patients to pay their bills.

If doctors prefer that the number of charity patients not be reduced, they have the right to say so, but prospective patients—who outnumber doctors considerably—should be heard as well.

Aside from the AMA's role, it appears that the bill lost because, as Republican Leader Halleck said, it was too conservative for many House liberals, and too liberal for many conservatives. And then, of course, there was much of the usual election-year politicking.

The national problems that fathered the reinsurance bill still exist.

They must be solved.

That's why the administration should keep plugging.

For Sweep of Imagination, Measured Phrase, and Moving Eloquence, the Honorable Edward J. Hart Was Magnificent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 6, 1954

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, this past Flag Day at a Kiwanis Club luncheon in Jersey City, N. J., the Honorable Edward J. Hart spoke so movingly that tears welled the eyes and cheers peeled from the lips, thunderous cheers, unashamed tears, of everyone in the room.

Those who recently heard our beloved colleague as he eulogized the late Mr. Tumulty on the House floor, will understand the tense emotion engendered by Congressman Hart on Flag Day as he rededicated the lives, the bravery, and the loyalty of all America to the honor and glory of the Stars and Stripes, forever our morning prayer, and our evening salute.

While I have not as yet been able to obtain a copy of the address Congressman Hart delivered before the Kiwanis Club on that memorable Flag Day past, nevertheless, I did receive a most thoughtful and exceedingly gracious letter from a very distinguished and friendly citizen of Jersey City, Mr. Frank J. V. Gimino, whose letter bears the impact of Mr. Hart's address.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I deem it a most extraordinary privilege to share in the history of recording for all time the effect the address of Congressman Hart had on Mr. Gimino, one of his listeners:

Supreme Lodge,
Order Sons of Italy in America,
Jersey City, N. J., June 17, 1954.

Hon. Alfred D. Sieminski,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

My Dear Congressman: Your colleague, and my good friend, Ed Hart has just finished delivering one of the finest addresses it has been my privilege of hearing during the years I have been around.

As you may have heard, he addressed the local Kiwanis at luncheon here celebrating Flag Day.

When one thinks of the multitude of orators who have spoken upon the same theme over the years, it requires something more than patriotism to say that such an address merits the superlative.

Now I know that Ed will think there was nothing superlative about what he said today. Naturally nothing worth preserving, being the modest man he is, and has been, during a lifetime of service. It will require some persuasion to convince him to recapture what he said and reduce it to paper. Certainly he would not do it sua sponte. But he should be asked to do it, if for no other reason than to rekindle in those of us who are his neighbors and his constituents, the faith of our fathers in these days when faith in the flag and in the Nation for which it stands, is necessary now more than ever.

He will beg off, of course, and tell you that it "was off the cuff, fragmentary, unworthy," etc., etc. But don't be fooled. His peroration, for sweep of imagination, measured phrase, and real moving eloquence was magnificent. He may talk about how limited his time was, etc., etc., but if it had not been for the limitation on his time, he would never have reached the emotional heights he did.

You will be doing us all a distinct service, your party included, if you will request Ed to write what he said and then you insert it in the Congressional Record. I only wish I were in your shoes to do just that.

While you do not know me, please do not consider this effrontery on my part to address you thus. I love the spoken word and when one has the opportunity of hearing a practitioner like Ed Hart—may God keep him—talk so movingly, that opportunity becomes an occasion never to be forgotten in one's life—to be preserved, if possible, in all its pristine glory in a permanent record like your official organ. This will only record the printed words—silent shadows of a wonderful, rare moment that once lived—but nevertheless a record.

Trusting that you may find it possible to cooperate with me in this noble endeavor, I am, with sincere sentiments of respect and thanks,

Yours gratefully,
Frank J. V. Gimino,
Assistant Supreme Venerable.

Conservation Bloc?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 14, 1954

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I would like to include an article which appeared in the Milwaukee Journal on Sunday, June 13, 1954. I am fully in accord with the views expressed by my colleague, Mr. Johnson of Wisconsin, that there should be a conservation bloc in Congress to represent the interests of sportsmen. I believe with Mr. Johnson that such a bloc should be nonpartisan in nature and that it should represent the interests of conservationists all over the country. The article by Mr. Lawrence C. Eklund, of the Milwaukee Journal staff, reads as follows:

CONSERVATION BLOC?—JOHNSON URGES ONE IN CONGRESS TO PROTECT INTERESTS OF SPORTSMEN

(By Laurence C. Eklund)

Washington, D. C.—Formation of a "conservation bloc" in Congress to represent the interests of sportsmen was urged last week by Representative Johnson, Black River Falls Democrat, in a House speech criticizing the use of duck stamp receipts for general purposes. The Federal duck stamp act was enacted in 1934 to provide funds for the acquisition of migratory bird refuges. Johnson protested action by the Bureau of the Budget and the House Appropriations Committee reducing the budget of the Fish and Wildlife Service to a point where the Service, beginning July 1, "will have to dip into the sportmen's duck stamp kitty for $1,200,000" to maintain the current level of administration. The budget lopped off $652,000 from funds requested for refuges, $110,000 from what Johnson called essential river basin studies designed to help locate land and water for refuges, $100,000 from law enforcement and $101,000 from research into problems of wildlife management. Then the committee chopped off another $463,000.

Johnson supported an amendment by Representative Metcalf, Democrat, of Montana, to restore the funds for the waterfowl program. The amendment was defeated by 24 votes.

LITTLE SPENT ON BUYING

In debate on the amendment Representative Thompson, Democrat of Texas, author of the bill boosting the duck stamp from $1 to $2 5 years ago, said it was the intent of Congress that the money be used for acquiring lands for refuges. Thompson said it was never his understanding that the funds could be diverted to other purposes or used for general expenses in operating the Fish and Wildlife Service.

Figures provided by Johnson showed that of a total of $35,839,551 collected since enactment of the duck stamp law only $3,403,690 was actually spent to buy 218,016 acres of refuge land. The cost of these acres was brought up to $6,492,374 because an additional $3,088,684 was spent by the Fish and Wildlife Service on appraisals, purchase surveys, and clearance of titles.

The biggest part of the duck stamp money, $21,246,786, was spent to develop and maintain refuges. Migratory waterfowl research cost $3,022,376; enforcement of waterfowl regulations and waterfowl surveys, $3,609,908, and the Post Office Department got $577,263 for printing and handling duck stamps.

There was no legal obstacle to spending the money this way, but sportsmen and a number of Congressmen believe Congress should appropriate money for maintaining the refuges, leaving more funds to acquire more land.

CUT OFF AT POCKETS

"Just as funds are beginning to be available for a greatly expanded refuge purchase and development program as a result of the boost to $2, the administration cuts the program off at the pockets," Johnson told his colleagues.

"This is not what our duck hunters had in mind when they came to Congress 5 years ago and said: 'Here is another $1 apiece—use it to assure a continuing supply of ducks.'"

Asserting that the Senate is now the only hope of sportsmen who want their duck stamp money used for the purpose for which it was intended, Johnson announced he had already contacted several Senators to ask them to restore the cut in funds.

Johnson inserted into the Congressional Record a recent Nevada speech by Carl D. Shoemaker, conservation consultant of the National Wildlife Federation, who urged all sportsmen and conservation groups to put the heat on Congress to restore the cut.

Shoemaker argued that Congress should make provision for the development and maintenance of the refuges.

"When your Uncle Sam buys a post office site, an air base, a proving ground, or any other facility for the use of the Federal Government or any one of its agencies it makes annual appropriations for its maintenance and operation," said Shoemaker. "Why should not this same policy prevail in regard to wildlife refuges?"

Tl

HC

I

I
Sp
as
pa
ne
the
ou
T
lio
Fo
the
ou
ca
inc
do
tot
me
pa
ma
of
sec
se
to
of
I s
Da
ab
un
in
Re
ve
to
tio
sk
to
fr
an
th
in
tio
pe
fe
to
A
tr
ic
do
re
th
di
co
te
lo
lo
m
w
c

Appendix

The Declaration of Independence, 1954

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 15, 1954

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, recently I enjoyed the honor, as did many Representatives, of participating with my family, friends, and neighbors in community celebrations on the occasion of the 178th anniversary of our Independence Day.

To every American citizen and to millions of people throughout the world, the Fourth of July stands for the triumph of the ideals set forth in ringing terms in our Declaration of Independence. Dedicated to the extinction of these ideals of individual dignity and individual freedom, communism, the organization of total conformity, threatens to enslave men instead of make them free. But the passionate conviction of the dignity of man and his right to liberty is still alive.

Thus, July 4, 1954, was not only a day of commemoration but of renewed consecration as we again resolved to preserve our heritage as a free nation and to help other peoples to achieve our goals of democracy. It was of this resolve that I spoke at the third annual Independence Day celebration at Warinanco Park, Elizabeth, N. J., on July 5, 1954. Under unanimous consent, I include my address in the RECORD:

THE DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE, 1954

Across the length and breadth of our great Republic today we are celebrating the anniversary of the greatest milestone in the history of freedom—the signing of the Declaration of Independence. When the fireworks go skyward in all their brilliance, they proclaim to all that we are still strong, we are still free, we are strong in our belief in liberty and prepared to defend our great heritage to the hilt if need be.

For 178 years the great principles embodied in the Declaration of Independence, the notion of government of the people, by the people, and for the people, have been defended by Americans. "We hold these truths to be self evident," proclaimed Jefferson. And any who have attempted to deny these truths have been thwarted.

Our mid-20th century generation of Americans has inherited a burning belief in freedom, but we have also inherited the awesome responsibility to lead the free world against the onslaughts of reincarnated tyrants, dressed up in their 20th century cloak of communism, fascism, know-nothingism, materialism, and fear.

Today I would like to take one moment to look to the future of our great Republic and look to our future responsibilities.

When we talk of the future of America, we might as well talk about the future of the world, because today the destiny of America cannot be separated from the destiny of the world. The challenge is for us to lead the way to peace throughout the world, using our basic ideals as the torch to light the way. I propose that democracy as an idea is so vigorous, so powerful, so beyond comprehension in its capacity to improve the lot of mankind that it can and will overwhelm communism without warfare. You all share my hope, I am sure, because to believe otherwise is to lack faith in democracy, to break faith with the Declaration of Independence, and to abandon hope for the future of the world.

Distasteful as communism is to me, we must understand how it differs from democracy. The Declaration of Independence spells out our ideals. Our Revolutionary ancestors said: "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." A vital reason for the superiority of democracy is the fact that it is fundamentally a moral and religious idea. It is the political embodiment of the Bible. The Founding Fathers properly traced our unalienable rights to our Creator.

What, on the other hand, are the essential ideals of communism? Communism offers only material promise and subjugates all men to the state. The first act of the Communists is to destroy the church and to abolish any form of religion. They have no room for faith in anything except the government. Individual rights under communism are unknown. Life itself can easily be taken away by the state. Liberty is forbidden. Pursuit of happiness implies lack of patriotism to the Communist.

The goal of America, this strong America, is peace, liberty, and progress. Being a democracy, we count that one of our burdens while improving our own lot is improving the lot of others. Communism, on the other hand, is belligerant, aggressive, grasping, vicious, and constantly watching for the moment to attack, for a show of weakness which will permit further conquests.

A principal danger to us in this country is that we will be diverted from our role as leaders of the free world to petty squabbles at home. Fear of ourselves is a dangerous cancer. It feeds on false doubts about patriotism, honesty, truth, faith in fellow man, and the deeply religious and democratic ideal of the dignity of the individual, under God.

I want to talk for a moment about freedom at home and some of the threats to it; I want to do this today particularly because we are commemorating the greatest document of freedom in history—the Declaration of Independence. Faith in America and in ourselves is struggling against the demagogs spreading fear of ourselves, branding groups of Americans whether they be religious groups, racial groups, political groups, or economic groups, as traitors. This is a terrible threat to our free institutions. If we move on the basis of fear, we will become more fearful, more likely to adopt extremist measures.

Now I don't decry all fears and all disagreements. Certainly there is justification for fear of war, fear of depression, fear of communism. And disagreement can be most helpful in solving these world problems because out of the intelligent debate can come solutions. Without some fear and intelligent debate can come solutions. Without some fear and intelligent debate on these great problems we might never act to save ourselves against these threats. But, for heavens sake, let's not permit fear to seize our minds to such an extent that it stifles our brain, reduces our reasoning power and paralyzes our will to constructive action.

There are no easy answers to the problems in the world today and those who have easy answers are those to be feared most of all. The problem of the long, tortuous struggle with the tyranny of the Soviet Union is a problem which requires patience, diligence, self-restraint, and intelligence.

I know we can meet and overcome this problem, but we must have faith that other Americans who disagree with us are as honest and sincere as we are. To oppose people, to condemn them, to question their loyalty as a political expedient is neither intelligent nor fair. The vote is too precious a right, too vital to our democracy, to have it stolen by dishonesty and by demagogs spreading false fear amongst us.

I have confidence in America's future. I believe we can and will face up to our problems, meet them resolutely. I believe we can and will maintain our basic structure of freedom and of liberty—not only maintain our heritage but I believe we can and will move ahead with the problem of expanding the areas of freedom in the world without being diverted by the hatemongers and the fearmongers who are attempting to exploit the problems we face for their own personal advantage.

We are now the leaders of the free world. Leadership for us means more than showing our muscle, more than being the policeman, more than holding the line. Leadership must mean for us to strive to achieve the revolutionary promises of the Declaration of Independence—life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. These goals are fine for us. Likewise, they are fine for our friends and allies. Extending these advantages throughout the world is not only a most rewarding contribution to mankind, it is the only sure way to peace. This is both a political embodiment of the Golden Rule and also a repayment of our debt to those nations who helped us in past centuries.

You ask, how in the face of Communist aggression can we afford to waste our time and thoughts on such ideals when there is fighting to be done? I reject the thought that fighting is inevitable, that the only solution to this conflict in ideas is warfare. I and my family have known too much of war to have faith in it as a single solution to the ideological struggle between democracy and communism.

I want to be clear on this question of war, however. We live in a world where our opponent uses every conceivable trick regardless of how unfair or ruthless. We must be prepared for his military efforts, and I believe we must contain him at every turn. This can be done without risks of world war. In fact, unless we do contain him, we step closer to world war with all its horrible implications.

We should not risk having to fight without adequate preparedness. In fact, the less prepared we are, the greater the risk, because the Communists will be all the more ready to attack us if we are weak. A powerful Army, Navy, and Air Force are primary instruments of foreign policy in this struggle. We must keep them strong.

Even more important to our foreign policy is what we do to help other people achieve our goals of democracy—life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness. People who are starving and sick, people who want work but can't find it, people who have no opportunity for personal betterment, regardless of their efforts and determination are being denied these ideals. To them the claim that communism provides land, food, and material goods in a siren call.

I am convinced that our free competitive system can work wonders for other parts of the world. We can go far toward providing leadership to relieve the lot of the downtrodden, not with vast sums of money but with a vigorous program to lead others toward prosperity. Where unemployment is chronic, then that society is sick. We can help it recover and grow strong. Where people are hungry, we can relieve their hunger with our vast food stocks. When ambition is thwarted, when people cannot advance themselves, and when tyranny prevails, we can be the hope of those unfortunate people by exercising our vast powers, without force of arms, to lift the yoke of the tyrant from their ambition.

Recently it was said that we would be struggling with communism for the next 40 years. While this was perhaps a casual comment, it bothers me, because it indicates doubts about our capacity to win out over communism where communism today has its most effective appeal—in the economic and politically backward areas of the world and among the downtrodden peoples of Western Europe. Our material advantages are so vast that, without straining, we can easily help other peoples in the world to help themselves and not with handouts of vast sums of money.

We have come a long way toward winning the peoples of the world to democratic ideas. We cannot now tire in these efforts, because they mean so much to those we help. We cannot risk the destruction and devastation of war because we have lost patience with our allies or because we lack confidence in the revolutionary ideas of American democracy. We cannot turn back time and forfeit our leadership because we thereby betray our world leadership and lose our own democracy at the same time.

We cannot now stop our support of self-help aid programs because of their cost, for that small amount is so slight compared with the cost of war. The point 4 program cost the United States one-third of 1 percent of our annual military costs.

In conclusion, let me say we have inherited a great tradition—a tradition of liberty and economic progress unmatched in human history. So let's not lose faith, not get tired, not relax in our efforts to enjoy and improve life, to achieve liberty, and to pursue happiness. Finally, let's not forget our obligation to carry this religious idea to the less fortunate throughout the world. So long as democracy offers any superior means of overcoming our enemy, we cannot afford war. We have the opportunity to remove warfare from the world by demonstrating the overwhelming advantages and the hope and promise of democracy.

We can do this, I believe, by reigniting the burning faith and belief and hope that marked our forefathers as some of the greatest men in history. The struggle between freedom and slavery has been long and bloody. Many have died so we today could enjoy freedom. Many have said with Patrick Henry, "Give me liberty or give me death."

Today it is our turn to defend this heritage. I believe we will not only defend our freedom but expand it, and I believe this can be done without war. Today it is our turn to be the leaders of the defense of freedom. With the burning belief that our cause is just with the dedication that inspired those who fought for the Declaration of Independence, with faith in our God, we shall not fail.

Editor John C. Sciranka Advocates Erection of Monument in Washington Honoring Saints Cyril and Methodius

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 15, 1954

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith a letter to the editor written by John C. Sciranka, editor of American Friends of Slovak Freedom, Passaic, N. J., which appeared in the Herald News of Passaic-Clifton, N. J., on July 8, 1954.

The letter follows:

NATIONALISM AND RELIGION

EDITOR HERALD-NEWS:

Former President Herbert C. Hoover hit the nail on the head in his recent speech when he said that besides religion, nationalism is the greatest weapon against communism. It has been proved on many occasions that blood is thicker than water.

Let us take the case of German missionaries in the ninth century who were invited to the Moravian empire by Emperor Pribina. Pribina wanted to introduce Christiananity to the Slovaks and Moravians. He built the first Christian church. But the German missionaries insisted on spreading the German culture. Although they spoke the Slovakian tongue, they insisted on teaching the people the German language. The people stopped going to Christian services and the mission was a failure. Emperor Pribina observed their mistake and asked them to leave the country.

When Rastislav became an emperor, he did not want to repeat Pribina's mistake, so he asked for Christian missionaries who would speak the Slolvak language. There were two such missionaries, now known as Saints Cyril and Methodius. Their mission was a great success. Cyril and Methodius celebrated mass in the Slavonic rite. This nationalistic trait, as Mr. Hoover observed, proved to be magic in spreading Christianity.

The writer was told over a quarter century ago by the Russian Count Spiridovitch, who had an estate on Staten Island, that Lenin admonished his Communist followers to respect, at least outwardly, nationalists and nationalism. Stalin disliked the Slavs, yet he followed Lenin's advice. Communists allow books for the spread of their ideology to be published in any language as long as it serves their purpose.

The writer advocates the erection of a monument of Saints Cyril and Methodius in Washington, D. C., as an inspiration to all American Slavs in their battle against communism. The late Count Spiridovitch worked for the establishment of the Slav Christian federation against communism. The United States has presently over 35 million Americans of various Slavic backgrounds. They are a great force and a strong front against communism. These Americans have family ties in various satellite countries. Thus they understand better the suffering of their kin abroad behind the Iron Curtain. Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, addressing foreign language newspapermen several years ago in New York City, called them the first line fighters for freedom of the oppressed nations.

This week in most of the Slovak and Slav churches throughout the world the feast of Saints Cyril and Methodius is observed with special celebrations. The Slovaks of the Eastern States will meet on Sunday, July 11, on the campus of Catholic University in Washington, where, let us hope, a monument will someday stand to glorify the two great apostles who converted the Slavic nationals.

JOHN C. SCIRANKA,
Editor, American Friends of Slovak Freedom.
PASSAIC.

"Defense in Depth" Study Necessary To Help Us Survive Hydrogen Bomb Attack, Says Missouri Congressman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. McCARTHY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 15, 1954

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, Mr. David A. Heller, writing for the Central Press Association, a unit of King Features Syndicate which supplies feature material to hundreds of newspapers from coast to coast, recently wrote an article on House Concurrent Resolution 229 to which I should like to invite the attention of the Congress.

This bill, introduced by Congressman RICHARD BOLLING, of Missouri, provides for a joint committee to make a study of "defense in depth" in connection with our defense against possible enemy attack with atom or hydrogen bombs.

Mr. Heller's article points out that we are lacking in having many necessary facts upon which to plan our defense in depth, a situation which Representative BOLLING's bill would remedy. I believe this is a matter which deserves thoughtful consideration on the part of all of us; and, under unanimous consent, I include the article in the RECORD, as follows:

"DEFENSE IN DEPTH" STUDY NECESSARY TO HELP US SURVIVE HYDROGEN BOMB ATTACK, SAYS MISSOURI CONGRESSMAN

(By David A. Heller)

WASHINGTON.—If the United States is ever attacked by an atomic or hydrogen bomb, it is probable that millions of unnecessary casualties will meet an agonizing end. Furthermore, the ability of our Nation to survive to fight back is being weakened by lack of effective study and preparation for "defense in depth."

That is the warning of Congressman RICHARD BOLLING, of Missouri, who declares that we are all guilty of sleeping now that we may burn for it later—literally.

BOLLING, author of a bill in Congress which would create a committee to make a new approach to the matter of defense against enemy attack, granted an exclusive interview to Central Press to talk about his plan.

"The American people and all levels of their government cannot escape responsibility for the dreadful inadequacy of our civil defense against atomic and hydrogen weapons," Representative BOLLING, who regards us as almost completely unprepared to face this sobering possibility, said.

"Despite the efforts of a few individuals, the Federal Government has failed to provide the funds and leadership to get civil defense rolling. The State and local government, with a few exceptions, have failed to carry forward even the limited program possible. And even the American people cannot avoid sharing the blame, for most of us, like ostriches, have hidden our heads and failed to cooperate in taking the steps which someday might result in saving our own lives," Congressman Bolling said.

What the outspoken legislator from Missouri favors is a radically different approach to the matter of defense from enemy attack. "The failure of civil defense is largely a failure on the part of the Government to let the people know of the extent to which an H-bomb attack could level our cities," he said.

"For example, many of the bomb shelters which have been built would seem to be worse than useless. We know that the hydrogen bomb can smash down to a depth of 160 feet—as it has in the Pacific tests. That means if we are unlucky enough to be in a target area we have the unhappy choice of being evaporated in a bomb shelter—along with the shelter itself—or of being evaporated outside the shelter.

"We must take effective steps not to be around when the bomb hits, and facilities must be created to care for the evacuation of persons on the edge of the attack area who may survive. Our present preparations may be just in the nature of kidding ourselves that we're doing something to meet the challenge, when, in point of fact, they may be totally ineffective."

"One thing seems certain about an enemy A-bomb or H-bomb attack," continued Congressman Bolling. "It's either going to be an all-out blow or it won't come. The enemy knows that if we aren't knocked out at once retaliation will be quick and effective. Unless he thinks he can kill America at one blow he's not likely to strike. It'll be all or nothing.

"What we need now is facts and more facts about defending ourselves against attack," Representative Bolling, 38, a scholar who became interested in politics while working as a college administrator, says.

"My bill would create a joint congressional committee on the economics of atomic defense. A staff of the leading brains in the Nation should begin at once gathering the facts that we'll need to know to plan America's defense in depth.

"Such a staff could gather facts to devise plans so that even with the fearful prospect of a mass attack on our cities with H-bombs, it would be impossible to knock America out. With that knowledge, the possibility of war becomes much more remote.

"We should find out how it is possible to defend ourselves in view of the new destructiveness of the hydrogen bomb. Our present plans, to guard against the less destructive atomic bomb, are now obsolete.

"It may be that there's little that we can do, but at least we should get the best economists and the best brains in the country to find out how much we can afford to spend for civil defense and how it should be spent.

"When this idea occurred to me," Congressman Bolling said, "I wrote to some of the leading scholars in the Nation, asking their advice. Among them were Leon H. Keyserling, former Chief of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, and Vannevar Bush, president of the Carnegie Institution. I'd like to bring a few words from each of them to readers of Central Press client newspapers.

"Mr. Bush said: 'It would certainly seem to me that a study of great thoroughness, devoted to passive defense measures, would be highly desirable.'

"Mr. Keyserling said: 'Much more could be spent on preparing for disaster without injuring national defense. False economics has long stood in the way of what every thoughtful and informed person knows to be necessary. Therefore, the economics of the problem should be proved simultaneously with the other aspects.'

"In view of these comments," Congressman Bolling said, "I think we'd better get moving on this matter. It's later than we may think."

H. R. 5380

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY W. WIER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 15, 1954

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the Congressional Record, I include an article from the National Tribune-The Stars and Stripes of Thursday, July 15, 1954, by Jack Kyle, national legislative representative, the 1902–14 Philippine Command Committee—Justi'tia Omnibus—Washington, D. C., on the subject of H. R. 5380, a bill for the relief of the Moro-Leyte-Samar veterans.

The article is as follows:

Second Open Letter to Majority Leaders

Gentlemen: Contrary to campaign promises and the sincere and vigorous efforts of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, the Republican-controlled 83d Congress has utterly failed "to care for him who shall have borne the battle and for his widow and orphan."

While you were authorizing $3.4 billion for foreign aid to help pension our former enemies and a host of gangsters for making war upon the helpless Ethiopians, including another $114 million Santa Claus money for Harold Stassen to buy tons of Christmas presents for foreigners all around the globe, the little bill to pension a small group of Moro-Leyte-Samar veterans with more than 150 engagements to its credit has been gathering dust in the Rules Committee pigeonhole. But, gentlemen, that is just a part of the record.

You have paid more than the lion's share of United Nations upkeep. American dollars are paying for—or helping to pay for—no less than two foreign wars. You have appropriated money that was actually used for the redemption of previously worthless German Government bonds. You have voted a few more billions in trickle down tax relief for the giant corporations. A little item of a $25 million a year increase in travel allowances for roving civil-service employees stands to your credit. And let us not forget that you have bought enough surplus butter, cheese, and eggs to feed Napoleon's army for the next 10 years, most of which will probably rot in tax-paid storage. Nor should we fail to note the impressive item of several hundred million dollars in genuine good old-fashioned pork-barrel legislation. In fact, gentlemen, the indelible record shows that you have looked after about everybody and everything at home and abroad except the needy veteran.

If the Rules Committee chairman has decided that H. R. 5380 would be improper legislation, upon what was that decision based? Was it improper in 1944 and 1945 when every Republican in the House voted for similar bills for the identical purpose for which H. R. 5380 was unanimously reported by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs nearly 13 months ago?

Really, gentlemen, should it be possible for veterans to have their ambitions thwarted by the deliberate inaction of a single party-controlled policy committee? If so, why? We submit that no veteran as such should ever be the subject of partisan political decisions. Veterans serve the whole country and all parties but never as partisans, and when a legislative committee reports bills for their welfare, every Member of the House should have an opportunity to stand up and vote for or against them in the good old American way.

The veteran can't win when the Rules Committee chairman will not so much as place his legislative committee approved bills on the committee agenda for consideration, but, gentlemen, we venture to suggest that the veterans' bills now being so handled could very well be on the agenda of several million voters next November.

QUESTIONS TO LEADERS

Since the Rules Committee chairman will not even answer the inquiries of the chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, the following questions are now directed to the majority leadership:

Of what possible use is the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, or any other legislative committee of the House, if the Rules Committee chairman is permitted to nullify their actions?

By what criterion does the Rules Committee chairman arrive at his decisions to impede the enactment of legislative committee approved veterans' bills? Does he hold secret hearings of his own? And are his legislative qualifications superior to those of the 28-member Committee on Veterans' Affairs?

Are that chairman's views in accord with those of the Republican National Committee or those of the White House, and is he familiar with his party history and current platform?

Although the few surviving Moro-Leyte-Samar veterans have waited for 40 long years for some favorable congressional consideration, it still isn't too late to extend a small measure of 11th-hour justice to them by enacting H. R. 5380 before adjournment this year. Once that bill is cleared by the Rules Committee there will not be a single vote against it in either branch of Congress. Literally hundreds of the people's elected representatives are anxiously awaiting an opportunity to vote for it. How tragic it is that a single Member of Congress is preventing that vote.

Jack Kyle
(For and on behalf of the 1902–14
Philippine Command Committee).

Let's Not Deceive Ourselves

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 15, 1954

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Speaker, the Red tide sweeps on in Asia while western diplomacy continues to parry and obviously tries to compromise with the menace of Communist imperialism.

Having secured the rich Red River Delta under their belts, a prize awarded to them by voluntary French withdrawal, the Communists are now sweeping on toward Hanoi. It is not a pleasant thing, Mr. Speaker, to read of Americans and other civilians fleeing with an alacrity that suggests panic at Hanoi, and of course there are increasing signs that a Red fifth column awaits only the signal to spring into action inside the city.

Soon, we are told, the battle for Hanoi will begin. Judging by the resistance that has been offered thus far to the onrushing Reds, this is not a very cheering prospect. The Communist offensive against this important city comes at a time when the French Government at home is at what appears to be a perpetual crisis, and the disposition of western diplomacy seems to be to make a gift of a large part of Vietnam to the Reds.

We might do well to pause and ponder what the recent French withdrawal from the Red Delta in Tonkin, Vietnam, meant. Without the firing of a shot, the Reds were handed a territory embracing some 1,600 square miles, and given control over some 2½ million of people. This region is a rich agricultural belt, but, more than this, the action handed over free peoples into Bamboo Curtain slavery—that is what it amounts to on a practical basis no matter how anyone tries to sugar-coat the bitter pill.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, a deal is being rigged right now at Geneva where "peace" for Indochina is being framed by "statesmen," statesmen who are bent on coexisting with communism and who will endeavor to legitimatize this selling out of millions of souls to Red tyranny. Mr. Dulles has already been importuned to get back to Geneva so that the prestige of the United States may be utilized to give an air of respectability to this newest and latest sellout to communism.

I ask you, Mr. Speaker, does any sensible, right-minded person believe for a second that anyone is going to be fooled by all the high-sounding platitudes that will be used to cover up this latest chapter of appeasement? Does anyone believe for a moment that the actions of Americans fleeing Hanoi will be lost on Asia's teeming millions as the West suffers the loss of face once more? No. When the people of the world see what is going on at Hanoi, they will be wondering when it will be Saigon's turn, and how long it will be before Tokyo becomes the target for an all-out Communist drive.

That is the logical course of events, Mr. Speaker, in view of the West's soft policy toward Communist aggression. All of these objectives I have outlined are but station stops on the Communist drive for world conquest. What a pity it is that, in the face of such brutal evidence, statesmen of the West—men who should know the ways of aggression and especially the wiles of the Communist plunderer—continue to delude themselves that this way of abject appeasement is the road to peace. What monumental folly, Mr. Speaker. What moral blindness. What dangerous policy.

I wonder how many of our so-called western "statesmen" stop to realize that in a world threatened by an atomic armament race the potentials of Asian resources far outstrip those of the Western World. Let us look to our maps, consult our geography, note the rich natural resources of Asia, and speculate upon the almost unlimited manpower of the East; then let us speculate, grimly, if you please, upon what will be the balance of power if, in our poverty of policy, we allow the Asian Continent to come wholly under Communist rule.

The first point in an intelligent, realistic approach to the global threat presented by Communist imperialism must be the realization that coexistence with communism can only be achieved upon Communist terms, and this represents victory for the Communists by default.

Secondly, no matter what the Communists pretend in the way of coexistence with the West, they do not themselves believe coexistence to be possible, for they are committed to the proposition that it is a matter of historical necessity that Marxism must eventually be triumphant over the West. So, when the Communists talk of coexistence they are merely using it as a pretext for a breather so as to gain time to digest their gains and get prepared for the next forward push.

Thirdly, in our diplomatic approach to the problem, we must realize that a political-moral chain reaction follows each and every single set of appeasement toward communism. An action in any one place in the world of public affairs is followed by political reaction everywhere else throughout the world. Japan, the bastion of the free world's defense in the East, is watching closely every development in Indochina. So, too, are Malaya, Burma, Indonesia, Thailand, and Pakistan and Iran—all of these states feel the political tremors as the Red storm breaks over Asia. Continued appeasement of Russian imperialism can only react to our ultimate sorrow.

Finally, we deceive ourselves at our own peril. We cannot embrace evil and hope to dwell in peace and security with it.

Mr. Speaker, I offer these suggestions for the West, and I commend them to the attention of western diplomats in the hope that the free world may arouse itself from the torpor of delusion and the sweet gas of appeasement before it is too late. It is even now well beyond the 11th hour.

H. R. 1227

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 15, 1954

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I am including in these remarks a petition concerning H. R. 1227 signed by citizens of Portland, Oreg., in my congressional district, as follows:

We, the undersigned, believing that the cause of total abstinence can be served by the reduction of advertising of alcoholic beverages over radio and television urge that our congressional representatives help bring the Bryson bill (H. R. 1227) from committee and support it by their vote. This bill would prohibit the transportation in interstate commerce of alcoholic-beverage advertising in newspapers, periodicals, and its broadcasting over radio and TV. We also request that you present the petitions to the House and to have a note made of them in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mrs. Freeda Irene Premo, Mr. R. A. Premo, Mrs. R. C. Yonge, Mrs. Blanche H. Griblin, Mrs. E. C. Bergstrom, C. F. Larson, R. W. Childs, Herman Nothiger, Mrs. B. Waddington, Mrs. Minnie McLaughlin, Mrs. D. Hugenberger, John P. Voit, Mrs. M. L. Thomson, Geraldine E. Moore, Harry A. Moore, Verda A. Snyder, Minnie A. Cushman, Muurine I. Long, Mrs. P. M. Clark.

Experiment in Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 15, 1954

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of the Congress and to the people of this Nation an editorial which appeared in the Canton (Ohio) Repository on Sunday, July 11, 1954. It seems to me that the writer of this article has vividly expressed the success of this administation which is now being applauded by the people.

The article follows:

EXPERIMENT IN GOVERNMENT

The prospect of unusual success for the Eisenhower administration's legislative program is being well publicized—and properly so. It is part of the party function in a two-party system of government to keep the public informed about its stewardship.

But there is a reason for this unusual success that does not lend itself to publicizing. It concerns something the Eisenhower administration has not been doing, something not easy to describe, nor easy to understand.

Yet, much of the acceptance of his administration's legislative ideas has been the result of an experiment in Government which President Eisenhower began when he entered the White House in 1953. He made it known he believed in the three-way balance of Federal power, and said he would not dictate to Congress.

This pledge, coming after the Truman administration, which had tried to dictate to Congress, and the Roosevelt administration, which had tried to dictate both to Congress and the Supreme Court, was mildly revolutionary in its implications. There have been times when the President seemed to be at the mercy of people who hold the view that failure to use his power in a personal way is a sign of weakness.

In a republic, the ultimate source of all governing power is the people themselves. They are sovereign. It never dawned on either Franklin Roosevelt or Harry Truman that the people's sovereign power was made manifest in the congressional coalition that blocked their legislative recommendations. It seems to have dawned on Dwight Eisenhower, however.

He has picked no fight with Congress, or with its members. He has made no preemptory demands, delivered no insults, refrained from off-the-cuff remarks, indulged in no squabbling and has done no overt politicking to take advantage of political opponents. He has achieved remarkable success with a legislative program by letting legislators find out for themselves what their constituents preferred; he did not try to tell them what the folks back home were thinking.

The dignity he has restored to the White House as the symbol of the executive power has been enhanced, not diminished, by his steadfast refusal to detract by word of deed from the dignity which belongs to Congress.

At the close of the second legislative year of his administration, President Eisenhower's experiment in republicanism is turning out more successfully than its critics ever wanted to believe it would or could turn out.

To Assist Local Communities in Building Modern Industrial Plants in Labor-Surplus Areas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DeWITT S. HYDE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 15, 1954

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted, I insert in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement, which I sent to the chairman of the Public Works Committee with respect to H. R. 9137, a bill to authorize Federal loans to assist local communities in building modern industrial plants in labor-surplus areas.

The statement follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., July 2, 1954.

Hon. GEORGE A. DONDERO,
Chairman, Public Works Committee,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: May I take this opportunity to request action on H. R. 9157, a bill to authorize Federal loans to assist local communities in building modern industrial plants in labor-surplus areas.

I have a labor-surplus area in my congressional district, namely Allegany County. This community has been listed as a distress area for some time and is urgently in need of new industry. There is a large surplus of highly skilled labor in this community which can and should be utilized by some progressive industry.

It has been my experience that in a community the size of Cumberland, Md., the procurement of sufficient capital to provide the required facilities is a major obstacle in attracting new industries. I believe that this bill offers an excellent solution in overcoming this financial obstacle. We know that when hardship areas such as Cumberland are given a boost, they react to the benefit of other areas; hence, there should be no objection to the bill.

The only change we suggest in the bill is a provision to insure that proper recognition be given the local industrial development groups without any Federal interference of appointment. I think it should also be made clear in the bill that a new industry would not have to be located within the city limits of the city which is recognized as eligible for assistance, but that such a new development could be located at least within a reasonable radius of the city limits.

I shall appreciate it if the Public Works Committee could consider this bill as promptly as possible. With kind regards, I am

Sincerely,

DEWITT S. HYDE.

This Can I Do

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 15, 1954

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, July 4, the Reverend Harold M. Mallett, minister of the First Presbyterian Church of Hutchinson, Kans., delivered a most timely sermon, one which was appropriate to the day and such a fine exposition of Christian patriotism that I hope it will be read by every Member of Congress.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include this sermon herewith:

THIS CAN I DO

"For their sakes, I sanctify myself." (John 17: 12.)

Leslie D. Weatherhead, of London, tells of two elderly ladies having their tea during the heaviest days of fighting in World War II. One of them, reading a news headline, looked up and said, "I see we have taken Tobruk."

You would be tempted to smile at the "we"—we have taken Tobruk—but we cannot deny this dear lady the experience of making herself a part of her nation.

In the sublime poetry of John Donne, we remember that he speaks of himself being a "part of the main"—that not a clod of England falls into the sea without it affecting England. "The bell," he said, "it tolls for thee," when he was speaking of a funeral toll. You are "involved in mankind."

Again, Leon Volkov, former Communist, and of Russian descent, writing for Newsweek, tells of trying to interview the Russian chess players recently victorious in competition. No sooner had he begun a conversation than a "watcher" would interrupt. These men were sent along, not only to "watch" the chess games but to "watch" the players so that none of them would make a bolt for freedom.

So Volkov remonstrated, asking if talking chess had anything to do with politics. "Of course it does," exclaimed the watcher. "Remember, we are Marxists and Communists. For us, everything is political, including chess."

Everything you are, do, say, have—everything—is an expression of patriotism of one sort or another. We are followers of, and believers in, Jesus Christ of Nazareth, and in this One, as in no other, was the desire to take upon himself the burden of others. "For their sakes," he prayed, "I sanctify myself," or, as the revised version has it, "I consecrate myself."

Look at his world, his nation. Israel had long since fallen. Men wept at the wailing wall. Hypocrites were in the drivers' seats of religion. Rome was, politically, in power. The disciples were wavering and incompetent. Several parties had sprung up, some of them fomenting revolution, others ascetic isolationism; it was a picture much like present France, too many parties, no unity.

Yet, in the face of this, the Christ showed his colors. "For their sakes"—no matter who is in power; regardless of the festering troubles; there is something higher than anything else which calls me to loyalty. I consecrate myself. This can I do.

"What can I do?" people are asking. Politics seem to rule the land, politics and money. "What can I do, when laws are made so far away in Washington, and treaties are signed on boats out in the ocean, or on some distant shore? I am only one citizen."

To this question I address myself. This can I do. I may be only one, but I am one. I cannot do everything, but I can do something. What I cannot do, I shall not try, but what I can do, God helping me, I will do.

I adopt for myself a four-point program.

Point 1: I shall keep myself as able-bodied as possible.

One night some years ago two young scientists appeared before the City Council of New Orleans and told them that if they did not appropriate $200,000 to kill the mosquitoes around the city there would be an epidemic of yellow fever. The aldermen laughed at this idea. How ridiculous to wage war on mosquitoes. But the epidemic came, and before it was over one of the young scientists was dead and three of the aldermen who laughed were in their graves, and it cost the city of New Orleans not $200,000 but $50 million and a thousand lives.

The next time you think that it is quite the vogue and up to date to pattern our lives on decadent, continental Europe, and especially France, consider Marshall Petain's judgment, that the reason France fell so readily to Germany was that the people had grown soft and undisciplined—they did not have the will to resist invasion.

Beside this, consider that the reason France is losing out in Indochina is that she cannot find enough ablebodied men to replace the officers she is losing in that area, and the report recently in Reader's Digest, that 1 Frenchman in 25 will die of alcoholism.

Let the United States understand this—that the Communist youth and the Eastern European young people have been recently judged the healthiest of the youth of the world.

We are being warned of the decimating effects of harmful practices which threaten, according to medical reports, to undermine the manpower of this country within a decade—habits which cause lung-cancer, heart disease, high blood pressure—not to speak of accidents caused by an irresponsible carelessness. As in a perverted game known as "Russian Roulette," where a revolver barrel with only one bullet is spun, the trigger pulled in a 5 to 1 gamble that the trigger and bullet won't concide, so many are taking chances with their health and lives. Our country cannot afford even the allowable percentile of casualties.

This can I do. I can resolve in the words of the Scout Oath, to keep myself "physically strong." Uncle Sam needs this of me, whether I am a soldier, preacher, doctor, teacher, merchant, or truck driver.

Point 2: My devotion to the young people of America.

I'm all for old-age pensions and social security and the comfortable retirement, but I wonder what all this shall mean, if our young people are not saved for Christ, the home, the church, the school, and the Nation.

Senator MCCARTHY and the Un-American Activities Committee have missed their biggest scoop. They have been so busy looking for Communists in the church, the schools and the State that they have overlooked 3 million people who have entered our country in the past year.

These 3 million are illiterate, do not believe in God, our religion, or our constitution. They have no respect for the flag, and less for our form of Government. They have the potential of disrupting our school system, and my be a threat to our churches.

Who are they? They are the 3 million babies who were born to American homes last year.

For this reason, I am concerned about the church colleges and the church centers on university campuses and the vacation Bible schools and the Sabbath schools and the youth camps and the YMCA and everything which serves our youth.

And I am likewise concerned as a citizen, about magazines and books, movies, television and radio, and anything which preys on the morals and the health and the citizenship of our United States young.

This can I do. I can become a vocal citizen, and a working Christian for our young people.

Point 3: I think I'll have to be a better student and salesman for capitalism.

When capitalism is on the defensive, it will never win. Communism is on the offensive. Let us stop defending capitalism, and start selling it. I know that there are some things wrong with capitalism—show me something human that could not be improved. But there is nothing wrong with capitalism that could be cured with communism.

We could prove, and we have been trying to, that capitalism as we practice it has produced the highest standard of living that the world has ever known, but let us not sell it short.

Capitalism has given dignity to a human being. In it, an emigrant or a youth, who wants to prove his mettle, can start a business, build it up, express the thrilling aspects of energy and initiative, and if there is a mind to do it, there comes a companionship between the boss and the laborer, and in many places profit-sharing, stockholding employees help make the business stronger.

And besides, there have been the beneficent gifts of capitalism. Think of the universities, the colleges, the churches, the schools, the hospitals, the parks, and museums, the foundation funds of the Fords, the Rockefellers, and the benevolence of many with less capital.

We live in a veritable wonderland. But this is not for our selfish gloating. Let us praise God for it, and speak of it in glowing terms, and begin to sell what we believe the way we should, since we are children of Uncle Sam. This can I do.

Point 4: I shall remember the God foundations of this Nation. I shall not take my religious liberties for granted.

I ask you, as you sit in this church, to close your eyes and imagine what it would be like next Sunday morning, if, as you came up the steps, you saw two rough planks nailed in an X across the doors, and a sign reading, "Regilious Exercises Forbidden."

I am not playing on your sympathies. This thing has happened in two-thirds of the world. In North Korea alone, 5,000 pastors have been murdered by the Communists for preaching the way I am this morning.

Long years ago, Isaiah warned the people of his country by saying: "The ox knoweth his owner, and the ass his master's crib, but Israel doth not know; my people do not consider * * * They have forsaken God, and the Holy One of Israel." (Isaiah 1: 3, 4.)

I must remember God. This can I do.

In our church, we have two flags. We pledged allegiance to them this morning. They are on the same level. The Christian flag means that our Nation was founded by God-fearing, Christian people, and that we are a nation under God—a Christian nation.

The American flag—the flag of the United States—is the symbol that here is a home, the doors of which are open for the preaching of the Word.

You would not have had the United States flag, if there had not been that for which the Christian flag stands. You would not have the Christian flag flying, if we did not have the Stars and Stripes. Under these two flags, I live, and so do others.

There are people of racial differences, who will want to know how I, as a citizen and a Christian will treat them. For their sakes, I consecrate myself.

There are laborers, farmers, bricklayers, the providers of my country, the bulwark of the economy, and they shall wonder how, in Christian America, they shall fare. For their sakes, I consecrate myself.

And here is my Government, my Government, and my President, not some man elected by some other party, whom I must accept; he is my President, Dwight Eisenhower, and my Vice President; my Congress, my Governor, my Ambassadors; none of them shall rise higher than the level of the citizenry. For their sakes, I consecrate myself.

And the Armed Forces, the Army, Navy, Marines, Air Force, and all related groups. For those who died in battle, for those who now serve, so that my home may be secure, and my ideals stronger; for those who in the future shall bear the military burden. For their sakes, I consecrate myself.

This can I do. God helping me, this shall I do.

Industrial Infiltration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 15, 1954

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include herein a very timely editorial which appeared in yesterday's issue of the New York Times:

INDUSTRIAL INFILTRATION

The House Judiciary Committee has acted with courage and wisdom in a field where both have been singularly lacking of late: How to deal with the internal threat of communism in the United States.

Last May Attorney General Brownell, with White House approval, sent identical bills to the House and Senate which went so far as to authorize the actual dissolution and liquidation of labor unions, business firms, and other organizations upon a finding by the Subversive Activities Control Board that they were Communist infiltrated. The bill attempted to define this well-worn phrase with as little success as might have been expected—especially for those who might be charged with the administration of the law. On July 6 the Senate committee shelved the bill on the ground, among others, that even the Communist Party itself has not been either liquidated or dissolved. The committee approved a less drastic measure that would require an infiltrated organization to register under the Subversive Activities Control Act, with a loss, if it were a labor union, of collective-bargaining rights and other protections afforded by the Government.

Now the House committee has turned down the Brownell proposal completely and approved a bill of Representative WALTER, of Pennsylvania, to set up a commission composed of 12 members, 4 each from industry and labor, and 4 representing the public, with 3 congressional advisers, to study the whole problem of security in industry and to make recommendations for action to Congress. The President and the officers of Congress are authorized to make appointments to the commission, which would have to submit its report before January 15 of next year.

We hope the committee will favorably report the Walter bill without delay, that the Senate will substitute a similar bill for the one now on its docket, and that both Houses will promptly pass it. The Brownell legislation was more like that of a police state than of a free democracy, and would have been impossible to administer even had it been either wise or necessary.

The Supreme Court Decision on Segregation in the Public Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 15, 1954

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, there comes a time when it is necessary that momentous decisions be made and when made they must be supported with all of the vigor, determination, and energy one possesses. Recently the so-called Supreme Court of the United States rendered a decision contrary to all precedent and former holdings of this Court. There was a complete reversal and a turnabout of the law of our great country, which makes us realize that we are subject to the whims and fancies and political philosophy of nine men who have constituted themselves as the legislative, judicial, and executive branch of our Government without regard to the rights of the people as guaranteed them under our Constitution.

Fortunately, we still have men of courage and conviction who are willing to meet the issue head on which has been created by this fantastic decision. In southside Virginia there are several outstanding editors of weekly newspapers who have the courage of their convictions and are willing to stand up and be counted on matters of importance to our way of life.

One of these men is Cary P. Flythe, president and editor of the Independent Messenger, Emporia, Va., who has dedicated his life to the betterment of mankind, the upbuilding of his section of Virginia, and the carrying on of those things that make this country a better place in which to live.

On Thursday, July 8, 1954, there appeared in his paper a very fine article explaining the terrible impact and dire consequences that can be expected to follow as a result of the abominable decision of the Supreme Court of the United States unless our people are willing to do that which is necessary to combat same.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith that fine article by that great Virginia gentleman, Cary P. Flythe:

IMPRESSIONS AND EXPRESSIONS

(By Cary P. Flythe)

The first definite step in opposition to the recent decision of the United States Supreme Court requiring segregation in the public schools of Virginia to be unconstitutional has been taken by the local school board, the board of supervisors, and the town council. It is very heartening to know that our local officials have the "guts" to come out openly and declare that we Virginians do not have to submit to the outrageous proposal of the Supreme Court to mix white children with Negroes in our public schools. We can fight. We must fight. And we will fight.

Regretfully, many people seem not to realize what can happen if we do not take action soon. Others have been misled by fuzzy-minded theorists or scripture-spouting dupes, many of whom seem really to believe that man can improve on God's plan to keep the races separate and identifiable.

I will repeat what I said in this column several weeks ago: "I have hundreds of Negro friends in this county whom I respect highly. I want to see them have the same advantages that I have, but for the sake of the ultimate welfare of both races, I do not believe a mixture of both races will lead to anything but bitter and tragic circumstances." Since the above quote appeared in this column of May 20, I have had a number of my Negro friends come to me personally and tell me that they agree with me, and hope, for the sake of a continuance of good will between the races, segregation will continue.

We have, in this and other communities in the South, an organization that is doing more to destroy the good will between the white and Negro than the revived Ku Klux Klan ever did—and that is the National Society for the Advancement of the Colored People. They forget that the white race has rights and principles for which they will fight, and if necessary die for. They will tolerate the Negro's fight for his economic rights, but when they tell us that they will demand social equality they are treading on very dangerous ground, because to all people it is a very sacred privilege to chose social associates and even among the Negroes will be found social class distinctions.

Our too complacent white population in the South has accepted outside interference by the NAACP and northern radicals, and has too often resorted to appeasement in matters which affect the relations between the Negro and white, until the time has now come for a firm and definite stand to be taken by the white people in the matter of integration in the public schools of Virginia as well as elsewhere in the South.

The Supreme Court's decision is an attempt to violate our rights as Virginians. And make no mistake about it, the Supreme Court decision against our separate but equal school system for the white and black races is a direct violation of the 10th amendment of the Constitution, which says:

"The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

Whoever heard of any court having judicial, legislative, and administrative powers? Well, that's just what your Supreme Court is doing. It is the wide opinion that our Supreme Court, politically handpicked, has rendered a decision against the South for the sake of a handful of votes, which they hope will come from the Negro minority.

I personally appeal to our good, honorable Negroes of Greensville County to give serious thought to the situation now confronting both races in the matter of integration into our public school system, and realize that any changes from the present system might bring about unrepairable damage to the amicable relations now existing in this community between the two races.

I would like to point to the new and modern Negro high school building recently erected and furnished at a cost of approximately $750,000 and identical to the one built for the whites at the same time. With these facilities provided for the Negroes why should there be a clamor for integration into the public school system? I am afraid that it is more of a dream or mirage than it will be a reality, because, take my word for it, the people of Greensville County are prepared and will fight to the last ditch to prevent such a situation to exist. There will be no intimidation or threats on the parts of the whites, it will be a matter of not accepting it at any cost.

Tribute to William J. Jernick, Newly Elected Grand Exalted Ruler of the Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 15, 1954

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, the Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks of the United States of America is favored in many respects. But our order appears to be especially favored in the unimpeachable character and outstanding qualifications of the men who are willing to devote a year of their lives to serve as Grand Exalted Ruler. We were more than fortunate at the recent Los Angeles grand lodge session in the unanimous choice of William J. Jernick, of Nutley, N. J., as chief executive for the ensuing year.

It is not strange that the Order of Elks was attracted to such a man or that the order appealed to him as offering a wide field for useful endeavor. His election to grand exalted ruler climaxes Jernick's 20-some years of membership in the Elks. He joined Nutley Lodge in 1934, and 5 years later was its exalted ruler. Then in 1940, he became president of the New Jersey State Elks Association. He entered the grand lodge by appointment to the activities committee, of which he became chairman. Further grand lodge service included grand treasurer and grand trustee.

Eighty-six years have passed since a small group of inspired men took the virtues of charity, justice, brotherly love, and fidelity, and bound them into the organization of the Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks. The order has grown from the modest to the magnificent and has increased from a parlor group to 1,122,803 members.

Under Bill Jernick's inspiring guidance we may turn our faces to the future, knowing our splendid traditions will be upheld and that the order will expand its sphere of usefulness to mankind. The guidance we can expect is well illustrated in William Jernick's acceptance speech at Los Angeles. After urging Elks and all Americans to plan their thinking and living toward the preservation of our freedom against the threat of communism, Jernick stated:

> If this world had more respect for divine guidance, it might have less need for guided missiles.

A charming wife and daughter—Mrs. Betty Duffy, of Honolulu—constitute the distaff side of the Jernick family. Two sons are Elks, Dr. Robert H. Jernick and William J. Jernick, Jr.

Bill Jernick is a resident and former mayor of Nutley, N. J. As an executive of the Thomas Edison Co. in Belleville, N. J., he is devoted to his work in the battery division as assistant vice president in charge of production. He has found time to give unselfishly to community interests and has established himself in the confidence and esteem of his fellow townsmen, as evidenced by the following editorial from the July 8, 1954, issue of the Nutley Sun:

PRIDE IN A GOOD NEIGHBOR

Nutley can but feel a warm glow of extreme pride in the election this week of former Mayor William J. Jernick to the office of grand exalted ruler of the Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks. His election is one of those one-in-a-million tributes because the Elks' membership now surpasses 1,125,000.

The national fraternal society recognized early in Jernick exactly the same qualities of integrity, honesty, endeavor, and ability which we, here in Nutley, recognized when time after time we elected him as our mayor. His record at the head of our town administration was outstanding and his temperate leadership, his calm, fair, and fearless guidance of the town commission he established our municipal government on a high standard of honest efficiency.

For the next year Bill Jernick will travel the land because one of the duties of his office is to visit as many lodges as possible. Wherever he goes, he can but add to the prestige of Nutley. It is with great deal of pride and happiness that Nutley will join in a "welcome home, Bill" fiesta in the oval on July 24 for his is a personality which makes only friends, no enemies. To all of us he is our good friend, our good neighbor.

R. E. H.

Price Supports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 7, 1954

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following editorial from the Christian Science Monitor, Tuesday, July 13, 1954:

SELF-SUPPORTING WHEAT

If Canadian farmers do not find price supports necessary, why has the United States Congress retained them? Twice it has postponed its own decision to end the system of rigid supports. Wheat is Canada's big crop. But even for wheat its Government provides only a very moderate floor—a type of support which would come into effect only as an emergency measure to prevent disaster.

The Ottawa Government—like that in Washington—also provides a backstop for a share of its crop under the International Wheat Agreement. But the price is governed in practice by the world market. In fact, since Canada has to sell so much of its wheat abroad, its growers plan on meeting the world price. This is in sharp contrast with growers below the border who know that Uncle Sam will give them about $2.50 a bushel.

Canada's wheat has to be self-supporting. As the Saskatchewan farmer puts it: "Canada, highly dependent on world markets for its food sales, can't afford to go in for high price supports. You can't force other nations to buy your products when they can get the same thing elsewhere cheaper."

In many cases farmers below the Canadian line can produce as cheaply as those above. Many of the big mechanized wheat ranches of the Northwest could make a profit selling wheat at half the support price. Many farmers would prefer to be free from Government supports and controls. But politicians are telling them that they will be ruined by even the mild flexing of prices proposed by Secretary Benson. A look north across the border should help to dispel such fears.

Freedom for the Baltic States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 15, 1954

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I submit the following resolution for inclusion in the Appendix of the Record.

This resolution, unanimously adopted by the Baltic States Freedom Committee, represents the sincere and heartfelt sentiments of American citizens of Estonian, Latvian, and Lithuanian descent for the eventual freeing of the peoples of these Baltic States from the yoke of Soviet tyranny. Every American citizen, dedicated to the cause of freedom, joins in this resolve to continue to work for the liberation and independence of the great nations of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia.

I include this resolution in the Record in order to keep our attention on this goal of freedom for the Baltic States and to call these specific recommendations to the attention of Congress:

Resolutions unanimously adopted by loyal citizens and residents of Estonian, Latvian, and Lithuanian descent, assembled on June 13, 1954, at Town Hall, New York City, N. Y., to observe solemnly the 13th anniversary of the mass deportations from Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania by the Government of the Soviet Union and to mark the 14th anniversary of the brutal and unprovoked aggression of the Soviet Union against the independent Baltic Republics:

"Whereas the Soviet Union has arbitrarily occupied and established Communist regimes in Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania and suppressed their freedom;

"Whereas the rulers of the Kremlin, after having occupied the Baltic States, began there a regime of terror, mass arrests, and mass murders, and as June 14, 1941, marks the beginning of the Soviet mass deportations of citizens from Latvia, Estonia, and Lithuania to slave labor in remote districts of the Soviet realm, with the ultimate aim to exterminate and to forestall the national struggle for freedom and independence;

"Whereas the Government of the United States has refused to recognize this 'incorporation' of Estonia, Lithuania, and Latvia into the Soviet Union and continues recognition of their lawful diplomatic representatives in this country;

"Whereas the investigations of the Baltic Committee, which was created in 1953 by the House of Representatives on the initiative of Representative Charles J. Kersten, has established beyond doubt Soviet Russia's flagrant violation of all international treaties, which she had voluntarily entered into with the Baltic Republics, and also her disregard for the human rights of the Baltic peoples; and

"Whereas the Senate of the United States has passed on April 29, 1954, a resolution endorsing the refusal of Presidents Roosevelt, Truman, and Eisenhower to recognize the Soviet conquests of Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That we, here assembled in prayerful sorrow for the victims of Soviet aggression and genocide in the Baltic countries, solemnly and vigorously protest against these acts of flagrant aggression and these inhuman practices of the Soviet Union; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That we respectfully request the Congress and the Government of the United States to initiate an investigtaion of Soviet violations of international treaties by the Assembly of the United Nations, and of the crime of genocide perpetrated in the Baltic States, with the object of pressing for the withdrawal of Soviet occupation forces from their territories; and be it finally

"*Resolved*, That we express our sincerest gratitude to the people, the Congress, and the Government of the United States for their resolute encouragement to the Baltic peoples in their struggle for liberation, and that we pledge our full support to the United States in the fateful fight of the free world against totalitarian Communist aggression."

Baltic States Freedom Committee,
Valdis Ignats, *President.*
Mrs. Alice Frey, *Secretary.*

New Plan Would Give Foreign Service New Lease on Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT B. CHIPERFIELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 15, 1954

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following editorial from the Daily Register-Mail, Galesburg, Ill., of July 12, 1954:

NEW PLAN WOULD GIVE FOREIGN SERVICE NEW LEASE ON LIFE

For some time now the State Department has been suffering from a lack of good Foreign Service recruits. Consequently any plan that promises sensibly to make up this lack merits the thoughtful consideration of Congress and the country.

A special committee has come up with a proposal that perhaps contains that promise. Secretary of State Dulles has approved it, and the matter thus is up to the lawmakers.

What the plan recommends is that entry into the Foreign Service be placed on virtually the same plane of prestige and talent as admission into the Army and Navy through West Point and Annapolis.

No special Foreign-Service school would be set up, but several hundred scholarships would be handed out annually to selected students in various colleges. Upon graduation, these students would go immediately into the State Department and serve a minimum of 6 years. This would assure the Foreign Service of a steady inflow of qualified young men.

As things presently stand, the number who pass the necessary tests is comparatively small, and often these successful applicants have to wait 2 or 3 years for an assignment.

The committee estimates the cost of the scholarship recruitment plan at $2 million a year. This seems a fairly modest price to pay for a program that may in time do much to elevate standards of performance in so vital a sector of Government as the Foreign Service.

No other agency of Government has been subjected to such damaging and constant assaults as this one. Indeed, that very fact is to some extent responsible for the difficulties of recruitment.

If Congress believes this Department has many times shown gross incompetence at the Foreign Service level—as one must gather from the general tone of criticisms over the years—then the lawmakers ought to welcome eagerly any program which offers seriously to bring qualified personnel into the Service.

A new lease on life for the Foreign Service will not alone restore the State Department to a high pitch of morale and efficiency. Many other factors are involved in its current low status. But this hopeful plan could help to build a stouter framework for the future.

The Legal Scatterguns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 15, 1954

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following article from the Wall Street Journal of July 15, 1954:

THE LEGAL SCATTERGUNS

Some of Attorney General Brownell's bills to control subversion and to combat communism have caught a cold eye in Congress and, in our opinion, justly so. For there was the look of a scattergun about them.

It is true that his wiretap bill, which this newspaper opposes, probably will become law in some fashion or other. But it has been whittled down in both House and Senate, and in the conference committee perhaps even more restrictions will be placed on the use of wiretapping.

Mr. Brownell's bills to control subversion in private industry—such as power plants and those engaged in defense contracts—and to allow the Subversive Activities Control Board, after court action, to dissolve any union or private business if it were Communist-infiltrated, are dead for this session unless the House Judiciary Committee reverses itself.

The bills were written in language that was too sweeping. One of them allowed issuance of orders to bar people from employment if there was reasonable ground to believe they might engage in sabotage, espionage, or other subversive activities. The orders could be issued not just when there was a national emergency but also in cases of threatened disturbance of the international relationships of this country, a state of affairs we are hardly ever not in the midst of.

Mr. Brownell's companion measure went even further into determining guilt and meting punishment not for what people have done, or even on proof that they planned to do it, but on the extent to which they fit into patterns which could legally classify unions and businesses as Communist-infiltrated. But the patterns themselves are unclear, and the proposal did not attempt to set forth limits to the extent-to-which doctrine. Indeed, it would have been impossible to do so; and while this doctrine, if adopted into law, doubtless would have gathered in some subversives and Communists, many innocent people may also have been injured in the process.

We recognize that it is difficult to pinpoint a law against a hidden conspiracy and a dedicated treason. But we do think that to punish people by the extent to which they may be able to do some injury or to authorize the invasion of privacy by wiretapping is to use legal scatterguns better left to the police states most Americans oppose.

Proposals To Change Rules for Probes Called Illusory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT H. BOSCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 15, 1954

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include an article by David Lawrence entitled "Proposals To Change Rules for Probes Called Illusory." I feel that Mr. Lawrence brings out some very important points that have been overlooked in all the discussion and confusion surrounding the work of the investigating committees of Congress. I feel also that much of this confusion has been planned by those who feel that they have a particular "ax to grind."

The article follows:

Proposals To Change Rules for Probes Called Illusory

(By David Lawrence)

Washington, July 14.—Maybe the millennium is just around the corner, but it is easy to be deceived about appearances—especially as one notes the wave of righteousness which seems to have swept the Democratic Party in respect to the proposed rules for conducting congressional committee investigations.

Certainly the Democratic Party leaders expect to control both Houses in the next Congress as a result of the coming elections, so in reality they are advocating changes for the conduct of committees to be presided over by Democrats in both Houses. In other words, the new rules are to be applied to Democratic chairmen and committees next time, so the spectacle of self-restraint which is being presented to the country is one that needs examination. For the proposals will prove meaningless when the Democrats start investigating the Eisenhower regime, which they may be expected to do if they get control next time. It will be too good a political opportunity to pass up.

RULES OF CONGRESS

It is amazing how unfamiliar most people are with the rules that govern the conduct of the Congress of the United States. Thus, it is assumed that to protect an individual from being smeared all that is necessary is to adopt a rule applying to the conduct of a congressional committee. The citizen is presumably to be given an opportunity hereafter to be notified ahead of time about the charges against him in a committee, and he is to be permitted—according to some of the pious plans—to cross-examine those who make the charges.

But what of the United States Senator who gets up on the floor of the Senate and calls a citizen a liar and smears an official in the executive branch of the Government? No citizen can have the privilege of the floor to answer back. There is no rule that can tie the tongue of an irresponsible Senator or Representative and, looking back over the years, the number of irresponsibles on the Democratic side in Congress equals approximately the number on the other side.

UNDER THE NEW DEAL

As for the conduct of congressional committees, there isn't a rule being proposed now that would prevent the damage done under the New Deal administration through the covert sending to Capitol Hill by executive officials of information with which to smear citizens innocent of any wrongdoing except to hold views opposite from the incumbent party.

Every Member of the House and Senate enjoys a legal immunity from restraint on what he says about the citizen. No libel law can reach any Senator or Representative unless he makes his damaging utterances away from the floor, and he is privileged to repeat anything he has already said in Congress or before a committee.

So those persons who think some kind of reform is being sponsored by those Republican or Democratic Members of Congress who have made high-sounding talks about a substantial revision of the rules are being misled. For it would be absurd if a committee were required to notify ahead of time a witness who is under fire what the charges are aginst him. Such a witness could, through his lawyer, hamstring the committee indefinitely and provent it from getting at the truth.

Alger Hiss or his attorneys could have easily checkmated the House committee if all the data possessed by the committee had been turned over to him in advance or if he had been allowed to cross-examine witnesses.

PURPOSE OF COMMITTEES

Another illusion rather widespread is that the congressional committee has no legitimate reason for existence except to gather information for legislative purposes and that to expose individuals who are guilty of wrongdoing not yet covered by any law is somehow only an executive function.

There are many hundreds of persons who have escaped detection because of the statute of limitations has run on their acts, yet they have been engaged in Communist Party activities which are close to moral if not legal treason. The congressional committee is the only vehicle through which they can be exposed before their fellow men. It may be true that they cannot be prosecuted because no laws were in existence when they committed their improper acts, but Congress has a right to administer the punishment of the fullest publicity unless they repent and assist the Government in running down others guilty of the same wrong practices. To say that the fifth amendment was put into the Constitution to protect a citizen against self-incrimination is correct, but it is not correct to say that this constitutional provision permits a man to conceal information about the criminal acts of his friends or acquaintances. Yet that's the main reason why the fifth amendment plea is heard so often.

DESIRABLE CHANGES

There are, of course, desirable changes which can be made, and some committees of the House years ago adopted enlightened procedure. Some improvement in the situation can be made by making the rules uniform, but there is no remedy against abuse by a Senator or Representative of his congressional immunity.

Far more damage is done to the public welfare by Senators or Representatives who in small groups block consideration of needed legislation or who filibuster at the close of a session than by any infringement of committee rules by overzealous chairmen. Maybe the facts of congressional life will some day leak out to the people and they will discover that, with all its faults, the Nation possesses an effective system of checks and balances especially in protecting the rights of the minority in the legislative branch of the Government and in checking up on the integrity of the operations of the executive agencies. Graft and corruption in the executive agencies can easily be concealed if committees of Congress are not given full information by employees interested primarily in the public welfare. As for compliance with the rules of self-restraint and fairness by individual Senators or Representatives, the millennium, hasn't arrived, so changes in the written rules are not as important as they are cracked up to be.

Ike's Self-Made First Team

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT C. BONNER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 15, 1954

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following article from the Hertford County Herald, of Ahoskie, N. C., July 13, 1954:

Ike's Self-Made First Team

"Ike and his first team came up the hard way," an article in a Republican Party news release informs us. "Most everyone knows that President Eisenhower came up the hard way; that when he was a boy he carried newspapers, mowed lawns, and worked in a creamery to help support the large family," says the article.

Then the article goes on to explain that "most members of Ike's first team also are self-made men, executives who have worked with their hands as well as their brains."

Vice President Nixon, for example, helped augment his family's small income by working as a grocery boy and in a gas station. Secretary of Defense Charles E. Wilson once worked 60 hours a week for $3, putting in 10 hours a day as an office boy.

Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson was born on a farm and grew up on it. Attorney General Herbert Brownell also had a newspaper route when he was a boy.

Postmaster General Arthur E. Summerfield left school after the eighth grade to go to work in an automobile factory. While still in grade school, Secretary of Interior Douglas McKay went to work to help out his family. He drove a butcher's wagon, sold newspapers, and worked as a janitor for $35 a month. Secretary of Labor James P. Mitchell was an errand boy during high-school days.

This is all very admirable, we say, and we appreciate the Republican National Committee's effort in bringing it to our attention. But it leaves terrible doubts in our mind and brings serious questions to the fore.

If Ike's "first team" came up the hard way and presumably knows the lot of the workingman, why then is their first interest nowadays to serve "big business" above all?

Why does Mr. Wilson think that "what's good for General Motors is good for the country?" Why is Secretary of the Interior McKay trying to give away our precious natural resources to a selfish few? Why is Secretary of Agriculture trying to plow under every third farmer?

It's an odd thing. There was Franklin D. Roosevelt, scion of Hudson River aristocracy, born with a silver spoon in his mouth. He was the greatest champion of the workingman and the great mass of American people of this century.

And there's Adlai Ewing Stevenson, son of wealthy parents, educated, as was Roosevelt, in the exclusive schools. He continues this vital concern for the vast majority over the favored few.

It's an odd thing. And if we are to draw conclusions from the experience of Ike's "first team" on one hand and the great Democratic Party leaders on the other hand, we'll take the "aristocrats."

Those who worked themselves up to the top seem to have forgotten the folks they used to work with.

West Texas State Parks Ready for Tourist Season

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 15, 1954

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, even Senators are beginning now to project their thoughts ahead to vacation time. I hope my distinguished colleagues will consider including my State of Texas in their vacation plans. We have much to offer.

A recent article in West Texas Today, official magazine of the West Texas Chamber of Commerce, gives a brief word picture of some of the attractions offered by State parks in the area served by the West Texas Chamber. This article was written by Gordon K. Shearer, very able director of the Texas State Parks.

I ask unanimous consent that the article from West Texas Today be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE PARKS IN WEST TEXAS READIED FOR SEASON'S TOURISTS

(By Gordon K. Shearer, director, Texas State Parks)

State parks in west Texas have come in for a major share in improvements for the benefit of visitors this year.

Abilene State Park has had all its buildings repaired and repainted and its attractive swimming pool cleaned and repainted. Latest reports from the park show that the lake has the most water it has had since 1941.

During the dry period there was a heavy toll on the trees in the popular picnicking park. While all dead trees have not been removed the dead timber that might prove hazardous has been removed.

The main red stone concession building has undergone repair of the erosion of its walls and has been prepared for special sealing treatment expected to prevent further erosion. Materials have been ordered for 20 new picnicking units.

Balmorhea State Park offers the tourist this year reefed shelters in a camping area paralleling the watercourse running eastward from San Solomon Springs. In the older part of the park, repairs to the walled swimming pool are nearing completion and new walks about the pool are being installed. The work is being done in sections so that use of the pool is not being interrupted. Along with this work, the pool design has been changed to stop the growth of vegetation in a portion that formerly lacked sufficient water circulation to keep it clear. A sunken garden will replace the former sluggish part of the pool. Cabins have been redone and given rubber tile flooring and rapid progress has been made on the landscaping. Regrading of the areas about the buildings has been completed making it possible to water the lawns properly. The bathhouse has been repaired and an improved basket system installed for swimmers.

Nearby Indian Lodge in the Davis Mountains has a widened roadway now nearing completion and the general appearance of this mile-high vacation area has been improved by repairs to the buildings that for many years were used as a geology camp. Additional parking space has been provided for guests at the lodge. In the building itself all baths have been tiled.

Thirty-Sixth Division State Park on Lake Brownwood for this summer has all its cabins equipped with electric refrigerators. Bathrooms have been redone in the cabins. New 14-foot metal boats, new picnic tables and additional buildings for the group area are other innovations. Removal of old structures used during the park construction has greatly improved appearance of the park.

The park road to Inks Lake and Longhorn Cavern has been retopped from Highway 29 near Buchanan Dam to the entrance of Inks Lake State Park, and repaired from that point to its intersection with U. S. 281 between Burnet and Marble Falls. At Longhorn Cavern added rest rooms have been installed to meet the needs of holiday and weekend crowds. Buildings at Inks Lake have been repainted and repaired.

Palo Duro Canyon's scenic railroad is expected this season to draw many times the crowds that it attracted during the trial months it was operated last year. The railroad is not a toy or kiddies ride, but the world's longest narrow gage scenic line that gives it patrons views of Triassic Peak, the Spanish Skirts, Coronado's Trail, Indian relics and other features of the canyon that cannot be viewed so closely from the automobile road. The train carries up to 10 passengers on a round-trip ride of 22 minutes. A public address system directs attention to the points of special interest.

MacKenzie State Park at Lubbock continues to be one of the beauty spots of West Texas. Its fine growth of planted trees is increasing in size each year. Continuing development under a long-term agreement with the city of Lubbock promises to keep this area one of the most-visited recreation spots in the State.

Possum Kingdom State Park on the Brazos River has been overhauled for this season and with the return of the river to normal depths is expected to be one of the leading fishing resorts.

Tourists will be specially pleased with a new blacktopped road that leads to the crest of Big Spring State Park with its wonderful view of the surrounding country.

Fort Griffin's herd of Longhorns has now grown to be an excellent display, as inferior animals have been culled. There are plenty of big horns to admire but the herd has been developed not for freak horns but to retain the various types of Longhorns that once ranged west Texas.

Blanco State Park has largely recovered from the flood damage of 1952. New plantings of cottonwoods are expected soon to take the place of those destroyed by the flood. Damage to the road crossing and dam has been repaired.

Additional sanitary facilities are counted upon to permit more camping at popular Garner State Park this summer. A new well is counted on to overcome a water shortage. Air cooling for the restaurant and complete overhaul of the cabins and particularly their plumbing are part of the new work there.

Wheat Acreage Allotments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 15, 1954

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, today I received a letter so wholesome in its Americanism and so full of the original courageous spirit of our forefathers that I felt all members of the Congress should have an opportunity to read it.

Portrayed in this letter is the plight of a lifetime farmer who has sought nothing from his Government, but the right to farm his property. Through no act of his own he now finds himself hamstrung by Government regulations and frustrated in pursuing his lifework.

In this letter is the simple forthright truth as to what is happening under our fixed parity program, spoken by a patriotic, unselfish American.

Under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I am now including a letter from a constituent farmer in Washington, N. J.:

WASHINGTON, N. J., *July 12, 1954.*

Representative WILLIAM B. WIDNALL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I wonder if you could do something to help many New Jersey farmers and myself on this Government wheat acreage regulation which I feel is very unjust to many a farmer who does not sign up to a certain wheat acreage or to penalized and threatened in various ways.

I am a man 63 years of age and have farmed all my life and have considerable acreage and depend mostly on grain farming for a living as the soil I have is more for raising grain than anything else I am able to grow, and we have an ordinary average dairy and grind our own feed from the grain we grow, and also have a number of chickens and prepare the feed for them as much as possible as to save expenses so we can pay our honest bills and make a living.

I do not believe in farm subsidies or signing up for anything I believe is wrong and unjust in principle for our Constitution of the United States of America is supposed to defend every citizen who is asking or seeking justice and living a good life. I have always felt we were supposed to be living in the land of the brave and free, but I am thinking I will have to change my mind unless we can do away with so much regulation and interference when we are trying to do our very best as citizens.

We as farmers should depend on ourselves as to farm management and less Government interference. The time is fast coming when most farmers will go bankrupt if they have to contend with such interference as we have now, and it is getting almost impossible to do our farming without nearly every day someone coming around and giving us orders as to what to do or not to do.

A successful ideal farmer must be on his own and manage his own farm if he is doing the work, and grow whatever crops he believes is best for his welfare and feed for his livestock; otherwise, he is not a farmer as a business of its kind, but becomes as a hired man himself and does as he is told, which is not freedom as I see it.

My farm taxes are nearly $1,000. The insurance and upkeep and other expenses are great on account of inflation and is becoming higher every year, that it makes one become entirely discouraged and give up and many farmers I have talked with feel as discouraged as I do. So much of our discouragement comes from overregulation and we are puzzled to know what to do for the best.

No corn was planted this year by us. Now we are told we cannot sell the wheat when harvested or use it for feed and fined for overacreage $1.12 a bushel. I only have 16 acres in and they booked me for 22 acres.

I have a heart condition and worked so very hard all my life and now such doings by the Government officials completely upsets my way of life, and many other farmers of your congressional district feel about the same way as I do.

Only a certain few farmers of our district signed up as to acreage for they grew no wheat to speak of at any time. There is nothing more beautiful than a field of ripe wheat on any farm and with a little air moving the wavings of the wheat, it becomes like a golden ocean moving wave upon wave, day and night. This has all become a part of my life's pleasure to watch the growing of the harvest.

There is not too much of anything grown in this world in the line of food but what can be used somewhere. Today thousands of people are starving to death in Europe and Asia for want of good food. I am willing to donate my entire wheat production to these starving thousands if our Government would see that something is done to get the wheat of overproduction where it belongs, for God wants none of his loved ones to starve. We could put an end to communism by giving them plenty to eat from free America and God would bless America. God does not want food wasted of any sort for Christ gathered up 12 baskets of bread and fish after the repast. So we all suffer from the doings and regulation of man when things become unreasonable.

You as a Congressman from New Jersey, I hope will see our point of view. So many farmers feel as I do but are afraid to speak to their representatives in Government departments to protect them.

Our country is over regulated by too many men running around in everybody's business and doings and here is just where dictatorship springs from and makes for interference in such a degree that the average person becomes confused.

If I stand alone I will, but as long as I live I want our great Constitution of United States of America to protect each one of us with justice.

I believe in every American farmer running his own farm to the best of his ability and making the best of his own management and consequences without outside interference. It should not be necessary for any farmer to sign up for anything he does not approve of. When a man can't raise wheat for his own use, I would call this dictatorship.

All the wheat raised in New Jersey is mighty small in comparison to the western grain farmers and for my part I can't see why the Jersey farmers' wheat needs regulation at all, for much of it is used for feed by the farmers themselves.

Congressman, the farmers will soon be voting on this wheat acreage again for next year's production, but hope you will see that fair justice is done for the farmer who does not wish to sign up for sake of free American principle. To fine a man $1.12 per bushel for grain he raised on his own farm by his own hard work, I feel is against our constitutional rights and we are no longer free men if this order should be carried out.

Hope you will fully consider our letter and do something in Congress so the wheat penalty will not be carried out.

Thank you.

Sincerely yours,

William R. Woolverton.
James A. Stull.

Don't Push France Too Hard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENDERSON L. LANHAM

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 15, 1954

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, with my own remarks I am glad to include in the Record an editorial which appeared in the Christian Science Monitor in its issue for July 13, 1954, entitled "Don't Push France Too Hard."

This is right in line with my thinking and with the stand I took in the House recently against the provision in the House foreign aid bill which attempted to force France to join the EDC and left no flexibility for the President and the Secretary of State in their "agonizing reappraisal" and their efforts to arrive at some other solution of the French and German problem as France was not willing to surrender its sovereignty to join the EDC.

The editorial follows:

Don't Push France Too Hard

We are glad that Secretary of State Dulles is going to Paris to consult with Premier Mendes-France and Foreign Secretary Eden. We hope he will decide to go on to Geneva to help them find out whether Premier Chou En-lai and Foreign Minister Molotov will support any settlement on Indochina that France can accept with honor.

For sound reasons the United States hopes France will ratify the European Defense Community Treaty. For sound reasons also the United States would like to see effective resistance against communism continued in French Indochina. But has not Washington been pressing France rather harder than is wise or reasonable on these two subjects?

In London, American and British officials, perhaps largely on American initiative, have completed a draft agreement in which they hope France will join—though Paris has not been consulted in the drafting—to give West Germany the degree of sovereignty contemplated in the Bonn "peace contract" of 2 years ago.

This is part of a search for an alternative if France fails to ratify the EDC pact, to which the sovereignty agreement originally was tied. That search leads almost inescapably toward a national army for Germany and membership in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

But France has something to say about these matters. It can refuse to agree to German sovereignty ahead of EDC. If the United States and Britain should go ahead to grant self-rule in their zones of occupied Germany, France could maintain the present status in its zone, thus adding a partition of West Germany to that already unhappily existing between it and the Eastern or Soviet Zone. And any one member, such as France, can prevent admission of a new member into NATO. The mood of France is one which calls for tactful persuasion rather than a bludgeon.

Meanwhile the reluctance of the administration in Washington to send a top-level representative back to the conference on Asia at Geneva has not accorded well with America's position of leadership in world affairs. It has tended to weaken the diplomatic position of the French and at the same time to imply they should stand up more strongly to the tide going so badly against them around Hanoi.

Is this realistic diplomacy? Is it a way to strengthen France in Europe? Or is it a concession to campaign-year politics which refuses to face facts and to a group whose conscious or unconscious policy toward communism at the moment seems to be to fight to the last Frenchman? That sort of policy will not maintain respect for American leadership.

Americans clearly have decided, and doubtless wisely under all the circumstances, that they do not want to throw American manpower into the struggle between Vietnam and Vietminh to save what is left of Indochina. Frenchmen apparently feel they cannot be strong both in Europe and in Asia, and wish an armistice in the Orient if one can honorably be obtained.

In every other context it has been argued that western diplomatic solidarity is important. Is it not worth finding out whether the French can obtain a peaceful settlement that will salvage at least some part of Indochina from threatened Communist inundation? To fail to stand beside the French at Geneva in seeking a cessation of hostilities may be to invite worse disaster for the people of Indochina than by being willing to negotiate.

Borrowing Tax Cuts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT C. BONNER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 15, 1954

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following editorial from the Raleigh (N. C.) News and Observer of July 13, 1954:

Borrowing Tax Cuts

The insistence of the present administration upon increasing the debt limit to borrow the money to pay for the tax cuts it has forced and is forcing through Congress is a complete reversal of the position taken last year.

But while the administration has reversed its earlier position that balancing the budget should come ahead of tax cuts, it has now reverted to the position which has been historic with the Republican Party since the days of President Grant.

That position is that the Republican Party always yields to pressure from its contributors. That pressure is always exerted for big favors and immediate favors.

For many years, and until as recently as the Hoover administration, a principal pressure was for high tariffs. That pressure resulted in unconscionable tariff acts when McKinley succeeded Cleveland and when Harding followed Wilson. But the recipients of tariff favors weren't satisfied for long either time. Still higher tariffs to replace those already far too high were enacted during the Harding and Hoover administrations.

In recent years, however, there have been many Republicans who have not been interested in high tariffs. The great pressure has now been shifted to tax cuts, but a special kind of tax cuts, for wealthy taxpayers.

In 1946 the Republicans elected majorities in both the House and Senate. When the 80th Congress met, the late Senator Taft was, as President Eisenhower was in 1953, for balancing the budget before reducing taxes. But Senator Taft shifted his position as President Eisenhower has done, and the 80th Congress, which found a surplus in the Treasury, left a deficit.

Of course pressures have not been confined to taxes. High tariff advocates are still powerful in the Republican Party and have prevented any effective action about tariffs. There have been favors for oil companies, private power companies and others. One pressure group is involved in the proposed increase of the debt limit. The Eisenhower administration wants to keep a minimum of $6 billion in banks without interest. That desire is the real issue in the debt limit fight.

So, in order to be sure of not using the money now used by bankers, who get it without paying interest on it, the administration wants to borrow the money to pay its tax cuts.

Public Housing for the Aged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 7, 1954

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, when the Congress reconvenes next January I intend, if returned by my constituents in the Second District of Illinois, to introduce a bill for Federal aid in the construction of old-age rest homes. I am giving notice of my intention now in the hope that my colleagues on both sides of the aisle during the intervening months will give serious thought to perfecting a program of public housing for the aged that will meet with universal acclaim. I invite my colleagues to join in sponsoring the legislative measure pointing such a program.

The housing shortage and the resultant high rentals are harshly severe on retired men and women trying to exist on small pensions, annuities, and assistance grants. The number of persons 65 and over is rapidly increasing. Present housing conditions, with few homes available with sufficient rooms, are making it more and more difficult for children in their prime to give comfortable shelter to aged parents. It is a field in which the Federal Government should be immediately active, taking up the good work already starting in a few States on a local level.

The program envisions a certain, and I hope it will be an adequate, number of new units of public housing especially built and maintained for the aged. This will be separate and apart from the present public housing program, which it will augment and with which it will not be in conflict.

It is my thought that the units should be convenient to the communities holding sentimental attraction to the occupants and in which their families and friends reside. The planning of the homes would provide the maximum of safety and the minimum of requirement for climbing and other physical exertion.

In the two Congresses of which I have been a Member I have served on the Banking and Currency Committee. During the 4 years covered by my congressional service I have lived with the housing problem which, as the Members know, is in the jurisdiction of that committee. I have been distressed that greater progress has not been made. Unfortunately, the housing shortage and the inability to put comfortable roofs within the financial reach of many of our people remains America's No. 1 domestic problem. I shall continue to devote myself to the task of aiding in achieving a sound solution to that problem. I bespeak your hearty cooperation on the phase relating to the housing of the aged. I hope and pray that on that phase there be complete unanimity.

By unanimous consent, I am extending my remarks to include the following article from the Daily Calumet:

Attorney Alfred O'Connor, of South Chicago, has made public the text of a resolution calling on Federal, State, and local governments to provide old age rest homes for America's elderly citizens. The resolution was adopted at the recent State convention of the Fraternal Order of Eagles.

South Chicago Aerie, No. 1358, of which O'Connor is a member of many years' standing, first adopted the resolution. Later it was approved by the northeast district of the lodge. O'Connor now plans to present the document at the national convention.

"The Eagles fostered old-age social security pensions, which are now law," O'Connor said. "We now seek to provide housing facilities for the elderly folks of America—within their means to pay for their own maintenance and support in healthy, fireproof homes."

Here is the text of the Eagle resolution sponsored by Mr. O'Connor:

"Whereas there are old-age rest homes maintained and operated in various parts of the country in many cities, towns, and villages throughout the United States wherein elderly men and women who receive old-age assistance or are living on a pension or other modest income are required to seek a place of residence where they do not have room to live with their children due to present crowded housing situations throughout the country; and

"Whereas many of the present old-age rest homes are practically boardinghouses and are virtual firetraps and many of them have burned down, killing their elderly occupants and which are unsafe and not fireproof; and

"Whereas many of the present privately operated old-age rest homes charge large and exorbitant fees from $100, $150, and $200 per month, and in many cases their charges are so exorbitant that even the sons and daughters are desirous of assisting their parents financially, they are unable to do so; and

"Whereas many of the men and women who desire to live in decent housing may need nursing or medical care from time to time and the money they receive from pensions or social security or other modest income is not sufficient to enable them to secure proper living quarters wherein they could pay their board, room, and maintenance on money they are receiving from such sources, and;

"Whereas there is a housing shortage in the United States and the Government * * * has done nothing to enable our elderly men and women of America find clean, health, safe homes in which to spend their declining years and there is a dire need to furnish old-age rest homes and to construct public housing or to construct old-age rest homes in various parts of the large cities where elderly men and women could live in the communities and neighborhoods wherein they have spent their lives and there is need of construction of such housing as old-age rest homes, and * * *: Therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the Fraternal Order of Eagles urge the Federal, State, and local governments to establish old age rest homes throughout the various cities, communities, and villages of America to be owned, maintained, or operated by the Federal, State, and local governments to furnish housing facilities and safe, healthy, and clean living quarters under the care, maintenance, management, and supervision of the Federal, State, and local governments and they be urged to pass legislation for the construction, maintenance, and operation of old-age rest homes throughout the United States of America and in various communities of our large cities, towns, and villages to enable the elderly men and women of America of modest means to have clean, healthy, and safe housing facilities and homes in which they can spend their declining years, within their means and ability to pay for their own care and maintenance; be it further

"*Resolved*, That the State convention of the Fraternal Order of Eagles be urged to pass a fitting resolution for said purpose and the Grand Aerie convention of the Fraternal Order of Eagles at their next annual convention be urged to pass a resolution in favor of construction of old-age rest homes and requesting Federal, State, and local governments to cooperate in accomplishing said purpose by appropriating proper funds and passing legislation for the purpose of accomplishing such housing facilities."

Churchill Encouraging Reds To Ask for Sky

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 15, 1954

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Edgar Ansel Mowrer:

CHURCHILL ENCOURAGING REDS TO ASK FOR SKY

(By Edgar Ansel Mowrer)

The same day that brought the text of Sir Winston Churchill's foreign policy speech to the House of Commons brought a Paris report to the effect that the Chinese Communists were asking a staggering price for allowing the French to stop the fighting in Indochina.

And small wonder. For in that speech—a report on his visit to President Eisenhower—Britain's wartime Prime Minister expressed two thoughts that could not but encourage the Reds to ask for the sky.

Explaining his satisfaction over President Eisenhower's acceptance of British Foreign Minister Anthony Eden's desire for peaceful coexistence of the Communist and non-Communist powers, Sir Winston continued with relief:

"What a vast ideological gulf there is between the idea of peaceful coexistence vigilantly safeguarded and a mood of forcibly extirpating the Communist fallacy and heresy."

NOTHING TO FEAR

In other words, Britain's Prime Minister hereby assures the Communists that they have nothing particular to fear from the western countries, who have decided to remain purely upon the defensive. In other words, Moscow can order a whole series of Koreas, each in a new promising spot.

If one succeeds, then the Communist Empire spreads by another country or part of a country. If it fails, the Communists can—as in Korea—suggest calling the whole thing off with the virtual certainty that the Americans and Britishers will be only too happy to have an end to fighting.

Of the punishment that should overtake every aggressor, not a word or even a hint.

Why, then, should not Red China's supremely astute Chou En-lai take advantage of every opening, demanding more and ever more for anything approaching a local settlement? For of a basic settlement the Communists have to date not even hinted, remaining true to their belief that in the long run coexistence between Communists and non-Communists is—in Lenin's words—unthinkable.

STEP FARTHER

But Sir Winston went a step farther. He confessed his reasons for advocating the kind of policy that, when followed by Neville Chamberlain toward Adolf Hitler in 1938, made the Churchill blood boil.

It was, Sir Winston stated, a description of the results of the first hydrogen bomb explosion that caused him to seek a meeting with the American President. Obviously, the English statesman was appalled, though why he should have so suddenly been shocked is not apparent. Most schoolboys have known since 1945 roughly what the new explosive weapons could do.

Anyhow—as he told the House of Commons—the new search for peaceful coexistence with the Communists "is a recognition of the appalling character which war has now assumed." In other words, the western countries must henceforth seek to avoid war even in circumstances in which formerly they might have felt it necessary.

REASSURE REDS

Obviously such an attitude cannot but reassure the Communists and confirm them in their present policy of aggression.

"But isn't it true that the prospect of a new world war, not only with atom bombs and hydrogen bombs but conceivably with the newest chemical and iological weapons, is enough to make the most stouthearted shudder? Have not the Russians themselves insisted that under such circumstances 'peaceful coexistence' must be sought?"

These things are true. Unfortunately, the Communists to date have not deviated one hair from their long-planned, indeed, essential, policy of expansion.

In fact, one of the Chinese Reds—I think it was Mao Tse-tung himself—remarked that China "is impervious to superweapons."

UGLY PROSPECT

Here, in my judgment, lies the imprudence of Sir Winston's confession. Communists are almost bound to put it together with Britain's readiness to see the French sacrifice half or all of Indochina in order to let Britain remain at peace.

And they are going to say to themselves that if Britain and the United States are ready to drop any plan for liberation of captive peoples and, indeed, to sacrifice still other peoples lest they start a superwar, then Red Russia and Red China can continue merrily to enslave people after people—or at least never to yield an inch of their stolen gains. This is not a pretty prospect.

Sir Winston may consider this a wrong interpretation of his statement. But it seems to me the one which most politically informed individuals are bound to reach. So small wonder the Reds are asking in Indochina that "staggering price."

Shortchanging of Food Producer Is Indicated

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 15, 1954

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an excellent article by Louis Bromfield on the current farm situation:

SHORTCHANGING OF FOOD PRODUCER IS INDICATED

(By Louis Bromfield)

The price paid to the food producer today is actually as low as, or lower than it was 10 to 15 years ago, while the cost of virtually everything the producer buys, from fertilizer to machinery, has increased from 50 percent upward. Much food, including dairy products and especially milk, is being sold today at a figure below the actual cost of production.

Cornell University estimates that behind every dairy cow there is an average investment of $6,000, yet in most areas of the country today the farmer is getting 7 to 8 cents a quart for drinking milk which sells for 22 cents a quart upward. The great proportion of the cost to the consumer goes, not to the hard-working producer with his heavy investment, but to the milk truck driver, the processor, and the distributor.

About 2 years ago the writer acted as moderator on a national network of 13 1-hour radio programs dealing with the actual costs of food and how they were apportioned. Included in the panel were a consumer, a farm economist, a producer, a processor and distributor, and a representative of the unions concerned in the processing or distribution of specific food commodities.

Two important facts, perhaps startling to the average consumer, emerged. (1) That the farmer received only a small percentage of the consumer's cost (his average return on all food commodities is today about 43 cents of the consumer's dollar and on many commodities, such as milk, far below that). (2) That the American housewife not only has the cleanest, the finest quality, the best packaged food in the greatest variety of a housewife anywhere, but she also has the cheapest food in the world. The standard of costs chosen was the only one that has any real validity—the percentage of the family budget spent for food and the amount of work time required to buy a pound of food.

There are other facts that may seem startling—that the total investment in land, livestock, machinery, and buildings represented by agriculture is larger than the total investment in industry, and that 50 percent upward of the citizenry derives, directly or indirectly, its employment, income, wages, and purchasing power from an agricultural base. Food is still the Nation's biggest industry.

Behind these facts lies another which is vital to our prosperity and even to the maintenance of a moderately stable economy—that when the farmer is making no money and cannot go to town to buy a radio, an automobile, a tire or a gallon of gasoline, our whole economy starts into a tailspin.

The whole vaunted prosperity and living standards of this Nation are founded upon a delicate balance which involves internal markets and self-sufficiency and coexistent prosperity of both agriculture and industry.

When agricultural purchasing power declines and finally collapses, the rest of the Nation's economy goes along with it. If you doubt this, you might check with the automobile and agricultural machinery industries. They can give you a quick, authentic answer to what poor prices and a poor share of the consumer's prices and a poor share of the consumer's price to the food and fiber producer mean to industrial profits, dividends, employment, and wages. Nobody knows this better than the intelligent union official. Industries and unions both benefit by direct and indirect subsidies which, if added together, would equal or surpass any amounts spent in maintaining agricultural prices.

Growth of Abilene, Tex.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 15, 1954

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, an Associated Press dispatch published in many Texas papers recently told the inspiring story of a Texas city that refused to become a ghost town after the end of World War II brought the closing down of a large military establishment there.

The city is Abilene, Tex. The story is about what citizens of Abilene have done to keep their city moving forward.

I ask unanimous consent that the Associated Press dispatch be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the dispatch was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Snyder (Tex.) Daily News of July 11, 1954]

ABILENE WAS CALLED GHOST TOWN 10 YEARS AGO—NOW LOOK

ABILENE, TEX., July 10.—A half-smoked cigarette lay crushed and browning on a tar street sprinkled with sand. And nobody cared.

It was a pathetic salute to the end of an era. And some said the end of a town.

For the tar street was one of hundreds that crisscrosed vast Camp Barkley. And in mid-1945 the vast base was closing down. The thousands training there were mostly gone. The thousands that ran the big military camp were leaving.

With them went the multi-million-dollar payroll that supported scores of war-born shops and stores; kept apartments and rooms and every kind of available dwelling filled.

Abilene, the ghost town, wrote newspapers and national magazines 10 years ago. Before and after pictures of streets showed why.

But Abilene didn't go back to being just another easygoing little town, a ghost of its World War II self, said the city's newspaper.

The Abilene Reporter-News, with button-popping pride, told what it did do in a series of stories.

They said:

Abilene has a population now of about 55,000 and is gaining about 2,000 persons a year.

It's become the hub for vast oil activity in west Texas.

Its skyline is changing, spreading out and up as new buildings zoom skyward.

The troops are coming back—with construction of a $70 million Air Force base now under way.

The newspaper figured 5,000 to 6,000 homes had been built in Abilene since the end of World War II; that $65 million had been spent in all types of construction.

In 1950, when the city's population was some 45,000, the population increase over 1940 was figured at 71.2 percent. But the newspaper quotes figures to show this figure is way out of date. It figures, too, that the new air base will have a payroll that will support 35,000 persons. It says new superhighways and boulevards now in the planning will bring in more business—and more people.

The city got the Strategic Air Command base located at the site of the old Army airfield by laying out $895,000 to acquire needed land. Groundbreaking ceremonies were held on the base site September 25, 1953.

The latest project for the skyline is the 10-story Citizens National Bank Building.

The latest manufacturing or distributing firm to make the city district or regional headquarters is the Magnolia Petroleum Co.

In its series of stories, the Reporter-News made it clear: Abilene's the darndest "ghost town" you ever saw.

In an editorial, the Reporter-News said the closing of Camp Barkeley was really beneficial to the city, because:

"Hundreds of families had been forced to live in chicken coops and hovels, because there was no material for new homes and no manpower to build them. When the temporary residents moved out, it left room for more and more families to move out of poor quarters into better ones until the chicken coops were empty."

To keep pace with its postwar boom, the paper said the city's government had been running like a scared rabbit.

It said highlights of extended public service were:

Construetion of 6 new schools and 2 more planned.

Two new fire stations and added equipment.

Paved street mileage brought to 134 miles and building of a million-dollar municipal airport.

It said bank deposits now were $67,056,000, compared to mid-1944's $31,589,000, when Camp Barkeley was going full blast.

Postal receipts are up from $263,049 in 1944 to $377,317.

Need for Revision of the Immigration and Citizenship Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 15, 1954

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a recording on the subject of our immigration and citizenship laws, made by me for the American Friends Service Committee's radio program entitled "Our Friend in Washington," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR LEHMAN

Our policy on immigration and citizenship should be of the deepest concern to every American. It involves and affects not only aliens, but also millions of naturalized American citizens. It directly affects even native-born citizens. It affects the prestige, standing, and leadership of the United States in the world abroad. Each of you who hears this broadcast is affected by what is commonly known as the McCarran-Walter Immigration and Nationality Act.

Do you know, for instance, that under our present laws a native-born American citizen can lose his American citizenship, automatically, if he goes abroad and works for a foreign government? Recently, I am told, there was the case of a native-born American who was denied his citizenship status because at one time he had worked for the Mexican National Railway, which is owned by the Mexican Government.

A number of native-born American citizens were deprived of their citizenship because they enlisted in the British Royal Air Force during World War II. Hundreds more were deprived of their citizenship because they voted in a foreign election while residing abroad.

These are but a few examples of the manner in which the McCarran-Walter Act operates with regard to native-born American citizens.

The McCarran-Walter Act is, of course, much harsher, much more cruel and unreasonable with regard to naturalized American citizens and, of course, with regard to aliens, both here and abroad. A naturalized citizen may be deprived of his citizenship for acts for which a native-born citizen is not punishable and, of course, an alien may be deported for a crime committed 30 or 40 years ago even though he has since then continuously led an exemplary life.

There are so many bad features in our present law on this subject that I could not even begin to enumerate them. Our present law discriminates against Poles, Czechs, Greeks, Scandinavians, Spaniards, Italians, Lithuanians, Hungarians, and many others. It discriminates against Negroes, Indians, Chinese, Filipinos, Japanese, Koreans, Siamese, Indonesians, and others.

These discriminatory features are built into what is known as the national origins quota system, the basic feature of our immigration law. Under the national origins quota system we select aliens for admission into the United States, not on the basis of their individual worth and suitability for American citizenship, but rather on the basis of their national origin. Moreover, in regard to Europeans we discriminate in one way: in regard to Asiatics we discriminate in another way. For Europeans, we base admission on place of birth. For Asiatics, we base admission on racial ancestry. In my opinion, these discriminatory devices are impossible to justify.

We cannot pretend to be a nation under God, conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal, when our immigration laws plainly discriminate against certain races and certain nationalities. We cannot pretend to be the moral leader of the world, preaching the gospel of democracy, when we do not practice what we preach.

You may be sure that the Communists are making good use, in their propaganda, of the injustices and inequities in our immigration laws. They delight in pointing out the differences between what we practice and what we preach.

But I do not say that we should revise our immigration law just because the Communists make propaganda out of it. True morality demands that if we are to revise our law, we must revise it because it is right to do so.

Do you know that American consuls abroad—low-paid and minor officials of our Government—have the absolute right to deny a visa to any alien who wants to come to the United States either as an immigrant or a visitor? There is no appeal from the decision of these consular officers—not even to the President of the United States. Their decision is final and absolute.

If an American citizen is denied the right to bring into this country a sack of potatoes from abroad, he can appeal to the courts, right up to the Supreme Court of the United States. But if he is denied a visa for his mother, wife or child who happens to be an alien, he has no right of appeal whatsoever.

I believe with all my heart that these laws now on our statute books should be substantially revised and overhauled. I am not alone in this view. President Eisenhower has strongly and repeatedly advocated the same thing, just as President Truman did before him. This is not a question of politics. It is a question of morality, justice, and equity.

The Labor Problem in the Shipbuilding Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 15, 1954

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, one of the important considerations too often overlooked in discussions of shipbuilding problems by the Congress is the matter of shipyard labor. These workers are a highly specialized group—they cannot be recruited overnight, or trained in a few weeks, or even months.

With so many bills pending to authorize needed ship construction—and so many of the shipyards about ready to close, or already in a standby condition, for want of contracts—I believe a word of caution regarding this phase of the maritime situation would be in order.

I ask unanimous consent therefore that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, two articles from the CIO News of July 12, 1954. One is entitled "Shipbuilding: Congress Is Throwing Away Its Greatest Asset, the Skill of Its Workers," the other "Danger of Losing Skilled Workers Is Told by Union, Navy, Management."

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

SHIPBUILDING: CONGRESS IS THROWING AWAY ITS GREATEST ASSET, THE SKILL OF ITS WORKERS—ARTISANS SENT TO NEW FIELDS BY JOBLESSNESS

(By Fred Ross)

"I'm sure of a job every day," said Alfred Thomas, a former Baltimore shipyard worker turned bakery salesman. He explained why he would not return to his former job.

"If I had gone back to my old job," he continued, "I would have been called back and then laid off three times since I was furloughed in April.

"I make as much money as I made in the yard, and if I get a better route I will earn more because my commission will increase."

This is the price Congress is paying for failure to pass several bills that would aid the merchant marine—the fourth arm of defense that played a vital role in two world wars and Korea:

Thousands of skilled workers are going to other industries where they are assured of more job security.

During the peak of World War II, some 1.37 million workers were employed in the shipbuilding industry. According to the Maritime Administration, employment in the industry dropped in May to about 100,000. The latter figure included manufacturing of canoes, motorboats and even pots and pans, these latter an acquisition of one shipyard, according to the CIO shipbuilding workers.

An adequate merchant marine is vitally needed today. The United States will not have it unless Congress acts soon.

The Germans sank scores of our merchant ships in World War II. The Soviet Union presents a greater threat today.

In a recent interview, Adm. Robert B. Carney, who as chief of naval operations, is the Navy's top planner and its representative on the Joint Chiefs of Staff, said that Russia has some 375 submarines, many of the modern long-range type.

Carney said that the Soviet Union is building more submarines, that she already has more than Hitler had, and that she could make "some effective challenge of the various sealanes."

Clifford N. Parry, Jr., executive secretary of Local 24 of the CIO Shipbuilding Workers at the Key Highway repair yards of Bethlehem Steel, in Baltimore, said that the trained workers needed to build and repair the ships necessary to meet the Soviet threat are rapidly going to other industries.

He quoted John M. Willis, general manager of Bethlehem Steel yards in the Baltimore area, who said that it takes 10 years to train a first-class shipyard mechanic.

Parry said that seniority lists furnished by the company for the Key Highway yard alone indicated that in 2 years some 1,250 workers had left the industry.

Many IUSMWA-CIO members at Bethlehem's big Fore River yard at Quincy, Mass., in New York City area shipbuilding facilities and in the Baltimore area report themselves disgusted with the lack of security in the industry.

But let them tell the story.

Laid off again after slightly more than a year's employment, Pete Sorrentino, another Baltimore skilled shipyard worker, is living on unemployment compensation.

Father of 5 children, he said his unemployment check does not begin to cover his expenses. In Maryland maximum benefits are $38 a week for 26 weeks. Benefits amount to $30 a week for the unemployed worker plus $2 a week for each child up to 4.

Sorrentino said meat and groceries alone cost $35 a week, and then, he added, "there are such things like the light bill."

A skilled worker at Bethlehem's Sparrows Point yard, where he worked for 20 years, Antonio Leonelli was laid off 3 months ago. Luckier than many, he turned to contracting as he had done during a previous furlough and is now renovating IUSMWA-CIO Local 24's hall.

Leonelli, who has six children, saw no future in the contracting business, but is looking for "a good job."

Then he could build a home, he added:

"There is no use working in shipyards," he said. "You work a month or two, are laid off and are called back. You think you are going to work steady, but then you are laid off again."

He said he would be sitting pretty if IUMSWA-CIO gained the guaranteed annual wage which it is seeking in current negotiations.

Arthur E. Westveer, who had just received his layoff notice from the Sparrows Point yard, said some 50 electric welders had been furloughed in his department, a number of whom were doing highly skilled X-ray work.

(In this work an X-ray machine is used to examine the welding for flaws. If the welder does too much faulty work he is transferred to a less exacting job.)

He doubted whether he would go back to work if called should he get another job. Westveer said that in addition to the irregularity of employment, his yard job was rough in winter, and that at any moment he could be hit and seriously injured by falling pipes or rivets.

Many of the men being furloughed now are lost forever to the industry, he declared, and pointed out that after heavy layoffs in 1951 the company had to start a school to train welders.

President Peter Bolfar and Executive Secretary Hewitt, of local No. 24, at the Sparrows Point yard, estimated that of the 1,000 skilled men furloughed during the last 3 months at least 40 were lost to the industry.

A comparative handful of men are working at Sparrows Point. Only a 16,000-ton tanker is being constructed at the 8-way yard, which IUMSWA-CIO Vice President Andrew A. Pettis said set a wartime world's record for production by turning out ships with an aggregate tonage of 217,570 last year.

The yard recently was awarded a Navy contract for two ammunition ships, but it will be months before a few hundred men are called back to work on them.

The plight of other shipyards is similar. It is the same story everywhere. At the Fore River yard, which with the nearby but now closed Hingham yard employed 65,000 men during the World War II employment peak, fewer than 3,000 are working, with the prospect of a reduction to 800 by September.

Among those laid off are James DiGravio, a first-class machinist with 38 years' seniority. The 54-year-old man, who has 3 children, was never laid off before.

Anthony M. Cardwell, a first-class woodpattern specialist, also was furloughed from his department, where only three remained on the job.

With 20 years' seniority, Victor Kendall, who mills shafts of some 40 tons, was laid off only 3 weeks after returning to work upon his recovery from a fractured left hand suffered on the job.

DANGER OF LOSING SKILLED WORKERS IS TOLD BY UNION, NAVY, MANAGEMENT

The CIO Shipbuilding Workers, shipyard management, and the Navy all have pointed out the danger of losing skilled workers because of the curtailment of merchant ship construction.

IUMSWA-CIO President John J. Grogan warned a Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce subcommittee:

"The preservation of the shipbuilding resources, facilities, organization, skills and highly trained personnel with somewhat unique and not easily replaceable qualifications is vital to national security.

"During the past year, there seems to have been small consideration given in Washington to the essential fact that the American-flag merchant marine constitutes the fourth arm of the national defense."

Rear Adm. W. D. Leggett, Jr., chief of the Navy's Bureau of Ships, testified before the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee:

"I am particularly concerned with the fact that highly skilled design and production personnel are rapidly being dispersed among other industries which can provide more stable employment. We may not have time, in the event of another emergency, either to recruit or train new workers."

George H. French, president of the Maryland Dry Dock Co., ship repair yards at Baltimore, said:

"The fall-off in employment is so severe as to represent a real threat to the survival of many of the productive units in the industry.

"Many of the crafts in the shipyards are unique to the ship repairing and shipbuilding industry—they simply don't exist anywhere else and it takes years to train them."

French called the problem a national one and not a local one. He said the ship-repairing industry was dependent on the prosperity of the American merchant marine and renovating of Navy ships in private yards.

Never Underestimate the Power of a Carrot

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ERRETT P. SCRIVNER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 15, 1954

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, a name well known to the journalists of this Nation is Merle Thorpe. In an article in the July issue of Service, Mr. Thorpe, in his individualistic way, discusses the subject of the business of oil exploration.

Mr. Thorpe's article follows:

NEVER UNDERESTIMATE THE POWER OF A CARROT

(By Merle Thorpe)

There is sore need today of a better understanding of the depletion provision in the tax law and, indeed, of what makes American business tick. It is more than an academic question. As our industrial processes become more and more complex, the people who rule in this country, not understanding, are apt to strike out blindly.

H. G. Wells once expressed it this way: "I greatly fear for western civilization, and particularly for the United States. It will be a race between education and catastrophe."

And Owen D. Young, a great business statesman, said 25 years ago: "Only one danger confronts us. The future electrical development of the United States is bound to be enormous. No one can prevent it, and all must profit by it. The danger is that the growth of our industry will outrun public understanding; that people will see and fear our size without understanding our service."

How prophetic! Not understanding, the people responded to the hue and cry of "power and light companies are bleeding the people white," and as a result, political agencies produce today nearly one-third of the kilowatts produced in the United States.

Josh Billings expressed this phase of the national danger in his own inimitable way when he said, "It ain't that the people are ignorant, it's that they know so much that ain't so."

Secretary Morgenthau confirmed the observation of Josh Billings; when he left the Treasury he described the depletion tax provision as "an iniquitous special privilege."

Greater confirmation of the lack of understanding comes from Oregon's Senator who threatens to "vote against Oklahoma drilling dry holes at the expense of the people of Oregon."

President Truman announced pontifically, "This allowance goes on and on, year after year, even though the original investment in the property has already been recovered tax-free."

(Allowance, by the way, is a bad semantic. It is not a monthly check sent to a boy at college; it is a recognition of an inequity which was unwittingly included in the income-tax law.)

Yes, it goes on year after year, and in the 28 years of its operation, it added to the country's wealth by the discovery of 60 billion barrels of crude oil.

Secretary of the Treasury Snyder confirmed Wells, Young, and Billings when he asserted, "The reduction of the depletion allowance would tend to reduce windfalls while protecting incentives for exploration."

This takes the prize for double-talk. A windfall means winnings, and since winnings are the incenives for exploration, how can you reduce the winnings and still protect the incentives?

But it was left to the head of the Office of Price Administration to reach the height of abysmal ignorance of an economic situation. Appearing before a congressional committee, he observed that it was an impoverished science that permits an industry to continue to drill dry holes. The wells that are going to be dry should not be drilled, he said with official ipse dixit.

One cause of this lack of understanding is that in the game of finding oil we hear only of the winners—not the losers. I shall not venture into that unhappy subject of the losers. It has been said that most wildcatters die broke. I don't think it has been that bad—but a sound economist, Dr. Carruthers, of Cornell, after a long study of the question, came to the conclusion that "more money has been put into oil production than has ever been taken out of it."

Perhaps the most intellectually tricky of all the criticisms of the oil producer's tax rights is the charge of "double privilege." The oil producer, according to this argument, is allowed to charge off depletion, tax-free, and then, in addition, to charge off intangible drilling costs, tax free. This is assailed as "double privilege" or "double deduction."

It is not a privilege, but a correction of an injustice to a group of citizens which the writers of the income tax law overlooked, and which later Congresses sought to rectify.

The oversight was a failure to recognize the plain fact that oil in the ground is capital, and that its depletion will be an expenditure of capital assets. It is not a special privilege—it is a protection against double jeopardy. It protects the producer's interests at two consecutive points, at each of which the law otherwise would drain off, or tap off, or take a part out of, a man's capital in the guise of an income tax. In addition to corercting a mistake, it guarantees to the Nation that more risk-takers will hunt for oil, thereby increasing the probability that more oil will be found.

Those who know the whys and the hows of the depletion factor have a duty and a responsibility to find ways and means of describing it in terms that the man outside the industry—and his legislative representatives—can understand. With a greater understanding of the facts, my observation has been that the people, through the men that represent them in Washington, will act judiciously upon the present proposal to reduce, or abolish, the depletion tax provision.

Perhaps one reason why many people distrust the right of oil producers to recover free of tax the capital value of their oil is because they have been indoctrinated in the communistic belief that oil and other natural resources really belong to "all the people." Therefore, they say, those who discover and develop them are simply "lucky."

In many foreign countries—and particularly in the most underdeveloped ones—the rule is that all subsoil rights belong to the government. The great argument in the tideland-oil controversy was that the offshore oil really belonged to all the people—even though if it hadn't been for the oil industry, and the wise leasing policies of the three States of California, Texas, and Louisiana, the people would never have even known that the oil was there.

In a practical sense, the natural resources of the Nation, like oil, simply do not exist. For all practical purposes, they are created by being found and brought to market.

Consider the German discovery of how to fix the nitrogen in the air and make it into nitrates. By one view, the nitrogen was always there; the German scientists merely found it. But let's be sensible. By finding it, they created something.

Or consider hydropower. All that water has been falling down Niagara, and down the Colorado and the Snake Rivers for centuries. Did the engineers of the last 50 years create the power that comes from this falling water, or did they merely grab what belonged to the people?

I say they created it. And I say that if they only took what belonged to all the people, then the original Indians who first had this continent were rich, indeed. Their only trouble was that they didn't know how rich they were; and that if they had known, they wouldn't have been able to make much use of these riches, anyway.

If you substitute the word "create" for the word "find," and see that the oil producer has created something, you get an entirely different—and much more practical—point of view. He has created something that for all practical purposes wouldn't exist if he hadn't found it.

In this sense the term "oil producer" is certainly a proper one. The wildcatter who finds oil has in effect produced something that wasn't there before.

In the American way of thinking he is morally entitled to own it, as capital, and to recover its value in the form of dollars, as capital, as it is used up and spent in its original form of oil.

Some of the opponents of the tax provision declare 27½ percent too high—that it should be 15 percent or 20 percent. They claim a few percent one way or the other won't matter.

Such a suggestion flies in the face of daily experience.

Government bonds move up or down on one thirty-second of a cent margin.

The traction company in my city raised fares 1 penny and passenger traffic decreased markedly.

A manufacturer in Evansville, Ill., once told me that if the power and light company carried out its proposed increase of ¼ of a cent per kilowatt, his company would change over to Diesel and manufacture its own power.

When the lowly penny postcard was increased to 2 cents, 25 percent less postcards were bought.

In finance, an increase or decrease of a fraction of a percent in the rediscount rate moves millions of dollars in one direction or the other.

I submit that tampering with the percentage provision of the Depletion Act is dangerous.

As a Lord Chief Justice of England once wisely said, "When it is not necessary to change, it is necessary not to change."

For years I have heard the expression "Money talks." Incentive moves not only the men but the dollars in their pockets. It takes 16,000 of these dollars to make possible one job in the petroleum industry; that is, to provide the tools and labor necessary to carry on that job. There are many operations in the oil industry all the way from prospecting to filling the automobile tank at a service station. And of all these operations, the one of drilling a hole in the ground to find oil is the most hazardous for the dollar.

There are two kinds of dollars. One looks for safe employment, and for this security is willing to work for 2 or 3 cents a year. The other is ready and able to take chances, to hazard its life on the possibility of a greater return. But we should not be too quick to blame the risk dollar for is speculative motives.

(President Hadley, of Yale, attributed the supremacy of America to the fact that America could afford to speculate as no other country could.)

The risk dollar looks around for opportunities. It is offered a job by a wildcatter. The wildcatter is honest and tells him that part of the dollar will be expended at once in locating a spot to sink a well. Then a lease. Another part in buying the tools, machinery, and power. Another part for labor. But, he tells the dollar that if it strikes oil, it'll get these expenses back and a pretty good profit.

The honest wildcatter then must tell him that there is an average of 8 dry holes to 1 producer, that of 11,062 exploratory wells sunk in the United States last year, only 1,575 found oil.

The dollar bill and its owner at this point stop to consider that that means that the successful well must pay for the full expenses of the eight unsuccessful ones.

The wildcatter then tempers the dollar's fear; he tells it that as a matter of equity, Congress, representing the people, recognizes that the oil you find is capital; that you can't grow a new crop of oil as you can wheat or timber.

Therefore, as a capital asset, its sale cannot be regarded as a profit for income-tax purposes.

After 8 years of experience with an earlier provision based on discovery value, the oil prospector goes on, Congress found it so difficult to get at the value of the oil in the ground tapped by the successful hole, that it worked out, 28 years ago, the present provision to take its place. It's the nearest thing that Congress and the experts could find to take care of all the costs that lead up to a successful well.

It is further explained that Congress leans over backward in protecting the people against any unfair result of the depletion provision. It has a beautiful hedge—if the 27½-percent provision is greater than 50 percent of the net, then the oil driller must accept the 50 percent.

The case for clearing up the misunderstanding of the depletion provision could rest upon incentive alone, not an additional incentive to the oil prospector, not a bonus or a gift, but an arrangement to make all citizens equal in the race, and not handicap the hunter for oil with an extra weight in the saddle.

The first humor I ever appreciated as a youngster in Kansas many many years ago was a cartoon in an old Hostetter Almanac. It pictured a farmer driving a donkey hitched to a cart. He had rigged up a contraption by which a carrot dangled just out of reach of the donkey's nose. The farmer was saying, "I find it's much better than a club."

The world is at grips today. Two ways of life are at war with each other. Two ideologies, communism, and carrotism, are in a death struggle.

In one, a small group, self-appointed, sets up a social order and compels the others to mold themselves into subordination and submission to it.

In the other, the ideal is to create an environment where men and women, through the incentive to excel, in themselves become competent and disposed to do what should be done toward each other and their community.

The East, led by Russia, believes in the club and the knout and the horsewhip.

The West believes in holding out a reward to the individual who improves his lot by his own efforts. His to have and to hold. By persuasion, not compulsion. From the bottom up, not from the top down.

Statement of James Tanham for the Chamber of Commerce of the United States Before the Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements, House Committee on Foreign Affairs, July 9, 1954

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER E. MERROW

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 15, 1954

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a most excellent statement made by Mr. James Tanham for the Chamber of Commerce of the United States before the Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs on July 9, 1954, relative to the declaration of policy of the United States Chamber of Commerce on UNESCO. The committee, of which I am the chairman, consists of the following members: Hon. FRANCES P. BOLTON, Ohio; Hon. KARL M. LECOMPTE, Iowa; Hon. LAURIE C. BATTLE, Alabama; and Hon. BROOKS HAYS, Arkansas:

My name is James Tanham. Before retiring from active business, I was vice president of the Texas Co., New York City. I appear here today on behalf of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States to present the results of a chamber study of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization.

For 7 of the past 8 years I have been a member of the chamber's committee on foreign policy, and I served as chairman of that committee from 1950 to 1951. From 1949 to 1952 I was a member of the chamber's board of directors.

The Chamber of Commerce of the United States is a national federation of over 3,000 trade and industrial associations and State and local chambers of commerce and also of over 20,000 direct business members with an underlying membership of 1,600,000 businessmen.

Because the chamber's membership embraces practically every important activity in our economy, it presents the opinion of a cross section of our country. Since it is a democratic organization encompassing a wide range of interests, its members retain every right to express themselves as individuals. Its policy positions are derived through the democratic processes of full debate, discussion and voting and represent the viewpoints of the majority of its membership.

On April 28, 1954, the delegates to the 42d annual meeting of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States unanimously adopted this declaration of policy on UNESCO:

"The national chamber supports the stated purpose of UNESCO: 'To contribute to peace and security by promoting collaboration among the nations through education, science, and culture.' It is our belief, however, that UNESCO can be made more efficient and more effective by adopting the following suggestions:

"1. The total number of projects should be reduced and the remainder evaluated in view of their practical short- and long-range contributions to the objectives of the organization. With the available resources at its disposal, both in funds and personnel, concentration should be on the most urgent projects and activities.

"2. Stress should be laid on pilot projects with the expectation that the individual countries will assume full responsibility for carrying them forward as soon as practicable.

"3. In order that publications of UNESCO will be readily understandable by lay persons and more accurately reflect the purposes of the organization, careful examination and approval of everything proposed to be published by UNESCO should be made by a reasonable authority within that organization.

"It is essential that the viewpoints of American business concerning international affairs be made known to other groups of our society so that business can exert its full influence in the shaping of American opinion and policy. To this end, the chamber should participate in UNESCO and other international affairs meetings and conferences."

My reason for appearing before this committee is not only to present this declaration of policy but to present to you the facts about national chamber action concerning UNESCO and the results of the study we made which led to the adoption of this declaration of policy. It is our hope that we may play some small part in increasing the understanding of the American people of UNESCO and in encouraging more business and professional people to take an active interest in the formulation and carrying out of our foreign policies.

Recent national chamber action concerning UNESCO grew out of a number of inquiries which it had received about our representation on the United States National Commission for UNESCO. We have been represented on the National Commission since its founding. Some of our members were aware of the accusations which had been leveled against UNESCO and believed that, if these accusations were true, the chamber should withdraw its representative from the National Commission and perhaps advocate American withdrawal from the organization.

The chamber felt that whatever action was decided upon should be taken on the basis of a thorough study of the facts concerning the activities of UNESCO and of the charges against it. Our foreign policies are surely too important to us today to permit actions based upon undue haste or ignorance. The chamber felt also that a study of this nature should be conducted primarily by men possessing as few preconceptions as possible about UNESCO. While a more professional job perhaps could be done by men experienced in the work of the organization, it was decided that what was wanted was the judgment of those who could look into the matter from the viewpoint and experience of our members.

As the national chamber representative on the United States National Commission for UNESCO and as a member of the chamber's 1953-54 Committee on Education, Dr. Hubert H. Race, consultant on manager development for the General Electric Co., New York City, was asked to serve on the special study group. Its other six members were chosen from the viewpoint of general familiarity with educational and foreign policy matters rather than for any particular familiarity with the work of UNESCO itself.

During the summer of 1953, therefore, the chamber appointed a special joint subcommittee of its committees on foreign policy and education to make a thorough study of the matter. Jarvis Davenport, a director of the national chamber and president of the Sturgis Water Works, of Sturgis, S. Dak.; Bradshaw Mintener, another director of the national chamber and vice president and general counsel of Pillsbury Mills, of Minneapolis, Minn.; and Dr. Race represented the chamber's committee on education. Robert G. Bodet, vice president of the Home Insurance Co., of New York; Charles J. Hearst, of Maplehearst Farm, Cedar Falls, Iowa; A. B. Sparboe, vice president of Pillsbury Mills, Minneapolis, Minn.; and I represented the chamber's committee on foreign policy. Mr. Sparboe acted as chairman of this joint subcommittee.

In setting up this subcommittee Richard L. Bowditch, then president of the national chamber, asked it to pay particular attention to the following five goals: (1) Clarifying what UNESCO is; (2) reviewing its program and activities; (3) examining criticisms made regarding UNESCO; (4) suggesting improvements in UNESCO and its operations; (5) proposing to the board of directors of the chamber a course of action for the chamber regarding UNESCO, based on a recommended new policy on UNESCO.

In setting about this somewhat difficult task the UNESCO subcommittee had several guideposts relating to chamber positions on American participation in international organizations, on the proper limits of the jurisdiction of these organizations and on the importance of education in expanding output in a growing national and world economy.

The national chamber has supported the principles of the United Nations since before its founding. During the Second World War our membership approved by overwhelming referendum vote American participation in a postwar international organization for the maintenance of peace and security. The chamber strongly supported the ratification of the San Francisco Charter and has consistently reaffirmed its support of the United Nations ever since 1945. As recently as April 1954, the delegates to our 42d annual meeting reaffirmed a statement of policy to this effect. Thus the principle of international organization, when utilized for objectives in the national interest of the United States and when not used to interfere in matters essentially within the jurisdiction of sovereign nations, has the strong support of the national chamber. It became, therefore, the function of the UNESCO subcommittee to determine whether these qualifications were met in the work of UNESCO.

The subcommittee had as guideposts several prior chamber policies and positions. Our policy on the United Nations, for example, has for a number of years included the following paragraph:

"The United States should be constantly watchful to see that no action taken by the United Nations violates that part of the United Nations Charter which specifically prohibits intervention in matters which are within the jurisdiction of any member nation."

Clearly one of the functions of the UNESCO subcommittee was to determine whether that organization as well was bound both in theory and in practice by such a limitation.

The UNESCO subcommittee was aware as well of the emphasis which the national chamber has always given to the importance of education in economic growth and well-being both nationally and around the world. In 1945, the chamber published a graphic study of 10 countries entitled "Education Steps Up Living Standards." This study concluded as follows:

"Our comparative study of various countries of the world gives strong support to the argument that education raises the level of production of a people. The case of a country such as Denmark provides further striking proof over a long period of time. Here we have a country that 100 years ago was poor and had few resources. It did increase its technical training and a high income has resulted. There is every reason to think that the same result would follow in the rest of the world if education were increased. * * * A traveler soon notices the wide range in resources among countries. After a little study, however, one quickly discovers that the countries with high incomes are not necessarily those with great resources."

A study just published on June 8, 1954, by the education department of the national chamber entitled "Education—An Investment in People" shows the correlation between literacy and per capita income in 10 countries. While not included in this particular study the correlation between literacy and foreign trade abroad is also very close. The interest of the national chamber and American business in increasing educational standards throughout the world was thus one of the factors guiding our UNESCO subcommittee.

With these standards to guide its work, the UNESCO subcommittee proceeded to study the activities of UNESCO and the accusations concerning it. It decided to meet in Minneapolis, Minn., at the time of the fourth national conference of the United States National Commission for UNESCO on September 16, 1953, in order to give itself an opportunity to study at first hand the activities of that group.

The question of the accusations leveled against UNESCO was of first interest to the subcommittee. It found first that the most serious of these charges could be divided into four groups: That UNESCO advocated world government; that it advocated subversion or communism; that it advocated atheism; and that it was a sort of worldwide WPA with the American taxpayer being forced to foot some huge bill for the sole benefit of other nations. Needless to say, if the facts had shown that any one of these charges was correct our UNESCO subcommittee would have returned an adverse report.

But when we looked into these specific charges we found them basically without substance. We looked for evidence and could not find it. A number of quotations have been offered at times to prove these specific points. Yet the subcommittee found that in some cases these were misquotations, in others they were parceled together from different pages and presented as a whole, while in still others they were quotations from opinions published by but not endorsed by UNESCO. The subcommittee felt that UNESCO had not exercised sufficient care in selecting its material for publication but that no evidence had been produced from these publications to support any of the above charges.

In regard to the charge of atheism the subcommittee was impressed by the support afforded UNESCO by the leading religious organizations of this country, including the National Council of Churches, the National Catholic Welfare Council, and the Synagogue Council of America. It noted too that the Vatican itself has a permanent representative at UNESCO and that the Catholic Church has been active in combating what it considers unwarranted attacks on UNESCO on the grounds of atheism. On the question of expense the subcommittee did not believe that the $12 million expended by UNESCO in 1953, of which one-third was contributed by the United States, was excessive, if wisely spent, considering the importance of the objectives of the organization.

The subcommittee was particularly struck by the contrast between the charge of Communist intent sometimes leveled in this country against UNESCO and the violent opposition of the Communist countries to its work. It could not help notice that up until that time the Soviet Union had never belonged to UNESCO and that the satellite states of Poland, Hungary, and Czechoslovakia had tendered their resignations charging UNESCO with being "an instrument of American imperialist propaganda. * * *" The Subcommittee on UNESCO could find no evidence to support the statements either of the Communist bloc or of the American opponents of UNESCO that the organization was a tool of either the United States or the Soviet Union.

The UNESCO subcommittee next considered the more moderate charges of inefficiency and waste concerning the programs and methods of the organization. While it did not consider itself competent to judge exactly the effectiveness of UNESCO's work, it felt that a number of reforms was clearly desirable. Any new organization, of course, must go through a period of experimentation in which failures, as well as successes, figure and in which much energy, time, and money are wasted in working out the best methods and programs. The subcommittee felt that this period in UNESCO work should be about over. It felt that a very strict order of priority should be established in regard to possible projects and that attention should be given only to those on the very top of the priority list. With the limited funds at UNESCO's disposal, the major consideration must obviously be the resources of the organization rather than the limitless needs of the world. Important, too, must be the willingness of the cooperating country to contribute itself to the project to the best of its ability.

The subcommittee also felt that UNESCO's role in each project should be considered transitional. Projects should be established with the expectation that they will be turned over completely to the participating country or countries as soon as possible. The idea of pilot projects rather than permanent ones should be the driving force of the organization. A teacher's success, after all, is determined by the speed and ability with which the student can emulate him. No teacher would be considered a success if his students went through life still dependent upon him for what they were supposed to have learned in school.

The UNESCO subcommittee submitted to the full foreign-policy committee of the chamber a report, the conclusion of which opened with the following paragraph:

"The UNESCO subcommittee has carefully considered the charges against UNESCO and believes that most of them are based on a lack of information concerning the real nature and activities of the organization. The UNESCO subcommittee, therefore, unanimously recommends that the Chamber of Commerce of the United States adopt a policy supporting UNESCO's stated purpose as contained in article I of UNESCO's constitution, 'to contribute to peace and security by promoting collaboration among the nations through education, science, and culture.' In making this recommendation we point out specifically that it is not, and never has been, any part of the purpose of UNESCO to promote in any manner the theory of world government or world citizenship in a political sense."

The report went on to explain why, in the opinion of the subcommittee, membership in UNESCO is in the national interest of the United States for two major reasons:

1. There are important advantages in human understanding and in international commerce which accompany and can result from the exchange of ideas and methods between American and foreign scientists and educators. In this regard the subcommittee was mindful of the great benefits which have come to the United States in its own development because of free access to the educational, scientific and cultural resources of the whole free world.

2. The subcommittee was also conscious that any organization which helps to preserve the peace is in the national interest of the United States. In addition, however, in encouraging the idea of collective responsibility UNESCO increases the chances that we will not have to fight alone if we are again forced to fight against Communist aggression. In addition to the suggestions for improving the effectiveness of UNESCO's work already mentioned in this testimony, the subcommittee further recommended some national chamber action concerning UNESCO.

It is recommended that the national chamber continue its participation in the work of the United States National Commission for UNESCO and that in line with this objective it should take action to broaden our national knowledge and understanding of the purposes and functions of UNESCO. As an example of the need for greater public knowledge of UNESCO, the subcommittee noted that Mr. Harry A. Bullis, chairman of the board of General Mills, Inc., Minneapolis, Minn., a national chamber director and chairman of the chamber's committee on foreign policy, had taken an informal poll of about 50 persons on UNESCO when asked to serve as chairman of the local sponsoring committee for the Fourth National Conference of the United States National Commission for UNESCO. Mr. Bullis, in his opening remarks at the conference, reported that about half of the persons interviewed had never heard of UNESCO while the remaining 25 had definitions ranging from a receptionist's opinion that UNESCO was "one of those chocolate wafer sandwiches with vanilla cream filling" to a banker's view that it was one of those subversive organizations on the Attorney General's list.

The subcommittee further recommended that the chamber should participate in UNESCO and other international-affairs meetings and conferences in order that the viewpoints of American business be made known to other groups in our society.

On a more general level, the subcommittee recommended that the chamber should continue to work toward increasing the participation of businessmen in the formulation of our foreign policies and toward increasing public understanding of America's leadership role in the world today.

The report and recommendations of the UNESCO subcommittee were considered by the full foreign policy committee, under the chairmanship of Mr. Bullis, at its October 16, 1953, meeting. The 1953–54 committee on foreign policy of the national chamber consisted of 36 prominent business and professional people representing all parts of the country and many segments of American business life.

The foreign policy committee gave the report and recommendations of the subcommittee on UNESCO a thorough examination. Here, too, the large majority of committee members was not hitherto familiar with the work of UNESCO but care was taken to send each member full explanatory material concerning UNESCO and the work of the subcommittee enough in advance of the meeting to enable the members to give sufficient study to the problem.

After a full day's debate and deliberation, the foreign policy committee voted unanimously to recommend a declaration of policy supporting the objectives of UNESCO and recommending certain reforms.

This recommendation by the committee on foreign policy was considered by the chamber's board of directors at its November 13–14, 1953, meeting. After due deliberation, the board voted without dissent to recommend it to the chamber's committee on policy.

The chamber's committee on policy, then under the chairmanship of Mr. Clement D. Johnston, now president of the chamber, has the function of reviewing all proposed chamber policies with the view of passing them on for annual meeting consideration. It considered the proposed policy on UNESCO at its February 19, 1954, meeting and made some editorial revisions which shortened the text of the proposed declaration. The committee then approved the revised declaration for annual meeting consideration.

All proposed new or revised chamber policies are sent to all members of the national chamber at least a month before the annual meeting so that there will be ample time for due consideration. At the annual meeting, held each spring all new and revised policies are voted on by the membership. Ample opportunity is given to any delegate who wishes to object to or speak against a policy to do so. Those policies to which there is no objection are passed and then those which have aroused opposition are debated and voted on. The proposed policy on UNESCO was one of those this year to which objection was raised. It was, therefore, passed over in the general vote on policies. When the time for the debate on UNESCO came, the gentleman who had raised the objection asked for the reasons which had led to its recommendation.

Mr. Harry A. Bullis, as chairman of the foreign policy committee, laid the facts behind the recommended policy before the delegates in somewhat the same manner in which I have attempted to do today. After him, some additional information was supplied by Mr. Bradshaw Mintener, a member of the joint subcommittee on UNESCO. As a result of these explanations, the gentleman who had raised the objection withdrew it and the policy on UNESCO was adopted unanimously by the 42d annual meeting of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States.

As this process shows, policies of the chamber undergo a long and thorough scrutiny before adoption. Our policy on UNESCO represents a sincere attempt to find out the facts and, acting upon the basis of them, to support what we think right in our foreign policies. We hope that our experience in this work will encourage other groups to take a new look at aspects of our foreign policies and to make the results of their inquiries available to the Congress and to the public at large. If the well-being of our country depends upon the soundness of our foreign policies, surely that soundness itself depends upon the active participation of private citizens and groups in the formulation and carrying out of these foreign policies.

Marine Corps Memorial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 2, 1954

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am extending my remarks to include the following resolution passed by the City Council of Chicago on June 30, 1954:

Resolution Memorializing the United States Congress To Consider the City of Chicago as a Site for the Erection of a Marine Corps Memorial

Whereas the United States Marine Corps has compiled a glorious record of valor in serving our Nation since the birth of the corps in 1775; and

Whereas Chicago and its environs have furnished the United States Marine Corps with a large percentage of the men who have, by their service, been instrumental in aiding the Marine Corps in the writing of some of the proudest chapters in the military history of America; and

Whereas many Chicagoland marines have died on beaches, in jungles, at sea, and in the air, giving the last full measure of devotion for country and for corps; and

Whereas the memory of these marines burns brightly in the breasts of their fathers, mothers, wives, children, and friends; and

Whereas Chicago would be proud to be the home of a memorial erected to the memory of these men from the heartland of America who have contributed so much to our heritage and to the spirit and tradition of their corps; and

Whereas there is presently pending before the Congress of the United States in the Joint Committee on the Library, a report of the Marine Corps Memorial Commission which, if adopted, will result in a Federal appropriation for a Marine Corps memorial to be constructed in Chicago: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the City Council of Chicago does hereby express itself as favoring the erection of a Marine memorial on a suitaable site centrally located in Chicago; and be it further

Resolved, That the city council memorialize the Joint Committee on the Library to act favorably on the pending report of the Marine Corps Memorial Commission before adjournment of the present session of Congress; and be it further

Resolved, That the city clerk be, and he is, authorized and directed to forward copies of this resolution, as passed, to the two Senators from Illinois and each Illinois Representative, and Senator Frank A. Barrett, chairman of the Joint Committee on the Library.

(Adopted by the City Council of the City of Chicago at meeting held June 30, 1954.)

Congress Brings Praise To Itself for Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 15, 1954

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave previously granted me, I request permission to have inserted in the Record the following editorial which appeared in the Columbus (Ohio) Evening Dispatch, commending the 83d Congress for its record of performance:

Congress Brings Praise To Itself for Record

For many good reasons President Eisenhower firmly believes that a good legislative record by this Congress will do a great deal to insure support for his administration at the polls this November.

It has been his conviction from the beginning of his term that the issues in the congressional elections of this year would revolve around the kind of a program Congress enacted during its 1953 and 1954 sessions. And as of now he is saying that he will be proud to go before the people in the coming preelection months and praise what Congress has done.

Congress has, in fact, come a long way from the day it was given a large and difficult administration program to put into effect.

The popular assumption then was that the cynicism of the recently deposed New Dealers probably had a lot more justification than was apparent, and that the American voter had been so corrupted by 20 years of a New Deal and Fair Deal paternalism, inflation, and socialism that he could never again stand without complete support from the Federal Government.

But the President believed differently, and over the months he has persisted in cutting down Federal waste and extravagance, cutting expenses, readjusting the tax structure, paring Government guaranties for everthing, and generally moving toward the time when every American citizen can be more and more independent of Government guidance and help and freer to arrange his own destiny.

The two greatest obstacles to the realization of his hopes in this respect were accounted to be the new tax measure and the reestablishment of a flexible system of farm price supports.

Within the past week he has gotten a tax bill to his liking, with many inequities and especially with the political injustices taken out of it, and is practically assured of a farm price-support measure which will give the administration some leeway in reducing farm surpluses.

What has happened generally as the greater part of the administration program has been enacted is that the Nation has been making the slow, careful turn, envisaged by President Eisenhower many months ago as he approached his task of getting the country back on a solid and even road.

By now it has almost completed the delicate maneuvering necessary to bring it about and face it again toward the goals of individual freedom and independence and away from the socialism which was threatening it.

In the meantime, the President has had to wrestle with the frustarting and dangerous issues of foreign policy.

The war in Korea has been brought to an end. The threat of advancing communism has been courageously faced, and the world has been given to know that the United States stands upon the reasonable ground that only a show of good faith on the part of the Communists is necessary to insure a peaceful coexistence of the West and communism in the world.

The President has faced the issues calmly and conservatively, and as a result crisis after crisis—domestic, foreign, political and economic—has been passed without any undue difficulty, or has been put off.

The President's old-fashioned belief that the executive and legislative departments are properly separate and that each has its functions has paid off in many ways.

His critics have been quick to chide him frequently for his patience and call loudly for an exercise of leadership on his part. Leadership has not been lacking, as results have proved, but any inclination toward dictatorial impatience has. And we may all be thankful for that.

The President has obtained the support of the conservative elements of Congress in both parties.

This is important for the country. It is important also for the President and for Congress.

Mr. Eisenhower can now, with all the pride he must feel at the accomplishments of Congress, go honestly before the Nation and support the program which has been enacted. And those Congressmen of his own party running for reelection have the benefit of a compelling and forceful political advantage in the fact that the program which has drawn such support merits even further support in the 2 years to come.

Red China Has No Right to Membership in the United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 15, 1954

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, there is no basis of right or justice that entitles Red China to membership in the United Nations. On the contrary, there is every reason why it should not be admitted as a member.

The history of Red China has been one of war. Its hands are stained with blood. Its entrance into the Korean war prolonged hostilities and resulted in the unnecessary shedding of the blood of good American boys. Nearly 150,000 casualties in the ranks of our Army in Korea can be charged to it. And today Red China is giving aid and support to the fighting that is raging in Indochina. What a record on which to base a claim of right to admission to the United Nations, the fundamental purpose of which is to promote peace.

Even the most casual reading of the purposes of the United Nations destroys any right of Red China to membership in it. Observe the following taken from the charter of the United Nations:

> Article 1 spells out the purposes for which the United Nations has been organized—
>
> To maintain international peace and security, and to that end: to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace, and for the suppression of acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace, and to bring about by peaceful means, and in conformity with the principles of justice and international law, adjustment or settlement of international disputes or situations which might lead to a breach of the peace;
>
> To develop friendly relations among nations based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples, and to take other appropriate measures to strengthen universal peace;
>
> To achieve international cooperation in solving international problems of an economic, social, cultural, or humanitarian character, and in promoting and encouraging respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion; and
>
> To be a center for harmonizing the actions of the nations in the attainment of these common ends.
>
> Article 2 imposes rules of conduct upon the members:
>
> The organization is based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all its members.
>
> All members, in order to insure to all of them the rights and benefits resulting from membership, shall fulfill in good faith the obligations assumed by them in accordance with the present charter.
>
> All members shall settle their international disputes by peaceful means in such a manner that international peace and security, and justice, are not endangered.
>
> All members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State, or in any other manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations.
>
> All members shall give the United Nations every assistance in any action it takes in accordance with the present charter, and shall refrain from giving assistance to any state against which the United Nations is taking preventive or enforcement action.

Mr. Speaker, measured against the requirements laid down in the charter, the Chinese Communists do not meet the standards prescribed for membership in the United Nations. They have shown a consistent disregard for fundamental human rights, they have degraded the dignity of persons, and they have obliterated the rights of individuals. Freedom has been stifled; intolerance has been substituted for tolerance.

In the international field the Chinese Communists have not only refused to assist the United Nations in its action taken in accordance with the charter against aggression in Korea; they have participated in the aggression. This is not alone the judgment of the United States. It is the considered conclusion reached by an overwhelming majority of the General Assembly. A regime that has been held to have violated the charter cannot plead that it meets the standards necessary to hold a seat in an organization pledged to support that very charter. Indeed to seat the Chinese Communists would only qualify them for expulsion. Article 6 states that—

> A member of the United Nations which has persistently violated the principles contained in the present charter may be expelled from the organization.

To accord representation to a regime that is unable or unwilling to discharge its international responsibilities would make a mockery of the very principles that led to the creation of the United Nations. It would violate both the letter and the spirit of the charter.

The moral and legal issues involved in this question are not in conflict with the practical issues. The United States and the United Nations are engaged in hostilities against the Chinese Communists. To give them a permanent seat on the Security Council equal in weight to that of the United States and the other permanent members, would enhance their prestige, give courage to their sympathizers, and weaken those who are resisting Communist aggression from without and Communist subjugation from within. It would imply an acceptance of their permanent conquest of China and give them an air of respectability. All of this is in contradiction to the judgement already expressed by the members.

The consequences of seating the Chinese Communists would be disastrous. It would be a reward to the enemies of the United Nations and of the United States. The prestige of the organization would suffer irreparably no less than that of the members who are fighting to uphold its principles.

The United States has vigorously opposed efforts to seat the Chinese Communists in the United Nations at each of the approximately 150 times that this question has been raised since 1950.

The administration under President Eisenhower has been alert at all times to the danger inherent in admitting Communist China into the United Nations. On July 7, of the present year, President Eisenhower in answer to questions addressed to him at his press conference replied in a manner to leave no doubt of his unqualified opposition. He said:

> I am completely and unalterably opposed under the present situation to the admission of Red China into the U. N. I personally think that 95 percent of the population of the United States would take the same stand. Now let's take a look at this thing for a minute, if you will bear with me. There is a moral question, first of all, that is involved. The United Nations was not established primarily as a supergovernment clothed with all of the authority of a supergovernment and of great power to do things. It was, among other things, an attempt to marshal the moral strength of the world in order to preserve peace, to make certain that quarrels were composed through a decent respect for justice and fairness and right, and to see whether we couldn't avoid resort to force. Now, today we have Red China going to Geneva and instead of taking a conciliatory attitude toward anything, it excoriated the United Nations. As a matter of fact, in Geneva it demanded repudiation of the United Nations position. On top of that, Red China is today at war with the United Nations. They were declared an aggressor by the United Nations in the Assembly. That situation has never been changed. They are occupying North Korea; they have supported this great effort at further enslavement of the peoples in Indochina; they have held certain of our prisoners unjustifiably and they have been guilty of the employment of the worst possible diplomatic deportment in the international affairs of the world. Now, how can the United States as a self-respecting nation, doing its best and in conformity with the moral standards as we understand them, how can we possibly say this country should be admitted or this government should be admitted to the U. N.? That is the way the case stands now, and that is my position.
>
> * * * * *
>
> We went into the United Nations under treaty forms. Now, I must say first, if the United States ever reaches the point that it wants to repudiate solemn treaty obligations it must do so after the most careful deliberation and study of all of the consequences that could be involved. Secondly, I repeat, the establishment of the United Nations was an effort to rally the moral forces of the world. I don't see how in all conscience the United Nations—I don't see how any state, impartial state, can vote for their acceptance under present conditions—I don't understand it.

This firm statement by the President as well as others by the Secretary of State and by Members of both Houses of Congress appear to have borne fruit. Within the past few days one of our major allies that seemed to be giving strong support to Communist Chinese representation in the United Nations has advocated a more cautious and realistic approach.

To further substantiate the strong position that has been taken by our Government, I draw attention to the letter of Thruston B. Morton, Assistant Secretary of State, dated July 8, 1954, addressed to Hon. ROBERT B. CHIPERFIELD, chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, in which he sets forth the policy of the United States Government. It reads as follows:

> DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
> *Washington, July 8, 1954.*
>
> The Honorable ROBERT B. CHIPERFIELD,
> *Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs,*
> *House of Representatives.*
>
> DEAR MR. CHIPERFIELD: Pursuant to our telephone conversation of July 7, the Department of State submits the following comments on House Joint Resolution 286 which provides that if the Communist regime of China "should be admitted to the United Nations or any of the specialized agencies referred to in article 57 of the United Nations Charter, the United States Government should reexamine its policy regarding the United Nations or the specialized agency, as the case may be, and its membership therein."
>
> This Government firmly opposes the seating of representatives of the Chinese Communist regime in the United Nations and the specialized agencies. The President re-

affirmed this policy as recently as July 7. United States representatives in meetings of the United Nations and the specialized agencies are actively carrying out this policy. They will continue to do so. In addition, the considered and firm policy of this Government has been made clear to other friendly governments beyond the possibility of any misunderstanding, and we will continue to reiterate our views whenever required. We believe that this course of action offers the best prospect for the continued achievement of our basic policy objective.

If representatives of the Chinese Communists regime should be seated in the United Nations or any of the specialized agencies, it is axiomatic that we would reexamine our policy regarding the organization concerned, in the light of the circumstances then existing. However, we would not think that the policy we have in mind would be promoted by any congressional action which seemed to take it for granted that the Chinese Communist regime would in fact be seated in the various organs of the United Nations.

Sincerely yours,
THRUSTON B. MORTON,
Assistant Secretary
(For the Secretary of State).

I am in full accord with the attitude our Government has taken in its opposition to Communist China. I shall vote in favor of the resolution—House Resolution 627—now under consideration by the House and which reads as follows:

Resolved, That the House of Representatives reiterates its opposition to the seating of the Communist regime in China as the representative of China in the United Nations or any of its specialized agencies and supports the President in his expressed determination to use all means to prevent such representation.

Health Insurance—Whose Interests Does It Serve?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 13, 1954

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, in my judgment, the reinsurance bill, H. R. 8356, is a hoax which the administration, innocently or otherwise, is perpetrating upon the American people. With a good deal of fanfare in the press and on television we are being sold a bill of goods, which, when examined, turns out to have been blatantly misrepresented.

The fact that the administration, in various pronouncements, has so accurately put its finger on some of the crying needs of the people in the field of health makes this misrepresentation all the more reprehensible.

It is true that our families are burdened and often financially ruined by the unpredictable and high cost of illness. It is true that only about 17 percent of private medical and hospital expenditures are presently covered by existing health insurance plans. Most insurance plans do not cover all the medical needs—and they are far from paying all the bills of those items that are covered. There are too many exclusions in insurance policies—the benefits often stop too soon. They are too expensive for middle- and lower-income groups. They have not been able to adequately provide for rural people, for retired persons, and for the unemployed. The long-term, chronic illness is barely touched upon under these plans.

All these are urgent problems and the administration has the temerity to tell us that its reinsurance bill would go a long way toward helping solve them. I say this bill, with its $25 million appropriation to set up a so-called reinsurance fund, could do nothing of significance to meet many of the problems.

At the hearings on this bill practically all the experts who testified—from diverse groups, many of whom have entirely different ideas about how to approach the problem—have said that reinsurance cannot do the job. Reinsurance is not a magic potion as the administration seems to think, or which it would have us believe.

I would like to point out that at no time has there been a concrete and conclusive demonstration of how reinsurance would actually perform its magic. I have even heard it suggested that we should vote for this bill because "it will not do any harm," and it should at least "be given a try."

I say that a bill with no more assurance than this of working is a downright imposition upon the American public—an insult to the people who look to the Congress for sound and effective measures to meet current problems. Enactment of a bill of this sort would be bad and irresponsible legislation.

The needs of the people for something to be done in reducing the tremendous burden of medical and hospital costs and in making available to everyone the best of medical care which modern science has made possible—are immense and urgent. We ought to show boldness and foresight in devising a program to meet the need. We must assess these problems and be willing to provide the funds necessary to cope with them.

This reinsurance bill deserves the treatment it has received in the House of Representatives.

Texas' D. A. "Andy" Adam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 15, 1954

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an article entitled "Fence Row Diplomat," written by the former Don Hinga.

The article has reference to Mr. D. A. "Andy" Adam, a close friend of mine and an employee of the A. and M. College of Texas:

FENCE ROW DIPLOMAT

(By Don Hinga)

The first blow that ill fortune took at D. A. "Andy" Adam brought him arthritis that curved his spine until he bent almost double. The next swipe tore off his left arm in an automobile accident. Then he slipped on an icy Houston street and broke his neck.

But that hasn't kept Andy, who is on the staff of the extension service of Texas Agricultural and Mechanical College, from doing one of the best jobs in the Nation of selling the American way of life in foreign lands.

Andy has the job of meeting foreign delegations who come to Texas A. and M. to study American agricultural and mechanical methods and take them back home. It's his job to greet them, shepherd them over broad Texas, and show them in the field, after they have studied at A. and M., how these methods are applied.

And Andy goes beyond just showing.

What Washington bureaucrat would think of seeing that every foreign visitor, from high official to student, is placed on the mailing list for a Sears & Roebuck catalog? In far-off Iran and Pakistan, natives pore over the catalogs and wonder at the multitude of things, luxuries to them, that are available to the average American.

And who would think of seeing that the wives tour sewing centers and go home with armfuls of dress patterns, a thing unheard of in the Middle East and other areas?

Andy does.

He goes farther than that.

When a large delegation of Turkish officials was coming to "Aggieland," thoughtful Andy saw that a restaurant across from the campus stocked up on olive oil, lamb, and other things he knew the Turks would like.

The Turks ate most of their meals at that restaurant. The cuisine was not all to their liking so they went into the kitchen and cooked their own food at times. Several had their pet dishes and soon the cafe blossomed out with such signs as "Abdullah's Fine Turkish Coffee," "Mustapha's Turkish Salad." Andy arranged that and the Turks felt right at home.

On one trip the wife of a Turkish official asked, "Can I see one of those rich houses like you see in the movies?" Andy got hold of the country home demonstration agent who had a friend with a fine home. The wife of the Turkish official was invited to drop by. Later she remarked to the home demonstration agent, "How can you, a working woman, know anyone with a home like that?"

Naturally Andy sells them first on Texas. He gives them a warm, Texas greeting, sees that in their rooms they'll find such books as Texas Welcomes You and Texas Is a Whale of a State, etc. The first thing a freshman learns at A. and M. is to greet all strangers on the campus with a warm howdy. The visitors eat it up.

One high official told Andy that "Most of my countrymen think that Americans are cold and selfish, that they are out for the dollar alone. They should be with me now."

When they are touring Texas, Andy phones ahead to eating stops and sees that restaurants have particular dishes they like. If the stop falls on some holy day, the menu is tailored to fit the demands of their religion.

The traditional war cry of the Aggie cadet corps at athletic events is "Gig 'Em Aggies." The big game each year is with arch foe, Texas University, on Thanksgiving.

A few years ago Thanksgiving caught Andy far away from Aggieland, taking a Turkish official and a student on tour. The car radio was on the blink and they could not pick up the game. At one stop, a garage man could tell them only that the Aggies were ahead by one point at the half.

Late in the day, at another stop, they learned the Aggies had won and Andy and the student did a victory dance in the road, yelling "Gig 'Em Aggies." The dignified official climbed out of the car, put his arm around the two, and said, "I am glad for you."

Then he let out a piercing Turkish "Gig 'Em Aggies."

From over the world this fence row diplomat gets letters from foreigners grateful for his thoughtfulness while they were in Texas. And a lot of those letters wind up, "Gig 'Em Aggies."

Public Laws 404 to 423, Inclusive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 15, 1954

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent, I am extending my remarks to include the reports to my constituents covering Public Laws 404 to 423, inclusive, as follows:

THIRTY-FIRST REPORT ON LEGISLATION OF THE 83D CONGRESS

DEAR FRIEND: As the 83d Congress continues the drive toward an expected adjournment around month-end the number of House Members who have answered all rollcalls (including quorum calls) has been reduced from 9 (of 435) at the close of the first session to 4 at the present time. I am happy that good fortune has permitted your Representative to remain on the list. I thought you would wish it that way.

The number who have answered all calls in the 1953–54 sessions, I am told, is the lowest in the modern history of the Congress, due among other good and valid reasons to the President's congressional luncheons and the trips to Nevada to witness atomic explosions. Important committee assignments at home and abroad necessarily caused others to miss some rollcalls.

Begining where we left off, here are the new laws of the land:

PUBLIC LAW 404

S. 2761, irrigation costs: This is legislation to take care of hardship cases in connection with the Hermiston and West Extension irrigation districts in Oregon. I found the facts interesting; I think you will.

Operation of the Hermiston unit started in 1908. Total repayments on the $2,573,000 cost have been little more than $300,000. The west extension unit was opened in 1917. Cost was $1,137,000; repayments have totaled $86,000. Reason: because of soil conditions, lands reverted to their original condition, covered with sagebrush and greasewood; farmers just could not raise crops to meet required repayments.

Public Law 404, similar to other laws in like situations, adjusts scale of repayments to gear with land productivity. The original act provided for an amortization period of 40 years, later extended to 50 years. Public Law 404 further extends the period to 163 years. At the end of that period slightly less than half a million dollars additional repayments will have been made on both projects, leaving Uncle Sam to hold the bag for close to $3 million. Próving, I would say, that all the millions that go into irrigation do not come out in fertile acres.

The overall record of repayments on irrigation projects in the 17 States where located is reported as good. Some have returned to the Federal Government 100 cents on the dollar, others have gone almost completely sour. This of interest to you since you contribute to the Federal tax dollars that foot the bill when miscalculations and overzeal in the planning result in later busts.

Also you will take local interest and pride that under the direction of Gordon Clapp, M. A. (University of Chicago) in the case of TVA not only has the repayment schedule been met, but payments are far in advance of a schedule requiring complete repayment in 40 years. Furthermore, TVA is returning a 4- to 5-percent yield on the money invested by the Federal Government. That University of Chicago's M. A. in this instance means "money ahead" for Uncle Sam and you, his taxpaying nieces and nephews.

PUBLIC LAW 405

S. 2773, mail distribution from motor vehicles: Envisioned in this law is a future with a post office on motor wheels driving up to your doorstep with your morning mail. At present there are 133 highway post offices distributing mail en route in rural short-haul areas. But existing law prohibited their operation where adequate railroad facilities were available. Public Law 405 leaves it to the discretion of the Postmaster General. Immediate expansion of the motor-vehicle service is in prospect, at first in substitution of branch-line railroads which either have gone out of existence or have greatly reduced train service. If it works, the post office on wheels in big cities like Chicago is among the possibilities.

The railway postal clerks and other postal workers are watching the development with some apprehension. I was present at a meeting of railway postal clerks in Chicago when an accredited representative of the Postmaster General stated it was the thought of his department ultimately to use the railroads only in long-haul operations, otherwise motors and aircraft. The railway postal clerks have rendered a long and honorable service to the Government. It is only fair that in any innovations in the name of progress, economy, and efficiency due respect be shown their right in seniority.

In voting for Public Law 405 it was on the assurance that its administration in the limited area planned would not be permitted to trespass upon the rights of present postal workers.

PUBLIC LAW 406

S. 3090, Falcon Dam on the Rio Grande: Falcon Dam, 75 miles from Laredo, Tex., is a joint multiple-purpose project of the United States and Mexico. It was completed in 1953. This year when devastating floods destroyed 1,500 homes and did vast damage around Laredo the huge reservoir of the dam (storing flood waters for future dry seasons) completely protected the area south of Laredo on both sides of the border.

The project includes one power plant. Two additional plants, one on the American side, one on the Mexican, are near completion. Cost: $47 million, divided equally between the two Governments. The power plants, interconnected, will generate 250 kilowatt-hours annually, subject to equal division.

Public Law 406 provides for the transmission and disposition (under the Secretary of the Interior) of our share of this power. Rate schedules will cover cost of production and amortization of Uncle Sam's investment. Protection against a grab by a private company is in this provision: "Preference in the sale of such power and energy shall be given to public bodies and cooperatives."

Here is a strengthening illustration of how two governments can work together in a joint adventure contributing to the economic development of both countries and in the end realizing the full return of invested capital.

PUBLIC LAW 407

S. 3524, temporary appointments in Navy: During the Korean emergency title III of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 relating to the advancement of junior naval officers was suspended. Now the Navy plans to go back to that act. Public Law 407 clears the way by classifying some 17,750 naval officers promoted since June 30, 1951, under another act as having been promoted under title III. Passed by consent.

PUBLIC LAW 408

S. 3446, West Point: This authorizes the needed rehabilitation of two barracks at the West Point Academy.

PUBLIC LAW 409

H. R. 107. Fort Buford, N. Dak.: By reason of this legislation the North Dakota State Historical Society will take over part of the site of Fort Buford (trading post in 1774) to restore it to the likeness of old days when troops rode from its enclosure to do battle with hostile redskins. Its proposed restoration follows a popular nationwide trend resulting from auto touring and the love of Americans to visit spots of interest in our national history.

THIRTY-SECOND REPORT ON LEGISLATION OF THE 83D CONGRESS

DEAR FRIEND: Continuing where we left off, here are the new laws of the land:

PUBLIC LAW 410

H. R. 2226, naval civilian employees: This repeals an old law (1902) under which civilian employees of the Navy serving overseas were paid salaries from date of vessel's departure from and arrival at United States ports. Hereafter they will be paid as all other Government overseas employees, from date of leaving their actual homes and arrival at work sites, and vice versa on return. Passed by consent.

PUBLIC LAW 411

H. R. 8487, census of manufactures: This is a good illustration of how the first session of the 83d Congress (1953) made a false showing of economy.

By law a census of manufactures, minerals, and other businesses is required every 5 years after 1949. That made one due in 1954. But the Congress, to make a paper showing of economy, failed to include it in the appropriations for 1953, when the work had to be done.

Public Law 411 authorizes the extension of the time for the census from 1954 to 1955. Result: the money saved one year will be spent the next.

PUBLIC LAW 412

H. R. 6328, Hawaii: Hawaiian Organic Act prohibits any exchange of public lands exceeding 40 acres in area or $5,000 in value. So when the Territory [to encourage citizen farmers and to consolidate its own holdings] wished to swap 288 acres of public lands near Waimea for Citizen Smart's 308 acres, Public Law 412 (authorizing the trade) was necessary.

PUBLIC LAW 413

H. R. 2849, Hawaii: In 1936 the Federal Government gave to the Territorial government of Hawaii some 9 acres at Kahului exclusively for use as a public park. No residences nearby, there is no demand for a park. But business of the port has boomed and there is presently a demand for additional storage and shedded area for increased shipping. Public Law 413 makes the 9 acres available for that purpose by removing the park restriction.

PUBLIC LAW 414

H. R. 5913, second-class mail matter: This simplifies the handling of postage on newspapers and periodicals by repealing an obsolete law (39 U. S. C. 286) requiring the manual affixing of stamps. It will save work and expense for both the postal service and the publishers.

PUBLIC LAW 415

H. R. 5831. Hawaii: Territorial Legislature of Hawaii petitioned the Congress for this legislation authorizing the Hawaian Homes Commission to exchange lands under its control for other public lands of equal value. the Commission makes homesteads available to native Hawaiians up to 5,000 acres a year.

PUBLIC LAW 416

H. R. 5833, Hawaii: Another law for the Hawaiians. It authorizes the exchange of public lands for private lands needed as the sites for new public schools.

PUBLIC LAW 417

H. R. 6888, Hawaii: Still another Hawaiian measure. This provides for the lease to native Hawaiians of irrigated pastoral lands in lots of from 40 to 100 acres.

PUBLIC LAW 418

H. R. 6800. Hawaii again: When the Legislature of Hawaii extended an electric light and power franchise on the island of Kauai it had to come to the Congress (under the organic act) for approval. Public Law 418 O. K.'s the act of the legislature.

PUBLIC LAW 419

H. R. 8092. Philippines: Under Public Law 419 nationals of the Republic of the Philippines coming to the United States as traders and investors will be issued nonimmigrant visas on the basis of a reciprocal agreement granting similar privileges to our nationals.

PUBLIC LAW 420

H. R. 6655, education of the deaf:

Columbia Institution for the Deaf was incorporated by Congress in 1857. It consists of Gallaudet College, the only college in the world exclusively for deaf students, and Kendall School, an elementary and secondary school for the deaf. Although not a Federal instrumentality, it largely is supported by Federal appropriations and by law 1 Member of the Senate, 2 of the House serve on its board of directors.

Public Law 420 changes the name to Gallaudet College (after Rev. Thomas Hopkins Gallaudet, 1787–1851, a clergyman who established the first school for the deaf in America). It also provides a new charter under which the board of directors will have full authority in curriculum and other matters similar to that usually exercised by the boards of private and State universities. The objective is to make Gallaudet College adequate to give the advantages of higher education to applicants from all sections of the country who have no other place to receive college training. With new facilities and improved teaching personnel, as planned, the college is expected to have a standing sufficiently high to become accredited.

This is the character of legislation I especially am happy in supporting with the vote you have delegated me to cast for you.

PUBLIC LAW 421

H. R. 8044, Philippines—hospitalization of veterans: Part of the expense of taking care of hospitalized veterans of the Philippine Army who served with the Armed Forces of the United States in World War II is borne by the United States. A hospital, now under construction, was made possible by a $22,600,000 grant from our Government. Public Law 865 of the 80th Congress (1947–48) authorized an annual appropriation of $3,285,000 to aid the Philippine Government in the care of the veterans. Public Law 421 of this Congress, passed by the House by consent, extends this authorization another 5 years.

PUBLIC LAW 422

S. 1794, care of demented Indians: This authorizes the payment to the South Dakota State Hospital for the Insane of $8,124 for care of demented Indian patients. Through inadvertence authority for hospitalization had not been cleared previously through the Bureau of Indian Affairs, as required, hence the necessity for another law. Passed by consent.

PUBLIC LAW 423

S. 2654, stone quarry in District of Columbia: In 1898 the District of Columbia purchased 17 acres in nearby Maryland for a stone quarry. It has been abandoned for years. Public Law 423 gives the District Commissioners the go-ahead in selling it at public auction to the highest bidder. It required a law of Congress.

Cordially and sincerely,

BARRATT O'HARA,
Member of Congress.

American Policy In the Middle East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 15, 1954

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I should like to have inserted in the RECORD the following speech delivered by Rabbi Abba Hillel Silver, of the Temple, Cleveland, Ohio, before the 57th annual convention of the Zionist Organization of America at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel on Thursday, June 24, 1954, regarding the American policy in the Middle East:

There is a radical difference between the set of problems which we faced before, and the set which we have faced since, the establishment of the State of Israel. The problems before the State was founded were the century-old problems of national homelessness, of a people "robbed and despoiled," the problems of persecution, concentration camps, refugees—where to go, how to survive—all the desperate problems of an abnormal national existence.

The problems since 1948 have been the more or less familiar problems which any pioneering state must face and wrestle with as part of the routine of its establishment on firm and secure foundations. These are the problems of a normal national existence. They may be grave and serious problems, but the effort at solving them carries with it an eager challenge, a creative joy and a deep spiritual confidence.

These problems bring with them new tasks. What these new tasks are is evident: They are the manifold and exciting tasks which have to do with nation building; with the construction of new homes and settlements; with bringing springs of water to dry lands and gardens to the wilderness. They have to do with industry, trade, and commerce; with mining and engineering; with seafaring and aviation; and with all the noble arts and enterprises of peace. They have to do with education, health, and religion, and with a people's chosen way of life.

These new tasks are of necessity also concerned with national defense—the world in which we live being the kind of a world it is and the neighbors of Israel persistently refusing to make peace. Some of these tasks possess greater urgency than others; some are of longer duration than others; some of them will continue indefinitely since they are coextensive with the life of a nation. None, however, is beyond the capacity of the State of Israel and of the Jewish people.

THE CHALLENGE BEFORE US

The Jewish people will assuredly match its great hour. It possesses the ability and the resourcefulness. In the long, hard school of experience through the centuries our people have learned how to build upon ruins and how to build in the face of adversity. This is the third commonwealth we are building, not the first. Others nations succumbed when their governments were destroyed and their people uprooted. Israel surmounted the loss of its independence; surmounted exile, dispersion, and savage persecution; and returned to its ravaged land to rebuild it and its national life. Our generation is learning the lessons which our forefathers learned in their day—patience and perseverance; how to run and not be wearied; how to renew its strength; how to be deeply concerned and greatly rejoicing at the same time.

When a nation finally settles down from its high revolutionary moments of exaltation and idealism which attend a liberation movement, to the less heroic day-by-day business of living, there sets in a perceptible emotional letdown. No people can collectively live indefinitely on the high plateaus of spirit. A leveling off process inevitably follows. There is no ground here for serious concern unless it takes on the character of stagnation and demoralization which are the by-products of spiritual exhaustion and disillusionment. Our people in Israel and in the Diaspora will, I am sure, wish to guard themselves against the dangers of such an emotional deflation. We must be determined to keep our minds firmly centered on the largely uncompleted job of nation building still before us, which is still so full of challenge—a different kind of challenge to be sure—but nevertheless one which can appeal to all that is noblest in our natures.

STUMBLING BLOCKS IN OUR WAY

There are Jews in our midst who would like to see us quit right now—not because they have become tired from the heavy burdents which they have carried in the process of helping to build the State of Israel. The only burdens which they carried were the rocks which they threw at the builders like Shimei, the son of Gera, who threw rocks at David and cursed him when he was in deep trouble fighting for his kingdom. These Jews did everything in their power to prevent the establishment of the State of Israel. They put every conceivable stumbling block in the way. They joined forces with the enemies of Israel not of our faith. They knocked on every door to inform against their own people. Though they were themselves religiously indifferent, they suddenly discovered, as a shrewd part of their strategy, a vast devotion to abstract Judaism, and under that cloak, as the American Council for Judaism, they proceeded to spread their insidious political propaganda.

These unhappy Jews, like their Arab spiritual kinsmen, some of whom are prepared to sacrifice 10 million Arab lives to wipe out the State of Israel, are unreconciled to the existence of the state. Since they cannot by wishing have it disappear from the face of the earth, they are trying their best to have it reduced in size, crippled, isolated, cut off from the sympathy and support of fellow-Jews in the rest of the world. They would like to see Israel a puny, hemmed-in Levantine statelet at the mercy of its Arab neighbors. No more immigration into Israel. No more spiritual identification of American Jewry with Israel. No intercession in its behalf with governments. From here on only Arab spokesmen and oil lobbyists and friends of the Middle East, and officers of the American Council for Judaism shall have access to the State Department.

AN AMAZING GENIUS FOR GUESSING WRONG

Most assuredly, these people would like to have us quit right now. And, significantly enough, some officials in the Near Eastern Division of our State Department have been echoing their views recently. They have been preaching political sermons to the Jews of America which well could have been written by ghost writers hired by Mr. Lessing Rosenwald.

I do not believe that these officials represent the true sentiments of the leaders of our Government, the President of the United States, or the Secretary of State, who have time and again given expression of their deep and sympathetic interest in the security and prosperity of Israel. I suspect, though of course I do not know, that the leaders of our

Government, being otherwise engrossed at the moment in the present extremely difficult international situation, with wars and revolutions erupting, and with critical international conferences monopolizing their attention, have been compelled to leave the affairs of the Middle East largely, although not entirely and not finally, in the hands of some people in the Department of State who have in the past displayed such an amazing genius for guessing wrong and for bedeviling the political situation. It is the same people, who a few short years ago backed the British mandatory regime in Palestine to the bitter end, who tried to persuade our people that there was no room in Palestine for a single additional Jewish immigrant, and who have been building one strong-man myth after another to serve as the keystone in the arch of American foreign policy in the Middle East, only to see their tenuous diplomacy crumble into ruins.

ARMS FOR IRAQ

At the moment, we are persuaded to believe that salvation in the Middle East will come from the feudal Government of Iraq, which is suddenly discovered to be a paragon of democratic virtue and most friendly disposed to the United States. Iraq is to be armed by our Government, not, to be sure, with sufficient military equipment to be a threat to Israel, but with just enough military equipment to resist possible Soviet aggression. Iraq will never use these American arms against Israel, we are assured, because it says so in the agreement—and agreements, as you well know—are never, never broken. It is not even clear whether there actually exists any such condition in the agreement. Iraqi spokesmen have said that the grant of arms to their Government was unconditional.

These officials, bent upon arming Iraq, are at the same time telling the Arab world that there is some justification for their fears that if the population of Israel were to expand materially through further immigration, it would be humanly impossible to maintain those people within the confines of the present state. In other words, they imply that Israel would be forced to undertake wars of aggression against the neighboring Arab States. A statement to this effect was recently made by Mr. Arthur Z. Gardiner, chief political and economic adviser of the State Department's near eastern division, testifying before the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

PRO-ARAB PROPAGANDA

The press report which carried Mr. Gardiner's statement also reported that Representative FRANCES BOLTON, of Ohio, chairman of the Near Eastern Subcommittee of the Foreign Affairs Committee, who is well known from her earlier violent anti-Zionist activities, and who appears to be the ready mouthpiece in the House of Representatives for all pro-Arab propaganda delivered herself of the following: "Israel has been reshipping strategic materials to the Soviet Union, thereby violating the Battle Act." She queried innocently whether Israel is actually such a bulwark against communism. She said, "Haifa was at one time the center of Russian propaganda." She also accused the Israelis of letting their land lie fallow, refusing to do farmwork, and expressed her expert judgment that Arabs are superior agriculturalists.

All this, of course, is strongly reminiscent of anti-Zionist propaganda antedating the establishment of the State. Mrs. BOLTON seems to be ignorant of the fact that the agricultural area of Israel has expanded in the last 6 years from 400,000 acres to nearly a million, and that agricultural scientists who get their information about agriculture from studying the soil and not from clipping coupons, have extolled time and again Israel's farming and reclamation achievements as among the finest in the world. It is strange that in making these charges against the Israelis, Congresswoman BOLTON had nothing to say about Arab boycotts and blockades which are seriously retarding the economic development of the entire Near East. While concerned with unfounded charges about Israel's reshipping strategic materials to the Soviet Union, she seems to be not the least concerned about the Arab blockade of the Suez Canal, which has made it impossible for Israel to obtain oil from nearby fields and has been compelled to purchase it from faraway Venezuela which involves excessive transportation costs, and that Israel today must buy considerable oil from the Soviet Union, to save on these transportation costs.

What blindspots these people develop when they come to ride a hobby or a lobby. How easily things get out of focus. And what dangerously unreliable guides they become for American foreign policy.

A VERY SERIOUS DETERIORATION

President Eisenhower and Secretary Dulles must know that Israel is no threat to the basic interests of American foreign policy in the Near East. They must know that Israel is a democracy, deeply rooted in the millenial democratic traditions of the Jewish people and Judaism, and that it will, to the last, defend its democratic way of life and institutions. They must know that there is a large reservoir of good will and gratitude to the Government and people of the United States among the citizens of Israel for having helped so vitally in the establishment of their state and for the economic assistance which has been given to it to this day. They are too proud to put their friendship on the auction block or use it in any diplomatic game of blackmail. They must know that Israel wants peace with all her Arab neighbors, and has time and again asked for it, only to be rudely rebuffed. They must know that Israel is prepared to cooperate in the solution of all the outstanding issues between it and its neighbors in a spirit of good will and is prepared to cooperate in any project such as the Jordan Valley Authority to benefit all the peoples involved, provided its own vital and legitimate interests are safeguarded. From all that has transpired in recent years they must know that the Arab League is an instrument for perpetuating turmoil, discord, and belligerancy in the Near East, and that there is no way of appeasing its intransigeance short of dismembering the State of Israel or liquidating it altogether. They must realize now that the New Look and the new approach which the above-mentioned officials and their colleagues advocated in respect to Arab-Israel relations have not only not improved matters but have contributed to a very serious deterioration. These officials are now attempting to cover up this progressive deterioration with speeches and propaganda designed to force concessions from Israel, with no assurance whatsoever of any countervailing action on the part of the Arab governments.

Part of this unfriendly propaganda is to suggest to the American Government and people, that the United States has contributed to the State of Israel grants-in-aid far in excess of what it has contributed to the Arabs. In order to make their case more impressive, they have had the amazing effrontery to include in American subsidies to Israel what the Jews of the United States have themselves out of their own personal contributions and through the purchase of Israel bonds, given to Israel; also what the German Government has contributed by way of reparations for Nazi depredations. Nothing is said by them of the hundreds of millions of dollars in oil royalties which the Arab States have been receiving annually from American oil companies—Iraq received in 1952, $110 million; Saudi Arabia, $170 million; Kuwait, $139 million—some of which millions at least might well have been contributed by these solicitous Arabs to the cause of the Arab refugees, in the same way that Jews have been contributing to Jewish refugees in Israel.

NO ARMS FOR THOSE COMMITTED TO WAR

The Arab States are committed to war against Israel. So long as they are so committed, they should not receive arms from the United States. They have violently resisted every effort that has been made inside and outside the United Nations to persuade them to sit down with Israel representatives in order to iron out their difficulties and to achieve peace. Just a few weeks ago Jordan gave additional proof, if such were needed, of the unwillingness of any Arab State to reach a settlement with Isarel. Jordan had presented complaints against Israel to the Security Council. The Council, after much wrangling, decided to go into the entire matter in the hope of improving procedures for carrying out the provisions of the armistice so as to avoid future unfortunate incidents on the borders. Jordan, which is not a member of the United Nations, was asked whether she would abide by the decisions of the Council which, by the terms of the Charter, all member states are obliged to respect. Rather than to commit herself to accept any pacific settlement which the Council might recommend, Jordan withdrew. Previously Jordan had refused a direct meeting with Israel to which she was obligated by the terms of the armistice agreement which she signed. It is clear that arms sent to one or another of these war-minded and peace-resisting states cannot by any twist of diplomatic dialectics be interpreted as an encouragement of peace.

ISRAEL SEEKS TO LIVE IN PEACE

The State of Israel has done nothing to endanger the position of any Arab state in the Near East. It is threatening no one. It covets no one's territory. It has instituted no boycotts and no blockades against any Arab state. It seeks to live in peace with everyone. It is convinced that through friendly cooperation and the pooling of resources, the whole area of the Near East can be developed in such a way as to bring prosperity and a higher standard of living, health, and education to all the peoples there. Israel has not flirted with Moscow to embarrass Washington. Israel will not sacrifice any of its already sharply apocopated territory of 8,000 square miles in order to augment the 2,700,000 square miles of its Arab neighbors. It will not agree to close its doors to any future immigration—to such who may wish to go there and may have to go there—in order to assure Arab governments that Israel will remain permanently weak and limited as to manpower while they get ready for their "second round." What folly to expect the Government of Israel to issue a Jewish white paper against fellow Jews. Within its present borders, given proper industrial and agricultural development, Israel can well support a population of four to five million.

These facts must be taken into consideration by any government or any statesman who wishes to be helpful in the situation. All those who ignore these facts will prove to be well-intentioned or ill-intentioned mischief makers.

OUR POLICIES ARE SUBJECT TO STUDY AND REVISION

There is a need for increased and effective organization to defend the political interests of Israel in the field of government and public relations, taking into account the increasingly bold propaganda and activities both of the open and the covert enemies of Israel. These pressure groups would like the American people to believe that not they, but only the Zionists constitute a political pressure group in Washington. What cynicism and what utter nonsense. Every group of American citizens which feels keenly on any vital issue will naturally make itself heard and should make itself heard in government circles. This is the only way that a democratic government can discover how its citizens feel about any vital issue, what the climate of public opinion is, and be guided in its action. Our first duty, of course, is to America and the interests of our beloved country are paramount. That does not mean that every policy of our State Department at any given moment is flawless and beyond criticism. The policies of our Government in other parts of the world, not merely in the Near East, have in some instances not been as successful as had been hoped. They are being constantly subjected to restudy and revision, and to the earnest criticism of patriotic American citizens.

Cushing Veterans' Administration Hospital

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 13, 1954

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to include herein the statement I made this morning before the Subcommittee on Hospitals of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs in favor of H. R. 9646, to establish a Veterans' Administration center at Framingham, Mass.:

Convert Cushing VA Hospital Into a Veterans' Home

(Statement of Hon. Thomas J. Lane, of Massachusetts, before the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, July 15, 1954)

Last month we celebrated the 10th anniversary of the GI bill of rights.

We are proud of this well-rounded program to rehabilitate the men and women who gave up the best years of their lives to protect us.

It is our obligation not only to provide eligible veterans with disability compensation, educational benefits, and hospital care—to mention but a few of a veterans' rights—but to carry out the continuing responsibility of caring for the aged, the homeless, and those who will never be well again.

Congresswoman Rogers, of Massachusetts, has prepared H. R. 9646, to establish a Veterans' Administration center at Framingham, Mass., to provide domiciliary care for needy veterans, and those suffering from chronic disabilities.

It is similar to H. R. 509, the bill I introduced for the same purpose on January 3, 1953. Other Massachusetts Congressmen, acting separately, have submitted companion bills, which indicate the growing public demand for a domiciliary home in the Northeastern States.

This is not a plan to clear a forest and build a resort hotel.

It is not a maximum cost project.

We look upon it as Operation Salvage.

To save the old and chronically ill veterans from abandonment by efficient conversion of an existing facility from one use to another.

The Cushing VA Hospital at Framingham, Mass., has more than paid for itself by the army of veterans it has saved from ill health by the excellent medical services it has supplied over the years.

Now that its duties have been taken over by more modern facilities, is not reason why we should junk this hospital, and dispose of it in haste.

Cushing is a familiar haven for tens of thousands of veterans who were rehabilitated by its competent care. It is a symbol of the Government's consideration for those whose health was impaired by their service in the Nation's defense.

We have seen other installations closed up or sold at a tenth of their real value, and we have been disturbed by such waste.

Cushing offers us the opportunity to set a new standard for the efficient use of Government buildings. As one use declines, we can convert it to serve a growing need. Duplication is avoided. Costs are cut. A new life for Cushing, as it is adapted to meet the changing needs of an aging veteran population, would be a service to them, and at a minimum charge to the taxpayers.

Cushing is near Boston, where the regional office of the Veterans' Administration is located.

It is the meeting place of the New England States, and a logical site for convenient service to dispossessed and chronically ill veterans.

In a quiet and peaceful environment, yet near to the world's finest medical facilities and skilled specialists at Boston.

This is an ideal spot for a veterans' home.

Ten years ago they were spending their splendid manhood for us in Normandy, and in the steaming islands of the Pacific.

Now some of them are disabled—beyond recovery.

If we are to complete our promise to them, we must begin to provide sanctuary for those who can never pick up the threads of their broken lives.

Cushing is available, and it can be converted into a rest home for old soldiers at a fraction of the cost that would be required to build a new facility for this purpose.

Cushing is an opportunity for us to fulfill the obligation inherent in the GI bill of rights.

Their job is done. Ours is continuing.

You Knew What To Say

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 15, 1954

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, within the last few days there has been brought to my attention an editorial from the Wednesday, June 30, 1954, issue of the Minnesota Legionnaire, which in my judgment is an outstanding declaration of our Independence Day spirit. The editorial was brought to my attention by my good friend and former associate, Mr. Orville L. Freeman, the distinguished Minneapolis attorney. I join Mr. Freeman in paying tribute to the message of freedom and liberty represented by the American Legion of Minnesota as it is expressed in the Legionnaire editorial.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial, as well as the letter which I received from Mr. Freeman, be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial and letter were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

You Knew What To Say

Korea, July 4, 1953.

It was 2 a. m. You were sleepy. The little shack that was office, pressroom, and everything else for the regimental paper was hotter than the hinges of hell.

At sunrise your outfit would be moving up to the front. That meant working all night to get the paper out. Sometimes you hated newspaper while guys up ahead were facing enemy fire.

Yet, everybody agreed the paper was important. A big morale booster. Something like special rations or extra mail from home. Even guys about to go into combat looked forward to seeing it. It gave them something else to think about, a chance to relax and forget for a while what was facing them.

You mopped your brow and looked at the copy. A story about a new guided missile. A peptalk from the "old man." An item on Marilyn Monroe, cribbed from a movie magazine. A report on the truce negotiations. Bits of news from home. And a cartoon by the regiment's Michaelangelo, to please the art lovers.

The words blurred. It was hard to hold your head up. There was a July Fourth editorial to bat out. But—what to write? What could you tell the guys who were thousands of miles from home, fighting to protect a little country from Red aggression?

Maybe if you closed your eyes you could think better. Now, let's see, "self-evident * * * that all men are created equal * * * that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights * * * that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. * * *"

And then you saw him. He was standing near the bulletin board. Tall. Red hair. Wearing a ruffled shirt and knee breeches. And that face—you'd seen it so many times on postage stamps and in history books. Tom Jefferson.

He came over and sat down, tapping idly against the table's edge with a long quill. "An Independence Day editorial, eh?" he said. "Well, soldier, I have an idea or two. * * *

"Put this in: What's happening here is part of the struggle that started back at Bunker Hill. There, Americans fought for a country where all the people, instead of some privileged class, would rule. Here, the South Koreans are fighting for the same thing—the right to rule themselves. By fighting the Communists here, you're not merely defending the independence of this little country—you're fighting for it everywhere.

"Soon an armistice will be signed. The shooting part of this war will be over. But the fight for liberty will go on. Why? * * * Because it's a never-ending job.

"And, soldier, make this very plain: Not all the foes of freedom are in foreign lands. Some are right at home—people who'd fight communism by adopting some of its worst features. They'd force our schools to teach only what meets with their approval * * * they'd curb our free speech and radio * * * they'd make Americans afraid to speak their minds. And they'd invade our traditional rights in the name of national security. These people should recall Ben Franklin's wise words: 'They that can give up essential liberty to attain a little temporary safety deserve neither liberty nor safety. * * *'

"And there are bigots—people who discriminate against a man because of his color or creed; who try to set up one group of Americans against another, weakening our national unity at a time when we need it most. * * *

"Soldier, Independence Day means many things. It means independence from hate, fear, distrust, mutual suspicion—the things that can wreck America. It means independence to speak, write, and think what you believe, no matter how unpopular your viewpoint—for in such freedom lies democracy's greatest strength. * * *

"Tell your buddies this: Victories on battlefields are wasted unless Americans keep on defending their liberty at home.

"Don't get me wrong. I believe we must keep our powder dry and be prepared to defend our liberties against Communists, Fascists, Imperialists or other aggressors and that eternal vigilance is the price of liberty."

LARSON, LOEVINGER, LINDQUIST,
FREEMAN & FRASER,
Minneapolis, Minn., July 9, 1954.
Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: I'm forwarding to you a copy of an editorial which appeared in the Minnesota Legionnaire of Wednesday, June 30, 1954.

This editorial expresses very effectively the basic conception of the American way of life. It made me proud to be a Legionnaire.

I'm sending it to you in the hope that it may be brought to the attention of more people for the benefit of our country.

Sincerely yours,
ORVILLE L. FREEMAN,
Attorney at Law.

Meeting of Seventh National Student Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 15, 1954

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I was pleased to hear from Mr. James M. Edwards, president of the United States Student Association, with regard to the forthcoming seventh annual student congress, to be held on the campus of Iowa State College, at Ames, Iowa, from August 22–31, 1954.

The congress will bring together some 800 elected student leaders from every corner of America, as well as some 30 representatives of national student organizations of the free world. The theme of the 9-day session will be the Responsibilities of Freedom.

I welcome this conference as another splendid bulwark of sound thinking on the part of the student body of the United States and of students of the free world—the young men and young women who tomorrow, figuratively speaking, will take over the world.

For too long, international communism had almost preempted the field of mass organizing of young university people. That is why I am so delighted that youngsters dedicated to the free way of life have banded together. It is really remarkable, Mr. President. They are discussing in the free way the ideas that are challenging them.

I send to the desk the text of an article carried in the March 17, 1954, issue of the Christian Science Monitor, and ask unanimous consent that its text be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, to be preceded by a list of the officers and members of the advisory council of the USNSA. The tile of the article is "Anti-Communist Bulwark: NSA Recruits World's Students To Spread Democracy." I think all of us can well take time to think about the significance of that gathering.

There being no objection, the list and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES NATIONAL STUDENT ASSOCIATION,
PHILADELPHIA, PA.

President, James M. Edwards, University of Illinois.

Executive secretary, Janet C. Cooper, University of Detroit.

Vice president, national affairs, Eugene H. Keating, College of St. Thomas.

Vice president, international affairs, Leonard N. Bebchick, Cornell University.

Vice president, student affairs, Lois MacPherson, Upsala College, 495 Watchung Avenue, Bloomfield, N. J.

Vice president, educational affairs, Cynthia Courntney, Dunbarton College, 4433 14th Street NE., Washington, D. C.

Vice president, student government, Amy Botsaris, Pennsylvania College for Women, 24 Risley Hall, Ithaca, N. Y.

Director, Educational Travel, Inc., C. Edwin Lacks.

Advisory council: Lucile Allen, dean, Pennsylvania College for Women; Wallace M. Alston, president, Agnes Scott College; Ralph J. Bunche, Director, Department of Trusteeship, United Nations; Erwin D. Canham, editor, Christian Science Monitor; Christine Y. Conaway, dean of women, Ohio State University; Althea Kratz Hottel, Director, Commission on Education of Women, American Council on Education; Clifford Houston, dean of students, University of Colorado; A. Blair Knapp, president, Denison University; Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt; George N. Shuster, president, Hunter College; Harold E. Stassen, Director, Foreign Operations Administration; Rev. Celestin J. Steiner, S. J., president, University of Detroit; Robert M. Strozier, dean of students, University of Chicago; Hurford E. Stone, dean of students, University of California; E. G. Williamson, dean of students, University of Minnesota.

Educational Travel, Inc., 48 West 48th Street, New York, N. Y. International Office, 52 Boylston Street, Cambridge, Mass.

[From the Christian Science Monitor of March 17, 1954]

ANTI-COMMUNIST BULWARK: NSA RECRUITS WORLD'S STUDENTS TO SPREAD DEMOCRACY

(By Mary Handy)

CAMBRIDGE, MASS.—The Communists and the free world are playing a desperately earnest game of chess for the allegiance of university students all over the world.

Although the Communists have won little or nothing in the schools of the United States, they have been markedly successful in southeast Asia, South America, and among students in many underdeveloped parts of the world.

The Communist controlled International Union of Students, with annual conferences, attractive magazines, and European radio broadcasts in seven languages is drawing students to its "peace offensive."

Meanwhile, a grouping of free-world students, representing national student unions in 44 countries is working—on a much smaller budget—to spread democracy. Its primary aim is to help students all over the world to work together without political bias.

DEMOCRACY ON STUDENT LEVEL

This is the picture described by Leonard Bebchick, vice president of the National Student Association in the United States, and director of the association's international headquarters in Cambridge.

This is what Mr. Bebchick, who is taking a year off from Cornell where he was a junior last year, is concerned with every day. On a student level he works to spread democracy among all the foreign student groups the NSA is associated with.

Mr. Bebchick and his associates spend their days poking into student activities in all parts of the globe. And they're convinced that its on the student level that one of the most vital battles between communism and democracy is going on today.

"Student life in the United States is not typical," they point out. "Twenty percent of this Nation's young people go to college. They are largely engaged in getting an education and only mildly active in political movements."

But in many Asian and South American countries only a minute fraction of the young people attain university education. Those who do are almost certain to develop into important leaders in their countries. Many are political forces while at school. Today's student leaders may be tomorrow's cabinet ministers.

The NSA has recently sent several graduate student teams to South America and Asia to survey student movements there.

While at Harvard, James Grant, now an assistant to Harold E. Stassen, Foreign Operations Director, was sent to southeast Asia for the NSA. He came back with this report:

The total population in six countries there he likened to that of the United States—but the university population he found comparable in size to the student body at one American university—the University of California.

Student affairs in Burma are of vital importance to the nation, he said. While he was in Burma the inauguration of a student body president was attended by several cabinet representatives, a group of members of parliament, and two envoys from foreign embassies.

The need for trained personnel is so acute in Indochina that he found that every young lawyer who had graduated from law school the spring before already had become a judge.

Communists have rightly been considering student movements of equal or greater importance than labor movements in southeast Asia, this graduate student reported. They have been deluging them with propaganda.

To back up these convictions the NSA headquarters on the second floor of an old building near Harvard Square here has thousands of letters from student groups all over the world.

They are filed in cases from floor to ceiling. Writing and answering them keeps Mr. Bebchick, Leonard Radio (a Dartmouth graduate), two secretaries, and seven part-time graduate and undergraduate students busy.

There are also shelves of reports like James Grant's, made by graduate students in foreign countries. By thumbing through these letters and reports one can visualize the situation of student groups in Venezuela or Sweden or Indonesia. One can find what scholarships are available, what kinds of student government are prevalent, the possibilities for student travel and hosteling—and the strength of the Communist student movements.

Mr. Bebchick explains that world alinement of national student movements started in 1946. As a byproduct of youth's idealism for peace following World War II, the International Union of Students (IUS) was formed.

To its headquarters in Prague came student groups from many countries, including the United States. They talked about athletics, hosteling, student travel—everything that concerns students.

But by 1949 it became apparent that the International Union of Students was Communist controlled.

So 16 national student groups broke away and held their own meeting in Stockholm. The National Unions of Students, they called themselves. They set up a coordinating secretariat in Leiden, Holland. They denounced the IUS as "partisan political." They attempted to steer clear of politics themselves and work toward bettering the lot of students in many countries.

Gradually this free-world convocation of students has grown. In January 1954, several hundred student leaders representing national unions of students in 44 countries attended its conference in Istanbul.

ACCOMPLISHMENT SEEN

"It was a wonderful meeting even though it was so cold we had to wear our overcoats all the time," explains Mr. Bebchick. "The magnificent palace in which we met was unheated.

"It's a tremendous accomplishment that students from such a wide number of diverse cultures can meet for the purposes of common cooperation. It's a real step toward world cooperation. We considered plans for scholarships, student travel, study abroad, student influence on university administrators—even an international student identity card."

And, most important, student groups from the democratic countries were working to show the value of democratic methods.

Students from all over the non-Communist world attended the Istanbul conference except those from Japan, Bolivia, Ecuador, and Panama. The national student unions in these countries belong to the IUS.

Student unions in Indonesia and Finland sent representatives to both groups.

For the first time this January an IUS Communist student leader attended the free-world meeting. "But," says Mr. Bebchick, "everyone was so interested in what they were doing they paid little attention to him."

The rest of the time, between conferences, student leaders in Leiden at the coordinating secretariat are working to develop free-world student cooperation.

SCHOLARSHIPS ARRANGED

Mr. Bebchick and his coworkers at the NSA international headquarters in Cambridge are arranging for scholarships in the United States, inviting student leaders to the United States, and working to improve conditions in many countries.

With students in other democratic countries, they are opposing a government move in South Africa that would impose segregation in universities in Cape Town and Johannesburg.

The NSA international work is largely financed by gifts from foundations. But its mission is too little known among Americans, Mr. Bebchick insists.

"The Communist-youth groups have gotten the most publicity—even in the United States," he remarks ruefully.

He will show you attractive magazines with colored photos the Communists put out calling for peace and filled with articles about everything from Ralph Waldo Emerson to a story by a young British youth about My Soviet Visit.

The only publication the free-world student group has put out, so far, is a rather amateurish information bulletin.

"It's vitally important what we are doing," says Mr. Bebchick. "We need to let people know about it. We need more support. Today's student leaders can be tomorrow's world leaders."

Question of the Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 15, 1954

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, can anybody tell us what "peaceful coexistence" means to Moscow?

Treasure Worth a King's Ransom: Records 300 Years Old on the Lives of the Colonists of Old Bergen Church of Jersey City, N. J.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 15, 1954

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, a sign on the Jersey side of the Holland Tunnel tells a tourist that Alexander Hamilton founded Jersey City, N. J.

History tells us that in 1609 when the *Half Moon* cast anchor off the Jersey shore and the Dutch hit the beach, they planted their flag on the summit of Old Bergen, top most point of the terrain overlooking the Hudson, now a part of Jersey City, in which is situated the Old Bergen Church, founded 294 years ago, in 1660.

This year, the Old Bergen Dutch Reformed Church of Jersey City celebrates its 294th birthday. In a vault of the church are records on the lives of colonists who walked the grounds of Old Bergen almost 300 years ago.

The sign on the Jersey side of the Holland Tunnel recalls our Revolutionary past. Hamilton, Washington, Grove, Mercer, Monmouth, Montgomery, all have streets named after them. Morris, Sussex, Essex, Henderson, familiar names of Revolutionary America, some of whose battles were waged in downtown Jersey City.

But the purpose of this commemoration, Mr. Speaker, is to turn the pages back 100 years beyond the Revolution, to honor the church of those earlier men whose faith, as is ours, was, "In God We Trust."

Under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to insert an article on the Old Bergen Church as it recently appeared in the June 5, 1954, issue of the Jersey Journal, of Jersey City, and Hudson County:

PRICELESS TREASURE OF NO INTRINSIC WORTH—OLD BERGEN CHURCH SAFE HOLDS RECORDS OF 300 YEARS

A huge black safe with foot-thick walls in the basement of a Jersey City church holds a treasure worth a king's ransom.

But its only value is about $5 cash, or a little more. Paper sells at 25 cents per 100 pounds.

The treasure consists of a record of the lives of the colonists of Old Bergen. It is the nearly 300-year-old history of Old Bergen Church.

DATES BACK TO 1666

The names of the streets of Jersey City are recorded in the baptismal registers, dating from January 1, 1666:

Booraem, De Kalb, Newkirk, Prior, Quincy, Rademann, Randolph, Richard, Sayles, Sip, Stuyvesant, Suydam, Tuers, Van Buren, Van Cleef, Van Horne, Van Houten, Van Keuren, Van Nostrand, Van Reypen, Van Vorst, Van Wagenen, Van Wart, Van Winkle, Vreeland, Vroom.

The names of Jersey City's history slide down yellowed pages; their births, baptisms, marriages, deaths, and burials.

FIRST IN HOLLAND DUTCH

They start in Holland Dutch and painfully record each step until, on a long page in 1809 without a pause for reflection or a hesitation in the fine Spencerian script, they switch their tongues:

1809—Joseph Van Winkel is overleeden den 4ten Augustus, den 5ten ditto begraven.

1809, James Crane, son of Morris Crane, died the 17th of August and was buried the same day.

And so it goes on:

"Mink," servant of Garrett H. Newkirk and Sare, servant maid of Daniel Van Winkle, adults, baptized and taken into membership July 7, 1816.

They married, the children are born, year after year, and are baptized, and themselves are married, and have children, who are baptized.

1771 CHARTER

The old church charter of 1771, granted by King George III, lies yellowing in the safe. The original conveyance, from William Jackson and Abraham Prior, the last two survivors of the minister, elders, and deacons to whom the land was granted, was signed over to the church February 25, 1779.

And so Old Bergen Church took heir to most of the land surrounding Bergen Square. The records record the land deeds, the rolling farms on Bergen Avenue, the woods of Communipaw and the forests of West Side. The books record the sales, the transfers and the construction.

How in the 1660's the settlers built a palisade at Bergen Square to protect them from Indians, just in the shape of the squared off street as it appears today.

REBUILT IN 1841

And how, when the church was rebuilt in 1841, the new construction cost $15,467.04, and the furniture was bought by the ladies of the congregation for $400.

The old safe also holds the mementos of the past.

A booklet, gift of the Reverend Benjamin C. Taylor to Mrs. Sophie Honeck on the occasion of her marriage July 10, 1855, is entitled "The Christian Minister's Affectionate Advice to a Married Couple."

CONTINENTAL MONEY

Continental paper money from the "United Colonies" and from the colonies of New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Connecticut is stored in the vault's drawers.

And the only article of intrinsic value, among the hundreds of books and documents now yellowing and fading with age as the church celebrates its 294th birthday, is an old silver baptismal plate. It is worth?

"Perhaps 2 or 3 dollars," the curator said.

A Salute to Columbus, Ind.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 15, 1954

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, the initiative and industry of one of our fine Indiana cities, Columbus, has been recognized editorially in some of the Nation's leading publications. The latest of these articles is in the July issue of Fortune magazine. This article is the basis for an excellent editorial in the June 28 issue of the Indianapolis News. I ask unanimous consent to have the News editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A Salute to Columbus, Ind.

Columbus, that amazingly energetic Indiana city, receives deserved national recognition in the July issue of Fortune magazine.

This publication, devoted to comprehensive, painstaking articles about business and industry, takes cognizance of the way Columbus industrialists and other citizens have joined hands to lessen that city's acute growing pains.

Most urgent was the problem of building enough schools to house the children of a population that had doubled within 10 years. School funds were wholly inadequate. The way Columbus met that challenge through industrial and individual contributions is by now a familiar story to many Hoosiers.

The same enterprise and cooperation was displayed in the fields of housing, traffic, and municipal improvements. Nor did the city forget the recreational needs of its youth. It established a program of youth activities that is financed by a $50,000 contributed annual budget. Fortune reports that juvenile delinquency now is almost nonexistent in Columbus.

The record of accomplishments is one of which Columbus may well be proud. It has provided a noteworthy example for other American cities. And its story is one of the finest answers that can be found to the Communist propaganda line that industry and free enterprise are oppressors of the people.

Senator Humphrey's Greetings to the People of Ulm, Germany

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 15, 1954

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, recently it was my privilege to participate in a radio program sponsored by the Voice of America and broadcast throughout Western Germany. The Voice of America broadcast highlighted and brought attention to a most worthy program of exchange of people between the city of Ulm, Germany, and the city of New Ulm, Minn. The efforts of local communities and individual citizens to build bridges of friendship and mutual understanding greatly strengthens the free communities of nations and people. Many American communities have demonstrated similar friendship to their neighbors in European cities, towns, and villages. Such exchange programs, whether sponsored by government or the voluntary and spontaneous undertaking of local communities or private groups, build greater understanding of our respective countries. These heartwarming expressions of friendship strengthen our foreign policy.

I congratulate the people of New Ulm, Minn., and their neighbors in Ulm, Germany.

I ask unanimous consent to have my message of greetings to the people of Ulm, Germany, as broadcast over the Voice of America program, be printed in the Appendix of the Record. It was, indeed, a great honor and privilege to be the spokesman on this broadcast for the people of Minnesota, and in particular, the citizens of New Ulm.

There being no objection, the message was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Senator Humphrey Extends Greetings From New Ulm, Minn., to Ulm, Germany

My greetings to the people of Ulm, Germany. It's a privilege for me to talk to you in behalf of the people of Minnesota, whom I represent as their United States Senator. We in Minnesota are proud of the fact that this summer we will be host to a number of your citizens and that you will be host to a number of our citizens. We're proud of our own city of New Ulm, Minn., and the German heritage which it represents.

In Germany the place where the Danube and the Blau Rivers flow together to become navigable is called Ulm. In America, in my State of Minnesota, on slowly rising terraces at the juncture of the Minnesota and Cottonwood Rivers stands the city of New Ulm. But this is not merely coincidence.

It all started a hundred years ago when a young German named Beinhorn, from Braunschweig, with six other Germans, whom he had met in a Chicago evening school, founded the Chicago Land Society for the purpose of finding a tract of land where they could build themselves a home; maintain their old customs and traditions; and work out their problems in their own way. In 2 months, 60 men had joined Beinhorn's society and by the summer of 1854 the association had grown to about 800 members—almost all workingmen. After rejecting several sites the group finally settled on what seemed to be an ideal one and in the early part of 1855, one of the settlers, Jacob Haeberle, named the settlement New Ulm, in memory of his German home.

New Ulm, Minn., and Ulm, Germany, had other close parallels in their development. As Ulm was burned down by Henry the Lion, so too was New Ulm burned almost to the ground in the two most important battles of our Sioux Indian War of 1862. But as Ulm soon recovered from its disaster to become an important city, New Ulm was also reorganized when the settlers returned to reestablish their frontier homes.

The history of German culture recalls the fact that Ulm was the spot where the Meistersingers lingered longest preserving without text and without notes the traditional lore of their craft. So, too, like its German namesake, New Ulm has been influential in perpetuating the German cultural influence in Minnesota by the establishment of a flourishing German theater. The New Ulm German theater certainly was responsible in part for the fact that such pure German was spoken there by later generations.

The migration of German settlers westward had an important influence not only on the town of New Ulm, but also on the entire State of Minnesota. Of the early groups migrating to Minnesota from abroad, it was the Germans who came in the largest numbers. They were a hardy and courageous people who brought their families with them. They sought good farm land with an adequate supply of wood and access to a navigable stream. They have become superb farmers and efficient business people in my State. The extent of this migration is reflected even today in Minnesota where according to the 1950 census of population, almost 25 percent of the people in our State were either born in Germany or are of German descent. The influence of their culture and way of life have become infused into the life of my State of Minnesota, and, indeed, into the life of the entire Nation.

Like the pilgrims and other early settlers, the German immigrants were seekers after enlightened democracy, equal opportunity, and justice, regardless of race or creed. In a word, they sought liberty. The appreciation of these German settlers has been expressed in the contributions they have made to their new adopted land. They have helped to develop America's culture and defend its freedom. They have tilled our soil, turned the wheels of our industry, and advanced our science. Great names in Government like Carl Schurz, father of our civil-service program, and the late Senator Robert F. Wagner—names like Damrosch and Stock in music or Mergenthaler in the printing industry. The kindergarten, and in many respects, the university, which are such vital parts of our system of education, were borrowed by Americans of German origin from their native land. The inventive genius of American-German immigrants has paid America large dividends. Distinguished among the great industrialists are many Americans of German lineage. They advanced because of their ability as bridge builders, chemists, engineers, merchants, developers of scientific apparatus, lithographers, printers, and brewers. These are just a small indication of the role German-Americans have played in the development of our Nation.

New Ulm is a shining example of the happy combination of the best of German traditions with American principles of liberty and freedom. Its future growth, like its past, will continue to express the best in the ideals and history of its forbears and the United States of which it is a vital part.

Is Everybody Anti-Semitic?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. GWINN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 15, 1954

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article appearing in the July issue of American Mercury, by Rabbi Benjamin Schultz, a distinguished leader and patriot in my district:

Is Everybody Anti-Semitic?

(By Rabbi Benjamin Schultz)

An injustice is being done the Jews. The word "anti-Semite," hurled indiscriminately, is becoming ridiculous. It's losing all meaning. Its sting is being dulled, and bigots made respectable.

Take that mass mailer of vicious diatribes against "Jewish Bette Davis" and "Jewish Kirk Douglas," bluntly suggesting violence against the Jews. He can now boast of innocence by association. "If I am anti-Semitic," we fancy him saying, "why, that's all right, because according to the bleeding hearts, so is every decent American from Richard Nixon to John T. Flynn, and from Tom Dewey to Fulton Lewis."

It's the liberals, through their broadside accusations, that have handed the crackpots this whitewash on a silver platter.

A cynical lot, quite cold to their racial pawns' ultimate hurt, the liberals don't mean to stop. Their gimmick is working. They have their motives, their weapons, and their dupes.

It's high time all three were exposed.

Senator Wayne Morse told an Alabama Jewish audience that Congress is riddled with anti-Semitism. He raised the specter of all Jews being driven from the United States. "I am amazed," the Senator declared, "at the number of my colleagues who in private meetings closed to the press, and in cloakroom sessions which go unreported, fight viciously to refuse aid and haven to millions of displaced human beings just because they are Jews." Legislative halls, he said, resound to "hatred for the Jews of America and of the world."

Spurred by such eminent authority, minority mongers sprang to action. Milton Friedman, in his widely syndicated Jewish column, typically announced that Eisenhower had embraced "anti-Catholic and anti-Jewish elements"; that "Senator Jenner tried to get the American Legion to join the anti-Semitic smear campaign against Anna Rosenberg"; and that the following are also undesirable: Richard Nixon, Robert A. Taft (defender of "rights of Nazi war criminals"); Representatives Leo Allen, Charles Halleck, Clare Hoffman; Senators Bricker, McCarran, and McCarthy. The Bricker amendment, by the way, was opposed because it "would make it impossible for the United States to endorse the U. N. genocide agreement."

That was the year Los Angeles' Jewish Community Council defended Nixon against charges of bigotry after photostats of his alleged "restrictive covenant" house lease had been circulated. Yes; and President Harry Truman conjured Hitler's ghost against Candidate Eisenhower, who, he said, "is willing to accept the very practices that identified the so-called master race."

This recalls that 10 years ago a Presidential aspirant was linked to Gerald L. K. Smith by the powerful Chicago Jewish Sentinel, which asserted Smith was "working hard" to elect him. "He is," the paper said of the candidate, "the last hope of the America First crowd and their seditious followers." He appeals, agreed the New York Jewish Review, to the "illiterate, bigoted, and intolerant."

That man was Thomas E. Dewey.

Now a darling of the "unbiased" set, Dewey, of course, was really the same then as he is now. It could happen to anyone.

There's an odd hysteria about all this. The admirers of Bricker, the late Bob Taft, Nixon, McCarran, and McCarthy comprise a large majority of Americans. Is this majority anti-Jewish? If it is, the Jews are in a bad way. For not only are they misfortune's victims, but there must be something really wrong with them. (Americans, noted for far-flung kindliness, would despise overwhelmingly only people that deserved it.)

Neither hypothesis is true. The scions of an historically persecuted group have been fortunate here. They have, in turn, served and been appreciated. In business, and in the arts and professions, amity prevails. Abraham Ribicoff was almost elected United States Senator from Connecticut in the Republican year 1952, outrunning his fellow Democrats. Shortly thereafter, Lewis Strauss was unanimously acclaimed as Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission. In 1953, Harold Riegelman, candidate for New York mayor, carried a large Gentile county, and lost the Jewish ones. The people acted purely as Americans—which they should have. And plain folks stay affectionate toward Eddie Cantor, Jack Benny, and the personable Eddie Fisher and Red Buttons. In fact, early this year an old and famous Jewish organization declared, "A new atmosphere of greater racial and religious amity has been created in America."

Why, then, has Senator Herbert Lehman compared Senator Joseph McCarthy with Hitler? Lehman's unrevised estimate stood in January 1954, when McCarthy's Gallup poll rating reached its peak, showing a majority of the country with him. If the people of the United States favor a Hitler, where is the new atmosphere of greater racial and religious amity proclaimed by Lehman's close friends—that same month of January?

Let's go further. Why the continued hysteria? The largest racial weekly, the Brooklyn Jewish Examiner, actively pursues its policy blazoned in black type in 1950: "We have no faith in the future security of American Jewry." It fears torture chambers and mass graves, echoing a Bronx organ which sees in the Washington loyalty hearings "the Brown House in Munich."

While the average citizen, Jew or non-Jew, remains calm, this mounting hysteria of certain spokesmen poses a peril. Most of them have now added Velde and Jenner to the rubric of McCarthyism. They oppose them. America supports them. There's dynamite there.

Embattled Joe himself was the center of some floundering which itself reveals the root sources of the spokesmen's indoctrination, of which they may be unaware. A popular monthly asked a racial defense agency executive whether the Senator is anti-Semitic. The very question showed the inroads of propaganda, for McCarthy is anti-Communist. The answer came and was printed: "Our files reflect no evidence of anti-Semitic activity on the part of Senator McCarthy."

Maybe there was an office uproar, and maybe there wasn't. Maybe it was a coincidence. But the defense group, at once, circulated a statement that while he is not an anti-Semite in the crude or professional sense, "Senator McCarthy's methods have injured many of the democratic institutions" and "the extension of civil rights and liberties" upon which "the security of our minority groups is largely dependent."

There you have it. Translated from its mock-sociologese, this simply means that Red-hunting is anti-Semitism. It is an insult to the Jewish people. It links the Jews, officially, with the Communists at worst, and the ADA'ers and eggheads at best. No one has a moral right to do that to us, to defame the plain Jew on Main Street and in full view of American opinion to boost bigotry in the name of fighting it.

There's been too much of that going on; too much "faint praise" of conservatives in cautious reports; too much "Well, his bigotry is subtle"; too much smearing, from varied sources, of patriotic men and women, of honorable organizations—of the American Legion, Catholic War Veterans, Daughters of the American Revolution, Facts Forum—and, yes, of David Schine, Roy Cohn, Benjamin Gitlow, Frank Chodorov, the late Ben Stolberg—all anti-Reds. Cohn and Schine were not defended against Smith's racist attacks on them. The professional defenders were busy with civil rights elsewhere. Their anti-McCarthyism—nay, their anti-anti-communism—proved stronger than their Jewishness.

Most of them, non-Communists, would be horrified to face their ideological ancestor. It was Earl Browder who shouted in Madison Square Garden in the old days, "Anticommunism is anti-Semitism." This was the signal for the Red communications underground to plant that idea among Socialists, do-gooders, and liberal Republicans, who, as usual, didn't know what was happening to them.

A neat blow that was. At one stroke, the Stalinists got powerful allies; inflamed the anti-Semites who accepted Browder's syllogism that procommunism is pro-Jewishness and, therefore, Jews are Communists; and presumably hastened Lenin's revolutionary moment when groups would be at "loggerheads with one another."

Senator Morse asserted in Alabama that the "very same patriotism" being marshalled "to hunt Communists" is "also being used as an excuse for Jew-baiting." I would never accuse Morse himself. But I do insist that a genealogist should come up with a "family tree" of his idea. On it would be Alexander Bittelman. An official Communist minority leader, he wrote in 1947 that American "Fascist-like attacks" against Reds should remind Jews that "the day that Hitler started his anti-Communist crusade—on that day the path was cleared for the establishment of crematoriums and concentration camps." He'd been bolstered by a party 1946 resolution establishing not only that defending the Jew "is a fight of a general democratic character" (reminiscent of the liberals' later extension of civil rights) but that Jew-hatred will vanish "only with the abolition of capitalism."

Then Carey McWilliams appeared on the scene—a highly respectable figure. Senator Morse may have heard of him. McWilliams' book, A Mask for Privilege, exposed anti-Semitism as a capitalist plot, lambasted the "Protestant white majority," instigated the Jew, and recommended collectivism as a cure. He was a raging success, selling books, giving lectures, and achieving acceptance by big defense groups.

Formidable today, his power began in 1948, about Bittelman's time. Perhaps by a coincidence, McWilliams has been linked to dozens of Communist fronts, and in 1940 was identified in sworn testimony as a Communist by two witnesses before the House Un-American Activities Committee.

Lying quick to the flame, like dry brush in the forest, is an anxiety neurosis among some Jews. Millions of my brethren were massacred in Europe between 1941 and 1945. We have not all recovered from the shock. There are a few extremists among us who feel that because Jews came to a horrible end in Germany, ergo, we are about to be destroyed in the United States of America. Add to this old memories of czarist religious persecution, and we can understand William Zukerman, who says in his Jewish newsletter: "It is shocking to realize how much of that morbid psychology which had long disappeared even in Eastern Europe, has been transferred to and retained in this country by American Jews who were born and bred here. * * * One is at a loss to fathom what is the cause of this strange manifestation. Is it a lack of faith and trust in the American people and society?"

Mr. Zukerman should be assured that the average American of Jewish faith is an American; and certainly does not distrust the American people, who include himself. Insofar, though, as extreme pro-Israel propaganda has attempted to cast doubt on Jewish security here, it must be openly repudiated. On the delicate question of Zionism, however, it must be emphasized once and for all that there are good Americans on both sides. There is too much smearing of anti-Zionists as anti-Semites. Anti-Zionism is not anti-Semitism. And American Zionists, in overwhelming number, have but a sentimental bond to Israel of the type exhibited toward Ireland by St. Patrick's Day marchers, or to Canterbury by United States Episcopalians. There is no question of dual loyalty involved. Nor should the hate fringe of the Klux group, with its pure fantasy about world conspiracies and protocols, be dignified by the discussion of decent men.

The plain truth is that, conservative though they be personally, hysterical minority mongers are playing into the hands of the left.

Not that the left really cares about any minority. It certainly turns against the Jews when that's profitable. There isn't an election campaign in New York's mixed Garment Workers' Local 22 which is free from Jew-baiting and slanders. The Communists annually spread anti-Semitic lies among the Negro and Puerto Rican members directed against Charles Zimmerman, the local's head, and other officials who are Jews and anti-Communists. This tactic only reflects the persecutions of Jews in the Russian hinterland, where the commissars flourish through inflaming and dividing the populace. The abolition of Jewish communal life in Russia, the closing of synagogues and imprisonment of rabbis, and the periodic outbreaks of intellectual anti-Semitism, are by this time well known. Nor did the cynical exploiters of the Rosenberg case wince at the bigotry they themselves had aroused. Rather, they welcomed it.

The recent target of the Reds in this country has been Joseph R. McCarthy. As might have been predicted, there came out of nowhere in July 1953, a special supplement titled, "McCarthy and Anti-Semitism." It was contained in Jewish Life, a Communist monthly. Through its dreary pages of simple untruths and thrice-removed guilt by association, there is, of course, no mention of the annoying fact that McCarthy hasn't a bigoted tissue in his body. No mention of Steve Miller and James Packman, Jews, who led his campaign for reelection in Wisconsin. No mention of young Cohn and Schine, except to slur them.

What leaps up to you is this key sentence: "McCarthy has demonstrated an appeal, never enjoyed by the Gerald L. K. Smith type of professional demagog, to certain solid conservative elements. McCarthy has plenty of financing backing." Thus the Bittelman amalgam of minorities versus conservatives is still effective. A closer look shows this is a quotation from Joseph and Stewart Alsop, though with their permission, I am confident.

"A voice of warning must be raised," writes Dr. Abraham A. Neuman, president of Dropsie College, denominational Jewish school. "More insidious than anti-Semitism itself is the fear it inspires. It is a disservice to American Jewry to play upon its fears rather than upon its spiritual strength. It is a distortion of American history and an insult to our country to exaggerate the influence of crackpots and bigots as if they were in any way truly representative of America."

The average American Jew is just as much a victim of the hysterical minority-mongers as the average American is. The average American Jew is an unwilling victim, but he lets his so-called spokesmen get away with it because of sheer inertia on his part and the very human tendency to let things slide.

In America, last bastion of free opportunity, we must not let infiltration and organized deception weaken our inner defenses. The false charge of anti-Semitism is clouding the reputation of one fine conservative after another. This is hardly accidental. The true bigots, profiting from this implied respectability, would unhesitatingly join their Communist allies in destroying Jew and non-Jew alike. Today they live on each other and both feed on tension.

Now more than ever, Americans must judge their neighbors as humans and individuals, without distinction of race or creed. Let all understand that no Communist is either a real Christian or a real Jew. And let us not heed the alien sirens playing on our sensitivities for purposes of politics and eventually of treason.

Notice of Further Consideration by Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of Health Reinsurance Plan of President Eisenhower—It Is Not Dead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 15, 1954

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I am convinced from the response that has come from all over the Nation that the people are back of President Eisenhower's demand, that Congress provide a health plan of insurance that will enable the people to obtain adequate insurance, both as to coverage and rates, and that will enable them to meet the high cost of present day medical and hospital care.

The President's plan had a setback in the House on Tuesday of this week. I agree with the President that it was only a temporary delay. The bill is a well considered and carefully worked-out plan. It has no element of socialized medicine in it. It is simply a plan to encourage insurance companies to expand the coverage of their present policies by including long-term illnesses, such as cancer, heart disease, tuberculosis, and other diseases as against which there are no available policies issued at this time by any insurance companies. Health insurance of this kind will help families to carry the terrific costs that must be met in these so-called long-term illnesses. The costs are so burdensome today, even as to the ordinary illness as distinct from long-term illness, that it wrecks the financial structure of the average family.

This bill is entirely voluntary in character. There is no element of compulsion, hence in no way socialistic in character. It does not even have within it anything that would tend to, or lead to, socialized medicine.

It is purely and simply an insurance bill. It is drawn along lines of good insurance principles. It has the endorsement of many of the outstanding insurance executives of the Nation who met in consultation with President Eisenhower, and, likewise it has the support of the most substantial insurance companies in the country.

The opposition of the American Medical Association to the bill was without any justifiable basis whatsoever. In fact, it had the support of some of the most outstanding and forward looking physicians in the Nation. It in no way was detrimental to the best interests of any practicing physician. In fact it would be of vast help to their profession. The insurance policy would provide funds from which physicians' fees and hospital and other medical charges would be paid. Wherein does this interfere either with rights of the physician or the right of patients to have a free choice of physician? Instead of a detriment it would be a great benefit to the physician. It is for these reasons, namely, absence of any form of compulsion, and an assurance that money would be available to pay fees and carry the usual medical costs, that physicians who have studied the plan are in favor of it. The only physicians who indicated opposition are those who have not read the bill, or who have been willing to follow blindly the unfounded, untruthful, and deceptive propaganda that has been put out by selfish interests who are opposed for other than justifiable reasons.

It is time that the members of the American Medical Association took a look at the proposed legislation which is a part of President Eisenhower's health program—a program that has been and is being worked out with the greatest care by the efficient and capable Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Oveta Culp Hobby.

The American Medical Association that comprises 140,000 out of 220,000 physicians throughout the Nation is a fine and worthwhile organization with ethics of a high order. For this reason it should not permit a few executives at the top to assume to speak for the rank and file of the membership. It has been evident to me many times, and, in many ways by personal conversation with practicing physicians, and otherwise, that the pronouncements and propaganda in the name of AMA did not represent the views of the great body of fine physicians, members of the organization and otherwise, who have in the past and will continue to render in the future noteworthy and beneficial service to our people. The opposition of AMA to anything and everything that has been proposed by way of additional facilities and otherwise, for the health benefits of our people, is not in accord with the progressive spirit that has driven the medical fraternity to greater and greater heights and achievements. It is time that physicians study for themselves the plans and programs of this administration to improve the health and welfare of our people. This administration and each of us who are a part of it are keenly aware of the need that exists today, and, we are determined to prevent socialized medicine even getting a foothold, and, furthermore we believe we can meet and solve the existing need in a truly American way that recognizes the American principle of free enterprise and freedom of choice—reinsurance health.

The bill which the American Medical Association through its executive officers has opposed does nothing more than recognize and make effective in the field of medicine the same principle that underlies the Federal Deposit Insurance law that guarantees bank deposits, the law that guarantees loans of Federal Housing and the many other similar laws. It is a well recognized and established principle not only in Government, but, also in the everyday transactions in commercial and industrial activities. All such have worked satisfactorily. So would the President's reinsurance bill designed to encourage the writing of health policies that will cover the ills of mankind and help our people meet the staggering cost incident to illness.

Yesterday, July 14, 1954, President Eisenhower expressed, at his press conference, his views on the subject of his Reinsurance Health Plan. He left no doubt of his conviction that it is a good law and that he will continue his fight for its enactment, notwithstanding the temporary setback that it had in the House of Representatives on last Tuesday.

I include the remarks that President Eisenhower made on the above occasion. They are as follows:

> Ladies and gentlemen, in the campaign I made two promises that have to do with the health of the American people. I said, first, that I was opposed to socialized medicine and would use every single attribute and influence of the Presidential office to defeat any move toward socialized medicine.
>
> I also said in talking about the great deficiencies in medical care in this country and particularly for people who can't afford the expensive type of service that is now

available to us in our best hospitals that something must be done.

We were going to study ways and means to bring better medical care to the rural areas and bring good and fine medical care within reach of the average household budget. This is what we have been trying to do.

I am sure that the people that voted against this bill just don't understand what are the facts of American life.

I don't consider that anyone lost yesterday except the American people. There is nothing to be gained, as I see it, by shutting our eyes to the fact that all of our people are not getting the kind of medical care to which they are entitled.

I do not believe there is any use in shutting our eyes to the fact that American people are going to get that medical care in some form or other. As I say, I am the last one to believe that the answer lies in socialized medicine, and I am trying to provide a plan. If they want to amend the plan or to perfect it in some way, to go ahead; but when the opponents of the plan get up in the House and say that this is only an effort of the Republicans to redeem our campaign promise, I plead guilty.

Of course I am trying to redeem my campaign promises, and I will never cease trying.

This is only a temporary defeat. This thing will be carried forward as long as I am in this office.

It is the duty of everyone, Members of Congress, and individual citizens also, to support this noble effort of our President to improve the health of the Nation, and make possible the means that will enable our people to carry the cost of illnes in a less burdensome way than now prevails.

To the end that the bill shall have continued and further attention it is my intention to bring it again before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House on Tuesday, next, July 20, 1954.

The plan is good. It deserves to live and not die.

Here's Where War Mobilization Stands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 15, 1954

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I herewith submit for the Appendix of the Record an article from Nation's Business for May 1954 entitled "Here's Where War Mobilization Stands" and ask unanimous consent that the limitation on the length of articles to be printed in the Record be disregarded in this instance due to the importance to Members of Congress of the information contained in this article. I have been advised by the Public Printer that the article will make 2⅔ pages of the Rocord at a cost of $226.70.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Here's Where War Mobilization Stands

(By Sterling Green)

The vast destructive reach of the hydrogen bomb, which blew an island out of the Pacific, is increasing the urgency of the question:

Are the problems of defense insoluble?

No one working on them so admits.

Although estimates of damage from enemy attacks are being revised upward to take into account Russia's apparent mastery of the hydrogen bomb, experts are satisfied that preparations already made would make it impossible for an enemy to nullify at a single blow our one vast superiority—the war potential of American industry.

These preparations are the task of the Office of Defense Mobilization, led by the mild, scholarly and tireless Arthur S. Flemming, former president of Ohio Wesleyan University.

As he explains it, ODM is trying:

"To plan for every eventuality—a cold war, a police action, an intercontinental duel, or an atomic holocaust. No plan can be final, no decision can be irrevocable, no ODM file can be closed. We must be ready for vast and flexible action.

"When we freeze prices or production, we want to freeze in a state of normality. When we convert industry to munitions, we want a smooth turnaround without waste of time, manpower, plant capacity, materials, or money.

"We are far ahead of any peacetime period in our history in mobilized strength. But we still must devise ways to save the industrial base of mobilization from dismantling and deterioration in the periods of half war and cold war. We must improve the Government's mechanisms to convert industry swiftly from a potential into an arsenal.

"And we must protect the mobilization base from an atomic assault. For the first time in history we face the problem of producing while under attack. Industry is not behind the lines any more. It is the front line."

The vulnerability of United States industry is obvious. Seventy-one percent of our industrial capacity and 54 percent of our workers are in 50 great metropolitan centers.

Still the Armed Services Committee of the Senate recently confirmed that it has received plans for an "effective defense" against both atomic and hydrogen bombs although "complete protection" is impossible.

Though the dispersion standards were drawn long before an H-bomb blew an island out of the Pacific, ODM says they "took into consideration the damage effect of the anticipated nuclear weapons."

ODM has been checking up on itself anyway. Its 15 member Science Advisory Committee, headed by President Lee A. DuBridge, of California Institute of Technology, has reported that it is "well impressed with the standards for reducing vulnerability of industrial resources to atomic attack."

Mr. Flemming adds:

"Don't forget we would be dealing the enemy an even more devastating blow. The war could be won by the country best prepared for rapid recovery.

"If we do a good enough job, the attack may never come. Part of our task is to convince an aggressor that American industry is so well dispersed and protected that it is an unrewarding target. Russia has the capacity to strike, but we can remove the incentive."

The first phase of mobilization, a massive build-up of weapons on hand and capacity in reserve, is nearing completion. The second phase, that of perfecting and protecting the industrial base, finds ODM giving priority to six basic planning projects.

In summary these are:

1. Increasing the number of plants that are dispersed or otherwise protected from atomic assault. A vast, long-term industrial defense program has been launched.

2. Rewriting, updating, and enlarging the framework of control bills which the President would send to Congress on M-day.

3. Solving a double manpower puzzle. It will be harder to muster 13 million fighting men than in the last war; yet the military callup must not snatch away skilled manpower from vital industry. A reorganization of the military reserves is in the making.

4. Providing a ready-to-tap flow of materials to feed a ready-to-roll munitions industry. The planners have sought, and believe they have found, a minimum harness of materials control which can become a full-war allocation system overnight.

5. Finding workable methods to keep idle assembly lines in standby. Otherwise the base will deteriorate almost as rapidly as defense contracts run out.

6. Measuring and remedying the gaps and shortages in the mobilization base which would show up in war.

To meet these problems Mr. Flemming has broad powers—many of which he does not assert—and full planning responsibility.

But he acknowledges several superiors. He calls ODM a staff arm of the President, and has organized it on compact staff lines with a minimum of direct operating functions.

The cabinet-level National Security Council, on which he sits, lays down the broad policy objectives. ODM's programs are subject to review by NSC, occasionally are laid before the entire cabinet.

The staff arm, moreover has many hands. ODM lives up conscientiously to White House instructions to work so far as possible through established agencies. Twenty of them do ODM's bidding on mobilization matters. On occasion they are assigned the planning spadework, but primarily they manage stockpile buying, allocating material, lending for defense, and the other housekeeping duties.

In size ODM is small. As a former member of the Civil Service Commission and the first Hoover Commission, Mr. Flemming leans over backward to pare personnel and costs. He has shrunk ODM to between 300 and 400 employees.

When Mr. Flemming took his job, he split ODM into eight divisions. Each could be transformed, in a full mobilization, into an emergency agency—economic stabilization, war production, a manpower authority, and so on. Most of them are commanded by executives on loan from industry and serving 6 months to a year.

When his term in Washington is served, the departing executive finds that Mr. Flemming wants from him, and from his company, an agreement that he'll return in event of war.

With this technique, the ODM Director hopes he is training a mobilization reserve of men in top management who know their emergency assignments in time of war—and also know the ins and out of Government.

This rotation has its drawbacks, of course. Although a top-flight Government career assistant backstops each newcomer from industry, the high turnover of executives may now and then impair ODM's aggressiveness and followthrough. As this was written, ODM never had had all eight key jobs filled at the same time.

When ODM was created 3½ years ago its instructions were: Be ready by mid-1954. The Government no longer recognizes "critical years" or target dates, because the hazard is now, and from now on. But this is the state of the mobilization in mid 1954:

The present needs of national defense have largely been met. Supplies of munitions are good. Some items threaten to become storage problems. Except for aircraft and guided missiles, the production trend is pointing down.

Deliveries of military "hardware"—planes, tanks, ships, weapons, vehicles, and ammunition—hit their peak last May at $2,400,000,000. They had fallen below $2 billion a month by the turn of the year. Some production officials believe the rate may drop as much as 30 percent or more by a year from now.

Defense plant expansion also is in its declining phase.

Completions will keep construction volume high for many months, but the flood of ODM certificates for 5-year tax writeoffs has abated.

Of 240 industries which ODM deemed essential and for which expansion goals were fixed, 150 have been subscribed up to what ODM considers the needed capacity for full mobilization. These include many industries which were bottlenecks in World War II—machine tools, bearings, condensers, sulfuric acid, rubber, and railroad equipment. Ninety goals are unfulfilled, however.

Close to $30 billion worth of plant and equipment has been built or scheduled with the help of the accelerated tax amortization program (which permits a company to write off in 5 years, in depreciation for Federal tax purposes, a portion of the cost of a defense expansion). Roughly $25 billion worth is scheduled for completion by the end of this year; however, completions have been running about $5 billion behind expectations.

This much is clear: If trouble comes in the next 5 to 10 years, plant construction will not rob the war production effort of men and materials.

Stockpile progress is good but uneven. In dollar terms the strategic reserve of 76 materials is four-fifths full. But at the last accounting the goal was less than half achieved for 24 of the materials.

The establishment of new supply sources, coupled with slackened world demand, has improved the prospect for orderly completion of the minimum goals. But disturbing new factors have intruded. Mines, mills, and smelters are as vulnerable to attack as factories, and are even more vulnerable to declining defense orders and falling prices. Faced with serious shutdowns in lead, zinc, and other mining operations, the White House in March ordered ODM to review stockpile goals, increase them if advisable, and arrange for additional purchases—primarily from domestic producers—of perhaps 35 to 40 metals and minerals.

Moving from what's done to what yet must be done, here is a progress report on ODM's most urgent problems:

PROJECT NO. 1. INDUSTRIAL DEFENSE

Now at the top of ODM's priority list stands a big problem which only the brains and skill of management can solve.

ODM calls it "Continuity of Industry." The Commerce Department's Business and Defense Services Administration (BDSA), to which ODM has delegated the responsibility, calls it "Industrial Defense."

To assist Government in bringing this problem to management's attention, the United States Chamber of Commerce has scheduled a conference on industrial defense for June 15 in Washington. Purpose of the conference is to bring to the attention of business and industrial leaders the need for action on practical programs designed to protect critical facilities and assure continued production to the maximum extent that is possible.

BDSA will have made individual contact with top management of each of the 3,500 industrial facilities rated most vital to defense. It will attempt to persuade and assist each one to do what is needed and feasible to protect itself.

Simultaneously BDSA will try to persuade each of 33 major industries to work out an atomic defense-in-depth. This would be based partly on prearranged plans, worked out by industry task forces or trade associations, for the rapid transfer of production, workers, and materials from bombed-out plants to undamaged ones.

Economic and social trends are working for the mobilizers. About 4 percent a year of industrial capacity has been moving to dispersed sites.

An estimated 80 percent of all plants built since 1951 have been on dispersed sites. Last year 84 percent of projects which qualified for the rapid writeoff certificates were so dispersed.

Of the approximately 200 plants rated "most important" to national security, officials find that half are on dispersed sites.

An "industry evaluation board" in the Commerce Department is far advanced in the appraisal of some 75,000 manufacturing plants from the standpoint of defense essentiality. It has located 2,700 so far which qualify as "important to national defense." It expects the number to reach 3,500.

The 2,700 in turn have been broken down into a dozen or more groups according to criticality. Each of the 200 in the "most important" bracket is so listed because it produces a substantial part—say, 25 percent—of the Nation's entire output of some vital weapon, part, or product.

The 100 or so which would be under the bombsights will be hearing from BDSA soon. They may suspect their critical rating but will not be sure of it, because others of the 3,500 "important" producers will be dealt with at the same time.

Where a company has more than one plant, BDSA will try to persuade it to transfer the defense work to one in a dispersed area.

Or, if dispersal is not feasible, BDSA will explore with management the possibility of shoring up vital hard-to-replace machinery by protective construction or underground installation. One hundred percent TA writeoff for protective construction is an established policy, if the project meets standards fixed by the Federal Civil Defense Administration. Until recently this privilege was granted only to plants in critical target areas. Now it has been extended to plants in all target areas designated by FCDA.

In many cases it will be sufficient if the vulnerable producer knows where there is another plant which could quickly take over his production with some retooling and training of workers.

In a real pinch—where dispersion, protection, and transfer are alike impossible—it may be necessary to calculate how long it would take to rebuild the plant, then stockpile enough of its output to last during reconstruction.

For products which deteriorate, like film and drugs, a "rotating stockpile" is being studied. This is simply an enlargement of the manufacturer's inventory; if the producer would need 6 months to rebuild, he'd keep an extra 6 months' supply in stock. The Government might pay the extra carrying charges.

A few alert companies are far ahead of Washington. Some have built remote-control executive headquarters; many have microfilmed business records, cached away vital blueprints for construction, deposited emergency funds in dispersed banks, designated successors to company officers and plant executives who might become casualties.

ODM estimates that it may take 6 months for the average industry to compile the preliminary plan which will identify what it can do for itself and what must be left to the Government. Hence the emphasis on speed.

Ready to help out are industrial dispersion committees in 91 industrial areas representing four-fifths of the country's productive capacity. Forty-three have completed surveys identifying dispersed industrial sites.

PROJECT NO. 2. WAR POWERS AND CONTROLS

Because economic controls kick up the most dust in Congress, newspaper readers may be forgiven the impression that mobilization planning starts and ends with drafting freeze laws. ODM's general counsel, Charles Kendall, has a bundle of legislation which could go to Congress within hours any day.

If the bomb dropped tomorrow, Mr. Kendall admits, some of the legislation sent up would be makeshift, imperfect. Continuous revision and improvement will be needed, right up to M-day.

In a full-dress emergency, something like this would happen:

ODM would dispatch to Congress, via the White House, a bill authorizing an immediate freeze of prices, wages, and rents for 90 days. The same bill would carry consumer rationing and credit control authority. The President would select the freeze date.

There's nothing magic about 90 days; it just seems a reasonable period in which Congress could develop detailed price and wage laws to replace the freeze. Rationing probably would not begin the first 90 days, but the authority would be needed to let the responsible agency begin developing its ration system. Sales of shoes, autos, or other goods on which runs might begin could be halted to protect supplies pending rationing.

Simultaneously Congress would get a bill conferring on the President priority and allocations powers. The war powers would include shutting off civilian production, requiring acceptance and performance of Government orders—in short, the well-remembered works.

The first batch of bills also would cover requisitioning of private property; extraordinary procurement powers; censorship; authority to build and operate industrial facilities, and to seize existing plants.

Next attention would go to export and import controls, alien property, and authority to set up emergency Federal corporations which would buy materials, build plants, lend money, purchase equipment. Also, a parcel of stiff wartime taxes.

The rule of flexibility applies with special force in ODM's stabilization division, headed by Glenwood J. Sherrard, president of a hotel chain and a director of the United States Chamber of Commerce.

He has begun consulting with industry and labor on the specific laws and regulations which would replace the freeze.

The tendency to think of target areas as solely centers of population and industry has overshadowed another element of preparedness. The same cities are centers of commerce and credit. Unless plans are ready, hits on one or two financial centers would cause credit collapses, market closures, business failures and shutdowns of industry.

The Federal Reserve Board is ODM's chief agent in this area.

It has gone so far as to stockpile currency. Old but usable bills are being stored in safe places to meet the need for ready cash in damage zones.

That just scratches the surface. While banks have microfilmed and dispersed records, and designated branches to take over operations, the Federal Reserve Board is laying plans for emergency loans and other backstops for the credit system.

PROJECT NO. 3. MANPOWER

Manpower is a ticklish problem in many ways, but mostly because there isn't enough of it. Men, rather than plants or materials, will put the ceiling on the next war effort.

Any legislation seeking to curb an American's right to work where and when he pleases, and as much or little as he pleases, is automatically suspect. By the same token, the defense worker at the lathe will do a better job if he's there because he wants to be rather than because he has to be.

Some defense authorities doubt that those considerations remain valid in the atomic age. Won't compulsion be needed to send reconstruction workers into radioactive ruins?

ODM thinking favors voluntary controls.

Still, in ODM's vault lies the draft of a compulsory national service act. There is also a law relying on indirect measures to curb wartime job jumping and labor piracy.

For a guess: Mr. Flemming would offer both plans to the White House if war came, but he'd also submit ODM's recommendation in favor of the indirect approach.

PROJECT NO. 4. FLOW OF MATERIALS

Materials allocation is nine-tenths preparedness, one-tenth control. There are few shortage items. Yet ODM knows it must keep an allocation program running, if only in low gear. Should the defense materials system be allowed to lapse, many months would be required to reestablish a complete allocation program after M-day.

Business advised ODM 9 months ago, and ODM agreed, that the system in use up to April 1 couldn't hold together indefinitely. In a period of declining defense production its burden of cost, time and paperwork would inevitably cause a breakdown.

ODM handed this problem, too, to BDSA. BDSA's answer is the skinned-down system now in force. It eliminates 90 percent of the redtape but preserves a framework which could be transformed into a warstyle "controlled materials plan" overnight.

The industries most concerned—steel, autos, aluminum, and others—were consulted every step of the way.

Until M-day, the system will serve primarily as a continuing record of the metals consumption of prime military contractors.

The passing of allotments on down to hundreds of suppliers and subcontractors of bits and pieces is eliminated.

When the emergency arrives, the allotments automatically become ceilings which prevent a materials grabfest. Civilian production can be frozen at going levels, then curtailed and brought under the allocation system as military requirements climb.

PROJECT NO. 5. MAINTAINING THE BASE

ODM's people have written at least 16 tentative versions and a half dozen official drafts of a program to keep the costly machines of war in shape to roll again, once they have stopped. Somebody at ODM or the Pentagon found bugs in all of them. ODM is still trying.

By the time defense production is throttled down to a maintenance rate for the long pull, some 2,000 plants will have dropped out of the active mobilization base. The approach now being tested is to give each important producer a maintenance contract. It would reimburse him for keeping the Government-owned assembly line, tools, and machinery in ready-to-use condition.

Unhappily this would be expensive. Some judge $100 million a year would be needed to maintain the equipment for only 500 or 600 critical military items. Another sizable sum would be required for rental of the space.

Still, the cost would be insignificant compared to the billions spent during the Korean buildup alone on new tools and production equipment.

Ideally, the way to maintain a mobilization base is to keep it in production, but this becomes impractical when you start getting more production than you can use. Aircraft is the exception. The lines can be kept running at a good rate until 1958, officials estimate, with the funds in sight. Still, if you like to borrow trouble, consider what guided missiles might do to the aircraft program.

Some experts suspect that when long-range missiles are perfected the country can get along with half the strength in piloted planes.

In 1951 Secretary of Defense Charles E. Wilson, then head of General Motors Corp., proposed dual-purpose plants which could turn out civilian or defense products, or both, in the proportions to meet any degree of mobilization. The idea is sound, but ODM faces the fact that few such plants exist and the rest must be maintained somehow.

A start is being made despite the frustrations. Arrangements have been completed for the packaging and storage of the complete kit of Government-owned equipment and tools from the Chrysler-operated tank arsenal at Newark, Del.

Other agreements are being talked out with major producers. ODM and the Pentagon hope to arrive at a uniform workable policy soon; the mothballing problem will become truly formidable in 1955 when hundreds of large contracts run out.

PROJECT NO. 6. CLOSING THE GAPS

Simultaneously the industrial base must be reinforced in areas of weakness.

This job is running a year behind schedule, but daylight glimmers ahead.

The approach boils down to a preplanning of the economy for each of the first 3 years of all-out war. No nation ever has attempted anything like it.

ODM accepts the principle that capacity to produce is a military reserve of the highest order. Production equipment seldom becomes completely obsolete, but stockpiles of weapons quickly become so. Providing capacity is easier on the taxpayer, too. It has been estimated that $500 million spent on hard-to-make equipment for aircraft could increase the potential output of planes by $18 billion in the first 2 years of a full mobilization.

Congress in 1953 appropriated $250 million to the Defense Department for production equipment. None of it has been spent, but it remains available. Another $500 million is available to the individual services for their own allocation. In total, that's about all the Pentagon could spend in the next year if it knew exactly what equipment it wanted, and how much. It doesn't know, at this stage.

That's where the Thousand Items comes in.

By mid-1952 it became clear that staggering sums could be spent on preparedness without providing all the sinews for modern war.

A plan with the unpromising name of "Program to Measure the Production Potential Under Full Mobilization Conditions" was devised. The sparkplug was John D. Small, then chairman of the Munitions Board. He was abetted by Henry D. Fowler, last of President Truman's three ODM directors. Together they sold it to former Secretary of Defense Robert A. Lovett.

Work began with a target date for completion in the spring of 1953. The program was seriously set back, first by the change of administration, then by the Joint Chiefs of Staff's new look at defense. Momentum was regained last fall. Now the end is in sight.

By common consent the PMPPFMC became the Thousand Items, because the basic tool is a projection, made by the Pentagon, of the military's full requirements of 1,000 major military end items for each of the first 3 years of all-out war. This had been done. The rising curve of war production not only has been plotted by quarters and half-years, but has been translated into tons, forms, and shapes of materials.

This job began with an estimate in dollars of the country's total ability to produce under wartime conditions.

The dollar total was divided up—so much for the military, so much for essential civilian use, so much for each of several defense-supporting activities.

The Joint Chiefs of Staff in turn parceled out the military share among the three services.

Then the Pentagon began converting its armament schedules into tonnages of metal in needed forms, shapes and fabricated components, while ODM put the civilian agencies to work. The latter have compiled a calculation of civilian wartime needs. It calls for an austerity never dreamed of in World War II.

Now in process is the matching of the total military and civilian wartime demands against careful estimates of materials supply, plant capacity, and manpower availability.

Wherever it appears that new plant capacity must be built, Mr. Flemming has announced, every effort will be made to induce private industry to take on the job. The inducements may be tax write-offs, long-term contracts to purchase part of the production, loan guaranties, or direct loans.

As a final resort, Congress might be asked to provide funds for Government construction of standby facilities.

There would be no blanket request for plant-building powers, Mr. Flemming vows. Each request would cover a specific project.

Year by year the master blueprint will change as gaps are filled, the economy grows, and the strategy changes.

The thousand-items should become a basic vehicle by which the United States can move, in minimum time after M-day, to the maximum realization of its military power. If it succeeds, no country ever will have been prepared to throw so large a proportion of its total resources into war.

Freedom Is Everybody's Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 13, 1954

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following letter I have received from Mr. Thomas H. Buckley, president, American League for an Undivided Ireland, Massachusetts Council.

The letter and the article, Think Back to Erin, follows:

AMERICAN LEAGUE FOR AN
UNDIVIDED IRELAND,
MASSACHUSETTS COUNCIL,
Boston, Mass., July 13, 1954.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Enclosed is a reprint from the Boston Traveler of Thursday, July 1, 1954.

In northeast Ireland persons are subjected to house search without warrant, arrest without charge, detention without warrant; penalized for displaying the tricolor of Ireland, the emblem of their republic, or speaking their native language, as well as denied public housing and gainful employment.

Winston Churchill in 1912 stated:

"Whatever Ulster's right may be, she cannot stand in the way of the whole of the rest of Ireland. Half a province cannot impose a permanent veto on the nation. Half a province cannot obstruct forever the reconciliation between the British and Irish democracies and deny all satisfaction to the united wishes of the British Empire."

Your signature on the Congressman JOHN E. FOGARTY discharge petition relative to this matter is one way of letting the world know that freedom is everybody's business.

Thank you.

Very truly yours,

THOMAS H. BUCKLEY,
President.
MARGARET M. O'CONNOR,
Secretary.

[From the Boston Traveler of July 1, 1954]

THINK BACK TO ERIN

When Winston Churchill speaks to the world one never knows what to expect.

He is equally adept at brilliance, belligerence, bombast, or baloney.

The joint statement on policy that he signed with President Eisenhower in Washington this week is an excellent example of Churchillian balderdash, appealing in sound but limited in meaning.

A vision of the green hills of divided Ireland comes to mind as we read through the text of that statement:

"We uphold the principle of self-government and will earnestly strive by every peaceful means to secure the independence of all countries whose peoples desire and are capable of sustaining an independent existence. * * *

"As regards formerly sovereign states now in bondage, we will not be a party to any arrangement or treaty which would confirm or prolong their unwilling subordination. In the case of nations now divided against their will, we shall continue to seek to achieve unity through free elections supervised by the United Nations to insure they are conducted fairly."

That's what the man said.

In case he's forgotten, we remind him of a parliamentary election for all Ireland, held under the auspices of the British Army in December 1918.

The vote was 79 to 26 in favor of a united and independent republic.

Even in the nine counties of Ulster, a majority of those elected favored the republic.

So Britain took 6 of those 9 counties and set up Northern Ireland, and that was the last all-Ireland election on record.

Of those six northern counties, Tyrone and Fermanagh today consistently favor a united Ireland. So do broad areas of the remaining four, but they can't whip the gerrymander that holds them in its beak.

Churchill has signed some brilliant statements in the course of modern history, but this wasn't one of his inspired moments.

He has gone on record in support of the very principles that Britain ignores or denies in her dealings with the Irish.

To be consistent, he should have extended the policy statement by two words: "Ireland excluded."

Echo Park Dam—Too Much Heat and Not Enough Light

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 15, 1954

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, it is often said that a little knowledge is a dangerous thing. I know this is true in the field of medicine—it must be true in other problems facing Congress.

The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, of which I am chairman, is often bombarded with the pros and cons of arguments on many subjects that seem to carry more heat than light. Emotions the easily aroused whenever you discuss the subject of conservation.

I have always been a firm believer in the fact that if the people know the truth, they seldom make a mistake. I believe knowing the truth will make you free. In that spirit I submit certain questions and answers that have been frequently asked on the subject of the Echo Park Dam in the upper Colorado River Basin. As chairman of the committee which is handling this legislation, I have tried to maintain a constructive and objective view of this problem.

I have been convinced of one thing—water is the lifeblood of many communities. With no water, there can be no development of industry or population. I am also convinced that one of the biggest wastes of the resources in this country is the permitting of water to run to the ocean without first being used over and over for power, irrigation, and domestic or industrial use. Communities live or die, grow or remain the same because they either have plenty of water or not enough water.

Mr. Speaker, I am convinced it is time for Members of Congress to talk about the new wealth coming from irrigation projects and the proper use of water instead of how much the projects cost. Water put upon thirsty land produces new wealth, new industry, and, of course, new taxes to help Uncle Sam meet the needs of a growing, dynamic country.

Very few quarrel over the many billions of dollars which are spent for flood control, river and harbor navigation, and agriculture conservation programs. What does it cost Uncle Sam—nearly \$7½ billion. This is more than 4 times the amount spent on irrigation and reclamation during the past 50 years. The total cost of navigation and conservation programs is also a sizable amount.

I might remind my colleagues that not 1 cent of this money is returned to the Federal Treasury. However, Federal money invested in irrigation and reclamation is returned to the Treasury. Federal money invested to generate power as incidental to irrigation is returned to the Treasury with interest.

I do not oppose appropriating money for flood control, conservation, and navigation, for they, like irrigation and reclamation, are a vital program of keeping our country strong and prosperous.

Those who fail to interpret the new jobs, the new homes, and the new wealth which comes from irrigation and reclamation are destitute of imagination. Rather than seeing our country grow and prosper, they would prefer to see it remain the same.

The Upper Colorado River Basin is one of the last major reclamation projects which remains undeveloped. It has been found to be economically feasible and the power and water to be made available by its development is critically needed throughout the entire area.

Now, as to the questions on the Echo Park Dam:

1. Question. Will the Echo Park Dam destroy or flood the Diaosaur National Monument?

Answer. No. The Echo Park Reservoir will occupy only 9 percent of the monument area, and this is confined to the bottoms of the canyons that are 3,000 feet deep. Thus, even at the dam site, inspirational values remain relatively unimpaired. The total effect is not to destroy inspirational values since there are literally hundreds of miles of deep colorful canyons remaining in the Colorado River country.

2. Question. Do the dams "invade" the monument and violate national park rights

Answer. No; the Dinosaur National Monument was enlarged to include the Green and Yampa Rivers in 1938. Two years earlier in 1936, Park Service officials promised residents of the area, both in Utah and Colorado, that the enlargement of the Monument would not interfere with the development of power and water projects in the river canyons. Good faith requires that these promises be kept.

3. Question. Will the construction of propose dams in Dinosaur National Monument doom wilderness areas in America to extinction?

Answer. In its present State only about 3 percent of Dinosaur National Monument is accessible to the general public. The remaining 97 percent is unseen and unknown to the traveling public as a whole.

Construction of the proposed dams, with their resultant lakes and safe waterways, will make the major features of the monument accessible to the public and still preserve large areas as untouched wilderness.

After construction of both Split Mountain and Echo Park Dams only 11 percent of the monument area will be inundated, leaving 8 percent in its present native state.

In the more than 150 national parks and monument areas of the United States are preserved wilderness regions nearly as large as the State of Maine. Canadian national parks preserve an area larger than Scotland or nearly 30,000 miles. The national forests of the United States preserve nearly 20 million acres of wilderness. State parks preserve additional thousands of acres. Besides all these vast wilderness regions, hundreds of thousands of square miles of untamed nature "run wild" outside these restricted areas.

Pioneers have struggled and died to tame a small percentage of this boundless area in order that the frontiers of civilization might be advanced. A few needed dams should not be looked upon as a national calamity. They are a means of securing hard won frontiers and pave the way for expanding populations. They provide the means for meeting acute human needs of these expanding populations.

4. Question. Is it true that the Dinosaur National Monument belongs to all the people of the United States, and, that, therefore, it cannot be used?

Answer. No. Admittedly, under its status as a national monument, it does belong to citizens of the United States. However, opponents of Echo Park Dam derive from this the absurd notion that it may not be used by local families thirsting for its waters in a desert area. Use of the monument for water-storage purposes was definitely promised at the time of its enlargement. Faith in and reliance on this promise has been demonstrated by (1) uncontested water filings involving dams near the Split Mountain and Echo Park damsites made in 1939 after the monument enlargement; (2) permission granted to the Bureau of Reclamation engineers to make surveys and core drillings of the damsites within the monument; (3) testimony of local Utah and Colorado citizens before the Secretary of Interior in 1950 and at hearings before Committees of Congress early in 1954; and (4) letters, testimony and expressions of high officials of the Department of Interior of both the previous and present administrations.

This moral commitment to the people must be kept.

5. Question. Will the Echo Park Dam cost the taxpayers money?

Answer. No. Funds used to build the dams are good investments by the Federal Government. All costs of Echo Park Dam are repayable together with interest on the power investment. Power revenues will also aid in paying for irrigation features of participating projects, after which millions of dollars per year will flow into the General Treasury of the United States.

6. Question. Do these dams mean Federal control and violate the principles of private enterprise?

Answer. No. On the contrary, the dams will encourage private enterprise by providing water and power for agriculture, municipal, and industrial use. Representatives of both private and public enterprise heartily support them.

7. Question. Will boating, now enjoyed by the general public, be destroyed?

Answer. No. The risky, rapid-shooting now possible on some stretches of the river is expensive and dangerous, and, is, therefore, not available to the general public. After completion of Echo Park Dam, a beautiful still-water reservoir for safe and economical boating will be enjoyed by great numbers of people instead of by just a select few.

8. Question. Why should Echo Park Dam be constructed?

Answer. Because—

(a) It is so located as to capture the waters of two rivers, the Yampa and the Green.

(b) It is needed to fulfill interstate compact obligations.

(c) It reduces water losses to a minimum.

(d) It is more efficient than any proposed alternatives.

(e) It will open up and stimulate the development of a vast recreational area now virtually closed to the general public.

9. Question. Are alternate damsites outside the monument just as good?

Answer. No. Many years of investigations by competent engineers have shown that there are no alternate sites or combination of sites that will provide the necessary river regulation, low cost power within reach of upper basin load centers, and a minimum of water loss by evaporation. "Alternate sites" being proposed are not substitutes for Echo Park because they, themselves, are integral parts of the overall plan of development of the basin and will be needed in addition to Echo Park in due course.

10. Question. Are increased losses of water by evaporation from proposed alternative reservoirs of little consequence as claimed by opponents to Echo Park Dam?

Answer. Any losses of water that can be prevented are of great consequence in an area which never will have a sufficient supply to adequately develop its natural resources. Even the most rapid opponents of Echo Park Dam admit that their proposed alternatives involve an increased loss of water sufficient to care for the acute domestic water needs of 200,000 people. Are these people of little consequence?

11. Question. Will the lower Colorado Basin States and California be hurt by the building of the Echo Park Dam?

Answer. No. Holding the excess waters back during a rainy season should make more water available instead of less. There is a contract to supply 75 million acre-feet of water over a 10-year period at Parker Dam. Holding back this extra water will make this possible.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that the building of this dam will attract many thousands of people instead of a few hundred. Roads will be built to make the place accessible. We, who have visited the Hoover Dam area, realize there would be no attraction now unless the dam had been built to hold the water back and make it more accessible to the millions who may now enjoy this area.

There are hundreds of canyons in the Rocky Mountain region which are unexplored that nature lovers can still enjoy.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it is in the interest of our America of tomorrow to develop such areas as the Echo Park Dam. A growing country must not falter in developing and preserving for future generations the assets that it possesses.

Communism Versus Christianity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED E. BUSBEY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 15, 1954

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, during the time I was in Europe recently with the Committee To Investigate Communist Aggression, it so happened that we were in Berlin on July Fourth. Not being in the vicinity of a church where English was spoken, I took advantage of the fact that there was a radio in my hotel room to listen to the devotional services broadcast on the Armed Forces network.

I thought the sermon by Maj. John T. Donnelly, chaplain of the 7350th Base Complement Squadron, Tempelhof Air Base, at Berlin, Germany, was so appropriate to the occasion and the circumstances that I secured a copy for insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

As a student of the subject of communism for the past 33 years, I believe this sermon entitled "Communism Versus Christianity" to be one of the best and the most concise statements of the issue it has ever been my pleasure to hear. The people of the United States would have a better understanding of the Communist menace and a greater realization of the problem which is confronting the world today, if we could have more sermons of this quality delivered from the pulpits of our churches throughout America Sunday after Sunday.

I wish to express my sincere appreciation and to extend my congratulations to Chaplain Donnelly. Having sung in a choir for 10 years myself, I desire also to congratulate the Tempelhof choir on their wonderful rendition of the hymns. Their music added a great deal to this inspiring religious program.

The order of service, opening prayer, sermon, and closing prayer follow:

Theme: He Shall Reign	Choir
Announcement	Corporal Mount
God of Our Fathers	Choir
Prayer	Chaplain
O Beautiful for Spacious Skies	Choir
Christ Lives in Me	Girls Trio
God Save America	Choir
O Jesus I Have Promised	Mixed Quartet
Onward Christian Soldiers	Choir
Sermon: Communism versus Christianity	Chaplain
God Bless America	Choir
Prayer	Chaplain
Sevenfold Amen	Choir
Announcement	Corporal Mount
Theme: Peace, Perfect Peace	Choir

God of our fathers, sincerely we thank Thee for the unnumbered blessings of political liberty which have been ours in the divinely blessed United States; and humbly we beseech Thee to guard our blood-bought freedom against the increasing number of those who from within our boundaries, as from without, would overthrow our Government. Guide the hearts and minds of all Americans. Help them to live gratefully, prayerfully, and conscientiously. Above all, so direct the people in our country that we may choose Thee, the Triune God, as our eternal Leader. Draw us to Thee in the heartfelt repentance that confesses all our sins but looks to the Lord Jesus for pardon and perfect peace. May our military men and women be assured of God's presence as they walk with faith in His sustaining love. We plead confidently, because we pray in Jesus' blessed name. Amen.

COMMUNISM VERSUS CHRISTIANITY

(By Chaplain (Maj.) John T. Donnelly)

Today the world is in a state of emergency surpassing any in its history. Such a claim is no extravagant creation of an overheated imagination of a lunatic brain. Statesmen, publicists, military leaders, scientists, world scholars, in every realm all agree, not that civilization is going to sink, but that civilization is sinking now.

Back of all the ferment of nations is not primarily the economic and social conflict. The real cause is the evil hierarchy now engaged in supreme and final effort to overthrow God's kingdom and set up a satanic universal one-world rule in its stead.

Today the key factors in this conflict are the Christian church and the anti-Christ religion known as communism. The announced goal of communism is the destruction of God and God's people. No threat more sinister ever confronted the Christian world. While in 2,000 years the religion of the Lord Jesus Christ has brought under its sway only about 500 million, in 1 generation the anti-Christ religion of communism has brought under its absolute control 800 million behind the Iron Curtain, and has won the allegiance of millions more in every continent.

How has this terrifying phenomenon been achieved? The answer is made in sad confession to the fact of a superior type of discipleship than that we are giving to Christ. Communism has succeeded in prostituting to itself a type of discipleship which belongs alone to Almighty God.

Communism has captured the devotion, the dedication, the spirit of self-denial and self-sacrifice, the missionary passion and the techniques of Christian discipleship and has turned them to the destruction of Christ, and to the destruction of the church—and to the destruction of the world.

Communism has multiplied itself 20,000 times in 1 generation. It needs now to multiply itself only three times more in order to engulf the entire world. At its present rate of conquest, how much longer will it be? This satanic anti-Christ religion can be overcome only by another religion more vital and dynamic that it is. Economic measures will not stop it because it is a faith. Military defeat will not overcome it. It is a religion. Our faith in Christ must produce in us a discipleship more vital, more dynamic, and more utter than that which communism inspires.

You can refuse now to do the things that will save your nation. You can refuse to run the risk and pay the price of Christian heroism to save your country. But if you continue to follow the ordinary stereotyped pattern of Christian discipleship, it means, for your nation and the whole world, what it has meant for China and Russia and Korea and Indochina—the triumph of the forces of unrighteousness and the defeat of the cause of Christ. This is grim business which demands the submersion of all personal interests, the very taking of your life into your own hands. It means now the dedication of ourselves to the task with such a passion and fervor that, before our holy might, communism will falter and fail.

That the Nation may be saved and the Gospel preached with freedom, I challenge you to throw yourself with all your soul and strength into the breach in this life-and-death struggle.

Let us lay to heart the truth that the high mission of the United States of America is that it be made a spiritual blessing to the world. Other lands have not come under our influence that we may cripple them, not that we may exploit them, but that we may serve them. "He that will be greatest must be servant to all," is a truth for a nation as well as for an individual. God has preserved in us a spiritual faith. And we are to bless with spiritual truth throughout the wide sphere of our international influence. Cynics may scoff at our Christian assumptions and aspirations, but we must prove by our character, our services, and our sacrifices the loftiness and genuineness of our God-given convictions.

However, if the present buildup of armed might is to be accompanied by a triumph of truth, be sure of this: We must have the Lord Jesus Christ uppermost in our hearts and lives—not the counterfeit Jesus of the brash unbelief, but the Scriptural Savior, God's Son, Who, with a love that passes our understanding and description, suffered Himself to be nailed to the cross and there died to restore us to His Heavenly Father; because only He can make better men, a better nation, a better world.

My countrymen, use every possible means of keeping America's course in harmony with Scripture and away from contradictions to its truth. If we learn to follow Christ's way, instead of the rule-by-force delusion, we shall be much happier, much safer, much nearer true peace and lasting blessing.

O Lord of Love keep America from a false sense of national security without Thee, and by Thy Holy Spirit daily help us build our hope only on the Lord Jesus Christ, the solid rock of our redemption. Bless this Tempelhof Choir broadcast today by turning many to Thee, for courage, comfort, pardon, purity, and power. We pray, through Jesus Christ, Thy Son, our Lord, who liveth and reigneth with Thee and the Holy Ghost, ever one God, world without end. Amen.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

Code of Laws of the United States

Title 44, Section 181. Congressional Record; arrangement, style, contents, and indexes.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the Congressional Record, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the Congressional Record semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

Title 44, Section 182b. Same; illustrations, maps, diagrams.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the Record without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the Congressional Record the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily Record as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided*, That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the Record with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the official reporters of the Congressional Record, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the Record shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the Record issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the Record for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the Record of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the Record shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the Record style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the Record.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the Congressional Record any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided*, That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix, but this rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided*, That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the Congressional Record.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the Congressional Record Appendix the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed.

10. *Official reporters.*—The official reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the Congressional Record by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this restriction shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. The Public Printer or the official reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the Congressional Record which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Illustrations.*—Pursuant to section 182b, title 44, United States Code (as shown above), requests for authority to insert an illustration in the Record should be submitted to the Joint Committee on Printing through the chairman of the Committee on Printing of the respective House in which the speech desired to be illustrated may be delivered. Illustrations shall not exceed in size a page of the Record and shall be linecuts only. Copy for illustrations must be furnished to the Public Printer not later than 12:30 o'clock p. m. of the day preceding publication.

13. *Corrections.*—The permanent Record is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided*, That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further*, That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized book dealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by book dealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the Congressional Record, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

PRICE OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

The Public Printer is authorised to furnish to subscribers the daily Record at $1.50 per month, payable in advance.

Remit by money order payable to Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C.

C

[St

Aik
An
N

Ba
Bea
Be
Bov
Bri
Bri
Bu
Bu
Bu
Byi

Ca
Ca
Cas
Ch

Cle
Co
Co
Cri

Da
Dir
Do
Du
Dw

Eas
Elle
Erv

Fer
Fla
Fre
Ful

Ge
Gil
Gol
Go
Gre
R

Hay
Her
N
Her
M
Hic
Io

Hil
Hol
Hu
M

Ives

Jac
Jen
Joh
Joh
Joh

Kef
Ke
Ker
Kilg
Kno
C
Kuc

Lan
Leh
Len
Lon

McC
McC
McC

Mag
W
Mal
Man
Mar
May
Mill
Mon
Ok
Mors
Mu

Mur

w
a

(

to
th
ha
st
to

ric
ch
bu
pe
you

Ge
sep

in
ter
tra
the

alo
mis
Bra
serv
miss
forc
agai

Th
ciate
Ame
the

In
stanc
Chica
you
uted

Sev
today
on O
severa
the fi

The
in dec
the D
sion
tions
time
field.
reserv
tivitie

The
moval
reorga

Appendix

Some National Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS CASE
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 16, 1954

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "Some National Problems," delivered by the Honorable Herbert Hoover, in Chicago, Ill., on June 24, 1954.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOME NATIONAL PROBLEMS

(Address by the Honorable Herbert Hoover)

I would be remiss if I did not at once state to this representative group of merchants that our magnificent distribution system has had a large part in building the highest standard of living for a nation ever known to mankind.

I could observe that my life has been periodically spent resisting the wiles of merchants in a frantic effort to balance my budget. In other words, I have been compelled to restrict my standard of living below your beguilements.

It is a privilege to be in company with General Wood and former Ambassador Joseph Kennedy who sponsor this occasion.

My association with General Wood began in the First World War when he was Quartermaster General and I was Food Administrator. His friendship has continued over these 38 years—in bad as well as good times.

Mr. Kennedy and I served and fought alongside on the First Congressional Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, and he is today serving again on the present second commission. General Wood served on the task forces of the first commission, and is serving again with the present Commission.

The general and I have long been associated in the work of the Boys' Clubs of America. He is a director, William E. Hall the president. I am the chairman.

In this effort General Wood has given outstanding leadership to that organization in Chicago. And in this connection, I will tell you a secret—Mr. Kennedy has just contributed $25,000 to this work in Boston.

REORGANIZATION OF THE GOVERNMENT

Several of you who are present, are serving today on the task forces of the Commission on Organization of the Government. And several of you served on the task forces of the first Commission.

The first Commission accomplished much in decreased cost and increased efficiency in the Departments. But that first Commission was restricted in making recommendations as to policies of the Government. This time the Congress enjoined us to cover this field. The law, however, contains a special reservation that we shall not apply our activities to the judiciary or the Congress.

The previous Commission secured the removal of roadblocks, which held up internal reorganization of the departments and agencies. Today the heads of the different agencies are each diligently placing their own houses in order. Our present Commission has therefore generally limited its activities to matters involving more than one agency with their duplications and overlaps. Just as an indication, I may mention that 41 agencies of the Government deal with medical matters. Twelve of them deal with the weather.

We are still in the study stage in the second Commission. Some 200 leading citizens are serving with us on 24 task forces or subcommittees.

I am confident that the recommendations of this Commission can show the way to balance the Federal budget and stop this spiral of inflation. That is provided we can overcome the roadbloacks and are not forced into war.

JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

One of our rising national problems is juvenile delinquency. Some discussion of it is warranted here because not only General Wood and Mr. Kennedy and I have a joint interest in the Boys' Clubs; but there are several of you who are also in this service.

Of the many agencies in the country devoted to this problem of delinquency, the Boys' Clubs have an important part. In this organization we are concerned with pavement boys—the boys in our slum areas whose only outlet after school and on Saturdays, Sundays, and holidays is the streets.

Over the whole country, we have over 380 of these clubs in 252 communities with approximately 360,000 self-starting boys.

These clubs are not a paper organization. They are as solid bricks and mortar as any man's club and would today cost upward of $120 million to replace. In them we provide constructive joy, health, occupational, and moral guidance.

Together with his sister, the boy is our most precious American possession. The normal boy can seem to be a child of iniquity yet he makes a great nation. The whole world is new to him. Therefore, he seeks adventure, discovery, and great undertakings. He must spend much time, if he is to expand, in the land of make-believe.

This normal boy is endowed with a dynamic energy and an impelling desire to take exercise on all occasions. His primary instinct is to hunt in a pack and that multiplies his devices.

But the normal boy has a primitive instinct and takes to competition and battle. In the days before our civilization became so perfect, he matched his wits with the birds, the bees, and the fish. He cannot find battle with animal or plant life in zoos or parks. If he doesn't content with nature, he is likely to take on contention with a policeman.

The fine qualities of loyalty to the pack can be turned to sports where the spirit of fair play is the greatest moral force outside religious faith. Sport is not so good on the pavements. For here the pack turns to the gang. And here we make gangsters and feed jails.

This Boys' Club organization has proved one of the most effective preventions of delinquency—always excepting mother. Some years ago in a certain tough district in Chicago over 80 percent of the boys in the district were in the hands of the police during the year. A few years after the completion of a club, the delinquency percentage dropped to 12 percent.

As to physical benefits to the boys I might mention that the national rate of 4–F's was over 30 percent in the last war. A canvass of 200,000 alumni of Boys' Clubs showed only 4½ percent. And they fought and died bravely.

Great editors, great musicians, great sculptors, and five major league baseball players were started in the channels of this organization. And today millions of boys from these clubs are solid patriotic citizen of our country. Due to the indefatigable efforts of General Wood and others in this work, Chicago slums are proportionately better served by the Boys' Clubs than any other city in the country. For here there are 21 clubs with 11,000 boy members.

GETTING ALONG WITH OTHER FREE NATIONS

But the American people are in far greater trouble than teen-age delinquency or reforms in our Federal establishment.

I do not need to describe the center of world conspiracy from which our international dangers arise. And our difficulties are not limited to the Communists. They arise also from a lack of unity among the free nations in dealing with these difficulties.

I have no intention of speaking upon specific foreign policies. Our disunities with the Communists are easy enough to appreciate, but our relations with free nations require more understanding. To discuss these problems objectively will not make the cold war any hotter. And it may illustrate that this is a time for patience and forbearance.

First. We must realize that there are wide differences in racial inheritances, economic and political objectives in each of the free nations. They come down from centuries. Also among them are age-old dislikes, and fears.

Second. It must be realized that military alliances or peacetime collective action can endure only as long as there are common objectives and purposes among the participants.

Third. Our people must realize that the interests, objectives, and policies of nations constantly shift with this rapidly changing scene. The last 9 years offer abundant proof of the rapidity of shifting national policies. In this short period, the policies of the United States have shifted, as witness our reversal of attitudes toward Russia, Germany, and Japan.

Fourth. We must realize that the atomic bomb and the steady growth of Communist military strength have contributed to shift the policies of some of the free nations.

Fifth. We must realize that the Communist members of the United Nations have paralyzed our hoped-for protection from military aggression through that organization, and that the United Nations is weakened in this major purpose by lack of full unity among the free nations.

Sixth. Our people should realize that many of the free nations of the world, in despair of protection by the United Nations from major aggression, have been forced into a multitude of military alliances. There are also groups present today determined to maintain their neutrality in any major conflict.

Seventh. We must realize that some of our military allies are faltering in the march. That hesitation again arises from shifting of interests and objectives with the changing scene in the world.

Eighth. Our people should realize that with these alliances, groupings, and shiftings, the whole concept of preservation of peace by collective action against an aggressor through the United Nations has gone by the board—at least for the present. We are now in the presence of age-old balances of power, power politics, and ancient forms of diplomacy.

Ninth. Our people must realize that in dealing with these gigantic problems of today we must have patience, tolerance, and understanding of these differences of interests and objectives of the free nations.

Tenth. Through this terrible labyrinth our Government must pilot our foreign policies. We cannot expect miracles. Free men must hold to the right to disagree with any policy of the Government. But especially in foreign affairs support should be the watchword until issues of deep conscience arise, and moderation is a good watchword even then.

Someone said the world is at the crossroads. My belief is that is it a cloverleaf junction.

Eleventh. In appraising the forces in the world, we should not conclude that the United Nations should be abolished. It furnishes a place with electronic equipment where nations may discharge their batteries of the evil things which they think about each other in five languages all at once.

But seriously, this institution has proved of value in pacific settlement of disputes among secondary nations. It has contributed to the spread of scientific knowledge, to philanthropic and public health measures.

These activities form a tenuous road to more unity of free nations and we should cling to any hope they may provide.

Twelfth. Above all, we cannot abandon the ideal that someday, somehow, unity for peace can be built in the world. Nor can we abandon the hope that some time the free nations who believe in God will mobilize against Red atheism and human slavery.

If inside or outside of the United Nations the free nations could unite, they have many potent moral, spiritual, and even economic weapons at their disposal besides military alliances.

Thirteenth. In these shifting shapes in the world, we must realize the vitality of a great spiritual force which we call nationalism.

The fuzzy-minded intellectuals have sought to brand nationalism as a sin against mankind. They seem to think that infamy is attached to the word "nationalist."

But that force in the world cannot be obscured by denunciation of it as greed or selfishness—as it sometimes is. The spirit of nationalism springs from the deepest of human emotions. It rises from the yearning of men to be free of foreign domination, to govern themselves. It springs from a thousand rills of race, of history, of sacrifice, and pride in national achievement.

Every nation has laid its dead upon the altar of its country. These died with their national flag before their eyes and their national hymns upon their lips. The pride of race has swelled from their suffering and sacrifice.

In our own country does not the word "America" stir something deeper within us than mere geography? Does not the suffering and the sacrifice of our forbears who fought for our independence flash in our minds with every mention of that word? Was it not our independence which gave the most expansive release to the creative spirit of mankind in all history? Was it not the release of intellectual and spiritual freedom on this continent that gave the moral strength and the self-reliance which penetrated our plains and forests?

Nationalism does not mean isolationism from the common interests of nations. We have ourselves proved that. Just as we have valued our own independence, we have fought for the independence of other peoples.

And equally do these emotions flow wide and deep in all free nations. Within them and their religious faith is their spiritual strength. It sustains their resolution against aggression and domination.

Nationalism cannot be abandoned if civilization is to last among free men. And we can have some hope that slumbering nationalism in the satellite countries will awaken to throw off the Moscow yoke as it has in Yugoslavia.

Fourteenth. And from all this, our people must realize that our own right arm plus some deterrents unhealthy to the aggressors are our major reliance for our defense. And these strengths are no weak reliance. With the magnificent officers and men in our defense establishments, with our genius and our productivity, we can defend ourselves.

Tyler, Tex., Jaycees Collect Flood-Relief Supplies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 16, 1954

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the people of Texas responded magnificently to meet the needs of victims of the recent disastrous floods along the Rio Grande. From all over the State, help poured into the stricken areas.

Typical of this spontaneous outpouring of humanitarian effort was the work of members of the Tyler Junior Chamber of Commerce. A story in the Tyler Morning Telegraph tells of their effective work. I ask unanimous consent that this story be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Jaycees Collect 60 Boxes of Flood-Relief Supplies

Tyler Jaycees Sunday piled up about 60 big boxes of clothing and canned goods for the relief of the Rio Grande flood victims as Tylerites responded to a radio appeal for aid.

Elmer Austin, one of the cochairmen of the drive, said Sunday night the Jaycee group had "answered about 300 calls and we have about 60 boxes and packages stored in the basement of the Salvation Army headquarters.

"We're going to crate it Tuesday night and ship it out to Laredo Wednesday," he said.

Nearly 200 calls had been received Saturday afternoon in answer to appeal over KGKB and KTBB in Tyler for items to be sent to the area stricken by the recent severe flood, and members of the junior chamber of commerce began picking up the supplies Staurday. Parcels were received up to noon Sunday and the remainder of the clothing and supplies picked up Sunday afternoon.

A group of Jaycees using three trucks donated by Tyler firms and several private automobiles, made the collection.

Tyson Payne, Jaycee president, said Jaycees all over Texas are taking part in the flood relief program, known as "Operation Now." The items will be shipped to Laredo Jaycees who will distribute them.

Ed Emmons, second vice president of the Tyler Jaycees, talked by telephone Friday to Jim Richter, president of the Laredo Jaycees. Richter said his organization had set up a giant headquarters in the high-school gym to receive and distribute the clothing and food sent by the Jaycee organizations over the State.

The relief supplies, however, will not be confined to Laredo alone, but will be sent wherever they are neded throughout the flod area, Richter said.

This "Mess" Calls for Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 16, 1954

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an editorial entitled "This 'Mess' Calls for Action." The editorial was first published in the Nashville Tennesseean, and subsequently was reproduced in the Florence (Ala.) Times of July 12. It relates to the action of the administration regarding the Atomic Energy Commission and the proposed contract with the Dixon-Yates group.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

This "Mess" Calls for Action

What goes on in Washington where the Republican administration said it would do business on the highest plane with every assurance that the taxpayers would have fullest protection?

The answer is that the Eisenhower regime has ordered the Atomic Energy Commission to contract with Dixon-Yates syndicate of power companies, and that the syndicate obtained the go-ahead without even seeing specifications for the proposals.

This disclosure, revealed in a transcript of testimony given in closed session before the Senate Antimonopoly Subcommittee, is in itself sufficient to justify the committee's announcement that it has found probable cause for suspension of the administration's negotiations with Dixon-Yates. A resolution has been adopted calling on the AEC to withhold approval of the proposed contract until it has completed full investigation of unusual circumstances surrounding the sordid deal.

For the American taxpayers it is fortunate indeed that a Senate group interested in monopolistic practices should have been prepared to go into this bald arrangement to favor a private power group at a cost of between $92 and $139 million more than if the power were supplied by the TVA, and on worse terms than had been offered by another private group which was shouldered out of the picture.

Such an admission by a Dixon-Yates attorney was astounding to Senator Kefauver who elicited it, and to his colleagues.

"The idea that the President of the United States would order the signing of a contract in the absence of bid specifications is a display of gross irresponsibility," said Representative Cliff Davis, of Memphis, and added: "This absurd manner of conducting Government business is shocking."

Senator Albert Gore's charge that the contract was tailormade for Dixon-Yates was coupled with the apt observation that it was designed to operate and maintain Dixon-Yates at maximum efficiency.

Tennessee's junior Senator was quick to see the Eisenhower campaign pledge working in full reverse, to the disillusionment of those believing souls who chose to take it all in and, as Gov. Frank Clement did a year later, were jumping at the chance to make a touching defense of Mr. Eisenhower's attitude toward TVA.

In Governor Clement's mind the Chief Executive's sincerity on his vague vote-getting pledges was never to be questioned, and it was he who put forward the neat suggestion that it might be well to deal with the problem by the appointment of still another commission—instrument for government by postponement.

Now, the Eisenhower administration is in danger of being held accountable for a tricky piece of business which needs a lot of explaining.

Especial interest centers in the brushoff given the group of Walter Von Tresckow and associates who offered to erect a steam plant at Fulton, on the Mississippi, furnish the power at cost and turn the remaining plant over to TVA at the end of a 25-year period. His only charge would have been a $4 million fee for arranging and financing, and there was no contemplation of a long-time Government subsidy.

By comparison, the Dixon-Yates syndicate would supply power on a 25-year contract from a proposed West Memphis plant, and the cost would be $3,600,000 more per year than if TVA built the plant.

Eventually, however, Dixon-Yates would own the plant and could be able to charge its own rates for future power furnished to TVA. As an example of the administration's paternalistic attitude in this instance, the AEC would pay all State, local, and Federal taxes on the private plant, and would be required to pay one-half the cost of the plant over $107,250,000 and up to $117 million.

All this because of a burning administration desire to give private power a foothold in the Tennessee Valley.

But it is not being done in the name of free enterprise when the proposition of open bids and fair competition is thrown out of the window under direct and admitted pressure by the private power combination.

In view of his unhappy experience in trying to make a decent and legitimate deal with the Government, we do not blame Mr. Von Tresckow from saying to reporters: "If this doesn't beat the Teapot Dome, I'll eat my hat."

In principle, we see little difference between the major scandal of the Harding administration and the way money is now going to be taken from the taxpayers, if something is not done, to accomplish the double purpose of fatting private power with lavish Government aid and invading the territory of TVA with the purpose of crippling its efficiency and destroying its brightest hopes.

Instead of improving, the moral climate in Washington takes on a tainted odor that is all too reminiscent of 20 years ago. (The Nashville Tennessean.)

Least Subsidy for Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN D. JOHNSTON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 16, 1954

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an article entitled "Least Subsidy for Farmers." The article was written by Drew Pearson, and was published in the Washington Post of Thursday, July 15, 1954, in the column which carries the heading "The Washington Merry-Go-Round."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

THE WASHINGTON MERRY-GO-ROUND

(By Drew Pearson)

LEAST SUBSIDY FOR FARMERS

Few people have ever seen the budget of the United States. Some people think it's merely an ethereal set of figures that Congress debates about every year. Actually, however, it's about the size of a New York phone book and just about as dull. The last few pages, however, are extremely significant and ought to be paraded on the Senate floor during the debate on so-called farm subsidies.

For these figures show the amount of subsidies paid to farmers, veterans, businessmen, and others. Highest subsidy, of course, is listed as paid to veterans in the form of bonuses and hospitalization, totaling $4,214,000,000 in 1953.

What may surprise some people, however, is that the subsidy paid to businessmen is about twice as much as that paid to farmers. Farmers got $523 million for soil conservation, price supports, and other Government help in 1953; whereas businessmen got $1,216,000,000.

This aid to business, incidentally, was not to small-business men. It was to upper-bracket business which has yelled so loud about creeping socialism yet spent so much money lobbying Congress into voting more money for galloping favoritism.

They include helpless little groups like the United States Steel Corp., the big utility companies, and some of the big shipping companies.

Humphrey's subsidy

Here, for instance, are some of the subsidies big business has been able to obtain—in contrast to farmers' price supports:

The M. A. Hanna Co., one of the biggest iron and steel holding companies in the United States, largely owned and operated by George Humphrey before he became Secretary of the Treasury, got more than $22 million in tax subsidies just a few weeks before he entered the Cabinet. The Hanna Coal Ore Co., one of his subsidiaries, got a 75-percent depreciation on an $11,345,000 iron-ore investment in Minnesota and another 70-percent tax writeoff on a $22 million nickel plant in Oregon. The 2 plants were permitted to depreciate 70 to 75 percent of their value in 5 years instead of about 25 years.

These tax writeoffs were rushed through during the last few weeks of the Truman administration so Humphrey's company would not be embarrassed by asking for them when he became Secretary of the Treasury later.

Today the new tax bill gives the same kind of quick depreciation tax writeoffs to other types of big business, and Randolph Paul, former general counsel of the Treasury and author of Taxation in the United States, has told Congressmen this tax subsidy will cost the public $40 billion in the next 17 years. In contrast, when a farmer builds a barn he gets no tax writeoff, but must spread his depreciation over a period of about 30 years.

Utility subsidies

The big utility companies spend an average of half a million dollars a year on their lobby to influence Congress. At least that's the amount they register officially with Congress. Today this appears to be reaping dividends. One utility combine, Dixon-Yates, has just put across by special order of President Eisenhower a 25-year contract with the Atomic Energy Commission, despite the opposition of a majority of AEC Commissioners.

Under this order, Dixon-Yates will invest only 5.3 millions cash, be guaranteed a 9 percent return by Uncle Sam; will own the plant at the end of 25 years; and will get the benefit of an annual 3.6 million overcharge made up by the taxpayers for the difference between what they would have to pay TVA instead of Dixon-Yates.

This was why Representative Chet Holifield, of California, a member of the congressional Committee on Atomic Energy, calls this not "creeping socialism" but "galloping Federal favoritism."

In contrast the farmer is guaranteed no 9 percent return on his investment. He has been guaranteed 90 percent of the price paid during a cross-section average of previous years.

More gravy

Here are some of the other subsidies to business to which the United States budget refers when it shows that business annually gets about twice the subsidy given to farmers:

Certain airlines get between $70 million and $95 million annually for carrying the mail. On top of this the taxpayers have paid for radar, lighting beacons and other safety aids for the airlines totaling $21,361,040 in 1951, $13,007,035 in 1952, and $7 million in 1953. Taxpayers also paid $73,931,733 for personnel to operate these safety aids in 1951, plus $80,484,761 in 1952, plus about $105 million in 1953. In addition, another $37 million and $16 million went for runways and construction work at airports in 1951–52 and another $19,821,000 in 1953.

The shipping companies also get an average of around $30 million a year in subsidies to operate their vessels; the United States Lines got a construction subsidy of $18,225,000, plus a national defense subsidy of $24,061,000 for building the steamship *United States*; while the Grace Lines and Moore-McCormack are being voted subsidies for four new vessels by the current Congress.

These vessels will be turned over to the United States in time of war and this subsidy policy may be a wise one. Also, it is important to keep United States airlines operating around the world. But likewise, the American farmer has to feed a good part of the world in case of war and he, like the shipping and airplane companies, can't contract and expand his economy for peace or wars without facing economic chaos.

Prelude to Liberty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. GLENN BEALL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 16, 1954

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, on July 4 it was my pleasure to attend and participate in the ceremonies commemorating the 200th anniversary of the Battle of Fort Necessity, the first military engagement led by George Washington.

At that time Miss Louisa Rae Bernbach, 63 Johnson Avenue, Uniontown, Pa., delivered an essay entitled "Prelude to Liberty." This was a prize-winning essay and Miss Bernbach was awarded a scholarship to the University of Pennsylvania.

Miss Bernbach is a very charming young lady and read her essay with great poise and distinction. I request that this essay be made a part of my remarks in the Record.

There being no objection, the essay was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Prelude to Liberty

(By Louisa Rae Bernbach)

When I met George Washington he was just a young major in the Virginia militia. I first saw him toward evening on October 30, 1753. He and his guide, Christopher Gist, were on their way to the forks of the Ohio to order the French out of British territory.

This was our first meeting but not our last, not by any means.

The French promised that they would not interfere with the British in any way, but the next year when the Ohio Company set out to build a fort at the forks of the Ohio they were attacked by the French and forced to surrender after 1 hour's fighting.

It was then that Washington, now an adjutant general, returned to the Ohio Valley, this time with 150 men.

Toward the end of May they crossed the main ridge of the Allegheny Mountains and camped near the parallel ridge of Laurel Hill, at a place called Great Meadows.

While they were camped there a runner came from Half-King, the leader of one of England's Indian allies, to tell Washington that they had found the tracks of two men leading to a dark glen in the forest where, Half-King believed, the French to be lurking.

Washington immediately proceeded with 40 men to Half-King's wigwams where a council was held. King and his warriors agreed to join in striking the French forces in a surprise attack.

The next day, with two Indians leading the way, they set out to find the French stronghold. They found the tracks of the two scouts, and marching single file, the party pushed through the forest into the rocky hollow where the French were supposed to be concealed. They were there in fact and in the short fight that followed Coulon de Jumonville, an ensign in command, was killed.

The English, hearing the French were ready to fight for their claims to the valley, sent men from almost all of the Colonies to reinforce Washington at Great Meadows.

The French also sent reinforcements to Fort Duquesne and the garrison now consisted of 1,400 men. They were again reinforced when Coulon de Villiers, brother of the slain Jumonville, arrived from Montreal at the head of an army of Indians. After joining some of the men from Fort Duquesne they continued on their march through the forest until, on the 2d of July, they arrived at Washington's abandoned camp at the Gist settlement. The next day, in spite of an unceasing rainstorm, they continued their march and finally arrived at the place where Villiers brother had been killed. After learning from a deserter the position of the enemy they attacked full force the little garrison at Fort Necessity. After 2 days of bitter fighting in which the French had the advantage of higher ground and the protection of rocks and trees Washington was forced to surrender. The date was July 4, 1754.

Yes, I was there when Washington surrendered to the French at Fort Necessity. Little did he dream that on another July 4, just 22 years later that, with his help the British colonies he was fighting to protect would become the United States of America. I was with Washington then, too, and later at Valley Forge and Yorktown.

I am met today and always by men and women as gallant and brave as George Washington. The wind, the sun, the stars, the logs of the stockade of Fort Necessity, I am all of these for you see, I am the spirit of freedom.

Tribute to Hon. Alexander Wiley, of Wisconsin, in Connection With St. Lawrence Seaway Legislation

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CARLSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 16, 1954

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the summer 1954 issue of the magazine the Heartland, a United States-Canadian quarterly on inland America, contains a brief but splendid account of a dinner held in Milwaukee on June 10 honoring our colleague the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Wiley] for his championing of the seaway law which bears his name. I believe that the account, as well as excerpts from a tribute to our Wisconsin associate by Dr. N. R. Danielian, president of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Association, will be of interest to my colleagues.

I send to the desk, therefore, the text of the article, together with the tribute, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Milwaukee Dinner Honors Senator Wiley

On June 10, 400 enthusiastic friends of the St. Lawrence seaway assembled at dinner in the fern room of the Pfister Hotel in Milwaukee to pay tribute to Senator Alexander Wiley and other leaders of the seaway movement in Wisconsin. The dinner was sponsored by the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Association, the Milwaukee Association of Commerce, and the Governor's St. Lawrence seaway committee.

Presided over by Mr. I. R. Witthuhn, president of the Milwaukee Association of Commerce, the dinner guests were addressed by Congressman Glenn R. Davis, of Waukesha, Wis.; Mr. Lewis G. Castle, president of the Northern Minnesota National Bank, of Duluth, Minn.; Gov. Walter Kohler, of Wisconsin; Mr. N. R. Danielian, president of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Association; and Senator Alexander Wiley. The invocation was given by Father Charles M. O'Hara, of Marquette University.

There were present also five members of the Wisconsin delegation in Congress: Hon. Gardner R. Withrow, of LaCrosse; Hon. Melvin R. Laird, of Marshfield; Hon. Glenn R. Davis, of Waukesha; Hon. John W. Byrnes, of Green Bay; and Hon. Alvin E. O'Konski, of Mercer; as well as members of the City Council and the Board of Supervisors of Milwaukee County, the Governor's committee, and the State waterways commission.

Opening the proceedings, Mr. Witthuhn said:

"As president of the Association of Commerce, I am proud to be serving as your toastmaster this evening, and I am honored to be presiding at this dinner meeting arranged to pay tribute to those whose keen vision, alertness, and, above all, tenacity of purpose have made possible a magnificent victory.

"Appreciate for a moment the vision of those who fought undauntedly for over three decades to bring about successful passage of legislation which allows the United States and Canada to join in building and operating a seaway so ocean vessels have a highway to the Middle West.

"By 1960 our dreams will become a reality when into the heart of the United States will be cut an inland waterway to benefit all America and the world—a waterway that will strengthen the economy of our Nation, bolster its defense, and be an answer to its needs of transportation, power, and raw materials. It takes little imagination to see Milwaukee as a great inland seaport with oceangoing traffic coming directly to our own port as well as others in Wisconsin when 92 percent of the world's shipping will be able to use the seaway. One need not to be a Nostradamus to predict the increase in foreign trade of the Middle West, the boom that the seaway will be to its manufacturing industries, its retailers, wholesalers, distributors, and farmers. Vital raw materials, essential to our industries, will be imported directly through Wisconsin ports, and our manufactured goods and farm products, will be dispatched to distant countries and shipped to seaboard areas at lower costs.

"The Middle West's labor, industry, business and agriculture will have an even greater stake in foreign trade. We are sure that this vision is not illusionary, for already our people are letting the world know that Milwaukee is an ocean port in midcontinent with the slogan of the harbor commission 'Ship Via Milwaukee, America's Most Progressive Inland Port.' "

Governor Kohler paid tribute to the unanimous support of the Wisconsin delegation in Congress, in particular to the leadership of Senator Alexander Wiley. Mr. Lewis G. Castle thanked Wisconsin supporters, particularly Mayor Frank Zeidler, the City Council and the Board of Supervisors of Milwaukee and the Governor's committee for their continued moral and financial support of the seaway fight. He laid particular stress upon the signal contribution of the senior Senator from Wisconsin whose dauntless championship of the seaway in the Senate finally resulted in successful passage of the Wiley bill.

A Tribute to Senator Wiley Delivered at the Milwaukee Dinner by Dr. N. R. Danielian

Mr. Chairman, Senator Wiley, Governor Kohler, Mayor Zeidler, distinguished guests, this is an unusual and a happy occasion for me. For nearly 14 years I have had to engage in polemics and persuasion with some of the most potent forces in the Nation, where throwing epithets and baseball bats are not an uncommon method of argumentation. Today we are here to celebrate our victory and to do honor to one who was in great measure responsible for this happy result.

I want to take this opportunity to make amends with our erstwhile opponents. I bear no ill will toward them. Both sides fought hard. The game is over. The issue is settled. I appreciate and share the sentiments of Mr. William Faricy, the president of the Association of American Railroads, who wrote to me last week, as follows:

"Now that the legislation has been enacted into law, I am particularly glad that the fight, spirited though it was at all times, has left no scars. Certainly, we at the Association of American Railroads feel no bitterness about the licking we took."

My own feelings in response to that princely statement are best expressed in the words of John Drinkwater, the poet:

> "For all ill words that I have spoken
> For all clear moods that I have broken
> For all despite and hasty breath
> Forgive me, Lord, forgive me, Death."

To repent is easy; but to live by a new style of speech is considerably harder. It is difficult, for instance, to forget the common experiences, the heartaches, and disappointments that we have shared together. When most of the country shrugged and passed us by, saying, as in Midsummer Night's Dream—

"I never may believe these antique foibles, nor these fairy toys," it took faith to hold to a constant course. Our guest of honor today had that faith, and shared it with me. As Scudder Middleton put it—

> "One must go trustful in the dark
> To earn the friendship of the stars."

He has fully earned that friendship.

In 10 years, the St. Lawrence seaway project was brought to a vote in the Senate four times. It was defeated three times—in 1944, 1948, and 1952. Common misery, shared in comparative isolation, creates a strong bond of understanding. One cannot work for nearly 10 years with another without learning something of his motivations. His are love of his country and compassion and sympathy for his fellow men.

We all have different ways of expressing our love of country. His has been the not inconsiderable means of changing the face of North America. Only when the deed is done will he realize how bold the dream has been. Just yesterday I read this poem in the New York Times so apt to the day:

> "How arrogant mankind must seem
> To ancient earth, while she
> Old and wise in beauty carves
> So deliberately
> Cliff and canyon, river gorge.
> And yet a man, though brief
> His days as dragonfly, as moth,
> Or drifting scarlet leaf,
> With hand impatient hastes to hew,
> To blast, or raze with fire
> Forest and hill—and then remold
> The earth to his desire."

Mr. Chairman, the country is grateful to Wisconsin for giving us the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee so he could remold the earth to our desires.

Dalhart, Tex., Offers True Flavor of Old West

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 16, 1954

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, with the tourist season getting into full swing, I take pleasure in calling attention to the attractions offered by the city of Dalhart, Tex., to all Americans who are interested in the early history of the West.

An article in the June issue of West Texas Today, official publication of the West Texas Chamber of Commerce, presents some highlights of these attractions. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EMPTY SADDLE MONUMENT IN DALHART HONORS COWBOYS OF FAMED XIT

The true flavor of the old West is still evident to the vacationer who vists Dalhart in the northwest corner of the Texas Panhandle. In addition to the modern recreational facilities found in any modern city, vast cattle ranches and historic reminders of the past are within easy driving range of the city.

Fishermen can find crappie, bream and catfish in abundance in the city-owned Lake Rita Blanca which is situated in a reservation of 3,000 acres as a part of the city park system. Boating is also enjoyed at the lake. Swimming may be enjoyed in the municipal swimming pool, heated because of nights so cool that sleeping under a blanket is a necessity even in July and August. The city has three other municipal parks in addition to Lake Rita Blanca.

Facilities at the Dalhart Country Club, which are available to the tourist, include a swimming pool, also heated, and a sporty nine-hole golf course. Young people may also enjoy game facilities at the publicly-supported youth center.

The trips in the area will appeal to the vacationer who wants a view of the cattle country. Some of the largest cattle spreads in west Texas are located here, and tourists are welcome at all times at most of them where they may see all phases of modern-day cattle operations in actual practice. The tradition on which the city of Dalhart was built is found at Buffalo Springs in the northern part of Dallam County. The ranchhouse, which still stands, was once the headquarters of the 3-million-acre XIT Ranch, traded to an eastern syndicate in exchange for the building of the State capitol building in Austin.

A monument to the cowboys of the XIT Ranch—the famed Empty Saddle—stands in Dalhart, and a big reunion and rodeo is held the second Monday and Tuesday in August each year in the XIT cowhands' honor.

America's first Boys' Ranch is a short drive south of Dalhart at Old Tascosa, originally the county seat for the entire panhandle. Here boys are given a chance to become useful citizens after being victims of neglect. Two original buildings of Old Tascosa are being used as a part of the school.

A visit to an extinct volcano, Mount Capulin, can be enjoyed, across the State line north of Clayton, N. Mex., Sierra Grande, the highest lone mountain in the Western Hemisphere is located nearby. Also in New Mexico not far from Dalhart, at Bueyeros, are buttes with Indian burial grounds atop them.

Two other tourist attractions are across the State line in Oklahoma—the No Man's Land Museum at Panhandle, A. and M. College at Goodwell, Okla., and the prehistoric Indian rock paintings between Kenton and Boise City, site of many dinosaur bone discoveries.

The entire area abounds in Indian artifacts in the three States, and Indian lore collectors can have a field day finding these relics.

Condemning TVA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 16, 1954

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, in the Florence (Ala.) Times there was published an editorial entitled "Condemning TVA." I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONDEMNING TVA

President Eisenhower's letter instructing the Atomic Energy Commission, in effect, to purchase power from certain private-utility companies is unfortunate from every point of view. As a matter of administration, this kind of interference with the independent judgment of a commission is mischievous. In terms of business practice, it is an uneconomic and imprudent arrangement, certain to prove costly to American taxpayers. Considered as policy, it seems to reflect a doctrinaire preference for private power instead of public power, regardless of the needs and problems of a specific situation. Indeed, it seems an unhappy reversion to the President's reference to TVA, just a year ago, as an example of creeping socialism. (The Washington Post and Times-Herald.)

The Mexico High School Dixie Grays Band

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE CANNON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 15, 1954

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, one of the happy features of the annual convention of the Lions International, meeting this year in New York City, was the invitation extended to high-school bands in various parts of the country to attend and participate in the convention program.

Among the bands which received the coveted invitation was the Dixie Grays Band, the famous high-school band of Mexico, Mo.

The band is under the experienced leadership of Mr. John Willer, band director of the music department of the high school. The trip is sponsored by the Lions Club of Mexico in cooperation with the State Lions organization, and is financed by the Lions with the aid of the Band Mothers Club, the A. P. Green Fire Brick Co., and the Mexico Refractories Co. The trip is under the capable direction of Mr. Robert H. Finley, former mayor of Mexico and vice president and general manager of the Northeastern Missouri Greyhound Lines, Inc., and adheres to a split-second schedule throughout.

The party, accompanied by Director and Mrs. Willer, Mr. and Mrs. R. C. Romdall, and Mr. and Mrs. Richard Kinne as chaperons, left Mexico the morning of July 4 and arrived in New York City July 6, where it played for the opening of the Lions International convention and participated in the huge parade of July 7 down Fifth Avenue.

Most of the States of the Union were represented in the 30-block-long parade which also included bands from Alaska, Australia, Bermuda, the Bahamas, Canada, China, Colombia, Cuba, Ecuador, Hawaii, British Honduras, Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua, Panama, Bolivia, Chile, Portugal, Puerto Rico, Samoa, Sweden, Switzerland, West Indies, Tangier, and Venezuela.

The vast meeting, so efficiently timed and directed, served as a remarkable example of international cooperation and emphasized the worldwide interest in music and the cultural training of the young people of all lands in student organizations.

The band completed its New York schedule July 8 and is now en route home and is sightseeing in Washington today, where it is being entertained by Senator SYMINGTON and the Senator's administrative assistant, Mr. Stanley R. Fike.

The personnel of the band and those accompanying it include: Rose Tratchell, Betty Martin, Donna Davis, Marilyn Morris, Linda Crump, Margaret Dickey, Nancy Harper, Judy Cooper, Dorothy Allen, Doris Harelson, Marjorie Farrah, Marjorie Merry, Judy Oiler, Barbara Durham, Jennie Norfleet, Mary Margaret Smith, Patsy Bonnell, Shirley Smith, Pricilla Aird, Donna Sapp, Betty Wray, Betty Payne, Glenda McIntire, Patsy Neal, Nina Harris, Marietta Tinsley, Warren Marinaccio, John Ferris, Hadley Stacey, Russell Sword, Jim Harrison, Gerald Keithley, John Precht, Charles Knox, Ronnie Curtis, James Clark, Jerry Romdall, Charles Inlow, Rogers Adams, John Bollinger, Kenneth Walker, Jim Kennedy, Richard Phillips, Ronnie Henderson, Larry Woodson, Larry Davis, Ned Dermody, Howard Hinze, Larry Niedergerke, Gordon Pitts, Donald Lotton, Ronnie Sapp, Larry Harvey, Donald Bonney, Carl Altrogge, Merril Gates, Larry Kaizer, James Breneman, Jerry Shay, C. J. Phillips, Delbert Clark, Donald Smith, Kit Bond, John Hopkins, Jim Grainge, Olan Tratchell, Gary Singleton, Jim Atkinson, Donald Ayres, Bill Young, Ronald Hampton, Donald Hampton, Mr. and Mrs. John Willer, Mr. and Mrs. R. C. Romdall, and Mr. and Mrs. Richard Kinne.

The President's Health Reinsurance Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. ALEXANDER SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 16, 1954

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, in the Washington Post of July 15 there was published an important and interesting editorial commenting on the vote in the House of Representatives a few days ago sending back to the committee the President's reinsurance health bill. I ask unanimous consent that this editorial, entitled "Vote Against Health," together with an editorial from the Washington Evening Star of the same date, entitled "Setback to Health Plans," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post of July 15, 1954]

VOTE AGAINST HEALTH

President Eisenhower is right in saying that the defeat of his health reinsurance bill by the House of Representatives is a critical loss for the American people. The House has turned its back upon the most hopeful middle-of-the-way measure that had been devised to bring health protection within the reach of many families. According to Secretary Hobby, the plan advanced by the administration could have broadened the protection of 92 million persons now insured and could have made health insurance available to 68 million persons not now covered. Her expectations may have been overly optimistic, for the plan was admittedly experimental. Yet it was a hopeful experiment entitled to a more sympathetic reception than it got in the House.

The idea behind the bill was to backstop private insurance companies and nonprofit health groups in assuming greater risks in the health-insurance field. The bill would have set up a $25-million fund to be supplemented by premiums from the participating groups. In turn those participating units could have drawn upon the fund to cover three-fourths of their abnormal losses. Experience might have required many adjustments in the plan, but that is no excuse for its outright rejection.

The President said yesterday that he thought the legislators who had sent the bill back to committee did not understand it. Rather, it appears that the measure was caught in an unfortunate crossfire from ultraconservative Republicans who feared that it might be a first step toward socialized medicine, and Democrats who favor a compulsory health-insurance system. Both groups seem to us extremely shortsighted. For the time being, at least, the door has been closed to compulsory health insurance. Those who take the attitude that Congress must vote compulsory insurance or nothing are likely to pay a heavy price for their stubbornness at the polls.

In no better position are those who think it is more important to fight words—"socialized medicine"—than to fight disease. Actually, the reinsurance bill had no relationship whatever to socialized medicine. It was merely an attempt to use governmental powers in a legitimate way to aid and extend voluntary health insurance, which has made sweeping strides without governmental help. Defeat of this bill will not help the medical profession. It means only that millions of Americans in urgent need of medical care will not get it. A vast number of others will be bankrupted by extraordinarily heavy medical and hospital costs against which they now can get no protection. The struggle to meet those problems must go on, as the President says, and legislators who are dragging their feet should not be surprised if they are caught in a tangle of public indignation.

[From the Washington Evening Star of July 15, 1954]

SETBACK TO HEALTH PLANS

Recommittal of the administration's health reinsurance bill in the House may be considered a political setback for President Eisenhower. Taken out of the political context, however, the House action—as the President told his news conference—is much more a defeat to the interests of the American people. For this modest proposal to establish a $25 million fund for the reinsurance of voluntary private health insurance plans was intended only to encourage the establishment or expansion of such nongovernmental projects—permitting a broadening of their coverage in some cases, increased protection or lower rates in others. Secretary Hobby, of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, estimates that 92 million Americans already are covered by private plans but that better protection is needed, particularly against long-term illness.

It was an unusual lineup of Democrats and Republicans that supported the recommittal motion. Although President Eisenhower repeatedly has stated his opposition to socialized medicine, and Mrs. Hobby specifically emphasized in a nationwide television address that this particular plan "rejects socialized medicine," one bloc of House opponents, mostly Republican, appeared to be basing its entire opposition on the belief the measure represented an "opening wedge" to socialized medicine. At the other extreme, it was argued—mostly by Democrats—that the bill did not go far enough, that it would provide greater help to private insurance companies than to the 63 million Americans now lacking health insurance.

The President has called this only a temporary defeat for his program to provide improved medical care for the American people. As far as this Congress is concerned, however, Majority Leader HALLECK put the House membership squarely on notice when he warned that recommittal would mean killing this particular bill. "Those who vote to recommit it will have to take that responsibility," he said. On that basis, 162 Democrats have the major responsibility—aided by 75 Republicans who deserted the administration leadership and 1 Independent.

A New Look at the Military Should Wisely Include Measures To Make Service Careers More Attractive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 11, 1954

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to include a very pertinent editorial, entitled "Morale Saver," which appeared in the June 7, 1954, issue of the Framingham (Mass.) News. The reported remarks of Air Force Secretary Talbott deserve the fullest attention and consideration of the Congress because the morale situation he points up affects not only the Air Force but the whole military service.

The article follows:

MORALE SAVER

Air Force Secretary Talbott again sounds the tocsin with regard to Air Force morale. The service chief asserts that the country is pouring out between 2 and 3 billion dollars a year on training replacements which need never be spent if service conditions were improved.

Pay increases and restoration of other benefits, he states, would bring savings of 4 to 5 dollars for every dollar spent.

But as matters stand, Mr. Talbott concedes that only 1 in 4 airmen plan to sign up again and that in some key units the reenlistment rate is as low as 10 to 15 percent. Next year the Air Force expects to lose 200,000 fully trained men, whose replacements will require the expenditure of an average $10,000 a man for indoctrination into the complexities of modern air power.

Mr. Talbott is convinced that thousands of men leaving the service would stay if they could just make ends meet. Many of these men are married and have families. They would like to make a career out of service but they also are committed to a career of life itself.

If the Air Force analysis is correct, it will actually save the country money to own up to the realities of the situation.

Need for Reappraising Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 12, 1954

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the subject of foreign policy is foremost in the attention of the American people. Included as part of my remarks are letters recently printed in the Wall Street Journal by people who maintain that the time has come to reappraise our foreign policy. Where is it leading us—to war or ultimate domination by the Communists?

FOREIGN POLICY—READERS AGREE IT NEEDS REAPPRAISING

BRITAIN A LIABILITY?

EDITOR, THE WALL STREET JOURNAL:

Your editorial, The Coming Reappraisal (July 1), telling the truth about the fundamental difference in outlook in foreign affairs of America and Britain is right to the point.

The meeting of Churchill and Eisenhower made it perfectly plain that Britain has completely altered its policy and view on alliances, and the sooner the American people awake to the fact that any trouble with Russia would bring us no support whatever from England, the better for this country.

The atomic and hydrogen bombs have plainly overwhelmed her. If any war, or threats of war, with Russia occurred, England would insist on keeping her army and air force at home, to prevent complete annihilation of her cities and her concentrated industrial plants. Indeed, if we face the truth, any alliance with her would probably prove more of a liability than an asset.

The sooner the American people realize the truth of the situation the better for us.

ARCHIE R. JONES.

EVANSTON, ILL.

COMPLIMENT

EDITOR, THE WALL STREET JOURNAL:

I want to compliment you on your editorial, The Coming Reappraisal (July 1), and wish that every American could read and understand it.

WILLIAM H. REIFSNYDER, Jr.

BOYERTOWN, PA.

COMMON SENSE

EDITOR, THE WALL STREET JOURNAL:

Your Coming Reappraisal (July 1) was, I think, a masterpiece of intelligence, insight, knowledge and commonsense.

Congratulations,

PIERRE LEBUN.

NEW YORK CITY

THE LAST BASTION

EDITOR, THE WALL STREET JOURNAL:

Your leading editorial July 1, titled "The Coming Reappraisal," represents to me one of the few remaining safeguards for the possible preservation of the way of life which we have fondly called American. Both positively and negatively the old, familiar safeguards have been eroded away by the waves of new thought that have been flooding our land during the last quarter century.

The time has come in this Nation's history for Americans to be painfully realistic, if that has become, as I believe, the fixed price of our preservation. As a part of this painful realism I would cite the steady growth of "thought" in the minds of our "friends" across the big waters—particularly Britain and France. The Chamberlain brand of appeasement may sound to future historians like a blessed benediction as compared with the sort of appeasement we'd have to extend to Communist China, and maybe to Nehru's India, if we should take our overall cue from the British and the French.

To me, without—I think—any illusions regarding the motives of the men and/or the nations exhibited in history's biggest headlines, the current situation simply furnishes additional evidence in support of the realism upon which was based the suggestion offered not so long ago by former President Herbert Hoover: That we prepare ourselves to become the last bastion of democracy, building up scientifically not only our defensive arm, but our offensive arm as well, so that we could strike with overpowering force anywhere on earth, at any time, at will, to save ourselves from the equivalent of extinction.

E. A. GENE HARRIS.

SAN ANTONIO, TEX.

WAY TO SOLUTIONS

EDITOR, THE WALL STREET JOURNAL:

May I congratulate you upon your editorial of July 1, The Coming Reappraisal. More rational thinking as disclosed in that editorial, expediency replaced by principle, would lead the way toward the solution of our problems.

H. M. KRUSE.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

FORCED ISOLATION

EDITOR, THE WALL STREET JOURNAL:

Your editorial, The Coming Reappraisal (July 1), is one of the most clear-cut realistic appraisals of world diplomacy which I have read in a long time. I only regret that it is not possible for every American to read it so as to receive a true picture of how the chips are falling in the big international game in which the United States is pitted against older and more experienced players in the field of foreign diplomacy, many of whom are only looking to their own interests.

In view of what you say, it seems that the United States is being deserted by the Allies whom she nursed back to health after World War II and whom she is still continuing to help at the present time. It seems that she might also be left in a state of forced isolation, all of which brings to mind the statements of a man who predicted this precise situation back in the thirties, but who was told to "hush up."

It looks as if the United States will have to stand alone in its fight against Communism while its Allies, Britain and France, make agreements with our enemies for more lucrative purposes than freedom and peace from aggression, namely, trade, money, and economic power. What will happen to Germany, one of the pawns in the game? And of what value will the pro forma support of Britain and France be in an effective Asian defense program if the hearts of these two countries are not in such a defense at all?

What the answers to this rather dismal situation are is difficult for anyone to say. Events will have to take their course and we can only hope for the best. However, I do believe that it is most important for the United States to maintain its firmness against communism, especially within the borders of her country and in her Government agencies; otherwise we might soon find ourselves in the position of also having to pussyfoot with those who would seek to destroy our freedoms and way of living.

ANNE MARIE WEILER.

OYSTER BAY, N. Y.

THE TIME HAS COME

EDITOR, THE WALL STREET JOURNAL:

Your editorial, The Coming Reappraisal (July 1), says so clearly and succinctly what bady needed saying by someone who commands the ear and the respect of the American public.

The ambiguity of the statements issued after the recent Churchill-Eisenhower conference simply covered up, for most headline readers, the fact that there really is no agreement as to the future course of action. Britain is very obviously going to appease the Reds, as France is engaged in doing at the moment. The former, in the interest of trade (they always think of it in capitals) as well as in the hope of again holding the balance of power, as you so wisely pointed out.

Certainly with our so-called best ally deserting to appeasement of communism, the time is at hand for that agonizing reappraisal John Foster Dulles spoke of months ago. Then it was only France—today Britain has done an about-face which brings her in the same category.

FRED FURLONG.

LONGMEADOW, MASS.

SUGGESTED COURSE

EDITOR, THE WALL STREET JOURNAL:

Congratulations for your brilliant editorial, The Coming Reappraisal (July 1).

An English statesman said, more than 100 years ago, "Britain knows no friendships, no enmities, but only interests." Let us pray that we, at last, may follow that course. To continue to show favoritism to any nation is courting disaster—just as Washington warned us in his Farewell Address, 158 years ago.

WILLIS ALLISON.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.

Noted Philippine Leader, Jose P. Laurel, To Visit United States To Help Trade Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 1, 1954

Mr. HAGEN of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, Members of the Congress and citizens generally will be interested in the early visit to the United States by former Senator Jose P. Laurel, one of the greatest leaders and statesmen in the history of the Philippines.

Coming to the United States will be a mission representing the new administration in the Philippines, of which Ramon Magsaysay is President, which mission will attempt to negotiate for the revision of the Bell Trade Agreement.

I believe the Members of the Congress will be interested in knowing more about the man who will head this delegation from the Philippines, namely, the Honorable Jose P. Laurel. They are also, of course, very interested in knowing something more about the new President of the Philippines, Ramon Magsaysay, who was elected by a big majority in last year's election.

I am pleased to include in the RECORD the following:

An article published in the Bataan magazine for December 1953, entitled "The Philippines under President Magsaysay." This article was written by myself shortly after the election last year. It was in the form of a statement or letter which I sent to Dr. John G. Udan for reading at a Magsaysay celebration dinner at the Washington Hotel in Washington, D. C., on November 28, 1953.

Secondly, I want to insert a statement by Benedicto Padilla, Madrigal Building, room 409, Escolta, Manila, Philippines, dated May 17, 1954, relative to Jose P. Laurel.

Thirdly, I am reinserting an article, condensed and revised, which I placed in the RECORD on June 27, 1947, in reference to Dr. Laurel and information concerning the situation in the Philippines.

These three articles follow:

[From Bataan magazine of December 1953]

The Philippines Under President Magsaysay

(By Representative HAROLD C. HAGEN, Member, U. S. Congress)

Ramon Magsaysay's victory in the Philippines signalizes an era of resurgent democracy in the islands. I know Mr. Magsaysay's pledges to clean out the corruption and drive out the crooks and grafters will be carried out. Magsaysay's administration is dedicated to improve the social and economic problems and create a better way of life for the rank and file of the Filipino people.

The Filipino people have won the admiration and respect of the free world for having made full use of their political freedom to elect a representative government of their own free choosing and dedicated to the service of all and not just a few favored Filipinos.

I am sure the Magsaysay government will establish a policy of strong friendship for the United States and will put greater emphasis on honesty and efficiency in government, and, lastly but by no means lesser in importance, will devote more attention to the problems of the Philippine workers and farmers. Mr. Magsaysay is a strong friend of the United States and he will greatly strengthen the ties between his government and the country that gave the Filipinos their independence.

Magsaysay knows that public office is a public trust, and he is fully aware that the beneficiaries of an established government are the people—all the people—and not a few favored relatives and intimate friends of the President. Magsaysay knows that the holding of a public office is not for personal enrichment or aggrandizement but an opportunity for honest public service for all his people.

SINCERE AND HONEST MAN

Magsaysay has used a magnetic personality, sincerity, and a record of individual honesty to turn the popular side against the Huks and the forces of communism. Yes, indeed, his rugged fearlessness, forthrightness, and superlative guidance stopped the onrushing tide of communism in the Philippines.

All great men have had to travel rough roads and many obstacles had to be surmounted. Magsaysay's road ahead is rough and rugged but the son of a blacksmith is well prepared. The examples of Rizal and Mabini prove conclusively that difficulties are not obstacles to the realization of honorable, legitimate ambitions.

Magsaysay has the driving force, the energy, and the sterling honesty which the Philippines need. In liquidating the Huks, Magsaysay risked his life many times. The world knows about the love of country, the self-sacrifice, and the dauntless valor of Dr. Jose Rizal, Gen. Gregorio del Pilar, Marcelo del Pilar, Apolinario Mabini, Andres Bonifacio, Dr. Jose P. Laurel, and other great patriots of the Philippines. I am confident that history will record a worthy addition to the list of great Filipinos—the addition of the name of Ramon Magsaysay.

Magsaysay will follow the advice of Rizal. He will tie together the forces for good, the forces which will make the Philippines stronger, and will build a great nation.

Magsaysay has followed the teaching and advice of Mabini because the next President of the Philippines loves his country next to his God; Love of country is not shown by words or empty promises, but by deeds.

Magsaysay has honorably endeavored to improve his country and the plight of his people. Honor is what prompts a man to strive for all that is noble, true, and lofty in thought and word and deed.

INFLUENCE OF RIZAL AND LAUREL

It is worthy of mention that two of the most beloved Filipinos who have served their people in every crisis during their lives have, by their deeds and advice, guided and helped to prepare Ramon Magsaysay for the tasks in the days and years ahead. I refer to Dr. Jose Rizal and Dr. Jose P. Laurel. I have read everything which has been written by my friend, Dr. Laurel. His book, Forces That Make Our Nation Great, has inspired and helped me. Dr. Laurel wrote: "An honest man is the noblest work of God. Honesty, like truthfulness, is a cardinal virtue because without it many otherwise fine qualities of the heart and of the mind become twisted and warped into antisocial traits. Generosity without honesty is nothing but the exhibitions of a vain man; and intellectual brilliance without honesty has often been the mark of men who have caused many of humanity's woes." The above words from the illustrious Laurel should be read by all of our world leaders today.

Magsaysay is in a position to assume office next January, with more prestige and power than any other former President of the Philippines has possessed. We can now see the dawning of a new day in the Philippines. Magsaysay will lead his people into that haven of happiness, peace, and prosperity that they have been struggling so hard to attain.

Jose P. Laurel, of the Philippines—True and Uncontradicted Facts

The most revealing and most authentic portrayal of Jose P. Laurel during the Japanese occupation was written by Paul W. Reeves and reproduced in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in Washington, D. C., June 27, 1947.

Not one sentence—or even one word—of this enlightening, factual, and magnificent document has ever been contradicted or challenged by the small group of willful and unscrupulous detractors of Jose P. Laurel.

More than 50,000 reprints of this Reeves article were distributed throughout the Philippines and many newspapers reprinted the article during the 1949 campaign for the Presidency. The article became famous and made Paul W. Reeves one of the most popular and best-loved Americans who has ever lived in the Philippines.

In view of the true analysis of the problems with which Dr. Laurel had to deal and the accurate predictions made by Mr. Reeves in 1947, and in the light of the overwhelming vote of confidence which was given Jose P. Laurel by the Filipino people in 1949 and 1951 (and also in view of the overwhelming majority vote cast in 1953 for Hon. Ramon Magsaysay, whose nomination was brought about because Dr. Laurel refused to accept the nomination), it is a distinct honor and a real pleasure to send at this time (May 1954) the very exceptional article which was written by my friend Reeves in 1947.

Abraham Lincoln gave his life to save the Union. The unselfishness and patriotism of Jose P. Laurel caused this humble man to refuse the unanimous nomination for the Presidency which was tendered to him in 1953 on a gold platter. I say that Jose P. Laurel was and is a great patriot. He is one of the immortals of all time.

I agree 100 percent with every statement which Mr. Reeves incorporated in his splendid article, and I am sure it will enlighten many Americans on hitherto unknown facts.

BENEDICTO PADILLA,
Room 409, Madrigal Building,
Escolta, Manila, Philippines.
MAY 17, 1954.

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 27, 1947]

Dr. Jose P. Laurel of the Philippines

(By P. W. Reeves)

While living in Manila in 1937 it was my good fortune to hear Dr. Laurel speak at a public function. I was fascinated by his sincerity, his eloquence, his great learning and, above all, his sublime humility. When I returned to Manila in March 1946 praise of this humble man was uttered by almost everyone you met, and he was condemned by some. I again had the opportunity to study the life and career of this man. One of the greatest pleasures of my life was the first evening I had dinner with Dr. Laurel. After that I talked with him a number of times. I studied the man and weighed his words at close range.

During my stay in Manila in 1946 and 1947 I discussed with many people the charges against Dr. Laurel. I talked with high government officials. I talked with associate justices of the supreme court. I visited in the homes of members of the cabinet of President Roxas. I talked with the middle classes, the working classes, and with men in the streets who did not have jobs. It was my pleasure to talk with President Roxas on two occasions.

My fascination for Dr. Laurel caused me to dig deep into every act of his life, particularly that part of his career when he served his people as President during the period of Japanese occupation. My investigation causes me to express the opinion that no man has served his country more conspicuously and more faithfully than Jose P. Laurel. He is, indeed, a true patriot of the highest order.

From 1909 until 1923 Jose P. Laurel served his government in various capacities. Governor Gen. Leonard Wood appointed him as head of the Interior Department. From 1925 to 1931 he served as a senator in the Philippine Senate. In 1935 he was selected to serve as a delegate to the Constitutional Convention and he was one of those selected to write the constitution for the Commonwealth of the Philippines, which same constitution was adopted when the Philippine Republic came into being. In 1936 President Quezon appointed Dr. Laurel to be an associate justice of the supreme court. On December 24, 1941, after war was declared on Japan, President Quezon again appointed Dr. Laurel (this time to one of the most important positions in the Philippines) to be secretary of justice. When President Quezon was preparing to go to Corregidor because of the imminence of the fall of Manila, Quezon sent for Dr. Laurel and told him he wanted him to accompany him in an advisory capacity. Dr. Laurel wanted to remain with his people, but he had never failed to answer the call of his country in time of peril and he was ready to go with Quezon on the flight to Australia. However, at the very last hour President Quezon decided, on account of Dr. Laurel's popularity with the Filipino people, that Dr. Laurel should stay in Manila. President Quezon instructed Dr. Laurel to stay and help protect the people. President Quezon took Justice Santos with him to Australia, and he told Dr. Laurel to do whatever was necessary to protect the people short of taking the oath of allegiance to Japan. Upon invitation from President Quezon, Dr. Laurel accompanied President and Mrs. Quezon to the boat that was to take them from Manila. Quezon's instructions to Dr. Laurel were given with the knowledge and approval of General MacArthur. General MacArthur's instructions were that the Filipino officials could serve in the Japanese-sponsored organization in order to better protect the people, but he admonished them that they must not take the oath of allegiance to Japan, otherwise they would be shot by his order upon his return to the Philippines.

From the fall of Corregidor on May 12, 1942, until October 1943, Jorge Vargas was head of the Philippine Executive Commission. During this same period Dr. Laurel served as Commissioner (head) of Justice. This was the same post which Dr. Laurel held under President Quezon by appointment in December 1941. In October 1943, Dr. Laurel was made President of the Republic of the Philippines by order of the Japanese who were occupying Manila. Dr. Laurel was carrying out Quezon's instructions to remain and cooperate with the Japanese in order to better protect the people. Dr. Laurel served as President from October 1943 until February 1945, when, over his protest, he was taken to Tokyo.

The late President Quezon was a patriot of the highest order. No man ever accused Quezon of being a traitor. When the Japs were approaching Manila, thousands of Filipinos fled to Baguio and to the mountains. Dr. Laurel remained in Manila, in accordance with instructions given by President Quezon. Dr. Laurel's designation to remain in Manila and protect the people was a distinct recognition of Dr. Laurel's patriotism and it was wonderful proof of the high regard which Quezon entertained for Dr. Laurel. Under date of September 30, 1943, the late President Quezon wrote: "I believe Dr. Laurel is doing what he honestly believes is in the best interest of the Filipino people for the time being." In the book The Good Fight, which President Quezon wrote shortly before his death, there is ample proof that President Quezon did not question Dr. Laurel's integrity or patriotism.

The Japanese demanded that Dr. Laurel declare war on the United States. In October 1943, Premier Tojo called President Laurel to Tokyo and reiterated his demands for a declaration of war against United States. Dr. Laurel explained to Tojo that the Filipinos could not be made to fight the Americans. Dr. Laurel pointed out to Tojo that Japan would lose much and would destroy, in the minds of the Filipinos, the estimation of independence which Japan had granted to the Philippines. With great courage, Dr. Laurel stood before Tojo and unhesitatingly and unflinchingly presented his reasons for failure to comply with Tojo's orders. According to Filipinos who were present at the conference in Tokyo between Dr. Laurel and Tojo, Dr. Laurel displayed iron strength and great courage in his argument with Tojo, and he finally convinced Tojo that he (Laurel) was right. After Davao and Legaspi were bombed by the Americans, the Japanese again demanded that Dr. Laurel declare war against the United States. Dr. Laurel called his cabinet together and stated to his cabinet that there were three courses open. One course would be to refuse and flee to the mountains. The second course was to make a stand at Malacanang Palace with the Presidential guard. The first course was ruled out because the Japs had placed guards around the President and all members of the cabinet. Flight to the mountains was impossible. The second course would mean sure death to Dr. Laurel and every member of the cabinet. Dr. Laurel told me when I talked with him in Manila in 1947 that death was not the determining factor that caused abandonment of the first two courses. He told me that he knew the Filipinos would suffer by his death. Dr. Laurel knew that when he and his cabinet were wiped out, the Japs would take over and govern directly and ruthlessly, or would name some rabid pro-Japanese to succeed him as President of the Philippine Government. The third and only course left open was to play ball and declare by proclamation that a state of war existed.

Dr. Laurel issued the proclamation stating that a state of war exists but added there would be no conscription of manpower. Dr. Laurel points with great pride to his next act, which was the cleverest bit of maneuvering performed by him during his entire rule as president. He told the Filipino people over the radio there would be no conscription. Dr. Laurel's purpose, as he pointed out to me, was to tie his own hands so he could not later disavow the promise he had made to his people that there would be no conscription. In all his life Dr. Laurel had never failed to keep a promise made to his people. He, therefore, had an ace in the hole in case the Japs later on demanded conscription. Everybody knew that a declaration that a state of war exists without conscription would be a joke. Dr. Laurel's act in refusing to order conscription saved the lives of hundreds of thousands of Filipinos. When the Americans landed in Manila, from all directions, they were met by hundreds and hundreds of thousands of Filipinos. One Army officer told me that if the Filipinos had had guns in their hands (instead of American flags) when the Americans arrived, at least 200,000 Filipinos would have been slaughtered.

The people of Manila had their places of business destroyed, their homes blasted to shambles. Fathers, mothers, husbands, wives, brothers, sisters, and loved ones were brutally slaughtered. And yet when Dr. Laurel was brought back to Manila in July 1946, the streets of Manila were lined with countless thousands and they were all screaming words of praise for Dr. Laurel. I witnessed many demonstrations of loyalty and love for this great idol of the Filipino people.

On August 18, 1946, the people of Dr. Laurel's home province of Batangas paid their native son the highest honor he received throughout his life. A mass demonstration and parade took place in Manila. All Manila streets were filled to overflowing. Many thousands of the residents of Batangas came to Manila to participate in the parade. Additional thousands from far-flung provinces poured into Manila. For 2 days before the parade took place in Manila there was a continuous stream of cars and various forms of vehicles on all roads leading into Manila. When I mentioned to Dr. Laurel that that parade was the greatest manifestation of love and affection I had ever witnessed for any man, Dr. Laurel said to me, with tears rolling down his cheeks: "Mr. Reeves, that was and that is my answer to the charges which some have brought against me."

The congressional district represented by the son of Dr. Laurel was badly damaged. The people were embittered because of the damage done to their people and their property by the Japanese. Congressman Laurel had a tough campaign for reelection because those who were trying to crucify Dr. Laurel were bitterly opposing Congressman Laurel. The charges against the father were paramount issues in the Congressman's campaign for reelection. Congressman Laurel was overwhelmingly reelected. The Congressman told me: "My great triumph was achieved because of the great admiration which our people still have for my father."

In discussing the Laurel case with various people, I have always contended that the people of the Philippines are in a better position to pass judgment on the greatness and patriotism of Jose P. Laurel than a few Americans in Washington, D. C. This little group will not succeed in turning America against Dr. Laurel once the true facts are known. I have endeavored to give the true facts to some of our people in America.

It is known throughout the Philippines that when the chief of the Japanese military police told Dr. Laurel that Manuel Roxas must die, Laurel's ultimatum was: "Before I surrender Roxas, you will have to shoot me."

Dr. Laurel has insisted upon a trial. He is not afraid to face trial. The politicians know that the Filipino people are solidly behind Laurel and a handful of men have concentrated their efforts on preventing a trial. This is not a trial of one man. The trial concerns 20 million Filipinos who benefitted from the patriotic service which Dr. Laurel rendered. I have talked with hundreds of Filipinos. Not a single Filipino has ever uttered one word against Dr. Laurel. They acclaimed him as their savior.

Hundreds and hundreds of incidents could be reviewed to prove Dr. Laurel's patriotism and loyalty to America. I need only cite the following incident to convince any fair-minded man about the patriotism of Dr. Laurel. In 1944 President Laurel offered to Col. Alejandro D. Garcia the position of Governor of Nueva Ecija. Colonel Garcia was undecided about accepting the post from President Laurel and he told President Laurel he would like to take up the matter with General MacArthur before accepting the appointment. However, his doubts about accepting the appointment were dispelled when President Laurel handed him a small piece of paper on which was written the following words:

"My loyalty to America can only be removed by cutting off my head.

"LAUREL."

Colonel Garcia was later taken prisoner by the Japs and the note above described was found in some private papers and effects which Colonel Garcia had left behind. The note in question was discovered by Capt. R. Espiritu, a guerrilla leader who was an operative of the Allied Intelligence Bureau.

There were some Filipinos who "played ball" with the Japs because they thought the Japs would be victorious. Those few made a lot of money. The record will show that President Laurel dealt brutally with this group of traitors. This small group of Filipinos who thought the Japs would win became bitter enemies of President Laurel and it was that small group which charged Dr. Laurel as being a collaborator and a traitor. That same group will continue to try to blacken the name of this great man.

An overwhelming majority of the Filipino people know that Dr. Laurel fought for them every step of the way. Notwithstanding the propaganda and attacks in some quarters of the Philippines and by a few men in America. I am convinced that Dr. Laurel is the most loved man in the Philippines. The Filipinos trusted Dr. Laurel before the Japs arrived. They trusted him during Japanese occupation. They trust and love him today.

In February 1947 I dined in the home of one of the most outstanding Filipinos in Manila who held a high judicial post under President Quezon, President Osmeña, and President Roxas. When I asked my friend what he thought of Dr. Laurel, he quickly replied: "Laurel is one of our greatest patriots. He has devoted his life and has given the best there is in him for the betterment of our people."

Dr. Laurel fought for the Filipinos before the Commonwealth was established. He fought for Philippine independence. He fed, he clothed, he guided, he protected his people during Japanese occupation. In the hardest times that his people have ever encountered, he did not hesitate to serve. He will never hesitate to serve his country in time of peril.

This plain man who is idolized by his people has innumerable outstanding qualities, the greatest of which is his sublime humility. Intellectually, Dr. Laurel has no peer in the Philippines among the living or dead. He has more earned degrees (not honorary) than any other Filipino.

Dr. Laurel's name is linked with the progressive administration of justice in the Philippines and strengthens the faith of the people in the courts as dispenser of that justice. Dr. Laurel's pen is the mightiest and most powerful in the Philippines. His service as a member of the supreme court enhanced the prestige and honor of the courts and gave luster and dignity to the Philippine jurisprudence.

Before the war and during Japanese occupation the name of Laurel was a living symbol of national assertiveness, of dignity, and of patriotic ardor which enrich the mainsprings of a noble heritage. The war did not change the genuine metal of his greatness. Today he has more friends throughout the Philippines than he had before the Japs arrived in Manila. The example set by Dr. Laurel will forever stand out as a beacon light, typifying the quality and character that go to make up a great man in all senses of the word.

Dr. Laurel seems to have been endowed with that extraordinary clarity of vision, that vivid imagination, which is the mark of the truly great man. There is not a coarse fiber in his makeup. He is quiet spoken, kind, and humane. He has used his great talents to advance the cause of justice. He has given his all to the cause of righteousness. His only concern is the triumph of justice. He has fought against every form of oppression and discrimination. He has used his wisdom, his influence, his energy, and what material means he had to assist those who needed his help and guidance. His intelligence, his strength, his greatness, has not caused him to lose the common touch. Today he is the champion of the common man in the Philippines. He represents the ideals which Rizal fought for. By his devotion to principle, his austerity, his refusal to compromise, his love of country, he has won millions of followers to his banner. He spent himself utterly, with never a thought of his own comfort or his own welfare. The one impelling force which has guided this great man throughout his life has been his desire to help his people.

On February 25, 1947, Dr. Laurel asked me to have lunch with him at a small restaurant in downtown Manila. When we walked into the restaurant all of the people who were sitting at tables and at the lunch counter crowded around the table which we occupied. There was such a crowd around us and the enthusiasm was so intense it was impossible for the waiter to serve us for almost 45 minutes. Finally, when Dr. Laurel and I had a light lunch and started back to my hotel, I asked Dr. Laurel for a statement. He reached for a sheet of paper and wrote: "President Quezon left us behind with instructions to do our best to protect the people, and he authorized us to do whatever was necessary to this end, short of taking the oath of allegiance to Japan. This was done with the knowledge and approval of General MacArthur. We did our best under the circumstances. We refrained from taking any step calculated to help the Japanese in their military objectives. If anything was done which might give the impression of rendering aid to the enemy, this was done either under force or duress under military occupation. This is evident, for instance, in the case of the declaration of a state of war where I refused to authorize conscription of the Filipinos for military purposes of the enemy. Our fundamental objective was to enable the people to live and to prevent their extermination by the cruel and barbarous enemy. We were faced with an actual situation, not with theories, and we did our best under God and in loyalty to our people. I am not insensitive to the demonstrations of affection of my people wherever I go, and I shall continue to serve them in my retirement with loyalty and courage." And, as he handed me the paper on which his statement was written, he said, "I would do it all over again."

As time passes the attacks and false charges of the litle bunch of small men who have tried to crucify this great patriot will be forgotten. When the true facts are known in America the stature of Dr. Laurel will be known as it is known in the Philippines.

When Dr. Laurel's time has come to an end historians of the future will present the true stature of this great patriot. They will rank him with Rizal, Bonifacio, General Luna, Mabini, and Quezon. It will be said that his understanding mind, his profound sympathy, his human kindness, his moral courage, his iron will, his rugged fearlessness will serve as an inspiration for unborn generations to come, and an illustration of how a great personality can utilize the opportunities of the land he so deeply loved. Justice cannot fail this great man whose sacrificial service now shines in the fullness of its grandeur within the contemplation of a grateful people.

Such a patriot of steel will always remain in the hearts of his people.

P. W. Reeves.

End Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 12, 1954

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including the following editorial that appeared in the Wall Street Journal on July 14 on the subject of foreign aid:

Ending Foreign Aid

One of the more useful things which the Senate Foreign Relations Committee did with the foreign aid bill was to provide for the liquidation of the Foreign Operations Administration by next June 30 in preparation for an early end of the formal foreign aid program itself.

It has been 7 years now since General Marshall, then the Secretary of State, launched the foreign aid program. In those years the program has undergone so many changes that it bears little resemblance to the original; and the times have undergone so much change that circumstances do not justify perpetuation of even the modified program.

When the first year's $6 billion was appropriated it was labeled as purely a war reconstruction program. The money was offered, ironically, to Iron Curtain countries as well as the Western nations. There were limitations on the use of the aid for military purposes. The whole program was to last at most for 5 years.

Well, when the Senate committee approved the $3 billion for the 1954–55 year, by far the largest part of the money was scheduled for military purposes. And no one suggested that any part of it be permitted to go behind the Iron Curtain.

The only resemblance of the present program to General Marshall's original program is that it involves billions of dollars going to foreign countries.

What all this has accomplished is a matter of debate. Billions of dollars poured out over 7 years could hardly help helping the recipients. But the economic phase of the program certainly never lived up to its prospectus. And now despite all the military aid, no one really knows how much defense we have bought in Europe.

NATO is a useful organization; but it does not include Western Germany. The European army, which would include Germany, does not exist; and even if the United States rams it down French and Italian throats it is a question whether it will be anything more than a ghost army.

So it is not too plain what we have to show for our 7 years of the Marshall plan, as amended. But it is plain enough that there is not much to hope from it.

The timetable set by the Senate committee is to close down the FOA next June and turn its remaining functions over to the State and Defense Departments. Economic aid would be shut off by June 1956, and formal military aid by the following year.

Perhaps there will be reason for further aid to particular countries for specific purposes; the United States, for example, might find it advisable to aid a West German army to get started if one should be created. But it will prove far better, we think, to consider these as separate cases to be handled as circumstances dictate than to continue a wholesale aid program that does not get value received for the defense dollar.

What the President Said About the TVA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 16, 1954

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an editorial entitled "What the President Said," which appeared a few days ago in the Decatur Daily, of Decatur, Ala.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

What the President Said

"If I am elected President, TVA will be operated and maintained at maximum efficiency. I have taken a keen appreciation of what it has done and what it will be able to continue to do in the future. Under the new administration TVA will continue to serve and promote the prosperity of this great section of the United States." That is the wording of a telegram sent by Candidate Eisenhower to editors of the Knoxville News-Sentinel and the Memphis Press-Scimitar just 2 days before the election in 1952.

We find it difficult to interpret the meaning of that telegram in the light of events which have trapspired in the last year and a half. We believe President Eisenhower to be one of the sincerest people in the world. He would not stoop to political chicanery. Yet the wool is certainly being pulled over his eyes by forces which have been in public disrepute for the past 25 years.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the Congressional Record is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Frank Brodie is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the Record at $1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

HI

Ch

Ro

Bi
du
to S

Bi
S

Co
S

Co
S

Co

in
18

of
w

pı
ar

S
ir
fe
a

F
p
p

A
t
r
l

oe
d-
on
le
er
ue
his
at
di-
lle
m-
52.
an-
nts
d a
to
rld.
ery.
over
blic

o is
here
ring
for
per
o be
the

Appendix

Anti-Semitic Activity in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 16, 1954

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, a statement I have prepared containing certain extracts from a report and appraisal entitled "Anti-Semitic Activity in the United States."

The report was prepared and issued recently by the American Jewish Committee.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR KEFAUVER

These unfortunately are troubled times in which certain subversive and dissident influences unhappily are able to continue their work of spreading discord and weakening the fabric of our constitutionally prescribed form of government. The American Jewish Committee's report is most timely in this respect. It provides the tools that are needed for the constant vigilance that is required by our people if they are to protect their liberties.

As the president of the American Jewish Committee, Irving M. Engel, Esq., of New York, states in the foreword to the report:

"Organized bigotry, like all other social ills, is best counteracted when its nature and symptoms are known to the public. To gather and disseminate such knowledge, the American Jewish Committee has engaged in continuing research and analysis of anti-Semitic activity and has rendered reports of its findings from time to time.

"Today, as the American people cope with the worldwide threat of communism and bend their energies to resolve many other crucial problems, it is more than ever necessary to guard against malicious movements striving to foment racial and religious discord. Many of these movements have now abandoned their former overt appeals to bigotry in favor of more subtle tactics to which the public must be alerted. It is this circumstance that has occasioned the present report.

"Founded nearly half a century ago, the American Jewish Committee is dedicated to the great common task of all loyal Americans—the strengthening of unity among our citizens of all races and creeds to the end that this Nation and its free institutions may remain secure."

The report is keynoted by an extract from the annual report of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, dated February 6, 1954, where, on page 5, the following statement appears:

"There are presently at work within the United States various and sundry hate groups, the leaders of which, while masking their activities under the guise of patriotism and devotion to the republican form of government, are in fact spreading dissension, discord, bigotry, and intolerance. In many instances, these organizations select ultrapatriotic names and devices to conceal their true and dangerous purposes. The subjects of the hate attacks are individuals or groups of religious and racial minorities among American citizens. The committee is by no means unaware of these activities, and investigation and documentation will proceed to the end that the individuals concerned may be disclosed for what they are. In the opinion of the committee, there are no degrees to subversion. It is not sufficient to be simply anti-Communist if one is anti-American at the same time."

It is true indeed that there are no degrees to subversion. Power mad zealots have too long been able to single out individuals or groups of religious and racial minorities among American citizens and subject them to hate attacks or casually snide implications that they should not enjoy the full exercise of the rights of citizenship which the Constitution provides for them. I regret to say that there have been such evidences even in my own State, but it always has and will be my privilege and my duty to the people of my State and the Nation to take a stand in opposition to them and expose them to the light of day.

The American Jewish Committee is a pioneer organization in the fight against bigotry and intolerance. It has chapters throughout our country and its members are leaders in their own communities. Its report is a sober and factual statement. The following extracts emphasize its principle points:

"In this time of worldwide tensions, it is more than ever important that we correctly appraise the force and scope of organized anti-Semitism—as distinguished from individual expressions of social and economic discrimination—in the United States.

"Until about 20 years ago, our country was comparatively free of this evil which had plagued the Old World for centuries. But with Hitler's rise in Germany, the anti-Semitic movement was forged into an exportable weapon which found its way into the hands of democracy's foes throughout the world.

"In the United States, this weapon has been wielded with varying effect over the years. Organized anti-Semitism has waxed and waned, but never has it vanished completely from the American scene; never has it ceased to be a threat, actual or potential, to our national unity and our free institutions.

* * * * *

"To achieve a proper perspective, it is necessary to understand that many anti-Semites have abandoned their former brash and obvious tactics. The more skillful hatemongers and cunning publicists have now developed a sense of public relations. They exploit current legitimate issues, toning down, if not eliminating, open anti-Semitism. They aim to win the support of respectable elements, rather than the lunatic fringe following which they so highly prized in Christian Front days.

"Thus, in the Presidential elections of 1952, when several thousand citizens in the States of California, Texas, Missouri, Arkansas, North Dakota, and Washington voted for Gen. Douglas MacArthur on the Christian Nationalist Party ticket, these voters were expressing their confidence in an American hero. They were unaware that the general had not accepted the nomination, and that the party was actually a front for one of the most vicious and implacable anti-Semites in the country.

"Similarly, when many people in Los Angeles protested against the schools teaching about UNESCO (United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization), they had at heart what they sincerely, albeit mistakenly, believed to be the best interest of our country. They did not know that many of the alarming rumors they had heard about UNESCO came from the propaganda of a man who makes his living stirring up hatred, and who once headed an organization which the Attorney General of the United States listed as Fascist.

"Such are the maneuvers whereby anti-Semites currently seek to influence public opinion. Thus far, their success has not been impressive; but the support and alliances they have gained by their deceptive tactics nevertheless constitute a potential danger.

"HOW THE CHANGE CAME ABOUT

"Overt anti-Semitism reached its high-water mark in the United States in 1939, when several hundred anti-Jewish groups, launched with Nazi money, tried to convince Americans that Hitler was right. Mainly composed of crackpots and presided over by petty fuehrers, these organizations held storm-troop meetings; they picketed; they published reams of abusive literature, but such blatant demagogery was offensive to the overwhelming majority of Americans; mostly the so-called lunatic fringe rallied to their banners.

"On Pearl Harbor Day most of the rabble-rousers scurried for cover, remaining there for the duration of the war. By 1947, organized anti-Semitism had reached its lowest ebb.

"The advent of the cold war brought many of these agitators back into the open. Some resumed their rabid fulminations against the Jews. Others, having learned from experience that racist appeals violated a basic American ethic, now courted public approval by exploiting the controversial issues of the day. The glibness of their arguments and the vigor of their attacks appeal especially to ultranationalist groups.

"Ultranationalist groups have been a factor in American life since the First World War. They have opposed all progressive moves to meet the needs of Government and society in these complex, industrialized, modern times. After almost a generation of collective bargaining, social-security measures, and Government welfare programs, ultranationalists still seek a return to the 19th century. Their view of States' rights would even preclude SEC regulation of security markers.

"Although three wars have proven their thesis fallacious, the ultranationalists are still vehemently isolationists. They oppose foreign aid, bitterly resent United States participation in the United Nations, and favor amending the Constitution to curtail the treatymaking power of the Federal Government. Suspicious of foreigners, they have consistently resisted immigration into this country except by persons of certain approved racial and national origins, and have fought all efforts to improve our immigration laws.

* * * * *

"Though often led and financed by reputable individuals, and spending millions of dollars to advertise their views via press, platform, radio, and other media, ultranationalists made little headway with the average American until the cold war brought about the present tense atmosphere of our national life.

"While some of the ultranationalist groups espouse retrogressive economic reforms, and others have political aims, all favor extremist techniques in combating communism—free-swinging, wild-accusation tactics which indiscriminately charge liberals with being communistic. Ultranationalists are now appealing to the American people on this basis, equating everything they oppose with communism, subversion, and a newly invented phenomenon—creeping socialism.

"During the past decade, ultranationalist organizations have increased measurably, and they now offer tempting opportunities for infiltration by anti-Semitic elements. In setting out to cultivate these groups, the professional bigot plays his hand adroitly, exploiting the particular political issues which are currently the focus of concern in ultranationalist circles.

* * * * *

"SOCIO-ECONOMIC MEASURES

"It is expected that ultra-nationalist groups will soon launch their strongest attack upon such long-accepted features of our national way of life as unionism, social security, Government welfare assistance, and similar social reforms of the past generation. Tied in will be appeals to 'save America from creeping socialism' and return to 'constitutionalism,' 'economic freedom,' and 'freedom of choice.' Anti-Semites add the 'Jewish angle' to these lines, alleging prominent Americans of Jewish background to be Machiavellian agents of a super-government.

"THIRD PARTY ISSUE

"The third party is not a new feature in American politics. Theodore Roosevelt's Bull Moose Party, LaFollette's Progressives, and the more recent political venture of Henry Wallace, bearing the same title, come readily to mind. Adapting this idea to their own objectives, ultranationalists contend that the present Republican administration is little more than a carbon copy of the Democratic administrations which preceded it. Many anti-Semites have sedulously taken up the third party cry; in so doing, their propaganda generally charges that both major political parties are controlled by Jews.

"A notorious instance of this dovetailing occurred during the 1952 Republican primary fights when both the ultra-nationalists and the anti-Semites opposed the nomination of General Eisenhower. The former proclaimed what they considered his failings, and the latter blaimed these shortcomings on Jewish influence. In some localities, laflets penned by as many as 10 agitators in different parts of the country were assembled into kits and distributed on main thoroughfares. A typical piece showed a Streicher-like caricature of the Jew pointing to Eisenhower and saying, 'Ike vill keep us boys in power.' This broadside was produced by Independent Republicans for MacArthur, a front organization established by Gerald L. K. Smith—without MacArthur's approval.

* * * * *

"PARTISANSHIP OF THE M'CARRAN-WALTER IMMIGRATION ACT

"The McCarran-Walter Act has been severely criticized by Christian organizations—Protestants and Catholic—as well as by Jewish and many other reputable groups. Much ultra-nationalist and anti-Semitic propaganda, aimed at stirring antialien sentiment, has attacked critics of the act, while minimizing or ignoring the opposition of Christian church groups. Played up instead is a portrayal of the Jews' as seeking the laws repeal because they wish to get millions of their coreligionists into this country. Hints of Jewish power are frequently woven into this argument.

"EXPLOITING LOCAL ISSUES

"The onslaught of ultranationalists against modern education has gravely harassed the school systems of many towns during the past several years. In some instances, so-called education groups, dominated or influenced by anti-Semites, have smeared modern educational methods as communistic and atheistic. Such features as intercultural education, especially, have come under vicious attack; leading educators have been vilified as Communists and their textbooks investigated. UNESCO teaching materials and the display of the U. N. flag have been frequently used as starting points for these attacks. The momentum produced by the earlier organizational and propaganda efforts of ultranationalists promises to keep the issue of modern educational methods alive for some time to come.

"In the grotesque effort to exploit the fears and phobias of the public, the anti-Semites have seized upon proposals in some sections of the country to fluoridate drinking water as a community health measure. Demagogic interpretations range from outright scares of mass poisoning and mass suicide to innuendoes that fluorine saps the individual's willpower—an end, it is charged, desired by the Government. Also suggested, if not openly asserted, is that a supersecret world government backs the project. Fantastic? Yet huge quantities of such propaganda were distributed in Cincinnati. They may well have influenced the negative vote which this proposition received in November 1953.

* * * * *

"CONCLUSION

"Organized anti-Semitic activity today bears little resemblance to the noisy, unruly assemblages of pre-Pearl Harbor days with their spewing of unvarnished racial hatred easily recognizable as Nazi inspired. Using as a point of reference the year 1947, when the anti-Semitic movement reached its lowest ebb, several changing trends in dynamics and tactics are discernible:

"First, more emphasis is laid on disseminating literature, rather than staging meetings, picket lines, rallies, and other demonstrations.

"Second, more subtle approaches are made to public opinion by exploiting such issues as communism, United Nations, and national economic policies.

"Third, there is a pronounced tendency among prominent ultranationalist organizations and leaders to accept—or at least tolerate—hatemongers and their propaganda products. In many cases this amenability is the result of unwariness; many would be more discerning, were it not for their own extremist viewpoints.

"And finally, professional fomenters of discord are in positions where they can cause much trouble, for they have learned how to salt public debate with hate propaganda, and have discovered the usefulness of general mailing lists, instead of relying on the private rosters of crackpot following in years gone by.

"The threat of bigotry polluting the American atmosphere can best be averted by an alert American public. Hatemongers and their machinations must be exposed. Vitally important is the responsibility of ultranationalists and ultraconservatives to recognize, and rid themselves of, the racists who seek to exploit and dominate them. Equally vital is the obligation of respectable leaders and supporters of these movements to dissociate themselves from groups which cannot dislodge the anti-Semites, and to persuade other men of goodwill to do likewise.

"There is much room in the market-place of ideas for opposing viewpoints on a multitude of issues—national and international, political, social, and economic. That is the glory of American democracy. But the public must be shown how to recognize and reject the ideological counterfeiters who would pass on as legal tender their hollow coins of bigotry."

Don't Let Red China Issue Wreck U. N.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GUY M. GILLETTE

OF IOWA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, July 17, 1954

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Don't Let Red China Issue Wreck U. N.," published in the Des Moines Register of July 8, 1954.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DON'T LET RED CHINA ISSUE WRECK U. N.

The opposition to U. N. membership for Communist China among American politicians ranges from nominal, "on the record" opposition to the passionate fanaticism of Senator KNOWLAND. But it is almost unanimous.

In one sense, this opposition to seating Red China in the U. N. speaks well for American politics. Clearly, American Congressmen want to keep the Chinese Communists out of U. N. primarily on grounds of moral principle. Seating the representatives of Peiping in the United Nations could not seriously injure United States interests in a material way.

The United Nations, as many of the most violent opponents of Chinese admission keep pointing out, has no real power as it stands today. National sovereignty is uncurbed, including the national sovereignty of both Soviet Russia and the United States. So the Red Chinese would gain no power advantage by being in the United Nations. However, they would gain "standing," perhaps, by being admitted to the "town meeting of the world" on equal terms.

It is to the credit of many American politicians that they insist on refusing membership to a regime which launched a war of aggression in Korea—against the United Nations itself—even though there would be no sacrifice of American interests involved. This stand is in the finest traditions of American moral leadership in the world and emphasizes the moral underpinnings of American foreign policy.

It could even be argued, and is, that admission of Communist China to the United Nations would be an advantage to the free world and to America. The British make the point that differences between Peiping and Moscow might be more fully exploited by the free world if the two great Communist powers were seated on equal terms in U. N. Whatever the merits of this argument, most American Congressmen, Democrats and Republicans alike, are willing to ignore it in order to stand on the moral principle that China cannot shoot her way into the U. N.

But the high moral principle behind American objections to letting Red China in the U. N. must be balanced against the equally high moral principle of general support for the United Nations and cooperation with America's allies in the free world.

General support for the United Nations is one of the most fundamental elements of American foreign policy. This is not a partisan matter, either. President Eisenhower and Secretary of State Dulles are strongly behind this policy as were the preceding Democratic administrations.

The conflict between these two basic principles of United States foreign policy will be emphasized during the congressional debates on foreign policy in the weeks ahead. Many of this country's strongest allies believe that China should be admitted to U. N., especially Great Britain. The United States may have to choose between accepting the majority view of its allies, and supporting the idea of majority rule in the U. N., or standing alone on the China issue and risking the destruction of the United Nations. Senator KNOWLAND and others who feel as he does would gladly wreck U. N. rather than give in on the point of Chinese membership.

This attitude seems to us not to give proper weight to the importance of maintaining a going world organization, however fragile that organization may be at the moment.

We, too, oppose admitting the Chinese Communist government into the U. N. We believe the United States should argue as effectively as it can against such membership—as indeed it has on numerous occasions.

But to say, as Senator KNOWLAND does, that the United States should withdraw from U. N. and refuse to give it financial support if the Peiping regime were a member, seems to us to be the height of irresponsibility and reckless of this country's long run interests in the world. At his press conference Wednesday, President Eisenhower cautioned against any such intemperate action.

Senate at Crossroads on Farm Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, July 17, 1954

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able editorial entitled "Senate at Crossroads on Farm Policy," which was published in the Philadelphia Inquirer of July 17, 1954.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATE AT CROSSROADS ON FARM POLICY

When the Senate takes up the burning issue of farm-price supports, probably next week, we hope every Member of that body bears in mind a statement made the other day by the operator of the largest privately owned wheat farm in the world.

"There are just two ways to reduce surpluses," said Thomas D. Campbell, of Billings, Mont. "First, to reduce acreage—that's primary. Second, to reduce the loan based on parity, so there won't be so much incentive to grow wheat."

There, in a couple of sentences, is the commonsense answer to the problems of huge, costly and growing surpluses, high retail prices and enormous costs to the taxpayer involved in the farm question.

There, simplified, of course, is exactly the kind of solution the Eisenhower administration and Agriculture Secretary Benson are fighting for—and it is the solution that a group of bitter-enders from the farm States is opposing with all its strength and stubbornness.

As the farm question goes into its crucial days in Congress, the administration has already scored a victory which a few months ago would have been considered all but impossible.

The House did not go all the way with Benson and the President. The original administration proposal to get away from the rigid, 90-percent-of-parity supports for basic farm crops by substituting a flexible scale of 75 to 90 percent had to be amended.

But the House, for the first time in 6 years, accepted the principle of flexibility. It set the range from 82½ to 90 percent, but by so doing agreed that the time for hard-and-fast 90 percent supports was over, and that another system, giving the consumer the benefits of higher production, should be instituted.

That this compromise is headed for serious trouble in the Senate is clear from the vote of the Senate Agriculture Committee, which last week decided to keep mandatory 90 percent supports on the basic crops for another year. The vote was 8 to 7, and 3 Republican Senators—MUNDT, of South Dakota; THYE, of Minnesota, and and YOUNG, of North Dakota—voted with 5 Democrats to upset the administration plan.

What's wrong with rigid high supports? The 7 minority members of the Senate committee—2 Democrats and 5 Republicans—who voted for the administration plan gave some cogent answers in their report filed this week.

"The 90 percent price support that was a Government incentive to produce for war," they said, "has been distorted into a peacetime program for temporarily guaranteeing profits for a minority of farmers."

When the farmer is getting guaranteed high support prices for his product, as the report says, commodities are held off the market and artificial scarcities follow. This means higher costs of food to consumers.

That is the situation the country is in today. Huge sums of money are spent to keep farm prices high, which encourage production. But at these prices sales to consumers are discouraged, while sales, in one form or another, to the Government are spurred. So the Government has rising surpluses for which the consumer and the taxpayer pay the bill.

The Senators ought to realize that blindly voting for another year of rigid 90-percent supports won't solve anything. It will diminish, rather than increase, markets for the farmers' products. It will cost the consumer and taxpayer more, not less, for their food. It will boost, not get rid of, surpluses.

Next week the Senators will have an opportunity to take a statesmanlike step on the farm problem in the interest of farmers and consumers alike. They can do so by overriding their own committee and backing the administration's flexible program.

Basic Agriculture Defended

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. THYE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, July 17, 1954

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter which appeared on the editorial page of the Minneapolis Star of Wednesday, July 14.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BASIC AGRICULTURE DEFENDED

To the EDITOR:

We were surprised, but honored, to see that your esteemed economist, Dr. Arthur Upgren, had taken note of what a country editor has to say about agriculture. Perhaps it's an indication that some attention is being paid to opinions from Main Street or out in the sticks.

Dr. Upgren takes issue with our contention that agriculture is still the basic industry of the Nation. He says only 20 percent of the people reside on our farms today. That is true. But when farm prices go down, he forgets the effect upon every rural town, hamlet, and city directly dependent upon that farm dollar. In those thousands and thousands of communities business suffers, there is less buying and less employment.

Take our own county out here. Half the people live in the towns, but our livelihood is based on the prosperity of the other half engaged in farming. In that sense all of us are farmers.

Yes, you might well term all the people of Minneapolis as farmers. Just have a crop failure or two in the upper Midwest and you can buy Nicollet Avenue for 10 cents a block. Big city people may think they are independent of the farm but are actually in the same boat with the farmer.

So take that 20 percent on the farm and add to that the people of all the towns and cities directly dependent upon that farm dollar, then throw in the effect of less buying in all those towns and this effect upon industrial centers and you will likely wind up with half the population or more adversely effected by a decline in farm income.

There is no single enterprise in our entire economy that has as far-reaching aftereffects as that of agriculture. It is very basic in that overall sense.

As William Jennings Bryan used to say, "Burn your cities and others will spring up as if by magic. But destroy your farms and grass will grow in the streets of every city in the land."

If agriculture is not so basic or important why is our Nation so alarmed about the status of this industry? In both political parties it has become the top issue of all our domestic problems. Probably they both remember what happened back in 1920–30, when agriculture was deflated, and when that tragic task was done, this basic industry finally dragged the entire country down with it.

Dr. Upgren called attention to the importance of agriculture in 1950 when he said: "The investment per worker on the farms of the Nation is larger than in industry," and cited figures showing an investment of $15,000 per worker on the farm to only $7,000 per worker in other industry. That situation gives us another argument why we believe farming is basic.

And much of our thinking was in the mind of former Vice President Barkley when he said: "Agriculture should have priority over all other persons engaged in all other occupations." That's quite a telling statement.

When the farmer quits buying, there's a heap of trouble. He not only has a wife but his family is on the average larger. But he has more than a house and a family to buy for. Think of all those other buildings on the place, the machinery he needs, the thousand and one items that mean heavy retail buying. The average city family can nowhere compare to the farmer as a customer of what the city sells.

O. B. AUGUSTSON,
Editor, West Central Minnesota Daily Tribune.

WILLMAR, MINN.

We Can't Quit U. N.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GUY M. GILLETTE

OF IOWA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, July 17, 1954

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an article entitled "We Can't Quit U. N." written by Peter Edson.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

WE CAN'T QUIT U. N.

(By Peter Edson)

It is significant that as the clamor increases from a minority who want to take the United States out of the United Nations, Russia is stepping up its U. N. activities.

What is shaping up is a struggle between the Communist bloc and the anti-Communist nations for U. N. control.

If we quit the U. N. it may be just as much a surrender as pulling United States troops from Korea, Japan, or Western Germany.

Also, if the Russians can gain control of the U. N., their program of world revolution will be greatly advanced. Communist domination of the Security Council would give the Russians a ready-made politburo for running the world.

This may explain why the Russians joined the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization after boycotting it 8 years. UNESCO has a program of fundamental education for backward countries. Agitation among illiterates is where communism makes its first converts. No wonder Russia went in.

This also may explain why Russia, Byelorussia, and the Ukraine showed up at the recent Geneva conference of the International Labor Organization, seeking admission. Russia had boycotted ILO since 1939, when she walked out of the League of Nations.

Any U. N. member may become an ILO member on application. Each country's delegation is made up of 2 government representatives, 1 employer, and 1 trade union member.

In Russia's case there was a question whether employer and trade union delegates could be accredited, since the Soviet Government has control over their management class, and employees.

So here was the making of a fight.

A two-thirds vote was required to upset the 2 to 1 majority report of the credentials committee, which favored seating the Communist delegates. United States spokesman Assistant Attorney General Warren E. Burger raised the question:

"Does the employers' or workers' delegate take orders from his government while he is at this conference, or is he a free and independent representative whose views and vote cannot be dictated to by any government?"

ILO ideals are not compatible with slave labor of Communist countries, Mr. Burger pointed out. The ILO would not survive if its representatives were dominated by monolithic governments like Russia.

The United States lost the fight of the 210 delegates from 69 countries, 105 voted for seating Red delegates, 79 against, 26 abstaining.

So now the Communists have another foot in the door to work for the subversion of union labor all over the world.

For the United States this offers a new challenge. It is to require the Communist countries to bring labor standards up to the required ILO minimum, to end the slave labor camps, and to free labor from totalitarian dictatorship.

This can be done, however, only by staying in the U. N. and its subsidiaries.

The Tariff on Watches

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 13, 1954

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I should like to include a very timely editorial which appeared in the July 6, 1954, issue of the Washington Evening Star. Let us hope that the President, in his wisdom, sees fit to take salutary action on this grave problem before the deadline of July 27.

The article follows:

THE TARIFF ON WATCHES

The makers of inexpensive watches in this country have presented an interesting case against the present tariff rates on imported watch movements—a matter now awaiting decision by the White House. These tariffs were cut in 1935. Since that time, as rising wages and prices made the tariff an even smaller percentage of the cost of an imported watch movement, imports have soared.

J. Lehmkuhl, president of United States Time Corp., one of the Nation's largest manufacturers of inexpensive watches, has said his company faces extinction because of foreign competition. Since the tariff cuts were made, that firm's competitors from abroad have jumped their sales here tenfold.

Another assertion is that the Government has canceled its contracts in this country for mechanical time fuses, supplied principally by the watch manufacturers, and has taken its fuse contracts abroad, where cheaper labor is available. The cancellation of the contracts here, plus the civilian market loss to foreign competitors, is forcing United States Time to fire 2,000 workers. The effect of the loss of such technical skills, in the event of a war which might cut off all this Nation's imports, could be quite serious.

It would take a long time to train technicians if it became necessary once more to produce such fuses here.

A recommendation by the Tariff Commission 2 years ago that the 1935 tariffs be restored was rejected by former President Truman. Now, Mr. Lehmkuhl says, the Commission has made a similar recommendation to President Eisenhower. Neither the Tariff Commission nor the White House will confirm, deny, or discuss whether such a recommendation has been made. But unofficial reports are that the Commission has in fact proposed an increase in the duties on watch movements.

Serious consideration should be given to the arguments of the watch manufacturers. And it is surprising that a curtain of secrecy, meantime, has been drawn around the Tariff Commission's recommendation.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Printing and binding for Congress, when recommended to be done by the Committee on Printing of either House, shall be so recommended in a report containing an approximate estimate of the cost thereof, together with a statement from the Public Printer of estimated approximate cost of work previously ordered by Congress within the fiscal year (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 145, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on Printing, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

DISTRIBUTION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

To the Vice President and each Senator 100 copies; to the Secretary and Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, each, 25 copies; to the Secretary, for official use, not to exceed 35 copies; to the Sergeant at Arms, for use on the floor of the Senate, not to exceed 50 copies; to each Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress, 68 copies; to the Clerk, Sergeant at Arms, and Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives, each, 25 copies; to the Clerk, for official use, not to exceed 50 copies; and to the Doorkeeper, for use on the floor of the House of Representatives, not to exceed 75 copies; to the Vice President and each Senator, Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress there shall also be furnished (and shall not be transferable), 3 copies of the daily Record, of which 1 shall be delivered at his residence, 1 at his office, and 1 at the Capitol.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the Congressional Record, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

IN

I
una
the
I h
tur
of C
is t
and
in t
Col
Gu
hav
bea

I
pri
foll
titl
Her
the
for
"Gu
Stru
Aga

T
mer
pri

T
the
tory
Arn
the
will
Wor

T
will
gove
of C

W
brig

E
Gua
er t
can
to r
ever
men
Actu
mor
own
trar
a la
Com
then
also
whi

R
wor
noti
mou
with
abso
mal
the

Appendix

What Future for Guatemala?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 19, 1954

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement I have prepared with regard to the future of the Government and the people of Guatemala. The gist of the statement is that the people of the United States and of the Western Hemisphere rejoice in the victory of the liberation forces of Col. Castillo Armas, which have rescued Guatemala from the unhappy fate of having become the unwilling Communist beachhead of the New World.

I ask unanimous consent, also, to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, following my statement, an article entitled "Guatemala Prelate Cited as Real Hero of Anti-Red Revolt," published in the LaCrosse (Wis.) Catholic Register for July 16, 1954; and an article entitled "Guatemala: Key to Latin-American Struggle," published in Freedom's Facts Against Communism, for July 1954.

There being no objection, the statement and articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

The people of the United States and of the Western Hemisphere rejoice in the victory of the liberation forces of Col. Castillo Armas which have rescued Guatemala from the unhappy fate of having become the unwilling Communist beachhead of the New World.

The people of our country and men of good will everywhere wish well to the strong new government and to the liberty-loving people of Guatemala.

We wish them success in attaining a brighter future for the people of that land.

Everyone recognizes that the future of Guatemala will become an acid test of whether the forces of vigorous anticommunism can indeed bring social justice, in addition to repressing communism as such. We have every reason to believe that the new government will pass that test with flying colors. Actually, of course, no people has proven more emphatically to the world than our own, that (a) communism is utterly contrary to the best interests of the people of a land and, (b) that the strongest anti-Communist regime is a government which, therefore, combats communism, but which also removes the unfortunate conditions which often breed communism.

Regrettably, there are many peoples in the world who have fallen victim to the false notion that communism is somehow synonymous with so-called national liberation and with so-called social justice. Actually, the absolute contrary is the case. Now, Guatemala must prove that contrary fact. Now, the new government there is given a golden opportunity to make Guatemala a model nation—a nation strongly anti-Communist, but one which is equally strongly dedicated to uplifting the well-being of the common man.

World communism could wish for nothing more than a failure in Guatemala to improve living standards. Then the Communists (who are far from destroyed as a power in Guatemala) could gleefully say, "See, when we were kicked out social reform stopped."

Of course, the facts are that the Arbenz government, while paying lip service to social reform, was actually totally uninterested in the average man. It was dedicated to merely serving Moscow's ends and to lining the pockets of the chosen few.

ARTICLE IN CATHOLIC DIOCESAN PAPER

On the issue of true reform, I was glad to note in the Friday, July 16, issue of the La Crosse (Wis.) Register, official diocesan paper, a fine reference to the consistent anti-Communist efforts of Archbishop Arellano, of Guatemala.

Not only did this distinguished churchman courageously fight communism while it was in control, but when the hour of communism's end had struck he prophetically appealed for a new hour of social justice.

He wisely said: "Arms may dislodge the Communists from a country, but only social justice, based on Christian love, can exterpate communism from men's hearts."

Fortunately, the government of Col. Castillo Armas has given welcome evidence that it recognizes that fact and that it is determined to carry out a forward-looking program of genuine reform.

FOREIGN INVESTMENT CRUCIAL TO HIGHER LIVING STANDARDS

A key element of that reform is a new, favorable climate for the entry and expansion of foreign private investment.

We of this country know that a favorable climate for such investment will be an indispensable factor in the true uplifting of Guatemala.

A fair return on investment—and overall fair and legal treatment of foreign enterprises—is far more important to Guatemala and to all other underdeveloped areas than it is even to the United States. We are, of course, deeply interested in just treatment of our nationals and of companies in which our nationals participate or in which they have invested their earnings. But the rest of the world has far more to gain from such just treatment than we ourselves.

A key point in the Communist program has always been to deceive people into believing that foreign investment constitutes so-called economic imperialism.

That is a lie because, actually, sound foreign investment, providing mutuality of benefits, is a key to the realization of the birthright of each people. It develops their resources, increases the reservoir of skilled talents of the people. It serves as a catalyst for the forces of economic progress.

In this connection, I was glad to see an analysis of Communist propaganda techniques among the underdeveloped peoples, as carried in the current issue of Freedom's Facts Against Communism. This is a publication of the All-American Conference To Combat Communism. This analysis describes an article—right from the horse's (or the bear's) mouth—in the March 1954 issue of the magazine, Communist.

TWO ARTICLES

I append now, (a) excerpts from the La-Crosse Register article and (b) a description from Freedom's Facts, based on the article in Communist.

I think that these two articles show in juxtaposition the contending forces—the Christian forces of truth versus a description of Communist forces of falsehood—the Christian forces for social justice, versus an analysis of the Communist forces of deception and of false promises.

In conclusion, I say, the Arbenz regime is dead, but "Maoism"—the treacherous new technique of communism—appealing to the poverty-ridden peasantry—is very much alive. Let us join to eradicate Maoism by vigorous anticommunism and by each doing our part in sound raising of standards of living.

[From the La Crosse (Wis.) Catholic Register of July 16, 1954]

GUATEMALA PRELATE CITED AS REAL HERO OF ANTI-RED REVOLT

When the complete story is told of the anti-Communist uprising, people will realize that the real heo of Guatemala is Archbishop Don Mariano Rossell Arellano of Guatemala City.

Early in the Arbenz regime, Archbishop Arellano, though advocating social justice in forceful terms, defied the Communist overlords and warned his 3 million Catholic faithful of the treachery and trickery of their political leaders. He told them in effect that their country was governed not from Guatemala City but from Moscow. For his courage, he was threatened with both assassination and exile.

On one occasion, when the Guatemala Parliament had decreed his exile, peasant women, laborers, and Indians guarded his home, telling Government representatives that the Government would take the archbishop over their dead bodies. So great was the demonstration of love for their archbishop that Arbenz sent a representative, who sneaked into the archbishop's home through the back door, to assure him that the Government would not exile him.

PRIESTS MET OVERWHELMING HANDICAPS

In spite of the lack of Catholic priests in Guatemala—less than 150 for 3 million Catholics—under the able leadership of Archbishop Arellano, they worked zealously to teach the Indian peasants the true Christian doctrine on property and the truth about Communist teachery. For that very reason, a Brooklyn-born Franciscan missionary, Father Sebastian Buccellato, was expelled early this year on the charge that he engaged in politics.

To strengthen the people against the terrors of their regime, in 1951 Archbishop Arellano organized a National Eucharistic Congress in Guatemala City. To prevent the pilgrims from traveling to the capital, the Red-dominated unions called a transportation strike. But more than 200,000 pilgrims, traveling by oxcart, donkey, and foot, attended the Eucharistic Congress in a demonstration of faith and of defiance of the Communist government.

PERSONAL COURAGE

On another occasion, when the Communists threatened to interfere with a pilgrimage to the shrine of the Black Christ at

Esquipulas, the archbishop flew to the city to take personal direction of the pilgrimage. As a result the Communists did not dare to commit any violence on this occasion.

In the final days of the revolt, when Col. Elfego Monzon was meeting with the insurgent leader, Col. Carlos Castillo Armas, one of the key mediators, together with United States Ambassador John E. Peurifoy, was the Papal Nuncio to Guatemala, Archbishop Gennaro Verolino.

* * * * *

NEW OPPORTUNITY FOR JUSTICE

No sooner was the anti-Communist uprising successful than Archbishop Arellano issued a pastoral letter warning that, though the rule of communism had been broken by guns, its roots could be torn out only through a program of Christian social justice. He warned the rich not to deprive workers of their rights to organize or to own property. Courageously, he charged the conservatives with blame for the Communist domination of their country because of their selfishness toward the peasants and workers.

"The hour of Christ's peace has sounded," he said. "The reality of social justice carried to its final consequences is the only way to establish a lasting and fruitful peace. Arms may dislodge the Communists from a country, but only social justice based on Christian love can exptirpate communism from men's hearts."

[From Freedom's Facts Against Communism of July 1954]

GUATEMALA: KEY TO LATIN AMERICAN STRUGGLE

The invasion of Guatemala by an "army of liberation" under Col. Carlos Castillo Armas set off the first open war between pro-Communists and anti-Communists in the Western Hemisphere.

Although no more than five or six thousand armed men were involved on either side, the outcome of the conflict is calculated to have affected the destinies of more than 3 million Guatemalans.

Just as a victory for the pro-Communist regime would have encouraged Communists to step up their efforts at infiltration and political agitation in Chile, Brazil, Bolivia, and other Latin American countries, the Armas victory can be expected to cause a slowdown in the Kremlin's entire timetable for Latin American action.

What plans does the Kremlin have for Latin America? The official Soviet Communist Party organ, Communist, of March 1954, discusses in detail the strategy they are using right now in their conspiracy to drag all of Latin America into the camp of socialism.

THE NATIONAL LIBERATION MOVEMENT

The Red plan for Latin America involves two distinct programs. The national liberation movement, designed to drive United States economic and political influence out of Latin America, is one of them. The other is the partisans of peace campaign to close down military bases in Latin America (which would include bases protecting the Panama Canal) and to break up all military agreements between the United States and Latin American countries.

While Communists are goading unsuspecting Latin Americans into supporting these two movements, they are busily infiltrating and seizing key positions of power in labor and peasant groups, propaganda organs, and the Government on a pattern which already has proved successful in Guatemala.

At the same time they deceive the Latin Americans themselves and much of the bewildered outside world into believing that these programs of national liberation and partisans of peace are legitimate political movements since they are led by publicly proclaimed non-Communists—such as Jacobo Arbenz in Guatemala.

How do the Communists get away with all this? The answer is that they have worked out a technique for taking over politically backward peoples by political means.

THE COMMUNIST POLITICAL TECHNIQUE

The technique is simple. Communists quietly move into an area where the people are politically backward, point out a few conditions the people are unhappy about, and then go into their ghost-written political sales talk blaming the capitalists for exploiting them and promising that the Communists will lead their struggle against the capital exploiters.

The magazine, Communist, explains that right now they are telling Latin Americans that the United States wants to exploit the land, natural wealth, and people of these countries for the preparation of a new war and that people of Latin America are struggling for economic and political independence, for the liquidation of the rule of imperialists of the United States of America on the continent.

The major villains, according to what Communist political agitators are telling Latin Americans, are the United States corporations which have seized key positions in the economy of Latin America. Thus, Standard Oil dominates in the oil industry, United States Steel in mining, Anaconda Copper in light metallurgy, Armour-Swift in the meat industry, and so on. In five countries of Central America (Honduras, Costa Rica, Salvador, Nicaragua, and Panama) the United Fruit Co. rules completely.

UNITED STATES CORPORATIONS ARE PRIMARY TARGETS

These corporations, thus, are major targets of the Communist conspiracy to drive United States economic and political influence out of Latin America. As soon as they can stir the people into a high pitch of nationalistic feeling, they plan to channel that feeling into programs of nationalizing natural wealth and industries; in other words, to expropriate property of United States corporations. This already has been done in Guatemala, where 400,000 acres of United Fruit Co. property has been expropriated.

This is not all they are saying in Latin America. Their political agitators also are attacking the entire concept of pan-Americanism. According to Communists, the Organization of American States is being used by the United States for its own selfish ends and pan-Americanism is merely one of Wall Street's methods of suppression and subjugation.

Guatemala, where the Communist program was furthest advanced, is a key to the developing struggle in Latin America. As the Communists themselves point out, events in Guatemala went beyond the question of whether or not a small Central American country went Communist. A larger issue is whether the example of (temporary at least) Communist domination of Guatemala would promote the growth of the national liberation and partisans of peace programs in other countries of Latin America.

DANGER IN LATIN AMERICA

The Communists point out that already the national liberation movement has led to the nationalization of the tin industry in Bolivia, cancellation of a military treaty between the United States and Mexico, growing demands in Chile to annul a military agreement with the United States, and a law in Brazil prohibiting the participation of foreign companies in the exploration of oil deposits.

This program of national liberation, they say, is "unbreakably tied to the fight for peace. The movement of the partisans of peace is directed against the imperialism of the United States of America. Peace partisans demand liquidation of military bases of the Untied States on the territory of Latin American countries, an end to the policy of militarism, and restoration or normal relatiotns with all countries of the world. In Argentina, Mexico, and Chile preparations are being made for national peace congresses. In Brazil they are getting ready for a call of a conference on national liberation."

TECHNIQUE OF GAINING POLITICAL CONTROL

While promoting these two programs against the United States, Communists are busily consolidating political control. As they explain it, "Progressive forces of Latin America are fighting for strengthening the unity of the working classes and their union with the peasants, thus creating the necessary conditions for the further unfolding of the national liberation movement. In each Latin American country there is a growing a fight for the organization of a democratic front of national liberation, unifying all anti-imperialistic and antifeudal forces and social groups. The Communist Party, being the leading force of the democratic movement, palces itself at the head of the fight for unity, for establishing a unified anti-imperialist, democratic front."

Thus the Communists have drawn their lines for a political battle in Latin America. They will campaign for support of the masses for a Communist-led united democratic front and against what they call United States economic and political imperialism. Both of these, of course, are phony issues, created by the skilled pens of Kremlin political strategists. By raising these issues they hope to conceal the fact that their chief aim is to turn Latin America into a series of Soviet satellites, and that the United States is the major obstacle to their plan.

It is up to the anti-Communists now to step up efforts to present a correct view of Latin American affairs. The way for Latin America to move toward greater independence, peace, and higher living standards, after all, is not through the Kremlin-controlled Communist Party or through the Communist doctrine of eternal struggle and class hate. Such goals can only be obtained through the further, peaceful development of the very democratic processes the Communists are most anxious to destroy.

Commemoration of Service of United States Third Infantry During Seminole Campaign of 1840

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SPESSARD L. HOLLAND

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 19, 1954

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, yesterday afternoon Mrs. Holland, Representative CHARLES E. BENNETT, of Florida, and I had the pleasure and honor of being present at Fort Myer, Va., when the Third United States Infantry Regiment, one of our most honored units of the Regular Army, now commanded by Col. Dennis M. Moore, received its 32d battle streamer at the hands of Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway, Chief of Staff, United States Army. This streamer was awarded to the Third Infantry in commemoration of its devoted service in Florida during the Seminole campaign of 1840. Florida was a sparsely settled territory at that time, beset by strife between the scattered settlers and the Seminoles. Military service was most rugged and, indeed, civilian life was terribly difficult. This award, therefore, relates to a part of the history of the State of Florida in pioneer days.

Because of the historic importance of the occasion, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of the factual statement which was delivered to all guests as part of the program and also the text of the statement delivered over the public-address system at Fort Myer prior to and during the presentation of the award by General Ridgway.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT FOR INFORMATION OF GUESTS

This afternoon the 3d United States Infantry Regiment, Col. Dennis M. Moore commanding, will receive its 32d battle streamer for its participation in the Seminole Campaign of 1840-43. The streamer will be placed on the regimental color by Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway, Chief of Staff, United States Army, in a time-honored ceremony, the origin of which goes back to the early days of our Nation.

A battle streamer is customarily awarded to a unit for each engagewent in which the unit participated. Through a combination of circumstances the 3d Infantry's streamer had been overlooked over the past 114 years. Today it will take its rightful place beside its 31 predecessors whose dates range from the Battle of Fallen Timbers in 1794 to the campaign of northern France in World War II. As the oldest regiment in the Regular Army, the 3d Infantry is the proud descendant of the Legion of Gen. "Mad Anthony" Wayne formed in 1784. The battle streamers of the regiment run like a silver thread through United States history—such names as Chippewa, Monterey, Gettysburg, and Santiago are a part of the history of the Army and the heritage of the American people. The men who will march before you today represent the spirit of the United States Army—a spirit undaunted through the trials of many years and forged in the crucible of combat.

HEADQUARTERS 3D INFANTRY,
Fort Myer, Arlington, Va., July 18, 1954.

Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. The United States Army welcomes you to Fort Myer.

This afternoon, the 3d United States Infantry Regiment, Col. Dennis M. Moore, commanding, will participate in a time-honored ceremony, the origin of which goes back to the early days of our Nation. Today, the 3d Infantry will receive its 32d battle streamer, in commemoration of its service during the Seminole Campaign of 1840. The music for the ceremony will be furnished by the United States Army Band.

The streamer will be placed on the regimental colors by Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway, Chief of Staff, United States Army. The presentation ceremony itself is one of the oldest in the history of arms. Following the rendition of To the Color, the colors are brought forward to the reviewing stand and presented to the reviewing officer. In fixing the streamer to the regimental colors, not only one particular campaign—but the entire rich history of the oldest regiment in the Regular Army is saluted.

The 3d Infantry's 32 battle streamers run like a silver thread through United States history. The men who will march before you today represent the spirit of the United States Army—a spirit undaunted through the trials of many years and forged in the crucible of combat.

(Adjutant's call will now be sounded.)

(To be read during streamer presenation.)

During the period October 1840 to April 1843, the 3d Infantry, under the command of its executive officer, Lt. Col. (later Maj. Gen.) Ethan Allen Hitchcock, distinguished itself in the Seminole Campaign in Florida. For their service to the Nation in the subjugation of these Indians, the 3d United States infantry is awarded the battle streamer embroidered, "Seminoles, 1840-43."

The Seminole Campaign lasted from 1835 to 1843. Often referred to as America's Forgotten War, it was actually one of the costliest and bloodiest Indian campaign's in our Nation's history.

The 3d Infantry has already received 31 battle streams for its participation in our Nation's wars. The Seminole streamer, the 32d, adds but more luster to the already proud history of the "Old Guard." The price paid for the strip of scarlet silk now being affixed to the regimental colors can only be measured in terms of those who gave their lives for their country. The streamer belongs not only to the regiment but to the heritage of the United States and the American people.

Western Hemisphere Trade Corporation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR A. KNOX
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 19, 1954

Mr. KNOX. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include herein a statement pertaining to a measure which I have introduced today to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 with respect to the definition of a Western Hemisphere trade corporation.

In 1942 Congress added section 109 to the Internal Revenue Code, as follows:

SEC. 109. Western Hemisphere trade corporations.

For the purposes of this chapter, the term "Western Hemisphere trade corporation" means a domestic corporation all of whose business is done in any country or countries in North, Central, or South America, or in the West Indies, or in Newfoundland and which satisfies the following conditions:

(a) If 95 percent or more of the gross income of such domestic corporation for the 3-year period immediately preceding the close of the taxable year (or for such part of such period during which the corporation was in existence) was derived from sources other than sources within the United States; and

(b) If 90 percent or more of its gross income for such period or such part thereof was derived from the active conduct of a trade or business.

In explanation of the definition of a Western Hemisphere trade corporation, the Senate Finance Committee report on the 1942 bill contained the following:

SEC. 142. Western Hemisphere trade corporation.

This section, which did not appear in the House bill, exempts from surtax certain corporations deriving their income principally from sources outside the United States and within the Western Hemisphere.

To be entitled, however, to such exemption, it is required that not less than 95 percent of the gross income of such corporations must be derived from sources without the United States, while 90 percent of such gross income must be derived from the active conduct of a trade or business. In addition, the entire trade or business of such corporations must be carried on in the Americas or adjacent areas. However, merely incidental economic contact with other countries outside such geographical sphere will not place such corporations outside the exempt classification. For example, the A corporation is engaged in mining activities in South America and in shipping its products to foreign countries outside the United States, including Great Britain. The mere fact that the A corporation ships its goods to England, retaining title to such goods until acceptance of the bill of lading and draft in order to insure collection of the price, will not be considered as carrying on business outside the Western Hemisphere. (S. Rept. 1631, 77th Cong., 2d sess., p. 111; 1942-2 Cum. Bull. 587-588.)

The 1942 report of the Senate Finance Committee thus clearly stated that a corporation did not lose its Western Hemisphere trade corporation staus merely because of "incidental economic contact" with a non-Western Hemisphere area, and illustrated the principle by the example of a sale by a South American mining company which shipped the products to England. It would, therefore, seem to follow obviously that if a transaction involving a sale with shipment to England was not intended to constitute "doing business" outside the Western Hemisphere, then a mere purchase from outside the Western Hemisphere, likewise, is not to be considered "doing business" outside the Western Hemisphere. In line with this congressional intent, the statute was so interpreted by taxpayers and their counsel generally. Moreover, such view was in accordance with all the cases which have ever considered "purchases" in relation to "doing business." The judicial decisions are, and always have been, uniform in the view that mere purchase of goods does not constitute "doing business."

Despite the above, and much to the surprise of everyone, the Bureau of Internal Revenue some 10 years later, in May 1952, issued a ruling to the effect that mere purchase, even insignificant purchase, outside the Western Hemisphere of goods by an otherwise qualified corporation constituted "doing business" outside the Western Hemisphere and resulted in the forfeiture of Western Hemisphere Trade status by such corporation.

This surprising ruling brought protests from the American Bar Association, the National Foreign Trade Council, Inc., the United States Chamber of Commerce, and the Machinery and Allied Products Institute, among others.

In its action on H. R. 8300, the Ways and Means Committee, to remedy this situation, modified section 109—section 921 in the new code—as follows:

SEC. 921. Definition of Western Hemisphere trade corporations.

For purposes of this subtitle, the term "Western Hemisphere trade corporation" means a domestic corporation all of whose business (other than incidental purchases) is done in any country or countries in North, Central, or South America, or in the West Indies, or in Newfoundland, and which satisfies the following conditions—

And so forth. In the report on H. R. 8300—page 78—the committee said:

To correct an obvious inequity which has arisen in the administration of this provision, it has provided that incidental purchases made outside of the Western Hemisphere, will not disqualify a corporation from the Western Hemisphere trade corporation credit if it is otherwise eligible for it.

The Senate Finance Committee in its deliberations on H. R. 8300 accepted the House amendment. Because of the policy of both committees that H. R. 8300 would contain no retroactive provisions, such amendment could not be made retroactive in H. R. 8300 and, therefore, to avoid any prejudicial inference which might be drawn from this situation, the Senate added a new sentence to section 921, as follows:

> For any taxable year beginning prior to January 1, 1954, the determination as to whether any corporation meets the requirements of section 109 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 shall be made as if this section had not been enacted and without inferences drawn from the fact that this section is not expressly made applicable with respect to taxable years beginning prior to January 1, 1954.

Since the inequitable ruling mentioned in the Ways and Means report is being applied back to 1942, it is necessary that the amendment which the Senate and House committees, because of policy considerations, could not make retroactive in H. R. 8300 be made retroactive by a separate bill. Therefore, I have today introduced a bill to correct this situation with regard to taxable years ending prior to January 1, 1954. This bill is noncontroversial in that it makes the identical change to section 109 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 as was made by the House and Senate committees in H. R. 8300, namely, the addition of the parenthetical phrase "other than incidental purchases."

Lead and Zinc Mining Industry Facing Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFTON (CLIFF) YOUNG
OF NEVADA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 19, 1954

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I should like to include a statement made recently by Mr. Otto Herres, chairman, National Lead and Zinc Committee, on the crisis facing the lead and zinc industry in this country. Mr. Herres is a man of outstanding experience, and the information which he presents here merits the attention of every Member of Congress.

The statement follows:

LEAD AND ZINC MINING INDUSTRY FACING CRISIS

(By Otto Herres, vice president, Combined Metals Reduction Co.; chairman, National Lead and Zinc Committee)

The lead-zinc mining industry of the United States is struggling for its existence. During a time when the country has been enjoying great prosperity and the consumption of zinc has reached an all-time high, 10,000 miners and millmen at the lead-zinc mines have lost their jobs. In the words of a worker from the Oklahoma zinc smelters to the Tariff Commission, "This is a serious situation with our people."

In 1951 the Government was calling on the miners to expand production of lead and zinc urgently needed for defense purposes and essential industries. Today, the lead-zinc mining industry is being destroyed by a flood of imports priced below the cost of domestic production.

Bad policy has put the mines in the fix they are in. The fault does not lie with the lead-zinc industry of the United States. The situation has been brought about by devaluation of the pound and other currencies, American aid programs and overstimulation of foreign production by high prices when United States mines were restricted by means of price controls.

ADMINISTRATION ADVICE

The industry turned to Congress for relief and presented its case to the Ways and Means Committee in May 1953. A provision for an antidumping tax on imports of lead and zinc was approved by the committee and included in the Simpson bill. But the bill was opposed by high officials of the administration who advised the industry that the remedy was to be found in an escape clause case before the Tariff Commission. The industry proceeded in accordance with this administration advice.

TARIFF COMMISSION INVESTIGATION

Virtually the entire lead-zinc mining industry of the United States with the exception of companies engaged in foreign mining activities presented positive and indisputable evidence to the Tariff Commission in a hearing held in Washington, D. C., November 3–6, 1953, to show conclusively that the mines of this country have been seriously injured and domestic smelters have been forced to curtail their production because foreign lead and zinc are flooding our markets at less than the cost of domestic production. That the mines were suffering serious injury was unquestioned. The facts are clear and were freely acknowledged by all appearing before the Commission. The question for the Commission to decide became not whether the mines were injured but rather what steps should be taken to preserve an industry important to national defense and essential to the civilian economy.

Concerned over the evidence of serious injury, the Committee on Finance of the United States Senate on July 27, 1953, and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives on July 29, 1953, each by unanimous resolution requested the Tariff Commission to institute a general investigation of the domestic lead and zinc industries, including the effect of imports of lead and zinc on the livelihood of American workers. Testimony in this investigation was heard by the Tarff Commission concurrently with the escape clause investigation requested by the industry. After a very comprehensive study the Commission submitted a complete and detailed report to the Committees of Congress on April 20, 1954.

RELIEF RECOMMENDED

And the Tariff Commission further on May 21, 1954, after one of the most complete investigations ever made of an American industry, recommended unanimously to the President that relief from the deplorable situation confronting the miners be granted under the escape clause of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act.

But after following administration advice to seek escape clause relief, it is the understanding of the industry that the State Department now strongly opposes the Tariff Commission recommendation and prefers to obtain the Nation's supply of metals and minerals from foreign countries. Informed opinion is that the State Department influence against the domestic industry will prevail at the White House regardless of the merits of the case unless Congress takes whatever steps are possible to see that the welfare of American workers and of an industry essential for defense receives consideration.

National security requires a healthy mining industry with ample productive capacity and experienced working forces. Our protection is industrial strength.

Zinc is coming to our stockpile from Peru and lead from Africa. We are buying copper to aid Chile and tin to help Bolivia. Why not give some consideration to the miners of the United States? Twice during the past 12 years the country has suffered from a shortage of zinc because of policies destructive to the domestic industry.

STATE DEPARTMENT POLICIES

When World War II came there was a shortage of metal. And again during the Korean emergency the experience was repeated. Soldiers were returned from the Army to work in the metal mines of the West during World War II.

But the State Department has been carrying on a program for financing expanded foreign production of metals in preference to protecting domestic production.

State Department officials contend that when a sufficient number of American mines have been wiped out prices eventually will come back to a profitable basis for lead and zinc because of decreasing supplies. By that time many once thriving mining communities will be deserted and many families will have lost their homes. Is that good American policy?

Large corporations can protect themselves by moving to foreign fields and receive United States Government assistance in their efforts to produce profitably when metal prices drop too low to permit profitable operation under our wages and living standards. But where does that leave workers and their families and the smaller independent companies and their stockholders?

Small independent mining companies unable to obtain financial support because of the depressed prices of zinc and lead are being forced out of existence. Some of the better mines are passing into the hands of large corporations that are able to hold on at a loss until foreign imports have virtually eliminated competition by pricing much of the domestic industry into bankruptcy. Is it the Government policy to liquidate small business in this country?

SAVING THE WORLD

Washington has been so engrossed in recent years with trying to save the world that problems here at home are forgotten. The State Department proposes to finance expanded production for all of the backward and undeveloped areas of the world where land and labor are cheap and take payment in metals, minerals and other raw materials. When raw materials come into a country where they already are produced in substantial amounts and create an oversupply the effect can be only lower earnings or unemployment for workers engaged in the industries affected.

The American taxpayer has been called upon to finance competition which is putting industries essential to our national security out of business. His money has gone toward the purchase of such metals as lead and zinc at high world prices by other nations, later to be released and depress our markets.

EXCESSIVE IMPORTS

The report of the Bureau of Mines on the Zinc Industry in the United States in 1953 states: "Domestic mine production of recoverable zinc fell off during the year, owing largely to low prices brought about by heavy imports. Output for the year was 535,000 tons compared with 666,000 tons in 1952. Import established an all-time high; the total—743,000 tons (zinc content)—was greater than domestic mine production for the first time on record. Domestic consumption of slab zinc was 978,000 tons, or 15 percent above the comparable figure in 1952, and a new high."

It is evident that if zinc imports are allowed to continue at the 1953 rates this year, lead-zinc mining in the United States will soon be finished as an industry of consequence. Unsold zinc on hand (209,828 tons on May 31) and imports at the 1953 rate, amounting together to some 952,000 tons, are sufficient to take care of the entire prospective demand for slab zinc in 1954 of some 850,000 tons with about 100,000 tons to spare.

Production of zinc from United States mines has dropped from an average of 60,000 tons per month during the first 6 months of 1952 by over one-third to 39,000 tons during the corresponding period this year. Employment at the mines has decreased in the same proportion. Imports for the year to date are coming at the rate of 48,260 tons a month (zinc content). Purchases of zinc for the defense stockpile at the indicated rate of 10,000 or 12,000 tons a month are far too low to remedy this situation.

The lead outlook is somewhat similar, particularly because much of the mine production of lead comes from complex lead-zinc ores. The difficulties of one metal seriously affect the other. And the question becomes, in an industry which is essential to national defense and security expendable to the cause of freer trade?

Had the lead-zinc mines reached the have-not stage frequently and often fervently predicted by the Washington planners? On the contrary new mines were being developed from one end of the land to the other; from Virginia, Pennsylvania, and Tennessee in the East to Idaho, Washington, and New Mexico in the West. This was the response of the mining industry to the Government's urgent request only a few years earlier to the mines to expand production of zinc for national defense and civilian needs at the time of the Korean emergency.

LIQUIDATING DOMESTIC MINES

Excessive tonnages of foreign zinc were thrown on the markets of the United States at prices as low as 9¼ cents a pound, or less earlier this year. Lead now 14 cents a pound reached a low of 12 cents during 1953. Competent studies of the cost of producing lead and zinc in various parts of the world, based on costs reported by the more efficient foreign producers, indicate that prices should stabilize at around 15 cents a pound for these metals. Why then should zinc now be selling at 11 cents a pound in this country? Perhaps the answer may be supplied by State Department officials who oppose any solution for the present predicament of the domestic lead-zinc mines. Their contention is that when a sufficient number of American mines have been wiped out by prices below the cost of domestic production the prices of lead and zinc will return to the more reasonable level of 15 cents a pound because of decreasing supplies. And then obviously the well-financed foreign producer who now sells zinc in this country at a loss can take over our markets and regain his losses as prices move up.

Certainly the national interest requires that the effect of the foreign trade policies of the United States on our domestic economy should be given at least the same weight as increasing benefits for foreign producers. No great contribution to world peace and prosperity will result from changes that lead to displacement of American workers and injury to our essential industries.

Approximately 315,000 tons of foreign lead and 300,000 tons of zinc imports ordinarily are sufficient to supplement supplies from domestic sources if protection is afforded to maintain a healthy mining industry in this country. During 1953, some 743,000 tons of zinc and approximately 563,000 tons of lead were imported, more than twice our needs.

Approximately one-fourth of all the workers employed in the lead-zinc mines of the United States lost their jobs during the past year, and the number continues to increase. In some districts wages have been reduced and living standards lowered in an effort to compete with imports from low-wage foreign areas.

PROBLEMS OF SURVIVAL

The tariffs on zinc ores and metal have been lowered by the State Department under successive Reciprocal Trade Agreements negotiations to six-tenths and seven-tenths of a cent a pound respectively, and on lead ores and metals to three-quarters of a cent and one and one-sixteenth of a cent a pound. These duties afford no protection of consequence against low-wage imports and devalued currencies.

If the domestic lead-zinc mining industry is to compete with the low level of foreign prices and continue to supply the major portion of national requirements it must become adjusted to the lower price level or be priced out of existence.

This would mean reduction of wages and selective mining of only the higher grade portions of ore deposits. Is reduction of wages and wasting natural resources better Government policy than furnishing adequate protection to an industry important to the security and economy of the United States? The alternative is increased dependence on foreign producers for essential metals and an unemployment problem at home.

SUGGESTED REMEDIES

Opponents of tariff relief for the domestic lead-zinc mines, acknowledging the need of a remedy for the serious situation which prevails, suggest the use of subsidies to support the mines and provide employment. But subsidies are not the cure for excessive imports. Are we to aim for freer trade and end up with a regimented economy? But then only in the United States is a Nation that gives protection to its workers and industries considered open to criticism. All other countries look after their own.

STOCKPILING PROPOSALS

On March 26, the President authorized the Office of Defense Mobilization to establish new mineral stockpile objectives. Additional stockpiling of lead and zinc will provide temporary relief if handled on a substantial scale. But unless imports are controlled by adequate tariffs, or by quotas on lead and zinc in metal form, the effect eventually will be to support and encourage continued over-production all over the world. The domestic market will be turned over to foreign producers at the expense of the American taxpayer who will have to stand the stockpiling expense as long as his pocketbook holds out.

The administration's long-term stockpiling programs appears likely to prove very disappointing. The President's authorization on March 26, 1954, stated: "Acquisition of metals and minerals will take place ordinarily at such times as the Government decides that purchases will help to reactivate productive capacity and in other ways to alleviate distressed conditions in connection with doemstic mineral industries that are an important element of the Nation's mobilization base."

But purchases were long delayed after being authorized and probably will prove to be too small to be of any great consequence without restrictions on imports. Without such restrictions it would appear that anyone who thinks the stockpiling program is going to help the American lead-zinc miner is in for a sad disillusionment. The net effect thus far has been to reduce the price of lead one-fourth of a cent per pound and to depress zinc sales. In New Mexico zinc properties of some of the most efficient mining companies in the world have been made idle by the excessive imports. Now that the stockpiling program has proved disappointing, unless favorable action is forthcoming on the Tariff Commission recommendation for escape clause relief, it seems impossible for the mines to reopen. Similarly, in Utah, the large lead-zinc smelter and mill of the International Smelting & Refining Co. will cease operating on July 10.

METALS FOR SECURITY

We all long for a peace that will save mankind from going further into a third world war. But another stake we have in the contest is the wealth, resources, and living standards of the United States of America. And destroying much of an industry essential to our national security will serve no good purpose toward the prevention of war.

Section 6 (a) of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951, as amended, states:

"No reduction in any rate of duty * * * shall be permitted to continue in effect when the product on which the concession has been granted is, as a result, in whole or in part, of the duty * * * reflecting such concession, being imported into the United States in such increased quantities, either actual or relative, as to cause or threaten serious injury to the domestic industry producing like or directly competitive products."

The Journal of Commerce in an editorial on June 1, critical of some cases brought before the Tariff Commission offers the following comment:

"This is not to overlook the purpose of the escape clause itself nor to question for a moment that relief should be granted where the need for it can be demonstrated on the basis of complete and convincing data.

"To deny access to this relief would be a flout of the law."

Thousands of miners and millmen who have been thrown out of employment because of the foreign metals flooding our markets and hundreds of communities throughout the country are hoping anxiously for favorable action by the President on the Tariff Commission recommendation for their relief which has been at the White Housing since May 21.

The case is clear cut. If it cannot be approved the escape clause provision of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act is meaningless and any further recourse to the Tariff Commission appears hopeless for domestic industries.

The mining industry can then look only to Congress to exercise its constitutional responsibility for the welfare of the American people.

The Supplemental Appropriation Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 19, 1954

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I was very much disturbed when I learned that two items were not included in the supplemental appropriations bill as reported by the Appropriations Committee.

One of these items was $22 million for reinstitution of the Federal-aid airport program. In my State of South Dakota, for example, a number of cities and towns and at least one country are extremely desirous of securing Federal assistance for airport construction to keep pace with requirements placed upon them by the growing tendency of our citizens to take to the air for business and agriculture. As you know, general aviation and scheduled airline travel are both increasing.

The $22 million appropriation is considerably less than was originally recommended. Further, the local governments have gone a full year without needed construction.

As evidence of the need for Federal aid for nonairline airports, I would like to point out that there are more than 52,000 private civil aircraft in the United States as compared with approximately 1,300 airline aircraft. The private or general aviation category airplanes are needed to fly to points that the airlines do not serve. Nonscheduled civil aircraft flew more than 8 million hours during 1953 for an estimated 1¼ billion miles and over 3½ billion passenger miles. In view of these facts, I feel general aviation should be given every consideration that is placed on the scheduled airlines. Federal assistance in airport construction is one of the most important considerations due general aviation, and I hope, therefore, that this $22 million item will be appropriated.

The other item in which there is considerable interest in South Dakota and which was eliminated by the committee was $35 million for aid to States in building hospitals and clinics.

One of the services in which our rural communities are most deficient is adequate hospital facilities. Many of our small South Dakota towns have had difficulty interesting doctors in establishing practices because of the lack of needed hospitals.

As you know, the authorization for this program was just signed by the President last week. It was one of the important parts of his health program. To fail to implement this authorization now with the necessary funds would defeat the purpose for which this legislation was enacted.

I sincerely hope that the two items—$22 million for Federal-aid airports, and $35 million for hospital construction—will be restored.

Colorado River Upper Basin Projects

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY R. SHEPPARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 19, 1954

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following news release from the Colorado River Association:

A solid front of unanimous opposition to pending congressional bills, S. 1555, H. R. 236, and H. R. 4449, for the Colorado River upper basin projects has been registered to California Senators and Representatives, it was announced yesterday.

"An avalanche of resolutions from many county, city, and community administrative bodies have been received by our California congressional delegation," said Walter W. Candy, president of the Colorado River Association.

"The statewide opposition to the proposed billion dollar nonliquidating tax subsidy, threatening our rightful share of Colorado River water, has been supplemented by telegrams and letters from recognized agricultural, labor, financial, property, and taxpayers organizations." Candy said that the list recorded to date includes:

City councils of Anaheim, Beverly Hills, Burbank, Calexico, Calipatria, Chino, Compton, Fontana, Fullerton, Glendale, Hemet, Holtville, Long Beach, Los Angeles, Ontario, Pasadena, Perris, San Diego, San Jacinto, San Marino, Santa Ana, Santa Monica, Torrance, and Upland.

The Los Angeles and Orange County Board of Supervisors; the County Supervisors Association of California board of directors; southern California council of the California State Chamber of Commerce; California State Grange; Los Angeles Central Labor Council; California Industrial Union Council, CIO; Coachella Valley Water District; Colorado River Board of California; Imperial Irrigation District; Brawley Chamber of Commerce; Los Angeles Department of Water and Power; Metropolitan Water District of Southern California; California Taxpayers Association; Property Owners Association of California; Railroad Brotherhoods Joint Legislative Council of California; Rainbow Municipal Water District in San Diego County; and San Diego County Water Authority.

Candy, who is president of Bullock's, Inc., stressed the fact that nationally these bills are opposed by the Advisory Board on National Parks, Historic Sites, Buildings, and Monuments; National Parks Association, Wilderness Society; Izaak Walton League of America; Sierra Club; National Wildlife Federation; National Parks magazine; National Council of State Garden Clubs; and Wildlife Management Institute. Also, the Engineers Joint Council, representing, among others, the American Society of Civil Engineers, American Institute of Mining and Metallurgical Engineers, American Society of Mechanical Engineers, and the American Water Works Association.

"These pump-priming measures would inflict on all American taxpayers an unjustifiable new burden, and for California as a whole it would add $93,200,000 to the State's $25,443,600,000 share of the present $273 billion national debt," declared Candy.

"This legislation calls for drastic changes in the existing Federal water policy with the construction of an Echo Park Dam, which would flood a considerable portion of the Dinosaur National Monument in Utah.

"As a result 80 years of a sound conservation policy would be broken and there would be created a precedent of like invasion of all our great national and State parks."

Objections of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association to H. R. 9757 and S. 3690 Reported by the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER JOHNSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 19, 1954

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to draw my colleagues' attention to a memorandum sent out by Mr. Clyde Ellis, executive manager of National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, on July 15.

The memorandum, which states the objections of NRECA to H. R. 9757 and S. 3690, summarizes very well the shortcomings of the proposed legislation. I have watched with growing concern and alarm the direction which the present administration is taking with respect to utilization of power and other natural resources.

I commend Mr. Ellis' memorandum and the objections of National Rural Electric Cooperative Association to H. R. 9757 and S. 3690 to the attention of my colleagues. The full text of the memorandum and the statement of objections follow:

NATIONAL RURAL ELECTRIC
COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D. C., July 15, 1954.

Memorandum to all members of United States House of Representatives
From Clyde T. Ellis, executive manager

The rural-electric systems were astounded that the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy on June 30 reported a bill (H. R. 9757 and S. 3690) to amend the Atomic Energy Act without either further public hearings or the opportunity for interested groups to present their views on such a vital piece of legislation which differs in some important aspects from that on which the committee held public hearings. This is a momentous piece of legislation, one which will affect the lives of all our citizens and one in which the rural-electric systems have a tremendous stake. Why should there be such haste to report this legislation without thorough hearings?

The rural electric systems were given an opportunity to testify on the original Cole-Hickenlooper bills, but we would like to point out that the bill reported to the House is an entirely different bill from the one originally introduced in the committee. We were denied the opportunity to appear and give our views on the bill on H. R. 9757 which has been reported to you.

The rural electric systems are anxious that the civilian atomic-energy program get rolling but they feel that H. R. 9757 should be properly amended to protect the public interest and make these atomic-energy benefits available to all the people and not just a select few. Attached you will find the main objections to the bill.

We urge the Congress to amend H. R. 9757 to overcome the objections pointed out in this memorandum. The rural-electric systems feel that such amendments would be in the public interest, especially in encouraging the widest possible use of this energy resource to meet the ever-increasing need for additional power sources.

Th farmers of America must not be denied the benefits of this great new and promising technology. They look to the Congress to display the same wisdom it has in preserving and furthering the REA program and to insure that this new power resource be considered a part of the public domain and be made available to all the people, not just a select few.

Sincerely,

CLYDE T. ELLIS,
Executive Manager.

OBJECTIONS OF THE NATIONAL RURAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION TO H. R. 9757 AND S. 3690 REPORTED BY THE JOINT CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE ON ATOMIC ENERGY

1. Private patents are permitted by the proposed amendments. Although the AEC can declare a patent affected with the public interest and make it available under a patent license to interested parties upon payment of reasonable royalty fees, we see no assurance in the bill that private patents could not be obtained from research financed pri-

marily by Federal funds and also that the amount of administrative discretion permitted will not permit the exclusion of some interested parties. The proposed amendments even make it possible to retroactively obtain a private patent denied under the present act.

We favor any amendments which would continue compulsory licensing of patents and make their usage available to all the people on a nonexclusive basis.

2. The licensing provisions of the proposed bill are not comprehensive or as well defined as those contained in the Federal Power Act.

3. No preference is provided for cooperatives and public bodies in obtaining a license for nuclear powerplant. The only preference contained in the proposed amendments is for facilities located in high-cost power areas in this country.

4. No preference is provided for nonprofit rural electric systems in obtaining nuclear materials as regards availability of these materials which are a public resource and should be so considered.

5. No preference in the marketing of power from federally financed nuclear powerplants is provided for rural electric cooperatives and public bodies.

6. There is no provision in the proposed amendments prohibiting the AEC from contracting for power which will not directly be used to meet its needs. The AEC can continue to contract for power under long-term no-risk contracts with the private utilities and force TVA under exchange agreements to absorb this high-cost power, thereby destroying the TVA yardstick.

Conclusion: The rural electric systems support any amendments which would remove their objections to H. R. 9757 and S. 3690 as listed above. The rural electric systems are strongly opposed to the bill in its present form, and without amendments which would remove their objections, this bill is completely unacceptable to them.

Two Significant Conferences

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL M. LeCOMPTE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 19, 1954

Mr. LeCOMPTE. Mr. Speaker the central question of the day is southeast Asia. That is where the crisis must be faced by the free world. Recently two pivotal conferences were held: one in Washington and one in New Delhi. President Eisenhower and Prime Minister Churchill met here; Nehru of India and Chou En-Lai of Red China met halfway around the world. The effect of those two conferences will be felt by the entire world.

Gen. Carlos P. Romulo appraises the importance of the two conferences and he gives a penetrating analysis that deserves our serious study and consideration. With the unanimous consent of the House, I insert excerpts of his address in the RECORD:

> A few days ago, President Eisenhower and Prime Minister Churchill met in Washington. At the same time, half a world away, Prime Minister Nehru and Communist China's Chou En-lai met in New Delhi. The two pairs of leaders talked and searched each other's minds, and out of their respective conversations came a statement or communique.
>
> The coincidence of these two meetings points up the great political crisis of our time.
>
> The meeting in Washington was between the leaders of two western allies whose policy of close understanding and cooperation was under heavy strain because of differences on the problem of Communist aggression in southeast Asia.
>
> The meeting in New Delhi was between the leaders of the two most populous states of Asia and of the world, and their ostensible purpose was to build a new bridge of understanding between them based on the so-called principles of nonaggression and noninterference in each other's affairs.
>
> In effect, the Washington conversations were between two dear cousins determined to iron out a family quarrel. On the other hand, the New Delhi talks were between two neighbors determined to know and respect each other better.
>
> But the fundamental issue involved in both these meetings was the peace, freedom, and security of Asia. The difference was this: In Washington two non-Asian powers were trying to reach agreement on what should be done in Asia, while in New Delhi two Asian countries were trying to reach agreement on what they wanted done in their own part of the world.
>
> I said a moment ago that the coincidence of these two conferences points up the great political crisis of our time. The crisis is not only military but psychological. It is psychological because one of the basic questions that must be decided before long is whether the will of the free Asian peoples or the will of outsiders will ultimately decide the fate of Asia.
>
> I have no desire to minimize the importance of Anglo-American friendship and understanding. Neither is it my intention to ignore the necessity which compels the United States to keep under close coordination its separate policies toward Europe and Asia in order to avoid dangerous contradictions.
>
> Nevertheless, it seems reasonable to suggest that in order to fashion an intelligent policy toward southeast Asia, the United States must first seek an understanding with the free countries of Asia rather than with the western powers that have interests in Asia.
>
> If the United States wishes to keep and maintain a position of respect and influence in southeast Asia, she must lose no time in establishing direct ties of understanding and cooperation with the free countries of the region.
>
> The American policy in southeast Asia continues to be vacillating and uncertain because France must be consulted (and France has a new Government which demands to be given a chance), and because Britain must be consulted (and Britain wants a Locarno-type settlement in southeast Asia).
>
> So the United States is hamstrung by the need of consulting its western allies. In effect, it has no Asian policy of its own at the moment except such as its principal allies in NATO are willing to support.
>
> This is a situation extremely difficult to justify. Granted that the United States must work closely with its Western European allies on all matters requiring common action to counteract or combat the Communist menace anywhere in the world. Granted further that the preponderance of American power as compared to its allies makes it all the more necessary for the United States to give due consideration to the views and interests of such allies. It is nevertheless important to point out that the purpose and nature of the American interest in southeast Asia are so radically different from the interests of France and the United Kingdom in the region that the formulation of American policy must require independent criteria.
>
> Having no colonial or other imperialist designs in southeast Asia, why should the United States subordinate its southeast Asia policy to those of European countries that have such designs or interests? Why shouldn't the United States rather formulate and follow a policy toward southeast Asia that is in closer harmony with its own history and traditions, and with its desire to strengthen the defenses of the free world and to put an end to Communist subversion and aggression?
>
> The history and traditions of America are built around the principle that all peoples have an inalienable right to be free and independent. Why should not the United States join in a formal declaration to that effect, emphasizing that this country would be prepared to share its strength and resources with all peoples who are seeking to throw off imperialist domination of whatever stripe? Such a declaration would immediately change the posture and balance of world politics; it would show up the hollow claims of the Communists as the champions of freedom and put them on the defensive everywhere; it would give a chance to the uncommitted peoples of Asia and Africa to test the sincerity of American policy; it would place the European colonial powers under notice that they must initiate and pursue a policy of liquidating their colonial holdings in order to establish free and independent states in Asia or risk losing them without American support.
>
> By coddling its Western European allies, the United States has come dangerously close to a position of being completely isolated from a substantial segment of southeast Asia. Sure of the friendship and cooperation of but the Philippines and Thailand in that entire region, the United States has permitted a situation to develop where its motives in the region have become suspect in the eyes of India, Burma, and Indonesia.
>
> The time that remains is short, but it is perhaps not yet too late. I would reiterate the suggestion I have previously made that the President of the United States seek a conference with the heads of state of all the countries of southeast Asia (Burma, Ceylon, India, Indonesia, Pakistan, the Philippines, and Thailand). That conference should discuss, not the formation of a NATO-like defensive pact for southeast Asia, but a new Atlantic charter for the region.
>
> It is true that we need a southeast Asia security pact, but no such pact will be of much value unless it is based on certain political principles generally accepted by the free peoples of the region.
>
> This is the kind of understanding or declaration which we need in southeast Asia. It is a declaration which would be worthy of America, and which the free peoples of southeast Asia would accept as an authentic voice out of the American past. It would not be a pale imitation of the Atlantic Charter, which was forged on the anvil of war by Roosevelt and Churchill. Rather, it would be the new version of that historic document, made more eloquent and timely still by the participation of the peoples who are most directly concerned, the peoples to whom freedom is not a grant, but a right.
>
> What I am proposing, in effect, is that the United States, without any further delay, embark on a program of reconciliation and understanding with the free countries of southeast Asia. Cutting loose from the policy influences of the European powers and seeking only the friendship and cooperation of the southeast Asian countries, it can go on its own great adventure of making friends in the region.
>
> It is often said that America can only negotiate with the Communist enemy from a po-

sition of strength, that is military strength. The reason is well known: The Communists understand power and they respect force. Today, however, the situation in southeast Asia is such that sheer physical power may not be the decisive factor at the present time. For negotiation is only a method of dealing with the Communists; the real objective is to effect an understanding, a reconciliation between the United States and the free states of Asia, in order that the latter with American support may be better able to withstand the menace of communism.

Therefore, while it is necessary that America should negotiate with the Communists from a position of military strength, it is no less essential that America should proceed from a position of moral strength in attempting to effect an understanding and reconciliation with the free states of Asia.

That strong moral position must be established in a kind of Atlantic Charter for southeast Asia which would guarantee, with American support, the enjoyment by the peoples of the region of human rights and fundamental freedoms, including the right to national freedom and independence. On such a basis American friendship with the peoples of Asia would rest solid and firm. Fewer divisions and less armaments would be needed to make it endure.

As a Filipino, knowing the real mind and heart of America, I have no doubt that by this kind of unselfish effort based on sound moral principles, the United States will win many friends and influence many peoples in southeast Asia, including those that today appear to have been foolishly attracted by the false values and hollow promises of communism.

Farm Surplus Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 15, 1954

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, the farmers of the Nation will be glad to know that we recently passed the surplus-property disposal bill—S. 2475—which will increase the sale of our surplus farm commodities to foreign countries and help to relieve the depressing effect of farm surpluses overhanging the farmers' market.

The bill authorizes the President to use a $1 billion revolving fund over the next 3 years to increase the sale of surplus farm commodities to foreign countries, and, when necessary, to accept local currencies of other nations, and also to barter farm commodities for strategic materials needed for the United States.

This legislation also permits the President to use $300 million in the 3 years to furnish emergency assistance on behalf of the needy people of the United States, and to the free peoples of other nations, in order to meet famine and urgent relief requirements.

Thus, we are trying to dispose of a minimum of of $1,300,000,000 or more of surplus farm commodities now owned and stored by the Government.

This legislation should greatly increase sales and exports of agriculture commodities to foreign nations. It will help to remove the roadblock of trade between the United States and other free nations by making it possible to accept their currencies during the period when they are short of American dollars. We, in turn, can use their currency with other nations in payment for import good to our country or in payment for some of our military operations in foreign countries.

It further provides that these surplus farm products can now be sold on the world market, which is some less than our export prices, and it should greatly help in selling more farm products to the nations of the world.

This practical emergency approach in the interest of the farmers is the most advanced step yet any Congress has made to increase our export and sale of surplus products abroad. It is bound in time to be of great benefit to the farmers, as it will reduce our very large surpluses of farm products that are costing the Government tremendous sums for storage, and are depressing, here at home, farm prices.

The Charter of the United Nations Endangers Our Liberties

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. USHER L. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 19, 1954

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, in the late fall and early spring of 1952–53, a subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee investigated American citizens who were in the employ of the United Nations. Twenty-five of these persons who were summoned to testify refused to do so, claiming their privilege under the provisions of the fifth amendment.

When this fact was communicated to Trygve Lie, Secretary-General of the United Nations, all were removed from their service with that organization.

Twenty-one of these people took an appeal to the Administrative Tribunal of the United Nations, sitting at Geneva, Switzerland. This Tribunal consisted of four foreign lawyers. They handed down a decision upholding the Secretary-General in 9 cases, ordered a rehearing on 1 case, and ordered reinstatement of 11, with monetary awards amounting to $170 thousand, and the United Nations was ordered to pay the money, which has been or will be done.

The Administrative Tribunal paid no attention to the laws or the Constitution of this country, and found that the action in dismissing them conflicts with the provisions of regulations 1 and 4 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

I have pointed out time and time again that all the people of the United States have to do if they want to get out of this mess, is to pass a resolution rescinding the approval of the Charter of the United Nations. If that act is passed by the Congress and approved by the President we are out of it. We do not need a Bricker constitutional amendment. We can act directly, and I have cited decision after decision of the Supreme Court of the United States pointing out that a statute passed subsequent to the approval of a treaty controls. If no action is taken a treaty becomes the supreme law of the land, but the way is open, and always has been, for direct legislative action to annul such treaty.

What will those do who are in control of the Government? Will they assert the sovereign rights of the United States, or will they, because of the groundless fear of Russian bombs, meekly pay this outrageous bill and continue right on being controlled by this United Nations organization?

We need intelligence and understanding in everything we do, but on this matter we need something more—we need courage and the unswerving will to protect the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic. Will we do it? We finally will do it, but it will be when we have no appeasers handling our affairs.

The Declaration of Human Rights has not been approved by the Senate and this universal declaration was approved by no one save the United Nations itself.

Here is a case where a foreign court, without counsel for the United States, and without considering the Constitution of the United States, made its decision, which deeply affects all the people of the United States. Since we pay almost 40 percent of the upkeep of the other 64 nations who are members of the United Nations, it is obvious that a foreign court has assessed damages against the United States on the theory that the laws of the United Nations govern the United States. That is just what the one-worlders want. They want to override the provisions of the Constitution of the United States and set up a supreme organization which will take away the sovereign rights of this great Republic.

The summary action of a foreign court indicates clearly the danger we are in through being a member of an organization like the United Nations. Probably, and very probably, if we do not make appropriations big enough for the United Nations to satisfy foreigners, that organization will directly assess the amount they want against the United States, and if that is done, will the United States abjectly surrender and squander more money for the taxpayers to dig up?

The administrative tribunal of the United Nations is composed of Madam Paul Bastid, president; the Lord Crook, vice president; Mr Sture Pe ren, vice president; Mr. Omar Loutfi, alternate member.

THE AWARDS

Ruth E. Crawford, staff of International Childrens Emergency Fund; award, full salary to date of reinstatement; reinstatement in position; $300 as costs.

Alexander Svenchansky, Radio Division, Department of Public Information; award, full salary to date of reinstatement and $300 costs.

Hope Tisdale Eldridge, Statistical Office, Department of Economic Affairs, award, full salary to date of reinstatement and $300 costs.

Edna Glaser, Secretariat Library Staff member; award, reinstatement with full pay and $300 costs.

AWARDS IN OTHER SEVEN CASES

Jack S. Harris, $40,000 in lieu of reinstatement and $300 costs.

Julia Older, $27,500 in lieu of reinstatement and $300 costs.

Frank C. Bancroft, $12,000 in lieu of reinstatement and $300 costs.

Jane Reed, $10,000 plus retirement pension and $300 costs.

Leon Elveson, $7,000 and costs of $300.

Sidney Glassman, $20,000 in lieu of reinstatement and $300 costs.

Joel Gordon, $6,000 in lieu of reinstatement and $300 costs.

Eugene Wallach, $300 and case remanded for reconsideration.

The dismissals were upheld in the cases of Irving Kaplan, Mary A. Middleton, Martin H. Rubin, Helen-Kagen-Posner, Sonya J. Sokolow, Celia Saperstein, Alfred J. Vam Tassel, and Marjorie and Herman Zap.

Our Best Chance To Survive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFTON (CLIFF) YOUNG

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 19, 1954

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, our Nation is most fortunate to have among its outstanding leaders in the field of aviation warfare at this critical period in world history the man whose extraordinary courage and skill was first evidenced almost 30 years ago in the nonstop flight to Paris of the Spirit of St. Louis, Brig. Gen. Charles A. Lindbergh.

In the past several years many of us have been watching with growing concern the threat of worldwide conquest by Communist Russia and the scientific development of atomic weapons. Our concern has been for a policy of national and civil defense that would best prepare us to meet the existing threat.

General Lindbergh has set forth his opinion on this subject in an article which appeared in a recent issue of the Saturday Evening Post. I believe that both his analysis of the situation and his recommendations should be widely known and considered by the responsible officials of our Government.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the complete text of General Lindbergh's article. It follows:

OUR BEST CHANCE TO SURVIVE

(By Brig. Gen. Charles A. Lindbergh, USAFR.)

In an atomic-missile war, a tremendous advantage will be achieved by the nation which strikes first and without warning. A large number of military objectives can be wiped out, millions of people killed, and all important cities destroyed. Unless its military forces are extensively decentralized as well as extraordinarily powerful, the ability of the struck country to counterattack may be reduced to a state of ineffectiveness resulting in submission.

The hydrogen bomb and the supersonic missile have eliminated defensive security on the surface of the earth. The most elaborate defensive network we can devise would intercept only a fraction of modern enemy aircraft launched in a determined attack on this country. In the near future, our potential enemies will have atomic warheads in long-range rockets which travel faster than a rifle's bullet. These we do not know how to intercept at all. Atomic bombs can also be delivered by submarines, ships, or saboteurs, and 1 bomb will erase 1 city.

To strike without warning is against the traditions and policies of the American people. Capitulation is an idea unknown to us. The alternative is to maintain strength that is as obvious to a potential enemy as it is certain to ourselves. If our strength is not obvious as well as factual, we may delude an enemy into believing he can destroy us by surprise, and the debacle of Pearl Harbor could be repeated on a titanic scale.

We cannot build impregnable defenses; but we must maintain an inexpugnable means of retaliation—a method of delivering our bombs in the event a surprise attack is made upon this country, and after we have absorbed the first terrific blow. If we manufacture atomic explosives without corresponding ability to deliver them, regardless of enemy action, the very size of our stockpile will encourage a surprise attack against us and increase the danger to our cities instead of adding to their security.

Suppose we have 100 bases from which to launch atomic aircraft, and the locations of these bases are known to an enemy whose agents travel freely through our country. Suppose that enemy has only 500 atomic aircraft. Three enemy aircraft could be assigned to destroy each of our bases, with 200 remaining in reserve. These reserve aircraft could be assigned to wipe out other military establishments, including, say, 100 cities. The attack could be timed to hit every target at the same secret moment. Such a situation would encourage a dictator to strike, regardless of the size of our stockpile of atomic bombs. He will be discouraged only if he believes that we will devastate his own country even after the most successful blow he can deliver against us.

A study of political and military conditions around the world today forces the conclusions that the survival of America depends on armed strength as never before in our history, that our weapons must be widely decentralized as well as extremely powerful, and that if we relax our vigilance even temporarily our civilization is likely to fall, with a loss of life that is staggering.

Mankind has entered another of the historically recurring periods of catastrophe and crisis, this time on a global scale. Our western peoples have already sustained major wounds from two World Wars. Western science, which enabled us to progress to the widest and strongest civilization the world has ever known, has suddenly created the tools to destroy it. These tools have now reached the hands of a Soviet Government which is ruthless, dictatorial, and antagonistic. Under such circumstances, it is inevitable that our primary attention be shifted from the advantages of progress to the essentials of survival.

As our ancestors have often been before us, we are confronted with the fundamental proposition that to progress we must survive—but amid new and almost inconceivably tremendous forces. To cope with these new forces and to find methods of controlling them is the most important mission of our generation. While economy must be emphasized in every move we make it is no longer a question of what we can afford on previous standards of life, but of what we must do and how we must live in order to exist and maintain the independence of our Nation. We, in our turn, now have an obligation to our beliefs, our ideals, and to future generations which demands unlimited sacrifice to essential military strength.

The minimum military strength we can afford must give us the unquestioned ability to retaliate against any enemy that attacks us or our allies. This requires, first of all, a fleet in being of the most modern aircraft—a fleet able to take the air with atom bombs within minutes after an alarm is sounded. This fleet must be scattered over hundreds of bases, over too many for an enemy to paralyze with a single blow. Nothing else will give us enough influence to discourage aggression.

Second, it requires research, development, and industrial decentralization programs that will improve the effectiveness of our future weapons and reduce our vulnerability. Research and development are absolutely essential if we are to maintain maximum power at minimum cost. We need higher accuracies, faster missiles, smaller launching sites, and a wider-spread economy. From now on, all of our planning should be based on a policy of locating important establishments, so far as practicable, outside of major target areas.

Third, we must emphasize development of the human element in our military forces fully as much as we emphasize the development of material elements in these forces. In this human element lies an extraordinary opportunity to increase our power and reduce our costs; it offers the quickest and highest return for money invested in national security. Our ingenuity in the use of man has not kept pace with our ingenuity in the use of the machines man manufactures. Fleets of atomic aircraft, costing billions of dollars, can be operated efficiently only by a skilled, satisfied, and experienced personnel; yet thousands of expert airmen leave the service each year to get better jobs in civil life. Economy itself demands that in this complicated electromechanistic age long years of expensive training should be followed by opportunities, pay, and conditions which encourage people to remain in the careers they were trained for.

Our military problems would be relatively simple if we had only to measure our forces against those of our potential enemies, and to keep in advance of their accomplishments. But the American policy of nonaggression requires a military position of such magnitude that if our enemies should strike us by surprise, annihilating hundreds of our bases and dozens of our cities, we can still exceed their power. This means a prodigious Air Force, a strong Army, a strong Navy, and strong allies.

It is a formidable task, extending into the future as far as we can see, but it is within our capabilities. Our objective is the survival of western civilization. Our policy must be dynamic. There is no longer such a thing as adequate defense. As long as a dangerous enemy exists, our security will lie in the indestructible power to destroy.

The Lesson of Chestertown

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 19, 1954

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the question is, Have we learned anything from Chestertown?

On July 16 the press reported 11 dead and some thirty-odd injured as a result of an explosion that rocked the little city of Chestertown, Md., a community of 3,140 people.

The press further reported:

> Mass evacuation chokes roads and bridges from eastern shore town.

Remember Chestertown, 3,140 people, explosion in plant employing 275 persons, roads and bridges choked, wild confusion, people helpless because transportation system is inadequate; what would happen if a more extensive explosion occurred in a large population center?

Same thing. "Mass evacuation, roads and bridges choked, people panicked, exits blocked, dead-end death."

Our present means of evacuation is totally inadequate. What can we do?

One helicopter for every 100 people, strategically located and maintained in each community, like fire engines, ready for immediate use, might well be the answer.

Sport Car Races on SAC Bases

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ERRETT P. SCRIVNER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 19, 1954

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, during the debate on the military appropriations bill, I discussed the matter of sports car races on Strategic Air Command bases.

This matter had been looked into from various angles by investigators for the Appropriations Committee and by the General Accounting Office.

The GAO report was not available until after the bill had been presented to the House.

Inasmuch as these races have been the subject of magazine and news articles, and editorial comment, parts of the GAO report should be made available to Congress and to the public, although the question is now moot, inasmuch as the Air Force has ordered all but 3 or 4 future races to be canceled.

In view of that cancellation the GAO investigators' work was cut short but even so was sufficiently complete to justify the criticism made and to support the action taken by the Air Force.

The introduction and summary of the GAO follows:

> #### Basis for Investigation
>
> This investigation was initiated as a result of information received from responsible sources to the effect that sports car races being held from time to time at Air Force cases, particularly bases of the Strategic Air Command, were a serious disruption to normal Air Force business, and provided little, if any, benefit from a financial or morale standpoint. The program has also been the subject of complaint letters from private citizens and comment in congressional quarters.
>
> #### SCOPE OF INVESTIGATION
>
> Investigation included a visit by investigators to MacDill Air Force Base, Florida, in January 1954 while races were being held, development of information from the records at several bases where races previously had been held, and a fairly comprehensive examination of the records and files on the sports car racing program at Headquarters, Strategic Air Command. Investigation at SAC Headquarters also included interviews with Gen. Curtis E. LeMay, Commanding General of SAC, and other Air Force officers connected with the program.
>
> #### SUMMARY OF FINDINGS
>
> The SAC racing program has taken on the proportions of a major activity. Approximately 100,000 man-hours are expended on each race, of which approximately 20,000 represent regularly scheduled duty time.
>
> SAC regulations provide for reimbursement to the Government for the labor costs of Government-employed civilians, for services furnished, and for Government-owned supplies and materials issued which are not returned to base supply in usable condition. The SAC regulations are at variance with regulations applicable to the Air Force generally in that Air Force regulations also require reimbursement for labor costs of military personnel used on this type of activity. The average labor costs per race for military personnel is estimated at $23,000 for regularly scheduled duty time, and $115,000 overall.
>
> In addition to the cost of military labor, one of the major items of cost for which no reimbursement is made is the use of military equipment, including aircraft. Upwards of 40 trips by airplane have been made between Air Force bases by observer groups in connection with the sports car racing program.
>
> There appears to be a strong undercurrent of opposition to the racing program among Air Force personnel, who feel that regular Air Force business operations are seriously disrupted by the general preoccupation of personnel with sports-car racing. No substantial evidence was found that military operations are disrupted.
>
> Information developed in the investigation points up a number of legal problems, such as the basic legal authority for using military installations for sports-car racing, and the legal capacity of the custodian of the Strategic Air Command airmen's living improvement fund to enter into binding agreements with the Sports Car Club of America.
>
> Since the program brings a net return of hardly more than $5 or $6 per enlisted man per year, it does not appear to be an effective means of improving the living conditions of airmen, particularly in relation to the personal sacrifices and disruptions to business entailed.
>
> By orders of USAF headquarters dated April 28, 1954, the scheduling of future sports-car races on Air Force bases was prohibited, and races already scheduled, other than those for which binding contracts existed or for which substantial amounts of funds had been expended, were ordered canceled. As of the time this report is written, 3 races had been canceled, 8 races were allowed to remain on schedule, and the fate of 4 races was still under consideration.

Mr. Speaker, the report which supports the above findings sets out some very interesting points.

RACES BECOME MAJOR ACTIVITY

It points out the fact that the SAC races have become a major activity calling for a 72-page manual of information on how to plan and conduct them. The manual covers layout of course, erection of concession stands, latrines, bleachers, crowd and traffic control, communications, fire fighting, insurance, publicity, and so forth.

Preparations begin three or more months in advance, by military personnel at the base, during duty hours, for the most part. In one or more instances requiring 5 officers and 6 enlisted men. Surrounding towns are visited—via military transportation—for publicity stories and ticket sales.

Let the report speak for itself:

> Work details of enlisted men are used to construct ticket booths, latrines, and food and beverage stands, to erect bleachers and snow fences (for crowd control), and to clean up the base before and after the race. At the Offutt race 5 ticket booths were constructed, 16,000 feet of snow fence were erected, 14 outdoor latrines were built, 9 concessionaire stands were constructed, and borrowed bleacher seats for 25,000 persons were secured, erected, dismantled, stacked, and returned.
>
> Base communications personnel install temporary telephones in race committee headquarters, and provide race day telephone service to the judges' stand, to positions around the track, and to the press box. At Offutt these services include the installation of switchboard facilities at the judges stand which were connected with telephones in the pits, at the starter's position, and at various points around the track. Approximately 11 miles of wire were used in making this installation.
>
> Starting several months before the race day with a nucleus of key race committee personnel working on a spare-time basis, prerace activity increases as the date of the race draws near. Three weeks prior to the race 10 or 15 persons are devoting almost all their duty time to it, with perhaps several hundred working part time. On the day before the race, the day of the race, and the day following, several hundred officers and enlisted men are working full time on the project. One commanding officer estimated that over 1,100 enlisted men and 72 officers were actively utilized in putting on the race at his base.

The racing event calls for the use of airfield runways, the erection of barricades and markers requiring the fields to be closed for 2 or 3 days prior to the run, and, of course, the day of the race. Frequently this calls for the transfer of activities to other nearby bases, such as it did at MacDill where operations had to be transferred to Tampa Municipal Airport—contact being kept by shuttle bus.

MILITARY MANPOWER REQUIRED

Crowd control requires many airmen. At Offutt it is reported that this phase of the race alone called for 10,000 airman hours.

The report states:

> No records have been maintained of military man-hours spent on sports car racing.

However, estimates have been made which show that at Turner Air Force Base 18,962 duty hours were expended. The comptroller at Offutt, 1953, estimated 117,239 man-hours were used—duty and nonduty. The average man-hours is in the neighborhood of 100,000 at a conservative estimate of $1.15 per hour—or $115,000 per race which far exceeds even the gross sales.

The GAO report shows that there is a great direct and indirect cost to the taxpayers, little of which is accounted for.

Although Air Force regulations required reimbursement to the Government for the cost of duty hour activities in events like this; here is what the GAO report says:

COST TO TAXPAYER

> The original SAC regulation on reimbursement to the Government for costs incurred in connection with sports car racing provided that reimbursements would be made "for any military labor utilized during regularly scheduled duty hours, and for any material furnished by the Government."

The regulations went on to say that material used during the event and returned in undamaged condition would not require reimbursement.

It soon became apparent that reimbursement for military labor would probably turn a race profit into a deficit, and this part of the regulation was never enforced. On April 28, 1953, after three SAC races had been run, the regulation was changed to provide for reimbursement to the Government "for labor utilized on work projects during regularly scheduled duty hours." The effect of this change was to limit reimbursement for military labor to that used on normal base maintenance type construction and repair work. This type of labor has been handled by the services as a "costed" item for many years.

On June 24, 1953, shortly before the first Offutt race, and while the local Air Force auditor was pressing for some sort of recordkeeping on military labor being utilized in the forthcoming Offutt race, the regulation was again changed to provide that reimbursement should be made to the Government "for civilian employee labor utilized on work projects." The revised regulation went on to say that "neither reimbursement to the Government for military labor utilized nor the keeping of records thereof is required." The effect of this change was to exempt military labor from reimbursement and to set up a new category of reimbursement, namely, civilian labor, which had not been mentioned in the prior regulations and which is not used to any considerable extent on the sports car races.

HOW LOSS TURNED TO PROFIT

Particular attention is called to the GAO statement:

> It soon became apparent that reimbursement for military labor would probably turn a race profit into a loss, and this part of the regulation was never enforced.

The report also shows that, although regulations require reimbursement to the Government for civilian labor used, in all except three, there is no record of reimbursement, although it is quite obvious that civilian employees were engaged in these activities—in administration, supervisory, and secretarial work.

Although the Air Force claimed that the duty time was made up by overtime, GAO could not find evidence of that, even though it is a known fact that many who were assigned to race duty were given leaves or passes with pay.

LITTLE REIMBURSEMENT

Very little reimbursement was made for material, such as lumber, canvas, wire, film, oil and gas, and so forth, and countless other items, which, although small in themselves, eventually run into surprising figures.

No reimbursement is made for use of military vehicles, including planes or the fuel and oil used therein. Neither is there for communication equipment such as telephones and radio, nor office equipment, tools, and the like.

At Offutt, for instance, reported cost of Government transportation furnished shows that 5-ton tractors were driven 1,886 miles, buses 1,487 miles, and passenger sedans 2,618 miles. The reimbursement? It was $86.90 for gasoline and $1.70 for oil.

However, the GAO reports points out the largest equipment item for which there has been no reimbursement is that of plane used by "observer group" who travel under "temporary duty travel orders." No per diem was authorized, but all other pay and allowances were received.

OPPOSITION IN AIR FORCE

As to the attitude of Air Force personnel, the report shows:

> There appears to be a strong undercurrent of opposition to this racing program among Air Force personnel.

Phone calls which I have received and letters sent to me are convincing proof that this is an understatement.

But let us proceed with the report:

> This undercurrent has reached such proportions that many officers have gone out of their way to voluntarily express their feelings to GAO representatives during the course of personal and official conversations. The consensus of the feelings of these officers seems to be that regular Air Force business is seriously disrupted by the general preoccupation of personnel at administrative and supervisory echelons with the additional responsibilities placed upon them incident to the sports car races. Two officers told the investigators that they had successfully objected to having military personnel under their jurisdiction detailed to racing duties on the grounds that their official workloads would not permit the diversion. The inference seemed to be that they had taken this stand at some risk to their Air Force careers because it would be interpreted as a failure to support command policy.
>
> #### MILITARY ACTIVITIES INTERFERED WITH
>
> GAO representatives making an inspection of supply operations at MacDill Air Force Base at the time of the January 1954 race found supply office records in a chaotic condition and the supply division in the process of extensive overhaul. Labor crews, working on special detail from the Warner-Robins air materiel area, were at work packing and crating hundreds of thousands of dollars' worth of excess property that had been generated at the base, apparently due to failure to maintain the necessary paperwork controls over inventories. Nevertheless, on the day following the MacDill races, 22 airmen assigned to the base supply office were away from their jobs working on a cleanup detail.
>
> In another incident, a representative of the GAO, making arrangements to visit an Air Force base to observe supply operations, was requested by the base command to defer the visit until the following week because the base was engrossed in getting ready for a sports-car race.
>
> The foregoing incidents are typical of the hundreds of disruptions, large and small, that necessarily entail from an operation as extensive as the sports-car races. The cost or damage resulting from these disruptions would probably bear no relationship to the value of the man-hours involved. A few hours of neglect in maintaining supply records can result in hundreds of thousands of dollars lost to the Government.

SERVICES VOLUNTEERED?

The Air Force has stated that most, if not all, of the services rendered were voluntary. My mail reflects an entirely opposite view.

The GAO did not go into this phase of the races. However, their report does show that at MacDill orders were actually cut detailing officers and men to specific duties in connection with the race. This, according to General LeMay, was a deviation from Air Force policy, yet the Air Force holds that any injury received by military personnel during any of these events will be considered in line of duty.

Although the Air Force also claimed that contrary to information given me, leaves and passes were not canceled for a period of time before and after the races, I have in my file a cut order which did cancel leaves and passes for several days before and after the races.

The report goes into some detail as to the purpose for which expenditures are made, but quite naturally does not raise the question of the attitude of the other military personnel who are on duty on the bases where funds cannot be so raised and so used.

REPEAT PERFORMANCE

The report does show that "repeat performances are not financially successful" and concludes that the races are not financial successes. The report states:

	First race	*Second race*
Turner Air Force Base	$47,764	$3,964
MacDill Air Force Base	30,746	23,393
Bergstrom Air Force Base	24,337	8,315

> Even if the level of return, which has averaged about $28,000 per race up to the present time, could be sustained, it is doubtful that the racing program can be regarded as a financial success. This return probably represents not more than $5 or $6 per enlisted man a year, a small sum indeed in relation to the effort and personal sacrifice involved on the part of the officers and men in putting on a race, and a drop in the bucket in relation to the overall annual cost to the Government of providing for the housing and welfare of the personnel at any given base.

EFFECT ON MORALE

While effect on morale was not within the specific orbit of their investigation, the GAO report says:

> Also for consideration, of course, is the effectiveness of the program from the standpoint of morale. SAC Headquarters has taken the position that apart from the material benefits derived from the program, a direct morale benefit accrues from airman participation in this type of program. Against this intangible benefit there would have to be offset the equally intangible adverse effect on morale of those personnel who do not find the races interesting and whose participation is on something less than a voluntary basis.

Mr. Speaker, as I have previously stated, I have no objection to sport car races, as such. However, the use of Government property at the expense of the taxpayer is something to which I do object. I would be derelict in my duty if I did not. It is my purpose to get the greatest amount of defense possible for the lowest possible number of dollars. Dollars spent for these races are not available for defense.

Personally, I feel that the decision of the Air Force was a proper decision—made upon full consideration of all facts, and that such decision, leaving out some rather complex legal questions, is fully justified by the report of the GAO and that of our committee investigators.

Fort Monmouth Rated Tops in United States by Local Chamber of Commerce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 19, 1954

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, under the authority granted me by the House, I am pleased to include with my brief remarks a statement issued by the Chamber of Commerce, of Eatontown, N. J., regarding that community's relationship with the United States Signal Corps stationed at Fort Monmouth, close by Eatontown.

During the recent hearings conducted by the Senate Subcommittee on Government Operations at Fort Monmouth this community received a great deal of publicity which caused a mixed reaction among the residents. The situation became so tense that the board of directors of the Chamber of Commerce of Eatontown under the able leadership of its president, Mr. Karl F. Wihtol, instigated a review of the community's relationship with Fort Monmouth and the personnel stationed there. It was felt that something should be done to restore the morale and spirit of that Army post and the overall good-neighborly feeling between the post and the community which the chamber of commerce felt had been impaired since the hearings were held. This action of the Eatontown Chamber of Commerce was well received and the simple, straight-forward language of the report it rendered is impressive; it has created a much better atmosphere in the whole community. I take considerable pride in noting this splendid spirit of cooperation which is evidenced by these fine people that I have the honor to represent.

The residents of this area are good Americans who hate communism and its godless ideology, and I am confident that their devotion to their country and to the principles of liberty and freedom which our Republic stands for will revive that patriotic spirit which has always been characteristic of this community. The above-mentioned follows:

FORT MONMOUTH RATED TOPS IN UNITED STATES BY LOCAL CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

The board of directors of the Eatontown Chamber of Commerce heard and studied the report of a special committee of the chamber who have been at work for the past 4 months reviewing the community's relationship with Fort Monmouth, the Signal Corps, and its mass of military personnel and civilian employees. The president of the chamber, Mr. Karl F. Wihtol, summarizes the community's report as follows:

1. Throughout the county, and especially in the boroughs adjoining one of the largest military and scientific establishments, namely, Fort Monmouth, it was found that the community in general and its surroundings are free of gambling joints and other vice establishments that could or might have existed, and that are often found near military establishments, especially in time of war.

2. It was found that both permanent and summer residents are proud of the Fort Monmouth personnel. Praises of the highest caliber are abundant regarding the personnel assigned to the fort.

3. The committee found that the cooperation existing between the military and local civilian authorities is excellent, and that an open-door policy exists between the military and civilian law enforcement groups.

4. Because of the high caliber of scientific work being accomplished in the electronics field, Monmouth County as a whole has become a community of the highest type of American citizens. The county has become famous not because of the unfavorable publicity caused by the recent hearings, but because the finest types of citizens have become residents of this community.

5. The Signal Corps officials feel the same toward officials of the community, its business people, and its citizens. The Army and New Jersey have established an amicable relationship.

The chamber of commerce directors gave a full vote of thanks to the committee, the executive secretary, Mr. Peter Edwardsen, and the president of the chamber.

> Karl F. Wihtol, President; Charles L. Carroll, Vice President; Patrick Williams, Treasurer; Michael J. Ricciardi; Anthony Scheri; Carley Garafolo; James Frangella; John W. Ousterman; Hervey Keator; Herbert Zimmerman, Board of Directors.

A GI Student Expresses Gratitude for Privileges and Opportunities Afforded Him as an American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. BUCKLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 19, 1954

Mr. BUCKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to hear from Mr. Michael Anzilotti, of 505 East 184th Street, Bronx, N. Y., with regard to the student-aid program made possible by the GI bill of rights. Mr. Anzilotti has just returned from Europe, where he is studying medicine at Bologna under this program. His enthusiastic account of his first year there and his gratitude for the benefits he has received from this experience are set forth in his letter to me dated July 13, 1954, as follows:

BRONX, N. Y., *July 13, 1954.*

Hon. CHARLES A. BUCKLEY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BUCKLEY: I have just returned from Europe and I am happy to say that I have had a very successful year at the medical school at Bologna. A good deal of my success, in no small measure, is due to the American way of life, that is, those American ideals and traditions that have made it possible for me as a veteran to qualify for the GI bill of rights which has been granted to me through your intervention in August of 1953. I have found that attending the university so many miles away from home, without financial worries, has been very stimulating and made me a much better student.

The medical school in Bologna is terrific and already we have tasted bateriology, biochemistry, osteology, myoloy, splanchnology, pathology, and physiology. All the examinations are oral, not written, and this has the effect to make us study and learn the material more intensely to be able to present it in as fluent a manner as the professors would have us.

The American students, in my year in particular, are making a tremendous showing and it has been said that the class of November 1953 is one of the best American classes to hit Bologna. The students for the most part are eager, industrious, and conscientious. They take to medicine like a duck to water. To us medicine is like a jealous woman. She demands all our time and only hesitatingly does she let us out for a night with the boys, an occasional poker game or a night at the theater. Even with this fault, though, she's a lovely lady, gracious, inspiring, cordial, and friendly and has many American students as admirers.

I hope this little letter has given you an idea of what the school and life at Bologna is like. More than this, however, I want to thank you once again for doing what you have done for me, for making it possible for me to receive the GI bill of rights.

If there is anything I can do for you, I shall be most happy to be of service if it is within my power. I will return to Europe in October to continue.

Sincerely yours,

MICHAEL ANZILOTTI.

Hands Off the Investigations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 19, 1954

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks, I include therein an article from the New Republic, under date of May 21, 1924, by Felix Frankfurter, now Justice of the Supreme Court, entitled "Hands Off the Investigations."

I believe this magazine article written by Justice Frankfurter more than 30 years ago will be of especial interest to all Members of Congress, as well as to the general public, in view of the controversy which is now going on relative to congressional investigations:

HANDS OFF THE INVESTIGATIONS

(By Felix Frankfurter)

So grave were the first disclosures made by the Walsh and Wheeler investigations that the immediate response of the country was profound humiliation. Only the recently disavowed organ of the Republican National Committee ventured brazenly to attack the exposers and minimize the exposure. But, as the effect of the impact of these disclosures wore off, partly because of the very extent of the revelations, public preoccupation with private worries and bewilderment over the variety of complicated issues were exploited by various powerful forces, from a variety of motives ranging from the lowest to moral confusion, all with a view to discrediting investigation and arresting its further progress. The gathering forces against the investigations and the investigators reached their culminating reinforcement in the support of a President who, while professing a desire to vindicate the law, assumes that law and order are bounded by the Penal Code, and helped to create an atmosphere in which necessary investigation could not thrive. The President's lead was promptly followed by such guardians of the public interest as Judge Gary. The most disheartening experience of the Ballinger investigation repeats itself: The condemnation of the most powerful is reserved for the exposers and not for the exposed.

Emboldened by the successful offensive against the pending investigations in Washington, various suggestions are afloat with a view to curbing future Walsh and Wheeler investigations. Professing, of course, that wrongdoing, impropriety, and unwholesome standards in public life should be exposed, critics, who have nothing to say for the astounding corruption and corrupting soil which have been brought to light, seek to divert attention and shackle the future by suggesting restrictions in the procedure of future congressional investigations. Not only do members of the bar thus propose to hamper a power which has been exercised since 1789, but even one of our financiers, who is a self-appointed mentor for all our national ills, urges curbs upon Congress drawn from his deep study of comparative parliamentary procedure.

A proper judgment of the Walsh and Wheeler investigations involves a consideration of (1) the situation which confronted them, (2) their accomplishments, (3) their alleged abuses. Only after such consideration can we properly assess (4) the pertinence of any formal change in the procedure of congressional investigation.

(1) Situation confronting Walsh and Wheeler: When the Harding administration began—in fact preceding it—the air was full of indications of the sinister influences that were to prevail and were prevailing in the conduct of some of the vital departments of the Government. Around Fall and Daugherty suspicions steadily clustered. Washington was thick with talk, and not the talk of irresponsibles. As time went on the intimations became more and more outspoken; but every influence of authority, of powerful social connections, of the press, the whole milieu of officialdom in Washington was on the side of those in power and against disclosure and truthtelling. More than that, when things could no longer be stemmed and an investigation of Daugherty's administration was entered upon by a House committee, the forces of wrongdoing rendered such an investigation abortive and futile, and thereby served to discredit further accusations and their investigation.

For nearly 2 years the efforts to uncover wrongdoing in the disposal of our public domain were hampered by every conceivable obstruction on the part of those in office and those influential out of office; involving members of the President's official entourage, and including perjury before a Senate committee on the part of one of the closest friends of the late President and one on close terms with the present Executive. The vast investigatorial agencies of the Government not only failed to cooperate with the efforts to unearth wrongdoing; they positively sought to frustrate congressional activity.

Governmental machinery, prestige, wealth, agencies of publicity—all were for covering up things. No one who has not had some experience of the power the Government can exert is able to realize the tremendous pressure against which Walsh and Wheeler were contending. Both the hostile resources and the inertia which they had to overcome were incredible. The odds which they thus encountered must be felt and not merely intellectually admitted and lightly dismissed.

(2) Accomplishments of Walsh and Wheeler: These are beyond question: the bills filed by the Government against the Sinclair and Doheny leases are based upon the findings of the Walsh committee, namely, corruption and conspiracy rendered possible through Secretary Fall's corruption and Secretary Denby's guileless incompetence; the disgrace of, and pending grand jury inquiry into, a recent member of the Cabinet—Fall; the resignation of another member through incompetence—Denby, the dismissal of a third member—the Attorney General—because of an enveloping, malodorous atmosphere.

It is safe to say that never in the history of this country have congressional investigations had to contend with such powerful odds, never have they so quickly revealed wrongdoing, incompetence, and low public standards on such a wide scale, and never have such investigations resulted so effectively in compelling correction through the dismissal of derelict officials. All this, it must be remembered again and again, was done by Congress against obstructing executive departments and, to put it mildly, unassisted by a President, who, unlike Roosevelt, is not a crusader against wrongdoing.

(3) Alleged abuses: One would like to have a bill of particulars of these alleged abuses. Objection is frequently taken against irrelevant, unfair, and unsubstantial charges and to the character of some of the witnesses. It is not easy to be patient with such an attitude. What were the irrelevant charges before the Walsh committee, and what were the improprieties in pursuing those charges? Certainly Senator Walsh has established all the charges surrounding the oil leases up to the hilt. Objections are made to the testimony centering around alleged prenomination and preelection affairs in 1920. Surely it was relevant to ascertain whether interests were on the lookout to put into the Department of the Interior a man who, honestly or dishonestly, held one attitude rather than another toward our natural resources. Necessarily much of this was hearsay and gossip. Nevertheless there emerged definitely the fact that Hamon spent a huge sum of money for campaign purposes. If these aren't "leads" properly to be pursued, then we had better frankly admit that the power of congressional investigation is a sham, and not an effective instrument for ventilating issues for the information of Congress and of the public.

What are the specific objections to be made against the hearings conducted by Senator WHEELER? Of course, the character of the witnesses in many instances was disreputable. It is of the essence of the whole Daugherty affair that the Attorney General of the United States was involved in questionable association with disreputable characters. It is naively suggested as to these individuals, that they are not competent witnesses. But they are exhibits. But in order to be exhibits, they had to be witnesses. This is the kind of hair-splitting that has for decades been attacked as a disgrace to American criminal procedure. In suggesting that WHEELER's witnesses were not competent witnesses but merely exhibits, perhaps all that was intended was that Senator Wheeler should have preceded the calling of each one of his disreputable witnesses by a speech stating that they were disreputable. Surely this is a naive suggestion. It is difficult, at best, to get witnesses to talk. This criticism is familiar to everyone who has ever had anything to do with criminal prosecutions, namely, an attempt to divert attention from the misconduct of the defendant to the character of the witnesses against him. Of course the character of a witness is a relevant item. As to Daugherty, it was a damning item. But the testimony of such people is not at all incompetent, and their character, as the New York World pointed out in an editorial on April 24, may be conclusive testimony on the issue of the fitness of a man to be Attorney General of the United States. If by the witnesses which Senator Wheeler produced he was able to furnish a living demonstration of the atmosphere which prevailed in and around the Attorney General of the United States, how possibly could that conclusion have been demonstrated except in the way in which Senator Wheeler demonstrated it? Eminent lawyers might have done it a little differently—but the chances are very strong that they wouldn't have done it at all. It requires pertinacity and high indifference to the winds that blow to drive through the obstacles which faced Senator Wheeler. The performance of such a man in such a situation cannot be finely weighed, by a distant onlooker after the event, on an apothecary's scale. We have clear indications as to how a better lawyer than Senator Wheeler would have dealt with the situation. The indications are furnished by the attitude of Senator Pepper; they are furnished by the supine silence of the bar before Senator Wheeler began, for from the time of his appointment as Attorney General lawyers widely knew Daugherty's unfitness for the post; they are revealed in the criticisms by the bar not of Daugherty but of his exposer, after the first flicker of indignation over the disclosures had subsided.

(4) Revision of procedure of congressional investigations: Nothing in the experience of the Walsh and Wheeler investigations reveals the need of changing the process or confining the limits of congressional investigations. The proper scope and methods of procedure appropriate to congressional investigations depend on the conception of the part they play in enabling Congress to discharge its basic duties. This has been nowhere better expressed than by Woodrow Wilson in his Congressional Government:

"It is the proper duty of a representative body to look diligently into every affair of government and to talk much about what it sees. It is meant to be the eyes and the voice, and to embody the wisdom and will of its constituents. Unless Congress have and use every means of acquainting itself with the acts and the disposition of the administrative agents of the Government, the country must be helpless to learn how it is being served; and unless Congress both scrutinize these things and sift them by every form of discussion, the country must remain in embarrassing, crippling ignorance of the very affairs which it is most important that it should understand and direct. The informing function of Congress should be preferred even to its legislative function."

Undoubtedly, the names of people who have done nothing criminal or wrong, or nothing even offending taste perhaps, have been mentioned in connection with these investigations. A number of such instances appeared in connection with Ned McLean's name. All those references are pertinent in showing the ramifications of McLean's influence in official Washington. Also, the names of counsel were mentioned who have had dealings with the Department of Justice which were wholly proper. But where so much that the Department of Justice was doing under Daugherty was not innocent, it is highly important that even innocent transactions in the general field of fraud and suspicion be explained in order to separate the sheep from the goats. The question is not whether people's feelings here and there may be hurt, or names dragged through the mud, as it is called. The real issue is whether the danger of abuses and the actual harm done are so clear and substantial that the grave risks of fettering free congressionl inquiry are to be incurred by artificial and technical limitations upon inquiry. Any quantitative and qualitative judgment of what Walsh and Wheeler were up against, what they produced and how they produced it, leaves the experienced and disinterested mind, duly regardful of the investigating duties of Congress, wholly without justification for changing congressional procedure.

It must be remembered that our rules of evidence are but tools for ascertaining the truth, and that these tools vary with the nature of the issues and the nature of the tribunal seeking facts. Specifically, the system of rules of evidence used in trials before juries "are mainly aimed at guarding the jury from the overweening effect of certain kinds of evidence." That system, as pointed out by Wigmore, "is not applicable by historical precedent, or by sound practical policy" to "inquiries of fact determinable by administrative tribunals." Still less is it applicable to inquiries by congressional committees. Of course the essential decencies must be observed, namely, opportunity for cross-examination must be afforded to those who are investigated or to those representing issues under investigation. Despite Daugherty's statement to the contrary, that opportunity has been scrupulously given by the Brookhart committee.

It must be remembered that in various fields there is no legal protection against harm due to unfettered speech. The only safeguards are those secured by social and moral pressure. Thus the immunities enjoyed by judges and legislators for anything said by them as judges and legislators are founded on deep experience. So also, the abuses of the printing press are not sought to be corrected by legal restriction or censorship in advance because the remedy is worse than the disease. For the same reason, congressional inquiry ought not to be fettered by advance rigidities, because in the light of experience there can be no reasonable doubt that such curtailment would make effective investigation almost impossible.

Our criminal procedure has been constantly under fire by the legal profession from Chief Justice Taft down because of its self-defeating technicalities. In a report to the American Bar Association, vigorous demand has recently been made for the liberalization of rules of evidence and procedure in criminal cases. Taken in connection with the proposal to curb the investigating powers of Congress, what is urged, in effect, is that we abandon the technical limitations which have been established to protect men from being sent to jail too readily, but introduce them into a field where they have never been resorted to and where they are wholly out of place, namely, in the exercise of the informing function of Congress.

A good deal must be left to the standards which Congress imposes upon itself and its committees; a good deal must be left to the duty of newspapers to report fairly and not sensationally, and to interpret wisely; a good deal must be left to the good sense of people.

In conclusion, there is no substantial basis for criticism of the investigations conducted by Senator Walsh and Senator Wheeler. Whatever inconveniences may have resulted are inseparable incidents of an essential exertion of governmental power, and to talk about these incidents is to deflect attention from wrongdoing and its sources.

The procedure of congressional investigation should remain as it is. No limitations should be imposed by congressional legislation or standing rules. The power of investigation should be left untrammeled, and the methods and forms of each investigation should be left for determination of Congress and its committees, as each situation arises. The safeguards against abuse and folly are to be looked for in the forces of responsibility which are operating from within Congress, and are generated from without.

Lawyers' Retirement Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 19, 1954

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent I would like to extend my remarks to include the Report of Committee on Lawyers' Retirement Benefits, of the Philadelphia Bar Association. This report is of considerable interest to members of the legal profession generally. Mr. William R. Spofford, chairman of the committee, deserves great credit for his efforts in bringing about the adoption of the resolution by the Philadelphia Bar Association, favoring the system of retirement benefits embodied in H. R. 10 and H. R. 11:

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON LAWYERS' RETIREMENT BENEFITS

JULY 8, 1954.

To the CHANCELLOR OF THE PHILADELPHIA BAR ASSOCIATION:

High income-tax rates make it difficult, if not impossible for the average lawyer to provide adequately for old age out of savings available to him after the payment of Federal income taxes. The income-tax exemption allowed for contributions to employee pension plans is not available to the majority of lawyers, for whom an employee status does not obtain. This discrimination in the law has directed attention to the need of a plan under which professional groups and other self-employed persons may be accorded similar favorable tax treatment with respect to savings set aside and earmarked for retirement. The development of such a plan has occupied the thoughts and deliberations of your committee over the past several years and was the subject of a prior report which was published in the Legal Intelligencer on June 2, 1952.

At the present time there is pending in the Congress such a plan, which is embodied in the Jenkins-Keogh bill (H. R. 10 and 11, 83d Cong., 1st sess. 1953). This bill has received the active support of the American Bar Association, but due to the press of other business will probably not be brought up for adoption at the present session of Congress.

This plan would allow lawyers and other self-employed a tax deduction of up to 10 percent of their annual net income (subject to a maximum deduction of $7,500 per year), if paid into a restricted retirement trust fund administered by a bank, or as insurance premiums for a restricted retirement annuity contract. Retirement benefits, in proportion to individual contributions, thus would be provided, to become available at age 65. Withdrawal in the interim would be restricted to cases of disability, and until the benefits were paid all income on the amounts so invested would be free of tax. This arrangement closely parallels the principles embodied in section 165 of the Internal Revenue Code which, in its present form, applies only to plans set up by employers.

It is important to note that under the proposed legislation, saving for retirement by lawyers is optional. The choice to participate, once made, does not constitute an annual obligation. The option is an annual one, to be exercised, or not, at the end of each taxable year. The only restriction is that a contribution once made, may not be withdrawn except in case of disability, prior to attaining age 65. The amount of retirement benefits available to the lawyer at retirement will, of course, depend upon the amount which has been contributed by him.

It may be worth noting, in passing, that a lawyer who would be able to set aside $7,500 per year for 20 years would obtain about $900 per month beginning at age 65.

In general, the attempt and purpose of the Jenkins-Keogh bill is to afford self-employed persons the same benefits under the Federal income-tax law already available to officers and employees of corporations. This is so clearly to the advantage of lawyers generally that your committee are unanimous in recommending to the members of the Philadelphia Bar Association that the adoption of the Jenkins-Keogh bill by the Congress be endorsed by the association and that your committee be authorized to collaborate with the American Bar Association and other interested organizations in supporting this legislation.

The Jenkins-Keogh bill is not special legislation for the benefit of lawyers. It is a bill for all self-employed persons.

Your committee do not represent that the details of the Jenkins-Keogh bill are in all respects perfect. The general principles of the bill, however, are believed to be sound and the sooner they are enacted into law the sooner will their benefits become available. Additional refinements can come later, if and when experience shows them to be desirable.

In the opinion of your committee, the need for this legislation is entirely separate and unaffected by any action by the Congress in expanding the social-security system to include lawyers. While we consider that the pending extension of compulsory social-security coverage to include self-employed professional groups is desirable, the point which your committee wishes to emphasize is that the inclusion of lawyers and other professional groups under social security will not in any way eliminate the need for the Jenkins-Keogh bill. The latter is designed to provide an opportunity to self-employed professionals, by dint of savings laid aside during years of maximum productivity, to provide retirement benefits reasonably commensurate with their old-age needs. Under present pension plans set up by employers under section 165 of the IRC, the deductibility of the employers' contributions is in no way prejudiced by social-security benefits. It is generally recognized that such benefits are inadequate to provide respectable subsistence for many wage-earning groups, and your committee suggests that such inadequacy is surely no less acute in the case of the self-employed professional. Your committee therefore recommends adoption of the following resolutions:

"*Resolved*, That the Philadelphia Bar Association endorses in principle the system of retirement benefits embodied in H. R. 10 and H. R. 11 now pending before the Congress, and favors the enactment thereof; further

"*Resolved*, That the committee on lawyers' retirement benefits be authorized to adopt such measures as may be reasonably appropriate in its opinion to promote such enactment at the present or any future session of Congress, including cooperation with the American Bar Association and interested organizations in the Philadelphia area, and such other appropriate steps as may be feasible within the limits of personnel and resources at its disposal.

"Respectfully submitted.

"Sanford D. Beecher, Sabato M. Bendiner, Earl Chudoff, Stephen T. Dean, Frederick E. S. Morrison, Fred L. Rosenbloom, Hugh D. Scott, Jr., Richard W. Thorington, Lewis Weinstock, Andrew B. Young, William R. Spofford, Chairman."

The Reclamation Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SPESSARD L. HOLLAND

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 19, 1954

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, on May 25 of this year, the Honorable Douglas McKay, Secretary of the Interior, addressed the 41st national convention of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress at Washington, D. C., on the subject the Reclamation Program.

Since I have the honor to be one of the national vice presidents of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, and in order that Senators may have an opportunity to read Secretary McKay's able address before that body on this vital program, I request unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD Secretary McKay's speech.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE RECLAMATION PROGRAM

(Address by Secretary of the Interior Douglas McKay)

I appreciate this opportunity to describe for you briefly the progress of the national program in assuring the best use of the Nation's water resources.

We are indeed fortunate today that the importance of providing irrigation for the arid and semiarid lands of the West was recognized early.

Through the foresight of a great conservationist and a great President, Theodore Roosevelt, the first Reclamation Act was passed in 1902. This act established as a primary purpose the construction and maintenance of irrigation works for reclamation purposes. In the past half century, we have moved ahead in carrying out that purpose so that the United States is a recognized world leader in the planned development of water resources.

We have learned not only to meet the problems of today, but, more important, we have prepared intelligently to meet more pressing future problems.

With population constantly increasing, the strain on natural resources grows more acute. Only by pursuing a balanced program for reclamation of land threatened by water shortages can we meet the responsibilities to preserve and extend national prosperity.

We have passed the halfway mark in the development of western land which can be made fertile by irrigation. More than 25 million acres in the West are now under cultivation. Possibly 20 million acres which are susceptible to development remain to be supplied with irrigation water. This remaining development will be costly. That is why we have supported the development by the Federal Government of bona fide multipurpose projects which can make a genuine contribution to our reclamation program.

The harnessing of our rivers has yielded rich dividends. Through Federal irrigation programs almost 7 million acres have been added to our productive land. Through Federal hydroelectric developments about 30½ billon kilowatt-hours of low-cost power are being made available each year. At the same time, untold benefits have accrued from river basin projects which have prevented floods, aided navigation, provided broader opportunities for recreation and enjoyment, assured protection to fish and wildlife resources and increased our municipal and industrial water supplies.

We can be proud of this impressive record. It should not be forgotten, however, that local citizens have been active partners—paying partners—in each of the projects which make this record possible. Local people have signed contracts to repay the Federal Government for part or all of the reclamation costs.

This is as it should be. It is a firm principle of the Eisenhower administration that the responsibility—and the cost—of resource development should be borne to the greatest possible extend by those who receive the benefits.

It is also important to note that local interests without any financial assistance from the Federal Government have financed construction of projects which supply water to about 18 million acres in the West. This is more than twice the acreage irrigated by Federal projects.

There has been some loose talk recently concerning the plans of this administration regarding the development of our water resources. So that there may be no mistake, I want to make it crystal clear that this administration favors a strong and continuing reclamation policy.

The Eisenhower administration has, in fact, already recommended to Congress the authorization of irrigation projects which will supply water for close to 800,000 acres.

I firmly believe that we must plan to conserve and utilize most effectively the limited water resources of the country. Plans to this end should be long range. To be most effective, they should be basinwide. And, like all plans for resource development, they should be economically sound and supported by the people in the areas that are to be benefited.

It seems to me that upon this commonsense basis we can move ahead with a reclamation program which is in keeping with the needs and desires of all of the American people.

We have established some basic ground rules for carrying out our reclamation activities. These rules constitute a return to the original purpose of the Reclamation Acts—the irrigation of water-short areas of the Western United States.

While hydroelectric power has had a proper place in the reclamation program since the Reclamation Act of 1906, the Department's incidental power responsibilities have too frequently in the past been permitted to dominate its primary irrigation functions.

We believe in a working partnership of power and irrigation. Power revenues from large multipurpose projects should be used to pay back not only the cost of storage works but also help reimburse the cost of irrigation works.

The two major water development projects which have been recommended by the Department for authorization in the past year both contain important hydroelectric facilities. In both instances, however, these facilities have a natural place as a part of the multipurpose construction necessary for the best use of the water. These are the Frying Pan-Arkansas and the Colorado River storage projects.

The Federal Power Commission is now conducting hearings on the application of the Idaho Power Co. to develop three sites on the middle Snake River.

I have directed all Department personnel called as witnesses in the Power Commmission hearing to make a complete presentation of the facts in this case, but the Department is making no recommendation either for or against the development by the private company. I hope the decision of the Federal Power Commission in the Hells Canyon case is made as promptly as possible. The arguments about who should develop Hells Cayon are not producing kilowatts, and additional kilowatts are needed if the Northwest and other areas are to grow and prosper.

The position we have taken in the Hells Canyon case has been misinterpreted by some to mean that the Department will no longer sponsor the development of water power projects. I want to stress as firmly as I can that this is not the case.

The Department will support the construction by the Federal Government of river basin projects, including hydroelectric developments, where such projects are needed and where they are beyond the means of local public or private enterprise.

Let me cite the Colorado River storage project as a specific example of the type of development which we vigorously support. In approving my recommendation for the development which we vigorously support. In approving my recommendation for the development of the basin of the upper Colorado a few months ago, President Eisenhower said: "This is a comprehensive well planned development. * * * The close Federal-State cooperation upon which the Secretary's plan is based also carries out this administration's approach to water resource development."

Another important multipurpose project which I hope can be undertaken in the near future is the great Libby Dam and Reservoir project on the Kootenai River in Montana.

The ultimate power production developed by Libby would serve the entire energy needs of a million people, roughly the population of Seattle, Portland, Spokane, and Tacoma. The benefits from the project will aid materially in underwriting the continued economic prosperity of the Pacific Northwest.

By supporting the Libby project and the development of the upper Colorado, in the first months of its incumbency, this administration has provided concrete demonstrations of its determination to carry out the full responsibilities of the Federal Government with respect to water resources development.

I want to make clear that we do not think the Federal Government should exercise a monopoly role in the development of water resources. President Eisenhower has said that this task is so great that it requires a local-State-Federal partnership in which each partner contributes to the limit of his ability. The Federal Government should participate, the President believes, not as a dictator, but as a friendly partner, ready to help.

That has been our approach to these problems. We believe the record proves that it is the type of approach the people want.

Local interests, encouraged by the administration's partnership policy, are planning to do their share. The ending of the Federal monopoly on water resource development is resulting in a cooperative program which will produce millions of new low-cost kilowatts for American industry, for farms and city homes.

Applications filed by local interests with the Federal Power Commission for water power projects since the administration took office provide a dramatic indication that the partnership plan is working. In the Pacific Northwest alone these applications total over 3,500,000 kilowatts.

The House has taken the first steps to make the power partnership a reality by authorizing construction of the Priests Rapid Dam on the mainstem of the Columbia and the Cougar Dam on the McKenzie on a partnership basis.

Sometimes these partnership arrangements involve the joint participation of the Federal Government with local public agencies, such as public utility districts or municipal systems. Sometimes they involve participation of the Federal Government with private companies. In the case of the proposal made for the construction of the John Day dam on the Columbia River a three-way partnership is involved.

The John Day dam will be a multipurpose project of far-reaching importance to navigation and other purposes as well as to power production. As this group has undoubtedly noted, this project will aid materially in improving navigation on the Columbia by the creation of another great slack water basin. The new basin would, in fact, make possible slack water all the way from Pasco to the sea and provide a real asset to the area in the form of low-cost river transportation.

I mention this feature of the John Day project because it underlines the importance of considering all the aspects of a project—not simply the power features, as was sometimes the case in the recent past.

We can no longer afford to think in terms of the relatively simple, single-purpose projects. Water has become too precious. We must be sure that we make the fullest use of all that is available. Integrated projects of great magnitude and complexity are required today to assure that every justified use of water is met to the maximum possible extent. This in turn requires that the projects be designed in harmony with local, regional, and national needs.

I want to emphasize one other aspect of this forward-looking partnership approach to the development of our water resources which should be particularly appreciated by the group here today. We have several departments and agencies of the Federal Government which are intensely interested in water resource development. You will shortly hear from Secretary Benson who will discuss the important responsibilities of the Department of Agriculture in this area, and from General Sturgis who will outline the functions of the Army Corps of Engineers. Each of our three departments operates under different laws in carrying out functions assigned by Congress with respect to water.

It has been my hope that the executive branch of the Government, working in close cooperation with the legislative branch, could develop and adopt an acceptable national water policy:. This policy should recognize the rights and responsibilities of the States and the other local interests. It should also coordinate the particpation of the Federal Government in this vital area of resource development.

This is not an easy task, as you will readily understand. I believe, nevertheless, that we can report substantial progress. As an example of the close cooperation which is being developed among the Federal agencies let me cite the agreement on the allocation of costs of multipurpose water-resource projects recently reached by the Interior Department, the Department of the Army for the Corps of Engineers, and the Federal Power Commission.

In the past, several methods of cost allocation have been used by the three agencies. As an illustration, the cost allocations on Bonneville Dam, Grand Coulee, Hoover Dam, and Fort Peck were each reached by the use of different methods. Under the new agreement, a uniform method will be applied to all projects. This has reduced the confusion under which 3 Federal Departments frequently arrived at 3 different answers to the same question. The advantages and benefits to the public and to the taxpayer are obvious.

The Interior Department and the Corps of Engineers have also developed a joint policy governing the acquisition of real estate for dam and reservoir projects. This new agreement is reducing real-estate costs to the Federal Government and also benefiting local and State governments through the increased amount of land left on the tax rolls.

President Eisenhower has just spelled out for you the very vital additional steps which will now be undertaken to advance interagency cooperation in the development of the Nation's water resources.

I hope that we will be able to extend this working partnership to the development of a positive overall water-resources program which will replace the patchwork of existing laws.

The sound development of our water resources is a key part of the great task of providing a firm foundation for the constant improvement of our American way of life. We are determined that this development will continue to move forward in conformity with our American ideals. In that way we can be certain that our progress will be both steady and sure.

One Month To Go

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 19, 1954

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have published in the Appendix of the RECORD three very interesting editorials from what I consider to be the greatest newspaper in our land, the St. Louis Post-Dispatch. The first editorial is entitled "One Month To Go," and was published in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of June 27, 1954.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ONE MONTH TO GO

It may be hot weather now, but it was plenty cold when President Eisenhower presented to Congress and the country his 1954 program last January. That was 6 months ago. With many weeks of lawmaking time ahead, the Chief Executive said: "It is my earnest hope that the Congress will take quick and effective steps to enact the measures I recommend."

Because this is the midterm election year with 36 seats in the Senate and 435 in the House at stake, Members of Congress are eager to end the session and get home so they can settle down to the business of campaigning. For months many have been making hurried trips back to their States for weekend visits. The adjournment target is July 31, and every effort will be made to keep it.

How does the Eisenhower program stand after all this time? The following report covers the most important of the President's scores of proposals:

Passed: Modified St. Lawrence seaway; five appropriation bills (including $28 billion for the armed services); highway expansion program; excise taxes (drastically cut nearly $1 billion from the Eisenhower request for sound fiscal operation); Korean defense pact.

Defeated: Bricker constitutional amendment (defeat of this proposal to hobble the President in foreign relations became a vital Eisenhower goal).

Killed or stalled: Taft-Hartley labor law revision (killed); vote for 18-year-olds constitutional amendment (killed); flexible price supports for farm products (presumably killed); foreign trade liberalization (killed; meaningless substitute accepted); Hawaiian statehood (stalled with Alaska); debt-limit increase (stalled); reinsurance of health insurance (stalled); District of Columbia home rule (stalled); postal-rates increases (stalled); atomic energy law revision (stalled).

Pending: Social-security expansion (compromise in prospect); housing program extension (compromise in prospect); foreign aid (compromise in prospect); unemployment insurance increase (compromise in prospect); tax revision; customs simplification; hospital survey; internal security legislation (bills to legalize use of wiretapping evidence, to compel witnesses to testify and to deprive convicted Communists of "citizenship" rights); six major appropriation bills.

Some of these measures are altogether worthy, as for example, the modified St. Lawrence seaway, which was passed after a 20-year delay, and the Randall Commission's proposal to extend and enlarge the reciprocal trade program for 3 years, which was defeated. Some are thoroughly bad. For example, the Brownell eavesdropping and immunity bills which would legalize police-state practices.

This, however, is not the time to evaluate the 1954 Eisenhower program. Neither is it the time to point out that while Democratic votes defeated the President on his Taft-Hartley changes, Democratic votes saved his bacon on the Bricker resolution and other important tests. This is a time to call attention to how the Eisenhower program stands after the second session of Congress has been meeting for a half year.

To review the record is to wonder what Congress has been doing besides debating the Bricker resolution and other constitutional amendments and listening to the McCarthy-Army battle. Certainly it has left a lot of work for the final month. No wonder the Wall Street Journal last Friday drew up a list of "likely adjournment casualties."

Dwight D. Eisenhower has said that unless the Republican Party can "develop and enact a progressive, dynamic program enhancing the welfare of the people of our country, it does not deserve to remain in power." He has said that his program will be the issue in the election.

This means that it is up to him and to the Republican majorities in both branches of Congress—since fate has just returned the GOP to numerical control in the Senate. It is up to the President and Congress to deliver in the next 30 days.

Foreign Policy of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 19, 1954

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, last week Colgate University, at Hamilton, N. Y., conducted its annual foreign policy forum, an occasion which has become noteworthy for the exchange of stimulating and constructive ideas on the subject of our foreign policy. These forums have attracted the leading minds and outstanding experts of the country and, indeed, of the world in past years, and this year was no exception.

Among the speeches delivered at this year's forum, two of the most interesting were made by two of the outstanding personalities of New York State and indeed of the Nation, who happen to be close friends of mine—the Honorable Averell Harriman and Representative FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT, Jr. Both these speeches deal with subjects which must give the deepest concern to all of us and present ideas which merit our most sober consideration.

I ask unanimous consent that the speech by Mr. Harriman, former Mutual Security Administrator, former United States Ambassador to Russia, and one of the most distinguished Americans, be printed in the Appendix of the Record. I ask also that the speech of Representative Roosevelt, a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House and an eminent figure in that body in his own right, and the son of the greatest President of the United States of our times, be likewise printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the speeches were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

How Realistic Is Our Foreign Economic Policy?

(Address of W. Averell Harriman, former Director for Mutual Security and former Secretary of Commerce, at the sixth annual foreign policy conference, Colgate University, Hamiliton, N. Y., July 14, 1954)

I have been asked to speak to you on the subject of How Realistic Is Our Foreign Economic Policy? I could answer that question very simply by saying, "Not very realistic," or "Hardly at all, in view of the fact that what we do with our economic power in the world today is at the heart of our foreign policy and involves the issues of peace and war and the very survival of our Nation."

As I am sure you realize, this is not an easy time to appraise our foreign policy, for it is hard to find an official root or branch of a policy to cling onto. The sky is black with chickens coming home to roost. With a rush that is, to put it mildly, bewildering, the flow of human events, and reactions around the world to our policies, our attitudes, and our lack of policies have obscured the guidelines set out to mark our way through a dangerous and troubled period.

Only a year and a half ago the West, united in spirit, policy, and action, had created situations of strength in Western Europe and in Korea that had checked and rolled back Communist aggressions and subversion there and promised a breathing space in which to help build strength elsewhere. We knew generally where we were going. Morale was high, likewise confidence in American leadership.

Today our policies are confusing and uncertain, our leadership is questioned, our alliances are creaking, and American prestige in the world has suffered a major eclipse.

We must face squarely the fact that our chief allies in Europe—and this goes for both governments and peoples—are thoroughly confused regarding our approach to the problems of Asia and decline to follow any longer our uncertain leadership there. We can justly criticize their willingness to negotiate from weakness rather than from strength, but threats from weakness are no substitute. And we cannot ignore the fact that a wedge has been driven into the alliance and that we have not come forward with programs that can rally united support.

We must also recognize the unhappy fact that our leadership is not attracting a large or enthusiastic following in many of the countries of Asia itself, or elsewhere. For the most part, many of the peoples of Asia do not see the East-West struggle in the same black and white terms as we do. They are attracted in varying degrees by certain material accomplishments in the Communist-controlled underdeveloped areas: rapid industrialization, material progress, increased national strength and weight in the world. They are not as frightened as we are at the terrific cost in terms of freedom and human dignity, for so many are already living in misery. They are not as alarmed as we at possiblities of invasion and subversion. They abhor and fear colonialism, but for historical reasons they associate it with the West more than with the Soviet Union. Many countries who have achieved political independence feel they are still held in economic colonial status because their economies depend so largely upon the sale of raw materials in fluctuating market controlled by the industrial countries. We may think that many of their views are shortsighted, and I certainly agree, but the raw materials of international relations are what peoples believe.

Allow me to paint in another corner of this melancholy picture.

Two weeks ago I listened to the Secretary of State as he went on the air to apportion congratulations over the happy outcome of the complicated and frightening situation in Guatemala. We can consider ourselves fortunate in the result. But only a battle has been won against communism in Latin America, not a war. In Guatemala, as in many of the countries of Latin America, there are festering economic and social conditions—poverty, ignorance, injustice—which create a foundation for chronic political instability. As I listened to Mr. Dulles I kept expecting—hoping, rather desperately—that he would arrive at a point in his speech where he would discuss the economic and social conditions that the pro-Communists have been exploiting, and pledge the aid of the United States in remedying them. Well, he never arrived at that point.

I would not mention this one speech did it not indicate an attitude and a lack of understanding of the nature of the struggle against communism.

What I am saying adds up, I think, to the view that our present leadership in foreign affairs has gravely misjudged the problems and temper of this age and what true leadership requires.

Carrying slogans reading "Liberation," "Instant Retaliation," "New Look," and speaking in multiple and contradictory voices, we have charged up the hills, and then we have charged down again. We have weakened our alliances by shortcutting the rules of coalition diplomacy, the most fundamental of which is not to put the leaders of a foreign country in the position of having publicly to knuckle under to American will, or of flouting it. We have tied ourselves up with prideful, rigid positions that have no relation to reality and are a negation of diplomacy. We are conducting ourselves as though we considered communism as something that can be contained abroad largely by military defense. We are failing to impress the world, by word and deed, that we are prepared to use adequately our tremendous economic and technical resources and our power over the world economic machine to help create rapidly—with dignity and freedom too—greater independence and better material conditions of life.

We are today confronting a challenge that reaches around the world, extends all across the scale from danger of nuclear attack to competitive economic growth, and the stakes are our most cherished possessions—freedom and independence. That this is no time for partisanship or for personal or national egotism is evident. But it is necessary that we try to size up the awful dimensions and character of the dangers ahead and try to chart the most promising course through them. That is the problem to which I am addressing myself this evening.

First, I would like to say again what I have said many times before, and that is that I have never thought and I do not think now that war with the Soviet Union is inevitable. International affairs are now conducted in the new and awful frame of hydrogen bombs. Given the inevitability of retaliation, there can clearly be no winners, and the men in the Kremlin are coldly calculating men, not madmen. In my opinion, the threat of mutually destructive nuclear warfare injects a degree—and it is cold comfort—a minor degree of stability into the situation, providing, of course, we continue to build our nuclear power and develop continuously the means of delivery and maintain necessary world-wide bases. Our enemies know strength when they see it. This gives us something—an objective situation—to build upon that is more reliable than the good intentions of our adversaries.

In recent years Communist efforts to take over in Western Europe, in Greece, Turkey, and Iran, and in Korea were frustrated. They were frustrated by Western unity in support of local resistance and aid in building local economic, social, and military strength.

At the Communist Party congress in Moscow in the fall of 1952 Stalin and Malenkov virtually admitted that their plans for an early take-over had failed, and it was there they began to talk about peaceful coexistence. War was not inevitable, they said; and they laid down a long-range strategy for accomplishing their end of world domination by means short of major war—keeping in readiness, to be sure, a powerful military force as a constant threat. The long-range strategy was based upon the premise of a continued higher rate of industrial and overall economic growth in the Soviet bloc than in the free world, with consequent greater military potential over a period of years and growing political attraction to underdeveloped countries; it assumed a loosening of the bonds of unity among the Western powers, quarrels, divisions, mutually destructive competitiveness, both political and economic; it looked forward to the breaking away of a revived Germany and Japan from western association, and it was predicated upon the inability of the free nations, divided into separate units, to work together and develop a common strength.

In other words, the Kremlin leaders believe that the Soviet system can over a period of years out-compete the free in economic growth, political stability, and military strength. And of course they will work their diplomacy, propaganda, and economic power overtime to weaken and divide the free world and isolate the United States. The Kremlin has challenged the validity of the entire system of free and independent nations, and it has challenged the worth of the free world economy—its ability to maintain stability, to grow rapidly, and to assure people, in their freedom, that opportunity for self-realization, that dignity, that material well-being, that have been achieved only in a few leading nations.

I think you will agree that this is no trifling challenge. But we are challenged in an area where we can be strongest if we use our strength wisely. I suggest that competitive coexistence all across the board is the realistic term, rather than peaceful coexistence. And I believe that if we accept the full implications of competitive coexistence of the kind I am talking about, we can preserve freedom and avoid a major war.

It is absolutely necessary that we retain, reinvigorate, and improve upon our alliances, increase military strength, and maintain the ability to retaliate powerfully against nuclear attack. And the Communist military breakthrough in southeast Asia must be contained. But assuming these things, I can conceive of a period of competitive coexistence in which we have a chance to make a hard, patient, prolonged, and, I believe, rewarding effort to give leadership in showing the world, and especially the underdeveloped countries, that our free society can bring greater strength and dignity and individual opportunity and material well-being—all these and freedom, too—than can the Communist. And, given this, I think we have reason to believe that time will bring increasing pressures behind the Iron Curtain which will undermine tyranny in its citadel.

The character and dimensions of the effort the West must make are sobering. Dictatorships are able to compel unity and enforce sacrifice to achieve economic growth and industrial expansion, and write off the human cost. Industrial expansion in the Soviet Union and its European satellites is occurring at a far faster pace than in the West or in underdeveloped countries. This exerts an attraction that must be countered. One of my Asian friends who is strongly anti-Communist recently told me that he fears the attraction that Red China would have on the people of his country if China's economic expansion and industrialization outstrip their own. We must achieve economic growth through cooperation under wise leadership.

Of prime importance for a free world expanding economy is an expanding economy here at home. We must clearly understand the preponderant size of our economy. With only 10 percent of the population of the free world, our total output of goods and services is greater than that of all the other free countries put together. Thus what happens here is felt in every other country.

Continued economic growth is essential for the welfare of our own people. We have a rapidly expanding population and labor force. In addition, technological advance is constantly increasing our productivity. If we are to use fully our human and material resources, we should have an annual growth of about 4 percent. Yet in the past year we have experienced a recession.

If we had had a normal growth, our present total output would be at a rate of $15 to $20 billion greater than it is now. Our purchases from other countries and therefore their ability to buy from us would have been higher. Increased purchases stimulate investment for increased production, and further demands for our products. This is a constant healthy cycle. Thus mutual prosperity is generated by an expanding economy here.

I am concerned by those who are complacent about the present level of business activity. I mean those who say that things aren't so bad if we do almost as well as last year, and that things are all right if we don't have a serious downturn. Lack of growth not only fails to give opportunity to our own people, but limits expansion in the free world. Our domestic economic policies must be shaped not simply to prevent disaster, but designed for opportunity and growth.

The problem as I see it is to bring about through a conscious, sustained, cooperative enterprise on the part of industrialized countries on the one hand, and the underdeveloped countries of the free world on the other, a pace of economic growth rapid enough and broad enough to do two main things: One, to enable underdeveloped countries to break through the vicious circle of poverty and dependence into a new cycle of self-propelled economic growth, capital formation, social advancement, and growing dignity and strength in freedom; and, two, to enable the industrialized countries to continue that marvellous process to which we in America have become accustomed of expanding production, increasing productivity, and ever-rising standards of living. These two things are interpendendent, for increasing production, productivity, and living standards in underdeveloped countries will result in increasing demand for the products of industrialized countries, and to expanding free world trade, eliminating dependence on East-West trade.

This business of stimulating the rapid development of underdeveloped countries is therefore not philanthropy. It is a necessity, from the point of view of our national security, or of the survival of freedom in the world. And it is sound economics. The task should be—must be—approached in the same spirit of seriousness and urgency as the building of worldwide military defenses. In terms of effort and application, this is a vast undertaking; in terms of money it is a relatively modest one, in view of the limitations upon the capacity of most underdeveloped countries to absorb investment capital.

As for the needs of the underdeveloped countries, I recall to you the key role that capital from advanced countries has always played in the development of underdeveloped of underdeveloped countries, including our own. Today, because of political insecurity and a complex of economic factors, private capital is moving from the United States abroad (Canada and oil-producing countries except) only in a trickle—this at a time when a much larger capital flow is required.

The present administration seems to be thinking in terms of the automatic functioning of the market to promote world economic growth by clearing away some of the obstacles to private investment abroad. And yet there is scarcely an economist who would agree that private investment abroad can or will be increased in the years immediately ahead by more than very modest and wholly inadequate amounts. Moreover, although the volume of capital investment in underdeveloped countries is important, equally important are the ways in which capital is invested, the social and political progress it engenders, and the ends that it serves.

Experience has demonstrated that in most underdeveloped countries private capital, important as it is, can do only a part of the job—particularly in the early stages—and that public investment and technical assistance with some grant aid must lead the way in the framework of broad development programs that include education and technical training, improvement in public administration, normal public services to health, agriculture, and industry, and the development of basic power and transport facilities. These are necessary to enable underdeveloped countries to mobilize increasingly their own human and material resources, attract private initiative and capital, and speed up the process of economic and social development.

We have made a good start with technical assistance, but based upon the success of our experience it should be expanded. Grant aid, which should be increased to some of the underdeveloped countries, is being in principle terminated except as direct military support and in a few other cases. The World Bank and the Export-Import Bank are making important contributions to international investment, but their fields are limited. There are no facilities of the kind to promote investment that must rely for its return upon the eventual success of broad development programs.

An expanding free world economy requires an increasing level of trade. We must adjust our own trade policies to the vision of the task ahead, rather than the narrow basis on which they are now being considered. If we are to expect other countries to break down trade barriers, we must take the lead. I am sure I do not need to belabor this point before this audience.

Although our job of promoting economic growth can be furthered by bilateral arrangements with underdeveloped countries, I believe that more can be accomplished if we work together on this problem with other industrial countries on a regional basis. Existing regional organizations can play a more important role. The Organization for European Economic Cooperation and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and the Organization of American States can be used for building common economic defenses. We should be increasing our initiative in and support of United Nations organizations whose work is directed toward these ends. And I wonder if our efforts to build an alliance for the defense of southeast Asia would not have been more successful in the past, and whether they would not be more successful now, if we approached the problem at least in part from the point of view of building an organization dedicated to mutual economic and social well-being.

Irrespective of tools or methods, it is of first importance that we realize the nature of today's challenge and start moving in the right direction. The resources of the free world, especially taking into account the potentialities of science, are infinite. To say that we, the most powerful Nation in history, cannot afford to lead in building worldwide the defenses of freedom is to lack faith in the capacity of the free human will and in the free political and economic systems it has created. We must hold to the faith that free men, in response to wise leadership, can overcome obstacles, transform the face of the earth. That is the attitude that must prevail in the conduct of our foreign economic policies in the period ahead if we are to survive in freedom. If that attitude should prevail—and I am confident we shall come to it—we shall do much more than survive. We shall make possible conditions of life in our own country vastly finer and happier than those of today, and enjoy, at the same time, the satisfaction of knowing we are living up to our responsibilities as leader among free nations and helping to create world security and a better life for all free men.

Speech by Hon. Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., of New York, Before Colgate University Foreign Policy Forum

It is 18 months since this administration took office and assumed the responsibility of guiding our foreign policy. In this brief period we have seen the end of the shooting in Korea replaced by an armed stalemate unhappily imposed on a divided and battered nation. We have watched the European Defense Community slip from a probability to a hazy dream. Trieste continues to disturb the relations between Italy and Yugoslavia. North Africa is turbulent. The relations between Israel and the Arab States and the internal political stability of many of the latter grow steadily worse. India continues to struggle for her political maturity, shrinking from a positive assumption of her international responsibilities, and yet deeply understands and hopes to guide the great quest for independence and economic well-being of her Asian neighbors. The last vestiges of colonialism go down the drain of Indochina as the free world fails to make it worthwhile and understandable to the Vietnamese to fight for their freedom.

The NATO alliance is today foundering on the rocks of mutual distrust. America's allies are distrustful and questioning and we sulk and fret at their unwillingness to do our hasty bidding.

The American people are confused because they suspect that our Government does not have a program and a workable means of achieving it. Our once firm allies doubt that we know where we are going or how we intend to get there. Not only is our purpose doubted, but our wisdom is suspect and our judgment considered unstable.

Last January we were told that our New Look in military defense would give us more strength for fewer dollars—a policy based on economy rather than on military necessity. Then Mr. Dulles proclaimed that our foreign policy was to be based on the New Look. By this he meant we would fight no more small wars, that we would rely on massive retaliatory force at the time and place of our own choosing. This has neither brought peaceful unity to a free Korean, nor an independent non-Communist Indochina, nor reassurance to our more exposed allies.

In April we were told that Indochina was indispensable to the security of the free world, and that it was to be secured by united action. But Mr. Dulles had failed to secure united action first, and so now we are told that Indochina is expendable.

And now Senator KNOWLAND, unfortunately assisted by Democratic Senator JOHNSON of Texas, threatens to legislate us out of the United Nations if Red China comes in, at a time when no one is seriously urging this new shotgun membership. Yet, Mr. Dulles says that he will use the veto to keep Red China out of the U. N. Apparently political demagogery for internal consumption was more appealing to KNOWLAND than the stable and responsible character of our Nation as a world leader.

In a chaotic world, fearful of Russia's determined purpose and cohesive action, we are a nation torn by opposing spokesmen, led by a faltering and divided party, fearful of grappling with the unpleasant facts of international life, baffling and confusing to our potential friends, in fact, a giant whose reactions are no more than defensive. If we continue as a nation without purpose, we will wander down the road to isolation, separated from our friends, torn from our course as a world leader. We will await our execution at the will of our enemy.

There are those who urge us to act in time by initiating a preventive war: destroy the enemy while we still have superiority. To this I say that it is not only unthinkable, but it is un-American. It violates the basic American tradition of seeking to live without envy and at peace with our neighbors. Even Mr. Dulles' proposal of using massive retaliatory force at the place and time of our own choosing is in violation of America's fundamental policy of waging war only when attacked. I believe with most of the world, that we have something better to sell than does communism and that we have better salesmen to do it. I believe that mankind wants its independence—political, economic, and social—founded on the equal justice of free men not submissive to the dictators in the Kremlin.

Specifically, therefore, what are our aims and how can we achieve them? It seems to me that our first objective should be to nurture and encourage the quest for independence and progress by all men and all nations who are still this side of the Iron Curtain. We cannot immediately seek to roll back the Iron Curtain but we can ensure that it envelops no more of humanity. Secondly, coexistence in itself is no worthy goal. But just as an armistice precedes a peace, so must we seek to maintain for our part, at least, a balance between the two armed camps of the world. In the face of Communist rearmament, we deter war by keeping ourselves stronger. And thirdly, our long-range goal must be to defeat communism, not with bombs, but, from without, by the example of the better life for men who are free, and, from within, by the force of disintegration which, in time, overtake and destroy any totalitarian regime.

We must face the fact that the rulers in the Kremlin are dedicated to the ultimate destruction of every and all systems other than their own. We must also face the grave probability that for free men to survive, we must achieve the decline and disintegration of the Soviet system. Does this mean that we are inevitably headed for a resolution of this irreconcilable difference only through a total war? Must we doom ourselves and seal our fate in an inevitable holocaust?

In the age of hydrogen bombs and germ warfare, when total destruction is just as likely to be wrought upon those who are its users as upon its victims, hydrogen-germ warfare has perhaps, and we pray, outlived any historic function war might have had. What good is our margin of superiority in atomic and hydrogen weapons when our flag of victory would be raised on the ashes and ruins of a decimated people and a civilization destroyed? We would win such a war, but there would be few, if any, to relish the bitter fruits of such a victory.

The men in the Kremlin must realize this prospect as much as we. With a conventional air force, larger in numbers if not in quality than ours; with 175 divisions—not counting the satellites—against our 20; with 375 submarines opposed to our 100, the Russians might conceivably and suddenly accept our proposal for international supervision of atomic and hydrogen energy and agree to outlawing its use in war. Looked on this way, we run a deep risk when, in the name of economy, we now put all of our military eggs in the atomic basket.

Gas warfare was never used in World War II. Hydrogen warfare may never be used in another war. It is entirely possible that hydrogen-germ warfare has outlawed any resort to total war.

Obviously, we cannot lull ourselves into the illusion that because of the total effects of this type of warfare we need not man our atomic development or our atomic defenses. We must carry forward on this technical military front as rapidly as we know how. We can never lose sight of the fact that, once having attained a decisive superiority in hydrogen-germ weapons, the Russian dictators might not hesitate to exercise that superiority. But given a stalemate, a condition under which they know that they will face just as certain devastation as they can give out, we face the real prospect that there will never be a hydrogen-germ war.

If this prospect that the hydrogen bomb may already have outlawed itself is correct—and I frankly think the Russians, since 1951, have based much of their calculations on this assumption—then we must reassess the basis on which the struggle between these two conflicting systems is going to be fought.

There are five dimensions on which this struggle is now being waged. Once we strip away the domination of hydrogen-germ warfare these strike at the heart of world power today. These tools of power are more conventional than are the superweapons, but how we and the Kremlin rulers understand and apply them might be the difference between the survival and death of freedom and freemen.

These five dimensions are, first, the use of actual and potential military power; second, the technique of dividing and disintegrating the opposition from within; third, the use of communications, the modern pressures that can be exercised on the minds of men; fourth, the weapon of diplomacy; and, fifth, the development and use of economic strategy.

The Russians drive all five of these forces at once as a team, shifting emphasis from one to the other as the situation requires.

For men chained to a rigid ideology, these Communists have demonstrated a startling mobility of tactics. Their flexibility is as remarkable as our defeats have been painful.

Let us see how the Russians have used each of these five tools of power:

1. On the use of actual and potential military power, the Russians have resorted to the tactic of the small war. In Korea, it was outright aggression. In Indochina and even China itself, they have thinly camouflaged the small war as a revolution. The Communist forces committed to these wars are Russian trained, Russian equipped, and the major offenses are often timed by the stringpullers in Moscow for their maximum impact on the broader international situation. The Korean aggression was timed to test the firmness of our policy of containment.

2. In sponsoring internal division within the opposition the technique of the Communists has been subjugation by infiltration. This technique brought about the rape of Czechoslovakia and of most of eastern Europe. If it is not successful in itself, it can easily be diverted into the small-war technique.

3. On the use of communications that affect the minds of men—what we know as Russian propaganda—the Communists have spared neither money nor ingenuity in using every conceivable device for maximum effectiveness in the target areas.

4. Diplomacy has been a weapon in the hands of the Russians. Having violated every rule of propriety, they have, nonetheless, demonstrated a shrewdness in drawing issues, agreeing to negotiations as much on their own terms as on ours. They are tough across the bargaining table and are quick to exploit every weakness we show.

5. Finally, on the development of economic strategy the Communists have employed the same shrewd and devious tactics. Six months before he died, Josef Stalin laid down the party line for what he himself called a relentless economic war against the United States in trade relationships. Since then the Russian missions have gone into the markets of the world with gold and with goods. Today they have trade agreements with Argentina, Canada, Denmark, Norway, Sweden, France, England, Italy, Greece, West Germany, and India—and others are on the list.

Clearly, the Russians have seized on these tools of power and have skillfully employed them for their own ruthless ends. They have been proceeding with success up to now—almost as though they assumed that the hydrogen bomb had outlawed itself.

If we are to succeed in our mission as leader of the free world, we must use these five tools of power more effectively than do the Russians. Let's look at our record:

1. On the use of actual and potential military power, obviously we must take a very different tack from the Communists. Even were it strategic for us to engage the Soviets in small wars, we would never commit an act of aggression. Our use of military power must be to mount such imposing forces of the free alliance that the Communists will not dare to begin even a small war.

Yet in January, Mr. Dulles told us that we were only going to fight big wars in the future. Our present military budget calls for reducing our divisions from 20 to 17 by next July, and to shrink our Marine Corps to less than three divisions. I do not believe that our manpower should police the world but neither should that of Russia. But I do believe that we can establish a joint command of the free alliance as we did in World War II. I do believe that other men in other nations will fight for freedom—not only Americans. But we must combine our military resources. Our joint strategy can be equal to that of the Kremlin. It is with regret that I say we have been marching in directly the opposite direction.

2. As for dividing and disintegrating the opposition from within, we have unfortunately urged on with hollow campaign oratory such forces of freedom as exist behind the Iron Curtain. These people are our most effective agents for striking at the soft spots of internal Communist weakness. We must encourage them and protect them. Above all, we must never heedlessly expose them.

3. In the field of communicating with the minds of men, we must ceaselessly tell only the truth about ourselves and those who would destroy us. Truth is our most effective weapon. We must also recognize that all other peoples on earth do not have to be cast in our image to be members of the alliance of the free. People can hold to beliefs—religious and political—which we do not wholly subscribe to and yet which are as fundamentally incompatible with communism as our own.

We have permitted unprincipled and reckless investigators to destroy the morale and the ingenuity of the Voice of America. And our Congress, with its eye on pennies, has prevented us from operating in this diversified field at a level comparable to the Russians.

4. Again, in the field of diplomacy, we have seen how reckless investigation can deeply disrupt the morale and the proper reportorial function of our foreign service. We have seen how a Secretary of State must twist and turn to accommodate the various factions within his own party. We must employ all our skill to exploit the weakness of our opponents. But we must also allow our negotiators the flexibility of negotiation that can result in the largest harvest of returns. Above all, we must stand for principle in diplomacy—principle that has positive meaning in the lives of people everywhere in the world. It is not mere coincidence that where we have stood firm for principle, we have negotiated at our best. When we have fluctuated wildly between extremes, motivated only by a blind will to resist and oppose, we have met with near disaster at the conference table.

5. In the field of economic strategy, we have one of our most effective instruments of power. Regardless of statutes, regardless of language or custom, people have a common denominator of economic survival. All men fight hunger, all men fight for proper nourishment, for food. The promise we can hold out is that men can achieve more economic security and a more decent material life without losing their right to be free. Under the Marshall plan, we helped rehabilitate the economies of the Western European nations. In the past 18 months, we have begun to deny these members of the alliance free access to competitive markets. There are those who shout for the protection of high tariffs in one breath and denounce our friends for trading with the enemy in the next. The whole question of international trade must be reexamined. We must take another look to learn how this country, the economic giant of the world, can best use its economic genius and productive capacity for achievement of its fundamental goal of a free and peaceful world. And above all, we must help people to learn to develop for themselves a constantly fuller and better way of life.

We have something beyond the mere challenge to use these instruments of power. We have a moral fiber, a meaningful end that we can honestly promise mankind, a promise our opponents cannot match. We have a basic respect for individual human beings. We fight for the rights of the governed, not for the power of the rulers.

It is this promise, this respect, this essential dignity about the character of our cause that can prove to be the essential ingredient that will see us through. There can come a time when freedom will perish from this earth, for freedom is the exception not the rule of human experience. But we cannot and will not let this torch of freedom fall. With intelligence and responsibility at the helm, with a sureness of purpose, we can win this deep struggle—not as a partisan for one segment of the earth, but for all men who cherish freedom who live upon it.

REA Against REA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 19, 1954

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have published in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "REA Against REA," published in the June 12, 1954, issue of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, which I consider to be a great independent newspaper of America.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REA AGAINST REA

For a $35 million Senate increase in REA loan funds, the thousands of farm families that depend on REA lines for their electricity can thank Senator DOUGLAS, of Illinois.

The Eisenhower administration cut the loan fund $28 million last year and tried to cut it another $24 million this year. These two reductions would have reduced the loan funds 40 percent from the last year of the Truman administration. REA itself, headed by President Eisenhower's appointee, Ancher Nelson, joined in these efforts to restrict its own activity.

No wonder Senator DOUGLAS said, with exceptional mildness, "It is my impression that the present administration of REA is not very enthusiastic about the program which it is being called upon to administer."

The $135 million to which the Senate raised the figure is still inadequate, but at least it is not a still further retreat from last year. Rural electric cooperatives estimate the amount really needed to clean up $100 million of backlog and fill applications they plan to submit is $249 million. This figure is the result of a survey by the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association. Every one of the association's advance estimates during the past 5 years has proved to be less than the total of applications which the co-ops subsequently filed.

Without sufficient funds, electricity could not be brought to farm homes which still lack it. As a still more serious consequence, existing cooperatives would be unable to meet the growing demands of their customers. Their service would be crippled and their solvency might easily be threatened.

Furthermore, as Senator MORSE, of Oregon, said:

"The farm families of the United States are in trouble. Their costs of production and of living have increased, while their incomes have decreased. The rural electrification program has been a factor in reducing farm production costs. In this time of distress the REA program should be pursued aggressively."

Notwithstanding all this, REA and the President's Budget Bureau asked for only $55 million in loan funds. The friends of rural electrification, believing it politically impossible to get the full $249 million amount needed, settled on last year's sum, $135 million. The House raised the $55 million request to $100 and the Senate to $135 million.

If the REA loan fund were an expenditure, it would be understandable that an economy-minded adminstration would want to reduce it. But the fund is not spent, it is invested, in sound loans which perform a public service and are then returned to the United States Treasury with interest.

Irreparable damage could be done to the cooperative either by cutting off their REA line of credit or by installing top REA officials with no zeal for the job.

If no harm to REA is intended, as administration officials have so often asserted, the best way of showing it is to demand adequate funds and zealous administration.

The Price of Eggs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. THYE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 19, 1954

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, on Monday, July 19, 1954, there appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald an article by George Dixon. This article attracted my attention because the heading was Nothing Like a Good Breakfast. This article first mentions a reference by the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Benson, to Mr. Dixon as having eaten the equivalent of four gallons of cornmeal mush for breakfast. He declared that anybody who eats 2 eggs and 2 slices of bacon has downed the aforementioned corn and mush equivalent.

There was further reference to the price-support program which Secretary of Agriculture Benson advocates. Reference was also made to the type of farm program which Representative CLIFFORD R. HOPE, of Kansas, supports. The implication of this story was that high rigid supports were keeping corn or feed grains away from a livestock-poultry type of enterprise or operation. The contention of the Secretary of Agriculture is that his plan would put meat, milk, and eggs into the stomachs of people. I cannot help but ask the Secretary this question: How many more eggs does he want than are now being produced?

I have on my desk petitions signed by several hundred farmers from Minnesota protesting the unreasonable low price of eggs. I have sent one such petition to the Secretary of Agriculture. grade A eggs are bringing between 27 cents and 29 cents a dozen to the producer, depending on the area of Minnesota. Ordinary "nest run" eggs are bringing around 22 cents a dozen in some midwestern towns. Do Senators want eggs in this day and age to be any cheaper, when the operating expenses of the producer are still at the inflationary level which prevailed during the Korean war? This applies to prices of commercial feeds, machinery, and any other operator's expense.

I believe this entire question is becoming so confused by erroneous statements that it will be a blessing when the farm bill is finally disposed of in this congressional session. It is a wonder to me that our agricultural economy has remained as stable as it has, considering the many attacks which have been made upon it by high officials.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record, along with the newspaper article by George Dixon, a letter which I received from Mrs. Albin Anderson, route 2, box 29, Murdock, Minn. This letter shows that the price of eggs there is 23 cents a dozen.

There being no objection, the letter and article were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

MURDOCK, MINN.

Hon. EDWARD THYE,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am writing to you, to see if something can't be done about the egg and poultry prices. In 1953, a year ago today, we were getting 45 cents a dozen and feed costs were as high. Now we are getting 23 cents a dozen and feed prices still remain as 1953 prices. We paid 35 cents apiece for our day-old pullets, fed them a whole year, and now hens are only 11 cents. What did we profit on this. We farmers can't pay for our groceries this way. They don't put such down; same with the clothing. Please do something about it or we will all have to go back on relief like in the thirties. I wrote Senator HUMPHREY too, so hope you do something about it.

Thank you,

MRS. ALBIN ANDERSON.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of July 19, 1954]

WASHINGTON SCENE

(By George Dixon)

NOTHING LIKE A GOOD BREAKFAST

Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson made me feel kind of bloated this morning. He said I had eaten the equivalent of 7 pounds of corn, or 4 gallons of cornmeal mush, for breakfast.

Well, I like to think of myself as a hearty eater, but I balked at the thought of gobbling 4 gallons of cornmeal mush. I always say 3 gallons is enough, provided I can have a few side dishes, such as a bale of hay and a trough full of tasty swill.

But the Secretary of Agriculture was insistent. He declared that anybody who eats 2 eggs and 2 slices of bacon has downed the aforementioned corn and mush equivalent.

That would seem to mean that practically everybody in the country, including dieting midgets, eats more for breakfast than a pig. But closer querying revealed that the Mormon elder was indulging a hitherto unsuspected talent for gustatory imagery. Ez meant it would take that much corn and mush to produce 2 eggs and 2 slices of bacon from the original vendors.

I do not claim to be on as intimate terms with barnyard cafe society as the Secretary of Agriculture, but he made it sound as if the hens and the hogs might be overdoing it with their calories. But he declared that the Benson plan for getting rid of our surplus grains by feeding them to meat animals was the only one that made sense.

He said his plan would put meat, milk, eggs, and poultry into the stomachs of people, while a rival plan, advanced by Representative CLIFFORD R. HOPE, of Kansas, chairman of the House Agriculture Committee, would put grain in storage bins.

I consider old Ez a pretty sapient citizen, so I am stringing with the Benson plan against the Hope plan. But I wish we didn't have to have any of these price-support gimmicks.

The Benson plan versus the Hope plan reminds me of what the big boll weevil said to the little boll weevil:

"You're the lesser of two weevils."

In addition to spasms of allegory, Secretary Benson has been going melodramatic lately. In one speech he pretended he was casting a play.

"There's the hero," he said. "He's high price supports. Then there's the villain. He's surplus disposal. Then there's another obnoxious character. He's production control."

Ez could have presented a more lavish production if he'd fattened up the all-male cast by adding a female—the poor, innocent victim of both the hero's and the villain's passion.

She's the city housewife.

Transfer of Brig. Gen. Daniel C. Doubleday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 19, 1954

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, in recent weeks Brig. Gen. Daniel C. Doubleday was transferred as commanding officer of the Rome Development Center, Rome, N. Y., to become commander of the Air and Airways Communication Service, Military Air Transport Command, United States Air Force in Europe.

On his departure from his post in Rome, N. Y., the Rome Daily Sentinel carried an editorial on General Doubleday's service at the Rome Air Development Center, and the Rome Chamber of Commerce presented him with a scroll.

I ask unanimous consent that a copy of this editorial and the text of the scroll be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Rome (N. Y.) Daily Sentinel of May 19, 1954]

DOUBLEDAYS REFLECT CREDIT ON AIR FORCE

A good neighbor is about to leave our town.

Brig. Gen. Daniel C. Doubleday, commanding officer, Rome Air Development Center, since August 1951, is going to Germany later this month. He will be in command of Air and Airways Communication Service, Military Air Transport Command, United States Air Force in Europe and North Africa, with headquarters at Furstenfeldburch, Germany.

Relations between the community and Griffiss AFB, site of Rome Air Development Center, have been continued at a high state of friendly and close cooperation during the administration of this fine officer.

General Doubleday has carried on his assignment here in the finest traditions of the Air Force. He has won the respect and admiration of residents of this area and of the personnel, both military and civilian, at the base.

As the wife of the commanding general with all the responsibilities of that position, Mrs. Doubleday has been a gracious first lady of the post. She, too, has proved to be an asset to the Air Force.

Rome loses good citizens in the departure of General Doubleday and his family. They have made many friends in Rome who will follow his future career in the military service with great personal interest.

General Doubleday is a man of good will, high character, and great credit to the Air Force—an officer one does not forget after the privilege of his friendship.

Copy of scroll presented to Brig. Gen. Daniel C. Doubleday, USAF, by the directors of the Rome Chamber of Commerce, May 19, 1954:

"In view of the approaching termination of your tour of duty as commanding officer of the Griffiss Air Force Base, it is our wish to express by means of this scroll our regret at your departure from the city of Rome, N. Y.

"By your understanding, your cooperation, your interest in the welfare of Griffiss Air Force Base and the city of Rome, you have earned the high esteem, admiration, and friendship of all who have been privileged to work with you. Your personality, your devotion to duty, your exemplification of an officer and gentleman in the finest traditions of the Air Force have done much to bridge the gap that many times separates the civilian and the military.

"You have carried on and strengthened the fine spirit of community relationship that has existed since the inception of Griffiss Air Force Base. You have added new laurels to the splendid record of your predecessors and set a high mark for those who may succeed you.

"We, who have had the privilege of your friendship, shall follow your career with great interest and it is our hope that some time in the future we may welcome you again as a citizen of Rome.

"God be with you.

"DIRECTORS, ROME CHAMBER OF COMMERCE."

A Rollcall To Remember

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 19, 1954

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an editorial entitled "A Rollcall To Remember," published in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of June 30, 1954.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

A ROLLCALL TO REMEMBER

The voters of the country are entitled to know just who among our 96 Senators voted to give President Eisenhower the 3-year extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act and the authority to lower tariffs by as much as 15 percent below rates of last January 1. This is what the President asked of Congress last March, and an effort was made, under the leadership of Senator GORE, of Tennessee, to write his requests into law after even President Eisenhower had abandoned them. The bill for a token 1-year extension now awaits the President's signature.

Thirty-two Senators voted unsuccessfully to give the President what he asked for. Four other Senators were paired in favor of the White House's original position. They are as follows:

ANDERSON, New Mexico; BURKE, Ohio; BYRD, Virginia; CHAVEZ, New Mexico; CLEMENTS, Kentucky; DANIEL, Texas; DOUGLAS, Illinois; EASTLAND, Mississippi; ELLENDER, Louisiana; FULBRIGHT, Arkansas; GILLETTE, Iowa; GORE, Tennessee; HAYDEN, Arizona; HENNINGS, Missouri; HILL, Alabama; HOLLAND, Florida; HUMPHREY, Minnesota; JACKSON, Washington; JOHNSON, Texas; JOHNSTON, South Carolina; KEFAUVER, Tennessee; KENNEDY, Massachusetts; LEHMAN, New York; LENNON, North Carolina; LONG, Louisiana; MAGNUSON, Washington; MANSFIELD, Montana; MAYBANK, South Carolina; MONRONEY, Oklahoma; MORSE, Oregon; MURRAY, Montana; ROBERTSON, Virginia; SMATHERS, Florida; SPARKMAN, Alabama; STENNIS, Mississippi; SYMINGTON, Missouri.

There is one exceedingly interesting thing about this list. That is the fact that there is not one single, solitary Republican Senator on it.

Foreign Service Academy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1954

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, in the course of my experience as a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives, I had the opportunity to come in contact, on many occasions, with individual members of our Department of State. I saw them performing their duties in Washington, and in many places abroad. It became readily apparent that things were not well with our State Department's personnel, particularly with the Foreign Service of the United States.

In many instances, there was evidence of poor morale, of rigid and unimaginative personnel management, of the lack of capable and realistic men in important positions abroad. I became convinced that the interests of our Nation could best be served by the adoption of far-reaching changes in the Department of State. The Department's personnel system needed a thorough overhauling. At the same time, it was my opinion that we needed a reservoir of able, specially trained, learned men and women who would give our Government the most capable and satisfactory representation abroad that we have ever had.

The task of overhauling the personnel system of the Department of State required careful and thorough study of men who were conversant with this subject. It was a job for a commission composed of experienced and able men, who could devote their wholehearted efforts to this task. The Wriston committee, which I shall mention later, was appointed to do this work.

The second problem—that of providing our Nation with a reservoir of able, specially trained men and women who could ably represent our Government in the foreign field—became my particular concern.

Both in the 82d Congress and in the 83d Congress, I introduced legislation providing for the establishment of a United States Academy of Foreign Service. My bills call for the creation of an academy which would offer a specialized 4-year course to train promising young men and women for a career in the Foreign Service. The students would be selected on the basis of competitive examinations, appointed on the basis of merit, and would receive the same pay and allowances as are received by cadets at West Point.

The graduates of the academy would be available for assignment with the Foreign Service of the United States in the Department of State, with the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce in the Department of Commerce, with the office of Foreign Agricultural Relations in the Department of Agriculture, with the Department of Treasury for service in connection with international finances and related activities, and with other Government agencies.

The text of my bill, H. R. 1870, follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in order to promote peace, greater understanding, and good will throughout the world and to provide for a trained force for the Foreign Service of the United States, there is hereby established an academy to be known as the United States Academy of Foreign Service.

SEC. 2. (a) The management of the Academy of Foreign Service shall be vested in a Board of Trustees, who shall have general charge of said institution and who shall determine the location for said Academy, which must be outside of the District of Columbia, but at a distance of not more than 100 miles therefrom. The Board of Trustees shall consist of the Secretary of State, 2 Members of the United States Senate, appointed by the Vice President, and 2 Members of the House of Representatives, appointed by the Speaker, who shall serve for 2 years and shall be eligible for reappointment. Not more than 1 of the trustees appointed from the Senate or more than 1 of the trustees appointed from the House shall be of the same political party.

SEC. 3. (a) The faculty of the United States Academy of Foreign Service shall consist of the president of the Academy and such deans, professors, associate professors, librarians, chaplains, and instructors as are necessary for the proper instruction of the students.

(b) The terms of the contracts and the salaries to be paid to the members of the faculty shall be determined by the Board of Trustees. The civil-service laws shall not apply to the president and the faculty. The salary of the president shall not exceed $20,000 per year.

(c) The selection of the president and the faculty of the United States Academy of Foreign Service for the first 2 years of its operation shall be by a committee on faculty. The committee on faculty shall consist of 12 educators to be selected by the Secretary of State from a list consisting of one educator from each State nominated by the governor thereof. Not more than one member of the committee on faculty shall be from any one Federal Reserve district.

(d) The members of the Board of Trustees and the committee on faculty shall serve without pay, but they may receive their expenses.

SEC. 4. (a) The course of study of the United States Academy of Foreign Service shall extend over a period of 4 years.

(b) The course of study shall include, but shall not be limited to (Government of the United States, political and governmental theory, comparative religion, history, literature, philosophy, science, composition, mathematics, economics, geography, foreign languages, agriculture, finance, international law, business and trade practices, and military and naval observation. The Academy may arrange to temporarily assign students to the Military Academy and Naval Academy of the United States for instruction in military observation.

(c) The United States Academy of Foreign Service is authorized to confer appropriate degrees upon its graduates.

SEC. 5. (a) The number of students in the United States Academy of Foreign Service shall be determined by the Board of Trustees, but shall not be less than one student for each Senator and Representative in Congress, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner, 5 from the District of Columbia, and 15 from the United States at large. If a greater number of students are authorized than the minimum number carried in this section, the allocation of said number to the several States, districts, Territories, possessions, the District of Columbia, and the United States at large shall be upon the same ratio as set forth in this section.

(b) The method of appointment of students to the United States Academy of Foreign Service shall be based on merit, and the appointments shall be made on the basis of a competitive examination.

(c) The students of the United States Academy of Foreign Service shall receive the same pay and allowances as are received by cadets at West Point.

(d) Admission to the Academy shall be limited to men and women who are native-born citizens of the United States, who have reached their 20th birthday and have not passed their 25th birthday at the time of their admission and who have had at least 2 years' college or university education or the equivalent thereof. In addition to these requirements, the Academy shall require an entrance examination of the applicant to ascertain his intellectual capacities and his aptitude for the Foreign Service.

SEC. 6. The Board of Trustees may require a student entering the United States Academy of Foreign Service to submit a statement in writing to the president of the Academy stating that he will serve the Government of the United States where assigned for a definite period.

SEC. 7. The graduates of the United States Academy of Foreign Service shall be assigned by the Board of the Academy for 1 year of specialized study in the particular foreign country in which they may be later assigned for service, and, upon satisfactory completion of the year, shall be appointed as Foreign Service officers without the examination provided for in the act of May 24, 1924, as amended, entitled "An act for the reorganization and improvement of the Foreign Service of the United States, and for other purposes", and said graduates shall have preference over all other applicants. The said graduates shall be available for assignment for service as follows:

First, to the State Department in said Department and in the Foreign Service of the United States.

Second, to the Department of Commerce for service in the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce or other related duties.

Third, to the Department of Agriculture in connection with the office of Foreign Agriculture Relations or other service relating to the production, distribution, and marketing of agricultural products.

Fourth, to the Department of the Treasury for service in connection with international finances and currency, tariffs, debt adjustment, and related activities:

Provided, That a graduate of the United States Academy of Foreign Service must be assigned to duties within the continental United States for a minimum of 1 year out of every 5 that said person is employed in the Government services set forth in this section. This proviso may be waived when the United States is at war.

SEC. 8. (a) The appropriation of such funds from the Treasury of the United States as are necessary to carry out this act is hereby authorized.

(b) The United States Academy of Foreign Service shall have power to acquire and hold real and personal property and may receive and accept gifts, donations, and trusts.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that to properly represent the United States, our delegates abroad should be fully conversant with the economic and political backgrounds both of our country and of a particular foreign nation. In addition, they ought to be learned in history, philosophy, language, and culture of the foreign country or countries to which they may be eventually assigned.

While there are several universities and colleges in our country which have established limited chairs and departments for foreign service training, I do not believe that they adequately meet the urgent need in this field.

The establishment of the Foreign Service Academy proposed in my bill would, in my estimation, eventually give our Nation better representation abroad on all levels, and foster better understanding, cooperation, and peace among nations.

Mr. Speaker, now I should like to return to a subject which I mentioned earlier: the problem of overhauling the personnel structure of our Department of State.

As I indicated, a special eight-man committee was appointed to study this problem. The committee was headed by Henry M. Wriston, president of Brown University. The group called the Public Committee on Personnel, recently issued a 70-page report entitled "Toward a Stronger Foreign Service."

The recommendations contained in the Wriston report should go a long way toward improving the conditions in the State Department, if they will be put into practice without any crippling amendments or reservations. I believe, however, that the committee has not gone far enough in proposing changes which would give our Nation an adequate reservoir of specially trained, capable men and women to serve our Government in the field of foreign affairs. That was and is the object of my bill, and it will not be fulfilled by the Wriston report recommendations.

Nevertheless, as a step in the right direction, the suggestions of the Wriston committee deserve our careful consideration and support. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish at this point to commend to the attention of my colleagues an editorial which appeared in the Milwaukee Journal of June 27, 1954, entitled "The Trouble at Foggy Bottom." The editorial presents a few brief and interesting comments on the Wriston report. It is my intention to discuss this document further on a later date.

The editorial follows:

THE TROUBLE AT FOGGY BOTTOM

It has been evident for a long time, to anyone interested, that things were not well inside the monumental State Department Building in Washington which is disrespectfully called "Foggy Bottom" (the nickname formerly used for the low, musty area where the building now stands).

This unhappy situation has been detailed now by a distinguished eight-man committee headed by Henry M. Wriston, president of Brown University. Named by President Eisenhower at request of Secretary Dulles, the group, called the public committee on personnel, has issued an able 70-page report entitled: "Toward a Stronger Foreign Service."

The Wriston committee verifies the oft heard charges that morale of State Department employees is low, that the Department is poorly organized and managed, that the best use is not made of personnel, that little is done to train personnel and that there is a tragic failure to bring new and able men into the service.

The gravity of this situation for the American people is pointed out in the following first paragraph of the committee report:

"Foreign policy will be dynamic or inert, steadfast or aimless, in proportion to the character and unity of those who serve it. United States foreign policy has entered upon a period of trial of unprecedented endurance and complexity. That policy will in large measure stand or fall according to whether the relative handful of men and women charged with its execution are able to work effectively and in concert toward the agreed end."

Here are a few disturbing statements of this important document:

"A high state of morale is essential to an effective Foreign Service. The morale of that service today stands in need of repair.

"The Foreign Service officer corps today numbers 1,285, the lowest strength in 5 years. Only 355 officers have been * * * appointed * * * since 1946 * * * not a single junior appointment has been made * * * since August 1952.

"There exists within the diplomatic department 2 separate basic personnel systems, one of which has 3 subsystems. The differences * * * have given rise to a sense of separateness where there should be a pervading sense of oneness.

"The base broadening problem has haunted the Foreign Services for well over 30 years. Even at the measured pace of diplomacy that seems a long time to leave so important an issue unresolved.

"A personnel system, in the contemporary meaning of the term, simply does not exist. Management of human resources has been irresolute and unimaginative.

"The Foreign Service is, in effect, in a condition of exile abroad. * * * Of 197 officers, with more than 20 years' service, 45 have had not more than 2 years of their service in the United States on assignment. * * * Men immersed continuously in other societies inevitably tend to lose touch with the circumstances and attitudes that shape national policy at home.

"The Foreign Service Institute, * * * an advanced training ground for officers destined for high command * * * is dying of neglect. * * * An advisory committee has not met in session for 4 years."

The Wriston committee has made recommendations intended to deal with both the problems of administration and of morale. Secretary Dulles has already ordered some of them put into effect. We shall discuss the recommendations and actions concerning administrative reform in future editorials.

Foreign Service Academy—Part II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 8, 1954

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, granted on June 28, I spoke about the personnel problem in our State Department.

At that time, I pointed out that the interests of our Nation could best be served by the adoption of sweeping changes in the Department. In the first place, steps ought to be taken to provide a reservoir of able, specially trained young men and women who would eventually serve our Government in various positions abroad. Secondly, the personnel structure within the Department of State should be overhauled, so as to do away with the causes of low morale and with poor utilization of human resources.

I had already discussed my proposal for the establishment of a Foreign Service Academy of the United States, contained in my bill, H. R. 1870. This proposal, when adopted by Congress, should provide the State Department and other executive departments and agencies with adequate specialized personnel for oversea work.

Today, in commenting further on the Wriston report for the overhauling of the personnel structure of the State Department, I should like to call to the attention of the membership of this body two editorials from the Milwaukee Journal, both having a bearing on this subject.

The first editorial is entitled "Bad Morale in Courier Service" and it appeared in the Milwaukee Journal of June 28, 1954. It demonstrates why State Department morale is as low as it is. It warrants our earnest consideration, because we cannot expect our Foreign Service to be efficient and effective while we close our eyes to the many causes which undermine its morale.

The editorial follows:

BAD MORALE IN COURIER SERVICE

We had a letter the other day from a friend who is a diplomatic courier in the American Foreign Service. Because of what the State Department's economy drive is doing to him and to the courier service, he is an unhappy young man.

Diplomatic couriers carry our country's vital documents between 110 United States diplomatic missions around the world. They cover four continents from regional offices at Paris, Cairo, Manila, and Panama. Today they travel almost exclusively by air. The courier travels far, sees strange places and has an occasional adventure. By and large, however, the job is arduous, exacting, occasionally dangerous and often monotonous.

When our friend joined the couriers in 1952 there were 100 men in the service. Schedules generally called for trips of 2 or 3 days, with the rest of the workweek in the regional office. Under such schedules, it was possible to make allowance for bad flying weather and airplane mechanical troubles. The couriers, many of whom are married, were reasonably assured of some time at home.

Since the Eisenhower administration came in, the courier force has been cut from 100 men to 66. On July 1 it will go down to 60. Inasmuch as the same number of missions must still be visited and the same number of miles flown, this means that 60 men must cover the routes and do the work that 100 previously did.

The letter from our courier friend explains what this means:

"I'm abashed for not having written sooner. However, the reduction in force of couriers has weighed heavily on our office. I've had just about time to drop off my laundry and pick up some clean clothes between trips. I've almost forgotten what the apartment looks like. Jane has a few thousand well-chosen and rehearsed words to say about the setup whenever we chance to meet. All we can do is hope that the pressure lets up soon. If not, most of us in this office are going to quit."

Courier morale is low for two other reasons. Most couriers, young men just out of college, joined the Service with the expectation that they could, in reasonable time, move up into the regular Foreign Service. They have recently been given to understand that, in view of overall reduction in the foreign staff, there is little chance of such promotion for a long time.

Couriers were also given to understand, when they joined the service, that they would get home leave after 2 years. Last winter they received notice that, for economy reasons, there would be no home leave until after 3 years of service.

All in all, we can't blame our friend for being unhappy. And it is easy to understand why morale in the courier service is bad. Maybe one of the congressional committees concerned with such matters should check into what looks like another example of false economy.

Mr. Speaker, the second editorial, taken from the Milwaukee Journal of June 29, 1954, lists the highlights of the Wriston report, stressing the fact that our Nation badly needs great improvements in the selection, recruitment, and assignment or utilization of the men and women who execute our foreign policy both at home and abroad. It is entitled "More and Better Men Are Needed for Foreign Service," and I commend it highly to my colleagues' attention:

MORE AND BETTER MEN ARE NEEDED FOR FOREIGN SERVICE

The United States badly needs more and better men making its foreign policy at home and representing it in the 68 embassies, 9 legations, and 167 consulates abroad. And it needs to use these men to better advantage than it is using its present diplomats.

This is about what the Wriston committee's recommendations to the State Department about administrative reform add up to.

There is not much new about its recommendations. Similar ones were made after World War II by the late Secretary Stettinius and later by the first Hoover Commission. Little came from them. As one commentator has said of the Stettinius reform: "The principal feature was the transfer of attendants from the corridors to the washrooms."

This time, however, there seems some reason to hope something will happen. Secretary Dulles has approved many of the committee recommendations and ordered them into effect.

Here are highlights of the Wriston committee's administrative reform program:

Personnel in the Foreign Service should be increased from 1,285 to 3,900. This should be done primarily by integrating into the Foreign Service the top personnel of the State Department's civil-service organization in Washington.

The Foreign Service must open its ranks to a large number of people with a high degree of specialization in other than the general practice of diplomacy.

The situation under which the Foreign Service is in effect a condition of exile abroad must be ended. Officers must be brought home for duty regularly to keep their knowledge of American life steadily refreshed.

A modern personnel system must be established under a Deputy Under Secretary of State who will enter the job prepared to stay. A promotion system should be set up.

The Foreign Service Institute should be revitalized to carry out its purpose—to train diplomatic officers as the War Colleges train military officers.

Foreign Service recruitment of young men must be stepped up through cooperation with colleges and universities and by accelerating present examination processes and security procedures. For the long range, a nationwide scholarship training program, patterned after the Navy's contract system for its Reserve Officer Training Corps, is urged.

All of these recommendations are worthy. We surmise, however, that it is going to take more than worthiness, and even Secretary Dulles' approval, to bring them to realization. In view of what has happened to equally good recommendations in the past, we think there must be continuing pressure by Mr. Dulles, vigorous administrative action, plus some outside prodding by the Wriston Commission and interested Members of the Congress and the public.

And most important of all, perhaps, there must be improvement of morale inside the Foreign Service and the State Department. The Wriston committee has recognized that this is very low and has suggested how to improve it: Discussion of the morale situation will follow in another editorial.

Foreign Service Academy—Part III

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 19, 1954

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, a short time ago, in presenting its recommendations on the subject of reforming the personnel structure of the State Department, the Wriston Public Committee on Personnel made this statement:

> Diplomacy has become serious, urgent, and arduous business. Precisely because diplomacy is so serious, urgent, and arduous, a high state of morale is essential to an effective Foreign Service. The morale of that Service today stands in need of repair.

Similar observations were made in the past, and suggestions were advanced with view toward remedying the situation. For that reason, some shortsighted persons may take the Wriston Report very lightly. But the fact remains that—if we are truly interested in having an effective foreign policy—we cannot afford to adopt such a narrow-minded and unrealistic view. The effectiveness of our foreign policy depends largely on the capabilities and the morale of the men who are entrusted with the job of executing it. For that reason, these matters ought to be of deep concern to each and every one of us.

Under permissions granted on June 23 and July 8, I discussed certain aspects of the personnel problem in our Department of State. I reviewed my proposal for the establishment of a Foreign Service Academy of the United States, and commented on the Wriston Report.

In further reference to those remarks, I wish to include in the RECORD an editorial from the Milwaukee Journal of July 6, 1954, entitled "State Department Morale Is Low, Must Be Restored." It is my hope that this outspoken and informative editorial will receive careful consideration of my colleagues:

STATE DEPARTMENT MORALE IS LOW, MUST BE RESTORED

Administrative reform within the State Department, as recommended by the Wriston committee and ordered by Secretary Dulles, will no doubt improve efficiency and effectiveness. It will not, however, remedy the major malady in the Department—low morale.

The situation is well expressed in these words of the Wriston report:

"Diplomacy has become serious, urgent, and arduous business. Precisely because diplomacy is so serious, urgent, and arduous, a high state of morale is essential to an effective Foreign Service. The morale of that Service today stands in need of repair."

Why is morale so low? There are many reasons.

One is the reduction in force of more than 22 percent under the Eisenhower administration. Another is appropriation cuts which, along with the reduction in force, have resulted in 80 percent of the personnel shifting jobs. Another is poor administration over a long period of time, with no consistent program of promotions or pay raises.

Two more reasons—major ones—remain.

One is the incessant political attacks upon the integrity and morality of State Department personnel, largely from congressional sources. This has driven many good men out of the Service in disgust. It has kept many good young men from entering the Service. It has frightened many men still in Service into becoming little more than reporters of events. They fear that to analyze conditions or express opinions or suggest policies will bring attacks on them, now or in the future, from partisans in Washington.

The other major reason is the administration of the security program within the Department. Here is what the Wriston report says of this:

"The program has been drastic and thorough * * * the task has inevitably occasioned uncertainties, doubts, and fears * * * investigations of such sensitive character should be conducted with the professional impartiality associated in the public mind with the FBI.

"Only as these investigations are carried out with the most scrupulous objectivity will the apprehensions of government servants be abated * * * if the security program is to achieve its true purpose of protecting the Government and the American way of life, it must be so administered that it does not impair the things it is designed to preserve."

Other critics have not been so unspecific, and so kindly, toward the security program administration and its chief, R. W. Scott McLeod.

Charges have been made that McLeod conceives it his responsibility to clear all Democrats and all liberal Republicans out of the State Department, that he has established a private spy system inside the organization, that people are forced to resign without hearing or trial, or, in some cases, without knowing the charges against them. It is claimed people are plagued into retirement by threats or by repeated investigations. A Washington correspondent recently related that stenographers in the planning division had been directed to make weekly reports of the reading matter of their bosses.

The Wriston committee expressed hope that with the reduction in force about completed and the security review scheduled to end this summer, there would be a quick recovery of morale.

For its part, it reports, it has been impressed by the "high standards of devotion and loyalty" animating our State Department people and "does not hesitate to urge the American people to reinvest their confidence, without reservaton, in the character and steadfastness of both the Department and its diplomatic arm."

We wish we could be as optimistic as the members of the committee. We cannot, however, see how there can be a revival of morale until the inquisitors and informers are gone, until demagogs stop using the Department as a punching bag, until an individual knows that his job is to report facts as he sees them, and until the Secretary of the State stands up and fights for his employees.

Rhee To Be Hailed by City Which Once Scorned Him

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 19, 1954

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, one of the greatest patriots of modern times is to address this Congress on the 28th of July. Syngman Rhee has foresight. He predicted Communist aggression in the Far East. He has the rare ability among modern day statesmen to look ahead and plan accordingly. Dr. Rhee is aware of the fallacy of indecision and appeasement. He has predicated South Korean foreign policy on principle rather than political expediency. Even the Communist world respects men who have convictions and principle and who will without vacillation stand by decency and honor.

Syngman Rhee will go down in history alongside of Douglas MacArthur and Chiang Kai-shek as the most farsighted and able statesmen to be affiliated with the Far Eastern situation in the 20th century. Yet it passes strange that these men have been smeared and abused by much of the free world more than any other contemporary leaders. It is a known fact that the Communists placed them among their top 5 or 6 men that must be destroyed before communism can advance according to plan.

While Dr. Rhee was predicting with accuracy practically every move of the Communists many leaders elsewhere, including our own, had only hindsight and were futilly attempting to cover up their own blunders by saying that everyone makes mistakes. Dr. Rhee is a bulwark of freedom in this troubled world. It will be refreshing for this Congress to hear a man who has fought valiantly for freedom as George Washington fought in the early history of our country against overwhelming odds.

The following article by Charles B. Seib in the Washington Star is excellent and timely:

RHEE TO BE HAILED BY CITY WHICH ONCE SCORNED HIM—KOREAN PRESIDENT DUE HERE JULY 26—TO ADDRESS CONGRESS

(By Charles B. Seib)

When Korean President Syngman Rhee motors from the airport on July 26 to a White House welcome by President Eisenhower, he can reflect on an earlier day when Washington was a town of closed doors, turned backs and deaf ears.

The 79-year-old Dr. Rhee will be greeted next week with the keys to the city, flags, cordons of soldiers and military bands. He will spend a night at the White House and address Congress. He will be hailed as the symbol of South Korea's resistance to communism.

It was just a decade ago, however, that Dr. Rhee's pleas for recognition of his Korean government-in-exile, his proposals for a fifth column against Japanese occupation forces in Korea and his warnings that a partitioning of his country would bring a Communist onslaught were being spurned by the officials of the Government now welcoming him.

THIRTY-THREE YEARS IN EXILE

From long before World War II until 1945, when he made a triumphant return to Korea after 33 years in exile, Dr. Rhee was a familiar figure at the State Department, at the Capitol and at the White House.

Whereever he went, he begged American help in freeing his people from the Japanese yoke. His outspoken warnings proved accurate with uncomfortable frequency. He warned, for example, that the Japanese were not to be trusted—a warning that was soon justified by Pearl Harbor. At the 1945 United Nations meeting in San Francisco, he created a furore by declaring that the Yalta agreements included the splitting of his country. This was denied, but the partitioning soon became a fact.

Everywhere, according to an associate of those days, Dr. Rhee was avoided, ignored or put off with vague promises. When he mailed his credentials to the State Department shortly after Pearl Harbor, for example, he was asked to come and take them away again.

WAS REGARDED AS A PEST

Such treatment did not deter the persistent little Korean, nor did he mind being called a pest. He had been a pest to various people since 1897 when he led a demonstration which won him a life sentence and 6 months of torture. Freed by an amnesty in 1904, he came to the United States and earned degrees at George Washington University, Harvard, and Princeton.

Dr. Rhee returned in 1910 to his homeland, then occupied by Japan, but his stay there was short. His anti-Japanese activities forced him to flee in 1912.

In 1919, Dr. Rhee was elected president of a Korean Provisional Government, which he directed from Shanghai. From then on, he spent much of his time seeking United States recognition for that government, declaring that "America is the hope of Korea." But recognition never came for the provisional government.

When Dr. Rhee returned to Korea in 1945, he went with Army approval as a private citizen who could help unravel the political tangle there. And when the Republic of Korea was finally established in 1948, he became its first president.

PREDICTED COMMUNIST INVASION

Dr. Rhee's plans for Korea were interrupted abruptly in June 1950, when the Communists began to move south across the line of partition as he predicted they would. He resumed his role as a thorn in the side of United States officials with a vengeance when the shooting stopped, denouncing the armistice agreement, threatening repeatedly to renew the war and freeing 27,000 anti-Communist North Korean prisoners of war.

Probably Dr. Rhee's closest personal friend in Washington was the Reverend Frederick Brown Harris, pastor of Foundry Methodist Church. Dr. Harris recalls that he and Mrs. Harris were Dr. Rhee's only companions at a 70th birthday dinner in 1945 and that "my study was the last place to which he came in 1945 before he left for Korea" under the sponsorship of the United States Army. Dr. Rhee said, Dr. Harris explains, "that the study meant so much to him he wanted it to be the place from which he left to return home."

Dr. Harris said that some of Dr. Rhee's friends became discouraged at times over his failure to get the attention of the State Department and the White House, but the silver-haired little Korean "never lost faith; he believed in his cause with a flaming devotion."

SLANDERED AND SMEARED

Dr. Harris considers Dr. Rhee "one of the great men of our generation." He says:

"Syngman Rhee has been slandered and smeared, but there is not a drop of dictatorial blood in his veins. People don't realize what conditions were like in his country or that democracy couldn't be introduced there according to the American pattern. Dr. Rhee is a true believer in democracy."

Dr. Rhee's spirit and love of direct action are revealed by the recollections of Col. M. Preston Goodfellow, publisher and wartime assistant to Gen. William Donovan when he was head of the Office of Strategic Services.

Colonel Goodfellow relates that Dr. Rhee came to him in 1942 and demanded that he be trained as a parachutist and be dropped into Korea to organize anti-Japanese forces. The colonel recalls:

"I asked him how old he was and he said he was 66. I said we didn't have a class for 66-year-old parachutists, but that I could use his help in rounding up some younger men. Dr. Rhee did give us considerable help in recruiting young Koreans who were dropped into China and who were again of assistance during the Korean fighting."

PATIENT FOR 40 YEARS

Dr. Rhee's impatience with delay so far as Korea's independence was concerned often was evidenced when he did get audiences with American officials. Colonel Goodfellow recalls that at one such conference a young officer told Dr. Rhee that he must be patient. "Be patient," exploded Dr. Rhee, "I've been patient for 40 years."

Dr. Harris, Colonel Goodfellow, and other old friends of Dr. Rhee look upon his scheduled cordial reception here as an honor long deferred.

As always in matters concerning Dr. Rhee, however, there are discordant notes. One came from Yongjeung Kim, president of the Korean Affairs Institute, who knew Dr. Rhee during his years here. Mr. Kim commented causticaly that "it would be greatly to the interest of the United States on this occasion to make him (Dr. Rhee) understand he should practice some measure of democracy in South Korea."

Diverse opinions of Dr. Rhee undoubtedly will continue as long as he is a public figure. But he has one characteristic that even his critics must admit—a stanch anticommunism of long standing.

During a conference with a high United States official in Korea in 1946 when the official told Dr. Rhee that he must compromise with the Communists and form a coalition government, the angry Korean broke up the meeting with the angry retort:

" You can't compromise with smallpox."

More Power for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 19, 1954

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I was surprised to learn that there is available to each person in Asia an average of less than 1 horsepower, while in the United States the average is around 30 horsepower.

I am caused to wonder if this ratio of horsepower might not well be related to the difference in standards of living. I also wonder if these great variations in power and living standards might, in a large degree, account for the difficulty in harmony and understanding between these great areas of the earth.

Change in 160-Acre Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR ENGLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 19, 1954

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, the other day I introduced a bill, H. R. 9862, which I hope will be the basis for settling the long-standing controversy over the 160-acre limitation law. This bill does not disturb the 160-acre limitation, but provides for an alternative method of dealing with the so-called excess lands—the lands in one ownership in excess of the 160-acre limitation. Mr. Edward H. Dickson, Washington correspondent for the McClatchy newspapers of California, in an article appearing in the Sacramento Bee under date of July 12, 1954, deals with this legislation in such detail and clarity that I believe his article will be informative to the Members on this subject, and, therefore, I include it at this point in the RECORD:

ENGLE URGES 2 WATER PRICES IN 160 ACRE DISPUTE

(By Edward H. Dickson)

WASHINGTON.—Congressman CLAIRE ENGLE today proposed a 2-price system on irrigation water delivered to farmers from Federal reclamation project in a move to try and settle the long standing controversy over the application of the 160-acre law to California's Central Valleys project.

The Californian, who is the senior Democratic minority member of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee which handles Federal water and power legislation, proposed that while all lands would be eligible to receive water, only those within the 160-acre limit would be eligible for the benefits of interest-free Federal money.

The practical effect of this he said, would be that the 160-acre irrigators served by the CVP would pay the existing rate of $3.50 per acre-foot. The larger operators would pay $3.50 on their first 160 acres and approximately $5.50 on acreage in excess of that amount.

STATE CENTER OF DISPUTE

The Engle measure would be applicable to all projects throughout the Nation but it has been in California where the controversy has been the hottest over a long period of years.

The smaller operators also would be favored further under the Engle proposal in that they would have the first right to water. After they were supplied deliveries could be made to the excess lands.

ENGLE frankly conceded he does not believe his program would satisfy what he termed "the extremists on either side of the 160-acre limitation argument" but argued that it appeared to him to be "a good workable solution of this long-standing controversy."

COMMONSENSE APPROACH

The Congressman said he has "felt for a long time there should be some commonsense approach to the settlement of this problem which would answer basic objections to serving unlimited ownerships with federally subsidized water and at the same times avoid all the Government redtape and legal difficulties involved in applying the limitation to an established agricultural area where the water supplied is supplemental to existing but insufficient supplies."

TIGHT

BOU

those determined to maintain the status quo.

It has been a controversy regarded as outstanding in emotional appeal but with partisans on both sides at times extremely careless in presenting facts.

The 160-acre partisans have assailed what they term "corporate farms," the "Montgomery Street farmers" of San Francisco, the "land barons," and "land speculators."

The opponents of the limitation have countered that the purpose of the 160-acre enthusiasts is to remake the State's social order and claim it never should have been applied to an established agricultural economy.

Life Is an Echo—Slip It to Him

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 19, 1954

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, it appears that since the days of Walt Whitman, Edgar Guest, and Irvin S. Cobb few bards have caught anyone's attention.

A while ago, on Route 2, in Petroleum, W. Va., a very cheerful gas-station operator and attendant, one Billy Knowles, had the following to say on the bestowal of praise and the echo of life which interested me, and which, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert at this point, trusting they will be of interest to others as well:

SLIP IT TO HIM

State of Illinois Favors $22 Million Budget as Minimum for Airport Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 15, 1954

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I herewith include a letter I have received from Mr. Joseph K. McLaughlin, director of the Illinois Department of Aeronautics, calling upon Congress to appropriate at least $22 million for implementation of the airports program for fiscal year 1955:

STATE OF ILLINOIS,
DEPARTMENT OF AERONAUTICS,
Springfield, Ill., July 13, 1954.

Hon. MELVIN PRICE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE PRICE: I have by letter, and Governor Stratton has by telegram, reviously expressed the concern and interest f the State of Illinois and its municipalities n the current and continuing appropria-ions implementation by the Congress of the evelopment of an adequate, balanced ational system of airports under the pro-ram contemplated and authorized by the ederal Airport Act.

The administrative freeze as of February 5, 1953, of all unencumbered FAPA ap-ropriations for fiscal 1953 and the lack of ny appropriations implementation at all for iscal 1954 has very seriously impaired the rrying through of what at the State and has heretofore been considered

HTLY

UND

VES

fol-
Post
some
ional
o our
tions
hina:

me at
entral
tever
d de-
have

"the
It is
these
urned
an an
s.
hard-
emlin
Look
And
on, no
ade to

reau of the Budget can therefore not be onsidered as anything more than minimal.

Considering the very nature of the air-raft vehicle, the economics and utilitarian otential of the airplane by hardheaded usiness concerns, the already substantial nd ever-increasing use in interstate travel y business organizations of national sig-ificance of each of our airports—even the maller ones—as have been improved to a easonable degree of year-round utility, all o to make it very difficult qualitatively to issemble between the action by the De-artment of Commerce in allocating, under he PRA program, funds to each State, not nly for primary interstate highways, but lso specifically for secondary and even intra-ity highways, and on the other hand, under he airports program, the attempt by Com-erce to delimit national interest to only hose airports impressed primarily with a cheduled interstate air-carrier character.

It appears that even the minimal $22 mil-on request, House Document No. 428, is for easons unknown, getting very rough treat-ent in the Appropriations Committees of he House and Senate—while in the respec-ive Committees on Interstate and Foreign ommerce, legislative proposals by Com-erce to give Commerce unlimited discre-ionary administrative power to delimit and etermine national interest has, in the reverse direction, been getting rough treatment.

I would respectfully and urgently request that the representatives in Congress from Illinois prepare en bloc, and with as much other support as possible, to introduce and vigorously back an amendment as will provide at least the $22 million, in the event that either Appropriations Committee report it out with a lesser or no amount for implementation of the airport program for fiscal 1955.

Yours very respectfully,
JOSEPH K. MCLAUGHLIN,
Director.

There are a few hopeful patches, to be sure, here and there in the picture. Guatemala is a gain. Things are better in Iran. Maybe there will be settlements soon between the Italians and Yugoslavs at Trieste, and between the British and Egyptians at Suez. These situations, that were acutely dangerous, are not so dangerous any longer, and in all these cases American diplomacy has helped to make the danger less.

But these local gains have not in any way counteracted the fundamental and all-important tendency, of which the anxious conference at Geneva is only a symbol. With increasing speed, with gathering momentum, the world balance of power is tilting in favor of the Kremlin and against the West. This immense process, which is nowhere being effectively checked, has taken three different forms to date.

First, there are the developments in Indochina, which only Sir Winston Churchill has had the honesty to describe as a smashing victory for the Kremlin. Maybe, at Geneva, the Communist negotiators will carry their arrogance too far. Maybe the Western Allies will nerve themselves to fight at last because they have been denied even the minimum of face saving that is regarded as indispensable. As these words are written, no one can tell.

Yet the outlook, certainly, is for an Asian Munich, followed by an Asian guaranteed Poland in the form of the projected South Asia Defense Community. The so-called containment policy may have been static, undynamic, and all the other bad things people said about it. Yet even static containment would be better than the passive sacrifice of strategically vital Indochina with all its inevitable repercussions in the rest of Asia.

Second, there is the rapid growth of the air-atomic power of the Soviet Union, so symbolized by the Soviet A- and H-bombs, and the new Soviet long-range bombers, the TU-37 and TU-39. Since the war, our only major military effort has been and still is, the decisive American air-atomic superiority. But that asset is being rapidly neutralized, and no replacement is in sight.

Third, there is the powerful disintegrating influence of this growth of Soviet air-atomic power. For example, the British have done everything they could to encourage Munich-like settlement in Asia, simply because they fear an Asian war may turn into a world war, and because they know that the British Isles already are exposed to total destruction. In short, the extreme peril of our allies is already beginning to cripple and perhaps to break up the Western alliance.

It is on the cards, furthermore, that the unfavorable shift of the world power balance will produce other, intensely unpleasant results in the fairly near future. A Communist triumph in Indochina will prepare the way for other Communist triumphs elsewhere in Asia. And in 2 or 3 years, when this country is exposed to total destruction in the way that Britain is exposed already, American policy also will begin to be enfeebled by the consciousness of peril.

These are the hard, basic realities of the present world situation. For insisting on these realities, these reporters have sometimes been called excessively gloomy. But today, there is no competent policymaker in the Eisenhower administration who bothers to deny that these are the realities, at any rate when speaking with the frankness that privacy permits. The shift of the world power balance in the Kremlin's favor now is freely acknowledged, among those few who know the facts.

Their knowledge of that shift, and their fears of its consequences, drove Admiral Radford, Secretary Dulles, and Vice President NIXON to argue hard but unsuccessfully for a bolder American policy in Indochina. The fact of the shift was admitted by implication in the remarkable speech by Admiral Carney, in which he pointed to the two roads ahead for America, and warned that the easy road would lead to utter ruin.

But with the sole exception of Admiral Carney, no leader of the administration has as yet ventured to speak very much of the truth in public. We are reaching the position of the British in the last years of Neville Chamberlain, but we do not even know about it—which makes it all the worse.

The "Mess" in Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 1, 1954

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, too few of us pay any attention to what the young men of our country are thinking. A good insight into that important segment of the American scene is furnished by the following address by Irwin F.

to each person in Asia an average of less than 1 horsepower, while in the United States the average is around 30 horsepower.

I am caused to wonder if this ratio of horsepower might not well be related to the difference in standards of living. I also wonder if these great variations in power and living standards might, in a large degree, account for the difficulty in harmony and understanding between these great areas of the earth.

Change in 160-Acre Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR ENGLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 19, 1954

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, the other day I introduced a bill, H. R. 9862, which I hope will be the basis for settling the long-standing controversy over the 160-acre limitation law. This bill does not disturb the 160-acre limitation, but provides for an alternative method of dealing with the so-called excess lands—the lands in one ownership in excess of the 160-acre limitation. Mr. Edward H. Dickson, Washington correspondent for the McClatchy newspapers of California, in an article appearing in the Sacramento Bee under date of July 12, 1954, deals with this legislation in such detail and clarity that I believe his article will be informative to the Members on this subject, and, therefore, I include it at this point in the Record:

Engle Urges 2 Water Prices in 160 Acre Dispute

(By Edward H. Dickson)

Washington.—Congressman Claire Engle today proposed a 2-price system on irrigation water delivered to farmers from Federal reclamation project in a move to try and settle the long standing controversy over the application of the 160-acre law to California's Central Valleys project.

The Californian, who is the senior Democratic minority member of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee which handles Federal water and power legislation, proposed that while all lands would be eligible to receive water, only those within the 160-acre limit would be eligible for the benefits of interest-free Federal money.

The practical effect of this he said, would be that the 160-acre irrigators served by the CVP would pay the existing rate of $3.50 per acre-foot. The larger operators would pay $3.50 on their first 160 acres and approximately $5.50 on acreage in excess of that amount.

STATE CENTER OF DISPUTE

The Engle measure would be applicable to all projects throughout the Nation but it has been in California where the controversy has been the hottest over a long period of years.

The smaller operators also would be favored further under the Engle proposal in that they would have the first right to water. After they were supplied deliveries could be made to the excess lands.

Engle frankly conceded he does not believe his program would satisfy what he termed "the extremists on either side of the 160-acre limitation argument" but argued that it appeared to him to be "a good workable solution of this long-standing controversy."

COMMONSENSE APPROACH

The Congressman said he has "felt for a long time there should be some commonsense approach to the settlement of this problem which would answer basic objections to serving unlimited ownerships with federally subsidized water and at the same times avoid all the Government redtape and legal difficulties involved in applying the limitation to an established agricultural area where the water supplied is supplemental to existing but insufficient supplies."

HOW IT WOULD WORK

Here is the way the Engle plan would apply on Federal project X where the costs allocated to irrigation development amount to $3 million with 10,000 acres to be served. Of the 10,000 acres, 8,000 are in tracts of 160 acres or less with 2,000 excess acres.

The cost of development would be figured at $300 per acre, $3 million divided by 10,000. The owners of the small tracts would pay back that exactly in water charges over a 40-year period. There would be no interest charge. The owners of the 2,000 excess acres would pay back through water charges the $300 per acre capital investment plus interest which the Government has to pay on its bonds. Currently, interest is running at approximately 2.6 percent.

The excess landowner thus would pay back roughly double the amount assessed against the smaller operator. But he would get water for his land which is denied him now under strict interpretation of the law unless he agrees to sell his excess holdings within 10 years.

* * * * *

The Congressman, who will be chairman of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee in the next Congress if the Democrats win control of the House, believes his proposal would take a lot of sting out of eastern opposition to western reclamation.

He points out a favorite opposition argument is that the East is paying interest on the Government's money invested in reclamation projects and that the benefits sometimes go to wealthy operators.

BEING REALISTIC

In being skeptical about what he terms "extremists on either side," Engle is being realistic about the attitude of those who see the 160-acre limitation as a vehicle to revamp the California agricultural economy and those determined to maintain the status quo.

It has been a controversy regarded as outstanding in emotional appeal but with partisans on both sides at times extremely careless in presenting facts.

The 160-acre partisans have assailed what they term "corporate farms," the "Montgomery Street farmers" of San Francisco, the "land barons," and "land speculators."

The opponents of the limitation have countered that the purpose of the 160-acre enthusiasts is to remake the State's social order and claim it never should have been applied to an established agricultural economy.

Life Is an Echo—Slip It to Him

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 19, 1954

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, it appears that since the days of Walt Whitman, Edgar Guest, and Irvin S. Cobb few bards have caught anyone's attention.

A while ago, on Route 2, in Petroleum, W. Va., a very cheerful gas-station operator and attendant, one Billy Knowles, had the following to say on the bestowal of praise and the echo of life which interested me, and which, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert at this point, trusting they will be of interest to others as well:

Slip It to Him

If with pleasure
You are viewing
Any work a man is doing
If you like him,
If you love him,
Don't withhold your approbation
Till the parson makes oration
And he lives with snowy lilies over his
brow.

For, no matter how you shout it,
He won't really care about it;
He won't know how many teardrops you have
shed.
If you think some praise is due him
Now's the time to slip it to him,
For he cannot read his tombstone when he's
dead.

More than fame
And more than money
Is the comment
Kind and sunny and
The hearty approval of a friend.

For it gives to life a saver
Makes you stronger, braver
Gives you strength and courage to the end.
If he earns your praise, bestow it
If you like him, let him know it.

Born in Scotland, Mr. Knowles, a United States Army veteran of World War I, proud father of a Navy veteran and a nurse who served Uncle Sam in World War II, had this to say on life:

Life Is an Echo

Life is an echo;
It all comes back
The good, the false, the true;
So give to the world
The best you have,
And the best will come back to you.

State of Illinois Favors $22 Million Budget as Minimum for Airport Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 15, 1954

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I herewith include a letter I have received from Mr. Joseph K. McLaughlin, director of the Illinois Department of Aeronautics, calling upon Congress to appropriate at least $22 million for implementation of the airports program for fiscal year 1955:

State of Illinois,
Department of Aeronautics,
Springfield, Ill., July 13, 1954.

Hon. Melvin Price,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Representative Price: I have by letter, and Governor Stratton has by telegram, previously expressed the concern and interest of the State of Illinois and its municipalities in the current and continuing appropriations implementation by the Congress of the development of an adequate, balanced national system of airports under the program contemplated and authorized by the Federal Airport Act.

The administrative freeze as of February 15, 1953, of all unencumbered FAPA appropriations for fiscal 1953 and the lack of any appropriations implementation at all for fiscal 1954 has very seriously impaired the carrying through of what at the State and local level has heretofore been considered to be a full partnership undertaking. Particularly, where there have been substantial local changes of position, by way of land-acquisition costs, engineering costs, and general-obligation bond issues upon good-faith reliance upon the letter and spirit of the act and Federal programs and design requirements of the Civil Aeronautics Administration, there is a very distinct feeling that under any concept of good faith and credit and intergovernmental concomity, independent of what may be the administration policy as to completely new airport projects proposed in the future, there should as an irreducible minimum be a carry-through by the Federal Government on projects where there has been such reliance and change of position.

Further, due to congressional appropriations in any given year falling far short of the schedule contemplated in the act, local sponsors have, in order to get a usable and useful facility into being, deferred Federal financial participating reimbursement on land-acquisition costs in order to apply such limited Federal funds wholly upon construction. Accordingly, CAA Administrator Lee's recent statement before the House Appropriations Committee that not more than $5 million could be definitely nailed down for expenditure in fiscal 1955 is totally incomprehensible; these deferred costs alone, irrespective of new construction, would absorb that much. Analysis submitted by the American Municipal Association, the American Association of Airport Executives, the Conference of Mayors, and the National Association of State Aviation Officials of needed new construction for which there is available State and local matching funds, points to the requirement of a congressional FAAP appropriation for fiscal 1955 of between fifty and sixty million dollars. The $22 million FAAP budgetary request approved by the Bureau of the Budget can therefore not be considered as anything more than minimal.

Considering the very nature of the aircraft vehicle, the economics and utilitarian potential of the airplane by hardheaded business concerns, the already substantial and ever-increasing use in interstate travel by business organizations of national significance of each of our airports—even the smaller ones—as have been improved to a reasonable degree of year-round utility, all go to make it very difficult qualitatively to dissemble between the action by the Department of Commerce in allocating, under the PRA program, funds to each State, not only for primary interstate highways, but also specifically for secondary and even intracity highways, and on the other hand, under the airports program, the attempt by Commerce to delimit national interest to only those airports impressed primarily with a scheduled interstate air-carrier character.

It appears that even the minimal $22 million request, House Document No. 428, is for reasons unknown, getting very rough treatment in the Appropriations Committees of the House and Senate—while in the respective Committees on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, legislative proposals by Commerce to give Commerce unlimited discretionary administrative power to delimit and determine national interest has, in the reverse direction, been getting rough treatment.

I would respectfully and urgently request that the representatives in Congress from Illinois prepare en bloc, and with as much other support as possible, to introduce and vigorously back an amendment as will provide at least the $22 million, in the event that either Appropriations Committee report it out with a lesser or no amount for implementation of the airport program for fiscal 1955.

Yours very respectfully,
JOSEPH K. MCLAUGHLIN,
Director.

Geneva and the Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 19, 1954

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial in the Washington Post and Times-Herald of today reveals some thoughts regarding our international problems which could be valuable to our State Department in future negotiations with the Kremlin and Communist China:

RUNES AND REALITIES

(By Joseph and Stewart Alsop)

While the world waits for the outcome at Geneva, it is already time to face the central fact in the American situation. Whatever happens to Indochina, the foreign and defense policies of the last 18 months just have not worked.

"Liberation," "recaptured initiative," "the New Look," "massive retaliation." It is downright unkind, nowadays, to recall these optimistic catchwords, which have turned out to have no more practical value than an old countrywoman's runes to cure warts.

No one has been liberated. There is hardly a region in the world where the Kremlin does not have the initiative. The New Look has turned out to be the new weakness. And after all the talk of massive retaliation, no serious and decisive effort has been made to prevent an Asian Munich.

There are a few hopeful patches, to be sure, here and there in the picture. Guatemala is a gain. Things are better in Iran. Maybe there will be settlements soon between the Italians and Yugoslavs at Trieste, and between the British and Egyptians at Suez. These situations, that were acutely dangerous, are not so dangerous any longer, and in all these cases American diplomacy has helped to make the danger less.

But these local gains have not in any way counteracted the fundamental and all-important tendency, of which the anxious conference at Geneva is only a symbol. With increasing speed, with gathering momentum, the world balance of power is tilting in favor of the Kremlin and against the West. This immense process, which is nowhere being effectively checked, has taken three different forms to date.

First, there are the developments in Indochina, which only Sir Winston Churchill has had the honesty to describe as a smashing victory for the Kremlin. Maybe, at Geneva, the Communist negotiators will carry their arrogance too far. Maybe the Western Allies will nerve themselves to fight at last because they have been denied even the minimum of face saving that is regarded as indispensable. As these words are written, no one can tell.

Yet the outlook, certainly, is for an Asian Munich, followed by an Asian guaranteed Poland in the form of the projected South Asia Defense Community. The so-called containment policy may have been static, undynamic, and all the other bad things people said about it. Yet even static containment would be better than the passive sacrifice of strategically vital Indochina with all its inevitable repercussions in the rest of Asia.

Second, there is the rapid growth of the air-atomic power of the Soviet Union, so symbolized by the Soviet A- and H-bombs, and the new Soviet long-range bombers, the TU-37 and TU-39. Since the war, our only major military effort has been and still is, the decisive American air-atomic superiority. But that asset is being rapidly neutralized, and no replacement is in sight.

Third, there is the powerful disintegrating influence of this growth of Soviet air-atomic power. For example, the British have done everything they could to encourage Munich-like settlement in Asia, simply because they fear an Asian war may turn into a world war, and because they know that the British Isles already are exposed to total destruction. In short, the extreme peril of our allies is already beginning to cripple and perhaps to break up the Western alliance.

It is on the cards, furthermore, that the unfavorable shift of the world power balance will produce other, intensely unpleasant results in the fairly near future. A Communist triumph in Indochina will prepare the way for other Communist triumphs elsewhere in Asia. And in 2 or 3 years, when this country is exposed to total destruction in the way that Britain is exposed already, American policy also will begin to be enfeebled by the consciousness of peril.

These are the hard, basic realities of the present world situation. For insisting on these realities, these reporters have sometimes been called excessively gloomy. But today, there is no competent policymaker in the Eisenhower administration who bothers to deny that these are the realities, at any rate when speaking with the frankness that privacy permits. The shift of the world power balance in the Kremlin's favor now is freely acknowledged, among those few who know the facts.

Their knowledge of that shift, and their fears of its consequences, drove Admiral Radford, Secretary Dulles, and Vice President NIXON to argue hard but unsuccessfully for a bolder American policy in Indochina. The fact of the shift was admitted by implication in the remarkable speech by Admiral Carney, in which he pointed to the two roads ahead for America, and warned that the easy road would lead to utter ruin.

But with the sole exception of Admiral Carney, no leader of the administration has as yet ventured to speak very much of the truth in public. We are reaching the position of the British in the last years of Neville Chamberlain, but we do not even know about it—which makes it all the worse.

The "Mess" in Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 1, 1954

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, too few of us pay any attention to what the young men of our country are thinking. A good insight into that important segment of the American scene is furnished by the following address by Irwin F.

Deutsch, delivered by him on June 11, 1954, at Amhert College, coincident with graduation therefrom:

THE "MESS" IN WASHINGTON

It is said that the cherry blossoms in Washington are quite beautiful this year, but the denizens of the Nation's Capital have lately been spending an unusual amount of time indoors; the reason, of course, is the modern passion play curently occupying television screens. Two years ago a newspaper editor asked Adlai Stevenson what he thought of the "mess" in Washington. Surely few of us would deny the suitability of the word to today's political scene.

There are probably few colleges where Senator McCarthy's name does not figure in commencement addresses this month, and I note that Johnson Chapel tonight is not one of the exceptions. But I submit that the junior Senator from Wisconsin is not wholly responsible for all the "mess" in Washington today. With your kind indulgence, I should like to dwell for a few minutes upon certain aspects of the Washington scene exclusive of Senator McCarthy's antics.

For the past 17 months the executive branch of the Federal Government has been the Eisenhower administration. Great changes were predicted and promised in 1952. Let us see what sort of changes have taken place. Walter Lippmann traveled extensively in Europe last year; upon his return he wrote that American influence abroad was "declining precipitously as the Eisenhower administration displays its weakness and indecision." According to Lippmann, Europeans "feel that President Eisenhower has failed to assert his legitimate authority." A similar, though gentler estimate was voiced by another world traveler, Adlai Stevenson.

Despite Defense Secretary Wilson's exhortations against atom-bomb rattling, Secretary of State Dulles appears to have succeeded in scaring our allies, if not our enemies, by his threats of massive retaliation. His failure to consult with our allies before policy statements has not endeared this country abroad. High-pressure tactics at Caracas a few months ago won us few friends below the Rio Grande, and Mr. Dulles' tactful consideration in allowing Western Europe 75 days in which to unify their armies after centuries of history was regrettably misunderstood as peremptory. Needless to say, the 75 days have long since come and gone. Chester Bowles was recalled from India, where he had won many friends for America; Mrs. Clare Booth Luce became our Ambassadress to Italy, where a somewhat different reaction has since obtained.

The bipartisan foreign policy engineered by two presidents who, we are now told, administered "20 years of treason," appears to have fallen upon evil days: Some Democrats wish to be let in on the takeoffs as well as the crash landings. Yet, the support offered the administration by the party out of power often contrasts peculiarly with the barbs aimed at the President's foreign policy by the leaders of his own party, including his Senate majority leader.

A New Look defense policy was announced, but has aged rapidly with the aid of numerous clarifications. Apparently it was based partly on the principle of strengthening our Armed Forces by cutting defense appropriations; fortunately, this policy was discarded before we halved our defense expenditures in order to double our strength. Our new policy was to be massive retaliation: Vice President Nixon thought this meant primary reliance upon atomic weapons, but this error was soon clarified. Ingenuous observers remarked that the Soviets too had atomic weapons. The administration solved this problem by cutting down the Air Force, evidently unaware of the late General Arnold's dictum that a second-best air force has exactly the same value as a second-best poker hand.

Domestic policies have been similarly coherent. Interior Secretary McKay testified before a House committe studying tariffs. Congressman Eberharter, of Pennsylvania, could not understand what the Secretary's prepared statement meant and therefore asked him. Mr. McKay's reply was at least as frank as it was enlightening: "I don't know what it means—I didn't write it."

The administration tax bill seems to be a revival of the old trickle down theory: Instead of reducing taxes to increase consumer purchasing power, further relief is granted industry for expansion. Yet, several automobile factories, for example, are operating on a part-time basis, and the steel industry is working at only 74 percent of present capacity.

That word recession has once again reared its ugly head. Professor Slichter, of Harvard, said recently that the "executive branch of the Government has shown a surprising lack of initiative and enterprise in fighting the recession. * * * The level of unemployment, which the administration regards as justifying action, seems to be considerably higher than the people of the country will find tolerable."

In other areas the administration's actions have seemed positively reprehensible. Discharged security risks were so variously calculated by the administration as to bring about a new parlor and committee-room pastime, the "numbers game." Mr. Shanley, counsel to the President, spoke of 1,456 subversives, but later admitted that such was not the case; other reports presented figures ranging up to 2,486. The Republican National Committee issued a pamphlet about the approximately 1,500 Communists, fellow travelers, etc., but these persons turned out to be individuals who left Government jobs for various reasons, not necessarily questionable loyalty, by resignation as well as discharge. Indeed, included in the figures were civil servants who left one position with the Government to take another higher one.

Attorney General Brownell's treatment of the Harry Dexter White case was also reprehensible. The Alsop brothers report that the lost 1945 F. B. I. report on White and others was the basis for proceedings before two grand juries that sat for 36 months but were unable to vote an indictment because corollary evidence was lacking. When Whittaker Chambers' "pumpkin papers" were provided, White was no longer alive. Furthermore, the man in direct charge of the White case was Thomas E. Donegan, today a special assistant to Mr. Brownell and the very man he selected to represent him with the National Security Council.

Contempt of Congress is a violation of Federal law, but the actions of certain Members of Congress have been truly contemptible, and have at times been noted with tacit acquiescence by their colleagues. One-man star-chamber hearings have browbeaten and slandered distinguished citizens, and offered distortions of secret testimony to the public press. Senator Langer publicized unverified hearsay charges against Chief Justice Warren. Irresponsible attacks on our Foreign Service and the United States Information Service have weakened those agencies dangerously. The Constitution was recklessly rewritten on the Senate floor: Senator Knowland defended his vote for the George amendment despite its obscure wording on the ground that the House could always correct it. Mr. Knowland, the majority leader, spoke against the George amendment for the administration, and then changed his seat to vote for the amendment. Last summer he journeyed to the Far East and declared that we would not be satisfied by anything short of unconditional victory by the French in Indochina; the next day, French Government spokesmen reminded him of the Korean settlement, and indicated that France, too, would accept a cessation of hostilities on honorable terms.

In the House, Congressman Velde, acting without consultation with his colleagues, issued subpenas for a former President of the United States, a Justice of the Supreme Court, and the Governor of the State of South Carolina. Congressman Reece's committee is currently seeking data to substantiate its a priori findings that a conspiratorial plot existed among educators to prepare the American people to endorse such leftist measures as social security.

It would, indeed, be difficult to compete with the television screen today and my fellow orators tonight in discussing the junior Senator from Wisconsin. Fortunately, some of his unsavory actions have been receiving wider attention recently, and there seems less need to add to his own self-denigration. But it is worth recalling that members of his own party were far from articulate in defense of Presidents Roosevelt and Truman, Secretary of State Acheson, General Marshall, the United Nations, and the other targets of Senator McCarthy's vituperations. Even after J. B. Matthews had attacked the Protestant clergy, the 4 Republican members of the McCarthy subcommittee voted their chairman 1 man absolute authority over staff appointments and discharges. The St. Louis Post-Dispatch commented in September of last year: "Let the Republican leaders never complain at the trouble that McCarthy causes this administration. It is they who have made him what he is." In October of 1952 General Eisenhower met the Senator at Peoria; the next day in Wisconsin he deleted his intended defense of his friend and wartime chief, General Marshall. Republican national chairman, Leonard Hall, repeatedly praised McCarthy; it is only recently that his public position has undergone change. In March of 1953 Harold Stassen accused McCarthy of undermining State and Defense Department negotiations with foreign governments, but withdrew his remark after a White House conference. And in the present controversy, Army Secretary Stevens was apparently left without the support of his superiors until the die had been irrevocably cast. Yet President Eisenhower's position has never been publicly changed: he favors the election of every Republican over every Democrat for every office any place.

Part of the "mess" in Washington today may be attributed to the doctrine of the separation of powers, which can result in competition rather than cooperation in the exercise of public authority by executive, legislature, and judiciary. But our constitutional structure is not responsible for all of today's "mess": it has worked satisfactorily in the past, indeed, in the very recent past, when Presidents were not overly diffident about exercising the leadership requisite to the determination and execution of sound public policy, particularly through the extra-constitutional party machinery. This President Eisenhower has thus far failed to do.

I have endeavored to present some facts to indicate that the Eisenhower political crusade, unlike the Eisenhower military crusade in Europe, has been singularly abortive. I am aware that this compilation may be viewed as partisan and one-sided; of course, Democratic Senator McCarren has done his very best to amend the inscription on the Statue of Liberty, and other Democrats are not suficiently above approach to serve as Caesar's wife. But I have chosen this topic in order to examine the results of the Republican crusade 17 months after its assumption of power, and I submit that my presentation has not been an inaccurate image of an administration that has led many who "liked Ike" to acute disenchantment. The Republicans in 1952 won the ballots of many Americans who will, I trust, acknowledge candidly their profound disappointment at their next trip to the polls.

A Postage Stamp To Commemorate 100 Years of Professional Entomology

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROY W. WIER

OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 19, 1954

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include a letter from Mr. T. L. Aamodt, director, division of plant industry, department of agriculture, dairy, and food, State of Minnesota, concerning a request to Postmaster General Summerfield for a 3-cent postage stamp commemorating 100 years of professional entomology.

The letter is as follows:

STATE OF MINNESOTA,
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
DAIRY AND FOOD,
DIVISION OF PLANT INDUSTRY,
St. Paul, Minn., July 13, 1954.

Hon. ROY W. WIER,
Member, House of Representatives,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE WIER: The profession of entomology is 100 years old this year. The people of the United States are now among the healthiest and best fed of any on earth, in part because of contributions made by some 6,500 entomologists during the period 1854–1954.

I am a member of a committee representing the State of Minnesota established to commemorate these 100 years. We chose this year of commemoration as a means to more fully inform the general public about its future insect problems. We believe this project worthy of a 3-cent postage stamp to help bring such problems to the attention of the greatest number of Americans.

May we earnestly urge you to lend your support to our attempt to have this stamp printed by the Post Office Department?

Entomology has accomplished much for the American public. It is not generally known, but none the less true, that without the benefit from research in entomology during the past 100 years, and the resulting application of recommended control measures by the American public, that insects would probably destroy at least half the annual per acre production of agricultural crops and livestock in this country. In the absence of such research and applied results, thousands of people would die and hundreds of thousands would be ill each year from diseases that insects carry. The economy of this country might not be what it is today; it might in fact have been brought to a standstill if it had not been for the efforts of entomological scientists.

In Minnesota we have now established in my office of the State Entomologist what I believe is an extremely efficient insect detection and information service. We have a staff of high caliber entomologists who are able to determine in numerous instances in advance what the farmer must do to save his crop from insect and plant disease enemies. The grass hopper situation is now such that we actually feel there should never be any excuse for tremendous outbreaks in the future due to our methods of detection and control. You have noticed in numerous of our releases that our program is now one of prevention because of the adoption of new scientific methods which we have brought into this field of work. At the present time, we are dealing with an outbreak of armyworm. Because the outbreak was detected early enough, excellent control is now being carried out by thousands of farmers in southern and western Minnesota. The forest tent caterpillar of northern Minnesota has been successfully and efficiently dealt with during its periodic outbreak. The close coordination between extension, research, teaching and regulatory pest work in this State is unusual and outstanding. The control of insects in Minnesota because of the adoption of scientific and up-to-date methods is a far cry from even 15 to 20 years ago. It is absolutely necessary that we continue to make insect control more efficient if we are going to continue to supply the necessary food and other materials from plants in years to come.

Sincerely yours,

T. L. AAMODT,
Director and State Entomologist.

P. S.—I am sure this subject needs no further elaboration because you will recall that I have tried to keep you posted on the important entomological activities in our State since your election to office. As busy as I know you are, I hope you can help me with this.

Philanthropic Mayor Gives Break to Bowling Green's Taxpayers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER

OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 19, 1954

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an article written by the distinguished newspaper reporter, Harry Bolser, which appeared in the July 17, 1954, issue of the Courier-Journal, of Louisville, Ky., entitled "Philanthropic Mayor Gives Break to Bowling Green's Taxpayers."

My good friend, C. W. Lampkin, is one of Kentucky's outstanding citizens. A public leader who loves his city enough to give of his time and energy to serve as mayor, as it were, without pay. And last, but not least, his successful career in the field of business has enabled him to carry on in his capacity as mayor in a most noteworthy manner. The people of Bowling Green will, I am certain, not only benefit by the charitable causes he is assisting, in turning his salary over to such purposes, but will prosper under his administration of their city government.

As pointed out by Harry Bolser, C. W. Lampkin is possessed of a deep, sentimental feeling for his hometown, and as Mr. Lampkin says:

> Bowling Green is a wonderful little town. It has just needed someone to take care of it.

The article is as follows:

PHILANTHROPIC MAYOR GIVES BREAK TO BOWLING GREEN'S TAXPAYERS
(By Harry Bolser)

BOWLING GREEN, KY., July 16.—This is one Kentucky municipality in which the taxpayers are getting a break—thanks to the city's philanthropic mayor and council.

After Bowling Green was changed from a third- to a second-class rating a year ago, C. W. Lampkin, hotel operator, decided it was time to do something about the conduct of the town's business. Like many Kentucky cities Bowling Green's expenses were running beyond its income and the taxpayers were footing the bill.

NOT SATISFIED WITH BEING APPOINTED

Lampkin was one of a large group of Bowling Green businessmen who had opposed a 15-cent tax-rate increase by the city commission when the town was still in the third-class bracket.

After the classification change, Bowling Green shifted to the council-alderman form of government, and Governor Wetherby named Lampkin as mayor. But Lampkin didn't want it that easily. He ran for mayor for an interim period and was elected by a large majority. Now he is assured of a 4-year term because he has no opposition in the coming election.

There is little wonder no one came out against the genial, hard-plugging hotel operator for the long term. It was a case of citizens knowing and appreciating an efficient, businesslike head of the town when they saw one in action and wanting to keep him in office.

Believing that public officials should serve their communities without thought of pay, Lampkin has not pocketed one penny of his $333.33 monthly salary since he became mayor nearly 6 months ago.

When the city's legal department advised him he could not serve without drawing a salary, Lampkin replied: "Well, I'm going to give every penny of it for the welfare of the community."

His honor, Bowling Green's philanthropic mayor, has done exactly that with the five paychecks he has received thus far.

The first one was turned over to the Bowling Green Boys' Club. The second went to the Baptist Mission in the city. The third was used to illuminate and beautify Fountain Square, the park in the center of the downtown business section. The fourth was handed to the welfare center to aid needy families. The fifth was given to the Negro Boys' Club.

In addition, Mayor Lampkin paid $100 out of his own pocket for reclamation of the Negro cemetery and paid for landscaping the city hall lawn.

"As long as I draw a salary as mayor of Bowling Green it will be turned over to an organization that is working for the betterment of our city," Lampkin has vowed.

One of the first official acts of Mayor Lampkin's administration—12 councilmen and 4 aldermen—after it took office 6 months ago was to cut off the 15-cent tax raise voted by the preceding administration. Lampkin's group also reduced water rates charged the small consumer and put the municipal golf course on a paying basis.

CITY PAYS AS IT GOES

"We were able to reduce the tax rate, because we cut operating expenses and put the city on a pay-as-you-go basis," Mayor Lampkin said.

The mayor said his administration has been making tax revenue take care of expenses and, for the first time in the city's history, has not been forced to borrow money in lieu of tax collections.

One of the many expense items Lampkin said he found when he took office was a $100-a-month entertainment fund for the mayor. He said he abolished that fund and returned the money to the city's general fund.

Possessed of a deep sentimental feeling for his hometown, Lampkin says, "Bowling Green is a wonderful little town. It has just needed someone to take care of it."

Railroad Retirement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD H. POFF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 19, 1954

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, I understand that the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has favorably reported H. R. 7840, pertaining to the Railroad Retirement Act. The bill is now before the Rules Committee awaiting a rule for floor debate.

It happens that approximately 1 out of every 10 people in the Sixth Congressional District of Virginia, which I have the honor to represent, depends directly upon railroad wages for his livelihood. Naturally, all of these people are interested in obtaining as many benefits as possible under the railroad-retirement plan. At the same time, they are also concerned that this plan should be and remain financially sound and strong. They feel, as I feel, that the benefits they now receive are little enough in comparison with the high premium they and their employer pay. That rate is 6¼ cents on each dollar earned, up to $300 a month. A like amount is paid by the railroad company. H. R. 7840 proposes to raise the taxable wage to $350 a month. This will mean an additional cost to each worker of $3.12½ per month. It will also mean a similar increase in the amount to be contributed by the railroad company. On the other hand, the additional benefits proposed by the measure are extremely meager.

I wish to call to the attention of the Honorable CHARLES A. WOLVERTON, chairman of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee and the Honorable LEO ALLEN, chairman of the House Rules Committee that I have on my desk a petition, signed by 208 Norfolk & Western railroad workers in Roanoke, Va., in the following language:

DEAR CHAIRMAN WOLVERTON: We, the undersigned, are opposed to H. R. 7840 recently reported out of your committee for the following reasons:

1. To increase the taxable base from $300 to $350 would cost the worker and the railroad an additional tax of $3.12½ each per month and would increase the pension only 5 cents per month. That looks like a fine investment, but for whom?

2. This base change would only benefit the labor union leaders who draw their pay from the unions and the employees of the Railroad Retirement Board.

3. More than 90 percent of the rail workers earn less than $350.

4. Most of the major railroads have a supplemental pension plan which takes care of all earnings over the present base of $300 and which cost less and pay more than the Railroad Retirement Act.

5. Should the taxable base be increased, the railroads would start their supplemental plan at $350, thereby cancelling the plan with respect to those earning between $300 and $350. For example, an employee with 50 years' service who averaged $350 per month for the last 10 years would receive a $25 pension.

6. If the railroads can pay this kind of pension for 4½ percent, it is high time the Congress finds out what is the matter with the Railroad Retirement Act.

7. As for the balance of this bill, the so-called benefits are worthless, meaningless, and impracticable of application.

I favor H. R. 5269, sponsored by the Rail Pension Forum, which is composed of 80 percent of the railroad workers, and which will give direct benefits to those who pay the bill.

Respectfully yours.

I also have in my files a photostatic copy of a petition bearing 270 names addressed to Senator H. ALEXANDER SMITH, chairman of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, urging that committee to hold hearings on S. 1911. This is the companion bill to H. R. 5269 on which I testified before the House committee on June 2.

In view of these petitions and as a result of my personal conversations with many of my railroad friends, I am persuaded that a poll of the individual railroad workers would disclose almost universal support for H. R. 5269 and S. 1911 and opposition to an increase in the taxable base.

If the railroad workers thought that they were now receiving all of the benefits they are paying for, I believe that all of them would be willing to pay a little more for reasonable additional benefits. But as long as they can compare their premiums and their benefits with the premiums and benefits available under a commercial insurance policy and find that they are paying for more than they are getting, they are going to resist any effort to increase the taxable base. They realize, of course, that they cannot get something for nothing and they do not want something for nothing. All they want is a dollar's worth of benefits for a dollar's worth of premium. Since the railroad retirement fund belongs not to the Federal Government but to the railroadmen themselves, it seems to me that we, as the trustees of the fund, should lend a sympathetic ear to its owners.

Big Housing Project for Negroes Fails

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. L. FORRESTER

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 19, 1954

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Evening Star of Saturday, July 17, 1954, carried on its front page a news item captioned "Big Housing Project for Negroes Fails."

Reading of that news item identifies that project as the swank Rhode Island Plaza, 413-unit interracial apartment at 1300 Rhode Island Avenue NE., in the District of Columbia. The article states that the FHA from the start regarded the project as an important experiment, and that the project received wide publicity as one of the first and biggest of its type to have Federal backing. The FHA guaranteed a mortgage loan which was made by the New York Life Insurance Co. to finance this great experiment in interracial living to the amount of $3,594,000.

Now, Mr. Speaker, according to the above news item, the great experiment has failed, and the New York Life Insurance Co. has notified the FHA that mortgage payments have not been met and that sufficient occupancy has not been obtained to make the project a successful project, and that said life insurance company is calling upon the FHA to pay the mortgage as it guaranteed it would do.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, when the radicals and wild-eyed leftwingers and mongrelizers are given an opportunity to join in these socialized experiments they refuse to do so. The taxpayers of the United States will have to pay for this blunder, unless the advocates of interracial mixing will come to their rescue, as they certainly ought to do. Maybe the members of the ADA will do their duty and move into this apartment project with their families and encourage others to do so. Maybe the officials in the FHA who thought this was a wonderful idea, to such an extent that they gambled taxpayers' money therein, will also move into this project with their families. Maybe those who endorse the recent United States Supreme Court decision will practice what was advocated in that psychological decision abolishing segregated schools and the United States Constitution, and save this experiment. That decision said "separate educational facilities are inherently unequal." If that is true, then separate living quarters are inherently unequal.

I understand that public schools are maintained by taxpayers' money, but this project was also guaranteed by taxpayers' money. A wonderful opportunity is presented to all these people to at last prove that they are honest in what they have advocated, and it is now time for them to move into this project, taking care that the interracial idea is scrupulously and uniformly maintained. If that project was good enough for others, certainly it is good enough for them and by moving into that project they can help salvage something for the taxpayers that they bound to pay this mortgage.

It is time now for these so-called leaders who are always crying "discrimination" to practice what they preach, for up to now that crowd has been living in the most exclusive sections of Washington, and it is high time they come out of hiding and prove they believe what they would put on less fortunate people.

Certainly it does not go unnoticed that the advocates for abolishing segregated schools are sending their children to private schools—notably the United States Attorney General, who filed a brief asking that segregated schools be abolished although the law and the Constitution was against it.

Mr. Speaker, I am wondering if the failure of this project does not teach us a great lesson? Evidently, decent white people and decent Negroes simply do not care to mix. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the next time a project like this is undertaken that it will be at the expense of those who advocate these experiments, instead of the taxpayers of this country who are not permitted to say yes or no to these wild and unjustified ventures.

No Friendship Dividend Sought for Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HOMER THORNBERRY

OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 19, 1954

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, in the July 16 issue of the Austin American, in Austin, Tex., there appeared a splendid editorial discussing the objectives of the United States in providing economic and military assistance under the foreign-aid program.

Because I think that all of the Members of Congress, regardless of their views, will be interested in reading it, I ask that the editorial be printed in the Record. It is as follows:

No Friendship Dividend Sought for Foreign Aid

In the debate on the $3,470,000,000 foreign-aid bill, Representative Clarence Brown of Ohio made an argument that bears a careful, critical look.

Noting that the United States has poured out more than $141 billion in aid since 1940 (and here he obviously is including lend-lease in World War II), Brown said we "now have more enemies and less friends than we started."

Implicit in this statement is the notion that we have sought to "buy friendship" abroad with American dollars, and have failed. A good many lawmakers in recent years have been making similar comment, often quite outspokenly and in the manner of one making a great revelation.

Actually, no sensible legislator or diplomat ever imagines that money purchases the affection of foreign peoples. Aid can help to cement existing friendships, or help to develop them. But many other important factors must also be present.

We have not given assistance to many nations, in war and peace, in the hope of thereby winning their unwavering loyalty to all American's views.

We have given it because we want these countries to remain free for their own sake, and because they must stay free if they are to be a part of our own defensive barrier against communism.

In some instances, we have quite understood that the recipients of aid might not only disagree with us on many things, but actively dislike us. But that has not kept us from extending the aid, and it should not.

Thus the point about what friendships we have or have not won with our dollars is largely irrelevant. The real question is: "Are the peoples we have helped still free and in a position to aid the cause of freedom in the world (including America)?"

The answer must be a resounding "yes," with the single possible exception of Indochina, now tottering on the brink. But Indochina has been embroiled in a war most of the time since aid programs have been operating.

Is there any doubt what would have been the fate of France and Italy, and perhaps others, if we had not granted substantial assistance in the dark days after World War II?

As for the statement that we now have more enemies, the fact is we have made no new enemies since the Communist coup in Czechoslovakia in 1948, the very year our vast postwar aid program began.

We do indeed have enemies today that we did not have in 1940. But these consist of Russia proper, of its European satellites brought to heel by the Red army or the threat of it, of Communist China, and of the Red puppets of Russia and China in North Korea and Indochina.

These became our enemies not because any aid program failed but because Communist leaders after the war returned to their goal of global conquest, and had the power of the Russian and Chinese armies to back up their determination.

All the gold in Fort Knox could not have removed a single Red foot soldier from the soil of Rumania, or Hungary, or East Germany.

Foreign aid justifies itself as a great support to the free world system. It is not essential that the system be lubricated with honeyed words of friendship.

Massive Economic Effects of the St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 15, 1954

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I noted with interest the article from the Magazine of Wall Street which I am now including in the appendix. Prepared by McLellan Smith, a journalist whom many of us in the House know, I think it is one of the most objective analyses of the economic effects of the St. Lawrence seaway which has come to my attention, and I would recommend it to the Members' consideration.

The article follows:

Massive Economic Effects of St. Lawrence Seaway

(By McLellan Smith)

After 2 decades of frustration, punctuated by intermittent and often heated congressional debate, the St. Lawrence seaway, which will directly link the Great Lakes with the Atlantic Ocean and the sea lanes of the world, to become a reality under the joint sponsorship and financing of the United States and Canada. Recent enactment of legislation necessary to our participation in the project was the first major accomplishment in the Eisenhower "dynamic" program.

Over the years, seaway proponents have painted glowing pictures of its economic advantages, while opponents have vigorously prophesied dire consequences to large segments of our national economy. Both sides to the contrary put forward seemingly unanswerable arguments. Consequently, the analyst who turns to recorded congressional hearings, engineering reports and other data finds himself compelled to "take a grain of salt" with some of the claims and counterclaims put forward. Yet the long range economic effects are obvious.

Before describing the various angles in connection with the seaway, it is worth while emphasizing the fact that whether completion takes a shorter or longer period than planned for, the economic effects are bound to be monumental, particularly with regard to specific industries. These may be ranked as shipping, some railroads, steel and strategic materials, including nickel and titanium, coal and grain products.

The cost of the seaway may well come to $5 billion or so but this is comparatively insignificant in comparison with the tens of billions of business dollars that will be generated within a decade after completion. After having made this statement, it is now time to look at the problems involved in sober fashion. It will be seen that the ramifications are immense and the problems quite complicated.

It will be a matter of a few years before the seaway becomes a traffic artery of real capacity. In the meantime, industry and our economy will not be static, nor will our Atlantic and gulf coast ports sit idly by, waiting for the coming waterway to put them out of business. They will have to move definitely. Port facilities will be enlarged and improved to meet the new competition and, of far more importance, be ready to supply the needs of an overall economy which assuredly will expand in the time it will take to complete the new water route.

In the opening paragraph the writer referred to the seaway as something which will directly link the Great Lakes ports with the Atlantic Ocean and the sea lanes of the world. However, it should be understood that the presently planned depth of the seaway—27 feet—is not deep for large oceangoing traffic, while the Great Lakes ports are shallower than that, running from 21 feet at Chicago to a maximum of 27 feet at Cleveland. The Great Lakes ports will yet become handlers of through waterborne traffic to and from the marts of the world, but that will come only after we spend several billion dollars in dredging Great Lakes ports to depths which will accommodate seagoing vessels of approximately 27-foot draft. But, these are problems of a somewhat distant future. Let us turn to what is more practical: What we can or may see now, the new economic advantages to the United States and Canada, as well as some of the possible harm to certain of our own industries and our coastal ports.

TWO VITAL PHASES

The principal immediate economic advantages of the seaway will be twofold, and in the order named, production of electric energy in the International Rapids section and the transportation of iron ores and other strategic raw materials from Labrador and eastern Canada to the manufacturing centers of the United States, principally those now long in production in western Pennsylvania, northern Ohio, and western New York.

Taking first things first, perhaps the most important and dynamic phase of the seaway is the planned installation of 2.2 million horsepower of generative capacity in the International Rapids section. This will be jointly undertaken by the New York State Power Authority and the Province of Ontario at a cost of approximately $600 million, equally shared. Our Federal Power Commission has issued the necessary license to the New York Authority. For a short time it appeared probable that litigation instigated by public power advocates would delay New York's participation in this phase of the project.

These proponents of public power, incensed by tentative plans of the New York State Power Authority to market the power wholesale to four, possibly five, private companies—Central Hudson Gas & Electric Corp., New York State Electric & Gas Corp., Niagara-Mohawk Power Corp., Rochester Gas & Electric Corp., and possibly Consolidated

Edison Co. of New York—applied to the Federal Court of Appeals to invalidate the action of the Federal Power Commission in licensing New York to share in the project. Losing out in the Court of Appeals, the public power advocates then applied to the United States Supreme Court to set aside the lower court's ruling. The High Tribunal, in a brief order early this month, declined to hear the appeal and thus swept away the last legal obstacle to this country's participation in the construction of the St. Lawrence River power project.

With these possible legal complexities out of the way, we can look at the power phases of the projected seaway. The now-highly industrialized Province of Ontario can have little industrial expansion without more electrical energy, while the industries of upper New York State can expand with the aid of additional power, and newer industries can come in to supply the growing markets of New York, New Jersey, portions of the New England States, Pennsyvania, and perhaps as far south as Virginia and Delaware. Not to be forgotten is growing Greater New York City; its Consolidated Edison Co., would well hook into the new source of energy, provided, of course, the mentioned areas do not absorb our half of the 12.6 billion kilowatt-hours of electrical energy which the power project in the International Rapids Section will produce anually.

CANADA THE GREATEST BENEFICIARY

Beyond question, Canada will derive the greatest economic advantages from the new traffic artery. She has the raw materials needed by our more advanced industrial establishment. For the first 10 to 20 years of the seaway's operation and until Canada can develop heavy industries of her own, our northern neighbor's chief gain will be through the sale of raw materials to the mills of this country.

The seaway will, of a certainty, give industry of the United States greater access to the vast reserves of strategic industrial materials recently discovered in the northern regions of Labrador and Ungava. Chief among these are the iron ores in the former. It may well be that by the time the seaway is completed and ready to handle an appreciable annual tonnage, these Labrador ores will be just in time to replace the ores of the Mesabi Ridge in Minnesota, now getting thinner, but not entirely exhausted.

As of the moment, production of Labrador iron ore is nowhere near the annual demand of our Midwest steel mills, but by 1960 or 1961, when the seaway is ready to bear its maximum annual tonnage, that production may be close to half the annual demand. And, as Mesabi Range production gets even thinner, Labrador output may increase rapidly enough to assure our Midwest mills an adequate and uninterrupted supply.

IRON ORE AND AMERICAN INTERESTS

In the meanwhile, Canadian and American industrialists have not been idle. They foresaw the coming of the new waterway and have made preparations to use it to capacity once it is a reality. In Canada, a new railroad to connect the iron-ore deposits of Labrador with a port on the St. Lawrence River has been completed. By midsummer the Iron Ore Co. of Canada will have moved 1 million tons of ore along this new carrier for transshipment, mostly to this country. The greater portion of it will move from Sept Isles, about 300 miles east of Montreal, by the St. Lawrence River and sea to Philadelphia where it will move on the to United States Steel Co.'s new plant at Morrisville, Pa., or to other east coast steel mills. What does not follow this route will move by barges to near Montreal where it will move by rail to Pittsburgh and Ohio bills.

It is believed that by the time the Seaway is ready for its maximum annual tonnage, variously estimated at from 30 million to 40 million, Labrador iron ore production will be at annual rate of 10 million tons, with a potential annual output of 20 million tons. Waterway transportation of this amount of ore would mean annual savings of around $500 million, according to those who have made close studies. But there will be other savings; Midwest grain, moving by water from Chicago to European ports, can be transported at a saving of around 5 cents per bushel. A single nickel is not a large piece of money in itself, but when you get to moving a few million tons of grain each year, the nickel saved on each bushel mounts into more dollars than we care to count here.

SAVINGS IN TRANSPORTATION COSTS

There will be other transportation savings. Durable goods of our Midwest factories—farm machinery, tractors, automobiles, refrigerators, electrical appliances, to name a few—can move from Great Lakes ports to European markets at savings of from $6 to $20 per ton from the combination rail-ocean rates now in effect. But these savings will not be in full effect until such time as we clear our Great Lakes ports to those depths which will permit seagoing vessels to sail from, say Chicago, to Liverpool without transhipment of cargo at Montreal. In the meanwhile, cargoes are moving over the waterway, and at transportation savings, despite the unloading and reloading at Montreal. Perhaps more cargoes would have moved over the waterway as it now exists but for the fact that transhipment now necessary is time consuming in an era when time is of the essence in international trade.

We have looked at the waterway's effects, west to east. A brief view in the opposite direction would not be amiss. Assuming that lake ports are deepened to accommodate ships direct from the ports of Europe, does it mean our Midwest and Far West is to suffer by competition from European manufacturers? The answer is brief—no more than our Atlantic coast commerce suffers from European competition at this time, and that competition is far from serious provided our own industries stay ahead of Europe in both quality and quantity.

Rail carriers, among the most vociferous opponents of the seaway, have predicted it would bring either their death in certain sections of the country or, if not their demise, demands for heavy Federal subsidies. Supporters of the seaway have held the view that new business, generated by the new water route, would take care of the railroads. The records reveal no substantial proof by either side of the controversy, therefore this is one area in which we can only wait and see. Biggest loss to the rails will be ore and grain traffic. It remains to be seen what discovery and invention of the next few years will bring in the way of new manufactured goods to be hauled by railways.

Ocean shipping interests of this Nation will gain little from the new waterway. With a 27-foot depth, it can safely accommodate vessels of small tonnage, perhaps 5,000 at a maximum. Less than 3 percent of our merchant bottoms are this small, consequently the merchant fleets which will derive the greatest gain from the seaway will be those of Norway, Finland, Sweden, Greece, Spain, and Portugal. Even our 10,000-ton fabricated ships of World War II vintage draw 32 feet when loaded to capacity.

With respect to tonnage to be lost by our Atlantic and gulf coast ports, the writer would point out that in calendar 1952, last year for which figures are available, their import-export tonnage totaled 141 million. The maximum annual estimated tonnage the seaway can handle—import and export—is placed at 44 million. But, according to all calculations, 20 million tons will be iron and other ores moving from Canada and Labrador to the United States. Thus we see the seaway robbing our Atlantic and gulf coast ports of a maximum of 24 million tons a year.

In the meanwhile, threatened ports are not remaining idle. Millions of dollars are being spent each year to improve facilities, speed the handling of cargo, and otherwise meet the competition of the cheaper but slower waterway. The Army Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of the Budget have approved plans to deepen the Delaware River Channel to 40 feet from Philadelphia northward to the new United States Steel plant at Morrisville, which largely plans to use Venezuelan ores. From Morrisville to Trenton, the channel will be dredged to a depth of 35 feet. Also approved is a 40-foot channel in the Hudson River from New York City to Albany. Similar improvements for other ports to the south are under way.

MILITARY ADVANTAGE OF SEAWAY

In the event of war, ore shipments from Venezuela would be vulnerable to submarine attack, and this points up the military strategic value of the St. Lawrence seaway, which would be relatively safe from undersea craft, but it should be pointed out that during World War II German submarines made 13 successful attacks in waters of Labrador Bay, through which ore vessels will have to pass to enter the eastern end of the seaway.

A recent press association survey of port-area opinions on the seaway and its effects on port tonnages revealed local views ranging from indifference to pessimism. Albany foresees loss of Great Lakes grain trade; Boston, closer to Europe than ports to the south, feels it may not be hurt bad and is going ahead with port improvements; Philadelphia authorities see traffic as normal during the 5 months the seaway is ice-locked, but continues with improvement of facilities to speed handling of cargo.

Norfolk, key city of the great Hampton Roads, expects no substantially adverse effects, while Baltimore, at the head of Chesapeake Bay, envisions "severe" impact on export grain movements, plus curtailed ore imports, when Labrador ores "move in quantity." New Orleans acknowledges keener competition for Midwest cargoes, but says this can be offset by "selling" and good service to shippers. Texas ports, Houston and Galveston, the former with vast oil and cattle tonnages, the latter handling largely raw cotton and fertilizers, are not too concerned, while the southern ports of Savannah, Ga., and Jacksonville, Miami, and Tampa, all in Florida, handle tonnages not likely to be affected by the new seaway.

While the above is a balanced statement of the real situation with respect to the St. Lawrence seaway project and the outline drawn of its nearby and more distant probabilities is couched in sober tones, there need be little question that the impact of this important development will be on a very large scale and will affect many sections of the United States and Canada.

One of the most immediate effects will be the increase of real estate values in localities in which new terminals are to be set up. Contrariwise there might be a drop in land values in terminals, particularly in the East, which will have to meet the new competition. This will apply more to terminals for smaller cargo vessels than for the big oceangoing ships.

Labor will eventually feel the effects and some movement of longshoremen and others involved in this traffic may be envisaged as developing in the direction of the new ports to be expanded along the Great Lakes and away from the older shipping ports. This shift of traffic will have a secondary effect on railroads feeding these centers.

It is obvious that the most immediate beneficiaries will be the various types of companies engaged in dredging and engineering operations of the type required in the construction of the new seaway.

Various large scale mining enterprises in Canada, aside from iron ore, should also feel beneficial effects as their products move down the seaway to Midwest ports and thence for distribution through the entire industrial complex of that vital part of the country.

Indians Are People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 14, 1954

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the discussion today on S. 2670 providing for the termination of Federal supervision over Utah Indians, I call attention to the following editorial which appeared in the New York Times on July 12, 1954:

INDIANS ARE PEOPLE

The recent moves of Congress and the administration toward withdrawal of Federal responsibility for the American Indian have aroused apprehension on the part of many Indian tribes and close students of Indian affairs.

It is all very well for the Federal Government to have as its long-range policy the ultimate removal of special protection for the Indian and his eventual establishment as a fully integrated citizen; but when this policy is brought down to practical terms involving individual tribes and human beings it can lead to real injustice and, indeed, to the disruption and demoralization of large segments of our Indian population. The reason is that though some Indians are prepared for integration many are tötally unfit, unable, and unready to stand on their own feet, partly because of the misuse and neglect from which they have suffered so long at the hands of white civilization. Therefore any policy looking to elimination of Federal controls must be highly selective and carefully worked out if it is not to do still further harm to the Indian.

Last year Congress passed a law authorizing (with certain exceptions) any State to impose complete civil and criminal jurisdiction over Indian communities within its borders, irrespective of the Indians' wishes. In this way it would be possible for the States to destroy traditional and successfully functioning tribal government whether or not the Indians desired it. In protesting this measure at the time, we observed that the key to the whole issue is Indian consent. When he signed the bill, President Eisenhower made special note of "the failure to include * * * a requirement of full consultation in order to ascertain the wishes and desires of the Indians," and he urged that "at the earliest possible time at the next session of the Congress the act be amended."

That was last August. Now, with less than a month of the session remaining, joint congressional hearings have just been held on the proposed amendments. One question now is whether Indian consultation will be deemed sufficient or whether Indian consent will be required whenever a State wants to take complete jurisdiction over the Indians. We think that in the interests of justice to the Indian, consistent with Federal policy over many years and simple commonsense in insuring enforcement of the law, no such change in Federal-State-Indian relationships should be effected without full and free consent on the part of the Indians concerned.

Another aspect of the same basic problem of these relationships has arisen with the so-called termination bills introduced in the present Congress, providing for an end to special Federal protection for various specified Indian tribes. In some cases termination is clearly justified, but in others it is not, such as the case of the Seminoles of Florida, and the Shoshones and Paiutes of Utah. No action has yet been taken on the Seminole bill, but the one ending Federal protection of the two Utah tribes (S. 2670) has passed the Senate and been reported from committee to the House. Those two poverty-stricken, ignorant, helpless tribes have not fared well; but obviously the cure is not to cut them off from all right to the special Federal protection and care that is their due but to see that they actually get it. As the Association on American Indian Affairs has pointed out, the Indians themselves have protested many of these bills which would rob the Indians of basic rights and destroy their hope for a decent future.

Government Competition With Business and Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CECIL M. HARDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 19, 1954

Mrs. HARDEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to refer to a subject of interest to all taxpayers.

I am sure that few taxpayers are aware that they are supporting oxygen and nitrogen manufacturing in the Department of Defense and the manufacture of argon, freon, and a great many other things, large and small. The truth is that the Federal Government is engaged in a great many classes of commercial-type activities of which one includes items such as those listed above.

At the beginning of this session of Congress the Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations of the House Committee on Government Operations began a program to identify Government commercial-type activities which use but do not pay taxes. The subcommittee thought that the elimination of any unnecessary commercial activities would be a long step toward reducing Federal expenditures and increasing the tax base needed to sustain legitimate functions of the Federal, State, and local governments.

The Department of Defense has joined in the efforts of the subcommittee and has issued a directive calling for a review of its numerous business activities on the installment plan. On March 8, 1954, the Department of Defense called for a listing of individual plants in the following increment of activities: Aluminum smelting or sweating facilities, clothing factory and cloth sponging plants, motion-picture studios, rope walk, bakeries, furniture repair shops, laundries and/or dry cleaning plants, scrap metal baling, coffee roasting plants, paint factories, sawmills, clothing reclamation shops, and ice cream manufacturing plants.

A listing by the Department of Defense of plants indicated that the Army, Navy, and Air Force have 239 facilities in this grouping.

It is hoped and expected that action will be taken to discontinue many of these facilities within the near future.

On June 28, 1954, the Department of Defense issued a call for a listing of facilities in increment No. 2, as follows: Chain manufacturing, automotive repair shops, caustic soda manufacturing, chlorine manufacturing, ice plants, oxygen and nitrogen manufacturing, powerplants, tree and garden nurseries, argon manufacturing, acetylene manufacturing, cafes and restaurants, cement mixing plants, cobbler shops, office equipment repair shops, power line construction, tire retreading activities, wood preservation, and freon manufacturing.

The taxpayers of the Nation should take heart in this program of the Department of Defense though it has just begun. There are many, many more activities in the manufacturing, service, transportation, banking, insurance, and other classes which need to be identified, analyzed, and justified or discontinued. The subcommittee has been hopeful that every agency of the Government would institute the same sort of a program now begun by the Department of Defense. While the Department of Defense is undoubtedly the largest operator in the commercial field, it by no means has a monopoly with respect to other departments.

The subcommittee has also been heartened by the fact that the new Hoover Commission is organizing to make a thorough study of private enterprises in the Federal Establishment. A recent letter from the Executive Director of the Hoover Commission indicates that all agencies of Government have been asked to list their facilities in these classes: Laundries; ice cream plants; coffee roating plants; clothing manufacture and repair; commissary stores, canteens, civilian cafeterias; dry cleaning plants; meat cutting plants; bakeries; shoe manufacture and repair; and post exchanges.

Who is responsible for this enormous unnecessary growth on our economic system? All of us—the citizen who encourages unneeded Federal activities in his city, the agency which creates the activity and annually justifies it, the Budget Bureau which annually sifts them through a large meshed budgetary process and of course the Congress which appropriates for their continuance.

The effort we are now making through the Subcommittee in Intergovernmental Relations will, upon its conclusion, provide us with the facts we need if we are to meet the problem posed by governmental competition with taxpaying businesses and industries.

I am extremely heartened by the progress which has been made to date.

Impact on America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HERBERT C. BONNER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 19, 1954

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Raleigh (N. C.) News and Observer of July 15, 1954:

Impact on America

To the Editor:

Will Rogers used to say, "All I know is just what I read in the papers." According to your paper, it seems that some highly educated intellectual legal lighthouses have decided that the colored folks ought to mingle with the white folks. I love the colored folks. I was raised up with them, and I don't propose to sit idly by and see them treated in any such fashion. The surest way to ruin a colored man is to force him over to mingling with the white folks. It ruins his personality, destroys his initiative, and corrupts his "psyrology." The colored folks have a magnificent culture distinctly their own. Think of the impact it has made on the life of America. They have produced great lawyers, doctors, scientists, musicians, and athletes. In fact, without colored folks we could have had no Civil War. Robert E. Lee and Stonewall Jackson might never have been heard of, and even old Sherman could have died out unhonored and unsung. Lincoln's administration would have been as slow and dull and draggy as Eisenhower's if it hadn't been for the colored folks. Think how listless music would have been in this country if W. C. Handy hadn't written St. Louis Blues. Al Jolson would have been a fool trying to sing Mammy in whiteface. What a terrible void we would have had without Amos and Andy. How uninteresting singing would have been without Ethel Waters, Cab Calloway, and Sister Rosett Tharpe.

The sweetest music this side of the Glory Land is a good old gospel hymn sung by the colored folks. Think how sorry baseball would be without old Satch Page, Robinson, Mays, and others. Without colored folks, Gov. Cam Morrison could never have buckled on his red sash, mounted his white stallion, and galloped over the rolling hills of the Pee Dee. Senators Simmons would never have seen his Senate without the colored folks. John Charles McNeill could never have written the "Augus' meetin' whar they warnt nigh room for seatin' all the sinners and saved what come to it." This country has produced two Washingtons, George and Booker T. When you try to mix 'em, it is like putting ink in a glass of water; the water is not fit to drink, and you can't write with the ink.

H. F. Seawell, Jr.
Republican Gubernatorial Candidate, 1952.
Carthage.

How Far Will the U. N. Push the United States?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 19, 1954

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include in the Record a timely editorial from the Detroit Times of Sunday, July 18, in reference to the situation in United Nations.

No one wants to see the United States remain an active and participating member of the U. N. more than do I. It is foolish to suggest or urge, however, that all is hearts and flowers in that organization. The recent action by the World Court at The Hague in ruling upon right which ought to be accorded to 11 members of the U. N. who were fired as security risks—and they were Americans—is just another instance of how our "friends" have their hands deep down in Uncle Sam's pocketbook.

It is enough to make you stop and wonder how far the American people are to be pushed in this business. Even though the action of the Hague tribunal has no binding effect, nonetheless its ruling will be used, casuistically, as an argument why the U. N. should recompense these discharged employees. If that is done, our own taxpayers will shell out a large portion of the money, which in light of what has gone before, is not in the least surprising.

The editorial from the Detroit Times follows:

The Stacked Deck

One of the reasons we dislike playing against a stacked deck in the United Nations if Red China should be a member is the way it is already stacked against us.

The stacked deck against us now is illustrated by our experience with the United Nations administrative tribunal in the matter of 11 employees discharged as loyalty risks.

The tribunal had ruled the United Nations must give these 11 Americans back pay in the amount of $179,000, and has been upheld by the World Court at The Hague.

Since the questioned loyalty of the 11 people to their own country was the issue, and since the United States will have to pay the bulk of the award—as it pays the bulk of all United Nations expenditures—American interest is deeply involved.

But American interest could hardly be more completely ignored than it has been by the agencies of the United Nations in this case.

It makes no difference to our U. N. associates that these 11 people lack the confidence of the American Government.

We could understand such an attitude on the part of our enemies in the United Nations, of whom there are many.

But why our supposed friends in the world organization are so willing to play the game of our enemies eludes understanding.

In any event, it is enough of a disadvantage to us as things are now in the United Nations without being under the greater disadvantage of having Red China within the circle.

Rock County (Wis.) Rejects Offer of Free Farm Agent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 19, 1954

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, it is encouraging to find that there are some local departments of of government that refuse to take Federal handouts.

The Rock County Board of Supervisors a week ago was offered the services of a farm agent, free to the county, with the Federal Government paying his salary which was in excess of $4,000 plus a $800 allowance for automobile mileage per year.

The supervisor who moved to reject the offer was Mr. E. W. Schenck, of La Prairie Township, a member of the Rock County Board of Supervisors. He and his colleagues on that board are to be congratulated.

Mr. Speaker, the Janesville Gazette in editorializing on this situation commented favorably; and as part of my remarks, I am including at this point, the editorial in question. It follows:

Free Farm Agent Rejected by County

Rock County supervisors Tuesday voted a rebuke to the Federal spenders which will have little effect and will receive much less attention than it deserves.

The board was informed that Rock County might obtain the services of an additional agricultural extension worker at the cost of furnishing him with a desk. A vacant desk in the courthouse is already available. The agent would receive a salary of $4,200 to $4,400, plus $800 allowance for automobile mileage per year. Forty such agents have been allocated to Wisconsin, the board was informed.

"I move that we let some other county have the advantage of this," said Supervisor E. W. Schenck, of La Prairie, and the board agreed with him.

In reporting the possibility of having an extra man on duty at no cost in local taxes, the agriculture committee of the board said that the funds for the agents are available because "Congress voted more money to the Department of Agriculture than it asked for."

Here is a case of sheer waste which can be chalked up directly against Congress. The bureaucrats had nothing to do with this one. Benson's department was given money to spend for which it has no real use. Farmers on the county board could see no need for another agent, and farmers themselves, remembering their Federal tax bills, will see no need either.

All of the protesting that Federal expenses are being cut to the bone, that further cuts cannot be made, and that tax reductions can only bring greater debts are undermined by such baldfaced squandering of money as that proposed in Janesville this week.

There are Congressmen who seems to believe that the way to get the farmers' vote is to buy it. They should be told in the only way they can understand—at the ballot box—that tax funds for extra county agents or for other unneeded and unwanted services will not do the trick for them.

The San Luis Division of the Central Valley Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 1, 1954

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced H. R. 9978, to authorize construction of needed additions to the Central Valley project in California. This Central Valley has achieved the distinction of being the largest and most highly productive agricultural area under irrigation in the entire country. This great valley extends from north to south approximately 500 miles with a variable width sometimes as much as

150 miles. Its irrigated farmland exceeds 5 million acres, which is 20 percent of the entire area under irrigation in the United States, which stood at 25,787,000 acres in 1949.

Because of its long north-south extension and surrounding mountain enclosure, the variety of climatic conditions is extensive and in its long frost-free growing season a wide variety of valuable crops are possible, some of which cannot be produced on a commercial scale in other parts of the United States. For many crops there can be found in the Central Valley extensive areas which show the most intensive and most advanced agriculture in the United States today.

This valley is an example of the wonderfully productive power of agriculture under irrigation. Technological advancements now under way promise great additional advancement in the superiority over agriculture dependent upon natural precipitation alone.

While the northern part of the valley, the Sacramento River segment, has developed largely on the basis of surface stream irrigation, the southern part, the San Joaquin section, with its more extensive area, has until recently developed predominantly on water pumped from underground reservoirs.

The seasonal pattern of rainfall in California, with its heavy concentration of rain and snow during the winter months and almost complete absence during the summer season, makes irrigation a must for profitable agriculture. The development of this Central Valley area has exhibited some of the most dramatic features of the progress of irrigation in the West. Water carefully applied, as it generally is in this area, produces some very high yields. This area, which in the main is only a few hundred feet above sea level, has a minimum of fog and clouds and thus a preponderance of uninterrupted sunshine during the growing season. This makes plants grow rapidly when water is applied in harmony with their needs.

Several types of crops which cannot flourish in the more severe weather conditions which prevail in many of the irrigated regions of the West find a favorable environment in this great valley.

The dramatic story of the intensive and productive agriculture that has been developed in the San Joaquin Valley part of the great Central Valley on the basis of extensive ground-water resources is quite well known. It is also a well-known part of this story that because of the ease of drawing water from copious underground reservoirs that an overuse of available supplies took place. Over extensive areas pumping in excess of the natural rate of replenishment led to a decline in water tables and required the formulation of a program to check and reverse the trend toward eventual disaster.

The great Central Valley project was put together to meet this situation by bringing supplemental water from the northern part of the State ,where water was still surplus and would continue to run to waste through the Golden Gate into the Pacific Ocean.

Heavy runoff from Central Valley rivers, nearly all of which is in the springtime, leaves a low flow in the unregulated rivers for use during the latter part of the growing season. These conditions established the need, both for building reservoirs to impound heavy spring flood runoffs and for canals for distribution of stored water to widely dispersed places over the valley.

Supplemental surface irrigation water was more and more necessary to maintain the great agricultural production in the southern or San Joaquin part of the basin that had grown up largely on the basis of the ground water resources. This plan also called for a transfer of surplus waters from the Sacramento River part of the basin through the Delta Cross Channel and the Delta Mendota Canal southward to supplement the water available from the streams fed by the runoff from the Sierra Nevada Mountains. Several basic units of the great Central Valley project have been completed; other parts are maturing rapidly and the necessary supplemental water is now available to preserve and make permanent a wonderfully productive agriculture for most of the valley. Water supply will be a combination of reduced amounts which will be kept within the safe yield of the ground water reservoirs and supplemental surface water delivered through the canals of the project.

The approved program, however, has not been extended to provide the supplemental water so desperately needed by another section of the San Joaquin Basin. Reference is made to the highly profitable agriculture which has been built completely on ground water resources along the west side of the valley. The intensive irrigation in that area has now created great difficulties and possible extinction of profitable agriculture because of the rapid falling of the ground water table.

Reference is here made to that great area extending from the Fresno-Merced County line southward to Tulare Lake, and into Kern County. In the Mendota-Huron area in Fresno, Kings, and in Kern Counties to the west of the center of the valley, there has been developed over the last 25 years a great irrigation project that has brought about a million acres of highly productive land into a state of profitable production.

Owners of irrigated farms, however, are face to face with the grim reality of a rapidly declining ground water table with the rate of decline accelerating rapidly. There is no immediate relief from any local water supplies that could possibly be harnessed and used. Natural runoff comes from mountains along the west side of the San Joaquin Valley. But these mountains are low and have relatively light rainfall and only very limited runoff.

Several small streams furnish no more than a small fraction of the water necessary for support of the irrigated region. It becomes necessary, therefore, to visualize the needs of this whole area in the light of its potential productivity and water requirements, and in the light of the threat of its early return to the desert.

Studies have been made of alternative plans of bringing the supplemental water necessary to provide permanence for this great productive area. This section is now in a threatened position, yet its potential productivity is as great as any other part of the San Joaquin Basin.

A program for this region has now been worked out and is nearing its final stages of preparation and will soon be ready for official presentation. If approved as part of the great Central Valley project, it can fully meet the urgent needs and continue this area in production.

Since there are virtually no surface streams, all of the irrigation water for this western segment has been drawn from underground water reservoirs. The first large-scale development of irrigation was initiated about 1915. The rate of exploitation, however, was relatively slow for several years, followed by considerable expansion in the late twenties.

Low prices for crops and other widespread economic difficulties of the early thirties checked the rate of growth, but there was a resumption of expansion in the latter part of the thirties which has continued to the present time. But this expansion has brought about a rapidly accelerating rate of disappearance of the ground water resources of the region.

It has been estimated that by 1935 approximately 135,000 acre-feet of water was being drawn from the wells in this area for irrigation in the northern half of this area. This yearly use had doubled by 1940, and by 1948 had doubled again, approaching at that time a total of 600,000 acre-feet per year. This mounted to 1 million acre-feet by 1950, and then 1,250,000 by 1952. By 1952 approximately 500,000 acres of land were under irrigation and a high productivity maintained over much of the area.

Favorable ground water reservoirs, generally thick layers of sand or sand and gravel, extend under the entire area that has been brought under cultivation. There probably are equally favorable geological formations under an additional half-million acres, in a southern extension of the cultivated part.

Approximately a million additional acres could be reclaimed from its desert conditions and be included in any project for permanent agriculture. This would make necessary the construction of larger projects to bring in water from surplus areas. The accumulated supply in the ground water reservoirs in the new area would rapidly be depleted if used without supplemental surface water.

These ground water reservoirs are found principally in porous, geological formations in the valley fill underneath the valley surface. They are interbedded with other formations that are quite impervious and which alternate through thousands of feet in the deepest parts of the valley.

It is in the sandy or sandy gravelly formations between the less permeable formations that water was entrapped in the process of building up the great total thickness of sediments. The first porous water-bearing sediments are found two to four hundred feet below the surface, but others from six hundred to a thousand or more feet below the surface have provided most of the supplies of water on which this great agricultural enterprise has been built over the last 40 years.

There was little cause for concern in the first part of that period, but over the last 10 years the rate of decline of the water table has been greatly accelerated. In more recent years it is proceeding at a rate that indicates the early termination of available water within practical pumping distances.

There is clearly an evident need of bringing water from other sources as rapidly as possible, to first arrest the rapidly declining water tables by furnishing supplemental water and then later to restore the water tables through recharge of depleted underground water reservoirs.

The total decline in the water table has ranged between 150 feet near the northern part and more than 360 feet in the southern part of the area. But rates of decline are accelerating and there is an imperative need to move rapidly to prevent the forced abandonment of many farms.

Unless this is done there will be destruction of the irrigated crops and the area will return to a desert condition. The amount of water that is now moving into the area from the west to recharge these declining ground water levels is probably not more than thirty to forty thousand acre-feet per year. The natural replenishments are from the west but this cannot be increased since the amount of water running in these small, western streams is not likely to improve.

The only other source of recharge apparently is from the east side of the valley; as ground water tables on the west side have lowered there has been a reversal of the slope of the water table. Originally ground water was higher on the west but this has now been replaced with a relatively steep slope from the east toward the west. An unknown amount of water is now moving in through the lower formations from the east to the west but this cannot supply more than a small part of the water needs, and reliance upon this source is not a proper or desirable solution to the problem.

This situation demonstrates that because of the intercommunication of the water in these deep underground water reservoirs the whole San Joaquin Basin is bound together as a unit.

When these two sources of recharge are added together, however, they provide not more than one-fourth of the amount of water currently used for irrigation. Under these circumstances the groundwater reservoirs will be rapidly depleted. Except under very high prices it will gradually become impractical to pump water over the great distances required from this declining groundwater level.

There is a logical place in the Central Valley program for bringing supplemental surface water to this western region. The facilities to supply these west-side units can be readily synchronized with the overall Central Valley project, including the proposed Trinity project. All needed facilities are within the range of engineering feasibility and have favorable economic features that can make the required extra water available at comparatively low cost. Extensive advantage will be taken of facilities already constructed.

Surplus waters which are still wasting out to the Pacific Ocean should be conserved and diverted through the delta cross-channel to the intake of the Tracy pumping plant. The facilities of this great plant, which is already in operation, are required, in their present uses, only a portion of the year, mainly during the irrigation season.

The cross-channel and the pumping plant could be utilized during the winter months and otherwise during periods of surplus capacity for existing purposes. The Tracy plant now elevates the water a total vertical distance of 200 feet where it is emptied into the Delta-Mendota Canal. It then runs southward for approximately 150 miles to supply water during the irrigation season to a large share of the San Joaquin Valley which formerly used water that is now stored behind the Friant Dam. Most of this water is then transferred southward through the Friant-Kern Canal as far south as Bakersfield.

Without adding to the capacity of the Delta Cross-Channel Canal, the Delta Mendota Canal, or the Tracy pumping plant, but rather through more continuous use of these facilities, it would be possible to supply the needed 1 million additional acre-feet of water. These increased amounts of water would then be transferred to near the southern end of the Delta Mendota Canal where a new pumping plant would be installed with a capacity to pump approximately 1,200,000 acre-feet of water up a vertical distance of 200 feet into a new San Luis Reservoir.

This reservoir would be located beyond the north end of the new irrigation project and have a capacity of approximately 1 million acre-feet of water. The pumping plant would be equipped to elevate these amounts of water during the season when it could be most logically synchronized with the existing responsibilities of the Tracy pumping plant and the Delta Mendota Canal. This stored water would then be available for use in the San Luis project as needed during the irrigation season.

This pumping plant, the reservoir, and the canals necessary to distribute the water to the San Luis project all are of standard types well within the normal range of construction that has been employed in other units of the Central Valley. No new or novel engineering difficulties or problems would be encountered and there would be a comparatively low overall cost. Water can probably be delivered to this highly productive San Luis project area at a cost even lower than costs for water to other parts of the Central Valley project. The cost per acre-feet should be far lower than has come to be the usual cost on many western reclamation projects.

The main dam for this new reservoir would probably not need to be higher than approximately 200 feet and could be of a rolled earthfill type. This would not require the elaborate and costly concrete structure necessary for higher dams. The capacity of the San Luis Reservoir would be approximately 1 million acre-feet and would provide all the water needed for the main project.

Extensions in the size of the total project, and especially extensions to the south, would be possible through an increase in the capacity of some of the facilities, the construction of new reservoirs, pumping plants, and canals.

This entire area has been developed by pumping from underground water reservoirs. These same sources will continue to supply substantial amounts of water and can keep the area in productivity for a limited period of time. This period is probably not very long as the water table is falling fast so that the urgency of this project is very great. Any delay in its approval and completion could precipitate a disaster since further substantial decline in the water table would require the abandonment of much of the land and result in a lapse of the foundation of the existing economy. A very much more expensive and unsatisfactory rescue program is inevitable if action is not quickly taken.

This urgency, together with sound engineering features and costs well within the earning power of the project are adequate to justify speedy approval.

Under these circumstances there can be no sound reason for further delay and, therefore, the plans which will soon be completed and ready for submission to Congress should have early approval. Congress by applying well-established measures would have no valid reason for delay since the project has superior physical, engineering, and economic features. A pay-out schedule can be assumed and maintained by those who will receive benefits from the project.

Existing, but more fully utilized, facilities will serve to bring the supplemental water to a transfer point where new pumping plants, reservoirs, and canals will need to be built to place the project in operation. All these new units will be a direct project obligation, to which must be added the operating cost and a possible part of the capital cost of the shared units.

While the general and some of the specific features of the southward extension of the project are already evident, and are authorized in my bill, it may be necessary to temporarily defer action on this second phase of the project in order not to delay the initial phase. Mainly because of the urgency of the situation confronting an economy with its entire foundation likely to collapse unless a practical rescue operation is immediately undertaken. It should be borne in mind that not only the farmers are faced with great economic loss but this would force inevitable collapse of the super-structure of processing plants, stores, shops, personal and professional services and other activities that have grown naturally from the agricultural base.

It may be found to be within the range of physical possibility and economic merit to convey much of the imported surface water to specific areas where effective recharge of ground-water reservoirs can take place. This would have the very great advantage of raising the ground-water level and thereby greatly reducing the cost of pumping for that part of the total water supply that can still come most effectively from underground-water reservoirs. Such management of subsurface facilities especially in areas where the wells are already equipped with efficient pumps, which draw their supplies from favorable ground-water reservoir formations, may be more efficient and economical than the construction and operation of surface-irrigation facilities.

These wells are specially advantageous for the acreage immediately overlaying the ground-water reservoir and surrounding the well itself. Use of these facilities will increase the versatility of the entire project by making it possible to synchronize all resources of water management. Such an over-all effectiveness can scarcely exist in more favorable relationships elsewhere.

Water for this project can best be made available and perhaps only be made available by construction of additional projects, especially the Trinity project. There are, of course, already definite proposals for construction of additional dams on Central Valley rivers with uncontrolled and widely variable seasonal flows from the high Sierra Nevada Mountains. Such reservoirs would be filled by the natural runoff and could provide the additional water supply necessary to supplement that which might not turn out to be available from the existing Delta Cross Channel and Delta Mendota Canal system. These sources could provide a more certain, independent, and new source of stored water for the project as originally proposed and for those additional areas which should be brought into effective use as soon as practicable.

Water from any new storage projects, such as the proposed Trinity River diversion, or the building of additional dams on other Central Valley rivers will serve to increase the versatility and effectiveness of the entire Central Valley project. Water from any new or old sources can be redirected in ways that will contribute to the surpluses necessary for use in the San Luis project.

It is not necessary for purposes of approval of this project that additional and new information be submitted in regard to the type of crops nor for the type of agricultural production that will be carried on and can be applied in this San Luis unit.

With plenty of water all of the necessary conditions will be present for the production of a wide variety of farm crops. This unit in its basic characteristics can be essentially the same as the units on the eastern side of the San Joaquin Basin within the same general north-south latitude range. While productivity and the crops that are currently growing out on this important project are of high value and represent a high rate of return on the investments, it is evident that with an increased and more sure supply of water many additional types of crops would become feasible. Especially will there be an increase in the growing of fruit trees and vines that necessarily have a long life cycle. It takes several years for these to reach maturity after which a high state of productivity can be maintained for a long period. It is this type of long-range crop which is both most needed by the country as a whole and would be of a highly stabilizing influence on the agricultural activity of this region.

All of these factors indicate that when the water supply is assured these long-range type farm crops will take their proper place in the pattern of production. This is now untenable because of the necessarily limited and uncertain character of the water supply as evidenced by the rapidly falling water levels in reservoirs that are now being over-pumped. Water is becoming more expensive and an increasing danger of final exhaustion confronts all of the farmers in the area. It is now necessary for them to adopt a very much more conservative type of program with short-range rather than long-range planning dominating the scene.

It is evident that with the assurance of the completion of the San Luis project with its required supplemental water that the farmers in the area will be on a sound foundation in planning the most effective type of farm-crop program. The prevailing situation in contiguous areas of very high productivity and effective agriculture in the eastern part of the San Joaquin Basin, where the water supply is now assured by the completed basic units in the Central Valley project, will be duplicated in the San Luis units.

Twenty Years of Foreign Policy Has Brought the United States a Lot of Grief

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 19, 1954

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I am including a timely editorial by the Milwaukee Sentinel entitled "Foreign Policy." This editorial points out our historic position in foreign policy matters and then also indicated that for the past 20 years our foreign policy has failed.

The editorial follows:

Foreign Policy

The ruckus raised over the seating of Red China in the United Nations was inevitable as long as the foreign policy of this country followed no basic principles but consisted of a long series of improvisations.

From the time that George Washington was President until Franklin D. Roosevelt's quarantine speech in 1937, in Chicago, the American foreign policy pursued a consistent course, which may be described as follows:

1. No entangling alliances with other countries which involved the affairs of Europe.

(We did join with other countries in limited efforts such as the Boxer Rebellion, refusing any extraterritorial rights; in World War I, we avoided the word "allies" and used instead "associated powers.")

2. Freedom of the seas;
3. The Monroe Doctrine;
4. The sanctity of life and property of Americans everywhere;
5. The inviolability of treaties;
6. The open-door policy for trade and commerce.

This is, of course, skeletonized and volumes have been and can be written on each one of these subjects. But the outline above suffices to indicate the general line of American thought on the subject.

In December 1941 the United States took over the management of the greatest war in human history, World War II. We accepted world leadership not only from a military standpoint, but in the rearrangement of the political and economic life of Europe and Asia.

This vast program has gone by several names, the Marshall plan, ERP, ECA, NATO, EDC. Whatever the name, it has been a failure and the United States finds itself isolated, faced by a powerful enemy in the Soviet universal state.

At the moment of this crisis, the United States faces four facts:

The continuing responsibility for the defeat in the Korean war;

The dilemma as to what to do with the war in Indochina;

The extension of the Soviet universal state to the American continents;

Our permanent policy toward Russia and Red China.

In the upsurge of the debate on these subjects, it is already apparent that the traditional American attitude on our foreign policy is reasserting itself.

There is an increasing demand for a reassertion of the Monroe Doctrine in the American Continents. This demand arises from the attempt of Soviet Russia to establish a satellite state first in British Guiana, then in Guatemala, and now possibly in Costa Rica.

As regards the recognition of Red China and the seating of that barbarous government in the United Nations, many fundamental principles are involved.

First, we shall no longer be pushed into a decision by Great Britain. No matter what may be the policy of the administration, the American people are no longer willing to be entangled in the affairs of Europe or to pay cash out of the earnings of the American taxpayer to countries which prefer Russia and Red China, for whatever reason, to the United States.

Secondly, Red China is a warmonger, having intervened in two war in Asia, the Korean and the Indochina war. The United States is in the United Nations by virtue of an inviolable treaty, but if Red China is seated in the United Nations, it means that a country can shoot its way into it, particularly by shooting and torturing Americans.

Whatever the outcome of these detailed situations, this is now clear: After nearly 20 years of world leadership that has brought nothing but grief, the American people are ready to pursue the traditional American policy of tending to American interests.

Col. Henry Crown Honored

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD W. HOFFMAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 19, 1954

Mr. HOFFMAN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an address by A.

Henry Goldstein, of the Chicago Bar Association, representing the class of 1904, to the graduating class of 1954 at the Jonathan Burr School, of Chicago, honoring Col. Henry Crown:

COL. HENRY CROWN HONORED

(Address by A. Henry Goldstein)

My dear principal, Miss Harz, teachers, members of the graduating class of 1954, and friends, permit me to extend my sincere thanks for the honor and privilege of being invited to deliver to this fine class of young Americans the address welcoming them to the alumni of Jonathan Burr School.

Today all of you are assured of at least a high school education. In 1904, out of a class of 96 graduates, only 30 entered the high schools. The balance were compelled by circumstances to find employment to help sustain their families. True, many were ambitious enough to attend night classes when possible, to supplement their educations by securing credits sufficient to matriculate in later years for their college or professional careers.

I arrived here today an hour earlier than the time specified for the commencement ceremonies so as to familiarize myself again with the school buildings, and to talk to some of the personnel, principal, teachers, clerks, and engineer, this being my first visit in over a quarter of a century.

The reports from all whom I had interviewed were that this was a fine aggregation of youngsters of whom they were all proud. Mr. Goodrich, the engineer, emphasized more particularly the exemplary conduct of the colored pupils. He said: "You will see a rather tall youngster, colored boy, whom I consider one of the nicest boys I have ever met, clean, trustworthy, honest and an excellent student. I certainly will miss that boy. I have been at the school for many years and the segregation problem is unknown here. All our pupils are honorable boys and girls, orderly, well mannered, and decent."

The recent important decision of the Supreme Court of the United States on the subject of segregation in schools is a wonderful tribute to the wisdom and great integrity of the distinguished members of that august body, but to Chief Justice Earl Warren, that learned and scholarly humanitarian, a grateful nation owes an everlasting debt of gratitude. It was his leadership and the great confidence reposed in him by the members of the Court, that resulted in an unanimous decision, and in such important cases this is indeed a rarity. Not one justice dissented nor wrote a dissenting opinion. America will always be safe with such great Chief Justices as Earl Warren, and his Associate Justices who grace that Court, and may God bless and keep him strong, well, and firm in his convictions for many years to come. In fact, that is my fervent prayer for all of the judges of our great Supreme Court of the United States.

Let me give you a small résumé of Jonathan Burr School and the person after whom it was named. Jonathan Burr was born in Bridgewater, Mass., of Scotch Presbyterian parents, and came to Chicago in 1848. He was a frugal and industrious man and became vested with large tracts of land on the northwest side, and later went into the banking business. He founded a school known as the Burr Industrial School, which was located directly across from this building, and later added additional buildings which were known as the Rolling Mill School. This was done entirely at his own expense. He organized and was president of the Home for the Friendless, which is still in existence and which was endowed by him. He died on February 4, 1869, and by the terms of his will his vast real-estate holdings and buildings reverted to the board of education of Chicago, and from this humble beginning grew what we know now as the Jonathan Burr School. He never married. In 1873 the first modern building was dedicated. In 1885 the second building was completed, and in 1897 the building adjoining this hall was put into service. There was a branch school across the street consisting of six schoolrooms, stove heated, and at the turn of the century Burr School was one of the largest in Chicago, and maintained that position for many years.

This school has had some great principals and teachers whose influence affected many of the graduates throughout the years. Such names as Charles Barthoff, who later became principal of Lane Technical High School; Prof. Frank L. Morse, a brilliant teacher and grandson of Prof. Samuel B. Morse, the inventor of the telegraph, who was principal of this school until 1909, when he was appointed the first principal of the new Harrison Technical High School; John Stube, a fine principal, and a host of other important educators. We had some wonderful teachers who inspired their pupils to higher thoughts and greater achievements. Miss Skelly; Mrs. Ida Groves; Miss Lizzie Justi; Miss Anna McClements, whose sister was the wife of Senator Thomas E. Walsh, of Montana; Edith V. Watson, and a host of equally famous teachers too numerous to mention.

In the last 70 years, Burr School graduates have been outstanding leaders in every field of endeavor. We have given the world great scholars, doctors, editors, writers, jurists, musicians, artists, architects, educators, scientists, religious leaders, high officers of the Army, Navy, in the armed services of our country, financiers, bankers, industrialists, legislators, and men and women in every walk of life. The great Dr. Ole Nelson who was chief of the Cook County Hospital, the largest institution of its kind in the world, and who recently passed away was one of our alumnus. Jack Lait, the editor of the New York Daily Mirror for whom Walter Winchell worked, was a Burr graduate. Many famous lawyers, masters in chancery, and individuals known the world over graduated from this school just as you are doing today. Joseph Baumgarten, who owns the Baumgarten Building, 105 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill., and who recently donated a classical building to Northwestern University costing upward of a quarter of a million dollars, is another graduate. The number of graduates in the last 50 years would approximate over 4,000. Of the class of 1904, we can account for only 28 out of the 96 members. The lapse of time, the devastations of war, disease, accident, and the Grim Reaper have taken their toll. Therefore, we the remaining members of the class of 1904 determined to make an exhaustive study of all available records so as to ascertain the outstanding graduate in the last 50 years, and after much deliberation and study and by unanimous decision, we have selected Col. Henry Crown as being one who epitomizes all of those virtues so essential for a great American and for this singular honor. Many have made great contributions in their particular field such as Hyman Ettlinger of the class of 1904, whose scholastic record was phenomenal, and who became the dean of the University of Texas until his retirement and who is now dean emeritus of that great institution of learning.

Col. Henry Crown is not a 1904 graduate, although his brother, Sol R. Crown, was a member of our class, and his tragic passing left so deep a wound on Col. Henry Crown that he has dedicated his life to the memory of his beloved brother.

Our selection of Col. Henry Crown was not predicated on his phenomenal financial success alone, and, although he had no college degrees, he was and is endowed with something more important to mankind and humanity, and over the years a grateful people are benefited by his wisdom, genius, benevolence, and humanity, of which he has an abundance. He is completely unostentatious, always accessible, eager to help in any charitable undertaking, provided—yes; provided—he may do so anonymously and "that my name must not be mentioned." He has a great and exceedingly exquisite philosophy: "Be a man and be a friend to everyone." "I consider a man is best educated who is most useful to his fellow man." "Your enemy is doubtless one who misunderstands you. Why, then, should you not rise above the fog and see his error, but respect him for the good qualities you find in him." I have heard great industrialists say that Col. Henry Crown's ideas in gigantic undertakings seem to be original in design, startling in concept, with all details worked out with consummate skill, resulting in meritorious success. He believes that a man who is not in sympathy with the simple little common everyday things in life and whose heart does not go out to the many should receive the absent treatment. He advocates, "Flee any man who does not have commonsense, no matter how great his mental attainments." It is said that he is a child of opportunity and devine energy, a most dynamic personality, whom fate had never permitted the extravagance of being able to go to high school or college during the daytime, but he certainly made up for it at night and by correspondence courses and actual experiences in his daily life. Genius is not acquired in college or university. It is born within one, but in his case we have the unique paradox of genius and a great beneficent heart in addition thereto

Whenever Colonel Crown enters an industrial undertaking, it is soon reflected in better, safer, and more humane working conditions, and a better understanding with employees. His mines are not only the safest, but the best maintained, the cleanest, and operated under men of proven ability as to character and appreciation for the best protection and welfare possible to each employee. He makes this his personal responsibility, and the spirit of recognition is carried out in every industrial undertaking in which he has an active or financial interest.

He does not desire to create a vast industrial empire. His enterprises are varied and skillfully maintained and operated. He does not crack a whip on those working with or under him. He accomplishes by affability and consideration, cooperation, and understanding. He is deeply interested in the welfare of the little fellow, his family, his problems, and his future, and they return in kind the proper loyalty. His modesty and deep dislike of publicity are two of the characteristics which make him the great benefactor that he is, and so, I am sure, always will be. He believes with all his heart in higher education and devotes a great deal of his time, efforts, and money to that cause. I have no statistics to prove how many youngsters have been the recipients of his beneficence, but they must be very many, and all anonymous. One must be born with that extra something that makes him the lover of humanity and friend of the less fortunate.

When I contacted him a few days before this graduation day, which by the way was the first time I had spoken to Col. Henry Crown in many years, the first thing that he asked me was: "What can I do for the boys and girls in the graduating class of Burr school; is there something I can give the class of a permanent or historic nature?" At that time he also asked me whether I attended Miss Justi's funeral, saying that he did not see me at the chapel; but I had been there the night before and my name was on the register. Miss Justi was a wonderful teacher who died recently at the age of 93, having had both of her limbs amputated because of diabetes. She had been an invalid for several years at an Evanston, Ill., rest home. She had no relatives whatsoever. I learned later that Col. Henry Crown was the Good Samaritan who did things again anonymously and upon which he refused to comment. I trust you will forgive me for mentioning here at this ceremony that these flowers which adorn your assembly hall and bear the legend "From the class of 1904 to the Class of 1935" was one of the little sparks of humanity by an anonymous benefactor. May I read to you a list of some of the achievements upon which we predicated our unanimous decision of calling him the outstanding graduate of the last 50 years. He is chairman of the board of Material Service Corp., described as the world's largest distributor of building supplies. He is a large stockholder and director of the Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway Co., vice president and director of the Hilton Hotels Corp., one of the owners of the Empire State Building. He owns the Chicago Mercantile Exchange Building, the 208 South LaSalle Street Building, the Freeman Coal Mining Corp., the Marblehead Lime Co., the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel the Hilton International Corp., the Omnibus Corp., Madison Square Garden, City Products Corp., West Indies Sugar Corp. He is a trustee of the Illinois Institute of Technology and DePaul University, trustee of the University of Chicago Cancer Research Foundation, member of North Western University Associates, University of Illinois citizens committee, director of the Evanston Hospital Association, national council member at large, Boy Scouts of America, served as a colonel in the Corps of Engineers in the United States Army during World War II, member of many clubs and industrial organizations and the Army and Navy Club, Washington, D. C.

Now it affords me great pleasure to present to the class of 1954 something that is not only rare but historical, and worthy of the greatest esteem and consideration. It is a hand engraved, beautifully framed, and extremely expensive "Historical Lipsner Kitty Hawk Cover." This is one of the items of the collection of Capt. Benjamin B. Lipsner, a native Chicagoan, and the founder of the United States airmail system, the man responsible for the first scheduled air flights and modern aviation as we know it today. This exhibit from which this purchase was made was held at the First National Bank of Chicago for 1 week commencing May 10, 1954, and thousands of Chicagoans and visitors, philatelists and collectors viewed with a great deal of interest this famous exhibit. On May 15, on the 36th anniversary of the founding of the United States airmail system, the United States Post Office Department in conjunction with the First National Bank of Chicago held an anniversary celebration at which time the postmaster of the city of Chicago, city, State, and county officials, generals of the Army, representatives of all of the Armed Forces, representatives of foreign consulates were present to pay homage to Capt. B. B. Lipsner on this occasion. This affair was so successful and the interest so keen in this famous Lipsner collection that upon the suggestion of the board of education of the city of Chicago and the request of the First National Bank, Capt. B. B. Lipsner permitted his collection to remain intact on display for an additional week in order to give the schoolchildren an opportunity to see this great historic and authentic collection. Well, this is one of those items from the famous collection, that was mailed in the presence of Orville Wright, autographed by the founder of the airmail system from the exact spot at Kill Devil Hills, Kitty Hawk, N. C., on the 25th anniversary of the first sustained airpowered flight in the history of the world by the Wright brothers. This is one of the limited number of the authenticated covers that was duly executed and authenticated on the 50th anniversary of the first sustained airpowered flight on December 17, 1953. Therefore, the class of 1904 presents to the class of 1954 as a token of great historic value in honor of Sol R. Crown, a wonderful American by an anonymous donor paid for by one who does not want his name mentioned. I leave to your good judgment whom this great benefactor really is.

Colonel Crown was recently honored by being chosen by 3,000 student leaders from 600 colleges and universities from coast to coast and given an award known as the Horatio Alger Award, under the auspices of the Association of the American Schools and Colleges, and he received this singular honor at the hands of President Eisenhower's brother, Dr. Milton Eisenhower. These are some of the motivating factors that caused us to pronounce him the outstanding graduate in the last 50 years. So I will close with wishing each of you, good health, and good fortune and success in the future, and with a most fervent hope and prayer that you will try to emulate some of the virtues of this great man, whom we honor today as the noblest example of Americanism, humanity, a friend of the common man, a blessing to our community and an outstanding reason for us to be proud to be members of a school which has produced so exemplary a man as Col. Henry Crown, and we fervently hope that he may be the principal speaker to the class of 1960, which will be the 50th anniversary of his graduation from Jonathan Burr School, and that as a soldier, a patriot, a man of unquestioned fidelity and trust, and an American of which any community would and should be justly proud, a man never seeking the limelight of publicity, one who gives of himself to help others, a good husband, a father, a loyal and devoted friend to mankind, a friend of labor, a man whose wealth and station in life has never dulled his vision. He is still interested in the little children that attend the school in which he received his first baptism in the three R's. May he live long and prosper. Thank you all.

Opposition Voiced by Four Major Groups in California to Colorado River Upper Basin Projects

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 24, 1954

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, four major organizations in California, the County Supervisors' Association of California, board of directors; the Los Angeles Central Labor Council; the California State Grange; and the Railroad Brotherhoods of California, have each adopted unanimous resolutions expressing strong opposition to pending congressional bills for Colorado River upper basin projects.

With every county in the State officially represented by the Supervisors' Association Board, their resolution presents a united defense against the proposed bills threatening California's rightful share of Colorado River water.

California's agricultural, industrial, and population growth is rooted in water, and we must protect its source to meet our present and future expansion and employment.

The resolution follows:

Whereas the County Supervisors Association of California has consistently opposed legislation injurious to the welfare of the citizens of this State and the Nation; and

Whereas the Colorado River Upper Basin billion dollar tax subsidy project bills (S. 1555, H. R. 236, and H. R. 4449), now pending before the Congress would inflict on all American taxpayers an unjustifiable new burden; and

Whereas for California as a whole, it would add $93,200,000 to the State's $25,443,600,000 share of the present $273 billion national debt; and

Whereas the economy of the Nation, the State of California, and every county therein would be seriously impaired by these costly and highly controversial proposals; and

Whereas this pending legislation calls for drastic changes in existing Federal water policy with the construction of an Echo Park Dam, which would flood a considerable portion of the Dinosaur National Monument in Utah; and

Whereas 80 years of a sound conservation policy would be broken and there would be created a dangerous precedent of like-invasion of all our great National and State parks; and

Whereas the County Supervisors Association of California is familiar with the organization, functions, activities, and program of the Colorado River Board of California in its representation of California in connection with matters relating to the Colorado River system; and

Whereas the State of California has a vital interest in the waters of the Colorado River system and said Colorado River Board was authorized and created and provided for by the Legislature of the State of California as an agency to protect the interests of the State of California in and to the waters of the Colorado River system: Now, therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Directors of the County Supervisors Association of California do hereby express our confidence in the Colorado River Board of California and supports said board's expressed opposition to this proposed legislation and authorizes the secretary of this association to mail copies of this resolution to all California Members of Congress.

The resolution of the Los Angeles Central Labor Council follows:

Whereas the Central Labor Council has consistently opposed legislation injurious to the welfare of the citizens of this city and the Nation; and

Whereas the Colorado River storage project bill (H. R. 4449), now pending before the Congress, would inflict on all American taxpayers an unjustifiable new burden; and

Whereas the economy of this city, the State of California, and the Nation would be seriously impaired by this costly and unnecessary project: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, that the Central Labor Council vigorously oppose passage of H. R. 4449 by the Congress.

The resolution of the California State Grange executive committee follows:

Whereas the California State Grange has consistently opposed legislation injurious to the welfare of California farmers and citizens of this State generally; and

Whereas the proposed Colorado River reclamation projects in Colorado, Utah, Wyoming, and New Mexico would endanger California's rightful share in the river's flow during the years in which the proposed upstream storage dams are filling; and

Whereas this overall scheme is unsound in that it would result in costly irrigation for comparatively few landowners and reclaim a limited acreage suitable for production; and

Whereas there is serious question whether the project could be self-liquidating, thus posing an unpredictable burden on the Nation's taxpayers; and

Whereas the legislation would make drastic changes in existing Federal water policy and, in one instance (Echo Park Dam), would create a dangerous precedent for invasion of an established national monument: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the California State Grange is opposed to enactment of pending congressional bills S. 1555, H. R. 4449, S. 964, and H. R. 236, as unsound Federal investments and a threat to California's rightful share of Colorado River water for its expanding population and agricultural and industrial growth.

The resolution of the Railroad Brotherhoods' Joint Legislative Council of California follows:

The Railroad Brotherhoods Joint Legislative Council of California, after due consideration of the effects of the enactment of the Colorado River storage bill (H. R. 4449), feel that the enactment of this legislation would not be in the public interest, and I am therefore directed to advise you of the position of our membership as outlined in the following resolution setting forth our position on this matter:

"Whereas the Railroad Brotherhoods Joint Legislative Council is vitally interested in any legislation affecting the welfare of the citizens of this country; and

"Whereas the Colorado River storage project bill (H. R. 4449) now pending before the Congress, would impose upon all American taxpayers an enormous additional burden; and

"Whereas the economy of the Nation would be seriously impaired by construction of this expensive and unjustifiable project: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the Railroad Brotherhoods Joint Legislative Council vigorously opposes passage of H. R. 4449 by the Congress; and we further urge that you do all possible to prevent this legislation from being enacted."

Adopted June 21, 1954, by the legislative representatives of the several organizations of the Railroad Brotherhoods Joint Legislative Council of California, upon behalf of the organizations and the membership thereof.

Clamp on Taxpayer Pockets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD H. BAKER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 19, 1954

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the Record, I include an editorial entitled "Clamp on Taxpayer Pockets," published in the Knoxville News-Sentinel on July 15, 1954:

CLAMP ON TAXPAYER POCKETS

Twenty years ago the national debt was a mere $27 billion—"mere" as Government spending now goes.

Today the debt is more than 10 times as big.

And the Treasury, scrambling for cash to pay bills contracted years back, again is after Congress to raise the debt limit to $290 billion so it can get by without defaulting on its bills.

The Eisenhower administration has made a genuine stab at balancing the budget. But it has not been enough. Still the bills pour in. There is no budget balance in sight.

Yet taxes have been cut by $7 billion. And because of these cuts, the Government is borrowing more money.

The truth is the budget is out of control.

The administration can't come fully to grips with it because of obligations incurred by the preceding administration. Congress still is spending money with one hand and cutting taxes with another—without letting either know what the other is doing.

What really is missing is taxpayer control.

Senators Harry F. Byrd, of Virginia, and Styles Bridges, of New Hampshire, are now proposing a method by which taxpayers may regain a measure of control.

They propose a constitutional amendment to forbid budget deficits except in wartime.

This seems to be the only way to get a balanced budget.

Twenty years ago, the legal debt limit was $30 billion. The country was never to borrow beyond that ceiling. But 4 years later, Congress raised the ceiling to $45 billion. Then to $65 billion, then $125, then $210, then $260, and finally to $300 billion. Only once has Congress reduced the debt limit, in 1946 to $275 billion. Now the pressure is on to make it $290 billion.

So long as the debt limit is subject to mere congressional action, there will be deficits. So long as there are election years, there will be tax cuts without comparable spending cuts. The record of the last 20 years leaves only one effective choice—a constitutional amendment to enforce balanced budgets.

The Independent Library

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. GWINN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 19, 1954

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, the organization of the Independent Library at Yale University is described by the chairman of the library, Mr. Gridley L. Wright, below. It may be a good example for other colleges and universities in the reawakening of the conservative mind:

The Independent Library at Yale was founded in January 1954, by five undergraduates. It is located in the basement of Farnam Hall on the old campus. The library stocks books and literature of a conservative nature, expressing the ethical principles of the Judeo-Christian tradition of individualism. The purpose of the library is to offer the other side of social, economic, political, and theological questions.

We hope to attract the interest of varied groups of students. Among those who we feel should be interested are:

1. Those who have been conservative, but feel that conservative principles are ostensibly refuted by their instruction in economics, sociology, political science, or religion.

2. Those who are conservative, but feel they do not understand the basis for their conservatism.

3. Those who are sincerely in doubt as to the validity of either conservative or neoliberal arguments.

4. Those who have not yet considered any of the questions carefully, but whose minds are receptive to the idea of questioning materialism before accepting it and to the force of logic.

5. Those who are neoliberals, but whose sincerity in searching for the truth obliges them to hear out both sides.

In general, then, the paramount purpose of the Independent Library is to make a basic appeal to everyone who believes that the truism, "There are two sides to every question," is not altogether passé. While we are, of course, interested in winning whatever proselytes we can, we feel that the best service we can perform is to furnish a sound basis of understanding and belief for those who are already inclined to the conservative side, or for those who have not yet been drawn away from it. This basis is a synthesis of spiritual, intellectual, and practical considerations; consequently, our books deal with topics found in all these fields.

The Independent Library is nonpartisan; its purpose is a positive one. We want to bring what we sincerely believe to be the truth about conservatism to all students. We hope that all thinking and intellectually unfettered persons will give our side of the question fair and rational consideration.

The personnel of the library at present consists of 5 juniors, 1 sophomore, and 1 freshman. We realize that an important consideration in beginning a project of this kind is that of perpetuating it after the founders have graduated. We feel that our location on the Yale freshman campus is particularly fortunate with regard to this problem. It is the freshman who comes to Yale, conservative because his family is conservative, but beyond this not knowing what a conservative is, or what reasoning stands behind conservative philosophy. His mind, however, is receptive to argumentation; he is willing to think, ready to be convinced. The first, and usually last, arguments and facts that he encounters are those of the neoliberals. Leftist philosophy is firmly entrenched in the minds of Yale's intellectuals. The economics courses are based upon the system of Lord Keynes; most political science courses have a quite observable democratic bias; sociology courses tell the student of the necessity for city planning, etc.; religion courses furnish him evidence for doubting his religion.

We have no desire to stop any of these practices, or to impinge upon anyone's academic freedom. We merely wish to make conservative arguments, conservative facts, conservative ideas, accessible to the undergraduate. For the freshman who arrives at Yale receptive to argumentation, ready to be convinced, the Independent Library is particularly accessive. Because our books are readily available, because we ourselves are readily available, we hope that an appreciable number of freshmen will become convinced of the validity of our arguments. Those who are most firmly convinced will be incorporated into the organization of the library. We think that a sufficient number of these last will be found to keep the library a going concern.

The present chairman of the library is a member of the sophomore class. The vice chairman is a freshman. We thus offer a positive guaranty of our library's constant activity until the year 1957. It is not unreasonable to expect that 3 years' concerted effort will constitute a good promissory note for the future.

The library is open from 7:30 until 11:30 every night of the week except Saturday. One or more of our group is always in attendance, to check out books and to talk to students who come in to read, to borrow books, or merely to look us over. We lend books free of charge for a period of 2 weeks, with the stipulation that borrowers will be responsible for replacing books that are destroyed or lost when checked out under their names. Those who wish to renew loans at the end of 2 weeks may do so. No books may be kept for a total period greater than 4 weeks.

At present the library is entirely self-supporting. Renovation of the physical plant, library equipment, preliminary publicity, and—most important—new books for expansion, will cost money. More money than we have, or can expect to have in the future. If the library is to achieve a high degree of success, if it is to fulfill the purposes we have delineated for it, financial support will be necessary. We now have about 130 books, 60 pamphlets, and numerous booklets and issues of periodicals; this obviously does not comprise the optimum of our library's development. There are countless other books to be added to our present modest collection. We wish to go further. We feel that we must go much further. We can do so only if we can gain the support of those that feel, as we do, that our work is vital to the well-being of our country, and that we have begun it where it should begin—in America's colleges.

The contest between Judeo-Christian moral individualism and materialist collecticism, in an often-heard phrase, is a war for men's minds. As such, it should be carried on in the fields where those minds are formed and given their intial positive direction. These are our colleges and universities. We hope that Yale can lead the way in this endeavor, just as she has done with so many others in the past.

For further information contact Gridley L. Wright, chairman, the Independent Library, 1783 Yale Station, New Haven, Conn.

Need for Mental Research and Funds Therefor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 19, 1954

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, one of my constituents, Mr. Ben May, of Mobile, Ala., devotes a considerable part of his income and much of his time to an effort to aid medical research. He spoke at a luncheon that I gave in the Vandenberg room for various Members of the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, this great man, Ben May, from the Deep South, has been my friend since we were boys and that has been a long, long time. I knew him when he started out and I saw him fight his way up from the bottom to the very top. He has been successful in all of his undertakings, especially in his business. He is one of the greatest humanitarians I know or ever expect to know. He is dividing what his great efforts for at least 40 or 50 years have produced for him and his family; he is dividing it with the afflicted people of his city, of his State, and of his Nation, and even of foreign countries. In Alabama he is one of the directors of the great research institute that Thomas W. Martin sponsors at Birmingham, Ala., that has done so much good. A school in Chicago has been named for the work and help that Ben May has given them.

I am speaking just for this one luncheon that we had in the Vandenberg room 2 weeks ago. Ben May and I have had many such meetings. He has talked to practically every Senator and every Representative of every State in the Nation, and that means he has talked to the representatives of men and women that represent over a hundred million people in this great Nation of ours.

I have never heard anything that was not in the fullest and best praise of this great man here in the Congress of the United States. I wish I could remember the words of Senator Wherry after we had had a luncheon for a group of Congressmen. Senator Wherry asked Ben May to come to his office. I went with him, and he told me how he wished he had met Ben May before. We had no idea at that time that this great Senator would be stricken with cancer. He talked to Ben May about helping to put up something in his hometown that would be helpful to the afflicted people there. Then Ben May went back with him several times.

I have heard the great WILLIS ROBERTSON, the Senator from Virginia, who has attended not one but a half-dozen luncheons that we gave so these men could hear the words of wisdom from this great man from Mobile. WILLIS ROBERTSON has said some of the finest things about Ben May that I have ever heard a Senator or anybody else say about any man.

The great Bob Doughton, former chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, who retired last year, attended one of these luncheons just before he left. He put his arms around Ben May and he said: "Young man, that is the greatest talk I have ever heard, and I want to help you every way I can."

Mr. Speaker, if we could all get behind this great humanitarian, Ben May, from my hometown, and help him in the work that he is doing, I do not know of any greater thing that we could do for the good people of this, the greatest Nation on earth. I consider my friend one of the most outstanding and greatest men, with the kindest heart and the biggest and best brain, that I have ever known or ever hope to know.

Mr. Speaker, I want all of us to know and read about some of the things that Ben May has done, is doing, and will continue to do. I wish all of you knew of the great work that he has done for the men in the service. I wish you could know what he has done for our churches of every denomination and for people of every race, creed, and color. There is no way to enumerate all the good things that this man has done and is doing, but I wish I could.

Under permission, I insert in the RECORD Mr. May's talk presenting the need for medical research first and secondly the importance of aid for research into the mental diseases:

I want to discuss in particular one type of research of great importance to our country but which, in the sense of interest in the matter as proportioned to its importance; has been the research stepchild of the Congress. I refer to research concerning mental illnesses, and because you may not have had enough time or perhaps occasion to consider the scope of the problem, or what you can do about it, I ask your indulgence while I discuss briefly the burden of mental illness to our Nation.

First, I shall devote 3 minutes to outlining the scope of the problem and during that time I will use some figures, but for the rest of this talk I shall try to avoid statistics. And when I finish this talk I will give you sources of authority on figures I use, if you wish them.

The Government spends over a half billion dollars yearly for pensions to veterans because of neuropsychiatric disabilities and for the hospitalization of certain of these veterans. Our various States spend considerably over a half billion dollars annually to care for their mentally ill. These figures take no account of the tremendous sums spent each year to build hospital facilities to house an ever-increasing number of mentally afflicted.

Part of the manpower loss to mental illness is as follows: There are between 550,000 and 600,000 inmates in tax supported mental institutions. Over half of them could work if it were not for their mental illness. Also about 125,000 workers are required by hospitals to care for the mentally afflicted in their care. All this takes no account of other hundreds of thousands of mentally ill kept home because no free public facilities are available for their care.

From the standpoint of loss of manpower to the military, during World War II more than 1,846,000 men were rejected prior to induction because of neuropsychiatric disabilities and 453,000 men were discharged by the services after induction because of neuropsychiatric disabilities. These figures mean that more men were lost to the military by neuropsychiatric disabilities than the Army sent to the Pacific.

I shall not attempt to figure the hundreds of millions of dollars lost in training, to a greater or lesser degree, these 453,000 men who were inducted and then were later discharged because of neuropsychiatric disabilities.

I have, with extreme brevity, outlined the problem and you may ask, What is the answer? The humane answer and the economical answer to all of this is to use research to find remedies or cures for many of the mental ills.

It is not a case of whether or not our country can afford to spend money for research into the mental diseases. The proposition is better stated as follows: We are not rich enough, and we are not strong enough, to heedlessly accept this ever-continuing hemorrhage of lost manpower, lost military power, and lost money occasioned by mental illness when research can show us how to stop a considerable part of the hemorrhage.

I have said we can do something about this problem by using research as the necessary tool. But I am only a lumberman who makes no bluff at being learned. Therefore you may well wonder how you as a layman can judge if there is a likely chance that my ideas are right.

I answer such a reasonable doubt with two points; namely, A and B. Point A: I have had the ideas I shall set out for you checked by well-known doctors, pharmacologists, and biochemists, as well as by professors of psychiatry in some of our best-known universities. These were nearly all research workers familiar with problems relating to human health. They believe the approach I suggest offers great hope of worthwhile achievement within a reasonable time. If you are interested enough to ask me the names of some of these scientists and the universities or labs with which they are connected, at the end of this talk I will gladly give you this information at the same time that I give you the sources of authority for the few statistics that I use, if you wish.

Point B: My second and final point is this. You can have confidence in your ability to judge the soundness of my ideas because my talk is in the everyday language of a layman. I shall simply set out some facts, many or all of which are likely known to you. The first facts I set out will be for the purpose of showing how chemicals affect the mind. Then I will list certain great cures and preventives of mental illness which have already been achieved by the use of chemicals. You can then judge whether or not a medical idea can be simple and yet represent a truth.

An engineer has never had a trace of mental trouble. At 63 he has a cataract removed. To reduce pain and induce sleep he is given sedatives like demerol and barbiturates. After 4 days of this sedation he becomes generally irrational and must be held in bed. He does not know where he is. He thinks people are out to get him and when a door is slammed he insists that he is being shot at. This is called toxic psychosis. You can give the patient something to speed up the elimination of the chemical causing the trouble and within a day or two to a week the man will be mentally normal and can stay that way permanently. His mental illness was caused by the effect of a chemical on the mind.

A stern, hard-boiled man drinks a pint or so of whisky and his character (that is, his mind) changes completely so that instead of being hard boiled he wants to give money to others. A chemical (alcohol) makes the man that way.

A sufficient continuing dose of the chemical ergot can cause people to go completely insane. Also, mescaline, lysergic acid, and other chemicals too numerous to mention can affect mental stability. Is it not reasonable to believe that if a chemical can make a person mentally ill, then some other chemical properly chosen can make that person well just as we know that a person may be made ill by one chemical which we sometimes term "poison," and yet the poison can often be overcome by another chemical which we term the "antidote" for that poison?

Now, how quickly can chemicals restore an insane person to sanity? The times varies but I will first cite a quick cure described by the doctors who achieved it, namely, Drs. Cleckley and Sydenstricker, of the University of Georgia Medical School.

A man not a pellagrin is completely irrational. He is overactive and needs to be held in bed. He cannot talk coherently. They begin to give him a moderate dose of sodium nicotinate intravenously. Within 15 minutes and while the chemical is still flowing into his veins he becomes cooperative and quiets down. Several hours later he is sane. This is not a case of recovery by coincidence because this case is one of a series of 40 cases reported by these doctors at one time.

As you know, our bodies require certain chemical compounds called vitamins. A vitamin deficiency may cause complete insanity. Until we knew this to be so, patients who were insane because of vitamin deficiencies were often locked up until released by death. This type of insanity is often associated with pellagra. One of the first doctors to use the vitamin nicotinic acid to cure pellagra was Dr. Tom Spies who proceeded to visit insane asylums and treat inmates he thought could be helped by this vitamin. He then gave this harmless chemical, and sometimes in hours, but other times in days, their minds cleared up. Dr. Spies told me of one woman who had been locked up for 12 years. He restored her from insanity to sanity in 3 days' time with 3 grams of nicotinic acid. This was about one-tenth of an ounce and cost a few cents.

Another patient feels certain that neighbors are trying to kill him. He sees bugs and animals on the wall and he can also see and feel them crawling on his body. He is incoherent. Yet a small amount of nicotinic acid restores the man to sanity and he can even discuss his recent past insanity just as one of us might decribe a nightmare after awakening.

Dr. Alexis Carell, who was one of the best known scientists of the Rockefeller Institute, wrote some years before he died that thought is the offspring of the endocrine glands as well as of the cerebral cortex. Dr. Carell further stated that man thinks with all his organs and the cerebral centers (that is, the thing we think of as the brain) are composed not simply of nervous matter but they also consist of the fluids in which the cells of the brain are immersed. These fluids are regulated by the blood serum which contains the secretions that diffuse the entire body. Therefore, said Dr. Carell "Thru the blood and lymph, every organ of the body is present in the consciousness."

I give you just one more quotation to indicate that for years certain men of vision have realized the importance of these chemicals, these physiological approaches to an understanding of mental illness.

Over 60 years ago Maudsley, a well-known alienist, said there could be no improvement in our treatment of mental illness until we ceased to think of it as so exclusively psychological and sincerely realize that mental ills represent the same pathological principles as other diseases and they are produced in the same way.

In other words, the brain is an organ. The second largest organ in the body and so chemically important that it alone consumes over one-fifth of all the oxygen used by the body.

Now you may feel that cures simply cannot be that easy, or otherwise we would have had the answers long ago. I answer such doubt by quoting a philosopher who said "Because man will not study the errors of the past he is condemned to repeat them." Therefore, let us consider an example from past medical history.

For centuries scurvy was the greatest illness among sailors. On long voyages they carried twice as many men as needed because they knew the illness would weaken or kill so many men. As far back as 1593 Sir Richard Hawkins in "Observations on his Voyage to the South Seas" told how to prevent scurvy by the use of lemon juice. A very few far-sighted shipping companies took up the idea, but until almost the beginning of the 19th century the greatest illness among sailors continued to be scurvy. It is a disease where the gums and different parts of the body continue to bleed, the gums become soft and sometimes the teeth fall out. Men become delirious and very weak.

In 1739 James Lind finished his medical apprenticeship and entered the British Navy as surgeon's mate. Reading convinced James Lind that scurvy could be cured or prevented by fruit juices. In 1747 he proved by controlled experiment that orange or lemon juice was a specific treatment for scurvy. He also developed an improved method for the preservation of these juices.

Despite his results and detailed report given in his Treatise on Scurvy, published in 1753, it was over 40 years before the Admiralty gave orders that lemon juice had to be issued on all boats, and during that time more seamen suffered and died from scurvy than for all other causes together.

I do not claim that we will find these chemical answers to many of the mental ills as easily as just trying the first thing that comes along, but I say there are many kinds of mental illness that will respond to chemical therapy, and the first essential for learning what to do and use is money—money enough to permit us to continue research along the present lines of endeavor, plus additional necessary funds to enable research workers to explore more fully these chemical approaches to the cure or prevention of many mental ills.

And now I want to mention some of the great accomplishments of the past half century in the conquest of mental disease. These accomplishments are the result of medical research.

Formerly 15 to 20 percent of all patients in State hospitals were there because of an illness called paresis. They were called paretics. Then through research the Wassermann test for syphilis was developed about 1906, and it was noted that generally all paretics had syphilis. Later, about 1913, the spirochetes of syphilis were found present in the brains of paretics. Doctors tried to cure this illness through fever therapy and they had a limited success. Then research produced penicillin, which is now curing and preventing so much syphilis that during the past 5 years admissions of mentally ill due to paresis have dropped over 50 percent and the country is saving over $40 million each year through this advance in the cure and prevention of this one kind of mental illness.

Thirty years ago every 12th case of mental illness in hospitals of the South was due to pellagra. Then through research it was found that nicotinic acid could cure this type of insanity, sometimes in a matter of hours, but more often within a week. If we contrast the cure of a pellagrin by the use of less than a dollar's worth of nicotinic acid against the cost of the care for that patient, often for the balance of the patient's life, we glimpse the possible economy I suggest that we work toward. I am pleading for enlightened self-interest. I say we can help the unfortunate and save taxpayers' money at the same time.

Our record with epilepsy is even better. Research has developed drugs which control or cure over 80 percent of epilepsy so epileptics can lead normal lives. Through these discoveries of research, millions of dollars are saved annually to our States and to our Government.

Even the feebleminded can be aided by research. Thus, cretins who are often misshapen, dwarf and idiot at the same time, can be made to grow into normal or relatively normal humans, provided the infant is administered a hormone from the thyroid gland. This seeming miracle is achieved because research has shown the cause of cretinism to be insufficient thyroid function.

I have spoken of mental research and now I would like to tell you how little is spent on research into mental illness. Government, State, and private funds combined spend as little on research as our country spends on goldfish. The Federal Government spends annually on research into the mental illnesses just about the cost of two modern B–52 bombers or, more likely, less than that sum.

I emphasize that I would not compare ordinary expenditures against appropriations for the military if it were not that these health matters are entwined with our economic strength, with our tax burden, and with our military potential.

The idea I seek to convey was expressed by Disraeli when he said, "The health of the people is really the foundation on which all their happiness and all their powers as a state depends." Mental health also is part of the foundation on which our happiness and our powers as a state depend.

Jewish Renaissance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 19, 1954

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include two splendid articles, one entitled "Jewish Renaissance," and the other "Toil, Sweat, Tears Remake Israel—It Seems Like a Dream," appearing in the July 7, 1954, and July 8, 1954, issues of the Boston Traveler, Boston, Mass.

These two articles were written exclusively for the Boston Traveler by Dr.

Alexander Brin, who is also the editor and publisher of the Jewish Advocate, the largest and most influential English-Jewish publication in the United States, who is nationally and internationally known for his leadership in educational, cultural, philanthropic, and welfare movements. The articles follow:

[From the Boston Traveler of July 7, 1954]

JEWISH RENAISSANCE—AMAZING TRANSFORMATION OF NATION IN BRIEF TIME TOLD BY HUB'S DR. BRIN

(By Dr. Alexander Brin)

The impulse to travel to see every part of the United States and across the seas has ever been strong in my heart for more than a quarter of a century.

It dates back to the time when, as chairman of the State Program Committee of the Massachusetts Bicentennial Commission, created by the legislature, my mentor and teacher, the late Dr. Albert Bushnell Hart, professor of history and government at Harvard University, invited me to accompany him on a nationwide tour to the innumerable historic landmarks connected with the founding of this nation.

BREATHE THE AIR OF LIBERTY

Having the rare privilege of breathing the same air that the founders of our Nation breathed, walking the same streets, viewing the same scenes, we sensed to a much deeper degree the true meaning of liberty.

It was a thrill to visit the shrines of the noblest American personalities who laid solid foundations for the political, industrial, and commercial progress of the country.

VISION, COURAGE

We need but look about us to see the blessed results of their planning, the multitudinous benefits which their vision and courage and service bequeathed to us, the mightiest fortress of freedom on the globe.

We rediscovered the basic ingredients which make up the American way of life when we visited the monument which the Nation erected to its founders at Plymouth, in our own State, where the history of our Nation began. This shrine is no longer a relic of the past—it meant now the indestructible symbol of the American way now being challenged by enemies from within and without.

We observed the five figures, symbolizing faith, morality, law, education, freedom, upon which, as if upon eternal rock, those brave and rugged Mayflower people founded our Commonwealth. It is a warning to those who attempt to pull down those colossal ideals to their own meager dimensions.

After seeing America first, I for one was willing to admit that there ought to be a law—a Federal law, compelling every American to see his own country before venturing beyond its borders.

But as a student of American history, I have read with great interest the written records by famous Americans about their travels abroad. The travel literature of Thomas Jefferson, the architect of America's character; Benjamin Franklin; and America's greatest authors of the 19th century, which included Mark Twain, Washington Irving, Nathaniel Hawthorne, James Fenimore Cooper, Ralph Waldo Emerson, and Henry Adams, all stressed the point that to appreciate America we must also see the rest of the world.

Perhaps the most thoughtful expression concerning travel was written by Mark Twain. He concludes the Innocents Abroad with this statement:

"Travel is fatal to prejudice, bigotry, and narrowmindedness, and many of our people needed it sorely on these accounts. Broad, wholesome, charitable views of men and things cannot be acquired by vegetating in one little corner of the earth all one's lifetime."

WILLKIE CONVINCED

In recent years, it was the late Wendell Willkie, who became a forthright spokesman for the "One World" when, after an extensive world tour, he came to the conclusion that America's role is the most profoundly important opportunity ever given to a great nation.

Willkie asserted that not only must we help to secure freedom on the battlefield, but we must never relinquish our role to keep the world free and to help others achieve the same blessings that we Americans enjoy: Basic human rights, public health, education, industrial aid, and the dignity of free men.

Everytime I return from a pilgrimage abroad, my foremost thought is a deeper appreciation of my country than ever before, and particularly so with regard to our system of government. Life in the United States is worth whatever it may cost. I have an unwavering faith that the American idea, based upon freedom of the human spirit, will eventually rule the world.

My interest in the State of Israel came through my association with the late Mr. Justice Louis D. Brandeis who, pleading the Zionist cause in 1914, said:

"My approach to Zionism was through Americanism. In time a practical experience showed me that Jews were by reason of their traditions and their character peculiarly fitted in the attainment of American ideals. The ideals of 20th century America have been the ideals of the Jew for 20 centuries.

"The Jewish renaissance in Palestine will enable us to perform our plain duty to America. It will help us to make toward the attainment of the American ideals of democracy and social justice that large contribution for which religion and the life have peculiarly fitted the Jew. America's fundamental law seeks to make real the brotherhood of man. That brotherhood became the Jew's fundamental law more than 2500 years ago."

A little more than 20 years ago, on the eve of my first trip to the Holy Land, from which have sprung nearly all the great spiritual impulses of mankind, Mr. Brandeis said to me, among other things, "Alexander, you shall witness in your lifetime the age-old realization of a Jewish national homeland in the cradle of civilization, Palestine."

HEARTS THROBBED

Twice since the State of Israel became a reality, as the head of pilgrimages of Christians and Jews to the land of remarkable vigor and stronghold of democracy in the Middle East, where human freedom has released the springs of imagination and creative ability, our hearts throbbed with emotion and glowed with pride as we observed what is transpiring with the fulfillment of Mr. Brandeis' prophecy. History has proven Mr. Brandeis to have been a supreme realist.

To visit Israel during the present blooming period and to tread the soil that has echoed the sounds of saints and prophets, where the Bible, whose pages are radiant with the light of liberty, democracy, and equality, saw the light of day, is a rich and unforgettable experience.

One feels instinctively that thousands of years of history are converging upon him. It recalled those verses of Scripture which spoke of human liberty and the rights of the common man against the kings of the earth. It recalled the words of the prophets filled with righteous living, and concerned with self-reliance and courage, uttered unafraid in a world of callousness and evil.

The great experiment in Israel reform may one day be the hope of the world. What is happening in Israel is one of the most amazing transformations of a country in a brief period ever recorded in the historic annals of civilization.

When I first visited Palestine 20 years ago, Jews were coming in large numbers, especially to Jerusalem, to die. The most characteristic feature of Jerusalem was the Wailing Wall, the few remaining mighty stones of King Solomon's Temple, where pious Jews used to gather to weep over the lost glories of Zion.

But now the sons of Israel no longer lament the past; they came to live and work for the future. The whole tone of Israel is one of idealism and progress, the sacrificing of the present for a better and nobler future for all God's children.

Israel is seething with life and expanding from day to day in a manner which parallels the early beginnings of the United States of America. Israel dwelt in Palestine from the days of Joshua—save for about 50 years of exile in Babylon—for 15 centuries. In the year 70, the Roman conquest ended Jewish rule.

The Arabs controlled Palestine for 800 years, from the 7th century till 1453, when the Turks took and kept possession until World War I. It became known as "the land God forgot," so slight has been the change in 14 centuries.

[From the Boston Traveler of July 8, 1954]

TOIL, SWEAT, TEARS REMAKE ISRAEL—IT SEEMS LIKE A DREAM—PIONEERS, IMMIGRANTS, REFUGEES WORKING WONDERS IN NEW STATE

(By Dr. Alexander Brin)

The nation of Israel stands because of the toil, sweat and tears which the pioneers poured into the forbidding wastelands; because technicians hacked their way through almost impenetrable rocky mountains so that foundations could be laid for hundreds of new settlements, 327 having been established since the state was born 6 years ago.

The brain and brawn of the pioneers, the intelligence and industry of the people, the enthusiasm and hope of the refugees, the generous and neighborly spirit of the native Israelis, who are referred to as Sabras (the derivation of Sabra comes from the fruit of the cactus—tough and pricky on the outside but sweet on the inside) have had much to do with marvels wrought against the centuries that the Arabs lived there.

IT ALL SEEMS LIKE A DREAM

When I look back in my memory to the Palestine of 20 years ago, everywhere barren wilderness and forbidding mountainous regions, with its soil covered with stones, thistles and weeds, and the unhappy Arabs trying to wring from the barren soil a meager harvest, it all seems to me like a dream.

The unwanted immigrant pioneers came to Israel with love and devotion in their hearts, with faith and courage in their souls, and they made their way through the obstructions of ignorance, prejudice, envy and are busy changing the barren hills and vales of Judea into spots of beauty and loveliness.

Beautiful little children, whose parents were the victims of Nazi gas chambers, sing and play and dance in colorful gardens under sunny skies of the Holy Land.

There is a spirit of kinship between Israel's independence and that of the United States of America. It is hard to find a better expression than the words used in Israel's Declaration of Independence. There is a quality in it gloriously American. It sounds like a reaffirmation of American ideals. There is something majestic about these words:

"The State of Israel will promote the development of the country for the benefit of all its inhabitants; will be based on precepts of liberty, justice, and peace, taught by the Hebrew prophets; will uphold the full social and political equality of all its citizens without distinction of race, creed, or sex; will guarantee full freedom of conscience, worship, education, and culture; will safeguard the sanctity and inviolableness of shrines and holy places of all religions and dedicate itself to the principles of the Charter of the United Nations."

Israel has remained true to its promise. The Arab inhabitants of the new state have joined their fellow-citizens of the Jewish faith in the development of a fuller and richer life for both, each enjoying full and equal citizenship and due representation in all governing bodies.

SCHOOL SYSTEM

Our American Founding Fathers pledged their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor for the support of their right to be an independent, democratic nation. The men and women of Israel daily make a similar pledge. For them, hardships and death are not too great a price to pay for liberty.

Because of my deep personal and official interest in education, I was thrilled to witness the wonderful school system offering almost a universal education.

The educational system entails kindergartens, primary schools, high schools, teachers' training colleges, vocational training schools, schools of music and of art, agricultural schools, theological schools, the Technion School of Haifa, the School of Law and Economics in Tel Aviv, the Weizmann Institute of Science, and the Hebrew University in Jerusalem, with its new addition of a medical school.

In order to meet the growing educational needs, they are building new colleges and universities, hospitals, and art museums. There are undertakings galore in the fields of music and the fine arts, institutions to promote scientific discovery and application of new knowledge to the wants and needs of man.

All these institutions breathe the American spirit of brotherly love and are open to serve the Arabs and the Christians and the Jews alike. Though maintained by the Jews, they are enjoyed by all groups. The Jew offers the Arab every cultural and philanthropic and industrial advantage he grants to his own.

Life in Israel is built upon the pioneer virtues of the Founding Fathers of our own Nation. No pleasure of greater proportion or more gratifying satisfaction has been mine than the opportunity to speak as an American citizen at a Passover Seder service in Jerusalem attended by representatives of freedom-loving nations in commemoration of the first bill of human rights in recorded history issued in the Holy Land.

I addressed a number of educational assemblies and helped to dedicate a number of cultural and philanthropic institutions, including a community center in a frontier town known as Kfar Blum, made possible by the Boston philanthropists, Mr. and Mrs. Joseph F. Ford. Mr. Ford is one of the founders and treasurer of Brandeis University.

It has been given to our generation to witness the rebirth of Israel and to have become again the religious and intellectual center of that ancient Land of Promise. Israel is destined to be a leader in the entire Middle East in the promotion of the arts of peace, in scientific progress, and in democratic living.

BIBLE IS KEY

Progress in industry has been just as remarkable, despite the acute shortage of raw materials. For the young State of Israel, the Bible is not only a great book of religion and a moral way of life, it is a book whose significant historical writings may give to modern Israel the key to unlock the mineral wealth of the barren Negev for a productive economy.

The Negev is a tract of southern Israel between the Dead Sea, the Mediterranean Sea and the Egyptian border. Scientists and archeologists have probed into its mysteries and have found proof that beneath the barren sands lie the mineral wonders described by the Bible as the true land of milk and honey.

The exploitation of the Negev is providing certain raw materials for basic industries and enabling the establishment of new industries. The existence of copper, manganese, sulfur, phosphate, felspar, glass, sand ball clay, has been definitely found, resulting in the reduction of imports and the saving of foreign currency. The Negev is producing tons of copper daily and the Dead Sea works yield thousands of tons of potash annually.

Some of the best scientific brains in Israel are working in the great educational centers to create products that may someday compensate for Israel's lack of industrial raw materials. They've already done some remarkable things with agriculture, such as the perfecting of a simple device for drawing water out of the atmosphere for aiding irrigation.

A feature of the new state is the reemergence of Hebrew as a language of everyday life, after many centuries during which it had been used almost exclusively for religious purposes.

CHILDREN RESCUED

This year, Israel celebrated the 20th anniversary of Youth Aliyah, which has succeeded in rescuing 65,000 children from 70 different countries and in bringing them to safe shores. It has given them a new faith in mankind, aroused wonderful creative forces, and has been responsible for pioneer endeavor through the founding of new settlements.

It is a remarkable testimony to the effectiveness of its educational work that over 90 percent, of these children saved from Hitler's clutches have remained on the land as pioneer settlers.

While in Jerusalem for Passover we worshipped in the Bnai Jeshurun Synagogue. Among the attendants was President Ben-Zvi and many members of the Israeli cabinet. Chief Rabbi Herzog is a most impressive looking man with a white beard who speaks with a suggestion of a brogue (he formerly was the chief rabbi of Ireland).

The ties of friendship between Ireland and Israel is evidenced by the spirit of friendliness and cordiality between the people of Ireland and the people of Israel.

Eamon de Valera, the former Prime Minister of Eire, and Robert Briscoe, the only Jewish member of the Irish Parliament, have visited Israel.

Both the Jews and Irish have similar traits. In the history of the Jews and the Irish, one finds that both have a hatred of injustice, that both have passionate devotion for traditions and ideals inherited from their forefathers.

There is also a similarity of national experience. Both the Jews and the Irish were oppressed for centuries, yet neither the Irish nor the Jews permitted the lordly nations to break their spirit.

The fact that both Israel and Ireland have, within a short span of time, achieved sovereign statehood—goals representing the fulfillment of centuries of yearning—strengthens the bonds between the Israelis and the Irish. In Rabbi Herzog, there is a personification of that bond of amity and goodwill.

The conflict between the Jews and the Arabs is a conflict between two concepts of civilization—the one, the modern concept, followed by Israel, is that of growth, expansion, development, making full use of modern ideas, modern technological methods and modern machinery; the other, that of the Arabs, is clinging to the old, leaving things as they have been for 2,000 years.

ISRAEL IS GRATEFUL

Israel is a small state, with a population of 1¾ million. The Arabs have a hundred times the area, have a population of 40 million and have oil. Oil is an important factor and that is why some of the Western Powers are more severe with Israel than they are with the Arabs.

Israel is grateful for the great help received from the Jews of America, and for sympathy and support of the free democratic world. Israel faces the future with faith and confidence. It is advancing under the inspiration of three great visions: development, freedom, and peace.

The Israelis are determined to continue to develop the natural resources of the country, to pioneer wastelands, and to press forward industrial progress. They plan to strengthen and consolidate the democratic regime built on the firm foundations of freedom. And they promise to stand together with all their might with peace-loving and freedom-loving nations of the world.

No civilization can rise higher than the individuals who comprise it. That is why every effort and sacrifice is being made by parents, teachers, and governmental agencies to keep the children of Israel healthy, happy, and self-reliant.

There is no problem of juvenile delinquency. The aim and hope of all is to raise a strong, independent and educated generation dedicated, in the spirit of democracy and the great noble religious traditions, to the service of humanity and the fulfillment of the prophecy of Micah:

"And they shall sit everyone under his vine and fig tree; and none shall make them afraid."

This was the same prophecy that was used by President Washington in the formative days of the Nation.

It Would Not Have Happened Had Dies Committee Been Heeded

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN DIES

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 19, 1954

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, since World War II communism has cost the United States thousands of lives and billions of dollars, and the end is not in sight. No one can predict the outcome. There may be another world war far more destructive and devastating than any war in history.

This situation was caused by the failure of the United States to grasp the fixed purpose of the Kremlin to conquer the world and to understand the tactics employed for the accomplishment of this purpose. On January 3, 1939, the Dies committee unanimously submitted its first report to the Congress and the executive department. Among other things, the committee found:

> We have shown that communism is a worldwide revolutionary movement aiming ultimately at the setting up of a world union of Soviet Socialist Republics. This is a proposition which is beyond dispute. It is substantiated by voluminous literature of the Communists themselves.
>
> In this plan for world revolution the Communists have omitted no country or people as too small or insignificant to command their attention. They have, on the other hand, taken the logical position of concentrating their attention upon the richest and most populous countries of the earth. Among these the Communists recognize the United States of America as the foremost

> The Communist's conquest of the earth will be far less than complete until it has conquered America and destroyed our free institutions.
>
> It follows logically from the Communist International's plan of world conquest that every possible tactic, device, maneuver, and intrigue would be employed to gain such an end as the communization of America. These tactics, devices, maneuvers, and intrigues are both boldly open and patently subtle, both violent and insidious. The tactics and maneuvers for revolutionary ends are the meat and drink of a Communist. They are the very air he breathes.

If our Government had heeded this finding of the Dies committee, it would not have made enormous concessions to Russia at Yalta and Potsdam. It was these postwar concessions which enabled the Soviet Union to emerge from a third-rate power to the status of a world menace.

Another cause of the Communist menace was the theft by Communists inside our Government of our military, diplomatic, and scientific secrets and the influence which these some Communists exerted upon our foreign policy. If we could have retained these secrets, such as the A-bomb and the H-bomb, as well as many others, it would have been a long time before Russia could have acquired them and thereby neutralized the tremendous advantage which the exclusive possession of these secrets gave us. Long before these secrets were stolen, the Dies committee named the Communists on the Federal payroll and urged their discharge. In its report filed on January 3, 1939, the Dies committee found:

> The Communist Party has penetrated the Government itself, with the result that some Communists hold key positions in Federal agencies and projects.

In the report of the Dies committee dated January 2, 1943, are the following findings:

> Since the committee's creation in 1938, there has come to its attention from time to time the presence in the Federal Government of high salaried employees who were prominently and definitely identified with communism and its front organizations. Many of these cases were promptly called to the attention of the President, the Congress, and the departmental head concerned by either the committee or its members. At this point, the committee would like to cite a number of examples where this procedure has been followed.
>
> On October 25, 1939, the committee made public the names, positions, and salaries of some 563 Government employees located in Washington, D. C., who were members of the American League for Peace and Democracy. In three reports which this committee has made to the House, it has found the American League for Peace and Democracy to be a Communist-front organization. * * *
>
> Pursuant to this request, the committee on October 17, 1941, sent to the Attorney General the names of 1,124 Federal Government employees who were members of organizations which this committee had found to be subversive. These membership lists had been obtained largely by subpena and have been identified and authenticated by the officials of the organization involved. All of the committee's files were immediately made available to the Attorney General and his investigators, who were charged with carrying out the mandate of Congress as contained in this act.

Thus, it will be seen that before World War II the Dies committee had furnished the executive department with the names of several thousand Government officials and employees who belonged to organizations with the committee and the Attorney General had found to be Communist controlled and subversive. Included in this list were the names of Alger Hiss, Harry Dexter White, and Harold Glasser. These people were kept on the Government payroll for at least 10 years after they were exposed, and the theft of our military, diplomatic, and scientific secrets was made possible because of their presence on the Federal payroll. Furthermore, these Government officials greatly influenced our foreign policy in favor of Russia.

Another cause which contributed to Communist successes was the failure of our Government to deport and exclude Communist aliens. In 1932, my bill to deport and exclude Communist aliens passed the House of Representatives but was stymied in the Senate by the liberal bloc headed by Senator La Follette. At that time, there were only 20,000 Communists in the United States and 90 percent of them were aliens. If my bill had become a law, these Communists would have been deported and the thousands who came after 1932 would have been excluded. The Communist conspiracy would have been nipped in the bud.

In the committee's report filed on January 3, 1939, is the following finding:

> The committee received considerable evidence of the activities of Communist, Nazi, and Fascist aliens in the United States. It does not seem that these aliens experience any difficulty in entering the United States or remaining here after entrance. A large part of un-American activities is inspired and carried on by these aliens. * * *
>
> The committee believes that it will be difficult to ever cope with un-American activities and propaganda in this country so long as the Department of Labor follows its present policy with reference to deportation. The laxity with which the Department of Labor deals with alien agitators would be unbelievable if we did not have before us the most convincing proof. * * *
>
> We further believe that greater care should be exercised in permitting aliens to enter the United States to the end that aliens who believe in or advocate communism, fascism, and nazism will be excluded.

In the committee's report filed January 3, 1940, we recommended:

> The mandatory deportation of aliens who advocate any basic change in the form of our government; the enactment of legislation to stop all immigration from foreign countries that refuse to accept the return of their nationals found under American law to be deportable from this country.

Needless to say, this recommendation was more or less ignored. Belatedly, however, 335 deportation orders were issued for alien Communists. A majority of the 335 names appear in the records of the Dies committee. There have been 99 indictments and, in most cases, convictions under the so-called Smith Act, and all but 22 of these persons were named by the Dies committee as Communists.

Another cause of Communist strength and success in the United States was the infiltration of labor unions and seizure of control. Through these labor unions Russia was able to wield great political influence. These unions had the balance of power in some areas. In its report filed January 3, 1939, the committee found:

> The Communist Party is boring from within labor unions on a wide scale, seeking to dominate or wreck the unions for purposes that are alien to the interest of organized wage earners. It deliberately projects violence in labor disputes for the purpose of training a revolutionary group in the tactics of civil war. It seeks to sabotage and cripple our economy on every possible front, with the view to its profiting by the resulting economic crisis.

The Dies committee cited the follow-unions as Communist-dominated:

> The United Electrical and Radio and Machine Workers; the United Office and Professional Workers; the United Farm Equipment Workers; the International Union of Mine, Metal, and Smelter Workers; the United Public Workers; the Food, Tobacco, and Agricultural Workers; the American Communications Association; the International Fur and Leather Workers Union; the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union; the Marine Cooks and Stewards; and the International Fishermen and Allied Workers.

The Dies committee was bitterly assailed by the CIO because it named these unions as Communist-dominated. In my own district where we had strong CIO unions, I was denounced by CIO leaders and publications as a labor baiter and a reactionary. Years later, however—in many instances 10 years later—all of these unions were expelled from the CIO for being Communist-dominated. If they had been expelled promptly after the Dies committee exposed them, as we recommended, the influence of communism in the United States upon our domestic and foreign policies would have been considerably lessened.

Another cause for Communist success in the United States was the infiltration of educational institutions. In its report filed January 3, 1939, the Dies committee found:

> The Communist Party is unusually active in our schools, both openly and subtly insinuating its propaganda into the minds of students.

In its report dated January 3, 1941, the Dies committee recommended as follows:

> Withhold all Federal financial support from any educational institution which permits members of its faculty to advocate communism, fascism, or nazism as a substitute for our form of government to the student body of these educational institutions.

If this recommendation had been adopted, educational institutions would have been compelled to expel Nazis, Fascists, and Communists from their faculty. This would have struck a telling blow at the Communist conspiracy.

After my bill to deport and exclude Communist aliens was stymied in the Senate, instructions went forth to all Communist aliens to become naturalized.

Therefore, in the committee's report dated January 3, 1941, we recommended as follows:

> We recommend that the statutory period during which citizenship papers can be revoked under existing law be extended to at least 10 years.

If this recommendation had been followed, our Government could have revoked the citizenship papers of Nazis, Fascists, and Communists and deported at least 90 percent of them.

A contributing cause to the growth of the Communist conspiracy in the United States was the ease with which Communist agents were able to travel to and from the United States. In its report dated January 3, 1945, the committee recommended:

> Due to the fact that the committee has discovered that many members of foreign-controlled organizations have traveled on American passports which have been fraudulently obtained, the committee feels that the statute of limitations should be extended from 3 to 7 years. This is made necessary because of the unusual difficulty in apprehending those who resort to the use of fraudulent passports within the period of 3 years.

The most important recommendation made by the Dies committee during the 7 years of its existence was the recommendation contained in the report of 1941, that foreign-controlled political organizations be outlawed. It reads as follows:

> The enactment of legislation to outlaw every political organization which is shown to be under the control of a foreign government. As long as these organizations have a legal status in the United States, it will be difficult for any agency of the Government to deal with them. We now know that they furnish the legal apparatus for the operations of saboteurs and the window dressing for espionage. The committee believes that legislation can be worked out to outlaw such organizations, and that this will in no sense constitute a violation of the Bill of Rights since such legislation would only affect organizations controlled or directed by foreign countries.

Mr. Speaker, had this recommendation been adopted in 1941, the Communist conspiracy would have been dealt a death blow. In its 1939 report, the committee found:

> The Government, by use of the provisions of the wartime legislation, drove the Communist Party underground, where it remained in an illegal status until 1924, when the repeal of the war measures and the consequent halting of Government activities by the agents of the Department of Justice permitted it to reappear. The Communists came more and more into the open until today they flaunt their revolutionary activities throughout the country. Since 1925 the Department of Justice has had no power, no authority, or no funds from the Congress to investigate Communist propaganda or activities. During the period that the Department of Justice had actual authority, the Communist Party was driven underground where it could not function successfully. Just as long as the agents of the Department of Justice were active, the movement remained comparatively stationary and innocuous. At the present time the Communist Party of the United States is thoroughly and highly organized, nationally and locally, and is extremely active.

Eventually Congress must pass my bill to outlaw the Communist Party and its subsidiary, auxiliary, and frontal organizations, because there is no other way to crush this criminal and treasonable conspiracy.

Mr. Speaker, before concluding this speech I would like to read a few excerpts from my book, The Trojan Horse in America, which was published in the early part of 1940 by Dodd, Mead, & Co. On page 354 I said:

> It should, however, be stressed that the Government itself has played an important role in the growth of communism by providing Commnists with jobs and opportunities for recruiting members and fellow travelers. There are few subversive organizations in America which cannot produce letters of endorsement and encouragement from prominent Government officials.

On page 362, I said:

> These leftwingers are scattered throughout the Government service and occupy key positions which enable them to oppose any efforts to combat the fifth column. * * * Until they are removed from their positions, we may expect at best only halfhearted and ineffectual action.

On page 363, I said:

> The issue is before the President. He must take the initiative in performing this necessary task in the interest of adequate preparedness.
>
> The President cannot supply the leadership on which our national security rests until he inaugurates a thorough and genuine housecleaning in Government service. This is the plain truth, and to deny or avoid it may prove fatal in the end.
>
> The President must surely realize by this time that his left-wing followers in the Government are the fountainhead of subversive activities.
>
> Whether or not we can develop courageous leadership in this country remains to be seen. It depends upon an awakening of the people. The totalitarian psychology of communism and fascism has taken root in the minds of many of our people. It must be eradicated before the Nation is prepared to defend itself against the assault of totalitarianism.

Veterans' Administration Regional Offices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 19, 1954

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, under the permission heretofore granted me by unanimous consent of the House, I include the following resolution adopted by the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, Department of New York, with regard to the possible closing of Veterans' Administration regional offices:

> Whereas it has come to the attention of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Department of New York, that the Veterans' Administration contemplates a reduction in force; and
>
> Whereas it appears that said reduction in force will be invoked against the Brooklyn, Syracuse, and Albany regional offices of the Veterans' Administration, causing these offies to close; and
>
> Whereas the rights, prerogatives of the veterans throughout the affected areas will be seriously impaired: Now, therefore, be it
>
> *Resolved*, That the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Department of New York, in convention assembled this 26th day of June 1954, in the city of Utica, N. Y., have inalterably opposed such reduction and demands that the aforesaid reduction in force be rescinded and the offices continue as presently constituted; and be it further
>
> *Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the director of the rehabilitation service of the Veterans of Foreign Wars in Washington, D. C.; the two United States Senators from the State of New York and all of the Congressmen from New York State.

Senate Joint Resolution 44

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 19, 1954

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include therein a letter I have received from John D. O'Reilly, Jr., professor of law, the Boston College Law School, of Boston, Mass., together with a copy of a letter sent to Hon. John Marshall Butler, United States Senator, in relation to Senate Joint Resolution 44:

> The Boston College Law School,
> *Boston, Mass., May 14, 1954.*
>
> Hon. John W. McCormack,
> *Washington, D. C.*
>
> My Dear Congressman: The House will shortly be called upon to consider Senate Joint Resolution 44, which was passed by the Senate on May 11. This resolution proposes a constitutional amendment which would seriously affect the Supreme Court by limiting its membership to nine Justices, requiring Justices to retire at age 75, and changing the present constitutional provision respecting the appellate jurisdiction of the Court.
>
> Under date of February 26, last, Senator Butler of Maryland, the sponsor of the resolution, in a letter, which I assume was addressed also to professors of constitutional law in other law schools, requested an expression of my opinion on the matter. I replied, under date of March 2, setting forth the reasons why I was not in favor of the proposal.
>
> Having failed to express publicly my views on the subject prior to the taking of action by the Senate, I am now taking the liberty of addressing the members of the New England delegation in the House and the members of the House Judiciary Committee, enclosing a copy of my letter to Senator Butler.
>
> I hope that this will be helpful to you in your consideration of the problem, and I trust that this serious matter will be given more extended consideration in the House than it apparently received in the Senate.
>
> Cordially yours,
> John D. O'Reilly, Jr.,
> *Professor of Law.*

> The Boston College Law School,
> *Boston, Mass., March 2, 1954.*
>
> Hon. John Marshall Butler,
> *United States Senate,*
> *Washington, D. C.*
>
> Dear Senator Butler: I have your letter of February 26, in which you ask for an expression of my views on Senate Joint Resolution 44.
>
> While I am in accord with some, though not all, of the objectives of the proposed amendment, I do not think that any of them should be frozen into constitutional provisions.
>
> I would not, of course, like to see the Supreme Court packed, as was attempted in

1937, but I do not think the best safeguard against this would be a permanent, inflexible requirement of a court of nine men, no more, no less. As time goes on, we may want fewer, or we may need more. Even now, for example, some reputable critics feel that the workload of the Court, as it is presently constituted, forces it to deny review of too many important and deserving cases. I would not like to see a constitutional provision which would prevent legislation to enable the Court most efficiently to perform its functions.

I do not care for any constitutional provisions (or legislation, for that matter) placing age limits on judicial service. I know that there have been justices who outlived their usefulness on the Court, but there have been others who will be remembered for their contributions after the age of 75. I may point out that there have been still others who have achieved intellectual senility at a much earlier age. Age limitations are not cure-alls, and the disadvantages may outweigh the advantages, especially when they are cast in the unyielding mold of a constitutional provision.

Section 3 of the proposed amendment is, in my opinion, unnecessary. Short of some revolutionary change, I do not think there is the slightest possibility of a repetition of the McCardle situation of 1867. The present-day concept of the position and function of the Court is so different from what it was then that I am sure that no Congress, even if it had the disposition, would have the temerity to make such a frontal assault upon the established jurisdiction of the Court. The only context in which I would care to see section 3 considered would be that of a proposal to extend the rulemaking power of the Court so as to give it complete autonomy, within the framework of the first paragraph of article III, section 2, to determine its own jurisdiction and procedure. I would not necessarily favor such a proposal, but I think it would be more profitable to consider that sort of amendment to the Constitution than one engendered of fear of abuse of the existing powers of Congress.

I share your belief that the Justices should be free of political pressure, and that the Court, as an institution, should not be subject to the suspicion that its decisions are influenced in any degree by political considerations or ambition. But I do not think the proposed amendment is the right way to achieve the ideal.

Perhaps my objection to this part of the proposed amendment is at the root of my objection to other parts. John Adams, when he wrote into the Massachusetts Constitution the celebrated phrase, "A government of laws, and not of men," painted a picture which is subject to some misinterpretation. I am sure that he did not envision a system of what we moderns might call pushbutton jurisprudence, a body of written enactments which would automatically solve all social problems in the most efficient and satisfactory way. He must have recognized that the excellence of a community's laws depends in very large measure on the excellence of the men who administer them.

When we write constitutions, it is impractical to set up the great branches of government in watertight compartments. It is hopeless to attempt to block specifically every possible means by which one branch may abuse its powers at the expense of another. It may be disastrous to adopt a precaution against today's real or fancied evil which would make us helpless to meet tomorrow's need. I think we must proceed on the assumption that those who hold high office, whether in the White House, in the Congress or on the Court, will continue to have and to manifest, on basic issues, a sense of responsibility and of the proprieties consistent with accepted American tradition. Without such an assumption, no constitutional amendments would amount to more than collections of words.

Cordially yours,

JOHN D. O'REILLY, Jr.
Professor of Law.

Religious Persecution in the Soviet Union, Czechoslovakia, and Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ROONEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 19, 1954

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, under the permission heretofore granted me by unanimous consent of the House, I include with these remarks the following resolution adopted at the general assembly of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America:

Whereas the members of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America and the people of the United States and throughout the world are shocked by reports appearing in the press and elsewhere concerning the program of the government behind the Iron Curtain directed toward the eradication of churches and other places of worship, brought to the attention of the world so dramatically by the recent imprisonment of His Eminence Stefan Cardinal Wyszynski, Archbishop of Warsaw and Primate of Poland; and

Whereas many acts of terrorism, confiscation and persecution have already been committed in what is now called the Ukrainian Republic of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Poland, Czechoslovakia, and other countries behind the Iron Curtain against the Ukrainian Catholic Church, Ukrainian Orthodox Church, and other churches and persons of religious beliefs; and

Whereas such acts have resulted unjustly and unwarrantedly in the confiscation of property and the deprivation of rights and privileges possessed by those people in the pursuit of their worship of God; and

Whereas through his efforts constantly to uphold and champion the ideals of freedom, tolerance and humanity, His Excellency Archbishop Joseph Slipyj, metropolitan of Halych, has been an inspiration to all mankind; and

Whereas His Excellency Archbishop Joseph Slipyj was unjustly condemned by the Soviet Union to hard labor in 1945 for 8 years for his religious teachings and beliefs as above stated; and

Whereas the Soviet Union has recently increased the term of imprisonment of His Excellency Archbishop Joseph Slipyij, for 9 additional years, and

Whereas the Government of the United States, because of its humanitarian interests in the various peoples of this country and their interest in the persecued clergy behind the Iron Curtain, should register emphatic protest with the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics with a request that it should cease and desist in it's program of religious persecution; and

Whereas the Government of the United States has, on other occasions, intervened and interceded in behalf of persecuted leaders of the church in other countries: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Secretary of State of the United States of America be and he hereby is respectfully petitioned to lodge an official protest on behalf of the Government of the United States with the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Czechoslovakia, and Poland, against the concerted attack which long has been and presently is being made directly and indirectly by the latter governments toward the Ukrainian Catholic Church and other hierarchy of the Catholic Church, residing in such countries, and that the Department of State be and it hereby is respectfully further petitioned to employ its best diplomatic efforts in an attempt to persuade said governments to desist from any further religious persecution, acts of terrorism and confiscation, complained of in this resolution, and that they further, set free His Excellency Archbishop Joseph Slipyj, and other members of the clergy; and it is further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States and to the Secretary of State of the United States and to each Member of Congress and the Senate of the United States, and that they be urged to do everything possible to accomplish the purposes of this resolution.

There Is a Way

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 19, 1954

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, I have the honor, privilege, and the pleasure of representing the Fourth Congressional District of Virginia. In this district there are several outstanding weekly newspapers who have editors of ability, integrity, and a love for our way of life second to none.

One of these newspapers is the Farmville Herald, owned and published by the Honorable J. Barrye Wall, of Farmville, Va., who in my opinion is one of the finest Christian gentlemen I have ever had to pleasure to know.

Barrye Wall has, at all times, demonstrated his love for his people, his State, and his Nation and has never shirked his duty as a citizen of this great country of ours. He has freely given of his time, his energy, and his talent in leading our people to do those things that have meant so much to our way of life and to retain as well as save for us those ideals, privileges, and rights that were handed down to us by our Founding Fathers.

The Farmville Herald has been a great bulwark in molding public opinion and presenting to the people of our section the issues of all important questions affecting their rights and future welfare.

We are familiar with the recent Supreme Court decision outlawing segregation in the free public schools of this country. We realize this was a political decision pure and simple and a complete reversal of all legal precedent as well as former decisons of this same Court. It tends to destroy our faith in the Federal judicial system. It presents a momentous problem and one that must be met and solved by our people if our way of life is to continue. I, for one, am willing to meet it head on.

Mr. Wall, in an editorial appearing in the Farmville Herald on Friday, July

9, 1954, goes into this problem fully, frankly, and fairly.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include his editorial and commend it to the American people:

THERE IS A WAY

In an adjacent column we publish an editorial from the Providence Journal, published at McLean, Va., and ably edited by Richard M. Smith. It is reassuring that Mr. Smith, in northern Virginia, recognizes the problems of the day, specifically the unfairness of the Supreme Court decision on segregation in schools. It is conceivable that some editors and some individuals not materially or immediately affected by the decision would not realize its importance.

The question of segregation in schools is of paramount importance and interest to the Negro race as it is to the white race. Its results, if taken to the ultimate conclusion as planned by the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, will bring in its wake unhappiness, unrest, discrimination, prejudices, and conceivably violence.

The South has been the "whipping boy" for many generations, and the preponderance of Negro population in the South has been the means of stirring up national and international prejudice against the South and the southern people. The facts are that the South has given the Negro many advantages, much culture, introduction to Christianity, and a way of life which has enabled the race to grow in stature, and develop a culture in music and philosophy entirely its own, and typically American. Unfortunately, northern agitators, zealous Negro leaders, politicians, religious Socialists, conniving labor leaders, and some southern sociologists have misled some of the southern Negro leaders to seek changes in customs and mores which have been the basis of development of the Negro race and the white race.

Negroes in Prince Edward County, especially, have been encouraged to own their homes and farms, believing that property owners make better citizens. Comparatively few Negroes in this county are employed in industry, thereby being in a position for economic influence by their employer. These conditions, plus a long period of subtle indoctrination, most likely influenced the NAACP national leaders to choose this county for the test school suit. It will be remembered that the announced purpose of the R. R. Moton school strike was to procure a new school building. Yet, the first meeting of the parent-teachers association following this walkout was dominated by State officers of the NAACP, who cunningly led the patrons into the suit for integration, culminating in the Supreme Court decision. Even if their tactics have been characterized by power, cunning, and individual pressures, the actions of the NAACP have been able directed through lawful procedures. In retrospect, the NAACP has been preparing its movement toward this goal for many years, through careful publicity in magazines, church groups, sociological teaching in churches, schools, and colleges, resulting in an exaggerated misconception among the unsuspecting of the race relationships in the South.

The steps in the future, according to information given by Walter White, NAACP leader, in an interview with the United States News, will be desegregation in public housing, travel, restaurant, hotel accommodations, employment, and the expansion of Negro voting power in the South. He advocates Negro teachers in white schools and vice versa, and "abolition forthwith of segregation (in schools)," and he adds, "the South is more ready for the change from segregation to integration than professional politicians believe it to be."

Thus we have endeavored to place in perspective the situation as we now face it.

The editorial by Mr. Smith gives a very clear background of the future political possibilities. We agree that a Supreme Court composed of men with judicial backgrounds and experiences would have rendered an entirely different decision. But we believe still in the principles of our Constitution and basically, the legislative, executive and judicial departments, each providing checks and balances to stabilize the Republic. The Supreme Court must be kept far above politics, and though we believe we have a politically minded Supreme Court at present we cannot agree that the South should, through political pressure, pack the Supreme Court in its favor.

Beyond doubt, some better means of appointing the Supreme Court members must be found to further remove it from political pressures, and it is possible that such can be done. We are perfectly willing for the membership to retire and an entirely new body be constituted, but to constitute another political court can be of no lasting value, even if it could be done.

The solution lies largely within the power of the people of the South. Abridgment of the rights of the States, even to the sovereignty of the State, is a threat which we must meet now, or submit to an all-powerful centralized Government.

In this connection, Mr. Eisenhower in his campaign promises to maintain States' rights, has been a party in this incidence to the breakdown of States' rights. He appears to have shown a complete misconception of the rights of the Southern States to continue the evolutionary process allowing development of two distinct races on a segregated basis.

The majority of the southern people, white and Negro, are not unaware of the problem which faces them. Forum letters in the press, letters to the governors, and other legal representatives, and private discussion have impressed us with the consciousness of southern people of the seriousness of this problem. Slow to act, deliberate and sound of thought, we believe the political and civic leadership in the South will, in due time evolve a program to save the customs and mores of the South to the benefit of both races, on a segregated basis so far as schools and social customs are concerned. May God guide them in their deliberations.

The Legal Scatterguns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 19, 1954

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, under the permission heretofore granted me by unanimous consent of the House, I include the following editorial from the Wall Street Journal of Wednesday, July 14, 1954:

THE LEGAL SCATTERGUNS

Some of Attorney General Brownell's bills to control subversion and to combat communism have caught a cold eye in Congress and, in our opinion, justly so. For there was the look of a scattergun about them.

It is true that his wiretap bill, which this newspaper opposes, probably will become law in some fashion or other. But it has been whittled down in both House and Senate, and in the conference committee perhaps even more restrictions will be placed on the use of wiretapping.

Mr. Brownell's bills to control subversion in private industry—such as powerplants and those engaged in defense contracts—and to allow the Subversive Activities Control Board, after court action, to dissolve any union or private business if it were Communist infiltrated, are dead for this session unless the House Judiciary Committee reverses itself.

The bills were written in language that was too sweeping. One of them allowed issuance of orders to bar people from employment if there was reasonable ground to believe they might engage in sabotage, espionage, or other subversive activities. The orders could be issued not just when there was a national emergency but also in cases of threatened disturbance of the international relationships of this country, a state of affairs we are hardly ever not in the midst of.

Mr. Brownell's companion measure went even further into determining guilt and meting punishment not for what people have done, or even on proof that they planned to do it, but on the extent to which they fit into patterns which could legally classify unions and businesses as Communist infiltrated. But the patterns themselves are unclear, and the proposal did not attempt to set forth limits to the extent-to-which doctrine. Indeed, it would have been impossible to do so; and while this doctrine, if adopted into law, doubtless would have gathered in some subversives and Communists, many innocent people may also have been injured in the process.

We recognize that it is difficult to pinpoint a law against a hidden conspiracy and a dedicated treason. But we do think that to punish people by the extent to which they may be able to do some injury, or to authorize the invasion of privacy by wiretapping is to use legal scatterguns better left to the police states most Americans oppose.

A Primer for Americans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 6, 1954

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, recently in the city of Huntington Park, Calif., which is just another of the very important, prosperous communities in the great 23d District, which I represent, this, my 8th year in Congress, the Huntington Park Junior Chamber of Commerce, in cooperation with the very important newspaper, the Daily Signal, printed in the said Daily Signal newspaper on Friday, July 2, 1954, on a very significant full page of said paper, the following Primer for Americans.

I know you will all join with me in complimenting the young men who are members of the Huntington Park Junior Chamber of Commerce, as well as the daily newspaper, for this very timely and important contribution to the knowledge, education, and inspiration of the American citizens, both young and old, by reason of this publication and in this manner of this Primer for Americans.

It follows:

PRIMER FOR AMERICANS

You live in the United States of America. You are an American. Real Americans like their country. They are proud of it. They think it is a good place to live. And they want to keep it good; to keep it getting better all the time.

Why is America the way it is? What makes it a good place to live? The answer is simply this: Throughout our history most Americans have believed that every person has certain rights and duties and responsibilities. Americans have believed that there are certain things people should do, and things they should not do. They have also believed in certain things that people are, and are not. These things that people believe are called principles. This book is an attempt to state the principles of America in simple, primer fashion so that you can understand them, learn them, and remember them.

This is important. It was because earlier Americans believed in these principles and guided their lives by them, that America has grown to be the good place it is.

If all of us learn and remember these principles; if we also guide our lives by them; then we can help to keep America growing better, and better, and better.

And if we follow these principles of America, we can help make the world a better place to live in, too.

The principles of America are these:

1. Each person is of importance and value as an individual: This is the cornerstone, the foundation of all our other beliefs in a person's right to live his own life, to speak for himself, to choose and change his leaders. From it comes our hatred of those isms under which the individual has no value or importance as a person, but is only one of many unimportant people who have to live the way their leaders tell them to. Coming directly from that first principle are two others that are also part of the foundation of Americanism.

2. We believe that all men should enjoy personal freedom.

3. We believe that all men are created equal: It is worth noting that the Declaration of Independence expressed the belief that all men are created equal. It did not state or imply a belief that men develop equally or have equal ability, or that they should ever be forced to an exact equality of thought, speech, or material possessions. That would be equality without freedom. Americans have always believed the two should go together. In our Constitution, and in other laws of our land, there are set down principles to protect the rights and freedoms and equality of individuals.

4. The right to freedom of speech: This includes freedom of the press, of radio, of motion pictures, of every means by which man may express his thoughts.

5. The right to freedom of assembly: As we believe in the right of individual action, so we believe that individuals should be free to act together.

6. The right to freedom of worship: Not only is the individual free to worship as he will, but religions themselves are free and equal.

7. The right to security of person and property: Not just 1 but 3 amendments to the Constitution (4th, 5th, and 14th) protect against illegal search and seizure, or loss of life, liberty, or property, without "due process of law."

8. The right to equal protection before the law: As individuals are equally important, so laws must apply equally to all, without special privileges for any group.

9. The right to freedom from slavery: This includes "the right to quit," for no individual may be forced to work for another.

10. The right to petition the Government: The right of the individual to "petition the Government for redress of grievances" is evidence of the American belief that Government is the servant, not the master, of the people.

11. The right to vote for people of your choice: This is the individual's most potent weapon in the protection of his rights and freedoms, a weapon that to be effective must be constantly and wisely used.

Other principles hold that every man has—

12. The right to a good education.
13. The right to live where he pleases.
14. The right to work where he wants to.
15. The right to belong to an organization.
16. The right to own property.
17. The right to start his own business.
18. The right to manage his own affairs.
19. The right to make a profit or to fail, depending on his own ability.

There are other similar rights of individual action which are principles of America, but all of these individual rights may be combined in these two broad principles:

20. Every man is entitled to freedom and equality of opportunity.

21. Every man may earn his living when, where, and how he wants to.

There are also limiting principles. Principles of individual freedom sometimes clash with those of individual equality. Therefore, our rights as individuals must be limited, and those limitations are themselves principles.

22. The rights of any individual shall not interfere with those of other individuals: Your right to swing your arms stops where the other fellow's nose starts.

23. The rights of any individual shall not interfere with the welfare of the people: Freedom of speech does not give the individual the right to shout "fire" in a crowded theater.

24. Every individual owes obedience to the laws under which he lives: The individual has the right to talk against a law, to work and vote to change that law, but not to disobey that law.

Principles that are patterns of behavior: Many of our principles of individual freedom and equality are guaranteed to us by law. But we have other beliefs, other general rules of action and conduct that have grown to the status of principles. And these too, are foundations of Americanism.

25. A man shall be judged by his own record: A man's family background, his race, or his religion, is not as important as what that man himself can do, for Americans believe a man must stand on his own feet.

26. A man is free to achieve as much as he can: We beleive that where any boy may become President, where any man may achieve greatness, there is the greatness incentive for every man to do his best.

27. To achieve anything, a man should be willing to work: Americans have always known that "you don't get something for nothing," that to get anything takes a willingness to work.

28. Achievement also depends upon the ability to do a good job: Add to "willingness to work" the ability to produce results and the combination is the basis for most individual achievement in our country.

29. Every man has the right to a fair share of the results of his work and his ability: Because of this belief, America has not only produced more goods, but they have been more fairly and more widely shared by more people than in any other country.

30. Security is the ability of a man to provide for himself: The only true security for any individual is the opportunity, the ability, and the determination to work and plan and save for his own present and future. Self-reliance is vital to individual independence and personal freedom. No man can be proud and free who depends on others for his security.

31. When an individual cannot provide his own security, the responsibility should be assumed by others: We believe that no one should starve, or be without adequate clothing and shelter, so those who have more than their basic needs share the responsibility of providing the essentials of security for those who need help.

32. Each individual must deal fairly with others: Honesty, fairness, and personal integrity are virtues that help free and independent individuals get along with each other without losing their independence.

33. Fair and free competition is a good thing: Americans have always believed that competition among individuals or groups encourages greater effort which in turn brings greater benefits to all.

34. Cooperation among individuals is vital: President Eisenhower has said: "The freedom to compete vigorously accompanied by a readiness to cooperate wholeheartedly for the performance of community and national functions, together make our system the most productive on earth."

Principles of individual responsibility: Freedom for individuals carries with it an equal responsibility to use that freedom wisely. If we wish to remain free, we must faithfully fulfill this responsibility.

35. The individual is responsible for himself and his family: He must protect them and provide for their present and future well-being.

36. The individual has responsibilities to the groups of which he is a part: He must give of his best to his community, his church, his employer, his union, and to every group in which individuals cooperate for their mutual benefit.

37. The individual has responsibilities to his country: He must be an active citizen, interesting himself in local, State, and National government, voting wisely, thinking and speaking and acting to preserve and strengthen freedom, equality, and opportunity for every individual.

38. The individual has responsibilities to the world: Man's horizons have expanded. What happens in the world affects him, and his actions can affect the world. Today, therefore, each man has a responsibility to act—and to encourage his country to act—so that freedom and cooperation will be encouraged among the people and the nations of the world.

FOR AMERICA'S FUTURE

Most of us have faith in our country's ability to move forward, to improve, to grow, to provide more and more individuals with more and more of everything they want and need in life.

If we, the people of the United States, want to have more material benefits, we must believe in and follow these two principles:

39. The only way we can have more is to produce more; and

40. As we produce more, we must make it possible for more and more people to enjoy that which we produce.

If we, the people of the United States, want to have a better life, spiritually as well as materially—

41. We must stand firmly for our beliefs, our rights, our principles. There are those who would chip away our confidence so that their special brand of tyranny might creep into America. They must not succeed. So, let us ask of every plan, or act, or idea, Is it with or against the principles of America?

Hon. Nathan Sweedler

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 19, 1954

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, under the permission heretofore granted my by unanimous consent of the House, I include the following newspaper editorial published on July 8, 1954, which concerns my good friend and former colleague on the staff of the district attorney of Kings County, N. Y., former Municipal Court Justice Nathan Sweedler:

A Flavor of Justice

The old conception of justice was that she is a blindfolded lady measuring out on her balanced scale the right doses of punishment for every wrong deed without favor, prejudice or qualification.

To put such a conception into practice, however, I would take what we proudly call our enlightened civilization back into the era of the dark civilization, when it seemed necessary for the security of society to put away to death or in well guarded dungeons, the accused without consideration for the examined truth or much delving into the motivation of the wrong doer.

It was our privilege the other day to experience a more enlightened and humane justice than the above-described version of the Lady with the blindfolds.

As the telephone rang, and we picked up the receiver to answer it, we heard the voice on the other end ask, "Do you speak Arabic?"

We answered in the affirmative, and the voice explained as follows:

"I do not know you. I found your name, 'Arab American Business Service Bureau,' in the telephone book, and though you might be able to help me.

"I am Judge Nathan Sweedler, presently special referee of the Supreme Court of the State of New York, and holding court in the Borough Hall Building in Brooklyn. I have in my chambers now, an old man, who says he is an Arab. His wife and her lawyer are before me on a motion to punish the husband for contempt of court on the ground of nonsupport. The husband claims that he is being persecuted, and does not owe any money to his wife. He also contends that he gave some lawyer money to represent him, but the lawyer did nothing for him.

"Now," Judge Sweedler continued, "I am not convinced as to his story. However, I do not want to find him guilty of contempt of court, with the consequent punishment requiring him to go to jail (where he already has spent 6 months), until I am certain that he is not fulfilling his obligations as determined by the court. In my quest for the actual facts, I searched in the telephone book for the name of an organization or company affiliated with the Arabic language, thinking that if they talked to this man in his native tongue, he might feel more at ease, and tell the complete story of his situation."

Judge Sweedler concluded, "Would you be willing to contribute a few moments of your time to come here and talk to this man? Or would you at least talk to him on the phone, and advise me of your impressions of his story, as he tells it to you in Arabic?"

Up to this writing, the case has not been decided yet. The point that struck us with the greatest force, however, is not the fate of the accused, but the attitude of Judge Nathan Sweedler, the presiding Judge, and his humane application of justice. Though his assigned duty was to pronounce judgment only on the basis of the facts presented before him, Judge Sweedler felt bound by a deeper sense of fairness to go beyond the limitation of his duty to his office in giving this human being all the benefit of the doubt, rather than to decide against him, with the possibility of imprisonment.

We find this flavor of justice very tasteful and commendable indeed.

Philip Kar.

Should We or Should We Not Have Taxicab Limitation in the District of Columbia?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 19, 1954

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, under the permission heretofore granted me by unanimous consent of the House, I include the following letter with regard to the proposed taxicab-limitation legislation for the District of Columbia:

To Whom It May Concern:

I wish to state my reasons against taxicab limitations in Washington, D. C. At the public hearing of the Public Utilities Commission I spoke against limitations because I am sincerely convinced that the law of supply and demand will provide its own limitation. Even after reading the report of the hearing held by the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia there is evidence that the law of supply and demand will effectively correct and better the conditions for the individual taxicab driver and those companies and other individuals directly or indirectly connected will benefit.

Even among those who testified in favor of limitation admitted without saying so that the law of supply and demand had reached its peak. At the Public Utilities Commission hearing one taxi association official said that at one time he had 160 members and now it has dropped to 80 members. Is this not self-limitation, in effect? Others testify they saw no future in more cabs. Is this not self-limitation, in effect?

Mr. Edwin A. Glynn, president of the National Transportation Co., Inc., operating the Silver Fleet taxicabs had at one time 78 cabs, now only has 18. Is this not self-limitation, in effect? Even the company in which I am associated, the Gray Line Cab Co., had as many as 35 cabs and now only has 7 cabs. Is this not self-limitation, in effect? Even Erwin Dollar and the heads of the larger companies testify that they see no future in more cabs; is this not thinking in the form of self-limitation? Must there be a law forcing one to think of self-limitation? Must we see the day when all forms of businesses will face limitation laws to satisfy a few? Each individual should have the opportunity of success without the redtape limitation legislation whether it be the cab industry, grocery store, drugstore, or the professional fields, such as doctor, lawyer, economists, etc.

Why must these company officials overlook the inadequate rates and overlook the inadequate straight line zone system? They testify they are happy with it and so are the individual drivers. The drivers need a corrected rate and zone structure and the company officials know it. The straight line zone system must be changed to the flexible circle zone system. The rates need the faulty figures corrected. These two steps must be taken first to improve conditions for the individual cab drivers, not limitation by law. The company officials only need to bring this before the PUC. Must the cab company officials deliberately put off and put off this action in order to force the thinking of the individual drivers to feel that the solution to their present problem lies only in the limiting of cabs? Self-limitation has begun to bring this about, a limit law is not needed at this time or any time in the future. And it will not in itself bring prosperity to the cab industry.

There were many reasons for the abnormal upward spiral of taxicabs when World War II ended. The very companies themselves who now claim they are in favor of limitation contributed the most to the abnormal increase in the number of cabs. They did so in this manner: When World War II ended the automobile manufacturers were unable to meet the demand for new cars. The cab industry was one of a few users of motor vehicles that had a priority and this attracted those men and women to obtain cars for their own personal use as taxicabs rather than have their name placed on a waiting list with their car dealers. They found they could get a cab immediately because of the priority given to the cab industry. While they were buying cabs and stayed in the business the cab company found it a profitable form of income. Now that conditions are near normal and these individuals have dropped out of the cab business the companies now miss the easy profits they made. The honeymoon is over, the companies and cab drivers must now work harder to survive. The misfits will drop out and should. This condition will be only temporary. Relief for this situation can be found in the law of supply and demand and not by creating limitation. Has not the present law brought to the Nation's Capital the reputation of having the best cab service in the world? Must we lose this fine reputation to satisfy a few who can see themselves profit by a limitation law? Where there is limitation in other cities the public has more to complain about when it comes to their local cab service. Many constantly testify facts and figures of many great cities in the Nation that have legal limitation laws such as New York City, Chicago, and Los Angeles. If the officials of these cities would come to the Nation's Capital and study how our present system has successfully stood the test of time and if they pass legislation opening the cab industries in their cities according to the law of supply and demand, these 3 cities I've mentioned could easily absorb 20,000 to 30,000 more cab drivers. City officials should consider this form of increased employment for thousands and the increased service to the public seriously. It is the duty of public officials to pass laws which will do the most people the most good. We have such a law here and it should not be changed to satisfy a selfish few under the guise of being interested in the welfare of all, when in actuality they are interested in the welfare of themselves.

There are a great many drivers who just don't have it in them to earn the maximum from the cab industry. It has always been said that it is much easier to be an employee, with a guaranteed salary and fixed hours, than to be self-employed. The drivers who find that their income is not sufficient should seek his employment in another way. Many drivers I have seen complaining would go on complaining whether it would be driving a taxi, working as a short-order cook, being a carpenter, office employee, or employed by some large private heavy industry. One cannot change their personal outlook if they prefer to take a negative point of view. Under the present law of no limitation, the answer is with each individual as to whether they will find the cab industry profitable. If they adapt themselves as they should, they can be happy in their work as a cab driver. The cab industry has produced a great many successes and can continue to do so under the law of supply and demand. Those individual cab drivers who were the industrious ones years ago are in many cases holding the responsible jobs today in the cab industry. Must we newcomers be denied the same opportunities they have had? Must we allow them to have you believe that we aren't capable of taking our place of leadership in the cab industry when the time comes? We can take our place of leadership and should be able to do so under the laws of supply and demand.

In the February 19, 1954, issue of the Taxi Topix it is stated: "The urgent need of drivers is to earn more money, a need that causes them to toss caution to the winds in the desperate scramble for fares." Such a statement to be tied in as a means to show why limitation is needed and that it will reduce traffic hazards is absolutely distorted. The individual cab driver will not throw caution to the winds for the sake of a passenger. They know only too well the many hazards of cab driving to become so careless of themselves and others. Cab drivers are professional drivers and handle their cabs with the thought of safe driving habits foremost in their mind.

Statements such as "we will have less accidents and create fewer traffic hazards because of limitation" is wrong. With limitation companies will operate the cabs on the 24-hour basis; in such cases the cab will be neglected and that is where the danger lies. An overworked cab will not be properly cared for, and they will be a menace on the streets.

Occasionally statements are made condemning the part-time cab driver. On a percentagewise basis, the part-time cab driver is a far more responsible person than many of our full-time cab drivers. Part-time employees have always been used in every industry. Why should the cab industry break away from this rule? Each individual is entitled to earn the money they need. It stands to reason that most part-time cab drivers do a limited amount of driving because one's endurance to work two jobs is rapidly used up.

The figures below indicate the number of cabs, year by year, from 1928 to the present year. These figures are a part of the PUC records:

1928	783	1942	4,751
1929	1,283	1943	5,201
1930	1,387	1944	5,287
1931	2,355	1945	6,438
1932	3,658	1946	8,885
1933	4,000	1947	8,422
1934	3,809	1948	8,529
1935	3,670	1949	8,568
1936	4,067	1950	9,069
1937	4,391	1951	9,414
1938	4,239	1952	9,944
1939	3,869	1953	10,490
1940	4,395	July 2, 1954	9,579
1941	4,858		

Population: 1930, 486,869; 1940, 663,091; 1950, 802,178.

Population: 1950, in nearby Maryland and Virginia, 485,155.

The population of nearby Maryland and Virginia had not been included in basing the figures of how many persons to each cab in the District of Columbia. The nearly 500,000 living in this area contribute a very substantial amount to the overall business of the District of Columbia's cab industry.

According to these figures, we reached our peak in 1953. It has now leveled off and a reduction in the number of cabs will become the actual story in the next 5 years.

The overall use of automobiles by the cab industry and the general public has shown a steady increase over the last 25 years, and has now reached its peak due to such conditions as available street facilities, parking facilities, and other means of public transportation.

It is with the sincerest thoughts for the welfare of the cab industry and the general public that I have presented this letter.

Sincerely yours,

IRVING SCHLAIFER,
Owner-Driver, Gray Line Cab No. 3.
WASHINGTON, D. C.

The Fryingpan-Arkansas Project, H. R. 236

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 1, 1954

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, there are a number of reasons for my vigorous opposition to the Fryingpan-Arkansas project. They are well-founded reasons, and they reflect the views of my State, as set forth by California officials responsible for protecting the Colorado River water supply upon which the whole economy of southern California especially depends.

Some of the major reasons for my opposition follow:

The Fryingpan-Arkansas project is a transmountain diversion project. That means it would take water out of the Colorado River Basin, move it over the Rocky Mountains, and release it on the eastern slope of that range, in the Arkansas Valley watershed. Such diversions would vitally affect the quality of water which comes down the Colorado River to the lower basin, in which California is located.

The Fryingpan-Arkansas project is the forerunner of a much greater transmountain diversion project which the Bureau of Reclamation and the State of Colorado plan to construct.

The Bureau of the Budget has not approved this project.

The bill makes drastic changes in existing reclamation law.

There is an enormous concealed subsidy in the bill.

The State of Colorado, in which this diversion would be made, is sharply divided on the project.

The Colorado River system rises at very high altitudes in the upper States of the basin. It is there, high in the northern mountains, that the purest water enters the system. What happens to the quality of the river water if large amounts of this purest water are taken from the system and diverted into another river basin, never to return?

The answer to that question is of great concern to California. It is highly probable that such large-scale diversions would impair the quality of the water California must use to such an extent that it would be unfit for irrigation.

In June of 1953, hearings were held on this project by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, of which I am a member. At that time, California officials raised this matter of quality of water, among other things, and I quote from the testimony of Mr. Raymond Matthew, chief engineer of the Colorado River Board of California:

> A problem of great concern and significance to the water users in the Colorado River Basin, especially those in the lower basin, is the effect of existing and potentially larger future export diversions of water from the upper Colorado River Basin upon the quality of water remaining in the Colorado River system.
>
> Generally the water for export is and will be diverted at high altitudes where the streamflow is much better in quality than in the lower parts of the system, and the diversion of relatively pure water leaves a higher concentration of minerals in the residual flow.
>
> It is the position of the Colorado River Board of California that the Colorado River compact intends that the water available for use in the lower basin shall be suitable in quality for all necessary purposes.

It is California's position, and mine, that before these immense transmountain diversion projects are built, a thorough study should be made of this problem of quality of water, and that full assurance should be given to the lower basin that the quality of the water upon which agriculture must depend shall not be impaired to the extent that it could not be used to grow crops.

It is perfectly logical to assume that if the purest water of the system is taken out at the top, the water which reaches the lower basin will be inferior. It is the pure water that keeps the salt content of the river at a low point.

At present, I am informed by experienced engineers, the salt content of the Colorado River water in the lower basin averages about 1 ton per acre foot. This salt comes into the water from seepage and from the natural cradles of the streams of the system.

If the purest water in the system is transported out of the basin, then the salt content of the water left in the river must increase.

The Colorado River compact, which is the "law of the river," says in article VIII that the rights on the river perfected at the time the compact was adopted shall not be impaired by the compact.

It is our position that the word "unimpaired" applies to the quality of the water as well as the quantity.

We do not know—and no one knows—how much the diversion under the Fryingpan-Arkansas project, and the greater diversion under the proposed Gunnison-Arkansas project, will impair the quality of the water California must use, and upon which California must depend. Certainly it is reasonable to ask that this question be answered before great amounts of the purest water are taken from the basin. And we ask that it be answered.

In the hearings on this project, which I mentioned, Mr. Northcutt Ely, special counsel for the Colorado River Board of California, submitted an amendment on the subject of water quality. It directed the Secretary of the Interior to make an investigation and report regarding the effect which the transmountain diversion projects would have on the quality of water received by the lower basin.

Mr. Ely asked the committee:

> Is anyone opposed to having those facts ascertained and published? Why? If the report shows no substantial impairment of

> quality, the upper-basin States should be glad to have that known.
>
> If the report does show substantial impairment of quality, then the Congress, as well as the States, should know the effect thereof on the great projects downstream in which the Government has invested hundreds of millions of dollars. * * *
>
> This amendment simply directs the Secretary to ascertain the facts.

This amendment was rejected by the bill's proponents.

I make no attempt to amend this bill now. Until evidence to the contrary is produced, I consider this transmountain diversion, and all others proposed, to be serious threats to the welfare of my State.

The Bureau of Reclamation's project-planning report, 1950, designated the Fryingpan project as the initial development of the potential Gunnison-Arkansas project. Because of the small and insufficient amount of water the Fryingpan project would furnish the irrigators on the east slope of the Rockies, it will not be long until they will be demanding the larger project. The Gunnison-Arkansas project, according to the Bureau of Reclamation, would divert upward of 900,000 acre-feet annually from the Colorado River Basin. It probably would involve a construction cost of at least $1 billion.

Obviously, the Fryingpan project is a pilot plant for the huge project to come. This makes it all the more mandatory upon me to oppose it in the best interests of my State.

Under the repayment provisions of the bill, the concealed subsidy from the Nation's taxpayers would amount to at least $425 million, and more probably $500 million for the major purpose of providing a small supplemental irrigation supply—one-half acre-foot per acre—to be spread on 309,000 acres. Using the smaller figure, this would be a subsidy of $1,375 per acre, or $220,000 per 160-acre farm—about 6 times the average value of fully developed irrigated land, which is stated to be $225 per acre, or $36,000 per 160-acre farm.

Engineering and financial feasibility of the project is highly questionable in several details:

(a) The estimates of firm power output and power revenues are unsupported and appear to be exaggerated. Moreover, the availability of power revenues as estimated 50 to 75 years hence is highly speculative.

(b) Analyses indicate the cost of producing power would exceed the proposed selling price for 4 of the 7 proposed powerplants; and that for the Pueblo powerplant, the cost of power, based upon the incremental cost of power facilities alone, would exceed the selling price.

(c) The project plans propose the construction and operation of an open power canal—the Arkansas power canal unit—to convey water to a series of 6 powerplants between the vicinity of Leadville and Salida, over a distance of about 20 miles along the canyon of the Arkansas River, at elevations of over 7,000 to nearly 10,000 feet above sea level, in a rugged mountain region where for several months of the winter ice and snow conditions prevail. The practicability of operating an open canal under such conditions is highly questionable. Under similar conditions, on the Colorado-Big Thompson project in Colorado, a few miles to the north, the Bureau of Reclamation found it necessary to substitute tunnels and covered conduits for the open canals originally proposed. This change in plans is one of the major reasons why the construction cost of that project to date has nearly quadrupled over the estimate offered to Congress.

The Secretary of the Interior has reported that if covered conduits are found to be required, the total construction cost of the Fryingpan project would be increased about $64 million, or 37 per cent, and that such increase would render the project infeasible.

This and other engineering and financial elements of the project should be investigated and reported upon by a disinterested board of qualified engineers in order that the Congress may be reliably informed.

(d) There is no assurance that the irrigators could or would pay the proposed rate of $5.40 per acre-foot for project water. The project planning report found that the irrigators would be able to pay only $3.60 per acre-foot. It appears improbable, therefore, that the irrigation revenues as estimated would be realized.

(e) The bill provides that the specific municipal water supply facilities proposed in the project shall not be built unless the Secretary of the Interior finds that the communities proposed to be served cannot build such works themselves. The evidence introduced at the hearings indicates that one of the chief cities, Colorado Springs, has other plans for municipal water and no present interest in securing water from the Fryingpan project; also, that the city of Pueblo is fully able to finance and build its own water facilities and secure water from the Arkansas River on which it is situated.

It is admitted by the Department of the Interior that the reduction of or elimination of proposed municipal water supply functions or features from the project would result in loss of project revenues, and an increase in repayment periods for irrigation and power or require increased rates therefrom.

Moreover, it is questionable if some of the cities and towns proposed to be served from a long pipeline down the Arkansas River Valley could pay the actual cost of delivered water which, according to Bureau reports, would range up to about 80 cents per 1,000 gallons based upon the Bureau's original cost estimates, which estimates have now, by latest Bureau figures, increased over 20 percent.

With all these uncertainties, it is highly questionable if municipal water supply revenues would be available to assist in repayment of the irrigation investment as set forth in the financial studies of the project.

(f) In commenting on the 1950 project planning report, the Army Chief of Engineers questioned the allocation of over $15 million of the cost of Pueblo Dam and Reservoir to flood control. This allocation now has been raised to over $21 million in the revised estimates submitted, an increase of 34 percent in this nonreimbursable item, with no justification offered.

(g) The Department of Agriculture indicated in its comments on the original project planning report (1950) that—

> In view of the obvious high cost of importing water from the Colorado River Basin, a separate evaluation should be made of the feasibility of importing water from the Colorado River Basin, considered as an incremental addition rather than an integral part of the project.

Such an evaluation has not been made. It should be, since it is highly questionable whether the high cost of this transmountain diversion would be justified by the benefits.

People of the area supplying the water do not want this project.

The committee heard testimony from a number of persons and organizations on the western slope of Colorado, from which the water involved would be diverted, objecting strongly to the entire project. In fact, it was necessary to hold additional hearings this year in order to accommodate these people, which hearings have not been printed. These people feel the economy of the western slope will be damaged by this taking of water from the Colorado River Basin, where the supply is already short, and placing it in the Arkansas River Basin, where the present supply has not been fully used. They express no confidence in the so-called operating principles referred to in the bill in connection with uses on both the eastern and western slopes of Colorado. The bill, therefore, accords them doubtful protection. They are fearful that this and future transmountain diversions will stunt the economic development of an area which holds an enormous industrial potential, assuming there is water to serve it.

The repayment plan proposed for this project would postpone the commencement of repayment of about 60 percent of the irrigation investment for 50 years or more and would extend the repayment period to 70 years or more. The irrigators would be able to pay only about 40 percent of the cost in 50 years. The balance is proposed to be paid by net power and municipal water revenues of the project after the investment for such facilities has been repaid in 50 to 55 years.

This is the so-called Collbran formula, patterned after the provisions in the act authorizing the Collbran project, Colorado. As applied here, it means that, as to 60 percent of the investment, the project commences to repay after the time—50 years—when existing law requires repayment to have been completed. It was definitely understood by the committee and the Congress when the Collbran project was approved that the repayment provisions therein were specially for that project only and not to be used as a precedent for other future projects.

By reason of postponement of commencement of repayment of a major portion of the irrigation investment, the interest cost to the Federal Government and the taxpayers on the funds advanced for this project is increased by several hundred million dollars over what it would be under existing law. Under the same conditions of costs and revenues, the interest cost is identical with the previous proposal of the Department of the Interior to apply the interest component of power revenues to the repayment of the portion of the irrigator's investment beyond the ability of the water users to repay—a proposal which has been generally condemned as unsound, which has never received the approval of the Congress, and which the present administration has shelved. The Collbran formula is a subterfuge to reach the same end.

Let me state unequivocally that I am not opposing this project because I wish to impede development in the States of the upper Colorado River Basin. I am opposing it, as I have said, because it presents a serious threat to the economy of my State.

Until that threat is removed, I shall continue to oppose it.

Trade Has Been Used by the Communists Strictly As a Political Weapon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRAZIER REAMS

OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 19, 1954

Mr. REAMS. Mr. Speaker, the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act has been extended for 1 year by this Congress. While the President was disappointed that his request for a 3-year extension was not granted, he has signed the compromise bill. The reason for cutting the extension from 3 to 1 years is that the House Committee may have an opportunity to study the Randall Commission report on foreign policy. This report came too late to be carefully considered before the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act was to expire. This law was largely devised and sponsored by Cordell Hull when he was a Member of the United States Senate. Under its provisions, the United States foreign trade expanded and strong commercial ties were built up between our country and those nations who signed these agreements and choose to trade with the United States on a selective basis. Under this law agreements have been made with these nations setting forth the conditions and the goods which will be traded between the nations. Under this plan those products which each member nation under the agreements can export the most favorably are chosen. In recent years the agreements have carried the "peril point" provision which provides that we may withdraw specific items from an agreement whenever the continuation of importation into our country of these competitive products has reached a point that imperils an industry here in the United States. The President himself is the final judge of when the peril point is reached on a particular product. Today I want to discuss with you the very large and important question of United States foreign trade. Particularly, do I want to speak of the controversial question of whether or not we should trade with the Soviet Union and Communist China.

First of all, I believe we can agree that foreign trade is essential to a healthy economy here at home. Since 1940 the productive capacity of our factories and farms has been very greatly increased. We have trained and skilled manpower which must either operate these factories and farms or we face a serious condition of unemployment. Before World War I, 6 percent of unemployment of the workers of our country was not considered a serious matter. Today 6 percent has become the danger point in unemployment. Above this percentage it is a matter of concern to the Government. Therefore, foreign trade is a matter which neither the President, nor the Congress, nor the people can afford to ignore. The problem of foreign trade in our future is going to be increasingly a matter of competition with the Communist countries dominated and controlled from the Kremlin. Stalin made it very clear before his death that communism sought not only political control of the world but economic control as well. He referred to the fact that World War II had left the economic world divided into two world markets. He said that the sphere of world trade between capitalistic countries would not expand but would contract; that capitalistic opportunities for sales in the world market would deteriorate; that the industries of the capitalistic countries would operate more and more below capacity as the Communists drew a greater part of the world trade. On this premise Stalin drew the conclusion that "wars between capitalistic countries" are inevitable, as each struggles to gain a larger share of the world market, which would be receding for the capitalist nations. There is much in the history of the world even in the short time since Stalin's death to support his prediction. It should be clear even now to the United States and other free capitalistic nations that we cannot do business with Communists and Communist-dominated nations and expect to win in this battle for world trade. As bait, the Communists may hold out, for the present, short-term gains. They did this in the 1920's when trained engineers from the United States were building the great electrical powerplants and factories in Russia, and our heavy machinery manufacturers were equipping them with dynamos and helping German and English contractors and engineers to develop the basic industry for Russia. It seemed like good business then, just as it apparently seemed like good business in the 1930's and 1940's to accept the peaceful approach of Russia on the political side.

Today marks the era when the Russians are offering the very tempting East-West trade not in order to develop a permanent trade with us but to get equipment they cannot yet obtain within the Communist bloc. It must seem clear by now that this is done only in order that they may become self-sufficient within the Iron Curtain. Then they will not need to trade with us at all. In this manner they expect to make the prophecy of Stalin come true. It was to divide the capitalistic powers in this competition for the Soviet's temporary trade and, eventually, cause discord and war among the free nations that in reality have so much in common with each other and so little with the Communist world. The United States is going to be tempted greatly to trade with the Soviet nations because the free world market has been contracted by Communist victories at the very time when our productive capacity has been expanded in excess of what we at home can consume in peacetime. It comes at a time, also, when we are especially sensitive to unemployment. We are already hearing in business circles and in the Congress the cry, "Why not trade with Russia and Communist China?" To answer this question of why we should not trade with Russia or even with Red China, we should look at the basic principles which underlie world trade. When we refer to world trade we must realize that there are both in the political realm and in the field of trade, two worlds: the Communist world ruled from Moscow and the free world of trade made up of many nations each eager to promote its own interests and thereby activated by the spirit of free enterprise and competition. We must realize that trade must be a reciprocal proposition before it can be on a permanent basis. Each country must have goods to exchange or money with which to buy. Each of the traders must have products which complement rather than compete with the other. To have a permanent trade with a nation there must be political security and stability. American as well as British business has had experience with trade with customers under unstable governments. It is difficult to trade with a country if its government is not going to protect the rules of trade and guarantee a reasonably stable currency or other media of exchange. These required conditions cannot be expected with any reasonable degree of certainty in trading with the Soviet nations. Even with the jealousy and competition which exist among the free nations there has been a code of honor among them going back through the centuries.

The law of merchant developed among the trading nations of Europe and adopted by this country has produced fair trade in the ports of the free world. But this is not true of the Communist world. The representatives in trade of the Soviet Union are not businessmen as is the case of the traders in the free world. They try to appear that way, but they are not. They are political representatives of Soviet governments strictly controlled by the men in the Kremlin. The ultimate end they seek is political not commercial. It is not private enterprise. Time and time again these minions of the Communist rulers come posing as merchants and making attractive offers and promises but have been unable as well as unwilling to carry them out. The record is clear that in the entire history of the Russian communism there has never been any effort at a continuous, reciprocal trade with any free country. Trade has been used by Communists strictly as a political weapon. It has been on the basis of building a self-sufficiency for the Communist countries and to give a little trade alternately to one country or another as the political advantage indicated. Chinese Communists follow the same pattern. The dictator Mao has announced on numerous occasions that his plan is self-sufficiency for China through nationalization of industry, collective farming, and all the other Marxian practices which exist in Russia. Sweden is an example of a country which has made a sincere effort to develop East-West trade but has found that even with Czechoslovakia, a country with which it did a satisfactory business as a free nation, that it was necessary to discontinue trade because of unfair practices and unsatisfactory payments. There is an insistent demand among some of our business people that the United States trade with Communists. This is either because our people do not know the facts, or because it is hard to resist the attraction to trade with China and other Communist countries at a time when a potential market anywhere is attractive to a nation which has overproduced. Now we come to the question of what is the alternative? The United States must have foreign trade if we are to keep the standards of living which we have come to appreciate and expect. I am greatly indebted in this study of the question of whether or not we should trade with the Soviet Union and Red China to Congressman Walter Judd. He made an excellent speech in the House of Representatives on May 28. I have drawn on that speech for some of the facts in this presentation. I have done this because having studied the situation myself, I find the clearest expression of my own beliefs and feelings in some of his words.

With reference to the difficulty of trading with China Dr. Judd says:

> Some good Americans believe that by increasing trade with Communist China we can detach the Chinese from the Russian Communists, or can drive a wedge between Peiping and Moscow.

But why should Mao move away from the Kremlin if he can have all the advantages of trade with the Western World as long as he needs it and, in addition to this, the closest relations with the Soviet bloc. Does anyone believe that the hard-headed men in the Kremlin would be moving heaven and earth to get Communist China accepted in the United Nations if that would lead or enable Red China to break with Moscow and thereby wreck the Communist world government? Since Dr. Judd lived in China for years and understands not only the facts but the philosophy and personality of the Chinese, his words cannot be overlooked. It is my belief that we have already gone as far as we dare go with Communist trade. The free world must build a free, reciprocal trade among the nations that are and expect to remain free from the yoke of Communist domination. We must not let the Communists win any more political victories or trade victories. We must develop our foreign trade first in this Western Hemisphere. If we continue building a genuine friendship and understanding with the countries in the American continents, we can have a reciprocal trade that will take care of most of the output of our factories and absorb the surpluses from our farms. Sound trade is based on the fact that different products traded in are complementary, not competitive. East-West trade implies by its very name that we are trading with those products that can be raised or produced under about equal circumstances in the same latitude. But from Alaska to the tip of South America there is every degree of temperature; every type of soil and, probably every mineral product needed in industry. If through a better prepared and instructed exchange of tourists; through an expanded student exchange program; through a more effective diplomatic exchange and an effective governmental policy, we approach the problem of a free foreign trade, not exclusively but predominately in the Western Hemisphere, we will not need be tempted by the siren of trade with Russia and Red China. We should continue through the United Nations to fight Communists on the diplomatic level but to build a sound trade with free countries.

Hon. Thomas J. Cuite: Brooklyn's Man of the Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 19, 1954

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, under the permission heretofore granted me by unanimous consent of the House, I include the following article published in the Brooklyn Eagle of Sunday, July 18, 1954, with regard to my good friend, State Senator Thomas J. Cuite, who was designated by that newspaper as Brooklyn's man of the week:

Brooklyn's Man of the Week—They Say He's a Stranger at Home

(By Wendell Hanmer)

Friends say of Thomas J. Cuite that he has installed in his home at 94 Dean Street, a life-sized photograph of himself so that his wife, the former Kathlyn Killeen, and their children, Thomas J., Jr., 9, and Cathlyn, 8, will know him next time they see him.

These friends also say—again spoofing, no doubt—that he is fortunate in having a brother, John, to run their real estate and insurance business at 44 Court Street.

The Democratic State senator of Brooklyn's eighth senatorial district, his absences from home while attending the legislative sessions at Albany and his occupation with the affairs of the 10th A. D. regular Democratic organization are discounted by these friends. What makes him a visitor in his own home, they say, is the time he gives to the Catholic War Veterans, of which he is serving a second term as national commander.

We telephoned the county headquarters of this veterans' organization for a casual check on his friends' allegation. "What State conventions of the C. W. V. had Mr. Cuite attended lately, say since May?" we asked.

Came a delay while records seemed to have been consulted. Then:

"In May, you know, he went to Korea with national commanders of other veteran organizations for a first-hand inspection of rehabilitation needs, and later went to Harrisburg, Pa., and to Washington, D. C., for the American-Korean Foundations. The C. W. V. conventions he attended were at Columbus, Ohio, then Lansing, Mich., and Yakima, Wash.; up in New Hampshire, over at Asbury Park, across to Connecticut, our own convention in Rochester—"

"Thank you," we interrupted, and hung up.

"You traveled a bit during May, didn't you?" we commented, when next we encountered Mr. Cuite.

JUST A FEW THOUSAND MILES

"Yes," he agreed, "about 31,000 miles—here and there—and to Rome for the canonization of Pius X."

A member of the American Legion, as well as of the C. W. V., Senator Cuite is a World War II veteran. He enlisted as a private at Fort Hancock in 1940 and was assigned to the 245th Coast Artillery, the old 13th of the Sumner and Jefferson Avenues armory, which had been federalized. In October 1941 he was discharged as a staff sergeant.

WENT TO OCS IN MARYLAND

Recalled to service in January 1942 he again was stationed at Fort Hancock. He was soon a first sergeant and in June went to the Officer Candidates School at Fort Washington, Md. Graduating as a second lieutenant of the adjutant general's division, he was assigned to the Port of Embarkation, Hampton Roads, Va. In turn assistant adjutant headquarters commander, director of administration and personnel and port commander, he advanced through grades and was an acting lieutenant colonel when he closed the port in May 1946.

Hampton Roads was a major port through which men and supplies passed throughout the war. The responsibilities of its commander were many. How the senator met them may, perhaps, be judged from the fact that he received the Army Commendation Ribbon with 2 Oak Leaf Clusters. He received his commission as a lieutenant-colonel when he was separated from the service at Tilton General Hospital, Fort Dix, in November, 1948.

HELD MANY C. W. V. POSTS

A member of the Edward A. Cummings Post, A. L., in which he has never held office, he held successively every office in the Rev. John J. Donlan Post, C. W. V., as well as being Kings County commander in the latter organization before his first election as national commander in June 1952.

That he should have been more active in the latter than in the former organization was influenced by his educational background. He is a graduate of St. Pames Parochial School, St. James Diocesan High School, and St. Francis College. Majoring in history and the social sciences, he obtained his A. B. in 1935.

In high school, Senator Cuite managed the baseball team and during his 4 years at college played basketball, captaining the team during his senior year.

PLAYS HANDBALL NOWADAYS

"Now, when I get the chance," he said, "I play a little handball for the exercise, but I can't find the time for spectator sports."

A past exalted ruler of the Brooklyn Lodge of Elks, one might wonder how he found time to participate in its affairs.

"They're a swell crowd," he explained. "I suppose I was riding my hobby when I joined them. Yes, I guess that is my hobby, if I have any hobby—meeting people."

Appendix

Veterans in Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 20, 1954

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following fine article which appeared in today's issue of the Wall Street Journal:

VETS IN BUSINESS: GI BILL, NOW 10 YEARS OLD, HAS HELPED MANY BUILD SUCCESSFUL FIRMS—JANITOR SERVICE AND MACHINE SHOP THRIVE AFTER STARTING WITH VA-BACKED LOANS—A DOSE OF MISFORTUNE, TOO

Two St. Louis suppliers of janitor service, a San Francisco machine-shop owner, a Pittsburgh manufacturer of soap imprinted with Mother Goose pictures, and a Houston lumber dealer are among thousands of thriving young businessmen whose success stories all started with the signing of the same bulky document 10 years ago this summer.

The document was the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, familiarly known as the GI bill. To help get veterans on their feet after wartime service, the GI bill provided for a Government guaranty of up to $4,000 on any business loan to a vet. There were provisions for Federal guaranties of home and farm loans, too, and for a Government-paid education plan that has helped send about 7.8 million ex-servicemen through colleges and other schooling programs at a cost of $15 billion.

Between the time the bill was signed into law and last May 25, when the latest count was taken, the number of business loans granted by banks and other lending institutions under the GI bill's terms totaled 213,964. They amounted to $576 million, of which the Government directly guaranteed $173.8 million. Well over half of these loans have already been repaid. Some 11,529 business loans totaling $12.5 million have defaulted.

THEIR SUCCESSES AND FAILURES

This is the story of what has happened to some of those veterans who started businesses on the stake Uncle Sam helped provide—their successes and, of course, their failures, too.

For ex-flier William T. Droege and ex-sailor Edmund G. Smith, both of St. Louis, a $2,000 Government-guaranteed loan in 1947 was the springboard that took them out of their postwar tax-collecting jobs with the Internal Revenue Service and into a business that now grosses more than $100,000 a year.

Bill Droege had been working for the tax unit nearly a year when one day he noticed a rug cleaner's truck parked near his home. He had a be-your-own-boss yen, and rug cleaning looked like a wide-open field, he recalls. Friend Ed Smith liked the idea, too, so they left their desks, got their $2,000 loan through the First National Bank of St. Louis, bought a $1,600 truck and some supplies, and went from house to house, office to office, offering to clean rugs on the spot.

TWENTY-THREE DOLLARS GROSS

The first month brought in a grand total of $23 and most of that was from relatives, Mr. Droege says. The first 6 months weren't too glistening, either, he adds, but the partners met their $88.86 monthly payments promptly.

"We were cleaning rugs in the board room at the Falstaff Brewing Corp. one day early in 1948 and were told the janitor service would move the furniture back the next day," recalls Ed Smith. "I'd never even heard of anything like a janitor service before. The Falstaff people weren't satisfied with the service they were getting and indicated they'd consider us if we wanted to take it on."

The two partners took up the offer. They called their enterprise the Barry Janitor Service, named after Mr. Droege's younger brother, a Navy pilot killed in World War II.

ADDING NEW CUSTOMERS

The business grew gradually. The partners signed up new customers with the argument that it would be cheaper for a firm or building management to take the Barry service on a monthly contract basis than to hire their own janitors and occupy themselves with the accompanying bookkeeping and hiring and firing and supervision problems. "And we do a better job," the two veterans told prospects.

"We would work all day cleaning carpets and half the night on the janitor service," Bill Droege recalls. "We beat our brains out," Ed Smith agrees.

Even as the two partners contemplate the struggles of those early days, they admit that it is partly continued hard work today that is keeping their firm growing. They have 75 employees now, and new customers continue to sign up with them. Last year they added 13 new contracts, and 8 more have been added so far this year. Their clients include two large downtown St. Louis office buildings, the Hampton Village Medical Center and offices of such companies as Inland Steel Products Co. and Great Lakes Carbon Corp.

But the 2 men say they still spend 3 or 4 hours on 2 or 3 nights a week wiping a finger on a windowsill to see if their workers have removed the dust, checking office building washrooms, and inspecting the polish on a customer's floor.

"We've learned that our work is only as good as the supervision," Bill Droege declares. "And we can't be shown anything today that we didn't do ourselves from cleaning washrooms to washing windows."

The veterans' original $2,000 loan has been paid off, and both partners, looking back on their $1,000-apiece initial investment, agree: "Neither of us would sell out today for $50,000 for his share."

MACHINE-SHOP OWNER IN COVERALLS

Walter Parks, of San Francisco, is another veteran who has built up a successful business in the past several years with the help of a GI loan and plenty of hard work. He owns a machine shop, and says, "Up until this year I haven't been able to get out of my coveralls, I've been so busy getting this thing going."

When he set up shop in an old stable 9 years ago, he and his wife were living in a $2.50-a-week furnished room. Today they and their four sons live in a three-bedroom house. "Our front room now would make about four of the one we had 9 years ago," Walt Parks remarks. And his business has moved from the stable to a 180-foot-long modern building.

His initial $5,000 loan, partly underwritten by the Government, helped pay for a half dozen secondhand machines. Walt, who was a mechanic in the Air Force and a former machinist with Standard Stoker Co., Erie, Pa., scurried about drumming up business "in my old beat-up 1935 Packard," he recalls. (Today he owns a Cadillac, an Oldsmobile, and a truck.)

He managed to gross $40,000 in his first year. So far this year he has done over $240,000 worth of business, he reports. His original 4 customers have grown into 60. Calling again on American Trust Co., which advanced the initial loan, he got several more small GI loans to finance growth as his list of clients grew. He now has 65 machines valued at about $200,000 and says the last of his borrowings have been repaid.

SOME FAILURES

Not all veteran entrepreneurs have had the qualities to start off with a GI loan and build up a successful business, of course.

A young Chicago vet, who prefers to remain anonymous, obtained a $4,000 GI loan after the war, bought a truck and tried to set up a freight-hauling business between Chicago and southern Illinois. He planned to carry peaches, apples, and berries in the summer and coal and lumber in the winter.

But there were a few factors he failed to consider. First he had to pay $3,200 for a used truck in the inflated postwar market. Then came high license and franchise fees, and repair expenses much higher than he had expected. Next he found he couldn't get the contracts he needed due to fierce competition from established trucklines. After a year of struggling, he went into bankruptcy still owing $3,300.

Officials of the Veterans' Administration, which administers the GI bill, say inexperience, lack of sufficient working capital, and stiff competition in fields such as trucking are the main reasons for veteran failures. Plain bad luck has hit some enterprises, too.

CHAIN OF MISFORTUNES

Take a look at the chain of misfortunes which hit three former Army pilots who set up an automatic car-washing business in Jackson Heights, a section of New York City, back in 1948. They obtained a $37,000 loan from the Reconstruction Finance Corp., one-third guaranteed by the VA (a $4,000 guarantee for each of the three vets).

"We were counting on getting the car-wash machine operating in time for the spring trade of 1949 and also on the early completion of a service highway which would be adjacent to our property and lead from Grand Central Parkway to Brooklyn," recalls one of the partners, who is now a fireman.

Construction of the building was delayed first by heavy snows in the 1948–49 winter, and later by the contractor's sudden death in an auto accident. The washer did not get into operation until July 1949. The outbreak of the Korean war a year later, with the resultant steel shortage, held up completion of the service highway. Then a citywide water shortage in the fall of 1950 forced the firm to shut down for a couple of weeks until a $3,000 well was drilled. Finally all three of the original partners were called back into service, and the foundering business sank for good.

WIFE TROUBLE

Out on the west coast, another type of misfortune sent another veteran's enterprise onto the rocks. He was a man who had been a pastry cook in the Army, and obtained a $4,000 GI loan after the war to open a bakery in a small California town. "He did an excellent business for a year and a half," a VA official recalls. "Then one day out of a clear blue sky he just disappeared. We heard later he had split up with his wife and that his three brothers-in-law were 'out to get him.' As far as we know, he hasn't turned up yet." This family affair cost the Government about $750.

But such cases of defaults are a small minority among all the businesses launched with an assist from the GI bill. Most loans granted under this law—which has been extended to apply to Korean veterans—have been repaid or are in process of being repaid.

Harry Gordon, who obtained a $4,000 GI loan from Pittsburgh's Potter Bank & Trust Co. in September, 1952, will make his final payment next month, slightly ahead of schedule. He began during the 1952 presidential election campaign to make soap imprinted with the picture of GOP candidate Eisenhower. "It got us some publicity and that's about all," he recalls. So his Picto Soap Co. turned with more success to making children's soap imprinted with colored pictures of nursery rhyme characters.

Ex-infantryman Gordon started production with "a couple of girls working part-time," and now employs 15-full-time workers. He says his firm did a "low five-figure business" in 1953 and this year expects a "six-figure business," and "profits are showing a healthy increase in line with our increase in volume."

THREE DETROIT BROTHERS

Among the successful veteran-entrepeneurs in the Detroit area are the Berkowitz brothers, Fred, Dave, and Julius. All three were sergeants in World War II. When they got out they went to work for others: Fred as a grocery clerk, Dave as a shipping clerk, Julius as a machine operator in an auto parts establishment. Then they decided to go into business for themselves, and with the aid of a $6,000 GI loan they set up Mansfield Automotive Parts Co., an auto wholesaling outfit supplying parts to gas stations, garages, auto dealers, and truck fleets.

The business was established in September 1946. Sales the next year were $10,000. By last year they had leaped to over $500,000. And so far this year they are 10 percent ahead of last. The brothers now hope to move their business into a larger building. The loan, obtained in 1946, was paid back 3 years later.

James Sherwood Crane, who was sales manager for a Texas lumber company before he went into the Navy as a noncom in 1942, opened a retail lumber business at Angleton, Tex., 50 miles south of Houston, a few months after the war ended. The firm was financed with a $4,000 GI loan and $3,000 put up by a partner. Ex-Seabee Crane had 3 years in which to repay the loan, but just 10 months later the debt was paid back in full.

About 4 years afterward a second lumber yard was opened at Almeda, Tex., just southwest of Houston. Since then, the partnership has been dissolved, with Mr. Crane's partner taking over the Angleton yard and Mr. Crane the Almeda business. He figures he has pyramided his $4,000 GI loan into a net worth of "well over $100,000," and he now plans to open two additional yards.

Alsop Column Sounds Warning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 1, 1954

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, I was greatly impressed by the important article of the distinguished writers Joseph and Stewart Alsop which was inserted in the RECORD yesterday by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN]. The article states facts bluntly and clearly. It is a noble effort to sound an alarm and awaken the Nation to the increasing dangers toward which we are complacently drifting. Yet because it will be unwelcome in the current political climate, it will probably go unheeded.

In some respects the present period reminds me of 1940 at which time I had joined with other equally worried citizens in trying to warn the Nation of the peril we saw approaching. For the most part our warnings fell on deaf ears. Had they been heeded the war would have been shorter and many lives would have been spared.

Just 14 years ago, on July 16, 1940, I made a statewide radio broadcast in California along the lines of the Alsop article. At that time I was a young obscure candidate for the Democratic nomination for the United States Senate. Although I knew my chances of being elected were slight, I felt it important that an effort be made to get the facts to the people. In the 1940 speech I said:

> It should be obvious to everyone by now that no one understands the weaknesses of democracies better than Adolph Hitler. No one understands so well how to take full advantage of such weaknesses. No one has ever been so successful at sending propagandists into democracies to aggravate their weaknesses; to undermine them from the inside while preparing to assault them from the outside.
>
> Totalitarian nations move in unison at the command of dictators. The national mind is made up when the dictator makes his decision. Such a decision is final. No one dares to question it. No one can even get access to enough facts to know whether or not the decision is in the national interest. Blind obedience is the subjects' only possible course.
>
> But in a democracy, government can only act with the consent of the people. Political leaders must wait for public approval of their actions no matter how important the time element may be. The strong are held back by the week. Those who are decisive must wait for those who vacillate. Those who have vision are delayed by those who cannot see ahead. Statesmen are hindered by self-seeking politicians. We must not close our eyes to these shortcomings. Rather we must strive to prevent our enemies from taking advantage of them.
>
> It is not pleasant for me to have to tell you that I believe the peril to our nation is far greater than most of your leaders seem inclined to tell you. In my humble judgment, the United States is stumbling along toward a test of strength it is not prepared to meet. We are not prepared, either mentally, or physically, and worst of all, we are not united. Unless we face the facts soon, unless we stop imagining that peace can be achieved by peace planks in political platforms, we may pay for our folly in the loss of our liberties, and the liberties of our children—children who have a right to expect us to preserve this democracy for them, as it was preserved for us.
>
> Now is the time to realize that although the dream of our people is peace, the state of the world is war. Only those who are fully prepared for war, mentally and physically, can even hope for peace. Neither fear, nor the most fervent desire to avoid the horrors of war, can protect us against international gangsters, who understand only the laws of overwhelming might. These gangsters, and only these gangsters, will decide whether or not we shall have peace. They may give us two choices—submission to their domination or war. The weak among us will favor submission, the strong will prefer to fight for freedom, as did the men who won our freedom for us.
>
> We should be preparing for war now as if it were already upon us. If we assume now that permanent peace is possible, we will be inclined to prepare ourselves halfheartedly, and to make the mistakes of other nonexistent nations that engaged in such assumptions. * * *
>
> The isolationists console themselves by saying that in a few years we will be prepared to meet any combination of foes. What do they think Hitler, Mussolini, Stalin, and Japan will be doing in those few years? Obligingly waiting for us to get ready for them? That, my friends, is the kind of reasoning that leads to ruin.
>
> The only way we can be assured of time to arm is to send sufficient war material to Britain to enable her to hold out while we get ready. If Britain can't hold out—and her ability to do so is problematical—where does that leave us? It leaves us hemmed in on all sides by international bandits, committed to a defense of a whole hemisphere, but without adequate arms to even defend ourselves.
>
> It leaves us alone, without effective allies, alone attempting to hold on to the richest lands on the face of the earth. This is the dangerous position into which the blind isolationists would surely plunge us. It is the position in which Hitler and his strange pals would like to find us. That is why the Communists and Nazis, both here and abroad, applaud every political move of the isolationists. That is why the subversive forces are back of certain of the peace groups that preach peace, only to divide us; blind us; keep us weak; and prepare us for the same slaughter other peoples have suffered.
>
> Don't let them blind you, by whatever name they call themselves—isolationists, Communists, Nazis, peace councils, some sincere, but blind; others sinister and insincere, but all poison for an America that needs to stop its day dreaming and get down to earth. We must not permit either dupes or foreign agents to turn us against our leaders by calling them warmongers. None of us wants war.
>
> Those who accuse the President of wanting war should have their own motives carefully scrutinized. They may be motivated by politics, by fear, by weakness, by hatred of democracy, or simply blindness—no matter what their motives—their program is dangerous. Think carefully lest you be misled by their proposals.
>
> What is there in Hitler's history, that makes the blind isolationists think Hitler and his cohorts will wait for us to arm before striking, if Britain is conquered, in short order. Hitler's agents are already busy in South America. He has already denounced the Monroe Doctrine. Remember there is nothing magic about the Monroe Doctrine. Our military power is all that can force respect for it. That is why Hitler hasn't much respect for it now—and has not hesitated to say so. Only the British Navy stands between

Hitler and this hemisphere. We must recognize this fact now. By sending war material to the British, we are increasing our chances of perpetuating the Monroe Doctrine. By not recognizing this obvious fact the isolationists are endeavoring to keep us making the same mistakes they have led us to make for 20 years. Now is the time to stop them. My opponent is a Republican and I am a Democrat. But this is not a partisan campaign. It is fortunate for America that the Republicans nominated a man like Wendell Willkie who has repudiated the isolationists, and their name calling.

By accepting Roosevelt's foreign policy, Mr. Willkie has refused to give comfort to Hitler, and has endeavored to unite us against external enemies. Mr. Willkie's stand leaves the isolationists without a major candidate willing to endorse their appease the dictators program.

Of course, I was called a warmonger and while my predictions were not popular they soon proved all too true. Precious years for proper preparation were irretrievably frittered away as disaster approached. Today, as then, the danger to America is real. Today, as then, it is not generally appreciated.

Probably only the President is in a position to get the facts across to the Nation. I hope he will soon see fit to do so. And I hope the Alsops will keep on laying it on the line. They are performing a great service.

Cost to Nation's Taxpayers, by States, of Colorado River Storage Project and Fryingpan-Arkansas Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN JARMAN

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 20, 1954

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, prior to consideration by the House of Representatives of H. R. 4449 and H. R. 236, it would be well for every Member to consider carefully the following conclusions of the National Conference of State Taxpayer Executives:

COST TO NATION'S TAXPAYERS, BY STATES, OF COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT AND PARTICIPATING PROJECTS AND FRYINGPAN-ARKANSAS PROJECT

The minority reports of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives, contain the following statements:

"REPORT NO. 1774, 83D CONGRESS, 2D SESSION—COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT AND PARTICIPATING PROJECTS (H. R. 4449)

"The bill includes a concealed subsidy from the Nation's taxpayers of over $1 billion to provide irrigation water for less than 370,000 acres of land (of which about 240,000 acres would receive only a supplemental water supply)—a gift of over $2,500 per acre irrigated or $370,000 for each of the 2,700 farms to be benefited. (The average value of the land fully developed is about $150 per acre.)

"REPORT NO. 1943, 83D CONGRESS, 2D SESSION—FRYINGPAN-ARKANSAS PROJECT (H. R. 236)

"Under the repayment provisions of the bill, the concealed subsidy from the Nation's taxpayers would amount to at least $425 million, and more probably $500 million for the major purpose of providing a small supplemental irrigation supply (one-half acre-foot per acre), to be spread on 309,000 acres. Using the smaller figure, this would be a subsidy of $1,375 per acre, or $220,000 per 160-acre farm, about 6 times the average value of fully developed irrigated land, which is stated to be $225 per acre, or $36,000 per 160-acre farm."

The cost to each State of the concealed subsidy involved in each of these proposed projects, in accordance with the percentage distribution of the Federal tax burden computed by Tax Foundation based upon actual data for the fiscal year 1953, is shown in the following tabulation:

Cost to Nation's taxpayers

State	Percent of total	Colorado River storage project (H. R. 4440)	Fryingpan-Arkansas project (H. R. 236)	Combined projects
Alabama	1.15	$11,500,000	$5,750,000	$17,250,000
Arizona	.51	5,100,000	2,550,000	7,650,000
Arkansas	.68	6,800,000	3,400,000	10,200,000
California	9.32	93,200,000	46,600,000	139,800,000
Colorado	.91	9,100,000	4,550,000	13,650,000
Connecticut	1.74	17,400,000	8,700,000	26,100,000
Delaware	.37	3,700,000	1,850,000	5,550,000
Florida	1.69	16,900,000	8,450,000	25,350,000
Georgia	1.53	15,300,000	7,650,000	22,950,000
Idaho	.34	3,400,000	1,700,000	5,100,000
Illinois	6.90	69,000,000	34,500,000	103,500,000
Indiana	2.56	25,600,000	12,800,000	38,400,000
Iowa	1.55	15,500,000	7,750,000	23,250,000
Kansas	1.31	13,100,000	6,550,000	19,650,000
Kentucky	1.27	12,700,000	6,350,000	19,050,000
Louisiana	1.34	13,400,000	6,700,000	20,100,000
Maine	.47	4,700,000	2,350,000	7,050,000
Maryland [1]	2.56	25,600,000	12,800,000	38,400,000
Massachusetts	3.19	31,900,000	15,950,000	47,850,000
Michigan	4.91	49,100,000	24,550,000	73,650,000
Minnesota	1.74	17,400,000	8,700,000	26,100,000
Mississippi	.65	6,500,000	3,250,000	9,750,000
Missouri	2.50	25,000,000	12,500,000	37,500,000
Montana	.40	4,000,000	2,000,000	6,000,000
Nebraska	.85	8,500,000	4,250,000	12,750,000
Nevada	.17	1,700,000	850,000	2,550,000
New Hampshire	.30	3,000,000	1,500,000	4,500,000
New Jersey	3.60	36,000,000	18,000,000	54,000,000
New Mexico	.38	3,800,000	1,900,000	5,700,000
New York	12.34	123,400,000	61,700,000	185,100,000
North Carolina	1.67	16,700,000	8,350,000	25,050,000
North Dakota	.30	3,000,000	1,500,000	4,500,000
Ohio	5.90	59,000,000	29,500,000	88,500,000
Oklahoma	1.12	11,200,000	5,600,000	16,800,000
Oregon	1.10	11,000,000	5,500,000	16,500,000
Pennsylvania	6.94	69,400,000	34,700,000	104,100,000
Rhode Island	.52	5,200,000	2,600,000	7,800,000
South Carolina	.86	8,600,000	4,300,000	12,900,000
South Dakota	.33	3,300,000	1,650,000	4,950,000
Tennessee	1.39	13,900,000	6,950,000	20,850,000
Texas	4.86	48,600,000	24,300,000	72,900,000
Utah	.40	4,000,000	2,000,000	6,000,000
Vermont	.19	1,900,000	950,000	2,850,000
Virginia	1.69	16,900,000	8,450,000	25,350,000
Washington	1.71	17,100,000	8,550,000	25,650,000
West Virginia	.89	8,900,000	4,450,000	13,350,000
Wisconsin	2.20	22,000,000	11,000,000	33,000,000
Wyoming	.20	2,000,000	1,000,000	3,000,000
Territories	.50	5,000,000	2,500,000	7,500,000
Total	100.00	1,000,000,000	500,000,000	1,500,000,000

---

[1] Includes Washington, D. C.

Hearst Newspaper Asks Action on Highways

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 1, 1954

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, the great Hearst newspapers have devoted much effort to the cause of adequate highways to "get America out of the traffic jam." It now appears that this effort, which I have been pleased to support, may bear fruit provided the administration proves willing to substitute action for talk. Our highway needs are critical. We need action now, this year, not some time in the future. I should like to include in our RECORD the following editorial from the San Francisco Examiner of July 16:

A GOOD UNITED STATES ROADS PROGRAM AT LAST

The news that President Eisenhower wants to spend an additional $5 billion a year on roads for the next 10 years is as surprising as it is welcome.

It is welcome because the sums mentioned demonstrate a realistic understanding of the job that must be done if our highways are to be adequate and a determination to get on with the job.

The program comes as somewhat of a surprise because the administration supported a Federal highway bill in this session of Congress that was obviously inadequate and which could have been substantially increased if the administration so desired.

The Hearst newspapers, almost daily, pointed out the serious flaws in the bill and tried until the day the President signed it to have it improved.

Now that the viewpoint of the administration has changed, the past can be forgiven and forgotten.

The governors' conference, to which President Eisenhower's remarks were made through Vice President NIXON, promptly reiterated its somewhat mouldy stand that the Federal Government get out of the highway business and let 48 governors take over.

They are beating a busted drum in a parade in which they are the only marchers.

The highway situation requires national supervision and coordination. The supervision comes with the power to tax and to make Federal grants.

Do away with one and you have done away with the other. The result would be something to make even the governors shudder.

We will be watching with great interest now to see how the President intends to implement his program and when he intends to do it.

There would not normally be a Federal highway bill again until 1956, but, we feel certain the President does not intend to wait until then.

We believe that the President now comprehends the scope and urgency of the highway program and that he will act with speed and enthusiasm.

No Seating of Red China in U. N.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 20, 1954

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include my statement registering my approval of House Joint Resolution 627, reiterating the opposition of the United States House of Representatives to the seating of the Communist regime in China in the United Nations:

None for, Is House Score on Admission of Red China to the U. N.

to wit:

Red China thumbed its nose against the United Nations when it invaded Korea.

Red China was indicted as an aggressor.

It still is.

Far from repenting or making amends the Chinese Communists continued their aggression against another neighbor, Indochina. At the beginning, an effort was made to represent this as a revolution within Indochina. That pretense has now been junked. It is the Chinese Communist leaders who will decide the fate of that country.

Aggression, plus aggression, compounded by insolence that demands complete surrender by the United Nations.

Will the British never learn?

The pattern that led to World War II is being repeated, but the British and other wishful nations, are making the same old blunders.

The rationalizing process is in full swing.

The bait of trade and the illusion of coexistence are being used to gloss over realities.

The U. N. as constituted has no legal or military authority to protect the peace.

Only as it speaks up bravely and resolutely for moral principles in the settlement of international disputes will it have any meaning or prestige.

When morality is abandoned nothing is left.

The United Nations will become as lifeless as the old League of Nations if it fails to take a stand now.

Appeasement is still appeasement, no matter how it is disguised.

The Communists are amused and are emboldened by this servile weakness on the part of once-great nations.

Cowardly concessions only win Red contempt.

If the U. N. gives in now it is gone.

There is not much time left to provide it with backbone.

Americans believe in fair play. When the chips are down they will, as they have always done, speak up unafraid for what is right and just.

They did so last week.

The United States House of Representatives by a unanimous vote of those present, 385 to 0, served notice on the world that the American people are completely and vigorously opposed to the admission of the defiant aggressor, Red China, into the family of nations.

Nothing in my experience as a Congressman gave me a greater thrill than that resounding rejection of those who think that right and wrong are interchangeable, who would ape Communism by putting expediency above eternal truths.

The conscience of America spoke in that vote.

It told of a retreat that was over, of a counterattack that has just begun. Time and again we have made concessions hoping that Communist Russia and Communist China would learn to mend their ways, so that they could be genuinely accepted into the family of nations on a basis of mutual trust that would never betray the peace.

That day is done.

The Red record is one long list of betrayals.

The time has come when the Reds must purge themselves of their aggressions first before they can ever hope for admission into the society of law-abiding nations.

The United States, speaking for all who believe in liberty and justice, has made a clear and irrevocable decision.

Red China will never be admitted to the U. N. until it makes restitution for the crimes it has committed against the peace of the world.

Establishment of a Steam Generating Plant at West Memphis, Ark.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. F. NORRELL

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 20, 1954

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following letters and a resolution:

July 20, 1954.

Mr. Clifford Penland,
Executive Vice President,
Memphis Chamber of Commerce,
Memphis, Tenn.

Dear Mr. Penland: I thank you for your letter of July 16 enclosing copy of resolution adopted by the board of directors of the Memphis Chamber of Commerce, incorporating the recommendations of the industrial department, for the construction of a steam generating plant at West Memphis, Ark.

Your thoughtfulness in furnishing a copy of this resolution is genuinely appreciated, being confident that it represents the practically unanimous thinking of the people of Memphis on the subject. I am greatly concerned regarding the controversy being waged, and in that connection there are three angles which I feel deserve consideration.

1. There is no doubt but that if TVA omits the charging of interest, taxes and other necessary expenses which private enterprise must carry to produce electric power, they can supply it cheaper than areas not so fortunate. I do not find fault however with our friends from the TVA area for exerting every possible effort to secure the cheapest possible power. Their desire in that matter is understandable.

2. I am sure that while I can certainly understand the attitude of our friends and neighbors in the TVA area, they can likewise understand the position of their neighbors in Arkansas who desire the steam plant constructed at West Memphis. It is a logical conclusion that the Government will not, in the foreseeable future, authorize the construction and provide funds for the proposed Fulton steam plant, it having been turned down several times. We are now desirous of helping ourselves as our neighbors have been to help themselves and, when we help ourselves in this case, if the Government will not authorize the enlargement of TVA, then we at the same time help our neighbors. There should be no argument or misunderstanding on this score. We in Arkansas look greatly to Memphis for leadership. It is our trade center, and we must and will live together.

3. The entire Nation is, and should be, interested in the expenditure of Federal funds, regardless of the use to which they are put. We have reached the time when it is most important that we have a high degree of practical economy, and this being true the rest of the Nation also has an interest at stake. They do not wish to subsidize power for any area. It is my thought that all we now ask is equal treatment, and I believe that the rest of the country will be willing, and happy, to mete out equal treatment to us. This means that we each pay our own way.

It is my hope that the Government will see to it that a fair and reasonable contract is executed between the Atomic Energy Commission and the Dixon-Yates combine for the construction of the steam plant at West Memphis to supply our area with additional power it needs. I shall never do anything detrimental to TVA insofar as its existing facilities are concerned. I am not in favor of destruction of that organization. A tremendous amount of money has been spent on it and it is a very great enterprise of which I am proud. It has reached maturity, and its accomplishments have been made possible by the taxpayers of the United States for the benefit of our area. There is a place for TVA in the area it now serves, even though we may not be willing to continue its enlargement, and I hereby pledge opposition to anything considered destructive of the Tennessee Valley Authority as presently constituted.

Sincerely yours,

W. F. Norrell.

Memphis Chamber of Commerce,
Memphis, Tenn., July 16, 1954.

The Honorable W. F. Norrell,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Norrell: We are enclosing a copy of a resolution adopted by the board of directors of the Memphis Chamber of Commerce on the 16th day of July 1954 in regard to the establishment of a steam generating plant at West Memphis, Ark.

Sincerely yours,

Clifford Penland,
Executive Vice President.

Resolution by the Memphis Chamber of Commerce Board of Directors in Regard to Establishment of Steam Generating Plant at West Memphis, Ark.

Whereas the details of the existing controversy as to the location of a steam generating plant in West Memphis, Ark., have been presented to the board of directors of the Memphis Chamber of Commerce by its industrial department in the following words,

Three Hundred and Eighty-Five Against,

"*To the Board of Directors, Memphis Chamber of Commerce:*

"The industrial department of the chamber of commerce is deeply concerned over the existing controversy as to the location of the steam generating plant in West Memphis.

"It is concerned, first, over the urgent need for the location of such a plant, either at Memphis or in the near vicinity, in order that Memphis may be assured of adequate power supply for its future development. This apprehension is based upon the statement of Major Allen, of the Memphis Light, Gas and Water Division, to the board of directors of the chamber of commerce, that at the present rate, and without the building of the Fulton steam plant, Memphis, would suffer a shortage of power in 1957, and that, therefore, every effort should be made upon the part of Memphians to aid and assist in bringing about the construction by TVA of the powerplant at Fulton, Tenn.

"Now it is certain that the Fulton plant will not be constructed. Four times the Congress of the United States has refused TVA to appropriate the money necessary to construct the Fulton plant. Without this plant, according to the opinion expressed to your board of directors by Major Allen, Memphis will face a power famine in 1957. This must not occur.

"It is the hope and belief of all Memphians that Memphis will continue to grow. Millions of dollars have been spent in the preparation of Presidents Island for industrial development. Other industrial sites are spotted in various places in our city waiting for development. Without power, these developments cannot be made. This is the primary reason that impels your industrial department to favor the construction of the West Memphis powerplant, unless its construction will be detrimental and deleterious to the health, life, and prosperity of the city of Memphis, which is basically an engineering problem.

"We are concerned for a second reason. Memphis is vitally interested in the growth and development of its trade territory. Anything that benefits our communities, in turn benefits the city of Memphis. The people of West Memphis will be greatly benefited by the construction of this large plant immediately adjacent to their splendid city. They are vitally interested in this development.

"We are concerned and interested for a third reason, and that is because the building of this plant and its operation will be very beneficial to the city of Memphis, to West Memphis and the surrounding territory. Its construction will entail the payment of an estimated $21 million for labor and many millions more for materials. Much of this money will find its way into the trade channels of Memphis. Its construction will entail the employment of 2,500 employees, most of whom will come from our midst. When completed, its operation will add an annual payroll of a million dollars to Memphis and to West Memphis.

"One argument that is being used against the location of the powerplant in West Memphis, 8 miles below Memphis, is that the smoke from that plant will deposit ashes on the city of Memphis. No competent engineering study has been made yet that affirms it.

"The fact of the business is that the great majority of our American cities today, including New York, Chicago, Philadelphia, Boston, Detroit, St. Louis, and Cleveland, all generate their power by coal, and many of their powerhouses are in the immediate vicinity of the uptown portions of their city.

"The chamber of commerce is here for the purpose of aiding and abetting in the development and growth, especially commercially and industrially, of the city of Memphis and its surrounding territory. We are fighting every day to bring new industries into Memphis, and yet we are told that in 1957 our efforts must cease unless additional power is made available.

"The industrial department is deeply concerned over a statement from Washington, D. C., made recently by the administration to the effect that the Fulton steam plant wasn't going to be approved, and if the West Memphis plant were not constructed, Memphis would be out of the picture for any additional power unless the city decides to build its own steam plant.

"The industrial department feels that its obligation is to promote and encourage all things for the good of the entire Midsouth area. Any other policy would be shortsighted upon the part of our community.

"We believe this project is of such magnitude and public interest that the chamber's board of directors should take a positive public stand in the matter.

"Let us remind you that the smokestacks that are detrimental to our city, and to the Midsouth, are those that are empty and their boilers cold, not the stacks that are in operation"; and

Whereas the matter has been thoroughly discussed by this board: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we, the board of directors of the Memphis Chamber of Commerce, hereby endorse and ratify the statement by the said industrial department and accept same as the opinion of this board; be it further

Resolved, That this board favors the construction of the present proposed steam generating plant in West Memphis, Ark., to insure adequate power for future industrial development of the city of Memphis and its surrounding territory; be it further

Resolved, That the executive vice president of the Memphis Chamber of Commerce forward copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, members of the Atomic Energy Commission, members of the Federal Power Commission, the Bureau of the Budget, members of the delegations to the Congress from the States of Arkansas and Tennessee, the industrial council of the West Memphis Chamber of Commerce and the public press.

This 16th day of July 1954.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS, MEMPHIS CHAMBER OF COMMERCE.

I certify that the foregoing is a correct copy of a resolution passed by the board of directors of the Memphis Chamber of Commerce at a meeting held in the office of the chamber of commerce on this 16th day of July 1954.

CLIFFORD PENLAND,
Executive Vice President.

Persecution of Church in Ukrainia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS M. MACHROWICZ

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 20, 1954

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, the world has been shocked by the numerous instances of persecution of the church by Communist terrorists in countries behind the Iron Curtain. We have already heard of instances in Poland, Rumania, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Lithuania, and other countries. Today I wish to call the attention of Congress to a resolution of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, Inc., bringing to light the inhuman and almost unbelievable acts of terrorism practiced by the Communist authorities in Ukrainia and directed toward the eradication of churches and other places of worship.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED AT THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE UKRAINIAN CONGRESS COMMITTEE OF AMERICA ON OCTOBER 11, 1953

Whereas the members of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America and the people of the United States and throughout the world are shocked by reports appearing in the press and elsewhere concerning the program of the government behind the Iron Curtain directed toward the eradication of churches and other places of worship, brought to the attention of the world so dramatically by the recent imprisonment of His Eminence, Stefan Cardinal Wyszynski, archbishop of Warsaw and Primate of Poland; and

Whereas many acts of terrorism, confiscation, and persecution have already been committed in what is now called the Ukrainian Republic of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Poland, Czechoslovakia, and other countries behind the Iron Curtain against the Ukrainian Catholic Church, Ukrainian Orthodox Church, and other churches and persons of religious beliefs; and

Whereas such acts have resulted unjustly and unwarrantedly in the confiscation of property and the deprivation of rights and privileges possessed by those people in the pursuit of their worship of God; and

Whereas through his efforts constantly to uphold and champion the ideals of freedom, tolerance, and humanity, His Excellency, Archbishop Joseph Slipyj, Metropolitan of Halych, has been an inspiration to all mankind; and

Whereas His Excellency, Archbishop Joseph Slipyj was unjustly condemned by the Soviet Union to hard labor in 1945 for 8 years for his religious teachings and beliefs as above stated; and

Whereas the Soviet Union has recently increased the term of imprisonment of His Excellency, Archbishop Joseph Slipyj, for 9 additional years; and

Whereas the Government of the United States, because of its humanitarian interests in the various peoples of this country and their interest in the persecuted clergy behind the Iron Curtain, should register emphatic protest with the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics with a request that it should cease and desist in its program of religious persecution; and

Whereas the Government of the United States has, on other occasions, intervened and interceded in behalf of persecuted leaders of the church in other countries: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Secretary of State of the United States of America be, and he hereby is, respectfully petitioned to lodge an official protest on behalf of the Government of the United States with the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Czechoslovakia and Poland, against the concerted attack which long has been and presently is being made directly and indirectly by the latter governments toward the Ukrainian Catholic Church and other hierarchy of the Catholic Church, residing in such countries, and that the Department of State be, and it hereby is, respectfully further petitioned to employ its best diplomatic efforts in an attempt to persuade said governments to desist from any further religious persecution, acts of terrorism and confiscation, complained of in this resolution, and that they further set free His Excellency, Archbishop Joseph Slipyj, and other members of the clergy, and it is further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States and to the Secretary of State of the United States, and to each Member of Congress and the Senate of the United States, and that they be urged to do everything possible to accomplish the purposes of this resolution.

H. R. 7840

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 19, 1954

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, it would appear that the leadership, in its desire to get home, will bring this session of Congress to a close without taking the major, overall actions necessary to get our economy back on the expansion road.

There are a number of individual measures, however, that it is imperative to enact, making necessary adjustments in various programs designed to meet the realities of rising living costs.

One of these is H. R. 7840, which liberalizes the railroad-retirement system and makes certain benefit adjustments to correct glaring inequities. This bill has been reported by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and is now before the Rules Committee.

I urge the Rules Committee to act on this measure so that we in the House may have an opportunity to clear it in time for Senate action before Members return to their districts.

The provisions of this bill are necessary unless we wish beneficiaries of the railroad retirement system to continue to bear the heavy burden of gross inequities and inadequacies of existing law.

I include herewith a letter from George J. Van Luik, who represents 200 railroad employees on the Missouri Pacific Railroad at Dupo, Ill.; Alton & Southern of East St. Louis, Ill., and the East St. Louis Junction Railroad, as general chairman of the International Brotherhood of Firemen and Oilers:

INTERNATIONAL BROTHERHOOD
OF FIREMEN AND OILERS,
St. Louis, Mo., July 9, 1954.

Hon. MELVIN PRICE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: The undersigned representing some 200 railroad employees on the Missouri Pacific Railroad at Dupo, Ill.; Alton & Southern of East St. Louis; and the East St. Louis Junction Railroad, as general chairman of the International Brotherhood of Firemen and Oilers, we are taking the liberty of communicating with you relative to H. R. 7840, and as a constituent of yours covered by the Railroad Retirement and Railroad Unemployment Insurance Acts, the people that I have the pleasure to represent in St. Clair County, Ill., are vitally interested in the expanded coverage offered in H. R. 7840, and respectfully urge your support for its passage.

The undersigned, of course, is not a resident of St. Clair County, Ill., however, as previously stated, we represent these employed on the various railroads and we know that you will support the passage of bill 7840.

With sincere best wishes and kindest personal regards, I am,

Sincerely,

GEORGE J. VAN LUIK.

To Improve the Unemployment Compensation Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 20, 1954

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following radio address I delivered on WMEX, Boston, Mass., on Saturday, July 17, 1954:

To have the mill where you work close down or move to another part of the country is not an unsual experience for New Englanders.

Other industries also have slack periods when the workers are told to go home and wait until they are called back to work.

To be out of work is bad enough, but to have no income of any kind during the layoff is worse.

Unemployment compensation is intended to fill that gap in part so that the worker who is jobless through no fault of his own can provide for himself and his family, and, at the same time, help to sustain the demand for basic goods and services.

As it stands now, the unemployment compensation program varies from State to State. Generally speaking, the benefits are too low, they do not last long enough, and they fail to cover all who are out of work.

The President himself has acknowledged these deficiencies.

He has recommended action to remedy these shortcomings.

Many of us feel, however, that the legislation he favors does not go far enough.

We contend that it should cover all jobs.

That the payments should be increased and extended.

And that States with a heavy burden of unemployment should be helped by reinsurance grants from the Federal unemployment account. This will enable them to handle critical situations without raising employer taxes so far above the levels in other States that industries would be forced to migrate.

No responsible person is predicting a national depression.

By the same token, no one can be blind to the fact that there are scattered places where the percentage of unemployment is critical.

With total wage and salary payments down $12 billion a year the addition of $1 or $2 billion of purchasing power through increased unemployment compensation benefits becomes necessary to prop up industry and agriculture.

I think that most people will now agree that Federal civilian employees should be eligible for such benefits.

As a group, they are subject to the risk of unemployment on nearly the same scale as nongovernmental, workers in the same type of work. The Committee on Ways and Means of the United States House of Representatives has come to the conclusion that these employees are entitled to coverage. Consider these figures. From a wartime peak of well over 3¼ million employees in June 1945, Federal employment dropped by a million between 1945 and 1946, and dropped considerably more in the next few years, leveling off at about 2 million in June 1950. After a new increase due to the Korean conflict, Federal employment again fell off by nearly 247,000 between June 1952 and December 31, 1953. The decline is continuing, as we have reason to know, from the Government's mystifying policy of drastic cuts in employment throughout New England. That this only aggravates our problem is apparent to everyone but the authorities in Washington who sometimes make decisions that couldn't be worse.

The committee believes that the Federal Government should not be in the position of providing less favorable conditions of employment, than are required of private employers. Yet, since Federal employees now have no unemployment-insurance protection, involuntarily separated Federal employees have been forced to rely upon accrued annual leave and refunds from their retirements accounts while looking for other jobs. Not only does this defeat the purpose of annual leave, but also, in many cases, the employee may have no such leave accumulation at all. Even where leave has been accumulated, there is evidence that it has been inadequate to cover the duration of Federal workers' unemployment. Moreover, the committee believes that withdrawal of an employee's retirement-fund accumulation is undesirable and a defeat of the purpose of the retirement program.

At long last discrimination again Federal employees will come to an end.

But what about those workers in private industry who are not presently eligible for benefits?

The administration would like to extend coverage to employers of 4 or more persons instead of the 8 or more standard that prevails in some States.

Many Congressmen, including myself, want to broaden its scope to include employers who have one or more individuals in their employ at any time during the taxable year.

To the worker, unemployment insurance is as important if he works for a small employer just as much as if he works for an employer of thousands. Moreover, it is as important to maintain the purchasing power of employees of small firms as of large firms.

The Forand bill, as distinguished from the administration's recommendations, goes to the heart of the question by providing for Federal unemployment compensation standards.

We, who support it, believe that the States, if left to themselves, will not reach these standards.

About 40,000 workers a week are being dropped from the rolls because their eligibility has expired. The average payment is less than $25 a week, which is hardly enough to keep body and soul together. The unemployed must live off the little savings they may have and then turn to public assistance, if they can get it.

In most States there is no shortage of funds. But the States, under pressure to compete with all others in holding down payments and taxes, don't want to provide adequate benefits. Under these circumstances, competition is harmful. Large reserve funds have been accumulated, reaching a level of almost $9 billion at the end of 1953. But only $1 out of each $5 in lost wages and salaries, is being replaced by unemployment-insurance payments.

This supercaution is denying benefits to the unemployed and is holding back help from those communities where unemployment is at depression levels.

Since the program was established in the Social Security Act of 1935, benefits have failed to keep step with average weekly wages. Although wages have tripled since 1936 payment ceilings for unemployment compensation did not even double.

Here's the catch.

Employers, from 1936 to date, have received far more proportionately from unemployment-insurance funds in the form of tax reductions than workers have received in the form of benefit increases. The average tax paid by employers now is less than half of the level originally projected for them when the program was established.

Legislative doubletalk in the States is transforming a program that was intended to help the unemployed into a program to help the employers. While the contributions of employers have been reduced by over one-half, the average weekly payments for workers declined relatively from 43 percent of average weekly wages in covered employment in 1938 to 33 percent in 1953. The proportion of workers whose benefits were depressed by payment ceilings rose from less than one-quarter to over one-half of the compensated weeks of total unemployment.

We believe that the maximum primary benefit payable under State laws shall be not less than 66⅔ percent of the State's average weekly wage. Subject to this maximum, each individual's primary benefit shall be not less than 50 percent of his weekly wages. We believe that benefits should be payable to all unemployed insured individuals for a period of not less than 39 weeks. Twenty-two States now have 26 weeks, the others less.

Again, there should be a clear and uniform list of disqualifications, so that no State shall default on its obligations to the unemployed by disqualifications that appear to be based on mere whim rather than on plain and understandable regulations.

Also, there should be reinsurance grants to those States that are in financial difficulty because of high rates of unemployment. These grants would have appropriate safeguards, but no harsh repayment strings that would force them to reduce rather than raise benefits.

The proposed Federal unemployment-compensation standards bill would continue the present Federal-State unemployment-compensation system. It would, however, correct inadequacies in the present State laws by imposing additional standards which States would have to meet as a condition of employers getting credit against the Federal unemployment tax.

We, in New England, believe in better standards.

To be effective all States must comply.

We have seen too many of our industries taken away from us by other States that violate the intent of the unemployment-compensation program by evading their responsibilities. This form of unfair competition must stop. It is harmful to the unemployed and to the Nation.

Only by minimum standards, applying to all States, can we avoid the sabotage of unemployment compensation and industry raiding by States that circumvent their obligations to the jobless. Any industries they attract by this manner will find their advantage to be an illusion.

To repeat, unemployment is governed by nationwide economic forces and should be dealt with on a nationwide basis.

The unemployed have first call on our sincerity and on our pledge to enact constructive legislation.

Public Power Association Against Concealing Subsidy in Collbran Formula or Diverting Interest Component

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 1, 1954

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, the House is approaching a showdown on reclamation policy. The Fryingpan-Arkansas bill is a forerunner of many others and has far-reaching implications. In this connection I should like to direct attention to two resolutions adopted by the American Public Power Association:

Resolution 8—Interest Component, Collbran Formula

Whereas the American Public Power Association, composed of the principal locally owned public power systems of the United States, has a direct concern in the standard of financial operations established for Federal power projects, as any public discredit resulting from uneconomic Federal power policies reflects in a degree upon the locally owned public power systems; and

Whereas the American Public Power Association disapproves the Federal power practice of diverting from the Federal Treasury the interest component of revenues derived from the power investment portion of Bureau of Reclamation projects, and using the interest so collected for retirement of capital amounts invested in irrigation projects instead of for paying interest on the resulting natonal debt; and

Whereas the Collbran formula proposed by the Bureau of Reclamation indirectly effects the same result, by postponing the commencement of repayment of the irrigation investment until the power investment is first retired, and is equally unsound; and

Whereas in the aggregate the sums involved in diversion of the interest component and Collbran formula would require the replacement through added taxes of many billions of dollars for the numerous reclamation projects now proposed; and

Whereas this association has been on record since 1946 as not opposing a reasonable subsidy to irrigation from power revenues, but insists as a matter of principle and sound economics that any irrigation subsidy believed to be in the public interest should be clearly set forth and be specifically recognized and approved as such in authorization of the project by the Congress; and

Whereas, as stated in this association's statement of power policy, total capital costs paid from power revenues shall not exceed the amount for which a comparable supply of power could have been developed had irrigation not been one of the purposes of the project: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the American Public Power Association condemns these practices and recommends that they not be employed in future Reclamation Bureau projects. This recommendation is made in the best interests of the American taxpayer, of the public-power industry, and of the public it serves. Adoption of such a reform would avoid a concealed subsidy, the benefits of which go to only a limited number of persons at the expense of the Federal Treasury.

Resolution 8 (a)—Excessive Subsidies to Reclamation

Be it resolved, That the American Public Power Association is opposed to the increasing burden which is being placed upon the power users in order to subsidize irrigation projects. In some projects recently proposed by the Bureau of Reclamation the irrigators are required to pay less than 15 percent of the costs allocated to irrigation, and the power users are required to pay more than 85 percent thereof plus all the costs allocated to power. In other cases, the subsidy to be exacted from the power users would amount to the equivalent of nearly $100,000 for each 160-acre farm. This practice is not in the public interest.

This association's declaration of Federal power policy states that when irrigation is one of the joint purposes of a project, power revenues may be used to pay that portion of the capital costs properly chargeable to irrigation which is beyond the ability of the irrigators to pay, but that the total capital costs to be paid from power revenues shall never exceed the amount for which a comparable supply of power could have been developed had irrigation not been one of the purposes of the project. This formula concedes fair and adequate subsidies to irrigation from the power users. If a reclamation project is sufficiently meritorious to justify greater subsidies, they should be fully disclosed, and paid from the General Treasury.

Adequate Benefits for Old Age

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 20, 1954

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following address I delivered at the annual meeting of the Massachusetts Society for Old Age Pensions, held at Salem Willows, Mass., on Sunday, July 18, 1954.

Mr. Charles C. O'Donnell, president of this organization, resides in Lynn, Mass., and has worked unselfishly attempting to promote adequate increases in our social-security benefits so that more security may be available to our older citizens.

The address follows:

Everybody wants social security.

From the youngsters starting out on his first job to the oldster who has left his last job behind him, everyone wants some form of protection against poverty when the working years are over.

This ferment is at work among all peoples and all nations.

It is no secret that the great majority of people have to labor for a living.

Sometimes they are overpaid, sometimes underpaid, and sometimes they receive no pay at all. When we think of the wives and mothers who are doing the most important job of all, building the homelife of America, we realize that judging a person by his income-tax return does not tell the whole story.

Some of the finest contributions to life are made by those who receive no dollars-and-cents credit for it.

Therefore no pension system for the aged can properly be based on the financial earnings of a person during his active years.

If this were the case, saints would receive nothing while some shady characters would receive far more than they deserve.

As it stands now the old-age and survivors insurance system is undersized and undernourished.

It must grow up.

From this it is but a logical step forward to the conclusion that it should be based upon national rather than individual earnings.

The total wealth and the total income of a nation means the sum of all its parts. No one can draw a line and say that on one side are the individuals, groups, and industries, that built up the United States. And on the other side are those who contributed nothing to our progress.

All decent people have a stake in America.

The success of our Nation is due far more to those who gave rather than to those who got.

The truly great, like Abraham Lincoln, wouldn't have a chance if we rated people simply by their financial assets.

It is the Nation that is forever indebted to Lincoln and to the tens of millions of humble people whose dependable faith and courage have carried us through every crisis.

In good conscience, therefore, any workable pension system must apply to all who are 65 or over, not just a token or part pension but one that will provide for the necessities of life.

We have no quarrel with those who believe that they are entitled to more because their earnings are larger than the average.

What we are concerned about is a cost-of-living pension for all as a foundation, with no redtape and no loopholes, where qualifying age shall be the one and only test of eligibility.

Anyone who has watched the workings of the old-age assistance program knows that, the sooner it is eliminated and its so-called beneficiaries absorbed into a national pension system where there will be no shame or humiliation, the sooner we shall provide realistically and honorably for those who deserve peace and comfort in their declining years.

And the shameful neglect of the aged shall be a thing of the past.

This year the Congress will extend the coverage of social security to millions of more Americans and will make small increases in benefits.

This is praiseworthy but still only partial.

It is the step-by-step approach to a problem that will only be solved by total coverage for the aged, with full benefits instead of percentage benefits and stripped of the means test and the case-worker system of prying into people's private affairs.

The late Senator Taft, who was highly respected for his common sense and his sincerity, once engaged in a congressional debate on the pay-as-you-go formula for social security. He thought we could have a universal pension system at a cost not much more than the Government is paying under the present circumstances.

When the formula is complex, as under the social-security law, hundreds of millions of dollars are used up in old-age assistance grants and in administrative expenses.

This could be put to better use by raising benefits and widening coverage.

There is no question in my mind that we are edging nearer to the idea of a national pension, call it what you will.

Eventually every person over 65 will be covered.

The issue is, why not now?

Some people in high places are very cautious in their approach to the inevitable. They are like the people who have to be dragged to the dentist's chair only to find after it is over that their worst fears were only products of their imaginations.

People who once opposed any form of social insurance are now all for it because they recognize its value both to the individual and to the Nation.

Hard-headed economists who once pooh-poohed the idea now speak seriously about such security payments in a businesslike way. They refer to them as being props to industrial activity. When younger people are out of work they must cut down on their purchases.

But, when older people who can never work again are provided with a pension, they are able to keep up their purchases. This stimulates demand, thus providing jobs for those under 65.

After this session of Congress, nearly 60 million Americans will be covered by social security. Each person's account is different from the next person's, depending upon his wages and how long he has worked. This calls for a tremendous amount of bookkeeping. In other words, too much is eaten up by the overhead of administration that should be applied to benefits.

How much better to have a simple pension plan that everyone could understand, and one that would not be fussing around with appeals, with investigators, and with bothersome means tests.

All Americans who have attained the age of 65, have earned the right to a pension of $100 a month by virtue of the many years they have given to the making of America.

No one should be discriminated against because he has not contributed a few dollars into the present OASI setup, because it did not exist during the prime of his life, or because he had jobs that were not covered by social-security legislation.

Under the present law, some retired couples get as much as $127.50 per month who have contributed only a total of $81 in their lifetime to the OASI fund. Is this fair when other oldsters can't get a nickel out of social security or have to fall back on old-age assistance with all of its humiliation and its haggling to get barely enough for food and rent?

In this day and age, an increase of $5 a month in the minimum payment is hardly better than no increase at all. This slow-as-molasses improvement is scant help to the needy. It fails to meet the problem squarely.

A number of Congressmen, including myself, tried to push the formula up so that it would come closer to the goal of $100 a month for each and every person over 65.

We maintain that the Social Security Act as it stands is a fraud and a deceit.

It is not social as long as it fails to cover all of our senior citizens.

It is not security when it gives them only crumbs.

We have spent over $100 billion to save other nations from economic disaster, to restore their industries, and to provide their citizens with useful employment; and what did we receive in return? Ingratitude.

For a fraction of this sum we could have had a $100-a-month Federal pension in operation today for the benefit of our own people who deserve it above all others.

Their peace and contentment would be our greatest reward.

And all the younger people would be grateful, knowing that they, too, would be protected in their old age.

The Massachusetts Society for Old Age Pensions is one of the organizations that is maintaining constant pressure to break through conservative resistance to a universal pension for the aged.

Slowly but surely that drive is succeeding.

As social security climbs upward and spreads outward, it is an admission of the fact that only a pension of $100 a month for all over 65 will provide a saisfactory answer to a problem that concerns everybody.

Your society, campaigning for a single system, is on the right track.

Your faith and your persistence is bringing us ever closer to the time when the years of retirement will be blessed with freedom from want.

That will be an outstanding victory for humanity.

Recommendations of Greater Alton, Ill., Association of Commerce on National Legislative Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 19, 1954

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following memorandum:

NATIONAL AFFAIRS COMMITTEE,
GREATER ALTON ASSOCIATION
OF COMMERCE,
Alton, Ill., July 19, 1954.

Memorandum to the President of the United States, Members of the House of Representatives, and the United States Senate.

After careful study and investigation, the national affairs committee and the board of directors, in joint session, wish to convey to the President of the United States and Members of the House of Representatives and the United States Senate the following recommendations and observations relative to important matters now being discussed in the United States Congress:

1. There should be no increase of the public national debt limit until all avenues of economy within the Federal Government have been explored and all wastage of public funds stopped, this includes all departments of the Government, including a doublecheck upon all expenditures being made by the Armed Forces.

2. The present subsidy program and parity-price structure in agriculture is failing, and, therefore, the Congress should approve the flexible-price program suggested by the President. No other commercial enterprise within the Nation is guaranteed price supports or Government subsidy if it continues to manufacture more goods than it can sell. Our agriculturalists should be told that they must apply the same methods of sound business management to their operations as is customary in the regular channels of trade within the supply and demand markets of the Nation.

3. The Congress of the United States should be very careful in allotting further funds for foreign aid and defense build up. Nations which accept our largesse should be called upon to back up their attitudes by strong and firm policies of supporting the western alliance. We are in a cold war against communism, and our allies who claim to be our friends should display their coalition with firm commitments against further communistic and Russian expansion on the world front.

4. Abuses of the national and State unemployment-compensation funds are prevalent in every State due to Federal and State laxity in enforcement of the rules relative to this program. The Federal Government should step out of the unemployment-compensation field and leave this to the States. Unemployment-compensation laws should be tightened up and not relaxed in favor of the workers who take advantage of these laws to draw loafers money while the sincere worker stays on his job. It should also be emphasized that the cost of unemployment insurance is paid for by the employer and not the employee.

5. Before further funds are appropriated for public housing ventures such as FHA, PHA, slum clearance redevelopment, etc., this entire scandalous mess should be given full appraisal by the Congress and no funds should be further appropriated for this agency until its administration has been revamped and better rules of supervision instituted.

6. The Greater Alton Association of Commerce favors a fair and liberal policy toward social security in which it protects the indigent and the elder citizens. In the matter of old-age security, this association is of the opinion that all citizens should be given equal protection regardless of their class of employment as any other program is discriminatory. Coverage should include all at the age of 65 and benefits paid regardless of other income.

7. In far too many cases the Government is in competition with free, private enterprise and this includes over a hundred fields. We heartily endorse any reasonable legislation that will take the Government out of the private-business field and this includes the control of PX stores within the armed

services, wherein sales should be limited to armed services personnel. It must be remembered that the taxes that support all forms of government are paid by industry, commerce, and employees which make up the solid core of our so-called American system of government and economy. Government in business only leads to ultimate socialism and an oligarchy.

8. Government-subsidized power plants have proven very expensive and being tax free have seriously cut into the private utility field. We oppose further expansion of this type of Government program and also oppose the selling of public power to the Atomic Energy Commission when this same power can be had from free, private enterprise which within itself pays taxes and is an important part of our free economy.

9. We also wish to be on record as opposing the so-called quick rate bill which does not afford ample opportunity for the Interstate Commerce Commission to investigate the raising of transportation rates.

These recommendations are respectfully submitted for the consideration of the President and Members of the United States Congress. Approved Monday, July 19, 1954 by the National Affairs Committee and the board of directors of the Greater Alton Association of Commerce, Alton, Ill.

Respectfully submitted

PAUL J. ROTHACHER,
President.
WALTER T. WOODCOCK,
Executive Director.

On motion regularly made by Wardein, seconded by Davitz, it was moved that the memorandum be approved as read and amended. Motion prevailed by 18 yeas and 3 nays.

Chicago Tribune and New York Times Discuss Colorado River Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 1, 1954

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include newspaper articles concerning the proposed upper Colorado project:

[From the Chicago Sunday Tribune of July 18, 1954]

GIRD FOR FIGHT ON COLORADO RIVER PROJECT

(By Joseph Hearst)

WASHINGTON, July 17.—The current debate in Congress over the proposal to permit the Atomic Energy Commission to contract with a private company for electrical power has overshadowed a bitter controversy over an alleged billion-dollar water subsidy.

Opponents of the upper Colorado River project, which was voted out by the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, 13 to 12, and which is now before the Senate Interior Subcommittee on Irrigation, are preparing for a determined fight to prevent passage of the measure at this session. The administration favors passage.

The project is listed as a billion-dollar job, and 9 of the 12 Congressmen who voted against reporting it out of committee signed a report asserting the bill includes a concealed subsidy of $1 billion.

FIGURES COST TO TAXPAYERS

They assert this concealed subsidy is to provide irrigation water for less than 370,000 acres of land—a gift of $2,500 per acre irrigated or $370,000 for each of the 2,700 farms to be benefited from the taxpayers.

The conference of State taxpayers executives has issued a statement that on the basis of the hidden subsidy the cost to Illinois taxpayers for the project would be $69 million, and that the cost to other Chicagoland taxpayers would be: Indiana, $25,600,000; Iowa, $15,500,000; Wisconsin, $22,000,000, and Michigan, $49,100,000.

The engineers joint council made up of such organizations as the American Society of Civil Engineers, the American Water Works Association, and the American Institute of Chemical Engineers, has expressed concern that Congress will act on the project before the current Hoover commission task force on water and power makes its report next fall.

HOOVER PREFERS DELAY ON BILL

The council has urged the House Rules Committee to consider the importance of defering action on the bill until the task force reports, asserting the recommendations of the task force for an overall national water and power policy could be seriously jeopardized by congressional action now.

It also is reported that representatives of Mr. Hoover have passed the word to legislative leaders that he is not happy at the prospect of the project being acted upon in advance of the report of his task force.

A cabinet committee on water resources policy, established by President Eisenhower last May 26, has been instructed to undertake an extensive review of all aspects of water resources policy and submit its recommendations to Mr. Eisenhower not later than December 1. Interior Secretary McKay is chairman of the committee. McKay favors passage now of the Colorado project bill.

Congressional sources said the fight over the project also has political overtones that could have a bearing on the fall elections, especially in southern California. Republican Members of Congress from that State are concerned.

Resolutions opposing enactment at this time of the legislation have been adopted by the Los Angeles City Council, the Los Angeles water and power commissioners, the directors of the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California, and the Colorado River Board of California.

The Colorado River Board in asking Congress not to enact the bill, said the project would intercept the lower Colorado River Basin's water supply with giant reservoirs at Glen Canyon, in Utah and Arizona, Echo Park in Colorado and Utah, and Curecanti in Colorado, capable of storing several year's flow of the river.

MIGHT CURTAIL DAM OUTPUT

Such storage and use of the water, it said, could seriously curtail the output of electrical power at Hoover Dam. The Colorado River also is an important source of water supply for southern California.

The Senate bill was introduced by the Senators, Republican and Democrat alike, from the States of Colorado, Wyoming, New Mexico, and Utah. Senator WATKINS, Republican, of Utah, is chairman of the subcommittee considering the bill.

The charge that the bill contains a hidden subsidy of $1 billion is based on the provision that repayment on most of the irrigation costs would be deferred for about 50 years and would be interest free.

WOULD BE FINANCIAL DAM

The House committee minority statement charged that the Glen Canyon and Echo Park Dams are so located that the water they store would irrigate no participating projects. These dams, it asserted, would be built solely to sell power.

"Even the Interior Department admits that for at least 25 years those dams would not be needed to store water for river regulation," the report said.

"The function of these two dams, for that period, would be solely to generate power for sale, first to pay off the cost of the dams allocated to power, and then, after about 50 years, to pay, without interest, the remainder of the cost of the dams and most of the costs of the irrigation projects to be built now. These would be financial dams, not water-conservation dams, at least for that length of time."

[From the New York Times of June 28, 1954]

SENATE UNIT TO AIR DAM IN ECHO PARK—TWO OTHER WATER PROJECTS COME UP TODAY IN CONTROVERSIAL COLORADO RIVER MEASURE

(By Luther A. Huston)

WASHINGTON, June 27.—A Senate subcommittee on irrigation and reclamation is scheduled to begin hearings tomorrow on an administration measure that, for some Republicans, poses a political dilemma.

Under consideration will be Senate bill 1555, "to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain initial units of the Colorado River storage project." This is a combined power and irrigation development the initial cost of which is estimated at $1 billion.

President Eisenhower in March approved the project and asked Congress to give early consideration. He said he firmly believed the development to be in the national interest.

Douglas McKay, Secretary of the Interior, in several public speeches, has cited the project as "the type of development which we vigorously support."

On the other hand, the proposal has encountered vigorous opposition from powerful groups of taxpayers, engineers and conservationists and some influential Members of Congress. It has become an issue in some contests in the November elections in which the Republicans will be fighting to strengthen their control of Congress.

VITAL VOTES IN THE PICTURE

The dilemma faced by Republicans in these political contests is whether to support a strongly favored administration proposal or run the risk of losing votes they may need to win. This is particularly true in California, the source of some of the strongest opposition to the project.

The Colorado River Board of California has asked all of the State's Representatives in Congress to oppose the bill. These include Senator WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND, the majority leader, and Senator THOMAS H. KUCHEL, who is up for reelection in November.

Reports from California are to the effect that Representative SAMUEL W. YORTY, the Democratic senatorial nominee, already is citing Republican support of the Colorado project as an argument in urging Californians not to vote for Senator KUCHEL. The election of Senator KUCHEL is considered vital to Republican hopes for control of the Senate.

Under the Colorado River compact, diversion rights to water from the river are fixed by law.

California, Arizona, and New Mexico, all of them States in the lower basin, now get more water than do Colorado, Utah, and Wyoming, in the upper basin. Because its greater population and industrial development, California receives the lion's share.

THREE BIG DAMS ARE PROPOSED

The Colorado River storage project is in the upper basin. The plan calls for the building of three power and storage dams, the Glen Canyon near the Arizona-Utah border, the Echo Park in the Dinosaur National Monument, and the Curecanti in western Colorado. The dams pould store water for irrigation and hydroelectric purposes.

President Eisenhower is on record that the "development will conserve water, enabling the region to increase supplies for municipal uses, industrial development, and irrigation" and develop much-needed electric power.

Secretary McKay has asserted that such projects are an example of "a working partnership of power and irrigation." Revenues from power in such multipurpose projects, he contends, should be used "to pay back not only the cost of storage works but also help reimburse the cost of irrigation works."

President Eisenhower described this policy as "the administration's approach to water resources development."

RIGHTS OF LOWER BASIN CITED

Groups in California opposed to the upper basin project maintain that it would adversely affect recognized rights of the lower basin.

"The proposed legislation," said a resolution adopted early this month by the Colorado River Board of California, "includes some, and foreshadows other, large transmountain diversion projects in the upper basin * * * thereby impairing the quality as well as the quantity of water available to the lower basin, and to which the lower basin is entitled under the Colorado River compact."

The project was assailed on much broader grounds, however, in a minority report of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives. This committee reported out a companion measure to the Senate bill by a vote of 13 to 12.

The minority report said the bill constituted a grossly excessive subsidy. A billion dollars' worth of taxpayers' money would be used, it said, to provide irrigation water for less than 370,000 acres of land and was a gift of over $2,500 per acre irrigated, or $370,000 for each of the 2,700 farms to be benefited.

The bill, according to the minority, also would put the Government directly into the power business, and the power generated would be high-cost power.

The minority also held that the power project would be built in a region abounding in coal, oil shale, and uranium deposits. With atomic power just over the horizon, the minority questioned whether the competitive market value of power would remain as high as 6 mills in that region for the next 75 years.

Nine members of the House committee signed the minority report. Among them were New York Representatives LEO W. O'BRIEN and JAMES G. DONOVAN, Democrats, and JOHN R. PILLION, Republican.

The Tax Foundation, with headquarters in New York, has estimated that Colorado, Utah, and Wyoming, the three States that will derive the most benefit from the project, would pay about $15 million of the cost, while New York taxpayers would pay more than $123 million.

HOOVER AGAINST THE MEASURE

Among Republicans reported to be displeased by the administration measure is former President Hoover. He heads a commission, created by Congress, on Reorganization of the Executive Branch of the Government. A task force of this Commission is studying public works and reclamation policies and procedures.

Mr. Hoover is represented as feeling that the administration should have awaited his Commission's report before sponsoring new policies and projects.

The Engineers Joint Council, a New York group, representing five large professional societies, has urged the House Rules Committee, which has the bill, not to report it out until the Hoover Commission report has been received.

SIERRA CLUB ASSAILS DAM

SAN FRANCISCO, June 27.—Richard M. Leonard, president of the Sierra Club, today urged conservationists to rally to the defense of Dinosaur National Monument on the Utah-Colorado border.

The club's executive director, David R. Brower, is in Washington to testify at the Senate hearing tomorrow.

The Sierra Club contends that the proposal for a dam in Echo Park constitutes "the gravest threat to the National Park System since its creation in 1916." One of the Nation's outstanding conservation groups, the club is leading the fight to have the dam built at some alternate site outside the Monument.

San Francisco's Hetch Hetchy Reservoir in Yosemite National Park was injected into the Dinosaur controversy today, as an example, Mr. Leonard said, of "what not to put in a national park or monument."

In a document entitled "Hetch Hetchy—Once Is Too Often," prepared for distribution to Members of Congress, the Sierra Club warned against repeating the Hetch Hetchy mistake in an Echo Park Dam that, according to the club, would flood nearly 100 miles of spectacularly scenic river canyons.

Flexible Versus Rigid Farm Price Supports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT B. SCUDDER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 19, 1954

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks, I desire to include an editorial from the Santa Rosta (Calif.) Press-Democrat of July 11, entitled "This Proves Flexible Supports Are Needed."

The editorial illustrates many of the inequities in agricultural production resulting from rigid farm-price support programs, especially in areas such as the First Congressional District of California.

It is my belief that Ezra Taft Benson, the Secretary of Agriculture, is doing an excellent job in his efforts to straighten out the farm program, and I believe that the action of the Congress this year will assist him greatly in bringing this about.

Supports during wartime as an incentive for farmers to grow large crops without a doubt were necessary. However, this program should have been revised immediately after the demand for the same had been passed. I commend this editorial to your attention as being timely and significant in view of the congressional action for flexible price supports.

THIS PROVES FLEXIBLE SUPPORTS ARE NEEDED

A piece in the paper the other day said the Federal Crop Reporting Service had announced that the 1954 wheat crop would be about the same as last year, despite acreage restrictions which were intended to prevent another terrific surplus. It said favorable rains in some sections were increasing yield enough to offset losses in the Dust Bowl area.

It didn't take a crop expert to predict another bumper wheat crop, nor was it necessary to wait this long. Your Press Democrat made such a prediction 3 months before the fields were even plowed to receive the seed for this year's crop. All we did was point out that the wheat farmers had voted for acreage reduction in order to continue to receive 90 percent of parity—and that the chemical fertilizer business was in for boom times because the farmers naturally would raise as much wheat as ever, using fewer acres to do it.

Along with this crop-outlook report for wheat, a national authority has just reported on the leading counties in the United States in net income per household. Every one of the first 20 are farm counties. Adams County, Wash., is in seventh place with an average net income of $10,356 per household. Lincoln, Wash., is ninth with $10,200. Sherman, Oreg., is 10th with $9,174. Also in the first 20 are Stevens, Kans.; Johnson, Kans.; Gilliam, Oreg.; Seward, Kans.; and Finney, Kans. They all had an average net income per household—after income taxes were paid—of $8,500 or better.

These are all wheat-raising counties.

The average income of a Sonoma County household, after taxes, is $5,139 and this is a very rich county, standing above the national average. The wheat counties are something very special indeed in terms of net income after taxes.

What goes on here? How come the wheat counties have an income 62 percent above the national average?

Why, under Federal law, do the rest of us subsidize them to raise wheat that we cannot consume, or even find room to store? The law pretends to control overproduction through requiring acreage reduction when surpluses result. As the Government's own crop forecast proves, this is only a pretense since proper fertilization permits raising just as large a crop on fewer acres.

Nor is this simply a matter of the rest of us subsidizing the wheat men so that they can net 62 percent more income than do the people who pay the subsidy.

Here in the Mid-Empire, we then have to buy that wheat to feed our poultry at a subsidized price that guarantees the wheat men their phenomenal incomes, then sell our eggs and meat birds on an open competitive market.

And that's exactly why your Press Democrat keeps saying that the Eisenhower proposal for flexible farm price supports, protecting against disaster without guaranteeing profits and adding to the surplus problem, should be made into law and given a test in operation.

It's also why we recommend that in the coming election, men be sent to the Senate and House who will support the Eisenhower program.

Investigation?—What the Reece Committee Proved

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1954

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include herewith an article by Roscoe Drummond in the Washington Post of July 20, 1954:

INVESTIGATION?—WHAT THE REECE COMMITTEE PROVED

This Congress seems to be perpetually having trouble with its investigations.

The methods of the McCarthy investigation have brought bipartisan demands for corrective reforms.

The Mundt committee hearings hurt the prestige of the Senate and its investigative process. The committee appears to be busy finding ways to put off the dread day of issuing its report.

And now the Reece committee inquiry, ostensibly to determine whether the big tax-exempt foundations, such as Carnegie, Rockefeller, Ford, are operating within the terms of their charters and within the law, has blown up in its face.

The committee, having run out of adverse witnesses, is closing down its public hearings without giving the favorable witnesses the public opportunity to reply.

The committee has spread onto the public record the most extravagant accusations, with the words "subversion," "conspiracy," "plot," and "un-American" being tossed about with abandon, and slyly shutting up shop without allowing rebuttal from the same rostrum.

Congress would hale a radio station before the Federal Communications Commission if it refused to give "the other side" equal time and equal facilities.

The "explanation" which Representative B. Carroll Reece, Republican, of Tennessee, the committee chairman, gives for adjourning the public hearings at the point where the foundation witnesses were to testify, is that Representative Wayne L. Hays, a Democratic committee member from Ohio, engaged in "obstructionist" tactics.

Representative Hays' "obstructionism" consisted of an unwillingness to take at face value the unproved assertions which came from selected witnesses and staff "experts." One witness thought that Pope Pius' encyclicals were communistically inclined. Hays insisted on searching cross-examination and this seemed an awful offense to Chairman Reece. It was spoiling the whole show and he evidently decided that it was riser to end the public hearings rather than have their emptiness further exposed.

It is certainly reasonable for the Carnegie Corp. to protest, as it did this past week, against the unfairness of the Reece committee in denying the foundation the right to reply publicly before the committee to charges made publicly before the committee.

It would be reasonable for the Ford Foundation to demand that the Reece committee either prove the grave charges of "subversion" and "un-Americanism" it has publicly made against the foundation or publicly acknowledge that they are without basis.

These are understandable exasperations when confronted by such tactics but what is important is that the philanthropic foundations have won the substance, if not the form, of full exoneration.

Chairman Reece had a scheme to try to show that most of the Nation's domestic legislation and most of its foreign policy (from Roosevelt through Eisenhower) was a "plot" and "conspiracy" by a little group of educators and philanthropists, and the sudden dismantling of the public hearings in midgutter is ample confession:

That these meat-ax charges were not being proved to anybody's satisfaction and that the public was quickly on to it.

That the attempt to show that the foundations were engaged in "subversion" and "un-American propaganda" was falling to the ground even before the foundations were invited to reply.

That the committee's technique of broadcasting its conclusions before taking any testimony and then hoping to find some facts to justify them had discredited the investigation.

That editorial opinion across the country—most of it Republican—was at least 90 percent critical of the Reece committee and that the committee has scurried to cover.

It would be nice if a majority of the Reece committee would modestly acknowledge that it has not found evidence to justify its accusations and make public amend to the loyal Americans it has condemned without public hearing. But that may be too much to expect. Public opinion has already seen through the Reece committee smokescreen, and Congress has before it another lesson in what happens when it permits irresponsible investigators to misuse the power which the Congress delegates to them.

Present World Situation Confronting the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 20, 1954

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in my extension of remarks I enclose a radio speech made by me on Sunday, July 11, 1954, over station WORL in Boston on the subject Present World Situation Confronting the United States:

Ladies and gentlemen of the radio audience, the feeling throughout the country is growing stronger and stronger that our leadership in the White House and in the State Department is weak, inept, uncertain, and confused.

There is no place where that is sensed quicker than in the Halls of Congress. For the Members of both branches of the Congress, representing States and congressional districts, are closest to the people. They are able to get public opinion at the grass roots.

Under the Constitution, the responsibility of making and carrying out foreign policy is vested in the President of the United States. When a President shows signs of weakness or uncertainty of leadership, Members of Congress quickly sense that fact. Under such conditions, the Congress is likely to undertake leadership in the field of foreign affairs.

It is only when there is a weak President that this can or will happen. Even if Congress is right in its decisions, congressional usurpation of the Chief Executive's constitutional duties and responsibilitie could be harmful.

For other countries cannot deal with the Congress. This is prohibited by the Constitution. Other countries also quickly sense and evaluate the situation, and, being unable to negotiate or deal with the legislative branch, they will naturally hesitate to deal or negotiate with a weak President.

While it is not too late for this situation to be adjusted in its proper constitutional light, it will require quick and courageous leadership on the part of President Eisenhower to regain and assume his prerogatives under the Constitution in the field of foreign affairs, otherwise it will be too late.

As evidence of the fact that the Congress has a feeling that the Chief Executive is uncertain and confused, I call attention to the resolution warning the Communists in Guatemala; of the insertion in the mutual aid bill of an amendment to the effect that aid should be stopped to any nation in southeast Asia entering into a nonaggression (so-called Locarno) pact with Red China; of the desperate but courageous utterances made by a prominent Republican Member of the Congress that he will resign his position of leadership if Red China is admitted into the United Nations.

These are actions in the field of foreign affairs started in the Congress. They are based on a lack of confidence to date in the leadership of the executive branch.

I have talked with many of my colleagues in Congress, both Democrats and Republicans, and none of them have any idea of the foreign policy in southeast Asia of our country under the present administration.

If Members of Congress have no idea and are confused, it is only natural that our people are confused. The people are quick to sense the situation.

During the past 18 months the world situation has worsened considerably for our country. Under President Truman everyone knew he made his own decisions, and when he made them, he meant them. The world knew in President Truman that America had at the helm of the ship of state a man of determination. Under him we had the friendship of other nations in the free world that was strong and united. The Communists were not able to make a truce in Korea they badly needed and which was made by the present administration, and which we now know was beneficial to the Communists. For it relieved them of their commitments in Korea and the strain upon them, and enabled Red China to give active and effective assistance to the Communists in Indochina, an area of vital interest to us, even far more important than Korea. For if the Communists get control of all of southeast Asia, our military and civilian leaders tell us that all of our Far Eastern defenses from Japan to Okinawa, to Formosa, to the Philippines, and even to Australia and New Zealand, will be out-flanked, and in the case of conflict, we would have to withdraw some thousands of miles to Hawaii, which means to our continental defenses.

We, with our friends, now have complete control of the Pacific Ocean, but if compelled later to withdraw, we lose that control which is so important to our whole national defense.

During the past 18 months the strong feeling of friendship between our country and other non-Communist nations has been strained and seriously disturbed. You only have to read the newspapers to realize this for yourself, and at this time when we are reducing our Army from 19 divisions to 17, with further reduction contemplated to carry out the present administration's unwise campaign promises.

We see the present administration trying to divert the public's attention from the administration's failures by prominent Republicans like Vice President Nixon, and others, bringing about disunity among ourselves by making the ridiculous charge that the Democrats—out of office now for 18 months—are responsible for Indochina and southeast Asia. All the Republicans did while they were out of office was to blame the Democrats, and now that they are in office—that is all they are still doing.

What kind of leadership is that?

The Democratic Party in Congress, despite these unfair and false attacks have been supporting President Eisenhower and all of his recommendations that have been in the best interests of our country. The Democratic Party will continue to do so. But the responsibility for leadership rests upon the Republican Party, as it has control of the machinery of Government, and particularly in the field of foreign affairs, the President of the United States determines our policies.

A weak, confused, uncertain President, or one who fails to protect, assert, and perform his constitutional rights and duties in this period can bring harmful, if not disastrous results to our country and to our people. Action—not high-sounding slogans—is the kind of leadership we need.

Such leadership in the White House is vitally necessary. Such leadership will receive the support of the Democratic Party and of our people. It is not too late for such leadership to assert itself. If it does not—then it will and must necessarily follow that the Congress will try and give our country the leadership it so badly needs, and this involves a calculated risk that would not exist in the case of strong leadership on the part of the President.

As an illustration of how the President could evidence such leadership, but not confining myself to the following observations: (1) The President could do all he could to unify our country; (2) he could direct those in the executive branch to stop making false charges which produce only disunity among our people; (3) he could instruct them to stop trying to deceive the people by blaming the Democrats for what has happened while the Republicans have been in power; (4) he could build up our continental defenses to save our people and our cities against any sneak attack; (5) he could take steps to stop the reduction of our Army and our Navy and to make America so powerful and strong that the Kremlin will be afraid to attack us.

For anybody with commonsense knows that the only thing the Communists respect is what they fear—and that is military strength and power greater than they possess.

The Democratic Party in Congress will support such leadership.

The Democratic Party stands for the proposition that a powerful balanced military organization is the best means to assure "peace through strength."

And that is what the American people want.

In the troubled world of today—that is what we deserve.

Drive for Patronage Seeks Added Jobs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 20, 1954

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend and revise my remarks in the Record, I wish to include an article written by Jerry Kluttz, which appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald yesterday. Mr. Kluttz points out the total disregard for the civil-service system by the Republican administration in its quest for patronage at any cost.

The article follows:

The Federal Diary

(By Jerry Kluttz)

DRIVE FOR PATRONAGE SEEKS ADDED JOBS

The Eisenhower administration is making a determined effort to assume partisan political control over many thousands of Federal jobs both in and out of the civil-service system.

The drive for patronage is being directed from the White House.

The Republican National Committee set up an elaborate system here to clear people down to the precinct level for both Federal appointments and promotions.

Army, Navy, Air Force, Foreign Operations and bipartisan agencies that have been more or less insulated from political patronage demands in the past are not excluded from the present drive for jobs.

It is routine—and expected—for the administration in power to exercise political control over many jobs outside the civil service and other merit systems such as those operated by TVA, FBI, etc.

But the current drive also includes some jobs under the civil-service system, jobs which are supposed to be free from partisan political considerations and to be filled on the basis of merit.

Outside the Post Office Department, where politics has been considered for years in appointments and promotions to many of its jobs, Civil Service and otherwise, the Civil Service system in general has been relatively free of partisan political influences.

A high-ranking official says the present Civil Service Commission seems to have closed its eyes to the growing influence of partisan political considerations on appointments to some of the jobs under its merit system.

The patronage drive, now well underway, has helped to silence demands on the Eisenhower administration for jobs from GOP Members of Congress and from the Republican National Committee.

Soon after the Eisenhower administration was swept into power, the Republican National Committee, as was expected, attempted to dictate appointments to many Federal jobs.

At first, the Committee had very little success. Its officials were told repeatedly that this or that job in question was under Civil Service or the person in it had either permanent civil-service status or veterans' preference rights.

Gradually, however, a few of the agencies began to clear appointments, including those for some civil-service jobs, with the Committee. This was done through a top-level appointee in the agency whose job is to check the political angle on appointments and promotions.

A notable example of political operation along this line is Harold Stassen's Foreign Operations Agency, where even stenographers and clerks have been required to produce the "proper political clearance." No appointment or promotion can be finally approved in the agency unless it has the approval of the lady there who is Stassen's liaison with the administration's political arm.

Other agencies, however, continue to make appointments and promotions within the civil-service process and they did not clear them in advance with the Republican National Committee.

Somewhere along the line came a recent showdown at the White House and the decision there was apparently cast with the patronage forces.

In recent weeks agency heads have received "confidential: not for publication" letters on White House stationery, in which they were directed to clear certain of their jobs with the committee before making appointments to them.

Strangely, the letters were not signed. Only a small supply was printed. Reportedly, they were delivered by hand to some agency heads for their information only. Precautions were taken to keep copies from the public eye.

However, it is reported on excellent authority that many agency heads have been instructed either by letter or orally to clear appointments to these jobs with the Republican National Committee:

Jobs in grade 14 ($9,600 starting salary) and upward, irrespective of whether they are in or out of the civil-service system.

So-called 303 jobs, positions under civil service, but which the CSC cannot fill with sufficient qualified eligibles. In such cases, CSC authorizes the agencies to hire people on the open market for them. The agencies, however, are supposed to require appointees to meet minimum civil-service standards for the jobs, to following veterans' preference, etc.

Jobs, such as attorneys and others, outside the civil-service system.

Even though the White House directive on jobs was unsigned, officials assume it came from the office of Sherman Adams, the assistant to the President. Adams' assistant on patronage matters is Charles F. Willis, Jr., and he is the contact man with the national committee and most agency officials.

Despite the directive, several agency heads whose jobs are under civil service are said not to have cooperated to the point desired by the patronage forces.

One top-rank official, an Eisenhower appointee, is said to have threatened to resign with a blast at the patronage drive.

Meantime, CSC, the agency charged with strengthening the merit system, is compiling details on many thousands of non-civil-service jobs which will be turned over to the patronage forces.

Mrs. Kee Earns Praise as First Congresswoman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 20, 1954

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, of kind and gentle disposition, but able, firm, strong of character, as well as courageous, sincere and loyal, was our late colleague, and friend, John Kee, of West Virginia. During his service in the National House of Representatives, during which he was chairman of the all-important Committee on Foreign Affairs, John Kee left his favorable imprint on the pages of our history. He served his people and his country with ability, courage, and distinction.

Upon his death, some 3 years ago, the people of his district elected as his successor, the lady who had been his inspiration, his wife, the gentlewoman from West Virginia, Mrs. Elizabeth Kee.

During her period of service Mrs. Kee has made an outstanding record; she enjoys the respect and confidence of all of her colleagues. As one of the Democratic leaders of the House of Representatives, I can definitely state that the Democratic leadership has complete confidence in Mrs. Kee. She richly deserves such respect and confidence because she has earned it by her hard work, by her devotion to her people, and to her duties, and by her loyalty and devotion for the progressive principles and policies the Democratic Party stands for.

As a member of the Committee on Veterans Affairs, Mrs. Kee is one of the best friends the veterans have in the Congress.

In 1954, Mrs. Kee received a splendid vote of confidence from the people of her district, being reelected for her first regular term by an overwhelming vote.

I am confident the people of her district, in recognition of her high character of public service, will reelect her by an overwhelming vote next November.

The character of service Congresswoman Kee has rendered, with the confidence the Democratic leadership has in her, which includes the Democratic members of the Ways and Means Committee, which members consitute the Democratic Committee on Committees, means that with her reelection next fall, she will be eligible for assignment to a committee of great prominence in another important field of legislative action.

Mrs. Kee is a worthy successor, in her own right, of her late distinguished husband.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to include in my remarks a splendid and deserving article about our distinguished colleague, the gentlewoman from West Virginia, written by Syd Barksdale, and appearing in the July 17, 1954, issue of the Sunset News, Bluefield, W. Va.:

Mrs. Kee Earns Praise as First Congresswoman

(By Syd Barkadale)

Three years ago in a special election on a hot July 17, 1951, Mrs. Elizabeth Kee, of Bluefield, was elected to Congress to succeed her late husband. She was the first woman ever elected to Congress from West Virginia.

Representative John Kee, dean of the West Virginia congressional delegation and chairman of the vital House Committee on Foreign Affairs, had collapsed and died while presiding over a meeting of his committee in the United States Capitol. In the wake of his death the special election had been called, and Mrs. Kee, who had been his highly able administrative assistant in Washington, had been overwhelmingly nominated by the Democrats in the Fifth District and decisively elected.

It was a significant day, for never before had West Virginia sent a woman to the House of Representatives. Would she make good? And particularly was the question asked in view of the distinguished record made by John Kee, who had served for 20 years on the Hill and established himself as one of America's recognized authorities on foreign affairs.

She made good all right, so definitely good that constituents in the district and colleagues in Washington alike, gaging her by the all-important criterion of service to her district, rank her with the top echelon of House Members. For her it has been a busy and productive 3 years.

ANNIVERSARY

Today, the anniversary of Elizabeth Kee's first election, finds her in the midst of her third election campaign. She was nominated first by convention and then won the special election of 1951. She stood then for the fall term in 1952, winning handily in the primary, and in the general election piled up a majority of 36,000 over her Republican opponent, a majority greater than any of her male colleagues from West Virginia was able to gain.

Now she is up for renomination in the Democratic primary on August 3, seeking election this time, not as the untested candidate of a short 3 years ago but as a seasoned and successful campaigner and as a respected Member of the United States Congress. There is little doubt that she will be renominated and reelected. Indeed, predictions are that, percentagewise, her vote will be the most decisive she has yet received.

There are reasons and good ones why this should be so: First and most important is the fact that Mrs. Kee serves her district with efficiency and tireless energy. She knows her constituents and they know her, and she puts their interests above factionalism in her own party and above political partisanship. She is a thoroughgoing Democrat, make no mistake, but she has done as much for Republicans in her district as for members of her own party. Despite election battles, she has never been petty nor vindicative.

PERSONAL ATTENTION

Visit her office in Bluefield or in Washington and you will realize the personal attention she gives the problems of her district. She's on the job early and late, and if there is any person who has learned her way around, that person is Elizabeth Kee. She knows and understands her district and she knows and understands Washington.

She makes a speech on the floor when the occasion demands it, but she is not a headline hunter nor a spotlight seeker. Rather she works quietly, and often behind the scenes, out of the glare of the publicity which so many Members of Congress court.

Consider, for example, her little-publicized work on the important House Committee on Veterans' Affairs. She is an authority on the subject. She has made it her business to learn about veterans' problems, and her file of successfully handled veterans' cases is thick. She has consistently worked for and supported legislation favorable to the men and women who have served their country in time of war.

Her own son, James Kee, now her administrative assistant, is a veteran of World War II and an active leader in the American Legion in the District of Columbia.

Mrs. Kee is a member of the special subcommittee of the House named to study veterans' hospitals, and she has personally visited many of them. Hers has always been the humanitarian rather than the strictly dollars-and-cents approach to the matter of Government responsibility in this field.

FIGHT FOR COAL

Consider another facet of her activity—her long fight in behalf of the coal industry's effort to curb the imports of foreign residual oil. Operators and union officials both will tell you that Congresswoman Kee has been a prime mover in the battle, a vocal and effective champion of coal both on and off the floor of Congress.

Consider again her effective work on such problems of her district as the Bluefield Post Office and the Mercer County Airport. Only a few days ago the bill providing for private capital construction of new Federal buildings, the measure to which she has devoted so much time in the past 3 years, was finally approved, clearing the way for a new post office here and in other cities. And as for the new airport, it is a going concern if we ever had one, thanks in no small measure to her persistent efforts.

MANY MORE

These projects, of course, are only a few of those to which Mrs. Kee has given and is giving time and talent. There are many more—the current effort to establish the Bluestone watershed, for instance—and the almost endless personal problems of her constituents in their dealings with the Government. All are part of the big job of being a good Representative.

Mrs. Kee is 1 of only 12 women in Congress—1 in the Senate and 11 in the House. Her long years of experience in Congressman Kee's office fitted her exceptionally well for the arduous tasks she has undertaken since his death. The manner in which she has earned commendation in her own right indicates her ability.

On this subject of women in Congress this is what Mrs. Kee herself has to say:

"A few years ago the emphasis on a woman Member was the fact that she was a woman. The emphasis now is on whether she is doing her job whether she can do her job well."

In our book, the Fifth District Congresswoman can and does do her job well. Her 3 years of solid service has proved it.

Opposition to Partnership Program in Development of Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 20, 1954

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record a resolution adopted by the Union County Pomona Grange, in opposition to the so-called partnership plan of the Eisenhower administration with respect to the development of power.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Union County Pomona Grange,
La Grande, Oreg.

Whereas the program of the Government building the multiple purpose dams and selling power to all users has worked out exceedingly well. They are ahead in their payments as well as receiving millions of dollars from income taxes: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That Union County Pomona Grange in regular session this 26th day of June 1954, go on record opposing any partnership program of our dams that does not preserve our postage stamp rate, the preference and priority clause, and all of our State water rights under our State Hydroelectric Act.

Henry Weatherspoon,
Master.
Laura E. Bates, *Secretary.*

A Date With a Tree

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 20, 1954

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, our distinguished Chaplain, Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, weekly publishes an article in various newspapers of the Nation. I ask unanimous consent that the article of last Sunday, appearing in the Washington Evening Star, and entitled "A Date With a Tree," be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Spires of the Spirit

(By Frederick Brown Harris, minister, Foundry Methodist Church; Chaplain, U. S. Senate)

A DATE WITH A TREE

In the shady expanses of the grounds surrounding the National Capitol are many noble trees. Most of them are tagged with their botanical designations. But tags do not explain the spell of a tree.

A glorious American elm proudly lifts its leafy, lofty branches and spreads its benign shade in close proximity to the famous white dome which, shining like alabaster in the darkness, is an inspiring symbol of America at its best. There are a number of such lordly trees standing sentinel near the Nation's legislative halls, which remind us of the phrase of the poet Keats, who always was awed by tall oaks: "Those green-robed senators of majestic woods."

Recently, a nationally known legislator, breaking away for a while from the relentless grind of office, committee room and forum was seen walking across the grassy knoll to the sylvan spot where this majestic elm holds kingly sway, its verdant robes flowing with regal and sacred grace.

Said the Senator whose form we have just glimpsed, to a colleague he chanced to meet, "I'm turning aside long enough to pay my respects to yonder magnificent elm." "You mean," said the other in evident approval, "you are about to call on a tree." And why not? Trees have been the intimates and the inspiration of some of the tallest among the sons of men.

There are voices in trees, but they never shout; they wait to be called upon before they speak. Trees are friends who respect our moods. But if they are to be won, they must be wooed. Then it is that "the communicative trees begin to persuade us to live with them in pensive meditation and quit our lives of solemn trifles." But their confidence may be earned only by one who, in spite of crowded schedules, still finds time for a date with a tree.

Thoreau, the hermit of Walden Pond, who, by example, undertook to show his generation how many energy- and time-devouring things men and women could get along without, once excused himself from a persistent visitor by explaining that he must needs go to keep an engagement that he had with a tree. The biggest and busiest of men never have felt that they had to apologize for keeping a tryst with a tree.

Ruskin once wrote, "No man can be far wrong in temper of mind or way of life who really loves trees." Oliver Wendell Holmes often left his home to trudge many miles, always carrying his measuring tape along so that he might take the girth of some great tree of which he became enamored. Frequently the genial autocrat of the breakfast table had a date with a certain grand old oak at Beverly, Mass., which he never approached without a bow and a genuflection. Of that tree he said to the friend upon whose land it stood: "Ah, John, you think you own that tree. But you don't. It owns you."

To the author of one of the most widely read novels a date with a certain tree was always a signal to exercise his own highest literary faculties. This is indicated as he reminisces: "The greater part of my work has been done at hime, my favorite writing place being in the garden, beneath an old beech tree. Often when its thick foliage has protected me with its cooling shadow it has been the only witness of my mental struggles."

But often an engagement with a tree does not mean that one, like a galley slave, is to bend in mental toil. It rather beckons to an escape as to an oasis from the clutching claims of the dusty road. James Russell Lowell, who once said he cared more for his trees than his books, advises that every man should sometimes retreat into the heart of the woods and closet himself in the rusling privacy of leaves, so that there one may find a peaceful pleasure, respite from nagging necessities, throwing the pack of pestering plagues which pursue off his scent by taking to the many-scented woods. Wordsworth has suggested in deathless phrases what enrichment may come to the spirit as recompense for a date with trees, when he wrote:

"One impulse from a vernal wood,
May teach you more of man,
Of moral evil and of good,
Than all the sages can."

An outstanding essayist on whose rhythmic pages words are set to music, and who is remembered by those who were privileged to know him as a courtly, cultured, knightly personality, passionately loved trees. He believed that a tree comes nearer to having a soul than any other creation in the vegetable kingdom. That reverent adoration for trees is mirrored in this sentence of his: "Many a village owns the tranquil lordship of one supreme tree, to which all visitors are expected to make pilgrimage and pay reverent court. And the pride of many a rural neighborhood centers in one gigantic elm which, like the old cathedral builders, has levied contributions on every side for a century to rear its huge temple, spreading its wide-arching branches in a span of a hundred feet as if ambitious, like Michelangelo, to hang the Pantheon in air."

No wonder in the history of worship we find that groves were the first temples. And how trees have figured in the great Judeo-Christian tradition. Moses, whose colossal form seems to bestride those early centuries, had an engagement with a tree which, for him, proved a vital factor in his destiny and that of the horde of slaves he freed. He turned aside to see and listen as a bush burned and was not consumed. At that tree the awesome commission of the God of Abraham and Isaac and Jacob was put into his hands.

And does not the psalmist liken a man who delights in the law of the Lord to a tree planted by the rivers of water, which bringeth forth fruit in its season, and declare that the righteous shall flourish like the palm tree and grow like a cedar in Lebanon? The great, glowing invitation of the New Testament is for sin-smitten human souls to shelter under the Tree of Life whose leaves are for the healing of the nations.

At the very heart of Christianity is the breathless good news of that One "who His own Self bore our sins in His own body on the tree." Shall we say it with a reverence that bows the head and bends the knee, the inevitable engagement of the Man of Galilee with that tree is the supreme event of human history?

Sidney Lanier, in one of the most tender and devout poems in all literature, lifts trees to the high altar of the soul, in his "Ballad of Trees and the Master"—with its two poignant pictures, Into the Woods, and Out of the Woods. With what delicate pathos he whispers that "the olives they were not blind to Him," that "the little gray leaves were kind to Him" and "the thorn-tree had a mind to Him" in the ordeal of the dark garden. Then, after that agony under the trees—

Out of the woods my Master came,
Content with death and shame.
When death and shame would woo Him last,
From under the trees they drew Him last:
'Twas on a tree they slew Him—last,
When out of the woods He came.

Senator Langer's Battle on Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 20, 1954

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excellent column written by Robert S. Allen entitled "GOP Senator LANGER Takes Battle on Power Direct to Farm People," published in the July 1954 issue of the Wyoming Rural Electric News.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GOP SENATOR LANGER TAKES BATTLE ON POWER DIRECT TO FARM PECPLE

(By Robert S. Allen)

WASHINGTON, June 1954.—Don't be surprised if you find a letter from Senator WILLIAM LANGER, chairman of the powerful Judiciary Committee, in your mailbox.

It will be a scorching attack on the administration's proutility power policy and how it is adversely affecting you.

The North Dakota Republican has broken with the administration on this vital issue and is carrying his fight directly to the 4 million electric co-op members of the country.

He will bluntly urge them to make their views felt in the fall elections.

LANGER's extraordinary action is the outgrowth of a concerted attempt by the Republican leaders of the Senate to block his plan for a sweeping investigation of the administration's power policy. The GOP chiefs have adamantly refused to give the militant Republican liberal the $75,000 he requested for the probe and have done everything in their power to obstruct his exposé of the private utilities' control of the administration's power policy.

WASHINGTON FEEDLINE

LANGER is fighting back without letup.

One of his counterblasts is a blistering report on the administration's record on the power issue. Consisting chiefly of statements of rural-electric co-op officials who have testified before LANGER's Subcommittee on Monopoly, the report charges that the administration's power policy is fostering private monopoly.

Specifically, the electric co-op authorities assert—

That Interior Secretary McKay has refused to honor contracts between the Government and cooperatives. This highhanded action has placed these co-ops in a serious financial condition.

Less Federal power is being made available to farmer co-ops and at higher rates than previously.

Interior Department officials, while refusing additional power to co-ops, have pressured them to purchase from private utilities at higher rates.

LANGER, whose subcommittee hearings have been overshadowed by the sensational Army-McCarthy brawl, intends to put his power report in the hands of every rural-electric system member.

He will do this in a personal letter, and he has asked co-op officials to furnish him with membership lists so he can send each farmer a copy of the revealing hearings of his subcommittee.

The magnitude of this undertaking is not daunting the veteran North Dakota legislator. When told by one official that there are 250,000 rural-electric users in the Southwest alone, LANGER replied:

"The more there are, the better I like it. My purpose is to inform these people about just what is happening on power and why their rates are being increased. And I am doing that so they may vote accordingly at the fall election."

THE RECORD

One of the most scathing portions of this record was submitted by Truman Green, manager of the Central Electric Power Cooperative, Jefferson City, Mo., a federated generating co-op. He charged Interior Secretary McKay with deliberately repudiating a Government contract and refusing to pay $750,000 owed CEPC, despite a court order to do that.

MORE EVIDENCE

The private-monoply charge was flatly leveled by Julius Helm, executive manager of Missouri State Rural Electric Association.

Michael L. Benedum's Own Birth Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 20, 1954

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, the Pittsburgh Sun-Telegraph of July 16 gives Michael L. Benedum's own birthday story.

Mr. Benedum, the great oil wildcatter of our country, and a fine American, gives a wonderful résumé of almost a century of world progress which should be read with profit by every citizen of our country.

I ask unanimous consent that the story and the editorial notes thereon be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the story and notes were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BENEDUM, 85, WRITES OWN BIRTHDAY STORY

(By Michael L. Benedum)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—For years and years, the Sun-Telegraph staff writers and editors have written a birthday story for Michael L. Benedum, multimillionaire oil wildcatter, political sage, philanthropist, and humanitarian. Today is his 85th birthday. He is physically well, spiritually happy, in full possession of all his remarkable powers. Today we felt turnabout is fair play, and asked Mr. Benedum to write his own birthday story. Here it is.)

The calendar says that I am 85 years old today. But the calendar, I have learned by experience, is a mighty poor yardstick by which to gage the span of a life. It deals only with days, months, and years which are calculated by the movements of the sun and the moon. Twenty-four hours is a day regardless of what that day brings forth.

To my way of thinking, time can be measured accurately only in terms of events and human progress. By that standard, I have already lived longer than Methusaleh. When that Biblical character died at the ripe old age of 969, conditions were as primitive as they were on the day he was born. I doubt if he was ever 50 miles from his birthplace. As far as he was concerned, time stood still throughout the nine centuries of his existence.

When I think of the advance of mankind since my birth in 1869, the 85-year period takes on the aspect of an entire epoch in our civilization. Within my life cycle time and distance have been virtually wiped out; drudgery and boredom have been lifted from the backs of the people; and atomic power now involves the possibility of new dimensions unconceived even by the Einsteins. I believe there has been more progress within the period of my life than in all the 6,000 years of previously recorded human history.

Whether or not I have lived longer than Methusaleh, I certainly would rather have had my 85 years in the most exciting and dynamic period of all time than to have lived Methusaleh's span when all days were alike.

The other day I flew from Pittsburgh to my old hometown of Bridgeport, W. Va. The distance by road is 115 miles; by air possibly 90 miles. The flight was made in 25 minutes.

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—He owns a private "flying office.")

As a boy I remember that my father thought he had established some kind of a speed record when he made the same trip in 3 days.

As I dictate these lines in an office that is brilliantly and immediately illuminated by the flick of a switch, it is hard for me to realize that it was I, and not some figment of my imagination, who, as a boy, helped my mother make the tallow candles that were our only source of light. Later came the oil lamp, which seems antique to us now, but we then regarded it as a great forward stride. Next I saw the gaslight. I had attained manhood before the incandescent bulb became a reality.

In my youth, the oxcart and the stagecoach were the principal methods of local and long distance transportation in the country areas of West Virginia. The telephone was unknown and the telegraph was still a novelty that served only the metropolitan centers. Water and sanitation services were so ancient that in the light of what we now know it seems a miracle that our community was not decimated by epidemics of typhoid and other similar diseases.

Among the only medicines known to our country doctor were calomel, quinine, and laudanum. Surgery was in its infancy. The only source of information was a weekly newspaper. The only fountain of knowledge for the children was a 1-room school.

We have made tremendous advances since those days. I have lived to see the sound barrier broken by the jet airplane. I have lived to see television and radio, atomic power, and other wonders of the 20th century. But when I look on the other side of the ledger I find there are some debits. The law of compensation has not been repealed or amended. While gaining some things, we have lost others, some of them priceless.

I am aware that with the coming of the industrial age, life has become complex and that we cannot, and should not, try to live by the standards that existed in my boyhood, but I do believe that there is still a place and a crying need for the self-reliance, neighborliness, and the willingness to work, save, and sacrifice that characterized the people of our community.

As to my views of the future, it is my opinion that the years of my life, while exciting by all previous standards of comparison, will seem tame indeed as compared to those that lie ahead. It is my belief that we have merely scratched the surface in our advance of the last 85 years.

The Creator has provided the elements for many other wonders and beneficences for His children, and He has provided the men and women who will come along and take positions of leadership in science, industry, and government, in the development of those elements.

This is the challenge which confronts the oncoming generation. I have every confidence that the young people of today will meet these responsibilities of tomorrow in keeping with the highest traditions of our country. My only suggestion to them is that as they conquer new horizons in the laboratory and in industry, they be ever mindful that material gains are empty unless accompanied by a corresponding enlargement of their spiritual world.

Price Supports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 20, 1954

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Oregon State Federation of Labor at its convention on June 21 to 25, 1954.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas we believe the farmer is entitled to a fair return for his labor and his investment, and should not be a victim of depressed prices; and

Whereas the Federal Government has recognized its responsibility in this field by price supports on several commodities; and

Whereas the practice has been for the Government to buy and store, thus creating an artificial scarcity, to maintain the price whenever a supported commodity falls below the percentage of parity fixed by law; and

Whereas now due to this practice storage and spoilage have become acute problems for our Government; while at the same time half of the world and some of our own people are undernourished: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we favor a system of price supports that would guarantee a fair return to the producer and still allow the product to find its own price level in the world market—the Government to make up the difference to the producer between a fair price and the market price, similar to the system now applied to wool; and be it further

Resolved, That we are opposed to dumping American products abroad at a cheaper price than is available to the American consumer; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Honorable Ezra Taft Benson, Secretary of Agriculture, the Honorable George B. Aiken, chairman of the Senate Agriculture and Forestry Committee, the Honorable Clifford B. Hope, chairman of the House Agriculture Committee, and the Oregon delegation in Congress.

The Milk Orders

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. THYE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 20, 1954

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "The Milk Orders," written by Alfred D. Stedman, and published in the St. Paul Pioneer Press of July 11, 1954.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MILK ORDERS

(By Alfred D. Stedman, from a talk before the Minnesota Farm Managers' Association at Winona, June 24, 1954)

Not just the one kind of Federal dairy price supports that has been nationally publicized, but two kinds are complicating the outlook of Midwest dairying.

Until April 1, the nationally publicized kind had supported prices of factory dairy products at 90 percent of parity. On that date, Secretary Benson reduced the support level to 75 percent.

The 15-percent cut looked drastic, and it was. But so was the situation, with more than a billion pounds of dairy products on the Government's hands. Neither in law nor in economics, has a clear case been made against Secretary Benson's action. That action counted heavily on the free market to increase consumption of dairy products. For butter, the Government reports success, with sales increases of 7 percent.

Now Midwest dairying seems entitled to frank official information as to why, if free American markets are so good for our factory products, the policy isn't extended equally to the second kind of Federal dairy price supports. These are the Federal price supports on fluid milk for table use, provided in 49 Federal milk orders in large consuming centers of the United States.

These milk-price supports date back to 1933. Then they brought order into demoralized markets. That aim of price stability we stanchly defended, and always will. (And we have defended also provisions of the St. Paul-Minneapolis order which level-headed leadership of the Twin City Milk Producers Association has held to that aim.)

But long before Ezra T. Benson became Secretary, the Federal orders, especially in East and South, moved on to the goal of setting Federal price-support levels for fluid milk much above general milk-price levels.

These higher Federal price supports could be maintained only by excluding cheaper milk from outside areas—that is, by enforced monopoly.

And the monopoly instruments? One, used either alone or in conjunction with Federal orders, is the sanitary regulation by which cities, States, or the Federal authorities in Washington, D. C., bar milk from distant areas.

The Federal orders have two of their own. The first is a prohibitive import duty levied against milk shipped from outside. The second knocks out the big freight saving on concentrated milk that had opened a way for Midwest milk to reach the high-priced markets of East and South.

Fluid-milk prices, Under Secretary Morse told the Senate committee, are not primarily affected by the Government's 15-percent cut in price supports on factory dairy products.

And the results? One is that fluid-milk production inside the Federal order areas has jumped at twice the rate outside. Another is high retail prices, high middlemen's charges, and big wage boosts inside the walls. A third is a drop in milk consumption, in New York City, for instance. A fourth is a huge overflow of milk unused for drinking into competition with Midwest dairy products. Finally, while high-cost productions is expanding, some dairymen out here, in the most economical areas, are told to quit dairying or get off the farm. Senator Thye put it bluntly to Morse this way:

"You are certainly discriminating against the producer who happens to be situated out in a surplus-producing area where he does not have the benefit of a big fluid market.

"You are going to make him take the entire rap, and for the man who is producing for the babies, who will drink it out of a bottle, you will hold the price up just exactly where it is today even though you say it is an unjust and unreasonable level."

Latin a Live Language

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 20, 1954

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an article entitled "Priest's Lexicon Proves Latin Living, Practical," appearing in the Catholic Register of July 11, 1954.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Priest's Lexicon Proves Latin Living, Practical

Fingal, N. Dak.—A lexicon compiled through 16 years by Father Siegfried Heyl demonstrates that Latin is not a dead and impractical language.

The as yet unpublished manuscript runs into several thousand pages, reports Catholic Action News, published monthly by the Diocese of Fargo, and contains virtually every word found in the index of Roget's Thesaurus.

The latest scientific, technical, commercial, social, and conversational terms have been taken from such authors as Gellius, Pliny the Elder, Pliny the Younger, Cato, Vitruvius, Macrobius, Fronto, Pomponius, Mela, Frontinus, Livy, and Cicero.

The scholar, who is pastor of Holy Trinity Parish here, has been careful not to force a word. He proves his case in almost every instance of translation by quoting the passage from which he derives the meaning.

The practical value of the work is in its purpose to make of Latin a conversational tongue. Father Heyl says he knows of no other comparable work. The inherent difficulties of the language, he remarks in the preface, "did not keep the [Roman] women from exchanging the latest gossip over their back fences."

The carefully diagramed sketch of a Roman chariot's speedometer, which operated on precisely the same principle as the speedometer on a 1954 Cadillac, gives the priest's lexicon the documented terminology that would enable a garage mechanic to speak the language of Caesar.

Other developments known to the Romans, but considered modern, were high-fidelity sound amplification and what one physician once told the priest was the latest treatment for high blood pressure.

Most Latin teachers today, says the native of Innsbruck, Austria, have no love for the language themselves and fail to strike enthusiasm in their students.

Large sections of the synodal book published by the Fargo Diocese in 1951 were translated by the scholar into a style of Latin that brought commendation from readers in Rome. The work of translating official documents sent from the diocese to the Holy See has been assigned to him.

Marketing Order Authority for Fruits and Vegetables

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 20, 1954

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record a letter addressed to me by Mr. J. E. Klahre, general manager, Apple Growers Association, Hood River, Oreg., in which he says, in part:

> We understand the Senate Committee on Agriculture has agreed tentatively to extend marketing authority to fruits and vegetables for canning and freezing. We have been told that this decision was reached after testimony given by Mr. Jack Anderson, of California, in which he stated that he represented the views of a substantial majority of the pear industry on the Pacific coast.

Mr. Klahre goes on to point out that Mr. Anderson does not represent the segment of the fruit industry that Mr. Klahre represents.

There being no objection, the latter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Apple Growers Association, Inc.,
Hood River, Oreg., July 9, 1954.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
United States Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: We understand the Senate Committee on Agriculture has agreed tentatively to extend marketing-order authority to fruits and vegetables for canning and freezing. We have been told that this decision was reached after testimony given by Mr. Jack Anderson, of California, in which he stated that he represented the views of a substantial majority of the pear industry on the Pacific coast.

I do not know the views of California pear producers on this matter, but I can assure you that the cooperative canneries in Oregon, and at least two of the cooperative canneries in Washington, have consistently urged that Congress do not extend marketing-order authority for fruits for canning. The reasons are many and have been enumerated repeatedly. These reasons have been presented to Congress in person and by letter from many segments of the industry in the Northwest.

On behalf of the 400 growers belonging to this association, we wish to state that Mr. Anderson's views do not represent the views of our association. I think you will find many other associations or producers will concur with us, and will so inform you within the next few days.

We hope you will seriously consider our view on this matter which we have given careful consideration. If the California cling peach growers want cling peaches subject to marketing-order authority, that is their business, but insofar as pears for canning are concerned there are a substantial number of pear producers in Oregon and Washington that are opposed to such action on the part of Congress. Mr. Anderson had no authority to speak for us.

Yours very truly,
Apple Growers Association,
J. E. Klahre, *General Manager.*

What's Been Gained by the Milk Price Cuts?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. THYE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 20, 1954

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, one of our leading Midwest farm publications, Successful Farming, in its July issue, asks the question, "What's been gained by the milk price cuts?" The magazine points out the following:

> On April 1, the dairy price support was lowered from 90 to 75 percent of parity. The three main reasons given for lowering the support price were: (1) To get the Government out of the dairy business; (2) to lower the price to consumers, therefore moving more diary products into consumption; and (3) to cut production of milk.

It then offers a roundup of results in answers to six questions.

I believe that the observations made are pertinent to pending debate in the Senate, and I ask unaimous consent that the statement from Successful Farming be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

What's Been Gained by the Milk Price Cuts?

What has it cost farmers? Price levels to farmers were not uniformly lower, but they were lower. Some dairymen in certain section of the country received as much as 60 cents less per hundred pounds of milk. Cuts to farmers in other sections amounted to 30 to 40 cents a hundred. The average price drop for the Nation's dairymen was about 45 cents a hundred.

Has price to consumer dropped? Yes and no. Butter prices, in many stores, dropped immediately after the lowered supports were announced. Some stores sold butter for about 50 cents a pound. However, some of these stores soon boosted the price to 65 to 69 cents a pound. Apparently, little permanent increase in sales has resulted from the price drop of butter.

Consumers in some areas bought milk for 1 cent a quart less after the support price drop. In other areas, the price remained the same as before April 1. In the past, when the price a farmer received for 100 pounds of milk dropped 45 cents, retailers lowered the price per quart by 1 cent, as there are 45 quarts in 100 pounds of milk.

Has consumption gone up? Although it's still early to predict the final outcome, lowered prices for dairy products to consumers are not resulting in significantly higher consumption. Many stores report customers are only mildly interested in the slightly lower prices.

Although ways and means for increasing butter consumption have been the subject of most debates dealing with the dairy situation, methods of significantly increasing fluid-milk consumption have done much more to solve the problem.

Increased advertising and promotion of fluid milk—before prices to consumers were cut slightly by lowered supports—did increase fluid-milk consumption. This fact leads many people to believe that the answer to the dairy problem doesn't depend on slightly lower prices to consumers and sharply lower prices to farmers, but on more and better salesmanship.

Will the Government buy less? Apparently not. It is expected that Government stocks of dairy products will continue to grow larger even though supports were cut.

Will supports go back up? There is a good possibility that supports will not remain at 75 percent. Several bills have been introduced in Congress to up the support figure. One bill calls for limiting a cut in dairy supports to not more than 5 percent in 1 year. Some sort of plan for increasing the present support level has a good chance of being passed this year. Indications are that if supports are increased, the increase will put the support at a little less than 85 percent.

Will production go down? No. The latest estimate is for a record production of 124 billion pounds of milk this year, compared with 121.2 billion in 1953. Midyear reports show an increase in the number of dairy cows in the United States, hence the prospect of record production.

To the Republicans Belong the Spoils?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 19, 1954

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, under the permission heretofore granted me by unanimous consent of the House, I include the following highly interesting article which was published in this morning's Washington Post and Times Herald:

Drive for Patronage Seeks Added Jobs

(By Jerry Kluttz)

The Eisenhower administration is making a determined effort to assume partisan political control over many thousands of Federal jobs both in and out of the civil-service system.

The drive for patronage is being directed from the White House.

The Republican National Committee set up an elaborate system here to clear people down to the precinct level for both Federal appointments and promotions.

Army, Navy, Air Force, Foreign Operations, and bipartisan agencies that have been more or less insulated from political patronage demands in the past are not excluded from the present drive for jobs.

It is routine—and expected—for the administration in power to exercise political control over many jobs outside the civil service and other merit systems such as those operated by TVA, FBI, etc.

But the current drive also includes some jobs under the civil-service system, jobs which are supposed to be free from partisan political considerations and to be filled on the basis of merit.

Outside the Post Office Department, where politics has been considered for years in appointments and promotions to many of its jobs, civil service and otherwise, the civil-service system in general has been relatively free of partisan political influences.

A high-ranking official says the present Civil Service Commission "seems to have closed its eyes" to the growing influence of partisan political considerations on appointments to some of the jobs under its merit system.

The patronage drive, now well underway, has helped to silence demands on the Eisenhower administration for jobs from GOP Members of Congress and from the Republican National Committee.

Soon after the Eisenhower administration was swept into power, the Republican National Committee, as was expected, attempted to dictate appointments to many Federal jobs.

At first, the committee had very little success. Its officials were told repeatedly that this or that job in question was under civil service or the person in it had either permanent civil-service status or veterans' preference rights.

Gradually, however, a few of the agencies began to clear appointments, including those for some civil-service jobs, with the committee. This was done through a top-level appointee in the agency whose job is to check the political angle on appointments and promotions.

A notable example of political operation along this line is Harold Stassen's Foreign Operations Agency, where even stenographers and clerks have been required to produce the proper political clearance. No appointment or promotion can be finally approved in the agency unless it has the approval of the lady there who is Stassen's liaison with the administration's political arm.

Other agencies, however, continued to make appointments and promotions within the civil service process and they did not clear them in advance with the Republican National Committee.

Somewhere along the line came a recent showdown at the White House and the decision there was apparently cast with the patronage forces.

In recent weeks, agency heads have received "confidential, not for publication" letters on White House stationery, in which they were directed to clear certain of their jobs with the committee before making appointments to them.

Strangely, the letters were not signed. Only a small supply was printed. Reportedly, they were delivered by hand to some agency heads for their information only. Precautions were taken to keep copies from the public eye.

However, it is reported on excellent authority that many agency heads have been instructed either by letter or orally to "clear" appointments to these jobs with the Republican National Committee:

Jobs in grade 14 ($9,600 starting salary) and upward irrespective of whether they are in or out of the civil-service system.

So-called "303 jobs" positions under civil service but which the CSC cannot fill with sufficient qualified eligibles. In such cases, CSC authorizes the agencies to hire people on the open market for them. The agencies, however, are supposed to require appointees to meet minimum civil-service standards for the jobs, to follow veterans' preference, etc.

Jobs, such as attorneys and others, outside the civil-service system.

Even though the White House directive on jobs was unsigned, officials assume it came from the office of Sherman Adams, the Assistant to the President. Adams' assistant on patronage matters is Charles F. Willis, Jr., and he is the contact man with the National Committee and most agency officials.

Despite the directive, several agency heads whose jobs are under civil service are said not to have cooperated to the point desired by the patronage forces.

One top-rank official, an Eisenhower appointeee, is said to have threatened to resign with a blast at the patronage drive.

Meantime, CSC, the agency charged with strengthening the merit system, is compiling details on many thousands of noncivil-service jobs which will be turned over to the patronage forces.

The Insect Infestation in Minnesota

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. THYE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 20, 1954

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, there is a very serious insect infestation in Minnesota. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record a telegram which I received from Mr. T. L. Aamodt, State entomologist, giving a report on what is being done to control the infestation.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

St. Paul, Minn., *July 19, 1954.*

Senator Edward J. Thye,
Washington, D. C.:

Your help and help from your colleagues has assisted us in alleviating the army worm situation which is probably the most serious in the history of Minnesota agriculture. We were well organized, in fact we have been prepared to deal with this insect since last winter when its importance was stressed in all of our county winter meetings which you are familiar as a former governor and commissioner of agriculture. Ten days to 2 weeks ago final notice of the critical situation was issued. We were ready in our State department of agriculture in cooperation with the Extension Service and the county agents. However, we found a shortage of toxaphene due to diversion of major supply of toxaphene to the South for cotton work. Governor Anderson declared an emergency at noon yesterday, Sunday, at my request which made available Army planes and State National Guard planes. General Matheny and General Nelson have given us admirable cooperation as these Federal and State National Guard planes have been hauling materials from other parts of the country to critical areas in Minnesota. Since yesterday afternoon the situation is alleviating. However, losses developed up to 10 percent of the grain and flax crop in some counties. Most serious situation in west central Minnesota. However, infestation extends over whole State. Whitlock of the Farm and Home Administration called me today to inform me that they would do what is possible to make immediate emergency loans to farmers in stricken areas, particularly in the Red River Valley area where floods ruined the crop last year. Crux of the situation is the need for cooperation between the State, Federal Government, and industry to see to it that never again will we run out of critical supplies. We must setup permanent supply centers in strategic areas throughout the county. Either legislation or some informal arrangement should be made with industry and the dealers of these insecticides to have adequate supplies on hand or available at short notice. By short notice I mean on hourly notice, if necessary. It is extremely important that the Federal Government probably take the lead in making such arrangements in view of the interstate and national picture. Our most recent report indicated that army worm situation is bad in North and South Dakota, and in Wisconsin. I have received word from several sources in Dakota and Rice counties that the situation is spotted but very serious. We are now establishing control centers in Faribault and Northfield. We have a man investigating the Northfield and Faribault areas this evening and tomorrow morning. The worst is probably over in southern Minnesota as the grain is maturing and is being harvested already.

T. L. Aamodt.

Wiretapping Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 20, 1954

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record the report of the civic affairs committee of the Decalogue Society of Lawyers on proposed wiretapping legislation.

I also ask unanimous consent that a newspaper article published in a Chicago paper be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the report and the newspaper article were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Report of the Civic Affairs Committee of the Decalogue Society of Lawyers, Chicago, Ill., on Proposed Wiretapping Legislation

(Approved by board of managers on May 14, 1954)

On April 8, 1954, the United States House of Representatives passed H. R. 8649. This bill, along with S. 3229, introduced by Senator McCarran, Democrat, of Nevada, is now being considered by the Senate Committee on the Judiciary. The two bills vary in only slight degree. This report will attempt to briefly survey existing legislation and decisions relative to wiretapping, examine proposed legislation, and recommend to the board of managers reasons for its opposing, on behalf of the Decalogue Society, the passage of the proposed bills.

A. EXISTING LEGISLATION AND DECISIONS

In 1928 the Supreme Court of the United States, in *Olmstead* v. *United States* (277 U. S. 438), held, in a 5-to-4 decision, that the introduction into evidence of tapped telephone conversations was violative of neither the fourth amendment's protection against unreasonable search and seizure nor the fifth amendment's prohibition against compulsory self-incrimination and denial of due process.

There is considerable basis for the conclusion that it was this decision which led the Congress, in 1934, to enact the Federal Communications Act, section 605 of which provides, in part, that "no person not being authorized by the sender shall intercept any communication and divulge or publish the existence, contents, substance, purport, effect, or meaning of such intercepted communication to any person."

In the first Nardone case, the Supreme Court held that "no person" included Federal agents and that evidence derived from wiretapping was, by virtue of section 605, barred by the prohibition against divulging such information "to any person" *Nardone* v. *United States* (302 U. S. 379 (1937)). Evidence, even though only indirectly obtained by intercepted communications, was similarly barred, on the so-called fruit of the poisonous tree doctrine, in *Nardone* v. *United States* (308 U. S. 338 (1938)). See also *United States* v. *Coplon* (2 Cir., 185 F. 2d 629), certiorari denied (342 U. S. 920 (1952)).

Other relevant decisions include *Weiss* v. *United States* (308 U. S. 321 (1939)), which extended to intrastate communications the interpretation placed upon section 605 by the first Nardone case; *Goldman* v. *United States* (316 U. S. 129 (1942)), holding that a dictaphone (or detectaphone) was outside the statutory sweep; *On Lee* v. *United States* (343 U. S. 747 (1952)), holding that the 605 ban did not apply where a transmitter was concealed on an agent's person; *Goldstine* v. *United States* (316 U. S. 114 (1942)), which denied standing to a defendant, not a party to the intercepted communication, to object to the admissibility of the tapped evidence in his own case, even though there was a violation of section 605; and *Schwartz* v. *Texas* (344 U. S. 199 (1952)), holding that it is for the State courts to determine the admissibility of evidence obtained by wire tapping in non-Federal proceedings.

It is clear that whatever exclusionary rules which exist today in the Federal courts, in regard to the admissability of evidence directly or indirectly obtained by wire tapping, are based not upon constitutional obstacles but upon the prohibtions of section 605 of the Federal Communications Act. That Congress has the power to remove these prohibitions seems unquestioned.

B. PROPOSED LEGISLATION

The provisions of H. R. 8649 provide that—

(1) information obtained prior to the effective date of the act by the Federal Bureau of Investigation or the intelligence branches of the Army, Air Force, and Navy, as a result of interception of wire or radio communication in the course of investigating interference with or plans to interfere with or endanger the national security by committing or conspiring to commit certain named crimes, shall be admissible in evidence in criminal cases involving such violations of the law, if the intercepted material was obtained upon express written approval of the Attorney General; and

(2) that information obtained after the act's effective date, to be admissible, must have been acquired pursuant to an ex parte order issued by a United States district court or court of appeals judge, who, upon proper application of an authorized agent of said investigatorial agencies, and after approval of the Attorney General, is satisfied there is reasonable cause to believe one of the named crimes has been or is about to be committed and that the material to be intercepted would assist in the conduct of such investigations.

The only substantial manner in which S. 3229 differs from H. R. 8649 is that in the former a court order authorizing wiretapping would extend for only 6 months (but is renewable for a like period of time). The legislation originally proposed by the Attorney General, but thus far rejected, at least in the House of Representatives, would have enabled wire tapping to be accomplished without the requirement of a court order and solely upon the Attorney General's written approval. The report of the Committee on the Judiciary of the House did, in fact, include such recommendations. (House of Representatives, 83d Cong., 2d sess., Rept. No. 1461, Committee on the Judiciary.)

C. RECOMMENDATION

Since 1940 the Department of Justice has attempted, unsuccessfully, to get Congress to authorize wiretapping. Each time there was sufficient opposition to prevent passage of such legislation. The opposition came from a variety of sources and existed for a variety of reasons. This, of course, was and is equally true of the support for such legislation.

Proponents of wiretapping legislation stress, in general, the need to protect our country against criminals. Earlier advocates dramatized the serious and evil nature of specific crimes, like kidnapping and extortion, and pointed out why wiretapping was an investigative technique particularly well suited to detection in such cases. More recently though emphasis has been laid upon its use in criminal prosecutions for offenses against our national security, and the pending legislation so confines its scope. The need for such legislation to aid in the detection of espionage, sabotage, treason, and other subversive crime is said to be patent and to deprive Federal agents of this means of detection is to leave their hands shackled by the operation of our very own law. (H. R. Rept. No. 1461, p. 4, supra.)

Opponents of such legislation are disturbed by a variety of things. As a policy matter most opponents would probably agree, as we do, with the following statement from the report of the committee on civil rights of the Chicago Bar Association, approved by its board of managers on April 29, 1954, dealing with the same subject:

"As a matter of policy, this committee feels that wiretapping is an evil which generally ought to be prohibited by law. In general, Americans should have an enforceable right to speak freely over the telephone. Although the right to be secure from the introduction of wiretap evidence in court is directly valuable only to those whom the Government may prosecute, the right not to be spied on is valuable to all. No Government, however benign, should invade the right to privacy which is one of the factors making American citizenship so valuable."

During debate in the House of Representatives, Representative Yates, Democrat, of Illinois, pointed out that he did not doubt that much evidence was obtainable by wiretapping, just as brutality, the third degree, and illegal search and seizures were productive totalitarian law-enforcement measures, and he quoted from a study reported in 52 Columbia Law Review 164, 196–197, as finding that corruption, blackmail, misuse of warrant procedures, failure to prevent unauthorized wiretapping, and loss of general confidence in the security of the telephone as a medium of communication had been the result of New York's experience with wiretapping even under judicial supervision. This we believe to be sufficient answer to those who suggest that the possible ends here justify the proposed means.

Additional objections to wiretapping legislation may be briefly summarized as follows:

(1) Unlike a search warrant, a wiretap order cannot be selective or restrictive. Tapping the wires of suspect A involves intrusion into his conversation with B, C, and D, however innocent the conversations may be and however innocent of any wrongdoing one or all of them may be. If A is suspect, a call to B, his lawyer, C, his doctor, and D, his minister, immediately makes them all suspect, to say nothing of intruding upon the confidential nature of A's relationship to these people. Mr. Justice Brandeis, in a historic dissent in the Olmstead case, pointed out that "the evil incident to invasion of the privacy of the telephone is far greater than that involved in tampering with the mails. * * * As a means of espionage, writs of assistance and general warrants are but puny instruments of tyranny and oppression when compared with wiretapping."

(2) Senator Morse, in an article which appeared in the January 11, 1954, issue of Newsweek magazine, wrote that wiretapping "is a coverup for lazy, inefficient, unimaginative, ruthless law-enforcement administration. The history of the struggle for freedom shows that indecent police methods, such as proposed by Brownell in this instance, breeds disrespect for law and shakes the confidence of law-abiding citizens in the administration of justice. Police tyranny is no substitute for police protection." Even Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, in a time of less stress, termed wiretapping an archaic and inefficient procedure which "has proved a definite handicap or barrier in the development of ethical, scientific, and sound investigative technique." (Letter dated Feb. 9, 1940, quoted in 53 Harv. Law Rev. 863, 870 (1940).)

(3) Apart from moral and ethical considerations, there is considerable skepticism about the effectiveness of wiretapping in apprehending criminals. This is probably especially true of cases relating to national security, and less true of cases involving kidnaping and extortion where the telephone is freely used. Mr. Hoover, in recent testimony before the House Appropriations Committee in connection with the 1955 Justice Department budget, said "The security measures which the Communist Party have taken in order to thwart the effort of the FBI have been many and detailed in character. * * * The use of the telephone and telegraph is avoided. * * * They communicate through couriers and avoid the use of written communications." Elizabeth Bentley, in a radio interview, made a similar observation.

(4) There is little basis for expecting that Federal agents and the Department of Justice itself, as a matter of departmental policy, will not abuse wiretapping privileges, however restricted. Almost since the passage of section 605 of the Communications Act of 1934 the Department of Justice has taken the position tht the Department's agents can tap wires—as it now admits it does on a large scale—providing the information obtained is not divulged to anyone outside the Department. The letter of the prohibition contained in section 605, against interception and divulgence, has been, therefore, probably adhered to, but not the spirit of the gloss placed on that legislation by the Supreme Court in the Nardone cases. Pending legislation, therefore, would merely sanction heretofore unlawful FBI practices and make the evidence obtained admissible. This is hardly a sound basis for enacting legislation which will, as the Chicago Bar Association report indicates, "necessarily derogate from the individual's freedom and right of privacy."

The pending legislation contains specific objectionable features which should be briefly enumerated:

1. Limitation to national-security cases concentrates wiretapping efforts to an ill-defined area elastic enough to provide a basis for extensive surveillance of political dissidents. The potential encroachment upon civil liberties here seems most acute, especially when conspiracies involving national security also justify wiretapping under the proposed bills. Innocent B, C, and D may become part of a conspiracy with A on less evidence than that which made A suspect in the first instance. Their lines may then be tapped and E, F, and G become a part of the ever-expanding conspiracy, with the evidence of guilt becoming increasingly attenuated.

2. No attempt has been made to clarify the relationship between pending legislation, existing State legislation in this area, and section 605 of the Communications Act, nor are there adequate safeguards to protect one whose phone is being illegally tapped.

3. There is considerable evidence that wiretapped recordings may be forged, i. e., that piecing together, out of context, of unrelated portions of the same or different taps. Without affording to accused persons an opportunity to examine the entire transcript and/or a provision for insuring the physical integrity of the transcript once obtained, this legislation does nothing to protect against this not inconsiderable risk.

4. The admissibility of evidence obtained prior to the effective date of H. R. 8649 seems objectionable, if for no other reasons than those indicated in the preceding paragraph.

5. Delegating authority to numerous investigating agencies and intelligence branches of our Government to engage in wiretapping increases the opportunity for abuse of the power and narrows the area of secrecy.

The civil affairs committee recommends, therefore, that pending legislation relating to wiretapping, specifically H. R. 8649 and S. 3229, not be enacted and that the board of managers adopt this report as and for a report of the Decalogue Society of Lawyers, and that abstracts of this report or statements consistent with its findings and conclusions be given such circulation as may be deemed appropriate.

Respectfully submitted.

Civic Affairs Committee.

Lawyers Oppose Wiretapping

Chicago, July 17.—Opposition to legislation to legalize wiretapping, now pending before Congress, was announced today by the Decalogue Society of Lawyers, which has more than 1,600 members of the Jewish faith. A report concurred in objections raised earlier by the Chicago Bar Association, which held "the right not to be spied on is valuable to all."

Free Enterprise Plan for Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 1, 1954

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, since I introduced House Concurrent Resolution 219 on March 22, 1954, the progress of events, combined with the constructive suggestions of such important organizations as the National Association of Manufacturers and such important persons as President Syngman Rhee, render it advisable to amend it to the end that it may better serve the original purposes and objectives which remain unchanged.

On March 5, 1954, I introduced a plan, published on page A1781 of the Congressional Record, called the private enterprise plan for Korea, which was designed to achieve the aforesaid purposes and objectives. The preamble to the plan described the struggle of President Rhee, one of the world's greatest and most courageous champions of capitalism and democracy, "to unloose from the backs of his people, the hated burden of Government ownership."

But, Mr. Speaker, we are today—just as we were last March 22, and indeed, as we have been since the war began in Korea—continuing blindly on our course, saddling upon President Rhee and his brave people, the very system of Government ownership and neocommunism that we sacrificed 140,000 American casualties and untold billions of dollars, to prevent. Was there ever before a more unbelievable, a more incredible paradox than to see America, the world champion of private enterprise, using the onerous taxes wrung from that very system, to create in the Republic of Korea, over the protests of its President, an economy comparable to that of our most deadly enemy, the U. S. S. R.?

Mr. Speaker, I have in vain sought to call the attention of the American people and their representatives here in the House and the Senate to that incredible paradox and to the cure for it, which lies ready to our hands. And now, before we become the laughing stock of the world, I shall try again.

Fortunately, many of our businessmen and industrialists—great and small—and some of our labor leaders have become aroused over our existing paradoxical and pernicious policies and practices in the Republic of Korea, and will aid and support the enactment of the amended version of House Concurrent Resolution 219, which is as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the House and the Senate that funds appropriated for the rehabilitation of the Republic of Korea, be separated from funds for relief and that all unexpended funds, together with all future funds appropriated solely for the rehabilitation of the Republic of Korea, be so expended as to assure therein a self-sufficient national economy based upon the rights of private property, personal freedom, and competitive enterprise.

World Tanker Fleets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER M. MUMMA

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 20, 1954

Mr. MUMMA. Mr. Speaker, there has been a great deal of discussion among the Members of the Congress within the past weeks concerning the action that should be taken to make certain that the United States maintains its lead in the ownership of tankers—a very slender lead at this time, I might say. There is difference of opinion as to just what kind of tankers can best serve our needs today, both as to speed and model.

A very interesting article having to do with this subject came across my desk this morning in the July 1954 issue of Marine Progress. It is entitled "World Tanker Fleets." I feel it will be of real interest and assistance to the Members of the House in their consideration of our tanker program. Pursuant to the privilege granted me, I include this article in these remarks. It is as follows:

World Tanker Fleets: Statistical Research Division of Sun Oil Co. Shows 2,502 Vessels of 23,473,000 Gross Tons as of December 31, 1952

Sharply stepped up foreign tankship construction continues to narrow the lead the United States has held since World War II in the ownership of tankers.

United States registry tankers now comprise only 26 percent of the carrying capacity of the world's ocean-going fleet while the United Kingdom has risen to 18 percent, Norway to 14.6 percent and Panama to 9.8 percent.

Immediately after World War II the United States owned 60 percent of the world's carrying capacity and no other nation owned more than 15 percent.

These facts are revealed in the 12th annual analysis of world tanker fleets made by the Statistical Research Division of Sun Oil Co.

The analysis showed a world tankship fleet of 2,502 vessels of 2,000 or more gross tons as of December 31, 1953. These ships aggregated 23,473,900 gross tons and 35,732,300 deadweight tons.

In terms of carrying capacity, the fleet was the equivalent of 2,003.5 T2-SE-A1 tankers, a World War II type used as a common denominator by the analyst. All countries' fleets were equated to an equivalent number of T2's of 16,765 deadweight tons each capable of steaming at 14.5 knots.

America's fading leadership is pointed up by the fact that at the end of 1953 there were on order or actually under construction in this country only 16 tankers totaling 385,000 deadweight tons which would fly the American flag.

This amounted to only 3.2 percent carrying capacity of the world total of 612 tankships comprising 13,053,000 deadweight tons on order or under construction.

In contrast, 164 ships of 3,200,000 deadweight tons were on order or under construction for Norway flag registry. This represented about 23.5 percent of all construction.

Only slightly smaller in magnitude was the program for the United Kingdom—137 tankers of nearly 3 million tons, or about 23 percent of the total.

Other principal recipients of tankers were France, Italy, Liberia, Netherlands, Panama, and Sweden, each of which exceeded the United States in this respect.

United Kingdom shipyards are the principal beneficiaries of orders for present tanker construction, the analysis shows. There 220 tankships were under order or being built as of the end of 1953. Total tonnage of more than 4,500,000 deadweight tons in this program comprised about 35 percent of the world's tanker construction.

In second place was Sweden with 101 tankers totaling more than 2 million deadweight tons, followed by Germany with 58 ships and the Netherlands with 62.

Total construction and orders in the United States numbered only 29 tankships of slightly more than 800,000 deadweight tons, or 6.7 percent of the world's total.

Although diminishing in comparative numbers, the United States flag fleet ranks above the world average when compared on the basis of ship size and speed.

This country's average of 14.8 knots is the fastest of the 4 major tanker-owning countries. Second among this group is Panama at 13.8 knots while Norway and the United Kingdom are both slower than the world average of 13.6 knots.

As recently as 1939, the United States fleet was rated at only 10.2 knots. United States and Panama tankships rank evenly as largest in average size at 15,700 deadweight tons in contrast to the world average of 14,300 deadweight tons. The 1953 average tonnage of the world fleet represented an increase of about 4½ percent within 15 months and a gain of approximately 14½ percent above the world average of 12,500 tons at the close of World War II.

Sun's analysts found in compiling tables that while the United States ship construction was low, the trend here is toward the supertanker. Average speed for new ships on order or under construction on December 31, 1953, is 16.5 knots and deadweight tonnage more than 24,000.

Also noted was that a greater portion of the United States fleet is approaching obsolescence than is true of the world fleet. While 89 percent of the United States fleet was constructed prior to the end of World War II (1945), the comparable figure for the world at large was only 56.7 percent.

Commemorative Postage Stamp in Recognition of Research and Achievement in the Field of Entomology

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. THYE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 20, 1954

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I have received a very interesting letter from Mr. T. L. Aamodt, director of the division of plant industry and State entomologist in Minnesota, and former president of the National Entomology Association, concerning a request to the Postmaster General for a commemorative stamp to mark 100 years of professional entomology. The proposed stamp would carry the slogan "Fight your insect enemies," one of the most familiar of which is, of course, the common house fly.

It seems to me that recognition should be given to the research and achievements in this field and to focus public attention on the needs and importance of the program of fighting the insect enemies of mankind. Mr. Aamodt is an authority in this field who has made a most worthy contribution of public service in Minnesota.

I ask unanimous consent that his letter, with its effective presentation of reasons for recognition of accomplishments in this beneficial field of scientific effort, be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

July 13, 1954.

Hon. Edward J. Thye,
Member of the Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Thye: We, in the State of Minnesota, urge you to lend your support in helping the profession of entomology obtain a 3-cent postage stamp issue from the Post Office Department for the purpose of more fully informing the general public regarding its insect problems.

I am a member of a committee representing professional entomologists in this State. The profession is now commemorating the 100th year. We are devoting our commemoration as an information program as a service to the public. One of the more important ways chosen to do this is through the medium of the postage stamp, a well-recognized method of focusing attention of the public to a specific problem.

Entomology plays a most important part in the everyday life of all the people of the world. All of man's possessions are affected directly or indirectly by one or more kinds of insects. It is a fact that if we did not control the insect scourges it would be impossible to produce in quantities needed to support the population of the United States, let alone supplying other parts of the world with food materials. In addition to the marked effects insects have on plants and domestic animals, they play a most important part in the health and comfort of mankind. Until the time of World War II, for instance, insect-borne diseases inflicted greater casualties on the armies of the world than did all the combined machines of war. The successful completion of World War II was possible only through control of insect vectors of human disease with knowledge supplied by entomologists from their efforts during the last 100 years.

Besides the tremendous economic effect insects inflict on man and his possessions, insects also play a vital role in man's welfare and prosperity as pollenizing agents, as biological agents in keeping the noxious species of insects and other animals in check, as well as in producing products of enormous commercial importance. Entomologists therefore are confronted with the dual task of reducing damages caused by harmful species and protecting and safeguarding beneficial forms. To carry out this herculean task, education is a most important matter.

It is important, therefore, that all our people know and appreciate the story of entomology. We believe a commemorative stamp bringing this subject to the attention of our people would aid materially in carrying out this great responsibility.

In Minnesota we have now established in my office of the State entomologist what I believe is an extremely efficient insect detection and information service. We have a staff of high caliber entomologists who are able to determine in numerous instances in advance what the farmer must do to save his crop from insect and plant disease enemies.

The grasshopper situation is now such that we actually feel there should never be any excuse for tremendous outbreaks in the future due to our methods of detection and control. You have noticed in numerous of our releases that our program is now one of prevention because of the adoption of new scientific methods which we have brought into this field of work. At the present time, we are dealing with an outbreak of armyworm. Because the outbreak was detected early enough, excellent control is now being carried out by thousands of farmers in southern and western Minnesota. The forest tent caterpillar of northern Minnesota has been successfully and efficiently dealt with during its periodic outbreak.

The close coordination between extension, research, teaching and regulatory work in this State is unusual and outstanding. The control of insects in Minnesota because of the adoption of scientific and up-to-date methods is a far cry from even 15 to 20 years ago. It is absolutely necessary that we continue to make insect control more efficient if we are going to continue to supply the necessary food and other materials from plants in years to come.

Sincerely yours,

T. L. Aamodt,
Director and State Entomologist.

Gamble Urges Foreclosure on Tin Firm

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE E. KILBURN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 20, 1954

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, I insert herewith an article from the Wall Street Journal. Also an AP dispatch from the Mamaroneck Daily Times, quoting some statements from the Honorable Ralph A. Gamble. Our respected and able colleague, Mr. Gamble, is vice chairman of the Joint House-Senate Committee on Defense Production and he acted as chairman to conduct the hearings on the United States Tin Corp. operations.

I know the Members of the House and the country will be interested in these articles which follow:

[From the Wall Street Journal]

Representative Gamble Proposes Government Foreclose United States Tin's Operations—Committee Told Firm Has Gotten $3 Million in United States Loans But Has Produced Little Metal

Washington.—Representative Gamble, Republican, New York, proposed the Government foreclose on the United States Tin Corp. operations at Lone River, Alaska, and get what money out of it we can.

"That would cost money, but it will cost more money if this foolishness goes on," he told a Senate-House Committee on Defense Production, of which he is a member.

The joint committee has heard evidence that United States Tin obtained $3 million in direct or insured loans from the Government since 1951, while producing practically no tin from its Alaskan mine, 90 miles north of Nome.

Mr. Gamble's foreclosure suggestion came after a Government auditor testified that Kenneth Kadow, while assistant to Democratic Secretary of the Interior Oscar Chapman, was hired secretly by United States Tin 2 months before the company obtained its first Government-guaranteed loan of $375,000.

The committee has heard previous testimony that Mr. Kadow lobbied for Government approval of the loan.

Clifford Smith, auditor for the General Services Administration in San Francisco, told the committee he discovered Mr. Kadow's early connection with the company through a study of its records.

He said he found in the proceedings of United States Tin's board of directors the acceptance in December 1950, of an employment contract with Mr. Kadow, to be effective April 15, 1951.

Mr. Kadow was then responsible to the Secretary of the Interior for checking on all Alaskan development affecting the Interior Department.

Mr. Kadow said in Juneau, Alaska, last week that any inference that he supported the United States Tin application for a loan just to create a job for himself is 100 percent false.

There is no question about his supporting the loan in the interests of Alaskan development, he said, but it was prior to any idea on his part or of company officials that he would join the corporation. He has been asked to testify at executive sessions of the joint committee beginning July 26.

[From the Mamaroneck Daily Times of July 14, 1954]

Gamble Urges Foreclosures on Tin Firm

Washington.—A Governmentment auditor testified yesterday that Kenneth Kadow, while assistant to former Interior Secretary Oscar Chapman, was hired secretly by the United States Tin Corp. Two months before the Alaska firm obtained a Government-guaranteed loan.

Clifford Smith, auditor for the General Services Administration in San Francisco, told the Senate-House Committee on Defense Production that he had learned this from a study of the company's records.

The congressional group is looking into the Government's lending of $3 million to a company which has produced virtually no tin.

With Mr. Smith's testimony, Republican Gamble, Republican, New York, said: "Let's foreclose this thing and get what Government money out of it we can. That would cost money, but it will cost more money if this foolishness goes on."

Mr. Smith said he found in the records of United States Tin's board of directors the acceptance in December, 1950, of "an employment contract" with Mr. Kadow, to be effective April 15, 1951. A stockholder meeting approved the action in January, 1951, Mr. Smith said.

Mr. Kadow was then responsible to Mr. Chapman, cabinet officer under President Truman, for checking all Interior Department programs affecting Alaskan development. In earlier testimony, Mr. Kadow had been described as "lobbying" for approval of the firm's first Government-guaranteed bank loan of $375.

James A. Farley, a Prospective Democratic Nominee for Governor of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 20, 1954

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record three editorials with respect to the suggested nomination by the Democratic Party of former Postmaster General James A. Farley to be governor of New York.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Poughkeepsie New Yorker of June 8, 1954]

Measure of Two Men

Through a combination of circumstances, Dutchess County had the opportunity last weekend to see two outstanding representatives of the Democratic Party and to take their measures, Representative Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., spoke at a 1954 victory dinner in Poughkeepsie, and former Postmaster General James A. Farley spoke at the James V. Forrestal school dedication in Beacon.

At the close of a day, this side-by-side appraisal of the two men left no doubt that in Mr. Roosevelt the Democrats have the politician, in Mr. Farley the statesman.

The coincidence in the public appearance of these two Democrats in Dutchess County on the same day, is matched in the further coincidence that both are viewed as party candidates for governor this year. Judged by what Dutchess County saw, leadership enthusiasm is for Mr. Roosevelt to be the candidate. Measured by the enthusiasm shown for Mr. Farley in Beacon, and gaged by the content of his dedicatory speech Mr. Farley has both popularity among the people, and a diplomacy and openheartedness which create about him an aura of idealism in a measurement of a man for the job of governor.

Had the stage been set purposely, and the speeches authored by a playwright, there hardly could have been created a sharper contrast of two personalities than that exemplified by Mr. Farley on the one hand and Representative Roosevelt on the other.

The pose and the words of Representative Roosevelt were wholly political: "I'm available for the * * * nomination; I'll carry the fight to Governor Dewey from now on; I'll welcome an opportunity to discuss current issues in every county and community between now and election day."

The attitude and the remarks of Mr. Farley were comforting, wise, reflective. In Beacon spoke a Democrat whose words came from the heart, whose mind dwelt on a long record of devoted public service and looked forward to a greater future for America: "Our God, our parents, and our children come first; Americanism consists of teaching the great truths of freedom * * * of all sorts; our form of government is for us the best form; we are living in a world of neighbors; education, above all, must build character; all teaching must be free of dogma, must be humane, must be useful."

Democrats of New York State know, as Dutchess County Democrats had so clearly demonstrated to them last weekend, the measures of both Mr. Farley and Representative Roosevelt as gubernatorial aspirants. Right now the pendulum swings to Representative Roosevelt for the nomination.

On the basis of Dutchess County's side-by-side look at the two men, New York State Democrats could be committing the year's prize political blunder in looking so sharply away from Mr. Farley as the time approaches for making the major party decision of 1954.

[From the Rockland County Journal-News of June 23, 1954]

Heard and Seen

(By Frank Ernest)

PRIMARIES AND THE ELECTION: FARLEY FOR GOVERNOR

But we've got a big job to do in the State this year and I think the Rockland County Democratic Committee is really sitting on its hands unless it moves—and very quickly—to endorse former Postmaster General James A. Farley as its choice for Governor of New York State. Mr. Balch and Mr. DeSapio may have Rockland under their thumbs, politics being what it is, but it is my opinion that Rockland—Jim Farley's native county—should move out to the forefront and give him its endorsement.

Far be it from me to tell the Democrats what they should do. But one thing is for sure in my mind. One New York newspaper says Governor Dewey will quit at the end of this term. The Dewey office indicates that he hasn't made up his mind. "Junior" Roosevelt is playing around with the idea that he might be induced to become the

Democratic candidate for governor. May I remind the Democrats that "Junior" was turned down by the Democratic organization, accepted the Liberal nomination for a congressional post, licked the whey out of the Democratic organization candidate in a district in which he didn't even live and went to Congress where, as far as I have been able to determine, his record has been no hits and no runs, principally because he has been riding the bench most of the time.

If the Democrats want to win this election, they've got to do something about it, such as sidetracking "Junior" ROOSEVELT. He has a brother running for Congress in California. But let's skip the Roosevelts, as many in the country would like to do. And let's recognize that the best potential winner in the Democratic camp for the office of governor is Rockland County's own James A. Farley. It would be my best advice to Rockland County Democrats to get out from under the thumbs of Mr. Balch and Mr. DeSapio and take a stand of their own by meeting and endorsing Mr. Farley. If the chairman would call a meeting to decide on candidates I have no doubt that the committeemen would go along with such a resolution, practically without dissent.

[From the Newburgh News of July 2, 1954]

NEWBURGH LEAFER TO BACK MR. FARLEY

Fred A. Mulholland, one of Newburgh's Democratic stalwarts, has announced his candidacy for delegate to the State convention with the awoved purpose of supporting James A. Farley for the nomination for governor. The former Postmaster General and Democratic national chairman is a man of great ability, sound judgment, and keen business understanding. Of all persons mentioned for the governorship on the Democratic ticket, he is the most qualified, standing head and shoulders above others.

Mr. Farley is a Hudson River man and is connected with business interest in this area. It is not known whether he is interested in the governorship, but we think his party owes him the nomination.

Herman L. Perry, Prized Citizen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PATRICK J. HILLINGS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 20, 1954

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, June 10, Herman L. Perry, of Whittier, Calif., passed away. His life and works inspired many of his fellow Californians to work for the benefit of their fellow citizens. These people range from Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON to hundreds of others whose identity will never be known.

I am proud that I have known Herman Perry and have had the opportunity to work with him and observe some of his efforts on behalf of community betterment. His loss leaves a gap which will be most difficult to fill.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to place in the RECORD at this point an editorial of the Whittier News, dated June 12, 1954, which describes the work of Herman Perry. I also wish to include a column from the same newspaper by its editor, Mr. Mel Rich. The articles follow:

HERMAN PERRY'S LIFE STANDS AS AN INSPIRATION TO ALL IN WHITTIER

There is no structure of words that will accurately reflect Whittier's loss in the death of Herman L. Perry.

He was a pioneer, a fine family man and father, a notably successful business executive in the competitive field of banking; a political worker who made the Republican Party proud to call him it own, a man with the vision to urge a young fellow like DICK NIXON to enter the political arena; a civic leader without peer for hard work and remarkable leadership, in all things a responsible citizen; and yet a man far more than all of these, a member of the community with an indefinable quality which all recognize but few can express.

Possibly as apt an example as any other was Perry's position during a recent campaign over a school-tax proposal in Whittier. Perry was neither for the tax nor against it. His only concern was that in the controversial campaign Whittier should not be split down the middle. He had no desire to see his hometown divided.

Such emphasis on the large consideration was symbolic of Perry's life in Whittier. His was the kind of hometown spirit that lifted itself above the petty and unimportant.

The thousands who knew him can find comfort in the fact that his passing came swiftly. A few hours earlier he had been at his desk writing letters to his friends. Less than a month ago he had confided to a personal friend that for a man of his years he felt overworked and was carrying too many civic responsibilities. How typical of Herman Perry that this was true. He had shouldered such tasks for more than 40 years.

Only rarely as the generations pass does a place like Whittier produce a leader like Perry whose influence is felt so long in so many phases of community life; all constructive influences, too.

We can only deeply mourn his passing, confessing that the years inevitably must take their toll.

But we can find strength and inspiration in the life he spent here and the record he leaves for matchless personal attainment.

Surely no Whittierite could have done more.

HERMAN L. PERRY, PRIZED CITIZEN

(By Mel Rich)

Whittier has lost still another outstanding citizen.

The passing of Herman L. Perry came as a shock to the entire community, and it leaves an emptiness in this great area which thrived on his countless contributions.

Throughout nearly 50 years as a leader of just about every worthwhile civic endeavor and accomplishment, Herman Perry gave of his time unselfishly.

His many interests testified to the old adage: To get a job done, give it to a busy man.

For at the time of his death Herman Perry was serving as chairman of the Whittier Chamber of Commerce road committee, member of the citizens of Los Angeles County transportation committee, member of the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce rapid transit committee embracing both the county and Los Angeles City.

He was a director of the Presbyterian Intercommunity Hospital board of directors (requiring at least an hour of his time daily), chairman of the site committee which surveyed this entire area for a location for the proposed hospital.

He was a director of the San Gabriel Valley Associated Chambers of Commerce, a member of the road committee of the associated chambers, member of the efficiency committee of the First Friends Church.

Only a few months ago he completed 13 months as a member of the city of Whittier charter advisory committee.

* * * * *

He was confidential adviser to two corporations.

He just recently headed up the campaign of Harlan Wood for Whittier City Council.

He was the senior partner of the firm Perry-Monahan realtors.

Just recently Herman Perry was heard to remark:

"I am 70 years old and I need a rest. Sometimes it is later than you might think."

But the need for rest didn't deter him from his great interest and services in community affairs.

Throughout his life here he was devoted to the betterment of not only Whittier but also the neighboring communities.

Herman Perry was a great Republican and pouring into his son and daughter have been messages of regret from Republican leaders all over the Nation, of course, and words of tribute from Democrats as well.

He was a man who could stand firmly for some things and yet hold the respect of his foes.

Gifts to his hometown, county, the State, and Nation are immeasurable.

In simple language, Herman Perry has left a lot to be remembered for.

Republicans and Democrats alike will miss Whittier's "Mr. Republican."

Polish Contribution to America Stressed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY W. WIER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 20, 1954

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include an article from the Minneapolis Morning Tribune of Wednesday, July 7, 1954, by Stanley M. Brya, of Minneapolis, Minn., entitled "Polish Contribution to America Stressed."

The article is as follows:

POLISH CONTRIBUTION TO AMERICA STRESSED

To the EDITOR:

Many Americans don't know that American history records are replete with examples of valor and sacrifices of Polish soldiers who fought and died for America's independence.

The Poles had 18 officers and innumerable privates in the Continental Army. Of the 18 officers, 6 were mortally wounded, sacrificing their lives at the altar of America's freedom. Foremost among them was Brigadier General Pulaski, a bighearted, chivalrous man, who met with a heroic death on October 9, 1779, while leading a furious charge near Savannah.

Many hundreds of other Polish soldiers fought bravely for the independence of America, and it is to their memories that John A. Joyce, American poet, dedicates the following four lines: "Polish heroes in their might fought in freedom's holy fight, brilliant as the stars of night, to maintain the pure and right."

Following the Revolutionary War, the Polish people in their native land embarked upon a migration. Let it be understood that the Polish lands were at about this time incorporated into the domains of the three predatory powers, Germany, Austria, and Russia, and after several unsuccessful attempts to free their country of the shackles of its enemies, a great number of Poles departed for America seeking political and religious freedom. Many men of learning were included. This immigration brought to America the noble culture of Poland as well as its lofty ideals of equality and liberty.

Today Poland is again ruled by foreign oppressors and many of her best citizens are scattered throughout the world. We know how tragic this situation is, yet the stubborn refusal of the Polish people to surrender faith in eventual freedom inspires all of us in our continuing efforts to create conditions which will permit freedom to prevail everywhere.

STANLEY M. BYRA.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.

Let's Encourage Defection in the Communist World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PATRICK J. HILLINGS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 20, 1954

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, earlier this year I introduced H. R. 8000, a bill to encourage defection in the Communist world. As a result of testimony I heard recently in Europe as a member of the Committee on Communist Aggression, of which our colleague and gentleman from Wisconsin is chairman, I am more convinced that our country must use every avenue of approach to encourage the breakup of the Red empire behind the Iron Curtain. I shall have more to say on this later.

I wish to place in the RECORD at this point an article I prepared for the July 1954 issue of American Mercury:

LET'S ENCOURAGE DEFECTION IN THE COMMUNIST WORLD

(By Representative PATRICK J. HILLINGS)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Mr. HILLINGS, a youthful, energetic, Republican Congressman from California, believes that one of the things the free world needs is more Gouzenkos. He has introduced a bill in Congress which he believes will accomplish just that. The American Mercury is affording him this space to explain to our readers the purpose of his bill.)

Scattered through the Iron Curtain countries, and in their numerous embassies, missions and underground cells in the non-Communist countries, are thousands of Government officials, Army, Navy, air and intelligence officers, and secret agents who have thoroughly sickened of the Red conspiracy.

All of our intelligence reports indicate this, and the statement is fully borne out by past experience.

Many of these disillusioned Communists hold key posts in their governments, have developed skills, training and experience that make them invaluable to the Communist cause, notwithstanding the indifference with which they may discharge their tasks.

Many of them possess secret information which would be extremely valuable to our own intelligence services both in assessing the strength, the plans and the ambitions of the Reds, and in uprooting the underground spy and sabotage networks that they have built up in every non-Communist country.

Moreover, we have every reason to believe that hundreds of these disaffected Reds would risk the hazards of flight, or if already abroad, would openly desert the Communist cause, if they had any assurance of safe asylum for themselves and their families.

Igor Gouzenko, the former Soviet Embassy employee whose defection exposed Communist espionage activities in the United States, and Canada, said in a recent interview that the strongest deterring factor he had to overcome in arriving at his decision was the fear that the Canadian and United States authorities would deport him to the Soviet Union. And he well knew what he and his family could expect should that happen.

The purpose of the bill I introduced (H. R. 8000, the Political Asylum Act of 1954) is simply to eliminate that fear. Under explicitly stated principles, it would guarantee political asylum in the United States to Communist officials and their families, subject to certain explicitly stated reservations. The bill is definitely not a refugee bill, and it would have no effect, one way or the other, on the ordinary refugee. The Communist asking for political asylum would have to comply with the following provisions:

1. He would have to be an employee of a Government designated by the Secretary of State as Communist, or a member of its army, navy, or air force, foreign service, security or intelligence agencies.

2. He would have to renounce his allegiance to the Communist country's government, and to international communism.

3. He would have to possess some information, or other asset (scientific ability, for instance) of special value to the security of the United States, and be willing to make that information or those special assets available to the proper authorities.

4. He would have to be willing to cooperate in the fight against communism.

5. He would have to be declared by competent United States officials as not a menace to the security of the United States.

The bill authorizes the issuance of up to 1,000 special, nonimmigrant visas to applicants meeting those requirements. The individual Communist officials, of course, would have to take the chance on his ability to satisfy our officials of his sincerity. The Secretary of State would be authorized to revoke the visa at any time he deemed it in the best interests of the United States, a necessary precaution, I believe, against efforts by the Reds to plant spies and false information.

The supporters of the bill, and I emphatically include myself, feel it would achieve three things:

It would increase the uneasiness, distrust, and chaos prevailing behind the Iron Curtain every time an official defects to our side.

It would deny to the Communist countries whatever skills and experiences the defecting officials might possess.

And it would bring to us an indeterminate supply of extremely valuable information.

It is, of course, just one more potential weapon that could be used by our side in the cold war. And I strongly believe that we should employ every single weapon, great or small, that might possibly be used to our advantage.

Red Overthrow in Italy Predicted

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 20, 1954

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an article which appeared in the American Federation of Labor News-Reporter under date of July 16, 1954:

RED OVERTHROW IN ITALY PREDICTED

(By Syd Stogel, Rome correspondent, AFL News-Reporter)

ROME, ITALY.—An Italian-born American trade-union official who has just concluded a 6-week study tour of the labor movement in this country predicts the defeat of communism in Italy, "but it's going to take a lot of fight and sacrifice by the forces of democracy to do the job."

The union officials is Vanni B. Montana, educational director of the ILGWU's New York Local 89, considered one of the best informed observers of the Italian political and labor scene. Montana arrived in Italy last May with a group of 72 American trade unionists of Italian descent who came on a combined good-will mission and vacation. While the rest of the group has already returned home, Montana left Rome only last week to visit Stockholm, Brussels, and other cities before flying back to New York.

During his stay in Italy, Montana talked to and visited workers and peasants in such cities as Florence, Bologna, Milan, Turin, Genoa, Naples, Catania, Messina, Palermo, and Rome.. In the course of his grueling schedule of speeches and meetings from one end of the peninsula to the other he was able to get a first-hand view of Italy's labor movement and what he found induced him to remark that he returns to the United States with a feeling of moderate optimism.

Admitting that communism in the ranks of Italian labor was still a serious menace to democracy, Montana said he thought the turning point had been reached and whereever he went he saw signs of free labor's mounting strength.

"I was especially glad to see," he said, "that the free trade unions are making serious inroads against the powerful Red CGIL federations in the south. It is in this region that communism has been concentrating all its strongest forces and its unlimited funds and equipment to exploit the misery there for its own nefarious ends.

"In Catania and other southern cities I met young trade unionists who were putting up a splendid fight against the CGIL, where it had previously been unchallenged."

Montana said he was lucky to be in Italy during the time the free trade unions here signed their recent nationwide collective bargaining agreement for industrial workers that is being hailed as free labor's biggest victory since the fall of fascism.

"This agreement," the New York labor leader pointed out, "is a tremendous step forward for the democratic unions. It marks the first time that free labor has been able to bypass the Communist CGIL, and for the first time in its history the CGIL is completely isolated. This accord may well be the starting point for the free unions to eventually ease out the CGIL, and finally dominate the labor picture in Italy."

Montana also commented on the schism between Italy's two free labor federations, CISL, and the UIL.

"That differences are much less now," he said, "and while no complete agreement has been reached as yet, they are cooperating with each other more than ever before. You might say that they have reached a sort of nonaggression pact."

On the not-too-bright side Montana charged that Italian industrialists are directly and indirectly contributing huge sums of money to the Italian Communist Party.

"I am bringing back with me to the United States," he revealed, "evidence that a number of reactionary businessmen here are contributing big money to the Communists through exports of goods—including strategic contraband material—to the Iron Curtain countries."

The ILGWU official was also critical of American aid to Italy programs in that he thought too little of this aid is being passed on to the workingman.

"People here do not see the benefits of American aid, * * *" he stated.

An Old American Custom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT P. MORANO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 20, 1954

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I wish to include an editorial from the Bridgeport (Conn.) Post of July 17 on the subject of the damage rendered the hatting industry by Vice President Nixon's frequent appearances in public minus a hat.

The editorial suggests that it might behoove the Vice President to visit the Connecticut hat factories, where he will get perfect quality and fit, and perhaps start a boom in the hatting industry.

While I do not subscribe to the idea of public officials lending their prestige to boost commercial products, I sincerely believe that men to whom the public looks for leadership should let no opportunity pass to bolster American free enterprise, to help such great industries as the hat industry, and to preserve and foster such age-old mores of the civilized world as the wearing of a hat.

A Hat for Hatless Nixon

It might be all right for plain Richard Nixon, ordinary United States citizen, to go without a hat if he wants to. There's no statute on any books saying he must wear one.

But as Richard Nixon, Vice President of the United States, it's another story, and the distinguished Californian was told just that by Congressman Al Morano. There's no law forcing Vice Presidents to wear hats, but there is an old American custom.

Even if the 41-year-old Vice President doesn't clamp a hat on his head every time he leaves the house, at least when he's being photographed, if he would only hold a hat in his hand, the Congressman told him, he "would do much a destroy a sartorial virus known as hatlessness which could do much harm to one of America's first and largest industries."

Representing the two leading hat manufacturing centers in the world, Norwalk and Danbury, Congressman Morano (who always wears a hat) keeps his constituency in mind, and he's not letting anyone forget it—not even the Vice President.

Mr. Morano pointed out to Mr. Nixon the sartorial elegance of Sir Winston Churchill and British Foreign Secretary Anthony Eden who were in Washington recently. Far from succumbing to the hatless fad, the two top British politicians added to their dignity by being properly crowned.

The Congressman further told the Vice President that he would be happy to present him with several hats, products of both Norwalk and Danbury. All he has to do is to furnish his size and the style he likes, and the Congressman will do the rest.

It might be a good idea for the Vice President to visit the Connecticut hat factories where he will get perfect quality and fit and perhaps start a boom in the hatting industry. He might even create a style to be known as the Nixon topper.

Opinion Poll Report for the 11th Congressional District of Massachusetts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 20, 1954

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I am more than happy at this time to place in the Congressional Record the tabulated results of a questionnaire which I sent early this spring to the residents of the district which I represent here in the House of Representatives.

My objectives in sponsoring this referendum were threefold:

First. To promote responsible citizenship by stimulating the widest possible discussion and understanding of major legislative issues of current concern;

Second. To determine in broad terms, for my own benefit, the attitudes and opinions of my constituents on these issues; and

Third. To enable me to present to Congress, for its consideration, the views of an important segment of the voting population.

The number of responses which I have received has been most gratifying, and I am proud of the active, aroused public interest in governmental affairs which has been displayed.

FOREIGN POLICY

1. Do you approve of the present method of handling our international relations? Yes, 1,761; no, 2,537; no opinion, 754.

2. Do you believe that the United States Government should continue our foreign-aid program? Yes, 3,094; no, 1,605, no opinion, 635.

3. Do you feel that we should continue military aid to foreign nations? Yes, 3,378; no, 1,122; no opinion, 734.

4. Do you favor the continuation of economic aid to foreign nations? Yes, 3,162; no, 1,360; no opinion, 712.

5. Do you support the point 4 program (supplying technical assistance, manufacturing know-how, and management skills to undeveloped nations to help them help themselves)? Yes, 3,235; no, 530; no opinion, 979.

(a) Do you believe this program should be reduced? Yes, 510; no, 1,413; no opinion, 1,048.

6. Do you believe that Russia should be permitted to remain in the United Nations? Yes, 2,274; no, 2,110; no opinion, 850.

7. Do you believe that Communist China should be seated in the United Nations? Yes, 723; no, 3,907; no opinion, 604.

TARIFF POLICY

1. Do you suport the present methods of handling tariffs? Yes, 902; no, 2,021; no opinion, 2,311.

2. Do you believe that foreign goods should come into the United States regardless of the effect that it may have on the American worker? Yes, 743; no, 3,538; no opinion, 953.

3. Do you understand the present Government method of handling tariffs? Yes, 1,714; no, 2,124; no opinion, 1,396.

STATEHOOD

1. Do you favor conferring statehood on—

(a) Alaska? Yes, 3,810; no, 1,676; no opinion, 689.

(b) Hawaii? Yes, 3,830; no, 694; no opinion, 710.

TAX POLICY

1. Do you believe that the Federal Government should spend more money than it receives in income? Yes, 1,685; no, 2,693; no opinion, 856.

If opposed, which of these steps would you take?

(a) Keep taxes high? Yes, 1,240; no, 1,430; no opinion, 2,564.

(b) Cut domestic spending? Yes, 1,940; no, 983; no opinion, 2,157.

2. Do you feel taxes should be cut more than they already have been? Yes, 1,796; no, 1,940; no opinion, 1,498.

3. Do you support an increase in the exemption for dependents? Yes, 2,881; no, 1,598; no opinion, 855.

4. Do you favor cutting income taxes across the board percentagewise? Yes, 1,586; no, 2,540; no opinion, 1,077.

5. Do you believe in more exemption for dividends and other unearned income? Yes, 1,208; no, 2,339; no opinion, 1,087.

6. Do you support exemptions to cover expenses for college education? Yes, 2,581; no, 1,956; no opinion, 697.

7. Do you favor an exemption for the first $1,500 of retired income? Yes, 2,568; no, 1,744; no opinion, 922.

SOCIAL SECURITY, HEALTH, AND WELFARE

1. Do you believe that the present 2 percent social security tax on the employee should be maintained? Yes, 3,551; no, 839; no opinion, 844.

2. Do you believe it should be returned to 1½ percent? Yes, 807; no, 3,174; no opinion, 1,260.

3. Do you support an increase in old-age assistance benefits? Yes, 3,608; no, 764; no opinion, 762.

4. Do you favor an increase in the death benefits under social security? Yes, 2,986; no, 1,435; no opinion, 1,148.

5. Do you believe that hospitalization, sickness and accident insurance should be covered by Federal law? Yes, 1,825; no, 2,527; no opinion, 882.

HOUSING

1. Do you believe that more low-cost housing should be built by the State and Federal governments? Yes, 2,906; no, 1,631; no opinion, 697.

2. Do you believe these should be multiple-unit dwellings? Yes, 992; no, 1,878; no opinion, 1,547.

3. Do you believe they should be in three-family units? Yes, 1,074; no, 1,758; no opinion, 1,585.

LABOR

1. Are you in favor of raising the minimum wage? Yes, 3,183; no, 1,283; no opinion, 768.

2. Do you feel this would be helpful to New England insofar as competing with the Southern States is concerned? Yes, 2,428; No, 1,442; no opinion, 1,364.

3. In your opinion could small business afford an increase? Yes, 2,198; no, 1,310; no opinion, 1,726.

4. Do you believe that the Taft-Hartley Act is fair to management and labor? Yes, 1,506; no, 1,755; no opinion, 1,156.

(a) Would you favor outright repeal? Yes, 762; no, 2,902; no opinion, 1,570.

(b) Would you favor changes through amendments? Yes, 2,986; no, 698; no opinion, 1,550.

5. Are there sections of this law which you feel are oppressive to workers? Yes, 2,332; no, 1,374; no opinion, 1,528.

6. Are there in your opinion, sections which are oppressive to small business? Yes, 1,805; no, 1,342; no opinion, 2,187.

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

1. Do you understand the questions involved in the St. Lawrence seaway? Yes, 2,584; no, 1,341; no opinion, 1,309.

2. Do you feel that the construction of the seaway would hurt employment in our area? Yes, 1,481; no, 2,022; no opinion, 1,731.

3. Do you believe the St. Lawrence seaway would hurt the future economy of the New England area? Yes, 1,591; no 1,876; no opinion, 1,767.

VOTING AGE

1. Do you believe that persons who are 18 years old should be given the right to vote in national elections? Yes, 1,897; no, 2,832; no opinion, 505.

LOCAL ISSUES

1. Do you believe that the port of Boston should have more Federal assistance? Yes, 3,362; no, 715; no opinion, 1,157.

2. In your opinion, is the Federal Government treating New England fairly on the policy of defense cutbacks? Yes, 809; no, 2,399; no opinion, 2,026.

Bridges at Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 20, 1954

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD 2 editorials, 1 being entitled "Bridge of Contention," which was published in the Washington Post and Times Herald of July 19, 1954; and the other being entitled "Planning Bottleneck," which was published in the Washington Evening Star of July 20.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post of July 19, 1954]

BRIDGE OF CONTENTION

It is dismaying to have the same chorus of opposition that has frustrated previous plans for an upstream Potomac River bridge now rejecting Senator CASE's proposal for a new crossing at New Hampshire Avenue NW. The Highway Department was headstrong in trying too long to bull through its plan for a bridge at E Street, but the prize for stubbornness now certainly shifts to the National Capital Planning Commission. At least the Highway Department moderated its position. But the NCPC has compromised not one whit. It seems determined to prove that it will sanction no plan that is not its own idea.

The opposition of the Theodore Roosevelt Association in the circumstances is understandable, if not entirely supportable; although the New Hampshire Avenue span would not touch Theodore Roosevelt Island proper, it would make use of tiny South Island which was included in the Association's original gift. But the NCPC opposition seems to derive from its insistence that its scheme for a bridge at Roaches Run take precedence over everything else. This is doubly unfortunate, for it tends to make an "either-or" proposition of the bridge problem when spans at both sides would be desirable—though in our opinion the New Hampshire Avenue crossing is the more urgently needed.

At any rate, the continued spat demonstrates clearly that if the area is to get approval of any new bridge at this session of Congress, it will have to be the Jones Point Bridge at Alexandria. This proposal has plenty of merits on its own, and we hope the Senate can be persuaded to see beyond the squabble and join the House in approval of Jones Point. At the same time, it is easy to understand why legislators become impatient over trying to do things for the District of Columbia. In the present controversy, at least, the National Capital Planning Commission seems to be trying to outdo Russia on the United Nations Security Council. Must cars continue to pile up until the terms of NCPC members expire or the staff changes before there can be any agreement to relieve bridge congestion?

[From the Evening Star of July 20, 1954]

PLANNING BOTTLENECK

Washington's traffic is not the only sufferer from bottleneck trouble. Planning has become a victim of the ailment, too. In fact, the bottleneck that has developed in the planning field is aggravating conditions in the traffic field. Right now the worst bottleneck is that affecting bridge construction. There appears to be little hope of bridge relief until something is done to break the bridge-planning jam.

Chairman CASE, of a Senate District subcommittee studying bridge sites on the Potomac River, has learned firsthand about the bridge-planning tieup as a result of his efforts to get action on a central-area bridge project. In a spirit of compromise, he suggested a site on the line of New Hampshire Avenue as a substitute for the District Highway Department's E Street proposal. The Highway Department, concerned with the growing traffic congestion on present bridges, agreed to go along with the compromise plan. But Chairman CASE reckoned without the National Capital Planning Commission. The spirit of compromise has been noticeably lacking at NCPC headquarters for a long time, when it comes to Potomac River bridges not proposed by the NCPC staff. It was so with the 14th Street twin-bridge project, with the East Capitol Street Bridge, and now with the central-area crossing.

Harland Bartholomew, NCPC chairman, told the subcommittee that while he believes a central-area bridge eventually will be necessary, his Commission wants more time to make up its mind on a location. It is his "intention," he said, to have staff studies completed by next January. But the plan for a central-area bridge is not something new. The Commission should have been studying this needed facility for years, not months. There is no assurance that the Commission will be ready to take a positive stand on any bridge site in the central area by next January or the one following.

Meanwhile, traffic congestion daily gets worse on all the existing bridges. The Jones Point Bridge at Alexandria, on which all agencies are agreed, is expected to handle about 15,000 cars a day. Yet the Commission cannot come to a decision on the more urgently needed central-area span, which highway officials predict will be used by four times the daily traffic load of the Alexandria bridge. It is high time that the Planning Commission concentrated attention on a site for the central-area bridge—one somewhere between the Memorial and Key Bridges. It should not take many more months to settle on a site for a bridge which has been under discussion for years.

Ballot Termed Biggest Enemy of Fluoridation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY W. WIER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 20, 1954

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include an article from the Minneapolis Morning Tribune by C. O. Castledine, Windom, Minn., entitled "Ballot Termed Biggest Enemy of Fluoridation."

The article is as follows:

BALLOT TERMED BIGGEST ENEMY OF FLUORIDATION

To the EDITOR:

Your report of the Minnesota poll (June 10) showing 65 percent of a selected 53 percent of the people favoring fluoridation of community water supplies does not compare very favorably with ballots cast by Minnesota residents in referendum elections regarding this issue.

As far as I can find, there is not a town in Minnesota with a fluorine compound artificially added to its drinking water which put it in with approval of a referendum vote.

The biggest enemy of water fluoridation is the ballot of the American public. The proponents of this measure are aware of this and in most towns, including Minneapolis and St. Paul, they have seen fit to sidestep the informed public opinion and sell the local politicians on water fluoridation.

For over 3 years the Minnesota Junior Chamber of Commerce has backed the fluoridation of public water supplies but the chapters have been denied approval by the people in their own communities. This includes the home town of the State Jaycee fluoridation chairman. In some towns they were able to win the approval of the city council. Also, I am still looking for a proponent who wants fluorine on the teeth of his own children enough to apply it by other means when his fellow citizens deny him their public water supply for his experimentation.

The only difference in the Minnesota poll findings and the actual election returns is that the poll was dealing with generalized opinions over a wide area while the latter groups turned in different verdicts after a fair and thorough coverage of the facts by both lines of thought.

An example of this is the fact that the Chicago City Council (not the voting public) recently approved fluoridating city water while the citizens of LaCrosse, Wis., voted it down by slightly less than 3 to 1 after the city had already spent some $18,000 for fluoridation equipment.

C. O. CASTLEDINE.

WINDOM, MINN.

The Perversion of Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 14, 1954

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following article written by our distinguished colleague in the Senate, the Honorable LISTER HILL, appeared in the July 19, 1954, edition of the New Republic magazine.

Senator HILL, among other important social legislation, is the coauthor of the TVA Act.

I am pleased to commend his words to the attention of this body.

On Thursday, the 17th of June, after 5 months of waiting, the meaning of the President's budget message with respect to the Tennessee Valley Authority became crystal clear.

No money was requested in the budget to provide new generating capacity on the TVA power system. As an alternative, the message stated that "arrangements are being made to reduce, by the fall of 1957, existing commitments" of the TVA to the Atomic Energy Commission by 500,000 to 600,000 kilowatts. The plan, as it was generally understood, was for AEC to find a private supplier to take over a portion of the TVA commitment to furnish power to the AEC at Paducah, Ky. It was understood that if satisfactory arrangements for such an additional power supply were not developed, a request for supplemental funds would be submitted at this session of the Congress in time to permit TVA to begin construction of new capacity.

In the same budget message the Congress and the public were advised that the decision was contingent not only upon the success of these arrangements to find another power supplier for AEC at Paducah but also upon the assumption that there would be no increase in the total national-defense demands on the TVA power system.

The people of the TVA region, the friends of TVA in Congress, responsible opinion everywhere assumed the message was submitted with some understanding of the problems and in good faith. We waited to be advised of the results of the explorations AEC was reported to be making. Some time ago we understood that new defense power requirements had already developed in this critical defense area, specifically that the Oak Ridge facilities of AEC had given notice that more power would be needed prior to 1957. We waited through February, March, through April, and through May to discover what the administration would recommend. Until the morning of June 17, when the independent offices appropriation bill carrying TVA appropriations was safely through both Houses and the conference report had been agreed to, the proposals made to AEC, the analyses reported to be underway, and the decisions reached were all something of a mystery. But on that morning, in testimony before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, the administration's answer became clear.

Neither of the alternatives set forth in the budget message to Congress had been pursued. TVA is not released from supplying a single kilowatt to the AEC. No new capacity is added to the TVA power system. Those were the stated alternatives. New defense requirements have admittedly developed but no new capacity is requested to meet them, although that was a stated condition. Instead, the President has directed AEC to negotiate a preposterous arrangement under which the power to be generated at a site to be selected by the Dixon-Yates private utility combine is to be purchased by AEC, not for its own use but to be fed into the TVA system and resold to TVA consumers.

According to the directive from the President, the terms of this contract are to be negotiated by AEC, the Nation's most highly sensitive and vital national defense agency, an agency above all others which should stand apart from, above, and beyond any controversies regarding domestic matters, an agency which should be left entirely free and protected to pursue its all-important, vital work of producing atomic energy.

As the AEC assumes the responsibility of a power broker in this fantastic arrangement, it will begin to drain millions of dollars directly from the Federal Treasury every year to be turned over as a subsidy, as a handout, to a favored private utility combine, a combine headed by the very men who have long been identified as leaders in the frenzied campaign directed by the private utility companies to bring about the destruction of TVA.

Certainly it was never the intention of Congress that the Atomic Energy Commission should submit to any such prostitution of its great powers. The AEC was to be an independent body, charged with a most sensitive and most vital responsibility.

No emergency confronts the Nation which would justify the Chief Executive in overriding the judgment of a majority of the Commission. A simple problem was presented. The Government owns a system of power generation and transmission—the TVA. TVA has the responsibility of power supply for a certain area, just as private power companies do for other areas. The largest single customer of TVA is the Government itself, through AEC. Loads are growing in the area—Government loads and the loads that are made up of the total electricity used on farms, in homes, and in private industry. To meet these new loads TVA needed more capacity. The management of TVA made a recommendation to the owner, the Federal Government, for the investment of more capital, precisely as a private-company management would do. TVA came to the Bureau of the Budget in the regular way last autumn. The Budget refused to transmit the request to Congress, and, as the President's message suggested, undertook instead to explore the possibilities of relieving TVA of a portion of its commitment to AEC. TVA understood, and those of us who were concerned understood, that the decision would be made on the basis of a comparison of the overall cost to the Government of that alternative solution. Yet this bizarre arrangement is ordered in spite of the fact that the cost to the Government will be greater, if this proposal is accepted, than if funds are provided as requested by TVA.

The AEC itself estimates that the excess cost to the Government of accepting this proposal, rather than adding power to the TVA system, will be more than $3.6 million every year for 25 years, a total of $90 million over the life of the contract. TVA estimates that the minimum additional cost to the Government will be more nearly $5.5 million annually, a total of some $139 million over the contract period. Those figures do not represent the cost of the power, of course. The figures simply represent the excess costs above the costs to the Government of providing the power by additions to the TVA system. These figures simply measure the bonus this administration is willing to pay to avoid continued operation of TVA at maximum efficiency.

This administration is willing to commit the Federal Government to an annual expense of between $3 million and $6 million to add to the millions the private companies are ready to spend every year to destroy the TVA. It is willing to pervert the powers of AEC to accomplish the purpose despite the fact the testimony before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy showed that 3 out of 5 members of the AEC oppose the plan. The General Accounting Office questions its legality and its wisdom, and refers to the excess costs as a subsidy to the power companies.

Some people do not seem to realize that there is no competition in the power business; it is a monopoly business and a cost-plus operation. The Dixon-Yates private utility combine proposes to borrow 95 percent of the money to build the plant on the strength of a Government-guaranteed power contract. The other 5 percent will be provided by the utility holding companies represented by Dixon and Yates. On this 5 percent they will be given a 9-percent return. The Government will provide this profit. The Government will pay all their taxes, State and local, even their Federal income taxes. No doubt this novel arrangement will be described as a great achievement of free private enterprise. This is nonsense. It is free pie for the private utility monopoly. There is no risk.

The Government will pay for the plant whether it is built by TVA or Dixon-Yates. The only difference is that the Government will pay more in this case and will never own the structure or get the profits.

I am not a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, but from conversations with members of the committee, and a reading of portions of the transcript, it is clear that the Chairman of AEC, who felt compelled to support the Dixon-Yates proposal, went to the length of endeavoring to discredit the record of TVA's performance at Shawnee in comparison with the record of the Joppa plant built by Electric Energy, Inc., a private utility combine across the river to serve the same AEC installations at Paducah. Both Adm. Lewis Strauss and Gen. Kenneth D. Nichols tried to give the committee the impression that power from TVA was more costly than power from Joppa. The record would have stayed that way but for the vigilance of members of the joint committee who invited clarification by a member of the staff of TVA who was attending the hearings.

The facts about Joppa are well known. EEI and TVA had started building plants in the same Paducah area at the same time. The Joppa plant was scheduled to come in first, and the private utilities had widely boasted that the Joppa-Shawnee construction would be a race, that the private utilities would win. But TVA won the race; Shawnee was 5 months ahead of Joppa. TVA completed the first four units under its estimates of cost, but Joppa costs went $58 million over estimates. The first four units of the Shawnee plant were built at a cost of $145 per kilowatt; Joppa will be something over $195 per kilowatt.

Those who followed the record of the two projects knew that Ebasco, hired by EEI to supervise construction, was fired when the job was halfway through.

Yet on June 18, 1954, a few days ago, the second day of the hearing before the joint committee to hear Admiral Strauss and General Nichols, one would have thought that power from Joppa was a bargain compared to power purchased from TVA.

Admiral Strauss' spirited defense of the indefensible record of Joppa is all the more surprising in view of the testimony of Commissioner Thomas E. Murray before the joint committee. Now, Mr. Murray has never been identified as an advocate of TVA. He is recalled as the man who suggested the idea that a combination of private utilities would be able to deliver power to AEC facilities at Paducah quicker and cheaper than TVA. It was his initiative that created EEI which in turn employed Ebasco to supervise construction of the Joppa plant.

Mr. Murray opposes this perversion of the function of AEC to destroy TVA and testified about Joppa:

"The 'Ebasco fiasco' * * * is quite a slogan. Unhappily it was not conceived without some justification. Putting everything one can into the balance in favor of EEI, one must admit the bald fact that the EEI operation was found wanting.

"A section of private power interests was given a fair opportunity to prove what it could do. * * * Competition was out in the open—competition as to time and competition as to dollars—and no one can escape the fact that TVA won the Paducah power contest."

I should like to know why Chairman Strauss feels it incumbent upon himself to defend the record of Joppa. Is it because Ebasco is once more to undertake the construction of a plant for private utilities. Dixon-Yates proposes to use them. Is his defense of Joppa required because Mr. Dixon is a participant in EEI, as well as a sponsor of the new proposal?

I do not know the answer to these questions. I only know that I am outraged by the way this whole matter has been handled.

Everybody loses except the Dixon-Yates combine. Everybody. Power consumers of the Tennessee Valley lose. AEC loses. The Federal Treasury loses. The taxpayers lose. The national defense loses. The reputation of this Government for integrity and wisdom in the conduct of its affairs is diminished. Whether the extra cost to the Treasury will be $90 million or $150 million, or $200 million, or more, I do not know. What is here revealed is an effort to force upon one Commission, over the disapproval of a majority of its members, an action foreign to their responsibilities in order to accelerate the destruction of another agency—TVA—an agency distinguished for integrity and competence, but regarded with hostility by this administration, hostility so well exemplified by the President calling TVA "creeping socialism."

The pledge implicit in the budget message of the President has not been kept. TVA is not relieved from a kilowatt of its contractual responsibility to provide power for AEC. And defense loads have increased. But no capacity is to be added to the TVA system. The Board of TVA has been advised that in spite of the fact that the requirements of the AEC at Oak Ridge have increased, no new capacity for TVA would be requested of this Congress. If an actual shortage occurred, wrote the Director of the Budget, Mr. Hughes, out of a wealth of ignorance, power could be brought in on an interim basis. Power on an interim basis is costly, and puts the customers at the mercy of the private power companies who have shown a vested interest in the extinction of TVA.

I do not believe that this administration had any intention of recommending new capacity for TVA under any conceivable circumstances. The assurances read into the budget message allayed fears and frustrated opposition. The region and its representatives relied upon good faith, but now both the conditions under which we understood new capacity would be requested have been met. Release of power now committed to AEC has not proved to be a feasible solution, and defense loads have increased. Yet no request is forthcoming from the administration. With callous deliberation a power shortage has been scheduled in the Tennessee Valley.

By contract or by crisis the power consumers of the Tennessee Valley are to be made dependent upon the very private companies they once rejected as power suppliers. And yet we hear pious talk of developing partnerships between local, State, and Federal Government. The people of the TVA power service area entered into a real partnership with their Government. They voted in referenda across the area. The 150 local distributors of TVA power, municipalities, and REA co-ops, have an investment of more than $400 million in that partnership. They have invested dollars, time, and talent. They have invested faith. Now they face betrayal. Under this administration their wishes are ignored, their future is threatened. Instead they find a new partnership created by the Government they trusted—the Bureau of the Budget, the AEC, and the Dixon-Yates private utility combine joined in a partnership created to destroy them.

Think Back to Erin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 20, 1954

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I wish at this time to insert in the RECORD a letter which I have received from the American League for an Undivided Ireland, plus the reprint which was enclosed from the Boston Traveler, of Thursday, July 1, 1954.

I was one one of the first signers of discharge petition No. 3 placed on the Speaker's desk by my colleague, Congressman JOHN E. FOGARTY, of Rhode Island. I wish to take this opportunity to urge every Member of the House of Representatives who has not already done so to add his signature to the petition in order that the House of Representatives may have the opportunity to vote on this resolution.

AMERICAN LEAGUE FOR AN
UNDIVIDED IRELAND,
Boston, Mass., July 13, 1954.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Enclosed is a reprint from the Boston Traveler of Thursday, July 1, 1954.

In northeast Ireland, persons are subjected to house search without warrant, arrest without charge, detention without warrant; penalized for displaying the tricolor of Ireland—the emblem of their Republic, or speaking their native language, as well as denied public housing and gainful employment.

Winston Churchill, in 1912, stated:

"Whatever Ulster's right may be she cannot stand in the way of the whole of the rest of Ireland. Half a province cannot impose a permanent veto on the nation. Half a province cannot obstruct forever the reconciliation between the British and Irish democracies and deny all satisfaction to the united wishes of the British Empire."

Your signature on the Congressman JOHN E. FOGARTY discharge petition relative to this matter is one way of letting the world know that freedom is everybody's business.

Thank you,

Very truly yours,
THOMAS H. BUCKLEY,
President.
MARGARET M. O'CONNOR,
Secretary.

[From the Boston Traveler of July 1, 1954]

THINK BACK TO ERIN

When Winston Churchill speaks to the world, one never knows what to expect.

He is equally adept at brilliance, belligerence, bombast, or baloney.

The Joint Statement on Policy that he signed with President Eisenhower in Washington this week is an excellent example of Churchillian balderdash, appealing in sound but limited in meaning.

A vision of the green hills of divided Ireland comes to mind as we read through the text of that statement:

"We uphold the principle of self-government and will earnestly strive by every peaceful means to secure the independence of all countries whose peoples desire and are capable of sustaining an independent existence. * * *

"As regards formerly sovereign states now in bondage, we will not be a party to any arrangement or treaty which would confirm or prolong their unwilling subordination. In the case of nations now divided against their will, we shall continue to seek to achieve unity through free elections supervised by the United Nations to insure they are conducted fairly."

That's what the man said.

In case he's forgotten, we remind him of a parliamentary election of all Ireland, held under the auspices of the British Army in December 1918.

The vote was 79 to 26 in favor of a united and independent republic.

Even in the nine counties of Ulster, a majority of those elected favored the republic.

So Britain took 6 of those 9 counties and set up Northern Ireland, and that was the last all-Ireland election on record.

Of those six northern counties, Tyrone, and Fermanagh today consistently favor a united Ireland. So do broad areas of the remaining four, but they can't whip the gerrymander that holds them in its beak.

Churchill has signed some brilliant statements in the course of modern history, but this wasn't one of his inspired moments.

He has gone on record in support of the very principles that Britain ignores or denies in her dealings with the Irish.

To be consistent, he should have extended the policy statement by two words: "Ireland excluded."

Case History: Communist Aggression

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT RAINS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 20, 1954

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Speaker, last evening, I listened to an NBC broadcast entitled "Comment." Among the speakers was Jim Robinson, an NBC correspondent, who has just returned from Hanoi, Indochina.

Mr. Robinson has lived 9 years in the Far East, and has been in every country in the Far East. He was a teacher in the University of Yenching, Peiping, China, before the Communists took over, and for 9 months thereafter, before he was allowed to leave, giving him first-hand study of Communists' movement in Asia. He covered the Korean war for NBC and the London Times, and is without doubt a qualified observer of the Communists' aggression in east Asia. Mr. Speaker, the statement which he made, and which I include with my remarks in the RECORD, is so timely I feel it should be read by every American. In his statement, he is brutally frank and I am sure unerringly accurate. To read his statement, Mr. Speaker, is to know the urgent need, now, for a complete reappraisal of our failing, floundering foreign policy.

CASE HISTORY: COMMUNIST AGGRESSION

The Communists are on the victory march in Asia. The Communist's ultimate goal is to conquer all the Far East. They say so, and they're in the process of doing it. The Communist operation in Asia is pure and simple totalitarian aggression, but it's disguised under national movements, reform movements, and such slogans as Asia for the Asians.

Right now the Communists are winning vast stretches of territory and millions of people in the Far East. They're doing this easily and rapidly. Why is this happening? Simply because there's no one willing, or if willing, able to go all out and stop them.

Certainly no Asian country has the wherewithal to halt this Red aggression. And no group of Asian countries, bound together in mutual defense, has the combined strength to halt it.

The free world, led by the West, principally the United States, has demonstrated its unwillingness to face realities in Asia. Through Asian eyes Korea was a Communist victory. And there's a similar victory now in Indochina. Always the same story—the backdown by the free world—the abandonment of millions of people to the Communists.

The price of our constant appeasement to communism in the Orient is beyond immediate calculation, but this is what's happening in the yet free Far Eastern nations. These countries now feel they have the proof the West isn't willing to face a showdown—not willing to use force to stop force. So these countries are in the process of their own agonizing reappraisal of the situation. Already many of these countries are frantically trying to achieve the role of neutrals. Many are casting secret feelers toward the Peking regime. These nations want to see if a deal can be made—a deal whereby they might be able to coexist with the Communists—or if it might be possible to retain some sort of national sovereignty if and when all Asia goes Red.

Asians are realists by necessity. They know they can't pack their bags and flee to a sanctuary across the ocean. They now see that sooner or later they might have to survive one way or another under some sort of Communist regime. They want to make this possibility as comfortable as possible—in other words they don't want to be on the opposite end of the execution squads when and if the time comes.

I've just returned from Indochina and I've seen why Asia is now in this frame of mind. For look what's happening in north Vietnam. You have there millions of ardent nationalists, anticolonialists—yet, but just as anti-Communist. Now our leaders promised to save these people from communism barely 2 months ago. But today we're joining in the nefarious act of handing these people over to the Reds. What example does this serve to the rest of Asia? What would you do or think if you were an Asian?

How have the Communists been able to achieve such tremendous successes in Asia? Simply told it's this way. The end of World War II found the Far East awakened but in turmoil. The days of colonialism, they felt, were over, in its place was an intense nationalism and a strong feeling of Asia for the Asians.

The Communists quickly got behind these nationalist feelings and movements. They quietly and subtly took over the reins of leadership in them. By adroit maneuvering, by acting quickly in local situations, the Reds consistently beat us to the punch. Put us in the position of opposing national aspirations, as least in the eyes of most Asians.

The Communists put forth an appealing program in Asia. Red leaders advocate needed reforms, the end to landlordism, the end to corruptions. In short, the Reds proclaim outrage at everything troubling the Asians.

Now we know in reality this is rank Communist propaganda. We know what happens when the Red regime takes over, but Asians want an end to corruption, to extreme landlordism, and end to hunger. The Communists promise them that. Too many Asians believe that no one else does.

Let's take an example of how the Communists operate in the field and how the United States operates in the field in Asia. We'll pick an unnamed Asian nation yet free. We want this country as an ally, the Reds want it as a satellite. Here is how the operation goes.

We pick a university graduate—clean-cut, intelligent, honest. His basic instruction is to go to this country and inform the people how nice democracy is—how bad communism is. This man has never been to Asia, doesn't know the language. He arrives and moves into a lovely home, has servants, a car, and chauffeur and an air-conditioned office. And our man zealously goes to work putting out slick paper pamphlets about how nice America is and what rats the Communists are. Good stuff for readers in Kansas City, but remote to the man in the street in Asia.

Now comes the Communist equivalent. First, he's an Asian, he speaks the local language, he lives with the people—in short, he is one of them, except he is highly trained—a specialist in Communist double-talk. When the Mr. Whong of Asia sits down in his local coffee shop, he meets this ardent Communist. But Mr. Whong doesn't realize this man is an agent. For this man speaks his language, talks of all the things bothering Mr. Whong and of course, adds his very cleverly planted seeds of revolt. A distorted picture? Unfortunately no. I wish it was.

Force is still the deciding factor in Asia. This fact goes aaginst our training and ideals. Not so with the Communists. They have force and are using it. At this late date we have but one choice—either we now move in and take over much of the control of Asia, or the Communists will. It's as brutally simple as that. If we're not willing, or able to do this, then the Communists surely will rule all Asia in the years to come.

Republicans Plan Big "Huckstering" Campaign

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 20, 1954

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, there is one thing about the Journal, published every Friday in Jeannette, Pa., by Jim Landis, and that is that it pulls no punches. In his editorial of July 16, Mr. Landis had an article entitled "Republicans Plan Big 'Huckstering' Campaign." I think the membership will find it very interesting, and, under unanimous consent, I include it in the RECORD:

REPUBLICANS PLAN BIG "HUCKSTERING" CAMPAIGN

Scuttlebutt in advertising and public relations circles today is that the Republican candidates for office will spend perhaps from $10 million to $20 million in the coming election.

This "Operation Huckster" being readied according to the best reports, indicates that the Republican National Committee will spend about $4 million. It is also reported that every possible medium of advertising will be used.

One of the chief Republican advertising "gimmicks" is reported to be "doctored films." (Shades of the McCarthy "doctored photo".) These films giving untrue and half true meanings we understand are to be used generally on persons calculated to be rather uninformed on the real truth. Reportedly they will be used widely on television during the final days of the campaign.

According to the dope being whispered around the political doings of the Republican Party from highest to lowest level will be run by Madison Avenue, New York, advertising agencies. It is expected that the local level campaign will be put on mostly by women and first voters. Republican Members of Congress will be supplied we hear with two specially made films aimed at his own area. As we understand it he may have the free services of professional photographers, ghost-writers, artists, ad-men, etc. Candidates are to be supplied with news-releases, advertising mats, specially written headlines for news releases and a complete speech kit containing speeches written on all major issues, quotable quotes and speech quips of a humorous nature. The Republican congressional candidates may participate in filmed television shows. The Republican National Committee is preparing many 1-, 2-, 5-, and 15-minute radio shows and 2-minute television spots for national use.

All these preparations to try to "huckster" an election come under the head of "saturation-point" advertising. In plain language it roughly means get them to vote your way even if you have to use a blackjack on their skulls.

A lot of "huckstering" went on in the 1952 election campaign if you remember. To refresh your memory we quote here a radio spot announcement, September 1952 by Presidential candidate Eisenhower: "We are going to bring them (taxes) down. And here's how. We are going to cut out the billions that Washington is wasting and put that money back in the pockets of the people."

Compact Relating to Higher Education and Establishment of New England Board of Higher Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 20, 1954

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to comment for a moment on the bill H. R. 9712, presently pending before the House Committee on Education and Labor, having to do with the Congress granting certain New England States the privilege to enter into a compact relating to higher education and the establishment of a New England Board of Higher Education.

In this connection, I would like at this time to express my great appreciation to one of my former colleagues in the Massachusetts Legislature, Wilfred S. Mirsky, of Boston, the former chairman of the Massachusetts House Committee of Education, and an outstanding Democrat, for his concerted efforts on behalf of this compact in particular, and his wholehearted aid in the education field in our Commonwealth.

Mr. Mirsky is currently the counsel to the Massachusetts commission, and his ability and handiwork has been most important to the successful drafting and passage of this compact through the legislature. The compact was approved in Massachusetts on June 7, 1954. The granting of congressional consent was brought before this House in the manner of a bill, H. R. 9712, 83d Congress, 2d session.

The purposes of the New England higher education compact shall be to provide greater educational opportunities and services through the establishment and maintenance of a coordinated educational program for the persons residing in the several States of New England parties to this compact, with the aim of furthering higher education in the fields of medicine, dentistry, veterinary medicine, public health, and in professional, technical, scientific, literary, and other fields.

The drafting of this compact as it was presented to the Massachusetts Legislature was most competently handled by Mr. Mirsky, and the very great thought and educational ideals of this man may be evidenced on every page.

Under Mr. Mirsky's leadership, the Democratic Party in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts initiated and passed the first antidiscrimination laws in the Commonwealth assuring all citizens an equal opportunity for higher education, at the same time securing a program of hot lunches in the public schools by having the Commonwealth cooperate with the existing lunch programs of the municipalities and the Federal Government.

The Democratic Party in Massachusetts launched a new school-building program to promote better educational facilities thereby improving opportunities for the children of the Commonwealth. The Massachusetts school-building-assistance program, incidentally, has become one of the leading in the Nation.

When I was speaker of the House of Representatives in the Massachusetts Legislature, the State university received consistent attention in the developments of plant, faculty, and student body increases. It was during this time that Mr. Mirsky was most instrumental in the passage of a bill through that legislature, establishing Commonwealth scholarships at the University of Massachusetts. These scholarships afford qualified students the opportunity for a college education and permitted those children of the laboring class from the larger cities who could not possibly afford higher education to take advantage of the opportunities that their more wealthy brethren could handle privately.

Mr. Mirsky's tireless efforts in the Massachusetts Legislature in codifying the laws pertaining to education in the Commonwealth and bringing them up to date so that educators can have the opportunity to administer these laws in the most expeditious manner for the benefit of the general public, is greatly appreciated not only by all teacher and administrators but by the Massachusetts Legislature itself.

Mr. Mirsky's driving force was the stimulus that prodded the legislature into taking definite action to the establishment of an educational TV station sponsored by the Commonwealth, and currently being established by the famed Lowell Institute. We all hope that Greater Boston will soon enjoy this marvelous innovation in education that will come to them through TV channel 2. It will afford the hundred educational institutions and universities in the Greater Boston area an opportunity to display and transfer from one to the other their facilities and faculties.

The chairman of the Massachusetts Tubercular and Health League has stated that Mr. Mirsky's untiring zeal on behalf of the health of the schoolchildren of the Commonwealth deserves honorable mention.

He provided support to the bill that permitted periodic X-rays of school employees and children. This law is certain to help assure more complete protection for all schoolchildren of the Commonwealth. No wonder then, that Hugh Nixon, executive secretary of the Massachusetts Teachers Federation, praised the efforts of the Democratic Party in general and Mr. Mirsky in particular, for their work on behalf of both the teachers and the schoolchildren.

The Democratic Party in the Commonwealth has championed a State dental and medical school. The recent platform adopted at Worcester by the preprimary convention reiterated that demand. If this compact will help to increase medical and dental services in the Commonwealth, I believe that it will receive the blessings of the Democrats in the Commonwealth, but if it be a mere subterfuge to delay and hinder the production of medical and dental services or in any way lower the stringent standards that we in the Commonwealth insist upon, then it will be subject to criticism.

I therefore feel that this Congress should make every effort to give consent to the compact and we trust that the individual States making up those great New England States will follow through with the high ideals for which this compact was originally proposed.

Competitive Spirit Among Members of Junior Chamber of Commerce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 20, 1954

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I believe that my colleagues are familiar with the outstanding March to the Mike program, which had been conducted by the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce as a vital part of the nationwide Crusade for Freedom drive.

The JCC has long had a distinguished record of patriotic contributions at Federal, State, and principally at local levels. Here, by means of the March to the Mike, however, the JCC was responding with its typical enthusiasm, imagination, and enterprise, in bringing straight-from-the-shoulder plain-speaking grassroots messages to the peoples behind the Iron Curtain.

I send to the desk the text of a most interesting article carried in the July 1954 issue of the magazine Future, published by the JCC. The article was written by Mr. William Charles Driscoll, news editor of the American Heritage Foundation. It describes the dynamic competitive spirit among the Jaycees.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JAYCEES VERSUS THE KREMLIN

(By William Charles Driscoll)

In Waterbury, Conn., Frank Stolfi, proprietor of Immaculate Cleaners, promised to do a pants-pressing job as a challenge to the Soviets. His unique threat probably went unnoticed by the Kremlin at the moment, but Mr. Stolfi was helping to light a fuse to something that made a pretty loud bang behind the Iron Curtain a short time later. That was when Radio Free Europe started to broadcast to Moscow's victims the encouraging voices of America's man in the street as recorded during the Jaycees' March to the Mike.

Jaycee Stolfi, Connecticut State chairman of the March to the Mike program in the Crusade for Freedom, worded his taunt as follows:

"I hereby challenge every other State to better Connecticut's record of chapter participation in the March to the Mike. * * * I will publicly press the pants of all other State March to the Mike chairmen at the Jaycee National Convention if any other State exceeds Connecticut's record * * *."

The rousing results of Connecticut's Jaycees in the March to the Mike yield to no one, but there were a few spots here and there around the United States that threatened Mr. Stolfi with a tough job of public pants pressing. Notably: California, Colorado, Florida, Illinois, Louisiana, Michigan, Minnesota, New York, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, and Washington—among others.

Throughout the country, over a hundred Jaycee chapters joined in the March to the Mike. A number of others took part in the crusade in other ways. Programing executives of Radio Free Europe say the Jaycee messages, carrying the actual voices of American men, women and children, represent one of their most effective methods of convincing the people behind the Iron Curtain that the people of America have not forgotten them.

One of the most unusual was recorded by Carl E. Stotz, of Williamsport, Pa. Stotz, the young man who founded Little League baseball and built it into an organization of 250,000 uniformed youngsters, went on the air to refute the Communist propaganda that American baseball is dominated by big business. He explained how the Little League is supported by community effort, often by Jaycee chapters, and he added:

"The important thing to understand is the way baseball creates a common bond of interest for a community."

While this might need careful translation for a Soviet commissar, there are few people in the captive countries who haven't heard how baseball makes community idolators of millions of Americans from Flatbush to Cucamonga.

Incidentally, Williamsport, Pa., was one of the spots where Mr. Stolfi's pants-pressing challenge received wide acceptance. The community newspapers and radio station went all out behind a Jaycee program aimed at the Kremlin's big lies about the American way of life. Leaders in politics, labor, science, education, and sports recorded their answers. They were all wrapped up in a half-hour radio program over Williamsport's radio station WWPA.

But what made Connecticut's Stolfi so confident was the fact that virtually all of the State's 18 Jaycee chapters signed up for the March to the Mike, "the biggest public-service event ever undertaken by the Jaycees," as Stolfi put it.

Hartford, Conn., put on one of the most unusual promotions in the country. Hartford's Jaycees had the whole town talking by putting up a 1954 Ford Mainliner 2-door sedan as prize in a "Who is Mr. Freedom?" contest which ran daily for 2 weeks in the 2 local newspapers—the Courant and the Times. Each day, a small part of a picture of Mr. Freedom appeared in each of the papers with clues in the captions. The photos and captions were enlarged each day with additional clues until a social worker walked off with the Ford by identifying "Mr. Freedom" as Gen. Anthony McAuliffe, whose quotation to the Nazis at Bastogne was resuscitated to fling at the tyrants of the Kremlin. Namely, "Nuts."

Meanwhile, the local radio stations plugged the march with spot announcements. Television station WNHC at nearby New Haven promoted it further with a 15-minute program donated by the Hartford Trust Co. It wound up with 1,200 persons marching to the mike and a "great deal more interest in the Crusade for Freedom and Radio Free Europe than was indicated on the surface," according to I. H. Schlesinger, Jr., president of the Greater Hartford Jaycees.

Miami, Fla., pulled out all the stops with a big street parade and a March to the Mike at the Bayfront Band Shell. Miami and nine other communities in the Miami area caused such a stir that it drew a comment from Drew Pearson in his coast-to-coast TV and radio program. The effort was backed by Florida's press and radio. The doings at the band shell were broadcast by Miami's WIOD.

Reporting for Washington, State Director Ed English said the Jaycees' March to the Mike was "one of the most inspirational programs of the entire year." In Spokane, Jaycees Arch Rutherford and Merle Claflin put on a program that lasted through Freedom Week, February 12 to 22. During the week, radio stations KNEW and KGA recorded "Truth Messages" daily. They recorded over 100 tapes representing 54 organizations. Directed by Ruth Ellison, Spokane's Lady Jaycees presented one taped program running 45 minutes and another of 15 minutes. During a "Self-Government Day," Spokane's high schoolers took over the city government with coverage by KHQ–TV and radio station KREM.

Over 1,000 took part in a Jaycee essay contest with books of passes to local movie theaters as rewards and prizes. Meanwhile, Rutherford directed a 15-minute program on KGA and a 15-minute skit on KXLY–TV to dramatize the work of Radio Free Europe. Backing Spokane's Jaycees in their program were 2 newspapers, 6 radio stations, 2 TV stations, 8 high schools, 39 grade schools, and 54 civic, labor, religious, and other organizations.

In Auburn, Wash., Richard D. Barnard, the Jaycee March to the Mike chairman, aroused enough interest to get two programs broadcast over KXA in Seattle. In Decatur, Ill., the Jaycees packed the local high-school auditorium with a contest to pick the most effective messages of encouragement for the Soviets' captives. The proceedings were recorded by WSOY and WDZ. In Alexandria, La., L. Brian Duke, the Jaycees' March to the Mike chairman, reported a wonderful turnout for a 3-hour program in Bolton High School Auditorium, thanks to a hard-working committee and all-out support of the Alexandria Daily Town Talk and local radio stations, KSYL and KALB.

Other notable "marches" were staged in Tulsa, Okla.; Greeley, Colo.; Denver, Colo.; San Francisco, Calif.; Rochester, N. Y.; Pittsburgh, Pa.; Minneapolis, Minn.; Austin, Tex.; and Hamilton County, Ohio.

H. R. 7839

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. HESS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 20, 1954

Mr. HESS. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent early in the day today, July 20, due to a cancellation of the American Airlines flight from Cincinnati, Ohio, to Washington, D. C., on which I had made reservations.

Had I been present at the time the vote was taken on the motion to recommit the conference report on H. R. 7839, I would have voted against it, as I favored the provisions contained in the report with reference to public housing. I previously voted for a provision like this when the bill was originally on the floor of the House. The amendment was offered by Representative WIDNALL and was defeated by an overwhelming Democratic vote.

I would also have voted for the adoption of the conference report had I been present.

Saving China From the Communists—A New Economic Plan—Tensions Between Red China and Russia—British and American Policies—The Geneva Conference—Vicente Villamin Discusses Asian Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 19, 1954

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, the problems of Asia are actively and dramatically before the American Government and people. It is essential that these problems are presented clearly and analytically. This has been done in a series of memorandums by Mr. Vicente Villamin, distinguished Filipino lawyer, economist, writer, and student of world questions. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I make them part of my remarks.

I wish particularly to direct attention to the economic plan for China which Mr. Villamin advances, for it challenges consideration as possibly the most effective means to save China from the Communists and to bring about real and abiding peace in Asia and the Pacific area of which the United States is an integral part.

Mr. Villamin's seven memorandums follow:

VARIOUS ASIAN PROBLEMS

(By Vicente Villamin)

The following memoranda do not cover all phases of the Asian problems. The Korean question is dealt with in my previous statements. I expect to write about Japan and her vital part in the Asian situation. I am dealing with China first because it is the central problem of Asia. As Russia is to Europe so is China to Asia. Both of them are grave problems to the United States.

I. ON AN ECONOMIC PROGRAM FOR CHINA

1. Red China has in operation an economic program. It is like Russia's in her series of 5-year economic plans. While Russia employed Americans, Britishers, and other foreign experts, China is using Russian experts. It is believed that, industrially, China today is about in the same position as Russia was in 1932.

2. Ten years hence China will be a strong industrial nation. Dominated by Chinese hostile to the United States, China would be a formidable threat to the United States on her Pacific front as Russia is already such a threat on her Atlantic front and her northern border from over the top of the world in the Arctic.

3. China can still be saved from the Communists. Nationalist China is waiting to take over. Its chance to succeed would be greatly aided if the United States should announce that if Nationalist China is reestablished on the mainland and the Communist regime is overthrown she will spend, say, $10 billion for a 5-year program of economic development of China. That assurance would lead the Chinese people to rally to the colors of Nationalist China, especially now when they are suffering from the rigors and cruelties of the Communist regime.

4. Under the Nationalist Government, China will be developed and become a strong and prosperous country by Chinese who are friendly to the United States. That China would be an ally of the United States instead of an enemy like Red China. With that China as an ally and friend, even the threat of Russia to the United States would be greatly diminished. The Pacific basin, which has the Western Hemisphere on its eastern rim, will become an area of peace instead of a Communist pasture.

5. The expenditure of $10 billion for the development of China under Nationalist auspices and American direction would be the best investment that the United States could make from every conceivable standpoint. Today the United States spends roughly $50 billion a year over her normal budget for national defense alone as the result of Russian pressure. When Red China becomes stronger, say 10 years from now, the United States will have to increase her national defense expenditures very substantially. The 3-year Korean war has cost the United States 160,000 human casualties and $15 billion in treasure, and she is spending hundreds of millions of dollars more for South Korea's rehabilitation.

6. In China, the American dollars will fight for peace, while the Nationalist forces will subdue the Communist resistance, obviating thereby the necessity of Americans fighting on Chinese soil.

7. The sum of $10 billion is less than 3 percent of the annual income of the American people. What it can do for the peace of America and of the world and for the suppression of communism and its evil works compels its serious and immediate consideration by the American Government and people. There is no clearer case where time for action is of the essence.

8. The economic development of free China will redound to the economic welfare of all free Asia. Overseas Chinese could be used in carrying out the economic plan.

* * * * *

III. ON THE VULNERABILITY OF RED CHINA

The following points indicate the weakness of the Communist regime in China:

1. The Chinese people maintain their silent resistance to communism as sharply opposed to their way of life. It is safe to state that less than 1 percent of the Chinese people believe in communism. In Russia the comparable figure is 3 percent. This would suggest that Chinese Communists have to exert more effort to control the people than the Russian Communists.

2. Every day the Chinese people are realizing that their life is being more and more restricted and constricted and that they are becoming mere pawns of the government, which is controlled by a few whose power has no limit whatsoever. This condition is a standing threat to the stability and existence of the Communist regime.

3. Intense fear is gripping the Chinese people as they learn that the policy of the Communist regime is to reduce the number of people of China substantially for political and economic reasons, employing the

process of wholesale liquidation through direct killing, overwork, and starvation.

4. The Chinese people are witnessing and feeling that their country has become a highly militarized state, which is expensive to support, and that the armed forces are maintained primarily to keep them down under rigid control and regimentation.

5. The oppressive system of espionage is becoming more and more strict as the Chinese people show resistance to it. There is a very little left of their personal privacy and freedom. Their family life is almost nonexistent.

6. According to Chinese prisoners of war who preferred to go to Formosa rather than return to China mainland—Chinese who were impressed into the Communist Chinese volunteer army in Korea—the first reason why the Chinese hate communism is that it intends to break up the Chinese home and family to make loyalty to the state total and absolute.

7. The Chinese people's respect for the Communist regime must be greatly lessened as they find that it is managed and directed by so-called Russian advisors, who are heavily compensated both with power in the government and high salaries.

8. The Chinese Communists must now realize that they have permitted Russia to have a virtual monopoly of China's foreign trade, causing the prices of imported commodities to go to unconscionable heights to the Chinese people, who resent such form of exploitation of them.

9. The Chinese people are coming to know the terms of the contracts of loans and services which their government had entered into with Russia which are oppressive, onerous, and unjust to China. The loans are chiefly in the form of Russian industrial goods and technical services which are overpriced, and their payments are mainly in the form of Chinese raw materials and common labor which are underpriced.

10. The economic and political interests of Red China and Russia and the northwest administrative territory, which includes the minerally rich autonomous state of Sinkiang, conflict with each other strongly as each country asserts its sovereignity and control of that territory.

11. In the development of the agricultural and industrial resources of Manchuria, the Russians are aiming to establish the supreme control, fearing that someday the Chinese would oust the Russians out of that rich area. The Chinese still remember that immediately after the war the Russians dismantled many industrial plants in Manchuria and carted them away to Siberia.

12. The displacement of the native population of North Korea by Chinese must be alarming to the Russians because, among other things, it would strengthen the Chinese in an area that adjoins Siberia in which Russia's most important port on the Pacific, Vladivostok, is located and which is not too far from Russia's fabulously rich gold mines in the Agadan region.

13. If China is to have an industrial nation as a collaborator in her economic development, the presence of such two nations, Japan and Russia, would place them in antagonistic position to each other, for they are competitors. Associated with the United States, Japan would be preferrable for China to have as an industrial associate, and much more so if China returns to the old, non-Communist, free and democratic Nationalist Government.

14. Communist China and Russia have conflicting interests in Tibet, China believing that Russia should not concern herself with that country. The same thing is true with respect to Indochina and other countries in southeast Asia. China considers Russia an interloper in both places.

15. The 12,500,000 Chinese who live abroad are overwhelmingly against the Communist regime in China. They are asserting themselves more and more strongly against the Communists, and their relatives in China know of that attitude which gives them more courage to oppose the Communist regime.

16. President Chiang Kai-shek has established in Formosa the model of the kind of government that will be instituted on the mainland when the authority of Nationalist China is reestablished there. That government is just, democratic, economical, and effective. It could still be improved and it would be. The Chinese people are encouraged to oppose the Communist regime in the expectation that once it is overthrown they will have a much better government.

* * * * *

V. ON RECOGNIZING TWO CHINAS: RED AND NATIONALIST

Some American newspapers have editorially advanced the idea that the United States should recognize two Chinese nations—Red and Nationalist—and have them both admitted to the United Nations. They believe this is the best solution to the China question.

This idea is unwise for the following reasons:

1. It would nullify the position of the United States that Nationalist China is the only legitimate government of China, divide China into two warring countries, and vindicate and recognize Red China, which is an enemy of the United Nations.

2. It would ignore the fact that the Nationalist government is in existence, exercising its powers on the territory of China, even if it is at the moment restricted, and planning to overthrow the Communist regime with the help of the Chinese people and of the free world.

3. It would be an abject surrender to Communism in Asia and a notice to free Asia that the march of communism to conquer other countries is not to be stopped. This knowledge might lead free Asia in sheer disappointment and desperation to give up their resistance to the Communists.

4. It would give Red China prestige and the color of legitimacy which she would use to proceed with her plan of conquest of the free countries of Asia. Red China, unlike the traditional China, believes in extending her control over other countries.

5. Once Red China is recognized by the United States and admitted to the United Nations, it could be expected that she would claim that Formosa is a part of China and she would proceed to conquer it, thus starting a war which might become a general war, world war III.

6. It would put an end to the plan of the reoccupation of the China mainland by the Nationalist government. There are multiplying proofs that when that government's armed forces set foot on the mainland, particularly when accompanied with the $10 billion economic development program mentioned above, the masses of the people will join them to subdue their Communist oppressors and upset their government.

VI. ON A MUTUAL DEFENSE TREATY WITH THE UNITED STATES

Press dispatches from Formosa reported that President Chiang Kai-shek and Gen. James A. Van Fleet, President Eisenhower's personal representative, were considering sympathetically a mutual defense treaty between their countries.

Such a treaty, when concluded, would result as follows:

1. It would be in line with similar treaties of the United States with the Republic of Korea, Japan, the Philippines, Australia, and New Zealand.

2. It would strengthen the western defense perimeter of the United States, Formosa being a vital link in the perimeter.

3. It would be a formal reassertion by the United States that she considers Nationalist China as the only legitimate government of China.

4. It would be timely notice to the whole world that the United States supports Nationalist China as China's legitimate representative in the United Nations and, therefore, its opposition to the admission of Red China to membership.

5. It would keep alive the hope of the Chinese people that their redemption from Communist oppression will be realized.

6. It would remove the relationship between the United States and Nationalist China from the twilight zone of indefinition to the plain status of friends and allies in the common cause of freedom and against Communist dictatorship and oppression.

VII. ON MEETING THE RED CHINESE DANGER

Red China is on the move. She is on the offensive. She believes she is winning both on the battlefield and in diplomatic encounters. She is threatening Formosa. She is waiting to be able to dictate terms in Indochina. She is occupying North Korea. She has her eyes on Japan. And she hates America. She must be met and the time to do it is now, and for the following reasons:

1. The roots of communism have not yet sunk deep in the soil of China. In fact, the soil is still arid and does not lend itself to their growth.

2. The Chinese people are militantly though silently opposed to communism, but their opposition is being ruthlessly squelched with the use of the Communist instruments of liquidation, terrorism, and starvation.

3. The Red army is not adequately armed because the widespread dissatisfaction and want among the people are so great that the industrial and agricultural programs to meet that condition have to be given first priority. Russia's arsenal has been depleted by the Korean war.

4. Red China has not acquired anything in the Korean war that would even start to compensate for her efforts and sacrifices. Her failure to beat the enemy in Korea has weakened her army's morale and proved her army's weakness.

5. A purge is going on in Red China of prominent Chinese military leaders whose sin is that they are becoming influential among the people. That is bound to cause demoralization both in the army and the government.

6. There is shortage of food in Red China as the result of the inadequacy and failure of the food program, which has been touted to make China a paradise where no one need be hungry or starve.

7. There is increasing realization by the people of the dominant power of the Russians in the Red government, and this diminishes the people's respect for and confidence in the Red regime.

8. There is silent but sizzling jealousy for national leadership as successor to Mao Tze-tung between Chu Teh and Chou En-lai that is capable of destroying the entire Red regime.

9. Nationalist China is ready and eager to start the reoccupation of the mainland with the support of most of the Chinese overseas.

10. The American people are resolutely against Red China for what she is and for the increasing danger that she offers to the United States and the rest of the free world.

VII. ON THE IMPORTANCE OF FORMOSA

1. In his historic speech to the United States Congress on April 19, 1951, General of the Army Douglas MacArthur declared: "I have strongly recommended in the past as a matter of military urgency that under no circumstances must Formosa fall under Communist control. [Applause.] Such an eventuality would at once threaten the freedom of the Philippines and the loss of Japan, and might as well force our western frontier back to the coasts of California, Oregon, and Washington."

2. With the Communists gaining headway in Indochina, controlling Hainan Island, and dominant on continental East Asia from

the Arctic north to Hong Kong, the control of Formosa by them would offer greater danger to the independence of Japan, the Philippines, Indonesia, and eventually New Zealand, Australia, and Burma and Thailand.

3. There is a great American airbase on Okinawa, which is less than 2 hours of flying distance from Formosa, and there are American military bases on the Philippines, Guam, and the Marshall Islands. A Communist ground, air, and naval forces stationed on Formosa would endanger them.

4. From the standpoint of military operations, Formosa today is like the beachhead of Pusan in the southern tip of Korea when the Republic of Korea and United Nations forces were driven there by the Communists from other parts of Korea and all but about to be swept into the sea. With reinforcements and tenacity the defenders held Pusan until the Communists were outflanked through the brilliant maneuver directed by General MacArthur which saw the landing of his forces at Inchon north along the Seoul line. From Formosa the forces of Nationalist China will at the right moment land on the China mainland and recover it from the Communists.

5. Formosa is the symbol of freedom and democracy in China that adverse circumstances have temporarily laid aside but which must be upheld and restored if communism is not to dominate all Asia and the island countries surrounding that continent.

6. The Nationalist Government under President Chiang Kai-shek is firmly established on Formosa, supported by a strong army and by the Chinese who live outside of China, and enjoys the recognition and respect of the great majority of the free countries of the world. This Government is one of the charter members of the United Nations, and was an ally of the United States and other free countries during World War II.

7. Considering the difficult conditions under which it operates and the ambitious plans that it has to reestablish itself on the China mainland, the Formosa Government has made a most remarkable record as a free and democratic government. Constructive criticisms by Chinese Nationalists themselves will help improve that Government. But such criticisms must not go as far as to weaken it in undertaking its historic mission on the mainland and to discourage American aid and regard for it, for they would thereby become destructive criticisms.

8. The most patriotic and the best Chinese leaders in different fields of human endeavor are with Nationalist China and against the Communist regime in China. They are the Chinese torchbearers in a world where the Communists are trying to superimpose their inhuman and severe way of life on the mankind's civilization which took thousands of years to achieve.

9. Between Nationalist China and Red China, the decided preference of the free world is for the former, and that preference should be made consistent, firm, and permanent.

10. Helping and defending Formosa is fighting and suppressing communism in Asia. If that is not done, communism will become irresistible and triumphant.

The Eisenhower Farm Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SPESSARD L. HOLLAND

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 20, 1954

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an editorial entitled "Surpluses Make an Argument for the Eisenhower Farm Plan," published in the Baltimore Sun this morning.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

SURPLUSES MAKE AN ARGUMENT FOR THE EISENHOWER FARM PLAN

The new crop report ties dramatically into the President's case against high-level price-support schemes in agriculture now pending in the Congress. The new report shows that we may close the present crop year with one of the biggest overall productions on record. This in the face of surpluses in such basic crops as wheat, which are already overtaxing storage facilities.

It is true that the new report shows that wheat and cotton acreage is down a little in line with previous control plans. It has to be remembered, though, that Congress did not allow those control plans to be applied as tightly as the facts warranted. Even more devastating is the evidence that even when farmers took lands out of wheat and cotton they put them into other crops in which equally troublesome surpluses now threaten.

Thus lands taken out of cotton and wheat merely boomed production of things like soybeans, oats, barley, flaxseed, sorghums, rice, dry beans, and sugar beets. Suggestively enough an amendment tacked onto the pending farm bill in the Senate Agriculture Committee would provide high-level supports in oats, barley, grain, sorghums, and rye. Thus, with new surpluses in these lines now in sight as a mere byproduct of high supports in other lines, the political farmers are pushing to extend directly to them more of the high-support influence which brought them into surplus supply in the first place.

It is plain—and alarming—facts like these which make the best ammunition for the Eisenhower people in making their congressional fight. This is the kind of factual argument which brought an administration victory in the House. The House finally took the flexibility principle which allows the price support to be lowered when surpluses threaten to develop. Senators AIKEN and ANDERSON, the brave Senate champions of the brave administration program, need merely stand fast on these facts to win general public support and, it may be confidently expected, a majority vote in Congress.

Damages Denied Fifth-Amendment Dodgers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD L. JACKSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 20, 1954

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following editorial:

DAMAGES DENIED FIFTH-AMENDMENT DODGERS

The much publicized suit of 23 film actors and writers to recover damages from the major film studios for denying them employment, following their refusal to testify before the House Un-American Activities Committee, has been thrown out of court. In an opinion which should stop future suits of this kind, Superior Judge Ellsworth Meyer cited two major reasons for denial of damages: (1) there is no law prohibiting employers from agreeing among themselves not to hire persons who refuse to answer questions about their activities; (2) the implied right that thus obtains is fortified by a natural right of employers to protect their business interests from the result of unfavorable inferences that might be drawn by their customers concerning a person who refused to testify.

In other words, it now seems firmly established that fifth-amendment pleaders may not escape the injury they do to themselves. As Judge Meyer put it, "A court or a jury is entitled to draw unfavorable inferences from the refusal of witnesses to testify." In a case where the proceedings are made public, as with the House Committee hearings, it is hardly possible to prevent the general public from drawing such inferences, and the result is that the witnesses themselves create the condition which makes their employment impossible.

The decision could not be otherwise if justice is to be served. However, one part of it confuses us. Although further legal efforts by the 23 against the major studios were specifically denied, the same relief was not granted Representatives DONALD L. JACKSON and CLYDE DOYLE, both members of the House Un-American Activities Committee and also named in the suit. The court held that the complaint of the 23 against them be thrown out, but granted the plaintiffs the right to file amended complaints within 30 days. This means that JACKSON and DOYLE, plus committee investigator William Wheeler, must face another court test, when logically, as public servants doing their sworn duty, there should be even less cause for complaint against them than against the film studios. We assume there is a technicality involved here that left the court no choice, but even so, the decision is to be regretted.

Our Seal of Approval?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 8, 1954

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, it is one thing to recognize the fact of Communist conquests in Asia. It is quite another to suggest we approve those conquests.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following editorial on the subject from the Minneapolis Star of July 13, 1954:

OUR SEAL OF APPROVAL?

Should the United States have top-level representation at windup sessions of the Geneva Conference on southeast Asia, or should we abstain? There are arguments to support either course, but at the moment the best course seems to be to abstain.

The French reportedly are angry with Washington's apparent decision not to give United States approval to what can hardly avoid being a disastrous defeat for the anti-Communist cause in Asia. Paris says this pulls the rug out from under the French delegation, weakens their bargaining power with the Communists.

That is hardly the case. United States advice to France as to the wise course in Indochina has been ignored, resented and rejected by Paris. Perhaps the French had their own good reasons for the course they did follow. But now the point has been reached where the policies heretofore advocated by this country can no longer do any good. There is nothing this country could do now which might save the day in Indochina—nothing, that is, short of a military effort exceeding our effort in Korea. The Communists are already well aware of all this; the physical presence of the United States Secretary of State at Geneva would not impress them.

We may not be able to say that we have no sare in the responsibility for the debacle in Indochina. We can honestly, however, since the policies we urgently supported were not adopted and did not therefore contribute to the present situation, reject the proposal that we assume a large share of the blame for France's costly defeat.

We can maintain with validity, therefore, that we should not be present to approve and to assume the stigma for a settlement which ratifies a new victory for Communist imperialism.

It does no good to argue that nothing more can be done now except to accept the facts. We may have to stand by and see yet another people swallowed up by totalitarian rule. We do not have to put our seal of approval on the disaster, and we should not.

It may be of some psychological value to other peoples in precarious positions, and even to those presently under alien Communist domination, to know that not all the western powers accept the principle that successful Red aggression can determine the status quo for the future.

Dr. Samuel J. Crumbine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 20, 1954

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago a great American passed away in New York City. I refer to the death of Dr. Samuel J. Crumbine, who began his career as a physician in the then small community of Dodge City. For a number of years he was a horse-and-buggy country doctor. Later he became dean of the medical school of the University of Kansas and secretary of the Kansas State Board of Health. Still later he went to New York as executive director of the American Child Health Association. Dr. Crumbine was a born crusader. More than anyone else, he brought to the American people a knowledge of the germ theory of disease and the necessity for improved sanitation. I doubt if anyone has made a greater contribution in the field of public health than he. The entire world is his debtor. As a part of my remarks, I desire to include the following editorial on the subject of Dr. Crumbine's life and work, which appeared in the Topeka Capital on July 15:

DR. SAMUEL J. CRUMBINE

Concern for the health of his fellowmen, and particularly of their children, put Dr. Samuel J. Crumbine into a crusade that made him internationally famous. Almost single-handed the country doctor ushered in an era of protective practices that since the turn of the century has lengthened the life span of Americans from an average of 49 years to the present 68-year expectancy. He died Tuesday at the ripe old age of 91 years.

Dr. Crumbine was one of the first health experts to connect disease prevalency with the common drinking cup, the filthy roller towel, and the breeding places of the house fly and other insects. He endured the ridicule, even enmity, of people who were loathe to change habits of a lifetime. But Dr. Crumbine eventually convinced the legislature, the medical profession and the general public that contagious diseases were spread through the germ breeders.

When Dr. Crumbine launched his "swat-the-fly" crusade typhoid fever was a common disease in Kansas, and all over the Nation. He showed the way to eliminate the pests which bred in filth and spread the germs to kitchens where persons contracted the dread disease. He was the father of later campaigns to clean up cities, and encourage the invention of sprays and insecticides which today have virtually eliminated the fly and its menace as a typhoid carrier.

Whole new industries were established in the wake of the slender, slightly-built, Kansas crusader's campaigns. The fly swatter, individual drinking cups and towels, antidotes for diseases caused by various kinds of insects and unsanitary conditions, followed as people realized that cleanliness promoted good health.

During his career as dean of the University of Kansas medical school he established a course in sanitary engineering, which he later incorporated in the rules and regulations of the State board of health. He was a relentless foe of the custom of pouring untreated sewage into the Kansas rivers, and started the crusade to end that dangerous practice, while serving as secretary of the State board for many years.

The fame won by his Kansas crusades for better health brought Dr. Crumbine's ability to the attention of the American Child Health Association, which he served as executive director from 1923 until his retirement a few years ago. Truthfully it can be said that the American people largely owe their increased span of life to the health practices instigated by Dr. Crumbine and his crusades to get them established on a nationwide scale.

What's the Matter With Dairymen?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. S. J. CRUMPACKER, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 20, 1954

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include the following editorial from the Plymouth (Ind.) Pilot-News of July 16, 1954:

WHAT'S THE MATTER WITH DAIRYMEN?

Congress, the farm organizations, and many others are grappling with the problem of surplus farm products, and can't decide what is best to do. The only thing they seem to be certain about is that there must be some Government support for prices which fall below "parity."

One of the biggest headaches in this big problem is the support for dairy products. Seems that Uncle Sam already has some 465 million pounds of butter on hand, and can't sell it. He offered butter to foreign nations for 42 cents a pound—far below local prices—but no takers. Butter and milk are drugs on the market, although everyone agrees that they are both super foods among all we eat.

Seems to us that both Government and the dairy industry have "missed the boat." What the dairy industry needs is to wake up and advertise their most wholesome product so they can sell far more than they ever have sold. They are "asleep at the switch."

Distillers advertise their product in flaming colors in newspapers and magazines—and sell. The dairymen have a far better product than the distillers, yet they sit idly by and fail to sell their products. We have heard one radio commercial on milk in late months. Why doesn't the dairy industry wake up and advertise their most wholesome product and sell enough to take up the slack? That's what all good businesses do.

The brewers advertise beer in all forms of publicity, and sell—but milk is a far better product than beer. Why don't the dairymen tell the world about it?

Cigarette manufacturers go to the smokers in continuous advertising, and sell—yet the dairymen have a far better product than the cigarette manufacturers. Why don't they tell the people about it?

Behold the report of food and drinks sold at the recent Arlington races where 45,000 fans gathered. 12,000 corn beef sandwiches, 30,000 hot dogs, 10,000 roast beef sandwiches, 35,000 orange drinks, 30,000 cokes, 24,000 bottles of beer etc. Not a glass of milk in that serving of the monster crowd.

What do the dairymen mean by allowing that golden opportunity to pass by unnoticed? They have a better drink than any sold to that big crowd—yet not a glass of milk mentioned in the long list of drinks sold. What's the matter with our dairymen; don't they want to sell their milk Are they content to storm Congress and ask for handouts to support their business instead of doing what other businessmen do—go after business in all ways of modern advertising?

Uncle Sam could accomplish far more for our dairymen if he would spend half the support money in advertising all over the Nation the high value of dairy products. That is the answer—sell more milk and butter and other dairy products through good advertising. They have the very best and most wholesome product of all in its class. All they need do is to go out and sell it.

Address of William E. Welsh, Secretary-Manager, National Reclamation Association, Before the National Rivers and Harbors Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 20, 1954

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, under permission to include extraneous material in the Appendix of the RECORD, I submit the excellent address which was delivered by Mr. William E. Welsh, secretary-manager of the National Reclamation Association, at the 41st convention of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress on May 26, 1954, in Washington, D. C.

I am quite certain my colleagues will find it most interesting and thought provoking. Mr. Welsh is to be congratulated for the fine manner in which he presented the benefits derived from irrigation and reclamation.

The address follows:

There are three basic elements upon which man must depend for his very existence—land, water, and air. There would appear to be an abundance of air. It is impossible to visualize a situation ever developing where it would be necessary to regulate the air we breathe, but with land and water it is a different matter. We have already learned that through improper use and inadequate protection our topsoil can be depleted and washed away. In fact, erosion is one of the major problems in the preservation of our soil. During the past 25 years there has been a great awakening throughout our Nation as to the necessity of proper soil conservation and the importance of watershed protection. Much is being accomplished along these lines.

WATER—CONTROLLING FACTOR

As a representative of the National Reclamation Association, I wish to discuss this problem as it relates to the western half of the United States—the arid and semiarid West. In that vast expanse of territory there is plenty of land—and good land, too—but the limiting factor, the controlling factor, which will determine the future growth, development, and prosperity of the West, is water.

The importance as well as the scarcity of water in that area has been recognized by the white man ever since he first set foot in the arid West. One of the many hazards which confronted the early pioneer who crossed the plains in a covered wagon was the difficulty encountered in finding water in quantities adequate for camping sites along the trails. There is a very interesting story about an immigrant caravan crossing southern Idaho, my home State, in 1862. A personal friend of mine told me that his father was the captain of a caravan which was following the old Oregon Trail along the south bank of the Snake River. Each day one of his responsibilities was to go ahead on horseback and endeavor to find a suitable place for camping for the night. Of course, it was always important to find a location which would be reasonably safe from attack by the Indians, but it was also equally important to find a place where water was available. On this particular day, he located a campsite close to the banks of the Snake River where natural hot water springs were pouring out of the ground, known today as Given's Hot Springs. When the covered wagon arrived at the site of the natural hot water springs, the members of the party got out and looked it over, agreed that it was a very desirable site, and that the hot water would be a very nice convenience for the personnel of the caravan in bathing and washing, but as they looked at the hot water they shook their heads and said, "No, we can't camp here. There is something wrong when water is coming out of the ground as hot as that. This place must be too close to hell." So the caravan moved on a few miles farther and pitched camp a safe distance away from the evil influences of the hot-water springs. That incident happened just 92 years ago this summer. We might not be quite so concerned about hot water now, but out in that dry desert country water is just as important as it was a century ago.

In the arid West man cannot survive upon water as it is made available by nature. A dry spell of 6 months' duration without rain is not uncommon. Most of the water in the West comes in the form of snow during the winter months. Hence, it must be stored in reservoirs during the spring runoff and held over for the dry, hot summer months to follow.

Because of the scarcity of water in that area, we believe that consumptive use should be given priority. For consumptive use, there is no substitute for water.

In the West our greatest development in the past has come—and in the future will come—through the development of irrigation by reclamation.

The National Reclamation Act was enacted in 1902 primarily for the purpose of developing the public lands of the West and creating opportunities and homes for people. Another reason for the passage of the act was the fact that the easier projects to construct had already been completed and the remaining projects yet undeveloped were too costly for private capital. Thus, most of the development of irrigation projects over the past quarter of a century or more have been brought about through Federal reclamation. That will continue to be true in the future.

However, we do not in any way consider the land and water resource development of the West now or in the future to be solely the responsibility of the Federal Government. States as well as local governments and local interests should actively participate in the planning and development of our water resource projects.

Reclamation has always been required to show financial feasibility, that is—there must be revenues produced from the project sufficient to repay the costs to the Federal Treasury. We have always approved that plan but we also have endorsed the time-honored plan of utilizing all revenues produced from the project, including power, to assist in repaying the costs.

NATIONAL BENEFITS OF RECLAMATION

The national benefits from reclamation will not cease in 40 years (the time now allotted for repayment), nor in 50 years. In fact, the national benefit will continue as long as the project remains in operation. For this reason, there should be no objection to extending the time of repayment as long as it is held within the useful life of the project.

The national benefits not only exceed the costs of interest-free money but in a very few years actually exceed the cost of the entire project. Secretary of Interior Douglas McKay, in his first published annual report stated regarding a study which had been made on 15 reclamation projects, "Thus far Federal taxes collected have exceeded the Federal investment in irrigation features in these projects by 4½ times. These revenues are in addition to the obligations voluntarily assumed by direct users of water.

The following factual and statistical information is convincing evidence as to the benefits of reclamation to the country as a whole:

Total Federal reclamation appropriations to date are $2,940,162,042.

Total cumulative crop value to date is $8,919,209,125. The larger projects have been producing only a few years.

Crop values annually now are approaching $1 billion.

Total area receiving water from Federal reclamation projects is 7 million acres.

Water users of Federal reclamation projects are less than 1 percent delinquent in the payment of amounts that are due.

FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLES RECOMMENDED

There are a few very fundamental and basic principles which, we believe, should be kept in mind.

1. Continued orderly development of the Nation's natural resources is essential to our national prosperity.

2. Water resource development should not be the responsibility of the Federal Government alone, but the Federal Government should remain ready and willing to participate to the extent necessary.

3. State water laws should be respected and observed by the Federal Government in the same manner as individuals are required to observe them.

4. The various departments and agencies of the Federal Government dealing with water resource development should retain the respective functional responsibilities now delegated to each by the Congress.

5. Water resource development should continue on a multipurpose, basin-wide basis wherever feasible.

6. The interstate compact approach should be encouraged in interstate streams.

7. There should be a shelf of water resource development projects investigated, planned, and ready to go whenever the economic conditions of the country might warrant such action.

8. The land limitation provisions of the Federal reclamation law should be reviewed carefully and modernized to the extent necessary to meet present day conditions.

9. Upstream watershed treatment should be considered as an appropriate part of a river basin development, but the fact should always be recognized that upstream watershed treatment alone will not control the major floods.

10. Valley authorities should not be established on any river basin except by full approval of a majority or more of the people living within the area affected.

A national program for the conservation and development of our land and water resources must of necessity envision the needs of every section of our country. Those needs will vary from East to West, and from State to State, and sometimes within States.

We will not have reached our ultimate goal until all of the rivers of the Nation are being used most beneficially in relation to the economy of the area in which they are located.

The President's Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD L. JACKSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 20, 1954

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following article from the Los Angeles Times of July 13, 1954:

By the Way With Bill Henry

Washington.—Whenever a churlish left-winger sidles up to you, as often happens in this town, and remarks that Dwight D. Eisenhower's great crusade doesn't seem to be getting airborne in the Congress—there's a good answer available.

PROGRAM

It has often been remarked that it is only 1 mile as the old crow flies straight down Pennsylvania Avenue from the White House to the Capitol but that it is the longest mile in the world. And most Presidents find that it gets longer every year they are in office. So when anyone starts needling about Eisenhower's troubles with the Congress it is only necessary to hark back one Congressional session into the history of the Democrats. That would be the year 1952 in which Harry Truman, having fooled everybody by being elected in 1948—thereby defying such authorities as H. V. Kaltenborn and the Chicago Tribune, both of which had solemnly announced his defeat on election night—was riding high, wide, and handsome in the 20th successive year of rule by the Democrats and boasting a good majority in both Houses of the Congress.

TROUBLES

Offhand I don't have the Truman state of the Union speech of that year before me but, if memory serves, some of the items which Harry Truman demanded of the Congress were (1) repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act; (2) approval of the Brannan agricultural plan; (3) approval of the St. Lawrence seaway; (4) FEPC legislation; (5) Harry's socialized medicine plan; and (6) more economic controls. Well, there were a lot more of them, all more or less right down the line of the left-wing Democrat policies which had kept electing them over and over again. How many of them did Harry get? Try to find any that he got. So when anybody starts measuring the failures of the Eisenhower program—there's a fairish sort of comparison with which to top off your little argument.

DIFFICULTIES

When you start any comparison you must begin with the realization Eisenhower's problem wasn't just to continue policies of many years' standing and a history of political success but, on the other hand, to reverse the whole trend. Furthermore it had to be done with the skimpiest of majorities in the House and no majority whatever in the Senate. To cap the climax the noblest Republican of them all, Bob Taft, died just as the new administration was, under his calm and strong guidance, getting itself organized to put the great crusade into action. It was a doubly cruel blow to the politically amateur Eisenhower administration to have its only top political professional pass from the picture before its program was even in the sketchiest shape.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Yet, despite these handicaps, the Eisenhower forces point to quite an astounding success. They put through the first complete tax reorganization in so many years that nobody can remember the last one. They overturned the high fixed-farm-price-support program and are assured of more logical flexible supports. They put through the St. Lawrence seaway project which Congress fought over bitterly for a generation and a half. A whole landslide of other legislation is now heading for passage. The major legislative setbacks have been on (1) the vote for 18-year-olds, (2) Taft-Hartley changes, and (3) statehood for Hawaii. There is some slight chance that this latter may still be enacted, as both House and Senate voted Hawaii statehood, but the Senate Democrats messed things up by tying Alaska to the Hawaii bill.

IMPROVEMENT

Less publicized accomplishments are nevertheless important; Congress passed all the major money bills before deadline (first time this has happened since the last Republican Congress of 1948) and will come close to the organization goal of adjournment by July 31.

Price Supports and Surpluses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 15, 1954

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following editorial from the Minneapolis Morning Tribune of Thursday, July 15, 1954:

Price Supports and Surpluses

Very soon, now, this session of Congress will make its final determination as to farm policy. Most important, it will decide whether to return to a system of flexible price supports as the present law provides, or to continue rigid, high supports on the so-called basic commodities.

The imminence of this vital decision prompts us to remind our readers, once again, that continuation of rigid supports will not solve the problems of farm production and income; it will merely postpone the day of reckoning.

Flexible supports will not solve the problems of farm production and income, either. The matter is too complex to be dealt with merely by changing the kind of props we us to shore up price levels. Flexible supports are no panacea, and it would be a dangerous mistake to consider them as such.

A sliding scale of supports responsive to production and demand will, however, start us on the road back from a wartime farm economy. The present system of high, rigid supports is a stimulus to production at extremely high levels. That kind of production was of great value in filling the abnormal demand here and abroad during war and postwar emergency periods. This insatiable demand—at least in terms of ability to pay—no longer exists. Rigid supports have outgrown their usefulness.

The most striking evidence of this is the mountain of surplus farm produce which has been purchased and stored by the Government. Without considering the crop now being harvested, our present wheat stocks would satisfy human consumption in the United States for more than a year and a half. We also have enough cotton on hand to fill United States demand for a year. Normal and emergency storage facilities are brimming.

There are already signs that the steady rise in surpluses is putting a heavy strain on the system of price supports. Dr. Karl Brandt, associate director of the Food Research Institute at Stanford University, puts the situation this way: "The support machinery is losing its grip."

We noted above that wheat stocks are tremendous even without taking the new crop into consideration. The new crop, however, must be considered. It is going to be another humdinger—an estimated 988 million bushels. The Department of Agriculture also expects a record oat crop and probably the second biggest corn crop in history. That is something to think about when the subject of production and price controls is considered.

Congress is understandably concerned—and not all its concern is crassly political—about the temporary reduction in farm income that would result from a cut in support prices. But Congress should be concerned, also, about the long-range damage to our farm economy that would result from ignoring the danger signal of unwieldy surpluses.

One Word Picture Is Worth a Thousand Words

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 20, 1954

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, every man is a poet at heart, but there are few who will attempt to write a poem, and an even smaller number who, having tried, will frankly admit they cannot. Nonetheless, more can be said in a few lines of good verse, often, then in a thousand lines of mediocre prose, and at a considerable savings in time, energy and eyestrain.

While wending my way happily to work the other morning, I was pleased to listen to a radio program Your Timekeeper, over station WRC in Washington, emceed by Mr. Bob Reed. At that time he recited a poem entitled "That Little Chap O' Mine." The words and spirit of it so intrigued me that I later secured a copy, which I include in the Record today.

The moral, it seems to me, is that we may not always become what we would like ourselves to be, but in response to the faith and adulation of a small child, we usually do not have the heart to give up trying.

The poem That Little Chap O' Mine, follows:

That Little Chap o' Mine

(Anonymous)

To feel his little hand in mine,
So clinging and so warm,
To know he thinks me strong enough
To keep him safe from harm;
To see his simple faith in all
I say or do,
It sort o' shames a fellow, but it
Makes him better, too;
And I am trying hard to be the man
He fancies me to be,
Because I have this chap at home
Who thinks the world o' me.
I would not disappoint his trust
For anything on earth,
Nor let him know how little I
Always think I'm worth.
But after all, it's easier, that
Brighter road to climb,
With the little hands behind me to
Push me all the time.
And I reckon I'm a better man than
What I used to be,
Because I have this chap at home,
Who thinks the world of me.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Printing and binding for Congress, when recommended to be done by the Committee on Printing of either House, shall be so recommended in a report containing an approximate estimate of the cost thereof, together with a statement from the Public Printer of estimated approximate cost of work previously ordered by Congress within the fiscal year (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 145, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on Printing, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. The money derived from such sales shall be paid into the Treasury and accounted for in his annual report to Congress, and no sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

E

I

IN THI

Mr.
days a
livered
the So
the co
illustra
well-fe
but on
A poor
fightin
happy.
The
torial
tration
tor fee
courses
eventu
to reap
I ask
torial
Ther
was ord
as follo

There
Vice Pre
for heal
cial wou
July spe
After
to Unite
strumen
to check
scattered
formula
as Engl
shortcon
could be
would r
vincible
for such
Howev
against
members
gether w
so thoro
needed
versal pr
Most
depender
gems of
dogs, pic
which h
all living
Observ
tions in
seaport
shores),
quired o
to the ca
"I sug
well fed
pears to
quarters
are they

Appendix

Parable of the Dogs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 21, 1954

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, a few days ago our great Vice President delivered a fine and eloquent address at the Somerset, Pa., sesquicentennial. In the course of his speech he used as an illustration the parable of the dogs. A well-fed, well-housed, and cared-for dog, but on the end of a leash, was unhappy. A poorly fed mongrel, with no shelter, fighting his own fights, but free, was happy.

The Somerset Democrat makes editorial comment and feels that the illustration can be well used by us. The editor feels that if we pursue some of the courses now being traveled, we may eventually be told when to sow and when to reap, and we may then go hungry.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PARABLE OF THE DOGS

There was only one fly in the ointment Vice President Richard M. Nixon produced for healing the political, economic and social wounds of the world, in his Fourth of July speech at Somerset.

After giving a sort of left-handed approval to United States foreign policy as an instrument for providing allies when needed to check Communist aggression on widely scattered global fronts, he did not offer any formula for getting any such stanch allies as England and France in line. Such a shortcoming (if such it might be called) could be excusable, though, inasmuch as it would require something possibly as invincible as a U. N. international police force for such an uphill job.

However, the Vice President's firm stand against admitting Communist China to membership in the United Nations—together with many other laudable objectives—so thoroughly overshadowed the problem of needed allies that his address deserved universal praise.

Most notable (also appropriate for an Independence Day theme) among Mr. Nixon's gems of eloquence was his parable of the dogs, picked up on a visit to Hong Kong, in which he illustrated the inherent desire of all living creatures for freedom.

Observing apparently prosperous conditions in various sections of the big Chinese seaport (governed by interests from foreign shores), Vice President Nixon said he inquired of a prominent native journalist as to the cause of discontent.

"I suggested that the people seemed to be well fed, they are dressed in garb that appears to be satisfactory, and their living quarters apparently are comfortable. Why are they dissatisfied?" he asked.

"I can best answer your question," the native replied, "by citing you the example of two dogs. One dog is kept in a comfortable doghouse, sheltered from the weather and from attack by man or beast. His food is supplied by his master, and in every way he is well cared for. Now and then he is washed and dried, maybe with an electric fan, even his hair is combed. In the doghouse he is a pet. He is looked after meticulously and affectionately. But he is chained.

"Then there is the other dog. He is just a long, lanky mongrel that has to look out for himself, find his own food and shelter, and fight his own fights. No master restricts his freedom of activity. He roves his territory at will. He is free. He is not chained. As he roams the fields and the streets he is seen by the other dog, and the dog in the doghouse is envious. It epitomizes the phenomenon of the mildly penal institution known as the doghouse in American slang."

The Asiatic parable of the dogs narrated by Vice President Nixon is not inconsistent with the wisdom of Confucius. It could be studied with profit by the American farmers who each year vote themselves into 90 percent parity bondage invented by vote-buying politicians.

Eventually, after mature analysis, the farmer chained to a restricted acreage would become envious of the free farmer at liberty to both sow and reap without Government interference.

His chains broken, the bribed farmer would not only embrace President Eisenhower's flexible price support program, but would throw all price fixing—rigid and otherwise—out the window.

Incidentaly, the regenerated farmer would let Secretary Benson out of the doghouse.

Republican Prospects in November

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EARLE C. CLEMENTS
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 21, 1954

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, for 56 years the people of Kentucky have welcomed each issue of one of our favorite local publications, the Kentucky Irish American, published in Louisville, Ky. Its columns have been filled with the best of humor and sage comments on the present condition of the State, the Nation, and the world.

One of the most widely read features of each issue is the column so ably written by the editor, Mike Barry. His figures of speech and his comments are often sharply drawn but always worthy of consideration, for he has a consummate alertness to the thinking of the man in the street and to reflect this thinking in his writings.

I commend to my colleagues the reading of Mike Barry's column for the issue of July 17, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

It seems we've been wrong. For some time now we've been under the impression that things weren't going so good for the Republicans. Business conditions around the country have been a little unsteady, our foreign affairs are in a worse muddle than usual, and the Republican Party itself has been split wide open.

Prospects for the GOP in the November elections looked pretty dim. It's been our guess—and all election forecasts are nothing more than a guess—that Republican candidates would not only lose all the races that look close, but would get knocked off in some districts where they hadn't lost since Honest Abe carried them home.

That's the way we saw it, but now the two biggest news magazines in the country say different. The current issue of Newsweek, a magazine that really struggles to be impartial, says there's a wave of optimism among leading Republicans—that they feel a trend toward their candidates.

Time magazine, which dropped all pretense of impartiality wnen Eisenhower first became a candidate for the Republican nomination, can be expected to go much farther than its rival, and Time does just that.

The July 19 issue of Time, generally referred to as the GOP answer to the Democratic Digest, soothed our fears regarding foreign affairs. That dynamic new foreign policy Time had talked about when Eisenhower went into office must be working far better than any of us had dreamed.

"Dulles and U. N. Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge were confident," Time said this week. Another paragraph referred to Dulles' "firm view" and his "confident tone," and added that Lodge "reflected Dulles' confidence."

Simmer down, everybody. Good ol' John Foster and Henry Cabot have got those foreign diplomats eating out of our hand. What if we do wake up some morning and discover the rascals have chewed off everything up to the elbow? Why, we'll take care of that right away—use our other hand for some of that instant, massive retaliation.

WHO LOST CHINA? CHIANG

If you want to be an old killjoy, you can quote the Milwaukee Journal. That paper's editorial said last week, "The Republican high command has apparently determined to make foreign policy an issue of the fall campaign. The theory, someone has said, seems to be that 'there is some more mileage in Acheson.' Vice President Nixon * * * charged in a television broadcast that the Truman administration left behind 'a foreign policy of weakness, a policy of surrender of principle at the conference table.'

"Much could be said about the dishonesty of these statements. And about the irony of a Republican spokesman making them at this time.

"It wasn't American policy that lost China to the Reds, of course. Chiang Kai-shek lost China. The United States tried to help him with materiel for 39 divisions and $2 billion in grants and credits. Wholesale desertions gave most of the men and equipment to the Communists. Chinese grafters in high places lined their pockets

"Only massive American armies fighting in China might have saved the country for Chiang. The American people, weary of the struggle after World War II, would never have consented to such action, had any American Government even considered it.

"As for the charge of weakness in foreign policy—the Eisenhower administration, to date, certainly looks worse than did the Truman administration.

"The Eisenhower administration has accepted a shaky and unsatisfactory armistice 'at the conference table' in Korea. It is standing by while Indochina, or great parts of it, disappear back of the Iron Curtain. The free world alliance is doing poorly under its leadership. Finally, while warning of the growing menace of communism, it has continued to cut back military, foreign aid and propaganda appropriations. * * *

"IKE A LEADER? YOU'RE JOKING

"It is heard that the Nixon speeches reflect desperation * * * about the coming elections.* * *

"Kicking foreign policy and issues around the political arena at this moment in history is a dangerous occupation.

"It complicates the problem of trying to develop a sound and sensible foreign policy.

"It makes it increasingly difficult for the Democrats * * * to continue cooperation with the present administration in foreign affairs. * * *

"It causes serious disunity here at home. * * *

"President Eisenhower might halt these tactics of NIXON and the GOP political masterminds. Or is a shabby try for political victory to be placed above national unity, bipartisan foreign policy, honesty, and decency?

"Is this the great crusade?"

That last part ought to be good for a laugh. Imagine expecting Eisenhower to exert leadership. He let the Republican masterminds run his campaign in 1952, let them shove MCCARTHY down his throat; Ike gagged a little, but he got him down, let them take over completely when he went into office.

As somebody said long ago, the whole trouble is nobody ever told Ike he was elected President.

ONE LAST WORD OF ADVICE

But is Eisenhower downhearted, worried, pessimistic? Not at all, he's looking at the world through rose-colored glasses. Time magazine says so, and you know Time. Honorbound, Time is—the editors stand behind every copy they sell. "Last week," said Time, "with considerable justification, the President found a handy word to describe the prospects for his proposals on Capitol Hill. His word: Rosy."

That, with considerable justification, wasn't enough, so Time's concluding paragraph said, "In balance, the Eisenhower program was in good health last week, considering the circumstances, and Ike's bullishness was justified."

Cheer up, all you Republicans. Everything's gonna be all right.

Just one bit of advice—if you've got a job in Washington, don't send out any more laundry after November 2.

The Late Honorable Joe Farrington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT HALE

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 21, 1954

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, Maine had its primary election on June 21, and so I was not on the floor on that day to join in the eulogies to my friend Joe Farrington, the late Delegate from Hawaii. I shall always regret this. No one could have been fonder of Joe Farrington that I was, and no one could have had a greater admiration for his capacity and character as a legislator.

There was no Member of our body better qualified to render a decision on any question that can arise here than Joe Farrington. Yet, under the peculiar terms on which he served, he was disqualified from voting on any question even if it was one of vital importance to the people whom he represented. I often wondered how he endured a situation which to me would be so humiliating and galling. But he did endure it with the utmost cheerfulness as he endured all the vicissitudes and frustrations of his service here.

Back in the year 1931 I first met Joe Farrington's father, the Honorable Wallace Rider Farrington, then Governor of Hawaii. His family came from the town of Brewer in Penobscot County, Maine. The Farringtons have always been a good Maine family. Joe and his father took the utmost pride in their Maine ancestry and were always deeply interested in all the affairs of the State. It was on that account that I first got to know Joe Farrington and so to become fond of him, when we arrived here together in the 78th Congress in January 1943.

As everyone knows, Joe's ambition was to make Hawaii the 49th State of the Union and all his labors in this vineyard were with that ultimate objective in mind. He could not have conducted this struggle with more dignity, more intelligence, and more ability. Statehood bills actually passed the House in June 1947 and in March 1950, but these triumphs were in vain because in each of these sessions the Senate failed to act. In the present Congress the House passed the statehood on March 7, 1953, and the Senate passed a statehood bill on April 1, 1954, but tied Alaska up with Hawaii, and up to this point they have not been disentangled. I should like to say with all possible emphasis that Hawaii should be given statehood before the present Congress adjourns. Joe Farrington needs no monument for his services, but Hawaii deserves justice, and I am convinced that statehood is no more than justice for this great and progressive Territory.

Joe Farrington was a good man and a reasonable man. He had Yankee shrewdness. He also had a tolerance and a temperateness which must have been his birthright as a citizen of those beautiful islands where, more than anywhere else in the entire world, people from all nations and of all races have learned to work together in democratic association for the common good.

Joe had Yankee culture behind him. He had the training of a famous American university. But he also was a product of Polynesian culture which is more remarkable than many of our people realize.

I particularly agree with what Walter Judd has said about Joe Farrington. He had great vision. He realized that this country could not hope to lead the world in the cause of freedom if its own institutions were defaced by racism and intolerance. He knew from earliest youth in Hawaii that to be a human being did not necessarily mean to be a Caucasian; and that, as far as Asia is concerned, the Asians would accept Communist supremacy rather than white supremacy. He knew that to be a good American did not depend on the color of the skin. To judge Joe Farrington's life work one must realize the spiritual greatness of his concept of America.

Mr. Speaker, you did me the honor to appoint me a member of the official delegation which went from this House to accompany our colleague's ashes to their last resting place in Nuuanu Cemetery, Honolulu, and to attend the memorial services which were held for him in the constituency which he represented so worthily.

That visit to Hawaii, though it could not have been sadder, was deeply revealing to me and I shall always be happy that I was able to make the journey. People in Hawaii told me that not since the end of the Hawaiian monarchy in 1893 has there been such an outpouring of affection, respect, and grief as was manifested for our colleague. This I can readily believe.

In addition to the funeral services held in the Congregationalist Church, our delegation attended the ceremonies where our colleague's ashes lay in state in the throne room of the Iolani Palace. That was one of the most extraordinary tributes to a man that I can imagine. Hour after hour the people of the Territory came to do reverence to Joe's memory while various groups of his people sang chants and funeral music in his honor. Nothing could have been more moving.

Quite apart from Joe Farrington's character and achievements as a legislator, I would pay tribute to him as a human being. A delightful host, a selfless friend, convivial in the best sense, sharing in the joys of life, one could never find a more charming companion. It is hard to understand that we shall not see him again in the flesh.

I want to take this occasion to express my sympathy to Betty Farrington his devoted wife, the very able partner in all his work, and to his two children of whom he was so fond who owe so much to his devotion.

American Trade Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. SMITH

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 21, 1954

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, the Commercial Appeal, of Memphis, Tenn., is one of the great newspapers of our country. During the more than a century in which it has been published, this newspaper has always been a leader in the fight against high tariffs and restrictive trade policies. Under unanimous consent, I include the following two editorials from the Commercial Appeal:

WATCHES AND DEFENSE

The watch-making industry is making a campaign for higher tariffs. It has obtained a split vote from the Federal Tariff Commission for a 50-percent increase in duties on Swiss watches and watch movements. President Eisenhower, who has been rejecting similar recommendations, has only a few days remaining for action on this one.

Strong emphasis is being laid by the makers of watches in the United States on domestic jeweled watch workers being essential to the national defense. These men work with a truly rare skill on extremely small bearings.

The tariff advocates tell of an incident in World War II, when military authorities relied on Swiss jeweled bearings, but found that it took 4,000 of these bearings to get one of our bombers into the air. Two men had to be smuggled out of Switzerland to get work underway here, and teach other workers their skills.

We believe the watch men have established the necessity of supporting jeweled bearing workers in this country, for defense needs.

But we read a better suggestion of a method several weeks ago. Let the Government pay a subsidy to the watch plants that use them, and also to the electronics industry, which uses many of them. Let the subsidy be paid from defense appropriations.

This would accomplish exactly what the watch men say needs to be done.

To attain this objective by way of a tariff would be wasteful in the extreme. It would require the entire public to pay the subsidy, at about $1.65 of increased price every time a jeweled watch is bought. It would support that much more margin of profit for well-managed watch companies, without assuring the continued existence of poorly managed companies.

Such a tariff change would break into mutually profitable exchange of sales. In 1946–53 we bought $1,020,910,000 of Swiss products, which allowed the Swiss to buy $1,464,590,000 from us, a valuable portion of international business in which all trades and industries have an interest, as well as the comparatively small watch business.

Protective tariff men keep reminding us of the workmen whose jobs could be lost because of imports. We point to the jobs supported by the $444 million balance of our exports to Switzerland beyond our Swiss imports.

We say leave the tariff alone, protect our many jobs in the export business, and look after the jeweled bearing evperts for defense purposes with a specific subsidy.

FREEDOM OF CURRENCY

Economic conditions in numerous European nations have improved substantially within the last few years. There are exceptions, notably France, but sound progress has been and remains the rule.

Perhaps the strongest evidence of economic recovery is to be found in the fact that there is widespread and serious discussion of eventual return to freedom of currency. Experts estimate that a cautious approach to reestablishment of so-called convertibility for the money of the major nations would be highly profitable to all concerned.

Within the last few days Harold Stassen, head of the United States Foreign Operations Administration, and Assistant Treasury Secretary W. Randolph Burgess went to London to debate with European leaders the possibility of reviving convertibility for the major currencies of the world. The meetings, held in the Treasury Building in London, included the finance ministers of 12 west European countries.

It is clearly understood that the problems involved in going back to the days when pounds, marks, dollars, francs and the like could be freely exchanged are many and difficult. Currency restrictions, imposed mainly because of conditions created by World War II, are numerous and complicated. Their removal would obviously create still other problems for national and global economies built up around them. It is fully agreed that haste must be made slowly.

At the same time, however, it is just as clearly understood that elimination of limits on the exchange of money would facilitate and expand international trade. It would, of course, stimulate competition and open markets that are now practically closed. Time would be needed for planning for adjustments to the changes certain to develop, and so it is reassuring that the approach is careful and gradual.

Any move toward convertibility depends largely on what Great Britain is able and willing to do. It is estimated that the pound sterling is used to finance around 40 percent of the world's commerce, and this fact gives the British numerous markets that are practically captive. In return for going along with convertibility the British would certainly want lowered tariff barriers and the reduction of other import handicaps.

If people who sell in Great Britain, however, were able to make rather free use of pounds to buy with us, it would increase and diversify our markets. Reports at the present indicate a start toward currency freedom may be made within less than a year. The London meeting is in a way preparatory to a meeting of the members of the International Monetary Fund in September. The auspices just now are good.

Defense Contracts With General Motors Corp.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 21, 1954

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, I recently received a request from one of my constituents to obtain for him information regarding defense contracts placed by this Government with the General Motors Corp. "Is it true," my constituent inquired, "that the United States has cancelled defense contracts with many industrial firms, but not a single one with General Motors?"

In order to reply, I requested the Department of Defense to release statistics showing the status of such contract cancellations, and I believe the answer to be of sufficient general interest to bring it to public attention.

I have in my possession a table showing cumulative net totals of military prime contract awards of $10,000 or more to all business firms in the United States in one column, and to the General Motors Corp. in another column, at 6-month intervals since Korea and through April 1954. The table shows that contract cancellations since June 1953 reduced the General Motors total from $7,095,800,000 to $6,728,900,000 in contracts of $10,000 or more. It also shows that the ratio of General Motors to all United States contracts of that size is now lower than at the end of any fiscal or calendar year since Korea. While at the end of June 1951, General Motors' ratio was 8 percent of the total, and stood at 7.2 percent at the end of the 1953 fiscal year, it dropped to 6.4 percent of the total by April 30, 1954.

According to the Defense Department, these General Motors figures include all contracts with subsidiaries and divisions of that corporation.

Mr. Speaker, there has been a considerable amount of loose talk and insidious rumor mongering on this subject, and to my knowledge, this is the first time that a clear-cut refutation has been furnished by authoritative sources, citing dollars and cents to set the record straight.

I believe that my constituent has performed a public service by posing the question which prompted my research and finally induced the Defense Department to release the information so that the people may know.

Net value of military prime contracts of $10,000 or more, with all business firms and with General Motors Corp.,[1] cumulative from July 1950 through specified dates

[In millions]

	United States total	General Motors Corp.[2]	
		Amount	Percent of total
June 30, 1951	$29,687.0	$2,372.5	8.0
Dec. 31, 1951	43,961.0	2,907.2	6.6
June 30, 1952	73,849.8	5,489.5	7.8
Dec. 31, 1952	80,331.8	5,285.2	6.6
June 30, 1953	98,723.0	7,095.8	7.2
Apr. 30, 1954	104,875.5	6,728.9	6.4

[1] Army, Navy, and Air Force supply, service and construction contracts awarded in continental United States, excluding all contracts of less than $5,000, excluding Army and Air Force contracts of less than $10,000 since Dec. 31, 1950, and excluding Navy contracts of less than $10,000 since June 30, 1951.

[2] Includes all contracts with subsidiaries and divisions.

Falkland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DeWITT S. HYDE
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 21, 1954

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article which was forwarded to me by Mr. Cyril J. O'Brien, editor, Applied Physics Laboratory News, Johns Hopkins University, Silver Spring, Md., and which appeared in the March edition regarding one of Montgomery County's historical landmarks, the Montgomery Blair Mansion "Falkland":

FALKLAND

A hundred years on top of the hill, the ancient walls of Falkland today house 5 members of the Applied Physics Laboratory—once it was 15—who live in an environment where every rung, pane, and board is heavy with history, legend, and the remnants of a grandeur long gone.

Falkland, at Blair Mill Road and East-West Highway, was once the home of Montgomery Blair, servants, coachmen, and southern elegance. It is now a busy, friendly, and homey boarding house.

Its 24 rooms, most of them occupied by guests, its paneled formal parlor, family living room, fame room, library, solarium, and spacious staircases reflect the gracious living it knew when Montgomery Blair became its master in 1853. Montgomery was the son of Francis Preston Blair, who headed the once-prominent Globe, was one of the founders of the Republican Party, and played a major role in the nomination of Abraham Lincoln in 1860.

Francis Preston Blair built a mansion on the estate he called Silver Spring (Eastern Avenue) in the midst of a wooded valley of horse chestnut trees and tall silver pines—until recently leased by the P. J. Nee Furniture Co. It is now being torn down. Montgomery Blair built his famous manor on top of the nearby hill overlooking the flat, level land below him that today is the community of Silver Spring. As his father, the master of Falkland proved a prominent figure in those halcyon days of the War Between the States, and the years immediately before and after. Montgomery Blair was Postmaster General under Linçoln, gave this country its first free postal delivery, defended Dred Scott before the Supreme Court, refused to own a slave, and helped secure a defense for John Brown at Harper's Ferry.

Most of the history of the old mansion was probably made on the first floor. Here—before fire consumed the original building in 1864—was where Montgomery Blair may well have prepared his case for Dred Scott. When President Lincoln had dropped by—and he visited Silver Spring and Montgomery Blair often—he may well have chatted in the privacy of the solarium, with its continuous wall seats, also used as storage boxes for the miscellany of the Blairs. Lincoln may well have noted the trophy of huge moose antlers over a crest of MB, which today lies at an odd angle in a corner.

But it was not all days of grandeur. Falkland also knew the terror of war. In that hot July of 1864, Lt. Gen. Jubal Early at the head of 1,600 cavalry and infantry, stormed down through Frederick and Olney, into Montgomery County on his way to Washington. Union pickets soon had the word to Washington that the Stars and Bars were almost within gunshot.

But Early allowed his men to rest in the cool woods, now the area of the Blair Station post office, and the Canada Dry Bottling Co. According to Blair Lee III, General Early found shelter in Falkland, and Maj. Gen. John C. Breckinridge, a distant relative of the Blairs, found shelter with his junior officers in the Francis Preston Blair manor. According to many reports, it was the Confederate soldiers who set fire to Falkland the next day, but Blair Lee III claims this was not the case. According to his grandfather, Blair Lee, a nephew of Montgomery Blair, Breckenridge set a guard around the home of Francis Preston Blair to protect it from the host of camp followers, civilian vandals, looters, and pillagers who followed in the wake of the troops. Early did not take this precaution at Falkland. It was these camp followers—not Confederate troops—who set fire to Falkland, Blair Lee said.

Montgomery Blair immediately made plans to rebuild Falkland, which was restored in 1865.

Montgomery Blair died in July 1883, at Falkland and is buried beside his father in the Blair tomb at the Rock Creek Cemetery.

Falkland is still owned by the Blair estate, which despite the pressure for land to house mushrooming apartments and commercial buildings, has managed to keep the immediate vicinity of Falkland hill unmolested.

Girl Scouting: One Answer to Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. KEAN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 21, 1954

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to include in the Appendix of the RECORD an article written for the Girl Scout Leader by one of my constituents, Dr. Lillian M. Gilbreth, entitled "Girl Scouting: One Answer to Communism."

Mrs. Gilbreth is not only well known as a successful engineer, but is the mother of the 12 children referred to in the best seller Cheaper by the Dozen, written by 1 of the 12:

GIRL SCOUTING: ONE ANSWER TO COMMUNISM

(By Lillian Moller Gilbreth)

Ever since its founding, the Girl Scout movement had made its principles and practices clear. Each girl and adult who joins the Girl Scouts knows the Promise and Laws. The public knows the organization, its aims, its program, its readiness to be of service. The record speaks for itself.

Yet we cannot assume that everyone understands our work and our motives for doing it. We cannot take comfort in the thought that everyone accepts us as spiritually minded, as patriotic, as trying to be constructive in every thought and deed. We must therefore reaffirm our beliefs, reiterate our pledges. As we think of our motto, "Be prepared," we must be able to answer for ourselves and for others the question, "Prepared for what?"

Today the world needs individuals and organizations prepared to meet the challenge of communism. As Girl Scouts we are prepared to do so because we are imbued with the responsibilities and the privilege of following our Promise and Laws day by day, as best we can. And we realize that this is not easy, even with no other challenge than the human impluse to dodge responsibility and overlook opportunity.

Communism challenges our beliefs in God and our country. It twists the bright and shining traits of character that we try to exemplify: honor, loyalty, usefulness, friendship, courtesy, obedience, thrift, clean living. But we stand with Girl Scouts and Girl Guides all over the world who know the true meaning of these words, each in her own language, each in her own life. In war and in peace, as individuals, in patrols, or in troops, we measure our activities, our plans, our program as designed to carry good intentions into effective action. We prize the girl who furnishes an outstanding example of bravery, of service. We respect the rights of every individual, and we expect each one to carry on, no matter what job faces her—doing the job in the Girl Scout way.

Every Girl Scout in the United States of America has the job, as a growing citizen, of doing her part to meet the challenge of communism to our country and our way of life. She has many resources in doing so—her family, her fellow citizens, the tradition of self-government which the past has bequeathed to her and in which she shares both opportunities and responsibilities. The religious and educational institutions that include her give security and support as free as the air she breathes. She recognizes, accepts, and appreciates all this as she pledges "allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the Republic for which it stands."

The great documents of our national heritage speak to her in matchless language, bringing her high ideals that expand her spirit. She points with pride to each President's wife as Honorary President of the Girl Scouts of the U. S. A. She is also proud of what her adult leaders and many thousands of former Girl Scouts have done to serve their country.

The Girl Scout knows that the badges for which she works are not awards or rewards, but rather indications of competence in various areas of interest. Her experience in earning them not only enriches her own life and helps her to participate more effectively in the various groups to which she belongs; it also points the way to types of service that may be useful to her community in times of need. She comes to recognize that every Girl Scout is expected to do her job with professional adequacy and with the volunteer spirit.

What can communism really offer as it challenges all this? Nothing. What should Girl Scouts do to meet the challenge? Keep busy at our work of service with serenity of spirit. Try to attain the educated mind, the educated hands, the educated heart which will help us to keep our Girl Scouts promise and prove ourselves assets to God, our country, and our fellow men. Girl Scouts try.

Free Enterprise and the Atom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DeWITT S. HYDE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 21, 1954

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, under permission heretofore granted, I insert in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Washington Evening Star of July 20 with respect to the amendment of the Atomic Energy Act of 1946 in order to bring private enterprise into the development of nuclear power for industrial and other nonmilitary purposes:

FREE ENTERPRISE AND THE ATOM

Senators LEHMAN, MORSE, MURRAY and a number of their like-minded colleagues have not won any credit for themselves with their extravagant attack on the much-needed move to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1946 in order to encourage greater participation by private enterprise in the development of nuclear power for industrial and other nonmilitary purposes.

From listening to these gentlemen—all members of the self-styled "little band of liberals" in Congress—one gets the impression that they honestly believe that our thoroughly outmoded 1946 law cannot be so amended without resulting in a "giveaway" of "such proportions as to dwarf the imagination." But at the same time, even if he has only some rudimentary knowledge of the facts involved, one also gets the impression that the Senators are talking through their hats in a way that makes the mind reel with wonder over how silly, and how reckless, our elected representatives can become when they give free rein to their doctrinaire prejudices.

For the amendments in question—amendments whose substance has been vigorously and unanimously endorsed by the 5-member Atomic Energy Commission—do not open the road to anything even remotely comparable to a so-called giveaway. Their sole purpose, actually, is to speed up our country's progress toward the achievement of economically feasible nuclear power through projects like the one now being undertaken by the AEC in cooperation with the Duquesne Light Co. of Pittsburgh—a history-making

60,000-kilowatt project in which the company is relieving the American taxpayer of a considerable burden by agreeing to pay about $30 million of the costs that the Federal Government would otherwise have to bear in carrying out the enterprise.

Nationally and internationally, of course, with just such projects as this, it is of utmost importance for the United States to do everything possible to achieve world leadership as soon as it can in harnessing the atom in a way that will enable nuclear power to compete on a relatively equal footing with the conventional sources of energy in producing electricity, running factories, illuminating cities, etc. But this goal is something that cannot be attained by the AEC working alone behind a wall of secrecy, with private enterprise frozen out of the picture and left doing little or nothing on the sidelines—a point that has been well and repeatedly emphasized by Commissioner Thomas E. Murray and numerous other experts.

Thus, as Mr. Murray put it some time ago, "Just as I am convinced that initially the Federal Government must sponsor and finance full-scale power reactor development, so I am equally convinced that such sponsoring and financing will fall far short of what is needed unless there are enlisted in this cause the cost-cutting drives, the know-how skills and competition of many segments of America's business and industry." And it is primarily for that reason that the current steps have been taken to amend the 1946 law to provide incentives to free enterprise as regards such things as atomic investments, leasing arrangements, patent rights, and ownership of certain facilities.

Accordingly, in opposing all this with the completely specious giveaway charge, Mr. LEHMAN and his group have in effect called for a continuing Government monopoly that would result—as the AEC itself has unanimously warned—in deplorable and perhaps very dangerous delays in the development of American nuclear power for peacetime purposes. Happily, however, most Members of Congress—a good, solid majority—seem to have vision enough to vote against such delays by voting for the speedup amendments.

Today Is a Black Day for Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PATRICK J. HILLINGS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 21, 1954

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, Communist tyrants across the world are rejoicing today. At dawn this morning in Geneva 12 million human beings were sold into Communist slavery by the action of leaders of the free world with the exception of the United States. The boundary line of the Iron Curtain was moved forward to include 77,000 square miles of territory in Indochina. This is, indeed, a black day for those who believe in the principles of human freedom and the dignity of man. This is a day which has strengthened the Communist hand immeasurably and which has undoubtedly advanced the date when we may be faced with world war III.

Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Select Committee on Communist Aggression, I have just returned from hearings conducted in Europe. I listened to scores of witnesses who had escaped from behind the Iron Curtain and who told us in graphic detail of conditions there and of what it means to live under the Communist heel. In addition, I visited the Soviet zone of Germany to briefly inspect that area and I talked with a large number of individuals in other parts of Europe in an effort to understand the situation. Last month, prior to joining the Committee on Communist Aggression in Europe, I was in Guatemala on the eve of the successful revolution which overthrew the Red regime.

As a result of my service on this committee, I am completely convinced that the more the free world surrenders to the Communists, the greater the chances are of a third world war. The stronger we allow the Reds to become the sooner they will proceed with their plans to destroy the United States and all remaining free nations.

The best allies the free world has today are the millions of people behind the Iron Curtain who know and understand the terrible consequences of communism. The Soviet Union and her Communist satellites do not dare risk war today for fear that the Communist world would collapse and that the enslaved peoples would turn on the Soviet masters. Just as the Guatemalan Army refused to defend the Red regime against the anti-Communist forces attempting to overthrow it, the satellite armies of the Soviets would not defend their Communist masters today if war should come. However, a few years from now the Reds hope to consolidate their gains by ruthless liquidation of leaders of anti-Communist movements behind the Iron Curtain. When that time comes, the Soviet Union and other Communist nations will be ready for all-out war.

It is essential that the leaders of the free world understand this basic fact: The Russians do not want war today. They are not prepared for it. If we are willing to risk war in order to stand firm against Communist demands and pressures, the Reds will have no choice but to back down in the face of such a determined position on the part of the free peoples. If we are not willing to take such a strong stand, the Communists will continue to gain in their plans for world conquest until such time as they are prepared for all-out conflict.

Those who talk of peaceful coexistence with Communists are making a terrible mistake. There can be no peaceful coexistence with the devil. Peaceful coexistence means giving the Communists time to gather the necessary strength to destroy us. It is my sincere hope and prayer that the leaders of the free world will awaken to this fact.

We must remember that time is on the Communists' side. They are constantly building their strength and increasing their war potential and indoctrinating the young people of the new generation. Eventually they will be in a position to overtake us.

Mr. Speaker, Premier Mendes-France returns to his country today and Mr. Anthony Eden returns to his to proclaim peace in our time. They will return to their countries from Geneva where they sat at the conference table with ruthless murderers of innocent people who represented the Communist nations. They will not mention the great moral principles which they surrendered at Geneva. They will place no significance on the fact that Communist Poland and pro-Communist India will control the so-called free elections which are scheduled for Vietnam under the terms of the Geneva agreement. This means there will be no free elections but only a Communist victory. Today is indeed a black day for freedom.

National and Illinois Conservation Day and Plow Matches

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 15, 1954

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech by me on the National and Illinois Conservation Day and Plow Matches recorded for radio stations in the 23d Congressional District:

The World's Fair of American agriculture will be held in our own southern Illinois soon, and I want to take this opportunity to help publicize this great farm event.

It is the National and Illinois Conservation Day and Plow Matches, to be held in Richland County, September 16, 17, and 18, and I am sure this center of population of the United States will be the center of interest for the Nation's farmers.

The people of Olney, the county seat, are preparing for more than 100,000 visitors for the 3-day event, which will be attended by Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson, who will speak at the plowman's banquet September 17.

One thousand persons will attend the banquet in the armory in Olney, and 4,000 more will come in after the dinner to hear Secretary Benson. The 5,000 listeners will represent agriculture, the farm machinery industry, and other groups interested in helping to advance agriculture.

More than 2,000 acres of rolling and flat surface lands have been leased for the plowing matches site, which is only a few miles from the marker on State Route 130 which marks the center of population of the United States.

America's best plowmen will participate in this annual event which is costing the sponsors $100,000.

Parking space has been provided for 500 airplanes because the flying farmers of America are expected to attend in large numbers.

There will be spirited competition in the State and national plow matches, and on 1 day set aside for them, thousands of youngsters will participate in agricultural problems.

Customarily, the plowing matches have been a 2-day affair, with State contests on the first day and national contests on the second. Richland County leaders decided that the soil-conservation demonstrations should be seen by the young people, too.

Thursday, September 16, will be Youth Day, and it is hoped that 50,000 young people will attend. The hosts hope that every high school student interested in conservation will have an opportunity to attend the contests, and particularly to see the soil demonstrations.

The youth program also includes the International Supreme Sheep Dog Trials, Land Judging, Tractor Operators', Junior Homemakers', and Boy Scout contests, and group singing.

Thinking people know that we must preserve agriculture to keep America strong; that the way to preserve agriculture is to teach our people the value of practicing conservation of óur soil, our water, our land's fertility, and all our other natural resources.

How wise it is, then, to implant these conservation practices in the minds of our young people.

Youth Day objectives are to provide an opportunity for school-age youth and teachers to observe good practices on conservation, reforestation, soil fertility, crop production and the latest practices in good farming.

The second day of the big Olney event will be highlighted by the Illinois plowing contest to select a State champion. The second day program is expected to draw 75,000 visitors to Olney and Richland County.

The climax will come Saturday, September 18, when 100,000 people, it is hoped, will throng to the national plowing contest.

A key value of the national contest is to provide the incentive for county plowing contests. There, many lessons of good soil practices are taught participants.

In addition to the plowing contest practices, there will be the featured demonstrations in dual conservation of soil and water.

The area designed for the demonstrations is typically composed of the tight clay soil found in southern Illinois and neighboring States, which presents contrasting soil problems to this land, year in and year out in combating the rapid erosion of heavy rainfall seasons and the destructive dryness of the drought period.

Control of the two major problems through intelligent conservation will be spotlighted first on the rolling land with terraces, grass waterways, contour stripcropping, renovation and seeding of pastures, and other valuable practical demonstrations.

Coupled with the rolling land projects will be the popular farm pond exhibition, which will clearly demonstrate the effectiveness of water reserves for livestock, irrigation, fishing, wildlife benefits, and fire protection, complete with various types of dams, brush removal methods, roadside bank stabilization, and seeding with asphalt emulsion.

The flat surface land will receive an equal share of attention with demonstrations of shallow and open-ditch drainage, land leveling, improved crop rotation, fertilization, deep tillage, and irrigation.

The 3-day event is sponsored by the National and Illinois Conservation Day and Plow Matches, Inc., along with the United States Soil Conservation Service, the University of Illinois Agriculture Extension Service, and other interested groups.

The idea for the national plowing contest was conceived by Herb Plambeck, farm director for radio station WHO, Des Moines, Iowa. For years WHO and the Des Moines Register and Tribune sponsored the Corn Belt regional plowing matches, and it was in the mid-1940's that Mr. Plambeck suggested that the event be put on a national scale.

Then, a group of farmers for the first time seriously recognized the high degree of skill involved in plowing and preparing the earth for crops. This fact, combined with the knowledge that farmers throughout the Nation must maintain familiarity with the latest farming methods and soil care, resulted in the inauguration of the national plowing contests. This event gives the Nation's soil breakers an opportunity to demonstrate their skill in their vocation, and at the same time, current farming practices can be introduced to the crowds.

The idea was heartily endorsed by leading farmers, soil conservationists, and manufacturers, and since then, a few days have been set aside each year for this brief but eventful national plowing contest.

The contest left Iowa for the first time in 1950, when it was held at Urbana, Ohio.

The next year, 1951, it was held at Bethany, Mo.

In 1952, Kasson, Minn., was host to 75,000 persons for the contest, and at Augusta, Wis., the affair in 1953 attracted 85,000.

Now grown in interest and importance, the contest is being held at the center of population of the United States this year, and Olney hopes to swell the crowd to 100,000.

I personally hope that southern Illnois will rally to this great national event and that farmers from this section will join the throngs at Olney, September 16, 17, and 18.

Seating of Communist Regime in China in the United Nations

SPEECH

OF

HON. EDMUND P. RADWAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 15, 1954

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the resolution (H. Res. 627) reiterating the opposition of the House of Representatives to the seating of the Communist regime in China in the United Nations.

Mr. RADWAN. Mr. Chairman, in April of this year I introduced a resolution similar to the one before us today. It was very gratifying indeed when the House Foreign Affairs Committee, of which I am a member, took up the resolution before us:

Resolved, That the House of Representatives reiterates its opposition to the seating of the Communist regime in China as the representative of China in the United Nations or any of its specialized agencies and supports the President in his expressed determination to use all means to prevent such representation.

I vigorously urge the adoption of this resolution. Certainly the events of the last 6 months have proved the necessity for giving increased consideration to this matter. The concern of our Government and of our people has been heightened by the Geneva Conference and the carefully planned activities of the Chinese Communist leaders and their cohorts throughout the world, who develop support for their efforts to acquire the seat now occupied by the representative of Nationalist China.

Early this year I stated, and today I want to bring to the attention of this great House of Representatives, that there is a growing apprehension among the American people that we could be moving in the direction of another Yalta. I have a strong conviction that Red China should not be admitted into the United Nations. My feelings in this matter are reinforced from time to time by letters I receive from my constituents, vigorously opposing any recognition of the outlaws who now rule close to 500 million Chinese.

Unanimous expression by this body, reflecting the solid view of the American people, will serve notice to the world that the position of the United States is clear and unequivocal, and that our free Government will not compromise a sacred principle. In the cold shadow of America's 32,000 Korean war dead, it seems a little short of sacrilegious to propose that the captive government of Red China be allowed to shoot its way into the United Nations.

Adoption of this resolution will have the effect of assuring the American people that the present administration, as well as the legislative branch of our Government, stands united in support of the principles of the free world.

I am glad that the language contained in the resolution makes reference to President Eisenhower's recent strong statement on this issue, and I am happy to support my President in his expressed desire and determination in this matter.

The Billy Graham Crusade in Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 21, 1954

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, no force in our lifetime has made such an impression on the British and the continental Europeans alike, as the recent campaign conducted by that great young American evangelist, Billy Graham.

A statistical summary of the terrific impact which Billy Graham had on the British, is as follows:

Dates of crusade, March 1–May 22, 1954.

Length of crusade, 12 weeks.

Attendance:	
Total attendance at crusade meetings, including overflow services and final stadium meetings	1,756,304
Total attendance at extra meetings addressed by Billy Graham during crusade	116,485
Total attendance at meetings addressed by Billy Graham	1,872,789
Total attendance at extra meetings addressed by other team members	174,544
Grand total attendance for London crusade	2,047,333
Recorded decisions for Christ:	
Total number of persons registering their decision for Christ in the counseling room at crusade meetings, individually counseled with, and entered into the follow-up program	+36,431
Total number of persons registering their decision for Christ in extra meetings conducted by team members	+2,016
Grand total of decisions for Christ as entered into the crusade records	+38,477

No evangelist in recorded church history has had so many human beings to listen to his voice. On Sunday, July 10, 1954, on the occasion of Dr. Graham's return to his country, he reported to the American people on his trip.

Mr. Speaker, under the unanimous consent of my colleagues, I insert this splendid outline of his experiences in Europe in the Appendix of the Record:

Message Delivered by Billy Graham on Sunday, July 10, 1954, Over the ABC Network, for the Hour of Decision

Only those that have been away from the United States for a length of time can understand the thrill of standing once again on American soil and breathing American air. You have to go abroad to appreciate America. While abroad you can look at the United States more objectively. You see its faults more clearly and its responsibilities in the world become more defined.

But you also have a deeper love and appreciation for everything the Stars and Stripes stand for. There is no place on earth like this melting pot of the human race. Whether we realize it or not, America is like a fish bowl, with the entire world looking in.

Everything we do and say is headline news in other countries. When a Congressman makes a rash statement in Washington, it is written up in some elements of the foreign press as though he were speaking officially for the American Government. When a film star gets a divorce, it is headline news abroad. When there is a gang-style killing in Chicago, foreigners gasp with horror. Some even have the idea that all Americans are like that. I seriously doubt if the American people have any idea of the tremendous responsibility that has been thrust upon us since the Second World War. We are now in a place of world leadership. The entire world is analyzing, dissecting, criticizing, or commending every action we make and every word we say.

In the world in which we live we can no longer live unto ourselves. We have become a part of a world community, whether we like it or not. Most Americans do not realize how much world opinion means in their daily lives. More and more, even our domestic policy is being influenced by opinion abroad. Some Europeans have an idea that America is a land of cowboys and Indians, gangsters and sex perverts, and irrational statesmen who cannot wait to drop a hydrogen bomb somewhere in the world.

That is the reason why we were told by American Ambassadors and Ministers abroad that these evangelistic meetings just held in Europe have done a great deal to help Europeans to see that America is more than the exaggerated thing they read of in the press. They are beginning to read in their newspapers that America is a land of great churches and deep faith. The Europeans are beginning to realize that a spiritual awakening is sweeping the United States, and this fact is already having a profound effect upon the thinking in European capitals.

There is no doubt, ladies and gentlemen, that there is a spiritual awakening underway in Great Britain and continental Europe. In Great Britain there is an increase in church attendance, of religious interest on the part of college and university students, unparalleled in recent years. There is an increase in financial giving in the churches. Certain London newspapers are discussing religion freely and writing commendable editorials on religious subjects. Christian magazines are enjoying an increase in circulation. People in all walks of life are discussing religion. There has been a phenomenal increase in the sale of Bibles and religious books. Church leaders are planning an extensive evangelistic program in most denominations.

All of these are evidences of a spiritual awakening in Great Britain such as they have not seen in many years.

On the Continent of Europe some of these same evidences were seen, though we did not have time to study them at great length as we did in Great Britain. However, our meetings on the Continent were a great surprise to me. I never dreamed that people in European countries would respond as they did. They sat by the hour to listen through an interpreter to the Gospel message, and when the invitation was given we had more people respond per capita than any meetings we have ever held in our entire ministry.

Even leaders behind the Iron Curtain told us privately and secretly that God is moving in Russia. Secret meetings are being held in homes. The few churches open are jammed to capacity, and there is a new interest in religion on the part of young people. Many religious leaders in Berlin and Sweden told us that the greatest religious revival of all time could take place in Russia today if there were freedom. Their contact with Russian Christians indicates that there is a deep hunger for God.

It has been my privilege to preach to hundreds of thousands of people, and to present to them the challenges and claims of Christ during the past 5 months. Many thousands of them have accepted these claims and responded to those challenges. What has happened in England and Europe could not possibly be the work of a man or a group of men. It has been the work of Almighty God and the moving of His Spirit on the lives of men. So, in our hearts, let us have a spiritual thanksgiving for the overwhelming victory which God has given. To Him and Him only is the honor, the praise, and the glory.

We want to thank those of you who have faithfully stood by us with your prayers. Never have so many prayed so earnestly and fervently for any event, perhaps even in the history of the Christian church. Harringay Arena, night after night, was saturated with the spirit of prayer and devout intercession. Never has it been easier to proclaim the word of God than in that sublime atmosphere. Never have men found it easier to yield to the pleasing of the spirit of God.

We also want to thank the thousands of you who have stood with us in a substantial, material way, with your gifts and offerings. Many of you have given sacrificially. You have stood by this team, who served at half salary as their contribution to the greater London crusade. Let me assure you that your investment has brought rich, lasting, spiritual dividends. Thousands have found Christ. The church has been reawakened. International good will has been created. The enemy has been confounded. The word has been proclaimed. Christ has been honored and God has been exalted.

Out of our experiences in England and Europe have come some very sharp focused conclusions. I would like to bring them to your attention. First, I believe that there is a universal hungering for God. The Bible says that the basic longing of man is his deep yearning for fellowship with the infinite God. The great audiences in London, which came—not for a night or a week—but continuously for 3 months, are a concrete demonstration and a convincing indication there has been a hunger for God. The large audiences in Finland, Denmark, Sweden, Holland, France, and Germany, probably showed that the longing for spiritual things is not dead in the hearts of modern man.

We made it clear in advance that we did not come to preach politics or even Americanism, but the gospel of Jesus Christ. I've seen evidence that the world is overcome by self-imposed weariness. First, I find evidence in the world of an intellectual weariness. Our most enthusiastic audiences were the world's top educational centers, such as Oxford and Cambridge. I'm not inferring that intellectual development is not needed, but we have emphasized education of the mind to the neglect of the education and development of the soul. There is a consciousness that man's wisdom alone cannot find all of the answers in a complicated world. There is a growing realization that man shall not live by bread alone, and that we need the help of Almighty God in so intricate and complicated a world in which we live.

In England, particularly, it seemed that even the upper class were more generally interested in spiritual things than they have been for generations. Two great wars have made them blasé and synical about a peaceful future. In desperation, in resignation, they are turning to God. Our meetings with Parliament, church, and educational leaders gave evidence that England at long last was beginning to turn to the God of their fathers. A weariness of treaties, plans, conferences, theories and deliberations, all indicated the inevitable return to God and the Gospel of Jesus Christ.

Second, there is a noticeable war weariness. It seems to be dawning upon intelligent people that force in itself cannot bring about lasting peace. The march of heavy-booted feet doesn't have the glamorous sound in Europe that it once had. There is a deep, passionate, longing for peace in Western Europe today. In some places, they are even ready for peace at any price and some people are even ready to sell their honor and principles for peace.

Thirdly, there is a sin weariness. Boredom sits on the throne where pleasure once sat. Men everywhere are discovering that God's word was right when it said, "She that liveth in pleasure is dead while she liveth." They are finding that sinful pleasure, like some forms of cancerious itch, is a symptom of a deeper disease. It may be plaesure for the moment, but the end thereof is death. Having gone down so many dead ends and blind alleys, mankind is now earnestly searching for the true way. I've found this hunger evident in the bomb-pocked, war-scarred land of Germany. I've found it in the picturesque country of Finland and its Scandinavian sisters. I've found it in the sin-ravaged country of France. There is a deep, unsated hungering in the hearts of men everywhere for God. This is the greatest hour the church has ever known. Let us arise, Christian Church, in the power of His light and with hearts aflame with the glow of His spirit. Take them the bread of life.

The next observation I would like to make is that materialism has failed. We have tried hard to make man out of a monkey but have succeeded only in making a monkey out of man. Materialism has given rise to the philosophy of force. It puts a gun in a man's hand rather than a cross on his back. It says might is right, rather than right is might. It says man is just another animal and treats him as such. This philosophy has given the world the triple evils of nazism, fascism, and communism. But the world is growing tired of its futile boasts and claims. On May Day in London, I saw Communists parade past my hotel for a solid hour on their way to Hyde Park for their annual meeting; but the thing that impressed me was that they paraded down empty streets. Very few were interested but Communists. I think that Western Europe is losing its zest for the emptiness of materialism, secularism, and totalitarianism.

Ten years ago in our universities it was quite the popular thing to be an atheistic materialist. Now it is not so popular. The world is catching on to the emptiness and futlity of materialism. Abraham Lincoln once said, "I have had so many evidences of His direction, so many instances when I have been controlled by some other power than my own will, that I cannot doubt that this power comes from above." Thousands are turning from materialism today to God.

The last observation I would like to make is briefly this, that men are yearning for a true authority. Notice that I said, a true authority. I firmly believe that man standing alone is inadequate. Perhaps that is the reason why so many deluded people have succumbed to totalitarianism. They feel the need of help beyond themselves and so it leads to their acceptance of the only help they know. This places a heavy responsibility upon us in the church. They must know of Him who spoke with authority and not as the scribes. I preach with my Bible in my hand today because I want people to know that it is my only authority. No man knows enough to be authoriative apart from God. The only thing that he can be dogmatic about are the things which God said. I preach nothing but what is found in the Bible. These truths are also found in the great creeds of the church.

The Bible says, "All have sinned." That is finally and authoriatively true. The Bible says, "Ye must be born again." So the new birth becomes a positive requirement for eternal life. The Bible says, "Call unto Me and I will answer thee." So we know that God answers prayer. We need to declare with positive authority the cardinal truths of Christianity and make no apology for them. They are basic. They are true and they are valid.

I would also like to suggest another observation, and that is that America must take the lead in spiritual things throughout the world. The general impression of Americans in Europe in some cases is not too flattering. Some think we are rich, naive, and pleasure loving. They are not unappreciative of the help we have given them and they should not like to live without us, but few of them have the impression that we are strong spiritually. This is unfortunate. We are not qualified to lead the world scientifically and militarily and politically unless we can lead them spiritually. There is a growing feeling among our leaders that we must fortify ourselves spiritually or pay the eventual price of forgetting God.

President Eisenhower has taken the lead in trying to direct the attention of the Nation to God. The text upon which he held his finger when he was being inaugurated into the presidency was one which will strengthen us spiritually if we will apply it to our lives and to our Nation. "If my people, which are called by my name, shall humble themselves, and pray, and seek my face, then will I hear from Heaven and will heal their land," says the Scripture. Many of our great leaders, having voiced their sentiments in regard to this matter, are praying, working, and hoping, for spiritual revival in our great land. They realize that it is futile to be prosperous, wise, and mighty, without the grace and favor of Almighty God. What we have witnessed in England we have seen in America, but we can see it in America in a greater way.

As I see it, there were three basic things which helped to bring about the beginning of a spiritual awakening in Great Britain:

First, there was a keen sense of spiritual need among the Christian leaders, and a willingness to lose their sectarian identity. Ministers and consecrated laymen of all churches worked together, heedless of denominational barriers.

Secondly, there was an all-prevailing spirit of prayer. For almost 2 years before the meetings people met—often in unheated churches—to spend whole nights in prayer for revival.

Thirdly, there was a willingness to work incessantly to accomplish the goal of spiritual awakening in their land. For months before the meeting consecrated people began to labor in the tedious work of preparation for the greater London crusade. For scores, the crusade took first place in importance in their lives. It was no sideline or hobby with them. Everything depended upon it, they did it in faith and unity, and their work was gloriously rewarded.

It can happen in the United States, ladies and gentlemen. We must be spiritual leaders among the nations. I beg of you, come to your churches. Rebuild the fires upon the altars of your devotion. Establish a family altar. Let Christ be first in your life. Right now, wherever you are, you can make this your hour of decision. As hundreds of thousands of people throughout Great Britain and Europe have turned to Christ in the last few weeks, even so you who are listening to my voice at this moment, can turn to Jesus Christ as your Saviour and Lord.

Last week, just as we docked in New York on the *Queen Mary*, a lady came to me and said, "Mr. Graham, after listening last Sunday morning to the talk that you gave on this boat, I went to my room and I found peace with God." She said, "I have made my decision for Christ. My whole life is entirely different." Ladies and gentlemen, as that woman out on the ocean came to know Christ as her Lord and Saviour, even so you, wherever you are, can surrender your life and your heart to Christ, and the revival that we are praying for and longing for in America can begin in you. When you make your decision for Christ, it is America making her decision for Christ at this crucial hour.

A Back Door Method To Kill TVA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT E. JONES, JR.
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 21, 1954

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following editorial which appeared in the Huntsville Times on July 16, 1954:

A BACK DOOR METHOD TO KILL TVA

The private power industry's plans to choke the TVA have taken the round-about method of supplying its needs by having the Atomic Energy Commission contract for a $107 million steam plant, across the river in Arkansas from Memphis.

This is the old "back door" method to avoid meeting the issue directly.

Just why should the Atomic Energy Commission, an independent Government agency, a majority of whose members are against this plan, be required, in a directive from President Eisenhower, to make a contract for this plant, in order to sell its output-to the TVA? The AEC is not asking and does not want this power. It resents being used as a middleman, or broker, for another independent agency, the TVA.

If the TVA needs power, and it will badly very soon, why will the Republicans not accept the proposal of Senator COOPER, of Kentucky, who is a member of their party, as well as an authority on TVA, and allow it to sell bonds to build steam plants? This would require congressional authorization, and not a cent of Treasury funds would be needed.

That the Republicans will not permit this, but insist on forcing the AEC to contract for and broker power for TVA from an AEC steam plant, is pretty conclusive proof that the private power interests will not permit them.

The power trust is bent on crippling or destroying TVA, because its yardstick shows its members up.

The Shipyard Pinch

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 13, 1954

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following article, written by David Eisen, is deserving of our attention. It gives a very enlightening picture of the disastrous situation of the local shipyards in and around New York.

The article appeared in the Staten Island Advance and follows:

BETHLEHEM FACING LAYOFF AFTER LABOR DAY

(By David Eisen)

That September deadline for new shipbuilding contracts or mass layoffs at the Mariners Harbor shipyard of the Bethlehem Steel Co. is deceptive.

If the yard doesn't receive Government orders within the next couple of weeks, hundreds of men are certain to lose their jobs after Labor Day.

Any orders that come in September will be too late to avert the layoff. It takes weeks, sometimes months, between receipt of a contract and the start of work. Plans have to be drafted, materials ordered, and work laid out.

By mid-September, only 100 out of 600 men now engaged in constructing harbor craft will be left. By October, that number will dwindle to 40; by November, it will be close to zero.

That will leave a maximum of only 400 men engaged in highly sporadic repair work. Repairs, too, are ebbing fast, because the American merchant marine is shrinking and foreign ships prefer to have them done abroad, where they are cheaper.

If several months go by before work begins on new ships, the yard's employes may be scattered far afield, many in other jobs.

If the Navy permits the yard to fold altogether, it would be writing finis to part of its own plan for industrial mobilization in a national emergency.

NUCLEUS OF OPERATION

Those plans call for the Mariners Harbor yard to serve as the nucleus for a shipbuilding operation involving as many as 100,000 workers—10 times the number it employed during World War II.

Bethlehem would be called on to manage two other major shipyards in this area, which are now lying idle. Experienced workers from the Mariners Harbor yard are being depended on to train the vast army of employees that would be needed at the three yards.

If those key workers are not available because the yard has closed down, a huge question mark would hang over the entire plan.

The Navy has plenty of work available to feed the hungry North Shore shipyard.

In the coming fiscal year, its budget calls for the construction of 5 destroyers, 8 destroyer escorts, 10 large landing ships, 2 tankers, 3 cargo ships and many smaller vessels, all of which the Mariners Harbor yard is equipped to build.

The Navy also has 12 major ship conversions on tap, including the refitting of a number of destroyer escorts and Liberty ships as radar picket boats.

OTHER YARDS AIDED

This type of work has been available for several years, but the Mariners Harbor yard has never gotten a share of it, with the exception of a single Navy net layer. The work has been parceled out to shipyards in other areas which have claimed they are in a "distressed" condition.

Bethlehem contends the North Shore yard is about as "distressed" as it can be, short of a total shutdown.

Since the end of World War II, not a single large ship has been built at the Mariners Harbor installation. Except for Navy vessels, almost the only ships that have been built in this country since the war are supertankers, giant cargo vessels and luxury liners too big to be handled at Mariners Harbor.

TURNS TO HARBOR CRAFT

As a result, Bethlehem turned to the production of harbor craft to keep going. Since the war, it has built three city ferryboats, a number of tugs and more than 350 barges, scows, and car floats.

At best, however, this type of production has meant the employment of from 450 to 600 men. Most of the craft built in this period required no machinery and few fittings, calling for only a few workers.

Now even this meager source of employment is drying up. The yard has no more orders booked that will carry production past November.

The whole situation is a far cry from World War II, when Bethlehem employed as many as 10,500 men and built 44 destroyers, five cargo ships, and 75 landing craft, plus converting scores of ships, including two merchant vessels into aircraft carriers.

The Mariners Harbor yard, which dates back to 1906, has been the borough's biggest shipbuilder since World War I. But company officials say that's no guaranty against its demise.

SHOOTERS FATE RECALLED

They recall the big Shooters Island shipyard, a beehive in World War I but today an industrial graveyard, as well as other North Shore shipyards, once prosperous but now moldering.

More recently, there is the example of the giant Federal Shipbuilding Corp. yard in Kearny, N. J., which employed 45,000 men during World War II and closed its gates not long after.

At a certain point, if the workload drops far enough, it becomes too costly to pay the high overhead expenses involved in keeping a near-idle yard open. Once it is shut down, inertia sets in; it costs even more to reopen, recondition dormant machinery and gather together a work force.

Bethlehem will hesitate before shutting down the valuable North Shore yard. It will probably take the step only if there appears no prospect whatsoever of a change in fortunes.

Once the gates are closed, however, it will take a mighty push to get them open. A war might be the only thing that would do it.

Giveaway Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1954

Mr. REED of New York. I am inserting in the RECORD some figures with reference to our giveaway program. This ought to be of great interest to the taxpayers of this country and it may open the eyes of some of the internationalists who have been voting away this money:

Foreign aid programs of the U. S. Government: Grants, credits, and cash expenditures from the Federal Treasury for foreign aid in the period from July 1, 1940, through May 15, 1954. Compiled from Statistical Appendixes, Foreign Transactions of the United States and other reports of the Department of Commerce. Arranged in 2 parts, the World War II period and the postwar era

WORLD WAR II PERIOD (PT. 1)

	Fiscal year					War period, total
	1941	1942	1943	1944	1945	
Gross expenditures:						
Grants	$203, 000, 000	$6, 205, 122, 095	$9, 165, 977, 760	$16, 650, 353, 676	$15, 758, 641, 526	$47, 983, 095, 057
Credits	115, 123, 052	476, 699, 333	47, 894, 356	122, 948, 106	90, 818, 352	853, 483, 199
Other dollar outlays	274, 443, 834	1, 273, 716, 986	2, 730, 758, 500	3, 827, 988, 633	2, 926, 153, 103	11, 033, 061, 056
Total	592, 566, 886	7, 955, 538, 414	11, 944, 630, 616	20, 601, 290, 415	18, 775, 612, 981	59, 869, 639, 312

POSTWAR PERIOD (PT. 2)

	Fiscal year								Total, 1946-53
	1946	1947	1948	1949	1950	1951	1952	1953	
Grants	$3, 288, 535, 118	$2, 074, 982, 401	$2, 583, 000, 000	$5, 169, 000, 000	$4, 617, 000, 000	$4, 280, 286, 000	$4, 440, 000, 000	$6, 283, 000, 000	$32, 735, 803, 519
Credits	1, 412, 400, 910	4, 766, 374, 998	2, 802, 000, 000	1, 138, 000, 000	405, 000, 000	419, 000, 000	658, 000, 000	747, 000, 000	12, 347, 775, 908
Other	2, 203, 186, 778	1, 682, 120, 213	1, 702, 000, 000	1, 295, 029, 206	1, 316, 536, 000	1, 925, 000, 000			10, 123, 872, 197
Total	6, 904, 122, 806	8, 523, 477, 612	7, 087, 000, 000	7, 602, 029, 206	6, 338, 536, 000	6, 624, 286, 000	5, 098, 000, 000	7, 030, 000, 000	55, 207, 451, 624

NOTE.—Payments to International Bank and Monetary Fund: $159,025,000, $3,225,975,000; total, $3,385,000,000.

Summary of foreign aid by periods

World War II period	$59, 869, 639, 312
Postwar period to 1953	55, 207, 451, 624
Fiscal year 1954 to May 15, 1954	4, 224, 906, 564
Gross foreign aid	119, 301, 997, 500
Gross foreign aid, July 1, 1940, to May 15, 1954	119, 301, 997, 500
Subscription to bank and monetary fund	3, 385, 000, 000
Total	122, 686, 997, 500

DOLLAR RECEIPTS OF THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT AS REPAYMENT OF LOANS AND CREDITS, PAYMENTS FOR SURPLUS PROPERTY, PLUS CREDITS FOR REVERSE LEND-LEASE

With respect to allowances for so-called reverse lend-lease, the United States was "charged" for the use of facilities needed in the assembly and training of the Armed Forces sent abroad for participation in the war and the invasion of the continents of Africa and Europe, as well as for other goods and services provided by the principal Allies, Great Britain, France, and several small nations. Compile in 2 parts: Part 1 covering the period July 1, 1940, through June 30, 1945 and part 2 covering the period from July 1, 1945 through May 15, 1954.

Dollar receipts by fiscal years

Part 1. The war period:	
1941	$47, 148, 824
1942	209, 741, 403
1943	340, 804, 133
1944	857, 489, 976
1945	972, 164, 171
War period total	2, 427, 348, 507
Part 2. Postwar period:	
1946	1, 140, 608, 963
1947	1, 788, 592, 276
1948	1, 372, 000, 000
1949	1, 059, 000, 000
1950	495, 944, 000
1951	361, 098, 000
1952	502, 523, 000
1953	694, 000, 000
1954 (9 months)	420, 512, 000
Postwar total	7, 834, 277, 239

War and postwar summary

Part 1, repayments	$2, 427, 348, 507
Part 2, repayments	7, 834, 277, 239
Total	10, 261, 625, 746

Net foreign-aid cost to American Government

[July 1, 1940, through May 15, 1954]

Foreign aid in war period	$59, 869, 639, 312
Foreign aid in postwar period	55, 207, 451, 624
Foreign aid, fiscal year 1954	4, 224, 906, 564
Total	119, 301, 997, 500
War and postwar returns	10, 261, 625, 746
Net foreign aid	109, 040, 371, 754

Net foreign aid plus interest cost

Net foreign aid July 1, 1940, through May 15, 1954	$109, 040, 371, 754
Simple interest on money borrowed for foreign aid	18, 606, 524, 210
Cumulative net total	127, 646, 895, 964
Investment in International Bank and Monetary Fund	3, 385, 000, 000
Grand total	131, 031, 895, 964

Analysis of interest cost to American taxpayers of money borrowed by the Federal Treasury in periods of deficits for the foreign aid programs (Interest calculated at the Treasury's average computed interest rate by fiscal years)

Fiscal year	Reported gross foreign aid in dollars	Reported dollar returns	Net foreign aid in dollars	Computed annual interest rate	Added new first year interest cost	Cumulative yearly interest cost	Total cumulative interest cost by years
1941	$592, 566, 886	$47, 148, 824	$545, 418, 062	$0. 02518	$13, 733, 626. 80	----------	$13, 733, 626. 80
1942	7, 955, 538, 414	209, 741, 403	7, 745, 797, 011	. 02285	165, 993, 461. 70	$179, 727, 088. 50	193, 460, 715. 30
1943	11, 944, 630, 616	340, 804, 133	11, 603, 826, 483	. 01979	229, 639, 726. 10	409, 366, 814. 60	602, 827, 529. 90
1944	20, 601, 290, 415	857, 489, 976	19, 753, 800, 439	. 01929	381, 050, 810. 42	790, 417, 625. 02	1, 393, 245, 154. 92
1945	18, 775, 612, 981	972, 164, 171	17, 803, 448, 810	. 01936	344, 674, 768. 96	1, 135, 092, 393. 98	2, 528, 337, 548. 90
1946	6, 904, 122, 806	1, 140, 608, 963	5, 763, 513, 843	. 01996	115, 039, 736. 30	1, 250, 132, 130. 28	3, 778, 469, 679. 18
1947	8, 523, 477, 612	1, 788, 592, 276	6, 734, 885, 336	. 02107	141, 904, 034. 02	1, 392, 036, 164. 30	5, 170, 505, 843. 48
1948	7, 087, 000, 000	1, 372, 000, 000	5, 715, 000, 000	. 02182	124, 701, 300. 00	1, 516, 737, 464. 30	6, 687, 243, 307. 78
1949	7, 602, 029, 206	1, 059, 000, 000	6, 543, 029, 206	. 02236	146, 302, 133. 00	1, 663, 039, 597. 30	8, 350, 282, 905. 08
1950	6, 338, 536, 000	495, 944, 000	5, 842, 592, 000	. 02200	128, 537, 024. 00	1, 791, 576, 621. 30	10, 141, 859, 526. 38
1951	6, 624, 286, 000	361, 098, 000	6, 263, 188, 000	. 02270	144, 444, 367. 60	1, 936, 020, 988. 90	12, 077, 880, 515. 28
1952	5, 098, 000, 000	502, 523, 000	4, 595, 477, 000	. 02329	107, 028, 659. 33	2, 043, 049, 648. 23	14, 120, 938, 163. 51
1953	7, 030, 000, 000	694, 000, 000	6, 336, 000, 000	. 02438	154, 471, 680. 00	2, 197, 521, 228. 23	16, 318, 459, 391. 74
1954 [1]	4, 224, 906, 564	420, 512, 000	3, 804, 394, 564	. 02380	90, 544, 590. 60	2, 288, 065, 818. 83	18, 606, 524, 210. 57

[1] Computation for fiscal year 1954 includes period from July 1, 1953, through May 15, 1954, or 10½ months.

Interest was calculated on the net dollar investment by grants, credits, and all other forms of foreign aid.

Sources: Computed interest rate from annual reports, Secretary of the Treasury; foreign aid from statistical appendixes, foreign transactions of the United States, issued by the Office of Clearing Information and its successor agencies in the Department of Commerce.

Trouble on Capitol Hill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 13, 1954

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I enclose an editorial from the New York Post on the reinsurance bill recently recommitted to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, of which I am a member.

This is one of the few editorials, if not the only one, which explains the position of those of us who opposed this bill. As I pointed out in the debate on this measure, we need legislation in this country to provide medical insurance for the millions of our people in the lower income groups who cannot afford the present high premiums on such insurance. However, H. R. 8356 does not have that effect.

If the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, of which I am a member, will consider a bill to effectuate such a purpose, I, and many of my colleagues, will be most happy to vote in favor of it.

The above-mentioned editorial follows:

TROUBLE ON CAPITOL HILL

For several weeks now, the GOP press has carried all kinds of raves about how Congress was going to do right by the Eisenhower program before the boys went home to dig in for the fall elections.

Not enough Congressmen in either party read the advance notices, it appears. The administration is having a terrible time on Capitol Hill.

The worse blow came this week when the House voted 238 to 134 to bury the Eisenhower health plan in committee. The "nays" came from 75 Republicans, 162 Democrats, and 1 Independent (REAMS, of Ohio). The GOP Brain Trust immediately made it clear that for vote-getting purposes in the fall the public would be asked to forget the 75 Republicans who voted against the President and keep both eyes on the 162 Democrats.

But the GOP strategy is thin.

The bill would have set up a $25 million fund to underwrite the losses suffered by private, nonprofit health-insurance plans. The Democrats argued that it would have done more for the insurance companies than for the people who need low-cost medical care. They voted against it because it did not go far enough, not because the American Medical Association's moth-eaten cry of "socialized medicine" was ringing through the cloakrooms. The Republicans who voted against the bill did so, in the candid words of House Republican Leader HALLECK, because they thought it went "too far."

President Eisenhower says he will continue to fight for the bill, but it needs a doctor. The White House got behind a "middle-of-the-road" program in the hopes of slipping it by, but many Republicans will not even go to the middle of the road and even more Democrats are prepared to go beyond it.

The President's problem is by no means small. Apart from the health plan, he is running into strong resistance on other fronts.

The Senate Finance Committee wants to make social security coverage voluntary for 3,600,000 farm operators and 500,000 professional people; the White House, properly, wanted compulsory coverage. Another Senate committee has an ax out for still more chops in the foreign-aid program. Still another is stitting on the administration's wiretapping bill. Others are cutting up the tax and farm bills.

It begins to look as if the time is at hand for another TV appeal from the White House to the people. We trust Robert Montgomery is waiting in the wings with the cue cards.

My Record on REA

SPEECH

OF

HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 20, 1954

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I want to pay a compliment to the fine work the officials of REA cooperatives have done throughout the Nation in bringing light and power to millions of farmers in the last several years, which greatly increases the wealth of the Nation by making an outlet for the use and purchase of electrical appliances, amounting to billions of dollars a year, which is an aid to business and to the economy of the Nation, lifting at the same time much hard work from the farm women of America.

FREE ENTERPRISE

As I have often said, I regard REA as one of the finest examples of free enterprise at the grassroots. The officials who direct the management of REA cooperatives have done a splendid job, nationwide.

The five REA cooperatives serving my congressional district have made every loan payment on time, and are ahead with their repayments now $1,763,954. This fine record shows they are paying off their loans faster than they come due.

When I came to Congress in 1942, only 49 percent of the farms in Illinois had electric light and power. Now, 12 years later, we have 95 percent served.

VOTED FOR $2,649,000,000

In these 12 years I have voted for REA loan funds a total of $2,649,000,000, which is $75 million more than was requested by Presidents Roosevelt, Truman, Eisenhower, and the Bureau of the Budget acting for those Presidents.

We appropriated	$2, 649, 000, 000
Presidents requested	2, 574, 000, 000

This shows we appropriated $75 million more for the REA loan fund than was requested by these three Presidents.

I thought the farmers should have these facts. I decided to give them to you because I have learned that a false campaign is being started by those who hope to gain political advantage by charging I had not adequately supported the REA.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VURSELL. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL] has throughout his 12 years in this House always fought for what he has considered to be just and fair treatment for the farmer in every respect. I recall the many times in which he has appeared before my Subcommittee on Appropriations for Agriculture in behalf of such programs as REA. I have noticed that during these 12 years the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL] has always voted as I have relative to REA loan allocations. I am positive in my own mind that during these years, he and I have voted for $155 million above and beyond what the budget has requested of the Congress. There is no better friend of REA and the farmer than the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Vursell].

Mr. VURSELL. I sincerely appreciate the comments of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Andersen], the chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee for Agriculture.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VURSELL. I yield.

Mr. HORAN. I just want to say that in my opinion the gentleman from Illinois is as good a friend of REA as there is in the Congress, and has been all down through the years. He has fully supported REA loan funds for the 12 years he has served in the Congress.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank both of these gentlemen, who are members of the Agriculture Subcommittee on Appropriations.

Mr. Speaker, the members of the Appropriations Committee of the House know that I have fully supported the loan funds for REA in every session of the Congress for the past 12 years.

The farmers generally know that I have not only supported the REA loan fund to extend light and power to the farmers of Illinois and the Nation, but that I have supported soil conservation and research and extension work; that I helped to write and pass the farm-to-market roads program—to pull the farmers out of the mud; that I have supported the Farmers' Home Administration loans to assist farmers to own their homes—and I note from a recent report that 50 farm loans have been granted to farmers in Marion County; that I have voted at all times and am still voting in this session to help the farmers on every front.

I have owned and operated farms most of my life. I helped to organize, as a charter member, nearly 40 years ago, the Farm Bureau in Marion County, and am still a member.

NAIL CHARGES DOWN

Mr. Speaker, I want to nail these false charges down by giving you the record of my support of REA loan funds, carefully compiled by a member of the staff of the House Subcommittee on Appropriations for Agriculture.

May I point out that, in order to save time on the House floor, on many occasions, no record vote is taken. When the Members are in agreement they often pass the bill by a voice vote rather than take the time to call the roll of 435 Members, which must be called twice on a rollcall vote.

Twelve years ago the first REA appropriation bill I was privileged to vote for came in the 1st session of the 78th Congress.

HERE IS THE RECORD

78th Cong., 1st sess., 1943

Budget request	$30,000,000
House committee approved	20,000,000
Senate approved	30,000,000

It then went to a conference committee of the House and Senate. When it came back to the House, Congressman Rankin moved that the House approve the Senate figure increasing REA appropriations to $30 million. The record shows that I voted "yes" on the Rankin substitute—page 6442 of the Congressional Record, June 23, 1943—which was defeated. This shows I voted to increase REA appropriations $10 million.

78th Cong., 2d sess., 1944

Budget request	$20,000,000
House committee approved	20,000,000
House approved	20,000,000

I supported the $20 million although there was no record vote. It went to the Senate, which increased the amount to $40 million. The conference committee representing the House and the Senate compromised at $25 million. No one opposed the conference report. I supported the $25 million, and this was the amount appropriated.

79th Cong., 1st sess., 1945

Budget request	$150,000,000
House committee approved	60,000,000
House approved	60,000,000
Senate approved	125,000,000

In the House on final passage of the $60 million, there was a record vote. I had been called to my office on an emergency matter, and returned to the floor as quickly as possible, but got there about 2 minutes too late to be recorded favorably on the House vote. Conferees, representing the House and Senate, compromised on $80 million, and I supported the conference report for $80 million.

79th Cong., 1st sess. (continued), 2d deficiency, 1945

Budget request	$160,000,000
House committee approved	50,000,000
House approved	120,000,000

I supported the $120 million on a division vote. There was no rollcall. The Senate approved $120 million. Final amount approved $120 million, and I voted for it.

79th Cong. 2d sess., 1946, urgent deficiency, 1946

House approved	$100,000,000

A motion was later made to recommit the bill, to eliminate funds for OPA, which was refeated on a record vote. I was not recorded on that vote, however, it had nothing to do with REA.

79th Cong., 2d sess., (continued)

Budget request	$250,000,000
House approved	250,000,000
Senate approved	250,000,000
Final amount approved	250,000,000

I voted for $250 million, as all other Members present did. In order to save time no record vote was taken.

80th Cong., 1st sess., 1947

Budget request	$250,000,000
House committee approved	225,000,000
House approved	225,000,000

Mr. Cannon of Missouri offered motion to recommit May 28, 1947, page 6030 Congressional Record, to provide $300 million for the Agriculture Adjustment Administration, $75 million for school lunches, and to increase REA $25 million. I voted against it because of the enormous sum added for AAA in the House.

On final passage of conference report I voted "yes" on the rollcall vote for $225 million—May 28, 1947, Congressional Record, page 6031; 315 of the Members voted "yes" and only 38 voted "no."

80th Cong., 2d sess., 1948

First deficiency 1948 budget request	$175,000,000
Committee approved	75,000,000
House approved	175,000,000

In other words, we in the House increased the committee request by $100 million. Mr. Cannon of Missouri offered motion to recommit, and increase REA by $100 million. I voted "yes" on record vote, page 3995, April 1, 1948, Congressional Record, and also voted "yes" on record vote for final passage on April 1, 1948. Senate also approved the amount.

Budget request (regular)	$300,000,000
Committee approved	400,000,000
House approved	400,000,000
Senate approved	400,000,000

This was under the 80th Republican Congress, which voted more funds in the 2 years it was in power for REA than has ever been voted in 2 years since REA was adopted. There was no record vote and practically no opposition. I voted for these large sums, as the other Members did.

81st Cong., 1st sess., 1949

Budget request	$350,000,000
Committee aprpoved	350,000,000
House approved	350,000,000
Senate approved	350,000,000

I supported this amount by a voice vote. There was no record vote.

Now, since there are always some people who are more interested in politics than they are in the farmers, I want to quote what I said with reference to the REA bill when we were considering it on April 5, 1949, 5 years ago. You will find my remarks on page 3921 of the Congressional Record. My comments then reflect the support I have always given REA loan funds throughout my service in Congress. This is what I said:

> Mr. Chairman, I had occasion to appear before the subcommittee handling this bill. They have brought out a very good bill. It appeals to me in almost every section.
>
> Particularly do I appreciate and favor that provision with reference to REA, which not only provides for an appropriation of $350 million, but has a proviso that the administrator of REA, Mr. Wickard, if he finds he is running short of funds may go to the Secretary of Agriculture and borrow in amounts of $50 million, if he can so justify, until an additional $150 million has been exhausted.
>
> I am glad this provision is worded so that the administrator does not have to come back to Congress, if more funds are needed for the year 1949. The Congress by this provision has given REA full opportunity for the extension of its services, so much needed by the people of the Nation.
>
> ### SOIL CONSERVATION
>
> I am also interested in the provision with reference to soil conservation. The greatest contribution we can make to the posterity of this country, as well as for the immediate future is that we try to leave the soil in a better condition than we found it, more fertile, and more productive, for those who follow after us. If we have done that, then we have really rendered a service to the country, not only for the present and the near future, but for the years to come.

The Record further reads as follows:

> Mr. Rankin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman [Congressman Vursell] yield?
>
> Mr. Vursell. I yield.

Mr. Rankin. This bill appropriates $350 million for rural electrification, and makes $150 million additional available if necessary. That is right, is it not?

Mr. Vursell. Yes.

Mr. Rankin. That would mean $500 million would be available.

Mr. Vursell. That is correct.

The above reflects the position I have always taken on REA loans and soil conservation.

81st Cong., 2d sess., 1950

Budget request (including rural telephones)	$450,000,000
House committee approved	375,000,000
House approved	375,000,000
Senate approved	390,000,000

Conference of the House and Senate committees approved a compromise of $382,500,000. Final amount approved, $382,500,000. I, with practically all other Members, voted for this large sum.

82d Cong., 1st sess., 1951

Budget request	$109,000,000
Committee approved	109,000,000
House approved	109,000,000
Senate approved	109,000,000

No amendment or record vote. No conference necessary. Final amount approved, 109 million. I, with practically all Members, supported the amount by a voice vote.

82d Cong., 2d sess., 1952

Budget request	$75,000,000
Committee approved	75,000,000
House approved	75,000,000
Senate approved	75,000,000

No conference necessary. Practically all of the House Members voted for the $75 million. No record vote was necessary.

83d Cong., 1st sess., 1953

Budget request	$200,000,000
Committee approved	185,000,000
House approved	185,000,000
Senate approved	202,500,000
Conference committee approved	202,500,000

Page 5457 of the Congressional Record, dated May 20, 1953, will show that I voted "yes" on final passage.

83d Cong., 1st sess., 1954

Budget request	$55,000,000
Committee approved	100,000,000
House approved	100,000,000

I urged the subcommittee to increase the amount to $100 million, and we approved it on a voice vote. There was no record vote. The Senate raised the amount to $135 million. Inasmuch as I could not be present when the conference report came back to the House, I made the following statement, which I quote from the Congressional Record of June 22, 1954, page 8208:

> Mr. Speaker, since it will be impossible for me to be present tomorrow when the conference committee reports on the agriculture appropriation bill, I should like for the Record to show that I favor the report, and if it were possible for me to be present, I would vote for the additional Senate $35-million loan authorization carried in the report for REA.

When the above bill was before the House, the Congressional Record of April 12, 1954, page 4753, carried my remarks, as follows:

REA FUNDS

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to note that our committee has provided additional loan funds for rural electrification in the amount of $100 million in this bill. I would like to point out that the Appropriations Committee has increased the budget request of $55 million by $45 million, which will bring the loan fund for the coming year up to $100 million.

FOR REA TELEPHONE SERVICE

I would also like to say that I voted for the original Telephone Act and to point out that we have provided the full budget request of $75 million loan fund to be used in the extension of the REA telephone service, which is an increase of $7,500,000 over the appropriations made for telephone service over the recent year.

COMMITTEE REPORT

The committee has had reported to it many instances where private power sources are placing more and more restrictions on the activities of REA cooperatives as condition to negotiating contracts to supply the necessary power. Many times contracts offered by the private power companies are on a year-to-year basis. In the opinion of the committee, REA cooperatives are entitled to a firm source of power at reasonable rates and on a dependable basis, with the full right to operate on a basis which will render maximum service to eligible consumers. The committee feels that the Administrator's authority to provide loans for power generation should be fully utilized, if necessary, in order to assure adequate power to REA cooperatives on a reasonable basis.

The committee report we wrote is important, and shows the Congress is determined to protect the REA as it grows in the future to the extent that they may build their own power-generation plants, when necessary, to assure them adequate power, at reasonable competitive rates. When they are not able to secure adequate power in an area without unreasonable rates, I want them to have this protection.

I further stated "that Congress is determined to protect the REA as it grows in the future to the extent that they may build their own power generating plants, when necessary, to assure them adequate power, at reasonable competitive rates."

Now, the above shows that I, with a majority of the Members of Congress, appropriated for the REA loan fund to bring light and power to the farmers of America a total of $2,649,000,000, which is $75 million more than was requested by the three Presidents under whom I have served during the past 12 years.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT—RECLAMATION, ETC.

The following will show that I voted with a majority of the Members of Congress to reduce some amounts for administration expenses and construction work, because the hearings held before the Appropriations Committee of 50 members showed these funds were not necessary, and would be a waste of the taxpayers' money.

ROLL CALL NO. 40, APRIL 25, 1947

A motion was made from the Democratic side to recommit the bill which would add funds to purchase 30 new automobiles for the Interior Department—mind you, not REA—and provide for $1,700,000 for administration of the Bonneville project, meaning they could employ more people who were not needed and spend more money.

The facts prove they had a carryover of $141 million in the Department that had not been spent. The Washington Post, the leading Democrat newspaper in Washington, published an editorial commending the action the committee had taken in reducing the Interior appropriation bill.

I voted against the waste of this amount of money because they already had too many automobiles and plenty of money for the administration of the project. I must have been right because 197, including Representative Nixon, now Vice President, and Representative William G. Stratton, now Governor of Illinois, voted with me, while only 140 voted for the motion to recommit.

ROLL CALL NO 39, MAY 2, 1951

Mr. Gary, chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee, and a Democrat from Virginia, offered an amendment to strike out $3,400,000 for the Southeastern Power Administration. I quote from the Congressional Record of April 24, 1951, page 4282, what Mr. Gary said:

> The purpose of this amendment is to prevent the useless expenditure of $3,400,000 to the Southeastern Power Administration for the construction of transmission lines to duplicate existing lines now in operation by private power companies.

Mr. Gary has the respect of every Member of the House. His amendment carried on the roll call by 248 yeas to 149 nays. I was glad to vote with Mr. Gary to prevent this waste.

ROLL CALL NO. 40, MAY 2, 1951

Congressman Harris, an able and respected Democrat of Arkansas, offered the amendment to reduce SWPA by $550,000. In support of his amendment, I quote from the Congressional Record of April 24, 1951, page 4295, his words, as follows:

> Mr. Chairman, this amendment is an effort to reduce in some small way the burden—the load of the taxpayer. It does not handicap or adversely affect the program or service of the Southwestern Power Administration. * * * If there ever was a time when Federal expenditures unrelated to our national defense should be reduced to the bone, it is now.

I was glad to help save this $550,000. The amendment carried by 222 yeas to 173 nays.

ROLL CALL NO. 41, MAY 2, 1951

Simply a vote for language to be inserted that no funds of the appropriation could be expended for the construction of facilities designated as comprising the western Missouri project. Yeas 247, nays 152.

ROLL CALL NO. 42, MAY 2, 1951

This motion was made to reduce the amount appropriated for Bonneville project by $5½ million. However, that left $62 million for that project, more than they could or did spend for the coming year. Motion carried 225 to 167. I voted to save $5½ million.

ROLLCALL NO. 44, MAY 2, 1951

This had to do with construction under the Bureau of Reclamation, Mr. Taber made a motion to reduce the amount from $207,190,000 to $197,000,000. That still left an enormous sum. I voted "yea" to slow down the spenders; 237 voted "yea" to only 160 "no." I voted against unnecessary waste.

ROLLCALL NO. 45, MAY 2, 1951

This was an attempt on the part of the spenders to duplicate transmission lines already rendering adequate service; 226 voted "yea," only 165 voted "nay." I voted with the 226.

ROLLCALL NO. 32, APRIL 28, 1953

This vote was on a motion to recommit the bill which had been considered for many weeks by the Appropriations Committee, and had been approved by that committee after long hearings. The motion would add to the bill about $6,856,000 to be spent on various construction projects in the Southwest, West, and Northwest parts of the United States.

The motion was voted down by a vote of 212 to 167. I voted to prevent spending $6,856,000, which was clearly unnecessary.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, on the rollcalls I have just listed I would like to point out that the Members of this House, by a big majority on every rollcall, voted as I did knowing it was our duty to prevent unnecessary waste of millions of dollars of the taxpayers' money. I am glad to have helped render that service.

Refrigerator Death Curb Sought—Roberts Bill a Must

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 21, 1954

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the Members of the House to an article which appeared in the Sunday Star, Washington, D. C., on July 18, 1954. This article points up an invention called Silok, which is a magnetic latch for use on refrigerators, an invention of Mr. Silas A. Morehouse, of Chantilly, Va.

It is to be hoped that this invention is the answer to the ever-growing problem of household refrigerators which have become death traps for children.

In 1952 icebox deaths totaled 14. In the past year 31 children, led on by their own curiosity, suddenly found themselves inextricably locked inside a refrigerator and suffocated to death before being discovered. With the number of deaths increasing each year, it seems imperative to me that Congress should give this growing problem its serious study and enact legislation to eliminate these children's deaths insofar as possible.

The Silok latch has the advantage of being a simple method and one that will be economical for the industry.

If this is not the answer, I certainly believe that a satisfactory safety device can be invented. It is inconceivable to me that the great scientific knowledge and inventive genius of this country of ours which developed the H-bomb, capable of completely destroying south Pacific islands, cannot develop a simple little lock on a refrigerator door which can be opened from the inside with a little pressure by a little child.

Two bills have been introduced in the other body of Congress, one by Senator Mansfield, of Montana, the other by Senator Sparkman, of Alabama. Similar bills have been introduced in the House—H. R. 8170 and H. R. 7620 by me.

This problem should be kept alive and should be studied by the Congress until a satisfactory answer is found which will eliminate the deaths of innocent children.

Two splendid editorials have been written by editors of the Fourth District of Alabama, which I have the honor to represent and, and are as follows: One dated July 12, 1954, in the Selma Times-Journal, of Selma, Ala., and one dated July 16, 1954, in the Piedmont Journal, of Piedmont, Ala.:

[From the Washington (D. C.) Star of July 18, 1954]

AND NOW COMES A MAN WITH A "KID-PROOF" ICEBOX

(By George Kennedy)

A Fairfax County resident has an invention to end the tragic deaths of children in abandoned refrigerators. The death toll from this type of accident, which broke out like a rash last year, has risen to 85 and there is general agreement that something has to be done about it.

The inventor is Silas A Morehouse, of Chantilly, Va., an early-bird pilot and former civilian employee of the Air Force.

Mr. Morehouse's invention has the virtue of simplicity. The icebox door is held closed by magnetism instead of by a spring latch. One magnet is fastened to the center shelf of the box; another to the inside of the door. When the center shelf is removed there is nothing to hold the door closed. And when the center shelf is in place, a child will not fit in the icebox.

He may be in the position of the fortunate few who have come up with a $1 million invention. He had a search made at the Patent Office and was surprised to find that no patent has been issued for a safety refrigerator door based on using the center shelf as a protective device. He has applied for a patent.

The idea of using magnets in refrigerators, however, is not new. General Electric used small alnico magnets embedded in the gasket around the outside of the door on its de luxe models in 1950 and 1951. The magnets were made of nickel, cobalt, and aluminum. The Korean war made these materials critical and the line was discontinued in 1951. The purpose of the magnetic door was convenience, not safety. A foot treadle disengaged the magnets. General Motors also experimented with magnets for its Frigidaire boxes.

Industry produces about 6 million new refrigerators a year. Mr. Morehouse believes the manufacturers would find they could produce the magnetic lock more cheaply than the spring latch. He would be perfectly willing to license the use of his idea at 25 cents a refrigerator. It is not hard to figure that if the industry has to come around to using his invention, his income would be about $1.5 million a year.

There are two bills before Congress to prevent the distribution of more refrigerators that are potential death traps for children. One was introduced by Senator Mansfield, of Montana, the other by Senator Sparkman, of Alabama. Both have practically the same language: That it shall be unlawful to introduce into interstate commerce any refrigerator unless it "is equipped with a latch which enables it to be opened from the inside." Most refrigerators, of course, cross State lines between factory and home and so would fall under the law's provision.

Mr. Morehouse, who testified at hearings on the bill held by the Subcommittee on Business and Consumer Interest of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, believes he has the latch that fills the bill.

Senator Purtell, of Connecticut, chairman of the subcommittee, is very interested in getting something done about the refrigerator menace. Since the introduction of the bills two children have been suffocated in abandoned refrigerators in his State.

Industry representatives in general opposed the bill at the hearing. They said the problem should be dealt with at State and local levels. Twenty States already have passed legislation requiring the refrigerator door to be taken off or the lock removed before it is discarded. They pointed out that this Federal legislation would have no effect until 10, 15 or 20 years from now when the new refrigerators manufactured in conformance to it become worn out and are discarded.

As for the Morehouse invention called "Silok," an industry representative said it would not hold the refrigerator door tight enough to prevent air leakage around the rubber rim. The magnetic latch on a refrigerator, which Mr. Morehouse showed the subcommittee, had a pressure of 8 pounds to the square inch. Industry engineers said 30 to 40 pounds is necessary.

Mr. Morehouse said he checked the latches on refrigerator doors and found that eight pounds was typical.

"If they really need more pressure," says Mr. Morehouse, "we can give it to them with larger magnets."

The magnets he uses are far more powerful than the old horseshoe iron magnets which are still a delight to children. They are the alnico magnets, the same make that General Electric used, only larger. Their strength is an important part of his demonstration.

They are made by Crucible Steel Co. and are magnetized at very high temperatures. It is difficult to remove the iron crossbar by hand from an alnico horseshoe magnet. It takes a very strong arm to wrest the bar away.

It would be rather difficult to open a refrigerator door with 40 pounds pressure keeping it closed. But a lever latch could be devised to turn the magnet on the door so that it would no longer be in direct contact with the one on the shelf.

[From the Selma Times-Journal of July 12, 1954]

REFRIGERATOR DEATH CURB SOUGHT

Kenneth A. Roberts, Dallas County's representative in Congress, is sponsoring legislation which may serve to eliminate the threat of child deaths in abandoned refrigerators.

Representative Roberts has authored a bill which would require refrigerator makers to provide inside latches on all such devices shipped in interstate commerce.

Such latches, he said, would reduce the number of child deaths caused by playful youngsters hiding in abandoned ice boxes by providing means of escape from what have proven to be fatal traps.

Congressman Roberts holds that publicity-scare campaigns to educate adults not to leave these attractive nuisances around for children to discover are very helpful, but they are not sufficient in themselves.

Mr. Roberts also urges that municipalities and counties be encouraged to enact ordinances making it illegal to abandon old refrigerators, but he cited instances to show that this method, too, is not sufficient to solve the problem.

The record shows that steps to curb icebox deaths are desirable, and it should be a matter of public regret that legislative pressure upon the Congress has forced delay of action on the Roberts bill until next session.

The importance of this matter indicates, however, that the Roberts bill eventually will achieve passage, thereby lessening the threat of child deaths in abandoned refrigerators.

[From the Piedmont Journal of July 16, 1954]

ROBERTS' BILL A MUST

Congressman KENNETH ROBERTS' bill, H. R. 7920, to require manufacturers to provide inside latches on doors of household refrigerators shipped in interstate commerce for the protection of children, has been unexpectedly postponed, due to a confliction of simultaneous bills before the House at the same hour. The purpose of the bill is aimed at preventing further tragic deaths by small children playing and hiding in abandned old refrigerators and iceboxes. Congressman ROBERTS, while regretting the delay in getting his important bill before the House at this session, has been assured by the chairman of the committee that the bill be scheduled for an early calling in the 84th Congress. The bill is very timely and very necessary, and no doubt will be promptly passed if and when it reaches the committee and subsequently the House. Theoretically, in view of so much publicity and the warnings through the press, radio, and television, these tragic deaths would stop, but the small fry's newspaper reading is confined principally to the comics and their radioing and televiews to kiddie programs.

Property Owners Association of California and Taxpayers Association Oppose Fryingpan and Upper Colorado Storage Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 24, 1954

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, two influential nonpartisan organizations in California have written letters to all Members of Congress from our State voicing well-reasoned opposition to the pending Fryingpan-Arkansas and upper Colorado storage projects. I desire to include their letters in our RECORD:

PROPERTY OWNERS ASSOCIATION
OF CALIFORNIA, INC.,
Los Angeles, July 1, 1954.

Hon. THOMAS KUCHEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: This communication to you is another expression of growing organized opposition in all parts of the country to bills S. 1555, H. R. 1449; S. 964, and H. R. 236 now pending in Congress.

If enacted they would authorize the start of enormous storage reservoirs and irrigation works in the upper basin of the Colorado River costing billions of dollars.

Estimates of water available for the projects are based on erroneous interpretations of the Colorado River compact and are under attack before the United States Supreme Court.

The scheme is for limited acreage of a relatively few landowners to produce more surplus crops. It threatens millions of people in southern California whose lives and economy had been established upon the assurance that they would retain their rightful share of Colorado River water.

More than that, the proposed projects would place an increased tax burden upon people in all States of the Union—$93 million for Californians.

Our association will support your active opposition to this political subsidy. Will you please advise if you are in accord with our hope.

Very truly yours,

——— ———,
Chairman, Board of Directors.

The following letter was mailed to the California Members of Congress:

MAY 21, 1954.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN YORTY: The executive committee of California Taxpayers' Association has asked me to transmit to you the deep concern of this association regarding H. R. 4449 which has recently been voted out by the narrow margin of 13 to 12 by the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee of the House. As you know, California Taxpayers' Association is a representative group of California citizens from every county of the State whose interests include everything from basic agriculture to industry and finance. It is completely nonpartisan; it bases its recommendations on research; and it takes the long-term point of view.

The people of California had scarcely taken a deep breath from the temporary lifting of the Arizona threat to our California water supply from the Colorado River when H. R. 4449 loomed up. In the opinion of many students of the subject, this bill presents potential dangers to our State as great as or greater than the Arizona project.

We realize that your mind, at this time, is burdened with grave problems of foreign and domestic affairs, but we feel so strongly the dangers of H. R. 4449, and its "foot-in-door" possibilities for establishing bad precedents, the wasting of public funds, and endangering California's share of Colorado River water, that we wish to bring our views urgently to your attention.

It seems wise to us that problems of reclamation, and water and power development should come under the careful and comprehensive scrutiny of the Second Hoover Commission, which the Congress established last year for the very purpose of bringing order and over-all common sense into the development of the Nation's natural resources. H. R. 4449 jumps the gun on these comprehensive studies now under way.

The official Views of the State of California raises many serious questions concerning vital and economic features of the bill. These views were expressed by the Director of Public Works, concurred in by the Colorado River Board of California, and approved by the governor.

There is no immediate crisis in water supply confronting the States in the upper Colorado storage project. There is no economic or social justification for more high-cost irrigation development of desert land at the time when we are plagued with costly subsidized surpluses.

We of California are the second highest contributors to the Federal Treasury. Californians, while comprising 7 percent of the American people, are supplying 9 percent of the Federal revenues. It is imperative that an adequate defense be established against the injustice of unmerited subsidies to other States paid for with our money, when the national interest is not involved.

While California does not have representation on the House Rules Committee, we hope you and other California Congressmen will be able to protect the people of our State and the Nation from this dangerous and costly enterprise.

Respectfully,

EARLE V. GROVER,
President, California Taxpayers' Association.

How Congress Can Help

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 15, 1954

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the RECORD an editorial from the Cleveland Plain Dealer of Friday, July 16, entitled "How Congress Can Help."

This editorial, written by the Plain Dealer's chief editorial writer, Ralph J. Donaldson, points out how the present Congress could do something concrete to advance American foreign policy in a vital area of the world.

Moreover this is something which it is incontestably within the province of Congress to do and which the administration wants Congress to do. That is to grant statehood to the Territory of Hawaii.

Mr. Donaldson has been associated with the Cleveland Plain Dealer more than 30 years. He is one of the most capable writers in the Middle West and he bears an excellent reputation among newspaper authorities.

Donaldson is a lifelong Clevelander, having been educated in the Cleveland public schools. He graduated from Glenville High School with honors, and matriculated at Harvard University. While attending Harvard, he enrolled in the British Air Force before the United States entered the First World War, and Lieutenant Donaldson became one of the pioneer air pilots. After the war, Donaldson joined the Plain Dealer staff as a reporter, Columbus correspondent, and political editor. I recall while serving in the Ohio Senate, Ralph Donaldson, shepherding the late E. H. Baker, publisher of the Plain Dealer, when he was advocating that the Ohio Legislature pass a port authority bill to get ready for the St. Lawrence seaway, which the Plain Dealer was advocating more than 30 years ago, and which I am happy to say was one of the fine accomplishments of this Congress and the Eisenhower administration. Donaldson had faith that Congress would pass the seaway bill.

The Plain Dealer has been editorially advocating Hawaiian statehood these many years, and I believe this editorial which points out a chance for this Congress to do something constructive about promoting American interests in Asia, is a most timely one.

We on the House side have already passed the Hawaiian statehood bill. I am hopeful that the House conferees will insist on the enactment of the bill without the inclusion of Alaska, and that the Senate will yield on that issue and add another accomplishment of the Eisenhower administration.

The editorial follows:

HOW CONGRESS CAN HELP

From time to time, Washington commentators note the struggle that has been going on since the end of the war between the White House and Capitol Hill to determine who is to control the foreign policy of the United States.

The struggle has manifested itself in various incidents, such as the investigation of the summary dismissal of Gen. Douglas MacArthur, the great debates over the Bricker amendment, and the assignment of American forces to Europe and the lesser debate over the ratification of treaties authorizing American military and civilian personnel to be tried in foreign courts for offenses committed within their jurisdictions.

It is currently seething over the issue of whether the United States should withdraw from the United Nations in the event the U. N. should commit virtual self-destruction by admitting Red China to membership.

The struggle has gone on without interruption, despite the change of administrations. Although Congress possesses the ultimate control through its power to grant or withhold appropriations, the White House, regardless of who was occupying it at the time, has won every issue that has been contested.

Today, however, Congress has a chance to do something to advance American foreign policy in a vital area of the world. Moreover, this is something which it is incontestably within the province of Congress to do and which the administration wants Congress to do. That is to grant statehood to the territory of Hawaii.

There are many reasons why Hawaii is entitled to statehood—population, literacy, wealth, Federal tax contributions, commercial ties with the mainland, a demonstrated capacity for self-government, devotion to American ideals and the free enterprise system, and a spirit of tolerance which is not to be found in some—perhaps most—of the States of the Union.

But there is another reason which is compelling at this time in history. That is the adverse effect which the withholding of statehood has on the people of Asia whom we are trying to influence. Or, conversely, it is the beneficial effect which the granting of statehood would have among Asians who are sensitive on the subject of colonialism and who regard Hawaii as an American colony.

Hawaiians have been asking for admission to the Union for 54 years at least. Why don't we let them in, then? Critics of the United States in Asia have an answer and, we are sorry to say, it may be the right one. They say we don't want Hawaii as a state because the islanders might send a couple of Senators to Washington with Japanese, Chinese, Filipino, Polynesian or mixed ancestry. They deplore this evidence of snobbery and intolerance and accuse us, rightfully, of not practicing the equality we preach.

Here is a chance for Congress to do something constructive about promoting American interests in Asia. The House should insist on the enactment of the Hawaiian statehood bill without the inclusion of Alaska, and the Senate should yield on that issue.

That would accomplish more good than all the talk about intervention in Indochina or threats about what we will do if Red China is admitted to the U. N., besides satisfying a longing by the people of Hawaii for a status for which they have every qualification.

The People Shrink

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER ROGERS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 21, 1954

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, thousands of words have been written and said about the evils of the all-powerful state. Mr. Paul Ord, the able editor of the Childress Reporter, Childress, Tex., in one short editorial has given as much food for thought. Under permission to extend my remarks in the Record, I submit the following splendid editorial by Mr. Ord in the Childress Reporter for July 14:

The People Shrink

> A famous pre-Soviet Russian historian, writing on the Tsarist era, said: "The state swelled and the people shrank."
>
> That has been true of every all-powerful state since time began—whether Communist, Socialist, monarchist, or clerical. In every instance individual rights are destroyed one by one till none are left, and the individual himself becomes a cipher.
>
> When the state swells the people shrink.

A New Victory for the Reds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 24, 1954

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, the Reds in Indochina have just gained a momentous victory. The surrender of territory by France means just that, no matter what other issues were involved. What we do not clearly understand in the United States is that the surrender of this territory also means a weakening of the strength with which the United States seeks to halt Communist aggression. In this particular case the loss of territory may not seem to be of immediate concern to us. But any increase in Communist prestige coupled with a loss of French will to fight, and to buck the Kremlin, is of very great concern. If our allies are unwilling to risk a collision of will with the Kremlin, they may be bluffed into discontinuing permission for our operation from overseas bases on their soil. Thus a vital source of our strength and our only geographical advantage could be lost without our consent just as the French surrender of territory in Indochina was arranged without the free consent of the citizens of the surrendered territory.

Those able Washington commentators, Joseph and Stewart Alsop, have some penetrating remarks on this subject in their column today. They point out what too many overlook, that the Strategic Air Command which is the long-range striking arm of American defense, has been planned just big enough to do its assigned job from overseas airbases. The retention of these bases is vital to our security and the heart of our foreign policy. The chief weapon of Strategic Air Command is the B–17, a medium-range bomber which can reach Soviet targets from American bases, but only by means of midair, inflight refueling. Overseas bases are essential to their efficient, quick, and successful operation in the event of Soviet aggression.

Meanwhile this administration seeks to win a global struggle with new phrases. Replacing last year's New Look, we have this year's "stretchout," as reported only yesterday at his press conference by the Secretary of Defense. Secretary Wilson argued that the defense cuts decided on by the administration last year had nothing to do with what has occurred on the international scene since. Hence, they can be continued. He argued that if we had twice as large an Army, Navy, and Air Force over the past 18 months, "not a single thing" that happened would have turned out differently. Russia, he said has relied on satellites and on fomenting unrest rather than direct military force. Hence, increasing our Armed Forces is no answer to our problems.

This attitude ignores the fact that while Russia has won victories through satellites and by increasing unrest, she has been building new weapons and increasing her air-atomic power possibly more rapidly than we are increasing our own. The Alsops make the assertion that the Pentagon now has convincing evidence that the Soviets have a guided missile that can drop an atomic or hydrogen warhead on most of our overseas bases. Furthermore, the Soviets are developing a greater guided missile that will bring all our transatlantic and transpacific airbases within range. Both types of missiles are probably now entering the phase of quantity production.

Meanwhile no steps are being taken to give the Strategic Air Command more long-range bombers, to speed up B–47 production, or to provide the kind of leadership and strength needed to insure our continuing possession of overseas bases. Instead, we are being treated to such soothing sirup as we heard from Quantico a few weeks ago, as we heard from the Secretary yesterday, and as we read in the joint congressional committee's report on the new atomic-energy bill—all asserting America's preponderance in atomic weapons and seeking to lull our citizens with the idea that we can afford a stretchout in military buildup—at least until after the November elections. This is certainly fiddle-faddle, as the Alsops call it. More dangerously, it is fiddling while fires that can consume the world are smoldering, ready to burst at any moment into flame. It is ridiculous to say that our military cutbacks have not encouraged the Kremlin. When you are in a race you are always encouraged when your adversary shows signs of quitting.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent of my colleagues to extend my remarks, I insert in the Congressional Record the following by Joseph and Stewart Alsop from today's Washington Post and Times Herald and New York Herald Tribune. The column is as follows:

The Fiddle-Faddlers

(By Joseph and Stewart Alsop)

> The Pentagon has convincing evidence that the Soviets are now quantity producing an efficient guided missile capable of being fitted with an atomic or hydrogen warhead, and with enough range to hit any of our overseas airbases except those in Spain and the Mediterranean.
>
> The Pentagon also has probable evidence of a still larger Soviet guided missile, most likely built around the powerful new M–103

rocket engine that the Soviet engineers have perfected. With a range of 1,800 miles, this missile will bring all our transatlantic and transpacific airbases under fire.

Very recently, hard information has been received of a large order placed in eastern Europe, for special rail cars apparently designed to transport missiles of the larger, longer-range type. This new development if correctly interpreted, indicates that these missiles are also entering the phase of quantity production.

Such facts as these, in turn, are clear proof that this country is now being treated to an unconscionable amount of fiddle-faddle by its leaders. The kind of thing that the official leadership encourages, and the public generally falls for, was well illustrated the other day by the Joint Congressional Committee's report on the new atomic energy bill.

"America's preponderance in atomic weapons," smugly declared the committee, "can * * * serve emphatic notice on the Soviet dictators that any attempt * * * to push further anywhere into the free world, would be foredoomed to failure."

Those words were written when the Soviet dictators were finishing a most successful push in Indochina. But that is not the worst of their implied untruths. Their worst untruth is the idea that large numbers of A- and H-bombs, in and of themselves, will always give this country the whip hand in the struggle for the world. This idea is the true "Maginot-line thinking" of the postwar period.

In fact, of course, the Soviet and American A- and H-bomb stockpiles are only one element in the balance of air-atomic power. A-bombs and H-bombs which cannot be delivered are mere expensive toys. In the era of plentiful stocks of the absolute weapons, the ability to deliver the weapons is obviously more important than the weapons themselves.

Nearly a year has passed since the Soviets tested their H-bomb with lithium hydride core, capable of being produced rather rapidly and in large numbers. There is no doubt at all that the Soviets already possess enough A-bombs to inflict terrible damage on this country. In 18, or 24, or 36 months—for the time is not long—the Soviet A- and H-bomb stockpile will be in the plentiful class.

This in turn confers a somewhat lurid future meaning on the two Soviet guided missiles referred to above. For when the Kremlin has enough A- and H-bombs in stock, the missiles can then be fitted with atomic or hydrogen warheads. And when and if that is done, our overseas airbases will, in effect, cease to be dependable assets.

This physical vulnerability of the bases is still quite largely in the future. In the present, however, there is another tendency of almost equal importance. As the Indochinese affair has shown, our allies are less and less willing to risk a collision of will with the Kremlin, because of their growing fear of Soviet air-atomic strength. That means that many of our overseas bases are also politically vulnerable.

No secrets will be revealed to the enemy, but no doubt Americans will be surprised to learn, that the loss of our overseas airbases from any cause, whether military or political, will be the exact equivalent of the physical destruction of approximately 60 percent of the Strategic Air Command.

Gen. Curtis LeMay's great force has been planned just big enough to do its job from the overseas airbases. Last year, the Eisenhower administration actually cutback SAC growth, on the ground that SAC did not need extra long-range air groups.

SAC now mainly relies on its superb medium range-bomber, the B-47. These planes can reach Soviet targets from American bases, but only by the difficult, dangerous and time-consuming process of double air refuelling. If this expedient has to be resorted to, the B-47 will only be able to make about 40 percent as many sorties as they could from the overseas bases. Obviously, cutting the number of possible sorties is just like cutting the number of available aircraft.

The Pentagon has effectively admitted the danger to our overseas airbases, by giving SAC a big tanker program, to increase air refuelling capacity. But no steps are planned to give SAC more bombers, or to speed B-47 production, which could be doubled in 6 months. And so the threat to our overseas airbases threatens to weaken our overall air-atomic power, at the very moment when Soviet air-atomic power is rapidly and formidably increasing.

The Honorable Robert Crosser, of Ohio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT T. SECREST

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 21, 1954

Mr. SECREST. Mr. Speaker, Congressman Robert Crosser will, this session, complete a long and honorable career in the House of Representatives. Never in the history of Congress has there been a more honest, conscientious, forthright Member of this House.

In 1939, on the 25th anniversary of his service in Congress, more than 1,000 of his friends attended a testimonial banquet in his honor. Many highly deserved tributes were paid to the dean of the Ohio delegation.

Under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I include many tributes paid to this great public servant which were printed in the Record on April 27, 1939:

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. Sweeney. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 minutes.

The Speaker. Under the practice of the House, the Chair will recognize a request by the gentleman from Ohio to proceed for 1 minute.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio to address the House for 1 minute?

There was no objection.

REPRESENTATIVE ROBERT CROSSER

Mr. Sweeney. Mr. Speaker, I rise on this occasion to call to the attention of the House of Representatives the fact that this year 1939 marks the 25th anniversary of public service as a Member of Congress of the United States of our distinguished colleague the gentleman from Ohio, the Honorable Robert Crosser. I am sure I voice the sentiments of the membership of this body on both sides of the aisle when I publicly extend to him and in your name the congratulations of this entire body. [Applause.]

Few men enjoy the privilege of serving a quarter of a century in the Congress of the United States. During all these years our friend has demonstrated that he is a firm believer in democracy in all the true sense of the word. He has been a champion of the rights of labor, and he has been publicly acclaimed by many of his admirers throughout the Nation as a friend of man.

I pay to Robert Crosser this personal tribute, based upon my acquaintance with him for many, many years, and my association with him for the past 8 years as a colleague in the Congress of the United States. I never knew an individual who excelled him in his liberalism, his philosophy of life, and his deep concern for the welfare of his country and his fellow men.

Mr. Speaker, to commemorate the silver jubilee of his services as a Member of Congress of the United States there gathered in the city of Cleveland in the evening of April 22 over 1,000 men and women to attend a testimonial banquet in honor of Mr. Crosser. The toastmaster on this occasion was his lifelong friend, a veteran newspaperman of Cleveland, the distinguished and nationally known Jack Raper. The mayor of the city of Cleveland, the Honorable Harold Burton, paid to Mr. Crosser this tribute:

"He has outlived his critics. Today he is beyond criticism." [Applause.]

The occasion was graced by the presence of the beloved majority leader of the House of Representatives, the Honorable Sam Rayburn, who paid an extraordinary tribute to his friend and associate of many years in the Congress. The speaker for the railroad labor executive associations was Mr. D. B. Robertson, president, Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen. He told of Mr. Crosser's sponsorship of legislation affecting the railroad workers of America. Congressman Michael Kirwan, Congressman Chester Bolton, and Congressman George Bender, all from Ohio, honored Mr. Crosser by their presence; also honoring him were the former United States Senator from Ohio, Robert J. Bulkley; Judge Charles M. Hay, of St. Louis; and former Congressman Edward Keating, now editor of Labor.

Hundreds of telegrams and congratulatory messages came to Mr. Crosser from all parts of the United States and Canada from those who were unable to be present. The President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Vice President of the United States, the senior Senator from Ohio, the chairman of the Democratic National Committee, Congressman John Dingell, and Congressman Carl Mapes all sent messages expressing splendid tribute to Mr. Crosser. I append herewith the messages referred to, together with the splendid tribute paid to Mr. Crosser by Mr. D. B. Robertson, and also the tribute of the Honorable Sam Rayburn.

Responding to the eulogies paid him, Mr. Crosser delivered what is considered by many of his friends who were present one of the finest speeches ever delivered by him during his entire public career. So his many friends in Congress and throughout the Nation may have the opportunity to read this speech, I insert Mr. Crosser's response to the tributes of his friends, together with an editorial which appeared in the Cleveland Plain Dealer under date of April 24, 1939, paying tribute to Robert Crosser. This editorial is unique and it comes from a newspaper which consistently, with few exceptions, fought Mr. Crosser in every campaign in which he engaged for election as a Member of the House of Representatives. I also include an editorial from the Cleveland Press under date of April 21, 1939, paying a similar tribute to Mr. Crosser.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, D. C., March 24, 1939.

Hon. Robert Crosser, M. C.,
Cleveland, Ohio.

My Dear Congressman Crosser: I regret that I was unable to accept the invitation to attend in person the dinner to be given in Cleveland in your honor and in recognition of your completion of 25 years of public service as a Member of Congress.

Although I cannot be present it gives me great pleasure to be associated with those who are gathering in your honor. Your able and conscientious service has made lovers of the liberal cause your debtors and I wish for your long years of health and happiness.

Very sincerely yours,

Franklin D. Roosevelt.

The Speaker's Room,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C., March 22, 1939.

Mr. Roy C. Scott,
Committee Chairman, Hotel
Hollenden, Cleveland, Ohio.

My Dear Sir: I have received and most deeply appreciate your cordial invitation to attend the testimonial dinner to be given in honor of Representative Crosser in Cleveland on Saturday afternoon, April 22 next. I very deeply regret that on account of my official duties here in Washington it will not be possible for me to attend.

Please allow me to say that I have been associated with Bob Crosser for a great many years in the House of Representatives, and I have seen hundreds of men come and go in and out of this body, but I can say with all candor and sincerity that I have never been associated with anyone in the House for whom I had a higher respect and admiration than Mr. Crosser. He is a man of fine mental attainments, of incorruptible integrity, and has great influence with his associates.

He deserves everlasting praise from all labor organizations for the constant zeal and ability with which he has represented the interests of labor in the House of Representatives. I hold for him an abiding affection.

Wishing you a very fine occasion, and again expressing my deep regret that I cannot be with you, I am,

Very sincerely yours,
W. B. Bankhead.

The Vice President's Chamber,
Washington, April 3, 1939.

Mr. Roy C. Scott,
Committee Chairman, Robert
Crosser Testimonial Dinner,
Cleveland, Ohio.

Dear Mr. Scott: I am grateful to you and your committee for the invitation extended me to attend the testimonial dinner in honor of Congressman Robert Crosser, to be held in Cleveland the evening of April 22. I regret exceedingly that I cannot be with you.

I have had the privilege of association with Congressman Crosser for a quarter of a century, the greater part of that time as his colleague in the House of Representatives. He is a big-brained, big-hearted American, who has served his district, State, and Nation efficiently and faithfully. It is a source of personal pleasure that his friends are tendering this deserved tribute of esteem and respect.

Very sincerely yours,
John N. Garner.

United States Senate,
Committee on Interstate Commerce,
April 22, 1939.

Mr. Roy C. Scott,
Committee Chairman, Robert Crosser
Testimonial Dinner, The Hotel Hol-
lenden, Cleveland, Ohio.

My Dear Mr. Scott: I have before me your invitation to attend the testimonial dinner in honor of Congressman Robert Crosser. I held off answering this letter, hoping that I might be able to attend, but I find it impossible, as my work is so heavy at this time that every minute is necessary.

In 1912 Congressman Crosser and myself were members of the Fourth Ohio Constitutional Convention. It was my good luck to be his seat mate in this memorable convention, and this convention will probably be the last ever to be held in Ohio because the people now have an easy method of amending their constitution in the adoption of I. and R.

Bob Crosser led, not only in this fight but in a great many progressive fights in behalf of the people as well. Bob Crosser and I have been firm friends from the time we were seat mates until the present time. He is "just folks." He will tell you that to live with, serve, and love "folks" has been the greatest blessing in his life of public service. He will also tell you that "folks" will solve all public questions correctly if they understand them. Yes; and he will tell you that "mother, home, and country" is the sweetest trinity locked in the hearts of "just folks."

One of the most worthwhile things in life is to make friends and deserve to keep them. I yield to no man in my love and respect for Bob Crosser—a man with whom one dares to be himself.

To Bob Crosser and his legion of friends surrounding him tonight, I extend sincere regards and best wishes.

Sincerely yours,
Vic Donahey.

Washington, D. C., *April 22, 1939.*

Chairman,
Testimonial Dinner to Hon. Robert
Crosser, Hotel Hollenden, Cleveland,
Ohio:

Please extend my hearty congratulations to Bob Crosser on his completion of 25 years of distinguished public service. He has been a faithful official and a loyal Democrat. I hope he carries on for at least another quarter of a century.

James A. Farley.

Washington, D. C., *April 22, 1939.*

Roy C. Scott,
Active Chairman, Committee on Ar-
arrangements, Crosser Testimonial
Dinner, Hollenden Hotel, Cleveland,
Ohio:

I am disappointed indeed because of my inability to be with you on this occasion. To pay tribute publicly to my esteemed friend and colleague, Bob Crosser, would have been in accordance with my plans and wishes. However, the people of Cleveland, and particularly those of Bob Crosser's district, know him so well that anything which I might say could scarcely add any luster to his good name and accomplishments. Therefore, please tender to the honor guest an expression of my high regard and very best wishes, and may he serve his constituency for many years to come.

John D. Dingell,
Member of Congress.

Washington, D. C., *April 22, 1939.*

Hon. Sam Rayburn,
Care Hotel Hollenden, Cleveland, Ohio:

I wish you would congratulate Bob Crosser for me on the fine and deserved testimonial which his friends are giving him tonight. He has had a long and distinguished service in Congress. With you I have prized his friendship over the years and greatly admire him for his character and for what he is as well as for his record of patriotic unselfish and valuable public service.

Carl E. Mapes,
Member of Congress.

Galt, Ontario, *April 22, 1939.*

Hon. Robert Crosser,
Hotel Hollenden, Cleveland, Ohio:

The voice of Bob, your fellow Scot Congressman from the Land o' the Leal, says carry on. Congratulations.

Bill Bremner.

[From the Cleveland Plain Dealer of April 24, 1939]

HE KEEPS THE FAITH

The tribute which came to Robert Crosser Saturday night was as unusual as it was merited.

"It is not often that any Congressman finds conspicuous members of an opposing party at a gathering in his honor and hears them praise him and his work. It is uncommon, at least in the North, for a national legislator to complete a quarter century of service with reelection year after year as certain as time's march across the calendar, though he serves a State and city famed for its varying political trends.

"The answer is that Robert Crosser is an uncommon Congressman. Always he puts principles before personal interest. With Caledonian tenacity he sticks to his convictions, whether or not they are popular at the moment. A follower of the Tom L. Johnson brand of liberalism, he has kept the faith.

"Often such a course has meant political oblivion. It is heartening to find, in Crosser's case, that this is not always true. So it seems to us that along with the just praise of Congressman Crosser there should also be a word of commendation for his constituents. They have not always agreed with him, but they recognize his worth and character. The matter is well stated by Republican Harold H. Burton, who says of Democrat Robert Crosser, 'he has outlived criticism and today is without critics * * * a man honored and trusted.'

"Cleveland honors itself in honoring the Representative from the 21st."

[Editorial, Cleveland Press, April 21, 1939]

Accolade for Mr. Crosser

"It is a well-deserved tribute and one that is long overdue, which labor, politics, and civic Cleveland will unite to pay to Congressman Robert Crosser tomorrow night.

"Few Clevelanders have served their city, their State, and their Nation more conscientiously and with less ostentation than the dean of Ohio's congressional delegation.

"A follower of Tom L. Johnson, Congressman Crosser always has remained loyal to the ideals of Cleveland's great mayor. During his long public career he has championed causes that were unpopular at the time, but he has lived to see his course vindicated. Few legislators can point to so much worthwhile legislation as the veteran Representative from the 21st.

"Ohio owes it initiative and referendum to Robert Crosser, who early in his political career was a member of the 1912 constitutional convention. Under this amendment voters can enact laws favored by a majority or repeal those which are obnoxious.

"The railroad men of the Nation are indebted to him for a pension system. Scores of laws calculated to advance the best interest of the country are his handiwork.

"The Congressional Directory lists the Cleveland Congressman as a Democrat. That does not describe him. He is independent in politics, independent in thought, and independent in deed, and his record proves it.

"Not once since he went to Washington in 1913 has Robert Crosser played to the gallery. Sturdy, reliable, and sure, the Scotchman from Lanarkshire who came to Cleveland in 1881 is an outstanding example of the highest type of public official.

"He has well earned the public acclaim that he will receive tomorrow night, and we trust that he will be spared to represent the 21st District and the Nation in the Halls of Congress for many years to come."

"A Railroad Man's Tribute to Robert Crosser

"(Address by D. H. Robertson, president, Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, speaking for the Railway Labor Executives' Association at the Robert Crosser testimonial dinner, Cleveland, Ohio, April 22, 1939)

"I am here tonight to bring to our honored guest, Congressman Crosser, whom we prefer to call affectionately 'Bob' Crosser, the greetings of the railroad workers of America. In what I shall say I shall speak not only my own sentiments but, I am sure, the sentiments of railroad men wherever they may be found, whether riding engines and trains, laying rails, flashing signals, or working in offices or shops, or on leave or furlough, or numbered among the thousands let out of the service in recent years. These men, all of them, are here tonight in spirit and bid me say to you, Friend Bob:

" 'Here we are, more than a million strong, your admirers, your supporters, your comrades, and friends.'

"Railroad men have reason for their faith in and affection for Bob Crosser. From his earliest years of public service we have known him to be our friend. He has all the while felt right toward us, but more than that, he has thought right about us and our problems. He has combined deep sympathy with broad understanding. He has been not simply our 'well wisher,' but our constructive thinker. He has, moreover, not only felt right toward us and thought right about us but he has done things for us.

"To recount his accomplishments of worth and service to railroad workers is to catalog the outstanding railroad legislation of recent years. I shall mention a few of them.

"THE AMENDED RAILROAD LABOR ACT

"In 1934 the Railroad Labor Act was so amended and revised as that today it stands as a model of legislation in the field of labor relations.

"Thanks to that act, the right of railroad workers to organize and bargain collectively is established and now universally recognized. Through the use of the agencies set up under the act for the settlement of disputes between managers and men, the railroad industry has in recent years set an example for the industries of the country in the adjustment of disputes and the preservation of industrial peace.

"To the achieving of these great and far-reaching results the counsel and leadership of Congressman Crosser were invaluable.

"RAILROAD RETIREMENT ACT

"What railroad man can ever forget Bob Crosser's fight for the Railroad Retirement Act? Not once or twice but three times he led the fight in Congress to the enactment of that measure.

"The ink was scarcely dry on the opinion of the Supreme Court declaring the first act unconstitutional when he introduced a second bill so drawn as to meet the objections of the Court.

"The opinion of the Court did not shake his belief in the fundamental soundness of a national system for railroad pensions and he pressed on. While the suit brought by the railroads attacking the constitutionality of the second act was pending, the railroads gave up their fight and joined with the railroad labor organizations in working out a measure acceptable to both men and management. This bill embodying the underlying principles for which Congressman Crosser had all along contended was passed by both Houses of the Congress, with only one dissenting vote. It is interesting to observe that the gentleman who cast the dissenting vote is no longer in Congress.

"The bill thus agreed to and enacted is now a part of the law of the land, establishing the great national system for pensions for retired railroad workers. We might appropriately add another 'R' to 'Bob's' initials and let him be known, at least to all railroad men, as 'R. R.' Crosser—'Railroad Retirement' Crosser.

"As the years go by and railroad workers grown old in the service reach out their hands to receive their pension checks, the name and devoted service of Robert Crosser should come to their minds in grateful memory. And if, after he is gone, each aged worker to whose comfort in old age Bob Crosser has contributed, should, as he receives his pension check, lay but a single rose upon his bier he would sleep forever beneath a wilderness of flowers.

"RAILROAD UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION ACT

"As the name of Robert Crosser will be forever identified with the Railway Labor Act and the Railroad Retirement Act, so it will be likewise with the Railroad Unemployment Compensation Act. This last measure was of a complicated and technical character, difficult even for men experienced in legislative matters to grasp it in its full details. When this bill was presented to the lower House of Congress it was generally recognized that the Members of the Congress had not had the opportunity to give it the careful and exhaustive study which a bill of such a complicated nature required for its full and intimate understanding. It is not too much to say that the good favor and ready acceptance which this measure was accorded resulted in largest measure from the fact that it bore the name and carried the endorsement of Robert Crosser. Many Members of Congress rose in their places to say that they accepted the measure because of their confidence in the integrity and high intelligence of Congressman Crosser, and because they knew that he knew what was fair and just to railroad men, to the railroad industry, and the country, and that he would scorn to be unfair to any interest or to champion an unsound or an unwise measure. No greater tribute could be paid to any man; no greater evidence of the invaluable worth of a servant and leader of the people in the Congress of the United States.

"OTHER WORK FOR US

"Congressman Crosser has served us as our friend and champion not only in his work for these notable measures but in relation to many others such as the signalmen's bill and a bill providing for an investigation of the question of a 6-hour day for railroad employees.

"Great comfort and a deep sense of security has come to us in the knowledge that he is there on the job—not only wanting to protect our interests but with an unsurpassed ability to do so.

"We rejoice that he is in Congress at this time when matters vitally affecting the railroad industry are pending before the Congress. We need, the whole country needs, statesmen who know and understand the railroad transportation system so that the highest possible intelligence may be applied to the solution of problems now confronting it. Such a statesman is Bob Crosser.

"CROSSER'S BROADER INTERESTS

"By what I have said I do not mean to imply that Congressman Crosser has been interested solely in railroad workers or the railroad industry. His interests are far deeper and broader than that. He is interested in railroad workers not only, but in all workers. He is a friend of labor, yes. But more than that, he is the friend of man. He is a Democrat, a Jeffersonian Democrat in the broadest sense of the term. He believes in equal and exact justice for all men. From this, his cardinal belief, have sprung his program and policies for railroad workers and workers as a whole.

"He has brought to the consideration of social and economic questions a philosophy, a breadth of learning, and a capacity for sound thinking of which few men are capable. His great speech on the floor of the Congress on the cause and cure for unemployment was an invaluable contribution to the study of that most perplexing and baffling problem. The people of Ohio will ever remember his outstanding work as a delegate to our State constitutional convention in 1912.

"He has strengthened our faith in public men and in our Government itself. It is, I know, an all too common trait to criticise and condemn our leaders and public officials as incompetent or corrupt. It is wholesome and inspiring for a leader to appear who silences the critic's tongue and commands universal respect. He contributes to the great body of public opinion and confidence essential to the maintenance of popular government. There are millions of plain men and women in this country tonight whose faith in American democracy is strong and virile because Bob Crosser has made it so.

"CROSSER NEEDED NOW

"If I had but one prayer to offer tonight, it would be this:

" 'God keep and preserve Bob Crosser in full strength for many, many years, because we need him so.'

"We need him now of all times. Democracy is on trial in America and the world around. If we are to preserve it here, we must make it work. If we are to make it work we must have leaders who can think things through and then make the people understand their thinking.

"On every hand we hear the cry:

" 'God, give us men!
" 'A time like this demands
" 'Strong minds, great hearts, true faith, and ready hands—
  " 'Men whom the lust of office does not kill:
    " 'Men whom the spoils of office cannot buy;
  " 'Men who possess opinions and a will;
    " 'Men who have honor, men who will not lie—
" 'Men who can stand before a demagogue and scorn his treacherous flatteries without winking;
" 'Tall men, sun-crowned, who live above the fog in public duty and in private thinking.'

"Such a man is guest of honor tonight—Bob Crosser. Because he is all that, we honor him, follow him, trust him, love him."

"(Address of the Honorable Sam Rayburn, Representative in Congress from the Fourth Congressional District of Texas, at a testimonial given in honor of the Honorable Robert Crosser, Cleveland, Ohio, April 22, 1939)

"Mr. Toastmaster, Mr. Crosser, and friends, frankly, I am deeply moved at this splendid tribute you pay to my friend, a great American, Bob Crosser. Bob, it is worth living a long, a toilsome, and an arduous life to have your fellow citizens pour out in numbers like this to pay you an honor that I know and that all Americans who know you believe you deserve. I have had no vacation since March 4, 1931. Then my party came into power in the House of Representatives and I became chairman of a great committee. Taking you a little further into my confidence, let me say that there is no other place, when we adjourned yesterday, that I would have gone because I need Saturdays and Sundays to rest. There is no other occasion that could have brought me away from Washington except to come here to raise my voice and by my presence say to you, his neighbors, and to all who listen and to all who may read, that I came because I love Bob Crosser.

"I have been a Member of Congress 26 years. Over the 26 years that it has been my honor and privilege to seek to serve I have served with more than 1,600 men.

"It shows you how often constituents change their minds and change their Representatives in Congress. I am so far away from home that my words will not reach back there, and they will not help me politically in the Fourth Congressional District of Texas. But the great record that this man has made, the outstanding service that he has been to you and other people, has come about because the people of his congressional district in the beginning had the intelligence to send to Congress a capable man and keep him there. It matters not how brilliant a man my be, for during the 150 years in that body there has grown up, there is, and there will ever remain, the seniority rule. No man ever arose to leadership in either body of the Congress of the United States in 2 or 4 years. So let me say this to you, as I say to all people wherever I go, when you start out to select a Member of Congress, select one with good commonsense, and that is all the sense there is. Select one with energy, and that means a great deal. Select one devoted to public service and then keep him there, for the longer he serves the more capable he is of service.

"I was the Democratic chairman of a great committee for 6 years. There was a great Republican member of that committee. He is today the ranking minority member upon it, and I desire to read to you a telegram that he sent to me today, knowing that I was going to be here, to show you that all is not partisanship there; that there are patriots on both sides of the aisle and in our personal friendship the center aisle does not divide us. The telegram reads as follows:

"WASHINGTON, D. C., *April 22, 1939.*

"Hon. SAM RAYBURN,

"Care Hotel Hollander, Cleveland, Ohio:

"I wish you would congratulate BOB CROSSER for me on the fine and deserved testimonial which his friends are giving him tonight. He has had a long and distinguished service in Congress. With you I have prized his friendship over the years and greatly admire him for his character and for what he is as well as for his record of patriotic, unselfish, and valuable public service.

CARL E. MAPES,

"Member of Congress.

"I am also happy to be here this evening to mix and mingle with you, and I want to say another thing—I am also one of those sentimental Scotchmen. I desire to pay tribute to the one who had marched by him and sustained him throughout the years, and through sunshine and rain has stood by him with deathless loyalty and devotion; who has been his helpmate, his partner, his great inspiration—Mrs. Crosser. I learned early in my life reading the history of our country that when I found a great man I looked around to find with him a great woman. There was the inspiration of the mother, sister, or wife in the life of every man in American history who has stood out and helped do the world's great work. When great matters affecting labor were referred to the committee of which I was chairman I did not take the authorship of them because I felt that sitting by my side was one more capable than I. And when these great measures of which Mr. Robertson has spoken came before that committee I always turned to one man and said, 'Take them, where you lead upon them I will follow.' That confidence I placed in BOB CROSSER has never been abused, and when measures governing things that he has made a study of came up in committee or upon the floor of the House, if I did not understand the question I resolved the doubt in favor of the side up which BOB stood. You know, BOB has a thundering voice at times when he speaks of what ought to be. He is capable, he is intelligent, he is trustworthy, and in doing the things he has done for railroad workers, for other classes of labor, and many times the so-called forgotten man, he has not forgotten 130 million of people who were involved. He has not been that kind of partisan that forgets all the people of America whose wishes and interests should be taken into consideration. And a remarkable thing is in our lives as legislators we are many times misunderstood because we are acting upon a high theater—the highest in the world. And we must do things sometimes that some people do not understand for the moment but we must lead the people to think—not only to think but believe that justice can only come to the great body of our citizens when the things that come serve the least among them. Out there these inarticulate millions have, through the years, cried out for someone with a voice who could interpret their needs. They stand not in high places but they serve their land in peace as well as in war, and they must no be forgotten. Their buying power is an index to the prosperity and to the hope of this country and to the perpetuity of this great institution of ours.

"We stand today not only nationally but internationally in what is said to be perilous times. Democracy not only in this land, but throughout the earth today is challenged by forces that would destroy. This Government of yours and mine, founded by our fathers, has stood unchanged in principle for a century and a half, and when I read the Constitution of the United States at times, and the more times I read it the more I am impressed, that these fathers over in Philadelphia wrote a document that has stood, and that none of its fundamentals had to be changed to meet changed conditions, and I wonder sometimes if the One who knows all things must have sat at their elbow and guided in the preparation of that document.

"We want no one's territory. We covet nothing that any other nation upon the earth possesses. We want other nations and other people and other men to leave us alone in working out our problems. America wants no war with anyone but now, as in times past, if our rights are challenged, if our liberty is threatened, if our territory is coveted, and if a foreign foe ever should attempt to set its foot upon America, well, the American people when so threatened are willing to meet the world in arms. Democracy is facing a serious test. I am an unfailing optimist. If I were not so I could not carry many of the burdens that I have. I still believe in the honor, in the integrity, and in the virtue of men and women. I cannot believe that my mother's faith was misplaced when she felt that a Man walked the earth 19 centuries ago to teach people how to live and to make the world better. She did not believe that His life was in vain. Neither do I.

"Troublesome times are upon us. It is a time that really tests the soul of men and women. It is the challenge to us, for us to answer—shall those who went before us, toiled, bled, and died, whether they toiled, bled, or died in vain. I do not think so. The clouds have been upon us for a few years; distress, want, and misunderstanding. I think in studying the history of our great country, when we were shaken by wars and dangers, even when the States went to war with each other, when the bitterness of sectional antagonism shot its fiery tongue into this great ship of state, and threatened to destroy it; those were troublesome times. Those were perilous days. But in my opinion the years beginning in 1927, 1928, and 1929, and extending until 1933 or 1934 were the most dangerous years in history. More faiths were destroyed, more hopes were lost, more of the seeds of evil, of disintegration, were about us than ever before. It is the greatest tribute to American manhood and womanhood that when times like these have come to us that they have selected and backed a leader whose shoulders were broad enough, whose brain was keen enough, and whose heart was big enough to deal with and solve our problems and when the mantle of leadership was placed upon his shoulders and the scepter was placed in his hands, he measured up to the high standards, hopes, and aspirations of the American people.

"He has gone before the American people with head held high and shoulders erect and convinced them that he had a program and had the courage to carry it out. Such was the case in 1932. I think that the most heartening utterance delivered in America ever since the Declaration of Independence fell from the trenchent pen of Thomas Jefferson was the inaugural address of March 4, 1933 by Franklin D. Roosevelt.

"The sun is going to shine again. Smiles have come to many faces where despair was written a few years ago. In my opinion we will again be a happy, hopeful people, and Bob, let me say to you that your great work, glad and willing and eager as you were to help do the world's great work, you have done much in a quarter of a century to lay the foundation for bringing back these smiles and to perpetuate through the years to come the glorious heritage that was transmitted to you and to me and all of us by the fathers of the Republic.

"MR. CROSSER'S SPEECH

"Mr. Toastmaster, Mr. Mayor, Congressman Rayburn, President Robertson, members of the committees in charge of arrangements for this affair, friends all:

"While sitting here tonight I thought of a short verse, a copy of which was presented to me more than 30 years ago by a good friend who has long since passed from this earthly scene. The words so well express my own thought at this moment that I quote them:

"'What deed or merit
Has been mine
That God to me
Should send
Of all His gifts
The most divine,
My other soul,
A friend?'

"Calloused indeed would be he not moved by the friendship and affection manifested for me tonight. I can only say in the most earnest and sincere way possible. 'Thank you,' and I shall be grateful if indeed it be found that I shall have served the cause of humanity in even smaller measure than that credited to me so magnanimously tonight. Let me say too, that if I have done anything worthwhile, the good people of the 21st District have helped greatly. During my many political struggles when the opposition was great and the handicaps almost overwhelming, the people of the 21st District stanchly supported and encouraged me. Their repeated return of me to Congress increased the effectiveness of my legislative efforts.

"Mr. Toastmaster, even in our early years we all wonder what is the purpose of life. Well do I remember that as a lad finishing high school, I had been enthused by my instructors about becoming a great scholar and lawyer, and eager to emulate the example of the great public men of the previous generation.

"Hardly a half dozen more years had passed, however, when I began to recognize the vanity of the mere effort to be familiar with the fashion in books, and in the striving for renown as a lawyer and for distinction in the public forum.

"More and more it became evident that such attainments were sought primarily to distinguished their possessors from the rank and file of humanity and to give them a sense of superiority. Surely, thought I, the worthy life consists not of mere mental acrobatics nor in a skillful use of mental tools and weapons. On the contrary, man's duty is to more fully manifest truth, that is, reality, and so to increase the enjoyment of good by all mankind. That this must be the purpose becomes evident as we begin to realize the unity of creation, the oneness of all life. As a part of the unity, we must then act in harmony with the universal life and law, and so not only serve and benefit all others but ourselves as well.

"All true activity must be in accord with the inherent and eternal laws of universal life; that is, of principle. Inherent in every one and necessary to all human progress is the right to freely speak and act for what he believes to be good, provided that in so doing he does not interfere with the exercise of the same right by others. That is the essence of democracy. The degree of democracy prevailing in any country is the measure of that country's civilization.

"Now to be truly democratic government the people must be assured of the right of direct and ultimate control of lawmaking, which is the most important function of government. The exercise of such control can be assured by providing for a vote of approval or disapproval upon laws passed by the representatives, when a reasonable number of people formally request such a vote. Direct control of public officials is also an essential of fundamental democracy.

"Although, clearly, democracy is necessary to human liberty, there are some in our country who, parrotlike, talk about democracy's inefficiency. My friends, we must either be for government according to the will of the people, or be against it. If against it, we then favor government according to the will of some absolute ruler, whatever may happen to be his title, and that means denial of the individual's freedom to think and speak as he believes to be right. Even if the directive type of government could assure to the people enough food and clothing and other material things—which it cannot—the denial to the people of their freedom to think and speak their honest thought halts the progress of civilization. When not used, mental faculties lose their strength and vigor, just as the muscles of the body become weak and flabby from lack of use. This is the name of efficiency. Efficiency means the prompt doing of what has been decided to be done. Far more important is the moral question, whether or not it should be done at all, and that is democracy's first consideration.

Now, a word as to the economic policies of government.

"For generations unemployment and its evils have harassed the people. Serious efforts have been made to remedy the trouble, but the end is not yet. Some explanation there must be for the continuance of the evil. Either injustice and its consequent distress and suffering are unnecessary and wrong, or there is no ground for the statement, repeated throughout all Christendom, that God made all that was made, and behold it was very good. 'Very good' means 'truly good'.

"One of the reasons why more progress has not been made in overcoming poverty and enforced idleness is that symptoms have generally been mistaken for causes. It has been observed that a few people possess great wealth and that the overwhelming majority have practically nothing. Thereupon some bombastic person denounces the few as if that would correct things. He does not realize that indulging in personalities never solved any problem.

"The fact is that practically all those who have excessive wealth understand the cause of the unjust distribution of wealth no better than do those who have little.

"My friends, all those having more wealth than they need might be killed tomorrow and their possessions divided among the others without in any way removing the cause of the unjust distribution of wealth.

"Another explanation for failure to correct economic injustice is that among those who presume to speak learnedly there is a lack of standards of what is absolute or inherent right by which to test the justice of proposed measures. They urge action by government without apparent regard to the violation of fundamental rights of the individual.

"The right principle ever exists, and upon it all human governments profess to base their laws and actions. In principle, everyone has the right to speak and act in such way as he believes will promote his happiness, provided that in so doing he does not interfere with like action by others. This is a personal right rather than a property right. It may also be stated to be the right to exercise the free play of one's individuality. Also, according to principle, all men inherently have equal rights in the bounties of Nature; that is, in the natural resources of earth. This is a right in common with others to natural advantages, and has the character of a property right. The two rights just mentioned are fundamental, and no legislation, no governmental action, should disregard them.

"Because no human being ever created a single particle of the earth, no one has a right to the exclusive ownership or monopoly of the earth or any part thereof. Rightful ownership of anything is based on the fact that the person claiming such ownership has created the thing in question or has received it from someone else who did create it or derived title from someone who created it.

"The benefits that are entirely due to the possession of the natural resources—that is, of the earth or any part thereof—belong, then, to society as a whole, because no person or persons made or produced them. All must be assured, however, upon proper terms, of undisturbed possession of such natural resources as may be rightly in their control.

"The possession by any person of the least productive part of natural resources used by society clearly gives him no special privilege or advantage, and he could not, therefore, be justly asked to pay for using what nobody else desires; but whatever may be the value of the additional productive power of the natural resources held by all other members of society belongs to all the people, and the yearly value of possessing such advantage should be taken by Government for the benefit of all. Such additional productive power is not due to the energy, enterprise, or industry of those possessing the resources having greater productiveness.

"On the other hand, the persons making the payments of such amounts to public authority are by every standard of right entitled to absolute and exclusive ownership and enjoyment of all they produce above and beyond what they so pay to society, and they should not be molested in the enjoyment of the same by any person or Government. That is the product of their own efforts and is not due to the enjoyment of any special advantage or privilege or to the force of nature. For the Government to take any part of it is as wrong in principle as for a private person to take it from them.

"The enforcement of this principle would supply Government with sufficient funds for its operation. More important than that, however, it would prevent the evils of special privilege—that is, monopoly—because if we were to collect the full yearly value of possessing natural resources, then, in order to provide means to pay to society the yearly value of such possession, the holders would be forced to use the resources, and use them effectively, too. This increased use would create a demand for workmen and the increased demand for workers would soon end involuntary idleness. With unemployment abolished, wages would rise, for men would not work for less than is fair when they could procure employment from others, who, in order to procure their services, would pay what would be just.

"With enough revenue paid to society for the use of natural resources, no longer would taxes be put on any of the things produced for the support and comfort of man. This would increase production, because removing the sales taxes, excise taxes, and all other kinds of taxes placed on the products of agriculture and industry would lessen the cost of such commodities by at least the amount of the taxes removed. Then as the prices should become less, more and more commodities would be sold, because more people could afford to buy the goods at the lower prices. On the other hand, when taxes are put on goods we increase the price, and then, because goods are higher priced, sales become fewer.

"When it will be to the interest of holders of natural resources to make use of them, instead of to keep them idle, we shall have an increased demand for labor, which would soon end unemployment. With employment to be had by all who desire it, everyone would have means to purchase from merchants the comforts of life. Merchants would in turn buy more and more from manufacturers, and manufacturers, in order to supply the demand for their products, would need more workmen.

"Men would thus be sure of employment, and no longer would prevail the constant fear of want which for ages has haunted mankind. Freed from worry and despair, men would then joyfully engage in creative effort. Desperation, resulting from want and fear of want, lead many in order to supply their needs to foolishly kill, rob, and engage in prostitution. Because they fear to assume the financial responsibilities of marriage, some men resort to libertinism. Men and women, once sure of economic justice, independence, and reasonable abundance of material comforts, would recoil from these evils which are wholly unnatural.

"No longer dreading starvation and lack of material comforts, man will cease frenzied efforts to accumulate vast wealth, wholly unnecessary to a sane existence, and, in fact, harmful.

"When comparatively little effort will supply material wants, and the making of a living shall have become only incidental to the real business of making a life, then will men turn to the work of developing the eternal verities of being. Then will he strive to understand, to become conscious of, the glorious realities of life which wait for recognition.

"This will be the reign of harmony. To promote it is the duty and can be the joy of all. Let none shirk the call, believing death will end the task. Now or later we must unfold reality, we must manifest the true life.

"Kipling pointed to this standard of life in the words which I quote as follows:

"'When the earth's last picture is painted and the tubes are twisted and dried,
When the oldest colours have faded, and the youngest critic has died,
We shall rest, and faith, we shall need it—lie down for an aeon or two,
Till the Master of all good workmen shall put us to work anew!

"'And only the Master shall praise us, and only the Master shall blame;
And no one shall work for money, and no one shall work for fame,
But each for the joy of the working, and each in his separate star,
Shall draw the thing as he sees it for the God of things as they are!'

"Reality has ever existed. It will continue to exist without end. The philosopher, Herbert Spencer, said that that which is real is permanent; that which is not permanent is not real.

"All the strength, beauty, harmony, and other elements of being ever exist or, to use Spencer's term, are permanent. Man's duty, then, is to become conscious of these infinite realities; his work should be to present to all mankind the manificent truths which continually enter the chamber of his consciousness. This way lies happiness. When man grasps this true meaning of life, then, throughout all the earth will be concord. The unity of creation will be clear, and in each other men will see not only the likeness of the Creator but brothers all. In joyous unison will the sons of men sound forth the grand symphony of life. In perfect harmony will each promote good for all.

"Not vain quest for personal glory then, is the true purpose of life. The service of all creation, not of self, must be the watchword.

"That great purpose, in a humble way, I have tried to serve. Whatever strength and talent I can command will be devoted to that end.

"In the familiar lines with which I close, each one of us can gain inspiration for noble efforts to extend the joys of life to every fellow being. These are the lines:

"'An old man, going a lone highway,
Came, at the evening, cold and gray,
To a chasm, vast, and deep, and wide,
Through which was flowing a sullen tide.
The old man crossed in the twilight dim;
The sullen stream had no fears for him:
But he turned, when safe on the other side,
And built a bridge to span the tide.

"'"Old man," said a fellow pilgrim, near,
"You are wasting strength with building here;
Your journey will end with the ending day;
You never again must pass this way;
You have crossed the chasm, deep and wide—
Why build you the bridge at the eventide?"

"'The builder lifted his old gray head:
"Good friend, in the path I have come," he said,
"There followeth after me today
A youth, whose feet must pass this way.
This chasm, that has been naught to me,
To that fair-haired youth may a pitfall be.
He, too, must cross in the twilight dim;
Good friend, I am building the bridge for him."'"

Mr. Sweeney. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record at this point and to include therein the speech of the Honorable Samuel Rayburn, the response of Mr. Crosser, the speech of Mr. D. B. Robertson, president of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, and the telegrams and messages I have referred to.

The Speaker. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. Jenkins of Ohio rose.

The Speaker. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio for 1 minute.

Mr. Jenkins of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Robert Crosser has been such a distinguished Member of Congress and such a highly esteemed citizen outside of his services as a Congressman that we, the Republican Members from Ohio, are proud to join in this testimonial by our good friend, Judge Sweeney, of Cleveland. Those of you who have had the privilege to serve in this House for some years will recall Robert Crosser in his early days as a great advocate of the things for which the common man stood; and if we were to epitomize his accomplishments in one sentence, we would say, "Robert Crosser is a man for men and among men."

We are proud to add to the tribute that Judge Sweeney has paid to our distinguished colleague from Ohio. [Applause.]

Postal Pay Raise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 21, 1954

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to have unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the Record an article which appeared in the Forum in the Baltimore Evening Sun, July 15, and which I think is very timely and merits consideration.

The article follows:

THE FORUM—POSTAL PAY RAISE

To the Editor of THE EVENING SUN

Sir: Many letters and a small bit of news have appeared in the local papers concerning a postal pay raise. The end is nearing in the legislative process of the present session of Congress and I'm writing this to acquaint the public, and those who are interested in what happens to their mail, as to the facts and current status of postal personnel, the same people who President Eisenhower in October, 1952, claimed were underpaid.

Congress is about finished, and, meanwhile, is desperately attempting, despite the hard, courageous work of some, to finish off what little morale has existed in the postal service. Never in many years has such pressure been applied to Congress by an administration to rubberstamp an O. K. on a vicious piece of postal legislation. The administration has not spared any trick of politics to fight the very personnel it promised to aid.

Congress, going before the electorate in November, ignores facts—and when it does that, one can only appeal to the voters and taxpayers. Politicians are noted for their disregard of promises made during campaigns.

Eisenhower promised us that we would have the highest morale because the postal policies he would inaugurate would spell financial security for the workers, cut waste in the administration of the service, and thoroughly cleanse the service of costly practices. But when we asked for a raise, which the administration admitted was honest and justified, the roof came down on us.

We were told that the highest executives were the ones deserving of a real raise; we rank-and-file would get $100 a year at most. They told us we should jump for joy that they didn't cut us.

We were also made over in the pattern of assembly-line workers, each performing a set task at lower rates than now. This classification plan would downgrade us, kill off any incentives for advancement, pit one worker against the other, causing irreparable damage to morale and a hellish situation for supervisors—and it would take away from Congress the right to determine our wages and legislative grievances and policies. We asked for bread—and got a rock instead, so far.

ANTHONY A. MAXEN, Jr.

BALTIMORE, *July 12.*

Third Open Letter to House Majority Leaders

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY W. WIER
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 21, 1954

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks at this point, I include an article written by Jack Kyle, national legislative representative of the 1902–14 Philippine Command Committee—Justi'tia Omnibus—and published in the National Tribune, the Stars and Stripes, of Thursday, July 22, 1954.

Mr. Kyle's article is as follows:

THIRD OPEN LETTER TO HOUSE MAJORITY LEADERS

Gentlemen, from Justinian's time it has been axiomatic that justice delayed is justice denied, and being assured by the Republican leadership that Congress will definitely adjourn before August 1, this group of Moro-Leyte-Samar veterans, who would benefit by the enactment of H. R. 5380, make this 11th-hour appeal for immediate enactment of that bill.

Those covered by H. R. 5380 are all worthy old veterans of 11 long years of jungle warfare with 150 engagements of record to their credit It is a national disgrace that justice has been denied them for 34 long years by the Government for which they fought so long and so well. Gentlemen, it is now the hour for decision. It is an undeniable fact that these unpensioned veterans prosecuted the Philippine Insurrection to a successful termination, and, as the case now stands, the Government has determined that but a part of the veterans of that insurrection, those who served prior to July 4, 1902, in one instance, and July 15, 1903, in another, should be pensioned. In other words, for pension purposes the Government has held, in effect, that the insurrection ended 11 full years before 150 bloody engagements were fought with 5,000 soldiers going to their graves. To use some of the President's choice words, that decision promotes second-class citizenship.

Obviously such a position is as ridiculous as it would be to say that World War II ended with the surrender of Germany, but that stupid decision stands on the statute books as an eternal bar to justice for these old veterans. Gentlemen, shall it stand? We submit that the issue here presented should be settled promptly and decisively. Does this Congress subscribe to the obnoxious proposition that it is just and proper to pension a part of the veterans of a war or campaign while denying the same pensions to the remainder? The Committee on Veterans' Affairs thinks not, but apparently your House Rules Committee chairman is willing to preserve that untenable precedent by refusing to let H. R. 5380 come to the House floor for a vote.

That unwholesome precedent should be so decisively destroyed by the Congress that the establishment of a similar one in future would be impossible, but so long as H. R. 5380 is permitted to gather dust in the Rules Committee, an overwhelming majority of the people's elected representatives in the House are not permitted to strike, it down, and strike it down they will once they are given an opportunity to vote for this bill.

Less we forget, in two previous Congresses every Member of the House—including the present leaders of the majority—voted for similar bills to pension this group. If our premise was sound then, why isn't it just as sound today?

Remember, gentlemen, time is of the essence. The average age of these old veterans is now 78 years, many of them are in desperate need, and due to the advanced age, nearly all of them are unable to earn a, support. Some are actually the objects of charity while still others, being ineligible for Government hospitalization or domiciliary care, are living out there days in State institutions.

In conclusion, gentlemen, we submit that failure to enact H. R. 5380 will be an outright repudiation of the veterans' plank in the 1952 Republican platform. That plank is writen in clear and undefeatable language. It reads: "Active duty in the Armed Forces of the United States of American constitutes a special service to our Nation and entities those who have so served to aid and compensation in return for this service." However, this group has never asserted that it was entitled to any gratuitous Government benefit, but has consistently insisted that the veterans of the Philippine insurrection should be treated equally, and, in furtherance of that principle, they have sought—and now seek—to have the aforementioned disgraceful precedent stricken from the statutes.

For and on behalf of the 1902–14 Philippine Command Committee.

JACK KYLE.

WASHINGTON, D. C.

Agriculturally Rich Lepanto Is Unlike Namesake in Greece

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 21, 1954

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Memphis (Tenn.) Commercial Appeal:

AGRICULTURALLY RICH LEPANTO IS UNLIKE NAMESAKE IN GREECE

(By Esther Bindursky)

LEPANTO, ARK., July 11.—The larger city of Lepanto, Greece, and her namesake, the smaller city of Lepanto, Ark., have something in common. They are the only two cities in the world bearing the name of Lepanto.

The Greeks had a word for it—something to do with water. Lepanto, Greece, is located on the north shore of the entrance to the Gulf of Corinth, in the Straits of Lepanto. And Lepanto, Ark., nestles islandlike in an arc of Little River.

And here the similarity ends. For this American city is unlike its counterpart grubbing a bare existence from barren and rocky land. Instead, Lepanto citizens live in the richest agricultural section of Arkansas.

An advertisement placed in the eastern division of the Wall Street Journal recently by the industrial committee of the Lepanto Community Development Council read: "Lepanto, in the heart of Babson's Magic Circle, is the logical spot to relocate or expand your production plants, chemicals, electronics, frozen foods, garment and shoe manufacturing. Readily accessible to the Nation's fastest growing markets."

DIFFERENT THEN

Back in 1890, a Yankee turned southerner, David Seeley Buck, who operated a trading post from a two-deck houseboat tied up on Little River, didn't find this section so accessible, even to Marked Tree, now a distance of 10 miles.

He put up with the inaccessibility for 10 years, hauling the mail 52 miles by boat on Little River to Marked Tree, then oftentimes by horseback, sometimes getting lost in the dense woods.

It was an all-day affair. In 1900 Mr. Buck wrote the Postal Department in Washington requesting a post office here. The request was granted and of the names submitted, Lepanto was chosen.

Lepanto was not incorporated until 1911 and the few businesses then were dominated by the timber industry and the sawmills. Only a small segment of the land was cleared.

The early history of Lepanto, like the history of other river towns in this area, was fraught with the rough and ready ways of pioneer days. Then the town was a mecca for easy money as the timberjacks came into town from their logging camps with a thirst of long standing.

Now the town, with a tricounty territory bordering on Mississippi, Craighead and Poinsett Counties, has a trade territory of about 15 to 20 miles populated with 10,000 to 12,000 residents. Dyess, Rivervale, West Ridge, Etowah, 3-Way, Spear Lake, and Frys Mill are nearby farming communities. Lepanto has about 2,000 residents.

GOOD CROP EXPECTED

Last year about 35,000 bales of cotton were ginned in the vicinity of Lepanto and a bumper crop is expected this fall.

Farmers of this area are highly mechanized and produce top crops. Agricultural diversification is making great strides. Last year an Aberdeen Angus bull owned by Clyde Carlton Eason won top honors in the Arkansas Livestock Association show at Little Rock. The Eason farms have some of the largest herds of Aberdeen Angus in northeast Arkansas.

The city, a mayor-council type government, is headed by Mayor J. H. Mills. Council members are George Carpenter, W. D. Holiman, Allen Eason, Frank McMurry, Thomas Joiner, Henry Lamb, W. H. Cross, treasurer; Carl Bass, recorder; and John S. Mosby, city attorney.

To facilitate the movement of products in this area a new hard-surfaced highway, No. 143, is now under construction from Caraway, through Riverdale to Lepanto and Beasley, connecting with Highway 63. This highway will speed traffic to Memphis and provide a through outlet to St. Louis.

A Program of Public Works Is Necessary To Relieve the Unemployment of the Coalfields

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL ELLIOTT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 21, 1954

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I submit a letter which I sent to the President of the United States on yesterday:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., July 20, 1954.

Hon. DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER,
President of the United States,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Please accept my thanks for the appointment of an interdepartmental committee to study the soft-coal industry.

A large part of the district that I am privileged to represent—the Seventh of Alabama—produces bituminous coal. Conditions in that industry are chaotic. Walker County, Ala., my home, which formerly produced large amounts of coal, has the highest unemployment, percentagewise, in the entire South. One-third of its people are drawing United States surplus agricultural commodities to ward off hunger.

The people I represent have exerted themselves wonderfully in an effort to provide more employment. They have given their time, thought, and energy in an effort to solve the problem. Although some small new industry has been brought to the area, it has not been sufficient to alleviate the prevailing unemployment.

In the 81st Congress, I introduced H. R. 7660, urging an investigation of the plight of the coal industry. I have introduced similar bills in each succeeding Congress. I am happy to see that such an investigation, through your committee, will begin shortly.

I especially want to invite the committee to look into conditions in the coal industry in the Seventh Congressional District of Alabama.

I am confident that your committee will suggest concrete means to bolster, strengthen, and improve the soft-coal industry. The people dependent upon that industry are suffering. I feel that every resource of our Government should be mobilized to find the solution to the problem.

I want to go a step further and suggest that, pending the investigation, the Government institute a program of public works for areas of high unemployment. River and harbor improvements should be undertaken. Schoolhouses should be constructed. Slum-clearance projects should be started.

These are but a few of the projects that would provide a temporary remedy for unemployment, while we await your committee's suggestions for a more permanent program.

With kindest regards, I am
Sincerely yours,
CARL ELLIOTT.

City of Los Angeles Resolution Against S. 1555 and H. R. 4449, Re Colorado River Storage Protest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 21, 1954

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, I herewith present the text of an original resolution dated June 23, 1954, unanimously adopted by the City Council of the City of Los Angeles, Calif. The text thereof is clear as crystal and self-explanatory. However, I wish to add my vigorous word in support of the objectives of said resolution.

I also wish to inform you that the County Supervisors Association of California, being representative of the boards of supervisors throughout the State of California, did recently adopt a unanimous resolution expressing strong opposition to pending congressional bills for Colorado River approbation project, as proposed in S. 1555 and H. R. 4449, on the ground, amongst other things, it is claimed it would add over $93 million to the State of California's already constituted sum of over $25 million of the present $273 billion national debt. I presume it is known that the Colorado River board also, as far as California is concerned, was authorized and created and provided for by the State Legislature of California as an agency to protect the interests of the State of California in and to the waters of the Colorado River system.

The great 23d Congressional District of Los Angeles County, Calif., which I have the honor and responsibility of representing in this great legislative body, this my eighth year in membership, has within it some of the most important cities in the State of California and in the Nation. Part of my congressional district extends to within about 25 city blocks of the city hall of Los Angeles. Then there are such important cities as Huntington Park, Compton, South Gate, Lynwood, Haywood, Bell, Vernon, and very sizable unincorporated communities as Paramount, Downey, Bellflower, Bell Gardens, Willowbrook, Watts, and Clearwater. These communities, within the area of which reside one-half million people, have communicated to me their registered opposition to the aforesaid numbered bills now pending.

The resolution follows:

Whereas the city of Los Angeles and the more than 2 million persons who now reside here are dependent upon the Colorado River for vitally important quantities of water and power for civic needs, as well as for residential and industrial uses; and

Whereas the share of Colorado River water and power for which this city has contracted and which it must continue to have to sustain its economy is threatened under the provisions of bills S. 1555 and H. R. 4449 now pending in Congress, which bills would authorize the initial units of the Colorado River storage project and participating projects: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Los Angeles City Council, acting for the welfare of the city and its residents, expresses its strong opposition to bills S. 1555 and H. R. 4449 and urges the Senators and Representatives in Congress from the State of California to oppose the enactment of that legislation; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON, Senators WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND, and THOMAS H. KUCHEL, all Members of Congress from the State of California, and all members of the Rules Committee of the House of Representatives.

HAROLD A. HENRY.
CHARLES NAVARRO.

JUNE 23, 1954.

Establishment of a Reserve Training Center by United States Army in Lawrence, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 8, 1954

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to include herein a portion of my remarks delivered at the ground-breaking ceremonies of the United States Army Reserve Training Center, North Parish Road, Lawrence, Mass., on Monday, July 19, 1954:

With pride and confidence we welcome the establishment of a Reserve training center by the United States Army in Lawrence.

This armory, which is a project of the Federal Government, will serve the needs of civilian soldiers form Essex County and part of Middlesex County.

We are pleased that Lawrence has been chosen as a center for this vital part of our military program.

It is a recognition of our key position in northeastern Massachusetts.

And it is a tribute to the patriotic spirit of our young men who can always be counted upon to do more than their share in the contributions they make to our national security.

The defense of the United States depends not only upon the men and women on active duty at stateside bases and at farflung outposts, but upon those who back them up.

These are the Reserves, our second line of defense in time of watchful waiting, and the cadre that will become our main reliance in forming a huge army should the necessity arise.

Reserves are standby soldiers, who must be equipped with plenty of military knowledge, skill, and practice to form the hard core for overnight mobilization.

It took us a long time to learn this need and prepare for it, but these ground-breaking ceremonies are evidence that we are becoming realistic concerning the perils that face our country.

Like the minutemen of Lexington and Concord, we must be ready to repel the enemy, and you may be sure that if, or when, it comes it will be without notice. Readiness, well in advance, will be the only insurance available to us.

Military defense today is highly complex. Men must learn about organizations, weapons, tactics.

We are fortunate that the United States Army is providing our area with the facilities, the program, and the skilled personnel, to give the best of training to reservists.

I am sure that many young men, realizing the value and the convenience of this training, will sign up and thereby help to make this program a mutual success.

Our very best wishes go to Maj. James T. Lofgren, who is to command this center, to Capt. John A. Cronin, executive officer, and to all the experienced military instructors who will give our young men the benefit of their know-how and their able leadership.

We are delighted to have a brand-new Army Reserve Training Center located in Lawrence. for the service of northeastern Massachusetts. With public opinion giving it auxiliary support it is bound to win its objective—that of helping to make our defenses strong and ready for any emergency. Side by side with the Navy and Marines.

It is my belief that the Army has decided wisely.

The success of this training center may well become a pilot plan that will point the way to the most efficient development of a reserve force.

That the Nation needs one is beyond question.

We have high hopes that the Lawrence Training Center will play an important role in the build-up of our national defense.

Morality by Arithmetic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT C. BYRD
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 21, 1954

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Speaker, it is with a heaviness of spirit that I feel compelled to make these remarks bearing upon the frenzied diplomatic activities of our country and the other members of the coalition, Britain and France.

In the face of all evidence, and almost in defiance of reason, I, like so many million other Americans, have been hoping against hope that the situation in Indochina could be retriever. Against our better judgment, we have let ourselves believe that the flurry of diplomatic activities these last several weeks could somehow change the essentials of a sorry situation. Eagerly we have snatched up the latest newspaper and hopefully listened to the last word on the broadcasts, devoutly wishing, in our souls, for some miraculous extraction from the pit into which weak, vacillating policy has plunged the Western World.

To be sure, a dramatic effort has been made to put substance into froth, as is evidenced by the abstention of America from Geneva, by the winging of Secretary Dulles to Paris, and by the dispatch of Under Secretary Smith to Geneva. I am not unmindful of the efforts of the Department of State or the administration to establish and hold a firm policy relative to Communist aggression in Asia. I acknowledge, and not grudgingly, that Mr. Dulles has been energetic and zealous in this pursuit. But the fact remains, Mr. Speaker, that when the last headline has been made, when the last broadcast has been completed, when the last flight has been checked in, the net result of all of this show is another and a substantial victory for the Communists—a victory that is not going to be contained within its present dimensions, but one that will spill over into other parts of Asia to be felt around the entire world.

What happens, Mr. Speaker, between the high-sounding, avowed purpose of our diplomacy and the regrettable accomplished result? The words are phrased in one way, but they come out as an entirely different record. This, the case of Indochina, is not an isolated example of how our morally proclaimed foreign policy comes to a shabby end. In fact, Mr. Speaker, not only is it not an isolated example, but it is, in fact, the pattern.

What disturbs me enormously—and I know that I largely speak the sentiments of this body—is the official thinking, as reflected in end-official policy, that it is an all-right arrangement to assent to carving up the world into zones to be handed over to the Communists at the price of an alleged armistice. This, it would seem to me, is appeasement by partition.

We are aghast at the notion that we should allow the Communists, at this stage of the game, to take over a whole country. This would be aggression; this could constitute imperialism; this would be repugnant to the West's moral code. But, somehow, it becomes all right to countenance, if not to actually assist in, the division of a country into two parts. Just how does it become a right and moral proposition to consign 2 million people to Communist slavery if it is an unthinkable thing to allow Communist conquest of 10 million people? Are morals divisible by arithmetic, Mr. Speaker? Can a moral principle be halved or separated into quarters? Does the application of a percentage table, applied to human slavery, make it palatable to the world?

I have said it before, and I shall say it often, the Lord willing, that what is morally wrong can never be politically right, and no amount of transoceanic flights or communiques or highly touted unity can make it right.

That which is going on, that which is being covered up with a shower of diplomatic language, Mr. Speaker, is a negotiation of conditional surrender in Indochina. Despite the mumbo-jumbo which pretends that great new starts are in the making along the diplomatic front, a country is being halved in such a way and under such circumstances that the Communists will be in position to gain full control ultimately.

This did not need to happen. It may be a convenient expedient for our State Department at this stage of the game to pretend that the United States is merely an onlooker, to give off with that hands-off statement, "I'm only waiting for a streetcar," but the fact remains, Mr. Speaker, that we footed the big end of the war costs in Indochina—something like 70 percent of the French expenditures—and, to make matters worse, it looks very much as though the Communists are about to fall heir to a most valuable cache of military loot—armament and supplies that will equip them well for new aggressions.

This is the same thing that happened in Korea. Do not we ever learn? Where is the coordination between our diplomats, our intelligence services, and the military? We should have been informed as to what French intentions were; we ought to have been apprised of the way the fighting was going; we should have known what the ultimate prospect was. But, above all, we should have been cognizant of the point at which it became advisable to plug the military pipeline.

But all of these considerations, important as they are, are swallowed up in the larger question: When, where, and how will the West stop falling back before the onpressing Communist tide?

As I have said before, Mr. Speaker, none but the whole world will suffice to satisfy the aggressive appetite of Communist imperialism. Each day brings evidence of that anew. As for ourselves, we must decide when we are going to cease being sold on successive retreats and we must decide to look the full threat of Communist imperialism in the face. We can no longer afford the luxury of wishful thinking. It has already started the free world down the road to defeat.

The Battle in Behalf of TVA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 21, 1954

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a telegram from Hon. George R. Dempster, president of Cities for TVA, and mayor of the city of Knoxville, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NASHVILLE, TENN., *July 21, 1954.*

Senator KEFAUVER,
Senate Office Building:

The 50,000 members of citizens for TVA send you their deep thanks and warm congratulations for the magnificent fight you are making on behalf of the continued integrity of TVA. We are all behind you 1,000 percent. Your efforts will never be forgotten, and they have our steadfast support.

GEORGE R. DEMPSTER,
President, City for TVA.

H. R. 9580

SPEECH

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 8, 1954

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 9580) to revise and extend the laws relating to espionage and sabotage, and for other purposes.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, in supporting this bill I am guided by the rule that always should prevail among the Members of the Congress of the United States. In time of war, of threatened war or of grave emergency measures regarded as vital to our security by those in closest familiarity with the existing circumstances and charged with responsibility for our protection must be supported.

At the present time we are engaged in a cold war. Sabotage and espionage in the kind of conflict in which we now find ourselves are as much to be met with strong defenses as the hostile maneuvering of enemy forces in a battle area during a hot war.

Moreover we are in the perilous years when new and terrible powers have been placed by the genius of scientific minds in human hands to use for man's advancement or to misuse for his destruction. As yet we have not reached with the other governments of the universe a mutually protective understanding, with valid and binding guaranties. Meanwhile there is forced upon us the exercise of every caution.

PRUDENT TO BE ALERT

It is not only that our plans, our blueprinting, and our secrets must be guarded from spying and unfriendly eyes. It also is prudent to be alert to the possibility of a brutal sabotage, the more horrifying in its possibilities because of the vastness of the opportunities.

Within recent years a bomb planted in a suitcase carried as baggage on a passenger plane caused the loss of the aircraft and many lives. In that instance there was no suggestion of sabotage with political motivation, but that one person seeking the murder of another could with such comparative ease cause the destruction in the air of a large aircraft and the death of many persons is an index to the dangers among which we live in this very perilous period. Not to take every precaution is to be foolhardy.

QUESTIONABLE DETERRENTS

Whether we strengthen our defense against criminal activities by increasing the severity of penalties I discussed at some length in my remarks yesterday on a bill then before us. It has not been the experience of mankind that severity of punishment has served as a deterrent of crime. The mind that has no respect for the laws of an organized society accepts as a greater challenge to daring and defiance the greater degree of retribution to be paid if crime is detected. I think most students of the subject, having reviewed the history of experiences in this and other countries, will agree that making penalties more severe has never operated to diminish the number of crimes.

Nor has capital punishment proved a deterrent of crime. Quite some years ago Clarence Darrow, the great defender, and I teamed up on a series of radio discussions exploring the futility of the death penalty as a deterrent, the possibility of the establishment of innocence after the execution of sentence, too late to rectify a human mistake, and the moral right of man as an integral part of an organized society to do that by the law of God forbidden him as an individual to do.

DIVISION OF OPINION

But these are questions upon which, among reasoning men, there is division of opinion. All are honestly seeking for the answer leading eventually to the prevention of crime. When an atrocious crime has been perpetrated, the immediate popular reaction is a cry for revenge, which may meet with just deserts, in an individual case, but may not serve the real objective of society, the prevention of similar or worse crimes in the future. When a national emergency exists, and immediate perils are being faced, the demand always has been and probably always will be for stern measures.

At the close of the war between North and South, among some in the North, was a demand for the execution of the leaders of the forces of the States of the Confederacy. We are a united country today, the scars of earlier years have been effaced, and the inspiration of great Americans on both sides of that conflict are part of the national heritage. This would not have been the case if in the climate of victory the spirit of revenge had taken over.

Following our war with Mexico we entered into a treaty of peace with the fallen enemy country which merits reading and re-reading by the present generation. It charted a path of peace which, during the intervening years, has led the two neighboring Republics to the land of understanding and of friendly cooperation.

Our war with Spain terminated in a treaty of peace by the terms of which our country, forebearing to ask for itself the price of revenge, actually gave the helping hand to the fallen foe, aiding it to regain its feet.

WORLD RESPONSIBILITY

Today we have a world responsibility on a scale forced upon us by destiny. That the spirit of revenge has never motivated our actions, that in victory we never have sought to employ our strength over the vanquished to retaliate for past wrongs upon us, is the measure by which the peoples of the world properly may judge us and appraise the character of our future intentions.

At the moment we are in a cold war. In the Korean phase it was a war of suffering and sacrifice attended with the loss of many American youths far from the shores of our own United States and loved ones at home. The cold war continues in the present phase of evil propaganda seeking to misrepresent and to malign us among other peoples and at home to undermine us by dishonorable practices.

This bill is presented to us as legislation necessary in the existing circumstances. It is intended, as I take it, as a cold-war measure. It cannot be judged by the measure of normal times.

Certainly as applicable to normal times, when again we will be at peace with all the other nations of the world, I would regard as inconsistent with our pledge of friendship to their governments and unfairly reflective upon the loyalty of our own people the provision in this bill making a capital offense of the crime of peacetime sabotage and espionage.

STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS

The effect of this provision is to remove from the running of the statute of limitations all offenses which actually may be those of sabotage or espionage or by purposeful design may be stretched to that appearance. After many years have passed the ability of the accused to establish his innocence is destroyed by the death of witnesses and the disappearance of competent evidence. This is the reason, founded in good judgment, for the statute of limitations.

Mr. Chairman, I think I am expressing not only my own thought but that of many other Members, very probably the majority of Members, that the bill for which we are voting today is for the period only of the existing emergency, be it the continuance of the cold war or something worse or something only slightly better, and upon the termination of that emergency the subject should be reexamined when perils are gone and nerves are quiet.

A Plains Town Goes to a Funeral for Its Mayor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER ROGERS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 21, 1954

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, not only Memphis, but the entire State of Texas felt a distinct sense of loss when word was received that one of our very distinguished and able mayors of Texas, Mayor Carl Harrison, at only 45 years of age, had passed on to reap the rewards of a noble life spent freely in helping others and in living the precepts of the Golden Rule. He was my good friend. I shall miss him greatly. Everyone who knew this gracious and kind man mourns his passing. Miss Jean Ehly, staff writer for the Amarillo Daily News, Amarillo, Tex., poignantly expresses the feelings of the little city of Memphis over the loss of its first citizen, Mayor Harrison. Under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I submit Miss Ehly's column entitled "A Plains Town Goes to a Funeral for Its Mayor":

(By Jean Ehly)

MEMPHIS, July 13.—This town closed up today to attend the funeral of Carl Harrison, the mayor.

An hour before the 10:30 a. m. services, business men, housewives, and farmers drove or walked to an aged Presbyterian Church. Nobody said much on this hot morning when the wind seemed to die in accord with the stillness.

Outside the church, on the worn brick walks, men stood in little groups, hatless, with suit coats on and shoes shined; women in sleeveless summer frocks wore gloves and small hats—some white, some black. Occasionally, one awkwardly bumped into someone else, while others came, confidently, heads up, stressing within themselves that death had won no permanent victory here.

The sun can be as hot in Memphis as on the desert and already its vise had gripped the little town. It made the church, with its silvery-domed top, stand out in its aged Gothic beauty; yet it spared no detail of its years of service. The sun was cheated of its heat by only a few sparsely-leafed elms making cooler the cement railing where we stopped to rest a bit before going inside.

An out-of-town friend of the bereaved stopped on his way at a filling station to inquire the way. Even there, a dozen blocks away, the attendant knew "that the mayor had already been taken to the church and that 'it'd be best to go right on over there'."

Folks in a little town know a "stranger's" car, too, and they know what you're there for and there's a feeling of kinship. * * *

Even though the church is an "overflowing one" the stillness persists and some have to sit out on the steps in the shade because with a town at a funeral, there's not much room.

The voice of a choir, reverently blended, drifted out into the yard; then came the minister's voice, clear, giving courage and hope because Jesus said, "Let not your heart be troubled; in my Father's house are many mansions."

A block away, the workmen ceased hammering the house they built; the cement mixer is quiet. Birds sit songless in their trees.

The service is over soon and as the town comes silently from the church, the stillness is broken only by the soft shuffle of feet, the careful shutting of a car door. Nobody talks. In that stillness outside the church, stands a whole town in silent communion under a sun so hot, the cars, houses, and people seemed bathed in the self-same sun-glazed patina.

There are tears, shed mostly by women but in the men's faces you see the mourning for one who listened to a little town's troubles as its mayor.

One who answered the phone any time of night to hear the emergencies of others; the businessman who could talk the language of the baker, banker, or laborer.

The funeral cars with the special flags flown standardlike have a sun-baked look and droop as they're carried through Main Street toward the cemetery; Main Street, penciled signs, "Closed for funeral; be back at noon," hang in every door. Nobody walks the streets. It is as if everyone had a personal friend in this man who was mayor.

After the cemetery, life, like a slow incoming wave ebbs back, back into the streets; cars appear, cafe and store doors open, a hotel radio blares forth the all-star game and Al Rosen hits a home run. Life has begun again for Memphis, a stronger town, now, from a unifying spirit of a much-beloved mayor.

Continuance of Father Edward J. O'Donnell as President of Marquette University

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 21, 1954

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I was pleased to note in the Sunday, July 18, issue of the Milwaukee Journal the news that Father Edward J. O'Donnell, S. J., will continue as president of Marquette University.

This great educational institution will next year observe its diamond jubilee. It is most welcome news to the alumni and friends of Marquette that Father O'Donnell, under whom this great source of learning has so prospered and expanded, will continue at the helm of that great institution, where, next year, his church and the Nation will pay tribute to three-fourths of a century of Marquette achievements.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

O'DONNELL CONTINUES AS PRESIDENT OF MU—POPULAR PRIEST'S TERM TO LAST 2 OR 3 YEARS BEYOND USUAL LENGTH OF SERVICE

Father Edward J. O'Donnell, S. J., will continue as president of Marquette University for 2 or 3 years beyond his normal term of 6 years, which ends in August.

The popular and energetic priest will remain here to continue the university's large building program and help with its 75th anniversary celebration in 1955 and 1956, according to Father Leo J. Burns, S. J. Father Burns is head of the new six State vice province created last month by the Jesuit order. Its headquarters is at 3400 West Michigan Street.

"There are no plans at present to replace Father O'Donnell," Father Burns said. "It seems likely that he will stay here for 2 or 3 more years."

SIX YEARS USUAL TERM

Six years has been the customary term of Marquette University presidents. They are selected by the Jesuit order, which operates the school. Some terms have been longer and some shorter, Father Burns said.

Father O'Donnell came to Marquette, the school from which he had graduated in 1931, as president in August 1948. Then 39, he was the youngest president since the university was established as a college in the fall of 1881. He is a native Milwaukeean.

He succeeded Father Peter A. Brooks, S. J., who died in 1948 after serving 4 years as president.

The Jesuit community and faculty here had assumed in recent weeks that Father O'Donnell would stay on to guide the university because no word had been received from the Rome (Italy) headquarters of the order. Father general of the order is Father John B. Janssens.

MOVE CALLED LOGICAL

Father Burns said that "it was logical for Father O'Donnell to continue beyond the normal term in view of the creation of the new vice province, the building program at

Marquette University and the general expansion of the Jesuit order throughout the United States."

The new vice-province headed by Father Burns was created by dividing the Missouri province, which up to that time had jurisdiction over Jesuit activities in 12 States. The new vice-province includes Wisconsin, Minnesota, Iowa, North and South Dakota and Nebraska.

On the eve of its 75th anniversary, Marquette University, under Father O'Donnell's guidance, has completed new buildings at a cost of $5,450,000. It has under construction and in the planning stage others that will cost an estimated $4,500,000.

STRUCTURES ARE LISTED

Built and in use are these structures:

Robert A. Johnston building of the college of business administration, a 6-story structure finished in 1951, cost of $650,000.

O'Donnell Hall, a women's residence building at 725 North 18th Street, named after Father O'Donnell, cost $1,200,000.

The Brooks Memorial Union, named in honor of Father Brooks, cost $1,400,000. It was opened in April 1953.

The Memorial library at 1415 West Wisconsin Avenue, cost $1,400,000. It was dedicated last December.

The Eben J. and Helene M. Carey Memorial library addition to the school of medicine, cost $800,000.

ADDITIONS ARE PLANNED

In addition to the renovating of the old Marquette Union Building at 617 North 13th Street, which is being remodeled as Carpenter Hall in honor of Matthew H. Carpenter, late executive of a baking firm, the university's program for the near future includes:

A $1 million addition to the science building.

A $1,450,000 residence hall for men.

A $700,000 addition to the dental school.

A $1,400,000 building which will serve either as a home for the college of journalism or as a combined headquarters of journalism and the school of speech. If a combined building, it would be known as the Building of Communication Arts.

Faculty members say that Father O'Donnell considers this program a must.

Elaborate plans are in the making to mark the 75th anniversary of Marquette's founding. Father O'Donnell in recent months visited the White House and invited President Eisenhower to speak at the commencement exercises in June 1955. The President made no definite commitments. But if he does come to Milwaukee, his commencement address would mark the opening of the diamond jubilee celebration.

Father O'Donnell also has other plans. Among them is the faculty development program estimated to cost more than $1 million. It is designed to help the faculty and give it more time for scholarships and facilities for research.

Father O'Donnell was in northern Wisconsin for a rest Saturday.

He is Marquette's 17th president. In his nearly 6 years here he has won the regard of students, faculty, and townsfolk alike. He is the third aluminus of the university to become its president. Others were Father Herbert C. Noonan, president from 1916 to 1922 and now on the faculty of Creighton University, and the late Father Brooks.

Father O'Donnell was baptized at Gesu church on the university campus. He attended Gesu grade school and was graduated from Marquette University High School in 1827. In 1931 he received a bachelor of arts degree from the university. He joined the Society of Jesus at St. Stanislaus Seminary, Florissant, Mo., the September after his graduation from the university.

In the 2 years before going to Marquette University as president, Father O'Donnell was at St. John's College, Belize, British Honduras. He first served as a teacher, then as principal. He directed the teacher training college and the adult education department there and was a member of the British Honduras colonial board of education.

Resolution Supporting Efforts in Behalf of Tennessee Valley Authority

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 21, 1954

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a resolution prepared and submitted by Melvin Handleman, national committeeman of the Young Democrats of Tennessee, which was unanimously adopted at the Young Democrats' national committee meeting at Providence, R. I., on July 19, 1954, in connection with the Dixon-Yates contract.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the Tennessee Valley Authority was created under a Democratic administration in accord with the principle of the Democratic Party that this Nation's natural resources belong to the American people and not to special interests for the purpose of exploitation of the people; and

Whereas the principle of the TVA has become an accepted principle of our free and democratic government, embracing the theory of regional cooperation for public power purposes through the financial backing of the Federal Government; and

Whereas the TVA is not in any sense a Federal grant to any one region but is a self-supporting, self-amortizing project; and

Whereas the TVA does not involve any discrimination of one region against another but helps all regions of the Nation equally through its favorable impact upon the national economy; and

Whereas the TVA works to the benefit of the electric-power consumer in every section of the United States by providing a power-cost yardstick to prevent undue profiteering by private power interests; and

Whereas private industry has grown and has prospered in this valley and, therefore, the valley's industrial, religious, cultural, and civic leaders speak as a single voice to combat the utterly false and malicious charge hurled by the selfish private-power lobby that TVA is creeping socialism; and

Whereas without the power generated under the TVA system, the atomic bomb might never have been developed and World War II would have dragged on for months or years longer, bringing death to hundreds of thousands more American young men; and

Whereas President Eisenhower promised during his political campaign of 1952 to keep TVA operating at maximum efficiency; and

Whereas despite this promise, the President later labeled the TVA as an example of creeping socialism and his administration has joined the private-power interests in a deliberate long-range plan to sabotage and destroy the TVA; and

Whereas this effort is being resisted in Congress by the Democratic Party under the leadership of Democratic statesmen, who believe that navigation and flood control and public power in this area as a yardstick for power rates in other areas are in the best interests of all our people and in the best American tradition: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the national committee of the Young Democratic Clubs of America, That this organization go on record as supporting the efforts of these courageous Democratic statesmen in their fight to save the TVA from the private power interests and their allies, and urging the people of the United States to rally behind them.

Postal Pay Raises: Raid on the Treasury?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. MOSS, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 21, 1954

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, Roscoe Fleming, a columnist in the Denver Post, quite effectively laid bare some of the true facts on proposals by Postmaster General Arthur Summerfield in a column July 9, 1954. Mr. Fleming's comments carry weight both because of the respect held for him in the circulation area of the Denver Post and because the newspaper which uses his column is one of the publications which called for a change in Washington and has been praising the change which has occurred.

The incisive comments point up the facts which have been presented to the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, on which I serve, during extensive hearings on the two major items affecting the Post Office Department.

POSTAL-PAY RAISES: RAID ON THE TREASURY?

(By Roscoe Fleming)

The papers say that all pay-raise bills for our postal employees have been held up, and probably can't get through Congress this year.

One bill would grant pay raises averaging about $800 a year all around. Another would grant the Department's big shots up to $5,000 a year, but clerks and carriers as little as $10 to $25.

This latter one is supposed to increase departmental efficiency, by rewarding its higher officials for getting more work out of the rank and file.

Postmaster General Summerfield is for the latter bill, but calls the former one a raid on the Treasury. In Washington lingo, if you fork it out for the right people it's a needed readjustment; if for the wrong ones, like postal clerks and carriers, it's a raid on the Treasury.

But higher-ups are always able to take care of themselves, and my interest is in the boys on the beat who walk the street with burning feet to bring your mail and mine.

They and the clerks are underpaid and everyone admits it. A fair pay raise for them would do more to raise Department morale, believe it or not, than for the boss to get more money to encourage him to make them work harder. It's funny, but they're that way—human.

One reason the Postmaster General bucks a general pay raise is because the Department is still running a deficit of something like half a billion dollars, which Mr. Summerfield went into office pledged to clean up.

He hates to increase that deficit instead, by raising rank-and-file pay to somewhere near a living level. This only means that decent pay for the postal workers is being sacrificed to continue the huge subsidies that various kinds of gravy-train riders have grown to expect from the Post Office Department, and through it, from the taxpayer and the underpaid postal worker alike.

For example, us humble taxpayers and the boys on the beat with their burning feet carry the big fat national magazines and newspapers at a yearly loss of nearly a quarter-billion dollars; and we carry those anonymous circulars and other junk addressed to patron, boxholder, and so forth, at a yearly loss of near $200 million.

We carry mail free for all Government departments, and we subsidize some of the airline companies millions of dollars yearly, by overpaying them for carrying the mail.

The big fat national magazines are hot against Government extravagance, and they're hell against pampering the farmers and other common people. But they never make a move to climb down off our backs, and walk on their own feet for a change.

They spend half the time telling us how brainy and efficient private business is, and how poorly and expensively our Government is run in contrast; and the other half yelling that they can't possibly continue to exist if we force them to rely on their own brains and effort to make their own living. There is a contradiction here somewhere.

Of course, Mr. Summerfield has a fine solution. The first class mail, the humble 3-cent letter, is the one division of the post office's business that is making money, about $140 millions yearly.

So naturally instead of abolishing the subsidies, he recommends charging 4 cents for first-class mail, cross-country. Talk about raiding the Treasury.

The solution to this whole deal is simple, that is, if we insist that the postal service must pay for itself.

Let Congress pass a one-paragraph statute saying that it is the duty of the Postmaster General that he is hereby authorized and directed, to see that no class of mail is carried at a loss, giving him about a year to make the readjustment.

Speaker Joseph W. Martin Again Honored

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 21, 1954

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, the Sertoma Club of Washington, D. C., being one of the very valuable and important service clubs in our great Nation, on July 20, 1954, at 1 p. m., at a luncheon attended by about 100 distinguished citizens of Washington, D. C., again extended due honor to our distinguished Speaker by designating the day as "Joe Martin Day," Joe Martin having heretofore accepted an honorary membership in this club of distinguished American citizens. I, as a member of the Compton, Calif., Sertoma Club, had the honor of also being present, as did our distinguished colleague, George Dondero, of Michigan.

The program part of the happy luncheon occasion was opened with the usual singing of America, followed by an invocation by John Meserve, a member. Club President Edward Place introduced the distinguished guests, amongst whom were James N. Milne, executive assistant to Speaker Martin, and Miss Rose Rhiner, of California, who brought special invitation to the meeting from the international Sertoma president, Dr. Fernald, of Los Angeles, for the Speaker to attend the 1955 convention to be held in Los Angeles.

Congressman Dondero made appropriate remarks, and Congressman Clyde Doyle brought greetings from the Compton, Calif., club, of which he is an honorary member; and in his complimentary remarks about Speaker Martin he stated that a statesman is universally recognized as a man who is well versed and informed in the principles and art of government and that a statesman is one who shows and practices wisdom in the direction of public matters and of government, and that statesman is one, who by reason of his statesmanship, is therefore influential and of great worth to his fellow citizens in the shaping of governmental policies and in influencing the destiny of his fellow citizens and of his nation.

President Place then called upon District of Columbia Commissioner Renah F. Camalier, member of the club, who made the following remarks, at the conclusion of which he presented to our distinguished Speaker a magnificent solid mahogany plaque, embossed with beautiful brass plate, upon which was engraved: "To Honorable Joseph W. Martin, statesman and Sertoman, presented by the Washington, D. C., Sertoma Club—the American way of living award."

Commissioner Camalier's remarks follow:

> Mr. President, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker Joseph W. Martin, Hon. Clyde Doyle, fellow Sertoman of California, Hon. George Dondero, of Michigan, fellow members, and ladies and gentlemen. When I hear the words, "the American way," I recall my ancestors in New England, and then I think of Speaker Joseph W. Martin, Jr.,—one, reminiscent of the past; the other, representative of the present and the future.
>
> As we share this luncheon with our distinguished scholar and statesman, the meaning of the American way is brought home to us, forcefully and forcibly, by the Sertoma Club of Washington, speaking on behalf of ten thousand members of Sertoma International, as it recognizes the sterling qualities and character of the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives.
>
> We are exceedingly proud that the recipient of the Sertoman American way of life award goes to him whose name rings from one end of America to the other as the champion of those principles which count and tell in the way of life so near to the hearts of our people.
>
> Speaker Martin has been showered with uncounted honors and feted by individuals and peoples here in Washington and across the miles; in fact, the whole world acclaims him as the guardian of the rights and liberties of men and women and of nations.
>
> Who, therefore, is more deserving of this presentation, more entitled to this recognition?
>
> The Congress is proud to have him as its leader. The American people, individually and collectively, applaud him, and his every effort based, as those efforts are, on honesty and sincerity of purpose.
>
> Sertoma and Sertomans applaud him; our pride is deep seated that he is a member of this fine civic group stretching from coast to coast, dedicating its life to the principles of Americanism, and voicing to young people everywhere expressions of devotion to the cause of American ideals and concepts.
>
> These ideals and these concepts are carried fully and definitely in our Declaration of Independence, and no higher duty falls upon the shoulders of Sertoma Clubs and upon their individual members than the distribution of this sacred document of America's position in the affairs of the world of men. Sertoma is fulfilling her mission.
>
> Our country has unequivocally declared her purpose, and America will stand by that declaration just so long as she has such leadership as the Honorable Joseph W. Martin, Jr., to maintain her frontline of defense against encroachment by those whose motives are inimical to our way of living.
>
> Today, we pay homage and honor to this intrepid leader of our times, an unselfish public servant, and I am proud that this privilege has been accorded me.
>
> Mr. Speaker, I present to you Sertoma's American way of life award in recognition of your magnificent contributions to mankind throughout your years of service to people, to country, and to God.

What Then of Horsepower And the 30:1 Ratio?

SPEECH

OF

HON. ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 21, 1954

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, in Korea, the Reds learned that firepower overwhelmed manpower.

What now of horsepower? It outpulls manpower.

What steps are the Reds taking to close the power gap between their world and ours?

At the moment, for each person in Asia, there is available, on the average, less than one horsepower. In America, for each person, the average is around 30 horsepower. Thus, the gap in horsepower between East and West could be expressed as 30:1 in favor of the West.

To dominate the world in peace as well as in war, it would appear that the Reds must first close the power gap, then pass the West, with a ratio in their favor.

In what way will the Reds power the East, before attempting to blanket the West?

A clear answer to that question might well guide the Congress in its vote on the use of atomic power. One or two observations might be helpful.

I am told that there is little water power in the East, that Russia has only only four great rivers and China fewer than that.

Thus, factors of strategy, tactics and economics lead one to conclude that the Reds will power their lands with atomic plants.

It took the blood of Korea to reaffirm the superiority of firepower to manpower.

What treasure will the future require, before the superiority of atomic power for peacetime pursuits is established, if ever?

What then of horsepower and the 30:1 ratio?

Our Propagandists Are the False Voice of Americans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED E. BUSBEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 19, 1954

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, under previously granted leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting in the Congressional Record the July 7, 1954, issue of Human Events.

The information contained in the article gives another reason and additional proof why the whole USIO program has been ineffective and should be overhauled and reconsituted by people who know something about the subject of Marxist communism.

For further details on what is wrong in this agency, I refer the Members of the House to pages 11328 to 11331 of the Record of August 3, 1953, and to pages 2544 to 2553 of the Record of March 4, 1954. These speeches were directed primarily at the record of Mr. Bertram D. Wolfe, who was chief of the Ideological Advisory Staff of the Voice of America in New York until my exposure of his having been a leading member of the so-called "opposition Communist" movement in this country forced his resignation.

Unfortunately, I do not have the time to check into and analyze the background of all the individuals who hold policymaking positions in the United States Information Agency.

The article by Eugene W. Castle, a former newspaper reporter, newsreel editor, and world traveler and observer, follows:

OUR PROPAGANDISTS ARE THE FALSE VOICE OF AMERICANS

(By Eugene W. Castle)

For the first time in United States history, American propagandists abroad are as numerous as our accredited diplomatic representatives and their staffs, and actually occupy almost as much office space and housing facilities.

In fact, these self-styled psychological warriors bid fair to supersede our diplomatic corps in importance. Already, our diplomats are all too frequently obliged to follow the Washington directives and press releases of the United States Information Agency and its overseas bureaucrats before they can make important moves and carry out recognized and effective diplomatic procedures.

Unless, and until, the Congress calls a halt to this dangerous and unwarranted encroachment, our ambassadors and ministers may soon become robots, their every move masterminded by propagandists, not unlike the "party line" political commissars attached to the Soviet armies.

This startling development and trend was uncovered by the writer on a recent 3-month tour of the Near East and Europe. Wherever he went he found United States propagandists, in their zeal to assert their importance, overshadowing our accredited diplomats. For the most part, these people are incompetents, incapable of holding down a cub reporter's job on a country weekly. Yet these hordes of propagandists, supported by the American taxpayer, have been empowered to interpret American policy and to plot American strategy in local situations abroad. Their efforts, as we shall see, have been grossly ineffectual.

The encroachment of the USIA on the once-proud diplomatic corps was illustrated bv a revealing photograph which appeared in a recent issue of the New York Times. It showed the entrance to the United States Information Agency offices in Copenhagen, Denmark. These offices are now located in the brandnew million-dollar United States Embassy in the Danish capital. They include the USIA press and film departments, an 8,000-volume library, as well as a medium-sized auditorium. The Embassy also houses the organization employed by Harold Stassen's giveaway Foreign Operations Administration. All this, of course, was approved by our Congress on the premise that it would help us to win friends in Denmark.

Unfortunately, many Congressmen are influenced by what they believe to be their own political future. In the Senate, influential Republican Senators, especially those seeking reelection, are constantly reminded that politics comes before patriotism and that they must be rubber stamps for the one-world spenders who still dominate the White House.

Why, in Copenhagen, do we have to supplement our normal and proper diplomatic establishment with these costly and totally unnecessary cultural embellishments?

Curiously enough the new embassy building, in which USIA is so lavishly housed, appears to be making us a laughing stock in Denmark. According to the dispatch in the Times, accompanying the photograph, "the Danish public is somewhat stunned by the new, modernistic building that was opened here in late May. The Danes are skeptical about the resistance of the light, glass structure to the damp, grim Danish winters."

Actually, what the Danes resent, like most Europeans the writer interviewed on his recent trip, is the introduction of an architectural style completely out of keeping with their architecture and traditions.

In Paris, the writer ran into many Frenchmen who complain bitterly of still-to-be-completed housing projects along both sides of the Seine. This development involves nearly 400 apartments, built and completely furnished by United States taxpayers, for the sole occupancy of Government payrollers in Paris. These are dubbed by people in Paris, "Ike's eyesores." The French quite properly feel that the decor is more in keeping with Las Vegas than their beloved capital, which they regard as the most beautiful city in the world. These housing projects in outward appearance are hideous, actually resembling egg crates piled on top of each other.

Foreigners generally are overwhelmed with amazement at the lavish expenditures for the USIA and other United States Government excesses abroad. On his recent trip the writer talked with several hundred foreigners. They were from all walks of life, editors and opinion molders, businessmen, professional people, politicians, and just plain citizens. Generally they agreed that the USIA is not only a useless weapon in the fight against communism, but, more importantly, it is actually harmful to our best interests. Typical was the comment of a prominent Parisian businessman, René Allain, who has no particular love for Communists.

"The naked truth," he said, "is that all Europeans hate propaganda from any government, including their own. They totally disbelieve propaganda in any form because they have, and for many years, been propagandized to death. Your hordes of busybody press agents here in Paris and elsewhere throughout France, actually harm Franco-American relations, and more than you would believe."

Indeed, the memory of the infamous Herr Goebbels is still too vivid in the minds of all Europeans. And the continuing Communist barrage of "locally inspired" lies and deceit in France, Italy, and elsewhere doesn't make them much happier.

Yet, our self-styled psychological warriors foolishly attempt to compete in this area. And with such little success that even the United Nations World, a magazine devoted to spreading one-world myths, largely at the expense of the long-suffering American taxpayer, was forced to admit it.

Writing from Paris, its editor, George Herald, declared that "all qualified observers agree that [the USIA] cannot do the job" of competing with Soviet propaganda.

"These information agencies," Herald continued, "are needed to spread accurate news and refute Soviet lies about America, but their positive efforts, booklets, posters, movies, magazines—however beautifully done—are immediately discarded as what they are: propaganda. Europeans have been so overfed with this sort of material that its effect on them is negligible."

To put it bluntly, the USIA is an utter fraud, kept alive by incompetent bureaucrats and their self-serving defenders who argue that since our Government is spending billions for defense it must spend hundreds of millions to "mold the minds of foreigners." Nothing could be further from the truth. The billions are being spent to protect Americans. The hundreds of millions are being spent to harm us.

Now, as never before, scarcely a day passes without a stream of self-promoting press handouts spewing from USIA headquarters in Washington, all attesting to its propaganda's effectiveness abroad. Many of these press releases, are inaccurate and all too many of them are completely untrue. This leads to a question: How can Americans expect the USIA to tell the truth about us to foreigners when its spokesmen cannot tell the truth to Americans?

It must be conceded the USIA gets a good press in several influential newspapers, particularly in Washington and New York. However, most foreign editors look upon the products of this Agency with deep suspicion. These editors view the USIA as just another Government propaganda outfit, and an ineffectual one at that.

So ineffectual, in fact that—at the height of the Communist-inspired furor in Europe last year about the atom spies, the Rosenbergs—the USIA was completely unable to reply to the Communist mendacities about the spy case.

One Paris editor, Boris Souvarine, has reported his attempt to obtain material with which to refute Red lies about the Rosenbergs. Believe it or not, he was actually forced to visit the USIA's elaborate propaganda establishment in Paris where he found "information specialists"—three large buildings filled with them—and all of them unable even to advise him.

Little wonder then, that the French generally, including high prelates of the Catholic Church, were led to accept the Communist version of the Rosenberg case.

This is described by labor columnist Victor Riesel as "the worst propaganda defeat in our history." And the reason, Riesel added, is that many United States employees abroad "did not believe, or did not know, that the atom spies were guilty. Instead our information agency issued some very meager and inconclusive material. They did not say that the atom spies were guilty."

What's more, said Riesel, many of these employees "still believe Alger Hiss is innocent."

Few Americans realize that nearly 70 percent of the 10,000 USIA propagandists are foreigners. It follows that these foreigners owe no allegiance at all to our country or what we stand for, yet, they speak for our Government. No other nation on earth would tolerate such a dangerous situation.

Recently, Congressman Pat Hillings returned from Europe with the charge that many of our employees abroad spend more time running down the United States with "inspired" stores about "McCarthyism" than they do about boosting our country. A startling commentary, indeed, on the type of people employed in agencies such as the USIA.

Let's visit the Amerika Haus in Frankfurt, Germany, to see what kind of material some of these employees are providing to foreigners. A few weeks ago in just one section of the library an American visitor noted these book titles: The Tragedy of the Chinese Revolution, by Harold Isaacs; A History of the Far East, by Harold M. Vinacke; Korea Today, by George McCune; Japan's Emergence as a Modern State, by E. Herbert Norman; Peking Diary, by Derk Bodde; and The Future of Japan, by William Johnstone. The bulk of these books, on Oriental subjects, were by writers who were scarcely critical of the Chinese Communists. There were no books written by foes of communism. And remember the cost of this USIA "cultural center" is charged to the American people.

At the USIA film center and theater on the main business street of Athens, the writer last February picked up catalogues, in both Greek and English, listing documentary film subjects being offered for showing in Greece. Here are a few of the titles: "Acheson's Speed," "President Truman's Address to the Congress," "Truman's Call Upon the Nations of the Free World to Arm for Peace," "President Truman's Inauguration," "President Truman Reports on Korea," "President Truman's United Nations Speech."

Curiously, although it has been rumored that General Eisenhower won the election in 1952, the USIA in Greece apparently had not yet heard about it.

Someone should tell Ike and in plain language that we have no USIA in Switzerland. Many millions of dollars could be saved for the American people by eliminating the USIA in Greece, Spain, Turkey, Belgium, Denmark, and the Netherlands. There is no Communist menace within these countries. Stopping propaganda to those who are our friends would actually aid our standing with the peoples of these countries. They would, at least, stop thinking that we are so afraid of the evil men in the Kremlin that we must share our fears with our friends.

Despite its long, lamentable, and very costly record of continued failure and all too often indirect assistance to Communist agitators abroad, the United States Information Agency continues, year after year, to demand more and more millions from the Congress. Recently, when Propaganda Director Theodore C. Streibert appeared before a Senate Appropriations Committee, Senator Pat McCarran, Democrat, of Nevada, sounded off thusly:

"I have been on this committee for 20 years and I have not seen any results from the money we have expended. I should like to see it now." "So would I," replied Mr. Streibert, "it would be very good to have a total measure of results. We just don't have it. We will never get it." Mr. Streibert, perhaps accidentally, gave the correct answer.

Our present United States Information Agency will never be effective for Americans because those who operate the agency are too busy catering to the administration which happens to be in power. They are too busy over-promoting politicians in countries where there are no votes for them. Moreover, they are too busy attempting to enlarge their already too big and unmanageable global establishment for press agentry. Also, they are too busy trying to assume the duties and responsibilities of our accredited diplomats abroad. They therefore have no time to pinpoint a job of good press relations for Americans and to confine that effort within the countries and places where our Government needs and should have such support.

Like the novice duck hunter, the United States Information Agency descends upon the world scene loaded with the wrong kind of ammunition, and too many kinds of it. The United States Information Agency shoots wild at the sight of the first pigeon crossing the horizon. Except in its own press releases for home and political consumption, the United States Information Agency scores no hits for Americans.

For more than 20 years, and during the administrations of Presidents Roosevelt, Truman, and Eisenhower, the American people have been conditioned to accept Government expenditures and deficits in the billions. Today, as in the past, the President and his chief spokesmen insist that only millions are spent for propaganda abroad and, in terms of Government spending this is only a drop in the Atlantic Ocean. That is true, but what remains unsaid is that in terms of potential damage to our country and all of our citizens, the impact of the USIA on most foreigners may, in the end, prove to be as dangerous as the force of a Texas tornado at the very height of its destructive fury.

Americans need good press relations in some foreign countries and places. There is only one legitimate and effective way to accomplish this. Abolish the United States Information Agency. In its place establish a small, expertly staffed news bureau, run by experienced professional newspapermen. This bureau belongs in the Department of State because that Department is, in reality, the only recognized voice of Americans to all foreign governments and peoples. When we stop being propagandists we can hope to begin influencing foreigners and extending our friendships abroad. Actually, the times are too grim to wait for another election to do this.

Imperative Educational Needs of Youth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 21, 1954

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, I am pleased to herewith present for your cordial attention and benefit, as well as the same for all of my distinguished colleagues the text of 10 points entitled "Imperative Educational Needs of Youth." This list was furnished me by one of the distinguished public school educators in the great 23d District, which I represent this my 8th year in the House. It came to me from Prof. Jack Robinson, superintendent of the Paramount Unified School District at Paramount, Los Angeles County, Calif. The communication from Professor Robinson called my attention also to an article in Collier's magazine, June 11, 1954, by Dr. Paul Elicker entitled "How Good Are Our Schools?"

Mr. Speaker, believing I have a right to assume you and all my other colleagues fundamentally agree with the 10 points listed and enumerated herewith, I wish to emphasize that I think we in Congress, together with the legislators at the State level of public responsibility, as well as at most other levels of public and official responsibility, are not yet paying sufficient heed to the necessity of more intelligently and more adequately doing constructive things in the area of juvenile delinquency. When I make this comment I, of course, wish to be understood as believing that one of the very material factors entering into juvenile delinquency is parental delinquency.

Mr. Speaker, I do not make this statement without bearing in mind the very enriching and enlightening experiences I had several years before I came to this great legislative body when I had the responsibility of being the chief juvenile county officer for a time in the Los Angels Juvenile Court, and then later also having the benefit of enriching and enlightening experiences by reason of membership on the California State Board of Education. My recital of these experiences on my part are made primarily so that you and my colleagues may be further enabled to appraise my strong approval of these 10 points, and of my own remarks at this time made in connection therewith.

Here, for instance, is the text of two important telegrams I have received from the State of California. The first is from Roy E. Simpson, superintendent of public instruction at Sacramento, and is as follows:

> Have been advised House Appropriations Committee has eliminated all Federal appropriations for State and White House Conferences on Education, Advisory Committee on Education and Cooperative Research in Education. Because of need to study vital educationl problems I urge your support of Federal funds for these purposes.

The second is from Hon. John Anson Ford, chairman, Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors, and is follows:

> Understand the House Appropriations Committee deleted $165,000 for support of juvenile delinquency project of the Children's Bureau. This is the only Federal activity we know of that attempts to bring together law enforcement, juvenile courts, probation, and welfare on a national level to combat the growing tide of juvenile delinquency. Certainly hope that this relatively insignificant sum can be restored to continue this important work. This special project has made a real contribution during the last 3 years. Will you please do what you can to have the appropriation restored?

And following is the text of the 10 points which I have heretofore referred to and which are considered by the National Education Association as imperative educational needs of American youth.

Imperative Educational Needs of Youth

(Editor's note.—Much of the program planning in high schools throughout the country today is based on the following 10 imperative educational needs of youth. The list was drawn up by the educational policies commission of the National Educational Association.)

1. All youth need to develop salable skills and those understandings and attitudes that make the worker an intelligent and productive participant in economic life. To this end, most youth need supervised work experience as well as education in the skills and knowledge of their occupations.

2. All youth need to develop and maintain physical fitness and mental health.

3. All youth need to understand the rights and duties of the citizens of a democratic society, to be diligent and competent in the performance of their obligations as members

of the community and citizens of the State and Nation, and to have an understanding of the nations and people of the world.

4. All youth need to understand the significance of the family for the individual and society and the conditions conducive to successful family life.

5. All youth need to know how to purchase and use goods and services intelligently, understanding both the values received by the consumer and the economic consequences of their acts.

6. All youth need to understand the methods of science, the influence of science on human life, and the main scientific facts concerning the nature of the world and of man.

7. All youth need opportunities to develop their capacities to appreciate beauty in literature, art, music, and nature.

8. All youth need to be able to use their leisure time well and to budget it wisely, balancing activities that yield satisfactions to the individual with those that are socially useful.

9. All youth need to develop respect for other persons, to grow in their insight into ethical values and principles, to be able to live and work cooperatively with others, and to grow in the moral and spiritual values of life.

10. All youth need to grow in their ability to think rationally, to express their thoughts clearly, and to read and listen with understanding.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided*, That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the RECORD with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the official reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided*, That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix, but this rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided*, That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Appendix the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed.

10. *Official reporters.*—The official reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this restriction shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. The Public Printer or the official reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Illustrations.*—Pursuant to section 182b, title 44, United States Code (as shown above), requests for authority to insert an illustration in the RECORD should be submitted to the Joint Committee on Printing through the chairman of the Committee on Printing of the respective House in which the speech desired to be illustrated may be delivered. Illustrations shall not exceed in size a page of the RECORD and shall be linecuts only. Copy for illustrations must be furnished to the Public Printer not later than 12:30 o'clock p. m. of the day preceding publication.

13. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided*, That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further*, That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revicion shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Printing and binding for Congress, when recommended to be done by the Committee on Printing of either House, shall be so recommended in a report containing an approximate estimate of the cost thereof, together with a statement from the Public Printer of estimated approximate cost of work previously ordered by Congress within the fiscal year (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 145, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on Printing, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. The money derived from such sales shall be paid into the Treasury and accounted for in his annual report to Congress, and no sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRICE OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

The Public Printer is authorized to furnish to subscribers the daily RECORD at $1.50 per month, payable in advance.

Remit by money order payable to Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C.

Industr

E

HO

IN THE

Mr. S
ident, I
printed
some re
Applica
Joseph
Atomic
Univers
On th
bell em
been a
the pre
atomic e
dramati
that the
energy
result in
in the ne
Mr. Ca
entation
the aton
attention
especiall
colleague
terested

There
were ord
ORD, as fo

In discu
man once
in the boo
the Atomi
Washingto
the real st
in the boo
There a
of atomic
headline
Destroy E
tion, espec
description
imaginary
ruin cause

A news
actors to
near futur
page. Peo
tions of h
and the da
the applica

As I talk
to minimiz
ness of th
the develop
of nuclear
the United
not attemp
which we a
velop nucle
produce ele
conventiona

But there
occurs to m
I look into

Appendix

Industrial Applications of Atomic Energy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. H. ALEXANDER SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 22, 1954

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD some remarks on the subject Industrial Applications of Atomic Energy, given by Joseph Campbell, Commissioner of the Atomic Energy Commission, at Rutgers University on Wednesday, July 21.

On this occasion Commissioner Campbell emphasized that though there has been a logical tendency on the part of the press to highlight the aspects of atomic energy which are sensational and dramatic, there was reason to believe that the industrial applications of atomic energy within the next decade could result in savings to American industry in the neighborhood of $1 billion a year.

Mr. Campbell's calm and factual presentation of our program in harnessing the atom for industry is worthy of the attention of the American people, and I especially recommend it to all of my colleagues who are, of course, deeply interested in this subject.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In discussing the Civil War, Walt Whitman once said, "The real war will never get in the books." There are times, as I sit in the Atomic Energy Commission Building in Washington, D. C., when I wonder whether the real story of atomic energy will ever get in the books.

There are exciting and dramatic aspects of atomic energy which are natural-born headline grabbers. "Hydrogen Bomb Can Destroy Entire City" is a sure-fire attraction, especially when accompanied by lurid descriptions of the effects of the weapon and imaginary illustrations of the rubble and ruin caused by the explosion.

A news story which states, "atomic reactors to produce unlimited power in the near future," is always good for the front page. People are excited by glowing descriptions of how the deserts may be watered and the dark places of the world lighted by the application of this new energy.

As I talk to you tonight I do not mean to minimize the fact that the primary business of the Atomic Energy Commission is the development and production of a family of nuclear weapons for the protection of the United States and the free world; I will not attempt to play down the emphasis which we are placing on the effort to develop nuclear reactors which may ultimately produce electrical energy competitive with conventional fuels.

But there is an intriguing thought that occurs to me from time to time. The more I look into it the more fascinating it appears. It is not dramatic. It is not alarming. It is not sensational, but perhaps it bears the same relationship to the development of our economy as plain common red bricks bear to the magnificent buildings which are their ultimate product.

Through experimentation and research we have discovered that all of the atoms of any particular substance are not identical. They may be the same chemically and physically, but insofar as their nuclear construction is concerned, they are slightly different. This slight difference between the various atoms of the same substance is of tremendous importance since some of them are unstable, that is to say they emit small amounts of energy in the form of radiation at precise intervals. We have learned that by exposing some atoms to intense radiation we can create other unstable atoms not found in nature. They energy emanating from these atoms can be followed, detected, and measured wherever it occurs and as a consequence we now have a research tool of incalculable value.

Without complicating my remarks too much, in essence we have discovered a means whereby we can take atoms of ordinary material, such as sodium, and turn them into little radio stations which send out signals which in turn can be accurately measured by a very simple device. We can, therefore, "tag" a minute quantity of material and follow it wherever it may go in metal, in fluids, or in the human body. We have put a scientific bell on the atom sheep which enables us to follow the flock. These so-called radioisotopes have two properties—precise identification and detectability from a distance—which in my opinion make their use limited only by man's ingenuity and his resourcefulness.

The significance of this scientific discovery relating to radioisotopes is now beginning to be realized in the industrial economy of our Nation. In 1946, just 8 brief years ago, there were less than 200 people employed in the manufacture of instruments for the detection of radiation. At the close of the year 1952 there were 75 instrument companies at work in this field, employing over 2,500 people and doing a gross business of about $20 million a year. The growth in 1953 has been equally astonishing and our best estimate is that by 1956 this entirely new industry will report sales amounting to upwards of $35 million annually.

Now if people are making instruments, it must be because they have customers who are willing to buy them. Let us examine briefly who these customers are and what they are doing in industry with the "tagged atom."

In the United States today there are 860 industrial users of radioisotopes. In this State of New Jersey there are 40 companies which have found that the atom can improve their product, lower their costs, and increase their profits. Here in New Brunswick, N. J., there are two important companies which purchase and use radioisotopes in their normal commercial operation. It may be slightly dramatic to point out to you that prior to 1946 the commercial distribution of radioisotopes did not exist, yet by May 31, 1954, the Atomic Energy Commission had made 47,566 shipments of radioisotopes to 2,139 users in the United States and 2,743 shipments to 53 foreign countries.

How can money be made out of the fact that atoms send out signals which can be detected on instruments? This is the fascinating part of the whole business. Here is where American ingenuity may eventually finance a portion of our whole atomic energy program. Let us examine some specific cases:

1. Radiographic inspection: One of the problems in the casting and welding of metals is the detection of flaws, the presence of which might cause serious breakdowns or actual loss of life. I am certain that every member of this audience is comforted by the realization that the welding which fastens together the various parts of an aircraft in which we travel is not in any way defective. Sometimes so much depends on such small things as a weldment or a casting.

If fabricators of metal could afford X-ray machines or radium, they could detect these flaws, but the type of equipment necessary is generally far too cumbersome and expensive for normal industrial use. With the radioisotope, cobalt-60, however, a capsule weighing less than an ounce and no bigger than the eraser on the end of a lead pencil, may be placed on one side of the material to be inspected and a photographic film on the other. After an exposure to the signals or radiation from the radioisotope, the developed film will indicate any defects in the metal. For $50 an industrial concern can buy an amount of cobalt-60 which corresponds, in effect, to a similar amount of radium worth $25,000. Furthermore, the amount of radioisotope, cobalt-60, now used for radiographic inspection by industrial concerns far exceeds the total amount of radium estimated to be available in the entire world. Cobalt-60 can be manufactured by the Atomic Energy Commission contractors in unlimited quantities, depending upon the market which is now available or which will be developed in the future.

In addition to the safety factor, there is a real dollar saving in radiographic inspection. It is a matter of record that the American Society of Mechanical Engineers recognizes the advantages of radiographic inspection, and accordingly their codes permit use of a 12-percent thinner boilerplate for pressure vessels. The use of radiographic inspection in the so-called Horton sphere, which is a 50-foot steel sphere for storage of high-pressure gases, results, on the average, in a saving of about $6,000 for each sphere. Considering that there are several thousand of these in use in the United States today, the cumulative saving is significant.

The perfection of this technique is no better illustrated than in the recently completed atomic submarine, the *Nautilus*. The specifications for the welding in that ship required that the maximum leakage from any pipe be limited to 1 drop in 500 years. Only with radiographic inspection could such an extraordinary standard be achieved.

2. Thickness gages: One of the recurrent problems in industry has been that of accurately measuring the thickness of a coating laid over a base metal. In many industrial processes it is necessary to measure the thickness of gold plated over copper or that of tin over steel. The two previous methods in use were that of chemical analysis, which was time consuming, and so-called transmission-type gages, which did not yield the desired accuracy of measurement. Both of

these processes necessitated a periodic stopping of the production line so that the uniformity of the plating could be measured.

At the present time through the marvel of radioisotopes, a type of gage has been developed known as the radioisotope backscatter gage. The principle is simple in that a radioisotope is enclosed in a sealed capsule with a thin window to permit the escape of radiation. When the electrons which are being emitted strike the metal or other material which is being plated, they bounce back and their intensity is counted. By recording this count on a simple meter, the thickness of the plating can be constantly observed without necessity for interruption of the production processes. This device has tremendous economic impact since there are thousands of companies in the United States engaged in plating processes. There are now 300 companies in the United States using radioisotope thickness gages. Several large companies report savings up to $100,000 annually in the control of thickness of rubber, sheet steel, plastics, etc. It appears as though the average year-round savings of companies using these devices is the equivalent of 2 percent of the value of the production being measured. In an attempt to describe to you what could happen in this particular application alone, if we were to assume 2 percent savings in the quantity of copper sheet produced in the year of 1952, it would amount to a saving of about $9 million. It is estimated, by one consulting firm, that only 5 percent of the market for these radioisotope thickness gages has been tapped. It is not too optimistic to anticipate that within the foreseeable future almost every production process, wherein one material is plated to another, will utilize some variation of this measuring instrument.

3. Use as tracers:

A. Pipeline flow: The usefulness of the two properties of radioisotopes, namely, that of precise identification and detectability, is demonstrated by their service to the oil industry. The costly pipelines that link our industrial centers with the oil fields are used to carry many different petroleum products. At various places along the line there are switch points where the products are diverted. There are also interfaces which means merely the place at which various grades of oil, flowing through the pipeline, meet. It is essential that the operators of the pipeline know when one petroleum product is about to come to a switch point so that the proper valves can be opened at the proper time. It is estimated that about 50 barrels of oil were lost (at average cost of approximately $500) every time a changeover, from one grade of petroleum to another was made. By adding the radioisotope antimony-124 to each different type of oil in the pipeline and by attaching a Geiger counter to the outside of the pipe at the diversion point, the new type of oil automatically announces its arrival to the Geiger counter, and the operator has but to adjust the valve. Estimated savings by this process, which is now used by practically all pipeline carriers, run in the neighborhood of $500,000 a year.

B. Leak detection: One of the ever-present problems in the maintenance of any system which carries water is the detection and location of leaks. One incident, which I hope never happens to any members of this audience, occurred in a ranch-type residence dwelling. It was heated by copper tubes, providing radiant heat, which were buried in the concrete floor. The fuel bill suddenly shot up to $400 a month and there could be no other conclusion but that there was a serious leak in the pipes. Instead of tearing up the whole concrete floor, a commercial laboratory added the radioisotope iodine-131 to the water in the heating system. The floor area of the dwelling was explored with a Geiger counter and the position of the leak was located because of the large increase of radioactivity resulting from the gamma radiation in the water surrounding the leak. From this original application for the detection of leaks in enclosed systems, the principle has been expanded and is being applied industrially in many different places.

C. Paint mixing: A problem which has confronted industry for many years is that of mixing two or more substances to form a uniform whole. Previously the only method available in the mixing of paints and pigments, for example, was to take periodic samples and subject them to laboratory analysis to see if the materials were uniformly distributed in the mixing vats.

Now, with the marvel of radioisotopes, an extremely small quantity of manganese-54 can be added to the pigment and counters attached to the stirring paddles or other mixing device. When the radioactive output from each of the counters attached to the paddles is the same, the equal distribution of the pigment in the vehicle is proven and the mixing process can be stopped.

D. Acidizing oil wells: The rate of flow of an oil well depends, among other factors, on the porosity of the formation through which the oil flows. As the oil is pumped to the surface, particles of limestone are deposited in this formation. As the oil flow slackens, hydrochloric acid under pressure is forced down into the well to dissolve some of the limestone and to reestablish this flow. Various methods have been used in the past two decades to determine at just what depth the acid should be forced out. These methods have been time consuming, expensive, and hazardous, since there was the ever-present possibility that if the acid were forced out at the wrong level it might completely ruin the well. At the present time a small quantity of radioactive iodine is added to the hydrochloric acid and by the use of a Geiger counter the position of the acid in the well can be determined with great accuracy because of the rays which are emitted by the radioisotope and recorded on the counter. When the acid has been brought to the proper level, the pressure is equalized and the acid is forced into the right stratum. The savings which may eventually result from this new technique are at the present time incalculable.

The industrial applications of atomic energy, of which I have listed but a few, are innumerable. At the present time radioisotopes are used in density gauges, in the elimination of static electricity in the printing business, in the measurement of the wear of machine tools, and in many other ways. It may interest the housewives in this audience to know that the radioisotopes have invaded the dishwashing business and the automatic clothes washing machines. I imagine there are few women who have not been irritated by the inability of their dishwashing machines to remove egg yolk from the plates. Now, in testing, by adding a little radioactive material to the egg yolk and subjecting it to various dishwashing detergents, we have only to read the counter to determine the presence or absence of this national menace. Instead of just putting plain dirt on the clothing which the launderers are testing, we now impregnate the dirt with a little radioactive material and by taking the radioactive count before washing and after washing in a washing machine, we can, without question, accurately determine the efficiency of the machine and of the detergent being used.

At this point in my remarks I begin to feel like the young itinerant preacher who had just graduated from a divinity school and had been assigned as a circuit preacher. On his very first Sunday when he arrived at a small church in the ranch lands of the West he was dismayed to find only one old cowpuncher in the church. Feeling embarrassed, he went to the cowpuncher and said, "Frankly, this is my first sermon, and since you are the only person here, I don't know whether to give my sermon or to ride on to the next town. What do you think?"

The sunburned old man replied, "Well, son, I don't know anything about preaching, all I know about is cattle. I reckon if I loaded up the hay wagon and went to the water hole to feed the cattle and found only one cow there, I reckon I would feed that cow."

The young preacher replied, "That's good enough for me," and he mounted the pulpit and for 1 solid hour he poured forth the 4 years of theology which he had learned in the divinity school. At the conclusion of his sermon, he again approached the old man and said, "Now, this is my first sermon and I would appreciate your frank comments and criticisms since it will be of help to me when I go to the next town." The old cowpuncher smiled and said, "Well, son, like I said, I don't know anything about preaching, all I know about is cattle. I reckon if I filled up the hay wagon and went down to feed the cattle, and I reckon if I found only one cow, I would feed that cow, but I don't reckon I would give him the whole load."

I guess I had better take a lesson from the old cowpuncher and not try to give you the whole load about radioisotopes tonight. I have merely skimmed the surface of potential industrial applications. The medical applications are a field apart and are daily contributing to the eventual elimination of some diseases which have plagued mankind for centuries.

The agricultural applications are amazing. For the first time we may be on the road to discovering the secret of photosynthesis or how plants take sunshine and soil and convert them into material matter. We may be on the road toward the elimination of blights, rusts and other plant diseases which rob this economy of hundreds of millions of dollars a year.

Despite my good intentions, I cannot resist displaying 1 example of medical application and 1 of agriculture. I have in my hand an extremely lightweight portable X-ray unit suitable for field use. It is 3 inches in diameter, 6 inches long and weighs approximately 10 pounds. It contains radioactive thulium and was developed by the Argonne National Laboratory of the University of Chicago, a Commission operation, in conjunction with the Commission supported Ames Laboratory of Iowa State University, and is capable of diagnostic X-rays of remarkable efficiency. I display here to you one of the X-ray prints taken with this machine. The approximate cost of this machine which, produced in quantity, would be under $200, and, for certain purposes, it will do a job now requiring large machines worth tens of thousands of dollars. It is my opinion that before long this equipment will be available to the armed services, to the rescue squads of our communities, and to our physicians and will be a boon to mankind.

I now hold in my hand 2 potatoes which in themselves constitute a remarkable demonstration of a possibility of the use of radioactive material in the preservation of food. Both of these potatoes are 2 years old. The potato in my right hand was subjected to radiation which killed the organisms in the potato which would have caused it to sprout. As a consequence, this potato is as firm and as fresh as the day it was removed from the soil. In my left hand is a potato from the same crop which was allowed to sprout and which is, of course, now unedible. Don't think for one minute we are trying to create radioactive "spuds" which will cause the consumer to glow in the dark. On the contrary, there will be no harmful radiation contained in the potatoes.

We are working in conjunction with various other Government agencies to determine how we can utilize the marvel of radioactivity in the preservation of food and the prevention of the bacterial growth which results in the spoilage of meat, canned goods, vegetables, and other foodstuffs and the resultant loss of millions of dollars annually. I believe we will eventually overcome the remaining problems, and when we do, mankind throughout the world will benefit thereby.

In the field of industrial, medical and agricultural applications of atomic energy, the people of the United States are extremely fortunate that the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy of the Congress of the United States has been actively and vigorously interested. Under the leadership of Sterling Cole, Republican, of New York, chairman of the committee, and Bourke B. Hickenlooper, Republican, of Iowa, vice chairman, hearings have been held, testimony taken, studies initiated, money appropriated, which will push this Nation rapidly forward in the application of atomic energy to these basic peacetime uses. In the hope that some remark which I have made tonight has created an interest on your part, I have taken the liberty of bringing with me some copies of hearings of a Subcommittee of the Joint Committee, headed by Congressman Carl Hinshaw, Republican, of California, which are available to you at the close of our discussion. Others may be obtained by writing to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy or to the Government Printing Office.

I really believe that in applying atomic energy to industry, to medicine and to agriculture, we are on the threshhold of a new frontier. I am going to give you the best estimate, or perhaps I should call it a "guesstimate" of what atomic energy now means to American industry. I believe the present savings, and I emphasize present savings, through the use of radioisotopes are in the order of $100 million a year. My guess is that within the next 10 years American industry will increase the savings to 10 times the present value, or in the neighborhood of $1 billion a year. This is the sort of vital, but nonsensational, progress that President Eisenhower referred to when he addressed a message to the Atom for Peace exhibit in Rome a few weeks ago, declaring:

"We have only recently passed the midpoint of the 20th century. I am convinced that history will one day record as the most far-reaching physical accomplishment of all this century—or even of 20 centuries—the discoveries which in recent years unlock, for the use of mankind, the boundless energy of the atom."

Extension of Foreign Trade Agreements

SPEECH

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 11, 1954

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 9474) to extend the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended.

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Chairman, developments within my district of Indiana have been such that I find myself in accord with those who urge caution in extending the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act.

By way of illustration, I wish to cite United States lawnmower production, a manufacturing segment that is basic to the prosperity of the second largest city in east central Indiana, the city of Richmond. In recent years Richmond mower factories—and they represent a substantial part of our Nation's total mower output—have been increasingly penalized by the rising importation of foreign-made mowers. Despite their best efforts to serve the American market with quality machines, both of the manual and motor-operated types, they have found it well nigh impossible to compete with the cheap-labor mowers that are beginning to saturate the United States market, particularly the competitive models coming in from Britain under a low tariff concession.

The consequences of such competition are as familiarly true in the mower industry as they have been—and threaten to be—in dozens of other lines of American industrial enterprise: loss of sales, curtailing of production, and dwindling employment for labor.

Not alone for the salvation of one industry that has sparked the growth of a typically fine United States community, but for the hundreds more experiencing competition from abroad, I believe our country should reappraise world conditions before extending further a program of international trade policies of questionable economic wisdom.

The Fifth Amendment: A New and False Friend for Some

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WINT SMITH

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 21, 1954

Mr. SMITH of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, much has been written and spoken about the use of the fifth amendment of persons subpenaed before the investigating committees of the Congress.

I submit herewith an article by Marc G. Boss, a prominent Kansas attorney, who most clearly presents an entirely new approach to the problem of the fifth-amendment patriots.

The article follows:

THE FIFTH AMENDMENT: A NEW AND FALSE FRIEND FOR SOME

(By Marc G. Boss, of the Kansas Bar (Columbus))

"Evil strides the earth bearing a passport signed by the soft tolerance of the good."—Author unknown.

Twenty-eight years of general practice in that section of our great land known as the Kansas Balkans, have virtually obliterated memories of specific things relative to law school curriculum; partly as a result of which, this country counselor would have an understandable reluctance to engage, with the head of any widely known law school, in a hassle involving the arcana of juridical hair-splitting on any subject whatever.

The lapse of time, however, will never erase the recollection of certain fundamentals inculcated in those of us who were privileged to attend a certain great Midwest law school under the tutelage of such outstanding Americans as Dean H. W. Arant, Dr. W. L. Burdick, Dr. Frank Strong, "Teeterin" Tom Larrimore, "Red" Hallam and Raymond F. Rice, not a single one of whom ever did a thing in his entire life which he would, could, or should be ashamed or afraid to disclose.

Officially they were law professors; but also they professed and taught love of God, country, honor, justice, and truth. The law they taught from text and casebooks; the rest by personal example. Their lives were an open book, because they were teachers.

That was almost 30 years ago.

Of late a number of college professors and faculty members of great universities, when questioned on loyalty to our country, have invoked the fifth amendment. For the purposes of this discussion, their legal right to do this will not be questioned; but the fact that they have done so is becoming a matter of real concern to the American people.

In turn, it would appear that the fact that the American people are becoming concerned about it is becoming a matter of concern to some of our leading educators.

When university professors maintain silence respecting possible Communist activities, connections, affiliations, or associations on the ground that truthful answers might tend to incriminate them, does this justify any suspicion that there is something rotten in the universities?

Rightly or wrongly, many people have drawn precisely that conclusion; and, as a result, according to Dean Erwin N. Griswold, of Harvard Law School, in an article in the June issue of the ABA Journal, "many members of the general public have come to have fear of our educational institutions, and general mistrust of academic people—charges are made against our universities and other educational institutions, and more or less believed by some segments of our people."

He then proceeds to reassure us that such fears are baseless and such charges are groundless, and to establish this he gives us the history of two college professors (designated simply as "Case No. 1" and "Case No. 2"), who invoked the privilege against self-incrimination; and a detailed account of the peculiar circumstances under which—according to the narrator—they felt obliged to claim the privilege even though neither was guilty of wrongdoing.

Frankly, the conclusions that they were guilty of nothing wrong seem rather dubious under the circumstances related, and are certainly not too convincing; however, let us pass that. By Dean Griswold's own statements in his article, the subjects of his case No. 1 and case No. 2 are not actual persons, but are fictitious—purely hypothetical cases, and Dean Griswold expressly states that "the facts are not the facts of any specific case."

Moreover, it is significant that in building up his two hypothetical cases, Dean Griswold, on his own motion, twice feels impelled to recognize and comment on the possibility "that both of the sets of facts are unlikely"—(a suggestion with which those who have closely observed the parade of fifth amendment professors will certainly not quarrel); and he finally defends his assumption of facts as "one of the ancient rights of any law teacher."

In this instance, Dean Griswold does not come to us as a law teacher citing hypothetical cases to illustrate principles and rules of law to a class of undergraduate law students. His role is that of an advocate presenting a defense to a jury composed of thousands of seasoned attorneys most of whom are leaders in their communities. Here, we are not dealing in abstract principles but with actual cases involving a sinister aspect of certain peculiar activities of some members of the teaching profession.

The questions which concern many members of the general public involve actual facts—not assumed cases. They are not particularly concerned with criminal prosecution, nor do they care anything about the private lives or public utterances of two imaginary professors. All they want to know is, Are Communists or Communist sympathizers teaching our younger generation, moulding their thoughts, influencing, their lives, and warping their opinions and characters? This is a question that can be answered only by true facts, and not by hypothetical or assumed facts which, being inapplicable to any specific or existing case, must of necessity be untrue. Emerson once stated very aptly:

"The firmest and noblest ground on which people can live is truth; the real with the real; a ground on which nothing is assumed."

Now let us consider these actual, real, live persons who are responsible for this discussion. Only a small number of college professors have been called for questioning by congressional committees. They were not selected at random, but because their backgrounds indicated a possibility of Communist or subversive taint, or that they might have information which would be of assistance in exposing disloyalty. As indicated by the published accounts of the hearings:

All were asked whether they were, or had been, members of the Communist Party.

Some were asked about membership in known Communist-front organizations.

Some were asked whether they had tried to recruit students in the Communist cause, or taught Communist doctrine in their classrooms.

Some were asked whether they had ever engaged in espionage against the United States.

Those who invoked the fifth amendment, did so by refusing to answer on one or more of the above or similar questions on the ground that truthful answers might tend to incriminate them. The issue is whether such refusal justifies their removal as teachers of the youth of our land—although why there should even be a question about it is sometime beyond this writer's comprehension.

In this connection it would appear that there are a lot of muddled ideas held by some segments of the people. The rule that a person is presumed innocent until proved guilty beyond a reasonable doubt, applies only to criminal prosecutions, but a surprising number of people seem to have the idea that there is something un-American in thus limiting its application; particularly where questions involving national security are concerned. As a result, many people affect to see nothing wrong in permitting a man with a highly questionable ideological background, or who associates with known Communists, to work in a plant handling highly secret matters vital to our national defense, or to be put in charge of the education of our young people, because of a silly, quixotic and hypocritical idea that to think otherwise would be to impute guilt by association. It would now seem that public enemy No. 1 is no longer the traitor, but is the person who still believes that "Birds of a feather flock together," and "A man should be judged by the company he keeps." Be that as it may, much of our secret defense information has leaked out to our enemies, and during the past decade many young men and women have come out of our colleges and universities bearing evidence of strange, unnatural indoctrination incompatible with their previous deportment, training and environment.

Molding and influencing the minds, lives, opinions, characters, and viewpoints of the younger generation is just as vital to the national welfare and security as is the work done in our most important, top-secret defense establishments; and any person whose loyalty is not above suspicion is a poor security risk and should not be permitted to stay in either place. Those who advocate otherwise are either blind or indifferent to the menace of communism as well as the aims, objects, and techniques of the Communist conspiracy.

The rule of reasonable doubt and the rule against self-incrimination are not of divine origin. Both are manmade rules evolved through many generations of torture and tears as a compromise in the age-old struggle between society and the individual; and both came into being because of the fear that an innocent man might be unjustly convicted of crime. The rule of reasonable doubt has no decisive or conclusive bearing on the question of actual guilt or innocence, but is merely an arbitrary safeguard set up to maintain the established policy that it is better for 10 guilty men to go free than for 1 innocent person to be wrongfully convicted of crime.

The subjects under discussion are not being tried here on a criminal charge. Yet the Griswold article leaves the impression that, in determining whether the fifth-amendment schoolteachers should continue to serve as schoolteachers, they should be accorded all the arbitrary safeguards and protections given the accused in a criminal trial.

In contrast, any other person, whether in a criminal case, a civil case, or a congressional hearing, cannot refuse to take the witness stand and submit to questioning. The only valid ground upon which he can refuse to answer any specific question is that a truthful answer might incriminate him—and he must so state. Surely his refusal to answer a specific question on the specific ground of self-incrimination invites a much stronger inference of guilt than that raised against a defendant in a criminal case; and here there are no statutes or other arbitrary rules forbidding use of such inference, nor is there any presumption of innocence.

While we may agree with Dean Griswold that the fifth amendment embodies a sound value which we should preserve; surely it is not necessary that we become intellectually maudlin about it. After all is said and done, the fact remains that when a witness who has peculiar knowledge of the true facts refuses to disclose them because they might incriminate him, it is only natural that others will take him at his word—and we might just as well forget about arbitrary statutes and rules, abstract niceties, and technical distinctions, and be realistic about it.

But Dean Griswold disagrees, and he quotes from *Burdick* v. *United States* (236 U. S. 79, 35 Sup. Ct. 267), as follows:

"If it be objected that (Burdick's) refusal to answer was an implication of crime, we answer, not necessarily in fact, not at all in theory of law."

The above quotation is inaccurate. It omits several significant words, thereby indicating a meaning clearly not intended. The entire sentence which Dean Griswold purported to quote reads as follows, the omitted words being in brackets:

"If it be objected that [the sensitiveness of Burdick was extreme because his] refusal to answer was [itself] an implication of crime, we answer, not necessarily in fact, not at all in theory of law."

Reference to the Court's opinion shows that when the Court said "not necessarily in fact, not at all in theory of law," it was referring to the words which the Griswold article omitted from the quotation, namely, the objection that "the sensitiveness of Burdick was extreme." Burdick had refused to answer questions before a grand jury on the ground of possible self-incrimination, although he had previously rejected a Presidential pardon which contemplated complete immunity from prosecution. It was pointed out that while acceptance of the pardon would have been the same as a confession of guilt, his claiming the privilege against self-incrimination had a like effect; and that in rejecting the one and claiming the other, Burdick was making a distinction without a difference, i. e., his sensitiveness was extreme. That is when the Court said not necessarily in fact, not at all in theory of law," and proceeded to point out the distinction; that acceptance of a pardon did carry with it a confession of guilt, whereas, when Burdick claimed the privilege against self-incrimination:

"It supposed only a possibility of a charge of crime, and interposed protection against the charge, and reaching beyond it, against furnishing what might be urged or used as evidence to support it."

One should not be misled by the Court's use of the words "only a possibility", etc., for in a later case the same Court held that the "possibility" of incrimination must be such that there is reasonable ground to apprehend danger, and the danger to be apprehended "must be real and appreciable * * * not a danger of an imaginary and unsubstantial character, having reference to some extraordinary and barely possible contingency" (*Mason* v. *United States* (244 U. S. 362, 37 Sup. Ct. 621)). There is nothing in the Burdick case to comfort the fifth amendment professors.

It is not contended here that a college professor should be dismissed just because he may have belonged to the Communist Party or some Communist-front organization in the past, without realizing their true purpose and nature; provided, of course, it can be established that he has since recognized his error and has sincerely repudiated his former position. The Griswold article presents no such case, that is, it presents no such actual case.

This writer holds the highest and most sincere respect, admiration and esteem for Dean Griswold, and nothing in this article should be construed or is intended as an attack upon him. It is to his everlasting credit that he has presented his arguments on a high, intellectual plane and has not stooped to mendacity and name calling. The trouble with Dean Griswold is that he is too honest to follow the old formula: "If you don't have a case, just give the prosecutor hell!" From him we have heard no mendacious cries of "book burning," "witch hunt," or "Spanish Inquisition"; he speaks not of "fascistic insistence upon conformity," or "thought-control"; nor does he shed crocodile tears over "interference with freedom of education" or the "black silence of fear" allegedly engendered by congressional investigations. He seeks not to defend by fake propaganda, but rather to explain by logic and abstract reasoning. Some of us may believe his explanations unsound and his reasons faulty, but we know they are honest because he has presented them honestly.

It is unfortunate that so many of Dean Griswold's colleagues, high in the ranks of the teaching profession, have not possessed the moral stature and restraint to emulate him in this respect. They comprise a closely knit group whose radical views on controversial political subjects, coupled with their positions in the academic field, are always good for a headline. Since the overwhelming majority of the members of the teaching profession have the traditional attributes of conservatism and dignified reserve, this comparative handful of ultra-liberal extroverts, through constant publicity, have assumed by default the popular role of "educational leaders," and as such, they falsely appear to act as spokesmen for the entire teaching profession.

These men seem to fear inquiry as to possible Communist infiltration; and they so violently oppose investigation of individual members of their ranks, that they do not hesitate to mouth the fake expressions and arguments—which Dean Griswold eschews—in order to spread the intellectual cloak behind which any crypto-Communists or their familiars in our educational institutions can skulk. It is one of the most articulate groups in the United States, and the bombastic pronouncements of these educational leaders through the media of speeches, statements, articles, and particularly commencement addresses—duly reported in press and radio—are the principal sources of whatever information the general public may have concerning conditions academic. As a result, isn't it only natural that people generally have been misled into judging the entire teaching profession by the actions, reactions, behavoir and attitude of these so-called educational leaders? If many members of the general public have come to have fear of our educational institutions, and general mistrust of academic people (as asserted by Dean Griswold) it is because this group has implanted the fears and engendered the mistrust. If there be anything "rotten in the universities," they have put it there.

The fact that they start bleeding whenever any suspected pro-Communist in their profession is cut, does not necessarily mean that they are pro-Communist. It could be that they believe they and all other members of their group are superbeings on a plane far above the rest of mankind; and this could account for their apparent rage at any suggestion that some individual members of this race of demigods may have clay feet and should be governed by the same laws and be judged by the same standards as the rest of us. But whether their behavior be motivated by procommunism or megalomania, so long as it exists in our universities there will be something "rotten in the universities." And the effective cure can only come when these so-called educational leaders are deposed and replaced by men truly representative of the teaching profession, picked from the tens of thousands of educators who are faithful, loyal Americans in fact, and not by reason of some legal fiction that they are presumed such until proved otherwise.

There is nothing in law, reason, logic, justice, or commonsense, which requires that any person be entitled to special consideration, enjoy special immunity, or be judged by different standards than the rest of the citizenry, just because he is a college professor. Like everybody else, if he is to be free from suspicion, he should comport himself in such manner as to merit freedom from suspicion, and not through any claim, presumption or inference that as a professor he is sacrosanct. If Caesar's wife was really above suspicion it would have to be because of her exemplary conduct, and not because she was the wife of Caesar. If the fifth amendment professors are suspect, it should be remembered that they alone are to blame. If educational institutions are suspect, the fifth-amendment professors and their ilk, and those who protect and keep them in their positions, are the ones who are responsible.

Tolerance is a virtue, but the American people may be carrying it to the point of committing national suicide; for every year many graduates of our left wing political institutes will be spread among the population and will help drown out the less articulate pro-American part of our population.

Yes; the fifth amendment may be "an old and good friend"—for some professors; but its exercise has done much damage—has made it a false friend—to the cause of education.

What the Veterans' Administration Means to Local Communities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 22, 1954

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, the Administrator of the Veterans' Administration, Harvey V. Higley, issued a statement which shows the important part the Veterans' Administration plays in the economic life of virtually every community in the State of Ohio.

The facts are so significant that this information should be of interest to the veterans and other citizens of Ohio, and to the people, generally. Under leave to extend my remarks, I want to review what he has to say.

Mr. Higley said approximately 95 cents of every tax dollar that the Veterans' Administration receives in any year goes back to the local communities in the form of cash or other benefits to veterans, their widows, or orphaned children.

The remaining 5 cents goes for the cost of administering Veterans' Administration. It is paid out in salaries and other expenses that are necessary to distribute the 95 cents in direct and indirect benefits to veterans or their dependents.

Mr. Higley said that because most of VA's employees work and live in local communities across the Nation, the salaries they receive from the 5-cent cost of operation are spent locally and thereby benefit the communities directly.

In the last year for which the Veterans' Administration has figures—July 1, 1952, to June 30, 1953—the State of Ohio received $199,600,000 in direct and indirect benefits to veterans or their dependents. That does not include certain life-insurance payments and a few other expenditures of a minor nature which cannot be broken down by States.

Of this amount, $123,600,000 was paid in cash to 177,000 living veterans or dependents of deceased veterans in the form of compensation or pension payments.

The remainder covered such benefits as GI bill education or training, vocational rehabilitation for the disabled, hospitalization, medical care, death indemnity, burial benefits, and the like.

Mr. Higley said the Veterans' Administration benefits the local communities of Ohio in another way. The GI loan program, he said, has brought the State of Ohio and its local communities many tax dollars in the 169,500 GI home loans totaling over $1,156,000,000 made to date.

The GI bill education and training program also has made its contribution to the general welfare of Ohio's local communities, Mr. Higley said. He explained this program not only has raised the general educational level of each community, it also has increased the taxes that GI bill trainees are paying from the higher earning power resulting from their training, according to a Census Bureau study.

The Veterans' Administration medical program, while of direct benefit only to veterans, has been recognized and is still being recognized for its contribution to the improved standards of medical care everywhere, Mr. Higley said.

In the treatment of tuberculosis alone, Mr. Higley added, VA has played an outstanding part in reducing the Nation's TB death rate since the end of World War II.

In short—

Mr. Higley said—

> the Veterans' Administration is your good neighbor in every aspect of your community life—economically, educationally, medically, and taxwise.

Transocean Airlines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. ALLEN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 22, 1954

Mr. ALLEN of California. Mr. Speaker, on several occasions I have placed in the RECORD information concerning the Transocean Airlines which I thought to be of interest and indicative of the nature of this industry and its management.

Recently there appeared in the Oakland Tribune, a leading daily newspaper on the Pacific coast, an editorial which states some of the facts which cause me to have such a high regard for the Transocean Airlines and the men who operate it. I was very pleased to see the Oakland Tribune express the views which it sets forth in its editorial.

The editorial referred to reads as follows:

NEW PACIFIC SERVICE

> One of Oakland's bigger industries, one which operates in all corners of the free world and one which has established an almost phenomenal record of expansion, is seeking Government approval for a new idea in promoting private enterprise.
>
> That industry is Transocean Airlines. Having played a major role in the military airlift to Korea and in contributing in large measure to helping break the Berlin blockade, with global experience in mas transportation of people and a wide variety of the world's goods, the line is now asking for the right to operate across the Pacific as a certificated airline.
>
> That operation would be in competition with the two airlines now certified for regular operations, but there are several distinctive circumstances in Transocean's planned operations that make it an aerial trail blazer in a still different direction.
>
> Transocean, in asking for the right to compete in the certificated Pacific route, from Oakland to Honolulu, Guam, Wake, Manila, and Hong Kong, has pledged not to seek one cent from the United States Government for mail pay or subsidy. That is in contrast to the minimum of $6 million a year asked by one of the two competitors in its application for a renewal.
>
> Transocean is not opposing renewal of the application for the other line. It is asking only that the recommendation made by the examiner for the Civil Aeronautics Bureau that it be certificated for irregular service, without subsidy, but depending upon its

own skill, knowledge, ability, and administrative organization to pay the way, be given final approval by the CAB.

It is an application that should be granted, without delay and without quibble.

The Challenge of Resource Conservation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 22, 1954

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith an address delivered by Mr. D. A. Williams, Administrator of the Soil Conservation Service, before the Rivers and Harbors Congress in Washington on May 25, 1954. This address describes the program of soil and water conservation of the Department of Agriculture, including the watershed program which will be expanded under the provisions of the 1954 Watershed and Flood Control Act.

This address also points out clearly the relationship between the soil and water conservation programs of the Department of Agriculture and the activities of other agencies such as the Corps of Engineers and the Department of Interior.

The address follows:

One day, not long ago, five newspaper clippings came to my desk. The first told of a devastating dust storm in the Great Plains.

The second described a million dollars' worth of flood damage incurred in a few hours by a small southwestern city.

The third noted an appropriation of a large sum of money for dredging the ship channel in one of our harbors.

The fourth was an editorial which speculated that New York City restaurant customers may not get a glass of water with meals unless they ask for it.

A fifth was a forecast of crop production for this coming year.

Our newspapers note such events and developments day by day. But seldom do our writers take time to relate these items to one another or to their common denominators—soil and water, and the use and management of those two basic resources.

These events are news because what happens to soil and to water so directly and so drastically affects people.

It was recognition of this fundamental relationship that gave birth to the conservation movement in the minds of a few farseeing conservation pioneers half a century ago.

Gradually, soil and water conservation came to be recognized as essential to a profitable and efficient agriculture. It became apparent that a vigorous program of soil and water conservation was necessary as a basis for national strength. In recognition of this need and as one move toward meeting it, the Congress in 1935 created the Soil Conservation Service as a permanent agency of Government. Since that time, some 1,400,000 farmers and ranchers working together in locally organized, locally operated soil-conservation districts, have joined with their Government in advancing a nationwide program of conservation farming. The land-use adjustments made and the measures applied, in accordance with the needs and capabilities of the land, have not only helped solve physical problems of land damage but have also helped farmers become more efficient and more flexible to meet fluctuating production demands, and price and cost variations.

Soil and water conservation is of value only as it benefits people. It therefore follows that the people benefited should initiate, plan, and apply the soil- and water-conservation program needed in each locality. From the beginning, the Soil Conservation Service saw its function as one of helping local people carry out their programs of soil and water resource conservation, improvement, and development.

In order to place the emphasis upon local initiative and responsibility, every administration since 1936 has encouraged the States and the farmers within the States to establish soil-conservation districts under State law to give this type of leadership to the conservation movement. By 1947 all of the States and Territories had adopted soil-conservation district enabling legislation. Land owners and operators have organized to date 2,586 soil-conservation districts covering about 1½ billion acres of farm and ranch land.

These local organizations are created by our traditional American democratic processes—at the ballot box. Their officers are locally elected without jurisdiction of or compensation by Federal or State agencies. They have proved to be a highly effective mechanism through which the Federal Government can serve local people who, at the same time, retain local leadership and initiative.

The primary job of the Soil Conservation Service is to provide assistance in technical skills in soil and water conservation which the farmers do not possess or are expected to possess. But technical assistance is only one part of the total job of soil and water conservation. Other organizations work with districts, too. The Federal and State Extension Services provide educational assistance. The Agricultural Conservation Program Service provides cost-sharing assistance in applying conservation practices. The Federal and State Forest Services provide specialized forestry assistance. Many State governments themselves appropriate funds to assist districts in their work.

Needed conservation practices have been planned and are being applied with SCS assistance on about 34 percent of the Nation's privately owned agricultural land. The results have been appreciable—in terms of more efficient production and reduction of soil wastage, and have clearly demonstrated the importance of a sound, acre-by-acre, conservation plan on each farm and ranch.

As more and more landowners have become conscious of these benefits of conservation practices on their own farms, they have visualized the needs for planning and applying additional measures that required group action—the kind of measures that no individual alone could accomplish and which benefit more than one farm. This has included stabilization of major gullies running across more than one farm, stabilization of eroding stream banks, improvements of headwater tributary channels to prevent excessive overflow and permit drainage of bottom-lands, waterflow retardation by small upstream dams, and water conservation for beneficial uses in small headwater impoundments. Farmers have seen that the same measures that prevent erosion on their fields also reduce the rate of runoff after gully washing storms. They have seen small retarding dams save culverts and bridges from washing out, and have seen them stop gullies that were cutting farms in two. They have seen their soil protected and crops improved by the same measures that helped control surface water. They have learned that more than half of the total average annual flood damages occur in the headwater areas where their farms lie. They have visualized what it could mean in terms of lessened flood damage if all neighboring farms in the same small drainage area were to receive the conservation measures each needed.

That visualization has resulted in a new emphasis on a program that relates farm-by-farm conservation work to the needs of entire small watersheds. I want to emphasize, however, that a watershed program, as we speak of it, is not something apart from the regular farmland conservation program in which the Soil Conservation Service assists farmers through their soil-conservation districts. On the contrary, the protection and improvement of small watersheds is part of the overall soil and water conservation program. The Soil Conservation Service, from its earliest days, has stressed the importance of treating entire tributary watersheds. Some of the soil-conservation districts were organized on a watershed basis. And we have frequently worked with groups of farmers and ranchers on their common conservation problems.

However, a major part of our technical assistance thus far has been on a farm-by-farm basis—helping individual farmers and ranchers to plan and apply the soil and water conservation practices that they themselves could install and maintain with the aid of our technicians and the educational and financial assistance of other agencies. The watershed protection program simply provides a means by which local people can get help in doing those conservation jobs that affect more than one farm or ranch and which the individual landowner or operator cannot do alone. Thus we look upon upstream watershed planning as the logical next step in our national soil and water conservation program.

Farmers and ranchers have not been alone in recognizing the need for greater emphasis on the watershed approach in conservation. President Eisenhower in his special message to Congress on July 31, 1953, and again in his January 7, 1954, state of the Union address, stressed the need for strengthening of upstream watershed conservation and encouraged the enactment of legislation to strengthen the upstream phase of our total conservation program.

Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson has pointed to upstream watershed emphasis as further evidence of the dynamic national program of soil and water conservation now underway.

Leaders in the Congress last year gave impetus to the watershed approach by appropriating additional funds for the Department of Agriculture which we were asked to use in setting up "pilot" projects that would develop, refine, and evaluate the methods and benefits in protection programs in small watersheds.

Many urban, industrial, business, and labor leaders have also recognized that the Nation's land and water resources cannot be protected and improved without a constructive program of upstream watershed measures as well as individual farm and ranch conservation practices. Hundreds of towns and cities have expressed the need for protecting their municipal reservoirs against excessive silting. Industries in cities like Cleveland, Buffalo, and Baltimore have seen the need for protecting their harbors by controlling erosion on the watersheds. Highway departments in many States and railroads have joined in seeking watershed treatment as a means of reducing maintenance costs and protecting bridges and rights-of-way from runoff and sediment damage.

Congress, in the 1936 Flood Control Act, recognized the national interest in providing for watershed improvements for runoff and waterflow retardation and soil-erosion prevention as a counterpart to downstream improvements of rivers and other waterways for flood control and navigation.

Within the past several years there has been a growing recognition of the need for more suitable Federal and State legislation to provide a basis for carrying out the upstream part of the total resource conservation job. Several States have recently enacted watershed district legislation in some form. Literally hundreds of local organizations and groups have been formed in the past 3 or 4 years to further the protection and development of upstream watersheds.

New Federal watershed legislation has been in the process of development since 1950 with bipartisan support. Many administration leaders, as well as the President, have endorsed watershed legislation such as that embodied in the Hope-Aiken bills now before Congress.

The principles embodied in this legislation extend the basic concept of soil conservation districts—namely, the preeminence of local initiative and responsibility, with teamwork between local, State, and Federal agencies and involving Federal technical and financial help only when local people request it. Both Federal and local interests are safeguarded by the requirements that benefits must exceed costs in order to receive Federal aid in improvements, and that local interests must assume a reasonable share of the costs of installation and must operate and maintain all improvements.

We have heard that some people have come to believe this watershed legislation, as recommended by the President, would lead to conflicts with the proper and timely development of our larger rivers and navigable waterways. I would like to say emphatically—and here I only reiterate what my distinguished predecessors, Dr. Hugh H. Bennett and Dr. Robert M. Salter, have said—that upstream watershed protection programs are complementary to and not a substitute for needed downstream river improvements. At the same time it is equally obvious that downstream river improvements cannot be a substitute for upstream watershed protection.

River, harbor, and major flood-control improvements carried out so competently for more than a century by the Corps of Engineers are primarily Federal public works undertakings required for the development of the Nation's commerce, the alleviation of disaster from floods in the main river valleys, and the harnessing of the Nation's rivers. Such works can, of course, produce no direct physical benefits to small valleys and upstream watershed lands above the works. Nor, on the other hand, can the combination of land treatment and interrelated small dams and channel improvements up in the watersheds provide adequate control of disaster-type floods that afflict such cities as Pittsburgh, Cincinanti, Omaha, or Kansas City.

Upstream programs developed by local groups with assistance from the Department of Agriculture are multiple-purpose in nature—aimed at soil conservation, water conservation, including drought relief, local drainage, local irrigation (as distinguished from reclamation) and flood protection. Upstream flood protection, as we conceive it, cannot generally prevent disasters in the major stream valleys caused by runoff from the great storms such as that which occurred over the Kansas River Valley in 1951. Upstream watershed protection can, however, prevent the frequent overflows of the small valleys that cause most of the headwater flood damages—providing land treatment and interrelated small structures are planned and installed concurrently or in proper sequence.

Planned and carried out in combination with and as a part of soil- and water-conserving measures on farms and in watershed communities, these local-action small watershed projects can help to achieve the objectives so clearly heretofore set forth by the Congress. So intimately related to agricultural interests of all sorts, it is only proper that these watershed soil and water protection responsibilities of the Department of Agriculture should continue to be given leadership and action consistent with the desires of the American public.

To be sure, there will be some river basins in which joint studies by several agencies will be needed to determine the best combination of flood prevention and flood-control measures to give the greatest total benefit per dollar of cost, and to determine how to best manage our water resources wisely from the land where rain first falls all the way down to the sea. We in the Soil Conservation Service stand ready at all times to participate in whatever coordinating studies are needed—within the resources provided to us by the Congress for this purpose. We are currently joining with the Department of the Interior, the Army, and other Federal agencies in cooperative efforts to coordinate our programs and studies in the Columbia and the Missouri Basins and in the Arkansas-White-Red and New York-New England watersheds. In each of these river-basin efforts, the Federal agencies and the States are working hand in hand.

We believe that Federal agencies, such as the Corps of Engineers, the Department of the Interior, and the Department of Agriculture, have a common responsibility for presenting accurate and adequate facts on river-basin development to the people. In the last analysis, the resolution of any differences in river-basin programing, based on such facts, should rest with the people of that basin through their institutions of government—the States and their local subdivisions, including municipalities, and soil conservation, flood control, conservancy, and other districts.

I am greatly heartened by the knowledge that so many people, in their local groups and organizations are facing up to their responsibilities in the management and protection of soil and water resources.

It has been a privilege to take part in your program here and to have the opportunity of exploring with you some of these vital matters of mutual concern. The strength of our Nation and its world leadership have been built largely upon a generous heritage of soil and water resources. To maintain that strength in the face of a rapidly growing population, we shall need to exert every effort and exploit every skill in developing and perfecting means of protecting and improving those resources. It is a great responsibility and a great challenge to us all.

Impounded California Tidelands Funds Should Be Released by Justice Department.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 22, 1954

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, although the so-called tidelands controversy has long since been settled by legislation which was upheld by the Supreme Court, the Federal Government is still holding approximately $25 million which rightfully belongs to the State of California. These impounded funds should be released to California without further delay.

The attorney general of California has diligently sought release of these funds. They are reported to be on deposit in banks where they draw no interest. Whether or not this is true, California is being deprived of funds to which the people of the State are the rightful owners. Unless the funds are released to California without further delay, I shall ask the Judiciary Committee of the House to investigate the reason for the dilatory tactics of the Justice Department.

Rural Electric Cooperatives and Atomic Energy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 22, 1954

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, most of us have no quarrel with the proposition that the Government should make available the patents and facilities for commercial use of atomic energy.

In our zeal, however, we should not lose sight of the fact that the developments in the fields of atomic and thermonuclear energy have been financed by billions and billions of tax dollars, collected from all the people. As such, the development program is a part of the public domain.

Before we turn this program over to private industry, we should make sure the public interest is fully protected. The pending bill fails to contain the necessary safeguards to protect the public interest.

In this connection, I include as a part of my remarks a telegram received from J. J. Smith, president, board of directors, National Rural Electric Cooperative Association:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *July 21, 1954.*

Hon. MELVIN PRICE,
The Capitol, Washington, D. C.:

By resolution passed unanimously at a meeting of the board of directors of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association at Wausau, Wis., July 21, 1954, the following message is sent to all Members of the Congress:

"It is our firm belief that the atomic-energy program, developed with the people's funds to the extent of $12 billion, is a part of the public domain as much as public lands, the navigable rivers and other resources long considered to be the people's property. We feel most strongly that this is the basic premise which should guide the Congress in the consideration of S. 3690 and H. R. 9757.

"We commend those Members of the Senate who have courageously set forward the issues in S. 3690 and urge the continuation of debate until all issues are clarified and the bill satisfactorily amended.

"We urge that the licensing provisions and procedures be brought into line by appropriate amendments to make such licensing subject to the same safeguards applicable to water resources under the Federal Power Act. This includes public notice to interested parties, public hearings, and preference to the public bodies and cooperatives on all licenses for the construction, operation and fueling of atomic establishments for the production of electric power.

"We oppose the granting of private patents on discoveries made with Government funds, in the past or the future, directly or indirectly, and we urge compulsory licensing of all patents affecting the use of this great resource. No private monopoly should be permitted to jeopardize the domestic welfare and national security.

We urge that preference in the purchase of electric energy generated as a byproduct of the atomic energy program be given to public bodies and cooperatives. Section 44 should be so amended.

We urge amendment of the bills to empower the Atomic Energy Commission to construct and operate or license any other Federal agency to construct and operate electric generating facilities, and that preference in the purchase of electricity generated in such facilities be given to public bodies and cooperatives.

We deplore the attempt to use the Atomic Energy Commission to open the way for invasion of TVA by the private power companies via the so-called Dixon-Yates contract, and we urge both Houses to amend the Atomic Energy Act to specifically forbid the signing of such contracts.

We urge the Congress to recognize the vital importance of this wholesale revision of the Atomic Energy Act; that the Congress recognize that S. 3690 and H. R. 9757 are primarily electric power bills; and that the rights of the people to the full benefits of their investments of $12 billion be recognized and safeguarded against monopolistic restraints and exploitation, through licenses, patents, subsidies for atomic fuel, and any and all other devices.

J. E. Smith, *President*
(For the Board of Directors of National Rural Electric Cooperative Association).

A Breath of Fresh Air

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM C. LANTAFF

OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 22, 1954

Mr. LANTAFF. Mr. Speaker, all of us in the Congress are familiar with pressure campaigns directed at us at various times to vote for or against various types of legislation. We all know too well that ofttimes the originator of a communication does not have the slightest idea about the details of the legislation he is advocating or opposing but is merely writing his Congressman as requested by some national lobby or group which has directed our constituent to follow that course of action. It was, therefore, a refreshing experience for me to receive an honest and frank telegram the other day from the mayor of Miami, Fla., the Honorable Abe Aronovitz. I should like at this point to insert in the Record Mayor Aronovitz' telegram, which was to me like a breath of fresh air:

Miami, Fla., *July 19, 1954.*

Hon. William C. Lantaff,
United States Congressman from Florida, Washington, D. C.:

I have just received a telegram from Randy H. Hamilton, director, department of Federal affairs, American Municipal Association, reading as follows:

"Federal-aid airports House Representatives agenda Monday. Wire Congressmen support Preston amendment providing $22 million."

I don't know Randy H. Hamilton or anything about the Preston amendment and certainly I do not know the sentiments of the citizens of Miami concerning such amendment. I do know, however, that many telegrams coming from mayors will probably arrive as a result of this kind of pressure. I refuse to join in any pressure which may be brought upon Congressmen because I believe it to be detrimental to Federal, State, county, and city governments. I believe elected officials, including Congressmen should resent any such pressure because they as well as other human beings should be able to analyze and use their thinking processes and because, if such pressure is continued, the Nation will spend itself dry.

Abe Aronovitz,
Mayor of the city of Miami, Fla.

Valedictory by Vasilike Athanasoulas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 22, 1954

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following valedictory by Miss Vasilike Athanasoulas, Bartlett Junior High School, Lowell, Mass., graduating class of 1954, on June 14, 1954:

"Work Done Squarely

"The longer on this earth we live
And weigh the various qualities of men,
The more we feel the high-stem featured beauty
Of plain devotedness to duty.
Steadfast and still, nor paid with mortal praise.
But finding amplest recompense
For life's ungarlanded expense
In work done squarely and unwasted days."
—*Lowell.*

Honored guests, teachers, parents, friends, the world today is in the midst of a troublesome and critical cold war. In this atomic age, nations and peoples are growing more restless and are arming themselves at a far more terrifying rate than that of the last world war.

The United States, the greatest democracy of the world, the leading defender of the rights and liberties of free nations and our Western civilization, is facing many serious and international and domestic problems.

The leaders of our Nation as they look toward the future turn to the youth of our country to have our "work done squarely," to be strong, to work for the peace of the world, and at the same time to be prepared to defend our American way of life. Therefore, we, the youth, have a great responsibility and a serious challenge before us, perhaps, the greatest in the history of America.

In general, we have advanced in science, medicine, literature and historical research. For this forward movement, America is proud of her scientists, scholars, and industrialists, who lead in the field of Atomic research and in the development of products beneficial to mankind.

As we ponder this great challenge history presents to our generation we are grateful to those who have prepared us for it.

To you, our teachers, we, the graduating class of the Bartlett Junior High School, have been extremely fortunate to have you as our teachers. You have kept pace with the progressive moves of your profession in our times. It is, indeed, a fact, that you are shining examples of good, able, and efficient teachers. For years you have distinguished yourselves by your patience, your "devotedness to duty," and your "work done squarely." You were always ready and willing to stimulate our immense curiosity and thirst for knowledge. You have accented the true meaning of fair play, understanding, teamwork, cooperation, and stressed the importance of moral values which will provide us the means to combat ignorance and bigotry. You have helped us to choose our reading wisely, and now under your able guidance we enjoy reading. This has become for us pleasuresome, entertaining, while at the same time we find that with proper reading we shall develop mentally and morally and thus become better citizens. We are now realizing that what we read is in a considerable degree responsible for making us what we are.

Therefore, please accept our most sincere thanks, appreciation, and deep gratitude for the solid foundation in education which you gave us, the graduates of 1954 and which will help us greatly whether we pursue our education in the higher institutions of learning or step out into the work of the world.

To you, our parents, at these most pleasant moments of our Bartlett School days, your eyes and attention are focused on us. Your love and affection penetrate our hearts and thoughts and fill us with pride. Your hearts are filled with joy and happiness of realization that your hopes and dreams are somewhat fulfilled, while all the while you cherish even greater dreams for our future. From our childhood days you have made countless sacrifices for our sake, to grant us the best life possible. You have done your utmost to provide us with all things necessary for a good life, providing for our physical welfare but never forgetting the necessity of instilling in us the best family traditions and the moral value of a wholesome life that would tend to mould our hearts to be virtuous and inspire us to be fine characters. This character building on your part, indeed, shall be the foundation of the success we may achieve in our future education, and later the business profession of our choice.

From the bottom of our hearts, we thank you most sincerely for all that you have done and may do for us in the future. To all of you, I wish and pray that the years ahead bring the fulfillment of your fondest hopes and dreams for the future of your sons and daughters.

Classmates, for us this day becomes a solemn occasion. For today draws to a close the period of perhaps the happiest moments we have spent together, several years now. During this time we have developed most sincere, wholesome, and we hope, lasting friendships. Even as we depart, I am certain that some of our relations shall continue; but whether they do or not we shall never forget the binding ties that Bartlett School has cemented.

As we part this day and take leave of our beloved school it is fitting that we praise and honor our teachers for their splendid work. Let us never forget their example and as we journey through life constantly refer to their inspirational teachings and seek to apply them in our lives. Let us pledge ourselves to our principal and teachers to do out utmost to bring credit and due honor to the Bartlett School wherever we go and whatever we do.

We pledge you, our principal, teachers, and parents, that in the path of our life ahead with its challenges and difficulties we will follow the straight road with devotion to our duty. We shall not hesitate or tremble, but with patience, perseverance, and faith in moral values we will try with all our means to be a success in the business, profession, or occupation of our choice. And, finally, we will strive to become better citizens of tomorrow for the benefit of our city, State, Nation, and the world.

In concluding, I wish everyone good health, happiness, success in all your endeavors, and the fulfillment of your hopes and desires.

I bid you all good night, to our school, goodby, and pray that God bless you all.

But Not Ireland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 22, 1954

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, an editorial recently appeared in the San Francisco Examiner commenting on the attitude of Sir Winston Churchill toward the application of his statement that free peoples, divided against their wills, should have free elections to regain their unity. Mr. Churchill made it very plain that Ireland was not included. Hence I ask, "and why not Ireland?"

The London Parliament divided Ireland in 1920, although it was opposed by the entire population of Ireland at that time. The partitioning of Ireland has been the pattern used in partitioning Germany, Austria, Korea, and now Vietnam. Mr. Churchill believes that it is wrong for other nations to divide and partition free nations, but somehow it is right for Britain to enforce partition in Ireland. If partitioning of a free nation is an evil, and none will deny that it is, then why not root out the evil at its source, namely, in Ireland.

Idealistic statements make excellent reading, but leave their hearers unimpressed when the ideals are not to be applied equally and forthrightly. So long as partition continues as a prototype in Ireland it is folly to mouth platitudes about the evils of partition elsewhere. If Mr. Churchill means what he says, if he would leave one outstanding act of integrity in diplomacy as a memorial to his name, then let him initiate the removal of the nefarious border in Ireland and bring about the unity of this country, which more than any other is geographically and ethnically one. When Ireland is united, then and then only will we be able to put confidence in the statements of Mr. Churchill and give credence to the musical mouthings of pleasing platitudes with which his speeches ring.

The argument in favor of the unity of Ireland is so well set forth in the editorial of the San Francisco Examiner, that I desire to make it a part of these remarks. The editorial reads as follows:

BUT NOT IRELAND

For a sardonic commentary on the practical application of an ideal, we call your attention to the reaction of Winston Churchill to a suggestion that the partition of Ireland be put to a vote in a free election.

One of the points in the declaration coming out of the Washington meeting of President Eisenhower and Sir Winston was that they would seek to achieve unity in free nations divided against their will by free elections supervised by the United Nations.

If such an election were held, the 26 counties of the Irish Republic would, of course, vote overwhelmingly to end partition.

But the interesting thing is this: There is a strong feeling also against partition in the six countries of northern Ireland, which is part of the British Empire.

As we understand it, and we think our facts are right, about 35 percent of the people of northern Ireland are against partition. When you come to the border counties, the people of Armagh and Fermanagh are preponderantly against partition, as also are the people of the southern half of County Down and the western half of County Tyrone.

So Cahir Healy, Irish Nationalist Member of Commons, worked the squeeze on Mr. Churchill the other day. Would he support the principle of free government for countries whose people wanted it, asked Mr. Healy?

Certainly, said Sir Winston.

Well, continued Mr. Healy, would he undertake to apply the principle to Ireland?

He would not, said Sir Winston, the terms of the principle were not applicable there.

It is curious, sometimes, what happens when ideals and self-interest meet.

As Good as Any Man

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. BONIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 22, 1954

Mr. BONIN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to pay tribute to the firm owned by Bill Betterly in Wilkes-Barre, as portrayed by the July 1954 issue of the American Legion magazine. The article clearly illustrates the caliber of the men employed by the owner and the type of person he is who has given these disabled veterans a life of their own.

Bill Betterly deserves not only a big hand and much encouragement in his venture with these men who have served us, to their own physical detriment, in our world wars but, to the veterans themselves, should go our thanks for the minds which have overcome physical disabilities to prove that where there is a will, there is a way. Our Government should assist this firm which is capable of turning out first-class work on Government contracts.

The article follows:

AS GOOD AS ANY MAN

When a man goes to work for William A. Betterly in his factory at Wilkes-Barre, Pa., two things are understood. First, the man is a disabled veteran because Bill Betterly hires no one else, and second, he is expected to do as good a job as any man can do.

Handling Government contracts to make such things as parachute bags, Bill Betterly's plant has tough competition. Even though he has to give his men on-the-job training, the Government gives him no preference, and time and again contracts have been lost to concerns which do nothing for the disabled.

Given a job to do, Bill Betterly's men can compete with any corresponding number of able-bodied workers. And they are paid accordingly. In a community where jobs are hard to get, Betterly's minimum pay is $1.10 an hour. This does not, however, imply that once a veteran goes to work for Betterly his future is secure. It is made clear to him at the start that he gets no special treatment—no babying—and if he can't measure up he's through. More so than the boss, other men working at the plant get this idea across to newcomers.

It's pretty strong medicine to some men, particularly those who have had no responsibilities of their own since the time they were wounded, but in virtually every case it's extremely effective. As Bill says:

"The thing these fellows want most is a chance to prove they've got what it takes."

There's another rule, also based on his belief that the greatest favor you can do for a disabled veteran is to prove to him that he can stand on his own two feet. This rule is that if a vet gets a better offer elsewhere, he has to take it.

"We don't want any of our men getting the idea that this is a club where they can spend the rest of their lives just because they've been injured."

Bill sounds very gruff when he says this, but somehow the gruffness doesn't ring true. Those who know him well point out that less than 4 years ago, when he was trying to get enough capital to get his factory going, he had to borrow money for a bus ticket to Washington.

Today the factory is running smoothly, giving work to many veterans who otherwise would be languishing in hospitals or at home. But when contracts are up for negotiation, Bill Betterly gets the same haunted look he must have had when he boarded that Washington bus.

Unified Ireland Essential to National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 22, 1954

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, one of the most strategic positions in the world today is Ireland, sitting as it does where it may be used as a base to protect the Atlantic shipping lanes, so essential to our national defense.

It is essential to our ability to defend ourselves that this strategic bastion be strong; and to be strong Ireland should be unified.

Whereas the United States cannot force the unification of Ireland, we can lend our great influence to that achievement. One way to accomplish this would be for the Congress to reaffirm the position taken by the 65th Congress in 1919, when we supported the right of the people of Ireland to determine the form of government under which they desire to live.

We can do this by passing the Fogarty resolution, which has long been pending. A discharge petition has been filed to bring the Fogarty resolution before the House. I was one of the first Members to sign this petition. I urge my colleagues to sign it, so that we may place the prestige of the House of Representatives behind a unified Ireland, which would be of immeasurable benefit to our national security.

Hazleton, Pa., Operation Bootstrap Welcomes New Superior Sleeprite Plant

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. BONIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 22, 1954

Mr. BONIN. Mr. Speaker, Hazleton, Pa., is an example of what an American community can do for itself. Rather than simply mourn the decline of the anthracite-coal industry in the region and witness the atrophy of their hometown, the people and commercial enterprises of Hazleton, through subscriptions of their own funds and their own efforts, have set out to convince American industries that their community offers the advantages of location, sources of supply, markets, transportation, and labor that business seeks; and one of the country's fastest expanding and progressive manufacturers, the Superior Sleeprite Co., has been convinced of the advantages of a Hazleton location and has built there a new plant employing some 200 workers.

The United States Chamber of Commerce has studied the impact of a new industry on a community. According to these studies, a new plant employing 200 persons, such as Superior Sleeprite does, will add 676 to the population, 234 new households, 344 employed persons, and 124 school children. It adds 6 new retail concerns, 330 new car registrations, 92 truck and bus registrations, and 108 new residence telephones. In addition, it increases retail sales by $750,000. Truly, Hazleton obtains help by helping itself; we have made our own industrial revolution.

Appended hereto are telegrams of congratulations on the opening of the new Superior Sleeprite plant from Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON, Secretary of Commerce Sinclair Weeks, Secretary of the Interior Douglas McKay, and Secretary of Labor James P. Mitchell, as well as new stories from the Hazleton Standard-Sentinel and the Hazleton Plain Speaker, marking this event:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *June 10, 1954.*
DR. EDGAR L. DESSEN,
President, Chamber of Commerce,
Hazleton, Pa.:

It is a great pleasure for me to extend my greetings and congratulations to the greater Hazleton Chamber of Commerce and to the Superior Sleeprite Corp. as its new modern factory building is officially dedicated on June 11. It is in the finest American tradition of local initiative and ingenuity that you have inspired community effort to meet the challenge of a secure economic future for the greater Hazleton area rather than rely solely on State or Federal financial aid. Such a courageous demonstration of the vitality of our free enterprise system and of the determination of our people to solve their own problems is deeply reassuring to all Americans. I am confident that Wendell Barnes, who is with you on this occasion, and who is doing such an outstanding job in Washington with the Small Business Administration, will effectively convey our admiration and best wishes for many years of continued and successful productivity.

RICHARD NIXON.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *June 11, 1954.*
DR. EDGAR L. DESSEN,
President, Greater Hazleton
Chamber of Commerce,
Hazleton, Pa.:

I am delighted to learn of success of your "Operation bootstrap," symbolized by dedication today of new plant of Superior Sleeprite Corp. The achievements of your organization and community leaders in developing new industry in Hazleton and making jobs in your area are an inspiring example of how friends and neighbors, through co-oprative teamwork and imaginative endeavor, can solve their own local problems. The companies which have responded to opportunities in Hazleton are demonstrating their faith in America's future. Heartiest congratulations to you all.

SINCLAIR WEEKS,
Secretary of Commerce.
WASHINGTON, D. C.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *June 11, 1954.*
EDGAR L. DESSEN, M. D.,
President, Greater Hazleton Chamber of Commerce, Hazleton, Pa.:

Regret exceedingly previous commitments prevent me from being with you today for dedicating of new Superior Sleeprite Building.

This occasion is a concrete demonstration of what an American community can do for itself. The establishment of an industry in Hazleton which will provide additional jobs is a significant event not only for the local community but is an indication that the anthracite area is prepared to meet these changing times with courage and vision.

I hope the dedication of the Sleeprite Building is but the forerunner of similar occasions in the future and I trust that I will have the opportunity to participate in some of them.

DOUGLAS MCKAY,
Secretary of the Interior.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *June 8, 1954.*
DR. EDGAR L. DESSEN,
President, Greater Hazleton Chamber of Commerce, Hazleton, Pa.:

Hazleton can be proud of the communitywide effort which today is paying such a splendid return in more jobs for its people. It is by the kind of united effort you have made that we built our country. The manner in which Hazleton has faced its economic problems demonstrates that our strength resides in the initiative and enthusiasm of local communities. Your success should serve as an example to other communities whose industries or resources have declined. You may be sure that I shall continue to watch with interest your efforts to attract new employment opportunities to Hazleton.

JAMES P. MITCHELL,
Secretary of Labor.
WASHINGTON, D. C.

[From the Hazleton (Pa.) Plain Speaker of June 9, 1954]

NEW INDUSTRY RESULT OF LATEST EXPANSION BY DYNAMIC FIRM—GROWTH OF SUPERIOR SLEEPRITE SINCE 1931 BASED ON OWNERS' PIONEERING IN BEDDING FIELD—FIRM STARTED WITH 17 EMPLOYEES—WORKERS NOW TOTAL OVER 2,000

When Hazelton's newest industrial plant is opened Friday by the Superior Sleeprite Corp., the event will mark the latest expansion of a dynamic firm which has grown steadily in 23 years from small beginnings to a position of leadership in the furniture and bedding manufacturing field.

Born in 1931—in the darkest days of the depression—Superior Sleeprite started with 17 employees and today numbers over 2,000 workers in its 5 factories, not counting the new plant on Hazleton Heights.

Notwithstanding the depressed economical conditions which attended the birth of the new firm, Superior Sleeprite prospered and earned a reputation for sound, wise business management.

CREDIT DUE OFFICIALS

More than a little of the firm's success is due to the merchandising-sales ideas of its president, Harry M. Shore, and the production and manufacturing know-how of Frank Wallen, secretary-treasurer and production member of the "management team."

Mr. Shore's program of direct selling to bedding and furniture retailers gained recognition for the well-designed and constructed products and quality materials used while Mr. Wallen's development of outstanding Sleeprite products gave the firm a merchandising ability which spelled success.

FAMOUS PRODUCTS

Among the well-known products developed and patented by the firm are the 3-in-1 chair-bed, space-saving chest-o-bed, the trio-bed, usable as either a twin-bed ensemble, bunkbed, or trundle beds.

The Sleeprite products are shown at permanent displays in New York, High Point, Chicago, Los Angeles, and San Francisco as well as at seasonal furniture and bedding markets throughout the country.

MADE METAL BEDS

Superior Sleeprite started corporate existence in Chicago, Ill., on March 1, 1931, as manufacturer of metal beds. Plant area occupied was aproximately 10,000 square feet, and personnel totaled 17.

In 1933 production was expanded to include metal furniture. In that year and the following, personnel grew to 40 along with the expansion of production.

Acquisition of larger facilities in 1935 and the further expansion of lines to include the manufacture of bed springs was begun. The new plant occupied 20,000 square feet, and again personnel was increased. The years of 1936 and 1937 saw additional increases in plant size and manpower to 50,000 square feet and 135 employees. During those years plans were made to round out the bedding lines by addition of a mattress-manufacturing department.

MARK NEW ERA

A new era in the firm's progress began in 1938. The new mattress department went into operation in new facilities requiring an expansion to over 100,000 square feet and 155 employees. With the new mattress line available, Superior Sleeprite could now offer an unusually well balanced line of products, and even small home furnishings retailers at comparatively long distances from the plant could do business economically with the firm through across-the-board purchases on carload basis.

The year of 1940 saw Superior Sleeprite pioneer "Hollywood" bed (no footboard) ensembles for the mass market. This required expansion of the boxspring department and addition of headboard manufacturing facilities further increasing plant area and employee strength. This year also saw the start of a strong line of dual-use furniture such as sofa beds. This line has ultimately expanded to include upholstered hi-risers, sleepers (overnite'rs), and sleep-chairs (TeVeChair-Beds).

PRODUCT EXPANSION

Thus, in the 10 years from 1931 through 1941, Superior Sleeprite grew from a plant of 10,000 square feet employing 17 persons to a plant total of 240,000 square feet and over 700 employees. Productwise, it was expanded from the manufacture of metal beds to include bed springs, folding cots, bunk beds, mattresses, box springs, studio couches, hi-risers, metal headboards, upholstered headboards, "Hollywood" beds, sofabeds, sleepers and sleepchairs. Metal furniture includes hospital, hotel, and institutional furnishings.

During World War II years, the considerable facilities of Superior Sleeprite's metal working departments were turned to the production of products for Quartermaster, Medican, Ordnance, VA, Maritime, Navy, Aviation and other governmental agencies. Mess equipment, ship's berths, hospital equipment, antiaircraft accessory housings, aircraft maintenance stands, precision parts, cargo truck bodies, and many other types of products were produced in voluminous quantities to fill vital needs.

POSTWAR GROWTH

Postwar years saw war-delayed plans for additional manufacturing units on the west coast and east coast completed. A new plant was opened in New York in 1945, and another new plant in Los Angeles in 1946. These new facilities brought total plant area to 625,000 square feet and a new high in number of employees of well over 1,000 persons.

In 1950, metal working production in Chicago was moved to the 200,000 square feet building at 2320 South Halsted Street. In 1952 bedding production facilities were consolidated in the 245,000 square feet building at 759 South Washtenaw Avenue.

Total plant area now is almost 1,000,000 square feet with an employee strength of approximately 2,000 persons, which does not include the new Hazleton plant.

[From the Hazleton (Pa.) Standard-Sentinel of June 12, 1954]

SECOND INDUSTRY REVOLUTION FINDS HAZLETON IN THE LEAD, IKE ADVISER SAYS AT DINNER—MANY CHANGES IN FUELS HAS FORCED AREA TO LOSE ONE-PRODUCT ROLE

Few Greater Hazletonians who have watched the events of the past 13 months leading up to yesterday's gala opening of the new Superior Sleeprite Corp., plant, considered the city as being in the forefront of a "second industrial revolution."

But that belief was expressed last night by the chief small business spokesman of the Eisenhower administration during the dinner for Superior Sleeprite guests in the Hotel Altamont.

It was Wendell B. Barnes, Chief of the Federal Small Business Administration, who told the 300 dinner guests that acquisition of this new plant puts this area on the very firing line in this second resolution in American industry based on diversification. He noted that Hazleton, especially, has a unique position in relation to both the first and second industrial revolutions.

The first, Barnes said, came about when machines took the manufacture of goods from the handicraft workers in the home and placed it into large factories where thousands came together daily to turn out marketable products. One of the greatest boosts for this magic transformation in the United States of the 19th century was King Coal, which drove the machines with unmatched power.

DISCUSSES OTHER FUELS

"Now other fuels and other modes of powering machinery have come along," Barnes said, "and are supplanting coal." It is little wonder that Hazleton, in the heart of the hard-coal producing area, feels the sagging economy of such a basic industry, he said.

Yet with the opening of plants such as Superior Sleeprite's new one on Hazleton Heights, Hazleton now becomes just as prominent in the second industrial revolution aimed at diversification as it was prominent for decades in producing the coal that drove the mechanical giants of Yankee industry.

"Some may give in to repinings that today cannot be as good as the good old days when coal was still king of fuels," he admitted. "Coal is largely giving way to fuel oil just as wood gave way to coal. Fuel oil is being pressed by natural gas, even now, as a fuel for factories. And just over the horizon, one can see the successor of all fuels for heavy uses raising its uranium-crusted head—atomic energy."

Barnes also noted that history has taught "almost anything is due to be supplanted by something else—cheaper or better, or easier to handle. In the case of Hazleton, it is meeting its second industrial revolution like any sensible community and diversification."

MULTIPRODUCT COMMUNITY

Hazelton—so long famed for a single product—now is branching out to become a multiproduct community, Barnes said. This is all by way of recognizing that change is the law of life. Hazleton is wisely not fighting inevitable change but is going along with the change. It hurts like fury at first," Barnes warned. "It's not easy. But once the changeover takes place, then everything thereafter is on a sounder basis and becomes progressively more easy."

Turning to the continued need for industries making something new and better, Barnes reported that in all the time before 1946, American industry spent a little more than $4.6 billions on organized research. But in the last 8 years, industry has spent $9.5 billion on research—"more than double the amount for the previous 170 years."

This has been matched in Government, Barnes said, by the fact that since 1946, Uncle Sam has spent twice the amount for research than he did in all the time prior to 1946.

After the main meal was served in the hotel, Harry M. Shore, Superior Sleeprite president, and Frank Wallen, corporation secretary-treasurer, joined in cutting the 100-pound cake baked by John Feeko in the shape of the new plant.

REMARKS BY OTHERS

Extensive remarks were made by: Albert S. Roistacher, assistant general manager of the National Association of Bedding Manufacturers who said he knew of the value of Superior Sleeprite to the bedding industry but never dreamed of the uplift the new firm will give the greater Hazelton area.

Adm. William M. Behrens, deputy State secretary of commerce, who extended the welcome to Pennsylvania to Sleeprite in behalf of Gov. John S. Fine.

Joseph Kallick, Superior Sleeprite sales manager, who pledged renewed effort for his bosses, Shore and Wallen, and for this new venture in Hazleton with business to keep the plant operating.

And by President Shore, who noted that some had questioned his plans for expansion this year but who reaffirmed his confidence that the new operation will be successful. He credited hard selling for the growth of Superior Sleeprite and he confided in his guests that if the future demands that type of selling, his organization is ready to do that, too.

MANY CONGRATULATIONS

Dr. Edgar L. Dessen, Greater Hazleton Chamber of Commerce president who served as toastmaster, read expressions of congratulations and hopes for success from a large group of national and State figures in Government and in the bedding and furniture industry.

He also introduced chamber officials and opening day committeemen.

Just before 10 p. m., the dinner ended and the guests were joined by several hundred others in the Capitol Theater to hear a 1½-hour concert by Phil Spitalny's All-Girl Hour of Charm orchestra. A special number for Superior Sleeprite was presented.

Before the first number, The Battle Hymn of the Republic, Chamber Executive Director Thomas N. Stainback introduced men prominent in the Superior Sleeprite project and President Shore presented a $500 check to Miss Jane Paul, Miss Superior Sleeprite Queen. Robert T. Wagner, chairman of the queen contest, presented these other awards:

GIFTS TO THE QUEEN

To the queen: Shoes, the Bon Ton; lingerie and nylons, Jay's; blouse, Hyman's; skirt, Debs, dress. The Darling Shop; bathing suit, Lauderbach's; playsuit, B. Levin Furs; hat, The Leader; bag and belt, Wears'; evening gown, Deisroth's; jewelry, Engle's and Landau's, and two return bus tickets to Atlantic City, Martin's Kids' Shop and Delite Sales Co.

To Agnes Piccino and Jeanne Veglia, the ladies in waiting—8 by 12 colored portrait, Cal Pane Studio; complete make-up analysis and cosmetics and gift, Ceil's Gift Shoppe; jewelry, Morris Square Deal Jewelry Store; and electric hair dryer, Cerullo's Electric Supply Co.

To each of the four other finalists—blouses, Judy Carol Shoppe, and necklaces, Ripa's Jewelry Store.

Once Was Too Often

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD T. MILLER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 22, 1954

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, approximately 6 years ago, the 80th Congress was winding up its work. The accomplishments of that Congress had been outstanding. The 80th Congress had provided adequate national defense; balanced the budget; paid billions on the national debt; given substantial relief to the overburdened taxpayers; reversed the trend of inflation; eliminated price controls and many of the wartime measures that had hampered and harassed business. It enacted over Presidential veto the Taft-Hartley law, which was to bring about vastly improved labor-management relations; initiated the investigations which landed Alger Hiss and other traitors in prison and led to the exposure of grafters, petty chiselers, and purveyors of special privilege.

The 80th Congress set up the Hoover Commission and laid the groundwork for a more economic and efficient government, and exposed to the white light of public opinion the recipients of mink coats and deep freezers.

In spite of this outstanding record, accomplished in the face of fierce opposition on the part of entrenched bureaucrats and selfish politicians, the New Deal-Fair Deal partisans and left-wing pinks began a smear campaign which labeled the 80th Congress a "do-nothing Congress," and the "second worst" in the history of the country.

False as were these charges, long and continued repetition sufficiently confused the thinking of enough voters to send down to defeat many fine Members of that Congress. The result was a change in legislative leadership, disastrous to the American people and to the Nation. Once again we were turned back on the road of deficit spending to such an extent that to this date we have not been able to achieve a balanced budget.

Members of the 80th Congress, absorbed in the needs of the moment, failed adequately to inform the people of the splendid record of accomplishments. This failure cost our country dearly. Already the same left-wing forces and political adversaries have initiated a similar smear against the present Congress.

We cannot afford a similar catastrophe in this year of 1954. It behooves us to rise above modesty and to proclaim proudly and loudly to the American people the story of the great accomplishments of this 83d Congress in cooperation with the present administration. We should see to it that the rank and file of American citizens are acquainted with the legislative performance of the past 2 years; legislation designed to advance President Eisenhower's program for the building of a stronger America where every citizen has reason for bold hope, where effort is rewarded and prosperity is shared.

We should point out that under this program the Nation has not been engulfed in the depression so glibly forecast by the prophets of doom. Over 62 million people are gainfully employed; in 1953 the gross national production amounted to a billion dollars a day; inflation has once more been checked; over $12 billion was saved during the first 17 months of this administration out of the planned spending of the last administration. The biggest tax cut ever made in the history of this or any other country—nearly $7½ billion—was effected this year and dozens of inequalities and inequities in the tax laws have been wiped out by the first general overhauling in 78 years. This Congress has enacted the most far-reaching Federal-aid highway program in history; abolished over 200,000 unnecessary Federal jobs; increased unemployment compensation coverage; expanded hospital construction; ended the tidelands controversy and restored the offshore lands to the States.

It has moved to get the Government out of competition with private business, and provided for the sale of the federally operated synthetic rubber industry. The groundwork has been laid for revising the atomic energy law, looking to peaceful application of scientific developments.

A new Hoover Commission has been set up and 12 reorganization plans adopted in the interest of greater economy and efficiency. Laws have been passed making it possible more effectively to combat communism and subversion at home. Successful prosecutions and deportations have greatly increased the hazards of treason and subversion, and more than 2,400 security risks have been eliminated from Federal jobs. Great improvements and increased benefits have been provided in broadened social security. A constructive agricultural program has been enacted, including a plan for a $1.3 billion farm surplus disposal abroad. Veterans benefits have been increased and our armed services and national defense streamlined and strengthened giving us more security for less money.

Mr. Speaker, I have mentioned only some of the headlines. The 83d Congress has made an outstanding, brilliant and constructive record, second to none.

We should make these facts and accomplishments clear to the American people. This Congress has been guided by the same leadership which led the 80th Congress. The greatest mistake made then, I believe, was the failure to make clear to the American people what had been performed. We must not repeat this mistake. It was so expensive that once was too often.

State Department Says Coffee Supply Situation Not Quite as Good as It Seems To Appear

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 22, 1954

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I wrote to Secretary Dulles on June 14 and inserted that letter on page A4638 in the Appendix of the RECORD of June 24, under the heading, "Will Our State Department Oppose Formation of a New Coffee Cartel?" In that letter I asked what steps the Government of the United States is taking to discourage the formation of a rumored cartel to hold up coffee prices and also what steps it was taking to persuade Brazil to abandon its recently established minimum export price of 87 cents a pound for green coffee at Brazil which would mean $1.50 a pound coffee for consumers.

The following reply from Mr. Morton was signed at the State Department that same day, June 24, and reached me several days later. I think anyone who saw my insertion in the RECORD of June 24, in all fairness will want to read the reply, which is as follows:

JUNE 24, 1954.

HON. LEONOR SULLIVAN,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MRS. SULLIVAN: I have received your letter of June 14 protesting the continuance of high coffee prices and stating that the statistical supply position does not warrant existing price levels. As you are no doubt aware, the President has requested the Federal Trade Commission to make a full study of the coffee situation and the Department has cooperated with the Commission in obtaining data required from foreign posts. It is my understanding that the report will be issued within the next month, and that it will provide an analysis of the factors underlying the increase in prices. It is the Department's belief now, as it was when I wrote you in January, that the basic factor is the tight supply situation which became evident in December 1953, and which may be expected to continue through the 1954–55 crop year. Undoubtedly speculation has also been a factor, as traders have sought to profit from anticipated shortages.

With reference to the statistical position, I should like to give you the latest information from the United States Embassy in Rio de Janeiro, which will corroborate, with slight amendment, the information given you previously, and which the Department of Agriculture states is in agreement with its latest releases insofar as Brazilian supplies are concerned.

Confusion arises from the varying bases on which data relating to Brazilian coffee are released. The Brazilian Government's official figures relate to registrations. From this figure our Embassy derives an estimate of coffee available for export by deducting estimated consumption in Brazilian port cities, which averages between 800,000 and 900,000 bags. The United States Department of Agriculture publishes, in addition, an estimate of total production which is obtained by adding to the official Brazilian registration figure the quantity estimated to be consumed in the interior of Brazil and never registered for shipment to port. This is generally believed to be about 3 million bags, but there is no way to substantiate this figure statistically.

As stated in my previous letter, the Embassy at Rio reported in January that it had reduced its estimate of the supply available for export from the 1953–54 crop from 15.6 to 14.1 million bags. It estimated total registrations at that time at 15 million bags and total crop at 18.1 million bags. The New York Times report, which you cite as stating that registrations for the year actually totaled 15,049,000 bags, proves that the Embassy's January estimate was exceptionally accurate. If 900,000 bags are deducted from the registration figure for port consumption in Brazil, the supply available for export out of this year's production was 14.1 million bags.

The Embassy forecast at that time that exports could nevertheless be maintained at approximately the same figure as in 1952–53, i. e., 15 million bags, by reduction of the year-end carry-over from 3 million bags in June 1953 to 1.9 million bags in June 1954. The latest report from Brazil states that late registrations have pushed the crop estimate up to 18.3 million bags, registrations to 15.2 million bags and exportable surplus to 14.3 million bags. The estimate of exports has dropped from 15 million bags to 14.5. If June exports do not bring the total above this level, carryover will approximate 2.7 million bags. It would appear that the high prices currently prevailing are tending to limit exports, and may help to ease prices in future months. Mr. Brewer's article in the New York Times, to which I believe you refer, is somewhat misleading in comparing the value of Brazil's May exports with the monthly average for the year. May is alway a low month, coming as it does at the end of the harvesting season. The value of Brazil's coffee exports in May 1953 was, roughly, $30 million as compared with $27 million this year.

The Department has requested further information from the Embassy at Rio with regard to the decree recently issued in Brazil establishing a minimum guaranteed price for coffee. The Embassy was instructed by the Department on June 4 to inform the Brazilian Government that the decree was likely to be interpreted in the United States as an attempt to peg the price of coffee, and that if world prices fall below the established minimum and Brazilian coffee is withheld from export there would be a strong reaction on the part of consumers in this country. The Brazilian Government could, of course, maintain prices to growers at a fixed level and meet world prices in export markets through payment of a subsidy to exporters, as the United States does under its wheat program.

You refer in your letter to a New York Times report that influential Brazilians are attempting to set up, in concert with other Latin American coffee-producing interests and nations, a cartel to keep prices at present levels. The article by Mr. Brewer states, "It is widely felt here that it would be a good idea for the coffee-producing countries to reach an agreement to protect their interests." He does not state that an agreement has been reached, or that the Government of Brazil or any other country has given its support to such a proposal. I believe that all responsible elements in the coffee trade of Latin America realize that a cartel to maintain prices would be self-defeating, since it would encourage competition from Africa and other areas which are becoming increasingly important competitors. It is natural that coffee traders should indulge in wishful thinking with regard to maintaining high coffee prices. However, the coffee shipper who is quoted in Mr. Brewer's article referred to the fact that "when prices rose after the United States removed price ceilings, Colombia had not rushed to take this advantage but has used the situation to increase her sales." This has been the reaction in all coffee-producing countries. Some have actually oversold, and been obliged to import to meet domestic consumption requirements. The fact that coffee has moved regularly to market, and that stocks are at record low figures suggests that cartel action, if present, has not been very effective. The Federal Trade Commission's report will undoubtedly cover this aspect of the coffee situation. If, at any time, information comes to the Department's attention which suggests that a cartel is operating in coffee to the disadvantage of United States consumer interests, it will place all the facts at the disposal of the Federal Trade Commission.

Sincerely yours,

THRUSTON B. MORTON,
Assistant Secretary
(For the Secretary of State).

Mr. Speaker, some later facts tend to contradict some things in Mr. Morton's letter. Coffee exports from Brazil in June, as well as in May, were substantially below normal according to the New York Times of July 11—apparently as a result of buyer resistance among importers to what by then had clearly begun to look like an artificially high price based on a shortage which had not actually existed. The Associated Press reported on July 6 that Brazil finished its 1953–54 coffee season June 30 with "unexpectedly high carry-over of nearly 3,100,000 bags" of 132 pounds each. It also reported that the Brazilian Coffee Institute has had to start buying up coffee to maintain the 87-cent minimum price for exports, "and it is feared that more will have to be purchased."

In this connection, I note from Mr. Morton's letter, the American Embassy in Brazil was instructed by the State Department on June 4 to inform the Brazilian Government that the 87 cent a pound minimum price decree "was likely to be interpreted in the United States as an attempt to tag the price of coffee, and that if world prices fall below the established minimum and Brazilian coffee is withheld from export, there would be a strong reaction on the part of consumers" in the United States.

The State Department further pointed out, and I think it is right on this point, that "the Brazilian Government could, of course, maintain prices to growers at a fixed level and meet world prices in export markets through payment of a subsidy to exporters, as the United States does under its wheat program."

That is the whole point, Mr. Speaker, of my protest over the minimum export price established by Brazil—a minimum price, which is just about the highest price exporters have ever received for their coffee at a time when the coffee market was going wild in anticipation of a shortage which never developed. If it is a case of supporting the price of coffee as we support many of our farm prices, then the Brazilian Government, it seems to me, should foot the bill for that kind of farm-welfare legislation and not force the American consumer to pay such an artificially high price.

I include as part of my remarks, the Associated Press report of July 6, entitled "Coffee Carryover High in Brazil," and also the New York Times article of July 11 entitled "Brazil Is Facing Dollar Shortage":

COFFEE CARRYOVER HIGH IN BRAZIL

RIO DE JANIERO, July 6.—Brazil finished its 1953–54 coffee season with an unexpectedly high carryover of nearly 3,100,000 bags, according to figures released today by the Brazilian Coffee Institute.

The high amount is expected to put additional pressure on the Government of Brazil to modify its minimum export price of 87 cents a pound. This price has been criticized by exporters and the local press here as unrealistic.

The coffee institute has already made some purchases of coffee to support the price and it is feared that more may have to be purchased.

[From the New York Times of July 11, 1954]

BRAZIL IS FACING DOLLAR SHORTAGE—LACK OF EXCHANGE LAID PARTLY TO RECORD COFFEE PRICE SET BY GOVERNMENT

(By Sam Pope Brewer)

RIO DE JANEIRO, July 10.—Brazil is on the verge of a critical shortage of dollars partly because of the record high price for coffee established by the government as a minimum.

The price move has been widely criticized as self-defeating.

Various elements have combined to cause the dollar shortage. One qualified source estimates it will be $80 million below the budget estimates by the end of this month. Data are not available to assess the relative effect of the different causes. But one of the important factors is that coffee exports in May and June to the United States were far below normal.

The Brazilian Government fixed the minimum export price for coffee as from July 1 at 87 cents a pound and guaranteed to buy at the cruzeiro price equivalent to that. The immediate reaction was a decline in demand in the United States and a drop in price. Thereupon Brazil began buying ahead of schedule through the Brazilian Coffee Institute on June 24 and managed to hold the price up. The action did not stimulate exports.

DECLINE ABNORMALLY LARGE

Official sources said that a drop in volume during May and June—the last 2 months of the export year—was normal. That is true, but this drop was abnormally large.

In May, for example, only 487,412 bags were exported, compared with 600,000 last year and 800,000 in 1952.

June shipments were even lower than those in May.

Qualified observers here say Brazil probably will be able to coffee up to the 87-cent level for the duration of the 1954–55 crop, which has just begun to move, but that forced reduction is likely the following year.

Meanwhile, there is a continued shortage of dollars that are badly needed for gasoline and diesel oil, for wheat, and for equipment and materials to keep the industry operating and developing. There is no apparent hope of making up the deficit this year.

Colombian and other coffee producers took advantage of the abnormally high price set by Brazil. They are reported to have unloaded all available stocks at prices below the Brazilian minimum, though Colombian and some other coffees normally bring a higher price than Brazil's.

A comment in the newspaper Diario de São Paulo noted that Brazilians laid themselves open to a charge of trying to work on two different standards. The move in the United States by Senator GUY M. GILLETTE to block possible speculation in coffee was denounced in the São Paulo State Legislature by Deputy Hilario Tarloni as "an act of economic aggression."

Senhor Tarloni said any such move was "a breach of promises made by John Foster Dulles in Caracas." He charged that at the 10th Inter-American Conference in Caracas in March, Secretary of State Dulles had "offered the Brazilian delegation explicit guaranties concerning the State Department's policy on Brazilian coffee." Diario de São Paulo, one of the important chain of newspapers owned by Assis Chateaubriand, carried comment that "anybody who comes out [as Brazilians did last February] in favor of free markets cannot consider falling prices as the work of speculators and rising ones as signs of sympathy with Brazil."

It added: "It is already exceptional that coffee and cacao should have maintained and even increased their prices while, tin, copper, zinc, wool, and cotton have taken considerable drops compared with 1952 and 1953."

BRAZILIAN PROTESTS CITED

Brazil has protested against price fixing and cartels in wheat and other commodities, this article reminded readers, but wants to set a fixed high price for coffee.

The strongest criticism, however, has been on the ground of economic expediency; that setting the minimum price too high will weaken Brazil in the world coffee market.

The influential independent newspaper Correio da Manha of Rio de Janeiro has attacked the new minimum price bitterly, remarking that "at the moment when coffee reaches the highest point in its history our Government ties it to a maximum price that it calls a minimum." It said the price was to temptingly high that coffee was being planted on land that would not give even marginal returns, and that "increasing production while decreasing productivity is economic retrocession." This leading editorial concluded that the Government was trying to sustain the cruzeiro "or rather hold off its inevitable collapse" by propping it up with coffee and that result would be disastrous.

"If coffee is not bringing in the foreign exchange forecast in the budget," it said, "the fault is not with coffee but with those who made the estimate."

There is much criticism along the lines that the excessively high price will continue to hurt sales and favor other producers. But the move is generally considered to have been primarily political, to please a large group in an election year, and there is no likelihood of an early change.

GI Bill Pays Off

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 22, 1954

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a very truthful statement which appeared in today's issue of the Boston Post, Boston, Mass.:

GI BILL PAYS OFF

Recently we commented upon the official report from Washington which showed that the GI bill passed 10 years ago providing funds for the GI's to go to college had paid off handsomely. By aiding the GI's to obtain a higher education, the fund had thereby raised hundreds of thousands of men into occupations where they could earn higher incomes and thus pay higher income taxes. It was estimated that the increased taxes thus received, would, over a period of a few more years, more than pay the entire cost of the Government expenditure.

Now this report on education is supplemented by another showing that this same GI bill, through another provision, has made possible government loans in small amounts to veterans planning to enter businesses of their own. Between the time when the bill was signed 10 years ago and last May 25, the latest count showed that 213,964 loans had been made involving a total of $576 million.

These loans enabled many of the GI's to build up profitable businesses which have paid large sums in taxes. So the Government aid has not only repaid the GI's in some part for their military service, but has also made a "profit" of a kind for the Government.

Texas State Fair To Present Agriculture Show Stressing Research

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 22, 1954

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, farmers in my State of Texas are becoming increasingly aware of the great value to them of sound work in the field of agricultural research. Pointing up this awareness is the announcement that the theme of the agriculture show at the 1954 State Fair of Texas—the biggest State fair in the world—will be research for Texas agriculture.

I ask unanimous consent that the announcement, as published recently in the Dallas Times-Herald, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the announcement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESEARCH THEME OF STATE FAIR 1954 AGRICULTURE SHOW PLANNING

Research for Texas agriculture will be the theme of the agriculture show at the 1954 State Fair of Texas, October 9 through 24, General Manager James H. Stewart announced Monday.

Elaborate exhibits will reflect the research conducted by the agricultural experiment stations of the Texas A. & M. College system, which has cooperated closely with the State fair in working out the unique and educational show.

The 12 A. & M. extension districts of the State each will have an individual exhibit, depicting how research has contributed to progress of the particular type of agriculture practiced in each region.

The district displays also will show how Texans as a whole are affected by regional research problems and their solutions. A huge central exhibit will portray the overall statewide picture.

For example, the Panhandle exhibit will show how research has scored a victory in the production of better wheat, which in turn makes possible a better loaf of bread.

The role of research on cotton growing, mesquite control water conservation and management, beef production, soil improvements, rice-pasture farming, and pasture development will be illustrated.

Forage production, dairying, sheep and goat breeding, parasite control, and range management also will be portrayed in their relation to research.

How agricultural research has helped Texas housewives get more for their food dollar in everything from fruits and vegetables to broiler chickens will be shown.

And one of the exhibits will be devoted to the role of research in forestry and the manufacture of forest products for better living.

The 12 district exhibits will demonstrate research in the following regions of Texas: The Panhandle, south plains, rolling plains, north Texas, northeast Texas, the Big Bend, Edwards Plateau, heart of Texas, Piney Woods, south Texas, gulf coast, and the Rio Grande Plains.

Prairie View A. & M. College will have an additional exhibit with the research theme.

Four-H Club demonstration teams will present daily programs as a feature of the 4-H exhibit which will be a part of the agriculture show.

Foreign Policy of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH E. FLANDERS

OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 21, 1954

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, our colleague, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], delivered an exceptionally fine speech at Colgate University last week. The Senator from Kansas, who is a member of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report of the Congress, spoke on the subject How Realistic Is Our Economic Policy? He set forth in clear perspective the program of the President of the United States to improve our economic relations with other countries, to the advantage of this country and to the peace and security of the world.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the speech of the Senator from Kansas be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW REALISTIC IS OUR ECONOMIC POLICY?

(Speech by Senator FRANK CARLSON, of Kansas)

Those who planned this series of discussions are to be commended for having phrased our subject this evening in terms of the realism or the practicality of our foreign economic policy. By limiting ourselves to the question of how realistic our policy is, we are spared the necessity of debating the details of an ideal policy—that is, the kind of a policy which we might feel was appropriate and which we might hope to pursue in a more stable, friendly world.

We are spared also the necessity of going over the pros and cons of free trade or protectionism. These are issues upon which untold speeches have been made in the United States Congress and the debating forums for decades. They are issues upon which honest differences of opinion exist, and probably will continue to exist for many more years. By focusing our attention upon the question of realism, we may be saved from much of the traditionalism and emotionalism which so frequently intrude when tariff policy is discussed.

In discussing the realism of our foreign economic policy, we must, of course, have some meeting of minds upon our policy objectives, at least in a general way. For this purpose, our objectives may be stated simply. Our aim is to maintain domestic prosperity while advancing the concepts and ideals of freedom and peace over those of the nationalistic, authoritarian philosophers. I take it that we can all agree that the theme of this series of conferences, Economic and Political Stability in a Free World, is itself a pretty good statement of objectives.

Foreign trade policy is so inextricably a part of overall foreign policy that we must judge its realism by the contribution which it makes to stopping the advance of totalitarian ideologies. In part that means keeping ourselves and our economic system strong and ready. In part it means winning, meriting, and keeping strong allies.

Paradoxical as it may sound, the first plank in our foreign economic policy is, therefore, to keep the American economy sound, dynamic, and progressive in itself. There are two reasons why this is important.

First, we all know that our economic system is being tested in the minds of hundreds of millions of people in the uncommitted parts of the world. While we in the United States are thoroughly sold on the free capitalistic enterprise system as the best and most productive way of organizing our economic resources, it is a basic dogma of communism that our system won't work. It is destined, they say, to stagger through successive economic instabilities and finally collapse, all because of the very freedom of choice which it permits.

The fact that that dire prediction has been propagandized about the world means that we cannot, in the sight of the rest of the world, afford marked deviations from full and productive employment at home. The struggling and less-well-off parts of the world watch and carefully weigh what our system offers compared to the achievements and, doubtless even to the promises, of the communistic system. The so-called new look in Russian economic policy, aimed at permitting a higher level of domestic consumption, is but a part of a calculated Soviet program designed to match the appeal of American plenty.

Another reason why domestic stability is so important to international stability comes from the sheer size of the role which the United States has come to play in the world picture.

While the United States has only about 5 percent of the world's population, we produce well over 40 percent of the world's output of goods and services. The Randall Commission on Foreign Economy Policy estimates that the United States alone generates perhaps as much as two-thirds or more of the world's flow of savings. This has made it possible for us to become the world's greatest exporter of capital and the world's greatest creditor nation. In 1952, our exports amounted to over 20 percent of the total world export trade and our imports to about 15 percent of total world imports. In some of the raw-materials fields our share of the world total is much larger.

While merchandise exports at present constitute only 5 percent of our national income, in many of the countries with which we deal the importance of export markets is much larger. As a consequence, any drop in our imports tends to have a much greater depressive effect upon the economy of those countries whose trade with the United States represents a relatively large proportion of their total national production. Under the circumstance, it is not surprising that, until quite recently, it had become almost trite to say and believe, as the London Economist once observed, "When America sneezes, the sterling area catches pneumonia."

While, as we shall see later, the recent decline in American business has not yet produced the dreaded foreign repercussions, all will agree that domestic policies calculated to keep us from sneezing or catching cold here at home are basic elements in any realistic foreign policy.

In the interests of keeping the domestic economy on a reasonably even keel, the Federal Government in the Employment Act of 1946 recognizes its responsibility for doing all that Government, under the free enterprise system, can do to aid in preventing a major economic depression. At the outset, we recognize that the Federal Government cannot guarantee employment for everyone. Nor does it guarantee that economic recession can never overtake us. As Americans, we value our individual liberty and the free-enterprise system much too highly to accept the promises of a Government which would assure everyone of a job at the cost of becoming an essentially slave state.

The responsibility which the Federal Government has under the Employment Act is, nonetheless, a positive responsibility and not merely passive resistance to economic fluctuations. The Government's role consists in creating an economic climate conducive to dynamic growth and a rising level of living. Its role consists in keeping open the incentives and opportunities for private business, labor, agriculture, and consumption.

Over the past year we have had in the United States a slackening in the rate of industrial production and a rise in the levels of unemployment. In keeping with its responsibilities, the Federal Government's program in recent months has been to strengthen and develop the so-called built-in stabilizers, and otherwise seek to encourage the private economy to take over as the Government's direct contribution in the form of defense purchases declines.

We have put into effect the largest tax cuts ever made in a single year, and are working on the first overall study and revision of our tax laws in more than a generation. This has been done with an eye specifically on reducing the impediments to private investment as well as to broadening the consumption base. We have at the same time pursued an aggressive policy of monetary and credit ease. Thus far the program appears to have been quite successful. It is perhaps too soon to say that all of our worries about recession can be dismissed. But it is safe to say that the readjustments in economic tempo which we have thus far undergone are perhaps no more than should have been expected as we move from a booming wartime and defense economy to a more stable growth pattern.

That the free world countries have benefited by our success in holding our domestic decline within narrow bounds can hardly be disputed. It is true, of course, that their own improving strength has also contributed. That improvement is one of the most gratifying elements in the recent world picture. Happily, such recession as we have experienced has not brought on the pneumonia nor the calamity abroad which was predicted and feared. There are several reasons for this.

Thanks to our policy of helping to rebuild the strength of the Western European countries, monetary and economic conditions there are today better than at any time since the war. The need for monetary discipline seems better understood and more generally accepted. In most countries inflation has been checked and the currencies are today fortified by larger reserves. During the first quarter of 1954, foreign gold and dollar assets increased another half billion dollars, continuing their uninterrupted growth since the second quarter of 1952. The buildup of industrial capacity in Western Europe is paying off in increased production, providing a broader base for their stabilization efforts and relieving their dependence upon us. As a result of the improved economic health abroad, the other free world nations are trading more and more with one another.

Any larger degree of recession here at home might well have dampened or overwhelmed these developing strong points in the free world situation. As it is, the experience of 1949, 1937, and 1929 has not been repeated. This time our slump has not precipitated new currency troubles abroad with a new round of devaluations and trade restrictions. Whatever the complex of causes may be, the contribution to the strengthening of the Western World which our aid policy has made in the past, and our steps limiting the recent economic decline here at home, must clearly be characterized as realistic and pragmatically successful.

In its international aspects our foreign economic program consists of four major parts. In a message to the Congress on March 30, President Eisenhower summarized the interrelated objectives of foreign economic policy, citing: "Aid, which we wish to curtail; investment, which we wish to encourage; convertibility, which we wish to facilitate; and trade, which we wish to expand."

In the furtherance of these objectives, the President recommended, among other things, that the Trade Agreements Act be extended for 3 years with amendments authorizing selective, planned reductions in existing tariff rates over the 3-year period.

Now, under our system of government, it is the President's responsibility to recommend programs to the Congress. But it is equally the responsibility of the Congress to weigh these recommendations and to modify and adapt programs in an atmosphere of legislative compromise. The President has recommended a good program. The fact that the Congress has seen fit at this time to enact something less than the President's original program in this area—an area in which personal and political viewpoints have traditionally differed widely—should not be interpreted as a rejection of the objectives of that program. In terms of the suggested four-part program there is little fundamental disagreement, although men do differ as to the ways and as to the speed with which the ends may be achieved. The Congress itself did not have time enough during the present session to give the proposals the full study which they deserve.

It has, nevertheless, been charged that the 1-year extension of the Reciprocal Trade Act, as voted by the Congress, will prove disturbing to the foreign nations. It is said that they are thereby left in doubt as to the sincerity of our asserted long-run interest in freer world trade and lowered trade barriers all around. While recognizing that a longer term extension of the act might have relieved some of this uncertainty, we also have a right to expect our foreign friends to take a realistic attitude on the subject. This program has already gone on for two decades. No matter what happens to the legislation, not a single trade agreement heretofore negotiated has or will expire until it does so under the terms of the agreement itself. Our allies in the free world have, moreover, had repeated demonstrations of the sincerity of our concern for their survival and well-being.

We in America, of course, understand and are proud that the ways-of-democracy allow time for discussion, time for considering opposing views, and time for majority opinion to crystallize and express itself. Our friends overseas must recognize this. In the nature of things this country is somewhat less dependent than certain other countries upon world trade. An appreciation of that fact helps also to explain some of the slowness and hesitancy with which we move toward lowered tariffs.

After all, we, too, have a right to be disturbed and fearful at some of the restraints to free production and distribution which we see persist in other friendly nations in their internal as well as international commerce. Curtailment of cartel practices, less resistance to measures making for greater productivity, acceptance of improved distribution methods would be welcome evidence on this side of sincerity and good faith on the part of others in the free world.

Returning to our long-run objectives as outlined by the President, the recommendation less aid, more trade is clearly a proper and desirable plank in foreign economic policy. Just as aid for postwar reconstruction has, in large part, given way to military aid, we all look forward to a time when military strength abroad will have been built up to a point where a reduction in the direct costs of military aid can be expected. At that time the present tendency toward a statistical balance between our exports, exclusive of grant-aid, and our imports may be upset. Our total exports of agricultural products and manufactures will then be reduced unless we replace military aid by some other forms of grant-credit or increase our acceptance of imports as an offset to increased commercial exports. Military aid is clearly the counsel of realism today. But by the same token the counsel of realism for the future dictates that we give thought now to the manner in which we wish to bridge the gap which the end of Government-supported military shipments may bring.

Realistically and ideally the answer is easy; we should then and now do everything we reasonably can to permit the free nations to earn their own way. That means that we must recognize that for every buyer there must be a seller. If we would be sellers, we must also have buyers—buyers who can afford to buy.

Granting that there is a large element of coincidence in the magnitudes, it helps to clarify our thinking about international trade to note that in 1952 grain exports from this country were approximately $1.5 billion, while coffee and cocoa imports—products which we do not produce—amounted to approximately the same figure. Superficially stated, we were trading bread for coffee. Our cotton exports ran something over a billion dollars that year. In exchange, we received shipments of tea, burlap, hemp, silk, diamonds, rubber, and tin aggregating almost the same in dollar amounts. Although one hears a great deal of objection to the imports, we exported more dollars' worth of petroleum and petroleum products than we imported. We imported some meat products, it is true, but exported almost the same amount of other meat products. These figures help to demonstrate that international trade, like all trade, is not a unilateral action but a 2-party transaction.

But, a moment's thought will also show how impractical a reliance on simple bilateral deals would be. Coffee dealers in Brazil would not and could not have taken all of our exportable grain. Instead, they followed the easier, commonsense way of selling their coffee for dollars, and then used the dollars to buy what, and when, and where they pleased. Our exporters of coal would find their problems greatly multiplied if they were forced to take cane sugar directly in payment. And yet, in terms of amounts, that is substantially what happens. The process is simply facilitated by throwing all of the trades into one trading account in which the transactions of private enterprises are cleared through triangular or broad multilateral trade.

Traditional American thinking about international trade often falls short of being realistic in our prepossession with the importance of exports and still more exports. We are rather proud and only wish that we could do better than export 23 percent of our tractor production, 12 percent of our agricultural machinery production, and one-sixth of our production of motor trucks and coaches. The substantial part of our agricultural production which goes into the export market will be cited later. But we cannot go about seeking world markets for our surpluses, either agricultural or manufactures, and at the same time hope to insulate our home markets against imports.

There can be no question but that the problem of adjusting ourselves to increased imports in certain lines does bring hardship and injury to specific, local segments of our domestic economy. We should not for a moment belittle or decry the plight of the pottery and glass workers of the Ohio Valley, who find employment curtailed due in part to sizable imports. Nor can we ignore the plight of the watchmakers, the clothespin makers, the bicycle workers, the toy producers, or the coal miners. But it would be entirely wrong to assume that their difficulties arise solely because of imports. Industries are often sick from a complex of causes so that the elimination of competitive imports, no matter how appealing, is not necessarily an easy, sure cure for the problems confronting a depressed segment of the economy.

While one cannot help but feel great sympathy for the problems of the workers in every depressed industry whatever the reason for distress, let us look more closely, for example, at the case of the workers in the bicycle-producing plants in the United States. If we, by tariff restrictions, discourage those who prefer foreign-made bicycles from buying them, we run the risk of cutting off employment now created elsewhere in our economy, let us say, by the export of 16 percent of our office appliances, or the employment attributable to 35 percent of our production of rolling-mill machinery. It is a hard economic and political choice. Would we be better off to undergo loss of employment among those of our people who now make tractors for export, or among those who produce chinaware for the domestic market?

It if were possible for us to look beyond the immediate displacements, the choice is, happily, less painful and difficult. It is not always easy to convince reluctant minds that the indirect and diffused gains from freer trade are important. It can be demonstrated, however, that anything which contributes to a more effective use of the resources of the free world will contribute to a higher level of living in this country. In the long run there is thus little doubt but that the best policy would be to create new jobs for those who might be displaced. That can best be done by maintaining an efficient, dynamic, and growing domestic economy. By taking advantage of the savings available on goods produced with comparatively greater efficiency abroad, we can add to our own comforts while keeping open the opportunities for added domestic employment in other industries. We would not then need to undergo unemployment but might, indeed, increase our aggregate employment as well as our flow of goods and services.

From the realistic standpoint, the challenge to our economic statesmanship and political sagacity is one of avoiding ill-considered and carelessly selected reductions in import duties which bring about serious and undue injury. There are, nevertheless, areas in which trade can be liberalized with a minimum of hardship. The discovery of those areas is a task for the Executive agencies and the Congress.

It was suggested last winter, for example, to the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, of which I am a member, that we might consider tariff reductions and the encouraging of imports on such items as those in which American goods already have heavy export markets—for example, automobiles—or those in which the imported goods sell in the American market at prices higher than the competitive American-made products—for example, briar pipes or fine cameras. In other cases, if it can be demonstrated that American industry and enterprise has clearly failed to keep abreast of foreign competition in quality, style, and cost, it may well be decided that continued tariff protection is unmerited.

Realism in foreign policy always, and especially today, calls for a blending of domestic programs with our interest in international security. Nowhere is this need more apparent than in the field of agriculture. Export markets have long been of vital importance to our farm population. In recent years we have exported 40 percent of our cotton and rice, one-third of our wheat, and a fourth of our tobacco and lard. About 30 percent of the value of farm marketings in 1952 were dependent to a highly important degree upon the export markets.

If there is any problem in the country today to which we must face up realistically, it is the problem of agricultural surpluses and the need for long-run adjustments. Our great agricultural productive capacity ought not to be in the position where Government nonrecourse loans and storage bins constitute an indispensable part of the market for the farmers' products. One way in which we can try to solve the problems of excessive crops is by setting up Government domestic price-support programs with their inevitable costs in the form of regulation, regimentation and often, in the end, surpluses taken off from the free market with the proceeds of Federal tax receipts. Another way in which to attack the problem would be to help the cotton and wheat and pork farmers to regain a part of the lost foreign market for their products. The best way to do that is to make it easier for foreigners to buy American agricultural products.

Given the extraordinary efficiency of our domestic capacity to produce agricultural commodities, there is a temptation to produce large quantities even if we must resort to export subsidies and dumping to get rid of excesses beyond domestic needs. There are undoubtedly opportunities of negotiating nonmarket distributions of these surpluses in various parts of the world. But our earnest quest for mere disposal abroad, outside regular market channels, must not blind us to the greater merits of private multilateral trade as a long-run solution. Dumping, export subsidies, import quotas, exchange controls, state trading of agricultural, as well as other, products are almost certain to bring retaliation. In the end they are likely to prove injurious to those whose interests lie, as does the American farmers', in expanding the world export markets.

Since we have been talking so much about realism as an objective of policy, a statement of the alternative solutions for our agricultural surplus problem may perhaps help us to recognize the best alternative. We have, first, the unattractive choice of reducing production—in a measure going out of the agricultural business—to a level which just covers domestic consumption plus an irreducible minimum which our customers abroad will take under the worst conditions. We have the choice of spending Government funds to buy and hold any agricultural surpluses. We have the choice of giving the surpluses away or what often comes to the same end, lending foreigners the goods or the money with which to buy them. We have the choice of helping foreigners to earn the necessary dollars with which to buy the products by trading with them, and increasing our own imports of those products they produce relatively more advantageously than we can. To state the alternatives is to point the way. There is no necessary conflict between realistic foreign trade policy and the objectives of our domestic farm policy. But we ought to choose the course which will place maximum reliance on the free markets while assuring the farmer of a deserved and relatively stable income.

As a supplement to the freer flow of trade in raw materials and manufactures on year-to-year account, we have also a considerable interest in encouraging private investment abroad. Realistically viewed, the contribution of private investment to expanded international trade is likely to be modest in any short run. Only over a decade or period of years will its impact upon world production and trade be fully felt. Its greatest contribution lies in the help which it affords economic growth in the recipient country. While this is of great economic significance, in the world of today it has a political and strategic significance as well. It is clearly to our self-interest to raise the level of living in underdeveloped areas of the world as one way to hold the masses in these countries from going over to the Communist philosophy.

On the side of the domestic economy, direct foreign investment serves to finance an immediate increase in exports of machinery and investment goods. If our Nation is to accept its place as a comparatively rich creditor, we must not, however, think only of the exports which flow from new investments. We must welcome the earnings which those investments produce over the years. When our debtor offers to pay interest or repay principal we must not slam the door in his face by effectively barring the import of the products which he has. It is one thing to make successful investment commitments abroad and be content, as we often have been in the past, to plow back or reinvest the rewards on the spot. But a part of our objective lies also in the expanded flow of trade freed from distrust and international barriers.

If we are going to regard foreign investment solely as a way of dumping excesses in production, we will be doing more harm than good. We must recognize that investments mean closer family ties among the nations. We must expect that the success of our investments abroad will add, not only to the wealth of our friends, but to our own national wealth and the flow of goods and services. If we are to achieve that end, we must accept responsibility as the leading creditor nation and behave like a creditor, not raising our hands against payment when the borrower tries to service the investment and make the payments due to us.

The fourth point in our minimum foreign economic program, as outlined by the President, is our wish to encourage currency convertibility. Government controls which restrict the convertibility of one nation's currency into that of another directly affect—and are affected by—the volume of world trade and investment. These in turn affect the world peace and unity. In recent months the free world has made great steps forward in restoring currency convertibility. The Dutch have relaxed their curbs on capital transfers, while the British have widely extended the areas and the products for which payments may be made in scarce sterling. We are apparently approaching the time when sterling balances may be transferred into dollars at will. This progress—an outstanding feature of the free world's gains in recent months—has been made possible by the generally improved conditions in Europe which we have already noted.

The problem of dollar convertibility is but another way of expressing the need which we have already mentioned—of our buying enough from foreign nations so that they may have dollars available in sufficient quantity to purchase American export products commercially.

When other nations were compelled to hoard and conserve their limited supply of dollars, all sorts of quotas and government intervention in the free market economy inevitably came about. The fact is that the discriminatory controls which foreign countries use to restrict purchases from us are in themselves evidence of their desire to take more United States exports if we will but let them pay for them. They are evidence of a suppressed demand for United States goods and services.

Our interest in freer trade and freer convertibility is well illustrated in a recent case where the shortage of dollars has caused repercussions directly upon American employment.

A recent issue of the London Economist tells of an outstanding American corporation which decided to build its machines in England because the overseas markets for its product threatened to be closed to its United States production for lack of dollars in the hands of would-be purchasers. By shifting manufacturing operations to England, the machines may be sold for sterling. The name of the company is well known as the largest maker of its type of machines in the world. I shall not mention the name here since one of the sad commentaries on tariff discussions is that we are so easily diverted by specific local hardships and forget the national good.

The employees of this particular company suffered directly from the fact that, as a Nation, we had failed to buy sufficient products from the rest of the world to enable them to acquire the necessary dollars to buy our products. The factory in question came into full production in England in 1949. Its exports have risen more than 10 times since then and more than 70 percent of those American-designed machines, produced in England, are being sent to Canada, the company's largest single export market. Now, we regard Canada as a very attractive market for American exports. The employees in the American plant which was making the product for export have, in effect, been displaced by English workers and a portion of our traditional market lost. By our reluctance to accept imports in sufficient quantity, we have cut the world off from the opportunity of earning more dollars, and by cutting off the supply of dollars have, in this case, increased employment abroad at a cost of declining employment in one of our outstanding domestic industries. Certainly our policy would have met the test of realism better in this instance had we reduced tariffs on articles which can be produced more efficiently and cheaper in Great Britain than here, instead of throwing American workers out of employment in a field in which we have the great comparative advantage.

By way of summary, we can do no better than quote a few sentences from the President's foreign economic policy statement of March 30. In that statement he said:

"The United States stands ready and able to produce and sell more than the rest of the world can buy from us. The inability of many foreign countries to buy our goods in the volume we would like to sell does not arise from any lack of desire for these goods. * * * Instead it arises out of the inability of these nations to pay—in dollars—for the volume we have to sell.

"Dollar grants are no lasting solution to this impasse. * * * The solution is a higher level of two-way trade. * * * Greater freedom from restrictions and controls and the increased efficiencies which arise from expanding markets and the freer play of economic forces are essential to the attainment of this higher trade level."

In judging our economic policy, we must test it by the degree to which it results in this higher level of two-way trade. Its realism must be measured by the extent to which it helps in breaking down the restrictions and impediments which have handicapped the free world economy in the postwar period. On this basis I am sure we must conclude that a great deal more can and should be done. It may be that a bolder program would have accomplished more in less time.

On the other hand, the world changes which have made the United States the world's leading economic nation have come upon us comparatively recently. We have, moreover, a long tradition and, if you will, a great many pressures to overcome in order to keep pace with our new responsibilities. If we accept this domestic tradition as a part of the milieu in which our policy must today be formed, we are inevitably driven to the conclusion that our overall program is indeed highly realistic, no matter how much it may fall short of being ideal.

Radio Commentary on Senator Capehart

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 22, 1954

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Congressional Record a commentary by Tris Coffin on radio station WWDC in Washington, July 21, about my colleague, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Capehart].

There being no objection, the commentary was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

A Gallery Glimpse

The Senate of the United States is a crucible—like a furnace running with melted ore in the steel mill. Into the Senate are poured a variety of men fresh from the hopes of the voters, farmers and lawyers and bankers and schoolteachers. Many of them never measure up to the hopes of the voters. Perhaps our standards are too high.

This is the story of one of the few who have been molded in this crucible into true steel. He is Homer Capehart, the Senator from Indiana.

I first saw him 20 years ago—a big, robust, two-fisted, red-haired product of free enterprise; a smalltown boy who made his fortune by sweat and willpower and shrewdness. Then he began looking around curiously for new worlds to conquer. Capehart, as a businessman, was annoyed in the free-style, vigorous way of redheads with what he thought were excessive curbs on business by the New Deal.

So he jumped into politics like a kid jumping off a high dive—with a big splash. He sponsored a cornfield conference of Republicans. I covered it as a reporter. It was hot and dusty and full of the blare of politics. But it had a wonderful effect on the then faltering Grand Old Party in the Midwest. It was a shot in the arm.

Ten years ago, Homer Capehart was elected to the United States Senate. He was a trump card for the GOP leaders in the Senate—an independent businessman, deep and sure-voiced, with the temper of a redhead and the face of a cherub, who fought the administration with a zestful scorn.

Today, 10 years later, Homer Capehart has been fused into true steel. He is an independent Senator who thinks and acts for the good of his country, based not on the cloakroom whisper of a political leader, but his own judgment. He has a mature point of view—based on not what is good for just one section of our economy, but for all. He looks beyond the hue and cry of the moment to the effect on tomorrow.

Now, Senator Capehart sits like some benevolent monarch in a committee room listening to the troubled conscience of the get-while-the-getting-is-good housing tycoons and the problems of the little people. There was among the latter a Negro employee of the United Nations in New York, a bewildered and troubled Navy veteran—both done out of money by suede-shoe, glib-voiced salesmen for gyp home repair companies. The salesman would come to the small home owner and say: We've picked your home as a model to advertise our great new product backed by your local bank and the FHA. We'll sell it to you at cost and give you $50 on the sale of this service to every home in a 3-mile radius. All you've got to do is sign on the dotted line. Too, there is testimony of huge housing developments where profits flowed like whisky at a class reunion.

It is a sorry story—of loopholes in the law that Congress refused to cover up year after year, of a Government agency too bureaucratic to fight injustice, of banks that didn't care whether the money they loaned went to gyp joints, of business men who would do anything to get a buck.

Homer Capehart, in the few glimpses I had at these hearings, showed a quiet compassion for the little people and a sense of outrage for the gyppers.

At one lull in the hearing, he set his jaw firmly and said, "We're going to get to the bottom of this."

More power to him.

Texas Farmer Proves Worth of New Ideas in Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 22, 1954

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, a Texas farmer named Clinton Harbers has been much in the news in my State recently because of his success with some farming methods which have greatly increased production from his land.

An editorial in the Taylor (Tex.) Times, one of our State's outstanding weekly newspapers, throws light on some of these methods. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

It's Worth a Trip Down

The Times from time to time has commented on the success of a cotton farmer down below Smithville is having with some newer ideas of farming.

There isn't any printed set of rules you can tack upon your wall and follow with results that your land will produce a bale to 2 bales of cotton to the acre, or 6,000 pounds of maize, 80 bushels of corn to the acre, but this farmer, Clinton Harbers, has pioneered some methods which we predict will be used widely in a few years.

Working with land not as good as lots of land in Williamson County, Harbers in 7 years has made his land over, so to speak. Chiefly he has done two things: (1) Built up the fertility; (2) increased the water-holding capacity.

His neighbors ask him how for example he can afford to leave a fourth of his land out of production a whole year while he grows Hubam clover on it. His answer is that he could leave a fourth of it out 6 years and still make more than he was making before he started his program. The first year he farmed his land produced less than a quarter of a bale to the acre. Last year it produced a bale and three-quarters to the acre. This year, even though he hit a drought, he's going to make at least a bale to the acre. Furthermore, while he fertilizes, he doesn't get his fertilizer costs out of line with his profits. Last year he netted $211 an acre on his cotton land, and in his costs he figured everything, including the total expense of making the crop, the expense of planting vetch on his land ahead of the cotton, the cost of depreciation of equipment, etc.

Harbers is a public-spirited young man, he doesn't mind explaining his methods, even though last year over 3,000 people visited his farm.

It's worth a trip down there to see his system, but as a suggestion, we suggest a large group of farmers get together and go at the same time, rather than a few at a time, so he could explain to all of them at the same time. The soil conservation district here is planning such a trip, and we believe it's worth a real effort to get scores of farmers to go. Watch for the planned date, and make up your mind now to go down.

Williamson County's real wealth is in its land, and that land can be made to produce a lot more than it is, in dry weather or wet. We'd like to see a real drive made to get a large number of Williamson County farmers to hear what Clinton Harbers has done.

We have examined his methods, and there aren't any bugs under the chips down there. He has done what he has done without any oil money, without a business in town, etc. He did it by hard work and some pioneer thinking, and any farmer in Williamson County can do the same.

How Low Can You Get?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 22, 1954

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an editorial entitled "How Low Can You Get?" published in the Marion Chronicle, of Marion, Ind., on July 13, 1954.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

How Low Can You Get?

The other day we were tempted to write an editorial commenting on the low moral tone to which officials of the New and Fair Deal Government had descended during the era when they were in power and had undisputed authority over our money, and therefore, more or less, of our habits, our persons, and our fortunes. But we didn't think it a very good subject until there were more developments and therefore fortunately abstained.

The abstention was worth while, for it remained for a beneficiary of the New and Fair Dealers to reach the height of something or other when one told United States Senator Homer E. Capehart he (the Senator) "was shooting off his mouth" as the Hoosier solon, chairman of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, continued to probe into scandals in the Federal Housing Administration which he said will make Teapot Dome, the RFC, and those of the mink-coat era "look like a Sunday school."

Senator Capehart made the statement after a New York builder testified he reaped a $2,700,000 "windfall profit" (an unearned profit) on a big apartment project. Capehart said he believed the FHA "participated in a grand scandal involving millions and millions of dollars."

It was at that point that Gustave M. Berne, operator of Rockaway Apartments in New York, testified that FHA knew builders were reaping in high windfall profits on the multibillion postwar apartment-house program.

Whereupon a lawyer, George I. Marcus, representing his client, Sidney Sarner, vice president of the Linwood Park Apartments, Fort Lee, Va., right under the nose of the national headquarters of the FHA, told the Hoosier Senator, "You are shooting off your mouth." Immediately thereafter he invoked the fifth amendment, whereby an accused person is exempted from testifying against himself by a constitutional provision.

This is not only a new low in standard of morality; it is a new low in defying a Senator, the distinguished head of an important Senate committee. Senator Capehart has no compunction or mercy in ferreting out the swindles perpetrated against the American people and taxpayers. He knows they have been swindled and he knows that they pay their taxes out of the sweat of their brows, and he knows how that feels. But this distinguished man, this United States Senator from the State of Indiana, is told by a pipsqueak lawyer, that he "is shooting off his mouth" when he proceeds in an investigation, long belated, participated in by many rich politicos of the Roosevelt-Truman era, when violation of the law was tolerated, even invited, and when morals were of no more import than an outgrown adage in an antiquated textbook.

How low can you get? How brazen? How corrupt? How insensitive to the tenor of American public and private life? How long will Americans pay taxes to have them squandered as they have been? Where is the stopping place? Who will say, "It is here and now"?

The Men's Apparel Industry of Philadelphia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. DUFF

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 22, 1954

Mr. DUFF. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record a statement I have prepared on the men's apparel industry of Philadelphia.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Statement of Senator Duff

For two and a half centuries, the men's apparel industry of Philadelphia has served the Nation in peace and in war. In this year of its auspicious 250th anniversary, I take this opportunity to salute its long and continuous production record, an event which is being commemorated in cities all over the country and which is being given official recognition in the largest city of my own Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

Long before our forefathers met in Philadelphia to found this great Republic, the American clothing industry came into existence in a few small shops on the shores of the Delaware River. In the intervening centuries it has developed into a $200,000,000-a-year industry, providing work for 10 percent of the entire industrial labor market of the Greater Philadelphia area.

There is not a city, large or small, through the vast expanse of our land, where Philadelphia-made men's apparel is not sold. The industry's progress and prosperity has been tied in closely with the national economy. Its harmonious employee-employer relations, uninterrupted for a quarter of a century has provided a happy pattern for all other industrial areas.

This industry provided uniforms for General Washington's army and in every war in which our country has since engaged. Its peacetime production has grown in step with the development of our Republic and today, as it observes its 250th birthday it is at the peak of its quality production.

It is a record of which this industry is justly proud and I hope all Americans will join in my sincere salute to the men and women who have made it great and to Philadelphia which nurtured so well its growth.

Utilization of Scientific Manpower in Connection With Selective Service System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH E. FLANDERS

OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 21, 1954

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record a letter to the editor of the New York Times, written by Thomas H. Chilton, chairman of the engineering manpower commission of the Engineers Joint Council. The letter is a timely comment on the present attitude of the Selective Service System regarding the deferment of those with specialized skills or training, and illustrates that we are failing to obtain the maximum utilization of our sicentific manpower.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Deferring Specialists: Maximum Utilization of Nation's Scientific Manpower Urged

(Editor's Note.—The writer of the following letter is chairman of the Engineering Manpower Commission of Engineers Joint Council.)

To the Editor of the New York Times:

I want to express my substantial agreement with your editorial which appeared in the issue of June 28 entitled "Scientific Manpower" and your statement that "the concept of equality of sacrifice must yield to the basic security needs of our Nation."

Your editorial states, however, that the draft authorities are under great pressure to eliminate every possible deferment because of the relative shortage of physically qualified young men available for military service. May I say that I interpret the facts quite differently.

A cursory examination of the statistics will indicate that current induction requirements can be easily met without making any substantial inroad on the relatively small number of specialized personnel within the military age group whose intellectual attainments and technical training make them vitally necessary to the advancement of science and engineering.

AVAILABLE FOR SERVICE

This year prior to July the selective service calls were running 18,000 a month. For the period July to December it is anticipated that calls will run 23,000 a month. There are in the selective service pool presently available about 650,000 men. To this must be added the new 18-year-old registrants, from which group about 50,000 young men who are physically fit will be available each month (after allowance for preregistration enlistments).

Notwithstanding the very substantial and constantly increasing number of men available for military service, there has been a continuous and disturbing decline in the number of occupational deferments accorded scientists and engineers. As of January 31, 1953, class II–A occupational deferments were approximately 30,000 but by May 31, 1954, this number had declined to about 18,000.

It is obvious that we cannot compete with our potential enemies in terms of total manpower. Therefore it is of prime importance that we recognize that our survival of this age of peril will depend on the degree to which we utilize the very definitely limited scientific and engineering personnel which this Nation possesses. In this connection we must always keep in mind the possibility of stepped-up or full mobilization.

As the exact nature of the problem becomes manifest we have no doubt that the good judgment of our people will prevail in this, as it has in the past, in matters of grave national importance. To judge this problem, however, it is necessary that our people have the facts upon which a sound judgment can be based.

Fundamentally, every man should serve the Nation where he can serve it best. If this leads to service in production or research, so long as those requirements are paramount, the individual registrant should be considered for deferment and deferred because of his importance to that work.

FLOW OF SCIENTISTS

We are mindful, on the other hand, that the needs of the Armed Forces for physically fit young men must be met and that the young scientist or engineer should only be deferred when the work which he is performing in civilian life is more important to the Nation than that which he would perform if inducted into the Armed Forces. There is equal need to maintain the graduate and undergraduate programs in our colleges and universities in order to insure the continued flow of young scientists and engineers into production and research.

We need, then, to reject universal military service as a basic concept and return to the principle of selection, under which men are selected for deferment by reason of their occupation and its importance to the national welfare or selected for induction because their service to the Nation in uniform is deemed more important than their civilian work. The drive for universal military service and the virtual nondeferment of young engineers and scientists have led many such individuals to volunteer despite their present value to research and production, just to get the whole matter over with, when their greatest conceivable contribution would be to remain on the job.

STAND ON EXEMPTIONS

We sincerely seek the maximum contribution to the Nation from our scientists and engineers and do not advocate the exemption of such individuals from military service. The fear that some men might escape military service through continued deferment is no longer a practical one with the extension of the age of liability to 35 for those who are deferred for various reasons, and the denial of deferment to those whose child or children were conceived or born after Aug. 25, 1953.

We agree with the intent of Congress, as expressed in the Universal Military Training and Service Act of 1951, as amended, in which it is stated: "The President is authorized, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to provide for the deferment from training and service in the Armed Forces * * * of any or all categories of persons whose employment in industry, agriculture * * * or other endeavors is found to be necessary to the maintenance of the national health, safety or interest."

In this uneasy age in which we live, of simultaneous hot and cold war, we ask that the Nation make the most effective use of its specialized manpower, not as a matter of preferred treatment of scientists and engineers, but in order that the Nation may survive.

THOMAS H. CHILTON.

NEW YORK, *July 8, 1954*.

We Ourselves and Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. BARRETT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 22, 1954

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to include an article by the Italian ex-Premier Alcide De Gasperi, published in La Discussione, of Rome, February 28, 1954. This article was called to my attention by Ludovico Barattieri di San Pietro, the Italian consul general in Philadelphia, Pa., and I commend it to the attention of all Members of Congress:

WE OURSELVES AND COMMUNISM

A Milan review has published a Report on Communism in Italy, which deserves to be read and digested. Some of the statements contained in it are inaccurate or out of date, some of the statistics set forth need to be checked or should be accepted with a pinch of salt, while in the mass of quotations with which the article is interwoven the proper perspective and the right proportions of things are often lost. Nevertheless it is true that communism in Italy represents a very serious danger, and that even after having been stripped of exaggerations, inaccuracies, and errors of fact, this report gives us a picture of Communist penetration into Italian society which cannot fail to make an impression.

The impression made on those who can see this picture from within, and are therefore in a position to compare the report with actual realities before their own eyes, may be beneficial, because colors and dimensions may be rectified and brought to their proper proportions by direct comparison; but what about international McCarthyism which might accept this report as gospel truth and be prepared to pass judgment on our country on the basis of its conclusions?

According to the author, not only are trade unions, associations, culture, physical science, industries, the State administration, and the fighting services tainted with or have been conquered by communism, but all the other political parties are accomplices of communism either through connivance or cowardice. No one escapes this charge, myself less than anyone else.

Indeed, with regard to myself the charge is definite and serious: De Gasperi is not the author of the ideological brawl, as Nenni defines it, and still less is he the enemy No. 1, as Togliatti calls him. Far from it. Here is how the report reads: "To understand the mentality which today inspires men like Pastore,[1] it is necessary fully to grasp the thoughts of one who, in 1924, was the political secretary of the Popular Party (the Italian Catholic Party of the time), and who in that capacity proposed and advocated the necessity for an agreement with the Socialists. Alcide De Gasperi, today once more politically responsible for the Italian Catholic forces, is substantially inspired by that same tendency, which prevents him from realizing the absurdity of certain alliances. His opposition to communism is born of an occasional and wholly temporary opportunism; to prove it we need only quote the following words. * * *"

At this point a passage is quoted from a speech of mine, delivered on July 23, 1944, at the first meeting held in Rome after the liberation. We were still at war, with the Nazis on the Gothic line, the Social Republic was in arms against the legitimate Government of Italy, thousands of partisans were on the mountains, we were demanding the return of a million prisoners, and we needed the help of everyone to bring the war to a victorious end, and reconstruct peace. Togliatti had become a member of the Cabinet before reaching Rome, and had thus made possible the formation of a national government with the King's Lord Lieutenant. Stalin, having repulsed Hitler's invasion, was standing forth victorious on the stage of history. Under such circumstances and at a moment when all the consequences of defeat were piling up on our country and a dangerous ferment was agitating the minds of men, it was necessary to utter a word of guidance, and I gave it at the first mass meeting, before a motley crowd, in the presence of representatives of all parties. Was it a word of temporary compromise, an act of demagogic opportunism? Nobody, rereading today the verbatim report of that speech can honestly affirm it. It is not enough to quote the acknowledgments which I then made concerning certain positive aspects of the Russian revolution, nor the hopes which I expressed, hopes afterward destined to be disappointed, but which at the time were shared by the whole of the Western World, of a possible insertion of the Russian revolution into the body of democracy. It should be added that to the positive aspects of that revolution I opposed a description of its negative social experiments and of the bloodthirsty nature of the dictatorship which had come to dominate the country, and also that I made, as shown by the shorthand transcript, the following statement: "What is it then that we feel to be an unsurmountable obstacle on the path of these social experiences? In the first place freedom, which is not merely freedom of speech and of public meetings; for the people the essential freedom is the right of being masters in their own houses. But how can man be free if the state, through its commissars, interferes from morning till night to regulate his whole life? * * * The enemy

---

Footnotes at end of speech.

of freedom is state totalitarianism. * * * Man comes first, and then the state."

And since that speech is also quoted to prove that I have kept silent on all the moral and religious objections to communism, I shall repeat once more that, after having insisted in the opening part on the historical Christian origins of the concept of freedom, my speech ended with an appeal to Christ, in the following words, which the abovementioned report takes good care not to quote:

"He indeed is the Saviour.

"If she is to arise from her civil and material death, our new Italy must associate her work with faith as did our communal republics, and the moral and material forces of Christian charity must contribute—as the Roman clergy have done so marvelously—to the work of social justice which we are determined to undertake."

This should suffice to prove that our policy in the field of reconstruction was not inspired by any substantial form of compromise. But the part of the same speech dealing with the constitutional problem is even more significant. At that very time I raised the alarm against the repeated attempts of the "Avanti"[2] to launch a form of Soviet republic, and called the attention of the public opinion to a point which was more serious than the alternative "Republic or Monarchy," adding: "Do we intend to found our new state, our new Italy, on the broad basis of the Italian people, united as it is in its municipalities, constituted by its families, by its historic character, or do we wish to split it up into factory councils?"

These words contain an announcement of the fight we were to start for a democratic parliament and for universal suffrage as against nebulous but dangerous tendencies which would have led to a proletarian dictatorship. Again a year later, on July 3, 1945, when the so-called north wind crisis had been overcome after strenuous efforts, I stated in a speech in Milan: "We are anxious above all about one thing; we have said it before and we say it on every occasion, and we must repeat it once more—we are determined above all else to save the organic freedom of the Italian people in the future democratic State." Pertini[3] had said that he wanted to make of the Constituent Assembly the platform of the Italian revolution for a future socialist society, while I was saying that I wanted the permanent method of democracy, which is tantamount to antirevolution. And even then, during the crisis of 1945, we were up against the Nenni equivocation. Situations are apt to repeat themselves. We read with astonishment in a polemic which I had with Togliatti about the crisis which brought the Parri Cabinet into power, the following words: "It happened that Nenni's candidature (for the premiership) was presented in the course of various conversations as a moderate leftist candidature which, in harmony with a certain European situation, should evolve from the so-called proletarian parties a Socialist fulcrum in an intermediate position between the communism extreme left and the democratic parties. We contested the reality of this construction, ever pointing out that the Socialist-Communist pact and the bonds uniting those two parties made it impossible even to speak of such a combination, that Nenni's was indeed nothing more than a Socialist-Communist candidature, and that it must be taken as such."

There followed the campaign for a referendum and for the Constituent Assembly and then, as a logical consequence, the revival of the democratic parliamentary regime and the ending of the system of the "Committees of National Liberation." All this peaceful and lawful evolution was possible because Christian Democracy, with the support of some minor groups, was clearly conscious of its own responsibility and resolutely staked on the defense of a free democratic regime against the totalitarian danger. This was indeed far from any "deviation" in the Marxist sense, as the abovementioned report claims.

If anyone wishes to attribute to me as a deviation of this kind the recent syndicalist thesis concerning the unlimited right to strike, he would be doing me a serious wrong.

Three times the cabinets presided over by me have submitted bills for regulating the rights of the trade unions and the practice of strikes, and every time the trade union representatives set forth their objections. Moreover, this should be borne in mind: I have no intention of admitting the suspicion of collusion with communism, for indeed the democratic trade-unionists consider this the best way of opposing it. But it is truly deplorable that in situations so fraught with danger for the democartic regime the forces supporting it should find no legal solution which, while safeguarding the interests of the workers, should respect the rights of the community as a whole and substitute for the ferment of constant agitations a procedure based on negotiations, leaving strikes merely as the extreme instrument of legitimate defense. It is true that with these words I expressed first of all my anxiety for that regime of freedom which gets weakened by the endless wear and tear of organized unrest, and so loses ground in the face of a totalitarian state; but I do not neglect the functions of the trade unions. If the trade unions wish to permeate the inner workings of economic life and become an organic social force, they must contribute to the stability of the relations between worketrs and employers and to an uninterrupted effort to increase production.

According to the author of the report the deviations attributed to me are not limited to the question of the trade unions. In his opinion I am in part responsible for the fact that at a certain moment we have witnessed a rebirth of fascism, and above all that the union of anti-Communist forces is opposed by a legitimist tendency in favor of a monarchist restoration. Here I really must give up any attempt at self-defense. The report is too deeply stained with facetious spirit to be worthy of discussion.

Nevertheless I know well enough that this publication may be exploited in the campaign already developing in America with regard to Italy, and it is for this very reason that I have decided to answer it, and shall make a few additional remarks to correct the picture thus presented.

The introduction to the report consists of a general survey of the legal provisions in force in other countries against communism. I need not trouble to inquire into the practical and effective value of the prohibitions or limitations enacted or announced in various western countries. The most conclusive fact is that in no country under a regime of freedom—not even in the United States—has the Communist Party been outlawed.

More significant, from various points of view, is the Swiss experiment. The Swiss Confederation during the war had vetoed the Communist Party, but it subsequently absorbed this exceptional law into the Criminal Code, under part 13 ("on crimes and offenses against the state and national defense"). This code enacted, in 1937, contains an article (266), which reads as follows: "(1) Whoever commits an act calculated to impair the independence of the confederation or to expose it to danger; to provoke the interference of a foreign state in the affairs of the confederation; or maintains intelligence with the government of a foreign state or with its agents with the object of bringing about a war against the confederation, is punished," etc.

This first text of 1937 was integrated with the law of October 5, 1950, containing an article (266a) dealing with acts preparatory to a crime, and punishing with imprisonment up to 5 years "whoever, with the intention of promoting or supporting undertakings or intrigues in foreign countries against the security of Switzerland, enters into relations with a foreign state or foreign parties or with other organizations abroad, or with their agents, or spreads inaccurate or tendentious information. * * *"

It will be remembered that on the basis of that article the Federal Court of Lausanne condemned to 15 months' imprisonment the Geneva Communist Pierre Nicole, who in several foreign newspapers and in his own Swiss organ had accused the Government (the Federal Council) of preparing to bring Switzerland into the Atlantic Alliance, thus impairing the independence of the country, ever riveted to its historic neutrality.

The defense of Swiss democracy is thus entrusted to the Criminal Code, applicable to all and in every circumstance.

What else has my government done in submitting in May 1952 to Parliament a bill for modifying the Criminal Code? The organic reform of the code having been too long delayed, my government proposed the amendment and bringing up to date of certain of its articles (art. 294/8/9) against any person committing acts of violence or issuing threats in order to prevent others from publicly expressing their political, social, or scientific opinions, or wholly or partially hindering the exercise of a political right; article 253 against military sabotage, both with regard to installations or to the manufacture of military material; article 499 against civil sabotage, viz. the destruction of raw materials or agricultural or industrial products; article 508 against breaking into and occupying industrial concerns; and finally article 633 against arbitrary occupation of land.

In all this there is nothing which is not already provided for by existing laws and subject to penalties. It was in fact merely a case of defining and restoring certainty to law in the face of a hesitating or compromised jurisprudence, but above all of seizing the occasion to reabsorb all special legislation, thereby creating legal instruments of defense in case democracy should be menaced. We wished above all to demonstrate our firm determination to defend democratic institutions against everyone and everything. Nevertheless the usual geese on the Capitol cackled for weeks on end, shrieking against scandalous reaction, while today we are reprimanded both at home and abroad for not being capable of energetic action or gestures of courage.

Tomorrow perhaps—because people are apt to forget—we shall see rising up against us in our own country those who in critical moments showed themselves, out of cowardice, ready for any compromise, and perhaps some American Senator will call us to account for the fact that in Italy, during these few postwar years while we have succeeded, of course with American help, in putting the country on its feet again, we have only been able to contain and not to uproot the evil weed, which was born and has prospered during the Roosevelt era owing to errors, certainly common and no doubt unavoidable, but of which it is not fair to lay all the responsibility on us: it would be easier to file away these errors in the records of history if at least in present day politics it would appear clearly and indisputably for all that a free and non-Communist regime is ever and everywhere preferred, supported, and defended.

Footnotes at end of speech.

[1] Christian Democrat M. P., general secretary of the Federation of non-Communist Trade Unions.

[2] Organ of the Italian Socialist Party.

[3] A Communist politician.

Benson Fakes Figures on Dairy Support Cut To Sway Senate Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 22, 1954

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, under the unanimous consent of my colleagues, I include in the RECORD an article from the National Farmers Union's Washington Newsletter written for the July 23 issue by the editor, Robert G. Lewis. The article follows:

Administration forces, from President Eisenhower on down, resorted to deliberate falsification and distortion of official Department of Agriculture statistics in their drive for additional cuts in farm-price supports in the Senate this week.

The Senate, meanwhile, delayed action on the parity package farm bill endorsed by its Agriculture Committee. Debate on an Eisenhower-backed move to turn over the future power needs of REA co-ops and municipalities in the TVA region to a private utility combine, at a cost of $140 million in extra rates alone over the life of the contract, kept the Senate tied up in overtime sessions into the week.

President Eisenhower condemned the House's recent vote to boost dairy supports to 80 percent of parity (from 75 percent at present) as a grave error. He told his press conference that prices of dairy products must be kept down to levels at which consumers will use them up. This apparently indicated complete rejection of the principle of supporting farm prices.

The President then went on to declare that the only people who would benefit from an increase in supports would be the middlemen, who would be able to sell butter that they have purchased at the lower price to the Government at the increased support rate.

The President's statement is directly and completely untrue.

The bill, as passed by the House, provides that only dairy products produced after September 1 would be eligible for the increased support price that would take effect on that date. Only by action of Secretary Benson on his own responsibility could middlemen reap the windfall profits referred to by the President. It is doubtful, in fact, that it would be legal for Benson to do at all what the President said would happen.

Another falsehood employed by the antiparity forces is the assertion that the increase in dairy supports would necessarily increase the prices paid by consumers.

Both the House-passed bill and the Senate bill authorize the use of direct payments to farmers as a method for supporting prices of dairy products. If this authority is approved, and if Benson uses it, prices to consumers can actually be cut below their present levels instead of being increased. Butter prices, for instance, would drop about 20 cents per pound below present levels.

Under the direct-payments method of supports, market prices would be allowed to drop until consumers took the available supply. The difference between the average market price and the price-support level would be made up by a direct payment to the farmer. The House bill raises dairy supports to 80 percent of parity, the Senate bill to 85 percent.

The baldest fakery of all, however, came out of the office of the Secretary of Agriculture in a report that was passed out as a bona fide economic analysis by USDA experts. President Eisenhower, who knows little about agriculture or economics, quite likely was honestly mistaken in making his charge that middlemen would be able to clean up by selling butter they had bought cheap from the farmers to the Government at increased support prices.

A report purporting to prove that "the new dairy support level of 75 percent of parity is achieving a better balance between production and consumption" was issued by Benson's office this week. It was timed precisely right to furnish big-city edtorial writers and Senate sliding scale leaders with ammunition just as the farm bill debate gets under way. It is strictly in keeping with the administration's strategy of using misled consumer pressure as the main political force against parity price supports.

"There are indications that downward adjustments in production are being made, even during the lush pasture season," the report declared. "These downward adjustments in milk production, though slight, indicate that a lower price does not stimulate increased production," the report maintained.

The "evidence" cited to "prove" that the sliding scale theory "works" was that milk production in June this year was lower than in May, and that 1954 production is running only 2 percent above last year as of June compared to 5 percent higher early in the year when supports were still at 90 percent of parity.

Mr. Benson's political statisticians had to go directly contrary to the facts to make up this "evidence."

The report says that June is "historically the month of peak production." The only thing that saves this from being a lie is that "historically" is a mighty long time. The fact is, according to records of the Department of Agriculture, that June dairy production was lower than May in 1942, 1945, 1946, 1948, 1949, 1952, and 1953, as well as 1954. A drop in production from May to June is the normal and usual thing in recent years.

Benson's propaganda missive implies that pastures are "lush." According to the Crop Reporting Board of the Department of Agriculture, pasture conditions on June 1 this year were the poorest since 1941. The condition on July 1 likewise was reported as far poorer than most recent years.

It is true that price-support purchases by the Government are slightly lower this year than in 1953. But not much. The Government bought 57 million pounds of butter in June 1954, down just slightly from 60 million pounds bought in 1953. Cheese purchases were down to 28 million pounds from 37 million in 1953. And dried milk purchases were actually higher this year than last, and by a substantial amount, from 75 million pounds in June 1953 to 85 million pounds in June 1954.

But how true is it that this indicates "a better balance between production and consumption"? Mr. Benson's political statisticians were a good deal more careful to exclude relevant facts than they were to make sure that the information they selected was accurate.

The channels of trade were drained almost dry of stocks just before April 1 this year, when the cut in supports took effect, because dealers unloaded everything they could put their hands on to the Government in anticipation of the coming drop in market prices. Since that time they have been filling the pipelines again—and that's where most of the slight drop in Government purchases comes from.

A look at the facts completely explodes Mr. Benson's political claim that "this trend (of production outrunning consumption) is being reversed."

The Government bought 12 million pounds less of butter in the 14 weeks since April 1 this year than last. But private dealers increased their stocks by 55 million pounds more from April through June this year than last year. The excess of production over consumption actually increased this year over last by 43 million pounds.

The Government bought 47 million pounds less of cheese during that period this year than last. But private dealers increased their holdings by 28 million pounds more during the 3 months than in 1953. The excess of cheese production thus was only 19 million pounds lower than last year.

And while the Government bought 4 million pounds more of dried milk in the 1954 period than in 1953, dealers' stocks were increased by 1½ million pounds less. Again, the net excess increased rather than the reverse.

Deliberate deceit is clearly the motive behind the Department's issuance of this twisted and tortured analysis of how the sliding scale is performing. All the figures referred to above were obtained in about 10 minutes from reports issued by the Department of Agriculture itself. Certainly the relevant economic data should be as easily obtainable by Secretary Benson as by the farmers union.

The growing tendency in the Department of Agriculture to falsify and distort economic information for political purposes is arousing grave concern in universities, commercial and business circles, students, and farmers throughout the country. The old Bureau of Agricultural Economics, over a long history of pioneering in its field, established a distinguished reputation for accuracy and honesty. That reputation is fast evaporating.

Any farmhand would know better, but the Secretary's hired men should, perhaps, be forgiven if they were unable to see the error of their report's final paragraph:

"In 4 of 6 major dairy regions, production per cow on July 1 was below a year ago. The percentage of cows in the herd which were being milked was likewise down, reflecting the lessened incentive to strive for high production."

Do you suppose they figured that the discouragement of 75-percent supports affected the incentive of the cows, or the farmers? Did the humiliated bossies lose their spirit for making the milk, or did the discouraged farmers lose their ambition to squeeze it out when prices fell?

As for the percentage of cows in the herd which were being milked, somebody ought to tell Mr. Benson's hired hands that what makes a cow come fresh is not something that can be hindered, slowed down, prevented, or deincentivized by all the statistics or all the price-support theories in the whole Department of Agriculture.

Increase in Compensation and Pension to Veterans and Their Dependents

SPEECH

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 21, 1954

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, it is with keen disappointment that I had learned earlier about the proposal to delete section 3 of H. R. 9020, the bill to grant increases in compensation and pensions to veterans of all wars and to their dependents.

There has been no doubt that veterans' benefits are in need of a fair and equitable revision. I fully concur with the view that the benefits paid to veterans with service-connected disabilities, to their widows and dependent parents, are particularly in need of an adqjustment. For that reason, I had actively supported the original bill, H. R. 9020, and signed a discharge petition intended to bring this measure before the House.

The legislation in question, however, also proposed moderate increases in non-service-connected pensions of veterans of all wars and their dependents. This latter proposal is now being deleted from the bill and many of us are very much disappointed with this action. In addition, the so-called compromise amendment suggests that the rates of compensation be raised by only 5 percent rather than by 10 percent.

Many arguments have been advanced in support of the compromise bill. They refer to our budgetary situation and to the necessity of reducing all outlays during this new fiscal year. Such considerations without doubt warrant our careful scrutiny. Nevertheless, it is my hope that a more substantial portion of the recommendations contained in the original bill, H. R. 9020, will be ultimately approved by both Houses.

I am certain that no one wishes to see the legislation before us deadlocked, with the result that possibly no increases should be enacted this year in the benefits paid to our veterans and their dependents and survivors. A favorable decision, even on this very modest compromise amendment, would be preferable to no action at all. I sincerely hope, however, that the Senate will take a more sympathetic view of this issue and restore the cuts being made by the compromise amendment.

H. R. 8300

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 22, 1954

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, as the passage by Congress of H. R. 8300 becomes imminent, we should be more aware than ever of the taxpayers' need for professional help in the determination and settlement of his Federal tax liabilities. Although the Internal Revenue Code of 1954—H. R. 8300—will result in simplification and improvement of the administration of the tax code, it contains a multitude of changes which in themselves will result for a time in considerable confusion for the taxpayer. In order to take full advantage of the tax relief Congress intended them to have, many individuals are going to require professional advice. At least until the new regulations become settled, an abnormal number of disputes can be expected to arise between the Commissioner and the taxpayer. Again, it is imperative that the taxpayer have competent representation when such disputes arise.

In March of this year Commissioner of Internal Revenue T. Coleman Andrews stated that the Government receives 65 million returns a year and at least 10 percent of the taxpayers submitting these returns get professional help. He also indicated that many others probably need such help but they either do not recognize the need or they cannot afford it. It is apparent that it is to the interest of the United States to encourage professionally competent persons to engage in such work. To the extent that such professionals are available, the Government profits from a collection process which is efficient, economical, and equitable. This is recognized by Commissioner Andrews. In a talk delivered in Texas last year the Commissioner made it very clear that his agency wishes to encourage those who render such services. I quote Commissioner Andrews:

> Now, my friends, in a system such as we have we cannot for 1 minute admit that anyone may restrict the right to practice before the Internal Revenue Service. There are too many people subject to our laws; there are too many tax returns that have to be filed, and there are already too few of us who are qualified to help. We cannot under any circumstances reduce the number who are qualified. Rather, we think that to the fullest extent possible, the right to practice ought to be extended rather than restricted.

The very success of the Internal Revenue Service depends on maintaining this attitude on who may help the taxpayer and the Government in this monumental task.

Recently this matter of who is qualified to render professional assistance to a taxpayer in settling disputes which may arise in the course of determining his tax liability has been thrown into a state of confusion by certain State court decisions. Apparently the State courts are not certain just what functions may be performed by agents enrolled to practice before Treasury. What has in the past been considered well within the scope of the legitimate activities of an enrolled agent has recently been held by a California court to be the unauthorized practice of law.

The purpose of H. R. 10007, which I have introduced, is to grant the Secretary of the Treasury authority to promulgate regulations which will clearly define who may represent a taxpayer in the course of any administrative conferences which may arise in determining his tax liability. If we are to give the Secretary of the Treasury and the Commissioner of Internal Revenue the administrative latitude they need in collecting the taxes required to finance the Government of the United States, it is imperative that the Congress grant this authority.

Classrooms Needed Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 22, 1954

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, an imposing list of important organizations interested in education have urged the President and the Congress to provide funds for construction of badly needed classrooms for our children. It seems utterly inconceivable to me that we should countenance any delay in helping to alleviate the unquestioned critical classroom shortage.

Democracy depends upon an educated, informed citizenry. Adequate schooling is indispensable to our survival as a nation and to the preservation of our institutions. It is patently absurd to argue that this great Nation cannot afford proper school facilities for its children.

Under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD a telegram from the aforesaid organizations to the President:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *July 21, 1954*.

Hon. SAMUEL W. YORTY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Following is the text of telegram sent today to President Eisenhower:

"The people of the United States possess no more precious national treasure than the children enrolled in our schools. To safeguard this resource and to meet the demands of increasing enrollments and rising birth rates our schools must have more classrooms. We believe that emergency funds should be provided to States and localities whose educational needs far surpass their available fiscal resources. For this reason, we respectfully urge you to request Congress to give favorable consideration to emergency public school construction bills introduced by Senator COOPER and 10 other Senators and by Representatives FRELINGHUYSEN. The letter follows requesting personal interview with group representing the signers of this message.

"American Association of School Administrators, American Association of University Women, American Federation of Teachers, American Library Association, American Parents Committee, American Vocational Association, Congress of Industrial Organizations, Cooperative League of United States of America, Council of Chief State School Officers, Department of Classroom Teachers NEA, Department of Rural Education NEA, Friends Committee on National Legislation, Jewish War Veterans of the United States, National Association of Secondary School Principals, National Congress of Parents and Teachers, National Council of Jewish Women, National Education Association, National Grange, National Jewish Welfare Board, Order of Railway Conductors."

J. L. MCCASKILL,
Director, Division of Legislation and Federal Relations National Education Association.

Losses Incurred by Post Office Department

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. MOSS, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 2, 1954

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, I have been requested by numerous Members this session to make available information I have received on the loss incurred by the Post Office Department in handling certain subsidized classes of mail.

The information was prepared by the Post Office Department at my request and included on page 351, volume II, of the hearings of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee during the discussion of H. R. 6052, the postal rate bill. The figures from the Post Office Department are:

Itemized breakdown of the amounts of deficit occasioned in handling mail of 5 largest circulation magazines and 5 largest circulation newspapers

	Quarterly weight	Copies	Quarterly postage at present rate	Cost of handling	Quarterly loss	Annual loss
	Million pounds	*Millions*				
MAGAZINES						
Life	47.5	45.8	$1,273,000	$3,424,000	$2,151,000	$8,604,000
Saturday Evening Post	34.1	36.9	690,000	2,321,000	1,631,000	6,524,000
Ladies' Home Journal	10.2	7.7	215,000	623,000	408,000	1,632,000
Collier's	17.4	33.1	386,000	1,623,000	1,237,000	4,948,000
Reader's Digest	7.0	23.5	134,000	1,051,000	917,000	3,668,000
NEWSPAPERS						
Chicago Tribune	5.9	9.8	154,000	601,000	447,000	1,788,000
New York Times	5.6	7.6	211,000	636,000	425,000	1,700,000
Detroit Free Press	.8	1.4	17,000	75,000	58,000	232,000
St. Louis Post Dispatch	1.7	2.6	37,000	150,000	113,000	452,000
Los Angeles Times	.5	.7	24,000	69,000	45,000	180,000

NOTE.—The above figures are based on mailings for the quarter ended Dec. 31, 1952. Postage paid has been adjusted for the 10-percent increase on Apr. 1, 1953. Costs are based on expenditures for the fiscal year 1952.

Loss of Nationality of Persons Convicted of Certain Crimes

SPEECH

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 21, 1954

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include my statement supporting H. R. 7130 providing for a necessary change in our laws with respect to Communists.

There is no sane or plausible reason why anyone living here should plot to destroy our Government. For then he woud be destroying himself, killing opportunity, closing the door on those flexible means by which all individuals and groups have made great and visible progress because we are building upon the foundations of self-government and representative government.

How can people ever think of betraying freedom?

Because they are sick with the strange malady that can do so much harm to others as well as themselves. It is diagnosed as the fanatical fever of communism. How do they become its victims? In many ways. Perhaps through carelessness, not understanding the danger, as some unfortunates take to narcotics. Maybe their resistance was weak in the first place. Or possibly because they have a hidden and unsatisfied compulsion to revenge themselves upon others by dominating their lives.

Whether they are impractical and misguided idealists, or the type who are incapable of meeting freedom's responsibilities and must have others live their lives for them, or whether they lust for absolute power, the end result is the same—they are a menace to the security of the United States and a danger to all of its people.

Traitors and spies?

Inconceivable, you say.

Maintaining that they exist only in novels and movies or in some dusty pages of history.

So it was, until the Communist international conspiracy started its network throughout the world.

Reaching into confidential positions within our own Government, slanting policies so that they would work to our disadvantage, and stealing defense secrets for the enemy headquarters at Moscow.

Some have been apprehended, tried, convicted, and punished.

Others, having gone underground, continue their subversion.

There are a few calling themselves Americans who boldly avail themselves of the very constitutional protections they would eventually liquidate to hide their disloyalty. By this technicality they escape, but not without earning the contempt of all who are Americans not only in name, in spirit, and in conduct.

The Reds are diabolical and cunning.

Communists want American citizenship so that they can use the rights and protections its confers to continue, unhampered, in their conspiracy to weaken and overthrow the Government of the United States.

We have never been challenged by such "worming-in" tactics to weaken our domestic security before.

We must therefore enact new laws to put down this threat, to checkmate and eliminate those conditions which permit Communists to exploit our principles and our institutions for the purpose of betrayal.

We must close the loopholes.

We must deprive convicted Communists of any further opportunity to bore at us from within.

The most effective cloak used by these plotters who put loyalty to a foreign power above loyalty to the land they are pledged to defend is their United States citizenship.

They think we are so concerned about the appearance of freedom, its slogans instead of its substance, that we are paralyzed by words and incapable of taking those honest, just, and forthright steps to defend outselves from those who prefer to the enemy.

The issue is clear and compelling.

Communism is a deadly international conspiracy.

In dogma and in action it is committed to our destruction or enslavement.

No person can serve it in anyway and still pretend loyalty to the United States and to the principles for which it stands.

As far as we within the United States are concerned there is no possibility of coexistence.

When Red Russia was recognized by the United States it solemnly promised not to interfere in our internal affairs.

That pledge was cynical and utterly faithless, as subsequent events have proved time and again.

This mockery must end.

Treason and subversion have already weakened the power to defend ourselves from aggression. They have stolen vital military secrets. They have been responsible for the loss of American lives.

As representatives of the people of the United States it is our duty to pass laws, and to check up on the enforcement of laws, designed to protect the public from those dangers that they cannot combat themselves.

There are signs that the people are not satisfied with present security measures.

They believe that more vigorous action, consistent with our basic beliefs, is not only advisable but imperative.

They are worried by the extent of Communist activity which assumes that the Constitution grants it "the freedom to destroy."

And they insist that we strike at the very center of this Communist deceit by stripping convicted Communists of the citizenship that they employ to undermine our sovereignty as a people and as a nation.

Article 3, section 3, of the Constitution expressly declares that "treason against the United States, shall consist only in levying war against them, or, in adhering to their enemies, giving them aid and comfort."

It also provides that "the Congress shall have the power to declare the punishment of treason."

To the end that the techniques used by communism to take over other democracies by subversion shall not prevail here the House of Representatives approved in Judiciary Committee last week H. R. 7130. Under its provisions, anyone convicted of conspiring to overthrow the Government would thereby forfeit the honor and the privileges of United States citizenship.

At last we are waking up to the danger and are taking effective measures to eliminate it.

H. R. 7130 is but the start of a program to protect our Nation from the enemies within.

The get-tough policy is the only way to squelch Communist treachery.

Tercentenary of Brooklyn Protestantism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 22, 1954

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, there can be no doubt but that we can make this a better world if we gave more time and energy to religion and to the practice of its precepts.

That was the underlying theme of the celebration of the 300th anniversary of the establishment of Protestantism in Brooklyn. The series of events marking this happy occurrence have recently closed.

Under the gifted guidance of my good friend, Richards W. Hannah, as chairman of the public relations and publicity committee, the message has been brought to the attention of millions of our citizens. It is my happy privilege to now permanently record the highlights of this beautiful commemoration.

The following are the introductory remarks printed in the program of the opening dinner on January 22, 1954:

The first churches in the now thriving Borough of Brooklyn were started in 1654 by our stanch Dutch forefathers. Coming to the new world to find religious and political freedom, these early settlers felt they could not exist without a church in their midst. Petitioning the Governor for a place of worship, Peter Stuyvesant sent Domine Johannes Megapolensis to institute the first congregations. The Governor then appointed the Reverend Johannes Theodorus Polhemus as the first pastor. From that early beginning of three churches and a few members, the Protestant churches in Brooklyn now number over 400 with a combined membership of 250,000.

One hundred and twenty-five years ago in 1828 the first interdenominational organization was founded, called the Brooklyn City Mission and Tract Society. Through all these years there has been an annual dinner. Through these years also other organizations have developed. In 1919 the Federation of Churches was founded. In 1933 the Federation and the City Mission Society united to form the Brooklyn Church and Mission Federation, and in 1944 this developing organization became the Brooklyn Division of the Protestant Council of the city of New York.

Therefore, as we are celebrating tonight the 300th anniversary of Brooklyn Protestantism, we are also holding the 125th annual dinner of Brooklyn's interdenominational agency through which the churches cooperate in service to young and old as they promote Christian education, evangelism, chaplaincy service in hospital and jail, a Protestant court consultant, youth projects, leadership training, and other civic, social, and welfare activities.

To carry on these essential programs in this tercentenary year, the campaign will be launched at this dinner tonight to underwrite the required budget of $76,469.25. The campaign organization which has been set up will begin solicitation shortly after this dinner, seeking the support of individuals, churches, organizations, commerce, and industry throughout our borough for these essential and ever-increasing interdenominational services.

"I deeply believe that one of the supreme hopes for the world's destiny lies in the American community: its moral values, its sense of order and decency, its cooperative spirit." (Dwight D. Eisenhower.)

Mr. Speaker, at that dinner messages were presented from President Dwight D. Eisenhower, Gov. Thomas E. Dewey, Her Majesty Queen Juliana of the Netherlands presented by the Minister Plenipotentiary, Dr. J. G. de Beus, Mayor Robert F. Wagner, Jr., and Borough President John Cashmore. Addresses were delivered by Charles P. Taft, executive committee, World Council of Churches, and Bishop William C. Martin, presiding bishop of the Methodist Church and president of the National Council of Churches.

Others who participated in the dinner were Dr. Harry D. Gideonse, president of Brooklyn College and chairman of the tercentenary committee; Rev. Stanley S. Slingerland, pastor, Flatlands Dutch Reformed Church; Rev. John E. Zeiter, president, Brooklyn Division of the Protestant Council; Roland Hayes; Rev. Henry A. Vruwink, pastor, Flatbush Dutch Reformed Church, and secretary of the tercentenary committee; Hon. John R. Bartels, chairman of the 1954 Brooklyn Protestant Council campaign; and the Reverend Cornelius B. Muste, pastor of the Old First Reformed Church.

On February 24 and 25, 1954, the Brooklyn division of the Protestant Council presented the tercentenary pageant This City Under God.

In connection with the tercentenary, the president of Brooklyn issued the following proclamation:

"Whereas the first Protestant Dutch Churches were formed in Brooklyn on February 9, 1654, by order of Gov. Peter Stuyvesant, of New Amsterdam, and the Reverend Johannes Theodorus Polhemus was appointed the pastor of these churches; and

"Whereas Protestant churches have down through the last 300 years increased in number until there are now some 450 churches in our borough of Brooklyn, with approximately 300,000 church and Sunday school members; and

"Whereas down through this history of 300 years, these churches, their clergy, and people have served loyally and well our community, our city, and our Nation; and

"Whereas these churches and peoples played a most significant part in the struggle for liberty and freedom by the colonies, the Revolutionary War, the Civil War, and the freedom of the slaves, in interracial and interreligious understanding, and recently in the two World Wars as well as at all times in peace;

"Now, therefore, I, John Cashmore, president of the borough of Brooklyn, do hereby decree and declare the year 1954 as the tercentenary of Brooklyn Protestantism, to be celebrated by all the people of our great borough, regardless of race, color, or creed, in giving thanks to our God for this most exceptional history and in looking forward to His continued blessing and guidance of our churches, our people, and our leaders in the years to come."

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the borough of Brooklyn to be affixed this 1st day of January 1954.

JOHN CASHMORE,
President, Borough of Brooklyn.

Attest:

JOHN F. HAYES,
Assistant to the President.

The invocation was pronounced at the tercentenary dinner by Rev. Stanley S. Slingerland, pastor, Flatlands Dutch Reformed Church, as follows:

O God, our Heavenly Father, Thou hast loved and cared for all the generations of the past as they struggled toward a better understanding of Thee. Thy children have defined and sought Thee in a multitude of ways, and yet have so often failed to follow Thee. Still, in spite of their doubts, fears, and spiritual gloom, Thy church has preserved Thy everlasting Word.

Steadily has she learned how to follow Thy way more fully, to serve Thee more faithfully, and to witness more truthfully.

We thank Thee, our Father, for the lessons of the past, and for bringing us to this great 300th anniversary celebration. Inspire us tonight and entrust us with ever greater opportunities for service to Thee in every succeeding generation.

Be present as together we break bread and fellowship, members of one body, even Christ Jesus our Lord. Amen.

The proceedings continued as follows:

Toastmaster, Dr. Harry D. Gideonse, president of Brooklyn College and chairman of the tercentenary committee, reads messages of greeting and congratulations:

"I have here a number of messages; first of all from the White House a letter of greeting from which I read":

JANUARY 18, 1954.

Dr. HARRY D. GIDEONSE,
Chairman, Brooklyn Protestantism Tercentenary Celebration, Brooklyn, N. Y.

DEAR DR. GIDEONSE: I understand that the first Dutch Churches in Brooklyn were organized on February 9, 1654, and also that the Reverend Johannes T. Polhemus, on the order of Peter Stuyvesant, was sent to these churches as their first pastor. To everyone celebrating the 300th anniversary of this significant event, I send my warmest greetings.

In a Nation whose rapid growth has been guided by the faith of its citizens, this celebration merits wide attention. By reminding us of an early milestone in America's religious development, it brings also to mind a principle basic to our Nation's liberty—the freedom of worship. This freedom is our richest heritage.

My best wishes go to all who are participating in this event.

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

From the executive chamber, Albany, N. Y., comes this message.

JANUARY 19, 1954.

Dr. HARRY D. GIDEONSE,
Chairman, Tercentenary Committee,
Tercentenary of Brooklyn
Protestantism, Brooklyn, N. Y.

DEAR DR. GIDEONSE: I am happy to send most cordial personal greetings to those present at the great banquet, on January 22d, to celebrate the tercentenary of Brooklyn Protestantism.

The event being marked in Brooklyn commemorates one of the proud developments in our free Republic. The Tercentenary of Brooklyn Protestantism should bring pride to the heart of every true, God-fearing American.

In 1654, what is now Brooklyn consisted of a few staunch Dutch farmers living in cabins scattered over the expanse of Midwout or New Amersfoort. These Dutch burgesses were men of courage and insight. They came to this country, as did most all of our forefathers, to secure liberty, above all, freedom of conscience. They wanted to worship as their conscience dictated. They demanded freedom for all and that the rights of the individual man should be ever recognized. They held that freedom of worship, of speech and the inherent rights of man should stand unchallenged.

Thus, in 1654 these free and determined settlers came together to start the first churches in the bush of Western Long Island. They demanded that the Governor, Peter Stuyvesant, should send them a dominie. So came Johannes Theodorus Polhemus, the first pastor, with papers directly from Utrecht, Holland. He rode horseback through woods still filled with local Indian tribes, to get to his Sunday preaching engagements. One of the most noteworthy facts about the churches organized then is that for 300 years two of them, Flatbush and Flatlands, have been located on the same plot of ground and have been a center of community life and worship continuously. The other church, the Old First Reformed, has had various locations, and it also has always been a strong force for righteousness in its neighborhood.

As Brooklyn has grown, the churches have grown. Brooklyn became known as the City of Churches because the church spires stood out about the housetops as one looked from the bay up the hillside in any direction. Protestant churches, more than 400 in number, are now cooperating through the Brooklyn Division of the Protestant Council. They are still and, God willing, they always will be, a force for that liberty and freedom our forefathers brought with them and preserved for their children and their children's children.

As governor of the State of New York, I am happy to recognize the contribution which has been made in Brooklyn, in the greater city of New York, in our State, and the Nation, by the men and women who have been in high office, who have fought for freedom and who have so nobly and so well upheld our Constitution. Our cities, our Nation, our world cannot go on in freedom and and righteousness without our churches and our church leaders and people.

On this tercentenary of Protestantism in Brooklyn, I tender heartfelt congratulations on behalf of all the people of the State, with my earnest prayers that Brooklyn and its churches may continue to work in the name of Almighty God for the truth which will indeed make us all free and bring us closer to a just and lasting peace.

With kindest regards and best wishes,

Sincerely yours,

THOMAS E. DEWEY,
Governor.

Dr. GIDEONSE. The third greeting comes from Her Majesty Queen Juliana, and she has chosen as her representative the Minister Plenipotentiary of the Netherlands, Dr. J. G. de Beus, who will speak in his own official capacity and who will present Her Majesty's message in the course of his remarks.

I would like to say that Dr. de Beus is not only an exceptionally young but also a very gifted member of the diplomatic profession. He is also an author of distinction. His recent book, The Future of the West, has been extremely well received and it is an attractive combination of historical and philosophical scholarship. It is also a very readable development of the idea that our free institutions in the West are fundamentally rooted in the strength of our moral tradition. This is, of course, the topic that brings us together this evening. It therefore gives me, personally, a very great pleasure to present Dr. de Beus on this occasion. Dr. de Beus.

Dr. DE BEUS. Thank you, Mr. Toastmaster, ladies, and gentlemen. I need hardly tell you how gratifying it is for me to assist as representative of the Netherlands at this tercentenary dinner commemorating the founding of the Dutch Reformed Church in Brooklyn. My Ambassador, Dr. Jan Herman van Roijen, has asked me to express to this meeting his particular regrets that he could not himself be here tonight in order to convey the message which Her Majesty Queen Juliana sends to you from the Netherlands on this occasion. He regrets so all the more since it was his father who 25 years ago, at a tercentenary dinner celebrating the founding of the first Dutch Reformed Church in Manhattan, transmitted a message from our then reigning monarch, Queen Wilhelmina.

I mention this fact because it proves that there is a coincidental irony of history and no purposeful intention in the cause of his absence, namely that he is now paying an extensive visit to the Dutch West Indies, which, as you may remember, we exchanged for New York and the New Netherlands some 300 years ago.

This tercentenary is a day of great rejoicing, specifically for the Dutch Reformed Churches in Brooklyn, but in a much wider sense also for Protestantism in America and the Netherlands.

Three centuries ago the Reverend Johannes Theodorus Polhemus came to Breukelen, now Brooklyn, on the order of Peter Stuyvesant, Governor of the Province of New Netherlands, to start the first churches. Polhemus must have been a son of the Netherlands in the best tradition: a deeply religious man, and at the same time a man of great tolerance, for although he was appointed by Stuyvesant he was opposed to his policy of intolerance toward other sects.

Thus three centuries ago the organization of Protestant communities was started among the Dutch farmers here in Brooklyn. Two of those first churches were founded at Flatlands, then called Amersfoort, after the Dutch city of that name, and at Flatbush, then called Midwoud. These churches were founded on the firm principles of the Dutch Reformed Church: that every man should be entitled to worship God according to his own conviction, and that neither wordly nor ecclesiastical authorities should stand between him and God.

One year earlier, in 1653, in another part of what now is the great city of New York, another event of equal historical importance had taken place. The same Peter Stuyvesant and his council proclaimed a grant of municipal government for New Amsterdam.

These two developments, the establishment of municipal government and of the Protestant church, were to be of an importance for outstripping anything the imagination of our ancestors could have foreseen. For not only did these events mark the official birth of the city of New Amsterdam, which was later to become New York, it also meant that the roots of Western civilization, Christian faith, and democracy, had successfully been planted in the Western Hemisphere, the face of which it was to change from North to South.

Grown out of these small settlements here stands the greatest city in the world. The seeds of Protestantism and democracy, sown three centuries ago, have grown to strong and blossoming trees, now covering the whole of the Americas.

The growth of those two has been mutually beneficial. For religion cannot do without democracy and democracy cannot do without religion. These two strands are inextricably interwoven in the texture of western civilization. And of the two, our Christian faith is the most fundamental, for its commandment of neighborly love implies that respect of the human individual which is the essence of democracy. On the other hand, as the experience of the recent decades has shown, religion is seriously threatened under any form of government which does not admit any allegiance of the human soul to a power beyond that of the state.

Today these fundamental values of our civilization are again even more threatened than they were in the 17th century, both from within and without. Eight hundred million people, one-third of the earth's population, today stand committed to a creed in which there is no room for the dignity of the human individual, nor for the freedom of his soul to follow God's will above anything else. It seems proper, therefore, on an occasion such as this, to rededicate ourselves to that fundamental truth upon which the Protestant churches in Brooklyn were founded: That man was made to serve the will of his Creator, not the Creator to serve the purposes of the state. This also implies that the church, as an instrument of God, should not be used or abused for sheer political gain.

Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to follow the example of the Dutch domine of one of these early Dutch churches, of whom the following story is recorded. After he had, in good solid Dutch fashion, been preaching for 3 hours, one of the members of the congregation in the front row held up his watch to show that it was getting late. Thereupon the domine interrupted his sermon, and said: "Put your watch back, Jan Schuurman; Paul preached until midnight."

I do not intend to follow that example, and should therefore like to get to the message which Her Majesty Queen Juliana has instructed me to convey to you tonight.

I mentioned earlier that 25 years ago Her Majesty's mother sent a similar message to an earlier Tercentenary in Manhattan. I recalled this fact because both these messages prove the lively personal interest which the Queens of the House of Orange have always taken in the offspring of the first Dutch Reformed Churches in America. This should not surprise anyone if one realizes that they are descendants of those Princes of Orange who, at the time these churches were founded, had just successfully concluded an 80 years struggle for those very principles upon which these churches were built. This heritage from the days of Polhemus rings in the message of Her Majesty, which it is now my privilege to read to you:

"I wish to extend to you my best wishes and my congratulations on the occasion of the 300th anniversary of the First Dutch Reformed Church, which was established in Brooklyn in the year 1654. Faith could span an immense ocean in the 17th century. May it now know how to span the enormous difficulties of our times.

"JULIANA R."

Dr. GIDEONSE. We have our own chief executive officer in the government of the city of New York with us. He has been a very good friend of the Brooklyn Protestant churches. He has, as a matter of fact, been the chairman of the Brooklyn division of the council's campaign, and honorary chairman, of course. He is an honorary chairman of the Tercentenary. He has helped out in many ways in the plans for this occasion and program—and if I may add a personal word from where I sit, we have in him, this gentleman and Borough President, just about as fine and as sympathetic a friend of public Protestant education in Brooklyn as may be found in the government of the city of New York. I'm very glad to present Borough President John Cashmore.

Mr. CASHMORE. Thank you, Dr. Gideonse, Reverend clergy, ladies and gentlemen, and fellow Republicans. Dr. Gideonse has laid the law down regarding jokes, but he did ask me if I would be willing to give a course at Brooklyn College on political economy. I said there isn't anything to that course. It's very simple. You shouldn't buy any more votes than you actually need. [Laughter.]

Since the founding of this great Nation, it has been a custom that the local chief executive should always take a polite and appropriate, though sometimes unimportant, part in the celebration and commemoration of any historical event in his own community. It has likewise been the custom at an anniversary celebration such as this for all who take part, especially the officials and the speakers, to hark back and dwell on the past.

But as we gather here tonight under the eyes of the God of us all, I think the situation calls for something more than mere thoughts of the past. The past, in comparison with the present, has been happy and serene for religious and God-fearing people.

The future, if it can be judged by the present, is something that must bring apprehension to every person who kneels down at night to worship his Creator. For today in nations of two continents—nations which within our own lifetime were leaders of civilization—we find the godless standing four-square against God, and the people of God.

We find our own Nation worried, threatened, preparing to defend itself if need be against an enemy dedicated to destroy not our material civilization but our religion and our way of life.

So tonight, when I come here as your borough president representing the community in which we live, I do it not merely as a polite and empty gesture. I am glad to be able to do it because I think it is important to demonstrate at every opportunity that public officials and religious leaders stand united on the essential things of life. It shows that in our Nation—in our community—the clergy and the laity of all faiths will stand as one in their determination to preserve this as a nation where people may continue to worship their God.

Make no mistake, these days in which we live are days of challenge—days of reckoning. They are not the days to boast of our beloved Brooklyn—a city of churches. Too often those churches are empty churches. Our borough—our city of the future must be a city not merely of churches. It must be a city of religion. It must be a thriving metropolis in the Kingdom of God.

It is the future not the past to which we must direct our thoughts tonight. In facing the future, we must remember this: The important decisions which will confront our Nation within the next few years may well be vital to the very existence of religion in America.

As citizens of a community that has long been blessed with happiness, prosperity, and religious tranquillity, let us resolve to face the future humbly and prayerfully.

Let us dedicate ourselves to the task that this Nation under God will assert a leadership that will bring peace to the troubled peoples of the world.

Dr. Gideonse. I have selected from a batch of other greetings, three that seem particularly appealing to me, the first, simply because of the organizational aspect and because they are really almost part of ourselves; a very cordial telegram of greeting from the Queens Federation of Churches. And then two greetings, one a telegram and one a letter, that are on a phase of the tercentenary, that I think most of you here will be interested in because it may be less familiar.

You know the Jewish community in New York City in this current year also is preparing and celebrating the tercentenary anniversary of the Jewish settlement. I have two documents here, one a very thoughtful letter from Rabbi de Sola Pool, Senior Rabbi of the Spanish and Portuguese Synagogue (Shearith Israel) in Manhattan, which reads as follows:

"My Dear Dr. Gideonse: On March 18, 1655, Domine Megapolensis, of the Dutch Church in Manhattan, wrote to the Classis in Amsterdam that: 'Last summer some Jews came here from Holland in order to trade. Afterward some Jews, poor and healthy, also came here on the same ship with Domine Polhemus.' The foundations of the synagogue which it is my privilege to serve were laid in 1654 by those 23 Jews who arrived in our city together with Domine Polhemus, who was the first minister of the Protestant Church in Brooklyn.

"Since that day 300 years ago, Christian and Jew have stood side by side in the defense and upbuilding of our city physically and spiritually. At times we have had to struggle for freedom, both civic and religious. For freedom of worship for all was a right which had to be won even in our America, just as we had to battle to win political liberty. In struggling to achieve religious freedom for themselves the Jews who came to Nieuw Amsterdam three centuries ago helped further it for men of all faiths in our land.

"Today in New York's harbor, which the frigate the *St. Charles* entered bringing in Domine Polhemus and the founding fathers of the American Jewish community, there stands the Statue of Liberty. The illuminating beam of its light of freedom is gloriously radiated over the whole of our blessed land. May it shine on until all men everywhere shall live in its spiritual glow. And may we, the spiritual children of the churches of Polhemus, and the spiritual children of the synagogue of Asser Levy, rededicate ourselves to be ever true to the heritage of religious loyalty, religious liberty, and religious light bequeathed to all of us as one by our American tradition of 300 years.

"Sincerely yours,

"D. de Sola Pool."

Dr. Gideonse. And a telegram from the chairman of the committee for the American Jewish tercentenary, Ralph E. Samuels, on behalf of the American Jewish Tercentenary celebrating this year the 300th anniversary of Jewish settlement in the United States:

"I am happy to extend greetings on the 300th anniversary of the founding of the first churches in Brooklyn. This is indeed a milestone in the life of our country which is founded on the bedrock of religious faith and adheres firmly to the principle of freedom of worship. As Americans and as Jews we wish you many more centuries of service to God and to humanity."

I have a few citations of my own here to make, and I shall now call first of all for a few words from the current president of the Brooklyn division of the Protestant Council and the pastor of the Hanson Place Central Methodist Church, who will present some citations that are directly related to the spirit of this celebration, which will honor some guests in this banquet hall, the Reverend John Emerson Zeiter.

Dr. Zeiter. It was our desire at this dinner to present certificates of recognition to as many Protestants as we could find who had lived through the 300 years of our tercentenary. [Laughter.] We discovered that the longevity of Protestants, although it is considerable, does not extend through the centuries. However, we did find that there were more than 30 Protestants in Brooklyn who were reported to us as having become nonagenarians of more than 90 years of age. There are undoubtedly more than 30, and we hope that if you know of folks who are 90 years of age or over, you will let us know those names so we can find certificates for them.

Three of these nonagenarians are here tonight. I want to pay homage to them, to honor and respect them. You may be surprised as I was to discover that among the oldest of our Protestants there is a Pope. [Laughter.] May I ask Mr. William Pope to come forward [Applause.] He is 90. And we have with us Mrs. Helen Schenck Fuller, 90. Mrs. Fuller, will you come here, please? And Mr. Garrett S. K. Remsen, who is 94 years of age. I have these certificates of recognition and will bring them to you in a moment.

Will Mr. Polhemus stand here with me at the microphone? Mr. Frederick S. Polhemus is not among the nonagenarians, but he is a direct descendant of the Reverend Johannes Theodorus Polhemus, first pastor of the Dutch Reformed churches in Breukelen in 1654.

Mr. Polhemus is somewhat of a traitor in two ways. First of all, I will say he now lives in Jersey—Princeton, N. J.—and, secondly, I have his permission to say that although he was a member of the Dutch Church for 50 years, he is currently a Presbyterian. [Applause and laughter.]

You know, Mr. Polhemus, I have felt so sorry for the people who sit on the periphery. All of these fortunate 200 who are seated near the dais are supposed to come from the presumably correct churches. [Laughter.]

As president of the Brooklyn division of the Protestant Council—and before Henry Vruwink (Dr. Henry Vruwink, pastor of the Flatbush Dutch Reformed Church) gets in his few pregnant words on The Dutch Began It—may I remind the rest of you that the Lord Himself once told a beautiful story of the workers in His vinyard. They came in at different hours, they did not all get there at the early part of the morning, but they all got the same pay. [Laughter.]

Rejoicing in 300 years of unbroken Protestant history in Brooklyn, since the founding of the first Dutch Reformed Churches on February 9, 1654, and with Thanksgiving to God for the outstanding contribution and leadership of the clergy and the church members during those formative years of our city and Nation, we the 450 Protestant churches of Brooklyn, cooperating through the Brooklyn division of the Protestant council and joining in the tercentenary of Brooklyn Protestantism banquet at the St. George Hotel ballroom, do hereby give this certificate of recognition to Frederick Duydam Polhemus, who is a direct descendant of Johannes Theodorus Polhemus, the first pastor of the Brooklyn Dutch Churches in the year 1654. [Applause.]

Mr. Polhemus. It is a real privilege, Mr. President to be honored on this signal anniversary of Brooklyn Protestantism. I am very grateful to be included on this memorable occasion. I wish that my four great grandfather, the Reverend Johannes Theodorus Polhemus could be here and I can picture his amazement and excitement at this memorable gathering. [Applause.]

Dr. Gideons. As you remember earlier in the program I announced our happiness and our appreciation of the willingness of the mayor of New York, who, with a very crowded schedule, with two other engagements tonight, would come here to give us his greeting.

You all have noticed that he has meanwhile arrived, and I am delighted to introduce him here. It's the first time I have had the opportunity to do so now that he has the new, very high responsible position in his own right. The "junior" has grown up—and we have now the Bob Wagner, who is mayor of the city of New York—his own full adult and personal responsibility. I have the very great pleasure of presenting the mayor of the city of New York, Robert L. Wagner.

Mayor Wagner. Thank you very much, Mr. President. Ladies and gentlemen on the dais, including my dear colleague and friend, Borough President of Brooklyn John Cashmore, and friends. First of all, I don't know whether I can indulge in that last remark about Presbyterians because my wife happens to be one. (The mayor's reference to a humorous remark that Mr. Polhemus is somewhat of a traitor in that he changed from Dutch Reformed denomination to Presbyterian.) Her name was Susan Edwards, and I don't think she would qualify for the Dutch; as a matter of fact, her father was born here in Brooklyn and was raised here on the Heights. His name was Duncan Edwards. He was a lawyer here and lived here a good many years. That isn't a Dutch name—Edwards? [Laughter.]

Actually, it gets a little difficult being that I was borough president of Manhattan for so long to come over here and feel like the mayor of the city of New York. But, since my mother and father were married in Brooklyn, I always feel a very close kinship to Brooklyn, although he took her across the river to Manhattan.

It always reminds me of a story, although certainly not true in my case, of a famous

British author who, after he made a great deal of money, decided that he wanted to leave London and go out in the middle part of England and have the benefit of living in the countryside and having a little peace. So he bought himself a very nice farm outside of a small city in the middle part of England, and about the second day after he arrived a group of citizens from the nearby city came to him and said: "Mr. Jones, you are the famous British author, and we would like to have you make the first contribution to our home which will be a home for the homeless. We figure if you make the first contribution it will get our drive on the way in good shape."

"Well," he said, "gentlemen, I'll give you £10 for this home for the homeless." The next day he looked at the paper and he saw in the local press the headlines: "Mr. Jones, the Famous British Author, Gives £100 to the Home for the Homeless." He called the committee back and said: "Gentlemen, I think you misunderstood me. I said £10, not £100, for the home." "Well," the chairman said, "that's easily taken care of. Tomorrow we'll have a headline in the paper saying 'Mr. Jones, Famous British Author, Refuses To Give £100'." [Laughter.]

"Well," he said, "no; that wouldn't be so good. I'll make a bargain with you. I'll give you the £100 if you allow me to write the inscription for the new home." Now the committee got into a quick huddle. They thought, we'll get the £100 and if this great British author will write the inscription unpaid; fine. They came back to him and he handed them the inscription. It read: "I was a stranger but they took me in." [Laughter and applause.] I certainly hope I'm not a stranger and I'm delighted that you took me in.

Just for a moment as we celebrate this 300th anniversary of Protestantism here in Brooklyn, and as we review all of the advances that we have made over those years, and we realize that from the beginning of the Dutch Reformed Church, all of the other great churches that have developed here; the great understanding that has existed between all faiths here in Brooklyn; and as we contemplate the continual increase in the interest and the participation in the great parade we have over here to celebrate Protestant faiths of our great faithful, we also have to take a little account of where we stand in our world today and where we stand in the place that our religious faiths play in this great drama. We know that in the world today there is a struggle going on between two ideologies; our democratic way of life, tied up so closely with this religion, and atheistic communism on the other side, struggling to captivate men's hearts and men's minds, and we realize, too, that we must win and we will win, because in our concept is the dignity of man's soul and man's success. And it seems to me as I review the world today, in my very humble way, what I hope to see is the resurgence of religion in the world, in our country, and in our city.

We look around about us and we see that the international word means nothing any more. We see our business people and our professional people engaging in practices and certainly not using the same methods that we used in the past. We see some of our people in political life being tempted by the underworld and gangsters. We see some of our young people being attracted to drug addiction or to throw athletic contests.

Again, in my opinion, if we could have a resurgence of religion, of religious teaching to our young people that so many of us didn't have the opportunity to have, that we would have a better world, that we would have a better America, that we would have our people in political life living up to the standards which they should, and we would have our people in professions and business using the highest standards of which their business and their professions are worthy, and our young people certainly not tempted to drug addictions or to throw athletic contests.

Because, be it so important for democracy, so basic, so involved with our religious principles and our faith, and without democracy, religion in many instances cannot exist, and all we have to do is look behind the Iron Curtain to see the struggle going on there and find out that religion has a very difficult time existing without democracy. If we could have that faith, you and I could look forward to a better day. And you, as you celebrate this great 300th anniversary—all of us have a challenge—in our examples, in our everyday life to be finer and better Americans and to be proud of our religious faith and adhere to its fine principles. Then, you and I, I am sure, when we lay down the heavy task, will say that we have given to our children a finer and better heritage, a finer and better America, because we have lived as good Americans, and as people who believe in our faith. And that faith gives us the inspiration to carry on. May this 300th anniversary be an inspiration for all of us to be better and finer New Yorkers, and to be better and finer Americans. And, as I have said on a number of occasions, and I repeat again, I am just starting out as mayor, and again, regardless of your political affiliations or your religious beliefs, please remember me, as we all do when we communicate with our God, please remember me so that you may say a little prayer that I can be a good mayor, so that we can have a finer and better New York. Thank you very much.

Dr. GIDEONSE. This is an historical occasion and appropriately historical briefs should therefore be essential to the program, and we're very lucky to have within our own family one who has made a special study of the beginnings here and it gives me great honor and pleasure to present the pastor of the Flatbush Dutch Reformed Church, Dr. Henry A. Vruwink, who will tell us how the Dutch began it.

THE DUTCH BEGAN IT

(Rev. Henry A. Vruwink)

The 17th century was, for a large proportion of the population of continental Europe and Great Britain, a hundred years of misery. Because of her situation on the North Sea at the mouth of the Rhine, the Meuse, and the Scheldt, part of the indescribable grief and horror of those days flowed into the Netherlands.

The 17th century, nevertheless, was a golden age in the history of Holland. During those years she emerged as a world power. The East India Company established trade centers and enjoyed a lucrative business with the Far East. The West India Company developed trade and extended Dutch power in the Western Hemisphere. Privateers like Piet Heyn preyed on Spanish possessions and carried fabulous wealth back into the fatherland. Even to this day boys of Dutch descent in America still sing:

"Piet Heyn, Piet Heyn zijn naam was klein
Zijn daaden groot, zijn daaden groot
Hij overwon de zilver vloot."

By 1650 the trade of the world was largely in the hands of the Dutch. It had surpassed the combined commerce of Europe's 11 principal countries.

Art flourished. There was a galaxy of famous painters, among them Jan Vermeer, Franz Hals, Jacob Ruisdael, Meindert Hobbema, and the crown and glory of them all, Rembrandt.

Persecuted peoples from other nations poured into the united provinces with their passion for freedom. The English pilgrim fathers sojourned for 11 years in Leyden as members of John Robinson's congregation.

As a center of Western culture and civilization, Amsterdam became more important than London. The University of Leyden ranked with Oxford and Cambridge.

From this nation, sorely wounded, yet riding the waves of prosperity and culture, the Dutch West India Company recruited colonists for the New World by poverty or war or persecution; they came because they were lured by a dream.

Coming from a country that had struggled for 80 long years to win political and religious liberty, not only for themselves but for the world, these Dutchmen continued to love liberty when they came to Brooklyn. They believed in it with a deep and steady passion. They guarded it jealously. Again and again they protested against infringements of it by the West India Company. They crowded the company continually for new charters of liberties and exemptions.

Liberty for these early Dutch settlers, however, did not mean license. They lived the lives of pioneers on the frontier and were guilty of the excesses that are common to such living, but they were nevertheless God-fearing, essentially religious. It was liberty under God that they prized and struggled to maintain and develop in the New World.

The West India Co. realized this as early as 1634. The company sent a "comforter of the sick." It was his duty to read sermons, offer prayers, console, instruct, baptize, and officiate at weddings.

In 1651 four lots were set aside for a church and parsonage in Flatbush.

On February 9, 1654, according to tradition, the Dutch Reformed Church was born in Brooklyn.

On October 13, 1654, Governor Stuyvesant signed an order permitting Dominie Johannes Theodorus Polhemus to preach. This he did every Sunday morning in Flatbush, and every Sunday afternoon alternating between the town of Brooklyn and the town of Flatlands.

On December 15, 1654, the governor issued another order appointing a commission to put up the first church building in Brooklyn. It was erected in Flatbush. Church buildings were erected in the town of Flatlands in 1663, and in the town of Brooklyn in 1666.

This was the beginning of the ministry of Protestantism in Brooklyn. During the 300 years that followed, the borough became known, far and wide, as the city of churches. That ministry included the building of churches by all the large denominations and by very many of the smaller fellowships.

That story you will see dramatized in stirring episodes in the magnificent pageant to be given in the Brooklyn Academy of Music on February 24 and 25.

As I review this history, I catch myself musing about the momentous changes the Protestant Church witnessed during these 300 years. What radical changes in our scientific outlook. What new ways of production and new social problems were introduced by the industrial revolution. It witnessed the coming of the steam age, the era of electricity, and now it stands bewildered and amazed on the threshold of a new period of electronics—the age atomic energy.

During these 300 years there have been revolutions and counterrevolutions; changes in economic theories and practices; social convulsions; periods of inflation and deflation, panics, and depressions, as well as periods of prosperity. Nationalist and racial groups have swarmed in and some have even swarmed out.

During these 300 years many things have been shaken that could be shaken, that the things that cannot be shaken might abide. Foundations of life again and again seemed to have been blasted out, but the church continued to build on the Rock of Ages. And so she does today, cultivating consciousness of God, His justice and love; inculcating reverence for and obedience to the moral law inherent in the nature of things; emphasizing the spiritual nature and the divine destiny of man, through Jesus Christ, Saviour of the world. And the Dutch began it.

Dr. Gideonse. Thank you, Dr. Vruwink. That was short and quite painless. [Laughter.] I have a number of little things I want to get out of the way. First of all, I want to be sure you have looked inside of your program. You will note on the page following on which the program is printed, the list of the committees that have helped out on the various phases of this program.

I spoke to you of the services of Assemblyman Lewis W. Olliffe, as the chairman of banquet committee. I should say something also of the services of Mrs. Carleton D. Mason, the chairman of the pageant committee. She is responsible for the overall direction of all that detail that is on the last cover page on the inside, about the pageant, about the announcements of the program there on the 24th and 25th of February and, incidentally, I would like here to express our appreciation of the very great help we have had in the arranging for the publicity of these programs with the help of the Brooklyn Eagle. Publisher Frank Schroth and Editor Ed Wilson are on the dais here and as a small token of our esteem for the help we have had, I think they rate a hand from this audience. [Applause.]

We have very much in mind that this is, also again together with the tercentenary year, the regular annual drive of the Protestant council in Brooklyn, and part of the overall city of New York Protestant council operation.

And on the page that follows the page that gives you the menu, which is now history [ripple of laughter], you will find first a number of chairmen—and then you will find listed, chairman, the Honorable John R. Bartels.

Now we have, of course, in the Protestant council a small unit of our own team, Dr. J. Henry Carpenter, who again on this program has been in every respect the buzzing dynamo that sees to it that things get lined up on time—and sometimes that's not as easy as it sounds, and the Reverend Malcolm Evans is his associate pastor of the Spencer Memorial Presbyterian Church, who, incidentally I see the other day in the paper, has been chosen as the outstanding young man of 1953 by the junior chamber of commerce.

From year to year we have had to draw in new blood from the borough's laymen to see to it that this organized corporate activity of a Protestant physametric group always has new life, new blood, new contacts fed into it and Judge Bartels, a former member of the supreme court here, now a practicing lawyer here, has now undertaken the responsibility of that chairmanship for this current year; and he will tell you all about it in the few minutes we have reserved to us for this very important part of the program, because, remember we made a tercentenary dinner to take the place of the usual annual opening dinner of the Protestant council drive. I am very glad to call on Judge Bartels. [Applause.]

Judge Bartels. Dr. Gideonse, distinguished guests, reverend clergy, ladies, and gentlemen, connected with my television set is a wire leading to my chair which permits me without rising up, by pressing the button, to cut off the commercial but at the same time to see the picture. That wire is called Grabbo. I hope that you have no such wire connected to this stage so that you do not wish because of my few comments that you had such a wire.

To celebrate the 300th anniversary of any event, indeed is a unique occasion. Not only is the founding of a church in Brooklyn 300 years ago being celebrated tonight, but there is also being celebrated tonight the establishment on that occasion in Brooklyn of a particular concept that has given men and given women freedom of conscience and the right to participate in every shade of thought and worship without control. A concept that because of its direct appeal to the scriptures themselves has held a loyalty of men and women in this borough for 300 years.

Last week in New York, Chief Justice Warren, of the Supreme Court of the United States, in an address referring to democracy said: "Our strength is our diversity." The same may be said of the Protestant religion, however, unlike the 48 States of the Union, there is no such group that might be called the United Protestant Denominations of America. So consequently the diversities which constitute our strength to some extent constitute our weakness.

However, as the years marched on, the churches in the borough found that this society was inadequate to effectuate all of their common objectives. Thereafter, many years later in 1919, for the purpose of more efficiently discharging their social and welfare obligations to their community, the Protestant churches of this borough organized the new group under the new name of the Brooklyn Federation of Churches. But these two separate organizations did not coexist as separate entities too long. Further consolidation was necessary. In 1933, therefore, the Brooklyn Federation of Churches and the Brooklyn City Mission Society merged into one organization under the name of the Brooklyn Church and Mission Federation.

In 1944, after some intermediate steps, the Brooklyn Church and Mission Federation merged with other Protestant welfare organizations in the city to form what is now known as the Protestant council, Brooklyn division.

So through a fortunate staff we have learned that to meet the ever-expanding demands for spiritual, social, and welfare gains, in this age of pressure and tension, the Protestant churches in this borough must unite under one banner such as the Protestant council, or fail in their common responsibilities.

It was obvious that no 1 or 2 or 3 churches or groups of churches could accomplish this task alone. And it was equally obvious that the Protestant churches in this borough were compelled to focus their efforts in one cooperative organization if they were to make available to Protestants the same grade of assistance that other religions were making available to their respective members.

Now the question resolves itself to this: Does Protestantism in Brooklyn represent something more than merely a concept of freedom of worship? Or does it also represent a form of Christianity and provide the everyday needs of this community? We feel that the accomplishments of the Protestant council have conclusively answered this query.

You immediately inquire then: What are the accomplishments of the Protestant council?

In the limited time allowed me tonight, it would of course be impossible for me to give you a complete story for accounting. I can only highlight some of its achievements and refer you to the literature upon your table for a more detailed accounting. Among the many cooperative services rendered are the following:

1. Christian education: This includes promoting and supervising 102 weekday schools of religion, released-time schools, and over 100 vocation Bible schools.

2. Chaplaincy service: By this service the Protestant council administers through chaplains to 33 hospitals, the Raymond Street jail, and to a number of Boy Scout camps.

3. Sponsorship of 25 radio and television programs weekly with an exposure of many millions of potential listeners in the area.

4. Brooklyn Council of Church Women: This council has united the services of the Protestant women throughout the borough in their work in hospitals and in their many other endeavors.

Last year, through their efforts alone, funds were raised for a counselor in the children's court for Brooklyn for Protestant children and their families. However, we need more of these court counselors. In addition to the above, the Protestant council renders evangelistic services, church-planning services, and many other services too numerous to mention.

In passing, it might be said in connection with church planning that six new Protestant churches are needed in the recently developed sections of Brooklyn.

So tonight it is appropriate upon the 300th anniversary of the establishment of the Protestant Churches in Brooklyn that we also take notice and celebrate the 125th anniversary of the establishment in Brooklyn of the united Protestant effort to render spiritual, social, and welfare service to the community, and in particular to the members of the Protestant religion.

In celebrating this 125th anniversary of the formation of the Protestant council, Brooklyn division, sight must not be lost of the future. If the past is a prolog to the future, the services of the council in the coming year will be subjected to increasing demands and these services of course must be faithful.

For the purposes of meeting the council's budget, a campaign is inaugurated each year. This year the council thought that the tercentenary dinner was the proper occasion to launch the 1954 campaign for funds, in view of the fact that the establishment of the council represents one of the accomplishments of Protestantism in Brooklyn during the past 300 years.

Now we feel that this campaign will receive the energetic and enthusiastic cooperation of Protestants throughout the borough. For all this work a campaign committee has been formed, and their names appear on your program.

You also see from the literature on the table that the council's budget for 1954 is approximately $131,000, which also will include tercentenary expenses. Of this amount, approximately $75,000 will come from endowment and other sources, leaving the remainder of $76,000, which must be paid by contributions. Frankly, this is a relatively small amount considering the nature of the appeal and the services it renders. Much larger amounts are raised year after year by our sister religions for similar purposes.

Now, one of the purposes of the tercentenary service is to ready a spiritual awakening in God. This, of course, includes an awakening to the needs of the community and of the Protestant religion in particular.

The celebration of freedom of conscience is meaningless if we worship materialists. The celebration of freedom of religion is meaningless if we ignore the multiple demands, the tensions, the pressures of the world today and tomorrow. The celebration of the freedom of religion is also meaningless if by ignoring the necessity of cooperation we permit ourselves to become enslaved by our own freedom.

In this community, where the percentage of Protestants in the population as a whole, and for reasons other than religion, is increasingly declining, it is necessary we meet our responsibilities with greater zeal and activity. Otherwise, we will not deserve our heritage and we will soon be known as the vanishing Protestants.

The effectiveness of this tercentenary observance will be measured by the rededication of Protestants to the task of attending to the call of Protestantism throughout our borough. I know that we will respond to this challenge and that our presentation will be an overwhelming success.

In his article entitled "Religion For Now," appearing in the December 1953 Harper's magazine, Dr. Nathan A. Huston, the new president of Harvard University, referring to the search for truth in religion, closed with these words: "We must go on trying (freshly and repeatedly) in humility and in love, and with all the allies we can find."

So in this campaign, we must go on trying with all the allies we can find. We are counting on you as our allies to support this appeal.

In closing, on behalf of the Protestant council, I wish to acknowledge the deep indebtedness of the council to its executive secretary, Dr. J. Henry Carpenter, for his many years of unselfish service beyond the call of duty in the cause of the Protestant cooperative effort. To Mrs. George M. Giddings, the council also owes a great debt for her establishing in 1944, the Brooklyn Council of Church Women, and also for her outstanding services to the council in its many campaigns. To both of these workers, as well as to the many workers for, and benefactors of the council in the past, whose names time will not permit me to mention, we are deeply grateful.

At the same time, I would like to express the appreciation and gratitude of the council to the honorary chairman, the vice chairman, the divisional chairman and to the 400 workers, and to the women in particular who have joined us to make this tercentenary campaign a success. May we all unite in this effort to preserve this common heritage with the faith it deserves. [Applause.]

Dr. GIDEONSE. Thank you, Judge Bartels. There is nothing I can tell you about the next speaker, he is better known to you than I am. You all know of his dynamic and creative leadership in his home city of Cincinnati. You know that he had the honor of the unusual responsibility, for a layman, of being the president of the Federal Council of Churches, one of the few Americans on the executive council of the World Council of Churches, and I think, probably, in the minds of everyone who saw him, he is looked upon as the leading Protestant in America today. He will speak to us tonight on the subject Religious Foundations of America. I am very glad to welcome here, Charles P. Taft.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, ladies, and gentlemen, I'm very happy to be here with you this evening for a number of reasons. One of them is for the opportunity of appearing on the same occasion as Roland Hayes. I mention that particularly because of what Justice Bartels said.

The last time we (Taft and Hayes) appeared together was at the annual meeting of the Massachusetts Council of Churches, which includes Boston council, and every person who was there paid $100 for his seat as a contribution to the Massachusetts Council of Churches. Now there are about 1,754 people here tonight, Judge, and at $100 each, would just about produce the budget you're after. [Laughter.]

I want to make a suggestion in that connection for I've had a great deal to do in raising money. There are some things I want to warn you about. You may remember the story about the fellow who went by the silver fox farm and saw the old man skinning a fox. He said, "How often do you skin your foxes?" The old man said, "If you skin them more than once a year they get nervous." [Laughter.]

I want to give you a little specific advice about this campaign. Another farm story: A fellow went by the farm and said as he saw the old man milking a cow, "Say, how much milk does the cow give?" The old man said, "She don't give none—you've got to take it away from her." [Laughter.] So that's what is involved in a financial campaign.

Let me say in the first place that I'm very glad to come back to Brooklyn again. The last time I was here, I think it was a visit to St. John's College, and I hate to tell how long ago that was.

I was trying to think of the people I knew in Brooklyn. This is a confession—and confessions are good for the soul. I don't know as much about Brooklyn as I should, or would if I went to college with Peggy Wood. A great actress in my opinion. I knew the Melishes, all of whom started in Cincinnati. Then I know Ted Eisenman and Jerry Lee. And I'm a little surprised that you haven't had Ham Fisher get Joe Palooka in this tricentenary celebration. [Laughter.]

I do want to say just a word about the background of religion in the United States, in our old tradition. I'm sort of ecumenical in connections; my great-grandparents were Baptists on one side and Presbyterians on the other. And then on one side they got to be Unitarians, somehow. My uncle used to say the reason there were so few was that there were so many in the other churches.

The beginning of our traditions in this country is witnessed by the establishing of the small independent religious congregations in England a little more than 300 years ago. They went by various names. Among them was a Baptist who arrived in England by way of Holland, where they had for the first time real freedom of religion, in association with the Dutch-Reformed who founded this great church here. And the reason that they were our ancestors in democracy and in the Anglo-Saxon tradition of democracy is because they governed their own affairs in their own local congregation, and we who are so used to using Robert's Rules of Order, in the way a meeting is conducted, don't realize that that was not always known; that there is a people today that don't quite understand that, don't know how—just the ordinary mechanics of running their own affairs in their own little organization.

And that began in churches, primarily. The effect of it was seen politically speaking, when the representatives of these little independent congregations, and one of the climaxes of the Puritan Revolution, debated with Cromwell on the subject of manhood's suffrage. It was taken down in shorthand by the Secretary of the Army, and we have it and it's a most interesting account to read through because they were saying, these representatives of the small religious congregations, that even every heathen, every man had a right to live; had a right to live, even as has a religious man. Therefore, had a right to vote.

Didn't move very fast because it actually wasn't until 1852, more than 200 years later, that all the restrictions on voting for males were removed in the United States, and it happens to be that New York State was the last because even at the time of the Revolution (presumably the American Revolution, 1775–81) only 1 person in 25 could vote, and I think it is fair to say that that change began at the turn of the century in 1800. It came about through the Methodist and Baptist revivals. So there are basic ideas of living together under the standing and place of the individual, grown out of this religious background. Now it was there even though church membership was pretty small. Church membership didn't measure very much, I suppose.

The question of even knowing how many members belong to your own church is a sizable and difficult one. Do they come? Do they really belong? If you take them off of the list they get mad, and if you keep them on the list they get mad. Church membership is not too accurate a test, but after all, you can measure something by continuous statistics of church membership. They are relatively correct year after year—and I want you to realize that in 1800, the church membership in the United States was 10 percent of the total population.

You don't remember that, I take it. Because if you compare it now with 57 percent of the population of the United States that are church members, whatever may be the use of statistics relative to that shows us something. We are becoming more a religious people—coming out of that background.

That's one of the reasons, probably, why there is a persistent threat, and the feeling of the people of this country toward the people of foreign lands; why we have had such a pressure outward of the missionary movement that has settled in almost every country of the undeveloped countries around the scope of the globe. That Christian community has spread in that way, essentially even while you might call our country isolationist. Underneath, exists feelings that we should do something for the people less fortunate close to us, and less fortunate farther away.

And it is that basic trend that could not be stopped or pushed down, which has come farther out and showed itself in these more recent years. That's why the Americans have taken such a leading part in the World Council of Churches. The efforts to bring people together from distant lands, and sometimes from stranger communions, into the kind of fellowship that you have within this council in the Borough of Brooklyn.

The World Council does some things for you that perhaps you didn't even know. It presented the ministry of the church to the prisoners of war behind the barbed wire through the last wars. It was done for the prisoners of war on our side of the line, and on the other side of the line. Not in Russia, but certainly in Germany and in the other parts of the Continent where they could be reached.

So, some of the leaders of the world council have visited the most distant and isolated churches and have brought to them a word they deeply appreciate and emotionally appreciate. They know that they aren't by themselves but are in fellowship with other Christians in other parts of the world.

Even in Russia, don't forget that it has been, and still has a base of Christian people as its core. Martin Niemoller, was the only German official representative to visit Russia a little over a year ago. To visit the churches, that was his specific request when getting his visa. Why they gave it to him no one knows, but he got it and comes back with a report of at least 20 churches open. Can't confirm that but that at least is the first direct word that we have had. He reported as having heard there are 3 million Baptists in Russia. The Baptists think that's more than probably there are, but there are at least six or seven hundred thousand Baptists there. You don't think of that when you see those names in the headlines. There are Christians there.

In Indochina, there is said to be with the possible exception of Korea, the largest proportion of Christians in a non-Christian country of any of the nations of the Far East. They are not all Protestants. The larger group are Roman Catholics; but there are Christians there.

The contact which comes through this world council and goes out—in a sense is your representative, and you find that fellowship doing some strange things, strange to us at least.

The problem of persecution. I think I'll say the word. Certainly the absence of religious liberty in many respects, in Egypt for instance, has produced a kind of combination that is somewhat inconceivable to us. A committee operation which seems to meet this kind of problem for all the groups concerned of which the chairman is the Roman Catholic bishop of Cairo.

Then Korea, where Dr. Charles W. Ranson, general secretary of the International Missionary Council, visited in January 1950 (from the 9th to 16th of January 1950). He found in Seoul, a North Korean congregation of 2,000 who were building a church for the congregation, and mostly supporting themselves. Then the war covered Seoul back and forth a couple of times and that congregation disappeared. Now it is there again, but it is left behind in the towns of South Korea to which those members were driven, left behind additional new churches in these several individual towns.

Now here is the world in which we Americans have been forced for almost the first time in our long experience as a democratic nation. We are the oldest almost in the modern sense; we are brought face to face with evils—a new experience we do not like. It certainly is the job, it has been through history, the job of the church to attempt to bring to lay people some answers to those dilemmas and particularly the problem of what to do when you face the kind of people we have in the world. That again is the function of the church and the churches working together can help to find those problems and make them easier to meet, give strength to meet them to the laymen who make up 99 percent of the church.

I want to leave with you the text, if there is any text of what I was going to say to you tonight—Dr. Moffatt's translation of the Epistle to the Romans—because it does meet our situation and I may say it is quite applicable to a financial campaign, incidentally.

The fifth chapter of Romans where St. Paul says: "We triumph even in our troubles, knowing that trouble produces endurance, endurance produces character, and character produces hope—a hope which never disappoints us, since God's love floods our hearts through the Holy Spirit which has been given to us." [Lengthy applause.]

Dr. **Gideonse**. Thank you for not only relating our situation to the American historic past but also to the contemporary challenge of the world outside America.

I don't think it would be any more fitting on a program of this sort than to come to a conclusion with an address by the President of the National Council of Churches. And since the current president of the National Council of Churches is also the presiding bishop of the Methodist Church, I think it would be appropriate if the bishop of the New York area of the Methodist Church, who is with us tonight, would introduce Bishop Martin. I'm calling on Bishop Frederick D. Newell.

Bishop **Newell**. Mr. Chairman, there could be no greater honor than to present Bishop Martin to you. He comes from Texas. Now everything that is great in the Methodist Church comes from Texas. Texas has our greatest churches and our greatest preachers, and our greatest prevaricators. [Laughter.]

The first honor that can come to a clergyman in the Methodist Church is to become the president of its council of bishops. The greatest honor that can come to a Protestant clergyman is to become the President of the National Council of Churches of Christ. To these two great offices Bishop Martin has come in this last year (1953).

I present to you one of the greatest leaders in Protestantism, one of the most beloved of Bishops of the Methodist Church, and one of my dearest friends, Bishop William C. Martin, of the Dallas-Forth Worth area of the Methodist Church. [Applause.]

A Resurgent Protestantism in a Confused World

(Bishop William C. Martin)

Mr. Chairman, honored guests, my fellow Christians in Brooklyn, this has been a perfectly wonderful evening—until now. If this were an occasion that was celebrated more often than it is, I would be disposed to say, "Let's call it an evening, have the benediction and go home." But, we've waited 300 hundred years for this celebration. So, let's be wholehearted about it and continue for the remainder of the night. I am going to be fair with your marvelous powers of endurance and suggest that if you will not look at your watches, I will look at mine. Perhaps we can thus enable the toastmaster to bring the train in not too much behind schedule.

I congratulate you and the Protestant Council of Churches in Brooklyn upon the celebration of this unusual occasion. When I go back to my home State of Texas and tell my friends that I had the privilege of speaking to more than 1,600 Protestant leaders in this city, they will look at me incredulously and say, "We didn't know there were that many Protestants in Brooklyn." What a grand job you are doing. You are not simply holding the line. I have sensed no tendency to regard this as a time for digging in. I have felt all through this meeting a spirit of confidence and aggressiveness which any Christian movement must have in order to fulfill the destiny that has been entrusted to it by those who have gone before.

There is time here this evening for only an outline of what I had proposed to say. I am trusting my fellow ministers to fill in this outline from their own acquaintance with the truths with which it will deal. I have had the opportunity of seeing evidences of the revival of a protestantism witness across this Nation during the last few months which cannot be explained in any other manner than that there is a spirit of resurgence which is an assurance of confidence and hope to all of us. There are three things which we need to keep at the center of our message and ministry if this spirit is brought to its fullest consummation.

First of all, we must recover the Protestant principle of the sacredness of Christian vocation. If you were to start out tomorrow morning in this city and ask 50 church members, "How do you serve God?" you would find a number of varied answers. Some would say, "I serve God by attending church and by giving financial support to it." Others would reply, "I serve God by reading my Bible and by daily prayer." Still others would answer, "My service of God is in terms of being a compassionate, helpful neighbor." It would be a remarkable thing if you found 5 out of the 50 who would reply promptly and emphatically, "I serve God through my daily vocation." Somehow we are in danger of losing the awareness of the sacredness of the day's work. We call it secular and think of it as something of a necessary evil. As a matter of fact, it is at this point that every follower of Christ finds his most relevant and dependable opportunity of serving God. Only a relatively small number of the laity will ever be church officers or can hold any place of official responsibility. But every man who is employed in an occupation which is necessary for the material well-being of his generation can be assured that it is through the open door of this opportunity that he is daily serving Christ. Certainly there has never been a time in our life as a Nation when the maintenance of the economic order in this country was of greater concern to the stability of world order than it is today. Therefore, every Christian man can say to himself as he faces the day's labor, "This is my chance to make my contribution to the kingdom of God on earth."

A second condition of a revitalized Protestantism is the recognition and practice of the principles of Christian stewardship. We have been disposed to regard money as a more or less unholy element of our life which was necessary as a medium of exchange. I have found a number of ministers who have been apologetic when it was necessary for them to speak to their congregations about the financial support of the church. There was a time in my own ministry when I approached this obligation with great reluctance. Then I began to read the New Testament more closely and found that the Book is saturated with the importance of a Christian's relationship to his material possessions. Jesus had more to say, directly or indirectly, about righteousness in this area of life than about any other single Christian obligation. From the time I made this discovery I entered upon a new attitude toward this part of my pastoral service. From that time forward I found real joy in asking people for money for the enterprise of the kingdom. I discovered that there was no better way to help a man to come into the closest relationship with God and the church.

A few days ago I was in Korea to represent the National Council of Churches to our chaplains and the men in the armed services. As I moved up and down the line I was struck by the contrast between the material resources that were available to the Army for doing its work and those upon which the church could rely for fulfilling its responsibility. I did not begrudge any dollar that was being spent by the Government to keep our men well fed and clothed. But I did find myself regretting that the church was not providing men adequate material support in order that the missionaries might do their work in a better way. The only adequate answer to this urgent need is the practice of Christian stewardship with respect to material possessions. The church simply cannot experience the outreach in the building of churches, schools, hospitals, and orphanages which are needed to provide for the expanding demands until a larger number of its members contribute to its work more liberally. We may put it down as a definite fact that unless the church Christianizes the city, the city will paganize the Nation.

The third condition which we must face as the price of recapturing the power which belongs to Protestantism is the practice of Christian witnessing by the laity of the church. We have become too much disposed to think of evangelism as an activity of the clergy. There has also been a tendency to rely too largely upon the effectiveness of our institutions. It would be a wholesome experience for us to recall that in the early Christian Church there were no institutions. The Kingdom of Christ was spread by the process of personal witnessing—one man or woman telling another what Christ had done for him or her. There can never be any adequate substitute for this kind of individual witnessing.

There are many factors in the life of the church today which remind us of the conditions in which the New Testament Church was born. When I hear a Christian today expressing a sense of apprehension as to whether Christian faith will be able to withstand the evil forces that are arrayed against it, I find myself wishing that such a timid soul might have an acquaintance with the history that is recorded in the Book of Acts. There is no more heroic chapter in the history of mankind than that which tells how a little handful of Christians took the torch of faith and carried it southward into Egypt, eastward into Mesopotamia, northward and westward through Syria, Greece, and Rome to the farthest reaches of the Spanish Pensinsula and around the southern margin of the Mediterranean Sea. And they accomplished this superhuman feat in less than 70 years and in the teeth of the most brutal persecution that a pagan empire could wage against them. If the church of this day could recapture the zeal and power of the early church, it could proclaim the message of Christ's love to a disturbed and doubting world in a single generation.

One of the revitalizing factors of our day is the realization by an increasing number of laymen that the blessings of religious liberty and freedom of worship are privileges that can be taken away from us. The only assurance that the abolition of religious liberty which has put its curse upon other nations of the world will not happen here rests upon the recognition by the Christian layman of the fact that if he desires the blessings which the Christian faith has brought to his life and his land, he must love the church so much that he is willing to make sacrifices for its welfare and to defend it with his life.

I think it was Joseph Conrad who said, "If I had the right word and the right accent, I could move the world." My fellow Christians, you and I have the right word: It is Christ, the Son of God. If you will give to this word the right accent—the recognition of His presence in all areas of life, a complete commitment to Him of all of life's resources, a bold and courageous witness to His power to redeem and transform life—the blessings of our Heavenly Father will be upon you through the next 300 years and you will help to lift this world closer to the heart of God.

Dr. GIDEONSE. Thank you, Bishop Martin. I bring this program to a close on the impact of the reflections of the glories of the past by a reminder of a prayer by a Canadian bishop to a convention of clergy which had not been too responsive to the bishop's consistence that they dignify themselves in all their current practices, so when he brought the convention to an end, he offered the prayer: "May we justify the esteem in which we hold ourselves." And I add, "May we demonstrate our respect for the past by support in the present."

And will you now please rise? The closing prayer and benediction will be offered by the past president of the Brooklyn Church and Mission Federation, pastor of the Old First Reformed Church, 1 of the 3 celebrating churches in this tercentenary, Dr. Cornelius B. Muste.

Dr. MUSTE. It seems quite fitting tonight that I'll give the benediction in two languages; my native language and the language used by the first minister in Brooklyn (Breukelen) here at the Dutch Reformed Church, and then in the language in which ministers use it today:

"De genade van onze Heere Jezus Christus, de liefde God's en de gemeemschap van den Heiligen Geest zij en blijve met u allen. Amen."

Translated: "The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the blessings of the Holy Ghost remain with you all. Amen."

Present-day version: "Now may the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ and the love of God the Father, and the fellowship of the Holy Spirit be and abide with you all now and forevermore. Amen."

Textile Unemployment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 22, 1954

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article from the New York Times of Sunday, July 18, 1954:

THE TEXTILE UNIONS

Last month Representative GORDON CANFIELD, of New Jersey, wrote President Eisenhower about textile unemployment in his area and suggested that the administration get together with management and labor to see what could be done to decrease it. Secretary of Commerce Weeks has now called a conference of woolen and worsted manufacturers for July 28 to discuss industry problems. He did not, however, invite representatives of the Textile Workers Union. William Pollock, its executive vice president, has written to Mr. Weeks that the union "wants in" because "joint labor-management participation in such a conference is established practice" and because the union has an 11-point program for strengthening the industry.

One plank in the platform is striking—especially in view of labor's traditional suspicion of technological improvements. It advocates the institution, either by Government or by labor-management cooperation, of an educational program to acquaint management, supervisors, and workers with the latest technological advances." The union apparently wants to cooperate with management to increase productivity in the industry, assuming that the workers will share in the benefits. It would seem to be in order for this subject to be on the agenda for the Weeks conference and for the union to have an opportunity to make constructive suggestions for working with the manufacturer to cut production costs in the interest of a wider market and increased employment.

Drought Reports Continue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 22, 1954

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, reports of what may be the Nation's worst drought continue to reach my office. By telephone, telegram, and letter I am receiving word of disastrous crop damage, the dumping of livestock at ruinous prices, and the threatened loss of millions of dollars in farmers' savings and investment. The unprecedented heat wave in our Southwestern States is creating a tragic disaster, and early action by the Congress and the Department of Agriculture becomes increasingly imperative.

The messages which follow are typical of many communications coming from Oklahoma:

COOPERATIVE EXTENSION WORK IN
AGRICULTURE AND HOME ECONOMICS,
STATE OF OKLAHOMA,
July 19, 1954.

Mr. MIKE MONRONEY,
United States Senator.
Mr. ROBERT S. KERR,
United States Senator.
Mr. ED EDMONDSON,
Congressman.

HONORABLE GENTLEMEN: This is a letter to advise you of the drought situation as it now exists in Delaware County.

Pastures are completely burned and dried up. The only feed cattle have is dry grass and stubble. Some ponds are dry and others low. Springs and wells which have never been known to go dry are failing or dry. Some farmers have been forced to start feeding their winter supply of hay now and others should be. A fair supply of early feed was baled or put in the silo and the oat crop was good; however many farmers did not have oats, others are almost wholly dependent on grain sorghum which they have planted. Late planted grain sorghum did not come up. Corn is completely burned up without making any ears. Some corn will be large enough to go into silos or be cut for fodder. Practically all of the oat straw has been baled for feed.

The most serious thing as we in the USDA see at this time is that we have contacted some of our bankers in this area and they tell us they do not have money that they can loan our livestock men, and if present conditions continue we fear that there will be a mass marketing of cattle all grades, including dairy herds.

Grasshoppers are damaging what crops remain. A group of farmers, local bankers, and all USDA agencies are asking that Delaware County be placed on a drought-relief program. This letter is being sent by the Delaware County Drought Committee.

Yours truly,

DEAN E. BARRETT,
County Agent, Delaware County.

MIAMI, OKLA., *July 21, 1954.*

Hon. ED EDMONDSON,
Member of Congress:

Crop and pasture situation critical due to 105° to 118° temperature throughout July with no relief in sight. Numbers of cattle being sacrificed. Heartily approve Oklahoma Cattlemen's Association action requesting Secretary Benson bolstering prices by Government purchase at 12 cents per pound to producer and making available cheap feed from surplus Federal stock. Request northeastern Oklahoma counties be declared drought disaster now. Immediate relief necessary.

MELVIN ESTUS,
Chairman, Ottawa County Drought Committee.
GEORGE VANPOOL,
President, Ottawa County Farm Bureau.
G. P. TROLLINGER,
President, Ottawa County Farmers Union.

The Futility of Financing French Imperialism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 21, 1954

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, Ludwell Denny, writing in the Washington News for today, has an article entitled "Subsidized Appeasement." He states very frankly that the American taxpayer who has financed the hopeless French colonial war in Indochina for the past 8 years will now be asked to subsidize the Geneva appeasement.

Mr. Speaker, certainly the American people will not stand for any such program and, if it is presented to the Congress, it should be rejected immediately and without equivocation. The article follows:

SUBSIDIZED APPEASEMENT

(By Ludwell Denny)

The American taxpayer, who financed the hopeless French colonial war in Indochina, will be asked next to subsidize the Geneva appeasement.

The billion-dollar a year American supply of arms is being shut off as a result of Red military victory in north Vietnam and political victory at Geneva, but France expects the United States to support with economic aid her colonial remnant in south Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia.

According to the French and British, who signed into Red slavery 12 million north Vietnamese over protest of the Vietnam and United States Governments, only large American subsidies can save the rest of Indochina from going Communist in the next elections. In Cambodia and Laos elections are promised for 1955 and in south Vietnam, for May 1956.

There are several catches in this:

The truce terms are loaded in favor of the Reds, so that they can get the rest of Indochina by "peaceful" subversion. This is true not only in south Vietnam, where large pockets of Reds are allowed by the truce to operate for 10 months; but also in Laos, where Red invaders are permitted to remain.

The same French colonialism, which created the conditions for Red victory in the 8-year war, is to continue in south Vietnam under the truce. The long-promised but never granted Vietnamese independence may be given in some phony form, and the discredited and despised puppet Bao Dai may be belatedly dumped by Paris. But no representative Vietnamese government is possible under the French, who have agreed to a partition of the country against the virtually unanimous protest of the non-Communist population.

Just as past American economic aid to Indochina failed to save French colonialism or to stop the Red flood, future economic subsidies under similar conditions are unlikely to have better results.

The same lack of American control of American funds, which wasted so many billions in the past, would drain future billions down the rathole. The French will not agree to adequate American control.

In addition to the futility of continuing to finance a French imperialism which has already collapsed, and which has degraded America's world reputation in the process, there are two basic fallacies in this whole approach.

One is the illusion that foreign countries can be bribed by American dollars to repulse communism. This has been disproved over and over again and in many lands, where Marshall plan aid failed because it was used to buttress evil conditions instead of for basic reform.

The second illusion is that economic aid, without a strong defense system, wards of communism. On the contrary, it only fattens up the victim for the Red kill.

Unless France and Britain join in a fast and effective southeast Asian security system, the Reds will use the Geneva truce to get the rest of Indochina and then the others.

Farm-Support Fight Points Up Subsidies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 13, 1954

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following article, written by Ray Tucker, is deserving of the attention of our colleagues. It appeared in the July 16, 1954, edition of the Brooklyn Eagle:

> The running battle between rural and urban blocs over the amount of future farm-support prices has focused attention on a problem long neglected on Capitol Hill, namely, the tremendous total in subsidies which Uncle Sam pays out to so many special groups.
>
> No interest which enjoys direct or indirect tribute from the Treasury—farmers, airplane companies, magazines and newspapers, the railroads, the shipbuilding industry—has been spared in the fierce exchange over who gets what. Although there have been sporadic and feeble investigations of the question, it may be assigned to a special committee for exhaustive study.
>
> The "city fellers" struck hard at their agricultural friends when they revealed on the basis of official figures that a few wealthy and apparently profiting producers of basic crops had received small fortunes from Ezra T. Benson's handouts. They showed that slightly more than 60 growers had obtained from $100,000 to $1,200,000 in loans on 1953 crops.
>
> Nor did it mollify the antisubsidy Members to learn that the famous King Ranch in Texas, supposedly the largest in the world, got about $32,000 in drought-relief funds.
>
> #### FEDERAL PAYMENTS
>
> The statistics disclosed that 34 individuals or corporations had more than $11 million worth of cotton in hock to the Government. The two largest, 1 in Mississippi and 1 in Texas, amounted to $1,269,492 and $1,246,516.
>
> Expressing a viewpoint that is growing rapidly throughout the farm areas, Senator Michael J. Mansfield, Montana Democrat, retorted that the producers of food were the latest arrivals on the "subsidy gravy train." After referring to the tariff as a grant to industries, he listed Federal payments exceeding the $74 million a year which, he declared, was the cost of the farm-support program.
>
> He charged that second-class mail was subsidized at $188,567,000 in 1951, that airlines drag down $80 million a year; that shipping construction has been underwritten at $40 million a year; that the Treasury spent $4,200,000,000 after the war to provide cheaper food; that business and industry were subsidized at $8 billion for 7 years. And, of course, he recalled the land grants and other benefits to the railroads.
>
> #### LOSSES IN MAIL HANDLING
>
> Senator Mansfield also paid his compliments to certain national magazines and newspapers, especially in view of the fact that many have conducted editorial campaigns against high and rigid farm supports. He quoted Postmaster General Arthur E. Summerfield's remarks in defending his request for higher second- and third-class postal rates:
>
> "The total I last saw for all subsidies paid for the price-support program (for storable commodities) for farmers since 1933 was something like $752 million whereas the loss in handling second-class mail (newspapers and magazines) for the same period has been $2,400,000,000."
>
> Summerfield gave the following totals of losses in handling certain publications for the last quarter of 1952: Life, $2,151,000; Saturday Evening Post, $1,631,000; Ladies' Home Journal, $408,000; Collier's, $1,237,000; Reader's Digest, $917,000; Chicago Tribune, $447,000; the New York Times, $425,000; Detroit Free Press, $58,000; St. Louis Post-Dispatch, $113,000; Los Angeles Times, $45,000.
>
> Obviously, the farmers are weary of charges that they are "Uncle Sam's mendicants."

Juvenile Delinquency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD S. MILLER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 20, 1954

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, not only as a father, but as a citizen, I am greatly concerned about the increasing juvenile delinquency in this country. We are all concerned. Every man and woman in the Nation with any appreciation of the higher motivations of human beings must be greatly concerned. The question arises: What is the cause of this increase in delinquency among the youth of our land? Not until we have ascertained the cause can we intelligently even consider the remedy.

What is the cause of delinquency? If delinquency is on the increase in recent years, something has taken place in that time that has brought it about. Yes; I used the word "brought" deliberately, for I lay it down as a settled and undisputable fact that juvenile delinquency is the product of the situations and conditions that the adult human beings create and place around the youth of our land. They are just as upright, just as delinquent, as we their elders and their parents have made them. The very fact that Congress and the people are wishing to do something about the situation is evidence that we realize that the environment we throw about our young people influences their character. If it will influence them in the future, it has influenced them in the past. But it was we adults who made the environment that produced the present character of our young people. It was therefore our responsibility.

Now that we have found ourselves to be responsible, the next question is: What have we done or failed to do that has brought on this regrettable situation? What changes have taken place in the environment of our children and young people? Where and under what circumstances do we find the greatest increase in delinquency? I understand that it is in the larger cities. If that is true, what is there in the conditions found in the larger cities that contribute to delinquency? Can we agree that the conduct of young people will depend almost altogether upon their associations and the way they spend their time? If we can so agree, and I am sure that we can, we have now brought our problem to the point where it is only necessary to find for our young people wholesome surroundings and decent employment. Might we further agree that decent employment, by which I mean a job on some worthwhile enterprise, is of itself a wholesome surrounding. How very simple, as simple as reducing a problem in arithmetic to its lowest terms. But to find those jobs in town or city, that is something else. It is a simple matter on the farm. To solve their problem in towns and cities is something else. It is one of our serious problems.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the Record.

PRINTING DOCUMENTS AND REPORTS

Documents and reports of committees with the evidence and papers submitted therewith, or any part thereof ordered printed by Congress, may be reprinted by the Public Printer on order of any Member of Congress or Delegate, on prepayment of the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 162, p. 1940).

IN THE

Mr.
mous
Append
titled
which
of the
Shippe

Ther
was or
as follo

WHAT S
PORT
EXPOR

Mutu
solve th
military
such w
chairma
on Ban
convicti
panding
simulta
tions, w
gression
at home

Occasi
marks
Club in
committ
of the
with ev
credit
guaranti

Franci
national
ner, at
the boar
dais inc
the spec
surance,
consulta
which
continue
in that
some tw
specially

Senato
the fact
high liv
were ma
During
through
ternation
observed
obvious
oped co
sphere),
we can h
credit.

Senato
own ear
point th
tional b
direct li
time; an

Appendix

Long-Term Export Financing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. IRVING M. IVES

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 23, 1954

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an article entitled "Long-Term Export Financing," which appeared in the July 19, 1954, issue of the magazine Export Trade and Shipper.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

What Senator Capehart Thinks About Export Credit Insurance and Long-Term Export Financing

Mutually beneficial trade will do more to solve the problems of the world than will military strength or political action. In some such words Senator Homer E. Capehart, chairman of the powerful Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, summarized his conviction that policies looking toward expanding commerce between nations are vital simultaneously to our international relations, world defense against Communist aggression, and to our own business prosperity at home.

Occasion for the Senator's heartening remarks was a meeting at the Metropolitan Club in New York, last Monday, of a special committee of the international trade section of the New York Board of Trade, charged with evolving a practicable plan of export credit insurance and exchange transfer guaranties.

Francis X. Scafuro, chairman of the international trade section, presided at the dinner, at which Fred J. Stock, president of the board, also spoke briefly. Others on the dais included Stanley E. Hollis, chairman of the special committee on export credit insurance, and Derek Brooks, of Washington, consultant to the committee. The meeting, which had started in midafternoon, and continued to about 10 p. m., was also notable in that prominent world trade figures from some twenty-odd cities in 17 States came specially to participate in the discussions.

CREDIT AND PROSPERITY

Senator Capehart laid great emphasis on the fact that the prospering economy and high living standards of the United States were made possible only by long-term credit. During his extended investigatory trip through Latin America, in his study of international trade financing, he said he had observed that lack of capital is the most obvious need of the so-called underdeveloped countries (not limited to this hemisphere), and this lack is something which we can help to overcome by the extension of credit.

Senator Capehart, recalling some of his own early business experiences, stressed the point that in domestic as well as international business, lack of credit facilities is a direct limitation of potential business volume; and that to expand trade volume requires the extension of credit. Such credit extension, furthermore, is good business if extended for constructive purposes which create more jobs and build up purchasing power.

THE CAPEHART BILL

This is the general philosophy behind Senator Capehart's bill, S. 3589, which has already been voted by the Senate, to restore the status of Export-Import Bank as an independent agency and to expand its operations; for it is recognized that the commercial banks cannot undertake long-term export financing involving the political risks of currency convertibility, whereas it is becoming increasingly believed that such risks can and must be assumed by some governmental agency, in order that United States exporters may find means of financing long-term credit terms which are competitive with the terms being offered by foreign exporters, who are, in effect, subsidized with credit insurance.

POLITICAL RISK INSURANCE

Senator Capehart was completely in sympathy with the views of the Board of Trade's committee, on the need either for private or governmental export credit insurance, with the political risks to be assumed (for a premium) by a governmental agency, but he disclaimed expert technical knowledge on the subject.

He expressed confidence that his present Eximbank bill will pass during the present session of Congress, and said that the President is also in favor of it, so that it should shortly become law. Then if the management of Eximbank does not find a way to satisfy the legitimate needs of the export community, as regards the long term financing of capital goods export sales, he said he has plans for a study during the next session, specifically on insuring against exchange convertibility and other political risks.

The Senator made it clear, throughout his informal talk, that his views on export financing, while favorable to American business, are equally based on the consideration of high policy problems. A businessman, he said, cannot sell his goods by talking only about his competitors' products—nor can we in this country sell the American system of free enterprise, by talking about nothing but communism.

A secure world, free of the Communist threat, is a world in which people have jobs, Senator Capehart said. Let us help create jobs in Latin American and other economically backward countries, by selling them tools and machinery on long-term financing. As their production rises, so will their purchasing power, and they will become bigger and better customers for our American producers.

EXPORT CREDITOR INSURANCE

In the board of trade committee discussions it was made very clear that the distinction is recognized as between commercial risks and political risks. The type of risk against which insurance by a governmental agency is being discussed is limited to the political side, such as convertibility guaranties, and insurance against expropriation, or losses arising from other actions by the regulatory or other agencies of governments, perhaps including certain risks of revolution, war or riot.

In contrast, it seems to be generally assumed that if the commercial risk is to be insured, i. e., the risk that the customer may default, such insurance should be undertaken by private enterprise. The basic trend of thinking seems to be that private insurance interests should handle the details of both types of insurance, carrying the commercial risk up to a maximum of perhaps 75 or 80 percent of the values involved, but reinsuring the political risk with some Government agency yet to be determined.

Unemployment Compensation Program

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 8, 1954

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 9709) to extend and improve the unemployment compensation program.

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Chairman, I am wholeheartedly in support of the Forand proposals which should be included in the pending bill. The contention advanced by sponsors of this inadequate bill that to write into it a set of minimum standards as to amount of weekly payments to the unemployed and the duration of those payments would be an invasion of the rights of the States has little or no merit. The Social Security Act as originally passed and as now in force contains a clear recognition of the obligation of the Federal Government to insure compliance by State laws and by the State administrative agencies with certain minimum standards. Although the law does not now deal specifically with amounts and duration of payments, the evidence is clear that present Federal standards must be extended into that field in order to let the unemployment insurance program do the job it was intended to do. The best evidence of the need for such standards is found in the table inserted in the Record by the distinguished chairman of the Ways and Means Committee showing how widely the benefits provided vary among the States. Although the laws of my own State, California, are fairly liberal in comparison with the treatment given the unemployed in the more backward States, I cannot sit back and permit this bill to go through without protesting denial of equal rights to the needy jobless in other States—and as we all know, there are far too many of them now.

Since the outset of the Federal Unemployment Insurance Tax Act, it has always been assumed that the purpose was not merely to provide a depository for State funds, as well as money for costs of administration of the State programs, but also to establish certain minimum standards to insure that the employers in the various States would not be able through control of their State legislatures to set up phony unemployment insurance laws—laws designed to give them the full allowable tax credit offset of 2.7 percent with respect to any State taxes that might be imposed under such type of program over and above the 3 percent Federal tax, while providing no real benefits to the unemployed.

At the time of the enactment of the Federal program, and the subsequent enactment of the various State programs, it was obvious that these various programs were founded upon the concept that they were part of a national program, were being created as part of a national program and would continue in existence only so long as the national program itself continued. In fact, many of the States in enacting them specifically provided to this effect, including my own State of California.

It is clear accordingly that at all times since the commencement of this program the underlying concept has been that unemployment is national in scope and transcends State lines and can be effectively reached through a so-called insurance program only if there is an overall Federal program with certain fundamental Federal standards.

Any argument at the present time that moves to improve the Federal standards are invasions of States rights are belated to say the least. That argument was disposed of when the original act was enacted into law and the propriety of that contention was resoundingly rejected at that time. The question accordingly is not the problem of States rights but rather whether the existing standards are adequate to accomplish the objectives of the program and to insure minimum conditions in the various States, consonant with a sound program.

In that regard, and as the committee chairman's own table shows, mere reference to the conditions prevailing in the various States as to the amount and duration of benefits will itself suffice to constitute the most persuasive argument. The benefits are as varied as the number of States, with some States paying as low as $3 and others paying maximums only of $20. It is evident that if such conditions continue unabated the program will soon destroy itself. Merely to bring a few additional employees under coverage as this bill does is not enough. The benefits to our jobless must also be geared to present-day standards rather than those which prevailed in 1935. The States have proven themselves unwilling to shoulder that responsibility. It is up to the Congress to insist that this be done. Past experience proves that employer-controlled State legislatures will not listen to a meek recommendation, either on the part of the Congress or the President. Such lipservice to great liberal principles sounds good in newspaper headlines or in campaign oratory, but as has been proved on issue after issue in this session, unless the administration and its congressional leadership give positive support to definite action these promised dynamic programs remain promises without performance. By supporting the Forand amendments to set a floor on weekly unemployment compensation payments and to require a reasonable minimum period of 39 weeks during which such payments shall continue, this House now has the opportunity to force action on at least one of the glib promises we have heard.

Mr. Chairman, I do not base my position on this problem on hearsay or theory. I take this stand because through my 8 years of experience in the California State Senate, during all of which I served on the Social Welfare Committee which handles this type of legislation, I know what influences are brought to bear on the State legislatures when action on unemployment insurance laws is up for consideration and I know how hard it is for the laboring man who is most affected to be heard. I, therefore, support and ask for the adoption of the amendments proposed by the distinguished gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. Forand].

Eric Sevareid's Report on Life Behind the Iron Curtain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 23, 1954

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an article on Eric Sevareid's Report on Life Behind the Iron Curtain, written by Harry MacArthur, and published in the Washington Star of June 15.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Eric Sevareid's Report on Life Behind the Iron Curtain

(By Harry MacArthur)

Eric Sevareid must be quite a trial to the rightwing bleeding hearts. It is the warped code of these latter that "I hate communism, you disagree with me, therefore you love communism." In their lexicon, Mr. Sevareid, the humanist, is a leftwing bleeding heart, a pinko, a fellow traveler, and probably a number of other things.

It is true that Mr. Sevareid does not do battle by standing and shouting that there are 127, or 29, or maybe 243, or heaven-knows-how-many subversives working in the PX at Fort Sludge. He does, however, take a good, healthy belt at communism or any other form of totalitarian, authoritarian, antihuman government whenever the opportunity presents itself. It must confuse the extremists of the far right.

Mr. Sevareid was confronted by another of these opportunities the other day and quickly grasped it on his newest television program, the American Week (WTOP–TV, Sunday, 6 p. m.). What Mr. Sevareid had was a series of motion-picture views of life behind the Iron Curtain in Germany. They constituted as effective an anti-Communist document as you have seen in some time.

That motion pictures were made by a German advertising man named Erhardt Fitze, who also knows an opportunity when he sees one. Put to work by the Russians on a propaganda film, he instantly saw the chance he had to get a picture of reality as well as propaganda. He smuggled his film across the border into West Berlin bit by bit until it finally added up to an impressive document.

These views of life behind the Iron Curtain probably did not surprise many viewers. This was concrete evidence, though. This was one case Mr. Sevareid noted in which the adage about the picture being worth a thousand words did hold.

It is a cold, gray, poverty-stricken paradise that the Russians have created in the East Zone of Germany. Herr Fitze has proved himself an able reporter with a camera, as he has captured, principally in the small city of Wittenberge, the dull drabness and depression of life under the Russian heel.

He captures instantly the spine-chilling essence of life in a police state, with brief views of school children being stopped by uniformed men, for examination of their papers. He goes on to show the training of children for the regimentation of the police state—the indoctrination, with guns and marching, marching and guns, of blind fealty to the Communist leaders.

"Whenever Russian imperialism enters," Mr. Sevareid commented Sunday "man's worldly goods depart. * * * Whatever Russian imperialism touches turns to gray." Herr Fitze's camera noted the departures and captured the oppressive gray mood.

It was an encompassing kaleidoscope: A railroad without rails, which had been shipped back to Russia. * * * Families gathering brush in the woods to take the place of the coal they used to have. * * * Pedestrians shuffling the streets without a single smile in all the beaten glumness. * * * Empty stores all in a row where private enterprise had succumbed to the onslaught of Communist economy. * * * A display of shoes, some even made of leather instead of paper composition, which cost a week's wages, maybe two. * * * Streets without a traffic problem because nobody can afford an automobile. * * * Fallow farms and fod shortages, the direct result of collectivizing the farms.

Mr. Sevareid had a brief look at East Berlin, too, through the eye of the Fitze camera. This is the showplace of the Russians, with new buildings, automobiles on the street, goods in the stores. The camera reporter, however, pierced deeper than the telephoto lenses can pierce from the safe side of the Brandenburg Gate, and showed the facade thin.

The gray numbness, the poverty, the spiritual depression, which accompany Communist oppression, are just beneath the surface, even in the show window.

Mr. Sevaried, a man who likes his irony, did not, incidentally, note a savage one implicit in these grim views of life under Kremlin domination. He let the pictures and his viewers' memories add up to the realization that the Germans brought this misery on of their own free will.

It was hardly more than a couple of decades ago that funny little man with a funny mustache was shouting "Traitors!" at all who opposed him there. Few Germans wanted to be called traitors or labeled pro-Communist because they were anti-Hitler. Adolf led them right into the Russian's nationwide concentration camp. There seemed to be some sort of an object lesson here about the debatable value of demogogues in the battle against the Communists.

It is to be hoped, by the way, that CBS finds time to repeat the Fitze films with more ample advance warning. It owes the viewers this much, at least, if it insists on scheduling Mr. Sevareid opposite Meet the Press.

Increase in Compensation and Pension to Veterans and Their Dependents

SPEECH

OF

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 21, 1954

The House then acting under suspension of the rules had under consideration H. R. 9020 to provide increases in the monthly rates of compensation and pension payable to certain veterans and their dependents.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply disappointed that this bill, as amended, is being presented now to this body for a vote rather than H. R. 9020 as it was first reported by the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

We are prevented from acting on the original bill by the Rules Committee under the leadership instruction, which refused to report it for action by the House. I was one of those who gladly signed a discharge petition to bring this bill to the floor for a vote.

I felt then, and I feel now, that the Veterans' Affairs Committee recommendation providing a reasonable cost-of-living rate increase to all our disabled veterans, both service and nonservice connected, for their widows, and children, and dependent parents was merely the recognition of justice.

Unfortunately these increased rates, recommended by committee members of their own party, were not acceptable to the leadership here and they have forced out this compromise amendment which sharply and inequitably reduces the compensation increases on the plea of necessary economy. They did this despite the implied pledge of President Eisenhower as a candidate in 1952 when he said, and I quote:

> No program of economy should overlook the legitimate rights and needs of disabled veterans.

Under the compromise we are offered, no increase is being granted for 975,000 veterans' widows and children now receiving pensions, although the Committee on Veterans' Affairs made every effort to include a 5 percent increase for non-service-connected veterans and veterans' dependents now receiving pensions.

However, the high point of injustice in this amended bill is the cold denial of any increase at all to a small group of widows of the veterans of the Spanish American War. These wonderful women of advanced age have been and are trying to eke out a restricted existence on a pittance of $51 a month. The leadership's determination not to recognize and honor these deserving and inspiring women marks a dark day, indeed, on their calendar.

By the standards on which this Congress generously appropriates money for assistance to questionable allies and subsidization of big business, the amount of money that this increased pittance would have meant is infinitesimal.

We may well question the economy cries of those who repudiate these heroic souls while at the same time they ask approval for appointment of another block of $17,500 a year Assistant Defense Secretaries to add to the 26 or more already on the payroll.

I am for economy, the reasonable and right kind of Christian economy, and I have consistently so voted, but I am sad, indeed, and cannot remain silent when priority is given to these $17,500 secretaries over these good women who are suffering such bleak and bare existence.

Nevertheless, this compromise measure, although leaving out so many needy veterans, and widows and dependents, grants some small relief, and since we shall have no other choice, I shall vote for it.

However, I shall not relax my efforts, and I urge you all to rally to the veterans' deserving cause to bring to the floor, before adjournment, another bill which will accomplish all the just and rightful objectives of H. R. 9020, as originally reported.

Politics in History: Training Diplomats

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. SMITH

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 22, 1954

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Mr. Carroll Kilpatrick, from the Washington Post and Times Herald:

POLITICS IN HISTORY: TRAINING DIPLOMATS

(By Carroll Kilpatrick)

A brilliant article by Hanson W. Baldwin in the July Atlantic argues that the West sacrified a large part of its victory in World War II because it concentrated nearly all its attention on military rather than political objectives. Russia made no such mistake. This is not a new argument, but Mr. Baldwin has approached it with honesty and a deep understanding of the importance of politics to history. Although he is a military expert, he would be the first to insist that wars must be directed by civilians with political objectives foremost in mind. He contends that America's great mistake was that "we fought the war to win, period, and did not sufficiently consider the kind of peace we wanted."

Mr. Baldwin's provocative arguments emphasize the compelling need for a stronger diplomatic arm of the Government. During the war, Americans marveled that a pacific nation like ours could produce the general officers who led the country to victory. American military leaders, including the previously unknown lieutenant colonel from Abilene, surprised the world by the genius of their leadership. We were not without able military leaders even though during the twenties and thirties we had tragically neglected the Armed Forces. Why? The answer, it is believed, lies in the command schools and war colleges. The officers had few divisions to command between the wars. But they had time to take long courses in military schools. They learned the history and theory of war, and when war came they were equipped brilliantly to put their theory into use.

President Roosevelt, as everyone knew at the time, virtually ignored the State Department in his conduct of the war. He was too busy directing the enormously complicated military operation to pay much attention to his Secretary of State or other civilian advisers. There was planning during the war for a world peace organization and was useful and necessary. There was not much planning with respect to overall peace objectives and the role the United States would play in various parts of the world. Certainly we did not think enough about the great shifts of power that would take place after the defeat of Italy, Germany, and Japan. Above all, there was little appreciation of the role which a greatly strengthened and expanded Soviet Russia would play in the vacuum areas created by the destruction of the Axis Powers.

America had emerged from her isolationism ill-equipped to be a leading power. It had many competent leaders, but it was without the practical experience of diplomacy, the knowledge that comes with long years of study and action in the international political arena. A primary Rooseveltian policy that had a profound effect on the war and postwar years was the demand for unconditional surrender. Yet, as Mr. Baldwin points out, no study of the meaning of this formula was considered by the Army or State Department prior to its promulgation by the President. Mr. Churchill was astonished when he heard it announced, but it was too late then for consideration and argument. Again, there was little consideration in advance as to the political meaning of atomic power or of the political effect of the atomic bombs dropped on Japan. The Government might to have better staff work and place greater reliance on staff work.

The Winston committee report on the Foreign Service argued strongly for a Foreign Service institute patterned on the Army War College, the Naval War College, and the National War College. It is essential that we develop such an institution with the highest professional standards. Foreign Service officers, like most other people in this hectic capital, have little time to study and to examine the premises on which they work. It is absurd to think that education is completed with the award of a college degree.

A sabbatical leave would be a fine and useful thing for almost any group of professional men. It is a necessity for military leaders, as all military services have recognized in the establishment of military colleges and command schools. It also is necessary, in the Foreign Service, which of late has tragically neglected the training of its officers. The American people in general, and Foreign Service in particular need the discipline that comes with scholarly reexamination of major problems. A basic understanding of the facts of history, the principles of government, and of the meaning of cultural traits are essential tools of a nation that attempts to be a world leader.

How Men Can Be Made Strong

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 21, 1954

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting a brief article by Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, which appeared in This Week magazine of last Sunday,

July 18. The admonition by Mr. Hoover can be well taken to the heart of America. He has called attention to one of the great eternal verities of life.

WHAT MAKES MEN STRONG?

(By J. Edgar Hoover)

"Trust in the Lord with all thine heart, and lean not unto thine own understanding." (Proverbs 3: 5.)

Through many years of active life, and the observation of many kinds of people, I have found that the strongest, wisest, most competent, and reliable man is also the first to admit his inadequacy.

Contradictory though it may sound, he is strong because he is humble—and remembers always that man is the creation of God. No rule of life is more basic.

When man "leans on his own understanding" when he lives by his own strength, when he boasts of probing the mysteries of the atom, the depths of the sea, or the secrets of outer space—he forgets God and claims he is his own master. The result is untold suffering.

Even though one's position is maintained, even though material wealth increases, success quickly turns to failure when God has been forgotten. There is no peace of mind, no personal satisfaction, no personal experience of inward joy.

To "trust in the Lord with all thine heart" is a mark of strength. And it is the only path to happiness, success, and true fulfillment.

Syngman Rhee's Predictions Have Been Right Too Often

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 23, 1954

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Daily News of July 23, 1954:

SYNGMAN RHEE'S PREDICTIONS HAVE BEEN RIGHT TOO OFTEN

By Andrew Tully

Don't blame President Syngman Rhee of Korea if he seems a trifle smug when he arrives here Monday for a state visit. That would come from having been right so often—ever since 1905, in fact.

Diplomats may feel particularly self-conscious about meeting him just now, in view of the sell-out at Geneva to the communists. The 79-year-old gamecock always maintained this would happen, and last May 13 he declared bluntly there was no point in continuing the conference.

CALLED THE TURN

He said at that time, "To me, it is beyond reason that any intelligent free man can look at the Geneva record of the communists and still maintain that there is any point in such negotiations."

Mr. Rhee was right once before about a Geneva powwow—the one in 1933 at which the defunct League of Nations was wringing its hands about Japan's seizure of Manchuria. Jump in with both feet and throw out the Japs, advised Mr. Rhee, or there'll be worse trouble later.

But Mr. Rhee first started warning against Japan in the early 1900's, when he was concerned with Japanese influence in the Korean Royal Court. He climaxed this particular campaign with a visit to President Theodore Roosevelt in 1905, and he warned Theodore Roosevelt that unless the United States stepped in to help Korea, Japan would take over the country and go on to further imperialistic adventures in the Far East. But the United States sat on its hands, and Japan first maneuvered a protectorate over Korea, then annexed it outright in 1910.

PREDICTED PEARL HARBOR

Again, at the disarmament conference of 1921–22, Mr. Rhee argued hotly that the Western powers were being too trusting with Japan. He was ignored. Then, in early 1941, he published his second book, Japan Inside Out, in which he warned that Japan was building up its strength for an attack on the United States. A few months later—on December 7, 1941—came Pearl Harbor.

At the San Francisco Conference on the United Nations Charter, Mr. Rhee's voice was one of the few raised in warning about the menace of Russia in particular and world communism in general. He predicted that unless the independence of Korea was immediately recognized, Russia would move into the peninsula.

In October 1945, after Korea had been divided into United States and Russian Zones, the Soviets began the buildup of North Korean military power which erupted in the Communist invasion of South Korea in June, 1951.

FOUGHT ARMISTICE

Mr. Rhee opposed the Korean armistice last year on the ground it would weaken the resistance of other Asian nations to communism and lead to further Red advances. "It would prove to be the prelude to more war, not less," warned Mr. Rhee. "It will lead to more suffering and ruin and more Communist victories in the Far East." He can claim now that events in Indochina have borne him out.

Mr. Rhee now predicts that unless the free world throws the Reds out of North Korea by force, all Asia eventually will fall to communism. Western diplomats hope he won't get another chance to say "I told you so," but, looking over their shoulders at Mr. Rhee's record of successful prophesy, they get that nervous feeling.

The New Munich

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 21, 1954

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the so-called free world debacle in Indochina has been rightly termed "the new Munich." As part of my remarks, I am inserting at this point an article by Joseph and Stewart Alsop on this subject:

MATTER OF FACT

(By Joseph and Stewart Alsop)

THE NEW MUNICH

The settlement agreed on at Geneva has turned out, as expected, to be a new Munich in the Far East. The parallel is exact at almost every point.

With hardly repressed sighs of relief, the free nations have yielded a vital strategic position to a ruthless totalitarian aggressor.

The manner of yielding is such as to make the next step rather easily predictable. The first bite of Czechoslovakia that Hitler took at Munich was only the prelude to the last bite that he took at Prague. In the same fashion the conditions have now been created for another Communist bite in Indochina.

Finally, Munich was a historic point of no return, in the sense that the abandonment of Czechoslovakia decisively tilted the power balance in favor of Hitler and against the free nations. The sequel of Geneva will come more slowly, and it will be more complex and less dramatic in its development. But there can be little doubt that the abandonment of Indochina will also be remembered as the moment when the power balance tilted decisively against the free nations and in favor of the Kremlin.

No one familiar with the local situation in Indochina can be very hopeful about the future of Laos, Cambodia, and the bobtailed remnant of Vietnam that remains in French hands. Almost every factor will work in favor of Communist capture of these additional territories.

In the first place, the set of political opinion in all Asian countries is most strongly influenced by the general estimate of which way the bandwagon is traveling. The French have suffered a shattering defeat. Their own forces, their own administration, must be demoralized thereby. The Vietnamese, the Laotians, and the Cambodians can no longer regard the French as reliable protectors. That means a great increase of Communist strength.

Second, Communist infiltration is already well advanced in many of the areas that are supposesd to have been forbidden to communism. Until this year, for instance, southern Indochina was believed to be almost wholly pacified and cleaned of communism.

But when the crisis of Dien Bien Phu revealed the weakness of the French, guerrilla activity immediately broke out on an important scale, throughout the southern provinces. Even in Saigon the grenade nets, which had not been used for years, had to be brought out again. It can be imagined what is now likely to happen, after the Communist success at Geneva.

Third, the provisions in the Geneva agreement for regrouping of troops are almost wholly unenforcible, except against the French. The Vietminh troops are regulars, with all the training and equipment of regulars. But the great bulk of these Vietminh regulars are also trained to imitate the simple peasantry and to live as guerrillas. Who can suppose that they will peacefully march away, abandoning the territory they now hold?

Fourth, the French have crossed a kind of Rubicon by making this settlement. They have laid down their arms. No doubt the Communist high command will let the French get used to peace for a considerable period, doing nothing drastic to disturb the settlement for a good many months. But if and when the French find themselves with a new civil war on their hands in southern Vietnam, who can suppose they will have the stomach to take up their arms again?

For all these reasons, this Geneva settlement must certainly be regarded as a mere prelude to a Communist grab for the rest of Indochina, unless and until subsequent events give clear, hard proof to the contrary. Furthermore, this Indochinese settlement must also be expected to produce the most far-reaching results outside of Indochina.

The results in Europe may be good. French Prime Minister Mendes-France has shown himself to be a man of force and character, and the Indochinese settlement gives him a chance to set the French house in order at last. But against such possible good results in Europe must be set all the evil consequences which are sure to flow in Asia.

The President has recently been emphasizing Japan's essential importance to this country. Now the Japanese drift to neutralism can easily become uncontrollable. By the same token, the demonstration at Geneva of Communist strength and western weakness will increase the demoralization in Formosa; strengthen the Communists in Indonesia and Malaya; threaten the pro-western government in Thailand; and greatly increase the difficulties of the stoutly courageous but sorely beset government of Burma.

In short, what has now happened, by any sane test, is a huge political-strategic disaster. This disaster has upset the whole horrible precarious balance of power in Asia, most probably beyond repair by such an expedient as the plan for a South Asian Defense Community.

It is a disaster for which any incidental gains in Europe can hardly compensate. And it is a disaster from which the American Government cannot possibly disassociate itself. For the plain fact is that the United States, as leader of the West, failed to act when there was still time to act.

Increase Program of Public Works

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 23, 1954

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following very interesting and enlightening article by Mr. Boris Shishkin from the current issue of the American Federationist, the official monthly magazine of the American Federation of Labor.

The article follows:

PUBLIC WORKS AND FULL EMPLOYMENT

(By Boris Shishkin)

At this particular moment of our history no firm judgment can be made regarding the extent of the future commitment of our country's resources for defense against Communist aggression. No one can say whether the change in the international situation will bring about an expansion in public expenditures for defense or permit their further contraction.

Yet the question looming larger and larger in the public concern is: Can America maintain full prosperity in the future without major reliance on public defense expenditures?

Our system has achieved greater productive capacity and a higher standard of living than any other. High employment has been maintained for 14 years. Can we keep it that way?

We believe deeply that America not only can but must stay prosperous when emergency defense expenditures are no longer needed. The proof is in the record of the 5 years following World War II.

The recession of 1949 was shortlived. Most significant of all is the fact that the upturn which pulled us out of that recession came many months before the Red invasion of South Korea and our decision to embark upon its defense. It simply is not true that full employment in recent years has depended solely on Government defense outlays.

Policies are needed which would not only help stop the present recession but also help bring economic activity back to full employment and steady expansion.

Deliberate provision must be made to permit and encourage future economic growth. Stabilization is not enough. Stabilization at the present levels of substantial unemployment would be nothing more than a deception. It would actually mean a gradual sinking to depression levels.

A substantial reduction in the Government outlays for defense has already taken place. National security outlays in the first quarter of 1954 were $6½ billion below the second quarter of 1953. Because of the increase in other outlays, the decline in all Federal expenditures for goods and services during this period was $5½ billion. If world conditions permit further cuts in security expenditures, a gap will be left which will need to be filled.

Part of this gap can and should be filed by substantial increases in consumer and business expenditures. But even if we achieve a rise in such expenditures, and even if there is a further substantial rise in State and local expenditures, the Federal Government would have to step up its annual rate of expenditures by about $4 billion for the coming year in order to bridge the transition from an economy mobilized for defense to peacetime growth.

The backlog of need for public improvement, including highway construction, educational and health facilities and conservation and development of resources, is enormous. Additional current needs continue to arise as the economy grows. A large proportion of these needs cannot be met by the action of State and local governments alone. Nor can the economic growth of our resources be kept in balance if we as a nation fail to provide the aid necessary for the development of the areas without sufficient financial resources to meet the necessary costs.

In outlining the national need for public construction, the President in his message to Congress last January estimated the needed expenditures for such construction to be $10 billion in excess of the present level of expenditures for public works. This projection includes a number of types of urgently needed public projects. According to this estimate of the need, for example, we should spend on highway construction $3 billion more than the $5 billion we were spending in 1953. Instead of the $2.5 billion outlay for schools, we should be spending yearly $6.75 billion, or $4.25 billion more. Instead of $600 million being spent on hospitals, we should be spending $900 million, or $300 million more. On water facilities we should be spending $200 million more than the $500 million currently spent. On sewage disposal we should double the $600 million rate of 1953 expenditures.

These estimates of need are extremely low. They are by no means the results of a searching study of real requirements for the various types of public construction. The Council of Economic Advisers has only recently begun an attempt to achieve a more complete evaluation of the overall requirements for public works.

Federal aid to States and local governments has been provided at far less than the needed rate, and a large proportion of this aid has been for defense-related projects. In 1952 the total of Federal aid to States amounted to only $2.3 billion and to local governments only $160 million. In the same year State aid to local governments amounted to slightly more than $5 billion. In 1953, when Federal expenditures for public works reached a peak, largely due to the demands of defense, they totaled $5.2 billion.

There has been much talk of a shelf of public works, held in reserve and ready to be put under construction. Unfortunately, what we actually have is a shadow shelf of public projects. Too many of the projects on hand are either obsolete or unrelated to the shifts in the need experienced during recent years.

It will take bold action to bring about timely preparedness for a program of public works in balance with the need for improvements and in proportion to the requirements for economic growth. To this end it is essential that one central agency be established in the Federal Government to ready such a program, screen the proposed projects, subject them to competent engineering and technical review and to assure their feasibility.

Such an agency should assume the responsibility for coordinating and directing the activities of other agencies having special competence for particular phases of the program. Thus the extremely vital program of aid to urban redevelopment as projected by the Housing Act of 1949 could be carried on by the Housing and Home Finance Agency, while other forms of aid to public works would be administered through the Department of Interior, the Bureau of Public Roads and other appropriate agencies.

There are certain types of public works in which the need for increased facilities deserves prior consideration. Federal aid for school construction is a notable example of a program that should be carried forward whether the economic activity is expanding or contracting. Aid to hospital construction is another among several programs where the need is controlling.

There are other types of projects whose realization can and should be timed in such a way as to make the public-works program an effective balance wheel sustaining the steady pace of economic progress. It should be the responsibility of a central public-works agency to permit the proper timing for necessary and useful projects in this category.

Some argue that an increased program of public works at this time is uncalled for because construction activity at present is at a high level. This is a do-nothing argument which the evidence does not bear out.

Let us look at the situation a bit more closely. The largest single element in the Nation's construction volume is residential building. Yet residential construction in 1954, according to the best official estimates, is expected to provide not more than 1.1 million new nonfarm dwelling units. This performance would be no better than the average of the past 5 years. It means failure to respond to growth.

The plain truth is that such a level of residential construction activity in 1954 will not be high enough to accommodate even the current population growth and the current replacement need. It will leave unmet the huge deficits of housing accumulated in the past. At the end of the year we will be left with a housing supply not larger but smaller than before in relation to America's stature and need.

This failure of residential construction to expand should, of course, be overcome through the expansion of housing activity. But, after much study and tall talk, Congress has brought out a midget housing program for 1954–55. Housing aids provided in the new law will not produce the needed expansion. At best they will keep housing construction once again at the limited volume of the last 5 years.

The important point is that residential construction, although not depressed, is not expanding. It leaves an ample unused margin of the construction potential for the development of a large-scale public-works program. This includes a wide range of projects that are urgently needed to enable our communities to begin to meet their requirements of welfare and growth. By providing modern facilities without which the standard of life in the communities cannot increase, such public works will provide a tremendous stimulus to the expansion of private investment. They will, above all, feed directly the vital stream of buying power, bolstering the whole economy.

It is also argued that proper labor supply is lacking for a large public-works expansion. This conclusion is likewise unsupported by the available evidence.

In May 1954 there were 2,613,000 workers employed on contract construction. In August 1951, nearly 3 years earlier, employment on contract construction was 2,852,000. Construction employment is now below the levels previously maintained. It is far below the potential employment which the country's economic growth would make possible at the present time.

Construction employment is expansible. It should be remembered, for example, that in 1940 the defense-mobilization job was vastly greater than the resources we then had available to do it. Yet this job was done swiftly and well. Employment in contract construction alone nearly doubled between 1940 and 1942, when it rose from 1,294,000 to 2,170,000 annual average. This was accomplished at the time when the Armed Forces heavily drained construction labor supply. Without such a drain under peacetime conditions even a greater expansion would have been possible.

Sound development of public works takes time. Blueprints alone don't yield projects. Financing, land assembly, and site development all have to be completed before actual construction work can begin. It takes, on the average, close to a year and a half to bring a public-works project to the construction stage.

Peacetime preparedness is just as urgent a necessity as military preparedness for defense. It means readiness to do the job which needs to be done when it should be done and on the scale proportionate to the need.

In order to assure full and lasting prosperity, we should make no little plans. Right now is the best time to begin a program of public works, concrete as well as realistic, and designed to help America to grow in the years to come.

A Job for Lawyers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRAZIER REAMS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 23, 1954

Mr. REAMS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Toledo Blade's page of opinion of July 19, 1954:

A JOB FOR LAWYERS

One of the most inspiring things to occur in Toledo in some time was the meeting last week of some 30 local lawyers who got together to consider the current threat to the traditional American due process of law and to make plans for defending civil liberties. The immediate spur may have been a resolution adopted by the American Bar Association calling for punitive action against lawyers who plead the fifth amendment.

There has been a lot of commotion in recent years about what is happening to our way of life under the menace of commnuism. It is granted that we must protect ourselves against those who would subvert our democratic ways. But in the process of doing that, must we whittle away at the rights and privileges, hard-won through the centuries, which have made us—along with other Anglo-Saxons—the freest people on earth?

This is, it seems to us, primarily a question for lawyers. Laymen often take a dim view of their profession, thinking of them as ambulance chasers who will do anything for a fee or as corporation lawyers bent on exploiting lesser folk for the benefit of their wealthy employers. Perhaps this attitude, which can be traced back through literature to ancient times, has been caused largely by the fact that ordinary people resent having the transactions of their daily lives regulated by legal hocus-pocus which they cannot understand.

But if under our democratic system we have come reasonably close to the ideal of equal justice under law, mustn't the credit go largely to our lawyers? No other profession is so tightly bound by precedent. From one case to another, they have evolved their precepts and practices and rules of evidence. They have learned through the cumulative experience of the ages that truth must be sought through time-tested procedures and that justice must be meted out through fixed principles.

If, then, in time of crisis the rest of us get panicky and are ready to toss those procedures and those principles out the window, who is to stop us? Who is to say that we can't save our free way of life by discarding the legal processes which made it possible? Who is to warn us that we run the risk of losing all our liberties if in fear or anger we jettison the safeguards established to protect them?

Surely our lawyers, who can split hairs between what is material, relevant, and competent and what is not in a way that bewilders the rest of us, are our best judges in such matters. And that is why it was good to see Toledo lawyers get together the other day to look into the situation, to find that corporation lawyers from our biggest firms are no less concerned than devotees of civil liberties about what is happening.

When the American Bar Association itself would impose sanctions on those who invoke a constitutional provision, it is high time that lawyers went to work to protect and defend the Constitution.

Flexibles—Benson's Plan for Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS G. ABERNETHY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 23, 1954

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, a few days following the debate on the Agriculture Act of 1954 I received a letter from Mr. Don Paarlberg, assistant to the Secretary of Agriculture. In his letter Mr. Paarlberg conveyed the opinion of the Secretary to the effect that during the course of the debate I had made an inaccurate statement. He continued that the Secretary had asked him to make a reply.

While there are great differences between the Secretary and me on farm policy and farm legislation, particularly on flexible supports, I do have a high regard for him as a man. He is a high-principled, Christian gentleman, undoubtedly sincere, and is entitled to and has the respect of the general public. Insofar as I know, he and I are on good terms. This being the case, it seemed rather strange that the Secretary himself did not make the reply or complaint instead of delegating it to a subordinate. In any event, the Secretary's objection to a part of my speech has been noted and carefully considered. With all deference to both the Secretary and his assistant, Mr. Paarlberg, I respectfully submit that my statement about which the Secretary complains was not inaccurate, and I have so replied in a letter to Mr. Paarlberg.

Mr. Speaker, as a part of my remarks, I include a copy of the letter I received from Mr. Paarlberg and a copy of my reply, as well as excerpts from a campaign speech made by Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower at Brookings, S. Dak., on October 4, 1952. They follow:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, July 6, 1954.

Hon. THOMAS G. ABERNETHY,
House of Representatives.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ABERNETHY: In the July 1 debate on H. R. 9680 you made a statement which appears on pages 8982 and 6983 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date. You contended that "The first time we ever heard of either candidate Eisenhower or President Eisenhower being for flexible price supports was when he dragged this fellow Benson from out of the air, whom no one had heardly heard of, and made him Secretary of Agriculture. Then and only then he came up with this idea of flexing and fleecing the American farmer. It is his plan. Benson's plan. He has made Ike repudiate his promises. All of you on my left know it and you are going to have to swallow it, bitter though it is."

Secretary Benson feels that this is an inaccurate statement. He has asked me to reply.

On June 29, Senator AIKEN made a speech in the Senate, which apepars on pages 8762–64 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date. Senator AIKEN quoted Candidate Eisenhower regarding price policy after 1954. He quoted the Democratic Committee for Agricultural Progress regarding their interpretation of Mr. Eisenhower's position, and also quoted the Farmers Union on the same subject.

The gist of Senator AIKEN's statement is that Mr. Eisenhower's position regarding price policy after 1954 was known prior to his election.

Certainly the recommendations made by the President on January 11 should not be called Benson's plan. The study which preceded that recommendation was a broad one, embracing opionions of legislative leaders, farmers, agricultural scientists, and research institutions. While there was diversity of opinion, it is significant that this study reached much of the same conclusions as an earlier study, with which you are familiar. The major parts of that earlier study were passed by Congress as the Agricultural Acts of 1948 and 1949.

Senator AIKEN's speech deserves careful reading.

Sincerely yours,
DON PAARLBERG,
Assistant to the Secretary.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., July 22, 1954.

Mr. DON PAARLBERG,
Assistant to the Secretary,
United States Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PAARLBERG: This is to acknowledge receipt of your letter in which you state, in behalf of the Secretary, that I was inaccurate during the debate on price-support legislation and that he had asked you to convey his complaint.

First let me say, it would have been quite appropriate if the complaint had come direct from the Secretary instead of from his subordinate. But, since it did not, I presume I am doing the proper thing in making my reply to him through the same channel.

A further examination of the record of the presidential campaign of 1952 makes it even more clear that General Eisenhower never mentioned any of the phrases which describe the price-support program the administration is trying to sell to farmers—sliding scale, flexible, or variable supports. If you have evidence that the general ever used any of these words and phrases, or synonyms, don't you think you owe it to Congress to ask Secretary Benson to come forward with the proof? Meanwhile, we feel the members of the House Committee on Agriculture owe it to farmers to point out the 180° reversal of direction by the administration since winning the 1952 election.

Reference has been made to the debate in the Senate which you cited, and we are pleased to note that someone was reading the fine print of the Republican campaign promises, the most golden promises in the recent history, at least, of political appeals to farmers. Assuming that the Committee for Agricultural Progress bulletin is quoted correctly in the Senate debate, but without knowing any connection it has with the Democratic Party, if any, we commend the committee's editors for the ability to read fine print and understand it.

At least this is more than the Republican candidates for Congress could do since they were campaigning for reelection as advocates of rigid price supports and against flexibles, contending their presidential candidate stood with them and cited his campaign statements at Kasson, Brookings and elsewhere as proof.

However, your endorsement of the interpretation made by the Committee for Agricultural Progress is most astounding, in view of the fact that the general bitterly attacked the same Committee for Agricultural Progress during the campaign for misrepresenting his position. At Chicago, Ill., on October 31, your candidate stated publicly:

"I was outraged to hear recently that the Committee for Agricultural Progress, which is allied with the Democratic National Committee, published an illustrated tabloid filled with deliberate falsehoods. They placed it in every rural mailbox in selected States. This folder was cleverly designed to frighten farmers into believing that our new administration would pull the rug out from under them. It tried to frighten farmers by misrepresenting the facts when it said that our crusade is opposed to price supports, rural electrification, soil conservation and other farm programs."

You may also be interested to know that Senator Richard Nixon took this same line while campaigning through Iowa. According to a New York Times report of October 23, 1952, the candidate for Vice President charged that the Committee for Agricultural Progress sent to every mailbox in farm States an illustrated tabloid publication "for the purpose" of frightening "farmers into believing that a Republican administration would permit farm prices to decline." Then the Times quotes Mr. Nixon as saying that this scheme was "malicious."

Actually, your favorable reference to this committee's work only corroborates our feeling that neither Secretary Benson nor those around him have studied Candidate Eisenhower's farm speeches. And, by the way, is it not rather inconsistent for the Secretary to point out and agree with the Senator's contention that Candidate Eisenhower was a supporter of flexibles from the days of the campaign speech at Kasson and to also, in his same letter to me via you as his proxy, contend that the President had taken no position on support prices until after the broad study "embracing opinions of legislative leaders, farmers, agricultural scientists and research institutions"?

The famous Eisenhower speech at Kasson, Minn., opening the farm campaign, did not promise flatly the continuation of 90 percent supports after 1954, but (1) it used every conceivable oratorical device to give that false impression, (2) it made no mention of sliding scale or flexible supports thereafter, and (3) the candidate was accompanied on the plane trip to that historic occasion by the Honorable Clifford Hope, Chairman of our House Commitee on Agriculture and long-time advocate of price supports which really support prices.

For these various reasons, the press and radio of the country were completely misled, a condition in which they remained throughout the campaign. The following collection of headlines which were used by leading newspapers on page one in reporting General Eisenhower's Kasson speech makes this obvious:

"Ike Promises To Work for 100 Percent Farm Parity." (Milwaukee Journal, Sept. 6, 1952.)

"Ike's Goal 100 Percent Farm Parity—Eisenhower Guarantees High Prices." (The Telegraph-Herald, Dubuque, Iowa, Sept. 7.)

"Eisenhower Calls for 100 Percent of Parity." (The Minneapolis Star, Sept. 6.)

"Ike Favors More Farm Props and 100 Percent Parity." (The Indianapolis News, Sept. 6.)

"Eisenhower Promises Farmers He's Behind Full Parity for Them." (The Lincoln Evening Journal, Sept. 6.)

"Ike Calls for Full Parity on Farm Products." (Madison Capital Times, Sept. 6.)

"Ike Would Up Farm Incomes." (Milwaukee Sentinel, Sept. 7.)

"Eisenhower Pledges Full Parity Try." (Wisconsin State Journal, Madison, Sept. 7.)

"Ike Offers Plan for Farm Price Boost." (Des Moines Register, Sept. 6.)

"Ike, Adlai Bid for Farm Vote—Both Promise to Continue 90 Percent Support." (Des Moines Register, Sept. 7.)

"Eisenhower Bids for Farm Votes—Tells His Plan for Full Parity." (Illinois State Register, Springfield, Sept. 7.)

"General Packs 100 Percent Parity Price." (Bismarck, N. Dak.) Tribune, Sept. 6.)

"Ike Down Line on Parity Laws." (Wichita Eagle, Sept. 7.)

"General pledges price aid." (St. Paul Dispatch, Sept. 7.)

"Both Ike and Adlai endorse 90 percent farm supports." (Minneapolis Tribune, Sept. 7.)

After Kasson, there were daily opportunities, of course, to correct the widely held false impression before farmers relied on it and voted accordingly. And most certainly General Eisenhower could have declared himself at any time in favor of flexible price supports for after 1954, if he had believed in them and wanted to do so. But we can find no record of his having mentioned the word "flexible" or any of its synonyms during the entire campaign.

As I stated on the floor of the House, President Eisenhower's use of those terms started after Ezra Benson became Secretary of Agriculture. Mr. Benson can't escape responsibility for the flexible program by simply adding that the "recommendation was a broad one, embracing opinions of legislative leaders, farmers, agricultural scientists, and research institutions * * *." All Secretaries are surrounded by experts, of whom you yourself are one. It is conceded that he counsels with and seeks advice of experts, inside and outside of government. But when thereafter he enunciates a policy it is his policy, not that of the experts, and he ought not endeavor to escape it by crediting it to his expert advisers.

But to get back to the sequence of the campaign, Candidate Eisenhower chose an appearance at Brookings, S. Dak., October 4, to summarize his farm views—1 month after the more famous Kasson speech. This time, there was no small print as you will see from this paragraph dealing with price supports:

"Quite naturally, in a great region such as this there is more of a special interest in agriculture than there is in some of our other economic forms of life. I have in a number of texts during this campaign tried to outline the specific position of the Republican Party and my own personal convictions about agriculture. At Kasson in Minnesota some weeks back, later in Omaha, and in a number of so-called back platform speeches I have tried to make my position clear. The Republican Party is pledged to the sustaining of the 90 percent parity price support and it is pledged even more than that to helping the farmer obtain his full parity, 100 percent parity, with the guaranty in the price supports of 90."

In the light of this solid endorsement of price supports at 90 percent of parity, you will see why Senator Case, of South Dakota, who is a member of your political party, interrupted Senator Aiken during the debate to which you have referred and pointed out that the Brookings speech, in his home State, was quite different from the Kasson speech. But Senator Aiken did not quote from the Brookings speech.

Many of us did not expect General Eisenhower to be familiar with the agricultural laws at the time he was campaigning. He did not pretend to be an expert; in fact, he confessed ignorance on several occasions.

For example, the Washington Post of June 6, 1952, quoted him as telling a press conference at Abilene, Kans., the previous day:

"We must make certain that it (agriculture) never suffers disaster due to natural causes and things which they cannot foresee. When you talk to me of 75 percent, 85 percent, 95 percent, gentlemen, I don't know."

And the same newspaper, dated June 17, 1952, quoted the general as telling a meeting of the American Agricultural Editors Association that "he was just about as much 'at sea' in a farm group as they might be in trying to plan 'an attack across the channel.'" He went on to say, according to the news account: "My brother, Dr. Milton Eisenhower, inherited all the brains in the Eisenhower family."

The plain fact is that the Republican candidate sought to outbid the Democrats by talking about 90 percent of parity, and even 100 percent of parity. The fine print in the contract is being read by millions of farmers now, but it left the intended impression and even furnished farm State Republican candidates with the text for their own campaigns. Many of them tried to keep faith by voting to continue the 90 percent of parity supports which they thought their presidential candidate stood for, and it won't help their bitter feelings at all to be told, as you and Senator Aiken are trying to tell them, that the fine print was there all the time or that the Brookings speech was extemporaneous.

To answer this latter point specifically, I am enclosing the exact text of the Brookings speech as issued to the press from the Eisenhower campaign train. The characterization of that document as extemporaneous hits a low point in political cynicism and apology.

Sincerely yours,

Thos. G. Abernethy,
Member of Congress.

Extracts From Speech by Dwight D. Eisenhower at Brookings, S. Dak., October 4, 1952

Senator Mundt and my friends of South Dakota: I am here in a capacity that it never crossed my mind I would be in when my friends used to ask me to come out here to shoot pheasants. I assure you this is a tougher job than tramping up and down the corn rows. Nevertheless, it is an inspiring job. The finest thing about campaigning is the opportunity it brings to a candidate to meet Americans face to face, to discuss with them problems of the day and to get their reactions. I do get reactions from audiences such as this. Sometimes I get them in the form of letters or telegrams to my train. Sometimes I get them in what they shout at me as I go along the road, or from the audience, and sometimes that language is the kind that I don't dare later to use over the radio. Nevertheless, I learn from them, I assure you, far more than I can tell them. I am trying to bring to them what is in my heart and mind as I carry on my duty and responsibility as Republican standard bearer.

* * * * *

I am especially glad to come to the home of this agricultural college of South Dakota. You know, I am a college president on leave, myself. It is rather up to you people to decide how long my leave is going to be.

* * * * *

Quite naturally, in a great region such as this there is more of a special interest in agriculture than there is in some of our other economic forms of life. I have in a number of texts during this campaign tried to outline the specific position of the Republican Party and my own personal convictions about agriculture. At Kasson in Minnesota some weeks back, later in Omaha, and in a number of so-called back platform speeches I have tried to make my position clear. The Republican Party is pledged to the sustaining of the 90-percent parity price support and it pledged even more than that to helping the farmer obtain his full parity, 100-percent parity, with the guaranty in the price supports of 90.

A Report on Civil Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 23, 1954

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed gratifying to note the sincerity and energy which many individuals and groups are bringing to bear upon the problem of civil defense. As a result, we are gaining ground in a program designed to meet the crucial need of safeguarding nearly 70 million of our citizens in 70 critical target areas. The critical areas had been so designated by the Federal Government on July 1, 1953.

To date, however, progress has not been uniformly rapid nor sufficiently extensive; consequently, our Nation continues to face a serious potential threat which could almost at any moment envelop decisive segments of our population. With our present ineffectively coordinated levels of civil-defense administration and operational organization, sufficient gaps and soft spots exist to enable an enemy attack drastically to reduce our capability and will to resist. Too much remains to be desired in a program which should recognize the compelling need for National, State, and local cooperative endeavor.

Remarkable progress characterizes the present status of development in the atomic-hydrogen age. Even the conventional atomic bomb is in some respects now obsolete except as a means of triggering the mechanism for the hydrogen bomb. Of extreme significance in the general area of civil defense is yet another obsolescence brought on by the recent dramatic detonation of a thermonuclear test device. What progress we had made up to the moment of this successful test has now been dissipated since previous civil-defense plans have very little, if any, significant meaning. Whereas formerly all persons caught within the crucial radius of the A-bomb were instructed to "duck and cover," such procedure would have little effect when a survivor of incineration, radiation, and burial under debris had to contend with carbon-monoxide poisoning. In the H-bomb era the only effective defense known at the present time is absence from the critical diameter.

Were such successful developments in nuclear fission confined entirely to the democratic powers or the free governments among nations, there may have been a lesser need for emphasis on civil defense. Since that has not been our experience, however, we can make nothing less than a truly realistic assessment of the potential danger and of what recourse we must take as a consequence. We can afford nothing less than a concerted plan of action designed to nullify, as far as possible, the dreaded prospects latent in the present international difficulties. It is imperative that we substitute vigorous action for apathetic and blissful forbearance. We may one day be grateful for the respite now granted us during which time we enjoy the golden opportunity to make necessary plans and preparations.

The recent press and radio releases with their dramatic descriptions and pictures of the destructiveness of the hydrogen bomb have effectively served one of the main reasons for the disclosure to the public. A great many individuals, both in and out of government service, have been suddenly and thoroughly indoctrinated with the vast and dire implications of thermonuclear fission. I have been deeply impressed, myself. News and military analysts have been writing prolifically regarding the potential capacity of the new bomb and publishing local maps defining the very large areas of partial and complete annihilation. Although specific references were made to the original hydrogen bomb detonated well over a year ago, news releases clearly indicate that a subsequently developed bomb is even more destructive. Let us fervently hope that the efforts of the Federal Civil Defense Administration as well as other jurisdictions concerned with our home defense will be vigorously stimulated.

I have given the problem of civil defense a great deal of thought and have arrived at some definite conclusions. First and foremost is the critical need for a positive and comprehensive program adopted without delay. Valuable time is ebbing away while we take only sporadic action. There should be centralized planning, with a strong initiative and leadership assumed at the national level, and with commensurate responsibility allocated to State and local groups.

In this respect I am heartened by the increasing thought and attention that is being directed towards organization at the national level. As an example, recommendations have been made for the creation, within the Department of Defense, of a Department of Civil Defense with equal status in relation to the Departments of the Army, Navy and Air Force.

In view of the urgent and compelling need to revamp the administrative and operational features of the Federal Civil Defense Administration, I am thoroughly convinced that the establishment of a Secretary of Civil Defense will result in a greatly improved overall organization. Our present program is founded on the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950. The result has been a loose, dissociated conferedation comprised of the several States, with the Federal Government's participation being little more than that of an information coordinating activity. I do not mean to reflect disparagingly either upon the Federal Civil Defense Administration or upon the excellent progress and achievement that some of our States and municipalities have made. It is at the national level however, where we are most urgently in need of organizational improvement; in some of our States as well much remains to be done. The proper and adequate organization at the highest levels, predicated upon the requirements and the capacities of subordinate jurisdictions, will serve to provide all citizens with reasonable assurance that their civil defense needs have been carefully considered and acted upon.

There is too great a dependence upon the voluntary and individual efforts of each State under our current system. Since the need for civil defense cannot be limited to any one State or region, the effective planning of defensive measures automatically devolves upon the Federal Government. The need continues, however, for the Government's closely coordinated cooperative endeavor with the several States and with their respective communities.

Recent technological advances which are reflected in the perfected hydrogen bomb further emphasize the need for a new look at civil defense requirements. An effective corps of trained personnel is more essential now than ever before. Coordinated programs, with a sharing of research and development between all levels—the national, State, and local—are urgently needed if we are to realize desirable efficiency in seeking to avoid national disaster attributable to poorly organized civil defense.

Since, in many respects, the task of civil defense is very closely related to our national defense program, the Federal Government must assume a greater share of the responsibilities which thus far are jointly borne by the States. The wide variation in the economic ability of certain States to support an adequate civil defense program is readily known through reliable statistics and from previous experience relating to other problems. Also, the present voluntary participation has demonstrated great variations in the quality and quantity of effort expended. There is a frequent tendency in many quarters to view the need for civil defense as some remote problem to be taken seriously only if and when we are faced with an emergency.

The Office of Civil Defense in the State of California is doing a remarkable job in organizing, training, and equipping a competent statewide civil defense corps. I am both eager and proud to acknowledge this wonderful achievement. Perhaps my distinguished colleagues in the House may be interested in a brief description of the activities of this Office which functions under the excellent direction of Walter M. Robertson, major general, United States Army, retired. It is hoped that other States may find inspiration in the fine example set in my home State of California.

Realizing the importance of providing complete and accurate news information and instructions to the public in an emergency, the California Office of Civil Defense, in cooperation with the University of California (Los Angeles) School of Medicine planned and organized a brief but comprehensive indoctrination course in civil defense organization and operations. Thus far, the course has been taken by a score of top Los Angeles newsmen, while plans are underway in the meantime, for representatives from other newspapers, wire services, and radio news organizations also to attend the course.

In recognition of the necessity for predisaster planning for emergency publication of newspapers and integration of the staffs and printing facilities of newspapers in communities outside major target areas into such plans, all who pursue the course will be indoctrinated with the need for such emergency publication. Similar stress will be given the need for educating the public in dispersal and other civil defense plans as they are developed. As the best procedures are determined, they will be taught to those who are in training.

The Office of Civil Defense prepared and distributed 683 individual first-aid-station kits on a statewide basis. Each kit, or unit, is made up of 75 cartons, boxes, and chests containing all necessary supplies and equipment including such items as antibiotics, surgical instruments, stretchers, blankets, burn dressings, and so forth, to treat 600 casualties in a 24-hour period. These supplies were acquired, unitized, and put in place in the field at an approximate cost of $5 million—50 percent Federal, 50 percent State.

Twenty-four rescue trucks have been purchased on a 50-50 matching fund basis and delivered to certain cities and counties adjacent to target and critical target areas. This involved a total expenditure of $228,000. These trucks are now being used for training crews and they are available for all disasters.

Federal funds have partially matched the cost of 16 mobile radiological laboratories. As rapidly as the radiological laboratories are equipped and technicians trained, they are assigned for use by public health agencies and research units. They are proving invaluable under present conditions where water supplies are checked and sewage is being constantly analyzed. With the advances in the nuclear sciences, private industry is making a greater use of the findings.

Through Federal matching funds, the Office of Civil Defense has completed a statewide attack warning system and has established a statewide communication system. Small amounts of Federal matching funds have been used for public information and training and education.

The most productive field for the use of Federal funds has been in the fire services, where a total of $1,675,000—50 percent Federal, 50 percent State—has been expended, primarily for 100,000-gallon-per-minute fire pumpers. This equiupment is dispersed throughout the State in accordance with the need for support in the target areas and is not procured merely to augment local fire services. It is used for training auxiliary firemen, for mutual aid, and on multiple alarm fires. In responding to a call the local jurisdiction having custody must send a minimum of 1 experienced engineer and 1 fireman with the truck.

The California Office of Civil Defense feels very strongly that adequate provision should be made for fire service funds. In view of its experiences, the fire service matching funds have paid and are paying the greatest dividends.

For the 2 years ending June 30, 1953, the State of California has expended $4,500,219.17 in matching Federal funds. In many of the programs, the State has passed Federal funds directly to local jurisdictions on a 50-50 basis. In some phases of the program, the State has participated to the extent of 25 percent, making the contributions 25 percent local, 25 percent State, and 50 percent Federal. During the same 2-year period, local jurisdictions have contributed $1,841,450.34 to the matching fund program.

It is apparent, therefore, that where proper attitudes toward civil defense and where sufficient determination and leadership are prevalent, a State may achieve a large measure of success in preparing for civil defense needs. Due to differences in average per capita wealth and income, however, not all States are able to provide the amount of funds deemed desirable for a good program. Because of localized budgetary difficulties, therefore, and because of the need for centralized direction and technical aid, the Federal Government should recognize and accept its responsibility in the general area of civil defense.

Congress Should Act Now To Halt Farm Recession

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 23, 1954

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, one of the most pressing problems confronting the 83d Congress is the developing recession in agriculture. This problem is of major concern for two reasons: First, it directly affects the present and future prosperity and security of nearly 30 million Americans living on the land; and, second, it has an adverse effect on the entire national economy in that it may be the first phase of a general business depression. It goes without saying, therefore, that any Congress having the interest of the farmer and the people at heart would, in such a situation, act vigorously to reverse depression-making trends and remedy the present unhealthy economic condition of farm life.

As a Democrat, I am proud to say that when my party controlled the Congress and the administration there was an honest effort to develop a sound and practical farm program. The 20 years of farm progress under Democratic leadership shows that these efforts were crowned with some success. Under the guidance of the late Franklin Roosevelt and Harry S. Truman, great gains were made in formulating an enlightened farm policy—in this connection I need only point to such basic legislation as the Triple A program, the Soil Conservation and Farm Credit Acts, and the rural-electrification law.

The record shows that these Democratic farm programs have been most successful in practice—they have contributed greatly to improved farm security and higher rural living standards. In 1932 some 42 percent of our farms were tenant-operated and most farm owners were burdened with heavy mortgages—in 1952 farm tenancy was down to 25 percent and the average landowner had a 91 percent equity in his land. Due to the REA program rural electrification increased from 10 percent in 1932 to 90 percent in 1952. In 1932 gross farm income was $5 billion per year—in 1952 gross farm income stood at over $32 billion.

GOP SEEKS TO TURN BACK THE CLOCK

While many GOP Congressmen recognize that today our farmers are in distress, I regret that the President and his Secretary of Agriculture, Ezra Benson, have been oblivious to the plight of agriculture. Mr. Eisenhower's 1952 campaign pledges of full parity and support for REA and soil conservation have been forgotten. The dynamic and forward-looking Democratic farm program has been repudiated, and the GOP's program of heartless disregard, inaction and do-nothingism has been substituted.

Let us look at the record. One of the first acts of Secretary Benson when he took office last year was to reduce PMA committees to advisory status and place power in the hands of his bureaucrats. Then all representatives of farm operators were fired from the Agriculture Department, and in their place spokesmen for the food processors and middlemen were appointed. Next, the administration indorsed "flexible" price supports, thus repudiating the Eisenhower campaign pledge of full parity. Last April price supports on dairy products were cut from 90 percent to 75 percent of parity—a move which is costing the Minnesota dairy industry an estimated $3 million per month. The REA program has been sabotaged indirectly by cutting off funds for REA transmission lines and by wrecking our public power policy to please the private power lobby.

What are the end results of this GOP program—if we dignify it by calling it a program? Here again we need only look to the record and let the record speak for itself. Since the Republicans took over, farm prices and farm income have fallen steadily. In 1952 gross farm income stood at $32.6 billion—this year estimated gross income of the farmer will be no more than $29.5 billion. In 1947 the farmer's net income totaled $16.7 billion—in 1953 it was down to $12.8 billion, and this year it may go as low as $10.8 billion.

To make a long story short, gross farm income has dropped 10 percent and net farm income has fallen 20 percent since the Eisenhower-Benson team started running things 2 years ago. This deplorable state of affairs is the direct result of the administration's shortsightedness in refusing to accept full parity, and because of its attempt to turn back the clock to the so-called free market of the Hoover regime.

EXTEND THE DEMOCRATIC FARM PROGRAM

Since the Democratic farm program developed during the 1933–52 period has proved itself in practice, Congress should accept this program as the basic blueprint or starting point in making farm policy, and on this foundation build a new and better farm program. Thanks to former Democratic administrations we have the basic legislation on the statute books—we should extend, broaden, improve, and liberalize this New Deal legislation in the interests of farm prosperity and rural justice.

Mr. Speaker, it is my contention that the following eight-point farm program would go far toward solving the more pressing problems of our farm population, and I recommend that Congress give these policy proposals full consideration.

First. Congress should liberalize the present farm price-support program to provide 100 percent parity on all farm crops.

Second. The present soil-conservation program should be strengthened and more consideration should be given to flood control and reforestation as a method of stopping soil erosion.

Third. The REA program should be expanded and improved, and greater efforts should be made to produce more public electric power and to build more REA transmission lines so that REA co-ops will be assured of an adequate supply of cheap power.

Fourth. Federal lending policies should be liberalized to provide ample farm credit at easy terms and lower interest rates so as to encourage family ownership and family operation in agriculture.

Fifth. Congress should enact new legislation to restore farmer participation in farm-program administration by returning to the farm committees the authority taken from them by Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Benson.

Sixth. Federal appropriations for research in animal husbandry, control of plant and livestock diseases, and in other fields of scientific agriculture, should be substantially increased.

Seventh. Farm cooperatives should be encouraged for use in the marketing of farm produce, the purchase of machinery, and other appropriate rural activities where cooperative organization has proven beneficial to farmers.

Eighth. Congress should expand our Federal forest practices program with greater emphasis being placed on woodlot forestry, tree planting, and technical forest assistance to farmers so as to assist the small Minnesota farmer who derives part of his income from logging and pulpwood operations.

The policy recommendations which I have outlined above constitute the framework of an effective program for meeting the basic needs of the American farmer. Such a program would tend to stabilize farm prices at full parity and thus correct the present farm recession; it would encourage farm production; it would aid in preserving the fertility of our soils; and it would create the economic conditions under which the family-size farm would thrive and prosper.

FULL PARITY IS AN ECONOMIC MUST

Mr. Speaker, it is my considered opinion that the parity issue is the crux of the whole question of farm policy—effective price supports are the key to farm prosperity and the only method by which the present recession in agriculture can be corrected. It is also my belief that the position taken by individual Members of Congress regarding full parity is the test of each Member's good intentions on the matter of farm welfare. Every person claims to be a "friend of the farmer" in an election year, but we all know that fair words are cheap. The $64 question that most farmers want answered is: How did my Congressman and Senators stand on full parity? Did my Representative favor higher price supports or did he betray the farmer by going along with Secretary Benson's scheme for flexible supports?

As for myself, I say without qualification that the farmer's economic welfare requires the establishment of a system of price supports providing full parity on all farm crops. I consider the Eisenhower-Benson proposals for flexible price supports to be a sell-out of rural America. I am strongly opposed to the House-passed administration farm bill, H. R. 9680, calling for flexible supports from 82.5 to 90 percent parity. I am opposed to the 15-percent cut in dairy price supports made by Secretary Benson last spring, and I look with disfavor upon the 5-percent increase compromise for dairy products contained in H. R. 9680.

While full parity on all crops is our objective, practical considerations require that liberal Congressmen support the temporary retention of 90 percent supports at the present time, and until a new farm program of full parity can be developed. Ninety percent parity is inadequate to cover cost of production and give the farmer a fair return on his labor and investment—yet we have no choice but to accept rigid supports at 90 percent parity as stopgap legislation until full parity can be guaranteed. Thus I must give my backing to the provision in the Senate farm bill, S. 3052, calling for 90-percent parity for basic commodities for another year.

Enemies of high price supports often offer two time-worn arguments in an attempt to rebut the case for full parity. One false argument is that price supports are a form of economic subsidy to the farmer. However, these antifarm forces never tell us that the so-called subsidy to the farmer is negligible compared to the special handouts given big business. According to figures supplied by the Department of Agriculture, the Government has lost less than $1 billion because of farm price supports over a 20-year period—compare this to a $45 billion total in Federal funds given to big business during the last 8 years in the form of reconversion payments, airline subsidies, tax writeoffs, and so forth.

A second phony argument often heard is that high price supports lead to overproduction. This claim of overproduction has no foundation in fact. Instead of overproduction we have underconsumption because millions of Americans lack the purchasing power to buy the food they need. If Congress would adopt a national food stamp plan to permit old-age pensioners—now living on about $40 per month per person—to buy food surpluses, we would soon see these so-called food surpluses dwindle to nothing.

Mr. Speaker, the case for full parity cannot be rebutted—a price-support program giving 100 percent parity to the farmer is an economic necessity. There are nearly 30 million Americans living on the land, and these hard-working people now find themselves caught in the clutches of a recession. Only full parity is the answer. It is my hope that the Congress will accept this answer and pass appropriate legislation. Action along these lines is essential to the Nation's future prosperity and security.

The Atomic-Energy Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 23, 1954

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a telegram I have received from Mr. John W. Edelman, Washington representative, Textile Workers Union of America, CIO, confirming my belief that before this program should be turned over to private interest we should be certain that the public interest is fully protected.

The telegram follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *July 23, 1954.*

Hon. THOMAS J. LANE,
House Office Building:

At the recent biennial convention of the TWUA, resolutions were unanimously adopted urging intensive efforts to adopt atomic energy to peacetime uses. Another resolution stressed the vital connection between electric power rates and the welfare of our textile industry. The principles enunciated in these resolutions lead us to active opposition to the present administration policies on power which we believe will force rates upward and finally bring about reduced employment. We oppose adoption of present atomic energy in its present form as opening door to monopolistic control and dangerously premature commercial exploitation of priceless new science and technology. Urge support of series of amendments similar to those being offered by liberals in Senate.

JOHN W. EDELMAN,
Textile Workers Union of America, CIO.

The Conservationist's Opposition to Echo Park Dam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 23, 1954

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, the bills making provision for use of our Nation's water resource are among the most important legislation being considered by this Congress. I wish today to discuss a few aspects of the questions which have arisen on the proposals for development of the upper Colorado River.

I am sure that none of us familiar with the problems of the Southwest would deny the basic need for development of the Colorado River to bring about the fullest utilization of its vast stores of natural resources. By the same token most of us are fully prepared to support any action which promotes the wisest use of these resources through a fully integrated plan which, in the words emanating from the early day conservation programs of Theodore Roosevelt and Gifford Pinchot, will bring about "the greatest good of the greatest number for the longest time." It is in line with this tenet that I wish to clarify the position of those who have so forcefully opposed the construction of Echo Park Dam within the boundaries of Dinosaur National Monument as a part of the initial development of the upper Colorado River storage facilities.

Congress, as the creator of the National Park Service in 1916 and its protector through subsequent actions, including the 1921 and 1935 amendments to the Federal Power Resource Act prohibiting the issuance of permits for power developments within our national parks and monuments, now finds itself involved in a controversy which touches on the very principles which guided its past action. Those who have sought to show that the upper Colorado River can be fully developed in a manner which will allow the preservation of the Dinosaur National Monument have repeatedly stated that we can only insure the sanctity of this and similar areas throughout our land by dedicating them for preservation so as not to permit their subsequent destruction. Our whole American policy for preserving our parks, monuments, and wilderness areas is based on the acceptance of two concepts: First, that our land and water resources are great enough and varied enough to make possible the preservation of a system of natural areas without sacrificing industrial considerations which make it necessary to develop our country; and second, in the planning of such a conservation program we must recognize that our civilization is such that no lands will persist unexploited unless they are deliberately set aside and protected. For this policy to prevail we must be faithful in respecting our dedications, for otherwise the dedicated areas will inevitably disappear one by one as it seems profitable to exploit them. To merely set aside an area until we got to it with some kind of exploitation project is a policy that defrauds both our own and future generations.

It is likely that the present administration will continue to support the assurances of the present and past administrations of the Interior Department that construction of Echo Park Dam by the Bureau of Reclamation is not to be construed as a precedent for the invasion of other existing parks. But what of those who follow? Would not the precedent have been established for the interpretation of those who may lack full appreciation of the need for preserving our national parks, monuments, and wilderness areas? American history has many examples of laws and policies which have been reinterpreted in a manner much different from their original intent. Realizing that policies are no stronger or weaker than the convictions of the men who interpret them, we are obligated not to permit the invasion of our system of national parks and monuments through any action that can be construed as a precedent at any future time. The action we recommend, made clear through an amendment to delete Echo Park from the bill authorizing construction of dams in the upper Colorado River project, will function as a guidepost for those who follow us and who also wish to insure the perpetuation of the recreational resources of our parks and monuments.

One has only to witness the weekend exodus from our towns and cities to fully appreciate the inner compulsion which takes the American people to the outdoors. Some have seen in this evidences of the heritage of our forefathers who hewed a nation from the wilderness and knew how in their few leisure moments to enjoy fully the outdoors as a place where their energies could be refreshed. Others point to this growing appreciation of the outdoors as a safety valve for people who suffer, as most of us do, from the tensions and rapid pace of our modern-day living. But whatever the cause, there can be no denial of the cataclysmic increase in the use of our outdoor areas. During the period from 1946 to 1953 there has been a rise of 112 percent in the number of visitors to the areas administered by the National Park Service. Last year over 46 million visits were made to these recreation spots, with more than 4 million people being attracted to the areas within the system in the State of California alone. In addition, some 35 million people fished, hunted, hiked, and enjoyed other outdoor pastimes within our national forests. The sale within recent years of 28 million hunting and fishing licenses can also be used to demonstrate the interest in the outdoors which takes the American public to our country's streams and lakes, fields and forests. Excluding those who are allowed to go afield for fish and game without the regularly required licenses, this number represents nearly 1 person out of every 6 men, women, and children in the country. In terms of dollars, the expenditures of sportsmen alone exceed 10 billion annually, placing this industry well ahead of those of filling stations, dealers in farm equipment, and business represented by either the cattle or hog markets. These figures make it apparent that the "outdoor industry" is one of unequaled importance to our national economy.

In our analysis of the controversy which has arisen over this proposed invasion of our national parks and monuments, it is important that we carefully consider the testimony of those conservation organizations, representing a large and important segment of the American public, which have most actively supported our systems of public recreational areas. These organizations find their main support in the millions of citizens who are willing to preserve and develop our publicly owned areas for the benefits that are to be realized in the form of outdoor recreation. We sometimes note derision in the voices of those who make attempts to demonstrate through inference and implication that the spokesmen for the lay conservationists represent a misty-eyed sect of idealists who spurn reality in their battles to obstruct the progress of normal development and use of our country's resources. These are gross misrepresentations which I, as a conservationist, take pleasure in refuting. The spokesmen for sportsmen, professional and lay naturalists, and other civic-minded citizens whom we find opposing the current legislation to authorize construction of Echo Park Dam within Dinosaur National Monument are realists. They are as different from the 19th century's preservationists and nature lovers as the modern-day doctor is from the bloodletter of yesterday. They support a conservation program that affirms the necessity for assuring fullest development of water and land resources in a manner which takes cognizance not only of the multiple-purpose needs of the present but also of the long-term needs of the future. Their memberships represent an important and rapidly growing segment of the public that is learning of the sadly neglected facilities of our national parks and monuments, the national forests, and other public lands. They are people who recognize the urgency for development of adequate road and trail systems and the need for installation of outdoor facilities sufficient to meet the great tide of humanity which washes over these public areas during the busy seasons. They recognize the inadequacy of appropriations for the agencies administering these resources as a denial of the wholesome enjoyment of public recreation areas that could be afforded the American people.

It is generally recognized that the battle of controversy sometimes brings into full flower a force which is destined to play a major role on the American scene. Certainly the conservation movement has made remarkable strides during the last few years when the principles for which it has worked were so seriously threatened. We have seen the unification of its members, who represent a diversity of interests, in a successful effort to defend from invasion our public lands that have recreational and other values far beyond those described by those groups who seek to appropriate these areas for their own uses. In the case of the Echo Park Dam controversy, the conservationists have suggested workable alternatives which do not jeopardize the sanctity of our system of National Parks and Monuments. They have disproved for all practical purposes the argument that evaporation losses from the alternate sites would be excessive and have brought to our attention the drastic revisions in the Bureau of Reclamation's figures which were originally used to justify the construction of Echo Park Dam. They have shown that the canyons of the Green and Yampa Rivers within Dinosaur National Monument are unequaled in their beauty and grandeur and cannot be duplicated in any other publicly owned area.

In a practical manner, our modern-day conservationists are looking ahead to decades of rapidly expanding population, more leisure, and greater mobility when every recreational resource will be desperately needed. They have shown that with only a fraction of the $21 million provided in the authorizing bill for development of the Echo Park Dam's recreational resources, they could make Dinosaur one of the Nation's leading outdoor recreation areas, furnishing a much wider range of qualitative experience than that which could be realized from one more impoundment in a vast series of artificially produced lakes that are planned for the upper Colorado River. An adequate system of roads and trails and public facilities would make this area as important a part of the American people's outdoor heritage as Yosemite, Glacier, Yellowstone, or the Grand Canyon. They have clearly shown that a postponement of the time when the values of this area can be fully appreciated does not justify the destruction of its most striking features by building the proposed dam at Echo Park. They have heeded the warning of former Secretary of the Interior John Barton Payne, who commented in the course of the successful defense of Yellowstone National Park against proposals for a dam at Yellowstone Lake that "once you establish the principle that you can encroach on a national park for irrigation or water power, you commence a process which will end only in the commercialization of them all."

In concluding I should like to reemphasize the fact that we are not faced with a choice between water and the irreplaceable values of Dinosaur National Monument: sound planning will conserve both. If we are successful in turning back this threatened invasion we shall be reaffirming the sanctity of areas dedicated by the American people for preservation.

Address by Hon. Carl T. Durham, of North Carolina, Before the Junior Chamber of Commerce, Greensboro, N. C., on July 15, 1954

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT C. BONNER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 23, 1954

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following speech of Congressman Carl T. Durham, of North Carolina, before the Junior Chamber of Commerce, Greensboro, N. C., Thursday, July 15, 1954:

It is a rare privilege for me to meet with the members of the Greensboro Junior Chamber of Commerce.

With your indulgence, I propose to talk with you today about the future of our national atomic-energy program. I wish to do this because, as a member of the Joint Congressional Atomic Energy Committee, I have been associated with the development of our atomic enterprise since 1947, and—more important—because of my deep conviction that the present and future impact of atomic energy upon all of us will deeply affect not only our hopes of national survival but the economic prosperity of our Nation as well.

These are eventful days in our atomic-energy program. For the past 3 months, the joint committee has been considering a basic revision of the original atomic-energy law—the Atomic Energy Act of 1946. Last week, the committee reported its legislative recommendations to the House and the Senate.

If adopted by the Congress, the committee-sponsored bills will lead to fundamental changes in the atomic program of our Nation. This legislation, as submitted to the full Congress, would permit, for the first time, private participation in the development of peacetime atomic power. It would allow private corporations, under carefully stipulated safeguards, to own and operate atomic reactors, and it would also permit private persons to produce and utilize atomic materials—although title to such materials would continue to be vested in our Government.

Beyond this, the legislation would pave the way for increased atomic cooperation with our allies, both on the peacetime and military sides. Pursuant to carefully stated conditions, the committee-sponsored bills would permit the Atomic Energy Commission, under certain circumstances, to transfer and exchange with other nations classified data relating to peaceful, industrial uses of atomic energy. The Commission would likewise be authorized to transfer to foreign nations atomic materials in amounts necessary for peacetime research and development purposes.

The legislation now before the Congress would also bring about more realistic planning among the NATO forces in connection with the tactical use of atomic weapons. Under elaborate security safeguards, it would allow the Department of Defense to transfer to other nations or regional defense organizations certain data concerning the use of atomic weapons. Such an information transfer, however, could not include significant data concerning the design for fabrication of these weapons.

It is my earnest belief that this legislation, if adopted, will make for greater atomic progress in both the peacetime and military areas. The Atomic Energy Act of 1946—the McMahon Act—did a superb job of coping with the problems of atomic energy as they existed at the time the original law was written. It is a tribute to that act that it has served our Nation well, without major revision, for 8 years. But during these same years, atomic development, both here and abroad, has moved forward by leaps and bounds. Accordingly, legislation which was admirably fitted for controlling our atomic program in 1946, must now be revised to take account of the realities of atomic energy in 1954. This, indeed, is the basic purpose of this new legislation. It seeks to bring our legislative controls over the atom into accord with the facts of atomic life as they exist in 1954—8 years after the original act was passed by the Congress.

Yet while I strongly support these amendments, I believe we would only be deluding ourselves if we now thought that any legislative changes, however necessary, can by themselves guarantee our Nation the kind of vigorous and bold atomic progress it needs if the atom is to make its full contribution both to the defense and the enrichment of our way of life.

Atomic energy is not a set of laws. Neither is atomic energy, regarded in its fundamentals, a group of atomic production plants. Basically, atomic energy is people—people with novel and daring scientific theories, people with minds capable of divining the laws of the physical universe and applying them for the benefit of man.

Our stockpile of nuclear weapons would not have been possible without drawing upon a stockpile of brilliant scientific hypotheses. And if we are soon to generate cheap peacetime power from atomic energy, it will be only because we have first generated the scientific theories and technical insights which will enable us to construct efficient atomic reactors. I am saying, in other words, that our future atomic progress depends primarily on increasing the fund of basic scientific knowledge available to our atomic researchers and engineers.

Had more Americans realized that atomic progress was so intimately associated with scientific attainments, I believe we would have been less surprised by the increasing evidences of massive Soviet progress in this field. It is true that the industrial revolution in Russia did not really get underway until the turn of the century, and it is also true that Russian technology—in the sense of industrial plant—still lags behind ours, though the gap is narrowing. But in pure scientific research, as contrasted with applied technology, the Soviets are rivals to be reckoned with. In fact, the best brains among the Russian people have gone into pure science for almost a whole century. When the Soviets seized power in 1917, they took over a nation which, although industrially backward, was by no means backwards in its pure scientific research. The Soviet dictators have built upon this base. From the very outset of their regime, they assigned top priority to expanding their reservoir of scientific talent. It may now surprise you to learn that the Soviets are now graduating more doctors of philosophy annually in the pure sciences than we are. Unless we now take steps, immediate steps, to correct this state of affairs, we may find ourselves 10 years hence being diversely outstripped in the race for scientific supremacy—and thereby military supremacy.

The situation is serious even now. Last month, Mr. Donald Quarles—the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Research and Development—reported that our technological lead of the Soviets is becoming progressively smaller. I remind you that, whereas 4 years elapsed between Hiroshima and the first Russian atomic bomb, only 9 months elapsed between our first full-scale thermonuclear explosion and the testing of a hydrogen device by the Soviets. I remind you also that the complacency of many Americans was recently jolted when, at the May Day exercises, the Soviets unveiled two new jet bomber types more or less comparable to our own Nations B-47 and B-52. The experts also tell me that the Soviets are now approximately our equal in translating a scientific idea into a mass-produced piece of equipment. As a result, we can no longer rely on our technological prowess to stay ahead in the arms race. If we are to remain ahead, it will be largely because we can generate more and better scientific ideas than the Soviets.

How, then, can we surge ahead of the Russians in scientific research? How can we assure ourselves of a clear and demonstrable lead in this most critical aspect of defense planning?

Part of the answer no doubt lies in increased support, under both private and governmental auspices, of basic scientific research. The establishment of the National Science Foundation is an appropriate step in this direction, and I earnestly hope that the Congress will give this program strong support.

But surely the matter goes deeper than this. Let us never think that we can buy a flourishing science—just as we would buy a steel mill or an airplane. The state of scientific advancement in some particular country reflects the entire way of life of that nation, and it is badly misleading the nature of science to imagine that there exists any panacea which can magically produce new discoveries.

I do not think it is any accident that, for the most part, scientific research has prospered best in the free nations. Neither is it any accident that scientific research in Germany, once in a high state of development, withered and died under the Nazi government. The fact of the matter is that science—the quest for knowledge—finds its most congenial home in a nation which not only tolerates, but positively encourages, novel ideas. Science can best prosper in a nation which permits its scientific workers to question basic assumptions—in a nation which does not require intellectual conformity.

I draw your attention to the fact that Soviet science and technology have been at their worst in those areas where the Soviet rulers have tried their hardest to straitjacket research into the confines of party line thought. I am thinking here particularly of the continuing failure of the Russian Government to raise Soviet agricultural production. In a large part, this failure is no doubt due to the morally repugnant and economically unsound program of collective farms. In another part, however, I believe this failure is due to the terrorized conditions under which Russian agronomists are compelled to work. You will remember that, in the course of the so-called Lysenko controversy, the Soviets have tried their hardest—but tried in vain—to substitute the erroneous precepts of Marxism for the immutable laws of nature. Agronomists daring to dispute the views of Mr. Lysenko have faced dismissal from their jobs, or else the prospect of the slave-labor camp. Recent newspaper reports, however, suggest that Mr. Lysenko, once the high priest of Russian agricultural research, is now in disfavor, and soon his fate may be that of the Russian scientists who had the intellectual courage to dispute his doctrines. Once again, we have had it demonstrated that no Communist can bend nature to man's purposes other than in conformity with the laws governing our physical universe. These laws are the same in the Soviet universe as in our own Nation, and these laws will remain the same long after communism is but a hideous memory among future generations of the world's people.

There is a moral in all this, and we will do well to heed it. It is imperative that we maintain the strictest security over scientific and technological discoveries which we believe are not now known to our Soviet rivals. Soviet aggression is a hard fact, not a theory. Accordingly, no matter how much we may regret certain restrictions on the free flow of information, the fact of Soviet hostility leaves us no alternative but to maintain these safeguards wherever they are necessary. It goes without saying that every official entrusted with governmental secrets has the solemn duty of abiding by both the letter and the spirit of our security regulations.

This much we should all take for granted. However, let us never carry security to the point where it discourages honestly held dissent. The line between wise and foolish security practices is a fine one, and it takes wisdom and statesmanship to draw it properly. Reasonable men can have reasonable differences of opinion concerning where wise security ends, and where unwise stifling of novel ideas begins. Let me only assure you that both the members of the Atomic Energy Commission and the members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy are keenly aware of the difficulties of striking an appropriate balance in this respect. As men of good will, we are all of us trying to strike this balance in such a manner that the protection of classified information does not result in intellectual paralysis among the members of our scientific community.

My point is that scientific advancement rests on more than the mass output of doctors of philosophy, important as increasing our reservoir of scientific talent is. The epochal discoveries in science—the discoveries which led to the steam age, the age of electronics, and now the age of atomic energy—have been the products of researchers possessing unique insights into the nature of the universe. As often as not, these researchers have made their great discoveries not while working in immense laboratories but while working in isolation. We must bend our efforts to search out these rare inquisitive minds, and above all, we must try to create a national environment in which bold scientific theories are not simply tolerated, but positively welcomed.

If the problem is posed in this manner, it becomes clear that the inherent advantages in the race for scientific supremacy are overwhelmingly on our side—if only we will seize them. Tolerance and diversity are the hallmarks of our free society, whereas intolerance and conformity underlie the very philosophy of Soviet communism.

However, we Americans would be untrue to our finest traditions if we now sought to encourage a flourishing of science simply because it held forth the prospect of increased military strength. Science equally requires encouragement because it is the touchstone to a world in which atomic energy and all the other wondrous discoveries of modern technology can be put to work in fighting against poverty, human misery, and disease. Still more fundamental, we should encourage the growth of a productive science because the quest for knowledge is an end in itself, and needs no other justification.

Knowledge, harnessed to the cause of morality, is a free man's most redoubtable ally in his unremitting struggle against the forces of darkness. The basic knowledge garnered by our scientific researchers can, if diffused among our people as a whole, point the way to a better tomorrow. In the words of James Madison: "A popular government without popular information or the means of acquiring it is but a prologue to a farce or a tragedy, or, perhaps both. Knowledge will forever govern ignorance, and a people who mean to be their own governors must arm themselves with the power which knowledge gives."

When we begin to restrict that individuality of opinion; when we begin to press for conformity in expression of opinion, then freedom is in danger. Freedom can never be an end in itself. It will be its richest and its best only as it exists to serve a larger and a more creative purpose.

The Leader

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STUYVESANT WAINWRIGHT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 23, 1954

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, in this past Sunday's New York Herald Tribune was to be found an excellent article entitled "The Leader." This piece was written by one of our critics, so it most certainly cannot be called partisan. The Alsop brothers, one of this era's best columnist teams, has given a very true portrait of our majority leader.

Personally, I would wholeheartedly endorse the views expressed. As a complete neophyte 18 months ago I was lost in the mysticism of House procedure and Mr. HALLECK was a fine guide to the understanding of our aims and objectives. Also, he, more than any other oldtimer in the Congress, is the most forceful advocate of the President's program, of the Republican program.

Yes; I am proud to join in the genuine tribute expressed in the following:

MATTER OF FACT

(By Joseph and Stewart Alsop)

THE LEADER

As a symbol of his power and place, the majority leader of the House of Representatives has no less than three offices on Capitol Hill. But he is most likely to be found in a little room buried obscurely among the labyrinthine corridors of the Capitol.

Small though it is, this room is curiously impressive, with its rich, deep-cherry damask curtains, its worn New England-Oriental carpets, its heavy black leather armchairs, and its high graceful arched ceiling. About it there is a smell of history—a comfortable, cigar-smoking 19th century sort of history—and of power. As House majority leader, CHARLES A. HALLECK is one of a dozen or so most powerful men in Washington.

Power is always interesting, but CHARLES HALLECK, a shortish man with a pink face and small shrewd eyes, is interesting for another reason as well. For HALLECK has crossed the great divide. He has successfully made the transition from opposition to administration leader—something a great many other Republicans, conspicuously including Senate Majority Leader WILLIAM KNOWLAND, have failed to do.

In the White House these days, CHARLIE HALLECK is the best liked man on Capitol

Hill. The President himself tells visitors how much he likes and admires HALLECK. Faced with almost any tough legislative or political problem, the Presidential aides tend more and more to reach for a telephone and call HALLECK. HALLECK undoubtedly spends more time at the White House—which most of his fellow Republicans still instinctively regard as the abode of the enemy—than any other Member of Congress.

HALLECK has had his failures as majority leader. One of these was the Eisenhower housing program, which was sunk without trace when it reached the House Banking and Currency Committee. The chairman of this committee is HALLECK's old friend, JESSE WOLCOTT, of Michigan.

"JESSE WOLCOTT spent years barnstorming around the country denouncing public housing," says HALLECK. "So did I, for that matter. Now, it's not an easy thing to do, to turn around and ask JESSE to sponsor a publict housing bill."

Before 1952, HALLECK himself always voted with the Taft wing of the party. One senses that he has been a little surprised to find himself fighting for expanded social security, or the $3 billion foreign aid bill, or various other items in the President's program. But despite the housing setback and 1 or 2 others, HALLECK has been the Eisenhower program's most effective champion in Congress.

"My job's about finished up here," he says. "That big chart of legislation in the President's office is just about checked off now, on the House side. The President is going to get pretty near everything he could reasonably expect from this session of Congress—if the Senate doesn't louse it up."

HALLECK is proud—and with good reason—that he lost only 10 Republican votes on the tax issue, and only 23 on the farm bill. With Republicans holding virtually every farm district, this last vote particularly suggests how remarkably persuasive HALLECK and Speaker JOE MARTIN can be in the pinches.

HALLECK regards the farm and tax votes as the two key votes, and he claims victory for the administration on both. On most other issues—St. Lawrence seaway, tidelands, foreign aid, social security—the House, HALLECK claims, gave the President substantially what he asked for.

"We were all ready to give him 10½ of the 12 points he wanted on Taft-Hartley, too," he says with some acerbity, "when the Senate grabbed Taft-Hartley first and fell flat on its face."

HALLECK is a belligerently partisan man. He is partisan about the House, which he loves and regards as a body infinitely superior to the Senate. But he is partisan above all about the Republican Party. He has been trying lately to control his temper, which used to be well known for its shortness. But he still gets angry when he thinks a Republican is being disloyal to the party.

This intense partisanship is the main key to his conduct as majority leader. Unlike so many other Republicans, loyalty to the Republican Party means to him loyalty to the first Republican administration in 20 years. This notion, he admits, is novel to many of his colleagues. But it is slowly taking hold. "Look at DAN REED," HALLECK says. "JOE MARTIN and I had a rough time with DAN in the last session on excess profits, but this session DAN's been doing a great job playing on the team."

Certainly the Eisenhower administration needs more Republican team players. So, if it is to survive as a responsible, reasonably unified party, does the Republican Party. Perhaps, as old scars heal, more and more Republicans will make the great transition that HALLECK has made and start to play on the Eisenhower team. If so, CHARLES HALLECK, able, energetic, and a party man to his fingertips, can take a good share of the credit.

Isle Royale National Park

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN B. BENNETT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 23, 1954

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to bring to the attention of the House, an article in the August-September issue of the Eagle magazine, official publication of the Fraternal Order of Eagles.

The article is entitled "Lake Superior's Vacationland," and was written by Lodi Mihelich, a friend of mine from Calumet, Mich. It discusses the unrivaled beauty of Isle Royale National Park and the tremendous opportunities it offers for the vacationer. Isle Royale is Michigan's only national park, in fact, the only national park in the Great Lakes region, which has a population of 35,000,000.

Isle Royale is in the district which I represent in Congress and it is a source of considerable pride to me that Congress has now recognized the need for development of the park in order to make its facilities available to more visitors, and has appropriated funds to inaugurate a much needed construction program.

The article follows:

LAKE SUPERIOR'S VACATIONLAND

(By Lodi Mihelich)

Unique among parks, no less national parks, is Isle Royale National Park near Houghton, Mich., on Lake Superior. Ordinarily one thinks of a park as a great area of land dotted with occasional bodies of water. But the Isle Royale is an archipelago, a large body of water spotted with 5 chains of islands and peninsulas forming 4 harbors on its northeastern end, and 1 large main island.

The park itself is about 45 miles long and 9 miles across at its widest point. It is actually an island with inland lakes, surrounded by 200 small islands and rocks. As it is separated from the mainland by 45 miles of water to the nearest Michigan shoreline and is 15 miles from Canada, it can be reached by boat or charter plane only. Nevertheless, it should be considered one of the beauty spots to be visited sometime by all vacationers, especially those who like to rough it.

Boat service is available to the park from Houghton or Copper Harbor, Mich., or Grand Portage, Minn. Motorists must leave their cars at these points, however, as there are no roads on the island.

If it's comfortable living you like, lodge facilities on the American plan are offered at Rock Harbor Lodge and Windigo Inn until Labor Day. For information on accommodations, rates, and reservations at Rock Harbor Lodge, write to National Park Concessions, Inc., Isle Royale National Park, Rock Harbor, Mich., via Grand Portage, Minn. Contact Windigo Inn by writing to Hjalmer A. Mattson, Grand Portage, Minn.

Those who prefer living under the stars will find desigated campgrounds available, though they are without complete facilities. Thus, campers should equip themselves with a supply of food (dried food is most convenient), first-aid kit, mosquito repellent, tent, warm bedding and clothing, a light raincoat, and stout footgear. When away from designated campgrounds, campfire permits are required and may be obtained from headquarters on Mott Island or from any park ranger.

One of the main attractions on the island is the abundance of wildlife, the type which was able to cross the water barrier when it froze from the Canadian shore in 1912. Beaver, coyote, mink, weasel, muskrat, red squirrel, snowshoe rabbit, and moose herds are found, and are especially interesting to watch in early morning when feeding in the rivers and bays.

An unusual aspect of Isle Royale Park is the complete dependence of the visitor upon boasts as a means of transportation. Motorboats provide the best method of investigating remote points of interest, yet allowing small coves to be visited. Canoes, in general, are not desirable for traveling on the open waters of Lake Superior, but are excellent for covering the numerous harbors and inland lakes. The more fortunate with sailboat or motor yacht will find enough well-sheltered, large docks to enable these larger craft to dock each evening.

Vacationers who do not own or rent a boat from a lodge may be put ashore from a commercial carrier and be picked up at a later time.

Fishing, hiking, and camping are the three main activities at the park. Fishing, about the best to be found anywhere, is especially good along the shores of the island, along the reefs, and in the harbors and bays. Inland lakes boast a number of game-fish species, the most common being northern pike, perch, and walleyed pike. In the large Siskiwit Lake, brook and lake trout are taken.

Rivers also provide a good source for brook trout. All told, there are 46 kinds of fish native to Isle Royale waters. A few species, uncommon elsewhere in the world, are found in the inland lakes.

Lake trout, a thrilling catch to make, may be taken by trolling with large metal spoons. Bait casting or spinning tackle is generally considered the best for inland-lake fishing while fly or telescope rods are best for streams. Deep-sea trolling, on the other hand, requires heavier tackle.

Naturally, extreme caution should be exercised when traveling the Isle Royale waters. Lifejackets and oars should always be included when a boat is taken out. Such a precaution must be taken because numerous reefs plus drifting pulpwood provide a threat to boats and occupants alike. In addition, it is wise to get a weather forecast from Moss Island Park headquarters, Rock Harbor, or Windigo ranger station before undertaking even 1-day trips.

Hiking and camping out, other than boating, offer the best opportunities to enjoy nature at Isle Royale. Quiet solitude of wilderness trails, bracing air, and scenic vistas of wave-swept shores are soul-satisfying and will be long remembered.

The island has over 80 miles of foot trails routed to inland lakes, historic mine ruins, geological landmarks, campgrounds, and fire lookout towers. The trails are primitive but well marked with orange metal tags. The Greenstone Ridge trail, extending 34 miles from Rock Harbor to Washington Harbor, provides the longest hike through the interior. Side trails give access to many of the harbors. Several days are desirable for this trip which offers varied plant and animal habitats, good fishing in inland lakes, and beautiful scenery.

A number of combination trips, by boat one way and trail the other, can be arranged with the lodge or commercial carriers. In planning hiking or camping trips, visitors are urged to obtain explicit directions.

Park rangers, engaged in protection and administration work, will give information and assist visitors to the limit of their available time. Self-guiding nature trails, conducted nature walks, nature exhibits, and evening illustrated talks or campfire programs are offered at the lodges.

The isle retains its ruggedness and beauty, and remains a source of inspiration for those who love the great outdoors.

California Hopes To Keep Us in Court While She Sneaks Off With Our Water

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BYRON G. ROGERS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 23, 1954

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein the following article from the Denver Post, Denver, Colo., on Tuesday, July 20, 1954:

California is fighting to delay as long as possible any final determination by the United States Supreme Court of its Colorado River water rights. The most recent stalling tactic was a request by California, last week, that Colorado and other upper basin States be made parties to the now pending Arizona-California water suit.

Nevada which has always played California's game on water matters has already asked to intervene in the suit. If California can succeed in bringing Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming into the litigation it is a safe guess that the case might be dragged out for another 6 8 or 10 years.

Law suits of this kind are always time consuming since they involve a trial conducted by a court-appointed master before the case ever comes before the judges themselves for consideration.

The longer it takes to decide the Arizona-California suit the more California and California water users will be pleased.

It is certain that Congress will not authorize the central Arizona reclamation project as long as Arizona's water rights are the subject of a suit.

If California can get Colorado and other upper basin States tied up in the case, California will have a new argument for delaying congressional action on the upper Colorado River storage project.

"Mr. Speaker," we can imagine a California Congressman saying, "I can sympathize with the desire of the upper basin States to use more Colorado River water but until the Supreme Court has decided what the respective water rights are, I cannot vote for these large and expensive dams."

It is plain by now that California is interested primarily in keeping other States—Arizona, and Colorado, along with the rest—from getting any new water projects.

California, already well equipped with projects, is in a position to use more than its share of the Colorado River year after year—just as long as the projects in the other States can be kept waiting.

Some Californians are even hopeful that, by stalling and by using more water than they are entitled to receive under the Colorado River compact, they can establish a permanent legal right to such extra water under a "first in use, first in right" theory.

Actually, there is no justification for attempting to make upper basin States parties to the Arizona-California suit, which is strictly a lower basin affair.

We hope Colorado and other upper basin States will resist this attempt to bring them into the controversy. The purpose of the Arizona-California suit was to get a court interpretation of article 3, paragraph b of the Colorado River compact.

That paragraph relates only to the use of water in the lower basin. It involves a question in which upper States are not concerned. The suit should be tried on its merits without bringing in outside issues which could only complicate the hearing and hold up any additional Colorado River project in either the upper or lower basin for years to come.

Building International Friendships—Arkansas Student Exchange

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 22, 1954

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the very fine article entitled "Building International Friendships—Arkansas Student Exchange," published in the Ladies Home Journal.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW DIPLOMACY

(By Margaret Hickey)

It is no longer true, if it ever was, that you have to be either rich and old or young and wicked to travel abroad. College and high-school students in the United States have many opportunities to visit other countries cheaply. One 20-year-old student traveler who cycled through Europe recently reported he had to sell his bicycle in Paris. "Expenses zoomed to nearly $2 a day," he explained.

It is still not so easy for foreign youngsters to visit and travel in the United States. The American dollar may seem small to us, but it is as large as the moon, and almost as hard to get, in most other countries. But variously subsidized scholarships are permitting many foreign students to live and study in the United States. Besides knowledge and skills, they take back home a true picture of life in the United States that false propaganda will never be able to distort.

Last year, under American Field Service International Scholarships, 265 overseas students studied in American high schools and 254 American youngsters lived with European families during the summer. This is a program of community cooperation in which individual families welcome students into their homes. The Young Adult Council of the National Social Welfare Assembly has another plan for getting the youth of various nations acquainted. In August, 50 well-informed young Americans will be in Singapore when the World Assembly of Youth meets to discuss problems facing young people in every part of the world.

Girl Scouts are going abroad too. A troop from Manchester, Conn., pooled its earnings from a year's potato-picking and baby-sitting to pay a visit to pen pals in Belgium. In Indianapolis, a troop sold doughnuts to help pay its expenses to France. Twenty-two other Girl Scouts are going to six European countries with assistance from the Juliette Low World Friendship Fund. As a part of the two-way exchange, American Scouts will soon welcome 36 senior guides from 6 foreign countries and 6 two-girl teams from South Africa, the French Antilles, Belgium, Panama, Switzerland, and the Netherlands.

These and many other arrangements are bringing the youth of all nations together. The Institute of International Education estimates that each year 70,000 persons are on educational-training missions between the United States and other countries. Getting to know people from other countries at the family dinner table, in the classroom, workshop, and field is the world's best diplomacy. Good neighborliness succeeds where high-level conferences may fail.

BUILDING INTERNATIONAL FRIENDSHIPS—
ARKANSAS STUDENT EXCHANGE

"Three wives are better than two," the young man from Thailand told his English instructor. In her extracurricular job as president of the University of Arkansas Foundation for International Exchange of Students, Mrs. Jessie O'Kelly hears many rather fantastic things.

During one class session, Marnop Debhavalaya, also from Thailand, remarked that he had once been a monk.

The French boy, Norbert Felter, was incredulous . "Non," he gasped. "You—not a really monk?"

Tan-hued Marnop is about 5 feet tall, a bit roly-poly, poised with great dignity on tiny, square-toed feet. A grave young man. His smile, though, is pure sunshine. "In my country," he said, "where my faith is customary to give 1 year in a Buddhist monastery. Is what you call sacrifice?"

"This is before you are married?" Norbert inquired.

"Oh, no. I am married then."

"Well," said Norbert, "you don't give up a wife to be a monk. What do you give up?"

"We don't eat tiger meat."

By then the class was in a hubbub in a variety of accents. Praderm Titatarn once caused similar confusion merely by saying, "I have tin elephants." ("You have 10 elephants." "No; really I have 11 elephants." "Oh, I thought you said 10." "That's right. They are tin elephants." "Then they are not real, they are tin?" "No. They are real tin elephants. They work in our tin mine." "They go down into the mine and mine tin?" "Oh, no. Tin elephants haul the tin." "All 10 at once?" Slowly, "My family has 11 real elephants that haul tin. One at a time." "Oh.")

As Som Smerasuta explained to Mrs. O'Kelly, it is an old saying in his country that 3 wives are better than 2. But it is a very sensible saying. In Thailand, where a man can have as many wives as he can afford, only the first and her children inherit the family fortune if he dies. Therefore, a second wife might be jealous of the first. But if there are 3 wives, the first knows that she is the most important and the 2 others can console each other.

Marnop, Som, and Praderm are the 3 Thailanders among the 43 foreign students enrolled this year in the University of Arkansas in Fayetteville. The university has a total enrollment of about 3,700. Fayetteville has a population of around 20,000. While one expects to see some foreign students on any big-city campus, it is surprising to find so many here, deep in the heart of America. There are special reasons.

Fulbright Act funds—money owed our National Treasury from the sale of war-surplus goods abroad—can be used to pay all expenses of United States citizens in many foreign countries, but it pays only for the transportaion of foreign students to this country. They must have other help. This year eight foreign students at the University of Arkansas are receiving scholarships and other assistance from Arkansas communities. The total has been as high as 18. During the past 4 years, 50 students from 12 countries have been wholly or partly supported through the local foundation for the international students by Arkansas clubs, church groups, and individuals. Other foreign students, many of them on Government grants, come because they know they are especially welcome.

Fayetteville is Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT's hometown. He is generally credited with inspiring the formation of the foundation, even though he had nothing to do with it directly. The foundation was started in 1949 by Richard J. Hostetter, an associate professor of history, and other members of the faculty of the University of Arkansas. Dr. Hostetter first interested clubs and civic groups in supporting such a project by taking foreign students about the State on speaking engagements. Later, contributions were solicited by letters, circulars, and newspaper ads.

Anyone who gives to the foundation becomes a contributing member. Sustaining memberships are from $10 to $100 a year; memorial memberships are $100 or more. Five-dollar bills steadily accumulate from the sale to alumni of book ends made from the walnut banisters removed from "Old Main," the first building on the campus. Student organizations also contribute. To have helped so many, the foundation has spent amazingly little. In 4 years, it has collected and disbursed $14,500. Many gifts, including some clothing, are not in cash. Fraternities, sororities, and Fayetteville families donate room and board. The university waives the higher out-of-State tuition for these international students, as the faculty prefers to call them.

Many of the international students speak before club, school, or church groups in various communities in Arkansas with great success; all have the opportunity to visit homes and farms. Donald T. King, foreign student adviser, has many letters from happy hosts, most of which say, in one way or another, "You sent us the best one." They find it hard to understand that all of these select students are the best. After Ricardo Pasco spoke before the De Queen Rotary Club, its president, Ben Core, wrote: "I am sure that hereafter when members of our Rotary Club think of the Republic of Panama, they will think of Ricardo and feel closer to and more kindly toward that country." The wife of a chicken farmer near Springdale, who had never seen a Japanese boy before, said after a visit from one, "I would just have liked to kept him."

Old wounds heal in the fresh sun of Arkansas. At the suggestion of a former Air Force pilot in the area, a scholarship was given to an Austrian boy whose home had been bombed on the same day that the pilot had been wounded in a bombing raid on the boy's hometown. Karl Sommer, a former German paratrooper who fought against American and British troops as Hitler's shattered armies retreated across France, was astonished by the friendliness he found everywhere. "Although this is not new to me now—I've experienced it since my first day in America—the novelty doesn't wear off."

But Nicole Weill, a French Jewess, found it hard to forget or forgive the year she spent in a German concentration camp. She brought a varicolored Alsatian folk-dancing costume with her to Fayetteville. "See this red petticoat?" she said. "Know what it's made of? A German flag." A few months later, after she had become well acquainted with a German girl, she admitted, "I love Inge as a girl—but I still hate her as a German."

Nicole was embarrassed when she was introduced to an American boy as "the French girl." "You should have seen the reaction. This misconception of morality in France bothered me quite a bit. I found out very soon the meaning of the word 'parking' on the campus. But how pleased I was when I got a corsage from a boy for the first time—and that is also a part of the American dating system."

The international students appear to be more serious in their thinking than many American coeds. Ingeborg von Groll, of Berlin, Germany, one of the first recipients of a scholarship, stated during the 1950 fund-raising campaign, "For 12 years I was taught to distrust democracy and individual freedom. Coming to Arkansas has given me my first opportunity to see democracy in practice and to breathe an air of freedom. The people are friendly, relaxed, happy, and most of all, free to speak, to think, to ask questions. I am constantly astounded at the measure of freedom Americans enjoy and I am puzzled by the way in which they take this freedom for granted."

Dr. John Tyler Caldwell, energetic young president of the University of Arkansas, receives letters from many boys and girls in foreign countries who have heard about the program and want to attend the university. Jeung Hi Pak, a girl in Korea, wrote to say she "awakened from dreaming every night about his institution." She had read an article in a Japanese magazine by Susumu Hara, a former foundation student, and she said, "I was touched to read the whole story about the townspeople's merciful mind. I would like to be a member of those who share the better understanding of the world."

Rosemarie Wodrig, from Bremen, Germany, who stayed at the Tri Delt house for a year, left a letter of advice to her successor. She said she was happy that another German girl was to have the same wonderful year she had had, but she warned: "There will be hours when you feel as if you are alone in the middle of perfect strangers and that nobody understands you and even wants to understand you. People will try to help you and will help you often without your even noticing it, but they don't know the kind of help you need—they don't know you or your background. They will suppose you are like them and treat you accordingly. But you are not like them, Renate, you are so different. You have gone through the war and even though you feel still very childish at home, when you compare yourself with your contemporaries here you will feel as old as Methuselah. You are in a rich country where people don't know ruins and misery. Try to live as they live, to think like they do. It may be hard for you but it is a good way to understand them and become one of them and isn't that what you came here for?"

A mature and introspective Frenchman, Bernard Foubert, is the scholarship student staying at the Sigma Nu house this year. He can talk for hours about French politics, but early in the year, lonely for Paris, he had found little in common with the fraternity brothers. An adviser suggested that he would learn to know and understand them before the year was out. "Oh, I will understand them," Bernard said, "But will they ever understand me?" Bernard is twenty-five, several years older than most of his classmates, and is resuming his studies after a stint in Morocco with the French army. A deep thinker, he finds adjustment to frivolity difficult.

Guenther Gottschalk, from Neheim, Germany, president of the International Students Club, and a brilliant graduate assistant in physics, doesn't think much of the "American dating system" either. When any of the international students speak before highschool groups in Arkansas, they are invariably asked, privately, if not in public, to "say something in a foreign language" and "How do you date in your country?"

Signe Kolderup, charming and wholly modest chemistry major from Bergen, Norway, left youngsters in Van Buren, Ark., gasping with the information that in her country it was not uncommon for boys and girls in the late teens and early twenties to take unchaperoned weekend trips together. She explained that these might be skiing or hiking trips and that they slept outdoors or in trail shelters, but questions persisted. Finally she said, "Our parents trust us." Jose Martini, of the Republic of Panama, helped out by saying in his country a girl with an older sister was often preferred, because the older sister, rather than her mother, could serve as a chaperon—and one had to be present every time a boy even spoke to a girl.

Eighteen-year-old Brigitte Ogrinz, an alert, serene beauty with a candlelight complexion and great poise, is a scholarship student from Austria who also prefers to talk about things which seem to her more important than dating. She was disturbed, nevertheless, to hear from girls in a university dormitory that "only sorority girls can win the campus-queen contests." She is annoyed, too, by what she feels is lack of student freedom in the United States—"Why do you have to be in at a certain hour?" and "Why is a freshman such a low-life?" At the University of Salsburg, which she will attend when she returns to Austria, there are no such distinctions or restrictions.

"But," she said, "there is not university life either. Students come to study and then they hunt for a job. Employers don't hunt for you as they do in the United States."

Young Arkansans learn a great deal from their international guests. And every member of each community group that has contributed to the foundation feels, when he meets a young boy or girl of another culture, that he has reached beyond his horizon and had some slight share in building a better world. The group of international youths who meet in Mrs. O'Kelly's living room to improve their spoken English learn more than a language. In a small way, they bring into reality the dream that all men, for all their great differences and eternal variations, are brothers. Here the customs and traditions of many great nations blend. At one dinner meeting the International Students Club served Chinese sweet pork with "lice," as Susumu Hara called it, Czechoslovakis salad, Swedish cookies, and English tea. Afterward they sang Vive l'Amour, Are You From Dixie? and Roll Out the Barrel.

The international students will not forget their Arkansas friends, nor will they be forgotten. They know the human heart beats warmly under any shade of skin. At the Christmas party in Mrs. O'Kelly's home last year, Som Smerasuta, who was leaving the university at the end of the semester, surprised everyone by singing a solo. It was Auld Lang Syne in Thai.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. The money derived from such sales shall be paid into the Treasury and accounted for in his annual report to Congress, and no sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

HI

Cha

Rou

Bills
duce
and

Bills
S.
Cou
Woo
H.
Instr
S.
serva
Fran

Bills
to ap

Forr
ing
birth
a sin

Tax
repo
agai
asses
signa

Tax
ing
H.
plete

Ato
S. 36
ing
R
natu

Editor

I

IN TH

Mr.
ask u
Apper
ment
pansi
newsp
name
the La
the E
the C
the G
the J
1954;
1954;
1954.

Eac
Presid
made
ernor
All o
omme
out, e
the Sa
view,
ment
gasoli
the b

The
rials
in th

[From

Shou

Unl
put t
Eisen
expar
contr
M. Zi
back

To
ine re
who
at th
N. Y.
progr
week
ernm
colle
taken

Th
linqu
they
from
tions
been
taxa
levie
as ou

Mr
belie
drop
lator

Appendix

Editorial Comment on Proposed Federal Roads Expansion Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER FERGUSON
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 23, 1954

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the Record editorial comment on the proposed Federal roads expansion program from the following newspapers of the State of Michigan, namely, the Saginaw News, July 15, 1954; the Lansing State Journal, July 14, 1954; the Escanaba Daily Press, July 15, 1954; the Owosso Argus-Press, July 15, 1954; the Grand Rapids Herald, July 17, 1954; the Jackson Citizen-Patriot, July 17, 1954; the Kalamazoo Gazette, July 15, 1954; and the Detroit News, July 14, 1954.

Each of these editorials relates to the President's speech, and to the speech made by the Vice President to the Governors on the Federal highway project. All of the editorials and articles recommended that the project be carried out, except the one which appeared in the Saginaw News, which takes the other view, doubting the validity of the argument that we should have a Federal gasoline tax or Federal interference in the building of the highways.

There being no objection, the editorials and articles were order to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Saginaw (Mich.) News of July 15, 1954]

SHOULD ROADS NETWORK BE FEDERAL PROJECT?

Unlike the several State governors who put themselves on record against President Eisenhower's proposed huge Federal roads expansion program because they want State control, State Highway Commissioner Charles M. Ziegler has announced himself as solidly back of the Federal program.

To understand conflicting views is to examine reasoning behind them. The governors, who were presented the President's proposal at their current conference at Lake George, N. Y., strongly favor a major road-building program. Their objection, repeated this week as in years past, is to the Federal Government's continuing role as a gasoline-tax collector and arbiter of projects to be undertaken.

They want the Federal Government to relinquish its 2-cents-per-gallon tax. In turn, they would release the Federal Government from further highway grants-in-aid obligations to the States. What they are and have been saying is, "Get out of our field of State taxation and let each of us impose our own levies and build our own highway systems as our legislatures and our people see fit."

Mr. Ziegler opposes this attitude since he believes that once the Federal Government dropped its 2-cent-tax levy, Michigan legislators might not make up the deficit with a commensurate increase in the State gasoline tax.

The Eisenhower proposal is an inviting temptation as Federal programs go. None will argue the Nation's highway system is adequate to accommodate today's automotive growth. Few will deny that the road-building program has fallen years behind the pace. The question is whether this highway deficit should be corrected through individual State efforts financed by State-levied taxes or whether the Federal Government should augment limited State programs.

As highway commissioner, Mr. Ziegler quite naturally leans to the side of established financial resources. Federal grants-in-aid have been increased steadily in recent years, including an added $500 million for this year. (Governors protest that this bounty is being proffered to stave off their persistent demands for greater local autonomy.) He would have to deal directly with legislators and be confronted by the gasoline tax-paying public to justify the direction and size of his proposed State highway developments.

In principle, the State control and State gasoline tax rate method is healthier than resort to Federal grants after these funds have been taken from the several States. State motorists would get just what they were willing to pay for. They would neither ask for part of other States' tax contributions, neither would they contribute to the highway handouts granted others.

The nearer home tax levying and spending is held, the more control taxpayers hold over their money. That is true in its application to any unit of government at any level.

Whether the Federal Government's capacity for directing a grand plan of coordinated interstate highway systems is an overriding consideration seems to be the only reason for pause in rejecting the Eisenhower proposal. The Federal Government is free at any time to step in with financial help where national interest demands it and no ready State resources present themselves. Adjoining States already have demonstrated their ability to plan cooperatively for efficient linking of interstate road networks.

In the face of strong and repeated protests, one might ask what good reason keeps the Federal Government clinging so tenaciously to its hold on a tax source that belongs to the States.

[From the Lansing (Mich.) State Journal of July 14, 1954]

A CONTINUING THREAT

In notes prepared for a speech at the annual conference of governors, now in session in New York State, President Eisenhower proposed a multi-billion-dollar modernization of the United States highway system to be undertaken jointly by the Federal and State Governments.

His proposal will be widely welcomed as an aid in focusing attention on the need for prompt action to make this country's highways adequate and safer.

There will be those, of course, who would welcome with greater enthusiasm a system under which there would be more State and less Federal control of highway planning and construction. For example, many have been urging that the Federal Government drop its 2-cent-a-gallon gasoline tax so that the States could collect more revenue for their own use in building highways.

No one, however, is likely to question the necessity for getting started without delay on improvement of the highways.

The President said that obsolete and inadequate highways are responsible for "an annual death toll comparable to the casualties of a bloody war."

There is no doubt, of course, but what obsolete and inadequate roads are responsible for many accidents. At the same time, it always should be kept in mind that highway defects are not responsible for the total fatality toll. The statistics show that high speed and other carelessness are a primary cause of accidents.

Building better highways is a part of the solution of the traffic accident problem. Every reasonable effort should be made to effect this partial solution as promptly as possible. But even if the highway system were to achive perfection the problem of reckless drivng would remain. Efforts to solve it will have to continue no matter what the road planners and builders are able to accomplish.

[From the Escanaba (Mich.) Daily Press of July 15, 1954]

OLD OPEN ROAD IS REPLACED BY TRAFFIC-PACKED HIGHWAY

"The old open road is a thing of the past," reports United States Steel news with a touch of nostalgia and the complaint that no longer can a family spend a pleasant Sunday afternoon enjoying a relaxing drive in the country.

Our highways are crowded, and its not hard to see why. Today 50 million high-powered autos are fighting for a place on a highway network which was designed for half that number of 1930-model cars. We have only about 4,000 miles of good highways three or more lanes wide.

A serious problem arising from our outdated highway system is the increasing highway accident rate. President Eisenhower recognized this fact when he called a White House conference on highway safety last February and asked representatives of business, labor, agriculture and other groups to participate.

President Eisenhower emphasized that traffic accidents are causing the death of more Americans each year than were killed in the Korean war. The traffic problem, President Eisenhower said, is "a national problem of first importance."

Our highways have been causing us to lose $3 billion a year through such operating wastes as low gas mileage and wages of truck drivers who are slowed down by traffic jams.

Highway officials estimate that if we spent only seven billions a year—which is a billion and a half more than we do now—for the next 15 years, we would eliminate operating losses in a few years' time and eventually be spending less for a first-class network than we do now for an outdated system.

Where is the "old open road"? It has been flooded with 50 million motor vehicles—just too much for the "old open road" to handle.

[From the Owosso (Mich.) Argus-Press of July 15, 1954]

HIGHWAY PROGRAM AT FEDERAL LEVEL UNDER LOCAL CONTROL

Some of the governors have raised the mätter of States' rights in connection with the relations between the Federal and State governments on highway construction programs. These governors contend that the

Federal grants to the States for highway purposes smack of paternalism and that too much control over State projects is attempted.

These dissenting governors would have the Federal Government relinquish its present Federal gasoline tax and to get out of that tax field entirely. They advocate that the States then could levy enough gasoline taxes to enable them to finance their highway programs without any further help from the Federal Government.

On top of this the governors heard Vice President Nixon at their annual conference convey the President's ideas for a long range Federal highway program involving some $50 billion. The President advocates this program on a Federal basis from the standpoint of coordinating the highway needs of the entire Nation in this atomic age and to speed up the construction of safer highways throughout the Nation.

Both of these arguments have considerable merit. Especially so as President Eisenhower also advocates that as much of the work be done under local control as possible. There is a definite need all over the Nation for safer highways. Very few of the States have kept pace with the need for more modern highway facilities. The use of motor vehicles has increased manyfold and we are still using inadequate facilities.

To take care of the increase in population and also to provide better transportation in the event of national emergencies, a coordinated and more extensive highway system is badly needed. The State governments operating separately cannot expect to do a kind of job this Nation needs to take care of either expanding population or the defense safety of this country. There are some things that have outgrown State lines today and a unified highway system for the entire Nation is one.

It is also true that any program can be carried out more efficiently if it is done at the local level as much as possible. There must be certain essential needs of a connected highway plan to serve the needs of all the Nation that must and should have Federal attention. Those entrusted with the duty of protecting the safety and welfare of the Nation would be amiss if they gave no thought to this problem and let each individual State work out their own problems.

The problem should be worked out so that local needs can be taken care of properly and at the same time the interests of the Nation as a whole protected. There will probably be more toll highway construction along with the development of better free roads. Both plans have a part in any general highway program serving the Nation as a whole. In fact it will be a merry hodgepodge if the problem is not studied with the needs of the whole Nation in mind.

[From the Grand Rapids (Mich.) Herald of July 17, 1954]

Fifty Billion Dollars for Roads

Motorists may object vocally to higher automobile taxes, and make their influence felt in the legislatures of the several States, but they want better roads and are willing to pay for them.

Contradictorily, they will fight to the last ditch against raising the gas tax a cent a gallon for free roads and then, when they have the chance, gladly and eagerly pay what amounts to an extra 15 cents a gallon to ride on toll roads.

President Eisenhower's call for a 10-year, $50 billion highway program should prompt them to examine the economics of the situation.

If motorists can save money by driving on the far better toll roads, why can't they save money by putting a bigger investment into the general highway system?

Toll roads—straight, wide, with few stops—save both time and fatigue. What if tolls do run 1 to 3 cents a mile? Engineers estimate that on the Arroyo Seco Freeway between Pasadena and Los Angeles motorists save about a cent a mile in fuel consumption. It is estimated that on the new 88-mile West Virginia Turnpike a trucker will save 22 miles and 2 hours of driving, making a saving in operating costs after paying the maximum toll of $6.50.

Poor roads, slow traffic, stops and starts—all cost us money. An Iowa study shows that one stop and start on an ordinary road uses as much rubber as a mile of normal driving and as much gas as two city blocks of normal driving.

Michigan is only on the threshold of a toll road program. If and when such roads are built it will be because of the State's reluctance to finance "free" roads of comparable quality, plus the motorists' willingness to pay for their greater convenience.

Everybody knows that good highways cost money. It is too often forgotten that they also save more than they cost. Good roads are profitable to the users.

At the governors conference where the President's proposal—only a good start on a grand plan to turn an obsolete road network into one adequate for a population of perhaps 200 million by 1970—controversy immediately arose.

The idea of a bigger Federal-State partnership ran afoul of the governors' traditional stand for States' rights. For years they have been demanding that the Federal Government give up its gasoline tax and turn the whole road program over to the States. Congress has been reluctant to do this, having a pretty good idea that if the 2-cent Federal tax came off it would stay off; the legislatures wouldn't raise their own levies correspondingly.

A few smaller States, too, would be in a bad spot. The Governor of South Dakota pointed out that his State has a population of only 670,000 and needs outside help if it is to keep its roads up as part of a national network. The point is valid. In some States the highways are used nearly as much by people from outside, in transit, as by their own people—perhaps more. And nobody wants roads to end at State lines.

President Eisenhower's highway thinking matches public practice, if not public thinking. In practice, people are willing to pay for the use of good roads even if they oppose the taxes to build them. The toll roads prove it.

Now it's up to the governors, at a prospective meeting in Washington this fall, to come up with a specific plan of their own. If they do, the Federal Government undoubtedly would get out of the highway business. If not, the President inferred, the Federal Government would go ahead on its own.

Whatever the plan, the public ought to take another look at the relative costs of poor roads and bad roads and insist on the profitable course.

[From the Jackson (Mich.) Citizen-Patriot of July 17, 1954]

More About Roads

The governors who spent considerable time at their recent conference making statements about President Eisenhower's highway proposals now should go back home and take a long, searching look at what is happening in their own States.

And they might call in a few legislative leaders and their highway commissioners to talk about the past, present, and future of their highway programs.

A good many of the governors might find, on sober reflection, that their remarks made in the atmosphere of the conference don't exactly square with what is happening in their own States. In most instances they would find that the State governments are not doing the job that is needed.

And while they are considering the matter, they might review the turnpike situation and what it means to the future of their highway systems.

Take Michigan, for example. The State's roads are inadequate. Along with most other States east of the Mississippi, it has set up a turnpike authority and is preparing to go into the toll-road business.

Why are toll roads built?

Because the free roads are inadequate.

Why are free roads inadequate?

Because sufficient funds are not available to build the roads needed for today's traffic.

Why aren't the funds available?

Because the people won't pay the gasoline and weight taxes necessary to supply adequate funds.

Wait a minute. The people will pay from 1 to 3 cents a mile to drive on toll roads—which means 15 to 45 cents a gallon on gasoline used.

Who says the people won't pay fuel taxes that are stiff enough to provide really adequate highways?

The politicians. At least that is true in Michigan.

Governor Williams fought an attempt to increase the gasoline tax in Michigan from 3 to 5 cents a gallon. A compromise at 4½ cents was forced on the legislature. Since that scrap no one has had the heart for a new fight to increase the State's road fund revenues.

The next move was the creation of a turnpike authority on the theory that if adequate expressways cannot be built with public funds, the next best thing is provide them on a pay-as-you-drive basis.

Financing of the expensive toll roads is possible because investment bankers are convinced that the people are willing to pay from 1 to 3 cents a mile to drive on good roads. Toll roads are fine. There always may be a place for them.

But few governors are willing to go before the people and say something like this:

"Give your State government a tax of 8 or 9 or 10 cents a gallon on gasoline and it can be build an adequate network of roads which will be free of tolls."

And a few State legislatures would back such a proposal.

If the governors want to reduce Federal participation in road construction they will have to take the lead in seeing that their States do an adequate job.

[From the Kalamazoo (Mich.) Gazette of July 15, 1954]

Roads and Money

The President's highway program, outlined to the governors' conference by Vice President Nixon, is said to have gotten a rather cool reception. It is not hard to guess why.

For a number of years, the governors' conference has been urging that the Federal Government transfer its gasoline tax to the States. And the governors, in general, want more State and less Federal control of highway planning and construction.

At last year's governors' conference, Mr. Eisenhower promised, as he had done in the 1952 campaign, to defend "the authority * * * and the revenues of the States." Furthermore, he has under way a big study of Federal-State relations, designed to carry out one of the major Republican platform pledges.

We can see no necessary inconsistency between the President's highway program and his views on the reallocation of revenues and powers. As we understand it, he wants the newly constructed roads to be self-liquidating, directly or indirectly; and we don't think he aims at any increase of Federal authority in this field. On the other hand, it is highly desirable that the Federal Government should coordinate the planning. Otherwise, there can be no truly national or properly located interstate system.

President Eisenhower has previously shown his deep concern over the inadequacy of the Nation's highways. The present Congress, on his recommendation, has already voted a greatly increased appropriation for Federal highway aid.

On the other hand, the State governments, too, have shown themselves fully aware of the need for more and better roads. At the same time, governors and legislatures have to consider most carefully the money side of the question. Everybody likes good roads, but very few of us like to pay for them.

That contrary streak in human nature goes far to explain the popularity of toll roads. Turnpike systems are showing an amazing development. In the first half of 1954, toll-road contracts were being let at a rate 50 percent ahead of 1953; and in that year contracts for throughway construction totaled nearly $800 million.

But the toll road is not by any means the whole answer. No toll road or system of toll roads can take care of more than a small part of the Nation's highway needs.

Then, too, as Business Week magazine points out, the expressways create a new set of administrative and economic problems.

Here in Michigan we have established a State turnpike authority, but the turnpikes, if and when they come, will make no more than a small dent in Michigan's problem.

In the meantime, the candidates for governor are coming out, in one way or another, for a big highway program and big borrowing to finance it. In this respect, Governor Williams, with his usual recklessness, set the pace some time ago.

The legislature at its last session wisely provided for a comprehensive survey of the State's highway needs. It is doubtful, however, that the 1955 legislature will wait for the completion of this study. It looks as if the bond proposal would go to the voters next April.

So the State politicians seem to be taking the bit in their teeth. The question is, How can the country get in this field the broad sound Federal-State cooperation that President Eisenhower wants? How can the country get the balanced highway system that he has in view, a system in which the National, State, and local needs are all understood and taken care of?

What we bid fair to get is a catch-as-catch-can collection of roads, planned and built in the kind of haste that makes waste.

[From the Detroit (Mich.) News of July 14, 1954]

One Highway System

As was to be expected, President Eisenhower's vision of a multi-billion-dollar-highway modernization program has run afoul of the philosophy of many now attending the annual conference of State Governors where the Eisenhower suggestion of a Federal-State partnership for highway betterment was submitted.

Governors win their jobs in the field of practical politics and are jealous of local prerogatives. Annually they meet and demand that the Federal Government abandon the gasoline tax field to the State legislatures and give over more control of highway system planning to local authorities.

Congress has leaned to the view that, if it relinquishes the 2-cent gasoline tax to the States, few legislatures would have the backbone to add it to local levies to meet road needs. The gasoline tax pattern varies among States now from 3 to 7 cents, depending on the success of local pressure groups in opposing it. Michigan was from 1929 to 1950 getting a 1½-cent increase to sustain a deteriorating highway system.

Under present planning, wealthier States do not get back in Federal aid all that they pay in Federal gasoline taxes. A portion of the payments go to poorer States to assure extension and maintenance of the interstate system of through routes, just as a portion of the gasoline taxes collected in Wayne County is expended on the State trunkline system to assure continuity of good roads into northern counties.

Few motorists now wish to go back to the days when good roads ended at the borders of poor counties or poor States. Yet localized authority over highway funds invites that state of affairs.

Mr. Eisenhower's highway philosophy matches the thinking of the time and the travel habits of the people. Its breadth reflects the transcontinental highway transportation growth of the Nation.

The Great Issue of Our Time

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 23, 1954

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the appendix of the Record a sermon delivered at the church service of the Imperial Council of the Shrine of North America at St. Paul's Methodist Church, Atlantic City, N. J., on Sunday, June 27, 1954. The sermon was delivered by Mr. George Stringfellow, and it was called the Great Issue of Our Time, or Romance of Remembering. Mr. Stringfellow is imperial high priest and prophet of the Imperial Council of the Ancient Arabic Order of the Nobles of the Mystic Shrine for North America, and in business is senior vice president of Thomas A. Edison, Inc., of West Orange, N. J., holds many civic positions which include the presidency of the New Jersey Taxpayers' Association, and is a member of the executive committee of the American Cancer Society. This sermon should be of general interest to all. I particularly like the reference where he quotes from a tombstone in an old New Hampshire cemetery.

There being on objection, the sermon was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Great Issue of Our Time

My text is from the 3d verse of the 20th chapter of Exodus: "Thou shalt have no other gods before me" and from the 28th verse of the 22d chapter of Proverbs: "Remove not the ancient landmark, which thy fathers have set."

Amid the hills and valleys of rugged New Hampshire a visiting minister, scanning the time-worn inscriptions on the old tombstones of a cemetery, read these words, "My son, that which thy father hath bequeathed, you must earn anew if you would keep." Would that this truth, carved in old New England granite, were etched today in the minds and hearts of every American.

No people in history have ever enjoyed as great a material heritage as has been given to us. Resources of mine and soil, water, field and forest, have been given to us in prodigal abundance. The power and wealth of industry which have arisen from the use of these resources are beyond comprehension, unrivaled by any empire present or past. Every American has a material heritage whose equal is to be found nowhere in the world. Truly, God has been good to us.

We are, however, the possessors of a spiritual heritage—morality, character, and religion—which transcends our material heritage as the sun surpasses in splendor the faintest star.

One aspect of this priceless gift from our heroic past is spoken in the immortal lines from The Landing of the Pilgrim Fathers:

> "What sought they thus afar?
>   Bright jewels of the mine?
> The wealth of seas, the spoils of war?
>   They sought a faith's pure shrine!
> Aye, call it holy ground!
>   The soil where first they trod.
> They have left unstained what there they found,
>   Freedom to worship God."

The Mayflower Compact was the first of the notable documents marking the birth of our Republic. Its memorable opening sentence, "In the name of God, amen" is followed by the solemn covenant in which appear these spiritual and significant words: "We have undertaken for the glory of God and the advancement of the Christian faith."

In the stormy days of 1620, in the bitter cold, haunted by privations and tortured by anxieties, God was the refuge and the everlasting hope of our Pilgrim Fathers. It is difficult for us today, in our comparative comfort and prosperity, to appreciate the hardships endured by those first settlers.

They established the right and freedom to worship God in accord with the dictates of their conscience. Moral conviction motivated their every decision. They were determined to build a society which would reverence and serve God. Their spirituality supplied life and strength to their every activity. From such an ancestry our way of life was born.

A century and a half later the signers of our Declaration of Independence held that moral laws were beyond the power of Government to alter or over-ride. In the opening sentence of that passport to freedom, our forefathers grounded their purpose and faith in the conviction that "the laws of nature and nature's God must prevail." In the final paragraph of that great document the signers appealed "to the Supreme Judge of the world for the rectitude" of their intentions. In its closing sentence their trust in God was revealed in words which will ring through the corridors of time for as long as men cherish liberty:

"And for the support of this declaration, with a firm reliance on the protection of divine providence, we mutually pledge to each other our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor."

In the summer of 1787, when our courageous and wise Founding Fathers were debating the Constitution of the United States, realizing the need for divine guidance, they opened every session of the 85-day conference by invoking the blessing of Almighty God.

Although it is not commonly known that Washington took part in the constitutional debates, it was he who, in a critical moment of the convention, rose from the president's chair and exclaimed, "Let us raise a standard to which the wise and honest can repair; the event is in the hand of God."

God had a hand in the development of that great instrument that made us a free and prosperous people, and which Gladstone described as "The most wonderful work ever struck off at a given time by the brain and purpose of man."

In 1796, almost a decade later, in his Farewell Address, Washington reminded his fellow countrymen that "religion and morality lead to political prosperity."

Our fair land was born and nurtured as a religious community, under the overarching sovereignty of God, and dedicated to human liberty and the dignity of man. Our Founding Fathers were brave because they were God-fearing men, and men of intellectual integrity. They prayed to God and their work brought forth a form of government that freemen hold dear.

We are the possessors of that great spiritual heritage. If it is to endure, it must be "earned anew" by every generation.

What have we done with our spiritual heritage? Have we earned anew what was bequeathed to us?

There are disquieting evidences that many of us have drifted far from the practice of the principles which made this country great. When flagrant political abuses were called to the attention of a high public official, he remarked, "These men have not violated the law".

We assume that he meant man-made law. I would remind him and other public servants that there are God-made laws which have traditionally transcended man-made laws in the esteem of our public servants.

George Mason, distinguished author and leading lawyer of his generation, who had much to do with composing the famous Virginia bill of rights in 1776, said, "The laws of nature are the laws of God, whose authority can be superseded by no power on earth. A legislature must not obstruct our obedince to Him from whose punishments they cannot protect us."

Some of us do not seem to understand that our citizens are bound to obey the laws of God as well as the laws of man, and that when man-made laws conflict with those of God, His laws must prevail. We must ever be mindful that our Nation is a gift from God, and that we are His people.

"We are watchers at a beacon
  Whose light must never die.
We are guardians of an altar,
  Which shows Thee ever high."

That was uppermost in the fertile mind of Thomas A. Edison who, in his last radio broadcast said, "Be as brave as your fathers; have faith and go forward." This is a wise admonition. We can do no better than to follow it now.

Our forefathers built on this continent a commonwealth which for prestige, wealth, and power, has never had an equal. But our material success has brought with it major hazards. In our material gains we have suffered grave losses. We have yielded to the temptation to place temporal things before spiritual values. There are sadly lacking, but not lost beyond hope of reviving, the sacred convictions which gave our forefathers the stamina and courage to push forward the frontiers of world commerce and thus to raise the standard of living for all peoples.

"This Nation is free under God," said Lincoln. "Tear down the Christian flag and Old Glory will sink of her own weight." Let us heed Lincoln's words as we seek to cope with the Communists and the fellow travelers in our midst who would tear down both the Christian flag and the Stars and Stripes and replace them with the Hammer and Sickle.

Communism holds that belief in God is an opiate of the people, and that the influence of religion must be exterminated everywhere before communism is safe anywhere. Thus the Communists indict themselves when they proclaim that their way of life cannot exist in the atmosphere of the Ten Commandments.

"People who are not governed by God," said William Penn, "will be ruled by tyrants." The grim proof of this stretches from Herod to Malenkov.

The great issue of our times is this: Will the forces which deny the existence of God enslave their fellow men? The alternatives are freedom under God or one global concentration camp. If we get the Communists and fellow travelers out of our Government, if we stop compromising the principles which made this country great, if we renew our spiritual heritage and practice true religion in our daily affairs as our forefathers did, we can successfully meet the greatest challenge to our way of life since the Declaration of Independence.

"With God all things are possible." Apathy can be changed to action. We can make this a better country and a better world for our children and their posterity. If we will, we can "earn anew" our spiritual heritage.

If we would save the world for decency, we must emulate St. Paul, who crying that the days were evil, labored to improve them. We must not follow Hamlet who cried that the days were evil and cursed them.

There are hopeful signs of better life. The Scouts and "Y" groups continue to flourish and grow. Public school education more and more stresses moral values. Church attendance is increasing. In the period from 1945 to 1950 the number of church members in the United States increased from 27 million to 28 million, a 14-percent increase, as compared with a 9-percent increase in the Nation's population. There are now more than a quarter of a million church buildings in the United States, in which man may worship God as he elects.

If we are to retain and be worthy of our spiritual heritage, there is much for each of us to do. We must place God first in our lives. We must obey the laws of God and the laws of man, and where these conflict, work for the repeal of the latter. We must give our churches our time, our talent, our treasure. We must be stewards of the gifts God has given us. We must discharge our duties as citizens, voting faithfully and intelligently, always putting truth and goodness and the welfare of people ahead of political party. We must concern ourselves with what is right rather than with who is right.

Plato said, "The state is the individual writ large." No government is better than its citizens. Your character matters. You hold the present and the future in your hands.

"O God, our Father, let us not be content to wait and see what will happen, but give us the determination to make the right things happen. Give us the courage to stand for something, lest we fall for everything."

Ike's Super Bloopers: The TVA Deal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BYRON G. ROGERS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 23, 1954

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado: Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein the following article from the Denver Post, Denver, Colo., on Tuesday, July 20, 1954:

IKE'S SUPER BLOOPER

The byproducts of confusion and embarrassment that are flowing from the Eisenhower administration's more spectacular bloopers are well illustrated by the forthcoming Senate investigation of the AEC-TVA deal.

We refer to President Eisenhower's Executive order directing the AEC to negotiate a firm contract with 2 private power concerns for construction of a plant to produce 600,000 kilowatts of electricity. The AEC itself was opposed to the plan. And if forced into being, it will cost the Government some $97 million more in power charges than if Uncle Sam himself had built the plant. As for the chosen utility, it would thus get a contract virtually without competition, be assured a customer for 25 years, be guaranteed an annual profit on the plant's operation, and be owner of the $107 million plant at the end of that time.

Senator LANGER, of North Dakota, Republican chairman of the Judiciary Committee, has swooped down on that deal like the grizzled old hawk that he resembles. And Congressman HOLIFIELD, of California, in a devastating commentary upon the deal, said, "Apparently (President Eisenhower's) method of stopping creeping socialism (at TVA) is by substituting galloping Federal favoritism."

Senator LANGER has hired a bright-eyed and bushy-tailed New York lawyer, a former law clerk for Hugo Black, Sidney Davis, as counsel. Mr. Davis is shrewd enough to know that Mr. LANGER is moving in on a rich vein when he begins to mine the Eisenhower public power record for political paydirt.

The AEC-TVA fiasco may provide Mr. LANGER and other sharpshooters who aren't above ambushing Ike with their one great chance for national attention.

The fact is that Mr. LANGER and Mr. Davis might have some difficulty whipping into headline material most of the more controversial developments in power policy. For example, the Interior Department's abortive marketing criteria for the sale of publicly produced power in the western Missouri Basin was amended and corrected before it did any real harm to public bodies and cooperatives.

Secretary McKay's withdrawal of his Department's objections to a private company's petition to dam the Snake River on the Oregon-Idaho border is supported by considerable logic and legal precedent in favor of the Federal Power Commission's preeminence in that field.

The administration's contract policy in the Pacific Northwest is partially justified, at least, by the peculiar circumstances of power production, distribution, and consumption out there. And the meaning and implications of the so-called partnership plan for hydropower projects are neither easy to understand nor to express, pro or con, in simple terms.

The point is that although the Eisenhower administration is politically vulnerable on the power issue, it is apparently trying to recover from a bad start. And it has stepped back to a middle-of-the-road position on some explosive questions enough to protect itself against the crippling charge of "giveaway." An example of this is in the accelerated engineering studies to provide some Government dam construction on the moot Snake River below the bitterly fought-over Hells Canyon site.

Then along comes this clumsy effort to clamp down on any expansion of the TVA.

We do not agree with the adverse connotation in the President's now-famous epithet for the TVA as an example of "creeping socialism," and a "monstrosity." But assuredly the President is entitled to his opinion and to his proposal for a "study of TVA's future," as he indicated would be made in the future. But the Milwaukee Journal, commenting on the AEC–TVA deal, asked two questions which were made to order for Mr. LANGER and other critics of the administration's power policy:

"Isn't the strange order telling AEC to negotiate with the private combine prejudging TVA's place in the future? And even if one accepted the idea of TVA critics that the project is 'creeping socialism' and a 'monstrosity,' isn't the new proposal merely creating another 'monstrosity' supported by the 'creeping socialism' of full subsidy?"

Discussion of Red Line in United States Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH E. FLANDERS

OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 23, 1954

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter published in the New York Herald Tribune, written by Goodhue Livingston, Jr., of New York, under date of June 7, 1954.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DISCUSSION OF RED LINE IN UNITED STATES TODAY

To the NEW YORK HERALD TRIBUNE:

What is the present Communist line in regard to the United States?

Is it possible that the rulers of Imperial Russia have been handed on a platter a better program for destroying us than the one they have employed in the past? As our production mounts yearly, the Soviet prediction of an early capitalist collapse seems unlikely. As we have made great strides during the past 20 years toward wiping out racial prejudices, the Simon Legree charge seems to be outmoded.

The new plan which they have received gratis, certainly should be a sound one from their point of view. Roughly it outlines as follows:

1. Work to divorce this country from its present allies and prevent us from obtaining new ones in the future.
2. Create as much disunity as possible within the American Government.
3. Foster our neurotic fears concerning subversion and sow suspicion and hatred among us.
4. Render the executive branch of government impotent to handle our foreign affairs in a decisive manner which is so desperately needed now as time and distance shrink.
5. Force a conformity of thinking on our foreign service, in particular, and among all citizens, in general.
6. Weaken the United Nations for concerted action in every way possible.

Such a pattern of psychological warfare is very similar to that employed by us in enemy countries during the last war. However, it is both deplorable and very tragic to see the enemy's schemes aided and abetted on our own soil by Americans who profess to be rabidly patriotic. For without their help the enemy would make little progress. As the situation stands today his plans seem to be making considerable headway.

There are several large groups in our midst who perhaps unwittingly follow the Communist Party line. A goodly number of these persons partly through fear of losing their material wealth and somewhat because of ignorance cling to the opinion that Communist spies constitute our main if not our only real enemy. To bring about a sworn society in order to protect their possessions, these superpatriots seem ready to tear up the Constitution and the Bill of Rights. Some who recently organized under the name of "For America" advocate sealing us off from the rest of the world. Building "fortress America" they call it.

Others among them wish to render the Executive impotent to conduct foreign policy by gumming up the Constitution with the Bricker amendment or a watered down version of same.

Nearly all of them have a passion for conformity which borders on thought control. In their eyes all intellect is sinful and free thinking subversive, particularly among scientists and educators. Certainly the men in the Kremlin would have had difficulty in dreaming up McCarthyism to further their aims. Their delight must be great that it came to pass without their connivance.

The fact stands that even with all friends and allies we can hope to muster we shall remain hopelessly short of manpower and possibly even of the raw resources required for the sinews of war. With the morale of our State Department declining—some of its best brains banished—with our point-4 program all but abolished, our world position continues to deteriorate daily. We appear to be wobbling down a very dangerous road lined with boobytraps laid by some of our chauvinistic countrymen.

Time is running out. It may well be later than we think. When our danger becomes completely clear, it may prove too late. The coming congressional elections are therefore most crucial. The urgent need now is to elect Congressmen who are willing and capable of global thinking—individuals who realize the peril willing to put country above party or personal interest. It should always be remembered that nations like individuals do not live forever and that their lives have often been unnecessarily shortened because they were unable to adapt themselves to changing conditions intelligently and because they divorced themselves from the basic tenets that gave them birth. It was once said "That those whom the gods wish to destroy, they first make mad." History seems to bear this out.

GOODHUE LIVINGSTON, Jr.,
Acting Chairman of the Committee for Collective Security.

NEW YORK, *June 7, 1954.*

Our Urban Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 23, 1954

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill which creates a Department of Urbiculture for the purpose of dealing with the pressing social, economic, and civic problems growing out of inadequate knowledge of the principles of urban land utilization. Many of our urban problems originate from our faulty techniques in the development and use of urban real estate.

Years ago approximately 75 percent or more of our people lived on farms. The most pressing economic problems of the day grew out of the utilization of farm lands. Very properly the need for research and the discovery and application of basic principles was recognized by the Federal Government and a Department of Agriculture was created with a Secretary of Agriculture assigned to the President's Cabinet. Agricultural colleges were founded throughout the country. Agricultural improvement in research stations were founded every year. Hundreds of millions of dollars have been spent in research and educational activities for our citizens who have vital personal interests in the efficient utilization of farm lands.

At the present time I am told that less than 25 percent of our people live on farms. Our most pressing and vital social and economic problems today originate in the cities. There has been no consistent research done to discover how best to "cultivate" urban lands so as to produce maximum yields in monetary terms and amenities. There have been innumerable half-hearted attempts at the fringe of the problem as evidenced by the various building codes, zoning laws, neighborhood rehabilitation programs and many other such ideas but the science of urban land economics remains in a nebulous state.

In the meantime we are appalled by the slum conditions, decentralization movements and other phenomena which we do not really fully understand or appreciate.

I am sure that we have in this country enough sound and able thinkers to develop urbiculture to a point where it can be as serviceable to owners and utilizers of urban property as the science of agriculture has been to the owners and users of agricultural property.

H. R. 1227

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARLEY O. STAGGERS

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 23, 1954

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include in the RECORD a petition and list of signers from Martinsburg, W. Va., in support of H. R. 1227. These citizens protest the advertising of alcoholic beverages in magazines and newspapers and over the radio and television, and request that they so be recorded:

SECOND BAPTIST CHURCH,
Martinsburg, W. Va., July 17, 1954.

Hon. HARLEY O. STAGGERS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

We, the undersigned members of Second Baptist Church, of Martinsburg, W. Va., do hereby petition you to do all within your power for the passage of the Bryson bill, H. R. 1227 (Langer bill, S. 3294), which would prohibit the transportation in interstate commerce of alcoholic beverage advertising in newspapers, periodicals, etc., and its broadcasting over radio and television.

Please print these names in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as favoring the passage of this bill:

Carl Cogle, Marion H. Myers, Austin O. Rudy, George Stephens, Jr., Raymond Randall, Daisy Hockenburg, Mrs. Jean Harris, Gloria Parkinson, Ernest Myers, Mrs. Dorothy Cogle, Velma B. Woodward, Mrs. J. P. Vesper, Ann Ellis, Charlotte Cinday, Janet Ellis, Edward Mills, Mary Lee Stein, Sally May Durflinger, Richard Woodward, Luther Jacobs, Jr., Curtis Shane, Bruce Shuster, Jack Ellis, Roger Myers, Roger Walls, Clarence Boyer, Isabelle Suplis, Donna Duke, Peggy Mills, Helen Mills, Fannie Duke, Mrs. George Stephens, Jr., Mary Catherine Myers, Grover

G. Mills, Mrs. Ollie V. Mills, Vernon R. Murphy, Jr., Frances Billmyer, Mrs. Roscoe Myers, Evelyn Ellis.

J. Kenneth Clark, pastor, N. C. Stephens, Lester Myers, George S. Dunn, Mrs. Maud Jenkins, D. G. Bryarly, George Whittington, J. W. Vesper, V. R. Murphy, Mrs. C. A. Montgomery, Mrs. Samuel Walls, Mrs. Calvin Secrist, Mrs. Roy Myers, Mrs. Vernon Murphy, Mrs. James Ramey, Mrs. Frank Mongin, Mrs. Virginia Showalter, Mrs. Luther Lanham, Mrs. John Murray, Mrs. Nellie Ellis, Mrs. Ernest Myers, Mrs. Wm. Calahan, Mrs. Ruth Clipp, Mrs. Paul Yeakley, Mrs. N. C. Stephens, Howard W. Custer, Will W. Cagle, William D. Calahan, James L. Ramey, Junior Snyder, C. A. Montgomery, John Britt, Mrs. George S. Dunn, Daisy M. Britt, Bernard N. Duke, Pearl Ellis, Margaret Rudy, Dorothy Custer, Jean Burris, Mary Mills, Dorothy Murray, Janet Shade, Virginia Shade, Glenda Woodward, Donna Murphy, Ellen M. Clark, Robert Rudy, Bill Allen, Roy Myers, Lelia Vesper, Edward Snyder, Jr., Robert F. Derflinger, Ray Walls, John W. Murray, Fred H. Harris, Naomi Cagle, George C. Stephens III, Mrs. George C. Stephens III, Samuel Walls.

The Maritime Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. T. A. THOMPSON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 23, 1954

Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of the House a matter of the utmost concern to those of us who are interested in preventing waste of the taxpayers' money and who look askance at corruption and improper acts perpetrated by Government official. Certain conditions in the Maritime Administration demand our careful scrutiny and I am coming to the conclusion that a good housecleaning is necessary if we are to remedy certain conditions which exist under suspicious circumstances.

The Republican administration has made a point of requiring that Government officials and workers sever their industry connections when they enter Government service. This is particularly true when the Government official's former business stands to profit by his new Government position. I have just learned that one of the most sensitive positions in the Maritime Administration, namely, Chief, Office of Ship Construction and Repair, has for the past month been held by one John McMullen, a person whose private business stands to reap great benefits by his current Government position. Mr. McMullen and his father for many years have been engaged in the ship-repair business, operating under the name of the Hudson Marine Co. When Mr. McMullen came to Government he spent half time here in Washington serving as Chief, Office of Ship Construction and Repair, and half time in New York getting business from ship companies for his father's firm, the Hudson Marine Co. It is very possible that Mr. McMullen is still working part time and if he is not, the change has been very recently.

Mr. McMullen has recently increased the staff at Hudson Marine Co. to include personnel whose job is to solicit business for the company. Efforts in this direction are concentrated on companies having Maritime Administration business. In his job at Maritime, Mr. McMullen has an opportunity to know what shipyards and ship operators have ship subsidies and the status of each subsidy. He also is in a position to throw a monkeywrench into the works if a shipyard or ship operator does not cooperate with him. It may be a strange coincidence, but the Moore-McCormack Ship Co., which has been in the process of having detailed plans drawn for a new vessel, has suddenly, and at the last minute, had those plans held up by Mr. McMullen's office in Maritime Administration. At the same time, the Moore-McCormack Co. has been approach by an employee of Mr. McMullen's company, the Hudson Marine Co., soliciting business—business that would amount to well over half a million dollars in the next year. The Moore-McCormack Co. plans had, over the months, been discussed at length with officials of the Maritime Administration and it was anticipated that they would be acceptable. I ask you, gentlemen, does it not seem a little odd that now, at the crucial moment when the plans are up for final clearance, they have been held up in what looks like, at best, most suspicious circumstances?

It seems evident that there are many questions to be asked, and I ask your permission to bring them up:

First. Is it proper for a Government official to use his public office to benefit his private business?

Second. If a Government official is using his public office to further the interests of his private business, is not his chief—in this case the Administrator of the Maritime Board—responsible, and should he not take proper action?

Third. Recently the attention of this body was brought to the fact that the Maritime Board was contemplating scrapping the *Cornhusker Mariner*, a $10 million vessel, rather than repair it for $2,300,000. Does it not seem that the Maritime Board is a little "loose" with the use of the taxpayers' money when it is willing to scrap a $10 million investment that can be protected by an expenditure of only $2,300,000?

Fourth. If this vessel is scrapped, is this not a jeopardy to our national defense in view of the fact that the Administrator of the Maritime Administration recently stated before the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, "We need every one of the ships in our reserve and more."

Fifth. How can the Maritime Board justify the scrapping of the *Cornhusker Mariner* when it is one one the largest, fastest cargo vessels in our fleet, capable of attaining more than 23 knots, when most of the ships in the fleet have a speed of only 16 knots?

Sixth. Only a few days ago the Administrator of the Maritime Board announced in a press release that he intends to scrap the $10 million *Cornhusker Mariner* which has seen only 6 months' service. His position on the *Cornhusker Mariner* is influenced by the opinions of one of his subordinates, Charles H. McGuire, Director of the Office of National Shipping Authority and Government Aid. On March 12, 1954, this is what the House Armed Services Investigating Subcommittee had to say about Mr. McGuire:

> We think it reprehensible in the extreme that a Government employee in a position of responsibility, presumed to be able to exercise discretion and judgment in matters of public concern, would have so little regard for truth and accuracy, that he would permit the head of an agency to harbor false and unsupported charges against another department of the Government. Such conduct is reckless (p. 12, hearing and report of the Subcommittee on Defense Activities of the House Committee on Armed Services).

Now we find that another subordinate of the Administrator of the Maritime Board, namely, the Chief, Office of Ship Construction and Repair, seems to be engaging in practices that are not acceptable to Members of Congress, or for that matter, to anyone who has a sense of ethics. Under these conditions, I ask you, gentlemen, whether it does not seem in order for Mr. Rothschild to carefully study the personnel in his agency and immediately weed out those who are not working in the best interests of the public?

And I further suggest that Mr. Rothschild should be more careful and considerate of the taxpayers' money. In view of his own recent statements on the necessity for maintaining a reserve fleet, he should rescind the order to scrap the *Cornhusker Mariner* and instead have the vessel repaired.

Does Mr. Rothschild intend to rely on "lip service" and pious protestations or does he intend to perform in accordance with his words which obviously belie his deeds?

The McCarthy Staff

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH E. FLANDERS

OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 23, 1954

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a telegram from Walter White, executive secretary of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *July 20, 1954.*

HON. RALPH E. FLANDERS,
Senate Office Building:

Your attack on the evil influence generated by the methods of Senator JOSEPH MCCARTHY and his team of Cohn and Schine is a challenge that must be met by the United States Senate and the country as a whole. Those of us who have fought communism and the conditions that breed it are appalled to see how the McCarthy method has cast a shadow on the loyalty of so many persons whose lives are passionately devoted to the service of our country. Each Member of the Senate should give you firm support.

WALTER WHITE,
Executive Secretary, NAACP.

West Virginia Farmers and 90 Percent of Parity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 23, 1954

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, in connection with the forthcoming debate on farm legislation, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter which I have received from C. R. Hawkins, director, division of markets, West Virginia Department of Agriculture; and an article written by J. B. McLaughlin, commissioner, West Virginia Department of Agriculture. I recommend these thoughtful comments to the attention of the Members of the Senate.

There being no objection, the letter and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Charleston, W. Va., July 14, 1954.

Hon. HARLEY KILGORE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR KILGORE: I am sure all intelligent farmers will support you in a program that will protect the family sized farm throughout the Nation. We feel our stand on 90 percent parity, rigid acreage allotment and controls to prevent switching to substitute crops is a step in that direction. We need only to look at the tobacco grower to see how sound this policy is. He gets a fair price for what he is permitted to raise, and the Government does not have a surplus problem. His credit is good at the market places of our Nation today.

We see this problem affecting West Virginia agriculture in the following ways: All good agricultural practices that have been taught for the past many years involve crop rotation with the six basic crops. The heart of the soil-conservation service, for example, sponsored by our Government is strip cropping and rotation of our basic crops. Without a sound policy on acreage allotments and controls regardless of parity prices the American farmer and the United States Government is in for difficult years ahead, due primarily to our ability to put into the fields, mechanical and chemical technology undreamed of when this program was first started.

Attached is one such practice, the use of anhydrous ammonit, that would become a reckoning factor to any agricultural program, involving these six basic crops. I would like to advise you that I observed personally one of these units operating in and around Morgantown, W. Va., this past spring. I know that you can see the significance of these practices that are bound to become commonplace on our farms.

Another advancement to be reckoned with is the genetic factor of artificial insemination of our dairy and beef herds. Most all dairy and beef farmers of our State have access to and are using the program to reach the goal of the cow Secretary Benson is milking on the attached page.

In view of the rapid progress being made in the farm machinery field, in the fertilizer field, and the knowledge of our farmers in the application of these developments, we will be presented with new problems.

These problems can be, if our program is adopted, changed to progress in permitting our farmers to retire less productive land to woodland that will help to conserve and hold water, prevent dust bowls and excessive soil erosion.

To do these things our farmers must have (1) 90 percent parity; (2) rigid acreage allotment; (3) rigid controls to prevent switching to other crops.

I trust that this letter will help you to vote for 90 percent parity.

Sincerely,

C. R. HAWKINS,
Director, Division of Markets.

[From the Farmer of West Virginia of July 7, 1954]

LOOKING AHEAD

(By J. B. McLaughlin, commissioner, West Virginia Department of Agriculture)

From all reports, we have the largest surpluses of grains, cotton, livestock, and dairy products that this country has ever experienced and, at the same time, surpluses are continuing to pile up. It would seem that Secretary Benson has finally started in the right direction when, a few days ago, he announced that his program for the future would be drastic and rigid controls on the supported agricultural commodities. This step should have been taken 18 months ago. It was, then, apparent that the only way to deal with the ever-increasing surpluses was by drastic regulations in the form of acreage allotments for all commodities, with rigid controls and parity price supports in order to make the allotments and controls effective.

The problem, figuratively speaking, can be best illustrated by a table with three legs, on which is placed all of the supported commodities. One leg could be called price support; one could be called acreage allotments; the other could be called rigid control. To try to make the program work by the removal of any one of the legs would cause the whole thing to crash and disaster will come to not alone the agricultural segment of our Nation, but will have its economic effect on all of our citizens.

The Secretary undoubtedly sees the necessity of drastic regulations to stop the further piling up of surpluses and I take this oportunity to commend him for his action. The farmers and citizens of our Nation must bear with him to accomplish what he has started out to do.

I am thinking, primarily, of the family sized farmer and his contribution to the Nation's food supply year in and year out. The program should be based principally on his ability to produce. Using him as a base, acreage curtailment should apply more severely to large or commercial farm operations, at the same time prohibiting them from diverting the acres curtailed to other competitive crops. By so doing, we will have a better conservation program and, at the same time, relieve surpluses more rapidly.

The tobacco program is a good example of what can be done. It has been very successful. Farmers are for it almost 100 percent. Tobacco has a fixed 90 percent parity, by law, plus rigid controls, and I know of no class of farmers who are in a better financial condition than the tobacco grower.

Generally speaking, our farmers are in bad financial condition. Prices of their products will probably go down another 10 percent this year. Government officials and economists say they can see no hope of increases in prices of the farmers' products for some time. As I view this situation, it is just as much the responsibility of Congress and the United States Department of Agriculture to subsidize the farmer now as it was at the time he was patriotically producing to win wars and furnish food to the starving nations who were cooperating with our country to prevent Communist invasion. I say this because the Government did and continues to subsidize manufacturers of all kinds who are producing war machines and materials with a guaranty of cost plus 10 percent profit.

Another argument is that all farm equipment, supplies, and materials that the farmer must buy for the operation of his farm still remain at the highest prices ever known in the history of this Nation and that living costs have not gone down, but in some instances have increased. The farm situation does not look good from more than one angle. With the curtailment of 40 to 50 million acres and with the prices of agricultural products down and continuing to go further down, presents an economic problem for this Nation, especially at a time when we have a $275 billion debt with the prospects of further inflation. Economists reason that we might find ourselves with $25 billion, or more, less gross annual income than we have had in the last few years. If this should occur, this means more people unemployed and more people with less buying power.

Saving Southwestern Soil

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN

OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 23, 1954

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Saving Southwestern Soil," which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of Saturday, July 17, 1954.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SAVING SOUTHWESTERN SOIL

Rainfall has checked wind erosion in western Texas, Oklahoma, and Kansas and in eastern sections of Colorado and New Mexico, permitting those farmers not ruined by floods to plant some crops. But 20 million acres suffered permanent damage in the drought and windstorms of last spring. Agronomists say that new droughts this year and windstorms early in 1955 could devastate 100 million acres if new soil conservation measures are not adopted.

How is a "dust bowl" born and what makes it grow? Extended dry spells and overcultivation of marginal land not suited for raising crops are the main factors. High commodity prices after 1941 and heavy harvests induced wheat farmers in particular to cultivate poor land, productive only when rainfall was heavy. When drought and high winds combine forces, as in the 1930's and last spring, this soil is the first to literally blow away. Damage spreads from bad land to good, as silt and sand deposits kill vegetation, loosen topsoil and open new areas to the wind.

Temporary antiwind measures undertaken by farmers who received $15 million in emergency loans authorized by Congress in May will be of no lasting value unless grass or another good cover is planted before drought strikes again. The President's farm program, under Senate committee discussion, calls for retirement from cultivation of about 8 million acres in "dust bowl" areas. This is a sound provision. As Secretary Benson recently pointed out, it is senseless to support prices of surplus products being raised on marginal land which could be beter saved for a day when it may really be needed. The Agriculture Department has received $55 million to begin conservation of marginal land. It needs the Nation's cooperation in saving soil that feeds us.

Equality of Treatment for All Veterans of the Spanish-American War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 15, 1954

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, equality of treatment for all veterans has been the practice of the people of the United States. There is one painful exception: the pensions for Naval veterans of the Spanish-American War.

The pension inequity affects some 50 surviving naval veterans and widows of veterans. Members of Congress have endeavored to provide a legislative remedy; but this legislation has had silent treatment by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, with the result that it never has reached the floor for action by the Members of the House.

In an effort to present the case of these naval veterans of the Spanish-American War to the judgment and sense of fair play of my colleagues, I am extending my remarks to include a memorandum prepared by Rear Adm. Leo W. Hesselman and presented to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, as follows:

Some particulars of how the pension discrimination against naval veterans, of the Spanish-American War, came about—

A. Beginning August 29, 1898, the Army granted mustering-out furloughs to its volunteers, 2 months being allowed those who served overseas, and 1 month to those who served only within the United States boundaries. The Secretary of War, in reporting this to the President, termed these furloughs an "indulgence." No similar grant was made to the temporary forces of the Navy, at that time.

B. The act of January 13, 1899 (30 Stat. 784) operated to terminate any further granting of mustering-out furloughs, and authorized that the equivalent of same, be granted to volunteers of the Army, in the form of extra pay, on muster out of service. This was, in part, responsive to the reactions of the volunteers, as expressed by one of them, that "if the furlough is intended as an honor or reward, it is not so accepted or considered" and further that "if a reward is intended, it would be best given by allowing on muster out 1 or 2 months additional pay. Such a reward would be substantial and fully appreciated" (p. 444, Congressional Record, Jan. 6, 1899). No similar grant for the Navy was included in the act.

C. The act of March 3, 1899 (30 Stat. 1214) authorized that the benefits granted volunteers of the Army, mentioned above, be granted to the temporary forces of the Navy in the form of the extra pay equivalent of the furloughs, making it retroactive to the date when the Army's furloughs began. This was, in part, responsive to the protest of the Secretary of the Navy that "giving to the volunteer Army, for similar service, privileges that are withheld from the Navy is a discrimination against the latter class" (p. 1296, Congressional Record, January 31, 1899). It may be noted that this act seemed to have disposed of the disparity in treatment accorded to men of the Army and Navy on muster out of service; and reestablished the long standing policy, of Congress, that rewards to veterans of our wars shall be the same to all.

D. The act of September 1, 1922 (H. R. 4, Public No. 294) seems to have disturbed the parity set up by the act of March 3, 1899. Neither of the mustering out benefits (furloughs or extra pay above mentioned) had been given pensionable status, until, by the act of September 1, 1922, Congress provided that the mustering out furloughs be included in determining the number of days served, making it retroactive to cover pension applications previously filed. No provision was made for like treatment of the extra pay retrocatively awarded to men discharged by the Navy during the period that the mustering out furloughs were in effect. It appears that "many claims of widows filed under the Spanish War Widows Service Pension Act of July 16, 1918, and under the first Veterans' Act of June 5, 1920, were rejected because there was less than 90 days' service credited to the veteran after deducting the period of his furlough. To avoid discrimination in these cases, the Congress provided in section 5 of the act of September 1, 1922, that all leaves of absence and furloughs (under War Department General Orders 130, AGO 1898) should be counted as actual service. This principle was incorporated in all subsequent legislation granting increases to veterans, and dependents of veterans, of the Spanish-American War" (from statement of May 8, 1935, filed with the House Committee on Pensions, by Brig. Gen. F. T. Hines, Administrator of Veterans' Affairs). The Navy has never been given the benefit of this principle and the dependents of the naval veterans of 1898 are, today, suffering for that omission. That left the law so that no pension is allowed the widow of a naval veteran of the combat area, who had as much as 89 days of actual service. As compared with that, the widow of an Army volunteer, with no duty in the combat zone and only 60 days of actual service, very properly, receives full pension. This discrimination, however, seems grossly unfair to the Navy.

An idea of how this disparity developed, and how it worked out in pensions, for men released from service during the "significant period," August 29, 1898 to January 13, 1899, whose service included duty overseas, may be gained from consideration of a few possible cases under existing law, as follows:

	Army (volunteer)		Navy (sailor, marine, or revenue cutter man)	
A. Mustering out benefit	Furlough		Extra pay equivalent of furlough.	
B. Status of mustering out benefit under the law	Pensionable		Not pensionable.	
	To veteran	To widow	To veteran	To widow
C. Pensions allowed for officially recorded actual service:				
10 days' actual service	70 day pension	No pension	No pension	No pension.
30 days' actual service	Full pension	Full pension	do	Do.
69 days' actual service	do	do	do	Do.
89 days' actual service	do	do	70-day pension	Do.
90 days' actual service	do	do	Full pension	Full pension.

There were probably no discharged veterans, who served outside the United States, who had as little as 10 days, or even as little as 30 days, of actual service but, if there were any, the law seems to authorize treating them as above indicated.

A theory has been advanced that the furloughs allowed the volunteers released in 1898, were mainly to enable the Government to recall the men if necessary. Most of these volunteers were State millitiamen of the National Guard who could, presumably, be recalled to duty by the President, under the same constitutional authority, that permitted their call to duty in the first instance. Such a theory seems to beg the question as to why troops who had duty overseas, were given 2 months of furlough; while those who had been retained within the United States, were given only 1 month. If this was a matter of holding troops subject to recall, it would seem that the holding time should have been the same or, perhaps, shorter for those who had served overseas. In September 1898, when Col. Theodore Roosevelt was at Montauk Point awaiting demobilization, he and his Rough Riders seemed to regard the furloughs as a gift, according to news reports at the time, and they expressed opposition because of the inconvenience to men after return to peacetime pursuits, by having them report at end of furloughs, from various parts of the country, to whatever command posts might be set up for that purpose. Similar sentiments, later on, caused discontinuance of the furloughs by act of Congress of January 13, 1899 (30 Stat. 784) which provided that thereafter the extra pay equivalent of the furloughs would be awarded men on release from active duty.

It is assumed that the mustering out furloughs granted by the Army were, in part, intended to offset intervals between dates the members of the National Guard reported at State mobilization centers, and until mustered into United States service, by officers of the Regular Army. There were intervals of that kind in the Navy also, especially in cases of merchant ships chartered for conversion into scout cruisers and other class ships. In some instances, the personnel of such ships were invited to volunteer for enrollment in the Navy, and those accepted were at once sworn in and assigned to duty, under naval orders. The naval commanding officers of such ships were fully justified by the urgency of their orders, and by precedent, to accept these men and assign them to naval duties before the formal paperwork of enrolling them could be officially accomplished. Where such ships immediately proceeded to sea, under peremptory orders to search for the enemy fleet, the formal official enrollments were delayed until many weeks after their duties under naval orders began. Many of these men served in the Navy for some 125 days, but were officially credited with less than 90 days of actual service. They seem to have been further penalized by the disparity mentioned above in paragraph 3. If that disparity were remedied, their pension inequities would seem to disappear.

Respectfully submitted.

LEO W. HESSELMAN,
Historian.

PORT WASHINGTON, N. Y., *June 8, 1953.*

Freedom of the Mind

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. IRVING M. IVES
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 23, 1954

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an excellent address delivered by Mr. John Hay Whitney at the 133d commencement exercises of Colgate University. Mr. Whitney's talk entitled "The Right To Think," is a clear and forceful exposition of the abiding need to safeguard freedom of the mind.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE RIGHT TO THINK

(By John Hay Whitney)

President Case, members of the graduating class, and guests, I have been at some pains to explore the rules that govern commencement speeches, and I find that, if I hew to tradition, I must stride resolutely down 1 or the other of 2 much-traveled avenues. If I take one route, I must be very doleful and tell you that the world is a sad and fearsome place, that evil forces are seizing command everywhere, that the happiest thing for all of us would be to touch off a bomb so cataclysmic that it would put everyone out of his misery. If I reject this path of doom in favor of the other road, I must tell you that the world has been waiting in palpitating eagerness for you to come along and save it, that yours is the most golden of opportunities, that you have but to grid the wings on your feet to attain glories men never have known before.

Now I realize that it is a risky thing in these days of suspicion to make any radical break with tradition, but I cannot conscientiously lead you down either of these tried-and-untrue paths. Instead, I would like to do a little prospecting with you along a middle course that seems to me to offer greater hope for happiness and a constructive life than either the pie-in-the-sky or the things-couldn't-be-worse approach.

I have no delusion that any of you will alter your summer plans because of any flash of illumination you will get from me. I don't expect you to cancel your sailing for Europe, your summer job, or even tonight's date—and to those of you who are headed for the armed services I want to make it absolutely clear that I can seek no preferential treatment on your behalf—but I do hope I can be a little helpful to you in seeing that life is not composed of stereotyped certainties, that the man with original ideas is the man with the real contribution to make in our society and that commencement is not a time to put your mind in dead storage, but a time to keep it alive and open.

By way of guarding against a jet-propelled flight into an Olympian fog of vaporous and useless advice, I should like to take as my jumping-off point a very unsolemn suggestion made by President Eisenhower at a gathering like this just a year ago. There was no pretension about what he said, no parade of erudition, no oratorical tinsel, but his talk seemed to me—and I say this with no intent to hurt my fellow cardholders in the commencement speakers' union—to have more point than all the millions of alternately calamitous and mellifluous words that were hurled into the unoffending ears of members of the classes of 1953 on campuses from coast to coast.

The concept that the President tried to get across in his address to the graduates at Dartmouth College last June was that the United States, for all its proud institutions, had not reached the point, and never would reach the point, where we could sit back and say: This is the best of all possible countries, and there is nothing we can do to improve it. Nor could we say that we have all the ideas that are worth having, and we should outlaw any independent or novel thinking because there are no unemployed ideas around that could do us anything but harm.

The President rejected this whole line of thought. I do not quote him exactly, but this is the sense of what he said: We still have a big job to do in this country. We can't do it simply by saying, "I love America," or by whipping ourselves into a frenzy every time the flag goes marching by. We have to prove our devotion by working hard at making America better and we need as many new ideas as we can get to help us do it. We must not try to hide our faults under the rug, and we must not deny anyone the right to honest thought just because we do not like what he is thinking.

Now, that is a creed on which you would think every American could hang his hat, whether it be a homburg, a fedora, a tin hat, or the sea of mortarboards I see before me. Yet in the year since the President made his speech, the spirit of free inquiry and independent thought has had increasingly rough going. More and more people view with acute hostility anyone who has the temerity to challenge our established thought patterns. It is not simply the new ideas they are against; it is the very act of thinking. There is an appalling trend to believe that there is something dangerously wrong about people using their minds, especially if they use them in original ways.

Why is this so? Didn't all this graduating class come to Colgate to learn to think—or almost all? The distribution of diplomas is certainly evidence that you achieved a certain success along that line. Isn't America dedicated to the proposition that more and more educated, informed, thoughtful citizens is what the Nation needs? Then why have the men of the mind lost caste? And why are they looked upon with suspicion? Why should "intellectual" be a term of reproach or contempt—not even to mention the unlamented egghead?

Maybe the answer lies in the fact that the intellectual tries to think independently and a large and dangerously growing part of our population seems not any longer to be in favor of independence of thought but would like to see it abolished in favor of dogma. This dogma can be dogma of the extreme left or dogma of the extreme right. We call the former communism; for the latter we have no satisfactory name unless we revive the word fascism, which I hope we never have to do. But the characteristic of Communist or Fascist or any other dogma is that it is always extreme, and that it always rejects independent thought which is its enemy.

How much independent thought does a society have or need? The celebrated British physician, Sir Heneage Ogilvie, once made the remark that it is quite possible for a doctor to lead an eminently successful life and do a great deal of good for his patients without ever making one truly original observation during his entire career.

Sir Heneage need not have confined his comment to physicians. Most of us leave college and go through our business or professional lives, innocent of having had anything that might be mistaken for an original thought. By and large, we find we can get along nicely by taking ideas that other people have had and adapting them in the infinite variety of ways that lend spice to the task of earning a living and bringing up a family. There is nothing wrong with that. It is a perfectly acceptable way of getting through life, even though it sometimes causes a mild atrophy of the mental processes.

From the national standpoint, it becomes bad only when this stand-pat attitude is carried to the extreme of stifling independence of thought. This country is a living monument to the importance of change. Its greatness grew out of its founders' refusal to remain meek under colonial rule and on the unwillingness of each succeeding generation to believe it had reached the end of the march toward human betterment. In industry, farming, science, education, community organization and social planning, each advance has tempted us toward a more distant frontier and we have turned to men of itchy mind to point the way to these ever-new goals.

To insure that there would be no break in our progress, we have encouraged inventiveness in every field—technical, social, and political. In our search for better answers, we have taken the blinkers of habit off the mind. That does not mean we heedlessly junk the old idea whenever someone comes forward with a new one. We have confidence that, in the free market of ideas, the things that are good will be kept and those that are bad will be scrapped. Our success in raising the living standards of our people, safeguarding individual freedom and dignity and extending aid to the rest of the world proves that our confidence has not been misplaced. Our democracy is no hothouse plant; it flourishes through exposure to new ideas, embracing those that have merit and rejecting those that would do it injury.

That is what our educational system is all about—or should be. Education is not merely a matter of training in what we know, but, equally, it is training in how to find out what we don't know. And with the ability must go the curiosity. At the great liberal arts schools like Colgate, your mind is trained to inquire. Some of you, I have no doubt, have resisted the urge, but for most this has been a period of mental awakening, as well as mental growth. That kind of awakening is not a thing for slaves, for slaves are not encouraged to ask questions; it is only good for free men with the training to take advantage of the opportunities it offers.

But even the universities, which should be the citadels of the untrammeled and inquiring spirit, are not immune to the demand of conformity. I am not talking solely about the influences that tend to muzzle professors and make them wary about voicing their opinions on "controversial" subjects. What worries me is something even more fundamental—the objectives that we Americans have established for the "product" of our educational system. (And when we talk of the "product," we mean you.)

We say you should be well balanced individuals; we say you should be capable of getting on well with other people; we say, hopefully, that you have been trained in something called orderly thinking, and for a well-balanced, popular, orderly individual, we reserve the ultimate praise: we say he has achieved "integration with the group." That is social engineering slang for "he's one of the boys."

But is that the goal? It certainly sounds comfortable, but I'm not sure that it isn't too comfortable. To be well-balanced and socially acceptable and efficient—all these are excellent qualities. But let's face it, they aren't enough. They aren't enough to keep America forging ahead in its great tradition. And I think it would be a terrible misfortune for America if these comfortable qualities should come to be the only ones we seek in educated young men and women.

There is enough conformity in life without setting up conformity as the target of educated men. Lord Dunsany once wrote a play about a queen, a very gentle-speaking queen, who kept saying, "I do not like to have enemies." So great was her dislike of having enemies that the play ended with the gentle queen inviting all her enemies to a banquet, at which she succeeded in murdering everyone who disagreed with her. We must not let ourselves be swept away by any such zeal for enforcing absolute conformity. Demanding that everyone think alike is just as senseless as demanding that everyone look alike. We cannot do it and we should not want to do it; its end result can only be a sterility of thought that means decay and dissolution. Conformity as a national goal could, if carried far enough, submerge all else in our national life—submerge our arts, submerge our science, and, even at last, submerge the imaginative pioneering on which the expansion of industry, the health of capitalism, and the profits of ordinary business fundamentally depend.

Let me make it plain that what I advocate is not a nihilism of the mind. I am against any indiscriminate urge to chop away all the economic, political, and philosophical pillars of our society. Negativism is not the hallmark of the free mind; thinking and rejecting are not Siamese twins. We should have no use for the man who parrots the shabby hypocrisies of the Moscow party line and tries to pass that off for originality of thought. That is machine-made thought; it is the very opposite of what I defend and what all of us must defend if our country is to remain vigorous and strong.

It is in the nature of some men to conform; it is in the nature of other men to question. Each nature must respect the other. Some men—and through history they have been the greatest—must forever be trying to push the frontiers of thought and action further and further from the comfortable firesides. To these quizzical and restless natures we ascribe a primary role in what we call "freedom of inquiry," which comprises all the freedoms to think, question, examine, and press forward with research. In America today we do a great deal of talking about this freedom of inquiry. We go so far as to call it sacred. What we seldom recognize is that this freedom of inquiry is no docile nag to ride, but a bucking stallion of the meanest possible disposition. Freedom of inquiry is not as simple as being for what is good and against what is evil. Any man can safely endorse that hypothesis—but the man who endorses freedom of inquiry, and stands by that endorsement in real and practical ways, may be in for some very tough times, and some very rough treatment. For no one can tell where freedom of inquiry is going to lead him; if it leads to a new scientific discovery, every one applauds; if it leads to a new social or political or economic theory, the chance of applause is almost zero, and the chances of being reviled as confused, or subversive, or both, are very great.

Now, the line between confusion and subversion is a very important one. To be subversive, in the sense of betraying our country or seeking its forcible overthrow, is, indeed, a crime. To be confused is not a crime; it may even be constructive. Whenever you run up against a man who seems to you to hold a flock of freak ideas, wait a minute before you scoff. Remember that the distinguished philosopher, Prof. Alfred North Whitehead, had some very flattering sentiments to express about what he called muddleheadedness. Professor Whitehead admitted that many college students qualified for this particular state of mind. But he added: "Muddleheadedness is a condition precedent to independent thought. It may actually be independent thought in its first stage." Of course, he went on, muddleheadedness may turn out to be just that and nothing more. But his counsel makes it clear that we had all better go slow before deciding that any man has abused freedom of inquiry.

It's for that reason that I'm distressed at what appears to be a rising mood of militant, defiant, and destructiye ignorance, actively dedicated to the eradication of the original mind. Its slogan is that, unless you constantly deal in dogmatic certainties, hallowed by popular acceptance, you are probably not a true American.

What we have here, it seems to me, is an organized attack on truth by certainty, for truth and certainty are seldom equivalent and are sometimes bitter enemies. The attack involves the colleges and universities and other posts of learning in this country more deeply than they have been involved in all the years since Colgate was created. It lends a particular poignancy to the strict limitations that Colgate's incorporators placed themselves under by their own act, back in 1819—"that if the said society * * * shall at any time pass any law or regulation affecting the rights of conscience * * * the said corporation shall cease and be void."

Where is today's attack on learning and on independent thought coming from? In general, it seems to be coming from the ranks almost exclusively of people who ought to know better, since they have been exposed to a certain amount of learning themselves. The attack on learning today is not some "town and gown" squabble such as used to be typical years ago. It doesn't come from the know-nothing ranks of society. It certainly doesn't come from the laboring man and his union; in fact, I think we would find in many labor unions today a respect for learning that would greatly become people who were supposed to have more of it. No, the attack on learning seems to come from a group of people in American life whom we can describe as the "fearful"—those in the ranks of our society who are afraid of progress, afraid of change, afraid of novelty.

I urge you as future citizens, whatever your social role, to stand up against this challenge and to support and defend the men of independent thought in your community, with all the power at your command. If you think some of them muddleheaded, remember Professor Whitehead's wise warning that this may be creative thought in its first stage. If the restless minds in your society get hold of some ideas unpopular with the general set in which you move, defend their right to these unpopular ideas. If their ideas are right, they will triumph eventually; if they are wrong, they will sooner or later fall to the ground.

As men educated at Colgate in the liberal arts tradition, I conceive that you have two duties. One is, indeed, to stand fast for America. But you cannot and must not make a career of only standing fast. And so I think your second duty is equally plain. It is the duty to stir things up a little. Conformity may take the greatest part of any life, but it must not take it all. And please note this: The man of real independence and real bravery is not the man who takes the extreme position; it is the "reasonable" man, usually the man in the middle, attacked by the dogmas of all extremes, but still fighting for his own independence of thought and action both, and the divine right to change his mind for good cause. Today this man needs all the help that young men, whose minds are still open, can possibly give him. His independence and yours are at stake. Vital though balance and order and efficiency may be to our present society, America was not made great by men who put all their reliance in these smooth qualities—and such men will not make it great in the future. I am for freedom of inquiry because I am for you and your chance.

You won't find this in your chemistry or physics books, but young blood is the most combustible substance in the world. If the hot enthusiasm and indignations of youth can find no open hearths in which to burn, they are bound to find underground stills in which eventually they will explode. I saw it happen to my generation—a generation that came to manhood in the dark years of the depression. Across the Atlantic, fascism was on the march. Hitler and Mussolini were choking off the liberties of their own people and threatening to enslave the rest of the world. Many of the finest young men in the thirties felt it their duty to participate actively in the fight against fascism. Their objective was noble, but they found no outlet for it under democratic auspices. And so these young idealists were driven into the arms of extremists, just as devoid of respect for human dignity as the men they professed to hate. I pray that in this country we may always recognize extremes for what they are, and that freedom will be the inspiration for the original in mind and the young in heart.

The radical of the class of 1954 worries me less than the man who leaves this campus convinced that the only important thing in life is to be "safe." The essentials to the American past were courage and daring and willingness to experiment, conserving what was beneficial in the old and substituting what was superior in the new. These same characteristics remain the essentials to the American future. The coonskin cap and the shot gun are no longer the badges of the man who has chosen to lead a hazardous life.

Thank you, and let me wish you profound good luck on your own perilous, electronic voyages into the future.

(At the conclusion of the exercises, the university admitted Mr. Whitney to the degree of doctor of laws.)

Two Stations Beyond

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 23, 1954

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the commencement address entitled "Two Stations Beyond," delivered by Conrad Bergendoff, president of Augustana College, Rock Island, Ill., which appeared in the Lutheran Companion of June 30, 1954.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TWO STATIONS BEYOND

(By Conrad Bergendoff, president of Augustana College, Rock Island, Ill.)

Recently I was in Berlin, probably the most curious city in our curious modern world. Here is a former capital of a great country, carved out into sectors, occupied by allies in a world war who now threaten each other with another world war. East and West face each other here in a manner that electrifies the whole city. Theoretically the lines of demarcation are clear, but it proved impossible to close off entirely the one zone of the country from the other, or the one sector of the city from the other. The visitor to Berlin from the West flies over 150 miles of the East zone to get to the West sector of the city. And in the city itself the visitor is amazed to find that the elevated lines are all controlled by the Soviet authorities, even the parts that run in the West sector.

It was at the entrance to one of the stations on the elevated that I saw a sign which gives me my topic. On a large placard was a warning to passengers. It warned them not to go to sleep on the train they were taking, for in dozing off they might not realize when they crossed from West to East. The line was two stations beyond, and a sleeping passenger might wake up and find himself in a world he didn't want to land in. Two stations beyond was the Russian sector, the Soviet world. The traveler needed to be on his guard lest he find himself where he didn't intend to go.

NEED DANGER SIGNS IN SCHOOLS

The more I have pondered on the meaning of that sign the more it has seemed to symbolize the danger of our modern world.

Through world-shaking events the western and the eastern zones have come up against each other. No neutral corridors separate them any longer. Both geographically and spiritually they adjoin each other. So close are they that some have already in unguarded moments found themselves victims of the Communists. The very momentum of the currents of our day may carry us across the boundary.

Experience has revealed the relevancy of the warning of what lies two stations beyond. American higher education ought to know where signs of warning should be placed. Some of them might well be placed in conspicuous places on the walls of colleges and universities. For even here are trends of thought and currents of feelings which may without our knowledge or will, in our careless moments, carry us across a fateful line.

MARX A RADICAL REVOLUTIONARY

Look back a moment on the road Russian communism has traveled. Three central stations stand out on the route, bearing the names: Marx, Lenin, Stalin. What made Marxism attractive in his day, and to following generations? It is no secret that this philosophy appealed to intellectuals, to certain university groups, to men and women who would have reacted in horror if they had foreseen where this train of thought would take them. But at the time something in Marx caught their attention and moved them to follow him. Was it not the picture he gave of the dreadful conditions of the workingman in English factory towns? The modern industrial revolution had destroyed the older communities and a certain security these had afforded a smaller population in a largely rural economy. The resulting poverty, insecurity, and mechanization of life presented a grim contrast between the worker and the owner, and moved men and women to ask how long such a system could endure. There is in every generation a portion of youth who are touched by inequality, inequity, and iniquity, and Marxism called the attention of such to the plight of the masses.

But Marx was not a social reformer. He was a radical revolutionary who reacted not only against social injustice but against the whole western tradition. He was not content to drive out the greedy traders from the temple. He sought to pull down the whole temple. He called for help to wreck the institutions on which Christian Europe had worked for 2,000 years—the state which protected the owning class, the church which gave the worker a future hope instead of present help, the system of property itself which was built on a biblical evaluation of the individual. In its place he would build a new society, without class, without relation to religion, a new earth where man's innate nature would lead to peace and plenty in a rule of the proletariat. It was a sort of a Pied Piper's procession that followed him. The seductive tones which promised an end to poverty and subjection drew a motley crowd from every land social class.

LENIN BROKE WITH FREEDOM

This utopian vision Lenin held out to the starving masses of Russia. But not only Russia. All the oppressed of every land should unite under his leadership. The revolution should be carried to all the world. The ties of nationality which had held the countries of Europe together should be dropped as chains, and an international power should be created to overthrow the old order. All the virtues of the Christian religion were as junk—the new order must be achieved in any manner possible—by deceit falsehood, violence. The dictatorship of the proletariat might be a bloody brutal phase—afterwards would come the classless, contented society. In any place where the new doctrine could be used in opposition to the established regime any means was justified to insure the overthrow of that regime so that the new party could take over. Scholars of the movement see in Lenin the break with the West on the question of freedom. In him it gives way to allegiance—blind, slavish allegiance to the party, and the substitution of a collectivist state for the ideas of democracy and freedom which Christian Europe had painfully evolved through the centuries.

STALIN SOUGHT WORLD POWER

In Stalin the international Communist state became identified with a reborn Russia. There is in Russian history a thousand-year-old tradition of Moscow being the third Rome. Constantine long ago had tried to center the rule of the world in his Byzantine capital on the Bosphorus. Now the attempt was again to be made to make all roads lead to a Russian Rome. The capitalistic countries, contrary to Marxian philosophy, did not wither away. But pass away they must, and Stalin would wherever possible push over the rotten columns on which they rested. Since the church and capitalism were identified with those nations, all were to go down together, and mankind would hail the new Messiah in the Kremlin. In ancient times oriental despots gave themselves the names of god. Whatever diety there is in communism belongs to the ruler who knows no power above himself.

This is the hideous and terrifying scene that is the present station of communism. We are more apt to be attracted to its policies of expansion in West and East. Against these we try to fashion some sort of resistance. But it is toward its inner nature that we need also to be on the alert. President Eisenhower not long ago used the simile of a row of dominoes—the falling one knocks down a whole row. It may be that the force that overthrows the first is great and violent. But it is a fair question to ask, Why do not the others stand? Is there no strength in them?

GREAT LIE OF COMMUNISM

Here is the heart of the problem. Why have nations fallen for communism? Why in Western Europe have laboring classes identified their cause with a system which, when it becomes supreme, turns laborers into slaves? Why in America have intellectuals thought it a mark of progressiveness to associate with a philosophy which in the end eliminates all freedom of thought?

To go back to our elevated train in Berlin which runs through the West sector before it enters the Communist territory, we may say that there is a stretch where East and West occupy the same ground. It is the area of modern industrial life which has revolutionized the older agricultural economy and brought great social problems in its wake. We, too, as Christians in the West are concerned about problems of employment, of distribution, of housing and education, of health and leisure. The great lie of communism is that it alone is concerned about these matters on which the life of people today depends. The teachers of communism have tried to switch all persons who are interested in overcoming the ills of society into their tracks, claiming they alone will create an order where each one will have what he needs. By their utopian promises they have attracted a great army of followers who have not seen through the deception and falsehoods of their claims. Let me describe 1 or 2 of the stations at which you will find yourself when you wake up in the real land of Sovietdom.

MATERIALISM IS STATION ONE

Station one is built of Marxian material and bears the designation that all life depends on material things. All history is only the story of the control of the means of producing material things. In the New Testament story of the Temptation, Christ was challenged by the devil to turn stones into bread. Communism has yielded to this temptation. The only thing that matters is bread, the material needs of man. In former times capitalism controlled the means of producing bread. This, it is held, is the curse of society. Now communism will take away all private property. Society itself will own all sources of wealth. Men will no longer strive against each other. All will be peace and sweetness because the cause of strife has been removed.

We need not pause to wonder at the naivete of such a hope, for we know already what peace and sweetness reign in Soviet lands. But we do need to warn against the more insidious temptation for which western intelligentsia has fallen, namely, that if only there is bread enough for all, all will be well. Even in our own land we hear the slogan, if only we increase production, all will have all they need.

But man does not live by bread alone. Bread is not the complete answer in either East or West. "Man lives by the word of God"—there is a hunger of man which his stomach will not satisfy. This is the fatal error of marxism. It knows no higher authority than man—unless it be the laws of nature which marxism thinks it can control. Breaking down faith in God is the way that marxism works. If you are interested in seeking the true fellow travelers of communism, you will find them wherever you find an undermining of the church. Once you have persuaded youth that there is no God to whom he is accountable, you are on the road that leads to the land where man rules alone—man, not as a child of God, but man as a brute, ruler by virtue of force alone.

IRRESPONSIBLE STATE IS STATION TWO

And the second station to which you soon come is that of the irresponsible state. You can hardly avoid coming to it once you have passed the first station. For if there be no higher authority to which man is responsible than man himself, then the strongest man or group of men become the state. Saint Augustine long ago asked, "In the absence of justice, what is sovereignty but organized brigandage? For, what are bands of brigands but petty kingdoms?"

Western democracy has evolved as a control of the state by its own citizens only because those citizens have faith in a greater Ruler to whom states themselves are subordinate. The history of Western Europe, is, from one point of view, the story of a balancing of the power of church and state. The church became the agency by which citizens could curb the autocratic power of the state. Russia never had a state-church conflict, it never had a reformation to prepare for a revolution. Its power has always been absolute, and when absolute power passed from the Czar it went to a dictator whom no Parliament or church dares oppose. When such a tyranny clothes itself in a materialistic philosophy and assumes a world-wide dominion, the result is the kind of state we now behold in Moscow.

Heartily as we loathe the spectacle, we are not free of the temptation in America of building up a giant government to whom we transfer all our problems and hence all our hopes. The only way to oppose an all-embracing state which wants to govern all of a man's life is to develop citizens who know how to govern themselves. We cannot turn over the disciplining of our lives to a power outside ourselves without building up that power to uncontrollable limits. The one institution which creates an inner discipline, a self-government of the individual is the Chuch of the Living God who commands that we love God above all things and our neighbor as ourselves, and gives us part in a fellowship wherein we obey a higher law. Whenever the church fails, the state will assume a greater police power over us. When the church fails altogether, the state will become absolute. Saint Paul calls government a servant or minister of God, and so it is when men acknowledge the God whom government serves. But when men turn from God, government becomes their master. Freedom is meaningless except it be a freedom given by the Highest Ruler so as to save us from false rulers.

Between the collectivism of communism and its atheistic notion of man, there is a very close connection. Trotsky once referred to soldiers of Russia as "tailless apes" who had to be sternly controlled. Western culture, for all its faults, builds on a Biblical idea of man as a chid of God, and the individual, since the Reformation and Renaissance, has been considered of decisive importance.

Are we witnessing in communism the emergence of a herd government? Men are not created in the image of God, they are so many animals in the pack which has to be driven by the strongest and bloodiest. Russian society is subhuman, and the logical outcome of a religion that degrades man into a mere brute in the larger herd. It is the church which has given man his charter of freedom, of divine significance, of humanity itself. The misled intellectuals who thought it smart to ride the Communist train of philosophy now find themselves in a Siberian wilderness where humanity is thrown to the wolves.

CRUEL INDOCTRINATION OF COMMUNISM

Anyone who recalls America's thought of the last 30 years knows how long it has been the educational fashion to be opposed to all kinds of indoctrination. It was supposed to be a mark of democracy that the teacher was objective to the point of not seeking to influence the student. Present the material, we were told, and the innate concern of the individual for his own welfare would automatically lead him to choose what was right.

We have lived to see the complete reversal of this doctrine in a system such as communism. While in Berlin I lived a week with a group of almost 100 men from the East Zone. They told me of the hard, cruel way in which the Communists control the education of a younger generation, slowly grinding away the freedom of the child and fashioning it completely in the ideas of the party. Another 20 years and there will be a people that not only votes one ticket but thinks one set of ideas only—the Communist.

LEARNING TO APPRECIATE OUR HERITAGE

To face such a terrifying situation, democracy must find ways of teaching youth both the ideals and the disciplines of freedom. To copy the methods of communism is but to help them win over us. But we need an enthusiasm for the heritage of the West which is strangely wanting from so much of our education. The fanaticism of communism must be matched not only by bigger and better bombs, but by a passion for what the Old and New Testament has meant for our civilization, our freedom, our education. American schools must inspire their youth to fight not for the comforts of some materialistic way of life or standard of living, but for the principles and ideas on which our Nation was originally built. We are too much interested in the byproducts and not sufficiently aroused about the main issues of our national structure. It is still an unanswered question whether a nation such as ours can long endure in the civil war of mankind today. We must awaken before the trend of our times lands us involuntarily in enemy territory. It is time to break company with enemies of the spirit in our midst and to seek anew the foundations of the City of God amid the debris of the cities of men.

OUR HOPE IS IN GOD

No man today knows the outcome of the fearful struggle in which we are all caught up. Will freedom survive? Will tyranny and brutal despotism be overcome? Will the right to worship, the right to think, the right to own, perish from the earth? Which way will the trembling balances move? Though we cannot predict, let us go on from day to day with the faith born of fellowship with Him who said, "Be of good cheer, I have overcome the world." If we ourselves are living by the words God has spoken to men, we can vanquish the tempter who would turn all of life's possessions into material things. If we have learned to worship the King of Kings, we shall not fall down before lesser potentates who claim all our allegiance. We will unmask the pretensions of those who build a new society by enslaving all who put their trust in their vain promises. We will enter into the task of serving our fellowmen in every area of need—physical, mental, spiritual, economic, political, social—but do it in His name who came that all might have an abundant life.

If thus we build strong men and women, and thus build cities of righteousness and justice, we can face the monster of communism calmly and with assurance, knowing that heaven and earth may pass away but the promises of the Lord will forever endure.

Representative Doyle Opposes One-Man Hearings and Investigations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 6, 1954

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted for me so to do, I am pleased to herewith present the text of my communication dated July 22, 1954, to all the Members of the House of Representatives. The text thereof is self-explanatory, and I wish to again at this time state my most vigorous opposition to any plan or proposal which would make it possible and practical to permit one-man committees or subcommittees for the hearing of witnesses under oath and also my most vigorous support of the necessity to have both majority and minority representation on all hearing and investigative committees of this House of Representatives.

In this connection, the only reason I do not mention the United States Senate is because it is well known that the House membership and the Senate membership determine their own respective body of rules.

The communication follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *July 22, 1954.*

To My Colleagues in the House of Representatives, 83d Congress:

If you are opposed to one-man hearings and one-man investigation committees and believe that both majority and minority representation on such committees is essential—then you must tell House Rules Committee so and tell them at once.

I. The Scott committee, which was appointed by the House Rules Committee several months ago, to submit to the House Rules Committee revision of House rules for all hearing and investigation committees of the House, has filed House Resolution 571.

A. It was referred to the House Rules Committee and that committee is expected to act upon House Resolution 571 within a few days.

II. That portion of House Resolution 571 which I now call to your attention as very objectionable and dangerous to the rights of witnesses and for the best interests of the House investigative and hearing procedures, is as follows, to wit:

Section 5 (e) (begining with "unless"): "Unless the committee otherwise provides, one member shall constitute a quorum for the receipt of evidence and the taking of testimony; but no witness shall be compelled to give oral testimony before less than two members if, prior to testifying, he objects."

A. It is, therefore, clear as crystal that neither in that section—nor any other section—is there any clear requirement for both the majority and minority representation on House investigative and hearing committees.

B. It expressly provides that "one member shall constitute a quorum." It leaves the door wide open for one-man committees.

C. This applies to both friendly and unfriendly witnesses. There is no provision that a witness shall be advised of his alleged right to object to less than two members sitting; nor, is there provision in this section or any section, that a witness shall be furnished with a copy of the rules under which his conduct and the conduct of his legal counsel is to be governed at said hearings or investigations.

III. Is it not time that the House take action to expressly provide for majority and minority representation at all hearings and investigations where witnesses are testifying under oath? Is it not time that the House take immediate steps to remove the just criticism of the American people directed to Congress for permitting one-man investigations by hearing and investigative committees?

A. I wish to make it clear that although I am a member of the House Un-American Activities Committee and also the Armed Services Committee, I am not sending you this communication nor doing anything in connection with the subject matter, for or on behalf of or with the authority of either committee. I am doing it on my own.

IV. Because it is clear that under the Scott report and resolution, House Resolution 571, to be before the House Rules Committee in the next few days, it leaves the door wide open for one-man subcommittees hearing witnesses, under oath, and also because it does not expressly provide that all hearing and investigative committees shall have representation of both majority and minority at all hearings, I propose to offer to the House Rules Committee the following amendmen to section 5 (e) of House Resolution 571, to wit:

"Strike out all of section 5 (e), beginning with the word 'unless' and substitute the following: Not less than two committee members, including both majority and minority representation, shall constitute a quorum for the receipt of evidence and the taking of testimony under oath by a witness who is know to be a friendly or cooperative witness with the committee hearings or investigation, unless a majority of the committee, all members being first polled, has expressly authorized only one committee member to hear the testimony and receive the evidence from that witness.

"But not less than two committee members, including majority and minority representation, shall constitute a quorum and hear the testimony or receive evidence from a witness who is know as uncooperative or unfriendly to the committee hearing or investigation."

V. Such proposed change in House Resolution 571 by the House Rules Committee would—

A. Permit expeditious hearings;

B. Protect the rights of witnesses and insure fair play and treatment to the witnesses;

C. Help restrain any intemperate or inconsiderate attitude or action by any committee member;

D. Help prevent the ease with which abuses creep into one-man committee hearings; and

E. Help remove existing ground for just criticism of House committee procedures and practices wherein one-man committee hearings are held and also wherein there is not both majority and minority representation on said committee.

VI. Here are some things you can do to give practical effect to your position in the matter, but you will have to do it now, to wit:

A. Personally speak to members of the Rules Committee immediately and make your protest.

B. Speak on the floor against allowing one-man committees and for both majority and minority representation on all hearing and investigative committees.

C. Appear before the House Rules Committee personally when House Resolution 571 is to be considered by that committee. If you will phone my office and tell my secretaries, Miss Tucker or Mrs. Talbert, that you want to appear before the Rules Committee, I will then try to notify you immediately upon my receiving notice from the Rules Committee, of the date and the hour when they will consider House Resolution 571.

VII. My years of active participation as a member of the House Un-American Activities Committee, during which time I have actively functioned as a committee member on literally dozens of hearings in different parts of the United States, together with my observations and conclusions of this subject, cause me to send this same communication to every Member of the House of Representatives at practically the same time you receive your copy.

Sincerely yours,

CLYDE DOYLE,
Member of Congress, 23d Congressional District, Los Angeles County, Calif.

America's New Front-Door Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 23, 1954

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Reader's Digest, issue of August 1954:

AMERICA'S NEW FRONT-DOOR POLICY

(By Hervé J. L'Heureux [1])

Present American immigration policy, it has been charged, embitters our friends, encourages our enemies and brings the good name of our country into disrepute. Such wholesale indictment is, I believe, unjustified. I should like to answer it.

The new law is a complete rewriting, the first in 30 years, of our vast and complex immigration procedures. It has been in effect only 18 months. No doubt its administration, in this early period, has been sometimes faulty, on occasion unnnecessarily harsh. But time and experience are smoothing out the rough spots. And time and experience are pointing the way to some adjustments in the law itself.

Meanwhile, the total record, as distinguished from the exceptions, indicates that our immigration policy is still in the generous American tradition. Our treatment of desirable aliens, whether visitors or immigrants, is, in fact, fairer and more friendly today than at any other time in my experience.

Let me first point out that admission to the United States is not a right but a privilege, extended by our Government on certain conditions. Those conditions, laid down in the law, are aimed to safeguard our country against "undesirables"—the criminal, the subversive, the diseased—and to promote what the Congress believes to be our country's best interests.

Unlike many countries where tourism is a major industry and where "undesirables" seeking admission are not a major problem, the United States does not write its immigration laws to attract millions of foreign visitors. We aim, rather, to give maximum protection to our own self-interest, while accepting responsibility in the world community. To judge our success at that difficult task, let us look at some pages from the recent record.

At New York's International Airport last February 24, a chartered plane carrying refugees from Communism arrived from Germany. There were 84 persons aboard, children and adults. A majority were Russians. Most were penniless. The passports of many were stamped "Stateless." Only a few knew any English. As they were ushered into the terminal they were unsure, bewildered, a little frightened.

Awaiting them at the terminal entrance were representatives of a number of valuntary agencies—Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish—authorized by the United States Government to help the strangers. Baggage and bundles were collected, documents and health certificates dug out. Interpreters stood by the newcomers as they lined up for inspection by United States officials.

There were three such inspections: customs, immigration, and health. The plane had landed at 9:05. By 11:15 all three inspections had been completed for every member of the entire group—and the door to America opened.

At 11:30 box lunches were distributed (with warm milk for infants) and the erstwhile refugees boarded a chartered bus for a railroad station in New York City. There each was given a ticket and the name of the sponsor meeting him at the end of his journey.

For 10 of these 84, cost of transportation to America was advanced by long-term, no-interest loan. For the other 74, the cost was paid outright by the United States Government. (Cost of transportation within the United States was covered by easy-term loans.)

Having observed how our officials administered the law dealing with these immigrants, the head of the United States office of the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration wrote to the Immigration Service:

"My highest appreciation for the way in which the processing of these migrants was carried out by the Immigration inspectors. The efficiency and speed of this responsible work aroused my sincere admiration. But I was particularly impressed by the warm, human attitude of the inspectors toward the immigrants. Nothing can more effectively impress upon the minds of these naturally tense and apprehensive people the greatness and human understanding of America than this first contract with United States officials whose kindness and solicitude turn a fearful ordeal into a truly American welcome."

Since the end of the war the United States has extended that welcome to more than 400,000 displaced persons, more than one third the total received by all the other countries of the world.

And we have done more. For the million refugees who have been resettled in other lands, the United States has paid one third of the total transportation cost. Also, it was an American proposal which led, two years ago, to setting up the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration, aimed to relieve Europe's overpopulation problem. Twenty-four nations are members. (The United States pay more than all the others combined.)

Now the doors to this country are being opened even more widely. Under an act passed last summer we shall receive in the next 2 years, over and above quota immigration, 209,000 additional refugees. To select and transport them we shall spend an estimated $50 million.

"This legislation," said President Eisenhower, "demonstrates again America's traditional concern for the homeless, the persecuted, the less fortunate of other lands." Here is an answer to those who charge that our immigration policy is one of unconcern for the world's needy.

Look, now, at another page from the record: our treatment of visitors from other countries.

The number of visitors is constantly increasing. Here, as a significant sample, is the way we treat one large, important group of them.

This year there are more than 34,000 visiting students in the United States. That is the largest number on record. It is more than in any other country.

These students, from 127 countries, were admitted without distinction as to religion, nationality or race. About one-third are Asians. With few exceptions, every student was personally met at the port of entry (generally by a representative of the voluntary Committee on Friendly Relations Among Foreign Students), sped through port inspections, given literature about the United States and started toward a school or college.

For more than 500 of these student visitors, all expenses (round-trip travel, tuition, living costs) are being paid by the United States Government. Another 8,500 get scholarship help from American schools where they are enrolled. For those obliged to earn part of their way, a clause of the new immigration law provides that, on recommendation of the school, permission for employment will be granted. As a result, more than 5,000 have part-time work.

Under previous law, foreign students were limited in attendance to certain "accredited" institutions. This closed the door to many who sought practical, rather than academic, training. Under the new law, vocational, trade and business schools are now approved.

How our consular and immigration officials, in their administration of the law, contribute to this American welcome is attested by the head of the Committee on Friendly Relations: "From the time of his application for a United States visa to his final departure from the country, today's visiting student is met with more understanding friendliness from American officials than at any time in my experience."

A Bolivian student recently wrote the Immigration Service: "I want to thank you for the excellent service and great kindness that you offered me during my permanence in this great country. I am carrying to my country a wonderful impression and opinion of the United States."

Within the necessary conditions laid down in the law, our present policy also increases the convenience with which a foreigner can visit the United States on business or pleasure or en route to another country. Despite the magnitude of our security problem, it takes only about 4 weeks to obtain a visitor's or a transit visa in Western European countries. For the convenience of the traveler who has too little time to get a transit visa, the new law permits passage through the United States without any United States documents whatever.

---

[1] Hervé L'Heureux has been in the American consul service since 1927. From 1947 to 1952 he was Chief of the Visa Division of the State Department. He is at present supervising consul general for Western Germany.

This measure, more liberal than any previous law, was included at the strong urging of the airlines seeking more intransit business. Such a document waiver is issued by the airline without Government supervision. The visitor signs a card of identification, declares his intention to "make immediate and continuous transit," and agrees while in the United States to accept close supervision.

Complaints, now diminishing, about this supervision are best answered by the fact that last year 20,000 foreign travelers took advantage of the no-document privilege. This year the number is expected to be at least one-third greater.

Experience over many years clearly shows that, under any immigration law, however carefully drawn, exceptional cases arise which on humanitarian grounds or in the public interest merit special consideration and action. Present policy gives considerable leeway to consular and immigration officers to deal with such cases.

Recently an Englishman, convicted 10 years before of larceny, applied for a visa to visit his brother, who was seriously ill in New York. A strict interpretation of the law would have barred him. But, after inquiry, the American consul issued the visa. A Cuban who recently applied with his wife and son for immigrant visas might have been excluded because of his son's physical disability. But the consul, convinced the boy would not become a public charge, issued visas of permanent residence for the entire family. Early last year a Chicago chemical concern inquired about bringing in a famous Greek chemist to direct a new development project. The normal immigration quota for Greece was filled for 4 years in advance. Under the preference given in the new law to needed specialists, however, a visa for the chemist was speedily secured.

Last September a French radio writer, a one-time member of the French Communist Party, applied in Paris for a visitor's visa. Under our previous immigration policy he would have been barred by the "once a Communist always a Communist" provision. The new law contains a redemption clause which permits former Communists who have broken with the party to enter the country. Under this provision the French writer, like numerous other one-time Communists, was admitted.

It is true that the security provisions of the new immigration laws are tighter than ever—reflecting the fact that our security problem is more serious. But it is also true that the present law goes further than any previous legislation to accord the alien the constitutional rights that are granted to American citizens.

In deportation proceedings, for example, it is provided that the alien must be given reasonable notice of the charges against him, that he may examine the evidence, present evidence in his own behalf, cross-examine Government witnesses and be represented by counsel of his own choosing.

Today more than 1,300 private immigration bills are pending before the Immigration Subcommittee of the United States Senate. Most of these bills are are bona fide efforts to grant the right of permanent residence to especially deserving aliens who are not technically eligible under the law. Thus the massive machinery of our National Government—from committee report to congressional vote to Presidential signature—is put into operation for the sole benefit of the individual noncitizen.

In another important area, that of naturalization, our treatment of foreigners meets the test of American fairness and generosity.

In San Francisco 1 day last summer, the courtroom of Federal Judge Louis E. Goodman was the scene of an affecting drama. Standing solemnly in rows before the bench were 182 Japanese aliens. All of them had lived for years in the United States, had established homes, raised their families here. But they had been barred from citizenship by the oriental exclusion clause in our former immigration law.

In 1952 the McCarran-Walter Immigration and Nationality Act wiped out the racial clause, eliminated such bars to immigration and naturalization. When, under that law, these Japanese applied for citizenship, they got immediate aid. From the Citizenship Division of the United States Immigration and Naturalzation Service they received free textbooks and home-study courses. Free citizenship classes were open to them in California's public schools. Then came the big day.

After Judge Goodman had administered the oath and declared them citizens, Kay Kunisaha Mineta, a San Jose shoe salesman, stepped forward and spoke for the group: "Today our dream comes true. With the passing of the years, some stormy, some uncertain, we kept an abiding faith in the country of our choice."

For foreigners of all categories who seek to become citizens, there are nearly 3,500 citizenship classes operating in all our States, Hawaii, and Alaska. More than 15,000 are enrolled in home-study courses. Last year the Immigration and Naturalization Service distributed 150,000 free textbooks for candidates.

Responsibility for proper enforcement of our immigration and naturalization laws rests primarily upon our consular officers abroad and the Immigration and Naturalization Service in the United States. At home and abroad, there are fewer than 2,000 officials directly engaged in this vast job. While enforcing our laws and protecting our interests, they must hear complaints, adjust disputes, and serve, on behalf of all Americans, as ambassadors of good will.

When one views the size and complexity of their task, the clamorous, often powerful pressures to which they are subjected, one wonders how they err so seldom; how, so generally, they do their duty by America's laws in a way that is a credit to America.

As an American, familiar with out past and present immigration policy, I am proud of our record.

Housing's Last Chance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VERA BUCHANAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 23, 1954

Mrs. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Housing's Last Chance," from the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette of July 23, 1954:

HOUSING'S LAST CHANCE

Unless the House of Representatives is given another chance to vote and reverses itself at the last minute, President Eisenhower's 4-year program for the construction of 140,000 public housing units has been effectively done in for this session of Congress.

The Senate approved the President's plan, but the House at first refused to provide for any public housing. The bill which emerged from the conference committee and which has now been passed by the House, contained a provision for 35,000 units in a 1-year extension of the public housing program. Authorization of the 35,000 units is so hedged in with restrictions, however, that public housing officials expect that very few new units can be started in the allotted time. If the present version of the measure is passed by the Senate, the public housing section of the new law will be mostly window-dressing.

Because its program is already well advanced, Pittsburgh's redevelopment of the lower hill district is not expected to be curtailed by a limitation in the pending Federal law. But advanced planning for other areaswould be affected if the current version of the housing bill becomes law. Slum clearance projects require several years of preparation. And the House-approved measure, unlike the President's 4-year proposal, does not permit urban planners to take the necessary long look ahead.

If Republican Senator IRVING IVES, of New York, is successful in his promised effort to seek restoration of the full Eisenhower program, the Senate will thereby reject the conference report; the bill will go back to committee, where the requested 140,000 units can be restored. The House would then be asked for the third time to grant the President's request. There is scant likelihood that this will happen. But sufficient public pressure might prevent the House from killing public housing, which it is now apparently intent on doing.

Committee on Foreign Trade Education, Inc.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. SMITH

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 23, 1954

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Foreign Trade Education, Inc., was organized in the New York metropolitan area some 5 months ago for the purpose of enlisting greater support from average citizens for definite steps toward a more liberal national trade policy. The leaders of this organization are aware of the fact that the success of our entire foreign policy and the prosperity of our domestic economy may be dependent upon urgently needed improvements in our foreign-trade program. Under unanimous consent, I include the following article from the Export Trade and Shipper in reference to this organization:

The Committee on Foreign Trade Education, Inc., composed essentially of young men and women with an active interest in "trade and tariff policies in the national interest," is doing a really aggressive job of stimulating interest in the New York area, in subjects of great interest to all exporters.

Last week, they sponsored a luncheon meting in New York City at which Isador Lubin, foreign policy adviser to F. D. R. and Harry Truman, called on the United States Senate to rise above partisanship and support the lead of Senators GORE and FULBRIGHT who seek to liberalize the trade agreements extension.

These Democratic leaders, as all of our leaders by this time know as well as we, in effect want to amend the simple, 1-year extension bill into a virtual counterpart of the bill introduced in the House by Mr. KEAN, of New Jersey, which would carry out the President's recommendations in his message of March 30.

Membership of the Committee on Foreign Trade Education is nonpartisan, including active leaders both of young Republican and young Democrat political organizations, headed by B. A. Rittersporn, Jr., active in the Republican organization.

Considering the diffusion and unorganization which Dr. Harry Hawkins attributes to those groups whose interests are most directly identified with liberalized trade policy, it is most gratifying to observe this committee's activities.

With no selfish axes to grind, beyond an abiding interest in the true national interest, these young and aggressive men and women are working on a volunteer basis from purely patriotic motives.

We understand that they hope to stimulate groups of politically conscious and aggressive young voters in other cities throughout the country to undertake and persistently conduct similar campaigns, directed at educating both the general public and the local political bigwigs.

We urge that export and world-trade groups throughout the country attempt to enlist the interest of young political groups in their own communities, and put them in touch with the New York group, for details of their activities and plans.

Inquiries should be addressed to Committee on Foreign Trade Education, Inc., suite 801, Building A, 270 Park Avenue, New York 17, N. Y., and we also feel that every firm or individual seriously interested in trade-policy liberalization should consider giving these hard-working young people the modest financial support for which they can clearly demonstrate the need.

General Agreement on Trade and Tariff

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT B. SCUDDER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 21, 1954

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Speaker, I am very much interested in the operation of GATT. The reason for my interest lies in the fact that my district is one that is much affected by the tariff question. We grow wine and wool in my district. We grow cherries and walnuts and hops. We have lumber, shingles, and hardboard production. We have tuna fisheries.

These products are all sensitive to import competition and unless proper protection is provided, imports can drive any of these producers to the wall. For this reason the tariff and how it is administered is of the greatest importance to us. That accounts for my interest in the operation of GATT.

This is an international body that meets once a year, usually in Geneva, Switzerland, and it concerns itself with questions arising from the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. GATT wields a great many powers over tariff and trade matters that I do not recall Congress giving up. It is something of a mystery how GATT came into possession of these powers. We in Congress did not deliver them.

If the Tariff Commission makes a recommendation to the President to raise a duty under the escape clause and if the President complies with the recommendation, GATT reviews the case to determine whether the action was justified. This has happened in every case that has been approved by the President to date when a protest was lodged by a GATT member.

Also when Congress in 1951 passed a law calling on the President to withdraw trade agreement concessions from Communist-controlled countries, we were not free to do so with respect to Czechoslovakia although that country had gone behind the Iron Curtain. Why were we not free after Congress passed and the President approved a law that we do so? It was because Czechoslovakia is a member of GATT. We therefore had to ask that body at its next meeting in Geneva whether we could withdraw from our trade agreement with Czechoslovakia.

After debating the issue GATT decided that we were free to make the withdrawal.

It is my opinion that the entire tariff issue should be discussed by the Congress and a law passed for the guidance of those who affect our trade agreements. I am not one who would exclude trading, nor do I believe in excessively high tariffs. I believe that we should live and let live, but that our trade negotiations should be realistic.

There is a great difference in the standard of living between various countries. There are climatic conditions that alter the customs of various places which should be taken into consideration. I believe that there is a solution to the entire trade program, but it should not be dependent upon international politics.

Too often small industries and specialized agricultural crops have been ruthlessly sold down the river as a concession in making agreements. I do not believe that any industry that is useful and beneficial to our civilization should be sacrificed for the sake of a trade negotiation.

It is my understanding that the representatives of foreign countries negotiating trade agreements have with them representatives of the industries being considered for trade negotiation. I am also informed that the American negotiators do not extend this same privilege to American interests. I believe this situation should be corrected by the administrative agencies, or Congress should act to see that the procedure is corrected. I believe that Congress should set up the rules in order to protect the economy of our own country.

The time has come when this whole situation must be brought into the open.

GATT has its next annual meeting in Geneva in October. Why should Congress not have an observer at that session? Why should our State Department delegation not report to Congress? Why should anything like GATT activities be carried on without prior authorization by Congress? These questions have been left hanging too long. They should be answered without further delay.

Value Received for Flood Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. SMITH

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 23, 1954

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include the following editorial from the July 15, 1954, issue of the Engineering News-Record:

VALUE RECEIVED FOR FLOOD CONTROL

Within 2 weeks, 2 outstanding examples of the value of flood-control investments have been spread on the record. How indelibly only time will tell, for the memories of taxpayers, lawmakes, and editorial writers are tragically short when expenditures for flood control are proposed. Wasteful, pork-barrel, unnecessary are some of the adjectives applied when the rivers are running dry. When they overflow, soaking up millions of dollars in losses and snuffing out lives, it is another story. Probably this cycle of opinion will continue to be repeated, but at least its fallacy can currently be highlighted by the experiences at Des Moines, Iowa, and on the lower Rio Grande.

In 1947 Des Moines experienced its most disastrous flood, when the Des Moines River crested at 26.15 feet. Two weeks ago a crest of 30.19 feet figuratively only wet the city's feet as heightened, strengthened levees guided the high water downstream. Possibly, even, the levee investment was paid off in this one flood. And had proposed reservoirs up and downstream been built, other flooded areas would have reaped like benefit.

But it was on the Rio Grande that the spectacular showing of flood control occurred. Considering the great loss of life and widespread damage along the river between Del Rio and Laredo, Tex., in the greatest flood in the river's history, it may seem strange to use this disaster as an example of wise and good flood control. But the damage that resulted in this stretch of river, where control measures had not been undertaken, gives added emphasis to the protection that was afforded the lower Rio Grande by the great, new Falcon Dam, which cost $33 million without the power facilities.

Seldom in history has a major flood-control structure been tested so fully so soon after it was completed. Seldom either have designers (in this case engineers of the International Boundary Commission, headed on the United States side by Commissioner Lawrence M. Lawson) been able to prove so quickly and conclusively that their designs were right.

Falcon Dam, a 150-foot earthfill some 5 miles long, had been planned to store 4 million acre-feet of water in its reservoir. Its spillway was made ample to pass 456,000 cubic feet per second. And it had been estimated that all of the water brought down by the then highest flood of record (1932) could be stored in the reservoir (on top of the storage reserved for irrigation) with the spillway operating at only 60,000 cubic feet per second. Last week's much greater flood was handled with equal facility—and even with greater margin since the reservoir fortuitously was nearly empty. But even had its dead storage and irrigation volumes been full the million or so acre-feet reserved for floods would have slowed the flow until the spillway could have doled it out downstream in quantities that would have been relatively harmless.

Falcon Dam proved itself to be a useful public investment and a credit to its engineers and builders. The tranquillity of the city dwellers and farmers in the rich orange-growing and produce-raising region below the dam—sure not only of their safety but assured of irrigation water next fall—provided a striking contrast to the frightened and helpless people above who could count the damage from the rising waters even before they arrived. This contrast bespeaks the necessity for supporting the International Boundary Commission in its plans for other Rio Grande dams and channel rectification from Laredo to Fort Quitman. And it focuses attention everywhere on the real value of flood control and the need to accord it the status of a worthwhile national investment and not just a convenient means of spreading money around among congressional constituencies as it is too frequently charged with being.

Operation Youth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK C. OSMERS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 23, 1954

Mr. OSMERS. Mr. Speaker, on July 2 my distinguished colleague, Hon. HALE BOGGS, of Louisiana, inserted into the RECORD a brief statement about Operation Youth, an inspiring program that is conducted annually for boys of high-school age by Xavier University in Cincinnati, Ohio. We owe a great debt of gratitude to the eminent Father Maguire, president of Xavier University, for the pioneer work he is doing inculcating young Americans with the manner of democracy and self-government. He is surrounded by a devoted staff who have helped produce fine results. Because of the general interest in the subject, I am, under unanimous consent, inserting copy of a letter which I have just written to Mr. John A. Moser, project director:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., July 16, 1954.

Mr. JOHN A. MOSER,
Director of Operation Youth,
Xavier University,
Cincinnati, Ohio.

DEAR MR. MOSER: The pressure of congressional business has made this the first opportunity that I have had to reply to your letter of June 30.

As you doubtless know, on July 2 Congressman BOGGS inserted your very fine statement about Operation Youth in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. May I tell you that I was greatly stimulated by my participation in this splendid program. It seems to me that the youth of this country will only live up to its responsibilities if it is informed about citizenship and democracy and the American way.

More than any other single factor, I was impressed by the incisive and intelligent questioning following the conclusion of remarks by Congressman BOGGS and myself. It was clearly evident to us that these young men of high-school age were on their toes, understood their Government, and had a grasp on the issues of the day. I suspect that their interest had been greatly stimulated by that portion of the Operation Youth program which had transpired prior to our participation.

I wish that more of our institutions of higher learning would follow the course set up by Xavier University in developing these great tenets; namely, fellowship, leadership, citizenship, discussion, appreciation, and understanding. I feel that the work being done under the leadership of your distinguished president, Father Maguire and his staff, is a healthy seed planted in the fertile field of American youth.

May God aid and sustain you in your efforts.

Sincerely yours,
FRANK C. OSMERS, Jr.

Health Reinsurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 20, 1954

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, the following is a notice I have issued as chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce with reference to further hearings to be conducted by the committee on the subject of Health Reinsurance, as provided for in H. R. 8356.

It reads as follows:

HEALTH REINSURANCE

Representative CHARLES A. WOLVERTON, Republican, of New Jersey, chairman of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, announced today that the committee would meet in executive session next Tuesday, July 20, to consider H. R. 8356, the health-reinsurance bill, which the committee had previously reported out and recommended for passage, but which the House last Tuesday recommitted to the committee. Chairman WOLVERTON said:

"I am bringing the matter before the committee in accordance with the vote of the House that further consideration be given to the bill by the committee.

"In accordance with these instructions, the meeting will be held to consider any amendments that anyone may wish to offer. I am hopeful that the American Medical Association will avail itself of this opportunity to present any amendments it may wish the committee to consider. This opportunity has been repeatedly extended to the AMA since January 28, 1954.

"On that date, in introducing Dr. Walter B. Martin, president-elect of the American Medical Association, who was testifying in our health inquiry, I said:

"'It has seemed to me, however, that no one should be in better position to set forth for us a concrete proposal of just what can be done to provide a real and adequate protection against these costs than the medical profession itself, as represented in its official organization, the American Medical Association. This is an association of men who have dedicated their lives to the mitigation of human suffering—men devoted to making available the best of medical care to all of our people, regardless of their economic status.

"'We, therefore, confidently look to them to come forward with a constructive program to meet this problem, one of the greatest facing us today.'

"Neither at that time nor at any time thereafter, including the appearance on April 5, 1954, of Dr. David B. Allman, chairman of the association's committee on legislation, to testify on this bill, have any representatives of the association come forward with one constructive idea or proposal for meeting this serious and important problem facing our American people today.

"It is amazing that the association's opposition is predicated entirely on questions which it raises in the insurance field. The association in no way whatsoever opposes the bill on any medical grounds or on any suggested interference with the practice of medicine or anything having to do whatsoever with the field in which the association's members are engaged.

"In connection with this committee meeting on Tuesday, I want to emphasize my complete agreement with President Eisenhower's statement that he did not consider that anyone lost by the House action last Tuesday except the American people, but that it was only a temporary defeat."

Echo Park Dam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. DAWSON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 23, 1954

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, several days ago Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, in her column My Day, urged her readers to write their Congressmen in opposition to the construction of Echo Park Dam, a vital unit of the upper Colorado River storage project. The reaction of this advice was immediate in the areas where the people know the relationship of this dam to Dinosaur National Monument. In a letter to Utah's leading evening newspaper, the Deseret News-Telegram, Mrs. Roosevelt admitted that she should perhaps have considered her advice a little more carefully. I am enclosing a newspaper account of Mrs. Roosevelt's reply to the newspaper and the newspaper editorial comments thereon. The articles follow:

WATER COMES FIRST, SAYS MRS. ROOSEVELT

Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt said Tuesday she did not favor preservation of scenery above the West's need for water.

But, added the widow of the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt, she felt Congress should look carefully into the question of constructing Echo Dam in Dinosaur National Monument.

Mrs. Roosevelt made the statements in a letter sent to the Deseret News and Telegram. She had been criticized by the paper and western leaders for an earlier statement against Echo Park Dam.

The controversy started July 12 when Mrs. Roosevelt, in her syndicated national column, appealed for letters opposing the dam on grounds it would ruin western scenery. She said she took this stand "upon receipt of two pamphlets from the Sierra Club" (a California conservation organization opposed to Echo Park Dam).

Her stand was attacked July 14 in a letter from Representative WILLIAM A. DAWSON (Republican, of Utah), who reminded Mrs. Roosevelt that it was her own husband, then President, who promised that Dinosaur National Monument would be kept open for needed reclamation projects.

The next day, in an open letter on the editorial page, the Deseret News and Telegram reminded Mrs. Roosevelt that vast areas of the West had been reclaimed by judicious conservation and use of water.

In her letter to the newspaper, Mrs. Roosevelt said:

"GENTLEMEN: I did not know I was coming in on a real discussion between Colorado and California. I am very conscious of the need for water in desert areas.

"I looked at all the pictures of the beautiful national park area and it seemed to me a pity to wipe it out if the necessary impounding of water could be done outside of the park area as well as through the destruction of a substantial and beautiful part of our national parks system.

"I am fully conscious of the need for impounding water in our desert areas and realize that scenery, even when it is preserved for the people of a country as a whole, is not as important as making it possible to bring new land under cultivation.

"But if water can be obtained in other ways, I think it is advisable to do so. I hope our Congressmen will look into the question carefully, for too much is being taken today from our national preserves and turned over to commercial use by individuals."

Mrs. Roosevelt Reconsiders

Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, who urged readers of her syndicated column My Day to write their Congressmen in opposition to the proposed Echo Park Dam "because the Sierra Club sent me two pamphlets," has decided to study the question further.

Mrs. Roosevelt's widely distributed attack on Echo brought her a flood of protest letters from indignant private citizens, from members of Utah's congressional delegation, and one from this newspaper, which appeared as an open letter in these columns.

The reply from the former first lady indicates she is in favor of reclamation, in principle, and that she had not given any study to the Echo Park matter beyond reading the Sierra Club propaganda. Her letter says:

"I hope our Congressmen will look into the question carefully for too much is being taken today from our national preserves and turned over to commercial usage by individuals * * *. If you wish to quote my letter in full I am quite willing to have you do so for I do not wish to be unfair to any State."

With Mrs. Roosevelt, we, too, sincerely hope that more Congressmen will thoroughly look into the Echo Park question, and that of the entire upper Colorado storage project. A number of Congressmen, and the Under Secretary of the Interior Department, along with a staff of experts, have already done so. For the most part, these men who have made a thorough investigation, including a visit to Dinosaur National Monument, are the men whose previous opposition or indifference has changed to solid support of Echo Park.

The recommendation that Congressmen look into the situation carefully is certainly sounder than Mrs. Roosevelt's original recommendation that all of her readers immediately write their Congressmen in blind opposition to Echo Park.

As to Mrs. Roosevelt's desire not to be unfair to any State, it might be suggested that her letter to this newspaper is hardly sufficient to remedy the damage done the cause of the Echo project by her first article. In all fairness her reconsidered attitude should be given the full circulation of her syndicated column, for all her readers to see and understand.

Great Lakes Once Covered Red River Valley of the North

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 13, 1954

Mr. HAGEN of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the Appendix of the Record a most interesting article published in the July 11 edition of the Fargo (N. Dak.) Forum, entitled "Glacial History Shows Icebergs Once Floated in Valley."

The valley referred to is the Red River Valley of the North, one of the most fertile areas in the entire world. Here one can look for miles in any direction and see nothing but lush fields of growing grain and other agricultural products. Geologists often have likened the fertility of the Red River Valley to the rich lands of the Nile.

A major portion of the Ninth District, which I represent in Congress, lies in the Red River Valley, and it is difficult to realize that at one time my hometown of Crookston, Minn., as well as Fargo, N. Dak., and its twin-sister city, Morehead, Minn., and also Grand Forks, N. Dak., and East Grand Forks, Minn., were all covered over by a huge sheet of ice 1 mile thick—and that icebergs actually floated in huge Lake Agassiz—a lake which was up to 250 miles wide in spots and 700 miles long, and which was created by this gigantic glacier.

This story of famed Lake Agassiz and its beaches named for the Minnesota towns including Herman, Campbell, and Norcross, puts in plain English the great glacial history of this part of North America.

This is good reading for anybody in the Agassiz Basin and also I should think, for any tourists, especially those with children, because the Fargo writer sets out just what signs and wonders to watch for in glacier country, as one might call it.

As more and more interest is manifested in Arctic and Antarctic lands the stories of glaciers take on fuller meaning. Who knows but that another rich Red River Valley may inspire song and story when a few Antarctic glaciers move out of the way. The organic topsoil with which we are acquainted of course is developed by nature only with the centuries, but who can say that man cannot move glaciers, arrange to pulverize rock, add a few chemicals, and make the land bloom? Anyhow, a lot of visions can be developed by looking at a Lake Agassiz map.

I have taken the liberty of inserting some additional names of towns in some portions of the story.

The article written by a staff writer, Roy P. Johnson, follows:

Glacial History Shows Icebergs Once Floated in Valley

(By Roy P. Johnson)

Icebergs once floated over Fargo and also Moorhead, Crookston, Ada, East Grand Forks, Warren, Hallock, and many other northwest Minnesota towns.

Great gales raged over a great lake which stood 200 feet deep over what now is the cities of Fargo, N. Dak., and Moorhead, Minn.

Seven hundred miles long, and 40 miles wide in the Fargo-Moorhead area, it was the largest body of fresh water on the North American continent.

A cataclysm of nature with forces greater than any hydrogen bomb resulted in the lake's formation.

Fargo and Moorhead lie at the bottom of a great depression occupied by the lake some 12,000 years ago.

These seemingly fantastic statements have been established as true by geological research.

If you were standing near Magnolia, N. Dak., with an unusually powerful telescope pointed east and held horizontal, you would see Muskoda, Minn., 49 miles away, but you would not see Fargo which lies midway between the two towns.

If the eight-story Black Building were twice its present height, its top would be just within sight.

Fargo and Moorhead are at the extreme bottom of the lake bottom. The cities are only 900 feet above sea level, while the two smaller communities are nearly 1,100 or 200 feet higher. They stand on the top brow overlooking the great depression.

When the sun begins sinking below the horizon, there is a shadow in the depressed area, while its rays continue to brighten the rim and the adjacent hills and tableland east and west.

Magnolia is a railroad passing point about 31 miles west of Fargo, and Muskoda is a tiny town, 18 miles east of Fargo.

While the two are unimportant otherwise, they are of significance geologically.

They are on the highest beach of ancient Lake Agassiz, which for 1,000 years filled the bowl in which Fargo and other Red River Valley towns lie. This beach was built up when the lake stood at its greatest size.

Only a narrow portion of Lake Agassiz extended southward into the valley. The lake's full sweep was from the southern tip of Lake Traverse into northern Manitob. In the Manitoba area it was nearly 250 miles wide.

The fortunes of Fargo and many other communities and farms are allied with the great cavity in the earth.

If it should fill with water again it would obliterate man and his works. Whether this will happen no one can tell.

For more than 100 years, the hole in the earth has been a mine of agricultural wealth. The rich silt deposited in the basin by the great lake has been called by geologists, "as rich as that of the valley of the Nile."

The discovery of Lake Agassiz was not told in bold headlines in the newspapers.

Scientifically, however, it was red-letter news which gradually received circulation in geologists' publications and government reports as the years went by.

That the lake had existed was confirmed in 1881, when Fargo was 10 years old. Prior to that time, a geologist named Keating who visited the area in 1823, had guessed at it.

In 1881, two geologists traveling on foot began circling the hollow with their instruments and established it to be a fact.

What Warren Upham and Horace Winchell of St. Paul did was to locate the principal beaches which marked the lake's shores at its various stages.

Upham told of his find in a government report published in 1888:

"A large part of the shore line of this ancient lake was traced and its height determined in the summer of 1881," he wrote.

"Horace Winchell was my rodman in the work of leveling. The height of the upper beach was ascertained and examined for 175 miles.

"Along nearly the whole of this distance there exists a remarkable deposit of beach gravel and sand, forming a continuous, smoothly mounded ridge, such as is found along any part of the shores of the ocean or of our Great Lakes, where the land sinks in a gently descending slope beneath the water level.

"The beach is a broad wave-like swell, with a smooth, gracefully rounded surface.

"Here and there were gaps cut through by streams. At places the outline of the lake shore or direction of shore currents prevented formation of beaches.

"There are similar interruptions in beaches of present lakes and on the seacoast.

"But the beach was clearly traced as one continuous formation along this distance of 175 miles." (Later Upham and others finished tracing the shoreline over most of its complete area, including Canada.)

Upham at this time definitely determined the size of the lake.

"When Lake Agassiz stood at its greatest height and formed the upper beach," he wrote, "its surface was 1,050 feet above the sea."

The beach located three-fourths mile west of Magnolia and just east of Muskoda station was formed as storms lashed the lake and waves piled up sand and gravel.

Upham named the highest shore Herman Beach, having first found trace of it near Herman, Minn., close to the lake's southernmost tip.

He named the lower beaches for other towns, Norcross, Campbell, and McCauleyville, the communities near which he first caught sight of them.

En route to the Minnesota lake region from Fargo-Moorhead over U. S. 10, the motorist finds the lowest beach, the McCauleyville, 5 miles east of Glyndon; the Campbell Beach a half mile further on; the Norcross Beach another mile along, and the Herman beach 2½ miles further on.

The Herman Beach, the highest, is approximately 8¾ miles east of Glyndon. Muskoda lies south of this point about a mile.

Minnesota State Geologist Newton Winchell named the lake for Louis Agassiz, famed for his study of glacial action, a force of nature from which the lake resulted.

A mile thick, the glacier inched over the land, grinding off hills and peaks, carrying the material along, dropping it in piles and ridges of boulders, sand, and silt.

The lake that grew out of it was so large it could hold all the Great Lakes. The tempests that raged upon it as the northwest winds swept down must have been terrifying.

That great icebergs broke off the end of the glacier, floated in the lake, were stranded and discharged huge boulders and other material is proved by the piles deposited in many places.

Great masses of this debris also were left by large sections of the glacier which broke off or were left on comparatively dry land by the advancing and retreating ice sheet.

This process went on for thousands of years, geologists say.

The story of the discovery that there had been an Ice Age on the globe resulting in lakes like Agassiz, and how it was traced and discovered is fascinating. Briefly summarized, the facts are these:

During the 1700's geologists began to wonder why deposits of clay, gravel, sand, and boulders were scattered about on the earth in strange, disorderly piles and seemingly out of place.

Some of the boulders and blocks of stone were marked by odd scratches and grooves.

At first it was believed the confusion of scattered material probably was due to the flood mentioned in the Bible. Signs of marine life were found in some deposits.

A study of the notched rocks in Europe disclosed the cuts appeared to have been caused by one sharp rock being moved across another.

This led to a study of glaciers in the Alps. It was found that the moving icefields carried boulders which scratched other rocks which were imbedded in a fashion similar to those found far away from existing glaciers.

By a further study of the European rocks, it was possible to trace direction of movement and it became clear that the great glacier that once covered much of that continent came from the north.

For a time it was doubted that glaciers actually moved, since the movement was not readily discernible to the eye. Agassiz and others proved they did move, slowly but steadily.

A little later, in Great Britain, Agassiz and others found beaches, proving that melting glaciers and lakes were related.

Now arose a big question. What formed glaciers where no mountains were evident?

This question is not yet finally answered.

It has been learned that the main ice sheets which spread over the northern part of the United States originated from a point just west of Hudson Bay, whence they moved to all points of the compass. This was called the Keewatin Glacier.

Its movements were traced by the strangely scratched rocks.

Enormous amounts of boulder, gravel, sand and clay were moved. Rocks were ground to powder to form clay and silt.

High points of land were carved off and carried along as the massive ice sheet passed with a terrific grinding action.

From it developed Lake Agassiz. At its greatest size it lay over the northwest in somewhat the shape of an enormous polar bear, with its front paws extended into the Red River Valley and its mouth agape in northeastern Minnesota as if to swallow the water of Lake Superior. Devils Lake, N. Dak., and other smaller bodies of water lay like cubs adjacent to its underside.

It covered eastern North Dakota, northwestern Minnesota and portions of Manitoba and Saskatchewan.

Great streams of water, much larger than any river now existing, flowed out of the glacier and when it began receding they poured their waters into Lake Agassiz.

Three great ancient rivers, the Pembina, Elk and Sheyenne helped fill up the great body of water.

Great sand deltas were formed at their mouths and still may be seen today. The Pembina and Sheyenne Rivers also still remain but the Elk's only remains are its wide, deep valley.

Walhalla, N. Dak., stands on the Pembina Delta.

Larimore, N. Dak., is located in the center of the Elk Delta. The Elk, incidentally, roared out of a crevice between two lobes of the glacial ice sheet.

The third great delta is that of the Sheyenne, located in the area beginning a few miles east of Lisbon and forming the well-known sandlands area with its dunes.

The Sheyenne Delta was the greatest of all, covering 800 square miles and consisting of about 8 cubic miles of deposited material, geologists say.

There are one or more smaller deltas in this area, one formed by the aged Buffalo River, lying just east of Muskoda.

Like a monster dam, the northward receding glacier held the waters in Lake Agassiz for many years.

With rivers filling it up, the lake continued getting deeper and finally spilled over at the lowest part of its rim at the location of Browns Valley, Minn., on lower Lake Traverse.

The water notched out a deep gorge, which geologists called River Warren, honoring an Army engineer-geologist.

River Warren eventually cut 60 feet deep and was 1½ to 2 miles wide. It carried the overflowing lake water across Minnesota and into the Mississippi River.

The gorge of this mighty stream is marked by Lakes Traverse and Big Stone and the Minnesota River.

When the ice sheet receded into the north, Lake Agassiz began falling, establishing new and lower beaches.

When the last ice was melted, the remaining waters of the lake began draining from Lake Winnipeg through the Nelson River into Hudson Bay. The waters of the Red River have moved in this direction since.

An important event taking place at the time Lake Agassiz was in existence is blamed for this northward flow of water.

The southern part of the Red River Basin was lifted and the northern part depressed by natural forces. This change proceeded slowly, probably over thousands of years.

That it actually occurred has been proved by changes in the lake's shoreline.

Normally, a lake beach will remain uniformly at the same height around the entire lake because of the effect of gravity on the water.

In the case of Lake Agassiz, geologists found that the beaches had been depressed toward the north and raised toward the south.

This explains why the Red River flows north. From Lake Traverse north, the fall of the riverbed averages about 1 foot per mile. Grand Forks, N. Dak., is about 65 feet lower in altitude than Fargo.

Just what caused the land to fall at one end and rise at the other end of the basin aroused speculation. One theory is that the displacement of the great ice mass as it receded north was responsible.

Peculiarly, the raising and lowering did not take place at any great distance from the bed of the Red River. Many of the streams tributary to the Red do not switch to the north until they get down into the flatland bed.

When the shores of Lake Agassiz receded, a new era began for the Elk, Pembina and Sheyenne Rivers, which made them "young rivers" at their mouths.

They began meandering through their deltas and across the flats to the bottom to join the Red River. The great Elk River dried up and only its small offspring, the Turtle, remained to flow from the delta to the river.

The Pembina and Sheyenne cut new beds into the depression.

Geologists looking at these new extensions of the Pembina and Sheyenne refer to them as "young rivers." The portions on the other side of the deltas they call ancient. The gorges cut in the plateau further back are proof of their age.

It has been noted that Moorhead stands on a slight rise in the lake bottom.

It is typical of meandering streams like the Red River that they usually have one steep bank and one more gently sloping. Wind and silt deposits play a role in this phenomenon.

In frontier days, early settlers noted the lower, miry appearance of Fargo. A large earth-fill program was necessary to build up Fargo's downtown section.

The Red River Valley is not a true valley, geologists say. A river valley is usually taken to mean one that has been eroded by the river itself. In the present case it should have been called Agassiz Lake Basin instead of "valley."

One geologist believes that a great northward flowing river rolled through what is now called the Red River Valley before glacial times, and that it cut the gorge into which the glacier later worked its way.

He has not suggested a possible source of this earlier river, but place the time as several million years ago.

While the glacial period which formed Lake Agassiz is believed to have lasted about 12,000 years, geologists say the lake probably lasted a comparatively short time about 1,000 years.

Speaking of lakes generally, geologists say that from the time of its formation a lake is destined to disappear.

What causes lakes to die is the depositing of material in them, the lowering by downward cutting of the streams that flow out of them, the accumulation of organic deposits such as dying vegetation, and evaporation.

Fargo-Moorhead residents are hardly aware of the great depression in which they live because of the gentle slope in its bottom, leading upwards to the rim.

But when returning from the Minnesota lakes via U. S. 10 on Sunday evenings they can see from the Herman Beach the gleam of the lights of Glyndon, Dilworth, and Fargo-Moorhead in the bottom 200 feet below.

Few realize they are looking down into a hollow that is one of the earth's wonders.

(With ordinary fieldglasses a breath-taking view of Fargo-Moorhead far below in the depression may be had by day on the Campbell Beach, at the historic marker, just off U. S. 10 where a road leads into the Buffalo River State Park. Pointing the glasses west, one finds the Moorhead water tower top on an even level with the glasses.)

(The downward slope is easily distinguished with fieldglasses. It is like standing on a high hill looking down on villages, groves, and landmarks.)

Red River Valley farmers who have tilled its soils, however, do not have to be told about the fame of the great lake bottom. For many years its famous silts have produced bountiful crops.

When man first came here, tall grasses grew over most of lower surface. There were many great marshes left by the washing of waves in the lake's later stages and by periodic inundations of the Red River. The sod was thick with organic material.

It was this growing material and the remains of animal and bird life that enriched and blackened the silts over a great many years.

It made the Red River Valley one of the richest spots on earth.

H. R. 7840

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 23, 1954

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to call to the attention of the Members of Congress that the Rules Committee yesterday granted a rule for the consideration of H. R. 7840, a bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act, Railroad Retirement Tax Act, and Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act. This bill was reported by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on June 21, 1954. It is a very worthy bill, and is financially sound. This bill should have the whole-hearted approval of the House of Representatives.

In order that the Members of the House may be fully informed as to this legislation, I should like to summarize, briefly, the provisions of H. R. 7840, as reported by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

PROVISIONS OF BILL

I

The amendments proposed to the Railroad Retirement Act are shown on pages 3 to 5 of the committee's report on this bill, House Report No. 1899. Briefly, these amendments are:

First. Benefits to widows, dependent widowers, and dependent parents at age 60 instead of age 65.

Second. Benefits to widowed mothers with physically or mentally disabled children over age 18.

Third. Full survivor benefits to widows, dependent widowers, and dependent parents who are also eligible for a railroad retirement annuity in their own right.

Fourth. Increasing the creditable compensation from the present maximum of $300 a month to a maximum of $350 a month in the calculation of a retirement or survivor annuity.

Fifth. Disregarding the compensation earned after age 65, if the crediting of such compensation would diminish the annuity.

Sixth. Changing the disability work clause to a maximum of $100 in earnings for any month without loss of the annuity for that month.

Seventh. Excluding the service of certain delegates to national or international conventions of railway labor organizations from coverage under this act.

Eighth. Elimination of the requirement in the present law that a child over age 16 and under 18 years must attend school regularly in order to be eligible for a survivor's annuity.

Ninth. Waiver of retirement benefits for certain individuals who are receiving non-service-connected veterans' pensions.

II

The principal amendment proposed to the Railroad Retirement Tax Act would increase the tax base from $300 to $350 a month, leaving the tax rate of 6¼ percent unchanged.

A similar increase in the tax base for employment covered under the Social Security Act was approved by the House on June 1, 1954, when it passed H. R. 9366. This bill provides, among other things, for the increase in the creditable and taxable wage base from $3,600 to $4,200 a year.

Almost two-thirds of the railroad employees now earn more than $300 a month, and they would pay the tax on their additional monthly compensation in excess of $300, but not in excess of $350. In return for this additional tax, these employees would get increased benefits resulting from the crediting of this additional compensation in the computation of their annuities. On the average, these employees would obtain benefit rights at the rate of $3 for each $1 in taxes they would pay. Furthermore, the liberalization of the survivor benefits provided for in the bill would apply across the board, and the families of all railroad workers would benefit, regardless of whether or not the employee was taxed at the rate of $300 a month or $350 a month.

It has been estimated by the Railroad Retirement Board that the increase in tax base from $300 to $350 a month would increase retirement-tax collections by $56 million a year, on a level cost basis. This amount is sufficient to pay for all the additional retirement and survivor benefits provided for by this bill.

III

The amendments proposed by the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act are shown on pages 6 to 8 of the committee's report on H. R. 7840. Briefly, the schedule of base year compensation is slightly altered, and the daily benefit rates for unemployment are increased by 50 cents a step, with a maximum daily rate of $8.50. Moreover, an eligible employee would be entitled to receive a daily benefit rate equal to half of his daily rate of compensation for the last employment in which he was engaged in the last calendar year. The total amount of benefits which may be paid to an employee separately for unemployment or sickness within a benefit year would not exceed his total compensation in the base year. The reported bill also would increase the maximum compensation subject to contribution from $300 to $350 a month.

SPONSORS OF BILL

The reported bill has the support of all standard railway labor unions, including the 4 train and engine service brotherhoods and all the 19 organizations affiliated with the Railway Labor Executives' Association. These organizations represent almost all of the railroad workers in the United States.

Colonel Kelley, chairman, and Mr. Harper, labor member, of the Railroad Retirement Board, favor enactment of the reported bill. The Bureau of the Budget favors enactment of the bill.

H. R. 7840 IS SOUND AND NECESSARY LEGISLATION

More than 60 bills to amend the Railroad Retirement Act have been introduced and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. I am happy to state that the Committee held hearings on all these bills, and considered each bill very carefully.

In the consideration of all these bills, the committee has placed great emphasis on the effect of the proposed amendments on the financial soundness of the railroad retirement account. The committee is unanimously of the opinion that, regardless of the desirability of certain proposals for the liberalization of benefits under the Railroad Retirement Act, no amendments should be made to the law which would jeopardize the financial soundness of the railroad retirement system. This principle is accepted by all the standard railway labor organizations as well as railroad management.

I am happy to state that the financing provisions of the reported bill are adequate to cover the costs of the additional benefits provided for in the bill.

In conclusion, I wish to state that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce believes that the provisions of the reported bill, H. R. 7840, are sound and necessary legislation, and that this legislation is consistent with the program recommended by the President. I urge the House to act favorably on this bill.

Security Provisions of Atomic Energy Act

SPEECH

OF

HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 23, 1954

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 9757) to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, as amended.

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Chairman, I want to discuss the security provisions of H. R. 9757.

I believe my colleagues in the House are familiar with my interest in the broad field of security in all its varied aspects.

My experience in the Government service, in the military service, and in my service on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy has given me an opportunity to study the problem of security—in terms of its statutory foundation, its procedural structure, and its effectiveness in practice.

The joint committee has a Subcommittee on Security. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS] and the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] both serve on this subcommittee. It has been my honor and privilege to serve as chairman of this subcommittee. Senator PASTORE and Senator CORDON are the other members. We have given the security aspects of this bill the closest possible study. Every line has been carefully gone over with the experts who have direct responsibilities in the field of security.

More important than our study of the bill, or at least of basic importance in terms of our competence to judge this bill, is the continuing review and close scrutiny given to the practice of security since the McMahon Act went into effect. I have not served on the joint committee during this entire period, but I have never ceased to give the matter my closest attention.

Chapter 12 of H. R. 9757, composed of six sections, modernizes the security provisions of the existing act, passed in 1946 and reflecting the attitudes of that period as to the exclusiveness of America's position in the field of atomic energy.

Chapter 18, dealing with enforcement, makes more practical and realistic the provisions for effectively maintaining adherence to the security provisions of the bill, and establishes a better legal foundation for enforcing the security measures.

As a matter of fact, the objectives of making practical and realistic the security provisions of the act characterize every change we have made from existing law.

I would like to recall to your minds, since I am sure my colleagues have gone over the report accompanying this bill—Report No. 2181—the discussion of this all-important security problem appearing on page 23 of the report.

I want to touch briefly on each section of this chapter, but before doing so, I would like to summarize the security accomplishments of this bill. I say "accomplishments" advisedly, not only because of the very merit of the proposed language but also because of the improvement effected in the Commission's security operations. The new language will give the Commission needed flexibility in specific fields, and assures the American people that the expansion of the whole business of atomic energy—in both domestic and international aspects—can be carried out with adequate protection for the security interests of the United States.

A major accomplishment of H. R. 9757 is to clear up a situation which has plagued both the Commission and all of the military services since the passage of the act. We have made several attempts in the past to cure this problem by legislation. Nearly 8 years of experience underlie these changes. The problem has been acute during the last 4, as the military services have intensified and expanded their competence, their training effort and their preparedness in the field of atomic weapons. What was once a unique and limited weapon for use only under conditions of very high and very narrow policy determinations—due to scarcity—is now a central item of ordnance in the total complex of weapons systems.

Let me give you an example of why the changes proposed in H. R. 9757 are so important. This is a hypothetical case, of course, but not necessarily so.

Put yourself in the position of an ordnance technician employed by a Department of Defense contractor developing a guided missile. One of the specifications, set up by the Defense Department, is that the missile must be able to carry an atomic warhead.

Can you go direct to the nuclear-weapon designers, who are employees of the Commission's contractors in the weapons field? They have a so-called top-secret clearance and so do you. You need to know about the shape and size and weight distribution of the nuclear warhead which your missile is to carry.

The present law says you cannot talk to the Commission's contractor unless you have been investigated by the FBI or the Civil Service Commission and cleared by the Commission. Not just cleared by the Department of Defense, even though you may have been investigated a dozen times and tested by every personnel-security procedure known to the Department of Defense. You may have handled the most sensitive information in the Nation's whole defense setup. for years but, unless you have also been through the parallel channels of clearance established by law for AEC contractors, you cannot talk to your fellow weapons expert in the AEC setup. H. R. 9757 clears this matter up. The Commission's contract employer can talk to you upon receipt and notification to your employer of the Department of Defense certification as to your clearance.

As matters stand now, this type of information could be given to you only through a third party officially cleared by both of the contracting agencies. The awkwardness and waste in such a procedure is obvious, for the duplication of investigations and clearance actions is costly and unnecessary.

The safeguards surrounding the exchange of information with our allies are of vital importance. But they are realistic. As matters stand now, General Gruenther, when wearing his hat as Commander of Allied Forces in Europe, cannot tell his British chief of fighter aircraft—assuming he has a British chief directing fighter-aircraft operations—General Gruenther cannot even tell him the basic weapon effects needed in the employment of the types of atomic bombs which fighter aircraft can carry. When the general put on his hat as commander of the American forces, he can talk freely to his American staff about the things the field-operations commanders need to know.

The proposed bill will assist the NATO commander in this regard. It permits the transmission, under rigid safeguards, of the information required for the military employment of the weapon. It specifically forbids, since there is no need for transmission of such information, all data about the design and manufacture of the weapon and the nuclear materials involved.

The bill provides the same flexibility in connection with the operations of our own forces. It permits the removal, as the Commission and the military may agree, the removal from the statutory restraints of restricted data of that information relating to the size, weight, shape, and ballistic characteristics of atomic weapons and provides for the continuing protection of such data under military security regulations. Just as the restricted data security requirements provide for one kind of protection of research and development and manufacturing operations, the military security regulations provide protection of another kind to meet the differing conditions of military operations. Heretofore, we have tried to impose the Commission's statutory security standards on information of military operations with respect to information primarily of importance to the military. Needless to say, both the Commission and the Department of Defense are very anxious to have this matter cleared up. We are assured that the language in section 142 will do this. Should it be necessary for me to speak later in more detail on these sections of this bill which deal with the operations of the security system, I will do so, but in order to expedite the business before the House, I suggest you first check the report. I believe you will find it very complete on this point.

The last point I will touch on is the authority given to the Commission to make a determination as to the degree of sensitivity of various types of restricted data. Again, an example might help.

During the building of one of the gaseous diffusion plants, there comes a stage when enough equipment is on the floor that a competent engineer or scientist in the field of isotope separation by gaseous diffusion could gain some knowledge of the output of such a plant. That is, he could see the size of the motors and compressors and examine the layout of the plant to get some idea of the volume of flow of the gases. Of course, he would have it for only the one bay, or wing, of the plant. Now, under the present law, the expert welders who have to put this vast system together, but who do not see any plans, specifications, production data, nor do they get anywhere near nuclear materials, and who work under the closest possible and very vital technical supervision and direction—these people have to go through the same security procedure as the top scientists who design the weapons themselves. The cost in time and dollars is obvious.

I want to assure my colleagues of the adequacy and effectiveness of the protective features of the bill. But there is one more item of major importance.

The joint committee has long been of the opinion that the most effective security is attained only if the areas of information requiring protection are held down to include only that information which positively needs protection.

H. R. 9757 constitutes an unequivocal directive to the Commission to maintain continuous review of all classified information and to declassify and publish scientific and technical data which can be published without undue risk to the common defense and security.

The bill, of course, continues, and I believe improves, the policy declarations with respect to the Commission's obligations to control of information in such manner as to assure the common defense and security, and with respect to the dissemination of technical information essential to scientific and industrial progress and public understanding and to expand and enlarge the Nation's reservoir of scientific knowledge available to all our teachers and research workers.

Eighth Annual United World Federalist Assembly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 22, 1954

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to call attention to the eighth annual assembly of the United World Federalists which was held in Washington, D. C., June 18 to 20, 1954, by placing before the House a few of the many messages addressed to that fine organization commending it for the good work it is doing together with the major speeches delivered to the convention.

They are as follows:

As the United World Federalists meet in their eighth annual assembly, I want you to know that I appreciate your efforts to keep the United States strong in a troubled world and to give support to the United Nations. Only through strength and cooperative effort will America and the world be able to work for a lasting peace. (President Dwight D. Eisenhower, the White House, Washington, D. C.)

I hope your meeting will prove to be an inspiring one and one that will do much toward attaining your goal. (Supreme Court Justice W. O. Douglas, Washington, D. C.)

Throughout the world free peoples are daily pouring out their prayers for a just and lasting peace everywhere. This can only come through unity—the sort of unity which established the United States of America as a haven of justice and liberty.

In more recent years a number of worthy organizations have been blazing a trail in the direction of world unity. These explorations—and that is all that can be said at this stage—have contributed great hopes to all who seek peace and good will among men. They must continue.

The United World Federalists has furnished real leadership in this highly important effort to attain the peace of the world. They deserve not only honorable mention, but universal commendation.

As the members of this organization gather in their 1954 convention, I extend best wishes for the advancement of their noble purposes. (United States Senator Robert C. Hendrickson, Republican, of New Jersey, Washington, D. C.)

The issue we face relates to survival itself. Man now has the means to destroy himself and his society. We know, however, that man also has the means to solve his problems without war. This must be our objective.

The creation of an international community is essential to the preservation of world peace. The United Nations must be preserved and strengthened as the means of achieving the community of interest which binds people together wherever they may live. We must keep alive the idea of international understanding and good will. This, in my judgment, is the task of the United World Federalists and is the task of all who seek peace within a framework of liberty. (United States Senator Hubert H. Humphrey, Democrat, of Minnesota, Washington, D. C.)

Hope for a peaceful world without the use of force will again be emphasized at this eighth annual general assembly of the United World Federalists. It is, therefore, an appropriate occasion for me to extend my best wishes to the delegates who assemble on this occasion and to commend the United World Federalists for its dedication to the cause of international cooperation. It has become increasingly impossible in recent years to think in terms of using military force on a large scale. Under the present circumstances only unreasoning fear can lead men to think in terms of a war which would be man's final destruction.

We must think in terms of constructing a free world which will destroy the Iron Curtain by the inherent power of freedom. I am sure United World Federalists will persist in advocating and supporting foreign policy, within the framework of the ideals, principles, and organs of the United Nations. (United States Senator Herbert H. Lehman, Democrat, of New York, Washington, D. C.)

No group has worked more diligently to build a peaceful world than has the United World Federalists. Your support of the ideals of international understanding and cooperation and of the United Nations has been inspirational to all who recognize that isolationism is neither practical nor desirable.

The building and preservation of a world at peace is a never-ending task. It is a task that does not permit discouragement, and one that must eventually bear fruit if civilization as we know it is to survive.

May your eighth annual general assembly result in an even greater determination on the part of UWF to continue every sound effort to build conditions that make for tolerance, understanding and world peace. (United States Senator John Sparkman, Democrat, of Alabama, Washington, D. C.)

Your organization's courage and determination in pursuing the noble cause of world peace and unity, despite the numerous roadblocks in the way, is most commendable. The need for finding a solution to the perennial scourage of war and preparation for war is growing steadily more urgent, and the Assembly's deliberations on this grave problem will, I know, be constructive and deserving of the most careful consideration. (Representative Hugh J. Addonizio, Democrat, of New Jersey, Washington, D. C.)

The search for peace must go steadfastly on even in the face of difficulty and strife. The fact that the United World Federalists continues its efforts diligently through education and discussion to further this need is gratifying indeed. (Representative Emanuel Celler, Democrat, of New York, Washington, D. C.)

The study before your convention of the revision of the United Nations' Charter is of paramount importance and I wish you and your organization every success in developing constructive ideas which will help in securing the desired ends. (Representative Sterling Cole, Republican, of New York; chairman, Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, Washington, D. C.)

I wish to extend to you and the members who will be gathered together at this assembly my best wishes.

I have been following the activities of your organization with much interest and will be glad to be advised of the conclusions reached by the assembly. (Representative Thomas B. Curtis, Republican, of Missouri, Washington, D. C.)

Your organization has played an important part in educating Americans toward meeting the international responsibilities which have been thrust upon them. At a time when the United Nations and our international alliances are undergoing unusual strains your work has very real importance. I hope therefore you will continue your work with even greater determination. (Representative Peter Frelinghuysen, Jr., Republican, of New Jersey, Washington, D. C.)

I am pleased to learn that the subject of proposed United Nations Charter revisions will receive the consideration of your eighth annual general assembly.

In drawing attention to the importance of preserving the United Nations and improving its procedures, your organization is rendering a great service. In contributing to the leadership that is so essential to a successful review conference next year, the United World Federalists are meeting a great national need. The discussion which your organization and others similarly interested in world peace have inspired is a real help in our effort to define issues and reach sound solutions to world problems. (Representative Brooks Hays, Democrat, of Arkansas, Washington, D. C.)

The members of your organization are to be congratulated for their enthusiastic pursuit of world peace.

With world conditions what they are todays, their united efforts to strengthen the United Nations are more necessary than ever before. The United Nations must be implemented with a police force to prevent aggression in every part of the world, thus making possible the peaceful universe which your Organization has so diligently labored to achieve. (Representative Abraham J. Multer, Democrat, of New York, Washington, D. C.)

It is heartening and strengthening to know that in a time of gathering perils and of disconcerting passions that there are those who remain steadfastly on the job of blueprinting the way to universal understanding and cooperation. My heartiest greetings and wishes for a most fruitful conference. (Representative Barratt O'Hara, Democrat, of Illinois, Washington, D. C.)

I wish to take this opportunity to extend to the delegates who will assemble at your eighth annual General Assembly my best wishes for fruitful and constructive deliberations. The problems which beset our world are many and complex, and their solution will be aided by enlightened particication of all our people. The prospects of achieving lasting and just peace in the world through the help of the United Nations Organization should have our most careful attention. For that reason, I hope that your group will give earnest consideration to the need of revising and improving the United Nations Charter, and shall look forward to receiving and studying your recommendations and suggestions on this subject. (Representative Clement J. Zablocki, Democrat, of Wisconsin, Washington, D. C.)

I trust that you will have an inspirational and successful assembly. Certainly you meet at the most challenging time in history when it is necessary that we all rededicate ourselves to the strengthening of the United Nations and the prevention of aggression so that we may have a world at peace under law. (United States district judge, Luther Youngdahl, Washington, D. C.)

United Nations accomplishments encourages strong support of the United World Federalists for solutions of basic world problems. Public opinion can become better informed on international matters of united vital opinion for bulwark against threats of war and the building of peace.

United Nations is organized for action now today and every day.

UWF assembly can give thought and inspiration for such cooperation. (Warren R. Austin, former U. S. Ambassador to U. N.)

In these days which are so critical in the life of the Nation, I feel so strongly that those who are connected with United World Federalists are working so intelligently and so definitely for peace, yet with a realism which also is important at this time.

I trust the assembly will be most successful in every way. (The Right Reverend Henry K. Sherrill, D. D., presiding bishop, Protestant Episcopal Church in the U. S. A.)

The urgency of our position grows with each passing day, as the world situation deteriorates. As I see it, we are being forced by the Communist will to domination and by the weakness and vacillation of our friends to give all our efforts to short-range measures of defense or of preparing our positions and forces in event of attack. No one in high places is now speaking up for the only effective solution to the problem of world tensions. No thought is being given to what alone can insure peace.

Under these sad conditions, the voice of United World Federalists must be raised, even though ears of the nations seem closed to it. I, therefore, send greetings and prayerful wishes to the delegates assembled in Washington to rededicate themselves to the biggest cause in history. (Rev. Philip S. Moore, C. S. C., vice president, academic affairs, University of Notre Dame.)

I have recently had a chance to see something of the ferment of modern Asia. The more I ponder the development of Asian nationalisms, the more convinced I become that this new-found pride in independence can only really flourish within the framework of a strengthened United Nations.

Without that framework the new Asian freedoms may be short-lived and fraticidal. They may be absorbed by neighboring systems whose very first principle is the stifling of indigenous cultural and political life.

UWF has been instrumental in proclaiming the necessity of a stronger world organization—long before events conspired to make that our last best hope.

I congratulate you on what you have done, and I am confident that you will continue with the same high determination. (Chester Bowles, former U. S. Ambassador to India.)

My best wishes for the success of your meeting and the world of United World Federalists in support of the United Nations.

These are times of decision on the greatest issues which have ever confronted mankind; issues which cannot be evaded and can be solved only by that combination of bold yet cautious thinking on international problems which frame the structure of the national state. Major problems like that of security are taking on new meanings as thermonuclear power becomes too deadly to be used by civilized nations in mutual destruction. The strategy of peace must be thought through, not along that challenge to power which has bred and still breeds suspicion and hostility, but by action for human betterment in which all share. The best police system is not that which puts the accent on punishment for crime but on the support of social and political justice. The World Federalists in their reexamination of the United Nations Charter to achieve these ends should have the support of all right-minded citizens. (James T. Shotwell, honorary president, American Association for the United Nations, Inc.)

I want to wish you a most successful convention.

I am sure all of us will agree that the fundamental test of the success of the United Nations is the devotion of people, their leaders and their governments. Will we recognize the depth of obligations under the charter and the opportunities the United Nations affords us?

On the eve of the 10th year of the United Nations, we need a rededication of faith. (Clark M. Eichelberger, executive director, American Association for the United Nations, Inc.)

I wish you every success in your important work. (George Olmsted, chairman of the board, Hawkeye Casualty Co.)

Since World War II, it has seemed to me that the world needed no further arguments than with war itself to convince anyone that means must be found for the peaceful solution of future problems and the avoidance of further conflict. If another argument was needed, no one could imagine a more compelling one than the hydrogen bomb. In any event, here it is. Someway, somehow, mankind must become more fully aware of this period of greatest present danger and that solutions must be found other than war. The United World Federalists become increasingly important. (Arthur Bunker, president, Climax Molybdenum Co.)

We have now reached the point all of us feared in 1945—the development of a nuclear-weapon race to the point where two nations are literally able to exterminate each other.

If we are to extricate ourselves from this dangerous situation, we must act in many fields, and the most important of those fields, in my opinion, is the education of the people concerning the need for world federation. If the people cannot see the need, civilization as we know it is doomed. (Harrison Brown, California Institute of Technology.)

In these days of doubt and confusion when the three great enemies of the human mind, fear, hate, and despair are paralyzing the clear and calm judgment of so many men in high places, only the great idea sponsored by United World Federalists shines as a beacon of hope to guide the human race back to sanity from its mad race to thermonuclear self-destruction. God be with you in your noble efforts. (F. R. Von Windegger, chairman of the board, Plaza Bank of St. Louis.)

My congratulations on the excellent work you are doing to further the cause of international cooperation and peace. (J. D. Zellerbach, president, Crown Zellerbach Co.)

All best wishes for a successful convention and one which furthers the cause in which we believe. (John Farrar, chairman of the board, Farrar, Straus & Young, Inc.)

No idea that man can have is too great for him to begin to try to translate it into reality. My greetings to the convention. (Grove Patterson, editor in chief, Toledo Blade.)

I send every good wish for the 1954 annual meeting.

I believe that we have now hammered out a set of principles so simple and solid that we can all support them with conviction.

I believe also that the time is fast approaching when even the most blind can understand that a choice must be made between a disarmed world governed by law and the imminent risk of unprecedented catastrophe. I have confidence that there is enough intelligence and commonsense in the world to choose the former road toward world order. And therefore, I believe that this is no time for UWF to falter or relax. On the contrary, it is a time for confidence that our principles can and will make faster headway and produce greater results from now on. So let us close ranks and go forward. (Grenville Clark, lawyer.)

Address by Victor Reuther, Assistant to the President, Congress of Industrial Organizations, Before the Eighth Annual Assembly of the United World Federalists, June 18, 1954, Washington, D. C.

Mr. Reuther. Mr. Chairman, and participants in this assembly of the United World Federalists, I consider it a great honor, indeed, to be privileged to have this opportunity to take part in your session this afternoon. As the chairman has indicated, the interests of the labor movement in international affairs, in world problems is not a newfound interest. It expresses a rather deep concern that people down in the shops, mines, and mills have had for a long time. While it has only been in rather recent years that a very few of the ranks of labor have been drawn into consultative bodies where their opinions might have been solicited on world affairs, the people down in the shops, mines, and mills know full well that when armies are recruited and are sent marching, they number in their ranks primarily those out of shops, mines, and mills and off the farms of our country.

The concern of working people in this land, as in other lands around the world, is their search for some practical approach to the problem of world peace. Believe me, it is a very genuine one. The trade-union movement is by its very nature a pragmatic, a very practical kind of organization, which is less concerned with the language of a collective agreement with an employer than it is with the way that agreement actually operates. It is concerned not only with amendments that may be negotiated to those collective agreements, it is deeply concerned with the atmosphere in which those agreements are negotiated because they give some indication as to whether or not there will be a genuine desire to carry out the terms of them.

I don't come before you this afternoon as an expert in international affairs, to lay before you detailed language of proposed charter amendments. You will find, however, that spokesmen of the CIO are giving of their suggestions and their thinking and their advice to the Senate committee as it moves across the country and conducts its hearings. I am pleased to say to all of you that almost without exception you will find that those recommendations and basic charter amendments coincide and parallel the thinking of this organization. That is because, like you, we have but one desire, that is to continue our very earnest and our determined search for practical approach to this problem. I am sure you share another view of ours that this search for peace, for an appropriate worldwide structure through which organized nations might find a basis for joint cooperation and collaboration, is not a matter to be left to the professional diplomats alone, nor to the professional soldiers; for all of us as civilians have such a very great stake and interest, not just the language, not just the frame work, the kind of atmosphere in which this is negotiated that we wish to be a party to them. While all of us will not have the privilege of sitting at the international conference table where these matters are negotiated, each of us as participants in our own vital organizations can make a tremendous contribution to building the kind of climate within our own respective communities, within our own respective nations, which can guide the hands of those who negotiate.

Believe me, it is significant that you meet at precisely this moment. I congratulate you on the courage which you have shown in daring to come together and express a hope that the world might show the good judgment to find a way for its peace. For we have just passed through an era that I trust definitely marks the end of it, where the spokesmen of dissension and division have enjoyed the headlines and have occupied the television screens for many a week. I trust that there will be no great vacuum left there that will be long unfilled. For among alert and determined groups that take seriously these questions for peace, we had better find ways and means of carrying out our practical fight for this, out into the communities, out into the legislative halls of our country. I trust we will influence people of other nations to do likewise. For I think there is very great danger that the ground that we have won in making the first initial steps toward building the framework of a world organization may well be swept aside in the kind of atmosphere of hysteria that is generated by the increasing tensions around the world. I count the home front here among these areas of tension.

Yet, we must not be defeatist. We must press forward with positive and constructive proposals for strengthening further and for implementing the work of this world organization, the United Nations. It is within an area of some practical implementations of the responsibilities of the U. N. that I should like to address a few remarks to you this afternoon, that is in the economic sphere. For I doubt if there is any single phase of the work of the United Nations that has brought forth such positive, constructive results in area after area around the world than the beginnings which the U. N. has made into the social and economic field yet the march of technological progress, in some measure as result of assistance which the U. N. has made possible in the field of health, great population increases that are growing around the world, are confronting us despite technological advances, improvement of production methods, or confronting us with a very real, pressing dilemma of standards of living in vast areas of the world and conditions are growing progressively worse instead of better.

This is perhaps the only place in the world where food production has more than kept pace with population increases; where we have actually made a positive gain of some 15 to 20 percent in our ability to produce, grow the food that is needed to meet human needs.

In Asia, while they have restored about prewar production levels, their population increase has been some 15 to 20 percent so that standards of living in Asia will grow progressively worse in the months and years that lie ahead, unless determined steps are taken to correct that.

Even our neighbors in Latin America, with one-third increase in food production, find 40-percent increase in population puts them in worse economic position than before the war.

Your chairman has referred to some small personal experience that I have had in distant parts of the world, in Europe, the Middle East and in Asia. That experience has left me with a very deep conviction that fundamentally human people all over this world are much alike. I think unless we believe that deeply and genuinely and sincerely, we will never conscientiously work toward building the kind of organization that offers some measure of hope for building the basis for world peace.

I have worked and lived inside the Soviet Union for nearly 2 years as an automobile worker, joining a group of technicians from Detroit to help get established the Ford automobile factory there, and I think I have some personal knowledge of the hopes and desires, the things that move and impel just ordinary people inside the Soviet Union. I have returned from some 2½ years working in Europe, living in places with German, Italian, Austrian, and Finnish workers, many of whom are writing a chapter of heroism in the down-to-earth fight against communism, that one Senator McCarthy would do well to read. For the fight against communism is not waged, that fight against totalitarianism is not fought with fancy slogans. In large measure it will be won or lost by what is done down in the shops and mines and mills of this world. The extent to which the democratic cause will be translated into more than just lofty ideals, that is repeated with such eloquence on national occasions, we shall either win or lose that, depending on the kind of life we will breathe into these words, the extent to which we can take the hopes and ideals of democracy, translate them into the bread and butter, into the substance that will give people a stake, personal stake in the democratic cause.

We have not even begun to wage that kind of battle and defense of a free and democratic world. There is a great and disastrous tendency to rely almost exclusively on a military campaign, begun some years ago, before this administration assumed responsibility. But, unfortunately, that trend was not reversed. It was even accelerated. Today, the only real program that we have, which offered any effective hope of putting tools into the hands of people who want to find ways and means of raising their living standards, finding the ways and means of raising their own concepts of democracy closer to them and more real, that economic aid program has all but been destroyed in its real significance, has but been made a symbolic arm of a military assistance program.

Believe me, no alliances anywhere in this world, which are won solely by an economic bribe of assistance, will offer any measure of security to the free world. For it is not so much alliances with governments as alliances with people that offer us some measure of hope for the future.

With what personal experience I have had with some of these people, if democracy would but put its best foot forward, if we would but wage this competitive struggle against the forces of bigotry, intolerance, totalitarianism, with those tools and those instruments which offer us by far the greatest possibilities of success, that is in the economic field, in the social, there is, in my humble opinion, no question at all but democracy would triumph in the end. For it is academic to talk about security from a preponderance of hydrogen or atomic bombs. What security is there for us here or the embattled people in Berlin or Vienna, down in Indochina, or Tokyo; what measure of security can possibly come from the fact that we might possess in a given moment a thousand hydrogen bombs, while the Kremlin forces may only have 800?

Yet, in the social and economic field, we have such a preponderance of the tools of production, the technical know-how, vast surpluses on all hands that even some consider a great catastrophe, these must be forged into a powerful instrument for good, for peace.

I would go further and say that view must not be used unilaterally, but must be used as a demonstration of our faith in a world organization.

I have reason to believe the world was much encouraged last April a year ago when the President of the United States, President Eisenhower, stated very clearly that it was the policy of the United States Government to dedicate an increasingly large measure of its economic resources raising living standards around the world. The United Nations took the first meager step in that direction when it established the organization known as the Sunfed, the United Nations instrument for economic world development, and United States hesitated to commit a paltry sum of $150 or $200 million; a paltry sum, because we have been pouring into economic development programs sums amounting to billions. But even the amounts which we committed under Marshall plan aid is but a drop in the bucket, is infinitesimal when laid side by side with what our expenditures have been in the military field.

Paul Hoffman, early administrator of Marshall aid, has estimated that World War II cost the American people $30 billion for each month of the 44 months. Why, 1 month's outlay in terms of the cost of prosecuting World War II is equal to 9 years of economic aid under the Marshall plan. How can we dare with a clear conscience say to any one, America cannot afford its economic responsibilities. After all, we cannot feed and clothe people everywhere in the world. It is not a matter of feeding and clothing them all, ourselves. It is a question of making clear to millions and millions of people around this world, who are yet uncommitted in the great struggle between the totalitarian and the free world, who believe that America is identified with the forces of imperialism, who believe that we are concerned with aggression and millions of people genuinely believe this. It is time that we set the record clear, not by words alone, but by deeds, and America and the whole West will assume the initiative in this great worldwide struggle. By so doing, I think they will lay the basis to avoid the possibility of a resort to war again. We can take the initiative, if by more than deeds alone we will commit from now for a determined period in the future, for the next 25 or 50 years, through the United Nations, a set amount to help in a concerted effort to raise living standards around the world.

When this is done through the instrument of the United Nations, it will be explicitly clear to those crucial areas of the world where unilateral action is suspect, it will be clear that our motives are genuine, that we have faith in a world organization; that we have faith in world law and order, and are not relying upon any superiority we may have in a hydrogen bomb race.

Can we afford it? Will the American people support it? This organization here, numerous organizations like you across the country which speak for grass root sections of America, ought to do some plain talking, I think, to the American people and tell them what the alternatives are. Either we commit our energies and our resources to this kind of an offensive or we will, whether we like it or not, be forced to commit them in the field of battle. If the American people know there is a choice, they will support you. They will see to it that the halls of Congress, these kind of voices are raised. I think the American people ought to be talked with very frankly, that those are the alternatives, that it is possible to do this; no one can make any guaranties, of course, that the policy of the Kremlin will change.

One thing is certain, this approach, this bold defensive on the peace front, committing vast economic resources to a concerted effort to win the loyalty of people by convincing them that we are interested, convincing them that we are interested in their welfare, will not only hold together the alliance of the free world, which is very shaky today, will win to our side millions who are uncommitted, who are not without doubt because the cause of democracy in this troubled world is in great jeopardy.

There is a lot more this afternoon that I would like to say to you. I know your agenda is heavy. I assured those who were in charge of your conference arrangements that I would not make a long speech. I am delighted with this opportunity to be with you. I want you to know that down in the ranks of the trade unions are people who are genuinely concerned about this problem. They are so concerned within CIO alone that they are contributing annually approximately a quarter-million dollars which goes abroad to help the democratic, non-Communist trade unions in their efforts to fight for a higher standard of living, in their efforts to combat the infiltration and penetration of Communist agents in their own unions.

I told you that I thought some of the most remarkable victories that have been won in this struggle are being chalked up in that area. Believe me, that statement can be backed up with ample evidence. For in the area of military conflict with the Soviet powers, at best we have won a stalemate in certain areas; in others, we are being forced back into open retreat. But where has there been a more smashing victory over the forces of communism than in the struggle of the free trade unions in Berlin, who, though they were completely surrounded by Soviet troops, but an island there in a sea of Red army forces, they have defeated the Communists to a standstill.

Where is there an example such as in little Austria, surrounded also, where in every open and democratic and free election that has been held the Communists have been getting a smaller and smaller percentage of the votes, until today it is less than 3 percent. It is significant that in those countries where living standards are high, and where the non-Communist free trade unions are strong economically in industry, and influential politically, there you have no internal Communist threats, none whatsoever. There is no internal Communist threat in Western Germany, despite the proximity of the Red army. There is no internal Communist threat in Austria, surrounded as she is with all the economic hardships that she must endure as result of the virtual blockade, economic blockage; there is no internal Communist threat in Britain, in Scandinavia, in the Benelux countries, in France and Italy, yes, where living standards are pitifully small, and no military alliance, no technical majority of the National Assembly in Paris. For the free France with its recruiting of French divisions, offer us no security, if those French divisions are as representative of the voting population of France today, for the Communist Party today has the greatest single voting block in France today.

The labor movement in France today is trying to change that by pulling out from the Communists their support in the factories, by leading a concerted effort to effect a higher living standard so the people in France, as well as Italy, feel they have a stake in this democratic society, that in the final analysis will be for helping far more men in securing the freedom of the free world than a military alliance alone.

I don't want to rule out or belittle the importance of military efforts in a period as tense and trying as this. I do want to make clear, it is naive and dangerous to follow the advice of the so-called experts and create the impression that this approach, and this approach alone, of a series of military pacts, regional or otherwise, is the hope for peace. If there must be a war waged, let it be a war waged to win the hearts and minds and souls of human beings to the cause of freedom in democracy.

We need tools in our hands to wage that kind of battle. Let it be the tools of the engineers, the agricultural experts, the health experts, who we ought to be sending out into all the areas of the world. These are the kind of ambassadors who speak with eloquence in other areas and offer some measure of success in our campaign to recruit friends to the cause of freedom. I know in that total effort you, and all of you, in the United States World Federalists, are more than committed; you are dedicated. I know that in this critical chapter of world history, you are making a contribution which is significant, which is a vital contribution to the total effort of free people everywhere, to win a measure not only of security, but of hope for the future.

I thank you very much.

Chairman Wolverton, of Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, Replies to American Medical Association's Letter Opposing President Eisenhower's Health Reinsurance Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 23, 1954

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, it is now generally known that the American Medical Association claims to be responsible for defeating in the House of Representatives on July 13 last, the health reinsurance plan offered as part of President Eisenhower's health program to provide additional medical and hospital facilities for our people at a reduced cost. I am surprised that anyone, much less an organization such as the American Medical Association, would want to claim credit for such. However, strange as it may seem, the American Medical Association did just that.

In the Washington letter No. 80 of the American Medical Association, dated July 16, 1954, issued by Dr. F. E. Wilson, director, there is contained the following:

THE WEEK IN WASHINGTON

You can rest assured that your influence with your representatives played an essential part in the recommittal by the House of the reinsurance bill. * * * Your wires and phone calls pointed out that this legislation was unsound and unnecessary. Other factors were present, including a partisan reaction and a rebellion by some Members against speedup pressure tactics. But we have reviewed what happened and have come to the conclusion that the other elements alone can't explain the vote—238 to 134, with 75 Republicans and 162 Democrats favoring recommittal and 120 Republicans and 14 Democrats opposing. A high percentage of the representatives had received word from you that the physicians of their home districts were convinced the bill was bad legislation—a fact repeatedly brought out in floor debate. I believe that this timely expression gave the various opposition factions the support they needed to make the fight.

The following statement was also included in the same communication:

PRESIDENT PLEDGES CONTINUED FIGHT FOR REINSURANCE

In his press conference the day following the House defeat of reinsurance, President Eisenhower expressed disappointment and made clear he would continue to fight for this legislation. * * * In the Senate, Chairman H. ALEXANDER SMITH, whose Labor and Public Welfare Committee favorably reported a companion bill (S. 3114) July 1, told the Senate he was uncertain what course to pursue now, although he felt the Senate should go through with the measure "and in the debate here demonstrate to the people * * * what this program is."

It was Mr. Eisenhower's contention that those who had voted against the bill "just don't understand what are the facts of American life." Authorizing the unusual procedure of direct quotation, he said: "I don't consider that anyone lost yesterday except the American people. * * * Of course, I am trying to redeem my campaign promises and I will never cease trying. This is only a temporary defeat. This thing will be carried forward as long as I am in this office."

Under date of July 13, 1954, a letter was addressed to me by Dr. George F. Lull, secretary and general manager of the American Medical Association. The letter, however, did not reach me until the day following action in the House. It reads as follows:

AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION,
Chicago, Ill., July 13, 1954.
Hon. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WOLVERTON: I have been asked by the board of trustees of the American Medical Association to review for you our position with respect to H. R. 8356, 83d Congress, an amended version of which has been reported favorably by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and which will be considered by the House of Representatives in the near future.

This bill, as you know, would do two things. First, it would authorize the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to conduct studies and collect and disseminate information concerning the organizational, actuarial, operational and other problems of health service prepayment plans and their carriers. This information and advice would be distributed, upon application, without charge. Secondly, the bill would authorize the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to issue a form of reinsurance to voluntary health service prepayment plans. According to the bill, this reinsurance would be issued, where needed, to "stimulate the establishment and maintenance of adequate prepayment plans in areas, and with respect to services and classes of persons, for which they are needed."

On April 5 a representative of the association testified before the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee in opposition to the bill. Since that time we have reviewed our position in consultation with authorities in the health-insurance field. Officers of the association and members of our staff have met during the past week with representatives of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and at the White House with administration officials.

After these conferences it is our conclusion that the minor amendments which have been adopted do not answer our objections to the proposal and therefore, our position remains the same. We remain opposed to the bill for the following reason:

1. The mechanism suggested will not accomplish the stated purposes of the bill, i. e., to promote the best possible medical care on reasonable terms.

2. The phenomenal progress of the health insurance industry makes Federal intervention not only unnecessary but a dangerous intrusion into a successful area of private enterprise. Such intervention would not help and could hinder continued expansion of health insurance coverage.

3. Reinsurance would not make health insurance more attractive to persons who can afford to pay premiums and have not done so. It would not make health insurance available to the indigent unless the Government provides a subsidy for the purpose of selling insurance for less than the cost of servicing the contract.

4. The program, without subsidy, would not reduce the cost of insurance, nor would it make health insurance available to any additional groups or geographic area that voluntary insurers cannot reach.

5. Most insurance authorities agree that the extent of health insurance liability is such that a Federal reinsurance program is absolutely unnecessary.

6. The measure would place extensive regulatory power in the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. The concentration and delegation of such authority and control over a vital branch of American indus-

try in an Executive Department of the Government without clear and convincing evidence of need cannot be justified.

In view of all of the above factors, it is the opinion of the American Medical Association that considerable more thought and study should be given to the subject measure prior to any favorable consideration.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE F. LULL, M. D.,
Secretary and General Manager.

I answered the above letter on July 22, instant, by letter addressed to Dr. Lull, reading as follows:

JULY 22, 1954.

Dr. GEORGE F. LULL,
Secretary and General Manager, American Medical Association, Chicago, Ill.

DEAR DR. LULL: I have your letter of July 13, 1954, in which you state you had been asked by your board of trustees to review for me your position with respect to H. R. 8356, an amended version of which had been reported favorably by this commitee and was considered by the House last Tuesday, July 13. I regret that your letter was not received until after the bill had been considered on the floor of the House.

In this letter you express your conclusion that the amendments which had been made to the original bill do not answer your objections to the proposal, that you continue to be opposed to the bill for 6 stated reasons, and that it is your opinion that more thought and study should be given to the measure prior to favorable consideration.

I note that in no way whatsoever have you expressed opposition to the bill on any medical grounds, nor on any suggested interference with the practice of medicine, nor on anything having to do whatsoever with the field in which the association's members are engaged. I note, however, that the reasons you have given for your opposition to the bill are all predicated on questions which you have raised in the insurance field, and I should like in this letter to discuss these with you.

Your 6 stated reasons for opposition and my comments thereupon are as follows:

"1. The mechanism suggested will not accomplish the stated purposes of the bill, i. e., to promote the best possible medical care on reasonable terms."

While legislation to accomplish the objective which you have stated is the purpose of this bill might be desirable, you have much too broadly characterized the purpose of this instant legislation. As stated in the bill, the purpose is "to encourage and stimulate private initiative in making good and comprehensive health services generally accessible on reasonable terms, through adequate health service prepayment plans, to the maximum number of people."

We think that the program provided for in this legislation will speed up the process of extending coverage to more people and of improving the protection available. We are supported in this belief by executives of private insurance companies, the Blue Cross, and the American Hospital Association, among others. The objective is to expand as far as possible the areas in which voluntary insurance can be made effective and to reduce to the minimum the areas which cannot be reached by the prepayment method. We have had testimony from carriers that they could experiment more broadly with this kind of backing.

"2. The phenomenal progress of the health insurance industry makes Federal intervenvention not only unnecessary but a dangerous intrusion into a successful area of private enterprise. Such intervention would not help and could hinder continued expansion of health-insurance coverage."

Despite the splendid progress of voluntary insurance to date, a Federal program in this area is necessary. Progress so far has been in the more easily covered areas of large employed groups and their families. The more difficult and doubtful areas of coverage still remain problems. It will take practical experimentation to reach the less easily accessible workers and their families, especially those employed in small groups, the rural workers, and the self-employed; to include the unusually expensive or long-term illness; to remove restrictions on account of age and physical requirements; and to improve the range of services by adding those which are more difficult to administer. The industry itself has indicated the need for study, research and experimentation on these problems. Protection against undue loss can speed up the experimentation and offer broader protection sooner, especillay for medium-sized and smaller companies.

The reinsurance program as outlined in H. R. 8356 could not possibly be a dangerous intrusion. It is voluntary from start to finish—voluntary for the subscribers and policyholders under the reinsured prepayment plans, and voluntary for the carriers who participate on the basis of formal application for inclusion in the program. There is no authority for general regulation of the industry, and reinsurance will not be provided when otherwise available.

The hearings brought out nothing which would support the contention that the reinsurance program could hinder the continued expansion of voluntary health-insurance coverage and much that would refute it.

Federal endorsement of voluntary health insurance will publicize the value of protection and increase public knowledge and appreciation of such protection. Certainly the volume of mail received by the committee from citizens all over the United States supports my belief that the public wants the Federal Government to take a positive and active interest in the health-insurance movement.

"3. Reinsurance would not make health insurance more attractive to persons who can afford to pay premiums and have not done so. It would not make health insurance available to the indigent unless the Government provides a subsidy for the purpose of selling insurance for less than the cost of servicing the contract."

It has been made perfectly clear throughout by the sponsors of this proposal that it is not intended to reach families who are unable to include premiums for health insurance in their family budgets. Those who are able to do so will be more inclined to purchase such protection as it becomes more attractive by the removal of restrictions, by an increase in the days of hospital care paid for, increased coverage of miscellaneous hospital costs and medical services outside the hospital.

"4. The program, without subsidy, would not reduce the cost of insurance, nor would it make health insurance available to any additional groups or geographic area that voluntary insurers cannot reach."

Experimental coverage offered at lower premiums during the initial stages than might otherwise be possible would stimulate a greater public response and increased participation, which in turn would further spread the risk of the new coverage and so lower costs to the individual subscriber or policyholder. It is also within reasonable expectation that the margin of reserve which the companies would consider safe could, if reinsured, be set at a lower level than otherwise possible, and this too, could operate to reduce premium rates. Major medical expense coverage is a possible case in point.

It is not the position of the sponsors that reinsurance will make "insurable," groups which are not so in fact. The purpose is to assist voluntary carriers to push their coverage to the feasible limits at the earliest possible date. What those feasible limits are can only be determined through a planned pattern of practical experimentation. The companies themselves are eager to establish what the practical limits of their markets are. There was testimony that experimentation would be useful on such problems as the following:

(a) Uncertain costs due to changes in the level of costs for services, to changing methods for rendering medical services and to broadened concepts of what properly is included within any particular category of services. Associated with this problem is the fact that insurance coverage itself has the effect of increasing the utilization of medical and hospital services.

(b) Making protection available, on attractive terms, to individuals who cannot be readily covered as members of employed groups—including the self-employed, those employed in very small establishments, those not employed, particularly older people, and those in agricultural employment.

(c) Achieving such a balance of protection as to prevent distorting the pattern of medical services to fit the insurance coverage. Specifically, there are pressures to place a patient in a hospital for diagnostic and other medical services simply because the cost of those services is reimbursable only when performed in a hospital and without regard to the most economical method of providing the services. Unnecessary hospitalization induced by some kinds of coverage aggravates the overcrowding of hospitals and increases cost of medical care.

"5. Most insurance authorties agree that the extent of health insurance liability is such that a Federal reinsurance program is absolutely unnecessary."

It has been argued by some that reinsurance is not suited to the risks involved in voluntary health insurance. This contention presumably rests on the premise that no single individual health and accident insurance risk could mount up so high as to require reinsurance as is the case in the life insurance industry. Howevcr, this overlooks the fact that the program proposed under H. R. 8356 would reinsure entire plans—no individual policies. Aggregate costs under a new health insurance plan in a new area of protection could be large and unexpected. Insurance premium rates and underwriting practices are based, in general, on past insurance experience, but, in offering new benefits, no such past experience is available. Judgment estimates must be made on the basis of general statistical data or perhaps the results of special surveys where they have been made. Premium rates and practices developed on this basis must be tested by observation of the actual experience under new offerings. During these evolutionary stages the combined losses on individual claims can be substantial. This program would put a limit on possible losses and so encourage the undertaking of new offerings.

Reinsurance would not be applied for, and therefore not provided, unless it was necessary and useful to the individual carrier who wished to have it for a particular plan.

"6. The measure would place extensive regulatory power in the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. The concentration and delegation of such authority and control over a vital branch of American industry in an executive department of the Government without clear and convincing evidence of need cannot be justified."

The bill does not authorize regulation of the insurance business by the Federal Government, as some have contended. On the contrary, the bill gives full recognition to the principle of general State regulatory authority in the field of insurance. The purpose clause reaffirms the policy declared by the 79th Congress in the act of March 9, 1945, entitled "An act to express the intent of the Congress with reference to the regulation of the business of insurance," and expressly disclaims any authorization of administrative action inconsistent with that policy.

The Secretary would be given no general regulatory power over any phase of the insurance business. The bill's grant of authority to make necessary regulations is limited to administrative regulations for purposes of the Federal program. What is authorized here is the establishment of reasonable conditions for participation in a governmental program which the individual carrier may take advantage of if he chooses. Departmental regulations would have no operative effect as to carriers who had filed no formal application for approval for purposes of reinsurance; nor would they apply to policies or subscriber contracts not written in pursuance of plans for which reinsurance was sought.

The bill allows a considerable area of discretion in the establishment of the terms and conditions for participation in the program but it was pretty generally agreed by those presenting testimony at the hearings that any such standards would not only have to be worked out in consultation with expert advisers, and representatives of carriers and other interested groups, but they would also have to be subject to modification and revision in the light of operating experience as the program developed. The bill, however, provides several safeguards. There are specific limitations on the extent to which the Secretary may concern himself with premium rates; retroactive effect of new requirements is prohibited; and acceptance for reinsurance of a direct-service plan which permits lay control of professional matters is forbidden. Furthermore, section 303 (b) requires appropriate consultation with the advisory council and other interested groups, including representatives of State insurance agencies prior to the establishment of terms and conditions for reinsurance. Section 403 requires the Secretary to include in his annual report to the Congress a summary of the recommendations of the advisory council, including minority views, if any.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES A. WOLVERTON,
Chairman.

Mr. Speaker, in my reply I have endeavored to set forth my views and what I consider controlling factors that show the need of legislation such as the President's plan for health reinsurance (H. R. 8356) and that it is sound and in full accord with American principles. I have made the reply as complete as possible so that physicians throughout the Nation who are not familiar with the provisions of the bill will thereby know that there is nothing violative of American principles contained in the bill. Furthermore, it contains no single feature that would justify anyone in raising the old cry of "socialized medicine." It is legislation that could prove not only beneficial to our people, but also to our physicians in providing a wise and worthwhile extension of Blue Cross and similar prepayment health plans that have met such a favorable reaction by our people throughout the Nation.

Communist Tactics in the Use of Narcotics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 23, 1954

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, shocking new evidence of Red China's outrageous and immoral efforts to subvert the free world has recently been presented to the American people and members of the United Nations.

Reporting to the United Nations Commission on Narcotic Drugs in May of this year, Federal Narcotic Commissioner Harry J. Anslinger once again gave documented facts regarding Communist China's dope peddling among American GI's in the Far East. This planned degradation of Americans not only enfeebles and neutralizes our military efforts, it is filling Communist coffers with profits to be used to advance the Communist cause wherever possible.

Again this month Mr. Anslinger, testifying before a subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, warned of the depths to which the Communists will stoop to spread narcotic addiction among our soldiers. As Mr. Anslinger testified, this is not the policy of one man in the Communist regime. This is the policy of the entire Communist regime in Peiping.

Mr. Speaker, this infamous and iniquitous business needs to be exposed as completely as possible. This plot to weaken the anti-Communist nations through subversion by debauchery cannot succeed if free people are informed of the threat and take proper safeguards against it. This, I submit, is an issue which should be thoroughly considered in any debate bearing on Red China's plea for admission to the United Nations.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include herein an editorial which appeared in the Newark Star-Ledger of July 20, 1954. The editor has forcefully and effectively highlighted the need for immediate countermeasures in dealing with this diabolic communistic plot.

The editorial follows:

DESTRUCTION OF AMERICANS

The depth of human depravity seems to be limitless with the Communists in Asia.

According to testimony by Harry J. Anslinger, United States Commissioner of Narcotics, before a subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, an undisclosed number of American GI's have become addicts of narcotics. Blame for this tragic situation was laid by Anslinger directly at the door of the Communists in Korea and Japan.

Anslinger said further that the Reds were engaged in a deliberate "attempt to neutralize the soldiers" by selling them heroin and other narcotics, and that "a substantial number of American troops have been addicted."

The worst of it was that the "situation is not under control * * * but the Armed Forces are doing their best."

Coming from a man with Anslinger's reputation for reliability and understatement, his report should shock the American people into demanding the strictest kind of control of the drug traffic which the Communists are using as part of a deliberate campaign to destroy the minds and bodies of American GI's.

Thus far the United States and 35 other nations have signed a protocol intended to cut world opium production from 2,000 tons annually to the 500 needed for medical purposes. The Senate has still to ratify this protocol, but it is hard to see what effect this will have on Communist efforts to flood the free world with drugs.

Measures to prevent this wanton distruction of Americans can be effective only from constant vigilance and hard-hitting on the part of the military commands.

Declaration of Interdependence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM M. TUCK
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 23, 1954

Mr. TUCK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an able and inspiring sermon delivered by Dr. John K. Roberts, pastor of the First Presbyterian Church, Danville, Va., on July 4, 1954.

The sermon reads as follows:

DECLARATION OF INTERDEPENDENCE

"Nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more." (Isaiah 2: 4.)

This past week I read again the Declaration of Independence. Though, as you know, it is concerned for the most part with indictments against George III, it is, nevertheless, one of the noblest and most courageous documents ever written. While reading it these thoughts arose: "Do we have men today who can think as clearly as did Jefferson and company? Do we still have men with the insights and raw courage of Patrick Henry and company? Does any of the sacrificial spirit of the Revolutionary days live in the hearts of modern Americans?"

Perhaps these and other questions should be put to us on this Independence Sunday, for these are serious days. Should we not bring ourselves then to take an inventory? To look at our country? To face ourselves? The look at the world of nations, and to consider the possibilities of the future? If on this hot, humid Fourth of July we are ready for such a searching of heart, then the first question is:

I. Who are we, the people? There are approximately 160 million Americans. We are representatives of all races: but who are we? Answers to this question fall into two broad categories. One opinion held by political philosophers, and other leaders, is that man has no real or lasting significance; from the dust he has come and to the dust he shall return. While he is on the earth he may be used to promote the good of society. Man is nothing more than a unit of work, or a unit of military power. He is a small thinking animal; he is a useful insect. But the average man according to this theory does not, and cannot recognize his best interests. He must have the direction of the state and the leaders thereof. This evaluation of man is held in various parts of the world. And wherever it is held, man is debased and exploited, his life is miserable and hard; he is little more than a slave.

On the other hand there are nations where the individual is most highly esteemed. Man is considered but a little lower than the angels. Some Western peoples have thought of themselves as the elect of God. Many Americans have come to believe that because they are Americans, they are the greatest, wisest, and best of all the peoples that live or have ever lived. Multitudes have come to the state of thinking that ruled the minds of the ancient Greeks and Romans during the heyday of their civilizations. In this country man is not an animal, or an insect, or an industrial unit, he is superior citizen of a superior state, and destined to remain superior.

Perhaps the truth of man's worth is somewhere between these two extremes. The cue is found in the Declaration of Independence itself: "We hold these truths to be self-evident; that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." If we Americans are inclined to think of ourselves as sons of God, let us not forget that in this sense all men are God's sons. And if we are inclined to think of ourselves as special sons of God, as the elect, let us recognize the fact that we are elect for a purpose and not for privilege; that our election is to extend the rule of the true living God among all peoples and nations. If we fail in this we shall go down like all nations have gone down.

II. The second question is: "From whence have we come?" Sometimes in order to determine where we are, to get a bearing, we have to know where we have come from. A knowledge of the past is necessary in order to appraise aright the present and to chart the future. A recent writer describes the strange actions of a boat captain: "In the northern Michigan peninsula there is a bend in the river through which Great Lakes steamers, navigating a short cut on their way to Duluth, require some unusual piloting. At this point the captain, standing at the stern, facing backward, gets his bearings from a great tree on a low hill, then swings the giant ship around the sharp turn with only a few feet of clearance between the banks. The pilot looks backward not with nostalgia for that which is behind, but that from the conspicuous landmarks in that direction, he may steer his ship safely ahead."

Has not the moment arrived, this July 4, when we should turn to look at the history of this Nation, to focus our eyes upon the great landmarks of our past that we may help steer the ship of state safely ahead? When we look to the past the most significant truth that stands out is this—that our forefathers founded this Nation "under God." Strong men came to these shores to find freedom, to establish a just society, to pursue and to promote the happiness of all men, but they sought these things "under God." In the first colonial grant made to Sir Walter Raleigh, he was instructed to enact statutes for the government of the colony * * * provided that "they be not against the true Christian faith." The charter of New England in 1620 was granted with the hope that there might be the "enlargement of the Christian religion to the glory of 'God Almighty.'" The charters of all the colonies bore true testimony to the Christian faith and expressed hopes for the propagation of that faith. The charters of the first schools and colleges revealed that the purposes of such institutions were to train and educate men for church and State. Many States declared that no one could hold office who did not believe in Jesus Christ and the Scriptures. The Declaration of Independence ends with these words: "We, therefore, the representatives of the United States of America, in General Congress assembled, appealing to the Supreme Judge of the world for the rectitude of our intentions * * * and for the support of this declaration, with a firm reliance on the protection of divine providence, we mutually pledge to each other our lives, our fortunes and our sacred honor."

Haven't we drifted away from these moorings and this course?

III. This brings us to the third question: "What are we doing; how are we faring?" There is no comparison between the United States of America of July 4, 1776, and of July 4, 1954. There is the difference between 3 million citizens and 160 million; between a few scattered towns on the eastern seaboard and the many gleaming cities that now stretch from shore to shore; between a few industries, and the great factories and foundries that could supply the needs of the world. There is no way to measure the strength of the United States. Just a few days ago a British paper acknowledged that this country is by far the most powerful Nation in all of man's history.

Materially, we are very strong. But, what about our spiritual and moral strength? In these respects have we gained ground or lost ground in these 178 years? The evidence is overwhelming that we have lost ground. The United States has experienced a serious breakdown in character in these last years. Just recently, we have had this added testimony: A former State governor, now dead, embezzled more than $300,000; many businessmen will be indicted because of their dishonesty in dealing with the FHA; our greatest scientist admits that he is a common liar. The late Huey Long said, "I can buy legislators like sacks of potatoes." And so it goes. What has happened to us? The answer is simple. As a people we have turned away from God. Belief in God, reverence for Him, a willingness to serve Him are the only bases for character, morality, ethics, and high purpose. Gen. Omar Bradley made this wise observation in replying to the question: "What is wrong with our age?" "We have too many men of science, too few of God. We have grasped the mystery of the atom and rejected the Sermon on the Mount * * * the world has achieved brilliance without wisdom, power without conscience. Ours is a world of nuclear giants and ethical infants. We know more about war than we know about peace; more about killing than we know about living."

What are we trying to do in this Nation? Are the men in Washington seeking to complete the ideal of the American democracy, or are they playing pork-barrel politics? Are our leaders determined to keep the American standard of living high even in the face of world starvation? Are we the people so addicted to comforts and pleasures that we scorn all disciplines and all responsibilities of the concerned life? The answers to these questions will determine the future of the United States and how the Fourth of July will be celebrated in 1976. These questions bring us to the last question.

IV. Where are we going? We could be headed to destruction. On April 7, 1869, an article appeared in the Journal of the Goncourt Brothers describing a conversation between two leading scientists of that day in which they predicted that in a hundred years "man would know of what the atom is constituted and would be able to create life [synthetically] in competition with God." "We have a feeling," the journal states, "that when this time comes to science God with His white beard will come down to the earth swinging a bunch of keys, and will say to humanity, the way they say at 5 o'clock at the saloon, 'Closing time, gentlemen.'"

It could be close to 5 o'clock. Mr. William L. Laurence, science reporter of the New York Times, tells us in graphic words of our immediate danger. "It is," he said, "because the hydrogen cobalt bomb could be exploded from an unmanned barge in the middle of the ocean [Pacific]. It could be made of any weight desired. It could, for example, * * * produce 7.5 tons of radioactive cobalt, equal to nearly 5 million pounds of radium. * * * The radioactive dust would reach California in about a day, and New York in 4 or 5 days, killing most life as it traverses the continent. * * * Four hundred 1-ton cobalt bombs would release enough radioactivity to extinguish all life on the earth."

There is now the possibility of race suicide—of a war that will in truth end all wars. However—and this the biggest however of all—this war of destruction is not inevitable. This we must believe, and our leaders must believe. Russian leaders are cruel and ruthless, but they are not mad like Hitler. They are chess players, and they are not going to move unless it is to their advantage. They are not going to plunge the world into a war that will destroy themselves along with others. So there is yet time. And something else, too: Where there is a tremendous will there is always a way. Think of the plight of the colonists in 1776. Every odd was against them. By every rule of logic, by every standard of power, they should have failed. But over against all the odds was the indefatigable will of a few men, and this will made the way of victory.

If we of this Nation, under God, are ready to dedicate our wills and our lives to seeking the things of peace, we can have a world wherein honorable peace shall reign among nations. In these closing moments let us consider the things that would make for peace. First of all, we, as individuals, should strive to rise to new levels of spiritual and ethical ideals. Here is a challenge that comes to every person who calls himself a Christian, and to every one who would have a part in the salvation of the world: "I must think higher thoughts, and achieve more Christlike attitudes, and seek to love all men everywhere."

The second step—and this fires our imagination—we should continue the American Revolution: There is no reason why the ideas of equality, liberty, and independence cannot be made the most contagious force let loose in the world while the fever of communism runs its course. We have been seeking military bases; let us seek bases in the hearts of all men. Let us go to the peoples of the earth, people who live in the little villages and in backward countries, with this political gospel. Let us say to them, "We believe that all governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed and not from some colonial power (whether from Russia or others); that every nation should have the right to self-determination; that every nation should have its independence, free from management or control of another nation. Let us assure you that we believe that every people is equal to every other, and all stand on the same footing." If these ideas were preached and practiced by the big powers among the little countries, it wouldn't be long before all tensions would be reduced, and nation would not be tempted to lift up sword against nation.

The third step in the way of peace is that people of good will begin immediately a war of kindly service through the United Nations and through the church of Jesus Christ. Let the U. N. be encouraged in all its auxiliary services, such as the World Health Organization, the Food and Agriculture Organization, that helps to win the battle of food against population, the child-welfare program that last year distributed food to nearly 600,000 children. Let us go forward again with the point 4 program and make it the world development authority, and send it into all the impoverished areas of the world. The greatest role in this new war of kindly service can be played by the church of Christ. The time has come for the church to multiply its efforts on the mission fields of the world and to put into the hands of our old and our new missionaries, moneys with which to build adequate schools, colleges, churches, and hospitals. The time has come to put into the field trained agriculturists, cattlemen, industrialists, engineers to help the peoples of the world help themselves.

Dr. Karl Menninger, famed psychiatrist, made this suggestion in connection with peace for the world: "Now if we are sincere in believing that love can be furthered and hate overcome * * * if we are sincere in wanting to win this victory over hate, each for himself and all for the world, I should think it would be most important, for our spiritual leaders, the clergy, to set us the example of humble petition. * * * It seems to me more worthy of the God I believe in for us to pray for more love in our world than to pray for more rain in our country." This, of course, is the last step in the way of peace.

We, as Christians, can pray a thousand times more effectively than we are praying; for our President who himself is a man of prayer, for the Congress, for the United Nations delegates (the Laymen's Movement for a Christian World prints all the names of all the delegates). Frank Laubach states that he has written every Moslem, Buddhist, and Hindu delegate telling them of his prayers. Each of them answered his letter with a word of thanks. We should pray for the Russian leaders and write them of our prayers and hopes. In the war of amazing kindness we should spend 10 times as much effort to help others help themselves and a hundred times as much prayer for men of great opportunity.

Where are we going from here? America could lead the peoples of the earth into the united kingdom of God wherein, as the prophet Isaiah declared many centuries ago: "Nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more." For the time has come when nations must live and help live; or together perish from the earth. Then, let us, peoples and nations, this day, recognize and declare our dependence upon God Almighty, and our interdependence, each upon the other, that we may live happily and not die miserably.

Extending Time of Korean GI Bill of Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 21, 1954

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, the bill now pending—H. R. 9888—is worthy in its purpose and should have unanimous approval.

The purpose of the bill is, first, to extend the commencement and completion dates under the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952, and, second, to extend the time for the completion of vocational rehabilitation training of certain disabled veterans of World War II and the Korean service period.

The bill would extend for an additional year the periods during which a veteran of service on or after June 27, 1950—Korean veteran—can initiate and pursue education or training. Today a Korean veteran must initiate his program by August 20, 1954, or by the date 2 years after his discharge, whichever is the later. He must complete it within 7 years after his discharge. The bill now before the House would extend these 2- and 7-year periods to 3 and 8 years, respectively.

Unless the law is amended as proposed, it is anticipated that there will be veterans who, for lack of such an extension, would be deprived of their opportunity to pursue education or training.

The bill also will provide time relief for the service-connected disabled group who take training under existing law. The service-connected group receive training of such character and of such duration to permit them to regain their civilian aptitudes or to create new aptitudes to enable them to overcome the handicaps caused by their service-incurred disabilities and thus regain employability.

There is no initiation date, as such, for such training. However, there is an overall completion date for World War II veterans of July 25, 1956—9 years after the termination of World War II for this purpose—and for Korean veterans of 9 years after the termination by Presidential proclamation or congressional resolution of the basic service period which began June 27, 1950.

The bill now under consideration in the House extends these completion dates from the present 9 years to 13 years in the cases of those disabled veterans who are basically eligible for the benefit but who have been unable to pursue vocational rehabilitation training within the present time limitations because of illness, or because of one of the other two compelling reasons specified in the bill.

Thus, in addition to the mentioned veterans for whom timely persuit of vocational rehabilitation training was not medically feasible, the bill would provide a like extension for the group of veterans who upon leaving the service received a discharge of a character which rendered them ineligible for these benefits but who subsequently have had their discharges corrected by competent authority. A third category concerns the group of veterans who have not met the requirement as to the establishment of a service-connected disability until a date which would not afford sufficient time prior to the existing terminal date in which to complete a course.

The purpose of the bill is readily discernible and certainly is most commendable. I give my wholehearted support to the bill and trust that it will be finally enacted into law. The men who suffered the sacrifices in Korea are entitled to the consideration this legislation seeks to give.

Socialistic Trend Is Detected

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 20, 1954

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by David Lawrence:

SOCIALISTIC TREND IS DETECTED—OPPONENTS OF DIVIDEND TAX RELIEF CALLED DEMAGOGS; LEFTWING ACCUSED OF ENCOURAGING HITLERISM

(By David Lawrence)

Although not outwardly identifiable as clearly as the socialistic groups that have broken up European parliaments, the Congress of the United States in the session now at its climax is also revealing deep-seated cleavages of an ideological nature.

On the surface, the controversy over whether to tax corporations twice—once when the profits are confiscated at a rate of 52 percent and once when the stockholder gets his dividend and pays a second tax—is supposed to be a contest between rich and poor. That's what the demagogs would have the public believe, but actually it is a contest between those who would confiscate the savings of the workingman and those who would stimulate thrift and give private capitalism a much needed stimulus.

For, unless investors have incentives for employing their funds as risk capital in American enterprises, the Government—the state—must provide the capital. That's the road to state socialism and Hitlerism. Yet the leftwing, which professes such an abhorrence of everything Hitlerlike, is behind the drive to prevent the encouragement of private investors.

The investor who buys bonds pays an income tax on the interest he receives, but he can invest in tax-exempt municipal or State bonds. As for corporate bonds, companies get a deduction for the interest they pay out. In this way the creation of more and more debt has been encouraged, whereas the use of risk capital has been discouraged because the corporations get no deduction for dividend payments—the sums they pay out for the use of capital.

America has been built up by risk capital. The investor in the early years of this country's development took a chance on the success or failure of an enterprise and, if it was successful, he got a reward commensurate with his risk.

But in recent years risk capital has been increasingly hard to find for the use of American business. For new enterprises, it has been even harder to get. Most new enterprises have been launched by already existing large companies with fat treasuries—an encouragement to monopoly and a discouragement to competition by smaller companies with inadequate capital.

In contrast to the socialistic trend under the New Deal and the Fair Deal, the Eisenhower administration set out to recognize in the new tax law the basic idea that a dividend payment should have some tax relief for the investor. While the amount is relatively small, the new bill just out of conference does recognize the principle of opposition to double taxation. It will give a lift to American enterprise and mean more jobs for the workers in existing businesses and more businesses that will create new jobs. Yet there are many Democrats and a few Republicans who take a demagogic view and would stifle the incentives that help private enterprise.

The same ideological prejudice has arisen on the issue of public versus private power. About 30 years ago the American people were told that rivers should be opened to navigation and that whatever byproducts in electric power became available would be incidental. Warnings against this deception went unheeded, and now the Tennessee Valley Authority has become a major public-power development.

Many taxpayers in the North and West and East are taxed heavily to pay for a local power development that serves only one region. If this principle were applied fairly to other sections of the country where rivers could be used to generate power, it would put the Government in the power business on a national scale.

The debate in the Senate this week about atomic power involves the same basic question. If atomic energy is to be solely a Government development, then the state will control many business enterprises directly or indirectly. Instead of leasing the facilities to the highest bidders and letting private capital do the job—and supply the Government with taxes out of its profits—there are some Republicans and many Democrats who believe in the Government-ownership doctrine. They would deny that they want the Government to own everything. But there isn't much difference between putting the Government in the power business and putting it into the food-store business or in the management of department stores and other retail enterprises. Then almost everybody would be employed by the Government, as in Soviet Russia.

At a time when the budget is strained and taxes are high there are some Members of Congress who want the Government to make large outlays for powerplants of all kinds. The Eisenhower administration's view is that private business—which pays taxes on its profits—should have the opportunity to do that work and that the state should get out of private business and stay out. It would be an interesting issue for the campaign, for, if they fully understood, the American people would promptly reject the doctrines of state socialism which so often have led to paths of communism and an all-powerful state.

Business Organizations Join Farmers in Support of My Bill To Provide Orderly Marketing Processes for Dairy Products

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 11, 1954

Mr. HAGEN of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, few people realize that the dairy industry is actually the greatest single industry in volume in the United States. There is not a man, woman, or child in America who is not a customer in one form or another of some dairy products. But in spite of its importance to our health and our economy, the dairy industry has too often been neglected and actually impeded in its efforts to establish orderly marketing procedures.

To help correct the situation, I have discussed the complex problems with representatives of farm organizations, dairy processors and individual dairy farmers and businessmen. As a result of these discussions, I have introduced H. R. 8359, a bill which provides for a mandatory price support through March 31, 1956 for milk and butterfat used in manufacturing dairy products.

My bill is designed to maintain the productive capacity of our dairy farming industry, to promote the orderly marketing of an adequate national supply of milk and dairy products, to encourage increased domestic consumption of dairy products in the interest of the national health and security.

Mr. Speaker, safeguarding this great industry is a problem for immediate attention. It is well and good to be concerned about helping other peoples and other nations, but I believe we can do more in fighting the Communist menace which threatens our country and the world, by maintaining a strong and efficient economy at home, than by squandering our substance worldwide while depriving our own people of needed benefits.

If this bill is passed, it will immediately give encouragement and confidence to the nearly 6 million farm families who are concerned one way or another with the dairy industry and to the several millions of people in urban communities who depend for their livelihood upon that industry. It will insure adequate supplies of milk and butterfat so that there will be no danger of failure of the supply of this vital food for our children. It will add to the national prosperity. It will help to stabilize our whole agricultural plant.

I hope that the Members of the House will give serious consideration to this bill so that we may pass it quickly as assurance to the farmer and the dairy industry that they have not been deserted by their Government, and that Congress is concerned with keeping the dairy industry solvent and healthy.

Increase in Compensation and Pension to Veterans and Their Dependents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 21, 1954

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, the bill now before the House (H. R. 9020) is a compromise bill. Consequently, it is not pleasing to many of us who feel that it does not provide sufficient increases in the monthly rates of compensation and pension to veterans and their dependents. Nor, does it provide any increase to many veterans and dependents. However, insufficient though it may be, we who are friends of the veterans will vote for the bill because if we do not do so, then there will be no increases in benefits for anyone during this session of Congress.

In my opinion, it was unfair and unjust to bring this bill before the House under a procedure that does not permit any amendment of the bill. It should have been brought before us under a rule that would permit amendments. If such had been done the many inequities that now are in the bill would not have been permitted to remain. They would have been eliminated and benefits in the amount fixed by the original bill reported to the Veterans' Committee by its subcommittee would have been adopted.

The original bill would have granted an increase of 10 percent straight across the board for all veterans and dependents now entitled to compensation or pension—and in some cases an even greater increase—was provided for.

This compromise bill now before us not only cuts the increase in benefits down to 5 percent, but eliminates many classes that should have had, and were rightly entitled to have, an increase.

There are approximately 975,000 veterans, veterans' widows, and dependents of veterans according to the Veterans' Administration records, who have been deleted from receiving any benefits under the bill now before the House. This includes some 482,000 veterans of World War I and World War II and Korean veterans who now receive a nonservice-connected pension. This deletion also includes 311,000 dependents of veterans of World War I and World War II and Korean veterans whose husbands or fathers lost their lives in the service of our country. Also 61,000 Spanish-American War Veterans and 82,000 Spanish-American War veterans' dependents. The average of Spanish-American War veterans has reached 75 years, but there is no increase provided for them nor for the few Civil War veterans' beneficiaries who still remain, as well as the few Indian war veterans and their dependents. There is no doubt that each of the classes I have mentioned should have had an increase in benefits to meet the increased cost of living.

The Committee on Veterans' Affairs is still fighting by means of a separate bill to provide increases for those veterans and their dependents that were left out of the bill now before us. I hope we can get such a bill before the House and have it adopted before we adjourn. I regret to say, however, that this is very doubtful because of the pending adjournment so close at hand. However, it is the duty of each of us to fight on in the effort to correct the deficiencies of the bill now before the House. It is hoped that when the bill comes before the Senate the veterans and their dependents will receive more considerate treatment. Nothing can more clearly demonstrate the tremendous cut that has been made in the original bill than to consider the comparative cost of that bill and the present bill. The cost of the initial bill as reported by the Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs was $289 million. This sum was pared down and reduced by the full committee to $231,722,000. Now the cost of the bill as finally pared down, in order to get it before the House, is only $109,854,000. Thus the total reduction amounts to $121,868,000 from the amount of the original bill reported by the committee.

This is without a doubt an injustice to the men who fought for our country and their dependents. It is not right to cut down the benefits due the defenders of our country and their dependents in this manner. And, yet within a few days before this Congress adjourns we will be called upon to appropriate $3 billion or $3½ billion for foreign aid. It is time America awoke to the obligations we owe to our national defenders. It is time America realized that our obligations to our servicemen exceeds that which we owe to any foreign nation. It is time we gave first consideration to our veterans and their dependents.

While it is deplorable that so many of our veterans are not included in this pending bill, yet it is gratifying that at least 2 million veterans, some 68,000 widows as well as 242,000 dependent parents will benefit as is shown in the following table:

Veterans:	
Korea	135,800
World War II	1,623,700
World War I	213,100
Spanish War	400
Regular:	
Wartime	1,500
Peacetime	61,900
Total	2,036,400

Widows:	
Korea	3,300
World War II	26,400
World War I	31,700
Spanish War	975
Regular:	
Wartime	325
Peacetime	6,000
Total	68,700

Parents:	
Korea	19,000
World War II	194,400
World War I	20,400
Spanish War	20
Regular:	
Wartime	1,480
Peacetime	7,300
Total	242,700

A more detailed explanation of the categories for which increased benefits have been provided for in the bill, and the amounts thereof is as follows:

INCREASED RATES OF COMPENSATION—PROPOSED SUBSTITUTE FOR H. R. 9020

Veterans' compensation—All wars and peacetime

	Present law war service-connected rates, Veterans Regulation 1 (a), as amended, pt. I	Substitute amendment	Present law peacetime service-connected rates, Veterans Regulation 1 (a), as amended, pt. II	Substitute amendment
(*a*) 10 percent disability	$15.75	$17.00	$12.60	$14.00
(*b*) 20 percent disability	31.50	33.00	25.20	26.00
(*c*) 30 percent disability	47.25	50.00	37.80	40.00
(*d*) 40 percent disability	63.00	66.00	50.40	53.00
(*e*) 50 percent disability	86.25	91.00	69.00	73.00
(*f*) 60 percent disability	103.50	109.00	82.80	87.00
(*g*) 70 percent disability	120.75	127.00	96.60	102.00
(*h*) 80 percent disability	138.00	145.00	110.40	116.00
(*i*) 90 percent disability	155.25	163.00	124.20	130.00
(*j*) Total disability	172.50	181.00	138.00	145.00
(*k*) Anatomical loss, or loss of use of a creative organ, or 1 foot, or 1 hand, or blindness of 1 eye, having only light perception, rates (*a*) to (*j*) increased monthly by	47.00	47.00	37.60	37.60
Anatomical loss, or loss of use of a creative organ, or 1 foot, or 1 hand, or blindness of 1 eye, having only light perception, in addition to requirement for any of rates in (*l*) to (*n*), rate increased monthly for each loss or loss of use by	[1] 47.00	[1] 47.00	[2] 37.60	[2] 37.60
(*l*) Anatomical loss, or loss of use of both hands, or both feet, or 1 hand and 1 foot, or blind both eyes with 5/200 visual acuity or less, or is permanently bedridden or so helpless as to be in need of regular aid and attendance, monthly compensation	266.00	279.00	212.80	223.00
(*m*) Anatomical loss, or loss of use of 2 extremities at a level, or with complications, preventing natural elbow or knee action with prosthesis in place, or suffered blindness in both eyes, rendering him so helpless as to be in need of regular aid and attendance, monthly compensation	313.00	329.00	250.40	263.00
(*n*) Anatomical loss of 2 extremities so near shoulder or hip as to prevent use of prosthetic appliance, or suffered anatomical loss of both eyes, monthly compensation	353.00	371.00	282.40	297.00
(*o*) Suffered disability under conditions which would entitle him to 2 or more rates in (*l*) to (*n*), no condition being considered twice, or suffered total deafness in combination with total blindness with 5/200 visual acuity or less, monthly compensation	400.00	420.00	320.00	336.00
(*p*) In event disabled person's service-incurred disabilities exceed requirements for any of rates prescribed, Administrator, in his discretion, may allow next higher rate, or intermediate rate, but in no event in excess of	400.00	420.00	320.00	336.00
(*q*) Minimum rate for arrested tuberculosis	67.00	67.00	53.60	53.60

[1] But in no event to exceed $420.

[2] But in no event to exceed $336.

Section 2 increases the rate of compensation for widows without children from $75 to $87 monthly. Dependent parents are increased from $60 to $75 and where two parents are living from $35 to $40 each.

Cost:	
Veterans	$60,045,000
Widows	9,722,000
Parents	40,087,000
Total	109,854,000

AEC as Power Broker

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 23, 1954

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Washington Daily News of July 13. It is presumed that this editorial not only expresses the opinion of the Daily News but of all other newspapers in the Scripps-Howard chain:

AEC AS A POWER BROKER

Protests against the President ordering the United States Atomic Energy Commission to sign a 25-yeas contract with a private power syndicate to buy electricity for the Tennessee Valley Authority have now provoked the administration, and some of its Democratic and Republican friends, to hurry to Mr. Eisenhower's defense.

We still think it is wrong for the President to use the AEC in this fashion as a power broker for another agency which is itself the biggest integrated power operator in the world.

And those who so loudly try to defend or explain the President's error in this case have not yet got to the heart of the issue.

The heart of the issue is that a majority of the United States Atomic Energy Commission—3 Commissioners out 5—was against the contract the President wants signed.

Commissioner Henry D. Smyth and Eugene M. Zuckert, then one of the AEC Commissioners, wrote to the Budget Bureau last April 16. Among other things they said:

"Under this proposal the Atomic Energy Commission would be used as a vehicle for the supply of 600,000 kilowatts of power in the Memphis area. * * * The proposed action involves the AEC in a matter remote from its responsibilities. * * * The present proposal would create a situation whereby the AEC would be contracting for power not one kilowatt of which would be used in connection with the Commission production activities. The creation of such a contractual relationship would place upon the Commission a continuing responsibility during the 25-year life of the contract for stewardship in respect to matters irrelevant to the mission of the Commission."

The third Atomic Commissioner, Thomas E. Murray, said if the AEC enters into a contract with the private power syndicate "we would not cancel, at least at the moment * * * any TVA contracts but would be negotiating for a bulk of power that is not needed by our present or projected production facilities. * * * The Atomic Energy Commission would be used as a vehicle to supply the expanding needs of the Memphis area."

Then Commissioner Murray added: "Since our program is not advanced by these negotiations and the subsequent administration of this 25-year contract, I do not believe that it is desirable for the Atomic Energy Commission to perform a function that another agency of Government could perhaps more logically perform."

We stand with those three Atomic Commissioners. We believe they were right when they took their stand against the idea of AEC becoming a power broker for the TVA.

We believe they are still right.

The country—indeed, the whole free world—depends upon our atomic might.

The Atomic Energy Commission administers our atomic program.

It should not be saddled with extraneous duties and responsibilities which have no relation whatever with its primary task.

To force these duties and responsibilities upon the AEC is, in our opinion, dangerous to our national defense.

Silly Regulations Keep Surplus Food From Poor People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 23, 1954

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct attention to an important newspaper story which appeared in Labor's Daily on Friday, July 23, 1954.

It is my feeling that not nearly enough emphasis is being placed upon distribution for consumption of our so-called surplus foods. Large categories of persons right here in the United States need more adequate diets. Until all Americans have adequate diets, food is not surplus.

The article follows:

SILLY REGULATIONS KEEP SURPLUS FOOD FROM POOR PEOPLE

UNIONTOWN, PA.—Bitter complaints are coming in from the coal-mining regions that the Federal surplus food program for the unemployed is bogging down in red tape and "silly" regulations.

Recently thousands of applicants for surplus food in Uniontown and neighboring towns had to line up at an old brewery and then wait 3 to 4 hours before they could obtain their food allotments. Many applicants were forced to leave before reaching the head of the line. One woman fainted in the crush which was so large that extra police were called out.

In Kentucky Judge James M. Caudill of Letcher County reported that the surplus commodities "were received in insufficient quantities and at such distance shipping centers as to make it almost impossible for counties such as ours, with limited finances, to administer effectively and adequately."

SURPLUS DISTRIBUTION SPARING

Sam Caddy, president of District 30, United Mine Workers of America, is quoted as saying:

"The facts are that Kentucky, including the mining areas, is one of the States very hard hit by unemployment and yet the surplus commodities were distributed sparingly, certainly insufficient to satisfy the hunger of people who have no jobs and no unemployment insurance payments."

Caddy declared that unemployed miners could not get unemployment payments because of protests by coal operators and other industries.

"We have mines that have been down 60 days now and not even a hearing has been held by inadequately staffed unemployment insurance commissions."

DISTORTED ACCOUNTS

Complaints have been made that distorted accounts of the handling of surplus food relief are being sent to Washington resulting in the issuance of long and complicated regulations which are tying up actual distribution of needed food.

Thus Washington was told that one relief recipient drove up in a Cadillac to collect his food. The facts are that a county official in an official county Cadillac on one occasion called for food to take it to a seriously ill miner who couldn't come himself.

Kentucky officials have flatly denied Washington reports of irregularity in the distribution of food, charging that Government agents have been hasty and inaccurate in making their reports of alleged chiseling. One result of these reports has been the issuance of what union men describe as "silly and almost impossible rules surrounding distribution."

The Housing Bill

SPEECH

OF

HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 20, 1954

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, the housing conference report presents an overall bill to promote and encourage housing construction in the United States that should receive support in both Houses.

Since I have become a Member of the House I have been interested in providing the opportunity for homes and better housing for our people.

One of my first acts in the House was to sponsor a nationwide housing investigation which resulted in the creation and constructive work of the Rains committee. As sponsor of the investigation, I was named as a member of the committee.

That committee conducted hearings throughout the United States and as a result of its investigations and findings thousands of cases of defective home construction were corrected and the possibilities of future errors were eliminated. Inspections, plot planning, and other home construction features were improved and safeguards provided for future home purchasers.

In the conference report on the new housing bill I am particularly pleased for several reasons.

First. The possibility of continuation of a sound public housing program is provided through adoption of a conference amendment that is essentially one provided in an amendment I offered to the House on April 2, 1954, when the House bill was first debated.

At that time I offered an amendment which proposed to continue the public housing program with 35,000 units for the fiscal year 1955. If permitted 35,000 additional units in the piplines necessary to meet the problem of relocating low-income families who were to be displaced by demolition of slum areas or other governmental action.

Although defeated in the House at that time it is now substantially as originally written in the conference bill. It means the continuance of a public housing program, tied into actual slum clearance, which was the original intent of the public housing program.

Second. Section VI of the conference report incorporates almost entirely as originally written a House bill introduced by me this year to provide a voluntary home mortgage credit program. This section seeks to provide and facilitate the flow of credit in sparsely populated areas, where thousands of families have previously been unable to provide adequate, modern housing for themselves. It seeks to develop a market voluntarily, at no cost to the taxpayer or the Government that will build good homes in the outer areas of the housing market.

With this section VI a great opportunity is provided for private enterprise in home construction. It should be a great step forward.

Third. Within the new housing bill is also a provision for a certificate of compliance to be provided by the builder or seller. This is a fine provision for better building and finer construction. It is the outgrowth of the House housing investigations and should largely eliminate the previous shortcuts and frauds of defective construction, inadequate sanitation and drainage facilities. I am particularly pleased about this section because it is the direct result of the investigation of our House Housing Committee.

This bill should provide, as stated by Majority Leader HALLECK, housing starts of over 1,400,000 per year. It is an incentive to good building—toward home ownership—and the ability of the average American to provide a modern home for his family.

There is nothing you can name that will prevent and provide a better cure for communism than a well-housed America. With this bill the ability of all Americans to provide adequately for the family is envisioned. There is a real sense of pride in assisting in the formation of its provisions.

Outlawing Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 23, 1954

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to commend to the attention of our colleagues the following editorial which appeared in the July 23, 1954, edition of the New York Times:

OUTLAWING COMMUNISM

For some years now our national legislators have been considering the idea of outlawing the Communist Party. Arguments for this move are obvious. Arguments against it are of two sorts—the theoretical and the practical. In theory it is held to be Amercan doctrine, supported by the Bill of Rights and by the post-Civil War amendments, that guilt is personal; a man may be guilty of conspiracy, but the guilt is nevertheless his own guilt, not the guilt of a group or party. In practice there are those who agree with Attorney General Brownell that outlawing the party would merely drive it farther underground and make it harder to control.

Nevertheless the feeling persists that Communists who actually understand and accept the party line are disloyal citizens and ought not to be citizens at all. This week the House, by voice vote, approved a measure giving this feeling a formal statement, though no new means of enforcement were provided. Since the individual must first be convicted "of advocating or conspiring to advocate the overthrow of the Government of the United States by the use of force or violence" he would be no worse off than he is now under the Smith Act. Similarly a House Judiciary subcommittee, with Representative Emanuel Celler alone dissenting, approved a bill outlawing the Communist Party, bag and baggage.

The question is, of course, not whether we dislike communism but how best, in the light of our traditions and present responsibilities, to deal with it. We can't put the whole party in jail. Probably we will have to continue to proceed against individuals for specified offenses, just as we do against murderers and burglars. And certainly persons charged with being members of a Communist conspiracy should continue to have the same rights—as they have had, to the last ounce of judicial patience—as burglars and murderers.

Leading San Francisco Citizen Proposes Bold Redevelopment Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 23, 1954

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, almost every large American city is in crying need of widespread redevelopment, but very few are fortunate enough to have a vigorous, able, and imaginative redevelopment advocate, like Benjamin H. Swig, of San Francisco.

Mr. Swig recently proposed a bold and comprehensive plan for redevelopment of an area of the great city with which his name has become synonymous. It is refreshing, exhilarating, and inspiring to find the pioneering spirit and energy of our people rekindled and directed toward the building of a better America. We are still a comparatively young Nation. We need not sit idly by and let large sections of our beautiful cities go to rack and ruin. Out of the decay and dilapidation can arise great new structures for the convenience and service of our growing population.

Leaders like Benjamin H. Swig are a great asset to America and to their communities. I congratulate him on his great plan for San Francisco. I hope it will inspire similar plans and new enthusiasm in cities throughout the Nation.

On July 1 two leading San Francisco newspapers editorially commended citizen Swig for his service to San Francisco. I should like to include in our Record the following editorials from the San Francisco Examiner and the San Francisco Chronicle:

[From the San Francisco Examiner of July 1, 1954]

WE CAN DO IT (PITTSBURGH DID)

We hope the enthusiasm that drives Hotelman Benjamin H. Swig is contagious. San Francisco will be the better if all of us come down with a massive infection of his imagination and drive.

His $50 million proposal for a convention-parking-stadium-shopping center south of Marget is daring; yes. It is big; it is difficult.

But let us remind the perennial doubters and the excessively cautious that it is not as daring, not as big, and not as difficult as the Golden Triangle project that remade Pittsburgh—restoring that city to its old business glory.

We will not believe that San Franciscans are less capable of acting boldly than the people of Pittsburgh, even though we have no Mellon fortune to show the way as Pittsburgh did.

Downtowners and city officials should proceed with all dispatch to a determination of what seems to us the two key questions in the Swig proposal: (1) Can the land be acquired by the city in a reasonable period of time; and (2) can the project be privately financed as Swig believes?

Let no one suffer, however, the illusion that the Swig proposal can be realized in a year or two and so make unnecessary the bond issues for the underground expansion of civic auditorium exhibit space and for a baseball stadium.

As Swig himself pointed out, these can and should be voted without altering or interfering with his plan.

The $5 million stadium bonds, as presently proposed, carry the safeguard that they would be sold and the stadium built only if big-league baseball came to San Francisco. Until such baseball was realized they would simply lie dormant.

Thus, if the Swig plan were realized, they need never be sold.

The $3,250,000 bond issue for expansion of civic audtiorium facilities has a somewhat different status. The need here is immediate, as the overcrowding of the recent American Medical Association convention showed so convincingly.

Unless these bonds are voted and the underground facility built, San Francisco will continue to lose large conventions, and can expect that 1958 will be the last time the AMA ever comes here.

Probably this civic-center expansion would be needed, as Swig said, even if his plan came to pass in its fullest details. If the Swig convention center is built, the civic-center project can be converted into an underground garage.

We have been a long time reaching the present point where we are about to get these two bond measures on the November ballot. It would be a grievous mistake to let enthusiasm for the Swig plan or any plan cause them to be sidetracked.

Similarly, the Swig plan would be no parking cure-all, nor does he see it as such. Its alleviating effect would be felt immediately north of Market Street. But north of, say, Sutter, the need for off-street parking would be as great as ever.

The Louis Lurie proposal for a parking garage at Sutter and Stockton retains its attractiveness, and must not be forgotten.

Let us explore Ben Swig's grand planning with diligence and hope. Let us not in the meantime neglect other improvements so painfully needed.

[From the San Francisco Chronicle of July 1, 1954]

SWIG'S BOLD DREAM

Ben Swig, a man accustomed to thinking big, has been thinking about San Francisco and for that he has our admiration and gratitude.

He has put forward a proposal for the redevelopment of a somewhat gone-to-seed area south of Market Street, with implications that might contribute toward the reinvigoration of the entire downtown area.

It is a large and ambitious proposal, a $50 million proposal, but its boldness and sweep need not frighten any one. For it is also an imaginative and exciting proposal, in the old San Francisco tradition. Even if it were practically impossible, which of course it is not, and financially unsound, which the very sponsorship of Swig would seem to belie, its author is entitled to the city's loudest cheers.

For merely by broaching a plan so broad and so audacious, Swig has renewed and strengthened the city's faith in its ability to do big things, in its right to be called the City That Knows How. His consolidated convention hall-air terminal-stadium-office building-parking area-moving sidewalk is the most satisfying breath of air that has refreshed the city since it summoned the desire and will to fling not 1, but 2 of the world's most majestic bridges across the bay.

While San Francisco has ben resting from that considerable and highly profitable exertion, other cities have been setting up and completing magnificent projects for their everlasting benefit. Off hand, we think of New York's Rockefeller Center, of Pittsburgh's Golden Triangle, of Los Angeles's Union Station. The Swig plan has elements of all three and even in its tentative and preliminary stage seems to warrant unstinted and enthusiastic encouragement.

Emergency School Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VERA BUCHANAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 23, 1954

Mrs. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include in the Record an editorial entitled "Emergency School Aid" from today's edition of the Washington Post and Times-Herald.

The bills referred to in the editorial offer the administration an opportunity to demonstrate that it has some thought for the children of this country and is not exclusively concerned with the oil and power interests.

The editorial follows:

EMERGENCY SCHOOL AID

A score of the most respected and responsible organizations in the field of education petitioned President Eisenhower on Wednesday to ask Congress for passage, befor adjournment, of emergency legislation to aid public school construction. The plea comes at the 11th hour. It asks for a kind of leadership the White House and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare should have shown long ago. Perhaps it is not yet too late to prod Congress to this vital act. Without it, the children in a great many American communities will be denied the educational opportunities which have long been considered an American birthright.

The Senate has before it a moderate and carefully considered bill sponsored by Senator Cooper to provide $250 million of Federal aid for emergency-school construction;

an almost identical bill introduced by Representative FRELINGHUYSEN is before the House. The Federal aid is intended to cover a period of 2 fiscal years and is to be used exclusively for the building of public elementary and secondary school facilities. The money would be apportioned on a basis taking into account a State's school age population and its average per capita income payments. Payments would be made to State treasurers for transfer to local boards of education to relieve emergency situations where existing facilities are so inadequate as to require extreme overcrowding.

The very terms of the bill reveal the desperate need for it. "Extreme overcrowding" means danger to the safety and health of children and serious educational disadvantagement. Nothing could call more imperatively for Federal intervention. For nothing more intimately affects the future of the Nation than the welfare of its children. A word from the President exhorting Congress to enact this needed legislation could be wonderfully effective.

H. R. 4213 Should Be Enacted To Provide for Waterfowl Management in California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 23, 1954

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, I hope both Houses of Congress will support H. R. 4213 and the purpose it seeks to accomplish. It is a good one. It will to some extent correct an unforeseen evil resulting from otherwise very useful and valuable works. It is a desirable bill from the standpoint of conservation.

The bill provides for construction of the necessary works and authorizes the utilization of water available under the Central Valley project for better waterfowl management in the San Joaquin Valley.

It has been estimated that 50 percent of all Pacific flyway birds winter in California, a large proportion of them in the San Joaquin Valley. Unfortunately, since the inception of the various components of the Central Valley project the balance of nature has been upset to some extent. Areas long frequented by migratory fowl have become dried up; consequently, there is a scarcity of the natural foods of these birds. This is unfortunate. The number of waterfowl is directly related to the available forage. Any factor affecting that supply will inevitably affect the number of birds.

This has long been recognized by experts in the field. Back in October 1950 the Federal Fish and Wildlife Service, the Federal Bureau of Reclamation, and the California Division of Fish and Game completed a study of the situation in the so-called Grasslands area of the San Joaquin Valley.

This area was found to be one of the primary wintering areas of the West. At one time California had extensive marshes and ponds which were the natural habitat of migratory fowl. Now much of this land has been reclaimed for agriculture. In the State of California, over 2½ million acres of land are involved in drainage enterprise, 1,402,766 acres of which have installed drains. Of this amount some 80 percent are in the Central Valley. Thus, the natural habitat of waterfowl has been shrinking. In other areas previously favored by waterfowl the story is the same. Marshlands at the mouth of the Colorado River at the head of the Gulf of California have been reclaimed for agriculture.

Drainage and extensive cultivation have so concentrated the wintering migratory birds on the ever-dwindling area of natural environment that they have become seriously overcrowded. In their search for food the fowl have been forced by circumstances to depend on cultivated areas. Thus, waterfowl depredations to rice and other crops have become a matter of increasingly serious concern.

Hunting of waterfowl in California is a big business. Duck stamp sales in the State were 173,136 in 1951-52 fiscal year, and 214,456 in fiscal year 1952-53. In 1948 it was estimated that waterfowl hunters spent over $28 million while indulging in the sport. This, from an economic standpoint alone, makes it important to protect the waterfowl resources of the State.

Lands that historically were highly valuable wintering areas for migratory waterfowl have been drained. Now their natural resting places have so shrunk that over $2 million damages per year are suffered by the farmers of the State at the hands of birds seeking food no longer available to them.

This condition had become so serious by 1948 that the Federal and State government agencies undertook a detailed study of the problem. Their conclusions were made public in December 1950 in a study entitled "Waterfowl Conservation in the Lower San Joaquin Valley." H. R. 4213 represents an effort to implement the recommendations made at that time.

The study recognized the inadequacy fo then existing waterfowl refuges in the area. Congress, in 1948, authorized the purchase of 20,000 acres of land in California by the Secretary of the Interior for waterfowl management area purposes and the State of California had a program calling for the immediate purchase of 10,000 acres in the lower San Joaquin Valley for the same purpose, or an amount equal to that recommended by the Department of the Interior in the same area. However, the study mentioned above noted that such a program was worthless without the assurance of an adequate supply of water.

Among the specific recommendations of this study were:

First. The State plan for the area be immediately carried out.

Second. There be developed from sources within the area a supply of water to replace interim supplies then being secured from Millerton Lake, to provide 13 second feet to the Los Banos State Refuge.

Third. Development of nearby water resources of the Central Valley project to supplement existing supplies for a proposed enlargement of the Los Banos refuge having an area of 6,700 acres.

Fourth. The same for a proposed 12,000 acre Federal waterfowl management area in Merced County east of the river.

Fifth. Drainage and underground waters to be utilized to perpetuate the Grasslands area as waterfowl habitat; principally through efforts of the landowners in the area through the formation of a special district for the purpose.

Sixth. Should local landowners not do as recommended by July 1, 1953, Federal and State agencies should acquire, develop and operate suitable waterfowl management areas; the water supply in this contingency be developed by the Bureau of Reclamation.

Seventh. Costs of providing and developing water under recommendations 2, 3, 4, and, if necessary, 6, to be included in a nonreimbursable allocation for fish and wildlife conservation to be made to the Central Valley project.

Eighth. Any further authorization of the Central Valley project necessary to include the measures herein recommended are approved.

Under this program the Fish and Wildlife Service and State of California would acquire, develop and operate management areas, while water supplies would be made available by Bureau of Reclamation.

Total supply of water needed to accomplish this program would include 7,000 acre-feet for supplemental water to Los Banos—expanded—and 40,000 acre-feet for the proposed Federal area.

It was believed that additional authorization of the Central Valley project was called for.

The bill introduced to accomplish this goal is H. R. 4213.

I am heartily in favor of the objective of this bill.

It will make available water to recreate the necessary natural habitat for waterfowl.

It will mitigate farmers' losses of grain due to foraging of waterfowl unable to survive on available refuges.

It will better enable the proper authorities to carry out a sound, well-balanced program of conservation.

It will be of assistance to the United States in carrying out its obligations under the migatory waterfowl treaty with Canada and Mexico.

It fully recognizes the rights of the State to control its own water resources.

In short, it accomplishes a worthwhile purpose and I heartily endorse it. I hope by colleagues interested in this bill will join me in urging the other body to act favorably on it in this session of Congress.

Amending Atomic Energy Act of 1946, as Amended

SPEECH

OF

HON. CARL HINSHAW

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 23, 1954

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 9757) to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, as amended.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of inquiring from my friend, the distinguished constitutional lawyer the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Graham] what his opinion is of this situation.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, I have a very distinct recollection of the time a number of years ago, 7 or 8 years ago, when Hon. Fritz Lanham, chairman of the Committee on Patents, consulted with us on the Committee on the Judiciary on this subject and Hon. Hatton Sumners chairman of my committee, assigned me as one of those to go into the matter. I may say that I am as firmly convinced as I am talking to you at this point that the language of the bill is unconstitutional. And you cannot compromise with the question of constitutionality. In my judgment, and in my humble opinion, the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York absolutely covers the situation and is an amendment which should be adopted by the committee.

Amending Atomic Energy Act of 1946, as Amended

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 23, 1954

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 9757) to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, as amended.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, a few minutes ago, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Dies] interrupted the speech of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Van Zandt] to inquire as to the meaning of the language contained in lines 11 to 15 on page 5, under the title of "Definitions." This language is as follows:

> The intent of Congress in the definitions as given in this section shall be construed from the words or phrases used in the definitions rather than from the choice of words or phrases defined.

The gentleman from Texas was promised that he would have an explanation of this later. I had hoped that he would take the time himself when we reached this point in the bill, but apparently he is not on the floor at the moment. Being interested, also, in getting an explanation of that language, I have requested this time in the hope it may be clarified.

I looked in the report to see if it explains that rather ambiguous language, and the only thing I found in the report which has to do with that particular section or that wording reads as follows:

> Those portions of the definitions which require substantive action have, in most cases, been separated from the definitions and have been put into the appropirate section of the bill.

Mr. Chairman, I lay no claim to any great wisdom or intelligence; in fact, I confess to being dull, but if this can possibly be explained to me in terms and language I can understand, I hope that some member of the comittee will do so. I will gladly yield to any member of the comittee who may desire to explain this language. Now if this were not such a serious matter, I would think this kind of language to be amusing. But, this is a serious matter—perhaps, the most serious piece of legislation we have considered this year. I do hope some member of the committee, and I will be delighted to yield, will give me an explanation which I will be able to understand because I cannot understand even what you have in the report.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I shall undertake to give him an answer. I am sure he will be able to understand it, but I am not so sure it will be acceptable to him. The gentleman referred to the statement in the committee report with respect to definitions in which it is said that those portions of the definitions which require substantive action have in most cases been separated from the definition and been put into appropirate sections of the bill. That has to do with portions of existing law where words are defined. Those are now brought forward into this single section under the title "Definitions" so that all of the expressions used frequently in the latter portions of the bill, which might have a variety of interpretations, are defined in this section under the heading "Definitions." With respect to the language used in the opening part of section 11, the effort there was to declare a direction to whoever it might be who would be called upon to interpret these words which have a special meaning, at a later time, to look to the definition itself in interpreting the meaning of the word rather than the word which was selected to be defined. Now to me that is perfectly clear. It may not be to the gentleman, but it is perfectly clear to me.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I do appreciate that because it is just as clear as mud to me.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I yield.

Mr. WHITTEN. I would like to make the comment, if I may that my good friend, the chairman of the committee, whom we all admire and respect, has demonstrated here the very great need the Atomic Energy Commission are going to have for him to be around on many of the sections of this bill in order to explain what is intended. In many of the sections, it is questionable as to what the limitations are or where the controls rest. This is an example of the great weakness, as I see it, of this bill. To carry it out as the gentleman intends to carry out the provisions of the bill is one thing but it is not tight enough to guarantee that will be done, and then we find section 162, it says point blank that the President can waive the legal requirements, as to contracts if he wants to do so.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Colorado's Fryingpan Plan Is Under Fire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 23, 1954

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call attention to an article by Mr. Raymond Moley which appeared in the Los Angeles Times on July 3, 1954:

COLORADO'S FRYINGPAN PLAN IS UNDER FIRE

Granby, Colo.—All Colorado is divided into at least two parts by great mountain ranges. Its people at the moment are also divided by a controversy of very serious proportions. It concerns water—a matter of life or death out here.

At present the major source of this controversy centers upon what is known as the Fryingpan-Arkansas transmountain diversion project.

This project is now before Congress for authorization. It has the blessing of the administration. It has been approved by the House committee. It may pass both Houses this session.

Briefly, the project would involve building a series of channels and tunnels high on the west slope of the Rockies, which would collect water from the headwaters of the Fryingpan, a tributary of the Roaring Fork, which flows into the Colorado at Glenwood Springs.

The diverted water would be poured into the Arkansas near Leadville and would pass through various power dams and into municipal water reservoirs and irrigation projects down the river.

I have discussed this project in these articles before, once 3 years ago in a piece written in Aspen. In the years since, there have been many new developments, some of which make it almost unbelievable that this administration has taken up the battle for the plan.

In the hearings in 1953 there appeared a remarkably well-informed witness against the project, John B. Barnard, an attorney here in Granby. He appeared as the representative of property owners and water users directly concerned on the western slope.

For many years Barnard's practice has been in reclamation matters, and his arguments before the committee proved him to be one of the few Americans outside the Government who is thoroughly conversant with reclamation and its implications.

I made a point on this expedition among a number of reclamation projects in the West to talk with him about the Fryingpan matter and its broader consequences.

Barnard's major contentions concerning the Fryingpan project are that it ignores the future demands of a potentially great industrial development in western Colorado; that this project, with others of which it is the forerunner, would deplete the supply of water to which the west slope is entitled; that it would supply water to the Arkansas River which that river, if properly regulated, could supply for itself; and, if I understand him correctly, the subsidy which it would supply to the lands irrigated in the Arkansas Valley would be unreasonable and unfair to the taxpayers of the Nation.

Volumes could be written on this subject—volumes, I may add, which every taxpayer might well ponder—but I shall refer here to only one of Barnard's points and in another article discuss the others.

The richest and most extensive oil-shale deposits in the United States are in Colorado, and at a point near Rifle, a Government pilot plant has been operating for some time.

The United States Bureau of Mines estimates that 100 million barrels of shale oil can be produced from each square mile of the richer parts of the deposits, and that there are altogether 2,500 square miles in the shale area. That means possible mining operations for hundreds of years.

Great quantities of gas would be a byproduct, and this and other available products would make possible a great chemical industry in the region, in addition to that which would extract and refine the oil.

It therefore becomes a matter of national importance whether such an industrial development should be endangered by a shortage of water which would be placed at great cost on agricultural land, raising crops which will probably not be needed.

Moreover as every newspaper reader knows, there have been found great deposits of uranium in the upper basin of the Colorado—running down from Rifle into Utah on the west and New Mexico on the south. The industrial possibilities of this should be obvious.

Amending Atomic Energy Act of 1946, as Amended

SPEECH

OF

HON. BROOKS HAYS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 23, 1954

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 9757) to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, as amended.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to address this inquiry to the gentleman from New York, the author of the substitute. Is it his purpose to leave to the President the power in the atomic-energy field that he exercises in other areas?

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is exactly right, subject to the constitutional limitations with respect to treaties and international agreements.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I listened very carefully to what the gentleman from New York, the chairman of the committee, had to say in general debate and I sensed in his comment on the President's power that he shares the view that the President's power should not be circumscribed. As a matter of fact, there is little difference between us on this principle. All the thoughts that have been expressed seem to converge at least at this point, that we would be eager to preserve the President's constitutional power. Now, that is not platitudinous in the present world situation. I agree with the gentleman regarding the President's position. His address to the newspaper editors and later the address to the United Nations Assembly inspired millions throughout the world.

And, the gentleman knows my attitude on the constitutional question. Whether a Republican or Democratic President is in the White House, I am eager for the legislative body to recognize his authority just as I would expect the Executive to recognize our authority in the present perils it is important that we leave him a free hand for world leadership, and I, for one, believe that only world leadership vigorously exerted can reach the goals we have in mind. It is the gentleman's viewpoint, as I understand it, that if there is any practical service to be realized by the President's agreements with other nations, it is largely with nations that are definitely on our side in the present cleavage. We are not going to have any agreements with Russia for example within the foreseeable future. Does the gentleman agree with that?

Mr. JAVITS. I certainly do agree with the gentleman, and I feel, therefore, that with the tremendous power which it gives the President to be able to speak and say the things he said, which are responsible for this international pool, that we ought to leave it untrammeled, and yet put conditions in with respect to the people we are going to do business with.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. It seems to me that the gentleman's approach is to be preferred to that of my good friend from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD].

The substitute simplifies and improves the section. Since complete clarification is essential, I hope that the gentleman from New York, the chairman, will accept the substitute.

Amending Atomic Energy Act of 1946, as Amended

SPEECH

OF

HON. WESLEY A. D'EWART

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 23, 1954

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 9757) to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, as amended.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, if it will aid the gentleman and expedite the matter, may I say that I am prepared to accept the amendment.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. D'EWART. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I am in favor of the gentleman's amendment. Does this protect the national park lands from commercial entry unless they get a specific order from the President to go in and file on the lands within the public parks and monuments?

Mr. D'EWART. As far as fissionable materials are concerned.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. As far as fissionable materials are concerned, but does it leave it open for other minerals, or is it already open?

Mr. D'EWART. There are specific laws that cover mining inside of national parks only by special permission. The regular mining laws do not apply to national parks or monuments, but there can be mining under certain circumstances under other laws. This applies to fissionable material.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Your amendment does not change or nullify any of the protection of the other laws?

Mr. D'EWART. Not in any way.

Amending Atomic Energy Act of 1946, as Amended

SPEECH

OF

HON. GEORGE MEADER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 23, 1954

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 9757) to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, as amended.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, I have been recognized, and I do not yield.

I want to say first of all, Mr. Chairman, that I am especially interested in this measure because I represent the district of Michigan wherein the University of Michigan is located. For the first time in the history of the University of Michigan our alumni were asked to raise a fund to commemorate the dead of World War II. We raised over $6 million to spend on a project for atomic-energy research for peacetime purposes known as the Phoenix memorial project.

I have checked this legislation with Dean Stason of the Law School of the University of Michigan, who has followed it very closely. He advised me this morning that he had read the draft reported by the committee and that although it was a compromise it was an excellent job.

I want to compliment the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE] and his committee on bringing this legislation before us. It will open up a whole new field of human endeavor to the ingenuity of the private citizen.

I want to compliment the gentleman also on offering his amendment with respect to the patent provisions of this bill. I call attention also to the fact that here is one of those frequent instances we find in the House of Representatives where two committees of the House have concurrent jurisdiction. Patent policy is a matter assigned to the legislative Committee on the Judiciary. Far-reaching changes in patent policy such as this, the constitutionality of which is very doubtful, should properly be considered by the great Committee on the Judiciary, of which I have the honor to be a member.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEADER. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from New York, who is chairman of the patent subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. KEATING. I want to reiterate the gentleman's remarks regarding the unconstitutionality of this provision. I am supporting the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York, to a large degree because of my great fear that the existing language would be in violation of the Constitution.

Mr. MEADER. Article 1, section 8, clause 8 of the Constitution reads as follows:

> The Congress shall have power * * * To promote the progress of science and useful arts, by securing for limited times to authors and inventors the exclusive right to their respective writings and discoveries.

The point has been made by patent attorneys who appeared before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy that Congress has the right to give the exclusive right to inventions for a limited time, but does not have the right to give a half-exclusive right or a right hedged around with a lot of limitations and conditions.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEADER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, a member of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. WALTER. Has a representative of the Patent Office testified on this very important question? I am as sure that the bill as written is unconstitutional as I have ever been about that question in any legislation. I believe that in order to make the bill constitutional the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE] must be adopted.

Mr. MEADER. I cannot answer the question of the gentleman completely. Perhaps a member of the Joint Atomic Energy Committee could answer it more completely. However, I did make inquiry as to whether or not the Patent Commissioner had been asked for his views by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. My understanding is that he had not been asked for a report by the committee, but that he had expressed his views to the Budget Bureau.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEADER. I yield to the majority leader, the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I just want to say that in my opinion the letter written by Mr. Shanley would not have been written except that it was cleared at the White House. It is obvious from that letter that the President has in mind a principle that must be protected, but leaves a certain degree of latitude to Congress in working for that objective. The matter is new to me in a measure, but I have listened to the fine statement by the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE], and I have been impressed by it. I might say, beyond that, that probably the provision in the measure in the other body will be as it is written here. In any event, the matter could go to conference and something that would achieve the objective for which we all strive within the Constitution and within our concept of patent rights can be worked out.

Mr. MEADER. I would just like to say in conclusion, Mr. Chairman, that we are taking a history-making step in opening this field of atomic energy to development by the American people. It requires ingenuity, invention, and discovery to be useful to the American people. We certainly would be taking the wrong tack if we stifle the incentive to discovery by some semisocialistic change in our patent policy.

Amending Atomic Energy Act of 1946, as Amended

SPEECH
OF
HON. J. PERCY PRIEST
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 23, 1954

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 9757) to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, as amended.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I agree with the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], that the hour is late and the Members of the House are somewhat wearied with many words. I feel, however, that the amendment pending at this moment is one of the most significant amendments, in its broad aspects, that this House will pass on during this session of the Congress or perhaps in any other session of the Congress.

I fully share the opinion of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE], who has just addressed you, that this is an issue that far transcends the question of the Tennessee Valley Authority. It transcends, also, the question of public versus private power, and I shall not go into that discussion at all.

During the course of this debate today, many times my good friend from New York [Mr. COLE], the distinguished chairman of this committee, has stood on the floor and said that we do not want the Atomic Energy Commission to go into the power business. I wish, Mr. Chairman, that my friend—and he is a friend whom I esteem very highly—would take the floor and with equal zeal and vigor say that he does not wish the Atomic Energy Commission to go into the job of buying and selling power, peddling power, if you please. I wish the gentleman might take the floor and take that position and argue that as eloquently and as zealously as he argued against some of those earlier amendments.

I say this is one of the most significant amendments in its broad aspects and implications that will be before the House during this session of the Congress, because I believe it strikes at the very heart of the question of the integrity and independence of independent commissions of this Government, and I believe that is the question that confronts us all.

Now a few minutes earlier I heard what the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] had to say about the generosity of the House toward the Tennessee Valley Authority, and I want to say on behalf of myself and many people that we are grateful for that consideration. But, let me say in the same breath that this is not a Tennessee asset, it is not a Tennessee Valley asset alone. It is a great national asset. It belongs to all the people of this Nation. It has contributed greatly to the winning of a great war and is making a significant contribution to the defense and security of the Nation and the free world. I shall not go into that, either. But, I do want to emphasize that the Tennessee Valley Authority is a national asset.

Now, just 1 or 2 words, Mr. Chairman. The question has come up many times in some other debates with reference to the TVA's service area. The proposal in the Dixon-Yates contract is to build a steam plant west of the Mississippi River and with extension lines built half way across that river to join with a line that TVA will be ordered to build to connect up with the Tennessee Valley Authority distribution line. And yet it has been argued many times on the floor of this House that Fulton, Tenn., which is on the east side of the river in the State of Tennessee, over which all of the transmission lines crisscross in every direction, that that is not in the service area of the Tennessee Valley Authority. It does not make logic to me to move still farther west to build a plant to furnish power, across a great river in another State, and say, that plant can be built there and serve the Tennessee Valley service area, but if you build one at Fulton, Tenn., it would be outside of the Tennessee Valley Authority service area.

I hope, Mr. Chairman, and I hope with all the sincerity I can express, that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER] will be adopted, because I believe, first of all, that it will prevent the Atomic Energy Commission from launching into a program, the end of which we cannot see nor contemplate at this time, one which is entirely out of harmony, in my opinion, with the purposes and the functions of the Commission.

I hope the amendment, Mr. Chairman, will be adopted.

Amending Atomic Energy Act of 1946, as Amended

SPEECH
OF
HON. CHARLES A. HALLECK
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 23, 1954

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 9757) to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, as amended.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the hour is late, but I would like to say that in all my experience in the House of Representatives, I have never attended a debate and discussion on an important matter where such a large attendance has been maintained as we have gone along, and where the debate has been on such a high plane. Amendments have been offered and discussed, and they have been understood. Some have been approved and some have been voted down. I think what we are doing here in the way of action on this bill should commend the House of Representatives to the favorable consideration of the people of America who sent us here. Of course, there have been some evidences of sharpness, but I trust that this will not continue to be manifested and that tomorrow we will continue to be good friends.

Mr. Chairman, I have supported the TVA in my time here. The TVA got under way before I came to the Congress. But during the nearly 20 years I have been here I have voted for hundreds of millions of dollars of appropriations for the TVA. I must say that sometimes I had serious misgivings as to just exactly what I might be doing to other sections of the country that are required to compete in this great market that is America with the area of the TVA where undoubtedly the boast of the people in that section of the country about their cheap rates has much to be said for it.

Mr. Chairman, I am fond of my friends in Tennessee who are here in the House as well as my friends in Tennessee who are not here, but I do want to say this to you. I think the rest of us have been mighty generous with you. We have given you a lot of money and you have developed down there a great project. It is true, it started out as a water resource development. But after that, on occasion, without my support, we have seen it go from a water resource development to a steam plant construction project. I have sometimes thought that perhaps you might be coming up on the Wabash River, if you extended the periphery of that project a little further. Of course, we could set up a little TVA on the Wabash. We would not need very much power up there, but then we could start firming up the power with steam plants. And then we would vote for a lot of power. We could say we wanted a lot more. Let me tell you folks in Tennessee not to ride a good horse too hard because we want to go along with the TVA. I have heard some harsh things said about the President in some statements that have been made.

I am afraid that your real concern is not that the AEC is going into the electricity business. I am afraid that your real concern is that possibly if this arrangement can be worked out, and it is a highly satisfactory arrangement, that it may jeopardize in some measure your demands for more and more steam plants. The AEC buys power from other private operations and uses that power.

The AEC operates in parts of the country where there is no TVA. In addition, TVA buys power from private sources and puts it in the system. It is not a matter of this proposal serving the city of Memphis because TVA is hooked up in one large arrangement. What difference does it make where you put the power in? You have got to take the power out somewhere to run the AEC which has the first call on the power. So all you do is put in one place the power that is taken out some place else for the AEC. To try to make a big hullabaloo about this is to draw a very false picture of the whole situation.

Why undertake to interfere with an arrangement that has been worked out under the law by the executive branch of the Government from the President on down, an arrangement that will provide what is needed in the Tennessee Valley for the AEC and at the same time will relieve the taxpayers of this country of an additional burden that otherwise they would have to bear?

Mr. Chairman, I trust that the pending amendment will be defeated.

A Bill To Change the Name of the Fort Randall Reservoir in South Dakota to Lake Evans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 23, 1954

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill which would change the name of the Fort Randall Reservoir in the State of South Dakota to Lake Evans.

I am introducing this bill at the request of the people of my State, including the State press association, Rotary and service clubs, which have passed resolutions requesting change of the name to honor George O. Evans, area engineer, who has been in charge of Fort Randall Dam construction since work first started on that project in 1946.

Mr. Evans deserves much credit and commendation for the faithful performance of his duties as engineer in charge of construction of the third largest earthen dam in the Missouri River development plan, Fort Randall. The tremendous job of chief engineer required great skill and patience. He left no stone unturned in making sure that everything was planned down to the smallest detail.

George O. Evans was born February 5, 1900, graduating with a bachelor of science in civil engineering from Mississippi A. and M. in 1926. He accepted a job as a surveyor with the Vicksburg engineers office in 1927, working his way up until he moved to the Fort Peck Reservation. In 1934 he was transferred to the Omaha district where he was chief engineer in charge of Fort Randall. Mr. Evans served as a lieutenant colonel during World War II and was discharged as a full colonel.

The story of the Fort Randall Dam began many years ago when the Corps of Engineers saw the possibilities of the construction of a dam in an ideal spot on the Missouri River. They recognized the importance of such a dam, that would provide control of floods, uniform downstream flow, power, irrigation, and recreation.

Of greatest importance to the people living in the surrounding area of this project is the generation of cheap, dependable electric power. Eight giant turbines will generate 320,000 kilowatts of electricity. The first power surged out on the high lines on March 15, 1954, when President Eisenhower pressed a buzzer in his office in the White House signaling Gov. Sigurd Anderson, at Pickstown, S. Dak., to throw the starting switch.

Recreation facilities are another of the many advantages of this huge reservoir. Fishermen and campers will enjoy the fruits of labors which began 8 years ago.

It is fitting and proper that such an important project should be named in honor of the man who has so faithfully contributed his abilities toward its construction.

I hope consideration will be given to the request that the reservoir be named after George O. Evans.

Sale of Hospital Land

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURNET R. MAYBANK

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 23, 1954

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Sale of Hospital Land," published in the Columbia (S. C.) State of recent date.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SALE OF HOSPITAL LAND

It was revealed in The State yesterday morning, through R. Steadman Sloan, State service officer, that the Veterans' Administration in Washington is contemplating the sale of 100 acres of the 205 acres which Richland County gave the Government in 1931 for the site of the veterans' hospital here.

The property in question is the rear part of the tract. It is fenced in with the remaining portion of the hospital land but is not at present occupied by buildings or used for hospital work. On the other hand, it is not costing the Government anything to carry it, and its availability is of great value, in our opinion, in giving the hospital protection. Also with this land already acquired there is room for expansion. Some day the VA may recognize the real demand for beds in this State, a need not now being met.

But if the land is sold, the proceeds should not go into the Treasury of the United States, but should be returned to Richland County, which deeded the property in fee simple. True, there was no reverter clause inserted in the conveyance, but that is a technicality that should not stand in the way of the Government's doing the right thing should the property be declared surplus.

As brought out in yesterday's issue of The State, the VA insisted that the site had to be 200 acres, and so 205 acres were purchased for the sum of $72,381.80 and donated to the Government. The land, of course, is much more valuable now.

We don't see why the VA should want to reduce the site, which cost the Government nothing and is costing nothing to maintain, a rental fee, we understand, taking care of the upkeep. But if the VA insists upon disposing of 100 acres, it would seem to us that in all fairness the funds derived from the sale should be turned over to the donor, or the land itself deeded back to Richland County. It simply doesn't sit well for donated land to be sold and the proceeds put in the recipient's coffers.

> While the Veterans' Administration has not come right out and said that the land in question is to be disposed of, R. M. Edgar, assistant VA administrator for construction, in a letter, which we reprinted yesterday, told Senator MAYBANK enough to reveal that such a sale is under consideration. He said he knew the land was donated, but there was no authority "under existing law that would permit the Veterans' Administration to convey it back to the city. If it is determined the land is excess, the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, requires the land be reported to General Services Administration at which time the fact of donation by the city would be made known to that agency." (Mr. Edgar evidently meant to say "county" when he said "city," since the deed was from the county.)
>
> We repeat that we don't see why the Veterans' Administration in Washington wants to reduce the size of the tract. It had better be looking to the future. But if the VA decides that it is going to declare these 100 acres excess, then our delegation in Congress should step in and see that there is authority granted under the law to return the donated land to the giver.
>
> Mr. Sloan has rendered a service in delving into this matter, and in bringing it to the attention of Senator MAYBANK, who, from the dates on the letters, seems to have gotten the facts in a hurry. Mr. Sloan has rendered a further service in making the correspondence public, so that there will be time for any protest that is in order, before final action is taken.

Prices of Oil

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, July 24, 1954

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, there has been a great deal of discussion relative to the price of oil in the United States. The Derrick, printed in Pennsylvania, is the original oil journal. On July 1 it contained a very able editorial under the heading "Oil Prices Will Fall If Supply Doesn't." I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OIL PRICES WILL FALL IF SUPPLY DOESN'T

> The oil business is fast skidding toward a pit of quicksand which will suck down its whole price and market structure, and the only thing that can pull it back is some positive action by the top management of the integrated companies, says the Oil and Gas Journal.
>
> There is just too much oil for the market to absorb this summer. Prospects of an increased demand next winter or 2 years from now don't alter the fact that the present oversupply is so serious as to threaten an early collapse of the price structure.
>
> Gasoline prices are falling, a bit here, a bit there, presaging a general price war. Refiners are taking big supply contracts at less than quoted prices, and are undercutting their own distributors. If products prices collapse—and they're tottering now—the price of crude can't hold. The value of crude is what it will bring as products.
>
> Last week some crude prices were cut in the Tristate area. Considerable Rocky Mountain crude is selling below the general gravity scale, with some companies quietly posting low field prices in that region. The glutted products market is forcing refiners to abandon historic suppliers and shop around for the lowest-cost crudes.
>
> There is crude oil seeking a home in almost every producing region. Last week pipeline proration was started in the Illinois Basin. Even eastern Ohio is prorated, and things are really bad when settled production in a big consuming area is crowded out.
>
> The top executives of big companies, many oilmen believe, are not aware that their own companies, down the line, are doing things which undermine the price structure. If they were, it is felt, they would take positive action to stop them. No illegal conspiracy is called for—just some sound business sense by individual policysetters.
>
> Here's what needs to be done: Reduce gasoline yields. Curtail refinery runs. Sell no crude or products below cost. Nominate for less production in prorating States and urge other States to adopt proration. Hold down flush yields to protect settled production. Reduce imports.
>
> The law of supply and demand still operates. Oversupply means a price war, but lower prices won't increase consumption. A demoralized products market undermines the price of crude. And if the crude price falls the whole industry will suffer—and it will be a long time before the price starts up again.

The Dixon-Yates Contract

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. GWINN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 23, 1954

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, it is still true, especially since we have had some experience with TVA socialism, that most Americans in private and public life believe that the free-enterprise system of economics is by all odds the best system. Some compromise of the principle has crept in by alleging, but seldom proving, financial incapacity to build a power dam, for example. However, this reasoning does not advocate that the Government should supplant private industry. Government should never operate in an area that could be occupied by private industry. That is what Adlai E. Stevenson, titular head of the Democratic Party says. On May 1, 1952, in a speech delivered at Portland, Oreg., Mr. Stevenson had this to say about the production of power:

> Where private enterprise can and is willing to do the job, I think it should be left free to do so. It seems to me that Government enterprise should be primarily addressed to the maintenance and enforcement of competition in our economic life and not its destruction. But where private initiative is incapable of, or for any reason fails to meet the legitimate needs of the people, whether it be for electric power or anything else, then I believe the Government will and should step in.

Everything up to that point where free enterprise is incapable must be reserved as free areas for free enterprise.

That being so, what is left of the controversy? Here we have a choice between taxpayers continuing to finance TVA, to build a powerplant or contracting private enterprise, capable and willing, to do it and finance it with private captial. How can that be a difficult choice.

A curious argument advanced against the Dixon-Yates proposal, is that it will enjoy virtual Federal tax exemption. Certainly TVA can't object to that, for it is exempt not only from Federal, but State and local taxes as well.

The last of the remaining arguments against President Eisenhower's proposal, is that TVA could supply the required power at lower costs. A comparison of the rates set by Dixon-Yates contract and what TVA is currently charging AEC shows no appreciable difference. In fact I expect the taxpayer will benefit from Dixon-Yates plan since a private utility must make its operations pay and cannot request annual appropriations and cannot avoid taxes or pass deficits in operations to the taxpayers.

The record of the private-utility companies is an impressive one and deserves mention here. In the 7-year period of 1947–53 the private-power companies have spent $15 billion expanding their facilities and this in spite of the Federal, State, and local taxes they must pay. In 1953 alone, construction expenditures totaled $2,876,000,000. During that 7-year period, the private companies increased their productive capacities from 42 million kilowatts to over 71 million kilowatts. Government agencies, Federal and local, increased their capacity in the same period by about 9 million kilowatts. By 1956 the private companies expect to expand their capacity by another 20 million kilowatts. Thus in 9 years they will have increased their capacity by 50 million kilowatts, or more than double what they had produced previously. No other industry can demonstrate a better record and it stands as the best proof that the industry is capable of performing what is required of it.

It should be pointed out that this expansion has made few headlines. The $15 billion were raised without any fuss, without any controversy, and without any politics. This is in contrast to the yearly squabble that develops in Congress when the annual subsidy to TVA is considered. Countless days are spent in Congress each year, arguing about TVA appropriations, but not 1 hour was necessary to authorize the $15 billion expended by the private companies on expansion in the last 7 years.

The annual bickering in Congress about TVA appropriations stems from the honest concern of most legislators to control and limit government spending. Indeed it was this concern of Congress, together with the equal concern of the President, that gave rise to the Dixon-Yates formula. This is an attempt to lessen the drain on the Treasury by insuring that the power will be supplied but not at the expense of the general taxpayer.

The proposal has another practical aspect to it that should be heartening to the advocates of TVA. It is common knowledge that TVA has not been able to meet the demands for power in the area it serves. It goes without saying that the additional power requirement involved in this controversy would not decrease the shortage. If the burden is removed from TVA it will be better able to meet the serious shortage it faces in its present territory.

The activity of the Socialists in the field of power production was outlined by me in the Congressional Record of April 8 of this year. Suffice it to say that these people not only want the Government to remain in the power production business to the extent that it is already committed, but to expand the Government operations. They do not intend to relinquish their gains easily and they will fight unscrupulously to further their purposes. Now if socialism is involved in this controversy, as I believe it is, let it be brought out into the open, so that we may have an honest discussion.

In conclusion, may I say that the people of Tennessee are reported as not being disturbed by the proposal. Indeed the businessmen in Memphis, Tenn., across the Mississippi River from the proposed site, have endorsed the Dixon-Yates contract. I submit the following resolution to that effect adopted recently by the Memphis Chamber of Commerce:

> *Resolved*, That this board favors the construction of the present proposed steam generating plant in West Memphis, Ark., to insure adequate power for future industrial development of the city of Memphis and its surrounding territory.

Dated July 16, 1954.

The Hardboard Bill—H. R. 9666

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 23, 1954

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the Record, I include therein the following letter I received from the Hardboard Association concerning the false publicity in the press regarding H. R. 9666:

Hardboard Association,
Chicago, Ill., July 23, 1954.

Hon. James B. Utt,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

My Dear Congressman Utt: Since H. R. 9666, the hardboard bill, was reported favorably by the Committee on Ways and Means on July 15, foreign and other interests have engendered distorted and false publicity about it appearing in the Washington Post and Times Herald and the New York Herald Tribune, designed to confuse and to prevent the Congress from considering this type of tariff measure on its merits. While I am sure that you have properly appraised these extravagant claims, I am writing to fully expose them for what they are.

The purpose of H. R. 9666 is simply to correct the present tariff classification of hardboard as a kind of paperboard under the papers and books schedule, by placing this all-wood product in its proper tariff category under the manufacture of wood schedule and item. It will correct an obvious administrative error which can be corrected in no other way without endless litigation.

The reasons for its enactment, which the opponents of this type legislation have carefully avoided, are self-evident. Hardboard is made of wood—tough, dense wood taken apart and re-formed mechanically for greater utility, unique in that its fibers are permanently bonded together by the natural fiber lignins that hold all wood together. In its manufacture, small or unusable pieces of wood are physically converted into large boards retaining natural-wood characteristics. It is a form of wood similar in strength and other characteristics to lumber and plywood. In use, it competes with other forms of wood, and has long been purchased and sold as a wood product.

The supposed ringer that Charles P. Taft is publicly reported to see in this legislation is fully explained in a Third Circuit Court decision (66 F. (2d) 451), which upheld the early basic, now expired, hardboard patent. Calling hardboard "a hard wood board with the major woody characteristics retained," that court said that "like wood (and unlike paperboard) it is nearly as stiff and strong when wet as when dry. * * * Though of increased density it can be cut and sawed like wood." That decision squarely distinguished the mechanical manufacture of hardboard from the chemical process of paper, paperboard, and composition board manufacture.

The opponents of this type legislation in public statements have misstated the present duty on hardboard, most of which as now classified carries a duty of $7.25 per ton but not less than 7½ percent nor more than 15 percent ad valorem (item 1413), and some of which carries the much higher combination duty of 7½ percent per pound plus 12½ percent ad valorem (item 1539 (b)). Ignoring all but the minimum duty their publicity falsely describes the bill as one to increase—to virtually double—tariff rates. On the contrary, H. R. 9666 in reclassifying hardboard, would give it precisely the existing reduced duty now applicable to other manufactures of wood (16⅔ percent ad valorem). In fact, if the GATT agreement were to be terminated, while other manufactures of wood would revert to the 1930 rate of 33⅓ percent ad valorem, the rate of hardwood would remain at 16⅔ percent ad valorem. An incidental effect of this bill would be to increase the present duty slightly on some imported hardboard and to reduce substantially the present duty on other imported hardboard.

The opposition's public lament for Finland "as our only friend in the Russian orbit" has no bearing on the proposed legislation and overlooks the facts (1) that Sweden and Canada are the largest hardboard exporters to this country; (2) that Canada, a major foreign opponent of the bill, imposes a 22½ percent reciprocal duty on United States hardboard; and (3) that exports of United States' hardboard to Sweden and Finland are wholly blocked by import controls as well as by protective tariffs.

The attempts made in public statements to belittle the greatly increased volume of imported hardboard not only are without basis in fact but are not germane to this legislation. They have tried to compare the volume of imported "screenback" hardboard to all domestic hardboard products, including many specialized items made only in this country. They fail to mention the sixfold jump in hardboard imports in 1953 over 1952, that domestic producers' sales of hardboard of the type imported have fallen off sharply during this same period, and that hardboard imports in 1953 were more than 20 percent of the same types produced here.

Their extravagant published claims that H. R. 9666 violates the GATT agreement are patently false. Apparently, because GATT concessions were made on the paperboard-pulpboard category (item 1413), the mistaken classification of hardboard by our officials as being in that category now precludes the Congress from ever touching hardboard. Their argument answers itself. Congress has unquestioned power—in fact, constitutional responsibility—to correct an obvious tariff misclassification. Certainly GATT, provisionally accepted under only the trade-agreements authority, and never yet approved by the Congress, has not, and cannot, diminish congressional power to act on tariff matters. Moreover, the GATT agreement contains express provision for just such classification changes as contemplated in H. R. 9666, congressional assertion of which in now way violates the agreement.

The complete impatience of the opponents, such as Mr. Taft, with any congressional consideration of tariff matters and their desperation to make tariffs an instrument of foreign policy is forcibly demonstrated in their public statements by intolerant opposition to any tariff reclassification not involving rate reductions, their intemperate statement that congressional correction of an obvious tariff misclassification is like "opening Pandora's box," and the remarkable claim that a forthright legislative correction of such an error is an "alarming start toward the complete undermining of present tariff procedure."

The proposed legislation should be considered on its merits. Hardboard, being solid pressed wood, is a manufacture of wood. So considered, H. R. 9666, as reported, should be promptly enacted.

Yours very truly,

Donald Linville,
Executive Secretary.

Effect of Ignorance on Production and Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, July 24, 1954

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, during the past 6 years I have on several occasions called the Senate's attention to the problem of illiteracy. I have done this by the introduction of bills to assist the States in attacking this problem and by the insertion of articles and statements in the Record, designed to throw light on the problem. Neither from the standpoint of our civilian nor our military defense can we afford the luxury of ignorance among millions of our adult citizens. Sooner or later we must face up to the necessity of eliminating this blot from our national life, and of the responsibility of the Federal Government to render assistance to States and local communities in attacking the job.

In the current issue of the Nation's Business, Sam Stavisky tells how ignorance cuts production and defense. He says that—

> In this age of increasing technical and mechanical complexity, extensive knowledge and highly developed skills are at a premium in the factory, on the farm, and in our national defense. Yet our national illiteracy hurts our whole economy.

How right he is, anyone familiar with the situation will agree. I urge the

Senate to face up to the problem of illiteracy in the United States.

The article is such a penetrating analysis of the illiteracy problem that I am asking permission to insert it in the Record. I hope every Senator will read it, and do what he can to inform his constituents about the seriousness of adult illiteracy among our citizens, because I plan again to introduce my bill to help fight this national menace as soon as the next session of the Congress convenes.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Ignorance Cuts Production and Defense

(By Sam Stavisky)

In the past year the Army was compelled to teach 120,000 draftees enough of the three R's to put them on the mental level of kids who have completed four grades of grammar school.

The Army has more important things to do than teach inductees the rudiments of reading, writing, and simple arithmetic. Yet, it has no alternative. Modern weapons are valueless, even dangerous, in the hands of illiterates.

The same is true of modern production machinery in industry and agriculture. This means that, as our technology advances, the illiterate is becoming more nearly a total loss in the American way of life.

The problem daily becomes more serious as our growing population requires increased efficiency at every level of our production system. In the face of a Communist enemy with greater resources of manpower and perhaps equal resources in production, this weakness could lead to calamity. Machines, like weapons, are useless in the hands of those who cannot understand them.

The Army's effort to man its ultramodern weapons provides a disturbing illustration of our danger.

It is generally recognized that, during World War II, the Army hit the bottom of the bucket in dredging the ranks of draft eligibles for manpower. But even during the partial mobilization for the Korean conflict, and in the uneasy peace which has followed, the Army has been forced to accept low-caliber manpower for the handling of high-caliber firepower.

Today, 1 out of every 10 draftees the Army accepts is a "functional illiterate" lacking the capacity to learn possessed by the average fifth-grade pupil.

Today, 3 to 4 out of every 10 draftees taken into the Army are marginal soldiers. Many of them must be assigned to common labor details, or housekeeping duties, because of their substandard mentalities.

Today, 36 percent of the Army's enlisted strength is classified as group IV, the lowest mental category accepted for service. Inductees make up the bulk of this group, plus the professional privates who like the peacetime service but who—according to the Army—do not make good combat soldiers. Relatively few of these marginal men will rise to the noncommissioned officer ranks—the cadre on which the Army must speedily build to wartime strength in time of emergency.

The Army is probably a little better off today in respect to its burden of undesirable inductees than it was 6 years ago. At that time, the Army was being swamped with marginal GI's, while the other services skimmed off the available brainpower.

The Selective Service Act provided that draft eligibles could not be rejected on mental deficiency grounds so long as they attained a minimum score on the Army's screening test. Congress set this minimum lower than the Army would have preferred. The other services, filling their personnel needs with volunteers, did not have to take the draftees, so that the Army wound up with most of the substandard recruits.

The late Secretary of Defense James Forrestal, in an effort to ease the protesting Army's load, issued a directive in 1948 calling for an equal division of inductees among all the services on the basis of mental fitness.

The Forrestal formula provided, in effect, that each service was to get the same percentage of "bright boys," or officer material (group I), good prospects for promotion to "noncoms" (group II), fair prospects for "noncom" advancement (group III), and the unwanted marginal men (group IV).

However, loopholes in the formula permitted the Air Force and Navy to acquire more of the higher-type recruits. As exclusive recipient of the draft, the Army could turn none away who met the minimum mental score on the screening test.

The Army's leaders, military and civilian, screamed in horrified anguish when Congress, in 1950, further lowered the minimum mental score for draftees to the bottom level of World War II. There was tremendous political pressure for such action. Southern Members of Congress denounced the high minimum mental score which resulted in high rejection rates for the South's draft-age Negroes. The draft boards, led by Maj. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, head of the Selective Service System, were concerned that the Army wasn't properly utilizing its manpower, and simply couldn't afford to pass up the physically able draftees merely because of their mental insufficiency.

Congress rejected the Army's pleas against lowering the mental minimum score for draftees, but it did order the Department of Defense to tighten up the Forrestal formula so as to give the Army a fair shake at obtaining more of the bright boys and fewer of the dullards. To this end, the Department of Defense set up a number of rules to prevent cheating—the services competed hard to obtain the better grade recruits—and at the same time ordered all recruits to be tested at the same Armed Forces Examining Station, rather than at individual service examining stations. Under this change, the Army did get a better break, in terms of brainpower, than in the past.

Yet, the Army found it had been compelled to induct 43 percent of its recruits in fiscal 1953 from the men who fell in group IV or below. In that year, the Army wound up with 8 out of 10 marginal recruits reluctantly accepted by all of the Armed Forces.

Trying to make the most of its marginal manpower, the Army created a string of special schools which since mid-1949 have graduated 257,000 illiterates to the level of a fifth-grade beginner. However, it made the mistake of sending the marginal men into regular recruit training first and then to special literacy school.

Early this year, the Army recognized its error and established seven transitional training units to which the marginal draftees are sent first. Only after graduation from the transitional schools are the illiterates sent on to regular recruit training. The transitional schools provide not only a minimum literacy standard, but they also give the marginal men a taste of military training so that they will not immediately stick out as the company "eight balls" when they show up for regular recruit training.

Special English-language training also is given to the draftees who lack an adequate command of our national tongue.

The Army hasn't been enthusiastic with the results of its special schooling. One reason is the time element. The other services, which take only volunteers except in the worst of emergencies, get 4 years out of each inductee. The Army, dependent mainly on draftees, is limited to 2 years. Take out the necessary time for training, furloughs, illness, processing, etc., and the 2 years dwindle to 16 or 17 months of utilization for each draftee. The illiterates lose an additional 2 to 4 weeks learning to unravel the simpler mysteries of the A B C's, and even after graduation some have to be discharged as hopelessly unqualified for military duty.

The Army, in fact, has a poor opinion not only of the illiterates, who are on the bottom of the mental totem pole, but of the mental group IV soldiers generally. Data based on tests and experience make it clear that the use of personnel of relatively low mental ability is costly from the standpoint of training, disciplinary problems, and manpower utilization, according to Assistant Secretary of the Army (for manpower) Hugh M. Milton II, a retired major general who served in both World Wars.

These marginal recruits, Mr. Milton notes, have a failure rate of 4 to 7 times as high as other GI's even in the simpler technical courses such as those for clerks, machinists, and track-vehicle repairmen. For example, approximately two-thirds of the marginal soldiers failed to achieve a passing grade in the clerical course. Other studies, according to Mr. Milton, indicate that the marginal soldiers get into trouble—through going A. W. O. L. and committing crimes—far out of proportion to their relative numbers.

Furthermore, a study of Korean troops by the Human Resources Research Office (HUMRO), a private organization conducting tests for the Army, supports the Army's belief that the marginal men are not only poor combat troops, but may prove to be a source of danger to the good soldiers.

Even the basic rifle squad, smallest and simplest of the Army's combat units, is highly mechanized to meet the demands of modern warfare. Greater firepower requires better brainpower.

HUMRO found that in combat the fighter generally had more education than the nonfighter. He was more intelligent, more stable emotionally, had a higher degree of social responsibility and a greater leadership potential than the nonfighter. HUMRO further found that the rifle squad seemed to get a disproportionately larger share of men with low intellectual ability. It appeared to HUMRO researchers that the fighter was penalized by having so many of these low-ability men who are less likely to fight well alongside him.

"To the extent that the Army is forced to accept men from the national manpower pool who are low in ability, to such an extent will its fighting potential be reduced," HUMRO observed.

On the basis of such studies, and its experience with marginals over the years, the Army is convinced that, with the widest possible latitude, it can reasonably use only 40 percent of the mental group IV recruits it expects to acquire in the next 12 months.

Then what will the Army do with the other 60 percent of the marginal men?

Mr. Milton says it will have to channel them into technical training, even though it recognizes that a large percentage of them will fail the courses. The Army will choose this alternative rather than place marginal personnel in responsible positions in the combat units, thereby jeopardizing other combat troops.

Students of the military, notably Eli Ginzberg, and Douglas W. Bray, authors of The Uneducated, a research project of Columbia University's Conservation of Human Resources, charge that the Army has failed to make the most of its opportunity to educate and utilize its marginal manpower. The

National Manpower Council has made a similar criticism. But these critics point out that the problem of the illiterates is fundamentally not an Army problem, but a national problem which requires a national approach to solution.

"Illiteracy * * * reflects 1 of 2 conditions," say social scientists Ginzberg and Bray. "Either the individual has had no opportunity to attend school, or he attended a poor school for a short period of time."

The community and the State, and not the Army, are to blame for illiteracy and the low level of education among the marginal men of the Army and the other branches of the Armed Forces.

The national responsibility for illiteracy—in the States and communities—was recently summed up, before a congressional committee, by William G. Carr, executive secretary of the National Education Association.

One out of five schools is outmoded, unsafe, or obsolete. The communities are short more than 300,000 classrooms for 8,800,000 students. Some 700,000 children are attending classes on double shifts.

The extent of the national problem is underscored by the latest census which finds that we have—today—9,500,000 illiterate adult citizens.

These illiterates are not only unwanted by the modern Army; they are also unwanted by modern industry.

A recently completed study by the education department of the United States Chamber of Commerce gives evidence that the uneducated and poorly educated are a drag on our progress. They generally have lower earning power as workers; have less success as farmers; are less active politically; attain a lower standard of living.

In the past as a nation confident of our industrial genius and productivity, we have shrugged off, or ignored, the ominous signs of our illiteracy. The United States came through World War II as victor, although its armed services were forced to use hundreds of thousands of marginal soldiers.

As of today, more than one-third of the Army's enlisted strength is made up of marginal GI's. In addition, the draft boards have a list of 500,000 American youths who were so mentally unfit that the Army would not take them in.

Every State—and virtually every community—contributes to the Army's pool of marginal men, and to the draft boards' lists of mentally rejected youths. Fourteen States have draft rejection rates, due to mental and educational deficiency, of 21 to 56 percent.

Actually, there is no Army problem insofar as the brainpower shortage is concerned. There is only a national problem. Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway, Army Chief of Staff, points to this stark truth when he declares:

"The disparity in manpower between the United States and the forces of the Communist bloc, which are today the great threat to our national security, makes American technological superiority in weapons and equipment mandatory.

"To use the more complex instruments of modern war properly requires men of higher caliber. There is a greater need than ever before for the soldier to have higher technical ability, intelligence, and initiative."

Yesterday, illiteracy was merely a national disgrace. Today, in the face of the Communist threat, illiteracy is a grave national problem. Tomorrow, if our States and communities do not take steps to abolish it, illiteracy can become a national disaster.

Impractical Curtailment of Postal Transportation Service Is Against the Public Interest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 22, 1954

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I should like to include at this time the letter that I addressed to John C. Allen, Assistant Postmaster General, protesting against the proposed curtailment of postal transportation service in the New England area, and the reply from Mr. Allen.

I earnestly hope that developments will prove the sincerity of Mr. Allen's words that "no action will be taken that will impair the postal service."

The letters follow:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., July 20, 1954.

Hon. JOHN C. ALLEN,
Assistant Postmaster General,
Post Office Department,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ALLEN: I am advised a Department order is being issued through your office to drastically reduce the railway postal transportation service in the first division area.

From an examination of the factors involved, it would appear that if this order prevails, with its implied consolidation of lines as well as trains, it would more seriously impair the public postal service that even now seems to be deficient in the Boston and New England region.

Obviously, it would impose real and substantial hardship upon those postal service members affected and their families who have permanently located themselves in various communities and who will be forced to move, not to mention the undetermined number of others who may well be eliminated from their positions or placed on very short hours; this in an area where threatening unemployment has been a most disturbing factor in the economy.

Also, it would seem reasonable to expect, from past experience, that considerable amounts of mail will not be able to be sorted enroute and therefore will have to be piled up at railway post office terminals and local post offices waiting upon necessarily delayed manual processing. Inevitably, that must lead to multitudinous complaints from families, and particularly business establishments who, I think, rightfully feel they are paying sufficient taxes to be entitled to full and complete mail service.

I know your earnest interest in attempting to improve, both in economy and efficiency, the organized disposal of mail. However, in this particular instance, may I respectfully ask your review of the pertinent factors outlined above, so as to insure no unnecessary restriction of prompt mail service is imposed upon the public at large, and no unnecessary hardship is visited upon loyal postal transportation service employees.

I shall be very grateful if you will notify me at your earliest convenience of your contemplated policy and plans in this matter.

Many thanks for your courtesy, and with best personal wishes.

Sincerely,

HAROLD D. DONOHUE,
Member of Congress.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT,
ASSISTANT POSTMASTER GENERAL,
BUREAU OF TRANSPORTATION,
Washington, July 22, 1954.

Hon. HAROLD D. DONOHUE,
House of Representatives.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DONOHUE: This will acknowledge receipt of your letter of July 20, 1954, protesting proposed reduction in railway post-office service in New England.

The general superintendent at Boston has been directed to make a survey of certain lines in his division that provide dual service with a view to effecting consolidations where it is possible to do so without impairment of the postal service.

This is part of a general program that has been in effect for several months and is not local to the New England area. You may rest assured that no action will be taken that will impair the postal service. On the contrary, we are most hopeful that the survey will result in service improvement where needed while at the same time producing substantial economies.

I appreciate your interest in this matter, and if I can be of further help to you, please advise.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN C. ALLEN,
Assistant Postmaster General.

Importance of Local Air Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 22, 1954

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, Members may recall my remarks of May 10 when I warned that caution and study were needed before we accepted the administration's proposed civil aviation policy review. I suggested that the provision recommending use of the Federal regulating power to eliminate nonscheduled airlines and feeder service to small communities might tend to create a big-business monopoly and drive smaller airlines out of business.

I went on to suggest that such an eventuality would weaken our commercial aviation, which we all recognize as the background for strong, healthy, military airpower.

The importance of the feeder airline to the aviation economy was discussed in an article published in the June issue of Flight magazine, and written by Leslie O. Barnes, president, Allegheny Airlines, Inc. Mr. Barnes, the youngest president of a scheduled, certificated airline in the United States, also discusses the worrisome problem of subsidy and offers some well-thought-out suggestions for sharp reduction and eventual elimination of the subsidies.

I commend Mr. Barnes' article to the attention of my colleagues, and include it as a part of my remarks. It follows:

LOCAL SERVICE—DESTINY AND DEFINITION

(By Leslie O. Barnes, president, Allegheny Airlines, Inc.)

It would seem that, after nearly a decade of experience, there would be a firm national policy on the question of (1) whether air service to intermediate cities should be continued, (2) to what extent it should be continued, (3) who should provide this service and (4) the extent to which the service should be underwritten by the Federal Government. Of equal importance, it would seem that by now we should be in a position to clearly define just what we mean by local service.

The fact is that there is neither a long-range national policy on this question of local service, nor has local service ever been defined. Executive Order No. 10—ordering separation of subsidy from mail payments—highlighted the subsidy question, and with it what might be the broader question of whether the subsidized air services are worth what they cost the Federal Government. As it now stands, each year these services are publicly re-examined and must be justified on the basis of their value to the Nation.

A long-range plan should be developed. It must be based on a careful analysis of the national worth of these services and the alternatives available if the services are not provided. Unless this is done, there is the very real possibility that a precipitate, harmful action will be taken through a determination to prematurely reduce or elimniate subsidy support without regard for the consequences.

Reduced to the barest essentials, there are two basic issues. In the case of the second, there are only two alternatives:

ISSUE I—Is air transportation to intermediate cities necessary in the national interest and to what extent, if any, should this service—regardless of who may supply it—be underwritten by the Federal Government?

ISSUE II—If it is in the national interest that intermediate cities be linked into the national air transport system, then the question remains: How can this service be provided at minimum cost to the Federal Government? Only one or two answers can apply to this question:

One answer: Continue the local service airlines which were created to provide the service, making them as strong as possible short of serious diversion from the trunk carriers, and enunciate this decision as a national long-range objective and policy.

The other answer: Terminate the local service carriers and require in their stead the same minimum frequency of operations over the same routes from the trunk carriers replacing them.

IS AIR SERVICE NECESSARY TO INTERMEDIATE CITIES?

Much factual support has been developed over the past 7 years which, without question, clearly establishes this need. While service to some cities might conceivably be discontinued without serious harm, by and large the record at over 200 intermediate-sized communities speaks clearly in defense of the need.

By way of summary, over the past 8 to 10 years the economic structure of our Nation has changed—and the business tempo increased—more sharply, perhaps, than at any time in the Nation's history. New businesses have been created in the outlying areas and linked to the larger metropolitan areas, industries have been decentralized, new branch offices created in more favorable labor areas, and excess labor markets in the intermediate cities absorbed—all as a vast and irresistible part of this new era. While this may be associated with a peacetime economy, it is not going to change in the event of a national emergency. Indeed, the need for industrial decentralization and a diversification of effort becomes even more urgent.

Over these past years much greater productivity is required of the human machine—whether he be salesman, executive, engineer, or technician. As a Nation, for a variety of reasons we have decentralized our laboratories, our businesses, our production effort. Air transport has been relied upon as a connecting medium. Often it has been the basis for selecting a specific location.

Nor is local service entirely for the benefit of the businesses and citizens in the intermediate city. In a recent survey we found that more than 50 percent of our passengers originate in the large metropolitan areas. The reason for this is clear—businesses in the large cities are just as dependent upon air service to intermediate cities as are businesses in the intermediate cities to the large cities. It's a two-way street.

If this is so, then who is going to take local air service away from even a handful of the cities which have come to rely upon it and have grown with it? By any measurement, air transportation, whether it be between large metropolitan areas, or whether it be between these areas and the intermediate cities, has become a necessary and essential fixture in our national way of life. Since this is so, then there remains only the question of how best to provide air service to the intermediate cities.

THE HOW (OR WHO) OF THE MATTER

It has been suggested from time to time, and again only recently, that as a means of eliminating subsidy, the trunks should be required to serve the less-profitable—often-costly intermediate cities. This proposal suggests that the profits earned by the trunks could well be used to underwrite the unprofitable air services and routes. This is unsound for a number of reasons. Let's look at three rather than obvious ones:

1. The trunk profit margin is already too narrow. The only "enthusiasm dampener" needed here is an inspection of the industry's first quarter reports for 1954 as compared to 1953. Unless there is a general fare increase this year, the profit margin will become even narrower and in some cases critical.

2. Mix very-much local service operations into a trunk carrier's machinery and several presently subsidy-free carriers will quickly become subsidized. One of two practical, and fairly recent, examples of this are already on record. The $21 million or so (out of $73 million for all services) which the 14 local carriers will receive for fiscal year 1955 will seem small by comparison.

3. The trunks have equipped themselves out of the local service market. The twin-engine equipment used by the trunks today will do a fine job at perhaps half of the intermediate airports. Either the trunks will have to reequip their fleets with DC-3's or someone will have the highly unpleasant, and perhaps embarrassing, job of explaining to the airport authorities, the chambers of commerce and citizens of some 258 communities why they have either no air service at all or very substantially reduced service.

There are other reasons, but these three should be enough to ponder for awhile. Condensed, they add up to this one cold fact: The local service airlines, as a segment of air transportation, cannot be replaced by the trunk lines at any national saving unless there is a wholesale abandonment of air service to two hundred-odd intermediate communities now receiving scheduled air service.

FORBIDDEN TERRITORY

A major factor contributing to the absence of either a long-range policy or a definition of the local service sphere of activity is the uncertainty of precisely how the local carriers fit into the scheme of things and the course their future development will take.

The uncertainty is by no means confined to any one person or group of persons, whether he or they be a segment of the industry, a Government agency or bureau, or a committee. The local carriers, themselves, tend to differ to some extent on the matter of their ultimate development. The management policies of the trunk carriers vary from complete acceptance and support of the two-level philosophy to consistent resistance to any development or strengthening of the local carriers.

Philosophies on how large the local service carriers should be, and what restrictions should be placed on their operations to avoid excessive competition to the trunks, also vary—both within the Government and among and within the carriers. Up to the present the overwhelming and persistent demands for local air transportation, the increasing acceptance of the services offered, the inevitable exemptions, shifts, and adjustments to meet newly developed demands, have permitted little time for a careful and searching examination of these questions.

The trunklines—even those supporting the local service concept—either keep a most watchful eye on their younger brethren, or are downright distrustful of them and their motives, and well they might, too, because, unless some pretty careful lines are drawn and a plan of development defined, it is conceivable the local carriers might very well become a serious competitive threat to the trunks. The threat does not lie in our activities at the intermediate cities; this activity is in strict accordance with the initial reason for our creation. Rather, the threat to the trunks is found in the possibility of our ultimately penetrating the nonstop operation between major trading areas.

This is forbidden territory and local carriers have no business invading it. The trunklines should be insured, so to speak, against this threat for two reasons: First, this is not our role, nor was it ever intended that it would be. Secondly, the ultimate success of the local service concept is dependent upon our concentrating on our particular mission—service to intermediate cities.

It should not be difficult to give this needed assurance to the trunks, because no other source of action makes any real or lasting sense. It must seem obvious that if the survival and growth of the local carriers are dependent upon long-haul business between major trading areas, then the original basis for our creation no longer exists. It was never intended that we should do other than provide the best possible service to intermediate cities, and should we or the Civil Aeronautics Board forget this, then all we would succeed in doing would be to repeat the mistakes of the past.

The fulfillment of our role—indeed our survival—is dependent upon our imagination, and the concentration of our abilities and energies on the development of air services at our intermediate cities. We should carry trunkline and local-service passengers between major terminal points only to the extent that we handle overflow from the trunks. Our growth should not, under any circumstances, be dependent upon attracting or penetrating this type traffic.

THE LOCAL CARRIERS' PLACE

The restriction against nonstop operations between major terminals obviously confines the local carriers to a specific activity sphere. This, in turn, tends to control the size and structure of the local carrier. The question of how large a local carrier should be and how it should look, is difficult to treat in a limited space; yet, from the standpoint of its importance to long-range planning and perspective, it possibly outranks all other facets of the problem.

So long as we do not attempt to compete with the trunks between major terminals, the size of the area to be served by the local carrier is of little importance. Obviously, it is desirable to spread indirect costs over the largest possible base. This, however, is not the controlling factor. In fact, there are some pretty bad booby traps involved where size is the primary goal.

The United States is rather clearly divided into a number of large areas of closely integrated interests, with each area embracing several large trading and industrial centers. The community of interest between the smaller intermediate cities within an area lies predominantly with one or more of the large centers within the same area. There is a relatively limited community of interest between the intermediate cities of one area with the trading centers or cities in another area.

The trunkline function is to link together the major trading and industrial centers within an area, and to link this area with the other areas. The local service function is to link the intermediate communities to the trade and industrial centers within its area.

The particular trade area, therefore, determines the size and the route structure of the local carrier. For maximum results the local carriers must be confined to these areas. By the same token, the local carriers' routes should be "anchored" to the large cities along the perimeter of the area being served. To accomplish this, some routes will have to be extended, while others should either be abandoned or transferred. For maximum development, there should be at least two routes into each of the "anchor" cities.

MAKING THE LOCAL CARRIERS STRONGER

Establish the boundaries and "anchor" cities of individual local service areas: Long-range planning is difficult, and certainly filled with inaccuracies, until the boundaries of the trading areas are established. Everything else stems from this initial step.

The next phase of development for the local carriers is the establishment of these areas. Accomplishment will entail some major alterations in the local service structure as we know it today—mergers, route transfers, consolidation of services, etc.

This will be a painful process. It should be accomplished within the next 3 years—more probably will take at least 5. Yet, it must be done, arbitrarily, if necessary, if a strong and permanent local service pattern is to be developed.

Relax schedule restrictions: The local carriers were created in an atmosphere clearly designed to avoid competition of any description to the trunks. As a result, the locals were originally required to make every stop on every flight; the routes were highly circuitous; unproductive stops were required in some cases by the locals simply to reduce or eliminate any semblance of competition.

The economics of this gradually became apparent, and gradually the routes have been straightened out; some unproductive stops eliminated, and some overflying permitted. With this greater flexibility, the locals have grown and done so without harm to the trunks. In fact, the converse is true, if the approximately $20 million turned over to the trunks by the local carriers last year is any measurement.

The trend has not gone far enough. I am a firm believer in the policy that the trunks should be protected against serious diversion between their major points. By the same token, I do not believe protection is necessary or called for between an intermediate community receiving only "token" service from the trunk and a major point; nor do I believe that there should be any scheduling restrictions between points where the local airline is the sole operator over the route.

The adoption of three basic scheduling policies would do much to strengthen the local carriers—

1. Reduce scheduling restrictions between major terminal points to the minimum necessary to avoid serious diversion from the trunks operating between the areas. A requirement for two intermediate stops normally should serve this purpose. In isolated cases, depending upon the circumstances, 1 stop would be sufficient; in a few cases 3 might be required but never more than 3. The reason for this is not to get into the terminal-to-terminal business of the trunks; rather it is to provide a better, more salable service at intermediate points at less cost.

In an area where demand at the intermediate cities has developed to the point where limited-stop direct service can be supported, the freedom to overfly easily translates into significant economics. For example, between 2 of Allegheny's cities we are required to make 1 stop. Due to the circuity of the route, the present fare yields us 6 cents per passenger mile. Operating direct without the stop and charging the same fare, our yield is increased to 7 cents per passenger-mile. One cent over our entire system means $35,800 per month to us.

There are two other byproducts of this freedom to operate direct flights between intermediate points and terminal points: First, the obvious one of greater operating economy. The circuitous operation in the example costs us nearly $30 more per flight than would a direct flight. The second byproduct is the not-to-be-ignored fact that we give the passengers a better ride and more attractive service, thus generating more local business.

2. Eliminate all restrictions between any intermediate point and the terminal point, especially where the restriction is designed to protect a trunk carrier which is operating only a token service of 1 or 2 round trips per day through the intermediate station.

Restrictions of this type are particularly harmful to local service development because very often they necessitate stopping flights at other intermediate points already receiving adequate service from the local carrier. The economics and other advantages are the same as those outlined in the previous point.

3. There should be no restrictions against operating non-stop service between terminals—regardless of the distance involved—where the local carrier is the only operator between a major terminal and its own terminating point.

In some cases this may involve a rather substantial distance. But it is emphasized that the only ban necessary on long-haul operation should be between major cities along regular trunk routes. The reason for the ban is to avoid diversion for the trunks; the ban is not against distance.

So long as we do not penetrate or directly compete with the trunk-line operation between major terminals, then we should be free to provide the best, most direct service between any pair of points served exclusively by the local carriers over regular routes. The only deterrent to direct non-stop operation of this type should be the question of whether the demand and use will support the operation.

Suspensions: Where a trunk carrier and a local service carrier's route parallel between an intermediate point and a terminal, and further where the trunk as a matter of consistent practice has operated only 2 or less trips per day through the intermediate station, then the trunk carrier should be suspended.

At first glance, this might seem like a "man bites dog" sort of thing, or even inconsistent with earlier statements on trunk versus local relationships. It is not. Suspension of the trunks at their thinly-scheduled intermediate stops would, in fact, strengthen both the trunk and the local carrier.

With but rare exceptions a trunk will lose money at a station served by two or less round trips. On the average, the suspended trunk loses only the revenue between the intermediate point and the terminal while at the same time more than making this up on the savings in station and operating costs. If the passenger goes beyond the terminal point, the chances are excellent that the trunk will get the revenue beyond the point any way, and without the expense of generating it.

As an example one trunk has suspended at three common points with Allegheny. We connect with this carrier at the terminal point of this route. During 1953, the total revenue turned over to the trunk carrier amounted to $370,771. This is substantially more than the total on-line revenue produced by all three stations.

A policy of suspension at such intermediate points is not harmful to the trunks, and it is a real help to the local service airlines operating in the area.

ON SUBSIDY

The subsidy question is, of course, the core of everyone's concern with this problem. Whether subsidy is justified for the local services is dependent upon the evaluation of the arguments presented here. If it has been justified, as it has to be before the core is reached, then the question is: How much and for how long?

It has been customary to measure subsidy in terms of the total subsidy dollars required to sustain the service. This is a poor measuring stick and it is deceptive in a most harmful sense. Subsidy—and progress—should be measured in terms of how much is being provided per dollar of subsidy. Whether you use seat miles, passengers, passenger miles or some other service criterion, the record will show that real progress has been made and that the Govenment and taxpayers are getting much more today for $24 million than they were getting in 1950 for $17 million.

Mail pay, or subsidy, has gone up, not because of any real or implied inefficiency, but rather because the services performed have been greatly increased. The simplest way to illustrate this is by means of the following table:

Services performed	1950	1953	Percent of increase
United States mail pay	$17,191,453	$23,996,730	39.59
Available seat-miles flown thousands	599,150	1,022,074	70.58
Revenue-passengers	969,428	2,034,832	109.99
Revenue-passenger miles thousands	188,782	391,384	107.32
Total non-mail revenues	$11,289,448	$24,993,374	121.39
Percent nonmail revenues to total revenues	39.64	51.02	----

Thus, for an increase of approximately 39 percent in mail pay/subsidy from 1950 through 1953, the Nation—by any standard of measurement—has received a very substantial increase in services rendered. This is a good bargain for the Nation, particularly when there appears to be no way to eliminate the subsidy without at the same time eliminating the service.

How long will subsidy be necessary? If the suggestions outlined here could be placed in operation overnight, then there is no question but that the Nation's subsidy bill would be immediately decreased. But even so, subsidy would not be eliminated.

It is unlikely that subsidy to the local carriers can be eliminated within the next 5- to 10-year period. Reduction and eventual elimination are dependent upon (1) the degree to which the local carriers' route system can be strengthened; (2) the generation of substantially increased nonmail revenues; and (3) a suitable replacement for the DC-3. In the meantime, there appears to be no reason why the total local service subsidy bill should be increased beyond the level forecast for fiscal year 1955.

Reduction below the forecast level should be a natural process. A program of reduction must be geared to the profit margin realized by the local carriers. The local carriers today are in a seriously weakened position financially—not because of any general mismanagement of the airlines, but rather because we have been straitjacketed by a formula which makes impossible a profit sufficient to build a reserve to pay dividends or to attain any degree of financial stability.

A premature or artificial reduction in subsidy will delay the day when a healthy reduction can be made. Reduction should be based on the profit and management record. It should not be based on a program of reduction for reduction's sake.

DESTINY

1. Local service cannot be curtailed without harm to the national economy.

2. Short of wholesale suspension of service, the trunk carriers cannot replace the local carriers without serious harm to their own economy.

3. The local carriers are a permanent fixture in the national air transport system. Their form will be modified, they will be contracted or possibly eliminated in some cases, expanded in others—but they will be continued.

DEFINITION

Local service is primarily the function of providing air service to intermediate communities, linking them to one or more large industrial or trading centers within a specified area or geographical section by the most direct routes and at the highest frequency consistent with demand.

DEFINITION

1. By whatever means are necessary, establish the permanent size and structure of the local carriers.

2. Strengthen the local carriers through route consolidations, elimination of scheduling restrictions between intermediate points and terminals, and suspension of trunks at "token service" points.

3. Avoid premature actions designed to reduce or eliminate subsidy; relate reductions to the profit margin. Reductions will be the product then of natural and healthy progress.

Amending Atomic Energy Act of 1946, as Amended

SPEECH

OF

HON. W. STERLING COLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 23, 1954

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 9757) to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, as amended.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, I am fully conscious of my inability to adequately deal with the subject matter of patents, but to me it is of paramount and transcendent importance that the manner in which this bill deals with patents in the atomic-energy field be properly treated. The bill, as presented for the consideration of the House this evening, requires compulsory licensing of patents in the nonmilitary field. As I endeavored to explain to the House a number of hours ago, this is the first time in the history of this country that the Congress would be adopting a law providing for compulsory licensing of patents although many efforts to do so have been made in years past. The argument is advanced by the supporters of the compulsory licensing approach that it is necessary in order to prevent a few companies or those persons who have been engaged in this program from reaping an unjust harvest because of that association with the program. With that objective, I am in complete agreement. But there is another way in which that can be reached without doing utter and complete violence to the traditional patent system that has made this country so great. It will be pointed out that the President in his recommendation to the Congress urged that the law with respect to patents be enlarged to make lawful patents in the atomic-energy field, but that it be circumscribed for the period of the next 5 years by requiring compulsory licenses. I felt so deeply on this subject that I undertook personally to communicate with the President by way of letter pointing out the dangers of such an approach. A short while ago I received a reply from which I will read but one sentence. The letter in effect reiterates the recommendation made by the President at that time, but it carries this additional sentence. I should point out that this reply is not from the President, but from Mr. Bernard M. Shanley, special counsel to the President. I quote from the letter:

> THE WHITE HOUSE,
> *Washington, July 15, 1954.*
>
> Hon. STERLING COLE,
> *House of Representatives,*
> *Washington, D. C.*
>
> DEAR MR. COLE: The President asked me to reply to your letter of June 26 with respect to the patent provisions of the proposed amendments of the Atomic Energy Act.
>
> The President is concerned, as I am sure you are, that permitting greater utilization of atomic energy by industry does not result in giving to the limited number of companies which have had contractual relations with the Atomic Energy Commission a monopoly position in this field. For this reason, he felt that it was essential that the act contain some effective mechanism to prevent this situation from arising. Hence, he suggested that the authority which the Atomic Energy Commission now has under the act to require a patent owner to license others to use an invention essential to the peacetime applications of atomic energy be continued for a limited period. This suggestion, however, was not intended to foreclose the consideration and adoption by the Congress of any other effective merchanism that would accomplish the objective that the President had in mind.
>
> With kind regards,
> Sincerely yours,
> BERNARD M. SHANLEY,
> *Special Counsel to the President.*

The amendment that I have proposed is to the effect that every application for a patent in this field must carry with it a sworn statement by the applicant telling the time and circumstances and conditions under which this invention or discovery was conceived, and if that information discloses that it was during the course of any employment by the Atomic Energy Commission or employment by a contractor of the Commission or in any relationship whatever with the Federal Government that then the Commission may deny to that applicant the right of a patent and declare that that patent is public property—based upon the argument that it was conceived in the course of an association with the Government which was supported by public funds. That to me accomplishes the objective. It prevents anybody at all—everybody whatsoever who has been engaged in this program from obtaining a patent in the nonmilitary field of atomic energy, if that invention or discovery was conceived during the course of any association or relation with the Government. My objection to the compulsory licensing provision is that basically it is clearly in contravention of the Constitution, which says that the Congress may grant exclusive rights to patents and inventions. As you will note, it says "exclusive right." Therefore, a compulsory patent law is a clear violation and infringement of the exclusiveness of a patent.

This subject was a matter of concern when the McMahon Act was considered by the Congress 7, 8, or 10 years ago. It was of such concern that the chairman of the Patent Committee at that time, a man who most of you will recall as being one of the most respected, most lovable and most learned men in this House, whose specialty was in the field of patents, took occasion when this bill was under consideration to take the floor and expound his view. The gentleman to whom I refer was the Honorable Fritz Lanham, of the State of Texas.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE].

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, in connection with a proposal that was contained in the McMahon Act dealing with a section requiring compulsory licensing, he said:

> It would be much more than a poor pun or a facetious observation to say of the patent section in this bill for the consideration of a bomb that it is "a-bomb-inable." It would sovietize our American system of patents upon which our prosperity and our progress have been founded.

That was the counsel of the one man in the House at that time who I dare say knew more about patents and the significance of our traditional patent system and the development of our industrial economy than any other man in the House at that time or since.

Further than that, it was a matter of such concern to members of the committee of the House having jurisdiction over this subject that it was the sole item contained in an expression of minority views of the Committee on Military Affairs. That expression took violent exception and protest against the adoption of a compulsory licensing system, although I point out it was rather academic because other sections of the McMahon Act prohibited patents. Therefore it was academic. But irrespective of its full force, the Military Affairs Committee or at least a minority of that committee took occasion to criticize it.

It is interesting to see who those Members were at that time in 1946 who opposed it.

First is the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER], who is presently a Member. Next, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN], who is still a Member. A former Member from the State of Ohio, a highly respected attorney, Charles Elston. Another former Member from the State of Indiana, who now serves in an official capacity in the other body, Mr. Forest Harness. Dr. IVOR FENTON, of the State of Pennsylvania, opposed compulsory licensing. The Honorable DEWEY SHORT, now chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, raised a word of warning against this step. The Honorable LESLIE ARENDS, present whip of this House, protested against compulsory licensing, and 1 or 2 others.

Mr. Chairman, this is the first step in a most dangerous direction. It will be argued that it is in a very narrow field of nonmilitary utilization of atomic energy, it will be argued that it is only for a short period of time, 5 years. The tragedy is that having taken this step it cannot be retraced. In the future other Congresses will point to the action which we take tonight and say that the Congress in 1954 determined that the public interest required the inauguration of a system of compulsory licensing, therefore we in 1964 can make it 10 years or 20 years or forever, we can make it not only in the atomic area of a patent application but we can make it in electronics, aircraft engines, aircraft frames, any phase of our industrial production. If it is logical in this small area for this short period of time, it must be logical to enlarge it to other areas.

Perhaps the most important argument against compulsory licensing is that it is a reversal of a great tradition. For Congress to enact such a provision into law would be to defile and debase a 150 years of patent precedent. Undoubtedly, there is not a single member sitting in either House who can be certain that the vast industrial success of the United States, our primary defense weapon, is not the direct result of this excellent system. Compulsory licensing will completely alter its basic concepts. In this regard the Congress faces an awesome responsibility when it sets such a precedent.

It is urged that the compulsory licensing provision in H. R. 9757 will serve the public interest by preventing a few companies from capturing certain key patents. I would contend that this provision could have the reverse effect. The industries involved might choose to use their inventions as trade secrets and not patent them. As a result, there would be no publication and no review of the publication by competitors who would immediately set their research effort on the improvement of the primary patent. Trade secrets are common in American industry and are quite successfully concealed. Obviously, the public interest is better served by publication and the incentive to improve upon the primary patent.

It has been urged that the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, as amended, provided for compulsory licensing of certain patents in the atomic energy field, and that therefore it would be a reversal of precedent for the present bill not to contain this provision. It can be clearly shown, however, that this provision in the McMahon Act is a naked grant. The compulsory licensing provision was an unnecessary gratuity on the part of the framers, who may very well have had motives for breaking patent precedent other than the furtherance of nuclear enterprises. Furthermore, it is apparent that since the 7b report was a condition precedent to compulsory licensing, the committee and the Congress would get a second look at the compulsory licensing feature.

The Constitution has established a perfect system of reward for the inventor. It is impossible to fix the price of monetary reward for a particular invention by Constitution or statute because no one can anticipate the value of a particular invention. Therefore, what is the best reward that the Congress and previously the framers of the Constitution could offer to an inventor? Obviously, there is but one answer. The reward is the exclusive right to his invention balanced by the constitutional right vested in Congress to limit the time this right vests. It is therefore urged that compulsory licensing provisions destroy this delicately balanced system of reward and incentive. In line with this reward concept and the value of a patent, it should be considered that patent rights are property rights. They are incorporeal rights. Above all, it should be remembered that they are the most perishable and uncertain of all property. They could be of value one day and valuless the next. How can any reward system be established in regard to elusive property such as this if the exclusive right formula is destroyed.

One of the major arguments through the years by the proponents of compulsory licensing has been that many large companies suppress patents. This argument is rebutted by the contention that suppression is relatively impossible under the patent system because of the necessity for publication. But more important, it can be fully established that both in the hearings before the Oldfield committee of the House in 1912 and in the hearings in March 1938 before the O'Malley committee, no witness presented evidence to prove that suppression had ever existed in major industries in the United States.

In this regard there are two interesting quotations:

Testifying before the Oldfield committee in the House in 1912, Thomas Edison said in this regard:

> I myself do not know of a single case.

Dr. Frank B. Jewett, president of the National Academy of Sciences, said in 1943:

> Personally during an experience in industry of nearly 40 years, I have never known of a single authenticated case where a valuable invention was willfully suppressed. Nor have I ever known anyone who claimed to know of a single such case.

In a book entitled "There Is No Mystery About Patents," by patent attorney William R. Ballard, there appears the following introduction:

> Were it my task as a supersaboteur to destroy America, I should certainly want to begin by disabling her patent system, thus to sterilize her entire industry.

The following is a quote from Ballard, cited above:

> A patent does not take something from the public and give it to an individual. On the contrary, a patent is the means of getting something from an individual and giving it to the public.

Another interesting quote is:

> Nothing could better promote the progress of any art than to have two or more companies (or individuals) competing under the spur of self-interest to see who could produce and patent the most and best improvements relating to it.

Insofar as compulsory licensing by patentees of certain classes of applicants to the Atomic Energy Commission is concerned, it is my contention that the provisions of section 152 of H. R. 9757 and S. 3690 are unconstitutional. The enactment of such a statutory provision would violate an express limitation upon the power of Congress under the Federal Constitution.

Article I, section 8, clause 8 of the Federal Constitution provides the Congress shall have the power "to promote the progress of science and useful arts, by securing for limited times to authors and inventors the exclusive right to their respective writings and discoveries." This express power has been frequently exercised by Congress in enacting the various patent statutes commencing in 1790. I maintain that the power of Congress under article I, section 8, clause 8, of the Constitution is subject to the express limitation of securing only "the exclusive right" to duly constituted patentees, and the granting of less than an exclusive right would be inconsistent with the Constitution.

Article VI, clause 2, of the Federal Constitution provides:

> This Constitution, and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof; and all treaties made, or which shall be made under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land; and the judges in every State shall be bound thereby, anything in the Constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding.

Speaking in the case of *Carter* v. *Carter Coal Co.* (298 U. S. 238), Mr. Justice Sutherland said:

> The supremacy of the Constitution as law is thus declared without qualification. That supremacy is absolute; the supremacy of a statute enacted by Congress is not absolute but conditioned upon its being made in pursuance of the Constitution. And a judicial tribunal, clothed by that instrument with complete judicial power, and, therefore, by the very nature of the power, required to ascertain and apply the law to the facts in every case or proceeding properly brought for adjudication, must apply the supreme

law and reject the inferior statute whenever the two conflict. In the discharge of that duty, the opinion of the lawmakers that a statute passed by them is valid must be given great weight, *Adkins* v. *Children's Hospital* (261 U. S. 525, 544); but their opinion, or the court's opinion, that the statute will prove greatly or generally beneficial is wholly irrelevent to the inquiry. *Schechter* v. *United States* (295 U. S. 495, 549–550).

Recently in the segregation case the Supreme Court held that "separate but equal" was not "equal" under the "equal protection of the laws" clause of the 14th amendment—Brown against Board of Education, decided May 17, 1954. It is equally true that "exclusive but forced to license" is not "exclusive."

No court is authorized to construe a clause of the Constitution, so as to defeat its obvious ends, when another construction, equally accordant with the words, and sense, will enforce and protect them—*Prigg* v. *Pennsylvania* (16 Pet. 612 (1842)).

The words "exclusive" and "right" are clear and unambiguous. Being free from ambiguity, the long-accepted rules of construction demand that we interpret the words by referring to their plain and ordinary meaning. This is construction by literal interpretation.

The plain and ordinary meaning of today is not enough. What was the meaning of these words during the period of the Constitutional Convention? They meant as much if not more than they convey today.[1]

Some modern reference sources contain the following:

Bouvier's Law Dictionary defines "exclusive" as:

> (Lat. ex. out, claudere, to shut). Not including; debarring from participation. Shut out; not included. An exclusive right or privilege, as a copyright or patent, is one which may be exercised and enjoyed only by the person authorized, while all others are forbidden to interefere.

Words and Phrases, permanent edition, 15A, "exclusive right," page 213:

> The exclusive right of a patent, or the franchise which the patent grants, consists altogether in the right to exclude everyone from making or using or vending the thing patented, without the permission of the patentee. This is all he obtains by his patent. In other words, the right is the right to prevent everyone from making or using or selling the thing patented without his consent. Or, to put it differently, it is the right to sue anyone who so makes, uses, or sells the thing patetned. It is not the right to make, or to use, or sell the thing patented. That he has the right to do irrespective of the statute by virtue of the common law (*Hartman* v. *John D. Oark & Sons Co.* (145 F. 358, 363)).
>
> The "exclusive rights" secured by a patent are the right to make, the right to use, and the right to vend the invention it protects. A grant, transfer, or conveyance of these exclusive rights throughout the United States, or a grant of an undivided part of these exclusive rights, or a grant of these exclusive rights throughout a specified part of the United States, is an assignment of an interest in the patent, by whatever name it may be called. A grant, transfer or conveyance of any right of interest less than these is a license (*Paylus* v. *M. M. Buck Mfg. Co.* (129 F. 594, 596, 64 C. C. A. 162), citing *Waterman* v. *Mackenzie* (11 St. Ct. 334, 138 U. S. 252, 255, 256, 34 L. Ed. 923); *Union Switch & Signal Co.* v. *Johnson Railroad Signal Co.* (61 F. 940, 943, 10 C. C. A. 176, 179); *Pickhardt* v. *Packard* (22 F. 530, 532, 23 Blatch, 23)).

By this reference to the plain and ordinary meaning of the words "exclusive right," it is inconceivable that they could mean less than the total privilege to shut out other individuals from participation. This Congress is not empowered to grant less than this.

The Constitution gave the Congress power to grant exclusive rights to ideas and inventions just as it gave to the Congress other powers and prerogatives which historically resided in the sovereign. The English sovereign had complete and sole authority to grant or withhold patents or other sovereign privileges. Yet even the most absolute sovereign could not, for all his power, divide that which is inherently indivisible. No English sovereign has ever been able to bestow a title of nobility binding an individual to the sovereign and at the same time allow such a nobleman to have some degree of loyalty to another sovereign. Neither has any sovereignty—be it king or Congress—any power or ability to grant anything in part if that which is granted is not by its nature divisible. So it is with the exclusive right to ideas and inventions. That right is either exclusive or not exclusive. It cannot be less than exclusive and continue in being. The indivisibility of exclusiveness is not unique. Many words in common usage at the time the Constitution was drafted, and still today, convey a single idea not divisible. To suggest but a few, who can conceive of citizenship, divinity, or virginity, as being less than single and indivisible ideas, however complex may be their definitions?

Were I to concede that a latent ambiguity existed in the constitutional provision, questions of construction would be resolved by determining the intention of the framers of the Constitution. I contend that reference sources support the proposition that it was the intent of the Constitutional Convention that the only patent rights which Congress has the power to grant are exclusive rights.

The words "patent" and "copyright" were words of common usage at the time of the Constitutional Convention and long prior thereto.[2]

I refer to the Records of the Federal Convention of 1787, edited by Max Farrand and published in 1911 by the Yale University Press. The words "patent" and "copyright" appeared therein in presentations to the Constitutional Convention.[3]

It is clear that the words "copyright" and "patent" were presented to the Constitutional Convention. They were terms bearing the same connotation as today and of common usage during the period of the Convention and prior thereto. Yet the framers chose the words "exclusive right" in their place.

The definitions in the dictionaries of the period[3] indicate that the phrase "exclusive right" was part of the common definition for the word "patent." It was used rather than the terms "patent and copyright." The terms were thereby interpreted for posterity.

I believe an examination of the possible reasons for this choice of words sheds considerable light on the intention of the Convention.

Some 13 years prior to the Constitutional Convention, in the year 1774, the celebrated English case of *Donaldson* v. *Beckett* (4 Burr 2408, 2 Brd. P. C. 129) was debated in the House of Lords. The issue involved in the case was the nature of the copyright, and question No. 4, which was presented to the lords, was the following:

> Whether the author of any literary composition and his assigns have tht sole right of printing and publishing the same in perpetuity by the common law.

Seven lords replied affirmatively to the question and four replied in the negative. It is therefore apparent that exclusiveness of a copyright was the subject of controversy in the years prior to the Convention. Would it not have been logical for the author of the clause to fear such arbitrary judicial interpretation of the terms and instead supply the interpretation itself?

Apparently Mr. Charles Pinckney, of South Carolina, is to be credited with the authorship of the patent clause in the Constitution.[3] Available sources indicate that Mr. Pinckney was reading law at the Temple in London, England, during or immediately following the period when the case of Donaldson against Beckett was being debated in the House of Lords.[4]

In his native State of South Carolina a clause relating to the granting of patents appeared at the end of a copyright statute.[5] Apparently this clause was the only patent statute then in force in the Colonies, and, in fact, there was no case involving industrial and manufacturing patents which came before a colonial court.[6]

Since Mr. Pinckney was an attorney and undoubtedly aware of the legal controversies of his era and the commingling of the patent and copyright concepts in his State statute, would it not have been logical for him to desire that the controversies concerning the nature of copyrights and patents be quieted by an explicit statement on their nature in the patent clause he suggested?

In the James Wilson version of the so-called Pinckney plan[7] it is noted that he used the words "exclusive right" in another respect. Pinckney proposed that Congress "shall have the exclusive right of coining money." Furthermore, in his published Observations[8] Mr. Pinckney refers to the exclusive right of Congress to regulate the militia.

Considering these references, it becomes difficult to construe Mr. Pinckney's conception of an exclusive right as a right subject to limitation.

In April of 1790, the First Congress, 2d session, enacted the first patent statute. April 10, 1790, Statute 109a. This Congress was closest in point of time to the

---

Footnotes at end of speech.

Footnotes at end of speech.

Footnotes at end of speech.

Constitutional Convention and closest to thinking and intention of the prior group. Some Members of Congress were at the Convention. In this first patent statute in section 1 and section 2 the words "sole and exclusive right" were used in relationship to the grant. The addition of the word "sole" could be regarded as meaningless, since it is synonymous with "exclusive" and the only right Congress was empowered to grant was the "exclusive right." Yet it would appear that the word "sole" was added to fortify the concept of exclusiveness.

In the second patent statute in 1793—February 21, 1793, I Stat. 318, chapter 11—the word "full" was substituted for the word "sole."

In construing the later but almost identical patent laws, Mr. Justice Day, speaking in the case of *Bauer* v. *O'Donnell* (229 U. S. 1) expressed the following:

> The right to make, use, and sell an invented article is not derived from the patent law. This right existed before and without the passage of the law and was always the right of an inventor. The act secured to the inventor the exclusive right to make, use, and vend the thing patented, and consequently to prevent others from exercising like privileges without the consent of the patentees. *Bloomer* v. *McQuewan* (14 How. 539, 549); *Continental Paper Bag Co.* v. *Eastern Paper Bag Co.* (210 U. S. 405, 425).

Speaking elsewhere in the same case, Mr. Justice Day stated:

> In framing the act and defining the extent of the rights and privileges secured to a patentee Congress did not use technical or occult phrases, but in simple terms gave an inventor the exclusive right to make use, and vend his invention for a definite term of years. The right to make can scarcely be made plainer by definition, and embraces the construction of the thing invented. The right to use is a comprehensive term and embraces within its meaning the right to put into service any given invention. And Congress did not stop with the express grant of the rights to make and to use. Recognizing that many inventions would be valuable to the inventor because of sales of the patented machine or device to others, it granted also the exclusive right to vend the invention covered by the letters patent. To vend is also a term readily understood and of no doubtful import. Its use in the statute secured to the inventor the exclusive right to transfer the title for a consideration to others. In the exclusive rights to make, use, and vend, fairly construed, with a view to making the purpose of Congress effectual, reside the extent of the patent monopoly under the statutes of the United States. *Bloomer* v. *McQuewan*, *supra*.

We have analyzed the intention of the framers of the Constitution, and I would like to call attention to their objective. I believe that the objective is clear and unambiguous and plainly recited in article 1, section 8, clause 8 of the Constitution. Therein it states that the objective is "to promote the progress of science and the useful arts."

Speaking in *Pennock* v. *Dialogue* (2 Pet. 1) Mr. Justice Story said:

> While one great object (of our patent laws) was by holding out a reasonable reward to inventors, and giving them an exclusive right to their inventions for a limited period, to stimulate the efforts of genius; the main object was "to promote the progress of science and useful arts."

Do the compulsory licensing provisions of section 152 of H. R. 9757 implement or defeat this objective? I contend that they tend to defeat it.

Three primary arguments have been made by proponents of compulsory licensing through the years in this matter. They are:

First. The granting of patents in certain situations tends to create monopolies.

Second. The patent grant permits the patentee to retard progress through nonuse of the patent.

Third. In the atomic energy program certain business enterprises have enjoyed an advantageous contractual relationship which could easily gain for them a preferential patent position.

In answer to the first proposal, I refer to the common law.

Monopolies were contrary to and in derogation of the common law and from the time of the Magna Carta, the legislatures and courts of England interfered to repress them and to uphold the rights and liberties of the citizens from being restrained by the English sovereign.

The statute of monopolies in 1623 was declaratory of the common law proposition that monopolies were illegal. The statute of monopolies in section 5 specifically exempted letters patent in grants of privilege as related to true inventors. This exemption under the statute of monopolies is certainly declaratory of the common law. By Lord Coke's definition,[9] a monopolist is one who by report of his exclusive privilege takes something from the public which they had a right to use before the grant of such exclusive privilege. In the case of the inventor, this is not true. He is not taking something from the public which they had before; he is creating something new. His industry, sacrifice, labor, and expenditure produced the new item.

I believe that the logic of the common law is not materially altered in our modern situation. I believe a monopoly is still created in the taking of something to which the public had inherent rights, through the use of conspiratorial business practices. This is incompatible with the concept of property right known to patent law whereby a grant is made to the one in whom the property right springs up. I therefore contend that it cannot be argued that the objective of the Constitution is defeated by the allegation that patents create monopolies.

Monopoly situations can arise as a result of unfair and conspiratorial practices in the business relationships of the patentee but I believe there are adequate remedies available to the Federal Government through the use of the antitrust laws.

The activities of patentees which have drawn the most attention of those reformers interested in compulsory licensing, as it relates to the antitrust laws, springs from the secondary aspects of the patent. The abuses, I contend, do not spring up in the "exclusive right" of the patent itself. An example of the type of patent abuse for which remedial legislation has been sought is reflected in the case of the *United States* v. *National Lead Company* ((1947) 67 Sup. Ct. 1634). Here we deal with territorial division, exchanges of patent licenses and patent technology, the making of each party the agent of the other, and an agreement not to contest the validity of each other's patents. These secondary aspects of patent use are subject matter within the purview of the antitrust laws.

I would be constrained to state, however, that the patent right is even superior to these antitrust laws since granting of "exclusive right" is a constitutional provision and is per se superior to the statutes.

It is said that nonuse of a patent tends to defeat the objective of the Constitution. I contend that the opposite is true. The nature of the patent system is such that the invention of a patentee must be published. If the nonuse of the patentee places his competitor in a disadvantageous position, what is the best remedy of the competitor? An easy remedy is the compulsory license; but this does not meet the objective of the Constitution.

The objective is best met by forcing the competitor to find a superior invention, an improvement through due effort and perspicacity comparable to that of the original inventor. The diligent competitor can soon devise and patent a development superior in the art. In this way the objective of the Constitution "to promote the progress of science and useful arts" is met. Through compulsory licensing the objective would be defeated and the sciences and the arts could atrophy.

In this respect Judge Brawley stated, in the case of *Crown Cork & Seal Co.* v. *Aluminum Stopper Co.* (108 F. 845, 870 (C. C. A. 4th, 1901)):

> Painter's invention is not one of those great epoch-making discoveries like that of printing, or the steam engine, or the electric telegraph, which opened to their inventors the portals of the Pantheon of the immortals. For such as these the love of fame and the glory of being benefactors of human kind served alike as motive and reward, but to the patient laborer in workshop and factory the incentive of fame and glory is absent. For them the stimulus of the rewards offered by our patent laws is needed to encourage by the hope of profit that zealous eagerness to improve processes, to remedy defects in machinery, to invent new methods and appliances for saving labor and cheapening production in the numberless articles that are in daily use. It is this stimulus that has made the American mechanic the most alert, observant, and studious of any in the world, and it is the indefinite multiplication of these small inventions and improvements that has wrought an industrial revolution and brought his country to the forefront of the world's commerce. It was the consciousness that in the knapsack of every private soldier there might be the baton of a marshal of France that inspired her soldiers to unparalleled achievements. In our unheroic, industrial age the central processes of a nation's life lie in production and distribution. The protection and hope of profit held out by our patent laws inspires that stimulating energy which leads to experiment, invention, and all the

---

Footnotes at end of speech.

> resulting benefits; a refusal of that protection in a proper case will deaden and destroy it.

And the First Report of National Patent Planning Commission, House Document 239, page 1, 78th Congress, 1st session, 1943, commented in this regard:

> The American patent system established by the Constitution giving Congress the "power to promote the progress of science and useful arts," is over 150 years old. The system has accomplished all that the framers of the Constitution intended. It is the only provision of the Government for the promotion of invention and discovery and is the basis upon which our entire industrial civilization rests.
>
> The American people and their Government should recognize the fundamental rightness and fairness of protecting the creations of its inventors by the patent grant. The basic principles of the present system should be preserved. The system has contributed to the growth and greatness of our Nation; it has—
>
> (1) Encouraged and rewarded inventiveness and creativeness, producing new products and processes which have placed the United States far ahead of other countries in the field of scientific and technological endeavor;
>
> (2) Stimulated American inventors to originate a major portion of the important industrial and basic inventions of the past 150 years;
>
> (3) Facilitated the rapid development and general application of new discoveries in the United States to an extent exceeding that of any other country;
>
> (4) Contributed to the achievement of the highest standard of living that any nation has ever enjoyed;
>
> (5) Stimulated creation and development of products and processes necessary to arm the Nation and to wage successful war;
>
> (6) Contributed to the improvement of the public health and the public safety; and
>
> (7) Operated to protect the individual and small-business concerns during the formative period of a new enterprise.
>
> The strongest industrial nations have the most effective patent systems and after a careful study, the Commission has reached the conclusion that the American system is the best in the world.

It has been argued that there is a grave danger that a few companies which have been intimately associated with the federally financed atomic-energy program would gain a significant patent position if some means is not provided to license whatever ideas those companies may patent in the future. In the first place there have not been just a few companies intimately associated with the atomic-energy program. There have been over 15,000 companies engaged in one way or another over the past decade and a great many of these have acquired new experience and know-how from which they may derive advantage. All of those who have worked for the Government in our atomic-energy program brought to that work their previously acquired know-how, experience, and, in fact, their patents. It has not been possible to pay for all that has been done in dollars. In many cases those who negotiated construction and operating contracts, both for research and development and for production, recognized and took into account that the most significant part of the recompense the contractors would receive would be know-how and future advantage. Therefore, to some extent, whatever advantage these present and past contractors may obtain can be regarded as a present public payment to them for an obligation incurred by the Government in the name of the people in the past.

Those who have expressed concern about the preferential position which may have been gained by an atomic-energy contractor seem to overlook or have no faith in the existing devices to protect against abuses of that advantage. These companies have obtained their know-how and experience in the atomic-energy field under contracts which have contained stringent clauses on the Federal property right to patents. No Government contractor in the atomic-energy program has been free to obtain patents on anything vital in atomic energy. Nor will any of them be able to obtain patents in the future which flow directly from activities financed out of the Public Treasury. Compulsory licensing would be a radical solution to a problem which can be controlled under existing contract law. This Government should not succcumb to the deceptively easy path of imposing an arbitrary penalty on those guilty of abuses of the law.

That adequately, at least so far as time available to me is concerned, covers the subject matter. I urge most strongly that it be adopted.

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. I think the gentleman stated that this amendment provides that the Commission may deny a license under certain circumstances. Does the gentleman mean "may" or "shall"?

Mr. COLE of New York. Well, whatever the bill provides.

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. Well, there is a great deal of difference.

Mr. COLE of New York. But since the gentleman has mentioned the Commission, I would point out, and it will be argued, that this requirement for compulsory licensing was the recommendation of the Atomic Energy Commission. That is true, but it was not the unanimous, unequivocal recommendation of the Commission. They were divided. Some of them protested against it. Some of them wanted unlimited, perpetual compulsory licensing in this field. So, it was recommended as a compromise that this be done. But, bear in mind that it is not the recommendation of the President that compulsory licensing is the only way it can be done, so long as we accomplish the goal of denying unjust enrichment of those in the program, a goal with which I thoroughly agree, a proposal which I submit my amendment will accomplish.

---

[1] The dictionary of Dr. Samuel Johnson, entitled "A Dictionary of the English Language," printed in London in 1810, sets forth in part the following definitions:

Exclusive:

"1. Having the power of excluding or denying admission.

"2. Debarring from participation.

"3. Not taking into an account or number; opposed to inclusive.

"4. Excepting."

Right, n. f. as used in this context:

"1. Just claim.

"2. That which justly belongs to one.

"3. Property; interest.

"4. Power; prerogative.

"5. Immunity; privilege."

Patent, n. f.: "A writ conferring some exclusive right or privilege."

The dictionary of Samuel Johnson, entitled "A Dictionary of the English Language," printed in London in the year 1770, contains the following definitions:

Exclusive, a. from exclude:

"1. Having the power of excluding or denying admission.

"2. The act of debarring from any privilege."

Right, f. as used in this context:

"1. That which justly belongs to one.

"2. Property; interest.

"3. Power; prerogative.

"4. Immunity; privilege."

Patent: "A writ conferring some exclusive right or privilege."

The dictionary of Thomas Sheridan, entitled "A Complete Dictionary of the English Language," printed in Dublin, Ireland, in the year 1790, reflects the following definitions:

Right, f. in this context: "Just claim; that which justly belongs to one; property, interest; power, prerogative; immunity, privilege."

Patent, f.: "A writ conferring some exclusive right or privilege."

The dictionary of John Walker, entitled "A Critical Pronouncing Dictionary and Expositor of the English Language," printed in London, England, in the year 1791 reflects the following:

Exclusive: "Having the power of excluding or denying admission; debarring from participation; not taking into any account or number, excepting."

Right, rite in this context: "Just claim; that which justly belongs to one; property, interest; power, prerogative; immunity, privilege;"

Patent: "A writ conferring some exclusive right or privilege."

[2] The English Statute of Monopolies (21 Jac. 1) enacted in 1623 refers to "letters patent" in excepting inventors from the statute.

According to the Encyclopedia Britannica, "Letters Patent (litterae patentes) are letters addressed by the sovereign 'to all to whom these presents shall come,' reciting the grant of some dignity, office, monopoly franchise, or other privilege to the patentee. They are not sealed up, but are left open (hence the term 'patent') and are recorded in the patent rolls in the Record Office.)"

[3] Vol. II, pp. 321–322 of Records of the Federal Convention of 1787, edited by Max Farrand, published 1911 in Yale University Press:

"In the Journal of Auguist 18, 1787, in a discussion of "additional powers proposed to be vested in the Legislature of the United States," the following references appear:

" 'To secure to literary authors their copyrights for a limited time."

" 'To grant patents for useful inventions."

" 'To secure to authors exclusive rights for a certain time.' "

Vol. II, p. 325:

"James Madison's diary of August 18 shows that the wording of the first additional power (listed above) was his own. The second and third were taken from the additional powers proposed by Mr. Charles Pinckney, delegate from South Carolina. (For this and other reasons contained herein, the weight of evidence would indicate that Mr. Pinckney is the originator of the clause.)"

Vol. II, pp. 505–506:

"The Journal of September 5, 1787, reports the following language agreed upon:

"'To promote the progress of science and useful arts by securing for limited times to authors and inventors the exclusive right to their respective writings and discoveries.'"

Vol. II, pp. 509–510:

"Mr. Madison's diary of the same day shows the above clause 'agreed to nem; con.'"

Vol. III, p. 122:

"In the text of a pamphlet which Mr. Pinckney caused to be printed in 1787, he refers to additional authorities of the National Legislature. One of these is 'to secure to authors the exclusive right to their performances and discoveries'; this is the same language which appears in the Pinckney plan, Mr. Pinckney's draft of the Constitution which he presented to the convention on May 29, 1787.

"This is the same language which appears in the Pinckney plan, Mr. Charles Pinckney's draft of the Constitution which he presented to the convention on May 29, 1787.

"The following extracts were taken from Elliot, Debates on the Adoption of the Federal Constitution. * * * Washington, 1845.

"Vol. 5, pp. 439–440:

"'Saturday, August 18: Mr. Madison submitted, in order to be referred to the committee of detail, the following powers, as proper to be added to those of the general legislature:

* * * * *

"'To secure to literary authors their copyrights for a limited time. * * *

"'To encourage, by premiums and provisions, the advancement of useful knowledge and discoveries. * * *

"'These propositions were referred to the committee of detail which had prepared the report, and, at the same time, the following, which were moved by Mr. Pinckney—in both cases unanimously: * * *

"'To grant patents for useful inventions.

"'To secure to authors exclusive rights for a certain time.'

"The Federalist papers contain but one reference. Madison commented as follows:

"'The utility of this clause will scarcely be questioned. The copyright of authors has been solemnly adjudged in Great Britain to be a right at common law. The right to useful inventions seems with equal reason to belong to the inventors. The public good fully coincides in both cases with the claims of individuals. The States cannot separately make effectual provision for either of the cases, and most of them have anticipated the decision of this point by laws passed at the instance of Congress.'"

[4] Biographical Directory of the American Congress, U. S. Government Printing Office, 1950.

[5] South Carolina Revised Statute.

[6] The Patent Grant. E. Binlow. Baltimore, Johns Hopkins Press, 1950.

The exclusive right of coining Money—regulating its alloy, and determining in what species of money the common Treasury shall be supplied, is essential to assuring the Federal funds (p. 19).

The exclusive right of establishing regulations for the Government of the Militia of the United States, ought certainly to be vesed (vested), in the Federal Councils. (American Historical Review, Vol. IX, p. 746.)

Footnote 7 represents the James Wilson version of the Pinckney plan. It is in Mr. Wilson's own handwriting and can be found among his manuscripts in the library of the Historical Society of Pennsylvania. James Wilson was a delegate to the Constitutional Convention and a member of its Committee of Detail, which was charged with the actual drafting of a Constitution.

The column on the right contains pertinent excerpts from Mr. Pinckney's pamphlet, Observations on the Plan of Government, Submitted to the Federal Convention, in Philadelphia, on the 28th of May 1787, which appeared soon after the Convention adjourned.

[7] 16. S. and H. D. in C. ass. shall have the exclusive Right of coinage Money—regulating its Alloy and Value—fixing the Standard of Weights and Measures throughbout U. S.

[8] 19 S. and H. D. in C. ass. shall regulate the Militia thro' the U. S.

[9] Institutes, Coke, vol. ch. 5.

Background of Farm-Price Supports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN

OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 23, 1954

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an editorial entitled "Farm-Price Supports," published in the Memphis (Tenn.) Commercial Appeal of July 21, 1954.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

FARM-PRICE SUPPORTS

As the Senate moves into the final stages of enacting this year's farm bill we are reminded of some easily forgotten background. The reminder comes in Senate Report No. 1810, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, setting out both sides of the farm-price argument.

We commend to your attention this observation.

"The program of farm-price supports was instituted in the late twenties and early thirties to assist farmers to market their commodities over a 12-month period in an orderly manner. A necessary part of this program was the providing of governmental machinery to farmers to assist in adjusting production to effective market demand, thereby increasing the opportunity for farmers to get a fair price in the market place.

"In recent years this idea has been twisted into the right of some farmers to a profitable fixed price for their commodities regardless of either how much the market will absorb or how great the price-breaking surpluses may become.

"The 90 percent price support that was a Government incentive to produce for war has been distorted into a peacetime program of temporarily guaranteeing profits for a minority of the farmers. * * *

"Farmers can never expect to obtain through a Government relief program as high or as satisfactory an income as they can by producing and selling what consumers want."

Near the conclusion, this summary says:

"Rigid price support amounts to price-fixing at the support level, misdirects the use of agricultural resources by maintaining an excess output, prohibits the proper flow of commodities into consumption, attracts additional imports of the goods in surplus, and prices American products out of the world market."

This is part of the minority statement. It was signed by seven Senators, some of them from States in which the farm votes dominate, and none of them from big-city States, where the voice of the consumer might be expected to make itself heard in even louder tones. These are the words of Senator George D. Aiken (Republican, Vermont), Senator Clinton P. Anderson (Democrat, New Mexico), Senator Bourke B. Hickenlooper (Republican, Iowa), Senator Spessard L. Holland (Democrat, Florida), Senator Andrew F. Schoeppel (Republican, Kansas), Senator Herman Welker (Republican, Idaho), and Senator John J. Williams (Republican, Delaware).

These men speak from long experience in farm legislation, and they put this year's problem into the proper focus of its own background.

The Foreign Aid Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, July 24, 1954

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, on Monday, July 19, Representative Herbert B. Warburton, of Delaware, made an excellent address before the National Republican Club, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Fellow Republicans, I welcome this opportunity to talk among ourselves, for it seems to me that we, of this administration, have now reached the time when we must take stock of ourselves.

Today, some people would say that we have not accomplished everything that we should, and I agree that there are things which yet remain undone. Yet, though some of us may blame the opposition for those things which remain undone, we Republicans must remember that it is we who are now in charge of the destiny of this Nation. It, therefore, necessarily is our task to guide this Nation's course in such a manner that our people will continue to entrust to us that stewardship. And that stewardship involves, above anything else, the ability to take and exercise leadership in every aspect of our national life.

The President expressed the basic and inherent truth of this philosophy when he said: "What is good for America is good politics." Too long have we experienced the reverse of that motto, when it was believed that what was good for politics was good for America, and it is questionable how much longer our Nation could have survived that attitude.

Leadership in this respect will show few quick gains. We are trying to change a line of thinking with which we have lived for a substantial number of years in our country's history, a line of thinking which has, in many areas, become as ingrained as standing up when the flag goes by.

Therefore, it is not enough for us merely to say that: What is good for America is good politics. We must lead our people to understand what is good for America and why it is good for America.

This is the challenge which faces us as members of the Republican Party and the Republican administration.

What, then, is good for America?

I say that that philosophy of Government in which the Republican Party believes is good for America because it repeats and underlines the basic concepts for living together and with our neighbors abroad which we believe are traditional to this Nation.

The Republican Party, in convention assembled in 1952, considered, wrote and published to this Nation—and to such of the other nations of the world as were interested in paying attention—its philosophy for conducting this Government. President Eisenhower, the Republican Party's chosen leader and then the Nation's chosen leader, and the Republican Members of Congress who sought election, campaigned upon that platform and advocated the philosophy which it expressed. There can be no reason to be ashamed of it.

In the last year and a half, the opposition has consistently charged that our philosophy of government is not, in fact, good for America. Quite the contrary; according to them it is inherently dangerous to America. Thus, today, as the new campaign approaches, the attack is intensified. So, even now, high members of the Democrat Party charge that we are giving away the secret of atomic power to private industry. This, in their mind, is dangerous because it removes the Federal Government from the complete and full control of this great new source of energy.

What great and beneficial thing is this so highly touted Federal control that it must be considered to have primary rights to all of those aspects and attributes of our life in every area which has heretofore been considered within the eminent domain of the private citizen?

And has not this Nation's greatness been realized through the initiative and the effort of our private citizen, without the interference and the control of the Government?

The recognition of this ability of the private citizen—be he industrialist, or laborer or farmer—is the thread woven through our party's philosophy of government.

The opposition scornfully calls us a businessman's administration because of it, and I thank God for it, because it is intended that this administration will work in a businesslike way, for the good of America, and within America's traditions.

Certainly, there is no businessman or workingman today who feels that his destiny lies in the subordination of his initiative, his effort, his enterprise—yes, even his investments—to whatever philosophy of collectivism, be it socialism or communism or some other watered-down version of state control advocated by those who would scoff at us.

Thus, I must necessarily conclude that our continued virile objection to any philosophy—domestic or foreign—which attempts to foist off on us a subversion of our basic concept of the relationship of government to the citizen is good.

It may be said that this is a trite statement and proves nothing. That may well be so. Yet let those who oppose it reveal themselves and prove to the American people that it is wrong.

But those things which this administration has done, which I think are good for this Nation, are not found only in this one general concept, as important as I believe it is.

This administration has presented to the Congress for enactment many specific recommendations which are in execution of the pledges it made to the American people and are in this Nation's best interests. You, as sincere citizens and interested Republicans, follow these in the daily press, so that it is unnecessary to outline each one of them now. Yet it would not be amiss to indicate a few of these legislative items which, incidentally, I believe advance the great basic concept I mentioned a moment ago.

Let us take, to make the examples more binding, those items which have caused considerable concern to the opposition in recent years, as they do now.

The Internal Revenue Code revision is scorned as being for the rich man. Its final form and contents have not yet been determined, though it has passed both Houses. This, however, is historically certain, regardless of its final form: the measure, as it was originally recommended, contained many specific items, including the taxation on corporate dividends feature, which the Democrat Party strenuously advocated throughout the administrations of Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Truman.

The House has passed the 82½–90-percent flexible farm price-support program. Its fate is still in doubt. But even should it be finally defeated, the victory the President claimed for it on House passage will remain—for the people will recognize the danger of all-out Federal control in this and any other fields and, once recognized, will eventually repudiate it.

The St. Lawrence seaway became an accomplished fact after almost half-a-century of effort. That the whole Nation will benefit from this additional avenue to our mid-continent cannot be denied, and I say that, even though I represent an east coast seaport area.

The mutual-security legislation is partway accomplished. It must eventually be finally adopted unless we desire to repudiate the responsibility of leadership which we have in the world today.

These are only a few of the big items. I could talk about tax reduction, reducing expenditures, or ending the Korean fighting, but this is not my purpose. And there remains an intensive program yet before the Congress whose accomplishment must be attained in a short period of time.

All of this legislation that is passed and will be passed, and all of these Executive actions which have occurred and will occur in accordance with our 1952 pledges are, I believe, in the best interest of America—and are our responsibility.

The legislation has, in my mind, one overriding characteristic which, if for no other reason, distinguishes it from much of the legislation we experienced under previous administrations. It is based upon solid study and investigation and is planned to afford sound long-term protection of our Nation's economy, of our people and of their well-being.

But, if we are to carry this program forward to its ultimate accomplishment, and thereby implement that philosophy of government in which we believe and which we advocate, we must avoid the pitfalls into which the previous administrations which opposed that philosophy fell. We must not become so smug and so self-confident that we have all the answers, to the end that we fear to subject ourselves and our efforts to critical appraisal and examination. Only in this way will we keep ourselves from reaching the point of believing that everything we do for America is good, solely because we thought of it or because we are doing it.

This is particularly true in today's world, when our leadership must be of the highest order. Each of us must strive to analyze his position and to suggest those areas in which we believe changes for the better can and must be effected.

Thus, I propose to discuss with you for a few minutes now certain aspects of our foreign-aid program. That program, as an implement of our position of world leadership in the tremendous struggle with communism, is a matter which vitally affects our economy, our people and their well-being. It can be a two-edged sword which will defend and support our allies, while it cripples us, and it is needless for me to remind any of you that once our economy is crippled, the defense and support of our allies is gone, even despite the tremendous strides their economies have taken in rehabilitation and recovery.

The huge potential of our economy continues unimpaired today. It is true, indeed, that we have unemployment today, and it is equally true that we have shifted our industrial plans from high-pressure all-out defense production, as it is true that business indexes generally show that the leveling-off process is in progress. So, also, it cannot be denied that the changeover occurred at the highest peak this Nation's industry had ever reached.

Yet, those of us who believe that the individual is entitled to an opportunity to be employed cannot deny that his unemployment is his tragedy and ours, in exactly the same way that we must also believe that this Nation falls far short of realizing its tremendous capacity for peacetime production, if we do not make every effort to employ the individual and to expend our production. Certainly, both the employee and the employer have that one goal in common: To create a mutual opportunity for performing gainful work.

Let us take the field of foreign aid. Here we can find an opportunity, both to defend ourselves and to assist our allies to strengthen their positions.

The President has made it clear that this program must continue as a vital and necessary bulwark in the fight against communism, and I subscribe fully to his support of it, as my votes in the Congress will show. Its continuance is, as President Eisenhower calls it enlightened self-interest.

But, in its administration, we must also be economic realists. We cannot kill the goose that lays the golden egg—and that goose is, in all the world, the American economy.

Our foreign-aid program was initiated on a rather cynical basis of realism some $40 billion ago; if France and Italy and Greece and Turkey and England were, at the program's inception, unable to borrow what they needed to make them strong in our joint struggle against communism, we gave them what they needed—and it was just that simple. We needed them—as they needed us—and we willingly gave.

But the program then—as now—was not a one-way street. Our contribution of money to any nation requires that it put up an equal amount of its own money in what is called counterpart funds. Our money contributes to worldwide acceptable currency with which to stimulate our friends' economies. Their counterpart funds are used to create domestic benefits in their own nation to forward the wellbeing and economic ability of their own people. Thus, if we advance $10 million to India to buy steam locomotives, India, in turn, puts up $10 million to build dams, to reclaim farmlands, or to provide housing, whatever the need may be. Thus India fights communism at the source of its particular danger—in its homeland—by removing the conditions which make people lean toward the promises of communism.

It is claimed that the program contains many abuses, at home and abroad. Be that as it may, no one party can claim credit for its good nor cast censure for its faults, because it is a program that belongs to all of us. So, it is our common weapon created from our common contribution.

But today's program dare not be yesterday's program, anymore than today's necessity for it is yesterday's necessity. After the war, the greater part of the free world was devastated physically and prostrated economically. The degree of postwar needs was measured by the urgency of Britain's request upon us for an emergency $3 billion loan to shore up her economy. The aid program's original purpose was to bolster and reconstruct tottering economies of our friends in order to build resistance to communism.

Today, these economies are no longer tottering, and the world's condition has changed since the Marshall plan came into being. The Japanese economy is getting back to a peacetime productive basis. England and France are moving rapidly ahead. And I may say that the strides which West Germany, Greece, and Turkey—firmly our allies—have taken are heartening indeed.

The American economy has also changed during that period. The President has reduced Government expenditures on every hand. The budget has been slashed and taxes have been cut. True it is that the budget has not yet been brought into balance, but progress has been made toward this end.

Through American generosity and American efforts the world is regaining balance and is presenting competition which our industries must meet from German, Japanese, British, and other industrial plants in every deal we seek. The plan worked well.

The first phase is done.

The second phase must now begin.

This administration has not forgotten the goose that lays the golden eggs as far as our domestic affairs are concerned. It is now time to apply the rule of economic realism to our foreign aid.

Let me take an example of how our good neighbor to the north, Canada, has adjusted to economic realism in this regard. For, Canada, too, just like us, has a foreign-aid program although it isn't as vast in amount as ours nor is it as highly publicized. But let us look at their method of operation as opposed to our own. And Canada is able to balance her budget, so it might be a healthy thing to peer through windows into the house of our next-door neighbor.

The nations of the British Commonwealth met at Columbo in Ceylon to consult as how best to help India. India needed locomotives. Canada agreed to give her $26 million for the purchase of locomotives. But, said Canada, you have to buy them in the Canadian market, because we have need for the work in our factories. India objected. Why? Because, said India, if you give us $26 million worth of locomotives which we could have purchased in Germany or in Japan or in Austria for $20 million, we have to put up counterpart money equal to $26 million instead of the lower figure of $20 million. And that's a lot of money. So Canada, always economically realistic, said: "Oh, no you don't. You shop around the world and see what you could have bought the locomotives elsewhere for. Ask Japan and Germany and Austria and England what they would have charged you. And then put up, as counterpart money, only that amount that you would have paid for them elsewhere."

"But," added Canada, "we are giving you this money and these locomotives. Our first interest is our own interest. We are first of all interested in Canadians, in our own workingmen, in our own factories, in our own well-being. If we don't look after ourselves first, we soon won't have the money to give away to you." That is now known as the Columbo plan. And Canada is thriving. And India is getting her locomotives free. And Canada has gained work and more money at home with which to continue her helpful giveaway program.

Now, what about America? Are we being as economically realistic? Let us take an exactly similar case, for the purpose of an example. Right now, the United States has allocated $20 million to help Indian railroads—$10 million for boxcars and $10 million for steam locomotives. So the case is pertinent.

The bidding is now out for this work. Bids have been invited from America, Germany, England, Austria, Japan, and perhaps other countries as well. The Congress has allocated the money. The regulations under which it is spent are a responsibility of the executive branch. Those rules were established under past administrations—under different economic conditions than those of today. But those same rules still prevail. Is that wise? Have we learned anything from Canada's example?

On August 6, next, these bids will be opened. It is a foregone conclusion that no American industry can compete. The boxcar builders of America, so I am told, have declined even to bid. They need the business urgently. They have serious unemployment problems. Their peripheral industries, from steel to groceries and automobiles and shoes, need continued incomes. But they won't bid. "Why," say they, "should we? With the American standard of living; with the American rates of pay; with the American taxation—we cannot compete. We cannot fight against Japanese, or Austrian, or German standards of wages or governmental aid to their own businesses. So we cannot bid. We cannot compete."

On the steam-locomotive side, American companies are bidding. But they know that, with the higher wages, taxation, and other costs here, they will be 35 to 40 percent higher than the Austrian, or German or Japanese bids. "We are helpless," they say. This situation affects thousands of workers, of grocers, shoe salesmen, and other merchants. It affects not only industry but labor.

I am not ashamed to call myself an economic realist.

It is realistic to do what Canada has done successfully. It is beyond the realm of theory. It is a proven fact. Canada has full employment in this industry and India has her locomotives—free.

This example proves that foreign aid can be a two-way street. The donor can protect its own industries and the recipient can get full benefit. This is economic realism in its finest sense.

There are, naturally, arguments against this course. If we give India the financial ability to secure the locomotives in Germany or Austria or Japan, we will kill 2 birds with 1 stone. India gets locomotives and Germany or Austria or Japan gets the work—and we help both nations with the same money. This is sound and intelligent—depending on economic conditions at home. Wherever possible, we should continue to place the work abroad.

But, while there is an American industry which needs work, and while there are American workers who want to but cannot find jobs, we must be certain that both have the first opportunity to secure any work which is created by the dollars of American taxpayers.

Let's keep working so we can keep giving.

Filibuster Against the Atomic Energy Act Amendments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. IRVING M. IVES

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, July 24, 1954

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the July 23, 1954, issue of the New York Times entitled "No Time for Horseplay."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NO TIME FOR HORSEPLAY

The Senators who started to filibuster—or that was what Senator MORSE, of Oregon, admitted he and the others were doing—against the amendments to the Atomic Energy Act had a legitimate criticism of President Eisenhower's power policy. They disapproved of his order to the Atomic Energy Commission to supply the Tennessee Valley Authority with privately produced power to take the place of power used by the AEC itself.

That issue, however, was decided on Wednesday night by a vote of 55 to 36 in the Senate itself. This vote killed an amendment which would have denied the President the right to order the feeding of privately produced power into the TVA system. There was no longer any excuse for a filibuster after this question had been decided, even though some of the filibustering Senators objected to some other features of the atomic-energy amendments. Wise legislators would thereafter have felt some responsibility for the further delays in essential legislation which were caused by the Senators' frittering away of valuable time. Majority Leader KNOWLAND's move for a cloture to end this meaningless flow of eloquence was understandable, even though one might not agree with his position on the administration's proposal to bring into the Tennessee Valley the power that will be produced by the proposed privately owned steam plant at West Memphis, Ark.

The President took occasion at his Wednesday press conference to define his attitude toward the Tennessee Valley Authority. He intends, he said, to support it as it stands with all the strength he has. What he does not seem to grasp is that if the Government begins to bring privately produced electric power back into the Tennessee Valley, TVA will be less able to function efficiently. An electric-power system, like any other human agency, must develop if it is to be healthy.

For the moment, however, this issue has been settled. The President has ordered, and the amendments to the Atomic Energy Act will doubtless specify in their final form, that the AEC can buy private power to replace that which it takes from TVA. It is the duty of every Senator, whether he belongs to the minority or the majority, to accept this result for the present and get on with his work.

An American Trade Unionist Meets His Counterparts Abroad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, July 24, 1954

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article, written by Solomon Barkin, which appeared in the April–May 1954 issue of the CIO World Affairs Bulletin.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN AMERICAN TRADE UNIONIST MEETS HIS COUNTERPARTS ABROAD

(By Solomon Barkin)

(Sol Barkin, research director of the CIO Textile Workers Union, journeyed last year to the Far East—where he made contact with trade unionists from countries which included Australia, New Zealand, Japan, India, and the Philippines. The following report records his personal observations of the trip.)

An American trade unionist visiting foreign countries as I did in Asia and Oceania can truly serve our Nation and its trade-union movement as well as the anti-Communist movement abroad. Our current efforts at communication with and aid to one another are frustrated by our lack of knowledge and the distances involved. The American official diplomats are too preoccupied with official responsibilities and circulate in governmental and business circles far removed from the mass of the people really to help bring us together. Even American trade unionists serving in official positions may be eyed suspiciously by local persons and are hamstrung by official limitations and policies. An American trade unionist moving and speaking freely can build the bridge of understanding, bring a direct message of fraternal interest, and help establish the base for mutual assistance.

In meeting these people, trust in one's sincerity and true trade-union position must be established early. We cannot be apologists for American policies and behavior, whether that of Government or business. We must speak frankly and truthfully of our own views as trade unionists whether they agree with or differ from the official point of view, for otherwise, we will be suspect. An American abroad must, by himself, represent the essential characteristics of our society which is freedom of thought and expression. We can, thereby, destroy the myths about our country spread by Communists in the train of their attacks on McCarthyism.

A BALANCED CONCEPT OF AMERICAN AIMS AND PURPOSES NEEDED IN ASIA

Americans face tremendous odds in getting accepted on our merits in many Asian countries where many progressives and intellectuals are prone to visualize America as the successor to the older European colonial and imperialistic powers. In some few instances, Asians started to dissociate us from these images of past repressive Western powers. But their own difficulties and the limited assistance they have received in surmounting their problems, as well as the close coordination of American and Western European policies in several Asian countries have prevented them from creating a balanced concept of our national purposes and aims.

In the Asian and Oceanic countries, American trade-unions are not understood. Workers and leaders want to hear a forthright story of our development, struggles, achievements and current problems but it must be told to them in terms of their own developments, concepts and problems. Man-to-man recitals are essential before the written word or films can bring detail. Confidence must be established to open the ears and eyes, because so much of what one tells about the United States is new and strange, and is in conflict with the propaganda spread by the Communist groups in these countries who speak in their own idiom.

In each country I visited, the workers and trade-union leaders wanted to know concretely how we live, what our jobs are like, what our trade-unions are, and how we realize our achievements. They want to familiarize themselves with our experiences and to compare them with their own. Everywhere, they eagerly press for the most minute details about our way of life and battle to achieve it.

The Asian worker most often cannot comprehend a description of the life and activities of the American union, because they are so far removed from his own experience. He, therefore, asks for comparisons with the problems he faces. Often, we had to go back to the life of the worker in earlier decades, in crowded slums and company towns, to retell our struggles and achievements and to aline our history with their current life.

The Australian and New Zealand workers want more direct and detailed comparisons. Their standards and ways of life are so much like our own that they want to evaluate the differences carefully. Is it true that the standards of the American worker have forged ahead at a more rapid rate since the end of the war? The vast range of wages, work conditions, and benefits existing in the United States between the highly organized and profitable industries and the unorganized and low-wage ones is difficult to present to workers and trade-union leaders in countries where uniform regional and national rates and conditions prevail and the differences between the national minimum and the pay rate for the most skilled are very small. They look askance on our system of securing piecemeal improvements through individual plant or company negotiations, when they have been able to establish high standards, relatively uniformly for all, through a combination of Government regulation and benefits and generous awards through National or State arbitration courts. They cannot comprehend the aggressive and effective opposition to unionism in some regions in the United States, in view of the American Government's boasts abroad of our system of collective bargaining.

All of these challenges and questions must be met frankly with honest trade-union replies. The confusing differences in bargaining procedures have to be sorted out to highlight the similarity of goals.

QUESTIONS ASKED ABOUT LABOR'S ALOOFNESS TO POLITICAL PARTIES

A common question put by workers and trade-union leaders throughout the world is why American unions are so relatively aloof from political parties. In some Asian countries, political activity has been accented, because they have recently gained independence, and workers' well-being is being determined by their influence in the new governments.

In other countries, such as Australia and New Zealand, political parties have been the instruments of the political ambitions of specific economic classes. A high degree of class consciousness exists, even in Australia and New Zealand with their narrow range of income levels and systems of uniform benefits. They ask most insistently why there is no Labor Party.

It requires a careful unfolding of our trade-union history to tell the story of the protection and support given trade unions by the Roosevelt and Truman administrations. The peculiarities of local and national political traditions and operations are difficult for them to comprehend. They cannot easily understand that our national parties are peculiar coalitions of regional economic and political views. The force of traditional voting for Democrats and Republicans is rather novel to Laborites in Australia and New Zealand, weaned on supporting the Labor Party. To them, the Labor Party is an instrument for negotiations for improvements. They lament our lack of sophistication, and are not reassured by the story that our pattern has served us and that the future will have to dictate our new course.

Again the contrasts in trade-union organization and collective-bargaining practices are most striking. We have been conditioned by our legal system to think of unions as representing workers in individual plants and to associate collective bargaining with individual employers. Therefore, it seems strange to industrial unionists to find the prevailing systems of bargaining in many countries built on a regional or national basis. In New Zealand and Australia, the negotiations are carried on with associations of employers. Agreements and arbitration decisions are binding upon all covered employees. Union membership is compulsory in New Zealand and in two of the Australian States, Queensland, and New South Wales. Grievances and complaints are seldom handled in the plants; they are dealt with through the union secretary, who is a regional official. The plant grievance machinery is strange to them. When they see it in operation in this country, they label it cooperation rather than collective bargaining. The drive for shop stewards, in the latter countries, has been associated with past communistic endeavors to establish a dual union movement.

In Asian countries, similar forces are at work. Agreements are with employers as a group. Even in Japan, where the American influence has been strong as a result of the period of occupation, the unit of bargaining is the large company or enterprise or groups of employers. Unions are constituted around these specific units.

In each of these countries, they rely upon legislation to enforce benefits which we would try to obtain through collective bargaining. There is, therefore, a great deal of uniformity in terms of employment. However, it must be said that in the Asian countries where unions are weak, the laws remain dead letters because they are not enforced and are widely avoided.

Many attitudes found among American workers are absent among workers in these other countries. Our confidence in the future and expectation of rising standards and continuous improvements are difficult to duplicate. The Asian worker is often at the brink of starvation. He has never really witnessed an era of constant economic improvement. He has no faith—he is pessimistic or resigned. Economic progress through trade-union action does not yet seem to offer a rewarding course of action. Political power offers more immediate rewards.

In countries like New Zealand and Australia, the strong trade-union movements, aided by their political parties, have assured workers of the maintenance of their living standards in face of rising living costs. The tremendous profits earned by the farmers from the world sale of meat and wool have hitherto provided resources both for taxes and wage negotiations for raising standards. It is only now, with the advent of modern technology and management, that they begun to seek more regular advances through claims on the rising national productivity. The tapping of tremendous new natural wealth in Australia will help to assure even greater opportunities for improvements in living standards from this source. The prevailing American optimism may well find its closest approximation in this country.

TRADE UNIONS ABROAD SEEK TO BENEFIT FROM EXPERIENCE OF AMERICAN LABOR

The trade-union movement of each country seeks to benefit from our experience and advances. In my own short contacts in Japan, I found trade-union leaders looking for counsel on the type of economic program they might espouse to inspire greater confidence in the constructive opportunities for rising living standards through trade unionism. In New Zealand, trade-union leaders were eager to acquaint themselves with the detailed methods of operation of our unions and methods of administering them within the plants. Australian trade unionists wanted to know how we dealt with modern management techniques and for them I prepared analyses of wage incentive plans and time study. The Indian textile unions asked me to participate in the preparation of their case in arbitration on a technical problem to illustrate our procedures and point of view. Each eagerly looks for our practical aid.

FOREIGN GROUPS SEEK DIRECT CONTACT WITH UNITED STATES WORKERS

I might add that the employers, faculties of universities, and government officials handling labor problems in each country are most desirous of meeting an American trade unionist. They have heard much about our system. They want to learn from the trade unionist what actually happens in this country.

A visit of an American trade unionist to a foreign country is a full assignment, as so many have questions to ask and want to learn about us from people they have come to trust as bona fide trade unionists.

Venezuela: America's Good Neighbor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, July 24, 1954

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have always favored a program of genuine reciprocity between the nations—a policy of genuine two-way benefits.

There are few countries with which we enjoy better, more mutually satisfactory relations, than with our good neighbor, Venezuela.

This splendid land has offered a model to the rest of the hemisphere—a model in its traditional policy of free enterprise and in its unrestricted opportunities for foreign investment. Today, Venezuela is our second largest export market in Latin America; our fifth largest in the world. A great many of the dairy, cannery, and other products of my own State are bought in Venezuela. We, in turn, would vigorously oppose, as would Venezuela, any attempt to restrict importations of petroleum from our good neighbor—a restriction which could do infinite harm to Western Hemisphere relations and, inevitably, to our own economy.

I was pleased to receive from Mr. George H. Speirs, president of the American Chamber of Commerce of Venezuela, a brief illustrated booklet setting forth certain facts on Venezuelan imports from our country.

I send to the desk this brief article, along with a foreword and a letter which the chamber had sent to the Randall Commission.

I ask unanimous consent that this material be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the article and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOREWORD TO UNITED STATES TRADE WITH VENEZUELA: A CASE STUDY IN MUTUALLY BENEFICIAL RELATIONS

American foreign economic policy is currently under intensive study by our lawmakers and by public-minded citizens throughout the country. One of the more important phases of this study is concerned with the imports of foreign crude oil and fuel oil, a high percentage of which originates in Venezuela. Members of Congress and innumerable private American citizens who have visited Venezuela recently have had many questions to ask regarding how restrictions on oil imports would affect the national interests of the United States and our relations with the friendly neighboring Republic of Venezuela.

The American Chamber of Commerce of Venezuela has been called upon to present its point of view on trade relations between the United States and Venezuela to the Commission on Foreign Economic Policy (the Randall Commission), the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, and the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, as well as to many private citizens. The mutually beneficial nature of United States-Venezuelan trade is graphically illustrated in a summary of the material presented to the committees and included in the following pages. We feel this data will be of direct interest and assistance to those seeking information on the subject. Letters similar to the one reproduced here to the Randall Commission were addressed to the Senate Banking and Currency Committee and the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

CARACAS, VENEZUELA, *December 1, 1953.*

Mr. CLARENCE B. RANDALL,
Chairman, Commission on Foreign Economic Policy, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. RANDALL: The American Chamber of Commerce of Venezuela acknowledges with thanks your letter request of October 27, 1953, for our views with respect to the problems under study by the Commission relating to international trade and its enlargement consistent with a sound domestic economy, our foreign economic policy, and the trade aspects of our national security and total foreign policy.

Our recommendations will naturally deal primarily with United States trade relations with Venezuela—a proven friend and ally, one of our best customers, a country dedicated to free enterprise, where American capital is welcome and where American citizens and American business receive hospitable treatment.

Some 200 American firms established here represent an investment of approximately $3 billion of private American capital in Venezuela. This money is invested in the oil and iron ore industries, and in a wide variety of manufacturing, importing, distributing, engineering, construction, and service enterprises—the number and scope of which is steadily increasing. These activities provide livelihood for some 25,000 Americans resident in Venezuela.

Venezuela is proud of its traditional policy of free enterprise and unrestricted opportunities for foreign investment. It is one of the very few countries in the world today which does not impose restrictions on the movements of trade, capital, or the remittance of profits and dividends.

The American business community and citizens who have the privilege of living here, sincerely believe their opposition to restrictive legislation affecting petroleum imports is not only in the best interests of Venezuela, but also the present and future welfare of the United States and its relations with the rest of the world, particularly the other American Republics which look upon Venezuela as an outstanding example of the advantages of free enterprise and close economic ties with our country.

We and our Venezuelan friends, therefore, look to your committee and Congress for your cooperation in preventing the enactment of legislation which would in any way interfere with the present sound relations between our two countries.

We have intentionally refrained from including detailed statistical data other than that contained in the attached illustrated material to graphically demonstrate the present mutually beneficial relations between the United States and Venezuela.

We thank you for this opportunity to express our views and recommendations, and for your information we attach a list of the members of our chamber.

Very truly yours,
THE AMERICAN CHAMBER OF
COMMERCE OF VENEZUELA,
J. W. FOSS
(For the Committee).

With a population of about 5 million, Venezuela is importing United States merchandise at the rate of some $500 million annually. It is now our second largest export market in Latin America, and fifth in the world. In addition to this one-half billion dollars of American products purchased by Venezuela, the unrestricted remittances of profits and dividends and funds resulting from associated services such as banking, insurance, shipping, etc., amounted to some $400 million last year, in other words a total of approximately $1 billion of income to the United States resulting from trade with Venezuela.

The Venezuelan Government and people wish to continue the present mutually advantageous trading relationship with the United States, but in order for them to do so we must continue to purchase Venezuela's products, mainly petroleum.

A principal concern today of the Government and the people of this country is the renewed threat of restrictions upon the importation of petroleum products into the United States from Venezuela. However, our Venezuelan friends have great faith in the American people and their way of life, and it is therefore inconceivable to them that the United States would arbitrarily cancel the existing trade agreement between the two countries or modify her trading relationship with Venezuela—in such a way as to turn our backs on a proven and trusted friend. They are therefore confident that our Congress will reject any measures to restrict the flow of trade between the two countries.

Any legislation impeding the flow of Venezuelan products into the United States, would obviously result in serious economic, social, and political problems in Venezuela because of the preponderant dependence of the country on the petroleum industry. The political and economic consequences of such restrictions would be disastrous to the Venezuelan and American interests and would seriously impair if not irreparably damage the bipartisan inter-American policy of our country. The Communists would surely make capital of such a development to the detriment not only of the Venezuelan Government and people but also the American interests in this country and throughout Latin America.

HERE'S WHERE VENEZUELA BUYS

Machinery, $142 million, 26 States.

Metal manufactures, $60 million, 16 States.

Automobiles and trucks, $60 million, 5 States.

Foodstuffs, $45 million, 24 States.

Textiles, $38 million, 19 States.

Chemicals, $36 million, 11 States.

Dairy products, $23 million, 15 States.

Wood and paper products, $19 million, 31 States.

Minerals, $14 million, 17 States.

All told, 40 States benefited directly from major purchases.

While all States produced one or more products used in manufactured products exported to Venezuela.

Since the war Venezuela has been one of our top five world customers. Higher still, if countries having United States loans aren't counted.

Also, Venezuela sent nearly $500 million more last year to the United States to pay for different services.

Venezuela provides almost a billion-dollar annual income to the United States of America.

Some 25,000 Americans from 44 States live and work in Venezuela.

Here's where we're from: 44 States.

More than 7,000 Venezuelan students are now studying in the United States of America.

Venezuela bought some $500 million of United States products in 1952.

Comparable statistics now available for first 10 months of 1953 show an increase over 1952.

Here's what Venezuela bought

Machinery	$142,000,000
Autos and trucks	60,000,000
Foodstuffs	45,000,000
Textiles	38,000,000
Chemicals	36,000,000
Dairy products	23,000,000
Wood and paper	19,000,000
Minerals	14,000,000
Various	123,000,000
Total	500,000,000

Unity Based on Principle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, July 24, 1954

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an excellent statement and letter to the President of the United States by Prof. Lev E. Dobriansky, of Georgetown University, in his capacity as president of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America.

There being no objection, the statement and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRINCIPLED UNITY FORGES UNITED ACTION

(Statement and Communication on Current Anglo-American Conference by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, president, Ukrainian Congressional Committee of America, Georgetown University, Washington, D. C.)

We are confident that millions of fellow Americans share our hope that the current talks between the leaders of our Government and British Prime Minister Churchill and Foreign Secretary Eden are proceeding with thorough frankness and candor as concerns chiefly the essentials of principle and fact determining a definite and winning policy of cooperation in the struggle against Russian Communist imperialism and aggression.

The first and paramount requirement for solid unity of action is the basic determination of policy by fixed moral and political principles hallowed in the liberal tradition of Western Society and in our own Declaration of Independence. The addresses of President Eisenhower and Secretary of State Dulles to the Nation are replete with affirmations of these principles on self-determination, national sovereignty, self-government, and independence. We have every reason to expect that they will impress upon the minds of Prime Minister Churchill and Foreign Secretary Eden these selfsame principles as governing our policy.

Although a solid unity of action against Russian Communist imperialism is desired most, it will prove to be hollow unless it is grounded in a mutual acceptance of moral and political principles applied to all captive and dependent nations in the non-Communist world and in the vast Russian Communist Empire. The President has stressed, "We shall never acquiesce in the enslavement of any people in order to purchase fancied gain for ourselves." Any appeasement schemes and worthless nonaggression pacts with criminal Communist states, as entertained by the British Ministers, would be tantamount to acquiescence. Short-run illusions of peace for us can only add up to long-run Communist advantages.

American moral leadership in the world has yet to deliver its powerful expressions. We cannot attract the allegiances of peoples and nations with guns, dollars, or pacts with international criminals. We cannot blindly resist or ignore the forces of history at work in this century, manifesting themselves in the sweeping and conscious assertion of peoples and nations for independent government—not only in Asia and Africa, not only in so-called satellite Europe, but also in the forced Soviet Union, a prison of nations. The problem of national independence in Indochina and the surging forces of nationalism in Asia and Africa are essentially the same in the Russian Communist Empire, including the non-Russian nations of Ukraine, Armenia, Georgia, Byelorussia, the Baltic States, and others in the Soviet Union.

The empire complex of Mr. Churchill's thinking conduces only to the benefit of the Kremlin, which, ironically enough, feverishly utilizes these dominant historical forces in its design for world conquest and domination. The ill effects of British policy in this century are concretely measured by Britain's ultimate and saving dependence upon our intervention in two world wars. To handicap our leadership now with schemes and ideas defied by the forces of our day leaves no recourse of salvation, either for ourselves or Great Britain.

Our own great tradition and the current forces of history must be wedded if our policy is to have purpose, definiteness, and universal appeal. Mere dependence on a contracting superiority of arms requires little vision, political wisdom, and courage. The concept of material power holds no attraction to nations and peoples with a spiritual and moral stake in the future. It can least encounter successfully the ideological drive of the Kremlin pitched to the self-assertion of dependent nations.

We therefore urge, as a constructive result of these talks, the formulation of a universal declaration of independence—one that Mr. Dulles himself advocated 2 years ago—a declaration with moral and political principles applying to all nations and peoples, including those in the Soviet Union. Only a declaration of this sort can provide true direction to our foreign policy, can meet the ideological challenge of Moscow, can win the souls and minds of people everyewhere, and can thwart Russian Communist ambitions for world conquest and thus deter a third world war.

It is our conviction that, if the present conference fails to treat these essentials with decisive intent, the immediate future will continue to be frought with confusion, indecision, growing despair, and questionable leadership. The Russian Communists know what they want and, in their diabolical way, know how to attain it. We, unfortunately, are found floundering on both grounds.

The following communication sent to President Eisenhower, and substantially a similar one to Secretary of State Dulles, sets forth in more concrete detail the general views expressed here:

The Honorable DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER,
President of the United States,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The far-reaching importance of your conference with Prime Minister Churchill and Foreign Secretary Eden to the future of our Nation and for the forces of freedom everywhere moves us to express certain views and sentiments of support which, we confidentially feel, are shared by great numbers of fellow citizens. These popular views deserve the attention of the conference and the frank thought of its eminent participants if realism and the prospect of success in the struggle against Russian Communist imperialism are to be well founded.

It goes without saying that a solid unity of action against the common enemy is desired most. However, in the circumstances of the world situation today, no such unity can be genuinely solid unless it is forged by a fundamental unity of principle and moral objective applicable to all nations and peoples. A sound and effective unity of action must of necessity be operationally grounded in fixed moral and political principles permeating the entire framework of our knowledge and understanding of the political realities not only in the free world but in the Russian Communist empire as well. The absence of this mutual and basic recognition or mere verbal deference to its content will only serve to measure the hollowness of any proclaimed unity of action and the alienation of captive and dependent nations whose stake in the future is also powerfully instrumental to the cause of freedom.

In your numerous addresses to the Nation, as well as those delivered by Secretary of State Dulles, these fundamental ideas are abundantly stressed. Along with millions of other Americans, we take pride and place our abiding faith and trust in the integrity of your words and the sound utterances of our Secretary of State. "We must prevent," as you declare, "further conquest by the Communists that would increase their strength and weaken us. We must also give to those already enslaved hope that will enable them to continue resisting the oppressor until his hold can be gradually weakened and loosened from within." This hope, in fact moral commitment, is plainly underwritten by your state of the Union statement that "We shall never acquiesce in the enslavement of any people in order to purchase fancied gain for ourselves."

Innumerable passages of like vein and clarity constitute the firm structure of Mr. Dulles' straightforward addresses. "We have not forgotten," he recently stated, "the Atlantic Charter and its proclamation of 'the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live.' We still share the wish expressed in that charter, 'to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have forcibly been deprived of them.' This is an hour when it is particularly important that our Nation's dedication to these principles should be made manifest." Indeed, this is the hour—in the time of this conference.

Cognizant of the unsurpassed nature of Russian Communist colonialism, we endorse fully the recent Seattle address by the Secretary of State and his principled opposition to colonialism and the subjugation of peoples anywhere, whether in the non-Communist world or in the Russian Communist empire. We heartily agree with him that "It came naturally to the United States to take a lead in this matter. We ourselves are the first colony in modern times to have won independence. We have a natural sympathy with those everywhere who would follow our example."

The American people have every reason to believe and to expect that these same spirited expressions and moral and political ends—which reflect our own great tradition, form the foundation of our leadership in the world, are conceptually attuned to the promised policy of liberation, and magnetize the allegiance of all true believers in freedom everywhere—will be impressed with equal force of purpose and clarity on the minds of Sir Winston Churchill and Mr. Eden. Our dedication to these ends in this time of mortal struggle cannot be traded in any purchase of peace for the fleeting moment of historical time.

The hope placed in America and for what it stands by all the capitive nations, now undergoing genocidal consolidation within the Russian Communist empire, and by dependent peoples elsewhere would be gravely undermined by schemes of appeasement and nonaggression pacts with criminal states that have long records of breach of contract. Such schemes and pacts may form the basis of self-glorification over the attainment of short-run illusions of peace, but in the long run contribute to nothing but disaster.

Notwithstanding the many excellent accomplishments of Prime Minister Churchill, it remains singularly true that the political thinking of one who did not become the crown's first minister "to preside over the liquidation of the British Empire" is heavily conditioned by the empire complex. His treatment of Poland cannot be easily forgotten, and in the eyes of many of his own countrymen represents an ineradicable blemish upon British history. With the aim of some workable and compromising arrangement with the Soviet Union, almost all of his public statements concerning Eastern Europe are punctuated by a complete disregard for the liberation and freedom of the so-called satellite nations.

As so clearly revealed by his writings on World War II, most unfortunate, too, is his conspicuous lack of knowledge and appreciative understanding of the tense multi-national composition of the Soviet Union which he consistently identifies with Russia and that is supposed to consist of 190 million Russians. It would most likely be a shocking revelation for the Prime Minister to learn that the national independence of Ukraine and its tremendous war potential could alone insure the historical cessation of Russian imperialism engulfing any non-Russian nation as well as the true liberation of the Russian people from centuries-long tyranny and despotism, largely fortified by external aggression and conquest.

We strongly urge (1) that an explicite affirmation of the stated moral and political principles be made at this hour to counteract any plans of the Prime Minister to acquiesce in the enslavement of any people in order to purchase fancied gain for ourselves; (2) that without compromising strains of expediency these principles be universally directed at all captive and dependent nations, including in name the non-Russian nations in the Soviet Union; (3) that by this universal declaration of independence, so vigorously advanced by the Secretary of State himself 2 years ago, our Government began to exercise strong moral leadership in the world for the combined attraction of all forces of freedom and the defeat of the ideological Russian Communist campaign: and (4) in garnering the forces of enlightened nationalism throughout the world that our Government proceed to implement concretely the promised American policy of liberation in order to stave off the accretions of Russian Communist advantage as the best deterrent to World War III.

The unmistakable sign of this century is the conscious assertion of peoples and nations for self-determination and independence. It is a century of demise of empires, including the notorious Russian Empire. For whatever reasons, failure to recognize this and to seize with courage and vision the powers and forces that history endows us with for the preservation of our own national independence and freedom, lies beyond the bounds of moral and political vindication.

It is inconceivable to us and doubtless to countless Americans that the issues presented here can be avoided or treated lightly in this vital conference. We earnestly hope that the views elaborated here will find ample expression in the constructive and realistic deliberations of the meeting.

Sincerely yours,

Lev E. Dobriansky,
Georgetown University.

This Business of Farming—Washington Hasn't Got the Answers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN
OF VERMONT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, July 24, 1954

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an editorial written by Paul C. Johnson and published in the Prairie Farmer of July 17, 1954.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

THIS BUSINESS OF FARMING—WASHINGTON HASN'T GOT THE ANSWERS

All eyes have been on Washington in recent weeks. How will the Congressmen vote? Will the farm program go rigid or flexible? These speculations show how we have come to look to the Government as the Savior in farm prices. Truth is that our situation is changed very little by the vote in Washington.

Farm products have to be sold if the farmer is to be prosperous. You can keep the price up for a while by having the Government put up the money and pile the goods in storage. But you can't hide them. The world knows they are there and markets are affected accordingly. Food can't be burned or dumped in the ocean on a large scale, because people won't stand for it. It's got to be sold in one way or another.

If farmers keep on producing stuff which can't be sold, agriculture will be in continuous trouble. How do you keep people from raising and hauling to market stuff that won't sell? There are two ways. Let the price drop so they look around for something else to raise that is more profitable. Lower prices also tend to sell more goods and clear the market. The other way is to establish by law what each is to raise and put a policeman on the job to enforce the law.

More and more farm folks are beginning to realize that this is the choice. Surpluses can't be wished away by pretending they aren't there. The taxpayer may be willing to buy what the market won't, for a time, but even the Government representing the taxpayer must find a use for the stuff or throw it away.

No farm program is any good that doesn't face this fact. Agriculture must accept either the discipline of the market place or the discipline of Government control.

It looks to us as if it would be better to ride out the low prices, clear the market and retain our independence in farming, but the decision will in the long run be made by farmers themselves. There's no Santa Claus in Washington, even if our lawmakers sometimes want you to believe that there is.

Protecting Welfare Funds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, July 24, 1954

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have an editorial from the July 23, 1954, issue of the Commonweal printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PROTECTING WELFARE FUNDS

The opposition of the A. F. of L. to governmental intervention is traditional, dating back to its founding. And the reasoning behind this fear of overdependence upon the Government is certainly sound enough, for what the Government gives, it can also take away. Yet David Dubinsky of the International Ladies' Garment Workers Union recently made news by breaking the long-standing A. F. of L. tradition in this matter.

In a significant article in the Federationist, official A. F. of L. publication, Mr. Dubinsky called upon organized labor to support legislation to halt the squandering and misuse of union welfare funds by racketeering elements. Noting that many rank-and-file union men are opposed to Government intervention, the president of ILGWU said: "But when these same unionists see some of the welfare funds squandered and misused by racketeering elements, some of whom are muscling their way into trade unions precisely in order to get their hands on these welfare funds, many rank-and-filers and leaders will come to look upon Government intervention—to protect welfare funds—as a lesser evil."

Mr. Dubinsky's position is not likely to go unchallenged inside the A. F. of L. Though A. F. of L. president George Meany may favor it, strong opposition to any Government intervention on welfare funds is expected from other A. F. of L. leaders. For our part, we would side with Mr. Dubinsky in this matter. As far as we can see, adequate safeguards against abuse in the handling of such welfare funds simply do not exist at this time. Most of the funds may be well administered, but there have already been a few spectacular cases of malpractice. And it should be remember that the amount involved in these funds is not chicken feed; some estimates run as high as $20 billion, and the funds are likely to increase rather than decrease in the near future.

In the face of this potentially dangerous situation, Mr. Dubinsky suggested legislation which would provide for the publication of financial data on the funds—including administrative costs and commissions—or the establishment of a minimum code of propriety and responsibility in the handling of these funds. As it happens, a bill along the lines of Mr. Dubinsky's suggestion was recently introduced by Senator Hubert H. Humphrey, of Minnesota, requiring public disclosure of all the facts about the handling of union-welfare funds. Senator Humphrey is certainly no foe of organized labor, and we think the unions would be wise to take the lead in supporting such legislation. Failure to do so will open the door to further abuse by some inside the labor movement and will prepare the way for harsh measures advanced by antilabor forces.

Tolerance Urged Over Integration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, July 24, 1954

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an article entitled, "Tolerance Urged Over Integration," written by Phil Fortman, and published in the Miami Herald of recent date.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

TOLERANCE URGED OVER INTEGRATION

(By Phil Fortman)

Belief that ending segregation of Negro and white students in schools and colleges can be worked out through "a tolerant and intelligent approach to the problem by both sides" was expressed at Miami Beach Sunday by one of the South's leading educators.

Dr. Oliver C. Carmichael, president of the University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa, here to address a convention of the Commercial Law League of America, said his own institution will attempt to comply with the May 17 ruling of the United States Supreme Court declaring segregation unconstitutional.

"We expect specific decrees to be laid down by the Court by sometime in December," the distinguished-appearing, white-haired college president asserted, "and at that time plan appropriate compliance."

The University of Alabama, with a campus student body of 6,500 and 5 extension centers with enrollments totaling nearly 6,000, has never in its history admitted a Negro student.

Dr. Carmichael praised both Negro and Southern white leaders for "a generally mutual sympathetic approach to the problem, one not to be treated flamboyantly if it is to succeed."

"It is difficult to legislate and hand down court decrees on folkways and traditions," Dr. Carmichael said, "but with mutual understanding and clear thinking the segregation problem can be worked out just as it has been worked out in the armed services."

The University of Alabama president said he recently made inquiry into the placing of Negroes and whites together at Fort Benning, Ga., and "there apparently were no objections there, once a basis of understanding was reached.

"Young people are not as sensitive to customs as older people and the South itself has undergone a tremendous change."

Dr. Carmichael said he will elaborate on that today in an address before convention delegates at the Casablanca Hotel. The talk is entitled "Some Aspects of Southern Progress."

The Commercial Law League, made up of attorneys, commercial credit men and educators interested in that phase of the legal profession, will conclude its convention here Wednesday. There are about 400 delegates in attendance.

Outlawing Deficits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, July 24, 1954

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, the proposal for a constitutional amendment suggested by the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. Byrd] and the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. Bridges] has created a great deal of interest over the United States. Many editorials have been printed concerning it. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an editorial entitled "Outlawing Deficits," published in the Washington (Pa.) Observer of recent date.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

OUTLAWING DEFICITS

Can unbalanced budgets be made unconstitutional? Senators Byrd and Bridges are convinced they can be. They have introduced a proposed constitutional amendment designed to have that effect except in event of war or other great emergency.

The object is to restrain Congress from appropriating more than estimated revenues for any fiscal year, and to require it to levy additional taxes when revenues fall short of the estimate and create a deficit.

The purpose of this proposal cannot be lauded too highly. Certainly there is no excuse for expenditures exceeding revenue in peacetime. Thought should be given to means of reducing the present astronomical debt. But a start will never be made if the Government is unable to balance its current budget.

Unbalanced budgets redistribute wealth by creating a huge national debt, and their effect is highly inflationary. It has been demonstrated in the last generation that politics makes balanced budgets hard to achieve. Presidents find it easy to succumb to pressures to spend more than anticipated revenue, and similar pressures seem equally hard for Congress to resist. Perhaps nothing less than a constitutional amendment will stiffen presidential and congressional backbones.

The two Senators, at any rate, are to be commended for trying to solve the problem of budgets perennially unbalanced by the pressure of spending pressure groups.

Invention of Kid-Proof Icebox

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, July 24, 1954

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the Record an article entitled "And Now Comes a Man With a Kid-Proof Icebox," written by George Kennedy. This may sound humorous, but we all know about the number of children who are killed in abandoned iceboxes each year. This article refers to an invention by Silas A. Morehouse, of Chantilly Va.

The distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. Sparkman] and I have introduced bills on this subject.

There being no objection, the article is ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington Sunday Star of July 18, 1954]

AND NOW COMES A MAN WITH A KID-PROOF ICEBOX

(By George Kennedy)

A Fairfax County resident has an invention to end the tragic deaths of children in abandoned refrigerators. The death toll from this type of accident, which broke out like a rash last year, has risen to 85 and there is general agreement that something has to be done about it.

The inventor is Silas A. Morehouse, of Chantilly, Va., an early-bird pilot and former civilian employee of the Air Force.

Mr. Morehouse's invention has the virtue of simplicity. The icebox door is held closed by magnetism instead of by a spring latch. One magnet is fastened to the center shelf of the box; another to the inside of the door. When the center shelf is removed there is nothing to hold the door closed. And when the center shelf is in place, a child will not fit in the icebox.

He may be in the position of the fortunate few who have come up with a $1 million invention. He had a search made at the patent office and was surprised to find that no patent has been issued for a safety refrigerator door based on using the center shelf as a protective device. He has applied for a patent.

The idea of using magnets in refrigerators, however, is not new. General Electric used small alnico magnets embedded in the gasket around the outside of the door on its de luxe models in 1950 and 1951. The magnets were made of nickel, cobalt, and aluminum. The Korean war made these materials critical and the line was discontinued in 1951. The purpose of the magnetic door was convenience, not safety. A foot treadle disengaged the magnets. General Motors also experimented with magnets for its Frigidaire boxes.

Industry produces about 6 million new refrigerators a year. Mr. Morehouse believes the manufacturers would find they could produce the magnetic lock more cheaply than the spring latch. He would be perfectly willing to license the use of his idea at 25 cents a refrigerator. It is not hard to figure that if the industry has to come around to using his invention, his income would be about $1.5 million a year.

There are two bills before Congress to prevent the distribution of more refrigerators that are potential death traps for children. One was introduced by Senator Mansfield, of Montana, the other by Senator Sparkman, of Alabama. Both have practically the same language: That it shall be unlawful to introduce into interstate commerce any refrigerator unless it "is equipped with a latch which enables it to be opened from the inside." Most refrigerators, of course, cross State lines between factory and home and so would fall under the law's provision.

Mr. Morehouse, who testified at hearings on the bill held by the Subcommittee on Business and Consumer Interest of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, believes he has the latch that fills the bill.

Senator Purtell, of Connecticut, chairman of the subcommittee, is very interested in getting something done about the refrigerator menace. Since the introduction of the bills two children have been suffocated in abandoned refrigerators in his State.

Industry representatives in general opposed the bill at the hearing. They said the problem should be dealt with at State and local levels. Twenty States already have passed legislation requiring the refrigerator door to be taken off or the lock removed before it is discarded. They pointed out that this Federal legislation would have no effect until 10, 15, or 20 years from now when the new refrigerators manufactured in conformance to it become worn out and are discarded.

As for the Morehouse invention called Silok, an industry representative said it would not hold the refrigerator door tight enough to prevent air leakage around the rubber rim. The magnetic latch on a refrigerator, which Mr. Morehouse showed the subcommittee, had a pressure of 8 pounds to the square inch. Industry engineers said 30 to 40 pounds is necessary.

Mr. Morehouse said he checked the latches on refrigerator doors and found that 8 pounds was typical.

"If they really need more pressure," says Mr. Morehouse, "we can give it to them with larger magnets."

The magnets he uses are far more powerful than the old horseshoe iron magnets which are still a delight to children. They are the alnico magnets, the same make that General Electric uses, only larger. Their strength is an important part of his demonstration.

They are made by Crucible Steel Co. and are magnetized at very high temperatures. It is difficult to remove the iron cross bar by hand from an alnico horseshoe magnet. It takes a very strong arm to wrest the bar away.

It would be rather difficult to open a refrigerator door with 40 pounds pressure keeping it closed. But a lever latch could be devised to turn the magnet on the door so that it would no longer be in direct contact the the one on the shelf.

The Supreme Court

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, July 24, 1954

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, a recent editorial in the Saturday Evening Post entitled "Senate Moves to Save Supreme Court From Future Attempts to Pack It" discusses some features of Senate Joint Resolution No. 44, a bill which I introduced in the 1st session of this Congress and which was passed by the Senate on May 11 of this session by a vote of 58 to 19.

Other aspects of Senate Joint Resolution No. 44 which were not alluded to in the Saturday Evening Post editorial deal with compulsory retirement for Supreme Court Justices and Federal Judges and protection of the appelate jurisdiction of the Supreme Court in all constitutional cases.

The Saturday Evening Post editorial correctly states that the provision fixing the number of Supreme Court Justices was designed to protect the independence of the Supreme Court from an over-ambitious executive, but in its necessarily short comments mention was not made of the fact that the Congress has also been guilty of attempts to destroy the independence of the Supreme Court, and the legislature would also be barred from weakening the Supreme Court by Senate Joint Resolution No. 44.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection the editorial was ordered to be printed in the record as follows:

SENATE MOVES TO SAVE SUPREME COURT FROM FUTURE ATTEMPTS TO PACK IT

One of the achievements of the late Franklin Roosevelt for which he seldom gets credit is a determination in Congress to slam the door shut on the possible revival of various features of the New Deal. Already the twenty-second amendment to the Constitution limits future Presidents to two terms in office. The Bricker amendment, an amended version of which failed in the Senate by one vote sought to prevent the resurgence of the Roosevelt habit of bypassing the Senate's treaty-making power through the use of executive agreements.

Most recently, the Senate has adopted a resolution proposing a constitutional amendment establishing nine as the permanent number of Justices on the Supreme Court. The idea is, of course, to block in advance any neo-Rooseveltian effort to pack the high court for political purposes. Like other efforts to prevent arbitrary acts by legal means, the proposed amendment is a roadblock. Alone, it would hardly suffice to curb the advance of an ambitious executive with fanatical public opinion behind him.

Strangely enough, the proposed amendment went through the Senate with little discussion outside the legal profession. It has been objected that the business of the Court is likely to increase so much that nine men cannot hope to handle it efficiently. However, lawyers point out that, unless it is proposed that the Judges should divide up the Court's business on a sectional basis, as is done in the Circuit Court of Appeals, the Supreme Court could not handle more cases merely by adding to the number of Justices. During the hearings on the subject, former Justice Owen Roberts indicated that, in his opinion, 5 men could reach decisions more expeditiously than 9 men can. Since all the Justices pass on every case that comes before the Court, it is probably true that a number greater than nine would add to the confusion rather than reduce it. Anyway, so those who favor the amendment.

In normal times, there is no important debate on the functions of the Supreme Court or on the best possible number of Justices. But during periods like the first and second Roosevelt administrations, when executive and congressional power threatens the reserved constitutional rights of individuals and local governments, the Supreme Court becomes the final defense of aggrieved minorities against arbitrary misuse of power. It then becomes vitally important to circumvent the efforts of the majority to bend the judiciary to its will, as F. D. R. attempted to do in his court-packing raid. This amendment is designed to save the fabric of our judicial system the next time an overambitious executive threatens it.

Amending Atomic Energy Act of 1946, as Amended

SPEECH
OF
HON. JAMIE L. WHITTEN
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 23, 1954

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 9757) to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, as amended.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York. I apologize to my colleagues for taking up the time of the committee when it is apparent that you wish to move to early adjournment. But I must take this time because I feel there is something that we should think about. The Constitution does provide that we may provide for the protection of patents for the use and benefit of those who make discoveries. But we do have statutes providing that where the result comes from the expenditure of public funds and public effort, the patent is recorded in the name of the representative of the Government for the use and benefit of all the people.

My committee handles the research funds for the Department of Agriculture. We have spent millions and millions of dollars annually for research. We provide many instances that those funds are paid by contract to private concerns who do the work. Where discovery comes from the expenditure of public funds, the law requires, and no one has ever questioned that law as being unconstitutional, that the patent must be recorded in the name of the Secretary of Agriculture for the use and benefit of all the people who want to make use of it. Certainly, the desire of this committee in its zeal to see that patents are not limited to these 8 or 10 companies who happen to have the know-how because of advantages provided them by the Government. They have had these contracts, and have earned their know-how and obtained the training of their personnel under this $12 billion that the Government has spent. The committee felt that for several years at least patents presumably would be based upon the results of the Government expenditures and where that public expenditure has contributed to the know-how and background and to patents which may come from that know-how and background, it is certainly sound to move in the direction of the law we have in other fields. Whether the language in the bill meets the particular demands of the Constitution, I do not know, not having studied it with that in mind. But certainly, to leave it so that a few people can get their hands on these patents and hold them for their own benefit is unsound. I say to you that provision that power which may come from this program must be transferred to private utility companies may do small injury as compared with what you may be giving to a few companies who have at least 8 to 10 years of background experience and all that know-how for which the American people paid. We spent $12 billion trying to get 2 or 3 years ahead of the Russians in this atomic-energy field and if you let the companies that have 6 or 8 years' experience ahead of the crowd, the others likely never will catch up with them. If this particular section giving some chance to all for use of discoveries which come from the expenditure of public funds does not do that then we need to provide a way that it can be done to protect the public interest. It can be done and it can be done within the Constitution. Certainly Mr. COLE's amendment would not recognize the fact that present know-how by all these companies is the result of the public expenditure of funds.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield.

Mr. HINSHAW. I think the gentleman from Mississippi may not have heard the language of the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE], which provides that any patent which comes as a result of any Government employment or any association with the project belongs to the Government outright.

Mr. WHITTEN. That would limit it to cases of patents that came before, but what about the patents that these companies might ask for in the future, based actually on the work of these scientists trained as a result of the expenditure of public funds.

Mr. HINSHAW. And it applies to future patents so arrived at.

Mr. WHITTEN. I did not so understand it. However, I doubt that proper determination of the Government interest will be made and future discoveries would not be properly attributed to the Government.

Mr. HINSHAW. I assure the gentleman that the amendment does so provide.

Mr. WHITTEN. I did not so understand it. Further, you are drawing a distinction as to what it is based on, this knowhow, and things of that sort. It is thoroughly impractical to try to draw the line as to what the value of years of experience amounts to in discoveries subject to patent for the next several years where we have given to these companies and individuals who are trained in this field, experience that very few people in the whole world have. That of itself constitutes a public contribution to the patents that may even be started next month or for the next several years. It is an advantage if we give these companies the advantage of exclusive patents where the Government has been responsible. It is very dangerous to give that advantage, if it is your desire to see benefits of this program reach the great American people, which I think they should reach.

Opening Blind Eyes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 23, 1954

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, it was my pleasure to hear a most outstanding sermon last Sunday by Rev. Edward O. Clark, D. D., pastor of Chevy Chase Baptist Church in the city of Washington. The text of this most impressive sermon was Opening Blind Eyes. This message had been given an award of merit. I am happy to be a congregation member of Dr. Clark's church.

I incorporate the full text and commend it wholeheartedly to the Members of this House:

"One thing I know, that, whereas I was blind, now I see." (John 9: 25.)

Let us think of this narrative of Jesus restoring sight to the blind man after the fashion of a spiritual parable. Our justification for this approach is in the fact that the gosper writer himself interprets the miracle in a spiritual manner. For the Pharisees with all of their seeing are represented as being blind, whereas this blind man at the last gained spiritual sight. When he saw Jesus as the Messiah, after his sight had been restored, he exulted fervently saying, "Lord, I believe." Hence it is clear that John is recording a double miracle: that of giving sight to the eyes and of light to the soul.

SIGHT AND INSIGHT

Jesus has been doing this latter thing all along, and of the two accomplishments the giving of spiritual insight is in many ways more important than restoring physical sight. Aunt Hope, a character in Dorothy Clarke Wilson's play, The Light in the Window, speaking to Jeremy who has been blinded by an accident says: "I can't help being sorry for anybody that doesn't believe in God's love, when every flower that blooms is just breathing out the mystery and joy of a new life. It seems so much worse than being blind, somehow. I'd so much rather have unseeing eyes than an unseeing heart." That's it. Better to have unseeing eyes than an unseeing heart; better far to see the true meaning and the solemn glory of life than to see only the external husks of things. Insight is not less important than sight.

And similar instances where both sight and insight have been the hoped-for result are not lacking in modern times. Recently the newspapers recorded the story of Earl Musselman, a man born blind who had his sight restored by the technical skill of a famous surgeon. It is only one of the many miracles of modern medical science. Here was a man to whom the world about him was a blur of voices, sounds, and scents in a confused inky blackness; and with the restoration of physical sight he, too, gained spiritual discernment. "The most outstanding thing," he says, according to the account, "is the fact that so many of you are oblivious to all the beauty around you—colors, flowers, trees, fields, rivers, mountains, skies, sunsets, moonlight, and the sea and all the glories of nature that make the world seem like a Garden of Eden to me I cannot help thinking that there is another kind of blindness almost as bad as that of the eyes—a blindness of the soul that keeps sighted people from really seeing and enjoying the beauties of nature." With his sight came insight.

THE TESTIMONY OF THE CHRISTIAN

There is no disputing the reality of the experiences of these men, whether having reference to sight or to insight; it is simply this: "One thing I know, that, whereas I was blind now I see." And the testimony of the Christian today while varying in form is constant in content and is to be stated somewhat as follows, "Formerly I looked out upon life, but I was blind to the real meaning hidden everywhere. I saw life centered only in self and everything was vain, futile, lustful." As an unknown author has written:

"I lived for self, I thought for self,
For self and none beside;
Just as if Jesus had never lived,
And as if He had never died."

But now all that is changed: Jesus has opened my eyes. I see life marvelous in beauty and freighted with a divine significance that makes my heart thrill perpetually. I see my life now as indispensable part of the divine creation. My supreme joy is to do God's will and to accomplish the work he has for me. With Browning, I see—

"* * * the world,
The beauty and the wonder and the power,
The shapes of things, their colors, lights and shades,
Changes, surprises, and—
God made it all!"

CHRISTIANS OR PAGANS

It is just here that we find a clue to the essence of the Christian faith; namely, in the distinction between those who have spiritual insight and those who in the presence of life's deeper mysteries, manifest little other than physical sight. A contrary philosophy of life differentiates them. The first group is spiritually minded; the latter group is materialistic. The former is committed to a purposeful, hopeful interpretation of life and the universe; the latter sees the universe in rigid mechanistic terms and views life's goal solely as hedonistic. The eyes of one group have been opened by Jesus: they are Christians. The eyes of the other group have never been opened by anyone: they are pagans.

These two groups, Christians and pagans, abound side by side in our modern life and are perpetually in conflict The pagans, or those whom Matthew Arnold characterizes from a cultural viewpoint as Philistines, are grossly materialistic and sensual. Life to them is meaningless, a hopeless enigma save as they can seize a sensual thrill or two before they come upon the extinction of death. They look upon the Christian Church as an antiquated institution. They have only patronizing pity to bestow upon any who cherish ideals of honor, faith, and love. They speak of fidelity in marriage as foolishly puritanical. In business as in other realms, jungle ethics is considered more efficient than soft-hearted love.

That such a blasé outlook upon life is prevalent today is clearly evidenced by our sex-obsessed novels; by the craze for cocktails, and by the frantic seeking of sensual thrills in an attempt to run away from self. Their very despair reveals their emptiness of soul.

THE BLIND ONES

As an example of this pagan spirit there is the tragic life story of the young woman known as Starr Faithful, who gained much notoriety a few years ago. What a name to have lived up to. But in the futile, wanton wasting of her life and in her final disillusionment in a suicidal death, how pitiful she was. Her confession written shortly before her death contained, according to the newspapers, the following lines which evidenced her great despair: "I certainly have made a sordid, futureless mess of it all. I am dead sick of it. It is no one's fault but my own. I hate everything so. Life is so horrible." The last 4 lines were underscored 3 times.

What was the matter with Starr Faithful? She was blind. Thrice blind she was to the finer and nobler purposes in life. Certainly we ought not harshly to condemn such ones. Let us be charitable. Let us take the attitude of Jesus and look upon their evident sinfulness as a sordid darkness of soul.

In fact the Starr Faithfuls may well be likened to black sheep. Out in the Colorado Rockies a Mexican shepherd was tending a great flock of some 2,000 sheep. One day a visitor happened along and fell into conversation with the shepherd. As they conversed together a black sheep began to stray across a ravine to graze in tall grass on the other side. Soon the other sheep were following until the shepherd was compelled to call them back. One by one they responded to his call, but the black sheep was the last of all to heed. Then the visitor said something about the proverbial "black sheep." "You think the black sheep bad?" queried the shepherd. "No," he continued answering his own question, "not bad, only foolish." So it is, I think, with many of our modern pagans: they are not really bad, only foolish and blind.

THOSE WITH SEEING HEARTS

Christians, however, by their discernment of the spiritual meaning of life are to be differentiated from such pagans as these. Jesus has opened their eyes first of all to the great thrilling reality, God, in whom their own little lives find a larger and an eternal destiny. Thence comes the noble vision, the purposeful life of worthy service, and that intuition which pierces the perplexing mysteries of heartaches and sorrows to their ultimate solution in the good that can be wrought out of them by a buoyant faith. This conviction concerning life's spiritual verities has come to them not by reason, nor by logic, but by a deep insight quickened into consciousness by the radiant personality of Jesus. He has given them the seeing heart.

It is essentially a quality of life, and it was this element which was lacking in the formal religion of the Pharisees. Jesus made it a fundamental prerequisite for his followers when he said to Nicodemus, "Ye must be born again." (John 3: 7.)

This insight of the soul is illumined for us in the story of the love of Elizabeth Barrett and Robert Browning. The beautiful and ennobling quality of their love is well known, and it is true, as someone has said, that one does not fall into such love, one rises to it. In a couplet from her "Sonnets from the Portuguese," Elizabeth Barrett Browning has recorded the transformation which came to her thereby. Wrought by that high and holy love she says:

"The face of all the world is changed, I think,
Since first I heard the footsteps of thy soul."

In like manner one in whom Jesus of Nazareth has wrought the spiritual miracle can say:

"The face of all the world, of life, even of
death is changed, O Christ,
Since first I heard the footsteps of Thy
Soul."

THE CHRISTIAN IRRATIONAL

Now it is important that we should frankly admit that the Christian outlook upon life is not based upon rigid logic but upon this spiritual institution. That is to say, the Christian life is an adventure and calls for daring; it cannot be proven in advance. Truce, Christian apologetics may call logic and reason to its aid, but such assistance is essentially in support of a position first of all attained by insight.

Actually at the heart of the Christian outlook upon life there is an irrational. In the Corinthian letter the Apostle Paul stated it bluntly when he called himself a "fool for Christ's sake."

Why, for example, should a young businessman give up a $12,000-a-year annual income to enter a seminary in order to study for the Christian ministry, in which profession he could hardly hope to attain a similar monetary reward? A young man in Texas is reported to have done this thing some time ago. There was no logic in such a decision, only love, love for the Saviour whose touch upon his life had brought a new spiritual insight.

And then there is the well-known story of Dr. Albert Schweitzer who was nicely located at a prominent European university as a professor, as a preacher and as a writer of scholarly books; all of which he gave up to become a student of medicine in the same university. Becoming a medical doctor and mastering tropical diseases he announced to his friends that he was going to the Lamberene forest region of Africa, as a medical missionary. They said he was foolish, out of his mind. There seems to have been no logic in such a decision, only the touch of Christ that brought spiritual sight to his soul.

Not by logic does one gain such spiritual insight but by love. The self must be surrendered to Christ the Saviour. One must say with the Apostle Paul, "I live, but it is no longer I that live; Christ liveth in me."

Would one see life aright? Would one see the earth and all therein as "my Father's world?" Would one view life here as love of God and service to one's fellowman? Then let him come with humble, repentant heart to the foot of the cross and then with the touch of Christ upon his heart he will find himself saying, "One thing I know, that, whereas I was blind, now I see."

Amending Atomic Energy Act of 1946, as Amended

SPEECH
OF

HON. CARL HINSHAW

OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 23, 1954

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 9757) to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, as amended.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I believe when the committee acted on the first amendment they included too much, so I have offered this substitute amendment to provide that only source material shall be admitted free of duty into the United States. The other materials and supplies, of course, certainly have to be under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Ways and Means, and we cannot say now what they may be. We have no idea what they may be. But the ore, the source material, we do know about.

I think the gentleman from North Carolina, the gentleman from California, the gentleman from Illinois, and the gentleman from New York are in agreement with my substitute amendment.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, I have no objection to the amendment.

American Policy in the Middle East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, July 24, 1954

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excellent analysis of current American policy in the Middle East in an article entitled "Impartiality Fails To Win New Friends in Middle East," recently published in the August issue of the Democratic Digest, together with a brief introductory statement and an exchange of correspondence which I had last February with the State Department.

There being no objection, the analysis and correspondence were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTRODUCTORY STATEMENT BY SENATOR DOUGLAS

I have for many months been concerned over the development and results of American policies in the Middle East.

I raised basic questions about our arming of potential aggressors in that area in a letter to Secretary of State Dulles on February 4, 1954. The reply from Assistant Secretary Thruston B. Morton, was as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, February 11, 1954.
Hon. PAUL H. DOUGLAS,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR DOUGLAS: The receipt is acknowledged of your letter of February 4, 1954, concerning our policy of military assistance to the Arab States and referring to threats allegedly made against Israel by the King of Saudi Arabia and the Prime Minister of Egypt.

While the Department is not in possession of an authentic version of the remarks which King Saud may have made regarding Israel, it is satisfied from reports received from its representatives abroad that remarks of the type reported do not accurately reflect the policies of the Arab Governments in relation to Israel. The Department has no information of the Prime Minister of Egypt having recently made any statements including belligerent threats against Israel. While it is clear that the Arab Governments and Israel are not yet in a position to conclude peace, there are no signs of a policy on the part of the Arab States, individually or as a group, to embark upon military aggression against Israel.

You may be aware that during the last session of Congress $30 million was appropriated for United States military assistance programs in states of the Near East. This was done in full recognition of United States security interest in this strategic area and of the importance of contributing to local defense against a possible Communist invasion of the region. In this connection, the pertinent provisions of section 202 (a) of the Mutual Security Act of 1951, as amended, are as follows:

"Whenever the President determines that such action is essential for the purpose of this act, he may provide assistance * * *: *Provided*, That any such assistance may be furnished only upon determination by the President that (1) the strategic location of the recipient country makes it of direct importance to the defense of the Near East area, (2) such assistance is of critical importance to the defense of the free nations, and (3) the immediately increased ability of the recipient country to defend itself is important to the preservation of the peace and security of the area and to the security of the United States."

Such United States military assistance as may be contemplated for states of the Near East will be granted as a measure to strengthen the area for the defense of the free world against Communist attack as well as to build up internal security against subversive movements. Any such agreements entered into with the states concerned will conform with section 202 (b) of the act, as amended, which states:

"No assistance shall be furnished under this subsection unless the recipient nation has agreed (1) that the equipment, materials, or services provided will be used solely to maintain its internal security, its legitimate self-defense, or to permit it to participate in the defense of the area, or in United Nations collective security arrangements and measures, and (2) that it will not undertake any act of aggression against any other nation."

In this connection, you may recall the Tripartite Declaration of May 25, 1950 (copy enclosed) in which the United States, the United Kingdom and France made clear their arms policy toward the Near East and their determination to resist aggression in violation of existing armistice agreements between Israel and the Arab States. The United States stands fully behind the commitments which it took under that declaration.

Sincerely yours,
THRUSTON B. MORTON,
Assistant Secretary
(For the Acting Secretary of State).
(Enclosure: Copy tripartite declaration.)

"MAY 25, 1950.

"The Governments of the United Kingdom, France, and the United States today issued the following joint declaration:

"'The Governments of the United Kingdom, France, and the United States, having had occasion during the recent Foreign Ministers' meeting in London to review certain questions affecting the peace and stability of the Arab States and of Israel, and particularly that of the supply of arms and war material to these states, have resolved to make the following statements:

"'1. The three Governments recognize that the Arab States and Israel all need to maintain a certain level of armed forces for the purposes of assuring their internal security and their legitimate self-defense and to permit them to play their part in the defense of the area as a whole. All applications for arms or war material for these countries will be considered in the light of these principles. In this connection the three Governments wish to recall and reaffirm the terms of the statements made by their representatives on the Security Council on August 4, 1949, in which they declared their opposition to the development of an arms race between the Arab States and Israel.

" '2. The three Governments declare their assurances have been received from all the states in question, to which they permit arms to be supplied from their countries, that the purchasing state does not intend to undertake any act of aggression against any other state. Similar assurances will be requested from any other state in the area to which they permit arms to be supplied in the future.

" '3. The three Governments take this opportunity of declaring their deep interest in and their desire to promote the establishment and maintenance of peace and stability in the area and their unalterable opposition to the use of force or threat of force between any of the states in that area. The three Governments, should they find that any of these states was preparing to violate frontiers or armistic lines, would, consistently with their obligations as members of the United Nations, immediately take action, both within and outside the United Nations, to prevent such violation.' "

I was glad to note the assurances, in line with the 1950 declaration of the United States, United Kingdom, and France, that these nations would resist any aggressions in violation of the armistice there. But no assurances were given that arms would not be sent to countries which maintain belligerent threats.

In the absence of a more constructive policy to bring a real peace settlement and to unite those Middle East countries in projects to raise the living standards of all, the dangers of continuing conflict between Israel and the Arab States is great, and the division and weakness on the edge of the Iron Curtain are also great.

The following analysis from the Democratic Digest for August 1954 outlines these grave dangers and, in my opinion, properly raises the question whether our Government should not reconsider the policies that have brought us the present uneasy and frequently tragic situation in the Middle East.

"IMPARTIALITY FAILS TO WIN NEW FRIENDS IN MIDDLE EAST

"A year ago, Secretary Dulles went off to the Near East in search of a new policy for that troubled and turbulent area.

"He returned with a slogan—'Impartiality.' Over a television network, on June 1, 1953, he offered a solemn new pronouncement.

" 'United States policies should be impartial, so as to win not only the respect and regard of the Israelis but also of the Arab peoples,' Mr. Dulles said.

"While Mr. Dulles' statement occasioned some misgivings in the minds of those who were troubled by its possible repercussions on both the Arabs and the Israelis, the general reaction was not unfriendly. For the word 'impartiality' has a pleasant ring. Everyone wants our country to be the warm and sympathetic friend of all the peoples of the world.

"But the trouble with the doctrine was that Mr. Dulles presented it as if it were something revolutionary. Accordingly, the inference to be drawn from his speech was that America had not been impartial in the past. This fitted in with the thinking of Arab leaders who have always accused America of preferring Israel. Their contention implicitly sustained, they were naturally inclined to believe that our interest in Israel would diminish and our solicitude for Arab favor would rise.

"It is not clear that this was Mr. Dulles' intention. But, whether or not Mr. Dulles so intended it, the Arab States have been encouraged by the slogan to increase their pressure for concessions at Israel's expense. The inevitable result of the new policy has been a sharp increase in Arab-Israel tension, marked by a series of violent border incidents.

"The Secretary of State is now being urged to take another look at his new look in the Near East. It is evident that his policy, or slogan, has failed. It has not brought peace to the region; it has not improved relations between Israel and the Arab States. And it has not helped the United States itself for it has won us the friendship of neither side. What is even worse, there is ground for believing that we are less popular than ever before.

"Mr. Dulles' basic blunder, some critics say, was his acceptance of the charge that America has been unfriendly to the Arab States. A look at the record is of value.

"American policy toward the Near East first assumed importance in World War I when Woodrow Wilson captured the imagination of the world by calling for the self-determination of nations as one of his 14 points. At the close of World War I the Western Allies broke up the Turkish Empire's near eastern rule, and opened the way for self-government by 45 million people. Four Arab States then came into being in the historic land at the Mediterranean's eastern end.

"The same principle of self-determination was reaffirmed in 1947 at the United Nations when we backed the recommendations of an independent commission for the partitioning of Palestine in order to create a separate State of Israel. When armed conflict developed over the partition issue, the United States maintained a scrupulous neutrality by declining to sell arms to either side.

"Higher economic standards for the entire area have been a cardinal point of more recent American policy. Though private American aid has gone exclusively to Israel, American Government assistance has been international in scope. The United States, for example, has contributed $124,500,000 to a single Arab program, the United Nations help for Arab refugees.

"From the self-determination of Woodrow Wilson to the 1952 Republican platform plank drafted by John Foster Dulles, this policy has been bipartisan. Like President Truman and Secretary Acheson before them, the Republicans in 1952 set their object as 'peace between Israel and the Arab States' and 'economic and social stability in the area.'

"Despite this aim, Secretary Dulles also set himself a new task when he said June 1, 1953:

" 'The United States should seek to allay the deep resentment against it that has resulted from the creation of Israel.'

"This revealed a readiness on the part of the Department of State to apologize for America's friendship for Israel and to disregard the contribution our Government has made to the development and progress of the Arab states. Moreover, critics of Dulles say, the utterance was tantamount to provocation. To what lengths would the United States go to allay Arab resentment? Arab leaders were invited to speculate on the answer to that question, to turn wide the faucets of resentment, for the more resentment the further the United States might go to meet their demands and to cut Israel down to Arab league specifications.

"Critics also say that in pursuit of Arab favor, we have made Israel the target of criticism and reproach, while we have exercised polite moderation in our reaction to acts committed by the Arab states.

"Until the beginning of the new administration, American policy actively advocated direct negotiations in an effort to work out a peace treaty between Israel and the Arab states, which are still technically at war. But under Mr. Dulles our Department of State changed its position. Today, we have a limited objective in the Near East. It is to reduce tension. But tension refuses to be reduced. On the contrary, tension has steadily risen.

"Egypt has intensified its blockade of the Suez Canal, and even food shipments to Israel have been confiscated. There is a fusillade of violent threats from the Arab side. The youthful new King of Saudi Arabia has declared that the Arab world should be willing to sacrifice up to 10 million people to wipe out Israel. The Prime Minister of Iraq told his parliament early this year:

" 'Whoever called for peace with Israel would be guilty of high treason and should be hanged.' "

"All through the spring and summer of 1953, the Israel-Jordan frontier was a line of bloodshed. There was a succession of raid and retaliation. Scores of men, women, and children lost their lives on both sides of the frontier. The Israel Government formally presented an appeal to the great powers without results. Israelis then took the law into their own hands in a raid on a Jordanian village. The issue went to the United Nations Security Council. No one condoned the Israel raid. Jordan, however, had also been guilty of flagrant armistice violations. Nevertheles, instead of dealing with the whole complex of Arab-Israel relations, and instead of calling upon Israel and Jordan to sit down forthwith to try to restore the crumbling U. N. armistice agreement, the Western Powers, led by our Department of State, pushed through a resolution which singled out Israel for rebuke and censure. The Arabs went away exulting in a diplomatic truimph.

"Border conflicts were related to the areas's chronic water shortage. The River Jordan, in fact, is the only running water supply in this controversial area, where the only thing people can agree on is that water is life. Indeed, the river has been fought over since Biblical times.

"In late 1953 the Israelis started construction on a hydroelectric and irrigation project using the Jordan waters. Syria promptly protested to the United Nations that Israel was violating a nonmilitarized zone. U. N. Truce Supervisor Vagn Bennike told the Israelis to stop work on the dam, which they at first refused to do.

"This touched off a rapid-fire series of incidents in the United States. First Mr. Dulles cut off aid to Israel for opposing Bennike. At a White House press conference, President Eisenhower said amen. Israel's Ambassador told the U. N. Security Council that Israel was blameless but would nonetheless halt construction while the delegates were considering the matter. It so happened that the United States had suspended aid on the eve of elections in New York City, where the feeling for Israel runs strong. The Republican candidate made a hasty visit to the State Department to intercede, and emerged from his interview reporting progress. Mr. Dulles announced that financial aid to Israel had been reinstituted, which the White House noted 'with pleasure.'

"Shortly afterward Eric Johnston announced that he had been appointed as a special envoy to the Near East to sell a TVA-type plan for international development of the Jordan. He had already left the country by the time President Eisenhower confirmed his appointment.

"The plan was advertised as a solution for the Arab refugee problem, but examination of the plan revealed it was a possible solution for only a small number of individual refugees and not for the refugee problem. Michael Straus, former United States Commissioner of Reclamation, indicated that the plan was more a tentative idea than a working document. It had been drawn 'without field surveys and with somewhat theoretical hydrology and shadowy cost estimates,' he said. 'A remarkable thing about the plan was its studious avoidance of the chief cause of all the trouble—the international boundary lines between Israel and the Arab states which crisscross the watershed. It ostriched on such cruel facts by explaining that it was answering a hypothetical question about how the water might best be used if there were no national boundaries.'

"As it turned out, the merits of the plan were irrelevant. Jordan didn't even wait for Johnston to land at Amman to announce that it would have no part of the proposal. In rapid succession, Egypt, Syria, and Lebanon said that they did not care to buy, while Israel countered by announcing an entirely different plan. American prestige in this area was not boosted by the incident.

"The Dulles regime has also been criticized for the proposal to make arms available to Iraq and any other Arab state which cares to apply for membership in the new Turkish-Pakistan alliance.

"Even advocates of this plan concede that these arms are not scaled to stand off a Soviet invasion. Moreover, there is no evidence that the United States has obtained any assurances that the arms will not be used against the Israelis. There is concern that the combination of these two factors maybe taken by the extreme nationalists as a tacit blessing on their turning the guns against Israel.

"Many observers are convinced that these guns are far less effective American gestures than economic aid which will help raise the living standards of large numbers of people in the region. Moreover, they point out, unless our prestige is at a high point, we have no assurance that these weapons will be used on our side in the event of an East-West showdown.

"While this point may be in dispute, there is no dispute that the road to reconciliation and peace between the Arabs and Israelis is a long and hard one. All we can insist upon is that both sides sit together in direct negotiations.

"We can't impose peace on them, but we ought not to make peace more difficult by letting it appear that we have relinquished hopes of its attainment. We ought not to encourage any side in the delusion that we condone continued conflict. We should not arm one side.

"That is the reasoning of those who say that it is time that Mr. Dulles took another look at his policy, and who would like to have him consider this question: Is so-called impartiality an adequate substitute for friendship? Is a slogan hiding a disruptive change in United States policy?"

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the Record.

PRICE OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

The Public Printer is authorized to furnish to subscribers the daily Record at $1.50 per month, payable in advance.

Remit by money order payable to Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

Code of Laws of the United States

Title 44, Section 181. Congressional Record; arrangement, style, contents, and indexes.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the Congressional Record, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the Congressional Record semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

Title 44, Section 182b. Same; illustrations, maps, diagrams.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the Record without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the Congressional Record the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily Record as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided,* That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the Record with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the official reporters of the Congressional Record, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the Record shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the Record issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the Record for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the Record of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the Record shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the Record style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the Record.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the Congressional Record any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix, but this rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the Congressional Record.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the Congressional Record Appendix the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed.

10. *Official reporters.*—The official reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the Congressional Record by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this restriction shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. The Public Printer or the official reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the Congressional Record which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Illustrations.*—Pursuant to section 182b, title 44, United States Code (as shown above), requests for authority to insert an illustration in the Record should be submitted to the Joint Committee on Printing through the chairman of the Committee on Printing of the respective House in which the speech desired to be illustrated may be delivered. Illustrations shall not exceed in size a page of the Record and shall be linecuts only. Copy for illustrations must be furnished to the Public Printer not later than 12:30 o'clock p. m. of the day preceding publication.

13. *Corrections.*—The permanent Record is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

Appendix

Opposition to the Chicago Water Steal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, July 26, 1954

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on July 19 the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] reproduced in my behalf in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and it appears on page 10420, a telegram which I had received from the attorney general of Wisconsin vigorously opposing H. R. 3300. That legislation has come to be known throughout the Midwest in the frank but accurate description of the Chicago water steal.

My State of Wisconsin has consistently opposed anything like this water steal legislation for more than three decades.

We regard the legislation as inimical to the best interests of eight sovereign Great Lakes States. It is contrary to fair and good relations with our neighbor, Canada—which has already protested against it—and, indeed, it is unconstitutional.

I am not going to take the time of the Senate now to present detailed argumentation against this legislation because I feel that should await another day and another occasion. But I do want to submit these few observations so that there will be no misinterpretation of the fact that the senior Senator from Wisconsin is 100 percent opposed to this legislation, as he indicated to the Public Works Committee of the Senate back in April.

It would be strange indeed if, in the final weeks of the session, the Senate, which is so heavily engaged in genuinely important matters, were to take up this highly controversial bill, all for the benefit of the Chicago Sanitary District.

It would be strange indeed, if the recommendation of the United States Department of State, opposing this legislation, should be ignored.

On April 20, 1954, State Department representatives told a brief—very brief—Senate Public Works Committee hearing that—

> The Department considers that since this proposed diversion is one phase of a subject now being examined by the International Joint Commission under a reference from both governments (Canada and the United States) that action in regard to it should await the report and recommendations of the Commission.

I ask: What kind of a procedure is it when a solemn United States-Canadian treaty such as the Boundary Waters Treaty of 1909 is ignored?

When a Supreme Court decision is flouted?

When an international commission is disregarded?

When the opinion of the attorneys general of great States such as Wisconsin, Michigan, Ohio, New York, Pennsylvania, Minnesota, and other States, is lightly passed aside?

I send to the desk now the text of a resolution which I had received from the Common Council of the City of Milwaukee which rightly urged completion of surveys on the problem of Great Lakes water levels by the International Joint Commission.

I also send to the desk the text of a description of the water diversion controversy as carried in the fall, 1953, issue of Great Lakes Outlook, issued by the Greak Lakes Harbor Association. This description was written by the able general counsel of the association, Mr. Herbert H. Naujoks.

I ask unanimous consent that these materials be printed in the appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION RELATIVE TO A LAKE LEVEL STUDY

Whereas the city of Chicago and the Chicago Sanitary District continue to seek congressional sanction for greatly increased diversion of water from Lake Michigan for the purpose of the Chicago Sanitary District, thereby circumventing the effects of the United States Supreme Court decree of 1930, which was issued after exhaustive investigation and after 40 years of costly litigation; and

Whereas the city of Milwaukee and the State of Wisconsin have repeatedly taken the position that the United States Supreme Court should retain jurisdiction of this matter, and that they will firmly oppose any diversion of water from Lake Michigan in excess of quantities fixed by Supreme Court decree; and

Whereas the Public Works Committee, House of Representatives, has favorably reported for passage H. R. 3300 which would, if enacted, provide for an immediate increase in the quantity of water to be diverted from Lake Michigan by the Chicago Sanitary District, and which implies a threat of even greater diversion in the future; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Common Council of the city of Milwaukee, That all affected officers and agencies of the city government are hereby authorized and directed to use their best efforts to prevent passage of H. R. 3300 by either the House of Representatives or the United States Senate; and, be it further

Resolved, That as a constructive alternative, the city of Milwaukee will support the passage of the principles expressed in Senate concurrent resolution 22 and House concurrent resolution 82, now pending before the House of Representatives and the Senate, both of which measures call for referral of the problem of fluctuating water levels on the Great Lakes to the International Joint Commission, for the purpose of making studies and investigations as necessary to determine the levels of waters in the boundary waters under its jurisdiction which will most equitably serve the rights and interests of the United States and Canada with respect to commerce, industry, navigation, power development, agriculture, natural resources, and residential use; and to prepare coordinated plans for control of water levels at equitable levels and to recommend control structures or other works necessary to achieve that end.

Adopted by the common council, city of Milwaukee, December 29, 1953.

[From the Great Lakes Outlook]

PRESENT STATUS OF THE CHICAGO WATER-DIVERSION CONTROVERSY

(By Herbert H. Naujoks, general counsel, Great Lakes Harbors Association)

The 1st session of the 83d Congress adjourned without having passed any one of the 14 House bills which, if adopted, would have increased the diversion of water from the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence water system over and above the amount of 1,500 cubic feet per second, plus domestic pumpage of about 1,700 cubic feet per second, fixed by the United States Supreme Court decree of April 21, 1930. However, the Jonas bill (H. R. 3300) which was approved by the House Public Works Committee, or any one of the other diversion bills can be brought up again at the second session of Congress which convened after January 1, 1954.

The Great Lakes Harbors Association and the attorneys general of the States of Wisconsin, Michigan, and Ohio vigorously opposed these bills before the House Public Works Committee in July. The brief filed by the general counsel on behalf of the Great Lakes Harbors Association opposed any increase in diversion for the following reasons:

First. Neither the Public Works Committee nor the Congress has the authority, under the United States Constitution, to pass these bills because the Congress has no jurisdiction in the premises, nor has Congress power to authorize the transfer of huge quantities of water from the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence watershed to the Mississippi watershed with substantial damages to the Great Lakes States, the municipalities located on the Great Lakes and their peoples. Any additional diversion of water from one watershed for the benefit of another is beyond the power of Congress and the Federal Government, particularly when made to create an artificial waterway or artificially to enrich a natural waterway (*Wisconsin* v. *Illinois* (278 U. S. 367)).

Second. The Supreme Court of the United States has expressly retained jurisdiction of this subject matter, and the proper forum is that Court. It has the machinery, and it has functioned many times, both on the application of the State of Illinois, and also on the application of the opposing Lake States to determine issues arising out of the Chicago diversion.

Third. The interests of Canada, a friendly foreign nation, with whom we have been at peace for more than 150 years, and which has a vital interest in maintaining the integrity of the lake levels, must be considered.

Fourth. It is the position of the International Joint Commission that if the pending bills have the effect of appreciably lowering the levels of the boundary waters, then it is not within the province of the Public Works Committee to attempt to change the amount of the present authorized diversion. Under the Boundary Waters Treaty of 1909 the two signatory nations—the United States and Canada—expressly divested themselves of all authority over the boundary waters as far as raising, lowering or diverting them was concerned. At the hearings before the House Public Works Committee in June 1952, Hon. A. O. Stanley, Chairman of the International Joint Commission seriously questioned the authority of the committee to take any action which would appreciably lower the levels of the Great Lakes. The Great Lakes Harbors Association concurs in this position taken by the International Joint Commission.

Fifth. Any additional diversion would effect a preference for the ports of Illinois over those of New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Michigan, Indiana, Wisconsin, and Minnesota and is therefore, uncnostitutional. *Wisconsin* v. *Illinois* (278 U. S. 367.)

Sixth. Any additional diversion would work injury to the States of New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Michigan, Indiana, Wisconsin, and Minnesota, depriving them and their citizens and property owners of property without due process of law and depriving such States of the natural advantages of their position, contrary to their sovereign rights as members of the union. (Id.)

Seventh. Additional diversion is not required to provide an adequate waterway from Chicago to the Mississippi River. The present diversion is ample and the increased depth can be obtained by dredging without requiring a change in the locks or dams. The present 9-foot channel can carry up to 100 million tons of cargo annually. Considering the annual tonnage transported on the waterway of roughly 17 million tons, an increase in diversion is unwarranted from a practical and economic standpoint and would be grossly inequitable to the Great Lakes States, their municipalities, people, and industries, and contrary to the power and authority of the Federal Government.

Eighth. Any improvement in navigable depths on a waterway from Lake Michigan to the Gulf of Mexico should not be made at the expense of the navigable depths of the Great Lakes.

Ninth. Additional diversion would be of no material assistance in cleaning up the Chicago drainage canal or the Illinois River. The only permanent and effective way of cleaning up these streams is by keeping out of them any untreated or partially treated sewage or other material which would pollute the water. Today, the lower Illinois River has reached such a stage of self-purification that the residents of that area are again able to enjoy fishing, bathing, boating, and other healthful water sports. If additional diversion is granted, it is certain that the sanitary district of Chicago would be tempted to dump into the sanitary canal, and thence into the Illinois River, untreated or partially treated sewage which is now being deposited in sludge beds along the banks of the sanitary canal and the Chicago River, and which is causing strenuous protests from the residents of those areas because of the obnoxious odors.

Tenth. The Great Lakes Harbors Association suggests that the real motive behind this demand for increased diversion is the desire on the part of the sanitary district to obtain additional hydroelectric power to be generated by the facilities it owns and operates at Lockport, Ill. While the sanitary district has repeatedly denied that it is interested in the development of additional power at Lockport, its denials cannot be given too much weight because at every opportunity the sanitary district has pressed for increased diversion of lake water in order to increase the power to be produced at Lockport. On May 8, 1946, a headline in the Chicago Daily News carried the statement that "By diverting more lake water, Lockport can double power." This article stated that Mr. Horace P. Ramey, assistant chief engineer for the sanitary district, asserted that increased diversion can double the power output at the Lockport plant of the sanitary district. In 1947 the suggestion was made by Mr. Anthony A. Olis, president, board of trustees of the Sanitary District of Chicago, that increased diversion of lake water was needed for development of atomic power because of the establishment of the Argonne Laboratory along the banks of the sanitary district canal 20 or 25 miles southwest of Chicago. In 1950 an application for increased diversion was again made by the sanitary district in dispatches to then President Truman, to ex-Secretary of Defense Johnson, and to the Illinois Senators to obtain additional hydroelectric power during the coal strike. From the foregoing it is plain that the sanitary district is interested in obtaining additional diversion for power purposes.

Eleventh. The United States Supreme Court in 1929 pointed out that the Great Lakes States and their peoples suffered irreparable and comprehensive damages due to the unlawful lowering of the levels of the Great Lakes by the Sanitary District of Chicago and the State of Illinois. It is plain that Great Lakes commerce will suffer increased costs if the levels of the Great Lakes are lowered through diversion at Chicago. As Secretary of War Stimson well pointed out in 1913 in denying an application by the Sanitary District of Chicago for a diversion of 10,000 cubic second feet—"in a word, every drop of water taken out necessarily tends to nullify costly improvements made under direct authority of Congress throughout the Great Lakes and withdrawal of the amount now applied for would nullify such expenditures to the amount of many millions of dollars, as well as inflict an even greater loss on the navigation interests using such waters."

In the light of the present critical international situation, it is important that shipping on the Great Lakes be maintained at its highest level in order to carry the important iron ore from the Mesabi Range to the fabricating plants which, in turn, furnish the steel and iron needed to provide the weapons for maintaining this Nation strong and free.

The Atomic Energy Act Amendments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. IRVING M. IVES

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 26, 1954

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record the texts of two editorials appearing in the July 25, 1954 issues of the New York Herald Tribune and the Washington Star, and entitled respectively "Disgraceful Performance" and "Phony Filibuster." I make no comment concerning these editorials because I think they speak for themselves.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the New York Herald Tribune of July 25, 1954]

Disgraceful Performance

A group of Democratic Senators, with the assistance of Mr. Morse, of Oregon, and without rebuke from the national Democratic leadership, has been staging a disgraceful performance in the Capitol. They call it an educational campaign, but the only education provided is in the motives and techniques of the Democratic Party. The whole business is merely a naked filibuster, already record-breaking, an attempt to win points by talk and obstruction that cannot be obtained by the votes of the representatives of the people.

The first item which the filibustering group has sought to achieve is the revocation of President Eisenhower's decision to have the Atomic Energy Commission purchase power from private companies, rather than from an expanded Tennessee Valley Authority. This attempt has the support of some otherwise conservative Democrats, who oppose the extension of Federal authority in almost every field except the TVA. Then there is another aim—nothing less than the conversion of the investment which the United States has made in the production of atomic weapons into a vast Federal power empire that may some day dwarf the great structure of Government power fostered by the New Deal, and hold control of the development of American industry in Government hands. Finally—and this is what appeals to the Democratic political strategists—the filibuster is blocking the Republican legislative program.

Evidently the Democratic high command believes that it can go to the country in November and point to this filibuster as evidence of the Republican Party's inability to keep the legislative machinery functioning smoothly. But the public is well aware who threw monkey wrenches into the congressional gears and why; it will not be deceived. In electing President Eisenhower and a congressional majority of Republicans in 1952 the voters expressed themselves in favor of the middle way—not for a continuing expansion of Federal authority. They expect their representatives to carry out their mandate, to perform a constructive legislative task. By spreading confusion in the last days of the session, the Democrats are engaging in a shoddy and self-defeating act of political partisanship; it will be charged to their account when the bills are presented at the polls in November.

[From the Washington Star of July 25, 1954]

Phony Filibuster

Most, if not all, of the self-styled liberal Senators who are filibustering against the Atomic Energy Act amendments have denounced the filibuster in past years as an evil and iniquitous thing. But this, of course, was when a filibuster was being used to block a vote on legislation which they favored, such as the civil-rights proposals.

Now the shoe is on the other foot. The liberals, knowing that they are in the minority, are trying to talk the AEC amendments to death. And they are trying to justify their filibuster by claiming to be the only true guardians of the public interest.

All of this may be in the best partisan tradition. But the pretensions to virtue which are being advanced by the filibustering Senators should not be accepted without critical examination. What is it that they are really filibustering against?

They say that they are trying to protect the public against some kind of gigantic, but not too clearly specified, giveaway. The implication is that the administration has either been bamboozled by the private power interests or has sold out to those interests and that the filibustering Senators are a kind of modern Horatius holding the bridge against the onrushing horde of private-industry looters.

This is a stirring picture, but it overlooks some significant facts. One of these facts is that the substance of the amendments was unanimously recommended after long study by the five members of the Atomic Energy Commission, three of whom were appointed by President Truman. And early last month the AEC submitted a report to the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy in which it told why it favors the amendments.

The more important of these reasons may be stated in summary form, as follows:

(1) Between now and 1975 the demand for electric power in this country will approximately triple.

(2) The AEC believes that nuclear power should be developed in order to supply somewhere from 2 to 10 percent of the 1975 consumption. This will become increasingly important as our own fossil fuels decline—a pressure which already is being felt severely in some foreign countries we would like to help.

(3) Nuclear power, however, "is not yet an economic reality in the competitive cost sense," and the AEC believes the big job of driving costs down to competitive levels can best be accomplished by joint effort of both industry and Government as a working team.

(4) In order that the principal effect of realizing nuclear power may be to confirm and strengthen rather than to change our economic institutions and our way of life, the AEC believes that nuclear power, as it becomes economically attractive, should be integrated into the existing power economy of the Nation; that nuclear power should be produced and distributed by the private and public power systems and not by the Commission.

(5) Obtaining full participation of the Nation's electric energy producers and equipment manufacturers in the development and production of nuclear power is, in the AEC judgment, the best way of securing the maximum return on the public investment in this phase of the atomic energy program. The accumulated scientific and technical knowledge, as well as the accumulated stockpile of fissionable materials, now in the hands of the Government, are a national resource. Putting this resource to work, through continued Government development where necessary, and through private industry, to strengthen the economy—to create power for industry and homes, open up jobs, create new sources of revenue—will most quickly and surely achieve and spread its benefits.

This, to repeat, is not the private power industry speaking. It is not even the Eisenhower administration. These are the considered views of the five members of the Atomic Energy Commission.

Any Senator, of course, has the right to disagree. But when this reasoned presentation is met with a filibuster, and when the filibusted trades in such shabby stuff as shouts of "giveaway" and "sellout," it becomes nothing more than an essentially phony device to impose the will of the minority on the Senate at the expense of the real interests of the country.

The Atomic Energy Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 26, 1954

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, it is terribly unfortunate that the much needed and relatively noncontroversial international proposal contained in the atomic energy bill was reported out with the overall measure containing many highly controversial and questionable provisions. The attempt to force a vote on so many aspects of the atomic energy program in one package is terribly ill advised. I favor the President's international proposal with respect to atomic energy and would give it my wholehearted support were it contained in a separate bill.

There were many other provisions in the bill with which I was in enthusiastic agreement. For instance, the Commission would be directed to exercise its powers to insure continued research and developments and to make arrangements with private or public institutions for the use of nuclear energy in medical, biological, agricultural, and health areas. I was in complete agreement with this provision.

But the overriding fact is that the bill, as it was finally amended, would put this country in the position of speculating as to whether or not we would move on to develop full utilization of atomic energy. The patenting provisions contained in the President's original recommendation were wholly changed by the action of the House. The President's worthwhile suggestion that new atomic methods should be open to all private developers through compulsory licensing was changed, in the amending process, to exclusive patents. This would mean that a single private firm could withhold development of the process for many years because of economic reasons of its own. I feel that we can't risk this possibility when we face the hard fact that in the Soviet Union the development of atomic energy for multiple purposes is proceeding at breath-taking speed. In the interest of defense, this Nation must keep up, and if we fail in this we may fail in all. Compulsory licensing would assure the most rapid progress possible and would give private industry maximum utilization of atomic power. However, the exclusive patenting provision contained in the bill would constitute reckless speculation with the future of atomic development and, hence, reckless speculation with the future of America's world leadership.

Another capricious provision in the bill is the directed contract guaranteeing operating costs and taxes plus 9 percent profit to an already selected private corporation to furnish power to Memphis, Tenn.—this without any competitive bidding. The Atomic Energy Commission turned down this proposal by a 3–2 vote. To embroil the atomic energy program in a public-versus-private power controversy is nothing short of a devious attempt to clip the wings of the TVA and the atomic energy program. The awful urgency of united support in advancing the atomic energy program should not be sacrificed by burdening the Commission with this controversy. Other changes in the President's bill in the House would have tied the hands of the Atomic Energy Commission generally in the development of usable electrical power from atomic energy. In an area where the cost of developing the process for creating usable power is so staggering, there is a good possibility that the great potential development of usable power for the people of this country will be put off for decades.

Civil Air Patrol

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 26, 1954

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an address of Maj. Gen. Lucas V. Beau, United States Air Force, national commander of the Civil Air Patrol, at the Civil Air Patrol congressional dinner at Washington, D. C., on May 5, 1954; and also the response of Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., to the remarks of General Beau.

The address and remarks follow:

ADDRESS OF MAJ. GEN. LUCAS V. BEAU, UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

Mr. Speaker, Secretary Douglas, Members of Congress, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, it is my honor and privilege to bring to you the greetings of more than 80,000 loyal Americans who make up the Civil Air Patrol, the civilian auxiliary of the United States Air Force.

It is a very great pleasure also to bring you a report on the activities of the Civil Air Patrol for the preceding year and to have the opportunity to talk with you briefly about some important problems of airpower facing America today, problems which I feel the Civil Air Patrol can help to solve.

First, for the benefit of those of you who may not be familiar with the Civil Air Patrol, let me tell you a little about this organization of doctors, carpenters, automobile mechanics, clergymen, farmers, grocery clerks and Americans of every description who hold in common a great love of country and a burning enthusiasm for aviation.

It was organized by executive order of the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt just 6 days before Pearl Harbor and was designed to give wings to the defense effort at home. Utilizing the services of pilots and crewmen who were too old or too young or otherwise ineligible for active military service, the Civil Air Patrol took on the unprecedented jobs of aiding the Navy in the antisubmarine patrol off the Nation's coasts; providing vital courier service between military bases, defense plants, airfields and hospitals; and other tasks. These missions were performed by unpaid volunteers flying in most cases their own single-engine lightplanes.

The flying minutemen of the Civil Air Patrol did their job well and in the course of duty 52 of them gave their lives.

In this now historic effort they established a proud record and set a precedent for public service of a new type in America—public service with wings.

In 1947 the Congress of the United States recognized the unselfish contributions of these patriotic citizens and granted to the Civil Air Patrol a charter to act as a nonprofit corporation. A year later Congress made the Civil Air Patrol an official auxiliary of the Air Force.

Let me quote briefly from the public law which granted our charter.

"The objects and purposes of the corporation shall be:

"(A) To provide an organization to encourage and aid American citizens in the contribution of their efforts, services, and resources in the development of aviation and in the maintenance of air supremacy, and to encourage and develop by example the voluntary contribution of private citizens to the public welfare;

"(B) To provide aviation education and training especially to its senior and cadet members; to encourage and foster civil aviation in local communities and to provide an organization of private citizens with adequate facilities to assist in meeting local and national emergencies."

The Civil Air Patrol commanders here tonight from every State and Territory in America and the members they represent are dedicated to the task of accomplishing those objectives. The Air Force officers, airmen and civilian employees assigned to my command share this common purpose.

Our progress toward achieving these objectives during the year just past is recorded in the printed report on our activities for 1953 which has been distributed to each of you this evening.

With your permission I would like to touch briefly upon some of the high points of this report.

One point I think most significant is that the adult membership increased by approximately 24 percent over the preceding year. I would like to add that it is my personal belief that the quality of this membership is the highest we have ever had.

Our record in search and rescue during the past year I feel is also particularly significant, since it is in this field that Civil Air Patrol renders one of its most outstanding nationwide public services. During 1953 the unpaid, volunteer civilian flyers of Civil Air Patrol flew more hours on air rescue service search and rescue missions in the United States than all other agencies combined. We flew 12,290 search and rescue hours. All other agencies combined flew 7,505 hours.

In another phase of our flying activity Civil Air Patrol flew in simulated low-level attack missions designed to aid in the training of ground observer corps volunteers.

In the fields of training and education I feel it is noteworthy that more than 6,000 young men and women attended summer encampments for Civil Air Patrol cadets at Air Force bases, and that some 200 high schools across the Nation have adopted aviation education courses based on the Civil Air Patrol Aviation Study Manual.

As part of its national program to support air power, the Civil Air Patrol joined in the observance of the 15th anniversary of powered flight. At the close of the observance, Gen. James H. Doolittle, chairman of the national committee, declared the widest support from any one aviation organization came from the Civil Air Patrol.

Another subject covered in the annual report is the international cadet exchange. This particular program of the Civil Air Patrol is very close to my heart because I feel that the international goodwill it is helping to create is of vital importance to our country.

In the international cadet exchange each year we send honor cadets of the Civil Air Patrol to visit friendly foreign nations while airminded young men from those nations visit the United States.

In his address to the American Newspaper Publishers' Association on April 22 President Eisenhower said, and I quote:

"If increased knowledge and understanding are necessary to promote unity of our people, they are equally necessary to the development of international cooperation. At this juncture in the world affairs, ignorance of each other's capabilities, hopes, prejudices, beliefs, and intentions can destroy cooperation and breed war."

The international cadet exchange is a direct contribution by Civil Air Patrol to the task of dispelling ignorance and prejudice, and promoting understanding among young people of the free nations.

Last year two more nations joined in the exchange—Greece and Turkey—bringing the total to 16. I might add that groundwork laid during 1953 enabled us in February of this year to bring Peru, Chile, Cuba, and Venezuela into the exchange for this coming summer bringing the total participating nations for this year to 20.

Those, briefly, are the highlights of the report of Civil Air Patrol activities in behalf of the Nation in 1953. Let me urge you to look this report over at your leisure for a more complete picture of those activities.

Now I would like to talk with you for a few minutes about the future—about some of the problems facing our country which Civil Air Patrol can help to solve. I want to deal particularly with two general problem areas.

The first of these is civil defense.

The somber shadow of a cloud lies across the heartland of America. In shape it resembles a fantastic mushroom, and the sunlight of the brightest spring day cannot quite dispell the awareness of it from our consciousness. How many times in recent months have you heard a long 5 o'clock siren blast, and paused a moment to listen for the second wail that might identify it as the warbling air raid signal, before noting the hour and shrugging the idea back into your subconscious mind?

The fact that America is vulnerable to a hydrogen bomb attack has been received by the America people in a manner which is causing grievous concern among our Nation's leaders. Public reaction toward the problem of civilian defense appears to be a peculiar combination of fatalistic "head in the sand" attitude, and the old familiar "let George do it" reaction.

In light of recent disclosures of the destructive magnitude of the hydrogen bomb we are forced to the inescapable conclusion that "George" may be somewhere in the same county as ground zero, and not among those present for duty if and when the time comes.

Back in 1951 we authorized Civil Air Patrol wings to participate in State and local civil defense exercises. Six such exercises conducted at various places around the country in 1953 demonstrated how extremely valuable the Civil Air Patrol mobile support teams would be in the event of an attack on this country. Landing and taking off from ball diamonds, parks and unobstructed streets, the light planes of Civil Air Patrol could carry in doctors, nurses, and rescue workers and carry out those too seriously injured to withstand other means of evacuation. Equipped with two-way radios and airborne loud speakers Civil Air Patrol planes could be invaluable in highway traffic control during evacuations. Our mobile radio stations working with our nationwide radio network now in operation could supply emergency communications.

Our Civil Air Patrol squadrons with their light planes could move complete field hospitals and doctors and nurses into stricken areas in a matter of hours. This may sound fantastic to some of you, but many of you living in the eastern part of the Nation no doubt read in your newspapers a month or so ago where the Pennsylvania wing did just that. Using Civil Air Patrol private planes and pilots, members of the Pennsylvania wing moved 1½ tons of equipment plus 46 doctors and nurses 52 miles in only 3½ hours. And they did it despite inclement weather with winds up to 40 miles per hour.

As you probably know the Federal Civil Defense Administration is essentially an advisory group. The operating level of Civil Defense is the State and local level just as it is in Civil Air Patrol. We have 125 mobile support teams already formed and in operation in various parts of the country.

We in Civil Air Patrol recognize that the danger of atomic attack on this country is real and we are training to do our part if the necessity arises. We stand ready in every State to cooperate in training exercises to help prepare others for the blow which we all pray will never fall.

The other problem area facing our Nation, which I feel compelled to touch upon tonight, is one that is not only complex, but one that is unique in the history of America. It is a manpower problem—the problem of getting young men to man the planes of America. For the first time in the 50-year history of the airplane, the supply of young men to fly it is dangerously low.

What makes the problem even more critical is the fact that this supply seems to be continuing to dwindle. In the past several years such distinguished men as our own General Spaatz, Gill Ross Wilson, and others to whom this growing shortage of potential pilots was apparent, have publicly expressed their concern. The Air Force has publicized the difficulty it has encountered in getting aviation cadet applicants of suitable caliber. The other services have had the same problem. In civil aviation the Civil Aeronautics Authority recently announced that issue of private pilots' licenses had decreased from 120,000 in 1947 to 14,000 in 1953.

The thing which gives this situation in America grim significance is the fact that in Russia exactly the opposite picture appears. Our intelligence data indicates that the Soviet Union is already several years ahead of us in aviation training for youth.

In discussing mutual aviation problems with representatives of the other free nations, participating with us in the cadet exchange program, I discovered that the United States is the only major power which does not have a government-sponsored plan whereby young men can learn to fly at no expense to themselves. Leaders from some of these nations expressed amazement that America, with all its wealth, did not possess a program such as theirs whereby the government provided basic flying training for any young man who wanted it.

In America the causes for this shortage of young men to man our planes is very complex. The causes are not all known and understood. Certainly the high cost of private flying lessons is one cause, especially where civil aviation is concerned.

But what of military aviation? Why do we no longer have a tremendous backlog of eager applicants competing for the aviation cadet quotas? Cost is not the primary consideration here because the military services offer a technical education and a flying-training program estimated at $60,000 free for taking to qualified young men. And I for one certainly cannot agree with some prophets of gloom who say the cause is fear. From my long experience with youngsters I know our young men are not afraid to fly.

It is, of course, a question of motivation. This much we do know. Why do young men of today appear not to have this motivation to fly which has been so universal in decades past? Up until recently we could answer this question only with guesses. We simply didn't know. In order to find the answer to this very vital question, the Air Force last year let a contract to a prominent psychological research organization.

All the results of the extensive surveys conducted by this organization are not yet in, but some of them are. One portion of this survey which dealt with our cadets confirmed what those of us in Civil Air Patrol have long believed, that young men who enter the Civil Air Patrol cadet program and participate in its various activities, are with few exceptions very strongly motivated to fly. A great many of them have their sights set on aviation cadet training.

One of the questions asked of Civil Air Patrol cadets who had indicated a strong motivation to fly after participation in the cadet program repeatedly produced a most interesting answer. The question sought the answer to why the young man had not felt motivated to seek aviation cadet training prior to his Civil Air Patrol experiences. Again and again came an answer to the effect that he had not considered aviation cadet training because he felt that it was necessary to be almost a superman to fly a modern military aircraft.

Here is the result of a decade or more of constant newspaper, magazine, television, and motion-picture publicity on pushbutton warfare, pilotless flying, supercomplicated airplanes of the future. Little wonder young men have been overawed by the prospect. How many of you here tonight can remember the awe with which you watched your first Ford trimotor or Douglas DC-3 roar off into the sky?

Here lies the strength of the Civil Air Patrol cadet program. It brings the youngster and the airplane together on a practical basis. In his association with senior member pilots and in his orientation flights the prospect of learning to fly is presented to him as a goal he could confidently expect to achieve from the very outset.

Again let me ask a question of you here tonight. How many of you associate the birth of your own interest in aviation with barefoot summer days spent hanging around a cowpasture airport which boasted one or two aeroplanes? How many of you who are flyers can date your fixed determination to be a pilot yourself to the time when one of your heroes at that cowpasture airport rewarded your silent devotion by taking you for a ride?

This, gentlemen, is where the Civil Air Patrol is rekindling the desire to fly among young people—at the grassroots of America. But the Civil Air Patrol program, although it cannot actually provide the flight instruction, carries the program considerably further than just bringing the youngsters and airplanes together. The young people we are able to reach through our cadet program get to ride in Air Force transports to the summer encampments. At the encampments they get to visit the maintenance shops, the meteorology stations, the control towers, and see firsthand many of the other phases of the aviation industry. They get to climb through the latest models of our aircraft. And some of them even get a ride in a jet plane as a reward for special achievement in cadet activities. Thus we are helping to provide an answer to the problem of providing young men to man America's planes.

Of course our program is limited, and it does not provide an answer to the financial problem of making actual flying training available to youngsters. Since the Civil Air Patrol does not provide flight training, it cannot compete with the Government-sponsored youth aviation program of the Soviet Union or for that matter with the programs of other free nations. But it does represent a long step in the right direction.

In closing let me point out that the Civil Air Patrol, with its 80,000 members in organized units in every State and Territory of America, is more than a trained and organized force of minutemen ready to serve our Nation in any of the many ways I have discussed here tonigtht. It is a dynamic, unified legion of patriots dedicated to the principle that the invincibility of America and the last great hope for peace in the world today lies in the strength of American airpower.

I thank you.

Remarks of Hon. Joseph W. Martin, Jr.

General Beau, ladies and gentlemen of the Civil Air Patrol, and friends, it is a great pleasure and a distinct honor to have been asked to respond for the Congress of the United States to this splendid report on the activities of the Civil Air Patrol.

As I looked around this room and as I listened to the remarks of your commander, my faith was renewed that the selfless principles which motivated the Minute Men of Lexington and Concord are still strong in our land today. In the Civil Air Patrol I see another such group of courageous, loyal Americans who place the security of their country and the well-being of their fellow men ahead of their own comfort and safety.

General Beau's report has been most enlightening to me and I know to many members of the Congress. It has given us a clearer understanding of just what the Civil Air Patrol means to America in terms of public service and what it is doing to help solve some of the perplexing problems of this air age.

In these days when the economy of our Nation is under great pressure, it is most heartening to know that America's private pilots and lightplane owners marshalled by the Civil Air Patrol are providing effective aerial search and rescue service at a fraction of what it would cost the Federal Government to provide the same service. We could not afford to provide Air Rescue Service with planes and personnel to do the job in the numbers available through the Civil Air Patrol.

In providing wings for Civil Defense, the Civil Air Patrol is performing another invaluable service to the Nation. Although the individual States are capable of controlling the hundreds of private aircraft within their boundaries and are capable of marshalling them in the event they are needed, neither the States nor the Federal Government have the organization capable of carrying on the long-range aviation-Civil Defense training program which is necessary if the Nation's thousands of private pilots and lightplane owners are to become an effective air arm for Civil Defense. From your report I can see that the Civil Air Patrol has such an organization and already has begun such a program of training.

Your contributions to the field of aviation education are most significant. The question of how to provide general aviation education to our youth through the schools has long been an item of great concern. In this field the leadership of the Civil Air Patrol has been inspiring.

I can speak from personal experience about your International Cadet Exchange. Last year I had the pleasure of meeting and talking with several young men who, as Civil Air Patrol cadets, were representing the United States in this exchange. I was impressed with their appearance as well as their bearing. Most of all, however, I was impressed with their great sincerity. Surely, a program which brings together young men such as these from many nations—all having a common bond—and the belief that the airplane is as great an instrument for peace as it is for war—can only enhance the prospects for peace among nations and understanding among all men.

While we continue to work toward this goal of world understanding through such programs as your International Cadet Exchange, we cannot close our eyes to the fact that the threat of world conflict must influence all our efforts toward world peace.

We cannot hide from the fact that the hydrogen bomb with the airplane to deliver it anywhere on the globe has brought the danger of nuclear attack to every man, woman, and child in the United States. It is a threat we must reckon with.

We know the greatest deterrent to foreign aggression against us and all the free world is a mighty air arm capable of devastating reprisal against an aggressor. The obvious answer is absolute supremacy in the air. Thus, it behooves us to guard and protect our airpower and to keep it the strongest on earth.

We agree with you, General Beau, the problem of finding the manpower to fly and maintain our planes is one of the most serious problems facing America today.

We agree with you that our young men are not afraid to fly. Something other than fear is responsible for their absence of interest in flying. I was most interested in your analysis of the problem of lack of motivation to seek military flight training on the part of our young men. I cannot help but believe you have offered a valuable clue to the solution of this grave problem.

This situation has been under consideration by the Congress for some time. Increased attention to it certainly is called for. While it is being studied, it is encouraging to know that an organization such as the Civil Air Patrol is already taking steps to rekindle the interest of American youth in aviation.

I am sure I speak for both the Department of Defense and the Department of the Air Force as well as for the Congress when I congratulate you members of the Civil Air Patrol on the tremendous effort you have put forth in behalf of air supremacy. You are creating an ever-greater public understanding of the need for airpower in America. You are also providing a closer bond between the man in Air Force blue and the man in the blue serge suit.

I thank you.

The Need for Trained Men

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 26, 1954

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a very interesting and most informative address made by Hon. Sinclair Weeks, Secretary of Commerce, entitled "The Need for Trained Men," delivered the evening of May 22, 1954, on the occasion of the 50th anniversary observance of the founding of Wentworth Institute, and the inauguration of H. Russell Beatty as president.

The Wentworth Institute, located in Boston, is one of the finest institutions of its kind in the world. Throughout its existence it has served as an avenue of progress for countless of thousands of young men and women. Its graduates have made outstanding names in their chosen field.

The address follows:

The Need for Trained Men

President Eisenhower, in his recent state of the Union message, described the grave problems of a national and economic security and outlined a constructive legislative program to help solve these problems.

He closed that memorable address on a high note of confidence. He said with deep sincerity—and I quote:

"There is no end to America's forward road."

Today Wentworth Institute celebrates 50 years of memory and, through the inauguration of its first president, anticipates years of further progress.

This, therefore, is a fitting occasion on which to repeat the optimistic prediction of the President of the United States, "There is no end to America's forward road."

Since the founding of this institution in 1904, the American standard of living has increased 4 times until today it is 7 times the average of the rest of the world. The secret of this matchless growth is that we have developed the skill to use our abundant matter and energy.

Part of our progress springs from the dynamic spirit of our people. But fully as important is that Americans have been wise enough to train themselves in constantly improved know-how.

One of the pioneers in recognizing the need for trained men in the industrial revolution was that great practical dreamer and your distinguished founder, Arioch Wentworth, and, as Secretary of Commerce, I am privileged this evening to express to him and to the school he started the gratitude of American industry for its great contribution to economic progress in this country.

Counting by the calendar, this is Wentworth Institute's golden anniversary. But in a true sense the spirit of Wentworth has grown for nearly 3 times 50 years. The solid rock of experience on which Wentworth is built was laid down in the second decade of the past century when its founder, Arioch Wentworth, was born just over the line in New Hampshire.

At the beginning of that century, the great march of modern science was just getting underway. Mechanics or craftsmen of that day became inventors and made discoveries of the first importance.

Peter Cooper, the ironworker, put together the first locomotive ever seen in this country.

Even amateur craftsmen, the kind of people who today keep a few "cut and try" tools in the cellar, made all sorts of valuable discoveries. They were men like Massachusetts' own Eli Whitney who invented, in addition to the cotton gin, the idea of standardized parts upon which our modern system of mass production is based.

New England, whose people were thrifty, mechanically minded and curious by nature, was a beehive of invention. Everybody took a hand in trying to find out how to do things simpler, faster, and better.

That was the climate of Yankee ingenuity in which Arioch Wentworth was born. The boy had a thorough education in one of the best secondary schools in the State, Dover Academy. After graduating, Arioch continued to help on the farm; he also taught school and worked in his father's granite quarry.

Perhaps the granite of New Hampshire was too hard for him. At any rate, when he decided to go into the stone business for himself he came to Boston, a young man in his early twenties, to work the granite of our State of Massachusetts.

We next hear of him going into the soapstone business, still in Boston, so we may assume, perhaps, that he discovered that Yankee granite is the same everywhere. Then he moved into the marble business.

His rapid success enabled him to ride the tides of competition. He retired from business in his seventies, after 36 years of unremitting but happy labor. However, he never forgot his struggles as a young man of great mechanical aptitude, but little technical knowledge.

He made his way despite this hindrance, like other pioneers. He did it by main strength. He felt that no one else should be compelled to retrace his path, for lack of a technical education.

In his will he stipulated that an institution for the purpose of providing education "in the mechanical arts" should be the residuary legatee of his estate. After providing for his family, he sought to do something for young men who had a good secondary school education, as he had, and were anxious to develop their practical skills. And Wentworth Institute is the result of his foresight and generosity.

Today the scientific technology upon which our mass-production economy is based is far too complex for any man to pick up on the side while trying to earn a living and build a business. What a boy can secure here at Wentworth Institute at a modest cost, is a supply of intellectual capital—the knowledge of how to do things—which is just as important as money in the bank.

Wentworth Institute produces the skilled manpower we need to serve science and industry today. Since its founding 50,000 graduates have gone forth to make their contribution to American progress.

We are very proud of their accomplishments.

The practical importance of the skills taught at Wentworth can be illustrated by the fact that in the 3 years between March 1950, and April 1953, no less than 177 projects requiring the most intricate workmanship were completed at the Institute.

The Air Force came to Wentworth because it is engaged in important research projects which demand the highest order of craftsmanship in the experimental stages of production. In the Wentworth electronics laboratory and machine shop, students, in addition to their other studies, have devoted themselves to the fabrication of instruments and equipment to be installed in V-2 rockets, Aerobee rockets, and lighter-than-air apparatus designed for the purpose of recording the phenomena of the upper atmosphere.

The data gathered by these efforts is urgently needed for the peaceful development of our Nation as well as for defense.

We at the Department of Commerce have participated in these efforts along with Wentworth Institute. Our Weather Bureau is utilizing data concerning the upper atmosphere to carry forward the development of long-range weather forecasting. Our National Bureau of Standards, I am proud to say, has probably played the major role in pioneering the advance of new instrumentation techniques in this country.

More and more research is the key to progress. Educational institutions and Government together are making substantial contributions to the research that is required by our dynamic economy.

In fact, of the grand total of around $4 billion spent for research and development in the United States in 1953, 62 percent was Government funds.

However, most of the work was carried on by private business.

Statistics on the $4 billion of research expenditures by performance of work show that 19 percent went for work done by Government agencies, 11 percent for work done by nonprofit institutions, and 70 percent for work done by private industry for the Government and for itself.

By 1920 there were about 300 industrial laboratories in the United States. Today there are 3,000. In 1920 there were 8,000 researchers employed by industry. In 1945 there were 76,000. Today there are more than 131,000.

Since the close of World War II, the number of research engineers and scientists engaged in all fields of research and development has jumped from 119,000 to 192,000—an increase of 73,000.

Research is Yankee ingenuity in modern clothes. Research is organized initiative. Research is a growing component of American enterprise in the 20th century because businessmen have learned that they must move ahead in order to meet competition and stay in business.

At a recent meeting of the Industrial Research Institute, L. R. Crittendon, a DuPont research supervisor, said, "research tends to snowball. Your company grows, and you're led into new avenues of research. Our research program grows 10 percent to 15 percent a year, while the company grows about 7 percent."

Such news is encouraging. But I feel it my duty to present some other news which should make everyone sit up and think.

I warn you that research will slow down unless we can man the laboratories and the field testing grounds. Despite the fact that modern society is wisely developing research at a record rate, one of the most alarming shortage is in trained manpower in scientific and technological areas.

There are about 300,000 scientists and 500,000 engineers in the United States at the present time. The number in both categories has approximately doubled since 1940. Fine. But it just isn't enough for the future. There is a current shortage of engineers of about 90,000. Estimates indicate that as many as 30,000 new engineers will be needed annually under conditions of mobilization readiness and a high level of national economy.

The number of engineering graduates has declined steadily since the 1949–50 peak of 52,000 and will reach a low of about 19,000 in the academic year 1953–54. After that, according to estimates, the number will gradually rise to 34,000 in 1957.

This slump is disquieting enough in itself. But here are some comparative figures that should shake us further out of complacency.

It is estimated by scientists that in the Soviet Union there were approximately 150,000 scientists and 400,000 engineers in 1952. It is further estimated that whereas only about 19,000 American engineers will be graduated this year, approximately 43,000 Russian engineers were graduated in 1953—more than twice our output.

It is a sobering thought to contemplate that, according to these estimates, the Soviet world not only may be catching up with us in the production of atomic power but certainly is in the total numbers of trained personnel to operate and increase that power.

Unless our famine in potential know-how is overcome, the results in relation to economic growth and national security could be exceedingly dangerous.

Standing under the shadow of the awful H-bomb mushroom, I am disturbed by the prospect of a prolonged slowdown in the output of trained brainpower. And so are you.

But in addition to the urgent need for more engineers and scientists is the growing need for supporting workers—for draftsmen, laboratory assistants and other technicians—without whom the efficiency and the progress of the engineer and the scientist would be critically curtailed or utterly lost.

For every two professional researchers the educational branches of our economy must provide three supporting workers. The ratio is one to five in the vitally important motor-vehicles industry.

It is the function of technical institutes such as Wentworth to train such essential personnel, upon whom our progress is as dependent as upon the graduate scientists themselves. And for the boy who wishes to start his own business, in such fields as electronics and construction, the training he receives at Wentworth is indispensable.

In training youth to serve industry—large and small—the big industrial laboratory and the one-man radio repair shop—Wentworth Institute is supplying one of the most urgent needs of our country, the need for more trained men in the engineering and scientific areas of industry.

You at Wentworth and our other educational institutions are producing the technological know-how vital to national survival in an age of peril. You are planting the seed for the limitless prosperity and happiness which can result when Operation Ivy becomes Operation Olive Branch in a just and lasting peace.

Our past national wealth came from the ground, as crops and minerals, or from harnessing beasts, wind, water, steam, and electricity. Today scientists, anticipating eventual exhaustion of natural resources, are exploring two great new sources of energy that seem inexhaustible—the sun and the atom.

If the solar energy that falls on an area 15 miles square could be collected, it could run all of the industries of the United States. The hitch is that as yet, we have discovered no economical way to capture that vast power. But scientists are working on the problem and each year devise new or improved methods of reducing the cost of solar conversion.

The study of atoms in industry has led to the discovery of an entirely new gold mine "in them thar hills." By combining atoms into new molecules not found in nature, science is creating new synthetics, new drugs, new products for safety, health, comfort, industrial wealth—and new jobs.

As we learn more and more about the structure of matter and energy, this knowledge is applied to human advancement. Our National Bureau of Standards scientists are experimenting with heat-resistant materials to keep tomorrow's jet engine from burning itself to cinders. A byproduct is an improved kitchen range burner.

On the other end of the thermometer, they are studying the coldest cold on earth. Our scientific explorers have reached a record ice world landmark within a few thousandths of a degree of absolute zero, 460° below zero Fahrenheit. Near that chill temperature liquid helium, for example, acts unlike solid, liquid or gas but something quite different. When poured into a receptacle the substance starts climbing the wall and spilling over the brim.

Cerium is a rare metal used in tinting optical glass. By first combining it with another material to make a suitable salt and then submitting it to such super-low temperatures that molecular motion quiets down, the nuclei of the cerium can be alined and its radioactive emission can be better studied.

This is a powerful new tool for a better understanding of nuclei and should lead to more effective utilization of atomic energy.

Thus by concentrated thought and by trial and error, modern science on many fronts is harnessing the atom. New methods of converting uranium 235 into plutonium raise the world's atomic-energy reserves to the equivalent of 90 trillion—mark word trillion—tons of coal which, if converted to industrial energy, could raise the standard of living of all mankind 25 times beyond what it is today.

Think of it, if Russia would join the free world in genuine peace, all the millions behind the Iron Curtain could share with us a universal prosperity 25-fold beyond today's standard of living. When in all human history have malice and madness kept mankind from greater blessings?

Of course, we realize the awful potential of destruction in the H-bomb and we must never lower our guard. But also we should always keep our eyes on the wonderful possibilities for human happiness in atomic power for peace.

The best years of our lives are ahead, if sanity and good will return to earth and man becomes the real master of the machine. The test tube can be Pandora's box, unleashing disaster on a doomed world. Or the test tube can be Aladdin's lamp, pouring forth blessings unlimited.

Arioch Wentworth foresaw a better world if youth could be better trained to develop the industrial age. And his great dream came true.

My friends, like him, let us train at Wentworth and elsewhere the coming generation with the know-how of the atomic age. Let us fill the depleted ranks of science and engineering. Let us bolster our own faith in a brighter future.

For the facts warrant such a trust. Let us say and believe in our hearts with President Eisenhower:

"There is no end to America's forward road."

Remarks by Everett T. Winter, Executive Vice President, Mississippi Valley Association, Before the 41st Convention, National Rivers and Harbors Congress, Washington, D. C., May 26, 1954

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 26, 1954

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following remarks by Everett T. Winter, executive vice president, Mississippi Valley Association, before the 41st convention, National Rivers and Harbors Congress, Washington, D. C., May 26, 1954:

Since the end of World War I Americans, whether they were a part of the majority or a part of the minority party, have sought the solution to the farm surplus problem.

Newspapers and magazines today are full of articles telling us how much butter, wheat, corn, and other foodstuffs Uncle Sam has purchased to support the market. I believe that the last figure that I heard was that the storage charge alone on this great supply of presumably unsalable food and fiber amounts to about $20,000 per hour.

I think that you will have to hunt for quite a while upon the Hill to find a Member of Congress from either party who will not admit, at least privately, that the farm problem is a very complex one and one for which there is no adequate nor simple answer.

Answers that we thought were obvious solutions a quarter of a century ago have since proved to be erroneous. The facts are that 40 percent fewer farmers today are producing 40 percent more per acre, and per farmer, than they ever did before the surpluses started to pile up.

Members of Congress, farmers and farm organization leaders have been seeking the solution to the surplus problem for 30 years. Billions of dollars have been spent and there is doubt in many of our minds if we are much closer to the solution of the problem than we were back in the early 1930's when the New Deal tried to meet the surplus problem head on. Since that time we have tried acreage allotments, market quotas and many other devices. The problem is still with us.

I think that every fair-minded American will admit that surpluses do create problems. To the man who produces or processes or transports these surpluses the problems involved are very real.

We could continue to talk about this problem for another 30 years. Maybe we could solve the problems attendant and maybe we could not.

Today I would like to raise some questions in your minds as to what might have happened if we had not had quite enough food and fiber in America instead of a surplus. I have never yet read of a civilization being destroyed by too much food and fiber nor by too high a standard of living. Surpluses are problems in a great country like ours—as are any other blessings.

Why is it that America, with 6 percent of the world's population and 7 percent of the world's area, is today giving away more foodstuffs than is known to be purchased by any other country in the world?

We might also ask: "Why did men die of starvation for 6,000 years? Why is it that we in America have a surplus problem and have never had a famine? Why did men walk and carry goods on their strained backs for 6,000 years, and then suddenly on only a small part of the earth's surface the forces of nature were harnessed to do the bidding of the humblest citizen?

Why did families live for 6,000 years in caves or floorless hovels without windows or chimneys; then within a few generations we in America take floors, rugs, chairs, tables, windows, and chimneys for granted, and regard electric lights, refrigerators, running water, porcelain baths, and toilets as common necessities?

Why did men and women and children eke out their meager existence for 6,000 years, toiling desperately from dawn to dark, barefoot, half-naked, unwashed, unshaved, uncombed, with lousy hair, mangy skins, and rotting teeth, and then suddenly in one place on earth there is an abundance of things such as rayon underwear, nylon hose, shower baths, safety razors, ice-cream sodas, lipsticks, permanent waves, and television sets?

It is incredible if we would but pause to reflect how swiftly—in almost no time as time is measured in the history of the world—Americans have conquered the darkness of night, have gone from pine knots and candles to kerosene lamps, to gas jets, then to electric bulbs, neon lights, and fluorescent tubes.

We have created wholly new and astounding defenses against weather—from fireplaces to stoves, furnaces, automatic burners, insulation, air conditioning.

These things have been and are possible because we have surpluses and because Americans spend a smaller part of their income for food than do any other important people in the world. No nation in the history of the world has been more blessed than Americans with soil and water resources. These are the two natural resources that are capable of creating new wealth year after year. In America we spend less than 25 percent of our total income for food. In China better than 90 percent of the citizens' income is required for food. We should thank God that ours has been a surplus rather than a shortage problem.

We have accepted this wonderful gift of adequate soil and water resources, but we have not taken proper care of it. Today erosion takes 21 times as much fertility from the soil each year as does production of crops. The Mississippi River dumps 735 million tons of topsoil into the Gulf of Mexico each year. During flood stages the Mississippi River carries past the city of New Orleans enough soil every 60 seconds to cover 40 acres with 7 inches of soil.

No nation can be that extravagant and expect to live. Fifteen percent of the good land that we had when our Pilgrim forefathers came to this country is lost forever. Topsoil and water constitute the real fundamental capital of this country. We are as many inches from famine and a lower standard of living as our topsoil is deep. It takes nature from 300 to 1,000 years to make an inch of soil. We in America have destroyed nearly 6 inches of soil in a little over 200 years.

Certainly the past offers eloquent evidence as to the consequences of wasteful expenditures of land resources. Not very far from the eastern shores of the Mediterranean we see vast deserts today. In a portion of this area, where two mighty rivers, the Tigris and the Euphrates parallel each other, was the site of the beginning of civilization on this earth. This is according to some eminent historians.

This in biblical times was the land of milk and honey. Today it stands barren and desolate with very sparse human habitation and with a very low standard of living for those nomadic travelers who do live in that section of the world.

The Tigris-Euphrates Valley, commonly known as Mesopotamia, was capable of supporting a population of over 15 million people and could have supported them bountifully for centuries. This was the valley of plenty, the site of the fabulous Hanging Gardens of Babylon.

Over the centuries the great annual floods of the two rivers washed away the rich topsoil which clogged these rivers and their tributaries and left in their wake important desolution. Slowly but surely the valley became less able to support human life. Those who so recklessly squandered the natural resources once abundant there, those who failed to put back into the soil as much as they were taking out, those who could not or would not understand that the mighty rivers which fed them could also make them starve, those were the people who were forced to migrate elsewhere.

It remains to be seen whether we in America follow the pattern that was followed in Mesopotamia, Egypt, Syria, China, and the scenes of every civilization recorded in the world's history.

While we are attacking this problem let us keep ever in mind that there is no conflict whatsoever between sound soil conservation practices and sound flood-control practices. Soil conservation with its terraces, contour plowing and other accepted scientific practices for conserving moisture is not a substitute but rather a supplement to the generally accepted flood-control projects which include reservoirs and so-called high dams. Soil conservation projects will not stop floods but they will help. Flood-control reservoirs do not constitute the final answer to soil conservation, but they will help.

Organizations such as the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, the National Association of Soil Conservation Districts, the National Reclamation Association, the Mississippi Valley Association and dozens of others are dedicated to the conservation and proper use of things that have made America great.

Sometimes we feel that we are accomplishing a great deal.

At other times, when we see the Kansas River on a rampage as we did in 1951, the Missouri River on a rampage as we saw it in 1952, the Red River of the South as we saw in it in 1953, there is reason for doubt as to whether we are accomplishing what we set out to do. Losses in those three floods cost our people, in actual and in potential wealth, more than has our entire flood control and conservation program cost the taxpayers of the United States since those programs were started.

I am not an alarmist, but let's face facts.

The Bureau of the Census tells us that we can expect to have a population of 190 million by 1975. That estimate in itself is astounding, and with this increase in population we are going to have an increase or an acceleration of the problems that we are here to study.

The most pressing of these problems will be the supplying of adequate food and fiber to maintain this additional population in the style to which we Americans have been accustomed. To accomplish this task the United States of America must harvest some 530 million acres of cropland in 1975 if our people are to be as well fed and as well clothed as they were during the period 1935–39. That 530 million acres represent some 68 million acres more than we now have. In other words, we are going to be approximately 68 million acres short by 1975 of having enough cropland to maintain our present standard of living. The United States Department of Agriculture predicts that by this crucial year of 1975 our farmers will have found only 45 million new acres. These of course will be the acres that are reclaimed by the stabilization of our rivers, by the clearing of timber and by the irrigation of now drought land.

This statement means that for all practical purposes our farmland deficit will be nearly 23 million acres by 1975. Technology, better seed, research, and many things that we cannot now imagine are going to take up some of this slack. While there is still an abundance I think we should very carefully study ways and means of continuing that abundance.

A few years ago Bill Webb and I heard the annual address of Walter Chamblin here in Washington. The two of us have not missed one of Mr. Chamblin's speeches before the Washington Board of Trade since. Mr. Chamblin told us at the time that the history of every civilization the world has ever known could be written in 10 words. Each nation that constituted a great civilization followed the same pattern.

The people started in bondage, they went from bondage to great spiritual faith, from spiritual faith to courage, from courage to liberty, from liberty to abundance, from abundance to selfishness, from selfishness to complacency, from complacency to apathy, from apathy to dependence, back to bondage.

Your ancestors and mine, most of them originating in Europe, were at one time in bondage. After acquiring spiritual faith they found the courage to come to America and fight for and win the liberty that we enjoy today. We are definitely today in the period of abundance. Our abundance is greater than has ever been known by any other people.

Whether we follow the same old pattern and go from abundance, to selfishness, to complacency, to apathy, to dependence and back to bondage, as did all other civilizations ahead of us, may depend upon the success of the great organizations we all represent. May you have the greatest of success in your efforts.

French Nurse, New Spur to Altruism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELIZABETH KEE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 26, 1954

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, I consider it an honor and a privilege to have this opportunity to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and to include the following very fine tribute paid to a very great lady—"the angel of Dien Bien Phu," Mlle. Genevieve de Galard Tarraube, who is now an official visitor in the United States:

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of July 26, 1954]

FRENCH NURSE, NEW SPUR TO ALTRUISM

(By Malvina Lindsay)

"I'm no Florence Nightingale," many a nurse of today quickly explains. It is an understandable attitude. The tradition of altruism has been exploited in nursing, as in teaching, social work, many other professions.

Yet the lift of heart given the world by the "angel of Dien Bien Phu," Genevieve de Galard Tarraube, who arrives in the United States today as an official visitor, has been occasioned by altruism and heroism in the Nightingale pattern.

One hundred years ago this fall Florence Nightingale, a former debutante of British court circles, went to the Crimea to labor in the hot and filthy barracks hospital that was receiving the wounded from the Battle of Balaklava. Now Genevieve de Galard, whose ancient line of military ancestors has made much of the words "duty" and "honor," is being paid tribute for her tireless devotion to the wounded in the besieged underground hospital at Dien Bien Phu.

The heroic French Air Force nurse has given new prestige to the ideal of service at a time when it is widely suffering from cynical disrepute. Her 3-week tour of this country may cause the hero-hungry populace that greets her to think more seriously about the great need of nurses, and also of nurses' needs. It may remind persons in all professions that too much is being made of the cult of success.

A national survey of health care made by Representative FRANCES P. BOLTON, who was instrumental in having Lieutenant de Galard visit this country, indicates that the public attitude toward nursing could stand an injection of idealism. Replies from about 4,000 persons concerned with the Nation's critical and ever-increasing nurse shortage list among the handicaps to nurse recruiting not only low pay, long and irregular hours, and competition from other fields, but also a decline in altruism. Though participants in the survey urged increase of financial aid, many of them pointed out that money alone would not solve the problem.

Perhaps an overdose of sentimentality regarding nursing has caused the pendulum to swing to the other extreme. Florence Nightingale, a hard-headed administrative genius, had no patience with sentimentality and the inefficiency frequently resulting from it. She wanted her legacy to the world to be a practical revolution in the methods of caring for the sick and wounded.

Yet neither did she have any patience with self-seeking. She felt she had been called to service (she maintained that God spoke to her audibly four times in her life) and she gave herself completely to that service. She expected her associates and disciples to do likewise—without thought of personal gain or ambition. Her inspiration motivated young women for years in the choice of their careers.

Much of this same attitude toward duty and service (now regarded as a 19th-century phenomenon) has shown up in the career of Genevieve de Galard. Like Florence Nightingale, she found her conservative family opposed to her undertaking. It was considered shockingly unconventional for her to assume such as arduous, hazardous life as becoming an Air Force nurse, even though the unit she joined was an elite one, largely staffed with girls from aristocratic families.

Yet she firmly went ahead. She is said to have been motivated by religion, by the military tradition of her family and by her own desires to serve where she was most needed.

The elderly mother of the French heroine, Vicomtesse de Galard Tarraube, who lives in a modest Paris apartment filled with family heirlooms, is quoted by Edmond Taylor, in the Reporter magazine, as saying that her daughter felt that going to Indochina offered her the "best opportunity to practice her profession usefully." The Vicomtesse added, "There are so many wounded out there." Again speaking of the family tradition she said, "My daughter merely did her duty."

A French veteran, who was a patient in the Dien Bien Phu underground shelter, told of the nurse saying calmly to the wounded, "I do only my duty. You give me courage."

Such remarks may seem old fashioned to young people who talk over their futures exclusively in terms of salaries, hours, pensions, quick chances to get to the top. But the attitude of both Florence Nightingale and Genevieve de Galard toward their careers seems to fit in with that inner satisfaction in the job itself that modern social scientists are trying to help so many discontented workers find.

The Late J. Ward Mailliard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 22, 1954

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, San Francisco recently lost one of her outstanding citizens, Mr. J. Ward Mailliard, Jr., the father of my colleague from San Francisco, Congressman WILLIAM MAILLIARD, who has been absent from our sessions in recent days due to the passing of his father. It was my privilege to have first met Ward Mailliard across the bargaining table, at which I sat as the principal spokesman for labor and Mr. Mailliard as the chairman of the committee representing management. Ward Mailliard and I did not always agree. In fact, our personal friendship was born in the fire of heated debate and disagreement out of which grew a mutual respect and an ability to settle, reasonably, equitably, and fairly, a number of serious labor relations matters.

It was also my privilege to serve with Ward Mailliard on the board of directors of the San Francisco Red Cross, the Community Chest, and other civic organizations. We may not have always agreed, but Ward Mailliard in his own way made great contributions to San Francisco's advancement and betterment. As a mark of the respect in which he was held under unanimous consent, I insert accompanying newspaper articles on the passing of this distinguished citizen of San Francisco, father of Congressman MAILLIARD, of the Fourth California Congressional District in San Francisco, in the RECORD:

[From the San Francisco News of July 12, 1954]

ILLNESS IS FATAL TO JOHN WARD MAILLIARD, JR.—SAN FRANCISCO CONGRESSMAN'S FATHER WAS 63

John Ward Mailliard, Jr., a leader in San Francisco business and civic life and father of Representative WILLIAM S. MAILLIARD, died yesterday in Stanford Hospital. Mr. Mailliard, who was 63, had been ill for several months.

Born in San Francisco, he was chairman of the board of Mailliard & Schmiedell, a food brokerage firm established by his father, held numerous other business directorships, was a past president of the chamber of commerce, and had served on city commissions.

Mr. Mailliard, whose home was at 3375 Jackson Street, was educated in Lowell High School, Taft School in Watertown, Conn., and Yale University.

BUSINESS CAREER

In 1910 he began his business career with an insurance company, then joined his father's firm and later became associated with other enterprises.

In 1926 he became a director of the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce and 7 years later was elected its youngest president, at 41.

He was president of the police commission from 1937 to 1940 and of the State harbor commissioners from 1943 to 1946, when he resigned to become finance chairman in Governor Warren's campaign.

ON PARK BOARD

He was a member of the park commission; in 1938 was a member of the board of managers of the Golden Gate International Exposition; a member of the California Centennial Commission in 1947–50; twice president of the community chest; a director of St. Luke's Hospital and the San Francisco Federated Fund; chairman of the American Cancer Society campaign and a trustee and president of the California Academy of Sciences.

HONORARY DEGREE

In recognition of his years of community service, the College of the Pacific conferred upon him the honorary degree of doctor of laws last year.

His activities were equally widespread in the business field.

He was a director of American President Lines, Western Pacific Railroad, and Firemen's Fund Insurance Co. At various times he was a director of American Trust Co., Home Fire & Marine Insurance Co., California Pacific Title Insurance Co., Pacific Mutual Life Insurance Co. of Los Angeles, S. O. S. Co., Cleanser Products, Inc., Kern County Land Co., California Spray-Chemical Co., Beech Nut Co. of California, and Schlage Lock Co. and was president of the American Molasses Co. of California, and Nulomoline Co. of California.

He was active in Warren's 1942 campaign and an executive committee member of the United San Francisco Republican Finance Committee.

WORLD WAR I SERVICE

During World War I he served in the field artillery.

Besides Representative MAILLIARD, Mr. Mailliard is survived by his widow, Kater; two other sons, John Ward Mailliard III and James Mailliard, of San Francisco; two brothers, A. Page Mailliard, of Yorkville, Mendocino County, and Thomas P. Mailliard, of San Francisco; and two sisters, Mrs. G. T. Bridgman, of Ross, and Mrs. William Moore, of San Rafael.

N. Gray & Co., Divisadero and Post Streets, have charge of funeral arrangements.

[From the San Francisco Examiner]

MAILLIARD, TRADE, CIVIC LEADER, DIES—FATHER OF CONGRESSMAN SUCCUMBS AT 63

John Ward Mailliard, Jr., 63, San Francisco civic leader and father of Congressmen WILLIAM S. MAILLIARD, died yesterday in Stanford Hospital after an illness of several months.

He was prominent in business circles as a food broker as well as a civic leader.

Chairman of the board of Mailliard & Schmiedell, food brokers, a firm established by his father, Mr. Mailliard had been associated with the company since 1911. But his business and civic interests were numerous, and he held directorships during his lifetime on a dozen or more firms.

Mr. Mailliard was a native son of San Francisco, having been born here on March 25, 1891.

He was educated in Lowell High School, Taft School in Watertown, Conn., and Yale University.

HONORED BY COLLEGE

Three years after his return to San Francisco in 1910 he was married in Belvedere. The family home is at 3375 Jackson Street.

Last year, in Stockton, the College of the Pacific recognized his many years of community service to San Francisco, as well as the rest of northern California, by conferring on him the honorary degree of doctor of laws.

Mr. Mailliard gained prominence through his civic activities early. He was elected a director of the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce in 1926 and 7 years later, at the age of 41 became its youngest president.

HEADED CHEST

He was president of the San Francisco Police Commission from 1937 to 1940 and of the board of State harbor commissioners from 1943 to 1946, resigning to become finance chairman in the campaign of Gov. Earl Warren. This was the second time he served Governor Warren in that capacity—the first being in 1942.

He also was a member of the park commission and twice president of the community chest. In addition, he served with the board of managers of the Golden Gate International Exposition in 1938 and with the California Centennial Commission in 1947–50.

Other posts held by Mr. Mailliard included director of the American Trust Co., of the Home Fire & Mutual Marine Insurance Co., Pacific Mutual Life Insurance Co., American President Lines, Firemen's Fund Insurance Co., and the Western Pacific Railroad Co.

He also was a director of St. Luke's Hospital; the San Francisco Federated Fund; chairman of the American Cancer Society campaign; and a trustee and president of the California Academy of Sciences.

He served in the Field Artillery during World War I.

Mr. Mailliard leaves his widow, Kate Peterson Mailliard; sons, John Ward III, William Somers, the Congressman, and James Mailliard; brothers, A. Page Mailliard, Yorkville, and Thomas P. Mailliard, San Francisco; and sisters, Mrs. G. T. Bridgman, Ross, and Mrs. William Moore, San Rafael.

Funeral services will be announced by Gray's, Divisadero and Post Streets.

Red Clerics Visit United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 26, 1954

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New Leader of July 26, 1954:

RED CLERICS VISIT UNITED STATES—THE HUNGARIAN CHURCHMEN INVITED TO THE WORLD COUNCIL OF CHURCHES CONVENTION ARE COMMUNIST QUISLINGS WHO DO NOT REPRESENT PROTESTANTS IN THEIR COUNTRY

(By Béla Fabian)

The World Council of Churches is to hold its convention next month in Evanston, Ill. Among those invited to participate are four Hungarian churchmen: Albert Bereczky and János Peter, bishops of the Calvinist Church; Lajos Vetö, a Lutheran bishop; and László Papp, a Calvinist minister and dean of the Budapest Theological Seminary.

These four men do not represent Hungarian Protestantism. They are minions of the Communist regime in Budapest, men who are willingly furthering the Kremlin's overall design for subjugating the churches of Eastern Europe. They are coming to America to pursue four vital aims of Soviet policy:

To achieve unification of all orthodox churches with the aid of the World Council of Churches—the Hungarian Protestant Church serving, as László Papp expressed it last February, as "the connecting link between East and West."

To create the impression that religious freedom exists in the Soviet orbit.

To utilize the World Council of Churches for Communist peace propaganda.

To prevent the establishment of an interdenominational front of Catholics, Protestants, and Jews against communism.

In the past, the Hungarian Protestant churches have been standard-bearers of freedom, and many Protestant preachers have died in defense of their faith. During World War II Calvinist Bishop László Ravasz, Lutheran Bishop Béla Kapi, and Unitarian Bishop Miklós Józan took a strong stand against Nazi inhumanity. Members of the Protestant youth organization, Soli Deo Gloria, risked their lives saving victims from Nazi execution squads.

The postwar Communist regime quickly turned its efforts to breaking the resistance of the Protestants. Their first notable victim was Bishop Ravasz. After the Communists had threatened to throw him in jail, deport his family and cut off the salaries of all Calvinist parochial-school teachers, Ravasz stepped down as bishop. His place was taken by Albert Bereczky, and the Calvinist Reformed Church became a Communist weapon against the other Hungarian churches.

The leaders of the Lutheran Church proved even more of a problem. Bishop Lajos Ordas and the moderator of the church, Albert Radvámszky, resisted every kind of pressure. Finally, the regime charged the two with black-marketeering and sent them to jail. A new leadership has been installed which dutifully follows Communist orders.

The Unitarian Church submitted without a fight.

The present leaders of Hungarian Protestantism have won no real favors for their churches by cringing before the regime. The Protestant press is enslaved, religious schools are closed or rigidly supervised, and the Communist Party is drawing away the youth. Nevertheless, the bulk of Hungarian Protestants have refused to follow their leaders in submission to the Communists. The church services of Bishop János Péter in Debreczen, for example, have been boycotted.

Reports from Hungary indicate that this same János Péter, who is soon to represent Hungarian Calvinists at the Evanston convention, is not only a member of the Communist Party but a secret-police agent. After the war, he served as private secretary to Rev. Zoltán Tildy, a weakling whom the Communists later made President of the Hungarian "People's Republic." It is now clear that Péter was planted by the Communists to spy on Tildy and report on his activities.

Since the Berlin and Geneva conferences, morale among the peoples behind the Iron Curtain has sunk to an all-time low, and Communist propaganda is exploiting this despair. "Don't count on aid from the Americans," the Communists are warning. "They are interested only in saving their own skins. Before long, the mighty Soviet Union will rule the world. Isn't it folly, then, to resist us?"

By welcoming Communist Quislings to this country as the representatives of Hungarian protestantism, the World Council of Churches is striking yet another blow at the spirit of resistance of the enslaved peoples of Eastern Europe.

Carrier Contract Would Aid Dorchester

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 26, 1954

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include an editorial with which I am in complete agreement, written by Edgar A. Craig, president of the Dorchester Board of Trade, Dorchester, Mass., appearing in the Dorchester Argus-News of July 22, 1954, entitled "Carrier Contract Would Aid Dorchester":

The Massachusetts Bethlehem shipbuilding yard is located in Quincy, Mass., and employs thousands of persons from Greater Boston, which includes Dorchester.

The city of Quincy has been hard hit and unemployment there exists to a great extent with resultant suffering among the unemployed and business in general.

The present Republican administration, despite campaign promises, has done nothing to relieve unemployment in labor-distressed communities in Massachusetts.

The assignment for construction of the fourth Forrestal supercarrier to the Quincy yard of the Bethlehem Shipbuilding Co., will contribute substantially to relieving the unemployment situation in Quincy and in Greater Boston, as well as most helpful to business generally.

The arguments and reasons why this carrier should be assigned to the Quincy yard are convincing.

The present administration should assign it to the Quincy yard for construction.

The editorial follows:

CARRIER CONTRACT WOULD AID DORCHESTER

(By Edgar A. Craig, president, Dorchester Board of Trade)

The people of Dorchester—residents and business people alike—want the Fore River shipyard to get the next Government contract for the huge Forrestal type of airplane carrier. Dorchester—like its neighboring community, Quincy—was greatly disappointed when the local shipyard lost the contract to Newport News, Va., several month ago. The fact that a similar contract is about to be awarded gives rise to renewed hope that our local economy will get the benefit of the many millions of dollars involved in such a great undertaking as a monster airplane carrier.

Hundreds of Dorchester families would be favorably affacted by peak activity at Fore River. The whole community would feel the beneficial effects—along with a score of other cities and towns in our vicinity.

On behalf of the Dorchester Board of Trade I earnestly request our elected representatives in both branches of the Congress of the United States to leave no stone unturned to bring the next carrier contract to Quincy. Further, we especially implore the Bethlehem Steel Corp. to have in mind the loyal support it has received from the Boston area in the past in making the bid for the contract.

This section has never been found wanting when, in war emergency, its manpower and resources have been of vital importance to national defense. Now our economy needs this important activity at Fore River. Please don't let us down.

Puerto Rico's Gains

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 26, 1954

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following interesting article published in yesterday's Washington Sunday Star, an appraisal by my good friend the distinguished Resident Commissioner of Puerto Rico, Dr. Antonio Fernós-Isern, of the progress made in Puerto Rico in the past 2 years:

PUERTO RICO HAILS HER GAINS IN FIRST 2 YEARS OF FREEDOM—DR. FERNÓS-ISERN REPORTS HIGHER STANDARD OF LIVING

"The people of Puerto Rico now have a feeling of permanence and solidity after being afflicted for many years by uncertainty over their political status and their future."

That is the way Dr. Antonio Fernós-Isern, Puerto Rico's Resident Commissioner in Washington, appraises the effect of the establishment of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico just 2 years ago today.

A companion effect, Dr. Fernós-Isern reports, is a stepup in the rhythm of improvements in the economy, education, and general well-being of the people of Puerto Rico.

HAVE OWN CONSTITUTION

Commonwealth status gave Puerto Ricans a constitution of their own and practically all of the rights and powers of a State except voting privileges in Congress. Before the Commonwealth, the island had a large measure of self-government, but it was based on an act of Congress, not on their own constitution. Dr. Fernós-Isern, interviewed in his Capitol Hill office, put it this way:

"The Commonwealth has satisfied the natural desire of the people of Puerto Rico to have a status that cannot be classified as colonial. Before, they felt that they were just recipients of a government conferred by Washington. Now they have a body politic of their own and their relationships with the United States are governed by a compact."

Dr. Fernós-Isern, a medical doctor with freckles and a friendly grin, originated the commonwealth idea in 1946 when he decided that neither independence nor statehood, both of which had many advocates, were practical goals. His idea was embraced by Luis Muños-Marín, the popular Governor of the island, and in 1951 Dr. Fernós-Isern presided over a constitutional convention. Congress ratified the new constitution on July 3, 1953, and the commonwealth came into being on July 25.

HIGHER STANDARD OF LIVING

The Commissioner reported that "Puerto Rico now has a standard of living equal to that of any Latin American country except Argentina and Venezuela." By offering tax concessions and other measures in Operation Bootstrap, he said, it has attracted textile, plastic, glass, ceramic, drug, and other industries. Also, there have been stepups in such traditional industries as sugar, coffee, cigarmaking, and rum distilling. The tourist trade is growing, too.

In regard to education, Dr. Fernós-Isern proudly noted:

"At the turn of the century we had 80 percent illiteracy. Now we have 80 percent literacy. And this was achieved while introducing English in all the schools, from first grade on, so that now Puerto Rico is truly bilingual."

The doctor said that about two-thirds of Puerto Rico's voters support the party which sponsored the Commonwealth. The others are split between independence and statehood groups, with a sizable edge for the former.

CRITICIZES NATIONALISTS

Fanatical Nationalists of the type who made the Blair House attempt on President Truman's life in 1950 and shot up the House of Representatives Chamber this year number no more than 500, Dr. Fernós-Isern said.

"These people," he declared, "have lost contact with reality. They refuse to see what is before their eyes. They talk as if Puerto Rico were a colony in the worst sense of the word. That's not so. They are not fighting the United States Government, but a Puerto Rican government, and they are going counter to the wishes of the people."

Dr. FERNÓS-ISERN feels that Puerto Rican progress is of great importance to the United States. He explained:

"We are a sort of show window, demonstrating to other Spanish-American countries the benefits that can come from relationships with the United States. Representatives of many Spanish-American nations come to Puerto Rico to see what technological assistance from the United States has done for us."

There will be parades and speeches in Puerto Rico today, but Dr. FERNÓS-ISERN will not be there because Congress is still in session. Instead he'll honor the occasion with a speech in the House of Representatives, where he has all the privileges of membership except the right to vote on legislation.

Employment Security Supplementary Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 26, 1954

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I enclose a letter I received from Dewey G. Archambault, director of the Division of Employment Security of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, showing the disastrous results in Massachusetts alone by the reduction in the amount recommended by President Eisenhower in the matter referred to in Mr. Archambault's letter to me:

COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS,
DIVISION OF EMPLOYMENT SECURITY,
Boston, July 22, 1954.

Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
House of Representatives, Congress of the United States, Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE MCCORMACK: The following comments are submitted with reference to the action taken by the House Appropriations Committee on the employment security supplementary budget request by which a reduction was made from $43 million, originally requested, to $4.6 million. This $4.6 million is to be restricted for contingency purposes only, with the provision, however, that the contingency fund may be used to defray the cost of any new statewide increases.

1. We are decidely in favor of allowing the contingency fund to be used for the payment of new statewide salary increases, as we in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts have a problem bearing directly on this matter. We request very strongly that this feature of the House committee's recommendations be retained.

State legislation recently enacted (prior to July 1, 1954) provides for the granting of salary increases to employees of the Commonwealth, based on the number of years of service in grade. Also, legislation was enacted providing for the upgrading of certain statewide classifications which also affected a number of employees in this agency. Although no final figures are available it is safe to assume that these salary-increase costs will approximate $215,000, and if this money can be obtained from the contingency fund, as the House Appropriations Committee apparently now wishes, it will help solve one of our major problems for the current 1955 fiscal year. Otherwise, we will be faced with the problem of paying for these salary increases from the basic budget which would be extremely difficult (if not impossible) and would necessitate the laying off of a substantial number of employees to meet these higher salary costs.

Consideration should also be given to allow the payment of normal in-grade step-rate increases from contingency funds as has regularly been done up to the preceding fiscal year. To require States to absorb such increases (which are authorized in accordance with State laws, rules, and regulations governing these matters) in their regular basic budgets necessitates curtailing the necessary operations in order to pay for these mandatory increases. In our agency the normal annual cost approximates $24,000 and failure to allow these payments to come from the contingency fund will make our financial position for the coming fiscal year even more acute.

2. It is requested that reconsideration be given to the amount of funds approved for contingency purposes in view of the fact that from all indications insured unemployment on a national basis is expected to be greater than that on which the tentative budget approvals for the fiscal year 1955 were based.

In this Commonwealth, for example, we have notified the Federal authorities that our benefit and claim workloads are expected to be approximately 15 to 20 percent higher than those workloads which they have tentatively approved for fiscal 1955 for this agency.

3. The tentative budget approved for fiscal 1955 for this agency indicates that we can be expected to have funds approved to pay for only about 1,785 positions. Our current staff as of June 30, 1954, is 2,049. This indicates an apparent overstaffing at the beginning of the fiscal year of some 264 positions which presents a serious problem to this agency if additional funds for basic employment security operations, as requested in this supplementary budget, are not approved. In view of the fact that workloads currently are at a relatively high level, it is impractical to consider a reduction in staff to stay within this tentatively approved budget, without impairing seriously the various operations carried on by this agency. Based on the tentatively approved budget for fiscal 1955, the functional areas in which we find ourselves extremely short of funds are as follows:

Personal services: (1) Experience rating operations, (2) local office employment service operations (involving various services to applicants and employers), (3) administrative and staff operations.

In addition to the above, drastic cuts were also made in categories of nonpersonal services, particularly in supplies and equipment, which will make it very difficult for this agency to meet the necessary expenditures anticipated in these accounts.

We urgently request that every effort be made to restore the supplementary budget request to the original $43 million which will provide additional money for regular basic employment security operations and will also provide adequate contingency funds from which higher benefit and claim loads, and from which statewide and in-grade salary increases can be paid.

Very truly yours,
DEWEY G. ARCHAMBAULT,
Director.

The Health Reinsurance Bill, H. R. 8356

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 26, 1954

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, on July 13 this body voted to recommit H. R. 8356, the bill known as the administration's health reinsurance bill. Secretary Hobby in a speech over a national network described the bill as the new approach toward solving the health problems of the American people, and declared it to be "the key part of the Eisenhower program for better health."

I voted to recommit this bill. I am, nevertheless, a firm believer in the policy of Federal responsibility for the health needs of our people. Franklin Roosevelt believed that adequate medical care is one of the basic human rights of all Americans. Harry Truman subscribed to that principle by submitting a plan for comprehensive health insurance to the Congress. I wholeheartedly approve a recent statement of President Eisenhower:

> The means for achieving good health should be accessible to all. A person's location, occupation, age, race, creed, or financial status should not bar him from enjoying this access.

I have no quarrel with the administration with regard to certain points related to this legislation and I agree with the administration that our various health insurance plans are deficient in the following respects:

First. Too costly for low-income groups.

The annual medical bill today costs our citizens $10.2 billion. Only 15 percent of this bill is covered by insurance. Eight million Americans are in debt as a result of medical expenses. And only 41 percent of the families earning under $3,000 a year have insurance.

Second. Health insurance does not pay the full medical and hospital bills.

The Health Information Foundation, a research organization supported by the great drug and chemical companies, whose chairman is Herbert Hoover, stated in a recent report that individuals covered by health insurance got back an average of only $17 a year in benefits from these plans.

Third. Health insurance plans do not cover all needed medical care.

Fragmentized medical care is costly and often inefficient. Diagnosis cannot be arbitrarily separated from treatment. And you cannot isolate surgery from preoperative and postoperative care. A health plan should be a comprehensive, unified program.

Fourth. The unemployed, the retired, those in rural areas, sufferers of chronic ills cannot obtain health insurance.

Two-thirds of all our counties are predominantly rural. In 1,000 counties there is no public health service. Some thirty million live in areas without properly organized local health departments.

I voted to recommit this bill because I feel that, however laudable and sincere its objectives may be, the bill does not provide the key to the program to improve the health of our Nation. It is the object of this legislation to improve the health program of the country by inducing private insurance companies to broaden the coverage of their health insurance and extend this insurance to greater numbers of our people. This is to be accomplished by the Federal Government underwriting the additional risk through a program of reinsurance. It was never made clear during the hearings whether anyone had faith in the proposed method.

It seems clear to me that if this reinsurance operation is run on a sound businesslike basis the achievement of our objectives becomes impossible. Therefore, if we are to achieve our objectives, it can be done only by operating our reinsurance business at a loss. If we are going to subsidize our health program, let us do it openly and adequately.

As I do not believe the administration's health reinsurance bill is sound but do believe we should act upon this subject, I recommend action upon H. R. 7700, the medical facilities mortgage insurance bill. Passage of this legislation will be a definite contribution to improving and increasing our health facilities, and this by means of private enterprise. This constructive proposal will permit the Federal Government to reinsure local lending agencies which are willing to advance funds for the building of hospitals and related facilities to prepaid comprehensive health plans. The bill would have the Government guarantee loans extended to prepayment groups by local financing agencies just as the Government has insured private real-estate loans.

Instead of reinsuring the profits of the insurance companies, let us take this step toward an enlightened national policy that will insure the health of our citizens.

Group Life Insurance for Federal Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 26, 1954

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following radio address I delivered over station WORL, Boston, Mass., on Sunday, July 25, 1954.

The address follows:

I believe it can be said without any fear of contradiction, that the Democratic Party was the author of social security.

The Republican minority in Congress during the 1930's opposed it at every turn. They tried to block it by calling it names. They said it was radical, socialistic, and would lead to a welfare state.

But the people were unafraid. They seemed to like what they saw of old-age and survivors insurance and unemployment compensation. In fact, they have been clamoring for improvements in the program.

In the present Congress, with its thin Republican majority, we have seen improvements put through because a large majority of the Democrats voted solidly for legislation which their party conceived in the beginning and will continue to develop until social security in the larger sense becomes available to all Americans.

This is our answer to communism.

This is proof that a forward-looking political party, under the flexible governmental system that we enjoy, can make those necessary social and economic changes by which an ever-increasing number of our people will participate in the fruits of production.

At the time this report is being written, another form of insurance is being debated by the Congress. It would affect only one segment of our population. It is an example, however, of the way we are building, piece by piece, those group protections that will finally benefit all.

By the time this report is given, it may have been written into law.

The arguments both for and against give us a picture as to how such legislation develops. It is with this in mind that I bring you some of the discussion dealing with the proposal to provide group life insurance for Federal employees.

It is designed to extend to all Federal civilian employees, elected as well as appointed, the opportunity to enjoy a fringe benefit which has long been available to many employees of private industry.

Group life insurance is truly a product of the 20th century.

By the end of 1912, there were only 25 master policies, covering only 12,000 persons, for a total insurance coverage of $13 million. By the end of 1952, it had made sensational advances to the point where 37 million persons were covered to the tune of $70 billion.

Under the Government's plan nearly 1,750,000 Federal employees would come under this protection. The annual premium collections would be $70 million with the Federal Government contributing almost $23 million of this amount.

The employee premium rate would not exceed 25 cents biweekly for each $1,000 of coverage. Thus the annual employee cost would be $6.50 per $1,000, about the same as the premium being paid through large group plans in private industry.

An employee earning $4,200 a year, if he elected to join in this program, would be insured for $5,000. This would cost him $32.50 a year, as long as he remained in active service at that salary. If he retired after 15 or more years of service, he would no longer have to pay the premiums, but would still be fully covered. At the age of 65, the protection would be reduced at the rate of 2 percent (or $100) a month. This would not be cut back below 25 percent of the original amount. In this case, he would have paid-up insurance of $1,250.

If he should leave the Federal service before retirement, he would be eligible to obtain from the insuring company a standard life policy at regular premium rates, without physical exhmination.

Here are some of the advantages to the employee:

1. Full insurance protection at the lowest possible cost during the child-rearing ages when it is most needed.
2. Double indemnity at lesser cost than that provided by most industrial group life insurance plans. Plus dismemberment insurance.
3. The chance to convert to standard life insurance at regular premium rates without a physical examination.
4. A low-premium rate that does not fluctuate with age.
5. Paid-up insurance after 65, amounting to not less than 25 percent of the employee's maximum coverage.

The following are regarded as disadvantages:

1. The proposed temporary term insurance is additional only and does not take the place of a permanent standard life-insurance program. Employees may get a mistaken idea of security, thus neglecting other forms of insurance coverage.
2. It has no cash-surrender value.

Here are the advantages to the employer:

1. It will serve to attract better employees and help to keep those already employed.
2. It should strengthen employee morale by increasing the employee's feeling of economic security.
3. By improving conditions of employment, it may increase productivity.
4. It may improve job relations and public relations.
5. It may remove the necessity of taking up contributions to help the survivors of a deceased fellow employee.

The disadvantage to the employer is that the prevalence of such plans among business and industry may cancel the argument that it would attract and hold better employees. However, this might also work against the Federal Government if it fails to inaugurate such a program, for private industry would be in the position where it would offer better inducements.

No one objects to the principle and the purpose of this legislation.

There is disagreement only with details.

Critics in this sense say that the Federal Government should offer this benefit free of cost. They maintain that similar group term life insurance is provided without cost to the employees of many large companies.

Supporters answer by saying that a great majority of such plans are contributory, the cost being shared by the employees, as well as the employer. They further point out that employees get more actual insurance and are more appreciative of it when they help to pay for it.

Critics do not like the reduction in coverage after the age of 65.

They say that 65 to 70 percent of the beneficiaries of persons covered by this plan will receive only 25 percent of the face value of the insurance. As more people are living longer, the value of an insurance program that provides declining coverage with age becomes progressively less.

Those who support reduced coverage after 65 reply that this is a feature of almost all group life-insurance plans. To continue full coverage would increase the cost.

As one who leans to the side of the Federal employees on this issue, I frankly believe that representatives of employees, or employee organizations, must have some voice in the operation and management of such plans. This would build a solid base of confidence, and permit any inequities that might arise, to receive instant attention.

Critics also object to the proviso that would permit exclusion of employees on the basis of the nature and type of employment, or conditions pertaining thereto.

To let an administrative official decide, instead of having the details spelled out clearly by law, would set a dangerous precedent.

Since about 1,000 Federal employees die every month, it is advisable to pass legislation that would provide some protection for their families. This, however, should not be used as an excuse to rush through a bill that might be used later on to prevent wage increases or to silence other grievances concerning working conditions.

On July 8, the Senate passed the bill authorizing the Civil Service Commission to make available group life insurance for civilian officers and employees in the Federal service.

Without amendment.

Federal employees are grateful that a start has been made in filling the security gap with reservations.

It is not as satisfactory as straight life insurance.

The provision that drastically reduces benefits by 75 percent in the years beyond 65 is quite a letdown. Even the low 25 cents premium, biweekly, for each $1,000 of insurance is not so cheap when you consider that the insuring firms have no solicitation, collection, or investigative costs.

The Government does all the work.

Unless this is widely publicized as supplemental insurance employees may not realize its limitations. Many Government employees upon being placed under the insurance program may mistakenly feel that they are fully covered.

Therefore, it is necessary to outline some of its advantages and its shortcomings.

Like all new legislation, difficulties unforeseen now may develop later.

As long as the Government approves a subsidy in part to the extent of $22 million it could be that it will go all the way in the future to supply this insurance free of charge.

In any event, Federal employees are winning the fight for more economic security in line with similar gains made by workers in private industry.

Is the Girl Scout Organization Un-American?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. BROWNSON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 26, 1954

Mr. BROWNSON. Mr. Speaker, on July 8 the Appendix of the Record carried an article written by Mr. Robert Le Fevre, entitled "Even the Girl Scouts," which makes serious charges that the Girl Scout movement is infiltrated to the point of danger with leftists and one-worlders.

In the interest of presenting both sides of the question I wish to call attention to a discussion of the Le Fevre article prepared by John Burkhart, an outstanding civic leader of Indianapolis, Ind.

I understand that the article by Mr. Le Fevre has resulted in many substantial donors to the Girl Scout movement becoming agitated over the problem of whether or not they should continue supporting what they had felt to be a worthwhile organization. I am concerned because I have two daughters in the Girl Scout movement.

Mr. Burkhart presented his side of the issue to the magazine in which Mr. Le Fevre's piece originally appeared and while it was acknowledged as being received, it was never printed nor did Mr. Le Fevre attempt to answer Mr. Burkhart's discussion of his charges.

Since both the original article and the reprint in the Record have caused the Girl Scout leaders some concern, it is my purpose to place Mr. Burkhart's answer in the Record so that it may receive the same consideration and distribution as did the original piece by Mr. Le Fevre:

Is the Girl Scout Organization Un-American?—A Reply to Mr. Le Fevre

(By John Burkhart)

The fact of Communist infiltration, its extent and the mortal danger it represents, arouses indifferences more often than action. Why? One reason perhaps—though certainly not the most consequential—is that among those who have developed a sensitivity to subversion, some see danger where no one else can find it.

In the March 31 issue of Human Events Mr. Robert Le Fevre makes grave charges against the Girl Scouts. Such of his readers as may have lacked time, inclination, or opportunity to investigate the facts quite probably are carrying in their minds a grotesque caricature of the Girl Scout organization.

Those who did investigate, who discovered for themselves the frightful irresponsibility of his attack and the utter groundlessness of his charges, now stand disillusioned. Other observers, more competent and more conscientious than Mr. Le Fevre, may henceforth find it harder to stir these victims of disillusionment to action—on future occasion when the need for action is a matter of utmost urgency.

In the discussion which follows the numbers in parentheses will denote page numbers in the 1953 edition of the Girl Scout Handbook, the special object of Mr. Le Fevre's lashings.

First he fulminates at this sentence: "This implies that every citizen of the United States of America is included in the United Nations because the United States is a member" (p. 228). Obviously this is a true statement unaffected in the least by any irrelevancies concerning Gary Davis.

And again, "It [the U. N.] is the only world organization set up to iron out the different viewpoints of nations, and that has authority to do so" (p. 228). Now many, with perfect propriety, question the desirability of an international organization; others like the idea, but think the veto makes it completely ineffective; probably the overwhelming majority of people want to continue efforts through an international organization but would deem it unwise to relinquish the veto power. But none of these viewpoints, none of this controversy detracts in the least from the validity of the statement quoted from the Handbook.

Referring to another section of the Handbook, Mr. Le Fevre writes, "The chart encourages members of certain races and countries—specifically the Chinese, the Negroes, and the Italians—in thinking that they are looked down upon by Americans, that Americans have been unfair toward them."

He draws this elaborate conclusion from a single question in a long, self-check chart: "Do I use such expressions as 'dago,' 'nigger,' 'chink'?" Presumably Mr. Le Fevre thinks our racial relationships would be improved if Girl Scouts were told to use such terms.

Mr. Le Fevre goes on to say, "The questions suggest that the Girl Scout who does not associate freely with all members of all other races, regardless of their individual merit, is morally deficient." Now, in truth, the Handbook neither suggests, implies, nor even hints at any such doctrine.

As a matter of fact, it handles this difficult subject with a great deal of grace and forthrightness. For example, "You do not like, equally well, every dress you have. You do not find equally companionable all the people in your school or troop. It is natural to like some people, as individuals, better than others" (p. 210).

According to Mr. Le Fevre, "page 347 of the handbook is an endorsement of socialized medicine." The easiest way to answer this completely incredible charge is to simply set forth, in toto, the offending text:

"The main health agency of the Federal Government is the United States Public Health Service. Some of the duties of this agency are: to prevent the bringing of disease from other countries; to prevent the spread of disease between States in this country; to study the cause and prevention of diseases dangerous to public health; to supervise the purity of products in interstate commerce; to assist State and local health departments.

"The United States Public Health Service has research laboratories and quarantine stations at all airports and seaports handling foreign travel and commerce" (p. 347).

It is doubtful, indeed, that the American Medical Association could find much fault with these straightforward, descriptive passages.

Mr. Le Fevre criticizes the "My Community" badge because it "emphasizes the idea that we are dependent upon a number of governmental agencies for our comfort and protection." Again the best answer is the Handbook itself. Out of the 14 points covered for this particular badge, only 1 deals with dependency upon governmental agencies, and here is exactly what it says:

"9. Find out what your community does for the physically handicapped, mentally ill, orphans, old people, poor, unemployed" (p. 415).

Another merit badge to feel the weight of Mr. Le Fevre's disfavor is the one on "world neighbor." He scornfully comments that preparation for this badge "calls for the Scout to memorize a part of the United Nations Charter. * * *" Intentionally or not, he neglects to point out what part of the charter. The anxieties of most readers will be somewhat allayed by the direct text of the Handbook:

"1. Memorize the statement on neighborliness in the United Nations Charter" (p. 428).

Continuing with Mr. Le Fevre's caustic comments, "To win either of those badges the girl scouts must sing paeans of praise for the U. N."

Well, we have already quoted the first requirement for the "World Neighbor" badge. Space will not permit a recital in full but we can cover in condensed fashion all the 12 points embraced in qualifying for the badge and each reader can judge whether or not the scout must sing paeans of praise for the U. N.

Point two is built around a patrol skit showing what it means to be good neighbors in the community and in the world.

Point three concerns itself with an imaginary trip—route, passports, point of interest, native dress and habits, something of past and present history of the land selected, etc.; point four is the presentation of the trip plan to an interested group; five, the location of girl scout and guide hostels; six, stamp and coin collections of the chosen country; seven, a person who has lived in the country is to tell the troop about it; eight involves learning courtesy phrases in the country's language; nine suggests an international troop project; 10 deals with proper letter form in writing a United States Ambassador; 11 is a demonstration of making friends with a girl guide of another country, without knowing her language; and, finally, 12 deals with the things a traveler should do in order to be a good representative of her own country (pp. 428–9).

"Nowhere among all of the merit badges did I find one that required the girl scout to memorize part of the Declaration of Independence or a statement from the Constitution or the Bill of Rights." So says Mr. Le Fevre. Herr Goebbels could have said it no better. Literally true, it is totally and shamefully false in its implication.

Let's look at the record. Among the requirements for the My Government badge we find this:

"e. Read aloud the Declaration of Independence, and the preamble to the United States Constitution and its Bill of Rights. Explain what these documents mean to you and why they are so important to your country" (p. 420).

Or again, a pertinent quotation may be made from among the requirements for the active-citizen badge:

"5. Talk over with your family and then with your troop how the Bill of Rights affects your daily life."

I hesitate to characterize the motives of a man completely unknown to me before and since his journalistic adventure in Human Events. But when he states that he now understands why his invitation to speak at the Girl Scout Council was withdrawn and hereafter advises all American mothers to discourage their girls from joining that organization until it * * * becomes what many think it is, a real American organization, it may fairly be said that he invites such characterization.

One wonders, not that his invitation to speak was withdrawn, but that it was ever extended.

He has done a terrible disservice to an organization with a long and notable record of character building in the best American tradition. He has frightened parents. He has alienated financial supporters of the Girl Scout organization. His words have been picked up by many speakers and writers who have come to regard Human Events as a dependable source of information and evaluation. Thus his original audience has been multiplied many times and in such diverse directions that the truth can never catch up with all who have been so badly and inexcusably misinformed.

His recklessness—is it stupid or cunning?—lends credence to the familiar chant of witch hunt and red herring and all the rest. Thus the whole movement to end subversion suffers a setback from this self-proclaimed dragon slayer.

Any thoughtful person will find a sentence here and there in the more than 500 pages of the Girl Scout Handbook with which he does not agree, or where he feels the emphasis is incorrectly placed or, perhaps, where even the subject matter is deemed inappropriate.

But to charge that its substance is dangerous, un-American, antitraditional, confirms one either a knave or a fool.

The Prevention of Juvenile Delinquency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 23, 1954

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to include herein a well considered and prepared informative address, in fact, a splendid address, The Prevention of Juvenile Delinquency—Affirmative Approach: The Building of Good Citizens, delivered by Hon. James P. McGranery at the opening of the Villanova University Institute on Youth, the Community, and the Law, on July 12, 1954.

Judge McGranery is one of the best qualified persons educationally as well as by experience, the latter, in particular, to discuss this delicate and trying and currently important subject.

In addition to his years of experience as an active lawyer, Jim McGranery gained invaluable practical experience as a distinguished Member of the National House of Representatives, later as judge of the United States district court for the eastern district of Pennsylvania, and later and until recently, in the very important position of the Attorney General of the United States.

The address follows:

THE PREVENTION OF JUVENILE DELINQUENCY—AFFIRMATIVE APPROACH: THE BUILDING OF GOOD CITIZENS

(Address by the Honorable James P. McGranery)

Father Chairman, Very Reverend Father Provincial, Very Reverend Dr. Hickey, Reverend Fathers, religious and brothers, lay members of the Villanova University summer school, friends, ever since the world began, the problem of guiding children in the way that they should go has confronted each successive adult generation. It is recognized almost as a truism that the child of today is the citizen of tomorrow. He is heir to the great traditions of the past and, at the same time, he is handicapped by the mistakes in thinking and acting of those who have made ready whatever home, community, or country is his.

In our present world, American children are fortunate to be reared in the part of the globe which is still free from the bondage of communism's encircling chains—in this Republic which was founded by men of religious convictions who recognized the dignity of each individual, his creation by God, his equality with all others in origin, nature, and destiny, and finally, his unalienable right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

If the ideals of the Founding Fathers were fully realized in the lives of today's citizens, every child would be given the necessary preparation for his future—in the world and in eternity: a period of preparation which would be the most wholesome and effective preventative of juvenile delinquency.

It may evidence temerity, perhaps, for me to state my own analysis of the preparation of the good citizen—to you, who are distinguished educators, scholars, and professional leaders of the social sciences, with years of successful experience in the education of youth, in the solution of juvenile problems. Nevertheless, in your graciousness, you have assembled at this institute on youth, the community and the law in Villanova University; and your presence is testimony to the wisdom of the president of the university, Father Donnellon, and the farsightedness of Dean Reuschlein of the Law School of Villanova University, in thus arranging discussions and the exchange of views on a problem, whose constructive solution is vital to the future of our country, to the world of today as well as tomorrow.

I am happy that our shared approach to the problem is an affirmative one. While I do not question the usefulness of the investigation by legislative and executive branches of our Government—National, State, and local—for these serve to alert the public to the existence of the problem of juvenile delinquency, and to its many contributing factors which must be remedied, nevertheless, the ultimate goal should be: Understanding and effective action to give to each child spiritual, mental, emotional, and physical security, enabling him to develop in accordance with the laws of his human destiny.

If parents are natural guardians and trustees of the child—then pastors, teachers, community leaders, and public officials share the duties of cotrustees. In the home, cradle of the family, the infant glimpses his first earthly vista, experiences the love and tenderness of father and mother, reaches for his first ball, shakes his first rattle. The lasting impressions of his earliest formative years are already his before the neighborhood, the community, the church, and the school can assume their joint but direct responsibility for training this citizen of the future.

No wonder, then, that the love of parents—manifested by the security of a mother's arms, the gentle discipline of a Christian household, the firm delight of a father's comradeship, can wisely inculcate first knowledge and love of God, and of his goodness as mirrored in the child's small world of the home. The spiritual motif of the family becomes the child's, gradually and naturally. Emphasis on the material, selfishness, harshness, indulgence, or confusion can, however, threaten the solid foundation of family life almost as much as squalor, starvation, and neglect.

In both may be traced community responsibility even though it is indirect. Just an there is a moral obligation to make available to the head of the family the means of earning a living wage, so there is a duty to make available housing within his purchasing power—where space and air, cleanliness and order will provide for the needs of growing children. The child whose first experience is in the fetid atmosphere of the crowded tenement, who must struggle with his brothers for the warmth of a ragged blanket, who is hungry more often than satisfied, begins his life with the uncertain status of a weed-choked flower. The child of parents who have absorbed the toxic atmosphere of materialism, whose mental nourishment is prepared in the pressure-cookers of Hollywood, whose religious life is nonexistent—is one almost as, or perhaps more, underprivileged.

The local and the national community alike must bear the onus for television, those magazines and those newspapers which contribute to the destruction of the mental health of parents, and render them unfit to perform the first happy duties of parenthood. Broken homes have long been recognized as contributing to the delinquency of children. The irreligious social forces which foster the breakup of these homes cannot be acquitted, however, in the recently popular indictment of delinquent parents.

Judge Alexander, of Toledo, Ohio, has observed: "The world is now full of people who have just discovered that juvenile delinquency is largely traceable to delinquent parents, and who would curb the former by punishing the latter." After a discussion of court action against runaway parents, vicious parents, aiders and abettors, triangular parents, and inadequate parents, his conclusion is that to punish parents who contribute to the delinquency of or neglect of their children accomplishes very few, if any, of the things claimed for it except revenge; that in some cases where the parent is refractory and resists the case-work approach, a certain amount of actual punishment may bring about cooperation; that in selected cases, where other methods have failed, prosecution and the threat of punishment, without actual punishment, are rather effective.

But punishing parents is no panacea.

Of course, it may be said that there is no panacea for any illness of man or of the body politic.

Preventative medicine is the most effective answer to illness, and preventative measures are the most reliable means for solution of the problem of juvenile delinquency.

If a child emerges from his home physically, mentally, and morally strong and fit to enter his preschool and school life, then an active partnership must be undertaken by parents, teachers, and community leaders to safeguard him in his broadening contacts with his playmates and fellow students.

The school will be his environment during the major portion of each day. The classroom which is crowded and ill ventilated provides a hazard, physical, emotional, and mental to student and teacher alike. A curriculum which does not give opportunity for directed and wisely supervised physical and social activity, is not well balanced. To provide physical and mental exercise and instruction, however, without also providing spiritual and religious interpretation of life is to fail in achieving the proper goal of education: The development of the whole person.

To say, as many do, that all religious instruction must come from the home or from Sunday school, is placing in an unnatural compartment the most vital truths that a child needs and hungers for. It is depriving him of knowledge concerning the reason for his existence. It is concealing from him the answer to his never-ending question: "Why?" It is refusing to him his first and his final incentive to do good and to resist evil.

"Incentives come from the soul's self,
The rest availeth not."

The poet said, but I doubt if he meant, that these must be ignored, and discussion of them constantly postponed until after school.

The child who loves God and learns about him is preparing to be a good citizen here and in eternity.

No community is fulfilling its responsibility to its children when it forbids the mention of God's name in its schools, or when it employs teachers whose loyalty is to the foreign ideology of godless communism. Parents who send their children to schools and colleges whose faculties are infiltrated by Communists, are reckless of their sacred trust.

The oath of allegiance, recently revised to recognize our Divine Creator, should keynote a return to spirituality—to religion in our schools and in all community action.

For the after-school hours and the out-of-school days present an equal challenge to the proper training of youth. Correctly supervised playgrounds and neighborhood centers provide opportunity for healthful activity and correct emphasis on the skills and talents that, when directed in the happy, American tradition, prepare youth to participate in democratic action according to the ideals of the founders of this Republic. The Boy Scouts, the Girl Scouts, religious-sponsored youth associations, and many other voluntary community organizations give to the growing girl and boy exercise in action of the fundamental American beliefs learned in the good school.

Parental supervision joined with such community activities lead the youth into fruitful channels where he is happier and more content than the lachstring child who wanders from poolroom to the purveyor of pornographic literature, to the seller of narcotics.

Recently it has been pointed out that the comics have exercised a vicious influence upon the children of today, far in excess of what has generally been recognized by parents or educators who failed to analyze the condensed crime and violence that they luridly illustrate.

The financial magnitude of the comics industry has enabled these books to circulate through tie-in sales to thousands and tens of thousands of newsstands and stores where children go to buy balls, bats, and dolls.

Action against this evil must be undertaken nationally, even though parents, meanwhile, should be alerted to the epidemic that threatens the mental attitudes of their children. In the same way, national action is needed to police the television industry which, in too many programs, glorifies crime and lawlessness, and presents gunplay as the most desirable of skills.

J. Edgar Hoover, whose name symbolizes the highest degree of patriotic devotion and alert citizenship, has wisely commented:

"Criminal behavior is learned behavior. The child and the adolescent are impressionable, and their active minds develop codes of morality no higher than those to which they are exposed. The environment which the adult community provides its growing children is the most important factor underlying the behavior patterns cultivated by the normal child."

A return to religion of today's adults, a reawakening to spirituality of the whole Nation will be the ultimate guaranty that tomorrow's citizens will live in accordance with American ideals—the ideals of a nation dedicated to God and the eternal principles of freedom and of the dignity of the individual.

Nevertheless, the problem of juvenile delinquency which is now confronting us, because of our failures of yesterday, must continue to be studied and a cure sought.

Since 1948, the volume and rate of juvenile delinquency has mounted in numbers and severity. Younger children in larger numbers are becoming involved in serious crime.

Nationwide juvenile delinquency as measured by offenders in juvenile courts, increased almost 30 percent between 1948 and 1952. During 1952, 37 percent of all persons arrested for robberies were under 21 years of age. This young age group accounted for 47 percent of all arrests made for larceny, 68 percent of those for auto theft, and 33 percent of all arrests for rape.

Mounting concern over juvenile delinquency has brought forth several national conferences, one congressional investigation, and many proposals for increased leadership on the part of the Federal Government in seeking a solution to the problem. Before considering specific proposals, it might be well to review, in their historical perspective, the present activities of the Federal Government in the general area of child welfare, with emphasis on juvenile delinquency.

Among social scientists today it is accepted that juvenile delinquency is the result of the interplay of many causes rather than the result of a single cause. It is not surprising, therefore, that many public agencies, at all levels of government, are concerned with delinquency control, treatment, and prevention. It is not surprising either, in the light of the historical development of the social welfare movement, that what was once primarily a function of State and local governments, has gradually become a matter of concern to the Federal Government. And as knowledge has increased, the emphasis has shifted from control through punishment to control through prevention and treatment.

ACTIVITIES AT THE FEDERAL LEVEL

Federal agencies directly concerned with juvenile delinquent behavior are the United States Children's Bureau in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; the Bureau of Prisons in the Department of Justice; and the United States probation system, in the administrative office of the United States courts. Indirectly, the National Institutes of Mental Health, the Public Health Service, the Office of Education, the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation, and the Federal Bureau of Investigation are also concerned with problems of juvenile delinquency.

In July 1952, the Federal activities were considerably expanded by the creation of a new, independent national agency, the special juvenile delinquency project. Housed in the Children's Bureau, it is, nevertheless, independent of the Bureau, receiving its support from foundations and individual donors.

The Bureau of Prisons, established in 1930, maintains several reformatories, camps, detention headquarters and correction institutions as well as two juvenile institutions. In 1952, 997 persons under the age of 18 were detained in these Federal institutions.

The administrative office of the United States courts, created in 1939, exercises general supervision over Federal probation officers. In spite of the general policy of Federal authorities to divert cases of children who have committed Federal offenses to the local juvenile courts, a considerable number of juvenile cases still come before Federal courts. In the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, 693 Federal juvenile offenders were placed on probation.

With this brief summary of Federal activities relating to juvenile delinquency, we may now consider recent proposals for increased Federal activity to curb juvenile delinquency.

SENATE INVESTIGATION OF JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

In response to increased public concern about the problem of juvenile delinquency, a resolution, jointly sponsored by Senators HENDRICKSON and KEFAUVER, was introduced and passed in the 1st session of the 83d Congress. The resolution called for a review of present Federal statutes dealing with youthful offenders, correctional action taken with respect to youthful delinquents by Federal courts, and a study of the extent to which juveniles are violating the narcotics laws. Hearings were begun in November 1953 and are still in progress. Many of the witnesses before the subcommittee expressed the belief that there is a lack of adequate national leadership in combatting juvenile delinquency. The concensus of opinion as to the kind of leadership the Federal Government can exercise in curbing juvenile delinquency points toward the establishment of a National Institute of Juvenile Delinquency.[1]

PROPOSALS TO REGULATE TRAFFIC IN NARCOTICS

One aspect of juvenile delinquency which has caused considerable alarm since World War II is that of juvenile narcotic addiction. In his testimony before the subcommittee, Commissioner Harry J. Anslinger of the Bureau of Narcotics made four specific recommendations:[2]

1. Heavier penalties for the seller of narcotics as distinguished from the addict.
2. Enactment of heavier penalty laws for the seller of narcotics by all States.
3. Addict commitment laws providing institutional treatment by all States.
4. Senate approval of protocol to limit the production of opium to the medical needs of the world.

PROPOSALS FOR UNIFORM STATE JUVENILE LAWS

One of the criticisms of our present handling of the juvenile-delinquency problem bears on the definition of a delinquent. Different States define the term differently. In most States, the delinquent statute has a dual nature in that it is concerned with (1) acts of the child against the community, and (2) acts of the child against himself (such as consorting with improper companions, using improper language etc.). Children in the latter category are often predelinquent and require different treatment than those in the first. The variation among State laws means that juvenile courts have difficulty in administering the laws and that all children are not treated alike. For these reasons several recommendations for the drafting of model legislation were proposed to the Senate subcommittee.

SECRETARY HOBBY'S CONFERENCE ON JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

Another recent forum which served to stimulate suggestions as to what the Federal Government should do in connection with the nationwide problem of juvenile delinquency was the conference on juvenile delinquency called by HEW Secretary Hobby (June 28–30, 1954).

The consensus of the conferees, as summarized by Bertram M. Beck, director of the special juvenile delinquency project, was that delinquency must be solved on the community level with Federal and State help. One group recommended the formation of a National Advisory Committee, representing public and private agencies and located in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Another group, presupposing the formation of such a committee, suggested that it contain three subcommittees—(1) service; (2) training; and (3) research—with an annual $3 million appropriation for personnel training alone.

Other groups emphasized the need for comprehensive research; increased grants for aid to dependent children; greatly enlarged school programs; collection of uniform delinquency statistics; a survey of the impact of television and comics on children; and special training of policemen who handle

---

Footnotes at end of speech.

juveniles. In general, these increased services would be financed through increased appropriations to the appropriate Federal agencies and through grants-in-aid to the States. Most of the work groups emphasized the need for more coordination and cooperation between all agencies dealing with juveniles.

CONCLUSION

Apparently there is general consensus throughout all levels of Government and among civic participation groups as to the need for increased Federal lederal leadership in the field of juvenile delinquency. At the same time, it is generally agreed that the primary responsibility in this area resides within State and local governments. The proper role of the Federal Government, as expressed in the Senate hearings and Secretary Hobby's national conference on juvenile delinquency, is not to take over that responsibility, but rather to provide needed resources and funds at the community level and to furnish leadership wherever possible.

And to this, I add my prayer: May such leadership ever reflect the spiritual ideals of this Nation which is dedicated to God and conceived in His eternal grant of freedom.

---

[1] U. S. Senate. Committee of the Judiciary. Juvenile delinquency. Interim Rept. No. 1064, 83d Cong. 3d sess., pp. 13–14.

[2] U. S. Congress. Committee on the Judiciary. Juvenile delinquency. Hearings before the subcommittee, 83d Cong., 1st sess., Washington, U. S. Government Printing Office, 1954, p. 178.

When an Industry Gets Sick, Business Can Be Good, Even Where Job Cuts Are Big

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. BONIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 26, 1954

Mr. BONIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to include the article which appeared in the U. S. News & World Report magazine for the week of July 23, 1954. The article is entitled "When an Industry Gets Sick, Business Can Be Good, Even Where Job Cuts Are Big."

The graph pictured in the article designated the hard coal area in Pennsylvania where unemployment has hit hardest. It shows the unemployment percentages as follows: Lackawanna County, 15 percent; Luzerne County, 16.1 percent; Northumberland County. 15.1 percent; Carbon County, 22.3; Schuylkill County, 20.3 percent.

The above-mentioned article follows:

WHEN AN INDUSTRY GETS SICK, BUSINESS CAN BE GOOD, EVEN WHERE JOB CUTS ARE BIG

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Is the hard-coal industry dying? Mines are closing, miners are out of work throughout northeast Pennsylvania. Yet no real depression is occurring. New industries are being developed. Anthracite operators, seeking new markets, talk of a comeback. Here is how one region manages to survive when its main industry falls into hard times.)

WILKES-BARRE.—In this five-county area of northeast Pennsylvania, one of the Nation's basic industries appears, outwardly, to be dying. This industry is hard-coal mining.

Anthracite, once considered essential for heating, has been slipping ever since the the 1920's, when natural gas and fuel oil began invading its markets. But now it is sinking fast. The industry, which, at its peak in World War I, employed 180,000 men, now provides work for only 34,000. Production, once 100 million tons a year, is down to 25 million tons.

Many question whether the anthracite industry, unless it finds new markets and undergoes drastic changes, can ever recover its former prosperity.

In the last 18 months, 67 mines or sections of mines have shut down, throwing 17,500 miners out of jobs. In all, 75,000 people—nearly 18 percent of the area's entire labor force—are out of work in the region shown by the map on this page. This region produces nearly all of the Nation's hard coal. It has become one of the country's worst pockets of unemployment.

Yet no real depression—as measured in terms of the 1930's—is occurring, even here. Almost normal life goes on. Shoppers throng the stores of Wilkes-Barre and Scranton. People go right on buying new cars, nearly as many as a year ago.

Savings, too, keep growing. Wilkes-Barre's banks and building and loan associations report a gain of $19 million in savings in the last 4 years.

Thousands of women, holding their jobs or acquiring new ones as their mining husbands are laid off, have helped sustain the area's economy.

Business, in general, holds up surprisingly well.

The big questions, though, concern the future.

Can hard coal make a comeback? If not, can this area find some other way to make a prosperous living?

The answers may emerge from plans just now getting underway. The outlook as viewed by those making the plans, is hopeful, though not rosy.

A quick comeback by coal is not foreseen, although operators hope to stabilize the industry soon, after the current sharp retrenchment is completed. Eventually, however, it is hoped that new markets for hard coal can be found, new processes for making it useful can be developed.

New industries, meantime, are being developed—not only as a temporary substitute, but as a long-range supplement for coal. Already these new industries are taking up some of the slack. They account, in part, for the strength that business is maintaining.

Scranton, leading the way in this direction, has acquired many new factories, mostly built by public subscription. It is after more. Wilkes-Barre and Hazleton have attracted manufacturers of electronics equipment, furniture, bedding, and shoes. Pittston, Pottsville, and Shamokin now are making similar bids for new factories.

The hope is that the economy of the entire area, once built almost entirely around coal, can be diversified. This, many feel, would assure the area's economic future, whether anthracite mining revives or dies.

This program of diversification, however, runs into difficulties. It will take a lot of new industry to make up for the recent loss of mining jobs. Fewer manufacturers than formerly are seeking new plant locations. Those who are, moreover, often employ mostly women, as in apparel and textile plants. This tendency to employ women already has given rise to complaints that "women work while men remain idle."

Temporarily, governmental program are helping cushion the shock. More than 52,000 laid-off workers are collecting unemployment benefits. Many oldsters are getting Federal and union retirement pensions. Here, the Nation is seeing a test of how such programs can help to avert a serious depression.

Special State and Federal projects to create temporary jobs also are being promoted. Some new highway construction is considered likely. A program for protecting mines from flooding may win Federal financing.

In the long run, however, many mine operators still pin their hopes on this area's major resource: hard coal.

The trouble now with hard coal is that it has lost its chief market. Once it was the Nation's primary fuel for space heating, used in millions of homes and office buildings. Now much of this is done by natural gas or fuel oil. The trend away from anthracite grew rapidly after World War II. Suddenly, hard-coal operators found themselves with more coal than they could sell. Operators, hoping for a revival in anthracite demand that never materialized, had delayed closing many inefficient mines that no longer were needed.

Finally, last year, producers decided something drastic had to be done. They began a big retrenchment program. The less productive and high-cost mines were closed. Production was shifted and concentrated into the most efficient mines. Operators are trimming costs, trying to stabilize their shrinking industry.

The results are to be seen on every hand. Idle coal breakers dot the countryside. There are empty stores on main streets, many vacant dwellings.

Towns such as Shamokin, Summit Hill, Coaldale, Nanticoke, Lansford, and Nesquehoning have very little other industry. Some of them are going steeply downhill. Population has dwindled. Tamaqua, hard hit by mine layoffs, also has lost its railroad shops. Mahanoy City, until recently, had three movie houses. Now it is down to one.

Hope for a comback by anthracite is based chiefly on the possibilities of finding new uses for it, new markets to replace the homes it used to heat. For some of these potential markets, the industry must change its product—hard coal must be converted into gases, or perhaps into liquid fuels.

One big potential, still in the research stage, lies in chemical uses of gases derived from anthracite. Projects under way contemplate conversion of coal into "synthesis" gas for making such things as ammonia, methanol and formaldehyde. Such a gas, or the methane that can be produced from anthracite by further processing, might also be used as a fuel, supplementing or competing with natural gas.

Synthetic gasoline can be made from hard coal, industry leaders say, at a cost only a little higher than gasoline from petroleum. Synthetic gasoline might become commercially profitable if the cost can be reduced a bit more, or if the need for it should become more urgent.

Another possibility lies in wider use of anthracite as industrial fuel. Factories and public utilities already buy about 30 percent of all anthracite. They take the small-sized, cheaper grades. To enlarge this market materially, the price of hard coal must be reduced. This seems to call for more mechanization, and some producers already are installing new machines.

Then, too, there is a prospect that anthracite may come into use as a subsitute for coke in the blast furnaces of the steel industry. Experiments in this direction are now getting under way, with hope for development of a new outlet.

Any or all of these potentialities will take considerable time to develop. But, in the minds of men who run the hardcoal industry, there is no doubt that some will prove out.

One anthracite executive summed up the outlook, as he sees it, this way:

"The hard-coal industry may change its form. But it won't die."

Strengthening the United Nations Organization and the Threat of Communist China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 26, 1954

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, the issue of Chinese representation in the United Nations organization has a direct and vital bearing upon the broader question of strengthening the United Nations through revision of the charter. The framers of the United Nations Charter wisely made provision under article 109 for the convening of a special conference for review of the charter if the member nations so desired. From present evidence that conference will probably be held within the next year or two. In anticipation of the revision conference the Senate, in July of last year, passed a resolution providing that a subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations make a full and complete study of proposals to amend, revise, or otherwise modify international security organizations. In September of last year the Secretary of State called for a broad public discussion on revision of the United Nations Charter, preliminary to the forthcoming conference. The Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee is preparing staff studies on many of the problems related to charter revision Hearings are being conducted in major cities throughout the United States.

We are informed that the American people—community organizations, service clubs, university groups, church bodies, professional groups, and private citizens in all walks of life—are inundating the subcommittee with correspondence and testimony. This evidence of a widespread interest in the United Nations is accompanied by realistic popular awareness that the charter is not an infallible instrument. It is recognized that the perfection of machinery for the settlement of international disputes and the maintenance of peace is an evolutionary process. The far-reaching search for means of strengthening the United Nations reflects not only evidence of inherent weakness in the present charter but a potential for strength which comes with experience and maturity.

It appears evident that such aspects of charter revision as relate to the composition and powers of the Security Council, the veto, and membership cannot be divorced from the question of representation of Communist China. More significantly, the issue of Communist Chinese representation brings into question the very purposes and principles on which the United Nations has been founded.

I call attention to charter revision since it is of profound concern to every American citizen, affecting as it does, the establishment of institutions which may preserve the peace long after the Chinese Communist regime is forgotten. Yet, the danger looms that in its present stage of development, the United Nations may be destroyed from within. While endeavoring to perfect the machinery of the United Nations, the organization is threatened, perhaps not so much by its structural frailties as by a possible compromise of the principles which provide the basis of its moral strength.

Notwithstanding mechanical failings, the United Nations will survive so long as a predominant will exists for the peaceful settlement of international conflicts and for the enforcement of collective action against those nations that violate the peace. However, the insinuations of a defiant, reckless, ambitious, and aggressive power into its midst, as a result of the abandonment of principle, would spell disintegration and perhaps even disaster for the United Nations.

If the strength of the United Nations depends upon the will for peace among its members and if the charter prescribes a willingness to carry out the obligations of the charter as a condition of admission of new members, by what reasoning can less strict criteria be applied to the admission of a new government to represent a state already a member? In the light of the standards of admission the exclusion of the Mao Tse-tung regime is predetermined by the very conduct of that regime. That conduct within China is documented in brainwashing, blood, starvation, forced labor, and the liquidation of literally millions of so-called counterrevolutionaries.

In its international conduct the Mao government has openly demonstrated its irresponsibility by renouncing and voiding the existing treaty and financial obligations of China. The normal and decent processes of diplomatic relations have been spurned. In attempting to qualify as a peace-loving state, willing to carry out the obligations of the charter, the regime defied the United Nations in its effort to repel aggression and to unify Korea. Chinese use of armed force was not only directed against the very society of nations the regime now aspires to join but was in defiance of purposes and principles which if sacrificed would mean the destruction of the United Nations itself. While inflicting this tragic misery the Mao regime demonstrated the depraved depths to which it could sink in atrocities committed against United Nations prisoners. It then attempted to camouflage its violation of international law by a coldly calculated propaganda tirade charging the United Nations command with the practice of germ warfare. In evidence of the sanctity in which this regime holds international accords, it has callously ignored its solemn acceptance of the restrictions imposed in the Korean armistice agreement. Until a solution is reached in Korea a de facto state of hostility exists between the United Nations and this regime.

Since the case against Chinese Communist representation in the United Nations is clearly grounded on the inability of that government to meet the admission tests of the Charter, there is little to be gained in rationalizations of expediency. To cast the question in the light of a possible relaxation of tensions in the East-West conflict or in the cold war or in terms of the advantages of resumed trade or even in the context of the free world versus communism, is to obscure the central issue, namely, the fact that the regime by its demonstrated actions does not meet the test for admission. To place the issue in the context of worldwide political considerations rather than on the concise basis of nonqualification might lead to the sacrifice of moral principle to Machiavellian intrigue.

The Chinese Communist government says in effect: either we are admitted to the United Nations or we continue to threaten Korea; threaten Indochina and southeast Asia; threaten Formosa; continue to foment separatist movements; continue to ignore the sanctity of treaties and the sanctity of territorial boundaries; and continue to hold United States citizens in confinement as hostages. For the United Nations to capitulate to this international blackmail would be for the forces of law and order to capitulate to the gangster. It would condone the behavior of a regime which has been an object of United Nations collective action. It would mean surrender to the evils of sponsored aggression and international anarchy. It would be the extinction of that great intangible moral force which is the strength of the United Nations. While striving to strengthen and perfect the autonomy of the United Nations we can ill afford, in the interest of expediency, to barter away through the admission of Red China those principles which are its very lifeblood.

Blunt Facts Concerning the Plight of the Soft-Coal Industry in Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 26, 1954

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the following address, delivered by Robert T. Laing, executive director of the Central Pennsylvania Coal Producers Association, Altoona, Pa., reveals the plight of the soft-coal industry in the Keystone State.

The address follows:

> There are 29 counties in Pennsylvania that produce bituminous coal. These counties have a population of 4 million and contain 23,000 square miles. In many of the areas, coal mining is the basic industry and chief source of employment and livelihood. Pennsylvania has produced coal continuously since the latter part of the 18th century.
>
> The bituminous coal fields of the State have many seams that vary in thickness from inches to 9 feet. The coal is very versatile in character and can meet the demands of any type of consumer. According to geological surveys, there is sufficient recoverable coal in the State to last, at the present rate of production, for 440 years.
>
> Until comparatively recent times the coal was recovered exclusively by the deep-mine

method. With the advent of World War II there was a sudden demand for great quantities of solid fuel and surface mining came into being on a large scale. This type of mining has had a phenomenal growth, and in the month of May this year accounted for 25 percent of the State production. Although by far the greatest percentage of the available coal at the present time is classified as deep mine, we hesitate to speculate on the extent to which surface mining can go. At the present time there are instances where 90 feet of cover is being removed to recover 36 inches of coal. Earth-moving equipment with great efficiency is constantly being produced. As this equipment is developed, the horizons of surface mining are extended. Because this coal lies so near the surface, it cannot be recovered by the deep-mine method.

Similar improvement in mining equipment has taken place in deep mines. In the last few years, mine operators have invested millions of dollars modernizing their plants in order to mine and prepare a product to satisfy the most discriminate users of solid fuels.

Despite the fact that we have done everything humanly possible to mine and market a high quality product, we have seen our tonnage and personnel decline steadily over the last 10 years. We have studied the number of captive and commercial mines and their tonnage; also, the number of active mines operating during the last 10 years, together with number of commercial and captive employees.

All of these items, you will note, indicate a general decline. This tremendous decline in tonnage has not only placed the investment of our operators in jeopardy but has also inflicted a terrific economic burden upon thousands of employees and their families, as well as to related industries such as railroads and small business enterprises that depend upon the economic well-being of the coal industry for survival. To cite a current example of the condition in our State, since January 1, 1953, 156 mines have closed, resulting in unemployment of 10,896 men. Besides this, curtailment has caused the dismissal of 5,351 more miners, making a total of 16,247 men thrown out of work.

We also studied the maximum capacity of our mines. This study is based on 3 shifts a day, 6 days a week, for 300 days per year, with the working personnel for each year. You will notice that our maximum capacity for 1943 was 119,004,000 tons and that of 1953, 94,556,000 tons. This decline in potential maximum is due to the closing of many mines and reduction in personnel. As will be pointed out later, it would be very difficult to increase this maximum on short notice.

Several factors have contributed to the decline in production and consumption of coal. Some of these are local in character, some national and some international. Perhaps the most acute problem facing the industry in Pennsylvania at the present time is the competition from imported residual oil. Most of this oil comes into this country from Venezuela and is marketed on the eastern seaboard which is the natural market, because of geography, for Pennsylvania coal. In the year 1953 this imported residual oil displaced 32,687,545 net tons of coal. The importation of residual oil not only hurts the coal industry but has an adverse effect upon domestic producers of crude oil.

Another factor that has greatly influenced the decline in production and consumption of bitminous coal has been the tremendous growth of the natural-gas industry. Although there are large gas fields in our Pennsylvania area, by far the greatest amount of gas being consumed in the area comes to us from the gas wells of the Southwest. There has been a tremendous conversion in the domestic field from coal to gas, but the most damaging impact is when industries convert from coal to gas.

Another factor in the decline in production and consumption of coal has been the dieselization of coal railroads. At one time the railroads were the largest users of bituminous coal. Their consumption has fallen from a peak of 134 million tons in 1944 to 28 million tons in 1953.

Another factor in the decline in production in Pennsylvania has been the competition from coal from the high-seam, low-cost areas in neighboring States. Great quantities of this coal are being burned on the eastern seaboard, a substantial amount of which is being burned in our own Pennsylvania industries.

The authorization of hydroelectric-power generation plants by the Federal and State Governments also has adversely affected the coal industry. Just recently the Congress of the United States approved the St. Lawrence seaway and the New York State Power Authority was given the right to construct hydroelectric plants. This, of course, means that coal will be replaced by hydroelectric power and all the Great Lakes area will be opened up for commerce from foreign countries, some of which undoubtedly will be residual oil.

Coal has declined steadily since 1920, while petroleum, natural gas, and hydroelectric power have gained.

Although the impact to the coal industry and the people employed therein is disheartening and devastating, there are other aspects of the situation that should give your commission and all others concerned with our fuel policy grave concern. I refer to the consequences that would result should this Nation become involved in another world struggle.

Fuel is one of the first essentials in times of emergency. In 1914 when World War I began, the mineral-energy supply in the United States was 16,290 billion B. t. u.'s. Four years later when we entered the war, the demand had increased to 21,449 billion B. t. u.'s, or an increase of 31.7 percent. In 1939, when World War II began, our supply of B. t. u.'s was 22,683 billion, and by 1941, when we entered the war, the demand had increased to 33,176 billion, or an increase of 46.3 percent. Based on this experience, we can safely predict an increase in demand of 75 percent, or about 65 trillion B. t. u.'s, should we become involved in an international struggle.

Between 1914 and 1918 the coal industry increased its production from 422 million to 579 million tons, or 37 percent. Between 1939 and 1944 the tonnage was increased from 394 million to 619 million, or 57 percent. Economists and fuel engineers tell us that in the event of a national emergency the coal industry would be called upon to produce 1 billion tons of coal per year. In the face of the current condition in the coal industry, this task would be nigh impossible because:

The hundreds of mines that have been closed are not easily reopened. When a mine is closed the equipment is removed. It fills up with water, the roof caves in, and is, for practical purposes, useless. The Nation not only loses a source of fuel, but millions of tons of valuable natural resources are lost forever. It takes just as much time, effort, and capital to open an old mine as to start a new one. Time would be an important factor. It takes many months to get a new operation into quantity production.

Manpower would be unavailable. Labor from mines that have closed has migrated to other industries. This is especially true of the young men. Many of the old men have remained in the communities because they could not get other employment. Mining today, in the modern, mechanized mines, is essentially a young man's job. Gone are the days when a pick and shovel were the only essential tools. The complexity of modern underground machinery requires keen, alert, well-trained young men.

During World War II the coal from deep mines was supplemented by 125 million tons of strip coal per year. Most of this coal was taken from the crop line and was easy to get. That source no longer exists.

Because of the decline in the coal industry the railroads have not kept their facilities ready to meet emergencies. Our transportation agencies would have a difficult time hauling the coal even if it would be produced.

We have tried to point out in this discussion what we believe to be the important factors which adversely affect the coal industry. We have been aware of these ills for some time and the entire industry has been concentrating on cures. Some of the avenues which have been explored are as follows:

Restrict the importation of residual oil.

Protect coal from the inroads made by natural gas, with the thought in mind that both oil and gas are critical fuels and in much less supply than coal and would therefore, be vary, very valuable in time of war.

Require the use of coal, where available and suitable, in Government buildings.

Investigate methods to reduce freight rates on coal. In many instances the freight rate approximates the value of the coal.

Encourage and promote, as far as possible, extensive and intensive research to discover better methods of recovery, more uses and more efficient methods to use coal.

Examine the tax structure affecting the coal industry with the thought in mind of giving encouragement to the industry.

We do not know how many of these suggestions might come within the scope of the Pennsylvania joint State government commission or the Pennsylvania legislature. They are given to you for your thinking and to form the basis, perhaps, for some further exploration.

Flood Control for St. Louis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 26, 1954

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, last Friday morning I went over to the Senate Public Works Committee to urge approval of the proposal of the Army engineers for a $112,880,000 project for the protection of St. Louis against floods. Because of the all-night session of the Senate the night before, the hearing did not go on as scheduled, so I was not able to appear in person, but I did file my statement, and, under unanimous consent, insert it in the Appendix of the Congressional Record, as follows:

Testimony by Hon. Leonor K. Sullivan, of Missouri, Before Senate Public Works Committee on Matter of Flood Control for St. Louis in Omnibus Flood-Control Bill, Friday, July 23, 1954

Mr. Chairman and Senators, the witnesses who are scheduled to appear here today on the matter of flood control for St. Louis are much better equipped than I to give you all of the facts on the technical aspects of our project for the protection of St. Louis. For that reason, I am not going to pose as an expert witness on this, except to say that I do consider myself something of an expert on the human aspects of this problem—the suffering and destruction to property and the dangers to health resulting from these periodic floods. They can be prevented, and I urge this committee to help us to prevent them by approving inclusion of the St. Louis project in the omnibus bill.

As the Members may know, I introduced a bill in the House—similar to Senator HENNINGS' bill over here—to authorize the St. Louis project at an estimated cost of $112,880,000. It was because of the time element—and only because of that—that I could not attempt to have the St. Louis project included in the omnibus bill which was reported out by the House Public Works Committee. The necessary administrative action within the Corps of Engineers, the Department of the Army, and the State and local agencies involved, had not been completed in time for me to seek to have it included in the House omnibus measure.

Consequently, I am very grateful that this committee of the Senate is taking up the matter, and I am here to thank you for that and to urge favorable action. As I said, other witnesses can provide you all the technical detail, so I will not repeat any of that. I have brough with me copies of my bill, H. R. 9378, which I submit to you for any assistance the language of the bill may be to your committee in incorporating these provisions into the omnibus bill.

Again I want to say I appreciate your action in scheduling this matter for hearing. I want to assure you we in St. Louis are solidly behind the project. If it is included in the omnibus authorization bill this year, it will make it possible for us in succeeding years to press for the necessary appropriations to get the work under way.

Every citizen of St. Louis who has experienced the scourge of floods first hand will be eternally grateful for favorable action on this matter, and, believe me, I will be, too.

Upper Colorado Political Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 23, 1954

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, when it comes to water—the cornerstone of California's past, present, and future economy—the administration has let us down with a loud splash.

From the President down they have been beating the political drums for the gigantic upper Colorado River project which would seriously damage our vital supply of water from the lower Colorado.

In addition to depriving California of an immense amount of Colorado River water, to which we have contract rights, this upper Colorado River project would cost the taxpayers of California more than $93 million.

It would cost the Nation's taxpayers more than a billion.

But how much would it cost the taxpayers of the States which would supposedly benefit from it? Those States are Utah, Wyoming, and Colorado. It would cost the taxpayers of those 3 States about $15 million.

These are not my figures. They are based on reports from the most reputable organizations, such as the Tax Foundation, the National Council of Taxpayer Executives, and testimony of expert witnesses before the House Interior Committee.

As a member of the committee, although anxious to foster scund development of the upper Colorado Basin, I found it necessary to vote against the administration proposal. It passed out of the committee by a vote of 13 to 12, largely because some Republican members cast aside their loudly proclaimed program of economy in favor of pork-barrel politics.

Disregarding California's welfare, and disregarding the taxpayers, Republican politicos obviously decided to take up the cudgels for the upper Colorado project to make the West believe they were great advocates of reclamation. High-powered strategists of the administration evidently bulldozed the Budget Bureau and the White House advisers into going along with them. It appears that the high-level political staff of the administration does not know much about western water problems. And after examining their actions of the past few months, it is apparent they do not care to learn.

The upper Colorado project is the most infeasible, costly, and impractical water and power scheme ever concocted by a Federal Bureau. It is a magnificent example of a purely political project.

If this gigantic farce were ever approved by Congress it would inflict on the American public a catastrophic burden. It would probably mean the end of all reclamation development.

The Republican strategists thought they could put this political project over, and they are still trying to do it. But they have learned that the road they selected contains some pitfalls, and they now appear somewhat hesitant in moving ahead.

Let us see what has happened since the GOP deep thinkers launched the upper Colorado scheme.

First, they adopted the project as part of their program. Now a President has inumerable duties and obligations. He cannot be an expert on every matter put before him. So he must rely on his White House and department advisers. That is what Mr. Eisenhower did. He most certainly took the word of assistants and department heads that the upper Colorado project was a necessary, sound project, and on March 20, 1954, issued a statement in which he said:

> The development will conserve water * * *. It will develop much-needed electric power * * *. The development calls for sound financing.

Mr. Eisenhower was misled by men influencing the course of this country and responsible for its welfare.

Shall it be said that the men advising the President did not know what they were doing? No, they knew. They knew that the upper Colorado project was nothing more than a political water project, that it could not pay out ever, that there was no market in the area for the power, that it would inflict on the taxpayers an unjustifiable load.

But the die had been cast, and the Republican machine was ordered to support the project before the public and in Congress. Secretary of the Interior McKay was appointed generalissimo, and he carried out his orders.

In May, Secretary McKay told the National Rivers and Harbors Congress in Washington that by supporting the upper Colorado project—

> In the first months of its incumbency this administration has provided concrete demonstrations of its determination to carry out the full responsibilities of the Federal Government with respect to water resources development.

Again in May, Mr. McKay told a $100-a-plate Republican dinner in Salt Lake City:

> Let me cite the Colorado River storage project as a specific example of the type of development which we vigorously support.

There we have the Republican leadership firmly on record supporting a project that will cost the taxpayers of California more than $93 million, and the taxpayers of the Nation more than a billion dollars.

There we have the Republicans on one hand proposing a gigantic, costly, totally unworkable project to bring in more highly subsidized acreage, while on the other hand the Secretary of Agriculture is cutting agricultural acreage.

Behind the Republican campaign for the upper Colorado project is a purely political motive. They are disregarding the economic welfare of both California and the Nation. They are thinking only in terms of the elections in the upper Colorado States.

The Republican support of the upper Colorado project is a move of desperation. To maintain political ground they are in danger of losing, they are willing to sacrifice sound economy and good government. Someone should get all the facts to the President and slow down his "politics at any price" strategists who have sold him a bill of goods. Evidently he listened to some tall fish tales during his Colorado vacation.

Diseased and "Needled" Poultry Endanger and Cheat the Public, and Other Rackets Flourish in Foods, Drugs, and Cosmetics, as Food and Drug Administration Appropriation Again Is Cut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 26, 1954

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I hope that many Members of the Congress, and also officials of the administration, particularly those with policymaking responsibilities in the field of health and welfare, read the excellent article in the Washington Evening Star on Wednesday, July 21, dealing with the Food and Drug Administration of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The article was entitled "Food and Drug Watchdogs Face Work With Less Funds."

I have tried during my tenure in the Congress to keep abreast of the work of the Food and Drug Administration and to do what I can to assure it adequate authority to do the work we expect of it, and also adequate funds. Last year, as a result of the Supreme Court decision, a loophole was disclosed in the basic authority of the Food and Drug Administration which prohibited inspectors of the agency to gain admission to factories preparing food, drug, or cosmetics preprarations, except on the invitation of the operators of those factories. We succeeded in closing that loophole in the legislation. It was a great victory for the consumer, for it restored the right of our Government to inspect the conditions under which these products are prepared and processed, and to act against insanitary conditions threatening the health of the public.

The fact remains, however, that the Food and Drug Administration has not been getting adequate funds to enable it to make the number of inspections it should make each year in preventing products which are dangerous to health, or which are fraudulently packaged, from getting into interstate commerce. The administration this year asked for only $5,200,000 for the appropriation of the Food and Drug Administration, as against the $5,600,000 appropriated under the Truman administration. The Congress then cut the administration's request by another $100,000, leaving the Food and Drug Administration only $5,100,000. That means a cut in the staff of this very essential Government agency by about 11 percent since 1952. Considering the work which the Food and Drug Administration does for all the people of the United States by seeking to eliminate poisoned, or adulterated, or mislabeled foods, drugs, and cosmetics from being sold to the public, I think this was one of the most shortsighted cuts ever made in an appropriation.

THE DISEASED POULTRY SITUATION

The work of the Food and Drug Administration has come in for renewed attention in recent months as a result of disclosures dealing with the sale in interstate commerce of diseased poultry and of frozen poultry which has been fraudulently weighted with water prior to freezing. Estimates on the extent of this dangerous and immoral racket have varied, but all the facts indicate that it has been an extensive problem. With its cut in funds in both last year's appropriation, and this year's the Food and Drug Administration has had to cut its enforcement work in this field by about 30 percent.

Following disclosures of this diseased poultry racket, I wrote last month to Mr. Charles W. Crawford, Commissioner of the Food and Drug Administration, asking for full information on the work of the FDA to protect the consumer against the sale of this diseased poultry, the time devoted to this work, the number of poultry processors in the country doing interstate business, the frequency with which they are inspected, etc. I also asked for any information he might have indicating transmission of diseases to humans as a result of the processing or consumption of diseased poultry. His reply, I believe, will be of extreme interest to every Member of the Congress concerned about protecting the health of the people of the United States and protecting them against fraud.

With the unanimous consent of the House, Mr. Speaker, I include as part of my remarks the article Food and Drug Watchdogs Face Work With Less Funds, from the Washington Evening Star of July 21, and also an exchange of correspondence between myself and Commissioner Crawford, of the Food and Drug Administration, as follows:

[From the Washington Star of July 21, 1954]

Food and Drug Watchdogs Face Work With Less Funds

Housewives might do well to provide themselves with scales to check the weight of packages of food they buy.

They would thus be taking over part of the work of the Food and Drug Administration. But that agency, its budget cut and its staff reduced, has assigned a low priority to the checking of the net weight of packaged food against the statement of weight on the label.

Wallace F. Janssen, assistant to the Commissioner of the Food and Drug Administration, said he does not believe the housewife would find many packages not full weight. But it would provide a check the Administration is not able to make.

The budget of the agency has been trimmed steadily in the last 4 years. For fiscal 1952 Congress appropriated $5.64 million. The next year the appropriation was $5.6 million. Last year it was $5.2 million, and for this fiscal year, 1955, it is $5.1 million.

ELEVEN PERCENT CUT SINCE 1952

The estimated number of the staff for this year is 815, an 11 percent reduction since 1952. That number includes laboratory scientists, administrators, clerical workers and, finally, the front line troops, the inspectors.

There were only 230 inspectors in 1950. Last year the number was 195. These figures leave out about 170 persons employed in testing certain products as they are produced, with the manufacturer paying the salaries through fees.

The head of the Food and Drug Administration is Charles W. Crawford, a career man with 37 years' experience. He has applied for retirement.

The staff cuts have led the Agency to the conclusion that it is more important to direct its efforts toward activities that protect health rather than those that protect the pocketbook. Therefore, it has assigned lower priorities on checking weights of packaged goods, checking the contents of cans and packages to make sure their composition is what the label says, and proceeding against those who make extravagant claims for products unless danger to health is involved.

Occasional cases on these grounds are made, it is true, but usually they are incidental to other activities.

The Agency admits frankly it would take 200 inspectors 12½ years to make inspections of each of the 96,000 food and drug company plants and warehouses. Last year 8,650 plants and warehouses were inspected.

LACKS FOLLOWUP FACILITIES

While the Agency is alert to cases in which public health is involved, it says it lacks the facilities to keep up with the testing of new products and materials which are being developed in increasing numbers. It cannot make followup investigations of the safety of new drugs after they are placed on the market. Important cases involving serious frauds have been delayed by a lack of medical and legal manpower.

The Agency does continue to seize contaminated and spoiled foods in large amounts. It goes after medical devices and products which make false claims. It prosecutes druggists who sell barbiturates and other prescription drugs without a physician's prescription.

After coffee prices went up the Agency decided it should check attempts by unethical dealers to take advantages of the higher prices. It seized a number of consignments of coffee.

It was learned that chickpeas, imported for canning, had become infested with insects. The chickpeas were diverted to coffee roasters. Coffee shipped by some firms were found to contain, in addition to the chickpeas, spent coffee grounds, barley, chicory, and soybeans.

FROZEN FOOD ADDS WORK

The expanding market for frozen foods has added to the Administration's work. One plant producing frozen turkeys was found to operate with a water hose having a hypodermic needle as a nozzle. Water was injected into the turkeys before they were frozen.

When one turkey was thawed 2 pounds of water seeped out. It was part of a lot of turkeys weighing 50,000 pounds. Taking the average weight of a turkey at 15 pounds, allowing for 1 pound of water per bird and taking the price at 75 cents a pound, the buyers were thus paying $2,500 for 3,300 pounds of water.

MAY BE POLITICAL APPOINTEE

With the retirement of Mr. Crawford pending, the agency has this question:

Will the new Administrator be a professional man, perhaps trained in the agency, or a person from some other category whose appointment is cleared with the Republican National Committee?

When the Eisenhower administration directed that Government policymaking jobs be listed and that they be taken from under civil-service coverage, various trade associations in the food and drugs fields urged that politics be kept out of the Food and Drug Administration. Mr. Crawford was not replaced.

With the prospect of his retirement the requests are being repeated. Carlos E. Campbell, secretary of the National Canners Association, said his organization has urged that the appointment be kept in the professional category. Other organizations have done the same.

JUNE 15, 1954.

Mr. CHARLES W. CRAWFORD,
Commissioner, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CRAWFORD: In view of the recent publicity given the sale of diseased poultry and the action of the AFL Meatcutters Union to try to bring about legislation to protect the American consumer against this menace, I would appreciate your sending me a statement on what the FDA is doing and intends to do to correct this situation. I would specifically like to have answers to the following questions, as well as any other information you can properly send me in connection with this problem.

What does the FDA do to protect the consumer against the sale of diseased poultry?

How much time is devoted to the inspection of that one particular item?

Are there any diseases of poultry that can be transmitted to humans through the consumption of diseased poultry being put up for sale?

If so, do you know of any instances where diseases of poultry have been transmitted to humans?

Do you know how many poultry processors there are in the country that do interstate business?

How often does the FDA inspect them?

I would appreciate it if you would send me your reply to these questions in quadruplicate.

Sincerely yours,
Mrs. John B. (Leonor) Sullivan,
Member of Congress.

Department of Health,
Education, and Welfare,
Food and Drug Administration,
Washington, D. C., June 23, 1954.

Hon. Leonor Sullivan,
House of Representatives:

Dear Mrs. Sullivan: We have your letter of June 15 in which you ask several questions concerning our enforcement program on diseased poultry. We are answering your questions in the order in which you have asked them.

Under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, a food is deemed to be adulterated if it is the product of a diseased animal or of an animal which died otherwise than by slaughter. This section of the act takes into account the basic objections of the consumer to the diseased product, whether or not actual danger to health can be demonstrated.

We have a carefully planned enforcement program under this section of the law, which includes inspection of poultry dressing and eviscerating plants and of other poultry processors, and sampling surveys in consumer markets to find diseased or otherwise unfit poultry. Under this program for fiscal 1953 and the first 11 months of fiscal 1954, we approved 106 seizure actions for the removal of unfit birds from the market, of which 64 actions included charges that the article was in whole or in part the product of a diseased animal. During the same period we also approved 33 criminal actions, 22 of which involved diseased poultry.

During fiscal 1953 we devoted 10 man-years to the poultry project, of which the work on diseased poultry is a part, along with work on filthy, decomposed or otherwise unfit poultry and poultry which has been "needled" or otherwise fraudulently watered to increase its weight. During fiscal 1954 this work has necessarily been reduced. We estimate, based on reports for the first 3 quarters, that 7 man-years will have been expended this year on this project.

The question of whether poultry diseases may be transmitted to man through the sale of diseased poultry cannot be answered with assurance. It is well established that certain poultry diseases are transmissible to man. These would include, for instance, psittacosis (parrot fever) and Newcastle disease. However, outbreaks of these diseases, so far as we know, have occurred only among persons handling live poultry or working in poultry dressing establishments. We do not know of any instances in which it has been proved that a specific disease was contracted through the consumption or preparation in the kitchen of a diseased bird. On the other hand, the possibility cannot be ruled out.

Several outbreaks of psittacosis have occurred recently among workers in turkey processing plants in Texas. In cooperation with the Public Health Service of this Department, we are currently investigating these outbreaks to determine whether diseased birds have been shipped in interstate commerce and the degree of hazard, if any, to the purchaser of such birds.

There is another group of diseases common to poultry and to man and apparently caused by the same disease organism in both, in which definite transmission has not been established. However, it is believed that poultry may at least serve as a reservoir of human infection by routes still unknown. Certain types of encephalitis and meningitis, pseudotuberculosis, and pasturella infections are in this group.

In a closely related category are the food-poisoning illnesses—salmonellosis and gastroenteritis—which are attributed to poultry and poultry products or in which such products are suspected as the vehicle of infection. Poultry which are actively infected with salmonella or which are carriers of the organisms, though apparently not diseased in the ordinary sense, undoubtedly are involved in many of these instances, and fecal contamination during processing may be a factor. For your further information on this phase of your inquiry, we are enclosing a mimeograph entitled "Poultry Diseases Transmissible to Man—Including Summary Report of Outbreaks," prepared by the Communicable Disease Center of the Public Health Service.

We estimate that there are approximately 1,300 interstate poultry dressing, freezing, or canning establishments in the United States. For the past 2 years we have made about 400 poultry-establishment inspections each year, of which we estimate that perhaps one-fourth represent reinspections of the same firms. Thus our program contemplates complete coverage of this industry about once every 3 or 4 years.

If we can be of further service, please do not hesitate to let us know.

Sincerely yours,
C. W. Crawford,
Commissioner of Food and Drugs.

Grim Advantages in the Indochina Disaster

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, July 26, 1954

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an article entitled "Adversity and Its Grim Uses," written by C. P. Ives, and published in the Baltimore Sun of Monday, July 26, 1954.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Adversity and Its Grim Uses

(By C. P. Ives)

There are grim advantages in the Indochina disaster which should not be overlooked: (1) Indochina may result in more unanimity on foreign policy within the United States; (2) Indochina may result in more awareness in Asia of what communism is really like.

In the United States, remember what the big split on foreign policy has been. It reached its climax in the debate on the Marshall plan. The losing side in that debate was led by the late Senator Taft.

The core of the Taft position on foreign aid he put as follows: "I did not think we should force our assistance on any nation which does not really wish to arm itself." This was a way of stating the belief that to be saved from communism a man or a nation must begin by disliking communism and liking its opposite.

There was a corollary to this reasoning. Men who really were against communism would fight it with a minimum of foreign aid. Certainly they would not wait to fight until foreigners lifted their living standards for them. And if foreigners lifted their living standards before they had made up their minds about communism, they might never make up their minds.

In the debate on Marshall aid and the North Atlantic Treaty few people questioned the theoretical validity of Mr. Taft's arguments. The anti-Taft people simply denied that the Taft arguments applied to Europe.

But there may be less dispute about the applicability of these rules to the Asian problem. Mr. Eden himself, who resembles Mr. Taft in few other ways, has already warned the West that Asia must cooperate in its salvation.

That is the reason why Mr. Eden is insisting, very wisely, that so far as possible the Colombo powers—India, Burma, Ceylon, Indonesia, Pakistan—be associated with the anti-Communist plans in Asia.

As for the second half of the Taft position, it has just received an eloquent and nobly heightened restatement by a distinguished Asian personage, the Prime Minister of Pakistan. "It is not material poverty but spiritual and moral poverty that breeds communism," said Mohammed Ali.

And then he pointed to some of the European countries which used to trouble Mr. Taft. "They have a higher standard of living," said Mr. Ali, "but communism is on the march. In the Moslem world, where the standard of living is below normal, we have no communism (which may be an overstatement—CPI) because we are spiritually and morally rich. * * *"

But if men as diverse as Eden and Ali take positions now much like the positions urged in the original foreign-aid debates by the side that lost the argument, certain things follow. For the side that won the argument is properly respectful of such foreign statesmen as Eden and Ali.

Certainly the Eisenhower administration shows such respect. When its European and Asian associates declined its proposal for last-minute military measures in Indochina, the Eisenhower people drew back.

In a recent press conference Mr. Dulles suggested that a people's wish to be saved from communism was an important ingredient in projects for its rescue. On such foreign-policy principles for Asia there will be wide unanimity in America.

And Indochina may prove to have had an equally useful effect on opinion in the Orient. For it may yet demonstrate to many Asian leaders what Chinese and Communist imperialism is really like.

We have to remember that in Asia the West is dealing not directly with the unlettered masses who take little part in affairs but with a minority of leaders. Many of these leaders have been educated in western universities.

But, says Ambassador Charles Malik, of the West Asian republic of Lebanon, "* * * the state of mind of Asia's intellectuals today is not a happy commentary on the West's influence to date. Many of them, after devoting years to learning in European or American universities, returned to Asia afflicted with a great intellectual restlessness. Some of these sincerely thought they found solace only in Marxism * * *."

Now such men, educated in the pragmatism and positivism typical of some of the western universities would resemble western liberals in being incapable of sensing the reality of communism until it forced itself upon them by betrayal and conquest.

It cost the free world a dozen countries and some millions of population to educate the western liberals on the reality of communism. The point is that Indochina may yet have educational effect on the Asian liberals.

Writing in another connection, and, indeed, before the Geneva meeting, Dr. Crane Brinton, of Harvard, put the thing this way: "* * * The fact, now patent even to liberals at home in the West, [is] beginning to be apparent to some of those curious mirror-images of western liberals who hold power in countries like India, that for 'undeveloped' peoples all over the world the alternative to western imperialism is not in fact complete independence from the West but Russian imperialism."

Contributions by America's Negro Citizens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, July 26, 1954

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, as chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and as an individual American interested in fair play, I was pleased to see in yesterday's July 25 issue of the Milwaukee Journal an article describing the increasing extent to which America's Negro citizens are participating in our overseas diplomatic corps.

Their very presence gives the lie to the Soviet slanders against racial relations in our country.

I believe that the Eisenhower administration is to be congratulated on the tremendous progress which has been achieved under it in assuring a square deal—in action, not merely in words—for the tenth of our Nation which is Negro.

Wholly aside, however, from the intensive progress which has been made under the current administration, the fact of the matter is that America's colored population is rightly coming into its own.

In every field of endeavor—in business, labor, the arts, science, education, the professions, the armed services, law enforcement—our Negro citizens are rising in accordance with their talents and abilities, as they have every God-given right to.

I am particularly gratified that our Government is taking increasing advantage of the vast reservoir of talent which had for so long been relatively untapped, and that able colored citizens are serving in important United States capacities, from the staff of the White House, throughout the staffs of other key Federal units.

The racial problem in the United States has a long, complex, and often painful history. It will not be solved overnight. There are many gaps and flaws, but much progress has been made in a fair, commonsense solution in the American manner and more progress will and must be made.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the Milwaukee Journal article be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

MORE NEGROES SERVE UNITED STATES IN POSTS ABROAD

(By George Schuyler)

New York, N. Y.—An American who recently girdled the globe by airplane, stopping off at dozens of spots in Asia and Europe, was impressed by the number and high caliber of the Negro personnel representing us abroad.

In Afghanistan the traveler found a Delaware Negro heading the United States educational mission. In India an expert from Georgia was not only teaching farmers of that caste-ridden country to improve agricultural methods but by his very presence offsetting what Red propaganda said about America's race problem.

In Jordan a colored New Yorker is field engineer aiding the rehabilitation program. In Europe a Negro who is a former newspaperman is channeling information to and from the entire organized labor movement outside the Iron Curtain, and a Mississippi-born Negro alumnus of Columbia University is directing all United States branch libraries in France.

MOCKS RUSS PROPAGANDA

Negro consular agents and employees were once buried in 3 or 4 obscure tropical ports. They are now encountered in Geneva, Marseilles, Paris, Ottawa, London, and Belgrade, where their mere presence mocks Moscow propaganda about the debased American racial minority.

When in mid-June the 27th session of the international-labor conference opened in Geneva with delegates from all over the world, the man heading the United States group was the Assistant Secretary of Labor, J. Ernest Wilkins, a Negro.

At home, too, America's investment in Negro education has enabled trained Negroes to make an increasing contribution in science, industry, and Government service. This comes at a time when the demands for some types of specialized ability are straining our human resources.

A southern white woman, absent from the country for 10 years, recently returned, pleasantly surprised, from her first shopping tour in New York. She had observed Negro clerks, bookkeepers, designers, window dressers, and personnel executives in stores.

FOUND IN SOUTH, TOO

What has happened is not confined to New York but is observed in many cities from coast to coast, including some in the South.

Negro nurses, interns, and physicians, once confined to hospitals, clinics, and sanitariums serving only their race, are now widely encountered in private and Government institutions.

There is scarcely a sizable city these days without Negro policemen. Colored men preside over courts of every judicial level except the highest United States Supreme Court. The number of public prosecutors is large. In the officer corps of the racially integrated armed services, at least two colored colonels are in line for the general's star. The last 15 years have seen scores of Negroes become instructors and professors in important white colleges and universities.

This trend has become the most effective answer to one of the most dangerous forms of Communist propaganda.

Moving To Break the Atom Filibuster

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER

OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, July 26, 1954

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an editorial entitled "Moving To Break the Atom Filibuster," published in the Baltimore Sun of July 26, 1954.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

MOVING TO BREAK THE ATOM FILIBUSTER

The splinter group of Senators spearheaded by the voluble Morse, of Oregon, has held up the atomic energy bill for several days. Their filibuster is sparked by one of the most tattered notions of the obsolete "liberalism" for which they stand. In the cadences of the late William Jennings Bryan, they are talking about power grabs and private monopolies and capitalist thefts from the people. What they mean is that in one section of its atom energy bill the administration proposes to allow private business, under public supervision, to develop the industrial uses of atomic energy.

To describe this project in the 1890 verbiage of grabs and exploitation is to overlook the new big Government which now bestrides all private enterprise. It is to forget the new tax laws which skim off all the cream and some of the top milk of industrial profits. It is to overlook the long and formidable roster of Government regulatory agencies of which the Atomic Energy Commission is a towering example. It is to forget the massive body of administrative jurisprudence under which, and free of court control, these new agencies impose the will of Government in pervasive and penetrative detail on the private activities which they police.

This seems to be the realization which has gradually dawned in the minds of the responsible Democratic leadership in the Senate. Men of the stature of Johnson of Texas are now unwilling to let Senator Morse shape the Democratic stand before the country. They have seen the House acceptance of the administration proposals. They know that each and every Member of the House must face the voters in a mere 3 months. They appreciate that the Members of the House majority would not have taken the administration bill unless they were sure that the public sensed the phoniness of the Morse group's criticisms. The responsible Democratic leadership is accordingly out to help break the filibuster. That it should do.

For the bill which the filibuster blocks is one of gravity. Not merely does it provide for the properly supervised development by private interests of industrial atomic power; it provides for a collaboration among friendly nations to a similar end. It provides for a security-tight exchange of information on atomic weapons with our military allies. Mr. Morse's little group of willful men has blocked this vital business long enough.

Dulles Maneuver Restores Unity of Western Allies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DONALD L. JACKSON

OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 26, 1954

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following editorial from the Daily News Life, of Beverly Hills, Calif., July 19, 1954:

DULLES MANEUVER RESTORES UNITY OF WESTERN ALLIES

Like the Paris sewers, much of the international finagling about French Indochina has had a certain intriguing, underground—and offensive—air to it. Diplomatic conspirators have chased each other down one malodorous subterranean corridor after another, splashing mud and filth on each other in their desperate grappling for the rich southeast Asian rice bowl.

Until last week the United States, in keeping with its position as lord of the West, usually had preferred not to soil its diplomatic robes by descending into the stench. Suddenly, however, the roar from below blew the covers off their manholes. The United States' John Foster Dulles moved hesitantly down the ladder to see what he could do about restoring order and unity among the Allies.

From the official announcements and highly placed but unconfirmed sources, we gather that Dulles' proficiency in maneuvering around in the depths of diplomacy was more than enough to keep his head above water.

Dulles knew his path would be a precarious one when he flew to Paris last week. In his talks with French Premiere-Foreign Minister Pierre Mendes-France and British Foreign Secretary Anthony Eden, he had to attempt to pull together the sagging western alliance, split badly on Indochina. But any agreement he made with those two nations had to (1) be suited to the desire of an election-year Congress and (2) fall in line with his immediate past policy of making no deals on Indochina, however unrealistic it may have been.

But Dulles' agreement to their surrender had a price tag on it. In return, he demanded that France and Britain join the United States in guaranteeing the remainder of southeast Asia against further Red aggression.

And, judging from Churchill's abrupt about-face last week in the British Commons, it is very possible that Dulles exacted from Anthony Eden a secret promise not to push for Red China's admission to the United Nations.

Most important of Dulles' feats in Paris, however, was the repair job he accomplished on western unity. By sending Under Secretary of State Walter Bedell Smith to observe the Geneva Conference on Indochina, he put up a last minute united front facing the Communists.

The reunification strengthened Mendes-France's bargaining power and increased his chance to remain in office after tomorrow, his self-imposed deadline for an Indochina truce.

Under Secretary Smith's unusual position at Geneva is also worth noting. At the conference table, he will not vote for the French position, in keeping with past Dulles Indochina policy and with the intents and desires of Congress at home. Under the table, however, he is free to help Mendes-France bargain for his truce, fulfilling the United States promise to Eden and the French Premiere.

Whether or not an Indochina peace comes out of Geneva, John Foster Dulles now has a firm foundation for building up southeast Asia against the Reds. He has a united West behind him, with both France and Britain ready to jump on any Communist aggression.

We think it will have to be conceded that our Secretary of State's intricate underground wading was also a masterpiece of tight-rope walking. He emerged from the sewers of diplomacy smelling like a rose.

J. S. B.

No Use To Fool Ourselves About Red Victory in Asia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 26, 1954

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Evening Star of July 22, 1954:

NEW MILESTONE FOR COMMUNISTS—FAILURE TO STEM REDS REAPS NEW HARVEST AT GENEVA WHERE PEACE SIGNING MAY RESULT IN LOSS OF ALL ASIA

(By Constantine Brown)

Flags are flying at half mast, figuratively speaking, in Washington as a result of the resounding trouncing the free world has taken at Geneva.

Our diplomats, well accustomed to lavishing billions of the taxpayers' money around the world, are not overly concerned by the loss of some $3 billion poured into Indochina by the United States in a vain attempt to bolster the resistance of the embattled French. But even the most inveterate optimists among our policymakers admit that the Geneva peace agreement may well be a death blow to our hopes for freedom and democracy in Asia.

Since the end of World War II 9 years ago, the Communists have made gain after gain at the expense of the free world. On V–J Day world communism was represenated by 180 million Russians. Today some 900 million are definitely under the thumbs of the conspirators of the Kremlin.

The Moscow and Peiping world imperialists gained most of their many victories by default, by the sorry lack of willpower in the free world, by the inability or complacency of the free nations in their failure to take a determined stand while there was yet time.

The early designs of the Reds against Poland and the Balkan nations were apparent to all who could see. A courageous and forthright stand in those first postwar years could have spared millions from their prisons behind the Iron Curtan, could have sustained the high hopes for a world of freedom and peace found everywhere after the defeat of the Axis. But the wise men at the helms of state asked in effect: What do you want us to do? Go to war with Russia for the sake of the Poles, or the Czechs, or the Hungarians?

When there was still time to save China from the Red clutches, we piously threw the Nationalist Government to the wolves and refused them enough arms and ammunition to defend themselves against these agrarian reformers whose roots were in the Kremlin and whose equipment and supplies were pouring in profusion from Soviet arsenals and captured Japanese materiel.

While the Chinese Reds steadily expanded their conquests from the little area around Yenan which they held in 1945 until they controlled huge areas of mainland China, the confused American people were being told that these particular Reds were benign advocates of democracy fighting against a corrupt military dictatorship. The few Americans who were outspoken in their warnings that these Chinese Reds were Reds of the dyed-in-the-wool variety were sneered at on the floor of the Senate and in much of the Nation's press as the China lobby boys.

The signing of the Indochina accord at Geneva marks another sorry milestone in the steady advance of militant communism. Reality permits of not other interpretation. The free part of Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia will gradually disappear behind the Iron Curtain just as surely as did all of Central and Eastern Europe in the years immediately after World War II.

Our allies, particularly the British and French, walked into the Geneva trap with their eyes wide open. They find some solace, publicly, in their argument that peace in Indochina will mean a stronger France better able to contribute to the defense of Western Europe. But observers of the political trends of Europe doubt that the traditional antagonism and mutual distrust of the French and the Germans will ever allow the realization of a truly effective European Defense Treaty.

Other considerations enter the picture, too. Even if the French and the Germans did succeed in working together to some degree, our European allies are concerned first of all with their own continental interests. They are strongly tempted to the happy thought that a profitable trade relationship with Moscow might avoid any military conflict. Recent flirtations between London, Paris, and Moscow lend weight to this prospect.

But the United States can gaze on no such rosy views. This Nation is the major Red target. Our leaders in the administration are convinced that the Pacific is at least as important to our defense and security as is Europe. At great expense and effort we have been working on the creation of a chain of perimeter defenses ranging from Japan southward through Formosa and the Philippines. And the peace agreement in Indochina seriously weakens an important bastion of this chain of defense, the Indochina peninsula.

Regrettably, the United States stands to lose as much prestige by the Indochina debacle as does Western Europe. The remaining free nations of Asia are beginning to see the Communist world as the holders of real power, the probable winning side in a conflict they fear. With oriental fatalism they may decide to accept the inevitability of Red domination. Worst of all, this fear may grip such key parts of our defense chain as Korea, Japan, and the Philippines.

The Geneva settlement may bring some respite to our European allies. But it will bring only increased pressure on the United States and on our Asiatic allies, who want to stand by us but wonder now whether we will have the capacity to stand by them.

The Vincennes Sun-Commercial: 150 Years of Public Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 23, 1954

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, on August 1 the city of Vincennes, Ind., will celebrate the 150th anniversary of the printing of the first newspaper in the Midwest, the Indiana Gazette, which is now the Vincennes Sun-Commercial.

When this newspaper was founded in 1804, Vincennes was the center of government for the Indiana Territory, which included the area which now forms the States of Indiana, Illinois, and Wisconsin, and parts of Michigan and Minnesota. Four years before. Gen. William Henry Harrison had persuaded Congress to divide the Northwest Territory; and the Indiana Territory was organized with General Harrison as its Governor. It is recorded that one of his duties was to "look after the Indians and get them out of the way of the oncoming settlers." This was truly a pioneer outpost beckoning to the rugged men and women in search of new lands and free homes.

Perhaps the real America as we know it today started in this area between the Allegheny Mountains and the Mississippi River. In the early days of our country the people were divided into colonies that were clannish and sought to carry on the traditions brought from

England, Scotland, Ireland, Holland, Germany, France, Belgium, and other European countries. When these early Americans broke their ties of race and colony and crossed the mountains into the Northwest Territory, they mingled as neighbors and friends; they worked together; they intermarried. From this association or melting pot emerged the true spirit of a new race of people—Americans. This early newspaper at Vincennes became a medium for recording the day-by-day blending and integration of these real Americans.

These early Americans were a strong and a courageous people. One writer termed them "the strong and the brave, because only the brave started and only the strong got here." These early Americans were deeply religious and genuinely interested in education. This attribute is still evidenced in Vincennes and community to this day by their churches and schools.

The Northwest Ordinance of 1787 wisely counseled:

> Religion, morality, and knowledge, being necessary to good government and the happiness of mankind, schools and the means of education shall forever be encouraged.

The Vincennes community took this advice to heart, and was one of the educational leaders of those early days. An area of land was designated to be sold and used to found a "Seminary of learning." So in 1806 Vincennes University was founded.

People so sincerely interested in religious and educational pursuits felt the need of a newspaper. There were only a few newspapers in the Nation when the Indiana Gazette was founded on July 4, 1804—the 28th anniversary of our national independence. Journalism was still in its infancy. The large, well-known newspapers of today in the United States were not established until years later.

At the time of the paper's founding, Jefferson was President of the United States, Napoleon was being crowned Emperor, and the Code Napoleon was established. Beethoven was composing one of his famous symphonies. Alexander the First was extending the power of Russia eastward across the Bering Strait to found Sitka in 1804. In our country Fulton was about to launch a steamboat on the Hudson; Lewis and Clark were starting on their western expedition; Louisiana had just been purchased; and the Capital had just been moved to Washington.

A vast panorama of American history has been chronicled in the pages of this Vincennes paper, which is almost as old as this Nation itself. Jackson's victory at New Orleans and the British sacking of Washington; the fall of the Alamo; the battles of the Civil War, from Fort Sumpter to Appamatox, were duly recorded, as was Custer's last stand. An interesting item appeared in its columns stating that "there is strong talk of building a railroad from Vincennes to the village of Chicago on Lake Michigan." Industrial expansion and the race of the pioneers across the continent were recorded in the old Vincennes Sun. The charge at San Juan Hill and the exploits of our fighting men in two World Wars and in Korea have been retold in its pages. Although the lines of communication were limited at first, this newspaper became the agency which linked the daring pioneers and settlers to the current events and the overall trends in thinking of our Nation and of western civilization.

One is awed by the thought of the tremendous influence this great paper, located in the heart of America, has exercised in the past 150 years.

Let me cite just one of a multitude of instances in which this paper was a part of, as well as a recorder of, history. Abraham Lincoln grew from child to man in southern Indiana in a real American atmosphere steeped in a love of freedom and a belief in God and in the dignity of man. The first newspaper plant that Abraham Lincoln ever saw was that of the Vincennes Sun when the Lincoln family passed through Vincennes in migrating from Indiana to Illinois in 1834. Recalling the stories of Lincoln's eagerness to read and his search for the limited amount of reading material of that time, we can appreciate even more what a copy of the Vincennes Sun meant to him and others of that period.

Just as the Vincennes Sun played a stellar role in the life of the early Indiana Territory, it has continued to be an outstanding publication, reporting the news, espousing causes for civic betterment, disseminating the facts of living and culture and thinking.

I salute the Vincennes Sun-Commercial, its editor, Ross Garrigus, its general manager, Howard Greenlee, its publisher, Eugene C. Pulliam.

One hundred and fifty years of public service is only a good beginning for this paper on the banks of the Wabash. It will surely carry on this proud record of service so long as the institutions of free men endure.

Arthur Dunn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD T. MILLER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 26, 1954

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, in these days tensions and political strife often tend to obscure some of the pleasant and wholesome features of our daily lives. One of these features is the community spirit and comraderie that exists among workers on Capitol Hill. It is unhampered by party affiliation, sectionalism, age group, or social cast.

This atmosphere of kindliness and friendly interest is an important factor in the normal routine of us all, although like many of our other blessings, we seldom think about it.

Under leave, I include here an article about one of our employees, Mr. Arthur Dunn, who hails from Springfield, Ill. It was written by my fellow Marylander, 17-year-old Robert Bauman, as an English theme in the Capitol Page School.

As a vignette of life on the "Hill," it illustrates the thought I seek to express:

ARTHUR DUNN

(By Robert Bauman)

Each morning when I arrive for my day's work at the Capitol I ride the elevator to the second floor. Although elevators are usually very uninteresting places there is one thing that makes this one outstanding. It is the little man who runs it.

This man's name is a simple one—Arthur Dunn, and he is, himself, as unpretentious as his name. He is a jolly little man, not more than 5 feet 2 inches and he gives a sparkling "good morning" to me and the same greeting to everyone, be it page or lawmaker. Arthur has a quality which not many men have. He has the rare gift to radiate happiness.

Some gloomy days, when things seem to be going all wrong and it looks as if the Republicans might not be able to win control of Congress in the next election, I get on board Arthur's elevator and his cheery greeting makes me feel better immediately. He has that power.

In this world of skepticism and struggle, it is good to know that there are still people like Arthur with his bright bow tie, who can make you feel glad you are alive.

I think a remark that Senator MUNDT made recently applies to Arthur Dunn particularly. The Senator said: "We all need to do our work with a smile on our face but a serious purpose in our heart."

Second Anniversary of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 26, 1954

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico celebrated its second birthday yesterday. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Territories and Insular Affairs, I take pleasure in bringing this significant event to recognition here. Never before has the United States enjoyed the smooth-working political and economic relationships which we now have with the people of Puerto Rico. They are citizens of the United States and they are citizens of the Commonwealth of Puetro Rico very much as we all are citizens of the United States, and in turn, citizens of the respective States we represent.

The Commonwealth of Puerto Rico is not a member State of the Union; albeit, it is a State in the definitive sense of the word. It is a free State organized by the people of Puerto Rico, with a republican form of government, which exists in voluntary association with the United States.

Internationally, Puerto Rico is part of the United States, although constitutionally, it is not. The United States Government has in Puerto Rico comparable Federal functions and responsibilities that it has in the States of the Union. The people of Puerto Rico have freely accepted this relationship.

For 2½ million people living in 3,500 square miles of territory, 1,000 miles away from the United States mainland; with a Spanish culture and language, a homogeneous people with strongly developed characteristics, the idea of commonwealth has been, indeed, a happy solution to the problem of political status. These people enjoy internal independence and live in interdependence with the United States in all matters of an external nature. They are free, but they are not alone.

Mr. Speaker, I think we must express our recognition to the people of Puerto Rico for having originated and developed this new political concept and for having brought it to us. And we should be happy that we accepted the idea, that we authorized the organization of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, that we agreed to its constitution, and that the people of Puerto Rico have assumed their own responsibilities as free men.

The development of self-government in Puerto Rico did not start yesterday or with the creation of the Commonwealth 2 years ago. It has been taking place for half a century. As successively the people of Puerto Rico assumed more and more responsibility for their own destiny, the rhythm of development accelerated. Since achieving Commonwealth status on July 25, 1952, Puerto Rico has forged ahead industrially, educationally, agriculturally, and socially. Its economy is sound. Its Government is stable. Every citizen is a toiler participating in the great work of the Commonwealth. These are good signs. In these troubled times, it is reassuring that once again, faith in freedom, self-determination, and respect for the dignity of man has proven its worth.

Japanese-American Evacuation Claims

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALLAN OAKLEY HUNTER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 26, 1954

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I have been advised that our distinguished colleague from Illinois, Judge EDGAR A. JONAS, chairman of the Judiciary Subcommittee on Claims, contemplates the holding of public hearings out on the west coast next month on H. R. 7435. This bill has been introduced by my fellow Californian PATRICK J. HILLINGS. The measure would amend the Japanese American Evacuation Claims Act of 1948 to expedite the final determination of the claims.

While I regret very much that the Congress was unable to approve this meritorious bill this session, it is my hope that it will be among the very first items to be considered by the 84th Congress next January.

I welcome these hearings because they will demonstrate the urgent necessity and the inherent justice of the Hillings bill.

I also take this opportunity to invite the Subcommittee on Claims to conduct a part of their hearings in Fresno, which is the center of the vast agricultural empire of central California.

Many of the Japanese Americans who will be benefited by this bill reside in my district, which comprises Fresno, Madera, and Merced Counties. They are among the finest vegetable and fruit growers in the country and are also among the finest of our citizens.

Fourteen years ago, as a military precaution, the Army summarily evacuated all persons of Japanese ancestry from their west coast homes and associations. Happily, the reasons that prompted that mass evacuation proved unfounded. FBI and military intelligence reports indicate that no person of Japanese ancestry in the United States committed any acts of sabotage or espionage before, during, and after World War II. Indeed, Japanese American troops, including many who were evacuated from central California, were members of the famed 442d Regimental Combat Team, the most decorated American unit in the military history for its size and length of service. Others performed with equal gallantry in the Pacific against the Japanese enemy. Many are still on duty in Japan and in Korea.

The Japanese were given little time to dispose of their properties, their businesses, their farms and orchards and vineyards, before their evacuation. As was to be expected under such circumstances, their losses were great; many lost everything they had, others lost most of what they had.

After the war, when we found that our fears concerning the Japanese were groundless, the 80th Congress enacted the so-called Japanese American Evacuation Claims Act in 1948 which authorized the Attorney General to receive and adjudicate some of these evacutation losses. In the 18-month period allowed for filing, almost 24,000 claims totaling nearly $130 million were filed with the Department of Justice.

The original law, however, proved difficult to administer and so the 82nd Congress in 1951 amended the statute to provide that claims under $2,500 could be compromised and settled. Under this amendment, about 20,000 claims have been compromised and settled, totaling about $25 million in amount, in the past 3 years.

Now, less than 3,000 of the larger claims remain to be adjudicated and paid. But, under the difficult procedural requirements of the basic law, it may be many years before these remaining claims can be adjudicated.

To speed up this program in order that those who suffered in the evacuation may receive some compensation in their lifetime, Congressman HILLINGS introduced his bill last January 21.

His bill simply extends the compromise settlement procedures that have proved so workable for the small claims to all the remaining claims without regard to amount. It also provides that if the claimant desires a legal determination he may elect to have the Court of Claims consider his claim.

I have discussed the Hillings bill with Mike M. Masaoka, whom many of you know as the Washington representative of the Japanese American Citizens League, the only national organization representing the interests of persons of Japanese ancestry in the United States. This league has a number of local chapters in my district.

Mr. Masaoka has assured me that this legislation has the wholehearted endorsement of his organization and that it represents the best possible solution to the problem of handling the remaining larger claims expeditiously.

Fourteen years have passed since the evacuation. Nine years have passed since the end of World War II.

As a matter of simple justice and common decency, to try to help a gallant people in their efforts to make up for the losses they suffered through no fault of their own and as a kind of wartime casualty, I urge that the Congress enact the Hillings bill at its earliest opportunity.

More Lambasting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 26, 1954

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following from the New Orleans Times-Picayune of Tuesday, July 6, 1954:

MORE LAMBASTING

New Orleans took another air bomb in the midsection with the Civil Aeronautics Board's decision to facilitate proceedings involving nonstop airline service, New York to Mexico City over this city.

Bilateral negotiations with Mexico still supposedly are being conducted looking to New Orleans-Mexico City service, with this city either a stop or a terminal. Recently Mexican Government representatives manifested decided interest in this long-overdue, supremely natural-communications provision. Without it, detours into Texas are the only means available for New Orleans-Mexico City flight. Detours to New York for that purpose are, of course, out of the question—except, perhaps, in the minds of those New York and vicinity commercial interests that from time immemorial have sought to get New Orleans bypassed in long-range communications.

A New York-New Orleans-Mexico City service, on the other hand, taking the natural great circle route, would satisfy the needs of New Orleans, Mexico, and efficiency.

The issue of making permanent the authority granted American Airlines to fly nonstop, like Air France, from New York to Mexico City, will figure in the hearing (not yet dated) set by CAB. This means abandoning an AA stop at Dallas and changing the route to a more direct one, via New Orleans. If Dallas lost her stop it would mean nothing to her not to be flown over. To New Orleans, to be flown over without ever having got the stop or service that reason dictates, adds affront to injury.

Still more or this last comes with Eastern Airlines' decision to get into the nonstop game. This involves apparent abandonment of a once-promising New Orleans-Mexico City flight project. It also involves a revival or revalidifying of this old permit, solely to effect New York-Mexico City flights (nonstop). The application says, in effect, that if we had this (old) permit, or regain it, it would be used for nonstop purposes.

Pan-American also has a nonstop application. Presumably it also involves flying over New Orleans. All these applications have been consolidated for joint hearing by CAB, with dissent only by Commissioner Josh Lee. They all want to fly over New Orleans, according to the face of the applications, but not stop here.

The bridesmaid who never became a bride had it easy compared with the Crescent City. New Orleans was at one time, at least, engaged, and still has hopes the engagement will go through. There must be some way in which reason may fly in the face of absurdity in this manner. So far it's been vice versa.

Labor Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 26, 1954

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article from the current issue of IUPPE International News, which is the official news organ of the International Union of Plant Protective Employees.

The editor of this widely circulated news sheet is Mr. Frank Ryan, of Lynn, Mass.

The article follows:

LABOR REPORT

A management bargaining technique which seems to be gaining popularity gets the green light from the United States Court of Appeals at New Orleans. It's O. K., the court says, for a company to decide in advance of negotiations how much it wants to pay, make an offer to the union, and then put the increase into effect for everybody outside the bargaining unit if the union turns it down. This approach, of course, is subject to the usual test of good faith, and applying this standard, the court decides that a company made the grade.

What the company did: At the start of negotiations, the company made concessions on five points and offered the union a 7½-cent wage boost. When the union membership rejected this offer, the increase was paid to unorganized workers. After the old contract expired, the company decided that an impasse had been reached and paid the extra money to workers in the bargaining unit.

A couple of months later, the company pulled the same deal with an additional gimmick. It said it would come across with an additional 5 cents in lieu of the fringe items the union wanted, provided the union would go along with a 2-year contract. The union didn't like this package, so the company gave the additional raise to nonunion people. This time, though, it announced that the union would get the increase only if it accepted within a week. The union answered this gambit with a strike.

NLRB's view: The company's conduct was illegal, according to the Board. The firm, it noted, had a policy of maintaining absolute uniformity between wages paid organized and unorganized workers. There was nothing inherently wrong with this practice, NLRB said, but combined with the granting of wage increases to nonunion workers in the exact amount offered the union, it had the effect of freezing the company's position. In the Board's view, it was evident that the company wouldn't seriously consider making any concessions which didn't square with what it had already decided to do.

The company's alternative was to negotiate with the union first and then pass along the negotiated benefits to the unorganized workers. This might be a bitter pill for a company which didn't want to enhance the union's prestige among the other workers, the Board conceded, but it was the only way to protect the bargaining rights of the people in the unit.

The upshot of NLRB's decision was that the company was ordered to bargain with the union and take back the strikers to whom it had denied reinstatement.

The court's decision: The court has a different slant on the case. The company, it points out, clearly had the right to insist on a general increase instead of the fringe benefits requested by the union, and it did in fact make some concessions. The Board itself, the court adds, didn't take issue with the company's policy of keeping wage increases uniform throughout the plant; it merely objected to the company's timing. Although the court doesn't analyze this theory, it does conclude that the company can't be held in violation of the law in the absence of any showing that it bargained in bad faith.

As a result of this finding, the strike which followed the breakdown of negotiations is labeled an economic strike, and the union—which lost its majority when its members were replaced—is out of luck. (*NLRB* v. *Texas Foundries, Inc.;* see p. 70:408.)

Importance of the decision: The court's ruling obviously adds a pretty lethal weapon to management's arsenal. Few things are more likely to undermine a union's bargaining position and create dissatisfaction among the workers it represents than the knowledge that unorganized workers are taking home a bigger paycheck while the union is still negotiating over wages.

The decision is also the first court test of the bargaining strategy which has become almost standard operating procedure at General Electric and which was used by North American in the recent UAW strike. The ruling doesn't embrace all of the aspects of the GE-North American formula—they've used a number of additional tactics—but it's likely that it will encourage more and more companies to hop on the bandwagon. As in the past, though, the good faith of a company's position will be judged on a case-by-case basis.

Keynote Address by Hon. John Marshall Butler, of Maryland, Before Republican State Convention, Baltimore, Md.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD T. MILLER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 26, 1954

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, the keynote address at the Maryland State Republican Convention held in Baltimore, Md., on July 24 was drafted by Maryland's senior Senator, JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER. Unfortunately prolonged debate in the other body prevented both of Maryland's Senators from attending the convention in Baltimore and Senator Butler's fine address could not be delivered by him in person.

Under leave granted, the remarks of Senator BUTLER prepared for that occasion are herewith included:

Governor McKeldin, Chairman Rinehart, honored guests, fellow Republicans, members of the convention, ladies, and gentlemen, 1954 will be recorded in history as a year of reawakening and resurgence—a year of purpose and action. This climate is not accidental. It is the product of vision, leadership and determination. It typifies the present strength, unity and vitality of the Republican Party. It offers the opportunity of even greater accomplishments.

Yes, my friends, we—Republicans everywhere—can face the future with optimism—with even greater determination—and with even greater dedication to those principles of integrity and of economy and efficiency in Government on which our glorious party was founded.

The lessons of the past 100 years have been fruitful. Unity of purpose and action has developed a cohesive spirit of republicanism which has been successfully demonstrated in our administration of the Federal, State and local governments. By our works we have earned the support and gratitude of the people. With firm principles—purpose and action—we shall prevail; and our horizons are unlimited.

I have already stated that this favorable climate did not occur by chance. On the contrary, it has been precisely calculated. It marks a crescendo of energy and wisdom, whose dictating force has been the halting and reversal of dangerous socialistic tendencies at all levels of government. The full volume of this crescendo is unlimited and the promise of the future for our Nation and the Republican Party is bright. The national posture of the opposition party has been confounded by a babble of political counsels, resulting in many cleavages. With our critics thus operating in a vacuum of confusion and discord, the solidarity of purpose within the Republican Party assumes greater significance.

You might ask—and the people of America might rightfully demand "What are the accomplishments of the Eisenhower administration and the 83d Congress which justify a continuation of Republican management in government?" The record of the past 2 years is truly filled with undeniable successes of lasting impact, and a few of these historic milestones are deserving of special emphasis.

The Eisenhower administration and the 83d Congress under Republican leadership are to be commended for their constructive achievements. They have dispatched the public business with efficiency. They have restored the people's confidence in the integrity of their Government. No longer are we compelled to tolerate the miserable display of arrogance, scandalous behavior, waste, and inefficiency which characterized 20 years of the New Deal and the Fair Deal.

The sacrifice of American lives in Korea has been ended. Russian imperialism and Communist aggression have been confronted with our firm determination to safeguard freedom and attain genuine peace. The devious Communist conspiracy, as inspired and carried out by the Kremlin, has been exposed in its true, ugly light. Without any weak-kneed surrender of basic principles, the Eisenhower administration has met this threat to freedom and liberty with a determination of lasting vigor. We shall not, and must not, lose sight of our cherished heritage and our pledge to freedom-loving people everywhere.

Today able men and women are striving to undo the damage created by the incompetency of the unrealistic foreign policy of the New Deal and the Fair Deal—a policy which permitted the dismissal of one of our greatest military strategists and one of the best informed authorities on far eastern affairs, Gen. Douglas MacArthur.

Our national-defense program has been reorganized and strengthened by policies capable of providing long-range security at substantial savings and without disruption of the national economy. Unification of the armed services has been effectively advanced through efficient management and careful coordination.

We have taken decisive action to safeguard the Nation from enemies within its borders and to remove Communist infiltration and subversion from all phases of our society. This serious threat has been illuminated to the extent that there is now wide public awareness of the potential menace to our traditional American way of life.

The trend toward destructive socialistic tendencies in Government has been arrested by the encouragement of private competitive enterprise, thrift, and the self-reliance of our people. Labor and private enterprise have been urged to solve their own problems without Government interference.

The States have been encouraged to meet their proper responsibilities. Their inherent rights to develop submerged lands and other resources within their boundaries have been restored, and we have rededicated ourselves to the concept of States rights.

The difficult transition from war to peace has been successfully bridged without disrupting the Nation's economy. National controls of prices, wages and rents have been ended, freeing American enterprise from undue Government interference. The Nation's economy has been stabilized and the value of the dollar strengthened, ending the cheating of our people by inflation and avoiding the distress of deflation, while employment, production, wages, and earnings have remained high. The solvency of America is one of our greatest weapons in combating those forces which are bent on destroying our free way of life.

Under this prudent administration, taxes have been cut three times since January 1953, reducing income tax payments, excise taxes on goods consumers buy, and providing substantial benefits in other deductions and allowances for individuals and enterprises.

All Americans look to the day when their individual and collective tax burdens will be reduced. Now, for the first time in many years, the Republican administration has made possible a tax cut of some $7 billion. For the first time in almost 80 years, our internal revenue laws have been broadly revised. The continued economic growth of our country will thus be stimulated. Millions of individuals and thousands of businesses will obtain tax relief from the tax measure which will be adopted by the Congress in the next several days.

By way of contrast, let us look at the record of the Democratic Party. Since 1913 there have been 15 income tax increases. All but one of these were voted by a Democratic Congress.

On the budgetary side, in the 1932–52 period, our Government lived within its income on only three occasions. Two of these three times, the budget was balanced only as a result of action by the Republican 80th Congress.

The Congress and the Republican administration have acted courageously to end the shameful waste of farm surpluses, to reduce the high cost of subsidies, and to provide farmers with a long-range program for an independent, self-reliant agriculture, with Government providing a shield against destructive forces beyond farmer control.

They have continued and enlarged the program to meet human needs, to strengthen civil rights, to aid our veterans to become established in civilian life and to provide adequate care for the disabled, to expand social security, and to assist the aged, the blind, and dependent widows and children. Many humanitarian benefits are also contained in the new Republican tax program.

In these and all other respects, the Republican administration and the Congress have fostered the forward progress of a free nation under a government without favoritism, without corruption, without waste or extravagance, but efficient, economical, trustworthy, and fair to all.

The essential task of removing New Dealers, Fair Dealers, and their ilk, from policy-making and confidential governmental positions, has progressed steadily. I prefer to describe this group as "crypto-socialists." They seek to subvert the American system of limited government, free enterprise and democracy and to replace it with a system hostile and alien to our traditions as a Nation. In striking at this cancer, which is gnawing at the very vitals of our government, we must, and shall, rid the Federal payroll of these "crypto-socialists" and other political hacks. In spite of efforts by the previous administration to preserve these purveyors of destruction and scandal, their replacement by competent Republican men and women has accelerated and continues rapidly.

The evidences of accomplishment by the Eisenhower administration and the 83d Congress cannot be disputed. The record is clear and positive. Even our severest critics must concede this. The President's dynamic program is now, for all practical purposes, a reality. The Nation and the world can give grateful thanks to President Eisenhower for his forceful leadership. If the accomplishments of the Republican Party are to continue in the service of the American people, President Eisenhower needs a stronger Congress through the election of Republicans this fall.

Any appraisal of the Republican Party would be incomplete without an analysis of the outstanding Republican Administration of our State Government, under the very able and vigorous leadership of our own Gov. Theodore R. McKeldin. Through the skillful use of the tools of government, during the past 4 years, the State of Maryland has attained a prominence in the community of States heretofore unknown to our people. The traditions and beauties of the great Free State of Maryland are now a byword throughout the world.

But, let us review for a few moments, the scope of specific improvements and benefits which have been made available to our fellow Marylanders as a result of Governor McKeldin's excellent supervision of the affairs of our State.

In the face of constantly rising costs, the State budget has been balanced without curtailment of the many services and facilities supported by State funds. Twice, surplus funds have been returned to the taxpayers in the form of a 15-percent deduction from income-tax payments.

Ladies and gentlemen, this is the type of achievement which needs no further explanation to be appreciated and enjoyed by Republicans and Democrats alike.

Yet, this new economy and efficiency in State government has been accompanied at every turn by increased services to our people. The health of our citizenry is better than at any time in our history. Through proper treatment and care, the tuberculosis rate has dropped by more than 38 percent. Even greater progress is expected with continuous improvement of our State institutions for the treatment of this and other diseases. Our improved health facilities cover most every type of human malady, including the care of mental disorders. All of us can be justly proud of the new Phychiatric Institute here in Baltimore. A part of the University of Maryland, and costing over $3 million, it is one of the finest centers of its kind in the world.

We have also made important, and I might add, much needed, improvements in our correctional systems. The old parole and probation system has been abandoned. In place of single authority and jurisdiction, a Board of Parole and Probation, with full powers and responsibility to consider and grant paroles, has been created, thereby assuring greater public protection and at the same time affording an orderly and reasonable rehabilitation of persons with probational possibilities.

Of far-reaching significance is the 12-year road program inaugurated by Governor McKeldin. This is truly one of the most extensive projects undertaken in our history. It will reach into all corners of our State. To be financed on a sound businesslike basis, these new roads in the months and years to come will add immeasurably to our commercial and industrial development, and to the convenience, enjoyment, and prosperity of all of our citizens. It will contribute to the ever-expanding needs of our national economy and to the transportation of goods and services among the people of our Nation. In addition, construction will soon start on a tunnel crossing of the Baltimore Harbor—to be financed on a self-liquidating basis, and essential to the solution of serious traffic congestion in the metropolitan Baltimore area.

No factor is more important to the future well-being of our State than our public-school system. In turn, the vitality of our educational system, to a larger degree, depends upon an enthusiastic, well-trained, and therefore adequately paid teaching staff. Governor McKeldin's administration has established the first systematic salary increase for public-school teachers. As a consequence, Maryland now ranks close to the top among the States as to teachers' compensation, and the Baltimore City schools for the first time in many years now have a full complement of teachers. These increases remove Maryland teachers from the heretofore consistently underpaid group of conscientious public servants, and will most certainly return to us manyfold in better education, supervision, and training for our youth—the citizens of tomorrow.

By a result of the recommendations of the Commission on Administrative Organization of the State, established by Governor McKeldin, the operation of our State government has been efficiently improved. This commission was headed by the brilliant Maryland jurist, and our friend, Simon E. Sobeloff, who is now serving his party and his country with even greater distinction as Solicitor General of the United States.

The comprehensive report of the Grotts Commission, which proposes solutions of State and county financing and borrowing problems, is also a milestone of Republican success. These proposals would preserve the principles of local self-government, the very foundation of democracy. In much the same vein, the governor has successfully championed the principle of home rule, and a constitutional amendment providing for home rule for municipalities is to be submitted to the voters in November.

Thus, in our State, as well as in the Nation, the Republican discharge of the public trust is written in the record of solid achievements. The lack of any constructive criticism by the opposition in the recent primary is conclusive proof of this point.

And so, to the benefit of the Republican Party, an enviable climate of public favor exists. This great blessing will not be treated casually, and we shall not approach the coming months with overconfidence.

We have made a real beginning, an excellent beginning. We have completely justified the confidence in us that the people bestowed in 1950 and again in 1952. The record made thus far is one of which we can be proud. An extension of our mandate from the people, in the congressional and State offices, is certain if we spell out these accomplishments with emphasis and conviction and in terms that all can understand. That is our task in the months ahead—with complete harmony and diligent effort on the part of all Maryland Republicans.

Let us then get on with the job here and now, to the end that we may continue to provide better government, honest government, and more economical government to the people of our State and our Nation.

Toward a Balanced Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 26, 1954

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following editorial from the Evening Star, Washington, D. C., dated Saturday, July 24, 1954:

Toward a Balanced Budget

President Eisenhower has good reason to speak pridefully of the fact that his administration has closed the books on its first complete fiscal year—which ended June 30—with a deficit of only a bit more than $3 billion, or roughly $6.2 billion less than last year's.

"Only" may not be quite the right word, of course, to use in connection with a red-ink figure of such dimensions. Still, relatively speaking, the sum represents a notable gain in terms of leading the Nation toward a balanced budget. To appreciate that, we have merely to keep in mind that the Truman administration, if it had been reelected in 1952, would have been committed to expenditures involving a deficit of about $10 billion for the fiscal year that has just ended.

In other words, the Eisenhower administration has lopped almost $7 billion off the red-ink showing that Harry S. Truman, in his last budget message as President, had forecast for fiscal 1953–54. And this has been done not by illusory bookkeeping devices but my systematic cuts in already-budgeted expenditures—cuts achieved by subjecting every phase of Federal activity to a continuous review aimed at prodding all departments and agencies into spending less, where possible, than the funds allotted to them. Thus, largely as a result of this policy, Government outlays during the past 12 months have been held down to $67.6 billion, or more than $3 billion under the total anticipated 7 months ago.

The President has not exaggerated in describing all this as a fiscal achievement that means a great deal to the American people. Nor has he exaggerated in claiming, even though living costs continue at a near-record level, that inflation has been halted, with the dollar's purchasing power having varied only one-half of 1 percent in the past 18 months. Although numerous factors account for this improvement, there can be little doubt that one of the most important among them is the stabilizing influence of the marked progress made toward equalizing Federal income and outgo. In the President's words, "We have come over two-thirds of the way toward balancing the budget. * * * We have made possible a program of tax cuts totaling $7.5 billion. * * * Our people have new confidence. We are laying a firm base for a healthy and expanding economy, for better national security and for more jobs."

More than a few Americans, it is true, take a decidedly reserved view of the President's optimism. Senator SYMINGTON, for eaxmple, argues, and with considerable cogency, that the administration has been following a seriously risky course in economizing on military expenditures. And it is certainly correct to say, as Treasury Secretary Humphrey has himself acknowledged, that plans for further cuts in Federal outlays are based on the altogether "iffy" premise that the Kremlin will refrain from grave, new adventures in aggression.

Nevertheless, with all that said, the fact remains that the administration's advance toward a balanced budget, the deliberate shift from continual deficit financing, is contributing significantly to the strength of our national economy. Certainly, if it continues, if it is not upset by Communist action, it is bound to benefit the American people as a whole.

Basically It Was Colonialism That Lost Indochina

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 26, 1954

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include herewith an editorial entitled "Basically It Was Colonialism That Lost Indochina," which appeared in the July 22, 1954, issue of the Courier-Journal, of Louisville, Ky.

The editorial is as follows:

Basically It Was Colonialism That Lost Indochina

In 1942 when the Allies lost Burma to the Japanese, Vinegar Joe Stilwell put matters tersely: "I claim we got a hell of a beating," he said. "We got run out of Burma and it is humiliating as hell. I think we ought to find out what caused it."

Stilwell's realistic words apply to what has happened in southeast Asia. Not France alone but all the West has taken "a hell of a beating" in Indochina, with 13 million Asians newly surrendered to the Iron Curtain and with the triumphant Communists well poised for fresh gains, either through infiltration and terrorism and subsequent elections or through fresh military efforts when the time seems ripe. It does indeed behoove us to do some agonizing reappraisal of our own, find out what caused our defeat, and make sure that the partial loss in Indochina is not followed by free-agent defeat in all of Asia.

It is too easy but too superficial to point to some of our recent mistakes, meaning those of the United States. But they are considerable, and they make the much-derided Truman-Acheson policy of containment of Communist aggression seem more brilliant by the hour. At least it worked—and it had the western allies united behind it. After the 1952 election it was shelved by the victorious Republicans in favor of liberation. That turned out to be a slogan instead of a policy, but even as a slogan, though it never liberated anything, it frightened our allies even more than the Communists. It never got even lip service in Congress, and the administration early this year abandoned it in favor of massive retaliation—which shook our allies and Congress even more until it was explained away into nothingness or as something considerably less massive than we had resorted to in Korea. But even this, which might have impressed the Communist world had it been backed up with an increase in our military strength, was accompanied by progressive New Look reductions in that strength, by fresh lectures to our allies for daring to follow our own lead in economizing, and by louder threats to the Communists as our strength grew weaker.

Small wonder, then, that the Communists did exactly what we warned them against doing when we negotiated peace in Korea in mid-1953. They transferred their chief efforts to Indochina, where 15 months or longer ago we should have built the joint defense which appealed to Secretary Dulles—and to few others—only as Indochina was falling. Now, paralyzed on the sidelines by lack of policy and leadership, we neither approve nor disapprove entirely, of the cease fire in Indichona. It has "features we do not like," in President Eisenhower's realistically gloomy terms, but as a good member of the United Nations we will not use force to upset it. But we will view with grave concern any renewal of Communist aggression (we said that in mid-1953, too). And we are actively pursuing discussions with other free nations with a view to the rapid organization of a collective defense in southeast Asia in order to prevent further direct or indirect Communist aggression in that general area.

So far have we come along the road of a wrecked bipartisan foreign policy which has been replaced only by indecision and paralysis. But it is superficial to blame our defeat only on recent errors of omission or commission. There are deeper reasons for it, reasons that far antedate the present administration and the exploded hope that billions or arms or troops alone can save Asia from the Communists. Until we give those reasons proper consideration and act in their light, not even Mr. Eisenhower's most rapid "organization of collective defense" in southeast Asia will save the day, because inevitably it will be, as the British have feared, a southeast Asian alliance without any Asians in it.

The prime cause of the West's defeat in southeast Asia has been the failure of the West itself to live up to its promises—and it can be the cause of further losses elsewhere, particularly in French north Africa. Those promises, highly propagandized by the Atlantic Charter of World War II but stemming directly back to Woodrow Wilson's World War I promise of self-determination for subject peoples, were in brief the substitution of national independence for the old colonialism.

Western ideas first, and Western promises later, brought the fever of nationalism to a peak during and after World War II. Where the West did not welsh on its promises, the results have been fair to good: The colonial powers cleared out of Indonesia, Burma, Ceylon, Pakistan, the Philippines, and India—and none of these newly independent countries, however little enthusiasm some of them may show for our side, are yet under the Communist yoke. In Indonesia, where the Dutch left only after two shooting wars and the heavy pressure of the United States and the United Nations, the tie with the West is none too strong. But in the Philippines, where the United States cleared out ahead of time, and in India, the empire the British gave up with diplomatic grace, there remain two useful bridges between East and West—and it is an impressive fact that today in India there are more Englishmen resident and in business than there were at the peak of the Empire.

France, however, learned nothing from such examples. A succession of futile postwar governments has clung tenaciously to the basic colonial concept, no matter how frilled up with token but meaningless facades of independence within the French Union. Even today, in what remains of Vietnam, the Vietnamese Minister of the Interior cannot order his own troops to repel rebellion without French permission—and this mockery in fact and in words has given a handful of Communists the priceless boon of appearing to millions of Vietnamese as the only fighters for real independence.

The weapons and the billions and the troops were there, in Indochina, bolstered by American willingness, from 1946 on, to support the unsupportable relic of colonialism. The ideas were not, or came too little and too late. The Dutch, with grim enlightenment, can remind us that we did not hesitate to lecture a small power on the desirability of freeing its colonies, but backed the great power of France (which has a veto in the Security Council, the ousted Dutch will remind us) without reservation, mindful of our need for France's strength in Europe.

We backed it until history caught up with us, and with the French, and until the cards were down, and no voices in the United States Congress would back President Eisenhower or Vice President Nixon or Secretary of State Dulles or Admiral Radford in bespeaking American military intervention. Now we are back at the old stand of building a new regional alliance against Communist aggression, while Communist China, taking a leaf from our own use of the Organization of American States in settling hemispheric affairs while excluding the U. N., moves to create a pan-Asiatic federation. If we are going to have any Asians at all on our side in future, the tide and the lessons of history demand of us as well as of the French that what we defend must be the complete and not the token independence of Laos and Cambodia and southern Vietnam and of southeast Asia, and not the right of the West to save them from the Communists for western exploitation.

The Point 4 Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH J. ADDONIZIO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 26, 1954

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to include an inspiring letter received from Miss Lenna M. Stage, of East Orange, N. J. If all of us would get something of the spirit of this group in our own lives, it would surely be a better world. I agree with Miss Stage that we should not lose the most imaginative and humanitarian program in recent history, that we should not submerge the technical assistance program within a primarily military aid program.

The letter follows:

East Orange, N. J., *July 20, 1954.*

Hon. Hugh J. Addonizio,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Congressman: I am a member of an international, interdenominational prayer group, known as the United Prayer Tower, in St. Paul, Minn., founded by Dr. Glenn Clark, formerly a professor at Macalester College.

We want you to know that we are holding you close in our prayers that God may guide you to bring into perfect fulfillment the point 4 program as it was originally intended, that of creating good will between the peoples of the world—not war. We believe that if our Government, with your cooperation, would adopt this program as it was set up in the very beginning, to aid peoples of other lands to help themselves to get health, education, and an adequate food supply, they would know that we are truly a Christian Nation in deed as well as in word. We know this program has veered greatly toward a military aspect during recent months, but you in your position would have the power to remold and make it truly Christian.

As a representative of America and as a Christian gentleman, we ask you to use your authority to bring our Nation to a realization of its importance in God's great plan before it is too late. Our prayers will be undergirding you in this tremendous opportunity and task.

Very sincerely yours,

Lenna M. Stage.

Controlling the Federal Debt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 26, 1954

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an extremely able statement prepared by Mr. Herbert J. Miller, executive director of the Tax Foundation, with respect to the public debt and the limitations that have from time to time been imposed by Congress.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

CONTROLLING THE FEDERAL DEBT

(By Herbert J. Miller, executive director, Tax Foundation)

Nearly everyone voices worry over the increasing Federal debt. The disaster at the end of the fiscal road we are traveling is pictured so constantly by group and individual pronouncements that there is growing wonderment why we cannot manage our financial affairs to make more debt unnecessary. Before this wonderment generates a craven acceptance of the idea that controlling debt is hopeless, the source of our fiscal danger must be identified.

What is the source? The stock answer is that more people support than oppose spending financed by borrowing, and that Congress is responsive to this decision.

Behind easy generalizations lies the real source of our dangrous debt situation: there is no place in congressional procedures where the authorization of expenditures is related to incomes from taxes or to the incurring of debt. Where and when can a Member of Congress exercise his right to oppose, or assume his responsibility for incurring government debt? Virtually the only time a Congressman or Senator has a chance to act on the specific question of incurring debt is when he votes "yes" or "no" on an increase in the statutory debt limit. The effectiveness of even this procedure has been uncertain. To appraise it requires a short explanation of Federal debt control from World War I to the present.

Prior to World War I Federal debt was a minor problem. On July 1, 1914, the interest bearing debt was less than $1 billion. At this time Federal debt could be created only by a specific act of Congress and the purpose which the debt was to finance was identified.

Due to the fiscal needs of World War I, this procedure was revised and the Secretary of the Treasury was given blanket authority to borrow, subject to an overall limit imposed by Congress. This statutory limit was raised successively from $11.5 billion to $20 billion, to $28 billion, to $37 billion, and then to $37.5 billion in 1921. It was raised to $45.5 billion in 1931, $48 billion in 1934 and then reduced to $45 billion in 1935. In 1940 it was raised to $49 billion, in 1941 to $65 billion, in 1942 to $125 billion, in 1943 to $210 billion, in 1944 to $260 billion, in 1945 to $300 billion. It was reduced in 1946 to $275 billion and a change was made in computing the debt covered by the limitation. Last year the administration requested that the $275 billion limit be raised to $290 billion. The House agreed but the Senate finance Committee blocked passage of the bill.

While there has been some challenge of the legal effectiveness of this limitation, an argument of some practical logic is that a Congress which has voted an expenditure and tax program requiring additional debt is thereby obligated to raise the statutory debt limit in such amount as is found necessary. This view was expressed by the Secretary of the Treasury in 1946, as follows:

"The amount of the public debt is a residual figure. Changes in it come about only after the Treasury has taken into account all of the Government's receipts from taxes and other sources in relation to the volume of expenditures that have been authorized by Congress. * * * In the final analysis, therefore, it should be clearly understood that the amount of the public debt is determined by Congress and is the end result at the Treasury of the appropriation and the revenue legislation. * * *

"This does not mean to say that I am against having a debt limit. On the contrary, the Treasury has always believed—and I too have believed both when I have been in and out of the Treasury—that a debt limit is a good thing to have.

"The point that I want to make is only that the limit in itself does not reduce the debt, and that the limit should not be set so low that it will remove from the Treasury some of the flexibility that it needs in current public debt management operations."[1]

ISSUE BECOMES CLOUDED

Thus, at the one point in the fiscal procedure where Congress faces up to the problem of debt, the issue is clouded by the fact that at such time it is a residual issue of prior splintered actions of the Congress on expenditures and taxes which were not related to the incurrence of debt. The fact, however, that it is the one place where the debt issue is raised explains the significance some Members of Congress attach to the statutory debt limit.

This year, for the first time, the statutory debt limit offers some opportunity to affect current fiscal trends. Prior increases in the limit were in amounts substantially above current needs but the present leeway (about $5 billion) between Government debt outstanding and the statutory limit is small enough to offer an opportunity to control not only debt but expenditures as fell.

Refusal by Congress to raise the present statutory limitation would present some challenging possibilities for fiscal management by the executive branch, including adjustments in the authorized expenditure program. Even if the limitation is raised this year, there is growing evidence that some Members of Congress intend to use this limit so as to make debt increase an issue which Congress should decide annually.

UNITED STATES ATTITUDE ON DEBT

This explanation of the existing congressional procedure to control debt poses the query, "Is the procedure adequate?" and, if not, "How can it be improved?" The answer to these questions requires an under-

---

Footnotes at end of speech.

standing of the traditional attitude in this country toward government debt. That tradition is deep rooted. If taxes are levied concurrently with public expenditures, the officials responsible for voting the expenditures must face the reaction of the people both to the expenditures and the consequent taxes. If debt is incurred to finance expenditures this concurrent review of expenditures and taxes is deferred, and according to our tradition that can generate irresponsible spending.

Professor Adams expressed our traditional attitude toward debt very well in his book, Public Debts, as follows:

"As self-government was secured through a struggle for mastery over the public purse, so must it be maintained through the exercise by the people of complete control over public expenditure. * * * Any method of procedure, therefore, by which a public servant can veil the true meaning of his acts, or which allows the Government to enter upon any great enterprise without bringing the fact fairly to the knowledge of the public, must work against the realization of the constitutional idea. This is exactly the state of affairs introduced by a free use of public credit. Under ordinary circumstances, popular attention cannot be drawn to public acts, except they touch the pocket of the voters through an increase of taxes; and it follows that a government whose expenditures are met by resort to loans may, for a time, administer affairs independently of those who must finally settle the account." [2]

As a result of this traditional caution, State constitutions and local charters are replete with limitations imposed on officials in the incurring of public debt. In most of the States, it is far more difficult to create debt than to vote expenditures financed currently by taxes. Forty State constitutions generally require either an amendment to the constitution or a vote of the people to authorize debt beyond certain specified amounts, except for such purpose as repelling invasion. Three other State constitutions contain less stringent procedural restrictions. Only five States have no constitutional controls. Despite modifications through legal interpretation, these constitutional restrictions disclose the deep-rooted fear among the people of carte blanche authority for their officials to create debt.

The committee on State government of the National Municipal League has prepared a model State constitution which provides as follows:

"SEC. 701. Borrowing power: The credit of the State or any civil division thereof shall not in any manner, directly or indirectly, be given or lent to or used in aid of any individual association, or private corporation.

"SEC. 702. Debt limitations: No debt shall be contracted by or in behalf of this State unless such debt shall be authorized by law for a single project or object distinctly specified therein; and no such law shall, except for the purpose of repelling invasion, suppressing insurrection, defending the State in war, meeting natural catastrophes, or redeeming the indebtedness of the State outstanding at the time this constitution is approved, take effect until it shall been submitted to the qualified voters at a regular election and have received a favorable majority of all votes cast upon such question at such election; except that the State may by law borrow money to meet appropriations for any fiscal year in anticipation of the collection of the revenues of such year, but all debts so contracted in anticipation of revenues shall be paid within 1 year." [3]

KEEP STATE DEBT DOWN

The effect of State constitutional restrictions on debt is of interest. The tax foundation, in a forthcoming study on constitutional debt limitations, notes that the average per capita debt of the 20 States which require a constitutional amendment to incur debt was $43.24 in 1953. (If the nine of this group which had approved veterans' bonuses were excluded, the average would have been $11.82.) The average per-capita debt for the 20 States which required a vote of the people was $49.46. In contrast, for the 8 States where there are either no constitutional restrictions or minor ones, the average per capita debt was $77.18.

The traditional State concern for safeguarding their incurrence of debt, evidenced by many constitutional restrictions, has no parallel in the Federal Government where incurring debt is as easy as passing a bill. The United States Constitution has no direct restriction on debt and congressional procedures are nearly as delinquent. May not this be a source of our fiscal danger, the presence of which is so universally emphasized?

To what extent was the easy road toward Federal debt responsible for the expenditures by the Federal Government during the depression of the 1930's? Was it a road made to order for those who fought Government debt was a way to finance expenditures to boost buying power of the people by deferring taxes, and that this course was sound because we owed the debt to ourselves? Did lack of debt control encourage the belief that Government could support the people by mortgaging future taxpayers? How many of these expenditures would have been tolerated if taxes had been levied concurrently?

There may be no sure answer to these questions, but it is certain that the ease with which the Federal Government can create debt has encouraged both civilian and military expenditures. Even now, in a period of high economic activity, it is proposed that the Federal Government should initiate a program of aid for education because the States and local government have restrictions on incurring debt and the Federal Government does not. Would this and other Federal aid programs be accepted so inertly if we moved out from behind the camouflage of Federal Government debt, and we recognized we had to pay for such aids by taxes?

One argument against recent proposals to put constitutional controls on Federal debt is that such restrictions are proper for local government and even the States, but that the Federal Government is sovereign and must be free to borrow. This has been suggested as a reason why our Founding Fathers did not put debt controls in our Constitution. It may be more reasonable to recognize that the present areas of Federal expenditure were not even visualized when the Constitution was written. It is most likely that the Founding Fathers thought they had so restricted Federal operations that there would be no need for debt control. It may be that they also assumed that the marketplace for Government securities would control debt, not realizing that a Federal Reserve System would provide a controlled market.

A misapprehension found in some opposition to constitutional restriction on Federal debt is that a definite dollar limitation is the sole objective. With our monetary experience in war and inflation, it would be unrealistic to put such a dollar limit in the Constitution. But accepting this view does not preclude other proposals which control debt incurrence rather than limit the precise amount of debt.

One provision found in some State constitutions is that more than a majority of the legislative body must approve incurrence of debt. If Federal debt is demanded on the grounds of emergency needs, it should not be too restrictive to require a two-thirds majority of the Congress to approve the debt (which majority is required to pass a bill over a Presidential veto). Other proposals would require identification of the purpose for which debt is to be created and insurance that the debt issue is specifically and annually faced by the Congress.

Opposition to constitutional provision does not bar consideration of statutory methods to improve our debt-control procedures. Many such improvements have been offered but few have been chosen. One such has fallen into disuse even though it is still on the statute books. In 1946 a joint committee of the Congress was created to recommend improvements in operations to enable Congress to better meet its responsibilities under the Constitution. In the report on strengthening fiscal control it was stated:

'Control over revenues and expenditures is divided not only between the House and Senate, but also within each House between its revenue and appropriating committees. Neither of the two Appropriations Committees imposes any overall limitations upon its total appropriations before the individual supply bills are voted on by the Houses. Nor do they attempt to coordinate appropriations with revenues so as to fix an overall fiscal policy for the year.

"With this divided authority existing not only between the Appropriation Committees of each House, but also among their many subcommittees, and among the revenue-raising committees, how could Congress have a general fiscal policy or follow it if it had one? * * *

"Your committee believes that only through the determination each session of a definite congressional policy on fiscal matters limiting the total amount to be appropriated can aggregate income and expenditures be properly related." [4]

The committee then recommended that a legislative budget be adopted annually by the Congress.

While a legislative budget was later incorporated in the Legislative Reorganization Act, it never was effective and is now ignored. Conceding basic faults in the proposal as adopted, it is plain that Congress at least recognized that it has no procedure which gives a Member of Congress the right, or imposes the responsibility, to vote annually on the issue of creating Government debt. Under present procedures the responsibility, official or unofficial, for incurring debt is about as nebulous as the identity of the taxpayers who must some day pay the bill.

It would be misleading, however, to infer that current taxpayers are escaping the entire burden of expenditures financed by Government debt. Many have paid a cruel price through inflation and a loss in the purchasing power of their savings. The further use of inflation to lessen the impact of a growing debt is not comforting as a prospect. Moreover, the huge interest on the debt must be met annually, although we can and have borrowed to pay interest costs. In the Executive budget for this fiscal year the interest on the Federal debt ($7 billion) is the largest item except for national-security expenditure.

The extent to which our Government policies reflect this mania of authorizing expenditures to win favor (and power) and deferring the cost to a future time so as to not generate disfavor should be a warning of the speed with which we are pursuing our dangerous course.

Voting for everything today which can be financed by mortgaging the future is as sure a path to disaster as history and an understanding of human nature can offer. Yet in the Federal fiscal procedure this issue is not related to the voting on authorized expenditures or tax levies, which are the determining factors in debt creation. The Federal Government needs fiscal procedures by constitutional and/or statutory mandates which make the incurrence of debt an issue in each

---

Footnotes at end of speech.

Footnotes at end of speech.

fiscal year and relate that issue to expenditures and income. Without such our Ship of State will have too much sail and not enough anchor.

---

[1] Statement of Fred M. Vinson, Secretary of the Treasury, before the Senate Committee on Finance, on reduction of the debt limitation, April 23, 1946, reprinted in Annual Report of the Secretary of the Treasury, 1946, pp. 293–294.

[2] H. C. Adams, Public Debts, D. Appleton & Co., New York, 1887, pp. 22–23.

[3] National Muncipal League, Model State Constitution, New York, 1948.

[4] Report of the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress, U. S. House of Representatives, 79th Cong., 2d sess., Organization of the Congress, pp. 18 and 19.

The President's Public Health Bill Defeated

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE L. HAYS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 26, 1954

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a newspaper release of Thursday, July 22, by my colleague, Mr. Burdick, of North Dakota. Although Mr. Burdick is a Republican and I am a Democrat, I have a great regard for his opinions and for the outstanding contribution that he has made and is making in the House of Representatives. I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. Burdick's comments on this particular piece of legislation coincides with my own and like Mr. Burdick I voted to recommit this bill.

The above-mentioned follows:

Your Congressman Comments

(By Usher L. Burdick, of North Dakota)

THE PRESIDENT'S PUBLIC-HEALTH BILL DEFEATED

The bill had only a name and nothing else and was defeated in the House by 100 votes. It was so obvious that this was a political "sop" to the people that even Congressmen understood what it was. The President had promised a public-health program and his advisers thought this bill would be accepted as a fulfillment of that promise. The only argument advanced for it was "the President wants it." Charley Halleck, Republican floor leader, knew the bill was a sugar-coated bread pill, but he is the President's "man" and had to orate for it. It was a good speech, but I do not recall what he said. It was much like the milky way—you couldn't outline it and the effect soon disappeared.

The bill provided for an appropriation of $25 million to be administered by another bureau, but did it help poor people get health attention? No. Not a dime was to go to people who could not get health insurance. It would help the 90 million who already had health insurance. The private companies who had issued this insurance could reinsure with the Government. It was a windfall to private insurance companies to strengthen them on insurance already paid for by the 90 million who are insured. This insurance against sickness had already been paid for by the insured—at rates the companies made themselves—and just why the President wanted to protect insurance companies instead of the people who have no insurance was not disclosed. In Halleck's speech he said the President wanted it and that was the only disclosure he made.

All the other people—poor people who were too poor to get health insurance—were left out. This class constituted 60 million people. If this $25 million fund had been set up for this purpose, the bill would have passed. Congress saw, however, that the bill was phony and promptly killed it.

According to the press, the President is right back, asking Congress for the same $25 million. He evidently wants it because he wants it.

Let Freedom Ring

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 26, 1954

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, since coming to Washington it has been my privilege to attend church many times at the Metropolitan Memorial Methodist Church, Dr. Edward Gardiner Latch, minister.

On Sunday, July 4, Dr. Latch delivered a message which, in my opinion, was outstanding and should be considered by everyone. In his human as well as eloquent way Dr. Latch gave us something to think about and, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including his sermon entitled "Let Freedom Ring":

Some 1,800 years ago an unknown author wrote a chapter which might well be called the hall of fame of the Bible. In it he recorded the names of the people of his race, men who in peace and in war had striven for the common good. By faith, Abel offered unto God a more excellent sacrifice than Cain. By faith, Enoch was translated that he should not see death. By faith, Noah prepared an ark and saved his family. By faith, Abraham set out not knowing whither he went. He looked for a city which hath foundations, whose builder and maker is God. By faith, Moses chose to suffer affliction with the people of God, than to enjoy the pleasures of sin for a season.

And why should I go on? Time would fail me to tell of those who through faith subdued kingdoms, wrought righteousness, obtained promises, stopped the mouths of lions, out of weakness were made strong. They were stoned, they were sawn asunder, they were tempted, they were slain with the sword, men of whom the world was not worthy. "And these all having obtained a good report through faith, received not the promise; God having provided some better thing for us, that they without us should not be made perfect." Therefore seeing we are compassed about with so great a cloud of witnesses, let us run with patience the race that is set before us looking unto Jesus, the author and finisher of our faith.

Now turn pages of history to the year 1863 when a great American stood on the battlefield of Gettysburg and referring to the thousands of men who there had yielded up their lives said "Fourscore and seven years ago our fathers brought forth on this continent a new nation, conceived in liberty, and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal. * * * It is for us the living to be dedicated here to the unfinished work which they who fought here have thus far so nobly advanced. It is rather for us to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us—that from these honored dead we take increased devotion to that cause for which they gave the last full measure of devotion—that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain—that this Nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom and that government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth."

In these two great utterances separated in time by 18 centuries the words are different but the meaning of what they are saying is essentially the same. Men have lived heroic lives and died heroic deaths; yet the causes for which they lived and died have not yet fully triumphed. And they cannot triumph apart from us. Without our devotion their devotion cannot come to its highest fruition. Without our dedication their dedication cannot bear fruit in our day and in the days to come. Without our faith their faith may soon lose its meaning. Therefore, on this Fourth of July, let us highly resolve that those who have lived and died so nobly before us shall not have lived and died in vain, and that this Nation under God, shall continue to have a new birth of freedom, and that government of the people, by the people and for the people shall not perish from the earth, and that through us they shall see some of the fulfillment of their hopes and some of the realization of their dreams. Remember, apart from us that for which they gave their lives can never fully triumph.

We must realize the truth that progress is not inevitable. Two generations or so ago Herbert Spencer was saying that progress was a beneficent necessity and this philosophy found expression in the words of Coue. "Day by day, in every way, we are getting better and better." Progress was inevitable. And so it seemed. Before World War I, there was a growing feeling of confidence throughout the world that science, education, and religion would triumph naturally and inevitably. On the wave of optimism the human race was advancing. The creed of many was efficiency, their Gods—money and power, their goal—unending material prosperity. Even the church drank deep of this spirit and emphasized numbers rather than newness of life, and elaborate organization rather than evangelistic zeal.

Then look what happened. There came World War I, followed by a spasm of prosperity, leading to the depths of depression, which gave rise to fascism and totalitarianism which in turn ushered in World War II, and the end is by no means in sight even now. Perhaps we can see finally and at last that progress is not inevitable, it does not come automatically, it will not arrive as a matter of course, it most certainly is not a beneficent necessity. Progress will never take place without human effort, human devotion, human discipline, and human sacrifice.

Civilization, insofar as it has advanced, represents a continuous struggle against inertia, ignorance, greed, and fear. If civilization is to endure, if civilization is to advance, this struggle must go on and on and on without interruption. There must be no stopping of the struggle against human inertia, no truce with ignorance, no peace with greed, no capitulation to fear and no compromise with communism, some leaders to the contrary notwithstanding.

Now the meaning of all this, so far as those who have lived and died for our country are concerned, is clear enough. We have them at our mercy. All that they lived and labored to do, all that they gave their lives to accomplish, we, the living, may conserve or destroy. If we choose, we can leave unfinished the tasks they so nobly began, or if we choose we can help to finish the tasks they have handed down to us.

Let us consider one of these unfinished tasks, unfinished business, I would like to call it, and see how true it is that the men who began it and helped it on its way can never see the fulfillment of their hope nor the realization of their dream apart from us. Take, for instance, the struggle for freedom.

Not all men believe that freedom is essential to human development and human progress, so let us say emphatically that freedom is worth dying for, worth fighting for, worth living for. Tolstoy is reported to have written a letter to a friend in which he complained of the Russian censorship and spoke of the effect it had on his own mental activity. He wanted to be free to write what he felt. But whenever he sat down to do so, he found himself considering what he would be permitted to publish or forbidden to publish, and with the awful specter of censorship before him he found he could not write. Suppose you had to write under the eyes of a relentless censor. What effect would it have upon your mental activity? Truly the lack of freedom cramps the human style. We cannot write our best, we cannot do our best, we cannot live at our best, we cannot arrive at any sense of self-realization apart from freedom, the freedom of the mind to think and to speak and to write and to do.

Not only the interest and welfare of the individual is here at stake, but also the possibility of intellectual, moral, and social advance. Suppose a censor had been on board the *Mayflower* in 1620 when a little group of 103 people crossed miles of threatening sea to a new continent to establish a foothold in a wilderness in order to secure for themselves and their children the freedom to worship God according to the dictates of their conscience. Suppose that censor had said "no" to the compact signed on that ship; an event which Bancroft, the historian, said "was the birthday of constitutional liberty."

"Amidst the storm they sang,
And the stars heard and the sea;
And the sounding aisles of the dim woods rang
To the anthem of the free."

Suppose a censor had been present in Philadelphia, July 1776, when the Continental Congress signed the Declaration of Independence—pointing the way to freedom on these shores. The old bell ringer, who had been told to be on hand to start ringing the bell as soon as the Declaration was adopted, was pessimistic and kept saying "they'll never do it, they'll never do it." After a while a boy appeared and said "ring, ring, let freedom ring." And the Liberty Bell rang the refrain of freedom.

Suppose a censor had been present in 1787 when the Constitution was adopted and later in 1789 when the Bill of Rights was proposed guaranteeing free speech, free press, free religion, and free assembly. But the Constitution and the Bill of Rights were adopted, and this great Nation under the great leadership under a great President was on its way—a free country with freedom for the individual.

No wonder we sing, and we ought to sing with all our hearts:

"My country, 'tis of thee,
Sweet land of liberty,
Of thee I sing:
Land where our fathers died,
Land of the pilgrims' pride,
From every mountain side
Let freedom ring!"

There can be no human advance, there can be no possibility of human advance apart from freedom. And note this fact—the struggle for freedom is never permanently won. It is always an unfinished task or as we might call it this morning—unfinished business. The freedom won by one generation must be won by the next generation. Freedom cannot be passed on from one meeting to the next, from year to year, from one decade to the succeeding decade, from one generation to the following generation. Each generation must win it for itself. Freedom of speech, freedom of press, freedom of assembly, freedom of worship—we thought we had them. Did not our dathers live and die for these freedoms? Are they not guaranteed by the Constitution? Yet this is not enough. The struggle must go on and on and on. Freedom must be won by each generation. The faith of the fathers must become the faith of the sons. The freedom of one generation must become the freedom of the following generation. The democracy of one decade must become the democracy of the following decade. Unless this is done—freedom is lost. Those who gave their all to secure freedom on these shores cannot have the fulfillment of their hopes nor the realization of their dreams apart from us.

Abel, Enoch, Noah, Abraham, Moses—all obtained a good report through faith, but they received not the full promise. For they without us cannot be made perfect. And so we name some of the great leaders of our Nation. George Washington, Benjamin Franklin, Thomas Jefferson, and Abraham Lincoln. As we think of their hopes and dreams for freedom, again we say apart from us they cannot receive the fulfillment of their hopes.

A man was taking his 8-year-old daughter to New York to see the sights. Among other things he took her to see the Statue of Liberty. She was fascinated by this marvelous statute which as stood for many years at the entrance to New York harbor, lifting her torch of liberty to enlighten the world. Going to bed that evening she said, "Daddy, I am thinking of that lady out there all by herself with nobody to help her hold up her lamp. It is dark out there. Shouldn't we be helping Miss Liberty to hold up her lamp in the darkness?"

To be sure we must. It is dark in our world and it is getting darker. Liberty needs help if she is to continue to hold up her lamp in the darkness. The bellringer needs help if he and we are to let freedom ring in our world. Now is the time for us to resolve that this Nation of ours shall keep freedom alive in our world and that all men everywhere, insofar as possible, shall have the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Talking about it is not enough, talking about doing something about it is not enough. As a people we must take a stand for freedom and we must denounce restrictions to freedom wherever and whenever found. We denounce them in Russia and rightly so. We must also denounce them in Spain, in South America, in Asia, and in Africa. Our position in the world would be higher and better if we would bring more integrity and more consistency into our national policies and our national principles.

Five men were asked the following question: "If good qualities could be given by hypodermic needle, what kind of shot would you recommend for most people?" The first man said, "A shot of gratitude"; the second many said, "A shot of understanding"; and the third man said, "Dependability"; the fourth, "Happiness"; and the fifth, "Proper sense of timing." It is my thought that our Nation needs a shot of integrity, of enough integrity, to take a stand for freedom anywhere in our world and to denounce the restrictions to freedom everywhere on our own planet. And should our Nation go down let her go down with integrity and with the flag of freedom flying.

This sense of integrity roots in the reality of our religious faith. When Lincoln wrote the first rough draft of his Gettysburg Address he said, "That we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain; that this Nation shall have a new birth of freedom." He reread it and wrote with a clearer insight, "This Nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom."

The only guaranty for freedom of the individual or for freedom in our world is in religious faith. And in the hearts of those who believe in God and keep themselves committed to Him.

Jesus saw this clearly. Before him one day was a great multitude of people all of whom were saying "what shall we eat, drink, wear?" These are natural human desires—every one has them. But Jesus says that we must not let worry and anxiety about them master us for our Heavenly Father knows that we need them. The surest way to get them without worry and anxiety is to seek first God and uprightness and integrity before Him and "all these things shall be added unto you." Food and drink and clothes are good desires but we will never get them without anxiety, without fulfilling a prior condition of God first and uprightness before Him.

Freedom is a great desire but we will never have it without fulfilling a prior condition, God first and uprightness and integrity before Him. With God we shall advance from one height to another, without God we shall descend from one disaster to another. For the ultimate foundations of a nation are not economic but ethical; not military but moral; not social but spiritual; not racial but regious. This is a basic law which underlies the good life everywhere.

What can we Christians do now? For one thing we can put some practice into the principles we profess. We want God in the life of the world and the Nation, then we must have God in the life of our churches, in the life of our homes, and in our own hearts. On our part there must be a genuine and a real commitment of our lives to God. Only as we do this can Christianity make a significant contribution to the cause of human freedom. Doing this we can make our homes fountains of developing Christian character, doing this we can make our churches seedbeds of idealism and power and good will; doing this we shall keep faith with our noble dead and this Nation, under God, shall continue to have a new birth of freedom and government of the people, by the people, for the people shall not perish from the earth.

"Our fathers' God to Thee,
Author of liberty,
To Thee we sing:
Long may our land be bright
With freedom's holy light;
Protect us by Thy might,
Great God, our King."

Dairying Is Important Industry in Kentucky

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 26, 1954

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial entitled "Dairying Is Important Industry in Kentucky," which appeared in the July 22, 1954, issue of the Leitchfield Gazette, of Leitchfield, Ky.

The editorial is as follows:

DAIRYING IS IMPORTANT INDUSTRY IN KENTUCKY

It is encouraging to learn that Kentucky now ranks 4th among the 48 States in production of evaporated milk, 8th in cheese production, 14th in total milk, and 16th in butter. If present trends continue, the State eventually should rank among the top producers of dairy products, a goal that deserves the support of every businessman and farmer in Kentucky. Much of our land is unsuitable for row-cropping and cannot compete with the Plains States in production of grain, but there usually is enough pasture on terrain that is more easily adapted to dairying than to any other large-scale farm operation.

Dairying requires a great amount of labor in comparison to other livestock, and that is what makes it particularly suitable to an area of low labor costs, as labor is one of the larger items in production of milk. Dairying also furnishes a regular source of cash income to farmers who in most other work must operate for long periods on credit or accumulated surpluses with no assurance of a crop that will be profitable. Like poultry raising, dairying generally pays off in direct proportion to the amount of planning and work done, whether the operator does the work himself or hires it done.

The advent of artificial breeding offers dairymen an opportunity to bring their herds up to a level of production comparable to the best. Failure to take advantage of the chance to improve stock is similar to using a wooden moldboard plow in preference to a metal one. Those who try to improve farming methods are more likely to realize profits from their endeavors and, at the same time, are aiding their neighbors to make more from their own efforts.

Legislation and the Constitution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 23, 1954

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am calling the attention of my distinguished colleagues to an editorial in the Chicago Daily Tribune, of July 22, 1954, calling upon the President of the United States to veto a bill passed by both branches of the Congress. The bill that the Chicago Tribune believes should be vetoed is one requiring Communists to register their printing presses and duplicating machines with the Government. The Chicago Tribune says that this is in direct violation to the first amendment of the Constitution.

I do not think that anyone, in agreement or in disagreement with the Chicago Tribune on matters of political policy, would accuse the Chicago Tribune of being in any sense pro-Communist.

The editorial coming from such a source indicates the vigilance required on the part of those of us in the Congress and upon the men and women we represent to draw well-considered distinctions between measures necessary to protect us from subversive activities and measures which, seeking a good objective, may actually serve in a broader area to undermine our constitutional rights.

By unanimous consent, I am extending my remarks to include the editorial from the Chicago Tribune:

VETO THIS ONE

Congress has approved a bill requiring Communists to register their printing presses and duplicating machines with the Government. This bill is in direct violation of the first amendment of the Constitution which say that Congress may make no laws abridging the freedom of the press. The requirement to register a press is a textbook example of how to disregard the letter and spirit of the amendment.

Requiring every printer to register his press with the Government is to proclaim that the Federal Government has a legitimate interest in knowing who owns printing presses. Compulsory registration is only one step, and a very short one, from requiring operators of printing presses to obtain licenses from the Government.

In the reaction after the Napoleonic wars, registration was required in England under a statute passed in 1820 which declared that every person possessing a printing press or types for printing and every typefounder must give notice to the clerk of the peace. The first amendment was intended to forbid the enactment of any such laws in this country and it is shocking, therefore, to learn that the press-registration bill, which has passed both Houses, and will shortly reach the President for approval or veto, was proposed by his Attorney General, Mr. Brownell. It is thus an administration measure, in a sense, but if Mr. Eisenhower vetoes it, as we profoundly hope he will, he will have earned the gratitude of all true liberals in this country.

A Vote of Thanks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 26, 1954

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to direct the attention of our colleagues to the following letter I received from Mr. Ross A. Messer, legislative representative of the National Association of Post Office and General Services Maintenance Employees, regarding my vote on H. R. 9245:

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF POST
OFFICE AND GENERAL SERVICES
MAINTENANCE EMPLOYEES,
Washington, D. C., July 23, 1954.

Subject: Voting against suspension of the rules for consideration of postage rate increases and postal salary increase in a combined bill

MY DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: I wish to take this opportunity to thank you for voting not to suspend the rules and permit consideration of H. R. 9245, as amended by the chairman of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee to include the postage rate increase H. R. 6052, and the so-called Rees compromise postal salary increase bill, H. R. 9836.

It appears that approval of the deletion of the wording of H. R. 9245 as reported and the substitution of the wording of H. R. 6052 and H. R. 9836 was a definite attempt on the part of the House leadership to force those who favor an adequate postal salary increase bill to accept a postage rate increase bill, and make the salary increase dependent upon the passage of the rate increase bill.

This association has never favored the tying together of two such bills. We favor the principle of letting each measure stand on its own merit. We want you to know that we honestly and sincerely appreciate your vote not to suspend the rules for consideration of the above matter.

Respectfully yours,
ROSS A. MESSER,
Legislative Representative.

Coal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILL E. NEAL

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 26, 1954

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to call to the attention of the House four articles on the subject of coal, written by Hugh Maxwell, of the Huntington Advertiser. I believe this gives a pretty complete picture of the situation as it is today. The first and second articles follow:

COAL MINE INDUSTRY IS SICK BUT OUTLOOK FAVORABLE—I

(By Hugh Maxwell)

West Virginia's coal industry—the State's economic mainstay and the employer of 1 West Virginian in every 16—is sick and no immediate cure is in sight. But the long-range prognosis is favorable.

The business—a $650 million operation last fiscal year which paid $395 million in wages and contributed one-fifth, or $8,267,000, of the State's gross sales taxes—is ailing for reasons largely outside its own control.

The industry in Kentucky, Ohio, and Virginia—in fact, over the whole of the southern Appalachian field—is also ill.

Bituminous coal, the "black diamond" of American economy, has been losing its market at home to fuel oil and gas. It has been losing its customers abroad to revival of coal mining there.

The coal operator of West Virginia and elsewhere in the rich bituminous fields finds himself trying to sell a commodity produced at high fixed cost in a market saturated by cheaper competitive commodities.

The coal operator has been forced to scale his production down to the diminished demand for his commodity. This has spelled unemployment for almost 44,000 of the State's 100,000 coal miners. It has brought localized depression to coal-mining centers like Logan, Williamson, Welch, Beckley, and others. It has hurt larger fringe cities such as Huntington, Charleston, and Wheeling.

COMPANION INDUSTRIES FURLOUGHING WORKERS

Retail trade is down. Layoffs in industries serving the coal business, such as railways, mine-car building firms, and mining machinery compenies, are occurring. The big coal-carrying railways serving the West Virginia fields, such as the Chesapeake & Ohio and the Norfolk & Western, are furloughing shopworkers in ratio with the decline in coal freight tonnage.

Chain-store companies are closing up and moving out of the coal-mining centers hardest hit by the slump.

What is happening to the coal industry in West Virginia and elsewhere adds up to a dark picture. The illness of the industry is profound but, strangely enough, the industry's leaders—both in organized labor and management—refuse to be downhearted.

They believe that the current dip is cyclical and temporary; that tremendous new demands for coal are shaping up as the American economy enters a new atomic and chemical era; and that eventually bituminous coal mining will be more prosperous than ever.

Of course it is useless to attempt to sell the idle coal miner a bill of future goods. He's got his month's rent to pay and he's living on unemployment compensation for as long as it lasts, a maximum of 24 weeks. After that, he accepts the 1 or 2 days' works a week his operator allows him for eating money. Actually some of the mines are operated only to keep the miners in necessary groceries.

But even the miner realizes that coal mining is going through a readjustment. He hopes for the best and meanwhile he reposes his faith—his complete and trusting faith—in John L. Lewis.

There is no sign among the United Mine Workers of the West Virginia fields, as yet, of any widespread disaffection for John L.

There is a drift of coal miners away from coal mining. In Logan County alone, there are only 9,000 left of an original 14,000.

DEMAND FOR BITUMINOUS COAL STEADILY GROWING

Almost unnoticed, even as workers drift away from coal production and operators close their unprofitable mines, a demand for bituminous coal is building up that may reach undreamed-of proportions within the next decade.

Atomic power is ahead. At first blush, it seems a threat to coal.

Actually, according to the forward-thinking leaders of the coal industry, it should be a help.

Atomic energy, they point out, is produced by prodigal expenditure of electric power. Coal produces this power in areas that lack waterpower and these areas occupy most of the United States.

The postulate has been advanced that ultimately atomic power will be used to produce itself, to the exclusion of electricity and coal. This possibility is limited, however, by supplies of uranium, which are scanty over the world, and by factors of safety and economy.

The relative cheapness of electricity and coal, as contrasted with tremendously costly and dangerous atomic energy may recommend permanent use of electricity and coal in the atomic age.

An increased demand from ordinary householders for electricity is pushing output of generating plants to unprecedented heights and this trend is expected to continue.

The American public is buying more and more home-comfort and labor-saving devices—all powered by electricity. They include air-conditioners, window fans, clothes washers and dryers, refrigerators, deep freezers, vacuum cleaners, home-lighting equipment and other conveniences.

Where coal benefits from all this is in sales to the generating plants. Already the plants of the larger utilities are buying coal by weekly trainloads.

CHEMICAL PLANTS BIG POTENTIAL COAL USERS

Another potentially big user of bituminous coal is the chemical industry. Coal is a storehouse of valuable chemicals. Coking releases many; others are recovered by other processes, new ones of which are developed rapidly.

More than 200 chemical compounds come from coal tar alone—examples are moth repellants, antiseptics, wood preservatives, and road toppings.

Chemicals from coal are used also in pharmaceutical manufacturing. Aspirin and a long list of other drugs come from coal. Benzene is a byproduct of coal as is toluene for explosives and antifreeze for automobiles. Rat poison, plastics, flameproof paints, fertilizers, and refrigerants all owe something to coal.

The enormous plant of the Carbide & Carbon Chemicals Corp at South Charleston, and that of E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co. at Belle, are leaders in the conversion of coal into marketable chemicals. Research heads of these firms believe the possibilities are limitless.

The history of coal in West Virginia is replete with interest. The coal industry is the direct successor to the salt-making industry of the Kanawha River Valley in the early 1850's. This was a thriving vocation until about 1857, when the saline supply neared exhaustion and workings began to close.

The salt operators turned to crude strip and drift mining of cannel coal, as the high-volatile coal of western Virginia—there was no "West Virginia" political entity then—was known.

Occasionally the early coal operators encountered natural hazards. Some of them, believe it or not, fell prey to spiteful Indians who had a habit of picking off unwary white men with the guns the white men had sold them illegally. If the pioneer coal operator managed to escape Indians he might be laid low by a wolf or bear. There were also panthers with which to contend.

The forests of western Virginia were virgin and teemed with wildlife, much of it predatory.

Wolves were so bad in the period immediately preceding the Civil War that the white settlers of western Virginia exasperated beyond tolerance, put on a wolf-extermination drive that cleaned up the country.

Coal mining finally got off to a good start. Foreign capital flowed in. It was influenced by reports made by Prof. W. B. Rogers, an early mineralogist of West Virginia University that fortunes in coal underlay the Kanawha River Valley.

Several coal companies were organized between 1850 and 1856 to operate along Kanawha, Elk, and Coal Rivers. In 1857 the Kanawha Cannel Coal Mining & Manufacturing Co. erected at Charleston buildings for use in the cleaning and preparation of cannel coal for the market.

In 1858, the Corwin Cannel Coal Co. built an operation at Mill Creek, 7 miles up Elk River. Another early company was the Peytona Cannel Coal Co., which in 1854 erected an extensive mining plant at Peytona.

All these companies prospered.

The Cabell and Logan Coal Co. was one of the State's most prosperous in 1858, the year the Guyandotte River railroad was built, inaugurating the railroad era in what was later to be southern West Virginia.

In 1860, James C. McGrew, a famed pioneer in coal mining, opened an operation at the head of Pringles Run, 10 miles south of Kingwood. He began to ship coal to eastern cities but was forced to abandon his enterprise by a discrimination in freight rates in favor of mines farther west in which railroad officials were interested.

CIVIL WAR HELD BACK INDUSTRY DEVELOPMENT

As far as is known, the luckless James C. McGrew was the forerunner of countless coal operators to be plagued, down through the years, by capricious freight rates.

The Civil War broke upon the Nation at a time when the coal industry was making real strides. Abe Lincoln in the North and Jeff Davis in the South drained the industry of its adult male workers, leaving boys and women to drudge at mining in order that munitions making might continue.

The war demonstrated to the Nation's metal industries the value of bituminous coal as a fuel for manufacturing purposes.

After the war, money was poured into coal mining. Companies were formed and operations built in Putnam, Boone, Wayne, Mason, and Monongalia Counties by 1869; in Marion County by 1870, on New River in 1873, and in Fayette, Harrison, and Ohio Counties by 1880.

In 1903, there were 530 mines in the State, as compared with 1,079 now. Production in 1903 amounted to 24 million tons, as compared with 131,872,563 tons a half century later.

In 1890-91 the railways penetrated the principal coal fields. Land values soared from $1 an acre to 10, 20 and 30 times that figure. Coal production boomed. In 1912 it amounted to 59,581,774 tons, valued at $56,602,665, or less than $1 a ton.

Production of coal mounted steadily each year with the exception of the depression years of 1907, 1921, and the early 1930's.

The all-time high annual production of bituminous coal was in 1947, when 173,653,816 tons were taken from West Virginia workings.

Since then there has been a progressive decline.

COAL OPERATORS DECLARE WOES NOT UNDERSTOOD—II

(By Hugh Maxwell)

The picture for black diamonds—West Virginia's bituminous coal—is black indeed, but the best brains of the producing industry are occupied with plans to bring a more roseate hue to the scene.

They believe they will succeed. If so, say the operators, it will be only after the public, mine labor, tax-fixing bodies, the railways, the utilities, and all others concerned, understand fully what is wrong with the coal business in the Mountain State.

They contend that the coal picture is shot through with much economic and social injustice visited upon the operators. They claim that there is vast lack of appreciation for what the industry—a principal arm of defense in wartime and a heavy wage and taxpayer in peacetime—means to West Virginia and the Nation. They assert that coal operators rapidly are becoming "forgotten men" in the general industrial scheme of the United States. They predict that unless rescued, a great industry that had a payroll of $395 million in West Virginia alone last fiscal year will continue to succumb slowly.

FIXED COSTS SO HIGH COAL CAN'T MEET COMPETITION

They want everyone to know about the afflictions of the coal industry. They feel that public opinion, and the innate good sportsmanship of the American people, will do the rest. They want everyone to know what is wrong with the coal industry in West Virginia and the rest of the Southern Appalachian field.

Briefly, what is wrong is that coal produced in unionized mines has such a high fixed cost that it won't sell any longer in its market against the competition of cheaper fuels such as residual oil, natural gas, and nonunion coal.

In consequence of this state of affairs, the following has happened within recent months:

Production of bituminous coal in West Virginia has dropped from a peak of 173,653,816 tons in 1947 to 131,872,563 in 1953, a decline of 41,781,253 tons.

Production in Logan County, one of the principal fields in the State, has declined from 23,874,520 tons in 1947 to 16,583,238 tons in 1953, a drop of 7,291,282 tons.

The number of coal miners employed in the State has dropped from a high of 121,000 in 1949 to only 56,111 in 1954, a falling-off of 64,889. The number of miners employed last April was 44,751 fewer than in 1952.

The number of operating companies has declined from 1,318 in the peak year of 1947 to only 1,025 today.

The number of operations in West Virginia has fallen from 1,505 in 1947 to 1,079 in 1953.

DIESELIZATION OF RAILROADS COST A GOOD CUSTOMER

Nationwide, the sale of coal to railways has dropped in the past 10 years from 100 million to 120 million tons a year to only 20 million to 30 million because of the dieselization of railway locomotives. This trend is proceeding rapidly and operators expect their patronage from railways to amount to only 5 million to 6 million tons within 2 years.

Residual oil from Venezuela and other Caribbean countries, imported into Atlantic seaboard States, has taken away the market for 30 million tons of coal yearly.

The gloomy statistics could continue indefinitely but a hundred more would add little to the picture of gloom.

The coal operators blame their troubles chiefly upon the following:

1. The high wage to members of the United Mine Workers. The wage, basically $18.25 a day, is swelled by so-called fringe benefits, such as pay for the lunch hour, payments by the operators into the miners' welfare fund and other surcharges, to $23 a day.

2. Continuing high taxes and high freight rates.

3. Nonunion competition. (Some nonunion operators are undercutting union operators as much as 50 percent per ton in selling price.)

4. Competition of fuel oil, including residual oil which is permitted to come into the country under the Reciprocal Trade Agreement Act recently extended for 1 year.

5. Dieselization of motive industry, including railways.

6. Loss of foreign markets due to revival of coal mining abroad.

There are a number of other factors which add up to a generally tough break for the operators, they said.

Leading operators speak for themselves in the following interviews:

David L. Francis, of Huntington, president of the Princess Elkhorn Coal Co., with operations in Floyd County, Ky.: "Because of shrinking coal markets, brought on by the inroads of gas, oil, and cheaper fuels, coal operators have been forced into a ruinous competition of a cutthroat type.

"In order to get business, the companies are being forced to underbid one another in a buyers' market. The bottom of this downward spiral has not been reached.

"Unless the operating companies still in business get together and have a reasonably firm price policy through regional sales agencies, the downward price trend will continue.

"If the operators can reduce their costs through modernization, mechanization, and in turn labor and the railways will go along, the coal industry can get enough oil and gas business converted to coal to keep the net total of employment stable. Perhaps the total can be increased."

COOPERATION CAN SAVE INDUSTRY FROM CHAOS

"Firm steps and cooperation among those directly and indirectly connected with the coal industry can save it from chaos. I predict that coal labor will rewrite its contract in such a manner as to be helpful to the operators in surviving their present depression.

"I cannot believe the United Mine Workers will let themselves be forced completely out of existence by letting the mines go into the red. John L. Lewis is too astute a labor leader to sit idly by and watch his organization crumble around him."

Charles A. Hamill, president, Sycamore Coal Corp., with operations at Cinderella, W. Va., and Patterson, Va. (an affiliated company has an operation at Hatfield, Ky.):

"The trouble with the coal industry is high wages, high taxes, and the competing fuels—residual oil from abroad and natural gas. The gas is being piped into areas formerly served by coal and is used by domestic consumers in winter and industries in summer. Someday the gas wells will became exhausted, and no new ones will be found.

"The coal industry has been unable to do anything about the residual oil. The reciprocal trade agreement under which this oil has been coming into the country has been extended for another year, despite its bad effect on the coal industry.

"High wages paid miners have had a great deal to do with bringing on the situation in which the operators find themselves today.

"Also, irresponsible operation of nonunion mines, paying half or less than the wages unionized mines have to pay, is hurting the established coal industry.

"We have a mine in Buchanan County, Va., which is producing 1,500 tons of coal a day. We are paying the union scale of wages, which averages around $20 a day. The pay ranges from the basic of $18.25 to $23 a day, when fringe benefits are added, but the average is $20 a day.

"We have a nonunion competitor near our Buchanan County mine who is paying $8 to $10. You can readily see what that kind of competition means to an operator operating under a union contract."

TAXES, HIGH LABOR COST ARE TWO MAIN THREATS

H. G. Andrews, secretary, West Virginia Coal Association:

"The coal business in West Virginia is threatened from two sources. First, excessive taxes paid in West Virginia places West Virginia coal at a disadvantage in competition with other coal. Second, high labor costs, high freight rates, and high taxes make it difficult for mountain State coal to compete in price with other fuels."

Walter R. Thurmond, secretary, Southern Coal Producers' Association:

"The coal industry is loaded with a high and unrealistic wage. The industry cannot long survive under present hour-and-wage rates.

"It is my judgment that before coal regains even part of its former position as the Nation's chief supplier of fuel, production costs must be reduced at least $1.25 a ton. With labor and fringe benefits constituting 70 percent of coal's production cost, it is apparent that labor rates must be revised downward if lower costs of coal is to be achieved."

What top grade coal costs consumer

(Breakdown based on average for entire State, reflecting figures of operators of profit-making as well as losing operations. Hypothetical case of delivery from Logan fields to Huntington consumer included. Fractions of cent eliminated.)

Mine labor	$2.72
Mine supplies	.88
Freight on incoming supplies	.02
Other mine expense	.11
Operating charges consisting of social security, welfare fund, royalties, taxes, insurance, unemployment compensation, etc	.91
Depreciation	.32
Administrative expense	.10
Selling costs	.17
Operator's profits	None
Total cost per ton at mine	5.23
Freight rate per ton, Logan field to Huntington	1.27
Federal tax on freight charge	.16
(Price delivered to retailer's yard, $6.66)	
Retailer's handling charge, delivery charge to householder, business expense, and profit per ton	$1.84
Total cost after leaving mine	3.27
Price to consumer	8.50

State Department Faith in Wishful Thinking Fails

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 26, 1954

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the United States is in desperate need of more representatives abroad who will report back to Washington promptly and correctly the conditions that prevail. Too often in the past Washington has had misleading and colored information from those who are supposed to give us a picture of conditions as they really exist. This practice has led to tragic consequences and has placed the whole free world in a critical situation. Misinformation about the agrarian reform in China contributed directly to the loss of that nation as a bulwark of freedom.

It happened in many many other areas of the world and is continuing today. The executive branch of our Government and the Congress need to know the cold, hard, unpleasant facts along with the good reports. If we get the bad reports in time something can be done to remedy the situation. It is better for America to overestimate our difficulties than to underestimate them.

Some of our people abroad represent the interest of the country where they are rather than representing at all times the people of the United States.

The following article in the Greenville (S. C.) News substantiates my own observations:

STATE DEPARTMENT FAITH IN WISHFUL THINKING FAILS

(By William L. Ryan)

The United States has learned a lot of hard lessons in the Indochina debacle. One lesson useful in Washington is this: Beware wishful thinking.

When I was in Indochina and elsewhere in southeast Asia recently, it struck me that some American diplomatic and military personnel had developed the habit of assessing situations not as they were but as somebody in Washington thought they should be.

TRUTHFUL MAN FIRED

One competent man in Indochina was sending home blistering reports on his view of the situation there. He painted it just as black as it was. He had little faith in French ability to hold off disaster, and he told Washington about it. He was recalled.

But there were others in Saigon and Hanoi who were saying—at least to me—that victory was within the grasp of the French. They had it all figured out neatly. It took a catastrophe at Dien Bien Phu to change their minds.

I was assured by these Americans that the monsoon rains would interrupt the fighting at Dien Bien Phu, that the Communists could not fight on in the rain at that pace, that there would be a long lull during which the French would build up for their autumn operation which was to be launched as the Navarre plan for victory.

Gen. Henri Navarre, the French commander in chief, apparently planned to launch a large-scale offensive in the autumn with massive American help in the form of equipment and supplies. Everybody knew about the Navarre plan, including the Communists. The sad thing about it was that the Communists didn't see fit to alter their timetable.

One high-ranking American in Saigon attempted to persuade me also that—

1. Bao Dai, imposed by the French as emperor and chief of state in Vietnam, was a reverted leader. All the evidence pointed the other way.

2. The Vietnamese people realized fully the menace of communism and would be united in opposing Ho Chi Minh. The fact of the matter was that the Vietnamese people largely didn't give a hoot who won the war and wanted mostly to be left alone. If anything, the bulk of them looked upon Ho as a patriotic nationalist who was trying to free them from the French. They displayed no taste for leaving the choice in Vietnam up to a popular vote, free or otherwise. They admit the likelihood of a Ho victory.

NO JOY IN FIGHTING

3. There was substance to the plan under which a Vietnamese army would take over from the French and fight the Communists. The fact of the matter was that if such a thing ever could be accomplished it was at least years away. Many Vietnamese soldiers displayed little love for the war and when they were led by their own officers, often proved unreliable. Their own officers, poorly trained and inexperienced, frequently were the butt of the men's scorn.

There will be other dangerous situations popping up in Asia from here on. If Washington is to be kept abreast of events in time, the need surely is for the ablest men available, who would be instructed to report the hard facts without any sugar-coating or any tender regard for the preconceived notion of somebody sitting behind a desk at home.

Public Laws 424 to 436, Inclusive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 15, 1954

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent, I am extending my remarks to include my report on Public Laws 424 to 436, inclusive, to my constituents in the Second District of Illinois, as follows:

THIRTY-THIRD REPORT ON LEGISLATION OF THE 83D CONGRESS

DEAR FRIEND: Continuing where we left off:

PUBLIC LAW 424

S. 2657; unlicensed practice in District: Another District of Columbia measure, increasing the penalties for the unlicensed practice of the healing art.

PUBLIC LAW 425

S. 3050, tobacco marketing penalty increase: Tobacco growers asked Congress to crack down on cheaters who produce above their quotas while benefiting from price stability maintained by farmers who do cooperate. Public Law 425 increases to 50 percent (of the market price) the penalty on marketing in excess of quotas.

PUBLIC LAW 426

S. 2225, revested public lands in Oregon: This will interest you if I can tell it briefly. In 1866 Congress gave a generous land grant to the Oregon & California Railroad. In 1916 it revested the unsettled portion. This included 472,000 acres, all timberland, part within the boundaries of the national forests, and managed to conform with the perpetual sustained-yield program. Since 1925 there has been a jurisdictional dispute between the Department of Agriculture and the Department of the Interior, now happily terminated by Public Law 426. The lands will continue to be administered by the National Forest Service, but receipts will go into a special fund, 25 percent covering cost of administration, 75 percent going to 18 Oregon counties. The law conforms with a 1954 decision of the United States Court of Appeals (D. C.) directing a payment of $7 million in accumulated funds to the fortunate counties of Oregon.

PUBLIC LAW 427

S. 1004, rehabilitation of ex-convicts: This will permit the Commissioners of the District of Columbia under proper circumstances to employ deserving ex-convicts for whom the Board of Parole with difficulty is seeking employment in its rehabilitation program.

PUBLIC LAW 428

H. R. 8583, appropriations for executive offices: Appropriation measures will be covered in a separate and later report.

PUBLIC LAW 429

H. R. 1005, Fort Union National Monument, New Mexico: Old Fort Union, part of the glory of old of the Santa Fe Trail when the Great Southwest was growing up, is deteriorating rapidly, due to the elements, grazing cattle and other causes. Public Law 429 preserves the ruins of the historic fort by the establishment of a national monument. The Union Land and Grazing Co. will donate the land (1,000 acres) and the State of New Mexico will build and maintain a highway. Touring automobilists, jot down.

Old Fort Union is linked with the names of such heroes as Kit Carson, U. S. Grant, Robert E. Lee, Phil Sheridan, Longstreet. From 1851 to 1891 many young lieutenants fresh from West Point were broken in at Fort Union.

PUBLIC LAW 430

H. R. 3097, study of grape culture: For use exclusively for agricultural research (grape culture) Public Law 430 conveys to the University of California 20 acres of land in Napa County, Calif.

PUBLIC LAW 431

H. R. 2566, termination of Contract Settlement Act: This was signed by the President on June 28, 1954. It provides a cutoff date 180 days thereafter for filing of claims under the Contract Settlement Act of 1944, a measure waiving formal and technical defects in war contracts.

PUBLIC LAW 432

H. R. 3986, International Peace Garden: This increases the authorized appropriation for the International Peace Garden in North Dakota (2,100 acres on the American Canadian international boundary near the geographical center of North America) from $100,000 to $200,000. The peace garden is maintained by the North Dakota State Historical Society as a memorial to the peaceful relations between the peoples and Governments of the two countries. Canada bears its share of the cost.

PUBLIC LAW 433

H. R. 6173, Southern Ute Indian Trail: Southern Ute Tribe of Indians in Colorado, numbering 540 persons, have $5,900,000 on deposit, settlement for tribal lands taken over by the United States. Public Law 433 authorizes, among other things, a $1,000 per capita payment under the jurisdiction of the tribal council to enable the tribal members to improve and make more profitable their small farms.

PUBLIC LAW 434

H. R. 8957, ⅜-bushel basket: Housewives, please note. Public Law 434, urged by some fruitgrowers, legalizes a new size basket, one with a content of three-eighths of a bushel. Previously among the sizes legal under the Standard Container Act of 1928 there was an eighth bushel, a quarter, and a half bushel. Congressman PETER MACK, JR., of Illinois, a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, made a gallant but unsuccessful fight in committee and on the floor of the House against this measure. I voted with MACK. The difference between a three-eights bushel basket and one with a half-bushel content would not be readily detected. Advice to the housewives in the Second District: Keep your eyes open; Public Law 434 has legalized a size with which you have not been familiar. A bad law, I think. I am glad to have the opportunity in these reports of forewarning you; makes the labor entailed seem worthwhile.

PUBLIC LAW 435

H. R. 8456, Memorial Hospital at Gulfport: This conveys to the city of Gulfport, Miss., for use in the Memorial Hospital the dispensary of the Gulfport Naval Training Station no longer needed by the Armed Forces.

PUBLIC LAW 436

H. R. 8933 Coosa River development: It is said that the Coosa River in Alabama and Georgia is the second greatest undeveloped waterway in America. In 1945 the Rivers and Harbors Act provided a comprehensive plan for the development of the river by the United States Army engineers. But Congress continued year after year to drag its feet in the way of necessary appropriations, just as it has been doing with Calumet-Sag.

Public Law 436, introduced by all Alabama Members of Congress including Senator SPARKMAN, permits private capital (Alabama Power Co.) to step in and do the job at an expenditure of $100 million under the jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission and checking by the Corps of Army Engineers.

The company first will build a flood-control dam, then other dams for hydroelectric power. Some, including your Representative were fearful of the measure as a dangerous precedent; finally reluctantly acquiesced because (a) immediate need of power for industrial growth and (b) bill had support of outstanding friends of TVA in both bodies.

Buffalo Chamber of Commerce Endorses Health Services Reinsurance Plan in H. R. 8356

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 20, 1954

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I am in receipt of a statement setting forth the favorable opinion of the Buffalo Chamber of Commerce on the health reinsurance plan embodied in H. R. 8356. While I am attaching the full letter and statement below for the information of the Members of the House, it appears to me that the covering letter from Executive Vice President Charles C. Fichtner, contains a most significant expression to which attention especially should be called. Mr. Fichtner writes that this statement "was adopted by the board of directors of the Buffalo Chamber of Commerce on July 19 after a study of the issue."

"After study." I wish everyone had reached their conclusions only after study.

After study, the Buffalo chamber correctly points out that the plan is a proposal for providing more extensive personal health services within the framework of health insurance under private enterprise. It is a plan to forestall Government intrusion, so-called socialized medicine, Government interference with the practice of medicine, and many other radical or imported undesirable solutions to the pressing problem of meeting today's costs of illness, by building on our own established institutions, our insurance companies, our Blue Cross, and our other health prepayment plan associations, not by destroying them.

The bill as introduced fully prevented Federal Government control of the insurance business.

The letter and statement follow:

Buffalo Chamber of Commerce,
July 19, 1954.

The Honorable Charles A. Wolverton,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Congressman Wolverton: The enclosed statement on the health service reinsurance plan, as embodied in S. 3114 and H. R. 8356, was adopted by the board of directors of the Buffalo Chamber of Commerce on July 19 after a study of the issue and a recommendation for approval by the chamber's national affairs committee.

We shall appreciate receiving your comments on our position.

Sincerely yours,

Charles C. Fichtner,
Executive Vice President.

Buffalo Chamber of Commerce Statement on Health Service Reinsurance Plan (S. 3114, H. R. 8356)

The plan for approaching the solution of providing more extensive personal health-insurance services within the framework of private enterprise is most commendable provided that safeguards are inserted that would forestall the control of the insurance business by the Federal Government.

It is also commendable in that encouragement is given to the insurance industry by the Government on a basis which will be self-liquidating and at no expense to the taxpayers.

July 19, 1954.

Puerto Rico Celebrates Second Anniversary as Commonwealth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 26, 1954

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, yesterday was a very important day for the people of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. It marked the second anniversary that the good people of Puerto Rico are living under this new political concept which was conceived by them and accepted by Congress as a happy solution to a problem which we all wanted to solve.

I am most pleased to have had a part in helping Puerto Rico adopt their constitution which has given them a workable blueprint for their Commonwealth. This action cut the ground out from under the shouting, arm-waving Communists and others who expounded the untrue venom that the United States wanted to keep Puerto Rico as a colonial possession.

The Commonwealth has been a success and I congratulate the people of Puerto Rico for moving forward under the forceful leadership of men like Dr. Fernós-Isern, the Resident Commissioner; their governor, and other legislative leaders.

The new Commonwealth had its troubles. It was plagued by a small group of terrorists known as the Nationalist Party. These fanatics are being controlled by every legal method. This group literally blasted its way across the land when a group of them fired on Members of this body from the gallery as the House was meeting. The first to condemn this action were the people of Puerto Rico—they were quick to point out that these fanatics did not represent the thinking of the people of Puerto Rico.

Puerto Rico is an old community. A full hundred years before Jamestown, the city of San Juan was founded by Ponce de Leon. As a result of the Spanish-American War of 1898, the United States assumed responsibility for Puerto Rico. Two schools of thought developed in the island, and for that matter, in the United States, as to what should be the ultimate status of Puerto Rico.

Following the precedent of all former Spanish colonies in the New World, some thought Puerto Rico should become an independent republic. Others, following the precedent of all territorial acquisitions of the United States, thought that Puerto Rico should become a State of the Union. For many years, these two opposing views seemed to paralyze thinking in the island, and in the United States, as it pertained to this matter.

Meanwhile, by a series of legislative enactments, the Congress progressively broadened the scope of self-government in Puerto Rico. During the intervening 50 years, close economic and spiritual ties developed between the people of the island and the people of the mainland, and while it was evident that full self-government eventually must be realized, the alternative solutions offered seemed to present difficulties not easy to overcome.

The people of Puerto Rico understood this. With constructive statesmanship, they proposed a third solution to Congress, one which offered self-government without separation but without incorporation, and yet with a solid basis of freedom and dignity in association.

In 1950, the 81st Congress adopted Public Law 600, which provided for the organization of a constitutional government by the people of Puerto Rico. The language of that act made clear that the principle of compact and of government by consent was thereby fully recognized. The act was to be submitted to the people of Puerto Rico in referendum for acceptance or rejection. If accepted, the compact was to become operative.

In a subsequent referendum held in Puerto Rico, the people of the island accepted the terms within which the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico was ultimately created. Thus, the new political concept of Commonwealth, as distinct from membership in the Union as a State, and from Territorial status or that of possession, came into being. The constitution of the Commonwealth, adopted by the people of Puerto Rico, was submitted to the Congress for ratification in 1952. The Congress ratified the constitution of Puerto Rico, and it became effective on July 25, 1952.

The first paragraph of the preamble of the constitution of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico reads:

> We, the people of Puerto Rico, in order to organize ourselves politically under fully democratic basis, to promote the general welfare and to secure for ourselves and our posterity, the complete enjoyment of human rights, placing our trust in the Almighty God, do ordain and establish this constitution for the Commonwealth which, in the exercise of our natural rights, we now create within our union with the United States of America.

The Commonwealth of Puerto Rico was therefore inaugurated on July 25, 1952. Fifty-four years earlier, on the same day of the same month, United States Armies had landed in Puerto Rico. Three days later, Gen. Nelson A. Miles, commanding these armies, issued a proclamation in which, amongst other things, he said:

> We have not come to make war upon the people of a country that for centuries has been oppressed, but, on the contrary, to bring you protection, not only to yourselves, but to your property, to promote your prosperity and to bestow upon you the immunities and blessingof the liberal institutions of our Government.

The Puerto Ricans arranged that the inauguration of the Commonwealth should fall on the anniversary of the landing of the United States troops in Puerto Rico. This was appropriate, for the Commonwealth is the consummation of General Miles' promise. The Puerto Ricans now share in our institutions. They are our fellow citizens and they have, as we do, a government whose powers are derived from the consent of the governed, a government responsible to the people, and whose authority is derived from the supreme authority of the people.

The present relationships of Puerto Rico with the United States are the result of common consent. Naturally, they may change with changing conditions, but they will continue to be the result of mutual agreement.

During the meeting of the General Assembly of the United Nations last fall, a resolution was adopted recognizing the fact that Puerto Rico has become self-governing. In the course of the consideration of this resolution, the Honorable Henry Cabot Lodge, United States Ambassador to the United Nations, speaking on behalf of the President of the United States, stated that if Puerto Rico should wish a more complete or even absolute independence, he, the President, would recommend to Congress that the wishes of the people of Puerto Rico be honored. Acting through their legislative assembly, the people of Puerto Rico, while revealing deep appreciation for the words of the President wherein self-determination was so forcibly affirmed, expressed their intention to maintain their association with the United States. It is not that the Puerto Ricans do not desire freedom. It is that they have freedom in association, and they believe that their freedom is thus secure, but might be lost in separation and isolation.

The development of the island, under the constitution of the Commonwealth has been uninterrupted. Puerto Rico is an example of what a determined people can do amidst unfavorable circumstances when they are environed by political institutions wherein human dignity is respected. Governments are properly servants and not masters of the people. May that never change.

Mr. Speaker, it is my warm wish that Puerto Rico's progress may forge ahead, and that the association between the people of the island and those of the mainland may continue to make for mutual benefit, for mutual satisfaction, and for the general good of all.

The Congress and the people of the United States join in wishing them every success in the future.

Amending Atomic Energy Act of 1946, as Amended

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN E. MOSS, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 23, 1954

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 9757) to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, as amended.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Chairman, at this early hour of the morning, I am not optimistic enough to believe that I will be gifted with the persuasive powers necessary to change the trend of voting which has continued for a number of hours. Despite the fact that the chairman of the committee will undoubtedly state, as he has on previous occasions, that this is a part of a barrage—a statement which I shall now deny—I do feel that there are some very significant points which should be made in offering this amendment.

In the first place, in the statement of policy contained on page 2 of the proposed act it says that—

> The development, use, and control of atomic energy shall be directed so as to make the maximum contribution to the general welfare, subject at all times to the paramount objective of making the maximum contribution to the common defense and security.

It also says on line 17, in section (b) under "Findings":

> In permitting the property of the United States to be used by others, such use must be regulated in the national interest and in order to provide for the common defense and security and to protect the health and safety of the public.

And a further statement, placing nuclear material permanently in the public domain, is made on line 21, page 3:

> It is essential to the common defense and security that title to all special nuclear material be in the United States while such special nucear material is within the United States.

That places nuclear material as clearly in the public domain as the water potential used in the production of hydroelectric energy. For that reason, I propose by this amendment to impose upon the licensee using fissionable material in the production of electric energy the same provisions of the Federal power law as are applied to those who are licensed to produce hydroelectric energy. These are neither strict nor difficult regulations to live under. They are minimal regulations of the simplest sort. They do not in any way conflict with the regulatory powers of the States. They do, in those areas where there are no State regulations, provide minimum regulations. They also provide the minimum regulations necessary for the retail seller of power across State lines. They are not onerous regulations and they are at least the minimum this country should impose upon a licensee receiving the benefit of some $12 billion of public investment.

Amending Atomic Energy Act of 1946, as Amended

SPEECH

OF

HON. CARL ELLIOTT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 23, 1954

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 9757) to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, as amended.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, I have spent most of the last 15 hours on the floor of the House of Representatives listening to the debate on the atomic-energy bill. Now, at 1 o'clock this morning, it is crystal clear to me that this bill is not ready to be voted upon.

This bill is undoubtedly the most important piece of legislation that has come before the House this year. It may possibly be the most important legislation voted upon since World War II.

I think the Republican leadership of the House makes a mistake when it attempts to ram through, without sufficient consideration or discussion, a bill of such importance. If we had adjourned last night at 6 p. m., the individual Members of the House could have used the past night to study the bill further, and we could have returned here today refreshed and have spent another day on the bill. I think it would be well for us to spend at least 3 or 4 days on this bill. I do not see how we can possibly adjourn next weekend anyhow, so why not give this all-important measure thorough consideration? The people of America are entitled to have their representatives do an excellent job on this legislation for the atomic age.

Mr. Chairman, I represent an area that has both public and private power. I have always thought that there is a place in America for private power, and a place for public power. We have streams to be developed by private capital, in conformity with well-defined safeguards for the public interest, and other streams that could and should be developed by Government.

The Tennessee Valley Authority was established by an act of Congress a good 15 years before I was privileged to come here. And, it has withstood the glare of pitiless publicity, through a generation of debate and public consideration. It stands today as an accomplished fact.

To delve a bit deeper into its history: The cataclysmic forces operating in the Tennessee Valley reached an agreement in 1939, that define the boundaries of its service area. I submit that that should have ended the argument. Since that time, as I understand it, the TVA has not expanded or attempted to expand its service area 1 square mile outside of the boundary then agreed upon. However, within its service area, it has the responsibility, as the only operating electric utility, to furnish its customers their electrical needs now and in the future.

The TVA needs new steam plants to provide it with more power to furnish its own customers, including the atomic-energy plant at Oak Ridge. This plant alone uses more electrical power, we are told, than all of the New England States combined. About 1948 or 1949 we began a program of constructing sufficient steam plants to provide the TVA with approximately enough power to serve its customers. The use of electric power throughout America—and also throughout the world—is growing by leaps and bounds.

I recall that in 1950 the power forecasters predicted that America would soon be using three times as much electric energy as it was using then. The Tennessee Valley is sharing the same phenomenal growth in its power needs. It was thought that when President Eisenhower, then a candidate, assured the people, at Memphis, at Knoxville, and by even a firmer statement in the fall of 1952, that he wanted to see the Tennessee Valley Authority continue at maximum efficiency, this meant that he wanted to see TVA go forward and build the necessary generating facilities to supply the people in the valley with their power needs.

The President's statement, later, that he regarded the Tennessee Valley Authority as an example of "creeping socialism"; his persistent neglect or refusal to confer or advise with officials of the TVA; his failure to reappoint the Honorable Gordon Clapp, one of the foremost power executives and one of the finest public servants in America, as Chairman of the Board of Directors; and now finally his direction to the AEC to contract with Dixon-Yates for 600,000 kilowatts of power, not for itself, but for TVA; these make crystal clear the attitude of this administration toward the Tennessee Valley Authority.

I tried to make clear earlier in my speech that I feel no hostility toward private power concerns. As a matter of fact, I have many reasons to admire the efficiency they have achieved in the generation and distribution of electrical power. If it is the attitude of this administration that TVA is to be choked to the point that it loses its yardstick character; if the administration is determined that TVA's new power needs are to be supplied from private power rather than from power generated from TVA itself, then I can see no objection to purchasing the power from the Dixon-Yates group.

However, a question does arise as to the method by which this purchase is being made. Would it not be much better for the President to direct the Tennessee Valley Authority to go out into the market and purchase its own power needs? It is one of the largest electrical power distributors in the country. It has had 21 years' experience in the field of power generation and distribution. Would not it be better for an agency skilled and schooled in generating, distributing, and purchasing power to do those things for itself and its customers, rather than entrusting the job to the Atomic Energy Commission, who, though a large user of power, presumably does not have the experience in this field that TVA would have?

Three of the five members of the Atomic Energy Commission have signified their disapproval of this method of doing business. Yet the President has, in effect, ordered them to take the Dixon-Yates proposal without shopping around with an idea of getting the cheapest power available.

Just a day or two ago I received a letter from one Walter Von Tresckow, whom I have never heard from before, saying that he can furnish the Tennessee Valley Authority the power it needs, at the point in question, for about $100 million less than any alternative proposal now before the Government.

As stated, I know absoluely nothing about Mr. Tresckow, but his letter does indicate the desirability of looking most carefully into the purchase of these 600,000 kilowatts of power. In the final analysis, the American people have to pay for this power. Much evidence has been developed in this debate that might reasonably lead to the conclusion that the Federal Government could generate power in the Tennessee Valley and distribute it to the AEC at a much lower figure than can Dixon-Yates, or anyone else. Many estimate that it will cost the Federal Government $100 million more to buy this power from Dixon-Yates, over a period of 25 years, than it would to generate its own power.

The party in power has stated thousands of times its intention to strive for fiscal solvency and efficiency. That condition cannot be attained if costs are given no more consideration than they appear to have been given in this case.

Mr. Chairman, as stated previously, I do not feel that the bill before us is a good bill. I do not believe that adequate consideration has been given to its present and future economic implications. I have voted for most of the amendments that have been offered to improve the bill, and expect to vote for several more, but I have been disappointed that none of these have been adopted. It will be my intention to vote against the bill. I know of no compelling reason why it must be voted upon tonight, or, rather, this morning.

I certainly feel that the American people should be fully informed of what we are doing in this legislation. They have $12 billion invested in our atomic and hydrogen developments. They are entitled to know how we are going to use that investment. They are entitled to know what dividends they and their children will receive.

South America Needs United States Bread, Not Guns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 26, 1954

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following article, written by Ray Tucker and which appeared in his column in the July 25, 1954, edition of the Brooklyn Eagle, speaks volumes. It is high time we put our good neighbor policy into practice:

SOUTH AMERICA NEEDS UNITED STATES BREAD, NOT GUNS

Although Washington's strong-arm tactics succeeded in stamping out a Communist brush fire in Guatemala, subsequent diplomatic dispatches warn that the United States has won a skirmish but not a battle in the cold war which Moscow hopes to carry to the western continent.

The South Americans feel both the Truman and Eisenhower administrations have snubbed and neglected them after accepting their aid during World War II. Our Latin allies got only a pittance from the $50 billion we have poured out in economic and military aid to check Russian aggression in Europe, the Middle East, and the Orient. They are down for only $113 million in the pending $3,300,000,000 measure for overseas assistance.

When we have not cut off purchases of their principal products for stockpiling purposes—tin, copper, nitrates, oil, lead, etc.—we have bargained for a lower price. Headline seekers on Capitol Hill have urged a boycott on high-priced coffee. The coal and oil lobby insists on a higher tariff on imports of petroleum. We are closing our markets at the very moment when they most need them.

POVERTY CHIEF PROBLEM

Whereas South America's chief problem is poverty, always an invitation to Communist agitators, we do nothing to alleviate this condition. We spend hundreds of million to feed the hungry of alien India, while we forget the starving on our doorstep.

Washington's fault, in South American eyes, and this applies to both Democratic and Republican administrations, is that we take South American nations for granted, as the saying has it.

We show interest in them only when we need them.

Anti-Yankee feeling is growing in several countries historically friendly to the United States—Brazil, Bolivia, Ecuador, Chile, Uruguay, and Paraguay.

Mere words of friends, or platitudinous resolutions adopted at infrequent inter-American conferences, will not convince them of our concern for their well-being and economic progress. We must do something practical.

THREAT TO PEACE STILL EXISTS

A South American threat to continental peace and security still exists, according to our best informed diplomats and newspaper observers. Suppose, for instance, it was Argentina, Brazil or Chile which had offered a beachhead to Russian Reds, with political domination or even military conquest as an eventual objective.

Consciously or unconsciously, Eisenhower has moved to eliminate the basic cause of this smoldering resentment. He did so when he approved the antitrust suits against the United Fruit Co., and the two airplane lines alleged to monopolyize transportation between North and South America—Pan American World Airways and its subsidiary, Panagra. Both actions may extract the sting from the charge of "American imperialism and commercialism."

But Eisenhower has been urged to take an even more positive and constructive step to demonstrate our interest and friendship. It is that he send a mission of the Nation's ablest industrialists, bankers, businessmen, engineers, economists, and agriculturists to South America, with not a diplomat or politician in the bunch.

It would be their assignment to study the Latin people's needs, material rather than political, and to recommend a long-range program for raising everyday livinng conditions to a decent level of existence. They are so far below that minimum now that it is pitiful.

In short, more bread and butter—or more tortillas and enchiladas—rather than the guns we shipped to the Guatemalan rebels will keep the Russian bear from our continent.

The Essence of a Liberal Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 21, 1954

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to place in the RECORD an excellent address on the Essence of a Liberal Education, delivered at the commencement proceedings of the Georgetown Visitation Junior College by Prof. Joseph G. Connor, registrar of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences at Georgetown University.

The crucial importance of a well-rounded and balanced liberal education for our youth today is being increasingly recognized in many quarters of our society. Professor Connor's interesting address on the nature of a liberal education is in the form of plain talk on the paramount qualities of such an education which can be understood by all. His ideas find a most receptive environment at the Georgetown Visitation Junior College, but they possess also fundamental meaning and value for institutions throughout the land which are striving to reestablish themselves on bases of the cumulative experiences of mankind and certain perennial principles of truth and wisdom.

These principles and lessons of experience are well conserved and perpetuated at the Georgetown Visitation Junior College. Founded in 1799 by the second Archbishop of Baltimore, it enjoys the status of being the first Catholic school for girls in the United States. Visitation's tradition has been a rich and fulfilling one. It has educated over the years daughters of high military and Government officials and of members of the diplomatic corps. Its treasures of learning and wisdom are priceless instruments for the wholesome growth of mind and personality of every daughter nurtured in its tradition. The import of Professor Connor's remarkable address could not but have carved a still deeper impression on those participating in the June commencement of the Georgetown Visitation Junior College:

Address on the Essence of a Liberal Education by Prof. Joseph G. Connor at Commencement of the Georgetown Visitation Junior College

Your Excellency Father Sellinger, parents of the graduates, friends of Visitation, students and alumnae of Visitation, I have been asked by Mother Margaret Mary—and greatly honored in the asking—to speak with these young ladies on this unique day in their lives. Never before, and never again, will they graduate from Visitation College. Since this is so, I know you'll understand if I ignore all except our stars. For the evening of such a day I know you have many plans, and I won't hold you for long. There are just three things I want you to think about with me—the past, the present, and the future. But don't be frightened. Out of the past I want just 6 minutes to chat about your education; out of the present another 6 minutes to see what your education has made of you; and out of the future still another 6 minutes to tell you what my generation needs of yours.

Now for the past: I'm going to let you girls in on something you haven't suspected. Quite properly, you don't think of the nuns here and the lay professors as fighters. But they are. And good ones. Almost a hundred years ago there began a violent revolution against the traditional in education. It was led by Harvard's President Eliot in his campaign for what was called the scientific education. As is so often true in revolutionary enterprises, there was some merit to the case. In the comparatively simple society preceding the industrial revolution there was need for only one kind of education. The leaders of that society were educated universally, we might say, and they were pretty versatile fellows; this education fitted them for any responsibility society might place on them. But then, in the middle of the 19th century, technological advances accelerated at a tremendous rate, establishing a need and an opportunity for technically or scientifically trained men—and the traditional college did not train them.

There was, then, this much merit to the case, but as is again too often true, the revolutionaries went too far. What resulted was an unbridled electivism which is still, like the world, "too much with us." The degree was—and still is—frequently awarded on the accumulation of about 120 negotiable credits, with the nature of which no one was particularly concerned. Specified courses, when there were any specifications, frequently stopped at one. I have recently seen the catalog of a respected university which boasts that there is no single course required of all students. This, of course, leads to the incredible position of one university president who advocated the inclusion of beauty culture in the agglomeration of courses which passed for a curriculum. Of course, in fairness to this gentleman, I should call your attention to the fact that your president has never been faced with this problem. Where Visitation girls are concerned, obviously beauty culture is quite unnecessary.

This is the chaos from which your faculty has been fighting to preserve education—and from which they have saved you. They have alined themselves through the years side by side with the other Catholic educators in the cause of an education which Newman says should be the development of judgment, of clear sightedness, of sagacity, of wisdom. They have fought the good fight, and the signs of victory are at hand. Just a few years ago a faculty committee at Harvard, where electivism started, issued a now famous report on general education in a free society, a report which, in its own words proposes necessarily to deal mainly with preparation for life in the broad sense of completeness as human beings, rather than in the narrow sense of competence in a particular lot. Those words have a familiar ring to the Catholic educator; and so do these from the same report: "The aim of liberal education is the development of the whole man. * * *" It seems that the committee had a quite adequate answer when, in regretting the enormous diversity among the present-day colleges, it said:

"Sectarian, particularly Roman Catholic, colleges have, of course, their solution, which was generally shared by American colleges until less than a century ago, namely, the conviction that Christianity gives meaning and ultimate unity to all parts of the curriculum, indeed to the whole life of the college."

This is on page 39; one can't help but wonder why the committee wrote a 267-page report.

Fortunately it is not only Harvard which sees the fatal weakness of the principle that anything is worthy of study at the college level. There is enough interest and activity in what is fashionably called general education to warrant calling it a movement. Columbia, Yale, Harvard, Florida, Minnesota—literally dozens of schools all have general education programs which prescribe courses in humanities, science, and social science.

Well, how should your sisters, and you, and all of us in Catholic education feel about this development? We are sorry they left us a hundred years ago—and we're glad to see them back. But we don't want to hear anything from them about new discoveries.

So much for the past. Let's look at the present. From now on you are Visitation girls; you are marked. And this mark is not a haphazard thing; it is as deliberately designed as a Japanese flower arrangement. It is a mark in the spirit of the encyclical of Pius XI:

"Hence the true Christian, product of Christian education, is the supernatural person who thinks, judges, and acts constantly and consistently in accordance with right reason illumined by the supernatural light of the example and teaching of Christ; in other words, to use the current term, the true and finished person of character."

Now this is tight phraseology, and we run a grave danger in trying to simplify. However, I think we are safe in saying that your education has made you young ladies capable of responsible, critical judgments. Since you live you can't avoid judgments, so the key words there are "responsible" and "critical"—and it's about those we should talk.

There is a whole science of ethics bound up in that word "responsible." Who is responsible? Responsible to whom? Responsible for what? It involves the troublesome dichotomies of right and duty, truth and error, of ought and ought not. And yet it is as everyday as this: When you pick up the car keys from Dad you say implicitly, "I am responsible for driving Dad's car safely." And if this is anything but sheer nonsense, it carries the further implications, (1) that you have a right to use the car and the public highways, (2) that you have a duty to Dad and to the unfortunate pedestrians, (3) that you have the freedom of choice to drive safely or unsafely, and (4) that there exists some unalterable norm of safe driving available to the man with the whistle. All of these things you ought to consider—what an inescapable word, that "ought." Volumes could be—and have been—written on these notions. Now I need only refer you to the book Readings in Ethics by your own Sister Jane Frances.

The other word we want to think about from back there is "critical." Your education has put you in contact with the rich heritage of western civilization, through, variously, in its literature, its history, and its philosophy. This heritage supplies you with standards of excellence which serve to make you a fine person—a young lady of taste. It is good taste that keep that word "critical" compatible with our other word "responsible." Good taste has nothing to do with long-haired affectations, with snobbery. These are in horribly bad taste. The girl of taste doesn't read Poe and Hardy's Jude the Obscure to the utter neglect of Pogo and Ketcham's Dennis the Menace; she can enjoy both. She doesn't watch Julius Caesar instead of Julius La Rosa or listen to Brahms instead of dixieland jazz—always; she can enjoy all of these in their proper proportion. This passive good taste of perception, once your own, rapidly spills over into the active good taste of doing. There are some things you just don't do—and some you just don't avoid! And how quickly, thinking along these lines, do we come to the insistent stirrings of the natural law. The extreme of bad taste is sinful; or looking from the other direction, can't we say, in a certain sense, that sin is in bad taste? To finish with the present, then, let's say that you have the equipment of young ladies of taste—of responsibility. And on these qualities you can erect your continuing education.

Now to look into the future. What does my generation need of yours? Well, we've made something of a mess of things. We give you the world on its ear; we give you fantastically efficient means of transportation, communication, and production; we give you an incredibly intricate electronic gadget which instantaneously extends the range of vision clear across the country. But we haven't been very bright about using these things. One of the few really worthwhile contributions we have been able to make is—you. And I'm speaking now not only to the honor students—the medal winners; today is their day in a very special sense—and I congratulate them. But the future belongs to you all. I'm speaking to you average girls who had a rough time in philosophy or a narrow squeak in mathematics, who may barely have made it in everything. We must not forget that we average folk are, by definition, in the overwhelming majority.

We—the average folk—manage to retain for the minimum time about 70 percent of the knowledge encompassed in a given course or curriculum, so you see it isn't realistic to base an education on an attempt to have all the members of a class acquire all the knowledge afforded. We are on the wrong track here. If you think back, you'll remember that the Pope and Newman made no mention whatever of knowledge. They speak rather of wisdom. In our own time, T. S. Eliot says regretfully:

"Where is the wisdom we have lost in knowledge?"

This, then, is what we need of you in the future; that you build your continuing education on the firm conviction that knowledge is rather cheap and rather common—and, if sought for its own sake, rather useless. Knowledge is available to you in reference works ranging from the encyclopedia to the telephone book. We want of you—wisdom. The early Greeks had this as the ideal of life, of education; too often today there are no ideals, but only aims. We expect you to restore this ideal of wisdom.

Wisdom is a beautiful thing; wisdom is humanized knowledge; wisdom is kind and charitable; wisdom is sympathetic and humble. These are wonderful words, regrettably debased in our language. Sympathy—for the Greek it meant "suffering with"; it's the Latin word "compassion"; and its full and rich meaning isn't satisfied by the little formal note out of Emily Post at times of great sorrow; no, it carries an everyday implication which makes you want to do something for the neighbor with a headache and a fretting child. Charity—caritas—this is love; it isn't the dropping of a coin into the basket for the annual charity fund; no, it is the completely unconscious selfless love which makes you do what sympathy makes you want to do—which makes you cook the dinner and hang out the launery for that neighbor. Humility—this isn't a degrading self-abasement, with much figurative breast beating and loud protestations of unworthiness; rather, it is the calm, dignified recognition of our true worth and place; it can't live with that aggressive self-assertion which draws itself up and says, "No one is going to make a fool out of me." All these qualities, though, must be firmly entrenched as habits; they must be worn as unconsciously as your head. You can see that they all merge, one into another; they seem different aspects of the same thing; one can't think of a proud girl as truly sympathetic or charitable. We might sum it up in the little plea, "Be kind." Be kind to your folks; be kind to your friends; be kind to strangers; and, when the time comes—as I understand it will shortly for four of you—when the time comes, be kind to your husband.

Charity, sympathy, humility, kindness—these, then, are the seeds, possibly the fruits of wisdom. It's as simple, and old shoe, and pedestrian as that. These are wisdom for you and me.

There is just one further thing which, in the realm of creatures, is uniquely human—laughter. It's significant that only to those of His creatures who can merit heaven did God give the power to laugh. And He doesn't tease us; He wants us to laugh. The natural theologians carefully establish His justice and goodness and omnipotence, and all His awe-inspiring attributes. This is proper and essential; but sometimes I wish that they would prove Him humorous. I think He'd like that.

Well, it's in the spirit of all this that I want to close with four verses out of Belloc. Properly understood, they encompass all I've been trying to tell you. If you will accept them in 20 years, when you return here to see your daughter graduated, you will be wise. They go:

"From quiet homes and first beginning
  Out to the undiscovered ends,
There's nothing worth the wear of winning
  But laughter and the love of friends."

The Curfew at Sundown

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 14, 1954

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, thousands of patriotic Americans from all walks of life have protested the so-called Brownell bills, which would empower a Government agency to shut down a union or business on the "extent to which" it was Communist infiltrated. The inherent dangers in such legislation are obvious to all. I call attention to a splendid editorial on this subject which appeared in the Wall Street Journal on July 21, 1954. The editorial follows:

THE CURFEW AT SUNDOWN

If the police in a city of some 640,000 people knew that there were 100 housebreakers about, the police would do their best to keep an eye on them. But the law officers would not declare a sundown curfew for everyone in the town in order to catch the lawless hundred.

In this country there are an estimated 25,000 dedicated Communists. They are dedicated to the violent overthrow of law, order, and the Government. The problem of controlling their activities, keeping a check on their movements, learning of their contacts and countering their subversive plots is a hard task indeed. How difficult it is—and how aware of the difficulty are the FBI, the Justice Department, and congressional committees which have investigated the problem—is clearly indicated in the number of bills introduced into this Congress to control subversion.

Some of these proposals came from the Attorney General, some from congressional committees, and some from individual Members of Congress. All of them are well-intentioned; they seek to strengthen the security of the Nation. But many of them are questionable, and some of them endanger the rights, privileges, and immunities not of Communists alone but of the 160 million of the rest of us.

To close a loophole in a law is one thing, but to create a lot of new laws which place in jeopardy peaceful people as well as the lawless is not the way to go about it.

The Government has jailed the top echelon of Communists. It has also convicted the second-string Reds. These verdicts were obtained under a law making it a crime to teach or to advocate or to conspire to overthrow the Government by force or violence.

That law, in our view, is a necessary one. But the climate in which laws are adopted and used are left unused on the books is as important as the law itself. Would any law, in the rather revolutionary climate of the 1930's, have been used against the members of the Ware cell which operated almost openly in the Department of Agriculture? Would the present laws have then been used against Alger Hiss, William Remington, or the late Harry Dexter White?

Reports on many of these men were made by the FBI to their department heads and they were shrugged off. The White House itself had Mr. White's record prior to his appointment as United States Director of the International Monetary Fund, but the appointment was made and confirmed by an unknowing Senate nonetheless.

There is still another climate which affects the wisdom and usefulness of laws. The old days of diffidence about or sympathy to communism are now gone. Most people are aware of the dangers and there is now a great commotion to pass laws to cure the evil.

This climate, we think, is the reason for the danger in some of the proposals. A wiretap law is now before the Senate Judiciary Committee because wiretapping was used against Judith Coplon and she was freed because that system of gathering evidence is inadmissible in Federal courts. No wiretap law was needed to convict all the rest; and in our view no wiretap law is necessary to the country's security. It is a bad law and we hope it fails of passage.

The same committee has before it a bill to grant immunity to congressional investigation witnesses and thus to force them to testify. We think this is also a bad proposal, for it does damage to the fifth amendment. That constitutional restraint on government was not placed there for the convenience of Communists alone; and to remove it in the one case is to set a precedent for another case in another climate.

We have expressed heretofore in these columns our opposition to Mr. Brownell's bill which would empower a government agency—with the right of court review—to close down a union or a business on the extent to which it is determined such an organization may be Communist-infiltrated. A philosophy of "extent to which" is a dangerous one; it punishes not for what has been done but because a person or a business or a union may be in position to do a thing.

Apart from their danger to innocent people, these proposals are not necessary from a security standpoint. Mr. Brownell said, just short of a year ago, that Government attention to the present laws—such as the Smith Act—has reduced Communist Party membership from 100,000 to 25,000.

We think even one Communist in the schools, in Government, in the Armed Forces, in defense plants is one too many. We think also that sundown curfews for 160 million people are not the way to go about controlling Communists.

Mr. Speaker, the danger of this type of legislation to American institutions was dramatically pointed up by a leaflet which was recently mailed to every Member of Congress. It purports to come from Herbert C. Holdridge, brigadier general, United States Army, retired, Sherman Oaks, Calif. This leaflet is an irresponsible diatribe against the Roman Catholic Church. The first recommendation General Holdridge makes is:

1. That, unless and until they publicly reject all teachings of the Vatican threatening our institutions, the hierarchy of the Vatican, including members in the United States, and including the Knight of Columbus, the Society of Jesus (Jesuits), Dominicans, Franciscans, Benedictines, and other confraternities of the Roman Catholic Church, be placed, forthwith, on the subversive list of the Attorney General, and subjected to the same restraints as are applicable to other subversives.

If such a man as General Holdridge ever came to power in the United States, which God forbid, he could use such laws as the proposed Brownell bills to carry out the above recommendation. The mailman delivers every day similar hatemongering attacks on the protestant churches, the veterans' organizations, and upon lodges, fraternities, and races in America. It is little wonder that labor unions, church groups, political organizations, and editors have banded together in condemning these dangerous bills.

TVA Is Crucified

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 26, 1954

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an article entitled "TVA Is Crucified," written by Peter Edson, one of the most conservative commentators in the United States, and published in the Washington Daily News.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

TVA Is Crucified

(By Peter Edson)

A convincing record of Eisenhower administration efforts to discredit the Tennessee Valley Authority has been built up in a year and a half.

It is climaxed by the controversy over President Eisenhower's personal instructions to the Budget Bureau and the Atomic Energy Commission. These instructions will require AEC to act as a power broker in making a contract with the Dixon-Yates group of privately owned utilities. The contract would call for the erection of a steam generating plant at West Memphis, Ark. This would not be to supply AEC with power, however. It would be power to supply TVA's long-contract customers like the city of Memphis.

Thus, TVA would be permanently stopped on its plan to build a steam-generating plant at Fulton, Tenn., north of Memphis, to meet future power requirements of this area.

The irony is that TVA would have to pay for this private power fed into its system. The cost to TVA has been estimated at $2 million a year or more higher than if the power were generated in a TVA plant.

In February 1953 Mr. Eisenhower unveiled his partnership power policy, whereby Government would work with private enterprise to develop river valleys. This is the essence of the Dixon-Yates program now being forced on the area.

Two months later ex-President Herbert Hoover declared that the Federal Government should get out of the power business as fast as possible to "rescue freemen from this variety of creeping socialism."

Mr. Eisenhower picked up the "creeping socialism" phrase not long afterward. Asked about this, the President cited TVA as an example, although he added that he had said 1,000 times he was not out to destroy TVA.

This happened just when TVA's appropriation was being considered in Congress. It is believed to have had influence in killing the Fulton powerplant.

When the Budget Bureau again this week refused to recommend construction of the Fulton plant, TVA supporters began to give up. The administration argument was that TVA's future power load estimates were not accurate. When the administration announced its plan to have Dixon-Yates develop additional generating capacity, however, it only tended to confirm TVA estimates.

The new arrangement of having private power supplement TVA's own supply had been hinted at in President Eisenhower's budget message. It did not come out in the open until April, and even then it had to be smoked out by Representative Chet Holifield, Democrat, of California, in Atomic Energy Committee hearings.

The arguments for and against the Dixon-Yates proposal are so complicated that few people can understand them. In presenting the administration case, however, its spokesmen have not hesitated to use any argument that would discredit the TVA.

AEC has claimed that it was overcharged for power by TVA, though its firm contract rates are far below those of AEC's cost-plus private power suppliers. And data supplied to the Congress to support the Dixon-Yates contract has been openly doctored to make TVA look bad.

Sanity on Health Matters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 26, 1954

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, an excellent editorial in the Bergen Evening Record, Hackensack, N. J., July 15, 1954, is so timely in its comment on the temporary setback sustained recently in House by the program for better health services to the people through reinsurance of health insurance policies, contained in H. R. 8356, that I wish to include it as part of my remarks.

The editorial follows:

Sanity Just Won't Do

As between the heartlessness of laissez-faire where lives are concerned and the social and political hazards of compulsory health insurance—colorfully but not incorrectly categorized as socialized medicine—President Eisenhower this year chose a sane and gradualistic approach to health insurance. Eventually embodied in a bill by Representative Wolverton, Republican, of New Jersey, was Federal encouragement of wider and more effective use of the voluntary prepayment method such as the President had sketched in his message of January 18:

"I recommend the establishment of a limited Federal reinsurance service to encourage private and nonprofit health insurance organizations to offer broader health protection to more families."

Mr. Wolverton's bill would have set up a $25 million Federal fund guaranteeing insurors against loss by reason of venturing into fields they must now shun—the catastrophic illnesses whose effect is to impoverish or destroy the families they invade.

The bill was, perhaps of course, denounced by the American Medical Association—whose record is dismayingly negative and whose behavior will one of these days supply a demagogue the means to make organized medicine sweat for its nonfeasances. It was opposed by the United States Chamber of Commerce. Insurance companies gave it their support after some initial hesitancy.

Its death in the House of Representatives, which has just voted to recommit it, cannot, however, be attributed to the powerful lobbies which opposed it. Here again was a measure whose fatal flaw was its moderation. Conservatives saw in it their customary bogeyman, the roving hands of anarchists who lurked in social-security and bank-deposit insurance. New and Fair Dealers saw in it no handouts to write home about—it wouldn't give away enough to people enough to matter. Secretary Hobby estimated it would extend prepayment insurance to 62 million not now covered and broaden benefits for 92 million now insured. It would immensely increase the ownership of a kind of insurance everybody needs. It died—guilty of being too much and also too little. We're glad to see that Representative Widnall, of the Seventh District, and Osmers, of the Ninth, were among the Republicans who stood up for sanity and their President. If all Republicans had done as well for the heart of the President's health program the bill would be alive today. It is interesting to find Mr. Halleck blaming Democrats for its death. He is allocating to them a responsibility for the administration's program which he may one day come to wish he could deny.

Straight From a Woman's Mouth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 26, 1954

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excellent editorial published in the Sussex Countian of July 15, 1954. It refers to the fine maiden speech which the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mrs. Bowring] made on the floor of the Senate.

There being no objection, the editorials will be printed in the Record as follows:

Straight From a Woman's Mouth

Some folks, including ourselves, get terribly mixed up about a lot of legislation that is being considered by the Congress of the United States. Particularly upsetting to Sussex Countians are the present proposed laws on farm price supports; for this is a rural section, and the welfare of all business is dependent upon the financial status of the farmer and the poultry industry. The fact that the agricultural leaders in many States are against rigid support and the United States Senate Agriculture Committee is for it and the House Committee against it only adds to the confusion. Our own Delaware Farm Bureau has gone on record as opposing rigid price supports. At the same time, politicians seem to be going all out for giving the farmers a lot of support which they don't even want.

But, in all this turmoil, a woman has come out against high, rigid support of basic crops with a very clear and simple statement that even the most uninformed of us can understand. She is United States Senator Eva Bowring, of Nebraska, who, in her maiden speech on the floor of the Senate stated: "In the long run, rigid price supports take from the farmer more than he receives. They encourage him to deplete his soil. They saddle the markets with surpluses which give him no opportunity to realize full parity. They destroy the normal relationship of feed and livestock prices."

Of course, Mrs. Bowring's opinion is that of the cattle raiser; but it is also the opinion of the broiler grower who is being ruined by the high support prices of feed. The grain-grower is all for high, rigid supports. Just how this battle between farmers will end is anybody's guess; but, undoubtedly, this country cannot continue its aid to one-half of the farmers to the detriment of the other half. Certainly, President Eisenhower and Secretary of Agriculture are still fighting the high rigid supports. They're upset about the high cost of food and the huge amount of surplus butter and grain that the Government owns. This battle of the farmer against farmer is reaching a climax. With the "farm bloc" divided, Congressmen from the city areas who are listening to the housewife's complaint against the high cost of living will, very likely, vote for flexible price supports. In the meanwhile, we might well listen to the words of Senator BOWRING who had nerve to say: "I feel that the hour is crucial; the congressional agricultural committee majorities are dead wrong and the flexible price support plan will best serve the future of the Nation and its agriculture."

GOP Starts War on AFL Postal Men

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 2, 1954

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, the East Bay Labor Journal for Friday, July 23, contained an article that should be as of much interest to my colleagues as it is to postal and other Federal workers who find themselves in the bind because of the ever-increasing cost of living and an unrealistic wage scale, the result of a political compromise of several years ago:

GOP STARTS WAR ON AFL POSTAL MEN—TOP MAN SAYS IKE WILL VETO BETTER WAGES

The war of the Eisenhower administration against the workers in the postal service organized in AFL unions who are asking Congress to increase their pay, had three phases of interest this week:

1. The postal workers' unions demanded a full investigation of a published report that an attempt had been made to bribe a Congressman in connection with postal pay legislation.

2. During this week or the next it was expected that some final action would be taken by the House of Representatives on postal pay.

3. A speech by Gerald Cullinan, confidential assistant to Postmaster General Summerfield, indicated clearly that the Eisenhower administration is lining up the postmasters and postal supervisors as a ruthless management team to smear or smash the AFL unions of the postal workers, with President Eisenhower prepared to veto any pay legislation the postal workers would willingly accept.

"BRIBES" AND BILLS

The charge that an effort had been made to bribe a Congressman was made in such a way that postal workers at once assumed it was a move to smear the workers and lessen their chances of getting a good pay increase.

Leo E. George, president of the National Federation of Post Office Clerks said:

"We hope this unsubstantiated report will not prejudice the attempt of 500,000 post office employees to regain their former standard of living."

The pay controversy in the House was tangled up in a maze of rival bills, the administration, fearing that the bill favored by the workers would get out on the floor, having introduced a confusing substitute.

In the Senate, hearings on pay legislation were set this week.

CULLINAN SPEECH

Postmaster General Summerfield is a deeply religious man, so he hates the AFL, and is highly resolved to line up the postmasters and postal supervisors of the country against the requests of postal workers for a pay increase.

That is the impression which labor people gather that Gerald Cullinan, confidential assistant to the Postmaster General was trying to make on the National Association of Postmasters in a recent speech before that organization in St. Louis, Mo.

Cullinan assured the assembled postmasters that "Mr. Summerfield is by all odds the most dedicated man I have ever known. He is also a man of deep and devoted religious conviction. * * * Don't think this campaign of insult hasn't taken its toll. * * * Frankly, it wouldn't hurt a bit if some of you drop him a line occasionally to tell him he's doing a good job. Everybody likes to get a pat on the back now and then."

ANTIUNION FIGHT

Cullinan soon made it plain that by this "campaign of insult" which so deeply disturbs his deeply religious boss he was referring to the effort made by organized labor to get a decent wage for postal workers.

Furthermore, Cullinan made it clear that he is trying, on behalf of Summerfield, to line up the postmasters and postal supervisors as though employers against the postal workers organized in AFL unions. He said:

"The point at issue today has gone far beyond the mere passage of a pay adjustment bill. It has got to the point a a struggle for control; who is going to run the Postal Establishment—we—and by that I mean you and us as joint partners in management—or Messrs. Doherty and Leo George."

The two men referred to are, of course, W. C. Doherty, president of the AFL National Association of Letter Carriers, and Leo George, president of the National Federation of Post Office Clerks.

NO NEUTRALS NOW

Cullinan outlined an implacable struggle between management and workers in the post office as follows:

"The struggle for power that has developed within the postal establishment is is based upon such fundamental concepts that any attempt to pussyfoot or appease would be unworthy and ineffectual.

"You can't appease the unappeasable. You can't appease those to whom conciliation is anathema. * * *

"It's as basic as that. That is why every segment of management must unite and present a solid front. * * *

"A controversy like this separates the men from the boys in no uncertain fashion. There can be no neutrals now."

Sneeringly referring to the possibility that Doherty may have conferred with the president of the American Federation of Labor, Cullinan said that perhaps Doherty "decided to become a little meany."

PLEDGES IKE'S VETO

Indicating that he had a solidly antilabor administration back of him, Cullinan said of the Corbett bill, which the postal workers have been backing:

"Even in the unlikely event that a discharge petition could get it out of the House Rules Committee and it were passed—I am morally certain it would never be signed by the President of the United States."

Some of the terms employed by Cullinan against those advocating the pay adjustment favored by the postal workers were: "Calumny and misrepresentation, demagogery, and selfish interest, bumbling ignorance and apathy."

FIRE 'EM

Cullinan also made it clear that the policy of the present administration is to back management against men, that when an employee brings charges against management in the postal service, we are dismissing—not the postmaster—but the employee.

Of course Cullinan qualified this by assuming that in such cases the employee's charges would be vindictive, or irresponsible.

This bitter attack on the postal workers' unions was concluded with the following highflown peroration:

"Don't you feel it in your bones today that we, by what we do together—as partners—can prove to all the darkened world that we in America shall never allow liberty, that torn and tattered document, signed by Christ and his angels, and a most impressive list of sponsors great and small, again to be threatened by the flames?"

National Park Development Shameful

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 14, 1954

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, the following article was written by Mr. Barclay Craighead, manager of radio station KXLJ, Helena, Mont., and broadcast over his station and later reprinted in the Montana Chamber of Commerce monthly magazine, Montana Affairs.

Easterners and westerners alike should recognize the deterioration of our national park system and demand that the Department of the Interior do something about preserving these priceless national assets:

NATIONAL PARK DEVELOPMENT SHAMEFUL

(By Barclay Craighead)

The American people can take pride in the ownership of something like 24 million acres of land in national parks. It was set aside as a vacation land, an area that would remain unused except as "a pleasure ground for the benefit and enjoyment of the people."

Montana was considered doubly fortunate among the States, when the parks were established, in that Glacier lies wholly within our borders and 3 of the 5 entrances to Yellowstone are through the Treasure State.

A SHAMEFUL RECORD

The record of the last 20 years has been shameful insofar as the development of the parks is concerned. No real improvements have been made since 1933. Only maintenance work has been permitted. Entrance fees have increased until in some years Yellowstone has taken in more than has been expended. The Government has been making a profit. As Glacier opened this year, charges to visitors again doubled. This was done to make the park more self-supporting, the Superintendent says. The annual fee for one automobile is to be $4 or $2 for 15 days; for trailers $8 for the season or $4 for 15 days. Since 95 percent of outside traffic cannot remain more than 15 days, the higher fees are in effect designed for Montana people.

Glacier National Park has less than 100 miles of improved roads. For the average tourist the Going-to-the-Sun highway has become a toll road with the fees higher than on the Pennsylvania Turnpike. Nothing has been done of value to extend the park highway system and 500 miles of new roads are needed to make the area truly accessible.

The situation in Yellowstone is even more disgraceful.

IT'S TIME TO INVENTORY

Established 82 years ago, Yellowstone is the oldest of the national parks. It sprawls into three States—Montana, Wyoming, and Idaho. The highway system consists of the old stagecoach trails, widened and oiled for auto traffic. The system has not been truly extended since the Cooke City entrance (outside the park and constructed during the depression). The Rockefeller interests are said to have spent more to develop the Grand Teton National Park in the past few years than our Government has spent in developing Yellowstone in 82 years. Far from saving money, last year's cut for Yellowstone actually cost the Government money. The budget reduced funds for the temporary force, leaving no money for employees at the entrance gates, so that to save $10,000 in salaries $47,000 was lost in entrance fees.

The Democratic Digest kidding the Republicans, suggests that this summer down in Yellowstone, as an economy measure, arrangements should be made so Old Faithful will spout only in rush hours.

Fortunately, perhaps, improvement of the parks is not a party measure. President Eisenhower specifically requested additional funds. So did Secretary of the Interior Douglas McKay. The House Appropriations Committee ignored both requests. The same thing happened both last year and this year and for the previous decade under both Republicans and Democrats.

A nation that is rich enough to spend hundreds of millions in Greece, and Turkey, and Morocco, and Spain, ought it seems, to be able to dig up enough money to improve our national park system. It is silly to do otherwise.

Here is a project for our State chamber of commerce to join with the other Western States in a program of improvement. We need at least $100 million for new highways alone in national parks.

A CALL FOR ACTION

If, after a reasonable time, no progress has been made, it might be well for Governor Aronson to join with the Governors of Idaho and Wyoming in asking that the national parks be returned to the States. Colonialism, we are told is not good for Indochina and South America and where not. Perhaps the form of colonialism which takes vast areas from so-called sovereign States, retains control in an administration centered 2,500 miles away, refuses to develop may not be good for Montana.

Possibly a few eastern Congressmen who apparently desire to hold the West back, members of both parties and who control the Appropriations Committee in the House of Representatives, could be persuaded to listen to President Eisenhower and develop the national parks as they should be developed. At present the Washington authorities are spending many times more on ship subsidies to transport tourists to Europe each year than has been spent to develop the great recreation areas of the West in national parks in the past decade.

The Texas Parrot Fever Scandal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 26, 1954

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following article by Drew Pearson printed in this morning's—July 26—Washington Post pointing out the extremely unsanitary conditions of a large part of the poultry slaughtering industry. Some days ago, I introduced a resolution calling for an investigation of this very subject. Mr. Pearson's article tends to confirm the charges which I then made.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WASHINGTON MERRY-GO-ROUND

(By Drew Pearson)

TEXAS PARROT FEVER SCANDAL

It has been carefully covered up, but a shocking scandal lies behind the outbreak of "parrot fever" in Texas. Inside story is that diseased turkeys, which caused the epidemic, have been dumped on the market, endangering those who handle them.

One 60,000-pound shipment, rejected by the Army, was later sold for civilian consumption. Public health authorities have traced other shipments all the way to Boston, Philadelphia, and New Orleans. Though packed in ice, some of these turkeys were still found to be carrying live parrot fever virus—the same virus that has already caused one known death in Texas.

While they constitute no danger once cooked, they are a danger to those who pluck or dress them.

Meanwhile, when Dr. B. C. Pier, chief of poultry inspection in the Agriculture Department, complained of lax inspection methods he was promptly removed from duty.

On June 1, Pier wrote a confidential memo to his chief, W. D. Termohlen, Director of the Poultry Division: "We feel that during the past year the efficiency of the poultry-inspection service has deteriorated markedly," he said. "This is evidenced by reports from canners and others who purchase inspected eviscerated poultry that it has not been properly prepared as ready-to-cook poultry. There is a widespread feeling in the inspection service that efforts to carry out a sound program will not receive backing if the industry objects. Many supervisors and inspectors have become extremely discouraged in their efforts. * * *"

For his memo, Pier was summarily removed as inspection chief and replaced by Dr. Roy E. Willie, whose first act was to inform employees that he wanted to be fair to the industry.

Pier was given a fancy but meaningless assignment in charge of State inspection programs.

Actually, the inspection of poultry is under both the Agriculture Department and the Food and Drug Administration of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Strictly speaking, the Agriculture Department is supposed to grade poultry. However, since the funds of the Food and Drug Administration have been cut so low by GOP Congressmen JOHN TABER, of New York, and FRED E. BUSBEY, of Illinois, that they can inspect factories only once every 12 years, Agriculture inspects as well as grades.

Only 20 percent of the Nation's poultry plants are Government-inspected, and the companies, not the Government, pay inspectors' salaries.

As a result of these lax methods and lack of funds, official reports received at the Agriculture Department reveal the following unpleasant, unpalatable, but unescapable facts:

Diseased poultry, often covered with sores and swellings, are thrown indiscriminately on the market. The blemishes are simply cut off, and the diseased parts are often sold in fancy packages, offering ready-to-cook drumsticks, breasts, and other featured parts.

The poultry companies that submit to inspection are constantly nagging the Agriculture Department to lower its standards. This industry pressure was what finally caused Chief Pier to complain that his poultry service had deteriorated markedly. But instead of cracking down on the industry, the Agriculture Department cracked down on Pier.

Parrot fever hits

The psittacosis or parrot fever epidemic struck Texas poultry plants in May, sweeping through the employees. More than 300 cases were reported, including one death. First hit were Corsicana Poultry of Corsicana, Producers Produce of Lampasas, Swift & Co. of Tyler, and Market Produce of Brady.

Veterinarians quickly traced the disease to sick turkeys. Most of the plants did not close down, but continued to ship turkeys to market from the sick flocks. This has been proved by public health authorities who have found Texas turkeys, packed in ice but still infected with psittacosis, 2,000 miles away in Boston and Philadelphia. Another shipment has been traced to New Orleans.

Here is one condfiential report made by Field Inspector S. B. Donelson after checking on the Producers Produce plant at Lampasas, Tex.

"On or about May 4, 1954, a sick flock of turkeys was processed at the plant," Donelson informed Washington. "I started work there May 12, 1954, at which time some of the employees were ill. Others became ill within the next week or two, until 26 of the 65 employees were affected. There have been two relapses among the 26. The plant did not close due to this outbreak."

This column will publish more about the way in which the Agriculture Department has bowed to the industry.

Amending Atomic Energy Act of 1946, as Amended

SPEECH

OF

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 23, 1954

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 9757) to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, as amended.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, at the beginning of this Congress, last year, not this year, there was a 90-day deadlock on the question of who should be chairman of the joint committee. This committee is a statutory joint committee. It is a permanent joint committee. It has a membership of 5 of the majority party and 4 of the minority party in each House, as the Members know.

We took the position on the House side that the dignity of the House was just as great as the dignity of the Senate, and we were just as much entitled to have the chairmanship of the committee for 2 years as the Senate was. We were in deadlock for 90 days, until the other body finally agreed that they would alternate this chairmanship back and forth from the other body to this body.

I think the Members of the House in attending and doing the work of this committee have established a far superior record of attendance and hours put in and hard work done to that of the Members from the other body. I say that not in criticism because I recognize that the

Members of the other body have many more committees on which they must serve. In the House under the Reorganization Act we have fewer committees on which to serve and we have been able to give the time and attention required. I can say, and I think I can say without contradiction, that 75 percent of the work of this joint committee has been done by the Members of the House.

I think it is incumbent upon the dignity of the House to have it written into the law so that there will be no further arguments and no deadlocks over this matter in the future, for the chairmanship to rotate back and forth and not be decided by a majority vote of the committee.

This is one case where I think the dignity of each body should be preserved on an equal basis. I believe the amendment the chairman has offered, which was turned down by a very decisive vote in the committee, should not be accepted by the House at this time.

Increased Benefits Under the New Social-Security Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 26, 1954

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, during the 83d Congress which is now coming to a close, I have worked for and supported legislation to increase the benefits under the social-security program.

I believe every person in the United States should come under social-security protection. The benefit age should be reduced from 65 years to 62 years.

Social security should be so improved that it will take the place of our present outdated and shameful old-age pension system.

Social-security payments at the age of 62 should not be denied on account of any other retirement or income benefits a person may be getting.

Although all the benefits I have worked for have not been enacted into law, I do believe this Congress has made a step in the right direction.

For the benefit of the citizens of my district, I would like to outline the benefits under the social-security program enacted by this Congress which I have supported and worked for during the past years:

INCREASED BENEFITS UNDER THE NEW SOCIAL-SECURITY PROGRAM

First. Average monthly wage: Your average monthly wage determines the amount of your benefits. The following chart will apply only if you worked at least 1½ years under the program since January 1, 1951.

(a) List by years all your earnings covered by social security, plus an estimate of your covered earnings up to the time you retire at age 65 or later. To realize the largest possible average monthly wage you may use either 1937 or 1951 as the starting date in your computation. Maximum covered annual earnings are as follows: 1937 through 1950, $3,000; 1951 through 1954, $3,600; after 1954, $4,200.

(b) In computing your average wage, you may cross out four of the lowest income years listed. You can cross off an additional year if you have more than 5 years of covered employment at any time. You can also cross off years in which you were under an extended total disability.

(c) Next, add the total wages earned in the years not crossed off. Divide by the number of months involved in the remaining years. This will give you your average monthly wage. Now locate this amount on the chart below under the heading "Average monthly wage."

Second. Monthly retirement pay: You and your wife, if both 65, will receive benefits as shown on the chart below. If your wife is under 65 when you retire, you will receive the benefit of a single person until she reaches 65. Your widow, at 65, will receive payments indicated whether or not you retire before your death. A woman with a wage record receives benefits in her own right if a higher amount will be realized.

INCREASED FAMILY SECURITY (SURVIVOR'S MONTHLY BENEFITS)

Third. Surviving widow: Your widow, if you leave children under age 18, is entitled to benefits shown on the chart below, regardless of her age as long as any child is under the age of 18 years.

Fourth. Surviving parents or orphans: Your mother or father who are dependent on you are eligible for benefits only if there is no surviving widow or child. Benefits for a parent, age 65, and also for one orphan under 18 years, are shown on the chart. Two parents, or two or more orphans receive correspondingly larger amounts.

Fifth. Lump sum at death: Lump-sum payments are in addition to benefits to eligible survivors. In the event there is no widow or widower surviving, the payment is made to the person paying burial expenses.

Now find the amount payable in your case in the columns opposite the amount you have determined to be your average wage:

Estimated average monthly earnings to age 65	Monthly retirement payments at age 65			Monthly payments to surviving widow with—			Monthly payments to dependent parents or orphan	Lump-sum payment at death
	Husband and wife	Single	Widow	3 children	2 children	1 child		
$54	$45	$30	$30	$50	$50	$45	$30	$90
$80	66	44	33	66	66	66	33	132
$100	82	55	41	82	82	82	41	165
$120	93	62	46	96	96	93	46	187
$140	99	66	49	112	112	99	49	199
$150	102	68	51	120	120	102	51	205
$160	105	70	52	128	128	105	52	211
$170	108	72	54	136	136	108	54	217
$180	111	74	55	144	144	111	55	223
$190	114	76	57	152	152	114	57	229
$200	117	78	58	160	157	117	58	235
$210	120	80	60	168	161	120	60	241
$220	123	82	61	176	165	123	61	247
$230	126	84	63	184	169	126	63	253
$240	129	86	64	192	173	129	64	255
$250	132	88	66	200	177	132	66	255
$260	135	90	67	200	181	135	67	255
$270	138	92	69	200	185	138	69	255
$280	141	94	70	200	189	141	70	255
$290	144	96	72	200	193	144	72	255
$300	147	98	73	200	197	147	73	255
$310	150	100	75	200	200	150	75	255
$320	153	102	76	200	200	153	76	255
$330	156	104	78	200	200	156	78	255
$340	159	106	79	200	200	159	79	255
$350	162	108	81	200	200	162	81	255

Moving To Break the Atom Filibuster

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER FERGUSON

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 26, 1954

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excellent editorial published in the Baltimore Sun of July 26, 1954.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MOVING TO BREAK THE ATOM FILIBUSTER

The splinter group of Senators spearheaded by the voluble MORSE, of Oregon, has held up the atomic-energy bill for several days. Their filibuster is sparked by one of the most tattered notions of the obsolete "liberalism" for which they stand. In the cadences of the late William Jennings Bryan, they are talking about power grabs and private monopolies and capitalist thefts from the people. What they mean is that in one section of its atom-energy bill the administration proposes to allow private business, under public supervision, to develop the industrial uses of atomic energy.

To describe this project in the 1890 verbiage of grabs and exploitation is to overlook the new, big Government which now bestrides all private enterprise. It is to forget the new tax laws which skim off all the cream and some of the top milk of industrial profits. It is to overlook the long and formidable roster of Government regulatory agencies, of which the Atomic Energy Commission is a towering example. It is to forget the massive body of administrative jurisprudence under which, and free of court control, these new agencies impose the will of Government in pervasive and penetrative detail on the private activities which they police.

This seems to be the realization which has gradually dawned in the minds of the responsible Democratic leadership in the Senate. Men of the stature of JOHNSON of Texas are now unwilling to let Senator MORSE shape the Democratic stand before the country. They have seen the House acceptance of the administration proposals. They know that each and every Member of the House must face the voters in a mere 3 months. They appreciate that the Members of the House majority would not have taken the administration bill unless they were sure that the public sensed the phoniness of the MORSE group's criticisms. The responsible Democratic leadership is accordingly out to help break the filibuster. That it should do.

For the bill which the filibuster blocks is one of gravity. Not merely does it provide for the properly supervised development by private interests of industrial atomic power. It provides for a collaboration among friendly nations to a similar end. It provides for a security-tight exchange of information on atomic weapons with our military allies. Mr. MORSE's little group of willful men has blocked this vital business long enough.

Russia's Militant Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 26, 1954

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an article by Joseph and Stewart Alsop. The matter they discuss is a very grave one, and it is doubtful if any of our citizens have realized that the Soviets have made such terrific advances or what this means to us in the future.

Certainly the people in our Government, who are responsible for our defenses, have a heavy obligation to see that measures are taken to put us in a position where we will have some feeling of protection, if not security.

It looks to me as though the New Look has been anything but that.

The article follows:

RUSSIA NEAR ULTIMATE WEAPON

(By Joseph and Stewart Alsop)

In the year 1960, by the agreed estimate of the Pentagon's official analysts, the Soviet Union will fly its first intercontinental ballistic missile.

That sentence may sound innocent enough, but it is not. The intercontinental ballistic missile, or IBM, as the experts call it, will be an accurately guided rocket, comparable to a giant V-2, capable of carrying a hydrogen warhead over a range of 4,000 to 5,000 miles.

Such a weapon will wed the ultimate in destructiveness with the ultimate in striking power. There will be no defense against this ultimate weapon, nor any warnings of its coming. And this is what the most highly qualified American experts now expect the Kremlin to possess in 6 short years.

It must be noted, furthermore, that our official experts have consistently underrated Russian weapons development. In every major case from the atomic bomb down to the new long-range jet bombers, the Soviet developers have always beaten the American official forecast by at least 2 years.

In the guided-missile art, great strides have been made recently toward solutions of the two most knotty problems—accurate guidance and atmospheric reentry. The Soviets are in good position to take advantage of this forward movement.

Since the end of the last war, they have been working all out to get a long-range guided missile, with the most massive human and material resources going into the effort. In this particular field, moreover, the Russians began with a technology and even a manufacturing capacity superior to ours.

Here in America, by contrast, we have not been going all out. Even today, the total budget of our Atlas project is reported not to exceed $50 million, and this and other guided-missile projects are complexly entangled in Pentagon redtape. At present, the National Security Council is mulling ponderously over the question whether to make an all-out effort. For the usual budgetary reasons, the NSC's answer is just as likely to be "no" as "yes."

In short, it seems entirely possible that the Kremlin will possess the ultimate weapon before we possess it.

Maybe it is foolish to be insistent about such unwelcome facts. Last week, Senator STUART SYMINGTON, Democrat of Missouri, made a brilliant speech on this subject. With all the authority of a man who knows the American defense picture from the inside, SYMINGTON warned of the danger described in this report. His speech, though thoroughly factual as well as grimly ominous, received far less attention than the most recent didos of the McCarthy committee.

Many people in this country are not interested in the facts of life and death, which the administration so sedulously conceals from them. All the same, it is time—it is past time—to realize that America's traditional invulnerability is not going to last forever, or even for very long.

The era of the intercontinental ballistic missile will be the final stage of the journey into danger. But there will be an intermediate stage first. For the Soviet stock of atomic and hydrogen bombs is continuously growing. The power of the Soviet long-range air army is also growing very rapidly. And business as usual has been the keynote of our air-defense effort, as of our guided-missile effort.

It is now 4 years since the National Security Council gave continental air defense the highest priority. It is 2 years since the summer study group of the Lincoln project proposed a design for an effective air defense. It is 1 year since the NSC received the culminating report in a long and weary series urging instant, energetic action.

But what has happened? There have been negotiations for an intermediate warning line in Canada, and that is all. On this line, the so-called McGill Line, not a spade has been turned, although equipment has been ordered.

Project Corrode long since proved the desirability and practicality of a more advanced warning line. But the establishment of some such a line has not even been mentioned to the Canadians. Neither has any arrangement for early interception, which is just as important as early warning, or any arrangement for unified command, which is also vital.

If these things had been done, or were being done, we might not enter the time of total peril until the IBM's are in the air. As it is, the time of total peril will begin for us in a couple of years. One wonders what system of logic explains the neglect of the dread problems and their persistent concealment from the American people.

Ohio Glassworkers' Protective League Meeting, Bellaire, Ohio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE L. HAYS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 26, 1954

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to include an article from the American Flint, the official magazine of the American Flint Glass Workers' Union of North America, which describes a meeting which was held in Bellaire, Ohio, in my district, relative to what could be done to protect the jobs of the glassworkers and pottery workers and others in allied trades from ruinous foreign competition:

OHIO GLASSWORKERS' PROTECTIVE LEAGUE MEETING, BELLAIRE, OHIO

(By Joseph I. Tracy)

Representatives of labor-management-Government vigorously denounced the Eisenhower administration's tariff policies which is ruining the glass trade in America because of foreign import to the point where it is becoming dangerous. Congressman WAYNE L. HAYS, on the 18th Congressional District of Ohio, boldly predicted that Eisenhower's tariff measure will meet certain defeat. In a meeting of the Ohio Glassworkers' Protective League in Bellaire, Ohio, the league adopted a resolution prepared by International President Harry H. Cook of the American Flint Glassworkers' Union of North America which reads as follows:

RESOLUTION

"Whereas employment in the glassware industry has long been menaced by imports of glassware from low wage countries with the result that many of our workers have lost their jobs;

"Whereas this foreign competition has been greatly sharpened by the pernicious tariff policy of the past 20 years, under which the protection of our workers has been weakened to the point of indefensible exposure;

"Whereas the remedy offered by the trade agreement escape clause is no better than a snare and a delusion, mocking the bitter plight of our unemployed and the communities in which they reside:

"Whereas it is now proposed by a bill carrying out the Randall Commission's recommendation to empower the President to negotiate further tariff reductions: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*—

"1. That we express our most vigorous opposition to any further extension of this obnoxious and injurious legislation which if much longer continued will weaken this country and lead it into the depression that has long been predicted and eagerly hoped for by the Communist world; and

"2. That we make known our sentiments to our national legislators, the Secretary of Labor, and to our own and the workers in numerous other industries that face similarly destructive competition from abroad."

Adopted by representatives in attendance at the meeting of the Ohio Glass Workers' Protective League, April 17, 1954, at Bellaire, Ohio.

In addition to the principal speaker, Harry H. Cook, International President of the AFGWU, were Carl W. Gustkey, president of the Imperial Glass Corp. in Bellaire; Howard Rodefer, vice president of the Rodefer-

Gleason Co., of Bellaire; Mayor Wilbur W. Shakelford, who welcomed the visiting delegates to Bellaire. State Representative A. G. Lancione of Bellaire was the Master of Ceremonies who was introduced by President Benny S. Mangiopane of Local No. 503.

Mr. Rodefer, of the Rodefer-Gleason, warned that Europe is a beehive of improvements in industries and we must reach a greater efficiency and bring new and improved products so that the job cannot be duplicated and thus we will need no protection.

Mr. Carl W. Gustkey of the Imperial Glass Corp. warned that the handmade industry will be killed completely unless the influx of foreign products under the present unequal tariff structure is halted. Gustkey pointed out that the reciprocal trade is not a two-way street it is supposed to be. Gustkey pointed out that in the past 4 months 8 additional foreign nations have passed prohibitive tariffs to keep out American goods. He also questioned a claim that high tariffs will affect the jobs of some 4,000,000 persons employed in the production of items for export, noting that the Department of Labor set that employment figure at a little over 1 million.

Congressman HAYS stated that because of currency manipulations and rigid wage controls in totalitarian countries such as Czechoslovakia can be adjusted to meet any standard. The Czechs have been known to sell cut glass by the pound to gain American dollars. HAYS stated that he favors no imports at all from Communist countries. He (HAYS) said we must educate Europeans to our way of life, including high wages, living standards, and encourage them to strive to the same standards as ours in their own countries.

Congressman HAYS condemned the Trade Not Aid slogan of the administration generally attributed to Henry Ford II, and predicted that the Ford people themselves will feel less kindly toward imports when the English-manufactured cars begin to appear on the American markets.

Hays said there is a need to crack the "iron curtain" which surrounds President Eisenhower which is composed of men only interested in big business and not the plight of the laboring man. He said that Eisenhower is surrounded by a "general staff" composed of big importing companies and that Eisenhower knows "only what he is told." Hays promised to continue fighting to get the message across to the President.

Slogans came in for a bit of criticism when many of Americans were fooled to believe that trade not aid would add to the strengthening of Europe and the rest of the world against communism. Wages and living standards are being controlled by countries under the yoke of tyrants. They seek to lower the standard of living and wages to a level that American factories are being closed and thousands are being forced to leave jobs to relief rolls.

International president Harry H. Cook reminded his listeners that the Free Traders claim that American industry and workers will have to adjust themselves to the tariff problem by closing plants which cannot compete and seeking employment elsewhere. President Cook said in the early days of the Imperial where he was an employee, many glassworkers bought homes, sent their children to schools, and became an important part of the community and government. President Cook stated it is wrong in making them the unwilling victims of its erroneous tariff policy by forcing them to tear up their roots and try for jobs in other cities where already people are walking the streets looking for jobs.

President Cook stated "that much good will come from meetings such as these" for many Congressmen have already written to him that they have so much mail that it is necessary to resort to mimeograph copy being sent as replies to their constituents.

International President Harry H. Cook, who is a charter member of Bellaire's Local Union No. 13, was touched with emotion when he received a large gold-painted punch-bowl set from local union No. 13. President William J. Jeffers of local No. 13 presented the gift as a token of their esteem for his work for the organization and as a charter member of local 13.

President Cook recalled many old timers with whom he worked. He recalled how he and many others would have to resort to various means of transportation in going to and returning home from work at the old Crystal Glass Works at Bridgeport, Ohio, and how they welcomed the opening of the Imperial Glass Co. in 1904. He stated he was one of many who worked the opening day and that he had gathered the first piece of glass in the operation of the Bellaire plant. He recalled how local union, No. 13, was given that number and that they didn't like the number 13 but today he is still proud that he is a charter member of No. 13. He said while they complained, former President T. W. Rowe insisted, and there was no other recourse but to accept the "lucky 13." Mr. Cook paid high tribute to Mr. Joe Flaherty, who was present, and referred to Mr. Flaherty as a faithful and stanch member of the American Flint Glass Workers' Union of North America.

President Cook often referred to the term "my old hometown" in which he is justifiably proud. Mr. Cook left Bellaire reluctantly to accept the position as assistant national secretary of the AFGWU in 1916. He rose to the coveted position of international president at the death of M. J. Gillooly. Mr. Cook reaffirms his love for his hometown in Bellaire and is received with much enthusiasm. He is possessed with much charm and a magnetic personality.

The Ohio Protective League was the guest of the various Bellaire locals, including locals Nos. 503, 13, 558, 34, 143, and 53, of the Imperial and Rodefer-Gleason, respectively, headed by general chairman of the arrangements committee, Mr. Louis (Cy) Welsch of local No. 503. Much of the credit to the publicity is due to Mr. Jimmie Mountain, Jr., managing editor of the Times-Leader of Bellaire, Ohio.

It was a reminder of the dangers of low tariffs which cause a full-scale unemployment and a certain depression. The quality of an average American must not be lowered to the standards of Europe or Asia. In the Communists' aim to reduce the world to a low level and the scheme of world conquest for international communism, many methods are devised to dupe us into the trick of slogans. We Americans cannot again rely on wars for false prosperity, but to educate Europeans and Asiatics to follow the line of Americans in high standards of living, wages, and a high degree of morality.

The invocation was given by Rev. Frank Coen, of local No. 503. Mr. Marion Mullins, of Columbus, Ohio, presided over the league meeting. Lancaster was selected as the site for the next league meeting.

Need for Government Support for Merchant Marine and Shipbuilding

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 22, 1954

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, debate on the Wigglesworth amendment to the supplemental appropriation bill which passed the House on July 20 showed that there is a great lack of understanding on the part of many Members of the House regarding the basic facts about the American maritime industry. The debate also showed a lack of knowledge concerning the laws which Congress has passed to give support to our merchant marine and our shipbuilding industry, and the reasons why those laws are necessary from a purely selfish standpoint—selfish on the part of the American people as distinguished from the maritime industry itself. The ignorance which was displayed on the floor of the House while we debated the wisdom of putting shipbuilding funds back in the bill would be pardonable in the average American. But it seems to me that those who are legislating on these matters in appropriations bills, if they are not content to accept the judgment of the House committees having jurisdiction, should be more familiar with the problems with which they are dealing and with the history and purpose of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 in providing at least a partial solution to those problems. The frequent references to "boondoggling" which we heard applied to the vital Government supported shipbuilding program prove that this familiarity is lacking. For that reason I have decided to insert in the RECORD a series of remarks reviewing certain phases of our shipbuilding history and intended to show that the dollars we appropriate to build ships are far from wasted, but are actually a sound and necessary investment for the Government and for the American people. I trust that the points I bring out will have educational value, will perhaps persuade some of my colleagues that when similar requests for funds are brought to the House in the future they should think twice before opposing them.

Typical of the many loose statements we have heard in the debate on the supplemental appropriation bill, Mr. Speaker, was the remark that neither the A. F. of L. or the CIO supported these shipbuilding fund requests. I know personally that nothing could be farther from the truth and that the major unions from both organizations whose members are employed in the shipyards or related fields have consistently supported these appropriations and have reiterated that position in connection with the bill we just amended. In fact, President Meany, of the A. F. of L., and President Reuther, of the CIO, have asked for the program in addition to the shipyard unions.

The ship construction differential subsidy provisions of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 were enacted for the very sound reason that the experience of many years had proved beyond doubt that the American shipping industry by itself could not afford to have ships built in American shipyards, in competition with low-cost foreign yards. We had spent \$2½ billion during the World War I period in a hurried and confused effort to rebuild a shipbuilding industry which had been allowed to die in the late 19th and early 20th centuries. Despite that \$2½ billion we were unable to get any new vessels off the ways in time to help win that war—concrete proof that the few millions we are asked to spend now to preserve the industry are not wasted. With a large fleet of vessels on our hands after World War I, the tardy product of the war effort, it was not until the thirties that the growing obsolescence of that fleet forced a hard look at our entire maritime industry on the part of Congress, although some legislative attempts had been made in the meantime to encourage private construction of ships with little result. The Merchant Marine Act of 1936 was the result of several years of study by congressional committees. Results since that time have proved its value beyond question, especially in that although the shipbuilding program it provided hardly had time to get under way before World War II was upon us, by the date of Pearl Harbor the subsidized shipping lines had 146 vessels built or building under its provisions which were quickly requisitioned by the Government. The so-called Harvard report prepared in 1945 for the United States Navy and the Maritime Commission stated:

> Because of the 1936 Merchant Marine Act, the United States had both a nucleus of modern merchant vessels before the disaster at Pearl Harbor in December 1941 and the machinery for greatly expanding ship production to meet the extraordinary requirements of World War II.

So this "boondoggling," as we have heard it called, was a major instrument in preventing a far greater disaster than Pearl Harbor—the possible loss of the war for lack of shipping in its early stages. Twelve billion dollars was spent by the United States Government during the war for construction of commercial-type vessels, and for putting up and restoring the shipyards in which to build them. We not only had to build ships in a hurry, but because of our improvidence in between wars many of our existing shipyards were in such a state of decay that they could not be quickly rehabilitated, and we had to funnel hundreds of millions of dollars into creating new yards on all coasts and on the Great Lakes to get ship construction going in the fastest possible time. Had our shipyards been more active during the prewar years, and had we spent a little money to keep more of the yards on minimum production schedules to prevent their rusting away and to keep modern ships coming off the ways, it has been estimated that as much as $8.5 billion of the $12 billion spent during the war years might have been saved. Skyrocketing costs, shortages of material and labor, and lack of a nucleus of trained shipbuilders all contributed to the tremendous loss of time and money resulting from our unpreparedness.

Certainly if we had any common sense we would not let that happen again. But those who talk now of Government-supported shipbuilding programs as "appalling waste" or as a WPA program should learn that our private shipyards now have less than half as many people employed as they did in 1941. Our war-built fleet is obsolescent in economic terms and is actually obsolete when we consider a possible wartime need for fast modern vessels to evade the huge fleet of Russian submarines. Remembering the lessons of World Wars I and II, it seems to me that if we have any regard at all for our national security, we should be doing everything possible to encourage private shipping operators to build new and modern ships under the 1936 act provisions rather than refusing to honor the Government's contractual obligations to help them do so.

As I have said, the ship-construction program under the act had hardly begun when World War II began and the Government took over the entire shipping industry, thus suspending the act for the war period. At the same time all of the resources of the shipbuilding industry were diverted to the Government's shipbuilding needs and large new shipyards were hurriedly built for Government account, involving the tremendous additional expense I have mentioned. It was not until 1947 that the Government permitted our shipping lines to get back into something approaching a normal peacetime operation, and again gave the ship-construction features of the Merchant Marine Act a chance to work.

In the immediate postwar years new construction was not a vital problem since the war-built fleet was in process of being sold or placed in our reserve fleet. Ships which had been requisitioned from private shipping lines were being reconverted for peacetime use and returned to their owners. Many such vessels had been lost through enemy action and were replaced by their equivalent from the war-built fleet. This delayed demobilization incidentally cost the shipping industry tens of millions of dollars in postwar profits which might have been realized had they been allowed to function freely.

In view of the above facts, Mr. Speaker, those who have severely criticized the provisions of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 regarding Government support for shipbuilding programs, and have taken cracks at the cost to the Government of some of the ships which have been built, should bear in mind that the act has been in actual operation for only a few prewar and postwar years. The ships built before the war and building at the time of Pearl Harbor saved the United States Government so much in terms of dollars and cents alone that it is fantastic to question the value received for the few dollars spent by the Government in their construction. It has been estimated that the availability of these vessels to the Government during the war saved us $500 million in charter costs alone. Up until December 21, 1952, the total subsidy liability of the Government on the 247 ships constructed and sold under construction-differential subsidy provisions of the act during the entire period of its existence amounted to only approximately $425 million. This includes both prewar and postwar vessels. As of December 31, 1951, the net cost to the Government, taking into account wartime requisitioning of vessels, amounted to only $88,311,326. This is surely a small price to have paid for the immeasurable advantages the ships gave us. On vessels built since the war a great deal of criticism has been leveled at the amounts the Government paid for aiding in the construction of the three great passenger liners, the *United States*, the *Independence*, and the *Constitution*. As I pointed out the other day lack of such troop-carrying vessels during the war cost us tremendous sums of money in payments to our allies for use of their vessels for that purpose. We now have those vessels available for that essential service. The only objection which can legitimately be raised on this score is that more of them have not been built, which brings me to the issue of construction of the four passenger-cargo ships for Grace Lines and Moore-McCormack.

While the funds for these vessels have now been voted by the House over the objections of the leadership of the Appropriations Committee, it is disturbing to me and I am sure it is disurbing to the industry that the committee majority apparently does not recognize the vital importance of this construction to the national defense, nor do they recognize the legal and contractual obligation of the United States Government to aid in the construction of these ships. Operating-differential subsidy contracts with the Government, under which the lines operate the ships which these vessels are designed to replace, require that the companies must replace them when they reach 20 years of age. These contracts were signed under authority of several sections of titles V and VI of the Merchant Marine Act requiring replacement of over-age ships. All of the vessels to be replaced are well over that age. For well over 2 years the 2 companies concerned have been seeking to get the Government through the Maritime Administration to comply with the legal requirements and sign contracts for construction of the replacement vessels with the aid of construction-differential subsidy funds. The act requires that new ships be built to replace 20-year-old vessels for 2 reasons. First, continued operation of obsolete vessels is bound to be inefficient and costly. Such operation would increase the costs to the Government of operating-differential subsidies. Second, and more important from our point of view, the entire purpose of the Merchant Marine Act is to keep available to the United States for national security reasons a self-sufficient fleet of modern vessels for possible wartime use. Keeping 20- or 25-year-old vessels on the seas does not serve that purpose. Construction of new vessels does, and serves the additional purpose of keeping shipyards activated for further construction and expansion if and when the wartime need arises. The framers of the act knew what they were doing when those requirements were written. It is unfortunate that we must now fight to put the provisions into effect whenever expenditure of a few dollars is involved. I trust that the Members of the House who have opposed these expenditures in the well intentioned belief that they are serving the cause of economy by so doing will give some consideration to the thoughts I have expressed here so that in future they will be more sympathetic to ship construction money requests.

Mr. Speaker, I expect to insert into the RECORD in the near future additional remarks on the purposes and operation of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936. In so doing I will attempt to answer criticism of the manner in which other provisions have operated. I will appreciate the attention of the Members to those future remarks in the interest of preserving and restoring the vital fourth arm of our national defense—the American merchant marine.

Bowman Elder

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAM W. REYNOLDS

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 26, 1954

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, several weeks ago I had occasion, with many others, to travel to Indianapolis to attend the funeral of a dear friend, Bowman Elder. Bowman Elder was one of the organizers and earlier officials of the American Legion. He spent much of his time, talent, and money in the true Legion spirit for God and country. His good works are known not only to many of the Members of this body but thousands of veterans throughout the land. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the eloquent eulogy delivered by the Reverend Dr. Frantz.

There being no objection, the eulogy was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BOWMAN ELDER

"The souls of believers are at their death made perfect in holiness, and do immediately pass into glory. And so shall they be forever with the Lord."

Jesus says to us now, "Let not your heart be troubled; ye believe in God, believe also in Me. In my Father's house are many mansions; if it were not so I would have told you. I go to prepare a place for you. And if I go and prepare a place for you, I will come again, and receive you unto Myself; that where I am, there ye may be also."

We do believe in God, and we believe also in Christ. And since we have this word of this most perfect Gentleman that ever lived, our minds are at rest, and our hearts abide in peace.

Death—men call it by that desolating name—cold and dark. Jesus describes death as His coming to receive us to Himself. Bowman believed the Lord, and he was not afraid of the shadows.

We thank God for his faith and for our faith.

Our life in Christ has no circumferences; it is not bounded by birth and death; it is not shut in by darkness and the shallows; it has an horizon, wide as heaven; and it has deeps as illimitable as the love of God.

In this confidence our hearts are free to thank God for his mercies in giving us such a friend as Bowman Elder, who is now more alive than he ever was in life.

God gave him a heart so big that it outmatched his ample frame—so big that his concern and compassion touched life all around. Anything that purified and sweetened our life here had his heart in it.

There are artists of many kinds; his art was the art of helpfulness. Once when I took to him another man's troubles, I asked him why he came to his office so early in the morning. He answered with stark simplicity: "So I can get my own affairs out of the way and have time for important things like this." He always had time.

Life was a big thing to him, and he helped us to see how big it is.

He had time for his church, the church of our redeeming Lord.

He had time for the affairs of his State and Nation. He served them well in war and in peace.

Every work of the community's compassion had his hearty help.

He had time unstinted for anyone in trouble, and with him was remedy.

His lips spoke courage, his hands worked kindness, his feet sought out the forgotten people.

There are so many of us, who owe so much to this big-hearted man, that merely to call our names would wear the day and the night out.

He had—

"Honesty as rare as a man without self-pity.
Kindness as large and plain as a prairie."

"His life was gentle, and the elements
So mix'd that Nature might stand up
And say to all the world 'This was a man'."

Such achievements raise a monument which shall endure until the sun grows cold.

Through a long aisle of thankful tears he is carried to his resting place. Good lives do not go out, they go on.

"And so shall he be forever with the Lord."

Fiftieth Anniversary of the Death of Theodor Herzl

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 26, 1954

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, July 20 of this year marked the 50th anniversary of the death of Theodor Herzl, the founder of the Zionist movement. In commemoration of this event, a series of observances are scheduled to be held throughout the world in tribute to Theodor Herzl, whose early vision of a Jewish homeland has been translated into the living reality of Israel.

Theodor Herzl first stirred world public opinion in 1896 with his book called The Jewish State, which led to the first Zionist Congress in Switzerland the following year. That was the beginning of the movement which, 50 years later, contributed so substantially to the establishment of the Republic of Israel.

On July 20 of this year the Honorable Louis Lipsky, an eminent American citizen who has held many positions of leadership in Jewish affairs in the United States, and who is now chairman of the American Zionist Committee for Public Affairs, delivered an address at a meeting called by the joint national Herzl committee, in tribute to the memory of Theodor Herzl.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Lipsky's remarks be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Herzl's distinction was that he gave the Jewish problem form, dramatic content, and passion. He provoked a general international discussion.

With startling self-assurance, on his own responsibility, he proposed the creation of a Jewish state. He became its sponsor and advocate. He used all his friends to help him find a way to distinguish supporters. He won the loyalty of Max Nordau, then at the height of his international fame. He met Baron de Hirsch who rejected his plans. He submitted a memorandum to Baron de Rothschild who thought his enterprise would be dangerous to Jews in general. He established contacts with Jews in England, in the United States, in Russia.

All his unrevealed talents converged to provide the audacity to become the first Jewish diplomat, the first to negotiate the cause of reestablishing the Jewish state on practical, political levels. The man of letters became a politcal strategist and diplomat. He seemed to carry the credentials of an ancient people who had regained old political manners and came straight to the throne of public opinion, seeking not special favors or mercy, but the righting of an ancient wrong. The heart of his plea was sovereignty, freedom, home. He was not an economist. He was not a financier. But he had the gift of an extraordinary imagination and an amazing resourcefulness. He was able to find harmony in discord, unity in diversity. It required great resoluteness at that time to face an arrogant Kaiser and to plead the Jewish cause with restraint and dignity. The effort to see and influence the Sultan of Turkey—to brush aside the army of flunkeys barring access to the Sick Man of Europe—was an elaborate conspiracy of great ingenuity. The influence of the Kaiser died early, but Herzl played the game with the Sultan to the bitter end, when the crafty ruler finally offered him Mesopotamia, Syria, and Anatolia for colonization, but specifically excluded Palestine. When the time came for him to turn to England, it was, in fact, the last available station on the adventuresome march begun in 1894. The English offer of Uganda was the only definite proposal Herzl was ever able to bring to his people.

It was the summation of his life. It was a distorted climax and a mockery. He was being detoured to East Africa. The movement would be called upon to cease reference to the return. It would lose contact with tradition and history. Zion would become a receding memory. The Russian Zionists for whom the haven of refuge was intended rejected it with grief and dismay. They said Zionism was the breath of their life and they could not stop breathing. Life could not be sustained as a part of a political maneuver. Although the majority was with Herzl, he knew from the start that the battle was lost. He went into the caucus of the Russian Zionists and saw them mourn over the betrayal of their hope; and realized for the first time how deeply rooted was the mystic relation of the chosen people and the promised land. He was driven by the power of Jewish memory to abandon the uncertain territory of his first thought and to accept without question the Land of Israel as the objective of Jewish hope. He knew then that he was not destined to lead the modern exodus. He did not have the strength to achieve in the few years of his own life what his people were unable to achieve in 2,000 years of suffering and faith. He was the forerunner. A new generation would have to be born to take on the burden. He had come to the end of his life. For 10 years he had carried on with an impaired heart. When he passed away he was under the impression that his life had been a failure.

He did not know that he had fired a revolution in Jewish life and thought. He did not know that he had created the instrument of redemption which would live on long after his departure, and would ultimately reach the goal he had missed. In the first flush of revelation he had thought freedom would come through the contributions of Jewish philanthropists, through foreign influence bought and paid for. He organized the Jewish Colonial Trust. He set in motion the Jewish National Fund. He made the Congress the international voice of the Jewish people. In the final hours of his life he knew that redemption would come from the struggle of his people, their sacrifices, their devotion, their belligerency, their passion.

It was his historic privilege to set the Jewish people on the road that would bring them to the promised land—not any land, not Argentina, not Uganda, but the land which finally found a living place in his bruised heart, and in which every tree and every bare rock bore witness to the covenant.

He said that the foundation of the Jewish State was laid at the first Basle Congress. He foretold that 50 years later the Jewish State would be a growing reality. The first Congress was held in 1897. The Balfour Declaration was issued in 1917. The Jewish people proclaimed the State of Israel in May 1948.

The Touchstones of True Patriotism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 26, 1954

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record a very able article written by Father Robert C. Hartnett, originally published in America, a National Catholic weekly review, and reprinted in the Washington Post of July 4, 1954.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

THE TOUCHSTONES OF TRUE PATRIOTISM

(The following article is reprinted from America, the National Catholic weekly review. As a text, and applicable to some patriots, Father Hartnett, editor of the distinguished Jesuit journal, took St. Paul's observation about some Pharisees: "They have a zeal for God, but not according to knowledge.")

(By Robert C. Hartnett)

"Patriotism," Sam Johnson once said, "is the last refuge of a scoundrel." As great a patriot as Theodore Roosevelt acknowledged that Johnson was right—but only, of course, partly right. For the caustic critic of cant was speaking only of the abuse of a great moral virtue.

That virtue is the well-ordered love of one's country and of his fellow citizens. The fact that a virtue may be used to cloak a vice in no wise destroys the luster of the virtue. True love between a man and a woman is a virtue, even though the vice of mere sexual infatuation often masquerades as true love.

The fact remains that all of us have to exercise care in deciding what attitudes are patriotic and what are distortions of that noble virtue. The commemoration of Independence Day offers an occasion to suggest the following norms by which to distinguish true from bogus patriotism:

1. The true patriot seldom labels himself as a patriot. He has an exalted idea of what the virtue of patriotism demands of him. He has an acute realization of how far he falls short of his own ideals. He applies to himself the words of our Lord to His disciples: "When you have done everything that was commanded you, say, 'We are unprofitable servants.'"

2. The true patriot embraces under "love of country" everything that preserves and promotes its moral and material, spiritual and temporal, character.

He tries to diminish the evil and build up the good in his society in every way possible; he does not limit his patriotism to the kind of conduct that makes people popular as patriots, such as buying Government bonds.

Whatever makes his country more pleasing in the eyes of God, increases its perfection as a corporate moral person, elicits the potentialities of its citizens for moral achievement, finds Him on its side. He understands patriotism, sub specie aeternitatis; that is, as a large part of the moral universe in which our Creator has placed us for the purpose of working out, in the medium of time, our eternal destiny. He therefore sees patriotism as part of the Christian order, the dynamic plan by which God's human creatures freely, intelligently cooperate in fulfilling the divine intentions for mankind.

3. The true patriot keeps his eye on the common good, properly conceived, of his local community, of his State and of his Nation.

His conversation is colored by such concepts as the common good and social justice. These ideas influence his judgments about such controversial issues as public housing, old-age pensions, unemployment compensation and public relief. He is concerned about the lot of the poor, the physically and mentally ill, the unemployed, the underpaid. He thinks a lot in terms of human needs—the human needs of people of all classes, colors and creeds.

4. The true patriot sees his own country and calls other countries as members of the family of nations, united by the indestructible moral bonds of a common human nature and a common human condition.

He knows that God, the Father of all, has created the material goods of this earth for the good of all His human children, as means by which they may be helped to attain their divine destiny. He knows that, under divine providence, the method of distributing these goods is grounded in the natural right of private property as regulated by individual States. But he also knows that the exercise of property rights must be accommodated to the international, as well as the national, common good.

So the true patriot does not whine about high taxes if they are necessary to achieve the divine purpose of all material wealth. He is disturbed in conscience when his fellow citizens sneer at foreign-aid programs as Operation Rathole, as if the beneficiaries were rodents instead of human creatures made in the image of God. He wants his country to accept whatever moral responsibilities good sense judges it to have for the political, economic, social, cultural improvement and security against aggression of the human race as a whole.

He is never the first to complain when tariffs are somewhat lowered to give other people a chance to improve their lot. Nor is he quick to restrict immigration from areas overcrowded with underfed, ill-clothed and shelterless fellow humans. And he doesn't bravely denounce international communism at chamber of commerce luncheons, but cry bloody murder at the very thought of having his son sent to Korea or Indochina to oppose Red aggression on the battlefield.

5. The true patriot defends the rights of every person.

He has only one set of principles of justice, which he applies to everyone. The fact that a fellow citizen of his was once a Communist does not, in the eyes of a true patriot, strip such a person of his human nature and the natural and legal rights recognized as belonging to all persons in his society.

In meeting out justice he is not governed by likes and dislikes but by the norms of right and wrong. If need be, he is willing to become unpopular because of his attachment to fundamental principles. In fact, he would find it odd if such attachment never involved him in criticism from others.

6. The true patriot upholds constitutional government and the rule of law.

He nows that laws and even constitutional provisions can involve serious inconveniences and sometimes injustices. He is prepared to bear with them up to a point in order to preserve orderliness in public affairs.

He is not opposed to the orderly revision of governmental procedures. But he is impressed by the soundness of the principle expounded in the Declaration of Independence: "Prudence, indeed, will dictate that governments long established should not be changed for light and transient causes." He opposes the violation of laws, or collusion with such violation, when means are readily available of changing the laws, if need be, through constitutional procedures. He patiently stands by the principle that governments should rule through laws rather than the will of individual men, in accordance with the ancient Christian standard of immunity from the arbitrary.

7. The true patriot tempers his zeal in order to avoid imputing unpatriotic motives to his fellow citizens unless their conduct leaves no alternative.

He does not brand them disloyal for having reached conclusions or made decisions different from his own. "In a republic," declared that most ardent apostle of Americanism, Teddy Roosevelt, "to be successful we must learn to combine intensity of conviction with a broad tolerance of difference of conviction."

He keeps a conscientious rein on even his suspicions about the loyalty of others. In doubtful cases he keeps his mind open, lest he commit the sin of rash judgment. He follows the principle Lincoln propounded when he himself was accused of religious infidelity: "I believe it is an established maxim in morals that he who makes an assertion without knowing whether it is true or false is guilty of falsehood; and the accidental truth of the assertion does not justify or excuse him."

He regards the accusation of disloyalty to country as being the gravest charge, in the temporal order, of which a man can be made the object. Hence he takes it to be a grave matter of conscience to require convincing evidence before he gives assent. His integrity keeps him from accepting secondhand, without scrutiny, judgments made by others who, he has reason to fear, might not be so scrupulous about stigmatizing their fellow citizens as he feels he must be.

8. The true patriot devotes himself to the public good as far as his time and talents allow.

He knows one cannot be a true patriot from the sidelines. When causes need his support, he supports them. He is not content to complain. He acts.

9. The true patriot counts the worth of his contributions to his country in terms of what they cost him in time, money, efforts, and convenience.

He does not complain that he works 2 days a week for Uncle Sam as if that were on the face of it too high a price to pay for membership in a society which carries the heavy burdens ours carries. He calculates his country's demands on him, not according to their size, but according to their necessity. If he has to pay high taxes, he knows it is only because his stake in his country is so high. The little patriot, too, gives willingly of his modest means when he realizes that the safety and peaceful progress of his country and mankind cannot be bought cheap.

10. The true patriot, finally, encourages patriotism in others in every way he can.

He gives credit to everyone who is doing a good job wherever he is; the factory worker, the housewife, the businessman, the teacher, the doctor, the lawyer, the clergyman, the public or private employee. He recognizes the dignity of their functions and how much the well-being of his nation depends on their being well done.

He will not condone wrongdoing by anyone, because it weakens the foundations of our society. What he admires most is character solid achievement, and public-spirited dedication. He opposes evildoers in every line: subversives, chiselers, grafters, calumniators, "confusionists," mere vote-seekers, the money-mad, the pleasure-mad—all who tear down instead of building up the fabric of a strong society. Even work shabbily done he regards as unpatriotic because it lowers the standards of what his people could accomplish.

One may agree or disagree with the touchstones here suggested. But should not every American have worked out for himself some standards by which he decides whether or not the attitudes and modes of conduct he is asked to adopt are really patriotic?

Patriotism, loyalty, and their opposites are occupying everybody's mind today. The least each of us can do is to refine our ideas about this noble virtue. For false notions of patriotism are abroad, based on jingoism, nationalism, selfishness, and (though one hesitates to employ an overused term) a rather unanalyzed fear. We cannot overcome the very real dangers to which we are exposed unless we rethink the ideals for which we stand.

Aristotle defined the state as a phratria, a "brotherhood." He was right: the bond of citizenship, a common patriotism, is love—love of country and love of our fellow citizens. If we keep that love right-ordered, we shall not go far wrong in the way we strive to be patriotic.

More World Press Reports on Ukraine's Plight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 21, 1954

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I returned last week from Europe where, as a member of the select House Committee on Communist Aggression, I enjoyed the privilege of engaging in highly important hearings on Communist aggression against Poland, Ukraine, White Ruthenia, Hungary, and numerous other nations now enslaved behind the Iron Curtain.

In connection with Ukraine, the largest non-Russian nation in eastern Europe, the full meaning and significance of the propagandized celebration of the 300th anniversary of the Treaty of Pereyaslav were clearly disclosed in the well-documented testimonies presented before the committee. They confirmed the accuracy and validity of my own address on this vital subject last January, in which I stressed the Russian Communist exploitation of invincible Ukrainian nationalism. They substantiate the innumerable world reactions to this propaganda play engineered by Moscow. I wish, therefore, to place in the RECORD these additional world reports on this subject, as assembled in the June 1–15 issue of the Ukrainian Bulletin, an informative organ of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America headed by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, professor of Georgetown University:

I. AMERICAN PRESS

CELEBRATION WITH A CATCH—SOVIET TIES UKRAINE CLOSER

(By Paul Wohl, the Christian Science Monitor, Boston, Mass.)

Celebrations of the 300th anniversary of the Pkraine's reunion with Russia have been stressing, on Moscow's order all the benefits the Pkraine has been deriving from that event—a theory that is at variance not only with previous Soviet history books but also with present conditions in the Republic, as disclosed in the Soviet press.

Judging from Soviet sources only, many western observers are forced to report the Ukraine as the most sensitive trouble spot in the U. S. S. R. The trouble is of three sorts:

1. Ukrainian nationalism has not become weaker; there are proportionately only about half as many Communist Party members in the Ukraine as in the whole U. S. S. R.

2. Agriculture in what Moscow proclamations refer to as "one of the biggest granaries of the Soviet Union" has been severely hit.

3. The turnover in the Ukrainian Communist Party and state administration during the past 2½ years was faster than in any other Soviet Republic, with the possible exception of Georgia.

UNIQUE POSITION

The Ukraine, proportionally the richest among the 16 Soviet Republics, occupies a unique position. Culturally, geographically, and economically, it in the Soviet Union's link with southeastern Europe. It also is a window to the world.

Between 1939 and 1945, nearly 45,000 square miles—an area slightly larger than Pennsylvania, with more than 10 million inhabitants—was added to the Soviet Ukraine. Many among these new Ukrainians have relatives in the West, especially in the United States, with whom they corresponded up to the war, and from whom they received substantial remittances.

The Soviets themselves have made known what happened in that newly acquired territory when the Red army arrived. There was prolonged and serious friction aggravated by the fact that the western Ukrainians roughly one-quarter of the total population of the Republic, speak Russian very poorly and do not understand it as easily as their eastenr Ukrainian brothers.

The Kremlin's commissars made no concessions. When in 1944 the half-Ukrainian Nikita S. Khrushchev arrived in Lviv to inform the people that hencefoth they were part of the U. S. S. R., he deliberately spoke Russian. The strength of the popular reaction can be gaged from the fact that during the first 2 years after the war, Moscow occasionally reported that bourgeois nationalists and Fascist bandits had had rallied forth from the woods and marshes to attack Communist strongholds.

RESISTANCE BROKEN

Guerrilla resistance was broken, but there are indications that it never was squashed entirely. Last year, when the Soviets announced that they had caught Ukrainian terrorists allegedy dropped from American planes, it was intimated they were caught in the country.

The full rigor of Moscow's forcible unification policy was disclosed last June when the Ukrainian Central Committee summarily dismissed its first secretary. Leonid G. Melnikov, a Great-Russian from Moscow Province, and accused him of having brutally Russified the western Ukraine. These were the days when former Police Chief Lavrenti P. Beria's policy of boosting the non-Russian elements in the U. S. S. R. was at its peak.

On June 28, Radyanska Ukraina, the leading Ukranian-language newspaper of the Republic, stated that in the western Ukraine, where Russian is so poorly spoken, almost all textbooks were in the Russian and not in the Ukrainian language. The transfer of large numbers of West Ukrainian teachers and other intellectuals to eastern territories outside the Republic was publicly attacked.

Economically, too, the Ukraine fared badly. The Ukrainian Central Committee, last fall, issued an 18-point program, listing a large number of incredible cases of mismanagement and corruption. The kolkhose (collective farm) merger was so unsuccessful in many parts of the Ukraine that Mr. Khruschev released in Kiev some of its sensational disclosures about the setbacks in Soviet livestock breeding and agriculture several weeks before he presented them to the central committee in Moscow.

CORRUPTION CITED

According to the press, mismanagement and corruption are still rampant, and the agricultural situation has not improved.

Nor can the Kremlin be happy about the fact that the Ukraine has only 1 Communist for every 50 inhabitants, whereas the ratio for the whole Soviet Union is 1 to 27. All this may explain why the Ukrainian Supreme Soviet has convened three times since Joseph Stalin's passing. Each time the Government was reshuffled.

At the last session, January 15, Prime Minister Demyan S. Korochenko, a veteran politician, was suddenly made chairman of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet, a mainly decorative position. His predecessor in that post, M. S. Hrechkha, held office only for a few months. The previous chairman of the Presidium, P. G. Tykhina, had been appointed last May. Thus, the supposedly highest position in state, frequently compared to that of President of the Republic, changed occupants 4 times within 9 months.

The new Prime Minister, Nikifor T. Kolchenko, had previously been Minister of Agriculture and First Deputy Prime Minister. His predecessor as Minister of Agriculture, Politburo member and Deputy Prime Minister Vladimir V. Matskyevich, was ousted in May 1953.

Last September, when the Government was reorganized in conformity with the regrouping of the Government in Moscow, three Deputy Prime Ministers and the chairman of the state planning committee went overboard, and have not been heard of since.

The party machine, too, has been run through the wringer. In 1952 it was disclosed that in four major Provinces—Tarnopol, Dniepropetrovsk, Zhitomir, and Lviv—between one-third and one-fifth of all party secretaries were in office less than 1 year. The central party organization is not any more stable. Among other recent changes I. D. Nazarenko, second secretary, a veteran member of the Ukranian Central Committee, had to cede his place to a Russian, N. V. Podgorny, a newcomer in the top party echelons.

The tercentenary celebrations with the endless flood of speeches, ceremonies, and parades may serve to drown the uncertainty which would seem to be the natural consequence of this situation. But the celebrations are not enough, especially in newly acquired western territories where American broadcasts can be heard and where millions of people know about the United States and the Western World.

In order to nullify these influences, the Communists last fall published two violent hate-America books. One of them, Two

Hundred Witnesses, purported to comprise letters from Ukrainians in the United States and from former immigrants who returned to their homelands after the war. Some of the latter, to dispel the suspicion of the authorities, do heap abuse on the United States.

Even for the powerful Soviet propaganda machine, this double-pronged drive—the tercentenary celebrations and the Ukrainian-language hate-America campaign—represents a huge expense of ingenuity, money and work.

II. Brazilian Press

UNHEEDED WARNINGS

Under the above heading O Jornal, Rio de Janeiro daily, published on March 22, 1954, a lengthy and timely article dealing with the futile hopes of the West for a political modus vivendi with the Soviet Union. The article, supplied by the Brazilian Center for a Free Europe, was written by Andrew Mazal, Ukrainian member of the center. Pertinent paragraphs dealing with the subjugated nations, read, in part:

"The fight in the Kremlin for consolidation of power apparently ended with the victory of Malenkov. The statements and declarations of the Russian Government addressed to the Western nations have a strong tone, and are almost always negative, and more than frequently insolent. While Moscow is marshaling its forces against the free world, it promises to lift the living standards in its slave states. * * * All this shows that the final balance between the Communist leaders has not been established. * * * The Bolshevik regime has never been more vulnerable than now. As a result the peoples still free should take the necessary steps to insure their independence and freedom in the face of warnings coming from the enslavement of 800 million people behind the Iron Curtain.

"The free world must understand that to try to appease these forces means risking losing its life, security; it means an alternative between freedom and subjugation by a totalitarian tyranny.

"At the moment we cannot go into enumerating the nations which should be freed. We must realize that either we will help all the peoples who love freedom and are subjugated by Russian imperialism, or we ourselves will fall into the darkest slavery with no parallel in history.

"Ukraine, which was the first victim of Red imperialism, gave warning to the civilized world on the barbarian methods of Cheka, GPU and NKVD. Ukraine's bleeding plea remained unheeded. But what happened long ago in Ukraine was repeated in the Baltic States, Poland, Rumania, Hungary, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, China and Korea.

"There is no evolution which would divert Russian imperialism from its dream of conquering the whole planet for the Bolshevik power."

III. French Press

UKRAINIANS ABOVE ALL PREFER FULL INDEPENDENCE

In the March 6, 1954, issue of La Croix, largest French Catholic daily, there appeared a lengthy and unbiased article on the transference of the Crimea to Ukraine, which article might serve as an example of the correct knowledge of Ukrainian affairs by the French. Pertinent parts of the article read:

"Moscow has decided to celebrate the 300th anniversary of the union of Ukraine with Russia with a special splendor. For this purpose the Presidum of the Supreme Soviet of the Ukrainian S. S. R. has delegated a special committee charged with the organization of the celebration.

"But in reality the three centuries of coexistence had not succeeded in suppressing the desire of the majority of the Ukrainian people for independence. The czars had continuous troubles with Kiev, capital of Ukraine; it is in this vast country that sovietization has met with many obstacles and opposition since 1917.

"Leaders of the Communist Party in Ukraine frequently opposed collectivization of the village and the privileges of the Russians with detriment for the Ukrainians. Every time Stalin replied with cruel purges. But the cunning dictator endeavored to appease the Ukrainian nationalism by accepting the traditional Ukrainian aspirations to be united in one state.

"Thus the territorial Soviet expansion in Europe at the beginning was effectuated for the benefit of Ukraine. Ukraine augmented its territory in 1939 as a result of the German-Soviet treaty concerning eastern Poland. In 1940 Rumania was forced to cede Bukovina and northearn Bessarabia. Finally in June 1945 Ukraine, incorporated Carpatho-Ukraine, which Czechoslovakia ceded to the U. S. S. R.

"But in order to appease Ukrainian nationalism the Kremlin spared no concessions, undoubtedly remembering the failures of the hard policy of the czars. But we must assume that Ukrainian nationalism must be extremely vigorous when the Government of Moscow now donates to Ukraine the Crimea, rounding up the territory of Ukraine, which even without it is larger than that of France.

"The Crimea—the pearl of the Black Sea—was conquered by Catherine II. From 1921 it was an autonomous republic within the framework of the Russian Soviet Socialist Federative Republic. In 1946, however, together with two other Caucasian republics, the Crimea was deprived of autonomous status and reduced to the status of an oblast—as a punishment for antipatriotic behavior of the Tartar population during the war.

"After the transferences of new territories from 1939 to 1946 Ukraine, which in 1938 had 445,000 square kilometers and 31 million people, has now become one of the largest countries of Europe with 576,000 square kilometers of territory and 40 million population. With the Crimea Ukraine acquires 1 more million people and 16,000 square kilometers of territory.

"But can these concessions balance the discontent of the Ukrainians? Hardly. The Ukrainians above all prefer full independence."

IV. Irish Press

The following editorial appeared in the April 22, 1954, issue of Irish Independent, of Dublin, Ireland:

"THE UKRAINE'S STRUGGLE

"Of the countries occupied by Russia, none is larger than Ukraine. With an area almost 7 times that of Ireland, it has a population of 40 millions and is one of the richest countries in the world. Ukraine has an untold wealth of minerals; without its oil wells Russia could never have stood up to Hitler. It also boasts of some of the finest farmlands in Europe.

"Yet the world knows little of Ukraine. An ancient Christian nation, its soldiers fought the pagan hordes from the east centuries before many of the present nations of Europe had been formed. Its history for the past 300 years has been similar to our own before 1922; even since their conquest in 1653 by the Muscovites (now called the Russians) the Ukrainians have been waging a guerrilla war in an attempt to regain their independence. With the collapse of Czarist Russia in 1918 their efforts seemed to have met with success. But Ukraine fell to the Bolsheviks in 1920, since which time an underground struggle has been waged, of which the outside world is not supposed to be aware.

"This year the Russians are using the tercentenary of the treaty by which Ukraine lost its independence to celebrate the devoted and eternal friendship of the Ukrainians with the Russian people. But throughout the world are scattered many exiles from Ukraine; in the United States alone there are close to 1 million. These people will not be deceived by the propaganda of Moscow. They know that as Ukraine was the first country enslaved by Lenin, it has been and still is the most troublesome part of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics."

Air Force Seeks Means To Solve Serious Problems Caused by Cuts and Restrictions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 23, 1954

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, in view of the critical shortage of skilled personnel in our Air Force, it is gratifying to learn that attention is being given to the problem of saving money and improving the Air Force by making career service more attractive.

In this connection, I should like to include in our Record an Air Force information services letter sent out by the Secretary of the Air Force.

The unwise personnel restrictions placed on the Air Force last year over the objection of Gen. Hoyt Vandenberg have caused or aggravated some of the current Air Force personnel problems.

The quotations from General Twining used in this information letter from the Office of the Secretary point out that in the current war of nerves, any sign of relaxation of our courage is welcome news to the Kremlin. It has always been my feeling that our announcement of military cutbacks last year, and particularly the Air Force cuts, gave great comfort to the Kremlin and encouraged them to become more defiant and aggressive. Since the cuts were announced, we have suffered a series of serious cold war defeats.

The information letter from the Office of the Secretary follows:

Washington, June 11, 1954.—Concerted efforts to increase appeal of Air Force careers are being made by Air Force. While some elements of this are known, the broad scope and seriousness of these efforts are not yet widely understood. The program stems from the top itself. Secretary of the Air Force Talbott has dedicated himself to the task of improving conditions of Air Force service and is getting enthusiastic cooperation from General Twining and the Air Staff. The Secretary has publicly stated:

"I am taking it as a personal responsibility to do everything in my power to see that their (Air Force members) contract with the Government is kept. This contract is simply one that our men and their families should be able to live a normal American life. * * * The continued service of these men in the Air Force is important to the security of our country. * * * I propose to do everything I possibly can to make service in the Air Force a popular one and a service that is sought after by the best young men in the country."

Discussing the need for increased service attractiveness at the recent Information Services Conference the Secretary commented: "I am no statistician, but I know industry and know that unless your men are happy and feel that they are progressing with the progress of your company you cannot get the best out of them. * * *"

He pointed up the importance of Information Services to this matter, saying, "No group is more important to morale and spirit in the service than you Information Services people. Our members must know as much about the Air Force in every phase as possible. I am not a public-relations counsel but I recognize the influence this function has on spirit in the Air Force. Esprit de corps is our most important problem * * * and this group does much to control it. I just want to impress this fact on you."

Referring to a recent informal survey of attitudes of Air Force dependents, the Secretary said it was found that 22 percent of complaints received were remediable by the base commander, 24 percent remediable by Department of the Air Force, and 6 percent remediable by Air Force personnel acting informally. Some 33 percent remediable by legislation, or by governmental authority above Air Force. The remaining 15 percent were miscellaneous matters, which by their nature were insolvable. The survey serves to emphasize that roughly half of complaints received can be resolved within the Air Force itself. It highlights the fact that Air Force commanders at every echelon can and must aid in making Air Force careers attractive.

Attractiveness problems which AF itself can solve are receiving much attention by United States Air Force; more is being done to attack personnel welfare problems than at any time in AF history. In recent months, 27 new policies relating to personnel welfare have been initiated by Headquarters, United States Air Force. Many of these are still in process of development but will be increasingly felt in future. New procedures affect assignments, retirements, discharge, and other aspects of service.

In addition to these internal actions, a comprehensive legislative program concerning AF careers has been submitted by AF. Some of these proposals have already been enacted; others are being processed in the executive and legislative branches of Government. These include: Adequate medical and dental care for dependents, allowance for additional PCS expenses, equalization of benefits between Regular and Reserves, improved survivor benefits for personnel, dependent education overseas, additional and more adequate family housing, GI bill type educational benefits for servicemen.

ISO's should emphasize this AF program in internal information activities. Stress should be placed both on actions accomplished as well as those proposed. Also fact that program is spearheaded by AF leadership. Material on this subject is being included in internal news releases sent field, and in other elements of new internal information program.

NEW SOVIET JET BOMBERS POSE LONG-RANGE THREAT TO UNITED STATES

New bombers were unveiled at May Day show in Moscow. Discussing these in recent address, General Twining said: "In the air parade they included nine new medium jet bombers comparable in size and design to our own B-47." The Chief of Staff also announced that Russia had displayed for first time in flight its new heavy jet bomber, comparable in size and appearance to United States Air Force's B-52.

General Twining said that the Soviets would need this new heavy bomber only to reach important targets in United States. "That the Reds intend to impress and to frighten us with their aeronautical progress and with advanced design of this new bomber and their new jet engines is clear," General Twining stated. "That they should expose their previously guarded secrets of aeronautical achievement at this time of international crisis is significant."

"It is significant because the cold war is to a very large extent a war of nerves. If it can bring about any loss of nerve among United States and our allies—if they can cause any relaxation of our courage and firmness, the Kremlin will win another important victory without the risk of military action. The Reds may be hoping to produce a degree of discouragement and despair in the United States of America. They know that their progress in long-range air power is most likely to cause uneasiness in this country.

"We still have a considerable lead over the Reds in long-range air power as well as in weapons that can be delivered by long-range air power. We can maintain this advantage if we are willing to pay the price in material resources and in the human resources of hard work."

AF will cooperate with Kiwanis in Kids' Day this year. Event is scheduled for Saturday, September 25. AF participation will be devoted primarily to base open house for youngsters—in cooperation, of course, with local Kiwanis Clubs. Details of program will be announced soon. (National Kids' Day Foundation is no longer involved in this activity.)

New AF internal information program was presented at major command IS conference in Pentagon on June 2-4. Command ISO's received document outlining new concept. Briefly, objectives of program (see letter, Nov. 12, 1952, from Vice Chief of Staff on reorganization of information, for background. Formal objectives will be published soon) are to achieve understanding of AF mission, increased team spirit and pride of service, understanding of democracy and Communist threat. In essence, the goal is informed AF people with high esprit.

Program rests on axiom that "public relations begins at home," and fact our AF members are first and basic "public" which we must inform. It also recognizes importance of human relations, that receptive attitude is essential to a successful information program. Techniques are based on public relations and leadership principles. Program is keyed to voluntary acceptance of information using appealing material that AF members will want to receive. Media for off-duty use are emphasized.

Program will contain current news about AF, as well as feature material relating to AF objectives. International affairs are included only when they concern AF members. Coordinated use of a variety of media will permit wide internal audience for a given subject. Also, hitting same subject in separate media, with variations in treatment, will make for greater impact. These are basic elements:

Base newspapers because of high readership will be a principal medium, they will be supported by an AF news service containing current AF news and features from Department of Air Force. This service will include TWX and weekly air mailings.

Commander's hour will replace previous information hour. It is designed as commander's leadership tool, concept stresses its use by commander personally to present command matters he desires. IS portion of hour primarily will use film presentations. Hour is mandatory once per month. (This is only mandatory element.) Certain films will be made for commander's hour. These will be supplemented by AFSFP and OAFIE films and will be furnished directly to ISO's.

Posters will be published on one-per-month basis, devoted to brief, direct themes relating to internal objectives. Readable pamphlets on subjects such as Getting Along Overseas are also included.

AF internal magazine designed primarily for airmen is projected. This is key medium for morale and motivation information. Designed as attractively as possible, it is planned for 1-to-10-people distribution.

Program guidance will be based on annual planning. Program bulletins forecasting up-coming materials will be sent ISO's monthly. Program is not restrictive. Field initiative and supplementary command objectives are vital. Armed Forces I & E written materials will be sent field for reading, but lectures not required.

Community relations will get increased attention. Media above will aid effort by informing AF members on their CR role and its value to them.

Implementation of program is proceeding as rapidly as possibly. AF news service is getting underway. Film program will begin soon. New regulations have early target date, should reach field by August. Existing regulations apply in meantime. Magazine is pending final approval, projected for December 1 publication.

Basic concepts of air doctrine are spelled out in a series of unclassified AF manuals now being distributed by Headquarters, USAF. Designed primarily to give all officers broader understanding of employment of air power. Manuals are being distributed on basis of one per each AF officer. Titles: AFM 1-2, "USAF Basic Doctrine"; AFM 1-3, "Theater Air Operations"; AFM 1-4, "Air Defense Operations"; AFM 1-5, "Air Operations in Conjunction With Amphibious Operations"; AFM 1-7, "Theater Air Forces in Counter-Air, Interdiction, and Close Air Support Operations." Manuals make this doctrine widely available for first time and are invaluable tools for ISO's. Additional AFM's in this series are planned.

Annual base newspaper of the year award has been established by SAC; uses these criteria for awards: News content, editing; general appearance; photo content; contribution to SAC internal information program. SAC recognizes base newspapers are key channels of internal information, increasing reader appeal is important element of internal program. Other commands may find newspaper award system useful as means of raising journalistic standards.

Outstanding community relations existing between city of Wichita Falls, Tex., and Sheppard AFB is underscored by informative brochure published by Wichita Falls Chamber of Commerce. Brochure, detailing excellent relations between city and base, received favorable comment of AF leaders.

Fifty AF reserve and ANG wings will train this summer. Training will be in 2-week periods running through June to September and will be held throughout United States, Puerto Rico, Alaska, and Hawaii. ISO cooperation at host bases is urged.

Assignment of athletes, entertainers, and nationally known personalities in the AF is subject of AF Reg. 35-18, May 12, 1954. ISO's should familiarize themselves with provisions of paragraph 3e of this regulation; concerns policy on news releases.

Coordination with this office is essential before making final commitments for story coverage in national publications to prevent duplication and to insure approval on policy and security. Magazine and Book Branch, SAFIS, is in position to offer guidance in such matters.

Air Force Association will hold eighth annual national conference at Omaha, August 19-20.

ears in
esidents
t 3 for-
did not.
nself on
at he is
aska by
deep-
to lack
himself

ower to
the pen
we are
ers, and
le back
he can

was for
nd the
set out
erritory

a con-
horage.
people

an like
orld to
athetic
ho will
e right

cretary
rage in
ll take
ndship
nd pre-

RROW

ent, I
good
grand

e, and
urther
ORD, I
recess

at (9
Senate
dnes-
m.

Appendix

America's Industrial Leaders Express Confidence in Our Future

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 27, 1954

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I was pleased to see in the August 1954 issue of the famous American Legion magazine an excellent article pointing up the resounding confidence of American business leadership in the future of our country.

The Legion magazine put an inquiry regarding United States companies' future plans to 17 prominent industrialists—renowned captains of industry. These 17 men feel the pulse of America; millions of stockholders and bondholders rightly have confidence in them based upon their past achievements.

The industrial leaders' optimistic answers to the inquiries give inspiring proof that, contrary to the fearmongers, the spreaders of gloom, we are headed for vaster investments and still brighter economic horizons.

I believe that this roundup article will be of interest to my colleagues.

I may say too, that, as chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, I know that upon an expanding American free-enterprise system depends an expanding economy for other free nations. Faith here at home will be paralleled by faith abroad; and it is and will not be a blind faith, but rather a faith based upon demonstrable encouraging facts of the present and future.

I send the text of the article to the desk and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MONEY TALKS

A good deal of talk has been making the public rounds in recent months to the effect that our Nation had better batten down the hatches, for a threatening hurricane-sized depression some politicians thought they saw in the offing.

This talk has come mainly from politicians and economists who have no direct dollars-and-cents investment in the accuracy of their theories and predictions.

A businessman, however, does have a hard cash investment riding on his opinion of where the economy is headed. He must plan his production and sales quotas many months, if not years, ahead. Upon his analysis of the future, company budgets are formulated.

Acting on the assumption that money can sometimes talk more effectively than theory, the editors of the American Legion magazine have queried 17 prominent industrialists, representing a broad cross section of our Nation's economy, on their outlook for the current year as reflected in their company's actual dollars-and-cents planning. Their statements follow·

Harlow H. Curtice, president, General Motors Corp.: "General Motors is undertaking a new expansion program calling for capital expenditures of $1 billion. The program, among other things, will provide additional capacity for our automotive divisions to meet the needs of an expanding market. I estimate that 60 percent of this program will be accomplished in 1954 and the remainder by the fall of 1955.

"Our new capital investment program is in addition to expenditures of $2 billion for capital investment during the 8-year period, 1946 through 1953.

"The fact that we are embarking on an unprecedented expansion program at this time is evidence that we have confidence both in the immediate future and in the long-term growth of the market for our products. This program is a measure of our faith in our country."

Benjamin F. Fairless, chairman of the board, United States Steel Corp.: "In the 178 years since this country won its independence, our standard of living—highest in the world—has constantly risen through the process of an expanding economy. United States Steel has implicit faith that our economy will continue to expand. During the past 2 years United States Steel has invested $830 million in its productive facilities and some $300 million more will be spent in 1954. Additional projects which would cost more millions currently are under construction. Like many other businesses, we have put our faith in action.

"These expenditures are essential to meet competition and the ever-increasing demands of a growing population and the mounting per capita use of steel. Although there have been periodic decreases in steel demand, overall consumption of steel has steadily grown over the years. By the time America celebrates the 200th anniversary of its independence 22 years hence, there will be 45 million more people to feed, house, and clothe.

"Even if the per capita use of steel remains the same, this increase in population would require the erection every 17 months, for 2 decades, of facilities equal in size to the Fairless works, United States Steel's newest plant, which took 30 months to build."

Gwilym A. Price, president, Westinghouse Electric Corp.: "Since the end of World War II, the Westinghouse Electric Corp., has completed one major expansion program and is well on its way toward completion of a second.

"The first expansion program was initiated in 1946 and completed in 1948. New plants and additions to existing facilities increased the company's productive capacity by 50 percent, at a cost of approximately $132 million. The second expansion program was started in 1950 and is expected to be completed by mid-1955. It will again increase the company's productive capacity by 50 percent, at a cost of approximately $296 million.

"Major projects now underway are: (1) A new plant at Staunton, Va., for the manufacture of residential and commercial air-conditioning equipment; (2) new central research laboratories near Pittsburgh, Pa.; (3) a new steam and gas-turbine laboratory at South Philadelphia, Pa.; and (4) a new laboratory for the development and pilot production of special alloys, to be built at Blairsville, Pa."

Austin S. Igleheart, chairman of the board, General Foods Corp.: "General Foods, in expectation of a continuing healthy economy and further growth in our business, plans capital expenditures exceeding $1 million a month in the coming year. This is twice the depreciation rate. Since 1945, we have invested more than $100 million in plant expansion and improvements."

Cloud Wampler, president and chairman, Carrier Corp.: "Carrier Corp. has made definite plans to spend at least $10 million for expansion and improvement purposes during 1954 and 1955. Our program calls for the construction of a new plant in the southern part of the United States and additional facilities in Syracuse, N. Y.

"The objective sought is a substantial increase in output, especially with respect to packaged air-conditioning equipment. Since 1945 Carrier Corp. has spent over $28 million on facilities. In fiscal 1945, our sales volume was $29 million. Last year it was in excess of $164 million. The new facilities that are now planned should enable Carrier to do more than $200 million of business annually."

Melvin H. Baker, chairman of the board, National Gypsum Co.: "In thinking of the long-range outlook, there will be a much larger market than we enjoy today. This enlarged market will be created by the demands of over 35 million children born during the past 10 years.

"Our firm plans are to spend about $25 million in the next 3 years in additions to productive capacity and in making our operations more efficient. While these plans will have their effect at each of our 35 plants, major improvements are scheduled at New York City and the construction of an entirely new plant at another location.

"Since World War II we have spent over $50 million on new plants and major improvements to existing ones. In that time our productive capacity has gone up from $25 million to $116 million worth of products. Employment has risen from 2,800 people to nearly 7,000. Similar growth is expected in the near future and must be accomplished if we are to keep on providing a rising standard of living for our people."

Thomas J. Hargrave, chairman of the board, Eastman Kodak Co.: "Eastman Kodak Co., for 1954, has budgeted $52 million to expand company plants and to improve equipment, methods, and processes in its United States manufacturing and other units. This amount is the highest capital budget in the company's history and represents an increase of nearly one-third over the company's actual expenditures for these purposes in 1953.

"Our total expenditures for additions and improvements since 1945 have been about $295 million, an average of about $37 million a year. These expenditures have been made from company funds on a pay-as-we-go basis. Our plants and equipment are now in good shape for efficient production, and the 1954 capital program reflects our optimism for the future."

Augustus C. Long, president, the Texas Co.: "We look forward to a high level of business and industrial activity during 1954, and we expect to carry out one of the largest and most important capital expenditure programs in the history of the company. Our total investment expenditures during the current year will be in excess of $275 million.

"We also feel that the long-term outlook is favorable, and have under consideration a 5-year expenditure program of more than $1 billion for the expansion of our crude reserves, and for new plant and equipment."

L. L. Colbert, president, Chrysler Corp.: "Two recent developments in Chrysler Corp. are characteristic of the positive and aggressive response being made by industry generally to tougher competitive conditions.

"One is the quarter of a billion dollar loan announced earlier this year, which will help Chrysler accelerate the expansion and modernization of its facilities—including further automation—and thus help it achieve even greater efficiency. The other is a decision to speed up the company's program of divisionalization through which it is emphasizing the spirit of competition and the profit motive in each of its operations.

"Since the end of World War II the company has invested more than $450 million for improvements and additions to land, buildings, machinery, and equipment, not including the cost of special tooling involved in model changes. Plant space has been increased by more than 90 percent and total passenger car and truck capacity by more than a third.

"Chrysler's program of investment in our economy also includes such outstanding engineering and research developments as an experimental regenerative gas turbine, the first of its kind capable of driving a conventional passenger car, and the opening of the 4,000 acre Chrysler engineering proving grounds—largest in the world.

"These are some of the ways in which Chrysler is betting on a rewarding future."

H. E. Humphreys, Jr., president, United States Rubber Co.: "Consumption of rubber per capita continues to rise. We look for a 30-percent increase over the next 10 years. To keep pace requires substantial capital investment each year. In 1953 we put about $26 million into expansion and modernization. While sales volume has been off for a few months, our capital expenditures in 1954 will be no less than in 1953. In 1955 we expect to spend more."

Don G. Mitchell, chairman of the board, Sylvania Electric Products, Inc.: "In preparation for the enormous potentials in the electronics—electrical industry, Sylvania has more that tripled its total investment in plant and equipment in the past 5 years, nearly 70 percent of our present facilities having been added since 1948.

"During 1954 a number of multimillion dollar projects will be completed. These will include a new television receiver at Batavia, N. Y., the company's largest facility under one roof and one of the largest TV set plants in industry; a new photoflash bulb manufacturing plant at Winchester, Ky., which will greatly augment the company's existing facilities; a television picture tube plant at Fullerton, Calif., to meet the greatly expanded needs of the west coast market.

"Even with our unprecedented expansion in recent years, it would not be at all surprising if our investment in plant and equipment doubled within the next few years, to meet the steadily expanding demands throughout the fields of television, lighting, electronics, radio, atomic energy, and related fields."

L. A. Van Bomel, chairman of the board, National Dairy Products Corp.: "During 1954 we estimate we will spend about $36 million for new and improved plants and replacements. This is the largest sum we have ever set aside in a single year for capital expenditures.

"Construction will be completed on four new plants started in 1953: a manufacturing plant for our Kraft Foods Co. at Springfield, Mo.; an animal feeds plant, also at Springfield, for Consolidated Products Co.; another animal feeds plant at Lancaster, Pa.; and a Sealtest milk plant at Detroit. Two new plants—one for Kraft near Atlanta, Ga., and one for Southern Dairies, Inc., a Sealtest division, at Charlotte, N. C.—were put into full operation last year."

Philip Sporn, president, American Gas & Electric Co.: "The American Gas & Electric Co., whose seven operating subsidiaries provide electric service in a 46,000-square-mile territory covering parts of seven East Central States, anticipates continued growth and utilization of electric service within the next 10 years so as to require a possible doubling of both its property and sales of electric energy within that period.

"Reflecting its confidence in the continued growth and development of its area, AGE will invest $94.6 million for further expansion in 1954. This figure will bring to $694 million the total investment in new facilities achieved by AGE during the period 1947–54—an average of $87 million a year. In electric generating capacity alone, this program has provided an additional 2,160,000 kilowatts and more than doubled the system's total capacity."

Cleo F. Craig, president, the American Telephone & Telegraph Co.: "Bell telephone system companies have spent more than $9 billion for service expansion, replacement, and improvement in the last 8 years. The total last year was $1.4 billion; this year their plans are at substantially the same level.

"Since 1946 the companies have added 19 million telephones, increased facilities for local dial calls, introduced dialing of long-distance calls, provided facilities for local and national television networks, and made available many specialized communications systems for industry, defense, and other governmental agencies.

"Work in progress covers more facilities of a similar nature plus the installation of the first transatlantic telephone cable."

John L. Collyer, chairman and president, the B. F. Goodrich Co.: "As a measure of our confidence in the ability of our economy to move forward, we are investing more than $30 million for new and better facilities in 1954.

"This will be about 35 percent more than the $23 million we invested last year and substantially above the amount B. F. Goodrich has ever spent in capital improvement in a single year.

"A sizable portion of this investment will be employed to increase the production and distribution of tubeless passenger-car tires, introduced by B. F. Goodrich in 1947.

"By increasing our capital investment we shall be fulfilling more than our share of the responsibility of private industry to maintain good business levels this year."

Gilbert W. Chapman, president, the Yale & Towne Manufacturing Co.: "Long-range planning of the Yale & Towne Manufacturing Co. is based upon strong confidence in the continued economic growth of the country. We are now engaged in a large scale capital improvement program in both the materials handling equipment and the lock and hardware sides of our business.

"Two new lock and hardware factories have been erected and are now in full production, bringing to 5 the number of our American plants now devoted to the production of Yale locks and hardware. We believe that sales of Yale hardware products in 1954 will reach the highest level in the 85 years of our existence."

Hobart C. Ramsey, president, the Worthington Corp.: "We are now bringing into initial production a new plant in Decatur, Ala., which will be devoted to the manufacture of self-contained air conditioning units. This plant has entailed an investment of approximately $3.5 million and is so constructed that it can be readily doubled in size to take care of the increased growth we are sure is ahead.

"Our expenditures for plant expansion and capital equipment in the year 1953 were approximately $5.5 million. We have plans for spending at least $4 million additional in the current year.

"Additions and improvements to fixed assets during the past 10 years totaled $27.5 million."

Communications Received by Hon. Wayne Morse, of Oregon, on the Atomic Energy Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 26, 1954

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have published in the Appendix of the RECORD sundry communications that I have received on the pending bill, none of which violate rule XIX.

There being no objection, the communications were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW YORK, N. Y., *July 24, 1954.*

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I want to express to you my profound admiration for your leadership in the campaign to prevent the giveaway of atomic energy to the Power Trust. Atomic energy was developed to its present level at the cost of $14 billion paid for by the taxes of all the people of the United States. It would be nothing short of a crime to let the big dealers turn over this patrimony of the people to the Power Trust for a song in the form of so-called royalties.

You are exactly right in calling the battle you and your associates are waging an educational campaign. The tragedy of the situation is that the people are mostly ignorant of the issues involved and do not realize how they are to be swindled out of this immense treasure for which they have paid with their tax dollars over a period of 12 years.

I wish with all my heart that you and the other champions of the people in the Senate will succeed and obtain consent to a law in which the people's interest will be adequately safeguarded. One feature of such a law should be that none of the patents, know-how, etc., should ever become the outright property of anyone except the Government. In other words, the Government must always retain the basic right of recapture after a certain period. There must be no compulsory licensing period, such as the 5 years proposed, after which licensing to new applicants would be foreclosed forever. If the licensing system is chosen, it must be open indefinitely to all qualified comers regardless of their size, including universities and foundations. The Eisenhower order to the AEC to negotiate with two handpicked utilities for the construction of a huge steam plant should be rescinded. It looks highly irregular to me.

With my best wishes for your and your associates' success in the people's cause,

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE WEISER.

Sacramento, Calif., *July 24, 1954.*
Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Sir: Congratulations on your stand on the Atomic Act now in the Senate. I think you are doing a wonderful job. How fortunate this Nation is to have a man in the Senate like you.

May the red roses never fade; keep the good work up.

With all good wishes.

Sincerely,

Louise A. Feuillard.

Detroit, Mich., *July 23, 1954.*
Hon. Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: For 2 months now I have been attempting to alert to the danger of the Cole-Hickenlooper amendment (butcher might be more appropriate) of the Atomic Energy Act. I have been pooh-poohed, told not to worry about it, accused indirectly of fanaticism, had my questions returned unanswered with the explanation that they were rooted in ignorance and as such unanswerable. It is therefore with a great deal of satisfaction that I note that at least one man share my ignorance, fanaticism, and fear. If this monstrous presumption can be legislated, what limit is there to the greedy cupidity of the better people? * * * I sure don't approve of an investigation of foundations such as that recently conducted, but the Phoenix project is a foundation whose activities certainly look suspicious to me, but my overtures might as well have been made to a blank wall. If the Cole-Hickenlooper bill was a dead issue and I was the only one who was interested in the issue, the callous disregard of my cautionary strictures might be understandable, but * * * then attempts to railroad through this bill with only limited debate, threatens cloture and darkly intimates the use of parliamentary maneuver as a sole means of restoring normal democratic processes, I wonder what has happened. Thank you for this educational effort. They got the tidelands but that was during the honeymoon and the honeymoon is over now. Best wishes for the success of your educational campaign. If there is anything that I can do to nelp, let me know.

Sincerely yours,

Donald M. Smith.

Waynesboro, Tenn., *July 22, 1954.*
Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Wayne: Please accept my sincere thanks for your courageous battle for the rights of the people to maintain the atomic resources they have paid for.

Very cordially,

D. H. Markham.

Kansas City, Mo., *July 24, 1954.*
Hon. Wayne Morse,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Morse: I read with much satisfaction of your stand against the atomic giveaway proposal. We are grateful for the long hours you are fighting on the Senate floor. So here is my thanks to one of our finest statesmen, and we seem to have such a dearth of statesmen these days.

Your speech on wiretapping was much appreciated. It was refreshing to see such fine and careful documentation. We grow so weary of proof by flag waving and "Eisenhower said so." Your kind of work gives us a sort of courage and a feeling of renewed faith.

Sincerely,

Elva M. Bramhall.

(Mount Pleasant, Iowa, permanent address.)

Denver, Colo., *July 23, 1954.*
Hon. Wayne Morse,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: My thanks to you and your vigilant colleagues for your firm stand against the atomic giveaway bill.

Sincerely yours,

Dr. Bernard Schor.

Bronx, N. Y., *July 25, 1954.*
Hon. Wayne Morse,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Honorable Senator: Keep up the good fight. The American people are behind you 100 percent.

We are all for you east, west, north, and South. God bless you. We should have more like you in the United States Senate. You remind me of the late Senator George W. Norris of Nebraska. Too many represent the private interests. You possese great moral courage. God help you. I am a wounded and gassed veteran of World War I.

Truly yours,

Reinhard Murmann.

Syracuse, N. Y., *July 23, 1594.*

Dear Senator: May I express my appreciation for the wonderful fight you are putting up to protect the country from giveaway and steals. Hold tight to your fight to retain the atomic energy plants and do all you can to hold onto and develop TVA.

The only hope of the country lies in your hands and those of the honorable men like you of which there are too few in the Senate.

Please do not answer this as it was not written with that in mind and I want to lighten your load.

Tell Senator Williams, of New Jersey, I feel the same way about him.

T. J. Werner.

Westwood, Mass., *July 23, 1954.*
Hon. Wayne Morse,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: Again, as in the tidelands debate, you are associated with those Senators who are fighting to prevent the resources of this Nation from being taken over by the private monopoly interests. You are to be commended for the fine work you are doing.

Certainly, any methods under the Senate rules should be used to prevent this vicious legislation as proposed by the administration from passing. Naturally, as was to be expected, the cry of "filibuster" is heard, and we are told that this obstinate group is preventing the adoption of the administration's program. One might properly ask, "What program?" I certainly agree with the sentiments expressed by Senator Neely when he said "That if the rest of the program of this administration is similar to that which has already been enacted, it would be no disservice to the people to filibuster to death that which remains, including the pending bill."

However, if the remaining program is so essential, why cannot the atomic energy bill temporarily be set aside and matters of a less controversial nature be considered? Why is it mandatory that such a controversial piece of legislation be forced down Senator's throats, and the cry of "filibuster" uttered when Members undertake to show the country its vicious aspects?

You, Senator, and the other Members of the liberal wing are to be commended for your refusal to surrender to such tactics, and for your courage in carrying on this fight to save the natural resources of this country for the people.

Sincerely yours,

John W. Anderson.

Detroit, Mich., *July 24, 1954.*

Dear Senator Morse: Just a word to tell you I hope you and your colleagues will be able to prevent our Government from giving such firms as General Motors, et al., control of atomic energy. * * * Maybe I don't understand this matter as is, but sems like it would be almost like handing our values to 2 or 3 companies to the detriment of honest smaller companies.

Keep it up.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth Painter.

Thatcher, Ariz., *July 23, 1954.*
Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Sir: Please excuse this hastily written note, but I want to wish you success in your fight against the "giveaway boys."

Being on vacation I have a hard time keeping track of the men voting against TVA development in the Midwest. Would you be so kind as to supply me the names?

Respectfully yours,

Ace Griffiths.

Hewlett Harbor, N. Y., *July 22, 1954.*
Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: We want to congratulate you on the wonderful public-spirited stand you've taken on the power giveaway issue.

Keep up the good work—an independent mind working in the public interest is the highest type of representation our democracy can hope to achieve.

Sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. I. R. Bogen.

Forest Hills, N. Y., *July 25, 1954.*
Senator Morse,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.

Dear Sir: Bravo, Mr. Morse, to you and your colleagues. What the American people need in the Congress are more statesmen like yourself.

We owe you a debt for fighting for us on this atomic bill. This bill is the most incredible piece of giveaway legislation ever devised. I'm sure we will win out.

Respectfully yours,

Henry Schlesinger.

Rock Island, Ill., *July 24, 1954.*
Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator: I want you to know how we appreciate the way you are voting these days. We need more men like you in Congress.

God bless you and give you strength to keep up the good work.

Very sincerely yours,

Edith Garbar.

Staten Island, N. Y., *July 23, 1954.*
Hon. W. Morse.

Dear Senator: Congratulations to you and your colleagues in your effort to stop the giveaway.

God bless you all and give you good health.

With best of luck.

J. Suffness.

Yale University,
Child Study Center,
New Haven, Conn., July 23, 1954.
Senator Wayne L. Morse,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: Congratulations on your courage and stamina in protecting us against the exploitation by private public utilities.

Cordially yours,

Milton J. E. Senn, M. D.,
Director.

West Glacier, Mont.,
July 24, 1954.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Sir: As a Californian (though resident and voting in New York) I am proud of Wayne Morse, a Pacific coast Senator, who is making such a strenuous fight for the interests of the American people.

Keep up the good fight on the atomic energy issue.

Sincerely,

Maud Russell.

(As from 103 West 93d Street, New York, N. Y.)

Belton Mont., *July 24, 1954.*

Hon. Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: This is just a short note urging you to keep up the good fight. I know you are a very busy man; that's why my note will be brief.

Thanks and best wishes,

Sincerely,

U. S. Albertson.

San Diego Calif., *July 24, 1954.*

The Honorable Senator Morse:

I wish to congratulate you for your stand in keeping control of the TVA. Also with you Senator Gore, Senator Kilgore, Senator Jackson. Not only myself, Senator, but hundreds of other Democrats here in San Diego; not one Republican for it. * * *

I hope you keep your strength and health to fight it out and you Senators stay with it till hell freezes over and never give up. * * *

I only wish I could help, though I shall help to vote the whole Republicans out of there. I hope you stay with them, never allow it to come to a vote.

Yours respectfully,

Charles E. Page.

Lees Summit, Mo., *July 23, 1954.*

Dear Senator Morse: Please excuse the pencil. My pen isn't working and I wanted to write you encouragement now while it might possibly mean more to you.

Not that I feel you need any more courage. I think what they have done to the TVA is shameful and I agree with you and your Democratic colleagues 100 percent in your present stand on atomic legislation. I will go one step further and say that I don't want to see us give any atomic aid, peaceful or otherwise, to Russia. * * *

I have followed you by way of the paper for some time now and as one independent American to another, Senator Morse, you are a man after my own heart. * * *

Keep up the good work. What we so badly need are more men who aren't afraid to speak up for what they believe in.

Sincerely,

Ruth Bordon.

Detroit, Mich., *July 24, 1954.*

Senator Wayne L. Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: I have been following with considerable interest the current debate in the Senate concerning the atomic-energy bill and would like to indicate to you the views of my wife and me in this most important matter.

The development of atomic energy was the exclusive result of a Government initiated research and production program and was accomplished through the expenditure of some billions of the people's money. Private industry's role in this program was strictly secondary, individual corporations serving as contractors for specific operations. And now the administration proposes to give the exclusive rights of peacetime application of this revolutionary scientific discovery to private industry.

We both are unalterably opposed to any legislation which will permit private industry to produce atomic energy for resale to business consumers or individual homeowners. The issue before Congress appears to be one of public versus private power. This is a significant question if, as it appears likely, atomic energy ultimately will become a source of power cheaper than steam generated or hydroelectric power and thus render our present power generating facilities obsolete. It is difficult to reconcile this legislation with the public interest. Why should the mass of the taxpaying public pay not only for the discovery and development of atomic energy but also give a profit to private industry for its actual production? A more satisfactory solution would be for the Federal Government itself to produce atomic energy at cost and distribute it in such a way as to benefit all consumers.

I congratulate you on your indefatigable energy. It is my sincere hope that you will continue to fight.

Sincerely yours,

John S. Harris.

Berlin Heights, N. J., *July 22, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Of Oregon.

Dear Sir: I am deeply grateful to you for your effort to kill the proposed Atomic Act. Pray you have the strength to carry on. Not one iota of our atomic material should be given to private industry. The utility, oil, and AMA interests in our country are entirely selfish. The bill some oilmen are trying to push through Congress to set up a tax-free foundation for boys by buying five racetracks not with their own money, but by borrowing it from banks, and so forth, is the most insolent act I have heard of in a long time.

Do hope the people of Oregon have the good sense to return you to Congress.

Thank you,

Esther W. Lloyd.

Oakland, Calif., *July 23, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Sir: Please keep on fighting to prevent atomic energy and TVA giveaway.

It is high time someone or few or many in Congress takes the welfare of our people into consideration.

I have noted over the months you have done just that. Thank you.

B. M. Codington.

Saginaw, Mich., *July 23, 1954.*

Dear Senator Morse: Thank you for the wonderful job of filibustering on the atomic bill that you and a few other Senators are doing. A small amount of the other side of the argument is beginning to seep through here in the press and some of the people seem to be awakening to the fact that there is more to the bill than was at first publicized.

It is another case of so many of us owing so much to so few of you. But believe me there are some of us who appreciate the terrific physical and mental strain you and those like you are undergoing for us and our country.

Sincerely,

Alice DeGanton Schranek.
Mrs. James E. Schrant.

Easton, Pa., *July 22, 1954.*

Dear Senator Morse: I wish to state I am not, not, not in favor of this new atomic giveaway. Part of those trillion dollars are mine. Let the private business interests keep their nose out of the little people's business. My share represented many hours of hard work behind a typewriter to pay my income tax and I am not going to stand for it.

Keep up the good work.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. Ethel Walters.

Takoma Park, Md., *July 25, 1954.*

Dear Senator Morse: We should like to express our appreciation of your courage and fine work in the United States Senate.

Sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. B. A. Fleishman.

Morris, Ill., *July 23, 1954.*

Dear Senator Morse: I heard you on Frank Edward's program last night, which I seldom miss. No matter what I happen to be doing, I tune in F. E.

Your speech is heroic, you and your little band of stalwarts should be honored in history and in story. Your alertness and courage in the face of might (money) and power (money) makes you soldiers of the right.

I sound flowery but I am very sincere. I only wish there could be a recognition of some kind for patriots like you. God bless you.

Josephine Chally.

Piper, Kans., *July 23, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: I am glad I have the support of many of my neighbors in expression of many thanks to you and those men in Congress who are willing to risk political disfavor by openly and courageously opposing Mr. Eisenhower and his billion-dollar Cabinet, and old-guard Republicans and their counterpart Democrats.

Mr. Eisenhower had been completely sold on the advice of the money kings, whom we have fought many years. Eisenhower is our first President to take the lead in turning everything the people own and have succeeded in building up for the good of all our people, to the money manipulators. The "big shots" are gaining control of this Government under Eisenhower in a much larger degree than under any other administration we ever had. They are in absolute control of our President and are only just getting started. If Eisenhower gets a majority in the coming election of a Congress, we will rue the day we ever took General Eisenhower off the job he had in Europe.

May God give you strength and wisdom to expose * * * so the people can stop them before its too late.

J. W. Morgan.

Anaconda, Mont., *July 24, 1954.*

Hon. Wayne Morse,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator: Thank God we have men in the Senate who have guts enough to stand up and protect the people's property against the GOP idea of giving away something that belongs to all the people. Anyone in their right minds that will go and vote the GOP ticket next November should go and have their heads examined. Keep up the good work, Senator.

Very truly yours,

Bill Allen.

San Jose, Calif., *July 23, 1954.*

Hon. Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: This is one battle that must not be lost. Those of you who are alerting the American public to the dangerous features of the AEC revision act are to be commended.

Private industry should have the opportunity to develop atomic energy. But the public investment of $12 billion should be protected by means of the yardstick principle of Federal development of electric power from atomic energy.

Sincerely yours,

Frederick Eissler.

Chicago, Ill., *July 24, 1954.*

Hon. Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: Your actions to delay passage of the Cole-Hickenlooper bill to amend the Atomic Energy Act are truly in the public interest and deserving of high commendation.

The Cole-Hickenlooper bill will sacrifice enormous public benefits for the sake of a relatively small immediate reduction in the investment of public funds.

I hope you will be successful in postponing revision of the Atomic Energy Act until more adequate legislation is formulated. The American people have invested large sums of their money in atomic energy and deserve a return on their investment in the form of availability of power and electricity at low cost. It is not the American people but rather the big power companies that object to TVA.

Respectfully yours,

Nina Byers.

San Francisco, Calif., *July 26, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D. C.:

We Americans appreciate the work you are doing. The present bill, if it is passed, will be the biggest robbery in American history.

Earl Popovich.

East Chatham, N. Y., *July 21, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse.

Dear Sir: Hope you will continue to fight against the President's plan for the AEC private power control. This is an important matter for the people of the United States.

Sincerely yours,

Jerome H. Schloss.

Chattanooga, Tenn., *July 18, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator: We as two Democratic voters of Tennessee want to take this occasion to thank you for the wonderful support you, along with Senators Lehman and Murray, are giving our 2 Senators—Gore and Kefauver—on the atomic giveaway program.

Your stanch support of such vital matters concerning the entire population of this great Nation is proving very popular in the deep South.

We are wholeheartedly against private utilities monopolizing our TVA. Any support we can give you, please advise.

Sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. H. H. Henderson.

New York, N. Y., *July 17, 1954.*

Dear Senator Morse: My admiration and respect for the fight that you are putting up now is only a flower on the sturdy plant of my steady respect and admiration for your whole career over all the years.

I wish that America had some way of voting for a Senator at Large so that some of us who feel as I do could vote for you.

You have been a watchdog for the interests of all the American people all of the time.

Faithfully yours,

Gertrude Nafe.

I salute your beautiful speech on giveaway of people's atomic and hydrogen power. Don't let that GOP do it, as already have given away too much precious oil. Rescue those precious cattle ranchers; do not let them lose any more money on their beef, and this, above all, those precious coal miners. Eric S. must have gone fishing but CC an excellent replacement; John L. Lewis had a beautiful idea—dig that coal and ship it down under, where they are having winter, or people will still be cold next winter. Can be stored anywhere, think Lehigh Valley, maybe should all become those precious Beavers—Walt Disney, and please do not let those dear bootlegger coal diggers get hurt. I hope for safety. Surely do like Senator Kennedy. This Book of Knowledge just don't know.

Roslyn, N. Y.

Keep up the good fight for all the people. The whole country is silently applauding your valiant struggle to prevent the atomic power developed by taxpayers' money being presented on a golden salver to the private interests.

Frances Story.

Santa Barbara, Calif., *July 17, 1954.*

Dear Senator Morse: I think all the people owe you deep thanks for your vigorous stand for Government control of nuclear energy. What greater danger could there be to have this great power in the hands of those who for profit often economize on safety devices, not to mention the "sell-out" of the people's property. Please keep up the fight. We need more Senators like you.

M. G. Wesselhoeft.

Denver, Colo., *July 17, 1954.*

Sir: Thanks for your efforts on TVA, and atomic energy. The GOP campaign pledges are being paid by the taxpayers. (Account the give-away.) I support public power, in any form by local government or national basis.

Very truly yours,

Curtis Hoots.

Berkeley, Calif., *July 19, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations. Keep up your good fight on the Cole-Hickenlooper amendment. Twenty-five voters meeting tonight voted to thank you for your battle in the interests of the people. Keep it up.

C. K. Warne.

Portland, Oreg., *July 17, 1954.*

Hon. Wayne Morse,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: I am writing to express to you my sincere appreciation of the courageous fight you are making for the people of the great Northwest in the fight to try to halt the giveaway program of the present administration of the Columbia River facilities (which, in my opinion, is the crime of the age). Please keep up the fight.

I was in Eugene last Saturday to hear Stevenson, and he made a wonderful talk, and had a large crowd. * * *

I have also noted your fight to try to stop them from doing the same thing with our investment in atomic plants.

I would like to offer my service in any way I can serve to help out in the election of different people to put a stop to this giveaway program.

The great difficulty in this State is that the voters don't vote and that the money interests and newspapers keep right on their toes to try to get their way. * * *

Keep up the fight. You are 100 percent right.

Sincerely,

B. H. Samuel.

Oakland, Calif.

The Giveaway Train

The giveaway train is running again.
  Where only the rich may ride,
And the gift of the hour is water and power,
  With an atom thrown in on the side.

The people who paid the taxes
To build the ditches and dams
Are a socialized set
Who mustn't be let to lead the country
    astray.

This set-up in Washington hastens the day
When they'll give them the works to run as
    they may.

The cure for this orgy of giving away,
Will come in November, God hasten the day.

C. R. Dowler.

Eagle Pass, Tex.

Dear Wayne: As they say here in Texas, "Mighty fine work."

Will write you next week regarding some things down here.

Regards,

Chuck Wright.

Eugene, Oreg., *July 26, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We heard Youth Wants To Know. Keep up the good work.

Mr. and Mrs. Claude Swango.

Bloomington, Ill., *July 24, 1954.*

Dear Senator Morse: We appreciate your discussion tonight, Youth Wants To Know. Keep up the good fight. More power to you.

Cordially,

Frank E. Fuller.

P. S.—I first voted in Oregon.

San Diego, Calif., *July 22, 1954.*

Dear Senator Morse: Many of us are glorying in your fight with Senators Hill and Gore to stay the power steal of TVA. Keep up the good fight, and know you are not alone.

Sincerely yours,

Louise McLean.

Portland, Oreg., *July 24, 1954.*

Senator Wayne L. Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Your Youth Wants To Know show timely, significant, impressive. You and associates' actions Senate floor more so. Keep up good work.

The Young Democratic Clubs of Oregon.

Toms River, N. J., *July 24, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
United States Senate:

Do not let them sell American people short. Keep up filibuster.

J. Peynsohn.

Toledo, Ohio, *July 24, 1954.*

Hon. Wayne L. Morse,
Senate Office Building:

Deepest regards. Appreciation for your leadership in this necessary struggle.

Mathilda Muyskens.

Bayside, N. Y., *July 24, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse:

Our grateful thanks for attempting to stop another giveaway.

The Sroge Family.

Medina, Ohio, *July 24, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse:

Congratulations for your stand against the power grabbers.

W. W. Johnson.

New Rochelle, N. Y., *July 24, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building:

Congratulations. We support your fight for conservation of all natural resources in hands of people.

Mr. and Mrs. Gels.

Indianapolis, Ind., *July 24, 1954.*

Wayne Morse,

United States Senate:

Accept sincere thanks for your tireless efforts on behalf of the propertyless. Good luck.

Mary Donovan Hapgood.

Evanston, Ill., *July 24, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,

United States Senate:

Please continue fight for public utilities.

J. Bramlette.

Columbia, Miss., *July 24, 1954.*

Hon. Wayne Morse,

Senate Office Building:

We are all praying that God will sustain you in your fight to protect the American people from the private power monopoly. Please don't capitulate to the enemy.

Kelly Hammond.

Philadelphia, Pa., *July 24, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,

Senate Cloakroom:

Please keep fighting as long as it is humanly possible. Not a word or a minute is wasted. Please tell Senators Sparkman and Kerr that many millions of Americans are behind them and you in trying to stop this monstrous legislation.

Charles Fisher.

Kittery, Maine, *July 24, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,

Senate Office Building:

Good work. Good luck to you and your colleagues.

John N. M. Howells.

Holland, Mich., *July 24, 1954.*

Hon. Wayne Morse:

Thank you and God bless you for your magnificent leadership.

Milton and Catherine Johnston.

Bogalusa, La., *July 24, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse:

Congratulations in your fight for public control of atomic energy. We are with you 100 percent and urge you to continue against the giveaway program.

Recovery Local 189, International
Brotherhood of Papermakers,
C. O. Price, *President.*

Chicago, Ill., *July 24, 1954.*

Senator Morse:

Your speeches and those of your colleagues will prove to be funeral oration for the part of greedy malefactors of wealth. More power to you.

I. S. Pomerance, D. D. S.

Charleston, W. Va., *July 25, 1954.*

Senator Wayne L. Morse,

Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations on fighting against leaping Bourbonism. Nothing is more important.

Alliston Cragg.

Sayville, N. Y., *July 23, 1954.*

Hon. Wayne Morse,

Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.:

Dear Senator Morse: Your 6-hour educational campaign discussion immeasurably heartening to all freedom-loving men. Your fighting stand foremost in alerting America of proposed multibillion-dollar giveaway of America's atomic-energy resources. As one American will always cherish the memory of New York Times page 1 photograph of Senator Wayne Morse reeling but unbowed following his historic 22 hour 26 minute filibuster for America on the tideland oil giveaway. It gladdened my heart to note today's front-page Times picture of America's most courageous Senator catnapping in Senate cloakroom. America and the free world need Senator Wayne Morse strong and alert. Please reserve your strength and energy because America must have the voice and guidance of her Independent Party in the crucial battles to come. With unbounded respect, admiration, and thanks for your fighting heart and eminently decent convictions. Most sincerely yours.

Sam Polur.

Philadelphia, Pa., *July 25, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,

Senate Building:

Thanks for trying to stop robber barons. Please keep up good work.

Samuel Hulnickn.

Rockford, Ill., *July 26, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse:

Continue filibuster. Definitely believe your reasoning is correct. Good luck.

Joseph Ellman.

St. Louis, Mo., *July 26, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse:

Senate Office Building:

Thanks for the fight you are making for the rights of the little people of this country. Keep it up. We need more like you. Two Missourians.

H. C. Turner.
D. C. Carroll.

Springfield, Oreg., *July 24, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,

Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.:

Keep up the good work in your fight against giving atomic energy to private-power monopoly.

T. J. Bourgeois,
President, Springfield Local 591, International Brotherhood of Papermakers.

Salem, Oreg., *July 24, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,

Washington, D. C.:

We are urging you to support public control of atomic energy, TVA, and preference clauses for public agencies and cooperatives.

H. R. Vicary,
President, Capital Local 230, Papermakers.

Oaklyn, N. J., *July 24, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,

Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations on your gallant fight to save the people's property from the plunderbund.

Dr. Miriam Vangelder,
James Price,
Elwood Wheatley.

Farmington, Mass., *July 25, 1954.*

Hon. Wayne Morse,

Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.:

Your courageous battle against * * * in a dismal overall situation is a sunrise of hope to see a few dauntless men give battle to * * * business-dominated leadership that knows no God but profits.

For the sake of our future generations, keep up the fight. If you must, go down with all guns firing, but never strike your flag.

If justice is not to be made a mockery, wage your David-like battle against the bestial goliath * * *. Keep the dreams and traditions of Norris and Roosevelt alive that they may prevail over the menacing forces of darkness.

For posterity your name will be inscribed in letters of gold on the scroll of history. May that caption also be able to proclaim "He brake the jaws of the wicked, and plucked the spoil from their teeth."

Alf Landgren.

New York, N. Y., *July 24, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,

Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.:

We support your stand against private monopoly of atomic power.

Mr. and Mrs. K. A. Monroe.

Orange City, Iowa, *July 24, 1954.*

Hon. Wayne Lyman Morse,

Washington, D. C.:

Keep up the good fight. We pray that the Lord will give you the necessary strength for this endurance battle. We are so happy, dear Mr. Morse, that we have men like you in the Senate. The people who understand what it is all about are with you.

Mr. and Mrs.Will Kalsbeek.
Mr. and Mrs. Gerard Kalsbeek.

Orange City, Iowa, *July 24, 1954.*

Hon Wayne Lyman Morse.

Dear Mr. Morse: We trust your leadership in the Senate keeps up your endurance fight. The people are watchinng you and are proud of you. Only the forces of reaction who want to sell us down the river again hate you. Consider that a compliment.

Engelties.

Wakefield, Mass., *July 24, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,

Washington, D. C.:

I admire you. Your sentiments are mine.

Harry M. Berry.

Walled Lake, Mich., *July 24, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,

Washington, D. C.:

Keep up the good work. More power to you.

William Massberg.

Falls Church, Va., *July 24, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,

The Capitol, Washington, D. C.:

Delighted to see so many Senators standing on principles. Please keep it up. Our best wishes for success.

Mr. and Mrs. John Lindeman.

San Francisco, Calif., *July 24, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,

Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.:

Wish to commend you for wonderful fight against administration's atomic giveaway plan. Keep up good work.

Walter and Marny Stitch.

Brooklyn, N. Y., *July 24, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,

Senate Building, Washington, D. C.:

Keep up the good work.

Mrs. F. Schiller.

York, Pa., *July 24, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,

United States Senate,

Washington, D. C.:

Keep fighting; 50 million voters believe as you do.

Lloyd E. Stough.

Milwaukee, Wis., *July 24, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,

Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.:

Your couragous fight to protect the public interest and rights in the field of atomic energy is sincerely appreciated. Keep up the fight.

Stanley Bundy,
President, Public Eenterprise Committee of Milwaukee County.

Mobile, Ala., *July 24, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,

Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.:

For myself and thousands of pulp, sulphite, and paper mill workers whom I represent be assured that we support public control of atomic energy. Please continue to defend TVA and support preference clause for public agencies and cooperatives. If amendments fail vote against bill.

Sincerely,

Homer L. Humble,
Vice President, International Brotherhood of Pulp, Sulphite, and Paper Mill Workers, AFL.

Chicago, Ill., *July 24, 1954.*
Hon. Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

The people are with you. Keep up the fight against the atomic energy and tax-revision bills.

G. H. Miller.

Joseph, Oreg., *July 26, 1954.*
Hon. Wayne Morse,
Senate Chambers:

Please accept our sincere thanks for your efforts to oppose atomic sell-out. Also extend appreciation to your faithful colleagues.

Wallowa County Democratic
Central Committee.

Vancouver, Wash., *July 26, 1954.*
Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building:

Atomic-energy bill appears to involve not only cloture in the Senate but throughout Nation. Public cannot express indignation because bill so new and complex. Urge postponement to permit public scrutiny. Appreciation for your valiant effort.

Gus Norwood.

Los Angeles, Calif., *July 22, 1954.*
Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Our prayers are with you that you win and protect people's property.

G. M. Hallett.
E. J. Spencer.

St. Petersburg, Fla., *July 25, 1954.*
Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Building:

Don't let them steal our atomic know-how. Stay in there.

C. E. Dewell.

Detroit, Mich., *July 25, 1954.*
Senator Morse,
Washington, D. C.:

Thank you for your recent support, and I wish you much success.

T. Gorecki.

San Rafael, Calif., *July 24, 1954.*
Wayne Morse,
Senator, Washington, D. C.:

We support you in your opposition to administration policy re atomic energy.

Hal and Althea Dunleavy.

San Rafael, Calif., *July 24, 1954.*
Wayne Morse,
Senator, Washington, D. C.:

We support you in your opposition to administration policy re atomic energy.

Nora M. Bott.

Detroit, Mich., *July 24, 1954.*
Hon. Wayne Morse,
Senator From Oregon,
Washington, D. C.:

Have always admired and respected your judgment. Certainly appreciate what you are doing for the welfare of the country now.

Gratefully yours,

Elizabeth D. Merdeith.

Newark, N. J., *July 22, 1954.*
Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

This citizen appreciates your action on atomic energy bill.

James W. Reilly.

Berkeley, Calif., *July 24, 1954.*
Senator Wayne Morse,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations to you and other Senators fighting against the atomic giveaway program.

Marvel Ball, Frank Brezee, Thou Ball, Maria Wayers, Roma Bishop, D. G. Gibson, Winton McKibben, Bill Finn, Lillian Durdoll, John Jencks, Barbara Lindsay, Daniel Salazar, Marvin Veregge, Eva Lane, Susanne McGee, Julia Robinson, Rhoda Warne, Nicholas Petriss, Nell Skattebol, Ben Rust, Pasqual Perry, Imogene Martin, Ada Daggett, Frank Kent, Mrs. Donald Meyer, George Evelett, Donald Meyer, Susan Scudder, Morris Henerson, Mrs. M. Landrum, Elizabeth Witkin, Lyn White, Ann Pitt, Shirley Thatcher, T. Willis, Joe Formice, Charline Charles, J. Fernandez, Frances Wirta, Doris O'Mara, Arthur Roth, Rush Roth, Lucy Stern, Mrs. R. Newman, Mr. P. Newman, and Marth Raeish.

Detroit, Mich., *July 24, 1954.*
Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Chambers,
Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations to you and your colleagues. Keep up your wonderful job. Please don't let them sell us down the river. Wish I lived in Oregon so I could vote for you.

Conrad Nathan.

Palo Alto, Calif., *July 24, 1954.*
Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Success to effort to foil monopoly's race with time for ceasing atomic energy. Hope you can force postponement to next session. Requiring prior hearings for organized protests.

Allis Hill Byrne.

Sausalito, Calif., *July 22, 1954.*
Senator Wayne Morse,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

We are grateful for your splendid fight to preserve the public power program.

J. D. and K. P. Short.

Redlands, Calif., *July 24, 1954.*
Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

I am sure I speak for many when I voice my gratitude to you and your little band of colleagues for your present struggle to preserve something for the taxpayer of this country whose equity in public resources and atomic development face further raids and possible destruction at the hands of the Eisenhower administration, which is nothing more than the "Charlie McCarthy" of the Power Trust.

It is too late to consider anything but the truth about Eisenhower. A one-party press is protecting him against far more brazenly broken pledges to the American people than could be charged to any other President. They cried, "creeping socialism" while they crept in behind a Chevy salesman and stole for themselves power developments which the taxpayer built. They know their time is limited and hence the present desperate maneuver. You must stop them, Senator. With his batting average as a President, Ike will soon be nudging old General Grant out of the cellar.

From a patient at Redlands Community Hospital, Redlands, Calif.

E. O. Thompson.

New York, N. Y., *July 26, 1954.*
Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

More power to you. Keep the filibuster going.

Dr. Sidney Tarachow.

Norwalk, Conn., *July 26, 1954.*
Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Our grateful thanks for your stand on the atom measure.

Mr. and Mrs. Alfred Muenchen.

Port Orford, Oreg., *July 25, 1954.*
Senator Wayne Morse:

People in this area aware of your splendid effort regarding atomic energy. Following message sent to other Senators and Representatives from this district Sixes Grange by resolution Saturday night: Urge your support efforts of junior Senator from Oregon to include public-protection amendment in atomic energy bill now being discussed in Congress.

C. H. Brooks,
Legislative Chairman.

National Rural Electric
Cooperative Association,
Washington, D. C., July 21, 1954.
Hon. Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: Thank you for sending me a copy of your speech entitled "The New Giveaway: Atomic Energy."

I had the privilege to hear your speech Saturday afternoon. It was reassuring to me to hear someone speak frankly and candidly, without fear, in support of his own convictions on the atomic-energy bill.

We in the rural electrification program know that there is a no more faithful friend than you when it comes to these matters. Oftentimes the faithful are taken for granted without proper acknowledgment but we do want to assure you that your efforts in our behalf are very much appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

Charles J. Fain,
Legislative Assistant.

Watch Hill, R. I.

Dear Sir: I think that you and others are to be congratulated on your fight against the monopoly and giveaway provisions of the atomic-energy bill. I think that you are right and hope that you suceed.

I, also, think that the fight against the President's order to the AEC to buy private power to be fed into the TVA is completely justified.

However, I think that the provisions of the bill to share knowledge of atomic energy with our allies are needed, and I hope that they are sufficient.

Sincerely,

Nemur R. Oleill.

Tahoma Lake Tahoe, Calif.
Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D. C.

Just a line to say keep up the fight on the power issue. You are tops.

Yours truly,

John F. Raleigh.

Burbank, Calif.,
July 22, 1954.

Dear Senator Morse: Is it possible that the bright idea in the present TVA proposition is that it will make a billionaire of Bobby Jones? We understand that Bobby, Ike's golfing partner, is to be a stockholder in the company which is to receive this gift. Why not ask every Senator who is willing and desirous to make Bobby Jones a billionaire to stand up so the people can see them? More power to you.

Very truly,

Frances Duncan Manning.

Harding had his Daugherty, Truman his Maragon, and Eisenhower? Eisenhower may profit by their example.

Daytona Beach, Fla.,
July 20, 1954.

Hon. Senator Morse.

Dear Senator: Best wishes to you and the Senators helping to stop the Eisenhower giveaway program.

It should be called the billionaire administration instead of the Eisenhower administration, because that's all it is or ever was.

I am sure the next elections will indicate how the people feel about all these crazy goings-on at Washington.

What a group of lieutenants he selected. Never in my lifetime have I seen the like of them; no one knows where we are going. I think his insurance bill should be looked into. Chances are it's a bill for the insurance companies, not for the people.

Sincerely,

Harry Berdel.

Bayard, Nebr.

Dear Senator: We were visiting the Senate yesterday while you were talking. See in the papers this morning that you accomplished a lot. We are from western Nebraska—Scotts Bluff County—and consequently are keenly conscious of the private power grabs anywhere. I'm glad there are men like you to carry the ball in this sort of opposition.

Mrs. John Lane.

Portland, Oreg.,
July 25, 1954.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Keep punching. We are all with you on the AEC.

A. E. Collins and Wife.

Eugene, Oreg.,
July 25, 1954.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We believe atomic power should remain public property. Certainly question needs careful consideration and vigorous debate.

Mr. and Mrs. L. T. Gibby.

Salem, Oreg.,
July 25, 1954.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We thank you and deeply appreciate your efforts on behalf of the people against the AEC giveaway.

Walter and Rosemary Berg, Alan Berg, Eugene and Barbara Hanneman, R. I. Lovell, Steve and Verna Anderson, Arthur and Eleanor Wilson.

Eugene, Oreg., *July 25, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D. C.:

Keep up the good work. We admire your courage and forthrightness. Protect atomic power for America's posterity.

Keith and Ellen Skelton.

Portland, Oreg., *July 25, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We wholeheartedly support you in your courageous fight for the best interests of the people. Never have we had cause to be prouder of you than recently during your struggle to prevent private interests from monopolizing what rightfully belongs to all the people. We are writing Eisenhower.

The H. D. Willits Family.

Independence, Oreg., *July 25, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We're for you 100 percent. Don't give up the fight.

Ben, Pearl, and Fay Johnson.

Los Angeles, Calif., *July 25, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Your courage and clear insight in protecting Americans people's interest in atomic energy development is appreciated.

Stanley and Eleanor Dembowski.

Oakland, Calif., *July 25, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

More power to you. Keep up the fight as good American. God bless you.

G. G. Avedik (a blind man).

Chicago, Ill., *July 25, 1954.*

Hon. Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Please don't give up. Atomic energy cost us too much to sell it cheaply to those who would charge us dearly for it.

Stanley Molner.

Provo, Utah, *July 25, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
United States Senate Chamber,
Washington, D C.:

We strongly commend you and your cooperating colleagues your valiant fight to prevent TVA AEC being given away to giant corporations. Pledge our unqualified support to preserve these great enterprises for benefit of all the people whose taxes have built them. Please pass our views to all possible.

Public Affair Forum of Utah County,
George A. Startup, *President.*

Berkeley, Calif., *July 25, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

The Democrats in California are without representation, so I as one appeal to you to keep the filibuster going against the atomic energy bill. Thank you.

Bob Theiller.

Temple, Tex., *July 25, 1954.*

Hon. Wayne Morse,
Senator, Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations for your part in the filibuster if it is what they call it. Hold that line; don't let Eisenhower and his administration give away the $12 billion worth of atomic to the power trusts. We may then lose also REA and telephone as too expensive to operate.

W. A. Klecka.

Davenport, Iowa, *July 25, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Sir: Keep up the fight. Don't quit. Is communism going to become the only alternative to the looting of the American people by the Republican Party? The majority do not know what it means to them.

S. P. Roberts.

San Luis Obispo, Calif., *July 25, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Think you are doing fine work. Don't know what we would do without you. I am a railroad man, have no ax to grind except do not want to see the future generation robbed. Keep it up.

Harry G. Wheeler.

Washington, D. C., *July 25, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

On behalf of the rural electric cooperatives and power districts, we congratulate you on your efforts to carry on debate and discussion until the issues are clarified, the people aroused and informed, and the bill amended to provide for Government participation, preference for public bodies and cooperatives, and safeguards against secret licensing and patent monopoly. We urge you most strongly to continue debate until this bill is amended to protect the interests and investment of the people in atomic energy. The House bill will apparently be hopelessly loaded against us. We are looking to you and other friends in the Senate to save the day. Please carry on until you prevail.

Clyde T. Ellis.

Brooklyn, N. Y., *June 25, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Chambers, Washington, D. C.:

You are truly a representative of the people. Commend your stand on the atomic energy issue.

Rose Schure.

Philadelphia, Pa., *July 25, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations. Keep up the good work.

George B. Light.

Palo Alto, Calif., *July 25, 1954.*

United States Senator Wayne Morse,
United States Senate, Washington D. C.:

Keep up your courageous fight. Republic is just beginning to get an idea of what you are standing for.

Jerry Simpson.

San Rafael, Calif., *July 24, 1954.*

Wayne Morse,
Senator, Washington, D. C.:

We support you in your opposition to administration policy re atomic energy.

Tom and Margaret McNamara.

Prescott, Ont., *July 25, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Setup already completed President's office, private business take over atomic power financed by colossal life-insurance companies New York State. In event atomic attack these private business companies and private insurance companies would be bankrupt. Nothing can bankrupt United States Government unless its great public resources like atomic power are handed over to private business companies controlled by private life insurance business both of which can be bankrupt by atomic attack. See Senator Jenner on question, Are New York State life insurance companies worthy to be entrusted with control of atomic power by control of private business companies handling atomic power?

Mrs. Grace W. W. Chamberlain.

AUBURN, WASH., *July 25, 1954.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D. C.:

We commend the outstanding support against giveaway of atomic plans.

SHERMAN MCABEE,
Chairman,
30th District Democratic Council.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *July 25, 1954.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Local press and radio distorting your principled position as an American interested in safeguarding people's birthright. Wish to thank your group for fight against steal of the century. As member AFL Teamsters know brother members would do likewise if they had the facts. Keep fighting.

MATHEW GELERNTER.

MADISON, WIS., *July 25, 1954.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D. C.:

We want preserved our public property rights in TVA and atomic energy production. They must not be sold down river to special interest.

Rev. ALFRED W. SWAN.

PITMAN, N. J.,
July 23, 1954.

SIR: I wish to express my appreciation for your present fight against the business hierarchy's latest attempt to steal the country's resources. Even though the bill sponsored by the administration should be passed, your remonstration should be invaluable educationally.

Respectfully,

W. A. STIVERS, Jr.

WILMINGTON, DEL.,
July 23, 1954.

SIR: Congratulations on your debate of the AEC bill. Your appearance on the Frank Edwards program, I think, helped a large majority of the American people to understand this bill much clearer. Best wishes to your continued success.

Miss IRENE BAROSKI.

DETROIT, MICH.,
July 22, 1954.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I wholeheartedly support you in your heroic fight for the atomic energy bill. Atomic energy should be used for the benefit of all the people and for peaceful purposes only. I urge you also to work for the outlawing of atomic weapons and the world suicide which would mean an atomic war.

Sincerely,

Mrs. A. KERR.

BALTIMORE, MD.,
July 22, 1954.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: It is indeed good to know we have a few statesmen left. We are for the stand you are making against the administration's atomic energy bill.

Sincerely,

Mrs. WILLIAM R. LLOYD.
WILLIAM R. LLOYD.
MARY LYNNE LLOYD.

CHICAGO, ILL.

DEAR SENATOR: Thank you for your fight on the AEC bill, keep up the good work.

H. LANDAIR.

NARBERTH, PA.

Thanks for your great fight in the public interest.

We must have bigger and better TVA's.

ROLLIN W. SIDWELL.

BROOKLYN, N. Y.

DEAR MR. MORSE: Congratulations on your determined stand against this atomic giveaway bill.

Sincerely,

ALICE SHIELDS.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have been watching the Senate proceedings for the last few days, and I want to tell you that it is a pleasure to see someone down on that floor who thinks he is there to represent the American people.

There are those of us who recognize the personal sacrifices involved in defending right principles against the cajolery and threats of the greedy.

I hope the people of Oregon will return you to the Senate as often as you care to come.

Sincerely yours,

LOUISA DODGE.

LUBBOCK, TEX., *July 22, 1954.*
WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Glad to hear the people have one friend in Washington. Keep up the good work.

MAC AUSTIN.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *July 22, 1954.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: My deep appreciation to you for your courageous fight to prevent the atomic energy giveaway. As long as we have men such as you in our Congress, we may have hope.

With very many good wishes for your continued success.

Respectfully,

Mrs. I. L. FENNER.

FAIRFIELD COUNTY PUBLICATIONS,
Fairfield, Conn., July 22, 1954.
Senator WAYNE MORSE,

MY DEAR SENATOR: Thank you endlessly for serving the people's interest so well and so faithfully. Keep up the good work against the administration's attempt to sell out to the private power combine.

Am a citizen of Connecticut (transplanted son of the Golden West), else I would deem it a privilege to keep you in the Senate indefinitely.

Very sincerely yours,

HUGO F. SCATENA,
Copy Editor.

P. S.—As a listener to Frank Edwards' radio program, I learn much of your activities through him.

TOPEKA, KANS., *July 22, 1954.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D. C.:

MY DEAR SENATOR: It's wonderful the way you're throwing your energy behind an effort to stop this Eisenhower galloping favoritism in atomic energy and other public interests.

Keep up the fine work.

Sincerely,

JAMES A. HAMLER, Jr.

SCRANTON, PA., *July 23, 1954.*
The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: As one who is very much in sympathy for public-power policies, I write this note to thank you, and the small group of Senators with you, for the stand you are maintaining on the atomic energy bill.

I speak for many other people when I encourage you to continue the fight as long as you possibly can.

Respectfully yours,

THOMAS DAVIS, Jr.

BEECH SWAMP PLANTATION,
Scotland Neck, N. C., July 21, 1954.
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Although no one regrets more than I that circumstances in the world of today will not allow unrestricted play of private enterprise, I realize that private enterprise due to various factors in economic life cannot function wisely and well in all fields.

Therefore I do hope that you will continue to a successful end your fight to keep the TVA's of our country out of the hands of private companies.

We need these publicly owned authorities, if for no other reason than that given by Mrs. Roosevelt, namely, as a yardstick to measure values and charges.

I also know that we who live in the rural areas would not yet have electricity, had it not been for the REA. The privately owned companies said they could not afford to finance the outlay required. Nonetheless through the REA we set up the required equipment, and in 5 or 6 years, we shall have paid entirely for our lines, have had the use of electricity for 20 (otherwise benighted years) and own our own lines.

So we know governmental aid in big undertakings is not without merit.

Keep up your noble endeavor.

With much admiration,

GEORGIE B. PURRINGTON,
Mrs. A. L. PURRINGTON.

BROOKLYN, N. Y., *July 23, 1954.*
Senator W. MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Congratulations on a splendid fight against the tremendous giveaway program of the present administration.

Your magnificent fight is inspiring the people of this great and glorious country with courage and stamina which hasn't been apparent of late.

There riches belong to all the people, not to a few favorites, who would enrich themselves at the expense of all of us.

Thank you.

Very truly yours,

Mrs. G. MENDELSOM.

NORWALK, CONN., *July 22, 1954.*
Senator W. MORSE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Your sentiments are entirely correct, so far as I am concerned, on the atomic energy proposals.

Hope you succeed.

Yours truly,

WILLIAM H. BANKS.

ALTOONA, PA., *July 23, 1954.*
Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senator from Oregon,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: You have done a wonderful job and rendered a great service to the public in contributing to the defeat of the atomic energy bill as supported by the administration. I thank you from the bottom of my heart.

Please be advised that you can count of my complete and wholehearted support in behalf of any WAYNE MORSE endeavor at any time in the future, any place and anywhere, event to the extent of going in hock for you.

Very truly yours,

JOHN LA MAUR.

BRIDGEPORT, CONN., *July 24, 1954.*

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Keep it up, Senator.

Your activities are a source of inspiration to the defeatists, to those who feel the fight's lost, and all the other down-at-hearts. Maybe if they'd pick up, you'd be able to pressure a few more of some representatives of the people (so-called) into aiding you.

Whatever it is, people like me appreciate it and fight harder and harder. It's tough, but the alternative, an American fascism, is rotten-tough.

Need any more roses?

Sincerely,

Donald Solorow.

Philadelphia, Pa., July 24, 1954.

Dear Senator: We Americans are fortunate to have a great Senator like you in Washington.

May God bless and protect you.

Sincerely yours,

Nellie Ludman.

Yonkers, N. Y., July 22, 1954.

The Honorable Wayne Morse,
Senator from Oregon,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Sir: I heartily agree with your stand on the atomic-energy bill. The American people should be very proud of you. You You indeed are a true defender and champion of the rights of all the people of this country.

Keep up the good work. The eyes of America are on you, and God bless you and spare you for a long, long time.

Yours respectfully,

Nathan Kean.

Oakland, Calif., July 22, 1954.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: You are wonderful; 6 hours is no short time to be on the floor in this hot weather. I think we are so fortunate to have you in the Senate, and I pray that you keep well, because you play such an important role in the history of our United States. Even the radio announcers seem to be pleased to announce the courageous fight you are making.

Perhaps not too many people take the time to write, but I assure you millions of us take courage from your position and vision on the important issues being decided in Washington.

Sincerely yours,

Ethel Cohen.

Trafford, Pa., July 22, 1954.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
Senate, United States,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Sir: It makes me feel real good all over, to hear you are fighting the very things you said sometime ago would happen. What are the Republicans doing, Senator? Giving everything away? The tidelands were given away even after the Supreme Court said they belong to the people, all the people. They traded the Chief Justice of the Supreme for some votes, and I feel we, the people, got the much worse of the deal. Tax reduction for whom? Now goes the power dams. Don't some of those politicians have a God? Not even an image? Never feel that your fight is not alone. This country of ours is made up of people, not a few ungodly, greedy people. God bless you, Senator. And keep up the fight. To me you're a statesman.

Sincerely yours,

Marius Steelo.

Chicago, Ill., July 23, 1954.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: This letter is to express my appreciation of your courageous (not to say exhausting) stand in the current debate over the revision of the Atomic Energy Act. In this, as in other cases where I have followed your record closely, you seem to me to be acting in the highest spirit of devotion to the public good.

Not long ago I happened to be in the audience when you spoke at Mandel Hall at the University of Chicago. I was impressed by your statement that pressure campaigns to influence your vote had no bearing on your action, but that you were glad to have thoughtful letters from your constituents to help you decide what was in the best interest of the country as a whole.

I am sorry that I do not live in Oregon so that I could vote for you.

Sincerely yours,

Laura C. Swabey.

Topeka, Kans., July 18, 1954.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D. C.

My Dear Senator: Am very happy to read of your efforts to attempt to halt the giveaway of the atomic energy to private companies. Your efforts are helping to preserve a lot of this country's wealth for the average fellow.

Keep up the fine work.

Sincerely,

James A. Hamler, Jr.

Port Arthur, Tex., July 23, 1954.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
Washington, D. C.:

Thank you for continuing to represent the people.

D. A. Davis.

Gainesville, Fla., July 22, 1954.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: I, like an inestimable number of other persons, have not written to tell you that you have the support of a great many more people than even you may suspect.

Since your abnegation of the Republican Party, I have watched rather closely what you have done in the Senate. If I am fair-minded, none of your words or actions have been unfair.

Let them bring in the cots; but for the sake of us all, you and Margaret Chase Smith and Paul Douglas, and a few others protect what we have left.

This is not a letter of advice, but one that makes a request that you who still have integrity not sacrifice it to expediency.

Sincerely,

R. E. Abbott.

Central Labor Union,
St. Petersburg, Fla., July 23, 1954.

Senator Wayne Morse, of Oregon,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Honorable Senator Morse: The officers of this council have noted your legislative record with approval for your stand on bills that are directly affecting the working people of these United States.

Your stand and leadership in defeating the proposed giveaway of atomic power rights and secrets to the electric power industry and protecting our investment of $12 billion in its development has prompted us to write and thank you and all who are truly representing the small taxpaying citizen. It was a tough fight from the newspaper accounts, and the credit is all the more for your courageous stand against the big-business lobby.

Our sincere thanks and appreciation, may you be a United States Senator as long as you wish.

Sincerely yours,

Russell B. Hayes, *Secretary.*

California Farm Research
and Legislative Committee,
Santa Clara, Calif., July 22, 1954.

To Members of the California Delegation in the Senate and House of Representatives:

Our committee is opposed in principle to changes in the Atomic Energy Act as proposed in bills S. 3323 (Hickenlooper) and H. R. 8862 (Cole).

The atomic-energy resources of America were developed by the Government at a cost of over $12 billion. They are therefore the property of all the people.

Giving private utilities exclusive patent rights on this tremendous source of energy would sound the death knell for public power and strengthen monopoly in this field.

We are also opposed to President Eisenhower's action ordering the Atomic Energy Commission to purchase electricity from a proposed Dixon-Yates syndicate plant in West Memphis, Ark., at a cost of from $92 million to $129 million more than the power would cost from facilities constructed and operated by TVA.

We urge that you vote against any giveaway of our atomic-energy resources and against any amendment sustaining President Eisenhower's order to the AEC. By following the leadership given in this matter by Representative Chet Holifield, of California, you will be defending the people's right to atomic power.

Very sincerely yours,

Joe C. Lewis,
Chairman.

The College of the Bible,
Lexington, Ky., July 22, 1954.

Senator Wayne Morse,
United States Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: I have appreciated very much your independent stand in the Senate. Now I am thrilled over your stand on the TVA–AEC measure. I hope that you do not have to talk too many nights. But I do hope you defeat the measure.

It is really remarkable to have the Independents, Republicans, and Democrats represented in this fight against the Dixon-Yates proposal.

If you cannot stop the measure now, I do hope that you can force a complete airing of the whole deal. It begins to look as though radio commentator Edward R. Murrow had something 2 or 3 weeks ago when he said that we were headed for subsidized private enterprise.

The Louisville Courier-Journal is giving good coverage to the stand that you public-spirited Senators are making.

With best wishes, I am,

Respectfully yours,

Lewis Smythe.

Charleston, Mo., July 26, 1954.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building:

Power to you. Pray never weaken.

Robert L. Burke.

Long Beach, Calif., July 26, 1954.

Senator Wayne Morse,
United States Senate Floor:

Please keep up the good fight to save public power.

Daniel T. Brice,
Vice President, Lakewood Democrats.

Berkeley, Calif., July 26, 1954.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building:

Appreciate your fight on TVA. Our best wishes are with you.

Very truly yours,

Mr. and Mrs. Philip Ferris.

Veterans' Hospital,
Madison, Wis.

Dear Senator Morse: By the time this letter reaches you the atomic-energy legislation may be over with, but, regardless of the outcome, you can rest assured there are many in this country who have hopes for the future as long as men like you are in Government. You have the fighting spirit of "Old Bob" La Follette, and we in Wisconsin are proud of you.

Although I am now studying for the Methodist ministry, I am proud to have graduated from Wisconsin Law School. I wish one could be as proud of our other graduates as we are of you.

I am also proud that you gave the commencement address when I graduated from Cornell College in 1946.

I am writing this from a veterans' hospital, so hope you will pardon the writing. Keep up the good work. The intelligent people in this country are all proud of you.

Sincerely,

R. H. Conner.

Detroit, Mich., *July 22, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Sir: I'd like to stand up and be counted in your corner. Your fight against Eisenhower's atomic-energy bill inspires heartfelt admiration.

Men of your integrity and caliber are few and far between. In our house your name has become symbolic of everything that is fine and decent in the political arena.

Heard your comments on Frank Edwards' radio broadcast tonight and feel outraged at the administration's proposed robbery. Tidelands and now this.

Every good wish for a successful fight.

Very sincerely yours,

Anne Friedman.

Lewisburg, Pa., *July 23, 1954.*

Senator Morse has come out of the West. Through all the wide borders his cause is the best. With apologies to Sir Walter.

Congratulations and good luck.

Sincerely yours,

Dessa (Mrs. P. L.) Harriman.

Massapequa, N. Y., *July 23, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Wayne Morse: Thank you for your stand in the interest of all the people of the United States.

May your efforts be rewarded by success.

Sincerely,

Bernice Shaw.

Madison, Wis., *July 23, 1954.*

Dear Senator: We applaud your efforts to prevent the exploitation of the peacetime use of atomic energy by one or a few utility corporations.

Keep up the show.

Sam L. Scheinberg.

New York, N. Y., *July 23, 1954.*

Dear Senator Morse: Seeing and reading your picture in today's Daily Mirror, lying on Army cots and reading the caption under it, here's wishing and praying for you, Senator Morse, and to every Senator whose opinion is akin to your own strength, endurance, keen understanding, and sound wisdom and knowledge, our dear Lord God willing.

New York, N. Y., *July 23, 1954.*

Senator Morse,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Sir: Please continue the fight.

Thank you.

Very truly yours,

S. Libby.

Brooklyn, N. Y., *July 22, 1954.*

Dear Senator Wayne Morse: Keep up the good work you are doing. Don't let them steal the atomic power as they did the oil power.

God bless you and keep you healthy so you can fight for the people.

Thank you again.

Yours truly,

Mr. and Mrs. Chas. Estrich.

Minneapolis, Minn.,
Thursday, July 22, 1954.
(Great day in history.)

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

My Dear Senator: As a citizen of this great country saddened too often by the performance of the Congress, may I again express my deep appreciation to you for your services in behalf of the citizenry.

I refer, of course, to your marathon performance on the floor of the Senate early today in behalf of public power and against the giveaway of atomic energy developed by public taxes. The press (radio) described you as "with flower in buttonhole and not a hair unruffled," and I shouted a silent, admiring "hallelujah." I am proud of you, and very grateful, indeed.

Sincerely,

Alice Gilbertson.

Chicago, Ill., *July 23, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator: Congratulations on the fine work you are doing to prevent the atomic energy giveaway. And my hearty thanks.

We are thankful that we have such men as you in the Senate.

Very sincerely yours,

Winifred Meeks.

Vanguard Advertising,
New York, N. Y., July 23, 1954.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Senator: Please continue the valiant fight you are waging to prevent the encroachment of private plunder on the atomic-energy program.

This problem needs long and careful study, with hearings to permit the public interest to be fully and adequate presented.

I don't understand the frenzied, indecent, and almost suspicious haste to force passage of this proposed legislation.

Sincerely yours,

J. M. Russakoff.

New York, N. Y., *July 23, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

My Dear Senator Morse: Your great courage in combating our present administration's specious concern with what's good for the people fills me with hope for the future of our country.

I am also a Republican who is thoroughly disgusted with the reactionaries and so-called liberals of the party.

I earnestly extend my best wishes for your good health and feel compelled to commend you for your fine principles. How badly this Congress needs more Wayne Morses.

Respectfully yours,

Rose Tenenbaum.

Brooklyn, N. Y., *July 22, 1954.*

Dear Senator Morse: Just having heard you on Frank Edwards program I was about to send a telegram of gratitude to you for your fight to save the TVA.

It then occurred to me I could write 5 letters for the price of 1 telegram. Also I would have the satisfaction of doing a small amount of work during this night while you are keeping watch.

I knew both the Senators La Follette and old "Bob's" cloak of courage seems to fit your shoulders,

Sincerely yours,

Betsy Graves Reyneau.
Mrs. B. G. Reyneau.

Ann Arbor, Mich., *July 22, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: Congratulations. You're doing a splendid job for the American people. Though from another State, I want to thank you.

I particularly am enjoying your hard-fisted attitude in view of a letter I wrote you in January 1953, asking you whether it wouldn't be possible to use the filibuster against the very people who have benefited by it for the past decades. Though your fight to save us the tidelands oil was unsuccessful, I certainly hope that this time the American people will preserve our resources.

Best of luck—both in the current debate and in the many years to come.

Sincerely,

George K. Levinger.

Easton, Pa., *July 22, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Morse: I wish to express my sympathy with your stand on the present administration's proposal to change the atomic energy law. I admire and appreciate your efforts to prevent that which is rightfully the property of the people from falling into the hands of a few.

My only regrets are that I cannot support you with my ballot, or express the same sentiments of gratitude to the Senators from my own State.

Respectfully yours,

James E. Pugh.

Washington, D. C., *July 26, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building:

Deeply appreciate your part in the tremendous battle for the public interest on the atomic energy bill. Hope you will continue fighting to defeat or substantially amend the bill which will affect so vitally America's future.

Wallace J. Campbell,
Cooperative League of the USA.

Chicago, *July 22, 1954.*

A word of encouragement to you on your fight against the atomic giveaway.

Leon Despres.

New York City, *July 22, 1954.*

My Dear Senator: Thank you for your attempt to prevent the mishandling of atomic energy. God luck in your fight.

Yours,

Mark Atwood.

Philadelphia, Pa., *July 23, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse, of Oregon.

Honorable Sir: We are praying for your success in your fight to help us. We are behind you in your effort in this giveaway atomic power and everything you do to help us.

Thank God, for people like you.

Sincerely,

Rose M. Weiss.

Cincinnati, Ohio, *July 23, 1954.*

Dear Senator: I heard you talk over Frank Edwards' program and appreciate your fine work and efforts in behalf of the American people versus the Fat Cats.

Thanks again and best wishes to you and your associates.

Keep fighting.

Sincerely,

P. H. Adams.

Madison, Ill., *July 23, 1954.*

Dear Sir: Having heard you talk last night on Frank Edwards' program. We thank you so much for working for us little people's heritage. My husband works at the steel mill and they are laying off men. The former has been cut drastically.

Mr. and Mrs. Louis Stovroff.

Hyannis, Mass., *July 22, 1954.*

God bless you, Senator Morse. You and your loyal little band of true Americans—Gillette, Hill, and the others. I was thrilled listening to your talk over Frank Edwards' program. You sounded hoarse but full of fighting spirit. Keep it up—my, the utility stooges are mad at you boys, but we, the people, love you. I used to live in Portland and still have many friends in that fine State of Oregon.

Wishing you and your band of patriots the best of luck.

Success.

Katherine Miller.

Brooklyn.

Dear Senator Morse: Very grateful for your fight to save TVA. I wish you success and the very best of health.

Sincerely yours.

Mrs. Mary S. Ritchie.

Lincoln, Nebr., *July 23, 1954.*

Senator Morse: I want to thank you for the gallant fight you are putting up for us, the so-called little people. While I am not a constituent of yours, I feel that you represent me and my family in the Senate.

Thanking you again and wishing you success.

Sincerely,

Mrs. Harry Sohl.

Lincoln, Nebr., *July 23, 1954.*

Dear Senator Morse: Just a line to commend you in your fight against the atomic giveaway program. Although I don't come from Oregon I feel that you are representing my interests in this fight.

Wish you much success in this fight and keep up the good work.

Sincerely yours,

John Sohl.

Croton-on-Hudson, N. Y., *July 22, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator: You are a great man. And you are entirely right when you said on Frank Edward's program, you are making a historic stand in the interest of the people of the whole country.

I for one, shall remember your fight for years to come. I am grateful to Senators Hill, Gore, Langer. Thank goodness for the few good men we have in our Legislature. And I wish to add the name of our own dear Senator Lehman.

Wishing you and our Nation success in accomplishing the rights of the people, I remain

Most sincerely,

Mrs. M. F. Sear.

Staten Island, N. Y., *July 23, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: Just to say I am very glad to hear the news today and the wonderful fight you are putting on over the latest giveaway deal.

You have a rooter here.

Sincerely,

Eve S. Fairbairn.

Oregon City, Oreg., *July 24, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building:

Keep fighting for public control of atomic energy. Papermakers Local 166 behind you.

Burt Elledge,
President.

Enterprise, Oreg., *July 24, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building:

Dear Senator Morse: We Oregonians can thank God that we have a man in Washington who cannot be bought. May God stay your strength.

Pearl H. Beard,
Assistant Chairman, Wallowa County Democrats.

Baker, Oreg., *July 24, 1954.*

Senator Wayne L. Morse,
Senate Office Building:

Congratulations to you and all your colleagues who helped to save the American people from disaster. Private companies will sell it to the highest bidder.

Joe Dewuhs.

Corpus Christi, Tex., *July 23, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Sir: Is it possible for a citizen to file an injunction against the atomic share-the-plan program?

Further, can a citizen file an injunction against a giveaway program in the Tennessee Valley project?

Please furnish all the material available in this line.

R. J. Hereford.

The Dalles, Oreg., *July 22, 1954.*

Dear Senator Morse: More power to you. Appreciate your efforts to keep the Eisenhower administration from giving away to private power companies the TVA.

Sincerely,

Ruth Stovall.

Monmouth, Oreg., *July 22, 1954.*

The Honorable Wayne Morse,
United States Senator from Oregon,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

My Dear Senator Morse: Congratulations Senator on the courageous stand you, Senators Gore, Lehman, Jackson, Magnuson, and the others are making on this terrible atomic power bill of the Eisenhower administration.

May I say you are going to have some fighters on your side come 1956. May God give you strength to win.

Very respectfully yours,

Nolan P. Rasnick.

Resolution of Oregon State Federation of Labor, Portland, Oreg.

RESOLUTION 80

Whereas atomic energy development for peacetime uses is now under discussion in the legislative halls of the National Congress; and

Whereas major private utility groups are seeking, for their own use, release of atomic energy patents in possession of the Atomic Energy Commission; and

Whereas the people of the United States, through their Government, have already invested approximately $12,500,000,000 in the development of atomic energy; and

Whereas these private utilities seek release of the patents on reactors to be used by them for generation of electricity; and

Whereas partnership plans of the administration already announced for hydroelectric development include those in which the Federal Government will build dams and the private utilities install the generating equipment, and such a partnership has been opposed by this organization, yet in this proposal of private utilities that they be given these patents to produce electric generation from reactors is an even more serious proposal because it means that these private utilities will be in on the ground floor to take over the benefits of the $12,500,000,000 already expended by the people of these United States in the basic development of atomic energy, and unlike the case in early hydroelectric development, here they will have the field to themselves from the beginning to reap the benefits of $12,500,000,000 of Federal expenditures: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Oregon State Federation of Labor, at convention in Astoria, Oreg., June 21–25, 1954, go on record opposing release of these patents to private utilities; and be it further

Resolved, That this organization believes it to be in the best interests of all the citizens of this Nation that control of atomic energy development and use be kept exclusively in the hands of the Federal Government, including atomic development for peacetime uses.

Astoria, Long Island, N. Y., *July 23, 1954.*

Dear Sir: Every day that goes by makes me admire your actions more and more. I only regret that you cannot represent us here in New York along with Senator Lehman. Your atomic energy bill discourse is an eye opener.

Keep up the good work.

Sincerely,

Mrs. Blanche Marienhoff.

Winter Hill, Mass., *July 22, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: My husband and I wish to compliment you on your fight against the atomic energy bill. We admire your spirit and your concern for the American people.

We hear you often via Frank Edwards' program.

Keep up the good work.

Sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. R. K. Darr.

Plainfield, N. J., *July 23, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator: How proud the people of Oregon must be of you. Moreover, how proud they can be of themselves that they are the kind of people to send a man like you to represent them.

Before my 16-year-old son went upstairs to bed last night, he said to the rest of the family: "We can afford to go to bed because there are people like Senator Morse staying up scrapping for us."

With my heartfelt thanks,

Virginia Van Zandt.

Brooklyn, N. Y., *July 23, 1954.*

Hon. Senator Morse.

Honorable Sir: No voter is able to thank you ever for the hours of your precious health you are sacrificing in the defense and protection of the taxpayers' and future voters' property and existence given away, thrown away, by our present know-nothings.

God help you and the other legislators in this essential campaign of protection, enlightenment, and education of us future voters.

Respectfully yours,

Bernard Ehrenpreis, M. D.

New York, N. Y., *July 26, 1954.*

Hon. Senator Wayne Morse:

Congratulations on your brave fight to inform American people of atomic giveaway.

Mr. and Mrs. S. Mann.

Kalamazoo, Mich., *July 26, 1954*

Hon. Senator Morse:

Congratulations are certainly in order to the honorable Senator Morse for his gallant stand to prevent Eisenhower's atomic enegy law. We are requesting you to support the stand Senator Morse has taken. Your vote on this bill will be taken very seriously.

Paul W. Storey,
President, Parchment Local 923, AGL.

Newport, Ark., *July 26, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse:

Thanks for your fighting spirit. We sincerely believe that steam and hydro methods producing electric power are becoming obsolete. Apparently atomic-produced electric power will replace conventional methods. Since this atomic power has been developed at the expense of the people of the United States, we believe that they should receive the benefits directly without paying premiums to the private power companies. This cooperative is an organization of some of those taxpayers and it is an instrument through which some of the benefits of atomic power can be delivered to the people directly. We know you have our interest at heart and we know you will protect that interest while the atomic energy bill is being considered.

Farmers Electric Co-op Corp.,
Corbett Johnston, *President.*
Walter B. Huff, *Treasurer.*
Carl Cross, *Manager.*

Clarksburg, W. Va., *July 22, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senator M. M. Neely,
Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations. Never sell out.

Mr. and Mrs. John Bowman.
Mr. and Mrs. Homer Vance.
Shinnston, W. Va.

Miami, Fla., *July 24, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse:

At-a-boy, take care of yourself.

Our love,
Helen and Harold King.

Springfield Gardens, N. Y., *July 22, 1954.*

The Honorable Wayne Morse,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

My Dear Mr. Morse: Let me send you and, through you, all those gallant gentlemen who fight side by side with you, the heartfelt thanks of my wife and me. In this trying ordeal of an around-the-clock session you have our sympathies and our best wishes. It is one of the few encouraging signs of our sad times to see brave men who refuse to give up to party what was meant for mankind, stand up to fight for the rights of the people and the Government of these United States. A President who never voted until he was over 60 is being misled by a selfish group. It is our very fervent hope that you will have the strength to fight to the finish this attempt to plunder the public, which spent billions of dollars for the development of something which the giant corporations refused to invest a cent in. Yet today they want to steal the finished product from the people of the Nation. We cannot allow public property to be stolen or the safety of the Nation to be handed over to a selfish Power Trust.

The best of luck to all of you in this historic debate.

Yours respectfully,
George Philip Silverberg.

Redwood City, Calif., *July 22, 1954.*

Hon. Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Sir: Wish you success in your fight against atomic energy bill, S. 3690.

Have heard you speak several times on Frank Edwards news program and would like to think that this November we can get a few more Senators to help you in your good work.

Sincerely,
Charles L. Perkins,

Arlington Heights, Ill., *July 22, 1954.*

Hon. Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: I have admired your courageous course of action for a year and a half, sir; and just wish to thank you for your present fine effort on behalf of the American people. The present administration is outdoing Grant's in its efforts to give away the people's resources to big business. The reactionaries are having their inning, but I believe the people of America will have theirs ultimately. Thank you for serving all of us well.

I'm sorry to be unable to vote for you, but I'll try to aid you indirectly by keeping Meek with us in Illinois.

Yours sincerely,
Kenneth Schaller.

New York City, *July 23, 1954.*

Dear Senator Morse: Keep up your stand against the "big power steal." Many former Eisenhower voters are beginning to see the grab leader as a shill for the power trusts. I believe the American public have come of age, painful though it may be.

My best to your colleagues and you. We will remember in November.

Sincerely,
Olga Murray.

Beverly, Mass., *July 22, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
United States Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: Congratulations on your fight against the Eisenhower proposals to ruin TVA, and to turn over atomic power to private enterprise. Keep on fighting. A lot of people are hoping you will win.

Sincerely,
Richard W. Thaler, M. D.

P. S.—I helped work my way through the University of Tennessee working for TVA and never met a creeping Socialist there.

R. W. T.

Brooklyn, N. Y., *July 22, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: Congratulations and thanks. Please keep talking. You have our moral support. Wish we could give you physical support also.

We are tired of seeing our national resources handed out on a silver platter by this administration to private industry.

Please let me know how you stand on the Echo Dam project. Is it an unnecessary project?

Very sincerely,
Sarah J. Smith.
Samuel Smith.

New York City, *July 22, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse.

Dear Sir: Just heard you on the Frank Edwards program, and was heartened by your words. The people do know we have some Senators in Congress working for the rank-and-file instead of only for the big operators.

Keep up the good work, Senator (which you always do) and may God give you strength and wisdom to carry on through this giveaway Congress. You sure called it right in that last presidential election.

Hoping the people wake up before it is too late. I remain,

Sincerely yours,
Nathan Jackson.

Des Moines, Iowa, *July 22, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: Not only all the people of our country, but the people of all the world are indebted to you for the way you are standing up against big-money interests in our country. They are not only trying to take over our country, but the world.

Our most heartfelt gratitude to you. Posterity will hail you as one of the outstanding friends of humanity, and saviors of the world. You were so right in saying that political and economic freedom in our country will always be in jeopardy, so long as so many of the world's people are being robbed of their heritage, though those are not your exact words. When we deny freedom to others, we lose what freedom we have had also. By giving ourselves in service to others, we served our own best interested. Likewise we rob ourselves, when we rob them.

All hail to your clearer vision.

Mary E. Cassill and Lucy B. Dexter,
(Another grandma, who likes to join me in these messages).

Astoria, N. Y., *July 22, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator: Keep up the fight for the public's interest with reference to atomic energy. It's good to know we do have some Senators who are more concerned about the welfare of the country as a whole and not in supporting some private power group.

With sincere appreciation,
F. Macaulay.

Brooklyn, N. Y., *July 21, 1954.*

Hon. Wayne Morse,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Sir: I listened to your short speech on Mr. Frank Edward's radio time and it made me feel good to know that we have some Senators who have the interests of the people at heart and will fight for the good of the people to the end. God bless you.

I regret that I am not one of your constituents.

There must be no more giveaways of the people's wealth.

Sincerely yours,
Irving Gelfand.

Brooklyn, N. Y., *July 23, 1954.*

Dear Senator Morse: Please accept the sincere appreciation of this family who are only sorry that they are not in a position to vote for you. Keep up the good work.

Very respectfully yours,
André Stephan Molnar.

Chicago, Ill., *July 24, 1954.*

Senator Morse:

Received your Oregon letter in regard to the atomic giveaway.

I think you are putting up a wonderful fight for the people of the Nation.

Receive the Oregon letter regularly and get information from it that I could not possibly get from any newspaper.

Sincerely hope you win the fight against the atomic giveaway.

Sincerely,
Edwin L. Rose.

Chicago, Ill., *July 23, 1954.*

Senator Morse,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Sir: Good for you.

We are in accord with your decision 100 percent. Keep up the good work.

Sincerely,
Dorothy Meltz.

Bronx, N. Y., *July 23, 1954.*

Senator W. Morse,
Washington, D. C.

Honorable Sir: Keep up the good work. The atomic giveaway is disgraceful.

Respectfully yours,

Max Steinman.

Wisconsin Dells, Wis., *July 23, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
United States Senate.

Dear Mr. Morse: We wish to congratulate and thank you for the tireless effort you are asserting for the protection of the peoples' freedom and prosperity.

It has always been our contention that Government should always operate and be a yardstick for public power and private energy be kept in control, lest it exploit the people.

More power to you.

Yours sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. Nels Christopherson.

New York, N. Y., *July 23, 1954.*

Dear Senator Morse: Since these are days of feeble tongues and private-power minds, it is a pleasure to read of your actions in the AEC debate. We hope you keep your vocal chords in prime working order and that you find men and means to outwit this bill and have it presented in a more proper form.

Sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. Alfred Archis.

Concordia College,
Moorhead, Minn., July 23, 1954.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: Keep up the good fight. The spirit of George Norris is with you. Old Bob La Folette must feel a strong urge to rise in his grave and cheer you on as you fight the battle for the people as he fought them years ago. The great myth of the Eisenhower administration has been the lie that it is serving the people, when every major step it has taken has been against the common man. Make that clear to the people, and the fall elections will do the rest. Surely there are enough public-spirited Senators willing to do a little talking and lose a little sleep for one of the most vital causes that confronted this Nation. Talk all summer, if necessary, to prevent this proposed betrayal of the people. God be with you in your good fight. History will class you with her immortals.

Sincerely,

W. E. Lillo.

Counts, Va., *July 23, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse.

Dear Sir: My hat is off to you for your faithful and courageous fight against the powerhouse gang who seek to destroy TVA and monopolize all of the Nation's electric power. Your fight is for not only the present generation but also for unborn babes. You fought like the good soldier that you are to save the tidelands oil for the people, but you lost, and this is the second time that President Eisenhower has surrendered to the plunder bund, and if these selfish forces win their goal our democracy will be swallowed up by the plutocracy and the howlers of creeping socialism are promoters of sneaking capitalism. The betrayal of the public interest by President Eisenhower should not surprise anyone, since he has teamed up with the very forces that he said during the Republican primary stole votes instead of long-horned cattle. Wayne, you tell both the friends and enemies of the general public that both Democrats and Republicans are madder than a hundred hornets over the defeat of the George bill to raise tax exemptions for the small-income groups. So keep up the good fight and may God bless your efforts.

Respectfully,

E. V. Counts.

High Point, N. C., *July 22, 1954.*

Hon. Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Senator Morse: Thank you for your fight against the AEC bill. You deserve the thanks of all Americans.

Sincerely yours,

Miss Katherine Morris.

Birmingham, Ala., *July 23, 1954.*

The Honorable Wayne Morse,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: Thanks again. It's really most heartening to see you and a few of the other Senators in there fighting when the interest of the whole country is at stake. Frankly, however, I've come to expect it of you.

I am writing for the Congressional Record for every day of this week, as I know there will be some very enlightening information to be found there. You may be filibustering, but it's certainly in a good cause. I've been getting so discouraged about so many things of late that it really gives me a boost to know what you're doing. The only trouble is I can't get too much information—or at least the information that I want—out of the daily paper.

I have really enjoyed and appreciate the newsletter which is being mailed to me from your office, even though I'm not an Oregonian.

Very sincerely yours,

Miss Farrar Armstrong.

Vanderbilt University,
Nashville, Tenn., July 24, 1954.

Senator Wayne Morse,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Sir: I would like to congratulate you on the fine job you are doing in the present AEC debate.

I, as well as many others, are backing you 100 percent.

Sincerely yours,

Natalie Katz.
Irving Bird.

Minneapolis, Minn.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
Senator from Oregon,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Senator: Even though it's hot and sticky here, I would feel guilty if I did not drop you a line to tell you how much I have always admired your statesmanship and your courageous stand against the present administration's giveaway program.

What a pity that we do not have more statesmen in Washington instead of a lot of party-labeled politicians who do not observe principles in voting for legislation and which will benefit the majority of people instead of just a few.

Keep up the good work, Senator, and may your health permit you to serve the people for a long, long time.

Sincerely yours,

M. J. Kasmarck.

Edmonds, Wash., *July 22, 1954.*

Hon. Senator Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Sir: Your untiring efforts are not going unnoticed and unappreciated.

At a time when rape, with the public as the victim, is being defined by the press and those in power as the highest type of moral activity, you have persistently and energetically tried to make the public aware of the real motives behind the Republican legislative program. We wish that apathy weren't so prevalent but want to assure you that many value your efforts immeasurably and that your protestations are decreasing that apathy by increasing proportions as time goes by.

We wish you continued good health and want to assure you that your magnificent efforts will continue to receive our wholehearted support.

Sincerely yours,

Ronald E. Fiege.
Richard H. Ryen.
Phyllis E. Fiege.
Ann A. Ryen.

New York, N. Y., *July 24.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: Please keep up the good fight you are waging right now.

All my family and friends are with you.

Good health and good luck.

Mrs. H. Brody.

State College, Pa., *July 25, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator: I am delighted with you. You are in the right. Hurray for Morse. I hope you can keep going forever.

Yours truly,

J. T. Law.

Elizabeth, N. J., *July 24, 1954.*

The Honorable Senator Wayne Morse,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: Our prayers are with you in your valiant fight for justice. May God give you the needed strength.

Sincerely,

Marianne Linehan,
Mrs. Robert V. Linehan.

Bethlehem, Pa., *July 24, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Sir: I want you to know that I am with those who are voting for Government control or ownership of atomic energy.

I am also in favor of your stand as a liberal in the issues that come before the Senate.

Sincerely,

Ruth M. Bonsteel,
A Member of the AASW.

Olivia, Minn., *July 23, 1954.*

Dear Senator Morse: You can never know just how many times I have breathed a great feeling of gratitude toward you for the way that you have stood up and been counted for standing up for what is right. It takes courage to do that and that is one of your great tributes. I imagine there are times when it seems that all are against you, but don't despair, for you cannot know that unseen or maybe unheard-of audiences that are behind you and who are thanking you for your tireless efforts to better the lot of the little man.

Right now, as I am writing, you are in there fighting against that atomic energy bill, you and a host of others. All power to you and the rest. We gave away our tidelands oil and now our atomic energy to big business, who will in turn scheme, as has been done before, with foreign countries, and more or less it will be our youth who will pay for it with blood. I read Drew Pearson's article in the St. Paul Dispatch evening paper of July 22 in which he told of the different sellout deals that had been made by some of our big business.

I will close this with saying all power to you and many thanks for the way you dare to stand up and be counted even if you have to stand all alone, but lately you have had plenty of help.

Your friend,
Mrs. Stanley Schnelle.

Jackson, Mich., *July 23, 1954.*
Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D. C.

My Dear Senator Morse: God bless you in your stanch struggle to protect the interests of the small wage earner and consumer. You are ever in the forefront in defending civil rights, upholding the fundamental provisions of our Constitution, and acting as a bulwark for freedom of thought in this age of fear.

We want you to know that you have our prayers for success in the present struggle re atomic energy bill. Bless you for helping stave off the power interests until the people can speak again in November.

Yours very sincerely,
Mr. and Mrs. Frank W. Anderson.

Metuchen, N. J.
Senator Wayne Morse,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator: Your efforts to keep power in public hands were it rightly belongs is greatly appreciated by this citizen.

Sincerely yours,
Donald E. Hall.

Greenville, S. C.,
July 24, 1954.

My Dear Senator Morse: Thank you for your valiant leadership to prevent a gigantic giveaway of our investment in atomic energy.

Yours very truly,
Theodreia S. Lowrey
Mrs. William T. Lowrey.

Los Angeles, Calif.
Senator Wayne Morse,
United States Senate Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Dear Senator Morse: I wish to take this moment to congratulate you on your splendid work in regards to the President's giveaway program. This proves that you were right all along about Mr. Eisenhower's ability. Keep up your good work.

Respectfully,
P. A. Schieldge.

Chicago, Ill., *July 24, 1954.*
Senator Wayne Morse.

Dear Sir: This is to express my great admiration and thanks for your untiring efforts to prevent the giveaway (to put it politely) to private concerns, of the production and sale of atomic power. You, and all those who are fighting this steal, are truly valiant soldiers in the battle to preserve some of the principles upon which this country was founded, but which are being sabotaged by un-Americans in high places.

Yours sincerely,
Emma Schmidt.

Cutchogue, N. Y., *July 22, 1954.*
Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D. C.:

My Dear Senator Morse: I feel that our good President is wrong in the AEC controversy, and I commend your courageous fight for public power. Keep it up.

Yours truly,
Florence F. Foster.

Philadelphia, Pa., *July 23, 1954.*
Hon. Senator Wayne Morse,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Dear Senator: Congratulations for your great effort, your endurance, and your will power in fighting the Atomic Energy Act, and the giveaway program of the Eisenhower administration. The folks at home, and my friends have words of praise for you.

What we need is more Senators like you that will fight this giveaway program. God bless you and wishing you and your dear colleagues in this great legislative battle, great success.

Sincerely,
Solomon Gregar.

Los Angeles, Calif., *July 23, 1954.*
Re atomic energy giveaway
Hon. Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Sir: Under our present Government of big business by big business, for big business, how can you win But thank you anyway for putting up a magnificient fight.

What this country needs, before it is too late, is a real crusade, and I think you are the one to lead it. I would gladly be a missionary for your cause.

Respectfully,
Mrs. Henry W. Taylor.

San Jose, Calif., *July 23, 1954.*

Dear Senator Morse: I want to thank you for what you are doing to stop President Eisenhower's atomic energy giveaway bill from going through. I wish we had more public interested men in Washington like you.

Keep up the good fight.

Sincerely,
William W. Llewellyn,

Stoneham, Mass.
Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: How proud we are of you. My butcher said to me this morning: "Morse has taken the place of Borah, Norris, the LaFollettes, and all the other great liberals."

I just hope God will give you the strength to keep going in your present fight for the American people, but, with so few of the Senators willing to stand out front and take the rap, the fight is in danger of being lost.

I heard you on Frank Edward's radio broadcast last night. You were great, but watch that precious voice of yours; we can't afford to lose that.

Sincerely,
Mrs. Elizabeth C. McDonald,
Secretary, Winchester Democratic Town Commission.

New York, N. Y., *July 20, 1954.*

Dear Senator Morse: I would like to express profound appreciation for the heroic job you are doing trying to stop the giveaway atomic energy bill.

I've been meaning to write a thank you note to you for years, but I didn't think it would mean very much until I was able to rate.

So thank you, thank you, for doing a consistent job of trying to introduce good legislation.

I admire your courage and bravery in standing above, and surely wish that I lived where I could vote for you.

Cordially,
Beatrice Ruth.

Pontiac, Mich., *July 24, 1954.*
Senator Wayne Morse,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator: You will remember me from our correspondence while I was at USVA Center, Biloxi, Miss. I was attempting to obtain a position as veterinarian in your great State of Oregon which was open at the time. While I was awaiting the outcome, I obtained a position here with the city of Pontiac and have been here since, nearly a year. I haven't given up hope of sometime obtaining a position as veterinarian in Oregon, although things have been all right here.

I want to sincerely congratulate you on your wonderful stand on that giveaway power business going on now. You are a hero in my eyes. You are like Theodore Roosevelt.

Sincerely,
Morgan L. Hannahs.

Washington, D. C., *July 25, 1954.*
Hon Wayne L. Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: Today's press quotes you as saying you might become unpopular in the Senate because of your objection to curbing debate on an important issue.

I'm sure such unpopularity will never affect your decisions—remember, Judith is only one of your supporters; my friends and I were there too.

It's a pleasure to say thank you.

Sincerely,
Harold B. Hughes.

La Jolla, Calif., *July 21, 1954.*
Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: What a wonderful stand you are taking for the rights of the people. Many of us appreciate it more than we can tell, so we are sending you worlds of good wishes for your historic fight.

Very sincerely,
Frances Mitchell.

July 25, 1954.

Senator Morse: It's indeed comforting to know that we have at least a few Senators who consider the people's interest in the future more important than their own interests. Don't give up.

Margaret E. Matthews.

Mattapoisett, Mass.,
July 23, 1954.
Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: Cheers, cheers, and more cheers for the liberals of today.

Whatever the result of your efforts, you are making a lasting imprint of valiant men waging a just war of words for the rights of their constituents.

May the Lord bless and keep you and cause His face to shine upon you always is the prayer of your friend,

Mary B. H. Ransom.

Chicago, Ill., *July 22, 1954.*
Mr. Wayne Morse,
Senator from the State of Oregon,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Senator Morse: I congratulate you for fighting those who would give away the public investment in atomic energy. I heard you on Frank Edwards' radio show at 9 this evening and had seen you earlier on a TV program. Keep up the good work. I have written to Senator Hill, too.

Sincerely,
Ed Conners.

Cambridge, Mass., *July 22, 1954.*
Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

My Dear Senator Morse: Not since Senator Norris have these American properties, the natural resources, had such vigorous and steadfast protection.

With appreciation of your courage and cogency; and may your words flourish on the Senate floor.

Heath Jones.
Suzerner W. Niles.

Glen Ellyn, Ill., *July 23, 1954.*

Hon. Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: We wish to commend and thank you for your part in the fight to amend the Atomic Energy Modernization Act and to keep it from passing the Senate in its present reactionary form.

We consider that it is contrary to the public interest for the President to order the Atomic Energy Commission to give a power contract to a competitor of the Tennessee Valley Authority—the Dixon-Yates group—which would receive the contract without competitive bidding and operate tax-free; and for Congress to enact the order into law is outrageous. We hope that you and your colleagues will be able to amend this part of the bill out of existence.

We are also strongly opposed to turning over the entire industrial atomic energy field to private capital. We think the cooperatives and publicly owned utilities should always be given priority for obtaining atomic power for developing their plants. It seems to us that the safeguards against creating monopolistic pools of patents should be strengthened in the bill. From where we sit, the bill looks like a bigger and worse giveaway than the offshore oil bill of infamous memory.

We congratulate you upon your fight against it in its present form and wish you the best of luck in your efforts to amend it.

Very truly yours,

Miss C. Z. Hartman.
Miss F. M. Hartman.

Boise, Idaho, *July 23, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator: Realizing the stupendous efforts you are making in behalf of the people, and after having heard you last evening with Frank Edwards, I want to add my endorsement, as many others are doing, to your ideas of justice.

Since your talk in Boise at the Hells Canyon breakfast, it became more apparent than ever that the people can look to you as a champion of their rights.

Many people here are following with interest the developments of the atomic-energy controversy. We know you will never give up.

We wish Glen Taylor were there to help you now and expecting that he will be in 1955.

With best wishes for the success of your ideas, I am,

Sincerely,

Bertha Thomas.

Seattle, Wash., *July 23, 1954.*

Dear Senator Morse: I have long admired your courage and fighting spirit, and only wish we had more men in our Government who were as honest and courageous in doing all in their power for the American people. I do hope that you, Senator Gore, and others will win this present struggle for us.

Most sincerely,

Mrs. D. Robbins.

Berkeley, Calif., *July 23, 1954.*

The Honorable Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: Last night I listened with great interest and appreciation to your report—over the radio broadcast of Frank Edwards—of what is going on in the Senate at the present time, and to your part in it. It is the part that I always expect you to take when it is a matter of the rights and interest of the people being jeopardized by politically powerful special interests.

Please accept my heartfelt thanks.

Gratefully yours,

Laura McAllister Carver.

Corona, Calif., *July 22, 1954.*

Dear Mr. Morse: I have your form letter of the 16th, and I write these few lines to express my appreciation of your stand in attempting to prevent the private power companies from grabbing federally owned and operated powerplants.

I am somewhat familiar with the attempt to get control of atomic energy for this purpose. It is not a pretty picture.

Whenever I get the opportunity in groups at which I am speaking or leading study groups I bring out these facts and mention you men who are trying to prevent the steal.

More power to you in your fight.

Sincerely,

F. Bruce Ellis,
Pastor, the First Methodist Church.

Berkeley, Calif., *July 23, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

My Dear Senator Morse: I'm very glad of the fight you and a number of devoted Senators are putting up about the AEC bill. I hope you can continue so as to get the whole thing tabled. I believe the whole Eisenhower program is obnoxious.

Thank you, Senator Lister Hill, Senators Gore, Lehman, Humphrey, Kefauver, for all you are doing.

Sincerely,

O. K. Powers.

Syracuse University,
Syracuse, N. Y., July 24, 1954.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Honorable Sir: This note is merely our way of joining the thousands of liberals in the United States who will be congratulating you in your fight on atomic energy and TVA and who would, as it were, be upholding your arms in prayer until a victory is won for the American people in this matter.

Very sincerely yours,

William C. Lehmann.
Jane S. Lehmann.

Seattle, Wash., *July 23, 1954.*

Dear Senator Wayne Morse: The Mrs. and I heard you in Seattle at few months ago. We're hearing you now. She phoned me, "Send a letter pronto to him," she said.

Go to it; give 'em hell. We donwanna any more Insulls and donwanna sell the Capitol, or, shall I say, do not give it away.

Mark M. Litchman.
Sophie M. Litchman.

Remember Teapot Dome.

Wheeler, Mich., *July 22, 1954.*

The Honorable Wayne Morse,
Senator From Oregon,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Sir: May I thank you for bringing the problem of the giveaway program involving the atomic-energy action to the attention of the public.

It is to be hoped that this new spotlight on the nondemocratic action of the present administration will result in the illumination of the whole unfortunate program. It may be that your sincerity will prompt your speech to quotable quotes which may inspire our people to overthrow these grab actions; perhaps you can fire many to the realization of the danger inherent in the rule of an economic majority.

I am the general public, and I am inspired by the kind of leadership which you represent. Your point of view in this discussion of the use of public power spells to me the kind of democratic action which should characterize our representatives. It appears to me that many are coming to fear the encroachment of those interests which dominate the political aspects of our Government. It will surely be encouraging to these many to recognize in you, and those who think like you, a real friend at court.

I have the honor to remain,

Most sincerely yours,

J. Hudson Snow.

Goshen, Ind., *July 23, 1954.*

Dear Senator Morse: I wish to congratulate you on your magnificent efforts along with Senators Hill and Gore to block the Eisenhower atomic-energy giveaway program.

It is shameful that a man of such distinction as President Eisenhower would deliberately try to scuttle a public-owned project and wreck TVA by ordering the AEC to get its power through the Yates-Dixon syndicate, a private gang with $$$ in its eyes, a faction which was hastily created only a few days ago. Either the President was badly misinformed as to the real effects of application of such a big private deal or else this is his way of winning recognition by big business (as if he hasn't already) as being a full-fledged member of the gougers of the public.

We the people are behind you all the way in your fight for us. We will keep this gallant fight in mind in November. Keep up the good work.

Very truly yours,

Darl K. Stump.

Law School of Harvard University,
Cambridge, Mass., July 23, 1954.

Senator Wayne Morse,
The Congress, Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: Thank you very much for your efforts in trying to save the people's wealth for all the people. First tidelands oil and now atomic power. My wife and I think you are wonderful.

With best wishes for many successful campaigns.

Sincerely yours,

Benjamin M. Shieber.

Red Wing, Minn., *July 24, 1954.*

Hon. Wayne Morse,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Sir: I want to take this opportunity to thank you for all you are doing on behalf of the people of these United States in trying to save for them their greatest asset, atomic power.

You have no easy row to hoe to put your point across to the Senate, but I earnestly hope you succeed. Without men like you the assets and natural resources of the country, which belong to all of the people, would have been given away to the few who are so anxious to obtain them for private gain without regard to public benefit.

While this letter is addressed to you, it is intended for all of the Senators who are fighting with you in this debate to halt the inroads on our natural resources and assets.

I speak with some experience when I say that you have quite a foe in the private power industry. As a member of the City Council of the city of Red Wing, I have watched them maneuver to get the rates desired by one means or another.

My best wishes for success in your debate.

Yours truly,

John B. Friedrich.

Portland Oreg., *July 23, 1954.*

Dear Senator Morse: Congratulations on your filibuster, but please don't make yourself ill. We can't get along without you.

All good wishes. God bless you.

Sincerely,

Mrs. Vivian Stratton.

Hillsboro, Oreg., *July 23, 1954.*

The Honorable Wayne Morse,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator: Hooray for you and all the other Senators who are publicizing the AEC bill. The Oregonian gave you front-page feature spot today. How they would love to have you on their side.

Keep up the tea drinking; it is wonderful for a pick-me-up. Take good care of yourself. Oregon needs you, and all conservation lovers.

Yours truly,
Mrs. Henry P. Desinger.

Salem, Oreg., *July 24, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Morse: Thank you very much for the Senator Morse Reports, for your radio talks, and your voting record.

Heard you Thursday night and Senator Humphrey last night on the Frank Edwards news broadcast which we get at 10:50 p. m. over KSLM.

We agree 100 percent on your stand on the atomic bill now before the Senate.

Many thanks to you and the other Senators who are working so very hard for our interests.

Sincerely,
Arthur L. Schulz,
Remoh Schulz.

Portland, Oreg., *July 23, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: Many thanks for the great work you and so few others are doing to try to protect our natural resources.

Sincerely,
Mrs. William Hoffstetter.

Milton-Freewater, Oreg., *July 24, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: Keep fighting on the atomic power issue. The people are with you. The present administration believe they have a license to steal.

Yours truly,
Richard Kolberg.

Portland, Oreg., *July 24, 1954.*

Senator Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington D. C.:

Hooray for you. We're rooting for you and those with you who would not give all we have away to private interests. With pride I say,

Your friend,
Pearl D. Tuttle.

Beaverton, Oreg., *July 24, 1954.*

Dear Senator Morse: Please accept our thanks for your efforts to keep their heritage for our six grandchildren. Thanks also for former efforts in their behalf.

Yours very truly,
Mrs. May S. Dodson.
Guy R. Dodson.

P. S.—Extend our thanks to other Senators working with you.

Portland, Oreg., *July 22, 1954.*

Hon. Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

My Dear Senator Morse: My husband and I commend you for your courageous fight against the administration's atomic energy legislation. If the people of our country had more farsighted leaders of your stature, they could afford to be indifferent, but many of us are boiling mad about the attempts of little men in our Government to give away the great resources of our country with no thought to our future needs.

We feel fortunate to have you as our Senator and thank you very much for the good work you have done.

Sincerely yours,
Mr. and Mrs. William Striplin.

Beaverton, Oreg., *July 23, 1954.*

Dear Senator Morse: Wish to tell you how much we all appreciate what you are doing in the Senate to prevent the betrayal of the public by the Eisenhower administration. This is the worst yet; it is far worse than the Harding administration. Even though you fail, we want to thank you for your efforts in our behalf.

Yours very truly,
J. R. Willis.

Portland, Oreg., *July 23, 1954.*

Hon. Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

My Dear Senator: I want to congratulate you on your concerted effort to stop the passage of the atomic energy bill sponsored by the White House. What we need is more and more Senators like yourself, Senator Gore, and others who are for the people first.

When it comes to a giveaway program, this administration makes the Harding administration look like a peewee.

Very best wishes.

Sincerely yours,
Mrs. Edith G. McConkey.

Corvallis, Oreg., *July 22, 1954.*

Hon. Wayne L. Morse,
Senator from Oregon, the Senate,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: I heartily congratulate you on your leadership of the attack upon those who would exploit atomic powerplants for private interest.

Yours truly,
Ray S. Hewitt.

North Platte, Nebr.,
July 25, 1954.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: You are doing a real job in this fight. I wish that I could be with you to pump more air into your fight. There have been times I could have beaned you, but you have redeemed all of my esteem.

Well, Senator, keep up the good work and don't give in.

In many ways you have got a rough deal from the party in past years, but you seem to have the stuff it takes to show the boys, and I am for you.

Sincerely,
G. J. Pass.

Long Island City, N. Y.,
July 24, 1954.

Senator Morse,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Sir: Courage. Continue to fight.
Mr. and Mrs. Kunzwell.

New York, N. Y.
July 25, 1954.

Senator Wayne F. Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Dear Senator Morse: In your capacity as United States Senator at large, though paradoxically and necessarily still depending upon your reelection from the Oregon electorate, may I agree and encourage your current stand against handing over to public utilities the atomic energy discoveries which we taxpayers have subsidized with our $12 billion of risk capital.

Should it be required to compromise this impasse, may I suggest that these private enterprises repay the taxpayers for the large sum which we have invested.

Thank you.
Sidney Feldman.

New York, N. Y.,
July 25, 1954.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Thanks for your courage and leadership in trying to block the atomic energy giveaway. Please, please keep up the fight until the bitter end. Here's hoping that democracy may still win, for giving to private industry tax supported developments is economic slavery.

Edna R. Hamburger.

Philadelphia, Pa.,
July 24, 1954.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Sir: You deserve a lot of credit in your fight against the giveaway program.
James J. Geraghty.

Philadelphia, Pa.,
July 24, 1954.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Sir: Congratulations on your fight against the power interests. Keep up the good work.

Elizabeth Geraghty.

Santa Monica, Calif.,
July 22, 1954.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D. C.

Senator Morse: I fully support your stand on the atomic power giveaway.

Good luck in your fight and unswerving support of the average citizen.

Respectfully,
Gerald Leairtt.

Los Angeles, Calif.,
July 24, 1954.

Hon. Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

My Dear Senator Morse: Permit an individual, not one of your constituents or even an Oregonian by origin, to send you a transcontinental pat on the back and a most hearty plea: Don't give way to the great giveaway.

In these days it is heartening to see a man stand up and open his mouth for the commonwealth, not for the common wealthy corps.

In admiration,
H. Arthur Klein.

Excelsior, Minn., *July 24, 1954.*

Hon. Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: God bless you and Humphrey and associates. The Eisenhower administration will give away to big business everything that is not tied down by you good defenders of the people. May the Lord above give you strength to stand against forces of monopoly.

W. A. McDonald.

Seattle, Wash., *July 24, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: Keep talking.
Ken Moritz.

Bowling Green, Ohio, *July 24, 1954.*

Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Mr. Morse: Congratulations on your farsighted viewpoint of the future. Keep up the good work. I'm completely in accord with your policy.

George Williams.

Tontogany, Ohio, *July 24, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Mr. Morse: Congratulations on your farsighted viewpoint of the future. Keep up the good work. I am completely in accord with your policy.

L. E. McCullough.

Santa Barbara, Calif., *July 22, 1954.*

Hon. Senator Morse,
United States Senate,
Capitol Building, Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: This card is to let you know I support your stand on the current atomic issue.

Yours truly,

Mrs. E. Wilkes.

Lamoni, Iowa, *July 23, 1954.*

Senator Morse,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.

Dear Sir: My heartiest cheers for the victory for public use of power. Many of us have been holding our breath in fear that the private-enterprise people might steal this power plan. We're for you.

Helen Harrington.

New York, N. Y., *July 24, 1954.*

Hon. Wayne Morse,
Senator, State of Oregon,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: More power to you and to your colleagues who are fighting another attempted grab of the national domain. Keep it up; the people are behind you. May the good Lord bless you and give you strength.

Sincerely,

E. J. Samut.

Jersey City, N. J., *July 24, 1954.*

United States Senator Wayne Morse,
United States Senator From Oregon,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Sir: I consider that you are doing a wonderful thing for the people of the United States of America in bringing to their attention the apparent attempt of the power groups to plunder the people's atomic resources.

Sincerely,

Edward O'Hare.

Chicago, Ill., *July 25, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: Thank you for fighting against the AEC bill as now drawn. We taxpayers and citizens ought to be grateful, and this one is.

Very truly yours,

Dorethy Yarnell Barton,
Mrs. George E. Barton, Jr.

Brooklyn, N. Y., *July 23, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: Congratulations and thanks for your courageous stand against the giveaway program.

Sincerely yours,

Charles H. McGuire.

P. S.—Let's start calling it EGAP.

C. H. M.

Fresno, Calif., *July 23, 1954.*

Dear Senator: People like you are the salt of the earth. Thank God, we have a number of courageous Americans that dare to put up a fight against giving over to billionaires and multimillionaires the natural resources that belong to all the people in a government of for and by the people. The Government paid for the development of atomic power and it belongs to the Federal Government. Please, keep up the fight. Senator Flanders is also a Member of which we can be proud. With a prayer in my heart I am yours,

Mrs. E. Jones.

P. S.—I sincerely hope you receive this card.

Mrs. E. J.

Los Angeles, Calif., *July 23, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D. C.:

Don't let them give atomic energy away.

Good for you.

Creighton Hall.

Syracuse, N. Y., *July 23, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: Please keep up your fight to protect the public interest. We have been following the whole program of the administration regarding public lands and conservation, and are convinced that if people knew what has been done in the last 2 years they would object strongly.

Mr. and Mrs. H. Spiren.

New York, N. Y., *July 24, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator: Congratulations and thanks for your efforts on our behalf. We are eagerly awaiting November.

Gertrude and Herbert J. Salomon.

Toledo, Ohio, *July 23, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D. C.

Honorable Senator: I address you, sir, as symbolic of your colleagues who are protesting against the administration's desire to permit the Dixon-Yates firm to provide power at lopsided profit as against TVA, thus weakening the latter and possibly providing a wedge which would mean more of the same kind of shenanigan in the future.

We appreciate what you are attempting to do and wish you every success.

This could also be a deterrent to such agreements as tidelands oil, etc.

Thank you all very much.

Sincerely,

Helen M. Hagemeyer.

Boise, Idaho, *July 23, 1954.*

Wayne Morse,
United States Senator,
Senate Offices, Washington, D. C.:

Splendid work in preventing the gigantic Eisenhower giveaway of all our resources.

Best of wishes always.

Mitchell.

Cape Elizabeth, Maine, *July 23, 1954.*

Hon. Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Wayne: You are again, as usual, in the forefront of the good fight.

I thank you.

Robert J. Saunders.

Scarsdale, N. Y., *July 22, 1954.*

Hon. Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Sir: I wish there were more Senators with your courage and integrity—men who really had the interest and welfare of the Nation in their hearts.

How grateful all the people in the States should be that, at least, we do have you to fight for us.

Most gratefully yours,

(Mrs. William) Verne Wright.

Chicago, Ill., *July 23, 1954.*

Hon. Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: I thank you for the valiant fight you are making in behalf of all of us. We agree that the present administration is certainly misguided in its policy in regard to public power.

Sincerely yours,

Stina Ekenod Hillman.

Columbus, Ohio, *July 24, 1954.*

Hon. Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Honorable Sir: The courageous stand you and your colleagues are taking and the efforts expended on the issue of the selling of atomic-energy plants to private enterprise is sincerely appreciated, as are all of your loyalty to truth and convictions in your work of lawmaking.

Yours truly,

Mrs. Lucille K. Grumley.

St. Louis, Mo., *July 21, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse.

Dear Sir: Thank you for your talk on KSO Thursday night and your interest in avoiding giving a monopoly to private interests on atomic energy or any other peoples' property.

Yours very truly,

J. J Lekar.
Miss Vivian Lekar.
Joe Vogel.

Western Springs, Ill., *July 24, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: We are proud of you for your constant championing of the people's rights. James Madison in 1788 said, "I believe there are more instances of the abridgment of the freedom of the people by gradual and silent encroachments of those in power than by violent and sudden usurpations." Keep up the good fight. Don't take time to answer this.

Mrs. W. G. Merz.

Mount Vernon, N. Y., *July 24, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: That's a wonderful fight you are making against the multibillion dollar plunder of the Nation's atomic power. Keep up the fine work, even if you and allied Dems have to talk until next Christmas.

Sincerely,

Allen Klein.

Paterson, N. J., *July 24, 1954.*

Senator Morse,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Morse: Keep up the good work because somebody has to represent the people of the United States.

Yours truly,

Joseph Cucchiaroni.

Lansing, Mich., *July 23, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator: I must express my admiration and gratitude to you for the leading part you took in fighting the Eisenhower giveaway of atomic power to private interests. The people of Oregon can be proud of themselves for having picked as courageous and sincere a man as yourself to represent them.

Sincerely,

A. CAVALARI.

SEATTLE, WASH., *July 23, 1954.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Keep talking.

E. and K. WIDMER.

TACOMA, WASH., *July 23, 1954.*

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Cannot send you fresh roses; but with all my best thoughts and wishes I hope you keep up your good fight against the power stead of the big industries and the giveaways of the Eisenhower administration.

MINNIE O. PRENTICE.

ESSEX, N. Y., *July 24, 1954.*

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Chambers, Washington D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Keep up the fight. Save atomic energy for the country and the people to whom it belongs.

Sincerely yours,

ALLEN KAPLAN.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *July 24, 1954.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

HON. SENATOR MORSE: I wish to commend you for your energetic effort to prevent our natural resources from being given away—for your opposition to the atomic energy bill.

Sincerely yours,

CLEVE WHISMAN.

SANTA MONICA, CALIF., *July 23, 1954.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you for the great fight you are making to save TVA and keep atomic energy for the people. I only wish that my Senators were helping you in this. Anyway, I want you to know that some of us appreciate what you are doing.

Sincerely,

GLADYS QUISENBERRY.

MOBERLY, MO., *July 23, 1954.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: May God give you strength to carry on, and allow you to do what you must do in order that the people will finally understand what a dreadful step is about to be taken.

Why don't you become a Democrat? I used to be Republican, too!

Mrs. W. LA MONTAINE.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *July 24, 1954.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am deeply grateful to you for the efforts you are making to protect our rights in atomic energy developments, during the present argument in the Senate.

Yours respectfully,

CARLOTA D. THERASHA.

WEST WINFIELD, N. Y., *July 24, 1954.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: Please do not let the administration give away my share of atomic energy. Keep up the good work.

Voter W. C. TRUEX.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *July 24, 1954.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you for your present splendid efforts to preserve our rights in atomic power.

Respectfully,

BOYNE GRAINGER.

SHRUB OAK, N. Y., *July 24, 1954.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: More power to you who are trying to save America for all Americans and not for a privileged few.

Very truly yours,

MAURICE A. SELLERS.
PHYLLIS K. SELLERS.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *July 24, 1954.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Bravo on your terrific fight against the atomic steal. Keep up the good work.

Sincerely,

BEATRICE SCHAPPER.

BROOKLYN, N .Y., *July 22, 1954.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: As our favorite out-of-State Senator, please accept our congratulations on your heroic efforts to expose the giveaway practices of the public resources to private interests.

We are happy to see that other Senators are beginning to share your views on this matter. Your fight will not be in vain if it serves to arouse the people in this year's elections.

Very sincerely yours,

A. SAIFER.

Order of Business

SPEECH

OF

HON. SAM RAYBURN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 23, 1954

(Mr. RAYBURN asked and was given permission to address the House.)

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I want to inquire what the program is. It is now Saturday. Every State in the Union that I know anything about that has a primary, when there were contests in it, we transacted no business on that day. So, I want to ask the gentleman from Indiana, or the Speaker, what we are going to do about Texas primary day. There are six members on the Texas delegation that think their opposition is serious enough that they be in the State of Texas. They can be here Monday, that is, the majority can. Now, I just want to know if our State is going to be treated like the other States. We on this side have always agreed that when there was a primary in any State we would have no business transacted important enough on which a roll would be called.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I have tried as best I could to protect the Members when their primaries were held, and likewise conventions. Unfortunately, on an occasion or two it has not been possible to do that. I recall that I was in difficulty with the Connecticut Members and also with the Members from Wisconsin and also California. I must also say to the gentleman that as we discussed the program for the week, and as we progressed up to date and through today, when there were conversations about whether we would vote today or whether we would go over until tomorrow, the first time any Member of the Texas delegation or the gentleman from Texas spoke to me about the necessity of keeping tomorrow clear for the Texas primaries was an hour or so ago when the gentleman spoke to me.

Mr. RAYBURN. I spoke to the gentleman previously. He must have forgotten. I am sure that I spoke to him about it earlier in the day, and I certainly spoke to the Speaker about it earlier in the day.

Mr. HALLECK. My memory might fail me, but I must say that I have no such recollection of the gentleman so stating to me. Now, not having had any such request from anybody from the Texas delegation——

Mr. RAYBURN. Well, I am a member of the Texas delegation, you know.

Mr. HALLECK. That is right. The gentleman spoke to me about it about an hour ago in the Speaker's lobby.

Mr. RAYBURN. That was the second time, as I remember it.

Mr. HALLECK. A great many Members have asked me as to what the situation would be if there was a demand for the reading of the engrossed copy of the bill. Of course, I must say that I am very sorry that there has been such a demand, because I am quite sure we all know very much what is in the bill and could have gone on ahead tonight and concluded action on the bill and had the matter back of us, and we would not have been in this difficulty. The gentleman has said that these absent members of the Texas delegation will be here Monday?

Mr. RAYBURN. I do not say all of them will. I think 3 or 4 of the 6 will be here Monday. I know 3 of them will be here Monday.

Mr. HALLECK. As I say, it embarrasses me, I might say to the gentleman, because I have said to so many of our Members that if there were a demand for the engrossed copy, the vote on the bill would be had tomorrow.

Of course, in view of the situation that we have in respect to the primaries if, under the circumstances, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] insists on it, I have no alternative but to put this vote over to Monday.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I must insist. I have never made an unreasonable request of anybody in my life. I have thought that we ought to do for the State of Texas what we do for every other State in the matter of the primaries. Mr. Speaker, I have had my say.

Imports of Foreign Oil

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 15, 1954

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, unless action is taken by the Congress or some power is exerted by the executive department of the Government, we will add to the present surplus of farm commodities a supply of oil commodities, and, in fact, have a tremendous surplus of oil commodities on hand now.

Time has proven that we should have passed legislation when it was before the last session of Congress to limit oil imports that are flooding the Nation, causing us to cutback and to continue to cutback our domestic productive capacity, and at the same time crowding our storage capacity, which has brought about a situation where the pipelines are reducing their purchase of oil, in some instances, by 30 percent, which has caused a reduction of crude oil, in some instances, of 12 cents per barrel, and is throwing out of work thousands of men in southern Illinois and the Nation, many of whom will have to revert to unemployment compensation. Their earning power is stopped, and with it the taxes the Government would receive if these men could remain employed.

This condition has been brought about by a few American oil companies bringing in oil from the Middle East and other places, which is working a great hardship on the small independent operators as well as doing great damage to the economy of the various States and the Nation.

In 1949 imports of foreign oil averaged about 784,000 barrels a day. That is as much oil as should be permitted to come into this country daily at the present time, yet, these imports have increased to one million barrels of foreign oil a day.

It is the responsibility of the Congress and the Executive Department to use whatever means they have to reduce foreign oil imports at the earliest possible date, to a reasonable level.

Mr. Speaker, these excess imports have created a very serious condition in the oil industry in the entire nation. I have in my hand two telegrams recently received which I am including in the Record. These will give you some idea of the condition that has been brought about among the independent oil producers in my State of Illinois, and may I say, this same condition is present in Indiana, Kentucky, and generally among the independent producers, and major producers as well, through the Nation:

Mount Carmel, Ill., *July 21, 1954.*

Hon. Charles W. Vursell,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

The independent oil producers of Illinois met spontaneously this week at Fairfield, Ill., alarmed and much disturbed over the recent cutback or proration and reduction of price by two of the largest purchasers of crude oil in the basin. This gathering represented 50,000 barrels daily oil of the total 180,000 barrels produced in the State of Illinois. A committee of nine, including myself, was appointed to contact our representatives in Washington, including the President calling to their attention the alarming and serious situation confronting us.

I was likewise appointed chairman of a special committee from our Rotary Club for a mass meeting with other civic clubs and chambers of commerce who are disturbed along with farmers and land owners. The entire business of the State and Nation will be seriously affected unless some means of relief is immediately obtained to help this situation and protect us against import oil and import buyers flooding our market to the detriment of the entire Nation.

We here cannot be compared in many respects with Western States where they primarily have large ranches and leaseholds as compared with our small farms with low oil reserves and an average production of seven barrels per day per well in Illinois, and with the drilling of each well committing us to drill on the small adjacent farms to protect them against drainage, we certainly should not be called upon to stand proration. Under such circumstances, we cannot carry out our commitments and obligations under this proration and the condition can easily become disastrous.

I know that our Representative in Washington with the aid of the good offices of the President should be able to remedy this situation. The oil operators asked for 50 percent reduction in import oil instead of the steady increase which we have been getting, which will greatly relieve our serious situation and the present national economy.

If it would help our cause to show the seriousness of this present situation, you can be furnished with at least 100,000 immediate spontaneous signatures to telegrams, letters, or petitions showing that this entire community is up in arms and at the stage of demanding militant action.

The school boards have just informed me that this reduction will greatly decrease their tax revenue, thereby impairing the present building program to replace the now extremely inadequate school facilities.

J. Roy Dee,
Member of the Committee, of the Combined Organizations of Oil Producers.

Carmi, Ill., *July 23, 1954.*

Congressman Charles W. Vursell,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Our local economy is seriously affected by recent curtailment of oil production. Fifty percent of local commerce is dependent upon the oil industry. We are not begging for subsidies of any kind, but are aware of the serious domestic results of imports of foreign oil. As representatives of the commerce industry and welfare of White County, we urge congressional action to curb imports of oil.

Carmi Chamber of Commerce,
George H. Schanzle, *President.*

The Eagle and the Storm

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 22, 1954

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the new 4-cent airmail stamp, to be issued by the Post Office in September, for use on post cards, underscores the significance of the American spirit and recalls a legend of the eagle and the storm.

Displayed in the Washington Post and Times Herald on Friday, July 23, 1954, the new airmail stamp shows a beautiful uncrowned, bald-headed American eagle in powerful flight, high in the clouds. It moves with an ease that arrests the eye.

Legend has it that when severe storms come, some birds flee in fright to hide in the lee of any convenient shelter. Others continue head on into the wind, flying until exhausted. The American Eagle, symbol of our Nation, spirit of our people, soars above the storm and keeps going.

The Post Office is to be congratulated for issuing a stamp which underscores so well the American spirit.

More on the Reinsurance Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILL E. NEAL

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 27, 1954

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, the reinsurance bill, rejected by the House and returned to committee, would create ananother bureau under the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The first 5 years the administrative costs would be borne by the general funds of the Treasury. It sets up a fund of $25 million to be used in a trial and error effort to develop a basis upon which the theory of reinsurance can be made to serve the medical needs of a greater number of people under the prepayment principle. This fund, after 5 years, supported by the payment of a percentage of total net collections from subscribers of carriers voluntarily participating, will then become a revolving fund to be administered by the Secretary.

The expressed object of the bill is to find ways and means of extending coverage of voluntary prepaid insurance. It makes no reference to compulsory coverage or to individuals and groups who are now without protection because of physical limitations or financial status. Therefore, it would seem to serve no useful purpose except to relieve those individual subscribers whose medical and hospital bills exceed the sums provided for in their contracts with carriers. Few subscribers experience this condition. However, in cases of prolonged illness and hospital confinement this does become a matter of serious concern to subscribers. It is here that any form of reinsurance would serve a great need if it could be made self-supporting.

Blue Cross and Blue Shield nonprofit organizations, together with many insurance companies, have been adopting the prepaid principle of health insurance over a comparatively short period of time, but with remarkable success. During the course of their wide expansion they have accumulated a great store of financial and statistical information, experience tables upon which they can plan extensions of coverage to more employed and individual groups on a financially sound basis. Operating as individual units, serving area groups living under varying social and economic conditions, they are able to determine local needs and rates and extent of coverage best suited to the community. By cooperative interchange of experience, each group can learn of the successes and pitfalls of others. Each group is entitled to advice and counsel of statistical and financial experts who have learned their lessons from actual participation in the growth and development of the program. It is the American way of solving local problems locally by local planners who understand local needs. It would be difficult to see how politically appointed Government Administrators could possess the background to perform a better job by issuing orders out of Washington than that being done with increasing success by those who have evolved the prepaid-insurance program.

As mentioned before, this bill providing reinsurance is not designed to protect that large group which cannot qualify for coverage. It affects only those who are employed and can afford the premiums. If reinsurance is needed to take care of those subscribers whose medical bills run beyond the contract provisions, then carriers can and probably will develop plans for such reinsurance. For this privilege, of course, they would be charged an extra premium, but the same cost would have to be paid if Government performed the same function as provided by this bill. In any event, reinsurance can be less expensively carried on by existing insuring agencies than can be done by Government, since they have at hand the facts of experience upon which to project plans.

There is, however, a sadly neglected group of citizens which the proponents of this bill seem to think can be covered eventually through a 5-year trial experimental period set out in this bill. I can see no chance that this will eventuate when reinsurance cannot be interpreted to protect those who for various reasons are unable to qualify for protection under prepaid contracts.

It is a distressing experience to see old men and women with no income, no old age pensions, no social security, and no friends or relatives, trying to exist on the meagre allowances they may be fortunate enough to receive from the inadequate or improperly allotted relief funds. They live in slum quarters on barely sufficient aid to pay their rent, to say nothing of food. Any medical service they get is usually limited to 1 or 2 calls authorized by a DPA inspector who will pay the doctor $2 for the first and $1 for each authorized call thereafter. If illness is acute and deserves hospitalization, it is often days before a bed is available. Sometimes too late. No one knows this better than the general practitioner of the large number of seniles, who for want of funds or friends are compelled to spend their ending days in rented rooms or in homes willing to provide food and bed for a meagre allowance provided by relief agencies. The number of unfortunate people who come under this neglected group can get no health insurance. Of course, reinsurance is of no benefit to them. Nor does it help the blind, the disabled, the widows, indigents and dependent children, whose care is too often placed in the hands of persons eager enough to take the pittance allowed by relief agencies, but who do little to provide the home life and comforts these people deserve. Federal and State funds are inadequate for those in real need. All the more so when depleted to encourage malingerers.

So, instead of adopting legislation to authorize an additional governmental agency of brain trusters and economists to tell us what to do, why not work through existing local and State agencies, placing more emphasis on more successfully implementing the provisions of Public Law 482, entitled "An act to be known as the Medical Facilities Survey and Construction Act of 1954." Part G of this act provides for construction of diagnostic or treatment centers, chronic disease hospitals, rehabilitation centers and nursing homes. Such facilities, in sufficient numbers and made to function properly, together with provisions for the timely care of indigents acutely ill, will do more to solve the medical needs of our people than anything else.

If I may add a word of criticism, I would say that doctors and patients alike are much to blame for the so-called high cost of medical care. Too many doctors hang on to their patients longer than is necessary, and too many patients insist on prolonging treatment beyond need. In either event, the costs increase needlessly. Doctors find it easier to treat their patients in hospitals than in their homes. Thus, to lighten their load or to satisfy the whims of their patients, they utilize hospital beds that otherwise would be available for patients more severely ill. Since the advent of prepaid hospital service, daily bed attendance has grown by leaps and bounds. Beds are seldom available for acutely ill patients because they are occupied by people who have little excuse for being there except that they are entitled to this service under their contracts. Many patients who for good and sufficient reasons should be hospitalized for observation and diagnosis are informed all beds are engaged for days and sometimes for many weeks ahead. Even ambulance cases are sometimes turned back at the receiving station for lack of accommodations. Under prepayment health contracts, that allow special fees for classified services, both doctors and hospitals permit the full use of diagnostic or treatment facilities even though not specifically indicated. Does anyone think that this all too human weakness would not tend to encourage higher medical and hospital costs when covered by reinsurance contracts?

There is too much tendency on the part of those who would socialize medicine to evaluate medical care in terms of its cost. This is not correct. Good medical care does not necessarily need to be prohibitive because of its cost. The conscientious doctor, willing to inquire into a patient's background, evaluate his environmental influences, make full use of his five sense to discover abnormal conditions, and put his patient's mind at ease, can ofttimes do far more for him than any expensive diagnostic routine at the hands of specialists who seem unable or unwilling to perform these services without the aid of the hospital and its equipment. This method of practice is still observed by the few general practitioners left and by the psychiatrists, but rarely by specialists. So, with doctors preferring to treat patients in hospitals, with patients, though not too ill, receptive to the luxury of a couple of weeks' rest and personal attention, and with the accommodations already paid for under the contract with the carrying agency, it is hard to know just where to place the blame for the existing overcrowded conditions of our general hospitals and the attendant high cost of medical care.

The diagnosis, control, prevention, and treatment of disease has gone far toward prolonging life, preventing epidemics, minimizing suffering, and rehabilitating the handicapped. In spite of the critics who charge a lack of adequate medical care, the people of America as a whole enjoy the most comprehensive care of any people of the world. Its cost is high but little, if any, out of proportion to increased costs of every other commodity or service we enjoy. It may truthfully be said that doctors' fees are sometimes excessive, but when patients encourage high-priced doctors and continue to judge their ability in terms of their fees they need expect no lowering of fee standards. People have learned and accustomed themselves to depend too much on the advice and judgment of doctors who must be paid to do for them or tell them how to do the commonsense things that they should do for themselves through reliance on their own mother wit.

We are living in a changing world. With these changes, medicine, like everything else, must undergo evolution. Economic changes with an evergrowing and shifting population create new conditions to which medical care must be adjusted. Lack of uniformity makes every problem one of direct local interest and should, therefore, be adjusted according to the circumstances. Medical service administered from the national level is incapable of solving innumerable health problems in as many separate areas of the land.

The Public Health Service has done the country a valuable service. Its role of disseminating information, intended to improve health, sanitary measures, and disease prevention, should be encouraged and adequately supported financially. Federal aid to State and local communities for the purpose of construction of facilities to provide decent care for those who, for reasons beyond their control, are no longer able to care for themselves is a moral obligation and should be so accepted. It is, also, a local responsibility for the local communities to assume control of the operation of these facilities without any administrative aid from the Government.

The Nation will always face medical problems. These problems will vary with varying local conditions. Their solution can best be met through local effort. Voluntary prepaid medical care is an advanced step in the right direction. If not too generally abused it will continue to grow in popularity. Otherwise it will defeat its own purpose, and its facilities will be used simply as places of rest, thereby making hospital beds unavailable for those who need emergency care, and, through the use of insured privileges, result eventually in increased costs beyond the ability of subscribers to pay. In addition to the initial fund of $25 million provided in this bill, additional costs of administration from Washington down through the State and communities only adds to an already staggering sum to exact from the taxpayer.

If, even after 5 years of experiment, ways can be found to extend voluntary coverage through the method of reinsurance, this same knowledge will become available to Government agents only as it is developed through the ever-existing purpose of insuring agencies to provide such coverage. In short, it is a case of Government duplicating the effort of existing agencies.

If this agency is established to operate a fund and this fund should become exhausted during periods of unusual demands, the temptation to utilize the agency to take over control of the costs of medical care on a national level will be too great to resist. Then only the taxpayer is left to carry the load.

So it would appear clear that the Federal Government is authorizing an agency at its own cost to compile facts already developed by insurance carriers through years of practical experience on the assumption that Government specialists can show them how to improve their service.

To summarize: This bill adds another central Government bureau to the all too many sharing the tax dollar. It opens the back door for Government to get into the insurance business. Reinsurance, under this bill, would aid only those who are financially able to carry prepaid contracts. It assumes Government planners can do a better job than practical people possessing a background of experience. It does nothing to improve the lot of that great number of unfortunates who cannot qualify for insurance must must remain at the mercy of relief rolls and local charity. If reinsurance is found to be practical at reasonable cost, the carriers are in better shape to find the solution than is Government. Reinsurance, like prepaid protection, can be effective only so long as the subscriber's income will support it. Once Government enters the field, no one can predict the extent to which social legislation may involve it in State medicine.

If we want to continue the American way, Government should not undertake the responsibility of solving local problems that should and can be better resolved locally in the interest of specific localities.

Girl Scouting: An Investment in America's Future Pays Off Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 27, 1954

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, America is proud of its Girl Scouts. Our great Nation has every reason to be proud of them.

They embody, in a single group, the finest traditions of our glorious past and the promise of untold progress yet to come.

They give efficiency to the family, practical help to the community, good government to the State, unity to the Nation, and a powerful bond of friendship to the suffering world.

They represent, foster, and encourage the highest, the noblest qualities of American womanhood.

An article entitled "Take Hold of the Thread of Scouting" appeared in Parade, the Sunday pictorial magazine of the Washington (D. C.) Post and Times-Herald, on July 25, 1954. I should like to include this timely observation by Dorothy C. Stratton, national executive director of the Girl Scouts of the United States of America, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

When the youngsters in the polio ward of the Children's Hospital in Boston organized a Girl Scout troop, they wondered how they could have the good-night circle in which all girls join hands. The beds were too far apart, and even if they had been close together, they still would have been too far—for some of the children could not raise their arms.

Then one little Scout said, "Let's get a ball of string and run it across the beds. If we hold the string it will be like holding hands."

To me this story is symbolic of scouting. For scouting is a thread of common purpose that unites girls of many backgrounds and creeds who promise to "do my duty to God and my country" and to live by the code of the Girl Scout law.

The power of this promise and code to capture the hearts of our children is measured by the growth of the Girl Scouts, which now has more than 100,000 troops and 1,500,000 members in the United States. Abroad there are 507 American troops in 34 colonies, countries, and bases. The growth of these troops is due to the longing of girls and their parents for a tie with home. Scouting is the thread by which they join hands with other Americans.

In the age-old relationship of sympathetic, interested adults and young people lies the "pull" of Scouting—both for girls and for adults. Just as every child has a deep-seated desire to be understood, so adults never cease to feel the need to be needed. Scouting preserves some of the finest things in our tradition by providing for such a partnership.

To say this is to recognize a challenge. Between now and 1960, population studies show, there will be an increase of 5 million girls in the age ranges served by the Girl Scouts. There is nothing exclusive about scouting. It is open to all youngsters 7 to 17. But children enjoy its wonderful advantages only in proportion to the numbers and quality of available leadership.

The Girl Scouts have a right to be proud of the leadership they have constantly recruited. Adults in Girl Scouting number more than half a million; 30,000 of these are men. One thread runs through all their thinking and doing: that of wanting girls to grow up into good homemakers and good citizens. Through this service, the adults themselves enjoy a fellowship with young people—often including their own daughters.

Just that sort of feeling linked a Brownie Scout and her father's commanding officer in a distant army camp recently. "I'm tired of taking someone else's daddy to the Father-Daughter Banquet," the little girl wrote. Her own dad was with her that night—on an unexpected leave.

Today, when we feel so profound a concern over the rise in juvenile delinquency, we don't have to worry about those youngsters who have hold of a strong thread of partnership with adults. They will manage to skirt the hazards and develop their own highest potentialities, even in this turbulent age. These are not stepchildren of our democratic community. They are the ones who "belong."

THE OTHER SIDE

But there is another side to the youth ledger. In the United States today, all the youth organizations together reach only one-fourth of the total boy and girl population. And this at a time when the pressures and social tensions that bring on delinquency increasingly affect boys and girls.

As friends of youth, who care deeply about our country's future, we have a job ahead that is almost a call to arms. It is a challenge—but it is also a magnificent opportunity. To teach by example—to be a hero to a boy or girl—is a fine thing.

But it isn't fine only for the youngster. For ourselves it is a fulfillment. It is one of the greatest experiences most of us will ever know. To know the joy of it, we have only to grasp the thread on which so many young hands so hopefully and tremulously rest.

A Critique of Dr. Hromadka's Politics—Chapter 6

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 27, 1954

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to insert the following chapter from Church in Communist Society, by Prof. Matthew Spinka, of Hartford Theological Seminary, and concerning Dr. Josef Hromadka, of Czechoslovakia, who is seeking admission to this country as a delegate to the World Council of Churches meeting at Evanston, Ill., next month:

A CRITIQUE OF DR HROMADKA'S POLITICS—CHAPTER 6

In summing up Dr. Hromadka's analysis of the current world catastrophe and the conclusions based upon understanding of the facts, we must, first of all, clearly distinguish between his Christian faith and his political and economic views. I have full confidence in his sincerity, his loyalty to Christ and His cause, and even in his devotion to the Christian Church. Although I do not share his theological interpretation of Christianity, for I regard Barthianism as an extreme reaction to the right against the extreme liberal movements of the left, yet I have no quarrel with any man on that account, I feel united with Hromadka in the bond of Christian faith and love, despite the very real differences in the realm of political and economic opinions which separate us.

Accordingly, I gladly testify to Dr. Hromadka's unusual sensitiveness to the need for the transformation of our society in accordance with the ideals of justice and equity. And society today, both West and East, certainly needs transforming. It has grown increasingly secularist, and in the Soviet Union this cultural tendency has reached its most acute stage—that of atheism. We are facing a crisis of global proportions and many people, Christians among them, are unaware of, and complaisant about, this grave situation. Perhaps, we are actually witnessing the end of the humanistic era—as Nicholas Berdyaev and a number of other astute thinkers suppose—and the beginning of something new of which only dim outlines have as yet appeared. I am unwilling to pass judgment on a question of such tremendous complexity and difficulty, even though I am painfully aware of many signs which indicate that these "pessimists" may be right. It may well be that the two giant power blocks into which the world today is divided will ultimately clash in an Armageddon in which either one or the other will emerge victorious, or more likely both will destroy themselves. Or, it may be that the one or the other world power will destroy itself from within, by its own rottenness and decay. For evil always destroys itself. It would not be a moral universe if such were not the case.

It is likewise true that the Christian churches have not borne as effective a witness to the social implications of the gospel as they should have done; in this matter, some are undoubtedly more guilty than others. But be it remembered that the liberal Christians, so severely criticized by Dr. Hromadka, have a better record of accomplishment in this regard than the Barthian group. But again it is easy to overstate the responsibility of the Christian churches and to lay blame on them for policies and actions which are not within their control; for the Christian churches do not hold the dominant position in society that they once occupied. There are no "Christian nations" today, but only Christians within each nation. Liberal democracies have separated the church from the state, and have practically monopolized all functions of a temporal nature which they once shared with the church.

The totalitarian states, both Fascist and Communist, claim the supreme loyalty for themselves, and either eliminate the church from any influence upon society altogether, or restrict it within purely cultic limits. The ultimate aim of these latter regimes, even where the churches are still allowed to function, is to destroy them and to "liquidate" all religion as superstition. This is the publicly declared goal of the Communist regimes everywhere, and there is no reason why we should not take them at their word. Hence, it is unfair to lay the blame for the social evils upon the churches as if they were exclusively or primarily responsible for them. I regard it as unjust to blame the Russian Orthodox Church for the evils which afflict the Russian people, and the Czech Brethren Church for the exploitation to which the Czechoslovak people are subjected, as I do when Dr. Hromadka pontifically condemns the western churches on a similar charge, and confuses Christian missions with nationalistic expansion or commercial imperialism. The Soviet Union is as guilty of political and commercial imperialism as any western democracies have ever been, and the Czechoslovak people have been exploited far worse under Gottwald and Zapotocky than they had been—as the Communists allege—under Masaryk and Benes. When has the present leadership of the Russian Church or of the Czech Brethren Church protested against the tyrannies of their governments? When has Dr. Hromadka, that fearless and inspiring fighter against nazism while he was in the United States, raised his voice with equal clarity against the iniquities of the present rulers of Czechoslovakia?

What, then, is the primary task of the Christian churches today? I dare to say, and say it deliberately, that it is the spiritual transformation of society. Only good men and women can transform society. Even the best systems, whether economic, political, or cultural, may be subverted to the worst uses by evil men. Thus the transformation is primarily a spiritual, and not merely an economic or political task, as Marxist-Leninist-Salinist communism teaches. Whatever technological or other improvements mankind achieves, they are good only insofar as they are controlled by men of good will. Otherwise, they are certain to prove to be means of destruction.

To be sure, the church cannot build a new world alone; other agencies of the political, economic, and cultural order also have a part in the vast task. The church must cooperate with such forces of the secular order, but must choose among them only those it deems closest to the spirit of Christ. To that degree, the church cannot be neutral. We Protestants do not advocate, as the Catholics do, a retrogression to some imagined medieval unities of the church with the state. We cannot advocate even a return to the Reformation. Moreover, our choice is limited by what is available and practically possible, which is never the ideally best; and even so there are legitimate differences about such a choice among Christians. Our task is to cherish and preserve whatever is best in our modern society, and imbue it with the spirit of Christ.

Thus, although necessarily taking a part in our society, the church must live in the world without being of the world: for the church is above any given political or economic order—a principle which Dr. Hromadka also upholds but which he unfortunately immediately neutralizes by advocating in a one-sided fashion the Communist system as the only just one. I would have no objections to such of his strictures of the west that are really just, if he applied the same yardstick to the east. We western Christians by and large believe that democracy is, of the available or practicable political systems, the closest to the Christian ideal. It undoubtedly has its faults, and is often subverted to other than its professed highest uses. But as Lincoln said of it, democracy is like a raft: one gets his feet wet, but then the thing never sinks. It is in this matter that we fundamentally disagree with Dr. Hromadka's judgment that liberal democracy no longer exists anywhere on earth, or that communism is therefore "the wave of the future." Since he believes it, it is no wonder that he has consistently followed the official Communist Party line. It is, then, understandable that he could serve as the principal Czechoslovak delegate in the world peace movement, which is known in the west for what it really is—cheap political trickery. Along with Dr. Viktor Hajek, the present synodical senior of the Czech Brethren Church, he protested against the Korean war resolution of the World Council of Churches adopted at Toronto, although he himself has constantly urged Korean peace on Soviet terms, and has accepted the base charge that the allied forces have waged bacteriological warfare. He has likewise advocated the unification of Germany on the Soviet pattern. Since 1948 he has never publicly recognized the actual political and economic injustices of the Soviet regime, known as real by the testimony of reliable witnesses and students of the subject, while his own lurid, distorted, and exaggerated description of western domocracies remind one of Picasso's Nightmares of Diseased Imagination. In short, Hromadka has succumbed to the view of the Grand Inquisitor in Dostoevsky's Brothers Karamazov, that happiness of mankind cannot be secured except by force and chicanery, by giving men bread at the cost of their freedom—save that Communist regimes have failed to provide the bread.

Furthermore, despite his denials, Hromadka in reality has adopted the basic and essential principle of the Marxist philosophy, i. e., that the Communist order of society must inevitably, irresistibly, and unfailingly secure victory over the old order. Although he himself is not a professed Communist, he holds this article of faith as firmly as any Communist party member. He presumably still repudiates the principal tenet of the Marxist dialectical materialism that economic forces must inevitably bring about the classless society as surely as other natural forces—gravitation, for instance—operate in their particular sphere. The acceptance of such a tenet would place him outside the Christian church. But if he does not accept dialectical materialism, why does he hold to its conclusions?

Moreover, if the economic forces operate scientifically, why denounce capitalism as unjust? Ethics has no place in naturalistic determination. Even Marx held it as a self-evident axiom that there could not be an antithesis unless there has first been a thesis; hence, there cannot be a proletarian class without capitalists. Lenin, of course, disregarded this axiomatic Marxist principle, and declared to his astonished Bolshevik fellow leaders that in Russia (which certainly had no highly developed capitalism in 1917) the capitalistic stage of development must be omitted and Russia must jump from feudalism directly into communism. But Marx proved right as against Lenin: to this day the Soviet Union does not have the Communist economy or the Communist order of society, whether political or social. What does prevail there is state capitalism. For in Russia there is only one capitalist, the state, which employs the entire nation in its enterprises, but without the check of competition or of the workers' right to strike. And even so the economy cannot operate without slave labor. As for the political form prevailing there, it is the most rigid of totalitarianisms, a dictatorship not of the proletariat, but by a small clique of men, or by one man alone, and over the proletariat, even over the Communist Party itself. In the social organization, far from the classless society, the small and highly privileged class exploits the vast masses of the workers. This vicious system is not Christ's revolution, not even Marx's revolution, but a travesty on all social justice, but the last stage of the old secularist era which, by destroying faith in God, has also denied faith in man. It has degraded man to the level of a mere economic tool, a handle of the grind organ, as Dostievsky used to say. No good society can be built on such a foundation.

Our further disagreement with Hromadka rests on Christ's principle that by their fruits ye shall know them. He argues that capitalism as an economic system is unjust, exploiting, and contrary to the Christian ethic; and that democratic political liberties are empty and meaningless because they are devoid of economic equity; hence, communism, by contrast, represents social justice for the masses of workers and even human dignity and true democracy. Such theoretical arguments could perhaps have been held by idealistic people up to the early thirties, before the Soviet leaders gave the lie to their belief that something could be salvaged from the Russian experiment by plunging the Russian people into a greater political and economic misery than they had ever suffered under the tsarist regime. They are no longer possible for informed and open-minded people, for experience denies such claims. It is only by ignoring, or even denying what is a commonplace to informed people outside the Iron Curtain, that Hromadka is able to retain the illusion that Soviet communism represents a just and free social order. His argument, therefore, is unconvincing to those who, holding to Christian principles, desire along with him a transformed social order.

But let no one suppose that because we do not identify communism with social justice, we therefore uphold and defend the injustices of western society, whether they be political or economic. No. The Christian church is above all human social orders. It has the duty of raising its voice against every injustice in every society, whether it be Communist or capitalist, and to declare the righteous judgments of God upon all who do evil, in the confidence that God shall not be mocked.

And, finally, communism is incompatible, both as a system of thought and a code of ethics, with Christianity. For atheism is basic to the philosophy or dialectical materialism, and both Christian faith and experience with the radical secularist movements of the last hundred years confirm the conclusion that the denial of God necessarily results in the denial of the spiritual nature of man. To believe in less than God is to be less than man. It seems, therefore, wholly fantastic to assert, as Dr. Hromadka does, that communism is really a form of "secularized Christianity," and that in time it will throw off its atheism as nonessential to its real core. No responsible leader of communism has as much as breathed any such idea.

Dr. Hromadka exhorts the western Christians not to rely on "guesses" in regard to the future, assuming thereby that the Communist victory is a matter of scientific certainty. But what if his prediction of the future transformation of communism into some theistic system, or perhaps even into Christianity, should prove a "guess"—as we are certain it is? What shall become of Christianity in a Communist-dominated world in view of the repeated declarations of all official leaders of communism that all religion must be eliminated as superstition, and its place taken by science? Should Christians willingly cooperate with a movement determined to destroy the church along with all religion, and with men who are effectively carrying out this aim? We are not misled by the opportunist policies at present adopted by world communism in order to postpone the final struggle with religion until after they are politically and economically firmly entrenched. And we are not deluded regarding the real and ultimate aims of communism.

It is for that reason that I have characterized Dr. Hromadka, in sorrow rather than in anger, as the prophet of doom. I know quite well that he would violently protest against my omission of the complementary characterization, and of resurrection (to follow the title of one of his books). Nor am I unaware of his many and eloquent professions of faith to the effect that after the crucifixion comes the resurrection, after the Good Friday comes the Easter morn. Far it be from me not to acknowledge the numerous assertions of his faith in the survival of the Church of God beyond any and all crises, in the present or the future. But what vitiates all such assertions is his equally dogmatic assertion that communism is destined to conquer the world and that we Christians must help in the conquest. If communism should become victorious, then the conflict with the Christian church is inevitable; and given time, Communist leaders are determined to impose their creed upon the coming generations by every means at their disposal, and to exclude religion from any influence upon society altogether. Islam has dechristianised the very cradle of Christianity—Palestine—as well as the principal scene of the Apostle Paul's missionary labors among the gentiles—Asia Minor, Egypt, and northern Africa, once the home of the most brilliant of Christian fathers, Origen, Cyprian, and Augustine, today are solidly Mohammedan, save for the pitifully small remnants of the original Christian communions. We, therefore, hold that no Christian can sincerely believe in the ressurrection of Christianity when at the same time he actively cooperates with the forces of doom. It is not reasonable to suppose that the survival of Christianity may be rightfully expected only where Christians oppose the faith of communism with even more determined faith in the truth and rightness of the gospel of Christ?

In conclusion, then, let us affirm our conviction that communism, far from being able to create a new and better world order, will collapse as the result of its own inner weakness and falsity. We believe that only good is permanent, and that evil destroys itself. The collapse of communism may be accelerated, even without war, if the democratic nations of the world be united and on guard against any further Communist aggression; if by a spiritual revolution they get rid of the social evils which infect their own body politic; and if they aid the oppressed peoples everywhere—both inside and outside the Iron Curtain—to secure for themselves a better life. The supreme task of the church in this common objective is, as it has ever been in the past, to preach the gospel in the confidence that God's power will thereby transform men dominated by their own perverse will into His own obedient children. Our aim is to produce responsible persons filled with the love and spirit of Christ, who will transform society in accordance with the mind of Christ. The fault that the kingdom tarries is not that of Cristianity but of Christians. And the way to transform the evil world into one imbued with the spirit of Christ is not merely by changing the environmental forces, economic or political, but by changing men.

A Realistic Approach to Robinson-Patman Costing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 27, 1954

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an article which appeared in the Trade Practice Annual, 1954, entitled "A Realistic Approach to Robinson-Patman Costing," by William J. Warmack, whose opinions on these matters have been cited as authoritative by the United States Supreme Court. Hence, the article deals authoritatively with several points on which businessmen have been misinformed and misled for years respecting the importance of cost savings and its relationship to voluntary compliance with the pricing provisions to the statute. The subject is of enormous importance to interstate sellers, and it bears directly on proposed legislation now under consideration.

The article follows:

A REALISTIC APPROACH TO ROBINSON-PATMAN COSTING—THEORISTS AND EXPERTS IN OTHER FIELDS NOT THE BEST ADVISERS ON COST JUSTIFICATION—POSSIBILITY OF DEVELOPMENT, SYSTEM, EXPENSE, AND ACCEPTABILITY OF DISTRIBUTION COSTING DISCUSSED FROM STANDPOINT OF EXPERIENCE

(By William J. Warmack)

One of the principal reasons that price discrimination is still virtually as prevalent in the market place as it was when Congress outlawed the practice nearly 18 years ago is that businessmen have been misinformed and misled for years on matters with respect to costing for pricing purposes under the due allowance proviso of the Robinson-Patman Act. Of course, the Congress and the Federal Trade Commission are both directly responsible for the continuing discriminations. The Congress has never provided funds for much more than a token enforcement of the statute. And up to the time of its recently announced policy, the FTC had done very little toward promoting voluntary compliance with the pricing provisions of the statute through costing.

THEORETICAL STUMBLING BLOCKS

Fluent theorists, many of whom are well recognized authorities in their own fields but who know little if anything about Robinson-Patman costing, publicly and continuously urge that (1) it is a physical impossibility to develop cost information sufficiently to prove that different prices make no more than due allowance for differences in cost under the provisions of the Robinson-Patman Act; (2) one must maintain currently an elaborate and expensive cost system on the distribution functions of their business if they would ever assume to be able to cost-justify different prices on sales of like goods to different customers; (3) costing for Robinson-Patman pricing purposes is so terribly expensive that only the rich can afford it; and (4) no cost defense of prices could be made under the provisions of the Robinson-Patman Act that would be acceptable to the Federal Trade Commission or the United States district courts.

These theories or contentions are without factual bases. They represent nothing more than guesswork and conjecture and that fact is immediately obvious to one who properly examines the record of past Robinson-Patman cost cases.

EXPERTS OUT OF RANGE

Item (1) above deals with impossibility. Much has been said and written on that point, most of which has had the effect of misleading businessmen and their counsel. For example, the present Director of FTC's Bureau of Industrial Economics, Dr. Corwin D. Edwards (now in England on leave of absence) said publicly back in 1947:

"Most of the costs which are relevant to the questions are joint costs. The allocation of joint costs, properly considered, is a matter of business policy, not a matter of fact. There aren't any reliable facts upon which to make such an allocation, and the imputations which we are learning to use usually assume that costs arise directly out of physical processes and hence are attributable directly to physical processes.

"Now that just isn't so; but the Congress has created the necessity to pretend that it is so in order to put any meaning into a cost defense in a situation where the costs are joint." (See CCH Robinson-Patman Act Symposium, 1947 edition, p. 60.)

It is the experience of this writer and the experience of a number of others who have actually conducted Robinson-Patman cost surveys and analyses that most marketing costs can be properly assigned to physical processes or functions—and often without too much difficulty. Hence, statements like that quoted above made by persons in high places serve only to mislead and confuse sellers and their advisers.

CONTINUOUS SYSTEM NOT NECESSARY

Re item (2) above, it has been publicly and authoritatively stated many times during the past 15 years that it is not necessary for a seller to maintain currently a distribution cost system so far as Robinson-Patman pricing is concerned. On this matter, in an address before a section meeting of the Illinois Manufacturers' Cost Association back in 1948, this writer said:

"I should like to comment on a few questions of cost which probably are uppermost in the minds of accountants and businessmen.

"The first question is: What kind of a system would provide cost information on which to base price differentials? The answer is that for many businesses it may be impracticable and uneconomical to maintain such a system currently. The benefit may not be commensurate with the expense involved. * * * Of course, this does not mean that the development of much-needed statistical data should not be considered or that their present development should be abandoned. It does mean that there is a limit beyond which the process may become uneconomical.

"That being true, the next question is: What should a vendor do if he desires to base prices on cost? The answer is that he should develop accurate information by making a functional survey and analysis of his costs. After thus determining his differentials, he should review his cost picture occasionally, perhaps annually, in the light of changing conditions, methods of marketing, etc., and he should bring the information up-to-date when such action is waranted by changed situations. As far as Robinson-Patman price discrimination matters are concerned, this is all that is needed."

LARGE EXPENSE AVOIDABLE

The contention set out in item (3) above to the effect that none but the rich can afford the expense of developing a cost defense of prices is also not in accord with the facts, although some large concerns have been sold on it, and even the chairman of the FTC was led to observe that—

"The few distribution cost studies that have been developed have been very expensive and have involved detailed functional analyses of the seller's entire business."

The facts are that in recent years there have been a few specialized R-P services in the Nation through which businessmen could be authoritatively advised as to what cost savings are allowable and how they may be proved—and at relatively little expense. Although it may not be widely known, it is a fact that a number of cost defenses have been accepted by the FTC where detailed functional analyses of the seller's entire business were not involved.

EXTRA COSTS DUE TO NEGLIGENCE

It is true that in a few isolated instances the expense of developing cost information has been excessively high. The fact is, however, that those who paid the fabulous amounts to have their costs developed have nobody to blame but themselves. Probably, hoping that lightning would never strike them, they took the law lightly, disregarded it altogether, or, at least, never went to the trouble of determining with reasonable certainty that their prices were or were not cost-justified.

HASTE MAKES WASTE

So after having their prices attacked, they rushed out and engaged high-priced talent to try to work up quickly a cost defense of prices that had not been based on proper cost information in the first place. Many accountants at high rates would be engaged on the job over long periods of time compiling statistical cost and sales data which could well have been compiled previously, for the most part, by the company's own personnel at relatively little extra expense. Therein lies the reason for the erroneous contention that all R-P cost surveys are too expensive.

It is the experience of this writer that it is relatively inexpensive to develop and maintain currently all of the cost information that is necessary for Robinson-Patman pricing purposes and that practical procedures to this end require functional cost surveys and analyses to cover no more than representative time periods and sales territories. Naturally, this would obviate the necessity of any expensive last-minute attempt to develop costs under pressure of time, to say nothing of securing the many benefits provided by accurate costing, the greatest of which is usually the elimination of wastes in marketing.

The contention stated in item (4), to the effect that no cost defense could be developed that would be acceptable to the FTC or the courts, savors of propaganda. It is sheer nonsense. All one has to do to refute such a contention is to review the past R-P cost cases. Cost defenses advanced in a number of them have been accepted.

Muffled rumblings are heard around to the effect that the FTC accountants themselves are too meticulous, too exacting, want the impossible, etc., etc., etc. In dealing with the FTC accountants on Robinson-Patman costing matters, the experience of this writer is that nothing could be further from the truth. Naturally, they must insist upon provable, factual cost information. They cannot accept guesswork and hope so as a cost defense of prices. At the same time, they have never indicated or assumed an arbitrary attitude respecting these matters.

COMMISSION SHOULD TAKE ACTION

It is a fair conclusion, therefore, that the false notions set out above concerning Robinson-Patman costing have confused businessmen and tended to the defeat of the real purpose and value of the pricing proviso which encourages cost savings, price competition, and efficiency. Consequently it is the opportunity and the duty of the Federal Trade Commission to inform business generally that distribution costing is practical, economical, necessary, and acceptable to it as evidence and as bases for voluntary compliance.

Tribute to the Halifax Farm Bureau

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. TUCK

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 27, 1954

Mr. TUCK. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD an excellent and timely editorial which appeared in the Record-Advertiser, a newspaper published in South Boston, Va., on July 8, 1954.

The editorial is as follows:

TRIBUTE TO THE HALIFAX FARM BUREAU

L. T. Weeks, manager of the Flue-Cured Tobacco Stabilization Corp., speaking at the fairgrounds last Friday, gave credit to the Farm Bureau for organizing the cooperative which has meant so much to tobacco growers. Mr. Weeks said that the Stabilization program has meant millions and millions of dollars to tobacco growers, and we believe that any observer of market trends will agree.

Halifax County tobacco farmers will readily admit that, had it not been for the Stabilization Corp., the bottom would have dropped out of the flue-cured market on many occasions. This is especially true of the situation which prevailed on the Old Belt in 1953.

The Old Belt, especially, should give thanks for the stabilizing influence of the cooperative program. During the 8 years that the Stabilization Corp. has been in operation on the tobacco markets, 43 percent of all the tobacco purchased by the cooperative has been on Old Belt markets. Last year, 63 percent of all of the tobacco taken by Stabilization was on Old Belt markets. Yet, the Old Belt produces only slightly more than 20 percent of the flue-cured tobacco grown in this country.

If the farm bureau had done nothing in its long period of existence except foster the stabilization corporation, it still would have been one of the most valuable organizations known to the tobacco farmer. But the farm bureau has done much more than this. It advocates and works for a sound program for the present while looking ahead to the future.

This newspaper has little patience and less time for so-called farm organizations which promise everything to everybody. One hundred percent of parity for everything which can be called a farm product, more and more Government handouts and subsidies, and a Federal grab bag for all have their immediate attractions, we will admit. But the future as well as the present must be considered.

Make no mistake about it, Government handouts must be paid for, not only in taxes, but in loss of freedom, more restrictions, and more regimentation. Every grant from the Government grab bag carries with it some loss of individual choice and privilege. It is no paradox that one cannot be dependent upon the Government and remain independent at the same time. And any organization which advocates giveaway programs at the expense of fiscal solvency and individual freedom is either extremely shortsighted or is guided intentionally by a socialistic philosophy.

This newspaper does not go down the line with all of the programs of the farm bureau, but we do believe that the farm bureau has better and saner programs to offer the farmer than any other active farm organization with which we are acquainted. Its planning, on the whole, seems in the best interest of not only the farmer, but the Nation; and not only for the present but for the future. For this reason, we believe it deserves the support of our farmers.

Radio Free Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS M. MACHROWICZ

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 27, 1954

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, like other Members of this House, I have been receiving in the past many reports on the activities of Radio Free Europe, some favorable and others unfavorable.

Because of the importance which I place upon psychological warfare in this present cold war, and because of the vital need to bring to the peoples behind the Iron Curtain words of truth and of hope from the free world, I decided to make a personal investigation to determine for myself the truth of the reports reaching me.

Taking advantage of my recent presence in Munich, Germany, with the Kersten Committee on Communist Aggression, together with my colleague, Congressman EDWARD BONIN, of Pennsylvania, I took time out to make a thorough and complete inspection of the activities of the Radio Free Europe station, particularly its Polish section, which is the largest branch of the Munich agency, operating under the name of Voice of Free Poland.

I have examined scripts from former programs, listened to current programs, conferred with editors and those responsible for the policies and formation of programs, and I have seen letters from people behind the Iron Curtain, giving their reaction to the messages from Voice of Free Poland.

I have examined their technical facilities and observed their thoroughness in monitoring the Communist programs from behind the Iron Curtain. I have also inspected their very thorough reference library and their current periodicals and newspapers received from Poland.

I must say that I was tremendously impressed with the entire organization. Reports that the Voice of Free Poland programs are not fulfilling the mission for which they were intended, are completely false and unjustified. The staff is extremely able, well qualified, and truly represents the proper political and psychological approach to the task they are faced with. The programs are interesting and diversified. They are eagerly listened to, and furnish much valuable information to listeners.

During the hearings of the Kersten Committee on Communist Aggression, a great number of witnesses, who had recently returned from behind the Iron Curtain, were asked by members of the committee regarding the effectiveness and quality of the programs of both Radio Free Europe and Voice of America.

I am happy to be able to report that, without exception, they were all very enthusiastic in their approval of both the quality and the effectiveness of these programs.

This is one matter which we must not forget in considering the advisability of continuing this kind of activity. There is and cannot be an open opposition party in any of the countries subjugated by Communist tyranny. Any such party has long ago been wiped out by the Soviet controlled regime. There are no newspapers, magazines, or radios able to give those opposed to Communist tyranny, a source of news or expressions of criticisms against tyrannical acts of the Communist overlords.

It is the Radio Free Europe and the Voice of America which fill this gap. They are the voice of resistance and of opposition, which the people of those countries rely upon for truth and news from the free world. We must keep these agencies operative and support them fully in order to keep the light of hope and faith burning in the hearts of the oppressed people.

I feel it my duty also to particularly express my complete confidence and admiration for the ability, zeal, and effectiveness of Richain Condon, European Director of Radio Free Europe, of John Novak, director of the Voice of Free Poland, and Marek Swiecicki, his deputy and chief assistant.

The Girl Scout Handbook

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TIMOTHY P. SHEEHAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 27, 1954

Mr. SHEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, on July 8, 1954, I inserted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, an article by Mr. Robert LeFevre entitled "Even the Girl Scouts," in which article Mr. LeFevre made some observations about the 1953 Girl Scout Handbook.

Mrs. Roy F. Layton of Washington, D. C., president of the Girl Scouts of the United States of America, and Mrs. William E. Hutchinson, president of the Girl Scouts of Chicago, contacted me with their views on this article.

Mrs. Layton advised me that the 1953 edition of the Girl Scout Handbook is now undergoing a major revision. This revised, 1954 reprint of the handbook will be available in the fall and will help to continue the great and praiseworthy aims and principles of the Girl Scouts of America.

Mrs. Layton's statement is as follows:

THE GIRL SCOUT HANDBOOK

When the 10th edition of the Girl Scout Handbook was published in the fall of 1953, it had undergone a major revision. The format had been changed, the contents rearranged, and 23 new badges introduced in such fields as agriculture, community life, home making, and nature.

Written for girls between the ages of 11 and 14, it gave special emphasis to citizenship activities. Many of the new badges and badge requirements had been suggested by the girls themselves and all were carefully checked by authorities in the various fields.

In rearranging the content of the handbook, material on our American heritage, previously scattered in various sections, was drawn together under the title "My Country," and instead of printing a small facsimile of the Bill of Rights we introduced several new badge requirenments through which the girls would learn what this great American document means to them and their families in their daily lives. A new section called My Government and much material on citizenship in sections called Active Citizen and Community Life were also added.

The reaction and comments of our membership were noted from the moment the new edition appeared, and a file set up so that suggestions for improvements, corrections, or changes might be taken into consideration in subsequent reprintings. Some minor changes had been scheduled for the fifth reprinting (due this summer) when recent criticisms called to our attention the fact that some parts of the handbook could be misinterpreted.

Some of the criticisms of the handbook have implied that we removed references to the Constitution, Bill of Rights, and Declaration of Independence, which, of course, is not true.

Our plans for the revision of the handbook include the following:

Reinsertion of the facsimile of the Bill of Rights; rewriting the section on the United Nations to present this subject informatively without editorial comment; clarifying a badge requirement relating to the statement on neighborliness in the United Nations Charter; and picking up in general on points which have subjected us to misunderstanding. The index will be made more inclusive.

The reprinting will be completed in August of this year and the corrected handbook available in the fall.

River and Harbor, Beach Erosion, and Flood-Control Projects

SPEECH

OF

HON. CLIFFORD DAVIS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 26, 1954

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 9859) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, as you may remember, a record flood came out of the Kansas River in 1951, doing damage along that river and along the Missouri River in the amount of almost $1 billion. That flood was a disaster of terrific national proportions. As you may remember, too, representatives of the House Public Works Committee, during the flood, flew to the scene to investigate. I was one of the representatives who made this trip. We toured such of the area as could be reached, inspected the several damaged cities along the Kansas and Missouri Rivers, and flew over the extensive and fertile, but inundated, river plains. All of us making that inspection were tremendously impressed by the scale and severity of the damage. I believe all of us were convinced that every effort should be made, and as early as possible, to prevent a recurrence of such a disaster.

The Public Works Committee, when it considered the plan of improvement for the Kansas Basin now before you for authorization, heard testimony for the better part of 2 days. Upstream landowners, downstream farmers, and representatives of areas and municipalities, all appeared. We gave careful study to their testimony prior to reaching our decision. From that study we became convinced that the improvements now recommended, as well as those already authorized, are essential in any plan which will prevent a recurrence of disaster such as that of 1951.

The recommended modification you are now considering would add to the authorized plan for the Kansas Basin nine local protection improvements to protect cities. All of these cities were heavily damaged in 1951 and, generally, the construction to be accomplished at each location is dependent, for safe operation, on upstream reservoirs to reduce materially flood flows. The recommended modification would add, also, to the comprehensive plan for the Kansas two critical reservoirs, reservoirs in the lower basin.

Reservoirs already built, under construction, or authorized, will control the major tributaries of the Kansas River except for 4,200 square miles of the Republican River drainage area below the existing Harlan County Reservoir, and the 1,140-square-mile drainage area of the Delaware River. These two areas are in the central and eastern portions of the Kansas Basin and are therefore in the more humid and higher rainfall area. Both are critical flood-producing areas. The Milford Reservoir is designed to control the major portion of the 4,200 square miles of the lower Republican, while Perry Reservoir is necessary to cotrol the major part of the 1,140-square-mile Delaware Basin.

Milford and Perry Reservoirs had been found necessary in studies completed even before the 1951 storms. All studies undertaken since—and very, very comprehensive investigations have been made—confirm and further emphasize the need for controlling these now uncontrolled areas by the two reservoirs in question.

Data furnished the committee concerning the effect that these two reservoirs would have had on the 1951 flood flows dramatically illustrate their capabilities. Peak discharge on the Republican River at Manhattan, Kans., would have been reduced from the 60,000 cubic feet per second actually experienced to only 20,000 cubic feet per second. Peak discharge on the Delaware at Perry, Kans., would have been reduced from the 108,000 cubic feet per second experienced to only 10,000 cubic feet per second. This control of the tributary flood flows would have significantly reduced flows on the Kansas River downstream. The Kansas Fiver flood plain down stream from the mouth of the Republican River contains 154,000 acres of some of the richest, most highly developed farmland in the Kansas Basin, numerous small towns, several large towns, including Junction City, Manhattan, Topeka—the State capital—Lawrence, and Kansas City, and a highly developed system of roads and railroads. The Milford and Perry Reservoirs are necessary to provide a large measure of flood protection for the rural area and small towns in this reach and together with the recommended local levee projects, are necessary to provide protection for the larger cities where damages are most concentrated. Milford Reservoir is of particular significance to protection for Junction City, Manhattan, and Topeka, and Perry Reservoir is of particular significance to protection for Lawrence and Kansas City.

Right now this area is experiencing its second year of drought. These drought conditions recur periodically as do floods and the consequences can be almost as severe. The committee in its study recognized the possibilities these reservoirs hold for minimizing both these effects.

The committee has also borne in mind, in recommending favorably on these reservoirs, that the Kansas River is part of the larger Missouri Basin problem and the effects of the reservoirs are needed for flood control and conservation on the lower Missouri as well as on the Kansas River.

The committee is strongly in favor of upstream development for soil conservation and appreciates the effects of such developments in conserving our soil, retarding runoff in normal rainfall and reducing flood damages on smaller streams. We are concerned here, however, with protection against major floods caused by severe and prolonged rainfall over large areas often falling on soils completely saturated by prior rains as in the disastrous 1951 flood. Experts are agreed that larger engineering works are necessary to achieve such protection. The committee is convinced that there are no acceptable alternates for the improvements now recommended for authorization in the Kansas River Basin and accordingly proposes that they be approved so that the program of flood control in this vital area can be continued.

Development of Puget Sound Harbors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK WESTLAND

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 27, 1954

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, the coastline of the Second Congressional District of Washington is said to be the longest of that of any district in the United States. Because of this and other natural phenomena, the maritime industries of shipping, boatbuilding, and fisheries are of extreme importance to the economic life of the area.

Puget Sound, a major portion of which is within my district, is favored by many fine natural harbors. Its waters are teeming with food fish, chief among which is the mighty salmon. For this reason commercial fishing has long been a major source of income for many of our citizens. In 1953 over $19 million was realized from the sale of their catch. Fish processing plants are located in nearly every community on its shores. These plants provide employment for thousands.

Safe and adequate moorage is essential if maritime industries are to be pursued efficiently and profitably. Good harbors are one of our valuable natural resources and they must be developed and maintained for the good of all of our people.

One of the chief deterrents to the orderly growth of the shipping and fisheries industries of Puget Sound has been the shameful neglect that has been apparent for many years in the development of its harbors.

The improvement of our harbors is a long-drawn-out process which requires much planning and foresight if it is to be carried out successfully. During the 20 years of the previous administration, during which it seemed that money was available for almost any purpose; during which our national debt rose from $21 billion to $265 billion despite the collection of the highest taxes in our national history; and despite the emphasis throughout the land of natural resource development, precious little was done toward improving the fine harbors of the Second Congressional District of Washington. Few if any major harbor projects there were even authorized during that period. Local interests have done and are continuing to do everything possible to accommodate the growing needs for space and accommodations but have been unable to keep up with the demand.

The House Committee on Public Works of this 83d Congress proposes now to do something about this situation which has been neglected for so long a time. They have recommended the authorization of improvement and development projects for eight harbors on Puget Sound, from Shilshole on the southern edge of my district to Everett, Bellingham, and Blaine on the Canadian border to the north. To the west is Cap Sante at Anacortes, then Port Angeles, and at the extreme northwesterly tip of the United States, on either side of Cape Flattery, is Neah Bay and Quillayute Harbor.

I sincerely commend the members of the Public Works Committee for their diligence in studying these proposed projects. During my many appearances before them, I was treated with great courtesy and patience. They have examined carefully the facts and figures in each individual case and have arrived at an intelligent and well-reasoned decision regarding all of them. I congratulate them and urge that this body concur in their recommendations.

BuAir Chief Has Praise for "Hancock" Performance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 27, 1954

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, the Department of the Navy, in line with the administration's policy of obtaining the most defense for the taxpayer's dollar, has developed a competitive spirit between public naval shipyards. This is a very wholesome situation and is resulting in great savings in the cost of construction and modernization of naval vessels.

The Puget Sound Naval Shipyard at Bremerton throughout the years has established records for economy, quality of work, and meeting time schedules in conversion of aircraft carriers. Recently, under a joint management pledge an all-out performance record was promised on the first modernization of a Midway-class carrier, the *Franklin D. Roosevelt*.

As an example of the Puget Sound Naval Shipyard's performance which has contributed to the shipyards recognition as the most efficient carrier conversion and repair yard of thhe Nation, I insert a short article from the Salute, a publication for Puget Sound civilian worker employees:

BuAir Chief Has Praise for "Hancock" Performance

With the U. S. S. *Hancock* now in California waters and the launching of her aircraft by steam catapult successfully completed, Puget Sound Naval Shipyard received a letter of commendation from Rear Adm. Apollo Soucek, Chief, Bureau of Aeronautics, via Rear Adm. W. D. Leggett, Jr., Chief, Bureau of Ships.

Rear Admiral Soucek states, "The exceptionally fine condition of the C-11 catapult installation is considered particularly noteworthy, especially in view of the difficult circumstances encountered during the installation, such as: being lead yard, meeting time schedules of plan completions for installation guidance by other yards in spite of late changes, using British drawings, and initiating refinements to the catapult design to insure satisfactory operation.

He closed by stating that he "wishes to express his appreciation to the Puget Sound Naval Shipyard for completing the aeronautical features of the *Hancock* on schedule while maintaining the usual high caliber of workmanship."

In an accompanying statement Rear Admiral Leggett noted that the "fine cooperation, wholehearted assistance,and technical competence of the field activities of both the Bureau of Aeronautics and the Bureau of Ships were an important contribution to the timely completion of the U. S. S. *Hancock* and her excellent condition on delivery," adding that he desired to take the opportunity to express his appreciation for this fine spirit of cooperation and mutual endeavor which resulted in a job well done.

The Editor Looks at the War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 27, 1954

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a column from the Jackson County Sentinel, of Scottsboro, Ala., entitled "The Editor Looks at the War."

Every week in that paper the editor has a column in which he discusses this subject in a very interesting and able manner.

I believe it will be good for every Senator to read that column, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Editor Looks at the War

This country editor probably is not capable of passing criticism on those who direct and lead world affairs. But we do think when the head of the French Government a few weeks ago made the statement that unless he could get peace with the Reds in the Indochina war by July 20 that he would resign. Now, what in the world could the Reds have wanted better than this sort of statement? All they have to do is sit tight and let the French Government take another tumble.

Our whole idea of dealing with the Reds has been sorter on this same basis. We first tell them we do not intend to get mad or do anything if they will not stop, but we warn them they better stop their aggression.

The French have lost long and costly war in Indochina, having several hundred thousand of their best soldiers killed or wounded. The United States has been financing a big part of the war with money and supplies the last 2 years, and this is another war we have lost, too.

The Geneva conferences which were planned to end the Indochina fighting quickly, of course, will wind up in the same style as our ending the Korean war. It took 2 years of talking and giving ground before the Reds stopped shooting and then they stopped because it suited their aim best to shift force to other places for action.

This editor wrote when the Korean truce was signed that this did not mean the end, it only meant the Reds needed a rest to start aggression elsewhere. And so it worked out. If the fighting in Indochina ceases with the surrender of France to the Reds there, it will be only a short time until the Communists take off somewhere else. That is their system and every time the free world backs up and hopes, the Reds grab off something else and get stronger for further assault.

The United States has now run out of "bought friends" and I doubt if we can ever buy them back again until they get flat on their backs and yell for help, and quick.

It is my opinion that never in the world's recorded history has the world's richest and strongest nation faced such a dilemma. If we back up, the Reds move in; if we mention standing pat, our "friends" scat away from us and yell that we are starting a big war. We are in the real position of "damned if we do" and "damned if we don't."

Very few believe it, or want to believe it, but propaganda has sold a great part of the world on other positive belief that the United States is all ready and wanting to go with the third world war. We are behind the "eight ball" and on the defensive through the world. The Reds have won the greatest propaganda victory in world's history. They have caused us to be bled white and now have pushed us into the position of a defendant being tried for all the world's ills.

There is certainly no need for Russia to start a shooting war herself at this time when her aims are being carried out by her Communist allies soldiers and through puppet management. The only thing Russia is watching now is to keep her own buddies from getting too strong. That is why it would not worry Russia a bit, in fact, it would please them, for the United States to get tied up in an all out war with Red China. But we are not going to do that. In fact, this writer believes we will back out of Red China's way until there is no further room for backing. We must remember that Red China is the only enemy we ever fought with whom we begged for a draw decision. The United States could not possibly fight Red China in a land war. They could pour in a flood of human beings faster than we could possibly kill them off. The only kind of war we could fight with China would be a naval blockade and bombing their cities and bases. This would be an endless proposition with us trying to fight thousands of miles from home. Our leaders know this fact and they also know our people are not of a mind to fight another overseas war on the Korean basis.

England wants to recognize Red China and start doing business with them. England believes and knows that unless she pretty soon begins doing business with someone she is going to fall to the bottom. England has to have trade to live. Our own system in the United States is set up on a high standard of living and high wages and large profits. We dare not let down the bars of trade for fear it will quickly wreck our own economy. And it would soon wreck our economy, if what we have is called by that name. The rest of the world manufactures goods far below our cost here and they are fast taking over a big slice of the world trade because of lower prices.

For instance, recently this newspaper office bought a press from the largest American press and equipment manufacturer. Imagine our surprise when we got this press shipped directly from England where it had been manufactured by English workmen for an American company. We presume it was because the company can get the presses built much cheaper in England and make more money even after paying for the long-distance haul. Also we learned that England and Germany are now full of American ocmpanies making products for world sale. This must be because the wage and cost spiral has gone so high in the United States that these companies are taking advantage of the opportunity to stay in the world competition in certain lines of manufacture.

American products, even farm productions, are being priced out of desperate and revived world competition. That is one of our big headaches next to the Communists pushing us around and regularly taking over more chunks of the world and enslaving more millions of people.

We read last week about Brazil being mad at us because of an effort to control coffee prices here. Oh, boy, and coffee selling for most any price asked.

We have been the world's Santa Claus for a good many years but right now Santa is in danger of having his whiskers torn off one by one and getting stripped of his warm, fur-trimmed coat.

The new and deadly bombs, and all the talk about them and what they can do, has had a peculiar effect on the public. In fact, we just do not believe it or that it can happen. A few folks may be scared, but most of us are more scared of the return of ration tickets than we are the prospect of a fleet of bomb carriers coming for a visit.

It is the writer's belief the Indochina truce and cease-fire business will drag on and on with the Reds benefiting with every delay. France is terribly tired and its home government has been in a state of disruption continuously since World War II. But the Indochina mess not only affects China, but it is the big stepping stone for complete conquering of Asia by the Reds. That is why the alarm and interest of the other free countries.

In recent visits and negotiations Winston Churchill had lost his "stand pat" and fighting spirit of days of old and he talked of working on and on for peace, at almost any price. This is not Churchill talking, but England talking through Churchill. All the free countries are terribly tired of wars and getting ready for wars. But that does not mean peace can be bought that way. Again and again, this writer has looked back over history and we fail to find a single instance where an aggressor was stopped by soft words or patience.

Today the Reds are riding high, even higher than with their Korean success, and those who think they are ready to be good and sit quiet with their present spoils as the final price are in for some rude jolts. The Reds will keep right on pushing and the day they think they are strong enough or we are weak enough they will hit the big blow. We must keep history in mind and always before us, for history is hard to beat when it comes to figuring out what aggressors have done and will do.

Our leadership now is no stronger or weaker than it has been. The same enemy is against us and it makes little difference to him who is in control at Washington. The Communists very seldom change their plans. They go right ahead with a set schedule and pay little or any attention to what we do or do not do toward stopping them.

The United States is the target of a powerful enemy with millions of manpower ready to be sacrificed if need be. That is a fact we must never let leave our way of thinking. There is no need for us to hide our heads under the sands of wishful thinking.

Rehabilitation in Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BURNET R. MAYBANK

OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 27, 1954

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record a letter from James H. R. Cromwell to J. A. Sisto pertaining to the services of a qualified steel engineer to supervise the rehabilitation of certain blast furnaces and a rolling mill in Korea.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Cromwell & Co.,
Washington, D. C., July 15, 1954.

Mr. J. A. Sisto,
Chairman of the Board, Barium Steel Corp., New York, N. Y.

Dear Mr. Sisto: This will acknowledge receipt of your letter with its enclosures from the firm of Knappen-Tippetts-Abbett-McCarthy (engineering consultants to the United Nations Korean Reconstruction Agency) requesting your aid in obtaining the services of a highly qualified steel engineer to supervise, on behalf of the Republic of Korea (ROK) the rehabilitation and subsequent operation of certain blast furnaces and a rolling mill located, respectively, at Inchon and Samchok.

KTAM's request so vividly illustrates what I term "the incredible paradox" in Korea, that I will use it to exemplify the necessity for prompt implementation by Congress of the principles contained in the "Private Enterprise Plan For Korea"—as endorsed by President Syngman Rhee. With this in mind, let us imagine that under the provisions of the aforesaid plan, the Barium Steel Corporation—inspired by patriotic realization of the vital issues at stake for our country in Korea— undertook to sponsor the rehabilitation and operation of the steel properties above described.

Although all the expenses and financial requirements requested by Barium would be loaned by the proposed American Allies Reconstruction Finance Corp. to a New Korean Steel Corp., set up for that purpose, yet the only material reward—for Barium's know-how, for training the Korean men and management and for risking the good name and prestige of Barium—would be Barium's ownership of 25 percent of the common stock of its New Korean Steel Corp.

Barium would, of course, send out to Korea some of its top steel engineers to survey the situation and to determine, in particular, what should be the potential market and consequent size of its New Korean Steel Corp., to the end that the enterprise would operate at a profit. Barium's engineers would then design and supervise the necessary construction and equipment and simultaneously would commence the assembly and training of the Korean men and management.

Thus, we can safely assume, every penny expended would be scrupulously calculated and accounted for by Barium's engineers and comptrollers and that graft, or squeeze, famed throughout the Orient, would be conspicuous by its absence. Finally, the new Korean Steel Corp. should, in the course of time, be managed entirely by the Korean executives Barium had trained and, except for Barium's 25 percent common stock interest, all the remaining 75 percent ownership of the corporation would be held by the Korean men and management and, in small, individual lots, by the Korean people themselves.

Under these circumstances, I submit, a system of private enterprise, along with its concomitants, freedom, democracy, and a higher standard of living, might reasonably be assured in the ROK. The ROK would become a show window displaying, for all the world to see, the superiority of capitalism and freedom over communism and slavery; American face and prestige would be incalculably enhanced and communism would be dealt a mortal blow. In short, Uncle Sam would get an honest-to-goodness run for his money.

Now, on the other hand, in examining our existing policies and practices in Korea—so graphically typified by the letter from KTAM—please ask yourself these questions:

1. Will it be possible to induce a really highly qualified steel engineer to give up a good job with Barium, or any other steel company, and place his future career in the hands of the ROK's inexperienced politicians?

2. Assuming that both compentent knowledge and diligent care were employed by the ROK's Ministry of Commerce and Industry in determining the potential market and the consequent size of the rehabilitated government-owned steel properties, who will be responsible, and who will lose out if the fledgeling bureaucrats, in their enthusiasm, make a bad guess?

3. Since it is virtually impossible to persuade reputable firms to submit large contract bids in Korea, and since rehabilitation is, therefore, necessarily conducted on a cost-plus basis, what capable and impartial authority will police the work progress and determine the integrity and propriety of the costs and time claimed by the contractor?

4. Once the government-owned, designed, and supervised steel properties are completed, will the highly qualified steel engineer be able to resist the political pressure for patronage with respect to the number and efficiency of his executives and employees?

5. Is not an accepted definition of neo-communism, "the ownership of the instruments of production by the State"?.

6. Although we sacrificed 140,000 American casualties, and untold billions to prevent the communization of the ROK, are we not, under our existing policies and practices, creating just such a collectivist economy with the taxes wrung from private enterprise in the United States? And will we not, thereby, become the laughing stock of the world?

7. Do you know of any alternative to the private-enterprise plan for Korea that will terminate this incredible paradox, i. e., by means of which the Government of the ROK can be divested of its ownership of industry and enterprise under freedom and democracy?

I am sure you will conclude that it is the duty and obligation of every champion of private enterprise in America to demand that Congress put an end to our existing paradoxical and pernicious policies and practices in the ROK, by asking his Congressman and Senators to support the enclosed and self-explanatory resolution 219.

Sincerely yours,
James H. R. Cromwell.

Amending H. R. 9859: The Omnibus Rivers and Harbors Bill

SPEECH
OF

HON. FRAZIER REAMS

OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 26, 1954

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 9859) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes.

Mr. REAMS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Meader].

Mr. Chairman, I wish to associate myself with the gentleman in the amendment that he has offered. The third of the three projects, Point Place, lies within my district and within the city of Toledo. I want to express my appreciation to the committee and particularly to the subcommittee for the very excellent hearing which they gave us on this subject.

Colonel Starbird from the Corps of Engineers testified on this and recommended it, speaking for the Corps of Engineers.

I feel that the opposition of the committee to this project arises principally because of the fact that they are associating this with the tides and floods that are common on the ocean and not on the Great Lakes. The Great Lakes, after all, are a river system somewhat extended because of the glacial deposits. The floods come not at regular intervals, but for the same reason that the floods come on the Ohio River. There is a building up of moisture in the headwaters and an increase in precipitation in the locality, which causes the flood. It is exactly like the floods in the Ohio River the subject matter of which admittedly is under the jurisdiction and under the force of the law in effect. When the snow is built up in Canada and the upper lakes and then we have an excess of precipitation in the Lake Erie area, we have these floods that are so devastating. In the last flood in this

Point Place area, which is the third on the map before you, the damage to that locality was about $240,000. That is more than half the cost the engineers estimate for this project, which will be an all-time benefit.

This dike they propose is not a new project. The dike has been built by the local people there and by the city of Toledo and by the township. This project is for the purpose of making a permanent dike out of it. One that will last for all time and will protect this property from these regular inundations that come from exactly the same kind of water and the same sources that the floods on the Ohio River come from.

Mr. Chairman, I ask consideration for this amendment.

Two Little Boys: They Gave Their All, But Were Mad at No One

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 27, 1954

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, once once again we Americans have been treated to a practical illustration of "peaceful coexistence" in an atomic age. I refer to the shooting down by the Communists of a British transport plane off the coast of China just this past week. American citizens were aboard. American citizens lost their lives.

Only the daydreamer could really believe that "peaceful coexistence" is the answer to the problems of today. It is like trying to catch a good night's sleep with a rattlesnake lying beside you.

I would like to respectfully recommend to your attention an article from the Washington Daily News of July 26, written by Andrew Tully. The theme is "peaceful coexistence." When one thinks about it, Mr. Tully is not far from right. If this coexistence is the coming thing, perhaps we should turn our attentions and hopes to something more realistic.

The most horrible part of all this business is that often it is the children who pay, as the Laurence and Phillip of this story.

The article from the Washington News follows:

LAURENCE AND PHILLIP BELIEVED IN COEXISTENCE, TOO

(By Andrew Tully)

The diplomats are busy talking about coexistence with the Communists—but it's hard to hear their voices above the last choking gulps of air breathed by two little boys far away from home.

Laurence Parish was only 4, and his brother, Phillip, was only 2, when they died. Presumably, though, they are enemies of the Communist tyranny, because they were murdered by two Red fighter planes which shot down a British passenger plane off the coast of South China.

Their father, Leonard Lee Parish of Iowa Park, Tex., was killed too, in that awesome moment when the two boys passed into eternity. But they left their mother behind, and their big sister, Valerie, 6, both of whom were rescued from the sea. And their mother and their sister will never stop missing them.

We like to feel that these two little boys are safe in a wonderful place, guarded by a Man Who loves children. But Laurence and Phillip Parish had a right to live in this world, too. They had done nothing for which they should have been murdered.

It's easy to visualize what Laurence and Phillip were like, especially if you've ever lived close to the gay, rough, tender, wonderful world which is a little boy's. If they were like the little boy you know best, they were a heart-touching mixture of mischief, boisterousness, laughter, and—at special moments—a kind of gentle sadness.

If they were like your little boy, they experimented with horrible noises and they woke up too early in the morning. They asked you if fish had ears and why weren't you a cowboy? They poked at dead fish on the beach, and collected crab claws. They fell out of trees showing off. They never walked when there was room to run. They liked their faces dirty and always tried to sneak to the table without washing their hands. They ragged their sister to tears one day, and brought her candy from a party the next. They tried not to cry when they were hurt, but sometimes they had to.

Like the little boy you know best, Laurence and Phillip probably did not aspire to become President. Their ambitions were more fun. They wanted to be Hopalong Cassidy, a locomotive engineer, a fireman, a pirate, a bear. They were impatient with knives and forks and liked people who owned boats. They got along fine with their father, but in the comfortable gloom of bedtime it was their mother they clung to.

But the main thing about Laurence and Phillip Parish is that they weren't mad at anybody. They weren't old enough to have learned how to hate. As cheerful advocates of coexistence, it must have come as a terrible shock to them to encounter people who make war on little boys.

The Private Keefe Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT H. BOSCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 27, 1954

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include correspondence from Hon. Fred A. Seaton, Assistant Secretary of Defense, Legislative and Public Affairs, and the records of the Department on the so-called Private Keefe case:

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D. C.

Hon. ALBERT H. BOSCH,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. BOSCH: Assistant Secretary of Defense Hensel, who is on an extended inspection trip in Europe, has asked me to write you regarding the Keefe case.

Prior to his departure Mr. Hensel gave considerable attention to the O'Donnell column of July 2, which is set forth in the extension of your remarks at page A4818 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for July 2. He asked me to send you a copy of his original letter to the Defenders of the American Constitution, to which is appended an official statement of the Keefe case, and to suggest that perhaps you might agree to insert this present letter together with the text of his letter to the Defenders of the American Constitution and its inclosure in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Your cooperation and interest in this matter is appreciated.

Yours sincerely,

FRED A. SEATON.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D. C.

DEFENDERS OF THE AMERICAN CONSTITUTION, INC.,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIRS: My attention has been drawn to your letter of February 3, 1954, addressed to a Mr. Taylor. This letter appears to be a circular sent out over the letterhead of your organization and enclosing a reprint of John O'Donnell's Daily News column of January 5. There is also inclosed a copy of an opinion letter signed by John H. Coffman, general counsel of your organization.

We have given very careful consideration to this letter and especially to the O'Donnell column of January 5, and we have come to the conclusion that we should call to your attention a number of factual inaccuracies which appear in O'Donnell's column.

In order that you may have a full account of the Keefe case, I am enclosing a copy of a special report on the subject, which we have received.

Among the misstatements of fact contained in Mr. O'Donnell's column, the following should be mentioned.

1. O'Donnell states that Keefe was sentenced to solitary confinement.

This is untrue.

2. O'Donnell states that Keefe was sentenced to hard labor.

This is untrue.

3. O'Donnell implies that Keefe as a result of the sentence was subject to possible exile to a French penal colony.

This is not true.

4. O'Donnell states that the offenses which Keefe committed would have been minor offenses under American law.

This is untrue. Keefe committed what was the equivalent of highway robbery at night, and he would probably have been sentenced to more than 5 years' confinement had he been tried by the United States authorities. Keefe, who is a Regular Army enlistee, was absent without leave from his post at the time of his offense and had a record of prior court-martial conviction.

5. O'Donnell states that the NATO Treaty placed American servicemen under the jurisdiction of local civilian police.

The truth is that United States military personnel in France were subject to French jurisdiction long before the NATO Treaty was even conceived, and the fact is that the arrangements which came into force last August as a result of the ratification of the Status of Forces Treaty accord a wider measure of jurisdiction to our military authorities than they had prior to the Status of Forces Treaty.

6. O'Donnell states that the treaty made American servicemen in NATO countries subject to local jurisdiction "for the first time in our history."

This is untrue for the same reasons as those just enumerated.

7. O'Donnell states that Keefe drove off in a French taxi parked near the bistro.

This is untrue. In point of fact, Keefe and his companion engaged the taxi and requested the driver to drive them to the outskirts of Orleans. There they garroted him, threw him out of his taxi, and drove off to Paris in his taxi, leaving their victim stranded on the highway in the middle of the night. As a result of the assault the taxi driver suffered an injured nose and breakage of false teeth, was hospitalized, and was incapacitated for work for 30 days.

8. O'Donnell describes Keefe's conduct as a "high-tooting joyride."

This is obviously untrue in view of what has just been stated.

9. O'Donnell states that United States soldiers are quartered where a drunken $1 theft is punished by swinging a meat cleaver and amputating the guilty hand that scooped in the change.

This is most definitely not true under French jurisprudence, and I would add that I have no knowledge that any American soldier has been subject to this type of cruel and unusual punishment in any other country.

In view of the serious errors of fact which I have enumerated above, I hope you will reconsider both your letter and your distribution of the O'Donnell column of January 5. I will leave it to you as to what steps should be taken in the interest of accuracy and fair play to correct any misinformation which might have been circulated.

Yours sincerely,

H. STRUVE HENSEL.

TRIAL OF PVTS. RICHARD T. KEEFE, RA22919444, 9TH HIGHWAY TRANSPORTATION GROUP, APO 58, AND ANTHONY R. SCALETTI, US52106050, 7805 AU, APO 58

This report of the trial of Pvts. Richard T. Keefe and Anthony R. Scaletti is based on information submitted by official United States observers present at their trial.

Privates Keefe and Scaletti were tried by the Essize Court in Orleans, France, on October 27, 1953, on charges of having stolen a vehicle owned by a Mr. Henault, during the night, on a public highway and with violence, circumstances which aggravate the offense of theft under French law. Privates Keefe and Scaletti were sentenced each to confinement for 5 years and to pay court costs jointly in the sum of 26,638 francs ($76).

Privates Keefe and Scaletti were represented by a French attorney appointed by the French court and assisted by an interpreter, similarly appointed. Both the attorney and interpreter were provided the accused at the expense of the French Government. The accused as well as their attorney and the interpreter were present throughout the trial. The accused were tried before a jury consisting of seven persons. This jury, selected by an impartial drawing of names from a container in which 15 names had been placed, were not challenged, preemptorily or for cause, by either the prosecution or defense, although afforded an opportunity to do so.

The official United States observers state that the trial commenced with a reading of the charges, a recounting of events upon which they were predicated and a statement to the jury that the punishment for the offenses charged "(vol qualifie") in the absence of mitigating circumstances was life imprisonment at hard labor. Article 381 of the French Penal Code provides that one who is guilty of theft will be punished by hard labor for life if the theft is accompanied by only 4 of the 5 following circumstances:

1. If the theft was committed by night.

2. If it was committed by two or more persons.

3. If the culprits committed the crime either with the assistance of outside help, illicit entry, false keys into a house, apartment, room or inhabited locals or connecting locals thereto by taking the title of a public servant or civil or military officer or after having dressed in the uniform of the public servant or officer or by carrying a counterfeit order of the civil or military authority.

4. If the theft was committed with violence.

5. If one of the culprits assured themselves of a motor vehicle in order to facilitate the undertaking or assist their getaway.

Article 383 of the French Penal Code provides that thefts committed on roads or in railway cars serving for the transport of passengers, mail, or baggage anytime that they are part of a train will be punished by life at hard labor when they will have been committed with the inclusion of two of the conditions included under article 381.

Thereafter Keefe arose in the prisoners' box and the president, reading from a narrative composed of statements and investigations in the case, asked Keefe if the facts were true. The president paused frequently to allow the interpreter to translate and to question Keefe on the truth or falsity of what had been read. The substance of what Keefe admitted as true is as follows:

Both he and Scaletti arrived in Orleans together about June 30, 1953, or July 1, 1953, coming from a period of confinement in a United States guardhouse in Germany. On July 2, 1953, both accused went to the center of Orleans without permission about 1400 hours. After drinking various alcoholic beverages, Keefe lost all of his money but 2,000 francs in a dice game. It was now after dark and both decided to go to Paris. Scaletti returned to the unit and obtained both men's clothing. At about 2350 hours both entered a taxicab in front of the railway station in Orleans with the purpose of getting out on the main highway to hitchhike a ride to Paris. About 1 mile after going through Chevilly (which is a small town on the Paris road several miles from Orleans) they had the cab driver, Mr. Fernand Henault, stop the cab. Both got out and discussed the idea of taking the cab. Scaletti then got in the back seat and removed two shirts from their baggage, one of which he handed to Keefe who got in the front seat. Scaletti placed his shirt around the driver's neck and Keefe placed his in the driver's month. They then tried to drag the driver from the cab. Failing this, Keefe struck the cab driver. Keefe and the driver rolled out of the cab onto the ground. Scaletti started the cab and both got away. Keefe stated that his previous statement that he had struck the blows was not exact as he had been drinking, he was not sure who struck the blows. They then drove to Paris where they abandoned the taxi upon arrival. After spending several days in Paris (the first night in a hotel, the rest on benches) they left. Both were arrested at Nogent-le-Rotrou, southwest of Paris, by French police while hitchhiking at 1030 hours July 6. Keefe had a bloody uniform. Both confessed to the Army CID the same day after first denying to the French police that they had been in Orleans. Their rights were explained to them before confessing. No question of voluntariness was ever raised.

Scaletti then testified that the facts as stated by Keefe were true and that he had nothing to add or change. Both accused, gave information as to their age, place and date of birth, marital status and military record including their previous convictions by courts-martial.

A French doctor then testified that both men were mentally competent, both at the time of the offense and at the present time.

The victim, Mr. Fernand Henault, a 65-year-old taxicab driver from Orleans, then testified in substance as follows:

At 2350 hours, July 2, 1953, 2 American soldiers (who were identified in court as the 2 accused) got in his cab in front of the railway station in Orleans, asking him to drive them to a small cafe on the Paris road. One mile after Chevilly (not more than 20 minutes had elapsed) he stopped to allow the soldiers to relieve themselves. When they got back in, the one who entered the back placed an undershirt under his chin and pulled him away from the wheel. The one in the front started beating him. He lost consciousness and come to while still in the cab. He grabbed at one of the men and fell to the ground. The one with him on the ground then jumped up and rode away in the cab. About 10 minutes later a truck passed and stopped. The driver promised to notify the police in Orleans. As no one came for 2 hours, Henault walked to Chevilly where he notified the police and was given first aid by a doctor. He was then taken to a hospital in Orleans where he stayed for a period of time (he was incapacitated from work for 30 days). He had an injured nose, his false teeth were broken, and he had numerous cuts and bruises. No civil damages were asked.

The truck driver then testified. He corroborated Henault's statement that Henault had stopped him near Chevilly on the night of July 2–3, and described Henault's bloody condition. He did not pick him up as his company did not permit such and he was suspicious but he did notify the police.

Two bloody shirts found in the taxicab were brought before the court for examination.

The prosecution then presented its argument, stating in summary as follows:

The United States soldiers were in France to help defend it and that an agreement has been reached under which the French had the right to try Americans committing offenses in France. As taxi drivers were being beaten and robbed, a harsh sentence should be given. An example of this was two French soldiers who had murdered a taxi driver the week before. Further, that both men had a poor military record. (No anti-American remarks were made.)

The defense then presented its argument in summary as follows: The men were young, were not criminals, they had only committed military offenses, were just on a drinking fling.

Scaletti then stood up and stated, in substance, that he was sorry for what he had done. Keefe thereafter made a similar statement. After the presentation of evidence, the president stated that a finding on the following matters were required in accordance with the French penal code:

Was the crime committed (1) at night? (2) by two persons? (3) on a public highway? (4) with violence? (5) with violence that left injuries?

The 3 court members and the 7 jurors retired and deliberated on the guilt. A simple majority is required to convict and fix the sentence. After approximately 1 hour, they returned. The president stated that all questions were answered in the affirmative, and the penalty was set at 5 years "reclusion," with banishment from France being waived. No verbatim record was made (in accord with French legal procedures).

In the opinion of the United States observer:

(1) Both men were adequately represented by counsel, who brought out all points possible in their favor; (2) they were given an opportunity to question the witnesses against them, present their own witnesses, and make statements in their own belief; (3) the court interpreter was very competent; (4) no rights guaranteed by the NATO SOF Agreement or usually enjoyed under American law were denied.

Information available to the Department of the Army indicates that both Keefe and Scaletti were in French custody from July 6, 1953, to the time of trial.

A release of pretrial custody in July 1953 requested of Orleans authorities where the men were confined awaiting trial, was denied.

A waiver of jurisdiction requested of the French Ministry of Justice on July 13, 1953, was denied on August 5, 1953.

Recent sentences against French persons for similar offenses have ranged from 10 years to life. French taxi drivers recently staged a nationwide 1 hour protest strike because of a light sentence given to Frenchmen who robbed or assaulted cab drivers (all such sentences exceeded 5 years).

The accused were visited prior to trial by army authorities who informed them of their rights, the charges against them, and the possible penalties. Both had possession of the charges against them at this time and these charges were the same as those on which they were later convicted. The subject of their appointed counsel was discussed and they expressed no dissatisfaction. On October 20, 1953, their attorney was interviewed by army authorities and it appeared then that he seemed thoroughly familiar with the case.

Hydroelectric Power in the Pacific Northwest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 26, 1954

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, there are several schools of thought as to how to best develop hydroelectric power in the Pacific Northwest in order to obtain as fast as possible the maximum amount of electric power at the minimum cost to consumers—not only for household use but to attract industries with more payrolls and jobs for our increasing population.

One of these schools of thought advocates, although not very openly, a Federal monopoly.

One school of thought advocates getting the Federal Government completely out of the power business. I do not subscribe to either of these philosophies. Nor do I subscribe to the philosophy that private-enterprise power should be eliminated. In other words, I firmly believe that the best interests of the public and the consumer lie in coexistence, on a regulated and competitive basis, of Federal and locally controlled public and private systems. Strongly I believe in President Eisenhower's policy that the States, counties, and local communities should have a voice in the development of their natural resources and where advantageous or necessary such as with multipurpose projects, the Federal Government should be a partner. Under this partnership plan the Federal Government would enter in and bear its full share of the costs that are not within the capacity of local groups.

In reaching the best solution of the vital power development program, I doubt if we will ever get a complete meeting of the minds—except on the one point that we will have an ever-increasing need for more electric power. Meanwhile, as to how we should get it, propaganda—much of it one-sided—has been flowing freely—most of this material reaches my desk in Washington, D. C., and I read it. Frankly, I find in much of the material there is a great deal of partisan politics and serving of self-interest mixed in with often slanted facts.

On the other hand, it is heartening to see the magnificent cooperation that is possible when local groups can get together to work toward a common goal. This very thing happened in the Pacific Northwest last spring when the Puget Sound Utilities Council was formed. Here are 4 publicly operated and 1 privately-owned electric system, banding together to develop more power for us, for their mutual benefit and the benefit of all the people in the Pacific Northwest. The council has drawn nationwide praise for this forward-looking action.

Then when one finds that according to the Federal Power Commission's annual analysis of retail electric rates, two Puget Sound cities, Seattle and Tacoma, with locally managed municipal plants, offer the lowest all-round electric rates in the Nation, it proves the point that the closer the management to the people served the better the management and the better the service.

So, as a general rule, I favor local ownership of generating and distributing development, and when there is competition or controversy—as between them, or between one of them and the Federal Government—I favor whichever one unbiased engineers, not politicians, decide can give the most power at the lowest cost per kilowatt. The Federal Power Commission was created for this purpose, to hear testimony and make decisions on the basis of technical engineers' evidence. But when and where laymen and politicians and self-interest groups make such a decision a partisan issue, look out—for wishful thinking.

When I hear the outpourings of the various schools of thought as to how we should get additional hydroelectric power, frequently I observe attempts to "smear" private investment and private companies. Let us be fair. After all, power companies, both private and public, are regulated both as to bookkeeping and proper methods of charging expenses. Private power companies' profits are limited to a fair return on invested capital, and they pay taxes.

Beware of the politician who has all the answers. If you want good advice on the relative engineering merits of a controversial project like Hells Canyon in Idaho, for example—ask a good engineer who is not getting paid to come with facts and figures to prove the point of the group who is paying him.

Ike's Fiscal Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 27, 1954

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an editorial from the St. Louis Globe-Democrat dated Saturday, July 24, 1954:

IKE'S FISCAL RECORD

Disclosing statistics for his first complete fiscal year in office, President Eisenhower was almost jubilant. He had a right to be. Though the administration has not yet accomplished all its pledged toward reestablishing Federal finances on a solid basis, it has made a good showing.

Briefly here is the record:

The annual deficit has been reduced from 1953's figure of $9,389,000,000 to $3,029,000,000. Ike has not yet balanced the budget, but he has gone more than two-thirds of the way.

The year's deficit was $245 million less than the administration itself estimated last January.

The Eisenhower budget for the year just ended was $10 billion less than the previous Truman budget, which of course provided for the Korean war. Actual spending was $6,500,000,000 less than for the previous year.

All this was done simultaneously with a program of tax cuts aggregating some $7,500,000,000.

Inflation has been halted. The President reports buying power of the dollar has fluctuated only half of 1 percent during the last 18 months.

Some of this record has been achieved by reduction in outlays for defense armament, a program that has been a subject of debate. Mr. Eisenhower has abandoned crisis defense spending for a more orderly program of military readiness. He has adopted a long-view, in which defense must be obtained probably for decades at a high plateau. He conceives arms needs must therefore be held at a point commensurate with a healthy economy, or the Nation will spend itself poor for weapons which too soon become outmoded.

There can be no such thing as impregnable defense, especially over an extended period. The President's judgment—and that of his top military advisers—has been dedicated to an American defense consonant with needs, a continuing cold war and a healthy American economy.

Much of the record of slashed expenditure has been a result of economy in many phases of government, especially the military plant.

Is Eisenhower Briefed on AEC?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE L. HAYS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 26, 1954

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include an article by the well-known columnist Doris Fleeson, which I believe speaks for itself:

IS EISENHOWER BRIEFED ON AEC?—PRESS CONFERENCE ATTITUDE ON POWER CONTROVERSY SHOWS LACK OF KNOWLEDGE ON MAJORITY STAND

(By Doris Fleeson)

President Eisenhower himself now has raised another momentous question in connection with the controversial private utility contract he has ordered the Atomic Energy Commission and TVA to sign. It is whether he is getting the proper information to make the far-reaching decisions which are his remorseless daily portion.

At his press conference he was invited to discuss his attitude toward the question of whether the President has the power to order independent agencies to take action that their administrators or a commission majority oppose. He was reminded that a major point in current Senate debate arose out of testimony before the Joint Atomic Committee that three AEC commissioners opposed signing the moot contract.

The President disclosed that he did not know the AEC majority had opposed the contract. He described that information as "a premise."

It is not premise but a fact, testified to in public hearings and carried on the front pages of the Washington newspapers that he is said to read.

Had an AEC majority not opposed the contract, it would not have been necessary for the President, through the Budget Bureau, to order AEC to sign it. AEC has two other contracts with private utilities.

Two of the protesting AEC Commissioners described their reservations in a formal letter to the Budget Bureau. The new contract seemed to them incongruous, roundabout, and a perversion of their sober primary mission.

The President indicated that he thought he had had an opinion from the Attorney General in the matter. Though his language was very involved, he appeared to feel that he was merely accepting a responsibility that he said lots of people would like to get out of.

On July 11 last, Attorney General Brownell was asked on the telecast Meet the Press whether he had given his approval to the contract now so bitterly debated. The Attorney General replied categorically:

"No; that hasn't come to the Department of Justice in any way."

The President concluded by saying that he did not believe the AEC was an independent Commission in the sense that the Interstate Commerce or Federal Communications Commission are. It is something, he said, that he was compelled to take action on and over which to exercise supervision. Actually, AEC was established by Congress with the hope and aim of making that most sensitive agency of Government more independent than any other. To protect it from Congress itself and all other interference, a special joint committee was established to be its political shield and mentor.

All this and much more the President might have learned just before his press conference from a trusted friend and the only Republican Senator from the TVA area, COOPER, of Kentucky. Senator COOPER, never consulted prior to the President's order, climaxed a long, patient effort to resolve the situation by waiting from 10 to 11 o'clock in a White House anteroom Wednesday for a word with General Eisenhower before the President met the press.

The staff couldn't seem to find the right door. Senator COOPER had earlier—and vainly—talked to Presidential Assistant Adams, Budget Director Hughes, Counsel Shanley, AEC Chairman Strauss, and AEC General Manager Nichols.

This week a Senator warned an AEC Commissioner: "Son, your honeymoon is over. You have had everybody's respect, you have been sheltered from political pressures. Now you are fair game for everybody."

Winery Workers and Grape Growers Deserve Protection

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALLAN OAKLEY HUNTER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 27, 1954

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, a very large segment of the wine industry of California is located in my district. Many thousands of the people whom it is my honor and privilege to represent are engaged in the growing of grapes or the making of wine.

For 20 years, foreign wine interests have campaigned to cut United States import tariffs on foreign wines. They have obtained four successive reductions since 1936. Rates then and now are:

	1936	1954
Table wine (bottled)......per gallon..	$1.25	$0.37½
Table wine (bulk)..............do....	1.25	.62½
Champagne......................do....	6.00	1.50
Vermouth (bottled).............do....	1.25	.31¼
Vermouth (bulk)................do....	1.25	.62½
Marsala........................do....	1.25	.62½
Other dessert wines............do....	1.25	1.25

TABLE WINES HARD HIT

In 7 years, 1947 through 1953, imports of foreign table wines soared 465.61 percent; champagne, 232.05 percent; Vermouth, 106.44 percent; dessert wines, 8.85 percent; all wines, 171.54 percent. United States table wines have been dangerously hurt; they are being driven out of prestige eastern markets by low-priced foreign wines. High markups on foreign labels induce retailers to drop United States wines.

UNITED STATES GROWERS MUST SELL TO AMERICANS OR STARVE

Ninety-nine and nine-tenths of all United States-produced wines are sold within the United States and its Territories. There is no other market for American wines. Foreign markets are closed—by embargoes, exchange restrictions, red tape, high tariffs. United States tariff rates are now the lowest of any major wine growing country.

FOREIGN WINE SURPLUSES

Major European wine countries are plagued with large annual wine surpluses. The French surplus in a single year often is 2 or 3 times the total United States wine production. The Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations reported the 1953 French-Algerian wine surplus was 449,089,000 gallons; the 1953 Spanish surplus, 277,378,500 gallons. Tariff cuts apply to 33 countries, many of them with wine surpluses.

FOREIGN LABOR CHEAP

Vineyard labor costs are from 12 cents per hour in Portugal to 27 cents in France, as compared with $1 to $1.25 in California. Winery labor costs are 17 cents per hour in Spain, 33 cents in France, and $1.45 in California.

DESSERT WINES NEXT

Dessert wine tariffs, not yet seriously reduced, now are the main target. Spain, Portugal, Italy want the United States market now supplied by California dessert wines.

FOREIGN DUMPING WILL RUIN THE AMERICAN WINE INDUSTRY

Without tariff protection, all United States wines can be driven out by foreign dumping. They can be undersold by low-cost, low-priced foreign wines—because American vineyard and winery workers are paid high American wages, 4 to 10 times greater than in foreign wine regions.

WILL CREATE GRAPE SURPLUSES

Every gallon of low-priced foreign Port or Sherry brought in—at low ocean freight rates—will displace 25 pounds of California grapes—20 million gallons would add 250,000 tons to California grape surpluses. Unless stopped, tariff cuts will bring economic ruin to 158,000 United States grape and wine growers and to many thousands in allied industries.

SAVE THE UNITED STATES WINE INDUSTRY

Mr. Speaker, in an effort to save the United States wine industry and to protect the property and livelihood of many thousands of people in my district, I have introduced a bill, H. R. 9159, which provides a method of establishing and maintaining adequate tariff and quota protection for United States wines against unfair and injurious competition from low-priced foreign wines. This bill is supported by the Wine Institute, representing the wine industry of America.

Compulsory Installation of Automatic Radio Call Selector on United States Cargo Ships

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 26, 1954

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 6004 would require United States cargo vessels carrying less than two radio operators to either put on a second operator or to install a patented device called an automatic radio call selector. It is poor legislation and should be rejected.

By indirection the net result would be mandatory installation, since the cost of the device would be less than the expense of an extra radio operator. This would affect approximately 1,500 merchant ships and would force them to buy a device which costs, before being changed to meet new specifications, about $1,750 installed. What the cost would be if and when the device is redesigned to meet increased application, as provided by amendments to the bill, no one knows.

As originally introduced this measure would have given one manufacturing concern a virtual monopoly. The committee sought to remedy this by an amendment requiring the patents to be available at reasonable cost. Personally, I doubt if other manufacturers could make this instrument on a competitive basis—the potential volume of business would not warrant it. So all the bill might accomplish, in my opinion, would be aid to one manufacturer.

The committee also amended the bill to provide that this device must respond to certain Morse-code signals as well as radio signals, and that it must be tested and approved by the Federal Communications Commission.

I oppose H. R. 6004 because it places an unnecessary burden on our merchant marine and duplicates the present internationally accepted autoalarm. The only difference is that the radio call device provided in this bill would be a code calling a particular ship instead of the present autoalarm which calls all ships. The radio call, if installed, would therefore do little more than duplicate the function of the present autoalarm as far as safety at sea is concerned.

Assuming that the necessary adjustments required in this legislation were effected, and assuming further that it was tested and approved by the Commission, and assuming thereafter that it was installed on every American cargo ship—what then? I fail to see where any of our maritime disasters, from the *Titanic* on down to the present time, would have been any less tragic.

During the hearings many cases were cited, but the fact remains that the present international distress signals would have alerted a nearby ship. Any foreign ship in nearby waters would not be alerted under this device, because it would be installed only on American ships.

The Moore-McCormack Line was cited during the hearings as having used this system on their ships. This was an unfortunate reference because, if you look at pages 43 and 44 of the printed hearings, you will find a letter signed by L. B. Victor, manager of Moore-McCormack's radio department. Mr. Victor says:

> This call alarm appeared to be very promising, but after our experience with 35 units during the past 5 years we have changed our opinion in regard to its reliability.

Again quoting from the same letter:

> In 1949 it was found that about 50 percent of the calls on Moore-McCormack vessels were inoperative due to mechanical failure.

After a change in specifications improvement was noted, but the letter stated that interference from other radio transmission or from static frequently disrupted the selector and prevented proper performance. The writer then gave his opinion that the automatic call alarm could not supplement or replace the autoalarm in summoning aid to vessels in distress.

Here is a summary of Department reports on H. R. 6004—all of them unfavorable:

Compulsory Installation of an Automatic Radio Call Selector on United States Cargo Ships

COMMENTS BY GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

1. The Secretary of Commerce is opposed to this legislation because it makes no contribution to safety at sea, and it duplicates already existing compulsory equipment which is better suited to receive distress calls (pp. 4 and 45 of the hearings):

"There appears to be no reason why an automatic call selector should be made compulsory for United States cargo ships carrying only one radio operator. Title III, part II, of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, is concerned with radio regulations designed to enhance the safety of life and property at sea. It is not believed that the installation of automatic radio call selectors would make a substantial contribution toward the safety of United States cargo ships already equipped with autoalarms.

"The automatic radio call selector appears to duplicate, in a less effective manner the function of an autoalarm tuned to the 500-kilocycle calling and distress frequency. The autoalarm will sound an alarm upon picking up the autoalarm distress signal transmitted to all ships. An automatic radio call selector set for the call sign of the ship carrying it will respond only if that particular call is transmitted. It is important for a ship in distress to alert as many other vessels as possible. It appears that the autoalarm, now required by law, is better suited to accomplish this than the automatic radio call selector which, under the circumstances, seems to be superfluous equipment insofar as safety is concerned."

2. The Department of Defense (Navy Department) is opposed to this legislation (p. 46 of the hearings) because it makes mandatory the installation of a device not presently in existence and not yet approved by the FCC. At such time as such a device is in existence and has been approved, they would not object to mandatory installation on United States vessels:

"Until such a device has been approved by the Federal Communications Commission, and its commercial manufacture has proved to be practicable, the Department of Defense cannot approve a provision requiring its installation. The Department of the Navy, therefore, on behalf of the Department of Defense, is opposed to the proposed amendment to H. R. 6004."

3. The FCC is opposed to the legislation because there is no such device now available, nor has one been submitted to FCC, for testing; if such a device were available, it would, by its very nature, be subject to a high degree of false alarms; the autoalarm device now required is adequate and is accepted by international agreement; it has been improved from time to time since its introduction 30 years ago; the FCC has no record of failures of existing equipment to meet its objectives; and the proposed device would only be required on 1,250 United States vessels, leaving 7,000 foreign vessels in the same trade routes without equal protection.

4. The Treasury Department (Coast Guard) opposes this legislation and states that they have experimented with a less complicated device by the same manufacturer as the one advocating this legislation (namely, Brelco Manufacturing Co.), and found it undependable. Further, they have found present autoalarm device adequate for safety purposes.

The Coast Guard, it must be recalled, is charged with the administration of the safety of life at sea statutes and thereby assumes the responsibility for shipboard safety on United States vessels.

5. Not a single Government agency testified on behalf of this legislation.

COMMENTS BY SHIPPING INDUSTRY

1. The shipping industry would not be opposed to this legislation if it made any contribution to safety at sea. We can only reiterate the staetments of the Coast Guard, FCC, Commerce Department, and the Navy that the present mandatory autoalarm is more than adequate from a safety standpoint to receive distress calls during off-watch hours. To force by statute the hiring of an additional radio operator (at about $6,500 per year, plus room and board, plus welfare benefits) in the event this untested, untried, nonexistent device at an unknown cost is not installed within a certain length of time, is, to say the least, unusual in the annals of legislation.

2. Telecommunications standards aboard ship are determined by international agreement. Section 922 of the International Radio Regulations requires that only distress calls and urgent cyclone warnings must be receivable on an autoalarm. The present equipment now on all United States vessels meets this requirement. General alerting by alarm devices on a range of less urgent frequencies has never come up for consideration at international meetings on safety at sea.

3. The Brelco Co., which in the past has manufactured a simplified form of the more complex device called for in this legislation, on July 1954 held a demonstration of a device which laid claim to the features called for in this legislation. This demonstration was reported in the New York Times on Monday, July 12, 1954. The best information available is that this demonstration was attended by two radio operator union members, several officials of the company, and a newspaper reporter. It is significant that no technical communications personnel from FCC, the electronics industry, or steamship lines were in attendance. The best information available is that none were invited.

4. Steamship industry witnesses were not invited to appear at the hurriedly called hearings on H. R. 6004 on May 3, 1954, although the industry was on record in previous hearings (1953) as being in opposition. However, written testimony was received from industry associations but no cognizance was taken of these views in the majority report on the bill.

MAJORITY REPORT

Even the majority report (H. Rept. 1906) does not completely support the safety objectives of the bill. In the report's conclusion it states (p. 5):

"The availability of this equipment on American ships might make an important contribution to safety on the high seas."

MINORITY REPORT

The minority report on the bill (p. 8) sums up the objections as follows:

"Legislation of this type is most unusual. If there is doubt as to the facts, the normal procedure is to direct that a study be conducted and a factual report be compiled. There is ample precedent for this method of proceeding in many fields of legislation and specifically in the field of marine safety radio requirements" (sec. 602 (e) of Communications Act of 1934), and concludes "* * * the legislation is premature and unwarranted at this time, in light of all the uncertainties."

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

The Merchant Marine Committee of the House, responsible for shipping legislation, was not consulted on this bill.

The Liberals Put on a Disgraceful Show

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TIMOTHY P. SHEEHAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 27, 1954

Mr. SHEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, it has been my observation through the years that the so-called liberals do not practice what they preach. The current filibuster in the Senate against the atomic energy bill is a classic example of the liberal disregard of principles when it suits their own particular need.

David Lawrence, in his column of Monday, July 26, in the Washington Star, made some pertinent comments on the so-called liberals. Mr. Lawrence's column is as follows:

Speaking of Disgraceful Shows: Columnist Wonders Why No Censure for Filibusters for Methods and Conduct Unbecoming Senate

Conduct unbecoming a United States Senator and which brings the United States Senate itself into disrepute has just been witnessed by the American people as they have watched a group of Senators in the minority striving to impose their will on a frustrated majority.

Where is the resolution of censure for the Senators who use methods that override constitutional ethics and the rules of fair play and seek to prevent the passage of laws through a contest in physical endurance, with all-night sessions, prearranged relays of speakers, and unlimited debate in what is known as a filibuster?

For several days now the Congress of the United States has been unable to function on a legislative program involving billions of dollars of appropriations and on measures of far-reaching consequence to the welfare of the people. The accumulated damage allegedly done by Senator McCarthy in his brusque handling of persons accused of having Communist connections is infinitesimal compared with the damage done by the filibuster of the last several days not only to the public business but to the prestige of the Senate itself, both here and abroad.

For the filibuster is just a palpably dishonest device whereby a rollcall vote, desired by the majority, is prevented through the incessant speechmaking of the minority, who hope by these tactics to force the majority to yield lest other bills—also sought by the majority—be sidetracked or lost if they do not come to a vote before the end of the session. No piece of legislation was ever so bad that it couldn't, if passed, be promptly repealed or amended when subsequent experience shows its errors. Hence no filibuster is ever justified in a constitutional democracy.

But who were the Senators conducting the latest filibuster? Did they come from the ranks of the "wicked reactionaries?" On the contrary, the group which has been engaged in the longest filibuster in the history of the Senate is composed primarily of so-called liberals—the men who usually prate about constitutionalism and the "rights of the people" and about the methods of whose who, they claim, are transgressing constitutional rights and trying to bring about thought control and conformity of thought.

Filibustering itself, of course, is not unconstitutional any more than is browbeating of witnesses before congressional committees or using the floor of Congress to call citizens liars and other epithets under cover of congressional immunity. But when the so-called liberals use disgraceful methods and get big headlines and their pictures in the newspapers as participants in a "talkathon," there are, strangely enough, no resolutions of ensure introduced nor any telegrams gathered by public-relations firms from lists of prominent people to clamor for the punishment of these obstructionists.

There is always a plausible excuse given by the filibusterers. This time it is that they wish to prevent what they call a giveaway of certain atomic-energy developments by the Government to private industry, though Government-owned channels in radio and television have long been awarded to private companies which make profits thereon. It's an oge-old controversy between Government ownership and private ownership, between state socialism or Communist socialism and private enterprise. The steady pressure for an all-powerful state, in which a political bureaucracy shall dispense favors to its political henchmen, has never let up since the New Dealers and Fair Dealers began to apply the scheme in various pieces of legislation.

The American people are really behind President Eisenhower in his drive to get the Government out of business and to give the people the opportunity to earn their own living and to conserve their savings and invest them in business enterprises, but the minority in the Senate uses the specious argument that the issue isn't fully understood—as if the voluminous record of millions of words spoken in several days of continuous debate will ever be read by anybody except the official stenographers.

The issue is well understood already. It is the difference between freedom of initiative and the stifling of initiative, between private enterprise and Government ownership or control of every business, every retail store, and every doctor's office, with no incentive to service and no competition to insure the quality of the product at the lowest price.

But, irrespective of the merits of this question, if the majority are ready to vote, why should the coercive tactics of a group of Senators with strong lungs defeat another group which apparently must appease them or else allow a whole legislative program to be wrecked? Is there anything which is more deserving of the censure of the people than unfair methods used in blocking legislation needed to promote the welfare of tens of millions of persons—their tax benefits and their social-security gains and their measures of national defense, all of which have been delayed by a phony liberalism and an unconscionable abuse of senatorial privileges? But will there be any resolutions of censure introduced now? Of course not—for these evidently are reserved only for one Senator who, sometimes with a bid of excessive zeal, fights the communistic influences in our Government and our insitutions which, if successful in their penetration, can make a shambles of individual freedom and democracy itself.

Indochina: Defeat or Retreat, or Both?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL B. DAGUE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 27, 1954

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, it is encouraging to find one of our columnists placing a logical estimate on the Indochina fiasco by plainly calling it a defeat of Western and especially American policy. I also find in Miss Dorothy Thompson's article in yesterday's Evening Star a brief and perhaps nostalgic reference to the policy of Washington's day when we were admonished by the Father of our Country to beware of entangling alliances. As Miss Thompson points out, we have been trying to pull everyone's chestnuts out of the fire and when we have burnt our fingers we have found that the sponsors of the causes we have been fighting have left us. In the plain assumption that Indochina and Israel and Egypt and a dozen other hot spots are none of our business, since we are bound to none of them by solemn commitment as we are to South Korea, we had better start tending our own fences and leave these colonial experiments to those who have profited from them. Miss Thompson's article follows and is worth reading:

Too Much of the Wrong Thing—Settlement at Geneva Held Defeat of An American Policy Which Has Changed Sharply Since Washington's Day

The settlement in Indochina is a defeat of Western and especially of American policy. It will be only another of a long series of defeats if the policy is not changed. But instead of digesting the defeat, which, under all the circumstances, was inevitable, attempts (such as that of Senator Knowland) will be made to extend the policy, and to find scapegoats for American failure to go too little, instead of too much, of the wrong thing.

The wrong thing has been to desert the traditional and successful American policy laid down at the beginning of the Republic which has been falsely branded as isolationism. That policy was not to pull other people's chestnuts out of fires, especially out of fires they themselves had kindled. It was to display toward all states, whatever their social and political form, a prideful courtesy that demanded strict reciprocity. It was to make no permanent alliances, but to maintain freedom of diplomatic action. It was never to be a mercenary for others, never to fight wars for millenial and unobtainable objectives, such as eternal peace and the world rule of law (whose law?), never to enter into dubiously enforceable pacts, but to keep one's power in reserve, and, in times of international crisis, be prepared to say the last word instead of the first one.

In the last generation nearly every vestige of that policy has been progessively abandoned in favor of universal Galahading, until today there is no party in America prepared even to debate it. The Republican Party, which, as the guardian of the conservative and traditional American forces, should have done so, even at the risk, temporarily, of losing, joined the bandwagon of the universal antisin campaign, and is now inheriting the debacle of its predecessors' policies, which it made its own.

Our allies, however, have had some second thoughts, and far from being their leader we are becoming their barely tolerated tool. This column does not censure them for this. All states take primary cognizance of their own interests and limitations with a view to their survival—all states, apparently, except our own.

Our allies count on the United States to back them in checking communism, or rebellions for independence, whether or not they are Communist-led or inspired, wherever the advance of these threatens their own interests, as it threatened the interests of France in Indochina, and will threaten them increasingly in North Africa. But they will certainly not join the United States in a universal crusade for liberation that might, conceivably, precipitate another world war. In the face of that possibility they will quit and ask the United States to ratify the terms of quitting, putting us in on all the defeats, in which, do to our proddings to hold the line, the United States comes off as the most ignominious, stripped of everything except a blanket of morality in which to wrap itself.

The advance of communism in the world is less a record of Russian victories than of American failures—of betting on the wrong forces ("wrong" because doomed) at the wrong historical time and under the wrong historical circumstances. Nothing could make the Indochinese pro-French, or the Arab world pro-French or pro-British, or India anti-Chinese. But America can make them all anti-American by convincing herself that every rebellion in the world, whatever its cause and case, and however inevitable and overdue, is Communist-inspired and must, for that reason, be suppressed.

We had the initial advantage in Asia of never having been a colonial power, or being the authors of the idea of self-determination and national independence, of having no military bases or forces on the soil of other nations, nor using the lesser breeds to fight our wars.

Not having taken up the white man's burden, we were happily spared having to lay it down. Instead our leaders have taken up what others better trained than we, and wiser in experience, have been forced to cast off.

This is just not bright, and no amount of platitudinous moralizing will cover its intellectual bankruptcy. In politics results count, not words.

The Upper Colorado River Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. DAWSON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 27, 1954

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the gentleman from California [Mr. Yorty] took occasion in the Appendix of the Congressional Record to charge that the Republican Party was supporting the upper Colorado River storage project for "purely political motives." Since I am author of the legislation to authorize this project I deeply resent the statement of the gentleman that this project is a political pork-barrel foisted on the Nation's taxpayers by the Republicans.

This is the first time that this vital project, developed during the previous administration and approved by the previous Democrat Secretary of the Interior, has been dragged into the political arena.

I feel it is incumbent, therefore, upon me to set the record straight concerning certain of the loose charges made by the gentleman from California, apparently for home consumption only.

It is regrettable that the attack upon the project is not more specific. It is regrettable but perhaps understandable. Despite the fact that the gentleman contends that this project would seriously endanger the water supply of his own State, he was not in attendance during most of the time that testimony from expert witnesses was received. The Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation of the House Interior Committee, of which the gentleman is a member, held 22 meetings on this vital project, and the gentleman attended only 4 of these meetings. The full committee which reported the bill out by a narrow margin, held 2 full meetings and the gentleman attended only 1. Had he had an opportunity to hear the testimony or a chance to read the Record, I trust he would have hesitated to make some of the statements attributed to him in yesterday's Record. For example, the gentleman charges, and I quote:

> The upper Colorado River project is the most infeasible, costly, and impractical water and power scheme ever concocted by a Federal bureau.

This, of course, is not a fact.

The facts are, 99.2 percent of the entire cost of this project will be repaid in a 50-year period to the United States Treasury. All power features of the project will be repaid with interest. The cost of operation, maintenance, and replacement will be paid by the direct beneficiaries of the project, and after the 50 year repayment program is completed, the project will yield the Government an income of from fifteen to twenty million dollars per year thereafter. In addition, of course, we have all of the other advantages of a reclamation program, such as increased tax revenue from industrial and agricultural development made possible by the project.

The gentleman from California also charges that there is no market in the area for the power to be produced by this project. Of course, this is not a fact. During the extensive hearings, which the gentleman was unable to attend, spokesmen for the private utilities operating in Utah, Wyoming, Colorado, and New Mexico testified that they were desirous of marketing any and all power the project would produce. We in the upper basin States feel that these attacks on the project from California come with poor grace. More than any other reclamation State, California has benefited from the interest-free features of our reclamation program. California also has been one of the chief beneficiaries of the write-off provision for flood control, which gives the beneficiary of multiple purpose projects Federal funds and which requires no repayment.

The gentleman from California says that projects such as the upper Colorado River Basin threaten the end of reclamation development.

I suggest to the gentleman that reclamation development will not be killed by the authorization of such basically sound projects as the one which he so vociferously attacks. If reclamation is in danger, it is endangered by the spokesmen of southern California who in their attempt to get water allocated by solemn compact to the four upper basin States, are reckless enough to center their attacks upon the heart of the reclamation program—the provision for interest-free loans for the construction of irrigation works.

Organic Chemicals and Tariffs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 27, 1954

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert an article in the Appendix of the Record which appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald, Tuesday, July 27, 1954.

This article was written by Mr. Cary R. Wagner, president, Synthetic Organic Chemical Manufacturers Association of New York, which is in reply to a recent statement by Mr. Charles Taft regarding tariff misrepresentation.

The article is as follows:

Organic Chemicals and Tariffs

You appropriately captioned Mr. Taft's letter in the Wednesday, July 21, issue, High Tariff Misrepresentations. Mr. Taft has the unhappy knack of confusing the facts in his criticism of industries to whom tariff protection is important.

For example. He states that the chemical industry exports $800 million worth of goods annually, and that "the Tariff Commission says" only $9 million of chemical imports are critical compared with his figure of $18 billion of domestic production.

Now, the Tariff Commission has never made any report upon which Mr. Taft's remark of only $9 million of critical imports would be based. He has repeatedly used this statement in his attempts to belittle the concern of the organic chemical industry over our national tariff policy. We asked the Tariff Commission if there were any Tariff Commission information on which the $9 million figure could have been based. The Tariff Commission advised us by a letter dated May 24, 1954, signed by its chairman that "the commission has never indicated either in its publications or orally by any members of its staff that the imports of coal-tar products in 1952, to which the $9 million relate, are the only really sensitive items among imports of all synthetic organic chemicals.

Imports of all synthetic organic chemicals in 1953 totaled $51 million, compared with $45 million for 1952, an increase of 13 percent. Exports for 1953 were $300 million, a decline of nearly 9 percent over 1952's $328 million. These figures illustrate the steady increase in United States imports of organic chemicals accompanied by a decline in United States exports of organic chemicals. In the fine chemicals sector of our industry the effect is particularly sharp. Domestic sales of dyes and medicinals declined in 1953 while imports increased 22 percent and 100 percent, respectively. Exports of dyes have declined sharply each year since 1947, falling from $78 million in that year to $14 million in 1952. Data for 1953 are not yet available.

Employment in the organic chemical industry has declined steadily since August of 1953, the loss in production workers reaching 24,000 employees or 10 percent by March of this year, the latest month for which figures have been reported.

These facts should be considered in the light of the extensive cuts which have been made in organic chemical tariffs—90 out of 116 rates having been reduced by trade-agreement concessions. The average ad valorem equivalent of duties paid on chemical imports in 1952, the most recent year for which the data have been published, was a low of 12.4 percent.

In 1953, United States imports provided 97 percent of the dollar exchange required by foreign countries for purchases and the service of United States loans and investments. As the Department of Commerce points out, the portion of the United States exports of goods and services financed by foreign countries from the proceeds of United States imports was higher in 1950–53 than during the entire period between the First and Second World Wars. Foreign countries were able in the 1950–53 period to add $7.8 billion to their reserves.

This remarkable record shows that "trade, not aid" is but the modern-day cry of "wolf." Our tariffs are certainly no barrier to trade. They are so low on many items that many of our domestic industries, large and small, are seriously affected by the constantly increasing imports and a loss of world markets to low-wage, low-tax foreign competition. Mr. Taft's belittling the situation with a cloud of incorrect or misleading statistics will not help the American public to understand the real nature of the issue.

Cary R. Wagner.

Tiny Device May Revolutionize Peacetime Pursuits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 27, 1954

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to call to the attention of the House an article which appeared in the Waterbury (Conn.) Sunday Republican of July 25, 1954. The article is most timely because at this moment the President is considering a recommendation of the Tariff Commission to extend some relief to the horological industry which is faced with ultimate destruction from a flood of watches and clocks from abroad. This article points out very eloquently the need for keeping our pool of trained domestic technicians and skilled workers in this industry intact.

The article follows:

Tiny Device May Revolutionize Peacetime Pursuits—Seen As Vital Force for World Peace, Too

On a peaceful hill in Middlebury, engineers and workmen of the United States Time Corp. are busy these days preparing to turn out on a mass production basis the world's smallest rate gyroscope, which may be a deciding factor in defending the free world in any future war.

The Sanders Subminiature Precision Rate Gyroscope (to call it by its technical name) may, in the opinion of United States Time engineers, revolutionize the future of peacetime transportation and communication as well as warfare. Although you cannot pin them down to the point of actually making a prediction, they do visualize a future day when gyroscope guided missiles will deliver mail from the east coast to the west coast so swiftly that a letter mailed in New York in the afternoon will be on the desk of a Los Angeles or San Francisco executive the same morning.

The rate type of gyroscope means an instrument that can indicate the rate of directional change in a moving object—and do something about it. And that, in turn, means guided robot planes, guided fighting ships on the high seas and guided missiles of destruction, with or without atomic loads.

HELPS OTHER WAYS

It also has other uses: Guiding aircraft instruments, radar antenna stabilization, fire control, and even such peaceful pursuits as keeping fishing smacks and pleasure boats on the right course. But it is its importance in time of war that is significant, because today nations are vying in the development of better and better "gyro brains."

This powerful little directional instrument, which is operated electrically, is so small that no other gyroscope possibly can compare with it. Its great importance, aside from its functions, is that it saves considerable space compared with the older standard gyros. It is less than an inch in diameter, not more than 2¼ inches long and weighs 3½ ounces—smaller than an ordinary flashlight battery. Compare this with the average gyroscope which is 3 times as long, nearly 3 times as great in diameter and weighs from a pound to well in excess of 5 pounds.

In spite of the difference in size, this amazing subminiature gyroscope sacrifices little in the way of precision, accuracy, or all-around reliability. In fact, the power within its small hermetically sealed cylinder is almost startling. Its motor drives the rotor at a speed of 24,000 revolutions per minute, or 400 each second. This speed can be attained from a dead start in less than 15 seconds. It is unusually insensitive to shock and vibration.

FAMILIAR GYROS

What is a gyro, anyway? In its simplest form it is a spinning wheel, disc or any other mass which is universally mounted; that is, it can rotate in all directions—about its own axle, about horizontal pivots, and about the vertical axis. Its center of gravity is in a fixed position but the wheel is free to turn in any direction around this point.

Most of us know of the string-walking gyroscopes regularly appearing in children's toys. With their rotors spinning rapidly, the devices can hang as if by magic from the lip of a glass. Or the owner of an automobile may or may not know that when his car makes a right-hand turn at a corner, the flywheel of the motor acts as a gyroscope.

Once their rotors are whirling, gyroscopes have the property of resisting change in the way they are oriented in space. So if a rotor is brought up to speed while lying in a horizontal plane, it resists being shifted radially on its own axis. This quality makes gyroscopes particularly effective in keeping airborne antennas sweeping the same area of sky regardless of the pitching and rolling of the plane.

United States Time decided to go into the mass production of these instruments—something never attempted before—long before there was an inkling that the Government would cancel its contracts for the production of mechanical time fuses. Indeed, the only connection between the two at this time is their mutual requirement of the one essential: Precision. Precision is by no means a stranger to United States-Time plants. It goes back to the middle of the 19th century when the old Waterbury Clock Co. turned out one of the first low-priced precision watches, later resulting in the mass production of Ingersoll dollar watches. Today United States Time's assembly lines are manufacturing many brands of watches, Timex and Ingersoll being the best known, and always the watchword is precision.

EXPERIMENTS NOTED

It was the importance of precision in the production of a gyroscope that interested United States Time when it learned that a group of scientists, known as Sanders Associates, up in Nashua, N. H., was experimenting with a revolutionary new type of instrument. In the latter part of July 1953, United States Time entered into an arrangement with the Sanders organization whereby the two firms agreed to pool their skills and facilities in the manufacture of the gyro. Sanders, which had expanded rapidly in the electronics field in recent years, continued research, development and pilot production in its Nashua plant, United States Time became responsible for the manufacture, merchandising and sale of the gyro.

Since that day more than a year ago, engineers of both firms have been carrying on secret experiments and improvements.

Actually, United States Time was engaged in gyroscope manufacture long before. In 1924 it began production of precision gyroscopes for the Armed Forces. During the Second World War and the Korean conflict its rate of gyro production rose as high as 17,000 a month.

Roger Lancaster of Stamford, manager of the firm's special products division, is also manager of the Gyroscope Division at United States Time. Edward G. Molin, 487 Farmington Avenue, is the Middlebury plant project manager, and Roger Bryson, Northfield Road, Watertown, is the electrical engineer.

Geneva: Synonym for Sellout

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL B. DAGUE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 27, 1954

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, the most nauseating performance put on in connection with the Geneva Conference, second to the abject appeasement of the French, has been that which has been staged by the British diplomats, and particularly our old friend, Sir Winston. In the following editorial taken from the Philadelphia Inquirer last Saturday, the damning parallel between Munich and Geneva is emphasized and we are amazed at the Churchillian affrontery in congratulating Eden for collaborating in the identical thing for which he castigated Chamberlain 16 years ago. It has been amusing to witness the alacrity with which Britain moved when one of her own possessions in the Western Hemisphere was threatened by a pro-Communist coup, while later looking askance at our evident interest in anti-Communist success in Guatemala. And we can only conjecture as to whether Britain will continue to be so enthusiastic for the admission of Red China to the U. N. now that those murderers have shot defenseless Britons and Americans out of the air. The editorial herein referred to follows:

Editorial by Sir Winston

After signing of the Indochina truce, Sir Winston Churchill sent this message to Foreign Secretary Anthony Eden at Geneva:

"I send you my sincere congratulations and those of your colleagues on the success which has at length rewarded your patient, persevering skill at Geneva."

In this "success" the free world surrendered 13 million Vietnamese to Red slavery, yielded half of Vietnam, and left the remainder, together with Laos and Cambodia, defenseless before future Red infiltration.

After the pact which another Briton signed at Munich, handing over a large part of Czechoslovakia to Hitler and leaving the rest at his mercy, Sir Winston cried:

"One pound was demanded at the pistol point. When it was given, 2 pounds were demanded at the pistol point. Finally, the dictator consented to take 1 pound 17 shillings 6 pence, and the rest in promise of good will for the future."

Yet Chamberlain thought he had bought "peace in our time." He was acclaimed more loudly than Eden is today.

Recalling that it is but 8 years since V-E Day, the whole free world might ponder another Churchill comment in 1938:

"Historians a thousand years hence will still be baffled by the mystery of our affairs. They will never understand how it was that a victorious nation, with everything in hand, suffered themselves to be brought low and to cast away all that they had gained by measureless sacrifice and absolute victory—gone with the wind."

Advancement of Physical Medicine in Corpus Christi, Tex.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. LYLE, JR.

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 27, 1954

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, any advancement in treatment of polio and cerebral palsy is of interest to the entire Nation.

Unusual progress has been made in Corpus Christi, Tex., through the efforts of Mrs. Sam Wilson, Jr., and Dr. K. J. Kemp, outstanding orthopedic surgeon, and many others.

Under unanimous consent, I include with these remarks excerpts from a report prepared by Dr. K. J. Kemp with the help of Ruel McDaniel, entitled "Advance of Physical Medicine in Corpus Christi, Tex."

I am very proud of Mrs. Wilson and the faith, courage, and determination that drove her to this unusual service to humanity.

The above mentioned follows:

Advancement of Physical Medicine in Corpus Christi, Tex.

(By K. J. Kemp, M. D., with Ruel McDaniel)

When Mrs. Sam E. Wilson, Jr., Corpus Christi, Tex., went with her young daughter to arrange for swimming lessons early in 1938, she unwittingly set an entirely new pattern for her life. That visit with a local lifeguard who gave private swimming instructions indirectly transformed this society wife of a leading Texas oil man into a missionary for the betterment of the lot of crippled children, and more particularly those marked by cerebral palsy.

Subsequent events that followed that visit have resulted in a creation of an idea and eventual construction of a modern crippled children's hospital operating under the name of Children's Hospital Medical Center, Inc., and better known as the Ada Wilson Hospital of Physical Medicine, that have drawn the attention of leading medical authorities in many sections of the Nation to this semitropical Texas city and the woman who as a layman has contributed so much to the progress of physical medicine in the United States.

That was the beginning of her interest in physical medicine. It has led her into a maze of study, experimentation, promotion, and development that has amazed specialists in the treatment of crippled children.

With her apparently boundless energy, her grim determination, and her sometimes good-natured "bulldozing" of doctors on her staff, she has not only built what generally is credited as being the first complete hospital in physical medicine in the United States, but has unwittingly established a reputation as a layman authority. Hers was the first hospital in Corpus Christi and Nueces County to be approved by American College of Surgeons.

In 1938, when this clinic started, there was no record anywhere in the Nation of another hospital or clinic specializing in physical medicine.

I was appointed medical director of the outpatient clinic upon its opening in 1938 and served as director for 14 years. Dr. Jackson E. Upshaw was appointed 2 years ago and is now medical director.

When I accepted appointment to the Ada Wilson Crippled Children's Hospital, Mrs. Wilson's first statement to me was, "We have another orthopedist whom I had the opportunity to select, but I have selected you for a top position and we want top efficiency, and top interest in this new phase of medicine—physical therapy, which you are going to direct as physical medicine. You're expected as a physician, to serve not only as diagnostician, but help our physical therapists. Every patient will be under your care from admittance to dismissal. Dr. Kemp, we have an unbounded future. It will take money, lots of it. The maintenance of a growing institution means responsibility. This phase of it does not worry me. It is the question of the medical aspects of cerebral palsy, the research stages and the advancement. I sincerely think we can do great things with physical therapy." Mrs. Wilson's own determination and perservance were incentive for further coordination tryouts. After a few months practice, I felt that I was a real part of the institution.

My fellow physicians know that the medical results of physical therapy treatments and all branches of physical medicine 16 years ago were little known and little appreciated. Dr. Winthrop Phelps is called the daddy of physical therapy. Many of our therapists were trained under him. He was assisted by many other renowned orthopedists who have paved the way for physical medicine as it is practiced today. Improvement and recovery of the cerebral palsied is a slow process, even with the best facilities today, and the challenge was a mammoth one for both Mrs. Wilson and me.

Here is a woman, a layman with philosophy and faith, who met this challenge squarely and forcefully with a burning desire for new methods, new treatments, and continuous research for these forgotten children.

Recommendations of the American College of Surgeons were followed in establishment of the hospital proper. It now consists of departments of physical therapy, speech and occupational therapies, hospitalization, X-ray, surgery, and the Ada Wilson School for Crippled Children.

The hospital itself has a staff of 38, including 5 physical therapists, 2 occupational therapists, 1 speech therapist, 6 registered nurses, 15 nurses' aids, radiologist, pathologist, neuro-surgeon, medical director, supervisor, psychiatrist, and 5 orthopedic physicians practice in the hospital.

The Ada Wilson School was founded as an integral part of the hospital because Mrs. Wilson takes the view that the child is a whole personality and that his academic progress should continue. In her visits to other crippled children's hospitals she noticed that the bodies of many of the children were being treated, but that their minds were being neglected.

The problem of accomplishing this coordinated program was not easy. At first, Mrs. Wilson had to finance the school in its entirety. But eventually the local school board recognized the practicality of the academic program and made the Ada Wilson School a unit of the public-school system under a law which Mrs. Wilson lobbied through the Texas Legislature.

Statistics show that about 70 percent of the attendance at the school could never have received any schooling prior to treatments that made the brain injured educable. The previously noneducable child has been made educable and is being educated.

The hospital recently has set up a training course for physical therapists and occupational therapists to start officially in October 1954. Two students took the course in the spring of 1954. The special school will be directed by and staffed by a psychiatrist and physical therapists, with Mrs. George Buckholtz (the former Amelia Geiger) as head of the occupational therapy training course. Courses are open to students of most of the State and out-of-State colleges and universities. A postgraduate course in both occupational and physical therapy also is being set up.

Without knowledge of medicine, Mrs. Wilson, with her intense interest in crippled children and her knowledge and understanding of human needs, has generalized an advanced program in physical medicine, and is utilizing the knowledge of physicians and physical therapists, to whom she extends full credit, for scientific details and advancement. The combination has created a crippled children's rehabilitation center quite unlike any other in the Nation.

Native North Carolinian Still Going Strong in His Adopted State of Georgia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. ERTEL CARLYLE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 13, 1954

Mr. CARLYLE. Mr. Speaker, on the 26th day of July, in the year 1879, Johnston Williams was born in the little town of Castle Hayne, N. C.

Seventy-five years later, on July 26, 1954, this aggressive though kindly gentleman of the Old South celebrated his diamond birthday among his hundreds of friends and followers at his home in Waycross, Ga., where he has lived and labored so successfully for nearly a half century.

It is fitting, indeed, that Jack Williams' native State and district join the grateful people of south Georgia in a tribute to this man who is leading such an outstanding life of service to others—a life dedicated to development and progress of the South. Among his many interests were the worthwhile projects of the development of Warm Springs, Stone Mountain Memorial, the development of Okeefenokee Swamp Park, and the advancement of Dr. Charles Herty's program of reforestation with slash pine in the Southeast.

An impressive force through the splendid newspaper he built into one of the most modern and efficient in the South, Mr. Williams has materially aided the development of the New South of today with wise counseling and assistance to hundreds of young people. He has been owner, editor, and publisher of the Waycross Journal-Herald since 1915, receiving coveted awards throughout the years for greatest service to his city, county, and State.

Who's Who in America, volume 27, 1952–53, contains the following:

Williams, Jack, editor, publisher: Born Castle Hayne, N. C., July 26, 1879; son of Thomas and Ellen Elizabeth (Johnston); preparatory education, Cape Fear Academy, Wilmington, N. C.; graduate of Oak Ridge (N. C.) Institute, 1904; married Ethel Katharine Woodard, June 19, 1912; children, Jack, Katharine Lee, Ruth Winifred, Betty Louise, Eva. In purchasing department, Atlantic Coast Line Railroad, Wilmington, N. C., and Waycross, Ga., 1899–1903; same position with Atlanta, Birmingham & Atlantic Railroad, Waycross, 1905–06; general storekeeper, same railroad, Fitzgerald, Ga., 1906–07; manager publishing company, Boston, 1909–11; editor owner, and publisher Waycross Daily Journal-Herald and Waycross Weekly Journal since 1915; also publisher of Blackshear Times 1924–26, Hogansville News 1925–26, and La Grange Reporter 1924–27; president Waycross Journal-Herald Publishing Co., radio station WAYX; vice president Georgia Loan & Savings Co., 1939–41; president Merchants & Mechanics Loan Co., since 1941; Waycross Building & Loan Co., Waycross Hotel Co., Progressive Life Insurance Co., president First Federal Savings & Loan Association. Served as State senator 1937–38 and 1943–44, member State legislature 1939–41 and 1942–47. Lieutenant colonel on Governor's staff. Member city board of education; president Kings Daughters Home for Children 1935–36. President Georgia Press Association, member 11th District Press Association (president); president, advisory board, Salvation Army; vice president Waycross Railroad YMCA; vice president Georgia Forestry Association; president Waycross and Ware County Chamber of Commerce 1936–37 and 1945–47. Awarded Sutlive trophy, Georgie Press Association, 1925 "for greatest service to community" of any paper in the State; Baynard Knight cup, Kiwanis Club, 1923 "for greatest service to community"; Miller medal "for having rendered greatest service to his city and county during the year 1932." Democrat. Presbyterian. Mason (Shriner). Elk. Clubs: Kiwanis (vice president 1928, president 1929), Okefenokee Golf (secretary), Dovers Bluff Fishing (president). Farmer, dairyman, and stock raiser. Home Cherokee Drive, Waycross, Ga. (summer home St. Simons Island). Address, Journal-Herald Building, Waycross, Ga.

Mr. Speaker, it is so apparent that Mr. Williams has lived an extremely active and fruitful life, and to me it is a source of real pride that he is a native North Carolinian born in the congressional district which I am honored to represent.

Will P. Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 27, 1954

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, early yesterday morning I was informed of the death, here in Washington, of a close comrade and Christian gentleman, Will P. Kennedy.

It has been said that the most a man can do for his friend is simply to be his friend.

Will P. Kennedy was a true friend to many. His example and energetic accomplishments drew many to him, persons of every station in life and from every corner of the land.

By profession he was a newspaperman. For over 30 years he served on Capitol Hill as representative of the Washington Star. Possessing natural journalistic ability, he was as at home reporting upon some local happening of small import as he was in telling an attentive public the whys and wherefores of national political convention or analyzing political or legislative trends in the Halls of Congress. His interest in civic affairs was an acknowledged and respected one.

Aside from his work on the Star, Will Kennedy engaged in a number of other writing activities, reporting for some of the smaller magazines and New England newspapers. He was an untiring worker.

Will was a member of the Knights of Columbus and was the founder of the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick. He was the father of 2 children, who, together with his wife, the former Miss Nancy Hanks, and 6 grandchildren survive him.

The character and life of this Christian soul, Will P. Kennedy, will long be remembered by those of us who have known him and worked beside him, and, with him, have quaffed deeply from the cup of friendship.

WILL P. KENNEDY

Washington and the Star suffered a loss a few years ago when Will P. Kennedy's byline disappeared from this newspaper, because of his retirement from active reporting work. The loss will be felt even more keenly now that Bill, as most of his colleagues knew him, has passed on. There was a time, before he retired on January 1, 1947, when it was a rare occasion not to find a "piece" by Will P. Kennedy in the daily or Sunday Star. Bill always was a tireless digger for news—local, national, or international—and during his long career with this paper he produced a prodigious amount of stories, many of them exclusive. As a veteran congressional reporter he won the friendship and respect of numerous notable in Washington official life. His honorary life membership in the congressional press galleries attested to the high regard in which he was held by his colleagues of the fourth estate. The Star, while mourning his loss, is proud to have had the faithful services of such a good reporter for so many years.

The Merchant Marine Act, 1936

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 22, 1954

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, continuing the remarks I addressed to the House on July 26, defending the need for Government support for shipbuilding programs and explaining the purposes of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, I wish to comment on certain often repeated criticisms of the act's operations—criticisms which I believe to be unmerited and unjust.

My remarks today will deal with attacks that are continually made on the construction-differential subsidies paid for ship construction by private shipyards under the terms of the 1936 act, and on the operating-differential subsidies paid to subsidized shipping lines operating on trade routes on which it has been determined that it is essential to the United States that regularly scheduled commercial sailings be maintained. A principal burden of such attacks is a complaint that—somehow and in some never completely explained way—American maritime labor is profiting outrageously at the expense of the American taxpayer from the subsidy payments made to the shipping lines and to those who contract to build ships under the Merchant Marine Act. In my opinion, those attacks are aimed not so much at the principles upon which these subsidies are based, as they are aimed at the traditional high standard of living enjoyed by American workmen as a result of receiving a decent living wage. That standard of living is the main basis of the continued economic prosperity of the United States. It is asinine to demand or expect that we can keep a merchant marine on the seas, manned by American seamen, without paying them wages which will enable their families to live as well as their neighbors. It is equally foolish and unjust to expect to keep our essential shipyards operating with crews of skilled American workmen unless we enable shipbuilding firms to pay their men a scale of wages competitive with those paid in other industries employing men with the same skills.

Realizing the vital importance of building our merchant marine around a hard core of citizen seamen, the authors of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 wrote into section 301 of the act a requirement that subsidized shipping lines pay their seagoing personnel a minimum wage scale and provide a minimum standard of working conditions for the officers and crews, and requiring also that all of the licensed officers and at least 90 percent of the crews of all vessels built with construction-differential subsidy aid or operated under operating-differential subsidies be American citizens. Section 603 (b) of the act provides that the amount of operating-differential subsidy paid the subsidized shipping lines shall include the "excess of the fair and reasonable cost" of wages and subsistence of officers and crews over the estimated fair and reasonable cost if the vessel were operated under the registry of foreign countries whose vessels are competing therewith. Section 502 (b) of the act, in a similar effort to encourage maintenance of domestic shipyards and trained shipbuilding personnel, provides for payment of a similar subsidy, the construction-differential subsidy, to cover the excess costs of building ships in American yards as compared to the estimated cost of construction in foreign yards. The cost differentials include, of course, the higher American standard of wages paid our shipyard workers.

Mr. Speaker, if it were not for the higher cost of every phase of ship construction and ship operation using American-made materials and American labor as compared with foreign costs, we would not need the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 or any form of encouragement to private industry to keep an adequate merchant marine and an adequate shoreside industry to keep it afloat. Free private American enterprise would do the job. But neither American businessmen nor American workmen are dumb enough to invest their funds or invest their time in an enterprise from which they can expect no adequate return. People in the maritime industry, like those in any other industry or in any other profession, have every right to expect a fair return from their investment, or a fair living from their labor. If that return is not forthcoming they have every right to turn to other fields.

Experience and commonsense both tell us how disastrous the abandonment of the American merchant marine would be to our national security. The provisions of the Merchant Marine Act which I have mentioned were designed to prevent that abandonment. Until someone comes up with a better plan, it behooves us to ignore the false prophets of doom who attack the provisions, and to implement and strengthen them instead.

Mr. Speaker, those who attack the higher wages paid American seamen and American shipyard labor as compared to foreign wages should examine their own consciences before shooting off their mouths. Let us consider some examples in this regard: For instance, American seamen's wages have been attacked on the ground that they are four times those paid British seamen in comparable jobs. But an American Congressman receives a $15,000 a year salary as compared to the $2,800 a year received by a Member of the British Parliament, more than 5 times as much. I do not hear any arguments that we should gear our salaries to the scale of the British Parliament, and I think we can all agree that there would be no sense in so doing. How does the case of the American seamen or shipyard worker differ from ours?

The American merchant marine is universally recognized as being the fourth arm of our national defense. As Fleet Admiral King said in November of 1945 in evaluating the part the merchant marine had played in the successful war effort:

> A large merchant marine is not only an important national resource; it is, in being, an integral part of our country's armed might during the time of crisis.

We do not expect our general or our admirals, our captains or colonels, or our other officers and enlisted men to take the same pay received by the British or by the members of the armed forces of any other foreign country. Neither do we determine their pay scales by any comparison with foreign wages—they are established on the basis of what is required by the American standard of living and the need to induce qualified personnel to join the services and to continue in them as a career. Why should we try to set any other standards for the members of the American merchant marine and the people employed in its supporting establishments?

The subsidies paid to American farmers are not based on any formula involving a form of parity with foreign agricultural prices—they are determined both at present and in proposed legislation on a system of maintaining for farm income an equitable relationship with the general cost of living in America. What sound reason is there for those who support this subsidy to those engaged in the essential job of farming to atack subsidies for the no less essential jobs of building and sailing ships?

We have a long-established system of tariffs and import duties levied against the industrial, mining, and agricultural products of cheap foreign labor as a means of protecting American industry and American workingmen in those fields against undue competition from that source. This protection, highly questionable in the case of many nonessential industries, places the Government in the position of imposing indirect subsidy payments on the American consumer for the benefit of protected industries. Yet those who are the most rabid supporters of high protective tariffs and who most strongly oppose the principle of reciprocal trade are all too frequently the same people who hamstring the appropriations for subsidies to the essential merchant marine and the maritime industry. The subsidy provisions of the Merchant Marine Act have been called tariff operations in reverse. They are the law of the land just as much as are the laws imposing tariffs. I do not see how refusing to appropriate the necessary funds to carry out maritime subsidy law can be justified any more reasonably than our customs collectors would be justified in refusing to collect the tariffs and duties due on foreign imports.

Mr. Speaker, the proposition is as simple as this: Our national security depends on maintenance of an adequate, modern maritime industry here in the United States. This has been proven in two wars. In the face of low-cost foreign competition such an industry cannot be maintained unless American businesmen and American wage earners in the industry receive just compensation for their investments and their labor. Foreign competition makes it impossible to insure such compensation without Government aid. The Merchant Marine Act of 1936 subsidy provisions were written into law to provide that aid on a reasonable basis and as a result of long study. Study after study by Commission after Commission has produced no more effective way of meeting the problem. The provisions of the act, for want of a better substitute, are still in full force and effect. The act as written contains provisions to protect against abuse if properly administered. Refusal to permit the act to operate is an inexcusable evasion of congressional and executive responsibility to maintain the security of the United States, and should not be tolerated either by the Members of this House or by the people of the United States.

In further support of that position I am preparing an additional statement with regard to other phases of the overall problem of keeping a modern merchant marine afloat. This statement will appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD within a few days. In the meantime I urge that those of my colleagues who may have questioned the need for maritime subsidies in the past do some soul-searching and serious thinking on the problem in the light of these remarks and those I inserted in the RECORD on July 26.

Ike's Program Takes Shape

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 27, 1954

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, "Ike's Program Takes Shape" is the title of an excellent editorial which appeared in the July 23 issue of the Daily Pantagraph, of Bloomington, Ill., in my district.

No single editorial, column, or article that I have seen so concisely, and, in my judgment, so accurately summarizes the overall objective and basic elements of the Eisenhower administration program.

The editorial makes an evaluation of the program as a whole, which is the only sound basis for any evaluation. Too often people pass judgment upon a program or a candidate on a basis of a single proposal or a single vote, and most likely as to how it may have affected their own individual or group interests without regard to the best interests of the country as a whole.

The Eisenhower program is not satisfactory to the New Deal elements who would remake America into a socialistic state, with everyone dependent upon the Government. It is not satisfactory to the reactionaries, who refuse to recognize that national and international conditions have changed and who would have us "turn the clock back." But I am confident the Eisenhower program has the approval of the overwhelming majority of the American people.

It has their approval because, as the Daily Pantagraph points out—

> It is neither a New Deal program nor a right-wing program. It is a wise application of traditional American principles to today's problems.

Mr. Speaker, I earnestly recommend a thoughtful reading of this editorial. It follows:

IKE'S PROGRAM TAKES SHAPE

The Eisenhower administration has been in office long enough now to begin to assess its direction. The President has been accused on the one hand of furthering New Dealism and on the other of returning to blind reaction. We believe that he does not deserve either criticism on the basis of his record and his program.

In a highly industrialized economic and social structure such as we have today the Federal Government cannot escape its responsibilities in maintaining basic programs for the general good such as social security, adequate health protection, housing for low-income groups and the like. This the President has recognized.

He is urging extension of social security. He has urged, and we believe wisely, that effective health insurance must be made possible by private means with Government encouragement or the people will demand complete Government health programs. The public will not much longer be denied adequate health protection.

The President has recognized TVA as a fact. He has made no move to dispose of it or to cripple it. He has recognized the importance of flood control and the utilization of generating facilities as a yardstick in influencing power rates. He has determined, and we believe wisely, that TVA is serving its purpose without further expansion into steam generation of power; that private industry can do the job under the regulatory eyes of Government. To conclude otherwise would be to sanction development of a Government power monopoly.

We believe the President is justified in his decision to let a private power company develop a 600,000 kilowatt plant in Arkansas rather than ask Congress to appropriate $100 million as the initial public investment in a TVA steam plant.

The President has proposed a joint $50 billion Federal-State road building program to catch the country up with current traffic needs. This, too, is a function in which the Federal Government has a legitimate interest because of the importance of a good highway system to the national economy and to national defense.

But the President is moving determinedly to get the Government out of business that private enterprise can and will do more efficiently. He moved months ago to dispose of 27 Government-owned synthetic rubber plants. He is working now to get the Government out of such enterprises as coffee roasting, operating cut-rate retail outlets, manufacturing paint, operating bakeries, running aluminum-smelting plants, rope factories, furniture-repair shops, motion-picture studios, auto-repair shops, ice-cream manufacturing, operating restaurants, cement mixing, cobbler shops, ice plants, office equipment repair shops, construction crews, tire retreading facilities, tree and plant nurseries, chemical manufacturing—the list is endless.

The House Committee on Government Operations headed by Representative Clare E. Hoffman, estimates that the sale value of the Government's commercial-type enterprises alone is between $25 and $40 billion.

The Hoffman committee says those arguing for Government operation of such plants and services are unable to produce cost-accounting facts to back up claims of economy or higher quality.

The President has pressed hard for the first general tax reform measure in decades with emphasis upon a tax structure that will yield the needed revenue and at the same time stimulate investment in new business and industrial ventures upon which our future economic health depends. He has moved to get the Government out of the lending business. RFC is in the final stages of liquidation. Moves like these have vastly improved the business climate and the results are showing in an unprecedented expansion program.

The question is one of balance; of improving and expanding Government services in those fields where the Government can do a better job and in taking Government out of those fields where competitive enterprise can do a better job. The Eisenhower program is moving in the direction of this twin objective. It clearly understands that no one can repeal the 20th century on the one hand and that on the other hand there must be a halt to expansion of Government in business.

That is neither a New Deal program nor a right-wing program. It is a wise application of traditional American principles to today's problems.

A Letter to My Constituents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 27, 1954

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following letter:

July 27, 1954.

My Dear Constituent: As the 83d Congress comes to a close, and I leave as the American delegate to attend the fourth annual session of the World Conference of Parliamentarians in London, I am dropping you a note highlighting the things that I have done during this session.

I have missed only one vote of importance this year and that was due to my being with the Emperor of Ethiopia.

I have maintained three full-time offices in New York and Washington and handled thousands of matters, as a result of which many thousands of dollars were obtained for constituents.

I have introduced every single civil-rights bill.

This is part of my record as a full-time fighter for the rights of all people during the 83d Congress, drawn only from the Nation's press:

"Successfully fought, over great opposition, to abolish segregation in veterans' hospitals." (Associated Press, Feb. 8, 1953.)

"Revealed shocking agreement between former United States Assistant Attorney General and the New York City Police Department to prevent the FBI from investigating police brutality in New York City." (World-Telegram, Feb. 19, 1953.) As a result, a special committee of Congressmen were appointed. They handed in a unanimous report assessing the blame. Today we have new leadership in the police department of New York City.)

"Segregation in the Veterans' Administration hospitals was ended last week after protest from Congressman Powell. (New York Amsterdam News, Feb. 28, 1953.)

"Only Member of the United States Congress to say that Paul Robeson lied when he stated that Negroes would never fight Soviet Russia." (New York Daily News, Mar. 7, 1953.)

"Testified that there was a housing shortage and tried to get Federal rent controls continued." (Mutual Broadcasting System, Mar. 12, 1953.)

"Requested President Eisenhower to abolish segregated schools on Army posts." (Kansas City Plaindealer, Apr. 10, 1953.)

"Representative Powell played the major part in obtaining more money for Howard University and Freedmen's Hospital." (New York Times, May 23, 1953.)

"Congressman Powell saved the undergraduate school of Howard University by his action on the floor of Congress." (Dr. Mordecai Johnson, president of Howard University.)

"Congressman Powell is considered one of the most courageous leaders and fighters for Christianity and human rights in the world." (Pittsburgh Courier, June 27, 1953.)

"Helped city post-office workers in move for better conditions and higher pay." (New York Times, Oct. 26, 1953.)

In January 1954, was American representative at the sesquicentennial of Haiti.

"Representative Powell urged the State Foreign Commerce Committee to report favorably his bill forbidding racial segregation of interstate passengers on any form of transportation." (Chicago Defender, Feb. 7, 1954.)

"The House Labor Committee overwhelmingly approved an amendment to the Taft-Hartley Act which would prevent unions from barring anyone because of race, religion, or national origin. The author of the amendment was Representative Powell." (Baltimore Sun, Mar. 11, 1954.)

Received civil-rights award for 1943 from the American Jewish Congress.

"As a result of Powell's investigation, United States Army has agreed to abolish segregation in the cadet mess detachment at the Military Academy at West Point." (Washington Post, Mar. 21, 1954.)

Due to Powell's protest, Secretary of Navy Anderson abolished all segregation in the United States Naval shipyards in the South and abolished segregated messmen divisions in the United States Navy.

Cooperated with Mary Church Terrell in successfully abolishing segregation in public facilities in the District of Columbia.

Worked with Gerald Wagner in Washington, D. C., theaters in successfully abolishing segregation in moving picture houses of the Capital.

"In reference to the Supreme Court's decision abolishing segregation in the public-school system in America, Representative Powell said, 'this is democracy's shining hour; this is communism's worst defeat. Communism cannot succeed when democracy works.'" (CBS–TV, NBC–TV, ABC–TV, Dumont TV and New York World-Telegram.)

Was the host to His Imperial Majesty Haile Selassie, Emperor of Ethiopia; His Honor the Prime Minister of Jamaica, Mr. Bustamante; the Prime Minister of Nigeria, Dr. Azikwe.

My staff in Washington and New York, as indicated on this letterhead, is available at all times to help you with any problem that you might have. Feel free to call upon us.

Ever sincerely, your full-time fighter
for the rights of men,
Adam Clayton Powell, Jr.

A Constitutionalist in Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 23, 1954

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to direct the attention of our colleagues to the following most timely article written by Richard L. Strout. It appeared in the Christian Science Monitor of July 24, 1954:

An Intimate Message From Washington

(By Richard L. Strout)

Washington.—Boston lawyer Joseph N. Welch makes the point that the opprobrious epithet "Fifth Amendment Communist" seems to lump the Constitution and communism into equal condemnation.

In the current issue of Life, Mr. Welch, the Army counsel in the Army-McCarthy hearings, feels restrained to withhold comment on the issue of the McCarthy case while it is still pending before the Mundt subcommittee. Mr. Welch seems to have an old-fashioned delicacy which few others share in the casual atmosphere of congressional hearings. In fact, it is the astonishment and gentle incredulity of the courtly Boston attorney at what he finds in Washington that creates the present article.

(It is always entertaining for a Washington reporter to watch the surprise of outsiders when first brought in contact with a free-wheeling congressional investigation. "How long has this been going on?" they exclaim. "Oh, a century or so," is the answer. "Well, why doesn't somebody stop it?" To which the answer is that it will go on just as long as public opinion countenances it and no longer.)

Mr. Welch recalls that the fifth amendment was written into the Constitution as part of the Bill of Rights. The Bill of Rights was the spiritual heart of the American Revolution. Many believe that if democracy wins the world contest with communism, it will be because the philosophy of the Bill of Rights has something in it more appealing to the world's masses than the materialistic preachments of communism.

But now the phrase "Fifth-Amendment Communist" lumps the two concepts together.

"Did my ears deceive me," asks Mr. Welch, "or is there in these words, used as they are, a connotation of opprobrium attaching to a provision of our Constitution? Are some of us beginning to wish, or being led to wish, that we had no fifth amendment?"

The fifth amendment, in 106 words, he says, provides that the Government can't seize property without paying for it; that no person can "be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law"; that no person can be put on trial on a major charge without considered action of a grand jury of fellow citizens, and that no defendant shall be subjected to double jeopardy or forced to testify against himself.

Most people know that in the bad old days an uncomfortable system prevailed by which a defendant was first tortured and then tried on the basis of his confession. Something like that is done in Moscow trials now. The fifth amendment says "no" to that sort of thing in America. Does the new epithet, however—carried to its logical conclusion—imply that the Communists have something after all, and that the protection of the fifth amendment should be abolished?

Mr. Welch agrees that many rascals have resorted to the fifth amendment in the years since it was written. Many men who are invoking it now, he says, may ultimately be found guilty. He adds:

"But no matter who invokes the amendment, it stands in our Constitution as one of the guardians of our liberties. It is for all men to use. * * * It would be a pity if the net effect of those long and laborious hearings, the confusion and travail, were merely to undermine our Nation's faith in the document that made the Nation possible."

How Not To Lose Our Heritage of Freedom, An Address by George E. Stringfellow, Senior Vice President, Thomas A. Edison, Inc., and Long-time Business Associate of the Late Thomas Alva Edison, Delivered Before the Alumni Association of the University of Georgia at Athens, Ga., June 7, 1954

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 26, 1954

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, on June 7, 1954, George E. Stringfellow, a distinguished citizen of New Jersey, was honored by an invitation to address the Alumni Association of the University of Georgia at Athens, Ga. He chose as a theme for the occasion a subject of very great importance in connection with our welfare as a Nation. The title of the address was How Not To Lose Our Heritage of Freedom.

The address delivered by Mr. Stringfellow was of such a character and so fundamental to our well-being as a Nation that it has received wide approval. As evidence of such, I include as part of my remarks a few of the comments from men of standing in our country:

Adrien B. Hommel, 33d degree, Past Grand Master of Masons, of New Jersey, said:

How Not To Lose Our Heritage of Freedom * * * will give courage to the hearts of all who read it and will give them strength to march forward in our fight to preserve those principles, teachings and ideals of democracy which are the cornerstone on which this great Nation of ours is built.

George H. Deike, chairman of the board, Mine Safety Appliances Co., and Past Grand Master of Masons of Pennsylvania, said:

I have had the pleasure and privilege of being associated with George E. Stringfellow—an exemplar of that which is helpful and good for all thinking peoples. His address How Not To Lose Our Heritage of Freedom before the annual meeting of the Alumni Association of the University of Georgia * * * would benefit the Nation at large if it could be broadcast to all of our citizens.

Walter D. Head, provost, Teaneck campus, Fairleigh Dickinson College, past president, Rotary International, said:

In his address How Not To Lose Our Heritage of Freedom before the Alumni Society of the University of Georgia, George E. Stringfellow pointed out one of the weakest spots in our American social order—a weakness which can be corrected only if the citizens generally realize it and are prepared to do something about it.

Mr. Stringfellow has, for many years, been interested in government of the highest type and in this speech he takes up one of the most important means of implementing that objective. It is what I would call the grassroots type of speech one which should appeal to every thinking citizen.

The following is the address delivered by Mr. Stringfellow:

HOW NOT TO LOSE OUR HERITAGE OF FREEDOM

(Address by George E. Stringfellow)

Mr. President, honored guests, and members of the Alumni Association of the University of Georgia, I am very grateful to the Honorable Abit Nix, one of the great lawyers and an exemplary citizen of our time, whom I have numbered among my friends for a long time, for his complimentary introduction. Abit Nix is a person who, when he confers a benefit, which is often, never remembers it, and when he receives a benefit, which is less often than he confers, never forgets it. He is one of the most selfless men I have ever met. Ralph Waldo Emerson must have had such a person in mind when he said, "I count him a great man who inhabits a higher sphere of thought, into which other men rise with difficulty and labor." Such a person is the Honorable Abit Nix, one of God's noblemen.

When my topic, How Not To Lose Our Heritage of Freedom, was selected, I knew that you, who had the privilege of spending your golden undergraduate days in this lovely place, were blessed with a great heritage. Until I came here, I confess that I did not realize how truly great that heritage is, not only in the tangible things such as your beautiful campus, its fine buildings, your up-to-date laboratories and your splendid library, but also in the imponderable thing called tradition.

In this country there are a great many good things of a tangible nature which most of us share to a considerable degree. I am of course referring to such things as food, housing, automobiles, and electric refrigerators. Let us concede that all of us are smart enough to appreciate those good things which most of us have in abundance. Sometimes, however, we do not appreciate a good thing until we have lost it. That would apply to our health, our best friend, our freedom. That is my theme today—our heritage of freedom. Must we lose this priceless asset in order to appreciate it?

We must not think of our American freedom as having come to us full blown and neatly packaged in the Declaration of Independence or the Constitution of the United States. The groundwork was laid by struggles and sacrifices over thousands of years by our freedom-loving ancestors before it was summed up in the principles outlined in those immortal documents.

The lonely caveman voluntarily gave up some of his individual freedom when he joined up with other cavemen for better defense against wild animals and other tribes of cavemen. But the tribe remained free until its freedom was lost through the aggression of neighboring tribes.

Through the ages there has been an almost constant struggle of one segment resisting enslavement by another. Those threats to freedom were external and easy even for primitive man to understand. There is nothing subtle about a flint ax or a hickory war club or a gun.

However, not all the struggles took the form of a physical combat against an external aggressor. One of the greatest victories on this side of the water was a legal victory won in 1735 by John Peter Zenger and his lawyer, Andrew Hamilton, who risked imprisonment and even their necks when they dared to plead the truth of the charges in Zenger's paper against certain public authorities. Their victory was the basis for that freedom of the press, which was later guaranteed by the first amendment.

Subsequently, Thomas Burke and William Pitt, in the British Parliament, defended freedom against a recognized internal assault. They helped to make the road a little less rocky for the architects of our American freedom.

But the battle has not been finally won, and probably never will be in the sense of being safely and securely "on ice," so as to require no more watching or guarding. The danger is no less dire or deadly because it is less obvious and more subtle.

Courage and determination have been enough in the past to defend freedom against its external and internal enemies. Something more than courage and determination is needed today if we are to remain freemen. Until a few decades ago, the danger to our freedom came from the possessors of military and economic power, as exemplified by Genghis Khan, or George the Third, or the so-called Axis or Nazi Germany, Fascist Italy, Communist Russia, and imperialistic Japan.

Now, however, the dangers that threaten not only freedom but our very survival come from every direction and it requires unceasing watchfulness and skill to recognize and combat them. It is no less true today than it was when the epigram was first uttered that "eternal vigilance is the price of liberty."

To maintain our defense, both Government and industry must be strong, clean, and efficient. As a chain is no stronger than its weakest link, so the moral fiber of government and industry is no stronger than the moral fiber of the individuals who compose them. If the individuals remain rugged and spiritually strong, the Government remains rugged and spiritually strong. If the people get flabby, the Government gets flabby and the whole structure collapses.

The weakest place in the whole American structure today is the framework of our political parties, which control government at national, State, and local levels. If our citizens tolerate laws which allow public jobholders to control the party organization, the result will be that government will be run, in the interest of jobholders, instead of for "we the people."

Nobody in his right mind has anything against jobholders as such. But our political parties would be healthier and our country safer if the jobholders would confine their activities to the public jobs for which we taxpayers are paying their salaries, and let the voters, who have no axes to grind, run the parties. In that way the party would become what it was intended to be, an organization of voters united in political views opposed to those of the other party with divergent political views.

You university people here in Athens know, and you put into practice the principle that a man cannot serve two masters at one and the same time. If you are elected to the board of trustees you don't use your influence to get a building contract for your company or jobs for your friends. There is no selfish motivation in the exercise of the power that has been entrusted to you as board members.

There is an old adage that a "public office is a public trust," but all too many of our public employees see nothing wrong in dividing their loyalty between the public interest and the political party of their affiliation.

In less perilous times this country could perhaps tolerate and survive this evil of professionalism in its political parties, but the surest road to the loss of our freedom, and perhaps even to national downfall, is the perpetration of party control by self-seeking professionals. Its fruits at best are extravagance, socialistic weakening of individual self-reliance, and mediocrity of leadership. At its worst, its fruits are corruption, disintegration, and loss of freedom. Weak, uncertain legislators, such as are all too often selected by patronage machines, can too easily succumb to the malevolent guidance of a potential dictator. A thoughtful student learns that lesson from the careers of Hitler, Mussolini, and Stalin.

There are other threats to our freedom—many others. One that stands out in my mind like a lighthouse in the dark is the usurpation of power by the executive department of government and the resultant undermining of our Constitution. Here are a few examples:

We have witnessed a Chief Executive urge Congress to pass legislation which it thought to be unconstitutional. In the promotion of such legislation, the Chief Executive said to the chairman of the congressional committee, "I trust your committee will not let doubts of the bill's constitutionality prevent its passage." An enraged Chief Executive urged the Congress to pack the Court with judges who shared his philosophy—a philosophy foreign to the spirit of the Constitution.

We have witnessed a Chief Executive throw our country into war in Korea without the authority of Congress, notwithstanding the fact that the Constitution says that only Congress has the right to declare war. That war cost us more than 37,000 casualties and billions of dollars and the end is not yet in sight.

We have witnessed the Chief Executive misuse the power of his office to seize the steel industry without authority of law and in violation of the letter and spirit of the Constitution. In justification of this lawless, unconstitutional act, the Chief Executive contended that the inherent power of his office gave him the authority to do what he thought best for the people. That kind of thinking might be expected of a dictator, but not of the President of our country.

Seizure of that basic industry was declared unconstitutional by a majority opinion of the Supreme Court. However, the Chief Justice rendered a minority opinion, in which he was joined by two of his associates. They reasoned that although neither Congress nor any express grant of power under the Constitution had authorized the Chief Executive to seize the industry, the United Nations Charter gave him power to do it. Only by a narrow margin did we escape from having the United Nations Charter confer upon the Chief Executive of our Republic a power not granted by either the Congress or the Constitution or intended by the framers of that great document.

We have witnessed the troubles resulting from secret agreements entered into by the Chief Executive without the knowledge and consent of Congress as provided by the Constitution. The Constitution is circumvented by calling these treaties "agreements," since only "treaties" have to be ratified by Congress. I submit that the judgment of one man may be as good as many, but the best proof is the test of his judgment against the many. That test is lacking in the secret agreements made during and since World War II when the Chief Executive settled great issues in penciled memorandums.

Our forefathers gave us a system of government which has produced greater liberties and higher living standards than ever experienced in history. If we are as smart as I think we are, we shall not have to lose our freedom in order to appreciate it, or fail to profit by the costly mistakes made by others. As citizens it is our duty and our responsibility to safeguard our liberties and to provide leadership for the rest of the world—that is our duty and we cannot avoid it if we would. "Duty," said Robert E. Lee, "is the sublimest word in the English language. Do your duty in all things," charged this great patriot, "you cannot do more and you should never wish to do less."

George E. Stringfellow

George E. Stringfellow, born in Reva, Va., the son of James and Elizabeth F. (Bowers) Stringfellow. Married Carrie M. Fearnow.

He is a director of Thomas A. Edison of Canada, Ltd., and Thomas A. Edison Ltd., Scotland, and director and senior vice president of Thomas A. Edison, Inc., West Orange: was a daily business associate of Thomas Alva Edison for many years.

He is director of Mine Safety Appliances Co., Pittsburgh, Pa.; member of the board of directors of the American Mining Congress, Washington, D. C.; member of the American Iron and Steel Institute and the American Institute of Mining and Metallurgical Engineers, New York City, and member of the board of directors of Indiana Technical College, Fort Wayne, Ind.

President and director of the New Jersey Taxpayers Association; member of the board of directors and executive committee of the American Cancer Society. Founder and first president of the New Jersey division of the society, and the recipient of the American Cancer Society award.

He is honorary member of the New Jersey Medical Society, was awarded the certificate of service by the Rotary Club of Orange, N. J.; was cited as the outstanding citizen of the Oranges and Maplewood; was cited by the Brotherhood Committee of Christians and Jews for bringing about a better understanding among the three religious sects.

Received an honorary degree of doctor of fine arts from Ithaca College; honorary degree of doctor of laws from South Jersey Law School; honorary degree of doctor of laws from Upsala College; honorary degree of doctor of humanities from Indiána Technical College; a citation of merit award from the New Jersey Association of Business Schools.

Served two terms as president of the Kiwanis Club of New York City; served two terms as president of the Chamber of commerce and civics of the Oranges and Maplewood; former chairman of the finance committee of the Republican Party of New Jersey; member of the Imperial Divan of the Shrine of North America.

His clubs: The Kiwanis Club of New York City; Advertising Club of New Jersey; Union League Club of New York and Philadelphia; New York Railroad Club; Duquesne Club of Pittsburgh; Montclair Golf Club, Montclair, N. J.; and the Essex Club of Newark, N. J.

Residence: 75 Prospect Street, East Orange, N. J.

Office: 177 Main Street, West Orange, N. J.

Questionnaire To Constituents: What Is Your Opinion?—How Would You Vote?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 13, 1954

Mr. HAGEN of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted, I wish to extend in the RECORD my own remarks and a questionnaire and opinion poll which I intend to send to my constituency. It follows:

WHAT IS YOUR OPINION?—HOW WOULD YOU VOTE?

DEAR FRIENDS: During the past few months a number of statewide opinion polls have been conducted in Minnesota and perhaps you have been asked to contribute your views and answers to them.

The results of these polls, you may have noted, have been varied and often contradictory. What is more, they do not necessarily reflect the opinions of you who live in the Ninth Congressional District of Minnesota.

Much useful information may be obtained from a public opinion poll which is properly executed. Principally, it may serve to strengthen the link between the people and their representatives in government, a link which due to obvious limitations of time and distance is not as strong as it ought to be.

This brief questionnaire is principally devoted to the farm problem which is so vital an issue with us in the Ninth Congressional District. Your opinions on these and other questions will be helpful to me as your United States Representative in Congress.

If there are other issues or problems not included in this form on which you would like to comment, I urge you to do so. Your suggestions, advice, and counsel always are welcome and greatly appreciated. I would like to hear from you.

THE QUESTIONS

1. A proposal has been made which would set up a system of flexible price supports for farm crops. In periods when there were large surpluses of crops, the support prices would be lower; in periods when there were no large surpluses, the support prices would be higher. Do you favor or oppose flexible price supports? Favor ☐. Oppose ☐.

2. Under Federal law, price supports on basic farm crops are guaranteed through 1954. Do you favor or oppose the Government's continued support of farm crop prices after 1954? Favor ☐. Oppose ☐.

3. Dairy price supports were lowered recently. Do you believe they should be restored or raised? Yes ☐. No ☐.

4. A suggestion has been made that the Federal Government dispose of some of our food surpluses by giving food stamps to low-income families. These stamps could be exchanged for certain kinds of surplus foods. Would you approve or disapprove of a food-stamp program like that? For ☐. Against ☐.

5. In general, do you approve or disapprove of the ways Ezra Benson is handling his duties as United States Secretary of Agriculture? Approve ☐. Disapprove ☐.

6. As a Representative of a predominantly farm area I have consistently supported 90-percent of parity for basic farm products and similar supports for other farm produce. In fact, for years I have fought for 100 percent of parity. In other words I have always favored and vigorously supported at least 90 percent of parity for all farm products, and I intend to continue to do so, recognizing of course some controls on production and marketing are necessary. The question is, Do you think I have been right in my position? Yes ☐. No ☐.

7. In general, do you approve or disapprove of the way the Eisenhower administration is handling our foreign affairs? Approve ☐. Disapprove ☐.

8. Did you vote for Eisenhower or Stevenson in 1952? Eisenhower ☐. Stevenson ☐.

9. Suppose you were voting today—which one would you vote for? Eisenhower ☐. Stevenson ☐.

10. Suppose that Freeman were running today against Gov. C. Elmer Anderson, a Republican, for the governorship of Minnesota. Which man would you personally favor? Freeman ☐. Anderson ☐.

11. If you were choosing a Senator today, which man would you personally favor, HUMPHREY or Bjornson? HUMPHREY ☐. Bjornson ☐.

12. Do you agree that Congress was wise in approving the St. Lawrence seaway project? Yes ☐. No ☐.

13. Do you favor statehood for Alaska? Yes ☐. No ☐.

14. Do you favor statehood for Hawaii? Yes ☐. No ☐.

(NOTE.—It is not necessary to sign your name. You may not wish to answer all of the questions. If not, please answer those on which you desire to express an opinion. You may just place an "X" in space provided after each question.)

Please return to United States Representative HAROLD C. HAGEN, Crookston, Minn. Feel free to use reverse side for your comments and remarks. Thanks for your cooperation.

Sincerely yours,

HAROLD C. HAGEN.

National Planning Association Urges Action for Economic Health

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 26, 1954

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, on May 5 in my speech entitled "Let's Build a Better America," I urged definite action to insure economic progress. I am gratified to note that the National Planning Association has made recommendations similar to mine especially regarding such programs as construction of schools, hospitals, and roads. In my speech I said:

EXPANSION OPPORTUNITIES

Wherever we look, opportunity challenges our imagination. We need only the confidence and courage to move boldly ahead—modern pioneers of a better, finer America.

Education is the very foundation of democracy. Yet years of enforced neglect have left us critically short of schools. Why not build them now while we need employment for millions of workers?

Our roads are literally falling apart. The traffic they carry is rapidly increasing. We need a real highway construction program with wide freeways crisscrossing the entire Nation.

We need hospitals. Our crowded cities need hospitals. Rural areas need hospitals. The Veterans' Administration needs hoshospitals. In some areas the shortage is very critical. And, incidentally, we all need to agree on a sound plan to bring adequate medical care within the financial reach of all our people.

Many of our people need improved diets. Here is the place to look for a sound answer to so-called farm surpluses. If we bring consumption into balance with production, there will be no surpluses. We need not start at the wrong end to try to solve the problem by bankrupting American farmers.

Old age is still a hazard to too many of our people. Why should this be so in our abundant land? But, we are asked, can we afford a real program of old-age security which will protect all of us in our later years? Of course, we can and we should. We will all benefit.

Last, but not least, we need to more fully develop and conserve our natural resources. As an example, far too much valuable water regularly wastes into the sea. Again we are asked, Can we afford to conserve it? The truth of the matter is we cannot afford to go on wasting it.

Our great national parks are beginning to show the signs of long neglect. There are power dams to be built and floods to be brought under control. These things add to our wealth and well-being. They add to our strength.

PROMISES VERSUS PERFORMANCE

Yes, all around us we see challenge and opportunity. Yet the present administration seems hesitant and uncertain. It appears to be divided between those who write the speeches and those who write the program. The promises are plentiful but the performance is not up to par.

At this point, under permission to extend my remarks, I include the following article by Charles E. Egan of the New York Times:

TWENTY-FIVE BILLION DOLLAR PRODUCTION RISE URGED FOR ECONOMIC HEALTH—PLANNING ASSOCIATION SAYS FAILURE TO USE FULL CAPACITIES WOULD BE INEXCUSABLE IN A PERILOUS WORLD SITUATION

(By Charles E. Egan)

WASHINGTON, July 3.—This country needs to step up its production of goods and services by at least $25 billion over the next 12 months to keep the economy healthy, the National Planning Association asserted today.

The group, organized in 1934 as a private nonprofit, nonpartisan body, embraces members from agriculture, business, labor, and the professions.

Its latest report, "Opportunities for Economic Expansion," held that the recent business recession had run its course but warned that an upswing in the gross national product—the total value of goods and services produced by the country—by at least $25 billion was essential if the Nation was to continue strong.

"Involuntary total or partial idleness on the part of a substantial number of workers and underutilization of productive capacity would be undesirable under any circumstances," the report stated. "They are inexcusable in a perilous world situation in which the most effective use of manpower and capacities concerns not only the comfort but also the security and possibly the survival of the Nation."

According to a committee headed by H. Christian Sonne, the upturn in production can be brought about only by a sharp increase in national defense spending or by such incentives to increased consumer spending as price and tax cuts, plant and equipment modernization, commitments for new schools, hospitals, and roads and similar outlays.

Mr. Sonne told a news conference that by fall President Eisenhower must decide how much of the $25 billion increase in the gross national product could be achieved through increased defense spending and then decide what part public works and other products should play.

According to close advisers on economic matters to General Eisenhower, the annual Conference of Governors to be held at Bolton Landing, N. Y., beginning July 11, will be asked to give the White House an estimate of the money each State is prepared to spend this year and next on public works. A summary of the reports, it was said, will be used by the White House to decide the magnitude of Federal spending necessary to prevent any further drop in employment and business activity.

The planning group said that "a sobering aspect" in the present business outlook was that economic activity has been leveling off at a rate of production which is more than $15 billion below the rate of reasonably full employment.

"Unemployment is still between 5 and 6 percent of the civilian labor force," the report said. "Including allowance for involuntary short hours and for temporary layoffs, one may estimate that an even larger proportion of the labor force is idle. And, looking at the now visible factors of demand, it is difficult to see what forces of the market under present programs and policies would be likely to lift business activity to the full employment level.

"Hence, there appears to be a possibility that, for some time, business activity might move approximately sidewise, considerably below the full employment level. With a continuing rise in the labor force and a rather rapid rise in output per man-hour, a sidewise movement of business conditions would result in an increased idleness of available human and material resources."

POSSIBLE GAP NOTED

A year from now the group said a gap of about $25 billion would exist between the realized output of goods and services and the full employment level.

The report gave the gross national product in 1953 as $367 billion and said that, at an annual rate, the first quarter of this year indicated a 1954 level of $356 billion with that of the first quarter of next year at an annual rate of $360 billion.

"If demand and production should continue over some time to move considerably below a full employment level," the report added, "it is likely that the existence of idle capacity would make business more reluctant to go ahead with expansion plans. Thus, a sidewise movement of business is possible only for a limited period of time. It would be likely to lead to a new downturn if continued over a extended period."

Mr. Sonne told reporters that the Government's policies and programs so far "may be enough to enable us to muddle along and avoid a depression" but not enough to stimulate the growth the economy needs.

"The situation is much more serious than most people think," Mr. Sonne added. "A shift from rising defense spending to declining defense spending is a major adjustment. Nothing the Government has done so far takes care of that."

Mr. Sonne said that it was a serious mistake to attribute the recent recession to excessive inventories in the hands of producers and distributors.

The inventory situation, Mr. Sonne said, was "merely a link in a chain of economic troubles," in which reduced defense spending was the primary cause. The drop in defense spending weakened markets, caused unemployment, made idle productive capacity, and in turn cut heavily into consumer buying.

Mr. Sonne said he thought it "quite likely" that the administration would increase defense spending between now and 1957. He also said that there was a particular need now for reducing income taxes because low income groups were made up of the people who "feel the relief immediately and buy more goods" with their money.

The National Planning Association's steering committee, Mr. Sonne said, favors a reduction of income-tax rates rather than higher exemptions because, in event of an emergency "it is easier to impose higher rates."

Public Laws 437 to 450, Inclusive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 23, 1954

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent I am extending my remarks to include my report to my constituents in the Second District of Illinois on Public Laws 437 to 450, inclusive, as follows:

THIRTY-FOURTH REPORT ON LEGISLATION OF THE 83D CONGRESS

DEAR FRIEND: Continuing my report to you on the new laws of the land:

PUBLIC LAW 437

H. R. 8779, appropriations for Department of Agriculture and for Farm Credit Administration: Appropriations will be covered in a separate and later report.

PUBLIC LAW 438

Senate Joint Resolution 167, extending provisions of Housing Act 1 month: Housing Act of 1954 being still in conference, Public Law 438 extended for 1 month provisions (such as FNMA, Wherry Act, GI loans) otherwise expiring June 30, 1954. Also extends RFC, now in process of litigation, 1 more month.

PUBLIC LAW 439

S. 129, limitation in contingent legal fees: The Indian Claims Commission Act of 1946 sets 10 percent of judgments recovered as the maximum fee to be allowed attorneys. But the Jurisdictional Act of 1935, relating to the Chippewa Indians of Wisconsin, sets up a 5-percent maximum. Public Law 439 raises it to 10 percent to conform with the general rule. The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs thought this equitable and reasonable.

I have an open mind. It is impossible for me fully to inform myself on Indian affairs. By establishing a 10-percent maximum, as in the case of veterans' pensions, perhaps adequate protection against exorbitant fees has been afforded the Indians who are our wards.

In the 81st Congress when the rent-control law was being written by the committee of which I was a member I urged a 10-percent limitation on fees for lawyers representing either tenants or landlords. The failure of my efforts meant, of course, that the fees were very much larger, in most cases swallowing up the benefits intended to help landlords meet increased expenses and thus penalizing both tenants and landlords.

PUBLIC LAW 440

S. 2742, Ute Indian Tribe: This law makes more money available for per capita distribution among the Ute Indians of Utah. Some $17 million was the tribe's share of the 1950 judgment. After expenditure of about $6 million (including a juicy attorney's bill for $430,000) the tribe including principal and accumulated interest has some $13 million left on deposit.

I do hope that in advancing toward the desired objective of placing the Indian on the common level of American citizenship the program is giving ample protection against the spoilers. You will have noticed in these reports many Indian laws enacted by this Congress. I think it is a subject that merits a full-dress review by the 84th Congress.

PUBLIC LAW 441

S. 2777, travel in Alaskan waters: This extends for another year the exemption of certain Alaskan ports from the law restricting to vessels of the United States transportation from one port of this country to another port of the United States. Reason: there is no American steamer on this route, only Canadian. See Public Law 124, enacted during the first session. It has to be done every year, pending the availability of American vessels in this area.

PUBLIC LAW 442

S. 2844, transactions by disbursing officers: Routine amendment to the act of 1944 authorizing certain transactions by disbursing officers of the United States.

PUBLIC LAW 443

S. 3103, extending title II of First War Powers Act: This was passed on the recommendation of the Department of Defense as necessary to insure an uninterrupted performance of contracts to facilitate the national defense. It extends title II of the First War Powers Act of 1941, revived during the Korean emergency, to June 30, 1955. Seems the Department of Defense is still functioning on a war (or expectant war) basis.

PUBLIC LAW 444

S. 3364, hospitalization of Indians: In 1949 Congress authorized a $1.5 million appropriation for a hospital to be built in cooperation with New Mexico and at which 100 Indian patients, wards of the Federal Government, were to be treated. There has been a delay in construction. Public Law 444 merely extends to 1957 the date for submission of certain reports by the Secretary of the Interior.

PUBLIC LAW 445

H. R. 445, Hawaiian bond issues: Whether the legislature of Hawaii is impowered by the Organic Law of Hawaii to authorize bond issues, without the consent of Congress, is a question raised by attorneys for prospective purchasers. Public Law 445 settles the point by approving of such bond issues, past, present, future. Merely a justification for legal eagles to collect a fee.

PUBLIC LAW 446

H. R. 2846, wharf landings in Hawaii: This permits the Territory of Hawaii to collect landing and wharf fees from United States vessels on the same basis as States of the Union in continental United States. Fair enough.

PUBLIC LAW 447

H. R. 6276, mortgages on foreign-flag vessels: Under this act ship mortgages on foreign-flag vessels may be foreclosed in the admiralty courts of the United States exactly as is done in the case of American-flag vessels. Previously foreign-flag vessels had an advantage over our own vessels.

PUBLIC LAW 448

H. R. 5840, land exchange in Hawaii: This authorizes Hawaii to exchange some 994 acres of public lands near Waimea for 1,250 acres of privately owned lands of equal value. Organic law of Hawaii requires approval by Congress of any exchange of public lands exceeding 40 acres in area. Hence the necessity of another public law.

PUBLIC LAW 449

H. R. 6154, Fort Peck Indian Tribes: Another of a long series of acts aimed at putting the American Indian on his own with other American citizens. Public Law 449 gives the Indian tribes at Fort Peck in Montana control of their own money. Recent oil discoveries are carrying the Fort Peck Indians on a wave of prosperity.

PUBLIC LAW 450

H. R. 8729, Federal Reserve: This extends until June 30, 1956, the present authority of the Federal Reserve banks to purchase securities directly from the Treasury in amounts up to a total of $5 billion.

Here is an illustration of how it works: Prior to receipt of income taxes (starting to come in on March 15, 1954) the Treasury borrowed $190 million from the Federal Reserve. On March 17, 1954, the Treasury paid back the entire $190 million loan from the money received from income-tax payers.

The committee of which your Representative is a member has jurisdiction over the Federal Reserve. The committee was unanimous in reporting out this bill. The subject is somewhat complicated. I hope my simple illustration will be helpful in pointing the outlines.

Cordially and sincerely,

BARRATT O'HARA,
Member of Congress.

Salary Increases

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 23, 1954

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I direct the attention of our colleagues to the following letter which I received from Morris B. Mitchell, chairman of the committee on judicial selection, tenure, and compensation of the American Bar Association:

AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION,
July 23, 1954.

Hon. ABRAHAM J. MULTER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MULTER: President William J. Jameson, of the American Bar Association, has recently written President Eisenhower, thanking him for receiving and talking with the board of governors of the American Bar Association during their recent meeting in Washington. I quote the following paragraphs from this letter:

"As you know, one of the American Bar Association's greatest efforts this year is to give every possible support to your recommendation for an increase in the salaries of Members of the Congress and Federal judges to the end that we may get and keep our finest and ablest citizens in these important offices. While we realize, of course, that most who assume these honored posts are motivated by a desire for public service, they should be assured of a rate of return commensurate with the demands and responsibilities of these high offices. People with the interests of the country at heart should not be expected to sacrifice so much that they cannot afford either to aspire to or to accept service in the Congress and on the bench.

"Accordingly, the American Bar Association has given unstinted support to the recommendations of the Commission on Judicial and Congressional Salaries. Representatives of the association have given unselfishly of their time, effort, and money to carry the message. The reports of our members throughout the country indicate widespread support of this program on the part of both the people and the Members of Congress. Naturally, we were gratified by this situation and hope that the bill will be brought up for a vote at the earliest possible time. We pledge our continued support of this important and necessary program."

I am enclosing herewith reports of a number of editorials relating to the proposed salary increases, which have recently appeared in newspapers in widely scattered parts of the country.

The judicial congressional salary bill (S. 1663) has been unanimously recommended for passage by the Senate Judiciary Committee and we hope it will be voted on at this session of Congress. We respectfully call your attention to the following facts which we believe justify passing this salary increase bill at this session—many of which facts may never again support such action:

(1) This salary increase bill has been heartily approved by the President and the Attorney General of the United States, who have urged its passage upon Congress.

(2) The salary increase was approved by 60 of the 63 witnesses who appeared before the Commission on Judicial and Congressional Salaries, including representatives of labor, agriculture, business and the professions. There is no organized opposition to the bill, which has been approved by many substantial national organizations.

(3) The salary increase has been approved by newspaper editors in all areas of the country and of all political affiliations. Reprints of more than 200 of these editorials have been furnished Senators and Congressmen by the American Bar Association.

(4) The salary increases have been approved by the House of Delegates of the American Bar Association, and by many State and local bar associations throughout the country.

(5) The salary increases were unanimously approved by the Commission on Judicial and Congressional Salaries, which consisted of outstanding leaders of labor, agriculture, business, and the professions. This Commission was appointed under Public Law 220 of the 83d Congress. This law required the Commission to determine appropriate rates of pay for Senators, Congressmen, Federal judges, et al., and to report to Congress by January 15, 1954. The law required Congress within 60 legislative days thereafter to enact legislation establishing the salaries of such persons. After a considerable amount of very hard work, the Commission has carried out its duties under this law. Needless to say, the members of this Commission hope that Congress will carry out its part of the bargain, and give effect to the Commission's unanimous recommendation that such salaries be raised to the amounts set forth in the report.

(6) Reports received from the many lawyers throughout the country who are interested in this matter (and who, as a public service, have devoted a very considerable amount of their time to supporting the proposal) indicate that a substantial majority of Senators and Congressmen in both parties are not only favorable to this bill, but are extremely anxious to have an opportunity to pass it at this session.

(7) Every Member of Congress needs this legislation, some of them desperately—and so do the judges. Why not face the situation frankly and courageously?

Some of the recent dispatches from Washington, and some recent editorials, have stated that the failure to bring this bill on for a vote at this session has been due to fears of political repercussions from disgruntled constituents, who would accuse those who voted for such a bill of voting to raise their own salaries. If, as we understand is contemplated, any increases would be made effective at the convening of the 84th Congress, then all of the House Members, and the one-third of the Senate Members whose terms expire this year, can make, if challenged, one conclusive and entirely apt rejoinder. That is, "Maybe a particular incumbent isn't worth it—but the job is—and whoever is elected should be paid accordingly."

Sincerely,

MORRIS B. MITCHELL,
Chairman, Committee on Judicial Selection, Tenure, and Compensation.

Postal Pay Raise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDNA F. KELLY

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 27, 1954

Mrs. KELLY of New York. Mr. Speaker, to deceive is unpardonable. In my opinion, this is what was attempted when the chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service moved to suspend the rules of the House to pass H. R. 9245. It bore the number and the title of the Corbett bill but it was not the measure the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CORBETT] had sponsored, nor was it the bill I had pledged to support. I submit the following excerpt from the RECORD to sustain this fact:

> Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, a point of order or parliamentary inquiry, whichever is proper.
>
> The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.
>
> Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, I find that the bill which is presently before us, H. R. 9245, has the title and the enacting clause of the bill which I introduced and which was passed out of the committee.
>
> I also find that it deals not merely with postal salaries but contains an entirely different title on postal rates, which action was never taken by the House committee. I do not believe that this bill can properly be before the House; certainly not with my name on it.
>
> Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, the legislation that is before us is an amended bill, that is true. But all the legislation that we are considering was considered by the committee and reported favorably by our committee.
>
> The SPEAKER. The business before the House is a motion of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].
>
> Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, the bill was never reported from the committee as amended and I was not even notified that my name would be on the legislation.
>
> The SPEAKER. The Chair knows nothing about that. That is of no concern to him except as an individual Member of the House.
>
> The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] has made a motion to suspend the rules and to pass the bill with an amendment. That is what the House is considering.

The original Corbett bill H. R. 9245, was reported by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. It recommended a 7 percent salary increase and the appointment of a commission to study post office reclassification. The minority, including the chairman of the committee, issued a report objecting to the Corbett bill and supporting the Rees bill which has the approval of Postmaster General Summerfield. This bill authorized the Postmaster General to reclassify the postal service.

When the Hagen petition to discharge the Rules Committee on the Corbett bill had been signed by 212 Members of the House, it was realized that the Rees bill was near defeat. Thus, the chairman of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee attempted to bring to the floor, a new, or so-called compromise bill bearing the title and the number of H. R. 9245. Speaking on this motion, the gentleman from Minnesota, Mr. HAGEN, a Republican, said:

> Mr. Speaker, first of all, I want to say it is difficult to oppose the leadership of any issue or legislation. However, I believe I am right and that it is my obligation as a Republican to speak out on this matter.
>
> In the few minutes that I have there will be little opportunity to discuss the provisions of the two bills. The postal pay bill—H. R. 9836—provides a small pay increase for postal employees and they are happy to accept and to receive it, although it is long overdue and it is not sufficient. But they do not approve or like this procedure.
>
> It has been reported to us that this is the only way that this postal-pay bill can come up in the House for a vote. Why is this so? There are many other ways in which this postal-pay bill can be brought up. I, for one, do not like a whip or club over my head with the threat that if we do not approve of this motion there will be no postal-pay legislation, even though 90 percent or more of this House favor a postal-pay bill.

The greatest heartache of a legislator is to have a compromise bill reported to the floor. Always it includes one main feature to which a Member has pledged his support. The Members who are so committed have then two alternatives: vote for the passage of the entire measure including features they would not support in separate legislation, or vote against the entire bill and thereby renege on their promises to support the main feature of the bill. The motion of the chairman on July 14 to suspend the rules to pass a package bill incorporating several bills without discussion and without the right to amend, was unwise and in my opinion it was a subterfuge. It was unfair to the postal employees because in giving them a small increase in salary, it gave the Postmaster General the authority to reclassify their positions. To this they objected. I was opposed to this method of reclassification because I feel that this is the duty of the Congress. Also, this bill included an increase in rates on first-class mail which is the only class mail showing a profit of about $150 million a year. Concerning this compromise or package bill, Mr. E. C. Hallbeck, legislative representative of the National Federation of Post Office Clerks, wrote:

> We believe it is unfair to bring those questions before the House in a single package and consider it a subterfuge to defeat adequate postal salary legislation at this session of Congress.

Mr. Jerome Keating, executive vice president of the National Association of Letter Carriers, said:

> The postal organizations have always opposed coupling postage-rate increases with postal pay.

The Members of the House who voted against this motion, did so with the understanding that this was not the only way to bring the postal salary bill to the floor. At that time, there remained but six signatures to be affixed to the Hagen petition on the Speaker's desk to bring out the true Corbett bill. This is the bill I have supported and will continue to support in accordance with the wishes of my constituents.

State Grange Opposes Upper Colorado Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 26, 1954

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, under permission heretofore granted, I include in the Record an editorial from the California Grange News.

The master of the California State Grange, Mr. George Shelmeyer, is a distinguished leader who has guided this great organiaztion for 28 years. The grange has always supported sound reclamation projects whether in California or elsewhere. In speaking out against the upper Colorado storage project, the grange is taking cognizance of the fact that this project is a threat to our whole reclamation program.

I know it is as distasteful to the grange, as it is to all of us who believe in sound reclamation, to find ourselves compelled by overriding national interest to call attention to the infeasible theories underlying the proposed upper Colorado storge project.

Let the upper Colorado States come forward with a feasible development proposal and we will all be most willing and anxious to help them get it accepted. But we cannot, in good conscience, close our eyes to the raid on the treasury inherent in the pending bill to authorize the upper Colorado storage project. When in addition, it involves a threat to California's water rights, we are left with no alternative but to oppose its passage.

The grange editorial follows:

LET'S LOOK A BIT CLOSER

One of the most important streams on the western slope of the United States is the Colorado River. Its waters serve the needs of millions of people—the great majority of them concentrated in southern California.

The wise use of this vital water flowing from the high Rockies to the Pacific Ocean is a matter directly or indirectly concerning every United States citizen.

Therefore, the far-flung proposals in the upper Colorado Basin project legislation pending in Congress deserve much closer scrutiny than the sponsors of the measure desire.

The executive committee of the California State Grange, following its study of the bills, has branded the project as unsound and dangerous in its proposed departures from present Federal water policy. The reasons are forcefully outlined in the State Grange resolution adopted by the executive board and printed in full on another page of this edition.

Copies of the resolution have been dispatched to each of California's United States Senators and Representatives and several of the lawmakers have replied of their intention to oppose the legislation.

The California State Grange would never oppose reclamation projects in the upper Colorado Basin States which were based on sound planning, reasonable benefits from the Federal investment, and due consideration to the water interests of Arizona and southern California.

Unfortunately, the projects now proposed by Colorado, Utah, Wyoming, and New Mexico meet none of these standards though it is estimated they would ultimately require more than $5 billion from the United States Treasury—staggering millions of which could never be repaid.

Atomic Energy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN D. JOHNSTON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 27, 1954

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I should like to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an editorial from the Anderson (S. C.) Independent of Friday, July 23, entitled "Ike's Cronies Proposing Biggest Steal of People's Heritage in United States History."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

IKE'S CRONIES PROPOSING BIGGEST STEAL OF PEOPLE'S HERITAGE IN UNITED STATES HISTORY

Unless a Democratic Congress is elected in November the American people are in grave danger of being subjected to the greatest legalized robbery in the history of the United States.

This became apparent this week during debate on the revised Atomic Energy Act.

It became even more evident Wednesday night when the Senate, dominated by the Republican Party, approved a sordid scheme to give a $107 million powerplant to two Wall Street utilities holding companies.

But that is chicken feed to what the greedy economic royalists of the land stand to grab unless the people awaken to the danger and elect Democrats to lock the doors to the Nation's atomic treasures.

Under the proposed Atomic Energy Act revision, the privilege of exploiting atomic energy for the generation of power will be turned over to a few huge financial combines.

It is proposed to hand to a small clique of powerful industrialists and financiers the benefits of the secrets and processes of an atomic development program that cost the taxpayers at least $12 billion.

Every person who reads this today—every American who pays taxes—has sacrificed to pay for that program.

Now, under the benign leadership of President Eisenhower's administration, it is all to be given away to a few selected Republican cronies—unless Americans wake up and recapture their Government from the piratical plutocrats pulling the White House puppet strings.

During this debate the Nation has been treated to the spectacle of the string-pullers in the galleries leering over the railing, like birds of prey, in anticipation of their Republican lieutenants in the Senate handing over to them the untold riches of the atomic empire millions of Americans bought and paid for with sweat-earned taxes.

Senator Gore, of Tennessee, called attention to the galleries in the midst of debate. "Let me point out," he said, "that there have been some remarkable guests in the gallery. We have been favored by visits from some of the utilities tycoons and a whole battery of attorneys."

They are taking the position that the American people bought and paid for the atomic energy program in wartime to make weapons; that the people have already received their $12 billion worth from the investment of their tax money; and that now this huge development should be turned over to them so they can reap profits rich beyond all dreams.

Since atomic energy will figure in every facet of American life in the future—power, fuel, science, medical research, transportation—it is apparent that if given free hand to exploit the people's heritage a few men could place millions in economic bondage.

"If the administration has its way," Senator Morse, of Oregon, warned, "there will be little or no competition for the giant utility companies from the Federal Government. Conditions are ripe for the giants to establish a monopoly in the atomic power business.

Senator Murray, of Montana, a Democrat, declared that to approve the bill in its present form means return to the 19th century—ignoring all the safeguards established against monopoly piracy the past 50 years—by "enacting atomic-energy legislation which will give the private power companies exclusive, unregulated, and unconditional right to use the public nuclear materials as fuel for generating plants without recapture provisions, without assent to regulation, without priority to public and cooperative power distributors—without any of the safeguards of the public interest to assure developments in abundance at the lowest possible cost which our predecessors in the national legislature—the Congress—have found necessary." He continued:

"On the very eve of revealing the practical use of nuclear materials to generate electricty, on the very eve of a great peacetime benefit flowing from the taxpayers' tremendous investment, it is proposed to pass a measure which will let companies with know-how move into the energy field, take out patents, and reap a potentially enormous profit from the taxpayers' investment."

Murray pointed out that he is not opposed, and neither are we, to private electric companies being licensed to build nuclear-fueled electric plants to provide more abundant power at lower rates—if they are regulated to assure reasonable rates.

"But," Murray said, "I am not in favor of the Government permitting the companies to patent some final step in the process of generating electric power with nuclear energy, and thereby gain control of the whole process. I am not in favor of them having a tollgate between the people's raw material and the end product, whether it be patent or exclusive license."

Indications are that the bill will be rammed through despite determined Democratic opposition. We have had the "big lie" in this administration. Now we are confronted with the "big steal"—the biggest potential theft of the people's heritage in the Nation's history.

The Late Albert Sidney Camp

SPEECH

OF

HON. ROBERT CROSSER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 26, 1954

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Crosser].

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Speaker, bear with me briefly while I try to tell the feeling I had about this distinguished colleague and good friend of ours, Sid Camp, who has just passed from this earthly scene. I have had the same experience many of you have had because of his friendliness and helpfulness. That I shall never forget. Indeed, no one who knew Sid could ever forget him.

All the beautiful things that have been said about him I endorse. I think all of us could wholeheartedly voice the beautiful sentiment about our friend Sid which is expressed in the lines which I quote as follows:

> What deed or merit
> Has been mine
> That God to me
> Should send
> Of all his gifts
> The most divine
> My other soul,
> A friend?

Mr. Speaker, Sid Camp was a true friend. I shall miss him very much. His wife and family have my sincere sympathy.

Los Angeles County Loyalty Oath

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 24, 1954

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, unanimous consent having been granted me heretofore to do so, I am sure it will be of interest and value to you and to all the Members of this great legislative body, in which I have now had the honor and responsibility of serving four terms, to see and read the text of the formal requirements by the county of Los Angeles, Calif., dealing with the important subject of possible subversive activities of any applicant for employment by said county. I, therefore, present a letter written to me under date of May 7, 1954, by the distinguished Assistant County Counsel Gerald G. Kelly. You will note that the letter says:

> This oath is no longer used because the State of California has occupied the field with a State form of oath which does not list any organization.

The following is the printed form, which is self-explanatory:

Los Angeles, Calif., *May 7, 1954.*

Hon. Clyde Doyle,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Congressman Doyle: Pursuant to your telephonic request of today, please find enclosed six copies of the Los Angeles County loyalty oath. This oath is no longer used because the State of California has occupied the field with a State form of oath which does not list any organization.

Very truly yours,
Harold W. Kennedy,
County Counsel.
Gerald G. Kelly,
Assistant County Counsel.

Oath and Affidavit

A. OATH OF OFFICE OR EMPLOYMENT

I, (print your name carefully) ______________________, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States and the Constitution and laws of the State of California, against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office or employment for which I am applying. So help me God.

B. AFFIDAVIT RE SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITY

I do further swear (or affirm) that I do not advocate, nor am I now a member, nor have I been since December 7, 1941, a member of any political party or organization that advocates the overthrow of the Government of the United States, or State of California, or county of Los Angeles, by force or violence, except those specified as follows: ____ and that during such time as I am an officer or employee of the county of Los Angeles, I will not advocate nor become a member of any political party or organization that advocates the overthrow of the Government of the United States, or State of California, or county of Los Angeles, by force or violence.

C. AFFIDAVIT RE ALIASES

I do further swear (or affirm) that I have never used or been known by any names other than the above, except as follows: (Give maiden name, if any; pen name; stage name, etc.) ______________________________

D. MEMBERSHIP IN ORGANIZATIONS

I do further swear (or affirm) that I have never been a member of, or directly or indirectly supported or followed any of the hereinafter listed organizations, except those that I indicate by a X mark.

Abraham Lincoln Brigade ( )
Academic and Civil Rights Council of California ( )
After School Clubs ( )
Agitprop ( )
American Artists Congress ( )
America for Americans ( )
American Committee for a Free Indonesia ( )
American Committee for Democratic and Intellectual Freedom ( )
American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born ( )
American Committee to Save Refugees ( )
American Communications Association ( )
American Communist Party ( )
American Council on Soviet Relations ( )
American Federation for Political Unity ( )
American Friends of the Chinese People ( )
American Guard ( )
American League Against War and Fascism ( )
American League for Peace and Democracy ( )
American League of Christian Women ( )
American Peace Mobilization ( )
American Russian Institute ( )
American Society for Technical Aid for Spain ( )
American Student Union ( )
American Writers Congress ( )
American Writers School ( )
American Youth Congress ( )
American Youth for Democracy ( )
Anti-Axis Committee ( )
Anti-Hearst Examiner ( )
Anti-Nazi League ( )
Anti-Nazi League of Hollywood ( )
Anti-ROTC Committee ( )
Arcos Limited ( )
Artist Front to Win the War ( )
Arts Advisory Council ( )
Authors League ( )
Balilla ( )
Bay Area Council Against Discrimination ( )
California Conference for Democratic Action ( )
California Labor School ( )
California Youth Legislature ( )
Centro Anti-Communista ( )
China Aid Council of American League for Peace and Democracy ( )
Citizens Committee for Better Education ( )
Citizens Committee for Defense of Mexican-American Youth ( )
Citizens Committee to Free Earl Browder ( )
Citizens Committee to Support Labor's Right ( )
Citizens No Foreign Wars Coalition ( )
Civil Rights Congress ( )
Civil Rights Council for Northern California ( )
Comintern ( )
Committee for Boycott Against Japanese Aggression ( )
Committee for Defense of Mexican-American Youth ( )
Committee for Support of S. W. Gerson ( )
Committee Protesting Attacks Against Abraham Lincoln Brigade ( )
Committee To Defend America by Keeping Out of War ( )
Communist International ( )
Communist Party's Little Theater ( )
Communist Workers School ( )
Communist Political Association ( )
Conference for Democratic Action ( )
Consumers National Federation ( )
Contemporary Theater ( )
Coordinating Commission To Lift Embargo (to Spain) ( )
Council for Pan American Democracy ( )
Cultural and Professional Projects Association ( )
Congress of Mexican and Spanish-Mexican Peoples of United States ( )
Daily Worker ( )
Democratic Youth Federation ( )
Elizabeth Gurley Flynn Club ( )
Elizalde Anti Discrimination Committee ( )
Emergency Committee To Aid Spain ( )
Emergency Trade Union Conference To Aid Spanish Democracy ( )
Ex Combattenti Society ( )
Farmer Labor Party ( )
Federation of Architects, Engineers, Chemists and Technicians ( )
Field Workers School ( )
First Congress of Mexican and Spanish-American Peoples of United States ( )
Friends of Soviet Russia ( )
Friends of Soviet Union ( )
German-American Bund ( )
Greater New York Emergency Conference on Inalienable Rights ( )
Harry Bridges Defense Committee ( )
Hold the Price Line Committee ( )
Hollywood Anti-Nazi League ( )
Hollywood Cultural Commission ( )
Hollywood Community Radio Group ( )
Hollywood Independent Citizens Committee of Arts, Sciences, and Professions ( )
Hollywood League for Democratic Action ( )
Hollywood Theater Alliance ( )
Hollywood Writers Mobilization ( )
Humanist Society of Friends ( )
Independent Citizens Committee of Arts, Sciences, and Professions ( )
International Labor Defense ( )
International Red Aid ( )
International Workers Order ( )
Jewish Peoples Committee ( )
John Reed Clubs ( )

Joint Committee for Trade Union Rights ( )
Joint Anti-Fascists Refugee Committee ( )
League Again War and Fascism ( )
League for Democratic Action ( )
League for Peace and Democracy ( )
League of American Writers ( )
League of Struggle for Negro Rights ( )
League of Women Shoppers ( )
League To Save America First ( )
Los Angeles County Political Commission ( )
Los . ngeles County Trade Union Commission ( )
Mooney Defense Committee ( )
Mobilization for Democracy ( )
Motion Picture Cooperative Buyers Guild ( )
Motion Picture Democratic Committee ( )
National Citizens Political Action Committee ( )
National Committee To Abolish the Poll Tax ( )
National Council on Soviet American Friendship ( )
National Emergency Conference ( )
National Federation for Constitutional Liberties ( )
National Negro Women's Council ( )
National Negro Congress ( )
National Students League ( )
New Masses ( )
New Theater League ( )
North American Committee To Aid Spanish Democracy ( )
Pen and Hammer Club ( )
Peoples Council of America ( )
Peoples Front ( )
Progressive Committee To Rebuild American Labor Party ( )
Refugee Scholarship and Peace Committee ( )
Second Annual California Model Legislature ( )
Simon J. Lubon Society ( )
Social Problems Club ( )
Spanish Relief Committee ( )
Student Rights Association ( )
United Farmers League ( )
United Federal Workers ( )
Western Workers ( )
Workers Alliance ( )
World Committee Against War ( )
Workers School ( )
Young Communist League ( )
The Young Pioneers ( )

Subscribed and sworn to before me this ---------- day of ----------------, 19----.

HAROLD J. OSTLY,
County Clerk.
By ---- ----
Deputy.

Positive Anticommunism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 24, 1954

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent for me to do so, having been heretofore granted me, I am pleased to present to the attention of your distinguished self and all of my other colleagues in this great legislative body, an editorial of June 2, 1954, by the editorial writer of the Christian Science Monitor.

This editorial points out an interpretation of the problem of anticommunism which must be vigilantly, sincerely, and promptly more and more considered and put in its proper relationship to the total anticommunism problem. Being on the House Un-American Activities Committee and hearing the evidence that comes to my attention in that official regard, I am increasingly searching out every possible point of advantage and truth to help me apply myself in the most able and sound manner possible. I know that each and every Member of this great legislative body is at least equally concerned with me.

Each time we vote billions of dollars for military defense and stability of our allies against the positive and antisubversive advancement of communism and its subversive conspiracy, I increasingly doubt whether or not we have yet placed upon our calendar of action sufficient emphasis of the desire and necessity of doing more and more at the grassroots of citizenship among our friendly allied nations in the matter of technical assistance, commonly called point 4. This program, Mr. Speaker, properly administered, should be an antidote against communism. It should be one of the factors included in positive anticommunism. Having now traveled officially for Congress as a member of the Armed Services Committee to many of the nations of our friendly allies, I am convinced that while it is absolutely necessary for us to be militarily strong and to promptly, soundly, and in good faith assist well-known friendly allies to do the same against antisubversive communism; nevertheless, I, in like manner and with no less vigor, believe we are not yet putting and placing sufficiently informed, intelligent, and applied emphasis upon the factors which must be included against positive anticommunism if we are to more adequately protect our national security against world communism conspiracy and if we are to stabilize the thinking and attitude and activities of the ordinary citizen, including children and youth of the free nations.

The editorial follows:

POSITIVE ANTICOMMUNISM

Truth can make men free. That fundamental confidence was the underlying theme of President Eisenhower's magnificent address at Columbia University's bicentennial celebration. His words were appropriately related to the theme of the observance—Man's Right to Knowledge and the Free Use Thereof—and equally to current events.

Dozens of passages in the speech carry eloquent reminders to Americans that they must trust in truth, that their Nation was founded on the rights of dissent—both the theory and the practice. Many citizens assume that there is no need for such reminders in the United States in 1954. But it may be well to recognize that there are degrees of freedom here and now for dissent. Unpopular opinions may get no American cast into a dungeon, but they can lose him a job or cause him to be harassed by a congressional investigating committee. It has happened even to effective battlers against communism.

Of course, the holder of unpopular opinions should be ready to pay the penalty—else his concept of truth is suspect as unable to inspire great devotion. But a free society should beware how great a penalty it makes any man pay for his dissent. Why? Because it is likely to suffer more than those directly penalized. Although the majority may believe it possesses the truth, in human affairs such knowledge can be sharpened and strengthened by testing against dissent. The suppressors of dissent often lose more than the suppressees.

For Americans, communism is so far from being a reasonable alternative to their own system that few even trouble to discuss its claims. It provides no useful grindstone of dissent. The danger here is that in the world contest for men's minds it is not sufficient to label a body of doctrine Communist and ignore it. Among the hundreds of millions outside the Iron Curtain who still have no proper understanding of free government the claims of communism must be challenged and exposed.

President Eisenhower ably outlined the nature of the struggle in the realm of ideas and called for continued "mobilization of moral and spiritual energies." He also advocated increased measures to spread the truth about freedom. We hope Congress will take note when it votes on efforts to cut appropriations for the information program.

Another danger in dealing with communism is that political orthodoxy will find it altogether too easy to fight unpopular views by labeling them communistic. Mr. Eisenhower warned both of conformity and of the intolerance which becomes persuaded that "every individual—or party—that takes issue with our own convictions is necessarily wicked or treasonous." It takes no straining to apply this to certain self-righteous Communist hunters and to Republicans who would use the "20 years of treason" slogan against the Democratic Party.

Doubtless a good many of the President's hearers made their own application of his warning that one who sets Americans to quarreling over methods of combating communism may be the "unwitting ally or tool" of the Kremlin's effort to divide and conquer. Moreover, news reports of the speech linked a certain Senator's name with Mr. Eisenhower's expressed confidence that Americans will "drive from the temple of freedom all who seek to establish over us thought control—whether they be agents of a foreign state or demagogs thirsty for personal power and public notice."

But the President stuck to his rule against personalities. And it would be well for all citizens to recognize that the attack on truth and freedom is impersonal. While standing firmly against improper methods and abuses of power, the great opportunity is to practice positive anticommunism by preaching and practicing freedom. The President nobly pointed to major guideposts on the path.

The Swiss Watch Cartel and the Tariff Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MILTON R. YOUNG
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 27, 1954

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement prepared by me on the subject of the importation of watches.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Swiss Watch Cartel and the Tariff Issue

At the present time there is pending before the President of the United States a recommendation of the Tariff Commission that the concessions in the rate of duty on watches granted to the Swiss in 1936 be withdrawn. It is my firm conviction that this recommendation should be accepted because it is in the national interest.

The United States has long had a tradition that free competition should exist in the market place. We have passed laws making criminal many activities in restraint of trade or tending toward monopoly. We as a people believe that these laws are necessary for the welfare of all of us because they prevent the establishment of monopolies or the carrying on of commerce to the detriment of the general public. We believe that it is in the national interest to foster free and open competition.

But we also believe that this tradition is important in international trade. We have taken a strong stand so far as international trade is concerned that cartels and monopolies and restraints on trade are not in the best interests of the promotion of freer commerce among nations, nor in the best interests of the United States. Congress stated this policy in section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, saying that where unfair methods of competition are used in international trade and their effect or tendency may be to destroy, or to prevent the establishment of, an industry in the United States, such methods are unlawful. When such unfair methods are found to exist, the President is directed to refuse entry into this country of any articles concerned. In the Trade Agreements Act, the President is authorized to suspend any concessions granted in trade agreements with respect to any articles imported from foreign countries because of acts, including the operations of international cartels, which tend to defeat the purposes of the act.

This law and our tradition against restrictions on trade should certainly be important considerations in regard to the tariff on watches. If they are to have any real vitality in international trade they should be brought into play in this matter. There are few, if any, cases where we are dealing with a more unfair or destructive cartel than the Swiss Watch Trust.

The trust is doing its very best to persuade the President and his advisers not to accept the Tariff Commission recommendation. Many Members of Congress have received propaganda from an organization signing itself "the Watchmakers of Switzerland." It may have occurred to some of you—I know it did to me—to wonder just who these "Watchmakers of Switzerland" are. What is their organization? What is their purpose? It came as quite a surprise to me to learn that this association is supported in Switzerland by a cartel admittedly devoted to the proposition of stifling competition in the production of watch movements wherever it may be found and of creating a monopoly throughout the world for exploitation by the Swiss watchmaking industry.

This cartel developed over a period from 1924 to about 1940. It was originally a loose organization of watch manufacturers. Gradually, all members of the watchmaking industry, as well as related industries, such as the watch machinery manufacturers, were drawn into this combination. Persuasion was tried at first ,then, as this failed, in some cases outright purchase of the freedom-loving, stubborn few was attempted. Some rugged individualists even managed to survive this period, and so they were eventually compelled either to join in the restrictive agreements or to abide by them, whether or not they had signed. Many of these restrictive practices were embodied in or enforced through specific legislation. Thus, the Swiss Government has not only condoned these practices, but has actively engaged in them itself. The majority of the stock ownership in the firms manufacturing the principal parts of watches is held by what they originally called the "Superholding Company," now disguised behind a more innocuous name. And the shocking thing to one who believes as I do in the American tradition of free economy is that the Swiss Government controls this holding company.

As a result of this government-sponsored combination and through a device known as the collective convention, the Swiss watchmaking industry has its prices and profits regulated. Its export practices are rigidly supervised. Expansion by any one company or the hiring of additional employees is restricted. The export or foreign licensing of new watchmaking machinery or the establishment of foreign subsidiaries is virtually forbidden. Through understandings, agreements, and leasing arrangements, this organization casts its pall over the small jeweled watch industry in Germany and the very meager facilities in the United Kingdom. It extends also into the nonjeweled watch and clock industry.

The purposes and intentions of this organization have been stated quite clearly by a representative of the executive branch of the Swiss Government. In 1950 a M. Petipierre, arguing before the Swiss General Assembly in favor of the extension of legislation giving federal sanction and support to the cartel, said: "These agreements aimed at restricting the export of 'chablons' (disassembled watches) and of spare parts, at promoting the exportation of completely assembled watches and movements, and at preventing as much as possible the creation of watchmaking establishments abroad." He went on to say later: "In the field of exports, the agreement imposes various restrictions on the manufacturers of the watch industry for the purpose of preventing the development of foreign competition." And still later in his argument he said: "Furthermore, the signers of the agreement agree not to create any watchmaking establishment abroad and not to give any assistance in any form whatsoever to a firm which has not signed the agreement or to a foriegn firm." It would be difficult to imagine a more open declaration of an intention to create a monopoly.

For propaganda purposes the cartel has been expressing great concern for the American consumer if he is forced to pay higher prices for watches because of a proposed increase in the tariff. Were tears shed by this organization for the independent Swiss firms which were forced to join the cartel? Were they concerned and sympathetic when the inroads of competition left the United Kingdom without a watch industry in a war emergency? Is any concern being shown for the consumers of Denmark, Norway, or other countries which have no watch industry and where Swiss prices seem to be higher? It is fantastic to assume that a foreign-controlled cartel would have any concern for American consumers once competition had been eliminated.

It might be said that there is no real danger of this cartel succeeding in creating a monopoly. But, let's look at the record. The first tariff concessions granted under the Recriprocal Trade Agreement Act of 1934 were to Switzerland early in 1936. Since that time, the annual import of jeweled watches from Switzerland has increased five times. The production of domestic jeweled watches has declined until it is now just about what it was in 1936. Since 1936, employment in the Swiss watch industry has soared. On the other hand employment in the domestic jeweled watch industry is now less than it was before World War II. At the time of the trade agreement with Switzerland in 1936, our domestic industry supplied about 50 percent of the jeweled watch market in this country. By 1950, this had been reduced to about 25 percent. By 1953, it was only about 18 percent. In 1954, it will be even less. The only manufaturers of jeweled watches in the world not under Swiss domination—outside the Iron Curtain—are the Bulova, Elgin, Hamilton, and Waltham watch companies in the United States. One of these companies has already been through bankruptcy and is currently producing only a small quantity of watches. Since the first Tariff Commission study, which ended with 1951, their combined employment and production on jeweled watches has fallen almost 50 percent. All of them have commenced importing completed watch movements from Switzerland. When this transition to imported movements becomes complete, the Swiss cartel will have achieved its monopoly and that is about to happen unless something is done immediately.

This cartel is using every possible method to extend its web throughout the world. The Government of Switzerland imposes a 12-cent tax on each lever-escapement watch movement manufactured or assembled. This so-called tax is then immediately turned over to the cartel association for use in propaganda and advertising. This fund amounts to well over $2 million a year, and it has been estimated that more than half of the fund is allocated to the United States market each year. A great deal of it is used to employ an American advertising firm to create and distribute propaganda favorable to the Swiss cartel. The representation of this vast pressure machine has proved so profitable that the advertising firm even maintains a branch office in Switzerland in the very building housing the main offices of the cartel.

Under the guise of expanding trade in the interests of the United States and of the free world we are in grave danger of distorting the entire trade program to foster an evil we have long since declared contrary to our public policy. When we consider the national interest with respect to trade we are not alone concerned with the increasing of trade—we are primarily concerned with increasing the proper type of trade. The interests of our great Nation will not be served by using our Trade Agreements Act as a vehicle for the fulfillment of the purposes of a foreign cartel which is supported by a foreign government. It would be a tragedy if, through a distortion of the purposes of one of our own laws, we should give it the active support of our Government, too.

Maritime Academies and Kings Point

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARGARET CHASE SMITH

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 27, 1954

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial of the Bangor (Maine) Daily News of July 22, 1954, which does much to answer observations made in an editorial of Newsday, inserted earlier in the RECORD by Representative WAINWRIGHT, of New York.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARITIME ACADEMIES AND KINGS POINT

Representative WAINWRIGHT, of New York, wants the Merchant Marine Academy at Kings Point, N. Y., currently operating on a year-to-year basis from Government subsidy, placed on a permanent basis.

Senators SMITH and PAYNE, of Maine, taking an opposing stand for the time at least, have asked the Senate to defer any action pending a thorough Commerce Department study of the Van Pelt resolution.

WAINWRIGHT finds literary support in Mark F. Ethridge, Jr., editor of Newsday, a daily newspaper published in Hempstead Town, Long Island. He takes an exceedingly dim view of the Maine senatorial delegation's efforts. In an editorial captioned "Patronage Versus the Point," Newsday had this to say:

"Once again the issue of State patronage is taking precedence over the national good in the Senate. Maine's two lawmakers, Senators PAYNE and SMITH, have asked the Senate to postpone action on giving Kings Point Merchant Marine Academy permanent status.

"The Maine delegation fears that such status for Kings Point may mean the end of their State academy, which is subsidized by the Federal Government. The bill might also mean the end of State academies in Massachusetts, New York, and California, the four of which cost the United States $787,000 a year.

"The fears of the Maine Senators, we hope, are justified. There is no reason why the Government should support State academies when it has the facilities at Kings Point to do the job.

"We see no point in holding up the bill. Though funds for the next year are already assured, morale is endangered by maintaining the Academy on what Representative BECKER called a crisis-to-crisis existence. As the Van Pelt subcommittee of the House has decided, and as Senator IRVING IVES asks, the school should be given permanent status and equally with the other service academies.

The two Maine Senators, however, are not without support. Commerce Secretary Weeks shares their view.

The merits of Kings Point are undisputed. It was started in 1941 on a site purchased from the Chrysler estate for $100,000. It is now worth $12 million, and boasts an enrollment of approximately 800. Even so, its function is identical to that of the Maine Maritime Academy at Castine, and the other three State academies, differing only in the length of its course. It offers 4 years against 3 by the State academies. When the final examination is passed, however, candidates for graduation receive Coast Guard licenses as third mates or third-class engineers in the merchant marine, and receive an ensign's commission in the maritime service and United States Naval Reserve.

What is behind the protest of the two Maine Senators, we do not know. But if the editor of Newsday is correct—that the request to defer granting the Kings Point institution permanent status was made through fear that Maine would lose the academy at Castine because of overlapping functions—there is nothing wrong with that. They should be commended for putting up a fight in behalf of the State they represent.

But we doubt that that is the only or compelling reason for the stand taken by the Maine delegation. There is the matter of economics.

In discussing this phase, the premise that the four State academies and Kings Point are equal scholastically and offer the same training stands unchallenged. The Federal Government has acknowledged this. The difference is in administration. Kings Point is totally subsidized by the Federal Government, the four State academies only partially so.

Kings Point can be disposed of briefly. The Government kicks in $3,200,000 annually to run it. It costs the Government in excess of $3,000 per student annually, and, having no ship, it "farms" the second-year men out as cadets with privately owned steamship companies. Put on the same basis as the Military Academy at West Point or the Naval Academy at Annapolis, where salaries would also be included, and taking the two service academies as criteria, it would cost about $5,000 annually for each candidate for a rating. Thus, after the 4-year course was completed, it would have cost the Federal Government $20,000 on the basis of "permanent Federal status" and more than $12,000 under current status to graduate one man.

The picture changes radically in the State academies. Castine will serve as the example. There the present student body started at 230 and now numbers 204, for an average of about 215. Each of these students pays $400 tuition, $510 board and $56 in fees and incidentals, for a total of $966. The State allots $95,000 by appropriation and whatever else may be needed from the contingent fund. The Government kicks in $37,500, all of which is used to run the ship assigned to the academy, and grants $400 scholarships to 150 students, making a total of $99,500 granted by the Government. This $60,000 in Government scholarships must, of course, be subtracted from the $207,690 paid by the students, leaving the total take from students at $147,690.

This leaves students and State contributing $242,690 and the Government $99,500, or about 2½ to 1 with the Government on the short end.

Under this partial subsidy, it costs the Government between $600 and $700 annually for each student, compared to the more than $3,000 at Kings Point under its present status.

Carrying this through to the 4-year course at Kings Point and the 3-year courses at the four State academies, the Government pays in excess of $12,000 on the one hand and about $1,950 for the identical thing on the other.

Sound economics argue loudly against any change that would increase this disparity.

Statement Relative to Misuse of Duck Stamp Money

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 27, 1954

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, as a former executive officer of the California Division of Fish and Game, I am intensely interested in those things that have to do with wildlife conservation.

The present trend is an apparent effort to divert certain moneys collected under the provisions of the Pitman-Robertson Act for purposes other than those stipulated in the law.

The present director of the Department of Fish and Game of the State of California, the Honorable Seth Gordon, is an outstanding conservationist whose reputation goes way beyond the shores of our country.

Before going to the California Department of Fish and Game as its director, he headed the Conservation Division of the State of Pennsylvania.

Seth Gordon knows whereof he speaks, and he speaks out in defense of fish and wildlife whenever he sees its well-being impaired.

I want to make this by way of introduction to a statement that he made before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the United States House of Representatives in June of this year.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA,
DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME,
Sacramento, Calif., July 22, 1954.

Hon. GEORGE P. MILLER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR GEORGE: I appreciate your comments of the 19th concerning the statement relative to the misuse of duck stamp money.

I doubt very much whether this statement will be of sufficient value to justify reprinting it in the RECORD; but if you think otherwise, you certainly have my permission to do so. In that event, here is an extra copy for that purpose.

With best regards, I am,
Cordially yours,
SETH GORDON, *Director.*

P. S.—We have received a lot of very favorable comments from various parts of the country on this statement, and none which are adverse so far.

STATEMENT TO COMMITTEE ON HOUSE INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS, OF THE UNITED STATES CONGRESS, RELATIVE TO MISUSE OF DUCK STAMP MONEY, BY SETH GORDON, SACRAMENTO, CALIF., JUNE 28–29, 1954

Mr. Chairman and gentleman of the committee, my name is Seth Gordon, and at present am the director of the California Department of Fish and Game, with offices in Sacramento.

By way of further identification, it was my privilege to be numbered among the early promoters of the duck stamp law. Later as the conservation director of the Izaak Walton League, Chicago, then as president of the American Game Association, with headquarters here in Washington, I had a material part in the campaign for the enactment of the law establishing the national refuge system, the duck stamp law to provide funds to finance it, and other important national legislation dealing with the general conservation problem.

DR. NELSON'S WARNING IN 1919

The basis for the legislation under which funds are now being contributed by 2,350,000 sportsmen from one end of the country to another, through the purchase of duck stamps, had its beginning back in February 1919 when the late Dr. E. W. Nelson, one of the Nation's foremost scientists, then Chief of the United States Biological Survey, while addressing a national conference on game and wildlife conservation at Ottawa, Canada, called attention to the fact that—

"Continued transformation on a large scale of marshy lands into farms in the western United States and Canada is decreasing the resting places and feeding grounds of migratory wildfowl, and constitutes one of the most serious dangers to the future of these birds. If a sufficient number of sanctuaries are not supplied, and if the drainage and devotion to agricultural and other purposes of the marshy areas continue, migratory waterfowl will diminish despite every effort along other lines to conserve them."

That same year Dr. Nelson also discussed the entire problem with the game and fish officials of the entire Nation assembled at Louisville, Ky.

In April of the following year, in an article published in the American Game magazine, published by the American Game Association, he further stated:

"Unless combined State and Federal action is taken in the near future to reserve permanently the marshy areas and shallow lakes most suitable for wildfowl breeding and feeding grounds, a few years will see their elimination."

REFUGES AND HUNTING GROUNDS SUGGESTED

Dr. Nelson, recognizing the importance of sound conservation programs, as well as of public hunting areas, recommended that the suggested reservations for migratory wildfowl be of two classes: "One in which no shooting shall ever be permitted, where the birds may have sanctuary and rest and breed unmolested; another series of reserves should be established as public hunting grounds, where, under the simplest restrictions the public shall have opportunity for good shooting and thus place it on a footing of equality with the owners of private shooting preserves. These areas, while shot over during hunting season, would be closed and become protected breeding and feeding places for wildfowl during the rest of the year, and thus help in increasing the supply."

It may interest the members of this committee to know that even back in that early period the danger of farm surpluses of various kinds was pointed out repeatedly in an effort to help stem the reckless drainage of millions of acres of land, much of which later proved valueless for crop production, which formerly had been the homes of waterfowl and other water-loving birds and animals.

CONSERVATION FORCES LED CAMPAIGN

Following the warnings from Dr. Nelson, the conservation forces of the country, under the leadership of the American Game Association, rolled up their sleeves and began organizing campaigns to help save the waterfowl breeding and feeding grounds, and to provide public hunting grounds for unattached shooters. Legislation for what was then known as the Federal license and public shooting-grounds bill, including a dollar sticker to be bought by all waterfowl hunters, was introduced in 1920 and kept before Congress in one form or another each succeeding session until 1929 when the Norbeck-Andresen law, known as the Migratory Bird Conservation Act of February 18, 1929, was passed and signed by the President.

While the Norbeck-Andresen Act was pending session after session, Congress provided funds to acquire, by purchase, two of the country's most important waterfowl breeding and feeding grounds, namely, the Upper Mississippi Fish and Wildlife Refuge, running from Davenport, Iowa, to Red Wing, Minn., and the Bear River Waterfowl Refuge in Utah.

When it seemed hopeless to obtain agreement upon the dollar Federal license plant, the conservation forces decided, with doubts and misgivings on the part of many, to get the basic law through without the license feature. Since the conservation of migratory birds benefits all citizens, and was pledged under a treaty with Canada, it was argued that Congress should very properly appropriate the necessary funds.

EIGHT MILLION DOLLARS AUTHORIZED FOR 10-YEAR PROGRAM

The bill in its final form authorized appropriations aggregating $8 million over a period of 10 years, "to more effectively meet the obligations of the United States under the migratory bird treaty with Great Britain by lessening the dangers threatening migratory game birds from drainage and other causes by the acquisition of areas of land and any water to furnish in perpetuity reserves for the adequate protection of such birds; and authorizing appropriations for the establishment of such areas, their maintenance and improvement, and for other purposes."

BIOLOGICAL CHIEF MADE COMMITMENTS

While that bill was under consideration, the late Paul G. Reddington, then Chief of the United States Biological Survey, among other things, promised to use the funds as follows:

"As suggested in the report of this Department on the measure under date of January 11, 1929, the $75,000 proposed for the first year's expenses would be used in making a comprehensive survey of the most desirable sanctuary sites throughout the United States, and in developing a clear-cut, businesslike program for the establishment of the necessary sanctuaries along the migration routes."

It was Mr. Reddington's conclusion, based on information in the files of the Biological Survey, that Federal sanctuaries were needed in at least 125 concentration areas.

Concerning the proposed allocations for the second year, Dr. Reddington promised that—

"Practically all of the estimated amount of $200,000 (authorized for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1931) will be expended in accordance with the present plans * * * on the acquisition of lands found by the investigation made during the first year to be needed for sanctuary purposes * * * it is not planned to expend any of this $200,000 in the administration of sanctuaries during this year.

"During the third year under the $600,000 appropriation we estimate that we will use 95 percent for the acquisition of additional lands, including the construction of necessary improvements such as dikes, ditches, dams, etc., and approximtealy 5 percent for administering the areas already acquired. Subsequently and until a sufficient number of sanctuaries have been obtained to provide for the welfare of the migratory birds, it is the present plan of the Department to use each year approximately 80 to 85 percent in acquisition and improvements, and not to exceed 15 to 20 percent for the employment of protectors to administer and patrol the sanctuaries."

Beginning with the fourth year, the amount authorized was $1 million annually.

CONGRESSIONAL SPECIAL WILDLIFE COMMITTEES

Following the enactment of the Norbeck-Andresen Act, it became evident that unless far greater support could be found for this important undertaking, the whole program would collapse. Fortunately, a special Senate Committee on Conservation of Wildlife Resources was organized on March 20, 1931 to make special studies of various proposed wildlife programs, which action was followed later by the establishment of a special Committee on Conservation of Wildlife in the House of Representatives.

Due to conditions which prevailed in 1930 and 1931, it was realized that while authorizations were one thing, obtaining actual governmental appropriations to carry out a program such as contemplated by the Norbeck-Andresen Act, was quite a difficult matter.

It was further found that since the Federal Government had committed itself to a migratory waterfowl restoration program, many of the States took little or no interest in the birds, except to fight for their full share in the open hunting seasons.

The American Game Association then came forward, September 1931, with a suggested $25 million bond issue proposal, the bonds to be issued at the rate of $5 million per year "to purchase, lease, and maintain migratory bird breeding, feeding, and resting grounds," and to be retired from funds to be collected through a dollar Federal license to hunt migratory waterfowl.

The plan further contemplated that the States would contribute on a 50-50 basis in the acquisition of the areas, and when the purchases were completed the projects would be turned over to the States for administration under the general Federal regulations.

The entire purpose of this proposal was to reemphasize the magnitude and immediate urgency of the waterfowl needs. Those who proposed it were looked upon as visionary but well-meaning individuals. Due to the delays land prices and everything else went up. Approximately twice the $50 million ($25 million Federal contributions, $25 million State contributions, expenditure then contemplated has already been made, and the job is far from completed.

CONGRESSIONAL HEARINGS HELD

The Senate Special Committee on Conservation of Wildlife Resources began to hold hearings on various proposals and submitted a series of reports, also introduced the present duck stamp bill, the primary purpose of which was to supplement and support the Migratory Bird Conservation Act of 1929 by providing funds "for the acquisition of areas for use as migratory bird sanctuaries, refuges, and breeding grounds; for developing and administering such areas; for the protection of certain migratory birds; for the enforcement of the Migratory Bird Treaty Act and regulations thereunder."

It will be noted that acquisition of areas was placed first on the list. The act provided that not less than 90 percent of the money collected from duck stamps, being issued at $1 each, was to be used for the purpose of locating, acquiring, administering, etc., suitable areas for migratory bird sanctuaries under the provisions of the Migratory Bird Conservation Act of 1929.

SPECIAL CITIZENS COMMITTEE NAMED

While the Duck Stamp Act was before Congress, the Secretary of Agriculture, early in January of 1934, set up a special 3-man committee consisting of Thomas H. Beck, chairman, J. N. Darling, and Prof. Aldo Leopold to study the wildlife needs of the Nation. In their report of February 8, 1934, they recommended that a total of $50 million be expended for purchasing submarginal lands for wildlife restoration and that a minimum of $24 million be so allocated; also that 4 million acres be acquired quickly, under 1-year leases with options to buy, for migratory waterfowl and shore birds to secure some of the highly important lands at once rather than to do a piecemeal job.

HUNTERS VOLUNTEERED EXTRA DOLLAR

The new duck stamps, which first went on sale on August 14, 1934, at $1 each, during the 1935 fiscal year totaled 635,001. In a special Fish and Wildlife Service publication of 1947 concerning the stemps and listing the number of stamps sold each year up to 1946 (1946—$1,725,505), the Fish and Wildlife Service stated:

"In general, about one-third of the expenditures from the 90 percent allocation of duck stamp funds has been used for land acquisition; one-third for refuge development; and the remaining one-third for refuge maintenance and operation."

We trusted this public statement. Those of us who had participated in the campaign for the program were satisfied that, on the basis of the above formula, the dollars collected were being used wisely. Recognizing the need for more money, we went along in 1949 and agreed to collect another dollar from all migratory waterfowl hunters. The first year, 2,127,598 of the $2 stamps were sold. It is estimated that for the current fiscal year, the total number of stamps issued will exceed 2,350,000.

OUR FEARS AROUSED, 1951

The several States cooperated to the best of their ability in this program, some of them more generously than others, but doubts began to develop in the minds of many of the State wildlife officials that the Federal Government was tapping the duck-stamp fund for purposes other than intended. Badly needed areas were not being acquired as contemplated, much more drainage was being done annually, and land prices were going higher and higher.

Our fears and suspicions were more than aroused when Mr. Carl D. Shoemaker (who in his capacity as secretary to the Senate Special Committee on Wildlife Resources had helped to draft the duck-stamp law) came before the International Association of Game, Fish, and Conservation Commissioners at Rochester, N. Y., in September 1951, with a summation of the manner in which the duck-stamp money had been expended.

He reported that up to June 30, 1950, the amount collected from waterfowl hunters was slightly more than $23 million, and that 10 percent of this money had gone for administration and enforcement, amounting to $2,300,000, which left $20,700,000 for the major purposes of the act.

In Mr. Shoemaker's address he stated:

"The expressed congressional thought behind the act was to acquire refuges along the various flyways in order to provide not only wintering, resting, and feeding grounds, but breeding areas in the northern tier of our States. As a corollary and of secondary importance to the act, such portions of this money as the Fish and Wildlife Service thought necessary could be used to maintain, operate, and manage already existing refuges."

In the above statement, Mr. Shoemaker very clearly voiced the intent of all of us who participated in the campaign for this legislation.

His next comment almost floored every State official present. He explained what had become of the $20 million, and reported that up to June 30, 1950, only 184,636 acres of land had been purchased with duck-stamp money at a total cost of $1,970,604, or an average of $10.67 per acre. He concluded with the statement, "this leaves a sum of $18,729,396 which went into phases of the waterfowl program other than acquisition of lands for refuges, which apparently was the real and major purpose of the Duck Stamp Act."

He further suggested that either Congress should be prevailed upon to provide more appropriations for the management and operation of the refuge program, or the price of the duck stamp should be increased, "with a proviso that the increase should be used in acquiring and developing more refuges along the flyways."

TAPPING SPECIAL FUNDS BREAKS FAITH

The report above gave the State wildlife officials and the sportsmen of the country cause for alarm. It looked as though the Fish and Wildlife Service, the Secretary of the Interior, the Director of the Budget, or the Congress, or a combination of all four, had deliberately tapped the Duck Stamp Fund for purposes never contemplated to avoid making appropriations from general tax revenues.

It is not unusual to find that budget officers and legislative bodies have an inclination to load onto special funds everything they possibly can "so long as it's within the law" in order to reduce general tax revenue appropriations to a minimum, a practice which ignores the "trust character" of such special contributions. It is a breaking of faith which should never be condoned.

LATEST REPORT WAS SHOCKING

When Mr. Shoemaker came before the Western Association of State Game and Fish Commissioners at Las Vegas, Nev., early in May of this year, and gave us a further report on the Duck Stamp Fund State officials and sportsmen were shocked, to say the least.

In summary he reported that from the beginning of the issuance of duck stamps to the end of June 1953 a total of $29,542,253 had been expended from the duck stamp fund; that the estimated expenditures for the fiscal year ending this June 30 would be $5,406,456, or a total of $34,948,709; and that there is on hand an unexpended and unobligated balance of $890,841.56 from a grand total of duck stamp receipts since August 14, 1934, of $35,839,551.

Shoemaker's latest report indicates that out of this total $34,948,709 expended from the Duck Stamp Fund, only $6,492,375 has been expended or budgeted for the purchase of lands for waterfowl management areas, including appraisals, titles, surveys, etc. We understand the Service had by then actually purchased only $209,329 acres, at $13.22 per acre from this fund, far short of the acreage contemplated in 1934. The balance of the sum indicated was actually used up for various other purposes, including leases, etc.

Another startling fact brought out was for every dollar paid to the owners of this acreage another 95 cents was expended to make the appraisals, negotiations, surveys, clearance of titles, etc., and that all the balance of the collections was used for other purposes simply because it was lawful to load all of these other activities onto the duck-stamp fund, even though it was not in keeping with the spirit and intent of the law.

EARLY SPONSOR'S SEVERE CRITICISM

One of the early sponsors of the campaign for the duck-stamp program to allow waterfowl shooters to contribute to the maintenance of their own sport wrote me just recently that the attitude of some of the principal policymakers in the Fish and Wildlife Service, in his opinion, has been detrimental to the whole concept of the original program, and that "back of the whole thing is the constant urge for more power by building up the Service and spending more money. The shooter is the enemy of the game; all he does is furnish the money. I know refuges that go in for picnic sites in a big way—concrete tables and benches and all ancient and modern inconveniences of tourist traps."

While this indictment may seem a bit severe, many of us definitely believe that the Fish and Wildlife Service has spent entirely too much duck-stamp money to develop and embellish properties that were never acquired for the purpose of benefitting waterfowl. For instance, it might be wise for the Congress to inquire how much duck-stamp money has been spent on such big-game-refuge projects as the National Bison Range in Montana, the Wichita Game Refuge in Oklahoma, and numerous others that might be mentioned, upon which it is alleged that duck-stamp dollars were expended rather lavishly in former years simply because it was easier to get the money from that source than it was to obtain it from Congress direct.

OUR WESTERN PROBLEMS NEGLECTED

It is quite clear that the duck-stamp money collected from the shooters has not been spent in the manner intended by Congress or the sportsmen who supported the legislation. It is also quite obvious that the fault does not lie wholly with any one of the four agencies involved, namely, the Fish and Wildlife Service, the Secretary of the Interior, the Director of the Budget, or the Congress, but that all four have been derelict in their duty and jointly responsible.

We in the West know what our needs are. We are convinced that much more of the duck stamp money should have been spent in the Western States to acquire and develop suitable waterfowl habitat areas before all of the few remaining marshes are drained and converted to agriculture. And we are certain that any further delay will make it practically impossible to acquire needed waterfowl management areas in a number of Western States, and especially California, because of the terrific demand for water.

We in California have been especially critical because of the slowness, of the Federal Government's program. While the Lea Act appropriations temporarily helped out, the amount expended in relation to the importance of the Pacific flyway wintering grounds in California for the ducks, geese, etc., is much too small, especially if we take into consideration the fact that our 220,000 duck hunters now contribute $440,000 annually to the duck stamp fund.

EXAMPLES OF NEEDED DEVELOPMENT, FEDERAL AREAS, CALIFORNIA

Proper development of waterfowl projects already bought in our State has been neglected, especially in areas where crop depredations are a problem. Two outstanding examples of the need for full development by the Fish and Wildlife Service are:

Sacramento refuge: Of the 11,000 acres on the Sacramento refuge, about 6,000 have been presently developed and approximately 5,000 remain in a native state. In this condition, the value of these undeveloped acres is limited to providing forage and resting areas primarily for geese during the period of winter precipitation. It is not felt that they serve the best purpose to which they could be devoted by better and higher type of development.

It has always been stated that funds are not available for such developmental work. Since this refuge, acquired about 20 years ago, is in the heart of the crop depredation area of the Sacramento Valley, it is felt that there is full justification for the expenditure of additional funds to bring it to its highest usefulness. No part of this refuge has ever been opened to public shooting, and there has been no valid excuse for failing to use duck stamp money for this purpose.

Merced refuge: The Merced refuge, comprising 2,500 acres bought with Lea Act funds, presently has about 900 acres developed, and for which there is a water supply over and above annual precipitation. The balance of the land is native grass and, after the start of fall rains and new growth of forage, provides feed and resting for various species of geese. This undeveloped acreage contributes too little to the solution of the crop depredation problem, to public hunting, or as habitat for ducks. Further and adequate development, including water, is highly desirable.

STATE DOING MORE THAN ITS SHARE

We in California have set up a fund of more than $4 million for the acquisition and development of additional waterfowl management areas. It is high time that the Federal Government meets its full share of the obligation. But if duck stamp moneys are diverted as they have been in the past, the original concept of the program will never be completed.

We strongly urge that a reasonable portion of the present $2 fee be earmarked for the acquisition of additional lands in areas where the last remaining marshes are rapidly being eliminated, and that they be held until such time as funds are available to develop them. Probably it will be found desirable to increase the cost of duck stamps further, but if this is done the entire increase should be earmarked for the original purpose of the program and not to carry a load of other operations of the Fish and Wildlife Service just because the law is broad enough to permit the raiding of the fund for functions which should be provided through appropriations from general tax revenues.

If this deplorable situation cannot be straightened out satisfactorily in the near future, the only alternative will be to urge the repeal of the duck stamp law, and request the Congress to appropriate funds to discharge this country's obligations under the treaties with Canada and Mexico.

The sportsmen of America are big-hearted and generous, but they do not like to be cheated. And they won't accept repeated alibis for broken promises.

International Public Relations, International Peace and Prosperity

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 27, 1954

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, earlier this year, the American Public Relations Association—APRA—held its 10th annual convention in New York for the consideration of a great many facets of domestic and international public relations.

During the 2-day convention, as later described in Public Relations News, APRA's audience of more than 300 executives heard 2 dozen speakers, representing publishing, counseling, government, radio-television, business, education, advertising, and organized labor.

One of the most important of the sessions was a four-man review of the problem of telling America's story to the world and of telling foreign peoples about America. Participants were Mr. John Glenn of the Mexican Chamber of Commerce of the United States, Mr. Paul French of CARE, Congressman Jacob K. Javits, and Mr. Joseph Jones of Reed-Jones, Inc.

I believe that this interesting discussion was an important contribution to professional and public thinking on the subject.

I ask unanimous consent that excerpts of the panel's comments be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PANEL DISCUSSION ON INTERNATIONAL PUBLIC RELATIONS BEFORE 10TH ANNUAL CONVENTION OF AMERICAN PUBLIC RELATIONS ASSOCIATION

Mr. TREADWELL. Our first speaker is president of Reed-Jones, Inc. He is also director of Export News Service, a publicity service for American manufacturers in foreign countries.

He is a veteran member and officer of many export associations, including Chicago Export Managers Club. He was APRA's first Midwestern regional vice president before coming to New York.

During the war years he served as an officer on the Board of Economic Warfare specializing in activities of the automotive industry.

And now after this brief "who's who," I want you all to meet Mr. Joseph A. Jones, president of Reed-Jones and one of our pioneers in international public relations.

Mr. JONES. As individuals, as agencies, as companies and associations, there's no reason for us to be sitting back eyeing the foreign field as a market for future development. That market last year was worth $12 billion. As in this country, public-relations work also builds sales abroad—and the potentials for American business were never so timely and enormous.

A dozen years or so ago, it was pioneer effort. Most companies had never thought of the idea, didn't see its need, had no budgets and probably would have had difficulty securing qualified personnel. As new agencies were formed in recent years, the combined selling force behind the theme of extending public relations on an international scale has helped to make American industry generally aware of its benefits.

As a result of the pioneering by a number of United States companies since the war, plans and procedures have been developed that take much of the guesswork out of previously little known areas of worldwide public relations activity.

The next few years, I predict, will see a far more rapid rate of extension of international public relations and participation by more of us—as individuals, agencies, companies and associations. Here is why:

1. More and more people with products or services to sell are pushing into markets abroad.

2. U. S. companies already established in foreign markets are encountering sharper competition from other supplier nations.

3. It becomes increasingly necessary to interpret to overseas customers the interest of the United States businessman in exportation—not exploitation.

The benefits of a well-planned program are the same as they are here but when reduced to final dimensions, there are only two reasons why American companies should embark on public-relations programs in other countries. That is, aside from your opportunities for foreign travel.

1. Commercially, to sell more products.

2. Patriotically, to help spread a better understanding of our country.

* * * * *

There are phases of overseas propaganda, however, which the businessman would better leave to government and other groups and in which he can assume a supporting rather than leading role. There are other phases of overseas propaganda, of a commercial nature, in which the business can "feel at home," sell his products and help promote a better appreciation of America.

As you extend your public relations activities and help build the desires of overseas customers beyond last year's mark of $12 billion, you will be creating propaganda in a physical sense. You will be providing these overseas peoples with more cars, trucks and buses for their transportation needs, miracle drugs for their health, tractors, and agricultural equipment for producing more food, radio, television and communications equipment to further their educational systems, labor saving machinery, chemicals, office and other products to raise their standards of living. The propaganda values of these not-so-silent American salesmen are inestimable.

At the point of origin of these goods—wanted and needed everywhere in the world today—American industry can help itself and others in international public relations. Here, too, is where industry can lend a bigger hand to Government in its international information program. Specifically, we can all help more in the international exchange of persons and technical assistance programs of our Government and private educational agencies.

No amount of posters can beat the enthusiasm of those visitors who come here under those programs and who report to their countrymen about their observations of our way of living and working, their stories of personal experiences on plant visits, PTA and town meetings and other warm-hearted hospitality events planned by both management and workers in Detroit, Elmira, Peoria, Milwaukee, Midland, Boston, Houston, and other American cities and farming areas they have visited.

For the most part, public relations men and women have succeeded in having a rightful place at management's side and offering counsel on sales, advertising, labor, stockholder relations, and other problems. Yet their responsibilities—both to their companies and country—have not been fully discharged if they have not convinced management of adopting a policy of keeping its overseas public as thoroughly informed as its public in the United States.

An international public relations program based on such a policy and adjusted to fit changing world conditions can overcome problems peculiar to the company or industry; counteract unfavorable political and consumer attitudes; augment advertising and merchandising programs; meet foreign competition; build sales and prestige; earn recognition by other governments of the contributions of the company's products to their national economies; and ease import restrictions and allocations of dollar exchange.

Once engaged in such a program, every company sees the almost endless opportunities for more and more constructive effort for itself and our Nation as a whole. The results are eminently practical. The potential is tremendous.

Mr. TREADWELL. Members of the convention, here is one of our greatest public relations programs abroad today. Behind CARE are many heroes, but its distinguished leader and executive director is our guest today. In his activities with this organization he has traveled over a million miles, crossing the Atlantic 66 times, and has traveled around the world 6 times. His motto has been: The word "democracy" will not be heard by people whose ears are deafened by the rumblings of their stomachs.

You all know the great work CARE has done, is doing, and plans to do for many years to come.

Ladies and gentlemen, may I now present our distinguished representative who is nightly remembered in the prayers of kids and adults all over the world, Mr. Paul Comly French.

Mr. FRENCH. When you eliminate the fancy words and phrases, the term "good international public relations" boils down to good human relations.

As a nation, we can spend billions making bigger and more powerful hydrogen bombs. But if we are going to succeed in strengthening the forces of peace and freedom we must take equal measures to win allies not in fear, but in friendship.

That means we must convince our world neighbors that America is sincerely concerned with their welfare and wants to help make life better for them. All human beings, regardless of race, color, or creed, want three basic things: They want enough to eat. They want protection from the elements—shelter and clothing. They want their children to have a better opportunity for the future. There is nothing revolutionary about these desires. Yet, more than half the human race goes to bed hungry every night.

Our Government has stored in warehouses right now over two and a half billion dollars' worth of surplus agricultural commodities. In many countries, I have heard the Communists tell people the United States would rather store its surplus food than use it to help them. Men and women who might be our friends become confused. The simple act of sharing food with those who are hungry can create the kind of friendship the world needs to ease international tensions.

A comparatively small amount of surpluses have, in the past, been distributed abroad through Government programs and through CARE and other private American agencies. It now seems possible that Congress will authorize expanded use of surpluses for foreign relief. CARE has asked that this be done through private agencies, rather than Government bureaus, so that the distributions will be on a people-to-people level that will gain fullest impact. We hope we can receive $750 million worth of surpluses to help feed the hungry in many areas. CARE has also asked Congress to provide for funds, where necessary, to help cover distribution costs, as part of the national policy to bolster the people of the free world.

Whatever the Government does, however, there is still a great deal individuals can and must do. This applies not only to food and other relief, but to programs that will help impoverished peoples help themselves to a better future. For example, through the self-help program CARE has added to its food and textile packages, Americans are sending overseas such varied gifts as modern plows and farm tools; new scientific and technical books; and audio-visual equipment for Philippine community centers that are safeguarding democracy by showing rural Filipino families how to improve their living standards.

In short you, as an American, have a direct responsibility. You can let your representatives in Congress know you approve of helping our friends throughout the world. You can see that organizations to which you belong sponsor foreign-aid projects. As an executive or employee, you can see that your firm undertakes to show the people of other countries that American big business is not the hardhearted capitalism of Red propaganda. The Mutual Life Insurance Co. drive to provide CARE plows and tools for farmers in India illustrates what can be done in this field. The day some stranger in a foreign land writes to you and says "Dear Friend," you will know you've had a hand in building good international relations.

INTRODUCTION OF JOHN B. GLENN

Mr. Treadwell. To my way of thinking, there is no man in this country today more qualified to speak on and discuss Pan American relations than our next speaker. I have closely followed his activities for many years, have been guided by his teachings and accomplishments. He is a famous national and international banker. Was at one time president of the New York Board of Trade, was a member of the mayor's business and advertising committee in New York City. Back in the days of the New York World's Fair, our guest was in charge of foreign participation.

Through international finance he became active with the Latin American countries. He is an honorary member of the Pan American Society, a former director of that organization and also a member of their executive committee.

His present position is that of president and director of the Mexican Chamber of Commerce of the United States.

And now members of the convention, I would like to present Mr. John B. Glenn.

Mr. Glenn. Mr. Chairman, members of the American Public Relations Associates, Inc., and guests, it is indeed a great pleasure to be with you today and to speak to you with regard to our relations with Latin America.

For many years I have been in constant contact with all of the Latin American countries and have always been deeply impressed with the value of their good will and friendship and particularly Mexico where I have lived at different times over a period of 22 years, as an American Consul and representing American banking, industrial, and commercial interests.

I am sure that most of us here today know a great deal about Latin America, since we are all so vitally interested in those countries, yet I do not think I would be far wrong in saying that for years it has been the general opinion of many Americans that Latin Americans have been brought up on the three R's of revolution, romance, and rumba. * * *

According to the opinion of many Latin Americans, an American, physically speaking, must be robust with brown hair and eyes and close shaven. He dresses simply, wears ready-made suits of good quality, but without a touch of personality. He has large feet, wears heavy shoes with rubber heels, and has stubby fingers and chubby hands.

He is always in a hurry, often pushing people around for no apparent reason, or rushing in front of a bus or car and then turning around to see it go by. He often gets up from his seat long before the train arrives at his station as he seems to want to be the first one to get off the same as he wishes to be the first one to get on. His tastes are simple—sports, automobiles, golf, and cocktails. When he is not smoking cigars or cigarettes he is usually chewing gum. Intellectually, though he may be successful in business he is slow and methodical.

* * * * *

Latin Americans also feel that we of the United States have been too imperialistic and money-minded, while Latin America is more idealistic and generous.

It is difficult to know which false ideas are the more preposterous—those common among Latin Americans or those of the United States.

Those of us who know Latin America, and particularly those of us who have lived in those countries, feel deep admiration, respect, and affection for their people and that there is a great deal which all of us can learn from each other. We also feel that our interests are mutual, that we have need for each other, and that one of our sublimest ideals is that of respect, consideration, friendship, and solidarity among all the peoples of this hemisphere.

Latin America, which extends throughout the West Indies, and all the way from our southern border down to Cape Horn, a distance of 7,000 miles, is composed of 20 countries with 163 million inhabitants, and in size is 3 times larger than the United States. Brazil alone is larger than our country and in population stands first with Mexico second, and the Argentine third. Of the Latin-American countries, 18 speak the Spanish language, while Portuguese is spoken in Brazil and French in Haiti.

All of these countries were colonized by Europeans, mainly Spanish and Portuguese, so that the culture and architecture is predominantly of these two nations and the religion is Catholic.

One must not make the mistake, however, to consider all of these countries alike, for although they all have similarities none of them is the same.

* * * * *

All of the 20 Latin-American countries are republics, somewhat similar to our own. All fought for their independence from European powers, and all are zealous of their rights as free and independent nations.

* * * * *

Since 1914, when Latin America discovered us, due to the closing of the European markets, our trade with those countries has greatly increased, amounting to well over 25 percent of our total exports.

During 1952 our total exports to the 20 Latin-American countries amounted to $3,480,000,000 and our imports were valued at $3,425,000,000.

Some of us may not realize the strategic value of our imports from Latin America, or that Canada, the United States, and the 20 Latin American countries constitute the most dynamic sector of the free world's economy: 100 percent of vanadium, 97 percent of antimony, 60 percent of copper, 50 percent of lead with large amounts of tin, zinc, and other metals and materials which we use are imported from the Latin American countries.

Mexico, our next-door neighbor, is the world's third largest buyer of goods from the United States and first of all the Latin American countries. During 1952 Mexico purchased from us 83 percent of her entire imports amounting to $613,988,000 and sold to us 80 percent of her exports amounting to $472,235,000 the apparent deficit being made up from the tourist trade of over $200 million and remittances of Mexican laborers in the United States of approximately $100 million.

Latin America offers today the most promising field for immediate development in the entire world. Many products formerly purchased in Malaya, China, and Russia can be mined or grown at our back door. Rubber is being produced in Brazil, in Mexico, and in Costa Rica, tea in Peru, Cuba can produce one crop a year more of silk cocoons than Japan, besides the enormous quantities of tin and managanese and other metals now being purchased from this hemisphere, which formerly came from Russia and the Far East. Formerly we have imported 94 percent of our essential tropical crops from the Far and Middle East and only 6 percent from Latin America, although many of these products originally came from South America, including the immensely important quinine and rubber all of which can be produced on this hemisphere.

* * * * *

The Latin American countries prefer American goods on the basis of quality but are tempted to purchase from Europe on account of barter arrangements and longer credit facilities.

Our direct investments in Latin America today amount to over $6 billion. These have been made in oilfields, mines, banana plantations, and various other industrial and commercial undertakings. These enterprises have been vital in the development of the Latin American countries in much the same manner that European capital of an earlier day was to the growth of the United States.

With a variety of climate from the tropics to perpetual snow, producing every type of vegetation and with vast resources of oil and minerals and the desire for industry, Latin America offers the largest and most fertile investment field in the world. Latin America welcomes American investments provided they are made in accord with the laws of each country.

* * * * *

Latin America and particularly Mexico, Colombia, and Brazil present a golden opportunity for industrialization, with an abundance of raw products, cheap labor, and little if any competition.

When Dr. Milton S. Eisenhower returned from his special mission as a good will ambassador of the United States to Latin America he stated in his report to the President on the importance of the economic ties between the United States and the 20 republics, and I quote: "As a market for our commercial exports Latin America is as important to us as all of Europe and more important than Asia, Africa, and Oceania combined."

And, later, our President in his address at the Falcon Dam on the Rio Grande, where he met the President of Mexico said: "Extending southward from this spot is a continent of magnificent resources and infinite promise. I need not emphasize the weight of the responsibilities that fall upon the United States in our dealings with the whole free world. Understandably, I think these have often in the past conspired to center our attention on points of the close remote from this continent. These responsibilities persist—indeed they increase but something else has likewise increased our awareness of the vital problems and the exciting opportunities here in the lands of the Americas. To these lands our attention is turned in warm friendship and constructive concern for the well being of all of our neighbors. We hope to understand their needs and problems."

Knowing these countries as I do I can assure you that in spite of our dollar diplomacy of the past, and the present active Communist propaganda that we are a capitalistic and imperialistic nation, most of Latin America has never been more friendly to us than at present. They now believe in our good-neighbor policy and are willing to meet us on even terms as they feel that we have respect for the sovereignty of each of the Latin American countries. Some of the countries, however, do feel that we are giving more consideration to Europe than to our own hemisphere.

I think that you will agree with me that this was borne out, with only a few minor differences, at the meeting of the 21 nations at Caracas, Venezuela, in March, where we were so ably represented by our capable Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles.

And in conclusion and stressing the importance of Latin American friendship and the solidarity of this hemisphere, may I say that we would do well to remember when the resolution to invite India to the Korean Political Conference of the United Nations came to a vote in August last, with a total of 27 nations in favor of inviting India and 21 against, but which lacked the two-thirds needed to pass the resolution, of the 21 votes favorable to us 17 were from the Latin American countries. The other three nations voting with us were Nationalist China, Pakistan and Greece.

I thank you.

INTRODUCTION OF JACOB K. JAVITS, REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE 21ST DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

Mr. Treadwell. Our next guest is a member of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs. He is chairman of the Subcommittee on Foreign Economic Policy.

All his other efforts on behalf of veterans, housing and rent control, education, civil rights, immigration, public health, labor, business, and discrimination are just as impressive.

In 1953 he received an honorary doctor's degree from Lincoln University, and now I would like to present the Representative in Congress from the 21st District, Dr. Jacob K. Javits.

Congressman Javits. It is essential that American business consider itself the principal arm of American foreign policy if we are to have a fair chance to win the struggle against communism without world war III. As the public relations men and women for American industry whose job it is to determine the attitudes of American business toward the American people and the world and, in turn, of the American people toward American business, I urge upon you to make this recognition by American business of its true role in American foreign policy as your public interest mission.

The objectives of American business playing its adequate part in the foreign policy of the United States may be attained through bringing about the investment of new private capital of American business abroad at an optimum figure of $5 billion per year, materially expanding the coverage and effect of the United States and U. N. technical assistance programs, by having American business undertake its own technical assistance programs or joining to expand those of the Government, and a massive effort for the exchange of workers and managers between the United States and other countries of the free world so that they may at firsthand on a greater scale than heretofore learn the lessons of United States production.

The greatest public-relations attraction of freedom, and so known throughout the free world and, indeed, throughout the slave world, is the great strength of the United States in its industrial and agricultural production; coupled with this is the genius for attaining mass production and mass markets, making for a high standard of living due to low prices and high wages. The whole world wants to copy this plan. * * *

The frantic efforts of the Soviet Union to integrate the Soviet bloc and build up its own industrial and agricultural production, to make its satellites dependent upon the Soviet Union for their export and import trade, and to establish the maximum amount of trade with the free world are indications that the rulers of the Soviet Union know this very well.

Something has been done in each of the fields in which Americans can most help foreign policy, but not nearly enough. Outflow of new private capital on the part of the United States at about $1,100,000,000 per year is one-half what it ought to be right now. The Government is now giving inducements in terms of guaranties against certain types of risks, such as convertibility and nationalization, and is about to give tax benefits for overseas private investment. But unless undertaken as part of a national duty by Americans it is doubtful that at this time the necessary impetus will be given to overseas investment by American business. Our goal should be a minimum of $2 billion per year of net new private capital outflow from the United States (aside from the reinvestment of the earnings of United States enterprises abroad) and the increase of this amount by $500 million per year to attain an optimum figure of $5 billion per year by 1960.

The expansion of the technical-assistance program is essential at this time. Our Government's technical-assistance program employs some 2,000 technicians in the field abroad and spends directly and through the United Nations technical-assistance program $134 million a year. This is inadequate to the needs for technical assistance of the underdeveloped countries in the free world. Only the direct activity of American business in rendering technical assistance on its own account, recognizing that it represents world public relations at the highest level, can expand the technical-assistance program within the proximate future adequately to meet the exigencies which our country faces in meeting the Communist challenge abroad. Finally, a great expansion of the exchange of workers and managers within business with the other free peoples can represent an enormous contribution to their productive efforts and an equally significant contribution to the knowledge and understanding which we respectively have of each other.

The figures upon the extent of poverty, ignorance, and disease in the free world keeping two-thirds of all the people in the free world on a submarginal level is well known. What is less frequently emphasized is the role of American business in helping the American Government to meet this challenge. Here is a unique opportunity for the public-relations advisers to American business, and I urge it upon you.

Mutual Security and the Spirit of Forty-Nine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 22, 1954

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, what sense of security did the 49'ers have in their rush to the west?

Did their sense of reward override the risk of ruin?

Does the sense of reward in the bill soon to come before the Congress on mutual security override the risk of ruin?

Would the cry "anti-Communist" or "offensive for peace" have spurred the rush to the west that helped to develop the United States in 1849?

In presenting this bill for approval of the House, do we play the chords that propel men to greater things?

There is literature that holds that the gold rush of 1849 choked Communist dogma in the United States, then being sown in Germany and France as well, by Marx and Engels. This same literature holds that Communist dogma was kept in its crib in America for the next century, from 1848 to 1948, because of the swift economic development of the United States. Depressions were overcome, labor was enlightened, and America fought on moral grounds, hence, Communist dogma produced little that was revolutionary to America. The wheels of government cared for the justified grievances of men, correcting them.

Is it proper to say that Americans were so busy, in 1849 and later, developing their lands and filling out their lives that communism had scant chance?

What would have happened had gold and its discovery not added impact to the development of the West?

Overlooking the embargo placed against our wheat in 1816 by the British, thus forcing our people to move westward, to develop markets, some literature would hold that were it not for the gold rush, in 1849, America would have been in ferment as was Europe—Germany, England, and France—and that Communist doctrines would have taken hold in the United States as they did in Russia and as they try to do in many parts of the world where vacuums in the life of men and nations develop.

It is interesting to note however, that in 1848, in Germany and France, industrial strife set in. Economics and the working conditions of man was a foremost topic of the people in their quest to live.

In America, at about that time, John C. Calhoun argued for the right of the South, on its terms, to compete with the North. A few years later war broke out between the States.

The working conditions of man were taking on more and more importance. For in the early 1890's a famous encyclical warned man to make economies his servant, not his master, warned man to run his industrial plant to the fullest measure of man's benefit, not to make man a slave of his industrial plant.

Then came a great war, the war of 1914.

Then came depression and another famed encyclical on the conditions of man in the early thirties.

Then there was another war, the war of 1939, and again the war of 1950 with Korea and Indochina now history.

What is next?

Is there a lesson in the items above, and if so, can they guide the free world to roll up an impact such as the 49'ers and the pioneers had on America? They sensed reward that overrode the risk of ruin.

Would it be correct to say that one can gage the extent of the success of the mutual-security bill by the degree to which it can help others develop and defend their lands and resources for a fuller life as free as possible of pain and suffering?

Does the mutual-security measure hold out for people a sense of reward that overrides the risk of ruin? Or does it appeal to people to crouch in fear in shelters with their weapons because the Reds are coming?

If the mutual security bill, soon to be voted on by the Congress, does not hold out the hope for more and more people, by their own effort to do and own more and more in greater safety for themselves and their families, to the greater prosperity of their Nation, then it avails little to label the bill "anti-Communist" or an "offensive for peace." They would have been strange words to the 49'er and the pioneer. They loved life. Fought and died for it because they loved it.

There is the gold of life in the mutual security bill, Mr. Speaker. It must be refined and brought out so that the sense of reward it holds for freemen everywhere will override the risk of ruin.

Why does not the mutual security bill include in it, Mr. Speaker, a provision enabling the United States to have in motion a continuing series of expeditions to Antarctica at a cost of about $1 million each expedition?

Surely the sense of reward for the United States in the venture overrides the risk of ruin. There is precious land on Antarctica. There are wonderful statements on the project which have been presented to the Congress in several hearings. I think of two. This year, before the other body, less than a month ago, by Capt. Finn Ronne who made an expedition there in the late forties and who was executive officer to Admiral Byrd on the admiral's famed expedition to Antarctica. The other statement was presented in the 1954 hearings on mutual security by Miss Elizabeth A. Kendall, taxpayer, citizen, U. S. A.

We should put a rider to this effect in this year's bill, Mr. Speaker.

Price Supports of Agricultural Products

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN D. JOHNSTON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 27, 1954

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an editorial entitled "If Farmers Plowed With Golf Sticks They Might Get 109 Percent Parity," published in the Saturday, July 24, issue of the Anderson (S. C.) Independent.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

If Farmers Plowed With Golf Sticks They Might Get 109 Percent Parity

If Anderson area and other American farmers plowed with golf sticks they might get a better break on price supports.

This was demonstrated in the Senate this week when the Republicans rammed through an amendment legalizing President Eisenhower's order that the Government subsidize construction of a $107 million powerplant at Memphis, Tenn.

In this order the President instructed the Atomic Energy Commission, acting against the will of its majority, to sign a contract with Middle South Utilities, Inc., and the Southern Co. for purchase of 600,000 kilowatts of power.

Middle South and Southern Co. are big Wall Street holding companies.

Southern Co. is mother hen to such companies as Georgia Power Co., Florida Power Co., Alabama Power Co., Mississippi Power Co., etc.

Certainly it would seem reasonable that such a combine would have sufficient capital to pay its own way if it wanted to build a powerplant.

But under the President's plan it doesn't work out that way.

Here is the Republican proposal that was adopted at behest of President Eisenhower:

Middle South and Southern Co., referred to as the Dixon-Yates syndicate, plan to invest $5 million equity capital in the $107 million venture.

The remainder is to be financed by bonds at 3½ percent. If the scheme goes through, the bonds should do a lot better than that because:

1. The Dixon-Yates group will be exempt from Federal income taxes—the only private company in the whole Nation to enjoy that privileged status. This will amount to an estimated $600,000 a year.

2. The Federal Government—meaning you and all other taxpayers—will pay all State and local taxes for the Dixon-Yates concern.

3. The Government will guarantee Dixon-Yates a 9-percent profit on their operation every year for 25 years.

4. The company will pay off the more than $100 million in bonds—with interest—with money paid them by the Atomic Energy Commission. That will be your tax money.

5. At the end of 25 years, the plant becomes the property of Dixon-Yates.

In addition, this will cost the AEC approximately $92 million more for power than it would cost if the TVA built a steam plant in approximately the same location.

This is becoming known as the "golf stick" scheme because of Senator Morse's reference to the fact that President Eisenhower's good friend, Robert Tyre Jones, the golfer, is a director of Southern Co.

In the last few weeks spokesmen for the Eisenhower administration have been shedding many tears over what farm price supports have been costing.

They want to cut the farmer's guaranteed return—his subsidy—from 90 percent to 82½ percent, or 75 percent or lower if they can get away with it.

Compare this: Farmers have been guaranteed they could not lose more than 10 percent, under the 90-percent parity plan. But the Eisenhowerites are telling the Dixon-Yates crowd, "You are going to be guaranteed that you make 9 percent. If you can make more, do it."

If you plow with a tractor and plow, they condescend to go as high as 80-percent parity—so your loss won't be but 20 percent.

But if you plow with a golf stick, and know the right people and pal around in the right exclusive millionaire club in Augusta, you are guaranteed at least 9 percent profit, or 109-percent parity. The actual profit, of course, will be much higher because every cent is tax exempt.

Little wonder that Senator Gore of Tennessee, has branded this "a crooked deal." The Nation will owe a debt of gratitude to the Democratic Senators who have fought so stubbornly against this brazen pay-off to interests that helped finance the Eisenhower campaign.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Printing and binding for Congress, when recommended to be done by the Committee on Printing of either House, shall be so recommended in a report containing an approximate estimate of the cost thereof, together with a statement from the Public Printer of estimated approximate cost of work previously ordered by Congress within the fiscal year (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 145, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on Printing, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

DISTRIBUTION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

To the Vice President and each Senator 100 copies; to the Secretary and Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, each, 25 copies; to the Secretary, for official use, not to exceed 35 copies; to the Sergeant at Arms, for use on the floor of the Senate, not to exceed 50 copies; to each Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress, 68 copies; to the Clerk, Sergeant at Arms, and Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives, each, 25 copies; to the Clerk, for official use, not to exceed 50 copies; and to the Doorkeeper, for use on the floor of the House of Representatives, not to exceed 75 copies; to the Vice President and each Senator, Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress there shall also be furnished (and shall not be transferable), 3 copies of the daily Record, of which 1 shall be delivered at his residence, 1 at his office, and 1 at the Capitol.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized book dealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by book dealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the Record.

Appendix

Address by Hon. Edward Martin, of Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 28, 1954

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address that I was supposed to have delivered at the annual convention of the American Legion, Department of Pennsylvania, in Convention Hall, Philadelphia, Saturday morning, July 24, 1954.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is a high honor to be invited again to address this important meeting of patriotic Americans.

The Legion is the greatest veterans' organization in the world. It is a strong bulwark of the American way of life.

It holds a high place of power and prestige because it has been faithful to its dedication—for God and country.

In every city and town the Legion membership represents a solid core of 100 percent Americanism. Every citizen can look to the Legion programs as a source of patriotic inspiration and as an example of service to the community, the State, and the Nation.

We can all be proud that the Legion has always been true to its ideals. It has never wavered in its fight to advance the welfare of the veteran who must go through life disabled or suffering from illness because of his service to the Nation.

It has never neglected its sacred duty of caring for the widows, orphans, or other dependents of our comrades who gave their lives in defense of freedom.

Ever since it was organized 35 years ago the Legion has been our most vigorous advocate of a strong, sound, dynamic America. Year after year the Legion has campaigned for a national defense so strong that no Nation on earth would dare threaten the safety and security of our land.

We of the Legion recognize that our future as a free Nation and the future of all civilization, may be decided by the measure of American strength.

We recognize also that the only threat to peace in the world today rises from the Communist ambition to dominate and enslave all mankind.

So long as communism conspires behind the Iron Curtain for the destruction of all freedom, we are not free from danger.

So long as a godless, ruthless enemy of honor and morality looks upon the United States as its final goal for world conquest, we must be prepared.

It would be extreme folly, if not a major crime, to underestimate the military capabilities of Red Russia and its satellites.

Inside the Soviet there is the most vigorous warlike preparation. The Communists have millions of men under arms. They have more millions of potential reserves to be drawn from the 800 million people under their absolute power in Europe and Asia. They have the most intense program of military training the world has ever known.

And, remember this, they are not far behind us in the development of atomic weapons and the hydrogen bomb.

We pray that war may not come, but if it does, we know it will strike with lightning speed.

For the first time in our history our civilian population, your home and mine, your family and mine, will be the targets for direct attack with weapons more terrifying than anything ever before used in warfare.

It will be more terrible, more destructive of human values, than any other conflict in all history. In such a war there will be no victory—only death and destruction. All the civilizations built by man's genius through the centuries will be blasted off the face of the earth.

That is a grim picture. It is not pleasant to think about. But you and I know that no matter how much we love peace it will not be achieved through weakness.

Only strength can discourage aggression. I have always maintained that American strength can be the most powerful influence for peace in the world.

It seems to me that every American should now be aware that we face a most desperate challenge.

It is a challenge that places in the balance all that we hold sacred.

It is a challenge that calls for undivided allegiance to the highest ideals of American patriotism.

It calls for willing sacrifice, stern discipline and obedience to the laws of God and man.

It is our proud boast that we are the richest and most powerful nation in all history.

That is true. No nation has ever equaled the American Republic in material possessions or in the greatness of our spiritual and cultural achievements.

We have the greatest accumulation of wealth the world has ever known—but we cannot buy security with dollars. Wealth cannot defend us.

We have unsurpassed industrial and agricultural production—but these great elements of our national strength cannot protect us in the event of sudden attack.

We have guns, ships, tanks, and planes. We have the most modern weapons created by scientific research into the secrets of nature.

We are rich in material resources—but we are miserably poor in trained manpower.

Our most dangerous weakness is our lack of reserves trained in the skills required by the many technical services of modern warfare.

The vast changes that have taken place in military science have not altered the basic principle that properly trained personnel, ably led and directed, is the decisive factor between victory and defeat. In the new military strategy only thoroughly trained men are qualified for combat service.

Trained manpower must be the solid foundation of our defense effort. We must have a great reserve of trained manpower, backed by high morale and the spirit and the will to defend our liberty.

An America, trained in the defense of its ideals, will be the most potent force for peace the world has ever known. It will be a warning that America is prepared to crush any form of aggression against our freedom.

To my mind that means we should without delay put into operation a system of universal military training.

The only alternative is the maintenance of a huge standing army at a cost which would mean national bankruptcy, even though we escape total war.

Nothing is more important to our national defense than complete recognition by every citizen of his individual obligation to his country.

The real American is hard-working, self-reliant, patriotic, and God-fearing. He is unselfish in his belief in his country. He believes that all must share equally in safeguarding the precious rights and privileges that we enjoy through the courage and sacrifice of heroes in every generation.

For many years I have advocated a system of training that would prepare every young man to serve his country in time of emergency.

Universal military training is American in origin, principle, and character. It calls for equal service with equal opportunity. It distributes equal responsibility for our Nation's defense among all classes and creeds, the rich and poor alike.

Universal military training, properly administered, can be carried out at a cost we can afford without keeping millions of men continuously under arms. It will give us a great reservoir of trained officers and men—a citizen army ready for immediate action.

It will instill in the hearts and minds of our young men a better understanding of what America stands for and a deeper appreciation of the American way of life. In addition to the work of a soldier, universal military training will teach the proper way to live and proper conduct under conditions of hardship and danger.

It will teach the value of organization, teamwork, and discipline.

In advocating universal military training the American Legion is following the principle laid down by George Washington who said, and I quote:

"Every citizen who enjoys the protection of free government owes not only a portion of his property but even of his personal service in defense of it."

Back in 1790 President Washington placed before the First Congress a defense plan which called for every able-bodied young man to be trained to defend his country.

Unfortunately Washington's plan was not adopted and as a result every war emergency has found us unprepared.

We have paid dearly in every war for our failure to heed Washington's advice. Vastly increased expense and heavy losses have always resulted from our tendency to postpone preparation until the actual outbreak of hostilities.

In both world wars we went into action before we were ready. The same thing happened when Communist aggression shattered the peace of the world in Korea.

Thousands of American boys paid with their lives because they did not have the training or the equipment to do the job to which they were called at a time of national peril.

It is not surprising that the most ardent supporters of military training are those who know the horrors of war. Every combat veteran knows from personal experience the tragic cost of unpreparedness in blood and suffering. They have seen brave comrades fall in battle who might be alive today if they had been better trained in self-preservation under fire.

No American boy should be sent into battle who is not adequately trained.

That is so fundamental that it is not even a debatable question.

Shall we now wait until an enemy attacks before we begin training our young men?

Or shall we begin now, while there is still time, to build up a constantly growing reserve of trained manpower as the backbone of our national defense?

It is my firm belief that basic military training for every young man, excepting only those physically disabled, is the foundation of any plan for building the defensive strength of the American Republic.

Under that system approximately 1 million young men would be fitted into a definite military organization every year, trained and ready to be called to the colors in a matter of days.

I place no confidence whatever in the idea that we can live at peace with the enemies of freedom who now rule the Soviet. We have learned that there can be no compromise with communism, that strength is the only language that the Kremlin understands.

We had high hopes when the United Nations entered into a solemn pact with the preservation of peace as its great objective. But from the very beginning Russia has done everything within its power to defeat the purposes of the United Nations.

Communist Russia has sabotaged every effort for peace and will continue to do so. Now Communist China seeks a place in the United Nations to stand with Moscow in opposition to ideals of freedom and human dignity.

The American people are overwhelmingly opposed to the admission of Red China to the United Nations.

There is no doubt in my mind that the majority of Americans would favor a new organization of Nations, truly united for peace in the world.

Such an organization should include only those nations that are dedicated to the principles of honor and justice and the right of free men to govern themselves.

It would be an organization that looks to God as the Supreme Ruler of the Universe and is obedient to the will of the Almighty.

Such an organization, standing together, would have the moral and military strength to free the world from the threat of enslavement under communism.

It would serve notice on Russia that any attempt at further agression would be resisted with unlimited force. Moscow would hesitate if its rulers knew that any violation of the peace of the world would bring total destruction to the heart of Russia with the hydrogen bomb.

Such a warning, backed by trained manpower and the great productive capacity of the United States, would put fear in the heart of every Communist in the Kremlin.

It would encourage the millions of courageous men and women in the Soviet Union who despise communism. It would brighten their hope that one day they too will live in freedom.

America's historic mission has been to set an example of progress under freedom of the individual and to strive for cooperation among all peace-loving nations.

We hope and pray for the day when all nations will lay down their arms and live in brotherhood under God.

But until that happy day dawns we must be strong. We must be prepared to defend the God-given freedom that we hold sacred.

With all my heart I appeal to the American people to support the Legion in its campaign for a strong America, prepared physically and spiritually, to defend our God-given right to live in peace and freedom.

The Duck Stamp Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WESLEY A. D'EWART
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 28, 1954

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, during the 83d Congress, a special subcommittee of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the Subcommittee on Administration, ably chairmaned by Congressman JOHN PILLION, of New York, held extensive conferences and formal hearings respecting the administration of the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior.

Almost without exception, witnesses at these hearings and officials of the Department expressed concern over present duck-stamp receipts covered into the so-called duck-stamp fund authorized under the Migratory Bird Hunting Stamp Act of March 16, 1934, as amended. That act authorizes sale of Federal duck stamps, costing $2 per season, and requires possession of such a stamp by any person over 16 years of age before migratory birds can lawfully be taken. Annual collections presently exceed $4.3 million; estimates for the current fiscal year indicate that the total number of stamps issued will exceed 2,350,000.

Under existing law, funds so collected are to be expended as follows: Not less than 85 percent for the "location, ascertainment, acquisition, administration, maintenance, and development of suitable areas for inviolate migratory bird sanctuaries, for the administration, maintenance, and development of other refuges under the administration of the Secretary of the Interior and for investigations"; the remainder is made available for the enforcement program, for personnel expenses, and for reimbursement to the Post Office Department of expenses incurred in connection with the stamp program.

On June 28 and 29 of this year, public hearings were held by the House Public Lands Subcommittee, of which I am chairman, with inquiry made into this matter of duck-stamp fund administration. The June meetings gave several outstanding and nationally-known fish and wildlife conservationists an opportunity to comment on present use of the funds. These people understood—as did many Members of Congress—that the Duck Stamp Act had as one of its principal purposes acquisition of refuge areas along the various flyways in order to provide not only wintering, resting, and feeding grounds for migratory birds, but breeding areas in the northern tier of our States. The record generally supports this contention, and the assertion that of secondary importance, under the act's provisions, was to be use of the balance for maintenance, operation, and management of already existing refuge areas.

The record, however shows that: to the end of June 1953, more than $29.5 million had been expended from the duck-stamp fund, that the total at the end of June 1954, would exceed $34.9 million. Of this total, only $6.5 million was expended or budgeted for purchase of lands for waterfowl management—with only 209,329 acres acquired. The balance went to existing refuges, enforcement, personnel expenditures, and the like.

The clear need is this: A long-range refuge program with particular emphasis on the needed pattern of breeding, resting, feeding and wintering areas for the important migratory bird populations. It is anticipated that as much as 4 million acres of land may be acquired and developed at an estimated cost of approximately $40 per acre to accomplish the needed program; to protect local governmental subdivisions. I believe for each acre so acquired a Federal acre of similar value should be transferred from Federal ownership.

Two suggested proposals have been advanced: First, to increase the price of the duck stamp from $2 to $5, or $4, or not less than $3.50, then earmarking the entire increase of $3 or $2 or $1.50 for the land acquisition program; or second, make additional funds available, earmarked for the acquisition program from present receipts.

Mr. Carl D. Shoemaker, conservation consultant to the National Wildlife Federation, and general counsel of the International Association of Game, Fish, and Conservation Commissioners, has submitted these proposals in response to a request for suggestions from our subcommittee members.

Tomorrow, July 29, 1954, our subcommittee will resume its duck-stamp fund hearings, with officials of the Fish and Wildlife Service scheduled to appear as witnesses.

To the end that a full record may be made for future action by the proper legislative committees of the Congress, I am today introducing a bill which has as its purpose amending the Migratory Bird Hunting Act to assure that not less than 40 percent of Federal duck-stamp fund receipts will be available for acquisition of land and water areas suitable for the breeding, nesting, and resting of migratory waterfowl; not more than 45 percent will be available for the other general purposes presently spelled out in the law; the balance would continue to be expended as presently provided for.

The June meetings were continued to this week in order to permit wildlife representatives from throughout the Nation—here to meet with Fish and Wildlife Service officials in conference on proposed regulations for the upcoming hunting season—to attend and to express their views and recommendations on the use of duck-stamp funds. My bill is only one proposed legislative device for accomplishing the ends desired before the 84th Congress is convened; it is my hope that final-type legislation may be developed for action early next year, by the proper committee.

I would commend to the attention of the Members a memorandum of July 27, 1954, addressed to my subcommittee by Mr. Shoemaker, in which he advances recommendations for legislative action on the matter of administration of duck-stamp funds.

Albert Sidney Camp

SPEECH

OF

HON. ELIZABETH KEE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 26, 1954

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity to add my personal tribute to the eloquent ones paid by my colleagues to the memory of our late friend and associate, the Honorable ALBERT SIDNEY CAMP. Mr. CAMP was gentle, kindly, warm, and friendly, courageous in his personal and public life, firm in his principles and convictions, and deeply beloved by his colleagues and by all who knew him.

In remembering his sterling character, so well known to all of us and so well described by our colleagues who knew and loved him best, I am strongly reminded of two poems which were favorites of my late husband, the Honorable John Kee. The first of these poems was written by James Whitcomb Riley and was entitled "Our Kind of a Man." It was often quoted by Judge Kee in connection with friends for whom he had a particular admiration and respect. It seems to me that this poem reflects the feeling that all of us had for Mr. CAMP:

The kind of a man for you and me.
He faces the world unflinchingly,
And smites, as long as the wrong resists,
With a knuckled faith and force like fists:
He lives the life he is preaching of,
And loves where most is the need of love;
His voice is clear to the deaf man's ears;
And his face sublime through the blind man's tears;
The light shines out where the clouds were dim,
And the widow's prayer goes up for him;
The latch is clicked at the hovel door
And the sick man sees the sun once more,
And out o'er the barren fields he sees
Springing blossoms and waving trees,
Feeling as only the dying may,
That God's own servant has come that way,
Smoothing the path as it still winds on
Through the golden gate where his loved have gone.

The second poem is one that I found while going through some of Judge Kee's papers after his death. I am sorry that I do not know whether he composed it, or whether he had copied it just because it appealed to him. Anyway, it seems to me that Mr. CAMP exemplified the spirit and meaning of this poem in all that he did and said, for he was never known to say anything unkind about ayone. What a great thing it would be if more people in public life could follow his example and practice his generous and kindly philosophy. This poem is entitled "I Know Something Good About You":

Wouldn't this old world be better
If the folks we met would say—
"I know something good about you."
And treat us just that way?

Wouldn't it be fine and dandy
If each handclasp, fond and true,
Carried with it this assurance
"I know something good about you."

Wouldn't life be lots more happy
If the good that's in us all,
Were the only thing about us
That folks bothered to recall?

Wouldn't life be lots more happy
If we praised the good we see,
For there's such a lot of goodness
In the worst of you and me.

Wouldn't it be nice to practice
That fine way of thinking, too?
You know something good about me;
"I know something good about you."

I join with all of my colleagues in mourning the loss of ALBERT SIDNEY CAMP and in being grateful for the privilege of having known him. I hope that his loved ones may be comforted in their deep sorrow by the knowledge that all of us mourn and are with them in the spirit of loving sympathy and understanding.

The Atomic Energy Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 26, 1954

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, this is one of the most important bills ever to be presented to this House. At present no one could possibly envision the ramifications of atomic energy and its future effect upon our economy and national life in war and peace.

There are great uncertainties and problems connected with this subject and some very definite certainties. For example, we know how terrible and destructive atomic energy harnessed for war is and can be. We do not know whether even more terrible and more destructive substances will be discovered to take the place of atomic energy but in view of scientific progress that is quite possible, indeed very likely.

On the other hand atomic energy may be able to provide most valuable peacetime uses in medicine, in science, in power, and other fields. At present its uses are limited. In the future they may well be extensive and fabulous beyond monetary measurement. But there is no certainty that they will be. There is as yet no assurance that atomic energy can competitively produce electric power. Such is the vagueness of the field in which we now propose to legislate. Only extended time can reveal the facts concerning this vital newly discovered force.

I am a believer in our system of free enterprise. I do not believe that the Government should conduct any business that can be efficiently conducted by private business. I do not believe that the Government should ever compete with private business so long as private business is capable of doing an honest, adequate job. In industries affected with a public interest, there are times when because private business does not or cannot do the job that the Government is compelled to intervene. Huge public power dams are an example of this situation.

But even in these instances the products and byproducts of such great public projects should be made available, insofar as practicable and possible, to the public through the medium of private industry.

Under this bill many patent rights may be granted to a certain few industries. In this way, a monopoly would be conferred upon a few by the terms of the bill over atomic energy and its secrets. Such monopoly rights may be relatively worthless, or they may be valued in the billions. There is a tight security curtain over this atomic field and I am unable to get the facts.

But I am not willing to vote to create a monopoly in this field, to give a few corporations exclusive rights to what may turn out to be extremely valuable assets of truly untold wealth.

I have other fundamental objections to this bill. I am not satisfied with its international pooling provisions. We are living in a very dangerous world—a world which is ablaze with the fires of Communist conspiracy and revolt. No one can tell when further serious aggression will come or where it will strike. Our so-called allies have not lived up to their undertakings under either the United Nations or NATO and I do not say this in an uncharitable sense. They permitted us to fight the Korean war practically alone and virtually unassisted. They have failed to implement their agreements under NATO. They have more recently at Geneva departed from our view of vital Indochina and Asian questions and deliberately gave aid and comfort to the Russian position.

We have no assurance whatever of what their future policy will be. It may move them, for trade or other reasons, closer and closer to the Soviet viewpoint. It may support the doctrine of peaceful coexistence in a world literally seething with rebellion and insurrection against the existing order willfully fomented and directed by the Soviet.

In view of this situation, I do not believe that we should share further atomic secrets or any other secrets until we definitely know just where we stand, just what our allies propose and just how they intend to carry out their solemn commitments to us and the free world.

We talk about getting some affirmative expression and act of good faith from the Soviet and I believe we should demand such assurance even though I have little faith that it will be forthcoming. But above all we should secure definite assurances from our own so-called allies concerning their future course, their policy, before we give them additional secret atomic information and techniques. I do not believe this feature should be adopted without very carefully devised safe-guards.

Although I cannot support this measure, I am constrained to pay sincere tribute to the great American who has so ably handled the bill on the floor, our distinguished friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE]. As one Member remarked, he conducted the debate and secured passage of the bill without ever raising his voice. That is a great tribute to STERLING COLE. And it is an example which might well find emulation.

I believe the entire subject matter covered by this bill should be exhaustively and intensively considered by the Congress.

The bill could well reshape the entire economy and life of the Nation. It should not be enacted without further deep and most careful study.

I therefore hope the measure will be recommitted and revised to remove present unsound provisions and include proper safeguards. Thus we may be assured that the future military, economic scientific and humanitarian requirements of the Nation may be met, as well as we can meet them at this time when science is moving so swiftly and foreign affairs are so perilous and uncertain.

Amending Atomic Energy Act of 1946, as Amended

SPEECH

OF

HON. ROBERT E. JONES, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 23, 1954

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 9757) to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, as amended.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, ever since the President sent the directives to AEC and TVA on June 16 ordering them to consummate the Dixon-Yates transaction I have been curious to find out on what possible basis of statutory authority AEC could proceed to buy 600,000 kilowatts of power for the use of TVA. It seemed clear to me from a reading of the AEC Act that the transaction was wholly beyond any powers which Congress had conferred upon AEC. I have written the Attorney General requesting his opinion for the enlightenment of Congress and of the public, but he has declined to furnish an opinion on the ground that he is forbidden by statute to advise Members of Congress on legal questions. I do not quarrel with Mr. Brownell's decision, but the net result is to keep Congress in the dark as to any possible statutory basis for the Dixon-Yates transactions if such a basis exists.

After the same question of the legal authority of the Commission had been raised in Senate debate for many days, Senator HICKENLOOPER finally inserted in the debate the opinion of the General Counsel of the AEC, Mr. William Mitchell dated June 22. I have now had an opportunity to study it carefully. Instead of allaying my doubts as to the existence of legal authority in the Commission, I can only say that the opinion supports and confirms them. Indeed, the only conclusion one can arrive at from a careful reading of the opinion is that in view of Mr. Mitchell himself the Dixon-Yates transaction is illegal.

Although the Mitchell opinion has already been inserted in the RECORD, I should like to have it included at this point in my remarks so that Members of the House can read it in connection with what I have to say about it:

JULY 22, 1954.

Memorandum.

To K. D. Nichols, General Manager.

From William Mitchell, General Counsel.

Subject: Commission's authority to enter into a 25-year contract with the Dixon-Yates group to provide electrical enegry.

You have asked my opinion on the question of whether or not the Commission has legal authority to enter into a 25-year contract with the Dixon-Yates group to provide electric-utility services for the Commission's plants at Paducah and Oak Ridge.

The Commission presently has a contract with TVA to supply the requirements for electric power at the AEC plant at Paducah. In December 1953, the Bureau of the Budget requested the Commission to explore the possibility of releasing 600,000 kilowatts annually to TVA under this contract and making arrangements with privately owned utilities for replacement of the electric power which would be thus released. After considering the engineering and economic factors, the Commission decided that the best arrangements would be to contract for construction of a new generating plant in the Memphis area which would tie in with the TVA system. Two offers were received, one from the Dixon-Yates group and another from Von Tresckow. Both offers were carefully analyzed and the results of these analyses were transmitted to the Bureau of the Budget. The Commission took no position on the advisability of this arrangement for replacement of the Paducah requirements, stating to the Bureau of the Budget that the question was one for higher authority to decide. However, the Commission stated to the Bureau of the Budget, that if this plan were to be adopted, the Dixon-Yates proposal appeared to be much more favorable to the Government.

The Bureau of the Budget, upon direction of the President, has now directed the Commission to make appropriate arrangements with TVA and with the Dixon-Yates group for release of 600,000 kilowatts under the present TVA contract, and construction by the Dixon-Yates group of a new generating plant at West Memphis, Ark., with a capacity of 600,000 to 650,000 kilowatts, tied into the TVA system, to meet the Commission's requirements for power at Paducah and additional requirements which have recently developed at Oak Ridge.

The question is whether, under these circumstances, the Commission has authority to make a 25-year contract with the Dixon-Yates group for this purpose.

Section 12 (d) of the Atomic Energy Act reads as follows:

"12. (d) The Atomic Energy Commission is authorized in connection with the construction or operation of the Oak Ridge, Paducah, and Portsmouth installations of the Commission, without regard to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, to enter into new contracts or modify or confirm existing contracts to provide for electric-utility services for periods not exceeding 25 years, and such contracts shall be subject to termination by the Commission upon payment of cancellation costs as provided in such contracts, and any appropriation presently or hereafter made available to the Commission shall be available for the payment of such cancellation costs. Any such cancellation payments shall be taken into consideration in determination of the rate to be charged in the event the Commission or any other agency of the Federal Government shall purchase electric-utility services from the contractor subsequent to the cancellation and during the life of the original contract."

This statute gives the Commission the necessary authority to make the contract in question. The TVA system is an integrated unit, supplied from various plants owned by TVA, and, on occasion, by delivery from privately owned generating plants. Once electric power has been delivered to the system, it is impossible to identify the source of power which is supplied out of the system for end use. If additional generating capacity is constructed at West Memphis and fed into the TVA grid in an amount which is necessary to supply the Commission's requirements at Paducah and Oak Ridge, this can properly be said to be a contract for electric-utility services in connection with the operation of the Oak Ridge and Paducah installations of the Commission.

The increased cost to the Government of the Dixon-Yates proposal as against the Commission's present contract with TVA would be approximately $3,685,000 annually. However, if the President directs the Commission and TVA to modify their existing arrangements so as to release to TVA 600,000 kilowatts under the present contract (and we do not question the President's authority to do this), then the Commission has authority to make the best contract it can for replacement of the power thus released.

My conclusion, on the assumptions set forth above, is that the Commission would have authority under section 12 (d) of the Atomic Energy Act to make a 25-year contract with the Dixon-Yates group for the purposes indicated.

WILLIAM MITCHELL.

Mr. Chairman, Members of the House will note in reading this document that it is addressed to a state of facts which does not exist. It discusses the legality of a transaction which the President described in his budget message but which was abandoned in the directives of June 16. By clearest inference it says that the Dixon-Yates contract in the form which the President has ordered finds no support in the AEC act.

In the President's budget message of January 21, the President spoke of meeting TVA's needs for power by releasing 500,000 or 600,000 kilowatts of the TVA commitment to supply the AEC facilities at Paducah. The President's message contemplated that AEC would replace the power thus released to TVA by purchasing an equivalent block from private utilities. That is the situation to which Mr. Mitchell addresses himself in his opinion of June 22. I for one have never questioned that the transaction outlined in the President's message of January 21 would be legal, however foolish and misguided it might be. But the whole basis of the transactions was changed in the directives of June 16. There it was stated explicitly that AEC would not release a single kilowatt of power to TVA, but rather that AEC would enter into a contract with Dixon-Yates for delivery of a block of power to TVA for TVA's general area needs. According to AEC's own experts this block of power would cost $3,685,000 more than the same power could be made available by TVA itself from new generating capacity on its own system. TVA's own estimates are that the extra costs would be $5½ million, both figures being exclusive of the Federal income taxes reimbursable by AEC. Of the extra costs, $1,499,000, representing State and local taxes payable in Arkansas, is proposed to be borne by AEC and the remainder by TVA. Now let us look at the opinion and see with what great care Mr. Mitchell has confined himself to approving the legality of a transaction which is now entirely academic and at what pains he has been to make clear that he is not passing an opinion on the Dixon-Yates contract which the President has ordered AEC and TVA to consummate. The very first paragraph of the opinion, which is in the form of a memorandum to Gen. K. D. Nichols, General Manager of AEC, states that his opinion was asked on AEC's authority to contract with Dixon-Yates "to provide electric-utility services for the Commission's plants at Paducah and Oak Ridge." If that was the question General Nichols submitted to Mr. Mitchell, then it was submitted only to provide Mr. Mitchell with exercise for his legal faculties, because the Dixon-Yates group would not provide a single kilowatt for the use of AEC itself.

In the third paragraph Mr. Mitchell again refers to the Dixon-Yates transaction as being in connection with the Commission's own requirements.

After thus misstating the essence of the transaction, Mr. Mitchell finds that the question is whether "under these circumstances" the Commission has authority to enter into a contract with Dixon-Yates. He concludes that if Dixon-Yates supplies power "in an amount which is necessary to supply the Commission's requirements at Paducah and Oak Ridge, this can properly be said to be a contract for electric utility services in connection with the operation of the Oak Ridge and Paducah installations of the Commission." I do not quarrel with that statement. So far as I am aware, no one quarrels with it. Unfortunately, however, the question is not as to the legality of a contract by AEC for amounts necessary to supply the Commission's requirements at Paducah and Oak Ridge, but as to AEC's authority to buy power for TVA which is not required at Paducah, or Oak Ridge, or at any other AEC installation.

In the next to the last paragraph of his memorandum Mr. Mitchell goes on to say that the increased cost to the Government of $3,685,000 annually is justified "if the President directs the Commission and TVA to modify their existing arrangements so as to release to TVA 600,000 kilowatts under the present contract" between AEC and TVA. No one quarrels with this statement. But the President has not directed AEC to release even one kilowatt of the TVA power supply commitment and AEC has stated that it does not intend to release a single kilowatt. Mr. Mitchell's opinion concludes with the statement that "on the assumptions set forth above" the Commission has authority "under section 12 (d) of the Atomic Energy Act" to enter into a contract with Dixon-Yates. However, every one of the assumptions "set forth above" is directly contrary to the facts.

I do not know how to explain this remarkable document. It is incredible that after almost a week to study the President's directives Mr. Mitchell should still be reading them backward and finding in them exactly what they do not say, but failing to find what they did say. Perhaps he was under pressure to provide some kind of a favorable opinion and being unable, in good conscience, to produce one on the set of facts which exist, he constructed a set of facts upon which it would be possible for him to rule favorably. This part of the mystery I will not probe any further but leave to the imagination of the Members of the House. What is even stranger, however, is that the Commission should not have asked Mr. Mitchell to revise his opinion in the light of the actual circumstances dictated by the President. The opinion was not disclosed until it was made a part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by Senator HICKENLOOPER on July 19, almost a month after the opinion was written. Surely by then there was opportunity to secure from Mr. Mitchell an expression of opinion on the Dixon-Yates in the form which it actually took under the President's directives of June 16.

As I indicated before, no one can read this opinion without recognizing that the essence of the legal justification in Mr. Mitchell's mind was the release of 600,000 kilowatts by AEC to TVA and the purchase of replacement power by AEC from Dixon-Yates. This is the sole basis and support for any claim of legality under the AEC. The Mitchell opinion indicates that without this element, the contract would be illegal and, as every Member of Congress knows by now, the Dixon-Yates contract is not a replacement contract. It is therefore condemned by the opinion of AEC's General Counsel.

Discussion of Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 28, 1954

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, since the recent approval by the House of the conference report on the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act I have received so many inquiries from Members of the House and others as to the practical effect of this legislation that I think it might be well for me to take this time in order to explain briefly the practical application of the provisions of the act as it was reported from the conference and approved by both the House and Senate.

This is an act designed to provide the basis for cooperation between the Federal Government, States, local governmental and quasi governmental organizations, groups of citizens, and individuals in carrying out flood prevention and water-control programs in the small upstream watersheds. To be eligible for consideration under this act the size of the watershed cannot exceed 250,000 acres and, of course, it must be an actual watershed of a specific stream or water course. However, where the local sponsoring agencies so desire, several watersheds, when they are parts of a larger watershed, may be planned together.

The initiative for all projects under this legislation must come from the people of the locality where the proposed program is to be carried out. It is not necessary that there be an official sponsoring agency in the very beginning of the movement for a watershed project. Individual citizens or a group of such citizens, whether organized or not, may develop local interest and evidence of local cooperation in a project. However, the application for assistance from the Federal Government must be filed by an official local organization such as described below.

Before any actual construction work can be done on the program there must be a local sponsoring organization authorized by State law to carry out, maintain, and operate the works of improvement which will be installed under the program. Prior to July 1, 1956, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to construct or enter into contract for construction of structures, providing there is no local organization authorized by State law to enter into such contracts. The Secretary may contract for or construct works of improvement on Federal land; that is, national forests. The exact type of local organization required will depend on local needs and State laws, but may include counties or other political subdivisions of a State, a soil-conservation district or water-conservation district, a flood prevention or control district, or any similar agency.

The projects authorized by the act can be of two general types: First, a straight flood-prevention program, including structures of various kinds and land treatment measures, or second, a project embracing primarily the agricultural phases of conservation, development, utilization, and disposal of water. Or, of course, the project can embrace any combination of these two general objectives.

The first step in the development of one of these projects is the organization in the local community, if such an organization does not already exist, of an organization capable of acting as the local sponsoring agency or which will lead to the development of such an agency. The next step is to outline the general proposal for the project and make an application for Federal assistance in working out the details of the plan. This application should be submitted to the State or local representative of the Soil Conservation Service and, at the same time, to the governor of the State. In order to prevent the conflict of these projects with other State development plans, the act gives the appropriate State agency or the governor a period of 45 days in which to disapprove such an application. If it is disapproved, no further action on that application will be taken by the Federal Government. If the application is not disapproved by the State, the Soil Conservation Service will assign technicians and other personnel to work with the local organization in conducting investigations and surveys, making such other studies as may be necessary, and working out detailed plans for the project. At the same time, it is assumed that work will be going forward in the locality on the other requirements which are conditions of Federal assistance.

These requirements are set out in section 4 of the act. They include the following:

First, acquisition by the local organization of all land, easements, or rights-of-way necessary for the project; second, evidence that the local organization is willing and able to assume its proportionate share of the cost and to maintain and operate the improvements after they have been installed; third, provide assurances that landowners have acquired necessary water rights; and fourth, obtain agreements from owners of at least 50 percent of the land above each retention reservoir to carry out recommended soil-conservation measures and proper farm plans on their land.

When these conditions have been met and a plan agreeable to the local organization and the Secretary of Agriculture has been worked out, the Secretary will submit the plan to Congress through the President. If the plan includes reclamation or irrigation work or affects lands under the Secretary of the Interior or if it includes flood-detention structures, the plan must be submitted to the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of the Army, respectively, for their views and recommendations at least 60 days before it is sent to the President for transmission to the Congress. The Secretaries of the Interior and Army are not required to approve the plan, but their views, if received by the Secretary of Agriculture prior to the expiration of the 60-day period, are to be transmitted to Congress, along with the recommendations of the Secretary of Agriculture. Unless the project is one of those relatively few in which there will be a dam providing more than 2,500 acre-feet of detention capacity, no formal approval by Congress is necessary before the project can be started. However, the act gives Congress 45 days after receiving the Secretary's report and recommendations in which to take any action which might appear desirable.

In the event that the plan includes a proposed dam or other structure impounding more than 2,500 acre-feet, the procedure followed is the same as that for other projects except that an appropriation for such a project cannot be made until the Committee on Agriculture of the House and the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry of the Senate have adopted committee resolutions authorizing the project. The maximum total capacity of any structure which can be constructed under the authority of this act is 5,000 acre-feet.

The method of making appropriations for this work will be determined from time to time by the Appropriations Committees and the Congress. It is anticipated that it will be worked out in such a way that there will be a minimum of delay involved and that funds for the start of work on a project will be available as soon as the project has been approved and the requirements for submission to the Congress have been complied with.

Our Postwar "Forced" Repatriation Policy Backfires, With Possible Adverse Effects on Prospective United States Citizens of Ukrainian Origin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TIMOTHY P. SHEEHAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 28, 1954

Mr. SHEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, some of the actions taken by our United States Government in the implementation of our postwar policy, especially in our relationships with the Communist Government of the U. S. S. R., are once again coming back to haunt us.

At the Yalta Conference, Churchill, Roosevelt, and Stalin agreed to the repatriation of displaced Russian civilians and Russian prisoners of war. Certainly no one denies that this was a subject on which some agreement had to be reached, especially where it concerned Russian nationals who desired to go back to their homeland. Yet the abuse of this agreement, whereby Russian nationals were forced to go back to their homeland against their will and regardless of whether they were friends or enemies of the Russian Communist regime raises a grave question which has not as yet been resolved, and which, in my mind, needs to be answered.

That question is, Who was responsible for the implementation of this Yalta agreement so that it became in effect a forced repatriation program? Was it Roosevelt, Truman, and the Democrat adminstration, or was it an interpretation by the Chiefs of Staff under Gen. George C. Marshall, or was this forced repatriation guided by pro-Communist elements which had infiltrated into high places in our Government? That is the question that cries to be answered. History has already noted the shameful blot on the American record caused by these forced repatriations which unquestionably were death warrants for many people returned to Russia, but history has not yet recorded who was responsible for that crime against humanity.

It shall stand to the everlasting credit of then Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower, that when the situation was brought to his attention he issued an order putting an end to forced repatriation of Russian nationals who pleaded political asylum.

As an aftermath of this program of forced repatriation, a very interesting immigration case was presented during the week of June 28, 1954, in Chicago. It was the case of Petro Walkowec, which was heard before a special hearing officer of the Immigration and Naturalization Service of the United States Department of Justice.

Mr. Roman I. Smook of Chicago, represented Mr. Walkowec. Mr. Smook has been very active in Ukrainian affairs and served 3 years in Europe with the International Relief Organization. He estimates there are at least 30,000 displaced persons in the United States from Iron Curtain countries, who have lied about their nationality here.

Mr. Walkowec had entered the United States in 1949 on an immigration visa from occupied Germany. He had been born in the Russian Ukraine.

As a result of the occupation of the Ukraine during World War II by the German forces, Walkowec, like thousands of other Ukrainian men, women, and children, was transported into Germany as a slave laborer. The end of the war found millions of such uprooted people, not only of Ukrainian nationality, but of many eastern and western European countries.

Under agreement, the allies were bound to return all U. S. S. R. subjects to Russia. While the people of the Western nations gladly returned to their homes, those from countries under Communist rule showed an unwillingness to accept repatriation.

The American military authorities in Germany and Austria began cooperating with the Russian Repatriation Commission in effecting forceful repatriation.

Petro Walkowec could well predict his fate and that of his wife and three children if they were returned to Russia. Half of his life was spent in Siberia and other slave-labor camps of the Soviet Union. He also knew that merely having witnessed the methods of western civilization was a crime punishable in the U. S. S. R. by slavery in Siberia, if not death.

With this prospect facing him, Walkowec, along with thousands of other displaced persons, changed their records to indicate citizenship by birth in countries other than those then under Communist rule, in order to save themselves and their families from forceful repatriation. In some cases it was necessary to flee to other displaced persons' camps in order to effect the change in records. Walkowec gave his birthplace as Poland.

At the time of giving this information, in 1945 and 1946, shortly after the cessation of hostilities, the furtherest thing from Walkowec's mind was the giving of false information for the purpose of obtaining an American immigration visa, because the displaced persons' program did not start until 1948.

Even though the forced repatriation later ended, the Russian Repatriation Commission was still allowed free entry into the displaced persons' camps for the purpose of inspecting records and searching for Russian subjects. Under these conditions no one dared to come forth and correct his records.

When it later became possible for Petro Walkowec and his family to apply for immigration to the United States, the necessary information, including the place of birth, was taken from his camp record and placed on his application. He signed that application and was admitted to the United States.

The United States immigration laws state, in effect, that an alien whose application for immigration visa contains false information as to his country of origin, among other things, shall be arrested and deported. There is no saving provision concerning what his intent, or circumstances under which the change of birthplace was made, may have been in giving such information.

This is the offense for which Petro Walkowec was on trial during the week of June 28. He is now awaiting the decision of the Immigration and Naturalization Service. If the decision is adverse, he faces deportation and loss of his newly-found freedom in the country of his choice. Should the decision be adverse, his wife and three children, one of whom served in the United States Army, must also go.

Walkowec's offense was not discovered by the immigration authorities. He came forth voluntarily and reported his situation, not only to ask for help in clearing his own record, but also in the hope of helping an estimated 30,000 other displaced persons in this country who are faced with the same problem.

It was only after Mr. Walkowec's oldest son, Harry, age 24, entered the United States Army, where he achieved the rank of corporal, and wrote his father that he wanted to be able to tell people that he was a Ukrainian rather than a Pole, that Petro Walkowec, wishing to clear the record for his son's sake, took his problem last August to the head of the Immigration and Naturalization Service in Chicago. He found his problem much greater than he realized.

Whether the decision in his case be favorable or unfavorable, it will leave some 30,000 other cases to be decided individually. These 30,000 people are today living among us in constant fear of deportation. They are, potentially, good American citizens. If we are to develop this potential, we must relieve them of this agonizing fear. The only real solution to their problems will come by way of an act of Congress.

By an act of Congress these people could be given an opportunity to present their applications and correct their records. Immigration authorities would review these applications and would have ample opportunity to look into their records and weed out any individuals who may be unable to give a good accounting for themselves.

Should Congress desire to conduct a hearing in this matter, many reliable witnesses would be grateful for the opportunity to appear and testify as to the facts related herein.

At the same time, Congress should determine those persons who were responsible for the forced repatriation of displaced persons, including anti-Stalinist Soviet citizens. The means that were employed to effect such repatriation went far above and beyond the original intent of the repatriation agreement at Yalta—so much so, in fact, that anti-Stalinists and anti-Communists were forcibly repatriated when any person with common sense and a normal degree of compassion should have known these people were being delivered to certain death or life-long slavery.

Dean Acheson, in an October 24, 1952, speech, let it be known that the American people felt it to be a crime against humanity to repatriate a single Korean war prisoner against his will. Yet in 1945–46, the administration of which he was a part followed an exactly contrary policy.

Mr. Eugene Lyons, in his book Our Secret Allies, outlines in detail the sordid spectacle of UNRRA carrying out a forced repatriation of many thousands, when it should have been known that a great many of these were being sent to certain death. In further support of Mr. Lyons' position as outlined in his book, a newspaper article in the Chicago Daily Tribune, datelined May 12, 1952, reads in part as follows:

> The document that turned up yesterday, dated March 21, 1947, describes measures to be used by UNRRA personnel to induce refugees, particularly those from Polish and Yugoslav territory, to return to the lands of their origin.
>
> The measures advised, besides ordinary persuasion, "enforcement of compulsory labor laws, prevention of antirepatriation, removal of displaced persons who discourage repatriation, and removal of UNRRA personnel who fail to encourage repatriation."

Someday Congress may reveal to the American people whether this stupid policy was the result of ignorance or malice.

Rhee Comes Visiting With Grim Reminders

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK L. CHELF

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 28, 1954

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include therein a most timely and cogent editorial that appeared in the Louisville Courier-Journal on July 27, 1954. In view of the speech today by the Honorable Syngman Rhee, President of South Korea, I think the editorial is not only extremely good but, in addition, the writers thereof were almost clairvoyant.

The editorial follows:

> RHEE COMES VISITING WITH GRIM REMINDERS
>
> In the wake of the disastrous events in Indochina, the problems of Korea have been, for the moment at least, almost forgotten. Syngman Rhee is here to see that they do not remain forgotten. The fiery, stubborn President of South Korea is here to remind President Eisenhower that his country, like Indochina, is still divided by Communist force, and that more than a year after the end of the so-called peace talks, his people know only an uneasy truce.
>
> Our officials know that Rhee is not likely to stop with these simple reminders. He is expected to point out that he warned us not to partition Korea, to parley with the Chinese Communists at Panmunjom or to confer with the Communists at Geneva. He will also undoubtedly reiterate his warnings against further relations with the Communists, and urge that this country use his nation as a spearhead of resistance to the Red aggression in Asia, even to the point of war. And he will probably ask that the United States give him arms and money to expand his army from its present 20 divisions to at least 35 divisions with proportionate air and naval support, and to furnish additional aid for the rehabilitation of his war-torn country.
>
> To support his request, Rhee is expected to use an American promise and a Korean threat. The promise is our commitment to consult with South Korea on possible further steps toward unification in the event the peace conference produced no concrete results in 90 days. This, Rhee can contend, we have not done. He can then threaten, as he has done in the past, to go it alone if we will not agree to his program, pointing out that he is no longer bound by commitment to "take no unilateral action to unite Korea by military means."
>
> President Eisenhower's political and military advisers do not believe that Rhee has any intention of making good his threat to attack the Chinese-supported North Korean government. But they cannot be sure. And for that reason Rhee's request for military aid constitutes a tense issue. The administration wants Rhee's troops strong enough to repeal any future Red aggression, but not so strong as to constitute a temptation to the aging, inpatient Rhee, who sees his time running out and his plans for unifying his beloved country coming no closer to realization.

His Imperial Majesty Haile Selassie

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 8, 1954

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago this Congress paid tribute to the Emperor of Ethopia when he addressed it in joint session at the beginning of a 6-week tour of the United States, Canada, and Mexico.

Wherever he went on that tour—to large cities and small communities from coast to coast—Haile Selassie was warmly received by America. Crowds greeted him everywhere, and each community paid him its highest honors.

One assessment of what America thought of its historic visitor is provided in the editorial comment of its press. I have here some excerpts from such editorial comment and as an additional honor to this great leader I ask unanimous consent to make these comments a part of the RECORD of this House.

I had two opportunities to meet and talk with the Emperor—when he visited the Congress in May, and when he visited Stillwater, Okla., in June. I think it is a particularly significant indication of Haile Selassie's character that he had come to Stillwater to pay tribute to the memory of Dr. Bennett, former president of Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College, who is regarded as the father of the point 4 program in Ethiopia. That work is being carried on today, under the direction of Oklahoma A and M, in a manner that reflects credit on the late Dr. Bennett, the college and this country.

The following are selected quotations from the American press dealing with the visit of His Imperial Majesty Haile Selassie, Emperor of Ethiopia:

> "The visiting Emperor is an enlightened monarch who has given his country outstanding leadership, economic advances, and

even a place in the sun of international affairs." (Kansas City Star, editorial, May 26.)

"For a quarter of a century Haile Selassie has been running a country which always has preserved an admirable stand in international affairs." (Cincinnati Post, editorial, May 26.)

"Haile Selassie has become the favorite emperor of most Americans. * * * In 1954 as in 1934 he is on the job, trying to help his country. That's what emperors are paid to do. It's what all other statesmen are paid to do. When they do it, they deserve credit." (East Liverpool (Ohio) Review, editorial, May 26.)

"The visit of Haile Selassie can be a timely reminder of the price that must eventually be paid for procrastination on turning one's back on responsibility." (Mansfield (Ohio) News-Journal, May 26.)

"Emperor Haile Selassie is both a democratic lord and a living legend. * * * He has introduced suffrage and is constantly pushing for more and better education and health facilities for his people. * * * The Emperor is intent on bringing Ethiopia out of the past into the present—but without revolution or bloodshed." (Neal Standord, columnist, Christian Science Monitor, Boston, May 26.)

"The visit of Haile Selassie at this time brings vividly to the attention of everyone the issue on which the future of civilization will be determined in the atomic age. That issue is collective security. The Ethiopian Emperor is its symbol because his country played the central role in the first attempt to halt aggression under the authority of an international organization." (Editorial, Boston Globe, May 26.)

"The American Nation is pleased to have Emperor Haile Selassie here as a guest. He is our friend. The years have not been easy for him. * * * Here and there along the way, he could have made international deals that would have won him great wealth—but at the cost of honor. He chose always to preserve that honor. * * * Remembering, we admire him and welcome him." (Editorial, Boston Traveler, May 27.)

"It is worthy of note that Ethiopia stood alone among the nations of Africa in sending troops to fight the Communist aggressors in Korea. Welcome to America, Emperor. Your courage is the kind that is needed in the world today." (Editorial, Chicago Daily News, May 28.)

"In contrast to many another nation with wearisome outstretched palm, Ethiopia assurredly deserves the most generous outlays of our foreign aid. We have a feeling this is one place it will not be poorly invested." (Editorial, Albuquerque (N. Mex.) Tribune, May 28.)

"Haile Selassie is a man who has suffered much in the common cause of human freedom and has contributed much to its survival." (Editorial, Camden (N. J.) Courier-Post, May 28.)

"Emperor Selassie is an international hero now, a symbol of the indomitable spirit of the little fellow standing up to the big bully." (Editorial, Salt Lake City Tribune, May 28.)

"With communism threatening to blanket the earth today, the words of Emperor Selassie are deserving of more serious consideration than was given to his pleas for aid when fascism posed a similar threat nearly two decades ago." (Editorial, New Bedford (Mass.) Standard Times, May 30.)

"Ethiopian troops, like those of Turkey, won for themselves in Korea an outstanding place in the respect of both foe and friend. Some pundits question whether the principle of collective security will ever become a reliable moving force in the action of nations. But the devotion of such supporters as Emperor Haile Selassie and his people gives strength to what is becoming a standard of world morality." (Christian Science Monitor, June 2.)

"During the bitter ordeal through which Haile Selassie and his country went, he never gave up. He never tired of reminding the world of the injustice Ethiopia had suffered. He is honored as a soldier and a statesman." (United Press quotation from the Durham (N. C.) Sun, May 29.)

"He [His Imperial Majesty the Emperor] is modern and progressive. He has given his country a constitution, a parliament, and an administration that has preserved law and order. * * * He has built schools and hospitals, and opened up his country to industrial and agricultural development. He is assured of a warm and respectful welcome as he travels about our country on the extended tour planned for him." (Fall River (Mass.) Herald-News, May 28.)

"I recall an Ethiopian telling me 20 years ago in Geneva: 'Our people say might is ephemeral. It passes by, but right prevails.' Today Haile Selassie is a living symbol of that faith." (Detroit Free Press, Columnist Bogdan Raditsh, May 31.)

"The people of America wholeheartedly welcome the visit of a famous head of a friendly state—Emperor Haile Selassie of Ethiopia. Haile Selassie is a man who has suffered much in the common cause of human freedom, and has contributed much to its survival." (Editorial, Camden Courier-Post, May 28.)

"He sent his best * * * troops to battle communism in Korea, where their valor exceeded even that of the Turks." (Editorial, Milwaukee Journal, May 27.)

"This man's dream [of developing his country] is one of the strangely intriguing stories that weaves through the middle years of this century as one of the unfaltering expressions of hope in the midst of adversity. Sometimes it seems an inescapable thought that if some of the rulers of the world who call themselves modern, but whose minds are primordial, could put themselves in reverse, as Haile Selassie seems to have done, we would not be worrying about H-bombs." (Editorial, Elmira (N. Y.) Star-Gazette, May 28.)

"Haile Selassie * * * has one good piece of advice for us now, carved out of bitter experience. It is 'It never pays to appease scoundrels.'" (Editorial, Salem (Oreg.) Capital Journal, June 1.)

"The land of Selassie has progressed a long way since the Italian invasion, and it has done it virtually unaided. The future of his country will probably be closer tied in with the destinies of the United States, and we should strive to bind the economic destinies closer together for the mutual benefit of both countries." (Editorial, Portsmouth (Va.) Star, June 2.)

"It is easy to be wise after the event. Haile Selassie was wise in his generation. Recalling these things now shows us what manner of man it is we welcome and honor today." (Editorial, Montreal Star, June 4.)

"Ethiopia's chief reliance is upon agriculture. Progress depends on production of farm goods for export and the development of markets. That is the key to the transition to a modern economy in which the Emperor is giving his country enlightened leadership." (Editorial, Roanoke (Va) Times, May 29.)

Pulpit and Press

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER ROGERS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 28, 1954

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the Reverend C. John Westhof, minister of the First Presbyterian Church at Tulia, Tex., has furnished me with a copy of his column, Pulpit and Press, which appears in the Tulia (Tex.) Herald. This column contains much food for thought, and it is my opinion that its contents should be made available to all possible. Therefore, under unanimous consent, I extend my remarks in the Apppendix of the RECORD to include this column:

PULPIT AND PRESS

(By C. John Westhof)

The facts of life, what are they? The latest definition originates with President Dwight D. Eisenhower. According to the Chief Executive they are what the opponents of his health insurance proposal don't know. One fact the President is having a little trouble accepting is the apparent defeat of his proposal in this session of the Congress.

Let's look at the facts. In outlining his program to Congress early this year, Eisenhower proposed a plan to underwrite some losses for companies which sell health and hospitalization insurance. The idea was that these companies could increase the benefits of the policies and pay them for longer periods. The policyholder would be ahead and the Government would make up the difference. A limit of 75 percent of the extra cost would be placed on the Government's share. To begin this program the President requested Congress to appropriate $25 million.

President Eisenhower was very emphatic that he is opposed to socialized medicine. We wonder if he is also opposed to socialized insurance. The extension of social security—without an honest facing of the economics involved—and the health insurance prosposal would indicate that the President is not wholly consistent in his thinking. What do we find when we examine the latter proposal?

At present some 100 million Americans are covered by some form of health insurance. Included in this figure are those covered by company plans and those who carry a policy on their own. This is roughly two-thirds of the population. Benefits in these plans range from expenses for hospitalization only to a scale which provides for drugs and doctor fees as well. Some include income for loss of time when the wage earner is involved. The cost for a sound plan starts at about $50 per year and rises according to extra features and increased benefits which are added to the contract.

It is safe to say that the vast majority of families can afford enough protection to take care of major expenses along this line. The majority of them are carrying this kind of insurance. A few probably cannot afford any. Others who can pay the premiums prefer to spend their money other ways. Another class of citizens provides for medical expenses by other forms of saving. As there is a variety of plans so there is also a variety of individual choices as to the kind of plan desired, or the desire for no plan at all.

It is interesting that this absolutely free choice system has provided us with the finest coverage of any people in the world.

Now think with me of the Eisenhower proposal. It would benefit the 100 million policyholders. The initial appropriation of $25 million figures out 25 cents per person. If that is all it takes to accomplish the ends the President has in mind, most of us would accept a premium increase of that amount.

A more realistic view of the situation, however, suggests that this is just the beginning. It looks to us like a small request to establish the principle of assistance. The process would call for larger and larger appropriations. The insurance would become more and more subsidized.

We do not like this way of doing business. We do not want 150 million people taxed to pay for our protection. If 100 million people voluntarily choose to share the risk that is fine. To force the taxpayer to help foot the bill is wrong. Neither the President's popularity nor the vote of Congress could make it right.

We are opposed to the kind of approach made to this problem. It implies a criticism of the plans offered by the insurance companies. It seems to say that for a small sum the Government can provide vast benefits. Social security was sold to the workers on the same basis. Now the story of increased cost is unfolding itself and the deductions grow larger and larger. The same would hold true for the health insurance plan. If the public were told the full story the idea would lose much of its appeal.

We are grateful for the high health standards of our Nation. It is a primary Christian concern to be interested in the welfare of men. We appreciate the ability to buy an insurance policy to prepare for emergencies. We do not even object to the fact that someone makes a profit out of it. We are willing to pay our own premiums without help from Washington, D. C. We want to be equally free to drop the policy anytime we see a better way of providing for medical expense. And in the process of exercising this freedom, we hold the strongest possible power in our hands to keep the insurance companies on their toes. With this freedom of choice they must design policies to please. In short, they must serve to sell. One hundred million citizens like the service they are getting.

Milford E. Shields, Poet Laureate of the State of Colorado

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 26, 1954

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I have on previous occasions brought to the attention of the Members some of the poems of a constituent of mine, Milford E. Shields, of Durango, Colo. Today I should like once again to refer to Mr. Shields, who has recently been appointed poet laureate of the State of Colorado. Two of his first official poems have an appeal greater than the confines of the State of Colorado, and I include them at the end of my remarks. The first of these is Colorado Day, 1954, and the second is Air Force Academy.

The poems follow:

COLORADO DAY, 1954

Across this land a throbbing cavalcade
Of days and men forged flaming destiny;
They fused as one in their intensity
And firm foundation for our State was laid.

Nor days were measured, nor the sweat of men
Until they mastered mountains in the sky
And then raised up the plains as truly high,
Creating holy State to God again.

"Nil Sine Numine" they set upon the seal—
Their hands and hearts were one in that high time
And all their days were in that day sublime,
That Day of Colorado, mystic, real.

Let us join spirits with their spirits free,
Let us fuse days with their majestic past,
Continue them as long as time shall last
This great one day in our proud history.

AIR FORCE ACADEMY

Let now our strongest eagles come
To this great State that stands so high,
Here where our mountains point them home
To nest within dynamic sky.

Let now America's high right
To higher place in heaven's sun
Be blazoned by their matchless flight
Until both tide and time are won.

Let them now wing Old Glory through
Most highest reaches men call space—
Beyond our Colorado's blue—
We ask it by God's holy grace.

Aviation in the Pacific

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 26, 1954

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, on July 18 the Sunday Star of Washington, D. C., printed the following article by Massey Stanley which gives a very interesting viewpoint on aviation in the Pacific:

CANBERRA.—A socialistic airline corporation, Qantas Empire Airways, wants to make the Pacific its own lake.

How far it succeeds may be out of the hands of the Government which owns it. Ironically, it is under the Australian Menzies government—first returned on an anti-Socialist program in 1949, and twice reelected since—that Qantas, as it is known, has made its greatest progress.

Qantas has many singularities besides being the only commonly used English word where the letter "u" does not follow the "q."

The name goes back to its origin in the twenties as the Queensland and Northern Territorial Aerial Service.

Providing an air link through the hinterland of the vast regions of the island continent connoted by those two place names was a mammoth undertaking for the times.

Today the root meaning of the initials has as much relation to the activities of Qantas as the village of New Amsterdam has to modern New York.

It is significant nevertheless that the name evolved by a sturdy band of pioneer capitalists—whose capital was mainly their skill and guts—has been preserved through a series of absorptions, first of private enterprises, by government enterprises, and then of government enterprises by a bigger government enterprise.

THE BOSS GREW, TOO

Oddly, too, the first boss of the original show, when it was little better than a barn storming affair in the Australian back country, is today chairman of the great Government corporation into which it has grown. Hudson Fysh, the Australian pilot of World War I who took on a new kind of battle soon after they declared peace, is still head of an airline that now girdles every ocean but the Atlantic.

Qantas has knocked even Government competitors out of the ring. In the first of its international ventures, Qantas did not go beyond Singapore. North of that, British-based Empire Airways operated.

Nowadays there is no Empire Airways beyond the word "Empire" in Qantas' name. And British Overseas Air Corporation, also a Government outfit, only by sufferance of Qantas comes to Australia.

The growth of Qantas' Government monopoly in the flying business is anomalous against a continuing background of distinctive Australian enterprise. Sir Gordon Taylor, another Aussie air pioneer and a die-hard private-enterprise man, is planning a trans-Antarctic link between Australia and South America. It is odd, too, in its growth under an administration even more fervently dedicated to private enterprise than the Eisenhower regime in the United States.

Why is it then that the Government has not only stayed in Qantas, the greatest of all the socialized businesses it inherited, but also goes after competitors—as it has done in extending its routes to San Francisco (served by Pan American Airways) and Vancouver (Canadian Pacific Airways)?

All the competitors are adding to costs with tremendous advertising outlays. Qantas goes right along, exploiting every device including free voyages and sponsored tours in the country of destination for international press parties.

QANTAS' AIM

Though Qantas does not say it aims to chase Pan American and CPA from the Pacific (and certainly from any American-Australian link) the implication is plain enough both in its present fiercely competitive spirit, and in its record.

It is O. K. for the aging Taylor to set out on as many pioneer flights as he wishes and to keep going until he follows his great colleagues, Kingsford-Smith and Ulm, into the ocean. But if he should attempt to establish regular passenger or freight service over any of these routes, the strongest discouragement he would meet would be from his own Government.

That Government is behind Quantas in excluding "British" competition of any kind (British meaning Commonwealth, including Australian). That applies across the Pacific to America, across the Indian Ocean to Africa and through Malaya, India, and the Mediterranean to Britain. In the Tasman Sea, between Australia and neighboring New Zealand, Quantas shares the monopoly with the New Zealand Government's Tasman Empire Airlines.

The answer to the question why Australia's anti-Socialist Government stays in the transport business (it also continues to own a line of steamers) is, as suggested above, that it feels the solution has gotten out of its hands—that it is on the back of a tiger.

The public excuse is that strategic matters are involved which make relinquishment to private enterprise impracticable in present world circumstances.

That does not clear up the mystery—the Government has stayed in an associated business. Trans-Australia Airlines, established by the Chifley Socialist administration with the express object of eliminating private enterprise from the air (as from rail transport) within Australia itself.

Although there are competitors (the Chifley administration did not last long enough to complete their strangulation), the Socialist-founded TAA remains the largest and, indeed, in all ways the most successful of the internal air services.

Internationally, Australia's great socialized air venture is going to meet its first major challenge from Japan, a country which, though inhospitable to Socialist experiment, has much experience in state enterprise.

This coming event has been foreshadowed by a recent development. The global network of Qantas routes includes the twice-weekly run to Japan, alternating through Singapore, Hong Kong, and through Manila.

MANILA DROPPED

Manila has just been eliminated because, pursuing its policy of excluding competition wherever possible, the Canberra government refused to give reciprocal landing rights in Australia to the Philippines airways. Qantas' public explanation for dropping Manila from its schedule was that a more rapid route to Japan had been devised.

Qantas' astute and experienced executives will have their biggest test when the present agreement with Japan for landing rights at Haneda and Iwakuni airports comes up for renewal in 2 years' time. The current agreement was drawn up before the signing of the peace treaty, when Japan was more complaisant than she is today.

Now Japan has an international airline—and if she insists on reciprocal landing rights in Australia (and there is every indication that she will) Qantas will either have to drop out of this vital route or put up with competition such as it suffers grudgingly from Pan American to San Francisco, and from K. L. M. (Dutch Airlines) through Darwin and the Middle East.

Reorganization of the Bureau of Mines and Related Activities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WESLEY A. D'EWART
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 28, 1954

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, I have been interested in the comments by other Members and in the press regarding the recommendations of the survey team on reorganization of the Bureau of Mines and related activities in the Department of the Interior. I am glad to report that I have asked and the gentlemen from Nebraska, Dr. MILLER, has agreed to call the Interior Department officials concerned before our Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to have a full explanation of the matter on Monday.

At this time I have seen only the news paper reports of the proposals, but I note in particular a recommendation for reorganization of the Bureau of Mines and reduction in the number of its field offices, and secondly, a proposal that certain of the Government's activities in the field of mining be terminated, reduced or placed in the hands of private industry.

It may be that upon careful examination, we will find that these recommendations are not all that they have been reported to be in the press, but are worth consideration in line with the President's program for greater economy and efficiency in Government and for divesting the Government of those activities that could better be handled by private industry.

However, the newspaper statement to the effect that some of the recommendations are to be put into effect immediately and the remainder within 1 year, coming as it does in the closing days of this legislative session, cause me concern.

These are matters upon which the Congress, after study by the Committee on Interior and Insular affairs, has expressed its policy and intent on many occasions. Montana is a State with vast mineral resources, including a large percentage of the Nations coal reserves, and we are vitally interested in the programs for development of low-grade coal bodies. We are interested in the experiments on oil shale and the development of synthetic and liquid fuels. Our committee will want to make certain that the proposals of the survey team will not in any way set back research in these important fields.

I am glad that our chairman, the gentleman from Nebraska, has arranged for a full discussion of the matter on Monday, and I hope we will have at that time the answers to many of the questions which are raised by the disclosure of the survey recommendations.

Meaning of Peril

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENDERSON L. LANHAM
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 28, 1954

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, with leave to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I am including a column by Joseph and Stewart Alsop entitled "Meaning of Peril," which appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald for Wednesday, July 28, 1954.

I am deeply disturbed about the fact that the present administration has refused to face the facts as they exist with reference to our perilous position in relationship to the increasing military strength of the Soviet Union. During the recess following the first session of the 83 Congress, I made every effort to inform the people of the Seventh District of Georgia, which I have the honor to represent, of the danger to our country from a sudden atomic attack. While some little progress has been made in strengthening our defense against such an attack, we still are wide open to such an attack and even our power to retaliate could be destroyed at one fell swoop by a Soviet attack.

I take this means of expressing my concern and my firm belief that we ought to forget budget balancing if it stands in the way of our strength to resist an atomic or other attack from Communist Russia or China. I am alarmed at the steps that have been taken, first, to weaken our Air Force and then, in a reversal of policy, to weaken the other branches of our armed services and a halfhearted and belated effort to strengthen our Air Force. The situation is truly alarming and I am expressing my alarm and concern just as I did during the Truman-Johnson era when I demanded the resignation of the Secretary of Defense because of his dismantling of our defense machine.

Of course, we must have a sound economy, but our defense posture and power should take precedence, which is not the case at present. There is no doubt but that our defense policy has been dictated by the Bureau of the Budget and the Secretary of the Treasury rather than by our Department of Defense. This attitude should be changed and first things should be first.

The Alsop column follows:

MATTER OF FACT
(By Joseph and Stewart Alsop)
MEANING OF PERIL

The sudden renewal of tension in the Far East ought to serve as a warning. If the warning is taken, which it probably will not be, the country will begin to object to the high percentage of fraud in our foreign and defense policymaking.

High officials are not knowingly lying to the country about the national situation, as they did in the period of the Truman-Louis Johnson disarmament that led to the Korean war. All the same, the country is being outrageously bamboozled about the national situation.

So far as one can judge, the leaders of this administration are bamboozling the country because they have achieved a happy state of self-bamboozlement. They do not want to believe that efforts must be made, money must be spent, and risks must be run. By a kind of official Coueism, made possible by concealing all the basic facts from the country, most of the policymakers have ended by concealing the basic facts from themselves.

The main point about which the great men of the National Security Council have so wonderfully bamboozled themselves is their own inevitable reaction to a time of total peril.

Two events of the last 12 months insure that the time of total peril for America is now not very far away. The Soviet hydrogen bomb and the new Soviet long-range jet bombers radically change the whole picture. The danger to this country is no longer to be calculated in terms of a slowly accumulating Soviet atomic stockpile, and a Soviet strategic air army equipped with slow, rather short-range TU-4's.

The big, economy-sized H-bomb with lithium hydride cores can be turned out rather rapidly. The new Soviet bombers, the TU-37 and TU-39, already are in quantity production. We have no air defense, and we are building no air defense, to protect this country against the Kremlin's modernized strategic airpower and hydrogen bombs.

Thus the moment is fairly near—the official estimates vary from 18 to 36 months—when the NSC planning papers will begin with the grim sentence:

"Assumed that the Soviet Union has the capability to destroy the United States."

The key question is, very simply, how our highest policymakers will behave when they see that ugly sentence in official black and white. In the abstract, they know already that they are going to see it fairly soon. But the facts have been hidden from the country. There is no public pressure on the policymakers to think about the facts. So they have shoved the whole ugly problem under the rug.

Meanwhile, the key question already has been answered, not in Washington but in London. Last December, one of these reporters passed through London on the way home from Indochina. At that time the leaders of the British Government plainly understood the uncontainable dangers of a Far Eastern Munich. And they were ready to take great risks to prevent it, if this country would only give the lead.

Instead, this spring, the British leaders rejected our tentative lead, and actively worked to bring about a Far Eastern Munich. The reason was simple. Between December and March, the British Government suddenly had become aware of the total peril of the British Isles.

How this happened is a curious but long story. It is enough to say that two trivial accidents—a speech by Representative STERLING COLE and the hydrogen bomb fallout on the Japanese fishing boat, *Fortunate Dragon*—suddenly waked up the British Cabinet.

They, too, had closed their ears to the experts. They, too, had shoved the problem of their peril under the rug. But when they abruptly faced the fact that the Soviet could quite literally destroy the British Isles—which already is the case—they went all out for appeasement at any cost. Thus, their peril paralyzed their policy.

It may be unmannerly to say so, but there is no reason in the record to believe that President Eisenhower and the members of his Cabinet are much braver and tougher than Prime Minister Churchill and his colleagues. Hence there is every reason to expect that the specter of total peril, when it is upon us, will have the same paralyzing effect on American policy as it has already produced in Britain.

Meanwhile, it is already clear that even a partial paralysis of American policy is going to be desperately dangerous. The ink was hardly dry on the Indochinese treaty, when Ho Chi Minh announced his determination to grab the rest of Indochina for communism. If there is no push in Indochina, there will be a push somewhere else in Asia; and if not in Asia, then somewhere in the Middle East or in Europe.

And what will the American policymakers do if the push comes after the beginning of the time of total peril? Will they say: "Yes; we are willing to risk the destruction of the United States for the Burmese, or the Berliners, or whoever it may be?" or will they duck the challenge, and so permit the Kremlin to begin gobbling up the free world on a piecemeal system?

There are other ways of phrasing the key question. Whether the idea of massive retaliation is a serious answer to this question deserves careful study in a subsequent report.

Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KIT CLARDY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 28, 1954

Mr. CLARDY. Mr. Speaker, the Congressional dictionary seems to omit the word "economy." In its place we seem to have substituted a sentence. In substance that sentence reads: "We are in favor of economy in theory, but it must never affect any project in our respective districts."

My one term experience here has confirmed a belief I held before I was elected. I am more convinced than ever that we will never get true economy until we deny the Congress the money it so freely throws around, usually at the request of pressure groups. I do not believe we can truly cut down big government unless we cut down the revenue upon which big government thrives.

The proposal to put a ceiling on income-tax rates is a step in the right direction. But I can visualize many ways of circumventing that restriction. Deliberate inflation is only one of them. I think we need something else in addition.

The prime reason why we find so much free spending is to be found in the obvious fact that most folks do not couple cause with effect. Everyone complains about high taxes, but most are unwilling or unable to see the true cause. Whenever some group want a Federal handout, they talk only about the great humanitarian causes the money will serve, but never do they talk about the increased cost and the increased taxes their pet project will necessitate.

And so between the date of adjournment and the meeting of the next Congress, I shall be working on a proposal for another constitutional amendment in the fields of taxation and appropriation. Recognizing full well the terrific size of the problem, I shall nevertheless try to put together a constitutional amendment which, I think, will go directly to the heart of our problem of extravagance.

I hope it will be possible to come up with a proposal that will link every appropriation with a measure that will raise the funds to meet it. In other words, I think the only way we will ever stop profligate spending will be to compel the people and the Congress to face reality every time Congress appropriates a dollar. My experience tells me the only practical way to stop the Congress and Government departments from unbridled generosity with other people's money is to let folks see the other side of the picture at the same time. If we can make every Congressman and everyone who comes before Congress for an appropriation, face up to the hard fact that Congress must raise a dollar in taxation for every dollar appropriated, it may and probably will slow down the mad dash toward bankruptcy.

I do not minimize the terrific problem ahead of me. I can think of many seemingly sound arguments against even trying to do what I suggest. But we will never get anywhere if we surrender before the fight begins. Some things will have to be scaled down or cut out. These things must be done to first bring revenues and expenses into balance. Then additional and new ventures by government will call for new taxes.

The revolutionary nature of this proposal will undoubtedly shock a great many. We have grown so accustomed to spending first and thinking about income later my proposal will probably be greeted with scorn and derision. "Visionary" and "impractical" will probably be the kindest comment I can expect. But if anyone can think of a better way to stop the profligacy to which we have grown accustomed, I will gladly embrace it. If I can start some constructive thinking, I will be satisfied.

The Late Albert Sidney Camp

SPEECH

OF

HON. A. S. HERLONG, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 26, 1954

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, SID CAMP was one of the first men I met after I came to Washington. Both of us were named for that great general of the Confederacy, Albert Sidney Johnston. Right off we had something in common. We always addressed each other as "Albert Sidney." I believe he knew every detail of the life of the distinguished man whose name we bore. We must have fought the Battle of Shiloh a dozen times.

These memories certainly make you feel close to a man, and I was devoted to SID CAMP. He was a great and able Representative, with a heart as big as a house. He was never too busy to help some other Member. I know how much he has helped me.

I extend my deepest sympathy to his loved ones in their and America's great loss.

Republican Newspaper Hits Administration's Economy Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 28, 1954

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, as a public service I am calling attention to an editorial in the Republican Chicago Tribune of July 27, 1954.

Stating that economy in government doubtless will be an issue in the fall campaign the Republican Chicago Tribune says:

> But it is hard to see how it can be used with much success by the Republicans.

The Republican Chicago Tribune points out that President Eisenhower has indicated an expenditure for the new fiscal year of $65.6 billion and that this is more than any single year's expenditure by the Truman administration.

> And Truman—

Remarks the Republican Chicago Tribune—

> had two excuses for swollen budgets. He was fighting a war in Korea that has been over since July 27, 1953. Moreover, he was carrying out the program of economic aid under the Marshall plan. Economic aid, we are told time and time again, has been almost completely stopped.

The Republican Chicago Tribune calls attention to the fact (a) that when General Eisenhower was campaigning for the Presidency in 1952 he promised to bring about a sharp reduction in expenditures and (b) that the indicated expenditures of his administration in 1955 are actually in excess of the 1952 expenditures he then criticized.

Coming from a Republican source this frank and unfavorable comparison of the record for economy of the present Republican administration with that of the preceding Democratic administration will be, I am sure, generally accepted as factually grounded and not motivated by political bias. The editorial follows:

EISENHOWER'S RECORD ON SPENDING

> Shortly after June 30 of each year the President of the United States issues a statement summarizing the income and outgo for the accounting year just ended. Almost invariably each President has stated his conviction that he has managed the Government well in the preceding 12 months and that

progress has been made in getting the Nation's finances on a sounder basis.

President Eisenhower conformed to custom when he announced Friday that during the fiscal year which recently ended, expenditures were cut, the year's deficit was brought down, tax reductions were made possible and "we are laying a firm base for a healthy and expanding economy."

In the recent fiscal year, outgo amounted to $67.6 billion. Mr. Eisenhower says this is $10 billion less than the last Truman budget. But that budget was never authorized by Congress. It was just the sum total of what the outgoing President told Congress the Government would need to carry on all the activities he had in mind. In that year, half Truman and half Eisenhower, the spending totaled 74.3 billion.

Mr. Eisenhower also places the saving at $3 billion under his own estimate made in January. The way to make a substantial showing like that in July is to make your estimate outrageously high in January. It was widely pointed out earlier this year that a $70 billion spending rate was excessive. The hope was then expressed that the President himself would recognize this.

When Mr. Eisenhower was campaigning for his office, he promised to bring about a sharp reduction in expenditures. In the year which ended in mid-1952, just before the campaign started, the Government disbursed $65.4 billion. The achievement of Mr. Eisenhower in bringing about economies must be measured by how much he has cut spending below this figure of $65.4 billion.

He hasn't reduced it at all. Instead, he has increased it. The Treasury outgo in the year he has just reviewed was $2 billion more than was spent by his predecessor whose record he had criticized.

The administration has indicated what the outgo is going to be for the new fiscal year which will end June 30, 1955. The total as it is set down in the Treasury Bulletin is $65.6 billion, or a little more than Truman spent in his worst year, and Truman at least had two excuses for swollen budgets. He was fighting a war in Korea that has been over since July 27, 1953. Moreover, he was carrying out the program of economic aid under the Marshall plan. Economic aid, we are told time and again, has been almost completely stopped.

Economy in government, as shown by the results of the last fiscal year, will doubtless be an issue in the coming election. But it is hard to see how it can be used with much success by the Republicans. All that Eisenhower can claim is that as a spender he is just a little more costly to the taxpayers than Truman was.

Mutual Security Appropriation Bill, 1955

SPEECH
OF

HON. GERALD R. FORD, JR.

OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 27, 1954

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 10051) making appropriations for mutual security for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Idaho by his own statement is a shotgun approach to this appropriation. It should be pointed out very clearly that the gentleman does not seek to reduce the amount of funds; he simply by the shotgun approach seeks to tie up an additional 4 percent of the obligational authority.

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. BUDGE. Does the gentleman question my statement that if the amendment is adopted the FAO will have all of the funds which it requested? Is not that true?

Mr. FORD. They will have all of the funds for some future date, but they can only obligate for the fiscal year 1955 the amount appropriated less 4 percent. The gentleman from Idaho seeks, in effect, to reduce this appropriation in fiscal 1955 by this limitation method.

It should be brought out and reemphasized that the Committee on Appropriations in recommending this bill to the Committee of the Whole has reduced the total funds requested by the executive branch by something over 13 percent or a total of $812 million.

The gentleman from Idaho by his amendment would further restrict the obligational authority during the present fiscal year by approximately $208 million, so that during this fiscal year you would have an outright reduction in funds of $812 million below that recommended by the President, plus this further hamstringing obligational limitation of some 4 percent, which would make a dollar limitation of $208 million.

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. BUDGE. I may say that I have no pride of authorship in this particular type of amendment which the gentleman has referred to as a shotgun approach. The original author of this type of amendment was the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. Taber] and the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. Thomas]. This type of amendment has been used in the Congress before under the sponsorship of those gentlemen.

Mr. FORD. I do not believe that this type of amendment is necessary or desirable. We have already taken rather serious action in reducing the funds that were proposed by the executive branch.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. This is really just an attempt to do with a shotgun what the House specifically refused to do with a rifle heretofore this afternoon.

Mr. FORD. That is entirely correct. We defeated an amendment earlier that would have seriously impaired the military aspects of this program. It would be very unwise in my judgment to approve such an amendment which would impair the military aspects of the program.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GARY. Would this, as a matter of fact, not put the House in the ridiculous position of saying "Here is the money, but you can only use 96 percent of it"?

Mr. FORD. That is entirely correct. I hope the amendment is rejected.

Mutual Security Appropriation Bill, 1955

SPEECH
OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 27, 1954

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 10051) making appropriations for mutual security for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes.

Mr. JAVITS. I wish to explain the situation. I am in favor of the Vorys amendment which is directed at a totally different matter, to appropriate the $17 million for the United States contribution to the United Nations technical assistance program. My amendment proposes to add what the Committee on Appropriations has taken out of the President's program for the United States technical assistance program, which was $112 million, which was the administration's express request for technical assistance by agreements between the United States and other friendly countries.

The Vorys amendment concerns the United Nations multilateral technical assistance program which is an excellent investment for us in those areas which we cannot reach, for sound reasons, with our own program. It is an excellent investment and I am for it, but it does not deal with the question of the reduction in the strictly United States technical assistance program, which program we should not reduce. The President has requested us not to, and we should not, for this reason.

We are talking here about a great struggle with the Communist bloc. Eighty-five or ninety percent of this bill is for military defense security. What is then our offensive in this struggle? We are to have over 3,000 technicians abroad working for the technical assistance program, building up good will and support for the United States and for the free world, in these numerous countries in the world. If you look at the roll, you will see that this technical assistance program is getting into every spot in the world which is in real danger in a most effective way.

Are we going to be so foolish as to pinch pennies in our strong point in the offensive for freedom? I am all for our program of military security. It is entirely justified; its costs run into billions. In terms of money aggregates it makes a ridiculous comparison for us to think that we are going to save $12 million by cutting it off this technical assistance program which gives help in $1 million or $2 million chunks or less to a whole host of countries. Which country are we going to take it out of? If any, it will probably be out of some country where we need it the most.

Let us take the case of Latin America, where we are spending about one-fourth of this whole amount provided for technical assistance something like $23 million. Those countries think so much of this program that they are contributing twice as much, something over $40 million a year to our $23 million so that this program may be carried on adequately.

It seems to me that the committee ought to vote my amendment, taking care of the United Nations technical assistance program and approving the President's request for the technical assistance appropriation in this offensive for freedom.

Matter of Fact

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STUART SYMINGTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 28, 1954

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an article concerning military questions, written by Joseph and Stewart Alsop, and published in the Washington Post and Times Herald of July 26, 1954,

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Matter of Fact

(By Joseph and Stewart Alsop)

WHY NOT BIRDS?

Long ago, in the far happier past, these reporters were among the first to insist that Soviet postwar intentions were inherently evil. In those days, this opinion of our former ally was still very unfashionable, and was regarded as excessively gloomy.

A charming lady—the wife of Field Marshal "Jumbo" Wilson—therefore complained that the reports in this space were much too depressing. She was asked to suggest something to write about more cheerful than the first Iranian crisis, which was taken in a dark and acute stage.

"Oh," said Lady Wilson, who was a strong British bird watcher, "why not try birds?"

This is one of the recurring moments when Lady Wilson's advice becomes very tempting. The political realities are immensely repellent. They have been officially concealed from the American public. Writing about those realities sounds like a description of a nightmare.

But this is the beginning of an attempt to assess what those realities truly are.

To begin with, this country has now accepted a new Munich in the Far East. ("Accept" is the new word of art used in this administration, to mean flabbiness in the face of danger.) The history of the decision not to intervene to save Indochina is enough to suggest the decision's future consequences.

Contrary to common report, the Joint Chiefs of Staff were unanimous that American interests demanded intervention. General Ridgway is alleged to have dissented, but this is not correct. By a conventional infantryman's analysis of the cost, character, and duration of the war, General Ridgway certainly made the project very unattractive. But he favored it all the same.

Besides Admirals Radford and Carney, and Generals Twining and Ridgway, Secretary of State Dulles insisted that Indochina must be saved. So did Vice President Nixon, with the authority of the detailed knowledge he gained on his Far Eastern trip. In the other corner, however, were Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey and the President's brother, Milton Eisenhower, who is this administration's power behind the scenes.

Because of the Treasury's budget, and because Milton Eisenhower argued that the "country wouldn't stand for it," the President decided not to do what the Joint Chiefs, the Secretary of State, and the Vice President insisted we ought to do. Unfortunately, a balanced budget is a very poor protection against the consequences of a Munich. And unless every high American official in close touch with foreign and defense problems is utterly mistaken, the consequences of a Munich must now be expected in the Far East.

Secondly, while accepting this Far Eastern Munich, the administration is also tacitly accepting certain other risks that are perhaps even more serious.

On the one hand, an impairment of our basic military asset is being tacitly tolerated. Gen. Curtis Lemay's Strategic Air Command is a superb instrument of war. It is not being cut down, it is getting better planes. But its striking power is still being imperceptibly reduced, by the growing political and military threat of our overseas air bases.

New Soviet guided missiles, which can bring these bases under fire were described in this space last week. That is the heart of the military threat. The political threat lies in increasing unrest of allies, who own these bases. Loss of these bases will be equivalent to the loss of 60 percent of SAC's bombers, for it will reduce by 60 percent the sorties that can be flown.

On the other hand, the administration is also tacitly accepting the inevitability of total peril. In contrast to SAC the Soviet long-range stocks of atomic and hydrogen bombs is continuously growing. Meanwhile the story of American air defense is still the same scandalous story of cheese-paring, delay, disorganization and neglect.

For these reasons, the time is coming rather soon—perhaps in 2 years—when the United States will be exposed to total destruction by Soviet air attacks.

Somewhat further in the future the time is also coming when the Soviets will have an intercontinental ballistic missile, against which there is no defense. The Soviets have been going all out to get this missile. We have not been going all out. Hence there is a good chance the enemy will have the ultimate weapon before we have it.

A Munich made already; our chief military assets being demonstrably devalued; the time of total peril not very far in the future, and even grimmer developments that may follow after that—these are the main features of the situation now confronting us. An emergency exists which is not being treated as an emergency. One must ask, therefore, where this emergency will lead. It would be nicer to think about birds, but it would be remarkably imprudent.

Mutual Security Appropriation Bill, 1955

SPEECH

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 27, 1954

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 10051) making appropriations for mutual security for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, this House should remember that the appropriation bill before us is really a $12 billion spending bill. This is three times what the FOA can spend. The bill should be defeated.

Mr. Chairman, the argument in this debate seems to revolve around the desirability of adequate military defense. No one on this floor, I am sure, would want to see anything but adequate defense all over the world wherever we were called upon to defend our interests. I submit to you, however, that if this is a military matter the Foreign Operations Administration is not the agency to carry it on. This is a matter for the Armed Services Committee.

I say that the Foreign Operations Administration or Mutual Security, whatever you want to call it, has always been inept in the administration of this legislation. The gentleman from North Carolina has already called attention to that situation. Here I want to compliment the committee on a very frank statement contained in the report regarding this agency. I refer to page 5. I want this in the Record, because it clearly indicates the weakness of administration.

On page 5 of the report, and again on page 7, is contained one of the most scorching indictments of a Federal agency that I have ever read. Here is a portion of the report on page 5:

> It has already been determined that questionable practices, involving substantial sums, are being followed in the classification and recording of transactions as obligations. They range all the way from plain clerical errors ($47,800,000) to amounts exceeding limitations stated in letters of intent not yet converted to definitive contracts. Substantial sums are included for lump-sum contingent amounts contained in contracts for spares, spare parts, engineering changes, and the like for which there are no definitized orders and which appear to amount in effect to nothing more than an administrative reservation of funds against possible future purchases. Contracts entered into in 1951 and earlier years, practically dormant for many months, are also included. There are other categories of questionable firmness such as canceled orders not yet removed from the books, excessive cost estimates, lower stock prices promulgated subsequent to the original requisitions, etc. The conditions found closely parallel those reported in March 1954 by the Comptroller General on obligations for regular aircraft-procurement funds in the Navy and Air Force.
>
> Similar tests were made of selected obligations reported as of May 31 under nonmilitary programs. Many instances were found of outstanding obligations with considerable age which were possibly out of date as well as many instances where there was a direct question of validity from a standpoint of legality and firmness.

Mr. Chairman, the administrator of this program should not be very proud of this indictment.

But more denunciatory than the above excerpt is another on page 7. To me it is nothing less than a charge of dishonesty in administration. Here it is:

JUNE BUYING

Examination of rates of obligation in fiscal year 1954 under several mutual security appropriations disclosed amounts for June 1954 so high as to be far above and beyond any normal relationship to rates of prior months. From an analysis of the underlying details, including examination of a number of specific documents forming the basis for such amounts, the committee can only conclude that there was a deliberate effort to tie up or dispose of available funds before the June 30 deadline. The finger points clearly to various forms of "June buying" to get rid of "hot money" as basis for support of 1955 requests, a practice long condemned by the committee and on which, as late as April 26, the Director of the Budget issued a directive to agencies cautioning against such practice late in the fiscal year.

I submit to you if that is the way this agency is handling its business it is about time some changes were made. I would suggest to the administrator that he stay home and do his homework instead of chasing to all parts of the world trying to effect trade agreements with countries behind the Iron Curtain. It is his responsibility.

Before I conclude my brief remarks Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment my colleague from Wisconsin, Mr. Davis, for his very able presentation of his amendment. It should carry. And to my other colleague, Mr. Laird, for his forceful argument in support of the Davis amendment. I am proud of these promising young men in the Wisconsin delegation.

Now, Mr. Chairman, what this bill before us really amounts to as a matter of fact is whether or not we are going to have fiscal responsibility in this Congress. I say to you that so far as I am personally concerned it is evidence of fiscal irresponsibility. This cannot continue.

Odd Tariff Proposal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS H. KUCHEL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 28, 1954

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an excellent editorial entitled "Odd Tariff Proposal," which appeared in the Sacramento Bee on July 17, and a letter addressed to me from W. J. Dauenhauer, chairman of the United Hop Growers of California.

This is an expression of concern on the part of the hop growers to the Tariff Commission of any further reduction in present tariff rates on hops.

In view of the repeated demands on the Federal Treasury, it is encouraging in Mr. Dauenhauer's letter to read:

> Our industry can survive without Government subsidy, and I can assure you we are anxious to proceed in that manner.

However, as Mr. Dauenhauer states:

> We must have proper protection against the dumping of cheap foreign hops on the American market.

I commend the editorial and the letter to the special attention of my colleagues of the Pacific Coast States, Idaho, and New York, where hops are grown in quantity.

There being no objection, the editorial and the letter were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Odd Tariff Proposal

A hearing before the Federal Tariff Commission will open in Washington, D. C., next Monday on a proposal to lower tariffs on hops, particularly those imported from Iron Curtain countries.

The dumping of cheap foreign hops on the American market not only could be ruinous to American producers but also is unjustified by domestic production and consumption statistics.

The United States yield, almost exclusively in California, Oregon, Washington, and Idaho, has declined from a peak of 63 million pounds in 1951 to an estimated output of 40 million pounds this year, but even that stands 10 percent above domestic consumption.

The reduction in acreage has resulted almost entirely from drastic reductions in prices due to the importation of foreign hops, mostly from Germany, which has enjoyed a tariff differential.

In a letter to Senator Thomas Kuchel, the United Hop Growers of California stated:

"If this downward trend is continued, it will no longer be feasible to produce hops in this country and could easily jeopardize the stability of a once thriving American industry."

That industry is important in this immediate area. A very substantial part of California's $4 million a year crop comes from the lower Sacramento Valley—$2 million of it in Sacramento County alone.

The principal beneficiaries of the proposed tariff reduction would be the Iron Curtain countries, for which the rate would be reduced from 24 to 12 cents per pound.

It would be ironical, indeed, were such a cut to be made to benefit Iron Curtain countries at the expense of the American growers.

The proposal at the best is highly questionable and dangerous to an established American agricultural activity.

Sacramento, Calif., *July 14, 1954.*

Hon. Thomas H. Kuchel,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Kuchel: The hop growers of California have recently been informed that the Tariff Commission is investigating hop production and will hold a meeting on the subject in Washington, D. C., July 19 with a view toward adjustment of tariffs. We understand the Commission will later make some recommendations to the Senate Finance Committee.

Upon receipt of the above information, California hop growers rapidly organized under the name, United Hop Growers of California, and asked me to serve as chairman. Mr. E. L. Markell, of San Francisco, has been selected to represent the group and will call at your office.

We respectfully request that you express to the Tariff Commission the need for an adequate tariff on hops. We believe you will readily agree with our position when you have become acquainted with some of the facts listed in the following paragraphs. More detailed information will be forwarded to you in the form of a brief. Oregon has a problem similar to ours and growers from that State are working with Senator Guy Cordon.

At the outset we would like to make it clear that the hop industry is not one that expanded abnormally during the war or during the Korean conflict. There was an increase which resulted in a peak production in 1951. However, production is reduced one-third from the 1951 peak of 63 million pounds and is now estimated at 40 million pounds for 1954. This production is approximately 10 percent above domestic consumption. The reduction in acreage has resulted from drastic reduction in price due to the importation of foreign hops. If this downward trend is continued, it will no longer be economically feasible to produce hops in this country and could easily jeopardize the stability of a once thriving American industry.

About 2 years ago the Commission reduced the tariff from 24 cents to 12 cents on hops imported from Germany, Japan, and all other non-Iron Curtain countries. The impact of this action can easily be demonstrated in an examination of the imports from Germany. The production in Germany increased from 8,528,000 pounds to 37,705,000 pounds in about 10 years. The price has dropped from $1.38 per pound (including tariff) in 1951 to about 50 cents per pound at the present time. Without the long-term contracts between brewers and domestic hop growers, many of our growers would have been forced out of production. You can see that this is a matter sufficiently urgent to justify immediate action if our industry is to survive. It is obvious that if we are to continue the American standards of labor we cannot compete with foreign competition based on cheap labor.

As you may know, most of the hops grown in the United States are produced in California, Oregon, Washington, and Idaho. California's hop production in 1953 amounted to 9,608,000 pounds, with a gross value of production of $4,804,000. This is a reduction of 4,927,000 pounds from the 14,535,000 pounds produced in 1951. Incidentally, those of us in this area are particularly interested because Sacramento, Yolo, and Sutter Counties represent approximately 80 percent of California's production, and the 1953 production for Sacramento County alone was in excess of $2 million. The bulk of this cost is, of course, returned directly to the local area through the payment of wages and the purchase of supplies. This crop requires more hand labor than any other agricultural crop, and, in addition, the investment per acre in trellises and other necessary equipment amounts to from $1,500 to $2,000 an acre, so it prevents the hop grower from rapidly switching his agricultural production to other crops. The value of hop production in Sacramento County in 1953, even with the reduced acreage, was second only to the production of alfalfa hay and barley.

Our industry can survive without Government subsidy, and I can assure you we are anxious to proceed in that manner. With the current market at approximately 35 percent below parity, it is obvious we must have proper protection against the dumping of cheap foreign hops on the American market.

We will deeply appreciate any appropriate action you can take in our behalf.

Sincerely yours,

W. J. Dauenhauer,
Chairman, United Hop
Growers of California.

Aircraft Production in America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STUART SYMINGTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 28, 1954

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an article entitled "Experts Fear Russia Will Nullify United

States Nuclear Edge by 1959, Match Us in Long-Range Jet Bombers," published in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of July 25, 1954.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Experts Fear Russia Will Nullify United States Nuclear Edge by 1959, Match Us in Long-Range Jet Bombers—Aircraft Production in America Tapering Off Just as Soviet Union Begins To Overtake Lead—Moscow Gives Favored Position to Scientists

(By Brig. Gen. Thomas R. Phillips, U. S. A., retired)

Washington, July 24.—A majority of our senior military officials agree with the statement made by Senator Stuart Symington, Democrat, of Missouri, in an address before the Senate this week that the military strength of the United States and its allies is becoming weaker as against the growing strength of the Communists.

They see the western allies making no progress toward overcoming the disparity between Communist and western ground forces.

On the other hand, they see the Soviet Union substantially ahead of the West in defensive air forces and progressing at a rapid rate in the building of long-range bombers, a field in which the United States has been supreme.

They fear that the Soviet Union is substantially ahead of the West in building long-range ballistic rockets.

In nuclear weapons, the Russians were 4 years behind the United States in exploding their first atomic bomb, but only 8 months behind us in exploding their first hydrogen bomb. The picture appears to be that the Russians are gaining where the United States is superior, but we are not gaining where the Soviets are superior. The great elements of Western superiority are our much larger and more varied stock of nuclear weapons, both fission and fusion, and the aircraft to deliver them.

MAY LOSE NUCLEAR EDGE

It is feared that the advantage of our nuclear superiority will be nullified by Soviet advances within 5 years, that within the same period the Russians will draw abreast of us in long-range jet bombers and ahead of us in long-range ballistic rockets.

The United States will still at that time have a margin of advantage in the delivery of bombs because of the peripheral bases around the Soviet Union, but this will hardly be decisive in a contest of mutual destruction with hydrogen bombs. The relative effectiveness of the defenses will be more important than this favorable factor.

Numerically, the Soviet air force in organized combat formations is larger than that of the United States.

The United States Air Force, Navy, and Marines have about 12,500 aircraft, including transports, in combat, formations, although the total inventory is 33,000.

The Russians have 20,000 aircraft in combat formations and 20,000 in reserve. Until recently the Soviet air force was directed primarily toward support of ground operations and defense against United States bombers. In the last 5 years, 15,000 MIG-15's have been assigned to this defense. In Korea our best fighter then, the F-86, just overmatched the MIG-15. Production of the MIG-15 has stopped and that of the MIG-17, an improved version is under way. During the May Day celebration in Moscow this year, 60 to 70 of these new planes flew by. The MIG-17 is believed to be supersonic. Supersonic booms have been heard over Moscow.

The United States is in production with its supersonic F-100, but it has not yet reached combat formations. The Russians are thus ahead of the United States in the race to produce a supersonic interceptor. From what has been learned and estimated about the MIG-17, it is believed to be inferior in speed and other characteristics to the F-100.

TWO 2-ENGINE JET BOMBERS

Two types of two-engined jet light bombers, type 27 and type 31, have been in production in the Soviet Union for about 3 years. They have speeds of between 500 and 600 miles per hour. Production is estimated to be more than 1,000 annually.

At the May Day celebration, the Russians exposed for the first time two new jet bombers, the TU-37 and the TU-39. The new TU-37 was a sensation to observers. Its size was about the same as that of the American B-52, but it was propelled by only 4 engines, as compared to the B-52's 8.

These engines it has been calculated, provide more than twice the thrust of any engine developed in the West. They give the TU-37 a range estimated as about 5,200 nautical miles and a speed in the 500-to-600 miles per hour class. The four engines of high power are more economical of fuel than eight of half the power.

Some foreign observers are of the opinion that the Russians have 27 of these long-range bombers in organized formations. Our experts doubt this, but admit that it is likely the Russians have more than one or two.

They base their reasoning on the fact that in practice rehearsals for the May Day celebration, the TU-37 was flown on 6 or 8 occasions. From their own experience with first models of aircraft, they do not believe this would be possible with only one plane. After every flight, such a complex new device as a long-range jet bomber is forced to go into the shop for correction of defects or modification. Hence our people assume this bomber is in early stages of production.

If this assumption is correct, the Soviets have an intercontinental jet bomber into production ahead of the United States. We have 2 of our 8-engined B-52's, and Boeing is setting up lines for production, but the bombers are far from coming off these lines now.

GREAT ADVANTAGE FOR UNITED STATES

The United States has, of course, a number of wings of the B-36 combined piston and jet intercontinental bomber, so we retain a very great advantage in this field for the present. The advantage will be lost in the next 3 to 5 years when the higher performance jet bombers comes into combat formations.

The TU-39 is a medium two-engined jet bomber somewhat comparable to the United States B-47 medium jet bomber. The B-47 is probably capable of higher performance. The TU-39 is in production, as 40 have been seen in flight. American production of the B-47 is far in excess of Russian production of the TU-39.

MEANING OF DEVELOPMENTS

It is easy to assess the meaning of these developments.

Within 3 to 5 years the Russians will have the means of delivering atomic weapons on the United States equal to our means of delivery against Russia. They will have a force of medium jet bombers to attempt to take out our peripheral bases and to attack our allies in western Europe. They will have a very large force of supersonic interceptors for defense. They will have a very large supply of aircraft of lower performance to support ground operations.

If the high performance aircraft of the United States and our Allies are added together, the West will still be inferior.

Furthermore, the limited missions and usefulness of Navy and Marine aircraft make their inclusion in western totals somewhat deceptive.

The Navy has never been willing to risk its ships for any length of time within range of shore-based aircraft. Consequently its operations are of the hit-and-run variety. The Marines think of themselves as a ready force to be the first in. Then they expect to come out as the Army takes over. Furthermore, the Marines tie down their aviation to ground units in a fashion that is agreed by everyone but the Marines to be extremely wasteful.

There are on our drawing boards supersonic fighters and bombers in the 1,000-miles-per-hour class, but production is years away. We know little about similar plans in the Soviet Union. To keep our technological advantage, it is vital that research and development on these craft be rushed. A crash program is required in the opinion of many officials in this field, as well as in guided missiles, or the United States is in danger of falling behind qualitatively as well as quantitatively.

PLANE OUTPUT TAPERING

Just at this time, while the Soviet Union is overtaking our qualitative lead, aircraft production in the United States is tapering off. With the completion of many of the big orders placed in the last few years after the Korean War started, production of aircraft will decline 50 percent in the next 18 months.

This has already started. One of the most efficient assembly lines and production teams in the United States, at Boeing, on piston-engined tankers, is being closed down with its contract completed. This team has been making heavy tankers for a dollar a pound. Jet tankers are needed, but no contract has been let.

Aircraft procurement is being planned on a basis of the expenditure of $4 billion annually to replace aircraft with a 6 years' obsolescence figure. Obsolescence is relative to the competition that weapons must match.

Instead of this comfortable, stable, and businesslike approach, the national interest requires, Air Force officials say, a stepped-up program of research, development, and production.

This would be more costly, but they look on it as the only way to retain a technical lead over the Russians. The present method is built-in assurance that the Russians will get ahead of us.

GUIDED MISSILES

In the field of guided missiles, it is believed that the Russians have outdistanced the West in development of the long-range ballistic rocket. They took over the German scientists and experimental station at Peenemunde and continued where the Germans left off. The Germans at that time were years ahead of the West.

It is believed here that the United States is in advance of the Russians in the development of the smaller guided rockets for antiaircraft defense, air-to-air use by fighters and in support of the battlefield. This confidence may, however, be due only to the small amount of information available.

We wonder how the oppressive Communist system is able to match our efforts both in volume and technical proficiency. Senator Symington told the Senate one reason when he said, "While we devote only a small part of our resources to the building of our new weapons military strength, the Communists are devoting a very large percentage of their resources to creating such strength."

And he also said they are graduating twice as many engineers annually as we are.

But these reasons are not the whole story. The Russians have been able to carry out crash programs simultaneously in jet bombers and guided missiles successfully, a major technical achievement.

FAVORED PLACE FOR SCIENTIST

One reason for their success is the favored position of the successful scientist and technician in Russia. Success in these fields in Russia is equivalent, in benefits, to making a million dollars in the United States. The Russian scientists and technicians have far greater incentives than ours. They provide for their own and their families' future by working 60- and 70-hour weeks in a struggle for accomplishment.

The scientists and technicians are selected from among the brightest youth in the Soviet Union and their schooling is a charge on the state. So not only are the abler youth directed into such critical fields, but they are also provided with great incentives to success and disgrace in case of failure.

The Soviet ground forces are still estimated to number about 175 divisions and 40 divisions of artillery, antiaircraft artillery, and other supporting units. They have been reequipped since the war. About 90 of them are available in western Russia and Eastern Europe.

The 65 satellite divisions in Eastern Europe have steadily improved in training and dependability. Where once they were more a liability than an asset, they now, with variations between different countries, are of some value. Their value will increase as young men who have never known anything but Communist loyalties become the larger proportion of their makeup.

The 90 Soviet divisions initially available in Europe from the Baltic Sea to Yugoslavia are opposed by western divisions of about one-third the number and half the power.

Failure to rearm Germany and build up the forces of other Western European countries has reached the point where the only hope of successful ground defense is by the massive use of atomic weapons. In that respect we have passed the point of no return. Our own weakness on the ground insures that we have to fight an atomic war with all the horrors that it involves.

The military people are terrified that, while our relative military position is deteriorating, the peace in Indochina and demands for economy will bring about a letdown instead of the increased effort to advance in armament that they see as necessary.

Senator SYMINGTON in his address to the Senate quoted a passage from one of Sir Winston Churchill's books which Churchill had given to him and marked for him on his trip to Europe this spring. This was written 6 years ago.

"No one in his senses," Churchill wrote, "can believe that we have a limitless period of time ahead of us. We ought to bring matters to a head and make a final settlement."

"We ought not to go jogging along, improvident, incompetent, waiting for something to turn up—by which I mean something bad to turn up."

SYMINGTON added:

"But we have been 'jogging along, improvident, incompetent, waiting for something to turn up,' and what has turned up has been bad."

1954 Platform of the South Dakota Republican Party

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 28, 1954

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a copy of the 1954 platform adopted at the State convention of the South Dakota Republican Party, which met at Pierre, S. Dak., during the last weekend. I call my colleagues' attention especially to the plank on agriculture set forth in the platform.

There being no objection, the platform was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

1954 PLATFORM, SOUTH DAKOTA REPUBLICAN PARTY

PREAMBLE

We ask the prayers of everyone in seeking a continuing peace for our tortured world.

We pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

We, the Republican Party in South Dakota, rededicate ourselves to those principles which animated our forefathers who settled this broad land. Those principles must be preserved.

AGRICULTURE

Agriculture is the most important industry in South Daktota and it is the basic economic activity of our entire Nation. When agriculture is prosperous and sound, our Nation and our State are prosperous and sound.

The farmers of South Dakota and the Republican Party in the State and Nation are intelligently recognizing the seriousness of the farm problem and are working toward an ultimate fair and final solution. We view with confidence the positive efforts and high purpose of President Eisenhower in attempting to solve the long-range problems of farm and farmers' prosperity.

We feel that until such time that the farmers of this State can attain full parity at the market place, a minimum support level of 90 percent on basic farm commodities should be maintained. We feel that our administration's long-range goal of permanent farmer prosperity can best be attained in this manner and pledge our support of such a program.

We commend the REA and the RTA for their quick action under the Eisenhower administration in expediting the process of loan applications and in making funds available to the cooperatives. REA loans to electric and telephone borrowers in the fiscal year 1954 totaled $241,000,000—the highest since 1951.

We commend President Eisenhower and the Republican Congress for removing price controls from meat products and for moving rapidly to meet the dangers of a depressing market in the livestock industry.

For providing farmers with additional grain storage. (In 1954 the Nation will have enough bins to store 1,123,000,000 bushels.)

For the expedited program for the disposal of surplus foods and fabrics to foreign consumers in a new "exchange of value program," and for furnishing State institutions, welfare clients, Indians, and the school-lunch programs with surplus agricultural commodities.

For extending the Federal crop insurance program, and for sponsoring legislation that returned the activities of the farm credit administration to the farmer.

For expanding the soil conservation and watershed programs through the enactment of new legislation providing for the establishment of watershed areas and for making both direct and indirect loans available to farmers and ranchers for soil and water conservation purposes.

For the successful negotiation of a new international wheat agreement and for effective action in imposing import controls for cotton, wheat, dairy products, oats, flaxseed, peanuts, rye, and shelled almonds.

For the substantial new emphasis and support given the programs of agricultural research and education.

For the prompt action which was taken in making emergency funds available to farmers and ranchers in drought- and flood-stricken areas through the Farmers Home Administration.

We favor the continued expansion of vocational, agricultural, and homemaking programs, of 4-H Club programs, school-lunch programs, of the services jointly sponsored by State-Federal cooperation through our State College of Agriculture located in Brookings. We further favor storage of surplus commodities on the farm, and we also recognize the importance of farmer-owned cooperatives to the farm economy.

We shall, as a responsible political party, continue our concerted efforts to improve farm living conditions and to assure freedom of opportunity so that young people will be encouraged to remain on the farm and in rural communities in the firm conviction that one of the bastions of freedom in this Republic is the farmer-owned and farmer-operated American farm.

COMMUNISM

We have always recognized communism to be a conspiracy against freedom and religion. We have never compromised with communism and we have fought to expose and eliminate it in Government and American life.

We pledge ourselves to a continuous fight against communism and the influence of Communists both at home and abroad.

We especially commend Senator KARL E. MUNDT, of South Dakota, for the outstanding service he has rendered to the United States of America in our fight against communism.

CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION

The constitution of the State of South Dakota was adopted 65 years ago. Since that time tremendous changes have taken place. It is well to examine our basic law and take action to make it conform to the requirements of recent times. Other States are doing this.

Our State constitution contains approximately 20,000 words. It is one of the longest State constitutions. It contains much legislative material; it contains much obsolete and archaic material. The constitution should be remodeled to better adapt the structure and operation of our government to modern conditions.

It is recommended that a constitutional convention be called at the earliest appropriate time to revise our basic law to fit the requirements of progressing and changing times.

EDUCATION

The State constitution says, in section 1, article VIII, in part: "* * * It shall be the duty of the legislature to establish and maintain a general and uniform system of public schools wherein tuition shall be without charge and equally open to all. * * *"

The responsibility for public education, kindergarten through college and university, lies with the people of South Dakota expressing their desires through the State legislature and the executive branch of our State government. The State government in turn has delegated supervision, administration, and financing of elementary and secondary education to school districts, which operate within the framework of State laws.

We believe—

1. That all agencies of government concerned with public education should support such measures as will promote the reorganization of our school districts into more economical and efficient units.

2. That the legislature should continue to pass such laws as will tend to equalize the property tax burden for elementary and secondary schools over the State.

3. We believe in State aid for public elementary and secondary schools and pledge

ourselves to continue such aid in benefiting those school districts which are efficiently organized and making satisfactory efforts to provide good educational systems.

4. That we need to continue to support our institutions of higher education adequately so they may continue to serve the needs of our people.

5. That the permanent school fund and lands are a sacred trust that have been given to the public schools and must be held inviolate.

6. That the department of public instruction and the State board of education should be given such powers as necessary to handle adequately statewide functions of education.

We pledge ourselves to support such measures as will tend to accomplish these things that we believe.

ELECTIONS

We favor extending the closing of the polls from 5 p. m. to 8 p. m.

In the event the candidate for governor does not receive 35 percent of the popular vote in the primary elections, we would endorse a run-off election between the two candidates receiving the largest number of votes.

We recommend that the legislature consider the appropriate extension of the State primary election for use in the nomination of candidates for the office of lieutenant governor. Since the lieutenant governor in certain circumstances may become governor, an elective office, and since nomination by convention may at times result in a change of the party represented, we recommend consideration of both nomination and election by the same process as for governor.

HIGHWAYS

In order to provide an efficient, safe, and economical highway system for the people of South Dakota and for the benefit of the economy of the State we endorse the following:

A sound and continuing highway program based on present and reasonably anticipated needs. The program to provide a balanced improvement of primary, rural, and urban highways.

Priority of improvements to be based on fact-finding surveys conducted by the State, or its subdivisions, in cooperation with the Bureau of Public Roads, to the end that highways with the greatest traffic demand be improved first.

Immediate establishment of sound and realistic personnel policies which will attract and hold technical services necessary to accomplish the objectives.

Utilization of private enterprise to the maximum extent in the construction and maintenance of highways.

Planning for meeting future public demands for an expanded highway program in the State and Nation.

We commend our junior United States Senator FRANCIS CASE who, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Works, authored and obtained passage of a Federal aid to States highway appropriation bill which returns to the respective States the full amount of gasoline tax collected by the Federal Government.

INDIANS

The Republican Party favors the establishment of a program to plan for the economic rehabilitation of our Indian citizens by establishing industry on or near the reservations wherever possible, which will absorb the excess supply of labor.

The Republican Party pledges itself to a continuation of the work of the Commission of Indian Affairs, and to actively respond to its findings and recommendations.

The Republican Party further pledges itself to seek rights for all Indians equal to those of other citizens of the State and Nation.

To enable the Indian to help himself attain the goal of complete emancipation, the Republican Party urges the Federal Government to expand and improve the health programs on the reservations, continue and enlarge the reservation road program authorized on July 1, 1954, and promulgate an equitable resettlement plan to meet the problems resulting from the Missouri River Basin development.

LABOR

We recognize the great contribution labor has made resulting in industrial progress in our State. We recognize that harmony between management and labor is necessary to promote proper employer-employee relations.

We will protect the right of the individual to work, irrespective of his membership or nonmembership in a labor union, and we advocate the solution of labor problems on a State level rather than a national level.

LAW ENFORCEMENT AND HIGHWAY SAFETY

We fully recognize the growing importance of safe highway transportation and feel that traffic laws should be studied and revised where necessary to provide greater uniformity in regulation governing safe movement of traffic. We further commend the present administration on its gradual increase in the number of highway patrolmen; we recommend that this program be continued in order to provide thorough traffic law enforcement, and that adequate funds be provided for this purpose.

LEGISLATIVE RESEARCH COUNCIL

We recommend continuing study of State government by the Legislative Research Council and Little Hoover Commission, and commend them for their past accomplishments.

We pledge increased support for both.

MENTAL HEALTH

The needs of the State institutions which care for the mentally ill are recognized as important State problems.

We pledge our efforts to assist in the solving of personnel and building needs to the end that a greater percentage of those so afflicted may be rehabilitated and returned as useful citizens in their own communities, and we recommend a further expansion of psychiatric help and care throughout the State for the mentally ill who do not require institutional care.

MISSOURI BASIN DEVELOPMENT

The Republican Party reaffirms its stanch belief that full benefit should be derived from development of the Missouri River. We believe that South Dakotans should give strong support to the Missouri River development program that will mean so much in living enjoyment and prosperity for the people of this State.

The Republican Party recognizes that the multiple benefits produced from the Missouri River program will improve agriculture and encourage industrial development that will supplement our agricultural income. The Republican Party believes that power and other benefits of the river program should be distributed to the people at the cheapest possible rates consistent with sound economics.

NATURAL RESOURCES AND OIL

We support a continuous vigorous program for development of our State's natural resources and commend the Natural Resources Commission for its past achievements.

We again advocate preparation for possible oil development in South Dakota by strengthening laws on oil conservation and by providing for a fair method of oil taxation.

PUBLIC WELFARE

The Republican Party reaffirms its pledge to insure proper care for those of our people who by reason of age, illness, or other incapacities are unable to properly care for themselves.

The 1953 Republican Legislature determined that a thorough study should be made of those needs. A special legislative committee is making this study.

We pledge ourselves to give serious consideration to the recommendations of this committee and to support those plans which seem best designed to advance the welfare of that important segment of our citizens.

TAXATION

Under the leadership of the Republican Party a tax program has been carried out which has enabled the State to: Operate on a pay-as-you-go basis; reduce taxes wherever and whenever possible; afford the citizens of South Dakota outstanding services and benefits.

The Republican Party pledges itself to a continuation of this sound fiscal policy, and that no new taxes are necessary excepting for highway purposes.

We further recommend continued research and study by the Legislative Research Council, looking to the improvement of our system of assessment and taxation in order that the taxload may be fairly distributed and that we may be assured of an equitable distribution of tax revenue from all sources to the State, counties, townships, school districts, and municipalities.

VETERANS

The Republican Party acknowledges the obligations which the State owes to those whose personal sacrifices were incurred for the benefit of all.

We pledge continued assistance to veterans in obtaining benefits to which by law they are entitled, including strict compliance with veterans preference laws in Federal service.

We urge that business and industry give special consideration to the employment of the disabled.

We favor the continuation of the Veterans' Administration as a separate and distinct agency in dealing with veterans affairs.

REPUBLICAN ACHIEVEMENTS

We commend our State administration under the able direction of Governor Sigurd Anderson who has demonstrated, by example, the practical application of sound Republican principles.

We likewise commend our congressional delegation in Washington, Senators KARL MUNDT and FRANCIS CASE, and Representatives HAROLD O. LOVRE and E. Y. BERRY, who have continuously advanced the best interest of the people of our State and Nation.

The Republican Party stands for solid, efficient and economic government in South Dakota. Its record speaks for itself. On August 1, 1954, South Dakota will pay off its last bond, calling the bonds before they are due, so that the State will save almost $260,000 annually in interest and become debt-free for the first time in 37 years.

The State officials and particularly the Governor have strongly supported the Missouri Basin development program which will prove so beneficial to South Dakota.

The Republican Party has continually worked to keep taxes at an absolute minimum and point with pride to the low per capita taxes paid by citizens of this State as compared to other States in the Union. The cost of State government in South Dakota compares favorably with other States. Costs in 1951 in South Dakota were $83.68 per person; North Dakota, $116.41; Minnesota, $96.37; Iowa, $93.71; Wyoming, $147.43; and Nebraska, $67.06.

These and other constructive accomplishments tell the story of Republican leadership in South Dakota.

CONCLUSION

The Republican Party of the State of South Dakota subscribes to the foregoing platform of State and national objectives. We stand confident that it expresses the hopes of the citizens of this State, and pledge ourselves to use every effort in attaining these goals.

We pray God to keep us on our road to peace with freedom, to prosperity with health and happiness, and to a sound State government ably administered.

"Fondly do we hope and fervently do we pray that we may find everlasting peace amongst ourselves and all nations."

What Now for Korea?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 28, 1954

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, in view of the visit to Washington of President Syngman Rhee to discuss United States expenditures concerning both military and economic aid for the Republic of Korea, it seems particularly propitious to enter into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD today an excerpt from an article written by Mr. Edgar Monsanto Queeny and published in the November 1953 issue of Monsanto magazine. This article was composed by Mr. Queeny subsequent to his visit to Korea as a member of a Special Committee of the American-Korean Foundation, sent there to analyze the relief and industrial rehabilitation problems of the ROK. We have learned from the amended House Concurrent Resolution 219, filed by my distinguished colleague, Hon. PAUL SHAFER, of Michigan, on July 20, 1954, that from the viewpoint of industrial rehabilitation we are presently confronted in the ROK with what Mr. SHAFER aptly describes as "an incredible paradox." This vital problem can and must be promptly and constructively solved, and in finding a solution, President Rhee and his people, and the American people too, should be greatly aided by their ability to refer to these selected comments and recommendations taken from Mr. Queeny's article. For the Korean people have no better friend than Mr. Queeny, nor one better informed about the onerous conditions and problems which they, with our help, must overcome. We all desire to help President Rhee and his brave people safeguard and reconstruct their shattered country; and surely the American people can find no one better qualified to advise us intelligently, in this respect, than Mr. Queeny, one of the greatest and most successful of the great industrialists whose genius have made our American productive system the wonder and envy of the world. Here are the excerpts:

WHAT NOW FOR KOREA?

It speaks well for Korean intuition that capable men, although inexperienced, were elected. The assembly, in turn, adopted a constitution and elected Syngman Rhee President of the Republic of Korea—ROK.[1]

The constitution was drafted with the advice of American experts.

It is significant, if one desires to understand the ideology of these official American advisers, to consider articles 85, 87, and 88 of Korea's Constitution. They provide that the State itself shall own all mines and other underground resources (oil), marine and waterpower resources; that all railroads and other important transportation enterprises, banks, insurance, electricity, irrigation, water and gas supplies shall be operated by the state; that "in order to meet with urgent necessities of national defense or national life, private enterprises shall be transferred to state or public ownership or their management shall be controlled by or transferred to the state. * * *"

In order to put this new American-communism in business, ownership of all Japanese property—which included almost all mines, railroads, powerplants, banks, insurance companies, and almost all important industries—was transferred to the Republic of Korea.

No wonder Ambassador Muccio urged a bewildered President Rhee to take Communists into his government. Communism's cardinal tenet is state ownership of all means of production, transportation, and communication.

And there is a very disturbing political note in the plans of all official reconstruction agencies. All the railroads, powerplants, mines, fertilizer, glass, steel, and other facilities that are projected are, in accordance with the Korean Constitution, to become the property of the Korean state. The anomaly is that a neocommunism or a complete socialism will be re-created in Korea by the taxation of private enterprise and individuals in the United States.

Syngman Rhee and his ministers indicated a desire to encourage private enterprise and foreign capital to invest in Korea, but no American private capital will enter a country which has a constitution providing that the State may expropriate it "to meet * * * the urgent necessities of national life." Rhee told us that, to encourage such investment, he would recommend changing laws if necessary. I am certain he was sincere.

The Eisenhower administration clearly favors the private ownership and operation of business. Why not extend this policy abroad? Rhee's attitude opens the way and America's large appropriations for Korea's rehabilitation should influence any recalcitrant members of the Korean Assembly. For Korea's own good, its constitution must be changed to permit private ownership of the now nationalized industries and protect against expropriation any new capital, Korean or foreign, that might be invested.

Rhee: Redeemer of Korean Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 28, 1954

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, the history of the struggle for Korean independence has been an arduous and a bloody one, and it is far from over today. For over 50 years the spirit and sinew behind the Korean movement has been the aging President of the Republic of Korea, Syngman Rhee. He has literally spent his entire life educating, first himself and then the world, to the need for autonomy and self-rule in his own nation. During the Korean war his people rallied again and again to his words of leadership. Many of his countrymen spent their lives in defense of the spirit of liberty and freedom which he has for so long examplified.

I call to your attention, Mr. Speaker, a very apt and true-to-fact article by David Lawrence from the Evening Star of Tuesday, July 27, telling of the dynamic leader of the Korean people.

Syngman Rhee stands today as the strongest link in the free world's chain of defense in the Far East. The fate or success of the Korean people is entwined inseparably with our own.

May it happen that we always remember the sacrifices of the Korean nation and the devotion and fidelity of their President, Syngman Rhee.

The editorial from the Evening Star follows:

SYNGMAN RHEE RETURNS HOME—WOODROW WILSON ONCE REFERRED TO ROK PRESIDENT AS "FUTURE REDEEMER OF KOREA'S INDEPENDENCE"

(By David Lawrence)

Syngman Rhee, President of the Republic of Korea, has come back home—for in this country he spent 33 years of his exile after 7 years in a Japanese prison.

He is a world figure today, but few of us knew him as we sat on the same platform to receive degrees at Princeton University in June 1910. He had studied there for a doctorate and had majored in international law and American history. Previously he had received a master of arts degree at Harvard and his first academic degree at George Washington University.

Curiously enough, while studying at Princeton, young Rhee became acquainted with Woodrow Wilson, then the head of the university, who often introduced him to friends as "the future redeemer of Korea's independence."

Few men in modern history have fought so long and so bravely for the independence of their native land. Associated as he was with the work of the Presbyterian Board of Foreign Missions in Korea, the youthful patriot strove constantly as a speaker and as a writer to interest the people of this and other countries in the future of Korea.

To hear Syngman Rhee, the gentle-mannered man of intellectual attainment and deep-seated belief in the doctrines of representative government characterized as a "dictator" or as a man who brushes aside constitutionalism—as critics abroad have pictured him—is to accept the propaganda attempts to discredit him which have been made by the Communists and left wing in Europe and to some extent in this country.

Syngman Rhee has had some tough decisions to make in wartime, and he has had to deal severely with attempts to infiltrate his government by subversives, but his record as constitutional President—and particularly the reforms which he has championed—bear out the faith and trust that Americans who have known him have placed in him.

Many times, in the dark days while the Japanese held an iron hand over Korea, Syngman Rhee sat at the home of a friend in nearby Virginia and chatted with this writer about his hopes for Korean independence. It has been a long and melancholy struggle for him, and now that he has returned here to address a joint session of Congress and to receive the plaudits of the American people for his brave stand in leading his countrymen against the Communist aggressor, it is indeed historic vindication of a man with a moral principle.

Syngman Rhee is nearly 80, but he has a strong and vigorus mind which has not forgotten the trials and tribulations of the far eastern history in which he has so long played a vital part. He fears the Japanese still but knows that sooner or later the

---

[1] In 1952 Rhee was reelected by a direct vote of the people, receiving 86 percent of the votes cast.

Japanese and Koreans must work together against their common enemy—the Red Chinese and Soviets. He is deeply interested in reconstructing his country, which has suffered the awful ravages of many years of war. The average American little realizes the fact that the Koreans killed during the period of fighting number in the millions and that the Koreans are a race entirely separate from the Chinese, quite capable of developing its autonomy in the world.

Indeed, the time may come when a standing army of Koreans numbering 1 million trained soldiers may prove the counterbalancing force in a military way in the Far East holding at bay the aggressor armies of the Communist Chinese.

The key to American policy in the Far East is a recognition that things will not soon change in that area and that strong allies are indispensable. It is essential, therefore, that friendly relations between Japan and Korea be established and this may prove possible if a regional defense pact is some day developed in which Japan can play an important military part.

But the emphasis of the hour is on ways and means of reconstructing Korea. The visit of the President of the Republic is opportune because the Geneva Conference revealed all too clearly that the Communists have no intention of agreeing to the unification of Korea. More than two-thirds of the population is in South Korea and, if the Republic is strengthened, it may in due time exercise a big influence on the people of North Korea, who silently watch the Red Chinese take steps virtually to annex the northern territory. Since patriotism runs deep among the Korean people, the Red China government cannot be relieved of the burden of policing that area and keeping large bodies of troops there; a circumstance which some day will be of vast importance if the people of China rise up in a liberation movement. At that moment will come also the chance for North Koreans to regain their liberty, too.

Syngman Rhee comes here to work out a program of economic reconstruction on which the United States has promised to help. The emphasis of his mission is on peaceful effort; a change from the days when it was being predicted that Syngman Rhee would go it alone. For he has learned to put his faith in the sincerity and wisdom of the American Government and in the conviction that it will never let him or his country down.

One Hundred Years of Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 22, 1954

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to note the forthcoming 100th anniversary of the founding of St. Mary's Roman Catholic Church in Jersey City, N. J.

St. Mary's has served the downtown section of Jersey City for all of these 100 years. It has nurtured and guided great men. It has developed thousands of wonderful Americans. It has given to four wars, noble and courageous sons.

St. Mary's is the first church in America that was dedicated to the dogma of the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin Mary, and on December 8, 1954, its wonderful parishioners and old friends will celebrate this anniversary. They have much in common during the close of this Marian Year.

St. Mary's was the first church in Jersey City to found a hospital, long before any municipal hospitals ever existed, and strangely enough the first 50 patients were orphans of Union soldiers during the Civil War.

The pastors and clergy that have served St. Mary's have been wonderful men richly endowed and dedicated for God's service. The heritage that has been left to those who remain is one of service and dedication to God.

Today the pastor of St. Mary's is the Reverend John Henry Byrne, a man like his predecessors, humble and assisting, always.

That God may continue to shower His blessings on St. Mary's faithful clergy and parishioners is the wish of all of us who know of the service His church has given to the people of Jersey City.

New Trends in American Immigration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 28, 1954

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address made by Edward S. Maney, Director, Visa Office, Department of State, before the National Council on Naturalization and Citizenship, New York, N. Y., on April 2, 1954:

NEW TRENDS IN AMERICAN IMMIGRATION

(By Edward S. Maney)

The National Council on Naturalization and Citizenship, I understand, is primarily concerned with the problems of the immigrant who wishes to integrate into the American community and to become a citizen of the United States. From this point of view the members of the council will be interested in certain changes which the Immigration and Nationality Act has brought about in the immigration field and which will be reflected in the composition of the group that makes up our new immigrants.

The Immigration and Nationality Act, which was enacted on June 27, 1952, has now been in operation for more than 15 months. Almost unnoticed by the general public, this act has brought about a number of changes that have proven beneficial to those who wish to come to the United States and have in many ways facilitated the administration of the law.

Before I discuss with you some of these changes, let me remind you that the basic concepts of the Immigration and Nationality Act are not different from those which have been the basis of American immigration policy ever since there has been a limitation on the number of immigrants to the United States. I am discussing these basic concepts not only because they have remained unchanged but also because they relate to American immigration policy, which is the responsibility of the Congress of the United States. I will discuss with you changes the new law has brought about and which have become most obvious to us in the Visa Office of the Department of State during these last 15 months.

One of the most troublesome problems consular officers in the field and we in the Department of State had to deal with before the new law became effective was that of an American citizen who had married a woman of Asian ancestry and discovered only too late that under our laws then in existence he had only the choice between his country and his wife since our laws, with few exceptions, then did not permit the immigration of persons of Asian stock.

One of the most important changes the new law has brought about is the elimination of race as a bar to immigration. Alien wives and husbands of American citizens and alien children of American citizens are now eligible for immigration and entitled to nonquota status irrespective of their race. While it is true that the quotas accorded to Asian peoples are minimum quotas, it must be borne in mind that the volume of immigration from a given area is composed of both quota and nonquota immigrants and the latter group of course may exceed without limit the numerical limitations placed on quota immigrants. This is best illustrated by the fact that during the last fiscal year 1,043 Chinese and 2,489 Japanese came to the United States as immigrants, although Japan has a quota of only 185 and only 105 quota numbers are available to Chinese persons. In evaluating these data it must be recalled that racial bars to immigration were not lowered until the second half of the 1953 fiscal year.

CHANGES IN QUOTA CHARGEABILITY

Another important change that the new law has brought about is a general relaxation of the method by which the quota chargeability of an alien is determined. The basic rule remains unchanged that the quota of an alien is determined by his place of birth. While formerly only an alien wife chargeable to an oversubscribed quota could be charged to the more favorable quota of her accompanying husband, under the new law a husband as well as a wife may be charged to the more favorable quota of the accompanying spouse. For example, the Greek husband of an English woman may be charged to the quota of Great Britain.

Similarly, a child may now be charged to his own quota, the quota of his accompanying father, or that of his mother, whichever of the three is most favorable. In the past a child mandatorily had to be charged to the quota of the accompanying father. This relaxation of the law which may seem unimportant, I assure you, has brought relief to many an immigrant family by giving them an opportunity to come to the United States together rather than choosing between separation or waiting together abroad.

Another change relating to the quota chargeability has brought relief for many hardship cases for which there was no satisfactory solution under the old law. In a considerable number of cases prospective immigrants born in countries with small and oversubscribed quotas had to be given the discouraging information that they had to anticipate an indefinite waiting period under the quota of their country of birth although they had no tie to the country of their birth.

The typical example is that of an alien born in India while his British parents were stationed there as missionaries or that of a Swiss person born in Egypt whose father was stationed there as a consular officer of his country. The law now permits that an alien who was born in a country in which neither of his parents was born and in which neither of his parents had a residence at the time of such alien's birth may be charged to the quota of either parent. In other words, to use our examples, the alien born in India may be charged to the British quota to which his parents would have been chargeable, and the alien who was born as son of the Swiss

Consul in Egypt may be charged to the quota of Switzerland.

Fuller use of existing quotas is made possible under the new law by permitting that any portion of a given quota not used during the first 10 months of a quota year may be used without numerical limitation during May and June, that is, the last 2 months of the quota year. The restriction on the use of quotas to 10 percent of each quota per month that now is applicable only during the first 10 months applied to every month of the quota year under the old law. Thus, quota numbers were lost if a demand for immigration visas in excess of 20 percent developed in May and June of a year under a quota that had not been utilized up to 80 percent during the first 10 months of the same quota year.

The prohibition against the immigration of manual labor, the so-called "contract labor provision" of the old law, by and large restricted immigration to the United States to relatives and close friends of American citizens and of permanent resident aliens. Aliens with good skills and many of them needed in this country but lacking family or friendship ties as a rule could not come to this country as they were unable to secure an acceptable affidavit of support as evidence that they were not likely to become public charges. Thus real "new-seed immigration" had become unknown in this country except for those immigrants who benefited under the Displaced Persons Act of 1948.

This situation has been drastically changed by two provisions of the new law. On one hand the outdated and inflexible contract labor law was eliminated. Now an alien is permitted to make arrangements for his employment before he comes to the United States and may submit evidence about his employment to show that he is not likely to become a public charge. Only if the Secretary of Labor certifies that there exists an oversupply of a given skill in a given locality of the United States will the immigration of aliens be barred who possess such skill and who are coming to this locality. No such finding has so far been made by the Secretary of Labor.

The other provision of the new law that is helping the "new-seed immigrant" as well as American industry, business, and cultural interests is the one giving a first claim to one-half of the quota of each country to aliens whose services are needed urgently in the United States because of their high education, technical training, specialized experience, or exceptional ability and to their spouses and children.

The provision permitting immigrants to have employment before coming to the United States eventually will make itself felt also in the distribution of immigrants throughout the United Staets. As long as immigrants had to rely for their immigration on affidavits of support from relatives and friends in this country, the traditional trend of the immigrant movement continued to be to urban areas where there was already considerable immigrant settlement. Now it is to be expected that the settlement of new immigrants in the United States will not only be influenced by their tendency to go where they have friends or relatives but that it will be guided by job opportunities throughout the country.

SECURITY PROVISIONS

Some misunderstanding seems to exist in the mind of the general public as to the effect the new law has had on the security provision applicable to immigrants. The opinion seems to be widespread that the new law is more exacting in that respect. Actually the reverse is true.

For all practicable purposes the new law has reenacted the security provisions that had been part of the immigration laws since the passage in 1950 of the Internal Security Act. One significant change, however, has taken place. In the past, and ever since 1940, not only present but also former members of proscribed organizations were excluded from admission into the United States as immigrants. For example, an alien who in his youth some 20 to 30 years ago was a member of the Communist Party was still ineligible to receive a visa regardless of the fact that long since he had given up his early political associations and had since become an outspoken fighter against communism.

The new law contains an escape clause for former voluntary members of proscribed organizations, a fact that has been given little if any publicity. The defector clause contained in the new law permits the issuance of a visa to a former voluntary member of a proscribed organization if the alien since the termination of his membership and for at least 5 years before the date of his visa application has been actively opposed to the principles and ideology of the proscribed organization of which he was a member.

This provision of law has made it possible to admit to the United States as immigrants a number of aliens whose record of the past years has justified that the United States show forgiveness for past political association and has thus enabled us at least indirectly to encourage future defections.

After this trial period of 15 months, we in the Visa Office, can say that the new law as far as it affects the visa function of the Department of State constitutes a considerable improvement over the earlier laws. I hope my brief presentation has shown you that the new law tends to keep families united in migration, makes the use of quotas more flexible, and facilitates the admission of "new-seed immigrants." It gives due recognition to the need in the United States for certain skills, professional knowledge, and ability. It also opens the door to those who in the past were permanently barred for reasons of race or as a result of former and long past political affiliations.

I know that some of you are critical of the basic philosophy of our immigration laws, particularly its national-origins quota system, which actually goes back to the Immigration Act of 1924. In all fairness to the new law, this criticism I think should be divorced from a recognition of the fact that the new law has brought many important improvements over the old law, particularly in relation to its treatment of immigrants.

In their administration, laws can be interpreted literally and restrictively. On the other hand, they can be given a reasonable and humane interpretation. I want you to know that ever since the Immigration and Nationality Act has become effective, we in the Visa Office have made every effort, without doing violence to the plain intent of the law, to interpret it reasonably and humanely. In our frequent discussions with the congressional committees on questions relating to the interpretation and administration of the law, we have found that it is also their desire to see the law administered in a commonsense manner.

I should like to use this opportunity to express my deep appreciation of the fine cooperation we in the Department of State have enjoyed in our close work with the Immigration and Naturalization Service. Ever since the new law was enacted, we have been meeting regularly with representatives of the Service and in close cooperation have worked out the various problems that naturally would arise in the implementation of a new statute. I am glad to say that we have been able to work out each and every problem that has come to our attention during these first 15 months.

Although I am not speaking here for the Immigration and Naturalization Service, I am certain I can say both for that Service and for the Department of State that we have done everything and will continue to do everything possible to interpret and administer the immigration laws consistent with the intent of Congress and in the best interest of the United States.

Postal Field Service Employees

SPEECH

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 21, 1954

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I intend to vote today for H. R. 9245 to increase the rates of basic compensation of postmasters, officers, and employees in the postal field service.

This is one bill in which there has not been complete agreement. I will admit the bill does not satisfy me entirely. However, all of us have seen legislation in the past few weeks come to the floor of this House to which we had individual objections. To me the test of this legislation is—does it serve the overall purpose which is intended when it is brought to the floor of the House. I believe this bill does have some things which will receive general approval and for those reasons it should be enacted. Let me point those out briefly:

First. This bill provides a permanent 5-percent increase for all postal employees with a minimum of $200 per year and a maximum of $400 for any employee except fourth-class postmasters and hourly employees.

Second. A much-needed uniform allowance annually for those employees required to wear uniforms is provided in this bill.

Third. A fourth longevity grade for all personnel in post offices.

Fourth. An increase is made allowable per diem for employees in the transportation service up to $9 per day from the present rate of $6 per day.

Fifth. This legislation will modify the existing law which restricts the number of permanent appointees in the Federal service. This has merit in permitting more permanent appointments to a large number of temporary and indefinite employees in the field service. This makes for better stabilization and a greater attraction to better personnel.

Sixth. There will now be provided a biweekly pay period for all postal personnel in the field service.

To me these are much-needed improvements for the personnel in the postal field generally. It has been 3 years since there has been any increase of salary to postal people. This increase is needed at this time, and something should be done about it before this Congress adjourns.

I do not know whether or not we are going to vote on any other bill during this session at all, but I do know that these provisions of this bill are needed sufficiently by postal personnel who deserve our consideration today.

I think all of the Members of the House have realized for some time that in the civil service system there exists a wage scale that keeps employees living on a marginal basis from year to year. This is now one of the more important matters under consideration by personnel boards here in an attempt to work out some equity in the situation. I believe that a majority of the Members of Congress believe that such an adjustment is fair and should be brought about.

As all of us know, both parties have been desiring an adjournment on August 1, or shortly thereafter. If we are to bring any realism into this situation we are going to have to give relief to the postal employees before we adjourn. It appears that this may be the only opportunity we will have for such a vote. These are my reasons for supporting this bill today.

National Wildlife Federation Asks Reconsideration of New Land Acquisition Policy of Department of Interior and Corps of Engineers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 27, 1954

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, sportsmen and the general public will be denied enjoyment of recreational use of many thousands of acres under a new land acquisition policy recently promulgated jointly by the Department of Interior and Corps of Engineers. Conservationists throughout the country are practically unanimous in their belief that this policy is contrary to the public interests. They state, and I am in agreement with them, that it will affect wildlife resources and recreational opportunities in connection with Federal reservoir projects.

Under leave to do so, I insert herewith communications from the National Wildlife Federation on this subject:

NATIONAL WILDLIFE FEDERATION,
Washington, D. C., July 26, 1954.

DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: The National Wildlife Federation is gravely concerned about the new land acquisition policy promulgated jointly by the Department of Interior and Corps of Engineers, approved January 13, 1954, and published in the Federal Register as Order No. 2744. We believe this policy to be contrary to the public interest as it affects wildlife resources and recreational opportunities in connection with Federal reservoir projects.

In brief, the policy restricts to the minimum Federal land acquisition in connection with the projects. This does two things which we regard contrary to the public interest:

1. It virtually eliminates opportunities for wildlife and fisheries management on periphery lands and shorelines.

2. It limits public access for recreational purposes and favors commercial exploitation by private land owners.

As secretary of the National Wildlife Federation I was instructed to send you a copy of a resolution adopted unanimously by the Federation's board of directors meeting at Rolla, Mo., June 19–20, 1954. The resolution is attached.

This land acquisition policy was not induced or established by legislation and legislation is probably not required to correct it. We believe, however, that the matter is of sufficient importance to be called to the attention of Members of Congress. We hope you will use your influence to protect the public interest.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES H. CALLISON,
Secretary.

RESOLUTION ON CORPS OF ARMY ENGINEERS AND INTERIOR DEPARTMENT JOINT POLICY ON LAND ACQUISITION, ADOPTED BY BOARD OF DIRECTORS, NATIONAL WILDLIFE FEDERATION, MEETING IN ROLLA, MO., JUNE 19–20, 1954

The board of directors of the National Wildlife Federation, representing through its 47 State affiliated wildlife organizations more than 3 million sportsmen-conservationists, respectfully urges the Department of the Interior and the Department of the Army to give reconsideration to section 6 of Order No. 2744, approved January 13, 1954, for publication in the Federal Register establishing a joint policy for land acquisition on reservoir projects for the following reasons, to wit:

1. The values of federally financed empoundments of water used in seeking appropriations in Congress take into consideration recreational and wildlife values to the general public.

2. The tremendous increase in the numbers of hunters, fishermen and recreationists in the United States requires full utilization of all recreational resources to meet increasing demands.

3. Nonreimbursable Federal funds invested in governmentally financed empoundments and structures are derived from taxes imposed upon all citizens of the United States. Fair and adequate development of wildlife and recreational values alone can justify the taking of such tax money for local and sectional flood control and irrigation projects.

Under the present policy the general public will be denied the enjoyment of recreation and wildlife values reasonably incident to a coordinated and comprehensive development of such projects. On the contrary the greatly enhanced benefits and increased land values will accrue not to the public, but to the riparian owners of contiguous land. Wildlife and recreation values, including adequate public access to and public use of impounded water and contiguous riparian land, should be protected by acquisition of reasonable land areas in depth above the high-water mark of all such federally financed projects.

Labels, Libels, and Equal Time—Address by Hon. Robert E. Lee, of the Federal Communications Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN PHILLIPS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 28, 1954

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, I had the pleasure, on Tuesday, of attending a luncheon at the National Press Club to hear the Honorable Robert E. Lee speak on the subject, Labels, Libels, and Equal Time.

Those of us who have known the speaker for the years he was the senior member of the investigating staff of the House Committee on Appropriations have recognized his ability, his grasp of details, and know his previous training with the FBI, and in the area of the functions of government. His speech before the National Press Club was well received on a timely subject. Unfortunately, the questions and answers, which always follow the speaker's addresses at these meetings, and which often make up the most interesting part of the programs, cannot be included. Mr. Lee displayed his knowledge of the job to which he was recently appointed; his good nature, and his ready wit. He made an excellent impression on his audience.

Under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include his address, which follows:

LABELS, LIBELS, AND EQUAL TIME

When I came into your famed club this noon, one of your more erudite members, who obviously knew all about the War Between the States, made the comment to me:

"This is as close as Robert E. Lee ever got to the White House."

As your irrepressible president has told you, I hail from the Chicago Lees, sir.

As for the War Between the States, I venture that if there had been television or even radio in the 19th century there would have been no such unpleasantness. If the peoples of the North and the South had been able to communicate with each other, to hear the pros and cons of the issues of that day, there would have been understanding and enlightenment at firsthand, rather than colored versions conveyed after considerable delays via the then existing avenues of communication.

Suppose the Lincoln-Douglas debates had been on the air. One has only to read them today to realize that large portions of the electorate could have been swayed; that probably brother would not have been pitted against brother in one of the saddest episodes of our history.

Pros and cons, issues of the day, and elections bring me to the text of my talk. Most of you here are journalists. Whether you report for the printed page or for the electronic presses that are the microphones and cameras of radio and television, you are men who chronicle current events. As reporters you have an avid interest in the great American game of politics. The rules of the game are pretty well established. It isn't my purpose to bore you with a dissertation on partisan politics, proselyting people or peculiar parties.

In every election year since broadcasting began in 1920 there have been controversies over equal time on the air for candidates for public office. Since the advent of television as a commercial service (and you can date that back only to the start of World War II), the controversies have been plentiful and acrimonious.

This bielection year is no exception. Already there have been repercussions and demands for equal rights. Already a few libel suits have ben filed because of campaign speeches in the primaries. Those talkathons are in vogue again. And the boys haven't even warmed up yet.

What's the origin of this political "equal time" provision of the law? What is a "qualified candidate for public office"? Why is it that station managers can't lay a blue pencil to libelous political copy, yet must give equivalent time to any rival candidate? What, if anything, can station owners do about it?

This, then, is the saga of section-315. Section 315 is the provision of the Communications Act of 1934, known variously as the "political section" or the "equal political time section." For the FCC it is known as the "headache section." It is also known by other and saltier designations by broadcasters who come to grips with it every election year, local, State, or National.

In view of the controversial nature of the subject and in the interest of accurate reporting of the facts, I must of necessity refer to the material which I have prepared for the occasion.

However, this method of presentation has its advantages. The late Indiana humorist Kin Hubbard, better known by his pen name, Abe Martin, said years ago, "There's one good thing about th' feller that speaks from manuscript—he knows when t' stop."

Now for another quote:

"The greatest of all injustice is that which goes under the name of the law; and of all sorts of tyranny, the forcing of the letter of the law against the equity, is the most insupportable."

The author of those words, Sir Roger l'Estrange, held an office in 17th century England which might be compared to that of an FCC Commissioner. His title was Licenser of the Press.

When he wrote the words, "the forcing of the letter of the law against the equity," he must have been looking into his crystal ball and foresaw the day when section 315 would be written into the Communications Act.

This section, plus the rules and regulations prescribed by the Commission to implement its provisions, and backed up by court interpretations, has raised many serious problems for both the Commission and the broadcaster.

One of the provisions of section 315 states that no station is required to permit the use of its facilities by any political candidate, but if any licensee permits a legally qualified candidate to use its facilities, it shall afford equal time to all other legally qualified candidates for that office: provided, and I quote, "that such licensee shall have no power of censorship over the material broadcast under the provisions of this section."

But—and here's the rub—the courts have held in many cases, which I will refer to later, that the licensee is responsible under the law for any libelous statements over his facilities.

In other words, the broadcaster, in an honest attempt to fulfill his obligations and present all sides of political views under the public-interest concept of his license, finds himself in the position of being "damned if he does and damnned if he doesn't."

The broadcasters' difficulties are further complicated by the fact that even fringe parties which are usually relegated to brief mention on the obituary page or to oblivion by newspapers are, if they qualify for a place on the ballot, entitled to equal broadcast opportunity with the two major parties.

Let me list a few of the legally qualified parties whose candidates appeared on the ballots of the various States during the 1952 election: Republican, Democrat, Prohibition, Progressive, Socialist Labor, Socialist, American Labor, Constitution, Christian Nationalist, Liberal, Independent, Social Worker's, American, American First, American Vegetarian, Greenback, Four Freedoms, and the Poor Man's Party.

The magnitude of the broadcasting industry's job under the act is illustrated by the number of candidates in the elections this fall.

There will be 32 United States Senators, 435 Congressmen, 35 Governors, thousands of State legislators, mayors, councilmen, and other muncipal candidates down to and including dogcatchers on the fall ballots, many of whom will be demanding equal time on the air.

Thousands of speeches will be made over radio and TV stations before the nominees are selected in the primaries and thousands more will be broadcast before election.

Compliance with the equal-time provision for political candidates has developed some vexing problems for the stations. Several years ago a legally qualified candidate of the Progressive Party demanded equal time from one of the local stations for his candidacy for governor. The station was willing to comply with his request but ran into difficulty in trying to rig up a line to his place of residence, which at that time was the Federal penitentiary.

In 1949 the chairman of one of the State central committees, speaking on the air in behalf of his candidates, charged that the opposition party, and in particular one of its candidates, were Socialists and that the difference between Socialist and Communist was merely the difference between a snake and a serpent. That left the party and the candidates suspect. One of the opposition candidates brought suit.

The station stipulated for the purpose of the trial that libel had been committed, but entered the plea that section 315 prohibited it from censoring political speeches, therefore, it was not responsible. The lower courts agreed; but the court of appeals reversed the decision and held the station liable. The Supreme Court refused to review the case and the station paid damages.

You might ask in view of this confusion in interpretations of the law why Congress does not take steps to exempt stations from libel in cases of qualified political candidates whom they are not permitted to censor. As a matter of fact, the FCC has reminded Congress of this situation and Congress has reviewed it from time to time.

I believe it is fair to say that few will disagree that there is an existing inequity. A number of States have recognized this and have adopted legislation designed to provide stations with some measure of protection against libel suits. It would seem to me that other States might well explore this approach with profit.

I would like to mention another and more closely related issue that is by no means so clear-cut in philosophy or application. I refer to the broadcasting of controversial matter which is not primarily political.

In accordance with Commission policy the licensee must present fair and reasonably balanced presentations on controversial issues if they are to operate their facilities in the public interest, convenience, and necessity.

In 1945 a certain self-proclaimed atheist petitioned the Commission to revoke the licenses of several stations in the West. His complaint was that for 2 years they had refused to make time available to him to preach atheism while they permitted the use of their facilities for religious programs. The petitioner contended that the question of the existence or nonexistence of a Divine Being is, in itself, a controversial issue, and that in refusing to make time available for arguments in support of the atheistic point of view, the stations complained of were not presenting all sides of the issue and, therefore, were not operating in the public interest.

The Commission denied the petition on the ground that the problem was far broader in scope than the complaint against the particular stations involved. However, it subscribed unanimously to a decision which some Congressmen called vaguely worded and which many broadcasters interpreted as a requirement that atheists be given equal time on the air to reply to religious broadcasts. There was a statement in the trade press at that time which read: "Jot down July 1946 A. D. as the day the FCC took jurisdiction over God."

In the case of political broadcasts, the problem is simply whether stations should be held liable for material over which they have no control. In the case of other controversial material, that problem is a less important factor, for the station can and does review such material beforehand. The problem that does exist here is that of trying to avoid pitfalls while following the Commission's policy that controversial material must be presented, and presented from both sides.

The broadcaster must determine, first, just what a controversial subject is. It's pretty hard to find a topic that isn't controversial to someone. A few years ago a well-intentioned lady delivered a radio talk in Ohio in praise of cats, and an indignant gentleman entered the studio declaring that many people considered cats repulsive, and that he should have reciprocal time to speak on dogs. I cannot remember whether or not he got the time, but I'll be glad to look it up for you if you are interested.

The broadcaster must determine, then, if a given controversial subject deserves to be broadcast. Is it a proper matter for intimate discussion in the home as to morals and good taste? Is it alarmist?

All good Americans are in favor of free speech within the dictates of good taste. I was privileged to spend a few years in the employ of the United States Congress and as such I spent a good deal of time on the floor of the House. How many times I have seen a proponent of a measure waxing eloquent in the well of the House in pursuit of his objective when an adversary would arise and shout, "Will the gentleman yield?" The opponent would quiver as he smelled a fray and he would reply, "I will be glad to yield to my friend from Podunk." The galleries would hush and the Members become attentive as they, too, smelled violent argument. The adversary would point the bony finger and dramatically state, and I improvise here. "I disagree with every word the gentleman says, but I will defend to the death, sir, your right to say it," and the tension burst with the sound of applause.

In some cases this could be demagoguery but in most cases it is sincerely intentioned. It is not a new phrase and my research carries me as far back as Voltaire and the founders of our own Republic. These were men of vision who could not have foreseen the impact of those words on our modern way of life, yet the impact is there. The automobile, let alone everything else, was as yet not even a gleam in the eyes of generations yet unborn. Who of them could foresee that we could talk into a gadget that we call a mike and a magic vibration occurs which carries not only the sound of our voice but our picture as well—now sometimes in color. Unfortunately, the air waves are too limited to permit time to be given to everybody who wants to sound off over them. Also, the nature of radio permits its signal to cross State lines, borders, and oceans—hence the FCC—the traffic cop of the radio highways. These are properties of all of the people, just as the waters of our rivers, and must be operated in their interest. They cannot be operated for the interest of a selected few anymore than we could deny the waters of our rivers to those who disagree with us. Broadcasting, like navigation, must be regulated. Certain citizens well qualified are entrusted with the privilege—not the right—of operating on the public air waves. On public issues it is their job to keep the public informed and not propagandized. This does not mean that I would deny them the privilege to editorialize, but this privilege must be carefully utilized, be properly labeled, and be subject to opportunity being afforded for expression of contrary opinion.

Free speech, therefore, is our doctrine, but free speech also implies responsibility and is certainly not a license for insurrection. Justice Holmes once ruled, "Free speech does not give a man the right to yell fire in a crowded theater."

I am confident that the broadcast industry is conversant with these problems and I am more than willing to leave these matters with our free industry which realizes, I am sure, that our convictions are based on our own experiences which could be limited to a very narrow sphere. It is safe to say, perhaps, that we are all a little bit right and a little bit wrong.

In their day-to-day operations the broadcasters must answer many controversial program questions. Will it truly serve the public interest if broadcast? If so, what form should it take—a panel discussion with both sides participating, or separate time segments for expression of both pro and con opinions? What if the con spokesmen refused to talk, or cannot be found? How should third or fourth factions and "splinter" groups be handled who demand time for viewpoints other than basic pro and con? To what extent does public interest demand a rehashing of a worn subject? Should the time be sold or given? If the time is sold, how can you keep the well-financed groups from over-balancing a subject?

To many of these questions regarding an individual program the FCC cannot give a specific answer to advisory opinion. The Commission, which is itself enjoined from censorship, simply reviews the overall operation of a station at license renewal time to determine whether or not it is fulfilling its promise and obligation to operate in the public interest. An isolated instance of unfairness, unless very aggravated, would not necessarily invite license revocation proceedings. We look at the broad picture of fairness over the license period.

The equal-opportunity provision of the Communications Act with respect to political candidates was first written into law in the mid-1920's. The reason was because at that time it was feared that there would always be a limited number of radio stations and it would be possible that only a one-sided presentation would be made. However, that situation has long since ceased to exist. There are hundreds more radio stations today than there are daily newspapers. Here in the city of Washington there are only three dailies. There are 7 radio stations and 4 television stations. In New York there are 7 daily newspapers and there are 14 radio stations and 6 television stations. In Los Angeles 5 dailies are published, while there are 12 radio and 7 television stations.

Congress has not tried to legislate equality of opportunity for space in newspapers. I wonder what the reaction would be if the Post Office Department sought authority to examine newspapers to determine equality or fairness in connection with the second-class mailing privileges newspapers enjoy? I would be the first to condemn it.

I am a great admirer of the free press we have in this country. I feel that over the course of the years, on the whole, the press has developed a sense of responsibility and a responsiveness to the needs, interests, and desires of the people. I suggest that another media of communication—broadcasting—has expanded to the point over the last 30 years in both size and stature so that it, too, has reached maturity.

Have we reason to fear that broadcasters will be unfair or irresponsible? Have we reason to distrust persons whose legal, financial and technical, and in many instances character, qualifications are so closely scrutinized before they enter this business of broadcasting? Whatever misgiving we may have evaporate when we consider that a broadcaster's operation is subject to the critical appraisal of the American listening or viewing public. His work and participation in community life are more responsive to the needs and desire of his neighbors than many Government officials in Washington. As a citizen of his community he is certainly conscious of his responsibility toward it. As a businessman in the community he is aware of the necessity of treating all interests fairly.

I know of no completely successful effort to legislate either fairness or equality. Should not the broadcaster, like the press, be permitted to shoulder this responsibility without either legislative or administrative second-guessing or directive?

The situation reminds me of the story of the cub reporter who was sent to Asia to cover a war. Weeks went by and no cables were forthcoming, though the expense account vouchers were received regularly. Finally the foreign news editor sent the young man a cable asking what was wrong and requesting a little copy. A wire came back as follows: "Great battle in progress. Much confusion. Can learn nothing."

An Open Letter to the People of Ohio Concerning the Future of Their Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 28, 1954

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave previously granted me, I respectfully submit for insertion in the RECORD the following address by Mary Lou Pfeiffer, director of women's activities, radio station WRFD, Worthington, Ohio:

Dear friends all over Ohio, I just returned from the Albany conference of the National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards and want to publicly thank the Ohio Education Association for inviting me. I also appreciate the invitation of the national commission for asking me to participate as an interrogator and source for radio information on the program.

I came back to Ohio with many new thoughts concerning public education. Its quality, objectives, and accomplishments—I also see a picture in my mind of America if we ever fail in our high standards of education.

Here are some of the facts I should like to share with you:

In 1957, 3 children will be in school where there were 2 in 1947.

Today our schools lack 150,000 qualified teachers.

In Ohio today we have 90,568 enrolled in kindergarten and 2,810 more teachers are needed in elementary education, a ratio of 36 to 1.

We must produce 425,000 more classrooms by 1960 to match soaring enrollments and replace obsolete school buildings in the Nation.

Ohio is among those figures.

The need for improving teacher pay is obvious from a look at the record. The teacher in an average public elementary school draws a yearly salary of approximately $3,400—an instructor in the average high school has an income of about $3,900 a year. Can you rear and educate a family on that according to your standards?

Some 75,000 persons leave the teaching profession every year and there is little doubt that low pay, overcrowded classrooms and heavy extra-curricular community demands on the teacher's time, speed the departure of many of them.

One of the leading college professors told me they simply could not keep a good chemistry teacher because of industry taking the top ones at much higher salary. As I see it, the supply will soon be gone and who will teach our future chemists and scientists and other leading people needed for our future business and education.

"If our schools are permitted to deteriorate, their human product will be commensurately inferior," says the Chamber of Commerce of the United States. Think about it and you, too, will become alarmed, I am sure. If you are a real red-blooded American and love your country, you can do something about it, you know. You can observe your school in action; you can ask yourself "Could I do as good a job as the teacher in charge is doing under the circumstances?"

If the teacher is not a qualified teacher and failing as a teacher—don't find fault with her. She may not be able to help it but she is at least trying. And what have you done? You as a parent and citizen?

Are you trying to interest some capable man or woman to enter the teaching profession? And what is your measuring stick? Are you willing to sacrifice and make financial contributions which keep schools and colleges operating?

We hear some complaints on how we are teaching. Perhaps the emphasis should be on what we are teaching and how well does the student retain and apply it.

Of all the criticism, though, I'm optimistic enough to feel under the circumstances and with many odds against the teacher, the majority of the schools are doing the best they can under the circumstances. My boy and girl are much more advanced in world affairs, social adjustments and an overall knowledge of generalities than I was at their age. Surely brighter babies aren't being born.

And remember, a schoolteacher finds scorn, mockery, cheating, elemental love and hate, envy, anxiety, rage, jealousy, and grief. Why does she submit to this emotional pounding? Well, don't fail to read the article by Alexandra Krastin in the Saturday Evening Post. She says because she happens to love kids and, in spite of everything, wants to share their destiny.

Let's all take an interest in the future of our children by working toward our goal of adequate educational facilities. This is a great part of our responsibilities as citizens of a modern democracy.

SUGGESTED FILMS ON EDUCATION

1. Don't fail to show Freedom To Learn in your community. See that everyone sees it, young and old. It is a film—color or black and white—16-millimeter sound—time 27½ minutes. A film showing the importance to our country of freedom to learn.

2. Secure the Blessing, another 16-millimeter sound motion picture dramatizing the role of the public school in democracy—time 27 minutes.

3. What Greater Gift portrays the teacher as a professional person—time 28 minutes.

4. Kippy and the Three R's shows how our teachers can teach the fundamentals better than ever before—time 29 minutes.

Don't fail to see:

All of God's Children. I sat through it three times and will see it as many times again if I have the privilege. I venture to say after seeing All of God's Children you will never hesitate to roll up your sleeves and say "I have work to do to help build a better Nation through better schools."

All of God's Children is a 26-minute sound film. An appealing story of a young Army veteran, a former prisoner of war in Korea, who returns home a hero and finds out his battle has just begun. In an intensely dramatic fashion, it points up the need for more good teachers and a more alert public to strengthen America's schools.

If you are interested in securing these films or want any information pertinent to Ohio schools, write to Mary Lou Pfeiffer, care radio station WRFD, Worthington, Ohio.

A State Department Academy Is Essential to United States World Leadership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 22, 1954

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I should like at this time to include a resolution adopted at a recent meeting of the officers and members of Waltham (Mass.) Post 2152, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, urging the immediate establishment of a State Department Academy similar to West Point and Annapolis.

As most of us know, the Winston committee report on the Foreign Service argued strongly for a Foreign Service institute patterned on the Army War College, Naval War College, and the National War College. It seems almost self-evident that the time has come when it is essential that we develop such an institution with the highest professional standards.

It is a well-known fact that unfortunately, the Foreign Service has had little time to consider the problem of appropriate training of its officers, which has consequently been sadly neglected.

Foreign Service representatives with a basic understanding of the facts of history, the principles of government, and of the meaning of cultural traits and customs of world peoples are essential assets of a nation attempting to provide leadership for a muddled world.

It is a responsibility of the Congress to take every precaution for the protection of the country. One of the basic means of fulfilling that obligation is to authorize and approve an appropriation for the establishment of a State Department Academy. I hope that all Members of Congress will give this proposal the serious attention it deserves.

The resolution follows:

The officers and members of Waltham Post, No. 2152, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, assert that the following facts and conclusions are self-evident to every intelligent citizen:

1. We win wars but lose the peace. The Second World War has been followed by international tension, expenditures of billions of dollars of American taxpayers' money to combat the menace of totalitarian communism at home and abroad, the Korean conflict, and increasing loss of freedom all over the world. Atomic war threatens. The American people ask, Why? Why do we win wars but lose the peace?

2. The military victories achieved in war by our Armed Forces have been largely the result of two causes. First, the United States is the arsenal of democracy. Second, our Armed Forces have been under the command of superior leadership by qualified officers who have been properly trained. This proper training for our military leaders has been provided in important part by West Point and Annapolis.

3. The diplomatic weaknesses suffered in peace by our Government are demonstrated by the observation that there is less democracy in the world today than before our Armed Forces and our military leadership overcame the enemies of democracy. What has been won on the field of battle with a tremendous expenditure of blood and treasure has been lost at the conference table. Our diplomacy has failed to win the peace.

4. Our diplomacy has failed to win the peace because our diplomats have not been provided with the same advantages of full-time preparation for duties in the now all-important field of diplomacy that the diplomats of other nations have received. Our diplomats have not been given specific proper training in the knowledge necessary to getting along with other people in friendly human relations and in foreign affairs.

5. This specific proper training necessary to adequately equip our diplomats with keen political vision and absolute loyalty in exercising proficiency in representing the American people and American interests includes languages, customs, history, government, economics, and other means to sufficient knowledge, skill, and understanding in their negotiations with representatives of other countries.

Therefore be it

Resolved, That our Government take an immediate forward step in the solution of the life-and-death problems which now beset our beloved country by the establishment of a State Department Academy similar to West Point and Annapolis for the proper training of qualified leaders for our diplomatic service so that the American people will be assured of strong, intelligent, and loyal representation in the councils of the nations of the world.

ROBERT F. NICHOLS,
Commander.
JOHN J. COLEMAN,
Adjutant.

President Syngman Rhee: A True Prophet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 28, 1954

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following editorial from the Daily Evening Item, Lynn, Mass., of Tuesday, July 27, 1954:

SOMEONE HAD COLD FEET

A refreshing gentleman is Syngman Rhee, 79-year-old President of Korea, who arrived in Washington yesterday for a little chat with our President about the future of that not too happy country.

When visting foreign dignitaries come to Washington, they usually devote the first few hours of their visit to mere pleasantries.

Not so the peppery Rhee, who has known the torture of prison camps and the privations of a hard-bitten soldier.

"If we had a little more courage, we could have reached the Yalu," said Rhee, bluntly, a few moments after he stepped on Washington soil. "At least we would not have to worry about the unification of Korea."

Rhee, of course, was referring to the handcuffs placed on General MacArthur when he sought to extend the Korean fighting to the Yalu River but was halted by orders from Washington and eventually brought home and retired.

Rhee is in this country to ask for military equipment for 10 to 20 more divisions in addition to the 20 his Republic now has. He is also expected to ask for more economic aid.

The typical foreign visitor in Rhee's shoes would have come with his hat in his hand, mumbling polite words and certainly not criticizing his host country.

But Syngman Rhee isn't built that way. He is a man of courage and bluntness who had a dream of uniting his country into a free nation, but now has only half a country. And he doesn't beat about the bush in expressing his views on why the United Nations did not achieve complete victory in Korea. If we had pushed our advantage at the opportune time, the Communists would have been completely driven off the peninsula and perhaps we would not have today the sorry picture that has just been painted in Indochina.

The world could use a few more Syngman Rhees.

Buying?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 28, 1954

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert the following advertisement by Schenley Industries, Inc., which appeared in the Evening Star, Washington, D. C., Tuesday, July 27, 1954:

DO YOU LIKE TO KNOW WHAT YOU'RE BUYING?

Imagine a law now actually before the Senate to compel American manufacturers to misbrand their goods.

Most of us want to know before we buy whether a product is all wool or part wool, whether it's 12 karat or 24 karat, whether it's imitation leather or genuine leather, whether it's 150 horsepower or 230 horsepower.

American have been brought up to want the truth.

We take it for granted.

We've been brought up to look upon such information as our natural right, and as a seller's ethical and legal obligation.

We won't tolerate anybody tampering with that right.

There is a bill, H. R. 5407, now before the United States Senate which would violate that right.

Here's what the bill says:

It says, believe it or not, that American distillers will be required, by law, to misrepresent their product.

It says they will be required, by law, to describe products over 8 years old as being only 8 years old.

And then it says that if they don't misrepresent in this way, they must pay the equivalent of a fine that would bankrupt many companies.

This is probably the heaviest money penalty ever provided in the history of American law.

If an American distiller makes a fine whisky 10 years old, or 11 years old, or 12 years old, this law says he must mislabel it, misadvertise it, misrepresent it as 8 years old.

Any foreign maker can sell his goods in the United States and tell the truth about it; but the bill says that American manufacturers in marketing their products cannot tell the truth.

This means that if you prefer to buy an 8-year-old product you can't know that you're getting it. And if you prefer to buy a 12-year-old product you can't know that you're getting that either.

We are not trying to take anything away from any other country doing business here.

We simply think that American manufacturers are entitled to equal treatment, certainly within their own country. We simply think that we should be given the right by law to tell the truth.

Schenley Industries, Inc.

New York, N. Y.

Woolgrowers Call for Probe of Lamb Price

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAMER H. BUDGE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 26, 1954

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Speaker, the Idaho Sunday Statesman of July 25, 1954, contains an article of importance to all those interested in determining why there is such a large spread between the price paid the producers of food and the price which the consumer must pay for the same. The article is as follows:

Woolgrowers Call for Probe of Lamb Price

The Idaho Wool Growers Association Saturday protested what it called "the ridiculously low prices" of live lambs and asked a United States Department of Agriculture investigation into "this unduly and unwarranted depressed price to growers."

In a telegram to Ezra T. Benson, Secretary of Agriculture, signed by John W. Noh, association president, the group said:

"Live lambs are selling at ridiculously low prices. Situation does not justify this condition considering light supplies. We are unable at this point to tell if demoralized price is discrimination by buyers. We urge you to investigate this situation to determine the reason for this unduly and unwarranted depressed price to growers."

M. C. Claar, secretary of the association, in commenting on the situation, said that the price paid for live lambs has dropped from 26 cents to 19 cents per pound.

"The price paid by consumers of dressed lamb has not reflected this price slump," Claar said, "and there appears to be no justification for the slash in prices paid for live lambs."

There usually is a seasonal slump in the price paid for live lambs, Claar said, but "not so drastic and it usually comes about 2 months later than this one." He said the normal price drop is 10 percent while the price this year already has dropped almost 30 percent.

The sale of live lambs is "a $20 million industry" and the current price slump is "quite a blow to the State's economy," Claar said. Most of Idaho's lambs are shipped to New York City, he added, and the price of dressed lambs there "does not reflect" the drop in the price of live lambs.

Mr. Speaker, from my own personal observation of the prices charged for lamb at retail in the city of Washington, I know that the depressed price being paid the producer is not even in a fractional degree reflected in the charge made to the retail purchaser. The same thing is true of other agricultural products, and I certainly hope that the Secretary of Agriculture and the Agriculture Committees of the Senate and House will explore the matter with a view to correcting it.

Report on Pending Immunity Bills

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 28, 1954

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following report by the Committee on Federal Legislation of the Association of the Bar of the city of New York is most enlightening. I commend it to the attention of our colleagues:

Report on Pending Immunity Bills, Committee on Federal Legislation, the Association of the Bar of the City of New York

At the first session of the present Congress, the Senate passed a bill (S. 16; McCarran) authorizing congressional committees, under certain circumstances, to grant witnesses immunity from prosecution after they had claimed their privilege against self-incrimination.

At the opening of the present session, Representative Keating introduced a bill (H. R. 6899) the passage of which has been requested by the Attorney General, authorizing the grant of immunity both by congressional committees and by the Attorney General in court and grand-jury proceedings.[1]

At present, there are numerous Federal statutes authorizing grants of immunity for the purpose of obtaining evidence in specific areas. There is no general statute, however, under which the Attorney General may compel testimony relating to any possible crime after the witness has pleaded his privilege against self-incrimination. The present Criminal Code section 3486[2] was intended to give this power to congressional committees; it does not accomplish that purpose because it fails to give complete immunity but only provides that the testimony given in a congressional inquiry may not be used as evidence against the witness in any criminal proceeding. Both the pending bills would repeal section 3486 and would substitute for it provisions under which complete immunity could be granted.

Our committee approves the portion of the Keating bill giving the Attorney General power to compel testimony in court and grand jury proceedings by immunity grants, but disapproves the proposals to vest that power in congressional committees (as in the balance of the Keating bill, and in the McCarran bill). The committee also believes that the repeal of section 3486 is warranted.

THE NATURE OF AN IMMUNITY GRANT

The privilege against self-incrimination is a qualification of the general obligation to testify as to facts within one's knowledge before any governmental agency which has the power of subpena. The privilege is embodied in the fifth amendment, which directs that no person "shall be compelled in a criminal case to be a witness against himself." This guaranty has been held to mean that a witness may refuse to answer questions in any proceeding—before the courts, congressional committees, and administrative agencies—if he believes that his answer may expose him to criminal prosecution.

The privilege is a personal one, for the benefit of the witness alone. A refusal to answer cannot be justified by the desire to protect others from punishment or interrogation. (*Rogers* v. *United States* (340 U. S. 367, 371 (1951)).) It protects from no unpleasant consequences other than the possibility of criminal prosecution. In *Smith* v. *United States* (337 U. S. 137, 147 (1949)), the court said:

"If a witness could not be prosecuted on facts concerning which he testified, the witness could not fairly say he had been compelled in a criminal case to be a witness against himself. He might suffer disgrace and humiliation but such unfortunate results to him are outside of constitutional protection."

Further, as the protection is only against compulsory self-incrimination, testimony voluntarily given may be used against the witness. This has led to the holding that once the witness has started answering questions in the era of possible danger, the privilege is waived and further questions on the same subject must be answered. (*Rogers* v. *United States, supra.*)

One serious qualification of the privilege derives from the nature of our Federal system. As the fifth amendment protects only against acts of the Federal Government, the fear of possible State prosecution affords no ground for a refusal to answer questions. (*United States* v. *Murdock* (284 U. S. 141 (1931)).) The problem which this qualification creates for immunity legislation will be discussed below.

When the privilege is validly invoked, its actual effect is to permit the witness to remain silent as to a matter which affects others as well as himself. For the purpose of securing such information while protecting the constitutional right of the witness, there has developed a pattern of legislation under which immunity from prosecution is substituted for the witness' privilege to remain silent. The first such Federal legislation was passed in 1857 (11 Stat. 155) but repealed in 1862 (12 Stat. 333). Section 3486, relating to testimony before congressional committees, has been on the books since the latter date. As stated at the outset, however, it does not serve its intended purpose. In *Counselman* v. *Hitchcock* (142 U. S. 547 (1892)), a like provision relating to testimony before grand juries (R. S., sec. 860) was held to be insufficient to compel self-incriminating testimony because the protection which it afforded was not as broad as the constitutional privilege. The Court pointed out that the statute merely protected the witness against having his testimony introduced in evidence against him, but that it did not prevent the use of his testimony to search out other evidence which could be used to convict him.

Shortly after the Counselman decision, Congress adopted the Compulsory Testimony Act of 1893 (27 Stat. 443), under which witnesses appearing before the Interstate Commerce Commission could be compelled to give self-incriminating testimony under immunity from prosecution "for or on account of any transaction, matter, or thing, concerning which he may testify or produce evidence * * *." The constitutionality of that measure was upheld in *Brown* v. *Walker* (161 U. S. 591 (1896)). That act was later incorporated by reference in many other regulatory statutes, and became the pattern for a large volume of Federal legislation. The Supreme Court has noted that this provision has been included "in virtually all of the major regulatory enactments of the Federal Government." *Shapiro* v. *United States* (335 U. S. 1, 6 (1948)), where many of the statutes are cited.[3]

The general immunity statutes relating to grand jury proceedings that was involved in the Counselman case was repealed, but the Congress apparently overlooked the companion provision (R. S., sec. 859) relating to witnesses before congressional committees; and that section became the present section 3486. This was pointed out by Chief Justice

---

Footnotes at end of speech.

Footnotes at end of speech.

Vinson in *United States* v. *Bryan* (339 U. S. 323, 336–7 (1950)):

"Section 860 was ultimately repealed. Its usefulness undermined by the Counselman decision, it remained on the statute books until 1910, 'a shield to the criminal and an obstruction to justice' (H. R. Rept. No. 266, 61st Cong., 2d sess.). But the attention of Congress has not, apparently, been called to the anomaly presented by the continued existence of Revised Statutes, section 859, which, like section 860, was a constituent part of an immunity 'bargain' declared invalid in the Counselman case."

In *United States* v. *Bryan*, supra, a divided Court held that section 3486 does not prevent the use of testimony given by a witness before a congressional committee as evidence in the prosecution of that witness for contempt committed in the course of that testimony.

At the present term, the Court has unanimously held that the section required the reversal of a State court conviction for operating a lottery, which conviction had been obtained by the use of an admission made by the defendant in testifying before the Kefauver committee. (*Adams* v. *Maryland* (347 U. S. 179, decided March 8, 1954).)

The present statute relating to witnesses before congressional committees, accordingly, is ineffective as a device for compelling testimony, but it prevents the use against a witness of testimony which he has given even where, as in the Adams case, the testimony was given without prior assertion of the constitutional privilege.

THE PENDING BILLS

Both the pending bills would replace section 3486 by an effective provision under which testimony could be compelled and the witness could not be prosecuted for any matter concerning which he has been compelled to testify after having claimed his constitutional privilege. In this respect they meet all constitutional requirements. (*Brown* v. *Walker*, supra; *Hale* v. *Henkel* (201 U. S. 43 (1906.)) They also reduce to a minimum the danger of an immunity both by limiting immunity to cases in which the testimony is compelled after the witness has claimed his constitutional privilege. In this respect, they follow the pattern of the more recent enactments on the subject and avoid the effect of the decision in *United States* v. *Monia* (317 U. S. 424 (1943)), in which a witness who had not claimed his constitutional privilege was nevertheless held to be entitled to immunity under the Interstate Commerce Act.[4]

Both bills are also alike in their provisions regarding the votes by which a House of Congress or a committee could grant immunity. They would require that in the case of testimony before a House of Congress the decision to grant immunity would have to be voted by a majority of the Members of that House; and in the case of testimony before a committee, the grant would require the affirmative vote of two-thirds of the members of the full committee, including at least two members of each of the two political parties having the largest representation on such committee.

The principal difference between the two bills is that which was noted at the outset of this report: the McCarran bill relates only to congressional investigations; the Keating proposal would authorize immunity grants in such investigations and also by the Attorney General in any court or grand jury proceeding.

The bills also differ with respect to the power of the Attorney General in connection with proposed grants if immunity by congressional investigators. The Keating bill would give the Attorney General a veto power by authorizing the grant of immunity only when the record shows that he has adjudged that the testimony to be compelled is "necessary to the public interest." The McCarran bill provides that at least 1 week before a congressional committee may vote on a proposed immunity grant, the Attorney General shall be informed of its intention to consider such question; and that if he shall not have consented, immunity may nevertheless be granted if authorized by resolution of the House of Congress having jurisdiction over the committee, by a majority yea-and-nay vote of that House.

THE NEED FOR LEGISLATION

The numerous recent instances in which witnesses before both congressional committees and grand juries have invoked the privilege against self-incrimination display the inability of the Federal Government, by any of its agencies, to compel testimony under certain circumstances. We believe that this situation should be remedied. If an individual who fears self-incrimination has knowledge of facts regarding crime or subversion, the power should exist somewhere in the Government to ascertain those facts at the price of immunizing that individual from prosecution. On this ground, passage of the Keating bill has been strongly advocated by the Attorney General (statement before Subcommittee No. 1, Committee on the Judiciary, House of Representatives; June 8, 1954).

Advocates of the legislation have not always distinguished between the proposal relating to congressional committees and that relating to court and grand jury proceedings. When the two proposals are joined, as in the Keating bill, we believe that an important issue is obscured. That issue is not whether the Government shall continue to be helpless against the witness who stands mute, but, rather, what agency of the Government shall have the power to make him talk, and under what conditions that power may be exercised. Consideration of that issue calls for separate discussion of the two distinct proposals: That relating to court and grand jury proceedings and that relating to congressional investigations.

COURT AND GRAND JURY PROCEEDINGS

Reference has been made above to the long list of Federal statutes authorizing the grant of immunity which is set forth in the opinion in *Shapiro* v. *United States*, *supra*, and in the Senate Judiciary Committee report on S. 16. A review of that list indicates no reasonable basis for distinguishing between the crimes which they define and others with respect to which no power to grant immunity is conferred. The principal factor in determining the matter has apparently been one which, on this issue, is quite fortuitous: the immunity provision has been included, almost as a matter of course, in detailed regulatory legislation; in the enactment of measures of other types, the subject is simply not considered.

No reason is apparent, for example, why immunity may be granted in the administration of the Social Security Act, but not in investigations of income-tax violations, or why the Securities Exchange Act should contain this provision but not the statute relating to mail frauds.

Not only is an immunity provision a common feature of Federal regulatory legislation; it has also been extensively used by the States. In New York, for example, the courts may even grant immunity to a debtor in order to compel the disclosure of information as to the disposition of property in the interest of the enforcement of a private judgment. (Civil Practice Act, sec. 789.)

Recent cases in the Supreme Court reflect an increase in reliance on the constitutional privilege not only before congressional committees, but also in grand jury investigations. (*Blau* v. *United States* (340 U. S. 159 (1950)); *Rogers* v. *United States*, supra; *Hoffman* v. *United States* (341 U. S. 479 (1951)).) Commenting on this fact, the Court in the Hoffman case wrote (341 U. S. at 485):

"The signal increase in such litigation emphasizes the continuing necessity that prosecutors and courts alike be 'alert to repress' any abuses of the investigatory power invoked, bearing in mind that while grand juries 'may proceed, either upon their own knowledge or upon the examination of witnesses, to inquire * * * whether a crime cognizable by the court has been committed,' *Hale* v. *Henkel* (201 U. S. 43, 65 (1906)), yet 'the most valuable function of the grand jury * * * [has been] not only to examine into the commission of crimes, but to stand between the prosecutor and the accused,' id. at 59. Enforcement officials taking the initiative in grand-jury proceedings and courts charged with their superintendence should be sensitive to the considerations making for wise exercise of such investigatory power, not only where constitutional issues may be involved but also where the noncoercive assistance of other Federal agencies may render it unnecessary to invoke the compulsive process of the grand jury."

Given the responsible law enforcement machinery described by the Supreme Court, it is appropriate to allow the Attorney General to determine in each instance whether it is more important to obtain the information which the witness can give, or to be able to prosecute him for a past crime which he may have committed. To allow that choice does not violate any constitutional right of the witness. It may be the only method by which facts within his knowledge can be obtained. This may be true even though the witness is not actually entitled to the privilege, for it is difficult to determine whether resort to the privilege is bona fide, due to the fact that the very inquiry may destroy the privilege. (See *Hoffman* v. *United States, supra* (341 U. S. at 486)).

The Congress has, in the past, authorized the grant of immunity in the interest of enforcing Federal laws. The power which it has extensively granted does not appear to have been abused. Our committee believes that as the Nation's chief law-enforcement officer the Attorney General should not be deprived of this device for obtaining information regarding any Federal crime, so long as the individual concerned is afforded the protection of court and grand jury procedure. We have reached this conclusion despite the possibility of State prosecution discussed below.

THE POSSIBILITY OF STATE PROSECUTION

The one serious cause for concern which we recognize is the possibility that as a result of our dual system the witness who is granted immunity may nevertheless be subject to State prosecution. (This problem, of course, arises no matter which branch of the Government compels the testimony.) The Supreme Court has held that testimony that has been compelled under a State-immunity statute may be used against the witness in prosecuting him for a Federal crime. (*Feldman* v. *United States* (322 U. S. 487 (1944)). On the contrary, it has been held in at least two States that the possibility of Federal prosecution renders ineffective the efforts of those States to compel testimony by granting immunity. (*People* v. *Den Uyl* (318 Mich 645 (1947)); *State* v. *Kelly* (22 Law Week 2451 (Fla. Sup. Ct., March 19, 1954)). See also *Marcello* v. *United States* (196 F. (2d) 437, 443 (1952)), where the Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit expressed the hope that more States would follow the Michigan decision.

In his testimony before the House committee in support of the Keating bill, Attorney General Brownell expressed the view that Congress may constitutionally extend to State court proceedings the immunity which it grants in exchange for testimony before a Federal agency. In support of this

---

Footnotes at end of speech.

position the Attorney General relied on *Adams* v. *Maryland, supra,* in which the present section 3486 was held to bar the use as evidence in a State court of testimony given before a congressional committee. Further support for his position is afforded by a dictum of the Supreme Court in *Brown* v. *Walker, supra* (161 U. S. at 606–608), that the Compulsory Testimony Act of 1893 has this effect; and also by the district court's decision in *United States* v. *DiCarlo* (102 F. Supp. 597 (N. D. Ohio 1952)), in which a witness before the Kefauver committee was upheld in relying on the privilege because the committee was engaged in the investigation of State, as well as Federal, crimes. Earlier cases in which the privilege was held not to protect against possible incrimination under State laws (*United States* v. *Murdock, supra; United States* v. *Greenberg* (187 F. 2d 35, 192 F. 2d 201 (C. C. A. 3d))) were distinguished in the DiCarlo opinion on the ground that they involved inquiries relating exclusively to Federal matters.

We think it clear that a Federal statute prohibiting the prosecution of an individual for a State crime would involve a more substantial invasion by Congress of powers normally exercised by the States than a mere prohibition of the use in a State court of evidence obtained by the Federal Government. See concurring opinion of Mr. Justice Jackson in *Adams v. Maryland, supra*. Despite the cases limiting the fifth amendment privilege to possible Federal incrimination, however, a strong argument can be made that Congress, under the supremacy clause, may broaden the immunity. It is suggested that the present bill should be amended to make clear that Congress intends to do so.

It must be recognized, however, that whether or not such an amendment is adopted, the situation with respect to possible State prosecution would probably not be resolved until the Supreme Court has spoken on the question. We do not believe that this uncertainty should prevent adoption of the proposal.[5] As stated above, any gap which would exist in the full protection of the witness from prosecution would be a product not of the immunity grant, but of our Federal system. Where no Federal crime is involved, testimony may now be compelled regarding facts tending to establish conduct that is criminal under State laws. (*United States* v. *Murdock, supra.*)

IMMUNITY IN CONGRESSIONAL INVESTIGATIONS

The proposal to authorize immunity grants by a House of Congress or a congressional committee, even when the grant has been approved by the Attorney General, ignores the important differences between the functions and procedures of a grand jury and those of a congressional committee.

The inherent congressional power of investigation exists for the purpose of enabling the Congress to ascertain facts to aid it in the legislative process. It is "an essential and appropriate auxiliary to the legislative function." (*McGrain* v. *Daugherty* (273 U. S. 135, 174 (1927)).) We do not wish to minimize the importance or value of such investigations. If it is to serve its purpose effectively, however, the investigative power must be protected not only from those who would defy it, but also from those who would subvert it to other ends. The great scope of the power (see, e. g., Landis, Constitutional Limitations on the Congressional Power of Investigation (40 Harv. Law Rev. 153)) and the uncertainly as to constitutional limitations upon the subject matter which it may reach (see *United States* v. *Rumely* (345 U. S. 41 (1953))) accentuate the importance of keeping its purpose clearly in view.

It is not a function of the Congress either to prosecute an individual, or to determine whether he should be prosecuted, for a past act. A grant of immunity constitutes a determination that an individual shall not be prosecuted. There is no doubt of the constitutional power of the Congress to authorize its committees to make that determination in the interest of obtaining facts to aid it in the legislative process. However, it would require a greater sense of self-restraint than has been shown by some committees to confine the making of such determinations to that legislative purpose. Neither tradition nor procedural safeguards impose any effective limitation upon wide departures from that purpose.

In the passage which has been quoted from the opinion in *Hoffman* v. *United States, supra,* the Supreme Court referred to the "most valuable function of the grand jury * * * to stand between the prosecutor and the accused." In congressional investigations there is no agency which performs that function. Furthermore, while grand jury proceedings are secret (rule 6 (e), Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure), they are under the control of the court. Whatever may be the technical standing of a witness to object to questions on the ground of irrelevancy,[6] as a practical matter he has a genuine measure of protection. If he refuses to answer a question on the ground that it is irrelevant, a judge is always at hand to determine, after hearing him and his counsel, whether the witness is to be directed to answer the question and whether the line of inquiry which the prosecutor is following should be curtailed; the recalcitrant witness in fact receives a full judicial consideration of his position, and a further opportunity to correct it, before he is found guilty of contempt. In congressional investigations, the witness has no such protection. Although he may in good faith believe the question to be irrelevant or beyond the scope of the inquiry, there is no impartial judge immediately available to pass on that issue. If he refuses to answer on any such ground, he construes the law at his peril. As the Attorney General himself pointed out in his statement in support of the Keating bill: "If mistaken, his good faith error of law constitutes no defense to fine and imprisonment."

Moreover, it is entirely proper that the standards of competence which apply in the courts should not restrict congressional inquiries. Hearsay reports, opinions and writings are understandably an important part of what is presented to legislative committees. Committee reports, unlike court determinations, need not be based solely on the evidence in the record. Political considerations necessarily enter into congressional determinations; and the historical bases of individual protection, such as the presumption of innocence and the requirement of proof beyond reasonable doubt, are lacking.

We do not believe that need for the proposed legislation is established by the recent cases in which witnesses before congressional committees have refused to answer allegedly self-incriminating questions. Both in the investigations of subversion and in that of interstate crime, the questions which have gone unanswered have related for the most part to the past associations of individuals. Even if it be assumed that every such question was a permissible one,[7] it does not follow that the committees' failure to obtain an answer materially interfered with the accomplishment of a legitimate end of the investigation.

It may be claimed that the power to grant immunity should be vested in congressional committees because many of their investigations are concerned with activities of the executive branch of the Government. See for example, *McGrain* v. *Daugherty,* 273 U. S. 135 (1927), upholding the power of the Senate, in an investigation of the Department of Justice, to subpena the brother of a former Attorney General who had resigned. Even in such a case, however, the congressional function is not to detect criminals or prosecute for crime. In the McGrain case, where power to investigate an executive department was fully upheld, the Court declared that "the only legitimate object the Senate could have in ordering the investigation was to aid it in legislating" (273 U. S. 178). Furthermore, we do not believe that such an investigation is likely to be materially hampered by a plea of self-incrimination on the part of an executive official. Certainly no such official can expect to retain his office after invoking the privilege.[8] And it is inconceivable that the Attorney General could remain unmoved in the face of the public clamor that such a situation would inevitably create.

We think it important not only to maintain the separation between the functions of the Congress and those of the Executive, but also to restore the public understanding of that separation which some recent hearings have tended to obscure. It seems highly likely that even if the immunity power were sparingly exercised by congressional committees, the mere passage of a bill giving them that power would add to the public confusion between the purpose of a committee hearing, with or without television cameras, and that of a criminal trial in a law court.

In summary, we believe that recent events have not demonstrated the need for congressional power to grant immunity, but have underlined the necessity of reaffirming the distinction between the functions of the different branches of the Government. In no area is that distinction of greater importance than in that of criminal prosecution. Legislative grants of immunity would lead to invasion of that area by the Congress. And the proposal in the Keating bill that this be authorized only when approved in advance by the Attorney General would further break down the division by giving to that executive officer a control over congressional action.[9]

If the Attorney General receives authority to grant immunity by compelling testimony in any court or grand jury proceeding the Government would be enabled to get required evidence from any witness. Should a congressional investigation point to the likelihood that evidence of crime might be uncovered by an immunity grant, the Attorney General could present the matter to a grand jury, where the rights of both the Government and the witness would be fully protected. This would bring about a salutary restoration of balance between the two branches of the Government, while maintaining the procedural safeguards of the criminal law.

Respectfully submitted.

Theodore Pearson, Chairman; Prescott R. Andrews; Don E. Cooper; Ambrose Doskow; Thomas H. Dugan; James J. Flanagan;[11] John French; Herbert J. Jacobi;[11] Charles L. Jaffin;[10] John C. Jaqua, Jr.;[11] Arthur Kramer;[11] James P. Murtagh; Arthur L. Newman; Charles D. Peet; Charles I. Pierce, Jr.; Orville H. Schell, Jr.;[11] Solomon I. Sklar; Jay H. Topkis; Royall Victor, Jr.;[11] Joseph L. Weiner; Charles H. Willard,[11] Committee on Federal Legislation.

JULY 7, 1954.

SEPARATE REPORT IN FAVOR OF GRANTING IMMUNITY POWER FOR CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS AS WELL AS JUDICIAL PROCEEDINGS

The report of the majority of the committee approves that part of the Keating bill which would allow the Attorney General to grant immunity "in any case or proceed-

---

Footnotes at end of speech.

Footnotes at end of speech.

Footnotes at end of speech.

ing before any grand jury or court of the United States," but disapproves that part of the Keating bill (as well as the entire Senate bill) which would permit the Houses of Congress and congressional committees to make similar grants of immunity in proceedings before them.

The undersigned members of the committee favor giving the immunity power in both judicial proceedings and congressional proceedings.

The distinction that the majority makes, for this purpose, as between judicial proceedings and congressional proceedings is not convincing to us. The majority appears to be motivated in large part by a personal dislike of some of the congressional committees that are currently abusing their powers. While we are not ourselves sympathetic with those committees, or their methods of conducting investigations, we are also out of sympathy with those witnesses who automatically claim their privilege under the fifth amendment to avoid giving information of any kind. Consequently, for the purpose of the matter presently under consideration, we believe the fundamental principle to be that if a witness is protected against prosecution "for or on account of any transaction, matter or thing" concerning which his testimony is compelled, his constitutional rights are adequately preserved. Since the protection of the witness is the primary issue, by its very nature the power to grant immunity cannot be abused, so far as he is concerned. He may be compelled to forego his rights under the fifth amendment, but in return he will be granted immunity from prosecution.

Aside from the apparent antipathy to certain committees referred to above, the gist of the majority argument against giving the immunity power to congressional committees is that witnesses before congressional committees have less protection than do witnesses before grand juries and courts; that it is important "to maintain the separation between the functions of the Congress and those of the Executive, [and] also to restore the public understanding of that separation which some recent hearings have tended to obscure"; and that "It is not a function of the Congress either to prosecute an individual, or to determine whether he should be prosecuted, for a past act." We feel, however, that this line of reasoning is wide of the mark. The constitutional power of Congress to investigate, and in the course of its investigations to obtain sworn testimony, is an inherent and important legislative power on a level with the executive power to prosecute or pardon criminals. It is not inconsistent with the constitutional division of powers to say that both the legislative branch and the executive branch may, in the course of their legitimate inquiries, employ the same weapon with which to compel testimony otherwise protected by the fifth amendment, namely, the power to grant immunity from prosecution, which seems to be the only constitutional weapon available for this purpose.

The majority argues that if a congressional committee were on the trail of evidence of crime, it could refer the matter to the Attorney General, who could then present it to a grand jury, where the power to grant immunity could be exercised. Aside from being a rather impractical suggestion, it is difficult to see how this procedure would give a congressional committee the information it would be seeking, since evidence given before a grand jury would be kept secret under any normal circumstances.

We agree with the majority that the provision in the Keating bill which would give the Attorney General a veto power over the granting of immunity by Congress and congressional committees is objectionable. On this point, the Senate bill provides that the Attorney General shall be notified of any proposed grant of immunity, and even if he does not assent, immunity can nevertheless be granted by a majority vote of the House having jurisdiction over the committee. We think this would be a satisfactory procedure.

The question of immunity from State prosecution is a difficult one. Both of the pending bills purport to protect the witness against any prosecution "for or on account of any transaction, matter or thing" concerning which his testimony has been compelled. The constitutional law on this point appears to stand today as follows:

(1) A Federal statute protecting the witness only against the use, in any subsequent criminal prosecution, of the actual testimony given by him is not enough to support the compelling of his testimony against a plea under the fifth amendment, *Counselman* v. *Hitchcock* (142 U. S. 547 (1892)). But a statute of this kind is binding on the States, and bars the use of the actual testimony in a later State prosecution, *Adams* v. *Maryland* (347 U. S. 179 (1954)).

(2) A Federal statute protecting the witness against subsequent prosecution "for or on account of any transaction, matter or thing" concerning which his testimony is compelled is broad enough to permit the compelling of his testimony, against a plea under the fifth amendment, even though the statute may perhaps not protect the witness against subsequent prosecution in a State court, *Hale* v. *Henkel* (201 U. S. 43 (1906)). There is yet no clear statement from the Supreme Court whether such a statute does protect the witness against State prosecution, but the concurring opinion of Mr. Justice Jackson in *Adams* v. *Maryland*, above, carries an implication that it does not.

Certainly it would be desirable that the immunity should extend to all subsequent prosecution, State as well as Federal, and perhaps the Supreme Court will eventually decide that such a result can be constitutionally obtained. However, so long as the point remains unsettled we would recommend that any Federal immunity legislation should both (1) take advantage of the Adams case by outlawing the subsequent use of the compelled testimony in any criminal proceeding, State or Federal, and (2) undertake to protect the witness against subsequent prosecution in any court, State or Federal, "for or on account of any transaction, matter, or thing," concerning which his testimony is compelled, even though the power of Congress to outlaw subsequent State prosecution is today doubtful. In addition, a carefully drawn severability clause should be included in order to assure that the immunity will extend as far as the Supreme Court may eventually decide it can.

Respectfully submitted.

James J. Flanagan.
Herbert J. Jacobi.
John C. Jaqua, Jr.
Orville H. Schell, Jr.
Royall Victor, Jr.
Charles H. Willard.

July 7, 1954.

Separate Report Opposing Pending Bills

A statute is unjust which promises a witness immunity from Alcatraz but not from Leavenworth. A statute is equally unjust if it keeps him from both Alcatraz and Leavenworth but allows him to be sent to Sing Sing. The Supreme Court of Michigan, considering the converse situation, has expressed itself as follows: "It seems like a travesty on verity to say that one is not subjected to self-incrimination when compelled to give testimony in a State judicial proceeding which testimony may forthwith be used against him in a Federal criminal prosecution." (*People* v. *Den Uyl* (318 Mich. 645).) These words, though sharply spoken, were endorsed by the fifth circuit court of appeals in *Marcello* v. *United States* (196 F. 2d 437).

As the report of the majority indicates, Congress has constitutional power to enact immunity from Federal prosecution although the witness is left open to State prosecution. The constitutionality of the enactment does not eliminate its injustice. The exercise of congressional power can be justified only on the reasoning that fairness to the individual must be sacrificed to the greater need of the Nation. Is Federal law enforcement so debilitated, the capacity of Congress to determine whether or not to legislate so undermined, that it is imperative to command such a sacrifice? To neither branch of the question can the writer answer "Yes."

Respectfully submitted.

Arthur Kramer.

July 7, 1954.

---

[1] Several other bills on the same subject have been introduced. One by Senator Kefauver (S. 565), which was also introduced in the last Congress, relates only to court and grand jury proceedings. As major attention has been focused on the two bills mentioned in the text, and the others present no different issues, this report will be confined to those two proposals.

[2] This statute (18 U. S. C., § 3486) reads: "No testimony given by a witness before either House, or before any committee of either House, or before any joint committee established by a joint or concurrent resolution of the two Houses of Congress, shall be used as evidence in any criminal proceeding against him in any court, except in a prosecution for perjury committed in giving such testimony. But an official paper or record produced by him is not within the said privilege."

[3] This list of statutes is set forth in the Senate Judiciary Committee Report on S. 16. Report No. 153, 83d Congress, 1st session; April 20, 1953.

[4] Where a statute requires a witness to claim his privilege, there still may be a question whether his mere failure to do so before a grand jury results in a waiver when he himself is under investigation for indictment. See the several opinions in *People* v. *DeFeo* (— App. Div. — (1st Dept. July 1, 1954)), applying New York penal law, § 2447 enacted in 1953, which changed the former rule regarding all grand jury witnesses).

[5] If it be claimed that at present the witness who fears only State prosecution may nevertheless achieve a practical protection by pleading the constitutional privilege, the full answer is that the successful assertion of the privilege in such a case is not due to the constitutional guarantee but is actually an abuse of that guarantee.

[6] While it has been held that a witness "is not entitled to urge objections of incompetency or irrelevancy, such as a party might raise," *Blair* v. *United States* (250 U. S. 273, 282 (1919)); *United States* v. *McGovern* (60 F. (2d) 880, 889 (C. C. A. 2d, 1932)), the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit has recently noted, without deciding, the interesting inquiry raised by the suggestion (8 Wigmore on Evidence 151, 152, 3d Ed. 1940) that this rule should not apply to a grand jury investigation where there are no pleadings and no judge is present. *Green* v. *United States* (193 F. (2d) 111, 113 (1951)). And the New York Court of Appeals has declared that "Where irrelevancy is asserted before a grand jury the witness is of course entitled to a ruling by the court." *Matter of Spector* v. *Allen* (281 N. Y. 251, 258 (1939)).

[7] One suggestion designed to reduce the number of refusals to answer questions, which we believe deserving of consideration, has been made by Dean Erwin N. Griswold, of the Harvard Law School. In a letter to Senator Kilgore dated May 13, 1953 (99 Congressional Record, A2827, May 18, 1953), Dean Griswold proposed an enactment to change the rule of *Rogers* v. *United States*

(40 U. S. 367 (1951)), by providing that no answer given by a witness would constitute a waiver of his privilege. There is force in Dean Griswold's contention that many witnesses are led to refuse to answer harmless questions because of the fear that by doing so they will be held to have waived the privilege.

[8] Cf. Executive Order No. 10491 (Oct. 13, 1953, 18 F. R. 6583), making resort to the privilege a basis for dismissal from Federal employment.

[9] If the immunity power is to be vested in the Congress, we believe that its separate authority as a coordinate branch of the Government should be maintained, and that it would be unsound to allow the Attorney General to veto its action, as the Keating bill would do. The provisions of both bills regarding notice to the Attorney General and the vote required to grant immunity are believed to be desirable features of any measure under which the power is to be exercised by a House or committee of the Congress.

[10] Concurs in result.

[11] See separate report at p. 17.

[12] See separate report at p. 21.

Shawnee National Forest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 27, 1954

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, one of the most prudent investments of public money is our investment for national forests. This investment brings good returns. Wise management of national forest lands will return, in time, every dollar spent. In addition the development work restores land, halts erosion and protects valuable watersheds. Moreover each national forest provides a demonstration area to show private land owners that which may be done in the way of conservation, while, at the same time, providing a means of earning an income.

A prime example of this type of Federal activity is the Shawnee National Forest, located in southern Illinois. This tract has been built up during the past 20 years. Its progress, according to a summary provided by Mr. E. N. Lee, forest supervisor, has been great. Already we have realized important returns from our investment, but a great deal of development remains to be undertaken.

The early development of southern Illinois followed a typical pattern. Creek bottoms and hill lands level enough for cultivation were cleared. Timbered lands, which contained some of the best hardwoods in the central States, were cut over. Early settlers burned fields to clear land, and curtail the growth of sprouts. Farm crops were mostly corn and small grains. Inability of the soils to sustain this type of product, plus the annual uncontrolled burning, brought about soil erosion and deterioration. Many farms were abandoned.

In 1933, the New Deal of Franklin Roosevelt in Washington and the New Deal of Henry Horner in Illinois joined forces to combat the serious problem of erosion and other wastage of natural resources. Congress passed the State Enabling Act, and this, together with an invitation from Illinois, brought the United States Forest Service in to set up two purchasing units, one known as the Shawnee. They instituted a land-acquisition program, and the Civilian Conservation Corps work program began the development. By 1939 sufficient progress had been made so that on September 6 the Shawnee National Forest was established by Presidential proclamation.

It includes parts of nine southern Illinois counties. Since 1933 the Federal Government has purchased about 210,000 acres of timber and abandoned farmlands. There was no acquisition program during World War II, and only a small program following. There has been no purchase program for several years, although there remain thousands of acres of land which should be under management for forestry purposes.

Approximately 75,000 acres of Shawnee was barren of timber growth, consisting of wornout, eroded fields and abandoned farms on which the soil had become unsuited for cultivation. To date, approximately 32,000 acres of these abandoned fields have been reforested. This has arrested the erosion. The soil has been stabilized and is now serving the people in production of forest products and in watershed protection. The reforestation program should proceed much more rapidly, but has been slowed down by curtailed funds. Much plantable area is lost. It is covered with brush, such as sassafras and persimmon. This helps the soil-erosion problem and provides watershed protection, but the land is nonproductive and does not pay its way. During the past fiscal year, the Forest Service planted about 2,300,000 trees, and in the present fiscal year plantings will be cut back to about 1,500,000. At this rate it will require 16 years to complete the reforestation program.

Since development, the Shawnee has sold about 29 million board feet of timber. Last year such sales earned $34,386. This forest will now support an annual harvest of 5 million board-feet of timber. It is expected to soon reach a sustained annual cut of 8 million board-feet.

Seventeen recreation areas—2 small lake developments and 15 picnic spots—have been developed in Shawnee. Total recreation use is estimated at 750,000 visitors a year.

As part of the Forest Service multiple use policy, tracts of land are leased to local farmers. Management of the national forest cooperates with other public agencies in management of fish and game, watershed studies, forest research and development of mineral resources. Returns to the Federal Treasury for other than timber amounted to $34,433 during the last fiscal year.

One-fourth of all revenues from Shawnee National Forest are returned to the counties in which the area is located. Each county's share is determined by the proportion of the forest land in that county.

Forest Service management has reduced the number of fires from a high of 500 per year during the thirties to about 100.

Shawnee National Forest has been of assistance in improving the economy of southern Illinois. It has shown proper land use, which is the key to our whole economy.

We Can Be Proud of Our Veterans' Hospitals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 28, 1954

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following very fine article from the American Legion magazine for August 1954, written by the noted surgeon, Dr. Charles W. Mayo, of Rochester, Minn., entitled "We Can Be Proud of Our Veterans' Hospitals." It is worthy of close reading by every Member of Congress:

> A few years ago the apparently poor medical care that our war veterans received was the subject of nationwide indignation and extensive investigation. It was said that we were giving third-rate care to first-rate men.
>
> Today, the war veterans in the Veterans' Administration hospitals get care that is second to none, in a medical program that is teamed up with leaders in private medicine all over the country.
>
> The VA's new, aggressive programs of medical research and education that are carried out in cooperation with leading medical schools and clinics are making an inspiring contribution to national health and medical progress.
>
> The VA, with its teammates in private medicine, has pioneered boldly all along the frontiers of medicine.
>
> It has developed new concepts of medical teamwork with astonishing results in patient welfare.
>
> It has made one of the outstanding contributions to the control of tuberculosis in the last 10 years. It was developed new techniques for treating active tuberculosis that often permit the discharge of patients in 8 or 9 months. It has screened more than 3 million veterans for tuberculosis in the last 4 years, and thereby has discovered 12,740 unsuspected cases of active pulmonary tuberculosis, as well as 34,470 inactive cases. This screening, combined with new techniques of treatment, has reduced the tuberculosis death rate among World War II veterans by 40 percent since 1948.
>
> VA projects have found ways to restore, and discharge to steady jobs, "hopeless" mental patients, some of whom had been hospitalized for 10 years.
>
> VA's medical leadership and teamwork with private medicine is fully as exciting in many other fields, including the readaptation of the blind, care of amputees, the development of artificial limbs and the whole broad area of rehabilitating the disabled.
>
> More than 3,000 paraplegic patients, discharged from VA hospitals, are managing their own homes, families, and jobs. In World War I, the life expectancy of a paraplegic patient was a few months. If he survived, he could expect a life of dependent invalidism.
>
> By providing a stimulating environment for research, VA has attracted the services of some of our best doctors, medical schools, and clinics, which has resulted not only in a high level of care for our veterans but also in discoveries and developments which doc-

tors and institutions all over the country are applying for the welfare of their patients. Cancer research at Bronx VA hospital has resulted in the identification of a cancer agent in leukemia (blood cancer) and in certain types of glandular cancer.

VA's pioneering radioisotope research has produced significant results, including a scanning technique developed at Los Angeles VA hospital by which tumors in hidden organs may be located.

A bedside technique for making emergency blood analyses rapidly with a portable kit began in a midwestern clinic some years ago. Now, it has been perfected at Seattle VA hospital. It does a job that previously could only be done slowly, in a laboratory. The technique recently helped save the lives of several patients with poisoning, in a southern hospital.

All told, there are some 350 major, advanced, medical research projects now under way in VA hospitals.

But perhaps these may never be finished. Recently, increasing criticisms have been heard which seem to imply that the activities of the veterans' hospitals should be severely curtailed.

Such curtailment could not happen immediately, since the House of Representatives Committee on Veterans' Affairs recently endorsed the present VA medical program after a lengthly investigation of it.

Yet, public opinion based on current criticisms might bring a serious curtailment in the long run. If it should do so, our national honor, the progress of medicine, and the welfare of the sick all would be involved and could be sacrificed. Therefore, both the veterans' medical program and the criticisms that we hear should be closely examined and carefully weighed.

In substance, the major criticisms of the VA hospitals boil down to one.

It is widely supposed that their activities are leading us into socialised medicine.

It was recently reported nationally that the VA hospitals are today rushing us toward socialized medicine with bewildering speed.

What are the reasons for fearing that veterans' medicine is moving us toward socialism? The chief elements that lead to this belief are:

(1) The fact that the law lets the VA care for veterans with non-service-connected disabilities if beds are available and if they are unable to pay for their own care;

(2) The expansion of veterans' hospitals after World War II and the increase in the number of patients who receive Government care as veterans;

(3) The fact that this expanding free medical care is furnished in Government hospitals;

(4) The belief that influential veterans' organizations have an insatiable and irresponsible appetite for more and more medical benefits for war veterans, and

(5) A widely held impression that many veterans are broadening the scope of free Government care by claiming care for non-service-connected illnesses when they can actually afford private care.

I have been closely associated with the Veterans' Administration medical program on a voluntary basis since World War II, and I have generally approved of it.

I could not have approved if I believed that our veterans' hospitals represent a trend toward socialized medicine; or if I believed that a significant number of veterans qualify for their care by dishonesty; or if I believed that the actions of the veterans' organizations on behalf of medical care for veterans were irresponsible.

In fighting socialized medicine, we doctors have not just been fighting a word. We have resisted proposals which, in our opinion, have boded ill for patient welfare and have threatened to bring about deterioration in medicine and injury to the doctor-patient relationship.

Our veterans hospitals are leaders in patient welfare and in the advancement of medicine. They do not affect the doctor-patient relationship. They contain none of the evils of very different proposals that we have defeated in the past with generous public support and the especial support of our war veterans.

We must be careful not to misjudge the recent expansion of the VA hospitals. To think of it as a trend toward expanding the principle of free care for certain veterans is to forget what we should never forget.

In the last 12 years we have placed more than 16 million young men in uniform during wartime. Since 1941, we have sent more than four times as many men to war as we sent in 1917–18. But we have not doubled the capacity of our veterans' hospitals.

There are no plans afoot in Congress or in the veterans' organizations to provide beds for veterans on the same scale as was provided in 1940. The trend is toward proportionately less medical facilities for veterans. The expansion in veterans' medicine that we see is a limited adaptation to the increased number of veterans.

Numerous as the veterans are, they are but 12.5 percent of our population—to whom 87.5 percent are eternally in debt.

Relatively few veterans qualify for care in the veterans' hospitals—about 1 in 200 veterans at any one time, or 1 in 1,600 of our population. When we say "socialized medicine" we are talking about Government-controlled care for everyone.

Most of the veterans who qualify for care are those with service-connected illnesses, or those treated for non-service-connected, long-term illnesses such as mental afflictions, tuberculosis, arthritis, heart disease, and cancer. Theer is little care to be found for them elsewhere.

Only 10 percent of the VA beds are geared to handle the kind of short-term illnesses that our voluntary, private hosiptals usually accommodate. Many of the veterans treated for short-term illnesses have been refused hospitalization in voluntary, private hospitals because of their inability to pay. Many others have been cared for in private hospitals until they ran out of money, when they were transferred to the VA.

The legal provision that a veteran may get VA care for a non-service-connected disability if he cannot pay for his own care, and if a bed is available, is a generous provision and a humane one. Congress has knowingly made sure that a certain number of such beds are available, so that slightly more than half of the VA beds are used for veterans with non-service-connected illnesses.

This practice indicates no trend toward anything. It is an American tradition, dating back to George Washington, that our Government recognise the services of our war veterans to the extent of aiding them when they are in dire straits. I believe most Americans subscribe to this noble tradition.

The precise present principle of veterans medical care for non-service-connected illness is 30 years old. The exact present law is 20 years old. Nobody in or out of Congress has any plans to liberalise the provisions of that law, and no trend—either toward socialism or toward more generosity— exists.

To say that many veterans are getting VA care by falsely swearing that they cannot afford private care is a serious charge. It must be backed up by evidence, but it has not been.

Several investigations have only verified the inability of most of the veterans with non-service-connected illnesses to provide their own care. Opportunities have been offered by Congress for the presentation of evidence of widespread cheating, without result.

It is not possible that more than 12 percent of VA patients could abuse the privilege. The VA has other information, besides the veteran's own oath and financial statement, to show that nearly 88 percent of its patients are qualified for care under existing law.

In the absence of substantial evidence that the 12 percent who could cheat are cheating, we could only be ashamed to claim now that the first-rate care we have fought for and achieved is going to third-rate men. They are the same men whom we called first rate when we were at war.

We should be careful in charging that the veterans organizations are irresponsibly selfish.

Since World War II I have had the honor of serving on the National Medical Advisory Board of The American Legion, along with many distinguished doctors.

My association with the American Legion's leaders has given me an entirely different concept of its organization, accomplishments and objectives.

In my opinion, the American Legion has come into adulthood, and recognizes and accepts its responsibilities not only to veterans but also to all other citizens of the country.

That the Legion would seek or permit socialized medicine is beyond belief. The Legion's policies regarding veterans' hospitals are guided by its national rehabilitation commission, whose executive and advisory members are representative of the kind of citizen who is our strongest bulwark against socialism.

The chairman of the Legion's rehabilitation commission is Robert M. McCurdy, assistant city manager of Pasadena, Calif. Other members include:

John H. Walsh, president and general manager of the Middlesex and Boston Street Railway and the Worcester (Mass.) Bus Co.

Judge Wilbur M. Alter, justice of the supreme court of Colorado.

Dr. Norman R. Booher, practicing physician in Indianapolis and a vice speaker of the American Academy of General Practice.

John S. Gleason, Jr., vice president of the First National Bank of Chicago.

J. Ross Foust, referee of the employees compensation commission of Pennsylvania.

Watson B. Miller, member of the Federal Subversive Activities Control Board.

W. Bea Waldrip, vice president of the Detroit Bank.

Clarence C. Horton, director of the department of veterans' affairs of the State of Alabama.

Joseph F. Dixon, owner of the largest department store in Natchez, Miss.

Earl V. Cliff, practicing attorney of Ortonville, Minn.

Other members of the commission and its advisory board of more than a hundred members throughout the country are respected business and professional men in their communities.

Perhaps the fact that the VA hospitals are Government or bureaucratic hospitals is the chief reason for the fear that they are socialistic. It is an unfounded fear.

Nine years ago the Veterans' Administration voluntarily abandoned the bureaucratic idea of medicine, which had failed to achieve medical leadership and could not have cared for the large number of disabled veterans of World War II.

When Gen. Omar N. Bradley became head of the VA he called in Dr. Paul R. Hawley to be his top medical man. In substance, Dr. Hawley said: "Let's forget bureaucracy and practice good medicine. Let's quit sheltering sick veterans and make taxpayers of them again. Let's bring in the doctors who know how to do the job."

The remarkable change in VA medicine since then has come about because it has been running away from bureaucratic medicine as fast as it could. For the care of its veteran patients, for the conduct of its new education and research programs, and for the formulation of its medical policy, the VA asked Congress to write a new law to let private medicine assume a huge role in the VA.

Today, 92 of the VA's hospitals are affiliated with 72 of our leading medical schools and clinics. The schools appoint deans committees from their staffs to help guide and formulate VA medical policy.

To create national VA medical policy, the VA depends largely on 2 committees of independent physicians, totaling 50 leaders in medical specialties.

Thousands of nongovernment doctors take residencies in VA hospitals to qualify for specialities, and VA has already contributed to the education of more doctors than are on its entire full-time medical staff.

Thousands of independent doctors work on a consulting basis in VA hospitals, caring for patients and guiding medical policy.

Most of the 4,407 full-time VA doctors are now members of the American Medical Association, while more than 11,000 nongovernment doctors participate in the program of the VA hospitals.

I know of none of these men who would work for socialized medicine, and they are in a strategic position to block it if it should threaten.

The whole inspiring story of VA medicine since 1946 is a brilliant example of the American way to solve enormous problems—a story of the voluntary teamwork of all concerned to accomplish what neither Government nor private monopoly could ever accomplish alone.

If it is anything, the VA's medical program is America's answer to socialized medicine. Its story should be told proudly to the world. Faced with the problem of providing medical care for a large number of beneficiaries, our Government asked private medicine to show it how to do the job. How they did it is a new and brilliant chapter of medical history.

What would happen if this remarkable program were curtailed by eliminating the veteran patients who are admitted because they are unable to pay for their care?

According to the leading independent doctors who advise the VA, the private doctors and the private institutions who now dominate the VA hospitals would have to withdraw. The VA, confined to patients with service-connected illnesses, would return to its former bureaucratic status. The problem of the displaced patients would remain to plague us.

I am proud of the care we are now giving our veterans. Some of my pride is personal, because I played a small part as one of the outside physicians who were invited to aid the medical program for veterans.

More of my pride is professional. Our hospitals for veterans have helped raise the standards of my profession.

Part of my pride is patriotic. I am proud that my country and the men of my profession have not forgotten, in peace and security, the awful obligation that we placed on millions of boys and young men in the prime of their lives, when they stood between ourselves and national ruin—and stood well. It is fitting, in time of peace, that if they now stand on the brink of ruin through failing health, we as a nation do not entirely forget them.

If sometimes we judge them, it would be wise to use no different yardstick than we used to judge them when we set them apart to bear our battles.

Life on the Mesa

SPEECH

OF

HON. ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 28, 1954

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, in a very fine letter just received from a friendly family with whom I visited near Yuma, Ariz., while on active duty with the Army last September, life on the mesa is vividly described.

As the letter covers many topics that affect our people on or off the farms, in or out of the cities, I think it will be of interest to the Congress to have the letter of Mrs. Helen Thomas, wife of "Tex," and mother of an Army sergeant and a growing daughter, spread on the Record, in part, at least.

I might add that I was encouraged to take this time, Mr. Speaker, to address the House and to insert the letter, because of the dramatic debate that took place a few minutes ago on the bill to step up the lending power of the Commodity Credit Corporation. Particularly effective, I thought, were the remarks of Congressman Burdick, of North Dakota, when, in substance, in support of the measure, he said:

> In the early thirties, when I had $6 in the bank and couldn't get it out, and everyone was broke and people were hungry and 15 million Americans were out of work, some people in my district broke the line of march; they raided grocery stores for the food that was meant to be eaten; though they had no buying power, no money to pay for it, they ate; they were hungry.

Shades of a Tale of Two Cities, shades of Viareggio, in Italy, when the Fifth Army passed through it and hungry people pleaded, "Bread, bread, pane, pane," "Food, food, mangare, mangare." Old people, young people, middle-aged people. It was a dramatic moment this afternoon when Mr. Burdick spoke, Mr. Speaker.

We do not want the tragedy of the early thirties to happen again, Mr. Speaker. We cannot afford it; if we expect to keep the red, white, and blue waving in the breeze as we know it, the course we steer must avoid the shoals we see brought into view in the letter Helen Thomas writes. In part, it follows:

> July 25, 1954.
>
> Dear Friend: We were very pleased to get your card. Have wondered and thought about how you are doing in Washington this year. Many things have changed in the past few months.
>
> We are well and as busy as we could possibly be, enjoying ourselves as we go along. Our son Jim is in Hawaii, has been since March. He wrote us this week that he has just made sergeant. There's been a lot of rain there this summer, and, he says, many white-collar inspections of late. Harold (Senator Giss), you remember him, says probably officials that want to see the islands. Said he wouldn't mind going.
>
> I was all packed to fly over to see Jim, and foolish me, I went as far as 'Frisco and came home. Sent Jim's Olds to him. It was just setting here taking up room when he can get a lot of enjoyment out of it over there. He was disappointed that I didn't come. It's just as well that I didn't spend the money as the farmers are really taking a loss. Thank heavens we have managed to keep out of debt so far. We have tried to economize, but seems hard to do as everything we use on the farm has increased in price and what we sell is worth very little. Our good alfalfa hay is down to rock bottom. Statistics show that it costs $17.50 per ton to produce hay in this locality. My dad was lucky enough to receive $18.50 for some the other day. There hasn't been any market for it recently. We are feeding 400 head of cattle. That way we hope to get our money back out of the hay.
>
> Hope to be able to operate without going in the red. We have our equipment in good condition and free of debt; would sure hate to be in some of the ranchers' boots, especially some of the poor GI's on the mesa. Some of them have leased their farms out to outsiders and taken jobs to hang on. Also most of the boys bought good cars and built good homes in hopes that by working hard they had it made. It has been a bitter experience for some of them. Most of them went into the farming business not knowing anything about the trials and hardships they would face. Its a good life, but as Tex says, "it separates the boys from the men."
>
> Don't know why the silly farmers don't want to take away all supports. Would certainly be better than having supports on some items and nothing on others. This country was built on free enterprise and doing without supports. Supply and demand will regulate prices more fairly. All the real dirt farmers we talk with think the same way, yet there are so many new, get-all-you-can type of people moved in the farming industry. They are the joiners and the promoters. The rest of us think ourselves too busy or not capable and let them do our polling for us, then we set and talk about how it should be done.
>
> Here in Arizona we are a new State and we are getting more and more big-business men from other States in here buying up land at a good price. They have the money to spend and are really developing a lot of the land. In many ways it is good for the State.
>
> There are more and more small farmers going out of business. Many men from other States are moving in to plant citrus as a sideline. Larger groves are going in all the time. In the future, Arizona will be the leading citrus State, I believe.
>
> Immigration officials have been down in these parts many times recently. They haven't visited any of us. Would have liked to have had them here to explain and tell them about a lot of things pertaining to the wet Mexican situation. If one only read the papers and didn't know anything else, then one would think what a wonderful job was being done. We were the first ones, here in the valley, to get men on contract years ago when we could first get men legally on contract. Tex and Mr. George Pickering (head of the association here) took the first truckload of Mexicans to Mexicali to get them processed.
>
> That was fine and everyone was very happy. Then came the time when contracts were to be renewed. All of a sudden, Mexico didn't want the same men to be contracted; they wanted to tell the farmers whom they could contract. After the farmer had gotten a man trained so he could do a good day's work without watching and teaching every small detail to the worker, the farmer couldn't have that trained man back; he was forced to send that trained man back and take a new man on a new contract; that wouldn't have been so bad if the Mexican Government hadn't sent men from drugstores, clerks, men from banks and other professions to be contracted. The regular wets that came of their

own accord wanted to work and could take the heat and stay well. The men that were sent over on the new contracts didn't know how to do manual labor, didn't care to learn, and couldn't stand the heat. It was bad for the worker, and he was of no help to the farmer. Therefore, when they couldn't get their men back, people started to hire wets. There's talk of unfair treatment. Always there are a few in any locality or business who take advantage. If the Mexicans were not treated right, they didn't need to stay. Personally, I don't know, but in a very few cases where the men weren't paid what they were supposed to receive was about what they earned. They were living better than they had ever lived before. Also they were happy.

Any farmer and most businessmen here in this part of the country know we can't farm without help. The white man here won't work on a farm and work the hours we are compelled to work. You can't irrigate 8 hours and shut the water off until the next morning. The farmer takes it for granted that during certain seasons and on certain jobs you have to do on the farm, you can't just shut down everything just because you have worked a certain number of hours. In the busy part of the year I know we are up early and won't eat dinner until 9 or later. Your hired man expects to get off early to eat, go to the show, or whatever the family would like to do. That is the way it should be, but when the crops are ready to harvest, you try to get it in before the wind or rain beats you to it. Small operators can't work their farms on a shift like you do a business; therefore you have irregular hours and usually long ones.

Another thing the farmer can't compete with factory or union wages. We just don't make that kind of money and never know when the insects, rain, or weather will ruin our income for the next few months or year. I don't mean that farming is not a good business, it is, and we wouldn't trade our way of life with the city dweller, but you can't farm by shifts.

A very good way to have handled the wetback situation and the cheapest, would have been to have stations at the border, where the farmer could take his men and get work permits for a certain length of time and when the farmer no longer needed the man or men, take them back to the station and get a release; each workman would carry his work permit with him and immigration could easily check any Mexican; if no work permit, he would be sent back across the border. All farmers would be listed, and how many men each had contracted; no association or anything else needed. It is too bad the wets infiltrated into the factories and industries. They don't belong and aren't needed there.

As far as Red infiltration, it wasn't the peon that came across the border to work. You could find many that came across on contracts. We here in this part of the country are amazed at the ignorance of some of our lawmakers and officials, about the whole situation. This big row and all the publicity that has been broadcast and space that it has been given, has been a big help to the Communists, both here and in Mexico. Here the Communists are telling the people that the wets are taking the work away from citizens and keeping labor down; the Reds say if the wets weren't here the farmers would have to pay union wages and every one would have a better job. I had a woman come to see me about work for her 16-year-old son, who has been away visiting, has returned and wants to work until school starts; one of our neighbors insulted him by offering him a job at 60 cents an hour doing odd jobs; the neighbor really didn't have a job but was only doing it to help the boy. Now, if that had been our son and he needed a job, he would have thanked the man and tried to do a good job and learned what he could; this boy was very indignant and would rather not work if he was only going to get 60 cents; I doubt if he is worth that much any way. This family firmly believes the agitators they have been listening to. I tried to explain to the woman that you couldn't lay off steady workers to give someone work who had to quit in a few weeks. Well she said the farmers were all getting rich because of the cheap labor. I told her how she has said for many years how she has thought we were silly for putting in so many hours, especially Saturdays and many times on Sunday, working; now she thinks we are getting rich and keeping her from working at higher wages; every thing she said during the conversation was just like a parrot repeating after an agent.

On the other side of the border the agents are busy telling the wets that have been sent back that both the North Americans and their own Government are trying to take everything from them.

As far as the men we sign up on contract being screened, that's a big joke; also, immigration would haul busloads of wets to Calexico and put the men over on the Mexico side; the next morning the same men would come across the line and go to work in the tomato, melon, and other fields, and at night the immigration officers would pick them up again and haul them back again. It looked good on paper; great amount of wetbacks they were hauling across; really doing a big cleanup job. It's true there has to be a limit on how many come across the border, and also the Mexicans should not be allowed to work in the industries or take work from American citizens, but here in the farming area, where we can't get anyone else to do the work, the Mexicans are a necessary factor in our farming operations. On my recent visit to San Francisco, I talked with many orchard owners; their apricots were falling on the ground; no one to pick them; and maybe you think the farmers weren't about ready to march; all the time in the papers there were statements as to the plentiful supply of farm labor to be had. You called the farm employment agency and also the same answer, "Nothing today, but call tomorrow, we'll be sure and have plenty of help." All the time the apricots and plums were falling on the ground. All the farmers think someone in Washington is either on the wrong side or very misinformed. You can't please everyone, but this matter could be handled in a much more economical and more satisfactory way. When Washington came down it spent a few hours listening to a handful of men chosen to tell it what it wanted to hear; had some pictures made and had the complete thing under control; this is what burns the farmers up. Another thing, there were many immigration officers not up to standard; in the past they have taken money away from the Mexicans; that is not just rumors. What chance does a wet have testifying against an officer? Our regular crew of border patrol here in Yuma are good men. Some of the officers that were sent in here were really rough. The union officials and the Communists are the only ones happy over the situation.

We at the present time have enough help. This time there were special negotiations arranged whereby we got contracts on some of our old hands, but in 6 months we will turn these men back and it will be all to do over again with more redtape and money wasted. There will be stiffer and more unreasonable requirements to meet. Our boys were all across the border, with one of our association men, for 3 weeks, while the officials stalled. It was carried on like the peace conferences, only in a lesser degree. You will be asked to approve over $3 million for the coming year to keep the problem under control. The thing the union leaders want more than anything else is to make the farmers pay a big fine if found hiring anyone without papers. As long as we can get labor legally at a fair working contract we won't hire men unlawfully, but what if we can't get help? Anyone would hire anyone to save their crops; that's only human nature. We have just played into the hands of those who wish to ruin our country. I still think it only right to have them come into our country legally, but we don't need a big army with airplanes and all the equipment to do it if it were done in a different manner. While all the men were across the border trying to get papers all the farmers tried to get help from our local supply. There wasn't any to be had. We were irrigating this 500 acres, cutting hay, raking, baling hay, and feeding 400 head of cattle green hay, which had to be cut three times a day and hauled to corral. We have a white baler crew; it has done our baling for a number of years. Luckily Tex and a friend of ours cut and raked, and Tex fed the cattle. I run all the errands and did what I could to help. We only found one man who thought he wanted to work. He was 2 hours late the first morning. You have to rake hay while it is still damp, so he didn't do much that day. Besides, he broke the equipment and Tex had to work that night and repair it.

The next day, he called at 8:30 a. m. and said he had overslept and would be out soon; Tex had been out since 3:30 raking and so when the man came to work I told him he had better cut, asked him if he wanted me to show him how and he said "No," he was experienced. In about 30 minutes I looked down where I had told him to start and he had the tractor off in a ditch and was coming to the house. Tex had to quit what he was doing and come get another tractor to pull him out. He had broken the cycle and Tex told him to put another one in. Did he know how? Oh, to be sure. Anyway he started to beat it out on the opposite side, one end has an opening to slide it out, but no; he was trying to pound it out through a solid end. Well, I didn't know Tex had as much patience. He put the cycle in and got him started again and then a few minutes later he came in and said he wanted a few hours off to take his wife to town to visit her mother. Imagine us; here we were, trying to get the hay in and not have to stop the water and he wants to quit to take his wife to visit. Anyway, he took off and was going to come back early the next morning. Well, the next morning he couldn't get up early because he had looked at television until late. Tex got him a job in town and we gave a big sigh of relief. That was our only experience with the only local man we could find.

All the time the immigration officers were coming in on the ranch every few hours checking to see if he had any wets in the haystacks or hidden in the bushes; if we hadn't been so busy it would have been funny to see them with their guns swinging on them and their billie clubs, about to pass out from the heat; many of them came from back in the Midwestern and Eastern States and naturally couldn't take this terrific heat; Tex and I felt different about them than many of our neighbors did. We considered they had a job to do and were trying to do a good one, some of our neighbors took it personally; thought the officers were only here to take their help away. They were certainly glad when orders came through for them to move out. They didn't find it much cooler where they went as the heat wave was all over the country.

Anyway the whole thing was misrepresented; we had no social problems here with the wets, as far as them being diseased and bringing dreaded sickness to our country, that is false as the men had to be pretty hardy individuals to withstand all the hardships they have to go through. Many of the men passed here for years and they never gave us any trouble; we never had anything stolen or harmed in any way. In the other valleys there were many robberies and burglaries, supposedly committed by the Mexicans. The Mexicans were good alibis. Well, enough said about the wetback situation. I only hope the farmer isn't made to pay a heavy fine in case he can't get help in the future; if we should go to war, all the farmers will be required to produce more, and we'll need labor from any source. It is a situation that needs a lot of thought before any action is taken. Do hope this situation can be handled in the future more to everyone's satisfaction and without a standing army to do it. My how I have spun my say. But anyway, I do wish there had been a little more factfinding done before the methods used were taken to do the job.

We expected you and Mrs. Sieminski and Christine to visit us during the Christmas holidays last year. We have plenty of room and would enjoy having you any time. During the next few weeks, before school starts, would be a good time; its hot outside, but not much worse than in other States. Our house is always nice and cool, due to our wonderful air conditioner. Chris and Brenda could go to the club every day swimming. We could do a lot of looking around in an air-conditioned car. Harold and Tex still are amazed at the shooting ability of General Swing. There are many doves coming in already; it will probably be good shooting again this year.

We have had little wind and rainstorms here every afternoon for several days; it has done a lot of damage to the alfalfa seed crops; so far it hasn't done too much damage to ours as yet, as ours is late; only turned 145 acres to seed this year as the price hasn't been what it should be to make much on. There's such a gamble on a seed crop. You always have Mother Nature to plan on, she always plays her tricks just at the worse possible time and many times gets your entire crop; we have had heavy losses from rain and wind for the past 3 years.

I have taken the money you and General Swing gave me to buy a gift for our little Mexican girl, and bought her a silver cake server and had your name and that of the general's engraved on it, and it will always be one of her most prized possessions. She got married last August and is expecting this September. We were fortunate in securing a 6-month contract on her husband, who has been with us for 6 years. She can stay with her sister in Mexicali and it isn't too bad; at least we know she will be well taken care of, as we have a very good doctor for her. She is like a daughter to us, only more in need of us as she has been orphaned so long. Her wedding clothes were beautiful and she was a very pretty bride to be proud of. Hope our Brenda can grow up to be as good and sweet as Vehenia.

Tex came in a while ago and really got a kick out of this book I have written. Did not mean to run an edition of South Gila News, but guess I am enjoying the much-needed practice on my typewriter. I have not used one for many years, and this one is about as old as I am. The combination, as you can see, is terrific.

Tex got his deer, elk, and antelope last fall. We have been too busy to do any fishing this year. Hope to go to San Diego before too long to go out for yellowtail to put in the freezer for this winter.

To get through this letter will be almost as bad as being a lawmaker in session during a filibuster.

Will expect you and the family to pay us a visit in the near future. Let us hear from you again soon.

HELEN THOMAS.

Mr. Speaker, so goes the letter. The idea is to keep people from breaking the line of march, be it from hunger, for food on grocery store shelves, as the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK] described it, or from lack of labor to save their crops. Farm folk, like mountaineers, pioneered this country, Mr. Speaker. They are tough and courageous, as are all Americans. It is the line of march we have got to watch. It must not break. That is our job.

The reference to General Swing. As Sixth Army commander, he hosted my inspection trip. We went shooting before dawn, on our time, not on Uncle Sam's.

Tercentenary of Brooklyn Protestantism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 7, 1954

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, early this year Brooklynites celebrated the 300th anniversary of the founding of the first Dutch churches in the borough. In that connection a pageant entitled "City Under God" was presented. The following article which appeared in the Brooklyn Eagle of February 25, 1954, tells of the highlights of this gala affair:

City Under God To Be Presented Again Tonight

(By Alan St. James)

An ageless and well-informed Protestant, versed in every phase of his church's history in Brooklyn, will take you on a time-capsule trip through the 300 years of Brooklyn Protestantism tonight if you visit the Academy of Music.

The Protestant, played by Julio Gasteiro, is the narrator for the pageant, This City Under God, presented in celebration of the tercentenary of Brooklyn Protestantism by the churches of Brooklyn and the Brooklyn division of the Protestant council.

He guided a near-capacity audience last night through a series of episodes in two parts depicting scenes from the early Dutch beginnings of Protestantism in Flatbush and Flatlands right up to the present-day church.

LAST PERFORMANCE TONIGHT

He'll do the same thing tonight at the academy in the second and last scheduled performance of the production.

Written by Helen Kromer and produced and directed by John Fuhrmann, the pageant begins with a prolog in which the 50-voice pageant choir files down the center aisle singing the inspiring hymn, A Mighty Fortress Is Our God, and the narrator briefly establishes the essential quality of the Protestant belief.

The early Dutch episode shows how Dutch settlers, plagued by English thieves, force Gov. Peter Stuyvesant, of New Amsterdam, to provide means for their protection, education, and religious needs.

The Governor, played by John Kennaday, establishes the Reformed Church here, and a succeeding scene shows the first pastor, Dominie Theodorous Polhmeus, played by Elmer Hausmann, catechizing children of the congregation.

In the next episode an edict from Amsterdam establishes religious freedom in the colony after an itinerant Quaker is arrested and tortured by civil authorities for merely preaching his religious beliefs.

BATTLE OF LONG ISLAND

The Battle of Long Island in the Revolutionary War brings out an interesting episode in which a couple of Brooklyn brothers are separated because one chooses to take the oath of allegiance to the King of England. Four years later he returns to the rebels after his brother had died in a Tory prison.

The next episode deals with the growth of many Protestant denominations in Brooklyn, the institutions they established, and the general growth of the city.

The final episode before intermission depicts the antislavery movement in Brooklyn. Perhaps the most impressive scene here, and of the entire pageant, is the one in which the Reverend Henry Ward Beecher, played by Linden Lindsay, redeems a Negro girl from slavery by conducting an auction in the Plymouth Church of the Pilgrims.

Beginning with a cheerful musical and pantomime sequence of immigrant arrivals after the Civil War, the first episode of part 2 tackles the depression of the seventies.

SETH LOW KNOCKS OUT CORRUPTION

The depression brings corruption, but good government is restored to Brooklyn by Mayor Seth Low and he established the Bureau of Charities to consolidate public and private funds.

In the following episode the humane efforts of Protestant institutions around the turn of the century is depicted in a Christian home for working girls, home missionary work and the newly established Methodist Episcopal Hospital.

Following an episode in which the 1914 era is shown by a music and dance scene called Windy Day on the Bowery, the Interfaith Movement is portrayed when Rabbi Alexander Lyons, Father John Belford, and Dr. S. Parkes Cadman speak out for interfaith cooperation.

The next episode shows the formation of the Brooklyn division of the Protestant council to add impetus to the interdenominational movement.

In the final episode a typical Protestant skeptic gets a fresh look at Protestantism and agrees with the narrator that "This isn't just a history I saw here tonight. This is me, and you, and you out there in the audience."

The pageant is brought to a close with the choir, directed by Cecile Jacobson, singing the Hallelujah chorus.

GIDEONSE GREETS GUESTS

Dr. Harry D. Gideonse, president of Brooklyn College and chairman of the 300th Anniversary Committee, welcomed the audience and introduced Borough President Cashmore, honorary chairman; Dr. J. Henry Carpenter, executive secretary of the committee, and Mrs. Carleton D. Mason, chairman of the pageant committee.

Dr. Carpenter presented Mrs. Mason with a bouquet of roses in appreciation of her efforts.

Lighting for the pageant, which has a cast of 300, is designed by Theron Musser. The choreography is by Kathleen O'Brien. Edith W. Wells is assistant director, the Rev. J. Blain Fister is production coordinator, and William Carr is stage manager.

Mr. Speaker, many organizations participated in this celebration which will be long remembered. The following article gives an interesting account of the growth of some of these Protestant organizations. It appeared in the Brooklyn Eagle of February 7, 1954.

Two Significant Anniversaries Coincide With the Tercentenary

(By J. Henry Carpenter, executive secretary Brooklyn division, Protestant council)

This is an exceptional anniversary year in Brooklyn. It is the 300th anniversary of the founding of the first Dutch churches in our now vast and important Brooklyn. Therefore, we are all together celebrating the Tercentenary of Brooklyn Protestantism.

There are two other very significant anniversaries this year also. The annual meeting of the Brooklyn division of the Protestant council which was held last Tuesday—the 125th such meeting in Brooklyn. The other anniversary is the 125 Sunday School Union parade which comes on June 10, and will be run by the Brooklyn Sunday School Union.

CITY MISSION SOCIETY

In 1828 our forefathers decided that in some way the churches of the then thriving community should come together to meet the problems of evangelism, social need, and for Bible and tract distribution. Therefore, in this year the Brooklyn City Mission and Tract Society was organized. It was to aid the poor and unfortunate, to evangelize the unchurched and generally distribute Christian literature, tracts, and Bibles to the seaman, strangers or those in prison or distress.

EVANGELISM

During the turn of the century, there was organized the Brooklyn Evangelistic Committee. It prospered, held services throughout the city, but in 1937 the officers turned the activities of this organization over to the Brooklyn Church and Mission Federation, and last year the interest on the remaining endowment and funds were given to the Brooklyn division of the Protestant council to be used in perpetuity for the original evangelistic purposes of the society.

FEDERATION OF CHURCHES

In 1919 a group of prominent ministers in our borough, not satisfied with the services and the program of the Greater New York Federation of Churches, organized the Brooklyn Federation of Churches. This church cooperative effort grew quickly to become an outstanding force for righteousness in our community. The first executive secretary was Dr. Frederick Marsh Gordon, who passed on in 1932. Under his energetic and forceful leadership, the Federation developed a Christian education department in 1926 with J. Henry Carpenter as secretary. Soon there were over 100 vacation and weekday schools in our borough. In the same year a department of chaplains for jail and hospitals was instituted.

CHURCH, MISSION FEDERATION

In 1928 a movement was started to bring the Brooklyn City Mission Society and the Brooklyn Federation of Churches together. The same board members were elected by each organization. Dr. Gordon became the executive secretary of both organizations. In 1933, a few months after Dr. Gordon's death, his plans and hopes became realized. The two organizations merged into the Brooklyn Church and Mission Federation. This brought together the endowments of the two organizations amounting to over $200,000, and made possible the continuance of the united church effort in the borough as one organization.

BOROUGH COUNCIL DIVISIONS

In 1940 plans for a citywide council were developing. In 1943 the Brooklyn Church and Mission Federation together with the Greater New York Federation of Churches and later the Metropolitan Federation of Daily Vacation Bible Schools merged into the Protestant Council of the City of New York. The officers, staff, and activities of the divisions remained the same, but the Brooklyn division had the valued advanttage of being a part of the whole—the citywide organization. Divisions were organized in the Bronx, Staten Island, and Manhattan, and for the last 10 years even greater progress has been made.

COUNCIL OF CHURCH WOMEN

In the year 1942, the Brooklyn Big Sister Council went out of existence. Brooklyn church women, however, felt there must be an interdenominational church organization. So, in 1944, former members of the Big Sister Council, the Women's Council of the City Mission Society and representative women of the churches came together to organize the Brooklyn Council of Church Women. Mrs. George M. Billings was the first president, and Mrs. Carrie D. Hepper the first executive. This council, affiliated with the Brooklyn Division, has grown and prospered. Mrs. John E. Zeiter, now president of the New York State Council of Church Women, was the second president. Mrs. Martin Paul Luther is the present president, and Mrs. Mary C. Packre the present executive.

FEDERATION OF PROTESTANT MEN

During the year 1944 a group of Christian laymen came together from four churches of the Flatbush area to form a Protestant men's organization. At first confined to this particular part, the Federation of Protestant Men has spread throughout the borough. It now has representatives from 24 churches including Lutheran, Presbyterian, Congregational, Baptist, Universalist, Methodist, Reformed, Disciples, and others. Churches on the Heights, in Bay Ridge and other areas are now participating. The annual communion breakfast held each year in the Flatbush Dutch Church brings together over 500 laymen.

LAWYER'S ASSOCIATION

The Protestant Lawyer's Association was organized in 1950. Although not a member, the group cooperates with the Brooklyn division of the Protestant Council. There are now approximately 75 members. They hold four meetings a year, and lead in better government and civil movements. They forward the place of Protestantism in public life. The first president was Federal Judge Walter A. Bruchhausen. The present president is Alfred C. McKenzie.

IN 1954

For 1954 the Brooklyn division of the Protestant Council is still growing and developing. The Christian Education Department is promoting and supervising 102 weekday schools of religion and 100 or more vacation Bible schools and day camps. The Reverend J. Blaine Fister is the executive director and Mrs. Alice F. Robertson, the associate. Dr. David M. Cory is the director of the Christian Social Relations Department and the chaplaincy service which ministers to 33 hospitals and the Raymond Street Jail.

WHAT IT COSTS

The total citywide budget adopted for 1954 is $457,811.15. The total Brooklyn budget, including the tercentenary celebration expenses, is $151,275. Of this money $74,805.75 comes in from services, interest on investments, special designated funds from the Protestant Teachers Association, foundations, and a citywide allowance. Therefore, Brooklyn has to raise only $76,469.25 this year. Approximately $1 is already assured to Brooklyn for each dollar donated by Brooklyn friends and members.

Reinsurance Plan's Defeat Pleases AMA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 28, 1954

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, the above caption is a headline appearing over a news item appearing in a recent issue of the Post and Times Herald, of Washington, D. C. The article purports to set forth an interview with Dr. Walter B. Martin, AMA president.

During the last few months, when the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has had under consideration President Eisenhower's health plan to meet the high cost of medical and hospital attention, I have had occasion to refer on several occasions to the adverse attitude of the AMA to certain important parts of that program. I have been fearful that at times some persons were a bit skeptical of any statement that indicated opposition upon the part of such a fine organization of men. However, the article to which I have referred, and which I have included as part of my remarks, seems to fully justify the truth of the statements made as to the position taken by the AMA in opposition to the health reinsurance plan of President Eisenhower.

It is important to note that Dr. Machin in the reported interview, said "he is satisfied that the proposal itself was no step toward socialized medicine," but, then proceeds to take the preposterous and unrealistic position—"A lot of people might have been disappointed and then might have tried to amend the law in that direction." It is hard to realize how anything more ridiculous than the last portion of his statement could have been conjured up in the mind of even the most aggressive opponent.

In describing the reason for the defeat of the proposal Dr. Machin was most unkind to the Members of Congress who voted as requested by the American Medical Association. He is alleged to have said that defeat of the proposal came as no surprise to him, because "a lot of Congressmen were undecided and a lot of others did not know what was in the bill." I hope this statement was a slip on the part of Dr. Machin and that he did not really mean what he said. If so, then, it was most uncomplimentary to infer that a lot of the Members who voted against the bill did so because they did not know what was in the bill. Surely, Dr. Machin did not want to be understood as charging that the Members who voted against the bill at the solicitation of the AMA did so without knowing what was in the bill.

Dr. Martin further says that "the idea advanced by Mr. Eisenhower needs more study" to determine whether it is really worthwhile. I am in full accord with the thought that it should have "more study" by Dr. Martin and other executive officers of the AMA who assume to speak for the physicians who are members of the organization. To do so will reveal that it not only was not a step toward socialized medicine, as he has so properly admitted, but, neither does it do any harm to any physician nor seek in any way to control the practice of medicine, or curtail the right of the patient to have the doctor of his own choosing. In fact the opposition of Dr. Martin, presumably speaking for the AMA, was based upon the fact that the plan was not satisfactory from an insurance standpoint. Upon what theory could such an opinion prevail in the face of the fact that many of the most outstanding insurance companies and insurance executives of the highest standing approved it. I am of the opinion that while many individuals would be willing to accept the opinion of Dr. Martin in a matter of medicine, that most persons would prefer to acept the opinion of insurance executives in a matter of insurance.

Furthermore, I am convinced from the many communications I have received that Dr. Martin, although assuming to do so, does not in fact speak for nor represent the views and opinions of the rank and file of the American Medical Association.

It is very plain that officials of the AMA, who have spoken out against the bill, have done so either without reading the bill or making any study of its provisions. Even a most casual reading of the bill would have been sufficient to convince anyone with an open mind that the bill was a most noteworthy approach to providing a solution for long-term expensive illness. Furthermore, a reading of the voluminous testimony developed during the long hearings, representing the viewpoint of many of the most outstanding physicians, businessmen, insurance executives, labor leaders, and those active in different types and kind of health insurance would have been convincing as to the great need for such a plan of reinsurance as the bill provided. It is true as Dr. Martin said, there has been a great growth in recent years of health plans to insure against the high cost of illness. And, yet organizations such as Blue Cross, American Hospital Association, and others of a similar character strongly endorsed and supported the plan provided in the proposed legislation. The fact that such organizations sought the enactment of the President's plan should be sufficient to satisfy any unbiased mind that the plan was meritorious and should be adopted.

I am convinced that the people of this country as they become more familiar with the President's proposal, and knowing as they do the need of some plan to help them meet the terrifically high cost of long-term illness, they will demand the enactment of a law that will make effective the President's plan.

President Eisenhower rightly said: No one but the people lost in the defeat of his plan.

I include as part of my remarks the news article that gave rise to this expression of views upon my part. It reads as follows:

REINSURANCE PLAN'S DEFEAT PLEASES AMA

(By William L. Umstead)

The head of the American Medical Association said yesterday his organization opposed President Eisenhower's health reinsurance plan as "ineffective and unneeded."

Dr. Walter B. Martin, AMA president, was interviewed by telephone from his home in Norfolk, Va., on the House's 238-to-134 vote Tuesday to kill the plan, heart of the President's health program.

Martin said he and other physicians in the AMA had wired their Congressmen to urge them to vote against the measure, but he said no undue pressure was brought on Congress by his organiaztion.

PRIVATE PROGRAMS PRAISED

"Defeat of the proposal came as no surprise to him." Martin added, "because a lot of Congressmen were undecided and a lot of others didn't know what was in the bill."

Martin said the AMA had informed the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare of its opposition to the plan on the grounds that it "wouldn't accomplish very much and would be ineffective."

The AMA president said private health insurance programs are growing rapidly and still expanding and should be able to meet health insurance needs without Government participation.

He noted that health-insurance coverage has jumped from 9 million to 93 million persons in 15 years, and said a remaining 37 million insurable persons in the Nation could be brought into the program in a reasonable period.

NEEDS MORE STUDY

"The President's proposal" Martin continued, "would not have made any more insurance available to persons who cannot afford it now and would not have reduced the costs of insurance."

Martin said the idea advanced by Mr. Eisenhower needs more study to determine whether it is really worth while. He said the original proposal had not been thoroughly worked out.

He said he is satisfied that the proposal itself was no step toward socialized medicine, but added: "A lot of people might have been disappointed and then might have tried to amend the law in that direction."

Mr. Eisenhower's plan was killed when the House voted to send it back to the Commerce Committee. GOP leaders conceded that this killed the bill for the year. The proposal called for the Government to underwrite private health insurance by absorbing 75 percent of the losses incurred by companies participating in the expanded program.

States Rights Group Is Formed in Augusta

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. DAVIS
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 28, 1954

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I insert herewith an item which appeared in the August (Ga.) Chronicle for Sunday, July 18, 1954, entitled "States Rights Group Is Formed in Augusta":

STATES RIGHTS GROUP IS FORMED IN AUGUSTA

An organization pledged to fight application of the Supreme Court's segregation ruling—and with an overall goal of enforcing States rights—was publicly launched here yesterday by a number of prominent Augustans.

Temporary officers of the group, named the Association for the Restoration of States' Rights, are Hugh G. Grant, president; Roy V. Harris, vice president; and Rodney S. Cohen, Jr., secretary-treasurer.

STEERING COMMITTEE

Members of its steering committee are S. D. Copeland, former Richmond County school superintendent; William M. Lester, former State senator; Bright McConnell, former Richmond County agent; and Frank Turner, former Richmond County commissioner from Blythe.

Public announcement of its formation came after preliminary meetings Friday night and June 14 that developed aims and plans for future operations.

The latter include a mass meeting—designed to make the move contagious—within 60 days at Bell Auditorium. Leaders are hopeful of securing Gov. Herman Talmadge and some United States Senator from a Southern State to keynote the session.

SECOND GROUP

While the association's top trio stressed that the group is not linked with politics or other groups with like aims, it nonetheless is the second Augusta area movement against mixing of the races to crystallize within the past several weeks.

Presumably working along similar lines is the newly formed National Association for the Preservation of the White Race, Inc., which says it seeks to retain segregation and counter the influence of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.

Harris, an Augusta lawyer and veteran State politico, said the association had been formed independently on a countywide basis. Hopes are, however, that the move will spread to other counties and in time to neighboring States, it was said.

Leaders contend they are not scared by implications of the High Court decision, since under Georgia's constitution public schools exist on a segregated basis or not at all.

MILITANT CRUSADE

Elsewhere—and from a long-range point of view—the association has resolved to wage a militant crusade against what it terms "the infiltration by radical organizations into churches and schools for the purpose of ending segregation."

And it struck out against what association members maintain are efforts by the Federal Government to usurp the rights of State and local governments.

Leaders also blasted recent resolutions by the North Georgia Conference of Methodist Churches, the Southern Baptist Convention, and the Southern Presbyterian Assembly endorsing an end to segregation.

The association insists that such acts are unrepresentative of the opinion of rank-and-file church members and adds the hope that the group will provide a mouthpiece through which these members can voice their opposition.

GRANT PRESIDES

Friday night's meeting, held at the Richmond Hotel, was presided over by Grant, former United States Ambassador to Thailand and Albania. Keynoters were Harris and Lester who summed up the thoughts of preorganization planning.

This session saw the association confirm a five-point resolution of aims and purposes drawn up during the June 14 meeting.

Citing the serious situation posed by the Supreme Court ruling, the resolution listed association purposes as—

1. To hold meetings with a view to bringing out all the facts in connection with the attempt to disrupt the system of segregation as established and maintained in Georgia.

2. To lend support to the appropriate State officials whose task will be to formulate a program to preserve the system of segregation in Georgia.

3. To lend support to the members of the Georgia Assembly in their official consideration of measures designed to preserve the system of segregation in the State of Georgia.

4. To lend support to the members of the Georgia congressional delegation in Washington in any steps taken on the Federal level designed to preserve the system of segregation.

5. To encourage the formation of organizations similar to this organization in other States which are confronted with the situation arising from the Supreme Court ruling.

Where Leadership Counts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 28, 1954

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, the New York Times on July 14, 1954, carried an editorial titled "Where Leadership Counts."

I would like to insert it in the Congressional Record.

The editorial follows:

Where Leadership Counts

If the country is successful in getting even a reasonably sound farm bill out of this session of Congress it will be because of the determination of the administration, backed by a handful of leaders who have had the courage to place the good of the Nation above selfish local interests.

The administration won its fight in the House of Representatives for flexible supports for the so-called basic commodities, though it failed to get the reduction in the minimum support levels that it sought. Before 90 percent rigid supports were introduced for wartime purposes the support range was 37 to 50 percent of parity. The abortive legislation of 1948 set it at 60 to 75 percent, and in the 1949 law the range was raised to 75 to 90 percent. The farm bloc has thus far succeeded, however, in blocking all efforts to make that provision for flexible supports effective. In the House the administration, for the time being at least, made the principle of flexible supports stick. The range agreed upon, however, was a far cry from the 37 to 52 percent crop loan provision of prewar years.

Now the fight is being waged in the Senate, and just as in the House the first round (that conducted in committee) has gone to the opposition. Considering how bad the bill is that emerged from the Senate Agriculture Committee, and considering that it was voted out by a margin of 13 to 2, the average person might be forgiven for concluding that the administration program now has little or no chance of success. Fortunately, that doesn't necessarily follow. The same thing happened in the House Agriculture Committee with respect to rigid 90 percent price supports, but this didn't stand up on the floor.

One reason is that, happily for the Nation, when vital issues such as this are debated on the Senate floor it is less a question of what the committee vote was than who the leaders are in the fight. Take as a conspicuous example the case of Senator Clinton P. Anderson, of New Mexico. This Senator, a former Secretary of Agriculture, is a Democrat, but every one of his colleagues in the Senate knows his record on farm legislation. They know that he has had only one interest—a sound farm law—and that he has worked incessantly with that end in view, regardless of the party in power. (It is typical of Senator Anderson that, while most of his objections to what he calls the miserable committee bill are shared by administration leaders, he hasn't hesitated to oppose one of the administration's own key provisions, the so-called set-aside provision.) When this bill goes to the floor for debate, to whom are the Members going to look for guidance? Are they going to look to this man, who has asked only one thing of every farm proposal to come before him—namely, Is it in the interest of the Nation? Or are they going to look to committee members like Senator Hubert Humphrey, who likes to be considered a liberal, but who is responsible for one of the most backward-looking of all the provisions that make this bill thoroughly iniquitous—the creation of a status for four more crops that would put them almost on the same footing as the six existing basic crops?

To ask that question is like asking which would have the greater firepower—a machinegun battalion or a battalion armed with flintlock muskets.

Trade Union Courier Approves President's Health Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 28, 1954

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, in the July 21, 1954, issue of the Trade Union Courier an excellent editorial appeared in support of the President's health plan. It would be well if some of those who are opposed to socialized medicine would read and ponder over the sensible and logical approach to a solution of the subject of high cost of medical and hospital attention that this editorial presents. It reads as follows:

President's Health Plan

It is regrettable that the President has suffered another defeat in his overall program to raise our standard of living for the entire Nation. When Congress voted, 238 to 134, to return to committee Ike's bill for the improvement and expansion of hospital and medical insurance plans, it certainly gave thereby unnecessary encouragement to the vociferous supporters of socialized medicine.

It is one thing to deplore such "Socialist" notions as socialized medicine on the grounds that the Government should refrain from any interference in science as well as industry, but still another thing to entirely repudiate governmental responsibility for helping the needy and the poor who cannot possibly afford high-fee medical care or costly life-and-death medication.

The President's health plan was indeed mild enough. It was designed to create a fund on which private groups might draw when absolutely necessary for their respective medical insurance plans which cover an important segment of the population. The President's plan was a step in the right direction, and we deeply regret that certain shortsighted elements in his own party have unwisely chosen again not to go along with his fair and reasonable approach to serious domestic issues.

Thus far the President is making good on all his promises and he has shown an admirable openmindedness on every controversial question. We suggest that some die-hard legislators ought to follow his example and reexamine their preconceived notions on creeping socialism.

PRICE OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

The Public Printer is authorized to furnish to subscribers the daily Record at $1.50 per month, payable in advance.

Remit by money order payable to Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Printing and binding for Congress, when recommended to be done by the Committee on Printing of either House, shall be so recommended in a report containing an approximate estimate of the cost thereof, together with a statement from the Public Printer of estimated approximate cost of work previously ordered by Congress within the fiscal year (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 145, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on Printing, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

DISTRIBUTION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

To the Vice President and each Senator 100 copies; to the Secretary and Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, each, 25 copies; to the Secretary, for official use, not to exceed 35 copies; to the Sergeant at Arms, for use on the floor of the Senate, not to exceed 50 copies; to each Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress, 68 copies; to the Clerk, Sergeant at Arms, and Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives, each, 25 copies; to the Clerk, for official use, not to exceed 50 copies; and to the Doorkeeper, for use on the floor of the House of Representatives, not to exceed 75 copies; to the Vice President and each Senator, Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress there shall also be furnished (and shall not be transferable), 3 copies of the daily Record, of which 1 shall be delivered at his residence, 1 at his office, and 1 at the Capitol.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided,* That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized book dealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by book dealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the Record.

Rem
m
fe

IN T

M
Gab
ant
fairs
on e
annu
fere
14, 1
info
futu
econ
prod
in th
addr
erno
ask
in th

Th
were
as fo

Go
gent
to co
econ
you
Ther
us w
in W

Pr
stabi
hear
port
preo
suffic
I fee
struc
was

At
you
were
this
men
duct
were
time
trou
deal
out
and
Ame
In th
Gove
of th
gove

W
and
at t
suad
abou
nego
men
requ
back

Appendix

Remarks by Dr. Gabriel Haugge, Administrative Assistant to the President for Economic Affairs

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CARLSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 29, 1954

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, Dr. Gabriel Haugge, Administrative Assistant to the President for Economic Affairs, delivered an outstanding address on economic development before the 46th annual meeting of the Governors' conference at Bolton Landing, N. Y., on July 14, 1954. The address was a timely and informative report on the present and future program for an expanded economy and increased gross national production of $440 billion to $450 billion in the period of the next 5 years. The address was well received by the Governors and the citizens generally, and I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Governor Herter, governors, ladies, and gentlemen, it is a very great privilege for me to come here to kick off this discussion on economic development, and I want to thank you very much for the opportunity to do so. There are few things of greater concern to us with responsibility in the economic area in Washington.

Frequently we lump together two ideas—stability and growth, or development. I have heard criticism of the January economic report of the President because it was too much preoccupied with economic stability and not sufficiently concerned with economic growth. I feel that is a rather unfortunate misconstruction of the document, because there was real concern shown on both counts.

At the time that document was written—you will remember, at the end of 1953—we were moving into a rather rough phase of this postwar readjustment. The unemployment figures were mounting, industrial production figures were declining, retail sales were beginning to show the effect of changed times, the workweek was beginning to show trouble. There was, quite naturally, a good deal of concern with stability. But throughout that whole economic report is a great and driving concern that the potentials for American economic advancement be realized. In that grand project, obviously, the Federal Government has a role to play, but as in all of these matters, it doesn't have the whole governmental role to play by any means.

We who have worked with these problems and have tried to help the President along at the staff level are fundamentally persuaded that a period of economic growth is about to begin. We think that we have about negotiated the difficult and awkward adjustment period during which the President was required to guide the American economy back off an inflationary war and postwar precipice, through the rough ground of transition that had to be traversed in order that we could once again resume our healthy economic advance. We think that has pretty well been accomplished, and we think that, marked against the yardstick of history under such postwar circumstances, it has been a remarkably moderate adjustment for the American people and the American economy.

Needless to say, we do not rejoice that the unemployment figures today are 2 million above what they were a year ago. But we do rejoice that we have not had to go through the typical historical experience of mass liquidation after a war inflation with its widespread foreclosures, its mass unemployment and all the other debilitating consequences. We have been able to make this adjustment with reasonable cost to our Nation, harsh as it has been to particular individuals. Now we are prepared to resume our economic growth again.

I think there are four basic conditions that can give us confidence in the longer-run development of our country.

First, there is the point that the Vice President spoke about Monday night—the thrust which population growth gives to the whole economic picture.

Second, there is the technological revolution which is going on at an astounding rate in the laboratories of this country. Last year we spent $4 billion dollars on research and development in the United States, and of this the Federal Government was responsible for half. We believe that is an intelligent way to stimulate economic growth and development and I think that this administration will continue to play its part in that respect in the future.

A third factor that prompts an optimistic outlook with respect to economic growth in this country is the impulse in Americans to what I might call "more and better." This fact provides a great, fertile field for American industry and business to exploit.

Fourth, I think we have finally succeeded in breaking the thrall that settled in upon some of us during the decade-long depression of the thirties, that somehow our economy did not have within it the regenerative forces to employ the labor and the capital of this country at reasonably high levels of use. I think that more and more Americans now are coming to the conclusion that we need not and will not have another depression, that our problem is rather one of so conducting our affairs that we can hold fluctuations about a growth curve within an acceptable range. I think the chances are excellent that we can do just that.

There is no reason why, over the next 5 years, the real production of this country—gross national product measured in terms of constant dollars—should not get up into the area of $440 to $450 billion.

Now what about Government policy?

As a result of the Employment Act of 1946, in which the Congress declared it to be a national purpose to create those conditions in which high employment was stimulated and maintained, we have had a great deal of thinking, constructive thinking, as to how the Federal Government can best and most effectively touch the private economy. It is not something you can or should do with sledgehammer blows. The kind of private economy we have in this country is a most extraordinary mechanism. The incentives that guide it, the responses it makes to restrictions, are delicate matters, and Government must move with due regard for that basic sensitivity of our economic system.

If we are going to have an enterprise economy, we have to release enterprise. If we do not do so we are going to be concerned with finding ways to make up what we are not getting from the enterprise system and that will lead, in the end, to a system unrecognizable from what we think we want. Therefore, a purpose of Government must be to remove, wherever possible—and to avoid adding—hampering restrictions upon the release of enterprise in individuals.

We believe that our tax system, our system of regulations and controls, should be such as to achieve their purposes without preventing the release of this personal enterprise which is the heart of the enterprise system. Nobody has found any solution for the spark that comes from allowing people to put things together which other people want to buy.

Also, if our kind of system is going to work, there must be equality of opportunity. That is another aspect of removing hampering restrictions. That means in education, that means in jobs, that means in every area where a man or woman who has something to contribute, he or she will be given a chance to do it.

Further, I think that government at various levels has, in the words of the President, a responsibility to help construct a sturdy floor over the pit of personal disaster. As I said to you when you were in conference in Washington recently, this economy is not going to get productive, efficient, buoyant members of the labor force if people are concerned primarily with how they are going to protect themselves when they lose their jobs, with how they are going to protect themselves wholly on their own resources. Therefore, we have programs at all levels of government that are sound economically—quite apart from the humanitarian reasons which also support these programs—because they give us the kind of people participating in our economic system who will risk and take a chance for the future ahead.

Finally, our kind of economic system is one that must create opportunity if it is to survive.

Now, there are two ideas about economic growth that I find as I look at opinion today. One is that growth at a maximum rate must be achieved at any cost and the cost usually is represented by a massive intervention by the Federal Government, with resultant inflation and unacceptable regimentation.

We hear today that it is a crime if the economy does not operate right up to its maximum pitch every month, every quarter, every semiannum, every year. In other words, our goal should be not only virtually to abolish severe business cycles, which I think we can, but also to abolish every little wrinkle in the curve of business activity as it sweeps upward and onward to greater and higher goals.

I'd love that, of course, but as I analyze this doctrine, which is presented in very attractive form in terms of a maximum rate of increase in the gross national product per year—with intervention by the Federal Government on whatever scale and in whatever manner is necessary to achieve it—I conclude it is something that we had better study carefully, to check its vaildity and to see what the costs are.

I think the costs would be very great in terms of inflation, in terms of increased regulation in our economy, and that ultimately it would be self-defeating. In all economic history I do not know of any economy which has been successfully stimulated by injections through the budget over a sustained period of time. I think it simply will not work. In Europe today I think we see a steady abandonment of that doctrine. Rather, I believe that the full-employment doctrine has become a more sensible, moderate concept, holding that government has a responsibility to try to create those conditions where these wrinkles in the business curve—as we go upward in higher levels of production, output and income—will be held to a minimum. But as long as decisions are made in an enterprise economy, freely, by entrepreneurs and workers, I think it is a dangerous illusion to suggest that we can eliminate completely the minor swings that reflect the free decision-making process.

There is an alternative to that idea of how to stimulate economic growth. It calls upon Government to create a set of conditions permitting a maximum release of the potential enterprise within our system and to use Government to build up a supporting structure so that fluctuations of the economy can be held within a small range.

I think that the fluctuations we have had recently—the sharp recession of 1937–38, the recession of 1947–48, the recession or adjustment, or whatever you want to call it, that we have had since the middle of 1953—indicate a possible progression away from the severe shocks that have shaken our economy in the past. There may be underway a progression toward much more moderate fluctuations, so that if we arrange our affairs correctly, we can handle them with a minimum and an acceptable amount of discommotion in our economy and to our citizens.

Where do we stand now? Today we have reached a position, I think, where the retreat from July of 1953 has been stopped, where there is a reorganization going on, where the economy is catching its breath for a new advance.

I think the employment figures for June and the failure of unemployment to increase are heartening. The lengthening of the workweek is an encouraging factor, because it usually precedes an improved reemployment rate. The strength of retail buying in June should not be lost upon us. I think the possibility of the savings rate being adjusted downward somewhat—in support of larger spending by consumers out of given incomes—is something to watch. I think that the shrinkage from 18 percent between May and June in the hard core of unemployed, those who are unemployed over 15 weeks, is a significant item.

What the stock market is telling us, the stability of consumer prices, the stopping of the decline in gross national product, the recent rise in industrial output, the continued improvement in average hourly earnings and average weekly earnings, the healthier situation with respect to inventories, availability of the money and credit, the high level of construction contracts awarded, I think these are solid facts on which we can conclude that the retreat, the settling out, the readjustment, the recession, whatever you want to call it, has stopped, that we have beaten the spiral process and that now there is every chance that we can go forward.

I would say that on the negative side of the picture we have certain facts that we have got to keep definitely in mind. We have got to keep cost-price relationships in mind. We've got to get our agricultural situation in shape, we've got to get that program cleaned up and get it on a healthy basis so that it is not a threat to the economy.

I think we've got to pay as much attention as we possibly can, to be as helpful as we can, to certain large industry areas which are undergoing a combination of cyclical and secular difficulties. I think that all of these things have to get very careful attention.

I think the economic program of the President which is now moving through the Congress, will make a very great contribution to the future potential growth of our economy.

Tax revision, the farm program, social security, housing, slum clearance, unemployment insurance, the St. Lawrence seaway, the potential expansion in road construction, all these things that are part of the President's program have billions of economic stimuli in them. They will become effective in due course soon after the Congress has acted.

These are things that the Federal Government is thinking about and is trying to accomplish, but, as I said in opening, the Federal Government and the way it touches the economy is only part of the story. As I understand it, the meeting here this morning is devoted to an examination of how the States, in their activities can most effectively contribute to this economic growth. These activities include taxes, public works, the way in which regulatory authorities conduct their business, and the attack on problems of particular industries. I hope that in the course of this morning's discussion a good deal of progress can be made in analyzing these issues. If there is any aspect of any of them that can be considered helpfully by any of us down in Washington, I will certainly be most happy to try to carry the word back and see what we can contribute in any way at all.

Recognition of Red China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 29, 1954

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, ever since China fell into Communist hands, placing a contiguous land mass from the Elbe River to the Pacific Ocean under the direct or indirect control of the Kremlin, the legal recognition of the Mao Tse-tung regime by the world's principal powers has been one of the major intermediate goals of Soviet diplomacy. Having themselves experienced the disadvantages of nonrecognition for a number of years, the rulers of Soviet Russia are determined to obtain universal recognition of Red China as speedily as possible since they rightly feel that international legality is at present a prerequisite for the effective furtherance of the Communist master plan for world revolution on the part of China.

Extension of diplomatic recognition to Red China by the United Kingdom was a major triumph for Communist diplomacy. It not only accomplished one of the points of Mao's master plan, but also created a wedge between the United Kingdom and the United States, which has been used effectively ever since. As a result of the Korean war and the recent Geneva Conference, increasing pressure has been brought upon official and public opinion in the United States to extend recognition to Red China for the sake of "peace." One of the principal arguments presented here is that it is unrealistic as well as politically unwise to withhold recognition from a government which rules a land mass one-third larger than the United States and is inhabited by more than 460 million people.

This argument is based on the vain hope that political differences could be effectively minimized through such recognition. It is based on expediency and disregards moral considerations. It also disregards the inevitable advantages accruing to the Red Chinese regime from legal recognition on the part of the United States.

To say that it would be unrealistic to ignore the fact of Red rule in China is true. The United States have recognized this fact by holding formal talks with representatives of the Red Chinese in Kaesong, Panmunjom, and Geneva. However, the United States refuses to recognize the lawfulness of the Red rule in China. Diplomatic recognition implies a stipulation of legality.

In 1917, the czarist regime of Russia was overthrown, and after a protracted struggle, there emerged the Bolshevik rule which consolidated slowly, survived internal upheavals and World War II, and which today is directing not only the affairs of the U. S. S. R. with its close to 200 million people, but also the string of conquered and subservient satellites as well as every Communist Party in the world.

The United States Government long refused to extend de jure recognition to the Bolsheviks. While this condition existed, the Soviets were unable to become a true world power—and a true world menace. Only after the government of Franklin Delano Roosevelt hastened to recognize Bolshevik Russia in 1933 were the Soviets able to cloak themselves in legality, send their agents abroad, and rise rapidly toward the zenith of power.

Once de jure recognition had been extended to Soviet Russia by the administration of Franklin Delano Roosevelt, the Russians immediately embarked upon a campaign to convince the world of their new-found respectability. And while inside Russia, the consolidation of Stalinist power found bloody expression in the great purges of the middle thirties, such moderates as Maxim Litvinov and Ivan Maisky spoke in dulcet tones at the conference tables of the League of Nations and the capitals of the Western World.

The rude awakening came in 1939, when the Soviets abruptly signed their notorious pact with Nazi Germany, thus opening the way for the start of World War II. That this historic bit of perfidy and blackest treachery should have been completely forgotten and forgiven a few years later when Soviet Russia asked for and received, in fact, the green light for postwar aggression at Yalta, remains one of the most astounding riddles of our time.

Legal recognition of Russia by the United States has brought about Russia's strong position in the United Nations, the charter of which not only grants the Soviets 3 votes instead of 1—Byelorussia and the Ukraine are regarded as separate entities—but also made possible the single power obstruction expressed in the 60 vetoes so far cast by the Soviets. There is no more justification for separate votes for Byelorussia and the Ukraine, than there is for Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto Rico.

History might have taken a different course but for the recognition of Soviet Russia by the United States. The mistake should not be repeated in the case of Red China.

The Forand-Douglas Bills, H. R. 9430 and S. 3553

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 29, 1954

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a resolution which is in the form of a letter from Mr. Wayne Yarman, president of the Knox County Labor Council, Federation of Glass, Ceramic, and Silica Sand Workers of America, Mount Vernon Local, No. 20, Mount Vernon, Ohio:

MT. VERNON, OHIO, *July 27, 1954.*

The Honorable J. HARRY McGREGOR,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Would you please carefully consider the following resolution:

"RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF IMMEDIATE ACTION BY CONGRESS ON THE FORAND-DOUGLAS BILLS, H. R. 9430 AND S. 3553, SPONSORED BY 86 REPRESENTATIVES AND 12 SENATORS FOR FEDERAL UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION STANDARDS

"Whereas present unemployment compensation payments to insured unemployed wage and salary earners are woefully inadequate as to weekly amount and number of weeks duration; and

"Whereas substantial and prolonged unemployment in Ohio and inadequate unemployment compensation payments have caused increases in expenditures for relief purposes resulting in increased drain upon revenues depleted by slackening business activity and income in the community; and

"Whereas the amounts of such unemployment payments in Ohio range from a minimum of $10 to a maximum of $30 and are limited to 26 weeks, with weekly payments averaging only 40 percent of the State's average weekly wage; and

"Whereas this is far below the average of 50 percent and the maximum of 66⅔ percent recommended to the States last February by President Eisenhower, Secretary of Labor Mitchell, the Federal Advisory Council on Employment Security, and the National Conference on Labor Legislation; and

"Whereas long-term unemployment has resulted in 600,000 insured workers exhausting their rights to payments before being reemployed and such exhaustions continue at the rate of 40,000 a week, making plain the need for an extension to 39 weeks, as proposed in H. R. 9430 and S. 3553, introduced by Representative FORAND, Senator DOUGLAS, 85 other Representatives, and 11 other Senators; and

"Whereas these companion bills, if enacted by Congress before adjournment, would implement President Eisenhower's recommendations as to amounts of unemployment compensation payments and would extend the duration beyond his recommended 26 weeks, to 39 weeks, and, at presently anticipated continuing unemployment, would get approximately $2 billion a year of additional purchasing power into the hands of insured unemployed workers and their families for instant high-velocity spending and distribution throughout our entire economy; and

"Whereas the House Ways and Means Committee has recently completed hearings on proposed amendments to the Federal unemployment compensation law and has recommended a bill to the House for passage before adjournment; and

"Whereas President Eisenhower, at his June 16 press conference, stated that he has no intention of urging Governors to call special sessions of their legislatures to implement his own recommendations, now more than 4 months old; and

"Whereas this puts upon the Congress the last hope and full responsibility for action to carry out this vital part of President Eisenhower's legislative program in any way that will mean anything to the unemployed, to our economy and to the budgets of our States, cities, and other political subdivisions: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved,* That the Knox County Labor Council meeting on this 27th day of July 1954, urgently requests our Representatives and Senators to use their influence and good offices to persuade the House Ways and Means Committee and the Senate Finance Committee to adopt and recommend the provisions of H. R. 9430 and S. 3553 so that action in both Houses may be completed before the present Congress adjourns; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That we urge President Eisenhower at this session to make congressional action to implement his unemployment compensation recommendations a must item in his immediate legislative program; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That if either committee fails or refuses to report out favorably the provisions of H. R. 9430 and S. 3553, our Representative and Senators support appropriate action such as discharge petitions or the addition of the provisions as a rider to other legislation; and be it finally

"*Resolved,* That copies of this resolution be sent to our Representative, Senators, the President of the United States, the Speaker of the House, and the Vice President as the presiding officer of the Senate, with the request that it be treated as a petition under the Constitution and, as such, printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

"Presented this 27th day of July 1954."

With every good wish I remain,
Fraternally yours,
WAYNE YARMAN,
President, Knox County Labor Council.

Progress in the Federal Supply Catalog Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. R. WALTER RIEHLMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 29, 1954

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, after nearly 7 years of stalemate in achieving a Federal supply catalog system, substantial progress under the present administration can be reported.

The Military Operations Subcommittee of the House Committee on Government Operations held hearings on the Federal catalog program in January and February 1954. It recognized that the common supply language which will result from this program is a basic prerequisite to the improvement of military supply management.

On the basis of the testimony presented at the subcommittee hearings, together with more recent information from the Department of Defense, I am convinced that the Federal catalog program, as it is now proceeding, is sound, and that considerable progress is being made in achieving the intended results.

The Federal catalog system requires one common identification language to be used throughout the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps for all supplies. It provides for the replacement of the variety of separate names, descriptions, and numbers now in use by each of the military services.

As identifications are completed in each commodity class or manageable area, the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps change over from their existing varied identifications to the single uniform Federal identification data. This process is called conversion. Conversion has been completed as of June 30, 1954, for all items of food, clothing, medical supplies and equipment, and fuels and lubricants. Other classes will be converted progressively.

To supervise this very complex operation under the direction of the Honorable Thomas P. Pike, Assistant Secretary of Defense—Supply and Logistics—Mr. Roger F. Hepenstall was requested to take over the leadership of this program and willingly accepted. Mr. Hepenstall is vice president of American Can Co., and was selected for this post because of his broad administrative and management experience.

In addition to these gentlemen who are actively supervising the Federal catalog program, several outstanding industry cataloging specialists conducted independent surveys with a view to determining the soundness of the program as it is presently proceeding. These experts have highly endorsed the program and rendered valuable assistance through constructive suggestions and recommendations.

Last January, during the Military Operations Subcommittee's hearings, Department of Defense officials reported that 530,000 items had been identified under the single-name identification system as of that time. They further estimated that during the first 6 months of 1954 an additional 300,000 items would be so identified.

Since the subcommittee's hearings and report, the Honorable Thomas P. Pike, Assistant Secretary of Defense—Supply and Logistics—has informed me that during the first 6 months of 1954, the identification of 400,000 items was completed, bringing the total number of items now identified to 930,000. Thus, it is estimated that 46 percent of the total identification program has been completed, based upon the estimate that identification of a total of 2,000,000 items will eventually be required. It is now estimated that the identification phase of the program will be completed by September 1956.

Further, Assistant Secretary Pike now states that the Department of Defense has been able to revise its estimated completion date for the entire program—including conversion and initial utilization of the catalog system—and that such completion is now estimated at December 1958 rather than 1960 as previously estimated.

Such progress can be interpreted only as a manifestation of the sincere and inspired effort on the part of all the officials of the Department of Defense and the military departments participating in this program.

My subcommittee has followed the progress of this program with untiring interest because of its close relationship to the economic welfare and the military preparedness of our country. Because of the inestimable savings which will result from the application of utilization of this new system, the significant progress being made should be of interest to every Member of the Congress and every taxpaying citizen.

I have complete confidence in the manner in which this program is now being conducted, and I feel that appreciation should be expressed to those whose leadership in this program is producing such positive results. I join with Secretary Wilson in fully supporting this program with the hope that it can be completed at the earliest practicable date.

The Mutual Security Bill, 1955

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD H. REES

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 27, 1954

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I regret that I cannot support this legislation. It provides for an additional expenditure against an already depleted Federal Treasury, in the amount of $5,208,000,000. This is in addition to $7,397,000,000 already appropriated but not expended. So, you have a total of more than $12,600,000,000 that you are going to spend in 60 foreign countries. It amounts to an average of $375 for every family in the United States.

It is possible, and I think proper, that a share of this expenditure is helpful. That is where it really reaches the individuals themselves. But most of this huge expenditure goes to the heads of the governments who spend it largely as they choose.

I just cannot see why, with $7,397,000,000 obligated but unexpended and with $2,312,476,000 on hand, why in the world you should obligate your Government and mine for this additional appropriation, which, in fact we have not got but will have to borrow. This, in spite of the fact that our debt now is more than the combined debt of all other nations of the world.

Certainly, if I thought this expenditure would halt communism, I would not hesitate to support it. I know every Member feels the same way about it. It seems strange heads of other countries do not appreciate our assistance as we think they should. The people, themselves, know only about a small part of it. In fact the governments of many of the countries who share in this fund are anxious to use it in trade with Communist dominated countries.

The least you can do is to withhold the new appropriation included in this bill and do more careful checking on the funds that have already been obligated. I want to repeat seven and a half billion dollars is a huge unexpended fund but already promised and earmarked for projects in foreign countries.

AEC Power Contracts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SIDNEY R. YATES

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 29, 1954

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, during the hearings before the Subcommittee on Independent Offices of the Appropriations Committee, of which I am a member, it was indicated that the costs of construction of the plants of the Ohio Valley Electric Co. and Electric Energy, Inc., which had contracts for furnishing power to the Atomic Energy Commission, exceeded their original estimates substantially. Inasmuch as the rates to be paid by the Commission for power to such companies were predicated upon the costs of construction, it seemed to me that I should make inquiry of the Atomic Energy Commission whether the increases in construction were properly chargeable and necessarily to be assumed by the Atomic Energy Commission. I checked the matter not only with the Commission but with the Comptroller General of the United States, as well.

Much has been said about the fact that the proposed Dixon-Yates contract for the furnishing of power at West Memphis, Ark., requires payment of the taxes by the Government of the United States. It is interesting to note that the Comptroller General's letter of July 26 points out that the contracts of the Atomic Energy Commission with OVEC and EEI also provide for tax reimbursement through the inclusion of the taxes in the base upon which power rates are computed. One wonders whether these contracts are the most provident ones which could have been executed on behalf of the Government of the United States.

My correspondence with the Atomic Energy Commission and with the Comptroller General of the United States follows:

COMPTROLLER GENERAL
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, July 26, 1954.

Hon. SIDNEY R. YATES,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. YATES: Reference is made to your letter of July 13, 1954, acknowledged July 15, 1954, regaining the Government's liability, through power-rate increases, for the large increase in the estimated construction cost of powerplants now being built by private industry to supply power to the atomic-energy installations at Paducah, Ky., and Portsmouth, Ohio. You ask whether payments, including the increase in construction costs, have already been approved by the General Accounting Office and, if not, whether the General Accounting Office considers such increased payments to be properly chargeable to the United States.

You are advised that no audit by this Office has as yet been made of the actual expenditures involved nor has any decision been rendered as to the propriety of past or future payments. However, in view of the testimony given by AEC to the subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee, a survey has been made by the Division of Audits, General Accounting Office, as to the reasons for the large increase in the construction cost of the Joppa plant now being built to serve the AEC Paducah installation. A brief statement of the pertinent findings of this survey is enclosed herewith, from which it appears that labor difficulties were an important factor in the increased cost of the plant, and that labor costs make up the major portion of the overall increase in cost.

Examination has been made of the contracts pertaining to both the Paducah and Portsmouth installations, and it is my opinion that the Atomic Energy Commission is legally obligated to absorb the increased construction costs of both powerplants under the contract escalation clauses whereby the rates charged for power are based upon actual construction costs. The contracts also provide indirectly for tax reimbursement through their inclusion in the base upon which power rates are computed.

Sincerely yours,

FRANK H. WEITZEL,
Acting Comptroller General of the United States.

AEC-PADUCAH POWER DATA

The Atomic Energy Commission originally had intended to procure all its power needs for the Paducah plant from TVA, and TVA had included the cost of the necessary plant in its budget request (second supplemental appropriation, 1951). During the period of the appropriation hearings AEC changed its intentions and decided to procure 50 percent of its power needs from TVA and 50 percent from Electric Energy, Inc. The latter is a corporation organized by five companies who invested $3,500,000 in the new corporation as follows:

Union Electric Co. of Missouri	$1,400,000
Central Illinois Public Services Co	700,000
Illinois Power Co	700,000
Kentucky Utilities Co	350,000
Middle South Utilities, Inc	350,000
Total	3,500,000

The EEI proposal was to furnish AEC 500,000 kilowatts, half of the total AEC requirements, by the construction of a 4-generator plant at an estimated cost of $73 million. The proposal was represented to the subcommittee of the House Committee on Appropriations by AEC as being "just about the same" from the standpoint of power cost as the previous TVA proposal, and was accepted by AEC. Prior to entering into the formal contract on May 4, 1951, the estimated cost of plant construction was increased from $73 million to $87 million. While there was an increase in the size of the generating units, the major part of the increase apparently resulted from a reevaluation of the original estimate. The formal contract between the AEC and EEI was made May 4, 1951, and the design and construction of the powerplant was let by EEI on a cost-plus-fixed-fee basis to Ebasco Services, Inc. The following is a summary of construction cost estimates for the original four-generator plant during the time Ebasco was acting as contractor:

Period ending—	*Amount*
May 1951 (contract estimate)	$87,000,000
July 1951	96,915,000
October 1951 (20 percent completion)	98,950,000
April 1952 (30 percent completion)	103,306,000
October 1952 (55 percent completion)	108,600,000
April 1953 (70 percent completion)	128,500,000

In October 1952 AEC and EEI entered into a supplemental agreement whereby EEI was to expand to a six-generator plant. The above figures do not include the construction cost estimates for the additional two units. Because of the great increases in costs, particularly the approximately $20 million increase in April 1953, EEI took over management of the construction in May 1953, and about the end of July 1953 the Bechtel Corp. was brought in to complete the work. The estimate of completion costs in December 1953 was $130,204,000.

An important factor in the cost increase was labor difficulty. During the period Ebasco was contractor, from May 1951 through July 1953, there were 48 strikes which caused 96½ days lost time by all crafts plus considerable additional lost time by individual crafts. The exact effect on the increased construction cost of the strikes, slowdowns, and overmanning to prevent jurisdictional disputes as contrasted with possible management efficiency in labor utilization and labor relations is not measurable. It is also possible that the initial estimates of labor costs were unrealistic. We can only conclude that labor costs make up the major portion of the overall increase in cost.

The contract between EEI and the AEC sets certain charges for power demand and energy furnished with provision for adjustment based upon the actual cost of construction and operation. Despite the direct interest AEC thus had in the cost of construction, it had no positive authority under the contract to direct or control the construction work. Section 3.11 of the contract provides as follows:

"Review and Recommendations by AEC. While it is recognized that the operation and construction of the facilities * * * are the responsibility of company, the costs thereof have a direct relation to AEC's cost of power under this agreement, and accordingly AEC may from time to time review and discuss with company its operating and construction plans, practices, and procedures and make recommendations with respect thereto which in AEC's judgment may provide for economies in construction or operation, and company will adopt such recommendations of AEC as may be mutually agreed upon."

Thus it is made clear that AEC may make recommendations but adoption by EEI is in no way mandatory.

In view of the nature of the contract, the degree of control exercised by AEC officials was limited. Such control has consisted principally of auditing construction costs to insure that they are properly chargeable under the contract, reviewing reports, and making general observations.

In conclusion, it appears that once AEC had executed the contract with EEI practical considerations such as impending AEC power requirements and the delay incident to seeking power from another source influenced AEC to go along with the deal regardless of the increase in cost. Also, since the contract provisions established a power rate based on actual rather than estimated costs and gave AEC no positive authority to control construction practices, there was no effective method by which AEC could prevent or limit the great increase in construction costs.

Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C., July 13, 1954.
Mr. Frank Weitzel,
Acting Comptroller General,
General Accounting Office,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Weitzel: I am enclosing copies of my correspondence with the Atomic Energy Commission relating to the costs of construction and power charges as a result of contracts entered into between the Atomic Energy Commission and Electric Energy, Inc., and the Ohio Valley Electric Corp. The correspondence stems from the testimony of the Atomic Energy Commission to the Appropriations Subcommittee on Independent Offices, of which I am a member, for fiscal years 1954 and 1955.

The attached letter of May 19 signed by Chairman Lewis L. Strauss indicates that increases in the cost of construction exceed the original estimates furnished the Atomic Energy Commission by $90 million. Inasmuch as the rates for power to be paid by the Atomic Energy Commission under the contracts are predicated upon cost of the facilities, the estimated increase in annual rates is $4,400,000. The contracts run for 25 years, in the absence of cancellation. It is apparent, therefore, as a result of such increases, that the Government of the United States will be compelled to pay $110 million in additional power charges over the life of the contracts. When the Atomic Energy Commission was before our subcommittee, I questioned whether the Government should pay the additional costs. The increase in cost of construction at the Joppa plant of EEI alone exceeded its estimate by more than 40 percent. The Ovec increase amounts to approximately 10 percent. Obviously, a very large sum of money is involved in this matter.

The letter I received from Chairman Strauss states that the Commission considers the charges to be proper. He does not indicate whether your office has approved the expenditures as having been properly and reasonably incurred and therefore, chargeable to the Government of the United States. I would like to know (1) whether the increase in construction costs and the proposed expenditures accruing therefrom have already been approved by the General Accounting Office; and (2) if not so approved, whether the General Accounting Office considers the Government of the United States to be properly chargeable with the proposed increases in costs of construction and increased annual costs for power.

Sincerely yours,

Sidney R. Yates,
Member of Congress.

United States
Atomic Energy Commission,
Washington, D. C. May 19, 1954.
Representative Sidney R. Yates,
House of Representatives.

Dear Mr. Yates: This will acknowledge your letter of April 12, 1954. We are pleased to have an opportunity to add information as to the status of AEC auditing of EEI construction accounts. The audit we have just completed for the period to July 27, 1953, covers the construction expenditures during the time Ebasco was responsible for design, and construction. It covers the partial construction of the first 4 units of the Joppa plant. At the time construction by Ebasco was terminated, 2 of the 4 units had yet to be completed.

Our audit indicates that with a few relatively minor exceptions, the costs incurred are considered properly chargeable to construction under the terms of our contract. The exceptions our auditors have noted pertain to payments of Ebasco home office expenses, Ebasco fee, and the treatment of return on equity during the construction period. These exceptions will be reviewed by us with EEI and adjustments or explanations made as may be found required, but we do not expect these adjustments will materially affect the total cost charged to construction for the period of the audit.

The following indicates the increase in estimates of cost of plants being constructed by EEI and OVEC and the increase in annual power costs estimated to result directly from the construction cost increases:

Increase in plant cost over original estimate: Joppa, $58 million; OVEC, $32 million; total, $90 million.

Estimated increase in annual power charges for changes in cost of facilities: Joppa, $2,800,000; OVEC, $1,600,000; total, $4,400,000.

Payment for power will be based on actual construction costs as determined by audit as soon as practicable after completion of construction. The final Joppa unit is scheduled to be completed in August 1955. Final OVEC unit is scheduled to be completed in June 1956.

We trust this information is sufficient for your requirement.

Sincerely yours,

Lewis L. Strauss, *Chairman.*

Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C., April 12, 1954.
Mr. K. D. Nichols,
General Manager, United States Atomic
Energy Commission, Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Nichols: Receipt is acknowledged of your letter of April 9 respecting the review by AEC of the costs of construction of the Joppa and OVEC plants. I note your statement that AEC auditors have completed an examination of construction at Joppa covering the period from February 15, 1951 to July 27, 1953. I assume this is the interval during which the increase in costs brought a corresponding increase in the estimate for completing the plant from $139 million to $197 million, as I recall the testimfony of Mr. Cook. Now that the audit is complete, I should like to know whether AEC accepts the approximately $60 million in increased costs as being legitimate and properly chargeable to the cost of construction, or whether AEC rejected any part of them as being improper. I should also like to know what the increase in power costs will be for AEC as a result of the increases in estimates at both Joppa and OVEC.

Sincerely yours,

Sidney R. Yates,
Member of Congress.

United States
Atomic Energy Commission,
Washington, D. C., April 9, 1954.
Hon. Sidney R. Yates,
House of Representatives.

Dear Mr. Yates: During the recent hearing on the AEC appropriation for fiscal year 1955, I promised to investigate further the advisability of having the FPC or some outside accounting firm review the costs of construction of the Joppa and OVEC plants.

In developing our conclusion concerning the utilization of services of public accountants or FPC auditors, we have examined (a) the terms of the contracts pertaining to auditing; (b) the report on the audit conducted by AEC to date on the EEI contract; (c) the experience record and qualifications of the key AEC personnel administering these contracts; and (d) the program for administering the OVEC and EEI contracts, including the assignments to the audit staff.

AEC auditors have completed an examination of construction at Joppa covering the period from February 15, 1951, to July 27, 1953, during which time EBASCO was the general contractor. The first report on OVEC and the next report on Joppa construction will be made as of June 30, 1954.

Quarterly audit reports will be issued thereafter. We have found that personnel responsible for conducting engineering, construction and audit reviews are well qualified. A brief synopsis of AEC personnel with broad background and experience in electric utilities has already been furnished the committee for the record (see p. 2770 of pt. 3 of printed hearings).

The terms of the contracts provide the Government adequate access to the contractors' records for purpose of engineering, construction and audit examinations. The audit completed at Joppa encompassed a determination not only of the accuracy of construction costs but also of their proper classification of EEI accounts in accordance with the FPC Manual of Accounts, as required by the contract, for subsequent computation of energy charges. In the course of the audit, questions were raised regarding the reasonableness of the charges which are now under study for final determination.

It is our conclusion that the fundamental audit objectives are being adequately served by the AEC examination. We see some decided advantage in continuing to have the audit performed by AEC personnel. It can be conducted on a more continuous and current basis than would otherwise be practicable, thereby resulting in more prompt disclosure of improper or questionable items for administrative action. Furthermore, the program developed for administering these power contracts after construction is complete provides for the audit to be an integral part of such administration.

We recognize that there may be occasions when the knowledge and experience of the FPC can be utilized. You are assured that the AEC has had and will continue to have no hesitancy in seeking assistance from the FPC.

Sincerely yours,

K. D. NICHOLS,
General Manager.

Fluorides and Votes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY W. WIER
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 6, 1954

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a communication by Miss Vera E. Adams, president of the National Committee Against Fluoridation, Inc., Washington, D. C., entitled "Fluorides and Votes," which appeared in the Christian Science Monitor.

The letter from Miss Adams follows:

FLUORIDES AND VOTES

To the Christian Science Monitor:

Thank you for your editorial of June 8, Fluorides and Votes.

So "the dental profession is concerned that a committee of the House of Representatives should reinject into the political arena a nonpolitical issue which already has been decided by more than 40 years of scientific research," says the Journal of the American Dental Association. They would imply that the hearings before the House select committee, in the spring of 1952, investigating chemicals in food and cosmetics, were all for nothing, that the 300 pages of testimony devoted exclusively to the subject of fluorine in drinking water are just water over the dam, and that they thought the whole issue was dead and buried. We can tell them it is very much alive, and is daily increasing in stature, strength, and intelligence.

The attitude of the association, and the Public Health Service, in apparently claiming automatic exemption from any supervision or regulation by the Congress, is the very danger signal which has aroused so many liberty-loving people in this country to organize for their own protection. When the paid emissaries of the Public Health Service go out into our States, and into our cities, towns, and communities, and get their work done through the local authorities altogether, without the consent and very often without even the knowledge of the citizens of those cities, towns, and communities, does not this then become a political issue?

The propagandists are following a book of instructions in high pressure salesmanship, compiled and put out and paid for by a Government agency—this same Public Health Service. They are using everything short of physical force to put this over on the people, as evidenced by the urgent appeals constantly received by this committee for information, counsel, and assistance in fighting this mass medication which is being forced upon them. How else shall the people try to get redress from this coercion than by working through the Congress, or their representative therein? That is what they are doing, and will continue to do until this impudent attack on the integrity of the individual is defeated.

The point I want to bring out is this—that the local residents of a community very seldom have anything to say about the introduction of fluorides into their drinking water. The whole thing is engineered and decided for them by the local medical society, the local dental society, the board of health, the PTA's, which are virtually under gag rule, the Jaycees, etc. Then some day they wake up and find that they are drinking fluoridated water, and many of them do not even know this for a long time, if at all. Many of the residents of Washington, D. C., don't know it, and they have been drinking it for about 2 years.

We have a list of cities and towns which had fluoridation forced upon them without even their knowledge, among them Anchorage, Alaska; Miami, Fla.; Salem and Beverly, Mass.; Saginaw, Mich.; Charlotte, N. C., where they lied to the people in a mock public ceremony; Pittsburgh, Pa.; Nashville, Tenn.; Marchfield, Rhinelander, and Stevens Point, Wis. Over a dozen, to our knowledge, have voted it out after it had been in operation for a number of years, or after equipment had been installed. At the present time our records show nearly 400 cities of varying populations which have rejected this mass medication in one way or another, and more are being added every day, including nearly a dozen of our largest cities, and representing altogether a population of around 30 million.

In the case of the voteless and voiceless District of Columbia it is Congress that is directed and empowered "to exercise exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever over the seat of Government." But our District Commissioners sidestepped Congress and, under persuasion of the Public Health Service, managed to get inserted in the appropriation for the Washington Aqueduct a little four-word phrase—"and fluoridation of water"—with no amount of funds named, which they claimed as sufficient authorization, under their so-called "police powers," for the mass medication of the local residents.

Dr. Gordon Leitch, of the Oregon State Medical Society, in the medical journal, Northwest Medicine, for March of this year, says, speaking of public health officials: "When they step from the bounds of communicable and contagious disease they step out of their legitimate, well-recognized field, into the realm of medical therapy, whether preventive or curative, where the rights of individuals are of paramount importance and far transcend the interest of the public. Police power of the State, from which stems public health authority, has no place in the prevention or treatment of a disease which harms only the victim thereof."

What I have tried to emphasize here is that it is entirely improper to speak of "interference in local affairs" in the case of the fluoridation campaign, as it is not really the local citizens who are deciding the matter at all in most instances. It is still being decided for them, over their heads and behind their backs, by local agencies representing the very source and motive power of this federally conceived, federally promoted, and federally financed project.

VERA E. ADAMS,
President, National Committee
Against Fluoridation, Inc.
WASHINGTON.

Needed: 60 Ships a Year—On Order: None

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 29, 1954

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, Baltimore City, a part of which I am privileged to represent, has one of the great seaports of the United States. Baltimore is the home of several of the great shipbuilding and repair yards in the country. These shipbuilding and repair concerns, which had such outstanding records of production during World War II, are about to completely close down for lack of orders. Thousands of skilled workers are losing their jobs. The economy of the entire city had been dangerously injured.

Under unanimous consent, I include an article which appeared in the current issue of the Nations Business, August 1954, written by Paul Hencke. Mr. Hencke clearly and vividly illustrates the precarious position the maritime industry is facing today not only in Baltimore but throughout the whole United States.

The article follows:

NEEDED: 60 SHIPS A YEAR—ON ORDER: NONE

(By Paul Hencke)

America's shipbuilders and operators are worried about the future of the Nation's merchant marine. Here's why:

United States shipyards have not received an order for a privately owned ocean-going dry cargo merchant vessel for more than 3 years. The last of a group of Government-ordered freighters under construction now will go down the ways in 1955.

In our pool of 1,028 active and 2,212 inactive vessels are many ships that were built just before or during World War II. They all will become obsolete between 1962 and 1967. Others, notably the war-born Liberties, always have been considered outmoded.

Cargo offerings have been declining as a result of the end of the fighting in Korea and the recovery of foreign economies formerly dependent on American aid shipments.

To bring at least temporary relief to the trouble-wracked merchant marine, Congress last month was expected to approve expenditures to cover the Government's share, under the construction subsidy program, of 4 passenger-cargo vessels which private steamship lines are ready to order; to pay for the experimental conversion of 4 Liberty ships to make them better suited to military requirements, and to promote the construction

E

of new tankers by permitting the Government to buy and retire to the reserve fleet a number of overage tank vessels.

Still unsolved, however, is the problem of how to put the merchant fleet on a solid long-range footing. To do this, according to Under Secretary of Commerce Robert B. Murray, Jr., a peacetime nucleus of 36,000 shipyard workers should be continuously employed to meet planned mobilization needs. To maintain this force, Mr. Murray estimates, shipyards would have to build 60 ocean-going merchant vessels a year.

Unlike many United States concerns, the ocean shipping industry is in constant, direct competition with foreign operators. Because most freight rates are fixed by international agreements among United States and foreign steamship companies (to maintain stable rates and prevent wild price slashing on the world market) the average shipper in foreign commerce would find little, if any, difference in the shipping price quoted by domestic and foreign lines.

But the American shipowner who operates under these uniform rates has much higher cost of operation than his foreign competitor. Wages of United States seamen are more than twice as high as those paid by The Netherlands, second best-paying nation. It requires more capital to build a ship in United States yards than anywhere else—and American lines pay more for repairs, insurance and food than operators under foreign flags.

The Government officially recognized the squeeze on United States shipbuilders and operators with the passage of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936. This measure provides subsidies for the construction and operation of ships serving trade routes which the Federal Maritime Board deems essential to our commerce and defense. In both cases, the Government pays the difference between certain American and foreign costs.

But subsidies do not assure profits. They do not even guarantee against losses.

To obtain an operating subsidy, a steamship line must demonstrate that it is meeting substantial foreign competition on its route; that other Unied States flag vessels do not serve the route adequately; that its sailings will be scheduled. Furthermore, it must submit to strick Government supervision of its accounts and operations and maintain its fleet by replacements as ships become obsolete.

Subsidies are awarded on the basis of long-term contracts—usually 10 years—and are subject to recapture by the Government. If a line's profits during the contract period exceed 10 percent of the capital necessarily employed in the business, 50 percent of the excess must be returned to the Government until the recapture has equaled the entire amount of the subsidy paid.

In the first 10 years of ship operating subsidy, the United States spent $67,222,996.87 and recaptured $28,529,825.39. Thus, in its first decade, the program cost the taxpayers $38 million. Between 1947 and June 30, 1953, subsidy expenditures totaled $100,016,175.43. The amount to be recouped in this period has not yet been determined. The Maritime Administration has estimated that $65,736,000 will be required for operating subsidies in 1954, and approximately $69 million in 1955.

Sixteen steamship lines currently are receiving subsidy aid. Their ships ply 28 essential trade routes.

Since 1952 United States-flag ships have been carrying a progressively smaller percentage of total American imports and exports.

Latest figures available—covering 1953—show that our import-export trade was averaging 11,813,000 tons a month, with American-flag ships carrying 29.6 percent.

Proponents of a strong United States merchant fleet cite this country's growing reliance on raw materials from abroad. The Committee of American Steamship Lines, trade association for the subsidized lines, stresses this theme in a recent study which reveals, among other things, that the jobs of about 1 million persons in Ohio, Indiana, and Michigan depend upon ocean transport of 15 raw materials vital to steel-mill operation.

Fifty-four passenger-carrying vessels are now operating under the United States flag. Thirty-seven are privately owned, 17 are property of the Government. Private owners maintain 758 United States flag freighters, of which more than 100 are now inactive, and 433 tankers, of which 94 are in layup.

Total private investment in dry-cargo vessels and tankers has been estimated at $1,830,000,000. What this figure fails to show is the career investment of some 200,000 men and women whose livelihoods depend upon American ocean ships.

The urgent requirements of defense underlie the efforts which such groups as the American Merchant Marine Institute are now making to improve our merchant fleet. Government officials have learned that they must equate our defense capabilities with a strong, readily available merchant fleet. World Wars I and II and the Korean conflict demonstrated conclusively that merchant vessels are indispensable to the mass movement of military equipment and personnel and the raw materials needed for war production.

The Housing Act of 1954

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JESSE P. WOLCOTT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 29, 1954

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, the Housing Act of 1954 makes comprehensive revisions in existing housing, home financing, and slum-clearance laws and adds important new authorities, including several provisions designed to further protect the interests of both the homeowner and the Government. The bill places new emphasis on the rehabilitation and conservation of the Nation's housing inventory.

The FHA home repair and improvement loan insurance program is tightened up so as to require an insured lender to assume 10 percent of the risk on each individual loan, participation is limited to supervised lenders and others specifically approved by the FHA Commissioner, and insured loan uses and amounts are restricted to further guard against abuses. Authority is provided for FHA insurance of advances under open-end mortgages so that an owner may obtain long-term financing at favorable interest rates to make major home repairs and improvements.

Loans and terms of existing FHA mortgage-insurance programs with respect to sales housing are simplified, liberalized, and more nearly equalized as between new and existing construction. On a 1- or 2-family structure, within a maximum mortgage limit of $20,000, an insured mortgage on a new structure may be in an amount up to 95 percent of the first $9,000 of value, plus 75 percent of the excess above $9,000. On an existing dwelling a similar formula applies, except that the ratio is 90 percent of the first $9,000 of value, plus 75 percent of the excess above $9,000. Flexible authority is given the President to increase the $9,000 figure to $10,000 and thus further ease home-credit terms should he find such action to be in the interest of the national economy. Mortgage-maturity limits are set at a maximum of 30 years, but cannot exceed three-fourths of the remaining useful life of the property. With respect to existing FHA rental housing insurance programs, mortgage limits are set on a per room basis except for units containing less than four rooms. The basic room-cost figure is $2,500, plus an additional $500 allowance per room in the case of elevator-type structures, and the mortgage limits in the act were determined by applying to such cost the appropriate insuring percentage—80 percent under FHA section 207, and 90 or 95 percent under section 213.

New FHA mortgage insurance programs added by the bill include a 95 percent insurance program for servicemen—mortgage limit $17,100—and programs designed to aid in the rehabilitation of existing housing and construction of new housing in urban renewal areas and for families displaced by slum clearance and other public improvement operations.

The interests of the homeowner in FHA mortgage insurance programs is further protected by new provisions which require that a builder's warranty be given in connection with new sales housing, that FHA appraised values be made available to purchasers, and that FHA benefits may be denied to those willfully violating FHA or VA statutes or regulations. The interests of the Government in FHA mortgage insurance programs are additionally protected by new provisions which strengthen the reserve backing the Mutual Mortgage Insurance Fund, allow more time for orderly liquidation of acquired properties through lengthening the maturity date of debentures to 20 years, and provide for effective restrictions on mortgaging out operations in rental housing programs.

To protect against the use of FHA insured rental properties for hotel or transient purposes provisions are included to control and prohibit such abuses and effective enforcement authority is granted.

Two titles of the new bill relate to improvement of facilities for home mortgage financing with emphasis on the role of private enterprise. One provides for the rechartering of the Federal National Mortgage Association and the other for the establishment of a voluntary home mortgage credit program. The rechartered FNMA will provide a Government secondary market for certain FHA insured and VA guaranteed mortgages, limited market assistance for special FHA programs, and orderly liquidation of the mortgage portfolio of the existing FNMA. Provision is made that users of the secondary market facilities subscribe to stock in FNMA to the extent of 3 percent of sales so that over a period

E

of time the Government's investment will be replaced with private investment. Under the new voluntary home mortgage credit program representatives of various types of financial institutions, builders, brokers, and the Government will cooperate, in an organized manner, in facilitating the flow of private mortgage funds for Government insured or guaranteed home loans into areas where needed, including remote areas and small communities.

Slums and urban blight are vital problems in many urban communities. The new bill broadens the present concepts of federally assisted slum clearance and urban redevelopment programs to also include activities for prevention of the development or spread of slums and blight. There is emphasis on conservation as well as on cure and added responsibility is placed on local governing bodies in developing and carrying out broad, workable programs. As previously noted, two new FHA mortgage insurance programs are made operative to assist housing problems arising in connection with the carrying out of slum clearance and urban renewal programs. Coordinating authority is placed in the Housing and Home Finance Administrator.

Authority is granted for the Public Housing Administration to enter into new contracts during fiscal year 1955 covering 35,000 additional public-housing units to be located in communities which are carrying out slum clearance and urban redevelopment or urban renewal projects with Federal assistance. The local governing body must certify as to the need in meeting relocation requirements and the Housing and Home Finance Administrator determines the number of units required for relocating eligible families displaced by governmental action in the community. Provision is also made for the eventual self-liquidation of public-housing projects as well as for disposition to private ownership if a local community so determines and retires all outstanding obligations.

The new act makes several changes in law which affect Federal Savings and Loan Associations, the Home Loan Bank Board and the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation. The lending limit of member associations is increased from $20,000 to $30,000 per mortgage and the property repair and improvement loan limit is increased from $1,500 to $2,500 per loan. The Home Loan Bank Board is granted authority through administrative and court proceeding to enforce compliance by a member association with its laws and regulations without the necessity of resorting to the appointment of a conservator or receiver as had been the case. With respect to the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation a 3-year statute of limitation on claims is established, provision is made that service of process may be made on an agent of the Corporation as well as on the Corporation itself and a procedure for terminating insurance of member institutions is established which is similar to the insurance termination procedures of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.

The new act contains a number of other provisions including the extension of the FHA military and defense housing insurance programs, increase in FHA insuring authority, extension of the farm-housing program, establishment of an urban planning program and creation of a reserve of planned public works, transfer of the public agency loan program to the Housing and Home Finance Administrator and the establishment of advisory committees by the HHFA and its constituent agencies. Miscellaneous provisions relate to the disposition of specific housing projects and certain types of Government-owned temporary housing accommodations, status of insurance proceeds on school buildings being transferred from the Government to communities, interest rates on college housing loans, submission of specifications, keeping of records, reports, and audits.

The new act with its many comprehensive provisions should materially assist in maintaining a high volume of new housing construction and encourage the conservation and improvement of the nations already existing supply of housing accommodations.

Hon. Leon H. Gavin Given National Award for Distinguished Service to Conservation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS E. GRAHAM

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 29, 1954

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, a short time ago our esteemed colleague, Hon. Leon H. Gavin, of the 23d District of Pennsylvania, was given a national award for distinguished service to conservation. This came from the Izaak Walton League of America, the National Parks Association, the National Wildlife Federation, the Wilderness Society, and the Wildlife Management Institute.

This high honor was well merited. Those of us in the Pennsylvania delegation have long known of Mr. Gavin's intense interest in this great and constructive work, and we are all delighted to know that he has thus been honored. Mr. Gavin has been a strong and forceful advocate of appropriations by Congress of adequate funds with which to carry out the study and management of fish and game resources on these public lands, and it is indeed gratifying to us to learn that his efforts have been thus recognized.

I am only too glad of this opportunity to make this statement in the Record so that all those who are interested in these vital projects may know of his efforts in this respect and of the high regard that the members of our Pennsylvania delegation have for our distinguished colleague.

The American Indian: An Obligation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 26, 1954

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, the last days of this session are upon us, and this becomes a time when we should not take action on matters which have not had the most careful attention. I should like to include, then, under leave to extend my remarks, an editorial from the Denver Post of Denver, Colo., with most pertinent comment on legislation which may come before the House affecting the American Indian. I think this editorial contains a great deal of valuable information, and I recommend it to the Members who are interested in the welfare of our Indian people:

THE AMERICAN INDIAN: AN OBLIGATION

In a teeming nation of one-hundred-and-sixty-odd million people, 400,000 Indians may not seem like an important segment of the population to worry greatly about. It may sound realistic to say let them quit being Indians, and let them quit being protected, and let them be treated just like other Americans. This thinking starts out to support the administration program to put Indian tribes on their own as soon as they are ready, then goes far beyond that program with an urge to put the Indians on their own whether they are ready or not. Many Indians are far from ready.

What to do about the American Indian certainly is not one of the pressing problems before the Government. Its importance only becomes towering in stature when seen as a moral issue at a time when the national state of morality is due for a checkup. We have treated the Indians in shocking fashion before this.

Now our own civilization is threatened with aggression. We have seen the invasion of nations that were a part of it. We might be more acutely aware of the plight of the aboriginal Americans, whose country our ancestors invaded and took over. Now, more than ever before, we are under moral obligation to see that justice is done to the survivors of that American invasion.

We like to think that justice for the American Indian means making him a 100-percent American like the rest of us. What this implies is a condition the Indian has not been brought to in many tribes.

It implies that he has had the same health advantages, which he has not had. (A Navaho has a life expectancy of 20 years; the rest of us can reasonably expect to survive until at least 68.)

It implies that he has had the same economic advantages, which he has not. (The average family among the Turtle Mountain Chippewas of North Dakota has an annual income of $500; more than half the families of desert-dwelling Paiutes of Utah are dependent wholly or partly on charity and relief.)

It implies that the Indian has had the same educational opportunities as the rest of us, which he had not had. Some of them speak no English; large percentages of them are illiterate; many of their children are not in schools; even those the government judges as "literate" have most learned leaders who write such sentences as the following in their formal documents and petitions to the Government:

"The Shoshone-Goship Tribes took action against the bill were sent to Congress and ε

the Interior Department has not necessary, such bill, we are writing now to report to you on the general situation."

The Commissioner of Indian Affairs, Glenn Emmons, has contended that each tribal group must be dealt with individually, and each brought individually to economic and educational competence. He declares that the only way to make a true economy in Indian affairs is to spend enough money on them to set the Indians on their feet. Yet the Government shows a strange way of following this in practice.

Last year when Public Law 280 was passed by Congress it contained an amendment to let any State extend civil and criminal law jurisdiction of the State to the supposedly Federal "protected" Indians living under their own tribal laws within the State. Signing the bill, the President urged that this amendment be removed at this session of Congress. Both Democratic and Republican proposals have been made to carry out the President's request. But they are pigeonholed.

The Senate has already passed a bill that would terminate Government protection for the Utah Indians mentioned above, and the House is dangerously close to passing it. Recently the President signed into law a bill to "free" the Menominee tribe of Wisconsin, the cut-off date for them being December 31, 1958.

The Menominees were unusual in that they wanted to be released from Federal protection. Not the least enticement, no doubt, is that each enrolled tribesman is promised his cut of $1,500 which is the individual Menominee share to come from a $10 million fund set up in judgment after a lawsuit some years ago charged Government mismanagement of their timber operations.

Liberating the Menominees was the first step in the Government program to put all the Indians out of the Federal protection tent. Perhaps it was time for the Wisconsin tribe to go on their own, perhaps not. It remains to be seen whether they will prosper or be exploited by lumber interests to their own grief.

In the case of tribes already grief-stricken even with the inadequate help of Federal protection, such a brush-off would be inhuman, immoral, and unforgivable. Deprive them of their lands now and about the only future seen for these descendants of the invaded and vanquished early Americans is another nomadic existence, as public charges of one "civilized" community of the United States after another.

The Atomic Energy Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PRESCOTT BUSH

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 29, 1954

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record three editorials: one by David Lawrence entitled "GOP Gets New Ammunition," published in a recent edition of the Washington Evening Star; another editorial by Gould Lincoln entitled "Atomic Act Vote Called Victory for Eisenhower," also published in the Washington Evening Star of recent date; and a third editorial entitled "Mr. Knowland Really Leads," published in the Washington Evening Star of July 29, 1954.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

GOP Gets New Ammunition—Thirteen-Day Filibuster If Properly Explained to Voters, Seen as Aiding Republican Cause in November

(By David Lawrence)

Maybe the Democrats in the Senate have, by their 13-day filibuster, unwittingly furnished the country with a very persuasive argument for electing a Republican majority in both Houses of Congress next autumn. For the filibuster will be pointed out as an example of obstructionism and how the next 2 years can produce legislative chaos if the Democrats gain control of Congress.

Until just a few weeks ago, in recognition of the political and personal popularity of President Eisenhower, the Democrats in Congress were boasting that they were doing more to secure the passage of the main items in the Eisenhower legislative program than were the members of his own party. But now, when it becomes apparent that the Republicans are showing unity as the major issues come to final votes in the closing days of the session, there is a change of tactics. The tax bill passed the House by enough Republican votes, irrespective of any Democratic aid.

Whatever their reasons for deciding to spend 13 days in obstructing public business, the Democrats—and it appears to have been a concerted move—gave unintentionally some valuable ammunition to the Republican stump speakers.

Thus, at a time when matters have reached a critical stage throughout the world and important appropriation bills containing measures of military and economic aid were held up by the 13-day filibuster, the delay was dramatically emphasized before the whole country.

The Republican spokesmen will ask the voters to decide whether they can expect the Democrats to cooperate or to obstruct, and they will point to the filibuster as a glaring example of party irresponsibility.

General Eisenhower expects to make a number of speeches in behalf of the Republican Party before the autumn congressional elections take place. His whole effort will be aimed at getting a vote of confidence from the American people. If they want his leadership continued and if they want the kind of administration for which such a preponderant majority of the people voted in 1952, will they get it by electing Democrats next autumn who will be committed to follow the party strategy of doing everything possible to obstruct the legislative program of the President and to wreck the administration?

Before the 13-day filibuster, such an argument might have been regarded as the usual theme of a congressional campaign in the middle of an administration. But after the filibuster and the tactics used to prevent the passage of important bills, the country will not need much convincing that extreme partisanship still holds sway in the minority party and that 2 years of frustration lie ahead if the President's party is not given a majority at the polls.

Some of the Republicans have themselves done a great deal of harm to the President's program by diversionary measures, but not one of them can be justly convicted of having actually held up public business, as did the 13-day filibuster. What is important is that the Democratic Party did not accidentally take the course that was recently followed but decided on it in a deliberate way after conferences among the party members.

Wrapped up in the filibuster question, of course, is the attitude of southern Democrats who see in that technique the only way to keep from being passed a flood of legislation applying the nonsegregation principle to a lot of problems, from public housing to Government contracts, and other laws to which provisions objectionable to the South could be attached. If these ever come to a vote, there's a majority to adopt them and hence the southern Democrats feel they have a vested right, so to speak, in keeping the filibustering technique uncurbed.

But some of the Republican Party have not been inclined to press such questions in deference to some of their southern colleagues who were voting with them on basic issues of conservation versus radicalism. But the South lately has been sending to Congress some radicals who do not vote with the northern conservatives, and there is a tendency now among northern Republicans to feel that the time may have come to force a strict cloture rule through the Senate so as to prohibit unlimited debate.

The southern Democrats and the northern Republicans have operated a conservative coalition for many years but the attitude of some of the southerners seems to have been changing, especially toward the Government-ownership side. So the Republicans in the northern States will have a much more penetrating issue on the subject of party responsibility than they have had before if they begin to take up the unlimited-debate rule which the Democrats by concerted action have frankly utilized to try to block legislation.

Few issues are as easy to explain to the voters as the one that says a majority shall rule and a minority shall not obstruct. And the big issue could be whether the Democrats should be given an opportunity to control Congress and to bring on more of the kind of irresponsible Government which the 13-day filibuster so vividly illustrated.

The Political Mill: Atomic Act Vote Called Victory for Eisenhower—Clears Way for Big Crop of Bills for GOP Record

(By Gould Lincoln)

Chalk up another victory for President Eisenhower and his legislative program—the passage by the Senate of the atomic-energy bill. Incidentally, the House's favorable action on this measure by a substantial majority was a clever move by the administration leaders on Capitol Hill. It had its psychological effect as the Senate drove ahead under the leadership of Senator Knowland, California Republican, to break a determined filibuster against the AEC bill, conducted for the most part by New Deal Democrats and Senator Wayne Morse, of Oregon, the one-man Independent Party in the Senate.

As the 2d session of the 83d Congress goes into its final phase—presumably—the legislative crop assumes larger and larger proportions. On the list of important measures still awaiting action by one or both Houses is the farm bill, with the Eisenhower-Benson-supported program for flexible farm-price supports. This measure already has been passed by the House in a form acceptable to the President. The Senate, after a fight, is expected to follow suit. The housing bill was sent to the White House yesterday. The omnibus tax bill, the foreign-aid bill, the bill extending social security, and some, at least of the administration's anti-Communist bills, all will add to the picture of accomplishment.

WILL HAVE RESULTS TO SHOW

So the President will be enabled, as he had planned, to go to the country and discuss, during the congressional campaign, the Eisenhower program which has won an impressive victory in Congress, despite the fact that the Democrats have, part of the time, outnumbered Republicans in the Senate, and all of the time have almost equaled Republicans in the House.

The President, it is true, has had to take half a loaf instead of a whole loaf occasion-

ε

ally, as in the case of the 1-year extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. And in a few instances he has failed—for example, with the Hawaiian statehood bill, and with the proposed constitutional amendment giving a vote to 18-year-olds. On the whole, however, the record is one of accomplishment, for which the Republican leadership in the House and Senate is to be congratulated. It has had cooperation, on occasions, of Democrats and of the Democratic leadership. Further, although the Federal budget has not yet been balanced, expenditures have been cut so far that a balance can be expected—provided the international situation does not worsen greatly. And at the same time the tax burden of the people has been reduced by billions of dollars.

CAMPAIGN SHAPING UP

The congressional campaign is rapidly taking shape. Basically, so far as domestic issues are concerned, the contest will be between the Eisenhower philosophy of government, which seeks to return business to private industry and to cut down an overgrown National Government, and the New Dealers' plans for an ever-expanding Federal Government. At the same time, the President's program is progressive in its social provisions.

The political value of President Eisenhower to the Republicans has not lessened. On the contrary, many Republicans are hopeful the popularity of the President will aid them in the coming contests. With crucial votes on important measures still to be taken, the President is not giving blanket endorsement to all Republican candidates. Generally speaking, however, he will go down the line for his party's nominees. He already has had his picture taken with about 112 Members of Congress who plan to use the pictures in the campaign. He is not demanding that Members shall have supported his proposals 100 percent—although that he would like. But he is not going to put himself out to reelect Republicans who have turned against him repeatedly during this 83d Congress.

KNOWLAND'S FIGHT PAID OFF

The determined fight by Republican Leader Knowland against the filibustering opponents of the AEC bill, in which he used the day and night continuous session, votes to table amendments, and constant proposals for limitations of debate, brought him sharp criticism from the New Dealers. His unyielding attitude, however, paid off. Had he complacently run along with ordinary daily sessions of the Senate, disposition of that bill might never have been had—certainly at the present session of Congress. He had, in the end, cooperation of Democratic Leader Lyndon Johnson, of Texas, in bringing an end to the long and wordy debate. Senator Knowland's insistence on the continuous session had a great softening-up effect, focusing as it did public attention on the fact that a minority of the Senate was assuming dictatorial power through filibuster tactics. Few majority leaders of the Senate in the past have followed his pattern so successfully.

Mr. Knowland Really Leads

Majority Leader Knowland, in the Star's opinion, deserves commendation for the methods he used to break the filibuster against the atomic energy bill.

There have been anguished complaints from some of those who felt the majority leader's heavy hand. Mr. Knowland was likened to Louis XIV. He was accused of parliamentary bludgeoning. When he cracked the whip to expedite a final vote, there were those who said that he was the real obstructionist. These protests and others like them, one ventures to say, will fall on millions of deaf or indifferent ears.

The job of the majority leader is to lead. Mr. Knowland tried to be reasonable. He did not try to ram the bill through without adequate debate. The filibustering opponents were decisively beaten on the key test more than a week ago. Yet they continued to talk and talk and talk, hoping, apparently, to talk the bill to death. Mr. Knowland tried to limit debate. He failed. He tried cloture and that failed. Meanwhile, the key measures in the administration's legislative program were being backed up and seriously threatened by the filibuster.

What was the majority leader supposed to do? He might, of course, have yielded to the phony protests that this was a giveaway measure, a bill which betrayed the public interest. He might have conveniently forgotten that the objectives sought in the bill had been unanimously indorsed by the 5 members of the Atomic Energy Commission, 3 of whom were Democratic appointees. He might, in short, have withdrawn the bill. Or he might have let the filibusterers go on at a leisurely pace, talking by day and sleeping by night, until it would be too late to get anything done in this session of Congress.

But Mr. Knowland did not take either of these courses. Instead, he took the position that he was not going to permit a willful minority to dominate the Senate. He kept the pressure on until the final vote was taken. And the outcome of that vote—28 Senators against the bill, 57 for it—pretty well speaks for itself. Mr. Knowland deserves praise, not censure.

Antisubversive Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 29, 1954

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the President of the United States has once more rightly recommended congressional action before adjournment on antisubversive legislation.

Among the important pending bills requiring action are:

First. A bill to make admissible in Federal courts, evidence gained through wiretapping.

Such a bill has been recommended by a Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on which I have served as chairman. I hope the full committee will report it promptly and favorably.

Second. A bill to cope with the critical problem of Communist-dominated unions.

Third. A bill, now approved by the House, to strip United States citizenship from those who have, by their own infamous deeds, proven their desire to overthrow the United States Government by force and violence, thus rendering themselves totally ineligible for citizenship.

And there are several other antisubversive bills as well meriting prompt action.

In these closing days of the session, I earnestly hope that the mass of other legislation will not prevent action on at least those antisubversive bills which I have enumerated as well as others like the administration's witness-immunity bill, and so forth.

In conclude by pointing out this fact: Just about everyone has long expressed the highest respect for the Federal Bureau of Investigation. The FBI, of course, more than merits such respect. No wthere is a chance to demonstrate that respect by deeds. For I am sure that what the Bureau and its distinguished Director, Mr. Hoover, would most appreciate, as would Attorney General Brownell and the President, would be the necessary new legal instrumentalities with which the Bureau can further discharge, as it has already so well done, its obligations to the American people.

Let us untie the hands of the FBI so that it can achieve additional success in the antisubversive battle.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of an editorial which appeared in the July 27 issue of the Washington Evening Star entitled "How Congress Can Help the FBI," be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

How Congress Can Help the FBI

House response to President Eisenhower's request for authority to strip citizenship from persons convicted of seeking the violent overthrow of the Government was most enthusiastic. The administration bill to this end was passed with shouts of approval. There are good chances of Senate action, despite the rapid approach of adjournment.

The denaturalization plan proved to be popular in Congress from the moment it was proposed last January by the President in his state-of-the-Union message. It is said that the idea of depriving convicted Smith Act violators of citizenship originated with General Eisenhower himself. The law already provides for revocation of citizenship for persons convicted of treason or of bearing arms against the United States. It would be logical, the President felt, to extend this penalty to those who, like the leaders of the Communist Party, were found guilty of teaching or advocating the overthrow of the American Government by force or violence.

Actually, however, the principal Communist conspirators in this country would escape the denaturalization process, since it would apply only to persons convicted in the future. Most of the top-level Red leaders in America already have been convicted under Smith Act prosecutions and are in jail. Only lower-level Communists yet to be tried would be affected, if convicted.

If Congress wants to give the FBI some really effective help in ridding the Nation of spies and saboteurs—and there is no doubt of congressional intent in that general respect—it can do so by enacting the administration's wiretapping bill. The House already has passed a modified measure, permitting the FBI to tap spy telephones after first obtaining a court order. Both Attorney General Brownell and FBI Director Hoover prefer the Justice Department's bill, which would lodge authority for wiretapping in the Attorney General's office, rather than the courts. In either case the legislation would legalize the use of wiretap evidence in Federal courts, thus plugging a large and dangerous loophole in our defenses against enemy plotters. The responsibility for continued existence of this loophole is on Congress.

E

Unnecessary Government Competition With Private Enterprise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK C. OSMERS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 28, 1954

Mr. OSMERS. Mr. Speaker, one of the leaders in the nationwide fight to end unnecessary Government business competition with private enterprise and free labor is George E. Stringfellow, president of the New Jersey Taxpayers Association. One of the finest statements made before the Committee on Government Operations in its recent hearings on the subject of Government competition was made by Mr. Stringfellow, and, under leave to extend my remarks, I place in the RECORD Mr. Stringfellow's statement to the committee, a brief biographical sketch of Mr. Stringfellow, and editorials on the subject from the Paterson (N. J.) News, the Trenton (N. J.) Trentonian, and the Camden (N. J.) Courier-Post. This also gives me an opportunity to thank Mr. Stringfellow for the important role he and his organization have played in this battle to protect and strengthen private enterprise and free labor in this country.

The above mentioned follows:

STATEMENT BY GEORGE E. STRINGFELLOW, PRESIDENT, NEW JERSEY TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION, BEFORE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS WITH REFERENCE TO H. R. 8832, H. R. 9834, AND H. R. 9835, JULY 15, 1954

My name is George E. Stringfellow, of West Orange, N. J. I appear before you as the president of the New Jersey Taxpayers Association, an organization that is partisan only to the taxpayers.

Our association works at all levels of government—local, State, and Federal. With respect to the Federal level, its annual program, adopted by the statewide membership, calls for sound Federal finance, including: (a) A balanced Federal budget and improved congressional facilities to study the budget; (b) reduction or elimination of Federal subsidies to State and local government, business, and agriculture; (c) curbing of the trend toward Federal competition with private industry.

The bills before us this morning touch upon all three of these interrelated objectives. They bring into focus fundamental questions as to the nature and purpose of the Federal Government.

Today the Government is engaged in multifarious business operations ranging from coffee roasting to great transportation enterprises, and totaling more than 100 widely diversified activities. These constitute a major deviation from the role envisaged by the framers of the Constitution. That document leaves with the States and the people all powers not specifically delegated to the Federal Government. Nowhere does it indicate governmental preemption of the fields of private enterprise. It casts government in the role of arbiter, not entrepreneur.

In this connection, we in New Jersey are concerned over the threatened increase in the statutory debt limit above the present $275 billion. We realize that this threat derives from the belief held by some that the Federal income is such that later this year it may not give the Treasury a satisfactory working balance. Assuming this to be the case, our question is, What are the alternatives to increasing the debt limit? If there are such, we believe they should be utilized. While we realize that it is impracticable to take the Government out of competitive business and place this business upon a taxpaying basis abruptly, nevertheless, we can only conclude that one of the causes of the present fiscal situation is that the Government has denied itself the tax income that would normally result if its heterogeneous industrial empire were operated as private enterprise.

Industry—the work of men—is the root of wealth. As we look back over the years when men have been free to devote their ingenuity and their efforts in the production of wealth, we see our Nation assuming preeminence among the nations of the earth and its people enjoying the highest living standard the world has ever known. When we ponder the extent to which the Federal Government has entered the fields traditionally reserved to private initiative, we have grave misgivings for the future of our way of life.

The free-enterprise system provides the lifeblood of the national economy; it is productive; it is regenerative; it pays taxes. The right of individuals to answer the call of economic opportunity will always spur men on to great achievement. But government ownership and operation of the instrumentalities of production are the essence of socialism and the genesis of dictatorship, corruption, and national degeneration.

In the field of private enterprise it is the responsibility of management to produce products that are acceptable to the public; to keep the cost of production under control; to pay local, State and Federal taxes; to conserve capital investment and to replace and expand it as necessary; and to give stockholders a reasonable return upon their investment. These are challenges which call for the best efforts that men can give. Through the resulting prosperity, the Nation prospers.

Usurping the role of industrial manager, government reduces the volume of private business, while competing unfairly with its own citizens. It deals largely with a captive market. It is able to avoid many of the rigors of cost control. It consumes taxes, but produces none. It may call upon the taxpayers of the Nation to replace and expand its capital structures. And it is not responsible to pay the stockholders, who are the taxpayers, a return upon their investment.

Ignoring the tax and other responsibilities of private enterprise, government assumes a fallacious accounting out of which it contrives so-called "yard-sticks" of cost and service charges. These it hurls like spears at taxpaying industry in an insatiable effort to widen its domain.

We in New Jersey are appalled at the size and complexity of the Federal Government's operations and their rapid growth in recent years, in competition with taxpaying business. True, there may be certain specialized businesses that the Federal Government must carry on for itself. But the vast scope of the Federal Government's industrial empire and its far-flung bureaucracy spell socialism—socialism which crept at first, but which now assumes a cyclonic velocity, sweeping before it the basic values of a worthy national heritage.

In recent years, under the abnormal pressures of a great depression and a second World War, government has explored many methods of promoting the general welfare. Some of the results of these explorations have been good, others bad. Now it is appropriate that these methods be reviewed; the good retained and the bad discarded.

Your committee now has before it three bills that have been introduced in the House of Representatives. I am pleased to note that one of these is by Representative FRANK C. OSMERS, Jr., of New Jersey, and has a counterpart in a bill introduced by Senator ROBERT C. HENDRICKSON, also of our State. Here it should be noted that various phases of the general subject are also under study by the second Hoover Commission. I do not propose to set forth a detailed critique of the relative merits of these bills, nor of any specific proposals to the same end. I am here to express our association's conviction respecting the general purpose of all of the efforts in this category.

We want the Federal Government to reembrace the philosophy which has made our country great.

We want the trend toward socialistic control of business reversed.

We want the Federal Government to get out of competition with private enterprise.

These are the purposes of the bills which you have before you. We applaud the efforts you are making, which are documented in the official publications of your committee and its subcommittee, to find the most logical, the simplest, and the best way of accomplishing these purposes. We realize that many Members of the Congress, in both the House of Representatives and the Senate, are pledged to these same ends.

I appear before you this morning to present these views held by the organized taxpayers of New Jersey. We have faith that you of the Congress will prove equal to the challenge at hand.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH OF GEORGE E. STRINGFELLOW

George E. Stringfellow, born in Reva, Va., the son of James and Elizabeth F. (Bowers) Stringfellow. Married Carrie M. Fearnow.

He is a director of Thomas A. Edison of Canada, Ltd., and Thomas A. Edison, Ltd., Scotland, and director and senior vice president of Thomas A. Edison, Inc., West Orange; was a daily business associate of Thomas Alva Edison for many years.

He is director of Mine Safety Appliances Co., Pittsburgh, Pa.; member of the board of directors of the American Mining Congress, Washington, D. C.; member of the American Iron & Steel Institute and the American Institute of Mining & Metallurgical Engineers, New York City, and member of the board of directors of Indiana Technical College, Fort Wayne, Ind.

President and director of the New Jersey Taxpayers Association; member of the board of directors and executive committee of the American Cancer Society. Founder and first president of the New Jersey division of the society, and the recipient of the American Cancer Society award.

He is honorary member of the New Jersey Medical Society, was awarded the certificate of service by the Rotary Club of Orange, N. J.; was cited as the outstanding citizen of the Oranges and Maplewood; was cited by the Brotherhood Committee of Christians and Jews for bringing about a better understanding among the three religious sects.

Received an honorary degree of doctor of fine arts from Ithaca College, honorary degree of doctor of laws from South Jersey Law School; honorary degree of doctor of laws from Upsala College; honorory degree of doctor of humanities from Indiana Technical College; a citation of merit award from the New Jersey Association of Business Schools.

Served two terms as president of the Kiwanis Club of New York City; served two terms as president of the Chamber of Commerce and Civics of the Oranges and Maplewood; former chairman of the finance committee of the Republican Party of New Jersey; member of the imperial divan of the Shrine of North America.

His clubs: the Kiwanis Club of New York City; Advertising Club of New Jersey; Union League Club of New York and Philadelphia; New York Railroad Club; Duquesne Club of

5

Pittsburgh; Montclair Golb Club, Montclair, N. J.; and the Essex Club of Newark, N. J.

Residence: 75 Prospect Street, East Orange, N. J.

Office: 177 Main Street, West Orange, N. J.

[From the Paterson (N. J.) News of July 21, 1954]

Government in Business

In his role as president of the New Jersey Taxpayers Association, George E. Stringfellow made a potent presentation before the congressional Committee on Government Operations. Burden of Mr. Stringfellow's argument before the representatives was that there has been too much governmental competition with private enterprise and he wants it eliminated or reduced to a minimum.

Even in advance of his forceful exposition, Mr. Stringfellow is in a fair way to seeing his goals achieved. The Eisenhower administration has demonstrated its sympathy with the principle of business for businessmen with a minimum of governmental interference. The current debate over the Atomic Energy Commission's dealing in power through private companies piped via TVA is an offshoot of the administration's encouragement of private dealing.

Strangely enough, however, an industry like silk dyeing, always proudly aloof from governmental control, went to Washington last week to seek official intercession for a business seriously affected by economic erosion. Not so many years ago, this would have been considered heresy in silk dyeing. Now leading interests want the Government to fix controls which it is felt would make for more workable intraindustry progress.

Mr. Stringfellow's arguments, however, are potent and forceful, as is always the case with him, because while they may promote debate, there is no argument as to the incisiveness of his viewpoint.

[From the Trenton (N. J.) Trentonian of July 23, 1954]

Government in Business

"We in New Jersey are concerned over the threatened increase in the statutory debt limit above the present $275 billion. We realize that this threat derives from the belief held by some that the Federal income is such that later this year it may not give the Treasury a satisfactory working balance. Assuming this to be the case, the question is—What are the alternatives to increasing the debt limit?"

That question, posed by George E. Stringfellow, president of the New Jersey Taxpayers Association, before the House Committee on Government Operations in Washington recently, is one that has troubled many citizens who worry about our national debt.

To the prudent, a debt is something to wipe out as expeditiously as possible. They are the people who are not in sympathy with the theory that our Nation must always be deep in debt, and they are not in sympathy with the idea that the easiest way out of financial difficulties is to increase the debt total.

At the same time, many thinking people find themselves on the horns of a dilemma. They believe that reduction of the national debt can be accomplished only through an increase in taxes, or at best a foregoing of any tax reductions.

Well, according to Mr. Stringfellow, and in answer to his own question, there is an alternative.

First he points out that today "the Government is engaged in multifarious business operations ranging from coffee roasting to great transportation enterprises, and totaling more than 100 widely diversified activities."

This, he holds, is contrary to Government's role as "envisaged by the framers of the Constitution.

So, while realizing "that it is impracticable to take the Government out of competitive business and place this business upon a taxpaying business abruptly," Mr. Stringfellow presents the opinion that "one of the causes of the present fiscal situation is that the Government has denied itself the tax income that would normally result if its heterogeneous industrial empire were operated by private enterprise."

"The free enterprise system provides the lifeblood of the national economy," he said. "It is productive; it is regenerative; it pays taxes. The right of individuals to answer the call of economic opportunity will always spur men on to great achievement. But government ownership and operation of the instrumentalities of production are the essence of socialism and the genesis of dictatorship, corruption, and national degeneration."

Mr. Stringfellow's complaint about the Government's participation in multifarious business operations" is not new. Protests against this trend were particularly commonplace during the Democratic administrations of Presidents Roosevelt and Truman.

Although the present administration was put into power on a platform partially dedicated to a reversal of this trend, we now find, ironically, that governmental participation in multifarious business operations is more rampant than ever. As a matter of fact, the trend is so strong that even the Democrats are beginning to demand that a halt be called.

With due allowance for the foregoing exceptions, there seems to be more than passing merit to Mr. Stringfellow's summation.

[From the Camden (N. J.) Courier-Post of July 26, 1954]

Government in Business: How Do We Feel About It?

Representative Frank C. Osmers, Jr., of New Jersey's Ninth District, has a bill in Congress to set up an anti-Government-competition board which would drive Federal agencies out of fields where they compete with private enterprise.

Hearings on the bill have just been concluded by the House Government Operations Committee.

President George E. Stringfellow, of the New Jersey Taxpayers' Association, was one of numerous witnesses testifying in support of the bill and pointing out that the Government's investments in commercial and industrial facilities range betwen $25 billion and $50 billion. They have testified that Government agencies are engaged in more than 100 types of business activity, including the operation of bakeries, ice cream factories, motion-picture studios, electric power plants, steamship lines, rope and paint factories, and shops producing false teeth, spectacles, and wooden legs.

It is not necessarily true that all these Federal activities in apparent competition with private business are unjustified and wrong. There may be good reason for some of them. But it is highly doubtful that there is for most of them, and highly probable that the Government should get out of most of them and leave them to private enterprise.

Most citizens and taxpayers are well aware, as one witness told the committee, "of the unreasonableness and unfairness of tax-exempt, publicly financed competition. They have seen that losses of such Government operations are often charged off to the taxpayers, both operating losses and capital losses."

In modified form, the bill now has been favorably reported to the House. It authorizes the Secretary of Commerce to hear specific complaints from businessmen affected by Government competition and to "suggest" that Federal agencies end such competitive activities under rules laid down by the President.

The bill also calls for an annual report to Congress by the President on what has been done in this respect and makes the following declaration of policy:

"The Federal Government shall not engage in business-type operations competitive with private enterprise except where it can be demonstrated that it is necessary for the Government itself to perform such operations in the furtherance of national programs and objectives legally established."

It is so late in the session that there is little chance for further action on the bill this year, but what has been done may furnish a basis for similar legislation in the next Congress.

But after the Senate vote Thursday ordering the Atomic Energy Commission to go into the power-producing business in competition with private enterprise, and the House's rejection of the same proposal Friday, one wonders how Congress really feels about the Government-in-business question, or whether it has any strong convictions on the subject at all.

For that matter, does most of the American public?

An Editorial on House Concurrent Resolution 165: A Must for U. N. Charter Revision

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY W. WIER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 29, 1954

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Staten Island Transcript, Staten Island, N. Y., entitled "An Editorial on House Concurrent Resolution 165: A Must for U. N. Charter Revision."

The editorial follows:

An Editorial on House Concurrent Resolution 165: A Must for U. N. Charter Revision

This newspaper sincerely believes that the No. 1 problem facing our beloved United States of America as well as the world is the aggressor-nation problem. A sound solution appropriate to the atomic-hydrogen age will change the course of history and will bless this and future generations. It is, therefore, with a great sense of love for our fellow man, that we urge all our readers as well as all Americans of all races and creeds to support one of the most momentous peace proposals ever submitted to the Congress of the United States. It is known as House Concurrent Resolution 165. As far as we know, this newspaper is the first in our country to come out editorially in favor of its adoption. While we do not wish to challenge the Post-Dispatch (St. Louis) as newspaperdom's preeminent crusader or to put to shame the seemingly callous indifference of so-called great newspapers which render lipservice to the great cause of world peace, we clearly realize that sparks generated by this editorial can cause little-publicized House Concurrent Resolution 165 to sweep the country in no time.

Congressman Roy Wier, of Minnesota, introduced this wonderful measure on July 20, 1953, just before adjournment.

House Concurrent Resolution 165 reads in part as follows:

"*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring)*, That the Congress of the United States favors the adoption of the following definition of the phrase, 'peace-loving state,' as used in article 4, of the United Nations Charter:

"'A peace-loving state is hereby defined as any nation which gives its people the right to vote in a referendum for peace or war, except in the case of direct invasion and except for the use of joint military power by this organization.'

"SEC. 2. It is further the sense of the Congress that any member nation of the United Nations which does not comply with this definition taking the necessary political action within 5 years after its adoption by the United Nations, shall be automatically dropped from membership in the United Nations.

"SEC. 3. The Congress requests the President to instruct our chief delegate to the United Nations to take all steps possible to effect the purpose of this resolution."

(Members of Congress will gladly send you a copy if you write to them at House Office Building, Washington, D. C.)

One of the outstanding features of this history-making proposal is that it effectively harnesses the power of all religions to prevent war, without even mentioning the word, "religion." It is rather evident that a person who has a voice in deciding an issue can effectively apply his or her understanding of God or good or religion to the problem. (What better way of putting religion into the United Nations than this.) And what issue is more important in any country than the question of peace or war. We feel confident that the majority in every country would reject an aggressive war. And we believe in "majority rule" (even if the majority may be wrong at times). We hardly need to remind you that "majority rule" is one of the cornerstones of our political structure.

A referendum is really a method of honestly and efficiently registering the will of the majority of balloting directly for an idea instead of voting for men who only promise to support that idea.

It cannot be denied that a referendum on a vital or supreme issue is democracy functioning at its best.

Another great advantage is that the U. S. S. R. cannot charge that the U. S. A. is trying to force its own political theories on the world for the simple reason that no nation in the world at the present time, holds such a referendum for a war of aggression. The war referendum idea can control, handle, or effectively discourage aggression between nations. It will make the people, instead of their leaders, responsible for acts of war. By scrapping "peace and war making by the few," we the people will gain "peace making by the multitude." Just think what this will mean to the mothers and wives in the world. And don't forget the men who know war first hand.

In one sense, the aggressor nation problem boils down to elementary justice and honesty. Was it honest and just for only a handful of nations to supply all the firemen and fire engines to put out the fire in Korea? What a morale builder and a propaganda weapon it would have been if all the members of the U. N. had at least token forces in Korea.

And what about those so-called peace-loving nations which were adding fuel and fanning the blaze? These nations should really be designated as peace-disturbing nations.

No one country is the direct target of this proposal. Obviously the U. S. S. R. is the most powerful country in the peace-disturbing category and so can be honestly called a threat to the peace. For all practical purposes the U. S. S. R. is no longer in the U. N. She is using the U. N. as a convenient sounding board for her propaganda for spreading confusion and apathy. Why should the bona fide peace-loving countries of the U. N. spend so much time in publicizing the big lie when they could be constructively engaged in publicizing the big solution as typified by House Concurrent Resolution 165.

Never was it more true that when there is no vision, the people perish. Our boys died in Korea, not so much because this was a Truman war, but because the statesmen of the world are blind to the overwhelming desire of all people for world peace. Newspaper editors and radio commentators would be rendering public service of the highest order if they would repeatedly and continuously publicize the big solution (exemplified by H. Con. Res. 165) every time that they report the latest phase of the big lie.

The adoption of House Concurrent Resolution 165 by the U. N. would force Russia to put up or shut up. It would be next to impossible for her to explain her voluntary or involuntary expulsion from the U. N. without setting off the sparks that would start the revolution. Certainly a revolution in the U. S. S. R. would be the very best way to solve the problem. And nothing should be overlooked to encourage the Russian people to eliminate their ruthless leaders as quickly as possible. House Concurrent Resolution 165 would cause the common people of Russia to really become our secret allies.

It is self-evident to every clear-thinking person that there is something radically wrong with the U. N. political structure. How many individuals in their right minds would ever care to join or retain membership in a private association modeled after the existing U. N. unless improvements could be reasonably made? And should not respectable governments act like respectable individuals? Every healthy organization has sound and effective membership provisions. Why should any member of the U. N. which fails to supply its quota of the necessary policemen to arrest the aggressors, be allowed to participate in the talking and voting?

If membership in the U. N. was limited to honest to goodness bona fide peace-loving nations, many of its present problems would evaporate. The founders of the U. N. failed miserably to provide a satisfactory and practical definition of the phrase, "peace-loving state." It is conceded that all nations shall eventually become members of the U. N., but only politically mature States those that adopt House Concurrent Resolution 165 shall be considered as eligible for membership as real peace-loving states. Is it not therefore logical to expect that membership of real peace-loving states would work together much better in organizing a powerful police force for mutual defense in stamping out aggression? Several other provisions may be desirable to wisely define the term "peace-loving state" as used in the Charter of the U. N., but the most important provision must be the principle contained in House Concurrent Resolution 165.

The United Nations Charter is scheduled to come up for revision in 1955. As the world looks to America for leadership it is of utmost importance that the United States of America be fully prepared with the best possible revision program.

Although the veto provision makes it seem almost impossible to achieve any major revision of the charter, yet the power of public opinion together wtih friendly statements from the new Malenkov regime make all things seem possible. Certainly the almost universal appeal of the principle in House Concurrent Resolution 165, together with President Eisenhower's strong spiritual background and Malenkov's New Year's statement, should contribute to its acceptance or adoption by the U. N.

When President Eisenhower spoke about a "new approach" to the atom problem in his recent dynamic speech to the U. N., it is indeed a case in point to say that House Concurrent Resolution 165 is very definitely a new approach to the aggressor-nation problem and of far greater potentialities. On the other hand Premier Malenkov's recent statement in reference to obtaining a pledge by the great powers not to use atomic weapons, might be considered as a clever propaganda move to put the United States of America on the spot in view of our great superiority in that field. What a counter offensive psychological warfare answer would be to the principle contained in House Concurrent Resolution 165. By his inherent power the President can use this idea without waiting for congressional action or instructions.

It is hard to reconcile our passage of disarmament resolutions and encouraging all nations as well as our former enemies to rearm. Partial disarmament might be very dangerous now.

It is also hard to reconcile our support of the policy of self-determination of peoples and our opposition to the seating of Red China in the U. N. while we approve of the U. S. S. R. and its satillites as members.

The United States of America could make House Concurrent Resolution 165 one of the chief cornerstones of its foreign policy by giving preferred treatment to any nation which supports this idea. Thus democracy would be encouraged to grow as never before in the world's history.

In his state of the Union message, the President spoke about "the value of holding the initiative in foreign affairs." Passage of House Concurrent Resolution 165 by this session of the 83d Congress will give us a real sure grip on "the initiative" for "winning the peace" and at the same time reassure other members of the free world that the American people hold the balance of power instead of American militarism. It would create the right kind of political climate for a future dependable disarmament.

In order to secure congressional action on House Concurrent Resolution 165 we strongly urge all citizens who are in favor of world peace (and especially those who pray for peace) to communicate with their Senators and Congressmen, their religious leaders, newspaper editors, radio commentators, civic, labor, and veteran organizations, and last but not least their friends and neighbors. Ask them to act by sending letters and telegrams.

It is especially appropriate to recall one of General Eisenhower's statements. "No one wants war. The common man everywhere hates war. We must enlist that hatred of war to prevent it happening again." He has also spoken about a "crusade for peace." We cannot imagine how he could do anything but favor the political formula for peace in House Concurrent Resolution 165. House Concurrent Resolution 165 is the best way to translate peaceful utterances into deeds.

In conclusion we say that the principle embodied in House Concurrent Resolution 165 deserves to be studied, discussed, and approved by the Congress and the U. N. in order to win the battle for the minds of men. The Bible reminds us that "When a man's ways please the Lord, he maketh even his enemies to be at peace with him" (Proverbs 16: 7).

If the atom-hydrogen bombs make war total, then the principle in House Concurrent Resolution 165 is the best way to make peace total. In other words, the spiritual equivalent of the atomic bomb must be used in order to gain the victory over the evil of armed aggression. The world's best hope for preventing world war III is to accept as quickly as possible House Concurrent Resolution 165.

While House Concurrent Resolution 165 is now under study in the House Foreign Affairs Committee, it is assumed that the special Senate Subcommittee on the United Nations Charter is simultaneously considering House Concurrent Resolution 165 together with all other proposals for amending the U. N. Charter. The United States must be thoroughly prepared with a sound and dynamic program when the Charter automatically comes up for review in 1955–56.

If the United States really wishes to capture the imagination and enthusiastic support of peace-loving people everywhere with inspired and effective leadership for peace, then House Concurrent Resolution 165 is a must for U. N. Charter revision.

Peaceful Coexistence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARLEY O. STAGGERS

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 29, 1954

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an editorial by Austin V. Wood, in the Martinsburg (W. Va.) Journal, of July 24, 1954.

The matter Mr. Wood discusses is a very grave one and I feel should be brought to the attention of the American people. I agree with this distinguished editor that it is time the American people be told by the President of the United States whether or not he agrees with Mr. Churchill's statement.

We know from past experience in trying to deal with Communists that we always come out on the short end. We cannot rely on their word, as their whole program is based upon the philosophy that the ends justify the means. They use lying, cheating, force, and any methods at their command to gain their ends.

As Mr. Wood pointed out, there is a vast gulf between the idea of peaceful coexistence and the mood of forcible extirpation. Let us be consistent in our stand before the world. Our policy has been the complete abolishment of communism. Are we now doing an about face and accepting communism by striving to coexist with this unholy power that will continue to work deviously and with fiendish cleverness to bring about their long-range objectives of world Communist domination?

I hope all my colleagues will take the time to read this editorial:

THINKING IT OVER

(By Austin V. Wood)

Mr. Churchill, in his report to Parliament on his recent visit to the United States, made a most important statement, the significance of which apparently has been overlooked by the press of the Nation. The statement is so important that it should be quoted verbatim. Here it is:

"In the speech which my right honorable friend, the Foreign Secretary, made in winding up the debate before our departure, he used, in speaking about the relations of the Communist and free worlds, the phrase 'peaceful coexistence.' This fundamental and far-reaching conception certainly had its part in some of our conversations at Washington, and I was very glad when I read after we had left that President Eisenhower had said that the hope of the world lies in peaceful coexistence of the Communist and non-Communist powers, adding also the warning (with which I entirely agree) that this doctrine must not lead to appeasement that compels any nation to submit to foreign domination.

"The House must not understate the importance of this broad measure of concurrence of what was in that case the English-speaking world. What a vast ideological gulf there is between the idea of peaceful coexistence vigilantly safeguarded, and the mood of forcibly extirpating the Communist fallacy and heresy. It is indeed a gulf."

If President Eisenhower agrees with this interpretation of the concurrence reached at the conference it means a direct departure from our former foreign policy.

During the entire Truman administration it was the conception of our State Department that eventually Russia must be compelled to withdraw from Poland, Czechoslovakia, and the other satellite nations. To this end underground movements were encouraged and there was much discussion concerning the organization of an army of liberation.

In the Far East we have refrained from recognition of the Chinese Communist regime, although, in the absence of armed intervention, it obviously is the well-established government of China. We have persisted in our recognition of the Chiang Kai-shek government both within and without the United Nations. This can only be interpreted as our conviction that Chiang Kai-shek is only temporarily in Formosa and eventually will return to power on the mainland.

There certainly is, as Mr. Churchill stated, a vast ideological gulf between the idea of peaceful coexistence and the mood of forcible extirpation. The one means we accept communism and the present Communist expansion as permanent. The other means we await the day when armed might will restore democracy.

It long has been apparent that our differences with Russia at some time or other must be settled either by war or negotiation. During the early years of the "cold war" we refused negotiation upon the plea that when the proper time arrived we must negotiate from strength. We built up that strength. We developed the atom and hydrogen bombs. We gave our military forces the firepower of atomic weapons. We surrounded Russia with airbases from which she could literally be wiped out of existence within a few hours after a declaration of war. Certainly if ever we are to reach a position of strength that goal has been realized. And yet so late as this past spring, when the Geneva Conference was proposed, we vigorously opposed that conference or any other negotiation, and only agreed to attend when it became apparent our allies were determined the conference be held.

Whether or not this policy has been wise is beside the point. Wise or unwise it has been our policy and it denoted our determination that at some time communism should be forcibly extirpated. If now it is our policy to accept partition of the world it logically calls for a change in our attitude.

If, as inferred from Mr. Churchill's statement, we are to accept communism as permanent and strive to coexist with the Communist powers, there would seem little logic in refusing to recognize Red China and in resisting its admission to the United Nations. This step would call for an end to our financial and military support of the Chiang Kai-shek government. It would call for an end to our interference in Indochina and other Asiatic struggles, except upon the invitation of the people of those nations and the plea that they were being enslaved.

Such a change in our attitude seems to make inconsistent our Voice of America broadcasts urging resistance and preparation for revolution in the satellite nations. It calls for an end to the almost daily name calling and vituperation. Above all, it calls for almost continuous negotiation, for if the present situation is to be permanent, international tension must be relieved.

All in all, Mr. Churchill's statement to Parliament is probably the most important statement of recent years. Certainly it calls for clarification from President Eisenhower. Is, or is not, Mr. Churchill's interpretation correct?

Rt. Rev. Msgr. Theodore G. Bateski

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN LESINSKI, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 29, 1954

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article about Rt. Rev. Msgr. Theodore G. Bateski which shows what perseverence and determination will do. An extremely religious man, a man of vision and foresight, Monsignor Bateski's life has been one of courage and spiritual guidance that may very well be a model for others to follow. The article follows:

[From the Detroit News of July 27, 1954]

UPPER PENINSULA COMMUNITY HAILS PRIEST WHOSE ACTS INSPIRE LEGEND

DETOUR, MICH., July 27.—A parish priest who has become a legend in Michigan's Northland was honored last night for 50 years of religious inspiration and community leadership.

Protestants and Catholics of this village of 611 joined to honor the Right Reverend Monsignor Theodore G. Bateski, 74, who never drew religious lines when fighting for a civic cause.

A dinner table crowd of 250, including State and local leaders, sang the praises of "the fighting priest of the Northland" at a dinner in Sacred Heart Community Hall. The occasion was Monsignor Bateski's 50th anniversary as pastor of the waterfront parish at this eastern tip of Michigan's upper peninsula.

JOINT COMMITTEE

A committee of Protestants and Catholics planned the testimonal. The dinner was prepared and served by woment from the Ladies Aid of Detour Union Church and the Sacred Heart Ladies Guild, working together in a common cause.

Governor Williams came to laud Monsignor Bateski.

The Most Reverend Thomas L. Noa, bishop of the Marquette Catholic Diocese, who last month elevated Father Bateski to the ecclesiastical rank of monsignor, sat at the speaker's table with Rev. Arthur Heyes, the Episcopal minister from Sault Ste, Marie and longtime friend of the pastor; and with the Reverend Hebert Bryce, of the Protestant Union Church of Detour.

DETROIT TOASTMASTER

The toastmaster was the Reverend Father Francis N. Reynolds, of Detroit. Speakers included C. G. Knoblock, general manager of Detour's Drummond Dolomite, Inc., who, like Monsignor Bateski, fell in love with the north country and wrote the book, Above Below. Knoblock, a non-Catholic, was chairman of the sponsoring committee.

Many leaders from the State's business, industrial, professional, governmental, and religious domains were present, including Prentiss M. Brown, chairman of the Mackinic Bridge Authority; Maj. James Robertson, of Sault Ste, Marie; Mayor John Donnely, of St. Ignace, and former Mayor Al Phillips; Circuit Judge Ned Kenlon, of Petoskey; Circuit Judge R. W. Nebel, of

5

Munising, and George A. Osborn, publisher of the Sault Ste. Marie News.

Speakers recall how Father B was sent to the wilderness post here in 1904 as a sort of punishment after the young priest had refused his bishop's order to go to Rome for advanced studies. They told how he quickly learned to love the area's rugged beauty, and turned down chances to go to larger parishes.

BUILT FOUR CHURCHES

They recounted how he built four churches in the area, going into the forest himself for lumber, and manufacturing concrete blocks in his backyard.

They told how he was drafted as village president during depression days and served three terms, heading a program of public improvements, how he acted as local WPA coordinator without pay and directed the building of an airport, a municipal dock, and improved roads; how he spearheaded a long legislative battle to close nearby Potagannissing Bay to commercial fishing, how he led the local campaign in support of the Mackinac Straits Bridge and was a powerful sponsor of the scenic highway from Cedarville to Detour.

There were other tales—of his exploits as a hunter and fisherman, of his friendships with persons of note, including the late Henry Ford and the late Senator Couzens, and of how he once walked out on a party of industrialists to sit at the bedside of a dying Indian.

Parishioners recalled, too, how he had refused to have a fire in the church furnace during a cold spell last spring because swallows were roosting in the chimney.

Wheat Referendum

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER M. MUMMA

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 29, 1954

Mr. MUMMA. Mr. Speaker, the farmers of my district have been writing and telling me for some time that they want hands off by the Government in connection with rigid production and marketing controls. That they meant what they said was evidenced on July 23 by the vote in Lebanon County, Pa., on the the wheat referendum—103 to 26 against high supports and rigid controls. You know these Pennsylvania Dutch farmers like to be free to do their own planning—and there are no better farmers in our country.

I think you will be interested in an editorial from the Lebanon (Pa.) Daily News of July 25, entitled "Wheat Referendum," and, under the privilege granted me, I include it in these remarks. The editorial is as follows:

WHEAT REFERENDUM

Lebanon County wheat growers put up for prominent display Friday their good sense and love of freedom.

They went to the wheat referendum polling places of the county and voted 103 to 26 against tough production and marketing controls and for free production, according to the United States agricultural stabilization and conservation office here.

They said, in effect, that they wanted a hands-off Government rather than one that meddles in their affairs.

An estimated 500 or more farmers in the county were eligible to take part in the referendum. Thirty-two were challenged at the polling places.

But the verdict rendered by those who voted was a distinct one, far more decisive than last year's. In 1953 there were only 64 county growers who voted against the high supports and rigid controls on wheat, as opposed to 55 who were for the obnoxious program.

Even in the Nation, taking into account the big wheat operators of the Midwest, farmers are beginning to show signs of wrestling themselves from controls. Last year 87.1 percent of the more than 350,000 wheatgrowers voting favored high supports, the political gimmick that is largely responsible for the mountainous surplus of wheat on Uncle Sam's hands.

This year, on the basis of almost complete returns, only 73 percent of the growers voted for the straitjacket controls. Only 267,000 of the Nation's wheatgrowers, estimated to number between 800,000 and 1,000,000, bothered to vote.

There is more than $6 billion in farm products in Government bins and warehouses at present. The Government had to take it over from farmers. Now the question is what in the world to do with it.

Congress some time ago passed a bill to get rid of about $1 billion worth of farm surpluses, $700 million through sale to foreign countries and $300 million in the old giveaway game.

Currently on Uncle Sam's hands are 889 million bushels of wheat.

That's a lot of wheat. It is 5½ bushels for every citizen of the United States, in fact.

This very surplus is the reason why Secretary of Agriculture Benson proclaimed wheat quotas for the 1955 crop.

The law requires Benson to so act when the estimated total supply of wheat exceeds the "normal supply" by more than 20 percent. The "normal supply" is a year's domestic and export requirements plus 15 percent as a reserve.

And get this: The available supply for 1954–55 is about 79 percent above the normal.

The supply of wheat is far too great for domestic consumption and export needs. Secretary Benson, under existing legislation, acted to chop down the surplus.

Thus the law of supply and demand would do nicely if it were only allowed to function. But that law has been hamstrung in favor of another law that is coated with more political sugar.

Lebanon County farmers are getting the short end in wheat supports and in every other phase of the price support program. They are finding that 90 percent supporters cost them money through higher feed prices in their livestock operations.

Livestock operations provide 77 percent of Pennsylvania farmers' cash income. In this State farmers receive only 6 percent of their cash receipts from the price-supported basic commodities.

Twelve Southern and Midwestern States derive more than 40 percent of the cash receipts from the basic crops. Who's ahead?

What about the excess wheat used to feed livestock or poultry on the farm? If the price of feed and bedding is inflated because of the supports program, can't farmers raise their own wheat for these purposes?

The answer is "No." Excess wheat which is fed on the farm is considered as having been marketed and is subject to the marketing penalty imposed by the Government. And that penalty is most certainly a convincing one.

There is little about this high price support program that is not entangled and complicated. It even reaches its farming methods, making for impractical and uneconomical farm operations incidentally.

But one thing is certain. Government controls are obnoxious in themselves. They are even more repugnant when they are part and parcel of a fantastically artificial farm economy, and economy of inconsistencies, surpluses, and restrictions.

Lebanon County wheatgrowers who voted against strong controls in the referendum are to be congratulated.

Polish People Warned "We Cannot Fight Our Friends" and Told to Support Congressman Timothy P. Sheehan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 29, 1954

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, our Republican colleague, Congressman TIMOTHY P. SHEEHAN, of the 11th Illinois District, since he was elected to Congress in 1950, has presented to the Congress many of the problems and interests of American citizens of Polish extraction.

He presented the original resolution calling for an investigation of the Katyn Forest massacre of Polish Army officers near Smolensk, Russia, during World War II. He has presented a resolution in the House of Representatives advocating the breaking off of diplomatic relations with the present Communist-dominated Polish Government.

In Congressman SHEEHAN's district on the northwest side of Chicago, the people of Polish extraction represent the largest single nationality group in his area, and all Polish people can be proud of the record of Congressman SHEEHAN.

That the Polish people are conscious of the efforts that Congressman SHEEHAN has made on behalf of the Polish community is fully evidenced by the editorial from the Dziennik Chicagoski—the Polish Daily News—on January 23, 1954.

The portions of this editorial from the Dziennik Chicagoski—the Polish Daily News—referring to Congressman SHEEHAN are as follows:

We cannot fight our friends, one of whom is Congressman TIMOTHY P. SHEEHAN, a Republican. The American Polish community should be interested in seeing that these two politicians remain in the offices which they have held up to the present. Moreover, if there will be any opportunity for them to obtain higher offices, we should consider it our duty to support them. For both have proven many times their desire to sincerely cooperate with us and both are respectable fighters for the Polish cause in the United States Congress. We should painstakingly endeavor to insure that the number of friends of our Polish community increases every year, because by our own means alone we cannot secure and guarantee a victorious outcome for our good cause. Our own strength alone would not be enough even if our Polish community were numerically three times as strong as it really is.

That is why we have been watching so fearfully the efforts of the Democrats who are trying to pick a proper candidate for Congress in Mr. SHEEHAN's district. They were looking for a candidate with a Polish name, convinced that only such a man might be able to defeat the Republican Congressman. It was wise that none of our Polish compatriots tried to run against Congress-

6

man SHEEHAN. Our Polish community can now openly support our present Congressman without running the risk of criticism in that we do not know how to respect our friends. * * *

We must always treat our friends with proper respect and never give them any reason for aversion. They are very useful and necessary for us in any political office they may hold, either in a city or in a county, as well as in the State or in Washington.

The Merry Mailman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN LESINSKI, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 29, 1954

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the following article from the Detroit Times, of July 25, 1954, explains very comprehensively why the postal employees need a raise.

The present leadership has deliberately botched all possibilities of this by trying to force through the House a combined post office rate bill and the postal salary bill. One was an inexcusable raid on the users of the mail and the other a partial solution for proper salaries.

Those of us who do not like legislation by coercion voted against the rule. The answer is obvious. Why have not pay bills been brought up? Why the move to adjourn by July 31?

The article follows:

THE MERRY MAILMAN

Detroit postal employees, as well as their colleagues across the Nation, are watching with concern the slow process of the wage-increase bills now before Congress.

This certainly should concern everybody in this city of Detroit which prides itself on well-paid employees, both public and private.

Few realize that the pleasant fellow who delivers their mail day after day, has more trouble making ends meet than almost anybody with a steady job.

A beginning postal worker starts at $1.61½ an hour—$64.60 a week—before the Government takes some back for taxes.

If the same unskilled worker took a job in a factory he would get around $1.78 an hour for sweeping floors.

Or if he worked on an automobile production line he would earn a minimum of $1.95 to $1.98 an hour.

Postal workers, of course, advance. A letter carrier who works faithfully for 9 years, at the standard increase of 5 cents an hour each year, would rise to $2.01½ an hour. If he had become a regular on salary, instead of an extra at hourly rate, he would receive an annual wage of $4,070.

His pay would still be below the average autoworker scale of about $2.14 an hour and slightly below the $2.04 paid drivers of city garbage trucks.

It could be argued that postal workers of long service eventually get longevity increases, and benefit by paid vacations, when on annual salary. But try dangling such inducement before young men in a competitive market.

Their attitude might well be:

At present wages let the public carry its own mail.

The attitude would be understandable.

Bishop J. L. Hromadka and the Assembly of the World Church Council in Evanston, Ill.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 29, 1954

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend and revise my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the text of a communication which has been submitted to me by Dr. Juraj Slavik, of the Council of Free Czechoslovakia, and a former Czechoslovak Ambassador to the United States. The article in question deals with Bishop J. L. Hromadka, head of the Czechoslovak delegation to the Assembly of the World Council of Churches which is scheduled to meet in Evanston, Ill., next month. The quotations from Bishop Hromadka's own writings will clearly show his strenuous efforts to collaborate with the Communist government of his own country in sharp contrast with his earlier pronouncements on this subject:

J. L. HROMADKA AND THE ASSEMBLY OF THE WORLD CHURCH COUNCIL IN EVANSTON, ILL.

The second assembly of the World Church Council in Evanston will be attended, according to the press announcement, also by protestant clergymen from behind the Iron Curtain. Eleven prominent leaders of the Czech Brethren and of the Lutheran Church in Slovakia, as well as of the Reformed and Lutheran Churches of Hungary are scheduled to attend the assembly of the World Council of Churches. All of them are, of course, leaders of the respective churches that are collaborating closely with the Communist regimes. Otherwise they would not be allowed to go abroad to foreign countries. All of them have proven to be reliable tools in the hands of the Communists and have already attended various peace meetings, organized by the Communists in order to promote Communist ideas and cooperation—a line which serves the Communists in infiltrating free countries and in preparing for aggression.

The above mentioned churches of Hungary and Czechoslovakia have prepared the line to be taken at the Evanston assembly very carefully. They have already issued statements and resolutions telling of their willingness to cooperate with the churches in the Western democracies. The church papers in Hungary and Czechoslovakia have been propogandizing the Evanston meeting ever since 1953. I happened to read the Hungarian papers Hungarian Church Press and Reformation Egyhaz and also the Czechoslovak papers Kostnicke Jiskry, Cirkevni Listy and Krestanska Revue. For an American or, for that matter, for any average foreign reader this reading might not be unsatisfactory, but for those of us who know what has happened to the free and really protestant churches, it is a sad and disappointing experience. The churches in the Iron Curtain countries are not free; the relations between church and state are regulated by laws which make the church subservient to the cause of communism. All churches are placed under the control of the State Office for Religious Affairs. Since all church property has been confiscated, the state assumes the obligation to pay the salaries of the clergy and the expenses connected with the maintenance of religious worship and public instruction. The churches have to present an annual report of their operations and submit a budget each year. It is obvious that the activities of the churches have to follow the Communist line.

The former dignitaries of the churches are all demoted, unless they were willing to follow blindly the Communist line. So in Slovakia the Lutheran church—my church, in which my father was a senior and I myself held lay positions—had to force into retirement the two bishops who had resisted nazism and who were faithful servants of God, and were forced to elect to these high offices men who are willing tools of Communist masters. Two of them are coming to Evanston: the General Bishop Chabada and the bishop of the western diocese, Kratina. Others to come are the dean of the theological faculty of Bratislava, Jan Michalko, and the bishop of the Magyar Calvinist Church, Varga, and the general inspector of the Lutheran Church in Slovakia, A. Ziak, Member of Parliament. But the ideological leader of the Czechoslovak delegation is undeniably the dean of the Comenius Protestant Theological Faculty of Prague. He will be accompanied by the synodical senior of the Czech Brethren Church, Victor Hajek, who protested against the Korean war resolution of the World Council of Churches adopted in Toronto and who urged Korean peace on Soviet terms. He even accepted the base charge that the allied forces had waged bacteriological warfare. Hromadka, too, signed the protest issued by Hajek; they also advocated the unification of Germany after the Soviet pattern.

I shall not deal at this time with the less important personalities of the Bishops Chabada and Kratina, because they are unlikely to play a significant role in Evanston. It is quite different with Hromadka, who is the recognized spokesman of the Communist regime in Czechoslovakia. I shall quote from the excellent booklet written by Matthew Spinka, Waldo professor of church history at the Hartford Theological Seminary, Church in Communist Society—A Study in J. L. Hromadka's Theological Politics: "Among the various functions in which Hromadka serves the regime, the most intensive is the so-called peace campaign. In this activity he is the most eminent among the church leaders who are likewise energetically engaged in this 'struggle.' For from the year 1950 on, the articles advocating 'peace' and denouncing the western democracies for warmongering appear extremely frequently in the church papers, sometimes in every issue." In this peace campaign Hromadka became the leading Czechoslovak figure. He was a delegate to almost all the peace congresses. Upon his return from the congress in Berlin (July 1–6, 1952), he declared himself convinced, on the basis of alleged scientific proofs, of the bacteriological warfare waged by the allies in Korea. No wonder that in July 1953 he received the first Czechoslovak peace award.

The booklet of Professor Spinka should be read in its entirety. Its 55 pages give us an objective explanation of the metamorphosis of this outstanding Protestant theologian, who is well known in America, where he taught and lectured during World War II. There are many people who still cannot believe that this admirer of western civilization and of America, as they knew him at Princeton, could speak so convincingly for the East in defense of Communist ideology and practice. I, too, knew Hromadka during World War II and believed that as an admirer of our philosopher, Thomas G. Masaryk, this theological professor would be-

5

come one of the leaders of a democratic and liberated Czechoslovakia. I have a number of his booklets written at that time which he inscribed to me "with respect." Professor Spinka's booklet deals in detail with the incredible roundabout of Professor Hromadka and he illustrates his points with abundant quotations. Nevertheless, I should also like to quote from articles Professor Hromadka wrote during his stay in the United States.

Zitrek (Tomorrow), New York, 1942, volume I: Before Sunrise:

"Our 20 years of independence was the product of all the great religious, ideological, and political Czech struggles since early medieval days. With aloof exactitude I observe the long line of Czech men and women, thinkers and statesmen, reformers and saints, knights and townspeople, peasants and workers, how one by one they had laid stone upon stone to build the cathedral of a free and sovereign state" (p. 80).

"And now the outer structure, built by the great philosophical, moral, and political effort of the Palackys, Havliceks, Riegers, and Masaryks (of our nation), is in ruins" (p. 81).

"I would consider it a mistake, in fact a tragedy, if we were to succumb, under the influence of Soviet victories over the Germans, to superficial emotion and to conform hastily our ideological and political program to Communist philosophy and to the Soviet conception of the future world order. * * * First of all, we fought for almost 2 years on the side of the Western Powers, namely of Great Britain, before the U. S. S. R. was dragged into the war. * * * This year will always be Britain's glory. * * * Britain's culture rests on moral and spiritual, individual and political forces, without which the future of humanity would be hopeless and crippled. * * * The historical fact will always remain that it was the British people who for 1 whole year were our only promise and guaranty of freedom; that they fought alone, forsaken; that they gave support to the wounded bodies of several small and subjugated European nations. * * * At the same time the Communist International deliberately undermined the sympathies of those in the neutral states who should have been supporting the brave struggle of the British workers" (p. 86).

"One cannot erase the grotesque fact that during the first 2 years of the war Communists cooperated with highly questionable Fascist, isolationist, and other reactionary elements" (p. 87).

"In America I reaffirmed my views very forcibly that the Marxist interpretation of history is not only inadequate scientifically, but that it can have disastrous results. * * * The Marxist method is not only inadequate scientifically, but it paralyzes moral energy, clearness of vision, and the courage to make quick decisions" (p. 87).

"Our sincere loyalty to the fighting Soviet people must not deprive us of our independent moral sense, of the basic principles of our cultural and political tradition. * * * In our religious, moral, and cultural tradition we belong to Western European civilization. Hus leaned on Vyklif, just as in all our Middle Ages from St. Vaclav on we followed the Western interpretation of the evangel, the Greek philosophy, and the Roman concept of law. At the time of its creative development the United Brethren was oriented toward Geneva. Palacky and Havlicek were inspired by West European enlightenment and liberalism. Masaryk and Benes deliberately linked our cause with the democratic West" (p. 88).

"Some of the basic European historical realities will be our basis of support and our guiding marks even after the war. Among these are medieval Christian universalism, the struggle for the reformation of moral sincerity, and a free interpretation of the evangel, the enlightened effort toward the unalienable right to human dignity, the ideal of responsibility and loyalty of knighthood, the social struggle for economic democracy. No matter what the mistakes and faults of the West may be, there could be no greater danger than if we were to forget what has been the scurce of Western inspiration and if we were not to seek a new, dynamic interpretation of its heritage, were we to accept passively the leadership of Eastern Europe" (p. 89).

"It seems almost unbelievable that the British and Americans would abdicate from (the task) of building a new, postwar world" (p. 89).

"Should the western democracies no longer lead, even then it would be our glorious mission to hold high the banner of the West European moral and political legacy for it is the small and middle-sized European nations which can become the bearers and new inspiration of western tradition by rebuilding and completing it in the image of the new cathedral.

"Official Soviet ideology is too narrow to suffice for the enormous tasks of a new Russia, a new Europe, and a new world" (p. 90).

"Today, at the crossroad of the ages, Masaryk can be a good guide and pilot, if we enter into the spirit of his works and understand the direction his alert mind points out to us. What is great about Masaryk is the fact that in his greatest desires he bridges the gulf between the pre-Munich period and the future world; that he gives us a great deal of reliable building material for its construction; and that as a guiding light he helps us to orientate ourselves in today's darkness" (p. 92).

Zitrek, volume III, January 1944, New York, the Soul of America, by J. L. Hromadka:

"Have you noticed how Masaryk, for all his criticism, held America in high esteem (that is, the people of the United States)? 'The good people are no less energetic in going after what they believe is good, whether it be humanity, religion, or cultural things. They are more enterprising in their goodness than we.'—'When reading the more recent American authors, you see how strict they are in their criticism of these faults and of the flatness of American life. * * * If only our authors were as critical of our faults. The hope of the future is that Europe will be America's equal and America will be Europe's equal. In brief: America has given me much to think about and to study; from America I have learned much, very much'." (Karel Capek: T. G. Masaryk Tells His story, p. 116.)

"The United States will undeniably be victorious in Europe and in the Pacific. It will become the first naval power, pushing Britain to second place. * * * To all the small nations, the American people can be a real guaranty of their freedom. The American tradition of humaneness, enterprise, initiative, personal responsibility, and kindly straightforwardness can bring a spirit into world cooperation which will be a pleasure and inspiration to millions and millions of less fortunate and less rich peoples in the whole world. What would the world be today without America?" (p. 118).

For a new Czechoslovakia (nove Ceskoslovensko) series of lectures published by the YMCA, Prague 1946:

"I was truly frightened when I saw how easily the motto has been publicized that just as we have until now turned to the West, we must now turn to the East. As though one could simply take off one's coat and put on another. In the question of one's spiritual orientation, man's highest, most important values are involved. It is a question of what is the truth, whom we should believe, and in whom to place our unconditional trust." (From Hromadka's lecture: Czechoslovakia's Mission in Present Europe, p. 29.)

"A free Czechoslovakia is unthinkable without the renewal of common European culture. Civilization, deeply rooted in the legacy of the Bible, belief in God and Jesus Christ, based on the Roman concept of law and order and on the philosophy and art of Greece has, for centuries formed a bond and unifying force among all the European nations and tribes" (p. 31).

"It is to our advantage that our greatest philosophers were great Europeans. Whether one speaks of Hus (or his predecessors), Comenius, T. G. Masaryk, or Eduard Benes, they are all great Europeans whose Czechism and Slovakism was deeply rooted in the soil made fertile by the heritage of European culture. * * * These of our greatest men accepted the heritage of our spiritual culture and tradition by looking forward. * * * They were not satisfied merely with preserving it. * * * Our real political leaders are the men who look forward. Firmly rooted in our classical culture, they are not afraid of any upheavals; on the strength of their faith, ideals and aspirations, they wish to build a new fellowship of soul and heart. We can perform a great deed for the entire world if we show how loyal we are to our people and country, and yet we are notwithstanding building a cathedral for all of Europe, as for our mother; how we wish to resurrect the fellowship of hearts and souls which stretches across Europe into all the continents. That is our great mission" (pp. 32, 33).

"All our great men, Hus, Comenisu, Masaryk, Benes are Westerners. One cannot undestand Hus, Comenius, or Masaryk without a western background with the emphasis on clear thinking, human dignity, freedom, law and order, and human rights." (From the Lecture to Youth, p. 72.)

It would be very instructive to ask Professor Hromadka at Evaston whether he still holds the views expressed so forcibly at that time. It would also be interesting to quote to him from his recent speeches in which he has reversed himself. I shall now quote from his utterances (though in condensed form) which were published in the Communist papers in Czechoslovakia:

"Six years ago the war operations of World War II were brought to an end, but not the war itself. * * * Western statesmen were disquieted, in fact roused that the U. S. S. R. had come out of the war internally strengthened and outwardly. It was apparent that the socialistic foundation of the Soviet people had proved itself and that social reconstruction had become necessary and unavoidable in other countries. Asiatic nations, colonial and semicolonial, experienced an awakening of their own dignity and launched the struggle for complete liberation. National freedom would not be possible, however, unless they would be liberated also from economic exploitation, social injustice, and colonial slavery. Across the entire Asiatic and even the African Continent voices were heard ever more loudly that there never will be real peace unless the countries, suffering from political and economic exploitation by the Western countries, will be given full national rights and economic self-determination. All their aspirations were centered on the Soviet Union, which after its famous victory in May 1945 had become the hope of the miserable and exploited peoples numbering hundreds of millions, perhaps even a billion.

"This historical absolutely new situation gave rise to the fear of those who until World War II had held in their hands international politics and world trade. An attempt was made immediately at the close of war to stop the growing influence of the Soviet Union and to frighten the Soviet statesmen by building more and more war bases, preferably directly on the borders of the U. S. S. R.

"Even those observers of international affairs who were in doubt as to who is responsible for the civil war in Korea but who finally came to the core of the east Asian situation, realized that the Korean crisis is the result of America's refusal to recognize the democratic Chinese republic, but to do everything to wrench it from Mao Tse-tung. All of Asia was in the throes of an unheaval threatening the domain of the Western white man. The entire foundation of economic capitalism was in a great crisis. War operations, together with more and more armament, were to block the social advancement and political regeneration of the Asiatic countries." (The World Council of Peace, pp. 403–405, in Slovansky Prehle No. XXXVII. 1951.)

"The work we are doing for peace is hard, but noble. We call to our friends in all the world, across frontiers of lands and nations, to give us their hand in the struggle for the return of the United Nations to its original purpose. We ask them to fight at home against the injustice commited against the great Chinese people by preventing their delegates from taking their rightful place in the organization of United Nations so that they could help the Korean people in their work of reconstruction and social progress. Above all, we ask them to obstruct the plan of making Germany an armed spearhead for aggression and conquest." (Rudé Právo, October 13, 1953, Prague.)

"When the news reached us that on the battlefield of Vietnam several hundred young Czechoslovaks had died fighting in the French Colonial Army, I was all the more overcome for I thought of the Vienna feeling of brotherhood of the progressive Frenchmen for the suffering people of Vietnam. At the very time when a gigantic struggle is being waged for agreement between nations, when the nations of Africa and Asia are struggling for their rights of self-determination and for their human rights, at that very time Czechoslovaks are dying for the colonial exploitation of the white man. What a terrible thought. One can say without false pathos or hesitation that the struggle against the people of Vietnam is waged in the interest of the most reactionary and greedy strata of a dying society. That is not the struggle for true European ideals of freedom and equality, brotherhood and human dignity. It is a struggle for the darkest leftovers of the old system of colonialism against the healthier people yearning for freedom. Let us compare the ideals which have led our people in the distant and recent past with the ideals for which the Czech and Slovak boys are now dying on the battlefield for false promises. We feel sorry for their parents and close friends. We hold responsible those who misled our young people into this dirty service which is a disgrace to European society. As for ourselves, we intend to do everything so that the nations of Asia and Africa would achieve their rightful place in the world family of nations." (Rudé Právo, 23 XII, 1953, Prague, The Traitors of the Nation.)

"Hydrogen bomb tests in the Pacific Ocean prove that new ways are sought how to frighten the world, how to paralyze its moral strength and force the nations to capitulate. After the fall of Dien Bien Phu, the Vietnam situation gave certain circles of the western and journalistic world, especially in the United States, the opportunity of depicting the danger of war in the darkest of colors and to frighten the people of the Western and Pacific countries with alleged plans of enemy aggression and expansion."

Professor Hromadka then continued to analyse the harmful effects of the so-called policy of imperialistic powers and to devote himself to the question of collective security:

"The principle of collective security means the principle of equality of nations. Each nation has the right to follow the road to social and political construction within the framework of common security. That means the end to the cold war—I repeat—that this is the most dishonorable way by which the politicians hope to keep up the war threat in times of peace; at the same time they remain in safety and take no risks themselves. We, the citizens of Czechoslovakia could say much about certain details of the cold war, because we have to deal with new attempts to deprive our people of the results of their labor. One example will suffice. We can say, however, that despite all the harm caused by the cold war, it has failed in its purpose and is turning against those who started, organized, and led it. The struggle for collective security is a struggle not only against the danger of war, but also against the low and false attempts at wrecking the construction of the other nation by deliberate, crafty acts of the marauders sent by the powerful state in peacetime to countries with which it is living in normal international relations." (From the address of the Czechoslovak Delegate, J. L. Hromadka, Rudé Právo, May 27, 1954, Prague.)

"Summing up the main features marking the present situation of the churches in Hungary and Czechoslovakia: The first of these is that these churches live and serve in the process of a profound historical change of far-reaching importance. This change is taking place in the fundamental thinking of historical existence. The Hungarian and Czechoslovak peoples are engaged in the vast work of reconstructing their social, economic, and political life. The second feature of the situation is that, while the peoples of this part of the world are building up a new order, they must constantly struggle with the difficulties and obstacles which are the remains of the old economic social and political order condemned by God. The third is that our churches, which were more or less grown together with the old order, must carry on a fight within themselves against their coalescence with the old order. The fourth feature is that it was by faith that the churches in this part of the world decided to affirm the new situation, explaining clearly to the entire world of Christendom the premises and consequences of this decision of faith. The fifth point is that while we confess that Christ is the hope of the world, we are not blind or indifferent to the good hopes which the entire people and the entire human race cherish, working, toiling, and making sacrifices for their fulfillment.

"What will happen in Evanston? We see two trends in the ecumenical movement. There are people who would like to turn the World Council of Churches and the entire ecumenical movement into a bastion, concerning the church in the state of spiritual self-complacency. They try to use the church as a fortress against the new historical process, turning it into a spiritual Maginot Line or even organizing a counterattack against what is going on in the world. But there is another trend, too. This means that we should try to make the World Council of Churches and, in particular, the Evanston Assembly, a place and occasion of inner self-searching, thus understanding the condescension of God's infinite love into this world in Jesus Christ. Let us pray that the second trend may prevail in the ecumenical movement, in the World Council of Churches and in the world assembly at Evanston." (Hungarian Church Press, vol. VI/4, Budapest, Feb. 15, 1954.)

"I, even 30 or 40 years ago, identified myself with the cause of the simple and poor people and, in the events of 1918, I sided with the progressive forces, in spite of the fact that my parents belonged to the class of well-to-do peasants. In 1938, after Munich, I realised that a historical period had come to its end. In 1948, when the final victory of the working class was accomplished, there was not a moment of hesitation in my mind as to where I have to stand. It became immediately clear to me in which camp we believing theologians have to fight, and so I am deeply moved that this celebration of ours is honored by the presence of the president of the State Office of Church Affairs, representing the Hungarian Government, and that the representatives of the Czechoslovak legation are also with us. There are people in the Western World who try to understand me by looking for motives of opportunism behind my position. I should like to emphasize here that it is by deep conviction that I side with those who are working for the spiritual and material development of the working people, for the defense of the world's peace and who are ready to make sacrifices for these causes." (On the occasion of his Doctorate hon. causa in Debrecen, Hungary, June 24, 1953.)

"The world revolution of our days, which is gradually spreading to all continents, was brought into existence and energized by the importance of that stratum of European and American society which carries the responsibility for the economical and political world order, which has been unable to thrive in the foundations of the bourgeois society, and has failed to secure full human rights to the great masses and render help to the hundreds of millions in Asia and Africa to enter the road of liberation leading them out of the misery of famine, poverty, illiteracy, and slavery. Today the very structure of human society is changing and human history is making a new name. The center of gravity has been moved from the old Western European center partly to the East and the Far West. Western European civilization, this world center of cultural progress, has lost its leading role and is struggling for its mere life. * * * There is nothing more terrible than to ignore stubbornly the events, trying to escape from them into personal lamentations and illusions. * * * The face of the world is changing. The civilization of the world will be shaped and molded by those nations which have grown up on the territories outside the pale of Christian society. * * * We must learn honestly, think progressively, face reality resolutely, and make up our minds. * * * It means victorious courage in settling our account with the Old World in penitent love, yet with a resolute and forward-looking face." (Lecture on the occasion of his receiving the honorary degree.)

"A TRIBUTE TO PROFESSOR HROMADKA

"In his extensive activities Professor Hromadka proves that the mission of a Christian theologician need not conflict with the effort to elevate socially human society. He has been winning over honest church representatives from other countries at conventions, congresses, and assemblies. Of excellent use are his friendly contacts and the esteem which he enjoys for his literary and scientific work abroad. His spirited words with which he speaks to the heart simply, honestly, and convincingly are winning over new citizens to build over peacefully the Old World." (Literarni Noviny, July, June 5, 1954, Prague.)

"J. L. HROMADKA RECEIVES THE ORDER OF THE REPUBLIC

"The President of the Republic Anton Zapotocky has bestowed upon Prof. J. L. Hromadka, the dean of the Comenius Protestant Theological Faculty of Prague, member of the executive board of the World Council for Peace, the chairman of the Czechoslovak Committee of the Defenders of Peace, and the holder of the Czechoslovak Peace Award on his 65th birthday—the Order of the Republic for his achievements in the struggle for preserving world peace." (Rudé Právo, June 8, 1954.)

"If the reactionary elements in America were to gain complete victory, then I, a lover of America, would feel constrained, as one freely determining his actions, and despite all my friendship with many people in the United States, to stand on the side of the East." (Kostnicke Jiskry, Oct. 6, 1947.)

"Perhaps the most powerful (impression) was made on me by the realization of the unique and incomparable changes in the basis of Soviet life which have occurred within a relatively short time. Society has become * * * monolithic. Human dignity has been elevated and secured by the conditions of the new life created for the working people and the peasants. * * * You observe no social barriers among the masses. Schools are open to all, obligatory for all. Immense housing projects for the workers are in the process of construction where only recently there existed tumbled-down shacks. The local and regional governments of cities, communities, and counties are in the hands of the working people. When you consider what Russian society was like 30 years ago, you cannot escape the powerful impression of change. * * * You also hear (and feel) that increased attention is being given to family life and that in relations between man and woman, boy and girl, there exists a much purer, more genuine, healthier and uncorrupted atmosphere than in the West or among us." (Kostnicke Jiskry, Dec. 4, 1947.)

"The Communists and Socialists may have been ruthless and unscrupulous, but they knew what they wanted and what was to be done." (Theology Today, vol. 2, Princeton, N. J., July 1948.)

"I accept the February step (the Communist putsch in Czechoslovakia) as the unavoidable and justifiable process of the social transformation of our life. * * * However, my attitude to the present regime is not that of an adaptation and self-identification. The center of gravity in my life and position is on another plane from that of the present masters of Czechoslovakia. The perspective of my political decision essentially differs from the perspective of communism. I believe that the social and economic transformation of our life along the line of socialism cannot be contained and halted. * * * The path of my faith and the path of the Communist activity intersect one another, but they are not identical; they are of an essentially different nature." (Theology Today, p. 275, ibid. (July 1948).)

"The Communist-controlled regime may, with a sinister inner logic, drive our life into the straitjacket of a police state and a totalitarian system. However, I believe in the possibility of another alternative: that the Christian heritage and witness may prove to be a transforming power and keep the new socialistic or communistic order free from spiritual stagnation and impotence." (Ibid., p. 276.)

"We should look at the new effort from the perspective of all historical and world occurrences; we should understand that what is going on is basically necessary, legitimate, and useful for the large masses of the people.

"Who will rejoice more than a real member of the Church of Christ when injustice and class differences will be overcome by a classless society? Is not the longing for a classless society of human brotherhood and freedom an echo of the prophetic and gospel message about Jesus Christ, the Son of God? * * * What could we have against the new order which does away gradually with violence, exploitation, and injustice? * * * But when the classless society will come into being, even then shall we meet with physical and spiritual disease, with sin and uneasiness of heart, with pride and selfishness, fornication and dishonesty. * * * And it will become evident that even the new society will need the church more than the church will need the new society." (Theology Today, vl. 4, p. 446, January 1950.)

We Czech protestants used to boast of our church and cultural progressivism, in order that we might strengthen our church in the modern Czech society. But who cares about our old progressivism today? * * * The sooner we get rid of it the better. Perhaps the time has come when it is necessary to break the bonds of the old confessions, of the church tradition, of the hidebound immobility and self-complacency." (Krestanská Revue, XVIII, 6, 1951.)

* * * * *

Is Professor Hromadka a defenso fidei? In our glorious history the leaders of the churches were ready to die for their belief. We have many martyrs, beginning with Jan Hus. Many of the unbroken souls are even now in Communist prisons and concentration camps. But Professor Hromadka has no word of condemnation for those cruelties and injustices. In fact, Hromadka spoke for the regime at the peace congress in Budapest at the time the leaders of the Baptist Church were being tried for espionage and given long prison sentences. And now, just as Hromadka is about to set out on his trip to Evanston, there to exalt the Communist way of life and the achievements of the brutal and godless regime—the news came from Czechoslovakia that the dignitaries of the Mormon Church in Czechoslovakia have fallen victim to the cruel regime.

We, protestants from Czechoslovakia, who had to flee from the country or resign from our posts in protest to the Communist overthrow of Czechoslovak democracy, are deeply ashamed of the so-called leaders of Czech and Slovak Protestantism. In our past history the protestants have always had a leading role in the fight for freedom and human liberties. Now, however, the Protestant Churches are collaborating with evil, while the leading role in the fight for freedom has shifted to the Catholics, who are resisting more valiantly against Communist barbarianism. For this Hromadka and his like are responsible. Even when freedom is restored to our country, the protestant churches will suffer because of the wrongdoing of the fellow travelers, who betrayed the truth and the teachings of Jesus.

Soviet Russia Was Established in the Heart of Europe by Virtue of a Blind Foreign Policy—Postwar Political Aims Absolutely Ignored—This Same Blind Policy Continues

SPEECH

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 29, 1954

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, history will record that when in July 1945 Soviet Russia was established in the heart of Europe that it was a fateful milestone for all of mankind. Such was the appraisal of that event by no less an authority than Sir Winston Churchill himself. He should know, as he was a principal actor in that tragic melodrama.

Mr. Hanson Baldwin, writing in the July Atlantic Monthly, evaluates Winston Churchill as a military strategist and world statesman. He concludes that Churchill was right in the position that he took on questions of military strategy. Further, that he was sound in assessing the future political situation subsequent to the war. Obviously the United States had no peacetime plans.

Baldwin points out that Churchill warned, prior to Potsdam, that an entire generation has been drilled to the conditioned reflexes of communism, that half of Asia is Communist, and the rest is a battleground. Three-fifths of our national budget goes for arms; 142,118 Americans gave their blood in Korea to halt the march of world conquest. He continues, "The world is two worlds—and there is no end in sight."

Mr. Speaker, Hanson Baldwin speaks with authority. I do not always agree with his conclusions, but his articles are interesting and challenging.

In the last volume of Churchill's personal account of World War II, he provides proof—proof buttressed by other documentation, "that American political astigmatism, our blindness to postwar political aims, and our naive belief that Soviet imperialism had modified its dreams of world conquest was partially responsible for the establishment of communism in the heart of Europe."

In blind pursuit of but one objective in World War II—that of a military victory, the political peace—so important to the world—was lost. Mr. Baldwin called the turn on this unfortunate situation in 1950. He says:

> My thesis—one held and advanced by many others—was that the unconditional surrender doctrine, our failure to penetrate the Danubian plain and to push into the Balkans, and the halting of our armies short of Prague and Berlin and their subsequent withdrawal to the west had helped to give the Russians hegemony over Central and Eastern Europe. Similarly Yalta, with its territorial bribes to Russia, to induce her to enter the Pacific war, and our hasty and unnecessary use of the atomic bomb against a Japan already defeated and prostrate influenced adversely the peace in the Orient.

Mr. Speaker, many who have defended Roosevelt's agreements at Yalta contend that failure of the agreements lies with Russia who broke them, who took advantage of our policies, and who turned our actions against us. Baldwin's response to that argument is:

> Our World War II actions, policies, and agreements were in many cases so naively trusting, politically superficial, or limited in outlook as to make it not only possible, but easy, for Soviet communism to turn them to its advantage. Our World War II mistakes aided Moscow to extend its Communist domination far beyond the borders of Soviet Russia.

The 800 millions of people now dominated by Russia is mute evidence of that fact.

What was the approach of the United States to Russia, under Roosevelt? Did the United States fear the domination of the Soviet in the heart of Europe? Mr. Baldwin says "No" and gives us the answer:

> Robert Sherwood records in Roosevelt and Hopkins that Harry Hopkins took with him to the Quebec Conference in August 1943 a document, Russia's Position, which quoted from a very high level United States military strategic estimate. This paper pointed out that "Russia's post-war position in Europe will be a dominant one * * * since Russia is the decisive factor in the war, she must be given every assistance and every effort must be made to obtain her friendship. Likewise, since without question she will dominate Europe on the defeat of the Axis, it is even more essential to develop and maintain the most friendly relations with Russia."

> It is remarkable that this paper and the entire policy of the American Government (until almost the end of the war) showed no worry about postwar domination of Europe by Russia, even though twice in the twentieth century, the United States had gone to war to prevent domination of Europe by Germany.

This was abject surrender to godless communism, Mr. Speaker.

Pointing out that Mr. Churchill was obviously aware of the coming Russian menace, while Roosevelt and his advisers, except in 3 or 4 instances, had no fear of it, Baldwin says:

> So much, then, for the attitude of Downing Street; Churchill's approach to the problems of international power was unquestionably far more realistic than the idealistic but impractical attitudes of the egocentric, charming but internationally inexperienced Roosevelt and some of his trusted advisers.
>
> What of the specific major issues of the war years which contributed to the later loss of the peace?

And again, he says:

> Thus one of the fundamental policies of World War II, a policy which has greatly influenced, for better or for worse, the lives of this generation, was born. Unconditional surrender was laid down as a "diktat"—a one-man decision—without any study of its political or military implications and was announced publicly and unilaterally at a press conference to the surprise of the Nation's chief ally, Great Britain. Historians may agree or disagree as to the validity of the unconditional surrender policy, but history can describe the manner in which this policy was born, in only one way: "This is a hell of a way to run a railroad."

Mr. Speaker, what are the political objectives—peace aims—in the present so-called cold war? It is important for our people to know. Is our objective solely a miltary one—resist communism by swift retaliatory strikes? But assuming we win, what happens after that? We await the answer.

We should have learned one lesson from World War II in this connection. Roosevelt's unconditional-surrender policy left a vacuum in Europe, and Red Russia moved right into it. Says Mr. Baldwin, on that point:

> This policy (unconditional surrender) represented a negative peace aim, not a positive one. It meant, as Mr. Churchill himself states, complete destruction of German (as well as Nazi) power, and peace terms so harsh that as the late British Foreign Minister, Ernest Bevin, put it, it "left us with a Germany without law, without a constitution, without a single person with whom we could deal, without a single institution to grapple with the situation. * * *"
>
> It meant the creation of vacuums of power, the complete destruction of two nations—Germany and Japan—which in modern history had been the traditional counterpoise to Soviet Russia. It meant the subordination of political aims to military ones; it put military victory ahead of political peace. The unconditional-surrendner policy was a triumph of the total-war concept—a concept that has never led, and will never lead, to the only kind of peace worth having, a more stable one.
>
> It was the foundation stone of the politico-strategic edifice the United States erected during the war upon the quicksands of unreality. We fought to win, and we forgot that wars must have political aims, and that complete destruction and unconditional surrender cannot contribute to a more stable peace. We substituted one enemy for another; and today's enemy, Soviet Russia, is more threatening than the old.
>
> History needs no footnotes to prove the truth of these assertions; it is written in the daily headlines and in all our policies since the war. Unconditional surrender meant in World War II the complete destruction of the power of Germany and Japan; nearly ever since, at the cost of billions, we have been attempting to build up again the power of these two nations in order to restore some balance of power in the world. The tragedy is that we cannot erase the psychological memories of unlimited devastation and destruction with unlimited dollars. The Germans and the Japanese have not changed and neither nation will soon forget the no-quarter terms of World War II.
>
> It will be hard, I think—

Says Mr. Baldwin—

> for history to refute the contention that the loss of much of eastern Europe was due in considerable measure to American political astigmatism.

It can be accepted as a verity that aside from military victory, wars must have political aims as well.

As a threat to the onward march of communism in this so-called cold war, it has been suggested that we rely on the deterrent of massive retaliatory power. It is only fair to ask against what type of aggression will be launch such an attack? Is the target Peiping or Moscow?

Assuming such strategy and that the mission was accomplished—the enemy defeated—what political objectives have the military planners been given?

What comes after victory—another divided Korea?—another divided Germany?—another divided Austria?—another divided Indochina?

If both sides visit devastation upon each other in this atomic age, what do we do next? Is unlimited destruction to be used for limited political ends? Just how will massive destruction achieve a peaceful, stable world?

Mr. Speaker, early last March I addressed a letter to the Secretary of State and asked him for an answer to some of these questions. I was particularly interested in the ones relating to the political. It is in this field that our foreign policy has failed so miserably in the last 20 years.

To this day, Mr. Speaker, I have had no answer to these questions by the Secretary of State. This may be quite an unimportant matter to him, but it is vitally important to all of the people of the United States.

Medical Society Issues Warning on Self-Run Low Salt Diets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RUTH THOMPSON

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 29, 1954

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following bulletin from the Illinois State Medical Society:

MEDICAL SOCIETY ISSUES WARNING ON SELF-RUN LOW SALT DIETS

CHICAGO.—The Illinois State Medical Society, through its committee on nutrition, today published a solemn warning of the danger in self-imposed and self-conducted "low sodium diets," especially in hot weather. The committee's statement follows:

"The committee on nutrition of the Illinois State Medical Society finds it necessary, as a public service, to sound an emphatic warning against the current fad for the so-called salt-free, salt-poor, or low sodium diet, when undertaken on the basis of self-diagnosis and self-administration.

"No individual should attempt to maintain such a diet except under close, constant supervision by a physician. It is dangerous to disturb the salt balance of the body.

"The only persons who might be benefitted by such a diet are those seriously ill of heart or kidney disease, who should therefore be under the constant care of a physician.

"This danger is especially menacing in hot weather. The increased loss of salt through excessive sweating in summer heat can cause a severe reaction, which might even be fatal, in a person whose salt or sodium reserve is already depleted by an unsupervised low salt diet.

"Any person who succumbs to the popular fad in the hope of losing weight or reducing blood pressure may be sadly disappointed, since the effect of sodium restriction is largely the loss of water, not tissue, from the body. The water is quickly replaced because of the resultant thirst.

"Sodium and chlorine are elements which are essential to normal body function. Every cell in the body requires solium in some way; a proper balance among sodium, potassium, and calcium, for instance, is essential to normal heart action, Chlorine is also required for health: For instance, an adequate supply permits the body to manufacture hydrochloric acid, a component of the gastric juice which is necessary to digestion.

"The usual American gets much of his daily requirements of these two elements from his meals, but part of it is taken in the form of extra table salt, which chemically is sodium chloride.

"Moreover, in areas such as the Great Lakes Basin, the soil is deficient in iodine, which is essential to proper function of the thyroid gland. Iodine is usually added to table salt sold here in order to prevent that type of goiter which is due to lack of iodine.

"When table salt is removed from the diet of the citizen of Illinois, therefore, he or she may be dangerously deprived of these three elements essential to life—sodium, chlorine, and iodine.

"Thus there is a great deal of risk in the low sodium or salt poor diet.

"Occasionally a physician will take that risk in order to relieve the symptoms of certain patients suffering from heart or kidney disease. In congestive heart failure, for instance, water can accumulate in the tissues, a condition known as edema or, popularly, 'dropsy.' That imposes a tremendous extra strain on the already weakened heart, so the physician tries to release much of the water, by reducing the intake of sodium, which tends to hold water in the body.

"This is a calculated risk, taken deliberately in order to relieve a more immediate dangerous condition. The patient must be constantly watched to see that his sodium reserve does not drop below the minimum essential to health, even to life.

"The physician must also be ready to increase the sodium intake immediately in case of any sudden additional loss of sodium, such as that due to prolonged heat and excessive sweating. Perspiration contains sodium chloride and the loss of the chemical via the sweat glands can be severe. That may occur even in normal persons exposed to extreme heat—with weakness, nausea, cramps, collapse, coma, and even death ensuing, unless the sodium deficiency is quickly corrected.

5

"It is clear, therefore, that anyone subjecting himself or herself to a low sodium diet, on his own initiative and without medical supervision, may invite disaster."

Summary: Low sodium diets without medical direction are: (1) Dangerous to life and health; and (2) largely futile since little or no fatty tissue is lost.

Conclusion: Don't do it, unless your physician orders it.

A Christian Witness in Communist Countries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 29, 1954

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an article entitled "A Christian Witness in Communist Countries," which is taken from certain preparatory material for the assembly of the World Council of Churches scheduled to take place in Evanston, Ill., next month. The most disturbing statement in this article is the one which fully and freely advocates cooperation between Christianity and communism when "a practical, useful task needs to be done." I greatly regret this apparent evidence that the World Council of Churches still tends toward the fallacious belief that it is possible to have peaceful coexistence with international communism.

The above-mentioned follows:

THE CHRISTIAN WITNESS IN COMMUNIST COUNTRIES—VII

As a result of the expansion of Communist power in eastern Europe and in Asia in the years following the war a large body of Christians now live in countries under Communist regimes. How do Christians in these countries understand and express their responsibility for society? What is the significance for ecumenical social thinking of their experience with the Communist system?

A. THE CHALLENGE OF COMMUNIST IDEOLOGY

It is difficult to generalize about the specific tasks of the churches in Communist countries, because circumstances vary greatly. In certain countries communism has become dominant through internal political action, in others it is associated with a strong indigenous Communist Party, and in others it has few roots in the native soil. In certain countries it has brought far-reaching social reforms, and in others it has thwarted democratic social reform movements. In some it came with the collapse of a bankrupt regime with no available alternatives, and in others it destroyed such alternatives. In some the churches have had experience in dealing with a totalitarian situation, and in others they have not.[1]

Nevertheless, all the churches in Communist lands must deal with the challenge to the Christian view of man and society resulting from Communist ideology. The points of conflict between Christian faith and Communist social theory and practice are indicated in many reports and may be summarized as follows.

(1) The claims of a total ideology, which aims at changing the consciousness of the population to correspond with a Marxist society: This involves the remolding of the entire school curriculum on Marx-Leninist dialectical materialist principles, and the examination of students on their points of view as well as on their knowledge; it means also control of the channels of public information by the same ideology, the schooling of the whole population in factories, farms, offices, and neighborhoods. The main problem here is what this means to the school child or student from a Christian family. The whole question of truth and sincerity is involved. Must he lie in order to remain at his school or university or must he bear witness to his faith and take the consequences?

(2) The claim of total power which the state makes and its means of exercising it: The Communist conception of justice is completely different from that held under other regimes. The interests of the party and state are paramount, and where the state and the individual clash the former is always right. It follows that the state feels justified in using whatever methods may be found effective to subdue resistance.

(3) The changes in the economic and political structure which result in the tendency to treat individuals and families as productive units: This proceeds partly according to the "class war" formula of the Communists, whereby property is transferred to public ownership, and positions are awarded to peasants or workers by the elimination of "landlords" or "capitalists" rather than by due process of law. It proceeds also by the total planning of the economy from the top. In collectivized industry and agriculture, personal, family, and vocational life is changed by compulsory schooling and vocational life is changed by compulsory schooling and thought control, by controlled wages and by compulsory activities embracing large portions of free time.

B. THE CHRISTIAN HOPE IN COMMUNIST SOCIETY

What is the witness of the church in face of these pressures? The church is able to bear witness only through the courage and fortitude which comes through a deep renewal of faith. The church lives in this situation only as it understands that it has a new opportunity, given of God, to witness to the truth of the Gospel. The great joy with which many Christians in Communist countries welcome the test of their faith is well illustrated by the words of a young pastor who was imprisoned for a period during the "church struggle" in Eastern Germany in 1953. He writes:

"Let me say clearly to start with, it is a good and precious thing to preach here in the East, that Jesus Christ alone, Lord and Saviour, refreshes the weary and the suffering, and that He has found the lost and the strayed; no one can snatch them from His hands or take from them the peace which their Almighty Father gives. * * * The man who has a light in the darkness of night is well established. Many wanderers will join him because they see from afar that 'there is light, guidance, security.' As Hitler came to power, all the stars of the bourgeois world lost their brilliance one by one, and many a citizen discovered with amazement the little light of the Gospel. Here among us in the East the old stars never came out again. A new (Communist) religion, claiming the whole universe as well as the inmost conscience of men, is being proclaimed from the rooftops and in the smallest rooms. Yet the * * * years we have been hearing it have only been able to make us more sure of the truth of God, and more sustained by it. * * * It is our growing experience that God's word is like a hammer which smashes the greatest rocks. Who can but rejoice at the chance to be there?"

Most Christian thinking in this situation starts by affirming a theological basis which strongly emphasizes hope because the historical action of God is so important. It takes as its starting point the lordship of Christ over history and over the church: this makes the church free from all concern for earthly position or power and critical of all ideologies. It recognized the judgment of God in the events which led to Communist rule, the importance of concrete repentance, and of accepting Christ in this new society. This does not imply acceptance of the system. The way of Christ is to follow a Lord who took the sins of the world upon himself, who suffered and rose again. But opinions differ regarding the way in which this theological conception of the basic Christian hope is to be applied to the actual developments in Communist countries. It is not possible here to survey all the different views, but two may be cited.

C. COMMUNISM AS A JUDGMENT UPON PRE-COMMUNIST SOCIETY

There is the view which holds that pre-Communist society, because of its spiritual emptiness, its social and economic injustice, and its failure to meet the challenge of the rising masses, collapsed completely before the revolutionary force of communism. This collapse is regarded as evidence of the total judgment of God. The new economic and political society of communism is seen as the first step toward the classless society, which is the provisional hope which Christians also can affirm. Professor Hromadka, of Czechoslovakia, who holds such a view, emphasizes that the prophetic response of the Christian to communism must not be a plain "No."

"We must meet * * * the challenge of Marxism and what it represents. First of all, we have to understand the real effort of the Marxists to reconstruct our social order; to raise the working class to a level of active participation in the shaping of human conditions; to establish a society in which all class differences and injustices would disappear. We must understand why it is precisely the Marxists who have taken over the heroic role of socializing our countries. Moreover, it is being taken seriously by its followers, while Christians are largely guilty of having no burning convictions. Many churches have degenerated into empty conventions and institutions."[2]

And a young Christian theologian in China writes:

"Many young Christian men and women are considering the ministry and church work as a way for them to serve God and the people. Today, Christian ministers are working within an environment of moral health and vigor. They can carry on their moral and spiritual tasks with consciences at peace because today they have the freedom to come all out for peace, democracy, and human dignity and all those things which the Christian faith demands of a human community."[3]

Those Christians who believe that Christians must affirm the fundamental liberating forces in the Communist social revolution emphasize the progress inherent in the social changes taking place in Communist countries.

The church, and each Christian, is called to participate in the building of the new society, to build up an atmosphere of trust between church and state, to prove that Christians are not imperialist or reactionary.[4] The church must help explain and gain approval for the measures of socialization, and of the "battle for peace." Christians may not become ideological Communists, but according to this view their place is in the mass organizations, perhaps even in the party. The Christian tries at the same time to humanize the social revolution. He may protest or set right the incidental injustices of it. He must help all those in need. However, there may also come a time when, as Professor Hromadka has stated, the church must say "No" to the state, "if someone tries to lead her away from God's authority and to subject her to a human authority."

Footnotes at end of speech.

Footnotes at end of speech.

D. CHRISTIAN RESISTANCE TO COMMUNIST IDEOLOGY

Another viewpoint claims to base a thoroughly practical realism about the forces at work in the world on the Christian hope. It discerns the judgment of God on the old society and on the church without making sweeping denunciations of it, and without illusion as to the character of communism. It sees in communism the attempt of another total ideology, a false faith, to press human beings into its mold, and to wield total power in the world. According to this viewpoint, the task of the Christian is to analyze the forces of society in the knowledge that God in Christ is their Lord and Judge, who has prescribed their true functions; to judge the policies of the Government with sober empiricism, according to whether they serve the needs and preserve the freedoms of human beings; to act in whatever range God grants, in responsibility, for one's neighbor in His Kingdom, without too much strategy, without too much hope for success, or fear of the consequences. These are the logical consequences of the Christian hope. This viewpoint is well illustrated in a statement by a pastor in Eastern Germany.

"We have to learn how to accept the limitations of the position in which God has placed us, and to limit our responsibility to the tasks He gives us. Christians in different places and times have had different ranges of potential influence and knowledge. Ours is very small. We have a little power in our immediate surroundings, but very little. We must reckon with prison where we will have less. We have some understanding of the issues at stake in the world situation, but it is one-sided and scanty. We are tempted always to become impatient with these limits, to imagine that our power or our knowledge is greater than it is, and that therefore the total trend of society is our responsibility. * * * We are called to much more modest strategies and more direct responsibilities—to bear witness to the truth as we know it, to work for a bit of justice or humanity wherever a way opens, to know our Bible (and next to it our Marx-Leninism) better than the Communists, in order that we can understand, love, and help the people with whom we live."

For Christians who believe it is necessary to resist the Communist ideology at specific points with spiritual power, four examples indicate the possibilities of social action;

(1) The very existence of the church as a parish fellowship in love of free men bound to one another in Christ, hearing and carrying the Word of God into their daily lives, is a social act. The church is the only voluntary fellowship in society. Therefore, these Christians exercise and defend the broadest possible scope of church activity and privilege. Freedom not to register church meetings with the authorities, the right of their own land, the right of religious instruction in the schools, all of which in a normal state would be matters for compromise, become here points on which the Christian stands against the state's total claim. The mutual confidence and love and the freedom from fear which grow in a church meeting or conference, the economic community based on free cooperation which can be built on church farmland as in Eastern Germany, and the witness which intelligent religious instruction can bear to all truth, are living challenges to mass organizations based on fear, forced economic planning, and ideological education. For example, as a means of resisting the totalitarian claims of the state, the churches in Communist countries have discovered the fruitfulness of Christian philanthropic, mission and social work, supported entirely by vountary contributions from church members.

(2) Social action in this situation is also the Christian's personal encounter with his neighbor, backed by the counsel and support of the congregation and the pastor. The Communist is thus encountered whenever a Christian refuses to participate in some mass demonstration—petition, parades, election, joining an organization, etc.—and has to answer for this refusal. He then has the opportunity to explain biblical commandments in their practical applications, and to draw Communists out of their ideological shell. Other men are encountered in their bitter hatred against the regime, and need the Gospel of Christ if they are to go on living in this society.

The following account of conversations between Christians and Marxists in Eastern Germany is a good example of the way in which the Christian through his personal encounter with his neighbor bears witness to the power of God, and helps his fellow sufferers and the victims of totalitarian ideology to rise above hate and resentment:

"Two young Communists are talking with us. They are trying to persuade us to take part in the voting for peace. When they have finished, we begin to ask about the nature of their struggle for peace in relation to the teachings of Lenin. They say: 'Peace means not a condition of peace between nations, but peace in the classless society, which will be achieved through revolution, the collapse of capitalist power and the dictatorship of the proletariat.'"

"So this plebiscite is directly connected with belief in the truth of scientific socialism?" "Oh, yes." "But you see, we don't believe that it is the truth." It nearly takes one's breath away to see how the two react to this unexpected conclusion. "Then what have you got instead of this belief?" And so begins a 3-hour talk about obedience to God's law, and other aspects of Christian faith. One of them, who is married, asks, "How can God be real if He has no substance? For nothing can exist without substance." "Is the love and confidence between himself and his wife real, and on the other hand can he prove that it has substance?" He agrees that his conception of what is real is inadequate, even for the relationships between people. He reflects and then puts a surprising question. "But supposing I am lying when I say that love and confidence are a reality between two people?" "Then your marriage must be a very unhappy one." Then his human side comes to the fore. "You are right; life would be awful without that." We ask other questions: Has Marxism any answer to the question, what is the death of the individual? Without it can there be an answer to the question, What is man? We men exist only as dying men. Has communism any answer to the reality of evil in us? When he took his leave he said, "I tell you frankly, that is my first encounter with the Christian faith. You have said things that I can't forget."

(3) The Christian can, so far as his knowledge goes, bear witness to a truth and an order of society which is based on the Kingdom of God. His faith makes him free from Communist interpretations, to see scientific facts and human relations more clearly. Recognizing that God ordains political order and justice and an economic system to serve the needs of man, he will cooperate with even a Communist state when a practical useful task needs to be done. He will also be free to resist state power or evade it, when only by this means can he serve his neighbor or remind the state of its true function. The church itself has resisted the state in East Germany on occasion, in official statements on land reform, on elections, on lying in propaganda and education, and the police threat behind it, and on attacks on the church and its youth since 1953. There are centers of social influence such as socially necessary professions (doctors, engineers, science professors, etc.) which give opportunity for effective Christian witness, and even in the more controlled ones there are opportunities. Economic freedom from the state becomes, in this connection, a treasure to defend for its value to this witness.

(4) All Christian action in society in Communits lands must reckon with the possibility of loss of employment, or imprisonment. The acceptance of this suffering as a vocation, when it comes, is a supreme act of responsible obedience. It breaks the hold of fear, which is the greatest single social illness in a Communist state. Thus it makes creative action and truly objective thinking possible. It carries responsible society into the heart of a system which does not believe in an ultimate responsibility to God—into its prisons, courts, and concentration camps. Even there the possibilities of Christian action are present. There are neighbors, and there is the power and grace of God.

---

[1] See The Responsible Society in a World Perspective, a memorandum published in the Ecumenical Review, October 1953, p. 80.

[2] J. L. Hromadka in The Ecumenical Review, October 1952, p. 57.

[3] K. H. Ting in China Monthly Review, July 1953.

[4] This view is expressed in a report for this survey from the Ecumenical Study Commission of the Hungarian Churches.

The Bricker Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 28, 1954

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Observations on the Policy of the Bricker Amendment," by the Honorable Claude Pepper, former Senator from Florida. This article, which appears in the spring 1954 issue of the University of Florida Law Review, is an adaptation of an address delivered by that great liberal and Democrat, former Senator Pepper, on October 24, 1953, at a breakfast of the legal fraternity, Phi Alpha Delta. Senator Pepper's observations on the Bricker amendment, which kept this august body in a hotly contested dispute for about 6 weeks of the present session of Congress, should be read by every Member of the Senate.

I have an estimate from the Public Printer that the cost of printing the article will be $191.25.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OBSERVATIONS ON THE POLICY OF THE BRICKER AMENDMENT[1]

(By Claude Pepper[2])

In this critical period, when our national and personal security and manner of life depend so much upon our relations with other nations and peoples of the world, many Senators, organizations, and individuals of eminence propose an amendment to the

---

Footnotes at end of speech.

Constitution of the United States relative to the powers of the President and the Congress in the making of treaties and executive agreements. Both its advocates and its opponents describe it as the most important change in the Constitution offered since the adoption of the Bill of Rights. Such a matter is of especial interest and, I hope, of concern to all lawyers, not only as individuals but also as leaders of public opinion in the sphere of the law.

The amendment is generally associated with the name of Senator BRICKER, of Ohio, who introduced a proposed amendment in the 82d Congress and again in January 1953 in the 83d Congress, but the version of an amendment reported favorably by the Senate Judiciary Committee last June is really more like the amendment proposed by Senator WATKINS, of Utah, in February 1953, which in part at least was in accord with the recommendation of the House of Delegates of the American Bar Association. This group, at the recent meeting in Boston, reaffirmed its position, partially because it felt bound by its previous stand, but the vote on the subject in the assembly revealed that the opponents of the proposal were gaining in strength in the association.

Frank E. Holman, of Portland, Oreg., a former president of the American Bar Association, has spearheaded the fight for the amendment, which has the militant support of many organizations and citizens of repute and prestige in this country. It is vigorously opposed, however, by the President, by the Secretary of State, who spoke strongly against it to the American Bar Association convention in Boston, by an impressive list of law-school deans, professors of constitutional law and practitioners, including John W. Davis, the acknowledged dean of the United States bar, and by many citizens. I should like to consider briefly what is proposed by such an amendment, why the advocates are seeking a change in the Constitution, and what the opponents of the proposal say, and to suggest a policy that I believe better suited to the demands of this crucial era.

The Constitution of the United States provides that it itself, statutes enacted pursuant thereto, and treaties executed under the authority of the United States are the supreme law of the land.[3] The President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, has authority to make treaties. The approval of two-thirds of the Senators present and voting, assuming a quorum to be present, is required in order to give this advice and consent on the part of the Senate.[4] By implication from the terms of the Constitution the President also has authority to make executive agreements with foreign powers.

Executive agreements are of three kinds: Those made pursuant to an act of Congress, those entered into and subsequently ratified or authorized by an act of Congress, and those reached by the President without any congressional authority.

Senator BRICKER and his supporters would write five material changes into the Constitution. These are:

(1) A treaty provision that conflicts with the Constitution shall have no effect.

(2) A treaty shall become effective as domestic law only when it is duly enacted by legislation.

(3) This legislation must be of such a nature that it would be valid if enacted without any relation to a treaty.

(4) Congress shall have power to regulate all executive and other agreements with any foreign power.

(5) Such agreements shall have no effect as internal law unless given effect by Congress in the form of duly enacted legislation that would be valid if not related to an agreement with a foreign power.

One quite naturally asks what is behind the widespread agitation and deep feeling for such an amendment to the Constitution, which has withstood in its present basic form the storms and tides of 165 years. The motivations of the advocates seem to lie in fears stirred from four sources: Executive agreements such as those of Teheran, Yalta, and Potsdam; the numerous conventions proposed by the United Nations;[5] the 1920 decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in *Missouri* v. *Holland*[6] relative to migratory birds; and the recent holding of the California District Court of Appeal in *Sei Fujii* v. *California*[7] that articles 55 and 56 of the United Nations Charter dealing with human rights, invalidated a provision in the California land law forbidding a Japanese to own land in that State.

These instances and decisions move Senator BRICKER and those with him, so they tell us, to fear that if the Constitution is not clarified as they propose, the President, or the President and two-thirds of the Senators, or the President and the Congress, will from time to time strangle the liberties of the people and undermine the institutions of the Republic.

These are serious charges. But what do the President, the eminent lawyer who is Secretary of State, the able committee on international and comparative law of the American Bar Association, the distinguished group of deans and professors of law, and Mr. Davis and the other citizens of high patriotism and repute opposing the proposed change say to these alarms? They believe, as I do, that the legal and practical safeguards of our liberties and institutions under our present constitutional provisions are quite adequate, as proven by the experience of nearly 165 years in which none of the calamities that they contemplate has come to pass. They further believe that this present period, in which our Nation is the hope of peace and freedom for mankind, is no time to weaken the power of our Government to mobilize our friends or master our enemies.

The opponents also emphasize that the first provision in the proposed amendment, namely, that any treaty provision in conflict with the Constitution shall be void, is totally unnecessary because that is the law now as declared by the United States Supreme Court in at least four cases since 1853.

For example, in *Doe* v. *Braden*[8] the Supreme Court said: "The treaty is, therefore, a law made by the proper authority, and the courts of justice have no right to annul or disregard any of its provisions, unless they violate the Constitution of the United States."

Although such an amendment would consist of words harmless in themselves in view of such decisions, yet it is dangerous to amend the Constitution to accomplish a useless purpose. The painful experience of government under the Articles of Confederation, which lacked the treatymaking power, prompted the framers of the Constitution to incorporate the present provision. Some meaning seriously impairing this important power might be read into such amendment.

Missouri v. *Holland*[9] does not impair what I have said or justify the fears that this opinion has aroused in the advocates of this amendment. In 1913 Congress passed an act regulating the shooting of migratory birds in order to protect their dwindling numbers.[10] Two lower Federal courts held this act invalid on the ground that the power to regulate the shooting of game is reserved to the States under the 10th amendment.[11] Thereafter the United States and Canada executed a treaty providing that each country should enact legislation protecting migratory birds flying between the two countries.[12] Congress passed an act carrying out the treaty;[13] Missouri challenged its validity. The Supreme Court upheld the act on the ground that the treaty was lawful as the exercise by the Federal Government of a duly delegated power to enter into treaties and that the act properly implemented the treaty. The Supreme Court in 1941, in *United States* v. *Darby*,[14] declared the same principle in holding that when the Federal Government exercises the commerce power under the Constitution it does not invade the reserved powers of the State under the 10th amendment even though intrastate business is collaterally affected.

The Supreme Court might well have upheld the original act of Congress protecting birds flying between States or countries. I think it would surely so hold in a similar case today. But clearly *Missouri* v. *Holland* does not give the Federal Government under the treaty provision the power to violate another part of the Constitution. On the contrary, Mr. Justice Holmes, who spoke for the Court, said "We do not mean to imply that there are no qualifications to the treatymaking power. * * * The treaty in question does not contravene any prohibitory words to be found in the Constitution."[15] Remembering that this is the fourth case in which the Supreme Court has said the same thing, it would not seem necessary to write that principle further into the Constitution.

You see, then, that the second provision in the proposed amendment, namely, that a treaty shall not have effect as internal law until the Congress so enacts, is an attempt to impair the power to execute a treaty that is self-executing, as many treaties are. It is, further, an effort to go back to the days of the Articles of Confederation and require the concurrence of the States in the treaty-making process; this concurrence obviously would be necessary if the theory of the advocates of this amendment that the power to regulate internal matters is a power reserved exclusively to the States under the 10th amendment is correct.

As a result the United States could not enter into a treaty to give reciprocal rights to citizens of this country and of other countries, or to regulate trade and commerce, customs, narcotics, atomic power production and facilities, and many other subjects without concurring legislation on the part of the States. This procedure would add not only a second step to the treatymaking process but possibly 48 additional steps and unpredictable delays. It would take us back to the time of the inability of the National Government to get the States to carry out treaties; yet this weakness was one of the principal reasons for calling for the constitutional convention and writing the provision that "all treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land."[16]

That this measure now proposed might well be called a States' rights amendment is emphasized by its third provision, namely, that no treaty shall have effect as internal law until it is duly enacted as legislation and that such legislation must be valid without any reference to treatymaking power. Under this provision even Congress could not implement a treaty unless such legislation came under some expressly delegated power in the Constitution or the necessary and proper clause.[17] One wonders whether the real purpose of this proposed amendment is not to curb what these advocates regard as too much internationalism and nationalism; whether, in short, the purpose of the amendment is not more to write a political philosophy than a legal safeguard for our liberties and institutions into the Constitution.

If this aim were the real purpose of this great effort it should be recognized that the Supreme Court has held in the Head Money

---

Footnotes at end of speech.

Footnotes at end of speech.

Footnotes at end of speech.

Cases [18] and others that the effect of any treaty as internal law can be defeated or modified by an act of Congress. Of course, treaties must always deal with matters that are properly the subjects of international agreements; and the courts are open to review any abuse of the treaty power by the Government, just as they are authorized to pass upon any other authority asserted under the Constitution.

The fears aroused by the California lower court decision in the Sei Fujii case,[19] holding a provision of the United Nations Charter self-executing, should have been allayed by the decision of the Supreme Court of California that these charter provisions are not self-executing.[20] No court of last resort to my knowledge has held to the contrary.

Further, it is elementary that the conventions proposed by the United Nations have no internal effect until negotiated by the President and ratified by the Senate as treaties or by the Congress. They are not self-executing.

The provision of the proposed amendment that Congress shall have power to regulate all executive and other agreements strikes at the Presidential power to act for the Nation abroad and ignores the power Congress already has relative to most executive agreements. So-called executive agreements, as distinguished from treaties,[21] are of three classes: Those made by the President by the authority of Congress; those executed by the President and ratified or recognized by the Congress; and those entered into by the President without authorization, ratification, or recognition by the Congress.

An executive agreement that is not authorized by Congress and that conflicts with a former statute is invalid.[22] And a subsequent statute may of course void any kind of executive agreement as internal law, just as it may invalidate as internal law a provision of a treaty.[23]

It would seem, therefore, that the necessity of congressional concurrence, express or actual, and the reserved power of congressional veto would be adequate safeguards respecting the so-called statutory executive agreements; and these make up 85 percent of the some 170 formal agreements our Government is making each year. The precise scope of the power of the President under the Constitution to act in respect to foreign affairs without the concurrence of Congress has never been defined and can probably never be spelled out in specific terms because of the duties and powers he has under the Constitution and the varied and challenging demands he must meet to protect and to promote the interests of the country.

At the 1933 American Bar Association Convention, Judge Parker, the senior circuit judge in the United States, quoted former Secretary of War Royal as saying that, if he had had to submit to Congress the agreement he made in the early hours of the morning with France and Britain respecting the Berlin airlift, that great and saving program would have been impossible. Furthermore, since the steel seizure cases [24] there can be no doubt about the power of the courts to review any assertion of power by the President.

I have thus far dealt with the legal aspects of the proposed amendment and have endeavored to make it clear that the safeguards of the Constitution, the Congress, and the courts, which have proven bulwarks of the people's liberties and our democratic institutions for nearly one and two-thirds centuries, through all the vicissitudes of war and peace, are still safe citadels of security in the present and forseeable future. In addition to these legal safeguards, there are practical assurances which are equally important and, I believe, sufficient. Our Presidents are nominated by conventions and elected by the people; they are subject to impeachment. Experience has proved that they are men of patriotism and integrity, devoted to our way of life and responsive not only to the restraints of congressional power and law, but of public opinion as well. The House and one-third of the Senate are elected every 2 years. We have an alert and militant press, an informed and articulate public opinion.

I should add references to the existence of an institution of which we southerners are particularly aware, the power of filibuster in the Senate. Under this recognized and protected Senate practice a small group of Senators—and surely if, from any source exercising the treaty or executive agreement-making power, there came a real threat to our liberties, a few patriotic and understanding Senators could be counted upon—can by prolonged speech prevent any action by the Senate either toward ratifying a treaty or in any way supporting or recognizing an executive agreement of any character. To stop such a filibuster, since the Wherry amendment, the affirmative vote of 64 Senators, two-thirds of all elected, is required. So, in case of any abuse of presidential or congressional power, the capacity of a very few Senators to require the affirmative vote of 64 Senators to any treaty or executive agreement adds further strength to the practical safeguards we possess against the invasion of our fundamental rights under our Constitution as it has stood for 165 years without the Bricker amendment.

The example of France, whose insecurity is a threat to our own safety because of the weakness of its government in this tumultuous time, should serve to warn us against emasculating our own Government, which has such fearful responsibility for the peace and progress of the world. If the amendment proposed comes from conscientious fears about the legal inadequacy of our present constitutional and legal safeguards, I submit that those fears are ill-founded. Of course, if this amendment agitation is a disguised effort to write into our Constitution the political philosophy of extreme conservatives and isolationists, then the effort should be met in the political forum and the full import and significance of what these earnest citizens would fasten upon our Constitution and upon us and our future should be made crystal clear to the Congress and the country.

I believe reflection will show that the wiser course would be to urge the President, the Senate and House, and an enlightened public all to work together as an effective team to meet and to master the menace that threatens us today. This course is more desirable than tampering with our Constitution, weakening our Executive or the Congress, and indicating distrust in them, our courts, and our people. This is essentially what Secretary Dulles said in the congressional hearing on the Bricker amendment. It is basically what Mr. Justice Jackson stated in his able concurring opinion in the Steel seizure cases.[25] It was the practice of President Roosevelt and the subject of the last correspondence, written rather informally, that I had with him just before his death. In the course of this correspondence I had occasion to make the following observations:

"Since I have been in the Senate I have done what I could to get the Senate to appreciate that it did have a joint responsibility with the President for our foreign policy and to stimulate it to discharge that responsibility fully.

"The practice of the Senate too often and too long has been not to discharge fully its responsibility with the Executive respecting our foreign policy. I consider it to be the duty of the necessary party to the consummation of a treaty, to give the negotiating party, in this case the Executive, some dependable indication as to the general policy it will support before negotiations are undertaken.

"I consider it also to be the duty of such a necessary party to advise the negotiating party, if its advice is required, even during negotiations, what its general views are and what in general it would do. On the contrary, the Senate has too often declined to take any such responsibility and has waited for the negotiations to be concluded, the conference to be broken up, with the settlement of world affairs of the greatest moment in suspense, and then has gone casually about the examination of the treaty negotiated by the Executive treating it with little more earnestiness or diligence than they [sic] would an ordinary bill.

"If our constitutional provision is to remain as it is and the Senate is the final authority upon the ratification of treaties the Senate has got to be more ready to give its advice than it has been in the past or our Government shall not have the power to make prompt decisions, which I believe to be so essential to a sound foreign policy in the modern world."

The President, in one of his last letters, dated April 9, 1945, replied as follows:

"I like what you say, and it is perfectly clear that fundamentally you and I mean exactly the same thing. As a matter of fact, while in questions of foreign policy the President ought to do the spadework of negotiations and the original nominating of certain officers, a long experience leads me to recognize that the Senate ought to be consulted both on the policy and some of the nominations. Both you and I know that as a matter of practice too much consultation would slow up both matters."

By such cooperation we can show to the backward-looking totalitarians and tyrants that democracy not only can but does work, and that free men working together in free nations and a world of expanding freedom will yet bring to pass that happy day, to which I heard Mr. Justice Jackson refer in delivering his great opening speech at the Nuremberg trials in 1945, "when every man shall live by no man's leave underneath the law."

Footnotes at end of speech.

Footnotes at end of speech.

---

[1] This article is adapted, with only slight modification, from the address delivered October 24, 1953, at the Phi Alpha Delta breakfast during the centennial homecoming of the University of Florida. Regardless of the fate of this proposed amendment in the current Congress, the policy issues underlying it are by no means dead, if indeed they are fully dormant in any real sense. We are accordingly publishing this article as an able presentation of the arguments against, and of some of the arguments for, the basic theory involved, without, of course, taking any position on the author's conclusions.

[2] Claude Denson Pepper, A. B., 1921, University of Alabama; LL. B., 1924, Harvard Law School; professor of law, University of Arkansas, 1924–25; United States Senator from Florida, 1936–50; delegate from U. S. Senate to Interparliamentary Union, The Hague, 1938; member of Florida and District of Columbia bars.

[3] U. S. Constitution, art. VI, clause 2.

[4] Id., art. II, sec. 2, clause 2.

[5] E. g., genocide, human rights, and some 200 others.

[6] 252 U. S. 416 (1920).

[7] 217 P. 2d 481 (Cal. App. 1950). But cf. 38 Cal. 2d 718, 242, P. 2d 617 (1952) (U. N. Charter held not to be self-executing).

[8] 16 How. 635, 656 (U. S. 1853).

[9] 252 U. S. 416 (1920).

[10] 37 Stat. 847 (1913).

[11] *United States* v. *McCullagh* (221 Fed. 288 (D. Kan. 1915); *United States* v. *Shauver* (214 Fed. 154 (E. D. Ark. 1914)).

[32] Treaty of August 16, 1916, between the United States and Great Britain, 39 Stat. 1702 (1916), found under Treaties and Conventions 95.

[33] 40 Stat. 755 (1918), as amended, 16 U. S. C., sec. 703 (Supp. 1952).

[34] 312 U. S. 100 (1941).

[35] 252 U. S. 416, 433 (1920).

[36] U. S. Constitution, art. VI, clause 2.

[37] U. S. Constitution, art. I, sec. 8, clause 18.

[38] 112 U. S. 580 (1884).

[39] 217 P. 2d 481 (Cal. App. 1950).

[40] 32 Cal. 2d 718, 242 P. 2d 617 (1952).

[41] Admittedly no clear title of demarcation has been drawn.

[42] *United States* v. *Guy W. Capps, Inc.* (204 F. 2d 655 (4th Cir. 1953)).

[43] *Head Money Cases* (112 U. S. 580 (1884)).

[44] 343 U. S. 579 (1952).

[45] Id., at 634.

Results of Questionnaire Sent to Constituents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. GWINN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 29, 1954

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, for some time past, I have grown weary of being told by self-appointed spokesmen, as to how the people think about national and international issues that confront the Congress and the Nation. These so-called experts on what a majority think or want have made a practice of threatening Congressmen with political defeat if they do not vote according to the wishes of a majority of the people which wishes they pretend to know. The voting records of Members of Congress are graphed and compared with what the majority demand is alleged to be. This sort of activity is standard procedure with the pressure groups in an election year.

In order to expose this self-serving business of the special-interest groups and to better inform myself and my colleagues in the House, I recently circulated by mail a questionnaire in my district. I am happy to report an enthusiastic response from my constituents, about 8,300 of whom participated. In addition, I received nearly 3,000 separate letters and memoranda further explaining the vote registered by them. I was amazed and delighted by the seriousness with which my constituents answered the questions. One man consulted his lawyer and paid him a fee to help get the right answers to his Congressman.

The questionnaire was sent to 91,000 people, or about one-half of the 180,000 registered as voters in 1952. The names and addresses were taken from all the phone books in the 27th Congressional District. Tabulation of the 7,363 questionnaires first returned was made by electronic machines of the International Business Machines Corp. The cost was paid for by me personally.

Approximately 46 farmers, 969 workers, 2,110 businessmen, 2,282 professional people, 1,727 white-collar workers, and 1,154 housewives overwhelmingly support the pay-as-you-go, balanced-budget theory of government. The willingness, even the insistence of a big majority, that they pay for their own housing, food, security, power, health, and education as opposed to leaning on the general taxpayers is encouraging. For they know there are no such persons to lean on.

Possibly the most gratifying of all has been the response of 969 workers. They score as one of the more conservative groups favoring free enterprise and reduction of the business and responsibility of government. They suffer most of all when government takes on socialistic or communistic functions.

With two or three unimportant exceptions, a majority—and in many cases an overwhelming majority—of my constituents voted as I have voted and as I intend to continue to vote.

	Yes	No	Undecided
1. Do you favor reducing President Eisenhower's national defense budget for 1955?	20.5	68.8	10.7
2. Do you favor further reduction of taxes before balancing the budget?	18.7	75.7	5.6
3. Do you favor increasing the Federal debt limit?	15.3	71.6	13.1
4. Do you favor return to the States of all Federal gasoline and oil tax revenues for highway construction purposes without Federal dictation?	55.1	29.9	15.0
5. Do you think that the Taft-Hartley Act is fairer to all parties than the old Wagner Act?	82.5	7.9	9.6
6. Do you think that employers should have the right to talk freely to their employees about all labor-management matters?	93.7	3.4	2.9
7. Do you think that the regulation or control of labor relations and activities in labor disputes within a State should be made by local or State law rather than Federal law?	48.5	36.9	14.6
8. Do you approve the present Taft-Hartley Act prohibition of secondary boycotts? (A secondary boycott is a boycott by outsiders not directly involved in a particular labor-management dispute)	78.7	13.6	7.7
9. Do you think management of money in welfare funds of labor unions should be regulated by law as insurance funds are regulated?	93.9	3.2	2.9
10. Do you favor reciprocal trade agreements regardless of competition of foreign products with domestic products?	37.9	43.2	18.9
11. Do you favor farm subsidies at 90 percent of parity?	7.6	75.6	16.8
12. Do you believe that providing any kind of farm subsidy is a proper function for the Federal Government?	37.4	48.0	14.6
13. Do you approve of Government buying up and storing farm surpluses at the taxpayer's expense?	11.6	80.2	8.2
14. Do you believe that the Federal Government should go into the business of producing and selling electric power?	16.3	76.8	6.9
15. Do you believe that where the Federal Government is in the business of producing and selling electric power, such projects should receive annual subsidies and be exempt from local, State, and Federal taxation?	12.7	78.2	9.1
16. Do you think the Federal Government should sell TVA electric powerplants?	61.0	23.6	15.4
17. Should it sell all publicly owned and operated tax exempt property used in competition with privately owned taxpaying businesses?	65.0	20.2	14.8
18. Do you approve extending social security old-age insurance to all groups of workers not presently covered by social security insurance or some equivalent plan?	77,4	13.5	9.1
19. Do you favor old-age insurance payments to all persons 65 and older regardless of need or prior eligibility?	45.2	45.0	9.8
(*a*) Should such insurance be wholly supported by deductions from wages and salaries?	60.2	11.2	28.6
(*b*) Should this cost be borne by taxpayers generally?	21.5	40.0	38.5
20. Do you favor nonprofit voluntary health insurance organizations?	70.4	19.0	10.6
21. Do you approve Federal construction of hospitals?	47.3	38.2	14.5
22. Do you believe that the administration and control of health and medical services to all the people is a proper function of the Federal Government?	19.7	71.6	8.7
(*a*) To any part of the people?	29.2	38.4	32.4
23. Do you favor socialized medicine?	9.3	83.5	7.2
24. Do you approve of Government public housing exempt from Federal, State, and local taxation and its losses in operation to be paid by taxpayers?	10.1	82.9	7.0
25. Do you believe that wage, price, and rent controls are proper functions of the Federal Government?	26.1	53.2	10.7
26. Do you favor a constitutional amendment making treaties with foreign nations of no force and effect if they deny or abridge any right enumerated in the United States Constitution?	55.9	28.3	15.8
27. Do you favor the development and use of atomic energy by private enterprise within our own country?	77.3	12.5	10.2
28. Do you believe that State and local governments, under present-day conditions are unable to keep law and order and provide adequate protection for life and property?	24.5	65.5	1.00
29. Do you believe that the Federal Government should tax private income and property so as to undertake vast publicowned and operated enterprises exempt from taxes in competition with its taxpaying citizens?	9.0	81.9	9.1
30. Please check the 6 issues you think most important today: [1] Foreign policy Defense and war preparedness Communism in America Government spending Taxation Atomic-energy policies Labor policies Federal debt Cost of living Farm price supports Unemployment problem Limitation of President's treatymaking power			
31. Should the United States continue its program of economic aid to foreign countries?	43.4	37.1	19.5
32. Do you believe atomic and hydrogen bomb know-how should be shared with other countries?	14.1	70.8	15.1
33. Do you think a Government agency should supervise an election held by unions for the purpose of deciding whether or not to go on strike?	66.1	24.4	9.5
34. Do you think that the United States should continue to pay ⅓ of the cost of maintaining the United Nations?	19.2	71.8	9.0
(*a*) Should the figure be reduced?	72.7	8.5	18.8
(*b*) Should the figure be increased?	2.5	51.5	46.0
35. Do you favor statehood for Hawaii?	68.9	17.8	13.3
(*a*) For Alaska?	69.4	17.5	13.1
(*b*) For Puerto Rico?	20.4	60.5	19.1
36. Do you favor direct United States participation in the St. Lawrence seaway if the project can produce enough revenue from shipping tolls to pay its construction and operating costs?	82.1	9.4	8.5
37. Do you approve generally of our present handling of foreign relations?	54.2	31.1	14.7
38. Do you believe American military aid to foreign countries should be continued?	62.1	22.6	15.3
(*a*) Should such aid be increased?	12.9	40.5	46.6
(*b*) Should such aid be reduced?	37.6	19.9	42.5
39. Do you favor keeping American troops abroad in some 50 nations?	27.6	53.7	18.7
40. Do you think we should send troops to Indochina if the French cannot win the war there?	22.1	54.8	23.1
(*a*) Do you think we are giving too much aid in Indochina?	17.9	53.3	28.8
(*b*) Or too little?	26.2	19.6	54.2
41. Do you think we should demand that our allies halt all trade with Russia and her satellites?	59.8	26.8	13.4
42. Do you feel that the President should have the power to commit the United States to active resistance in aggression in Europe and Asia without the consent of or consultation with Congress?	18.2	74.0	7.8

[1] These have been rearranged in the manner indicated by the vote.

	Yes	No	Undecided
43. Do you favor amendment of the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act so as to allow increased immigration in the United States?	22.9	63.9	13.2
44. Do you favor United States expenditures abroad for the development of backward nations?	47.7	38.9	13.4
45. Do you favor the United States making trade agreements with Russia?	15.7	69.6	14.7
46. Do you favor the investigation of Communist subversives by the McCarthy committee?	68.0	22.9	9.1
47. Do you favor Congress enacting a program of universal military training in peacetime?	77.1	15.0	7.9
48. Would you favor a Federal compulsory antidiscrimination law similar to the one that is now in effect in the State of New York?	34.2	52.0	13.8
49. Do you think the Communist Party should be outlawed in the United States?	68.0	22.3	9.7
50. Do you favor speeding up the reduction in number of Federal employees? (Reduction in 1953 was 220,950; there are still 2,361,057 costing $10.5 billions annually.)?	79.5	8.5	12.0
51. Do you favor increased postal rates to make the post office break even?	70.1	21.5	8.4
52. Do you approve of the Federal Government taxing the local communities for education and sending back 20 percent of it as Federal aid to education?	14.9	66.6	18.5
53. Do you think 18-year-old boys and girls have enough experience to vote on such questions as raised above?	23.6	68.6	7.8
54. Do you, yourself, feel that you should be expected to vote on such questions as to how many power dams, houses, loans, gifts, subsidies and wage, price, and rent controls Congress should enact?	31.6	57.2	11.2
55. Do you believe these are proper functions of Government and that you should be expected to vote on all such questions in the conduct of Government?	32.9	44.5	22.6
56. Do you think issues in Federal elections should be confined largely to the ability, character, and fitness of the candidates for office?	77.0	16.1	6.9

This is to certify that the recording of the poll conducted by means of questionnaires for the Honorable Ralph W. Gwinn, Congressman, 27th District, New York, was performed by the service bureau of the International Business Machines Corp., Washington, D. C., office.

* * * * *

Service Bureau, International
Business Machines Corp.
Washington, D. C.

Local Airlines Deserve Permanent Certificates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAIR ENGLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 28, 1954

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, the House recently passed H. R. 8898, a bill providing for the permanent certification of local airlines. The record shows that the Civil Aeronautics Board has not issued any permanent certificates since 1936. This practice has prejudicially affected the operation of the local carriers, which cannot afford to make capital investments on the basis of year-to-year certificates and cannot get the type of financing that a permanent certification would make available. The San Francisco Chronicle in its issue of July 26, 1954, discusses this problem and vigorously supports the passage of the pending legislation for permanent certificates in the editorial which I attach:

LOCAL AIRLINES DESERVE PERMANENT CERTIFICATES

Although they have been faithfully serving the American public for almost a decade, 14 local scheduled airlines now operating in the United States are forced to live a year-to-year existence on temporary Civil Aeronautics Board certificates.

Last year these temporary carriers served no fewer than 440 cities, and carried 1,998,000 passengers. Two hundred and sixty American cities are served exclusively by local airlines. In California, for example, 28 cities are served by Southwest Airways, one of the outstanding successes among the local airlines.

Any interruption of this network of local air service between the 260 cities which the major trunk airlines do not touch would, of course, greatly handicap the flying public. So long as the airlines are required to operate on temporary certificates, there is a continuing threat of service suspensions. Because of this the affected airlines are seeking permanent Government certification. The House has unanimously passed the Hinshaw bill, providing for this. Tomorrow, a similar bill, Senate bill No. 3759, comes before the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. We urge its approval and passage this session.

On the free enterprise competitive principle as properly applied to air transportation, we are convinced there is a distinct need for more air stops than the trunk airlines of the country make. Although these major airlines, plus railroad and bus interests, are organized in opposition to permanent certification of the local airline carriers, we believe the local carriers rate the stability and strength which permanent certification would give them. Air transportation for the smaller cities should be a concern of Congress, and the way for Congress to express it is to pass this pending legislation.

The Late Honorable A. Sidney Camp

SPEECH
OF
HON. A. FERNÓS-ISERN
RESIDENT COMMISSIONER FROM PUERTO RICO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 26, 1954

Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN. Mr. Speaker, a kind and great figure in the Congress passed with the death of our beloved colleague, Sidney Camp. I can think of no more generous or considerate person.

I shall always think of Sidney Camp as sort of a pool of sunlight. He had that manner about him which blends cheerfulness and encouragement in all situations. Even when Sid lost his sight, his cheerful attitude was not affected. He was always ready to stop for a moment and chat in a neighborly way. I feel that I have lost a dear friend.

The people of Puerto Rico whom I represent owed a special debt of gratitude to Sidney Camp as one of those in the Congress who took particular concern with problems affecting Puerto Rico, and which were the subject of legislation. For example, it was he who was largely instrumental in having the social-security program extended to Puerto Rico. This was one of the most beneficial pieces of legislation for Puerto Rico which ever passed the Congress.

I believe that the extension of social security to Puerto Rico was a direct result of investigations conducted by a subcommittee of the House Ways and Means Committee which visited Puerto Rico in 1949 under the able chairmanship of Sidney Camp. In a way, it will be his monument in Puerto Rico.

The Republican Method of Destroying Agency Independence

SPEECH
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 28, 1954

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the Export-Import Bank was incorporated by the Congress under the Export-Import Act of 1945 as an independent agency of Government to provide financing to facilitate imports and the exchange of commerce between our country and foreign nationals, without however, competing with private capital or private banks.

Until the advent of the Eisenhower Republican administraton of the bank operated as an independent agency of Government under the management of a board of directors and with representation on the National Advisory Council.

On April 30, 1953, President Eisenhower sent to the Congress Reorganization Plant No. 5. By that plan he destroyed the independence of the Export-Import Bank. He abolished its board of directors, placed it under the management of a single person and deprived the bank of its representation on the National Advisory Council and placed the control of the policy of the bank in the Treasury Department. The plan became effective 60 days later, to wit, May 31, 1953.

In one full swoop the President not only subordinated the bank to the Treasury Department, but at the same time, got rid of the bank managers appointed by prior administrations and supplanted them with his own appointees.

Less than 14 months later, the Congress goes through the pretense of again giving independence to the Export-Import Bank. This bill which we are now passing again creates a board of directors instead of a single director. Again it gives the bank representation on the National Advisory Council and of course, says again that it shall be an independent agency.

Of course, the President will appoint the new directors. The degree of independence these new directors will dare to show will best be judged by the fact that their terms of office "shall be at the pleasure of the President."

If there is any publicity attendant upon the enactment of this bill, it undoubtedly will stress that this is to be an independent agency. I doubt whether the American public will be so gullible as to believe in that kind of independence. Their independence will be marked by their subservience to the President and his Secretary of Treasury.

This bill is further evidence that this administration is the greatest expert in double talk yet produced on the American scene.

Southwest One of the Finest Local Airlines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAIR ENGLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 28, 1954

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, no local airline in the country has more grassroots appreciation and support than the Southwest Airways, which gives service through my district and in major parts of California. This splendid little airline has become an integral part of the communities in which it operates. The Chico Enterprise-Record in an editorial of July 24, 1954, reflects the attitude of the local people. We are grateful for the service that the Southwest Airways has given our communities and because of that service we believe that the operating certificate of the Southwest Airways should be made permanent. I include herewith a copy of the editorial which describes the pioneering of Southwest Airways in the field of local service and demonstrates the type of appreciation and support this airline has achieved in northern California:

ON BEHALF OF SOUTHWEST

Everybody knows the old saying that if you build a better mousetrap the world—with the exception of the mice—will beat a path to your door and deliver you success.

But the other side of the coin has never been as thoroughly publicized.

The other side of the coin is the hard fact that, after the world has recognized your better mousetrap, you have to beware lest some slicker slip up and abscond with the benefits of your work by duplicating your product or beating you out of it.

Current testimony to the existence of this "other side of the coin" is the case of Southwest Airways, the sterling "small airline" which furnishes Chico and 27 other medium sized coastal cities with excellent scheduled air service—passenger, freight, and mail.

People of the Chico area feel a particular kinship with Southwest Airways, because the Chico area is sort of a charter member on the airline's list of service points. We can remember back in the early years of the postwar period when Southwest launched its service.

Those early years were lean ones. Operating on even less than the proverbial shoestring, the airline by dint of little more than hard work and long hours worked at building its place in the sun.

Gradually the Southwest Airways acquired quite a reputation. Known as the "hurry-up airline" because of its tight schedule up and down the State, Southwest attracted national acclaim as the most efficient and satisfactory local airline carrier in the Nation. It built a safety record second to none.

Southwest plowed its revenue right back into the company. The hard work and long hours continued and the company grew and became important in the economies and lives of the cities it served.

The airline's relationship with Chico is typical of its entire operation. Southwest presently has six regularly scheduled flights north and south out of Chico daily, connecting the Chico area with the rest of the valley and linking the city's passenger, freight, and mail services with major continental and overseas lines.

During 1953, Southwest handled 4,128 passengers at its Chico stop. Chico airmail toted by Southwest amounted to 18,223 pounds and freight and express totals showed large gains.

As such Southwest Airways has achieved maturity.

And now comes the other side of the coin.

Under present law airlines such as Southwest are required to obtain renewal of their operating certificates every 3 years. Southwest is currently seeking its renewal. But two other airlines—Bonanza, of Reno, and big United Airlines—are attempting to acquire the right to the route built up by Southwest.

Now that the pioneering, the lean years, the hard work, and the long hours have borne fruit, the Johnnies-come-lately would like to ease Southwest out of the picture. Now that Southwest has become important to the cities on its route, the Johnnies-come-lately would like to take over for Southwest.

That's why Ted Meriam, mayor of Chico, is making a special trip to San Francisco next Tuesday. Knowing the feeling of Chicoans toward Southwest Airways, and knowing the value of Southwest and its superb service to the Chico area, Mayor Meriam is going to plead the case of Southwest's renewal effort before the United States Civil Aeronautics Board.

Meriam will be armed with a special brief of facts and figures in support of his arguments on behalf of Southwest. Prepared this week in a commendable cooperative effort by city and chamber of commerce officials, the fact brief will be offered to substantiate the mayor's argument that growing, alert, and businesslike Southwest Airways is important to the growing, alert, and businesslike Chico area.

All citizens of the Chico area can hope that Mayor Meriam—and officials of other cities on Southwest's route—will meet with success in their arguments and that the airline's certificate will be renewed.

If the renewal effort on behalf of Southwest Airways does prove successful, then Mayor Meriam and the chamber of commerce—and their counterparts throughout Southwest's service area—will jump right into another battle on the side of the airline.

This second battle will be a long-distance affair aimed at Washington, D. C., where Congress is currently considering legislation under which airlines such as Southwest could be granted permanent operating certificates.

Such legislation has already been granted unanimous approval of the House of Representatives. A similar bill in the Senate—S. 3759—is in committee. Its backers are currently urging California Senators KNOWLAND and KUCHEL and Vice President NIXON to schedule hearings as soon as possible in order to improve the chances of completing action on the matter during the present session of Congress.

Some of the major airlines are bucking the plan to grant permanent certificates to small airlines, of course. But we can hope that, in this matter, right—as personified by the arguments of Mayor Meriam—will prevail, instead of might, as personified by the big airlines.

Southwest Airways is entitled to the product of its pioneering. It has a right to the top side of the coin.

Congress Should Enact H. R. 7840, To Amend the Railroad Retirement Act by Enlarging the Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 26, 1954

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has approved H. R. 7840 which is designed to amend the Railroad Retirement Act so as to liberalize and enlarge the benefits. It is a worthwhile bill and financially sound. The proposed amendments are needed and should be adopted. The benefits provided by the amendments are briefly summarized as follows:

First. Benefits to widows, dependent widowers, and dependent parents at age 60 instead of age 65.

Second. Benefits to widowed mothers with physically or mentally disabled children over age 18.

Third. Full survivor benefits to widows, dependent widowers, and dependent parents who are also eligible for a railroad retirement annuity in their own right.

Fourth. Increasing the creditable compensation from the present maximum of $300 a month to a maximum of $350 a month in the calculation of a retirement or survivor annuity.

Fifth. Disregarding the compensation earned after age 65, if the crediting of such compensation would diminish the annuity.

Sixth. Changing the disability work clause to a maximum of $100 in earnings for any month without loss of the annuity for that month.

Seventh. Excluding the service of certain delegates to national or international conventions of railway labor organizations from coverage under this act.

Eighth. Elimination of the requirement in the present law that a child over age 16 and under 18 years must attend school regularly in order to be eligible for a survivor's annuity.

Ninth. Waiver of retirement benefits for certain individuals who are receiving non-service-connected veterans' pensions.

The principal amendment proposed to the Railroad Retirement Tax Act would increase the tax base from $300 to $350 a month, leaving the tax rate of 6¼ percent unchanged.

A similar increase in the tax base for employment covered under the Social Security Act was approved by the House on June 1, 1954, when it passed H. R. 9366. This bill provides, among other things, for the increase in the creditable and taxable wage base from $3,600 to $4,200 a year.

Almost two-thirds of the railroad employees now earn more than $300 a month, and they would pay the tax on their additional monthly compensation in excess of $300, but not in excess of $350. In return for this additional tax, these employees would get increased benefits resulting from the crediting of this additional compensation in the computation of their annuities. On the average, these employees would obtain benefit rights at the rate of $3 for each $1 in taxes they would pay. Furthermore, the liberalization of the survivor benefits provided for in the bill would apply across the board, and the families of all railroad workers would benefit, regardless of whether or not the employee was taxed at the rate of $300 a month or $350 a month.

It has been estimated by the Railroad Retirement Board that the increase in tax base from $300 to $350 a month would increase retirement-tax collections by $56 million a year, on a level cost basis. This amount is sufficient to pay for all the additional retirement and survivor benefits provided for by this bill.

The amendments proposed by the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act are shown on pages 6 to 8 of the committee's report on H. R. 7840. Briefly, the schedule of base year compensation is slightly altered, and the daily benefit rates for unemployment are increased by 50 cents a step, with a maximum daily rate of $8.50. Moreover, an eligible employee would be entitled to receive a daily benefit rate equal to half of his daily rate of compensation for the last employment in which he was engaged in the last calendar year. The total amount of benefits which may be paid to an employee separately for unemployment or sickness within a benefit year would not exceed his total compensation in the base year. The reported bill also would increase the maximum compensation subject to contribution from $300 to $350 a month.

The Numbers Game—Part 1

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 26, 1954

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, events move so rapidly these days that public matters which seemed to be of supreme importance a few months ago, when the present session of Congress began, have already been almost forgotten. For example, my fellow Members will recall the tremendous interest aroused, both in and out of the Congress, by certain statements made by President Eisenhower and other eminent Republicans concerning the removal from the Federal Government of a considerable number of employees under the President's new Federal employee security program.

Briefly, the series of statements began in October 1953 with the White House announcement that 1,456 employees had been forced off the Federal payroll since the institution in the preceding May of the new Federal employee security program provided in President Eisenhower's Executive Order No. 10450. Considerable speculation concerning this figure, 1,456, and sharp criticism of its use by administration spokesmen followed during the months of November and December. On January 7 the President announced in his state of the Union message that 2,200 persons had been separated under the program. Discussion and criticism were increased by this second figure and, as administration spokesmen continued to use it with the implication, if not the direct statement, that 2,200 Communists, spies, traitors, and espionage agents had been discovered, more and more "numbers" began to appear. These were usually based on statements made by representatives of the executive departments and agencies in their appearances at budget hearings before the subcommittees of the House Committee on Appropriations.

I shall not review today the heated discussion which began last December and died out slowly during the past few weeks, but you will remember the famous numbers game long after its confusing details have been forgotten. No one, to the best of my knowledge, found out the real facts either as to how many employees had been dismissed or as to the reasons for their dismissals, and I doubt that this information will ever be made available.

The President, his special counsel Bernard M. Shanley, Senator Joseph R. McCarthy, Gov. Thomas Dewey, Postmaster General Arthur Summerfield, Chairman Young, of the Civil Service Commission—to name a few top-ranking Republican leaders who made public statements on the subject—furnished plenty of information, to be sure, particularly in the course of the celebration of the birthday of their leader, Abraham Lincoln. We will not try to solve the mystery of the irrelevance of such information in that connection, striking though it was. But it was amazing to hear these administration leaders furnishing to the public such obviously contradictory and erroneous information on a subject of great importance.

The speakers not only were inconsistent with each other—they contradicted themselves. Sometimes a number like 1,456 or 2,200 represented the number of Communists in Government—sometimes it was subversives—sometimes loyalty or security or loyalty-security risks. Sometimes it included every one who resigned, retired, was dismissed for any cause, or—in one case, at least—died. Sometimes it included only employees who were dismissed under the provisions of Executive Order No. 10450 which established the program. And, finally, having produced a situation of almost indescribable confusion and distrust and having offered no reasonable final clarification, the administration permitted the whole matter to vanish from attention.

I cannot let this session close without making at least an effort to present a few little known facts which throw some light on the "numbers game." Needless to state, I am in no position to compute for you the final correct number to complete the series of authoritatively announced totals emanating from administration spokesmen. But I found out when the published hearings of the various subcommittees of the House Committee on Appropriations began to appear, a few weeks ago, that my colleagues on those subcommittees had been just as interested in trying to get the facts as I am, and that they had succeeded in drawing out—sometimes forcing out was required—some very interesting and important facts from the representatives of the executive departments and agencies, appearing in defense of their 1955 budgets. I would not say that this process was exactly comparable to the psychiatrist's delving into the subconscious mind of his patient, but it does appear that the intimacy of a hearing before a small subcommittee from whom a recommendation for next year's spending money will be forthcoming has a certain effectiveness in producing facts.

Since all Members of this House are just as busy as I am—and that is unfortunately far too busy to permit us to read the hundreds of printed pages of reports of hearings before our appropriations subcommittees—I have had all this information compiled for your use and mine, and I shall have it included in the Appendix for your consideration. In the case of 24 different executive departments and agencies, subcommittee consideration was given to the matter of dismissals under the President's employee security program, in hearings which started in December and ended in May. Secretaries of executive departments and heads of agencies, and their principal personnel and security officers explained in detail the actual operations of this program in their respective jurisdictions. A new set of statistics summarizing the results of the program cannot be compiled from the hearings because information was not furnished on a uniform basis. But many aspects of this situation are more important, in my estimation, than the actual numbers of employees affected by it.

A few of the most important questions which arise as one reads these hearings are the following:

First. How can an accurate report concerning the operations and results of the investigation of the loyalty and security of Federal employees be presented to the public without prejudicing the determination of their cases?

Second. Is it possible to agree upon a uniform terminology and to devise basic procedures for such investigations so that the program is carried out in the same way in all departments and agencies, and so that their reports will be comparable?

Third. To what extent have the current difficulties in reporting and evaluating the results of the loyalty-security programs been due to the fact that there is a minimum of central control? If more central control is needed should it be exercised by the Civil Service Commission, the National Security Council, some other existing agency, or a newly established special agency?

Fourth. How shall proper statistical account be taken of an employee charged with two or more loyalty-security of-

5

fenses? Of an employee under investigation in one agency who is transferred to another agency?

Fifth. What course should be taken in cases of employees charged as loyalty-security risks who resign or are dismissed—particularly in a reduction-in-force operation—before the conclusion of their cases?

Sixth. Are cases of violation of the security order which involve law-breaking being reported promptly to the Department of Justice and are they being handled promptly by the Department?

Seventh. What, if any, agency records of loyalty and security cases should be made available to the House Committee on Appropriations and other committees?

As you read these hearings I know that many more questions will be raised in your mind. I know, too, that whatever your earlier judgment may have been it will be modified as you consider what the responsible officers of these 24 executive departments and agencies had to say about their own experiences in the operation of the President's program during its first months of existence. I doubt very seriously that any one of you will be entirely satisfied with the situation which they present, and I assume that many Members on both sides of the aisle will agree in my judgment that our serious consideration should be given to this extremely important problem. It is too late in the present session to initiate action in this direction, but it ought to be taken up as soon as we return next year. This is not a partisan matter, and members of both parties will want to find proper answers to the questions raised by the "numbers game."

In the Appendix of the Record I shall introduce a series of excerpts of relevant material under the general title: "Information Concerning the Operation of the Federal Employees Security Program as Presented Before the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives in Hearings on the Fiscal 1955 Appropriations." I urge every Member to consider carefully these most significant statements.

The Numbers Game—Part 2

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 26, 1954

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following excerpts from hearings on the 1955 appropriation bills:

INFORMATION CONCERNING THE OPERATION OF THE FEDERAL EMPLOYEES SECURITY PROGRAM AS PRESENTED BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES IN HEARINGS ON THE FISCAL 1955 APPROPRIATIONS

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

(From hearings on December 7 and 9 and March 16, 1953)

Representative John J. Rooney, Democrat, New York: "With regard to this matter of 1,456 discharged security risks in Government, I think it might be interesting to know how many of the 1,456, which is a much talked about figure, apply to the Department of Justice."

Herbert Brownell, Jr., Attorney General: "We can get you that figure."

S. A. Andretta, Administrative Assistant Attorney General: "Yes; we can give you that; those who were removed under security regulations."

Mr. Rooney: "Can you give an approximation of the number at this time?"

William P. Rogers, Deputy Attorney General: "I would not want this in the record, but I think it would be, maybe, 10.

"(Note.—The Deparment determined later that the correct number is 8.)"

Mr. Rooney: "What is wrong with that being in the record?"

Mr. Rogers: "Because I am not sure of the number and want to be correct."

Mr. Rooney: "You can correct the figure, if it is not correct. Of that number in the entire Department of Justice, how many of those were Communists?"

Mr. Rogers: "I do not believe I can answer that."

Mr. Brownell: "I know one that was a former Communist. He came up to me for review and has since been separated from the Department."

Mr. Rooney: "The others, I presume, are in the category of homosexuals, alcoholics, and incompetents?"

Mr. Brownell: "There are eight different categories, I think, under the security order."

Department of Justice, Federal Bureau of Investigation, December 9, 1953:

J. Edgar Hoover, Director: "As regards the inquiries of the Civil Service Commission, you will recall that this committee in 1948 issued specific instructions that the Civil Service Commission advise us of action taken in all cases where criminal records of applicants or employees were located in our files. I want to report to the committee that through October 31 of this year [1953] following actions had been taken by the Civil Service Commission since the inception of the program approximately 10 years ago: 12,792 were dismissed; 7,586 were confronted and reprimanded; 4,545 were issued letters of warning; 22,464 names were flagged on the eligible list.

"This shows that the results of the searches which we made for them resulted in positive action being taken."

Mr. Hoover described the work of the Bureau under the Executive order of April 27, 1953. Their burden was "materially increased" because the new program required investigations of security and not only subversion. "I would like to cite the workload of the name checks that were received, showing the volume of the workload in 1953. We received requests for name checks on 398,640 persons; we made fingerprint searches on 423,646; we opened 4,407 field investigations and made preliminary inquiries in 3,381 cases. The volume will run approximately the same for the current fiscal year [1954]. For the next fiscal year there may be slight increases in 1 or 2 of the items. The increase in searches and reviews of additional references as required by the new order has increased that phase of our work about 69 percent."

Mr. Hoover explained the work of the Bureau under various legal and administrative provisions relating to the investigation of Federal employees.

In a "tabulation of specific increases in criminal and civil work, fiscal years 1953 versus 1952"—the item departmental applicants for 1952 was 14,905 and for 1953 it was 30,760—an increase of 106 percent.

Mr. Hoover described the indictment of Communist leaders, totaling 105, for the period from July 1948 to November 9, 1953. In reply to a question from Representative Rooney, Mr. Hoover presented a table indicating that 20 of the 105 had been indicted since February 1, 1953.

On March 16 the committee, in considering the third supplemental appropriation bill of 1954, engaged in the following discussion:

Mr. Rooney: "Mr. Chairman, it appears that the Eisenhower administration has no intention of giving up their numbers game. On Saturday evening last the Vice President of the United States made a speech in which he said that 422 Government employees' files showed subversive activities or associations.

"Now, the law of the land, as I understand it—this is permanent law, and repeated in every appropriation bill for a number of years—provides that 'any person who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence and accepts employment the salary or wages for which are paid from any appropriation or fund contained in this or any other act shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction, shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both.'

"This will be found in section 1209, Public Law 759, 81st Congress.

"I should like to ask the Department of Justice how many cases it has pending at the moment under this law which makes it a felony to belong to an organization which advocates the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence?

"I believe that it has been held that one who belongs to the Communist Party is a member of an organization which advocates the overthrow of the United States Government by force or violence.

"How many prosecutions have been instituted or are pending under this provision of law?"

Mr. Andretta: "I do not know, but I can get the information for you, Mr. Rooney."

Mr. Rooney: "This appropriation request for the security transfer would take away a substantial sum of money from the Immigration and Naturalization Service at a time when we have the deplorable condition along the Mexican border which was pictured to the committee by the Attorney General and the Assistant Attorney General, and I was wondering if the Attorney General is familiar with this provision of law, which is contained in Public Law 759 of the 81st Congress. If you have found 422 Communists in the Government, how many are being prosecuted under this law?"

Mr. Andretta: "I do not know the answer to that.

"(The following information was later furnished.)

"The records of the Department do not disclose that any indictments have been returned or prosecutions brought under the provisions of this statute."

Representative Frederic R. Coudert, Jr., Republican, New York: "Will the gentleman yield?"

Mr. Rooney: "I gladly yield to my friend from New York."

Mr. Coudert: "I would like to suggest to the witness, when he answers the gentleman's questions as to what prosecutions may be pending, that he indicate what prosecutions may have been instituted in any prior years, beginning in 1951."

Mr. Rooney: "A speech broadcast over the radio and television was widely publicized on Saturday evening in which the Vice President of the United States claimed that there were found 422 subversives or associates of subversives. I think that Attorney General Brownell should explain how many of those 422 are being prosecuted under the provisions of this Public Law 759 of the 81st Congress."

Mr. Coudert: "Will the gentleman further yield?"

Mr. Rooney: "Certainly."

Mr. Coudert: "I think the Attorney General might again explain how it was that during an earlier administration Dexter White and Hiss remained in Government

5

service without being prosecuted by any agency of the Government."

Mr. Rooney: "I thought that Alger Hiss was prosecuted by the Truman administration. If I recall directly, the 10 Communist leaders in New York and the Rosenbergs were investigated and prosecuted under the Truman administration. I could give the gentleman other cases. Aside from the Detroit cases started in the Truman administration, I do not know what this administration has done to prosecute people who are engaged, they say, in subversive activities. If there are any so engaged, I am sure the gentleman will agree with me that they should be prosecuted. Let's just don't talk about it for political purposes. Let's get them out of the Government, and prosecute them, if there are any."

Mr. Coudert: "I will agree with the gentleman's last observation, and I think if the members of the gentleman's party would follow that very wise counsel we would be much better off, but let me remind him again that the prosecution of Mr. Alger Hiss was the product of the investigation of the committee of the House of Representatives."

Mr. Rooney: "I am inclined to agree with the gentleman, but nevertheless he was prosecuted under the Truman administration, tried by a jury, and convicted, as were any number of others the gentleman might refer to.

"Now, Mr. Andretta, how much has been spent by the Department of Justice in investigating possible security risks in the Department?"

Mr. Andretta: "We spent no money outside the regular money for character investigations.

"As I pointed out earlier, the person who comes into the Department of Justice—we have always done that for many, many years, and the FBI has funds to make character investigations for all employees.

"So we have never received any additional funds to carry out this security program. These are the first funds now that are being made available, if they are made available, for that purpose."

Mr. Rooney: "I suppose the Department of Justice has sufficient personnel on hand to determine whether or not they had a security risk in the Department of Justice."

Mr. Coudert: "Would the gentleman from New York yield to me again?"

Mr. Rooney: "I always gladly yield to my friend from New York."

Mr. Coudert: "Before we complete the discussion of the subject of prosecution which my friend, Mr. Rooney, brought up a few moments ago, my attention has just been called by my good friend from Oregon, Mr. Coon, that Martin Dies declared on the floor of the House a few days ago that in 1941 he turned over a list of 1,124 known Communists, affiliates with Communist organizations, to the administration, including the names of Hiss and White.

"I ask the witness whether, when he provided the information, in answer to Mr. Rooney's question, that he will also include information as to which of those 1,124 were prosecuted by the early administration in any way, shape, or form.

"(Note.—The information requested will be supplied the committee.)"

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

(From hearings on December 8 and 10, 1953)

Representative Gordon Canfield, Republican, of New Jersey: "General [addressing Arthur E. Summerfield, Postmaster General], have you discharged any employees because they were considered bad security risks?"

Mr. Summerfield: "Yes, we have; 116 was the last figure I have had laid on my desk. And I might add there are many hundreds under investigation."

Mr. Canfield: "Does the record show that there were any firings in former years for this reason?"

Mr. Summerfield: "I have not checked that. I know that we inherited a tremendous number of possible security risks that were supposed to be in the process of investigation, in which they were so far behind that it was ridiculous, but they are in such numbers that it may be some time before the work is completed."

Mr. Canfield: "Have any of those been in the Washington office of the Post Office Department?"

Mr. Summerfield: "I think they were pretty general all over the country."

Mr. Canfield: "What I am geting at is, Have any of those been in the higher echelons of the Post Office Department?'"

Mr. Summerfield: "No. That is correct, is it not, Mr. Stephens [referring to David H. Stephens, chief post-office inspector]?"

Mr. Stephens: "That is correct."

"(Off-record discussion.)"

Mr. Canfield: "I can say for the record that this committee, General, compliments you on pursuing this situation. * * * Are there any questions by the members of the committee at this time?"

Representative J. Vaughan Gary, Democrat, of Virginia: "Not now, Mr. Chairman."

Two days later (December 10) Mr. Gary questioned Mr. Summerfield and Mr. Stephens, as follows:

Mr. Gary: "I believe you stated that you have dismissed something over a hundred cases on account of security risk."

Mr. Summerfield: "That is correct; 166." [Note.—On December 9 he gave the number as 116—is this a typographical error?]

Mr. Gary: "You also stated that when you came into the Department there were a large number of cases under investigation. Were those cases that arose under the loyalty program?"

Mr. Summerfield: "I do not know whether or not the 160 were; I have not identified them to that extent."

Mr. Gary: "Did the cases that you referred to as under investigation when you took over arise from the loyalty check on all Federal employees?"

Mr. Summerfield: "I believe so. I will ask Mr. Stephens to comment on that."

Mr. Stephens: "There were some, Congressman, which had been handled under the loyalty program, and there were some under the security program. It was a combination of both."

Mr. Gary: "The loyalty program was initiated by an Executive order of the President, in 1947, which required a name and fingerprint check of every Government employee. Now, did these pending cases arise under that program?"

Mr. Stephens: "Not all of them, but some were employees that had been processed under that order, and who were on the rolls. Some of them had even had hearings under the loyalty program; and there were also cases that required reevaluation under the new security program."

Mr. Gary: "Under the new security program. When was that adopted?"

Mr. Stephens: "It was adopted by the President's Executive Order 10450, April 27, of this year."

Mr. Gary: "The cases pending when you took over could not have arisen under the security program, as that program was not adopted until after you took over."

Mr. Stephens: "That is right, but under the new program there had been additional cases."

Mr. Gary: "I understand. Now, have all cases been pretty well cleared up, or how many have you under investigation?"

Mr. Stephens: "We have many cases to be reevaluated. We have received for handling a total of 23,548 cases. Of these, 1,295 originated or were in process under the old loyalty program. We have received 409 cases under the new security program, new cases, new evidence, and investigations currently in the making. We have had a national agency check on all new employees coming into the service, totaling more than 13,000, making a total in excess of 23,000. * * *"

Mr. Gary: "Were any of the dismissals that have been made among the higher officials of the Department?"

Mr. Stephens: "No, sir."

Mr. Gary: "As I understand, the cases that have not been disposed of are still under investigation, and it is your purpose to carry the investigation to its conclusion? * * *"

Mr. Summerfield: "That is correct."

Mr. Gary and Mr. Canfield discussed a statement made by Posmaster General Hannegan in the course of hearings on the 1948 appropriation bill (before the loyalty program was put into effect), and a statement made by Postmaster General Donaldson in the hearings on the 1949 bill. Both officers had described the situation in the Department as being very free of Communist activities during the period under consideration.

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK

(From hearings on January 8, 1954)

Representative Gordon Canfield, Republican, New Jersey: "General [addressing Maj. Gen. Glen E. Edgerton, Managing Director], have the security personnel investigations, started during the current fiscal year, been completed?"

General Edgerton: "I think they have all been completed. We have had 1 or 2 vacancies filled with new employees, and I think those investigations have all been completed."

Sidney Sherwood, Secretary: "They are all completed."

General Edgerton: "We did that as a packaged deal this year."

Mr. Canfield. "Have you ever had to discharge any employees under this program?"

General Edgerton: "We have not discharged any in my time."

Mr. Sherwood: "No, Mr. Chairman; we have not."

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

(From hearings on January 12, 1954)

Representative Sidney R. Yates, Democrat, of Illinois: "Has the Commission made any dismissals of its employees for security reasons?"

Rosel H. Hyde, Chairman: "Since I have been Chairman, I have had the duty in just one instance to suspend an employee pending an investigation as to whether or not he should be continued in employment. I am not aware of any request for a hearing and I have reason to believe that resulted in his suspension from the service. That is the only one."

Mr. Yates: "Was this because of a question of loyalty, or for some other reason than security reasons?"

Mr. Hyde: "It was loyalty."

[Omission.]

Mr. Yates: "Has the Commission had occasion to separate from its service any employees because of reasons other than loyalty but which would still fall within the security order?"

Mr. Hyde: "Not since I have been Chairman."

Mr. Yates: "How long have you been Chairman?"

Mr. Hyde: "Since April 18 of last year, 1953."

Mr. Yates: "Do you know of any the previous year?"

Mr. Hyde: "I do not."

COMMERCE DEPARTMENT

(From hearings on January 12 and 20, 1954)

Representative John J. Rooney, Democrat, New York: "I should like to inquire how many security risks have been discharged from the Department of Commerce?"

Sinclair Weeks, Secretary: "It is about 450, is it not?"

James C. Worthy, Assistant Secretary for Administration: "Mr. Secretary, I can answer that as I have the actual figures here, but I would like to go off the record."

Mr. Rooney: "I want it on the record. I want to know how many alleged security risks were discharged for subversive activities."

(Discussion preliminary to going off the record to permit Mr. Worthy to make a comment.)

Mr. Worthy: "Since the 20th of January we have separated from the Department a total of 132 people as security risks. This is security risks as defined by the new Executive order. They are not all subversives, in the literal sense of that word."

Mr. Rooney: "How many were subversives in the literal sense of the word?"

Mr. Worthy: "I do not have that figure."

Mr. Rooney: "Would you say it was 1, 2, or 3?"

Mr. Worthy: "I would not want to estimate that figure, sir."

Mr. Rooney: "More than three?"

Mr. Worthy: "Because under the new Executive order the only criterion is security. We have been operating on that basis."

Mr. Rooney: "A great number of these might have been homosexuals?"

Mr. Worthy: "Some of them were."

Mr. Rooney: "Drunkards? But how many of them were security risks in the literal sense of the word, engaged in subversive activities?"

Secretary Weeks: "Mr. Chairman and Mr. Rooney, I think under the rules of the game that a homosexual, or whatever he may be, is considered just as much a security risk as anybody else."

Mr. Rooney: "Of course he is, and that is why we gave the former Secretary of Commerce authority to fire them summarily."

"(Omission.)"

Mr. Worthy: "I do not have those figures."

Mr. Rooney: "Can you tell me how many of these were homosexuals?"

Mr. Worthy: "I can tell you that. Thirty-six."

Mr. Rooney: "How many were drunks?"

Mr. Worthy: "I do not have that further breakdown."

Representative Frederic R. Coudert, Jr., Republican of New York: "Off the record."

"(Discussion off the record.)"

(After discussion of other subjects, the committee returned to security risks.)

Mr. Rooney: "Mr. Worthy, when you mentioned the figure of 132, which you did a while ago, the subversives, homosexuals, drunkards, and incompetents, how many employees do you now have in the Department of Commerce?"

Mr. Worthy: "As of the 31st of October the permanent full-time employment was 31,519."

Mr. Rooney: "I take it that my request is still before you and that there shall be inserted in the record"——

Mr. Worthy: "Excuse me. I did not hear the question."

Mr. Rooney: "I take it my request for the figures to which I directed your attention is still before you and that they will be inserted in this record"?

Mr. Worthy; "That is correct."

Mr. Rooney: "How many are security risks in the literal sense and how many drunkards, and so forth."

Mr. Worthy: "We will supply that. I might say this 31,519 employment figure is permanent full-time paid employment."

Mr. Rooney: "Did any of the 132 come from the part-time workers?"

Mr. Worthy: "I would have to check that. I cannot answer that."

Mr. Rooney: "Will you so state when you furnish the information for the record?"

Mr. Worthy: Yes.

"(The information referred to follows:)

1. Cases involving morals charges	36
2. Cases involving alleged subversion or disloyalty	23
3. Cases involving charges other than morals and alleged subversion or disloyal charges	73
Total	[1] 132

[1] None of the foregoing involved part-time employees.

Mr. Rooney: "And how many part-time employees you have. Will you furnish that for the record?"

Mr. Worthy: "Yes.

"(The information referred to follows:)

"As of October 31, 1953, there were 5,368 part-time and intermittent employees."

(On January 20, 1954 the Committee again considered security risks.)

Mr. Rooney: "I have one matter and that concerns the Department as a whole and not merely the Office of International Trade. I inquired of the Secretary and/or you, Mr. Worthy, with regard to the number of actual security risks in the Department. I note in answer to my question there was furnished a bare statement that 36 were separated for morals reasons, 23 for alleged subversion or disloyalty, and 73 for other security reasons, which would include habitual drunkenness, loose talk, and so forth. Is that the only information you propose to give this committee on this subject?"

Mr. Worthy: "It is my understanding that was the information you requested."

Mr. Rooney: "There has been an impression given the public that 2,200 people have been separated from the Government because they were subversive. A great many people suspect that is a lot of hogwash. When you talk of security risks, you are not talking of subversives. Are these 36 cases homosexuals or do they include other cases involved with respect to morals?"

Mr. Worthy: "All homosexual cases, I believe."

Mr. Rooney: "How many are drunks? How many are loose talkers? There are eight categories in the Executive order, are there not?"

Mr. Worthy: "As I recall it; yes."

Mr. Rooney: "Then with regard to the alleged subversion or disloyalty, how many of those people resigned? How many did you fire?"

Mr. Worthy: "Let me examine the records, please."

Mr. Rooney: "What did they do? I don't want their names. What did they do? I think we are entitled to this information before we sit down and mark up an appropriation bill."

Mr. Worthy: "I will be very glad to go back and examine the records in more detail. I had understood that you wished a breakdown between the broad categories."

Mr. Rooney: "No."

Mr. Clevenger: "Who is the security officer in your Bureau?"

Mr. Worthy: "Col. Newman Smith."

Mr. Clevenger: "We had his predecessors down here on various cases."

Mr. Rooney: "The Secretary himself used to sit across the table and give us the details on this."

Mr. Worthy: "We would be very happy to give you whatever information you wish, Mr. Rooney. We want to be careful to give it in such a way that individual cases cannot be identified."

Mr. Clevenger: "We have never had that problem."

Mr. Rooney: "I am glad the Department is getting cleaned up. We used to find 55 and 75 homosexuals in a batch. Now you find 36 out of 30,000."

Mr. Worthy: "We will submit more detailed information on that."

Mr. Rooney: "How many more do you suspect there are, Mr. Worthy?"

Mr. Worthy: "That, Mr. Rooney, I would not even conjectures a guess on."

Mr. Clevenger: "Off the record."

"(Discussion off the record.)"

Mineral Leasing Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFTON (CLIFF) YOUNG

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 29, 1954

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, legislation has been enacted by the Congress which provides for the multiple mineral development of the public lands of the United States.

I wish to commend the mining, and the oil and gas industries, for their sincere efforts to rise above narrow self-interests in order to assist the Congress in arriving at legislation that will permit the maximum utilization of our mineral resources. In all these efforts to arrive at a fair answer to the problem and to protect the prospector and small-mine operator, I and other members of the House Interior Committee have had the cooperation and able assistance of the American Mining Congress, the Nevada Mining Association, and the Western Oil & Gas Association.

In view of the fact that S. 3344, as enacted, is a very complicated measure, and because I know that the miners and prospectors of Nevada and other Western States will wish to learn how they may be affected by the new law, I have prepared an explanation of it which should answer many questions raised by those concerned.

WHY WAS IT NECESSARY TO CHANGE EXISTING MINING AND LEASING LAWS?

The Mining Act of 1872 provided for the location of mining claims on public lands. It was contemplated under that act that the minerals of the country would be disposed of completely and exclusively under its provisions with the mineral claimant obtaining full title to his claim when a patent was granted. The first radical departure from that system came about through the passage of the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920 under which, save for valid claims then existing, oil, gas, coal, phosphate, sodium, or oil shale could be disposed of only under that legislation. The Mineral Leasing Act also resulted in a determination by the Secretary of the Interior that lands which were known to contain those minerals or which were under lease to develop such minerals were not subject to location under the mining laws of 1872.

The conflict between the Mining Act of 1872 and the Leasing Act of 1920 increased with the years. The basic principles of the mining law, with its exclusiveness and entirety of disposition and the granting of a full title, was inconsistent with the limited method of disposition under the leasing laws.

With the rise in exploration for uranium, stimulated by the Atomic Energy Commission, the conflict between the mining laws and the Mineral Leasing Act became more apparent. The principal area of domestic uranium-mining activity is at present in the Colorado plateau area, which is heavily covered by oil and gas filings. This situation has had the effect of excluding development for fissionable-source materials and other hard minerals. In this same area, where oil and gas filings have not been established, oil and gas prospectors hesitate to file and commence drilling because of the existence of mining claims which would impair their rights. This situation was temporarily met when the 83d Congress enacted Public Law 250, which validated a limited number of uranium-mining claims located on oil and gas lands from August 1, 1939, to December 31, 1952.

At the time that law was enacted Congress recognized the need for more permanent legislation which would provide for legal compatibility between the mining laws and the Mineral Leasing Act. This new law is the result.

This law also solves another problem. It provides that mining claims may be located for fissionable-source materials and for issuance of a full patent on such claims. This removes an uncertainty brought about by enactment of the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, which reserved fissionable-source materials to the United States, and by a ruling of the Department of the Interior in 1948, which held that mining claims could not be located based upon uranium.

WHAT DOES THE NEW LAW DO?

This act will open to location, under the mining laws, about 60 million acres now withdrawn under the Mineral Leasing Act. The first three sections of the act are designed to protect equities created as a result of Public Law 250, enacted last year.

Section 1 gives a preference to any mining claimant who attempted to validate his claim under Public Law 250. This section brings forward the cutoff date of Public Law 250 to February 10, 1954, in order to protect those who acted in good faith in prospecting between January 1, 1953, and the issuance of AEC Circular No. 7, February 10, 1954, which outlined procedures for uranium leases.

Section 2 sets up priorities to resolve conflicts between claimants who have located mining claims on the same tract of land, which at the time of location was withdrawn under the Mineral Leasing Act. Where conflicts develop, claims located during the period covered by Public Law 250 have preference to those located after the cutoff date. Also, preference is given to claims located before February 10, 1954.

Section 3 gives the owner of a lease or the holder of any pending uranium lease application, under AEC Circular No. 7, a preference right to locate a mining claim on the same lands, subject to a valid mining claim filed before February 10, 1954.

Sections 4 and 5 establish a basis for multiple use of the same lands under the mining laws and the Mineral Leasing Act. Mining claims can be located hereafter on lands leased under the Mineral Act, or known to be valuable for Leasing Act minerals. Also, any mining claims heretofore located which become valid because of this act, and all future mining claims, shall be subject to a reservation to the United States of all Leasing Act minerals. Any patent issued for any such claim shall contain such reservation only as to lands which at the time of issuance of such patent are known to be valuable for Leasing Act minerals, or are included in a permit or lease, or are covered by an application under the leasing laws.

Section 6 establishes the basic principles of operation which are to be followed under multiple use of the same lands. It establishes the general principle that each operation shall be conducted in a manner compatible with any other mineral use insofar as reasonably practicable. This is a reciprocal section, and calls upon the miner and the lessee to act in such a manner as not to unreasonably interfere with the operations of each other.

Section 7 provides an in rem procedure whereby those who claim rights in the Leasing Act minerals under an unpatented mining claim can be called upon to come forward and assert those rights. It is based upon the procedure which is followed in securing mineral patents and which is well known to mining people. It has been held that one who has an unpatented mining claim has certain possessory rights as may be found valid by the Secretary of the Interior. Under the procedure established by this section, a mining claimant is called upon to assert his rights to Leasing Act minerals or, upon failure to do so, his claim shall become subject to a reservation to the United States of Leasing Act minerals. This section provides procedure under which lessees may obtain determination of rights under unpatented mining claims affecting lands under which oil- and gas-lease rights are asserted. The purpose is to eliminate title uncertainties which follow from possible existence of unidentifiable mining locations and from uncertain status of inactive locations.

Section 8 authorizes the owner of an unpatented heretofore located mining claim to relinquish his rights as to Leasing Act minerals. Recordation of such a relinquishment in the county office of record makes such a mining claim thereafter subject to a reservation of the leasable minerals.

Section 9 restores lands within two helium reserves, which had been withdrawn from the public domain, to entry and location under the mining laws and to permit and lease under the leasing laws, upon determination by the Secretary of the Interior that such entry will not result in loss or waste of the helium-bearing gas. The Secretary may at any time require the entryman to conduct his operations so as to prevent such loss or waste. The helium reserves so affected are the Woodside and Harley Dome Fields, located in Emery and Grand Counties, Utah.

Section 10 amends the Atomic Energy Act to eliminate the reservation to the United States of fissionable source materials in the public lands of the United States and to confirm the validity of otherwise valid mining claims located on the basis of a discovery of fissionable source material alone. This section also reaffirms the Atomc Energy Commission's authority to purchase, take, requisition, condemn, or otherwise acquire supplies of source materials or other interest in real property containing deposits of source materials and to conduct prospecting and exploratory operations for such deposits in any real property believed by the Commission to have possibilities of containing source materials. The AEC is required to make just compensation for any property or interest in property so acquired.

Section 11 contains definitions of terms used in the act.

Sections 12 and 13 provide that if any provision of the act is found to be unconstitutional, invalid, or unenforceable, the other terms of the act will not be affected thereby; and limits the act in its application from affecting areas withdrawn from the public domain which are not specifically covered in the act.

HOW WILL THE NEW LAW AFFECT THE OWNER OF AN UNPATENTED MINING CLAIM HERETOFORE LOCATED?

Miners will be affected by the act in that all claims heretofore located will be subject to section 7 of the law in the event their mining claims are located on lands later subject to oil or gas leases or permits. In this event, mining claimants of lands located within an area in which the rights in oil, gas, or any Leasing Act minerals are asserted would be required to come forward and establish the validity of each mining claim if he desired to assert his possessory rights to Leasing Act minerals. The determination of the validity would be made by the Secretary of the Interior or his designated agent. Procedures by the Leasing Act operator and the mining claimant to be followed under section 7 of the act are as follows:

First. Any Leasing Act applicant may file in such office as the Secretary of the Interior may designate, a request for publication of notice of such application, provided that not less than 90 days prior to his request for publication there shall have been filed for record in the county office in which the lands covered are located, a notice of the filing of such application with a description of the lands covered by such application.

Second. The Leasing Act applicant must also certify that he has examined the lands involved, and has made reasonable effort to ascertain whether any person was in actual possession of, or engaged in, the working of such lands, and shall set forth the nature and results of such inquiry in said affidavit.

5

Third. Prior to publication, the Leasing Act applicant must examine all instruments of record in the public records of the county in which said lands are located and then set forth the name and address, if available, of any person disclosed to have an interest in said lands under any unpatented mining claim.

Fourth. Thereupon, the Secretary of the Interior, at the expense of the Leasing Act applicant, shall cause notice of such application to be published in a newspaper having general circulation in the county in which the lands involved are located—such notice shall describe the lands covered by such application and shall state that if any person asserting any right or interest in Leasing Act minerals as to such lands, by virtue of an interest in an unpatented mining claim, shall fail to so notify the Secretary of the Interior—see 5. below—within 150 days from the first date of publication of such notice, such failure shall be deemed to constitute a waiver by such mining claimant of any interest as to Leasing Act minerals and to constitute a consent that such mining claim and any patent issued, therefor, shall be subject to a reservation to the United States of all Leasing Act minerals.

Fifth. If any mining claimant desires to assert this possessory right to Leasing Act minerals, he must file a verified statement in the office where the Leasing Act applicant filed his request for notice of publication within 150 days, setting forth the following information concerning each unpatented mining claim: (a) Date of location; (b) the book and page of recordation of notice of certification of location; (c) the section or sections of the public lands survey which embrace such mining claim, or if any such claim is unsurveyed, the section or sections which would probably embrace such mining claim when the public land surveys are extended to such lands or a tie by courses and distances to an approved United States mineral monument; (d) whether he is a locator or purchaser under such locations; and (e) his name and address and the names and addresses, so far as known to him, of any other person or persons claiming any interest or interests under any such unpatented mining claim.

Sixth. When the claimant has filed such a verified statement, the Secretary of the Interior or his representative shall fix a time and place for a hearing to determine the validity and effectiveness of the mining claim. The hearing shall be held in the county where the lands in question are located, unless the mining claimant agrees otherwise.

Seventh. Any person claiming any right in Leasing Act minerals by virtue of any unpatented mining claim heretofore located and desiring to receive a copy of any notice of any application under the Leasing Act, which may seek lands embraced in such mining claims, may file for record in the office where the mining claim is located an acknowledged request for a copy of any such notice. Such a request shall give the name and address of the person requesting copies, as well as the following information: (a) Date of location; (b) the book and page of recordation of notice of certification and location; and (c) the section or sections of the public lands survey which embrace such mining claim, or if any such claim is unsurveyed, the section or sections which would probably embrace such mining claim when the public land surveys are extended to such lands or a tie by courses and distances to an approved United States mineral monument. No request for copies of notices shall affect the title to any mining claim nor be deemed to constitute constructive notice that the person requesting copy has or claims any right, title or interest in or under any mining claim referred to in the request.

Eighth. If any Leasing Act applicant fails within 15 days after publication to either personally deliver or mail by registered mail a copy of such notice of application to each person in possession or engaged in the working of the land, or to any person ascertained to have an interest in a mining claim in the search of the county records, or to any person requesting a copy of any such notice, the publication of such notice shall be deemed wholly ineffectual as to that person and the failure of that person to file a verified statement asserting an interest in Leasing Act minerals shall not affect any rights of that person.

Ninth. The owner or owners of any mining claim heretofore located may, at any time prior to issuance of patent, waive and relinquish any rights to Leasing Act minerals by recording such a waiver and relinquishment in the county office of record. No such waiver or relinquishment shall be deemed to constitute any concession as to the validity of any mining claim.

WHAT BENEFITS FOR MINERS ARE CONTAINED IN THIS LAW?

First. Will open to location under the mining laws about 60 million acres now withdrawn under the Mineral Leasing Act.

Second. Will validate all claims located since July 31, 1939 on Leasing Act lands and establish priorities in order to protect individual equities.

Third. Will validate claims heretofore and hereafter located on the basis of a discovery of fissionable source materials. The Atomic Energy Act had reserved to the United States all fissionable source materials in public lands, thus casting a shadow on the validity of all claims prevously located for fissionable source materials.

Fourth. Will provide that the owner of an unpatented mining claim may sell or assign his possessory rights to Leasing Act materials.

WHAT DISADVANTAGES TO MINERS ARE CONTAINED IN THIS LAW?

First. Will reserve to the United States title to Leasing Act minerals on all claims hereafter located, except that patents issued for such claims shall contain such a reservation only as to lands, which at the time of issuance of such patent, are known to be valuable for Leasing Act minerals, or are included in a permit or lease, or are covered by an application under the leasing laws.

Second. Will require the owner of an unpatented mining claim who may claim rights in the Leasing Act minerals to come forward and assert those rights. If the claim owner fails to assert these rights, such failure will subject the mining claim to a reservation to the United States of all Leasing Act minerals, but will not affect any other rights of the claim owner.

WHAT ACTION SHOULD BE TAKEN BY MINING CLAIMANTS WHO DESIRE TO RETAIN POSSESSORY RIGHTS TO LEASING ACT MINERALS?

First. Before any possessory rights to Leasing Act minerals can be asserted, the miner should assure himself that his claim is valid. There must have been timely compliance with the mining laws and there must have been a mineral discovery. Although performance of annual assessment work is not required to establish the validity of a mining claim, it would insure that the claim is not jumped by other parties.

Second. The miner should make certain that his claim or claims are properly posted. It is also advisable that he include his current mailing address in his posted notices.

Third. It is advisable that he add his current mailing address to his location notice on file with county recorder.

Fourth. It is advisable that he file an acknowledged request in the county office of record for a copy of any notice of any application under the Leasing Act.

Fifth. A mining claimant must come forward and assert an interest in Leasing Act minerals when notified of a Leasing Act application, either by personal service, registered mail or public advertising, if he desires to retain his possessory rights to Leasing Act minerals.

Elmira College, the Oldest College for Women in the United States, Celebrates Its First 100 Years of Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. STERLING COLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 29, 1954

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement concerning the centennial of Elmira College:

ELMIRA COLLEGE, THE OLDEST COLLEGE FOR WOMEN IN THE UNITED STATES, CELEBRATES ITS FIRST 100 YEARS OF SERVICE

Significant events are scheduled for the year 1954–5 at Elmira College, century-old college for women in Elmira, N. Y. On October 22–23, when Dr. J. Ralph Murray is inaugurated 10th president, educators will gather at the college to discuss the unique contribution of the small college to liberal arts education. In January 1955 Elmira will begin the year-long program of events celebrating its first 100 years of service. From January through June an event a month will mark the centenary, including forums, an art festival, exhibits, a ball, a candlelight religious service, and a community parade at the commencement season. A summary forum is scheduled for the fall of 1955.

5

Simultaneously the college will launch a development program and a campaign for $1 million for the construction of three new buildings and expansion of services.

Elmira College, founded in 1855, is the oldest existing college for women in the United States which, from its beginning, has offered degrees to women comparable to those granted by men's colleges.

Today, when over 700,000 American girls go to college every fall, as a matter of course, it is hard to realize that a scant 100 years ago the doors of American colleges and universities were closed to women. Coeducational Oberlin in Ohio had begun to admit women in 1837, but in the East women's education was confined to "female seminaries."

Discouragement had to be overcome by the liberal leaders who spent 4 years searching for funds to start Elmira College. Clergymen issued warnings that "the bloom would fade from the cheek, and vigor and fulness waste away from the frame" if the female intellect were developed. Even more ominous, women would be rendered unfit for their roles as sisters, wives, and mothers.

But in central New York State the pot that resulted in the enfranchisement of women had begun to boil. Elizabeth Cady Stanton and here friend, Lucretia Mott, had called a women's rights rally in Seneca Falls in 1848 at which it was resolved to demand the right to free education, equality with men in business and the professions, free speech and participation in public affairs. In 1849 Elizabeth Blackwell was graduated from Geneva Medical Center, the first woman to receive a medical doctor degree in America.

Women had become active in the abolitionist and temperance movements and were being employed in factories. Their demand for equal educational opportunities was inevitable.

The efforts that led to Elmira's founding began on April 11, 1851, when a group of liberal-minded men met in a church parlor in Albany and resolved it "expedient to make an effort to establish in this State" an institution for the higher education of women.

Out of this meeting and after many trials and errors, Elmira Female College was chartered by the regents of the University of the State of New York in 1855. Its establishment and location were largely due to the generosity and zeal of Simeon Benjamin, a wealthy and deeply religious citizen of Elmira.

In the three decades that followed there was an advance in the education of women such as the world had never seen. In this movement Elmira served both as a precedent and a model. In 1865 Vassar College came into being. In the planning of Vassar's curriculum and the assembling of its faculty, Elmira made substantial contribution both in counsel and in the person of its most distinguished teacher, Prof. Charles S. Farrar. Within the next 20 years other great colleges for women were established: Smith and Wellesley in 1875, Bryn Mawr in 1885, Barnard in 1889 as a coordinated institution of Columbia University, and Radcliffe in 1894 as an adjunct of Harvard.

When Elmira's first president, Dr. A. W. Cowles, was inaugurated, he said:

"Education is the right development and training of all the powers of the rational human being so as to form the best preparation for all that this life requires and all futurity may reveal."

Those trained powers have been demonstrated over the intervening decades by many of Elmira's 4,122 graduates who have achieved distinction as educators, physicians, research scientists, nutrition experts, social workers, writers, editors, and businesswomen. Throughout the world, from Beirut to Buenos Aires, Elmira graduates are to be found.

The alumnae now serving on the college's board of trustees include Mrs. Edward V. Donohue, first woman city assessor in Utica; Dr. Myrtle Picker, attending pediatrician at the New Rochelle Hospital, who in private life is Mrs. Lee Kolker and the mother of two children; Miss Katherine Thorn, director of the speech clinic at the University of Buffalo; Mrs. Pauline W. Rivers, director of the Club Service Bureau and the annual forum of the New York Herald Tribune; Miss Catherine Personius, head of Cornell University's food and nutrition department; Mrs. Sherman Voorhees, of Springfield, Mass., a former member of the Elmira College faculty, and Miss Virginia Brown, formerly on the staff of Editor and Publisher.

Noted women who attended Elmira College over the years have included Mary Lord Harrison, second wife of President Benjamin Harrison; the Honorable Alice Robertson, of Oklahoma, first woman to be elected to Congress under the 19th amendment, famed for her pioneer educational work with the Indians; Dr. Mary Blair Niles who established the first school for the blind in China; Lena Gilbert Ford Brown, author of the World War I song, Keep the Home Fires Burning; Mary Gray Peck, biographer of Carrie Chapman Catt; Mrs. Daniel Scott Lamont, whose husband was Secretary of War in President Cleveland's Cabinet and in whose Washington home the American Association of University Women first met; Frances Bainbridge Colby, mother of Bainbridge Colby, former Secretary of State; Kathleen Lewis, nutritionist who planned the rations for the Byrd Antarctic expedition and who went with the Johns Hopkins Hospital unit to the Fiji Islands; Pauline E. Holbert, expert in light and electron microscopy for the Celanese Corp.; Fay Mitchell Kanin, successful Broadway and radio dramatist, and many another.

A recent survey of Elmira alumnae showed that one-fourth are currently employed in the professions and 13 percent in business. Prior to their marriages, 65 percent had been employed in professional work and 33 percent in business. The prophets of gloom who threatened the breakdown of family life if women went to college have been proved ridiculous. According to the survey, 78 percent of the living alumnae are married and have produced an average of 2.1 children apiece.

The survey gave the alumnae a chance to report their civic and other voluntary or citizenship activities. The replies crowded the pages. Elmira graduates are leaders in their churches; in local, State, and national welfare programs, in their PTA's and youth projects, in foreign policy associations, and on their local school boards.

Elmira is proud of the fact that its honor graduates can wear the Phi Beta Kappa key. It is one of only three women's colleges in up-State New York which can make this claim.

Education at Elmira has always had as its core the liberal arts studies, based on the traditional disciplines of the humanities. In addition, for the last 50 years, the student at Elmira has also received training preparing her for a future career or profession. Teacher training, secretarial studies, and home management courses are given at the college and students are prepared for further specialization in medical technology, medicine, nursing, occupational or physical therapy, merchandising, personnel work, public service, social work, or journalism.

A college placement bureau helps students to find part-time and summer employment during their college years if they desire it, and permanent positions after they graduate.

The Community Education Division, offering late afternoon and evening classes to men and women of all ages, makes the college's resources available to the citizens of Elmira. Last year over 300 different persons enrolled in these college courses.

This spring the common council of the city of Elmira voted to close 2 city streets, covering a distance of 3 city blocks, so that the college might expand its campus and have a proper site on which to erect a separate chapel building.

This vote was one of the first steps in the development program by which Elmira College is preparing itself for its second century of service. Another step was the enlistment of top-flight leadership under the chairmanship of Charles W. Perry of Perry and Maxcy Insurance Co., president of the board of trustees of the college.

To an already strong board were added Perry W. Shoemaker, president of the Delaware, Lackawanna & Western Railroad; Harold W. McGraw, vice president of McGraw-Hill Publishing Co.; A. Marshall Lowman, president of the Elmira Floral Products Co., Mrs. Pauline W. Rivers of the New York Herald Tribune; Miss Virginia Brown of New York; Charles A. Winding, chairman of the board of the Marine Midland Trust Co. of Southern New York, and Franklin B. Pollock, chairman of the board of the Thatcher Glass Manufacturing Co.

Douglas G. Anderson, president of Hardinge Bros., Inc., is treasurer of the board of trustees. Mrs. Norman J. Learned is vice chairman of the development campaign.

Eugene Ritter, vice president of the Westinghouse Corp., heads the important community-faculty committee developing the community education program. The Honorable W. Sterling Cole, chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy in the 83d Congress, is a trustee of Elmira.

William C. Decker, president of the Corning Glass Works, will state the case for Elmira College to the foundations. Norman J. Learned, president of LeValley, McLeod, Inc., will solicit corporations, while George L. Hinman, attorney, will encourage bequests. Josef Stein, president of the Elmira Greeting Co., heads the important Advisory Council which for 10 years has raised funds to help the college balance its budget in a period of rising costs. Another publisher, Benjamin Fidelman, president of the Artistic Card Co., heads the recruitment committee. Present enrollment is 300 students; goal is a sustained maximum of 450, to be carefully selected for admission.

Because its history spans so many generations, the buildings on Elmira's 27-acre campus in the residential section of the city represent many architectural periods. Still dominating the campus is Cowles Hall, marvel of its day, the first structure in America to house a true college for women. Built around an octagonal core, it has wings extending north, east and west, which house the offices of administration, a dormitory unit, and the college dining commons.

The library is one of the finest examples of English collegiate gothic architecture in America. Eight other buildings, including 3 residence halls, a science building, 2 classroom and conference buildings, and residences for the president, dean, and faculty, represent a capital investment of $4 million.

After months of study on the part of a planning committee headed by Charles F. Kennedy, president of the Kennedy Valve Co., and by trustees, faculty, engineers, and architects, Elmira is ready to take a long step forward, pioneering in the 20th century as it did in the 19th. Trustees, alumnae, and friends of the college will be urged to implement a 3-point program of needs for (1) new buildings, (2) renovation and reequipment of the present facilities, and (3) sound financing of educational and developmental activities.

The three new buildings are to include:

Activities building, to include gymnasium, swimming pool, auditorium to seat 450, physical education offices and classrooms, alumnae offices, and a student social center. Estimated cost is $500,000.

Fine arts building, to provide studios and classrooms for the music, art, speech, and dramatics departments, including facilities for the teaching of radio and television programing, and the use of audiovisual techniques in the teaching of art. Estimated cost is $200,000.

Chapel, to meet the religious needs of an interdenominational student body. Estimated cost, $100,000.

For renovation and replacement of equipment a total of $75,000 is needed. The estimated need for operating funds is $125,000.

The alumnae are being organized for their part in the capital-gifts solicitation through regional and district chairmen. Miss Virginia Brown, of New York, and Mrs. Thomas J. Flynn, of Elmira, are cochairman of the national alumnae organization.

The special-gifts phase of the campaign is scheduled for the fall of 1954; general solicitation begins in January 1955.

A network of committees planning centennial events has Mrs. S. G. H. Turner, of Montour Falls, as honorary chairman, and Mrs. Richard S. Heller, of Elmira, and Mrs. Pauline W. Rivers, of New York, as cochairmen.

Sponsoring the observance of Elmira's centenary will be a centennial commission, composed of nationally known persons who will assist in special ways in its planning and execution.

The calendar of centennial events is as follows:

October 22–23, 1954: Inauguration of President Elect J. Ralph Murray, at Elmira College; forum on liberal arts education for women; meeting of the alumnae council.

January 1955: Initiation of the centennial celebration and capital gifts campaign with simultaneous meetings of Elmira alumnae clubs throughout the country.

February 19, 1955: centennial ball in the New York State Armory in Elmira.

March 1955: Forum at Elmira College on business and industry and higher education.

April 1955: Founders' day tea, April 13, Hotel Waldorf-Astoria, New York City; fine arts festival at Elmira College.

May 1, 1955: Candlelight religious service on south lawn of Elmira College.

June 3–6, 1955: Centennial commencement and homecoming week, college and community celebration. All classes to have reunions and parade of 100 floats to be staged by the city of Elmira.

Fall 1955: Forum on the second century program at Elmira College.

Tercentenary of Brooklyn Protestantism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 7, 1954

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, Protestantism in Brooklyn early this year celebrated its 300th anniversary. Included in the many festivities was a huge banquet at the Hotel St. George. The following article, which appeared in the January 23, 1954, edition of the Brooklyn Eagle, tells of the highlights of this gala affair:

ONE THOUSAND SIX HUNDRED HEAR PLEA FOR CHURCH VIGILANCE AT BANQUET CELEBRATING TERCENTENARY—RELIGIOUS RIGHTS COULD BE LOST, BISHOP DECLARES

As a reminder of "an early milestone in America's religious development, the tercentenary of Brooklyn Protestantism, in the words of President Eisenhower, also brings to mind "a principle basic to our Nation's liberty—the freedom of worship."

This freedom, which the President of the United States hailed as "our richest heritage" in his message of greeting to more than 1,600 persons who last night crowded into the Hotel St. George ballroom for the tercentenary banquet, Brooklyn Protestants today know "can't be taken for granted."

For, ringing in the ears of men and women, representative of more than 135 churches and organizations, who attended the banquet, was the solemn warning of Bishop William C. Martin, of Dallas, Tex., presiding bishop of the Methodist Church, and the president of the National Council of Churches of Christ in the United States of America, that it could happen here—that Americans, unless ever vigilant, could in a generation lose the right to religious freedom and worship.

A QUEEN'S MESSAGE

Representatives of the Goverments of the Netherlands and South Korea joined with our own to grace the occasion.

Queen Juliana, of the Netherlands, who in 1952 visited the Flatbush Dutch Reformed Church (1 of the 3 churches established in Breucklen in 1654), sent greetings through a personal representative, Dr. J. D. deBeus, Minister Plenipotentiary.

"Faith could span an immense ocean in the 17th century. May it now know how to span the enormous difficulties of our times," were the Queen's words, in part, as expressed in the message.

Representing South Korea was Col. Ben Limb, that country's representative at the United Nations.

Mayor Wagner, who lauded "the great understanding" that has existed between all faiths in Brooklyn, and declared the Protestant faith to be "one of our great faiths," hoped for a resurgence of religious faith and teaching in the city and the Nation. This resurgence, he said, could create better standards in business, among politicians tempted by sinister influences, and in the life of youth.

"You say it can't happen here. Who's going to take our liberties from us?" the bishop's challenge rang out.

He recalled the fate of peoples in totalitarian states who lost religious freedom under the dictator's heel, and declared, "If the churches are neglected, if the Bible is closed for one generation, anything can happen in America."

"Unless," Bishop Martin warned, "the church Christianize the city, the city will paganize the Nation."

The seriousness of the bshop's message, with its earnest plea for individual daily Christian stewardship coming at the close of one of the most impressive Protestant events in Brooklyn history, was in marked contrast to the rejoicing of the hour, the celebration of 300 years of Brooklyn Protestantism which began with the establishment here of three Dutch Reformed Churches in 1654. Bishop Martin was introduced by Bishop Frederick B. Newell, bishop of the New York area of the Methodist Church.

"Few things in America are 300 years old," observed Dr. Harry D. Gideonse, president of Brooklyn College and chairman of the tercentenary committee as toastmaster. He saw the great turnout, including many distinguished clerical and lay leaders, as indicative of vitality in the idea to which Brooklyn Protestants are rededicating themselves in the tercententary celebration.

STRESSES NEED FOR UNITY

"With our Nation worried, threatened, preparing to defend itself, if need be, against an enemy dedicated to destroying not only our material civilization but our religion and our way of life," Borough President Cashmore said it was important at every opportunity for officials and religious leaders to stand united. Clergy and laity, in community and nation, he said, would stand as one in their determination "to preserve this as a nation where people may continue to worship their God."

Charles P. Taft, brother of the late Senator Robert A. Taft and chairman of the American Friends of the World Council of Churches, was a speaker. Among other messages read were those from Governor Dewey and Ralph E. Samuel, chairman of the American Jewish Tercentenary.

Fred S. Polhemus, of Princeton, N. J., a direct descendant of the Reverend Johannes Theodorus Polhemus, pastor of the first Dutch churches here, and 3 of 36 Brooklyn Protestant church members over 90 years of age were present to receive special certificates of recognition. These were presented by the Reverend Dr. John Emerson Zeiter, pastor of Hanason Place Central Methodist Church and president of Brooklyn division of the Protestant Council.

The banquet also inaugurated the 1954 Protestant Council campaign in Brooklyn, during which, former Superme Court Justice John R. Bartels, campaign chairman, said approximately $76,000 will be sought in contributions. The occasion, he pointed out, also celebrated the 125th anniversary of the establishment in Brooklyn of the united Protestant effort to provide spiritual, social, and welfare services to the community and especially to members of the Protestant faith.

Present pastors of the three Dutch Reformed churches whose founding 300 years ago inaugurated Brooklyn Protestantism participated in the program. They were the Reverend Dr. Henry A. Vruwink of the Flatbush Church, who spoke on the topic, "The Dutch Began It," and the Reverend Stanley S. Slingerland of the Flatlands Church, and the Reverend Dr. Cornelius B. Muste of the Old First Church, who offered prayers.

Assemblyman Lewis W. Olliffe was chairman of the anniversary banquet committee.

Mr. Speaker, the following editorial which appeared in the Brooklyn Eagle of January 25, 1954, contains a message for all us regardless of our religious beliefs:

THE TERCENTENARY OF BROOKLYN PROTESTANTISM

The principal note struck at the huge banquet at the Hotel St. George to mark the tercentenary of Protestantism in Brooklyn was the vital part that religion plays not only in the life of the people but also in the life of a Nation. As President Eisenhower said in his special message, freedom of worship is "our richest heritage."

In slightly differing fashion this theme ran through the speeches with President Harry D. Gideonse, of Brooklyn College, the toastmaster, pointing out that the Protestants' insistence on the church being kept free of any government control was a great contribution to the maintenance of freedom of worship as we have known it throughout American history.

Three hundredth anniversaries are mighty rare in America, so Brooklyn may well take pride in the fact that three Dutch Reformed churches here—the Flatbush, Flatlands, and Old First—trace their history back to 1654 when there was only a handful of sturdy Dutch Colonists and a still smaller group of English, who settled in Gravesend under the leadership of Lady Deborah Moody, occupying the whole of what now constitutes the Borough of Brooklyn.

The tercentenary celebration will be climaxed by a historic pageant to be given at the Academy of Music on February 24 and 25.

Methodism came to Brooklyn before the Revolutionary War was over. The First Episcopal Church was established in 1784. In the next few decades other denominations followed and so numerous and strong were they that Brooklyn came to be known as the City of Churches.

Catholicism and Judaism flourished alongside of Protestantism then and throughout the years since. An outstanding evidence of this came just after World War I when a notable trio representing the three great faiths—Msgr. John L. Belford, of the Roman Catholic Church of the Nativity, Rabbi Alexander Lyons of the Eighth Avenue Temple and Dr. S. Parkes Cadman of Central Congregational Church—raised their voices in behalf of important moral, civic and cultural issues.

Another thrilling thought at the dinner was contained in a message from Queen Juliana of the Netherlands who was in the Flatbush Reformed Church when she visited here 2 years ago. Read by the Dutch Minister Plenipotentiary, Dr. J. G. de Beus, it stated: "Faith could span an immense ocean in the 17th century. May it now know how to span the enormous difficulties of our times."

Certainly there is no question in our mind that the evil forces that confront us today cannot be overcome without faith—in God, in ourselves and in the free, democratic way of life which every true American cherishes.

We congratulate the leaders of all the faiths who go to make up the Protestant movement in Brooklyn for the inspirational leadership they are furnishing their people by this emphasis on the historic past in its relationship to the challenging present.

Civil Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFTON (CLIFF) YOUNG

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 29, 1954

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, one of the most important problems facing our Nation today is that of civil defense. Unfortunately there can be noted a great deal of apathy with regard to the need for a sound civil-defense program and unbelief of the fact that it could happen here.

I am proud to have from my State a man who has long been cognizant of the weaknesses in our civil-defense program. He has worked diligently to improve our preparedness for a day which we hope will never come. I refer to Charles A. Hendel, assemblyman from Mineral County, Nev., whose keen interest and support have added so much to civil defense in my State. The following is an article which was prepared by Mr. Hendel and which I feel is well worth reading by all citizens:

Civil Defense

Civil defense. What is it? Is it something that is practical or is it just a lot of hooey and nonsense, and a lot of people "shootin' off hot air"? What do you, the reader of this item, think about it? And, what is more important, what are you doing about it? What is your opinion of the man down the street, or the fellow in Las Vegas, in Reno, or somewhere else whom most people seem to think is "just another one of those dippy guys" with a lot of yaketyyak about this and that that is going to happen to us unless we get a solid, united civilian force united and lined up for something "that just can't happen to us"; or are you by chance, one of those "dippy guys" yourself, and are just as disgusted and exasperated as are the rest of this minority group of earnest expounders of the law of survival, and who, in all of their waking hours are preaching the gospel of preparations for home-front defense and wholehearted cooperation with our civil-defense director, our Governor, Congress, and our President in the overall task of getting ready for this great last-ditch fight for survival with the hordes of infidels and destroyers who, now in Guatemala, are already at our doorstep, massing its force to strike at the opportune moment when their hydrogen and atomic bombs have done their dastardly "Pearl Harboring" and have softened us to the point where their murderous minions by the millions may be parachuted from the sky to finish up the job.

Japan didn't have the necessary ground force to complete the Pearl Harbor job, but Russia, the Chinese Reds, and her subjugated satellites do have a ground force, and from what we learned in Korea and in Indochina, we know that they will use them in their typical, most brutal, fanatical, and suicidal form.

All this stands in the record, it is proven in history, and history shows that what has once been done can, and often does, occur again. The human race in its beastliness ultimately runs true to form; yet, strangely, civil defense, with the handwriting glaring so plainly and threateningly from the wall, still has to be sold to an indifferent and indolent American public and most of its public officials.

Must we wait for this superduper Pearl Harbor before we awaken? Or has the light begun to dawn and will commonsense and our instinct for self-preservation and survival prevail?

How much longer do we dare sleep at the switch of indifference, or let the drugs of conceit and parasitic greed falsely lead us on down and to the brutal end of this which we well know is but a destructive, deceptive trail?

In this next war it will not only be our own precious sons and grandsons, daughters and granddaughters, whom we send overseas in ships and planes who will have to do the fighting. In this next war mom and pop, little junior, and baby sister will have their own front seats in the three-ring circus, and will all be nicely placed for the moment when the big top is set to collapse, catches fire, and burns them all to a crisp.

Of course, the bombs may begin to drop somewhere else first; maybe they will not hit Nevada at all. But California—you do the guessing. It is a 100-to-1 shot that the whole coastal region will come under attack and when those bombs do begin to drop there and the millions of routed and destitute Californians in exodus begin to come over the hill, then the struggle for survival will really get under way, for our meager stocks of fuel, food, and medicine will quickly disappear. When this happens don't begin to cry and holler for help, because there will likely be none to come, and don't say, "Why didn't somebody prepare for this; why didn't somebody do something to prevent this?" And don't point your fingers our way, because some of us have been trying to do something about this for years. My own 1951 and 1953 legislative record will show what I have been trying to do since 1944 and up until 1951 I couldn't get a half dozen sincere people interested in the deal, and I'm wondering how many of you are interested in it even today.

In civil defense as in national defense thre are no halfway effective measures. We are either for or against civil defense; middle roaders, in my book, are the same as those who are against it, regardless of who or where they are. This is their country as well as it is mine, and it is their job to protect it as well as it is mine, the civil defenders, and their neighbors and kinfolk under arms.

So think it over, you who have not yet enrolled for civil defense or have otherwise served your country. This is your land and the land of your children. Let your record of national and civil defense be such that your children and grandchildren may never be ashamed to tell what dad or granddad did or did not do for his country. This country is their heritage. Let us, by all means, include its freedom in that heritage and not a one-way ticket to the Russian uranium or salt mines, a bayonet trust or a gas chamber, as their victors may callously and beastly decree.

My country—your country.

Let's preserve its freedom for our kids.

Charles A. Hendel,
Mineral County Assemblyman.

Increase Borrowing Power of Commodity Credit Corporation

SPEECH

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 28, 1954

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 9756) to increase the borrowing power of Commodity Credit Corporation.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of the time to the gentleman from New York [Mr. Multer].

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, members of the Committee, including farmers, I think the House has fallen rather low when a Member comes before it and says you are trying to sell a program you have failed to explain or justify, and you have to accuse that colleague of being illiterate, instead of trying to explain.

Someone said there would be a revolt against this farm program unless you do the right thing, and the revolt will come, if it comes at all, because of the confusion and the lack of understanding that is attendant upon this program.

My distinguished friend from New York [Mr. Javits] says he is opposed to this bill, despite the fact that he voted for flexible price supports. This gentleman from New York now addressing you tells you I am opposed to this bill, despite the fact that I voted for rigid price supports.

Even though this bill does not involve the question of rigid or flexible price supports, I must say that there is something radically wrong with this entire program, either in the law or in the administration of the law.

With rigid price supports we now find that cotton goods sold you in the store are selling for less money despite the fact that they are made with cotton that comes from cotton supported by rigid supports. The milk we are buying in the store is selling for more money, despite the fact that it comes from the milk producer who is getting less for that milk which comes out of the milk produced under flexible price supports.

Maybe we city consumers are illiterate, but you better start doing some tall

5

explaining because we have votes, we have Representatives in this House and in the other body who vote, and I, for one, am not going to vote to expand this program.

I have always voted for the farm program, I have followed the farmers and their advice, but I am stopping today. I am going to vote against this bill because I say to you, as indicated earlier in the debate, this bill is born of political trickery and chicanery. I do not accuse any of the Members of this House of that political trickery or chicanery.

Although I have the highest respect for Secretary Benson, his honor and his integrity, I must point my finger at him. He is the man who has been picked by the Republican administration as the agricultural expert of this country. He was that during the campaign when he advised Candidate Eisenhower on the farm programs. He was named the official governmental expert on agricultural problems when he was named Secretary of Agriculture. He was studying the problem during the campaign, he has been studying it since, and he has told the Committees on Agriculture that he is studying the problem, he has told the Committees on Banking and Currency he is studying the problem and he still does not come up with a plan to do something about any of these problems.

This House only a short time ago authorized the cancellation of $741 million of losses sustained by CCC, wrote it off the books and canceled the indebtedness, restoring that much money or buying power or lending power to CCC.

Having urged that that be done, Secretary Benson came before the committees of the Congress and asked for another $1¾ billion to increase the borrowing power of this Corporation to $8½ billion. He did that on the basis of estimates, facts, and figures which he submitted to both Houses. He said the increase would carry him through this year and until the next Congress meets next year. Now, within 4 months he comes back and tells us he has made a mistake, that he needs another $1½ billion to carry him through until next January.

Mr. Chairman, there is something wrong with the planning and thinking of a Secretary of Agriculture who can make that kind of an error. The best he can do to support his argument for another billion and a half is to tell you that up to June 30 of this year he has used $6,400,000,000 of the $8½ billion authorized, having on hand another $2,100,000,000 at this time. Yet he says he needs another $1½ billion to support this program.

On his recommendation this House passed the agricultural bill and sent it to the other body. It contains a provision, which I am sure will prevail, permitting the Commodity Credit Corporation and the Secretary of Agriculture to set aside out of the $8½ billion as much as he chooses up to $2½ billion of the products he has stored away, and the Treasury Department is authorized to cancel that $2½ billion indebtedness. That way the $8½ billion will not be impaired one penny. So he will take the $2½ billion of surplus that is stored away—some of it rotting away—set it aside, cancel the indebtedness, and still have $8½ billion to use for this farm program.

I supported that provision in that bill—at least, I did not raise my voice against it. I thought maybe that was one way to accomplish the purpose that was sought to make the farmer prosperous, to keep him prosperous, and selfishly the city boy is saying to keep us prosperous, too, because his prosperity is my prosperity, and vice versa.

But when you have done that and you have given him the right to write off the books $2½ billion and to use that $2½ billion, and having given him $1¾ billion more only 4 months ago, how can you possibly justify coming here now and asking for another $1½ billion when he has on hand $2,100,000,000?

If you are going to destroy this program, Mr. Farmer and Mr. Farm Representative in this House, if you want to destroy this price-support program, this is the way to do it.

Let me recapitulate the figures for you. Four months ago you increased the authority of the Commodity Credit Corporation by $1¾ billion, making the total authorized lending and buying power of the Corporation $8½ billion. On June 30 the Congress, both Houses, approved the conference report on the Agricultural Trade Development Act of 1953 and authorized the President to use $741 million of agricultural surplus products now stored and owned by the Government. That same act calls for the cancellation of the notes issued by the CCC to the United States Treasury in the equivalent amount. That means that as those surplus products are given away the equivalent amount is made available to the CCC, so that the $8½ billion is thereby increased by another $741 million—that makes a total of $9.241 billion available to the CCC. This House passed and sent to the other body the Agricultural Act of 1954, in which you authorized the setting aside of $2½ billion of surplus products now owned and stored by your Government, taking it completely off the market and, at the same time, authorizing the cancellation of the indebtedness to the United States Treasury of the equivalent amount, thereby making available to the CCC another $2½ billion, or a total of $11.741 billion.

If you pass this bill now as you are bent on doing, you give them another billion and one-half dollars, or a total of $13.241 billion.

Now let's look at the other side of the ledger. What is the maximum amount that may be needed for this program? Under no prior administration did it ever run to $6 billion. Four months ago when the Secretary of Agriculture asked for another 1¾ billion he told us that the maximum outstanding liability of this Corporation was at that time $6.1 billion. When he came in and asked for the additional $1½ billion provided for by this bill the Secretary of Agriculture told us that the maximum liability of this Corporation as of June 30, 1954, was $6.4 billion. In other words, as of the time he was testifying in support of this bill he had an unused balance of $1.200 billion which has since been increased by the $741 million provided for in the Agricultural Trade Development Act of 1953, and which will be increased by another $2½ billion provided for in the Agricultural Act of 1954, making a total that he will have available of $5.141 billion, even without the billion and one-half you now seek to give him by this bill. He cannot possibly justify the need for a fund of $6.641 billion over and above the $6.4 billion that he now has outstanding.

This is without attempting to discount the moneys that will not be needed because of the tremendous losses of corn and wheat and other crops because of the extensive drought that various areas of the country have suffered in the last few months.

Some members have indicated some doubt as to whether or not it is not essential to give them this additional authority in order to implement the flexible price support program as written into the Agricultural Act of 1954 by this House. Permit me to direct your attention to the fact that the Under Secretary of Agriculture has testified before our committee that his estimate which he uses to support the need for this additional money called for by this bill is not based upon a flexible price support program but it is based upon a rigid price-support program. He says that he needs this money in order to carry on his rigid price support program. He concedes that he doesn't need this additional money for a flexible price support program which he urges will necessarily call for less money than the rigid price support program.

I suspect that the request for this authority is part of the pressure that the Secretary of Agriculture and the administration seeks to exert upon the Congress in an unfair effort to force the Congress to adopt their views as to a flexible price support program.

Incidentally, I trust no one will try to say that this money is necessary because of any maladministration by any previous Secretary of Agriculture or because of any action of any prior Democratic administration. The testimony before our committee is that the program is being operated exactly the same now as it was during prior administrations, the method of estimating is the same, the method of computing what is coming in and going out is the same, the method of making loans is the same, and the use of banking facilities is the same. The only change has been in personnel.

One other facet of this problem requires some attention. The testimony before our committee shows that the Treasury Department has advised the Secretary of Agriculture that in using $6.4 billion of the authorized $8½ billion the Government will come within a half billion dollars of the debt limit. For the CCC to use another billion and one-half dollars will necessarily exceed the debt limit by a billion dollars. That is without considering any part of the cancellations heretofore referred to. If any part of that $3.241 billion worth of cancellations is used then you get that much closer to exceeding the debt limit by this much more depending upon the amount used.

I have heretofore pointed out to this House the improper bookkeeping methods used by the CCC as a result of which a false picture of its operations are shown to the American people and as a result of which its actual losses are covered up or concealed. I will spend no time on that subject today.

The distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] has already fully and fairly developed the picture showing the improper and unlawful financing operations indulged in by the CCC under the direction of the Secretary of Agriculture and with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury. I will spend no further time on that phase of the subject except to advise the Committee of the Whole that when we get back into the House I will offer a motion to recommit this bill with instructions to include a provision in this bill which will prohibit such practices. Whether the motion prevails or is defeated I will continue to urge the defeat of this bill.

I repeat that the best way for the farm representatives in this Congress to destroy the price-support program and with it to destroy the farmer is to enact this kind of legislation.

The Kind of Health Insurance America Needs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 28, 1954

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, next to war, illness is the greatest destroyer of human and economic resources. Sickness puts more Americans in hock every year than the 1929 Wall Street crash. And, ironically, more Americans are better insured against death than against the ravages of poor health and its two evil companions—accumulating medical bills and payless paydays.

Here are some shocking statistics:

America's sick bill is a staggering $9.4 billion a year. This is the private expenditure for medical care. It does not include more than $2 billion in tax money paid out annually for treatment of illnesses in local, State and Federal institutions such as clinics, State mental hospitals and veterans hospitals.

How much of this does health insurance pay? Only $1.6 billion—a mere 17 percent of the total. The rest comes out of the individuals' pockets, often to an extent that hurts and sometimes bankrupts. Fifty million American families spent 4 percent of their income on medical care; 29 million spend under 5 percent; 17 million spend 5 to 20 percent. Then comes the category of those who pay and pay until they go broke. They are the 4 million families who have to spend from 20 percent to more than 100 percent of their income paying sick bills.

Illness puts 8 million families in debt every year for a total of $1.1 billion. According to the Securities and Exchange Commission, three of the larger small loan companies last year made a total of 445,000 loans for payment of medical bills.

More grim statistics:

Do you know that it costs $4,380 a year in hospitalization for a chronic heart patient? That it cost $10,000 a year to keep a polio patient in an iron lung? To treat a child 1 month at a cerebral palsy center offering all the necessary medical, psychological, and social services comes to $750.

These figures tell the story of a great American tragedy. It is a heartbreaking story that has been unfolding for many months before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the United States House of Representatives, of which I have the honor to be chairman and which has been studying the problem with a determination to find a happy ending.

If arithmetic confuses you, let me tell you two stories—two real life stories of the tragic consequences of disastrous illness. The first was told to our committee by Mrs. Oveta Culp Hobby, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. Hers is the story of a struggling young couple whose fifth child, a girl, was born defective. The parents spared nothing in pursuing the forlorn hope that the child might some day be normal. The best medical care that money could buy was all in vain. The baby lived only a year, most of it in a hospital. Now the father, a reporter making $100 a week, is paying off what to him and most families is a heavy debt—more than $1,200—and the other four children must do without much that they need so that their father can pay for the baby who died.

The second is the story of a man I know—a man whose wife was stricken with cancer, the second greatest killer of all.

The patient was in one hospital for months. The treatment, exclusive of doctors' fees, cost $5,000. After a brief interval at home, the patient was taken to the hospital for another long stay. Same treatment. Same cost. Then she was removed to another hospital where death mercifully ended her agony about a year later.

The expenses for a total of 18 months of hospital treatment—still not including the doctor fees—amounted to about $20,000. There was hospitalization insurance. But it did not begin to meet the cost. Benefits were paid only for a time anyway, and then ceased. The woman's husband went through his hard-earned life's savings long before she died. This catastrophic illness wiped him out financially. I know. The man was my brother.

That personal tragedy, which occured some years ago, was not in vain. More than ever it impressed upon me the urgent need for bringing to American families adequate protection against the harsh financial burden imposed by a long and costly illness. It is a recognition of this need that prompted my committee to initiate a study of this whole subject to find out what can and must be done to help solve the problem of financing medical care. This problem does not beset those at the opposite extremes of the economic spectrum. Society has made provision for hospitalization and medical care required by the very poor—the indigent. And the very rich are quite able to underwrite their own medical expenses. It is the great middle class that is caught in the middle.

The ancient Chinese had their own peculiar approach to the problem of medical economics. They paid the doctor for keeping them well; the doctor paid when the patient got sick or died. Not such an archaic theory. It is, in fact, the idea behind modern prepayment health insurance—you pay the insurance when you are well and the insurance pays you when you are sick. But does it pay enough? Does it cover enough people? If not, what can be done about it?

Voluntary health insurance has made great strides in the 20 years since it became part of the American way of life. Under the triple stimulus of greater insurance consciousness, more and more labor union collective bargaining agreements with group insurance provisions for workers, and extension of employee coverage to dependents, the number of persons with some form of health insurance protection has jumped from 8 million to 92 million.

The most widely purchased type of insurance is for hospitalization. It is estimated that nearly all of the 92 million who have some form of health insurance protection have hospitalization, which helps defray costs of a hospital room for a specified period, certain drugs when they are administered in the hospital, use of the operating room and the like. Growing in popularity is surgical insurance, which helps meet the costs of operations. Some 73 million of the total with health insurance protection have surgical insurance, compared to 3 million in 1939. Comparative newcomers to the health insurance scene are medical expense insurance which doesn't require a patient to be hospitalized in order to receive certain benefits such as for physician's fees, X-rays, and catastrophic illness insurance, for major illnesses of long duration and great expense.

Benefits have expanded with the years. So have hospital costs. For example, the first commercial hospital insurance policies 20 years ago provided $3 a day toward the hospital room and board bill, up to $15 for operating room, laboratory, and anesthetics charges. Now they pay up to $15 and $16 a day, and instead of only $15 for operating room and laboratory services, they pay for nearly all necessary hospital services and supplies. The early model policies put a 21-day limit on the period of hospital confinement for which payment would be made and a person had to be confined for 24 hours before he could become eligible for payment. Today, the limit has been increased to 31 and 70 days, with some as much as 120 days, and there is no minimum confinement period. Dependents of employees were not included at first, as they are now.

Premium rates have necessarily increased.

Conspicuous in the march of progress have been prepayment groups such as Blue Cross, the Kaiser health plan, and HIP—Hospital Insurance Plan—which provide services differentiated from cash benefits such as are made under commercial policies. Illustrating this type is the Kaiser plan, a creation of Henry J. Kaiser, the builder of ships and automobiles and dams. Motivated by personal tragedy—the death of his mother for lack of medical care when he was 16 and the blight of multiple sclerosis which fell upon his son Henry, Jr., now 36—devised an innovation in health-care protection. He built up a system of nonprofit medical centers and created a plan supplying comprehensive, low-cost, prepaid medical, surgical, and hospital care to 416,000 persons on the west coast.

The basic Kaiser plan provides for the subscriber himself, 111 days of hospital care annually for each illness or recurrence. This includes board, room nursing, operations, specialist's consultations, and other hospital treatment, plus all drugs and medicines while hospitalized during the 111-days-a-year limit. Subscribers' dependents receive the same benefits except that free hospital care and treatment are limited to 60 days a year for each illness. Half the private rates are charged for the next 51 days. Basic monthly membership fees are $4.30 for a subscriber; $7.60 for a subscriber and 1 family dependent, and $9.50 for a subscriber and 2 or more family dependents. No benefits are provided for mental illnesses, congenital conditions and those present at the time of joining the plan, tuberculosis and epidemic or disaster illnesses and injuries.

The Kaiser Foundation has 14 hospitals manned by general practitioners and specialists who are united in participating doctors' groups. These doctors are paid by the Kaiser health plan. Subscribers are urged, but not required, to select a doctor from the group as their personal physician.

These illustrate the strides and efforts being made toward the goal of bringing proper medical care to the people at a price within their means.

But for all the progress that has been made, the blunt and tragic fact is that there still are 63 million Americans with no health insurance protection of any kind whatever. Even more bluntly, 12 to 15 milllion of them cannot afford health insurance even at the lowest premium prices reputable companies can offer. Another 10 million or more cannot, because of geographical or occupational circumstances, avail themselves of group health insurance protection. They are the farm workers, the self-employed such as maids, and persons working for small firms which do not employ enough workers to qualify for group health insurance coverage.

Then, there is that vast group of unfortunates in the no man's land of health insurance; those who cannot beg or buy health insurance even if they were to offer a king's ransom, yet those who most need protection against the cost of medical care—the aged and the chronically ill.

An unfortunate fact we must face is this: those who need health insurance protection most are least likely to have it. A recent Government study showed, for example, that the lower the family income the fewer the number of families participating in voluntary hospitalization insurance programs. Thus, 3 out of 4 families with an income of $5,000 or more a year are protected, but only 1 of every 4 families with incomes below $2,000 a year have hospitalization insurance. The insurance companies are not to be blamed for this condition.

One of the cruel ironies of medical progress is that it is multiplying the problems of health care and costs. It is all to the good that in the past half century the average life expectancy has increased from 47 to 68 years. Miracle drugs and new techniques have created a new race of older people—more people who are ineligible for health insurance.

Penicillin may save Uncle Bill from going to an early grave with pneumonia. He will live to a ripe old age. At 65, he will be retired—or maybe fired—from his job because of age. Will Uncle Bill enjoy his retirement? Probably not. More likely he will be tormented by the fear of getting sick or becoming a senile invalid. And there will be the terror of this thought: "If I have a long and costly illness, how can I pay for it?" For, you see, when Uncle Bill is old and needs insurance protection more than ever before he will not have it. He will not have it because he was dropped automatically from the factory or office group health insurance plan when he became 65. Or even before that if he lost his job.

Uncle Bill will have to use up the little nest egg he had put aside for the enjoyment of his life in retirement. Maybe he will have to sell or mortgage the little bungalow he had hoped to leave to his children. If, for one reason or another, he has not saved anything, then he must face up to the greatest dread of old age—becoming a burden on others. He will have to depend on the relatives or—worse still from the standpoint of pride—charity.

Again, modern medicine may save a patient from dying of polio and keep him alive for years in an iron lung—at a cost of $10,000 a year. If the patient's family is fortunate, it had polio insurance which paid perhaps as much as $5,000. And maybe it had hospitalization insurance which, at the very best, provided benefits covering 180 days of hospital treatment.

But even if the family had hospitalization, surgical and medical insurance, it collected only part of the initial expenses, let alone the long-haul costs.

Insurance against so-called catastrophic illness—a serious long-term sickness or major injury—is the most recent and perhaps the most important development in group insurance coverage so far. Even so, the maximum coverage is $10,000. And only about 1 million persons are covered by major sickness insurance, most of them under a group plan, because the cost of an individual policy of this kind is prohibitive for most people.

Testimony before our committee shows that major sickness insurance was pioneered 5 years ago among a group of General Electric employees. The GE plan embodies the so-called deductible and coinsurance features, neither of which is commonly found in basic coverage such as hospitalization, surgical, or ordinary medical insurance. The deductible feature involves the same principle as automobile collision insurance—the patient pays the small claims or, in the case of a major illness or injury, the first $200 or $300 of the bill. The coinsurance feature provides that the patient must pay a certain percentage of what remains to be paid after the basic insurance pays its share and the patient puts up the amount required under the "deductible" provision.

There are gimmicks in such plans, as there are in even the most advanced health insurance plans. For one thing, you cannot buy major medical expense insurance unless you also have basic health insurance such as hospitalization and surgical protection. Like most basic policies, an employee's dependent parents are not covered. And you cannot buy it if you are 65.

Gimmicks of this kind are known in the trade as exclusions. Many reputable insurance firms have such exclusions in their policies, to protect themselves against abuses and unnecessary risks. These reputable insurance companies are trying their best to provide the kind of health insurance America needs. But they cannot write policies that would destroy them.

Unfortunately, there also are a great many outfits peddling the kind of health insurance that America does not need, and should not buy. They are the ones who advertise that their policies provide a get-rich-while-sick bonanza—"just a case of sniffles will get you $50 in benefits." But the small print in their policies takes away just about everything promised in the big print.

How can you tell whether your policy is a good one? Examine it carefully. Does it carry a clause providing benefits for "bodily injury sustained through accidental means"? If so, watch out. "Accidental means" means that if you fell from a ladder while cleaning leaves out of your house gutters and broke your neck, the company could claim that the means of injury was not accidental—that you deliberately climbed the ladder. Therefore you cannot collect. Better that the clause read that benefits will be paid for "accidental bodily injuries." Legally, that means exactly what you think: If you hurt yourself accidentally while doing something you intended to do—like climbing the ladder to clean out the gutters—then you are protected.

How does your policy define "total disability"? Does it say "inability to engage in any occupation or employment for remuneration, wage, or profit"? If so, the one word "any" can bring you lots of grief. That means if you cannot do your chosen job—let us say carpentering—as a result of a total disability, but can earn a few dollars doing something else—such as making hooked rugs—then you are not likely to collect insurance.

You are better off if the policy defines total disability as "inability of the insured to engage in his occupation."

Be on guard against policies which provide sickness benefits when confined within doors. This means that if you have had a serious operation that will require weeks of convalescence, you could lose your benefits if you spend any part of that convalescence sitting on your front porch, basking in the sun on the hospital grounds, or motoring through your favorite park. Make sure there is no house-confinement provision in your policy. That is important, for if your doctor advises you to go to the mountains during your convalescence, you are still covered for the period of your disability.

These are a few of the pitfalls that should be avoided.

Many unsuspecting persons discover when they get sick or hurt that their insurance benefits amount to much less than they expected. Indeed, some find that their policies are canceled suddenly. Upward of 90 percent of nongroup, individual health-insurance policies sold today can be canceled by the insuring company—sometimes at once; frequently when the insured's next premium payment is due. Such policies usually carry a clause saying: "This policy may be renewed with the consent of the company from term to term." The term could be a monthly one. In that case, a company could pay benefits for the last few days of one term and then cancel when the next premium came due.

On file with our committee are a number of letters giving firsthand accounts of such practices. One sadder but wiser Iowan told how he filed a claim with his insurance company after his doctor hospitalized him for diabetes. "I sure was surprised how fast they dropped me," he wrote. He enclosed a letter from his insurance company saying: "You will find stated on your policy in large type that it is renewable at the option of the company only. We reserve the right to refuse to accept a premium payment on any date that a premium is due."

America doesn't need the kind of insurance policy that is canceled just because the insured becomes ill and eligible to collect benefits. A company which plays that kind of sure-thing game violates the very spirit and purpose of insurance—to provide protection at the time of need, not to take it away.

Here are a few simple guides in buying health insurance, especially insurance purchased on an individual basis:

First. Choose a reliable company, one that is licensed in your own State. That way, you will be protected by your State insurance department.

Second. Avoid policies which give the company the privilege of canceling at any time. A noncancelable, guaranteed-renewable policy is the preferred type because it assures you benefits during long periods of illness or disability.

Third. Carefully read the exclusions and exceptions.

On the other side of the coin, I regret to report that evidence has been presented to our committee that some patients with health insurance are charged more than those without insurance. It is a fact that, in fixing fees, the medical profession takes into account the ability to pay. Some physicians, in calculating ability to pay, take into account the fact that a patient has health insurance. But generally speaking, health insurance actually tends to stabilize fees.

We know, too, that there are abuses by persons covered by health insurance. Some are guilty of taking unneeded hospital "rest cures" they otherwise would never even contemplate if they had to foot the bill themselves. This type of abuse not only leads to higher insurance premiums, but contributes to hospital overcrowding which often deprives sick people of desperately needed hospital care.

As part of our study of what must be done to bring our people proper medical care at a price they can afford, our committee made an on-the-spot investigation of foreign health plans. We toured England, Australia, New Zealand, and other countries that have national socialized-medicine programs. We found that their programs could be successful only through full cooperation of physicians, and we were told that the wide area of opposition from the medical profession has largely disappeared. In England, for example, we obtained figures showing that more than 90 percent of the doctors are cooperating with the program. Medical opposition has disappeared because the rough edges are being smoothed out; agreements have been reached on the fees to be charged.

Let me emphasize that the purpose of our study abroad was to gain some knowledge of foreign medical programs—what mistakes they have made; how they have corrected them; what pitfalls we should avoid; what we can and should do to shape a sound, adequate, workable American health-insurance program. We definitely did not make the study with the thought of adapting to our free-enterprise system what would be acceptable under a socialistic form of government. I am opposed to socialized medicine; even compulsory health insurance such as was proposed by the Truman administration in the form of a payroll tax.

Health insurance, as I think I have made plain, has come a long way in 20 years. But much yet remains to be done to curb the losses which disease inflicts upon our national economy.

What must we do? What kind of health insurance does America need?

Private insurance companies could write the kind of health insurance that millions of families need in order to bear the burden of a major medical expense. But the premiums would have to be so high that most of these same families could not afford to pay them. So there is a great gap—on the one hand, millions of families in need of broader and deeper coverage; on the other, insurance companies that cannot give them the coverage at premiums they can pay.

So what is the answer?

My view is that the national health is partly the responsibility of the Federal Government. Firmly rejecting the concept of socialized medicine, I believe the Federal Government can step in and help within the framework of private enterprise. I believe the Federal Government must step in for two reasons—to give us the kind of health insurance millions need but cannot now get; and to help provide the medical facilities that are needed to assure that no one wants for medical care.

How can the Federal Government help? How can we provide the kind of health insurance America needs? Here is how:

First. Federal aid to States so that States or nonprofit health groups can build chronic disease hospitals, clinics, nursing homes and rehabilitation centers. Such institutions would provide less expensive care and more benefits per dollar. We have statistical proof of this. We know that the cost of taking care of a patient in a chronically ill hospital is only about $6.63 a day compared to $18.35 in a general hospital. One reason for this is that it is cheaper to build, equip and operate a hospital for the chronically ill; you do not have to have specialized technical facilities such as special diet kitchens, operating rooms, laboratories or oxygen equipment in every room.

Even greater savings would result from federally aided construction of clinics and nursing homes. For example, a clinic in a rural area would save a farmer the time and expense of traveling to a city hospital where he would have to spend a day and a night to get the same X-ray treatment he could get at the rural clinic in a couple of hours. Nursing homes—built with Federal aid and operated by local communities or nonprofit groups—would provide care at small cost for the aged and the chronically ill, the unfortunate group which now is ineligible to buy health insurance, but which needs protection most. Our committee has been told that care in such nursing homes might not run more than $2 or $3 a day.

Second. To encourage individuals to carry voluntary prepayment health insurance, every taxpayer should be allowed to deduct from his income-tax returns all health insurance premium payments up to $100 a year. This would be in addition to the present allowable deduction of all medical expenses over and above 5 percent of gross taxable income.

Third. Government insured mortgage loans should be made more readily available to voluntary prepayment health groups such as Blue Cross, HIP, and Kaiser to encourage and help them to build more hospitals, clinics, medical centers, research laboratories, and other medical facilities.

Fourth. Direct long-term Government loans at reasonable interest to voluntary prepayment, nonprofit health associations to help them meet all or part of the cost of equipping or building health service facilities.

Fifth. To start with, a $50 million Federal reinsurance fund to encourage private insurance companies and nonprofit health groups to provide broader insurance coverage for more people and especially to many of those who do not have it now—the self-employed, farm families, workers in small firms, the unemployed, and possibly the aged. Just as the Federal Government, through the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, insures individual bank deposits up to $10,000, the Government would offer reinsurance to private companies and nonprofit groups willing to try selling broader health insurance. Under this plan, Uncle Sam would share policy risks with the companies by underwriting part of the benefit payments, particularly for catastrophic illnesses. It would guarantee policyholders that the conditions set forth in their policies would be fulfilled; provide for extended coverage and benefits to meet the higher cost of medical and hospitalization not covered under many policies issued today, and maintain health insurance protection for the person who loses his job by providing for waiver of premium.

The reinsurance plan, in my opinion, is a vitally important approach to the problem of meeting major medical expenses. Because the Government would underwrite a share of the risk, a policy could, for example, pay up to $10,000 of medical expenses instead of $5,000. Reinsurance premiums and reinsurance benefits would be established by State law. Reinsurance benefits would be two-thirds of each claim in excess of $1,000 during any 12-month period. The plan would provide for 6 months of hospitalization during any year, a free choice of contracting hospital, subscription charge based on the income of the subscriber. The policy would pay 95 percent of the cost of medical services in the hospital and 75 percent of the cost of 12 doctor visits at home or at the doctor's office during any year, excluding the first visit. The Government would not underwrite any policy unless it is noncancelable. That way, we can discourage the sale of policies that can be taken away from persons when they need insurance protection most.

I have introduced legislation to do just these things.

There have been charges that some of my proposals amount to socialized medicine; that the reinsurance plan would be a form of Government invasion of the insurance business. To this I say, "nonsense." No insurance group would be forced to get Government reinsurance. The same cry went up against the idea of Federal insurance for bank deposits. The private banking business seems to have survived very nicely. The Federal Government helps farmers with farm price supports and soil conservation; it helps States build better roads with its Federal highway aid program; it helps you put a roof over your head through FHA-insured loans. That is not socialization. Neither is my proposed health program. Indeed, I believe that my reinsurance plan will stimulate competition among private companies and encourage them to provide ever better protection.

I am hopeful, too, that prepayment health groups will be able to open their membership rolls to farm families, the self-employed and workers in small firms. An entire rural county could come under the protection of group health insurance by making arrangements for some bank to be the collecting agency for the county group. Community groups and trade, bar and medical associations could perform a similar service for the self-employed.

In our efforts to bring America the kind of health protection its citizens need, let us concentrate on the common enemy—disease. Cooperation is necessary to fight this battle. We must mobilize our energies and our talents—in the research laboratories, hospitals and clinics; in the medical societies and the physicians' offices; on the farms and in the factories; in Washington and in the State legislatures.

Let us dedicate ourselves to the task of guarding our most precious resource—our national health. Let us wage all-out war against disease so that we can emancipate innocent little children from the cruel bondage of steel braces; conquer cancer, heart disease, multiple sclerosis, cerebral palsy and all of the other dreadful diseases.

And let us strive to provide proper health protection for every American. For, in a land so provident as ours, it is a reflection upon our national honor when any American wants for medical care or dies for lack of it.

Heroine of Dien Bien Phu

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANTONI N. SADLAK

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 28, 1954

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced House Joint Resolution 573 authorizing and requesting the President to proclaim Sunday, April 3, 1955, as a day of prayer for the "man and woman in white." This resolution has been referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. Speaker, the idea and suggestion of this tribute and observance came from one who recently had an extended stay in the hospital and realized, as she had not previously, the really great devotion of the nurses and doctors to their professions. That person is "Mom" Bazinet, as she is affectionately known for her outstanding welfare work in Hartford and her exceptional contribution in behalf of the young people of Hartford and vicinity.

It is coincidental, Mr. Speaker, that today we have in our midst a great heroine in white who has been called the French Angel. She personifies the sacrifice and determination to fulfill the oath to be of service to her fellowman that each nurse assumes. Of course, I refer to Mlle. Genevieve de Galard-Terraube, the heroine of Dien Bien Phu. And under leave to extend these remarks I also include a very fitting and informative editorial concerning her that appeared in the Hartford (Conn.) Courant, of July 26, which follows:

HEROINE OF DIEN BIEN PHU

The arrival of the heroine of Dien Bien Phu to the United States is a reminder that faith and honor are still virtues dear to the hearts of many in France, despite the inroads of communism. The inspiring character of Mlle. Genevieve de Galard-Terraube who refused to leave behind the wounded to gain her own safety is a symbol of all that is best in both the nursing profession and in France.

The ancient Catholic family of De Galard in France has a record of fealty and devotion to country. Their recorded history antedates the 10th century. An ancester of Mlle. de Galard rode at the side of Joan of Arc in 1429 when the girl saint lifted the seige of Orleans. Mlle. de Galard has written another page in that family history with a story of heroism not unlike that seen in the Maid of Orleans.

The first Sunday in April has been stipulated in this resolution as the day to honor the fine "man and woman in white" because April 5, 1827, was the birthday of Dr. Joseph Lister, founder of antiseptic surgery, and it would simultaneously acknowledge all the benefits derived from his great contribution to medicine.

I urge the adoption of this resolution paying tribute to our men and women in white at an early date.

DISTRIBUTION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

To the Vice President and each Senator 100 copies; to the Secretary and Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, each, 25 copies; to the Secretary, for official use, not to exceed 35 copies; to the Sergeant at Arms, for use on the floor of the Senate, not to exceed 50 copies; to each Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress, 68 copies; to the Clerk, Sergeant at Arms, and Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives, each, 25 copies; to the Clerk, for official use, not to exceed 50 copies; and to the Doorkeeper, for use on the floor of the House of Representatives, not to exceed 75 copies; to the Vice President and each Senator, Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress there shall also be furnished (and shall not be transferable), 3 copies of the daily RECORD, of which 1 shall be delivered at his residence, 1 at his office, and 1 at the Capitol.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized book dealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by book dealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

Addr
So
In

IN T

M
thir
rese
fina
lord
mee
follo
for
ness
Dep
serv
chap
of
Serv
T
adm
clos
pub
our
at t
Cla
of t
sent
dres
tere
incl
T
den
be
Pub

I
"an
tere
goo
vat
the
of
the

I
the
jec
pa
bee
the

the
th
m
an
su

ut
as
A
m
b

fe
h

Appendix

Address Delivered by Clarence A. Davis, Solicitor of the Department of the Interior

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER FERGUSON
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 2, 1954

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, the third conservation conference for representatives of business, industry, and finance was held at Hidden Valley, Gaylord, Mich., from May 20 to 22. This meeting was sponsored jointly by the following groups: General Committee for the Conservation Council of Business, Industry, and Finance; Michigan Department of Conservation; Soil Conservation Society of America, Michigan chapter; University of Michigan, School of Natural Resources and Extension Service.

The new program of the Eisenhower administration, which has brought about close cooperation between private and public interests in the development of our natural resources, was ably presented at the Friday afternoon session by Mr. Clarence A. Davis, Solicitor, Department of the Interior. I ask unanimous consent that his condensation of this address, entitled "Public and Private Interests in Resource Management," be included in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the condensation of the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PUBLIC AND PRIVATE INTERESTS IN RESOURCE MANAGEMENT

I am very grateful for the conjunctive "and" in the title "Public and Private Interests in Resource Management," for in a good many places it would be "Public or Private Interests in Resource Management," thereby highlighting one of the great issues of our time—namely, Government against the citizen.

It is most appropriae that someone from the Interior Department discuss this subject, for Interior is the primary resource department of the Government; in fact, it has been suggested that it should be renamed the "Department of Natural Resources."

* * * * *

It must be apparent that I cannot discuss the details of public management of all these things or even one of them. I, therefore, must confine myself to general philosophy and governmental policy as it relates to the subject.

These problems of the conservation and utilization of natural resources are as broad as America. They touch every phase of the American economy, finance and the Government itself. Life and civilization are bottomed upon land, water, and minerals.

The objectives that we seek by this conference and the numerous other conferences held annually throughout the United States are probably agreed to by all. They are the conservation of these basic resources, the wise use of them, that each succeeding generation may share in their benefits, that we shall not impoverish ourselves by their wasteful or destructive use, and that we shall not rob the future by improvident management of them.

But how? And by whom?

The history of resource development has been characterized by (1) a constantly expanding knowledge of the quantity, quality, uses and efficiencies of these resources; (2) by a constantly expanding public interest in the necessity of their intelligent management; and (3) by a constantly expanding governmental activity and control of them.

It is a field over which Government from time immemorial has undertaken to assert control.

* * * * *

The greatest problem is to draw a wise line between adequate control and protection of these resources on the one hand and their federalization, or socialization on the other, to achieve the objectives which all of us will concede are necessary, and at the same time avoid the collectivism which is ever impending. The path we take will determine America's future, both economically and governmentally.

Let us look for a moment at these basic resources.

First, land.

Let us remember that the control of land means the control of the income from land, the control of housing upon land, the nature of the crops which may be grown, the hours of labor which may be expended, and all of those other controls which an idealistic government might see fit to impose as a condition of land use by individuals.

This is not at all a political speech, but I might mention the tendencies of the Interior Department in the past to impose conditions upon the use of land and mineral resources, which were totally unrelated to the normal use of the land or minerals, but which fitted into the pattern of what someone believed was an economic or social objective to be desired. There is almost no limit to the terms and conditions which the owner, in this case the Government, may impose in his leases or his grants upon those who desire to use or occupy public lands. That is why the question of who controls the land is vital to freedom.

Take water. Upon water depends the entire future of large areas of the United States. This is not to mention the millions of irrigated acres, the crops which they produce, the people who live upon them and whose lifeblood, of course, is the impounded water which supplies their economy. But upon water depends public health, the problems of stream pollution, the problem of adequate domestic water supply.

The classic example which occurs to me at the moment is the case of *Arizona* v. *California* in the Supreme Court of the United States, in which Arizona is seeking certain interpretations of the Colorado River compact which, if sustained, would permit the development and the utilization for agricultural purposes of large areas of the central part of Arizona, but which, at the same time, might spell a serious curtailment of the water supply of Southern California, including the Los Angeles area. It is not inconceivable, since the supply is limited by the flow of the Colorado River, that one or the other of these great areas may ultimately suffer through the loss of the use of this basic resource. * * * It is certainly true that who controls the water supply controls the economic destiny of a region.

Take power. Power is, of course, the mainspring of industry, and in some areas of the United States the Government is the dominant factor in the supply of electric power. It is true in the Tennessee Valley, and it is true in the Columbia Basin. The attitude and the conduct of the governmental agencies with reference to the utilization and supply of this vital industrial resource controls the industrial destiny of the area.

For instance, at the present time, because the Government has dominated the erectric supply of the Pacific Northwest, we have, and I hope only temporarily, reached that acute stage where, in order to start a new industry or to very much expand an existing industry, the Government must be approached as to whether it can or will supply electric power. In my judgment this is a most unwholesome situation. Any region which becomes dependent for its supply of electric energy upon the whims of succeeding Congresses is in economic jeopardy.

Take minerals. A very substantial part of the minerals of the United States are located in and under public lands. Our policy of encouragement or discouragement of their development by individuals who are engaged in minerals activity means success or failure to great industries upon which may depend national security.

Summarizing, let me put it this way: Let me control the land, water and power, and I will control America.

That is neither a sage nor novel observation, because Karl Marx made it about a hundred years ago.

While sounding this note against the absolute control by Government and the inherent dangers of excessive governmental expansion, which is obviously socialization under the name of federalization, great tribute must be paid to the past and present contributions of Government to the development as well as the conservation of our natural resources. Also great tribute should be paid to the numerous voluntary societies and organizations dedicated to the conservation of natural resources of various kinds. They are enthusiastic and very vocal in demands for the protection of the particular resource to which they are dedicated. They exercise a very wholesome influence on both the Congress and the executive branch. Unfortunately, in their enthusiasm, they frequently are in direct conflict with other organizations equally dedicated to the preservation or development of an equally important resource.

One of the great problems of Interior is to reconcile and harmonize, if possible, in the overall national interest the conflicting viewpoints of these splendid organizations as to which resource is more important.

* * * * *

I have already mentioned that some areas of the United States are actually confronted in the foreseeable future with a shortage of the domestic water supply. In other large areas, as you know, through the Bureau of Reclamation we have constructed gigantic storage dams for irrigation, and, incidentally, the production of hydroelectric power. There is a real water problem in the United States, and the current administration has under consideration an attempt to formulate a sound and permanent national water policy. It involves such fundamentals as the adequacy of the domestic water supply, the problems arising from stream pollution, the problem of preference in the uses of water in the event of conflicts, the question of the role of the State and the Federal Government, whether Federal action should be direct or in the form of aid to States and local agencies, the problem of the conflicting authority between Federal agencies, that is, the Corps of Army Engineers, with their traditional construction of large flood-control dams; the Bureau of Reclamation, with its construction of large storage dams, and with each agency in the field of multipurpose dams and the consequent problems of cost allocations to various functions; the Department of Agriculture, with its prospective activity of upstream control, which I have outlined, and the obvious problem raised by the constant development of additional irrigable acreage in the face of existing agricultural surpluses.

In addition to these is the extremely interesting Federal program with reference to the conversion of saline water to domestic and industrial uses. This program now in effect for several years is operated by the Interior Department. * * * If that program could be brought to successful conclusion, it would work almost as great a revolution in the world as has atomic energy, for it would make available to millions of people living upon submarginal and desert lands all over the world the means of an adequate food supply with the resulting raised standards of living, education, and culture, which would accompany water on their land.

The problem of mineral resources is equally vital. Assistant Secretary Wormser has summarized it well when he said:

"I take the position that a strong, vigorous, and prosperous mining industry is needed by this country. This has always been the position taken by the Interior Department. I know of no better way to add strength to the Nation's economy than by extracting substances placed in the earth by nature and converting them into useful materials."

The Bureau of Mines and the Geological Survey have both made tremendous contributions toward the long-range development of our mineral resources. We are long past the day when the prospector and his burro represent any substantial contribution to the development of mineral resources. The Interior Department, through these bureaus, has made a great contribution to the development of the petroleum reserves of the West. Its petroleum and oil shale experiment station at Laramie, Wyo., is cooperating with the oil industry on production, research in the studies of petroleum chemistry and the behavior of petroleum underground. Its field offices are cooperating with producers toward better recovery of oil and gas.

* * * * *

All of these processes and data except those necessarily of a secret military nature, have been made available to the mining industry by the Bureau of Mines and the Geological Survey. It is a tremendous contribution to the prosperity and perhaps even the safety of the country which has been made by the Federal Government.

* * * * *

I should next discuss briefly the subect of hydroelectric power, one of these numerous subjects about which I would purport to have some personal knowledge, but the one which is the most controversial and which, at the moment, is so highly political that I shall confine myself to only a few generalities.

The Government got itself into the power business by pure accident, when, in 1906, in the construction of reclamation dams for the storage of water, it became evident that there were hydroelectric potentialities, and the Secretary of the Interior was authorized to develop them primarily for power for pumping irrigation water, but he was authorized to sell any surplus power to be used for public purposes to help reduce the cost of the project.

There never has been any authorization of the Federal Government, constitutionally or otherwise, to engage in the electric-power business as such. There is grave question of its right to embark upon the business as such. There is no doubt of its right to dispose of hydroelectric energy created in connection with the exercise of constitutionally authorized functions, such as the control of floods and the improvement of rivers for commerce and navigation.

Out of this incidental production of power has grown a very sizable hydroelectric capacity, owned and operated by the Federal Government. However, despite its wide press publicity, it still amounts to only about 11 percent of the electric capacity of the United States, and it is likewise true that the hydroelectric capacity of the United States has definite limitations which are far below the electric requirements of the country.

For instance, in the Tennessee Valley it is interesting to note that already more than 40 percent of the electric-generation capacity of the TVA is steam, and that percentage will continue to increase. The Columbia Basin, on the contrary, still offers tremendous hydroelectric potentialities, and, as you know from the press, there is tremendous pressure by those who believe that all such developments should be constructed, owned, and operated by the Federal Government. On the contrary, President Eisenhower has taken the position that there must be some limitation to the activities of the Federal Government in this field, and, therefore, whenever these projects can be developed by local interests, States, public agencies, power authorities, or private utilities, they should be so developed, under the strict control of the Federal Power Commission, to make certain that the plans adopted fit in with the most comprehensive development and beneficial use of the resources of the river valley.

Some idea of what we gain by this may be had from the fact that the Chairman of the Tennessee Valley Authority estimates that between two and three hundred million dollars a year would be necessary for a substantial period of years in the future to merely meet the normal power requirements growth of the TVA's connected load. A further idea of the amounts of money involved may be had from the fact that once the shadow of Federal domination was removed from the Columbia Valley, applications now pending before the Federal Power Commission, more than half of which are by cities and public agencies, total something like 6 million kilowatts of capacity, representing an investment of something like a billion and a half dollars, all of which will come from private sources rather than from the pockets of Federal taxpayers.

Budgetary reasons alone, therefore, would indicate the desirability of some limitations on Federal participation in this public-power program. Diversified ownerships at the local level are also the greatest guaranty against ultimate federalization of the entire industry, preserving as they do some of the elements of a competitive and free economy and providing comparisons of operating costs and investment costs that will be clear to the public, which has frequently not been the case with Federal construction.

Above all, from the standpoint of conservation, it must be recognized by all of us that it is not prudent in the long run to have a patchwork of developments of the water-power resources of the country, and that it is always vital, therefore, that each proposed project be properly coordinated with other projects, present and future, to obtain the maximum use of the falling water. Such standards are required in the Federal Water Power Act. Their enforcement, says the Supreme Court of the United States, is committed to the Federal Power Commission, and, therefore, regardless of all of the temporary political shouting, it must be presumed that the Federal agency entrusted with this great responsibility will properly perform its functions, and that we will obtain the maximum benefit of this resource, regardless of the ownership and management of the project.

Let me conclude this address where I began. Legal restraint through Government is absolutely necessary if we are to adequately preserve the natural resources of the country. Government exploration and experimentation have contributed immeasurably to the wealth and well-being of the country. On the other hand, the greatest material asset of the free world is the enormous industrial and agricultural strength of the United States. This position has been reached primarily through our competitive private enterprise system and can only be maintained under Government policies and practices, which provide incentive for private investment in plants, equipment, and opportunity for employment at wages which make possible the maintenance of the American standard of living. This system, combined with the governmental activities to which I have referred, has created our true wealth. The Government must necessarily exercise powers of restraint against excessives, but it must also hold open the door of opportunity and lend a helping hand to its citizens.

The way of federalization of these resources, of their socialization, of their bureaucratic operation, and the regimentation that accompanies it, is not primarily the American way. Long-range planning has its place in the conservation of resources, but long-range planning has no place over the lives and fortunes of the individual. I am dedicated to the proposition that not all wisdom reposes in the District of Columbia. * * *

If the philosophy that land should not pass to private individuals because it "disturbs the pattern of Federal land management" (and Interior has said that from time to time) had prevailed from the beginning, then I should point out to you that all the land west of the Alleghenies would still be federally owned and most of us would be tenants of a vast Federal bureaucracy.

I am still impressed by an old geography of my grandfather, which, across the center of this continent, including my home State of Nebraska, has inscribed the words "Great American Desert, unhabitable," and yet there is a great State with the greatest cattle and butter markets in the world, with almost as many cattle as Texas, almost as much wheat as Kansas, almost as much corn as Iowa, with a capitol building which is an international architectural monument, and with no income or sales taxes and no State debt. It has been scornfully referred to as a "simple rural economy," but it is comprised of a healthy, intelligent, and prosperous people, and I have a little difficulty in believing that Washington could have planned it so well.

* * * * *

Therefore, let us watch the steady pressure for the exercise of more and more Government power, more and more regulation, for it is a growing menace to individual and civil liberty. No one has yet devised a plan which is an adequate substitute for the inherent desire of all human beings to improve their position over that of their fellows, to acquire things which are theirs and to do better than their neighbors. Whatever else we may do, we must not stifle this inherent drive of the American people, which is the first great security of the United States.

Curtailment of Railway Postal Service in New England

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 30, 1954

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a very informative letter I received from Wallace J. Legge, Jr., president, first division, National Postal Transportation Association, in opposition to curtailment by the Post Office Department of railway postal service in New England. The letter of Mr. Legge with supporting evidence therein seems to me to clearly establish the fact that a sharp curtailment is or about to take place and that Mr. Legge has been correct in his previous statements. I join with Mr. Legge and his association in protesting this reduction in service. To me, it is another illustration of false economy.

The letter follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *July 24, 1954.*

The Honorable JOHN W. McCORMACK,
Democratic Whip,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN McCORMACK: Thank you for your letters of July 16 and 21 in reply to my telegram, regarding the Post Office Department's intention to curtail railway post offices which would seriously impair postal service in New England.

In your letter, you state that Assistant Postmaster General John C. Allen advised you that "no action will be taken that will impair postal service."

Mr. Claude Hoover, assistant to Mr. Allen, is quoted in the press as saying "no definite action regarding changes in railway post offices in New England has yet been decided upon."

The Springfield, Mass., newspapers report that L. A. Waddington, general superintendent of the Postal Transportation Service in New England, stated that he does not foresee any changes in the very near future in railway mail service in New England.

Despite the assurances of these high postal officials, the plans for curtailment are rapidly moving ahead.

On July 19, the district superintendent of the Postal Transportation Service in New Haven sent four letters to the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad advising that he intended to recommend the discontinuance of certain railway post-office service at the earliest practicable date. One of the organizations affected is the run from Boston, Mass., to Waterbury, Conn., and return, trains 131 and 136, and from Boston, Mass., to Hartford, Conn., and return, trains 130 and 135. If placed into effect, this recommendation would eliminate entirely all railway post office service between Boston and Waterbury, and Boston and Hartford. This is not consolidation of service; it is elimination of service. This would impair postal service, not only for Boston, Hartford, and Waterbury, but also for the towns and surrounding communities of Norwood, Walpole, Franklin, and Blackstone, Mass., and Putnam, Willimantic, Hartford, Elmwood, New Britain, Bristol, and Terryville, Conn.

The same district superintendent has also advised the New Haven Railroad that he intends to discontinue railway post office service on trains 50 and 405, running from Grand Central Station, New York to Springfield, Mass., and return. These are trunkline trains carrying 60-foot railway post-office cars, and their discontinuance would materially affect postal service in Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, and Connecticut; as well as, mail moving from New England to all parts of the world.

The New Haven Railroad has also been notified that the Post Office Department intends to curtain railway post office service between Bridgeport and Hartford, Conn., by 33⅓ percent through the elimination of trains 150 and 157. This curtailment would impair postal service for the towns and surrounding communities of Bantam, Beacon Falls, Litchfield, Norfolk, Oakville, Shelton, Seymour, Thomaston, Torrington, Watertown, and Winsted. Because of lost connections at Hartford and Bridgeport, mails originating along the RPO run would be delayed.

The Post Office Department has also advised the New Haven Railroad of their intention to discontinue railway post office service from Boston to Springfield, Mass., and return on trains 49 and 554. Train 49 provides the only railway post-office service between Boston and Springfield during the hours 12:45 a. m. and 2:30 p. m. The discontinuance of this train would seriously effect mails originating in Maine, New Hampshire, and Massachusetts destined for the South, Southwest, North, and Northwest. Trains 554 distributes a great volume of mail for Massachusetts, Maine, New Hampshire, and Rhode Island and makes connections with trains to the North. Postal service for Maine would be seriously impaired if this train is discontinued, as it is the last Bangor and Boston RPO connection making morning delivery in Maine.

These intended curtailments are those of only one district out of seven, and there may be even further recommendations for curtailment forthcoming from this district within the next 2 weeks.

On July 20, the district superintendent, postal transportation service, White River Junction, Vt., called in the organization committee of the St. Albans & Boston RPO and advised them that he intended to discontinue trains 308 and 305, running from White River Junction, Vt., to Boston, Mass., and return. This curtailment would directly impair service for Vermont, New Hampshire, and Massachusetts, and indirectly for Maine, Connecticut, and Rhode Island.

On July 21, the same district superintendent called in the organization committee of the Newport and Springfield RPO and advised them of his intention to discontinue service on trains 717 and 732, between White River Junction, Vt., and Springfield, Mass., which would impair service for many towns and communities in western Massachusetts, New Hampshire, and Vermont.

If only one railway post office car is discontinued, it starts a chain reaction which effects to some degree dozens of others. Consequently, it is almost impossible to curtail any railway post office service without impairing postal service.

In view of the disparity between the statements of Assistant Postmaster General Allen, his assistant, Mr. Hoover, and General Superintendent Waddington that there will be no impairment of service, and the contradictory actions of the postal transportation service's district superintendents, curtailing railway post office service, it is obvious that efficient mail service in New England is seriously threatened.

In closing, I would like to express my appreciation for your cooperation and efforts to build and maintain an efficient postal service for New England.

Sincerely,
WALLACE J. LEGGE, Jr.,
President, First Division,
National Postal Transport Association.

Higher Watch Tariff: A Step Backward

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK E. SMITH
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 23, 1954

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include the following editorials from the Baltimore Sun and the Christian Science Monitor:

[From the Baltimore Sun]

HIGHER WATCH TARIFF: A STEP BACKWARD

President Eisenhower's decision to raise the tariff on Swiss watches and watch movements is a step backward. Here, as we see it, is what this decision does:

It gives protection to a group of watch manufacturers in this country who claim damage from Swiss competition, and do not wish the concept of free enterprise extended, in their case, beyond the borders of the United States. It recognizes the watch manufacturers' contention that their skills are vital to the national defense; a contention with great merit, but overstated in the manufacturers' arguments, which gave the impression that failure to raise the tariff would cause virtual atrophy of those skills.

To protect a group of American manufacturers, the decision strikes hard at the entire economy of a European country—a country with which we have long maintained the friendliest commercial relationships and, what is more, the European country most firmly devoted to free capitalistic enterprise.

Nor are the Swiss the only ones hurt. Switzerland buys heavily from the United States. It buys automobiles, tractors, raw cotton, lard. It is the largest purchaser of high-grade Maryland export tobacco.

With the higher tariff on Swiss watches, Switzerland will have fewer dollars with which to buy those products and commodities. This is entirely apart from the expected Swiss reciprocal modification, in the light of our modification, of the reciprocal trade agreement of 1936. Reciprocation is a word of various meanings.

For all that, it is in its larger implications that the tariff increase is most disturbing.

Constantly since the end of World War II we have held before European eyes the slogan "Trade, Not Aid." Whether or not the watch-tariff question can be taken as a fair test of our sincerity, it has built itself up in Eupropeans minds as a test. We must acknowledge, too, that many people in this country have been awaiting decision, as a test.

Perhaps it was not a true test. But if it was, we have, in the eyes of those who believe in free trade, failed it.

[From the Christian Science Monitor]

BLOW TO TRADE

We trust the upward revision of the American tariff on Swiss watches does not herald a general trend toward higher trade barriers. One immediate effect now predicted is Swiss withdrawal of concessions which had facilitated sales of American farm products and automobiles in Switzerland. But President Eisenhower says he is not retreating from his basic effort to increase world trade.

For the key reason given for the President's order is the military necessity of preserving a healthy American industry. This is the strongest argument that can be made for tariff boosts. American watchmakers rendered a tremendous service on precision instruments in the last war. But so did makers of cameras and electronic devices. Will they also now ask for higher tariffs? The military necessity argument should be questioned and tested by hard facts.

There appears to be considerable support for the American watchmakers' contention that Swiss competition got a jump during the war and is seriously damaging them. For while the three chief domestic movement makers have increased production and had good profits last year, the Swiss have captured an increasing share of the American market. But conceding much force to these two arguments, we must still ask whether it would not be possible to safeguard vital interests by less costly means.

In several ways the cost is great. It is believed the tariff change will add about $5 to the cost of all watches in the less expensive grades—possibly $60 million a year to consumers' bills. American importers will suffer, and exporters of American farm products may. In straight dollars and cents, wouldn't it be cheaper to give a direct subsidy where necessary to preserve precision instrument skills?

The intangible costs may well be greater. It is hard for Americans—who have so many larger industries—to realize how the Swiss feel about watches. In the overall exchange of goods they buy more from the United States than they sell to it. Their watch exports to America are already off 20 percent this year. They point out, too, that they make military instruments of great delicacy—wholly for the free nations. Will their own necessities change that situation—despite theis strong anti-Communist sentiments?

There is damage also from the impression that American words about freer world trade are belied by American deeds. We hope the administration will provide quick and positive proof that—despite this reverse—it is firmly pursuing the trade policies Mr. Eisenhower has so eloquently advocated.

Safety in the Coal Mines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 30, 1954

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I was surprised and chagrined to read the recommendation and its acceptance by the Secretary of the Interior in the matter of the Federal mines inspection bill. I wonder what the Secretary of the Interior has been thinking about if he doesn't know that this matter of education has been conducted for years by the Bureau of Mines. Through this effort much has been accomplished.

With reference to the gradual shifting of the responsibility to the States for the safety program, these two combined are as threadbare as they are transparent, because these are the arguments the opponents have been screaming about all along. I might remind this uninformed Secretary that this legislation was enacted 2 years ago to improve the safety in the coal mines and particularly to prevent, if possible, major catastrophes—where 5 or more men are killed. This was purely a bipartisan measure. It was drawn up after many weeks and hours of hearings, consultations and study. It was participated in by the Bureau of Mines, coal operators, and coal miners who, by the way, were certainly not even considered by the committee who made these recommendations to the Secretary.

I am happy to remind the Secretary that there has been no major disaster in the coal-mining industry since the enactment of this measure. This is a proud and commendable record and now he wishes to tamper with it and revert to the old ideas of education and States' rights. Education has taught the industry what causes catastrophes in coal mines, and also how to prevent them, but it certainly cannot "educate" the will to carry out the preventive measures.

The States have been very negligent in this matter. The industry in trying to cut costs, has taken chances and State officials have been rather reluctant to force some in the industry to carry out the preventative measures because they were sympathetic to their efforts to cut production costs.

This Federal mines inspection bill was the result of the failure of the States to do the job they should have done years ago. It has been successful and now the industry is asked to revert to the old practices and rely upon education and State officials to do the job.

Education is necessary but it can be no substitute for rigid inspections and enforcement. Those who would scream for education and for States' rights in this matter are abysmally ignorant of the safety problems of the industry. Does this mean the Secretary is going to flout this law? If he attempts to carry out the recommendations of this committee, which he apparently will, and a major catastrophe occurs in the industry, I charge that the tragedy will rest squarely upon his shoulders.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following editorial which appeared in the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette of July 28, 1954, entitled "Safety in the Coal Mines":

Safety in the Coal Mines

Interior Secretary Douglas McKay has endorsed a report that, in one particular, looks toward an ending of the Federal Government's coal-mine inspection service. According to a team studying the Bureau of Mines, the Federal Government ought to make a big educational effort designed to bring all State inspection services up to its own high level. Says the team in its report to the Secretary: "As this change is accomplished, the need for Federal coal-mine inspection will decrease and eventually cease to exist."

Mr. McKay had better think that one over again. This is no matter to be decided casually or by some doctrinaire notion of States rights. When you talk of mine inspection you are talking about the safety of thousands of Americans who work in those mines. And the record of coal-mine disasters in this country shows that the individual States by and large cannot be relied upon to do the proper inspection job. Not only is the Federal safety code much stricter than that in some States, but chances for political interference with inspection is far less on the Federal than on the State level.

The real weakness in our mine safety program is that the Federal Government doesn't have enough power to enforce its code. Two years ago, and several months after a terrible disaster at West Frankfort, Ill., in which 119 miners were killed, Congress did get around to granting some enforcement authority to Federal inspectors. (Federal inspectors had tagged the hazard at West Frankfort long before the tragedy but could only recommend, not compel, changes.) But Congress hasn't yet put enough teeth into Federal inspection.

Now we find the Interior Secretary endorsing a program that could, in the end, leave Federal inspection with no teeth and indeed no existence. It may be that Mr. McKay has only the educational aspects of this program in mind and its worthy aim of raising State safety standards. But that disquieting reference—that "the need for Federal coal-mine inspection will decrease and eventually cease to exist"—makes it urgent that he clarify his position.

A Statue of Liberty for France

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT P. MORANO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 30, 1954

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following statement:

Statement by the Honorable Albert P. Morano

Congressman Albert P. Morano, Republican of Connecticut, a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, today urged Congress to authorize a gift of a Statue of Liberty to France just as that nation gave the United States its famous monument which has become the symbol of freedom in New York harbor.

"At this crucial time in France's history," Representative Morano said, "it would be a fine and worthy gesture and a reaffirmation of our historical friendship with France."

The suggestion is embodied in a joint resolution submitted in the House today by Mr. Morano. It calls upon Congress and the President to authorize funds for the "erection and maintenance of a Statue of Liberty in such location in France as may be agreed to by the government of France."

The resolution points out that the Statue at Bedloe's Island, N. Y., "stands as a beacon of freedom, giving inspiration to our own people and to all peoples yearning for freedom" and that a gift of a similar statue to France by the United States "would reaffirm to the people of France the confidence of the peole of the United States in their defense of liberty and would create a symbol to the peoples of the entire world of the determination of France to maintain its position in the vanguard of those nations dedicated to the cause of freedom."

The Statue of Liberty, nicknamed "The Lady With the Torch," completed on May 21, 1884, was formally presented on July 4 that year to mark the impending 100th anniversary of the Declaration of Independence.

"Since that time," Mr. Morano said, "millions of immigrants 'yearning to breathe free,' as the inscription on the monument says, have thrilled to see this majestic statue looming out of the mist as their ships entered New York harbor.

"It is a great and lasting monument to Franco-American friendship as well as one of the eternal symbols of freedom not only to Americans, but to all humanity."

He added that today, with France's world position delicate and her internal situation difficult, the United States can demonstrate its gratitude and friendship by a reciprocal gesture.

"A symbol of this kind might help rekindle that great French spirit which Americans have respected and admired through the centuries," he asserted, "the spirit of the revolutionists who battered down the gates of the Bastille and paved the way for eventual democracy, the spirit of the Battle of the Marne and Dien Bien Phu."

Duryea Teen-Ager Orchestra Wins National Title, Landslide Choice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. BONIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 30, 1954

Mr. BONIN. Mr. Speaker, in June I had occasion to hear the Teen-agers band from Duryea, Pa. They are certainly outstanding youngsters and musicians led by Mr. Charles "Masters" Mustinski.

It was pleasant to learn, when I returned from Europe, that these youngsters made good on the Ted Mack show by winning the national amateur championship. I had related the story of the teenagers to my office staff and they joined with me in voting for this band when they appeared, on June 19, in the Madison Square Garden show. The story of their success follows:

DURYEA TEEN-AGER ORCHESTRA WINS NATIONAL TITLE, LANDSLIDE CHOICE

Duryea residents were agog last night, and well they might be as the television flashed the news they had been waiting for since June 19.

The news: "Duryea Teen-Agers Orchestra won the national amateur championship on the Ted Mack show." And the announcement continued "won by a landslide."

The youthful and accomplished musical organization tutored and directed by Charles Mustinski, well-known Duryea musician, appeared in the national competition on June 19 at Madison Square Garden. Prior to that they had competed and won honors in their first appearance on the Ted Mack show and in the semifinals on the same show. They competed against other semifinalists in the June 19 Madison Square Garden show.

The youngsters have created quite a sensation in the musical world as well as in towns of the Greater Pittston area. Their most recent appearance locally was on a special float in the Pittston centennial parade on June 26.

The winning of the national championship brings with it a $2,000 gift for the orchestra as well as possible assignments in key entertainment centers. There are reports too that the Teen-Agers may tour the Pacific and the European theaters to entertain American Armed Forces under sponsorship of the USO.

The entire area joins with Duryea and the Teen-Agers in their happiness over the winning of the national title. The contest developed keen interest throughout the region and many people were "sweating out" the program on Saturday night along with the participants, to hear the flash announcement that climaxed the program.

Members of the Teen-Agers Orchestra who now wear the crown of national amateur champs in musical competition are:

Ronald Swenton, Ronald Coolbaugh, Richard Cimakosky, Andrew Wasta, Leonard Vrabel, Ronald Gallagher, Albert Dunaj, Marta Balchune, William Patalon, Bernard Pernot, Paul Butrymowicz, Eugene Kobal, John Bachkosky, and Frances Kashuda.

Steam Generating Plant in West Memphis, Arkansas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 30, 1954

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

RESOLUTION BY THE WEST MEMPHIS CHAMBER OF COMMERCE IN REGARD TO ACTION OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE MEMPHIS CHAMBER OF COMMERCE ENDORSING THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE STEAM GENERATING PLANT IN WEST MEMPHIS, ARK.

Whereas the West Memphis Chamber of Commerce and its Industrial Council have worked diligently to attract industry to West Memphis; and

Whereas the proposed $107 million steam generating plant to be built at West Memphis by private enterprise under the directive of President Eisenhower to supply power to the TVA for the Atomic Energy Commission represents the greatest industrial opportunity in the history of West Memphis; and

Whereas the proposed plant and the contract for its erection have been under a bitter and unjustified attack by the advocates of TVA and as a result the people of the Memphis area have not had access to the true and complete facts of the controversy; and

Whereas notwithstanding this public attack the board of directors of the Memphis Chamber of Commerce, after careful consideration and thorough deliberation of the facts of the case, did by unanimous action and in the true spirit of free enterprise pass a resolution endorsing the proposed generating plant at West Memphis and expressing a spirit of true friendship and real concern for the mutual interests of the people of Memphis, West Memphis, and eastern Arkansas; and

Whereas this resolution, when brought to the attention of the general public, the President of the United States, Members of the United States Congress and representatives of other interested governmental agencies, did have a very direct and beneficial effect on the final decision of the United States Senate in confirming the erection of the plant; and

Whereas this splendid gesture and expression of friendliness and cooperation has served to weave even closer the bonds of understanding between the people of eastern Arkansas and the people of Memphis; and

Whereas the action of the Memphis Chamber of Commerce and its extremely beneficial effect accruing to the community of West Memphis has been thoroughly considered and discussed by this board: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we the board of directors of the West Memphis Chamber of Commerce do hereby and herewith express the undying gratitude and deepest appreciation of the people of West Memphis and eastern Arkansas to the board of directors of the Memphis Chamber of Commerce and to the members they represent for this forthright, voluntary, and effective expression of true friendship and cooperation; be it further

Resolved, That the members of this board of directors do hereby affix their individual signatures to this resolution and order that it be presented to the Memphis Chamber of Commerce as perpetual reminder of our appreciation and that a copy of this resolution also become a part of the permanent records of this chamber of commerce to be preserved for all to see and remember.

W. K. Ingram, President; James Bledsoe, First Vice President; Bernie McCorley, Second Vice President and Treasurer; J. C. Johnson, Third Vice President; Bernard High, Roy Marley, Herman Spears, J. C. Tennison, Miss Margaret Woolfolk, R. J. Pryor C. H. Rowton, Leonard Warden, Charles J. Upton, J. W. Rich, Hugh Chalmers.

This 24th day of July 1954.

Religion Versus Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. J. CARNAHAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 30, 1954

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article by A. C. McKinley, colonel, USAF, entitled "Religion Versus Communism," taken from the Sunday Star, Washington, D. C., of July 25, 1954.

The basic strength of this Nation is a spiritual strength, grounded in the principles of freedom of worship according to each individual's own spiritual concepts. These principles are guaranteed by the first amendment to the Constitution of the United States, and are reaffirmed by the United States Supreme Court. In *Zorach* v. *Clauson* (343 U. S. 306) the Court says:

> We are religious people whose institutions presuppose a Supreme Being. We guarantee the freedom to worship as one chooses. We make room for as wide a variety of beliefs and creeds as the spiritual needs of man deem necessary.

I commend Colonel McKinley for his timely article in which he warns the people of the world that a man cannot be a Marxist-Communist and at the same time believe in God, and that a man cannot aid the Marxist-Communists without being a traitor to his own spiritual beliefs. The article follows:

RELIGION VERSUS COMMUNISM

Hundreds of millions of people who have a spiritual belief can now be enlisted to construct a worldwide spiritual dam. Once men have been shown the danger of Marxist-Leninism to their spiritual belief, they can be cemented into a determined unity of resistance against Soviet engulfment. A joint resolution by Congress, reaffirming our foundation and firm, continued stand on the freedom of religion, will be the strongest single move we can now make. The people of all world religions would be brought to realize that all our religious efforts are for their, as well as our own beliefs.

All thinking people now realize that we must use all the strength of the free world, not just part of it, to halt universal engulfment by the Communists. World events forcibly have impressed every one with the necessity for increasing free world military strength. No one needs to be told that strength and an empty stomach do not go together. However, we have failed to consider the overwhelming ferment of man's spiritual belief, his greatest strength and common tie with other men. Man's religious nature is Russia's greatest weakness, our strongest weapon, the single goal which will cement men together. There are over 2 billion people who have faith in some form of spiritual belief. History has proven man to be naturally and normally religious. Attempts to prove that there are whole peoples destitute of religion never have withstood the tests of examination. Moreover, the real depth of a man's spiritual feeling is much greater than he himself often realizes. Once it has been established in the minds of men that communism in any form is dangerous to their right to believe in God, their determination to resist that enemy will be permanent. Men then will be essentially impregnable to communistic propaganda.

Asia, holding half the world's people, now is in a turmoil. Yet, where else but in Asia has man's religion been such a cornerstone of his life and government, his culture and civilization? Cementing the people of Asia around a common goal, and so constructing a religious dam against communism, is alone worth any effort.

In 1917 Lenin and his fellow travelers arrived in Russia from worldwide undergrounds. These men were not of the working class but intelligent, educated, shrewd, with hearts of cold steel, with neither an inhibition nor a scruple among them. These men were cruel and immoral. A man cannot be a Marxist Communist without being a traitor to God.

In enslaving almost half the world's peoples since 1917, the few men of the Kremlin have obtained the power to educate half the world's children. They are educating these children without belief in God. Each generation will have less knowledge of spiritual belief. Finally, there will come a generation of children who will have neither knowledge of God nor any spiritual belief. They will be atheists. This development men will fight against. To protect the right of their children to have a knowledge of God, they will stand together as permanent, dedicated enemies of Soviet communism.

The philosophy of the present-day Communist Party stems from Karl Marx. A quotation from Marx sums up well the party's danger to religion: "The people cannot be really happy until it has been deprived of illusory happiness by the abolition of religion." Thus, the party aims not at a mere distortion of religion, but at its total dissolution. This concept is as dangerous to one religion as another, be it Christian, Moslem, Hindu, Hebrew, or other.

Our strength as a nation rests on the principles behind the founding of our democracy, the basic principles of tolerance to all, kindness to humankind, and a freedom of both life and spiritual belief. Many of the peoples of the world have forgotten the religious origin of our democracy, our early struggles for religious and social freedom. Congress has the ear of the world. It is time to reaffirm the American stand on the freedom of spiritual belief as provided for in the first amendment to the Constitution adopted in December 1791. The time element is all-important. The eyes and ears of many people may be closed forever to the outside world before Congress reassembles. In the 35 years since Lenin and his followers took over, they have engulfed on the average of over 28 million persons a year.

A. C. McKinley,
Colonel, USAF.

Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced House Joint Resolution 575, as follows:

Whereas the basic strength of this Nation is a spiritual strength, grounded in the principles of freedom of worship and freedom of religious expression; and

Whereas all races, nationalities, and religious faiths have contributed to the basic strength of the free world; and

Whereas the international Communist movement seeks to distort and destroy the rights of people of all nations to speak, act, and worship in accordance with their own spiritual beliefs: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That the people of the United States reaffirm their devotion to these principles of religious freedom and call upon the people of the world to join in protecting their continued right to worship God and to practice their spiritual belief.

Biography of Hon. Wayne L. Hays, of Ohio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 30, 1954

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a biography of my friend and colleague, Hon. Wayne L. Hays, of Ohio. Congressman Hays has made a great contribution to the Congress during his terms in office, and I am glad to place in the Record this biography, written by Mr. Joseph McCaffrey for station WLW in Cincinnati, which is 200 miles from Mr. Hays' district.

Since it was broadcast on April 18, 1954, Congressman Hays has received nationwide commendation on the editorial pages of many of the leadings newspapers of the United States for his vigorous defense of academic freedom and constitutional liberty as ranking minority member of the Special Committee To Investigate Tax Exempt Foundations.

The biography follows:

WAYNE L. HAYS, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, 18TH DISTRICT OF OHIO

Slowly the employment barometer has fallen, and as it eases its way downward there is more and more concern in Congress. One unemployed man can mean 4, 5, or even 6 people in distress, depending on how large a family the unemployed man has at the time he gets his pink slip.

The gradual increase in our employment is called by the experts a natural result of the cease-fire in Korea. Where we once poured material into that war, we no longer are using the guns, tanks, trucks, and all the rest that we pushed our factories to produce. With the demand gone, the factories have begun to idle back to a peacetime pace. The result has, quite naturally, been a tapering off of employment.

Although we are now in April, one man in Congress has been voicing public concern about unemployment for almost a year. Ohio's Wayne L. Hays, who represents the 18th District—has been battling the unemployment tide for almost a year.

On his desk are hundreds of letters from workers now looking for work. These men and women come from his five-county area of Belmont, Carroll, Columbiana, Harrison, and Jefferson.

But just because the Congressman has been concerned about the climb of unemployment up the economic graph doesn't mean that he is a pessimist. He thinks there can be a cure for it; he believes that America is still a young, pioneering Nation and that it can absorb not only all the men and women now unemployed, but the thousands who will be entering the laboring field from high school and college this June as well.

"We can continue to climb," says Hays, "but we must have courage and we must think in terms of an expanding economy—not a shrinking economy.

"We must think in terms of selling—in terms of easier money for the speculator who wants to start a company which may, if successful, employ hundreds, even thousands of people.

"We must do everything we can to encourage new venture capital.

"Certainly," he continues, warming to his subject, "We can't afford to sit back and say, 'Well, this is what we must expect and we can't do anything about it.'

"Such an attitude," warns Hays, "will only gather us more unemployment. Now is the time for leadership and courage."

But although the Congressman from Ohio is concerned about the unemployed workers, he is also concerned about the American farmer. This is only natural for, although he is an educator and a lawmaker, he is also a farmer.

The tall, good-looking Hays, who looks 5 or 6 years younger than his 42 years, thinks one of the ways to bolster the employment picture is to give fast attention to the declining farm price situation.

"When the farmer has to stop buying new machinery and fertilizer," says Hays, "then the cycle picks up. The dealer in town has to cut back because he isn't selling as much as he had planned; the factory begins to cut back; and the farmer gets hit again, because the workers who are laid off aren't going to be buying as much milk and potatoes and all the rest as he would have had he been kept on his job."

Hays is best known in Congress as a man who likes to debate. He'll take on anyone in a floor fight and his friends never worry about him.

As Illinois' Congressman Mel Price says, "Wayne can handle himself and anyone else out there in the well of the House. He can hammer a word into any weapon he wants. If he wants to beat an opponent over the head he fashions his words into hammers—and if he wants to torment him, he'll have his words filed like a rapier."

Hays was just like that in school, too. And in order to feed his appetite for debate he'd sometimes take opposite sides. In those days it didn't mean too much which side he was on as long as he got someone on the other side so he could be assured of a good argument.

Hays is one generation from the traditional—at least for a man in American politics—log carbin. His did was born in a log cabin just a mile out of Bannock, Ohio. Hays, himself, was born in Bannock on May 13, 1911, in a frame house which is still standing.

The oldest child, Hays had two brothers and a sister. Because their grandfather was a horse trader, each of the four children had a pony.

They did a great deal of riding, because back in those days the auto hadn't laid its claim on all the roads and driveways. But even if it had, the Hays children would still be able to do a lot of riding because grandfather's farm was just outside of town. He never grew anything on it, using it for grazing so the children were able to ride over it at will.

His grandfather's house in town was as large as most with white pillars and when young Hays was 14, after his grandfather's death, the family moved into it.

Hays' first schooling was in a two-room frame school at Bannock. The school, incidentally, is still used today, only now it has three rooms—growing along with the population because when it was first opened many, many years ago it only had one room.

Although he protested about going to school, the protest lasted only 1 week. After that he settled down and became a good student, completing the first eight grades in 7 years.

When Hays entered high school he also started working in his father's grocery store. But even so he found time to ride, swim, skate, and hunt.

As he recalls it today, sitting at his office desk in the new House Office Building, Hays says, "Wheeling Creek was on the edge of town so I did a lot of swimming. We didn't think of taking lessons back in those days, we'd just learn from the other kids.

"In the winter we went ice skating behind the school. Some of the time the ice wouldn't be thick enough to hold us and we'd fall in * * * getting wet wasn't half as bad as getting a licking for it when we'd get home."

Hays paused for a minute then laughed, "I didn't play hookey from school; dad's store was only a block away from the school and it was too easy for them to check up on me."

Hays also had a newspaper route. He carried the Martins Ferry Times, now the Times-Leader. He kept that job until he graduated from high school, making $2.50 a week. During vacation time, he would caddy at the local country club. And, under the advice and sharp eyes of his family, he kept part of his income at the local savings bank.

Thinking about it now Hays says, "I'd just as soon spent it—but the family thought otherwise * * *."

Hay's favorite subject in high school was history. His history teacher was Gertrude Brown who now teaches in McKeesport, Pa.

Just how Hays became a Democrat is a little hard to fathom. His whole family were Republicans. The only Democrat before Wayne in his family was his grandfather J. W. Taylor who had been a soldier in the Confederate Army.

J. W. lived in West Virginia—much to his distress. He always felt it had been taken away from Virginia and the confederacy and that bothered him to his dying days.

In high school Hays was on the State championship debating team. It wasn't until he got to college that he took an active part in politics.

He had been exposed to it earlier when his uncle, John D. Hays, was an Ohio State senator from 1915 to 1921. His first political campaign was helping Gordon Hayes—who was no relation and spelled his name differently—run for Congressman-at-large. Professor Hayes was a Democrat and also the head of the economics department at Ohio State.

During the famous campaign of 1932—Hoover versus Roosevelt—Hays worked hard. And when he graduated from Ohio State in 1933 he had a feel for politics.

He had taken a prelaw course, but it was during the depression and when his money ran out there wasn't any way to borrow or beg new funds. So Hays switched to education and became a teacher, teaching at Flushing high school for 4 years.

He quit teaching because he couldn't have academic freedom. Looking back on it today Hays says, "The way I feel is that a teacher should teach the way he wants to, he shouldn't have over-eager parents or an over-eager board of education dictating every lesson plan to him."

He then ran for mayor, holding that office for 3 terms, from 1939 to 1945. And he also ran for and was elected to the board of education for 2 terms. In 1939 he ran for State senate, winning. In fact, there was a 2-year period when he held all 3 offices.

In 1941, the day after Pearl Harbor, he volunteered for active service in the Army, having held a Reserve commission since his graduation from Ohio State University. He was discharged in August 1942.

In 1944 he was elected county commissioner and held that post until he was elected to Congress in 1948.

But Hays would just as soon talk farming as politics. When he bought his farm there were only 100 acres. He has since pushed that up to 300 acres. He raises pure-bred Holsteins and is proud of the fact that his farm has been called a model by such experts as the county agent.

In Congress Hays is a member of the Banking and Currency Committee. This is the group which keeps a weather-eye on the Nation's economic well-being. It's most recent activity in this role was a study of our economic conditions.

The committee's duties include the control of price of commodities, rents or services, deposit insurance, the Federal Reserve System, the coinage of gold and silver, public and private housing, and the financial aid to commerce and industry.

It was established as a standing committee back in 1865 and its duties and powers were broadened by the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946.

In the present Congress the committee is chaired by the veteran Jesse P. Wolcott, of Michigan. The ranking Democrat is the experienced and beloved Brent Spence, of Kentucky.

Hays is regarded as a valuable committee member. He not only is faithful about attending committee meetings, but has a quick and ready mind which goes to the heart of the testimony and retains the important facts about the legislation under discussion. Because he is a good public speaker, he is a valuable asset to the committee when it finally brings a bill to the floor for debate.

Hays is also a member of the Committee on House Administration and is the ranking Democrat on the Select Committee to Investigate Tax Exempt Foundations. He is one of no more than a dozen members of the House to have a seat on three committees.

Democratic leaders in the House generally regard Hays as one of their most effective ball carriers during an important debate. His speaking combines logic with a ready sense of humor and when it's known that he is going to speak the rest of the Members come into the Chamber from the speakers' lobby and the cloakrooms. That, then, is Ohio's Congressman Wayne L. Hays.

There Is Liberty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 26, 1954

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, the increasing influence of ideologies alien to our own which exists throughout the world today is destroying liberty amongst millions of peoples and constantly threatening our own. Many of our citizens are concerned over that threat and are fearful lest we in America lose our traditional freedoms. Of course, they can be lost through our own apathy or neglect. But if we are continually vigilant and alert we can preserve them. Each individual citizen has a responsibility in this regard. It is not the sole responsibility of government. As a matter of fact one of the greatest threats to liberty lies in government itself. The all-powerful superstate as it exists elsewhere in the world has been responsible for countless peoples living in subjection and slavery.

An excellent discussion of this subject is to be found in a sermon given by the Reverend Robert A. Russell which appeared in the Denver Post. A portion of it was reprinted as an article in the Christian Science Monitor under the heading, "There Is Liberty." I have thought it so worthwhile that I am inserting it in the Congressional Record. The article follows:

Norman Peale tells a little story that sets the theme of my sermon.

A man took his 8-year-old daughter to New York to show her the sights. Among other things, he took her to see the Statue of Liberty. She was fascinated by the thrilling story of the gift to the United States by France of this marvelous statue which has stood for many years at the entrance to New York harbor, lifting aloft her torch of liberty to enlighten the world.

That night sleep did not come easily to the child. Her father sat down beside her and asked what was the matter.

"Daddy," she said, "I am thinking of the beautiful lady out there all by herself with nobody to help her hold up her lamp. It is dark out there. Shouldn't we be helping Miss Liberty to hold up her lamp in the darkness?"

In normal times that story would have made little impression upon us, but not so today. It is very dark out there, and the darkness is growing all the time. Miss Liberty does need our help, if she is going to keep that light burning in the darkness, for liberty is our most fleeting and fragile possession.

It has been estimated that only 3 billion of the 40 billion persons who have lived in recorded human history have every had any experience of liberty, and it is certain that only in the past 175 years have men known what true liberty is. But see what is happening today.

Little by little liberty tends to disappear from the face of the earth. Lights that once burned brightly are now flickering and in danger of going out. Yet even here in America where we still talk about the land of the free there is a growing fear and paralysis in the minds and hearts of many of our people. That hideous doctrine of the superstate is beginning to take root, the most dangerous, disrupting, and vicious doctrine ever let loose—the concept that the state is our master rather than our servant.

That little girl had the right idea—Miss Liberty does need our help in keeping that light burning out there in the darkness.

How are we going to help? Well, the first thing we can do is to keep our own lights burning. The Bible gives us the secret of freedom. Man created in the image of God is a free man. That knowledge implies that our freedom is not dependent upon our weapons of war, upon our Government, nor upon our politicians, but upon us. That is something that few people realize. Freedom is an individual matter, and only the individual can keep it alive.

"If I were a dictator," said Quentin Reynolds, "the first book I would burn would be the Bible. I would burn it because I would realize that the whole concept of democracy came out of that book."

Here is Moses delivering a band of rebellious slaves—mud mixers in Egypt—from their oppressors, forging them into a little nation, transforming their minds, giving them the watchword of free men ever since—"God made man in His image."

The whole concept of freedom got started in that belief—the importance and dignity of man. Not the dignity of a few men, dictators, demagogs, great men, wealthy men, white men—the dignity of all men. All men are born free with certain worth, dignity, value, and privileges not conferred by any government but inherent in their birth as children of God. Our religion rests upon that foundation. Our democracy is built upon it.

The world into which Jesus came was a dark and desperate world. He was, as St. John said, "a light shining in darkness." There were only two kinds of people in that world: the master and the slave, the oppressor and the oppressed.

The common man had little freedom in those days and free speech was an invitation to disaster. Jesus was crucified by the political bosses of His day because He talked too much. Those who refused to sprinkle incense on Caesar's altar were thrown to the lions. St. Paul enjoined the Galatians to "Stand fast in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free, and be not entangled again with the yoke of bondage."

Standing fast has meant a struggle which has resulted in the formation of the United States of America—a land that enjoys greater freedom than is to be found anywhere in the world, a land presided over by the Lady With a Lamp, who at all times needs our help but never more urgently than now.

St. Paul said, "Where the spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty." Awareness of this truth gives a new understanding of the word "liberty." It is a spiritual thing. When we have once made that discovery we are in a position to defend our God-given freedom. As long as the Bible is read in our homes, as long as we as individuals accept the privilege of freedom and the responsibility of maintaining it, it is secure. The fervent prayers for help in the guidance of our Government which we hear today from the lips of our President are heart warming and reassuring.

They Are Our Sons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEO W. O'BRIEN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 30, 1954

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday of this week, at Fort Dix, a noncommissioned officer was acquitted by a court martial board of charges that he kept 225 recruits at punishment attention for 1 hour in 92° heat. Earlier, his immediate superior, a lieutenant, was cleared of "dereliction of duty" charges.

That sergeant, it seems, was "acting on orders of his superior," but his superior testified he knew nothing about the formation until the sergeant told him about it the next day. Perhaps the recruits gave the orders for their own ordeal by sun fire.

It is not my right to pass judgment in this case, but someone must have been responsible for the fact that 225 recruits were subjected to this treatment and for the fact that those who fainted under the harsh sun were doused with water and put back into line for more of the same.

I would not bring this matter to the attention of the House, Mr. Speaker, were it not for a shocking happening a year ago involving the son of a friend of mine. That young man had asked to be relieved from a desk assignment for more active duty. He was sent to an eastern Army camp and, as part of his basic training, he participated in a drill which took place in extreme heat. The young man, according to a witness, fainted. He was placed under a tree, revived, and then ordered back into the drill. He collapsed again and died that night. He was a strapping young man, apparently in good physical condition.

I sought permission from the bereaved father to bring the matter to the attention of Congress. He sadly remarked that it would not restore his only son, and I dropped the idea of relating the happening to you.

After what has happened at Fort Dix, however, I cannot, in conscience, remain silent. I believe a subcommittee of the House Committee on Armed Services should investigate this latest episode and, if the facts there warrant, inquire into whether other recruits, taken from American homes to serve their country, are being trained or bedeviled.

I realize that most of the officers and noncommissioned officers of our armed services are fine, intelligent gentlemen, but we should make very sure that there is a tight curb on the sadistic and unfit.

I do not suggest that we transform our training camps into country clubs or that we avoid training methods rigid enough to turn out capable soldiers. I do suggest, however, that we treat our young men as human beings and that we bring them along in their training at least as sanely as the coach of a football team develops his players.

During recent weeks, we have passed several bills designed to spur reenlistments in our armed services. We have voted larger bonuses and improved housing. Are we to destroy these incentives by permitting the impression to go out that the soldier is fair game for superiors without judgment or human feeling? Mr. Speaker, these are our sons.

Schedule of Dates for Conferences and Visits With Constituents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. McCULLOCH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 30, 1954

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, I believe that a Congressman should be in his district to confer and visit with his constituents whenever possible.

When Congress adjourns this summer, I expect to return home and to be available for conferences and visits with residents of the Fourth District in the courthouse of each county seat between 9 a. m. to 4 p. m., in accordance with the following schedule:

Eaton, Preble County: Tuesday, August 24.

Celina, Mercer County: Wednesday, August 25.

Wapakoneta, Auglaize County: Thursday, August 26.

Sidney, Shelby County: Friday, August 27.

Lima, Allen County: Monday and Tuesday, August 30 and 31.

Greenville, Darke County: Wednesday, September 1.

Troy, Miami County: Thursday, September 2.

No appointments will be necessary. Any problem with, or opinion concerning, the Federal Government will be proper subject for conference.

Of course, I will be glad to see residents of the district, in my Piqua office, any time that the Congress is not in session, except on the days scheduled above.

The World Council and Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 30, 1954

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend and revise my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include portions of an article entitled "The World Council and Communism," by Dr. J. B. Matthews, which appeared in the August 1 issue of United Evangelical Action:

THE WORLD COUNCIL AND COMMUNISM

(By J. B. Matthews)

WHAT WILL EVANSTON DO ABOUT THIS GREAT WORLD ISSUE?

The second assembly of the World Council of Churches will be held at Northwestern University in Evanston in August, the first (and founding) assembly having been held in Amasterdam, Holland, the latter part of August 1948.

During the second half of August, the news interest of the entire religious, and much of the secular, world will be focused upon Evanston, Ill. Millions of people will learn for the first time about this suburb of Chicago, although Evanston has long been an important educational and religious center of the United States.

Protestant church delegates and observers, thousands of them, will stream to Evanston from many parts of the globe, including countries which are behind the Iron Curtain.

COMPOSITION OF THE WORLD COUNCIL

In a printed leaflet, the World Council of Churches announced that its constituent denominational bodies, as of January 1, 1954, numbered 161 churches in 48 countries.

The council then proceeded to group all of its constituent members under 49 (not 48) geographical headings and 1 nongeographical heading. The discrepancy between the figures 49 and 48 may be explained by the fact that Australia and Australasia are listed, the former being encompassed by the latter and, therefore, not a separate country.

Under the single nongeographical heading, "Other Churches," two denominations are listed; namely, the Estonian Evangelical Lutheran Church and the Lithuanian Reformed Church. The question arises as to why these two churches were not listed under the geographical heading "U. S. S. R." Was it a piece of trickery calculated to avoid naming the Soviet Union as the 49th country in which the World Council has constituent bodies? If so, it was a thin disguise, for the Council openly proclaimed that it has member bodies in China, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, and Rumania, all of which are Soviet satellites.

In China, there are 4 members of the WCC; in Czechoslovakia, 3; in Hungary, 2; in Poland, 2; and in Rumania, 3. The ecclesiastical heads of these 14 denominations in the Iron Curtain countries are stooges of their Communist regimes.

Proof that the heads of these Protestant churches in the Iron Curtain countries accept and disseminate the propaganda of their Communist governments is voluminous and conclusive. Two examples of this proof must suffice for the present.

Under date of June 28, 1952, a group of 410 Protestant church leaders in China addressed a letter to the Red Dean of Canterbury, Hewlett Johnson. The letter reads as follows:

"We Christians of China would like to report to you an inhuman and anti-Christian crime recently committed by the American aggressors, which is the bacteriological warfare they have launched against the Chinese and the Korean people. Rev. Wang Tzu-chung of the Peking Congregational Church went to Korea and northeast China as a representative of the Chinese religious circles and saw with his own eyes the various germ-laden insects dropped by the United States Armed Forces as well as shells of containers carrying insects. He collected with his own hands a great many evidences of the American bacteriological warfare. Many of our Christian doctors have witnessed the germ-disseminating insects and other carriers spread by the American aggressive forces, and taken active part in making every effort to defeat the American bacterological warfare. We Chinese Christians confirm that the crimes of the bacteriological warfare committed by the American aggressors are irrefutable, undeniable. * * * For the sake of humanity, righteousness, and world peace, we want to appeal to the Christians throughout the world to raise protest so as to put a stop to the atrocious deeds of the American aggressors in massacring Chinese and Korean people with bacteriological weapons."

Bishop Albert Bereczky, of Hungary, is one of the prominent Protestant leaders in that country with whom the leaders of the World Council of Churches maintain cordial relations. Not long ago, Bishop Bereczky addressed a message to the WCC, which reads, in part, as follows:

"Some time ago I heard that a leader of Chinese Christians sent a message to Western Protestants to the effect that they, the Chinese, have, thank God, come under Communist rule and now the churches can go on freely with their work. * * * We, too, would like to ask the Western Protestant churches, and particularly the World Council of Churches: Let their eyes and hearts be open to the countries which walk on the road to socialism."

Ernest Gordon in a recent issue of the Sunday School Times observes that "Prof. Joseph L. Hromadka, of Prague, may come to Evanston. If he comes, he will be acclaimed by the Evanston assembly. But what of Dr. H. Prohaska, director of the Baptist theological school in Prague, who has been sentenced to 12 years imprisonment on false Communist charges? And what of Jean Ricar, president of the Baptist Union of Czechoslovakia, condemned to 18 years; and what of Cyril Burgert, pastor of the First Baptist Church of Prague, now started on a 7-year prison term; and what of Michael Kaspar, president of the Association of Baptist Churches of Slovakia, now on a 5-year term?

"Will Hromadka, who has submitted to communism, lead the assembly in an appeal for release of these sufferers?" asks Mr. Gordon. "Would that one could believe it. There will be northern Baptists in the Evanston meeting. Will they propose that the World Council ask our Government to use its good offices in behalf of the Czech Baptist leaders?"

Such are the leaders of the Protestant churches in the Iron Curtain countries who are welcomed into fellowship of the World Council of Churches. It is interesting to speculate on what would have happened to American protestant leaders if they had maintained similar relations with ecclesiastical stooges of the Nazis.

WHAT WILL EVANSTON DO?

Dr. Daniel A. Poling, noted editor of Christian Herald, puts the issue squarely before us in his editorial, Evanston (July 1954). He says, in part:

"Evanston must declare communism antireligious, anti-Christ, and utterly antagonistic to everything for which the Christian church should stand, or Evanston will divide the American Protestant community. * * *

"Unmistakably clear it is that delegates from the captive churches behind the Iron Curtain will come to Evanston as puppets of atheistic communism.

"But whatever the words of these men with whose unhappy bondage we must deeply sympathize, even more significant may be the words of our own American representatives. What are we going to say at Evanston? It is finally what we say there that will strengthen or weaken—that may indeed make or break—organized Protestant unity in the United States for decades ahead. * * *

"If at Evanston, for any cause whatsoever, we compromise or, in doubletalk, seem to compromise with atheistic communism, then Protestant Christianity in the United States may well conclude that we have betrayed our Lord."

A New Patent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. ALLEN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 30, 1954

Mr. ALLEN of California. Mr. Speaker, an article appeared in the San Francisco Examiner a few days ago announcing the invention of what is probably a very simple but very useful device that will make it possible to keep every home a little cleaner, a little easier. It has to do with pouring things from paper cartons without spilling them all over the kitchen. The inventor lives in Oakland, Calif.

The article to which I referred is as follows:

BOON TO MODERN PACKAGING

A built-in pouring spout for paperboard cartons that snaps shut with a positive seal has been developed by inventor Henry F. Phillips.

He is the same Henry F. Phillips who invented the Phillips recessed-head screw, which is in general use by practically all major manufacturers in the United States today.

Referring to Phillips' latest invention, Harry L. Phillips, son of the inventor and president of Delaware Pacific Corp., Oakland, said, "It is a case of lightning striking twice in the same spot."

Delaware Pacific Corp., which holds exclusive worldwide license rights, has licensed Container Corp. of America to use its patented pouring spout, Phillips, Jr., said.

Container Corp., as the No. 1 licensee of the Flo-Seal pouring spout, is preparing to go into commercial production.

Delaware Pacific's license agreement with Container Corp. is for the life of the patent and any improvements thereon. Additionally, the name Flo-Seal must appear on all cartons using the patented spout.

Another privately owned company will share with Delaware-Pacific in royalties, as well as the expenses, of the enterprise. That firm is Flo-Seal Corp. This company holds the patents and owns the die-making machinery. Royalties will be 4 percent of the selling price of the cartons, f. o. b. point of manufacture. The officers and directors of Flo-Seal Corp. are Charles Dean Purcell, Leo J. Hanley, and Arthur Reed.

The opening and closing Flo-Seal spout is an integral part of the carton itself. It is formed by making the die inserts a part of the cutting and forming process.

The gluing operation is identical to that of present sealed cartons except for the use of a wider glue wheel to accommodate the Flo-Seal glue flap. This does not impede the speed of the gluing operation nor does it interfere with the speed of automatic filling machines.

As delivered to consumers the spout forms an airtight seal which is claimed to be infestation proof and sift proof. When the spout is opened the product may be poured accurately without spillage or waste, with the size of the pouring stream readily adjustable.

Several spout sizes are available to meet the size of the package and contents. They range up to the spout which would accommodate a large soap carton.

After each use the spout can easily be closed to its original position forming an almost airtight closure. Filling of carton, handling, and shipping in no way interferes with the sealing of the spout.

In the granulated field the Flo-Seal spout is adaptable to soaps, detergents, flour, salt, sugar, rice, cereals, spices, seeds, tooth powder, and many others.

The key to successful mass production has proved to be the special die inserts which are sold to licenses at costs ranging from $2.50 to $3 per set, depending on the size of the die inserts. The die inserts, made by the Pain Die Works, San Leandro, are furnished to Delaware Pacific licensees.

Henry F. Phillips started work on the self-sealing spout in 1943. However, it was not until May 1952 that he developed a spout that could be manufactured commercially. The problem was solved by his development of the Flo-Seal die insert.

Except for the wide wheel glue pot used in the gumming operation, no additional equipment is required to produce the Flo-Seal spout. The potential market for the new carton runs to several hundred million packages a year in the United States alone. No Flo-Seal licenses yet have been negotiated abroad.

Same Old Horse, Another Name

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 29, 1954

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the House should be congratulated on its rejecting of the Fryingpan-Arkansas project reclamation bill which was on the floor Wednesday.

The Members should give some special study as to what happens to the money authorized and voted for some reclamation projects. Most Members believe that the 3-percent rate on money loaned for power features finds its way to the United States Treasury; this is not a fact, the Reclamation Bureau is the recipient of this money which belongs to the Nation's taxpayers.

For the information of the membership, I am submitting an article entitled "Same Old Horse, Another Name":

SAME OLD HORSE, ANOTHER NAME

Back in the forties, the Interior Department and the Bureau of Reclamation appeared on Capitol Hill with a gift horse which they asked Congress to present to the 17 western reclamation States.

The name of the horse was "Interest Component."

This steed was the fantastic result of some miraculous crossbreeding and with it the reclamation States could win any economic derby they entered. For instance, if the Reclamation Bureau wanted to build a big power and irrigation project of dubious feasibility, it would ask Congress to put up the money. The law said, and still says, that money put up to build the power features of a project must be paid back to the Federal Treasury within 50 years and with 4 percent interest. The Federal money put to build the irrigation features of a project must also be repaid, but is interest free.

Now it frequently happened that the water users were unable to repay the costs of the irrigation features. That is where the gift horse named "Interest Component" came into the picture.

Instead of packing the 3-percent interest on money loaned for power features back to the Treasury, as the law demands, "Interest Component" had been trained to carry it only to the Reclamation Bureau. There the interest money, which belonged to the Nation's taxpayers, would be used to pay off the costs of the irrigation features of the project. The Treasury would be left holding an empty feed bag, because the Treasury had to borrow the money in the first place. When the Treasury borrows money it has to pay interest on the loan, just like anybody else. To understand this, just consider E bonds.

The result of this scheme would have been that the taxpayers of all States would have to bear the burden of the lost interest money, which had gone to benefit a few farmers who couldn't pay their own bills.

Congress took a good look at Interest Component. While it had a sleek coat and trim frame, it also had a crafty eye and the ability to kick any taxpayer into kingdom come, Congress refused to approve the gift of Interest Component to the reclamation States.

When the present administration took over, the Interior Department promptly announced that poor old Interest Component had been sent to the glue factory.

But not long afterward, department emissaries rode up Capitol Hill on a new horse. This one was named "Collbran Formula," and it had been combed and curried to a fare-you-well, and had pretty blue ribbons in its mane and tail.

Some Members of Congress are good horse traders. While they openly admired the sleekness of Collbran Formula, they also took a look at its teeth. There, all slicked up, was nothing less than the same old nag, Interest Component, wearing a new monicker.

But something else had been added. Collbran Formula had been taught new tricks. For example, he had been taught to stand still for the first 50 years of an economic race, then to rush out and do his stuff. By this time, the others in the race who weren't dead would be so exhausted that they could be easily beaten in the home stretch.

This is the Collbran Formula scheme:

Suppose the Reclamation Bureau wants to build several enormous power and irrigation projects with financial structures that would make any reasonable fiscal agent commit suicide. Take for illustration the Colorado storage project and the Fryingpan-Arkansas project.

Under the formula the cost of the power features would be repaid in 50 years, at 3 percent interest. But while this is being done, the cost of the irrigation features is not being repaid. That simply is postponed until the power costs have been repaid. When this is done, Collbran Formula goes into action. He takes the power revenues—not to the Treasury, where they belong, but to the Reclamation Bureau where they are used to pay for the irrigation costs. For half a century, therefore, the taxpayers have been footing the lost interest bill, just as they would have done when the old hayburner, Interest Component, was pushed out on the congressional stage.

Obviously, Treasury money ain't hay. The Members of Congress who took a look at Collbran Formula's teeth have protested vigorously against the attempt to sell them the same old package in new wrapping.

The Colorado storage project and the Fryingpan project would cost the taxpayers a round billion and a half, probably a lot more, never to be recovered.

Interest Component was generally condemned as unsound, was never accepted by Congress.

Collbran Formula is nothing more than a subterfuge trained to reach the same goal by another route.

Brunson Honors Beloved Physician for Years of Unselfish Healing Care

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 30, 1954

Mr. RIVERS, Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from a recent issue of the Hampton (S. C.) Guardian:

BRUNSON HONORS BELOVED PHYSICIAN FOR YEARS OF UNSELFISH HEALING CARE

(By Martha Bee Anderson)

If wealth could be measured in terms of a storehouse overflowing with love and affection, respect, good will, and grateful hearts of an entire community of about 900 to 1,000 citizens, then Dr. J. W. Mole, 76-year-old Brunson physician, has become a millionaire practicing country style medicine in this Hampton County town for half a century.

Last month as a token of community-felt gratitude, citizens of Brunson, inspired by a committee of young matrons, presented to Dr. and Mrs Mole, a handsome television set, installed in their home.

There are many remarkable facts in the life story of Dr. Mole.

Certainly one thing about this country doctor which leave most newcomers to Brunson astounded is his business tactics. His fees for visits, home and office, range from 50 cents to $1, and he never bills anyone. Asked if his fees aren't a little behind times, Dr. Mole says, simply, "I'm too old to learn new tricks," and changes the subject casually.

Living in a modest frame home in the middle of Brunson and right beside Highway 28, Dr. Mole maintains a cubby-hole office in the front yard. Office hours are flexible and he's available to patients almost any time he's needed. He has the reputation for never refusing to answer a sick call to anybody's house, black or white, at any hour of day or night.

A physician known for strict sobriety, Dr. Mole has a score of varied, interesting things to do in his free moments.

Twenty-two years ago he launched a new hobby and this spring the Mole place was a "little Summerville" as a result of it. In 1932 he took a fancy to azaleas, and purchased in a Savannah dime store a bundle of 12-inch azalea plants. In the intervening years friends have added to the collection, sending rare species often, and he has bought more from time to time from azalea centers such as Mobile, Ala. And now the original plantings are giant azaleas—6, 7, and 8 feet tall and spreading in every direction. Blossoming time is magnificent, there being masses of brilliant blooms in blending colors, set off by the stately pines scattered through the garden. White dogwoods among the pines set off this riotous spring scene, making a picture of perfection. Tourists passing on the highway often stop to take color photographs and folks from all parts of Hampton and adjoining counties flock to Brunson to see it at peaktime each year. Extending the hobby considerably, Dr. Mole has in the past 20 years rooted hundreds and hundreds of cuttings from his original plants, adding them to the garden as they matured. Several years ago he started a similar project with camellias and within a few more years the back of their home will be camellia scenic. Dr. Mole is completely wrapped up in his flowers and spends most of his extra hours keeping up with their demands.

Another interesting pastime of Dr. Mole's is that of weaving his own shrimp nets for shrimping near Beaufort. A great fan of the outdoors, he delights in shrimping and fishing and builds his own boats for this purpose. When the weather's right and fish are biting, "Gone fishin' " is a familiar sign on the office door.

A Brunson native, following the footsteps of his father, Dr. J. W. Mole, Sr., who practiced medicine all of his life in Brunson (52 years of practice), this Dr. Mole set up practice in his hometown in 1904. After finishing medical training at the Medical College of South Carolina, Charleston, in 1901, he practiced in Georgetown long enough to pick a wife, the former Miss Nita Munnerlyn, of the Georgetown Munnerlyns. He entered the United States Army Medical Corps in 1917, serving in France during World War I, and remaining in the Medical Corps Reserve through World War II, when he returned for a short period of Active Reserve service in Florida, Alabama, and Louisiana.

Active in civic, church, and school affairs of Brunson, Dr. Mole has been for many years a steward of the Methodist Church. He served for a long period as chairman of the board of trustees of the school. Recently he was awarded a 50-year Masonic pin by Buford Lodge, of Fairfax and Brunson.

The Moles have 2 children, Henry Mole, of Barnwell, and Mrs. C. J. C. Hutson, of Yemassee, and 2 grandchildren, Alice Jo and John Mole, of Barnwell.

In 50 years of successful medical practice, Dr. Mole has dispensed, from his little office and his little black bag, millions of pills. (He fills his own prescriptions as a general rule.) He has delivered no telling how many babies, for he stopped counting several years back, he said, when the tally reached 1,500. In his wide and varied experiences, he has covered a lot of ground, caring for patients within a broad area of Brunson. He's brought newborns into this world in all kinds of places, including inside automobiles, but never inside a hospital.

The stories he tells are sparked with rustic humor and pathos, reflecting for the most part the simple goodness of the country folks to whom he's been a godsend for more than 50 years, as "Dr. Willie."

The greatest compliment a doctor's wife could desire for years has been said of Mrs. Mole—"She's a perfect doctor's wife."

At 76, Dr. Mole is spry as a cricket and says he'll live to be a hundrded, at least. And you know, I believe he will.

It Would Not Have Happened Had Dies Committee Been Heeded

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN DIES

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 29, 1954

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, every informed and unbiased authority now agrees that Communist successes which threaten the world with destruction can be attributed in large part to the pro-Russian policy of the United States from 1933 until a few years ago. As the most powerful Nation in the anti-Axis alliance, the United States could have forestalled the Communist plans of world conquest during the latter part of World War II and in the postwar period. At that time Russia was exhausted from the devastating effects of Hitler's invasion and in no condition to resist American demands for settlement and commitments that would have insured a just and lasting peace. In his monumental book, Triumph and Tragedy, Churchill published the urgent pleas which he made to President Roosevelt during the latter part of the war, that adequate measures be taken then to frustrate Russian schemes.

The cause of America's pro-Russian policy was the influence exerted upon the Roosevelt administration by Communists, fellow-travelers, and their dupes, and the deception which they were able to impose upon those in charge of our foreign policy. Few people yet understand the tremendous influence which the Communists, fellow-travelers, and dupes exercised in the United States during this period. They controlled and directed scores of frontal organizations which had a total membership of approximately 10 million gullible and unthinking people. These organizations held the balance of political power in many key areas of the United States. They published and distributed over 600 magazines, newspapers, and periodicals in the United States which reached millions of people with pro-Russian propaganda. They infiltrated leading newspapers, magazines, and radios. They were entrenched in the moving-picture industry. From these vantage points the Communists and their fellow-travelers were able to carry on an incessant bombardment of deceptive propaganda which shaped and maintained a pro-Russian foreign policy.

The most accurate appraisal of Communist influence in the United States was made by Earl Browder recently when he said:

> In those days Communists exerted a powerful and pervasive influence. * * * At election time their support was sought by candidates and factions in both major parties. * * * Communists were asked to speak at universities not despite but because they were Communists. * * * Government officials, church leaders, scientists, doctors, lawyers, and judges collaborated freely with the Communists. * * * In politics, of course the main weight of Communist influence was thrown behind Roosevelt.

From 1938 to 1945, the Dies committee did everything within its power to combat the Communist influence and deceptive propaganda. In a unanimous report published on January 3, 1939, the Dies committee solemnly warned:

> We have shown that communism is a worldwide revolutionary movement aiming ultimately at the setting up of a world union of Soviet Socialist Republics. * * * In this plan for world revolution the Communists have omitted no country or people as too small or insignificant to command their attention. * * * Among these the Communists recognize the United States of America as the foremost.

If our Government had heeded this warning, it would not have made enormous concessions to Russia at Yalta and Potsdam. It was these postwar concessions which enabled the Soviet Union to emerge from a third-rate power to the status of a world menace.

Another cause of the phenomenal growth of Communist power was the theft by Communists inside our Government of our military, diplomatic, and scientific secrets and the influence which they exerted upon our foreign policy. In its report filed on January 3, 1939, the Dies committee warned:

> The Communist Party has penetrated the Government itself, with the result that some Communists hold key positions in Federal agencies and projects.

In the report of the Dies committee dated January 2, 1943, are the following findings:

> On October 25, 1939, the committee made public the names, positions, and salaries of some 563 Government employees located in Washington, D. C., who were members of the American League for Peace and Democracy. * * * The committee on October 17, 1941, sent to the Attorney General the names of 1,124 Federal Government employees who were members of organizations which this committee had found to be subversive.

Included in this list were the names of Alger Hiss, Harry Dexter White, and Harold Glasser. These people were kept on the Government payroll for at least 10 years after they were exposed, and the theft of our military, diplomatic, and scientific secrets was made possible because of their presence on the Federal payroll. Furthermore, these Government officials greatly influenced our foreign policy in favor of Russia.

Another cause which contributed to Communist influence in America was the failure of our Government to deport and exclude Communist aliens. In 1932, my bill to deport and exclude Communist aliens passed the House of Representatives but was stymied in the Senate by the liberal bloc headed by Senator La Follette. If my bill had become a law, 90 percent of these Communist aliens would have been deported and the thousands who came after 1932 would have been excluded.

In the committee's report filed on January 3, 1939, is the following finding:

> The committee received considerable evidence of the activities of Communist, Nazi, and Fascist aliens in the United States. * * * A large part of un-American activities is inspired and carried on by these aliens. * * * The committee believes that it will be difficult to ever cope with un-American activities and propaganda in this country so long as the Department of Labor follows its present policy with reference to deportation.* * * We further believe that greater care should be exercised in permitting aliens to enter the United States.

In the committee's report filed January 3, 1940, we recommended:

> The mandatory deportation of aliens who advocate any basic change in the form our Government.

While about 300 Communist aliens cited by our committee were finally deported, and 77 Communists cited by us were convicted under the Smith Act, this recommendation was more or less ignored.

Another cause of Communist influence in the United States was their control of some of the powerful labor unions in our country. Through these labor unions Russia was able to wield great political influence. These unions had the balance of power in some areas. In its report filed January 3, 1939, the committee found:

> The Communist Party is boring from within labor unions on a wide scale, seeking to dominate or wreck the unions for purposes that are alien to the interest of organized wage earners.

From 1940 to 1944, the Dies committee cited 11 labor unions as Communist-dominated. In 1950 these same unions were expelled from the CIO as Communist-dominated. If these unions had been expelled promptly after the Dies committee exposed them, the influence of communism in the United States upon our domestic and foreign policies would have been considerably lessened.

Another cause of Communist influence in the United States was the infiltration of educational institutions. In its report filed January 3, 1939, the Dies committee found:

> The Communist Party is unusually active in our schools, both openly and subtly insinuating its propaganda into the minds of students.

In its report filed January 3, 1941, the Dies committee recommended as follows:

> Withhold all Federal financial support from any educational institution which permits members of its faculty to advocate communism, fascism, or nazism as a substitute for our form of government to the student body of these educational institutions.

If this recommendation had been adopted promptly, the influence of communism in our country would have been greatly reduced before it was able to accomplish its purposes.

Since many Communist aliens had become naturalized after 1932, and the time had expired within which such naturalization could be revoked, the Dies committee on January 3, 1941, recommended as follows:

> We recommend that the statutory period during which citizenship papers can be revoked under existing law be extended to at least 10 years.

The most important recommendation made by the Dies committee was that Communist organizations be outlawed. In our 1941 report we said:

> As long as these organizations have a legal status in the United States it will be difficult for any agency of the Government to deal with them. * * * The committee believes that legislation can be worked out to outlaw such organizations.

If the Communist organizations had been outlawed in compliance with our recommendation made in 1941, the influence of communism in the United States would have been destroyed long before it was able to shape our foreign policy in favor of Russia and destroy by theft the tremendous advantage which exclusive possession of the A-bomb and other military and scientific secrets gave us.

Mr. Speaker, in 1940 I warned the President of the United States what would happen if he did not take prompt action. On page 363 of my book, The Trojan Horse in America, which was published in the early part of 1940 by Dodd, Mead & Co., will be found the following statement:

> The issue is before the President. He must take the initiative in performing this necessary task in the interest of adequate preparedness.
>
> The President cannot supply the leadership on which our national security rests until he inaugurates a thorough and genuine house cleaning in Government service. This is the plain truth, and to deny or avoid it may prove fatal in the end.
>
> The President must surely realize by this time that his leftwing followers in the Government are the fountainhead of subversive activities.
>
> Whether or not we can develop courageous leadership in this country remains to be seen. It depends upon an awakening of the people. The totalitarian psychology of communism and fascism has taken root in the minds of many of our people. It must be eradicated before the Nation is prepared to defend itself against the assault of totalitarianism.

Park Service Appropriations, 1945–55

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 30, 1954

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, much unwarranted criticism and erroneous information has been given the people about the appropriation for the national parks, hence I ask unanimous consent to insert the following facts and figures in the RECORD.

You will note that Congress appropriated this year more than 6½ times the amount appropriated in fiscal year 1945.

The national park request for funds for fiscal year 1955 was reduced below fiscal year 1954 a less percent than most any other agency of Government.

Park Service appropriations, 1945–55

Year	Management and protection	Maintenance and rehabilitation	Construction	General administrative expenses	Total
1945	$2,405,020	$1,679,085	------------	$729,505	$4,813,610
1946	2,767,835	1,804,105	------------	962,340	5,534,280
1947	4,863,752	5,825,078	$13,911,421	1,496,155	26,096,406
1948	4,468,405	3,464,900	1.375,000	1,338,750	10,647,055
1949	5,187,974	4,816,325	2,629,150	1,461,800	14,095,249
1950	7,437,432	7,000,000	14,595,813	1,164,190	30,197,435
1951	7,643,700	7,350,000	17,687,500	1,294,500	33,975,700
1952	8,175,000	7,448,790	11,370,000	1,254,774	28,248,564
1953	8,786,550	8,003,370	15,030,410	1,342,000	33,162,330
1954	8,869,550	8,300,000	15,416,300	1,268,000	33,853,850
1955	9,098,390	8,425,000	13,618,200	1,084,000	32,225,590

Appropriations for "Management and protection" of the national parks and monuments have been steadily increased from approximately $2,500,000 in 1945 to approximately $9 million in 1954.

Appropriations for "Maintenance and rehabilitation" of physical facilities have steadily increased from approximately $1,700,000 in 1945 to approximately $8,400,000 in 1954.

Appropriations for construction of new roads, trails, parkways, buildings and utilities varied in magnitude from $1,300,000 to $17 million between 1947 and 1954. Variations in this appropriation are caused largely by amounts provided for parkway construction outside the boundaries of the parks proper.

These figures indicate generous treatment during a period in which all possible economy has been attempted in nondefense appropriations.

The Price-Support Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. D. R. (BILLY) MATTHEWS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 30, 1954

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, along with many other members of the Congress who represent a farm area, I have insisted that the price-support program has no appreciable effect on the prices that the consumer pays at the market for the farm commodities supported. In further evidence of my position I would like to talk about some information that I read in the Washington Post and Times Herald in its issue of Friday, July 30. This very interesting report tells of the investigation of the Federal Trade Commission concerning the increase in coffee prices from 91 cents to anywhere from $1.18 to $1.32 a pound between December and April. During the same period the price of green coffee went from 58 to 96½ cents per pound. The Federal Trade Commission found out that contrary to widespread industry explanations of a shortage, last July's Brazilian frost had no significant effect upon the 1953–1954 crop. And although Brazil's 1954–1955 production will be down 8 percent, the overall world output will be slightly larger. The Commission found that five great roasters of coffee in this country grabbed up coffee so quickly after last July they translated the expectations of shorter supplies and higher prices into an immediate market shortage. The report continues, a small group of Brazilian speculators started buying up coffee-crop futures on the New York Coffee and Sugar Exchange on December 1, one day before the Brazilian Government announced a big boost in its loan to coffee farmers.

The Brazilians and two succeeding small groups bought in when coffee was 58 cents a pound and kept their corner until January 13 when the price had risen to 72½ cents. It should be emphasized here that they were quickly joined by United States speculative interests. Now the Federal Trade Commission indicated, according to this most interesting article, that there was little excuse for restaurants to raise coffee prices during the recent boost in retail wholesale prices. The FTC in its report noted that the cost of the coffee in the 5-ounce restaurant cup is only 2 cents when the coffee costs $1 a pound, and only 2.8 cents when the coffee cost $1.48 a pound. The price of coffee in restaurants should not have gone up more than 1 cent a cup at the most. However, restaurants generally raised prices from 5 cents up to 10 cents per cup, demanding a 100 percent extra profit, and a considerable number of restaurants, according to the Federal Trade Commission, increased prices from 10 cents to 15 cents, 20 cents or even 25 cents a cup. They were not content with making a 100 percent profit, but they even demanded more. Now I point out with all of the emphasis with which I am capable that this is just another indication that one reason we have high prices in the market place, and the chief reason, is because of speculative interests and the profits of the middleman, some of which are proper but some of which are exorbitant, and these high prices are not due to the support program that has meant so much to American agriculture. The Federal Trade Commission recommended that extensive hearings with United States coffee interests be held and then that corrective measures be recommended to Congress for enactment into law. Mr. Speaker, I along with other Congressmen who are interested in the desperate plight of American agriculture, have consistently maintained that we cannot expect the farmer to go it alone in an economy where so many segments are protected. As for the proof of this point of view, I want to point out another interesting article in the July 30 issue of the Washington Post and Times Herald which is headed "PUC Allows Increase in Phone Rates."

The article goes on to say that the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. yesterday was given permission by the District Public Utilities Commission to raise its rates high enough to bring in an additional $1,625,000. Under yesterday's order telephone company investors who now receive 5.3 percent on their investments will receive a return of 6.2 percent, judged fair and reasonable by the Public Utilities Commission of the District.

Every farmer in the Eighth Congressional District of Florida would whoop and holler if he could be guaranteed a 6.2 percent profit on his crops. We realize that such a guaranty on all of his crops is perhaps impractical, and yet I maintain that the support program with its fixed supports is at least a partial attempt to give the farmer the justice that he deserves in the complex economy of American society. I do not maintain that any segment of our economy should be denied fair consideration and reasonable profit, but I do maintain that the farmer must not be left by the roadside. He certainly cannot exist in our highly competitive economy unless our Government grants to him the same sense of fair play and consideration that it grants to other areas of the economy.

A Bill That Strangles United States Public Housing Plans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM J. GREEN, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 30, 1954

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, the Philadelphia Inquirer, Friday July 30, 1954, has a very fine editorial entitled "A Bill That Strangles United States Public Housing."

It is too bad that they did not point out that all the Members of Congress from Philadelphia have been strong supporters of the position advocated by the Inquirer and had worked hard and voted for the President's program of 140,000 units over 4 years with no restrictions.

The article follows:

Many cities throughout the country, including our own, have made admirable strides in slum clearance in recent years. Rundown city areas have been rehabilitated and slum residents have been given the opportunity to live decently in good public housing at moderate rentals.

These projects have been made possible mainly through Federal financial support. Unless that support is continued, the housing and slum-renovation program must be reduced disastrously.

It is for this reason that the final passage by Congress of the omnibus housing bill with its emasculated provisions for federally authorized public housing must be viewed with misgivings.

More public housing and more slum clearance are needed, not less. Yet the bill as sent to President Eisenhower by Congress authorizes no more than 35,000 dwelling units next year and confines these to families actually displaced by Federal slum-clearance projects. It has been estimated that this restriction will further reduce construction to 10,000 units all told.

President Eisenhower had called for a program of 140,000 units over 4 years, with no restrictions. The Senate approved that program, but the House refused to authorize any further public housing. In the Senate-House conference committee the 35,000-unit compromise was agreed upon.

How small a drop in the bucket of housing needs this authorization will be is evident from the fact that Philadelphia alone needs 70,000 additional public housing units as quickly as they can be built.

The bill as passed by Congress leaves Philadelphia's housing program facing strangulation. Instead of slum clearance, we have the prospect of slum expansion.

City and housing authorities must now look to the next Congress for correction of this disastrous blunder. We have no doubt that Congressmen who voted against adequate public housing will be hearing from their constituents during the coming campaign. An effort should be made to have all candidates place on record their views on this subject before the congressional election.

Actions Needed To Deal With Textile Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. DEANE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 30, 1954

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, on July 29, I presented a study appearing on page 11971 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, that I had made of trends in the textile industry. It showed the basic importance of the industry to the people of this Nation and of the textile-producing States. It traced the trends of employment in the several branches of the textile industry which appear to indicate that on the whole we cannot expect much increase in the total number of people working in textiles. Obviously, however, some of the newer branches of the industry will continue to expand, and we should expect some increase of employment in newer textile centers. This means, however, that continuous efforts must be made to preserve employment opportunities in the older textile centers. I am referring here to the older textile-manufacturing centers in the cotton-producing States, as well as to the problems which have been faced for many years by northern mill towns.

Although my study fairly bristled with figures from the census of manufactures and the annual survey of manufactures, I had to point out that there has been no complete census of manufactures of establishments since 1947. The basic law governing the operations of the Bureau of the Census calls for censuses of manufactures to be taken every 5 years. The failure to appropriate funds for the taking of a census of manufactures means, however, that we can only guess what has happened to textile employment in the various branches of the textile industry within the individual States since 1947.

Today, I want to talk more particularly about the problems of the textile industry and what can be done about them. We must have more adequate information than we have today about textiles and we shall continue to need studies of the textile industry. However, we need more action as a result of our studies than we have had in the past. Too often in the past people have started studies of the textile industry when the country was in the grip of a recession but have done nothing about it after the study was completed. During the recession of 1949, for example, the Council of Economic Advisers caused a study to be made of employment trends in New England and the Joint Committee on the Economic Report made an excellent study of textiles which it selected as one of five distressed industries to be studied at that time. I have been unable to determine, however, that any major actions resulted from these studies which could not be completed until the business recovery was well underway.

PROBLEMS OF THE TEXTILE INDUSTRY

The textile industry suffers from two chronic problems. People outside of the textile industry tend to forget this fact when business is generally booming. However, the textile industry suffers both from wide swings of production and from the failure of mills that may leave stranded communities behind them.

Make no mistake about it, there was a depression in the textile industry in the second half of 1953. We hope that this particular downswing touched bottom during the first quarter of 1954, but the textile industry has not yet recovered. The United States Bureau of Labor Statistics has indicated that there were about 39,700 less textile workers employed in the Southeastern States this year than there were a year ago. If we go back to the last extremely prosperous period that the textile industry experienced, we find that employment for the country as a whole decreased from a peak of 1,365,000 in February 1951 to 1,075,000 in April 1954. The most serious decline has been in the wool and worsted industry. In that industry the Federal Reserve Board index of production declined from 97 in the first quarter of 1951 to 59 in the first quarter of 1954. The Federal Reserve Board's indexes of production are based on average production in 1947-49. Production in the first quarter of 1954 was therefore only 59 percent as large as it had been in the 3 years 1947-49. The Federal Reserve Board index for the production of cotton and synthetic fabrics averaged 127 percent of the 1947-49 average during the first 3 months of 1951 and 99 percent in 1954. Considering the production of textile-mill products generally, the Federal Reserve Board's seasonally adjusted production index declined from 117 in the first quarter of 1951 to 90 in the first quarter of 1954, a drop of almost one-fourth.

THE NEED FOR INFORMATION ON INVENTORIES

These wide ups and downs in the production of textiles occur so frequently that business writers talk about the "2-year textile cycles." They mean that on the average a boom one year tends to be followed by a year of bad business or depression, and that this in turn is followed by another good year. The so-called textile cycle does not in fact happen quite as regularly as this, but as the workers and businessmen in every textile town know, textiles has been a feast-or-famine industry and the years of alternating good and bad business have put terrific stress on family budgets and business profits.

These cycles are usually explained as being due to changes in business inventories, inventories of clothing hanging on the racks of department stores, inventories of finished cloth in the hands of garment manufacturers and of converters, inventories of yarn and cloth in the process of being manufactured in mills and finishing plants, and inventories of raw materials. I understand that the total of all of these inventories is believed to amount normally to about a 6 months' supply of textile fabrics.

Businessmen, however, do not keep their inventories to any particular figure. When they expect prices to rise, they expand their inventories. In such periods, therefore, manufacturers have to expand production not only to supply consumers with finished garments and other textile products but also to meet the inventory requirements of other businessmen. On the other hand, when business gets bad and prices begin to fall, businessmen cancel their orders and supply part of their customers' needs from existing inventories. Thus, while normal inventories may average something like a 6 months' supply, it is believed that inventories at some times may amount to as much as 8 months' supply and may at other times be drawn down to no more than a 4 months' supply.

When inventories begin to pile up businessmen become nervous and tend to start working their inventories off. When inventories begin to reach bottom business picks up. This, of course, makes for a big swing in production.

This is the sort of thing that people are talking about when they say we have been going through an "inventory cycle" or an "inventory readjustment." Yet in spite of the importance which everyone attaches to changes in inventories as a cause of changes in employment in the textile industry, our information on inventories is shockingly inadequate. I use the term "shockingly" intentionally because some of the people who would need to report their own inventories if we were to have really good inventory information in the textile industry feel that they can make more money by speculating on the wide swings which occur in textile production.

However, in my opinion the distress caused when people are laid off in textile mills is far too great to permit this kind of situation to continue. If inventories are as important to the textile industry as its leaders say they are, the industry should start collecting complete data on inventories as a first step toward reducing the wide swings which have plagued this industry.

STRANDED COMMUNITIES AROUND CLOSED MILLS

There is no more tragic sight than a stranded industrial community. The failure of a textile mill is very likely to create such a community because textile mills are often located in what are essentially one-industry towns. It is much more serious when a large manufacturing establishment fails in a community of that sort than it is when a business fails in some large city where the workers may find employment with some other firm and where the businessmen have customers who are employed in a wide variety of industries.

The problem of stranded mill communities is in many respects a more serious problem than the problem of alternating years of high and low textile production, because when a mill closes down the effects of the closing are likely to be felt by the community for many years. However, the two problems are so closely interconnected that it may be dangerous to try to say that one is more serious than the other.

For example: One of the very real difficulties those of us who are vitally interested in the textile industry experience has been the problem of keeping attention focused for a long enough period of time on textile problems. In every period of nationwide unemployment the distressed textile communities show up as an especially serious part of the overall picture and attention is drawn to the problems of the textile industry. However, just about the time that the resulting study gets underway, the production of textiles begins to pick up. People who don't know textiles tend to forget that things need to be done about textiles. We therefore have had many studies but not enough action.

The failure of individual mills occurs for a wide variety of reasons. Feast-or-famine profits make wise financial planning difficult. Competition in the textile industry is more severe than it is in most other manufacturing industries in the United States. In some instances there has been an inbreeding of management and the second and third generations have often been less efficient managers than those who founded the business.

However, in almost any industry the essence of business survival is more or less continuous modernization of plant and equipment, adaptation of products to changing markets and the attraction of new blood to the management. The severe downswings of profits that occur so frequently in the textile industry make it most difficult for a mill that has dropped to the margin to find capital for new equipment and the meagerness of average profits in the industry has tempted people to coast along until they are really compelled to spend money.

Furthermore, the severity of competition, especially in periods of poor business, led among other things to second shift and third shift operations. The overhead cost for machinery and equipment is lower when it is used on a 3 shift basis than when it is used on a 2 shift basis. However, when the industry adds a third shift, it has about the same effect on machine capacity that would be experienced if a lot of new mills were built. It is a matter of record that the textile industry has continued to suffer from "overcapacity" in spite of the fact that many mills have been closed and that much obsolete equipment has been junked. The following table indicates, for example, that with a diminishing number of cotton spindles that the cotton mills did as many spindle hours of work in 1937 as they had done in 1923:

Year	Spindles (millions)		Spindle hours (billions)
	In place	Active	
1923	36.3	34.6	101.9
1927	34.4	32.5	102.6
1937	25.4	24.2	101.2

Source: U. S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. Wages in Cotton-Goods Manufacturing, 1939, pp. 20–26.

OLDER MILL COMMUNITIES

A great many people have assumed that the problem of stranded mill communities was peculiarly a problem of northern textiles States. This may have been true in the 1920's and the problems of survival may still be more difficult for mills in the North than for mills in the South. However, there is increasing evidence that southern mill communities are beginning to feel the full force of the swings that occur in the production of cotton and rayon goods.

The following figures from the Bureau of the Census indicate that the South now has seven-eighths of the cotton spindles in the country:

In the South:	Percent
1929	55.0
1939	73.0
1949	78.0
1953	82.8

As you know, cotton and rayon-staple fiber are both woven on cotton spindles.

Many of the older mill communities in the South where the textile industry spread out from 1870 to the turn of the century are beginning to show the effects of being "old" mill towns. They have 2- and 3-story factory buildings. Some of them have relatively poor locations for parking and road transport. Some of the mills are operated by second- and third-generation owners and plant managers.

On the other side of the picture we find many of the new mills being built in farming and timber areas, far from existing sources of labor supply. But in such areas a new plant can spread out and reserve ample space for growth. If it hauls its materials over the roads, it has more freedom of location than does a plant that is dependent upon essential rail connections.

While I think it must be realized that many of the older industrial centers in the South face a serious problem of holding their manufacturing employment, I think one can note many encouraging things. Generally speaking, there has not been a major problem with respect to differences in textile wages among the cotton-growing States. The older centers in this respect can hold their own with the newer mill communities which are developing and no State should mistakenly try to advertise that it has lower wages than neighboring States. Industries that are attracted by small wage differentials are very likely to prove fly-by-night affairs.

In this connection, I noticed a report the other day in a North Carolina paper which said that North Carolina has lower wages in manufacturing industries than any other State in the Nation. The full story was not published and I therefore have not had an opportunity to check all of the facts behind this statement. However, I think the article may have given the impression that, industry by industry, wages are lower in North Carolina than they are in other States. I think this is not true. I imagine there is very little difference between wages paid in a cotton-cloth mill in North Carolina and one in South Carolina, and similarly that there is comparatively little difference between wages in the spinning room of a cloth mill and wages in the yarn industry. However, weavers have always been paid more than spinners in the cotton industry. For this reason alone, since there are no weavers in a yarn mill, the yarn branch of the industry will average lower weekly earnings than cloth mills. And, since North Carolina has proportionately more yarn mills than South Carolina, average weekly earnings in North Carolina for all workers in the cotton textile industry would be lower than wages in South Carolina, even if every weaver and every spinner got the same wages in both States. Actually, in May 1954, average hourly earnings in all manufacturing industries, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, were the same in North and South Carolina and Georgia.

One of the most hopeful changes that has come to the textile industry is that we appear to have increased three-shift operation so much that we may not be able to go much farther in this direction. For example, if a mill operated three 40-hour shifts for 50 weeks, it might average 6,000 spindle-hours a year. As is indicated by the following figures from the Bureau of the Census, we are now approaching this kind of a situation:

	Hours per active spindle
1929	3,285
1937	3,962
1948	5,424
1953	5,904

Thus, while the removal of spindles from New England during the twenties gave no immediate relief from excess capacity in the industry, because of increased two-shift operation of equipment in other parts of the country, we may now have reached the point where the scrapping of antiquated equipment will rather quickly restore a balanced capacity for the industry.

WHAT CAN BE DONE?

The older manufacturing centers of a textile State have certain advantages as well as certain disadvantages in comparison with new areas in the same State. A plant moving into a new area has an opportunity to spread out on relatively cheap land. On the other hand it is likely to have to pull together a labor force from distant towns, and may even have to pay more than average wages in order to attract an adequate labor force. Actually, many of the older mill centers in the South have enough nearby vacant land to permit a firm to build a new mill on its outskirts rather than to move to a location 40 or 50 miles away.

However, if the older industrial centers are going to retain their manufacturing employment in any part of the United States, they will have to keep on their toes. This places a responsibility on the local community and local businessmen and also upon the States. Many such towns throughout the United States are setting up communitywide committees to bring in new industries. However, in some parts of the country such efforts are resisted by industries which are already established because they fear that a new industry may bid up the price of labor.

The essential function of the local community is to analyze its real advantages. The location of new plants is now studied sufficiently carefully so that attracting a new industry involves much more than just talking up the town. People will want to know, among other things, where land for factories will be available, how much it will cost, what kind of water supply and transportation facilities are available, and how adequate the labor supply may be.

I suspect that one of the difficulties of some of the older industrial centers is that they have not studied carefully enough what real advantages they may have to offer. In this business of analyzing local community advantages it is also necessary to insure aggressive leadership from those State agencies that are engaged in fostering industrial development. A State that does not offer such leadership to its communities would soon find that it was losing out to other States that pursued new industries more energetically.

The Federal Government can do something to help development efforts of this sort, but by and large the promotion of industrial development is a local and State responsibility. Unless such work is pushed vigorously at the local level it will not be done.

The need for new industry was developed a few days ago by Dr. S. H. Hobbs, Jr., of the University of North Carolina, addressing North Carolina editorial writers at their fifth annual conference at Chapel Hill, N. C. One of the two major themes of the conference was a discussion of ways and means of lifting North Carolina from its status as the 45th State in per capita income. Dr. Hobbs emphasized the importance of preserving the income the State now has and of developing new sources of wealth.

However, in tackling the problems of the textile industry, primary responsibility rests upon the industry, the management of the individual textile-mill companies, and the workers in the industry. I have already pointed out the importance of having the industry as a whole assume responsibility for the collection of adequate statistical information on inventories, for example. Under the conditions of competition which prevail in the textile industry, workers must be prepared to see that labor costs in their plant are kept fully competitive. This does not mean that they should work for low wages, but it does mean that they must cooperate with management in the development of efficient production. On a whole, the record of the textile workers in this respect is one of which they may rightfully be proud. American labor has been far more progressive than certain other countries, but there is always some question in the older manufacturing centers about keeping working rules and practices flexible enough so that they will adapt to newer methods of production, while caring for the workers' legitimate desire to be protected against undue speedup.

The major responsibility, however, for the maintenance of efficiency rests on individual company and plant managers. Only through the efforts of management can the individual enterprise be kept abreast of the times and only through efforts to keep abreast of the times can it hope to survive.

In this connection the problem of giant corporations raises certain new problems. The textile industry used to be one that consisted for the most part of locally owned companies operating 1 or 2 mills. During the past 20 years there has been a continued tendency toward concentration and we have even seen instances recently in which one corporation acquired another which already operated 5 or 6 mills.

Large and small mill companies each have their own advantages. The large company, for example, has an opportunity to do pioneer research work in the development of new combinations of fiber that may definitely enlarge the total market for textiles. Efforts of this sort by American companies were recently described to the International Congress of Man-Made Textiles which was held in Paris, and the account has been published in North Carolina.

On the other hand, the smaller mill companies may have the opportunity to attain a degree of efficiency in their owner-operated plants that can never be attained by a giant corporation which operates through hired managers. Bureaucy is a dangerous disease in big business just as it may be in Government. The small company may have precisely the same sort of advantages that one finds in the Government of a town or city run by a locally alert mayor and city council.

It is important to discover what advantages the one-mill company may have. It is possible that one of the disadvantages of small companies is that they cannot individually afford the kinds of engineering or marketing surveys which might enable them to determine just what their advantages are and how they can compete more efficiently.

I think that all of us are very much concerned after our recent experience of depression in the textile industry with the question of what the influence of the very large corporation may be on textile communities. Will the large corporation assume the same sort of responsibility for the well-being of the community in which it is operating as did the old one-mill company? There have been some unfortunate instances of companies in industries related to the textile industry which have scrapped their obsolete plants and moved to a totally new community, leaving many of their workers stranded. It is hard to see any reason why a textile company should follow a policy of "mining out" an old plant and then moving to a new mill location. But, it requires a greater sense of responsibility to keep a plant alive decade after decade than it does once in a long while to draw up a plan for a brand new mill in a brand new area. There are also serious questions that need to be asked about the relationship between the development of giant companies and the continuation of the old textile cycle with its wide swings of production. I have had a sense that the problems of the textile industry have been accentuated when giant textile companies have gotten into trouble. When one such company is forced to sell its inventories almost regardless of price, it may break the entire market.

I do not doubt that large companies in the textile industry are here to stay. Textiles are becoming big business but with their bigness goes greater responsibility, and one of the first responsibilities is to take all possible measures to avoid wide up and down changes in textile production and employment.

You will note that I have talked comparatively little about things that the Federal Government should do. Primarily the problems of the textile industry are the responsibility of the textile companies, the textile workers and the textile communities. They can and must cooperate with each other. They can be assisted by State and Federal governments.

I have thought myself that one of the major forms of assistance that the Federal Government has given to the textile industry has been through the establishment of minimum wages which prevent cutthroat competition at the expense of labor and through the development of unemployment compensation. There should certainly be further study to determine whether our present unemployment-compensation system is adequate to meet conditions which are created when a business fails in a one-industry town. It may be that in situations of that sort provisions should be made for an extension of benefit periods and for various devices to assist in the retraining and relocation of workers.

There is surely room for a study of the competitive effect which experience rating has had on tax rates for unemployment compensation. The philosophy of experience rating does not appear to be particularly well related to the needs of the textile industry, because the textile cycle is something which cannot be controlled by the individual manufacturer. If the marginal textile mill has to pay the highest tax for unemployment compensation it will become just that much harder to keep such a company afloat.

I am also concerned that textile-mill communities in North Carolina and other States which are suffering from high unemployment rates shall continue to receive special consideration in the awarding of Federal contracts. I think there has perhaps been too much of a tendency to think that only New England textile communities require such consideration but the Federal Government should be concerned about textile communities wherever there is unemployment.

Farm Price Supports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 28, 1954

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I noted an article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, July 23, by Congressman BLATNIK, of Minnesota, entitled "Congress Should Act Now To Halt Farm Recession."

It is true that we had a recession in agriculture, but this occurred during the last 2 years of the Truman administration. The record shows that in 1952 our country had one of the most wide-open farm-price breaks in all history. Official figures reveal that parity ratio stood at 113 during February of 1951. By the time the Eisenhower administration took office on January 20, 1953, it had dropped to 94—a decline of 19 points in 23 months under the Fair Deal. One of their major mistakes was to continue high-support prices without some controls. This started the accumulation of large surpluses.

Farmers and the Nation are entitled to a more commonsense price-support program. The House of Representatives has already acted to improve the laws that will permit and encourage more profitable and sound farming.

The farm program proposals made by this administration are part of our effort to help agriculture market its production, not stock it away in warehouses at a cost of $5 million per week for storage alone.

The removal of artificial price barriers would encourage the movement of crops to market, at home and abroad. Over a period of years the results would be higher and more stable income for agriculture, larger and more permanent markets, and more efficient and balanced farming.

Flexible price supports would enable us to recapture some of the markets which we have lost to synthetic and substitutes, both at home and abroad. They would also permit us to compete with other exporting nations, particularly in the world wheat and cotton markets.

AGRICULTURE ACCOMPLISHMENTS

The following résumé of accomplishments clearly indicates that the Republican administration not only has kept its campaign pledges but also will never let the American farmer down:

First. President Eisenhower issued an order removing price controls from all meat products.

Second. Department of Agriculture launched a program of advertising and special inducement to increase beef consumption. Result, one-third increase in beef consumption last year.

Third. Administration is breaking all records in providing farmers with grain storage. We will have enough grain bins to store 1,123,000,000 bushels.

Fourth. Administration returned the Farm Credit System to the farmers.

Fifth. Last year's serious drought was met with prompt action. Action has been taken to meet this year's growing drought.

Sixth. Administration is getting action on an expanded soil conservation and watershed program.

Seventh. Congress increased CCC borrowing authority.

Eighth. The administration has sent several trade missions to foreign countries to investigate possibilities of expanding our foreign markets. Since their return our exports have increased.

Ninth. The Department of Agriculture has furnished institutions, welfare, Indians, and school-lunch programs with 267,800,000 pounds of food.

Tenth. They have also assisted the starving peoples abroad through 17 United States private welfare organizations in 36 friendly countries.

Eleventh. The importation of New Zealand beef into United States markets through Canada was stopped.

Twelfth. Secretary Benson recommended that imports of oats be restricted.

Thirteenth. President Eisenhower ordered that military procurement of beef be stepped up.

Fourteenth. Cotton exports have increased and are expected to increase more next year.

Fifteenth. A new International Wheat Agreement was entered into to dispose of surplus wheat.

Sixteenth. Department of Agriculture is helping the dairy industry promote a successful campaign to push the consumption of dairy products.

Seventeenth. Department of Agriculture has streamlined the soil conservation setup to improve the service and create greater efficiency. The farmer will now receive a larger proportion of each conservation dollar.

Need for Industrial Dispersal in the Age of the H-Bomb

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 30, 1954

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I send to the desk the text of a brief statement which I have prepared on the need for industrial dispersal in the atomic-hydrogen age.

I ask unanimous consent that its text be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

Last month I was pleased to note the holding here in Washington, under the auspices of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, of a conference on industrial defense in the atomic age.

For the first time, high-level officials of the Nation's industry were brought together to learn the hard facts about the vulnerability of their own plants in this dangerous age.

Since the holding of the conference, there have been additional news reports which further underline the gravity of American defense problems.

Reports have it that the Soviet Union has been making alarming progress in the development of an intercontinental ballistics missile (IBM).

According to some experts, within 5 or 6 years or less, the Soviet Union will have the capability of firing from deep within the Soviet heartland a shower of guided missiles—with A-bomb and H-bomb warheads—aimed at the heartland of the United States.

This ghastly prospect is one to give every thinking American deep cause for reflection.

To date, there is no known defense whatsoever against the prospect of intercontinental missiles.

The possibility of such missiles causes us to reevaluate all of our defense plans, not only with respect to American factories, but with respect to American strategic bases at home and abroad.

Under these circumstances, it is more than ever important that at the very minimum there be adequate dispersal of United States industry.

When missiles start falling on our country, there will be no time to try to disperse our factories. Either the factories are dispersed at that very moment, or they will go up in smoke in the conflagration of our major cities.

Even if we were to exclude for the moment thought of the future danger of the missiles as such, we would still be faced right now with the increasing Red air armada—the TU-37 and the TU-39 bombers, capable of raining destruction down upon our country, including our overcentralized factories.

Yet, industry provides the very backbone of American military strategy. If American industry is wiped out, if the skilled workers who man it are wiped out, we cease to be a first-rate power; we cease to be a power capable of surviving in the atomic age.

I believe, therefore, that the chamber of commerce is to be congratulated for the holding of this conference.

I am glad that Director Arthur Flemming, of the Office of Defense Mobilization, held out to the conference the possibility of tax amortization benefits being granted to companies which removed their plants from H-bomb target areas.

Obviously, unless some break is provided under the Nation's tax laws, we could not possibly expect even a modest proportion of United States companies to start thinking in terms of relocation. Dispersal involves a tremendous investment of money, a tremendous amount of time, a tremendous number of man-hours. Providing a break under the tax laws is one of the means available to us to start this long, difficult, and complicated process.

The time is long overdue for us to use tax incentives in this manner.

I conclude with this thought: By preparing for the worst, we will help assure the best.

By preparing America for the worst possible contingency, we will help guarantee that this contingency will never come to pass.

But by closing our eyes, by sitting back in smug complacency, we will make more likely the dread contingencies of the future.

The time to act is now. The time to begin dispersing is now, in a calm, careful manner. The time to start thinking in terms of all the actions that would have to be taken in the event of an enemy attack on our country is now.

We must think for example in terms of modern telecommunications systems to knit together—with lightening speed—our defense and industrial forces. We must think in terms of safeguarding the lives of our civilian population. We must think in terms of protecting the skilled workers of our industries.

The Federal Civil Defense Administration can't begin to do this job alone. It is up to every single American to think in terms of the role he personally would play, assuming the worst came to the worst. Only by every single American pitching in can we possibly meet this awesome problem.

I append now the text of the letter which President Eisenhower sent to Mr. Clem Johnston, president of the chamber of commerce, commending the defense conference, as well as the text of a writeup describing the conference as contained in the June 18, 1954, issue of Washington Report, published by the chamber of commerce.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, June 14, 1954.

Mr. CLEMENT D. JOHNSTON,
President, Chamber of Commerce of the United States, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. JOHNSTON: The Chamber of Commerce of the United States is performing a national service in sponsoring a businessmen's Conference on Industrial Defense in the Atomic Age.

These are days of unique peril to civilian poulations, to the security of our cities, our industries, and their peoples. This is, therefore, a subject of grave importance to all of us which you, your colleagues, and your guests will discuss during this conference in Washington. I know that you will gain much from this interchange of ideas, and that the Nation itself will be strengthened by your deliberations.

The decisions this problem requires are difficult and involve inconvenience and expense. But the program for industrial defense to be proposed to you may constitute the most valuable investment you can make toward assuring our survival as a free Nation.

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

FEDERAL TAX INCENTIVES PROPOSED TO SPUR INDUSTRY H-BOMB DEFENSE—FLEMMING URGES PLANTS MOVED FROM TARGET AREAS

Tax amortization benefits for companies which remove their plants from H-Bomb target areas were held out this week by a key Government official as a possibility to accelerate American industry toward more realistic defense programs.

Two hundred and fifty business and industry executives heard Director Arthur Flemming, of the Office of Defense Mobilization, cite such a plan in an address before the national chamber's conference of industrial defense in the atomic age.

The 1-day Washington, D. C., conference brought together for the first time high level officials of the Nation's industry to learn cold, serious facts from Government and business experts in defense needs and plans.

JOHNSTON OPENS EVENT

"Industrial defense," said National Chamber President Clem D. Johnston opening the conference, "is primarily industry's responsibility." The chamber, he added, felt the obligation to see that every American businessman understands the problems of industrial defense and gets the best available advice toward solutions.

Besides Mr. Flemming, other speakers were Federal Civil Defense Administrator Val Peterson, Donald A. Quarles, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Research and Development; Gen. W. S. Paul, Assistant Director of Non-Military Defense, Office of Defense Mobilization; Administrator Charles F. Honeywell of the Business and Defense Administration, and John Redmond, assistant production manager of the Koppers Co., who has made strides in its own plant defense programing.

TAX BENEFITS IDEA

Mr. Flemming noted that while tax amortization benefits have been granted for the construction of new plants which comply with dispersal standards, none has been offered companies which want to transfer from target areas existing plants making products important to defense.

"If the owners of such plants want to remove them to outlying areas," the ODM Director said, "we'll be glad to talk with them about the possibility of tax amortization certificates."

Emphasizing the importance of maintaining our mobilization base to assure instant action in event of war, Mr. Flemming also warned that the Nation could not rely upon current production alone, citing the decrease in defense output after the end of the Korean conflict.

He called for the storage of machine tools and the preservation of a hard core of technical and management personnel to keep them up to date and in plentiful supply.

Civil Defense Administrator Peterson said American industry has shown itself to be a dominant factor in winning a long war, but "it would not be too difficult to lose a short war" in this air-atomic age.

"To lose a short war, you lose enough productive people and plants—quickly enough—to demoralize the rest of the nation's defense production and destroy the nation's will to resist," Mr. Peterson declared.

Machinery can be repaired and plants rebuilt in a comparatively short time, but, the speaker said, "It may take 10 years to train a skilled industrial worker, and when you lose him—and enough like him—you have lost a war."

It is not enough to brace an employee's morale by making his factory job secure; more must be done, Mr. Peterson continued. "You've got to help him protect his wife and his children, and all the other things he works for," he added. "He's got to have evidence he can come back fighting with you, and win, in the face of any attack."

Mr. Quarles, the opening speaker, said Soviet Russia's capability to deliver an attack upon America had increased since they acquired a new jet heavy bomber.

"There is no absolute air defense system in the international chess game of technological move and countermove," the Defense Department official commented, adding:

"Our primary dependence will be on offensive power to destroy the power of the enemy, his industry and his forces in being. As a counterpart to this offensive strength we must continue to make every reasonable effort to achieve a sound air defense. * * *"

The awesomeness of the hydrogen bomb was brought home to the conference with the showing of the 1952 test explosion technicolor film, Operation Ivy.

At the afternoon session, Mr. Honeywell said his agency acknowledged that the greater part of the job of industrial defense must be done by owners and managers, and that while there must be State and national coordination, "we have an idea that a thousand good company plans are to be preferred to a single master plan superimposed by governmental authority.

"BDSA would like to see," he emphasized, "every important defense company, on a voluntary basis, prepare an overall company plan for the protection of its facilities, the continuity of its management and the continuity of its operations. Such a document would be reassuring to the employees, the stockholders, the customers and the Government."

The best defense against nuclear attack is dispersion, General Paul stated.

"We must place our new industries, our new urban growth outside of the present congested areas," he declared. "By this we do not mean we should uproot our established factories and move them out in the desert. We do recommend that new industries locate at least 10 miles from the boundary of a target zone, to obtain relative safety and still meet economic requirements."

Mr. Redmond told the conference that "effective security is a companywide job. Every employee has an interest in it because his life is at stake in the event of a catastrophe or enemy attack."

Koppers, in preparing its defense security plan, Mr. Redmond added, aimed for these objectives:

1. To safeguard facilities from enemy attack, espionage, and sabotage; 2, to insure uninterrupted operation of designated facilities vital to operations; 3, to establish physical security standards to meet security requirements of the Government for defense contracts; 4, to establish physical security standards providing adequate defense protection meeting local consideration and peculiar individual facility hazards.

Farm Conditions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN D. JOHNSTON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 29, 1954

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very timely address on the farm situation, delivered by Neville Bennett, of Clio, S. C., at the REA electrical fair, Barnwell, S. C., on July 20, 1954, while the subject was under discussion in the Senate. I have been advised by the Government Printing Office that the article slightly exceeds the two printed pages allowed under the rule, and that the cost of printing it in the RECORD is $226.70.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY NEVILLE BENNETT, OF CLIO, S. C.

Mr. Chairman and fellow South Carolinians, Senator Brown was very kind in his introduction. He has always been such a strength in the Democratic Party, both State and national, that I appreciate it all the more.

He referred to what was said to him about rural power lines by Franklin D. Roosevelt while Governor of New York. I think you should know what the present Governor of New York said about REA not long ago. He referred to REA communities as "those communities which bow the knee to the Moscow concept." If he were here, he probably would address you as "comrades" or "fellow travelers."

As much as I appreciate personally the invitation to speak to you today, as well as the kind welcome and hospitality shown me, I am also well aware that I was invited and am here to speak to you as chairman of the Democratic Party of South Carolina. I regard the holding of this position the highest honor with which I have ever been entrusted. In the light of the history of the past few years, it carries with it a great responsibility, the responsibility of assisting in the healing of old sores, and the uniting of old friends again under the banner of the great party historically and traditionally so dear to South Carolina.

In the election of 1952, the position of those of us who supported the Democratic ticket was well known, and the reasons for it were equally well known. But a very great many people in South Carolina, and a tremendous majority of the people of the United States held contrary views, arrived at for reasons which, at the time seemed sufficient to them. Let us credit all with honest and patriotic motives.

With those who felt conscientiously compelled not to support the Democratic ticket, we had no quarrel then, nor do we have one now. It is the essence of democracy that one may vote as he pleases and actively support the candidate of his choice. Insofar as the leadership of the Democratic Party of South Carolina is concerned, since that election, not one word of public condemnation or abuse has ever been uttered. The proof of the pudding is in the eating; if the fathers eat sour grapes, the children's teeth are set on edge.

My topic today is Quo Vadis. No doubt many of you saw that great picture, or read the even greater book by that name. Quo vadis is a Latin phrase meaning "Whither goest thou?" In modern day words, "Where are we headed?"

Here today, in this great REA meeting, surrounded by material evidences of the kind of life farm people have a right to enjoy, celebrating in a way, one of the greatest accomplishments of the Democratic Party, that of bringing the blessings of electricity to the farm home, here in this great gathering of rural South Carolinians, the most American part of America, let us ask and answer this question quo vadis? Where are we headed?

Nearly 2 years have passed since the great crusade rolled down Pennsylvania Avenue in shiny black Cadillacs and the great change in Washington was started with the famous words uttered by a member of the millionaire cabinet, "What is good for General Motors is good for the country."

At that time the REA cooperatives had every reason for confidence that the rural electrification program, begun when only 10 percent of the farms had electricity, and carried forward under Democratic administrations until only 10 percent did not have electricity, would be supported adequately until not only electricity but telephones would reach into every farm home.

Although Abraham Lincoln, first Republican President, had said: "We must not promise what we ought not, lest we be called on to perform what we cannot," he had also said: "The legitimate object of government is to do for a community of people whatever they need to have done, but cannot do at all, or cannot so well do for themselves, in their separate and individual capacities."

Certainly rural electrification and rural telephones, judged on the basis of economics and history, unquestionably fell under Lincoln's definition.

The rural electrification program was twofold: First, to furnish electricity to the farms; and second, to furnish it at a cheap rate. REA had been talking about an ultimate goal of 1-cent electricity, which, though far below the average national rate of 4 cents, had nevertheless been attained in 34 electric systems in Canada and on some 15 systems in the United States.

Outstanding in the United States was the great TVA system, which provided cheap power abundantly, transforming not only the farm life but the industrial life of a great region. Of the TVA the President had said in 1952 while campaigning at Memphis, Tenn., in the TVA country: "TVA has served the rural areas well and has created many industries in this section. It has helped to conserve national resources, control floods, and promote national defense."

The REA is under the Agriculture Department. When Mr. Ezra Taft Benson was being examined by the Senate Agriculture Committee on January 15, 1953, on his anticipated nomination and confirmation as Secretary of Agriculture, the following questions and answers occurred:

Question: "Are you familiar with the rural electrification program?"

Answer by Mr. Benson: "Yes; somewhat."

Question: "Are you in sympathy with it?"

Answer by Mr. Benson: "Yes. I have been in sympathy with it through the years."

Question: "Are you familiar with the rural telephone program that has just gotten well under way?"

Answer by Mr. Benson: "Not as familiar as I am with the other phase of the REA. But I am somewhat familiar with it."

Question: "Are you in sympathy with that?"

Answer by Mr. Benson: "I remember when the telephone first came into my home. It was a cooperative project which the farmers provided themselves. That was a happy day in our home."

This was very reassuring, and was entirely in line with the statement made by the President while campaigning at Kesson, Minn., on September 9, 1952, to a vast crowd of farmers gathered at the national plowing contest: "We must be always concerned with developing rural electrification and telephone service."

Not so reassuring was the comment of Senator WAYNE MORSE, Republican-Independent, of Oregon, with reference to Gov. Douglas McKay, of Oregon, Secretary of the Interior, next to agriculture in special importance to REA. Senator MORSE said he would be "very good for the reactionary forces that are out to plunder the people. McKay is a well-recognized stooge of the tideland thieves, the private utility gang, and the selfish interests which place materialistic values above human values."

In March the true intentions of the adminstration with regard to REA began to emerge.

The first step was the summary firing of Claude Wickard, farmer from Indiana, former Secretary of Agriculture, from his position as REA Administrator, although his term of office still had 2½ years to run. His chief fault was that he favored loans to electric cooperatives at reasonable rates of interest for the construction of transmission and distribution lines.

The next step was the President's budget for 1954. Under this budget the authorization of loans to cooperatives was reduced from $165 million to $120 million, nearly a 25-percent cut. This could not be justified on the grounds of saving money or reducing taxes, for these amounts were for loans, not appropriations.

In addition to that the administration rammed through Congress a provision in the appropriation for the Interior Department in effect voiding written contracts with REA cooperatives in Oklahoma, Missouri, and Arkansas. It was made impossible for the Southwestern Power Authority to continue delivering wholesale power to cooperatives serving 250,000 farmers in Oklahoma, Missouri, and Arkansas, although the contracts had been twice upheld by the courts. All new facilities to directly serve REA cooperatives in the Southwest were killed, at the administration's request.

Among those appearing in favor of Secretary Benson's budget was Mr. Allan B. Kline, president of the American Farm Bureau. On April 27, he stated to the Senate committee: "The American Farm Bureau Federation board of directors came to the conclusion that the approach to the problem made in the revised recommendations of Secretary Benson met with the general policy of the American Farm Bureau Federation and should receive its support. (It) recommends to the committee that the overall objectives contained in the revised Benson budget be affirmed in reporting the agriculture appropriation bill."

Although Mr. Kline's views on agricultural matters have long reflected the views of the Wall Street Journal, the National Association of Manufacturers, and the United States Chamber of Commerce, many farmers still could not bring themselves to believe that he would so brazenly and callously turn his back on the million and a half farm families, who support his organization, pay his salary of $25,000 per year, and had trusted his board of directors to represent faithfully and sympathetically their interest. In my opinion, Mr. Kline, although President of the American Farm Bureau Federation, does not represent the views of Farm Bureau officers and members in this State, and is no longer entitled to be heard as presenting the views of the majority of farmers of the United States.

Well might we say, as the bleeding and dying Caesar said to his friend Brutus: "Et tu, Brute. And Thou, too, Brutus."

Thanks to the Democrats in Congress, and despite the recommendations of the President, Secretary Benson, Mr. Kline and his well-tamed Board of Directors, the bill as finally passed provided REA loans of $180 million instead of $120 million; REA Telephone loans $67,500,000 instead of $50 million.

But, the President and his administration have had the last say after all. The administration ordered the REA Administrator to lend no more to REA Cooperatives than the President had requested in his budget in the first place, leaving $45 million unused, despite the fact that the administration had on file $175 million in applications from cooperatives that had not even been acted on. The clear intent of Congress was defied, the provisions of the law disregarded, farm people left without electricity. And, for the 1955 fiscal year the President's budget has recommended that REA loans be reduced $100 million below the authorization for the 1954 fiscal year.

It is safe to say that during 1953 and 1954 the administration has made every effort to harass, impede, and discredit every phase of the REA program. Throughout this entire country policies have been conceived and executed that can have ultimately but one effect, the weakening of the financial structure of REA cooperatives, the deterioration of the quality of their service, the final liquidation of their affairs, and the sale of their properties to the power companies, doubtless, if under this administration, at a giveaway price.

Well may we ask, "Where are we headed?"

Unfortunately for the farmer, the promises made during the campaign with regard to all other phases of the farm program have been broken; and we have seen the outrageous spectacle of the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Benson, who is charged by law with the duty of administering the program, of assisting the farmer in his difficulties, and of speaking for agriculture, going about this country criticizing the work of his own Department, exhibiting a distorted and untrue picture of the farm program, and both personally and through the facilities of his office stirring up consumer opposition to the very programs he is supposed to sympathetically administer.

If Secretary Benson had spent half the effort defending the farm program that he has spent in organizing and directing the opposition to it, the welfare of the farm people of America would not be in jeopardy.

For years the Republicans complained about the Government lobby and a critical press held up its hands in holy horror, even when Secretary Brannan mildly made suggestions to Congress. And in the case of the famous family farm policy review, both Republicans and the American Farm Bureau Federation lambasted it as subversive and dangerous, though it was only an expression from local people, some of whom may have been connected with the Department.

But here we have a lobby such as has never been seen before in Congress, operated by the Secretary himself, with its messenger boys and buttonholers slipping about on the floor of the House of Representatives itself, until the Members of Congress itself protested and demanded that they be spared this kind of behavior. Oh, consistency, thou art a jewel.

Many farmers expected fair treatment from this administration.

The 1952 Republican Party platform stated: "We favor a farm program aimed at full parity prices for all farm products in the market place."

During his campaign the President made the following definite statements:

On September 6, 1952, at Kasson, Minn:: "I firmly believe that agriculture is entitled to a fair, full share of the national income. A fair share is not merely 90 percent of parity, but full parity."

On September 30, 1952, at Columbia, S. C.: "I believe wholeheartedly and without any 'ifs' or 'buts' in Federal programs to stabilize farm prices, including the present program insuring 90 percent of parity on all basic commodities."

On October 3, 1952, at Brookings, S. Dak.: "The Republican Party is pledged to the sustaining of the 90-percent parity price support, and it is pledged even more than that to helping the farmer obtain his full parity, 100-percent parity, with the guaranty in the price supports of 90."

How much plainer can language be? Certainly the newspapers printed them and the public read them. Certainly lesser campaign orators went out enthusiastically and repeated what he had said.

And yet, on July 1 of this year, Mr. Halleck, Congressman from Indiana, Republican floor leader, contended on the floor of Congress, that those words I have just quoted meant flexible supports.

No wonder Congressman Abernethy, of Mississippi, jumped up and replied: "The people of this country understood full well that he was for supports at 90 percent of parity, and 100 percent if he could get it. That is the impression that those headlines and those speeches left. How could they have been otherwise understood?

"Now, he made a 90-percent-of-parity speech at Columbia, S. C.; he made another in Brookings, S. Dak.; he made another in Omaha, Nebr.; and he made one in Memphis, Tenn.; and he never once mentioned the words 'flexible price supports' in those speeches when as a candidate he was appealing for votes.

"The first time we ever heard of him being for flexible supports was when he dragged this fellow Benson from out of the air, whom no one had hardly heard of, and made him Secretary of Agriculture. Then, and only then, he came up with this idea of flexing and fleecing the American farmer. It is his plan, Benson's plan. He has made him repudiate his promises."

But Mr. Benson did not do it alone. During the past winter, in Atlanta, Ga., I was amazed to hear the secretary of the American Farm Bureau say: "We studied his campaign speeches. We interpreted them as endorsing flexible supports. We felt that he interpreted them as endorsing flexible supports. And as long as he understood himself to mean that, and the officers and staff of the American Farm Bureau understood him to mean that, after all what did it matter what the voters interpreted his words to mean?"

As we meet here this afternoon the battle over the program goes on in Congress. On one side are arrayed the forces of Benson, the President, the American Farm Bureau Federation, the processors, and middlemen, seeking to drive farm prices down. On the other side is arrayed both Senators Maybank and Johnston and all our South Carolina Congressmen, the Agriculture Committee of the House, both Republicans and Democrats, a majority of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and Senators and Congressmen from all sections of the country, striving to prevent a calamity on the farms that will surely engulf our whole country, as it did in 1932.

It now looks like the enemies of the farmer will prevail. But regardless of the outcome, we can all appreciate the gallant fight that the Senators and Congressmen from South Carolina are making; and hope that the congressional elections this November will restore Democratic control of both Houses of Congress.

On page 9 of the Joint Economic Report, prepared by a joint committee of both Houses of Congress appears these words of warning: "Whatever the merits of flexible supports and modern parity may or may not be as a long-run program, it is questionable whether their contribution at this time will act to sustain farm income in the months immediately ahead when the threat to our economic stability is so generally recognized."

In order to win the battle, Secretary Benson has sought to array farmer against farmer and commodity against commodity. He has contended in the North and Midwest that most of the benefits of the price-support program went to the farmers of the South; while, only recently one of his top aids told North Carolina farmers that the dairy-support program benefited only the farmers of the North.

He has sought to array the city consumer against the farmer producer. He has repeatedly told city audiences that the 90-percent program had cost billions of dollars, when the truth is, as shown by Congressman Cooley, of North Carolina, that commodity-credit loans on basic crops have cost but $21 million in 21 years. He has gone on the radio and television to tell the city housewife that high support prices are responsible for the high prices paid by the consumer, when he knew this to be false, and testified to the contrary before the House Agriculture Committee.

He knew that when he cut the price of milk to the dairymen 45 cents per hundredweight and cost the dairy farmers $400 million, the price of milk to the housewife did not decline but the share of the middlemen went up 28 cents per hundredweight. He knew that in 1947, when the wheat farmer was getting 2.9 cents for the wheat in a loaf of bread, the loaf of bread was selling for 13 cents; but that in 1953, when the farmer was getting only 2.5 cents for the wheat in a loaf of bread, that same loaf had gone up to 16.4 cents. He knew that the average cotton shirt selling for $3.64 contains only 35 cents worth of cotton, and that there would be little advantage, if any, to the consumer if the cotton farmer gave the cotton to go into the shirt.

He has proclaimed that the average farmer is getting rich, and so he is striving with the religious zeal of the fanatic to carry out his plan of reducing the price of wheat from $2.20 to $1.55; to reduce the price of cotton from 31¼ to 25¼ cents per pound; to reduce the price of corn from $1.62 to $1.21 per bushel.

He knows, for the statistics of his own Agriculture Department show, that the net income of all farmers fell from $17 billion in 1947 to $12.8 billion in 1953, a 25-percent decline, and that it declined 9 percent during his first year in office, and that it went down another 4 percent during the month of June 1954, according to the Congressional Record. He knows also that in the year 1953 the per-capita income of nonfarm population increased from $1,482 to $1,898, while the per-capita income of farmers fell from $905 to $882. He knew that in 5 years farm mortgages have risen from $4.7 billion to $7.6 billion, and the short-term farm debt has risen from $2.9 billion to $7.2 billion.

He has set up advisory boards containing some few very large farmers to make recommendations, and has turned down even their recommendations; he has disregarded the written opinion of his own solicitor general as to his powers under the law, in order to carry out his own ideas; he has fired every single top level employee in his office who favored a support program, even getting rid of Louis Bean, famous statistician and creator of the parity formula, who was under Civil Service and who had served over 30 years under 4 Republican and 4 Democratic Secretaries of Agriculture.

He has violated the campaign promise of the President to bring dirt farmers themselves into the policy-making bodies, but has filled the important positions with businessmen, especially middlemen, hostile to the support program farmers want. As Assistant Secretary of Agriculture he has installed former Congressman Risley, who while in Congress had a voting record of solid opposition to farm programs, and who voted against REA 9 times out of 13. To head up the price-support program he has installed J. A. McConnel, who in a speech just before he was appointed called price-support programs, such as cotton and tobacco programs, a socialistic conspiracy. As assistant to McConnel, he has installed Walter C. Berger, former president of the American Feed Manufacturers Association and former owner and manager of the Des Moines Oats Product Co.; as personnel director of the entire Department of Agriculture he has installed Mr. MacHenry G. Shafer, whom he got from the Northern Trust Co.; and to dispose of surplus commodities, he has chosen Mr. N. R. Clark, who had been vice president of Swift and Co. Only this past month the Department sold 400,000,000 pounds of dried milk to feed manufacturers at 3½ cents per pound, one-fifth its market cost.

No wonder Business Week, which certainly could not be accused of being prejudiced against the Secretary, said: "There's no doubt that Benson's top staffers are probably more properly classified as businessmen than as farmers."

Mr. Benson's ideas on supporting and stabilizing prices is demonstrated in his actions and reassurances to beef cattle producers. When he assumed office in January, cattle were selling at an average price of $19.70 or 92 percent of parity; by October 1953 they had fallen to $14.70 or 72 percent of parity. What prices have done since last October you know as well as I. Yet during all this period of disaster to the farmer, he steadfastly refused to face the facts or to employ the powers he had in any effective way, but month after month went on assuring farmers that prices were stabilized. On March 8, 1953, he said: "Within 30 days after taking office we checked the cattle price decline." Yet cattle had fallen $1.90 per hundred. On September 19, 1953, he said: "The cattle price decline has been halted." By them cattle had gone down another $2 per hundred, and were bringing 76 percent of parity. On November 2, 1953, he said: "The situation has now become fairly stabilized. When we look back we see that there has been but little change in the parity ratio." At that time cattle were averaging $14.70, down $5 from January, and instead of 92 percent of parity were bringing 71 percent of parity. How pleased the cattle growers must be to learn that cattle prices have not declined, and their parity ratio has been maintained.

It is really hard to evaluate the mental processes of such a man.

Henry A. Wallace was anathema to Mr. Benson's crowd, but Mr. Benson has adopted the "ever normal granary plan"; and though Republicans wept copious campaign tears over the slaughter of little pigs, which after all were born to be killed, Mr. Benson's kindhearted department has recommended to dairymen that they kill part of their cows, which, after all, were not born to be killed, but to furnish milk to people who have never had enough milk in their history. The Brannan plan was attacked by the Benson crowd as the very work of the devil and the sure road to national ruin; but to divide the forces of agriculture this great crusading party has just passed an exact copy of the subsidy features of the Brannan plan to buttress the income of the wool growers.

The President made his campaign on the basis of States rights, and on that basis many people voted for him. It now turns out that the States rights talk referred to only one thing and that was the giving of the tidelands oil reserves back to the States so that they might in turn virtually give them to the big oil companies. In every other sphere States rights have been forgotten.

With regard to agriculture, the President in a campaign speech at Shreveport, La., on October 15, 1952, said: "The crusade wants to give the local farmer, the local authorities, maximum influence in farm programs in both their development and operation and keep Washington out of it as far as it is possible to do so."

On December 4, 1953, the president of the National Association of Soil Conservation Districts stated: "Washington is controlling much more of the program than it ever did before."

Secretary Benson has completely destroyed all county and State participation in policy making and in June of this year ordered drastic curbs on the freedom of farmers to choose the committees of farmers which we call the PMA committee. He has abolished the democratic processes of holding PMA elections. He has directed that no committeeman who has served 3 years can be chosen even though his neighbors want him to serve. The result will be to eliminate experienced farmer representatives, and provide that future representatives will be eliminated by the time they gain enough experience to combat the decrees from Washington.

He has continued to sabotage the soil-conservation program by rendering it impossible for many farmers to cooperate. As an example of his processes, here in South Carolina he has provided for next year, that no aid for an irrigation pond will be allowed if the construction of such pond will increase the amount of land under irrigation; that no aid for drainage canals or ditches will be allowed where the farmer intends to clear up any additional land on account of such drainage.

He has provided that next year every farmer must participate in every acreage-control program in order to participate in the benefits of any one program; and the new regulations will prohibit the planting or growing of any crop for sale, directly or indirectly on any land taken out of cotton, wheat, tobacco, or any other crop under controls. He has and is doing everything that the law allows him to do to make the provisions of the program as harsh as possible and as unworkable as possible, so that the farmers will become disgusted with the whole thing.

The Wall Street Journal of April 8, this year says that Secretary Benson says he "longs to free farmers from Federal regimentation, but has been quietly readying new and tougher restraints for the rural populace."

But the President said in a campaign speech at Omaha, Nebr., on September 18, 1952: "The Republican Party will provide farmers with economic protection without putting them in chains."

When we ask ourselves, "Where are we headed?" it is hard to find an optimistic answer. Should the agricultural policies of this administration be carried to their conclusion, I shrink from the wretchedness that will result. Should the agricultural policies of this administration be carried to their conclusion and the four horsemen of the Apocalypse ride again through our rural communities as they did in 1932, it will not be long before they ride through the cities as well. It will come, if it does come, as the direct result of the action of the same administration which, while in complained of the small cost of the farm program and called the farmer a suppliant for a hand-out, blithely distributed without necessity hundreds of millions of dollars in increased interest rates, a million and a half dollars to holders of Hitler bonds purchased for a song, gave away untold billions to tideland oil, surrendered public water rights to private corporations and violated every promise made to the rural people of America.

The architects of our misfortunes are Benson, Kline, Dewey, Nixon, and Milton Eisenhower. Our destinies are in the hands of an administration that has entrusted them to a man as Secretary of Agriculture who, though no doubt sincere, is touched with a kind of fanaticism; who, having no consciousness of deliberate cruelty and heartlessness, is as determined and implacable in carrying out what he regards as his mission as were the religious fanatics of the Spanish Inquisition, who were cruel and heartless in the name of right, and unmerciful in the name of religion.

I have tried to give you facts, only facts. I have tried to speak from the record and for the record.

As the farmers of this country see and understand the record that is being made they will before long say to this administration the words interpreted by the prophet of old to the heathen' king: "Mene, Mene, Tekel, Upharsin—Thou are weighed in the balance and found wanting."

Franco's Fabulous Daughter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 30, 1954

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Franco's Fabulous Daughter," written by Mr. George Dixon, and published several days ago in the Washington Post and Times Herald.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FRANCO'S FABULOUS DAUGHTER

(By George Dixon)

WASHINGTON, July 22.—If it is true that Spanish Dictator Francisco Franco is guilty of repressive measures, he obviously does not extend them to his daughter and son-in-law. They are the most unrepressed personages entertained here in a long while.

Ordinarily I do not go overboard for visiting foreigners, because I am very provincial, but it is almost impossible not to go for Franco's kid and her good-looking grandee, the Marques Cristobal de Villaverde, which my bride tells me is the Spanish equivalent of Chris Greenhouse.

(The Spanish couple is now visiting the San Francisco Bay area.)

They are also far and away the best public relations envoys ever to come here from Franco's Spain.

The Marquesa is 5 months along in what my Aunt Rhoda calls a delicate condition but she has been hopping around at a dizzy succession of dances without ever stopping to recover her wind and seemingly without ever tiring.

Marques told me that if she ever so much as wheezed he would call a halt to her dancing at once. And he has a very sensitive ear for wheezes because he is a surgeon who specializes exclusively on chests. He has a big chest clinic in Madrid, which he worked up without any help from his father-in-law, but he is not chesty.

He is going to pursue studies at various medical centers here while Carmen goes home to arrange for a second grandchild for Franco. I am a chest man myself but nobody invites me to look into these things more deeply. Discrimination in favor of furriners, huh?

The Marqueses de Villaverde—the Spanish pluralize one title for both of them; not like the English who long-wind it to marquis and march hare—have really taken this blase capital by storm. I overheard one old society battleax, who hasn't said a good word for anybody since she recited a prepared eulogy on Mrs. Grover Cleveland, burble: "What a sweet girl. She must have a sweet father."

In the few days they were both here, the marqueses did more dancing than a six-a-day hoofer for old Pantages. All the Latins in Washington, of whom there are 1 or 2 more than somewhat, knocked themselves out to join them in the rumba, samba, caramba, and gosh-damba.

The Dominican Ambassador, a gay fellow named Manuel de Moya, put on a show he learned at manuel training school. And the next night, before the marqueses could change their corn plasters, Gwen Cafritz gave them a dance on her front porch.

I danced so madly at both places I must have gotten dizzy because, when my eyes refocused 3 days later, I found I had taken the following disconnected notes:

"President Syngman Rhee, of Korea, is coming to Washington, July 26. Chief of Protocol John F. Simmons told Marques his biggest worry is that our State Department bigwigs will call Syngman 'Sigmund.' Says nearly everybody makes that mistake."

"Former Senator Millard Tydings, of Maryland, said he has made a lot of money at the law since Joe McCarthy combined to defeat him. Said Tydings: 'The only thing that still burns me is that I got beaten by lies. But I've never been so happy and prosperous in my life. To the victim belongs the spoils.' "

My notes, which don't seem to have much to do with Carmen and Cristobal continue:

"Mrs. Tydings asked a waiter to bring her a full bottle of champagne. She had left the table when the waiter returned. He said to me, 'Will Mrs. Tydings be back here?' I said, 'I swear it.' 'Okay then' he said, and surrendered the bottle."

"I couldn't quite get it, but the Tydings' beautiful blonde daughter, Mrs. Warren Gillette, Jr., explained: 'He knows us. He used to be my grandfather's (old mission to Moscow Joe Davies) butler.' "

I have a lot of notes on Gwen's party, too, but I must have been listening too attentively to Mrs. Cafritz because they are unintelligible. Well, as I said before, no country has ever had public relations ambassadors like Franco's nearest and dearest.

Tribute to Brynhild Haugland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MILTON R. YOUNG

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 30, 1954

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the Record an article entitled "Miss Haugland Shares Spotlight in New Volume on Women Leaders," appearing in the Minot Daily News, of Minot, N. Dak., under date of June 21, 1954.

The article gives an interesting account of the well-deserved recognition Miss Haugland received in the new book entitled "Ladies of Courage."

Mr. President, I was privileged to serve in the State legislature for more than 10 years with Miss Brynhild Haugland. This book is very accurate in its account of Miss Haugland's service as a member of the North Dakota State House of Representatives. I know of no more respected member.

Miss Haugland has been recognized as one of the most able and effective members in the history of the North Dakota Legislature.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Miss Haugland Shares Spotlight in New Volume on Women Leaders

Recently off the press, Ladies of Courage, by Eleanor Roosevelt and Lorena Hickok, which recounts the progress women have made in public life, has more than passing interest for Minot and northwest North Dakota folk.

Byrnhild Haugland, of Minot, whose record during her years in the North Dakota House of Representatives has attracted interest beyond the borders of her home State, is one of the Ladies of Courage.

Almost four pages of the book are devoted to Miss Haugland in a sketch which gives something of her personal background, her experiences as a farmer, and her achievements in public life.

Said the writers, "Her chief interests as a legislator have been agriculture, public health, and welfare. She is given credit for the establishment of a badly needed agricultural experiment station in her home county.

"She also was responsible for legislation setting up county health units, and she has been a member of a State health-planning committee appointed by the Governor to allocate Federal funds for rural hospitals in North Dakota. Go down the list of laws passed by the North Dakota Legislature in the last 15 years to help meet the farmers problems and improve his living conditions, and you will find that Brynhild Haugland had a hand in every one of them."

Brynhild is described in the book as being not a gentleman farmer, but rather one who rode a tractor in worn, faded overalls, milked cows and delivered the bottled product to her customers in Minot. She disposed of her dairy herd in 1946, but still carries on the farming.

The writers also quoted a Minot businessman who said of Miss Haugland: "Brynhild is not starry eyed, arbitrary or contentious in her approach to any problem. She always keeps her eye on long-range objectives, desirable goals, but she recognizes that they cannot always be achieved overnight. She has infinite patience."

In this well-documented volume which the book jacket calls the "inspiring story of women's struggle for recognition in American public life," the ladies of courage include among others: Senator Margaret Chase Smith, Representatives Frances Bolton, and Mary Norton, Judge Florence Allen, Claire Booth Luce, Oveta Culp Hobby, Molly Dewson, and Margaret McCullough Lee, who served as mayor of Portland, Oreg.

The book is dedicated to Miss Dewson, who went to Washington in 1933 when Franklin Roosevelt was setting up his New Deal and inaugurated a new deal of her own—a new deal for women in politics.

Lorena Hickok, a former South Dakotan, wrote the Political Profile of Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, which forms one of the chapters. Some of the other chapters are titled "How To Break Into Politics"; "Women Are Here To Stay"; "Leadership Is Not All Glamor"; "States Rights for Women."

Miss Haugland's copy of the book is autographed by the author.

The Establishment of a Commission on Old-Age and Retirement Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 30, 1954

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, within the last few days the Newark News carried an editorial describing the departure of 50 experts on the problems of older people for an international conference on that subject in London. The editor called attention to the importance of further study of these problems because, in his words:

> Constant increase in the number of aged persons throughout the Western World is a problem with which society is grappling, but for which, as a whole, it has found no definite solution.

I agree with the editor. I further suggest that our approach to these problems of older citizens has too often had much in common with Mark Twain's remark about the weather—namely, that lots of people are talking about it, but nobody is doing anything about it. I am convinced, moreover, that something can be done about it—and that we must find the answers as to how the United States, as the richest and most powerful of nations, deals with the economic status of those who can no longer work because of advancing years.

For this reason I introduced a bill, H. R. 3313, on February 19, 1953, which would etablish a bipartisan Commission on Old-age and Retirement Benefits. This Commission would be made up of 12 members, from public and private life, appointed by the President, the President of the Senate, and the Speaker of the House. Necessary compensation and travel allowances would be provided together with the services of a competent staff. Its duty would be to investigate the role of retirement benefits and annuities in providing income for our senior citizens. For myself, I am convinced that such an investigation would confirm such scattered studies as have already been made, by showing that for most people aged 65 and over—or even for many aged 55 and over—their income is far from adequate.

Mr. Speaker, one major reason for such a study grows out of an anomaly of our time. The marvels of medical science have made it possible for more people to survive the dangers of childhood diseases. The conquest of other dread diseases of the past, such as pneumonia, has further reduced mortality. We are very proud of the fact that the average life span in this country has increased by about 20 years since 1900.

But too often we have failed, in any realistic or positive way, to accept the accompanying results of the medical miracles which are making it possible for more of us to live longer.

Here, then, are some of these facts. The 1950 census showed that slightly more than 8 percent of the total population of the United States were 65 years of age or over. This was twice the proportion of older people at the beginning of the century. One of every eight persons of voting age is now 65 or older. Equally significant is the increasing proportion of persons in middle age. In 1900, 1 person in 7 was 45 to 64 years of age. Today the ratio is 1 in 5. Furthermore, older people are increasing faster in proportion than any other age-group above 10 years of age. Between 1940 and 1950, the number of older people increased 37 percent, while the total population increased by less than half that proportion—or by 15 percent.

Moreover, the economic problems faced by our senior citizens have been greatly increased because within a few decades we have changed from a predominantly agricultural country to a predominantly industrialized urban society. In 1950, almost two-thirds—or 64 percent—of our people over 65 were living in cities or towns. It follows that they need more money income in the city than did the grandparents of previous generations who could remain on the farm as a happy and useful member of the family.

Now, how positively have we accepted these results of the development of our scientific skills and the growth of our industrial capacity? Too often, I am afraid, we have preferred to act as if no problems exist, to hope vaguely that they may disappear, or to push them into the corner whenever they are presented. Not long ago one student of the subject remarked bitterly that there was at least one simple solution. If we stopped all medical research and went back to the practice of medicine as it was carried on before sulfa, penicillin, streptomycin and other medical advances were known, he pointed out, the problem would solve itself. Life expectancy would soon drop back to its former level. I use this extreme example, because, to my mind, it points up the tendency of our times to reject any real understanding of the sharp reduction of income and the experience of rejection which too many old people suffer today.

As I have said, such facts as we have suggest that a basic cause of the problems faced by our senior citizens is lack of adequate income. In 1950, 43 percent of the families headed by a person 65 years of age or over had a cash income of less than $1,500. Thirty percent had under $1,000. Nearly 40 percent had less than $500.

Field surveys of the circumstances of persons receiving old-age and survivors insurance benefits have shed some light on the actual living conditions of a representative group of such beneficiaries. They reveal that most people have only small amounts of money income in addition to their insurance benefits. Their incomes are severely limited. The great majority fall into the middle range of incomes among the aged, which means that they have less than $1,000 a year to live on. Most of them cannot live on their retirement income, and are able to maintain themselves only by withdrawal from savings, supplementation from public assistance programs, aid from relatives, or temporary gainful work. To meet large medical expenses, many aged beneficiaries received assistance from relatives or drew heavily on savings. Illnesses requiring hospitalization and hospital expenses accounted for 37 percent of the cases requiring help from relatives or withdrawal of assets.

Another study of the special problems of the older members of our population, conducted by the Institute of Industrial Relations of the University of California under the sponsorship of the Rockefeller Foundation, shows similar results. Let me quote for you just a few of the conclusions drawn.

Prof. Robert Dorfman, of the University of California, summarizes his findings on the labor force status of this age group as follows:

> Older persons have insufficient incomes—in part because they do not have jobs. They are isolated, frustrated, and maladjusted—in part because they do not have jobs. * * * Nor, therefore, is it surprising that an increase in the job opportunities offered to older persons should be one of the most frequently suggested solutions to most of these problems.

Now, no one will deny that an increase of job opportunities may help to solve some individual problems. But listen to Professor Dorfman's down-to-earth conclusions as to the efficacy of this solution on an overall basis. He writes:

> The results of the survey which I am about to present add up to two conclusions, both grim and neither surprising: First, it is certainly true that older members of the population have to a substantial extent become separated from their jobs and from all that their jobs mean in terms of income, social standing, and psychological satisfaction. * * * The second conclusion is that programs for reemploying older people, although they certainly may work constructively in any individual instances, cannot be expected to do much toward relieving the whole range of problems faced by the aged. Partly this is because 40 percent of the men over 64 are already employed, so that, insofar as employment is a cure for their problems, they are taken care of already. To a larger extent this is because 77 percent of the older men who are not in the labor force feel that they are not well enough to work. * * * There is a noticeable tendency * * * for the older man to be demoted even before he stops working.

And listen to the equally forthright conclusions of another participant in this survey, Prof. Peter O. Steiner:

> Dr. Dorfman—

He writes—

> has suggested one dismal conclusion: A significant increase in the labor force participation of the aged is not to be expected. I suggest another: The resources of the aged are, to a shocking degree, inadequate.

It seems clear to me, therefore, that we cannot continue to hope that we will find the solution in some easy panacea, any more than we can solve these problems by ignoring them.

Another development of our times which sometimes tends to create the illusion that the problem is solving itself is the development of private pension plans. Again, I would be the first to say that the further development of such plans is a sound approach to the problems of many individuals. But I must also point out that such private plans have at least three limitations in meeting the overall problem. First, they tend to penalize the worker if he moves from one plant to another. Second, they make it harder for older workers to find employment because of the increased pension costs for older workers. Third, they do not give adequate coverage. The first two defects cannot be eliminated without creating grave financial problems for individual employers and for the economy as a whole as well as for our senior citizens. The lack of adequate coverage is suggested by recent estimates that only about 1 of every 6 workers today is covered by such a plan.

Once again, then, we are faced with the fact that the problem is not solving itself. I am convinced we must accept retirement from the labor force as the inevitable answer for most of our old folks. I believe that until we have a complete picture of the role of retirement benefits and annuities in providing income for our senior citizens—the kind of information my bill would provide—we will not be able to find solutions in a realistic or mature way. Until that time we shall be dealing in half-truths, or wishful thinking, with regard to one of the most important problems which we face today. As Bernard Baruch, one of our most eminent oldsters has said:

> The economic problem of the aged is increasing. Down through the ages, there have been every kind of pills, theories, treatments, to avoid old age * * *. In our country and in our times, we don't need these weird ideas.

And now, lest I be accused of painting too gloomy a picture, let me speak briefly on the positive developments of recent years which will help us to find these solutions. First of all, it seems clear to me that there is a growing interest, in certain areas, in getting at the facts and studying the problems in a realistic way. I have cited the conclusions of some of the studies which have already begun to appear, covering selected groups of our population. The conference in London of the International Gerontological Congress, which I mentioned at the beginning of my remarks, is further evidence not only of the growing interest in such problems, but also of the fact that we have men and women trained in this field who are capable of conducting such a study as I propose.

In this country this interest is becoming apparent at a community-wide and statewide level. Early this year representatives of health and welfare authorities in the 48 States were brought together in a series of regional conferences under the auspices of the National Committee on Aging of the National Social Welfare Assembly. A majority of the States have called general conferences on the subject or have conducted special studies in the field. Many individual communities and many individual citizens are demonstrating their willingness to approach these problems directly and realistically. In my own State one such individual citizen, Robert Gaede, of Ridgewood, is compiling a directory of recreational facilities for senior citizens in the entire State of New Jersey.

All of this interest and all of this ability must, I am convinced, be recognized more concretely at the Federal level—and my bill proposes to do just that in a way which will not only give us adequate working knowledge of the situation in which we find ourselves, but will also be useful in the development of the activities on the part of States, communities, and individual citizens.

I have confidence, born in my deep conviction that we have, in this country, demonstrated our ability to meet and master problems which may seem insuperable that we will find solutions. My confidence is based on our spontaneous, if sometimes slow, adjustment to the facts of life. I suggest that our high standard of living may mean other things than just more or better commodities. It may mean a lower rate of labor force participation especially among young mothers and older folks. It could mean more leisure. It may be that our existing retirement pattern is out of date as a result of the medical and industrial advances which I have mentioned. As for myself, I am convinced that the conventional retirement age of 65 years is already outmoded—as recent pension-planning procedures are already indicating. Looking back at our times from the year 2,000 it may well be that the transformations which must come will seem as spontaneous and natural as the increased urbanization and industrialization, or the growing participation of women in the labor force which has happened in our lifetime.

I want to make it clear, therefore, that my purpose in introducing my bill is to begin to put to use the science and the skill and the great ingenuity of our citizenry in meeting the problems I have outlined. I am convinced that we cannot begin to meet them until we know what they are, on a broad base. As a first long step in this direction, I urge your support for H. R. 3313 so that the Commission on old-age and retirement benefits may be set up immediately. We owe it to those senior citizens who are today facing the problems of getting enough to eat, a place to live, and the right kind of medical care. Indeed we owe it to ourselves.

The article from the Newark News follows:

STUDYING CARE OF AGED

Constant increase in the number of aged persons throughout the Western World is a problem with which society is grappling, but for which, as a whole, it has found no definite solution. That is why 50 experts in the care of old people have flown to London to attend the International Gerontological Congress. Later they will go to Norway, Sweden, and Denmark to see what progress is being made there. Then one group will visit the Netherlands, Belgium, France, and Britain. The other will go to Germany and Switzerland.

As scientists devoted to the phenomena of old age the travelers from our shores will doubtless be asked how the United States, as the richest and most powerful of nations, deals with the mental and physical status of those no longer able to work or who are denied employment because of advancing years. There should be nothing surprising in the knowledge that Federal old-age pensions and private pension systems combined are in most instances inadequate for full support. For this is a nation where, since Franklin's day, thrift has always been preached, and has been practiced by many.

The gerontologists are less concerned about normal diseases among the aged than about the degenerative ailments—cardiac and circulatory. Belgium and the Netherlands have special housing, even villages, set aside for the aged, like a few communities in Florida and southern California.

But some of our scientists think that type of segregation might be mentally injurious to many. They will find elaborate arrangements to care for the aged in the Scandinavian countries. In Germany and Switzerland a medical group will study what has recently been learned and done about the biology and chemistry of old age. In France our travelers will see what it is that keeps the aged in the younger family group. As an outcome of this trip, while there may not be unanimity of opinion, there is certain to be acquisition of knowledge that can be put to profit.

United Nations Charter Revision

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. THYE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 30, 1954

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a thought-provoking letter I have received from Miss Ada Hanson, of Minneapolis, on the subject of the United Nations charter review and revision.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., *July 26, 1954.*

Senator EDWARD J. THYE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR THYE: It is with great appreciation to you that I say thank you for your part in the conducting of the U. N. Charter review hearings in Minneapolis on Saturday, July 10, 1954. Your questions and comments on specific phases were very helpful.

After listening to the hearings all day I wish to point up those ideas which to me seem especially pertinent to consideration of charter review and revision.

1. We need a charter review. When a machine, an organization, or a system is not functioning properly and is not accomplishing the job for which it was intended (in this case, to keep the peace) it is time for a thorough examination.

2. We need charter revision. When examination reveals that that machine or system is not adequate for the job because of construction defects, the experts are called in—to study, make recommendations, and to act. (In this case some of the structural defects are the assumption of unanimity of nations, and the lack of sufficient specific powers to give it police, courts, and tribunals.)

3. We need much study and wide range of opinions. The example of public hearings is an indication of what is needed throughout the country. The friendly listening to all types of opinions is what will bring out final good decisions.

4. From this point now, the important phases of charter revision in my opinion are:

Specific strengthening of the U. N. powers to deal with war and aggression.

Specific limitations on the legal powers of the U. N.—limiting the legal power to the matters of war, aggression, and armaments. (All powers not specifically delegated to the U. N. to be reserved to member nations.)

Control of arms and armaments with gradual disarmament down to that necessary for internal law and order (but insufficient for aggression against another nation).

Final aim—universal membership.

In other words the revision of the U. N. Charter sufficiently to permit the following and carrying out of the program outlined in President Eisenhower's speech of April 16, 1953, to the newspaper editors, should make of the U. N. an organization with sufficient specific powers necessary to keep the peace. You could do no better service to your country and to our world than to "carry the ball" for charter review and revision. We need the U. N.—but need a strengthened U. N.

Cordially,

ADA HANSON.

Upper Colorado River Storage Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 28, 1954

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, the action of the House in rejecting the rule to bring legislation authorizing the Fryingpan-Arkansas project to the floor recalls that there is now pending in the Committee on Rules a request for a rule on H. R. 4449, the upper Colorado River storage project bill. In connection with that legislation I wish to point out to the Members of the House that on July 27 the San Francisco Chronicle carried an article by its political editor, Mr. Earl C. Behrens, outlining certain factors which have a bearing on whether the project should be authorized at this time.

The article points out that the project involves an eventual cost of approximately one and a half billion dollars, and that the people of California would be taxed in excess of $93 million to bear their share of this cost. The article further breaks down this cost by cities and counties within the State and points out that every individual Californian would be hit for $7.61. The question is then raised as to whether this subsidy by the taxpayers is not grossly excessive in consideration of the fact that the project will provide water for only 370,000 acres of land at a cost of over $2,500 per acre.

Mr. Behrens also mentions that the Colorado River Board of the State of California opposes present enactment of H. R. 4449 on the ground that the United

States Supreme Court now has under consideration litigation between the States of California and Arizona which opens to question the terms and conditions set down in the Colorado River Compact and the Boulder Canyon Project Act, under which the development and apportionment of the water resources of the Colorado River Basin, both upper and lower, must be determined. The statement is made that California's $700 million investment in water development projects, made in reliance upon maintaining the present apportionment of Colorado River water among the States, would be jeopardized by any further legislation which might encroach upon the rights recognized in the lower basin States by those documents. It is contended that until the Supreme Court renders a decision clarifying the division of waters provided for in the compact and the Boulder Canyon Project Act, the pending legislation by permitting further withdrawals in the upper basin would prejudice the possible findings of the Court.

One other major question raised by the San Francisco Chronicle article relates to the sufficiency of total waterflow in the Colorado River. The upper Colorado River project, it is contended, would be capable of intercepting several years' total flow of the river while the storage reservoirs were being filled. Present projects on the lower river, notably at Hoover Dam, require nearly all of the present flow to assure their present firm output of electric power. Without statutory controls to require continuance of an adequate flow into these projects, the power revenues upon which they depend for financing could be seriously impaired.

The article concludes by pointing out that the Hoover Commission is now studying all Federal water and power policies, including those for the Colorado River Basin. The contention is made that in view of this study the Congress should not adopt any legislation establishing new policies until the Commission's report is completed.

The article follows:

Dinosaur Dam Plan Would Cost State $93 Million

(By Earl C. Behrens)

Washington, July 26.—California's share of the cost of the proposed $1.5 billion upper Colorado River storage project which would inundate Dinosaur National Monument would be in excess of $93 million, according to opponents of the proposal.

A bill approved by the House Interior Committee authorizes hydroelectric installations behind dams at Glen Canyon, on the Colorado River in northern Arizona; Curecanti, on the Gunnison River in Colorado, and Echo Park, in the Dinosaur National Monument.

Legislation is also pending in the Senate. The Senate Interior Committee last week approved a measure which would authorize 6 major dams instead of the 3 in the House bill. This proposal would also include an Echo Park Dam.

Both bills involve a cost of about $1.5 million.

SAN FRANCISCO'S SHARE

San Francisco County taxpayers, would be hit by an estimated $5,587,700 as their share of the big Federal project's ultimate cost.

Alameda County taxpayers would have to dig up more than $6 million for Uncle Sam in the distribution of the costs by the Federal Government.

Other San Francisco Bay area estimates include San Mateo County, $2,317,000; Santa Clara, $2,835,000; Sonoma, $842,500; Marin, $693,000, and Napa, $434,800.

Los Angeles, of course, would pay the bulk of the future bill, something over $36 million being its share.

A bitter fight will be waged against the Senate bill authorizing the immediate construction of six big power dams.

The Echo Park Dam will "invade" the Dinosaur National Monument and break 80 years of conservation policy, according to a minority report by 9 Members of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee. One of the Members who signed the report was Craig Hosmer, Republican, of Long Beach.

Representative Clair Engle, Democrat, Red Bluff, however, was one of the majority Members who approved the legislation in the House committee.

OTHER DAMS

In addition to the Echo Park Dam, the Senate legislation provides for the Glen Canyon Dam in Arizona; Navaho in New Mexico, Flaming Gorge on the Utah border and Cross mountain and Curecanti Dams in Colorado.

Fred W. Simpson, San Diego, chairman of the Colorado River Board of California, is here aiding in what may be a hopeless fight to defer action on the legislation for both the series of dams, including the Echo Park project and the Fryingpan-Arkansas project in Colorado.

One of the reasons the California representatives want the big projects held up for more study is the fact that litigation involving California and Arizona over the division of Colorado river water is now proceeding.

George I. Haight, Chicago attorney, the special master appointed by the United States Supreme Court, in the Colorado River litigation will meet with the Arizona and California-Colorado River Board members in Phoenix, August 5 to work out procedure for the hearings which he will hold to obtain testimony in the dispute.

COMPLAINT

Members of Congress are receiving complaints from all parts of the Nation from conservationists who protest the despoiling of Dinosaur National Monument. Many of those communicating with Congress contend that there are better sites for a dam than Echo Park. Supervisors Association.

Among California organizations opposing the legislature are the State Grange, various committees of the State Chamber of Commerce, many city councils in Southern California, the CIO and the AFL.

Fears are expressed that southern California's future water supply will be endangered if the upper basin projects are constructed by the Federal Government.

Chairman Simpson, of California's Colorado River Board declares that California favors continuation of the development of the water resources of the Colorado River Basin on a sound economic basis, as the need for development occurs.

"California," he states on behalf of the board, "recognizes the right of the upper basin States to utilize the waters apportioned by the Colorado River Compact as approved by the Boulder Canyon Project Act, but subject to the terms and conditions of those documents as the Supreme Court construe them in the case of Arizona versus California now pending.

PROTECTING $700,000,000

"By the same token, California, in protection of its investment of nearly $700 million in water development projects which it has made in reliance upon the Colorado River Compact and the Boulder Canyon Project Act, and the economy and population of more than 4 million people dependent upon these works, must resist legislation which would encroach upon the rights recognized in the lower basin States by those documents."

The Colorado River storage project, as now proposed, it is contended, "would intercept" the lower basin's water supply with giant reservoirs at Echo Park (flooding Dinosaur National Monument), Glen Canyon, and Curecanti capable of storing several years' flow of the river. In the absence of statutory controls of the operation of such reservoirs designed to protect the output of firm power at Hoover Dam, upon which the United States and the power contractors relied, the use of such large storage could result in seriously curtailing the revenues at Hoover Dam and other dams on the lower river and upon which these lower projects depend for financing.

Simpson said, "It is against the best interests of both the power users in the lower basin and the Federal Treasury to so legislate."

The contention also is made that a Federal subsidy of over $2,500 an acre of irrigated land and the postponement for nearly 50 years of the commencement of repayment of irrigation would be on unwarranted and unjustified burden on the Nation's taxpayers.

DOUBLY AFFECTED

"California, as a major taxpaying State, is doubly affected, because the amount of the overdraft on the water supply of the Colorado River Basin," states Simpson, "is directly related to the amount of Federal subsidy to the irrigation projects creating the overdraft."

Objections are raised to the legislation which is part of the Department of Interior program on the grounds that the subsidy by the taxpayers to provide water for less than 370,000 acres of land is grossly excessive; that the Government would be put directly into the power business; that the financing plan is unrealistic; that the project is not self-liquidating and that the recommendations of the Bureau of the Budget for drastic revision of the legislation were ignored.

A plea also has been made that since the Hoover Commission is now investigating and making recommendations as to all water and power policies, no legislation should be adopted by Congress establishing new policies until the report of the Commission is completed.

California's ultimate share of the costs of the projects would amount to 9.32 percent of the total cost and every man, woman, and child in the State would be hit for $7.61 as his share of the huge undertaking.

We Can Stop the Reds in Asia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 30, 1954

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article by Maj. Gen. Claire Chenault which spells out a proposed solution to a perplexing problem. Since we now are losing ground steadily in the area referred to in this article, we cannot afford to minimize any suggestion which offers an improvement.

This article was called to my attention by Mr. J. A. Jones, a prominent businessman of Pensacola, in my home State of Florida:

We Can Stop the Reds in Asia

(By Maj. Gen. Claire L. Chennault as told to Joe Carmichael)

If the Communists take Indochina, the United States will have to pull its defense line back to Alaska, Hawaii, and America's west coast.

And, in view of long-range submarines and bombers in use today, that is too close.

We can't hold Asia if we lose Indochina. All Indonesia will be exposed then to Communist attack, as will be the Philippines, Formosa, and Japan.

Our present defense line in Asia begins in Alaska, traces out the Aleutians to Japan, Formosa, the Philippines, and along the northern border of Indochina to Siam. Siam is the anchor of our defense line. If Indochina falls the Communists will have driven a wedge into that defense line; it will be broken and flanked.

It seems the administration in Washington is preparing us for intervention in Indochina. That is the worst thing that could happen.

Indochina is important, but direct intervention by us is not the way to win the war. We should use all those Asiatics who are interested in fighting communism.

The way for us to win the war in Indochina is for us not to fight in Indochina. The Reds have got to be stopped in other areas first. I don't believe a war in Indochina could be won by the combined forces of the United States, France, and Great Britain—the terrain is just too difficult.

There are two possible areas in which we could wage a winning war to stop the Communists in Indochina. The areas are: (1) Korea, (2) southeast China.

Both Syngman Rhee and Chiang Kai-shek could go to town if we'd just let them. There have been statements of their people's desires to unify all of Korea and to reconquer China. The ideas have become national objectives.

Red China can't arm and feed more than 1 million first-class troops. The Reds say they have 4 to 5 million soldiers—but 3 to 4 million of those are provincials, second-line Chinese troops not properly equipped or trained.

The equipment for Red China's first-line troops comes from Russia through Siberia by rail to Mukden. Korea is only 150 miles from the Mukden railhead. Add 1,500 more miles from Mukden to South China and you see how the Reds' supply headache increases. All supplies, all troops, to a South China front would have to be moved overland by rail, for there are no rivers running in that direction. So South China is where Chiang should hit.

A simultaneous campaign into North Korea would harass the Communists still more. Reports indicate that during the Korean war half the Communist forces were Chinese. They were Chinese who could not have been there if there had been a line to defend in south China.

Get my idea? Two fronts, 1,500 miles apart, with fighting in Korea and south China at the same time. The Reds would have a problem in logistics that could not be solved. They would have to quit in Indochina to do what they could in China and Korea.

We would end the Red menace in Indochina and we would do it without having to use a single American ground soldier to fire a gun.

To make the pincer squeeze effective we would have to use naval units to blockade the coasts of China and Korea. We would supply experts to supervise ground services—quartermaster, communications, medical. We would supply the South Koreans and the Chinese Nationalists with arms, ammunition, and other war equipment.

In October the monsoons will be over in Indochina. Clearing days will bring out Vietminh forces for harder and better fighting, because of increased Russian supplies and supervision. If a forecast I made earlier comes true, October will bring MIG fighters flown by "volunteers" and possibly Vietminh pilots. The French won't be able to stop such air attacks.

To put this logical plan into operation we will have to start almost immediately training and equipping additional military forces in South Korea and Formosa.

South Korea needs 1½ million troops with as much air and as much light naval forces as we can train. An additional 150,000 Nationalists should be added to Chiang's forces. There we would have 2½ million first-class, well-armed, well-trained troops, well supported by air and naval forces. In no way could the Reds meet that. They couldn't concentrate in the north because of fear of Chiang and they couldn't concentrate in the south because of transportation difficulties.

In South Korea and Nationalist China we have two military forces willing to fight communism. Their plans fit into our plan.

What is our plan?

Our plan is to contain communism in Asia, to prevent its spread. As I said, their plans fit perfectly into our plans.

Sometimes I get the half-hearted objection: "What if Syngman Rhee or Chiang Kai-shek won't stop when we want them to?"

The answer is very simple. All we have to do is stop their supply lines. They can't manufacture their own arms and supplies. There is no danger of their going farther than we want. They have to comply with our limitations.

And I hear the question: "Won't attacks by Nationalist China and South Korea on the mainland and on North Korea set the fuse of world war III?"

I think this plan of two-pronged attack is one of the surest ways of preventing world war III.

Russia won't go to war for its satellites. It never has and it never will. And there is no reason for going to war in Europe for what happens in Asia. I never have believed that Russia would start anything in Europe until her Asiatic flank is secured.

The Reds' No. 1 objective is to take Asia and hold it solid. They need more supplies to feed their war machine. Indochina, for instance, can furnish enough rice to feed 1 million more troops; it has lead, iron, coal, tin, timber—all sort of natural resources that Red China needs. If Red China succeeds in getting Indochina it could support twice as many troops as it now has.

Politically, too, Indochina is important to the Communists.

Russia has been talking of a Laotian Peoples Republic which would include north Siam and part of Burma as well as Indochina. The republic would include all those people with a common tongue. Furthermore, a Communist victory in Indochina would lose for the United States all the confidence ever given us by the Asiatics.

Would accreditation of the Red China Peking Government to the United Nations buy peace in Indochina?

The Reds have the same objective now that they've had for years, and they will not be appeased. Compromising with them by putting Red China in the U. N. would only make problems more difficult, instead of easier. The Communists wouldn't relinquish their objectives for admission to the U. N. We'd have just as much chance of gaining peace in Asia by admitting the Reds to some fraternal lodge.

In 1949 I warned the Senate Armed Forces Committee that if the United States didn't save China from communism the Red tide would engulf Indochina, Malaya, Siam, Burma, Indonesia, and eventually threaten the Philippines and Formosa.

When I made that forecast I tried to visualize the Communist plan in Asia. I tried to put myself in their place in China. What did they need? Rice, resources, manpower. My forecast is coming true.

So far, the Philippines have been protected. If the Reds get Indochina it will be only a short distance across a quiet sea to the islands. The Communists will send in agitators and arms, and trouble will follow.

Malaya will be in grave danger. Britain soon will be hollering for help if the Reds take Indochina.

Roads are being built all over Tibet. That's right in line with Red strategy. Burma will be very vulnerable. Roads from southwest Burma to Yunan Province in China will give access to central Burma.

The Communists failed to get all of Korea. They threw their forces into Indochina. If they don't get Indochina they'll call a cease-fire and turn their strength to Tibet, Nepal, India.

Communist aggression is flexible. Our defense has not been flexible. We've been forced to fight wherever the Communists dictate.

The only way to keep Asia is to have our friends on the mainland of China and in the whole of Korea.

Looking at a map it appears absurd that the Nationalists occupying an island the size of Formosa could hope to retake a land the size of China. But Nationalist China consists of a lot more than just Formosa.

I mean by that, if the Nationalists would make a beachhead on south China and hold it, they could count on 90 percent of China's people to help. They would help in various ways—take up arms, engage in sabotage, do what they could to aid the Nationalists.

I am being conservative in my 90-percent estimate. Of the 14,500 Red Chinese prisoners captured in the Korean war who wanted to go to Formosa instead of returning to China, only 2 had ever been to Formosa. On questioning, these fellows said that 95 percent of the people inside China now were bitterly opposed to communism and would fight against it if they had a chance of winning.

As another bit of proof, Nationalist raids on the mainland first met with stubborn resistance. Now many Reds are giving up by units—squads, platoons, companies. In fact, the Communists have become very worried about morale.

Now seems like a good time to launch the logical pincers movement in Korea and South China, doesn't it? Then why don't we do it, you ask, and stop the fighting in Indochina and save our defense line from being rolled back to our own west coast?

One reason is the British influence in our foreign policy.

Great Britain has declined to a second- or third-rate power yet she still is trying to dominate world politics. Britain wants to regain the monopoly of trade in China. That's why she's been playing footsie with the Communists. The British hate Chiang Kai-shek because he preferred to do business with Americans.

The second reason is a strong remnant of the Roosevelt-Truman regime in Washington. History indicates that their policies aided communism. The remnant has a great deal of influence on today's policies.

Those two forces, the British influence and the remnant of pro-Communist or fellow-traveling regimes, have combined to prevent us from having a sensible policy in the Far East.

Communists measure world affairs in terms of power and force. Pretensions don't mean a thing. The Reds prey on weakness, and back off from strength.

The United States has been trying to form a giant combine to stop communism automatically. But it won't work. There are a lot of people in the combine who don't want to fight.

Instead of teaming with Great Britain and France in Asia, we could do a lot better with another triangular alliance—the United States, Formosa and South Korea. Here would be a combine willing to fight communism.

And the only way to stop communism is with force used in the right places.

Hate Propaganda Through the Mail

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 30, 1954

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, appended hereto is the reply of the Postmaster General to my resolution of inquiry, House Resolution 632, also appended. The attachments are available for inspection at my office:

OFFICE OF THE POSTMASTER GENERAL,
Washington, D. C., July 26, 1954.
Hon. EDWARD H. REES,
Chairman, Committee on Post Office and Civil Service,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Reference is made to your request for a report, by July 26, 1954, on House Resolution 632.

House Resolution 632 requests that the Postmaster General furnish to the House of Representatives certain information with respect to 10 single print and periodical publications. The information requested is:

(a) Whether the United States mails were or are being used for the distribution of these publications;

(b) The time or times of such transmission, the volume of mail in each case, and the class of mail used;

(c) Whether the United States mails are being used for the transmission, from outside the United States to destinations within the United States, of any of these publications; and

(d) Whether any action has been taken under the laws of the United States regarding the transmission of these publications through the mails.

The records of the Department at the headquarters office at Washington, D. C., do not contain all of the information sought by this resolution. For example, if any of these publications are mailed at the third-class rate of postage, under permit or otherwise, the only complete record of such mailing would be at the office of mailing. The volume of individual issues of second-class publications can be obtained only from the post office where the publication is entered. Accordingly, in these two respects at least, I will have to call upon the postmasters at the points of mailing for the information requested. This is being done, and as soon as information is received it will be forwarded to your committee.

The information presently at hand is set forth in the attachment to this letter.

Of prime importance among the items requested by this resolution is a report on the action taken with respect to these publications.

The Congress has, over the years, prescribed what may or may not be transmitted through the mails. It has, for example, said that obscene materials are nonmailable (18 U. S. Code, sec. 1461). This same section of the Criminal Code provides that matter of the character tending to incite arson, murder, or assassination is also nonmailable.

Section 1717 of title 18, United States Code, provides that circulars, postcards, prints, newspapers, etc., which contain matter advocating or urging treason, insurrection, or forceful resistance to any law of the United States are nonmailable. This same section also provides that matter in violation of a number of other sections of title 18 is likewise nonmailable. Among the sections listed is 2388, which section provides, in effect, that whoever, when the United States is at war, makes or conveys false reports or false statements with intent to interfere with the operation or success of the military forces of the United States, or to promote the success of its enemies or willfully causes or attempts to cause insubordination, disloyalty, mutiny, or refusal of duty in the military forces, or obstruct the recruiting or enlistment services to the injury of the United States, shall be fined not more than $10,000. Mail matter doing any of these things is nonmailable.

The sections of the law which might be said to cover the publications listed in the resolution are 1461, 1717, and 2388 of title 18. It should be noted, however, that these sections do not expressly provide for the exclusion from the United States mails of matter attacking a particular religion, religious group, or race. In order that publications may be treated as nonmailable, therefore, it must first be determined that they incite to arson, assassination, or murder (sec. 1461, title 18), advocate or urge treason, insurrection, or forceful resistance to law (sec. 1717, title 18) or certain false reports and false statements or other material reasonably calculated to cause insubordination, disloyalty, or mutiny in the Armed Forces (sec. 2388, title 18).

With respect to these sections of the Code, the courts have, on a number of occasions, held that before a violation of the sections could be spelled out and therefore before the material could be called nonmailable, it was necessary that there be a clear and present danger that the things proscribed by the statute would come about. Because of these interpretations the Post Office Department has rarely been able to find that publications of an anti-Semetic, anti-Catholic, anti-Negro or anti any other race, creed or color, were nonmailable. In reviewing publications of this character the Department has, on occasion, sought the advice and counsel of the Department of Justice. That Department has consistently advised that before publications may be declared nonmailable under these sections of the law the requisite, intent, and willfulness, must be spelled out.

It is, of course, regretted that the postal facilities are employed for the dissemination of material of this type. However, in the absence of authority to exclude it, the Postmaster General has no alternative but to accept the material and deliver it to destination.

I regret that I am not able at this time to fully comply with the information requested in this resolution. It is a physical impossibility to produce all of this information within the time prescribed, because, as has been above noted, much of the information requested must be procured from points far distant from the headquarters of Washington, D. C.

Due to the urgency of this request, this report has not been cleared through the Bureau of the Budget.

Sincerely yours,
ARTHUR E. SUMMERFIELD,
Postmaster General.

House Resolution 632

Resolved, That the Postmaster General is hereby requested to furnish to the House of Representatives at the earliest practicable date, full and complete information with respect to the following:

(1) Whether the United States mails were or are being used for the transmission and distribution of the following described publications:

1. Common Sense, allegedly published twice monthly at Union, N. J.

2. Pamphlet entitled "The War Criminals," attributed to Editor Einar Aberg, Norrviken, Sweden, allegedly published in 1950.

3. A single sheet entitled "Communism," by the same editor as in item 2 and from the same place, carrying the pictures bearing the date "February 1954."

4. A single sheet headed "Stop Invasion," allegedly issued by the Committee To Save the McCarran Act, Tulsa, Okla., or Los Angeles, Calif.

5. A periodical publication Williams Intelligence Summary, allegedly published at Santa Ana, Calif.

6. A single sheet headed "Open Letter to Congress," allegedly published by West Virginia Anti-Communist League, Huntington, W. Va.

7. The Cross and the Flag, allegedly published monthly at Los Angeles, Calif.

8. A single sheet headed, "The Kiss of Death," allegedly issued by the Citizens Protective Association, St. Louis, Md.

9. A periodical publication called the Western Voice, allegedly published in Inglewood, Calif.

10. The American Nationalist, allegedly published at Inglewood, Calif.

(2) The time or times of such transmission and distribution described in (1) above, the volume of mail in each case, and the class of mail used therein.

(3) Whether the United States mails are being used for the transmission from outside the United States to destinations within the United States of any of the material described in (1) above.

(4) Whether any action has been taken under the laws of the United States regarding the transmission and distribution through the mails of the material described in (1) above.

To Reorganize the Capitol Police Force

SPEECH

OF

HON. CHARLES B. DEANE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 29, 1954

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DEANE].

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, the statement by the chairman of the Committee on Rules indicated that the leadership supported this bill. There is divided opinion among the Members, but as far as the leadership of the House is concerned, I feel that they still stand for some approach to a merit system for the Capitol Police.

I feel the House would be interested in knowing some of the background leading up to this particular bill.

For 102 years the Capitol Police system has been on patronage. The present captain, 8 lieutenants, 9 sergeants, and 139 privates have during these many years been designated or recommended by Members of the House and the other body. And that is true as of this time.

Under this bill there is no particular effort being made to immediately bring absolute security to this House Chamber. We do feel that it is an approach in the right direction to try to bring the

Capitol Police system under a merit system.

At this point I want to express my sincere appreciation for the members of the present police force. The incident that happened on March 1 is not at all directed toward the Capitol Police. It has come to my attention tht perhaps certain Members feel that this bill is directed toward them. That is not true. At no time during the discussion in our committee was there any reflection whatsoever on the present Capitol Police. The House itself must assume personal responsibility for the neglect that we ourselves have allowed the Chamber to gain, by virtue of the rules that have been adopted, because under the present rules of the House the Capitol Police are not allowed to enter the gallery unless invited to do so. Under our particular bill, the rules of the House will have to be amended, in order that these men may go into the gallery.

But I do want to make this statement concerning the men on the present force. Let us think for a moment about the present organization. Of the present 157 on the force, 83 are students; approximately 15 of those men are 50 years of age and over; there are 3 on the force who are 60 years or over. There are 4 on the force who are 70 years or over. Approximately 16 men on the force have served for over 3 years. There are 15 on the force who have served for over 15 years, and there are 13 on the force who have served over 9 years. I have no idea as to the political affiliation of any member of the force.

I would like to point out there is nothing in this bill that would prevent students from taking the examinations and having membership on the force; but it would mean, under this particular bill and under the rules adopted, that they would have to give their full time to the work.

If you have the bill before you I would like to direct your attention to page 18, section 2 of the bill.

Section 2 (b) sets up the Capitol Police Board. The Capitol Police Board is composed of the Architect of the Capitol and the Sergeants at Arms of the Senate and House. The Capitol Police Board has been in force for many, many years.

The bill provides that the membership may go up to as many as 200. It is not contemplated that the present force would be increased. I know there are Members on the House floor who would be interested in whether or not the police of the Library of Congress and the Supreme Court might not be brought into the Capitol police system. Under the present arrangement and under the law we would have no authority over the police in the Library of Congress or in the Supreme Court. I was interested in determining that the Library of Congress has 76 members on its force. If we could bring the Library force into ours, our maximum of 200 would not be sufficient.

In this connection, the Supreme Court has 33 officers.

The appropriation has already been passed to cover this legislation. On page 509 of the supplemental appropriation bill is an item that calls for $633,203. That represents an increase of $217,523. This increase is reflected as indicated on page 3 of the report. Certain additional men are brought into the system.

Under the proposed legislation there would be a Chief, Capitol Police. The salaries are indicated. I point out that the salaries indicated are the gross salary.

I think the House is entitled to know there would be certain increases. The captain is now receiving a total gross of $5,813.33. Under this proposed legislation he would receive $8,500. The lieutenant is now receiving $4,283.05. He would receive under this legislation $6,009.

The privates are now receiving $3,996.27. It is proposed under this particular bill that they would fall within class 1 or 2, and the class 2 would call for a total gross of $4,115, as compared with the present salary scale of $3,996.27.

I might add in passing that these salaries are patterned after those of the Metropolitan Police Force.

You will notice that a clerk is set up here to officiate with and serve the Capitol Police Board.

I think it should be mentioned that currently and for a number of years we have been paying $28,000 to three Metropolitan policemen as liaison with the Capitol police. It is expected that within a period of time this liaison could be reduced to a minimum of perhaps one, but liaison is necessary for smooth working between the Capitol Police and the Metropolitan Police.

I would like to remind the House also and it perhaps should not be discussed at the present time, that since the March 1 incident, certain protection has been given to the Capitol which represents a decided increase in costs.

There is one feature, too, that should be brought to mind, that under this proposed legislation on page 31, section 12, it is proposed to give the men training by the metropolitan police force. It would not cost the Congress anything. They propose to run the Capitol police in with their own men and give them the training at certain periods each year. Those particularly better men would be given certain training with the FBI. It was interesting to those who have gone into this subject that at the present time there is not even a book of rules, there is nothing to guide the men other than a few perhaps written instructions. But so far as training is concerned, they do not receive any specialized training whatsoever. It has been determined also that perhaps some of the men who have been placed on the force have never had a gun in their hands.

I think it should be pointed out also that after the examination they will serve on a temporary basis for 1 year. All of the members would, of course, be subject to the examination which I shall not discuss but other members of the committee will follow that this is truly a merit system. At the present time there is no security clearance on any of the men, but under this proposed legislation there would be the usual security check. The bill also provides for veterans' preference and the bill provides for an oral examination.

Too Much of the Wrong Thing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 28, 1954

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am including as part of my remarks a recent article by Dorothy Thompson in which she contends that the settlement at Geneva is considered a defeat of an American policy which has changed sharply since Washington's day:

Too Much of the Wrong Thing—Settlement at Geneva Held Defeat of an American Policy Which Has Changed Sharply Since Washington's Day

The settlement in Indochina is a defeat of western and especially of American policy. It will be only another of a long series of defeats, if the policy is not changed. But instead of digesting the defeat, which, under all the circumstances, was inevitable, attempts (such as that of Senator Knowland) will be made to extend the policy, and to find scapegoats for American failure to do too little instead of too much, of the wrong thing.

The wrong thing has been to desert the traditional and successful American policy laid down at the beginning of the Republic which has been falsely branded as isolationism. That policy was not to pull other peoples' chestnuts out of fires, especially out of fires they themselves had kindled. It was to display toward all states, whatever their social and political form, a prideful courtesy that demanded strict reciprocity. It was to make no permanent alliances but to maintain freedom of diplomatic action. It was never to be a mercenary for others, never to fight wars for millenial and unobtainable objectives, such as eternal peace and the world rule of law (whose law?); never to enter into dubiously enforceable pacts, but to keep one's power in reserve; and in times of international crisis be prepared to say the last word instead of the first one.

In the last generation nearly every vestige of that policy has been progressively abandoned in favor of universal Galahading, until today there is no party in America prepared even to debate it. The Republican Party, which, as the guardian of the conservative and traditional American forces, should have done so, even at the risk, temporarily, of losing, joined the bandwagon of the universal antisin campaign, and is now inheriting the debacle of its predecessors' policies, which it made its own.

Our allies, however, have had some second thoughts and far from being their leader we are becoming their barely tolerated tool. This column does not censure them for this. All States take primary cognizance of their own interests and limitations with a view to their survival—all States, apparently, except our own.

Our allies count on the United States to back them in checking communism, or rebellions for independence, whether or not they are Communist-led or inspired, wherever the advance of these threatens their own interests, as it threatened the interests of France in Indochina, and will threaten them increasingly in North Africa. But they will certainly not join the United States in a universal crusade for liberation that might, conceivably, precipitate another world war. In the face of that possibility they will quit and ask the United States to ratify the terms of quitting, putting us in on all the defeats, in which, due to our prodding to hold the line, the United States comes off as the most ignominious, stripped of everything except a blanket of "morality" in which to wrap itself.

The advance of communism in the world is less a record of Russian victories than of American failures—of betting on the wrong forces ("wrong" because doomed) at the wrong historical time and under the wrong historical circumstances. Nothing could make the Indo-Chinese pro-French, or the Arab world pro-French or pro-British, or India anti-Chinese. But America can make them all anti-American by convincing herself that every rebellion in the world, whatever its cause and case, and however inevitable and overdue, is Communist-inspired and must, for that reason, be suppressed.

We had the initial advantage in Asia of never having been a colonial power, of being the authors of the idea of self-determination and national independence, of having no military bases or forces on the soil of other nations, nor using the lesser breeds to fight our wars.

Not having taken up the white man's burden, we were happily spared having to lay it down. Instead our leaders have taken up what others better, trained than we, and wiser in experience, have been forced to cast off.

This is just not bright, and no amount of platitudious moralizing will cover its intellectual bankruptcy. In politics results count, not words.

To Reorganize the Capitol Police Force

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN E. MOSS, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 29, 1954

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 9413) to reorganize the Capitol Police force in order to increase its efficiency in the performance of its duties.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I cannot agree with the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] that we do in fact give service preference and take it away in another section of the bill. That was not the intent and that is not the fact.

This matter was given great consideration.

Mr. BAILEY. If the gentleman will yield, and he should since he has mentioned my name, will the gentleman explain to me section 5 (a)?

Mr. MOSS. If the gentleman will withhold for just a few moments, that is exactly what I will do. "Section 5, subsection (a) that the Capitol Police Board may at any time require any member to take a physical examination to be given by the attending physician of the Capitol," requires that the examination show that the person is able to perform his duties. That is not any different than the situation right now. At any time that the Capitol Police Board should determine that the gentleman you have referred to is not physically fit to perform his duties he would no longer be retained in the employment of the Congress. This is not an unreasonable requirement, it is a very ordinary requirement. I can think of no police force that does not have a similar requirement.

Mr. BAILEY. Then of what value is the 5- and 10-percent preference clause?

Mr. MOSS. The same value that it is in every instance where a man seeks employment in the Government.

Mr. BAILEY. You give it to him in one section and take it away from him in the other.

Mr. MOSS. You do not take it away from him. You have merely required that a man be physically fit to do the job he is employed to do. I say it is not an unreasonable requirement.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOSS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BURLESON. In fact that is the only purpose for allowing the 10 percent for disability.

Mr. MOSS. That is correct.

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MOSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DEANE. In the passage of legislation like this certain people will be penalized. The age limit in the bill is 62 years. There are 5 or 6 men on the force today who are 70 years of age. If we make exceptions in one case it seems to me it would be only fair to make them in terms of all these deserving men.

I am glad to associate myself with the gentleman from California who has worked so hard and faithfully in helping draft this legislation.

Mr. MOSS. I want to make this comment. It is well to recall here what we are trying to do. We are trying to provide more security by creating a professional police force, by holding out inducements to attract the best possible people. It is not aimed at eliminating from the present force any man who is qualified. To require a minimum of physical fitness from a police officer is not in any way unreasonable. I think it would be fundamentally dishonest to say that a man unfit physically to perform his duties should continue on the payroll regardless.

I urge that you defeat the amendment.

Pity the Poor Taxpayer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 30, 1954

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted, I wish to cite further considerations that have weighed heavily in my decision to be among those voting against another multibillion dollar appropriation in the name of mutual security. An editorial appearing in the Indianapolis (Ind.) Star, issue of July 28, under the heading Pity the Poor Taxpayer, reflects the questioning attitude most citizens of my district have developed toward Uncle Sam's fabulous foreign spending. I believe it deserves to be quoted in its entirety:

The United States foreign aid program for next year includes $800 million for France to pay part of the costs of the Indochina War. That war is now over, at least temporarily. There is no longer any reason to earmark this money for France. The Senate, which is completing work on the foreign aid program, should completely eliminate this $800 million item.

Other cuts in foreign aid should also be made. The original idea of the foreign aid program was to fill the "dollar gap" that was opened between European exports to the United States and American exports to Europe. Our aid was supposed to make up the difference between what they spent and what they earned so that they could get on their economic feet and then build their own military defenses.

It hasn't worked out that way. They have done little toward building their own defenses. And the United States has been more than filling the "dollar gap," we've been overflowing it. In 1953 this country sold $21,300,000,000 worth of goods and services to other countries. Other countries sold $16,600,000,000 to the United States. Thus their "dollar gap" deficit was $4,700,000,000. But the United States gave away $6,700,000,000 in foreign aid last year. That is $2 billion more than other countries needed to pay their bills. As a result they are all adding to their dollar reserves while the American taxpayer is still shoveling out money and the American Government has gone deeper into debt.

The Federal deficit last year was over $3 billion. If we had not given away that extra $2 billion our deficit would have been only $1 billion. There is no reason whatsoever why the American taxpayer should have to pay a nickel to build up the dollar reserves of other nations. There is no reason why we should go into debt to build up surpluses in their treasuries.

The Federal Government has a backlog of over $10 billion earmarked for foreign aid. To this leftover money Congress has been asked to add another $3 billion or so. It doesn't make sense. The Senate should drastically cut the pending foreign aid program and instruct the executive branch to reevaluate the spending of the leftover $10 billion.

DISTRIBUTION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

To the Vice President and each Senator 100 copies; to the Secretary and Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, each, 25 copies; to the Secretary, for official use, not to exceed 35 copies; to the Sergeant at Arms, for use on the floor of the Senate, not to exceed 50 copies; to each Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress, 68 copies; to the Clerk, Sergeant at Arms, and Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives, each, 25 copies; to the Clerk, for official use, not to exceed 50 copies; and to the Doorkeeper, for use on the floor of the House of Representatives, not to exceed 75 copies; to the Vice President and each Senator, Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress there shall also be furnished (and shall not be transferable), 3 copies of the daily RECORD, of which 1 shall be delivered at his residence, 1 at his office, and 1 at the Capitol.

Appendix

The Philosophy of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, July 31, 1954

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, on Thursday, July 29, 1954, in the city of Washington, the junior Senator of the great State of Nebraska, the Honorable Samuel W. Reynolds, delivered the principal address before the opening session of the Department of the District of Columbia, the American Legion.

That address by my fellow Senator and my fellow Legionnaire was written out of the rich experience of the Senator in his more than 35 years of active membership and leadership in the American Legion.

It encompasses a philosophy that all Americans, Democrats and Republicans alike, can wholeheartedly and enthusiastically subscribe to and support.

Because of its tremendous importance to every American, I ask unanimous consent to have the stirring address printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

In accepting my governor's appointment to the United States Senate, I broke a rule of many years standing. When I have been urged to run for office, as has happened on many an occasion, I have always said, "No, thank you, I would much prefer to be the cussor rather than the cuseee." Now it appears that I am on the receiving end.

Like most businessmen who get to Washington occasionally, I have seen the Senate in operation for many years, but only as an outsider looking on. Now that I have had a chance to look behind the scenes, I can say to you that it is much like a Legion convention.

For 35 years, our Legion conventions have come in for much criticism by outsiders who never get a chance to look behind the scenes. They see us performing high jinx in the streets, debating on the floor, and parading in all manner of uniform, from dress to undress, but these outsiders never get to see behind the scenes. They never see the hard-working committees in action. The photographers like to take pictures of the fellows performing high jinx on the street, but never a picture of some hard-working committee at two o'clock in the morning trying to do something for our disabled and more unfortunate buddies.

The same holds true of the United States Senate. The public seldom gets an opportunity to see a committee working long hours over a tremendous stack of bills—and in each bill some large group of citizens has a keen personal interest. Just as the public would have more respect for a Legion convention if they could view the real work done in committees, so would they have more respect for the United States Senate.

My observation, based upon a short period of time in which I have been a Member of that body, is that the Senate does not in any way deserve the criticism heaped upon it by some columnists and many editors. A majority of the Members of the Senate are hard-working, conscientious individuals, trying to do a job as they are given to see the light. The United States Senate, like any other group of typical Americans, is made up of some men of great ability, some of average ability, and some of ordinary ability. It would be futile for me to catalogue the Members of the Senate in those classifications, because that would be my own opinion. Someone else might completely reverse the order, were they to do the cataloging.

We are all rather prone to think that the man who agrees with us is a smart chap, while the man who thinks differently than we do is pretty dumb. No legislative body can function efficiently and in an orderly manner unless there is respect for the other man's opinion. When the Senate completes its work, some people applaud the legislation, and some criticize it in no uncertain terms, but let me point out that in a free country, no man can have his own way. Only a dictator has his own way. All good legislation is a matter of compromise, after applying that most sensible principle of give and take, but whether you like what your Congress does or not, thank God, you still have the right to cuss, criticize, and condemn—a right which we freeborn Americans have, and one which is enjoyed by a few free men in the world today. We still have constitutional representatives government in America.

One of the great programs of the American Legion is our Boys State program and, as you know, the activities of Boys Nation is going on in Washington this week. This program of teaching the youth of America how the machinery of government functions is a tremendous one. I wish that we could go a little farther and do a little more toward drilling into these boys some of the fundamental political philosophy of the Founding Fathers.

Too few people in the Nation today understand that political philosophy. Too many people talk glibly of the rights which the Constitution grants them. Too few people realize that the Constitution grants no rights. Our freeborn American rights are God given. Every American is endowed by his Creator with certain inalienable rights. No king or potentate or government gave an American any rights—he was born with them and the Constitution was set up solely to guarantee that no government would take them away from him.

The Founding Fathers knew, as did no group of men in all history, that government is the source of all tyranny and all oppression. The Constitution which they wrote has but one purpose, and but one purpose only—to control government. Nothing could do more to guarantee the future greatness of this Nation than to drill that simple philosophy into the minds of every American boy until it becomes his creed. If that and that alone were the creed of every American, the future of this Nation would be safe, regardless of what catastrophe might befall it. Even though many of our cities were destroyed by hydrogen or atomic bombs, even though we suffered an economic collapse of disastrous proportions, the cities could all be rebuilt and our economy restored, provided the survivors could carry on under the same political creed as did their forebears.

I have put my thought in rather crude language. The same thought has never been voiced more eloquently than by Daniel Webster, when he arose in the United States Senate well over a hundred years ago and said, "Other misfortunes may be borne or their effects overcome. If disastrous wars should sweep our commerce from the ocean, another generation may renew it; if it exhausts our Treasury, future industry may replenish it; if it desolate and lay waste our fields, still under a new cultivation they will grow green again and ripen to future harvests. It were but a trifle even if the walls of yonder Capitol were to crumble, if its lofty pillars should fall and its gorgeous decorations be all covered by the dust of the valley. All these may be rebuilt. But who shall reconstruct the fabric of demolished government, who shall rear again the well proportioned columns of constitutional liberty, who shall frame together the skillful architecture which unites national sovereignty with States' rights, individual security, and public prosperity. No—if these columns fall they shall be raised not again. Like the Colosseum and the Parthenon, they will be destined to a mournful and melancholy immortality. Bitterer tears, however, will flow over them than were ever shed over the monuments of Roman or Grecian art, for they will be the monuments of a more glorious edifice than Greece or Rome ever saw, the edifice of constitutional American liberty."

Another program of the American Legion which was emphasized during the past year is one which should be at the forefront of our programs in all the years to come. I refer to our back to God movement. I hope every boy who is here in Washington attending Boys Nation will be taken over and given an opportunity to view that architectural gem, the Jefferson Memorial, and be permitted to stand there and read some of Jefferson's immortal words, particularly these words: "God who gave us life gave us liberty. Can the liberties of a nation be secure when we have removed a conviction that these liberties are the gift of God." Let me apply those words to the world situation today by simply saying, "Russia with all her devilish works if multiplied a hundredfold is not as powerful as God."

I have spoken of 1 or 2 of our Legion programs. Now let me refer to one of our most ancient programs and suggest a followup or rather an up-to-date extension of that program. No organization in America has such a keen interest in the Subversive Activities Committee of Congress. It is a well-known fact that had it not been for the American Legion, that committee would have been disbanded years ago. I propose to mention no names, but there are many who are doing yeoman work today in trying to root out of our Government and all of our American institutions, all subversives. I have but one criticism of them, and that is hardly a criticism. I can only say that they are Johnny-come-latelys. The Legion's interest and the Legion's activities on this score go back for some 35 years.

Well do I remember sitting as a delegate at the first national convention of the American Legion in Minneapolis on Armistice Day some 35 years ago next November 11 and hearing the news of the Centralia massacre.. Here was the Legion Post, of Centrallia, Wash., newly organized and marching down the streets of its home town on the first anniversary of the armistice when, without warning, members of the IWW opened up with rifle fire from the windows of its office along the line of march. Warren Grim, commander of that post, was shot down and killed.

The IWW were the extreme radicals of those days. They were the counterpart of the Communists of today. Much as is said today about methods, the Legion will never forget the methods used by the Wobblies. Rifle fire was their method. From that day to this minute, the Legion has declared war on all those from boxcar red to parlor pink who seek to destroy by any means American institutions for which American veterans have fought throughout the years. No man today could be more vociferous than the Legion was some 25 or 30 years ago. Shades of Homer Chaliaux, Arthur Woods, Henry J. "Sailor" Ryan, Alvin Owsley, and Garland W. Powell.

These were the early directors of Americanism for the American Legion. Perhaps they were born 30 years too soon, but history repeats itself. In those days, the newspaper editors were prone to criticize the Legion, even laugh at us. They called us Red baiters, and thereby dull the point of our argument. Today some call us Fascists and super patriots. But all that we Legionnaires predicted has come to pass. The record is written where all who run may read. The point I want to make, however, is that in all those 35 years, the Legion conducted its campaign against subversives on the permise that it was a battle between Americanism and communism—between Americans on the one hand and the Communists and all their fellow-travelers on the other. Never once, in all those 35 years, was there the slightest hint of partisan politics. American Legionnaires, Republicans and Democrats alike, joined the crusade. Today, it appears that this crusade has degenerated to the great detriment of the Nation into a partisan political hassel. The Legion could do no greater service to the Nation today than to take the lead in getting the train back on the track.

I would like to see every department convention including this one, pass resolutions urging that the national convention do likewise and call upon the citizenry of America, nay, even do more than that—demand of our fellow citizens that they cut out the partisan politics and join up as Americans all in running the subversive enemies out of our Government, our labor unions, our schools, our churches, and our industry. No organization is in better shape than the Legion to say to the Republicans and Democrats alike, "A plague on both your Houses."

Let us get the train back on the track and as Americans all, not as Republicans and Democrats, get this job done to the end that our children might say as we say today, and as our forebearers said before us, "We here in America bend our knees to no master; we bow only to God."

Rebuke to the Spenders

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 28, 1954

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an editorial that recently appeared in the Wall Street Journal entitled "A Rebuke to the Spenders." The editorial has warm praise for the House Appropriations Committee which cut back the 1954 foreign-aid appropriation bill by some $812 million:

REBUKE TO THE SPENDERS

The House Appropriations Committee has voted to cut back foreign aid 13 percent—or some $812 million. At the same time the committee accused the Foreign Operations Administration of fiscal irresponsibility.

Mr. Stassen's bureaucrats, the House committee said, were caught in the old bureaucratic game of spending everything in sight at the end of a fiscal year. This is a practice to avoid questions from Congress why the bureaus asked for more than was needed and to duck suggestions that perhaps not so much is needed this year as last since there is some left over.

This time the Congressmen had some things to say about the practice. FOA sped up spending "in a deliberate effort to tie up or dispose of available funds" before the fiscal deadline. Thus June buying got rid of "hot money as a basis for support of 1955 requests." The agency did this in the face of warnings from the Director of the Budget. In addition, four different sets of figures were supplied for obligations in the first quarter of 1954, which only added to the confusion. And it was compounded by FOA's questionable practice of listing previously appropriated funds as obligated for expenditure—a little bookkeeping trick to hide some extra funds.

Even when the bookkeeping wasn't tricky, it was bad, the committee reported. Plain clerical errors amounted to some $47 million.

Well, there must be some explanation for all of this and doubtless Mr. Stassen's pencillers will have something to say in reply to the committee. We recall the explanation of an error of $1 billion in foreign aid confessed last year. The answer was that it had all happened under a previous administration.

If FOA did juggle its figures in this manner, the rebuke was certainly justified. The reduction in foreign aid funds should have come in any case; under the circumstances outlined by the committee there was justification for much larger reductions than were recommended. The way for the Congress to cut down on the waste is to further cut down on the funds.

The Numbers Game—Part 3

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 26, 1954

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following excerpts from hearings on the 1955 appropriation bills:

Information Concerning the Operation of the Federal Employees Security Program as Presented Before the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives in Hearings on the Fiscal 1955 Appropriations

TREASURY DEPARTMENT

(From hearings on January 12, 27, 29, February 3 and 8, 1954)

Elbert P. Tuttle (general counsel): "I am Acting Personnel Security Officer of the Treasury Department. When the President's Executive order was issued we started to reevaluate the entire security program in the Treasury Department. Since that time there has been a total, up to December 6, of removals of 308 in the Treasury Department. Of that number, as you well recognize, a substantial number are removals for other than security reasons. One hundred and ninety-four of the 308 were for other than security reasons. The remaining ones were for security reasons, and those security reasons were not by any means all under the original concept of loyalty, or subversive activities but on the ground of anything that would make a person an undesirable security risk, which means that of the total of 308, 104 were for reasons that do not fall within the President's security program definition and 114 do fall within that."

In reply to questions, Mr. Tuttle and other Treasury officials stated that approximately half of those removed were in the Washington office, and that none was in the highest or second highest echelons of the Department. Total employment in the Department as of December 31 was 33,982. Mr. Tuttle did not have information indicating how many of those removed had been removed for subversion and for other causes named in the Executive order. This information was supplied for calendar 1953 and inserted in the record:

Removals under Executive Order 10450	130
Removals for other reasons	209
Total removals	339

This comment followed the statistics: "No statistics have been kept, and none will be available reflecting the number of the above removals which were effected for reasons classified as 'subversive,' if by this term is meant some type of identification with Communist or Soviet causes or interests. The reason for this is that during the course of an investigation there may be evidence of some such association but, without the necessity either of completing the investigation into, or evaluating this phase of the employee's activities, it becomes abundantly clear that the employee has been guilty of other acts that make him an unacceptable security risk and he is dropped. In such a situation, it would be obviously unfair to classify such removal as a subversive removal, but it would be equally inaccurate to state that there was no subversive problem involved. From my own experience in handling these matters, I do know that persons have been dropped as security risks on easily provable cases of dishonesty or false swearing in which information as to possible subversive activity was present.

"Acts of reckless, irresponsible or wanton nature indicating poor judgment, and instability, while not strictly speaking subversive in themselves, may, under some circumstances, indicate that the individual might disclose security information to unauthorized persons or otherwise assist such persons (whether deliberately or inadvertently) in activities inimical to the security of the United States, and thus engage in subversive activities. Similarly, the presence of a close relative of an employee in an unfriendly nation, or identity of a close relative with a Communist organization or activity, while not raising any inference that the employee is subversive, might suggest the possibility that coercion or pressure could be brought on the employee through such relative to engage in subversive activities. It could be said that a person becomes a security risk due to suitability factors only when such factors raise reasonable cause to believe that such person might, at a later date, actually engage in subversive activity."

The committee's questioning of officials from the Bureau of Customs revealed that there had been approximately a half dozen dismissals because of security risks in the Bureau last year. In each of the six cases

Acting Commissioner David B. Strubinger said that there was indication of a Communist contact, or there had been a previous membership to such an extent that it was considered a definite security risk.

Rear Adm. A. C. Richmond, Assistant Commandant of the Coast Guard, stated that there had been approximately 80 dismissals for cause in the past year but he did not know how many were for security reasons. Since the loyalty program was initiated, there had been the following dismissals "for cause" (not further broken down):

1947	15
1948	10
1949	12
1950	14
1951	57
1952	143
1953	80

O. Gordon Delk, Deputy Commissioner of Internal Revenue, stated that he was not prepared to separate into categories the reasons for dismissals from the Bureau. The following information was later supplied for the record:

Dismissals under Executive Order 10450	58
Dismissals for all other causes	69

Reference was made to the comment (quoted above) concerning the reasons for the impossibility of making a further classification of these two groups. Figures for previous years were included in supplementary testimony of Mr. Tuttle on February 8.

On February 8 Mr. Tuttle and Mr. Strubinger were before the committee which met to consider some seemingly conflicting testimony concerning the Bureau of Customs.

Representative J. Vaughan Gary, Democrat, Virginia: "Mr. Tuttle, when you first testified before the committee you stated, if I am not mistaken, that 114 people had been separated from the service under the security order issued by President Eisenhower. I asked at that time for a breakdown of that figure showing those who were actually subversives or connected with subversive organizations. You stated that the information was not available at that time and I requested that it be inserted in the record. When the manuscript came back to me, I was astonished to find a statement that the information was not available. I knew that could not be correct for the simple fact that the Department is bound to know the reasons for which the 114 persons were discharged, and if they do not know the reasons for their discharge, then the Department owes them an apology for discharging them at all.

"Later I found that the statement that the information was not available had been stricken from the record and that a letter had been inserted. The letter still is not responsive to the request that I made. Subsequently, I made a request through the executive secretary of our committee that this information be enlarged to show how many had been separated from the service each year since 1947—the year in which the first Executive order dealing with the security program was issued—and I was astonished when that information was not supplied.

"All I am asking is that this committee be given a comparative statement showing how many were separated annually from the service under the Executive order issued by the President of the United States in 1947 and how many were discharged under the Executive order issued by President Eisenhower, the figures for each of the years being broken down so as to show the actual subversives and persons disloyal to the United States."

After some discussion Mr. Tuttle replied that he was trying to be as responsive as possible. When he first appeared he had said that 114 out of a total of 209 dismissals were for reasons based on Executive Order 10450. That 114 had now increased to 130, carrying through the month of December, and this figure had been used in the information furnished to the committee. He gave the following information concerning security dismissals: In the 5 years, 1948–52, under President Truman's Loyalty Order 9835, there were only 8 dismissals because disloyalty to the United States was the only ground for dismissal. The whole basis changed under President's Eisenhower's order and the 130 dismissals in 1953 are not comparable to those in 1948–52. No statistics showing grounds for dismissal during this 5-year period are available and to prepare them would require analysis of every person dismissed. He said: "We are not authorized to open the personnel investigative files to the extent of turning over to the committee the files within the categories of dismissal beyond classifying them as security risks. * * * We feel that is the place in Treasury where the line should be drawn—that is, giving statistics between security and nonsecurity but not breaking them down into the actual categories because the categories do not give the full answer."

Mr. Gary: "Is there any reason why you cannot make those a category in itself? The impression has been created throughout the United States that 2,200 disloyal persons have been separated from the Government service. That is not true, but that impression has been created. Then when you ask how many of the 2,200 were disloyal, you say you cannot give us the answer for this, that, or another reason. I think we are entitled to have a breakdown of those figures."

Representative Gordon Canfield, Republican, New Jersey: "Will the gentleman yield?"

Mr. Gary: "Yes."

Mr. Canfield: "Has it not been stated repeatedly that 2,200 Federal employees have been discharged as 'security risks'?"

Mr. Gary: "And it has also been stated that 90 percent were either Communists or perverts, which is not true."

Mr. Canfield: "What you are seeking to determine is whether they were Communists, espionage agents"——

Mr. Gary: "It would be difficult to prove whether a person was a Communist or an espionage agent. If they would say they were suspected—I do not believe in firing people on suspicion, but if they were fired on suspicion of belonging to a subversive organization, give us that classification. I understand a lot of those people were drunks. I think when a person gets to a point where he canont control his appetite for liquor he is a poor security risk, but that does not mean he is disloyal. To turn such a person out with the imputation of disloyalty is a gross injustice. There is a difference between a man being an alcoholic, which is a disease, and being a Communist, which is a traitor. I do not want to attach to these 2,200 people the guilt of being traitors to the country when it is not true. All I want to do is to give the American people the information and I think they are entitled to it."

Representative Benjamin F. James, Republican, Pennsylvania: "Will the gentleman yield?"

Mr. Gary: "Yes."

Mr. James: "I am not familiar with the source of the charge that these 2,200 persons were disloyal. Was that an official statement?"

Mr. Tuttle: "I would like to say, Mr. Gary, that the Treasury has not published any of those statistics either directly or as a part of the civil-service report, as far as I know. Some of the persons dismissed from the Treasury Department may be included in that 2,200 figure, but they may not be. If they are, they were picked up from the IBM cards sent to the Civil Service Commission, but Treasury has not made any publication of those dismissals under any classification."

Mr. Gary: "I understand that. I will give the answer to the gentleman. The President, in his state of the Union message, made the statement that one-thousand-four-hundred-and-some-odd persons had been separated from the service for security reasons. Everybody assumed that meant that they had been discharged for disloyalty. The number mentioned by the President was as of the time he made his state of the Union message. The number subsequently was enlarged to 2,200. People throughout the United States have the idea that 2,200 Communist spies have been dismissed from the service within the last year. The President has denied this, but there has been no breakdown of the cases. All I want is to give the people of the United States the facts. I think they are entitled to know the facts, and I want to give them to them. That is all."

Mr. Canfield: "May I say, for the benefit of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, I am not sure he heard me read earlier this paragraph from the New York Times dispatch of this day. May I quote it again: 'President Eisenhower expressed his concern over the problem at a news conference last week. At that time he said he was determined that innocent persons should not suffer guilt by association. The White House staff, the President continued, has been directed to consider ways of making some information, by way of a breakdown, available.' "

Mr. James: "Of course as yet nobody has been willing to say that all of these people or 90 percent of them were dismissed for disloyalty. In my mind there is a vast difference between saying that people are dismissed because of perversions or because of associations with persons who are known to be disloyal to the Government, and saying that they themselves are disloyal. Disloyalty means treason in my book. But I cannot understand how the statements that have been made here could be construed as a charge that anybody has been dismissed for disloyalty."

Mr. Gary: "Nobody has broken the figures down."

Mr. James: "What I am trying to say is that nobody has said those 2,200 people or 90 percent of them, have been discharged for disloyalty."

Mr. Gary: "All I want to know is how many have been discharged for being disloyal."

Mr. Tuttle: "The Treasury cannot give it to you because we have not checked the files of each person dismissed."

Mr. Gary: "I demand to know the persons who have actually been found to be disloyal. You can make any statement that is true as to the rest of them, but I do not want a statement to stand unexplained that is misleading to the people of the United States. All I want to do is to give the people of the United States the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth."

[Omission.]

Mr. Tuttle: "I have a specific answer to one of the questions you last asked, Mr. Gary. We do have during 1953 a completion of the loyalty program that was initiated under Executive Order 9835, and four persons have been dismissed from the Treasury Department as disloyal by findings of the loyalty procedure under the previous order. Executive Order 10450 did not become effective in Treasury until its regulations were issued in September. The dismissals I spoke of previously were under the standards set up under Executive Order 9835 and they totaled 130. The 4 I speak of are the only ones of the 130 as to whom charges of being disloyal were made. The 130 include either dismissals or forced resignations."

Mr. Gary: "Some of the 130 did resign?"

Mr. Tuttle: "Yes."

Mr. Gary: "Will you give us the total number of dismissals and forced resignations from 1948 through 1953?"

Mr. Tuttle: "I am sorry. I would like to, but only in 1953 were the forced resignations kept separately. We do not have statistics on forced resignations for the previous 5 years."

Mr. Gary: "Will you give the total number of dismissals?"

Mr. Tuttle: "Yes. I have a table showing Treasury employees discharged during the calendar years 1948 to 1952, and this same table shows the number discharged on loyalty grounds under the then existing loyalty program. I will leave that table for the record. The total dismissals from 1948 to 1952, including resignations, were 994. Eight of those were dismissed under the loyalty program itself."

(The table referred to is as follows:)

Treasury employees discharged during the calendar years 1948–52

Year	Under provisions of Executive Order 9835	For other reasons	Total
1948	3	111	114
1949	2	155	157
1950	2	181	183
1951	----------	238	238
1952	1	301	302
Total for period	8	986	994

Mr. Tuttle: "The total dismissals and forced resignations for 1953 were 339, of which 130 were for security reasons and out of the 130 were the 4 specifically found under the prior loyalty program to be disloyal persons. Those four are the only ones on whom a finding of disloyalty was made. Instead of 4 being included in the 130, only 3 were included because 1 was in Puerto Rico and, being out of continental limits of the United States, is not included.

"You asked specifically about Mr. Strubinger's department. I have the figures for the Bureau of Customs for the 5 years 1948 through 1952, and there were none dismissed under the provisions of Executive Order 9835 in that 5-year period. That makes it completely responsive. I had intended to make it responsive by stating there was no program in the preceding 5 years that was comparable. I submit for the record a table on the Bureau of Customs."

(The table referred to is as follows:)

Employees in the Bureau of Customs, Treasury Department, discharged during the calendar years 1948 through 1952

Year	Under provisions of Executive Order 9835	For other reasons	Total
1948	----------	10	10
1949	----------	12	12
1950	----------	12	12
1951	----------	16	16
1952	----------	17	17
Total for period	----------	67	67

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

(From hearings on January 24 and March 16, 1954)

Representation John J. Rooney, Democrat, New York: "How many Communists have been found in the Department of State in the last year?"

Walter Bedell Smith (Under Secretary of State): "That I cannot answer. I do not know that any have been found there. Mr. McLeod [Robert W. S. McLeod, Administrator, Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs, and Personnel] knows. The only time I checked I was cognizant of two probable Communists in the Department. Alger Hiss, whom you know about, and the other a minor employee who was discharged some years ago because he was found to be a Communist."

[Omission.]

Mr. Rooney. "I failed to inquire, when we were talking about the Communists you found in the Department last year, about alleged security risks?"

Mr. Smith: "We found a number who were security risks."

Mr. Rooney. "How many?"

Mr. McLeod: "Approximate 300."

Mr. Smith. "Please, gentlemen, when you talk about a security risk realize that covers a wide field."

Mr. Rooney. "Yes. That covers drunks" ——

[Omission.]

Discussing the 300 security risks mentioned above:

Mr. Rooney. "How many of these were Foreign Service officers?"

Mr. Smith. "I suppose you could count them on the fingers of two hands."

Mr. McLeod. "I am reluctant to break this down too much, because I am afraid we will identify individuals if we do"——

Mr. Rooney. "My position is if you do not give us the information you do not get the money. I do not know if the committee will agree with me."

[Further discussion ensued dealing with taking up the matter later in the hearings.]

Later in the hearing on January 25 Mr. McLeod described very thoroughly the method of conducting security investigations in the Department and the problems met in this activity. He then took up the earlier question of the number of dismissals.

Mr. McLeod: "As soon as Mr. Rooney indicated his interest in the breakdown, I called the Security Office to get the figures broken down. I do not have them broken down now. I can give you what I have now, with this explanation: Under the Executive order, when a person's case was evaluated under the old Truman loyalty security order, it must be reevaluated under 10450. So to set up the machinery on this phase we took those cases which had previously been through the old process and scheduled them for readjudication under this new order. When any person left the Department, for whatever reason, who was on the list, we notified the Civil Service Commission that this unresolved security-integrity question existed in order that any other Federal agency which might employ that person would be aware of this situation and would inquire into it with respect to the sensitivity of the job he was to be assigned to. This is meant to be, and in my judgment is, justification of the fact that the Department, in reporting these figures to the Civil Service Commission, reported people who left the service by whatever means, which included transfers. That has been subjected to attack as a dishonest reporting device. I do not defend it, I can only explain it.

"Under that reporting system, which is the one we have in effect because of the forms sent to us, we have had a total of 590 separations on which a security question existed. That was from January 1, 1953, to December 31, 1953. We can break those down as follows:

"Those discharged for cause, a total of 21."

Representative Prince H. Preston, Jr., Democrat, of Georgia: "Discharged for what?"

Mr. McLeod: "Discharged for cause under Public Law 733, which is the basic law under which the Executive order was issued.

"Resigned, 188.

"Terminated in the course of reductions in force, 50. I ought to point out that the reduction-in-force actions are based on relative retention credits and are carried out consistent with civil-service regulations. There is no way I know of that we can reach a security risk through a reduction in force.

"Terminated due to expiration of limited appointments, 36. Those are people whose terms just ran out.

"Retired, 4.

"Transferred to other agencies, 291.

"These figures total 590. Included in that number, and in those categories listed so far, there were a total of 99 cases in that calendar year of separations involving homosexual deviations as the principal factor.

"I might point out another difficulty in trying to assign these cases to one criterion or another is that there is overlapping. A person might be an alcoholic and also a sexual deviate; or he may be associated with Communists and also a drug addict.

"At the present time we have 278 pending investigations in the sexual deviation category on which there has been no determination.

"Under the order—this is not a part of that general total but apart from it—we have completed the evaluation of 45 cases where there was an adverse recommendation from the Security Office. So far we have not successfully finally completed the procedure in a single case under this order. I think we have two cases where appeals are pending, but the appeals have not yet been heard. The system work as follows: The recommendation of the Security Office comes to me. If I recommend we pursue the case, it goes to Mr. Lourie, [Donlad B. Lourie, Under Secretary for Administration] and if Mr. Lourie recommends it, it goes to the Secretary and the Secretary determines whether or not there should be a suspension. If there is a suspension, that starts the formal machinery. The employee is then furnished a letter of charges, he has 30 days to reply, and his reply is again the subject of a decision. Recommendation is made to the Secretary that the employee is terminated or reinstated. If the decision is reached that he is to be terminated, he has a right of appeal and the appeal board is made up of three people who are not in the Department but in some other Government agency. We have not as yet carried any case through that machinery to the final determination."

(Omission.)

Mr. Rooney: "With regard to the 21 separated for cause, those 21 were fired, right?"

Mr. McLeod: "Yes."

Mr. Rooney: "How many of those 21 were fired for being Communists?"

Mr. McLeod: "I do not have the breakdown, and I could not say they were Communists even though the information indicated they were."

Mr. Rooney: "Could you not say any of them were Communists?"

Mr. McLeod: "I cannot offhand, Congressman. I am coming back again to justify my own budget, and I will try to have a breakdown."

Mr. Rooney: "How many of the 21 cases were referred to the Attorney General or district attorney, if any?"

Mr. McLeod: "I would not normally refer cases to the Attorney General. We have had a couple of instances where people have falsified payroll records or made false statements on their Form 57 which we detected and referred to the Attorney General, but the Department has the FBI make investigations for possible prosecution."

Mr. Rooney: "Such prosecutions would be included in the 21?"

Mr. McLeod: "I think the two I was thinking of, both people resigned, so they would be under resignations."

Mr. Rooney: "Can you tell us whether or not there was any person fired since January 1953 from the Department for subversive activities in the literal sense?"

Mr. McLeod: "I have the list of all the individuals here. I could go through it and answer your question, I think."

Mr. Rooney: "There are only 21 on your list, including all the categories."

Mr. McLeod: "Yes. I find one here who was discharged for pro-Communist activities or associations, which would be the farthest we would ever go."

Mr. Rooney: "There was one?"

Mr. McLeod: "I have found 1 in the first 4 pages. Do you want me to go through this?"

Mr. Rooney: "Yes. You understand my position on this. I am for separating those who should be separated from the Department, but I think the public is entitled to know something about what is going on."

[Omission.]

Mr. McLeod: "Here is one. This fellow certainly is not subversive, but he did have relatives who were Soviet nationals, and we discovered he was subject to pressure because he was in the Department, and it was for his own good as well as the Department's good that we got rid of him."

Mr. Rooney: "In what area was he employed?"

Mr. McLeod: "I do not know about that. I just have his name, date of separation, and reason."

Mr. Rooney: "Do you have his grade there?"

Mr. McLeod: "No."

Mr. Rooney: "Will you furnish it for the record at this point?"

Mr. McLeod: "His grade?"

Mr. Rooney: "Yes; and in what area he was employed."

Mr. McLeod: "That would probably identify him."

Mr. Rooney: "If you do not want to identify him, that is all right. But I feel if you found something with regard to subversive activities, those cases should be prosecuted. If, on the other hand, you do not find subversive activities, there may be some reason why you should not give their names. Suppose you give us off the record the area and grade, when you get it, and then we will determine whether or not it should go on the record."

Mr. McLeod: "Eleven of the twenty-one were discharged for pro-Communist activities or associations."

Mr. Rooney: "Can you give us the classifications of these people, their grades, and how many were Foreign Service employees?"

Mr. McLeod: "I will have to get that. I do not have it with me."

Mr. Rooney: "This man mentioned by the Under Secretary this morning, with whose separation I would agree, in what category would he be? Do you know the man the Under Secretary referred to this morning?"

Mr. McLeod: "Yes, sir."

Mr. Rooney: "Is he in this 21?"

Mr. McLeod: "No; he is not in the 21 because he is not as yet separated. Can we go off the record in talking about him, because I am afraid he is pretty easily identified?"

"(Discussion off the record.)"

Mr. Rooney: "In regard to the 11 of the 21 separated for cause, how many of those had charges been filed against which were pending as of January 1, 1953?"

Mr. McLeod: "I will have to furnish the answer."

"(The information requested is as follows:)"

"Seven of the twelve had charges pending against them as of January 1, 1953."

Mr. Rooney: "That is all, Mr. Chairman."

[The limitations of the departmental security investigations and the maintenance of security in the case of American employees of the U. N. were considered in some detail.]

[Later, Mr. McLeod made a statement containing sections on suitability factors and the work of the Office of Security.]

In hearings on the third supplemental appropriation bill for 1954, on March 16, 1954, the Department of State requested additional funds ($900,000) to accelerate the security investigation of employees. Approximately 6,000 investigative cases remained to be investigated. Mr. McLeod spoke in defense of this request, and details were brought out in response to committee questioning. The number of prosecutions and the number of subversives discovered were the subjects of the following discussion:

Mr. Rooney: "How many people, if any, have you prosecuted under this law to date?"

Mr. McLeod: "We have no prosecuting function, Congressman Rooney."

Mr. Rooney: "How many cases have you turned over to the FBI, or to the Office of the Attorney General for prosecution under this law, if any?"

Dennis A. Flinn (Director, Office of Security): "All of the cases involving any information that appears under the heading you have indicated there we submit to the FBI and the FBI, under the Executive order, completes the investigation itself."

Mr. Rooney: "How many cases have you turned over which would fall into this category?"

Mr. McLeod: "I think we would have to furnish that for the record. You understand we do not turn them over for prosecution; we turn them over for investigation."

(The following information is submitted later as requested:)

"The Office of Security during the period September 1, 1953, to February 28, 1954, referred to the FBI for investigation pursuant to Executive Order 10450, section 8 (d), 75 cases. These cases were referred under the mandatory provisions of the Executive order because security questions concerning the individual employee had arisen.

"In the event an individual against whom there is a security question terminates his employment with the Department of State for any reason, and an FBI investigation is pending, the Department of State immediately notifies the FBI to terminate its inquiries under the provisions of Executive Order 10450 since the individual is no longer an employee of the Government. Any further action taken in a case of this nature will naturally come under the national defense statutes but would be a part of the President's security program, and any prosecutive action would necessarily have to originate with the Department of Justice."

Mr. Rooney: "Evidently the answer is 'None,' because my question has not been answered at all. If you as head of security in the State Department find a case that fits within this law which I have read, is it not your duty to initiate prosecution by turning it over to another agency to prosecute?"

Mr. McLeod: "It is not only my duty, but it is standard operating procedure. In fact, by Presidential directive, if we detect any cases that might possibly come within this subversive category, we have to turn them over to the FBI. We do not investigate those cases."

Mr. Rooney: "How many have you found which fit in the category of this public-law?"

Mr. McLeod: "I will have to furnish the figures for the record; I do not know what it is."

Mr. Rooney: "Of course this business of furnishing figures later on for the record is an unfortunate one; because, when you leave here and insert that figure this afternoon, and these hearings are going to be printed tonight, you do not give us much chance to inquire behind the figures you give."

Mr. McLeod: "It would be very difficult to foresee that this matter would come up as a result of our request today."

Mr. Rooney: "There is nothing difficult about it. I think the public understands if subversives or Communists have been found in the Government who have been accepting salary or wages as Government employees from the Treasury of the United States, that they should be prosecuted for a felony."

Mr. McLeod: "I agree."

Mr. Rooney: "That was the intention of Congress when it enacted this law in every appropriation bill beginning a number of years back. You agree with me, do you?"

Mr. McLeod: "Yes, sir."

Mr. Rooney: "Now just tell us how many are being prosecuted by the State Department for violation of this law?"

Mr. McLeod: "I will have to ask the Attorney General to give me the answer to that."

Mr. Rooney: "Will you just find out and get us the answer, because I think it is pertinent."

Representative Cliff Clevenger, Republican, of Ohio: "At the same time, would you find out over the period of the last 10 or 12 years how many have been prosecuted under the act and turned over for prosecution from your Department."

Mr. McLeod: "Since this language was first inaugurated?"

Mr. Clevenger: "That is right."

Mr. Rooney: "And while you are at it, you might find out how many of the 422 that were mentioned by Vice President Nixon in Saturday night's broadcast have been prosecuted under this law.

"That is all I have Mr. Chairman."

Mr. Preston: "Since you became security officer of the State Department, have you found fewer or more people with subversive tendencies than you expected to find when you assumed the position?"

Mr. McLeod (after a pause): "I am trying to think back as to what my expectations were."

Representative Frederic R. Coudert, Jr., Republican, of New York: "As a lawyer, I would call that a leading question."

Mr. McLeod: "It is pretty hard to give you an honest answer on that."

Mr. Rooney: "Mr. Chairman, I must say one thing about Mr. McLeod, if I may interrupt. He does give me some honest answers."

Mr. Preston: "I agree with that. He was very frank with this committee when he appeared before us in January."

Mr. Rooney: "And I admire him for it."

Mr. McLeod :"I think I have found fewer than I expected to find."

Mr. Preston: "That is all, Mr. Chairman."

Mr. Clevenger: "There might be something in numbers—in the fewer places to find them in."

Mr. McLeod: "The reorganization plan did make for fewer employees."

The Numbers Game—Part 4

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 26, 1954

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following excerpts from hearings on the 1955 appropriation bills:

Information Concerning the Operation of the Federal Employees Security Program as Presented Before the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives in Hearings on the Fiscal 1955 Appropriations

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

(From hearings on January 27, 1954)

(Note.—The committee went into all aspects of the work of the Commission in connection with the security program. Necessarily, much of the text of the hearing must be omitted in the present report which is limited to the determination of the numbers charged, cleared, and dismissed and the causes for action. For complete text see Hearings on the Civil Service Commission before the Subcommittee on Independent Offices, House of Representatives Committee on Appropriations, Part I, pp. 950–952, 959, 960, 979–989, 1004–1006, 1008–1031.)

In discussing the investigation by the Commission of United States citizens for employment by international organizations, under Executive Order 10459, David F. Williams, Director, Bureau of Management Services, stated that the International Organizations Employees Loyalty Board had closed out 2,397 cases through January 16, 1954, and that 956 cases were pending. The status of the workload of the Board as of January 16, 1954, was as follows:

"Cases received in Board	3, 353
Cases completed by Board and transmitted to State Department for use of Secretary General of United Nations or appropriate head of other international organizations:	
Clear: Cases in which no derogatory loyalty information was developed by the investigation	2,040
Advisory loyalty opinion: Cases in which a loyalty issue was developed by the investigation	108
Suitability summaries: Cases in which the investigation discloses derogatory suitability information other than of a loyalty nature	125
Dicontinued: Cases discontinued by the agency because individual was no longer employed or beings considered for employment	124
Total	2, 397
Cases on hand in the Board	956"

The greater part of the committee's consideration dealt with the security program in the civil service:

Representative SIDNEY R. YATES (Democrat, Illinois): "In how many cases since last May did you ask the FBI to make a field investigation?"

Philip Young (Chairman): "I cannot tell you offhand. I do not know."

Mr. YATES: "Do your records indicate it?"

Mr. Young: "Yes, our records would indicate it."

Mr. YATES: "Can you supply it for the record?"

Mr. Young: "I believe we would prefer not to, Mr. YATES, as part of the breakdown under this security order."

Mr. YATES: "It will be the first time in years that you have not supplied it because I have gone through the records of hearings since 1950 here and, for example, here is Mr. THOMAS' examination in fiscal year 1951 and it is revealed in all these hearings."

Mr. Young: "That was under the loyalty program."

Mr. YATES: "What difference does it make for this purpose?"

Mr. Young: "This is a different program."

Mr. YATES: "I am not asking for the names of the employees, so there is no question involving the identification of any particular person. No person will be harmed as a result. Certainly, in view of the practice of this committee of having this information, and it has been supplied each year, these figures should be made a part of the record. I call attention of the chairman to what has occurred.

"For example, on page 1405 Mr. THOMAS asks the question:

"'What part of the 1,155 cases that have been heard by the regional boards will actually be cleared and permitted to work in the Government service; that is, the cases that the regional boards have held so far for the fiscal year 1950; that is, through December?

"'Mr. Williams. We can get it for the record. We do not have it with us.

"'Mr. THOMAS. Do you remember an approximate figure? In other words, what I am trying to get at is just how serious do all these investigations turn out to be when we bring them out into the open?

"'Mr. MITCHELL. The percentage of the incumbents is very small; a fraction of 1 percent were actually discharged.

"'Mr. THOMAS. Less than 1 percent?

"'Mr. MITCHELL. Less than 1 percent.'

"On the next page the following informátion is supplied by Mr. Moyer and this is under the heading of 'Results of Loyalty Program.'

"Mr. Moyer says: 'I might furnish this information if it would be helpful, Mr. Chairman, that from the beginning of the program, that is, from October 1, 1947, to November 1949, the number of incumbents who were actually dismissed was 95. There were 57 appointees dismissed, 440 incumbent employees left the service during investigation, and 947 appointees left while their investigation was in progress.'

"Then there is a table put in the record showing the employees who left the service prior to the adjudication of their cases, those who left the service during the investigation, and those dismissed or denied employment as a result of ineligible determination.

"I think if you will examine the hearings for each of the subsequent years, you will find that same information furnished by the Civil Service Commission.

"I think certainly this information should be furnished.

"For instance, where did Mr. Brownell get his information? Did he get the information from your agency?"

Mr. Young: "What information?"

Mr. YATES: "Information that he used to declare that approximately 2,200 employees have been separated from the Federal service for security reasons."

Mr. Young: "The President used that figure in his state of the Union message."

Mr. YATES: "Where did the President get that information."

Mr. Young: "That was compiled by the Civil Service Commission."

Mr. YATES: "Does not the Civil Service Commission have a breakdown to determine the reasons why the employees were dismissed?"

Mr. YOUNG: "Are you familiar with the objective of this employee security program, Mr. YATES?"

Mr. YATES: "'Mr. Young, I am asking you a question as to whether or not you have that information."

Mr. YOUNG: "I would like to point out that under this employee security program, the objective of it is to assure the American citizen, you and I, and others, that the persons that are employed by the Government are reliable, trustworthy, of good conduct, and loyal to the United States. The people who have been separated are persons who have given us serious doubt as to whether they measured up to the criteria in this Executive order."

Mr. YATES: "That means all parts of the criteria, not just one."

Mr. YOUNG: "Not just one.

"One objective of this program is to avoid the kind of a breakdown that you are suggesting, so that persons are not stigmatized by a question of disloyalty such as they were previously."

Mr. YATES: "How will they be stigmatized if their names are not mentioned?"

Mr. YOUNG: "There are some persons that seem to think that the names ought to be mentioned."

Mr. YATES: "I do not care for the names. Certainly, we should not draw any inference as you suggest, but what about the speech of the type that was made last night by Postmaster General Summerfield implying—I do not remember whether he stated it specifically, but certainly the implication was there—that the 2,200 people who were discharged were guilty of treason.

"Is that a correct or fair interpretation to be drawn from the dismissal of the celebrated 2,200 cases?"

Mr. YOUNG: "I did not read his speech, so I do not know what he said."

Mr. YATES: "Let me presume that he stated that the 2,200 were dismissed for loyalty reasons. Would this be a correct statement?"

Mr. YOUNG: "Certainly the 2,200 were not dismissed for loyalty reasons. They were separated under the criteria of section 8 of Executive Order No. 10450."

Mr. YATES: "Of the 2,200 employees, concerning whom we have been speaking, were any of those employees discharged for reasons contained in section 8 (a) 1 (F) of Executive Order 10450?"

Mr. Young: "I cannot tell you, Mr. YATES, as to how many were discharged pursuant to any individual subsection of section 8 or as to how many of these criteria entered into any individual case."

Representative JOHN PHILLIPS, (Republican, California.): "Do I understand from that, that in an individual case more than one of these criteria may have entered into that case?"

Mr. Young: "Certainly."

Mr. YATES: "Is it likely too, that some of them may have been dismissed for a single criterion in section 8 (a)?"

Mr. Young: "It is possible."

Mr. YATES: "Would your records so indicate?"

Mr. Young: "No, sir."

Mr. YATES: "What would your records indicate with respect to the 2,200 who were dismissed?"

Mr. Young: "The Commission is now preparing a complete report of the results of the security program, which will be submitted to the National Security Council in the relatively near future. As to what information the National Security Council and the White House is going to release, based on that report, I do not know."

Mr. YATES: "What information does your central index file contain with respect to employees who were dismissed under the Executive Order 10450?"

Mr. Young: "The central index file would certainly carry a notation if the individual was separated under 10450."

Mr. YATES: "And the reasons for the separation?"

Mr. Young: "Yes. His file would carry the reasons for separation."

Mr. YATES: "Do you not think it strange that members of the Cabinet get this information for public use and Members of the Congress cannot?"

Mr. PHILLIPS: "How do you know that members of the Cabinet have the detailed information for which you are asking? The only statements I have heard have been along the lines of the ones you just referred to indirectly, of 1,653, or whatever it is, people have been separated from the service. The implication has been at times they were separated for security or loyalty reasons. But I have seen no breakdown which would indicate that Cabinet members had any of the breakdown about which you are asking Mr. Young."

Mr. YATES: "How many people were separated from the civil service under Executive Order 10450 since the new administration took office?"

Mr. Young: "From the civil service?"

Mr. YATES: "Have been separated from the Government, as a result of the operation of Executive Order 10450?"

Mr. Young: "The President used the figure or 'more than 2,200', if I recall it correctly, in the state of the Union message."

Mr. YATES: "Do you know the exact number?"

Mr. Young: "That is the only figure that has been made available."

Mr. PHILLIPS: "The floor leader of the Senate, I think, used a figure which had a first and second digit in there of 1,653, or something like that, whatever it was. Those are the only figures I have seen. The official one that we have is 'more than 2,200.' "

Mr. YATES: "Do you know the exact number?"

Mr. Young: "We have to report, under section 14 of the Executive order, as to what happens under the security program. We are constantly getting statistics and figures from the agencies in order to comply with those reporting requirements and to discharge our responsibility to the National Security Council.

"The Civil Service Commission, you see, has no authority or responsibility to serve as a public information center or to release figures or information with respect to the workings of that program. Our functions are mechanical in terms of operating this central index, providing participants for potential hearing boards, and this reporting function under section 14."

Mr. YATES: "Do you consider that in this respect the terms of Executive Order 10450 are different than those orders under which previous Civil Service Commissioners operated when they gave this committee information of the type that I am requesting here?"

Mr. Young: "I think the concept and objectives of the employees' security program are quite different and distinct from the old loyalty program."

Mr. YATES: "In terms of protecting the employees?"

Mr. Young: "I am not sufficiently familiar with what was done under the old program."

Mr. YATES: "I suggest you might read previous hearings of this committee when other Commissioners gave us that information."

Mr. PHILLIPS: "Could we distinguish, for my sake, so we have officially the difference between loyalty and security? I think we use those terms somewhat inappropriately at times."

[Omission.]

Mr. YATES: "How many investigations are anticipated to be covered by the request for the appropriation for 1955? Did you break them down in that way?"

Mr. Williams: "The table on page 21 will give you that information, Mr. YATES. It has the number of work items."

Mr. YATES: "Your statement in the justification is on page 26 and states: 'When a national agency check and inquiry case develops adverse security information, other than that requiring full field investigation by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, a limited personal investigation is made by the Commission to resolve the question in cases of appointees to positions in the competitive service, and in cases of appointees in excepted positions, for agencies not having investigative facilities.'

"How many of those investigations have been made since the Executive order went into effect?"

Mr. Williams: "So far this fiscal year there have been 3,200."

Mr. YATES: "How many have been disposed of?"

Mr. Williams: "That is the figure I am speaking of. That is the processed figure for this fiscal year, 3,200 completed cases."

Mr. YATES: "For fiscal year 1954 so far?"

Mr. Williams: "Yes."

Mr. YATES: "And how many of those cases resulted in separations of the employee?"

Mr. Young: "We could not break it down. We do not have the information."

Mr. YATES: "Of that number of investigations, you do not know how many of those employees were separated and how many were not separated but continued to remain working? Is that what you are saying?"

Mr. Young: "That is what I am saying; yes. We would not have that information."

Mr. PHILLIPS: "His previous testimony said they furnished that information to the head of the agency."

Mr. Williams: "That is correct, sir."

Mr. PHILLIPS: "Your question is: Do they go beyond that and see what happened?"

Mr. YATES: "I asked him whether he had the information."

Mr. PHILLIPS: "Your question is: Did they go ahead and find out whether they have the information?"

Mr. YATES: "Yes. Because later on they stated they got the information, the other agencies were required to tell them."

Mr. Young: "That information would come back into the central register."

Mr. YATES: "Then the answer to the question is 'Yes'."

Mr. PHILLIPS: "Are you saying the information may be in the mail register, but that you do not compile it?"

Mr. Young: "Yes. It could be compiled."

Mr. PHILLIPS: "The information comes back but they do not compile it, according to the testimony."

Mr. YATES: "Does your agency have that information?"

Mr. Young: "The information could be compiled probably from the Commission records."

Mr. YATES: "Mr. Williams has told me you have conducted approximately 3,200 of the investigations. I am asking you as to how many of the employees who were the subject of those investigations remained with the Federal service and how many of them were separated?"

Mr. Young: "As I say, we do not have that information compiled."

Mr. YATES: "Can you supply it for the record?"

Mr. Young: "We would prefer not to."

Mr. YATES: "That is the first time it has not been done. What do you think, Mr. Chairman?"

Mr. PHILLIPS: "I do not know. I am listening to this with a good deal of interest."

"I can see a point in Mr. Young's position, that if we begin to push on this thing, then they compile that so many were dropped off for this reason, and that boils it down to a smaller group, and then everybody begins to work on that group even to the extent of going around and asking people, if they wanted to go that far.

"In the past, we have had a general statement, and I am free to admit that under the previous loyalty board I did not think much of it. So I did not think the information was of too great a value. Now we have gotten apparently a more comprehensive and carefully administered type of examination, and I am trying to form an opinion in my own mind as to just which way we ought to lean."

Mr. YATES: "May I ask this question, then: Would your records indicate what portion of those who were separated were separated for reasons of disloyalty?"

Mr. Young: "Mr. YATES, I explained before as to what our reports are going to show to the National Security Council and the information that is going to be made available with respect to that report is going to be up to the National Security Council and to the President."

Mr. PHILLIPS. "You just used one word there, Mr. Yates, that I would not agree with, and that is how many are separated for 'subversive' reasons.

"The contention is often that the poor man is not subversive, all he has done is run around with a lot of drunks and other people with secrets of Government that we do not want to get out, and the poor fellow has been fired because he is 'subversive'."

Mr. YATES: "I tried to use the word 'disloyal' and Mr. Young carefully walked around it and said it is not the same type of order. I have been trying to find a word which would permit disclosure of information under the new order comparable to the information we received under the old loyalty order."

Mr. PHILLIPS: "I will rule that you have to argue that out with Mr. Young, but that I will not accept the word 'subversive' as the only reason for discharging these people, because a lot of them we just do not want."

Mr. YATES: "Suppose I substitute the word 'disloyal' for 'disloyalty to the country'?"

Mr. PHILLIPS: "Frankly, I, myself, prefer the term of 'poor security risk'."

Mr. YATES: "That includes more reasons than this one."

Mr. PHILLIPS: "That is just why I want to use it, because I think there are lots of reason why these people ought to have been gotten out, and I do not want to get into a national argument that this poor, abused, incompetent drunk should have been fired out of the Government, because he was not 'subversive.' He actually had not been caught setting fire to the Capitol.

"You get my point, I think."

Mr. YATES: "I get it very well, indeed.

"Mr. Williams, you stated that there were 3,200 investigations"——

Mr. WILLIAMS: "So far this fiscal year."

Mr. YATES: "Under Executive Order 10450; is that correct?"

Mr. WILLIAMS: "Under this limited security investigations item; yes, sir."

Mr. YATES: "The President of the United States has declared that more than 2,200 Government employees have been separated from the service. Are we to draw from his statement and from yours the conclusion that out of 3,200 investigations, 2,200 were dismissed?"

Mr. PHILLIPS: "Those are investigations concluded in this fiscal year."

Mr. YATES: "That is correct."

Mr. Young: "Limited security investigations; it is not total investigations."

Mr. YATES: "I am talking about investigations under Executive Order 10450."

Mr. Young: "Of this limited security type only."

Mr. PHILLIPS: "There was a short period from January 20 to June 30 that you skipped over."

Mr. YATES: "What is the difference between an investigation of a limited security type and an investigation under Executive Order 10450?"

Mr. Young: "A limited security investigation originates from a case where a national agency check and inquiry shows adverse security information, but not of a sufficiently serious nature to turn it over to the FBI for a full field investigation. In that situation, a limited personal investigation is made by the Commission to resolve the questions involved with respect to that particular individual. Then it is only made in those instances where the agencies do not have their own investigative facilities."

Mr. YATES: "My question that was directed to Mr. Williams was: With respect to the 2,200 cases that he testified to, were those of a limited security investigation type?"

Mr. Williams: "Yes, sir."

Mr. Young: "He did not refer to investigations, Mr. YATES, as I recall the state of the Union message."

Mr. YATES: "What type did he refer to, then?"

Mr. Young: "He was not referring to investigations, as I believe he said more than 2,200 people have been separated from the

Federal service under this employee-security program."

"I do not have the exact language; do you?"

Mr. Yates: "Are you stating now that the 2,200 who were discharged were not discharged because of limited security investigation?"

Mr. Young: "No. What I am saying is that the number referred to by the President represented the number of separations from the Federal service under the employee-security program, particularly those standards and criteria established by section 8."

Mr. Yates: "Under Executive Order 10450."

Mr. Young: "And the additional Executive order, whatever the number was, having to do with the fifth amendment."

Mr. Yates: "Are not you I fencing about a nonexistent thing, Mr. Young? Your first sentence says: 'These cases originate as national agency check and inquiry cases under Executive Order 10450.' The caption is 'Limited Security Investigations.'

"What is the difference; what is the distinction you are trying to draw? It seems to me that if the language of this justification means anything, it means that the first sentence and the words 'limited security investigation' are about equal to each other."

Mr. Young: "I am not sure I understand your question, but this is merely one of several categories of types of investigations submitted in these papers, and each one discussed separately. And this is only one small part of the investigations under Executive Order 10450."

Mr. Yates: "Are there any investigations carried out under Executive Order 10450 other than those of the limited security investigation type?"

Mr. Young: "Surely. All your national agency check and inquiries, for example."

Mr. Yates: "How many of those were undertaken since this Executive order went into existence?"

Mr. Young: "I think the number is in that table we were just looking at here."

Mr. Yates: "Is that the 3,200 number that Mr. Williams referred to?"

Mr. Young: "In 1954, this shows national agency check and inquiry cases processed, 303,744 for fiscal 1954."

Mr. Yates: "Then we read the second sentence of the justification as it appears on page 26:

"'When a national agency check and inquiry case develops adverse security information, other than that requiring full field investigation by the FBI, a limited personal investigation is made by the Commission to resolve the question in cases of appointees to positions in a competitive service. * * *'

"How many cases were there since this order went into effect?"

Mr. Young: "I think that was the question you asked before you went upstairs; was it not, Mr. Yates?"

Mr. Yates: "I would still like an answer."

Mr. Young: "I would still prefer not to answer, to break down the 3,200 figure of limited security investigations processed; which I believe was the intent of your question."

Mr. Yates: "Are you saying now that there were 3,200 such cases?"

Mr. Young: "I believe that is what Mr. Williams said."

Mr. Williams: "That is the number processed as of December 19."

Mr. Yates: "3,200 such cases that were investigated. How many dismissals were there of those cases?"

Mr. Young: "That is what I just got through stating, Mr. Yates. We prefer not to break down that 3,200 figure."

Mr. Yates: "Do you mean you are not going to tell this committee that of the 3,200 cases that were initiated by the Commission under this order, you are not going to tell the committee how many of those resulted in separations from service? Or how many are still employed?"

Mr. Young: "We would not have that information compiled, although it probably could be compiled from records of the Commission."

Mr. Yates: "Can you supply it for the record?"

Mr. Young: "We would prefer not to."

Mr. Yates: "Mr. Chairman, I think that ought to be supplied for the record."

Mr. Phillips: "I have to think that one over. I think Mr. Young has made a statement regarding the intent of the law, which would have to be settled before we decided whether or not he should break that down for us.

"I would like to ask this question also, if I may, on the same point: You say a statement is made that 2,200 or so people have been separated from the service?"

Mr. Yates: "The President of the United States has stated that. He just said what the President said."

Mr. Phillips: "The President of the United States said there are 2,200 cases.

"Now, you say, Mr. Williams, there are 3,200 decisions—settled cases?"

Mr. Williams: "I said we have processed under this line item of limited security investigations, 3,200."

Mr. Phillips: "They had more cases but they came to a conclusion in 3,200. You wish to subtract the 2,200 from the 3,200; and I am beginning to wonder, from the colloquy, whether there are other areas in which people have been dropped or have left the service, or have been discharged, which do not come in the category to which Mr. Williams referred; and it begins to dawn in my mind that maybe some of these people were in the Voice of America, or maybe some of these people were in the CIA, or something like that, who in no way come under the Commission."

Mr. Yates: "Mr. Chairman, I certainly think we should have that breakdown."

Mr. Phillips. "Mr. Young could say that maybe there are people in these other agencies of Government, which are not subject to any investigation or control by the Civil Service Commission, who may have been in the 2,200 included in the President's figure."

Representative Albert Thomas (Democrat, Texas): "Mr. Chairman, let us see if we cannot get this behind us. I suggest that Chairman Young make a statement—I believe the President has so stated—that 2,200 people have been separated from the service. He declined to say for what reason—whether it was for the reason of drunkenness or some minor misdemeanor or the way they comb their hair, or whether it was security reasons or whatnot. You cannot expect the Chairman here to go against the President. So let him make a statement and no need to argue about it."

Mr. Yates: "Have you been directed by the President not to make this information available to the committee?"

Mr. Young: "We have no authority under the provisions of the Executive order to release any information. We are reporting to the National Security Council and doing certain mechanical functions as outlined in that Executive order."

Mr. Phillips: "If I make a ruling, maybe I should rule that your question should be directed to the National Security Council. Am I right?"

Mr. Yates: "No; you are not right because his agency has the information. Presumably we want information in this committee, and if his agency has the information, even though it requires tabulation, it would be a different practice than this committee has observed in the past if that information is not given."

Mr. Thomas: "The point is he says he has no authority to release the information."

Mr. Yates: "Have you stated that?"

Mr. Young: "I said we have no responsibility and no authority under this Executive order to release any information concerning that point.

"Could I make one observation with respect to these investigations?"

Mr. Yates: "Of course. I am trying to get you to say something."

Mr. Young: "I am trying to cooperate.

"This category of limited security investigations is only a very small segment of all the investigations which are conducted pursuant to Executive Order 10450."

Mr. Phillips: "By you, or by all agencies?"

Mr. Young: "By us and by all agencies. Look at this 338,000 in all agencies and this is 3,800 or something like that. Then in addition to that you have the various FBI field investigations, you have the investigations of other departments and agencies. The Department of Defense does all of its own investigative work, and you have 51 percent of all your Federal civilian employees in the Department of Defense.

"There is a very large piece missing from the figures that we have here."

Representative Norris Cotton (Republican, New Hampshire): "I merely want to raise this point: For several years some of us have lamented the fact that we have these expensive and cumbersome appeal boards, so that anybody who found himself aggrieved and turned away from Government employment claimed that his character was irrevocably stained, and they would go through all this process which was costing a lot of money. I was delighted to learn of the new system, believing that nobody would claim to have a constitutional right to Government employment and that we could quietly turn people away, if there was any question about it, without any reflection about it and without being obliged to give them reasons, and without doing any damage.

"If Mr. Young has the same information and starts disclosing to the committee the reasons why these people were discharged, it would seem to me that we pretty soon would be back to the situation where we have to have all these appeal boards and where we have to fight it out."

Mr. Yates: "Mr. Cotton, I could only suggest that you do what I did, and that is to look through the hearings for the last 5 years. I went back 5 years, and in each of those years I found that when any member of this committee asked the Civil Service Commission as to the number of employees, not their names, but the number of employees who were discharged for security reasons, that information was furnished to the committee. I have asked Mr. Young to supply the same information to the committee, and that request has been refused up to now.

"I do not know that I have been unreasonable in making that request."

Mr. Young: "That is one reason why we have a new program."

[Omission.]

Mr. Yates: "Getting back to the 3,200 people who were subjected to the investigation Mr. Williams referred to——

Mr. Phillips: "Those cases were decided."

Mr. Yates: "Under Executive Order 10450."

Mr. Phillips: "I want you to make a distinction between the number of people investigated and the 3,200 which were the people whose cases were decided."

Mr. Yates: "Yes.

"Would your records indicate how many of those persons left before the investigation was completed?"

Mr. Young: "Resigned voluntarily?"

Mr. Yates: "Yes."

Mr. Williams: "During the process of the investigation, very likely none of them."

Mr. Yates: "I do not remember whether I asked you the question before, whether out of the 3,200 cases your records would indicate how many of those employees were still working for the Federal Government."

Mr. Young: "Yes; you have asked that twice before, Mr. Yates. The answer was that that information probably could be compiled but that we prefer not to break down this 3,200 figure."

Mr. Yates: "Is there a relationship between the 3,200 figure and the 2,200 figure announced by the President of the United States?"

Mr. Young: "There might or might not be."

Mr. Yates: "I am asking whether there is."

Mr. Young: "I do not know."

Mr. Yates: "Congresswoman St. George has made the statement that of the 2,200 that were dismissed, less than 10 percent were dismissed for loyalty reasons. Do you know whether this statement is accurate?"

Mr. Young: "I have no idea where she got her information or derived that figure. Maybe she has more accurate information than the executive branch."

Mr. Yates: "Have you been directed by the executive branch not to disclose this information to this committee?"

Mr. Young: "As I have stated before, the Civil Service Commission, under the terms of this Executive order, has no authority or responsibility to release any information concerning the employee-security program."

Mr. Yates: "Is there a prohibition against releasing it?"

Mr. Young: "There is no authority to do it."

Mr. Yates: "Mr. Chairman, I will close my examination by stating that if we do not get the information, it will be a bad situation."

Mr. Phillips: "When you asked me before for a ruling, I was not entirely sure that that was a formal request or was the usual informal discussion which goes on in this particular subcommittee. But if you want a formal ruling I will make one.

"I will rule that if the Chair has the right to say to the witness that he must disclose that information to the committee, the Chair would first have to find out if he has that right legally.

"Secondly, the Chair would be reluctant to make that ruling now because of two things: First, the question of the legal restriction placed upon the Commission by the law itself, which should be examined from the standpoint of its legal weight—and I am not a lawyer.

"I think first the question should be directed to the National Security Council, and it is our good fortune they are coming before this committee within the next few days. Mr. Yates can then direct the questions to them.

"Next, the point which Mr. Yates raises, as to a comparison between the questions asked the previous Commission and the questions he is asking this Commission, the questions are not germane and that they are not comparable; that in all previous years we discussed the number of people released from the service on a loyalty basis."

Mr. Yates: "I am willing to take that same comparison and take any computation based only on loyalty reasons."

Mr. Phillips: "We are now working on security. Finally, if this is not settled satisfactorily to you, Mr. Yates, I will at any time call an executive meeting with this committee and decide in the committee what the action of the committee shall be.

"Is that satisfactory?

"We thank you gentlemen. We will see you again next year, and I strongly suspect we will see at least the Commission again this year."

Mr. Young: "We will look forward to it."

Messages in Opposition to Atomic Energy Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, July 31, 1954

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in pursuance of the permission granted me today, I submit for printing in the Record various telegrams and letters showing the reaction of the people throughout the country to the efforts made by those of us who fought the atomic-energy bill.

There being no objection, the telegrams and letters were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Iselin, N. J., *July 24, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: We hope you will get to read this little letter from two unimportant but very interested American citizens in your efforts and feelings as a representative of us. We would like to commend you on the stand you have taken on this atomic-energy bill which the administration is trying to put through. You are voicing our feelings on the issue, as we feel other millions of us taxpaying Americans must also feel, too. May God give you the strength and energy to keep at it until you and the other wonderful Senators opposing this bill as presented now defeat it.

We most sincerely feel the minority will benefit from it instead of the vast majority of us citizens, and we feel this has been happening with too many bills passed in this administration.

God bless you always in all your efforts in the future, as well as for those in the past, as you have represented to us a most sincere and diligent Senator, working solely for the good of all instead of the few.

Most cordially yours,

Anne R. Hess.
William J. Hess.

P. S.—Whatever the outcome concerning the bill, just to know men like you are trying hard on our part encourages our belief in the future of our children.

Portland, Oreg., *July 27, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building:

You are doing wonderful job protecting our interest in atomic-energy bill.

Lee Caldwell.

Clackamas, Oreg., *July 27, 1954.*

Hon. Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building:

Congratulations and best wishes your stand on atomic-energy bill.

Ruth R. Heald.

Rogue River, Oreg., *July 27, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse:

You should have the Nation's thanks. You have ours.

Mrs. E. A. Simerville.
Verl L. Hoover.
Frank Hoover.

Portland, Oreg., *July 26, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations on the good job you are doing. Hope to see you in Portland soon.

Charlie and Maggie Hensley.

Nyssa, Oreg., *July 26, 1954.*

Hon. Wayne L. Morse,
Washington, D. C.:

We, the people composing the undersigned groups and organizations, want you to know that we deeply appreciate your action on the floor of the Senate in opposing passage of the administration's atomic-energy giveaway bill. Also, please express to your colleagues our sincere appreciation for their fight to preserve to the people the billions they have invested in atomic energy.

Thomas G. Jones,
Chairman, Malhuer County Democratic Central Committee.
Clint Sinclair,
Chairman, Wallowa County Democratic Central Committee.
W. B. Russell,
Chairman, Beet Growers Committee.
Ormond Thomas,
Chairman, Malheur Democratic Club No. 1.
Hope Grider,
Chairman, Dairymen's Committee.

Hillsboro, Oreg., *July 26, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Don't give away atomic-energy program.

C. H. Franklin.

Portland, Oreg., *July 26, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Please accept our sincere gratitude for the valiant fight you are waging to defeat the atomic-energy bill.

Mr. and Mrs. M. L. Siegel,

Portland, Oreg., *July 27, 1954.*

Senator Morse:

Don't sell out.

Walter Yates.

San Francisco, Calif., *July 25, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C:

Dear Senator Morse: I am 100 percent behind you in your fight to stop the giveaway program.

Thanks.

W. Hager.

Denver, Colo., *July 25, 1954.*

Hon. Wayne Morse,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: Everyone, I believe, has been reading of your gallant fight to save this or the AEC from being turned over to big business. May the Lord bless you all who are trying to save what belongs to the public.

Charles Colvin.

Ogdensburg, N. Y., *July 24, 1954.*

Hon. Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Just to let you know a lot of us are watching the grand fight you and others are putting up against the atomic-energy bill and hoping you will win, for it is the biggest steal yet under the administration. I personally am hoping that you will win this fall, for men like you are needed in the Senate. Best of luck.

J. S. Graham.

Upland, Calif., *July 24, 1954.*

Wayne Morse,
Washington, D. C.:

Thank you so much for your efforts in behalf of the people.

Cordially,

Mr. and Mrs. E. Robbins.

Los Angeles, Calif., *July 25, 1954.*
Hon. Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: Keep up the good fight against the atomic-energy bill. The more you debate this bill, the sooner people will wake up to what is happening. Be sure and tell who is back of this big grab.

C. Inez Feeney.

Monrovia, Calif., *July 23, 1954.*
Hon. Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Honorable Senator: I hope that you and the Senators who go along with you will be able to stop another juicy giveaway such as the one now you are trying to stop. What a shame instead of going forward, the fogies are rushing windward. More power to you and your colleagues.

Very sincerely yours,
Dominick Di Leonardo.

Newark, N. J., *July 25, 1954.*
Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: I commend you greatly for the fight you are making on behalf of the American people in opposing the present atomic energy giveaway bill.

It is in keeping with your wonderful devotion to the great good of our country and our people.

Respectfully yours,
Nathan Davis.

P. S.—I have written to the New Jersey Senators on the bill.

Reseda, Calif., *July 24, 1954.*
Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Sir: Heartfelt thanks to you for your good fight against giving the people's atomic energy project to the private utility group, Dixon and Yates.

Best wishes.
Sincerely,
Mrs. Mildred Ditzler.

San Lorenzo, Calif., *July 26, 1954.*
Senator Wayne Morse,
United States Senate,
Capitol Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: Our warmest congratulations to you on your effort to protect the public interest in the present atomic energy bill now before the Senate.

Whether you and we win or not, and if there were more like you in the Senate there would be no doubt of our final victory, your attempt will be as much appreciated.

We would appreciate receiving your bulletin as to the progress of Hells Canyon Dam; we are Oregonian by birth and interested in what happens there.

Sincerely,
Anna and Lena Pitney.

Syracuse, N. Y., *July 26, 1954.*
Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D. C.:

Good work on the atomic filibuster.

Berkeley, Calif., *July 22, 1954.*
Hon. Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: Congratulations on your work in stopping the power giveaway. History will record the fight and the fighters. Please keep up the filibuster.

Yours,
A. E. Castello.

Milwaukee, Wis., *July 25, 1954.*
Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: You have proved your fighting ability before, and we have confidence that you can keep up the good work. The Senate ought to permit writing on a blackboard when the voice wearies.

Thank you for the good fight.

Sincerely yours,
Ethel Keshner.

Ashton, Md., *July 26, 1954.*
Senator Wayne Morse, of Oregon,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: Congratulations to you. I think you're a wonderful man for having the fortitude to try and prevent the country from handing over the atomic-energy projects to the private-power companies. I only hope and pray that your efforts will not be in vain.

It's good to realize that there is at least one thoroughly honorable watchdog in this fair land of ours who cannot be bought or bribed or be persuaded to sell his country down the river.

Cordially yours,
Mrs. C. A. Watkins.

P. S.—No acknowledgment expected or required.

New York, N. Y., *July 23, 1954.*
Hon. Wayne Morse,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.:

You certainly deserve the thainks of the American public for the vigorous and courageous fight you are waging against the power grab for control of the atomic power, and the public will remember these Republican antics when election time comes around.

Sincerely yours,
Ida Kunin.

New York, N. Y., *July 26, 1954.*
Senator Wayne Morse,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: You have many citizens behind your noble cause. Keep up the good work. There are many of us who appreciate your efforts in our behalf. Thanks.

Very respectfully,
Minnie Krawitz.

Chicago, Ill., *July 26, 1954.*
Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: I regard your current attempts along with those of your cohorts, to highlight the basic issues in administration's giveaway atom legislation as another noteworthy service for the voters of this Nation.

As an independent voter, I hail your many courageous stands for good government.

Yours truly,
Mr. Lloyd K. Winston.

Albany, N. Y., *July 23, 1954.*
Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

My Dear Senator Morse: I take off my hat to you for the magnificent fight you are putting up for us, the American people, in the atomic-energy struggle.

Sincerely yours,
Gussie A. Schneider.

St. Petersburg, Fla., *July 26, 1954.*
Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: Thanks from one humble citizen for your adherence to principle, your valiant fight for our interests. I wish there were 95 more like you in the Senate, who put country above self.

Grace E. Jones.

Cresskill, N. J., *July 24, 1954.*
Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: Your honorable, forthright battles against the greedy predators are deeply appreciated, Senator Wayne Morse. You are upholding the finest traditions of the Senate.

Dr. Alfred Human.

Allston, Mass, *July 24, 1954.*
Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We saw and heard you on TV tonight, Saturday, July 24, and you were great; in fact, we have never heard anyone on TV that compares with you. We wish we could vote for you and, believe me, we think you would make one of the greatest Presidents of all time. I suppose those blow-bag pals would never stand for a man like you. Please keep up your great work.

God bless you.

Mrs. C. Lyness.

West Boylston, Mass., *July 24, 1954.*
Senator Wayne Morse.

Dear Sir: Just after watching you on local TV being interviewed by youth.

Suppose you won't ever see this but would like you know it is a pleasure to see and hear one Senator that talks like a man and apparently thinks like a Senator. Sort of relieves one, to find that perhaps all the champions of progress aren't too much swayed by public opinion to say and do what they feel.

The purpose of this letter is only to give you a moral lift.

Sincerely,
W. G. Shildon.

Palos Verdes Estates, Calif., *July 26, 1954.*
Wayne Morse and William F. Knowland,
Washington, D. C.:

Do not lessen but rather increase Tennessee Valley Authority.

Clarence H. Lee.

Macon, Ga., *July 27, 1954.*
Senator Wayne Morse,
United States Senate:

Stand to your guns. America is watching every move, praying for the noblemen fighting our battles. Yours for honesty.

Mrs. Ed C. Alumbaugh,
Editor, Spider Ross Street.

Ann Arbor, Mich., *July 27, 1954.*
Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building:

Congratulations on your courageous stand.

Kathleen Walker.

Minneapolis, Minn., *July 26, 1954,*
Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Stand on atomic bill is excellent. Support is widespread and gaining.

Kenneth J. Enkel.

LAFAYETTE, CALIF., *July 26, 1954.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Our congratulations on your stand on atomic energy.

BILL GEORGE,
PATRICIA ALTON.

ABERDEEN, WASH., *July 26, 1954.*
Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senator from Oregon,
Washington, D. C.:

The membership of local 315, International Brotherhood of Papermakers, are vitally interested in the gallant fight you and other Senators are making to prevent atomic energy giveaway to private power monopolies.

BENJAMIN COLEMAN,
President of Local 315, International Brotherhood of Papermakers.

GREAT FALLS, MONT., *July 26, 1954.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D. C.:

Appreciate your valiant fight to save atomic energy public power for the people. Best wishes.

LEONARD KENFIELD.

ALPENA, MICH., *July 26, 1954.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

There are many of us everywhere who are not vocal but who are concerned about the present giveaway attempt. To you and those Senators assisting you we express deep gratitude for this important public service you are rendering. Good luck in your attempt.

Mr. and Mrs. EVERETT GENDLER.

ROCHESTER, N. Y., *July 26, 1954.*
Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations and because you are right you cannot do other than be successful. Our best wishes.

GEORGE AND KATHRYN RILEY.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *July 26, 1954.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
United States, Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Urge you to continue wonderful fight against administration atomic-energy bill.

REBECCA DAVIDSON.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *July 26, 1954.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Talk on. Prevent the vote on the atomic-energy bill.

IRENE VANECKHARDT.

INDIANAPOLIS, IND., *July 27, 1954.*
Senator MORSE,
Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations on your fight. Am with you. Don't let Eisenhower steal everything. Eisenhower so far has given away too much to the big interests and has lowered taxes on multimillionaires. Eisenhower is a big bust.

JAMES MALOY.

WHITTIER, CALIF., *July 26, 1954.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Thanks for the magnicent service you have again given the American people. We are with you.

NOLLIE HUDSON.

RICHMOND HILL, N. Y., *July 27, 1954.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Keep it up.

NORMAN and GEORGE CRAMER.

WHITTIER, CALIF., *July 26, 1954.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

I am against the present AEC legislation. Thanks for your present stand.

WALLIS E. PEREIRA.

BOSTON, MASS., *July 26, 1954.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Just a line to tell you to keep up the good work. As an independent Republican I think you are doing a marvelous job. Don't let them stop you.

JAMES W. SANTRY, Jr.

IRVINGTON, N. J., *July 27, 1954.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building:

Congratulations and best of luck.

CHARLES STEINER, M. D.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *July 27, 1954.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE:

Thank you for your fine fight against the administration's atomic energy giveaway. We hope you will continue this fight so that the Nation may see whose interests the administration has at heart. Thank you again.

Mr. and Mrs. JEROME SHAPIRO.

MILL VALLEY, CALIF., *July 27, 1954.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate:

I am grateful for and support your courageous stand against passage of atomic energy bill. May you win out.

JACQUELINE ONSLOWFORD.

Defense Line Against Communism Grows Weaker

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 28, 1954

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an excerpt from an article by Dr. M. J. Bonn, which appears in the July issue of Economic Trend Lines. This excerpt points out that the defense line against communism has not grown stronger after our failure at Berlin. This was a failure, if not a defeat, according to Dr. Bonn. It did not succeed; it did not even ease the plight of Berlin. The excerpt follows:

> Unfortunately, the defense line against communism has not grown stronger after the failure at Berlin; for it was a failure, if not a defeat. The West had entered the conference with the object of pushing its main defense line eastward toward the Oder-Neisse. It did not succeed; it did not even ease the plight of Berlin. There is little chance that this situation will improve, for if Russia is genuinely frightened of the West, which may be true insofar as she is worried by a German military contribution, she is certainly not giving up the ground she has secured. If she is not frightened, which may be due to her misinterpreting the temperament of the United States, there is even less reason why she should hand back what she holds. The heroic defense of Dien Bien Phu will go down in history as one of the great tales of heroism of which Europe is justly proud. But it was not one of the world's decisive battles. The real battle cannot be won in the Far East. For even if the specter of communism could be eliminated all over Asia, Russia would still stand near the Rhine, at least 50 miles nearer to it than the barbarians stood in the days of Charlemagne, 1,100 years ago.

Coal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILL E. NEAL

OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 27, 1954

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to include articles 3 and 4 of the series on Coal, by Hugh Maxwell, of the Huntington (W. Va.) Advertiser. The first two articles appeared in the RECORD yesterday:

> COAL: MINERS NOT THE VILLAIN IN PRESENT MARKET BATTLE
>
> (By Hugh Maxwell)
>
> If there's a villain in the West Virginia bituminous coal situation, it isn't the miner and his so-called high wage.
>
> This is what the miners say in discussing the blight of idleness that has spread through the rich bituminous fields of the Mountain State.
>
> The stalemate in coal—blamed by the operators upon high fixed costs, including the miner's wage—that assertedly has made coal unmarketable in competition with fuel oil and natural gas, has left the miners bitter.
>
> They feel the operators should look to their own faults before finding fault with the miner.
>
> What are these asserted faults of the operators?
>
> In the opinion of the miner and his leaders in the United Mine Workers, they are:
>
> "Dollar greediness," which allegedly has led the operators into cutthroat selling competition among themselves, with the result that, paradoxically, some are losing money on their product.
>
> Inability of the operators through their associations, supposedly powerful and closely knit, to do anything politically about the dumping of cheap foreign oil on the American market.
>
> YOU WON'T FIND COMMIES IN THE MINERS' RANKS
>
> Too much preoccupation with the material instead of the human element in their business.
>
> Too much social consciousness which keeps a gulf between the grimy miner and his white-collar boss. (Operators insist that John L. Lewis fosters this antagonism.)
>
> Failure to keep in step with changes in economics and the market and to make their policies conform.
>
> The miner is bitter and he's veering toward socialism, but you won't find a Communist among his ranks. He takes pride in being an American and in the fact that he's a soldier on the home front in wartime. He buckles down in wartime and produces coal by the multitrainload. The miners of the southern Appalachian field, which includes West Virginia, broke all known production records during World War II.
>
> William (Bill) Blizzard of Charleston, president of United Mine Workers District 17, and officially spokesman for miners in

the Logan, Mingo, Boone and Kanawha county fields, has the following to say about the miner's role in the coal situation:

"The coal miner isn't to blame for the situation in which the operators find themselves. Their own cutthroat selling competition is their principal trouble. They're trying to undersell one another and in consequence are losing money on their coal. Nobody is benefiting from this situation of selling coal for less than it costs to produce—least of all the miners.

"It would pay the operators, and all others concerned, to realize that the miner's wage agreement really is a stabilizing influence in the coal business.

"It establishes a price floor under union-mined coal because it's a definite element of cost. If it were not for the wage agreement there would be chaos in the coal business. Some of the operators would be virtually giving their coal away to grab a few dollars."

REOPENING OF CONTRACT MATTER FOR POLICY GROUP

Mr. Blizzard was asked by an interviewer whether John L. Lewis would request reopening of the current wage contract. He replied:

"I am unable to say whether the contract will be reopened as that is a matter for the UMW policy committee to decide. Of course, the operators themselves can ask for reopening by filing the requisite 60-day notice.

"Both the United Mine Workers and the operators are bound to continue under the present contract unless one side or the other requests reopening by filing the 60-day notice.

"As I said, I am unable to say whether Mr. Lewis will ask that the contract be reopened.

"I will say definitely and positively, however, that if the contract is reopened, there will not be a miner's wage reduction.

"A wage cut imposed upon the miners wouldn't sell another pound more of coal. It would only reduce the miner's standard of living, upset the economics of businesses dependent upon the patronage of miners, and set a precedent cruel and dangerous to all wage earners.

"We don't want a return to the so-called normalcy of periods in the past, such as during the Harding administration, when the wages of the miner were cut to the point where he couldn't eat and when operators couldn't give away their coal.

"About all the miner and his family can do now, under the reduced operating schedules of the operators, is eat. If his wages for the 1 or 2 days a week he works now are cut, he won't eat."

OPERATORS URGED TO END "CUTTHROAT COMPETITION"

"Good wages are basically good economy. Each segment of our economy is interdependent upon other segments. If the miner's wage is slashed, not only is he hurt, but many others are hurt. The ultimate gain is nil.

"The miner's wage necessarily is a part of the price of coal and there seems to be a great deal of discussion about the price of coal.

"I have noticed, however, that it isn't the general public which is complaining about the price of union-mined coal.

"Certainly the coal operator is hurt by competing fuels such as natural gas and residual oil. With oil, the responsibility for letting cheap oil into the country, to usurp coal markets, close mines, and throw miners out of work, is the Federal Government's.

"If the Government is going to take away the jobs of Americans, then the Government ought to feed them.

"The trouble about this residual-oil situation is that the coal States of West Virginia, Kentucky, Ohio, and Virginia haven't enough Congressmen to stop the oil dumping. Coal, in the Halls of Congress, is a minority interest. Coal hasn't a tremendous voting bloc like the farm interests.

"If the coal operators want to correct their situation they should end their cutthroat competition and find a way to sell their product that will keep their mines operating at a profit, with the miners fully employed," Mr. Blizzard continued.

"Constantly blaming the miner's wage contract for the ills of the coal industry will get no one anywhere. The operators have little room for complaint. They signed the wage contract of their own free will; no one made them do it. They accepted the wage agreement and they ought to realize that it is the only stabilizing influence in the coal business today.

"Even if the miner's wages were cut, the same old trouble with the coal industry—cutthroat competition among the operators—would continue and the general situation would worsen.

"The miner's wage and the gross sales tax on coal are about all West Virginia gets out of its coal, anyway. At least 85 percent of the State's coal operations and land are absentee owned and the profits of the business go out of the State."

(In the fiscal year that ended June 30, 1953, West Virginia's coal industry paid in excess of $395 million in wages, or 26.9 percent of all wages paid within the State. For the calendar year of 1953, the coal industry paid in excess of $8,267,000, or 20.8 percent of the State's gross sales tax.)

COAL MINER HAS HIS SAY ABOUT THE SITUATION

What does the coal miner himself say about his situation? Cam Mingrone, 60, of Mount Gay, W. Va., on the outskirts of Logan, is a miner who quit his vocation and turned to other jobs because of sporadic work and other unsatisfactory conditions.

Mr. Mingrone said he mined coal as far back as the Hoover and Harding days, "when things were bad." He added:

"We had only 1 or 2 days' work a week. Things are almost as bad today for the miner; maybe worse, because everything the miner has to buy is so high. He makes good money, but it won't buy what it should.

"I quit mining because it was so uncertain and went to work for the Appalachian Electric Power Co. They're fine people.

"The mines hereabouts are working only 1 or 2 days a week. For the maintenance men there is steady work; for the underground men unsteady work. It isn't right."

Logan County miners by the thousands are following Mr. Mingrone's example and leaving. Once there were 14,000 coal miners in West Virginia; now there are 9,000. The miner's only effective protest to his situation is quitting.

The best opinion—among coal operators, UMW leaders and the miners themselves—holds that John L. Lewis will never consent to a cut in the miner's wages.

There is a definite feeling that, if the wage contract is reopened, he may concede something on the fringe benefits. He has his own economists studying the coal situation constantly and if they recommend a concession to the operators, to perk up coal sales, John L. will take their advice, it was said. If he does make a concession to the operators, it will be the first of his long career in labor.

The coal operators complain the loudest about the fringe benefits in the contract. These are the 40-cents-per-ton payment into miner's welfare fund, pay for portal-to-portal travel, and pay for a 30-minute lunch period. The fringe benefits boost the miner's basic wage of $18.25 a day to $23.

Besides paying into the welfare fund, the operators also pay into the miner's social security account and give him an annual 10-day paid vacation.

EARNINGS IN BUYING POWER HALF WHAT THEY APPEAR

The miners retort that the high pay, basic and fringe, "is in 50-cent dollars" and that their earnings, in buying power, are actually half what they appear to be.

The operators feel that if the welfare fund payment were cut, and the paid lunch period and portal-to-portal pay eliminated, they could cut their coal selling price to the point where they could meet competition.

The blight over the coal fields has hit hard the coal-mining towns such as Logan, Welch, Beckley, Madison, and others.

A third to a half of the miners in these depressed communities are living on unemployment compensation—and it runs out after 24 weeks. Then there is the choice of public assistance or pulling up stakes.

Indicative of the situation in Logan is the report by Keith Arnett of the State unemployment compensation office that 3,800 unemployed coal miners, of the 9,000 remaining in the country, are now drawing unemployment benefits. Another 1,000 are idle but ineligible for benefits, by reason of having been employed by companies working fewer than 8 persons. Mr. Arnett said he processed 781 new unemployment compensation claims last May.

J. W. Colley, secretary of the Logan Coal Operators' Association, reported that 15 of the county's 30 mines are closed. "This is because of the loss of coal markets to competing fuels," he said.

LOGAN IS CONFIDENT DESPITE BEING HARD HIT

G. W. Raike, president of the National Bank of Logan, expressed himself about the town's situation:

"Logan is absolutely dependent upon coal mining. Many of our miners are still living in Logan but are working elsewhere. The economic effect of this state of affairs upon the community remains to be seen.

"The loss of markets for coal is attributable to cheaper competing fuels and to high wages of miners. As a result of the coal situation, some operators are closing poorly-producing mines and concentrating on better mines. These better mines are giving some of our miners 5 days' work a week. This is helping Logan.

"Our mine operators are using more machinery and more efficient production methods to offset high labor costs."

Mr. Raike said that he and his bank have faith that Logan will survive her troubles. He pointed to a new banking home under construction across the street. "We're optimistic enough to be building a new home," he smiled. "Everything will be all right with us if our miners aren't misled by their leaders and if all working people work more."

Coal: Golden Age on the Way in Chemicals, Power

(By Hugh Maxwell)

Coal, the sick industry of West Virginia and other States in the southern Appalachian bituminous field, will recover—and in a big way. Its golden era looms.

The billion-ton-a-year-plus production and consumption year is ahead. Probably it will be the year 1970. From them on, coal's possibilities are limitless.

If the idle coal miner, the operator desperate for business to stave off bankruptcy and the mining-town merchant needing patronage to pay overhead, can hold on for a few years more—perhaps only a few months more—the tide will have turned. Perhaps it already is turning. Consumption of bituminous coal increased in 1953 over 1952.

While the coal industry waits for the definite turning of the tide—the flood wash of 1970—it can content itself with the prospect that increased demands of present customers in the immediate years ahead should soon relieve distress in mining areas.

PRESENT PRODUCTION WILL LOOK TRIVIAL

Present production, around 450 million tons annually, and consumption of 426 million tons, will look trivial in comparison with the future. Coal, to be the adjunct of the atomic and chemical industries, and to replace oil and gas when they run low, eventually will be one of the Nation's big three industries. The three will be atomic power, chemicals, and coal.

A pipedream?

Not according to the hardheaded economists of the Bituminous Coal Institute, in which are concentrated the best brains of the coal industry.

To support their beliefs, they have called for corroboration upon a competitor in the oil industry, Eugene Ayres, nationally known economist in the field of energy resources and presently serving as technical adviser to the Gulf (Oil) Research & Development Co.

The Bituminous Coal Institute economists, in their 1953 annual report just published, quoted Mr. Ayres as follows:

"All signs now seem to point toward an almost explosive expansion in United States consumption of coal.

"By 1958 I believe that demand should be about 600 million tons, by 1960 it should be 640 million, by 1965 at total of 900 million, by 1970, an aggregate of 1,200,000,000.

"The reasons for such a rise are the rate at which electric power demands are increasing, the inadequate potential capacity of hydroelectric power, expected peaks of production of natural petroleum and natural gas around 1965, expected peak of production of world petroleum between 1985 and 2000, expected higher rates for present liquid fuels and wordwide demands for such fuels.

"I believe that by 1960 we shall be unable to import all the oil we need because of the competitive need of the rest of the world. By 1970, we shall want to import 4.5 billion barrels, while the world shortage will be nearly 4 billion. And by 1980, we (and the remainder of the world) will experience an annual oil shortage of 7 million barrels."

PETROLEUM'S COSTS WILL JUSTIFY LIQUEFYING COAL

"Because of these conditions of growing shortage, the price of petroleum will go high enough to justify the conversion of coal to liquid fuel. No residual fuel oil then will be sold except that required for ship bunkers. Some liquid fuel will be produced from oil shale but only a minor part of what we shall need."

Supporting the opinions of Mr. Ayres is Herbert Hoover, former President and a mining engineer of worldwide reputation. He says: "There is no engineer who believes that this Nation (the United States) can do without huge supplies of coal.

"Despite the encroachment of water power, oil, gas and possibly atomic power, the Nation will need increased coal production. There is in sight no ample substitute for much of our steam produced by burning coal, no substitute for a large part of our household coal, no substitute for coal in the metallurgical industries and for coal to produce chemicals."

In the situation of declining petroleum and natural gas supplies in the United States, and elsewhere over the world, coal literally has "an ace in the hole."

Underground in West Virginia alone is the colossal total of 117,500,000,000 tons of bituminous coal.

NATION'S COAL RESERVES AMOUNT TO TRILLION TONS

In the remainder of the United States, coal reserves amount to almost 1 trillion tons.

Roughly 75 percent of all this coal is recoverable.

Petroleum and natural-gas reserves are insignificant compared to the enormous coal reserve underground. According to a study made by Joseph Pursglove, Jr., of the Pittsburgh Consolidation Coal Co., bituminous coal should begin gradually to move into the markets occupied by oil and natural gas after 1955.

There is enough coal in the United States to last a thousand year, Bituminous Coal Institute economists estimate.

West Virginia has just begun to touch her supply. Of this State's original coal resources of an estimated 123 billion tons, only 5,500,000,000 tons have been taken out in the past 100 years.

The tide in the coal business may already have begun turning from bad to better.

Hidden in cold coal statistics is the curious fact that, despite the bleak aspect of the business lately, consumption actually increased in 1953 over 1952. The consumption last year was 426 million tons as compared with 419 million in 1952.

COKE, ELECTRIC UTILITIES—COAL'S BEST CUSTOMERS

The consumption figures show that the two best customers of the coal industry at present are the coke plants, which make coke from coal for the steel industry, and electric utilities.

The coke plants used 112,378,000 tons in 1953. The electric utilities consumed 112,278,000 tons. Retail dealers bought and sold 61 million tons. Other industries, including the chemical industry, consumed 113 million tons. Railroads used 28 million tons.

Each branch of consumption used more coal in 1953 than in 1952 except the railroads and retail dealers. Consumption by the railroads, which were far along with dieselization of locomotives by 1953, dropped 10 million tons in that year as compared with the prior year. Retail dealers used 7 million fewer tons in 1953 than in 1952 because the 1953 winter was mild.

The best immediate chances for expansion in demand for coal, and the quickest relief for the sick industry, apparently lie in atomic-power development, electric-power generating plants, and chemical factories.

The Bituminous Coal Institute believes, with other leaders in the coal industry, that atomic power doesn't pose a threat to coal.

The Institute says: "Those best informed see little chance of atomic energy replacing coal in the foreseeable future.

"America's great atomic energy program has required enormous amounts of heat and energy which have been largely supplied by coal. The association and dependence will be close and greater in the future. Indeed, one of the requisites for the sites of new atomic installations is accessibility to coal supplies."

What the atomic program means to coal is illustrated forcefully by the fact that the atomic gaseous-diffusion plant being built in Pike County, Ohio, will require such an enormous amount of electric power that 3,110,000 tons of coal annually will have to be burned to supply it.

The tonnage mentioned will be consumed each year by the Kyger Creek electric generating plant being built by the Ohio Valley Electric Co. to feed electrical power into the gaseous-diffusion plant.

The American public, through purchase of electrically powered home comforts and conveniences such as air conditioners, heat pumps, window fans, clothes washers and dryers, refrigerators, deep freezers, vacuum cleaners, and home-lighting equipment, has been using more and more electricity.

To supply this power in 1953, the electric utilities burned 112 million tons of coal. The power demand and coal use are expected to double within 10 years.

The chemical industries in 1953 burned an estimated 25 million tons of coal, much of which was converted to carbon by the hydrogeneration process and the carbon thereafter converted to chemicals.

More than a score of chemical-producing plants in the Kanawha River Valley, including that of the Carbide & Carbon Chemicals Co. at South Charleston and the enormous operation of E. I. du Pont De Nemours & Co. at Belle, used multitrainloads of West Virginia coal last year.

KANAWHA VALLEY PRODUCES MORE THAN 200 CHEMICALS

The Kanawha Valley plants produce more than 200 industrial chemicals from coal, besides numerous medicines including the sulfa drugs.

Locked within coal, according to chemists, are scores more of useful chemicals, awaiting only the proper processes to free them. Research directed toward developing these processes is underway.

The demand of the chemical industries for coal should double and triple within 10 years. The chemical industries also are on the threshold of their golden era.

The du Pont plant at Belle makes more than 100 industrial chemicals, mostly from coal.

From coal, water, and air this plan produces ammonia, ethyl alcohol, methanol (a nylon intermediate), urea, polythene and related chemicals used in nylon products, plastics, automobile antifreezes, fertilizers, and feed compounds.

H. W. Schweinsberg, production superintendent of Du Pont's polychemicals department, said his department alone produces 31 major products from coal. These include urea, anhydrous ammonia, lucite plastic, the bulk of the nylon intermediates such as adepec acid and diamine, nitric acid (indirectly from coal), and toluene, an explosive component.

So extensive has Du Pont's use of coal become that the company is building a new coal gasification plant at Belle.

The Du Pont plant, Mr. Schweinsberg reported, uses 1 million tons of coal annually.

The Carbide & Carbon Chemicals Co. uses hydrocarbon gases derived from coal and other sources for hundreds of industrial chemicals including ethyl alcohol, acetone, acetic acid, ethylene glycol, and plasticizers. The chemicals are used in antifreezes, lacquer thinners, rubbing alcohol, and fumigants.

RESEARCH HARD AT WORK SEEKING NEW COAL USES

Research workers in the coalfield itself are at work seeking new uses for coal. Coal research is working on the feasibility of converting coal to gas right in the underground seam without mining it. The gas could be piped to market, or electric powerplants powered by gas turbines could be built right at the mine and coal's power wired to the user.

Coal research directed by the Bituminous Coal Institute is directed toward developing a coal-fired, gas-turbine locomotive. The Norfolk & Western Railway already has taken delivery of an experimental coal-burning, steam-turbine electric drive locomotive.

All in all, the future for coal couldn't be brighter. Those with a foothold in the industry now are fortunate.

Messages in Opposition to Atomic Energy Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, July 31, 1954

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in pursuance of the permission granted me today, I submit for printing in the RECORD various telegrams and letters showing the reaction of the people throughout the country to the efforts made by those of us who fought the atomic-energy bill.

There being no objection, the telegrams and letters were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

New York, N. Y., *July 27, 1954.*
Hon. Wayne Morse,
United States Senate:

Add our encouragement for your fight on AEC bill.

G. Schwenk.
R. Ruffins.

Seattle, Wash., *July 27, 1954.*
Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building:

Keep up the good fight.

Winnifred Lovejoy.

Oakland, Calif., *July 27, 1954.*
Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Building:

Hope you keep this giveaway bill from passing.

Irene McAllister.

San Francisco, Calif., *July 27, 1954.*
Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building:

Don't give up the fight. Behind you 100 percent.

Quirk Mangelsen.
Dowden Nickel.

Fort Wayne, Ind., *July 27, 1954.*
Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building:

Congratulations on your most magnificent attempt to stop the monopoly's greedy grab for the Government's atomic power program. This latest phase of the Government's giveaway program following closely on the heels of the tidelands fiasco should be a very clear indication to all citizens that the present administration is one of and for and by big business. Again congratulations, and we hope and pray that you are successful in your efforts to halt this latest giveaway deal.

Leonard L. Hutson,
President, District 9, IUE–CIO.

Petaluma, Calif., *July 27, 1954.*
Senator Wayne Morse,
United States Senate:

Keep up your good work against the atomic giveaway.

Dr. David T. Jones.

Oak Park, Ill., *July 27, 1954.*
Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Building:

Keep on fighting.

Fred Wezeman.

Weiser, Idaho, *July 27, 1954.*
Hon. Wayne Morse,
Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.:

Your heroic fight most heartening. Communism must fade in land of patriots like you.

D. L. Carter.

Berkeley, Calif., *July 27, 1954.*
Hon. Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building:

Your stand on atomic energy bill appreciated. Keep up the fight as long as you can.

Charles J. Fox Rods, Inc.

Los Angeles, Calif., *July 27, 1954.*
Senator Morse,
Senator Floor.

Senator Morse: We are with you. Keep talking and fighting.

The Fruchter's.

Buffalo, N. Y., *July 27, 1954.*
Senator Wayne Morse:

Congratulations. Keep up the good work.

Mr. and Mrs. Peter Zinion.

Oakland, Calif., *July 27, 1954.*
Senator Morse,
Senate Office Building:

Thank you, Senator Morse, and all Senators who support you to save the American workers their hard-earned atomic plans.

Mrs. Elizabeth McDonald.

Seattle, Wash., *July 27, 1954.*
Senator Wayne Morse:

You have our great gratitude.

Mildred Kerr,
Helen Elliott.

San Francisco, Calif., *July 27, 1954.*
Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building:

Keep up the good fight.

Mr. and Mrs. Walter Stack.

Berryville, Ark., *July 27, 1954.*
Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building:

Please accept our most heartfelt thanks in your efforts to avert another power graft.

Carroll Electric Co-Op.,
R. G. Gates.

Boothwyn, Pa., *July 27, 1954.*

Dear Senator Morse: Just got back from Ocean City, Md., and looking over my mail find out that you were also in Maryland, and after reading the papers, Senator, you are certainly going to need a good rest.

I had a small clipping that I cut out of one of our papers and I thought it real cute; also a picture of you trying to take a snooze. I am sending you the small clipping, but the picture I am keeping.

Senator, I think you are doing a fine job, and you keep on talking; what we need is a few more like you.

Senator, while I was writing this, you came on television, and it seemed nice to hear your few words which means so much, so very much.

I want to tell you you sure made me very happy keeping my picture—I should say honored.

Yours sincerely,

Mrs. Margaret Gill.

"OTHERS READY

"Also well rested for a second try were Hill and half a dozen others. And always in reserve was Morse, who is the Senate's champion long-distance talker."

P. S.—Senator, I hope you don't mind me writing to you, but I do think you are wonderful, and I admire you for the work you are doing.

Indianapolis, Ind.
Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Sir: Cheers to you and the few fellow Senators with courage. You have my gratitude, admiration, sympathy.

Sincerely,

Grace Thomson.

San Diego, Calif., *July 27, 1954.*
Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator: My wife and I want to thank you for the good job you are doing in helping us all to see the reverse side of the atomic energy bill.

The common citizen's stake in the use of atomic energy is bound to be enormous, and it is of the utmost importance that his rights be preserved.

Thank you for what you have done and are doing.

Arthur and Ethel St. John.

Akron, Ohio, *July 28, 1954.*
Senator Wayne Morse,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: I have admired very much your attempts to explain the power issues in the Senate and regret exceedingly that more of the Senators do not vote with you on this issue.

It requires much courage to fight on, and the people of your State certainly will support you in 1956. Some of we voters have been blinded by the fool's gold in the Army brass. Maybe more of us will change sooner than the majority think. Keep up the fight.

Sincerely,

J. R. MacGregor.

Skaneateles, N. Y., *July 27, 1954.*

Dear Senator Morse: On my first visit to Washington, last Wednesday, I was sitting in the Senate gallery just after the Ferguson amendment had been passed. You were wandering around with such apparent unconcern that I felt certain you'd given up the struggle. For that erroneous speculation I must apologize, and add in all sincerity:

Battle bravely! Battle on!
  Aid the cause you feel is right.
Days keep dawning, pale and wan;
  They creep past noon, give way to night.

Yet still keep trying—still hold fast!
  Let them threaten, moan, and curse;
Principles come first, not last.
  Defeat is bad; concession, worse.

Talk and talk as you have planned;
  From now till doomsday hold the floor;
Talk to the people of this land;
  Tell them what you're fighting for.

And on! And never cease thy fight;
  Through weary day and night discourse,
Till they who listen see the light.
  May luck be with you, Wayne L. Morse.

It must be really hard to counteract the influence which a few powerful private power lobbies have exerted for months, but, if anyone can do it, you can. If the bill goes through, as tidelands did, at least it will be in the record, as with tidelands, that somebody sure opposed it.

Good luck.

Eileen Heffernan.

Ithaca, *N. Y., July 28, 1954.*
Hon. Wayne Morris,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations and commiserations on your heroic fight against atomic exploitation.

Bertram Willcox.

Boston, Mass., *July 29, 1954.*
Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We congratulate you on your fight to stop the atomic giveaway program of the Republican Party.

PAC Committee, UPWA, Local 11,
Theodore Saife, *Chairman.*

New York, N. Y., *July 29, 1954.*
Wayne Morse,
Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Greeting from McMillonites. Thanks for guarding our rights to public domain for our children and our children's children. Too bad there aren't more people in the world regarding the rights of the so-called little people, the ordinary, everyday taxpayer who raises his family, pays his bills, can't afford vacations or yachts but who loves his country and does his best.

Respectfully,

Mrs. Ruth Gott.

Hammond, La., *July 27, 1954.*
United States Senator Wayne L. Morse,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: Please do not give up the fight for TVA. All of the American people, except a small handful of grafters, are with you. You and your loyal associates, have got the Power Trust grafters whipped. I hope and pray God will give you strength, power, and faith to keep the victory, Wayne.

Yours truly,
J. W. Singley.

East Lansing, Mich, *July 27, 1954.*
Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: We wish to express our appreciation to you and to your colleagues for the fight you are putting up to prevent the giveaway of atomic energy to big business. We have been your admirers for years and can only regret that there aren't more men in the Senate with your intelligence, ideals and courage.

Mr. and Mrs. Joseph Mettes.

Eugene, Oreg., *July 24, 1954,*
Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: Thanks from one of the people here at home for the great work you are doing in calling the attention of all America to the atom debate, and the way the people who work and die for America get robbed by the socalled rulers.

Who and what will they be when we are all starved and killed off? They won't last long then.

Hats off to you men of honor and decency.

Yours for a better America,
Irene Elliott.

New Hampton, N. Y., *July 28, 1954.*
Senator Wayne L. Morse,
Senate Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Sir: Congratulations on your fourth right speech against private acquisition of atomic rights. We can always depend on you to fight against the power interests and for the rights of the common people, God bless you.

Sincerely,
David Weiner.

New York, N. Y., *July 25, 1954.*
Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Senator: Thanks for a good fight on the AE bill.

W. Tully.

Springfield, Mass., *July 28, 1954.*
Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: This is to express my since appreciation for the physical sacrifices you, especially, and others made in your determined and, I think, reasonably successful attempt to modify the atomic-energy bill. I think you have performed an invaluable public service in focusing attention on the giveaway deal.

Yours truly,
Leo Newman.

Las Vegas, Nev., *July 30, 1954.*
Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator: We are with you hourly in your wonderful fight to protect the people's interests. Congratulations to you and the Senators who are with you.

Mr. and Mrs. L. Meehan.

Berkeley, Calif., *July 28, 1954.*
Hon. Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: Congratulations on the wonderful service you are rendering. Please keep up the filibuster and save the people's power and treasury.

Gratefully,
A. E. Castello.

Santa Cruz, Calif., *July 27, 1954.*
Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: Congratulations on your inspiring fight to protect the rights of American taxpayers as opposed to the atomic-energy bill. My deep appreciation and thanks to you and those working with you in this matter.

Sincerely,
Shirley Cereseto.

Seattle, Wash., *July 26, 1954.*
Senator Wayne L. Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Sir: Bully for you and your support against the gangsters and thieves in sheep's clothing.

This is their last chance for another 20 years, and they know it, so are acting accordingly, drat them.

L. J. McCarthy.

Springfield, Ill.
Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Sir: Our most grateful thanks and sincere appreciation for your heroic fight for the people of the United States of America.

Most sincerely,
Margaret L. Taylor.

Wyandotte, Mich., *July 28, 1954.*
Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Sir: Thanks for your fight against the power trust. Keep up the good work.

Sincerely,
R. C. Waltmire.

Buffalo, N. Y., *July 28, 1954.*
Hon. Wayne Morse,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: Keep up the good fight. We need men like you who put our country first—ahead of private interests. Good luck.

Edward Bingert.

Duluth, Minn., *July 28, 1954.*
Senator Wayne Morse,
The Senate, Washington, D. C.:

I thank God; yes, I thank my God for men of your courage. God bless you.

Gertrude Wyatt.

Los Angeles, Calif., *July 28, 1954.*
Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear W. M.: Thank God, for one in the Senate who can spot a phony, and a phony issue. Give 'em heck—all those who want to giveaway our national resources, to the corporations, and the exploiters, and the personal profit boys.

Yours truly,
Fleming Family.

Pittsburgh, Pa., *July 28, 1954.*
Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: Dr. Benesch and I wish to thank you for your fight against the atomic energy bill. Though the bill has passed, you have alerted many people to the dangers involved in such legislation.

Very truly yours,
Joan S. Benesch.

Los Angeles, Calif., *July 28, 1954.*
Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator: Keep up the fight. As the recession deepens this fall things will change and I hope the people will start favoring the liberals again.

L. A. Admirer.

Los Angeles, Calif., *July 28, 1954.*
Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: I wish to commend your courage and persistence in your attempt to halt action on the shameful atomic giveaway bill. Every hour you postpone action gives more time for the word of the steal to get about. More power to you.

Yours truly,
Juliet Green.

Porterville, Calif., *July 27, 1954.*
Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: Thank God for you and the others who have the interests of the people at heart. I know what you are doing is not easy, but it's worth it. We're behind you. After all, what other legislation can compare in significance with the big giveaway. Keep it up.

J. Josephine Learner.

Los Angeles, Calif., *July 29, 1954.*
Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Morse: I want to commend on your excellent stand, to filibuster against the giveaway of atomic energy. I am backing you in your fight.

Yours truly,
Anna Weiss.

Detroit, Mich., *July 28, 1954.*
Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator: Thank God for men like you who work day and night to protect the interests of the people.

Sincerely,
P. M. Goss.

Astoria, N. Y., *July 28, 1954.*
Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D. C.

Honorable Sir: Please keep up your courageous attempt to stop our great monopolists from stealing our natural resources from the future generation.

Luck.
Mrs. M. Silverman.

New York, N. Y., *July 28, 1954.*
Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Sir: You didn't fight hard enough against the atomic energy "grab", but thank you for at least trying. Let's get that mess out of the law books.

Sincerely,
Sam Crockett.

Chicago, Ill., *July 28, 1954.*
Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator: Thank you for your magnificent fight on the AEC bill.

Esther Landau.

Federal Aid to Beach Erosion at Last

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. T. MILLET HAND

OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 30, 1954

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, so far as I am personally concerned, July 26, 1954, was a memorable day in my years of service in Congress. On that day, the House passed the omnibus rivers and harbors bill. This was the first such bill which we have had a chance to consider in 4 years due to the emergencies caused by wartime conditions.

Included in that bill were authorizations for Federal assistance to control beach erosion for 3 great seashore resorts in my district, Atlantic City, Ocean City, and Cape May. These were the only ones which had pursued the required cooperative studies in order to get preliminary approval of the projects from the Chief of Engineers, and the Secretary of the Army.

The bill specifically authorizes the expenditure of Federal funds in Atlantic City in the amount of $2,044,000; in Ocean City $105,000, and Cape May in the amount of $260,000.

These funds have been revised upwards since the original cost estimates, and in each case, of course, they follow the basic Federal requirements which provides that the United States can contribute one-third of the cost of construction for the portion of the beaches which are publicly owned.

REIMBURSEMENT FOR WORK DONE

Of course, in the long delay which has ensued, largely as a result of the delay in considering any omnibus bill to which I have just referred, each of these cities has been obliged to go forward with the construction of groins, sand pumping, and other devices, and it is therefore of the utmost importance that the House of Representatives included in this bill section 102, which reads as follows:

> The Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized to reimburse local interests for such work done by them on the beach erosion projects authorized in section 101, subsequent to the initiation of the cooperative studies which form the basis for the projects: *Provided*, That the work which may have been done on these products was approved by the Chief of Engineers as being in accordance with the projects hereby adopted: *Provided further*, That such reimbursement shall be subject to appropriations applicable thereto for funds available therefor and shall not take precedence over other pending projects of higher priority for improvements.

Briefly, this provides that where the work has been done in accordance with the plan approved by the Chief of Engineers, the municipalities may be reimbursed for such works even though done prior to congressional approval.

A further explanation of this section is found in the report of the Committee on Public Works—House Report 2247—on page 5 thereof which says:

> Following the listing and description of the navigation projects, there is information given for the beach-erosion projects upon which testimony has been heard and which have been reported favorably by the Corps of Engineers. In general, these beach-erosion reports are the result of cooperative studies, financed jointly and equally by the United States and the local public agency requesting the study. These beach-erosion projects are improvements for the protection of the shores of the United States and its Territories. In including these projects, the committee has followed existing law which limits Federal participation to a maximum of one-third of the cost of protecting publicly owned shores. It has also recognized the general principle that because of the emergency nature of shore protection, it is not always practicable for local interests to wait for authorization and appropriation. The committee believes it equitable, therefore, and has included in the bill, provision for reimbursement to local interests, where they have found it necessary to take immediate action in protecting shorelines and where this protection has been studied and approved by the Corps of Engineers and later authorized by Congress for Federal participation.

Wanting to be completely sure that this section applied to the cities in my district, I questioned the chairman of the committee while this bill was being debated on the floor of the House. A brief paragraph of my colloquy with Chairman DONDERO would seem to definitely clear up the point, and I quote it:

> Mr. HAND. So the interpretation, as I understand it, especially after having examined your report is that any time that the Chief of Engineers approved actual work done prior to seeking an appropriation, there may be reimbursement, is what the act means; is that correct?
>
> Mr. DONDERO. That is right. That is the way I understand it, and I believe that is correct.

TEN YEARS OF WORK

Mr. Speaker, the action of the House, which I feel sure will be followed by comparable action on the part of the Senate, is the culmination of a full 10 years' work on my part; first, to get the Federal Government to acknowledge a responsibility for the protection of our coastal areas, and second, to get them to implement it by the legislation which was passed on July 26.

I first served in the 79th Congress. At that time, the gentleman from New Jersey, [Mr. AUCHINCLOSS], who represents the north shore of New Jersey, wholeheartedly cooperated in sponsoring legislation wherein the Federal Government recognizes its responsibility to help. Following an actual inspection of the New Jersey coast by dirigible which many in south Jersey will remember, and following extensive hearings, the Public Works Committee recommended and the Congress passed the basic beach erosion laws, which provided that the Federal Government may contribute one-third of the construction cost of projects in proportion to the amount of publicly owned beaches. A companion law provided for a cooperative survey to be paid for 50 percent by the United States and 50 percent by local municipalities, and such surveys were undertaken. The surveys resulted in the approval and adoption of such projects by the Chief of Engineers, which approval was obtained a long time ago. However, as I have said, there was a long delay because of the emergencies caused by wartime conditions. Now, if the Senate adopts the action taken by the House, we will have concluded all but the last step in actually providing help for our seashore, that is the actual appropriation of funds, not only for future construction but also for approved construction undertaken in the past. Of course other seashore cities may take advantage of this law.

Mr. Speaker, I am delighted with the action recently taken by the House, which represents at least a partial culmination of many years of unremitting effort on my part. Hearings both formal and informal have been undertaken. Conferences in Washington and in the district have been innumerable, but all of this effort will have been amply repaid when these authorized projects are firmly established and appropriations become available for them.

We have plowed the long furrow and we seem to be reaching the end of it. This is of the utmost significance to the entire State, because the seashore resorts of our area, entertaining millions from all over the world, are literally a billion-dollar industry in our economy.

For the information of those who are interested in the details of the approved plans, they are appended as follows:

ATLANTIC CITY, N. J.

(H. Doc. 538, 81st Cong., 2d sess.)

Location: On Atlantic coast of New Jersey, about 45 miles northeast of Cape May which is at the southern tip of the State at the entrance to Delaware Bay. It includes nearly one-half the length of the barrier beach island known as Absecon Island.

Report authorized by: Cooperative study provisions of section 2 of the River and Harbor Act approved July 3, 1930, as amended and supplemented.

Existing project: Navigation project adoped 1922, provides for an entrance channel in Absecon Inlet 20 feet deep and 400 feet wide.

Recommended plan of improvement: Provides for (a) removal of damaged concrete wall at the city park and replacement by a steel-sheet piling wall; (b) a stone jetty extending from Brigantine Island, about 4,800 feet in length; (c) two new groins and stone extensions of existing groins along Maine Avenue; (d) revetment at toe of bulkhead along Maine Avenue; (e) artificial placement of sand fill to widen the ocean and inlet beaches, the amount not to exceed 1,200,000 cubic yards dredged from the east side of the channel; (f) extension of Oriental Avenue jetty; and (g) five new timber groins and extension of a stone groin on the ocean frontage.

Estimated costs

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Project document (1948)	$1,579,000	$3,159,000	$4,738,000
Current (fall 1953)	2,044,000	4,088,000	6,132,000

Local cooperation: Federal participation in the project is recommended provided that the city of Atlantic City will (a) adopt the recommended plan and pay two-thirds of the first cost of its construction; (b) submit to the Chief of Engineers for approval detailed plans and specifications for the work prior to its commencement; (c) provide all necessary lands, easements, and rights-of-way; and (d) give assurances that it will maintain the project during its useful life, hold and save the United States free from all claims for damages, prevent water pollution from sources within its jurisdiction, and continue public ownership for the shore and its administration for public use only.

Project economics

	Project document	Current
Annual charges:		
Interest and amortization	$204,075	------------
Maintenance (local)	380,000	------------
Total	584,075	$689,400
Annual benefits:		
Protective	3,000	------------
Beach preservation	8,439,000	------------
Prevention of loss of income	550,000	------------
Recreational	337,000	------------
Total	9,329,000	12,313,000
Benefit-cost ratio	16.0	17.9

Action by local interests: (a) Placed 1,250 linear feet of stone revetment along inlet frontage in 1950; (b) constructed 5 timber groins on ocean frontage in 1951; (c) completed approximately 1,560 feet of Brigantine Island jetty in 1953; and (d) reconstructed seawall at north end of New Hampshire Avenue in 1953.

Remarks: Local interests have accomplished certain work at Atlantic City since formulation of the recommended project, because of the urgent need for protection and improvement. This work forms a part of the recommended project.

OCEAN CITY, N. J.

(H. Doc. 184, 83d Cong., 1st sess.)

Location: On the Atlantic coast of New Jersey about 35 miles northeast of Cape May at the entrance to Delaware Bay. Includes the barrier beach island 8 miles long between Great Egg and Corsons Inlets.

Report authorized by: Cooperative study provisions of section 2 of the River and Harbor Act approved July 3, 1930, as amended and supplemented.

Existing project: There is no existing Federal project for shore protection in this area.

Recommended plan of improvement: Provides for (a) artificial placement of approximately 1,900,000 cubic yards of sandfill to widen the beach to a width of approximately 300 feet from the boardwalk or bulkhead to the mean high-water line, from Surf Road to 12th Street, a distance of about 9,500 feet; and (b) extension of 7 existing stone groins as deferred construction when experience indicates the need therefor.

Estimated costs

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Project document (October 1950)	$199,000	$1,683,000	$1,882,000
Current (fall 1953)	105,000	887,000	992,000

Local cooperation: Federal participation in the project is recommended provided that the city of Ocean City or other local authority will (a) adopt the recommended plan, undertake the initial work within 5 years of the date of authorization by Congress, and pay two-thirds of the first cost of construction applicable to publicly owned portions, and all the first costs applicable to privately owned portions of the shore; (b) submit to the Chief of Engineers for approval detailed plans and specifications for the work prior to its commencement; (c) provide all necessary lands, easements, and rights-of-way; and (d) give assurances that it will maintain the project during its useful life, hold and save the United States free from all claims for damages, prevent water pollution from sources within its jurisdiction, and continue public ownership of the shore and its administration for public use only.

Project economics

	Project document	Current
Annual charges:		
Interest and amortization	$79,490	$35,000
Maintenance (local)	62,100	62,000
Total	141,590	97,000
Annual benefits:		
Beach preservation	40,000	------------
Protective	30,000	------------
Increased land values	27,000	------------
Recreational	369,000	------------
Total	466,000	569,000

Action by local interests: Replenished beach between 14th Street and Atlantic Boulevard by placement of approximately 2,500,000 cubic yards of sand in 1952.

Remarks: Local interests have accomplished certain work at Ocean City since formulation of the recommended project, because of the urgent need for protection and improvement. This work forms a part of the recommended project.

COLD SPRING INLET (CAPE MAY HARBOR) N. J.

(H. Doc. 206, 83d Cong., 1st sess.)

Location: In Cape May County 6 miles east of Cape May Point which is the southwestern extremity of the New Jersey coastline at the entrance to Delaware Bay. Study area extends from Cold Spring Inlet to the western corporate limit on Delaware Bay of the borough of Cape May Point.

Report authorized by: The River and Harbor Act approved July 24, 1946.

Existing project: There is no existing project for protection of the shore between Cold Spring Inlet and the borough of Cape May Point. The existing navigation project for Cold Spring Inlet provides for an entrance channel 25 feet deep and 2 parallel jetties extending to the 25-foot depth in the ocean.

Recommended plan of improvement: Provides for artificial placement of approximately 832,000 cubic yards of sand to widen the beach in Cape May City to 100- to 200-foot width above mean high water, artificial placement of 300,000 cubic yards of sand on the adjoining 3,000 feet of shore to the east, construction of 5 new groins and extension of 5 existing groins, the groin construction to be deferred pending demonstration of need.

Estimated costs

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Project document	$237,500	$926,500	$1,164,000
Current	260,000	1,010,000	1,270,000

Local cooperation: Federal participation in the project is recommended provided that local authorities (a) adopt the recommended plan and pay two-thirds of the first cost of its construction applicable to the non-Federal publicly owned portions and all of the first costs applicable to the privately owned portions of the shore; (b) submit to the Chief of Engineers for approval detailed plans and specifications for the work prior to its commencement; (c) assure maintenance of the protective and improvement measures during their useful life; (d) provide all necessary lands, easements, and rights-of-way; (e) hold and save the United States free from all claims for damages; (f) assure prevention of water pollution from sources within their jurisdiction; and (g) assure continued public ownership of the shore and its administration for public use only.

Project economics

	Project document	Current
Annual charges:		
Interest and amortization	$48,750	$44,800
Maintenance (local)	84,250	91,000
Total	133,000	135,800
Annual benefits:		
Protective	23,000	------------
Increased land value	6,300	------------
Recreational	204,000	------------
Total	233,300	265,000
Benefit-cost ratio	1.8	2.0

Action by local interests: Constructed 2 stone groins in 1951, and extended 4 existing stone groins, 2 in 1952 and 2 in 1953.

Remarks: Local interests have accomplished certain work since formulation of the recommended project, because of the urgent need for protection and improvement. This work forms a part of the recommended project.

Messages in Opposition to Atomic Energy Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, July 31, 1954

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in pursuance of the permission granted me today, I submit for printing in the RECORD various telegrams and letters showing the reaction of the people throughout the country to the efforts made by those of us who fought the atomic-energy bill.

There being no objection, the telegrams and letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW YORK, N. Y., *July 28, 1954.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations on your magnificent fight against the AEC bill.

JOSEPH RATNER.

FLUSHING, N. Y., *July 28, 1954.*

In re AEC revision bill.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I and many other voters in this State are grateful to you for your efforts to try to maintain atomic-energy resources in the hands of the people, who financed it.

We do not believe that private companies can develop this great power more fruitfully or more economically than could a Government agency. This power should have been public power. I hope that in the future and before too much harm is done, this act can be altered in our favor.

JOAN VEIT LAVIN.

ALLSTON, MASS., *July 28, 1954.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

SENATOR MORSE: Thanks for a great fight against the Eisenhower giveaway game.

You did great and all you could.

Wish we had more like you.

Will you please thank the other Senators who fought with you for us.

God bless you.

Mrs. Chas. Lyness.

Chicago, Ill., *July 28, 1954.*

Hon. Wayne Morse,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

Sir: Thank you for your heroic fight against the atomic energy giveaway. Your efforts were magnificent and the moral and physical courage they required are deeply appreciated.

Mrs. Valerie White.

Santa Monica, Calif., *July 26, 1954.*

Hon. Wayne Morse,
Washington, D. C.:

The writer hopes you and your colleagues will be successful in your efforts to protect the interests of the American people during these Eisenhower giveaway days.

Yours very truly,

B. V. Killian.

Cleveland, Ohio, *July 27, 1954.*

Senator Morse of Oregon,
Washington, D. C.:

Keep on fighting against the giveaway policies of the present administration. You and other Senators fighting on your side are doing a great service to the American public. I admire you all.

A. Goodman.

Wilmington, Calif., *July 27, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Capitol Building, Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: We are sending you this card to express to you and the other farsighted Senators our deep appreciation for the wonderful fight you are putting up to save the people's great atomic power project. Keep putting forth every possible effort to save it.

We are coming to hope more and more that you are a man of destiny for our critical times.

Sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. B. O. Bertelson.

Dearborn, Mich., *July 25, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

My Most Respected Senator Morse: May I offer my sincere congratulations to you and your colleagues on your position against the administration's atomic energy bill?

My one regret is that you are not a Michigan Senator so that I would be able to vote for you.

Best of luck.

E. F. Urban.

Long Beach, Calif., *July 27, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator: I am happy to know we have one Senator who tries to look out for the American people's interest. There are millions of people think the same as I do.

Thanking you, I remain,

M. C. Naylor.

Coral Gables, Fla., *July 28, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator: Reading in the New York Times of your valiant battle on the atomic energy giveaway bill of President Eisenhower. May God bless you.

Sincerely,

Los Angeles, Calif., *July 26, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

You have our heartfelt appreciation for your effort to keep this country a good place for the majority of people to live.

Richard and Elizabeth McGregor.

Hollywood, Calif., *July 26, 1954.*

Honorable Senator Morse,
Filibuster Session,
Washington, D. C.:

Keep talking, Senator, you're doing great.

Yours truly,

Herman Leuzna.

Takoma, Wash., *July 27, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Honorable Senator Morse: You won't have time to read much. Just like to tell you how much we admire your spunk and also the few others who are fighting for the peoples' right. Tell Senator Symington we are waiting to hear his voice, too.

Captain, don't give up the ship.

——— ———.

Encinitas, Calif., *July 25, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Thanks for your enormous effort in bringing the issue of atomic energy to the closer attention of the American public.

Mrs. Paul Ellsworth.

Los Angeles, Calif., *July 25, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Morse: It is my wish to thank you again for upholding the rights of the people in the atomic energy which certain groups want to give away. If there were more sincere, conscientious people like you the American taxpayers would have less fear. May God's blessing be upon you and may He continue to give you the strength and courage in carrying on the fight in protecting the peoples' interest.

Sincerely,

Cleo Darman.

Cincinnati, Ohio, *July 27, 1954.*

Hon. Senator Morse,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: Keep up your good fight for the people versus the big interest. You are fighting a just cause and we are with you 100 percent.

M. O. Saluetz and Wife.

St. Paul, Minn., *July 27, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: My heartiest congratulations to you for the splendid fight you are putting up against the giveaway of the AEC. In fact, congratulations are due you for taking your independent stand on everything. I can only hope others of your colleagues will be inspired by your action.

Yours truly,

Mrs. S. P. Andersen.

Bronx, N. Y., *July 27, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: Happy to see you continue to fight the good fight. God grant you many years to continue in the cause of right and justice.

(The memory of your evening in the Bronx at Israel bond rally some time back, which gave me wonderful opportunity to meet a Senator whose courage I had long admired—that personal meeting will long be remembered.)

Sincerely yours,

Miss Belle Kirschenbaum.

Staten Island, N. Y., *July 27, 1954.*

Hon. Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

My Dear Senator: Please accept our deepest gratitude for the heroic efforts you are making in the behalf of the American people.

It heartens one to know there are some Senators who act from principle.

If there is anyway in which as private citizens, who try to be informed, we may help in this or other issues, please keep us informed what we can do.

Sincerely,

M. C. Larson.

Brooklyn, N. Y., *July 28, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: Congratulations on your efforts to keep the administration from "giving away" more of our natural resources. It is heartening that you are so persistent in your efforts to combat givaways, whether it be tidelands oil or atomic power. I'm sorry that your efforts were not more successful but keep up the good work. I only wish more Senators had your moral courage. With all best wishes,

Sincerely yours,

Sidney Salters.

New York, N. Y., *July 28, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator: My deepest gratitude for your splendid efforts in behalf of the taxpayers. Many thanks.

Sincerely,

Hannah Finkel.

New York, N. Y., *July 28, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: My congratulations and thanks to you and your colleagues for your magnificent jobs in dramatizing the undesirable aspects of the atomic energy bill.

Gratefully,

Estelle Wolf.

New York, N. Y., *July 28, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: 3 cheers and 1 million thanks for the fight for our atomic energy. My sweat and aching muscles have gone into the making of my tax money. I hate to see the Congressmen throw it around. I wish there was some way I could make them sweat. They would have more appreciation and use the money wisely instead of using it to take German brats to the country by air.

Disgustedly yours,

An Angry Citizen.

Mercersburg, Pa., *July 28, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse, of Oregon,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: We thank you for your gigantic efforts in the behalf of the people and their posterity and regret that you do not receive fairer treatment in the papers and news broadcasts.

But you have the satisfaction of knowing that the AEC bill was not shoved through without its horrible weaknesses being know.

Sincerely,

MARY M. SHAFFER.

BALTIMORE, MD., *July 28, 1954.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: The country owes you a great debt. Keep up the good work. Many are with you.

SIDNEY BLUM.

NEW YORK, *N. Y., July 27, 1954.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.

Mr. SENATOR: Congratulations on your splendid protest against the bad features of the giveaway atomic energy bill.

Sincerely yours,

GUVINA HJERSTOOS.

SANTA BARBARA, CALIF., *July 27, 1954.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Building, Washinghton, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I want you to know how I appreciate your endeavor to save our Government-owned dams and also your effort to stop the Eisenhower givaway program. I lived in the Northwest for a number of years and know it would be tragic to the Northwest.

More power to you.

Yours truly,

HARLAN R. STONE.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *July 24, 1954.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE, of Oregon,
Senate Offices, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Keep up the good work against giveaway, including the current atomic energy bill.

Thank you.

A. PIERSON.

MODESTO, CALIF., *July 25, 1954.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: You are doing a wonderful job. I was a Republican for 23 years, but no more.

A veteran,

C. W. BLACK.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *July 27, 1954.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We California liberals are very grateful for the fight you are waging in behalf of TVA and public ownership of atomic energy. There are many people in California and in the country behind you.

Thank you for the effort you are putting into this.

Thanks also for your statement today about the "war clique" in the country. You have great courage.

Sincerely,

JEAN TRAPNELL.

WILLAMETTE DEMOCRATIC SOCIETY, INC.,
Portland, Oreg., July 27, 1954.

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Just a note to let you know Oregon is proud of your effort in the Senate. Please do not take your time and energy to answer this.

Sincerely,

EMERY C. INGHAM.

ASHLAND, OREG., *July 26, 1954.*

The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I want to commend you and thank you for your efforts in the Senate at this time, and my prayer for you is that you may have courage and strength to continue in this good work. I would like to be on your mailing list if I may, please, so that I can keep in closer touch with what is happening.

Sincerely,

MRS. MEA RUSSELL.

PORTLAND, OREG., *July 25, 1954.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
United States Capitol,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have been meaning to write to you for some time now to commend you on your courageous and statesmanlike stand on many issues and to express my appreciation for the material you mail to me from time to time.

I feel so strongly on the wisdom of your stand that, regardless of whether Red China gets into the U. N. or not, we should remain in that organization that I am writing to commend you.

While I have not made a sufficiently detailed study of the complicated power situation to understand all the charges and countercharges, your recent TV speech in Oregon certainly made sense and I certainly have serious questions about Secretary of the Interior McKay toward BPA and the obviously necessary multipurpose dams which can only be built by the people through their Government and which certainly should retain ownership.

Your statement on Youth Wants To Know the other night on farm surpluses is certainly thought provoking. I have tended to favor Secretary Benson on the basis that we should stop piling up and wasting food surpluses. If these surpluses could be used, as you suggested, in countries where they are needed to help combat communism, without requiring that the people agree with us 100 percent as a condition for receiving them, this might be a good reason for continuing high parity prices and producing surpluses for a good use.

I know the Truman administration made many mistakes in foreign policy and sometimes gave the Communists too much initiative, but I am deeply disturbed by what seems to be confusion and lack of leadership in the Eisenhower foreign policy.

I know you will keep up your good work and I trust that this fall we will elect a more alert Congress more sensitive to its responsibilities and less concerned about headlines.

Respectfully yours,

J. BARRON FITZPATRICK.

PORTLAND, OREG., *July 27, 1954.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: We want to express our support and admiration for the great job you are doing to protect the people's interest in the atomic giveaway proposed by the present administration. We are in back of you 100 percent and hope you have the strength to continue the fight. Thanks for so nobly representing us.

Sincerely yours,

FRO and HELEN BEISWENGER
(Mr. and Mrs. F. Beiswenger).

PORTLAND, OREG., *July 24, 1954.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,

DEAR SIR: Perhaps you may sometimes feel it's a thankless job what you are doing in Washington, but may I take a few minutes of your valuable time, to do just that, thank you. We in the South family think you are doing a wonderful job. Oregon should be very proud of you. We never miss one of your broadcasts, especially, on Frank Edwards program. As long as we have men in the Senate like you, we have hope of keeping our great country as it is. We know one man can't do it alone, but thank God for the others that stand with you. You have been wonderful, on your stand against the atomic giveaway. We appreciate your letter in regard to the Social Security Act.

Thank you again for your time, and all you are doing for Oregon, and each and every one of us. May God bless you.

Sincerely yours,

MRS. PAUL J. SOUTH.

PORTLAND, OREG., *July 25, 1954.*

The Honorable Senator WAYNE MORSE.

SIR: Your stand in regards to the proposed bill to turn our atomic resources over to private enterprise is highly commendable. If this problem were presented to the general public, through the facilities of radio or television for a referendum vote, there would be no doubt as to the fate of such a bill.

Today, we are faced with the alternative of giving away costly and hard-earned wages to keep our defenses in shape to guarantee our safety.

Must we let a decision of a few who would profit by this move, reveal secrets to all who would represent private business?

Our Senate and Congress were elected to protect our country from such things, and to assure a fair and safe use of our defense weapons. If this atomic energy is to be used for the benefit of the public, then let that public finance and manage the uses to which it is put.

Government administration of the power and peacetime uses of atomic energy is vital and fair to all. Any of the unscrupulous groups who would like this for their own gains, would as easily sell it to an enemy agent for the use against us. Too much of our vital legislation on these matters is decided by a few.

This should be brought before the people for a vote upon the proper action. The cost of such a vote is small compared to the costs of rebuilding a destroyed country or paying an exorbitant fee to some private concern for what we have financed the production of already.

As a voting and loyal citizen I thank you for your stand, and those who were of the same mind on the subject.

I remain,

Respectfully,

STEVEN ROBINSON.

The Legality of Trade Associations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 30, 1954

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, trade associations and business groups are among the most important influences in our business and political systems. When their affairs are property and legitimately conducted, they are able to make contributions of inestimable value to the business and professional—and to the public interest.

The current issue of the Journal of the American Trade Association Executives, an organization whose members are managers of most of the important trade and professional organizations of the Nation, contains an article by the Honorable Albert A. Carretta, a member of the Federal Trade Commission, bearing on this subject. With your permission, I place an article in the RECORD entitled "The Legality of Trade Associations," by the Honorable Albert A. Carretta, member of the Federal Trade Commission:

I shall direct my comments on this subject of Legality of Trade Associations to the earnest, sincere and hard working trade association executives of this country. I have more than a casual interest in this field but rather than write a lengthy dissertation on the subject, for the sake of brevity, I shall restrict my consideration to the following points:

First. Are they, meaning trade associations, viewed with suspicion by the Government?

Second. What risk does one, meaning a member of an industry, assume when he joins a trade association?

Third. Are such risks increased by restrictive admission standards?

These are all very good questions, and I fully realize the interest of trade association executives in any writings with respect to such questions which may bring them informed and reliable opinions. I shall do my best to explain my thinking along these lines, but I caution that even though some may do me honor by considering my opinions to be "informed" opinions—they are by no means "reliable" opinions. I am only 1 of 5 Commissioners of the Federal Trade Commission, and even if 2 of my colleagues of the Commission were to agree with me, there is always the possibility that the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice might take a different slant of the same problem.

ASSOCIATION DEFINED

Without any doubt, there must be in the minds of each of us a particular concept or definition of a trade association. So that my concept of a trade association may be known. I will say that I prefer to define it very simply as a voluntary, nonprofit organization of individuals, partnerships, or corporations engaged in a particular kind of business and designed primarily to improve conditions within that particular industry. The most important word in my definition of a trade association is "nonprofit." A true trade association should be solely a service organization, and should not have as one of its objectives a pecuniary return to its members. The second most important word in my definition is "voluntary." By no means should a member of an industry ever be coerced or compelled to join a trade association.

The first point which I will attempt to cover is:

"Are trade associations viewed with suspicion by the Government?"

This is a difficult question to answer because the word "Government" sometimes means different things to different people. If, by "Government," the Federal Trade Commission is meant, then I can hazard a guess as to the attitude of the present Commission. Although no poll has been taken by me among the Commissioners, it is my belief that trade associations, in and of themselves, are not viewed with suspicion by the present Federal Trade Commission. If by "Government" is meant the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice, I do not know what the answer to the question is. Since the judiciary is also a part of our Government, one might interpret the word "Government" to mean the judiciary. As to decided cases, the opinions of the courts speak for themselves. As to the attitude of our present or future judges toward trade associations and their activities, I do not know the answer.

CHANGES QUESTION

Without changing the subject matter, I would like to suggest a redrafting of the first question to read:

"Should trade associations be viewed with suspicion by the Government?"

If the question is thus put, it makes no difference what is meant by the term Government. Further, the answer to this reframed question might be educational and might even soften the attitude of those individuals who presently view trade associations with suspicion.

My answer to this reframed question is: "Trade associations should not be viewed with suspicion by the Government."

They should be viewed with any more suspicion than is an ordinary individual engaged in a business venture.

I do not mean to simplify this problem because all of us know that there is no rule-of-the-thumb for drawing a line between permissible activities of trade associations and those activities which are unlawful under the antitrust laws and under the Federal Trade Commission Act. Most of the objectives of trade associations are in themselves laudable and such objectives are mutually beneficial to industry and to Government. The injudicious acts of a small number of trade associations should not result in condemnation and suspicion of all trade associations.

SOME ARE SUSPICIOUS

There are certain individuals—some in govermental circles I am afraid—who believe that the joint activities of members of trade associations are generally so bound up with collusive restraints of trade that most such activities must be regarded as suspect by their very nature. Some individuals even go so far as to compare trade associations to cartels. With such individuals, I cannot agree.

One of the Supreme Court cases dealing with trade association activities which I have read and reread a few times is *Maple Flooring Manufacturers Association* v. *United States* (268 U. S. 563, 582 (1925)). I especially like that decision because of the following language contained in the opinion of the Court written by Mr. Justice Stone:

"It is the consensus of opinion of economists and of many of the most important agencies of Government that the public interest is served by the gathering and dissemination, in the widest possible manner, of information with respect to the production and distribution, cost and prices in actual sales, of market commodities, because the making available of such information tends to stabilize trade and industry, to produce fairer price levels, and to avoid the waste which inevitably attends the unintelligent conduct of economic enterprise. 'Free competition' means a free and open market among both buyers and sellers for the sale and distribution of commodities. Competition does not become less free merely because the conduct of commercial operations becomes more intelligent through the free distribution of knowledge of all the essential factors entering into the commercial transaction."

Consider carefully this last sentence:

"Competition does not become less free merely because the conduct of commercial operations becomes more intelligent through the free distribution of knowledge of all the essential factors entering into the commercial transaction."

Turning his attention directly to the Sherman Antitrust Act, Mr. Justice Stone stated, in that same opinion:

"It was not the purpose or the intent of the Sherman antitrust law to inhibit the intelligent conduct of business operations, nor do we conceive that its purpose was to suppress such influences as might affect the operations of interstate commerce through the application to them of the individual intelligence of those engaged in commerce, enlightened by accurate information as to the essential elements of the economics of a trade or business, however gathered or disseminated."

NO REASON FOR DISTRUST

I cannot, for the life of me, understand why trade associations, as such, should be viewed with suspicion by anyone in the Federal Government. As a matter of fact, the Department of Commerce, under President Wilson's administration, embarked on a program in 1913 to strengthen and promote the relationship between businessmen and cooperative, nonprofit organizations. The prevailing feeling at that time was that trade associations and other related groups were of the utmost importance to the individual businessman and to the national economy as a whole. That program called for the initiation of a series of directories, handbooks, and other publications on trade associations and allied organizations. Such program has continued as a part of the functions of the Department of Commerce. In 1923, Herbert Hoover, then Secretary of Commerce, extended and widened this program. Spanning the years, we find that in January 1949 President Truman, in his annual state of the Union message, made the following statement:

"The business cycle is man-made; and men of good will, working together, can smooth it out. So far as business is concerned, it should plan for steady, vigorous expansion—seeking always to increase its output, lower its prices, and avoid the vices of monopoly and restriction. So long as business does this, it will be contributing to continued prosperity, and it will have the help and encouragement of the Government."

The cooperative efforts of business along the lines pointed up by President Truman find their medium of expression through our trade associations and other related organizations.

VALUE LONG RECOGNIZED

The Federal Trade Commission has long recognized the value of trade associations in its trade practice conference program and as early as 1919 it initiated what is now known as its trade practice conference procedure.

The Commission is appreciative of the cooperation given by trade associations in the drafting of rules covering trade practices peculiar to their own industry. Through such rules and within the confines of the statutes which the Commission administers, the Commission attempts to advise, guide, and inform businessmen of those methods of competition and of those acts or practices which it considers to be unfair or deceptive. Trade associations generally have been the instrumentality through which the Commission has been able to channel its corrective influence in the stamping out of these practices. Although our rules are not of a substantive nature, they are regarded as beacons to guide the businessman in the conduct of his everyday affairs.

The preservation of the competitive system depends in no small degree upon the ability of businessmen, and particularly the smaller businessmen, to work out their more important problems through collective action.

SEEK TO MAINTAIN COMPETITION

It has been the policy of the law to maintain competition and to protect the public against economic exploitation. By the same token, another traditional public policy is the preservation of private-business enterprise and responsibility. The essential purpose of the antitrust laws has been to harmonize economic liberty of private-business enterprise with public security. The antitrust laws thus seek to guard the public welfare by preventing the suppression of competitive conditions. Conspiracies, in every form calculated to obstruct the free course of trade, are condemned. However, there is a difference between unlawful conspiracy and legitimate cooperation as practiced through the great majority of our American trade associations.

All this does not say, however, that cooperation through trade associations is not necessarily limited. Unbridled private freedom not restricted by public authority in the public interest, tends to defeat its own purposes. Although the cases do not furnish us with such convincing information as would be conducive to making a list of "do's" and "don't" for trade-association activities, they have been helpful in defining to a great extent the ambit of trade-association activity.

The second point which I will attempt to cover is:

What risk does a member of an industry assume when he joins an industry trade association?

First, I want to say that, in my opinion, a certain amount of risk is involved in everything we do. A person riding in an automobile assumes a risk when, out of the goodness of his, heart he picks up a hitchhiker in the rain. The hitchhiker may be a thug who may relieve the automobile driver of his money and other valuables. Or, even if the hitchhiker is not a thug, the driver of the automobile may later be sued for injury resulting from an accident due to sudden failure of the automobile brakes or other reasons. Consequently, even where membership in an industry trade association is concerned, it must be admitted that some risk is involved in the mere joining of the association. As in the case of giving automobile rides to hitchhikers, the mere possibility of a risk being involved should not deter the ordinary person from doing what he thinks is right. The knowledge that risks are involved should merely put each of us on guard against obvious risks. Automobile drivers should be careful, at least insofar as the outward appearances of the hitchhikers are concerned. That is not to say, though, that a trade association should be viewed superficially. An industry member should not join a trade association until he knows something of the purposes and background of the association. Furthermore, I believe one should determine whether or not the activities of such association are guided by an attorney who is fully informed on the subject of antitrust low. If this is followed, the risk is minimized.

MUST KNOW FACTS

In law, as well as in business, the knowledge of the facts is an essential prerequisite for intelligent action. Law, as well as business, must take cognizance of actualities.

The Supreme Court has announced on various occasions that each case arising under the antitrust laws "must be determined upon the particular facts disclosed by the record."[1] Furthermore, in *Chicago Board of Trade* v. *United States* (246 U. S. 231, 328 (1918)), the Supreme Court stated:

"The history of the restraint, the evil believed to exist, the reason for adopting the particular remedy, the purpose or end sought to be attained, are all relevant facts."

In my opinion, one of the outstanding cases in which the Supreme Court clearly enunciated this policy was that of *Appalachian Coals, Inc.* v. *United States* (288 U. S. 344 (1933)). In that case the defendants contended that the primary purpose of the formation of the selling agency was to increase the sale, and thus the production, of Appalachian coal through better methods of distribution, intensive advertising, and research: to achieve economies in marketing; and to eliminate abnormal, deceptive, and destructive trade practices. Throughout the opinion, the Court took cognizance of the "unprofitable condition" of the industry, and stated that the evidence therein required the following conclusion:

"The fact that the correction of abuses may tend to stabilize a business, or to produce fairer price levels, does not mean that the abuses should go uncorrected or that cooperative endeavor to correct them necessarily constitutes an unreasonable restraint of trade."

Footnotes at end of speech.

But although there is found one or more Supreme Court decisions which appear to sustain a particular practice, it must be remembered that what might appear to fall squarely within the limits of legality under a Supreme Court decision may later be condemned because it is but a part, although a lawful part, of an illegal whole.

MAY NOT RESTRAIN FREEDOM TO ACT

It may generally be said that a trade association may regulate the conduct of its members. However, in so doing, it must be careful not to restrain their necessary freedom of action. At the same time, it must be exceedingly careful as to the manner in which it attempts to regulate the conduct of its members. The trade association official, with the assistance of its counsel, should be able to distinguish between a regulation of trade and a restraint or a restriction of trade. The Supreme Court of the United States, in its decisions, has labored to make this distinction plain to the general public. Consequently, the question which an industry member must ask, and necessarily must answer, prior to entering into an agreement with fellow members of his industry, is whether or not the proposed action will make each of them a more useful, better informed, more capable, and yet still free unit, in their industry, or whether their actions deprive or lessen the individual's freedom of expression of judgment and effort.

WHEN RISK IS INCREASED

The third point which I will attempt to cover is:

"Are the risks assumed by one joining an industry trade association increased when the trade association has restrictive admission standards?"

There is no question in my mind but that restrictive admission standards increase whatever risks one necessarily assumes upon joining a trade association.

As previously stated, members of a trade association are members in such association by agreement. Not all agreements are unlawful under the Sherman Act but it must be borne in mind that the act was specifically intended to prohibit independent businessmen from becoming associates in a common plan which is bound to reduce their competitor's opportunity to buy or sell the things in which the businessmen compete.

One of the earliest complaints issued by the Federal Trade Commission against restrictive admission practices of an association was that directed against National Harness Manufacturers Association. In that case, the Sixth Circuit Court upheld an order of the Commission which provided, among other things, that the respondents refrain from:

"(b) Using any scheme whereby the active membership of the Harness Manufacturers Association concerted to favor with or confine their patronage to manufacturers and jobbers comprising the associate membership of that association. * * *"[2]

The findings of the Commission upon which that part of the order was predicated were that the association had refused the privilege of associate membership to accessory manufacturers and jobbers who sold to mail order houses, and had established an associate membership restricted to manufacturers and jobbers who did not sell to mail order houses.

All of us recall, I am certain, the Government's suit against the American Medical Association.[3] The indictment in that case alleged a conspiracy against the American Medical Association, the Medical Society of the District of Columbia, and certain other defendants, in violation of section 3 of the Sherman Act.

Footnotes at end of speech.

The conspiracy had, as its background, the long continued policy of opposition on the part of the American Medical Association to risk-sharing plans for medical and surgical services, growing out of the fear of its members of the business competition connected with that type of organization. It had as its general purpose, the restraining of doctors in the District of Columbia in the pursuit of their calling; the restraining of hospitals in the District of Columbia in the operation of their business; and the destruction of Group Health Association which was organized for the purpose of providing medical hospital care and surgical care to individuals on a risk-sharing prepayment basis.

Through enforcement of their rules of ethics, and the consequent expulsion of practicing member doctors from membership in any of the defendant associations, such expelled members were deprived of the value of consultations with other members, purportedly in good standing, of the defendant associations.

The Court found, among other things, that the power of the defendants to impose restraints, under its membership rules, upon physicians affiliated with Group Health Association through threat of expulsion, or actual expulsion, was in violation of section 3 of the Sherman Act as an unreasonable restraint of trade.

SUMMARY

Summing up my thoughts on this last point, I would say that restrictive admission standards of trade associations have the tendency to increase the risks normally taken by industry members who join trade associations. It would therefore be wise to open trade associations to all businessmen engaged in the same line of endeavor.

Having disposed of the 3 points originally set forth by me, I should now like to close by saying that I., personally, believe in trade associations, and that, assuming their purposes to be legitimate, and the means of achievement thereof to be likewise, trade associations should be released from any prejudices incurred by historical or hysterical precedents.

---

[1] *Maple Flooring Manufacturers Association, et al.* v. *United States* (268 U. S. 563, 579 (1925)).

[2] *National Harness Mfrs. Assn., et al.* v. *Federal Trade Commission* (268 F. 705 (6th Cir. 1920)).

[3] *American Medical Association* v. *United States* (317 U. S. 519 (1943)). (For earlier case as to sufficiency of the indictment, see *United States* v. *American Medical Association* (110 F. 2d 703 (1940); cert. denied June 3, 1940.)

Messages in Opposition to Atomic Energy Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, July 31, 1954

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in pursuance of the permission granted me today, I submit for printing in the RECORD various telegrams and letters showing the reaction of the people throughout the country to the efforts made by those of us who fought the atomic-energy bill.

There being no objection, the telegrams and letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Stayton, Oreg., *July 26, 1954.*

Dear Senator Morse: I give you the sincere thanks of a citizen who appreciates your unparalled devotion to the public interests in the field of atomic energy.

I would appreciate receiving a copy of the speech, against giving atomic energy to private monopolies, which you said could be obtained upon request.

Again I wish you all the success possible in your gallant struggle to uphold the rights of each and every citizen.

Yours very truly,
Nestor Van Handel.

Salem, Oreg., *July 27, 1954.*

Senator Wayne L. Morse,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: We thank you for the fine battle you are making for keeping the benefits of the atomic energy and hydrogen energy for the entire people of the United States of America instead of for a few selfish groups.

Most of the newspapers give very good comment on your struggles and favorable comment regarding you as an individual.

Thanks for the newsletters regarding the bills also.

We agree with your stand on TVA and 160-acre limitation, also with you in regard to other views you have expressed.

Very truly yours,
(Mrs.) Madie Thomas.

Port Orford, Oreg., *July 27, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Sir: This is the first time that I have written a letter of this kind. My husband, John Green, asked me to write and thank you for your strenuous efforts to keep electrical power in Government hands.

When we lived in Ohio a few years ago, it was almost impossible to get the Toledo Edison Electric Co., to bring electricity to us only 1½ miles from town without a prohibitive charge—until the REA came through with electricity.

We are two constituents of yours and know of many others who appreciate what you are trying to do.

Sincerely yours,
(Mrs. John N.) Glendora Green.

Aurora, Oreg., *July 27, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse:

Keep up the good work Senator Morse, we are Democrats but we are 100 percent with you. Filibuster them to "heck."

Mr. and Mrs. Wm. Crabtree.

Ashland, Oreg., *July 28, 1954.*

Hon. Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

The heroic efforts of yourself and other guardians of the public interest to avert ramming through the Senate of the United States a special-privilege measure should not go without recognition.

The present administration now stands revealed as the creature of big business. I earnestly hope come this November the people will have become aware of this threat to their heritage and will send to Congress only such good men and true as you and your sympathetic colleagues. Men who still have the guts to fight on the side of the people. For the noble effort of yours I say, well done these good and faithful public servants.

L. Peers Wilmeth.

Portland, Oreg., *July 26, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: Stay with the fight, Senator. You are on the right side—the people's side. It is best I don't sign my name. I might be investigated.

A Vote for You.

Portland, Oreg., *July 27, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building:

The development of atomic energy for domestic use is still so new that the general public has no conception of what the passage of Senate bill 3690, amending the McMahon Act, at this time would mean to them. Urge you to continue debate until the people of this country are thoroughly acquainted with the provisions of this bill and understand just how it would affect their pocketbooks. Full development of this Nation's hydroelectric potential will not provide all the electric energy our expanding Nation will require in the future. Atomic energy will be the cheapest source for generation of electricity. Its control must not pass into the hands of the private-utility companies who can then levy against the public for use of a resource which was developed at public expense, giving the patent rights on atomic development to private corporations at this time when the entire future of domestic use of atomic byproducts is completely in the realm of speculation is indefensible. Any and all benefits from the development of nuclear research carried on at the public expense should accrue to the public.

Elmer McClure,
Master, Oregon State Grange.

Portland, Oreg., *July 27, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senator From Oregon:

We sincerely appreciate and laud your valiant stand and terrific fight in arousing the people of the danger of the attempted Republican giveaway of atomic power development to private interest. Keep fighting for us and we will fight for you.

Barney Freeland.
Dr. A. H. Wilson.
M. B. Phillips.
F. Aeswnger.
Mr. and Mrs. Ben Harris.

Fresno, Calif., *July 27, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
United States Senate:

Good luck, Senator, we are with you 100 percent.

John Bernier.
Don Flinkard.
Charles Hurley.

Mahnomen, Minn., *July 27, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse:

We request you urge support in seeing that the Atomic Energy Commission bill as presented is not passed at least until consideration is given to rural electric cooperatives.

Board of Directors, Wild Rice Electric Cooperative, Inc.

St. Louis, Mo., *July 27, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building:

Your efforts in protecting all the peoples' interest should not go unnoticed, specifically referring to the splendid part you are playing in the debate now going on in respect to S. 3960. May we extend to you our congratulations for a job being well done in the interest of our country. Best of luck.

Joseph Appelbaum,
Director, District 8, United Gas, Coke, and Chemical Workers, CIO.

Eugene, Oreg., *July 28, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building.

Dear Sir: I want to congratulate you for your splendid work on the giveaway bills. I only regret that we do not have more men like you.

It makes me furious to think that we need funds for education so badly and to bring the schools up to standard. In my opinion, it is lack of education that causes us to lose our share of those giveaway bills that are passed. I wonder what next winter will be when there are so many now on welfare. I think in order to have full employment and consume production the social-security age should be reduced to 60 at least, at about $150 per month, to be spent every month. I believe I'm safe in saying two-thirds of the people do not live to draw it. Many are working that are not well but have no other means of living. As I understand it, no one collects on bachelors and widowers, either. Another thing, a student should be allowed to make as much as $1,000 without losing them as a dependent, as anyone knows it takes money for a college education.

We listen to your broadcast and think Frank Edwards is one of the best.

Good luck in the future.

Sincerely,
Mrs. Mabel Olson.

P. S.—We are attending a meeting Friday night at Friendly House on power. Gillette is from our home State, Iowa, and am proud of him.

Roseburg, Oreg., *July 27, 1954.*

Hon. Wayne Morse,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: I'm enclosing a letter that just arrived. Of course, you are aware of the facts long since, but I wanted to write you about that mess and tell you I think it wonderful that you stand up to be counted on things that half the others believe are right, only votes keep them from doing as you're now doing. God bless you.

As I see it, we, the people, have been taxed and taxed to develop the atom power, then the private utilities get the benefits (profits) and then will raise our rates for power.

In haste, and in hope for our democracy,
Sincerely,
Mabel K. Jaeger.

Enterprise, Oreg., *July 28, 1954.*

Senator Morse,

Sir: Congratulation on your fight on TVA. I think that's what it is called. I was against you when you bolted and so were some of my friends.

I for one now try to point out our mistake to them; this or any country needs men like you.

Very respectfully,
Ad Gustavo.

Racine, Wis., *July 31, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building:

The Racine County Industrial Union Council extends its sincere thanks to you and your splendid stand on the recent atomic-energy legislation.

Harold J. Thompson,
Secretary.

Washington, D. C., *July 30, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Wayne: We just want you to know that in spite of the way the press in general has treated the debate on atomic energy, we have greatly appreciated your valiant stand. This is truly an historic issue. We feel you are fighting for the public interest, and that you will never regret the stand you have taken.

Once again, our depest appreciation.

Sincerely yours,
The Cooperative League,
Wally.
Wallace J. Campbell.

County of Clackamas,
County Court,
Oregon City, Oreg., July 27, 1954.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator: Congratulations on your wonderful service to the people this past week. I know it must be a very rigorous and trying experience. Certainly no one is better suited to meet this challenge.

In reading your report of July 16, 1954, you mention the fact that the Republican leaders are abandoning the policies of Teddy Roosevelt, George Norris, and McNary, but that you do not intend to. I find that hosts of Republicans who have heretofore criticized you severely are now rushing to your defense, claiming that you are the lone Republican in this administration attempting to save the policies of these great Republican conservationists. We Democrats are tickled to see this reversal. Your popularity is gaining momentum daily. Keep up the good work.

Best of luck.

Bob Jones,
County Commissioner.

Chicago, Ill.

Senator Wayne Morse.

Dear Sir: Bravo. Do you and all those who like you are standing up to be counted while the big boys are moving in for a kill. We will take care of some of them in November. Wait till we clobber our Mr. Meek when he makes his try. This atomic bill looks like the Republican Party is trying to get away with as much as possible before they destroy their party.

Keep up the good fight, and please thank Senator Langer for me too.

Yours,

E. Malter.

Oakridge, Oreg.

Hon. Guy Cordon,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Sir: We are vehemently opposed to giving private industry our rights to atomic energy and cannot understand why so many Republican Congressmen want to help the millionaires unless they are getting paid for it. Talk about Democratic graft. We were disgusted with them but are twice as much so with the Republicans. It seems the only man in Congress who represents the people of our locality instead of the big interests is Wayne Morse and we are writing him our appreciation of his efforts.

Sincerely yours,

Mr. and Mrs. Fred Hayes.

Sandy, Oreg., *July 24, 1954.*

Senator Morse.

Dear Sir: I have followed your work in Congress through the years in the newspapers and over the radio, and I admire you. Recently I have heard your opposition to giving atomic power to private industry and you are right in trying to prevent it. Atomic energy has been developed by the taxpayers' money and certainly should belong to the Government.

In Denmark the Government owns and operates public utilities and people such as I receive a pension. I have multiple sclerosis and am unable to work at my trade. I am now 60 years old. My wife is 57. We are still a long way from social security. I hope you will carry on in the future as you have in the past and preserve this Nation, as it the greatest nation on earth.

People in general no longer vote a straight party ticket, but vote for what a candidate stands for and does. Hoping you will continue as you have done, I remain yours in admiration.

John J. Dunn.

Albany, Oreg., *July 26, 1954.*

Dear Mr. Morse: We have been listening to reports of the continuing debate on the Senate floor regarding the President's atomic-energy bill with mixed feeling of anger, frustration, and delight.

We delight in you and all the other Senators who are so vigorously withstanding this pressure to give away yet more of the people's wealth. We are angered at a man who can be so blind to the people's rights and privileges, that he will give away what should be a continuing heritage, willy-nilly, to the wealthy few. We are completely frustrated that we can do nothing about it.

Keep up the good work. What the majority of this State thinks of you, we have no way of knowing, and the press is bitterly anti-Morse, you may be sure.

Thank you for keeping us constantly informed.

Sincerely,

Mrs. F. J. Stauble.

Milwaukee, Oreg., *July 26, 1954.*

Dear Senator Morse: I wish to thank you and our other friends on Capitol Hill for your endeavors in our behalf.

It is gratifying to have at least a few in Washington who have the people's interests at heart.

Strange, isn't it, what becomes of the many we have at election time.

The best of luck to you; but successful or not, my thanks for your effort.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. Edward Corson.

Corvallis, Oreg., *July 23, 1954.*

Dear Senator Morse: Just to let you know of my hearty approval of the stand you are taking on many issues—the atomic-energy bill in particular.

Keep up the good work—and thank God there are people like you in the Senate.

Sincerely,

Jeanette Chamard.

No acknowledgment necessary. I'm on your mailing list.

Baltimore, Md., *July 27, 1954.*

Dear Senator Morse: The people of the United States owe you a lasting debt of gratitude for your educational work re the atomic-energy bill.

Sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. Michael G. Hall.

Philadelphia, Pa., *July 27, 1954.*

Dear Senator Morse: Our family would like to thank you for your wonderful fight in the Senate.

I am sure the millions of Americans who have not written you but stand squarely behind you on the atomic-energy fight are equally as proud of you and your Senate friends as we are. Keep it up.

Sincerely,

The Heisman Family.

July 28, 1954.

Dear Senator Morse: I have read in the papers that if worst comes to worst you will read the text of the proposed atomic-energy bill and make commentaries on it sentence by sentence.

I would like to suggest that you also may use all the declassified list of research reports for sale by the AEC and put out by the Office of Technical Services, Department of Commerce. These researches were financed by the American people.

Reading the list, I suggest you can prolong your talk until God knows when, if you read it leisurely enough.

More power to you.

An ardent admirer,

P. V.

St. Clair Shores, Mich.

Senator Wayne Morse,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Sir: I simply wish to extend my thanks and appreciation for your efforts in the current atomic-energy revision bill. Your courage and honesty are heartening at a time when liberal ideas are so suspect.

Sincerely,

Victor B. Glover.

Trenton, N. J, *July 25, 1954.*

Dear Senator Morse: Thank you for your great fight to keep the atomic power under Government control. The people have paid millions in taxes to create this great power. I honestly believe that, rather than a mere weapon of war, atomic power could be our means to wipe out the national debt. Also we must be as particular about the people we choose to work with this power as we are with the men we choose to work with our FBI.

Enclosed is an editorial from our local paper. Twenty-five years from now that fireworks factory could well be an atomic factory. Therefore, I disagree with the writers' final comments.

For the good of the country, this is one business the Government must take over. Keep up your fight.

Yours truly,

Mrs. Elizabeth Andesirp.

New York, N. Y.

Dear Mr. Morse: My husband and I both want you to know you have our support in your attempt to kill Eisenhower's atomic bill.

The majority of the people appreciate the fight you are waging to protect them from an eventual powerful monopoly. The atomic energy belongs to the people, and it's wonderful that there are still a few men in the Senate who are willing to make this fight for us. Extend our thanks to the other Senators who have joined with you.

Sincerely yours,

Mr. and Mrs. Lou Myers.

Baltimore, Md., *July 28, 1954.*

Senator Wayne L. Morse,
Washington, D. C.:

Please accept my humble thanks for the gallant and vigorous fight that you are waging for me and many millions of American taxpayers against the atom bill. It should be called the giveaway atom bill. And like tidelands oil bill, which you fought so very hard, again many thanks; it was designed for the select few. The forces of evil, Senator, are very powerful, indeed. I deeply admire your spirit and great courage, patriotism, and understanding. No, you will never receive Cadillac gifts or offers of directorship in a big utility like some of your colleagues, or at least not from large financial barons. You have, though, endeared yourself in the hearts of many fellow Americans. I have many friends who feel this way. We also like Senators Douglas, Humphrey, and Lehman, and a few others.

Win, lose, or draw, I am your loyal champion. In behalf of my friends and myself, many, many thanks.

Sincerely yours,

Evan J. Kupina.

San Francisco, Calif., *July 26, 1954.*

Dear Senator Morse: Just a note of encouragement from one who has followed your wonderfully courageous and intelligent fight against the administration's atomic-energy bill.

I was present at the Cow Palace here when you spoke at the IAM meeting early this summer, and I remembered your promise to fight such a program.

For so many years the filibuster technique hampered so many attempts to pass liberal legislation and all efforts to amend the Rules of the Senate to make filibustering impossible were defeated by the reactionaries. Now it is ironic and just to see them squirm, trying to stop the same technique being used for once for the good of the people.

I am sure you must be receiving thousands of encouraging letters like this from all over the country.

Please do not feel that you are obligated to answer this letter, as I know how busy you must be. Save your strength and time and energy for where it will do the most good—on the Senate floor—and where I am sure you will continue the fight.

Again, congratulations on a magnificent struggle.

Sincerely,

Mrs. Edith Fountain.

Bernard Baruch Cites the Urgent Need for Standby Controls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 30, 1954

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, when it comes to Federal legislation the American consumer is, as has been declared again and again, truly the "forgotten man." That is a truism. It is, indeed, self-evident. But, nonetheless, it is a fact that needs to be called to our attention over and over. When we are considering economic legislation we are almost always thinking, in one way or another, of producing groups in our population. In considering farm price policy, we are concerned with the welfare of farmers as producers. When we are considering protective-tariff legislation we are thinking of manufacturers as producers. When we debate about changes to basic labor legislation we are thinking of workingmen as producers of goods and wealth. But at every turn the interests of the consumer appear to be, if not completely forgotten or ignored, at best put into second place.

It is not my purpose today to consider the reasons why this odd state of affairs has come to prevail. Some of the reasons are, of course, not hard to find. Consumers are not as intensively and effectively organized as are farmers, manufacturers, workers, and other producing groups of the economy. The interests of the consumer are not always readily pinpointed. They are often less subject to specific legislative action than those of producers.

This does not mean that nothing can or nothing should be done. On the contrary. There is no need to stand idly by. The resolution to which I am addressing myself, House Concurrent Resolution 47, which I introduced in the House on February 9 of last year, 1953, is one small step which will, I trust, point in the right direction as to how consumer interests can be effectively safeguarded and promoted. This resolution has the purpose of establishing a joint committee on consumers to consist of 7 Members of the House of Representatives and 7 Members of the Senate.

The committee would have the duty to study and make recommendations in six major fields, and I quote from the bill:

> 1. Measures to safeguard consumer interests under conditions of the present national emergency, and otherwise, how they are affected by the policies and programs of the Federal Government and of a consumers' economy generally;
>
> 2. The fairness to consumers of prices, quality, and terms of sale for cost-of-living items;
>
> 3. Methods and costs of producing, processing, and distributing cost-of-living items;
>
> 4. The extent, character, and effectiveness of consumer services made available by the Federal Government; and
>
> 5. Activities of State and local governments and private groups relating to the foregoing.

At first glance, this might seem like an unusually large task for a congressional committee to undertake. Indeed if I were not convinced as to the gravity and urgency of the subject, I would be most reluctant to propose such an addition to the already overcrowded duties of the Congress. However, I wish to suggest that it is not as burdensome as might at first glance appear; furthermore, it does have an urgency in these perilous times that has thoroughly persuaded me that any postponement would be folly.

You will note that I have stressed the importance, in any study or investigation to be undertaken by the committee, of the basic cost-of-living items that represent the standard goods in the budget of the ordinary American family. I am not concerned with the luxury items that only a small minority of our people can afford. I am, however, vitally concerned with the prices and quality of the basic articles of food, clothing, and shelter which we have come to recognize as essential for a decent American standard of living. And by concentrating on these basic needs, a congressional committee on consumers could provide a real service that would be quite within a practicable range.

I am not minimizing the achievements in providing the American consumer with what he wants that our free-enterprise economy has provided. That our people as a whole enjoy the highest standard of living of any peoples of the world is an admitted fact, not only here, but throughout the world, wherever even the most meager knowledge of the United States exists. But this fact cannot lead us to be complacent. We all know that despite the wealth of this Nation, and the economic advantages which most of our people retain, there are many thousands of our citizens who even today do not enjoy the minimum standards of food, housing, clothing, and medical care that we consider a part of the American way of life. Obviously there is no panacea to this problem. No congressional committee is going to eliminate poverty. But the Congress can take steps, however small, to see that the interests of the American people as consumers are constantly represented in the minds of the legislators and the administrators of our Federal Government.

Most of all, I want to stress the urgency for this committee to be established now, so that we may be in a better position to consider the consumer interest in case of any deterioration of world conditions. If I were asked to pick out the heart of this bill, the core of the problem which it is intended to deal with, I would point to the first area which this committee would be directed to study and investigate: Measures to safeguard consumer interests under conditions of the present national emergency, and clearly in any future emergency.

It is, unfortunately, not difficult to imagine situations arising in comparison with which our present state of uncertainty and strain would seem very blissful indeed. We know that the Soviet Union has the power to unleash atomic weapons of undescribable fury. That is a fact we cannot wish away. It is an eventuality that we must prepare ourselves for, as consumers no less than as producers.

In view of this state of world affairs, I was impressed, as I am sure all of you will be, with the views recently expressed by Bernard Baruch, to whom the term "elder statesman" has probably been applied more often than to any other living American, and who has been the adviser of Presidents, Democratic and Republican alike, from Wilson to Eisenhower.

Bernard Baruch is of the firm conviction that legislation is urgently needed now to provide for standby authority that could be instantly invoked in case of enemy attack. In forceful language he predicts:

> The next war is likely to explode all in a big smash. Cities may be all but obliterated. Who knows where Congress will be? If this standby legislation is not enacted, and the day of the big smash comes, there will not be a person alive who will not bitterly rue this tragic, needless neglect.

Now as you know, Bernard Baruch's programs calls for an extensive array of economic controls. The standby program he envisages includes a ceiling on wages, prices, rents, and other consumer costs; consumer rationing; credit and monetary curbs; a revised tax program; and "priorities and all other features of a thorough industrial mobilization program."

This is, of course, a sweeping program, one which is deserving of serious debate. It is not one that I necessarily subscribe to in all details. But it does emphasize the one point that I do think important, and that is that in any all-out emergency such as Baruch envisages, the consumer is placed in extreme jeopardy unless legislation protecting his welfare is enacted prior to the disaster. The Joint Committee on Consumers would be in an admirable position to examine any proposed mobilization and controls program from the point of view of the consumer. Baruch's own plan could be examined as to its feasibility and effectiveness. But unless a legislative committee, such as the Joint Committee on Consumers I am proposing in this bill, takes the initiative, we can be certain that action will be too little and too late.

Let me in closing quote again some wise words by Baruch which have impressed me deeply:

> To wait is to die. To wait is to make certain our mobilization will be needlessly slowed which means lengthening the struggle for victory and dooming some to lose their lives—needlessly. To wait is also to make certain that there will be some degree of cruel inflation—again needlessly.

Let it not be said that we waited, heedless of our peril. Favorable action on this bill will be a token that we are alert and aware of the emergency confronting us, that we do not intend to ignore or sidestep our responsibility to the American consumer, in other words to the American citizen.

[From the Newark News of July 18, 1954]

Baruch Wants Law for Controls Rushed—Fears Delay, War Would Be Fatal

Washington.—Elder Statesman Bernard M. Baruch warned yesterday that if Congress fails to enact standby economic controls legislation in the closing days of this session it may cost us dearly.

"To me it would be the height of folly," he said.

His warning came after disclosures that President Eisenhower's mobilization staff is preparing wage, price, rent, and materials controls to be presented to Congress in case of a military emergency.

Baruch said the administration, in not sending the legislation to Congress now, is both ducking the issue and avoiding a decision. He described this as "deluding themselves, or deluding the public, or maybe both."

Time is of the essence, he said, and recalled this statement he once made to Congress:

"The next war is likely to explode all in a big smash. Cities may be all but obliterated. Who knows where Congress will be? If this standby legislation is not enacted, and the day of the big smash comes, there will not be a person alive who will not bitterly rue this tragic, needless neglect."

ALL-EMBRACING

The financier's views were asked after he wrote a letter commenting on a recent Washington dispatch detailing the administration's emergency plan.

He replied that the standby program he envisions includes a ceiling on wages, prices, rents and other consumer costs; credit and monetary curbs; a revised tax program, and "priorities and all other features of a thorough industrial mobilization program."

"A setup for rationing would definitely be provided and it would include penalties for both the seller and the buyer in instances where the regulations were broken," Baruch said.

He also indicated the regulation should be flexibile—less severe for a situation such as military intervention in Southeast Asia than in an all-out war. "Controls would last only as long as they were required—certainly for the duration of the emergency and for a sufficient time thereafter to permit a proper readjustment," he said.

CRITICAL OF OLD PLANS

He criticized the controls programs put into effect during World War II and the Korean conflict. He said they were piecemeal and were put together at the last minute.

Baruch told Congress last year he believes a ready controls program would be "the surest deterrent against another war" because an enemy could only hope to "overwhelm us before our gigantic productive energies can have been converted from peace to war."

The administration has been holding closed-door sessions with industry leaders on the program to be sent to Congress in case of an emergency.

"To wait is to die," Baruch said. "To wait is to make certain our mobilization will be needlessly slowed which means lengthening the struggle for victory and dooming some to lose their lives—needlessly. To wait is also to make certain that there will be some degree of cruel inflation—again needlessly."

Messages in Opposition to Atomic Energy Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, July 31, 1954

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in pursuance of the permission granted me today, I submit for printing in the Record various telegrams and letters showing the reaction of the people throughout the country to the efforts made by those of us who fought the atomic-energy bill.

There being no objection, the telegrams and letters were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

New York, N. Y., *July 27, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: I have followed with great interest your fight against the atomic-energy bill as it now stands. Thank God there are men such as yourself in the Senate who are truly representing the people, and not private interests. I regret that we do not have Senators-at-large in the United States, who would not be elected from any particular State, but by the Nation to represent them. If we had, I am sure you would be elected. Thank you, and good luck in the future.

Very truly yours,

Edna C. Wollk.

Birmingham, Ala., *July 26, 1954.*

Honorable Senator: Fight the giveaway bunch to the standstill. If Ike can go out and play a few rounds of golf with B. Jones and give him and his company the atomic-energy plant he might take a little batting practice with Willie Mays and give the Capitol to the New York Giants. That's about all he has left, and I don't think he'll need it after 1956.

Truly yours,

M. Goodson.

Brooklyn, N. Y., *July 27, 1954.*

Senator Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: Thank you for the good work you are doing for our country. Don't let them sell out our atomic energy.

Yours truly,

Edith Fastnacht.

Detroit, Mich., *July 26, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: May I express my deep appreciation for your efforts in behalf of all of us.

I am profoundly grateful to Oregon that we have you to speak and fight for the protection of our resources for all of us—for a more secure living for all of our people.

You may be assured of my support and the support of my organization—an independent professional group—at all times.

Thank you.

Sincerely yours,

Katharine E. Nagher.

Dear Senator: I hope you don't compromise on your present opposition, which will probably be over before you get this.

And may I also suggest that you pick such time that you think it will get in a lot of papers to tell the United States that large dams that produce electricity are very profitable and the proceeds from same should be used to build smaller, unprofitable dams for flood control like T. V. A.

Best wishes,

D. L. Calhoun.

Chicago, Ill., *July 26, 1954.*

Dear Secretary: This is a very late suggestion:

That you let the Senator read all letters favorable to him while he is holding the floor against such bills as the present one giving some $18 billion worth of know-how to private industry for a song.

I think you are lucky to be secretary to such a man as Wayne Morse.

Respectfully yours,

D. L. Calhoun.

Los Angeles, Calif., *July 26, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: I wish to thank you for the magnificent fight you have made for the people all through the year, but most spectacularly during the last week. In my opinion, you are the greatest Senator we have. If only there were more like you. You must feel quite lonely at times.

Respectfully yours,

J. Bennet Olson, Ph. D.

Grosse Pointe, Mich., *July 26, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: Because I like this country so much and its people I vote to have atom power develop both so that we in the future are in the same favorable conditions that other countries and peoples will be where atom powers is used to benefit the many instead of the few.

Very sincerely yours,

A long time American since 100 years before 1776—Hudson River area.

Mary Newell
(And many relatives).

St. Louis, Mo., *July 25, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: Just listened to your very enlightening answers to the Youth Wants To Know pertinent questions, especially those relating to the give-away-of-our-national-heritage features of the pending AEC legislation.

Also, several nights ago, I heard your interesting comments during the Frank Edwards news time.

Best wishes for your success in this important matter of the preservation of our national heritage.

Sincerely,

John Nowakowsky.

Ojai, Calif., *July 25, 1954.*

Senator Wayne L. Morse,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator: I am one of your great admirers, and have never written to a Senator before, but want you to know that we are praying for you, that you may be given the strength, wisdom, and courage to carry on your great fight in the interest of millions of inarticulate common people who if it were not for the decency and honesty of such men as yourself, would be deprived of the rightful benefits of all the people to public power, water, parks, and many other such things.

I homesteaded after World War I in Alsea, Oreg., in 1920 and lived there 12 years. It is near Corvallis.

Thanking you again from the bottom of my heart, and may God bless you.

Yours sincerely,
WM. C. WATERS.
VELMA W. WATERS.

BROOKLINE, MASS., *July 25, 1954.*

MY DEAR SENATOR: Your appearance on Youth Wants To Know was very much enjoyed by my family and myself.

If we had 96 Senators like you in the Senate we would have little to worry about regarding justice for the common man.

There would be less tax amortizations for the rich at the expense of the worker, and also his rightful heritage would not be stolen from him.

Thank you sincerely for your defense of my property.

I am hoping for you to be around in the Senate for many a year to come and am hoping that your sincerity will become contagious to the other Senators and also throughout every branch of the Government from the President down.

Respectfully, gratefully, and sincerely yours.
HAROLD EVANS.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *July 25, 1954.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senator Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: We hope that if necessary you will still be talking when this letter arrives. It is encouraging to know that there are still a few Senators who are not afraid to fight against this present administration's giveaway policies. Atomic power belongs to all the people and not just a few chosen private-power monopolies, so please continue your fight—you have our complete and thorough support.

Very sincerely,
Mr. and Mrs. ROBERT FRANK.

ZANESVILLE, OHIO, *July 26, 1954.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE:

Thank you and all of the other honest men who recognize right and have the courage to place the right before personal selfishness.

Once before when the atomic question was mentioned I wrote to the President, but it seems he is bent on selling us out just the same way Grant sold out to the private bankers.

May God sustain you and your fellow men of the same mind, and may you win.

Sincerely,
Mrs. LULU JAMES MILLER.

LONG ISLAND CITY, N. Y., *July 23, 1954.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I like to express to you my deepest thanks and the thanks of my family for the fight you are waging in the interest of the people of the United States by retaining their right to public power production and by protecting their investment of $12½ billion in the Atomic Energy Commission.

A letter like this is not able to express what we want to say to you and the small group that is fighting with you.

May the Intelligence and the Spirit who enclosed the energy in the atom give you strength and courage to go further on the path for the welfare of the whole Nation, as the Constitution demands. The Great Spirit attached no tags to the natural resources, oil for Rockefeller, iron for Carnegie, Frick, and Eugene Grace, et al., etc. He gave them to mankind to be used for all. May the spirit of science and the spirit of wisdom always guide you and bless you.

Most sincerely yours,
ELIZABETH F. GODEFROY.

HAVEN, KANS., *July 24, 1954.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE.

DEAR SENATOR: I am a midwestern grain and dairy farmer—just a common man—but I want you to know how much I and many others like me do appreciate your efforts to protect our interests in Washington.

Keep up your fight in our behalf. We do appreciate it more than you will ever know.

Right now in your gallant stand against the administration's giveaway at TVA you probably are severely criticized privately as well as publicly. Be not dismayed. You have millions of us on your side (and the right side).

I have long admired your attitudes toward the general welfare and in our behalf. Very rarely do I take time to write to anyone because of such a full schedule as a dairy farmer has these days, but I felt it high time to encourage you in your tireless effort in our behalf. May God richly reward you in ways that only He can.

We common people are caught in a terrible bind because of the administration's farm program. And, believe you me, Mr. MORSE, we know now we have been sadly betrayed.

The press and radio blare out honeyed words and phrases to try to allay our qualms and fears, but we don't need them to tell us where we are financially. We know. Thanking you.

Respectfully,
HENRY D. YODER.

GRANTS PASS, OREG., *July 24, 1954.*

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: This is to urge your support of, and vote for, the Flanders resolution. Any doubt as to the need for such a censure has long since departed from the minds of most of the voters.

I wish also to express my appreciation for your recent opposition to the administration's giveaway of resources to private owners. Your stand on the matter of private power to the AEC is approved of by all thinking people.

It is gratifying for a voter to know that at least one of his congressional delegation represents the people of the State rather than just its corporations.

Very truly yours,
GLENN E. HALM.

SPRINGFIELD, OREG., *July 26, 1954.*

Hon. WAYNE L. MORSE.

DEAR SENATOR: May your courage to fight for the people continue, and God bless you for your efforts.

Yours truly,
H. E. MCELHANY.

EAST LANSDOWNE, PA., *July 27, 1954.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I hope that you will agree with me that all of the natural resources of the country are a God-given gift that belong to the people of the United States of America as a whole and cannot honestly be given away or transferred to any person, corporation, or group of people without violating a natural right.

The title of the natural resources, including forests, rivers, harbors, tideland oil lands, mineral wealth, and all patents developed with taxpayers' money, must be held as a sacred trust and the property of the United States of America for the people of the United States of America.

Therefore, recognizing the principle of free enterprise as the standard adopted economic policy of our country, the entire bill should be rewritten in the form of a lend-lease, on a profit-sharing basis with the United States of America, and retaining all of the amendments so far adopted by the Senate. The new lend-lease to be only for a number of years to be revised and amended as time goes on in the best interests of all concerned.

Dear Senator MORSE, please accept my admiration for your fight in the best interests of our country.

Respectfully yours,
A. W. LEVER.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., *July 26, 1954.*

Senator WAYNE L. MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am sure there are millions of good people in this country who are applauding with me your principled and courageous defense of our rights. Your battle is not lost, as the newspapers keep claiming, as long as you continue to provide the headlines that alert the Nation to the monstrous steal you are seeking to prevent.

You are doing an inestimable service, even if the steal goes through. Keep up the good fight.

Sincerely,
CHARLOTTE DORSEY.

READING, PA., *July 27, 1954.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE, of Oregon,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Thank you very much indeed for your heroic efforts in behalf of the people of the United States on the atomic program. I appreciate your speaking on Frank Edwards' news programs also.

Very sincerely,
Mrs. F. G. MABBUTT.

BROOKLYN, N. Y., *July 27, 1954.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: It is not only gratifying, but thrilling, in this day of the success of cynical private greed, to find a man like you fighting so hard to protect the public's interest in our basic resources, our basic institutions, and our basic principles of freedom and justice. Your stupendous efforts cannot help but have a beneficial effect on all of these in the long run.

All Americans owe you and your leadership a tremendous debt of gratitude.

Appreciatively yours,
HOPE S. BAGGER.
(Mrs. F. E.)

MADISON, WIS., *July 26, 1954.*

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: The part that you have had in opposing the administration's bill for revising the Atomic Energy Commission in our opinion deserves the support and commendation of every thinking citizen of the United States.

The long hours that you have spent on the Senate floor in behalf of the public interest on this and other issues place us deeply in your debt. Unfortunately, as residents of Wisconsin, we will be unable to express our appreciation in the form of votes as we would like to. As citizens of the United States, however, we can and do wish to say that your work is deeply appreciated.

Very truly yours,
Mr. and Mrs. PHILIP MUNTZ.

CLAYTON, MO., *July 27, 1954.*

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Independent Senator From Oregon,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Having long admired your stand on many matters I write now only in appreciation of your magnificent efforts in behalf of the American people, as always. As you know, we have two excellent Senators from Missouri, and I have no doubt they, like yourself, are opposed to this further "grab" of holdings of all of the people by a favored few with sanction by an uninformed President, I am sorry to say.

When the issue comes up for vote I hope it will be a rollcall affair as I wish to look over the voting records of all Senators and on vital issues have long been completely against "voice" votes. The elected representatives of the people owe their constituents rollcall votes on all vital matters, unless some Senators are afraid to have it known to those who certainly are interested and we so interpret "voice" vote.

Courage, Senator Morse; the people are not unmindful of your good work and I only pray for an opportunity to repay your wonderful efforts in behalf of all the people.

Very respectfully,

Mrs. Vivian Campbell.

Carmel, Calif., *July 26, 1954.*

Hon. Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: The country owes you a debt of gratitude for your courageous fight to defeat the atomic bill.

May you and the Democratic Senators who are with you succeed in defeating this gigantic giveaway program is the sincere hope of all of your many friends in Carmel.

Respectfully yours,

Mary Newell.

Santa Clara, Calif., *July 26, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: On behalf of myself and my children I wish to thank you and all of your courageous colleagues for the fight you are waging in the Senate to defeat another giveaway. I do believe that in the long run private enterprise should take over the development of atomic power, but I believe the utilities should pay the American people for their equity. It seems that the people who howl most about free and competitive enterprise will not face up to the real meaning. They are the people who holler about free enterprise and at the same time have their hands up to their elbow in Uncle Sam's pocket. Most of this administration's program either gives away or takes away so from the people's standpoint it really does not matter anyway if they never get along with their program.

J. Johnson.

Bronx, N. Y., *July 27, 1954.*

Dear Senator Morse: Please give me the liberty to express my thanks and congratulations on your gallant fight for the modification of the administration's Atomic Energy Act.

A long-time admirer of yours.

Robert J. Ney.

Baltimore, Md., *July 26, 1954.*

Dear Senator: Here is wishing you luck on your filibuster or whatever it is—I don't, as long as it can work. But if you lose out to a few scatterbrain Democrats, it sure won't be your fault or the ones with you. The Eisenhower giveaway knows if they don't get it through now, they won't be able to after November. I was Republican, but not now. I will vote straight Democratic, as will millions more of unemployed as myself. Here is wishing you and your partners in this fight of ours the best of luck and health. Here is hoping that, if you do lose out, there will be enough at next session to repeal it and give it to the people.

Best of luck,

Charles Bowman.

P. S.—If you care to show this letter or read it on the floor or over the radio, such as A. F. of L. Frank Edwards, it is O. K.

Pacific Palisades, Calif., *July 26, 1954.*

Hon. Wayne Morse,
United States Senate Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: A group of us Californians want to express our appreciation for your courage in standing up against the pious pimps of plundering pillionaires. We have to count on you to represent us little people. Our big wheels appear to favor the generalissimos.

We hope you and your colleagues—I heard you mention them on Frank Edwards' program—continue the fight and beat down the billionaires' boys.

Sincerely,

Jack Wells.

Wichita, Kans., *July 26, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: I sincerely hope you win this atomic energy argument. I can see no reason why taxpayers should build facilities to be sold to private industry at a tenth of the cost later.

Someone told a story once about the taxpayers buying a taxicab, selling it to a private company for one-tenth of the original cost, and then paying to ride to work in it; and it seems to me that is about what this deal amounts to. More power to you, and if there is ever anything a good many of us out here in Kansas can do to help you out, please feel free to write us, and I can assure you we will do everything we can to help.

Just one thing Senator: Don't ruin your health for the people of this country. I am beginning to wonder if we are worth it.

Very sincerely yours,

Mrs. Mary F. Manning.

The Atomic Energy Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 30, 1954

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following article from Time magazine of August 2, 1954:

The Atomic Energy Bill

WHAT IT PROPOSES

Drafted by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy (headed by New York's Congressman W. Sterling Cole and his vice chairman, Iowa's Senator Bourke Hickenlooper), the bill has two main objectives: (1) to create a private atomic-power industry, and (2) to prepare allied nations for atomic warfare and peacetime uses of atomic energy.

To end the Government's atomic monopoly, it would set up machinery for licensing companies to make electric power from atomic energy. Under the AEC's paternal eye, the companies would acquire their own reactors and other facilities, but the Government would keep title to nuclear materials which it would lend out. The bill also would allow private citizens to take out patents on atomic-energy developments, and would encourage prospecting for fissionable materials on public lands.

In the international field, the bill would permit the United States to ship nuclear source materials to allied nations which make a substantial contribution to the free world's security. The United States could also send to allies or regional-defense organizations, e. g., NATO, atomic-weapons information needed for (1) defense plants (2) training personnel in using and defending themselves against atomic weapons, and (3) evaluating the enemy's atomic capabilities. However, no design secrets which would tell other countries how to build A-bombs would be revealed. To spur foreign development of industrial atomic operations, the bill would let the United States transmit information on (1) refining and processing source materials (2) reactor designs, and (3) health and safety measures.

WHAT THE FIGHT IS ABOUT

Despite these important new proposals, the heat in the Senate was generated by the shopworn issue of public versus private steam plants. Last Month President Eisenhower ordered the AEC to contract with private companies for electricity, which it will be needing beyond the amount already being supplied by the Tennessee Valley Authority.

TVA said it could supply cheaper power by building new steam plants with Government money. The administration held that even if TVA could do the job more cheaply, the Government should stay out of the steam-plant business as much as possible. Led by Senators from the TVA area, e. g., Tennessee Democrat Albert Gore and Alabama Democrat Lister Hill, public-power enthusiasts, mostly Democrats, sided with the TVA. They decided to fight for a rider on the AEC bill that would block the Eisenhower order.

With the filibusters' energies concentrated on the TVA fight, little attention was paid to the far more important provisions.

Score in Steubenville, by Martin Stevens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE L. HAYS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 30, 1954

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I am including an article from the April 1952 magazine Information. I picked up the magazine in an airport in Cuba not long ago, and had my first opportunity to read this very fine article about the work of the Most Reverend John King Mussio, bishop of Steubenville. The story of the outstanding achievements of this vigorous and hard-working bishop is worthy of wide circulation. It is an honor, Mr. Speaker, to number him among my constituents:

Score in Steubenville

On August 15, 1935, young John King Mussio was ordained to the holy priesthood in St. Monica's Cathedral, Cincinnati. Less than 10 years later, on May 1, 1945, John Mussio—by then Very Rev. Msgr. Mussio, chancellor of the archdiocese of Cincinnati—returned to the cathedral to be consecrated first bishop of Steubenville. To have attained the fullness of the priesthood less than a decade after ordination was an honor indeed. To have been named first bishop of Steubenville was a headache which neatly balanced the honor. John Mussio was a man to take both in stride.

On the map it looks fine—you draw a line around 13 counties in southern and eastern Ohio (an area of almost 6,000 square miles), take them from the diocese of Columbus, and you have your new diocese of Steubenville. The figures look fine, too. In those 13 counties you have 60,000 Catholics. Bishop Mussio filed the figures, scrapped the map, and went out to have a look.

Yes, there were 13 counties and 60,000 Catholics. But three-fourths of the Catholics were in only two of the counties. One-fourth was sprinkled through the remaining 11 counties. The farthest parish was 250 miles from the episcopal see. There were expanses of nearly 100 miles without a single priest, and much of the area was mission territory. The largest city, Steubenville, had a population of 40,000, with 4 Catholic churches. Only 2 other cities had a population as high as 20,000. And there were only 62 priests to administer to a 6,000 square mile area.

With the exception of one small hospital, not a single Catholic institution graced the entire new diocese. At least the books balanced, because there were no funds either. So, with 60,000 Catholics spiritually starved for priests and for institutions that weren't there and for which there was not a red cent available anyway, Bishop Mussio rolled up his episcopal sleeves and plunged in.

His first act was to dedicate his new diocese to the Immaculate Heart of Mary—the first diocese in the Nation to be placed under the special patronage of the Immaculate Heart. Bishop Mussio claims that it requires no great ability to turn an impossible job over to the blessed mother and say "Please, you do it." The fact that she has done it is no indication, however, that she would have done the same for a son less willing to spend every ounce of himself for her and for his people.

The first 6 months of the young diocese foreshadowed its amazing progress. Before the end of 1945, a preparatory seminary was established, a diocesan newspaper The Steubenville Register was inaugurated under the editorship of Monsignor Joseph P. Kiefer, a three-story building to house diocesan offices was purchased, and a diocesan-wide drive to establish the new diocese on a firm financial footing netted $150,000.

SACRIFICE

Now, $150,000 is a tremendous amount of money when you consider that Bishop Mussio's 60,000 Catholics are poor people, mostly coal miners, steel workers, and farmers.

Tim McC. is a typical coal miner of the diocese. To see Tim and his wife and kids at Sunday mass, all spruced and shining you'd never dream that Tim digs out a dirty and dangerous living for underground. Look closer, and you'll see that those clean clothes are well worn and mended. Tim considers himself lucky because he lives in a house, white-shingled and microscopic with, a patch of garden. Many of his fellow miners live in miserable company shacks. But though his daily pay is good, Tim works only about 20 weeks a year, and 20 weeks pay stretches mighty thin over 52. Sometimes when Tim works in his garden he wonders if he'll be there to see his seeds push up into vegetables for the kids and flowers for Gert. He wonders how long it will be before the increasing mechanization of the mines (Tim pictures the machine as a sort of guillotine) lops off his job, as it has so many others. But he gave cheerfully toward that $150,000.

Herb L. works in a steel mill. His job is more stable, but he hasn't been able to save any money. The last strike wiped out what he had. There's another baby, now, to make the next one harder. Herb earns $1.62 an hour, seldom works more than 40 hours a week, and it doesn't take higher mathematics to figure his weekly take-home. A $10 bill to Herb represents a princely choice; two pairs of boys' shoes, or three pairs of boys' sneakers. In the actual spending, it goes for sneakers because Herb has three boys besides the baby. Yet Herb put in $10 toward the $150,000.

Finally, there's John M. who works around the clock with his family to eke out a living from his acreage. Some years crops are good. Other years—well, best not to remember them, but they have taken their toll. Cash money is a rare and precious commodity to farmer John, but cash money he gave toward Bishop Mussio's $150,000.

GROWTH

That initial $150,000 launched an astonishing 7 years of courage, sacrifice, and accomplishment. Today the original 62 priests have grown to 104, including 13 religious. Thirteen new parishes have been established, 9 new missions opened, 13 new churches, and 3 new chapels erected, 15 new rectories and 10 new convents built or purchased.

St. John Vianney Seminary, established 4 months after Bishop Mussio took over in 1945, has a present enrollment of 44 students. Formerly a summer camp with spacious grounds including a farm and a lake, it has been enlarged and improved, and offers a preparatory seminary course of 4 years of high school and 2 years of college, conducted by diocesan priests.

There are now 5 Central Catholic high schools in the diocese, with an enrollment of 1,500. Two of them are new buildings, in Steubenville and Bellaire, dedicated in the fall of 1950, and erected at a combined cost of nearly $2 million. A campaign was held in the 2 areas when these schools were being planned, and a total of $968,000 was pledged within 2 weeks. A second campaign in Steubenville, conducted 2 years later realized an additional $500,000. There are 31 elementary schools with an enrollment of 5,000. A boarding school for girls and a mother house for nuns have been built by the Sisters of St. Ursula at Old Washington, Ohio.

The year after Bishop Mussio's consecration the College of Steubenville was opened by the Third Order Regular of St. Francis from Loretto, Pa. It started with one building, now has four—with an enrollment of nearly 600 students, men and women of all faiths. Its 34 professors, mostly laymen, include some outstanding DP's. The college conducts both day and night classes, and popular among its courses is the annual one given for little-business men. Each year the college awards a Poverello medal to honor individuals or organizations which have rendered a special service to humanity.

HARVEST

How about the poor, the sick, the aged? In a diocese dedicated to the Blessed Mother you can be sure they come first. St. John's Villa at Carrollton is the Diocesan Children's Home for orphans, underprivileged children, and delinquents. Costing $250,000 to build, it was dedicated last November. St. John's Villa is conducted by the Sisters of Our Lady of Charity, and serves also as mother house for the order which made its foundation in the diocese in 1948 with 4 sisters and now embraces a community of 14. The Sisters of the Poor of St. Francis accepted Bishop Mussio's invitation to the diocese in 1946, and now minister to the sick poor and needy of all faiths in Steubenville. Mount Saint Mary's Hospital in Nelsonville, costing $1,2500,000, conducted by the Sisters of St. Francis of Penance and Christian Charity, was opened in the spring of 1949. Three years ago Villa Maria opened in Steubenville to house convalescents and the aged.

Catholic life in the diocese is vigorous and flourishing, judging by Catholic Action which is its pulse and proof. It could not be less than vigorous under its fighting bishop. One of the country's most powerful speakers, Bishop Mussio won equal acclaim for his letter writing with his famous letter on bingo in 1946, in which he gave a crackling answer to a dozen ministers who had obtained police powers in order to clean up the Steubenville underworld. He established the Catholic Women's Clubs, with a membership of over 5,000. He set up the Catholic Rural Life Bureau in the diocese, the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine, the CYO, the Legion of Mary, the Diocesan Retreat League, and Diocesan Society for Vocations, the Legion of Decency, Social Action Committee, Clergy Relief Society, Lay Union, the Serra Club (a luncheon club of Catholic business and professional men), the Boy Scouts, and Sodalists.

The Holy Name Society holds an annual public rally every October, and the young women of the diocese honor the Blessed Mother in public ceremonies on Marian Day each May. The annual Labor Day Mass and Red Mass are traditional. During 1950, a group of 30 made a diocesan Holy Year pilgrimage to Rome and the shrines of Europe, under the leadership of Monsignor Kiefer.

HEARTBREAK

Add it all up, and what do you get? A score that will surprise you. For a score, remember, is two sided. The side we have given is phenomenal—7 years of heroic labor and sacrifice which have reaped an astonishing and golden harvest. But here is the other side. Here is the heartbreak:

The 1950 census showed a population drop of 17,000 in the 13 counties making up the diocese of Steubenville. The Catholic population of the diocese dropped more than 1,000 during the past year alone, despite the fact that baptisms and conversions were at an all-time peak.

It is an alarming trend, one that contains a grave threat to the future of the diocese. Two priests, Fathers Louis Phillips and Cornelius Gallagher, were assigned to make a careful and detailed study of the situation, in order that a course of action might be mapped.

They discovered that the decrease in population was due to the exodus of families who were forced to move to other areas because of unemployment caused by the mechanization of coal mining and agriculture, or because of the uncertainty of employment due to frequent strikes. Several large mines have closed in recent months. In those still operating, one machine can now do the work of 20 to 30 men. The use of newer and larger equipment in mining coal, both in strip and deep-shaft operations, is displacing men rapidly. Conversion to gas by many homes and industries, and the use of oil by many railroads, is crippling the coal industry which is the chief occupation in the diocese. The survey also showed that the forced exodus is an unwilling one, for 80 percent of the people of the diocese are homeowners, and do not want to leave.

S O S

New industry seems to be the only answer to the threat. So Steubenville is sending out an S O S to industry. Commissions have been set up to contact industrial leaders in an effort to get them to locate in the Ohio Valley area. Entirely apart from Steubenville's need, such a relocation would be a smart move for many industries. There is a network of important railroads, fine main and secondary highways, and abundant electric power in the area. The facilities of the Ohio River would be a boon to any industry. Equally important and as much of an asset to industry is the abundance of young, skilled, home-loving men eager to put their hands and hearts into work which will enable them to keep the homes they have labored to build.

The facts prove that industry has nothing to lose, and everything to gain. But Bishop Mussio doesn't rely on fact-sheets alone. He's counting on the persuasive powers of the Blessed Mother to bring new industrial life to Steubenville.

The Libby Dam and Reservoir Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WESLEY A. D'EWART

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1954

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, the blunt, bold outline of Canada's unprecedented and unreasonable demand for a share in the power to be generated at the proposed Libby Dam in Montana is now clear.

I have previously referred to this project in statements to the House, and to the difficulties we have had in negotiating with Canada as a result of the fact that the proposed Libby Reservoir would back water across the International Boundary and inundate a small area of remote, inaccessible and sparsely settled Canadian woods country.

We have endeavored patiently to come to some agreement as to the monetary indemnity that should be paid as a result of any injury to Canadian persons, land, or resources by the inundation of this wilderness. This has always been the practice and custom in our dealings with boundary waters since the treaty of 1909 which established the International Joint Commission. I might say that under this practice, the United States has been most generous to the Dominion of Canada, has cooperated faithfully with our neighbor government, and has never in any way hindered Canadian development of the bountiful natural resources we share in this continent.

I regret to say that at this time we are not receiving the same kind of treatment from the Dominion of Canada.

The Libby Dam and Reservoir project is probably the best undeveloped power project in the Columbia Basin. It is proposed to develop some 4,250,000 acre-feet of storage which when allowed to flow through the powerplant once would develop 6 billion kilowatt-hours of energy. This is a tremendously important undertaking. The development of the Northwest requires that we pursue it diligently. Libby project should be constructed at the earliest possible date, so that the power it can provide and the benefits of upstream storage can be made available when needed. Anything that interferes with that development is harmful not only to the Northwest but to the Nation as a whole.

Mr. Speaker, we have now received a statement in response from the Canadian Government, in the matter of the application of the Government of the United States to the International Joint Commission for approval of the construction and operation of the Libby project.

This statement in response from the Dominion of Canada, and a supplementary statement from the Province of British Columbia, state that approval of the Libby project will be granted on conditions as follows:

First. The protection and indemnity against injury of all Canadian interests.

Second. An equitable recompense to Canada for use of Canadian resources, which will include an amount of power based on the increase of level permitted at the international boundary and a share in downstream-benefits of storage in power on a basis to be negotiated.

Third. Any rights for the use of storage in Canada will be for the life of the project.

Fourth. All considerations which may be deemed relevant as a result of the Commission's study of all engineering and economic factors in the Columbia River Basin in general, and the Kootenai River in particular, be taken into account.

The statement by the Province of British Columbia attaches two more conditions. They are:

First. All labor employed by the United States within Canada must be residents of the Province.

Second. The power with which the Province desires to be indemnified must be delivered at a point on the border designated by the Province.

Mr. Speaker, these harsh and unwarranted demands go far beyond anything contemplated in the Boundary Waters Treaty of 1909 as provided in article VIII thereof. They go beyond anything found in past actions of the IJC. Indemnities have invariably been agreed upon in terms of a sum of money. Never has it been contemplated that a block of electric power should be granted in perpetuity from one nation to the other.

I call attention to the fact that this project is to be build with United States money, by the United States, at the expense of the people of the United States, and can be justified only as a contribution to the development of the United States. Canada furnishes nothing beyond the forty-odd miles of inaccessible river valley that will be inundated.

Canada itself has numerous sites for power development on the Kootenai River and the Columbia. Canada will gain many benefits from the upstream storage furnished by Libby Dam for any development Canada may have on the Kootenai after it flows back over the International Boundary or on the Columbia after it is joined by the Kootenai. Canada has as great an interest as we in the proper development of the basin. But Canada has no right under law or treaty to expect, let alone demand, that we give outright and forevermore a portion of the power to be developed by an American dam built by American dollars on American soil, and which by no stretch of the imagination can be said to do any serious injury to the Dominion, the Province, or more than a handful of Canadian citizens.

A short time ago I called the attention of the House to the fact that the Dominion of Canada had threatened to divert within Canada the entire flow of the Kootenai River so that the Libby project could not be constructed at all.

Such a threat, followed by such demands as these, certainly is not in conformity with the spirit of cooperation and neighborliness that we have always felt toward the people of Canada.

As one of my constituents has written to me, we can make some diversions ourselves. We can divert the Kootenai within Montana and Idaho, and make Canada's Kootenai Lake a mud flat.

But this is not the spirit in which we should approach these mutually beneficial international projects.

In the past the United States has extended grants, loans, and credits to Canada in amounts of many millions. We constructed a highway clear across the most inaccessible regions of the western provinces, and gave it to them. In many ways over the years our friendship toward Canada has been demonstrated in such gifts and acts of kindness.

I am certain that General McNaughton, now chairman of the Canadian section of the International Joint Commission, was glad indeed to have American equipment and American assistance for his troops in the late war. I fail to understand how he can now press such greedy and unprecedented demands upon our Libby project.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely trust that the American section of the International Joint Commission will stand firm in its refusal to accede to any demands contained in the statement of response, and that the Dominion and the Province of British Columbia will review and amend their statement, so that the Libby project can take its place in our development program.

Exploring Antarctica

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 28, 1954

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I want to introduce a letter to the editor, which appeared in the Washington Sunday Star of July 4, 1954:

EXPLORING ANTARCTICA

With all the trivial and controversial issues emanating from congressional circles and cluttering the headlines during recent weeks, it would seem appropriate that some serious consideration be given to a bill recently introduced in Congress by Senator FRANCIS CASE of South Dakota, and Representative THOR TOLLEFSON, of Washington, to provide financial assistance for an American expedition to the Antarctic. The cost of such a scientific expedition would not exceed $200,000, plus the use of essential Government equipment and Government civilian and military personnel. The amount involved is trivial indeed when one stops to realize the vast sums that have been readily appropriated for other frivolous projects, to say nothing of the give-away programs to peoples all over the world.

The Antarctic is known to have much unexplored land that can be claimed for our country, some of which may be rich in mineral deposits and many other discoveries of inestimable value can accrue from such an undertaking.

The expedition would be headed by Capt. Finn Ronne, USNR, who is one of the greatest living polar explorers. He was a member of Adm. Richard E. Byrd's two expeditions to the Antarctic in 1933–35 and 1939–41, and was also in full command of the 1947–48 expedition to the Antarctic which produced invaluable scientific data for the United States Government. His father, Martin Ronne, acompanied the famous Norwegian polar explorer, Capt. Roald Amundsen, via dog sledge team to the South Pole in 1910–12, and also accompanied Amundsen during 1902–06 in discovering the Northwest Passage, proving for the first time that it is possible to sail from Norway (north of Siberia) to Nome, Alaska. This hazardous voyage was made on the *Gjoa*, a vessels 90 feet long and only 140 tons displacement.

It seems to me that a scientific project of this kind that can be carried out under such able leadership and at so little cost to the taxpayers is well worthy of our wholehearted support. We should indeed be thankful that there are men of the stature of Captain Ronne with enough daring and courage to offer risking their lives in ventures of this nature for the projection of scientific knowledge of inestimable value to the United States Government.

Harold O. Nelson.

Messages in Opposition to Atomic Energy Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, July 31, 1954

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in pursuance of the permission granted me today, I submit for printing in the Record various telegrams and letters showing the reaction of the people throughout the country to the efforts made by those of us who fought the atomic-energy bill.

There being no objection, the telegrams and letters were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Bristow Lunchroom,
Bristow, Ind., July 26, 1954.
Hon. Wayne Morse,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator: Although you are not from my State, I still want to commend you on your stand in opposition to the administration's atomic-energy bill.

I hope you will keep on talking until this nefarious bill is dead.

I have been keeping my eye on you. You can rest assured that the majority of the people are behind you, even though they do not say so. Keep up the good work. More power to you.

Sincerely,

Robert Klueh.

Little Falls, N. Y., *July 27, 1954.*
Hon. Senator W. Morse:

With thanks and deepest respect for our fighting Senators, let us hope that our President will understand the handwriting on the wall.

Thanks.

Sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. E. Haugaard.

Brooklyn, N. Y., *July 27, 1954.*

Honorable Sir: I very much admire your stand on the atomic-energy bill now before the Senate.

Please feel free to show this letter to your colleague, Senator Lehman, a very fine Senator.

Very respectfully yours,

Max N. Ogen.

Cumberland, Ky., *July 25, 1954.*

Dear Senator Morse: You already know how I feel about your fight for people's rights. This steal of our birthright over atomic energy is the Harding oil days all over again. Give them their due, for the people are with you.

Sincerely,

Waldo R. McNutt.

Seattle, Wash., *July 27, 1954.*

Senator Morse: I was in Washington on Saturday morning and heard the end of your 8-hour speech and realized something of the full measure of devotion you were giving to a vital issue. I don't know much of the details of what is at stake, but I can appreciate that the precedent of who has control of this tremendous atomic power is a vital issue for us now and for generations to come. The last full measure of devotion has probably been given on the battlefield for lesser issues.

I am a schoolteacher, and I am inspired to pass on to others the worthwhileness of fighting for our democratic freedom.

Josephine P. Sanders.

I am elated to see by the Tuesday Times that you have not given up.

Indianapolis, Ind., *July 25, 1954.*
Senator Wayne Morse.

Dear Senator: I want to thank you for your many efforts in behalf of the common man. Your satisfaction must be great. I saw you on TV last night. It must be difficult to buck the big wealthy interests who control all means for public expression.

Congratulation for being among the leaders in the big atomic-energy fight and being for the masses who don't fully realize or appreciate your efforts in their behalf, because wealthy interests keep them misinformed by their control of press and radio. I wish you great success.

Yours truly,

Morris E. Layton.

Chevy Chase Baptist Church,
Washington, D. C., July 27, 1954.
Hon. Dwight Eisenhower,
President, the United States,
Washington, D. C.

My Dear Mr. President: I am writing to urge upon you reconsideration of the bill before the Senate causing the present filibuster. You have it in your power to end this situation by taking into consideration the amendments proposed by Senator Wayne Morse and others.

Some of us feel that, if the Republican Party presses through Senate this present bill, giving away to private power interests billions of the taxpayers' money, it can become a second Teapot Dome scandal.

For the good name of the Republican Party and for justice to the American people, I urge your reconsideration of this matter along the line of the Washington Post editorial of July 26.

Respectfully yours,

Edward O. Clark.

(Copy to Hon. Wayne Morse, United States Senate.)

Bridgeport, Conn., *July 28, 1954.*
Senator Wayne Morse.

Senator: I'm not sure of something that's mighty important. I'm not sure that you know the extent of feeling that's been backing you. And, also, the number of people that are in accord—en rapport—with you and your actions.

Keep it up!

Sincerely,

Donald Solobow.

Washington, D. C., *July 27, 1954.*

Dear Senator Morse: I feel I should thank you for the wonderful fight you are putting up on behalf of the American people. I heard you over the radio on Sunday on Youth Wants To Know, and I admired you that in spite of your tiring fight in the Senate you still had time for answering the questions of young people. I am so sorry that you do not get more support from the Democrats who always tell us that they are protecting the interests of all the American people.

I vote in New York, and therefore there is not much I can do for you. But I wanted to tell you that I am one of many people who have admired you for a long time, because you are one of the very few who are not afraid of speaking up for his convictions and who really has the interests of the American people at heart.

Yours very sincerely,

Hermine Herta Meyer.

Proctor, Minn., *July 25, 1954.*
The Honorable Senator Morse,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator: I just listened to you on the radio program, Youth Wants To Know.

I listen to this program quite often, and let me say you are one of the few who answered most of the questions honestly, and clearly, and not just giving the youngsters a brushoff, or evasive answer.

The main reason for my writing is not the radio program, but the stand you have taken in the Senate on the atomic question now being debated. I didn't think the few Senators, apparently being spearheaded by you, would get to first base in the fight to stop passage of the present giveaway. Your determination and persistence is admirable, and I sincerely hope you will be able to stop it.

From the reports, and records, one would think that preservation of the political party was more important than the preservation of the Government, or rather the country.

It is reassuring to know that there are a few representatives down there to whom the country is more important than their job, one of whom I think is our Senator Humphrey.

I am sorry I will be unable to vote for you at the coming election.

Keep up the good work and best wishes for more success in your efforts.

Yours truly,

J. M. Adams.

Los Angeles, Calif., *July 26, 1954.*
Hon. Wayne Morse,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Honorable Senator Morse: I among many of other Californians sure praise your continuous filibustering of the atomic bill, and do hope you will win your point. I know Senators Clinton P. Anderson, New Mexico, and Lister Hill, Alabama, will continue this fight with you to the end that us little folks will be recognized by big business, and won't be pushed around.

If you need a hot lunch during your future fighting, I'll see that you are provided with same.

So here is more power to you and the other Democrat friends of ours.

Yours very truly,

William F. Ulrich.

Albany, Calif., *July 25, 1954.*
Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: I am writing this on the eve of the resumption of the so-called filibuster which you and some of your Democratic colleagues have so vigorously waged to awake and inform the American public on the great issues of peacetime atomic-power development and control. In my opinion your action has been manifestly in the best interest of the American people, and you along with your fellows are to be commended.

The late reports seem to indicate the Democratic leadership may work with the majority leaders to bring about a cessation of this public service. Be that as it may, I hope you with the others can continue so as to force the public-interest compromises you seek—or at least a delay of the immediate decision in this important public-policy question until an informed public can express its judgment.

For myself I want to wish you good luck, and to give you my thanks.

Sincerely,

William R. Berkman.

Senator: We are for you and admire the brave fight you are making to protect the public interest. Future generations will recall the names George Norris and Wayne Morse with gratitude.

Thos. H. Armes.

San Diego, Calif., *July 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator: Good luck to you on your brave fight for the public on the atomic secrets. Would that we had more Senators with your courage and ability.

Sincerely,

Mrs. Margared Jenkins.
Mrs, Alvina Holdt.

Erie, Pa., *July 24, 1954.*

Dear Senator Morse: When the Honorable is attached to a Senators name, I and a few other friends feel like laughing.

But, sir, when it is attached to your name and a few others, it is justified.

We love and respect you, for your undaunted courage, honesty, and loyalty to your constituents and all citizens of United States of America.

If only America had many more Senators, such as you, God bless you and keep you here with us for a very long time.

A few friends at my house heard your speech on the AEC bill and we are grateful to Mr. Frank Edwards, to whom we listen 5 days a week, for having you on his program.

We thank God that there are men in this mixed up apathetic world such as you and Mr. Edwards.

The State of Oregon should be proud of her outstanding son.

Bless Oregon and you, sir.

With respect and love,

Mr. and Mrs. Reese.

Petaluma, Calif., *July 25, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Sir: Once again Californians must thank you for safeguarding the rights of the public, the public domain which is our joint heritage, and now the atomic developments for which we have paid such a fabulous amount.

The Eisenhower administration seems bent on liquidating everything that we own as a government, which means as a people. TVA, Indian reservations, public lands, Hells Canyon—give it away. Our Central Valley program here in California will probably go the same way, impoverishing our State and our people and enriching a few big corporation farmers, and always benefiting the private power companies.

Keep up the fight. We depend on a few fearless men like you to stir others and lead them.

Yours very truly,

Mrs. Margaret Moreau.

Brooklyn, N. Y., *July 21, 1954.*

Dear Senator Morse: We support you wholeheartedly and admire your efforts in trying to keep atomic energy out of the hands of monopolists. Your actions are 100 percent in support of the interests of the people of the United States, and we wish to encourage you to continue in this vein.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. J. Reminick.

Millburn, N. J., *July 26, 1954.*

Hon. Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: Keep up the wonderful work. You are splendid. Would there were more like you.

Although I am a permanently registered Republican, I do not feel we have to say "Yes" every time the President jumps. I am very strongly against his atomic energy bill. I believe in progressing with the times. I despise the idea of some of the Senators—trying to hang on to the "horse-and-buggy days." They certainly appear ridiculous in these advanced times. The Senators must be aware of "creeping-senilism."

I think it is far more important to pass some good bills than waste time trying to pass that good-for-nothing atomic energy bill.

It is far more important to pass an improved social security bill extending benefits such as from $3,600 to $4,200, and generously raising the monthly amounts.

Also, it is far more important to raise benefits for service-connected disabled veterans.

Also, it is far more important to raise the amount from $600 to $800 for internal revenue exemption. I have money in stocks, but I am very strongly against a cut on dividends from stocks.

I hope you can kill that idiotic atomic energy bill, or greatly change it.

Best wishes.

Yours sincerely,

Rose M. Larsen.

San Diego, Calif., *July 26, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: You have my vigorous support in your fight against the giving away of the atomic development to private monopolies.

Yours very truly,

Mrs. Mary Service.

Perry, Mich., *July 26, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Good luck and God bless you in your fight on the atomic bill. Don't give up. The newspapers and radio give negative reports but Frank Edwards' program is a godsend to us.

Mr. and Mrs. W. L. Fordham.

Syracuse, N. Y., *July 26, 1954.*

Hon. Wayne Morse,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Sir: We wish to inform you that we highly approve of your efforts to maintain governmental control of atomic energy.

Mr. and Mrs. John de Jung,
Slocum Hghts., Syracuse.
Mrs. Florence Gerdes,
Missoula, Mont.

Hagerstown, Md., *July 27, 1954.*

Senator Morse of Oregon,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator: I certainly appreciate your efforts and those with you to hold the line against Eisenhower and his billionaire friends of the big grab of TVA and atomic energy. This is another kind of communism I am opposed to.

John S. Jones.

Brooklyn, N. Y., *July 24, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse:

Honored Sir: This is a mere postal but it carries tons of gratitude for your firm, gallant stand on the atomic giveaway.

Respectfully,

Caroline L. Cook.

Phoenix, Ariz., *July 24, 1954.*

The Honorable Wayne Morse,
Senate Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: Mr. Baker and I have just had the pleasure of seeing and listening to you on the program Youth Wants To Know. How you could be and look so cheerful after your long siege in the Senate Chamber is more than we can understand.

The young people were certainly on their toes in their knowledge of current events and even though you must have been very tired your answers were tops. We, the audience, learned a great deal ourselves about what is going on and the workings of the Senate.

We were surprised about the lack of knowledge that President Eisenhower has on the atomic legislation. However, we feel he is trying to pay off his campaign debts. The tidelands was the first payoff and this the second. What will be next?

We are grateful to have a man like yourself to help take care of our interests. Thank you.

Very sincerely yours,

Mr. and Mrs. G. N. Baker.

P. S.—Mr. Baker was a member of the house four terms in Arizona. He too tried to look out for the interests of all concerned.

Washington, D. C., *July 22, 1954.*

Hon. Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Members of the National Farmers Union commend you for your efforts to safeguard the right of the American people to develop and use electric power and atomic energy resources which are rightfully their own.

Federal power policy and programs which have been developed over a period of 50 years must not be destroyed. The right of the Federal Government as an instrumentality of all the people to build yardstick electric power and atomic energy plants which produce electricity must be preserved. The right of cooperatives and municipalities to build atomic energy plants which produce electric power and the right of these groups to have first call on such power should be set forth in the atomic energy bill.

We urge you to continue to bring to the attention of the American people the attempt of the Power Trust to take over atomic energy resources and development.

We urge you to seriously consider the Lehman substitute, an amendment which was proposed by the administration as a basis for cooperating with other nations in matters relating to atomic energy information and projects.

James G. Patton,
President, National Farmers Union.

Oakland, Calif., *July 26, 1954.*

National Broadcasting Co.
New York City.

Re Youth Wants To Know and Senator Wayne Morse.

Gentlemen: This was an excellent program and Senator Morse answered not only the questions youth wants to know but also what we adults need to know. Mr. Morse gave such a clear, concise picture of what is involved in the atomic energy bill and the millions of people who listened, feel it is not so difficult to understand. We should have more programs with Senator Morse. He knows what he is talking about and he knows how to explain things without being abstract as so many others are.

Thanks for this program and Senator Morse.

Sincerely yours,

Ethel Cohen.

The Western Massachusetts
Gladiolus Society, Inc.,
July 27, 1954.

Dear Senator: Thank you for the excellent work you did against the atomic-power grab. I tried to do my little part here.

I have been working on our 200th anniversary as a town which was observed in late June, so my glad planting suffered, but my first blooms came this week and I am sending the first half dozen to you, with the observation that while a glad wilts as does the rose, yet it renews itself from day to day by a new floret or two; therefore, the next time you use a flower to strike terror into the heart of an enemy, try the gladiolus for it will last a fortnight. All it needs is water and a fresh slicing of the spike. Wish they were better but they were what I had. Name is Bo Peep.

Again my thanks for your stand.

Cordially,

Hermann G. Patt.

North Granby, Conn.

New York, N. Y., *July 28, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

My Dear Senator Morse: Congratulations on your valiant effort to salvage some of the $12 billion giveaway.

With every good wish to you, I am,

Sincerely,

Harry M. Seldin.

Philadelphia, Pa., *July 29, 1954.*

Hon. Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: Your brilliant and courageous speeches made in Congress, and read by me in the Congressional Record, should be made compulsory reading for all American schoolchildren. That is the only way to break the hold the reactionaries have on our civilization.

We could make a fortune if we published them in book form. I'm surprised some enterprising capitalist hasn't thought of this sooner.

They would act as a credo for thinking Americans to embrace in these troubled times—clarity, logic, simplicity, conscience versus confusion and selfish self-interest.

Under no circumstances rejoin the Republicans or ally yourself too closely with the Democrats. Stay aloof and they can't force you to prostitute your ideals and principles.

If at any future time I may be of any assistance to you, please feel free to call on me.

Sincerely,

Martin J. Leveston.

Question of the Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 29, 1954

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, the World Council of Churches meets in August in Evanston, Ill., with churchmen from Communist Czechoslovakia and Hungary attending. Do you think they will like to go home?

Liberty or Equality, Americanism or Marxism, Which Shall It Be?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. DAVIS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 30, 1954

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, Mr. R. Carter Pittman, of Dalton, Ga., a distinguished member of the Georgia bar, delivered an address before the annual convention of the Alabama Bar Association at Montgomery, Ala., on July 16, 1954.

The subject of his address was Liberty or Equality, Americanism or Marxism, Which Shall It Be?

Mr. Pittman's address was eloquent, informative, and thought provoking.

Pursuant to unanimous consent request previously granted, I insert Mr. Pittman's address herewith:

Several years ago J. Edgar Hoover asked Herbert Philbrick, a quiet, humble church worker of Massachussetts, to go underground and become a "Communist" for his country. For 9 years Philbrick was an FBI counterspy deep in the Communist underground. Finally he emerged and is now on the staff of the New York Herald Tribune. Speaking in Arkansas recently he said:

"One of the great problems which we have in dealing with communism is the fact that there seems to be in the minds of the American people certain blind spots."

He then described how the Communists have reduced deception to a science—the science of filling in blind spots with falsehood and misleading people by "scientific" thought control. The Communists call that system "cybernetics." It is the control and falsification of information. It is hypocrisy in red robes.

Empty minds, like empty stomachs, grab at any bait. Man learned that as a jungle dweller. Russians claim to have just discovered it. Cybernetics therefore consist of the elevation of the lowest level of human depravity to the dignity of sociological "science." Its name sounds learned. As usual, many who wish to appear learned become fellow travelers, and Communists use them as a front. Fellow-travelers usually call themselves and call each other "doctors" or "liberals."

A well-conceived and plausible falsehood, spoken or written at the proper moment gains popular credence, shapes thoughts and actions, and makes history.

Man is frail, is gullible, and is prone to err. He stands forever in need of fervent prayers and gentle guidance. The best of us stagger forward to ideals that seem always beyond reach.

The most fertile field for the communistic and "liberal" practice of the socalled "science" of cyberentics lies in the barren area left by our ignorance of the foundations of human liberty and dignity in America. Liberty has lost its landmarks. Its history is a blind spot.

Twenty-eight years ago an eastern university law-school senior, paying his way by tutoring American history, questioned certain conclusions of Dean J. H. Wigmore, late of Northwestern University, as to the history of a provision of the fifth paragraph of the Federal Bill of Rights. Soon this student had run the indexes in the law and general libraries of Columbia University. He not only found nothing on the history of the fifth amendment, but found nothing indexed on the history of the many other provisions of the Bill of Rights. Librarians were consulted. The casual and unconcerned reply was: "We have nothing."

At the New York Public Library the answer was: "We have nothing." At the Harvard and Yale University libraries, the answer was: "We have nothing." Finally, at the Library of Congress, that supreme repository of the records of American civilization, the inquiring student stood speechless to hear the final verdict. It was: "We have nothing."

A quick look at the indexes revealed mountains of books on the history of the Declaration of Independence, a document that accords no constitutional right and affords no constitutional immunity, a document no man could use then or now to shield his naked body from the lash of tyrants, a document that served a noble but temporary purpose in the American Revolution, but which never drew one breath as living law.

The indexes at Harvard University library revealed many thousands of volumes on fish. A recent news item disclosed that Harvard's great Widener Library is the proud repository of 21,800 volumes on fish and fishing. But it does not yet contain one book on the history of the Federal Bill of Rights or any of those State bills of rights that preceded it and particularly the Virginia Bill of Rights, and upon which it was based. The most influential constitutional document ever penned by man was the Virginia Declaration of Rights of June 12, 1776. It was the grandfather of them all. Both it and its author await a Boswell.

The disillusioned and empty-handed student spent spare time for a full year, trying to find materials with which to set Dean Wigmore aright. Old unindexed records of American civilization were searched in boiler rooms and basements. Uncut leaves revealed that no other had traveled that way before.

At last he was able to piece together a semicoherent story of the historical evolution of the Privilege Against Self-Incrimination in America. A few years later the resulting paper was sent to Harvard Law Review, where it was rejected as uninteresting. Columbia Law Review rejected it for the same reason. Finally Virginia Law Review printed it as a space filler. Dean Wigmore picked it up in the third edition of his Work on Evidence, quoting that part of it that caused him to change and restate his views.[1]

Justices Black and Douglas are especially fond of it. The Supreme Court has since cited it many times. Dean Griswold, of Harvard Law School, used it in his article on the subject in the June 1954 issue of the American Bar Association Journal. The Attorney General, Herbert Brownell, Jr., used it in his address to the Law Club of Chicago on November 6, 1953, in which he told the lawyers of Chicago more than once to see Pittman, The Colonial and Constitutional History of the Privilege Against Self-Incrimination in America (21 Va. L. Rev. 793, et seq.).[2]

Candor of mind displaced humility of heart, that I might tell that story for the first time. That student speaks to you now. Aside from and yet germane to the purpose we have in mind, we beg indulgence as we exercise the natural right of self-defense and quote one paragraph of that article. It has never been quoted in any reference we have seen in the mass of literature that cites Pittman to buttress fifth amendment Communists. Here it is:

"This privilege against self-incrimination came up through our colonial history as a privilege against physical compulsion and against the moral compulsion that an oath to a revengeful God commands of a pious soul. It was insisted upon as a defensive weapon of society and society's patriots against laws and proceedings that did not have the sanction of public opinion. In all the cases that have made the formative history of this privilege and have lent to it its

---

Footnotes at end of speech.

color, all that the accused asked for was a fair trial before a fair and impartial jury of his peers, to whom he should not be forced by the state or sovereignty to confess his guilt of the fact charged. Once before a jury, the person accused needed not to concern himself with the inferences that the jury might draw from his silence, as the jurors themselves were only too eager to render verdicts of not guilty in the cases alluded to."

"Society's patriots" in this Nation will need that "defensive weapon" and foxhole of liberty in the bleak winters ahead. Treasure and use it for the causes that our Anglo-Saxon forefathers intended it to be used. Stand mute before the bars of sociological injustice. Informed Anglo-Saxon jurors will do the rest. The privilege against self-incrimination was fashioned to parry the blows of just such a government as the Supreme Court seeks to impose upon us in 1954. In such a government, the last refuge of helpless man is "a jury of his peers," with courage and virtue to render verdicts of not guilty. It was fashioned for cases where governments—not the governed—broke out of bounds—where rulers ruled by will instead of law.

In his great work on Civil Liberty and Self-Government (1880), at page 24, Francis Lieber said:

"A people that loves liberty can do nothing better to promote the object of it than deeply to study it; and in order to be able to do this, it is necessary to analyze it, and to know the threads which compose the valued texture."

There is no surer way for a civilization to lose liberty than for it to lose, defact, ignore or destroy the charts which mark its springs and sources. We have done that. The repositories of our cultural records are virtually barren of any evidence as to the springs and sources of basic American liberties. The foundation stones of our freedom are as abandoned rubble.

The shocking experience of the law school senior left in him an urge to place one book on the library shelves of America that would tell the history of each provision of the Federal Bill of Rights. For 27 years he accumulated materials. Hard earned and expended dollars soon became hundreds. Hundreds soon became thousands. It was early found that all the main roads of constitutional liberty in America bypassed big names to converge at last at a grand terminal with evolution's pioneer George Mason, of Gunston Hall. It was found that big names had borrowed from that fearless, humble godly and forgotten man. It was soon learned why Jefferson regarded him the wisest man of his generation; why Madison described him the greatest debater he had ever heard speak, and why Patrick Henry named him the greatest statesman he had ever known.

The search was renewed with Mason as a guide. It was rewarding. Microfilms, photostats, and other material accumulated. The project outgrew the researcher. The sympathetic chief justice of the supreme court of an Eastern State encouraged the researcher to apply at the portals of an eastern foundation for financial help to finish the job. The insulting reply discouraged any further opening for like humiliation. Hope matured into despair.

The Truman-sponsored National Historical Publications Commission was activated in 1951. Since Truman professed to be a historian, it was hoped that the Commission would list the father of our Bill of Rights as one whose papers were worthy of publication, but on the list of 121 published names of Americans whose writings were deemed worthy of publication the name of George Mason was not to be found.

Judge Felix Frankfurter was a member of the Commission and helped to make up that list. He preferred to list the papers of Andrew Carnegie, Tench Coxe, Ignatious Donnelly, Harvey Firestone, Samuel Gompers, Horace Greeley, Robert La Follette, Brigham Young, and Sidney Hillman as of more importance than those of the father of our most cherished freedoms. Frankfurter would guano American minds with trifles and mulch them with trash.

Ask cybernetic doctors of philisophy, "Who wrote the Federal Bill of Rights?" The answer most likely will be: "Thomas Jefferson." One who has never been to school and can't read and write may say: "I don't know." That would be about the only correct answer one would get.

A staff of 25 editors of Life magazine issued a publication in 1951 entitled "Life's Picture History of Western Man." On page 288 this book speaks of the Constitutional Convention of 1787, saying:

"The delegates were fortunate in two respects: First, there were among them several great men—notably, Adams, Hamilton, and Madison—who not only believed in the Declaration (meaning the Declaration of Independence) but had taught themselves to know more about political philosophy than any men of their time."

In the next paragraph Life's editors described the limitations of powers reenforced by "Jefferson's Bill of Rights." In the same paragraph it was stated that Jefferson "aimed to give the Supreme Court a democratic bent by making it the guardian of his Bill of Rights." They then gave John Locke credit for Jefferson's "pursuit of happiness" phrase.

(1) John Adams did not attend the Constitutional Convention. He was in England. (2) Jefferson never wrote a single liberty preserving provision of any Constitution or Bill of Rights that has ever been adopted in America. (3) He never sat in a Constitutional Convention in his life and was in France while Mason's struggle for a Bill of Rights was being waged. (4) He formulated his preamble to the Declaration of Independence, containing the equality and "the pursuit of happiness" phrases from George Mason's Virginia Bill of Rights, adopted June 12, 1776, and John Locke had nothing to do with it. (5) The only connection Jefferson ever had with the Federal Bill of Rights was that he favored it from afar. (6) "Political philosophy" played no respectable part in the framing of our Constitution, and none in the Bill of Rights. Experience was the guide. John Dickinson expressed the idea well on August 13, 1787, on the floor of the Constitutional Convention, when he said:

"Experience must be our only guide. Reason may mislead us."

There was only one philosopher in the Constitutional Convention of 1787. His name was Dr. Benjamin Franklin—one of the least influential men there. It has been noticed by several students of the convention that he seemed to be the proponent of more rejected proposals than any other delegate.

If the editors of a great publication such as Life magazine pay such homage to philosophy and falsehood, how can we expect our children to know the historic truths that made and kept our ancestors free? A free press that knows not the author of its freedom will not long remain free.

Ask cybernetic doctors where Jefferson got the preamble to the Declaration of Independence. In unison, 98 percent of them will cry out, the philosopher, Dr. John Locke, and quote from a hundred books written by other doctors. Jefferson himself denied it many times, but most cybernetic doctors had rather make Jefferson out a liar than to admit that he worshiped at the feet of George Mason, who knew history and laughed at soothsayers. Some philosopher must be made to play the leading role in every great scene on the hill tops of history, even though he be a ghost.

The most intensely uneducated, ignorant and dangerous men in America are some of those who salve an inferiority complex by calling themselves doctors of philosophy or some pseudo-socio-science. The Un-American Activities Committee of Congress lists such doctors by the scores on their roll of treachery and dishonor.

The genealogy of the Declaration of Independence remains an untold story, though often told by doctors of cybernetics. Jefferson did not tell an untruth about it. When he said that it was not original with him but its source was the American mind, he told the truth. When he said he "copied from neither book nor pamphlet," he excluded Locke, Otis and Paine and again told the truth. He didn't exclude newspapers, manuscripts or circulars. That tip was the payoff but the cybernetic doctors all duck it. Those selfstyled doctors prefer to lose it in John Locke's philosophy, even if they must defy truth and defame both Jefferson and history.

Philosophy and sociology have always been the tamper tools that have sprung institutions of liberty out of alinement. Historical research and common sense born of experience, have always been the tools to spring them back into place. Doctors of pseudo-socio-science have always been the apes of tyranny.

A few days ago we glanced over the various constitutions of Alabama from her first until the last, printed in Thorpe's Charters and Constitutions (1909). We found one provision traceable to Thomas Jefferson. It was in her carpetbag constitution of 1867. It was article 1, section 1, as follows:

"That all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness."

That was forced upon the people of Alabama by carpetbag doctors of pseudo-socio-science, while Federal bayonets held the outraged white people at bay. As soon as those doctors were run out, Alabama called a constitutional convention, struck the first line, went back to George Mason, copying from the first paragraph of the Virginia Delegation of Rights of June, 1776:[3] "That all men are equally free and independent."

The carpetbag doctors put the same doctrine of equality into the constitutions of Arkansas, Florida, Louisiana, North Carolina, and South Carolina. Every one of these six States, except North Carolina, heaved it as soon as the carpetbag doctors were driven out.[4] North Carolina ran her carpetbaggers as far as her college campuses. There they swapped their title "Scalawag" for doctorates and there they have ever remained, screaming: "Academic freedom."

George Mason's original first line was, "That all men are born equally free and independent." The Virginia convention changed it to read: "That all men are by nature equally free and independent." Jefferson perverted it to read, "All men are created equal."

We do not condemn Jefferson for converting the first three paragraphs of the Virginia Declaration of Rights into a preamble for the Declaration of Independence. But we do not commend him for playing the part of a gypsy, first defacing before claiming as his own. But men don't stand on etiquette in the midst of revolution. Jefferson was writing, not to appeal to America but to appeal to France. America was in a death struggle. Washington commanded her troops long before July 4, 1776. The doctrine of equality then had a powerful appeal to the simple-minded peasants and philosophers of France. Jefferson was just giving them some cybernetics. He knew that France was a despotism tempered with epigrams. He knew the secret Napoleon later revealed at St. Helena when he said that the French mind wanted equality more than liberty and, it not being possible to give both, he gave them equality.

Footnotes at end of speech.

Jefferson was not a stranger to wisdom. He could have foreseen that which Lord Acton recorded many years later: "The deepest cause which made the French Revolution so disastrous to liberty was its theory of equality."

Jefferson was an advocate, pleading America's case at the bar of French public opinion. If "all is fair in love and war," he was justified in appealing to the ignorant and shallow-minded philosophers of France with a false epigram, palatable to them, though abhorrent both to himself and to all America. He could not know that a Supreme Court would try to turn it into an "American creed" near two centuries later.

Jefferson indicted George III because: "He has excited domestic insurrections amongst us." He clipped that from the South Carolina Constitution of March 1776, whose indictment read, "* * * excited domestic insurrections; proclaimed freedom to servants and slaves * * *." Again, a Jefferson defacement fooled France and her philosophers. It didn't fool America then. Only fools are fooled now. Marxists and Communists never object or even refer to that clause of the Declaration of Independence. Servitude and slavery is a necessary concomitant of equality—look beyond the Iron Curtain.

Let it be said to the honor and glory of the American States, of the United States, and of the whole non-Communist world, that the George Mason concept of equality of freedom and independence under law took root in all of their constitutions. Faint traces of the Jeffersonian dialetical defacement may be found dangling like dodder in the declarations of rights of Idaho,[5] Indiana,[6] Kentucky,[7] North Carolina,[8] Massachusetts,[9] and Nevada.[10]

The original George Mason concept is both implicit and explicit in the constitutions of every one of those six States. It is to be found in all of our constitutions today and in more than one-half cf the American state declarations of rights in the words of Mason. Paragraph after paragraph and clause after clause of the original phrases of George Mason are to be found in the fundamental laws of every American state, the United States Constitution and more than one-half the constitutions of the world. The equality clause of the Declaration of Independence never took root in America. The philosophy of equality beyond the range of legal rights dies in free soil. It thrives only in the sewers of Slavic slavery.

At a quick glance we identified 16 paragraphs of Alabama's Declaration of Rights of 1901 as having been first framed by the pen of George Mason, before being recorded as preservatives of liberty in Alabama. They are as follows: Paragraphs 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 11, 15, 21, 25, 26, 27, 29, 35, 36, and 42. Jefferson is unknown to Alabama's fundamental laws.

Of the 83 constitutions of sovereign nations of the world in 1950, 50 expressly preserved the old Anglo-Saxon concept of equality under law. The same concept is implicit and protected by safeguards in 78 of these constitutions. Only four contain the carpetbag concept of social equality. Those four are Guatemala,[11] the Mongol Peoples Republic,[12] the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic,[13] and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.[14]

Mongolia puts it this way: "Equal rights in all spheres of the state, economic, cultural, and sociopolitical."

Russia puts it this way: "Equality of rights of citizens of the U. S. S. R. irrespective of their nationality or race; in all spheres of economic, government, cultural, political and other public activity."

America expressed it in the 14th amendment with the phrase—"equal protection of the laws." The carpetbaggers that fell on Alabama in 1867, didn't fall on the Nation in 1868. We can thank God for that.

Thirty-one of the constitutions of the nations of the world use exactly the same equality clause,[15] to wit: "Equal before the law."

Each of the other 47 non-Communist nations use language that means the same thing. (See Peaslee, Constitutions of Nations.)

France rejected Jeffersonian advocacy to copy George Mason's concept into her Declaration of Rights of 1789, in these words: "All men are born and remain free and equal in respect of rights."

In the bath of blood we know as the French Revolution, Jefferson's defacement replaced the Mason original in 1793, as follows: "All men are equal by nature."

That substitution was symtomatic of the government of flesh that was to leave a tragic legacy in the history of France. After 153 years of sorrow, Jefferson's advocacy was stricken and Mason's concept went back into her fundamental law in 1946, exactly as it was in 1789.[16] Six years before, France had found the light in sackcloth and ashes. Her revolutionary motto: "Liberty, Equality, and Fraternity" was stricken from the tomb of her liberty. That cluster of inconsistencies no longer tarnishes the tricolor of France.

The doctrine of socracial equality no longer stands forth in this world, except in four Communist countries and within the secret chamber of a strange Supreme Court of the United States.

On June 26, 1787, Alexander Hamilton, speaking on the floor of the Constitutional Convention in Philadelphia, said:

"Inequality will exist as long as liberty exists. It unavoidably results from that very liberty itself."

Every mind assented.

It is inequality that gives enlargement to intellect, energy, virtue, love and wealth. Equality of intellect stabilizes mediocrity. Equality of wealth makes every man poor. Equality of energy renders all men sluggards. Equality of virtue suspends all men without the gates of heaven. Equality of love would stultify every manly passion, destroy every family altar and mongrelize the races of men. Equality of altitude would make the whole world a dead sea. Mountains rise out of plains. Plains rise out of the sea.

Equality of freedom cannot exist without inequality in the rewards and earned fruits of that freedom. It is inequality that makes "the pursuit of happiness" something other than a dry run or a futile chase.

On page 334 of his book (cited above) Francis Lieber said: "Equality absolutely carried out leads to communism." Communism is but another name for equality in slavery. There can be no equality of freedom, without leaving to man his own free choice of the lawful "means of acquiring and possessing property, and pursuing and obtaining happiness," as George Mason had it when Jefferson copied and defaced it from the first paragraph of the Virginia Declaration of Rights of 1776. The right to equality of freedom is a guaranty of the right to unequal shares of the earned fruits in freedom.

The recent decision of the Supreme Court on segregation was one in which the Court was led into a vacuum by the cybernetics of sociological doctors, who found a judicial blindspot and practiced a fraud upon the judges to victimize a helpless people. The most effective "expert" in cybernetics seemed to be Dr. Gunnar Myrdal, who wrote the American Dilemma (1944). His 1,483 pages of "psychological knowledge," financed by Carnegie Foundation, controlled the Court. It was cited by the Court as the "modern authority" on which its decision was grounded. The American Dilemma is now Corpus Juris Tertius in American pseudosocio jurisprudence.

Dr. Myrdal learned that the biggest blindspot in America is our abysmal ignorance as to the basic principles of American liberty. He found a vacuum or a vortex into which most anything could be thrown and it would pass for food. Thus he created an "American Creed," that would have evoked universal laughter but for the fact that his creation was in a "blindspot." Ignorance can't laugh for fear of being laughed at. On page 4 of his atrocity he defined his "creed" as "the fundamental equality of all men."

In the same breath he said its "tenets were written into the Declaration of Independence, the preamble of the Constitution, the Bill of Rights and into the constitutions of the several States. The ideals of the American creed have thus become the highest law of the land."

He knew that what he said was an untruth, but he thought he was in a blind spot, and had that same feeling of security that an ambush gives to a midnight assassin.

Nevertheless for fear some unbeliever might cite the Constitution on him he put his shoes on backwards to make tracks both ways. On pages 12–13 he said:

"Conservatism, in fundamental principles, to a great extent, has been perverted into a nearly fetishistic cult of the Constitution. This is unfortunte since the 150-year-old Consitution is in many respects impractical and ill-suited for modern conditions * * *. The worship of the Constitution also is a most flagrant violation of the American creed * * * which is strongly opposed to stiff formulas."

On page 18, lawyers and judges became anathema to the American people and the "American creed," because, as he says, the "judicial order * * * is in many respects contrary to all their inclinations."

As his cybernetic pages of Slavic philosophy are turned, the "American creed" becomes the amalgamator of races. On page 614, "* * * the cumbersome racial etiquette is 'un-American.' "

He praised Thomas Jefferson to heaven on page 8 for the equality content of the specious "creed," which he claims to have found in the Declaration of Independence. But he again reversed his shoes on page 90 and damned him to another place for proposing emancipation and simultaneous segregation of Negroes to Africa, in his Notes on Virginia.

While reversing his shoes in rapid succession, his socks slipped off. What an odor. On page 9 he exposes a half-concealed truth in the midst of half-truths. Here it is:

"Against this [liberty] the equalitarianism in the creed has been persistently revolting. The struggle is far from ended. The reason why American liberty was not more dangerous to equality was, of course, the open frontier and free land. When opportunity became bounded in the last generation, the inherent conflict between equality and liberty flared up. Equality is slowly winning. The New Deal during the thirties was a landslide."

For once Dr. Myrdal told the God's truth. Liberty and equality cannot coexist. The Supreme Court of the United States affirmed that truth and used equality to destroy liberty. Dr. Myrdal is the modern authority on that truth. Was that the purpose of Carnegie Foundation in financing Myrdal's atrocity? John W. Davis is one of the Carnegie trustees. He is a lawyer. He defends Carnegie Foundation with the same mind he used to defend the Constitution and the Anglo-Saxon race. Before a committee of Congress, he defended Carnegie's employment of Alger Hiss, and his retention after his treason was known, by pleading stupidity.

Footnotes at end of speech.

Footnotes at end of speech.

the blindspot in his mind must have been a cavern—a heaven for cybernetics.

The Supreme Court specifically held that the records in the so-called segregation cases affirmatively disclosed that the "separate but equal" formula laid down in *Plessy* v. *Ferguson* (163 U. S. 537), had been fully and completely complied with, and that equality of white and black schools in respect to all tangible factors had been demonstrated beyond doubt. The Court thus found itself faced with three alternatives: (1) It could adjudge according to law and facts and find in favor of segregation; (2) it could usurp the powers of a Constitutional Convention and give to itself power to legislate against segregation; or (3) it could copy Dr. Myrdal and Ananias, usurp the power of God, and make new facts. It chose both alternatives (2) and (3) and made a new constitution and new laws for the cases, and new facts for the records. It did not hold *Plessy* v. *Ferguson* to be bad law. It held it to be bad sociology, according to Dr. Myrdal, the modern authority.

Unabashed, the Court went back to the records in the graduate school cases of *Sweatt* v. *Painter* (339 U. S. 629), and *McLaurin* v. *Oklahoma Regents* (339 U. S. 637), and extracted from them what the Court described as "intangibles" and transplanted them into the Kansas, South Carolina, Virginia, and Delaware case records, then before the Court.

Next the court found an intangible lurking in the Kansas record that the trial judge had discovered by a new process of psychoanalysis. It was that segregation generates a sense of inferiority and that such "a sense of inferiority affects the motivation of a child to learn."

The court didn't stop to consider whether the effect was good or bad. Most psychologists hold that an inferiority complex increases the motivation of a child to learn, but the Supreme Court could not afford to subject Dr. Myrdal's cybernetics to the light of reason. It transplanted that unevaluated, and hypocritical intangible into the records of the South Carolina, Virginia, and Delaware cases in order to fill vacuum with void. By that time the Court had lost all sense of reason, direction, and proportion. It then doubled back to fill void with vacuum. Here is the new intangible that made its first appearance in Anglo-Saxon jurisprudence and its last in a government of law:

"Whatever may have been the psychological knowledge at the time of Plessy against Ferguson, this finding is amply supported by modern authority.[11] Any language in Plessy against Ferguson contrary to this finding is rejected."

The modern authority as set forth in footnote 11 is quoted below.[11] It is sociology, not psychology.

Modern authority is not law. The Court said it wasn't. It is not within the remote boundaries of the science of law. It first made its appearance as gossip, in whispers and undertones in the secret chambers of the judges.

It is not evidence, because, as said by Mr. Justice Brandeis in *U. S. et al.* v. *Abilene & Sou. Ry. Co.* (265 U. S. 274, 288): "Nothing can be treated as evidence which was not introduced as such."

Modern authority was never introduced in evidence in any of the cases. It couldn't have been admitted if tendered, because it was hearsay and gossip. No court this side of Moscow admits such evidence.

In *Ohio Bell Telephone Co.* v. *Public Utilities Commission of Ohio* (301 U. S. 292), the Supreme Court held, by a full bench, that to treat anything as evidence which was not introduced as evidence, denies to the complaining party "due process of law," as guaranteed by the 14th amendment. By the same reasoning, like judicial misconduct on the part of a Federal court is a denial of fifth amendment "due process of law." Thus Virginia, South Carolina, Delaware, and Kansas parties were denied "due process of law" by the very Court that had held such to be unconstitutional. "Sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander," even though the gander struts.

In that Ohio case, the commission transplanted factual findings from an Illinois Federal case into the Ohio record. It also transplanted therein "information secretly collected" by the judicial body. Exactly what the Supreme Court did in the segregation cases. When asked for an opportunity to examine, to explain, and to rebut them by the injured party in Ohio, the response was a curt refusal. In the so-called segregation cases no opportunity was given to ask. The whole thing was kept secret until the judgment was announced. Justice Cardoza spoke for the Supreme Court, in the Ohio case, with indignation:

"The fundamentals of a trial were denied to the appellant. * * * This is not the fair hearing essential to due process. It is condemnation without trial. * * * This will never do if hearings and appeals are to be more than empty forms. * * * There can be no compromise on the footing of convenience or expediency, * * * nothing * * * gave warning * * * of the purpose of the commission to wander afield and fix * * * [the facts] * * * without reference to any evidence, upon proofs drawn from the clouds. As there was no warning * * * there was no consent to it. We do not presume acquiescence in the loss of fundamental rights."

Cardoza is no more, but Black is. In *National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, Inc., et al.* v. *McGrath* (341 U. S. 123), a group of organizations listed and publicized as communistic by the Attorney General were complaining that the Attorney General had acted on secret information without notice and a fair hearing. Justice Black was enraged. His sociological blood ran hot. We quote him as he tempered the wind to the shorn lamb skins that concealed the communistic wolves:

"The heart of the matter is that democracy implies respect for the elementary rights of men, however suspect or unworthy; a democratic government must therefore practice fairness; and fairness can rarely be obtained by secret, one-sided determination of facts decisive of rights.

"* * * The plea that evidence of guilt must be secret is abhorrent to free men, because it provides a cloak for the malevolent, the misinformed, the meddlesome, and the corrupt to play the role of informer undetected and uncorrected. Appearances in the dark are apt to look different in the light of day. * * * The validity and moral authority of a conclusion largely depend on the mode by which it was reached. Secrecy is not congenial to truth-seeking and self righteousness gives too slender an assurance of rightness. No better instrument has been devised for arriving at truth than to give a person in jeopardy of serious loss notice of the case against him and opportunity to meet it. Nor has a better way been found for generating the feeling, so important to a popular government, that justice has been done."

An "opportunity to meet" Myrdal with a pointed cross-examination would have withered him in a few minutes. What a dissertation he would have given on George Mason's constitutional privilege against self-incrimination. He might even have cited Pittman, on the history of it.

In *Stromberg* v. *People of California* (283 U. S. 359), Stromberg had been convicted in California for violating a statute forbidding the display of a red flag "as a sign, symbol, emblem of opposition to organized Government or as an invitation or stimulus to anarchistic action or as an aid to propaganda * * * of a seditious character."

The Supreme Court reversed the case, holding that it was a violation of the 14th amendment thus to trample upon the banner of communism and strike its flag of treason.

However, in *Beauharnais* v. *People of Illinois* (343 U. S. 250), the shoe was on another foot and turned backward. The Supreme Court stated the facts as follows:

"The information, cast generally in the terms of the statute, charged that Beauharnais did unlawfully * * * exhibit in public places lithographs, which publications portray depravity, criminality, unchastity, or lack of virtue of citizens of Negro race and color which exposes (sic) citizens of Illinois of the Negro race and color to contempt, derision, or obloquy * * *. The lithograph complained of was a leaflet setting forth a petition calling on the mayor and city council of Chicago 'to halt the further encroachment, harassment, and invasion of white people, their property, neighborhoods, and persons, by the Negro * * *.' Below was a call for one million self-respecting white people in Chicago to unite * * *, with the statement added that if persuasion and the need to prevent the white race from becoming mongrelized by the Negro will not unite us, then the aggressions * * * rapes, robberies, knives, guns, and marihuana of the Negro, surely will. This, with more language, similar if not so violent, concluded with an attached application for membership in the White Circle League of America, Inc."

In his opinion upholding the conviction of Beauharnais, Justice Frankfurter expatiated on the terrible racial troubles in Chicago and vicinity, describing the race riots in that nonsegregated area, such as are unknown to the segregated South because of segregation. He said:

"Only those lacking responsible humility will have a confident solution for problems as intractable as the frictions attributable to differences of race, color, or religion. * * * Certainly the due-process clause does not require the legislature to be in the vanguard of science—especially sciences as young as human sociology and cultural anthropology.

"* * * It is not within our competence to confirm or deny claims of social scientists as to the dependence of the individual on the position of his racial or religious group in the community."

So the Red banner streamed in California, while Beauharnais served his sentence in Illinois, because the Court didn't have the competence to evaluate racial issues in a science as young as human sociology.

The Supreme Court just had too much humility to say that Illinois had run afoul of the constitutional rights and liberties of Beauharnais. Human sociology and cultural anthropology were just too young in 1952. The Court thus humbly disavowed its competence to confirm or deny claims of social scientists on racial issues.

Never before, in all recorded history, have human sociology and judicial competence blossomed before they budded. Never befor have such flowers been plucked from the same vine.

When color alinements changed from white to black, and from red, white, and blue to red, human sociology and judicial competence descended upon the Court like an avalanche. Judicial humility lost its virtue to a strange and alien suitor in the secret chambers of the Supreme Court on May 17, 1954. Liberty under law was then and there prostituted by the depraved philosophy of equality under sociology.

A civilization that lets carpetbag doctors paint the alien equality philosophy of Karl Marx on the minds of its children for one whole generation cannot expect them to retain their liberties. Presidents who systematically exclude lawyers from the supreme

---

Footnotes at end of speech.

judicial bench can have no wish to retain the liberties of the people.

Under our common law and under our Constitution, no man or body of men may make law for freemen except the elected representatives of the people. Every freeman in a republic has the despotic right to veto all laws made by any man or group of men except his own delegates. For 500 years Anglo-Saxon freemen have exercised that veto power. Only a blind spot in our knowledge of history could cause any man to doubt the right of any freeman to disobey the unconstitutional edicts of a judge or king. Only fools and pseudosociodoctors contend that the Supreme Court can make law, but of such is the kingdom of tyranny. Constitutional liberty is the child of Anglo-Saxon history, christened by the blood of our fathers. How could we so soon forget that the leading principle of the American Revolution was that only delegates chosen by the people may make constitutions and laws for the people? Every forgotten grave from Lexington to Yorktown is a memorial to that principle.

We have no answer to the dilemma. It may be too late. Liberty is lean. In his Virginia bill of rights, George Mason said: "That no free government, or the blessings of liberty can be preserved to any people but by a firm adherence to justice, moderation, temperance, frugality, and virtue, and frequent recurrence to fundamental principles." None but a fool would dispute his word. None but a fool, or a cybernetic doctor, will tell you that liberty and equality may grow in the same soil.

Equality reaches into the pockets of the frugal to put fat on lazy bones. Fat fools don't fight, except at the trough. From the trough of equality there may be no road back. The next gate may lead to slaughter pens or to the mines of Siberia. We may have lost the will to be free.

In closing we mention one answer taken from the history of the sanguinary struggles of the Anglo-Saxon race to retain liberty under law. The one word that best describes it is segregation. The very gates of heaven were built for the sole purpose of segregating the good from the bad and the true from the false. The God who segregates beyond the earthly grave by the principle of inequality, segregated the races of men in the beginning by the principle of color, placing the yellow man in Asia, the black man in Africa, the white man in Europe, and the red man in America. We must not be afraid to practice his principles.

At the peak of the tyranny of the sociological Stuart kings in England, our forefathers segregated the royal court and every friend of the court. As Charles I rode from Whitehall to Guildhall and thence into the city of London, with his armed guards, seeking to effect the arrest of five members of Parliament for opposing his tyrannies in 1641, multitudes lined the streets. Everywhere Charles I turned, his eyes were met by cold stares. The only greeting he heard was "Privileges of Parliament." "Privileges of Parliament." A man by the name of Walker boldly stepped forth and planted a pamphlet in the royal carriage at the King's feet, entitled "To Your Tents, O Israel." Thereafter wherever the King and his friends were seen they were greeted: "To Your Tents, O Israel." As Charles I went to the block to lose his head, the crowd cried out to him: "To your tents, O Israel."

Forty-five years later that watchword of freedom was still ringing in the ears of old Judge Jeffries of the Bloody Assizes. At the trial of Richard Baxter, in 1685, Jeffries was in a rage. From the bench and before the royally packed jury, he screamed at Baxter: "Time was when no man was so ready at bind your king in chains and your nobles in fetters of iron, crying, 'To your tents, O Israel.'" As Jeffries cheated the gallows to die in London Tower, rather than on Tower Hill, "To your tents, O Israel" was the last sound recorded in his depraved mind.

In 1773, as the chains of slavery were being forged for our forefathers in the American Colonies, the Sons of Liberty revived that old Anglo-Saxon watchword. Sociojudicial prostitutes were chilled to the marrow of their bones as they constantly heard that cry, and saw it written on roadsides. When they tried to hold courts on Massachusetts circuits, jurors called to the bar stood mute and took no oaths.

The irate socio-judicial tools of tyranny were finally led from the bench at Worcester by an orderly crowd of 5,000 patriots and gently caused to walk between parallel single files, each of 2,500 patriots and were gently forced to disavow, 30 times, compliance with the tyrannical laws of England they were sent there to enforce—30 times. A symbol of the 30 times Parliament had been forced to reaffirm Magna Carta on account of depraved king's judges who had destroyed governments by laws in England and driven our forefathers to American shores. As those judges were herded to a haven to his majesty's ships, the last words that rang in their ears was, "To your tents, O Israel." Samuel Adams was the brain behind it in New England. Segregation was the secret. Every traitor to his land and race was segregated.

In Virginia the committee system was instituted. George Mason was the brains. George Washington was Mason's most effective segregator. The Washington papers in the Library of Congress still contain the papers George Mason wrote for Washington to circulate for signatures. In fact, Mason wrote every state paper Washington ever carried in his pockets before he assumed command of the continental army before Boston. Washington went to Williamsburg with Mason's Fairfax county resolutions in his pocket in the spring of 1774. There they became the Virginia resolves in the summer, and at Philadelphia they became the Continental resolves in the fall. Listen to the old Anglo-Saxon doctrine of segregation in paragraph 20, "that the respective committees of the counties, in each colony * * * publish by advertisements in their several counties, a list of names of those (if any such there be) who will not acede thereto; that such traitors to their country may be publicly known and detested."

Every traitor was segregated in order that America might regain its freedom. Every traitor must be segregated in 1954 that we may retain that freedom they won for us. The Anglo-Saxon race must again emulate the Founding Fathers and organize to fight fire with brimstone. "Sons of Liberty" is an honored name for such an organization. "To your tents, O Israel."[38] Is an honored watchword. Above all remember this: Samuel Adams and George Mason had brains and character. There is no substitute for those qualities at the top.

---

[1] Wigmore on Evidence, 3d edition, vol. 8, p. 303 et seq.

[2] His speech reported in Tulane Law Review, December 1953, vol. 28, p. 1.

[3] Art. 1, sec. 1, Alabama constitution, 1875.

[4] In Arkansas constitution art. 11, sec. 1, 1864; out, art. 11, sec. 2, constitution 1874; in, Florida, art. 1, sec. 1, 1868; out, art. 1, sec. 1, 1885; in, Louisiana, title 1, art. 1, 1868; out, 1879. Maryland, 1864; out, 1867. In, South Carolina, art. 1, sec. 1, 1868; out, 1895.

[5] Idaho (art. 1, sec. 1, constitution, 1889).

[6] Indiana (art. 1, sec. 1, constitution, 1851).

[7] Kentucky (sec. 1, constitution, 1890).

[8] North Carolina (art. 1, sec. 1, 1868).

[9] Massachusetts (pt. 1, art. 1, 1780).

[10] Nevada (art. 1, sec. 1, 1864). (See Thorpe's Charters and Constitutions alphabetically and chronologically arranged.)

[31] Art. 23.

[32] Art. 79.

[33] Art. 103.

[34] Art. 123. (See Constitutions of Nations, alphabetically arranged, by Peaslee (1950).)

[35] Albania, art. 12; Argentina, art. 28; Belgilm, art. 6; Brazil, art. 141; Bulgaria, art. 71; Burma, art. 13; China, art. 7; Costa Rica, art. 25; Cuba, art. 20; Czechoslovakia, sec. 1; Egypt, art. 3; El Salvador, art. 23; Finland, art. 15; Haiti, art. 11; Ireland, art. 40 (1); Italy, art. 3; Japan, art. 14; Korea, art. 8; Lebanon, art. 7; Lichstenstein, art. 31; Luxembourg, art. 11; Monaca, art. 5; Nicaragua, art. 109; Panama, art. 21; Paraguay, art. 33; Rumania, art. 16; Switzerland, art. 4; Thailand, sec. 27; Turkey, art. 69; Uruguay, art. 8; Yugoslavia, art. 21.

[36] Peaslee, Constitutions of Nations, vol. II, p. 21.

[37] K. B. Clark, effect of Prejudice and Discrimination on Personality Development (Midcentury White House Conference on Children and Youth, 1950); Witmer and Kotinsky, Personality in the Making (1952), ch. VI; Deutscher and Chein, the Psychological Effects of Enforced Segregation; A Survey of Social Science Opinion, 26 J. Psychol. 259 (1948); Chein, What are the Psychological Effects of Segregation Under Conditions of Equal Facilities: 3 Int. J. Opinion and Attitude Res. 229 (1949); Brameld; Educational Costs, in Discrimination and National Welfare (McIver, ed., 1949), 44–48; Frazier, the Negro in the United States (1949), 674–681. And see generally Myrdal, An American Dilemma (1949).

[38] This was the watchword of revolt of the 10 tribes of Israel, when they separated from Rehoboam.

Who Is Responsible?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 29, 1954

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, under the permission heretofore granted me by unanimous consent of the House, I include the following editorial from the Brooklyn Eagle of Wednesday, July 28, 1954:

TABLING OF HAWAIIAN STATEHOOD BREAKS PLEDGE OF REPUBLICANS

Refusal by the House Rules Committee of a request to let separate Senate and House bills to grant statehood to Hawaii and Alaska go to conference means that the Republican majority in Congress will fail to produce on a major platform pledge.

This is a failure which administration leaders will find it difficult to explain or defend. There may be an attempt to attribute it to the successful Democratic strategem in the Senate of tying the Alaska bill to the Hawaii bill. Standing alone, the Hawaii bill could have been passed.

An attempt to shift responsibility would be unimpressive, however, in view of the fact that it was well within the power of the Republican majority to enact the legislation. In addition, the platform pledges of both parties applied to Alaska as well as Hawaii.

In 1950 President Eisenhower was unequivocally in favor of admission of both territories as a demonstration that "America practices what it preaches." More recently, however, his statements on the issue have conformed to the Republican attitude that Alaska is not ready.

Both Hawaii, which would in all probability send Republican representation to Congress, and Alaska, where Democratic strength is believed to be predominant, have long been ready for statehood. Hawaii is a bastion of military strength in the Pacific and is qualified in all ways to fulfill the responsibilities involved in statehood. This is true also of Alaska, which might some day have to bear the brunt of attack from across the strait separating the Territory from Soviet Russia.

As matters stand, America does not practice what it preaches and Congress has missed an opportunity to give an impressive demonstration against the spirit of colonialism which we criticize so freely when found in other nations.

Messages in Opposition to Atomic Energy Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, July 31, 1954

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in pursuance of the permission granted me today, I submit for printing in the Record various telegrams and letters showing the reaction of the people throughout the country to the efforts made by those of us who fought the atomic-energy bill.

There being no objection, the telegrams and letters were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

July 28, 1954.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: The only vote I can cast for you is a vote of thanks.

Maybe you didn't beat the atomic energy grab, but by God, sir, it was a good try.

Walt Taylor.

Sacramento, Calif.

Brookline, Mass., *July 29, 1954.*

Dear Senator Morse: May I applaud you in your effort to stop the big steal of the atomic energy, by the private interests groups. Your effort woke many people to note the big steal by private interests.

With every best wish,
Yours truly,
John David Hughes.

San Francisco, Calif., *July 27, 1954.*

Dear Senator Morse: Just a note to thank you for your courageous stand on the atomic giveaway bill. It is of great importance to me and many citizens to know, that at least one people's representative is what the word applies, he or she should be. May your strength continue.

Sincerely,
Betty Blom.

Pasadena, Calif., *July 29, 1954.*

That's the stuff, Wayne. Give 'em the works and stay with it.

P. S. So will we.

Wayne Mich., *July 29, 1954.*

Dear Senator Morse: You're O. K., buddy.

E. Fodor.

Norwalk, Calif.,

Dear Sir: Keep up the good fight. You and your fellow Senators are doing America and the American people a great service.

Very truly yours,
Raymond C. Drapkin.

Bakersfield, Calif.,

Dear Senator Morse: This card will suffice to say that I have the greatest admiration for your stand on the atomic energy bill, and I want to thank you for suffering fatigue in the interest of the majority of the American people. Your're a busy man so I won't go on, but thank you again for your dogged stand.

Respectfully yours,
Jean H. Leonard,
Mrs. James Leonard.

Nashville, Tenn., *July 28, 1954.*

Hon. Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building, Washington.

Dear Senator: Thank you on behalf of the finest job of resources control and conservation our country ever has done for itself—TVA, of course.

As a kid, I helped build Wilson Dam. I've grown up with this thing. It has been clean as a hound's tooth since George Norris fathered it through F. D. R., in the days of our great building. The whole Nation should be strutting about it, like a peacock, instead of countenancing with much apathy a creeping job of sabotage against it.

Thanks greatly for holding the pass, and for your own ever heartening independence of mind.

Yours,
Jennings Perry.

Pittsburgh, Pa., *July 29, 1954.*

The Honorable Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Sir: Just a note of appreciation for your fight for the right kind of legislation on atomic energy. Indeed there are thousands of thoughtful voters who are grateful for the role you have played since the beginning of this administration. May you have the strength to continue.

Sincerely yours,
Mrs. G. C. McCombs.

Brooklyn, N. Y., *July 30, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate, Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: May we express our thanks for your wonderful fight on the atomic-energy bill, and for all your past wonderful fights.

You are an excellent backbone stiffener and if there is anything we can do to help, please let us know.

Thank you.

Sincerely,
Mr. and Mrs. Abraham Eisenstadt.

July 29, 1954.

Dear Sir: I want to thank you once again that we have a Senator like you. I have been alone most of my life, too.

Hope your vocal cords hold out, and good luck and best of health to you.

Chris. Christensen,
A grateful citizen.

La Crosse, Wis.

Hayward, Calif., *July 26, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
United States Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Sir: May I express the heartfelt thanks as one small individual for your valiant efforts in your present attempts to defeat the general's purchased and paid for atomic giveaway program.

Your honest efforts to defeat this and other like legislation are not unappreciated by ordinary individuals such as myself. This short note is sincere and I only hope you have received many more such notes.

When you next appear in this area I would certainly like to meet you and shake your hand.

Yours very truly,
Eugene E. Gill.

Bronxville, N. Y., *July 30, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: I have been trying for the last week to think of the right words to express my gratitude for all that you tried so hard to do for the people of this country. All I can say is thank you, and remind you that the race is not to the swift, nor the battle to the strong, but time and chance happeneth to them all.

Sincerely yours,
Elizabeth M. Klein
(Mrs. E. S.).

Mill Valley, Calif., *July 28, 1954.*

Hon. Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: Just a line to let you know how much we appreciate the great fight you are putting up to protect the peoples' interest in the current issue of atomic energy.

We have already written our own Senators and Congressman of our feelings on this matter.

Sincerely yours,
Mr. and Mrs. B. B. Jones.

Walnut Grove, Minn., *July 29, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: May I say a word of commendation for your recent efforts concerning the atomic energy bill?

As long as America contains a leavening of philosophies such as your own, I am not so prone to fear for her future.

You are an American radical in the best sense of the word and in the most honorable of traditions—your positions are not dictated by dogmas of privilege, respect for established institutions as such, or the allure of comfortable habits.

Through people such as yourself America has realized, I'd assume, nearly all of its progress. Such dynamic personal philosophies and dedication to individualism are our best bulwark against conformist "isms" from either abroad or from within.

You and your colleagues in this effort and all similar ones are to be congratulated.

Yours respectfully,
Walter Mann.

Nashville, Tenn., *July 29, 1954.*

Hon. Wayne Morse,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Sir: Allow me in my small way to congratulate you and to say that I admire your statesmanship, and your fortitude in behalf of a cause which you believe in. I further admire your foresight and judgment.

I like your attitude toward the natural resources, public power, labor-management, taxation, and other issues.

I believe there are many other Americans who would deem it a privilege to support you for President of these United States.

Wishing you abundance of good health, happiness, and good luck, I beg to remain,

Sincerely yours,
Carlton M. Randall.

July 27, 1954.

Dear Senator Morse: Congratulations on your great fight to prevent this big business grab of atomic power.

Our Nation needs your type of representation.

Keep up the good work. We're sure behind you.

Betty and Sonny Slosburg.

Los Angeles, Calif.

July 28, 1954.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: As an American citizen interested in the preservation of our country as a democratic republic, I wish to offer you my most heartfelt gratitude and appreciation for your courageous stand on the people's rights in so many cases, and especially this last heroic fight for the people's rights to their own natural resources.

There are a great many people, thinking ones, who feel as I do and are proud that even in this dissolute time there is one patriot like those in the early days of our country—one who has the integrity and courage to stand alone, if necessary, for the principles that our former great men stood for. That patriot is Wayne Morse, Independent, of Oregon.

May God guide you and keep you in your work.

Most respectfully,
Mrs. A. M. Petrich.

San Diego, Calif.

Chicago, Ill., *July 30, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: It is always a pleasure to hear you speak on Frank Edwards' broadcast, and it must have been very hard for you to take time out from your gallant fight on the Atomic Energy Act amendment to do so.

None of the Chicago papers carried a true picture of what it was all about. Even the Sun-Times, which is fairly liberal, gave a distorted story on it. So had it not been for Frank Edwards we would have been very much in the dark.

But it seems to me that you always take the heaviest part in these protracted fights, and you must take things easier. We cannot get along without men like you—they are so few—so in the future you must not take such chances with your health.

With best wishes for your success,
Sincerely yours,
Mary Elizabeth Murray.

No answer expected.

Decatur, Ala., *July 29, 1954.*

Hon. Wayne Morse,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: Permit me to introduce myself. I am 86 years of age; Welsh descent. I am a Hickory Jackson-W. J. Bryant-ex-Senator Norris-Franklin Roosevelt democrat. I wish to congratulate you on your magnificent fight to prevent the giveaway of the Atomic Commission, and, of course, eventually, the destruction of TVA. I have so far not yet read the names of the 12 or 13 Democrats who voted and helped pass the bill, pushed through by the Republicans, but I believe they will see the day when they will regret their action.

I feel sure the people all over our country will more and more come around to your way of thinking.

I am sure our Senators from Alabama stood firm against this effort to destroy TVA.

I feel that when the election rolls around in November the people of the United States of America will speak out against this giveaway of our electrical power to a few selfish men. I am wondering if there is no way to block this action of Ike and his cohorts by court action. If I live, I hope to meet you and shake your hand when I go to Washington next year.

Best wishes for your success in your fight for the people.

Sincerely yours,
Charles E. Layman.

Culver City, Calif., *July 27, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Sir: You are to be congratulated on your stand concerning the administration's atomic-energy bill. It is unfortunate that more elected representatives of the Government do not consider the welfare of the Nation as a whole rather than select pressure groups.

Please continue thinking of the individual rather than the vested interests.

Yours truly,
H. Javit.

San Francisco, Calif., *July 29, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator: The writer has often had the impulse to write and express admiration for your forthright stand on principle, regardless of party affiliation, and your championship of the people's rights on every major issue. Your recent fight almost singlehanded against the majority of the Republicans and the weaker elements of the Democrats certainly merits the thanks of every thinking American. You did what you could, and I, for one, am grateful.

Eisenhower's middle-of-the-fence attitude and abject eagerness to please all, including the isolationists and reactionaries of his party, disillusioned many besides yourself, even during the campaign.

I only wish we had you, and a few more likt you, in California. Keep it up, and may the best man win.

Sincerly,
Gertrude M. Smith.

July 29, 1954.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: I am a busy man but I feel that, as a decent American citizen, I must take time out to pay tribute to you as a great American statesman. Your courageous fight, almost singlehanded, for the rights of the people to their own natural resources as against the modern-day robber barons is an inspiration to any citizen.

It is men like you, Senator Morse, that the American people as a whole would like for President of our Nation. Were it not for political machinery controlled as it is by financiers and their military, we could have real statesmen like yourself at the helm of our ship of state.

May you have the support that you need to win these battles for the people's rights.

With respect, admiration, and deep appreciation,

Carl A. Digilio.

San Diego, Calif.

Dallas, Tex., *July 28, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse.

Dear Sir: I just had to write you a note of commendation for the stand you have taken in the interest of the people of the United States. It is most encouraging to know we still have men in Washington who put their principles above personal gain.

Again let me thank you for your stand and please keep the good work going.

Sincerely,
Helene McCallum.
(Mrs. D. A. McCallum).

Van Nuys, Calif., *July 26, 1954.*

Dear Senator Morse: Thanks for your hard work in opposing the atomic energy bill.

We must continue the TVA and public power here and in Oregon and Washington.

Your friend,
Robert Baxter.

Oakland, Calif., *July 28, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Sir: I wish to express my appreciation and thanks to you for the fine way you tried to stop passage of that atomic energy bill. Like you said it is a terrible thing to put over on the American people.

This administration is the worst yet. You fought a fine battle and I am sure sorry it passed in spite of you and the few Senators who stayed with you.

Respectfully yours,
Hazel M. Linton.

I concur in the foregoing.

Respectfully,
Russell L. Linton.

Ferndale, Wash., *July 25, 1954.*

Senator Wayne L. Morse,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

My Dear Senator: I listened to your discussion this a. m. on Youth Views the News. Senator, you are the first Senator whom I have ever heard who without any hesitation gave an answer to each question that left no doubt in our minds. Or, in other words, a "Yes" or "No" answer that enabled the listeners to know exactly what you meant. Sorry that we do not have more of your convictions.

I do admire and congratulate you on your position in the Senate on TVA. I am sure that there are millions throughout our land that feel as I do but are careless in telling you of their feelings though they must surely know that a word of approval means much to one who is so sincerely working for the interests of the people.

Again congratulating you and with sincere best wishes for your continued success.

Sincerely yours,
James T. Sullivan.

Pasco, Wash., *July 28, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: I wish to express my sincere appreciation for your courageous fight in trying to have our national resources for all the people of the United States. It has been a most heart-rending thing to see the work and dreams and taxes of so many be given in one short term to the benefit of the favored few.

My grandparents and parents were pioneers to the Oregon Territory. My father spent a lifetime working toward the development of the vast waterpower resources of the Pacific Northwest and especially to the Columbia Basin irrigation project.

It is with a feeling of extreme bitterness that I note the underhanded machinations of the power interests in their greed to grab for themselves the benefit of generations of effort. The tidelands first, now power and atomic energy. What next?

Please, please, Senator, don't become discouraged and give up fighting. You have thousands of people back of you. I think the younger generation who wanted a change and who were so easily deceived in this last election, are becoming increasingly aware of the mess this administration has made of the so-called mess in Washington.

I could not vote in this last election, having moved from California to Washington State just 4 months prior to the national elections. Why should one be disfranchised simply because one moves from a State in these United States to another? Can't something be done about this?

Sincerely,
Kathleen Flesher.

Oakland, Calif., *July 27, 1954.*

Dear Mr. Morse: I have been following your courageous stand on the atomic-energy bill, and I want you to know of my personal gratification on your stand. I guess that it must be very discouraging for you at times to take such stands, and try to battle your way through all alone, without much help. But believe me, sir, when I tell you that there are a great many people like myself, who I admit don't have much influence of any kind, which feel the same way as you on this power grab by the Republican administration. When I vote in November I'll keep them in mind. In closing, sir, I wish I could call you my Senator and be able to vote for you, unfortunately that isn't possible. But please accept my well wishes for a job well done. God bless you.

Good luck.

Theodore T. Shippie.

P. S.—Please excuse the paper and the miserable hand it is written in, but I wanted you to receive this message as soon as possible.

Concord, Calif., *July 26, 1954.*

Dear Senator: This comes to you from a family who appreciates very much the work which you and the Democrats are doing to protect the people of our country from losing much which we have gained since 1932. I won't go into more details, but will say please pass my good wishes on to all your group.

Sincerely,

Mrs. M. C. Godfrey.

Dear Senator Morse: Always, as so often before, we fall to depending on you as a watchdog for our freedoms.

We know you'll do all in your power—and thank you for it.

Sincerely yours,

Richard F. Frey.

Albany, Calif.

Ephrata, Wash., *July 27, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
United States Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Morse: I thank you very much for your heroic effort to get the atomic energy bill amended to protect the rights of the people.

Please get your tooth taken care of, get some rest, so that if the conference committee does violence to the amendments you can go to bat again.

Many of us in Washington State appreciate your struggles.

Again, thank you.

Cordially yours,

Miss J. Alice McKnight.

Colorado and Judge Breitenstein: The Case of a Man With Two Hats

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HARRY R. SHEPPARD

OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 30, 1954

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, my naturally generous nature impels me to suggest that every man should possess at least two hats. I do not suggest any specific type of hats, for a man is entitled to make that choice himself. He may, likewise, decide which of his two hats he will don on any certain day.

The extent of my generosity, however, is equaled by the scope of my natural curiosity, and the following question lately has attracted the application of my mental processes:

What would happen if a man appeared wearing both his hats at once? Of course, I am speaking of a man with one head.

Purely in the interest of studying such a phenomenon, let us consider the case of Federal Judge Jean S. Breitenstein.

Judge Breitenstein has long been a leading citizen of the State of Colorado, a commonwealth bordering the 102d meridian and containing various high ranges of the Rocky Mountains from which course innumerable streams of life-giving snow water. These geographical facts have a bearing on the subject before us, for they helped to shape the career of Judge Breitenstein.

It may be stipulated that Jean S. Breitenstein went to law school, graduated, passed the bar examination and was admitted to practice. Eventually his professional shingle was displayed in the thriving city of Denver. The very nature of the high and rich country about him provided the setting over which his star ascended to legal prominence. The development of natural resources, such as water for irrigation and hydroelectric power for homes and industries, presented innumerable complicated legal questions to be answered through litigation. Attorney Breitenstein applied himself diligently to the opportunities at hand, and soon was recognized as an authority on such matters. Unquestionably his fees were sufficient to permit him the luxury of more than one hat, and as far as can be determined he then wore only one at a time.

The Colorado River has long been known as the River of Controversy, and today this conflict seethes in the Halls of Congress, the courts of the land, and the bistros of the West. It was not long before Lawyer Breitenstein was caught in this maelstrom. His voice was heard up and down the countryside proclaiming the rights of his clients, and demanding the kilowatts and acre-feet to which he thought them entitled.

In the year 1948, it happened that the State of Arizona was attempting to break open the doors of the United States Treasury and secure a number of billions to build a reclamation project that would pauperize the Nation's taxpayers. Moreover, water for the project would have to come from California's legal share of the Colorado River, and California didn't warm up to the idea. Both California and Arizona are Colorado River Basin States, and they had been waging legal war for years over the matter of water rights in the lower river.

In an effort to reach a final accord, California introduced in Congress a resolution asking the permission of Congress to take the old dispute before the Supreme Court. Such permission was necessary inasmuch as the Federal Government was an indispensable party to the proposed litigation, and the Government could be taken into court only with the sanction of the Congress.

Out of the West, wearing only one hat, rode Lawyer Breitenstein, a formidable brief ensconsed with his extra Sunday shirt. Into the hearing room of the Senate Interior Committee he strode, requesting to speak his piece in opposition to Senate Joint Resolution 145, the California resolution.

Lawyer Breitenstein identified himself as counsel for the Colorado Water Conservation Board. History notes that Colorado seldom if ever has approved any act of California involving the waters of the Colorado River. Colorado long had fought river developments proposed by California, and had exacted a high price for its approval of lower basin projects.

Lawyer Breitenstein was prepared to do no less. In clear and emphatic tones he told the Senate Committee—Hearings, Senate Joint Resolution 145, 80th Congress, second session, May 11, 1948, page 198:

> Colorado is one of the upper basin and upper division States involved in the Colorado River compact. Two of the States, Colorado and Wyoming, are entirely within the upper basin.
>
> The resolution does not specifically name those two States, Wyoming and Colorado, and it is a proper inquiry as to what interest those two States, which are entirely in the upper basin, have in this matter.
>
> Colorado is one of the signatory States to the Colorado River compact. We feel that any matter which involves the interpretation or application of the Colorado River compact necessarily involves every State which is signatory to that compact. In fact, we feel that in any litigation each of the signatory States would be an indispensable party to the litigation.

The State of Colorado and its official legal counsel, Jean S. Breitenstein, left no doubt that in any litigation involving Colorado River waters, the Sovereign State of Colorado was an indispensable party. No legal door should be shut in Colorado's face. On the other hand, neither Colorado nor Lawyer Breitenstein wanted California to get into the Supreme Court to settle the old river controversy, but if such did happen, Colorado demanded to be included in the show.

Without attempting to coin a phrase, it must be said that time went on. California failed to get into the Supreme Court. Arizona failed to get the fantastic Central Arizona project approved by Congress. Lawyer Breitenstein never failed to be on hand in Washington when Colorado River matters were on the congressional stage.

Came the day when Arizona did an about face, and performed the very legal act that California had attempted. Arizona itself went to the Supreme Court with an original suit against the State of California, asking that the old river war be finally adjudicated. This was in August 1952.

Soon it was rumored about that the State of Arizona had gone outside its own borders for assistance in preparing the brief it filed in the case of Arizona against California. Where had Arizona gone for aid? Why, to Colorado. Who had Arizona retained? Why, Lawyer Breitenstein.

Lawyer Breitenstein, you say? Why, in 1952, Lawyer Breitenstein was counsel for the Colorado Water Conservation Board. Could he work for two States? And if so, did he do it with the official sanction of Colorado?

Mr. Speaker, these were interesting questions, and they pertained to the theme of this discourse on the wearing of two hats, so I chose to look into them.

On July 28, 1954, I sent the following telegram to Ivan C. Crawford, director,

Colorado Water Conservation Board,
State Building, Denver, Colo:

> Will you please telegraph me collect the answers to the following questions: Was Mr. Jean S. Breitenstein employed by the State of Colorado during the period of June 1952 to May 1954, and if so in what capacity or capacities? Did the Water Conservation Board of the State of Colorado know and approve of Mr. Breitenstein's employment by the State of Arizona in the case of *Arizona* v. *California?* Thank you.
>
> Harry R. Sheppard, *Member of Congress.*

Before the day ended, I received the following reply:

> Hon. Harry R. Sheppard,
> *Washington, D. C.:*
>
> Mr. Jean Breitenstein was retained on a part-time basis as attorney for the Colorado Water Conservation Board during period of June 1952 to May 1954. On June 24, 1952, he was authorized by the director of the Colorado Water Conservation Board and the attorney general of Colorado to accept employment as legal consultant for the State of Arizona in the case of *Arizona* v. *California.*
>
> Ivan C. Crawford,
> *Director, Colorado Water Conservation Board.*

Two days before this, it so happens, June 26, 1954, I had sent the following telegram to the Honorable Ross F. Jones, attorney general of Arizona, Phoenix:

> Please advise me whether Jean S. Breitenstein was employed by Arizona in the preparation of the case of *Arizona* v. *California et al.*, now in the Supreme Court, and if so, the inclusive dates of such employment. Request reply by telegram collect to my Washington office.
>
> Harry R. Sheppard,
> *Member of Congress.*

A few hours later I received the following reply:

> Hon. Harry R. Sheppard,
> *Washington, D. C.:*
>
> Mr. Jean S. Breitenstein was employed by the State of Arizona in a consulting capacity relative to *Arizona* v. *California.* Employment from June 1952 to May 1954.
>
> Ross F. Jones,
> *Attorney General, State of Arizona.*

Mr. Speaker, my research into the two-hat question had begun to bear fruit. Lawyer Breitenstein was indeed an excellent example. Not only was he wearing two hats, but during the period of June 1952 to May 1954 he was drawing 2 salaries from 2 States. Pretty good for a high-country lawyer.

I decided to delve a little deeper into the matter, and I am forced to admit that what I turned up next was a bit surprising.

I discovered that in 1953 the upper basin States, including Colorado, had come into Congress with a bill for a multi-billion-dollar project that staggered the imagination. Hearings were set for June 1954 before the Senate Interior Committee.

But pause. Important events had been transpiring meanwhile in the life of Lawyer Breitenstein.

Here is the record of them:

April 6, 1954: Lawyer Breitenstein nominated for United States District Judge for the District of Colorado. Nomination received by the Senate this day—Congressional Record, 83d Congress, 2d session, page 4415.

April 7, 1954: Notice that a hearing on Lawyer Breitenstein's nomination given by Senator Langer for Committee on the Judiciary. Hearing set for April 15, 1954—Congressional Record, 83d Congress, 2d session, page 4484.

April 15, 1954: Hearing held—Congressional Record, 83d Congress, 2d session, page D419.

April 23, 1954: Nomination confirmed by Senate—Congressional Record, 83d Congress, 2d session, page 5159.

Mr. Speaker, one never knows what others will do. While Lawyer Breitenstein was getting two salaries from Colorado and Arizona he was being made a United States judge. He continued to work for both States for a month after his nomination was confirmed. I suppose he is of a thrifty nature.

Well, Mr. Speaker, here were the upper basin States in Congress with the biggest reclamation bill ever dreamed of, and Lawyer Breitenstein was a Federal judge. I could sympathize with him. The greatest legislative show the upper basin States ever put on was about to begin, and Lawyer Breitenstein would have to be sitting up there on the bench in Denver in black robes listening to dull cases about the theft of some unstamped "moonshine."

But I need not have wasted my sympathy. When a Colorado River bill is introduced in Congress, a Breitenstein will not be far behind.

On June 30, 1954, Federal Judge Breitenstein walked into the hearing room of the Senate committee deliberating on S. 1555, the Colorado River storage project. None the worse for his long years of battling California and working for two bosses, he was, like in the old days, armed with a formidable brief.

He admitted to the committee at the outset that he was a little embarrassed. The young lady who had mimeographed his statement had put his new title of judge at the head of it. There should be no implication at all that he was testifying in an official capacity. He had come as a private citizen, on his own time, and at his own expense.

Moreover, he had got a letter from his boss granting him permission to appear, and he produced a photostatic copy of the letter, which was signed by five judges of the United States Court of Appeals, Tenth Circuit. There was, the letter proclaimed, nothing improper in his appearing before the committee, even though he had been sworn in as a Federal judge.

Well, Judge Breitenstein was allowed to wear his official judge's hat. He could not very well have taken it off, as he had been sworn in. Then, before the committee, he also put on his private citizen's hat, and began to talk.

I trust, Mr. Speaker, that you will recall what the then Lawyer Breitenstein told the same Senate committee in 1948—that Colorado and the upper basin States were indispensable parties to any litigation involving the Colorado River compact. Also recall, please, that in August 1952 Arizona had sued California in the Supreme Court and the case was now pending as Judge Breitenstein talked to the committee this last day of June 1954.

This is what Federal Judge Breitenstein said, Senate hearings on S. 1555, 83d Congress, 2d session, June 30, 1954, page 284:

> This case, *Arizona* v. *California* (No. 10 original, 1953 term, Supreme Court of the United States of America) involves controversies of long standing as to the rights of the lower basin States to the use of Colorado River water. The States of Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming are not parties to, or involved in, this lawsuit.
>
> The pendency of the *Arizona* v. *California* case has no effect whatsoever upon the authorization of the Colorado River storage project. (S. 1555). All parties to that case assert and rely on the 1922 (Colorado River) compact, the Boulder Canyon Project Act, the Mexican Water Treaty, and the other laws and instruments which constitute the recognized and admitted law of the river. Similarly, the authorization of the Colorado River storage project is predicated upon the validity and integrity of the law of the river. While it is true that in the lower basin there has been a prolonged controversy over the application and construction of certain specific terms and provisions, these controversies do not affect the upper States or the availability of water for the Colorado River storage project.
>
> Any insinuation that the authorization of the Colorado River storage project should be delayed until the *Arizona* v. *California* case is decided is an attempt to defeat upper basin development. There is no legitimate reason for any delay in this project because of the lower basin controversy. (Ibid, p. 285.)

It so happened, Mr. Speaker, that California was inclined to believe that Lawyer Breitenstein was right the first time, that the upper basin States were indispensable parties to any litigation involving the Colorado River compact. So the State of California in the month of July 1954, filed a motion with the Supreme Court to make the upper basin States, including Colorado, parties to the case of Arizona against California.

It was just by coincidence that this motion was filed a few days after Federal Judge Breitenstein testified on June 30, 1954, before the Senate committee.

It is difficult for me to understand how Colorado and Federal Judge Breitenstein can pretend to be neutral in the case of Arizona against California. The judge had said Colorado must be a party to any litigation involving the Colorado River compact, and the case of Arizona against California certainly involves that compact.

Judge Breitenstein went to Arizona to start the case. He knew the gun was loaded, and Colorado knew the gun was loaded when it gave Lawyer Breitenstein permission to work for Arizona and to start the suit.

As I said before, Mr. Speaker, I submit that a man is entitled to have two hats. But when a man appears wearing both of his hats at once, and at the same time goes about the halls of Congress disagreeing with himself, it is a matter worth observing.

I feel that way about the case of Federal Judge Breitenstein, and I am glad I looked into it.

You Conform or Else

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD L. JACKSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 30, 1954

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Robert Vernon Andelson, published in the American Legion magazine, issue of August 1954:

YOU CONFORM OR ELSE

"Thought control," according to a noisy minority of college professors, is something senatorial "witch hunters" use to destroy "academic freedom." I know better, for I was the victim of thought control imposed upon me by some of the very professors who scream so loudly against every attempt to investigate communism on our college campuses.

A year ago last spring I was a graduate student in the Federated Theological Schools of the University of Chicago. I had completed 3 years of undergraduate work at various colleges in Los Angeles and had put in almost 2 years toward a master's degree in ethics at Chicago. Last fall, after having wasted 2 years at Chicago, I started out all over again to earn my degree. I had been refused admission to candidacy for that degree by the Chicago faculty committee; I was vilified as a "menace" by the campus newspaper; I was expelled from the University's Young Republican Club; I was characterized as lacking in "moral and personal integrity" by the faculty committee—all because I wrote an article exposing the activities of subversive organizations on the Chicago campus.

My troubles began when Bob Munger, National Director of Students For America, asked me to write an article for that organization's publication, the American Student. Students For America is an organization dedicated to promoting American ideals among college students and to counteracting the collectivist propaganda to which they are constantly subjected by their professors and by Red fronts flourishing on the campuses.

When Bob suggested that I write an article on communism at Chicago there were already faint rumblings of a United States Senate investigation of subversive activities in the university. I knew that such an investigation was needed. I knew it would definitely establish the fact of Communist operations on the Midway—Chicago's campus. Following such an investigation the university authorities would have to face the issues squarely and withdraw official sanction from the campus chapters of the Labor Youth League and the Socialist Youth Laague, both organizations listed as subversive by the United States Attorney General.

But there was no assurance that such an investigation would be made. The Senate committee, I reasoned, might be easily deceived by the university's newly acquired halo of conservatism into thinking an investigation unnecessary. That spurious halo had been worn ever since the resignation of former Cancellor Robert Maynard Hutchins. In 1949, during his regime, the Illinois Legislature had investigated seditious activities on the campus. As a result of that investigation the legislators had condemned the university severely and recommended revocation of its tax exemption.

Now, with the sarcastic Dr. Hutchins replaced by genial Dr. Lawrence A. Kimpton, Chicago had taken on a pleasant, protective coloring. Since Dr. Kimpton's reign in the Chancelloor's chair the Midway showed a new face to the world. Communist coddling, presumably, was gone, vanished with Dr. Hutchins' departure for a high post in the Ford Foundation.

Actually, the facts were just the reverse. Communism still flourished at Chicago, and, it seemed to me, a full-fledged Senate investigation was the only stick by which the university administration could be prodded into cleaning up the Red mess on the Midway. An exposé in the American Student, I felt, might help to bring about such an investigation.

So I wrote the article and it was published. In it I cited 15 instances of Red activity at Chicago, 8 of which had taken place since Kimpton's inauguration at chancellor. For example:

"Ninety University of Chicago faculty members have called on President Truman to recognize the People's Republic of China. * * *"

"3,600 copies of Common Human Needs by Prof. Charlotte Towel of the University of Chicago School of Social Service Administration were destroyed by the Government Printing Office after being characterized as 'viciously un-American.'"

"Prof. Dirk J. Struik, indicted for the advocacy of violent overthrow of the Government of the United States, spoke at Mandel Hall. He was sponsored by the Maroon (the university's student newspaper). Money was collected at the meeting and turned over to the Struik Defense Committee."

"The Student Government passed a bill authorizing letters to be sent to President Truman requesting clemency for the Rosenbergs, convicted atom spies, urging him to reduce their sentences. Prof. Malcolm Sharp of the Chicago Law School condemned the sentence because it 'increases redbaiting.'"

There were other examples—all equally evidencing a softness for Communist ideas, Communist nations and convicted Communist conspirators, so obvious as to leave only one conclusion: Either Chicago's faculty and student body were riddled with pro-Communist sympathizers, or the intellectual leadership on the Chicago campus was so blind as to justify serious doubts as to its competence. Nowhere in my story did I indulge in the "wild charges" some professors call an "inquisition" and an "invasion of their academic freedom." I accused no one of being a Communist. I merely cited the record and let the facts speak for themselves.

I described, for example, the case of Dr. William T. Couch, who was summarily dismissed from his position as Director of the University of Chicago Press 3 years before. As a full professor, Couch, supposedly, had "academic tenure" and could not be fired for anything short of rape or murder. When he got his marching orders, on November 20, 1950, he was told to vacate his office in the Press Building and have his personal belongings removed by 5 p. m. the same day. No reason was given for his dismissal. No hearings were held prior to the dismissal. Nor did Dr. Couch have an opportunity to challenge the dismissal or defend himself.

In the case of Dr. Couch, academic tenure was no protection. He was given the very treatment that pro-Communist professors claim they suffer at the hands of duly appointed investigating committees of the United States Congress. His academic freedom was brutally violated without even the benefit of an inquisition. Dr. Couch's refusal to take this treatment lying down eventually led the university to pay him a large settlement in an attempt to keep him quiet.

"One of my friends in the university faculty," Dr. Couch reported, "said I couldn't expect any help from the people in the university, who usually made a big noise about such matters, because I am not a Communist or even suspected of being a Communist sympathizer. * * * I have been convinced for a long time that I was making handicaps for myself when I gave hell to the Communists and leftwingers." Thus did the advocates of academic freedom display their liberalism when a patriotic American teacher sought to purify the thought stream of his university.

My article continued with an account of how the Labor Youth League was being tenderly encouraged in its activities by the university authorities. This notorious group was formerly known as the American Youth for Democracy, and before that as the Young Communist League. I then told of the conversation I had had with Dean of Students Robert M. Strozier. I had gone to him and protested the fact that the Labor Youth League was being allowed to function on campus with his official sanction, pointing out that it is listed as a subversive organization by both the Attorney General and the House Committee on Un-American Activies. Dean Strozier ridiculed the House committee and the Attorney General, saying that he did not regard them as dependable authorities.

Bob Munger wanted to publish my article anonymously in order to protect me from retaliation. However, I insisted that my name be used. I knew that what I had to say would be twice as effective coming from a student in the university, and one who was willing to stand publicly behind his message. Besides, I have never had much respect for writers of anonymous literature.

As soon as the article came out, I sent a copy of it to Dean Strozier, along with a letter stating that it had been written out of a sense of patriotic responsibility, not because of any personal animosity toward my professors or the Chicago administrators. Dean Strozier's reply read, in part:

"I shall not attempt to answer in any detail the many charges that you have made in this article, but will content myself now with the observation that you have misinterpreted and misrepresented conditions and policies at the university.

"I suggest that the wisdom and tolerance of the university are demonstrated by your unquestioned freedom to present so dubious an analysis, without jeopardy to your status as a student."

As the Harvard Crimson later put it, the tolerance of the university was somewhat short-lived. But I'm getting ahead of my story.

It would be rather an understatement to say that my article hit the campus like a blast from an atom bomb—a hydrogen bomb would be more exact. A whole rash of stories, letters, and editorials appeared in the Maroon, filled with personal assaults upon my character. One editorial called me a menace and a pain in the neck. I attempted to answer the charges in the letters to the editor section, but my reply was cut beyond all recognition. I was finally forced to pay $36 to have it printed as an ad.

When I was being questioned by the Maroon reporters, one of them asked me if I were so disloyal to the university as to be willing to testify against it before a congressional committee. I replied that I had already testified the previous summer before the House Committee on Un-American Activities in a private session at the La Salle Hotel. I told him that I had supplied the committee with a dossier of documentary evidence of subversive activities on campus. The reporter was aghast. "I should think you would consider yourself a spy," he exclaimed, spitting the word out with a snide grimace.

"You can call me a spy if you want to," I replied, "but my first loyalty is to my country, not to my university."

I received a hysterical letter from a student, one Miss Binnie Rosenberg:

"I have never before felt such indigation as was provoked in me upon reading your article attacking the University of Chicago. For every communistically inclined person you can show me on campus, I can show you two who are not." Apparently Miss Rosenberg did not feel, as I do, that 1 Communist out of 3 persons is rather an uncomfortably high ratio of Communists.

A significant aspect of the controversy over my article is the fact that nobody seriously attempted to refute it. The Maroon was satisfied to charge me with "untruths, misquotes, faulty references, a confusion of concepts * * * and all the other facts of the vicious doctrine of guilt by association." It didn't bother to give examples, except to berate me for "equating communism with subversive activities"—a serious fallacy indeed.

A colleague accused me of "social snobbery," because in the article I criticized Chicago students for going about unshaven and unkempt. I told him that his reasoning seemed a bit strained to me, inasmuch as one can buy a comb for a nickel, a bar of soap for 7 cents, and razor blades are within the economic reach of every student. If aversion to slovenliness is "social snobbery" then I plead guilty.

One of my favorite professors called me on the telephone and delivered an excited tongue-lashing. He told me that inasmuch as my loyalty to my country seemed to conflict with my loyalty to my university, the honorable thing for me to do would be to resign from the university. "John D. Rockefeller would turn over in his grave if he knew what was going on at Chicago," I answered. "In the light of the fact that Rockefeller founded the university, perhaps the honorable thing would be for the administration to resign, not for me."

I was expelled from the campus Young Republican Club for being "disloyal to the university and therefore to the club." The type of Republicans who were members of the club may be indicated by the fact that one of its officers subsequently wrote a lengthy column in the Tool Die and Engineering News, enthusiastically praising the infamous Communist writer, Howard Fast, and urging the purchase of one of Fast's books. My expulsion from this group did not bother me particularly, since it only served to enhance my good standing in the county organization and in the Midwest Federation of College Young Republican Clubs.

Very suddenly, just as the crescendo of invective against me had reached its height, a significant thing happened. Official recognition was withdrawn from the campus chapter of the Labor Youth League by the dean of students. I knew then that my efforts had not been in vain. Naturally, other reasons were given, but I hope I may be pardoned for thinking it more than sheer coincidence that this action occurred only 3 weeks after the appearance of my exposé.

Then the blow fell. It was not really a surprise. It come in the form of a letter from Dr. Bernard M. Loomer, dean of the Federated Theological Schools, and chairman of the faculty committee which controls the awarding of degrees in my field of specialization. I had petitioned the committee to admit me to candidacy for the master's degree. My faculty adviser, Dr. W. Barnett Blakemore, had told me I had satisfied all the requirements—that my admission was purely a routine matter and there was no reason to suppose that it would not go through. Dean Loomer's letter stated that the committee had deferred action on my petition. It implied that the committee had found me lacking in "moral and personal integrity."

In a way I was glad it happened. For it clearly vindicated the thesis of my article, namely, that liberty of expression on the midway is limited to Reds alone. And it gave the lie to Dean Strozier's smug prating about "the wisdom and tolerance of the university." The intellectual dishonesty of Chicago's boast of "academic freedom" was now exposed for all to see.

Last spring Dean Loomer headed a group of clergymen who petitioned President Eisenhower to commute the death sentences of Julius and Ethel Rosenberg. The average man can hardly be blamed for assuming that he must have believed in the "moral integrity" of these traitors.

Not many months before, some students had made preparations to celebrate a "black mass" on campus. A "black mass" is an obscene pervision of a sacred religious rite. Its details are so lewd that it would be improper for me to describe them here. Did the faculty question the "moral integrity" of those students? No. Instead, the dean of students practically apologized to them for not letting them hold the ceremony in the dorms.

In 1952, Arthur Bierman was chairman of the campus chapter of the Labor Youth League—the youth arm of the Communist Party. The Communist Party is a conspiracy against our Government and our way of life. Did the faculty question Bierman's "moral integrity"? No. Instead, he was awarded a fellowship.

Once a student at the university named William G. Heirens was arrested for illegal possession of deadly weapons. He had a long previous criminal record. Did the faculty question his "moral integrity"? No. Instead, representatives of the university persuaded the judge to let him go because he was "a good student and a good boy." Within the next 6 months William G. Heirens had murdered 2 women and a little 6-year-old girl in cold blood, fiendishly dismembering their bodies.

I went to Dean Loomer and asked him if I had been charged with rape, or murder, or theft, or any of the things people generally consider to be immoral. No, said the dean, no one had accused me of any of these things. My crime was much more serious; I was guilty of not having an "integrated world view."

Dean Loomer admitted to me that the committee's action was primarily the result of my article, and later publicly confirmed this fact in the metropolitan press. He said that it was the unanimous opinion of the committee that my article was irresponsible and betrayed "loose handling of data and interpretation." However, he conceded that many members of the committee had not read the article in full, but only excerpts which had been quoted in the Maroon. In fact one member had not read the article at all. He further admitted that the committee had not discussed the article in detail, and that no specific passages had been cited as evidence of irresponsibility.

When I asked how I could satisfy the committee as to my "moral and personal integrity," Dean Loomer replied: "That's a tough question, and I'm afraid I can't answer it. 'Moral integrity' involves an integrated world view. There ought to be a connection between the discipline in one's academic work and the writing one does outside. We feel that such a connection is lacking in your case. Your article would not have been acceptable as a term paper."

I went to my room and thought about our conversation. The dean had told me that my article would not have been acceptable as a term paper. But it had not been written as a term paper. It made no pretense of being a scholarly analysis of the university in all its aspects. It was simply a presentation of certain bad features which I felt needed to be brought out in the open. It did not purport to be anything else.

Not have been acceptable as a term paper, indeed. Since when had a student's outside writings been subject to such a criterion? If the outside writings of students were to be thus judged, why not the writings of faculty members also? I thought of an article I had read by Dr. James Luther Adams, chairman of the department of ethics and society. It was a choleric attack upon a nationally respected clergyman, the pastor of the largest Congregational Church in America, together with his associates. It spoke of them in the following terms:

They are kept men, they are working for the priests of Mammon. As Hosea would put it, they have gone awhoring.

Would this ill-considered blast have met the standards of objectivity necessary for acceptability as a term paper? And yet Dr. Adams is a member of the committee which presumed to sit in judgment upon my outside writings.

Next morning I went down to the Chicago Tribune and told what had happened to me. I did not do it for vindictive reasons. I harbored no bitterness against Dean Loomer or the committee. But I felt that the affair should be publicized, as it afforded such a vivid illustration of the hypocrisy of the university in proclaming itself to be a citadel of free expression.

For example, the faculty senate of the university, in a formal statement, had declared that the university as a free institution of higher learning cannot prosper intellectually, or serve * * * the community of scholars and citizens, if it is committed to any particular social, moral, philosophical or spiritual ideology or any other specific formulation. And its administration had officially endorsed the student bill of rights, a document which guarantees the right of every student to conduct research freely and to publish * * * any findings or recommendations, and the right of every student to * * * publish and disseminate his views and those of his organization on and off campus.

The committee's action against me was in direct violation of the above guarantees, inasmuch as it admittedly occurred primarily as a reaction to my published views and research. But neither the Faculty Senate nor the administration protested the committee's action, or in any way attempted to stop its obvious infringement upon my "academic freedom."

As soon as the matter began to receive attention in the newspapers, a program of deceitful propaganda was launched against me by the public relations department of the University. It took the form of an attempt to disparage my academic record. University spokesmen told the Chicago American that my petition had been denied because my "academic record was not satisfactory." The Sun-Times carried a statement accusing me of "scholastic incompetence." Actually, my grade level was clearly above average. All during my sojourn at Chicago I was the holder of a Disciples Divinity House scholarship, valued at $1,000 a year, and awarded on the basis of "academic record and strength of personal character." Obviously my scholarship would have been rescinded had I been deficient in either respect. Furthermore, a month before my article appeared, a dean and the heads of two departments had recommended me for another scholarship. Previously a professor had recommended that a term paper of mine be published in the Divinity School Quarterly.

Last summer I returned to my home in Los Angeles, where I enrolled in the Graduate School of Religion of the University of Southern California. Due to technicalities related to the unorthodox academic procedures instituted at Chicago by Dr. Hutchins, University of Southern California refused to accept more than a fraction of my Chicago work on the graduate level. I lost the equivalent of almost 2 years of graduate scholastic credits.

In February the Chicago committee reaffirmed its refusal to admit me to candidacy for my degree there. The chairman wrote me that it took this position for precisely the same reason that it took its original position.

The other day someone asked me if I regret having written my exposé, in view of all the personal troubles which have come to me as a result of it. I thought of all the insults I have borne, and the anxiety my family has experienced, and the heartbreak of all those wasted academic credits that I earned so painfully during my 2 years at Chicago.

And then I thought of the sacrifice of 140,000 American lives, wasted in a war without victory in Korea, and my sacrifice of wasted credits seemed insignificant indeed.

I turned to my friend who had asked the question. "I'd do it again," I said.

More About Salaries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 26, 1954

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to commend to the attention of our colleagues the following editorials which have appeared in various newspapers throughout the country, urging salary increases for Members of the Congress and our Federal judges. They were enclosed with a letter I received from Morris B. Mitchell, chairman of the committee on judicial selection, tenure, and compensation of the American Bar Association which has already been made a part of the Record.

The editorials follow:

[From the Milton-Freewater (Oreg.) Eagle-Times of March 12, 1954]

Listen Americans

(By George S. Benson, president of Harding College)

A commission of citizens appointed by the President has made a study of the pay scale for Members of Congress and has recomended substantial raises. A higher salary scale for Congressmen would be a good investment for the American citizenry. I think one should be approved at this session. It should be a straight salary raise and should not include any tax-free allowances or provisions.

In our present-day American society Congres is the most vitally important agency of Government, the heart of the Republic. Its Members have a value to the Nation that cannot actually be measured in dollars and cents. Only a few are independently wealthy, and this will likely be the situation in future Congresses. Therefore, for nearly all Congressmen and congressional candidates the size of the pay check—and the take-home pay—is a determining factor in their career.

The American people should be in favor of any reasonable measure that would help attract the very highest order of citizens to serve in Congress. Once they are in Congress the Members' pay is not calculated on comparative merit, unlike employees in private enterprise and other governmental fields. Congressmen may not expect additional salary compensation or promotion for unusual ability, extra hard work, long hours, or extraordinary diligence.

Yet Congressmen and prospective Congressmen are human. They desire for themselves and their families an improving living standard, the good things of life. It is to our advantage to place the salary scale for Congress in balance with the challenging requirements of the job. The philosophy of Americanism is for reward on the basis of worth.

If congressional salaries now are raised to $27,500, as the Presidental Commission suggests, the Congressmen actually would be only $1,322 better off than they were in 1939 while drawing only $10,000—because of inflation and increased taxes.

We citizens might well tell our Congressmen that the raise we are suggesting at this time, to bring their living standard in line with the value and importance of their service to our Nation, is being approved with two stipulations: (1) that Congress balance the 1954–55 Federal budget and thereafter keep the budget balanced; and (2) that a program of tax reduction and reform be continued until taxes are drastically lowered and are levied equitably, without favoritism.

[From the Fayettville (N. C.) Observer of February 22, 1954]

Cut-Rate Congress: It Will Mean Cut-Rate Legislation

It is not hard to appreciate the canny Scotch thrift of congressional candidate Seavy Carroll in opposing the movement to increase the salaries of the men and women who serve their constituents in the Congress of the United States.

Economy in Government is to be highly regarded in an age which has seen, and is still seeing, deplorable waste in many departments.

On the other side of the proposition is the formula that the worker is worthy of his hire.

The cost of living has skyrocketed astonishingly in the past 14 years. During that period the pay of Members of Congress has not kept pace with the rising cost of living, and it has not kept pace with the income that persons of congressional caliber could earn as private citizens.

It has been traditional that when a branch of government becomes penurious in the wages it pays public employees it increases the percentage of indifferent or downright crooked employees on its payroll.

At the same time it is traditional in private business as well as governmental employ that the high dollar attracts the better type of worker.

In this critical period of world history the Congress of the United States is the most important governmental deliberative agency which functions. The caliber of the men and women who comprise that body govern the efficiency with which it functions.

It makes no difference whether the public servant be a humble policeman on the beat or the senior Member of the United States Senate, his happiness and efficiency is affected strongly by the pay he earns.

If you have a cheap Congress you will get cheap legislation—and in 1954 cheap legislation could mean a leaky roof for our national security, a cheap lock on our door of defense against international burglars.

We agree with Mr. Carroll that Congressmen should not be compensated out of proportion with other Government employees but are of the opinion that serious consideration should be given to raising their stipend to correspond with the modern trends in salaries, wages, and living costs.

[From the Harrisburg (Pa.) Evening News of April 29, 1954]

Judicial Pay Increases

Proposed increases in the salary scale for the Federal judiciary seem to be bogged down by the coy reluctance of Members of Congress to vote themselves more pay in an election year, since the pay of the judges has been coupled with a similar move pending on the legislative branch.

Increases have been recommended by an 18-member advisory commission authorized by Congress, bringing the annual pay of a Member from $15,000 to $27,500, at the same time suggesting boosts in salaries of the Vice President and Speaker of the House, and for Federal judges.

These recommendations, incorporated in a bill introduced early in the present session, were reported to the Judiciary Committee of the House, where the bill still rests. Chairman Reed, of Illinois, said 2 months ago that there is an understanding for the Senate to act first, but the Senate is reluctant to act.

The January report of the advisory commission pointed out that salaries of Members of Congress and Federal jurists have not kept pace with the greatly increased responsibilities and workloads of their offices; that private industry paid larger salaries to men in positions of less responsibility, and salaries of legislators and jurists lagged far behind the increase in the cost of living.

However, the timorous in the Congress on both sides of the Capitol keep casting anxious eyes at the November balloting. Whether they will overcome their fear of reprisal should the pay raises be approved remains to be seen.

[From the Boston Globe of February 20, 1954]

Judicial Salaries

Congress' hesitating about pay increases for its Members in an election year may leave Federal judges' salaries unchanged, since the two proposals are tied together in a bill pending in Congress now.

Senator Saltonstall's support of Baily Aldrich, of Cambridge, for the newly created fifth Federal judgeship in Massachusetts calls attention again to the inadequacy of judges' salaries today and the financial sacrifice which able lawyers in private practice must make when they ascend the bench.

District judges like those of the tax court and the customs court now receive $15,000 a year, on which they pay income tax. They have no pension system for widows, though they are named for life. The Commission on Judicial and Congressional Salaries recommended an increase of $15,500, with a provision for a contributory pension for the widow.

The commission reminded the public that "to obtain judges of the necessary stature, their compensation must be such as to attract the ablest members of the legal profession from private practice without asking too great a financial sacrifice."

As things stand now it often is necessary to have private income to supplement a judicial salary. But this is not the best way of qualifying for public service. Even if Congress does not want to raise its own pay this year, it should consider seriously the matter of some increase of judicial salaries.

[From the Sayre (Pa.) Times of April 19, 1954]

Good Move Held Up

The reluctance of Members of Congress to vote pay raises for themselves in an election year—coupled with some inept planning in tying together two objectives in one legislative measure—is holding up a projected pay raise for the Federal judiciary.

An 18-member advisory commission authorized by Congress at the close of the 1953 session filed its report on January 15. It recommended an increase in congressional salaries from $15,000 (including a $2,500 allowance plus tax benefits) to $27,000 a year. It called also for boosts in the salaries of the Vice President and Speaker of the House, and increases for the Federal judiciary to range from $12,500 a year for district judges to $14,500 a year for Supreme Court judges.

The commission report noted that salaries of Congressmen and Federal jurists had not kept pace with the greatly increased responsibilities and workloads of their offices, that private industry paid larger salaries to get men of less responsibility, and that salaries of legislators and jurists lagged far behind increases in the cost of living.

All of these points were well made—both as to Congressmen and judges.

When the commission report was translated in to a legislative bill, the pay of both classes of officials was embodied in one measure. But Congressmen are unwilling to go before the voters in their home districts this year and say that they have just increased their own salaries.

So for that reason—which is strictly politics, but proper for Congressmen insofar as it affects themselves, if they so wish it—the badly needed revision of judicial salaries has been stymied. There is little prospect of action this session on the joint bill. But there still is time for the introduction of new legislation, separating the two classes of officials—and the pay hike for the courts should be thus separated from the balance of the measure and passed, regardless of action on the rest of the program.

[From the Los Angeles Herald-Express of February 22, 1954]

SALARY INCREASES

The Commission on Judicial and Congressional Salaries has recommended to President Eisenhower and to the Congress that there be a readjustment of congressional and judicial salaries to correct inequities of long standing, a readjustment which, if adopted, would cost the taxpayers $4,527,302 a year for Members of Congress, and $2,981,491 a year for Federal judges.

In these days of billion dollar expenditures on the part of Government, the cost of the contemplated salary readjustment does not seem excessive: Actually, we know that many fine citizens who would be of inestimable value to the Nation if they were in Congress or Senate feel that they cannot afford to hold office.

After all, we want top brains in Government—and the cost of salaries and adequate remuneration woud be small compared to what they would save us in the long run.

[From the Kansas City Star of April 20, 1954]

IN FAIRNESS TO THE JUDICIARY

It now appears that adequate pay for Federal judges will go by default and mainly because this happens to be an election year. Members of the Federal judiciary are not concerned about the election but the Members of Congress are, and that makes the difference.

Proposed salary increases for the judges were recommended by a special commission last January. Similar increases were recommended for Congress Members. Neither group had received a pay advance for 8 years, a period of inflation and higher living costs. The intention was to adjust the compensation of both groups accordingly, increasing the amounts from $15,000 to $27,500 for Congress Members and Federal district judges. The higher scale of pay for Members of the Supreme and appeals courts would be adjusted on a similar principle.

But Congress must vote all the increases and its Members are reluctant to do it through fear of criticism for raising their own pay in a campaign year. They might separate the two proposals and act for the judiciary alone. Still there is no evidence of such a move. Congress, however, has voted its Members increased pension benefits. So why should it hold out on the judges?

[From the San Bernardino Daily Sun of March 19, 1954]

BETTER COMPENSATION

A number of Congressmen have been rather reluctant to go along with the proposed pay increase for themselves, the Vice President, the Speaker of the House, and all the Federal judiciary.

They point out that this is a rather poor time—what with the administration espousing an economy program—to vote themselves more money.

However, the Commission on Judicial and Congressional Salaries, made up of representatives from agriculture, labor, and business and the professions, has offered some potent arguments for a pay boost.

The report it issued notes that adjustments in compensation of Federal judges and Members of Congress have been made on the average once in 20 years. In other words, their compensation, in comparison to that in private industry and practice, has lagged behind the times.

There was an observation on the recommendations of the Hoover Commission. In line with the suggestions by the Hoover group, the compensation for other employees of the Federal Government has been adjusted upward five times since the last salary increase for Congressmen and members of the Federal judiciary. Although made 5 years ago, the Hoover recommendations for pay increases to Federal judges and Congressmen were not followed.

It perhaps should be pointed out that the duties of judges and Congressmen are incomparably more complex than they were 20 years ago. This is largely due to the tremendous expansion of the powers and jurisdiction of the Federal Government.

With that in mind, and also remembering that the Commission had a number of task forces study every phase of the problem, here are the proposed salaries for a fair and reasonable compensation for the principal offices in the judicial and legislative branches of the Federal Government:

Chief Justice of the United States, $40,000; Associate Justices of the Supreme Court, $39,500; Vice President, $40,000; Speaker of the House, $40,000; Members of Congress, $27,500; judges of the United States courts of appeals, $30,500; judges of the United States Court of Claims, $30,500; judges of the Tax Court of the United States, $27,500; judges of the court of military appeals, $30,500; judges of the United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals, $30,500; judges of the United States customs court, $27,500; and judges of the United States district courts, $27,500.

Those would represent increases of $14,500 for the Supreme Court justices, $13,000 for circuit judges, $12,500 for district judges, $12,500 for Congressmen. But take out the tax bite and the increases range from $7,755 for the Supreme Court justices to $8,494 for the lawmakers.

What would the increase cost the taxpayer?

The report figures the gross annual amount of the raises for the Members of Congress would be $6,622,500. But they would pay taxes on that, making the net cost to the Government $4,527,302.

The net cost of the increases for the justices and judges would be $2,981,491.

Broken down further, the increases would constitute one one-hundredth of 1 percent of the Federal budget.

In a sort of aside, the report also recommends consideration of pensions for the widows and dependents of the officials considered in the study. It also suggests the advisability of pensions for former Presidents and Vice Presidents and their surviving widows and dependents.

The Commission's points are well taken. It is particularly on the mark in its observation that even these increases would not enable the officials to maintain a standard of living comparable to that enjoyed before World War II by those persons in the same posts.

[From the Galesburg (Ill.) Register of April 19, 1954]

HIGHER PAY FOR JUDGES STALLED

The reluctance of Members of Congress to vote themselves more pay in an election year is holding up a projected pay raise for the Federal judiciary whose compensation has been coupled in pending legislation with that of the legislative branch.

An 18-member advisory commission authorized by Congress at the close of the 1953 session filed its report on January 15. It recommended an increase in congressional salaries from $15,000 (including a $2,500 allowance plus tax benefits) to $27,500 a year. It called also for boosts in salaries of the Vice President and Speaker of the House and increases for the Federal judiciary to range from $12,500 a year for district judges to $14,500 a year for Supreme Court Justices.

The original bill to set up the Commission would have required that Congress act on its recommendations within 60 days, but this provision was eliminated before final passage. However, the bill did require the Commission to report by January 15 and more than 90 days have now elapsed since its report was filed.

A bill to put the Commission's recommendations into effect was promptly introduced in the House by Chairman REED (Republican, Illinois) of the Judiciary Committee, and referred to his committee. But REED said on February 27 that the committee has an understanding that it will "let the Senate act first." The entire House is to be elected this year; only about a third of the Senate must face the voters in 1954.

Over on the Senate side, there is reluctance to act because the House has in effect obtained a $7,500 bonus for all Members of Congress. A bill passed by the Senate in 1953 would have liberalized pension benefits for legislative employees only. Benefits for Members of Congress, somewhat larger than those in the final bill, were tacked on in the House this year, without debate and without a record vote. The conference report was adopted by the Senate, 61 to 30, after the benefits had been pared somewhat. It was Senator WILLIAMS, Republican, of Delaware, who protested that the new benefits amounted to a "bonus of $7,500 for all participants."

Still another bill on the Senate Calendar would provide a flat $10,000 across-the-board increase for members of Congress, and comparable increases in judges' salaries. Introduced by Senator MCCARRAN, Democrat, of Nevada, it was reported to the Senate by the Judiciary Committee in 1953, but has not been called up for action.

The January report of the advisory commission pointed out that salaries of Members of Congress and Federal jurists had not kept pace with the greatly increased responsibilities and workloads of their offices, that private industry paid larger salaries to men in positions of less responsibility, that salaries of legislators and jurists had lagged far behind the increase in the cost of living. The final report was unanimous, though some members of the commission had voted for larger and some for smaller increases than were finally recommended.

[From the Chicago Sun-Times of April 21, 1954]

JUDICIAL PAY

For more than 3 months now, a report urging salary increases for Congressmen and Federal judges has received little legislative attention. The report filed January 15 recommended raises of $12,500 for Members of the House and Senate, and increases ranging from $12,500 for United States district judges up to $14,500 for Supreme Court Justices.

Election-year reluctance is the reason for inaction. In the House, Chairman Reed, Republican, of Illinois, of the Judiciary Committee, introduced a bill to put the recommendations into effect. It was referred to his committee, which has indicated it will not act until the Senate does.

While all House Members face reelection this year, only a third of the Senate Members do. But the Senate has not gone even as far as the House on the report.

Some fair and telling reasons were offered in support of pay increases. The salaries have not kept pace either with the rising cost of living or the increased responsibilities and work loads of these offices; private industry pays larger salaries to men with lesser responsibilities.

From a public standpoint, the principal argument in favor of higher salaries for legislators and judges is that better pay would attract better men and compensate adequately good men already there.

Congressional timidity on this issue is understandable, but if Congress lacks the courage to raise its own standards by raising its own pay, it should at least have the courage to grant the much-needed increases to the Federal judiciary. There is no reason why election-year fears should deprive our Federal judges of the adequate compensation long overdue them or discourage the elevation to the bench of able men who cannot, for good reasons, make the financial sacrifice now necessary.

Messages in Opposition to Atomic Energy Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, July 31, 1954

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in pursuance of the permission granted me today, I submit for printing in the Record various telegrams and letters showing the reaction of the people throughout the country to the efforts made by those of us who fought the atomic-energy bill.

There being no objection, the telegrams and letters were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

University of Missouri,
Columbia, July 29, 1954.

The Honorable Wayne Morse,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

I wish to commend you for your efforts in behalf of the public against the recently passed atomic energy bill. Two more years of this administration and we, the public, won't have anything left to give away.

Another thing for which I should like to commend you, is your uncanny knack, manifested some 2 years ago, for smelling a rat, and consequently leaving the Republican Party behind you. I hope your constituents feel the same way about it.

Maybe things will set themselves right some day. We can still hope, anyway, especially as long as the Senate has at least some Members who remember that they are supposed to be serving the public interest.

Sincerely yours,
Richard R. Cornwall.

Tahkania, Okla.

Dear Senator Morse: I enjoyed you very much on the Youth Wants to Know program this afternoon.

Keep plugging for we farmers. We need it. The Eisenhower administration has put both me and my husband hunting jobs this winter. We thought we were good successful farmers but we found our acreage cut too much to pay for the land and high-priced equipment and keep four children fed, clothed, and in school. It's hard for us to keep from hating Mr. Benson because we died a little when we had to sell our farm. Our hopes and prayers are for an administration next time that understands the problems of the farmers. It is not only us, although by being in debt we were hit particularly hard, but our neighbors are all tightening their belts.

I only know one family in Oregon but I'm sending along a letter to remind them to never forget a vote for you when the time comes.

Sincerely yours,
Mrs. Edward Scott.

Klamath Falls, Oreg., *July 27, 1954.*

My Dear Senator Morse: I read your report within and I very much appreciate your fight for the people and against tyranny in high places. Give it to them. Oh, how I wish Tom Paine was here to help us. Down with tyranny.

Yours in this fight for justice.
J. P. Wirth.

Local 1090,
Furniture Workers Union,
Portland, Oreg., July 29, 1954.

The Honorable Wayne Morse,
United States Senator,
United States Senate Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator: It is with heavy heart that I read of the defeat of the liberal Senators who joined together to fight for the people of this great Nation on the atomic energy bill. I can, however, take heart in the thought that if it had not been for yourself and several others it could have been many times worse.

I want in behalf of my local union to thank you for the splendid fight that you waged on our interests. If it is common practice I would like to have you pass on to the others that joined you in the fight our most heartfelt thanks.

Senator Morse, I know that you are a very busy man and it may be too much to ask but if it is at all possible I would like to have you send me as much of the Congressional Record as you can on the debate of the atomic energy bill.

Again I say, good work well done and more of it is what this country needs.

Yours truly,
Charles L. Shelly,
Business Agent.

Springfield, Oreg.

The Honorable Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator: This is just a brief note to express my thanks for the reports which you send out periodically to keep your constituency informed. I have read them with great interest and trust you will keep me on your mailing list.

I would like to give a brief expression of my opinion on some of the measures before you. You may take them for what they are worth.

Public power: As a Christian clergyman I believe that natural resources are given to all the people by their Creator and I am therefore opposed to the power policies of the present administration. I appreciate your efforts in this regard.

Wiretapping: As one whose vocation is dependent upon maintenance of freedom of speech and thought I am deeply concerned with efforts to make wiretapping a legal procedure. This invasion of one's private life is too closely related to Hitlerian tactics and the methods of the NKVD to find a place in the United States of America of the founding fathers and the lovers of freedom (not just economic freedom).

Atomic energy: Again I reiterate my belief that God has endowed all his creatures with the natural resources. I resent the attempts of certain big business enterprises to usurp what rightly belongs to all the people.

One hundred and sixty-acre limitation: The same as above. Unless something drastic is done to prevent the land grab of large corporations and the decline in the number of the family farms we shall soon find ourselves living in a feudal-type society. Freedom and the possibility (as well as the right) of owning land go hand in hand. You will continue, I trust, to attack those measures which continually threaten the small landowner.

Polygraph: I have been concerned for several years about the prestige of the so-called lie detectors. Many scientists have been skeptical about the reliability of this infernal device. Here again we have an infringement upon the dignity of the human person. The use of the polygraph is little more than a duplication of the ancient trial by ordeal. I hope you can do something to discredit this damnable practice.

Filibustering: While I heartily endorse your stand on atomic energy, I cannot endorse filibustering tactics. I do hope that the move to give away atomic power to private corporations can be blocked. I do not think the filibuster is the proper means. We have all seen some of the finest legislation blocked by these tactics in the past. We cannot allow this means of blocking bad legislation unless we also admit the possibility of blocking good legislation. In a democracy such as ours, it is my belief that we must allow the people's representatives to exercise their authority by majority rule. I believe this even when I think that the people are acting like hysterical fools and when they elect scoundrels to represent them.

Sincerely,
Alfred Stenner.

Portland, Oreg., *July 28, 1954.*

Hon. Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator: My family circle and I are proud of you for the manhood you have shown in the fight for the people's rights to not let this giveaway of the atomic secrets and rights be sold down the river. Other countries will buy their rights and we will be fighting our own secrets. Also $12 billion of the workingman's money going down the drain.

I am writing President Eisenhower.

I am going to do some campaigning this summer and fall; something I have never undertaken before, this unreasonable tax that's put on the working class, this giveaway to the rich, is beyond my power to take without a protest.

I still receive your letters and information. Thank you.

Yours truly,
H. W. Lowers.

Lakeview, Oreg., *July 27, 1954.*

Hon. Wayne Morse,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: The news just came that you once more held the floor all night. We began to worry, not that the roses wither, but fear you are overdoing. Please take care of yourself, and manage to get adequate rest. You know out here you are considered one of our greatest assets. We appreciate you for your true Americanism and national honor. Which are altogether too scarce these days. We find ourselves wishing you'd sent their old giveaway bill back to committee in the night. But of course you know best.

Because you are a part of the America we love most, we send our love and best wishes to you and family and may the dear Lord bless and keep you, is our prayer.

Sincerely yours,

Mr. and Mrs. L. A. Pierson,
Clodhopper farmers, Lake County.

Coos Bay, Oreg., *July 28, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse.

Dear Sir: I think you are doing a wonderful job. I wish I could vote for you for President.

Please send copies of your speeches and let me know if there is any way I can help.

Yours sincerely,

J. G. Russell.

Sunland, Calif., *July 24, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: I don't know what we would do if it wasn't for you and our good old Roosevelt Democrats. All we heard during Truman's last term was impeach someone. All the wonderful things that were done to benefit all our people under President Roosevelt and President Truman are being killed or given away to private interests now. We are proud of men like you and we thank you so much for the fine work you are doing and have done. We are against the Eisenhower atomic bill. I think those Republicans who are in favor of all these "giveaway" bills are trying to kill our wonderful TVA and give atomic energy to the big interests is something I cannot forgive Eisenhower for.

More power to you, Senator, and may the good Lord give you good health and many, many years more.

Sincerely yours,

Cora M. Glazer.

Newport News, Va., *July 28, 1954.*

The Honorable Wayne Morse,
Senator From Oregon.

Dear Sir: I hereby express to you my sincere appreciation of the great efforts which you made in the Senate against the atomic bill.

To me the atomic bill is comparable to the tidelands oil giveaway. I am much concerned about when it is all going to be stopped.

Sincerely yours,

J. Grant Hebble.

Seaside, Calif., *July 26, 1954.*

Dear Senator Morse: I worked on citizens' movement for American Falls Dam and understand the importance of your efforts to stem the greedy gobble program of this administration. Water power is bad enough but this atom power grab is unspeakable.

More strength to you.

Thankfully yours,

Ethelyn Goodman
(Mrs. W. W. Goodman).

I was secretary, Idaho Reclamation Association. We organized Western States Reclamation Association.

Chicago, Ill., *July 29, 1954.*

Hon. Senator Morse.

My Dear Sir: I think you are to be congratulated on the great success of your efforts to secure for all the people benefits from public control of atomic energy in the power field.

I am sure the tremendous effort and passion you put into the issue you will find very worthwhile, not only you but other Senators with you who had a part in this effort.

Yours sincerely,

David J. Varner.

St. Petersburg, Fla., *July 29, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: Just a note Senator, to express my appreciation and thanks for the gallant, courageous fight you waged and led against the Eisenhower atomic energy giveaway bill.

You have been referred to in the press as the real leader of the Democrats in this battle. The Democrats could not have fumbled onto a better man.

It must seem very discouraging and hopeless to you at times Senator Morse, but try not to be disheartened. I think it was Woodrow Wilson that once said, "I would rather fail in a cause that will someday succeed, then suceed in a cause that shall someday fail."

Again Senator, thanks, and kindest regards.

Sincerely yours,

Albert F. Johnson, Jr.

Battle Creek, Mich., *July 28, 1954.*

The Honorable Wayne Morse and others,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator: I want to commend you and others for your noble effort to keep out the strangling road-block to TVA's development.

I am among those who oppose the administration giveaway to a select coterie of public pillagers the best of what is left to give away.

Sincerely yours,

Elmer Stevens.

Stark & De Mayo,
Patterson, N. J.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

My Dear Senator: May I commend you upon your valiant stand against insurmountable odds. I have read your remarks in the Record and they were wonderful.

You have rendered our beloved country a distinguished service. May God bless you.

Carroll J. Stark,
An American Democrat.

Birnamwood, Wis., *July 28, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Independent, Oregon,
Washington, D. C.

Honorable Sir: I wish to compliment you on your recent fight in the Senate. I think you did a very good job. Hope you feel O. K. after your ordeal.

I do hope you will vote to keep our boys from going to fight where it is useless; I believe your ideas are correct and wish you lots of success.

Yours truly,

Dale J. Cannon.

July 23, 1954.

Honorable Senator Morse: I congratulate you on your courageous fight against the administration bill.

The character of your activity in the past years has created an emotion that transcends mere respect.

Sincerely yours,

Carl Langenohl.

St. Louis, Mo.

July 27, 1954.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: I very much appreciate your vigorous efforts to defeat the atomic bill. Thank you for your services above and beyond the call of duty, for staying up all night in defense of the interests of the people of the United States, and for giving liberal Democrats such able and much-needed leadership.

I also appreciate your pointing out the warmongering of the Republican Party as reported today in the Daily News. This country is much in debt to your one-man Independent Party. I hope the voters will be smart enough to realize it.

Sincerely yours,

Claire Smith
Mrs. Alan W. Smith.

Whittier, Calif.

Washington, D. C., *July 28, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: No doubt some of the smoke is beginning to rise from the battlefield on the Senate floor after yesterday's session.

Thank you very much for your hard work and your fight for what is right. This took courage and physical stamina. As the years go by I see so many fail to fight for a principle—seemingly only interested in the expedient thing to do, which brings the payoff sooner or later. Cause and effect continue to work.

You, as an individual, have grown in moral stature because you proved the courage of your convictions, although the people have lost on the administration's atomic energy bill.

I am not one of your Oregon constituents, but just a member of the human race that owes you a thank you for your fight on this atomic bill, as well as the giveaway oil and other challenges you have met.

Yours very truly,

Elizabeth McClene Conn.

Alameda, Calif., *July 27, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

My Dear Senator: The great majority of American people support your patriotic and courageous fight to protect the best interests of our great country in the development of atomic power.

History will award you the high place you deserve for this and other splendid battles in behalf of our country.

Yours truly,

Joseph M. Sullivan.

July 29, 1954.

Dear Senator Morse: A good job well done on atomic energy bill.

Keep it up.

Anxious to read full text of your talks in Record on atomic energy bill.

If possible would appreciate recent copies of Record for days you discussed the matter.

I follow with interest, and respect your effort and work with considerable admiration.

Sincerely,

Eugene T. Ferrar.

Glen Rock, N. J.

July 28, 1954.

Senator Wayne L. Morse,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Wayne: I wish I could adequately express my admiration for your splendid fight against the Republican administration's giveaway atomic-energy bill. It is depressing to see the fight was lost. I realize that even so, your stand helped eliminate some of the worst features of the bill, but I am very despondent over the showing my own party made.

I wish I could also think of some brave platitudes to taken away the sting of defeat, like "the fight has just begun" or "a Democratic victory will change everything." But all this aside, I felt you should know that your stand won my approval, and I hope the future will prove me wrong and you, eventually, right.

Sincerely,

Murray H. Gerson.

Venice, Calif.

July 28, 1954.

Dear Senator Morse: Just a word of appreciation and applause for your gallant fight.

Sincerely,

Harold and Dorothy Israel.

Moylan, Pa.

Midland, Mich., *July 29, 1954.*

Dear Senator Morse: I wish to send you our sincere thanks for your recent fight on behalf of the majority of the American public.

Without you and some of your fellow Senators, the rest of us liberals throughout this country would be very, very discouraged.

Thanks again.

Sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. C. E. Grabiel.

Dear Sir: Thank you so much for trying to save the United States for all the people. Don't ever quit and say it is not worth while, someday people will understand the meaning of statesmanship. Keep up the fight always, and may God bless and keep you.

Yours truly,

Victor J. Buskirk.

Minneapolis, Minn.

Tulsa, Okla., *July 28, 1954.*

Hon. Wayne Morse,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator: I want to express to you my very great appreciation of the effort you are making to defeat the proposed atomic energy bill, which is clearly a rich gift to the public utilities.

I am a Democrat by birth and training but deeply regret that so many of our so-called Democratic Senators do not have the intestinal fortitude to stand up and help you fight for the decent things that are so essential to the well being of all the peoples of the Nation. I have not always agreed with your views, but on most matters you are a real defender.

May you long live and fight for those things that we so desperately need to make this a Nation of which we can always be proud. Thanks for your fine efforts and may enough Senators eventually wake up and help you so that right may prevail.

Most respectfully yours,

C. C. Smith.

P. S.—Please do not take the time and trouble to reply, I fully realize the pressure you are under, therefore, do not want you to take any time from your efforts.

Sovereignty for West Germany

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 23, 1954

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, most Americans who recall their history of Europe look upon the partition of Germany into East and West as a weird political anomaly which cannot endure. We think in terms of the natural affiliations of the German people, their historic ties, their common boundaries, and the artificial separation imposed by the Communists upon the country. All of us expect that, ultimately, by one means or another, unification will be achieved.

France looks upon the German situation through entirely different glasses. She remembers aggressions in the days of Bismarck, Wilhelm II, and Adolf Hitler. Germany is not regarded as a stable ally in Paris. And the French are not too deeply interested in the establishment of a strong Germany as a possible buffer against aggressive communism because France does not expect to fight Communist expansionism any more than she fought Nazi expansionism, down to the last ditch.

In this tightrope situation, our Senate Foreign Relations Committee is urging recognition of West Germany sovereignty by the United States. Such a step would force France's hand on the whole problem of European security and would stimulate German efforts to achieve its own salvation. It would be a bold move in a timid world, and boldness by the West may be the one effective answer to terrorism by the Soviets.

"The Committee for an Effective Congress"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 28, 1954

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the audacity of man with money seeking to control the Congress of the United States has descended to a new low. This fact has just been revealed in the present debate in the Senate over the Flanders Resolution.

"The Committee for an Effective Congress" is the phony name of a group of rich men who seek not an effective Congress, but a defective one—one that will be subservient to them.

Mr. Speaker, the public is not being fooled by these men who have hired Washington lobbyists to do a hatchet job on Senator McCarthy. Their "con game" is out in the open and it will fail.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an article on this subject by Mr. Jack Steele:

THE MEN BEHIND FLANDERS

(By Jack Steele)

An organization which raises campaign funds for liberal Members of Congress—most of them Democrats—is providing most of the lobbying steam behind the Flanders resolution to censure Senator Joseph R. McCarthy, Republican, of Wisconsin.

The group is the National Committee for an Effective Congress, with headquarters at 680 Fifth Avenue, New York City. Its board of advisers is liberally sprinkled with the names of former New Dealers and Fair Dealers.

(It is not to be confused with the Committee for Strengthening Congress—a group which takes no part in elections but tries to improve congressional procedure.)

The Committee for an Elective Congress has been active behind the scenes for several weeks in behalf of the Flanders resolution.

Its officials have been advising Senator Ralph E. Flanders, Republican, of Vermont, on strategy.

It has opened a Washington office at the Carrpll Arms Hotel, adjacent to the Capitol (which also happens to be a hangout for McCarthy supporters.)

It solicited and released the endorsements of 23 prominent citizens for the Flanders resolution. The list was headed by Paul G. Hoffman, former chairman of the Citizens for Eisenhower movement.

Its staff members have been buttonholing Senators to win their votes for the Flanders resolution.

Some of those buttonholed have received campaign funds from this committee since it was set up in 1948 with the purpose of helping elect what it considered deserving Members of Congress.

The committee's pressure campaign for the Flanders resolution has aroused the ire of Senators on both sides of the issue.

Republican Leader William F. Knowland, of California, had this group in mind when he charged a few days ago that the CIO and the Americans for Democratic Action were the real sponsors of the Flanders resolution.

(The committee is not allied with the CIO or ADA but usually supports about the same list of congressional candidates.)

Other GOP leaders, including Senator Homer Ferguson, of Michigan, put chief blame on the committee for forcing a showdown on the McCarthy issue.

Some Democrats who favor the Flanders resolution admit privately they are incensed over the committee's activities.

They say they have been "put on the spot"—pressured to vote for the Flanders resolution by a group which contributed to their campaign chests.

Robert E. Sherwood, dramatist and onetime speechwriter for the late President Roosevelt, was chairman of the committee until recently. He is now a member of the advisory board. The present acting chairman is Sidney H. Scheuer, a New York textile broker.

Other advisory board members include Brig. Gen. Telford Taylor, former head of the Small Defense Plants Administration, who often has tangled with Senator McCarthy; Arthur M. Schlesinger, historian, whose son was an adviser to Adlai E. Stevenson in the last campaign; James Roosevelt, now a Democratic candidate for Congress from California, and Robert R. Nathan, a one-time New Deal braintruster.

Committee officials who have been working here for the Flanders resolution include Maurice Rosenblatt, a Washington lobbyist and public relations man; William Frye, onetime press agent for the Defense Department, and George E. Agree, executive secretary of the committee.

Tenth Anniversary of the Battle of Warsaw

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, July 31, 1954

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record a statement I have prepared on the 10th anniversary of the Battle of Warsaw. This statement commemorates one of the bravest uprisings in the history of man, and also condemns one of the foulest betrayals in the history of man.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Statement by Senator Douglas

Tomorrow, August 1, is the 10th anniversary of the Battle of Warsaw. It is the anniversary of one of the bravest, most heroic uprisings in the history of man. It is also the anniversary of one of the foulest betrayals in all of man's long history.

The Communists are adept in betrayal; it is their stock in trade.

The Warsaw uprising was instigated by the Russian Communist high command. On July 31, 1944, the Russian armies were within a few miles of the tortured city, and the shelling of the Germans could easily be heard. On that evening, the Russians continued their radio appeals for an uprising within the city, and announced a general attack from their positions a few miles to the east.

At once, the Polish underground went into action. As the brave General Bor described it, "In 15 minutes an entire city of a million inhabitants was engulfed in the fight. * * * The battle for the city was on."

The carnage was indescribable.

Immediately, the Communist Russian radio went silent, the Communist armies ceased their attacks and their shelling of the Nazi forces, and halted all air activity. They simply sat down and waited for the Nazis to slaughter the brave Polish underground army. The Nazis were not slow to act. They moved in the Herman Goering Division, two S. S. tank divisions, pulled up artillery, cut the city into pockets, and started a methodical slaughter of the Polish people.

The Russian Communist armies and air forces made no move to relieve the Polish underground army of General Bor. Men, women, children fought bitterly, street by street and house by house; buried the dead insomuch as possible; cooked and delivered meals to the men at the rifles; tended the wounded who piled up in cellars and houses. Virtually the only weapons the Poles had with which to fight the Nazi tanks, artillery, and Luftwaffe were rifles, revolvers, and bottles filled with gasoline.

Meanwhile, the Warsaw radio made repeated appeals for help. The Communist armies did not budge.

In Churchill's Triumph and Tragedy a special chapter—The Martyrdom of Warsaw—is devoted to this betrayal. Repeatedly Mr. Churchill and President Roosevelt appealed to Marshal Stalin to set his armies in motion to relieve the city. He refused. Then they sought permission for the British-American Air Forces to make air drops of ammunition, food, medicine, and guns to the underground forces. In order to accomplish this, because of the distances involved, it was necessary to obtain Stalin's permission to fly on and land for refueling of the planes behind the Soviet lines.

This, Marshal Stalin bluntly refused, not once but many times. In Churchill's volume, one may read the series of urgent appeals to the Communist Marshal Stalin.

Not once did the Communists lift so much as a single rifle to support the uprising they had instigated. It soon became apparent that they were guilty of the most degrading perfidy; they were waiting for the Nazis to slaughter off the real resistance and patriotic leaders of the Polish peoples. Then, with the heart of Polish patriotism crushed, they would be free to impress on the Polish people their own puppet Lublin Communist controlled government.

The battle was being waged above ground and even in the sewers of the city. On September 4, the brave women of Warsaw broadcast a message to the Vatican. I want to repeat a part of it here:

"For 3 weeks, while defending our fortress, we have lacked food and medicine. Warsaw is in ruins. The Germans are killing the wounded in hospitals. * * * The Rusisan armies which have been for 3 weeks at the gates of Warsaw have not advanced a step. * * * God alone is with us."

Churchill said of the Communists:

"They wished to have the non-Communist Poles destroyed to the full, but also to keep alive the idea they were going to their rescue."

One of the last broadcasts before the Warsaw radio was silenced and the slaughter completed tells the entire story:

"This is the stark truth. We were treated worse than Hitler's satellites, worse than Italy, Rumania, Finland. May God, who is just, pass judgment on the terrible injustice suffered by the Polish nation, and may He punish accordingly all those who are guilty."

After more than 2 months of the bitterest fighting, the resistance was crushed—without a single act of the Russians to help the brave underground army.

Of the 40,000 men and women of the underground army, 15,000 were killed. Nearly 200,000 persons were wounded. Ten thousand Nazis were killed, 7,000 were missing, and 9,000 wounded. A mortal blow had been struck at the Germans, weakening them in the front of the Russian armies, but at a terrible cost.

I want to quote the final lines of Churchill's recital.

"When the Russians entered the city 3 months later, they found little but shattered streets and the unburied dead. Such was their liberation of Poland, where they now rule. But this cannot be the end of the story."

In remembering this 10th anniversary of the Battle of Warsaw, let us forget neither the Communist treachery against their own ally, nor Churchill's final statement:

"This cannot be the end of the story." We must see to it that it will not be.

Red China Shows Her Colors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 23, 1954

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, the Communist press throughout the world has been ranting in uninterrupted ecstasy over the Indochinese surrender ever since it took place. Like fanatics drunk with new power, they have been urging their followers on to new visions of things to come. Britain and France were expected to follow up the Indochina peace with overtures looking toward the admission of Red China to the United Nations, but the reaction of international communism has given pause even to Churchill and Mendes-France.

But nothing said or done at Geneva is likely to have more influence than the ruthless shooting down of a British airliner over international waters, and the attacks upon American planes searching for survivors by the Chinese Communists. The arrogance with which Red China has treated the situation is enough to shock the most cynical diplomat. Peiping has warned the United States to stop our "provocations" or "suffer the consequences." Peiping has also told the British to limit their search for the destroyed airliner to one plane.

This is the answer of Red China to the demonstrations of conciliation and good will which were most marked on the part of Churchill and Anthony Eden, at the Geneva meetings. Give the Communists an inch, and they will reach for a mile.

Messages in Opposition to Atomic Energy Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, July 31, 1954

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in pursuance of the permission granted me today, I submit for printing in the Record various telegrams and letters showing the reaction of the people throughout the country to the efforts made by those of us who fought the atomic-energy bill.

There being no objection, the telegrams and letters were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Philadelphia, Pa., *July 28, 1954.*

Dear Senator: My deepest thanks to you for your devotion to your country and to the best interests of all the people.

I and many of my friends followed your valiant efforts to keep the atomic-energy resources in the hands of the tax-paying citizens who made it possible. We can only hope that the loss is not irretrievable.

With best wishes and deep appreciation for all you do to keep democracy at work,

Sincerely,

Bertha S. Gruenberg.
(Mrs. Fred K. P.)

Vista, Calif.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator: Words cannot express our appreciation of your gallant fight to prevent the power grab that this administration is attempting to railroad through Congress.

Would to God, that we had more real representation like yourself and your worthy colleagues who are doing so much in this grand fight.

Once again, our prayer and best wishes to you and your very worthy colleagues for success. Don't give up.

Very truly yours,

Thomas F. Hastings.
Verna J. Hastings.

Whittier, Calif., *July 27, 1954.*

Dear Senator Morse: The people of the United States owe you a great debt of gratitude for the valiant fight you are making in their behalf. It is my hope that hundreds more take the time to thank you, for you should have at least an expression of opinion—that is the least that should be expected from we, who, while sleeping comfortably in our beds, consider the long hours of your day and night vigil, for the good of our country.

We Democrats, in California, are working hard to get the truth to the voters. We are trying to get precinct workers, in each precinct, in Whittier, where the Republican vote is 2 to 1. How successful we will be remains to be seen.

Thanking you again with all my heart,

Sincerely,

Mabel Rohde
(Mrs. Edward).

P. S.—No acknowledgement of this letter is expected. I would not add to your burdens.

Executive Hearing Aids,
Milwaukee, Wis.

Hon. Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator: Your filibuster is well justified and since seeing you on TV there are many folks here that believe as you do. I don't suspect you'll have time now to read this and your 41st secretary may get to read it but anyhow that's all we can do is say hurrah for a good man and a good purpose.

Sincerely,

E. G. Darbo.

Beverly Hills, Calif., *July 27, 1954.*

The Honorable Wayne Morse,
United States Senator, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: Keep up the good fight.

The United States Senate needs more men like you. More men with views, ably expressed. More men with courage and who are not afraid of the ruthless tactics of this administration.

Keep up the good fight.

Fight for the rights of we, the people. Let the Republican Party find out that there are just plain citizens who admire your stand and the stand of the other liberal men of both parties.

I wish you luck and admire your courage and honesty.

Sincerely yours,

Richard Sklaar.

July 28, 1954.

Dear Senator Morse: As a retired American history teacher I have had time to read of your efforts on behalf of our natural resources. It was a wonderful effort you have made and as one American citizen and voter I want to thank you for it.

This struggle began during and after the Civil War when Congress began to give away most of the natural wealth west of the Mississippi River. One great American historian has written that if our Congress had leased on reasonable terms our natural resources to corporations instead of giving them, sometimes dishonestly, the returns would have paid all the Federal taxes from 1865 to 1914. But the "Robber Barons" got all this wealth.

Keep up the fight until next November's election and we may all have a change in policy.

Thanking you again I am,

Sincerely yours,

Henry G. Willman,
Ex-History Teacher.

New York, N. Y.

Brooklyn, N. Y., *July 28, 1954.*

Hon. Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Sir: Although I do not live in your State and cannot, therefore cast a vote for you, I would like to express my admiration for you and for the fight you have been waging on the atomic energy bill. Even those who disagree with you must at least respect you for your sheer physical endurance.

The fact that the fight was hopeless and has been finally lost does not detract in any way from your splendid showing and the courage with which you fought. More power to you, sir, and better luck in future battles for the people of this country.

Sincerely,

Nathan W. Harris.

Wichita Falls, Tex., *July 27, 1954.*

Hon. Wayne Morse,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Sir: I want to thank you for your Herculean stand on the atomic energy measure in fighting for proper safeguards for the public interest.

I feel that you are upholding the finest example of statesmanship that has been exhibited in the Senate in years.

Sincerely,

W. S. Neale.

Philadelphia, Pa., *July 28, 1954.*

My Dear Senator Morse: Congratulations. Thank you for the fight you made for the rights of all the people.

There are thousands of independent voters, and we find it hard to understand why Congress too often forgets this fact. But, in you, we feel we have a sincere and honest representative.

Again, thank you for your fearless representation.

Sincerely,

(Mrs.) Martha I. Mather.

Westfield, N. J., *July 27, 1954.*

Dear Senator Morse: I have been following your career ever since you broke with your party to support Adlai Stevenson in 1952.

I am now attending Georgetown University and was fortunate to hear you chastise your fellow Senators for their absenteeism from the Senate floor one day last spring.

I am writing now to express my great admiration for your defense of the American people's atomic heritage. Sir, you are a great credit to the United States Senate and a personal inspiration to me as I hope to enter politics myself one day.

I wish you many more years of service to our country.

Very truly yours,

Richard Comerford.

Bloomfield, N. J., *July 27, 1954.*

The Hon. Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washingon, D. C.

Dear Sir: I am unable to express in words my gratitude and admiration for you in the gallant fight you are conducting on the Senate floor.

I know that God is on your side.

Sincerely yours,

Ralph J. Nussbaum.

Senator W. Morse:

I am convinced that there are only a few who are genuinely and 100 percent interested in the welfare of the people over and above the welfare of the party and personal welfare.

I only wish I could extend or show that I personally, as well as many others personally appreciate your efforts.

A. Pietromonace.

Seattle, Wash.

Brooklyn, N. Y., *July 28, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: My family and I wish to express our thanks to you for the tremendous fight you put up to retain public control of atomic power. We wish that we had a Congress composed of men like you who understand the full implications of private control and who are really concerned with the welfare of the people as against the vested interests.

It has become more and more difficult to find public figures who have the courage to stand up and speak against the administration, despite the fact that it is an administration that has done nothing to advance the well-being of the majority of citizens.

Men like you provide much inspiration to people who think as you do, but often become apathetic or discouraged in their efforts to improve things.

Many thanks again.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. Rhoda Howard.

Los Angeles, Calif., *July 27, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator: Millions of people are thrilled by your heroic fight against the proposed atomic steal. Many more throughout the world are grateful to you for the exposure of the war-mongering Radford-Dulles cabal.

I salute you for your courage, sincerity, and statesmanship.

Most sincerely yours,

Morris Kominsky.

July 26, 1954.

Hon. Senator Morse.

Dear Sir: I am thankful for your courage and determination to see that the people of this country get fair consideration. I hope the people of Oregon are beginning to understand what you are doing for them, as well as the rest of us.

One of your many admirers,

Mrs. Alma Moody.

Granada Hills, Calif.

San Fernando, Calif., *July 27, 1954.*

Dear Senator Morse: We want to thank you for the magnificent work you and other Senators are doing to protect the interests of the people. It renews our faith in humanity. It makes us happy to know there are men of high principle and courage among us. Wishing you success in your efforts.

Mr. and Mrs. W. E. Sawyer.

Beresford, S. Dak., *July 26, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: The warmest congratulations to you on your latest senatorial struggle. What would we do without you?

"Say not, the struggle naught availeth."

Again, thank you.

Very truly,

Mrs. C. O. Peterson.

Phoenix, Ariz., *July 26, 1954.*

Hon. Senator Wayne Morse,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

My Dear Sir: I am now writing to you, my very first letter to any national political figure. In so doing, permit me to extend to you the utmost in congratulations. I admire you very much and know many in this immediate vicinity that do likewise. Keep up the good work, for the cause is great, and the forgotten man needs you and many more like you. Unfortunately, the people as an elective group have so seldom the opportunity of electing men like you to represent them. My State of Arizona could well be proud to claim you if this were possible.

May God bless you and keep you.

With kindest regards, I am

Yours truly,

E. F. McIlroy.

Brookline, *July 27, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: It is a wonderful experience these days to wake up in the morning and find that a few good politicians are still fighting the brave fight in the people's interest.

I have been reproaching myself daily for not writing to thank and congratulate you. And most Americans, I fear, will probably have to reproach themselves with never having written you at all.

But I think I know how the people must feel and their probable lack of articulateness comes from some lack of experience in letter writing, and from their being engrossed in their own affairs—sometimes pretty desperate affairs, as you know.

I am single and a stenographer, so I am managing to find the time to express my gratitude and the gratitude of 1 or 2 other people, for all that you and your untiring group are doing for us.

Thank you. Thank you all. And I hope that Senator Anderson is right in saying that you will keep the Senate in session until Thanksgiving—yes, until Christmas—rather than let this great birthright of the American people (which we have already bought and paid for) from going over the dam, with so many other things that are lost forever.

Respectfully yours,

Alison Campbell Laing.

Portland, Oreg., *July 27, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
United States Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: I want to commend you and the other Senators for your fine efforts against the private power features of the atomic energy bill.

I am sure the overwhelming majority of thinking people agree that the Atomic Energy Act needs revision to enable us to cooperate with our allies in the international control and development of atomic energy for peaceful purposes in the development of adequate defensive measures against atomic attack. But we do not want these needed revisions to serve as a screen for vast giveaways to the private utilities. The AEC contract affecting TVA, the proposal to allow private ownership of fissionable materials on public lands, and the proposals to favor private over public development of commercial atomic power should be resisted to the utmost. If that means keeping the Senate in session until Christmas, then so be it.

Keep up the good fight.

Sincerely,

George D. Dysart,
Temporarily on Active Duty
as Captain, USMCR.

Cleveland Heights, Ohio, *July 26, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Wayne Morse: I am writing to tell you that I appreciate the courage and determination which you are exhibiting in your attempt to make the issues known concerning the new Atomic Energy Act.

Thank you, and good luck.

Sincerely,

Daniel Goldrich.

Granada Hills, Calif., *July 26, 1954.*

Hon. Senator Wayne Morse,
United States Senate.

Dear Senator: It seems to me, on the basis of conversations, that I express the sentiment of many when I say that we are filled with admiration and gratitude to you for the courageous and stubborn fight for the interests of the American people that you are conducting on the floor of the United States Senate.

May God bless you and give you the strength and power to continue to defend the welfare of our people.

Gratefully yours,

J. Y. Alper.

Minneapolis, Minn., *July 28, 1954.*

Dear Senator: Thank you for your untiring efforts in behalf of the American people and I say thank God for you and all who are opposing the atom bill, which is a bigger sellout than the tidelands were and that was hard to swallow. Keep up the fight, we'll never forget it. It is time for brave, courageous men to take heed of what is happening to this, our America.

The Indochina thing is something disgusting, to sell out all those people so the Republicans can say, as one did on a TV show last Sunday "There is no shooting war anywhere in the world." They take credit for human sacrifice, have they no conscience?

I hope the people of your great State realize what you are doing for them, and all of us in America, and vote you in time and again.

Unemployment is something too. We, who have a 20-year-old son who cannot find a thing, it's so very discouraging when there is sickness in the family and bills are pressing. Believe me one doesn't care sometimes whether life goes on or not.

I hope God gives you the strength and courage to go on and defeat the atom bill.

Thank you again.

Very respectfully,

(Mrs.) Helen B. Clark.

P. S.—The people of America have their thinking caps on and follow happenings closer than ever. They can't be lulled to sleep these days. H. B. C.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator: This is to express my admiration and gratitude for the courageous and patriotic battle you are fighting against those who would give away so much of the national heritage in mineral, recreational and power resources and would turn over to private exploiters the results of years of devoted effort by selfless, patriotic people who have worked without thought of personal gain to make our country strong and secure. It is gratifying to know that there is one man in Congress who is devoted to the welfare of America and its people without thought of partisan or personal advantage.

I received a copy of your initial speech on the wire-tapping bill. I wish a copy of it could be put in every American home. If there is any way I can help in bringing this about, I shall be glad to do what I can toward sharing the work and expense.

Yours sincerely,

Hallen M. Bell.

Birmingham, Mich., *July 20, 1954.*

San Francisco, Calif., *July 25, 1954.*

Dear Senator Morse: I wish there were more men in this world like you Senator, it would be a better place to live in.

Believe me, when I say you have the respect and gratitude of me and my whole family. May God give you strength in your fight against the forces alined against you.

I am sure that there are millions who feel the same way I do but, who don't take the time to write you, nevertheless always remember they are with you in spirit and God is with you because you are right.

Sincerely yours,

John P. Slaviero.

July 26, 1954.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Office of the Senate,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Sir: I would like to thank you for your gallant fight against the giveaway program of our public power and dam sites.

I feel we are really fortunate in having you as our champion in fighting for us.

May you and your fellow Senators keep up the good work you have been doing until the fight has been won.

Sincerely yours,

Charles D. McClain.

Wenatchee, Wash.

Charlotte, N. C., *July 25, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator: Your answers to the questions on Youth Wants To Know were priceless and I wish to extend wishes for your complete success in this Senate fight and in your next campaign.

This country needs men with honest convictions and the tenacity and courage to adhere to them.

Yours truly,

Doralee Vause.

Laramie, Wyo., *July 27, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Sir: I last wrote you on the occasion of the tidelands oil steal.

I am now mad again. I have just heard Chet Huntley's newscast on ABC this Monday. What does the present administration, and I use this word only because I can't think of another, think it is doing? This matter of giving the atomic energy secrets away to large big business is just as rank as the tidelands deal. I have never heard of anything like it.

If I'm not too badly mistaken, the United States has developed into a welfare state in about the last 50 years. Now in the space of a year and a half, the Republicans have given away 1, and are about to give away 2, of the greatest means of continuing this program. You can talk all you want about the Government not wanting to compete in private business, and that they really don't care one way or the other who is in a position to profit by the giveaway, but when you come down to the basic facts of the issue, it's not the people who will get the benefits of it, it's still the big money interests.

I'm not trying to spiel the virtues of the welfare state. I am not sufficiently acquainted with the program to give a tinker's damn one way or the other. But the fact remains that it is here, and from all that I can gather it is here to stay. All of this is well and good. Big business is going to make a few more billions of dollars out of something that could have been used for the good of almost all of the people. Now they want to give away one of the greatest inventions in modern history, so that a few paunchy, bald, old men will make even more money. It just isn't fair. It's not giving the American people a square shake. The game is being played with loaded dice.

Enough of this. By the time you get this, it will be put to a vote. I will pray for its defeat.

As long as I am writing I would like to know what happened to the Idaho Power bid to seize the Snake River. I was studying like mad at the time and didn't have a chance to keep up with the matter. I suppose they got it.

Also I would like to take this opportunity to thank you on behalf of myself and the rest of the folks that think like I do.

Thank you from the bottom of my heart.

Sincerely,

Richard R. Hassheider.

This Is a Recession?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 23, 1954

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I should like to insert in the Record the following editorial which appeared in today's New York Daily News, which I think is most interesting:

This Is a Recession?

We've used that headline over previous editorials, but we're rather expecting to put it in cold storage for a while.

It seems to us that the "recession" whooped up by such Democratic politicos as Adlai Stevenson and Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, of Illinois, is becoming more of a pipedream by the day.

Some pieces of evidence:

General Motors Corp. reports that in the first 6 months of 1954 its profits rose to a record high—$683 million plus before taxes, as compared with the previous record of $803 million in the first 6 months of 1950. True, GM sales were 7 percent off from the same period of last year; but this was chiefly because of a 22-percent sag in defense orders.

Westinghouse Electric Corp. comes through with similar news. Its first half of 1954 business was the best in its history, as regards both volume and net income.

Radio Corporation of America reports likewise. From January 1 through June 30 of this year it did almost $445 million worth of business, which was an 8-percent jump above its previous record racked up in the first half of 1953.

Inland Steel for 1954's opening 6 months reports a record net income of almost $20 million, its previous record of $18 million plus having stood since 1950.

Standard Oil of New Jersey, for 1954's first half estimates net earnings at $293 million, as against $268 million for the same period last year.

Nor is this by any means all the bright news currently coming out about United States business and industry.

We're not saying, you understand, that a boom is just around the corner, or that everything is lovely wherever you look on the business landscape.

We would be pleased, though, if the political-recession merchants would either put up some evidence of a recession or shut up.

Brooklyn's Negroes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 26, 1954

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to direct the attention of our colleagues to the following very interesting articles on the progress of our Negro citizens in Brooklyn.

These articles are part of a series, the first of which appeared in the Brooklyn Eagle of July 25, 1954. It is as follows:

Brooklyn's Negroes Have Risen Steadily Ever Since 1633

(By Sid Frigand)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—On May 17, the Supreme Court of the United States stirred the conscience of the Nation and the admiration of the free world with a decision upholding the rights of our Negro citizens. The historic ruling, which broke the back of Moscow's pet propaganda line, caused many persons in Brooklyn to look with new interest at his Negro neighbor. Who is he? Where did he come from? What is he doing. This series of articles is devoted to a study of the Negro in our community, his achievements and his hopes.)

One hundred and fifty years before the first daughter of the American Revolution bawled her infant greetings to the world, Negro settlers were living in Brooklyn. Records dating back to 1633 reveal that Negroes held property as freemen in the tiny Dutch village that later mushroomed into the largest residential community in the world.

The dark-skinned residents of young Brooklyn were, in fact, pioneers.

Strange that today, some 3¼ centuries later, our Negro Brooklynites are still looked upon as pioneers—painstakingly, and sometimes painfully, toiling to clear away the obstacles that stand between them and their modest goal of equal opportunity and community respect.

To some, it seems incomprehensible that this goal should be so elusive when it is so patently familiar to all: the Holy Bible has given it many names; most of the world calls it "civilization," and here in this country many of us call it "Americanism."

COLLECTING ON BIRTHRIGHT

How does the average Brooklyn Negro react to collecting his birthright on a 300-year payment plan? Bitterness would be expected, but instead we find a dogged resolution and an inexhaustible optimism, which only recently was whetted by the highest court in our land.

This same average Negro Brooklynite spends very little time philosophizing about his plight or his progress. His chief concern, like everybody's, is earning his keep. He's got to eat, feed and clothe his kids and dignify these basic necessities with that intangible thing called "home." The building of "home" has not been easy—there were many economic and sociological factors barring the way—but, for the most part, it has been accomplished.

The Negro in Brooklyn has reached a point now where he has turned to building the community in which he lives. He wants a place to live—not survive—and he wants to make Brooklyn a better place to live.

THRIVE VIGOROUSLY HERE

It is apparent that the Negro from the South, the Negro from the Indies and the native Brooklyn Negro have decided to take root here—and they are all thriving vigorously in our cosmopolitan soil.

The process of integration into community life is slow—especially for Negroes—and sometimes the other residents of the community are scarcely aware of the progress made.

Too often our knowledge of other people is only of the present and the immediate past. To appreciate and understand them, however, one must be familiar with their history and concerned about their destiny.

Approximately 1 out of every 10 persons living in Brooklyn today is a Negro. This ratio is not surprisingly large in this community—it was approximately the same during the census of 1820 and most likely similar a hundred years earlier than that.

SLAVERY FLOURISHED

Slavery was, of course, the institution responsible for swelling Brooklyn's Negro population. The Dutch settlers of the 17th century were unwilling masters, but the Dutch West India Co. was anxious to increase profits by having the system of slavery introduced here. When the British took over in 1664, slavery began to flourish.

According to Gertrude Lefferts Vanderbilt's Social History of Flatbush, the first slaves came to Kings County in 1660. They were comparatively well-treated by the Brooklyn masters and often were able to select their masters upon the death of their old master or arrange for their own sale.

The shackling British laws, however, brought unceasing pressures upon the Negro slave. On November 11, 1697, for example, a law was passed forbidding Negroes from being brought to Brooklyn from Manhattan on the Sabbath without special permit.

In subsequent legislation the Negro was forbidden "to run about on the Sabbath" or to purchase liquors on that day.

FREEMAN'S PRIVILEGE

All of Brooklyn's early Negroes were not indentured, however. According to Ralph Foster Weld's "Brooklyn Is America," which ran serially in the Eagle in 1948, one of the original patentees of Boswyck (Bushwick) was Francisco the Negro, who along with Antoon the Negro was listed on the roll of officers and soldiers of Boswyck in 1663—a privilege reserved only for freemen.

The yoke of slavery hung heavy over the heads of all black men in the country, and the yoke was not easily discarded. Blows for liberty were struck early in New York, but the first uprisings were set down with even bloodier blows.

In 1712, slaves who had suffered ill-usage under a Manhatan master set fire to his house and killed and wounded all who came to extinguish it. This plot to destroy the city's whites by fire and sword ended with the hanging of 18 leaders, while others were deported or broken on the wheel.

UPRISING QUELLED

In 1741, another uprising, described by some Negro historians as the most important event in the history of the Negro in the whole colonial period, was set down in New York—this time at the cost of 125 Negroes arrested, 8 hanged, 71 deported, and 13 burned at the stake.

Brooklyn's history was less violent, but advances were comparatively rapid. Before the Revolutionary War had ended, New York State had begun legislating to free slaves, but Brooklyn's enlightened landowners—sparked by the ideals of liberty—were already setting their slaves free by manumission.

The laws of the land notwithstanding, the freed Negro today still faces difficulties peculiar to his race. Although this series of articles is focused upon the fruits of the Negro culture in Brooklyn, the picture cannot be complete unless we understand some of their problems.

Fortunately, these problems are manmade, and what man has made, man can undo.

Mr. Speaker, the following article is the second in this series. It appeared in the Brooklyn Eagle of July 26, 1954:

Tells Proud Story of Brooklyn's Early Negro Celebrities

(By Sid Frigand)

Brooklyn's large Negro population is the product of several national catastrophes—the depressions that reduced the South to wastelands and the wars that created jobs in the North.

The migrant Negroes, however, added their numbers to an already well-established nucleus of colored Brooklyn residents whose families had called this borough "home" long before the potato famines, pogroms and poverty of Europe had provoked many Brooklynites' forebears to try their luck in the New World.

One of the pillars of Brooklyn's Negro old-time set is Dr. Walter N. Beekman, a practicing dentist at the age of 75, who was the first Negro member of his profession to be licensed in the State of New York.

Dr. Beekman, as an official of the New York African Society for Mutual Relief—the oldest such organization in this country, has long interested himself in the history of his people and the work of the society, which was founded in 1787 and chartered in 1810.

Interviewed at his home at 170 Jerome Street, in the Highland Park section, the quick-minded dentist painted a warm picture of Negro life in Brooklyn at the turn of the century, when he was a struggling student at New York Dental School (later to become part of Columbia University).

The Brooklyn dentist was the first Negro student to attend the school, and, he confided, probably the first to enroll on a promissory note.

"Dr. Charles Milton Ford, the head of the school, was one of the finest men I ever met," Dr. Beekman said slowly. "I told him all I had to my name was $55, and he agreed to accept three notes from me, payable at the end of the semester."

"I paid promptly," Dr. Beekman assured, "and I even won the Faculty Gold Medal at graduation in 1802."

The gray-haired dentist recalled that Dr. Ford's predecessor had refused to permit him to enroll, because "we've never had a colored boy here before."

"Dr. Ford (who took over when the other dean died) was different," Dr. Beekman added. "When I came for my interview, he just looked at me as I stood in the doorway and said, 'Come in'."

Through Dr. Beeckman's description of the Negro personalities prominent in Brooklyn at the dawn of this 20th century, it became apparent that these people—through their versatility and ability—were early pioneers in breaking down the stereotyped picture of the lazy, shufflefooted black man that had been etched in the minds of other Brooklynites.

Samuel Scottron was one Brooklynite who couldn't fit that stereotype, no matter how much one wished it. Scottron, a successful inventor-manufacturer, just exuded Yankee ingenuity, producing such devices as "Scottron's Adjustable Mirror" for barbers, an extension cornice and an extension curtain rod.

Dr. Beekman pointed to a lampstand in the corner of his living room to illustrate another Scottron invention—imitation onyx, made from glass through a process developed by Scottron in 1894.

At about this time another talented Brooklyn Negro, Lewis H. Latimer, was making his mark as an electrical engineer and draftsman. Latimer, who worked with Alexander Graham Bell and Thomas A. Edison in their early experiments, drew the original sketches of Bell's telephone, and his drawings of the incandescent light still hangs in the Edison Museum in West Orange, N. J.

In the field of medicine and pharmacy, Dr. Peter W. Ray proved to be an outstanding figure. Dr. Ray, both a physician and pharmacist, was one of the founders of the Kings County Pharmaceutical Society and the Brooklyn College of Pharmacy, which is now part of Long Island University.

Dr. Beekman cited another old friend, Jerome B. Peterson, as an example of Brooklyn's enterprising Negroes. Peterson, a scholar and writer, was coeditor and coowner of the New York Age, and later served as United States consul in Venezuela.

Incidentally, his son, Dr. Jerome Sidney Peterson, also a native Brooklynite, was appointed in 1952 to head the Public Health Division of the United Nations World Health Organization.

The 75-year-old dentist recited with alacrity name after name of prominent Negro members of the community of the past generation. He interrupted his list to lament the fate of Rufus L. Perry, an exceptionally brilliant attorney and scholar.

Perry, who had mastered, among other things, a working knowledge of Sanskrit and dozens of other languages, died in near obscurity after meeting countless disappointments in his career.

"He was an outstanding man," Dr. Beekman said ruefully. "He was fit to serve on any bench, but he couldn't get anywhere politically in those days."

With modesty, the distinguished Brooklyn dentist unfolded the story of his own life, which started November 2, 1878, in Charleston. His father, John C. Beekman, a cabinetmaker who originally came from New York, brought his family back to Brooklyn to live in 1896.

The young boy, Walter, worked his way through dental school by peddling coal, wood, and ice in his off-study hours. His perseverance paid off, with dividends.

Through the long years that followed, Dr. Beekman has been honored many times: In 1913 he was the guest of the Brazilian Government at the first Pan American Dental Congress; later, Mayor Jimmy Walker selected him to serve on the Washington Centennial Committee, and, in 1944, he was appointed by Governor Dewey as a member of the State Committee on Discrimination in Employment. The latter group paved the way for the establishment of the existing antidiscrimination laws of the State.

After 52 years as a dentist, Dr. Beekman has established himself as a comfortable man of property. He owns his office building at 746 Fulton Street and other real estate, as well as the trim, tree-shaded house in which he and his wife live.

The Beekmans are the only colored persons living on the Jerome Street block and there are no indications that their neighbors were moving out in panic.

"We've been living on this street for 42 years," Dr. Beekman said with gentle humor. "I don't think anybody is concerned about his property value declining at this late date."

Mr. Speaker, the following is the third article in this series. It appeared in the Brooklyn Eagle of July 27, 1954:

Racial Cooperation Eased Tensions in Bedford-Stuyvesant

(By Sid Frigand)

The depression of the thirties brought Negroes to the Bedford-Stuyvesant section in droves. The huge increase in Negro population was viewed with alarm by neighborhood residents, and the possibility of bloody, ugly race riots increased under the pressure of the hungry, desperate depression days.

"I knew if something wasn't done soon, we'd have trouble on our hands," said William Taylor, a white-haired resident of Bedford-Stuyvesant for the past 6 decades.

Mr. Taylor's positive action in those crucial days probably was one of the deciding factors in easing the severe tension that existed in Bedford-Stuyvesant and bringing about a growing consciousness of community welfare.

In 1937, the Bedford-Stuyvesant Neighborhood Association got its start, with Mr. Taylor as its first president and Myles A. Paige, now a special-sessions justice, as its first vice president. The combined white-Negro leadership, working harmoniously, set a pattern that turned the tide of resentment.

"Our biggest job in the beginning was prejudice," said the tall, lean elder statesman of Bedford-Stuyvesant, "but after a few social functions, the color barrier began to fall."

As the organization passed its first huge hurdle, it came face to face with another problem which challenged the first in proportions.

The association was aware that Bedford-Stuyvesant, an old neighborhood with old-houses, was rapidly becoming a slum area—a condition accelerated by the large influx of Negroes with low incomes.

As Negroes bought houses, most of which were already in sad condition, they were forced by their economic situation to take in roomers, subdivide buildings, or merely to let the houses run into further neglect.

Once again, a challenge was met, this time by the formation of block associations. In 1942, Cecil Paris—now president of the Bedford-Stuyvesant Neighborhood Association—went to Mr. Taylor with five blocks organized. He asked to join the association and work through it to further organize the neighborhood.

Today, 92 blocks in Bedford-Stuyvesant are organized into associations—with charters, officers, and constitutions. The associations meet once a month to discuss problems of the block and to work out cooperative methods of improving conditions.

All through the neighborhood during the past few years, signs have appeared on the gateposts of the old brownstone houses reading: "This is your block, keep it clean."

These little reminders have turned the trick; blocks that were teeming, filthy slums in the late 30's have been transformed into neat, tree-lined residential sections.

"Walk along Jefferson Avenue," Mr. Taylor said, "and you'll see the change that has taken place in the course of a few years.

"People are quick to blame the Negroes," he said, "for the condition of many of these houses. They never think for a moment that these buildings were already deteriorating when the white families left them for better housing—houses with garages, and windows in every room."

"I remember these houses 50 years ago," recalled the mild-mannered Mr. Taylor, "when the owners had their own carriage houses, and the butlers wouldn't let you in the front door unless you put your card in a silver plate."

Making his point about the age of these houses, the Bedford-Stuyvesant leader hammered home his contention that he knows of no other group at the moment that has a keener interest in improving its community than the Negroes.

The work in these directions is not confined to the "oldtimers." A fine example of Bedford-Stuyvesant's young civic workers is Maudester Newton, an attractive, college-trained young woman, who devotes long hours to such groups at the Brooklyn Home for the Aged Colored People and the Stuyvesant Community Center.

Miss Newton is the Brooklyn-born daughter of Hugh Newton, a former superintendent of several buildings on Brooklyn Heights, whose family devotion and careful saving permitted him to provide comfortably for his wife and two daughters before he died.

Mrs. Newton and Maudester live in the neat house at 105 Bainbridge Street which Mr. Newton had purchased when the block was still in a "white neighborhood."

Miss Newton, director of employment and counseling at the Harlem Branch YWCA, is very enthusiastic about her work with the home for the aged, located at St. John's Place and Kingston Avenue.

"We're proud because it's owned and operated by Negroes," she declared. "It isn't a charitable institution set up by others for Negroes."

The Stuyvesant Community Center, which deals mostly with youngsters, had difficult times in the beginning, she said. But, now that it has a new home—located in the Albany Houses—Albert Edwards and his staff have many fewer worries.

"We had some serious problems with youth gangs there," she recalled, "but the gang leaders were won over to our side."

It is almost symbolic that William Taylor, a white man, and Maudester Newton, a Negro, represent the old and new Bedford-Stuyvesant working toward a common goal of community rehabilitation.

"Every day," declared Mr. Taylor, "we find more organizations working toward cementing good feeling among the residents of this section. Even the Carlton YMCA, once a Negro Y, has become intercultural."

The veteran Bedford-Stuyvesant resident was careful to point out that he didn't say "interracial."

"We don't like to use 'interracial'," he said. "As far as we're concerned there's only one race—the human race."

Messages in Opposition to Atomic Energy Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, July 31, 1954

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in pursuance of the permission granted me today, I submit for printing in the Record various telegrams and letters showing the reaction of the people throughout the country to the efforts made by those of us who fought the atomic-energy bill.

There being no objection, the telegrams and letters were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Seattle, Wash., *July 27, 1954.*

Hon. Wayne Morse,
United States Senator From Oregon,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

My Dear Senator Morse: I wish to express my great appreciation of the magnificent battle you are waging in behalf of the American people, in company with your colleagues.

You have earned the gratitude of millions of Americans by this stand, and it cannot help but have good results, whether it be for the present, or for the future. Some of those results are sure to be forthcoming in the defeat of this very shortsighted administration in the coming elections.

The people of Seattle, who have for years, as you are doubtless aware, enjoyed a very low rate for electricity for many years because they have a municipal organization to supply their fuel and lighting needs, etc., instead of a private concern. The private concern, the Puget Sound Power & Light Co., was forced to make a low rate, as all Seattleites can testify, in spite of Stone-Webster's efforts to wreck Seattle City Light. (PSPL, subsidiary of Stone-Webster.)

Tacoma has also, as you are aware, enjoyed a low kilowatt rate, even though their municipal organization had no competition.

The inhabitants of Washington's two cities, Tacoma and Seattle, should rise up and call you and your colleagues blessed.

Again let me thank you and your brave colleagues for your valiant stand for the right.

It would be splendid if you could find it possible to give a series of radio talks preceding the elections. I know it is very expensive and only wish someone who has the means would provide such an opportunity for you.

Most sincerely,
Margaret V. Sherlock.

July 27, 1954.

Senator Morse:

The common people are behind you. I do not like the idea of having a private monopoly take over.

Keep fighting.

William Hourihan.
Willimansett, Mass.

Fargo, N. Dak., *July 27, 1954.*

Hon. Wayne Morse,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: Those of us who have followed your career closely during your years of service in the United States Senate are indeed grateful for your present valiant efforts to bring the facts out concerning the present administration's nefarious plan to dispose of Tennessee Valley Authority and atomic energy.

In spite of the press attempt to tag your debate as a filibuster, it is the belief of many of us that it is necessary to dramatize this issue because the press has heretofore been reluctant to publicize adequately this vital matter. By your actions at this very moment on the floor of the United States Senate, you are earning the gratitude of future generations of Americans. I am confident that you will not allow yourself to be deterred by the unfriendly comments in the newspapers.

So in conclusion, I cannot urge you too strongly to keep it up and keep right on filibustering, if necessary, until Christmas because you are doing a wonderful job of bringing the facts and enlightenment to the American people and the American people shall ever be in your gratitude. Just keep right on filibustering.

Respectfully yours,
Herschel Lashkowitz.

Yakima, Wash., *July 27, 1954.*

Hon. Wayne Morse,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

My Dear Senator Morse: Hold the fort.

This is once when filibustering is excusable.

No more effective fight against communism could be made than the defeat of this atomic-energy bill.

Yours very truly,
Ira D. Cardiff.

July 27, 1954.

Senator Wayne Morse.

Dear Senator Morse: I want to congratulate you on your courageous stand in the United States Senate against this shameful attempt to grab the public-power potential in the United States. And further, your forthright statements on the war aims of the administration are a signal of hope to all of us, who long for a return to peace and sanity.

I wish I could support you actively in your home State; as a Californian, I can only say you represent a great symbol of honesty and decency in our Capital, and I hope, for Jehovah's sake, that you will not stop in your battle to stem the tide of reaction, war, and total destruction of all that this country has come to mean.

Sincerely,
Robert O. Bland.
Los Angeles, Calif.

Topeka, Kans., *July 24, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator: After hearing your answers to the questions on Youth Wants To Know, Saturday, July 24, I feel I need to add my small word of commendation to you for the excellent job you are doing as a people's representative in our democracy. It is my earnest wish that you continue as a prominent figure in our Government as long as possible. I only wish I could cast my vote for you next time you run.

Please continue to stress your program of exporting surplus wheat to India, under any conditions available. It would do more good filling hungry bellies than overflowing from circus tents, where it has been stored around here after elevators have been filled.

Sincerely,
John E. Chappell, Jr.

Norman, Okla., *July 27, 1954.*

Dear Sir: Just a short note to let you know how much I appreciate your efforts to forestall the enactment of a most unwise bill. All thinking people with humanitarian principles are behind you. A few more such people and we wouldn't be in the mess we are presently in.

Thanks again. Hope you can hold out.

Sincerely,
Frank M. Hoadley,
Instructor, English Department, University of Oklahoma.

Oberlin, Ohio, *July 28, 1954.*

My Dear Senator Morse: More power to you and thanks a million times for the great fight that you are putting up for the United States common people and justice for all.

Don't like tax bill giving the General Motors Corp. a benefit of $71 million while mine is 43 cents. I am planning adding 3 cents so that I may benefit my 15 grandchildren by giving each a 3-cent stamp. Bah, again bah with such legislation.

Yours for the fight and justice and equality for all.

Sincerely,
J. A. Strong.

Pittsburgh, Pa., *July 27, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Sir: I am not addicted to writing to public officials, but I feel that I must write to you to tell you how I feel about your actions in the Senate. They have made me proud to be your fellow countryman. I have no favors to ask of you therefore I am not attempting flattery when I say that I sincerely believe that you are one of the outstanding men that has ever served his country in the Senate. My sincere congratulations. I am only sorry that it is not my privilege to vote for you.

Respectfully yours,
Laurence H. Lattman.

Los Angeles, Calif., *July 27, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: Congratulations on your courageous stand against the administration's attempt to negate the great progress of the TVA by presenting private interests with all the public investment in atomic energy at little or no charge.

Men of your conviction will always be remembered by those Americans who have the best interests of our people genuinely at heart. Your courage and personal sacrifice does not go unnoticed.

Respectfully yours,
Aaron Hock.

Providence, R. I., *July 27, 1954.*

Dear Senator Morse: I would like to commend you on your intelligent and courageous stand in regard to the administration's atomic bill. I hope that through your action enough support from other Senators will be enlisted to prevent passage of this bill which harms the majority of our people at the expense of favoring a special interest group.

Good luck and good health,

Sincerely yours,
Sidonie Cassirer
Mrs. Thomas Cassirer.

St. Paul, Minn., *July 27, 1954.*

Hon. Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: Keep up your fight to kill off the administration's atomic-energy bill.

I wish that I could be down in Washington and see you in action.

The present administration has reneged on all of their campaign promises.

They have also done the postal workers dirt too.

Best of regards,
James B. West,
Independent Voter.

San Francisco, Calif., *July 27, 1954.*
Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Sir: You have (and I hope, still are) performing a great service for the American people in dramatizing the undesirable features of the atomic-energy bill. Please continue to do all in your power to kill this "biggest steal" of all.

More power to you.

Sincerely,

Mary and Allen Ross.

Arlington, Va., *July 28, 1954.*
Hon. Wayne Morse,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: I wish to take this opportunity to thank you for the stand you took in the Senate on the give away features of the so-called atomic-energy bill. The morning paper indicates that a few minor concessions were made by the majority party to end the debate.

I was particularly concerned about the physical strain under which you went on the matter in speaking for prolonged periods of time. I was in hearty agreement with your stand and also your stand on the giveaway provisions of the tidelands. The taxpayers have approximately twelve billions invested in the development of atomic energy. The Government did the ground work and took all the risks. Now that it has great potentialities for the benefit of all the people, the powers that we have decreed that it must not be, and the benefits the public will receive will be those that private industry care and wish to give, if any.

I noticed that not one shred of credit was given to the late President Roosevelt who made the decision to proceed with the development of the atom, and the terrible risk that he took in the event that the program had proven to be a dud.

Again congratulating, commending and thanking you for the effort you made on behalf of all the people of the Nation, I am.

Yours very sincerely,

W. G. Swicegood.

July 26, 1954.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: Thank you, thank you for your great physical and noble acts in keeping the hogs away from our country's atomic development for peacetime uses. I'm sure you have said all imaginable during your marathon, but I'd like to add that knowing these greedy men they would be sure to monopolize and curtail its use with the aim of the most for them with the least for the people.

The Eisenhower administration is surely exposed by this dead-attempted giveaway. I think it is fine that you have the courage of your convictions not to be connected with his political party.

Respectfully,

Mathelda Selecir.

San Francisco, Calif., *July 27, 1954.*
Hon. Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: My husband and I greatly admire your courageous stand against the flagrant handout of the Nation's atomic energy developments to private monopolies.

We believe the American people as a whole are with you and the others in this fight and that they are rapidly getting disgusted with the administration's maneuvers, none of which have benefited the working people one iota.

Yours very truly,

Mr. and Mrs. L. Anderson.

Kansas City, Mo., *July 26, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse: Please do not turn over the power features of the atomic energy program to private industry.

Sincerely,

Reverend and Mrs. F. E. Jenkins.

July 27, 1954.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: I want you to know that you have my enthusiastic support for what you are doing in this present Senate debate to safeguard the vital interests of the majority of the American people.

My heartfelt thanks and success to you and your supporting colleagues.

Sincerely,

Genevieve Blue.

San Francisco, Calif.

Senator Wayne Morse:

Keep up good work against atomic giveaway.

James Nice.

Van Nuys, Calif.

San Mateo, Calif., *July 26, 1954.*
Senator Morse, of Oregon,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Sir: Congratulations to you and your friends on your battle over the atomic-energy bill.

Yours sincerely,

G. Rosekilly.

Los Angeles, Calif., *July 27, 1954.*
The Honorable Wayne L. Morse,
United States Senator, State of Oregon,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

My Dear Senator: As an American citizen, I wish to extend to you my appreciation for the wonderful effort you are making to defer passage of the Atomic Energy Act in its present form until the voters have had an opportunity to weigh its merits and demerits.

We all owe you a debt of gratitude we can never pay for your continued fight to conserve and protect the national heritage. Not one person in a hundred thousand has any idea of the changes proposed in the bill you are debating or knows what it's all about. Most of the large city dailies carry very little information about the bill itself; some of the radio commentators have attempted to enlighten the public; but on the whole it has been reported as marathon contest in which certain Senators are engaged.

You may be sure that I have written the two California Senators my views.

Sincerely yours,

George L. Erts.

New York, N. Y., *July 27, 1954.*
Hon. Wayne Morse,
Senate Office, Washington, D. C.

Dear Sir: A brief note to thank you for all you are doing for us. We wish you good health and strength.

May God bless you.

Yours sincerely,

John A. Whyte and
Mary E. Whyte.

July 27, 1954.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: We were in the Senate Gallery this past Friday night when you started your talk. It was quite late so we couldn't stay for the whole of it.

Our sincerest thanks to you and your fellow Senators for the current efforts to prevent atomic power from becoming a private monopoly.

We trust you will enjoy a pleasant and restful recess until the next session of Congress. You've earned it.

Sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. Irving David Gessow.

Palo Alto, Calif., *July 27, 1954.*
Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D. C.

My Dear Senator Morse: Three rousing cheers for you and for the other Senators who are so valiantly striving to retain for the American people the benefits that may accrue to them from the Tennessee Valley project and from their $12 billion investment in the research and development of atomic power. Surely you are making plans for all to see the extent and ruthlessness of the giveaway purposes of the present administration.

Respectfully yours,

Marie G. Eustace.

San Francisco, Calif., *July 27, 1954.*
Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: I wish to express my appreciation for your courageous efforts to obstruct the administration's atomic power steal.

It is indeed heartening to know that there are still men like you in Washington, who dare to defend the public interest against the greed of the privileged few.

Sincerely yours,

John G. Roberts.

San Francisco, Calif., *July 27, 1954.*
Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator: We support your position of trying to defeat administration's atomic energy steal.

Sincerely yours,

J. G. Livingston.

July 26, 1954.

Senator W. Morse.

Dear Mr. Morse: I just cannot go along any further without writing telling you how wonderful that you are for taking a firm stand against that Eisenhower administration atomic steal. Now you know when the Chief of the Government administration will favor an illegal bill to eliminate the amendments in the Constitution to safeguard the people for about 160 years you know that he and his gang is not fit to even be a mail carrier for the Government.

Now, Mr. Morse, will you please instruct your gang that if a bunch of troublemakers can have that much courage to stay up night and day to pass a bill that will depress millions of people and deprive of their freedom, it seems to me that they should have much more courage to fight and save this country from a Hitler fascism.

Now, before I close this note, I want to say to you, and I think you will agree with me, you know that this Government administration is in a critical condition, and it ever has been since the birth of this country. Now, Mr. Morse, I can firmly say that you have millions of people behind you. Will you please let all of your gang read this note and never give into a bunch of troublemakers.

Respectfully yours,

Marshall Norful.

Berkeley, Calif.

Textile Workers Union of America,
New York, N. Y., July 28, 1954.
Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Wayne: That job you did was superb. It really projected the problem of public power right to the fore and showed up the administration for what it really is.

We are proud of your contribution and your personal sacrifices in this big battle with big business.

Sincerly yours,

SOLOMON BARKIN.

JULY 27, 1954.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: The dozen telegrams I yearned to send your way as a testimonial to your thrilling battle for the people of this country in the atomic energy tabling of motions and amendments have already taken the form of one letter of appreciation.

Now the battle is over, but not lost, and I must again tell you how grateful I am, and how thrilling and reassuring it is to know that this country still has men of the caliber of its Founding Fathers.

I also heard your wonderfully informative, marvelous articulate and relaxed broadcast on the Youth Wants To Know program on Sunday. You're great—in the best sense of the word. You gave those young people a vivid, convincing picture of the true aspects of this controversy—and of a United States Senator worthy of this great Nation and its fine people.

Three cheers, hallelujah, and again thank you for having ideals and holding to them.

ALICE GILBERTSON.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.

JULY 26, 1954.

Senator WAYNE MORSE.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: For some time I've been meaning to write you to thank you for the efforts you're expending in behalf of good and reasonable government. This evening, after reading about your work on the atomic-energy bill. I decided to do so.

This is one of the few bills I know very little about.

The Minneapolis Star and Tribune have been strangely silent on the matter. Must be it's even too dirty for them.

Anyway, I hope you don't lose heart. If you were from Minnesota I'd sure pitch in and pound the pavement for you. I imagine there are folks who feel the same way in your own State.

Sincerely,

BILL NEE.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *July 26, 1954.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Me and many of my friends have been watching the progress of the atomic-energy bill.

Your courage and determination to work for the American people is again revealed, and here in the East it does not go unnoticed. We do need a few more like you.

We want to thank you sincerely and send God's blessing to you.

Sincerely yours,

MADELINE E. ARDNER.

What's Ahead for Americans?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 23, 1954

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, in a world of uncertainties highlighted by the H-bomb, the A-bomb, and dire predictions of a C-bomb, Americans, like the rest of the world, have much to disturb us. But, upon the seemingly sound assumption that the world does not intend to commit suicide in the foreseeable future, all of us should be planning ahead for life and the expectation of posterity.

During the past year's time, our population has increased from 159,900,000 to 162,700,000. The last 12 months have set a new record of 4 million births. With all the talk of hard times, some of it stimulated by political soothsayers, consumer spending throughout the Nation has dropped from the record year of 1953 by less than 1 percent. In fact, our country spent more on homes, new housing, and the family automobile than was spent last year. During this same brief period, the movement outward from cities into newer suburbs has affected well over a million people. More than 1 million new homes not located on farms have been erected in cities and suburban areas. Incredible as it may seem, we have 2½ million more automobiles on the highways than we had 1 year ago.

If these are not signs of a vital and expanding economy, we just do not know how to read. The secret of stock-market rises is no secret at all. It is based upon the belief in a continuing market and a continuous growth for the American way of life.

Religion's Contributions to Mental Health

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, July 31, 1954

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, with each passing day, medical science comes to understand more and more the importance of a greater understanding of the spiritual laws which govern this universe.

In turn, spiritual leaders appreciate the need for a better understanding of the dynamics of men's minds.

I was pleased to note in the summer 1954 issue of the Menninger Quarterly, issued by the Menninger Foundation, an article entitled "Religion and Psychiatry Plan Together."

I send it to the desk along with a list of conference participants and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RELIGION AND PSYCHIATRY PLAN TOGETHER

A forthright effort to improve relations between representatives of the fields of religion and psychiatry was undertaken at Topeka in mid-May when 27 psychiatrists and clergymen met together at the Menninger Foundation for 2 days of free discussion.

The Edward F. Gallahue Planning Conference in Religion and Psychiatry, named for a Protestant lay leader who is also a member of the foundation's board of governors, was primarily intended as a preliminary session for the purpose of finding ways in which to proceed toward a better collaboration in the relief of mental suffering.

Working sessions were open only to the invited participants and discussions were candid, earnest, direct, and off the record. However, a single semipublic meeting was held when attitudes and goals were presented more formally. A statement was issued by the participants at the conclusion of the conference.

It declared that in the opinion of these men "there is nothing incompatible between the principles of religion and those of psychiatry, and that a man's relationship to God, no less than his relationships to other men and to the world, is relevant in both psychiatry and in the ministry of religion.

"Psychiatrists attending the conference indicated that their daily work with patients requires understanding of the importance of religious experience and of the teachings of religion. For their part, the clergymen attending indicated that their understanding of people is enhanced by the insights of psychology and psychiatry.

"Certain misrepresentations which have been made about both psychiatry and religion were discussed and deplored. For example, some clergymen have charged all psychiatry with being materialistic and with placing excessive emphasis on sex. Some psychiatrists have considered all religion a manifestation of neurosis. Such distortions have prevented some members of each group from adequately appreciating the work of the other and have served to confuse the public.

"The psychiatrists and clergymen participating agreed that they are at work on many common problems and that their spheres of function are mutually involved in many respects. The sharp separation between facts and value judgments is artificial and prevents the realization that the rich insights gained through both religion and psychiatry are basically complementary. The participants recognized that areas of disagreement remain and will remain until further understanding leads to integration.

"They felt that further collaboration would be profitable and resolved to continue to further the aims of the conference in their professional work.

"The conference endorsed existing efforts to promote the instruction of medical students and psychiatic residents about the principles of religion and the work of clergymen, and the instruction of theological students about the principles of psychiatry and the work of psychiatrists. The members urged the extension of such mutual education both through formal training programs and future conferences at local and national levels. They agreed to report to each other within 2 months their comments and evaluation of the meeting. These comments and additional papers to be submitted during the course of the year will be used in planning a similar conference to be held at the Menninger Foundation next year."

CONFERENCE PARTICIPANTS

Representatives of religion

Visiting: Father John R. Connery, S. J., professor of moral theology, West Baden (Ind.) College; Dr. Perry Epler Gresham, president, Bethany (W. Va.) College; Prof. Seward Hiltner, acting dean, Federated Theological Faculty, University of Chicago; Father Gerald Kelly, S. J., professor of moral theology, St. Mary's (Kans.) College; Dr. Arnold H. Lowe, Westminster Presbyterian Church, Minneapolis; Rabbi Samuel S. Mayerberg, Temple B'nai Jehudah, Kansas City; Dean James A. Pike, New York Cathedral; Father Dunstan Wack, O. S. B., professor of psychology, St. Benedict's College, Atchison, Kans.

From Topeka: Dr. Orlo F. Chaguill, First Presbyterian Church; Dean John W. Day, Grace Cathedral; Dr. Eugene Frank, First Methodist Church; Chaplain Herbert P. Fritze, Winter Veterans' Administration Hospital; Chaplain Charles V. Gerkin, Kansas Industrial School for Boys; the Reverend Donald Jones, Rossville Methodist Church and the Menninger Foundation; Chaplain Thomas Klink, Topeka State Hospital; Chaplain Robert A. Preston, Winter VA Hospital.

Representatives of Psychiatry

Visiting: Sol Ginsburg, M. D., psychoanalyst and psychriatrist, New York City; Frederick Hacker, M. D., psychoanalyst and chief of staff, Hacker Psychiatric Clinic and Hacker Foundation, Los Angeles; Ian Stevenson, M. D., associate professor of psychiatry, Louisiana State University School of Medicine, New Orleans.

From Topeka: Alfred Bay, M. D., superintendent, Topeka State Hospital; Otto Fleischmann, Ph. D., director, department of psychoanalytic training, the Menninger Foundation; Dr. Bernard Foster, M. D., director, department of neurology and neurosurgery, the Menninger Foundation; Bernard H. Hall, M. D., education department, the Menninger Foundation; J. Cotter Hirschberg, M. D., director, department of child psychiatry, the Menninger Foundation; Frank P. Merker, M. D., section chief, Winter VA Hospital; Karl Menninger, M. D., chief of staff, the Menninger Foundation; Gardner Murphy, Ph. D., director, research department, the Menninger Foundation.

Representative of the sponsor

Edward Gallagher, executive vice president, American States Insurance Co., Indianapolis.

Messages in Opposition to Atomic Energy Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, July 31, 1954

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in pursuance of the permission granted me today, I submit for printing in the Record various telegrams and letters showing the reaction of the people throughout the country to the efforts made by those of us who fought the atomic-energy bill.

There being no objection, the telegrams and letters were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Dear Senator Morse: The troubles come thick and fast. I'd like to help in your fight on that dastardly attack to which you and your colleagues are rallying so nobly. Keep it up; go to it; sic 'em. Don't let that dirty deal get through. Remember, I'm throwing everything I've got to you and tell the others, too, and tell 'em Murray won the primary 15 to 1. Guess that's going some. Of course you knew that.

Goodness, won't I be glad when we kick out that gang.

You know who I am I'm sure.

Best wishes, as ever.

Sunday.

I listened just now to Youth Wants to Know, and your answers suited me marvelously.

I'm a little leary of our people investing in other countries. Look at the mess they have made in South America. The people are so poor they can't see the riches of the country draining out of the land. See Inside This and That by Gunther.

Thanks all over again for your gallant fight.

Bronx, N. Y., *July 28, 1954.*

Hon. Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Sir: I want you to know how much I appreciate your present long-drawn-out fight on the Senate floor against the power giveaway bill. This is not the first fight that you have put up for all of the people and I want to thank you for it. After all, you are only responsible to the people of your own State, but somehow you think and know what is good for most of us.

Most sincerely,

J. S. Volkert.

Stamford, Conn., *July 27, 1954.*

The Honorable Wayne Morse,
Congress of the United States,
Washington, D. C.

My Dear Senator: People whose main concern in life is an ever-present fear that where disaster strikes, they will be caught unprepared—materially and practically speaking—are now swaying the Government.

This 42-year-old housewife thinks it an obvious truth: That all that ever counts in a disaster is your own integrity, be you a person or a nation.

I appreciate your stanchness from the bottom of my heart.

Thank you ever so much, dear Senator Morse.

Sincerely yours.

Martha Physio Larsen
Mrs. L. Gunnar Larsen.

Ben Lomond, Calif., *July 28, 1954.*

The Honorable Wayne Morse,
The United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Sir: Please accept my unqualified admiration and encouragement in your fight to inform the American people and safeguard their interest in the battle over the atomic-energy bill. Your heroic efforts are helping to bring the whole momentous issue to light. On this occasion, as in the past, you have earned the gratitude of the Nation, and I believe it is certain that at a future time you will have it.

Respectfully yours,

H. Douglas Wild.

New York, N. Y.

Dear Sir: I take the liberty of writing you in order to express my deep gratitude for representing, as you do, the finest in American politics today. If there were only more men like you in our Government.

Sincerely,

Robert Fabian.

San Diego, Calif.

The Honorable Wayne Morse,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Senator: More power to you, I don't see how you can keep it up as you do. All this giving away. What belongs to the people; will be known as the great betrayal.

Our ship of State as far as the Republicans go is rudderless.

When we get in again we'll certainly inherit worse than a mess. I think it is Strauss who would dictate if the power companies get it. I do not trust him. No individual should have all the things that have been given away. A few Americans like yourself are all we can count on. Bless you.

Sincerely.

Edna M. Gourley.

July 27, 1954.

Mounds, Ill., *July 27, 1954.*

The Honorable Senator Morse,
Washington, D. C.

Our Dear Senator: May the blessings of heaven rest upon and sustain you in your noble, courageous fight for the preservation of the inherent, and I trust inalienable rights of our American people, whose eternal gratitude will forever rightly be yours.

Wishing you the utmost success in your most noble endeavor, I beg to remain,

Sincerely and gratefully yours,

J. Kelly Smith,
Attorney.

Los Angeles, Calif.

Dear Senator: Your heroic struggle for the people these days is an inspiration for everyone.

Men like you are too few, but throughout history they have proven to be more than sufficient to win the battle for human betterment.

May I offer my respects and congratulations to a valiant fighter.

Sincerely,

Leonard R. Brunswick.

Los Angeles, Calif., *July 27, 1954.*

Hon. Wayne Morse,
United States Senator From Oregon,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: As a constituent of California, let me clasp your hand in thanks for the great fight you gave the atomic energy giveaway bill. Thanks to your efforts it may still be defeated.

Very truly yours,

Cerena Longstreth.

Miami, Fla., *July 27, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: For the last few months of the congressional session I have been watching the moves you have made. I have come to consider you the true barometer of the liberal American. Your actions point out that you have always been a true friend of the average citizen. The stand you took upon the controversial atomic energy bill points out that you are not just a Senator politician but a citizen-American. The breech that exists between voters and politicians, that very same breech which is only filled 5 weeks before election day to the election day, seems to have made it easy for some members of both the executive and legislative branches of Government to disguise their actions under the guise of legislation and administration. I was very happy to see that you caught this obvious farce (the giveaway) and tried with the utmost of your efforts to correct said wrong. I would like to know why the fight was so suddenly given up and a vote called.

I am just 16 years old but your actions are so outstanding that I and most other liberal youth recognize your leadership in the Senate but much more all Americans, through your actions, will soon come to realize above all you are an American before you get your paycheck, and you will never have to take orders from any party or machine.

Yours truly and sincerely,

Lester Meltzer.

Miami, Fla.

East Detroit, Mich., *July 27, 1954.*

Dear Senator Morse: May a citizen in Michigan extend a right hand of praise and good luck to a great Senator from Oregon? I shouldn't have waited so long to write you. During the past years I might have done so on any number of occasions where your words and deeds towered head and shoulders above your colleagues.

Good luck, good health, and every best wish in all your work.

Sincerely,

Stewart Moore.

July 27, 1954.

Dear Senator Morse: Just a word of appreciation for what you are doing for all of us, in your opposition to the AEC bill. What a pity there are not more with your courage and fighting spirit.

We hope Oregon returns you to the Senate for many, many more elections.

Very sincerely,

Ethel and Jim Becker.

Pasadena, Calif.

Pasadena, Calif., *July 28, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse: The able and honest men who have fought side by side with you deserve great credit for keeping us common and useful Americans from losing all faith in public men. It was a grand and successful effort against an array of dishonesty, against men who are at every turn selling us down the river.

I am a former Portlander, a registered Republican, who will vote Democratic this fall. I know you will fight against giving away to private billionaire corporations property the people's money has developed in the Northwest.

With restored confidence, I remain,

Respectfully,

Charles C. Myers.

Cleveland, Ohio, *July 28, 1954.*

Hon. Wayne Morse,
United States Senator, United States Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

My Dear Senator: I would like to extend to you my heartiest of congratulations on your recent stand in regard to the atomic energy bill. It was with deepest regret that I received the news of its passage. I am sure that you did all you could.

You will always have my respect and admiration.

Sincerely yours,

John S. Putka, Jr.

July 27, 1954.

Dear Senator Morse: You are the most heartening phenomena our country has seen since F. D. R. More power to you.

Oregon is lucky to have you represent them. I wish, however, that you were a Californian. We could sure use you. But at least we know your represent us, too.

Sincerely yours,

William Piehl.

San Francisco, Calif.

Kansas City, Mo., *July 28, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Friend of the People: Thank God for your courage and those all of you who recently put up the strenuous fight for the general public good.

We are so busy making millionaires now that we haven't time to help stop communism that sweeps over Asia and Europe.

You who are our only backlogs must stick this through.

Rev. Dr. Rosalie Ihrig.
A Democrat.

Philadelphia, Pa., *July 28, 1954.*

Hon. Wayne Morse,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: The issues that prompted the challenge made by you and your supporters or cooperators will have to be taken to the voters in the coming elections.

You all made a gallant stand. The campaign will have to be carefully planned so the widest possible publicity is given the people. The power groups are strong and will put heavy dough into the campaign.

It seems to me, from the vote in the House and Senate, that they heard their master's voice. And "stuffed shirts and gallant knights" will fall in the fray next November. Every candidate for Congress and Senate will have to be put on the spot by the voters and declare himself or herself, also candidates for legislatures, governors, etc.

Sincerely,

Thomas H. Garvin.

Campbellsville, Ky., *July 27, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: I have been hearing on the radio about your filibuster on the atomic energy bill. I hope there will be enough men in the Senate to have the interest of the taxpayer at heart to scuttle that bill.

I believe in private business, but not to the extent that it will cost the taxpayer several millions needlessly to help big business. We did not have electric lights in our home until the REA came into existence, and not until it had been around for several years. It is my belief that if it had been left to the private utilities we would not have electric lines in the country now, or if there were powerlines the charges for wiring and hooking on the lines would be prohibitive for many that would want power.

I hope you can defeat the present bill as I think the facilities the Government now owns should be used for the atomic energy plants at Oak Ridge and Paducah, with additional facilities to take care of the present customers with a reserve to take care of future customers.

I got your letter containing your speech on the wiretap bill. Thanks. I haven't been able to keep up with the news lately. If that bill came to a vote I hope it was defeated. We are on a party line down where I was raised (reared to some people) and I wouldn't want some gumshoe listening to my phone conversations just because some one is on the line that they think needs watching. Even if the police are required to get a permit from a judge on a United States court that does not mean that there won't some day be a judge on the bench that would be too free with the permits.

I am against both the wiretap bill, and the power bill for the atomic energy plants as long as it gives millions to the private power companies over and above what the same power furnished by the TVA would cost.

Very truly yours,

William H. French.

Newburyport, Mass., *July 27, 1954.*

Hon. Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Wayne: I am not a resident of your State, but I am taking the liberty of letting you know that I honestly appreciate the fine stand you are taking on the atom power bill. You are dead right, this bill is a giveaway to the power trust.

I admire your independent stand on all matters. I may be prejudiced, but I know from experience the profit the electric companies are making. They do not generate electricity any more than water companies generate water. Any engineer will tell you they only generate voltage (pressure like a pump). They just put pressure behind it like a water company does water. Thanks for your fine stand.

Respectfully,

Warren O'Neill.

Allston, Mass., *July 26, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator: Keep up your fight against the atomic giveaway program, or rather the fight of all Americans who now look to men like you for leadership and protection of the people's interests. Never stop fighting for what is right, for the people will always stand behind you when they know the facts.

Sincerely yours,

David L. Fox.

Los Angeles, Calif., *July 24, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Senator: The Republicans have made a great discovery: The big steal can be used in the same way they have been using Hitler's big lie.

Yours sincerely,

H. A. Vaughan.

Menlo Park, Calif., *July 24, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: I want to drop this card to let you know that we appreciate what you and the rest of the liberal Senators are doing to stop the giveaway boys.

Hope we can give you more help after November.

More power to you.

Respectfully,

L. D. Sharon.

Farmington, Mich., *July 26, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Sir: We count ourselves very fortunate to have a man like you representing us in the Senate even though we are not your Oregon constituents. We are particularly proud of your firm fight on the incredible atomic energy bill General Eisenhower wants passed. We heard your wonderful Detroit luncheon speech just days before the 1952 election and see now again how right you were. Keep up the good fight. We express the appreciation and gratitude of family and friends who just don't bother to write although they say they feel as we do.

Mr. and Mrs. L. Pearl.

Bethesda, Md., *July 27, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Good luck to you in your efforts to defeat the AEC bill. Carry on.

R. Carl Millican.

Washington, D. C., *July 26, 1954.*

Hon. Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: May I express my appreciation to you for the fight you are waging in connection with the atomic energy bill. I am glad you and the others on your side have stood up to it and pointed out its dangerous effects. God grant that your efforts won't have been in vain.

Gratefully yours,

Agnes Kessler.

San Diego, Calif., *July 26, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

My Dear Senator: I am writing to commend your stand against the unwise bill concerning the use of atomic energy for peaceful purposes, which should be amended with the elimination of objectionable features and debated with great care and thought.

Yours truly,

G. V. Bedinger.

Cincinnati, Ohio, *July 26, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: Mr. Kerney McCain and I are very pleased with your fight to keep the atom power for the people.

Lawrence Kendig.

Bergenfield, N. J., *July 27, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations on the courageous fight you are making for the American people.

Jacqueline Wolf.

Elkins Park, Pa., *July 27, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: Please accept my thanks and best wishes for your valiant fight against atomic energy giveaway bill.

V. Emanuel Robbins.

New York, N. Y., *July 28, 1954.*

Hon. Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Honorable Sir: We are literally swelling with pride at the effort you are making in safeguarding the birthright of the American people. Were I on the Senate floor, I would endeavor to help you; as is, I must content myself by writing. Keep up the good work.

Sincerely yours,

Morris Rubenstein.

Jackson Heights, N. Y.,
July 27, 1954.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: You deserve the heartfelt thanks and gratitude of all of us for taking care of our interests and preventing the giveaway by the administration. It's good to know we have some friends in the Senate.

Respectfully,

Mrs. R. R. Spinrad.

New York, N. Y., *July 27, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Thank you for your wonderful fight in trying to keep the crusaders from giving the whole country away.

R. A. Wilson,

Grand Rapids, Minn., *July 26, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator: Just to let you know we appreciate your efforts to defeat the giveaway atomic-energy bill. Whether you win or not—it looks like not—you have done your best and can feel confident you have served your country like a good soldier.

Sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. Erling Grinde.

Chicago, Ill., *July 26, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Hon. Senator Morse: I admire your fight against President Eisenhower's giveaway atomic-energy bill. Keep up the good work. I am writing to Senator Douglas from this State asking him to give you his support.

Respectfully yours,

Julius Engel.

How Uncle Sam Is Spread Abroad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 19, 1954

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, some interesting information has just come to my attention. It shows just how our largess is being spread around the world with very questionable results. Certainly our efforts to stop communism are ineffective and recent conferences indicate a lack of political sagacity. How long will this situation continue? The interesting information follows:

1. Thirty-four nations receive grant aid military assistance.

2. Forty-seven nations participate in reimbursable military assistance.

3. Twenty-two nations have a United States military mission.

4. Twenty-six nations have a MAAG. The MAAG in Belgium also serves Luxembourg and is not separately included in the 26.

5. United States troops are stationed in 14 countries and possessions exclusive of United States Territories and possessions.

6. Forty-eight nations plus DOT's (dependent overseas territories) receive economic and/or technical assistance. This is for fiscal year 1954.

The Indians' Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 28, 1954

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, today the distinguished majority leader announced that one of the bills to be brought up under suspension of the rules on August 3 was S. 3385 to transfer agricultural extension services for the Indians from the Indian Bureau to the Department of Agriculture. Despite the exemption of Arizona and New Mexico from the bill there are other tribes of Indians who have objected to their inclusion who have not been exempted. Among these are Montana Indians who strongly object to S. 3385.

Toward the close of last session Congress passed H. R. 1063 which was signed by the President and became Public Law 280. When President Eisenhower signed it he issued a statement in which he expressed reluctance in approving the legislation. He said:

> My objection to the bill arises because of the inclusion in it of sections 6 and 7. The sections permit other States to impose on Indian tribes within their borders, the criminal and civil jurisdiction of the State, removing the Indians from Federal jurisdiction, and in some instances, effective self-government. The failure to include in these provisions a requirement of full consultation in order to ascertain the wishes and desires of the Indians and of final Federal approval, was unfortunate. I recommend, therefore, that at the earliest possible time in the next session of the Congress, the act be amended to require such consultation with the tribes prior to the enactment of legislation subjecting them to State jurisdiction, as well as approval by the Federal Government before such legislation becomes effective.

Even though bills were promptly introduced at the beginning of the second session by the gentleman from South Dakota and others no action has been taken to carry out this recommendation of the President.

Insofar as the withdrawal of the Indian Bureau from extension service activities is concerned many States including Montana have entered into contracts with the Department of Interior that are working well and have the approval of the Indian tribes directly affected.

But other Indian tribes would prefer to go along with their accustomed procedures. Surely the Indians should be the best judges of the kind of technical assistance they need. This bill will abruptly force the Indians to adopt a course that in some instances is not desirable or beneficial.

Before enactment of such legislation it should be amended to provide for the consent of the Indians to such a transfer before it becomes effective. But under suspension there is no opportunity to submit such an amendment.

In this effort to give full political rights to the Indians and remove them from the supervision of the Indian Bureau a great deal of harm can be done by forcing them to do things that they oppose and participate in unfamiliar programs in which they have had no experience.

I call attention to a recent editorial in the Boston Daily Globe for July 27, 1954, which discusses Indian rights and suggests that the approach of Public Law 280 in forcing legislation upon Indians against their will is unfair. All Americans will agree with the editor that "justice, principle, and common honesty" support the "right of consent."

The editorial follows:

THE INDIANS' RIGHTS

> An embarrasing question has been raised for Washington by the Indian tribes of the American Southwest. With eyes fixed on Congress, they want to know why the United States Government, insistent in its foreign policy dealings with troublesome regimes abroad upon the principle of consent of the governed, and the sanctity of treaties, doesn't practice what it preaches, here at home?
>
> The query at this particular moment seems disconcerting and inopportune to Members of our National Legislature, whose only present anxiety is to get through their lawmaking jobs and back to Main Street and campaigning. It is, nevertheless, important. For involved in it are the destinies of some 400,000 original Americans, who have enjoyed full rights in citizenship since 1924.
>
> Destinies is used advisedly. The term encompases, for instance, such issues as the survival of their tribal culture; their ownership, individually or collectively, of some 56 millions acres of land in no fewer than 26 States; rights granted them in perpetuity by some 3,000 tribal treaties and laws during the past century or more; and a number of other safeguards designed, down the years, to protect them from exploitation by unscrupulous white men.
>
> The Indian policy of our Government, which the 83d Congress seems bent upon eliminating as speedily as possible, is, despite all its weaknesses and not infrequent mismanagement in the past, almost unique in history. It represents one of the few instances where a conquering people have sought to give some recognition to continuing social, political, economic and property rights of the vanquished.
>
> What the Navaho Tribal Council, together with the All Pueblo Council and other tribal organizations, now protest is the apparent determination of Congress to shrug off the whole matter, without allowing the tribes, supposedly guaranteed by treaties and other laws, any say in the affair. The protests from the Indians of the Southwest are reiterated

by other Indian groups across the continent.

Congress affirms that the Indians must now be assimilated like all other American citizens. To further that aim, it enacted last year Public Law 280, divesting the Indians of Federal protection and supervision in 5 States, and providing that any other State could, if it chose, assume the same criminal and civil jurisdiction over Indian property granted the 5 mentioned.

The avowed aim of this law (now being further tinkered by Congress) is to take the Federal Government out of the Indian question and give responsibility to the States. The result, as the Indians see it, will be to transform the only indigenous culture in America into a sort of racial slum.

The current theory of assimilation is not new. For 40 years prior to 1928, it operated full force, with results close to being a national disgrace. During the Presidency of Herbert Hoover, steps were taken to clean up the mess; and in 1934 a new, reorganized Indian policy ended the scandal.

That policy continued until 1945. It sought to preserve the heritage of the Indians—in property, in rights, in culture, in law, and in custom; and to improve their lot through education, training in skills adapted to tribal habits, and a program raising living standards.

It is significant that with postwar pressures of an expanding economy, congressional desire to unload Federal responsibilities for protection and supervision of the Indians has grown.

The Indians themselves almost unanimously plead for a right of consent. Justice, principle, and common honesty support them.

UNCLE DUDLEY.

Georgia Reports on Loyalty Day, 1954

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. DAVIS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 28, 1954

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Department of Georgia, have been active in procuring the annual observance of the first day of May as Loyalty Day.

I have noted with interest and appreciation the energetic efforts of VFW Georgia State Loyalty Day Chairman Charles A. Moran to make Loyalty Day a memorable event. He and his associates have worked unceasingly to make the occasion a great success, and their results have been most gratifying.

Chairman Moran made a report on Loyalty Day to the department encampment in Augusta, Ga., on June 17, 1954, which indicates the work done upon this program and its successful results.

Under leave previously granted, I attach herewith as a part of these remarks Chairman Moran's report on Loyalty Day to the department encampment:

Comrade Commander Wood, comrades, and friends of the VFW, it is with a feeling of profound gratification and pride that I appear before you today—gratified, because I am reporting a very appreciable progress in the activities of the Loyalty Day committee since our encampment last year—and proud, because I am associated with such a unique group as you.

Loyalty Day, observed annually on the 1st of May, was set up by national several years ago to counteract the demonstrations of the Commies on that day—also, to help minimize the influence of their Red, subtle propaganda. On that day all our people have an opportunity to participate in some public way, reaffirming their loyalty to God, to our country, and to our flag—a rededication to those principles on which our country was founded.

First of all, thanks to the splendid cooperation of Governor Talmadge, Representatives Jimmy Floyd and Braswell Deen, Jr., and Department Publicity Officer Julian Brisendine—all loyal Veterans of Foreign Wars members—our general assembly at its last session adopted H. R. 314, which officially designates May 1 of every year as Loyalty Day in Georgia. As a result, many of our fellow Georgians, veterans and nonveterans, have learned more about this important day in our lives, and have entered into the spirit of it wholeheartedly. And at the proper time, Governor Talmadge issued another inspiring Loyalty Day proclamation.

We urged all the posts to sponsor some kind of Loyalty Day observance. They were sent a directive containing suggestions, aids, and suggested items for the newspapers and radio. Reports indicate an increasing enthusiasm. Celebrations or observances were held in Gainesville, Albany, Atlanta, and Moultrie. Parades were held in Conyers, Griffin, and Augusta. The climax came in the evening of May 1 in Atlanta where some 40,000 people were assembled to witness the Scoutorama of 13,000 Boy Scouts from a dozen adjacent counties, accompanied by their scoutmasters. It was a spectacle that words cannot describe. The program began with the statement from the announcer: "We shall all stand and together recite the pledge to the flag as our observance of Loyalty Day." We thank them, and we thank those posts and the personnel of their committees for a job well done; also, we thank the sisters of our auxiliary. Keep up the good work—and do it still better.

Various TV and radio stations throughout the State gave us time and announcements, outstanding among these being our good friend, Veteran Bob Siegrist, of WGST, Atlanta. Also the press—especially where observances were held—gave the story of Loyalty Day in their columns by inspiring stories and editorials and pictures, notably the Atlanta Journal, the Statesman and the Georgia VFW News. Our national director, Admiral Lovette, asked me to convey his thanks to all the personnel of the Georgia VFW News for an excellent story and I wish to add mine also.

Time will not permit listing here the names of all who helped to spread the message of Loyalty Day. We are indeed indebted to all of them—members and nonmembers. We want them to know of our appreciation and gratitude. Especially to those comrades on this splendid team who helped us to attain our objective, do I extend my personal thanks.

Attached are two items on Loyalty Day that appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I will not attempt to read them here, but I request that they be made a part of this report. The author is our good friend, Judge JAMES C. DAVIS, Congressman from the Fifth District of Georgia. We publicly thank him for his usual cooperation in helping to take the message of Loyalty Day to every corner of our country.

I believe, comrades, that we Georgians may feel gratified that the results of the efforts of our committee did not end with the boundaries of our State. All during the year numerous and various organizations—fraternal, civic, patriotic, professional, and so forth—holding their National and State conventions in Georgia were contacted and urged to take the story and objective of Loyalty Day back to their respective communities. It so happened that one national president from a very populous Midwestern State requested additional information to take back with him, for, as he said: "We do not have such a committee in my State." His enthusiasm and interest were gratifying. Ambassador Lodge and Senator BRICKER, who spoke before national conventions in Atlanta, were also contacted.

In closing, may it be stated that our President has signed a bill to include the words "under God" in the pledge to the flag. Such action was recommended by this committee, and adopted by resolution, at our department encampment in Atlanta in 1953. The VFW did not receive any recognition or publicity about this beyond the reference to it by Judge DAVIS in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Comrade Commander and comrades, it has been an honor and a pleasure for me to serve in this capacity. I greatly appreciate the confidence that was placed in me and trust that you have not regretted your action. As I have said before, comrades, I love you all and that affection and pride will increase in proportion to your work for our VFW. It is my hope, with God willing, that I can continue to serve our order and the less fortunate for many years to come. May God bless us all and may He prosper our organization here in Georgia and everywhere.

Messages in Opposition to Atomic Energy Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, July 31, 1954

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in pursuance of the permission granted me today, I submit for printing in the RECORD various telegrams and letters showing the reaction of the people throughout the country to the efforts made by those of us who fought the atomic-energy bill.

There being no objection, the telegrams and letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHICAGO, ILL., *July 26, 1954.*

Senator MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Your wonderful efforts in behalf of the preservation of our natural resources, such as atomic power, waterpower, etc., is deserving of the sincere thanks of all of us Americans.

J. E. JACOBSON.

BOONTON, N. J., *July 27, 1954.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: We are hoping you will win in the battle you and your courageous colleagues are waging to save the people's property for the people.

Sincerely,

MRS. E. SCHOLZ.

ELKINS PARK, PA., *July 27, 1954.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Keep up the filibuster against the dangerous atomic-energy bill. Congratulations. We are with you.

Sincerely yours,

EDWIN STEEBLE.
OWEN F. STEEBLE.

Seattle, Wash., *July 25,-1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: I appreciate very much your study on civil liberties, a pamphlet recently received. Also congratulations on your position on atomic energy. Too bad someone has not produced a hybrid carnation that will not wilt.

Sincerely,

W. L. Atkinson.

New York, N. Y., *July 27, 1954.*

Hon. Wayne Morse,
Senator from Oregon,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

My Dear Senator Morse: I am sure all citizens are indebted to you for bringing out into the open and clarifying the point on the atomic energy bill. Thank you.

Sincerely yours,

Anthony F. Runté.

Orlando, Fla., *July 26, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

Greetings and congratulations for your wonderful work to block off the atomic energy bill in the Senate. More power to you.

Yours,

W. P. Webb.

Portland, Oreg., *July 26, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Dear Senator Morse: Just a note to tell you that all the people, especially those of us from the Northwest, are with you in the fight for public power.

Yours,

David Novogrodsky.

Los Angeles, Calif, *July 24, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: Congratulations on your magnificent stand against the atomic energy steal.

Yours truly,

Mr. and Mrs. Norman Jensen.

Los Angeles, Calif., *July 26, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: I shall write a decent letter but can't wait to thank you, Sanator Gore, and others (too few) for the terrific battle for the little taxpayers. I've always said they take more money from the little exploited stenographers than from the rich, and the steal includes not only atomic power but world peace and a cultured civilization as well. The damage is almost incalculable.

Erma Dutton.

North Hollywood, Calif., *July 27, 1954.*

The Honorable Senator Morse,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Sir: I consider you one of our honest Senators.

Ben Green.

Los Angeles, Calif., *July 27, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.

Sir: Congratulations on your stand and fight for retaining rights to atomic energy development for us taxpayers.

M. S. Cruther.

Louann, Ark., *July 24, 1954.*

Senator W. Morse,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator: Congratulations for your untiring labors for the right.

We would be glad to make you our President.

We also appreciate your coworkers there for what any blind man can see is right. We know who they are as well as those who want to give away our hard-earned, costly property to a favored monopoly.

We here want to keep our yardstick.

Sincerely, your friend

A. P. Purifoy.

Berkeley, Calif., *July 27, 1954.*

Senator Morse,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

My Dear Senator Morse: Thank you for having brought to our attention the issues involved in the atomic energy bill, and particularly for having done something about it. Your courage and perseverance in the matter of presenting amendments designed to remove the objectionable features of the bill deserve the admiration and gratitude of all those of a similar persuasion in this regard.

Respectfully yours,

Robert E. Ellis.

San Francisco, Calif.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Thanks for your fight against atomic energy bill. Wishing you success and good health.

James T. Long.

Brooklyn, N. Y., *July 26, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Dear Senator: God bless you. May the Almighty give you all the necessary energy to keep up your fight for the people of the United States of America.

One of your admirers.

Dr. Max Belgrade.

Long Island City, N. Y., *July 27, 1954.*

Senator Morse, *of Oregon,*
House of Congress,
Washington, D. C.

Honorable Sir: Please keep up your dissent on the Republican giveaway of the resources to private ownership. You are one very small who represents all the people.

Good luck.

Mrs. M. Hotaling.

Dayton, Ohio, *July 27, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Dear Sir: Congratulations to you on your courageous stand in the Senate. We wish you well in your continued efforts.

Sincerely yours,

Mr. and Mrs. Maurice Gilbert.

Hillside, N. J., *July 27, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Dear Senator Morse: I heartily support you in your fight to prevent the administration giveaway of the Nation's atomic energy resources. Your principled position gives the common people hope and strengthends our belief in independent political action.

Milton Zisuian.

Chicago, Ill., *July 26, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator: Congratulations for your magnificient fight for all the people of the United States on the attempted sacrifice of TVA and atomic energy to private power interests.

S. Pfeifer.

Knoxville, Tenn., *July 22, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator: I wish to express my appreciation to you for your constant fight on behalf of the public's interest. Especially the TVA and atomic energy bill, in which you and others are at this time endangering your health in the interest of decent Government. We, in this area now realize the President has determined to destroy TVA.

I feel the people of Oregon have an able and honest Representative, and one I would like to have as President.

Very truly,

Mrs. Mabel Rogers.

Boston, Mass., *July 23, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: I heard you over the radio last night on Frank Edwards' program, and on other occasions. I hasten to congratulate you and Senator Gore, and, through you, the other Senators who have and are so valiantly fighting the administration's atomic energy bill. It is a wonderful fight you are making and all real Democrats of either or any party, or Independents, greatly appreciate and will thank you for making. You and the other Senators opposing this AEC bill deserve great credit which I am certain you will receive. I know from the radio, press reports and liberals magazines, that you are absolutely sincere and that what you say or do is not done in order to receive applause or credit, but because you feel that it is your duty.

It is nearly 2 years since I wrote to you and received a friendly letter from you inviting me to talk over the political situation when I return to Portland. This I shall be glad to do as I too am an Independent and a liberal. I'm not registered with any party (since 1920), nor have I been, since 1920, except 2 years when I supported my friend the ex-Governor, Robert F. Bradford, a few years back. He won the first time, but lost to Paul Dever the second time.

This country needs a man like you, or, rather, needs you, as President, and I sincerely trust that you will be a candidate for that office in 1956.

I expect to return to Oregon next winter to resume the practice of law, probably in Portland, and trust that I may then have the pleasure of talking to you.

Greetings and best wishes from

Sincerely and respectfully yours,

Gustaf Blaine Nissen.

Philadelphia, Pa., *July 23, 1954.*

Hon. Senator Morse: I am heartily in support of your courageous battle to protect the interest of the Federal taxpayers against the attempt to saddle the special privilege-seeking groups on the overburdened load we are now bearing.

Morse for President, sez we.

Cleus R. Jonson.

Brownsville, Tex., *July 27, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D. C.:

Salute your inspiring courage.

Dennis and Betty Williams.

Fresno, Calif., *July 27, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate, Washington, D. C.:

You are stopping the big giveaway. Keep talking atoms for us, not General Motors.

Earl and Eloise Sullivan.

Cudahy, Wis., *July 28, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Keep up the fight against the atomic giveaway. Local union unanimously adopted motion to back your fight.

Peter Zagrodnick,
Local, No. 40, United Packing House Workers of America.

Sausalito, Calif., *July 28, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations on your courageous stand on atomic energy bill. Keep it up.

Gertrude Saxton.

Los Angeles, Calif., *July 28, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations. Keep up your fight to save atomic resources for the people.

Downtown Club, Independent Progressive Party,
Nan Blair, *Secretary.*

Cleveland, Ohio, *July 28, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Magnificent fight. More power to you and for us ringsiders.

Pearl Nelson.
Milla Pay.
Marion Friedman.
Elsie Bucke.

Detroit, Mich., *July 28, 1954.*

Senator Wayne L. Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Accept our sincere thanks for your effort in trying to save this Nation from an all-out plunder. Convey our thanks to other Senators.

Edmund Zaremba.
A. John Zaremba.
Frank Zaremba.
John Partyka.
Joseph Zaremba.
Leo Zabemba.

San Francisco, Calif., *July 27, 1954.*

Senator Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Support your position on the Atomic issue.

Lillie Vishnevsky.

Los Angeles, Calif., *July 27, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
United States Senate Building, Chamber,
Washington, D. C.:

Keep up the fight. We are pulling strong for you.

Mr. and Mrs. M. C. Frishberg.

Lombard, Ill., *July 27, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

My husband and I commend you for your untiring efforts to defeat objectionable features in the Atomic Energy Act.

Mrs. Henry D. Tefft.

Jamaica, N. Y., *July 27, 1954.*

Wayne Morse,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

As an American I thank you and your associates for the fight you are waging.

James Hope.

Branchville, N. J., *July 27, 1954.*

Hon. Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We support your staff on the atomic-energy bill. Keep up the good work.

Paul and Louise Meier, *Baltimore, Md.*
Frank, Clara, and August Meier, *Newark, N. J.*

Beverly Hills, Calif., *July 27, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

In behalf of your many friends in this community, I wish to extend to you our sincere admiration and appreciation for your efforts in the Senate.

Thank God for so outstanding an American as Wayne Morse.

With personal regards.

Joseph B. Shane.

Newcastle, Pa., *July 27, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations on your stand on AEC bill. Keep up the good work.

Stephan Dmetruk, Jr.,
Legislature Committee, Chairman,
Local 2728, Bessemer, Pa.

Jersey City, N. J., *July 27, 1954.*

Senator Wayne L. Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Keep up the good fight. Millions of Americans are with you in your fight against predatory interests who wish to sell our country short. Good luck. May God be with you.

Sincerely,
Mr. and Mrs. Edward J. O'Keefe.

Rockford, Ill., *July 27, 1954.*

Senator Wayne E. Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Morse: We are violently against private interests getting atomic developments. All power to you in your fight. It's too bad there are so few like you who are for all the people. This administration is for no one but big business. We are hoping to get rid of a lot of them in November.

Sincerely,
Winnebago Democratic Veterans League,
Gilbert Dale, *Secretary.*

Altus, Okla., *July 27, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Behind you 100 percent in fight on atomic energy bill. Keep up the good work.

Glee and Hugh Garnett.

Redlands, Calif., *July 27, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Thank you for trying to protect our rights. Keep up the good work.

Mrs. N. Von Kaesborg.

Norman, Okla., *July 27, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Capitol Building,
Washington, D. C.

Sir: The people respect your eternal vigilance. Continue your inspired fight for liberty and America.

Hillel Chodos.

Minneapolis, Minn., *July 27, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
United States Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations on magnificent stand against atom giveaway. Keep up the fight.

Mr. and Mrs. Leonid Hurwicz.

New York, *N. Y., July 27, 1594.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Good for you. I hope there are many who join me in praying that you and the other Senators supporting you are sucessful in your effort to guard for all Americans the wealth and benefit of atomic power.

Mimi Schorr.

Brooklyn, N. Y., *July 27, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Pour it on. Keep it up. For you 100 percent.

Bernard Atkins.

Cincinnati, Ohio., *July 27, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
United States Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Thanks for role you and colleagues are playing in educating public by exposing contents of atomic bill that otherwise would have gone unchallenged until too late. Keep up good fight.

Donald Jones.

Ventura, Calif., *July 27, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

I support your position regarding atomic energy steal.

Mrs. E. F. Kays.
Ojai, Calif.

Salt Lake City, Utah., *July 28, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Resolution Atomic Energy Commission:

Whereas the Government of the United States of America has expended some $12 billions of the people's money to develop atomic energy of a defense measure; and

Whereas this atomic program of the Government has now been developed to the point where these great energies may now be applied to peacetime pursuits; and

Whereas there are now certain powerful and privileged interests who with the support of the present administration of our Government are attempting to enact legislation that will turn over to these special interests this great source of energy to be used for their private gain; and

Whereas we the people who are taxed to develop this source of energy believe that it should be retained by our Government in a manner so that it may be used to benefit all the people: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the 11 Western States Conference of Machinists assembled in Salt Lake City endorse and support a program which will retain the benefits of the Government develop atomic energy for all the people. Please advise your colleagues of this action.

Eleven Western States Conference of Machinists,
H. B. Egbert, *Executive Secretary.*

New York, N. Y., *July 28, 1954.*

Hon. Wayne Morse,
United States Senate:

We have watched with interest your great fight to bring to the people the dangers inherent in the giveaway atomic-energy legislation. Your efforts have unquestionably brought worthwhile concessions. You reflect much credit on the word "independent."

Amalgamated Lithographers of America,
John Blackburn,
International President.
Donald Stone,
Secretary-Treasurer.

The Eisenhower Administration and the Negro

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. T. MILLET HAND

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 30, 1954

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, in the 18 months that the Eisenhower administration and the Republican Congress has been in office, more real advance has been made toward the permanent solution of America's race problem than in all the preceding years of lip service.

For a long time past we have been regaled with a great deal of favorable talk about what was going to be done for the benefit of American Negroes, but a great deal of it was talk. Now, under the first Republican President in two decades we can point to very substantial accomplishments. By far the most important step forward was the opinion of the Supreme Court of the United States on May 17, 1954, striking down segregation in our public schools, and reversing the former doctrine of the Court with respect to "equal but separate facilities."

Chief Justice Warren, formerly the great Republican Governor of California, and President Eisenhower's only appointment so far to the Supreme Court, wrote the opinion and had much to do with bringing the Court into agreement unanimously.

The Court took a broad social view of this problem and quoted with approval the following significant language:

> Segregation of white and colored children in public schools has a detrimental effect upon the colored children. The impact is greater when it has the sanction of the law; for the policy of separating the races is usually interpreted as denoting the inferiority of the Negro group. A sense of inferiority affects the motivation of a child to learn. Segregation with the sanction of law, therefore, has a tendency to retard the educational and mental development of Negro children and to deprive them of some of the benefits they would receive in a racially integrated school system.

It is impossible to exaggerate the great importance of this opinion by a Republican Chief Justice in a Republican administration.

Mr. Speaker, the Chicago Defender, one of the leading Negro newspapers in the United States, has referred to the great strides made in behalf of the Negro, and concludes that they spring mainly from the President's "deep-seated moral and spiritual convictions." Republican National Chairman Leonard W. Hall explains all of this very simply by saying that the President's whole philosophy and his whole aim in Government is to achieve, in the President's language, that which "is good for all Americans everywhere."

So we have seen, largely by executive action, the beginnings of abolishing segregation in the Nation's Capital, long a fortress of race prejudice, and what amounts practically to the abolition of segregation practices in the armed services, in the South as well as in the North.

Among other concrete accomplishments have been the following:

SPECIFIC ILLUSTRATIONS

Thompson Restaurant case abolishing segregation in eating establishments in the District of Columbia. Attorney General Herbert Brownell filed a brief as friend of the court requesting the Supreme Court to declare the existing antisegregation laws valid. This is in line with President Eisenhower's declaration that every vestige of segregation must be eliminated in the Nation's Capital.

Major veterans hospitals in the South are no longer segregated. Integration is the rule instead of the exception. The Veterans' Administrator has said publicly that "segregation is undemocratic, uneconomical, and undesirable. It should be eliminated in all veteran establishments." This statement has been put into operation.

May 18, the recreation department in the District of Columbia abolished all segregated playgrounds.

Segregation at Army post schools abolished by Executive directive.

POSITION OF CONGRESSMAN POWELL

Referring again to the former problem of segregation in the Armed Forces, Congressman ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, a Negro Democrat from New York, and a champion of his race, spoke in Congress on April 29, 1954, and among other things said this:

> For the 10 years that I have been a Member of this House of Representatives, I have consistently voted against appropriations for the armed services because of the policy of segregation carried forward by our Armed Forces. I am extremely pleased, therefore, to stand here today and to announce with a clear conscience that I can vote for appropriations for the Defense Department of our Nation. In stating this I know I am stating the feelings of not only the 15 million peoples of my race, the Negro race, but also the scores of millions of right-thinking Americans who know that you cannot have a first-class army of democracy as long as any portion of it is composed of second-class citizens. Today, there is not a single segregated arm of our Defense Department. The last segregated unit in the Army was abolished within the past few days.

Surely this is significant praise of the Eisenhower administration, coming as it does from a leader of Negroes and a Democratic Congressman.

APPOINTMENTS OF NEGROES

Such general actions have been followed by specific recognition of the qualifications of Negroes and their right to serve their Government in highly respected capacities. Among hundreds of such appointments, who has ever heard before of appointments like the following examples, all made by President Eisenhower and confirmed by a Republican Senate: Archibald J. Carey, Jr., Illinois, first alternate delegate to United Nations; Vernon F. Greene, Maryland, legal counsel, Post Office Department; Roberta Church, Tennessee minority groups consultant, Labor Department; Jesse D. Locker, Ohio, Ambassador to Liberia; Scovel Richardson, Missouri, member, Federal Parole Board; E. Frederic Morrow, New Jersey, adviser on business affairs, Commerce Department; Carmel Carrington Marr, New York, area adviser on staff of Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., United States Mission to U. N.; Jessie Vann, Pennsylvania, member, International Development Advisory Board; Lois Lippman, Massachusetts, secretary in the White House; J. Ernest Wilkins, Illinois, Assistant Secretary, Department of Labor; Ulysses G. Plummer, Jr., Oregon, attorney for Bonneville Power Administration, Oregon.

CONTRAST THE DEMOCRATIC RECORD

By contrast, what has been the general record of preceding Democratic Congresses during the 20 years from 1932 to 1952?

Here are the facts about what actually happened while Democrats were talking civil rights but doing nothing:

Out of 19 Senate votes, a majority of Democrats balloted against civil rights issues 17 times. In 2 instances, not 1 Democrat joined Republican majorities. In 18 of these 19 civil-rights tests, a majority of Republicans voted favorably; 3 times they lined up 100 percent.

In the House during this same 20-year period, Republicans voted between 68 to 100 percent for civil rights measures on 14 occasions. House Democrats failed on 7 of these test ballots to produce even 50 percent.

Just one specific example of Republican action versus Democrat failure when civil rights showdowns came:

The only FEPC bill ever passed in House history—February 23, 1950—was backed 124 to 42 by Republicans. Democrats voted against it, 134 to 116.

Mr. Speaker, the Republican administration can be proud of this record, and 15 million Negroes can point with pride to their vast strides forward under a Republican government which has demonstrated its friendship to them by action rather than by words.

Not So Definite and Irrevocable

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 28, 1954

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted by the House, I wish to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following editorial which was published in the Daily Times, Mamaroneck, N. Y., titled "Not So Definite and Irrevocable."

NOT SO DEFINITE AND IRREVOCABLE

A week ago Albany news correspondents broke out in a rash of competitive and contradictory predictions as to the political intentions of Gov. Thomas E. Dewey.

One account had him succeeding Secretary of State Dulles. Another had him heading a new department to be set up in President Eisenhower's Cabinet. And a third had him announcing a definite and irrevocable decision to retire from all public office.

It is quite possible, of course, in fact quite natural, that Mr. Dewey may wish to retire from public service. After all, he has had 25 years in public harness, with 12 of them in the terribly tiring job as head of the largest State of the Union.

But we do not believe that Governor Dewey has taken any definite and irrvocable attitude. And in substantiation of that belief we offer his own words of Monday:

"Last year I indicated that I expected to announce my plans by the end of spring. I have expressed by own views to the State chairman and a number of others.

"Because of their strong feeling that further consideration should be given to views they have expressed, I am deferring any statement at this time."

It may be wishful thinking on our part, but we see in those words a good chance that the Governor may, for the sake of his party and his State and his Nation, be induced to run for a fourth term.

Certainly there is in his statement no warrant for the belief at this time that his intention to retire is definite and irrevocable.

Messages in Opposition to Atomic Energy Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, July 31, 1954

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in pursuance of the permission granted me today, I submit for printing in the Record various telegrams and letters showing the reaction of the people throughout the country to the efforts made by those of us who fought the atomic-energy bill.

There being no objection, the telegrams and letters were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Senator Wayne Morse.

Dear Sir: Saw you on "Youth Wants To Know" Saturday July 24, 1954. Congratulations on having the courage of your convictions. We admire you sir and want you in the White House. We may even move to Oregon so we will be able to vote for you. Men of your caliber are far to scarce in our land. More power to you and long may you live and serve.

Mr. and Mrs. Edward G. Flett.
Wollaston, Mass.

Dear Senator Morse: Please keep going. More and more people are becoming aware of the extremely important issues involved in this fight.

Robert K. Arnold.
Palo Alto, Calif.

Long Beach, Calif., *July 24, 1954.*

Dear Senator: How thankful we are that there are folks like you and those that have stood beside to prevent the current big atomic steal.

By comparison the FHA scandals, scandalous though they may be are "peanuts" by comparison.

Have agreed with you in all of your positions taken.

Sincerely,
Marvin R. Schafer.

July 26, 1954.

Dear Senator Morse: I am behind you 100 percent in your fight against turning over atomic energy to private interests.

Keep up the good fight.

T. R. S.

Frederick, Md., *July 25, 1954.*

Dear Senator Morse: I strongly approve the fight you are making to defeat the administration's proposal to amend the atomic-energy law.

Yours very truly,
Wayne C. Neely.

Iowa City, Iowa,

Dear Senator: You are doing the work that Senator Norris did on the TVA in the twenties. Perhaps it is clear now where the Republican program is going. It is clear to me. If you feel you must speak till Christmas, I will wait for the Eisenhower program—what ever that is.

Respectfully, Malcolm Sillars.

Los Angeles, Calif., *July 27, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

I urge you as Senator of our neighboring State of Oregon to carry on the fight to save the atomic energy program for the American people. From the 15,000 members of Retail Clerks Union, Los Angeles, congratulations to the little band of Senators who have what it takes.

Regards to Estes. Frank Edwards doing fine job on radio.

Joseph De Silva,
Secretary, Retail Clerks, 770 Los Angeles.

Indianapolis, Ind., *July 28, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: You are a busy man so I will not take too much of your time.

Thanks for the good work in behalf of the average citizen of this country for all of your untiring efforts to slow up the type of legislation being passed in behalf of the small minority who only have pieces of silver and gold to add to when the legislation they want is passed by those who profit with them. They fool no one. I am sure that you have realized this more than any one. The average man has long been patient, but the volcano will explode one of these days.

Special privileges should be done away with and all legislation should be passed for the general welfare of the whole country.

Will you please read this plea to your fellows in Congress.

We, the people, want legislation passed for the benefit of all and not the few.

This includes tax legislation, farm legislation, business legislation, foreign thinking and acting legislation.

We, the people, do not want have these rights under the Republican Party and this fall will see the change again back to those who will recognize what belongs to the people by right.

Please warn the Members of Congress that they do not fool the people at all.

Thanks again for your great work in our behalf.

Yours sincerely,
C. Ross Smith.

July 27, 1954.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Sir: I wish to express my appreciation and admiration for your stand and fight in the current atomic energy legislation.

Your very truly,
Wayne Reno.
Wichita, Kans.

July 28, 1954.

My Dear Senator Morse: May we add our voices to the many we hope you are hearing in praise of your courageous actions on the atomic energy measure.

We believe in the words of Senator Lehman that opposition to the bill is not a filibuster but an effort to protect the basic rights of the people.

Sincerely,
Dr. and Mrs. Edward Winkel.
Bala, Pa.

Bayonne, N. J., *July 24, 1954.*

Dear Senator Morse: Congratulations on putting up such a great fight for the average American against the administration's atomic energy bill.

I only regret that I do not live in the State of Oregon so I could vote for you.

I feel sure the majority of the American people are with you, and you will be recorded in history as one of our truly great Senators.

Sincerely yours,
Edward F. Powers.

Have just watched Youth Wants To Know, and congratulate ourselves that Oregon sends such a courageous, admirable Senator as you to take care of United States interests. It would be a real honor if we could vote for you in 1956. But the wise people who sent you, will continue their support, we hope and pray. Thank you for being an example of honest, independent thinking and doing.

The Rice Family (by Mrs. Rice).
Waban, Mass.

July 28, 1954.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator: I want you to know that I wholeheartedly support your position on the atomic energy bill and greatly admire your courageous stand on the Senate floor.

As a liberal Democrat, we are glad to have you on our team.

Respectfully,
William J. Ober.
Forest Hills, Long Island, N. Y.

Brooklyn, N. Y., *July 28, 1954.*

Hon. Wayne Morse,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: In recent months, certain men in Congress have choked me with frustration and impotence by their actions and public (mis)interpretations of American opinion.

My pleasure with your presence in the Senate is not new, but your opposition to the proposed atomic-energy program compels me to tell you of the wonderful feeling I get when I know that there is somebody really working for me.

A man like yourself gives genuine significance to the system of popular representative government.

Sincerely,
Paul Lion.

Santa Monica, Calif.

More power to you, Senator Morse. I am glad there are some Senators who are interested in seeing that the taxpayers' money is not handed out too freely. I would like to keep more of the tax money that is taken from me, and give it away as I choose; and I assure you I wouldn't choose to give it to the already overgifted powerhouse barons.

Sincerely,
J. Monahan.

I hope your toothache gets better.

Hollywood, Calif., *July 26, 1954.*

Dear Senator Morse: I am deeply grateful for the good fight you put up on the atomic-energy bill.

Now, toward the end of the session, the atomic-energy bill is shoved down our throats. The impression I get is another giveaway.

Anyway, thank you for taking the stand you did. I think your role is becoming increasingly important every day.

With best wishes,
Ernest McBride.

Austin, Tex., *July 28, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
United States Senate Building, Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: Please accept my thanks for the gallant fight which you, Senator Gore, Senator Anderson, and some others put up to try and protect the people's rights in regard to the atomic-energy bill.

Again, thank you.

Yours truly,
Mrs. John McCrary.

Oakland, Calif., *July 27, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator: I am writing you briefly to tell you I, like the common people throughout the Nation, are wholly on your side in trying to prevent the giveaway to private companies of the enormous wealth of atomic power. Teapot Dome was taking candy from a child in comparison.

Keep up the fight to the last ditch and beyond.

Mrs. Gertrude Warwick.

Whittier, Calif., *July 27, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: We are most grateful to you and others who are trying to save for the people of the United States the control of the atomic energy in its peacetime uses. We trust you may have success and that people may have time to become informed on this most vital issue.

Sincerely,
Ruth D. Parish
(Mrs. John C.).

South Euclid, Ohio, *July 27, 1954.*

The Honorable Wayne Morse,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator: I extend my hand to you for the brave fight you made against the atomic giveaway bill. I am indeed sad that we the people did not win; but it is very heartening to know that we have statesmen like you and we here in Ohio sorely need such a man. Wishing you the best of health and thanking you, I remain

Sincerely yours,
Charles J. Novy.

Mount Vernon, Wash., *July 24, 1954.*

Dear Senator Morse: I was not surprised that you became one of the leaders in opposing the President's attempt to allow the private power companies to profit from the people's huge investment in atomic power development. There is no moral or ethical justification for this undemocratic giveaway.

Sincerely yours,
Arthur E. Northey.

Sag Harbor, N. Y., *July 28, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

My Dear Senator Morse: My husband and I feel impelled to tell you how deeply we appreciate your stand on the atomic energy bill. Your disappointment at its passage, after you have fought it so courageously, must be deep. Perhaps it may be mitigated however since it must be shared by many like ourselves. Like ourselves, too, there must be many who are heartened that the fight was made. One man who continually faces serious issues honestly and bravely raises the standards of the Senate and of us all.

Please continue to represent the Independent Party.

Very sincerely,
Hortense Webber.
(Mrs. R. L. Webber).

Scotia, N. Y., *July 28, 1954.*

Hon. Wayne Morse,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: An expression of admiration for and appreciation of your persistent efforts to defeat the giveaway of our resources and experience in atomic power.

Good health to you and more power to your voice, sir.

Very cordially yours,
Frederic E. Greene.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator: I wish there was something I could do to help you stop the big steal of the people's heritage, but all I seem to be able to do is stand on the sidelines and shout "Don't give us the ship."

Jim McCrary.
Oakland, Calif.

Beverly Hills, Calif., *July 28, 1954.*

Honorable Sir: I could either write pages, or what I'm going to, hoping you'll understand that we understand what you have been trying to accomplish for our country.

Senator Morse, we do appreciate and actually revere you for the wonderful stand that you have taken on the atomic issue.

Thank you for being a wonderful Américan and person.

Sincerely,
Mrs. H. Braverman.

July 27, 1954.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator: Mrs. Maas joins me in congratulating you on your magnificent stand in defense of the interests of the American people again the giveaway program of the Eisenhower administration.

Atomic energy is certainly a property of the people—one which they have paid for handsomely and to turn the program over to private power companies for private profit would be the height of folly and arrogance.

Keep up the fight—we the people are with you.

Sincerely,
Mr. and Mr. James Maas.
San Francisco, Calif.

Fallbrook, Calif., *July 27, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator: God bless you for your valiant fight in behalf of the American people's continued ownership of atomic energy and its potential benefits which may accrue in the future.

Appreciatively,
Nora and Donald Robertson.
Mary and Russell Olson.

Fallbrook, Calif., *July 27, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D. C.

Honorable Sir: My family and friends heartily commend you for your heroic fight to preserve for the American people what is theirs—ownership of atomic energy. We taxpayers paid for its development and should resent Eisenhower's giveaway bill.

God bless you.

Sincerely,
Louise C. Cole.
Stella Hornbrook.
George R. Clark.
Alice A. Eifert.
Martha I. Baughman.

July 27, 1954.

Dear Senator Morse: God bless you for your efforts to kill Eisenhower's pet schemes to hand over the atomic energy plants to the big power boys.

Do keep well for you are doing God's work.

Most humbly yours,
Harry Abramson.
New York, N. Y.

Thank God for yourself, Lehman, Monroney, Murray, of Montana, and the other friends of the people.

Washington, D. C., *July 29, 1954.*

Hon. Wayne Morse,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: As a taxpayer, I wish to thank you for the valiant effort you made to protect our investment and our future. I have long admired you for your courage and true spirit of public service.

Sincerely yours,
Helen Keating Neal.

Knoxville, Tenn, *July 27, 1954.*

Dear Senator Morse: We are writing this note to commend you on your stand with regard to the AEC bill. More power to you and your colleagues who are fighting the sellout to private power interests. Peacetime benefits of nuclear energy should be public—but it may be a long hard educational job. I believe you are winning support, if you can hold on long enough.

Thank you for your efforts on behalf of the public good.

Yours respectfully,
Mr. and Mrs. Alvin H. Nielsen.

Thornton, Ind., *July 29, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: You deserve the highest gratitude of the American people in your gallant fight to protect the public interest in the pending atomic energy legislation. Whether or not you and your stalwart colleagues are successful in your struggle to prevent the atomic resources of the Nation from coming under the monopolistic domination of private industry, which will exploit them to the hilt for profit, time will tell. You have, at least, called the attention of the public once again to the fact that the present administration has an alliance with big business which runs counter to the welfare of the Nation as a whole.

I commend you for your courage, conviction, and insight.

Sincerely yours,
Robert W. Sievers.

Superior, Wis., *July 27, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: You have our wholehearted admiration for your efforts to block the Republicans' latest perfidy.

Sincerely yours,
Mrs. Patricia Hickerson.

The Letter Carriers' Position

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 26, 1954

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to commend to the attention of our colleagues the following letter which

I have received from the officers of the National Association of Letter Carriers regarding my vote on H. R. 9245:

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF
LETTER CARRIERS,
Washington, D. C., July 26, 1954.

Hon. ABRAHAM J. MULTER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MULTER: We want to inform you that we thoroughly understand the motives that prompted you to vote against the motion to suspend the rules to permit a combined postal rate and postal pay bill to be taken up together on July 21.

There has been some apprehension expressed that the postal employees would blame the Members of Congress who refused to go along with the suspension motion. This is not true. We understand thoroughly the situation that confronted the Members of Congress. We believe that the Congress and the individual Members of Congress should insist upon their rights and prerogatives. We are sure that all of the members of our organization will thoroughly understand your position.

We are most anxious to see a pay raise bill passed before Congress adjourns. We compromised on our original request for $800 by agreeing to the Corbett bill, H. R. 9245, which calls for a 7-percent increase. The Rees bill providing for only 5 percent increase was presented as a substitute and it was our belief and understanding that the administration was going to bring that bill up for a vote either by a rule or under suspension. The addition of the rate bill to the pay bill created an unfortunate situation. We do not believe that rates and postal pay have any direct relationship to each other.

We want to assure you that we thoroughly understand your position and we will see that the letter carriers of America thoroughly understand the vote that was taken in the House on July 21.

Our honor roll is the discharge petition. Thank you for signing it.

Sincerely,

W. C. DOHERTY,
President.
JEROME J. KEATING,
Vice President.
PETER J. CAHILL,
Secretary.
R. B. KREMERS,
Assistant Secretary.

Conference Report on H. R. 8300, the Internal Revenue Code of 1954

SPEECH
OF

HON. WILBUR D. MILLS

OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 28, 1954

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, undoubtedly the popular thing to do by any Member of the House during an election year is to vote for any bill that proposes to reduce anyone's taxes. However, I am concerned over the fiscal affairs of the Government and the present policy of enlarging our debt even at a time when we are not engaged in a shooting war.

I for one believe that we, as Members of the House, should face up to our responsibilities as legislators and not in effect, short-change the taxpayers. Running the financial affairs of the Government is no different, except as a matter of degree, than running our own financial affairs. If we in either case are going further into debt, we must face the day of reckoning at some time in the future.

The tax reduction in H. R. 8300 mean a further increase in our deficit, and in turn our national debt. The taxpayers in the long run are going to have to pay this debt if democratic processes are to continue to exist in America. Countries in the past that have repudiated internal governmental debt have experienced changes in government. At best, this reduction in taxes now just postpones the time that we can eventually pay off our public debt. It also means that future generations will bear a greater share of our present debt, and we and they will pay more interest on it out of taxes collected in each succeeding fiscal year. Interest now being paid is above $40 per capita per year.

I am particularly concerned that the reductions in revenue provided for in this bill amount to $1.363 billion, while at the same time the administration has asked that the ceiling on the public debt be increased because the debt itself is again rising.

I am also concerned over increasing our deficit by granting tax reductions in a very selective manner to businesses and individuals. If tax reductions are properly spread, so as to bolster our economy generally, they may in net effect increase revenues to the Government. The ones proposed in H. R. 8300 are so selective that very few corporations, businesses, and individuals will be benefited, since they must be in a particular circumstance in order to take advantage of the proposed reductions. For instance, more favorable tax treatment of annuitants, working dependents, retirement income, and so on—while very meritorious—in and of themselves still will benefit relatively few individuals compared to the total of our taxpayers. In the case of corporations, the major reduction is that due to the adoption of new depreciation methods. Unless a corporation plans large investments in plant and equipment, it will not be benefited from this change.

The type of tax reductions proposed in this bill would be much more commendable if they benefited individuals, corporations, and businesses generally, such as would be the case from reductions in rates and increases in exemptions. Certainly this type of tax reduction would be fair and equitable to all.

I realize that there are many meritorious provisions in the bill that are appealing to the Members of the House, including me, and many outside the Congress. However, the selective manner in which these provisions apply will mean little to taxpayers generally.

A typical example of the selectiveness of the tax reductions proposed in H. R. 8300 is the exclusion and credit against tax for dividend income. This certainly cannot be considered as benefiting the average taxpayer. Even if it should be admitted that some tax relief should be provided for dividend income, I question whether the approach of a dividends-received credit is the proper one. In my statement on the floor of the House on March 18, 1954, I set forth an example of how the dividends-received credit would work. That example shows that, carried to its logical conclusion, the proposal for dividend income in the bill would amount to not only a complete elimination of personal income tax on dividends received by individuals, but an actual reduction in taxes for individuals on other types of income which they may also receive.

The claims which are being made that about $7 billion in tax relief has already been provided are very misleading, since the impression is being given that businesses and individuals generally have already benefited from this tax relief.

In the first place, most of these reductions came about by terminations contained in the law and without affirmative action on the part of the present Congress. In the case of the excess-profits tax which expired on December 31, 1953, only about 50,000 of the 450,000 corporations in the country were paying such taxes. In the case of individuals, the $3 billion increase in taxes provided for in the Revenue Act of 1951 terminated on December 31, 1953, as provided for by that act. Low-income individuals got no real benefit from this termination, because of an increase of one-half of 1 percent in social-security taxes on January 1, 1954. In the case of a family of 4 where the taxpayer earns less than $3,500 a year, taxes were actually increased due to the increase in the social-security taxes. I was not opposed to the social-security tax increase as provided for on January 1; however, the effect on low-income individuals, as far as their take-home pay was concerned, amounted to a decrease. If any group is entitled to tax relief, they are the ones who should be first considered.

I cannot conscientiously vote to reduce taxes on a selective basis, while at the same time leaving millions to pay more and in the process increasing the deficit of the Government. In the first place, such reductions actually disproportionately increase the burden on taxpayers generally and, in the second place, we are neither being fair with ourselves or the public since these are not even true selective reductions for all time to come but merely add to our public debt which all must eventually pay.

I cannot escape the conclusion that H. R. 8300 does not meet the needs of individuals and businesses generally in the way of tax relief. We must continue to strive for that type of relief which is needed and do so at an early date.

Messages in Opposition to Atomic Energy Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, July 31, 1954

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in pursuance of the permission granted me today, I submit for printing in the RECORD various telegrams and letters showing the reaction of the people throughout the country to the efforts made by those of us who fought the atomic-energy bill.

There being no objection, the telegrams and letters were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Boulder, Colo., *July 28, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: As a citizen of the United States, I want to thank you for the great fight you have just made in the interest of the common people of this country.

I cannot understand why a President of the United States who takes an oath of office can deliberately give away to public utilities and bloated wealth the natural resources of the United States. He talks about "creeping socialism," and is making great strides in destroying everything that Roosevelt did for the American people. In what manner does the President think he helps the masses by deliberately giving to the great corporations the wealth that rightfully belongs to the people? I do not believe that "what is good for General Motors is good for the United States."

I am tired and sick of having to pay $50 every month to foreigners. This destroys all of my savings. I expect to do everything in my power to help defeat Eisenhower this next term. I do not believe that he works for the good of the masses. I have read of the big dinners Eisenhower has been giving frequently at the White House to millionaires.

Thank you again for your loyalty to the Nation and for your love for this our country. I think the American people from now on should join hands in removing corporation control from the White House.

Cordially yours,
Brandon Trussell.

New York, N. Y., *July 23, 1954.*

The Honorable Senator Wayne Morse,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: Although dismayed to find your name absent from the list of those supporting Senator Flanders, I wish to add my voice to those of millions of Americans who appreciate and support the efforts you and a number of colleagues are making to defeat the President's misguided atomic energy bill.

It would seem that again this is a case of a well-meaning but benighted President serving as the influential spokesman for so-called rightwing elements both in and outside the Republican and Democratic parties.

Defeat of this measure to subvert the TVA would constitute a heartening victory for all the American people.

To you and your colleagues who have labored so mightily on this and other issues of broad public interest, thank you and all good wishes.

Yours sincerely,
Donald S. Dimond.
Edward Daunais.
Floyd D. Schwalb.
Ainke Shinskey.

Dear Senator Morse: You don't know me, but, of course, I know you. You can find my name in the Washington Register where it has been ever since my husband left there to command the Philippine Islands Division—1908.

I simply had to write this today to suggest the kind of thought that belongs to today's problem. I am mailing the same thing to Senator Hill, who is a long-time friend of mine. Please call him up.

In great haste.

Maria Lamar Duvall
(Mrs. Wm. P. Duvall).
Montgomery, Ala.

Tampa, Fla., *July 19, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse, *Oregon,*
Senator Herbert H. Lehman, *New York,*
Senator Hubert H. Humphrey, *Minnesota.*

Honorable Sirs: I am addressing this letter to you three gentlemen to congratulate your stand upon the giveaway of some of our power you three have taken in this session of Congress, especially on the selling out to the powerful power companies, namely, the building of a steam plant at Memphis, Tenn., selling this power to the AEC to the tune of several millions dollars' expense to the taxpayers. This present administration is practicing as much false economy as they know how to devise; they must have a corps of consultants sitting up nights to devise ways and means to cut down some small jobholder and then raid the taxpayer with a giveaway such as Hells Canyon, offshore oil, now power sites.

I think that your respective States should be commended for sending such wise and competent representatives to our Halls of Congress. We have too few of these watchdogs up there.

I think that some of the investigation that is being conducted by various Senate committees are being carried on to divert the American people from the more important issues.

I sometimes wonder how your stand on this issue was given publicity in the daily press, as in many cases they report these things and give a very distorted account of their version of how adversely it will affect the people in general, which is nothing more than propaganda of the same corrupt political machine that does a big advertising business in the daily press.

So all power to you three gentlemen in having the courage to fight for the common people. I am sure it is appreciated by them, and we will watch the votes of the other Senators on this issue.

Yours very respectfully,
J. B. Thomas.

July 18, 1954.

Dear Senator: Keep up your fight. Don't let private industry take away our atomic power.

You are a great man. Hope you will be President someday.

Charles J. Mackey.
Somerville, Mass.

New York, N. Y., *July 19, 1954.*

Hon. Wayne Morse,
United States Senator, Independent,
Oregon, The Capitol, Washington, D. C.
The Capitol, Washington, D. C.

Dear Sir: Last week I read you are called an obstructionist because you wanted to speak your mind on a new giveaway that the Republicans have engineered—the atomic power giveaway. This brought hope that the liberal minority, with you in the forefront, would take the reactionary's own method, the filibuster and talk the bill that would also make Lewis Strauss a big man to death and give it its rightful end.

I remember when you broke the filibuster record of Huey Long on the oil giveaway bill. I am proud that you are such an obstructionist. If we had 48 more like you, the United States Senate would be the place that men like La Follette, Borah, Johnson, and Norris thought it should be.

I would like to congratulate you on your fine and painstaking efforts on behalf of civil rights and liberalism in general. Even though I am only 17 years old and not a voter, I just wanted to express my appreciation.

I hope your efforts on behalf of liberalism succeed.

Respectfully yours,
Maurice T. Spreuete.

July 26, 1954.

Hello, Senator Morse: May God give you strength to continue your courageous fight against the ghouls who are trying to gift wrap the atomic bill into the hands of private power.

Although a lifelong Democrat, I became one of your disciples when you laid your political future on the line and have since been abused, "for of all things," keeping your campaign promises to those who elected you into office. What good a promise, if not kept? How do the others get back into office after proving themselves to be liars?

You, sir, will be reelected by a far larger margin than ever before, because you have proven yourself a fighter and a leader. Above all you have proven yourself a champion of all the people. You are going to pull the free thinking Democratic vote along with your own.

As soon as I can shake myself loose from hospitals, I shall accept your office's invitation to call on you. I hope that will be this coming fall.

Wishing you and yours all of the best.

Respectfully yours,
Frank E. Hayes,
Glenn Dale Hospital,
Glenn Dale, Md.

Keep fighting, sir.

Memphis, Tenn., *July 24, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator: Keep the fight up. For you and other Senators are fighting for rights of the American people. What right has our President to give away the AEC to private interest after we have spent 12 billions on it. Also the TVA, they are doing all they can to destroy it; hope they won't let private power build here in Arkansas. Spend that money on TVA. We had the private power here before TVA and we know how they rob the people.

We need 365,000 schoolrooms here, clean up our slums, give us better roads, enough to do here for our own people instead of spending billions in Europe. More Reds there today, with all the money we have spent to stop them.

This FHA scandal is awful, when they educate men how to make big profits from Government, that is premeditated graft, so put them in prison. If I stole $1 from my Government, guess they would put me there.

If Truman tried to give away AEC by force and wreck TVA the Republicans would yell impeachement.

Best wishes,
Mrs. A. F. Gartaide.

Keep the fight up regardless of rest—that is against the people.

Berkeley, Calif., *July 25, 1954.*

To the Honorable Wayne Morse,
United States Senator from Oregon,
United States Capitol,
Washington, D. C.

Sir: The warmest thanks and heartiest congratulations from many thousands of citizens all over the United States of America are going out to you today for your truly heroic fight against the atomic energy bill now being debated on the floor of the Senate.

Your crusade against the encroachments of special interests upon democratic procedures and principles cannot fail eventually to bring results, and we realize that "eventually" means soon in such a struggle as this.

Knowing at what a great personal sacrifice you have fought in the past and are fighting now for the highest standards of democratic government, we hope that you may hear our cheers, perceive our prayers, and know that we are fighting for and with you, as you are fighting for and with us.

Respectfully,
Gladys G. George.

July 26, 1954.

Dear Senator Morse: You are putting up a wonderful fight on the atomic energy bill. I hope for our sake you and Senator Lehman and the others win this fight. There should be some safeguards in the bill re price, etc. I also believe that like every other patent holder the United States Government should get royalties on its patent which our hard-earned tax money created. Surely it would help balance the budget and ease our tax burden. I hope you win this fight but do take care of yourself.

Sincerely,

Ellen Worden.

Brooklyn, N. Y.

New Britain, Conn., *July 25, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: Having just listened to your session with the youngsters on Youth Wants to Know (although I am nearer by far, to your age than to theirs) I want to thank you, both for your honest and intelligent answers to these young peoples' questions and for your courageous fight in the Senate to protect the rights of all the people in the power giveaway situation. I trust your strength will hold out as long as need be in this grilling ordeal.

If only we had more men in Congress willing to put principle above party and the good of the country above personal or sectional interests, as you have consistently proved yourself willing to do.

We can only hope more and more constituents may develop the wisdom and integrity yours have, and learn to send such men to Washington in greater numbers. Meanwhile, more power to you.

Sincerely,

Miss Caroline E. Nichols.

Cohoes, N. Y., *July 24, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator: Bravo. Don't let Ali Baba and his 40 thieves take away the heritage of all of us and give it to a few of their cronies.

Stand fast.

Respectfully,

Ernest L. Harding.

Baltimore, Md., *July 26, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Morse: Congratulations on the job you are doing at this time on the giveaway—the atoms administration bill. More power to you in this work of keeping private business out of TVA.

Yours truly,

Dorothy G. Atkins
Mrs. Joseph K. Atkins.

Chicago, Ill., *July 25, 1954.*

My Dear Senator Morse: The American people, the taxpayers, are with you 100 percent plus, to stop Eisenhower's givaway programs. Now this 12 billions.

We are remembering the tidelands oil among the dozens of such giveaways. It has been a vile prostitution of power by Eisenhower that is bankrupting the United States.

Teddy Roosevelt was also a Republican but his thought first, last, and always was to protect the natural and acquired resources and keep them for the American people—for all of the American people.

Very truly yours,

J. B. Mitchell.

Kansas City, Mo., *July 25, 1954.*

Senator Morse,
Washington, D. C.

Honorable Sir: This is to congratulate you upon your courage and stamina in defending the interests of the American people.

Would that the masses of voters be endowed with the intelligence to understand who is for them and who for the millionaires; who is for genuine American democracy and who is for hypocritic or spurious democracy.

May there be many like you, Mr. Morse.

Sincerely yours,

Saul Kleiman.

Providence, R. I., *July 24, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

My Dear Senator: Please accept our good wishes and heartfelt thanks for your strong and intelligent fight against present attempt of a certain clique of legislators to give away atomic power; or, if not to give it away, to ease it into the laps of monopolies.

Thanks again and more power to you.

Respectfully,

William S. Jenckes.
Mrs. Ruth M. Jenckes.

Santa Rosa, Calif., *July 25, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Independent, of Oregon,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Sir: I think I fully realize the magnitude of your spirit in your fight to preserve the rights of all the people of this country. It is a tough job convincing people they must crawl out of the graves of their ancestors and participate in the goings-on of the world of now. I hate the picture that communism or socialism or any other "ism" that is drawn by men who makes a bogey man out of anything they are against. I am against any form of human regimentation, and dedicated to fight to the last drop of blood any form of thought-control over the mind of man, for if his mind is controlled, his body is controlled.

The eternal energies and forces of Nature exist for the benefit of everyone, for the slave as well as the king. Just because a mere handful of men have the desire to profiteer off the bounty and providence of the Almighty at the expense of all the people should we allow it? Are their selfish desires more important in the eternal scheme of things than the welfare and happiness of millions of other human beings?

I couldn't sit idly by watching men fight for my rights and not let them know I appreciate it. I hope you will pass this word along to all of the wise and good men in this fight that their efforts haven't gone unnoticed.

Here's to each tomorrow better than today.

Edgar Leslie.

Bronx, N. Y., *July 26, 1954.*

To the Honorable Senator Wayne Morse:

Thank you very much for the wonderful fight you are putting up for we, the public, in behalf of the atomic giveaway. Please keep up the talking. I only wish I could afford to send you a dozen roses, but this Republican Party has slowed down work so, and has given the common people no tax relief until we can hardly exist with high food prices and rents and very little work. It is only knowing that we have Senators like you that are truly interested in the people's welfare that keeps us hoping that some way or other you and your colleagues working together will someday be able to help us. I read the writeups of your talks in the New York Times newspaper Sunday, July 18 and 25. I also listen to you always on Frank Edwards' radio program, so I know we, the people, have a true and real representative who fights out in the open, unafraid of what man might say or do, with clean hands and a pure heart toward all people. May God bless and strengthen you, because we need you and, as you say, the battle has just begun. And may God bless that devoted wife and loving daughter that stand by you 100-percent. Smile, see I keep up with you.

Very respectfully yours,

Mrs. Beatrice Hamilton.

Wichita, Kans., *July 25, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: Just a few lines to let you know that we approve and admire you for your efforts in fighting to keep the present administration from giving the atomic energy to the big business corporations.

Stay right in there and you can't help winning.

Yours truly,

Mr. and Mrs. A. R. Pirtle.

Homestead, Fla., *July 25, 1954.*

Hon. Wayne Morse,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Sir: I heard you on the radio program, Youth Wants To Know, this p. m., and I was so much impressed with your honest, straightforward answers and explanations to questions that I just wanted to shake your hand and since I can't do that I am writing to tell you that I like you and appreciate you for your honesty. It is so unusual to hear a politician express his candid opinion regardless of party affiliation. My hat is off to you and I wish there were more like you.

I am a Democrat but not blinded by the party label. I try to vote for what is best for my country.

I appreciate your stand on the atomic energy bill in Congress. I very much fear that too few people will soon have control of too much wealth in our country as in 1929. If we had more Senators and Congressmen like you and Senator Gore the American people could feel more secure in their government.

I think the President is a good man and a great general, but is not a politician. He has not fulfilled his campaign promises.

I am a teacher in the public schools and find the teachers hesitate to express their opinion on any political matter. There was a time when we talked freely among ourselves, but no more.

If you ever run for President I'll surely vote for you.

I sincerely hope you will be reelected and feel sure you have enough good people in Oregon who appreciate your sterling character and will elect you again.

Best wishes in your job.

Sincerely,

Mrs. Eva Fletcher.

Detroit, Mich., *July 23, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D. C.:

You are performing a wonderful service. I hope the American people will appreciate it.

Yours truly,

A. L. Day.

Rock Island, Ill., *July 26, 1954.*

Hon. Wayne Morse.

Dear Senator: I admire the stand you and other Senators are taking to safeguard the interest of the common people of the United States of America. More power to you!

You might be interested in the enclosed printed form, relative to a State-owned canal, now obsolete, which is now being brought to the attention of the Illinois voters in a proposition to amend the State constitution.

The measures taken back in 1870, to guard against the sale of the canal to railroads or any other competing agency (with the idea in mind of abolishing the canal traffic) were well taken and we would be fortunate indeed today, if our lawmakers had included such a provision to protect the interest of all the citizens of this United States against the utilities combine.

Sincerely,

An Illinois Citizen.

Des Plaines, Ill., *July 26, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: Continue your battle to keep the atomic energy under Government control. It was paid for by the people and should not be given away to allow a few people to make themselves more wealthy.

Sincerely,

Mrs. Mary Parouhek.

Clearwater, Fla., *July 25, 1954.*

Hon. Wayne Morse,
Washington, D. C.

Hon. Mr. Morse: Congratulations on your magnificent fight on the atomic energy giveaway bill. The forces of reaction and greed are so definitely in the saddle that intelligent and courageous leadership such as yours is especially commendable. Carry on.

Yours cordially,

W. B. Stevens.

Amended Version of Agricultural Act of 1954 Needs Further Study

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 1, 1954

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, on July 29, an amended version of the Agricultural Act of 1954, S. 3052, was introduced in the Senate in the form of a substitute bill. I am particularly concerned about a new section, title VIII, that was added, and which contains the same provisions of the national forest grazing bill, S. 2548. The amendment has been printed as Senate Calendar No. 1825, and is awaiting action in the other body.

In my judgment, it would be most unfortunate if that move would deprive the House of the opportunity to give full consideration to a piece of legislation to which there is such widespread public opposition.

I do not believe that measures involving the administration of about 200 million acres of our national forest and Bankhead-Jones lands should be rushed through in the closing hours of Congress without proper consideration.

The grazing bill, S. 2548, as amended in the Senate, has been in the House Agriculture Committee for quite some time. Hearings have been held, and it has been discussed by the committee members in executive session. The committee obviously has found that the measure needs further consideration, or it would have been reported before now.

Practically all of the national conservation organizations have registered vigorous opposition to this legislation. I have a letter on the grazing bill from one of the larger organizations, the Wildlife Management Institute, and wish to insert the same as a part of my remarks for the information of the Members:

Wildlife Management Institute,
Washington, D. C., July 30, 1954.

The Honorable John P. Saylor,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Congressman Saylor: This response to your request for an outline of the principal objections of the national conservation organizations to the grazing bill, S. 2548, has been condensed as much as possible. All of the following viewpoints are significant and merit consideration.

There is widespread public opposition to this bill, and that obviously is the main reason that it was not reported by the House committee. All of the national conservation organizations opposed the original bill, and, to our knowledge, only one national and one regional organization have endorsed the amended version. Several of the State affiliates of those two organizations still are opposing any such legislation.

1. S. 2548 is regarded as unnecessary legislation. While it has been changed to appear of benefit to other users of the national forest lands, it was tailored to meet the wishes of the livestock organizations. It definitely will create questionable legal complexities that could hamper effective administration of the national forest lands. Moreover, it is nothing more than a modified version of earlier proposals for an act that were squelched by overwhelming public objection. As an indication of the intention of the sponsors, when the Senate passed S. 2548 Senator Welker stated that further concessions will be sought next year.

2. The existing discretionary authority that was granted by Congress under the Administrative Procedures Act would be replaced by inflexible legal requirements that could not be altered to meet emergencies and changing conditions. Few people are willing to go along with S. 2548 simply because it is supposed to contain the first recognition given to other users. While those other users are merely recognized in the bill, the permittees would be given legal rights in Uncle Sam's acres.

The conservation forces have been battling for years to get discretionary authority for the administrative agencies that are charged with responsibility of managing the natural resources under the custodianship of State and Federal agencies. If the Secretary of Agriculture were deprived of the flexible authority that is needed to meet emergencies and changing conditions, it would be a serious step backwards.

That so-called recognition is embodied in section 11 of S. 2548, which reads: "In order to obtain the views and recommendations of the various users of lands described in section 1 and their resources on questions of policy involved in the multiple use of such lands, the Secretary may establish multiple-use advisory councils; provided, however, that such councils shall not supersede or perform any of the functions of the advisory boards established under section 18 of the act of April 24, 1950 (16 U. S. C. 580k)." Yes; S. 2548 provides that the Secretary of Agriculture may appoint advisory boards, but in view of the many things that he is mandated to do for the permittees, the position of the other users remains about the same.

3. The proposed appeal procedure is much more complicated than at present. The Secretary of Agriculture is restricted unwisely and unnecessarily in the handling of appeals. A complex and burdensome procedure would be made applicable to administrative actions and decisions. (The present law provides for appeal to the courts for arbitrary and capricious acts on the part of the Secretary. Moreover, of the 84,000 administrative decisions made in the past 30 years, only 83 appeals have been taken to the Secretary, which is proof enough that no change is needed in the appeals procedure.)

4. One rather good provision that appeared in the original draft of S. 2548, which would have required a survey of grazing fees, has been deleted. While the Forest Service has the right to conduct such a survey, the conservationists would like to have the Congress rather than the Secretary see how far the Forest Service fees are below the prevailing rates of comparable private lands, and see how ridiculously low the Taylor Grazing fees are in relation to those of the Forest Service.

5. Perhaps the most important objection is that the Secretary is mandated to encourage grazing permittees to improve the national forest lands. A vested right is established in the provision that is made for compensation of the unused or unexpired value of such improvements up to 20 years. Many people believe that this is contrary to the basic land ownership laws of this country. Permittees would be urged to make fixed improvements to the property of another (public-owned lands), and would thereby acquire a legal equity in the ownership. This also means that congressional appropriations for national forest land improvements undoubtedly would decrease year after year; the Government's responsibility would be shirked more and more as time goes on, and the permittees would continue to grasp a more firm hold on precious watershed, timber production, recreational, and fish and game lands belonging to the entire citizenry.

Congressman Saylor, we already are getting calls from all parts of the country about the fact that the grazing bill has been included in the substitute agricultural bill, S. 3052, in the Senate. You have been a stanch advocate of sound natural resource management in the public interest, and can appreciate the grave concern about this last-minute maneuver. The conservationists are hopeful that this strategem will not prevent the Congress from giving full consideration to this legislation.

Sincerely,

C. R. Gutermuth,
Vice President.

Messages in Opposition to Atomic Energy Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, July 31, 1954

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in pursuance of the permission granted me today, I submit for printing in the Record various telegrams and letters showing the reaction of the people throughout the country to the efforts made by those of us who fought the atomic-energy bill.

There being no objection, the telegrams and letters were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Central Methodist Church,
North Easton, Mass., July 26, 1954.

The Honorable Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

My Dear Senator Morse: We heard you on the television program Youth Wants To Know and were greatly interested in your answers to the vital questions confronting us today. May we thank you for your frank, straightforward answers.

We would also like to commend you for your stand on the present atomic energy bill, and say, "Keep on talking." Surely one giveaway is enough for any administration.

Again we want to say thank you for your present efforts on behalf of the public. As a young married couple with an interest in the betterment of all people, we are happy to know that one with your views is in Washington.

Sincerely,

Rev. and Mrs. Jacke C. Harris.

Dwight, Ill., *July 24, 1954.*

Dear Senator and Friend of the People: Never have so few done so much for so many people. No doubt you are still talking while I am writing this letter. Keep up the good work, and if you go down to defeat, go down fighting. God bless you and give you strength to continue.

Thank you so much.

Yours forever,

C. A. Cowan.

Mattapau, Mass., *July 25, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator: May I, on behalf of all the members of my family, who are all adult voters, and on behalf of many friends, thank you for your courageous fight in the battle against the AEC revision bill, and the President's giving over to the utilities the people's atomic energy program. We are proud of you and your colleagues who are with you in this fight.

Please keep up the good fight and may success crown your efforts.

More power to you.

Respectfully yours,

Herman Coman.

Chicago, Ill., *July 27, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: While we are not your constituents we feel that we would like to express our thanks and compliments to you for the splendid work you are doing in behalf of the people's interests rather than the interest of a few. We hope you will continue to keep up the good work and we wish that more of our Senators would follow your example.

Respectfully yours,

Mr. and Mrs. S. Lukazewski.

Brooklyn, N. Y., *July 25, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator: Please accept my thanks for your efforts in behalf of the American people. As an independent Democrat, I am especially conscious of the good work you are doing for all of us and of the extremely trying conditions under which you strive.

Respectfully,

R. R. Smylee.

Chicago, Ill., *July 26, 1954.*

Hon. Wayne Morse,
United States Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator: I appreciate your efforts to acquaint the American public with the giveaway of the Government's billions of dollars cost of atomic processes to the private-power interests without payment.

Why should the power companies not be required to pay under license provisions, for the use of this publicly financed process?

I know that President Eisenhower's advisers and managers are impatient with the delay which your opposition causes to their plans to repay the campaign contributors who are afraid to have the public understand what is proposed.

Few newspaper writers or radio and TV commentators have bothered to explain why you and others in opposition are so determined; but seem satisfied to picture you as an obstructionist solely.

I can see why there is so much concern about FHA housing windfalls and so little about this giveaway.

I hope you can gain enough assistance in the filibuster to force the administration to compromise at least to the extent of recovering from the power companies some of the taxpayer's investment in the atomic development under a licensing plan.

I am a Democrat but glad to see that you and a few others are yet out of the pay of the power lobby.

M. L. Wilson.

July 26, 1954.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: We heard you on TV Saturday night on the Youth Wants To Know program and kept saying "bravo, bravo, and bravo." We found that your words made good sense and your sincerity in fighting for the people's rights was unmistakable.

Perhaps by the time this letter reaches you the cause might be lost, but we hope not and that you can do something to prevent the giveaway of the public's rights in the development of atomic energy. This is what the large body of Republicans were after, and we are glad you are not counted as one of them.

Again, our thanks for standing up for the truth and justice.

Sincerely,

An Admirer.

P. S.—Please forgive the anonymous signature. The times are not such that we feel free to speak openly about anything.

Josephs Mills, W. Va., *July 26, 1954.*

Hon. Wayne Morse,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: I don't have words or the force in which to express my feelings since to have heard your talks a few nights ago with Frank Edwards.

I don't know why this administration wants to give away what so justly belongs to the taxpayers and the people of this Nation.

That is unfair to the great majority of people and it is not just equality. Is this reasonable and just with all the American people of whom voted for this administration thinking their best interests would be protected, since it had been so plainly promised that it would be?

I am at complete loss to understand just why they would do this if they mean fair play and just equality.

And I wish to say, dear Senator Morse, we shall trust and hope that you will be given strength to continue this loyal and just fight for the benefit of our people.

And we trust that you will have the same force and guidance that the wise men of the East had when they saw the star and their footsteps were guided.

Most truly we shall pray that you will have God-given strength for this loyal fight in behalf of our people that is deserving.

From the old man that is trusting.

Most faithfully yours,

Chas. Smith.

Baltimore, Md., *July 24, 1954.*

United States Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: God bless you for voting against giving private companies power over United States atomic energy; against giving private companies power over United States atomic energy electric power; against giving private companies power over TVA electric power.

This belongs to the United States taxpayers, and to the United States Government.

Sincerely,

Joseph Kotner.

Greensburg, Pa., *July 25, 1954.*

Senator Wayne L. Morse,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: Thank you for the stand you take to safeguard the best interests of your countrymen and women—in this instance, the Government's great investment in atomic sources and potential power. I, too, have been a Republican for many years, but of independent mind, and little confidence in Ike's capacity and insight in these matters.

Thank you for the physical and mental effort you must make.

Respectfully and with best wishes,

Gracia Bubenheim
(Mrs. H. J. Bubenheim).

Tuckahoe, N. Y., *July 25, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: I should like to voice my great appreciation of your fight in opposition to the giveaway features of the legislation concerning the atomic energy now under consideration in the United States Senate. I urge you to continue to oppose this legislation vigorously and to continue your strong position against turning over publicly held land and natural resources of any kind to private utilities or other private owners.

Sincerely yours,

Miss Ruth C. Wylie.

Beaver Falls, Pa., *July 24, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: Although I am a registered Republican, I heartily endorse your stand in opposition to the giving away of the control of atomic energy to private utilities. Stand firm in your opposition to all the programs which would give away natural resources.

Sincerely yours,

Georgiana Wylie
(Mrs. H. H. Wylie).

New York City, *July 26, 1954.*
Washington, D. C.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,

Dear Senator Morse: I want to wish you the utmost in the way of good wishes and devoted support in your opposition to the giveaway of natural resources to which the Eisenhower administration seems bent. At a time when most men lack the courage to speak out against the inroads against our conservation policy, your understanding of the issues involved and your willingness to be counted bring hope to men of good will everywhere.

Very sincerely yours,

Dr. Robert K. Robison.

Hatboro, Pa.

My Dear Senator Morse: I suppose letters do no good, but I want you to know that I feel you have done a fine thing in trying to educate us on this atomic energy thing. I don't suppose you have much chance of stopping passage of the bill, but you have my thanks and those of my husband for trying.

Sincerely,

Jeanne H. Hopkins.

Hatboro, Pa., *July 26, 1954.*

Hon. Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator: I wish to compliment you on your courageous and vigorous stand against turning over our atomic energy to private power companies. I wish you success.

Sincerely,

Mary C. Coleman.

New York, N. Y., *July 23, 1954.*

Senator Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Sir: We, the undersigned, wish to sincerely thank you for your favorable vote on the Johnson amendment to the atomic bill.

With best wishes for your continued good work in behalf of all the people of these United States and with much appreciation.

Sincerely yours,

Albert O. Mazza.
Autry M. Mazza.
Eric Mazza.
Concetto Auditore.
Annette Auditore.
Pauline Mazza.

Worcester, Mass., *July 25, 1954.*

United States Senator Morse,
Washington, D. C.

My Dear Senator: Kindly accept my sincere thanks for your great fight on the atomic power bill. No newspaper has told the people of the amount Eisenhower has tried to give over to the private utilities.

He gave the tideland oil lands over to the oil crowd with their net earnings of $3 billion; he saddled $330 million of debt in 3½ percent bonds he exchanged for 2¼ percent bonds; now he tries to give the biggest gift of all to the public utilities.

I believe the Revolutionary War was fought for less cause.

Sincerely yours,

Frank R. Kent.

Chicago, Ill., *July 26, 1954.*

Dear Wayne: I can do little more than stand on the sidelines and cheer you on. You have become the conscience of the Senate and of the country. My admiration for your political course is unbounded.

Yours sincerely,

John A. Lapp.

San Francisco, Calif., *July 25, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: Wish to thank you for your valiant attempt to stop this gigantic giveaway. If you have been able to break through the conspiracy of silence by our solidly Republican press, you will have served the people of San Francisco very well.

Yours truly,

Mrs. Viola Surian.

Oak Park, Ill., *July 25, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator: You are to be congratulated for the work you are doing on the atomic energy bill now before the Senate.

Thank you for helping us to understand the issue.

Sincerely yours,

Florence Johnson.

New York, N. Y., *July 25, 1954.*

Hon. Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Sir: Please permit me to take both the pleasure and honor of congratulating you on your very liberal thinking and action in all vital matters.

It is very comforting to know that we do have a number of representatives who are vitally interested in the welfare of the people as against the big interests.

Keep up your great work and continued courage for the majority of the people of the good old United States of America.

Destruction comes from excess greed, and it takes men like yourself to control it.

Sincerely,

Philip Klupt.

Minneapolis, Minn., *July 25, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: I wish to express my deep gratitude to you and Senator Humphrey, as well as those other Senators who are striving so greatly to forestall the giving away of the $12 billion in taxpayers' money that has been invested in Federal atomic developments.

Your firm devotion to the cause of liberal government for the people of America and your unceasing and alert attention to the welfare and best interests of all the people of these United States will surely be long remembered by a grateful Nation as a true example of a real American statesman.

Faithfully yours,

John A. Blomgren.

Upland, Calif., *July 25, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: Americans really interested in our country thank you and your Senator colleagues for the grand fight you are putting up for us reference this huge steal or giveaway of our $12 billion atomic plant and patents to ye private power monopoly or ye power trust of "confessions of the Power Trust" fame. Also, re: this sneakup on our grand TVA, including 600,000 kilowatts.

Having gotten a pretty good summary today, Sunday, first, via Senator Gore on Capital Cloak Room; then Howard K. Smith, from London; and the views of London on our pouting, diplomatic, Geneva acts on Indochina; and then CBS's George Herman; and you a few days ago on Frank Edwards program, the question arises: Just where does the public stand on this atomic-power and this sneakup on our TVA? Thanks to the witchhunt and to intimidation that is abroad in our land these days, the vote via mail will be cut; however, this fall's election will tell the story of an awakening public, an awakening that is taking place throughout the world. This fall we will surely at the polls "excuse" some of ye private-power-monopoly "agents" in the Congress, agents of those against our country's welfare. And when I speak of those against America, I mean exactly that. For who ever heard of private power interested in other than single-purpose and scarcity-power projects. Is that how TVA operates? Certainly not. TVA operates, as you know, on a multipurpose basis or hydrology basis, meaning not just electric power, but the even more important phases of hydrology, namely: flood control, water and soil conservation, re- and afforestation, hundreds of small and large lakes (full of fish and fine playgrounds for our kiddies and adults), lakes holding the water back and depositing it in the natural, underground reservoirs; all this rather than the flood water going into the Ohio and Mississippi Rivers when not only lives are lost but vast damage done each year. No more floods in the great Tennessee Valley.

And why the rush in slipping this atomic power to private power as Congress closes? Atomic power will hardly be needed for say 25 years or until we have installed TVA's from the Atlantic to the Pacific, and thus repairing the destruction and rape of Mother Nature in every State in our Union, rape that has been going on for at least 100 years. It's an old trick this rushing through the Congress at the last minute smelly items such as this atomic power and this sneakup on our TVA.

Thanks, Senator.

Cordially,

Franklin Baxter.

New York, N. Y., *July 25, 1954.*

Dear Senator Morse: We still hope that your fight will not prove in vain, but at any rate you have again conquered the imagination, affection, and respect of all freedom-loving Americans.

More power to you and keep on fighting. As ever.

Sincerely yours,

Hans Lamm.

New York N. Y., *July 24, 1954*

Hon. Wayne Morse,
Senator From Oregon,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Sir: Your unceasing, heroic efforts in behalf of the welfare of the great majority of the people, deserve the gratitude and appreciation of every thinking, conscientious American.

May the Lord grant you the necessary strength and courage and may your efforts be crowned with success.

Respectfully,

B. Grossman.

Detroit, Mich., *July 24, 1954.*

Hon Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator: I am not a resident of your State, but have always felt that Oregon was my adopted State because I have spent many wonderful times in your State. I was a member of the 96th Division which is from Oregon.

I want to express my appreciation for the wonderful work you, Senator, have been doing for the people of this great country of ours. I think you are one of the few men in this country who has looked out for the people's interest at all times.

Keep up the good work Senator for I am sure there are a lot more people who feel as I do.

Yours truly,

Steve Melayh.

New York, N. Y., *July 24, 1954.*

Hon. Wayne Morse,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Sir: It looks to me as if the GOP have no intentions of staying in power more than the 4 years allotted them. Just time enough to appreciate a change. That is why they are in such a hurry to grab as much chickenfeed as they can. Little realizing that the slow, but sure, way might cover up more.

Best wishes for you and your colleagues. It makes me feel good that there are still a few mammals in our leaders in Government. Too many behave like jellyfish.

Good luck and God bless you.

Sincerely,

Mrs. Ella Bella Mondschein.

South Euclid, Ohio, *July 24, 1954.*

Dear Senator Morse: To you and your associates in this fight against another giveaway by the present administration I wish to offer my thanks and appreciation for your gallant fight. May God bless your efforts.

Sincerely,

Ruth and A. D. Horwitz.

Stockmen Get Foot in Doorway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 28, 1954

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, the attempt to add the revised version of the so-called uniform grazing bill to the Agricultural Act of 1954 is an example of the evils of attaching riders to bills that are not directly concerned with the subject matter of the principal legislation.

This grazing legislation has no bearing whatsoever on the price-support program. Many proponents of high-price supports are vigorously opposed to the adoption of S. 2548. Many hunters and fishermen from city districts who want to insure the farmer a decent minimum standard of living are opposed to giving away their rights on public lands to a handful of special interests.

The big livestock interests who have vigorously fought the whole farm program and condemned it for years are now hitching on to a price support bill to try to get their foot in the door and control the public domain. I hope that responsible proponents of the Agriculture Act of 1954 reject this attempt to make them the vehicle for the enactment of bad and dangerous legislation.

I also include a discussion of S. 2548 by Michael Hudoba in his report from Washington in the July 1954 issue of Sports Afield magazine:

STOCKMEN GET FOOT IN DOORWAY

The drive made by certain groups of stockmen who sought unusually special privileges for grazing on our national forests, as expressed in bills H. R. 4023 and S. 1491, petered out when the public raised a storm of protest to Congress.

But following President Eisenhower's message to Congress on natural resources, two bills were introduced by the chairmen of the Senate and House Committees on Agriculture. These bills sought to meet some of the stockmen's demands for security of tenure for livestock grazing permits on national forests.

S. 2548 and H. R. 6787 by Senator George Aiken (Republican, Vermont), Senator Edward Thye (Republican, Minnesota), and Representative Clifford Hope (Republican, Kansas) are a considerably modified version of the D'Ewart-Barrett bills, and have the endorsement of the administration.

S. 2548 passed the Senate in an even more modified form, although the majority of conservation organizations strongly object to its provisions. Conservationists claim the provisions are unnecessary since most of the proposals are already in effect by order of the Agriculture Secretary. A particular objection is against the foot-in-the-door priority for grazing-permit domination of our national forests.

The Senate amended S. 2548 to eliminate the words "grazing uses" from the bill, and substituted instead the words "any occupancy and use of." This action together with the change of the bill's title would make the bill more of a multiple-purpose-use deal for our national forest lands. But as you examine the provisions of S. 2548, it becomes clear that the details for administering this proposed law are designed for grazing-permit uses, and in effect make grazing a priority use of these lands.

The multiple-purpose-use councils, which the Senate put into the bill to pacify the public's conservation wishes, would have representatives of the various interests of the national forests, such as timber, wildlife, recreation, and so on. But the council is not necessarily required by the proposed law, and whether it would be set up at all is left up to the Secretary of Agriculutre. Even if the multiple-purpose-use council should be set up, there is no provision for expenses for council members to represent the public, and the council could not supersede the grazing advisory boards established under the Granger-Thye Act.

While S. 2548 states a congressional policy that such uses as grazing, watershed conservation, timber production, recreation, mining, and wildlife should be safeguarded and given full consideration, it does not spell out this aim in the detail for law and administration as it does the various provisions for grazing use.

Livestock permittees would be given statutory rights to improve national forest land for grazing purposes with the consent of the Agriculture Department, and to benefit from such increased grazing capacity. This could include fencing of the public forest lands, and so on. They would have implemented rights for appeal in district courts over disputes on grazing uses and rights on national forest lands.

In other words, while timber, recreation, and other multiple-purposes uses remain in the status of temporary permissive trespass use, the grazing right and grazing permit occupancy would be implemented and bolstered by law far more than other public uses.

We suggest that you refer to the May 1954 issue of Sports Afield for the revealing story, It's Still Your Land, that tells about the stockmen's scheming that led to these bills.

Messages in Opposition to Atomic Energy Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, July 31, 1954

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in pursuance of the permission granted me today, I submit for printing in the Record various telegrams and letters showing the reaction of the people throughout the country to the efforts made by those of us who fought the atomic-energy bill.

There being no objection, the telegrams and letters were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Chicago, Ill., *July 24, 1954.*

Hon. Wayne Morse,
Senator From Oregon,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: I am writing to you on behalf of my wife and myself to express our gratitude for, and to convey our appreciation of, your courageous and inspiring fight against the administration's ill-conceived atomic energy legislation. We heartily support and endorse your efforts.

At the same time, we would like you to know that we have long admired you for the intelligent and forthright manner in which you have played your self-appointed role of gadfly and public conscience in the Senate on many other vital issues.

Keep up the good work.

Sincerely,

Richard L. A. Sterba.

Marietta, Ga., *July 28, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: I thought that you might enjoy glancing at my column of July 22 that was an appraisal of you. It is enclosed. It appeared in the North Georgia Tribune of Canton, Ga.

I am very proud of your recent talks on atomic power.

My students at the Marietta Center of the University of Georgia appreciate your maverickism. In our age of conformity the word Morse is becoming a symbol of independence.

Sincerely,

Ernest Jernigan.

SENATOR WAYNE MORSE A POLITICAL MAVERICK

(By Ernest Jernigan, history instructor, University of Georgia, Marietta Center)

A dictionary states that a maverick is "An animal found without an owner's brand." Although there are but a few mavericks on the range today due to fences, the United States Senate has a statesman who is roaming unchecked in that honored body despite efforts to corral him. The Senator who can be saddled with the nickname of "Maverick" is Wayne Morse.

Being from a pioneer State—Oregon—perhaps one should not be too surprised to find a man with a sturdy independent spirit. Unlike the other 95 Senators who have party labels of Republican or Democratic, the unbranded Morse belongs to a unique group—the Independent Republican Party. "And why," a reader might inquire, "is it unique?" Simple. It has but one member—"Maverick" Morse.

In the 19th century the cowboys toted shootin' irons but the irrepressible Morse who is a guardian of the interests of the man on the street has a weapon with a more telling effect—a biting tongue. Judging by the pained howls of some vested interests which are attempting to get something for nothing his vocal cords have been put to an effective use.

Due to his training and experience, this battler is well equipped to combat those who slow the hand of progress. Among many other honors, Morse has been dean of the Law School of the University of Oregon. Previously he had been an instructor of argumentation. In addition, he is possessor of the Senate record for speaking continuously over 22 hours.

When General Eisenhower refused in 1952 to take a positive stand on some critical issues and allowed McCarthy to ride on his personal train, Morse—not smitten with bandwagonitis—shocked the faithful by bolting the Republican Party and backing Governor Stevenson. Following the Republican victory in November 1952, Morse got the "treatment." He was booted off key committees (a fate that has not happened to McCarthy).

What is the difference between a statesman and a politician? Who is qualified to sort the two groups? It has been said that a statesman lives for the next generation whereas a politician lives for the next election. The political scientists who make a life study of politics should be qualified to evaluate those in public office.

In 1952 a group of political scientists were called upon to rate the Senators. Their judgment separated the statesmen from the politicians. As might be guessed Morse rated high, being exceeded only by Douglas and Kefauver. Other Senators whose ratings might be of general interest are Fulbright (5), Margaret Chase Smith (6), Sparkman, (13), Flanders (21), Russell (25), George (31), Nixon (71), and McCarthy (last).

Few will dispute that pioneer spirit made America great. But is that spirit vanishing like the buffalo and the 5-cent cup of coffee? If the answer is yes, what solution can be put to use in an effort to counteract the seepage of spirit?

A new Morse code might well be utilized to inject a new vigor into America. In the 19th century, communication received a terrific boost by the dots and dashes of Samuel F. B. Morse. A century later America is being faced with survival in an atomic era of crisis.

It seems that America would do itself a favor by adopting a newer and greater Morse code—which contains strong doses, not dots and dashes—of courage, character, optimism, honesty, intelligence, and maverickism.

Baker, Oreg., *July 27, 1954.*

Hon. Wayne L. Morse,
United States Senator From Oregon,
Senate Office Building, Washington,
D. C.

Dear Wayne: Your fight to stop the giveaway of atomic power to the private utilities should go down as one of the great legislative battles of our time. Your work to focus attention on this phase of the administration's giveaway program deserves the appreciation of citizens throughout the country.

We may not be able to evaluate the success of your efforts at this time, but I know that what you have done will play a big part in bringing to the attention of people throughout the country the administration's position on development of power resources.

Keep up the good fight.

Sincerely,

Al Ullman.

North Little Rock, Ark., *July 26, 1954.*
Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Morse: When I saw this picture and read of your well-known stand I thought again that is my Senator even though I didn't get to vote for you for two reasons: I am not from Oregon and I am a Democrat.

We neglect to tell our Senators how much we appreciate the hard battle they fight for us often, but I feel that I must let you know that your untiring efforts in the behalf of we the working people and other low-income people are really appreciated.

May God bless and keep you as you fight the battles for we the people of all of the United States of America.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. Emily McCaul.

Pittsburgh, Pa., *July 26, 1954.*
Hon. Wayne L. Morse,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: I am writing this brief note to tell you how much I appreciate your hard work in behalf of the people of the United States. You and those associated with you in this difficult task now going on in the Senate are to be commended for your fine work.

I sincerely hope that you will succeed in stopping the giveaway of the rights and property of all the people to a selected few. These selfish interests are doing more to harm the cause of a free democratic government than any group on the scene today.

Yesterday afternoon I had the pleasure of hearing you answer questions of the young people on the American Forum program. I thought you did an excellent job of giving straightforward answers to some very pertinent and appropriate questions.

I do hope you seek reelection from the great State of Oregon when your present term expires.

With every good wish to you and your family, I hope you soon again will have the occasion to visit Pittsburgh at which time I may renew my acquaintance with you.

Sincerely yours,

James W. Knox.

North Hollywood, Calif., *July 25, 1954.*

Hon. Senator Morse: Congratulations on your fight against the dip into the taxpayers pockets for the benefit of the power lobby.

If this administration keeps on as they've started under the guidance of President Eisenhower and Secretary McKay, we'll have as much giveaway as there was under Harding.

Keep up the good work, and we will try to help out at the next election.

Yours respectfully,

Sam Semmering.

Weymouth, Mass., *July 24, 1954.*
Hon. Wayne Morse,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: George Norris, T. R., La Follette, and all the many others who fought, bled, and died in the cause for the rights of the masses, are happy tonight that you and the others with you are waging an honest fight to preserve the precious rights they won for us.

If a few of the Senators had read Carl Thompson's Confessions of the Power Trust, it would help a lot. I'd certainly recommend it and several other books that might help the President to know what this is all about. Mr. Eisenhower is a victim of his advisers. He simply does not know what is behind this power move, I know.

Thanks with all my heart for your devotion to the cause that means so much to all of us.

Sincerely,

Winnifred Mathews.

New Haven, Conn., *July 25, 1954.*
Hon. Wayne Morse,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: We wish to express our wholehearted approval of your efforts to inform the public of the undesirable consequences of several of the proposed changes in the Atomic Energy Act. We agree that, since it was developed by the public, it should be controlled by the public. We hope that more leeway will be allowed in sharing atomic information with our allies.

Sincerely,

Dr. and Mrs. Douglas Rees.

Arlington, *July 26, 1954.*
Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building.

Dear Senator Morse: I am not one of your constituents, but a person who appreciates your courage and integrity. Thank you for the way you guard the people's rights.

I am unalterably opposed to giving the investment of the American people in atomic energy to Dixon-Yates or any other private concern.

Sincerely yours,

Miss Johnie Christian.

Arlington, Va., *July 27, 1954.*
Hon. Wayne Morse,
Senate of the United States.

Dear Senator Morse: We appreciate what you are doing for the people in the filibuster that is now going on.

I hope and pray that you will succeed.

Sincerely,

Catherine Trottier
Mrs. J. L. Trottier.

West Redding, Conn., *July 25, 1954.*
Hon. Wayne Morse,
United States Senator of Oregon,
United States Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: I am indeed happy to have the opportunity to add my name to, I am sure, many hundreds more of your friends, to the list of congratulations for your honest and sincere fight against the President's AEC bill to turn over to private power as an entering wedge to destroy public power. I am sure that if Senator George Norris were alive he too would take you by the hand and say, "congratulations you are fighting for the common people."

I would like also to add to the list of congratulations those names of United States Senators, according to press reports, who are standing by you in this fight for the common people and against the power trust: Senators Gore of Tennessee, Hill of Alabama, Neely of West Virginia, Johnson of Colorado, Lehman of New York Magnuson of Washington, Sparkman of Alabama, Anderson of New Mexico, Humphrey of Minnesota, Douglas of Illinois, and the two Republicans, Hon. William H. Langer of North Dakota, and John Sherman Cooper of Kentucky, and others.

Senator Morse, I fully realize that you have an uphill fight, but I feel sure it will not be in vain. This giveaway program of the present administration must be stopped. They got away with the offshore oil bill; now it is public power, aluminum plants, synthetic-rubber plants, and Hells Canyon now to be turned over to the power trust.

I received your speech on wiretapping. Thank you very much. Again congratulations and best wishes.

I am, very sincerely yours,

Leonard Craig.

Burlingame, Calif., *July 25, 1954.*
Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: We think the proposed atomic-energy bill should be sent back to committee for complete rewriting and elimination of the many objectionable features governing domestic development of atomic energy, especially the vicious feature directed against TVA.

The basic patents should remain in the hands of the people by all means. More power to you and your courageous colleagues. We hope you may win this good fight.

Yours truly,

J. A. Waldron.
Ruth Waldron.

Washington, D. C., *July 26, 1954.*
The Honorable Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: Just a short note of encouragement in your current fight on the atomic-energy bill. I feel, as I believe you do, that the domestic phases of this bill is another step in the giveaway program of the administration. The enactment of this bill in its present form would accelerate the already rapid trend toward monopolistic control of our economy by a limited number of business giants.

I find your vigilance in this and other matters highly refreshing.

Sincerely yours,

Arthur Korn.

Walla Walla, Wash., *July 25, 1954.*
Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: I, as a citizen, want to thank you for your courageous and effective efforts to keep the atomic-energy investment of our country from being handed over to private interests. I think that this is the most crucial issue which has been faced in the history of the world. There is no question in my mind but that munition makers have fomented wars for decades. If we place atomic energy with its bomb potential in the hands of private interests, the world will have little chance of escaping an atomic war. Of secondary importance, of course, is the fact that the Government has spent huge sums to develop atomic energy; so the benefits should certainly go to the taxpayers, and not sold to them at a profit.

I thank you from the bottom of my heart for the great work you are doing and pray for your success.

Sincerely,

Guy W. Hawkins.

Berkeley, Calif., *July 25, 1954.*
Hon. Wayne Morse,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Sir: We Democrats of California are deeply grateful to you, Senator Gore, of Tennessee, and the other Senators alive to the various menaces in the AEC bill on atomic energy for the valiant battle against its endorsement.

Regarding this bill as one of "giveaway powers" to powerful monopolies, with little protection for the interests of the general public, and one of the worst of several such "giveaways" in this administration, we feel that it is vital that the bill be defeated.

I am a true Daughter of the American Revolution and a voting citizen of many years.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. Joanna Bryan George
(63 years of age).

SEATTLE, WASH., *July 22, 1954.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We need more WAYNE MORSES in the Senate. Our best wishes and hopes are with you in your atomic-energy filibuster.

Sincerely yours,

VIRGINIA M. KNOWLES.

DORCHESTER, MASS., *July 25, 1954.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: This is to advise you that I much appreciate the efforts of your associates and yourself to prevent the passage of the Eisenhower atomic-energy power bill in its present form.

I have long admired your independence, integrity, and devotion to your responsibilities as a Senator.

CHARLES H. ANDERSON.

SAN MATEO, CALIF., *July 25, 1954.*

Hon. WAYNE C. MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: If I had the money, I would send you a dozen fresh roses for your buttonhole. With the leadership of the Democratic Party joining a gag move, your ranks will be thinned. Unfortunately, there are still not near enough legislators who consider the general welfare more important than politics.

I hope this private-monopoly bill will become a millstone around the neck of the administration. I shall do my utmost in my own small area to see that this is so.

Thank you, very much, sir, for reminding me by your stand that there are some strong men left. The cause of liberals would be hopelessly lost if this was not true.

Sincerely yours,

MACK C. MCCOY.

BOSTON, MASS., *July 25, 1954.*

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I would like to express my admiration for the courageous stand you are taking on the atomic-energy revision bill. Not only in this, but in all questions before the Senate you have consistently shown and proven your liberalism and your sympathy with what will benefit the majority of the people.

I especially admire your complete candor, because that is one quality which is so sadly lacking in our not always so distinguished Senate. Your forthright and outspoken voice is badly needed throughout the country today, when it is considered dangerous to disagree with the prevailing opinion, a most pitiful and disgraceful state of affairs.

I do want to express my respect and admiration for you which has extended over these past years.

Yours truly,

MRS. RUTH DICK.

NEW MARKET, N. J.

If every Senator were independent (like Senator MORSE) we certainly would have a better United States of America.

Keep up the good work.

THEO. A. MARKS.

ENGLEWOOD, COLO., *July 24, 1954.*

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Most of the time when I think of writing a letter to the Times or to Washington it is to be highly critical, so it is a welcome thing to write you again to say that there are still people to admire in Washington and you are still the highest on my list.

Anyway, I'm at last convinced that the best way to be a good citizen is to be a cheering section for those in Government one admires. I sincerely wish there were a lot more men like you in Washington, and we are lucky to have the few we have.

Keep up your good fight. It must be a terrifically hard job to buck the fog of ignorance that pervades Washington now and you deserve the grateful thanks of all people burdened with the capacity to think.

My most sincere appreciation and thanks are yours.

PAUL BUSCH.

SAN JOSE, CALIF., *July 23, 1954.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Am enclosing copies of letters which are, I believe, self-explanatory.

We hear on the radio newscast that your speech of last night lasted 6 hours. The President's proposal that the TVA contract with private power interests for power certainly should be opposed along with the other giveaways of the people's property.

It is gratifying to know that one of your stature is pitching for the interests of the many rather than favoring the few who already have more than enough.

Respectfully,

ALBERT NORDMAN, Jr.

LONG BEACH, CALIF., *July 24, 1954.*

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senator from Oregon,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MORSE: I cannot tell you how much I admire you for the courageous stand you are taking and how great is the debt of the people of this country to those in Washington who are fighting to preserve for us the resources for which we have paid enormously.

It is inspiring, heartening—and all too rare—to see a man with the courage of his convictions, a man to whom country takes precedence over party, and principle precedence over all.

I hope the people of Oregon appreciate you and will never forget.

Sincerely yours,

CLARA G. HARRINGTON.

Should We Let Russia Take Over U. N.?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 27, 1954

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following editorial from the Milwaukee Journal of July 26, 1954, entitled "It Would Be Stupid, Indeed, To Let Russia Take Over U. N."

As the editorial points out, we stand to gain very little, if anything, by walking out of the U. N. But much could be lost if we play into the hands of the Soviet policy of trying to isolate us from the rest of the free world. For that reason, I wish to commend the editorial to careful consideration of my colleagues.

The editorial follows:

IT WOULD BE STUPID, INDEED, TO LET RUSSIA TAKE OVER U. N.

Russia's best bet for dominating the world is to try to isolate the United States, cut us off from our allies, and force us out as leader of the free world.

Nothing could further that policy more than American withdrawal from the United Nations. Yet there are those who would have us leave the U. N. They seem to want to make foreign policy out of the bromide about "cutting off your nose to spite your face."

The fact is that through the U. N. the United States has implemented its leadership of the free world since the end of World War II. If we withdrew in a pique over not having our own way in everything, one of two disastrous things would happen: The U. N. would cease to exist as a hopeful, workable agency for discussing and trying to iron out world problems, or we would be giving Russia U. N. leadership tied up in gift wrappings.

It is the latter possibility that must have Soviet leaders licking their chops. There has long been a struggle for U. N. leadership. So far we have won. But Russia and her satellites are intensifying their fight. They are busy joining U. N. agencies which in the past they have ridiculed and boycotted.

Russia has just taken up membership, after an 8-year boycott, in the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO). Why? Because UNESCO's work in backward countries has been effective. It has won friends for the free world. Russia has called UNESCO programs agencies of American policy. Failing to wreck those programs, Russia now wants a voice in them, and if possible, control over them. American withdrawal from the U. N. would hand over UNESCO to Russia.

Or, take the International Labor Organization (ILO), dedicated to raising world labor standards. The Communist bloc has boycotted ILO. Now Russia, the Ukraine and Byelorussia have taken up ILO membership. Nobody imagines that the Communists will end or allow inspection of slave labor camps or do anything about labor standards. But as ILO members they can be harassed and questioned on these matters. If we quit the U. N. we not only will lose a chance to show up Russia's labor policies for what they are, but will give the Communists opportunity to subvert labor movements over the world.

Russia has long looked upon the U. N. primarily as a propaganda sounding board. We have been more successful there than Russia. But if we walk out, the sounding board becomes Russia's alone—and Russian strength will tend to dominate other U. N. members.

Britain's place in the U. N. without us would be difficult. Britain would be isolated and the forces trying to drive her into the neutralist bloc would intensify.

Whatever some of our dissatisfactions with the U. N., the fact is that we and not Russia have been the gainers because the U. N. exists. On issue after issue Russia has been shown up before the world as uncooperative, recalcitrant, bullying, and deceitful. The U. N. Charter provisions have given added authority for our mutual security pacts. It was U. N. authority which gave meaning to Korean resistance of aggression. We have won most of the major tests in the U. N. between the free world and the Communists.

For many of the small nations of the world, and for most of our allies, the U. N. is the world's best hope for peace. If we desert, we weaken that hope and dilute the faith of our friends. We would be in the position of a big boy grabbing his marbles and going home because he couldn't have his own way.

Nothing could be gained by our walking out of the U. N. Much could be lost. And the greatest loss to us and the free world would be a gain in the Russian policy of isolating us from the rest of the world.

Messages in Opposition to Atomic Energy Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, July 31, 1954

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in pursuance of the permission granted me today, I submit for printing in the Record various telegrams and letters showing the reaction of the people throughout the country to the efforts made by those of us who fought the atomic-energy bill.

There being no objection, the telegrams and letters were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Brooklyn, N. Y., *July 25, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: We applaud you. My wife, my mother, and myself have heard you on the program of Frank Edwards and we are, indeed, thankful that someone in Washington is looking after the welfare of the people.

Our only regret is that we cannot vote for you. Thank you again.

Sincerely,

Howard B. Barton.

P. S.—Don't bother to answer this—use the time to rest.

Alexandria, Va., *July 26, 1954.*

Hon. Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator: Your efforts in re the administration's AEC-TVA private-power program are infinitely commendable.

Yours,

Herb A. Mack.

Los Angeles, Calif., *July 23, 1954.*

Hon. Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: I want to thank you very much for the great battle you are putting up in behalf of the people of America. I don't know what we of the West would do without you.

I always feel safe when I hear your voice, or read your speeches—whatever cause you plead I know it will redound to the good of America. May God bless you and give you continued good health and vigor.

I have often thought Senator, Morse, that it would be a wholesome thing if we had some kind of a law whereby a Senator, after a certain tenure in office could be voted for at large, that is, a combination of three States might seek the representation of an outstanding public servant; or the States might be given the privilege of so voting. I have wondered about this often. There was the great Senator Norris, of Nebraska, who did so much for the Middle West; he should have been made a Senator at Large so that we who lived in adjoining States could have voted for him. I was living in Colorado at that time. There are so few real statesmen that when one is found a greater portion of the country should have the advantage of his leadership.

Thank you again. I keep you in my prayers.

Respectfully,

(Mrs.) Susie Campbell.

Ocean City, N. J., *July 25, 1954.*

Dear Senator Morse: Please accept our utmost appreciation for your fight on behalf of the people of the United States, seeking to prevent the giveaway of the wealth of atomic energy to big business.

Gratefully,

Robert and Evelina R. Pruitt.

Bellflower, Calif., *July 24, 1954.*

Hon. Wayne Morse,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator: I am sure only recorded history will give the full share of rightful recognition so well deserved to you and your colleagues in your heroic and commendable effort to keep for the American people that which is rightfully theirs.

I do hope the apparent indifference of these same American people will not result in any lessening of your efforts in your constant fight in their behalf. Surely the lack of liberal newspapers and radios must be responsible.

Your appearances on Frank Edwards AFL programs are most invigorating and enlightening. Please do so more often.

Yours for more liberal legislation.

Paul Cover.

Cincinnati, Ohio, *July 22, 1954.*

Dear Senator Morse: We thank you for looking after the people's interest with your forthright stand in the atomic energy debate.

Sincerely,

Mary and Martin Berman.

San Francisco, Calif., *July 25, 1954.*

Dear Senator Morse: I would like to thank you for your excellent work in fighting the atomic power giveaway. You certainly are to be commended for your resistance to pressures applied by big power concerns.

It is indeed a shame that there are so few newspapers in this country that make clear to the population the underlying motives of this bill. Perhaps if the people knew more about the bill you would not have to fight so hard.

I, and many other Californians, wish you luck in defeating this treacherous piece of legislation.

Sincerely yours,

Jan Polissar.

North Boston, N. Y., *July 26, 1954.*

Hon. Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

My Dear Senator Morse: Congratulations upon your vision—and physical stamina—which have aroused us to the importance of the Atomic Energy Commission bill. I have just written Senators Lehman and Ives about it.

For all our sakes, I wish you continued success. I regret that geography prevents my voting for you.

Sincerely yours,

Marguerite Boldenow.

San Francisco, Calif., *July 26, 1954.*

Dear Senator Morse: Once again I want to congratulate you on your courage in fighting the giveaway Republican program—also to thank you for guarding our interests—hearing you last night on that Youth Wants To Know program galvanized me into writing to you.

Hoping you soon win through to victory and can have a well earned rest.

Sincerely,

May R. Gibson.

Berkeley, Calif., *July 24, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator: Thank you for your courageous stand against the administration's proposed amendments to the atomic energy act.

Best wishes for your success.

Sincerely,

Eugene K. Friedman.

Bloomington, Ind., *July 24, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: May we congratulate you on your stand in regard to the atomic energy bill now being heard on the floor of the Senate. We wish you every success in your fight.

My husband and I want you to be assured that you have our deepest admiration and respect. We wish there were about a dozen more like you serving the people of this country. It is about time that the private power interests are defeated and become aware that the American people will rise out of their apathy and support men who are their champions.

It is not necessary that you answer this letter, save your time for the important things you are doing.

Very sincerely yours,

Serena E. Arnold.
James O. Arnold.

P. S.—I just heard the program, Youth Wants To Know, and seldom will youth hear as straight forward answers from a United States Senator; we appreciate you.—S. E. A.

New York, N. Y., *July 26, 1954.*

Dear Senator Morse: You are a wonderful man. Thank you for giving of your strength and vitality and courage in defense of the people.

Juliet Lowell.

Dearborn, Mich., *July 25, 1954.*

Senator W. Morse,
Senate Office Building.

Dear Sir: Please keep up the good work, in regards to the atomic giveaway.

Yours for more thinking Senators.

R. J. Gibb.

Morrison, Okla., *July 27, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: My husband and I always try to get the Youth Wants To Know program which comes over NBC on Sunday, and we were delighted to hear you on that program last Sunday. I do think it very generous of you to spare the time from pressing matters to give the young people who were in the audience your time in answering their questions so concisely and clearly.

We want you to know that your answers and explanations on the problems of today were far more valuable to youth, and to all listeners, than any we have ever heard on this program before. We admire your straight thinking, and your courage in sticking to what you think is right—and right it is! Stay right in there and pitch, Senator, and don't you ever forget that there are millions of people right in there behind you, pitching for you.

We are lifelong Democrats, but not to the point where we cannot see the good and bad in anyone. What this country needs is more men like Senator Wayne Morse in Washington.

Very sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. E. C. Isbell.

University of Minnesota,
College of Education,
Minneapolis, July 29, 1954.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Wayne: The morning radio indicated you are off on one of your marathon speeches again on the atomic-energy bill. My congratulations on the efforts you are making with your colleagues to dramatize that whole situation. I certainly become very much irritated when I hear all this prattle about free enterprise and then find big business out for a big grab in terms of something which the Government has developed for other purposes and to do this without discrimination, as it may involve basic secrets of this potential weapon of destruction.

The actual purpose, however, of this letter is to send you a clipping which I think you will appreciate and for any use you may wish to make of it if you do not have this clipping in your files already, as I suspect you do not. As the time for the vote on the Flanders resolution appears, I wish to voice my own concern that all Senators stand up and be counted, first on a censure of MCCARTHY if that is the thing that finally emerges; secondly, on the removal of MCCARTHY from all his chairmanships that in any way jeopardize the welfare of the operations of democratic principles. I am well aware that there are a lot of so-called senatorial courtesies that have become obsolete and yet apparently Members of the Senate unwilling to be realistic about. I think it is up to the Senate to clear their own house and put it in order before the situation becomes such that it will be forced upon them by the public. This is simply to say that as an old friend, and an American citizen, I urge most emphatically that your own vote and your influence be cast in the direction of the intent of FLANDERS' resolution concerning MCCARTHY.

Cordially,

NELSON L. BOSSING,
Professor of Education.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *July 29, 1954.*

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR WAYNE: Like far too many other people, I rarely take my pen in hand to express my approval of something an elected representative has said or done.

But I must take this opportunity to redress the balance, at least to some extent. I wish to express my admiration for the magnificent fight that you put up in your effort to improve the atomic-energy bill. You and the small, determined group of men who worked on this matter are entitled to the Nation's gratitude.

Best personal regards.

Sincerely yours,

BENJAMIN S. SIGAL.

NEWPORT, OREG., *July 27, 1954.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Your efforts in support of amendments to correct deficiencies in atomic-energy legislation appreciated. Keep up the good work.

MILLARD MARTIN,
President, Central Lincoln Public Utility District.

PORTLAND, OREG., *July 27, 1954.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We send you our best wishes and support for your efforts to prevent the atomic-energy giveaway.

Mr. and Mrs. K. C. TANNER.
WILL TANNER.
Mr. and Mrs. ROBERT VAN BRUGGEN.

EUGENE, OREG., *July 27, 1954.*

WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Keep up the good work.

M. B. VANDEGRIFT.

CORVALLIS, OREG., *July 27, 1954.*

Senator MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We wish to commend you for your courageous stand in the Senate on the atomic bill. You may rest assured we are all with you.

BEN LITTLE,
Manager, Benton Lincoln Electric Cooperative.

CORVALLIS, OREG., *July 27, 1954.*

WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.:

Further commend you for courageous stand on atomic bill. You and Senate colleagues will also win argument for us at BPA on pending reorganizaiton of the agency if you succeed in present endeavor.

Kindest regards,

BILL TROMMERSHAUSEN.

SALEM, OREG., *July 27, 1954.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: We urgently request delaying action on atomic bill now before Senate until its present damaging features can have careful study and understanding. Our people amazed by recent disclosure of the amount of their tax moneys now involved and the apparent intent of Congress to deal carelessly with their investment.

HARLEY LIBBY,
President, Oregon State Farmers Union.

PORTLAND, IND., *July 28, 1954.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building:

The shoes of George Norris fit you perfectly. Carry on.

HOWARD J. BOURNE.

MORGAN HILL, CALIF., *July 26, 1954.*

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We wish to commend you for the strong stand you are taking against the administration's enormous giveaway program. We are confident that when the people in general come to understand the real issues involved they will thank you for your brave fight to save our natural resources for the common good.

With best wishes for your continued success we are,

Most sincerely yours,

A. W. BILLING.
Mrs. A. W. BILLING.

Amendment of Railroad Retirement Act

SPEECH
OF

HON. CHARLES J. KERSTEN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 30, 1954

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 7840) to amend the Railroad Retirement Act, the Railroad Retirement Tax Act, and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I want at the outset to congratulate the chairman, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON], in bringing in the very worthwhile amendments that have been presented to the committee.

This amendment that I have offered at this time refers to a very small class of people but a very important class of widows. During the struggle to enact a proper railroad-retirement bill, those here who are more familiar with the legislation than I will recall that there was a period between the years 1935 and 1938 during which there was no act operative to take care of surviving widows. I believe one of the laws enacted previous to that time had been declared unconstitutional. The result was to leave a small group of widows who up to the present time have received nothing, although their husbands died in the service over a long period of time.

What my amendment does is simply this: To consider as beneficiaries those widows whose husbands died during this period between August of 1935 and June of 1938 who had 30 years of service and which widows now have no other kind of benefits, public or private, widows whose husbands really helped build the railroads of this country at that particular period, that they be considered as beneficiaries under this act.

I offered this amendment in 1951 and recall Mr. Harris remarked at that time that it was a worthwhile provision, but he wanted to give it more study. I think the gentleman from Florida might recall that the following year I offered it again, and he indicated that it should be studied and have consideration.

At that time the Railroad Retirement Board stated, 1951, that there would be no increase in the tax rate needed to take care of the situation.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Has the gentleman estimated what the cost would be?

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. At that time the cost was esimated to be less than $10 million completely, all through the years. That was in 1951. It was estimated that the number of such widows was less than 2,000. At the present time it would be reasonable to assume that it will be half of that amount. This is for widows who are absolutely unprovided for by any kind of benefit. So that this narrowing small group of aged widows of railroad men who had more than 30 years' service might participate in this act, people who were left out because of the interpretation of the law during that period of time. They deserve sympathetic consideration as well as the children. As I say, it is a worthy small group of aged widows whose husbands have had 30 years of service. I think they should be given consideration, because their husbands were the men who helped build the railroads.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Why fix the starting date at 1935? How about going back further and taking care of widows whose husbands died prior to 1935?

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. I think this period covers practically all the widows who survive. There might be some few others perhaps with these qualifications, but I think widows in this category when the law was not operative, when it had been declared unconstitutional, should be given consideration.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. The gentleman understands, of course, that this $10 million it will cost must come out of the railroad retirement fund.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. That was the cost estimated in 1951. The Railroad Retirement Board estimated that it would not require any increase in the tax rate. That was in 1951.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. During the hearings on the bill H. R. 7840 the gentleman will find statements to the effect that any further liberalization of this law will further weaken the fund.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. However, this very small group of widows whose husbands died after 30 years of service are deserving of consideration and the Board has said the cost would not impair the fund.

Is This the Great Crusade?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 27, 1954

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I wish to commend to the attention of the membership of this body the following editorial taken from the Milwaukee Journal of July 7, 1954, and entitled "Is This the Great Crusade?".

For a long time, the members of the Republican Party have misrepresented, misinterpreted, and maligned the record of the past administration in the field of foreign affairs. Some of them insist on doing it even now, perhaps to divert the attention of the people from the poor performance of their own administration in this field.

For, after all, what has the great crusade accomplished?

What nations have been liberated?

What advances have been made in the free world's struggle with Communism?

The great free world alliance is cracking, and running out of breath; the Communists have made new gains in the Far East—gains that have been sanctioned, at least for time being, by the West; and, to top it all, the administration and its party members in our National Legislature are cutting our defense, mutual security, and anti-Communist propaganda appropriations.

The editorial follows:

IS THIS THE GREAT CRUSADE?

The Republican high command has apparently determined to make foreign policy an issue of the fall campaign. The theory, someone has said, seems to be there is some more mileage in Acheson.

Vice President Nixon seems to have signaled the course in Milwaukee when he said that Acheson policy was directly responsible for the loss of China and added that if China had not been lost there would have been no wars in Korea and Indochina. That this was no accident was evidenced last week when he charged in a television broadcast that the Truman administration left behind a foreign policy of weakness, a policy of surrender of principle at the conference table.

Much could be said about the dishonesty of these statements. And about the irony of a Republican spokesman making them at this particular time.

It wasn't American policy that lost China to the Reds, of course. Chiang Kai-shek lost China. The United States tried to help him with materiel for 39 divisions and $2 billion in grants and credit. Wholesale desertions gave most of the men and equipment to the Communists. Chinese grafters in high places lined their pockets. Only massive American armies fighting in China might have saved that country for Chiang. The American people, weary of the struggle after World War II, would never have consented to such action, had any American Government even considered it. The Republicans advocated no such thing. They held back on foreign aid compared to the Democrats. They once even voted to stop aid to Korea before the Communists attacked.

As for the war in Indochina, certainly the Vice President must know that it got under way in 1946, 3 years before the Chinese Reds took China and chased Chiang to Formosa.

As for the charge of weakness in foreign policy—the Eisenhower administration, to date, certainly looks worse in this respect than did the Truman administration.

The Eisenhower administration has accepted a shaky and unsatisfactory armistice "at the conference table" in Korea. It is standing by while Indochina, or great parts of it, disappear back of the Iron Curtain. The free world alliance is doing poorly under its leadership. Finally, while warning of the growing menace of communism, it has continued to cut back military, foreign aid, and propaganda appropriations.

The Truman administration, on the other hand, stopped communism in Greece and Turkey, blocked it in Europe with the Marshall plan and NATO, fostered the great free world alliance, blocked the Reds in underdeveloped areas with economic assistance and Point 4 and led in stopping outright Red aggression in Korea.

It is heard that the Nixon speeches reflect desperation of the top Republicans about the coming elections and the feeling that attacks on Truman-Acheson foreign policies helped win in 1952 and could help again in 1954.

Furthermore, there is the argument that "the Democrats ran against Hoover for 20 years, why shouldn't we run against Truman and Acheson for a while?"

There is, however, this difference: Kicking foreign policy and issues around the political arena at this moment in world history is a very dangerous occupation.

It complicates the problem of trying to develop a sound and sensible foreign policy. It makes it increasingly difficult for the Democrats (who are almost in a majority in Congress now, and may be after January) to continue cooperation with the present administration in foreign affairs. It bewilders our allies and delights our enemies.

It causes serious disunity here at home, and we Americans need unity today as we have needed it only in other hours of crisis.

President Eisenhower might halt these tactics of Nixon and the GOP political masterminds. Or is a shabby try for political victory to be placed above national unity, bipartisan foreign policy, honesty, and decency?

Is this the great crusade?

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Printing and binding for Congress, when recommended to be done by the Committee on Printing of either House, shall be so recommended in a report containing an approximate estimate of the cost thereof, together with a statement from the Public Printer of estimated approximate cost of work previously ordered by Congress within the fiscal year (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 145, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on Printing, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

DISTRIBUTION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

To the Vice President and each Senator 100 copies; to the Secretary and Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, each, 25 copies; to the Secretary, for official use, not to exceed 35 copies; to the Sergeant at Arms, for use on the floor of the Senate, not to exceed 50 copies; to each Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress, 68 copies; to the Clerk, Sergeant at Arms, and Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives, each, 25 copies; to the Clerk, for official use, not to exceed 50 copies; and to the Doorkeeper, for use on the floor of the House of Representatives, not to exceed 75 copies; to the Vice President and each Senator, Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress there shall also be furnished (and shall not be transferable), 3 copies of the daily Record, of which 1 shall be delivered at his residence, 1 at his office, and 1 at the Capitol.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorised book dealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by book dealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the Record.

In

IN TH

Mr.
teresti
to my
of fa
Social
been
made
Christ
Age
Depar
Welfa
In o
availa
I ask
report
OASI
dix of
The
was o
as foll

ATTITU

POSITI

Both
Farme
age an
operat
eration
with co
sufficie
coverin
lating
questio
furthe
perienc
Surv
Agricul
experin

Posi

Connec
Total
Pro__
Con_
Nonc
(Cou
opinion

Wiscon
Area
To
Pr
Co
No
(Cou
opinion

Area
To
Pr
Co
No
(Cou
opinion

Appendix

Inclusion of Farmers in the Social Security Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. THYE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 2, 1954

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, a very interesting compilation has been brought to my attention relative to the attitude of farmers toward inclusion under the Social Security Act. This study has been summarized in a brief statement made available to me by Mr. Victor Christgau, Director of the Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

In order that the information may be available to all Members of the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that the brief report, Attitude of Farmers Toward OASI Coverage, be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

ATTITUDES OF FARMERS TOWARD OASI COVERAGE

POSITION OF NATIONAL FARM ORGANIZATIONS

Both the National Grange and the National Farmers Union favor the extension of the old-age and survivors insurance program to farm operators. The American Farm Bureau Federation takes the position that the experience with coverage of the self-employed is still insufficient to determine the practicability of covering farmers under the provisions relating to the self-employed, and that the question of coverage of farmers should be further deferred until more satisfactory experience is obtained.

Surveys conducted by the Department of Agriculture in cooperation with agricultural experiment stations in four States:

Position on farmer coverage of farmers

Connecticut (7 counties) 1951:

Total surveyed		626
Pro	Percent	57
Con	Do	29
Noncommittal	Do	14

(Counting only those who expressed an opinion, over 66 percent pro.)

Wisconsin (13 counties) 1951:

Area A (6 counties):

Total surveyed		204
Pro	Percent	69
Con	Do	17
Noncommittal	Do	14

(Counting only those who expressed an opinion, over 80 percent pro.)

Area B (7 counties):

Total surveyed		454
Pro	Percent	57
Con	Do	27
Noncommittal	Do	16

(Counting only those who expressed an opinion, 68 percent pro.)

Texas (Wharton County) 1952:

Total surveyed		255
Pro	Percent	56
Con	Do	23
Noncommittal	Do	21

(Counting only those who expressed an opinion, over 70 percent pro.)

Kentucky (1 county) 1954:

Total surveyed		204
Pro	Percent	77
Con	Do	9
Noncommittal	Do	14

(Counting only those who expressed an opinion, over 89 percent pro.)

Poll conducted about a year ago by Congressman Russell V. Mack, of State of Washington (Third Congressional District) among farm operators in his district: One-fourth of these farmers responded. 708 (more than 90 percent) favored coverage of farm operators. Sixty-four (less than 10 percent) opposed.

Poll conducted by Congressman Robert Thompson Secrest, of Ohio, (15th Congressional District): Representative Secrest reported on April 7, 1954, that he received 3,266 replies from farmers on the question of social security coverage for farm operators. Of the 3,266 replies, 2,933 (90 percent) favored coverage; 333 (10 percent) opposed.

Poll conducted by Congressman Arthur Lewis Miller, of Nebraska (Fourth Congressional District): Representative Miller reported on May 24, 1954 that a poll which included the question, "Do you favor extension of social security to cover farmers or all groups?" the rural results showed 58 percent favoring coverage of farmers under social security.

Poll during June 1953 among individual Farm Bureau members who attended county meetings conducted by Ohio Farm Bureau for the purpose of discussing old-age and survivors insurance. Of 5,263 Farm Bureau members who were asked to express opinions, 32 percent opposed old-age and survivors insurance coverage, 29 percent favored such coverage, and 39 percent said they needed more information in order to form an opinion. (The American Farm Bureau opposes coverage of farmers at this time. This, together with the fact that many of the members polled apparently did not understand old-age and survivors insurance, may have had considerable influence on the results of the poll.)

Tally kept by Bureau of OASI of reactions of farm operators toward coverage (February 1, 1954 to March 5, 1954). Of 8,567 inquiries, 79 percent favored coverage, 7 percent opposed, and 14 percent were noncommittal.

Effects of Industrial Migration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 2, 1954

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, on Thursday last, I submitted a resolution calling for the appointment of a subcommittee to study the effects of industrial migration upon our economy and our people. That resolution was cosponsored by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Kennedy] and the Senator from New York [Mr. Lehman].

I later found that, by sheer coincidence, on the same day I submitted the resolution, the New York Times published an excellently reasoned editorial calling upon the Senate to undertake just such a committee investigation. That it was coincidence is proved by the fact that my resolution had been circulated on Wednesday afternoon among members of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. President, I believe this editorial in the New York Times is deserving of the attention of every Member of Congress. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that it be set forth in the Appendix of the Record. In this connection, Mr. President, I should like to call specific attention to the last paragraph in the editorial, which points out that the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Kennedy] has made a thorough study of this whole problem and is exceptionally well qualified to act as chairman of such an investigative committee. I thoroughly concur in that conclusion.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

REGIONAL COMPETITION

Factory relocations are rapidly becoming a pressing national issue. Two articles by A. H. Raskin in this newspaper marshaled enough concrete details of what is going on to disclose the magnitude and complexity of the problem they present.

Its most aggravating form is the so-called runaway plant. Many northern firms have been closing at least some of their operations and moving them to the South—and more seem to be planning to do so. These moves leave a bitter train of displaced workers, loss of income for those thrown out of work—not to mention the losses of local merchants, property owners, and banks—and general resentment all around. The resentment is often increased by the reasons for the shift. It is common practice in the South for municipalities to build factories, pay for them out of tax-free municipal bonds, and lease them to the runaway firms at low rentals made possible in part by the fact that the buildings themselves are tax-free. Then, too, Southern States as a rule have lower standards for unemployment compensation. Furthermore, labor is far less well organized in the South and wages there are generally lower.

Any program for action to deal with this situation calls for a clear understanding of a far broader one of which it is merely a part. Bargain basement inducements often have nothing to do with relocations. We are in the midst of an industrial expansion probably unmatched in peacetime history. Industry in this country is on the move. Firms are opening up new plants in new places:

To get nearer supplies of raw materials, nearer to changing markets, or nearer to cheaper sources of power, and also to achieve a wider dispersal of industry in the face of the threat of atomic attack.

For moves such as these there can be little legitimate complaint. But something should be done about unfair regional competition. Various proposals have been made. Unionization of the South, comparable with that in the North, is of course what labor wants, but union organization is seriously obstructed by the right to work laws of 16 States, mostly in the South, which are often used to break strikes. Amendment of the Fair Labor Standards Act to raise the national minimum wage above the present 75 cents per hour would reduce wage differentials. Minimum Federal standards for State unemployment insurance would further help the situation. The International Ladies Garment Workers Union is taking direct action to lure workers in Virginia away from low-wage plants by building a factory and renting it to a New York manufacturer who has agreed to hire union members at a higher scale.

The situation calls for comprehensive study by the employers and unions most closely involved and by the Government itself. The Council of Economic Advisers has a task force at work on the whole range of problems raised by industry on the move. A committee of the Senate might well be appointed to get the pertinent facts, to hear the opinions and suggestions of those best informed, on both sides of the industrial fence, and to formulate a constructive program to deal with the problem in a practical way. Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY, of Massachusetts, has made a thorough study of the whole situation and frequently has brought it to the attention of the Senate. His qualifications to act as chairman are exceptional.

Let the Senate Answer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 2, 1954

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Let the Senate Answer," published in the Christian Science Monitor of July 30, 1954.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LET THE SENATE ANSWER

Senatorial investigators often demand "yes" or "no" answers from citizens summoned to testify. Today the Senate itself—and every individual Senator—is being required to answer a few simple questions:

1. Are you responsible for the actions of committees authorized by you to make investigations?

2. Will you fulfill that responsibility by reprimanding abuse of such authority?

3. Will you apply to your own Members the same rules of contempt—for refusing to answer a committee—that you do to ordinary citizens?

4. Should these acts be censured: Encouraging the breaking of law; exploiting senatorial office for private gain; recklessly blackening the reputations of innocent citizens and hiding behind senatorial immunity; attempting to purge Members who dare to differ on methods; repeatedly resorting to misrepresentation and slander?

5. Have you the courage to stand up and be counted on this issue involving the honor, moral integrity, and responsibility of the United States Senate?

"Yes" or "no"?

Senators who answer those questions in the affirmative will not try to shelve the Flanders resolution with flimsy excuses that it is "untimely," that any vote on it may damage them politically, or that the issue is not clear. The issue is very clear. It does not involve either partisanship or a man's attitude toward communism. Nor does it require animosity toward any person; it is a simple matter of censuring actions which "bring the Senate into disrepute."

Let the Senate answer.

Greetings of Hon. Edward Martin, of Pennsylvania, to 10th Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 2, 1954

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD remarks I was to have made on Saturday, last, at the 55th annual reunion of the 10th Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, at Washington, Pa.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

United States Senator EDWARD MARTIN, Republican, Pennsylvania, told his Spanish-American War comrades today that the defense of American freedom calls for a strong, stable, expanding economy, supported by patriotism and the highest moral and spiritual standards.

Senator MARTIN addressed the 55th annual reunion of the 10th Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry at Washington, Pa. A former major general commanding the 28th Division, Pennsylvania National Guard, Senator MARTIN began his military career as an enlisted man in the Spanish-American War and saw service in the Philippines with the 10th Pennsylvania Infantry.

Senator MARTIN said in part:

"The atomic age into which we have entered brings before us a most desperate challenge.

"It is a challenge that can be met only by American strength. Not military strength alone, not the great wealth we possess as a Nation, but the strength and power of a strong, stable, expanding economy, supported by patriotism and the highest moral and spiritual standards.

"In view of the situation in the world today it seems to me that every real American should now realize that he is a part of the Government and that the kind of government we have depends upon the will of the people.

"The foundation of American strength must be built on a strong, dynamic government in which every citizen recognizes that he has a share of the responsibility.

"It is up to men like you to take part in Government. It is up to every organization of veterans to work for honesty, economy, and efficiency in government so that we can have government at a cost we can afford.

"The vast expansion that has taken place in Federal, State, and local affairs since 1898 should be carefully considered in planning for the future.

"When we went into service the national debt of the United States was a little more than $1,200,000,000. Now it is close to the statutory limit of 275 billion and there is talk of pushing the limit above that staggering figure.

"In that year there were about 200,000 employees on the Federal payroll as comparied with about 2¼ million today, even though the present administration has eliminated more than 200,000 Government jobs.

"The present session of Congress, now coming to a close, has enacted legislation making substantial reductions in Federal taxes, but the tax burden imposed on the American people is still the heaviest in the world.

"The debt of State and local governments is the highest in our history, and they are continually asking for more taxes.

"All of these things must be given careful study in planning the defense of our freedom.

"They have a direct bearing on the strength that we can develop to meet and hurl back the threat of Communist aggression against the peace of the world.

"We hear so much these days about what the Government should do for the people.

"I sometimes believe that with some of us leaning on the Government has become a national pastime. But I ask you to remember that America was built by sturdy, courageous, God-fearing men and women who did not look to the Government for security. They were self-reliant. They depended on their own hard work and thrift.

"As a member of the Senate Finance Committee I have been giving a great deal of attention to the problem of social security. I support the principle of social security, but I believe it should be placed on a pay-as-you-go basis. That is the only way that the people can become aware that they pay from their own earnings for the benefits they receive from the Government."

The Case for Public-Owned Utilities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY M. JACKSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 2, 1954

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "No Need To Take Fresh Look at Power Preference Clauses" published in the Longview (Wash.) Daily News of Tuesday, June 29, 1954.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NO NEED TO TAKE FRESH LOOK AT POWER PREFERENCE CLAUSES

From the Capital comes a report that a showdown vote is coming up in Congress on the traditional preference clause included in power dam construction legislation.

The issue will concern the Priest Rapids Dam bill, in which Cowlitz County has a direct interest. This bill won approval in the Senate Public Works Committee, but without a preference clause provision.

An attack being made currently by private power companies may be responsible for the issue being raised in Congress at this time. The National Association of Electric Companies is appealing to the public to in turn appeal to Congressmen to take a fresh look at preference clauses.

A booklet circulated by the association urges us to take a fresh look at the problems of Federal power marketing policy. These policies, we are told, set up two classes of customers: preferred ones, who get first crack at Federal power; and others who must take a back seat.

Then the electric companies go on to ask if we would favor the Post Office serving everyone equally or giving someone special favors. Or if we thought that motorists who bought gasoline from the Government ought to have priority on the public roads. Then, after they have posed several questions the answers to which are obvious, they throw this one in:

"When electricity is generated at a Government flood control or irrigation dam, built at the expense of all taxpayers, should all citizens in the area have equal chance to buy and use this electricity or * * * should certain 'preferred groups' have first chance to buy the power?"

Without any understanding of the theory behind the preference clauses, a person reading such a pamphlet would obviously conclude that preference in sale of publicly generated power is wrong.

That it is not considered wrong by a majority is evidenced by the fact that preference clauses have been standard policy in Government for a great many years. For example, the Eisenhower administration's power policy says this:

"The Department of the Interior will operate the federally owned generating and transmission facilities under its control for the benefit of the general public and particularly of domestic and rural customers, and the Department will give preference and priority to public bodies and cooperatives in disposing of electric energy generated at Federal plants."

The basic reason for public power of any kind is to provide power to the consumer at the lowest possible cost. A public utility does not have to show a profit, as a private utility does. Therefore, theoretically at least, it can deliver power to its coustomers cheaper than a private utility.

The same thing is true of a Federal hydroelectric dam. It is publicly owned. It does not have to make a profit. It sells the power to its customers at cost plus an amount needed to pay back the money borrowed to build the dam and powerplant.

A publicly owned distribtion system, such as a PUD, is a first cousin of a publicly owned wholesale power distributor, such as the Bonneville Administration, and a publicly owned generating plant, such as Grand Coulee or Bonneville Dam.

When cheap publicly generated power is sold to a private utility, the Government has no assurance that the benefits of the low cost power will be passed on to the consumer. While it is true that a private utility's rates are subject to Government regulation, the private utility is privately owned and has the profit motive always in mind.

Hence the preference clause. The publicly owned distribution system, whose only motive is to deliver cheap power to consumers, is given first call on power that is generated with that same purpose in mind.

It is misleading for private power companies to say that there are two classes of consumers, as the NAEC booklet does. There are only two classes of consumers in the sense that some happen to be served by private utilities while others are served by publicly owned utilities because they have voted for that method.

It is not reasonable, we think, to say that those who have chosen not to be served by public power should have the same preference for cheap publicly generated power as those who have chosen the public power way from the generator at the dam straight through to the electric light in the home.

To Reorganize the Capitol Police Force

SPEECH

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 29, 1954

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 9413) to reorganize the Capitol Police force in order to increase its efficiency in the performance of its duties.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I speak with reluctance because I appreciate the good intentions, the study and the time that have gone into the preparation of this bill by the distinguished members of the committee. My reluctance is the greater because the measure has favorably passed the scrutiny of leadership both Republican and Democratic and under a bipartisan sponsorship is brought before us with the expectancy of a prompt and unanimous adoption. Under such circumstances it would seem presumptuous on my part to set my judgment above that of great statemen with long and honorable records of service in this body.

I have been a Member of but 2 Congresses, 1 of Democratic administration and 1 of Republican administration. I have seen no difference in the courtesy and the degree of service of our Capitol police.

Some of them may be young men who are attending the colleges and universities in this area. I have found them without exception courteous, competent, alert. I do not think it is to their discredit that they are working their way through college. I do not think that it detracts from the service that they render as police officers that they are enabled to go on with their education.

It may be that some of the members of the Capitol Police force have passed the age of 62. I am not because of that fact for throwing them to the dogs as long as they continue to efficiently to function as I have without exception observed them perform the duties of their assignment.

OUTRAGE OF MARCH 1

It happened that on the 1st day of March of this year a group of fanatics, gaining entrance to the galleries of this House in the manner that had obtained for a century or more, outraged the dignity of the House and the traditions of a self-governing people.

For many years visitors to Washington, including delegations of school children, visiting the Capitol of their country in the spirit of pilgrims to a shrine, had come to the galleries of this Chamber to witness the legislative functioning of the democracy of which they were a part. It remained for these fanatics, possessed of no real grievance, for the first time in our history to violate all the restraints of a people gifted with the ability of self-government.

The lives of Members then on the floor of this House were by their conduct endangered. I think we all feel very deeply that only the benevolent will of God saved the lives of many Members. I can only interpret the sparing of our lives in this tragical incident as a manifestation of the divine acceptance of our country and our Government as an instrumentality for the fulfillment of His purposes.

DEMAND FOR GREATER SECURITY

It is natural and proper that being forewarned by something that had happened that never had happened before ways should be considered of minimizing the possibility of a repetition. The Members of the Congress, and especially the members of the committee charged with the responsibility, have given much thought to the subject.

At one time I understand the proposition was considered of building enclosed walls of bulletproof glass to separate the visitors in the galleries from the legislators on the floor of this body. I do not like to feel that my constituents coming to their Capitol, sometimes at financial sacrifice, would be separated from me as I represent them on this floor by a wall of bulletproof glass. I am sure that all my colleagues, including those on the committee, entertained a similar thought.

PICKING ON CAPITOL POLICE

Unfortunately, in discarding a security proposal not to anyone's liking, and challenging the good reputation of the many millions of Americans visiting their Capitol, the Capitol Police were picked on. I am using the words "picked on" with well-considered judgment.

The Capitol Police were not, as everyone knows, a factor in the atrocity of March 1, 1954. Theirs was not the responsibility of protecting the galleries. It was not part of their job. To the contrary, the authority for protection of the galleries was vested elsewhere.

This bill implies, no matter what its proponents may say to the contrary, that the outrage of March 1 would not have occurred if the present Capitol Police had been on the job. Because I want to be fair, and because I think this House in everything should be fair, I do not like the implication.

ENVIABLE RECORD OF 102 YEARS

What is the record of the Capitol Police?

For 102 years there has not been a fatality resulting from a traffic accident in the area under the protection of the Capitol Police. Every day when I come to this House and when I return from this Chamber to my office I get safely across the street despite the fact that there are few streets in America that are filled with more traffic hazards. This is true of every other Member of this body. It is true in like measure of every child, of every woman, and of every man, constituting our constituents, who come to visit us in the Capitol of their country.

I have never seen an instance in the two Congresses of which I have been a Member, one Democratic and one Republican, when the utmost in protection, in direction, and in courtesy has not been extended by the Capitol Police. I think, Mr. Chairman, that the job they have done in the zone of duty to which they have been assigned constitutes a policing record that never has been and never will be excelled.

LONGER CONSIDERATION NEEDED

Whether you can get a better job done and with the same contribution to good public relations, as well as security, by changing the system I certainly think should be given longer consideration. Among many other things to be considered is whether we should give priority to protecting ourselves from the public, mostly our own constituents, or protecting from traffic fatalities in a dangerous area, and from discourtesy, our own constituents.

Whether we want and feel that we need for our own security a professional police force is a matter I think can be determined with a clearer evaluation of all the factors after we have been home for a few months mingling with our constituents. We are in the closing days of a hard and long session. Soon this Chamber will be vacant and the galleries will be unoccupied. There will be no danger of a repetition of March 1 until the 84th Congress convenes in January. Why then the rush of hurrying through this legislation?

What sense does it make when in the intervening months there will be no danger to say that the passage of this bill at this time is demanded by a proper sense of security? I am not saying that there should not be at the proper time and after the proper consideration legislation minimizing the dangers of a repetition of March 1, 1954.

UNIFORMED POLICE IN GALLERIES

I do not know that it is in the interest of good government that we should have uniformed policemen stationed in the galleries. This is not the practice in the case of protection of our President, our governors, and the mayors of our large cities. They are protected, and they should be protected, especially since there has been an alarming increase in mental disorders. But it is not done by the public display of uniforms and guns. Indeed it is done so that in most instances the public is not aware of the protecting personnel.

I think, Mr. Chairman, that to rush pellmell and in the closing days of this session into the adoption of legislation of this character might end in a gesture of security ending up in something actually increasing the insecurity.

VETERAN HAS NO PROTECTION

That bill as it now stands is grossly unfair to the present members of the Capitol Police is so clear that no serious attempt is being made to deny it. The gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. Bailey] has made it as clear as the ringing of a bell that under this bill the veteran has absolutely no protection.

I know of one member of the Capitol Police, badly wounded in an engagement of World War II, and if I remember correctly a wearer of the Congressional Medal of Honor, who is as clearheaded, as efficient and as courteous as any man in or out of the police service that I have ever known. Under this bill he could be called for a physical examination and if he could not wiggle his toe and twist his thumb according to the prescribed formula he would be fired.

POLICEMEN OVER 62 BANNED

Under this bill any member of the Capitol Police force who had passed his 62d birthday would be thrown to the wolves. I appreciate that this is the rule that obtains in my own city of Chicago and in many other cities. It may be all right as far as the professional police group of a large city is concerned. I am not arguing that. But I am saying that there are many outstanding police officers in our great cities forced to retirement by this arbitrary 62-year rule, who actually are in their physical and professional prime, and who in such situation can be most advantageously recruited for the Capitol Police.

Mr. Chairman, we have a growing class of American citizens in the aging group. I do not like to see the Congress of the United States put itself on record as saying that a man 62 years of age and who retains his full physical and mental vigor cannot be employed by the Congress of the United States in a job for which he is eminently well qualified.

If the Congress of the United States, fully understanding the issue, so puts itself on record I say to you that the older people of the United States, who now have the balance of voting power, will very soon make themselves felt in a position to the rear where the pantaloons start to drape from the belt.

CONCERNING PATRONAGE CHARGE

It is argued that the Capitol Police are now part of the patronage system. Permit me to say something on that score. I do know that the majority party has what is known as a patronage committee and that all appointments stem from that source. That is all I known about it. As a Member of no seniority I have had no personal contact with the system.

But as I have said I have been a Member of a Democratic Congress and a Republican Congress. I have been merely an observer, not a participant. I have seen in both Congresses the same type of young men working for us as a means of continuing their education. I have seen the same type of older men earning some means of maintaining themselves by serving us. I have seen the same type of veterans. And everywhere I have seen efficiency, I have seen exhibited a courtesy and a delight in being helpful that I have never seen elsewhere in like measure.

From this observation I have reached the conclusion that these appointments come not from political motivation but from good and understanding hearts no matter which party is in power or which patronage committee is functioning.

I do not want to see these young men now serving with the Capitol Police forced either to give us their jobs or abandon their ambitions for higher education. This would be going farther than we ever have gone in the big cities of the United States. In my own city of Chicago we are happy and proud that every year members of our police force receive academic degrees and degrees in law and medicine and dentistry and enginering as a result of college work that they had done while in the working hours giving full time and attention to their police duties. One of my colleagues in the debate today has said that under this bill this could not be done here in Washington in the policing force which is our creation and over which for 102 years we have exercised authority.

Mr. Chairman, I have felt an obligation to myself and to what I have always regarded as what is right and what is wrong to speak my thoughts on this bill. I have done so with the utmost respect for the good intentions of those who offer the measure and of the long service and the statesmanship of those who advocate it.

OBJECTIVES SOUGHT COMMENDABLE

The objectives sought are commendable. The structure of obtaining those objectives, attaining a greater security but not at the loss of some of the precious qualities of that which we now have, requires more study. In January I am sure we can come up with a better structure, and in the meanwhile the Congress will be in adjournment and there will be no one in the galleries to be protected against and no one on the floor of this House to be protected.

I hope that this bill will not be numbered among those for which later we will have to make the excuse that it was passed in the closing spasm of a Congress that was tired out and wanted to get home.

Lt. Genevieve de Galard Terraube, Heroine of Dien Bien Phu

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 2, 1954

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an article relating to Lt. Genevieve de Galard Terraube, the heroic French Air Force nurse of Dien Bien Phu, published in the Catholic Register of July 30, 1954.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

First Ever Invited by United States Congress

Paris.—Lt. Genevieve de Galard Terraube, the heroic French Air Force nurse, of Dien Bien Phu, left here for a 3-week tour of the United States, the first foreign citizen ever to receive an official congressional invitation for a visit.

The 29-year-old Catholic, the only woman in the besieged Indochinese fortress at the time of its fall, told La Croix, Paris Catholic daily, that the influence of her faith was the dominant factor in her life in the last days of the garrison's stand against the Communists.

Many of the dying soldiers, she said, asked that their mothers be informed that they had died with a peaceful conscience.

She has received a gold and amber rosary from Pius XII as a token of his high regard for her courageous charity. The French Government has given her two of its highest awards, and the Red Cross presented her with its highest honor, the Florence Nightingale Medal.

In addition to a citation from the United States Army Nursing Corps, Miss de Galard will be the first nurse ever to be given honorary membership in the Association of Military Surgeons.

ANCESTOR FOUGHT FOR JOAN OF ARC

A member of one of France's oldest families, she includes among her ancestors fighters in the Crusades and in the Battle of Orleans, led by St. Joan of Arc. Her mother, the Viscountess Olgade Galard Terraube, is an active member of the French Women's League for Catholic Action.

The nurse was invited to visit the United States by Congress. This is the first time that Congress has ever formally invited a citizen of another nation to visit the United States. In 1824 Congress extended the use of a Government ship to bring the Marquis de Lafayette to this country, and in 1851 the same courtesy was extended to the Hungarian patriot, Louis Kossuth, but never before has a foreign citizen been formally invited through a congressional resolution. (NCWC radio and wire.)

Hot Potato Juggling

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 2, 1954

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Hot Potato Juggling," published in the Christian Science Monitor of July 20, 1954.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOT POTATO JUGGLING

Senator FLANDERS' decision to postpone his motion to censure Senator MCCARTHY prolongs the Senate's hot-potato juggling act. Many Senators are hoping that some way will be found to escape going on record either for or against McCarthyism. But this potato may not cool off at all in the next 2 weeks. It could become even hotter.

We question the estimate that there will be more time to consider a censure motion at the end of the session. But with more of the legislative program out of the way Republican leaders will find it harder to argue that the Flanders motion would stall it.

Politicians are very polite people; they hate to offend anybody. But they have more courage than they are given credit for. An increasing number have been standing up to Senator MCCARTHY, and if the issue becomes clearly seen as one of maintaining the Senate's honor, authority, and responsibility, many Senators will grasp the hot potato firmly and deal with it.

Two things could help them. One would be for Senator MCCARTHY to show that he does not intend to change his ways. His resumption of one-man hearings—in defiance of the known wishes of many Senators—is an example. A mere change in his committee staff—on which Senator POTTER rightly insists—will not go to the root of the trouble.

Indeed, it might only blur the issue. So might another move—desirable in itself. Adoption of a reform code for committee hearings will end abuses only if upheld in spirit and enforced. A vote of censure would prove that the Senate means business.

The second thing that would help Senators take a firm grasp of McCarthyism would be for Senator FLANDERS to furnish a bill of particulars showing how the junior Senator from Wisconsin has damaged the honor of the Senate, flouted its authority, and abused its powers. The parallels with Hitlerism developed in Mr. FLANDERS' latest speech deserve attention. And he does well to press the moral issue. But more specific indictments would strengthen his censure motion. Strong material to support the motion appears available; we trust it will be marshaled effectively.

Authorizing the Secretary of the Interior To Construct, Operate, and Maintain the Talent Division of the Rogue River Basin Reclamation Project

SPEECH

OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 30, 1954

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 8384) to construct, operate, and maintain the Talent division of the Rogue River Basin reclamation project, Oregon.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I hope my colleagues will not take the gentleman from Pennsylvania too seriously in his tirade against irrigation projects.

Someone has said some time back that the cities and the industrial areas of the East could dry up and blow away but the farmers would still exist.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I have but 3 minutes; the gentleman had about 9.

Mr. GAVIN. I merely want to correct an erroneous statement.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I would suggest that the gentleman take a very sane, careful, and understanding look at these irrigation projects. The farmers borrow the money under the irrigation laws; they pay back the money over a period of years without interest.

The other day the gentleman from Pennsylvania voted for a flood control bill of nearly a billion dollars—not 1 penny of which is paid back in interest or principal. He admitted that he had a $600,000 project in his State of Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. No; I do not yield.

They pay back not 1 penny.

The gentleman from Texas is talking about the cost of this. Why, the city of Dallas has a big reservoir for city water. The Army engineers built it for the municipal water supply. They got this tremendous water supply project without having to pay one penny and without having to pay one penny of interest or principal.

More than $10 billion has been earmarked for flood control in the past few years. Flood control is nothing but keeping water off the land. Flood control pays back not 1 penny in interest or principle. In irrigation they try to put water on land that needs it to produce crops, crops which do not come under price support. They are crops that are needed and not adding to the surplus.

Let me remind you folks in the east that a hungry person does not want your prayers, does not want your arguments, he wants food in his stomach. Half the world is hungry. The world has doubled and tripled in population in the last quarter of a century. They need to be fed.

We should take into consideration the fact that it takes 10 years to get an irrigation project going, and we should look to the future. The people one day will need food. The people of the world now need this food and properly distributed it would take care of a lot of people whose bellies are normally empty. Our country has assumed the role of furnishing food all over the world.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Is it not true that local benefits other than flood control benefits such as stream pollution, low flow control, and that type of benefit must be paid for by the localities at the time of contsruction of the project, and not over a 50-year period?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. No. Ohio has benefited tremendously from flood control. If you are not for irrigation you ought not to be for flood control because you build dams to hold the water off the land which if left flooded would produce nothing.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Very briefly, for a question, not a speech. What is the gentleman's question?

Mr. GAVIN. In the billion-dollar civil functions bill Pennsylvania got $1,900,000. We pay out in taxes $45 million. So when the gentleman is saying we do not contribute that does not make sense; we are contributing.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. No flood-control moneys pay any interest or principle, and the gentleman knows that.

Mr. GAVIN. Certainly, but the Government has to pay the taxes and put up the money to build the project.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Flood control does not pay any interest or principle. In the interest of the people of the West, a growing economy, a dynamic country, so that your children and mine will have a place to live in comfort, we should pass this bill. You know up there above the Speaker's podium is a quotation from Daniel Webster:

> Let us prepare the resources of our land, call forth the power to build up its institutions and promote all of its great interests and see whether we also in our day and generation may not perform something worthy to be remembered.

I say to you, Mr. Chairman, that developing irrigation land, helping the resources of this country, is something worthy to be remembered. I say to you who voted for the bill providing foreign aid the past few years that we have spent more money in that bill for irrigation projects in foreign countries than we have spent in our own country for irrigation projects and flood control.

So I urge you to support this bill as reported out so that the folks in the Rogue Valley in Oregon may get the water they need to produce sufficient crops to take care of their own needs and perhaps the needs of other people in the United States.

Thank God for Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. SMITH

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 23, 1954

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, many of us have listened for many years to the broadcasts of the Salt Lake Tabernacle Choir over the Columbia Broadcasting System. The spoken word on this program is by Richard L. Evans.

On July 4 of this year Mr. Evans' statement, Thank God for Freedom, made such an impression upon my friend and constituent, W. W. Ellis, that he has called special attention to this inspiring message. Under unanimous consent, I include it, as follows:

THANK GOD FOR FREEDOM

(By Richard L. Evans)

On this meaningful day for America, may we take a moment from some of the side issues and from some of the irrelevant celebration, and clear our thoughts and humble our hearts and get down on our knees and simply, fervently, thank God for freedom—and then get on our feet with a firm resolve to preserve it against all who secretly or openly would set it aside. Thank God for freedom—and for the the Founding Fathers who reaffirmed to a new nation, an eternal, timeless truth: that the right of choice—that the free agency of man—is a Godgiven inalienable right, and is essential to the peace and growth and progress and salvation of the very soul. This truth has been challenged again and again, and will yet be challenged again and again. It was challenged in the heavens before time began, by the brilliant but rebellious Lucifer. There was war in heaven—for freedom. And anyone who seeks to enslave men in any sense, in mind, in spirit, in thought—anyone who seeks to enslave the minds, the hearts, the spirits of men is essentially in league with Satan himself—for "where the spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty." Thank God this day for the Constitution of our country, which was brought into being "by the hands of wise men whom (the Lord God) raised up unto this very purpose." Thank God for the promise that in this choice land, men "shall be free from bondage, and from captivity, and from all other nations under heaven, if they will but serve" God. Thank God for the right of choice, for the right to become whatever we can become in a free and provident land that, despite its imperfections, has proved to be more efficient for progress and human happiness than any society founded on the false philosophies that would seek to enslave the minds and souls of men. God grant that we may repent wherever we have departed from the principles of freedom—that we may preserve the right to fail and the incentive to succeed, and live, as did the Founding Fathers, knowing that there are no acceptable substitutes for freedom—and "pledge—our lives, our fortunes and our sacred honor" for freedom—"that this Nation under God, shall have a new birth of freedom, and shall not perish from the earth."

The Warsaw Uprising

SPEECH

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 30, 1954

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. I yield.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleagues in commending my beloved and eloquent friend from Chicago [Mr. KLUCZYNSKI] for the tribute he has paid to the people of Poland and the spirit of freedom that always has found in them an instrumentality for highest expression.

In an address both scholarly and dynamic, observing the 10th anniversary of one of the great events in history highlighting the courage of man in standing in unbroken fidelity to high principles in the fact of overwhelming dangers, the distinguished gentleman from Illinois has held us in rapt attention. We will remember this as one of the great never-to-be-forgotten orations of the 83d Congress, now on the eve of adjournment.

This is an anniversary that will be observed each year with increasing realization of its significance. As the years and centuries roll on man in the perplexities of his problems will find the strength to carry on in the inspiration of the story of courage sublime and sacrifice supreme that immortalizes the event of 10 years ago tomorrow.

It is most fitting that today the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States turns from discussion of the existing problems of an unhappy world to devote this hour to an observance of an anniversary belonging not alone to the people of Poland but to all the peoples of the free world.

I commend the Polish American Congress and other patriotic groups for the large contribution they have made in keeping alive the memories of the Battle of Warsaw. To Charles Rozmarek, president of the Polish American Congress, I am deeply indebted for a statement of the facts of the Warsaw uprising and the great sacrifice of Poland's heroes in the cause of liberty. It is a statement so full of historical interest, so vibrantly freighted with the drama of simple truth and earnest sincerity, that having read it I have placed it in my permanent files for future reference and reading.

(Mr. O'HARA of Illinois asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Troopship Shift From San Francisco Appears Not Justified

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 27, 1954

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in our RECORD the first three of a series of articles by Mr. Jack Foisie of the San Francisco Chronicle.

It seems evident that inadequate study of the relevant facts was made by the Army before it decided to shift troopships from San Francisco to Seattle. Mr. Foisie makes the flat assertion that "the Army did not bother to inquire of the Navy if there were any added troopship costs involved in the Army's decision to move virtually all Orient bound troops through Seattle." This is a shocking example of incomplete analysis and study of an important policy decision detrimental to the economy of a great city. In addition to the detriment to San Francisco it may well be that full consideration of all cost factors would show that the claimed reduction in costs is exactly the opposite.

It is evident that the Defense Department owes it to San Francisco and the taxpayers of the Nation to reconsider its action in the light of all the facts. The illusory facts purporting to justify the transfer appear to be ex post facto excuses rather than determinants of a sound decision.

The Chronicle and Mr. Foisie deserve commendation for an excellent job. The articles follow:

TROOPSHIP SHIFT TO SEATTLE COSTING MORE

(By Jack Foisie)

SEATTLE, July 24.—Three months ago the Army abandoned San Francisco as its gateway to the Orient.

It ordered its soldiers—some 30,000 a month—to sail in and out of Seattle.

It ordered the closing of Camp Stoneman, the San Francisco Bay area center which served as the springboard to victory in the Pacific in World War II.

The Army said that the mothballing of Stoneman, and the consolidation of overseas processing here in Seattle would mean greatly increased efficiency.

Last week the Chronicle sent this reporter to the Northwest to see how the new Army program is working out.

Evidence gathered from official sources indicates that all of the $3 million the Army claims will be saved by shutting down Stoneman is being spent and then some due to the added expense of the Seattle operation.

While not all the facts learned here favor San Francisco, strong arguments were turned up for an appeal to the Defense Department.

Such an appeal is to be made by San Francisco's save the troopships committee later this month in Washington. The committee will ask that the overseas processing center be returned to the bay area. It does not dispute the closing of Stoneman, but believes the job of processing overseas troops can be done with real economy at Oakland Army base.

Loss of the Army troop flow, and the loss of five Navy transports which moved them to the Far East, was a body blow to the bay area.

San Francisco has been the main Pacific port of embarkment since the Spanish-American War. Now Seattle leads, although the Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps still moves its men via the Golden Gate.

Loss of the Army business takes a $14,430,000 year slice out of the economy of commercial shipyards and other maritime firms that serviced the big gray troopships.

In addition to its economic aspects, the switch to Seattle put the transports and their crews and passengers 2 hours closer flying time to Russia's Siberian bomber bases.

The Chronicle's survey of the Seattle port developed the following points:

1. The Army has ignored the added cost of transporting men and supplies from the inland population centers to Seattle. That city is handicapped by its location in the northwest corner of the country.

2. The Army has overrated Seattle's Great Circle route to the Orient. If used, it would save ships some 300 miles in sailing to Yokohama.

However, Capt. John R. Sanford, the Navy's troopship operations officer, says only one round trip a month is made over the true Great Circle route because it takes a ship too far north into bad weather. The ship that sails it does so only because of a monthly call to Attu in the Aleutians.

3. The 3-to-1 split of the services in their use of San Francisco and Seattle has made the Navy's troopship operation extremely wasteful. The fleet of 29 troopships is split about even between the 2 ports to take care of the varying needs of the various services, with many ships not being able to get a full load.

On this point, San Francisco backers say all military replacements should move through one port, as on the east coast. In such a showdown at the Defense Department level, San Francisco advocates believe their city would win out, and Seattle would be used only to move troops to Alaska.

Troopship Dispute: Shift to Seattle Costing an Added $720,000 a Year

(Second of a series of articles)

(By Jack Foisie)

Seattle, July 25.—Because of where it is, the Seattle troopship operation is costing the United States taxpayer an estimated $720,000 a year extra in railroad and airline fares.

The evidence is right in the Army record of where soldiers live in this Nation, and what it costs to move them from their homes to Seattle—and back home again after they've served their time in Japan, Korea or Okinawa.

In fighting the Army switch of its overseas processing center from Camp Stoneman, in the bay area, to Fort Lewis and Fort Lawton here, San Francisco port advocates insisted it must cost more to move men to the far Northwest than to California.

An Army expert, Lt. Col. Norton Jackson, said no.

Jackson insisted that both Seattle and San Francisco "are located on the periphery of a circle and so are about equal distant from manpower and supply centers."

"If anything," Jackson said, "Seattle is in a more favorable position on this score because it lies closer to the heavily populated northern communities such as Chicago and New York.

While this is true, an analysis of passenger lists for 4 big troopships arriving in Seattle in June, showed that a devastating number of Texans, other southerners and midwesterners—to say nothing of Californians—also fought in Korea and came home through the Northwest.

In this sampling of average troopship loads, New York led in the State-by-State breakdown, followed closely by California, Pennsylvania, and Texas. In regional tabulation, more men served from the Deep South than from New York, New Jersey, and the New England States.

To Texas and the Southern States, the railroad and airline fares from the two west-coast ports greatly favor San Francisco, while the difference from the two to Chicago and New York is not nearly so much.

In the May hearing, Jackson had the answer to that, too. He said that "railroad bidding tends to equalize fares to every point."

But today, asked for a clarification, he issued a formal statement through the Sixth Army in San Francisco. He said that bulk fares run between 15 to 30 percent of commercial fares and do reflect distance traveled. This appears to make San Francisco's point valid.

Other Army officers said airline charter rates to the Army also follow the same principle.

The Army still may want to argue that the difference is inconsequential. But the Chronicle survey does not find it that way.

A long bout with an adding machine produced the fact that 7,499 soldiers off the 4 ships traveled 500,774 more miles from Seattle to reach processing centers nearest their home than if they had traveled from San Francisco.

This is based on the assumption they all traveled by railroad. They did not in this particular case, some two-thirds going by chartered aircraft. However, the combined rail-air milage would still favor San Francisco by about the same margin.

There also were 1,313 airmen who came home on the Seattle ships, even though the Air Force prefers to have them shipped to San Francisco where regular processing facilities are available. These men traveled 162,998 additional miles from Seattle to get home. And there is no question of bulk fares here. The airman gets paid his travel at 6 cents a mile, according to Maj. William Croft, Air Force processing officer.

Now it is possible to compute the added bill to the taxpayer. For airmen's added fares from Seattle: $9,770.88. For soldiers' added fares: $5,000. This is a conservative estimate. The exact amount cannot be calculated because the Army says its transportation rates are secret.

Anyway, the amount is about $15,000. This represents only half the movement through Seattle in June. The monthly total would be $30,000, and the yearly total would be $360,000.

Since replacements are made on a man-for-man basis, the outbound-fare situation gives us another $360,000 in added fares, or a total of $720,000.

Actually, this is conservative figuring again. Col. Bertie E. Craig, executive officer at the Fort Lewis center where overseas replacements arrive, say "at least 50 percent of the men" arrive individually from their homes after furlough, and are repaid for the commercial fares at 6 cents a mile.

Troopship Dispute—Cockeyed Alaska Schedule Costly

(By Jack Foisie)

Seattle, July 26.—The revamped troopship operation makes this port the military gateway to the Far East—but at the same time makes San Francisco the chief embarkation point for Alaska.

"Cockeyed as it sounds," a Navy officer said, consulting his schedules, "two transports a month serve Alaska from San Francisco, only one from Seattle.

He calculated the added round-trip mileage from California as 1,000 miles, or 2½ days extra steaming—at $2,300 a day added cost—for the ships currently used in the Alaskan run. They are the U. S. S. *Thomas Jefferson* and the U. S. S. *President Jackson*.

These ships take airmen from Parks Air Force Base, in Alameda County, to the far north, which is primarily an Air Force theater of operations.

Representatives of every service agree the split operation to Alaska "doesn't make sense" but it continues because one of the early unification plans—unification of overseas processing—has never been taken off the Defense Department shelf.

Even San Francisco port backers, smarting over the loss of the Army processing center to Seattle, agree that Seattle should do all the Alaska processing but contend that San Francisco is the logical place for moving troops to and from all other Pacific areas.

The crowning inefficiency in the *Jefferson-Jackson* schedule, officers of the Navy's Military Sea Transportation Service said, is that after leaving San Francisco for Alaska the ships often drop into Seattle anyway to fill out their passenger lists.

Such reckless spending doesn't show up in the peculiarly simplified accounting system used by MSTS. Whether the troopships take a man from San Francisco to Seward, or from Seattle to Seward, the charge assessed the service by the Navy is the same—$66 for cabin space, $22 for a bunk in troop quarters.

Similar flat rate fares are fixed for trans-Pacific passage, regardless of shipping point. Thus, the Army did not bother (it now admits) to inquire of the Navy if there were any added troopships operating costs involved in the Army's decision to move virtually all Orient-bound troops through Seattle.

Another often-expressed sentiment encountered during the Chronicle's survey of the costs of the Seattle port operation was amazement or amusement that San Francisco was upset about losing a few ships to Seattle.

The "it means very little" attitude was voiced by the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce itself before discovering that the transfer of just five troopships, their crews, servicing agents, and passengers meant an estimated $14 million loss of revenue annually, and might start a snowballing of more ship transfers away from the port.

This snowballing effect, it appears, already is in progress, aided by the active cooperation among Seattle's military commanders, mayor, labor and business leaders.

In the San Francisco Bay region military commanders stay clear of city hall politics. But Capt. J. R. Topper, head MSTS man in Seattle, is chairman of the mayor's port committee and takes an active part in port promotion.

The united-we-stand spirit was brewed in 1946–47, a Seattle leader explained, when the Army moved to reduce Seattle to a subport for Alaska and make San Francisco the chief port for the Pacific. The plan was bitterly and successfully resisted.

"From then on, Seattle never let down its guard and never failed to nibble away at San Francisco's strength," he added with candor.

"With the Korean war, both ports boomed again. As far as troop movements went, it was about a 50–50 split. Slowly, however, the Army increased the flow in Seattle's favor until by the end of 1953 it was a 65–35 split.

"Thus, when it came to a decision to consolidate the soldier traffic through one port, the performance record favored Seattle."

Having captured 95 percent of the Army movement (the other 5 percent goes from San Francisco to Hawaii and the central Pacific), Seattle now is in a position to cut into the once-exclusive movement of airmen and sailors through San Francisco.

At Far East ports such as Yokohama, Inchon, and Pusan, Seattle-bound troopships already loaded with Army men top off with sailors and airmen waiting for San Francisco ships. In this way, some 3,000 airmen went home in June via Seattle—necessitating duplicate processing facilities in the Northwest.

Fuller ships allow Seattle Army officers to make a better record for Washington superiors. Comparisons of troopship utilization in June is extremely unflattering to San Francisco.

Seattle ships sailed 95 percent full, according to Captain Topper.

San Franscisco ships sailed 54 percent filled in June. This does not include two near-empty ships that went to San Diego for marines. Nor does it include the *General Pope*, for which no load was available in California so it was shuttled to Seattle.

It does include such red-ink operations as the *General E. D. Patrick*, which cleared on June 29 for Honolulu with only 105 passengers or 5 percent of capacity. The next day, the *David Shanks* sailed for Honolulu with 383 passengers, or 39 percent of capacity.

Part of this bad record is due to a seasonal increase in homebound military families.

But with inbound and outbound service traffic expected to be equalized by fall, San Francisco will have to get more business or lose some more of its troopships to Seattle, one high-ranking Army officer said.

Trip-Leasing Bill Should Be Enacted Into Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 30, 1954

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, as adjournment of the 2d session of the 83d Congress approaches, I have been greatly concerned to note that the Congress has not yet completed action on the trip-leasing bill, H. R. 3203.

After exhaustive public hearings before the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, of which I am chairman, extending from April 21 to May 7, 1953, with a printed public record of 520 pages, and a favorable report following lengthy executive sessions by our committee, the House of Representatives overwhelmingly passed this bill on June 24, 1953, over 13 months ago.

Hearings were held on the bill before a Trip-Leasing Subcommittee of the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, of which the late Senator Dwight Griswold, Republican, of Nebraska, was chairman, on July 8 and 9, 1953, with 191 printed pages of testimony, and before the full Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee on May 10 and 11, and June 7, 8, and 25, 1954, with 511 printed pages of testimony. Thus, there have been over 1,200 printed pages of testimony on this bill.

The bill in its present form vests the Interstate Commerce Commission with additional and affirmative authority not heretofore specifically provided by statute to regulate leasing practices of authorized motor carriers in order to bring about adequate carrier responsibility, and to promote safety on the highways; but it denies to the Commission the authority to regulate the duration of leases or amount of compensation thereunder. This limitation on the Commission's authority is the heart of the problem as far as agriculture is concerned because irreparable damage will be done to the effective marketing of farm products by any restrictive and unwarranted regulations to impede the haulers of agricultural commodities from entering into bona fide leases of their trucks to authorized carriers. Agricultural trucks have for many years been leased, and farm people say they should continue to have the right for their trucks to be leased for a single trip or other short periods of time, both for flexibility of movement and economy of operation.

Since the passage of the bill last year by the House, and the subsequent amendment of the leasing rules by the Commission on November 30, 1953, it has been suggested by some of the opponents of the measure, including the ICC, that the rules so amended take care of agriculture's needs and that the urgency for passage of the legislation has been diminished or removed. It is my firm conviction that the need for the enactment of this bill into law is as great today as when it was passed by the House last year. The recent testimony of many farm groups, including the American Farm Bureau Federation, the National Grange, the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, the National Farmers Union, and the United Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Association, and many others—details the reasons why this bill is essential to preserve the flexibility of motor transportation needed in marketing agricultural products from the farm to the consumer.

I am very much impressed, too, with the reasons in support of his advocacy of the passage of this bill as set forth in a report from Secretary of Agriculture Ezra T. Benson, dated May 6, 1954, as contained on pages 398 and 399 of the printed hearings before the Senate committee. The following excerpts from Secretary Benson's report are particularly convincing and in point:

> We believe, however, that the Commission's amended order does not restore the flexibility which Congress intended should accompany the exemptions set forth in section 203 (b) (4a) (5) and (6) of the Interstate Commerce Act. We wish, therefore, to express our continuing interest in, and support of, the legislation proposed by H. R. 3203.
>
> The flexible, efficient, and economic movement of exempt and processed agricultural commodities may not be adequately accomplished under the rules presently prescribed by the Commission.
>
> * * * * *
>
> A great deal of confusion over a long period of time has resulted in growing uncertainties and conflicting opinions with respect to the matter of trip leasing. In order that all parties may be properly guided by the intent of Congress, it is our hope that H. R. 3203 will be enacted into law, thus removing the multiple uncertainties concerning the activities of vehicles embraced within the provisions of section 203 (b) (4a) (5) and (6) of the Interstate Commerce Act.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely trust that final action may be taken by the Senate on this important measure before Congress adjourns, and that it will be promptly signed by the President. Failure to do so would permit the Interstate Commerce Commission to continue to handle this important policy matter with the type of indecision, confusion, and uncertainty that has been evident in its handling of the problem up to this time.

International Sertoma Club American Way Committee Report Points Out Constructive Emphasis on Freedom and Free Enterprise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June, 24, 1954

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, at Denver, Colo., June 10, 1954, Sertoma International, one of our distinguished service clubs of American business and professional men, received the report of its American way committee for 1954, under the chairmanship of Mr. George E. Saunders, of Denver, Colo. A perusal of its worthy text is not only informative but it appears to me as truly inspirational and worthy of the kind attention of each and every Member of this great legislative body.

Mr. Speaker, increasingly it becomes indelibly fixed in my awareness that these service clubs in our beloved Nation, consisting of successful business men and women, do a great and constructive service with lastingly good results.

The following report is another instance of such American citizens seeking for tangible ways and means to be definitely and specifically helpful in the support of the American way of life. I compliment Sertoma, which, spelled out, means service to mankind.

In the great 23d Congressional District, Los Angeles County, Calif., which I have the honor to represent this my 8th year in this great legislative body is a Sertoma Club in the important city of Compton. It is my honor to be an honorary member of that club.

You, Mr. Speaker, do a great honor to the Washington, D. C., Sertoma Club by being its honorary member. And to you, sir, said club recently awarded you the American way honorary plaque for statesmanship.

The text of the report mentioned follows:

DENVER, COLO., *June 10, 1954.*

REPORT OF THE INTERNATIONAL AMERICAN WAY COMMITTEE FOR THE FISCAL YEAR JUST ENDING

To Sertoma and Sertomans Everywhere:

First I wish to pay tribute to, and to say thanks to all of the members of your American way committee for their active cooperation and their hard work which has reaped such a golden harvest this past year.

It is a pleasure for me to bring to you this annual report of your American way committee, and for my third year.

It is a real pleasure to be able to say that our work, like that of all Sertoma, has increased manyfold. The expansion this American-way program has enjoyed, this past year, is almost beyond belief.

No attempt will be made to reduce this success story to cold, statistical figures. They are always somewhat meaningless. But in this growth, such rapid progress has been made that it has been an impossibility to reduce it to figures and to keep up with it.

Some districts are 100 percent effective. The first one to become a 100-perçenter was that great district in the "land of the setting sun," Arizona and the Golden State of California. Out there they even outdid themselves. Districts 1 and 2, and all of the rest of them, did a fine job.

We increased our distribution of the Declaration of Independence by more than 75 percent. We increased our flannel board presentations. I just wish that time would permit me to point out all of the great achievements of all of our fine clubs.

Anyway, we of your American way committee thank you all.

In these days of cold war, hot war, and war of ideals, there are those who enlist in and join the fight for the freedom of men and ideals. I am proud that Sertoma didn't wait to be drafted, but volunteeered, and has been in the front lines. Sertomans are among the shock troops; they are gaining ground every day in this battle for the control of men's minds in our country and throughout the world, especially the minds of our youth.

We believe that the right of man comes ahead of other rights; we believe in the dignity of man; we believe that we, in this country, by precept and example, have established the best government and system of society so far devised by mankind.

We believe that we must tell our story; we must brag, if you please, of our accomplishments. Above all we must tell our children, our youth, our friends and our neighbors about our way of life. We must point up what it has done for the human race, not what it promises to do.

We must point to the real achievements of our free-enterprise system; we must point to the success of our two-party, political system. We must sell America every day. Millions now under the Communist yoke would not be there if they knew the true story, the real story of our democracy. We must continue to pass out copies of that greatest of all documents, the Declaration of Independence.

This has become the No. 1 part of the American way committee's program. It has caught on with our local clubs, with various chambers of commerce, and particularly with the schools, both public and parochial, far beyond our expectations. For the great record it has enjoyed, the sincere thanks of your committee goes to all of the hard workers in the good clubs which have participated.

This is our third year of this endeavor. It exceeds everything else in club participation. The methods of distribution have varied. Some have been prizes for recitations; others make a community project of it, placing the emphasis upon the importance of the document itself. This has been the best method.

We have successfully resisted efforts to embroil Sertoma in direct controversy; we have ignored those outside influences which were attempting to steal our thunder, so to speak.

We have "stuck strictly to our knitting" in promoting service to mankind in our American way of life. It has paid off.

In September 1952, your American way committee formulated a program from which, thank goodness, we have never deviated. It goes like this:

"Freedom is our heritage; it is freedom for each of us as an individual which makes America truly the 'land of the free—land of the Pilgrims' pride—land that we love.' "

That's a strong belief. We set out to find the basic reasons for it; to prove them; then to capitalize upon them. We struck responsive chords everywhere. It has been successful, thanks to all of you.

So, first, Sertoma Clubs have the distribution of the Declaration of Independence, with which all of you are familiar.

Second, Sertoma Clubs are making effective, powerful presentations of the great issues of free enterprise to other organizations in their communities by use of the flannel board programs.

Third, promoting the singing of our national anthem at sports events has enjoyed a fair measure of success.

Fourth, the honoring of outstanding citizens has been done by several clubs. It has proven so interesting and successful that, we feel sure, it will enjoy still greater growth this coming year. The accompanying banquets, with resultant newspaper, TV, radio, and other publicity have enhanced Sertoma tremendously.

Fifth, the American way award is a relatively recent innovation. Memphis started it; others are adopting and adapting it to their local situations. It is a $250 scholarship, plus the designation of the Bert Bates Plaque, given to the club judged to have presented the best American way program of the year.

Why has Sertoma adopted such a program? Because we believe that we need to sell America and to sell community enterprise. The word "enterprise" is used because we believe that enterprise, meaning free enterprise, has a great deal to do with our American way of life.

We speak of free enterprise, and we extoll the accomplishments we have enjoyed by its use. However, enterprise, in itself, can do very little to get things done. We must have a purpose, a program, and a plan, plus the enterprise to get the job done.

Our forefathers had those things, all of them, and through their use we have built the best system of society known to mankind.

Some folks, these last few years, have expressed great fear of communism and, in efforts to ease those fears, have been willing to give up a part of their freedom. But we, in Sertoma, have thought that too much emphasis has been placed upon fear; we have assumed, too often, that our American way of life is faulty; we have listened and applauded most every time some one pointed up some of the weaknesses in our system of government.

Our papers have headlined and been filled with so-called news which did not compliment our way of life. Is it little wonder, then, that our children have expressed, in polls, some doubt as to the value of democracy?

We tell them about all of the things which we believe to be bad. It's little wonder that they question not only us, but the future. How often have we told them that communism was tried, in this country, by the Pilgrims in the Plymouth colony? Do we point out that, after a short and almost fatal trial, our forefathers found that it would not work, and they set up a new system whereby people were rewarded for enterprise?

In recognition of these facets of our American way, your American way committee has been fortunate. It merely wrote the theme song, so to speak. You good club workers, individually and collectively, sang that song from that point, with ever-increasing and greater harmony and effectiveness.

Out of all of this splendid activity has come the increasing conviction that America's democracy is the finest product by which to live in all of this old, worn, torn world of ours.

And what is America? It is 160 million people working together for the common good and, believe me, making a success of it, too.

It is freedom, as never before known in the world. It is the indescribable stir of free peoples of all colors, creeds, and faith, traveling east and west, north and south, going, doing, working, living, and enjoying, when and where they will.

It is good to be a part of that freedom which you, of all of Sertoma, have promoted so well. So let us thank God for that lady who stands on Bedloes Island in the harbor of New York. May the torch she holds on high never be dimmed; may the liberty she exemplifies be our heritage forever.

May Sertoma continue to sponsor the cause of our freedom of thought, of action, of religious belief and, above all, the privilege of free enterprise.

Railroad Retirement Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. MOSS, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 30, 1954

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, on last Friday I voted for H. R. 7840 to improve provisions of the railroad retirement program. I believe that the improvements included in the bill are excellent, although there are a number of other benefits which I believe could have been included without impairing the economic stability of the railroad retirement fund. H. R. 7840, however, appears to be the only bill covering the subject on which we will be permitted to vote this session. It has, therefore, my wholehearted support.

I particularly am happy to be able to support legislation lowering the age at which widows may receive survivors benefits from 65 to 60. I also think it is very important to continue survivors benefits for the widowed mother of a totally disabled child after the child reaches the age of 18.

The liberalization of unemployment benefits for jobless railroad workers also is a step which should have been taken earlier. These, and other improvements in the railroad retirement program, deserve the strongest support of Congress. I hope we will be able, in the future, to apply some of these improvements to other retirement and unemployment insurance programs just as I hope we will soon approve other needed changes in the railroad retirement program.

Highlights of the Republican Tax Revision Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 22, 1954

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the Republican tax revision bill, H. R. 8300, which I sponsored and which is now to become law, is the most monumental legislative undertaking in the history of the Congress.

It is the first comprehensive revision of the internal revenue laws since before the turn of the century and the enactment of the income tax.

Approximately a half a million manhours of work have gone into this gigantic achievement.

Over 3,000 changes in the revenue laws are contained in the tax revision measure. In general, the purpose of these changes has been to remove inequities, to end harassment of the taxpayer, and to reduce tax barriers to future expansion of production and employment.

The new law closes over 50 loopholes through which taxpayers today can avoid paying their fair share of taxes.

The new law contains $827 million relief for individuals and $536 million relief for business. In addition, the new law will extend the present 52 percent corporate income for 1 year which means an additional $1.2 billion tax on business. This increased tax on business practically pays for all of the tax relief granted so that the net cost to the revenue will be only $163 million.

Without attempting to give a technical interpretation, the following represents some of the highlights of the new tax law. These changes in general are effective last January 1 so that the taxpayers will receive the benefit from them this year.

DEPENDENTS

First. A parent can claim a deduction of $600 for each child regardless of the child's earnings if the child is under 19 and the parent continues to furnish more than half the child's support.

Second. A parent can also claim the $600 dependency deduction for a child over 18 regardless of the child's earnings if the child is attending school or college, or receiving on-the-farm training, and the parent continues to furnish more than half the child's support.

Third. An aged parent or other dependent cared for by several members of a family can be claimed as a deduction by one of the members of the family.

Fourth. A taxpayer can claim a $600 dependency deduction for a foster child.

Fifth. A taxpayer can claim a $600 dependency deduction for a child awaiting adoption.

Sixth. A taxpayer can claim a $600 dependency deduction for any other person, regardless of relationship, if the taxpayer supports that person in his home.

Seventh. A taxpayer can claim a $600 dependency deduction for a cousin who is institutionalized because of physical or mental disability.

Savings to taxpayers, $85 million.

CHILD-CARE EXPENSES

First. Single working parents, such as a widow, are allowed a deduction up to $600 for the expense of child-care for children up to 12 years of age.

Second. The same deduction is allowed for a married woman who must work because her husband is incapacitated.

Third. The same deduction is allowed with respect to any dependent, regardless of age, who is mentally or physically incapable of caring for himself.

Fourth. A similar deduction is allowed a married woman if the combined income of her husband and herself does not exceed $5,100.

Savings to taxpayers, $130 million.

MEDICAL EXPENSES

First. Medical expenses can be deducted when they exceed 3 percent of income, instead of 5 percent as under present law.

Second. Example: A family with $3,000 gross income and medical expenses of $150 will be able to deduct $60. The same family can deduct nothing today.

Third. The bill doubles the present maximum limit on the amount that can be deducted.

Savings to taxpayers, $80 million.

HEAD OF FAMILY

First. A single taxpayer who has a dependent son or daughter will be entitled during the first 2 years after the death of his spouse to the same income-splitting privilege as is accorded married couples.

Second. A single individual can receive half the benefits of income splitting if he has a dependent parent and if the taxpayer maintains a household for the father or mother.

Savings to taxpayers, $11 million.

RETIREMENT INCOME CREDIT

First. All retired people 65 and over, including schoolteachers, firemen, policemen, and civil servants, will in effect be exempt on all retirement income up to $1,200. This will mean a tax reduction for these retired people of up to $240 a year.

Second. Example: A retired single individual over 65 who has a total retirement income of $3,000 today pays about $300 in income tax. Under the bill, his tax is reduced to $60—a saving of $240.

Third. The same exemption will extend to individuals under 65 if they receive a pension from a public retirement system, such as do teachers.

Savings to taxpayers, $141 million.

CREDIT PURCHASES

The bill allows a deduction for interest up to 6 percent on installment purchases.

Total saving to taxpayers, $10 million.

CHARITABLE CONTRIBUTIONS

The bill increases from 20 to 30 percent the allowable deduction for charitable contributions to churches, hospitals, and educational institutions.

Total saving to taxpayers, $25 million.

AID TO FARMERS

First. Deductions up to 25 percent of farm income are allowed for soil and water conservation.

Second. The bill permits more rapid write-off of the expense of farm machinery, equipment, and construction.

Third. Removes tax on the proceeds of the sale of cattle when the sale is necessitated by disease.

Savings to taxpayers, $10 million.

SICKNESS AND ACCIDENT PLANS

First. Premiums paid by employers to health and accident plans will not be taxable to their employees.

Second. All accident and health benefits paid as reimbursement for actual medical expenses to employees, their wives, or children, are completely exempted from tax.

Third. Payments to employees for loss of wages due to injury or illness are exempted up to $100 a week.

Savings to taxpayers: No estimate possible.

DEATH BENEFITS

The bill exempts all death benefits up to $5,000 paid by an employer to the widow or other beneficiary of an employee.

Savings to taxpayers: No estimate possible.

PENSIONS AND ANNUITIES

In addition to the $1,200 exemption extended to retirement income, the bill also provides a simpler method for taxation of pensions and annuities, ends annual 3-percent tax paid on annuities and provides instead a method of computing tax on basis of cost divided by years of life expectancy.

Savings to taxpayers, $10 million.

DIVIDEND CREDIT

First. Excludes first $50 in dividends from taxation and provides a credit against tax equal to 4 percent of the balance.

Second. Example: An individual with $50 or less in dividends from his savings will be entirely exempt from tax on that amount.

Third. Example: An individual with $250 in dividends from his savings will exclude the first $50 entirely, and then reduce his total tax by $8—4 percent of the balance of $200.

Savings to taxpayers, $204 million.

DEPRECIATION

The bill will permit the more liberal writeoff of the cost of new equipment. For example, in the first year of life of new equipment, the taxpayer will be able to write off twice the amount now allowed.

Savings to taxpayers, $375 million, of which $75 million represents savings to individuals such as farmers, shopkeepers, and salesmen.

DECLARATIONS OF ESTIMATED TAX

The requirements are eased for filing declarations of estimated tax. Upward of a million taxpayers will be relieved of the present requirement for filing.

FILING TAX RETURNS

Tax returns will be due April 15 instead of March 15, giving taxpayers 1 additional month in which to prepare their final tax returns and make their final tax payments.

RESEARCH AND EXPERIMENTATION

The bill grants taxpayers an option to either deduct as an expense or to amortize research and experimental expenditures.

No revenue estimate possible. The provision is designed to encourage business research with the objective of creating new products, new processes, and new jobs.

METHODS OF ACCOUNTING

The bill brings tax-accounting rules into harmony with business accounting, thereby eliminating to a great extent the necessity for taxpayers to maintain two sets of books. It provides realistic computation of net income for tax purposes in conformity with sound business practices.

Savings to taxpayers, $47 million.

DEPLETION

The bill increases the rate of percentage depletion on a variety of critical and strategic minerals in order to encourage the development of domestic sources of supply.

Savings to taxpayers, $34 million.

PARTNERSHIPS

First. The bill adopts comprehensive provisions concerning the tax treatment of partners and partnerships in order to remove confusion of existing law. Principal objectives are simplicity, flexibility, and equity between partners.

Second. Certain proprietorships and partnerships are given the option to be taxed as corporations.

Savings to taxpayers, $20 million.

INVENTIONS

The bill extends capital-gains treatment to proceeds realized by an inventor on the sale or exchange of a patent.

No revenue estimate possible. The new provision is designed to encourage invention and thereby promote a healthy economy and an improving standard of living.

NET OPERATING LOSS

The bill extends the net operating loss carryback to 2 years and makes certain other adjustments.

Savings to taxpayers, $120 million.

LIFE INSURANCE

The bill lessens the estate tax on the proceeds of certain life-insurance policies.

Savings to individual taxpayers, $25 million.

CONSOLIDATED RETURNS

The bill removes the 2 percent penalty tax with respect to consolidated returns filed by regulated public utilities.

Savings to taxpayers, $35 million.

IMPROPER ACCUMULATIONS

The bill eases the penalty tax on certain accumulated earnings in order that business, especially small businesses, may have greater freedom in retaining their funds for legitimate business purposes.

Savings to taxpayers, $10 million.

CORPORATION INCOME TAX

The bill extends for 1 year the present 52 percent corporation income tax.

Total increase in revenue, $1.2 billion.

REPUBLICAN ACTION FOR TAXPAYERS

The 10 percent reduction in Federal income taxes which went into effect last January 1 saves individual taxpayers a total of $3 billion annually. This tax cut would not have been possible if the Congress and the administration had not cut the Truman budget for fiscal 1954 by $12 billion.

Nor would the $2 billion tax saving by elimination of the excess-profits tax have been possible without this budget cutting.

The Republican excise-tax reduction law saves taxpayers an additional $1 billion.

The tax revision act will save taxpayers $1,400,000,000.

A total of $827 million of this tax saving is for individuals. The remainder, $536 million, is tax relief for business.

The overall tax-cut program will save $7,400,000,000. Of this amount, individuals receive an overall total tax saving of $4,700,000,000. The tax savings so far surpass any previous total in the history of Congress.

The Gorgas Memorial Institute of Tropical and Preventive Medicine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 2, 1954

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, in the Senat on July 24, 1954, I referred to the organization and work of the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory, and I included as part of my remarks a statement made by the Hon. Maurice H. Thatcher, former Representative in Congress from Kentucky and, since his retirement from Congress, vice president and general counsel of the Gorgas Memorial Institute of Tropical and Preventive Medicine, Inc., which organization has charge of the laboratory. In the same connection, I included a statement by Dr. Victor H. Haas, director of the National Microbiological Institute. These two statements were made before the subcommittee of the Senate Appropriations Committee having charge of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare appropriation bill for 1955. They give many excellent reasons for the organization and operation of this outstanding isthmian institute, and justify the item carried in the appropriation bill for the laboratory and its work.

I have the honor to be a member of the subcommittee, and was present at the hearings which took place on May 10, 1954. At the hearings there also appeared Col. Joseph F. Siler, president of the institute. He made a statement detailing some of the more important achievements of the laboratory. Colonel Siler served as Chief Health Officer of the Panama Canal from 1929 to 1934, and there made a brilliant record of service. In fact, in varying capacities as a member of the Medical Corps of the Army, through the years he has performed many important tasks with fine ability. He has been a devoted and outstanding public servant. I am proud of the fact that he is a native Alabamian, as was General Gorgas.

I believe it would be well to complete in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the picture of the work of the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory by including substantial portions of Colonel Siler's statement made before consent, Mr. President, to have that done.

There being no objection, the excerpts from the statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF COL. J. F. SILER, PRESIDENT, GORGAS MEMORIAL INSTITUTE OF TROPICAL AND PREVENTIVE MEDICINE, INC.

The Gorgas Memorial Laboratory is the only research agency permanently established in the tropical areas of the Western Hemisphere and because of its permanency, research workers of the Departments of the Army, the Navy, the Public Health Service, and other Government agencies and non-Government research organizations are sent to the laboratory for special investigative work from time to time.

In subsequent paragraphs we will review briefly some of the research activities that have been undertaken by the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory since it first began operating in 1929, and the results that have been obtained.

* * * * *

TRYPANOSOMES

For many years it has been known that trypanosomes, parasites that inhabit the blood and tissues of infected men and animals, cause sleeping sickness in humans in Africa and that they also cause Chagas' disease in Central and South America and a highly fatal disease of horses and mules. The disease in these animals in the Canal Zone and Panama was first recognized by Dr. Darling when he was head of the Board of Health Laboratory in the Canal Zone in 1909.

It has been established that in Africa the tsetse fly was the transmitting agent of the trypanosomes, but the method of transmission of trypanosomiasis to mules and horses on the Isthmus of Panama was a mystery until 1932 when Dr. Herbert C. Clark, director of the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory, demonstrated that vampire bats were the carriers.

The species of trypanosomes involved occur also in cattle, hogs, sheep, and goats, but these animals act only as reservoirs of the disease and are themselves unharmed by it. The bats transfer the organisms from such animals to horses and mules in which the disease has a high fatality rate. Dr. Clark and his staff recognized the fact that the bats fed only at night and recommended that stables housing horses and mules be well lighted at night or screened to prevent entrance of the bats. The recommendations were put into effect with the result that there was very great reduction in mortality rates from trypanosomiasis among Government animals on the Canal Zone.

ANTIMALARIAL DRUGS

When the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory was established in Panama City in 1929, its director, Dr. Herbert C. Clark, suggested that one of its initial research activities be an investigation of the possibilities of controlling malaria through the administration of antimalarial drugs to infected individuals in specified population groups over a long period of time. The suggestion was immediately put into effect. A few villages in Panama in the Chagres River area adjacent to the Panama Canal were selected for the investigations.

In 1929 an initial blood film survey of the inhabitants of the 5 villages selected for treatment was made and 45.6 percent of the inhabitants were found to have malaria parasites in their blood. During the period 1930–34 blood surveys were made at monthly intervals and all individuals with malaria parasites were treated with quinine. By 1934 the malaria rates had declined from 45.6 percent to 21.5 percent.

Beginning in 1935 the use of quinine was discontinued and all patients were treated with atabrin or plasmoquin with the result that by 1947 the malaria rate had further declined to 10.1 percent.

SPRAYING HOUSES WITH DDT

In 1944 an additional preventive measure, the spraying of all inhabited houses, inside and outside, with a 5 percent solution of DDT in kerosene was initiated in certain of the villages under experiment. This resulted in 70 percent to 99 percent reduction in the number of mosquitoes found in the sprayed dwellings. Since 1947 bimonthly blood surveys of the inhabitants of the villages under observation have been made and the houses have all been sprayed with DDT at least three times a year. These measures have resulted in a further reduction of malaria in these villages to 1 percent.

Since 1935 the new antimalarial drugs (atabrin, chloroquine, plasmoquin, aralen, and paludrin) have been subjected to tests in the treatment of cases of malaria, in lieu of quinine, and excellent results have been obtained. During the past year or more two newer antimalarial drugs, primaquin and plaquenil (which is closely related to aralen) have also been subjected to trial with excellent results. During the present year a still more recently developed antimalarial drug, daraprim, is being tested and will be reported on at a later date. The great advantage of using the most effective of these drugs lies in the fact that the frequency of administration and period of treatment of acute cases of malaria is greatly reduced as compared to quinine.

The very excellent results being obtained in malaria control through treatment and the spraying of houses in the Chagres River villages greatly interested the Government of the Republic of Panama, and in 1947 the ministry of health of that government with the cooperation of members of the staff of Gorgas Memorial Laboratory undertook a campaign of spraying inhabited dwellings in villages throughout the Republic with DDT three times a year.

* * * * *

This spraying compaign was continued for 3 years (1947–49) and has resulted in very marked reductions in malaria throughout the Republic of Panama. The excellence of these results can best be appreciated when one examines the annual statistics covering the occurrence of malaria in Panama Canal personnel. For many years most cases of malaria in Panama Canal personnel in reality have been contracted outside the Canal Zone.

During the 30-year period 1917 to 1947 the malaria rates in this personnel were usually about 12 to 16 cases per 1,000 per annum. In 1947 the rates began to decline. And, notwithstanding the fact that the nationwide spraying with DDT was discontinued by the Panama Government at the end of 1949, the annual malaria rates in Panama Canal employees have remained low (1949, 3.1 per 1,000; 1950, 1.1 per 1,000; 1951, 2.0 per 1,000; 1952, 3.2 per 1,000; and 1953, 2.6 per 1,000). Since 1947 there has also been a material reduction in the malaria rates among the Armed Forces serving in the Canal Zone area.

* * * * *

RESEARCH ON YELLOW FEVER

As is well known, investigations undertaken by the Walter Reed Research Unit in Cuba in 1900 demonstrated definitely that the virus causing yellow fever was transmitted from person to person by the Aedes egypti mosquito. As a result it became possible in the early years of the 20th century to bring to an end the epidemics of yellow fever that previously had been of such common occurrence in many sections of the Western Hemisphere.

JUNGLE YELLOW FEVER

However, the disease continued to occur in heavily forested areas in Brazil and Colombia in some individuals working in or visiting such areas. Investigations undertaken demonstrated the fact that so-called jungle (sylvan) yellow fever prevailed in monkeys inhabiting these forested areas and that the virus causing the disease was transmitted from monkey to monkey and from infected monkeys to humans by at least two species of mosquitos (Haemagogus spegazzinii falco and Aedes leucocelaenus) that breed in the forest trees (in holes containing small collections of water).

In November and December of 1948, five residents of the village of Pacora, a few miles southeast of the city of Panama, were admitted to Santo Tomas Hospital in Panama City and all died of yellow fever after 1 or 2 days hospitalization.

Early in 1949 a committee consisting of representatives of the Health Department of the Panama Canal, Medical Departments of the Army and Navy, Department of Public Health of the Republic of Panama, and the Pan American Sanitary Bureau, held a conference to determine the steps that should be taken in the premises. The initial step was the immediate vaccination against yellow fever of approximately 650,000 individuals constituting populations of the Republic of Panama, the Canal Zone, and the United States military and naval installations. Since that time only a few known deaths from yellow fever have occurred in nonvaccinated Panamanians working in the forested areas where jungle yellow fever prevails. It can be assumed, however, that some others died during this period in the wilder sections of eastern Panama.

At the joint conference referred to above, it was agreed that the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory would be requested to survey the monkeys and other arboreal animals in representative forested areas throughout Panama to determine the degree of prevalence of jungle yellow fever in wild animals, particularly the monkeys.

In hunting expeditions in various forested areas throughout Panama, blood specimens were obtained from several hundred slaughtered arboreal animals, particularly monkeys. Examinations of the blood specimens in yellow fever laboratories in Brazil and Colombia demonstrated that a fairly large percentage of the monkeys had acquired immunity to yellow fever, indicating that they had survived yellow fever attacks.

The percentage of immune monkeys was somewhat higher in the area of Panama extending south from the Panama Canal to the Colombian border than was the case in the northern area between the Panama Canal and the Costa Rican border. In 1951 members of the staff of the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory, in cooperation with the Pan American Sanitary Bureau, made a survey of monkeys in forested areas in Chiapas Province, Mexico, and examination of the blood specimens so obtained showed a small percentage immune.

STUDIES ON SPECIES OF MOSQUITOES

At the joint conference referred to previously, the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory also agreed to undertake comprehensive studies of the species of mosquitoes prevailing in the forested areas of Panama, this study to include area distribution, annual cycles of abundance, distribution of various species at different levels in the forest, and the relationship of the various species attacking man to the transmission of jungle yellow fever. Since 1949 comprehensive studies have been made of the species of mosquitoes prevailing in many of the forested areas of Panama. To properly carry out these investigations, it was necessary to establish collecting stations in selected trees with 1 collecting platform 20 feet from the ground and another near the top of the tree.

Access to the two platforms was by strong ladders securely attached to the tree trunk. Each tree station was manned by a crew of 3 collectors, 1 at ground level and 1 on each of the 2 platforms, and a foreman. The collectors remained at their stations for definite periods of time each day capturing all mosquitoes alighting on their bodies. The many thousands of mosquitoes collected at these stations were transported to the laboratory where they were examined for species determination.

Many additional mosquitoes were secured by placing bamboo sections filled with water on the platforms of the tree stations, allowing mosquitoes to lay their eggs in the containers and then transferring the collections of larvae to the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory where the larvae hatched out as adults and were then examined for species determination.

A number of species of mosquitoes have been identified, including the two species already proven to be transmitters of jungle yellow fever in South America.

* * * * *

JUNGLE YELLOW FEVER EPIDEMIC

During the summer of 1951 an epidemic of jungle yellow fever occurred in Costa Rica with some 38 deaths, and since that time, additional deaths have been reported. Difficulty was experienced in promptly completing the vaccination of the inhabitants against the disease because a considerable portion of the population lived in areas which were inaccessible because of lack of communicating roads. This difficulty was largely solved by the use of helicopters supplied by the United States.

The accumulated evidence demonstrates beyond question that jungle (sylvan) yellow fever is gradually extending northward into the most northern of the Central American States as monkey and human fatalities were reported from northern Nicaragua in 1953. Because of the extreme importance of gaining more definite knowledge relative to the extent to which jungle yellow fever prevails in the monkeys of the forested areas of Central American countries between Panama and the United States, and concerning the prevalence of species of forest mosquitoes that may prove to be transmitting agents, including their abundance under varying conditions, plans were completed early in 1953 for the extension of the forest mosquito surveys and surveys of monkeys in specially selected areas in the countries north of Panama—Nicaragua, Honduras, Guatemala, and Mexico.

These studies have been undertaken in cooperation with the health services of the various countries concerned and the Pan American Sanitary Bureau. A period of 2 or 3 years probably will be required to secure the essential information. It is particularly important that these investigations be carried out without delay, as in some areas in Central America Aedes agypti mosquitoes, which transmit yellow fever in urban areas, still exist in such numbers as would make possible the occurrence of epidemics of the disease should individuals living in such areas contract jungle yellow fever.

It is of special significance that some of the close relatives of Haemagogus spegazzinii, which is known to transmit yellow fever in other places, have been found in northern Mexico, in the vicinity of the United States border. Though monkeys no longer are found in southern Texas, certain marsupials, such as opossums, appear to be concerned in the transmission of jungle yellow fever and these inhabit many areas in the southern section of the United States.

MOSQUITO COLLECTING STATIONS

During the rainy season of 1953, mosquito collection stations were established in specially selected forested areas in Nicaragua, Honduras, Guatemala, and Mexico, with the intention of continuing collecting activities at these stations for a year or more. All collections of mosquitoes are being shipped to Gorgas Memorial Laboratory for species determination.

So far, large numbers of mosquitoes have been collected in the various areas and the determination of the species obtained indicated that the species of Haemagogus known to transmit jungle yellow fever in South America is present but that the species of Aëdes involved in the spread of the disease in South America is not present. However, other species of Haemagogus similar in many respects to the species known to transmit jungle yellow fever also are present and are being given consideration as possible transmitting agents.

More adequate facilities are now being provided at the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory for making the necessary studies to determine which of the species of mosquitoes found are involved in the transmission of jungle yellow fever in northern Central America.

SURVEYS OF MONKEYS

Surveys of monkeys and other arboreal animals, such as were made by Dr. Clark, of the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory, throughout Panama and in one section of Mexico, are being made by representatives of the Pan American Sanitary Bureau in the areas in northern Central America now under study. Testing of blood specimens collected so far indicate that some of the animals have acquired immunity to yellow fever, indicating that the disease is gradually extending northward.

LEISHMANIASIS

For many years a group of diseases variously known as leishmaniasis, kala azar, Mediterranean fever, oriental sore, et cetera, have been known to prevail in certain areas in Europe, the Near East, and Asia. These diseases are caused by parasites known as Leishmania, and in recent years it has been demonstrated that certain species of sandflies (Phlebotomus) transmit the causative organisms to human beings.

Certain of these diseases are also known to prevail in the Western Hemisphere in certain areas, particularly in Central and South America. As sandflies are of common occurrence in many areas, it can be assumed that they, in all probability, are responsible for the transmission of this group of diseases in the Western Hemisphere. Because of the importance of securing more definite information concerning the part played by sandflies in the transmission of these diseases in Central and South America, members of the staff of the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory initiated studies of sandflies about 10 years ago.

RESULTS OF STUDIES

Since the initiation of these studies, the following results have been obtained. More than 100,000 specimens of sandflies (Phlebotomus) have been collected in the various sections of Central and South America and in limited areas in the West Indies. This work has established the fact that at least 60 species prevail in Central America and Mexico; whereas, only 9 species were known when the work was begun.

Approximately 40 of the 60 species found are new species not heretofore reported in entomological publications. Much has been learned concerning the geographical and seasonal distribution of the various species and concerning their biting habits. Fortunately, only about a dozen species, so far, have been observed biting human beings.

In 1945 members of the staff of the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory, after making a survey of sandfly-borne diseases prevailing in some construction camps in Peru, sprayed a group of houses with 5 percent DDT with a view to eliminating the species of sandfly that presumably was transmitting the infectious agent. The experiment was completely successful and the expansion of the DDT spraying to all construction camps in the area has resulted in the elimination of leishmaniasis in the area. As a result of the abovementioned experiment, which was observed by an Italian scientist, DDT spraying to control leishmaniasis in Italy and elsewhere in the Mediterranean area has been adopted as a routine measure with excellent results.

FOREST MAMMAL RESERVOIR OF DISEASE

There appears to be no question but that some forest mammal serves as a reservoir for the disease, as leishmaniasis but seldom occurs in towns and cities and usually attacks individuals visiting forested areas or engaged in clearing such areas. * * *

Field observations suggest that in all probability some rodent inhabiting forested areas in Central and South America eventually will be proven to be the animal reservoir.

Since leishmaniasis prevails in many areas of Central and South America, the studies of sandflies will be continued, as it is highly important that definite information be obtained as to the species of sandflies that serve to transmit the disease in this hemisphere and the rodents or other mammals that serve as animal reservoirs of the infectious agent. Plans were completed to initiate a project of this nature in Costa Rica in the fall of 1952, with the expectation of extending investigations for a period of at least 2 years.

COOPERATION BY COSTA RICA

The Government of Costa Rica offered its cooperation. As the operating funds available annually to the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory are not sufficient to cover all the investigations contemplated, the United States Public Health Service was requested to make available a research grant for the purpose. The request was approved but it was necessary to postpone the project until late 1955 or 1956, as Dr. Hertig, of the Gorgas Memorial Staff, who was to be in charge is now working in Korea as head of a unit investigating hemorrhagic fever fo the Medecial Department of the Army.

TUBERCULOSIS

During recent years there has been a marked increase in the incidence rates of tuberculosis in Panama City, Colon, and elsewhere in Panama; and in January 1949 the Ministry of Health of Panama, with the cooperation of the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory, initiated an antituberculosis campaign consisting of B. C. G. vaccinations. By October 1951, 128,967 persons had been vaccinated. At that date the project was turned over to the Servicio Cooperative Interamericano de Salud (a joint point 4 activity of the United States and Panama), which anticipated completing the B. C. G. vaccinations throughout the Republic.

SPOTTED FEVER

Several years ago a virus laboratory was added to the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory. Since that time, as examples of important work accomplished, the organism causing Rocky Mountain spotted fever in Panama was isolated and the identification of the vector established and three strains of the virus causing acute anterior poliomyelitis were isolated during studies undertaken in connection with an outbreak of poliomyelitis of unprecedented proportions which occurred on the isthmus late in 1950 and early in 1951. The virus of yellow fever was recovered from a case of jungle fever, and the survey of live forest animals for protective antibodies against yellow fever has been carried on since 1949.

VISITING RESEARCH SCIENTISTS

As an independent, permanently located research organization, in continuous operation since its establishment in 1929, the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory is able to offer its facilities, its services, and the knowledge of a staff permanently resident in the Tropics, to visiting research scientists. It not only carriers on long-term research projects with its resident staff, but also acts as a base of operations for other investigators engaged in short-term projects, and the capital outlay that would otherwise be needed to set up the short-term projects is avoided and economy thereby effected.

Over a period of years, the laboratory has been thus used by the United States Government services, by private institutions, and by international health agencies. Medical officers of the Army, the Navy, and the Public Health Service have all carried on research projects either at the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory or in the area under the auspices of the laboratory.

More About Salaries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 27, 1954

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to commend to the attention of our colleagues the following editorials which have appeared in various newspapers throughout the country, urging salary increases for Members of Congress and our Federal judges. They were enclosed with a letter I received from Morris B. Mitchell, chairman of the committee on judicial selection, tenure, and compensation of the American Bar Association, which has already been made a part of the RECORD.

The editorials follow:

[From the Springfield (Ohio) News of May 1, 1954]

CONGRESSIONAL PAY HIKE

The reluctance of Congressmen to vote themselves pay raises in an election year is understandable but nonetheless regrettable.

Fifteen thousand a year is totally inadequate for the job these men do. Small wonder that many desert the ranks. Without a private income, it is almost impossible for a Congressman to make ends meet, given the expenses of his office.

No one expects government service to be remunerative. It has other compensations. The Government always will attract good men who are prompted by sincere ambitions toward service.

It is important, however, that no one be denied the opportunity to serve simply because he does not have private means. No citizen should find it necessary to subsidize the Government by serving at a financial loss.

We trust that Congress will surmount its timidity and vote itself a raise. Congressmen should get at least to $20,000 and preferably to $25,000. Federal judges should be raised commensurately.

[From the St. Paul (Minn.) Dispatch of April 21, 1954]

CONGRESS HESITATES ON MEMBERS PAY INCREASE

The foundation has been laid for an increase in the salaries of Members of Congress, but neither the House nor the Senate as yet had courage to bring the matter up for a vote. This election year hesitation has had the additional effect of stalling proposals for higher pay for Federal judges.

A Commission was established by Congress in its 1953 session to recommend pay changes for Senators, Representatives and judges. The Commission unanimously found that all three groups are entitled to more remuneration. House leaders decided to wait for the Senate to take the initiative, but the Senate has not yet started the ball rolling.

Since the bills which have been drafted link up judicial pay scales with those of Congressmen, the delay is affecting the Federal judges, who might otherwise have obtained separate consideration.

Substantial salaries for public officials are in the public interest because this is one way of getting and keeping capable men in office. Members of Congress almost unanimously support this theory, but their fear of adverse reaction among voters causes them to hesitate about taking action.

[From the Portsmouth (Ohio) Times of April 26, 1954]

Rough on Judges

If there were any time to shed a tear for the wrongs that are going to be committed in this session of Congress, a special one might be shed for Federal judges.

The dignitaries apparently are going to be sidestepped out of a raise it is generally believed they are entitled to have. What happened to them shouldn't happen to anyone but Hawaiian's seeking statehood when Democrats control Congress or Alaskans seeking statehood when Republicans control it.

The proposition of increasing judicial salaries was tied to a proposition for increasing the salaries of Members of Congress. Therefore, if the Congressmen developed cold feet about that particular morsel of political trouble the Federal judges could whistle for their raise.

That is exactly what happened.

A bill to raise the pay of Congressmen and Federal judges was introduced early this year. The chairman of the House Judiciary Committee sat on the bill because he said the Senate should act first; only a third of its Members must face voters this year, although every Member of the House will be subject to review.

But the Senate stalled because it charged that House Members had given themselves a $7,500 bonus in effect by liberalizing their pension benefits.

All this has no effect on Federal judges, who can only brood in judicial objectivity over the system of hooking up one proposal with another so neither has a chance of winning if the cards are stacked against one, or of losing if the cards are stacked against neither.

[From the Cedar Rapids (Iowa) Gazette of April 4, 1954]

Hard To Swallow

One Congressman told the Commission on Judicial and Congressional Salaries that he couldn't bote for a raise for himself without displeasing the folks back home. We don't believe it. Much higher salaries for labor leaders have not been begrudged by union members. They have gotten their money's worth. We don't believe the taxpayers are content for business and industry to continue to have first pick of topflight brains and administrative talent. Government is our biggest business. To hesitate to pay Members of Congress in reasonable proportion to what private industry pays those who manage its affairs, while expecting them to be responsible for multi-multi-billion-dollar business, is indeed to strain at a very young and undernourished gnat while swallowing not just a camel, a herd of elephants.

[From the Albuquerque (N. Mex.) Journal of January 30, 1954]

Another Federal Judge

Even before Congress has acted upon a measure to create 30 additional Federal judgeships, including a second judge for New Mexico, Republican Party leaders in the State are considering persons to recommend for the appointment.

In event it all comes about the appointees as well as the present judge are likely to be the beneficiaries of an increase in salary. A special Commission has recommended salary increases for members of the Federal judiciary.

The Commission declared that salaries for judges, "are and for a long time have been grossly inadequate." It would boost the pay of Chief Justices of the Supreme Court from $25,500 a year to $40,000; that of Associate Justices from $25,000 to $39,500; appeals court judges from $17,500 to $30,000; and district court judges from $15,000 to $27,500.

At one time New Mexico had two district court judges, but the bill creating the additional judgeship provided it was for the tenure of the new appointee. When Judge Orie L. Phillips was elevated to the appeals, or circuit court, the second position lapsed.

The judges of the lower courts presented rather convincing testimony before the special Commission that their present salaries of $15,000 are too meager to attract our most capable lawyers to the bench. The salaries are not exempt from the high-income tax, and this combined with the present-day living costs make the bench less attractive than ever.

Justice Bolitha J. Laws, of the United States district court in Washington, testified his salary as a judge is less than his income 15 years ago when he was 29 and practicing law. He explained that though not living on an extravagent scale, that with the income tax bite and to maintain a position of reasonable dignity for himself and family he actually was going into the hole.

A $15,000 annual salary may seem like a bonanza to some persons, but it is too meager to attract our most capable lawyers to the bench today.

[From the Bridgeport (Conn.) Post of April 5, 1954]

Congressional and Judicial Salaries

More than 5 years ago the Hoover Commission recommended a general upward adjustment in the salaries of Federal employees in conformity with higher living costs and the standards required in such positions. In general these recommendations were followed in the executive branch of the Government, but for some reason, were never applied to Members of Congress, or to the Federal judiciary where similar increases were recommended.

The result has been that today the ambition to be a Member of the House or of the Senate or a Federal judge is being confined more and more to persons of independent means. In view of the fact that a Member of Congress must maintain 2 homes—one in Washington and one in his home district—and the heavy expenses to which the Federal judges are put, it seems strange that the compensation allowed in these 2 branches of Government has remained static, while there have been no less than 5 upward adjustments elsewhere.

Contemplating this situation and the recommendations of the Hoover Commission, the 83d Congress appointed a Commission on Judcial and Congressional Salaries, composed of 18 persons including representatives of agriculture, labor, business, and professional groups. This Commission held numerous public hearings and also conducted special investigations producing great quantities of factual material hearing on the subject.

The upshot of all the public hearings, the fact finding, and the research, was a recommendation made unanimously in January of this year that the annual salaries of Senators, Representatives, and United States district judges be increased from $15,000 to $27,500 with corresponding increases for other United States judges. The report itself is a printed volume of 36 pages, but it may be summarized briefly:

Salaries of these officers (judges and Congressmen) have not been adjusted to keep pace with the growth of the duties and responsibilities of these same offices, and the difference between salaries paid here, and those paid in private enterprise to persons of similar ability but less responsibility, has grown too marked.

Present salaries of Federal judges and Congressmen tend to confine these important positions to persons of independent wealth or outside earnings.

In making the recommendation of a salary of $27,500 as reasonable, the Commission considered such factors as a 92-percent increase in the cost of living since 1939, the required standard of living for such persons, the duties and responsibilities of these offices, the higher income taxes to be deducted (making the apparent increase much greater than the effective increase for spending purposes), and the necessity for assuring freedom from economic pressure to persons in such important positions.

Federal judges often sit in cases involving enormous property rights, such as railroad reorganizations, patent litigation, and the like. Members of Congress, of course, pass upon the laws which govern all of us. In this case a bill to put into effect the unanimous recommendation of the Commission has been introduced, and we hope that both the Senators and all the Congressmen from Connecticut will vote for it, and will do so without the slightest embarrassment because of the fact that they will be voting for a raise in their own salaries.

[From the Norwalk (Conn.) Hour of April 30, 1954]

Congressional Salaries

Increasing support is in evidence for higher salaries for Members of the National Congress and United States district court justices. There's opposition too, with something to be said on both sides. It does seem that there should be an increase; the question is what the increase should be.

There is no question of the responsibility of these positions. No one can deny that we want the best possible men to fill the positions. No one wants any of them to serve at his own expense.

The case of the late Chief Justice Fred Vinson of the Supreme Court has been presented in connection with the proposed increases. Dying suddenly, he left little more than enough to meet funeral expenses, with no provisions for his wife. Now it is up to us, through Congress, to do something for her.

Members of Congress do have to maintain homes in Washington, as well as their own in the States whence they are sent to Congress, and it is an expensive proposition. The average taxpayer knows that double what he used to be paid isn't adequate to meet current high costs. That makes the case of the Congressmen look serious. Back in 1939 they received $10,000. Now they get $12,500, plus $2,500 in nontaxable expense money, making $15,000 in all. However, he must pay taxes on the $12,500, so what would be his take-home pay if he could take it home is just about $12,500. That goes for both the Senate and the House.

The purchasing power of that $12,500 or so is placed at $6,700, so the Congressman finds himself worse off than back in 1939 when he received $10,000. We know the dollar is worth only about 50 cents, so it figures.

Pursuant to Public Law 220 of the 53d Congress, the Commission on Judicial and Congressional Salaries was named, consisting of 18 persons, representing agriculture, labor, business, and professions. Public hearings were held, and over 60 witnesses were heard, representing a good cross-section of the public. The commission recommended unanimously that the salaries be increased from $15,000 to $27,500.

That $12,500 increase must have staggered taxpayers who already were feeling the pressure and the Congressmen must have heard from home, because they have done nothing about voting themselves the increase. However, it does appear that something should be done about the situation. If they are $5,000 or more worse off, that amount, instead of $12,000 should be a help at any rate. Perhaps if they proceeded with a raise from $15,000 to $20,000, even $22,000, to make their position as good as that in 1939 or perhaps a little better, there would be more general understanding and sympathy.

Why hasn't someone suggested the $20,000 before? Figuring taxes, the cost to the taxpayers would be an additional $2 million or so instead of $4,800,000 that the $12,500 increase would cost, and that would be a little more than a cent apiece for 160 million Americans.

That doesn't seem like too much to offer as a challenge for good government and integrity.

[From the Fairfield (Conn.) News of April 8, 1954]

No Place for Pound Foolishness

With our attention fixed on the new budget for Fairfield, and the indication that we are in for a substantial hike in town operating costs, most of us are not too sympathetic with a proposal to increase Federal Government costs.

But a big and important decision will come up in Washington shortly that deserves our understanding and support. It has to do with the salaries of Congressmen and Federal judges.

A special commission made an exhaustive study of the problem and has reported that the salaries of Senators, Congressmen, and United States district judges should be increased from $15,000 to $27,500, with corresponding increases for other United States judges.

At first glance this seems like a whopping increase in pay, and many of us will react in a traditional American manner, looking with some suspicion on such salary ranges for our Government representatives.

But careful reading of the commission report presents some very strong arguments for favorable action.

First of all, it's pretty clear that the scope of the job has greatly increased in the past 15 years. The basic welfare of our country demands the best in ability, training, and leadership in these important Federal offices. It follows that it takes a competitive level of income to attract able people into Government service. At the present time, these positions tend to be confined to people of idependent wealth or outside earnings. This doesn't mean that people in this category have no ability; but it does limit the field to choose from.

Secondly, salaries of Federal judges and Congressmen have lagged far behind the increase in living costs, and the general level of executive salaries in business and industry. It is calculated, for instance, that the proposed increase in pay will only amount to a real lincrease in purchasing power of a few hundred dollars for judges and less than $1,500 for Members of Congress.

Third, the total cost of such increases—while a large figure to most of us—is a minute sum in comparison to the total Federal budget. The total annual cost of the increase to $27,500 is estimated at $7,500,000, roughly one one-hundredth of 1 percent of our present budget.

Congressmen will naturally be reluctant to vote this kind of increase for themselves in an election year. After all it's hard to act like everybody's neighbor at a political rally and know that the neighbors have just been tagged for more money for one's own paycheck.

In fact the increase in pay will probably not be approved this term unless Representatives and Senators have pretty strong backing from their constituencies. We think the long-run importance of putting Federal salaries on a scale that will attract our best citizens warrants this kind of support. If you share this view, why not write Senator Bush and Purtell, and Congressmen Morano and Sadlak. Let them know your views and urge them to put Federal pay levels on a par with those in commerce and industry for like talents, responsibilities, and effort.

[From the Hartford (Conn.) Courant of April 5, 1954]

More Pay for Congress and for Federal Judges

Lost in the legislative log jam in Congress is a report. It recommends the salaries of Representatives, Senators, and United States district judges be raised from the present $15,000 to $27,500, with corresponding increases for other United States judges. This report, made by a commission of laymen set up earlier by the 83d Congress, was unanimous. And the reasons set forth are convincing.

It has been forgotten that, following a recommendation of the Hoover Commission, salaries in the executive department were raised in 1949. The Hoover Commission also recommended that the salaries of the judicial and legislative branches of the Federal Government be raised. But nothing was done. The result is that pay for these key posts in the national life is inadequate to the responsibilities involved, in a day when a fearfully complex world piles on ever heavier responsibilities. The pay lags far behind for comparable talent and effort in private industry. That, unfortunately, will always happen. What is not right is that the average Congressman has to spend, out of his own pocket, some $3,000 more than his salary. And, in the words of the report, "Federal judges have been forced to use up savings accumulated prior to becoming judges, and the widows of some Federal judges have been left destitute."

This kind of thing means that there is increasing pressure to fill the top posts in the judiciary and the legislature with men rich enough to afford the luxury of serving the public. That is not the American way of doing things. Congress, which has an obvious self-interest, may be expected not to neglect this report. It shouldn't. It should note instead that the full amount of the recommended increases will cost $7.5 million a year. That is one one-hundredth of 1 percent of the Federal budget. Democracies are notoriously niggardly toward their public servants. But this is a kind of penny-pinching the Nation cannot afford.

Congressional Adjournment Versus Legislative Duty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 27, 1954

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, there appears to be a well-founded rumor around here that the leadership is planning to offer a resolution to adjourn sine die at the end of this month. If the rumor is true and the proposal is presented to the House, I intend to vote against it.

Every one of us knows there are many grave domestic problems, upon most of which the President himself has requested our action, that have not yet been accorded any consideration. Also, no one can predict what emergency may suddenly erupt on an international front. The new atomic-energy bill, the foreign-aid measure, the postal and Federal employees' pay revision, and the question of raising the public debt limit are matters of such serious national consequence that they should not be given hasty and peremptory treatment just to meet a politically expedient closing date.

These, and other major issues ought to be accorded the long, careful, thorough debate, and discussion necessary for the full understanding essential to patriotic and intelligent action. Any other course practically amounts to a denial of our responsibilities.

The people who sent us here have a right to expect us to place legislative duty and the national interest above any personal convenience or political expediency. I, for one—and I deeply feel there are a great many others who agree with me—am willing to stay on the job until our full duty is conscientiously discharged.

The Golgotha of Ukraine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS A. BURKE

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 2, 1954

Mr. BURKE. Mr. President, we in the United States could never attain to a full appreciative understanding of the horrors of Soviet Russian genocide as has been perpetrated upon the many non-Russian nations in the Soviet Empire, such as Lithuania, Ukraine, Poland, Hungary, Slovakia, and others. We can, however, arrive at an appreciable knowledge of the genocidal devastations visited upon the various nations subjugated by Russian Communist imperialism, and make full use of this knowledge in the United Nations and elsewhere in exposing the barbarous and criminal character of Russian Communist rule.

Undoubtedly the blackest chapter of Soviet Russian genocide was the manmade famine of the early thirties in Ukraine, in size and population the largest non-Russian nation behind the European Iron Curtain. Several eyewitness accounts of this terrible famine in Ukraine, which was instigated and fostered by the Kremlin in an attempt to quell Ukrainian resistance to Soviet Russian enslavement of the 42 million Ukrainian people, have been assembled and published by the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America under the title of "The Golgotha of Ukraine." Under the leadership of its president, Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, professor at Georgetown

University, this national organization of Americans of Ukrainian ancestry performs a valuable public service in disclosing facts and realities relating to the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe generally. The Golgotha of Ukraine is a disclosure of the international crime of genocide which is systematically practiced by the Russian Communists, one that we cannot afford to ignore before the bar of world conscience.

I ask unanimous consent to have the introductory remarks of Dr. Luke Myshuha, editor of the Ukrainian American organ Svoboda, and the testimony of W. Krivetsky printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the introductory remarks and the testimony were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

"To the memory of my murdered father and those ill-fated Ukrainians who lie in countless obscure graves in Siberia," is the dedicatory epistle to the book, "One of the Fifteen Million—About One Man's Experiences in a Soviet Labor Camp," by its author Nicholas Prychodko.

The dedication to this booklet could well be: "To the millions of Ukrainians who died in 1932 and 1933 of hunger, of a famine arranged purposely by the Kremlin regime to suppress the opposition of the liberty-loving Ukrainian peasants to collectivisation.

Nowadays no one here in America or elsewhere questions the existence of the politically inspired terrible famine which swept through Ukraine in 1932 and 1933. Such was not the case then, however, when millions of people there perished as a result of the famine. In retrospect, it is hard to understand how in such a freedom loving and warm hearted Nation as ours, which stands for right and justice, how was it possible for it then to ignore the terrible tragedy that was taking place in Soviet enslaved Ukraine, to pay no heed to the sufferings and the pleas for help made by their kinsmen and friends here, and, what was most dismaying, to either doubt the very existence of the famine or to completely ignore it. For once, the human conscience was lacking in this great country of ours; and we hope never again.

For how could one interpret this in any other fashion when even a resolution introduced in Congress (73d Cong., 2d sess.: H. Res. 399) was generally ignored, although that resolution did not call for any material aid for the starving Ukrainians but merely contented itself with asking for an expression of sympathy for the million hapless victims of the Kremlin-Communist reign of terror in Ukraine.

The resolution began as follows:

"Whereas several millions of the population of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, the constituent part of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, died of starvation during the years of 1932 and 1933; and

"Whereas the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, although being fully aware of the famine in Ukraine and although having full and complete control of the entire food supplies within its borders, nevertheless failed to take relief measures designed to check the famine or to alleviate the terrible conditions arising from it, but on the contrary used the famine as a means of reducing the Ukrainian population, and destroying the Ukrainian political, cultural, and national rights; and

"Whereas it has been the traditional policy of the United States to take cognizance of such invasion of human rights and liberties: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the House of Representatives express its sympathies for all those who have suffered from the great famine in Ukraine which has brought misery, afflictions, and death to millions of peaceful and law-abiding Ukrainians."

At about that time, too, the Department of State received a memorandum from the United Ukrainian Organizations of the United States of America which dealt in detail with the Kremlin-conducted terror in Ukraine, presented documentary evidence of the existence of the famine in Ukraine, and was appended with an appeal to the civilized world made in this matter in August 1933 by the Vienna cardinal, Dr. Theodore Innitzer, as well as with reprints of press articles dealing with the famine written in August 1933 by Dr. Ewald Amende, secretary general of the Congress of European Minorities. Noteworthy in this connection is that when that Congress met September 16–19, 1933, in Bern, Switzerland, the question of saving Ukraine under Soviet rule from starvation was the principal issue at its sessions.

Moreover, on September 29 of that year, the Premier of Norway, Mr. Morvinkle, raised the question of the hunger in Ukraine at a meeting of the Council of the League of Nations in Geneva.

The memorandum to the State Department contained eye-witness accounts of the famine as reported in the press, such as the Manchester Guardian (September 13, 1933), the New York Jewish Daily Forward (December 27, 1933), the Parisian Le Matin (August 30, 1933), the New York Times (August 29, 1933).

Another intervention in this matter was made by the Ukrainian National Women's League of America. This organization tried to arouse countrywide opinion among the American women against this Soviet attempt to bring the Ukrainians into submission by using famine as a weapon. The organization also sent a letter to Congressman Herman P. Kopleman of Connecticut, calling his attention to what was happening in Ukraine. The Congressman responded by forwarding a memorandum of the Ukrainian women's organization to the Soviet Minister of Foreign Affairs, M. Litvinov. He received the following reply from Mr. Litvinov, in form of a letter dated January 3, 1934:

"I am in receipt of your letter of the 14th inst., and thank you for drawing my attention to the Ukrainian pamphlet. There is any amount of such pamphlets full of lies circulated by counterrevolutionary organizations abroad, which specialize in the work of this kind. There is nothing left to them to do but to spread false information or to forge documents. * * *

"Yours truly,

M. Litvinov."

This was the time when Litvinov succeeded in persuading our American Government that it was possible to do business with Stalin. Our press in those days, one recalls, was full of glowing anticipations on how many billions of dollars of profits America could make in trading with Russia. Naturally these anticipations were based upon empty promises being made by the Soviets in order to gain American recognition of the Soviet Union.

This was the time, too, when such a well known American newspaperman as Walter Duranty of the New York Times reported from Moscow, upon his return from a trip through famine-ravaged Ukraine, that he saw no cases of starvation in Ukraine, only some cases of malnutrition.

There were, however, a few conscientious American newspapermen, notably William Henry Chamberlin, who had spent 10 years in Moscow as a staff correspondent of the Christian Science Monitor. In its May 29, 1934 number he told a ghastly story of what he saw when he traveled through Ukraine during the famine. He declared that more than 4 million peasants are found to have perished in 1933 when state forced collective farming on them. Despite him and a few other conscientious newspapermen, the general apathy in this country toward the famine in Ukraine remained.

Thereupon Americans of Ukrainian descent began to arrange mass demonstrations in various cities throughout the country, in protest of this famine which the Kremlin created and kept going as an instrument of national policy, dooming millions to death to break down resistance to government edicts (editorial, Boston Post, May 31, 1934). In New York the demonstration on November 18, 1933, took the form of a huge parade, with tens of thousands participating in it, and was followed by a mass rally. Chicago, Detroit and other cities had similar anti-Soviet demonstrations. They were widely reported, but even then the press failed to take the matter seriously, and referred to the existence of the famine with some skepticism.

The fault for this deplorable situation lies squarely on the shoulders of those liberal liberals of those experts who then had considerable influence on public opinion concerning Russia. Even today, some of them still consider themselves as experts and do everything in their power to prevent the American people from knowing the truth about the Soviet Russian reality, about the traditional Russian imperialism, clad currently in the Soviet garb.

Concerning these journalists, who wrote as experts on Soviet, Dagobert D. Runes notes in his recently published book, the Soviet Impact on Society (Philosophical Library, New York), page 66:

"But that American newspapermen like Louis Fisher and Walter Duranty, with full knowledge of the daily executions of Russian citizens who are charged with no other crime than being in opposition to Stalin * * * that these two American newspapermen as well as a group of other scribes, should carry on their distasteful publicity on behalf of Stalin's bloody dictatorship, gives us material for thought concerning these motives of these correspondents.

Worth noting here is that in another section of the book (p. 103) Mr. Runes wrote: "I admired the Ukrainian energy and endurance."

James Burnham, a true authority on the Soviet reality, in his review of Peter Vierick's book Shame and Glory of the Intellectuals, notes that "this was the glory of the intellectuals: That in spirit and body they stood firm against Nazi assault. It is the shame of the intellectuals that they stood not firm but servile, deceived and seduced before the equally vicious approach of Nazism's twin, communism. They refused to recognize concentration camps, aggression and terror when, instead of the swastika, there flew the flag of the revolution and spoke in the name of radical slogans." (The New York Times Book Review, Mar. 15, 1953.)

Still another reason why the American people in general remained unaware of the fact that millions had perished from this artificially created, by the Reds, famine, is set forth by Eugene Lyons (a member of the board of directors of the American Jewish League Again Communism, Inc.) in his article on the American Jews and the Kremlin Purges in the New Leader, March 2, 1953:

"In the last 30 years, a number of Jews, especially among the educated and the well-to-do, came to defend the Soviet Union and its works. Influenced by Communist propaganda about racial equality and the proscription of anti-Semitism, they found it possible to gloss over assorted Soviet obscenities. In a glow of liberal righteousness, they tended to accept Sovietism despite everything. * * *

"The Hitler-Stalin pact cured many of these people; the outbreak of undisguised state anti-Semitism will cure most of the others. But their revulsion against the latest expression of the Kremlin's nature will be considered hypocritical by many people unless they acknowledge their moral dereliction in failing to denounce the liquidation of kulaks, the man-made famine, forced labor, and the continuous system of purges."

Today, of course, the existence of that Soviet-engineered famine in Ukraine in the early 1930's is generally acknowledged. Yet many of those who in the Ukraine famine days refused to admit or report its existence, who refused to tell the truth about that Russian imperialism which has always menaced the free world and our national existence as well, today those Moscow sycophants are still in circulation as experts in matters pertaining to east European affairs, Russia, and even Ukraine. They have not changed their colors a bit. The will of Moscow seems to be more compelling for them than that of Washington.

Perhaps a perusal in the following pages of the eyewitness accounts of the horrible incidents which took place in famine-ridden Ukraine will shock the readers into an awareness of the Soviet reality. Perhaps this brochure will be of aid to Americans of Ukrainian birth or descent in their endeavors to make their fellow Americans and the American Government itself truly realize the menace of Russian imperialism, in whatever garb it may appear, not only to Ukraine and other Soviet Russian enslaved nations, but to the free world and America as well.

Dr. Luke Myshuha.

Testimony of W. Krivetsky About the Weeders From Kharkiv, Who Worked on the Farms of the Blahodatna Village, Kharkiv District

Upon order issued in the spring of 1933 by Paul Postishev, especially dispatched to Ukraine by the Politburo, high-school students in the Kharkiv district were sent out to weed the beet farms. The peasants by this time were too weak from hunger to do the job.

I was one of a number of students sent to the Blahodatna village. Others were sent elsewhere. As our group approached it, we were struck by the deathly stillness in the air and the deserted roads. We soon learned the reason. Two-thirds of the village population had perished from lack of food.

A local schoolhouse was assigned to us for living quarters. Although we had taken loaves of bread with us, the village authorities had arranged a sociable evening supper. The latter consisted of thin soup which the famished villagers prepared for us in the school playground.

When that evening we emerged for the supper, children and grownups swarmed around us, begging most piteously for a piece of bread and some of that soup.

Shocked by their appearance, we began to dole out what we had. In the act, we began to converse with them. Immediately they were ordered not to do any talking with us, and we were ordered to cease giving food to them. The order, however, came too late. The children who had managed to eat some of the bread started to scream in pain and fall to the ground from the cramps which assailed them. At the sight the girl students began to cry out in hysteria. So all of us were ordered to get back into the school while the writhing children were carried away.

On the following day we went into the village. The first sight to strike us was that of a wagon loaded with corpses wending its way from house to house. At each it would pause and its inmates would be asked if anyone had just died there. If the answer was yes, several men would carry out the corpse or corpses and place them in the wagon, and it would proceed on its way. Since the peasants were too weak to dig any kind of a grave, the bodies were dumped in the nearest underground storage place, and then earth would be shoveled over the bodies.

No one wept or cried out. Apathy prevailed among the peasants. But the effect on us, the students, was simply awful. So our leaders forbade us to venture out into the village anymore or to converse with any outsiders.

Soon we began weeding in the fields. Being from the city we were unaccustomed to such labor, and soon all of us were fatigued. But that was the least of it. What really knocked us out took place that very first day. To assist us the kolhosp assigned to us a peasant whose job was to sharpen our weeding hoes. This he did painstakingly and in silence. During lunchtime some of us took pity on him, and, without realizing the danger, we gave him some bread to eat. He fell upon the bread like a ravenous beast. In less than an hour and a half he died before our very eyes.

Returning to the village, we encountered a group of girls who had also been hoeing. Some of the students surreptitiously passed some bread to them. They hid it in their blouses. One of them said: "Why did you have to come here to hoe. It would have been better if you had sent us some bread, and left the hoeing to us. We're much better at it than you."

Deep depression assailed me. I decided I could not stay any longer and returned to Kharkiv. I managed to do this only because I was an intellectual worker and also because I had some friends who helped me to get out semilegally.

Leaving the village and approaching the railway station, I saw before me a group of starving people. Their emaciated appearance and that terrible look in their glazed eyes caused me to shrink from passing to them close.

Once I reached Kharkiv I immediately left for Tiberdi in the Caucasus. Arriving at Batalnashynsk, the last railway stop, I had to wait there for a bus to Tiberdi. Wandering about the station I came to a luncheonette. I was staggered by what I saw. There on the tables were clean napkins, menus, and plenty of food, mostly meat. We had not seen this in Ukraine for a long, long time. Then it occurred to me that this had been prepared for some visiting delegation. So I went outside again and walked around for about an hour. Returning to the luncheonette, I found that everything was the same as earlier. Summoning my courage, I approached the counterman and asked whether I could order some warm soup. Imagine how surprised I was when he gave me a menu and told me to order anything I wanted. So there you are. At a time when in Ukraine it was impossible to get anything without a ration card, where luncheonettes and restaurants were closed, here in the Caucasus I could purchase all the food—and good food at that—and at a very low price.

Later as I traveled through the Caucasus I discovered that there was not only a plentitude of food there, but more than enough to take care of the needs of populace.

Brooklyn's Negroes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 27, 1954

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to direct the attention of our colleagues to the following very interesting articles on the progress of our Negro citizens in Brooklyn.

These stories are part of series which began in the Brooklyn Eagle of July 25, 1954. The following article is the fourth in this series and appeared in the Eagle of July 28, 1954:

Music of Negroes Is Cultural Trump That Stops the Scoffers

(By Sid Frigand)

Scoffers for years have attempted to use many arguments to "knock down" the accomplishments of America's Negroes, who have won world recognition in various fields of endeavor.

Although these arguments may have a tinny ring, they can convince a few who are willing to be convinced—until, of course, the Negro plays his cultural trump card:

Music.

If one could measure a community musically, Brooklyn would be one of the richest areas in this country. Here, within the confines of our borough borders, live men and women who have cast the seeds of America's native music.

Some of these people will not be known to younger Brooklynites by name, but their music—Sugar Blues, I'm Just Wild About Harry, Memories of You—will always be with us.

Some of these people have remained in the spotlight for several generations. Ethel Waters is such; making the transition from the lusty blues songs of the roaring twenties to musical comedies in the thirties to straight dramatic roles in the last few years.

The soulful-eyed apostle of the haunting Negro rhythms, who is currently appearing in a Chicago version of Mamba's Daughter? spends her leisure time in her Brooklyn apartment at 190 New York Avenue. She settled in Brooklyn 3 years ago to "avoid the crowds," said her landlady and close friend, Mrs. Marie Saunders.

Brooklyn has provided sanctuary for another artist, Clarence Williams, who gave the rhythms of his native New Orleans to the world shortly after the turn of the century.

One of the "daddies" of jazz, Williams came North in 1917 with a new brand of music that swept the Nation and soon was assimilated into the lifeblood of musical Americana.

Williams' jazz combinations have boasted names that are still familiar to us: Sidney Bechet, Louis Armstrong, Coleman Hawkins, and Roy Eldridge, to name a few.

The jovial pianist-composer also earned fame as a pioneer in radio back in 1922 with his famed singer wife, Eva Taylor. (She and their daughter, Irene Williams, are currently touring with Porgy and Bess.

Williams, now separated from his wife, urchased a house on Madison Street near Patchen Avenue 5 years ago. He commutes daily to 58 West 125th Street in Harlem, where he operates the Harlem Thrift Shop.

"I used to buy lots of knick-knacks," he explained, "and my wife kept putting them down in the cellar. Finally, so many collected there," he grinned, "I decided to sell them. I've been in business ever since."

Sugar Blues is one of Williams' most famous tunes and has probably earned him more than $50,000 over the years. He didn't stop there, however. He has continued to compose and publish music. His publishing company, incidentally, was purchased by Decca Records in 1943, but he remained with Decca as a talent consultant and writer.

Williams' prolific pen, alone or in combination with Spencer Williams or John Piron, was respsonsible for many jazz classics familiar to the students of the medium: Royal Garden Blues, I Ain't Gonna Give Nobody None of This Jellyroll, Gulf Coast Blues, and other, ad infinitum.

The pen hasn't stopped. With his protege, who calls herself "Phebby" on stage, singing the lyrics in sultry tones, Williams played some of his latest compositions. One of them, "Vice Versa," which is soon to be published, sounded just the other side of terrific.

The happy-go-lucky Williams appeared content with his home.

"I like it 'cause it's quiet," he said. I don't go around tooting my horn * * * I'm just glad that I served God in some way.

"I don't do nothin' unless I talk to The Man upstairs," he added with a warm grin.

Just a few blocks away, at 284–A Stuyvesant Avenue, lives 71-year-old Eubie Blake, who practically lives off the royalties of songs like I'm Just Wild About Harry and Memories of You.

The ebullient artist apparently found the fountain of youth in his music. He looks like 50, talks like 35 and dreams like a kid in his teens.

Age is of no matter to Blake. He works in his parlor which is lined with pictures—mementos of the past—but his mind is always on the present and future.

As an example of his present accomplishments, he produced a diploma certifying he had completed a course in the Schillinger System of Musical Composition at New York University—at the age of 66.

Blake won fame early as a member of the vaudeville team of Sissle & Blake (Sissle, of course, is the famed Noble Sissle), which tourned the Keith circuit with top billings.

The hit show, Shuffle Along, which he and Sissle wrote in collaboration with the Negro team of Miller and Lyles, produced the ever-popular "Wild About Harry," which has since sold about 2 million copies—with an assist from ex-President Truman.

Then came the "1930 Blackbirds" and other shows, both Negro and white, that Blake had a hand in writing. His colored reviews were responsible for presenting new stage talents like Lottie Gee, Florence Mills, Josephine Baker, and Paul Robeson.

Blake said he was often criticized by other Negroes for producing "handkerchief head" shows—that is, shows that might satisfy the distorted stereotype that whites attributed to Negroes.

Blake shook his head. "I love my race and I love my music. If playing our music is 'handkerchief head' stuff then I'm guilty."

"There isn't a millionaire's house around that Sissle and Blake didn't entertain in," he continued. "And what got us into those swanky homes? Music!

"Music's the international language," he added, "and I'm glad I can speak it."

Mr. Speaker, the following article is the fifth in this series. It appeared in the Brooklyn Eagle of July 29, 1954:

Borough Welcomes Negro Artists, Writers

(By Sid Frigand)

Hostility isn't too conducive to creativity. An artist can't probe his mind and soul when he's busy saving his skin.

Brooklynites who are under the impression that only the underprivileged Negroes of the country come here to make their home, might be surprised to learn that our borough has become a Mecca for Negro artists and intellectuals.

"Brooklyn is much different than Chicago or any of the other big cities I've seen," John O. Killens explained "There's no overt hostility against the Negroes here."

John Killens is a recent vintage Brooklynite who came from Georgia bubbling over with experiences that he wanted to set down in a novel.

His first book, "Youngblood," recently published by Dial Press, is a moving documentary of a Negro family, set in Georgia, and later in Washington and Brooklyn. The book has been well-received by the critics.

First novels are a chore for the writer, who must devote gargantuan chunks of precious time to literary teas, women's club luncheons and other sorts of promotional punishment. Nevertheless, the 36-year-old Georgian has managed to get started on a second book dealing with his experiences in World War II.

Killens spent 26 months in the South Pacific as a staff sergeant in an amphibious force outfit. He fought in New Guinea and in General MacArthur's "I-have-returned" campaign in Leyte.

The second novel will deal with the relationship of Negro and white soldiers in the South Pacific, he explained. "I've had plenty of experience along those lines."

The youthful-looking, soft-spoken novelist does his creative work within the quiet confines of his five-and-a-half room parlor floor and basement apartment in a brown-stone house at 652 Lafayette Avenue. He does most of his work during the day, when his wife, Grace, is out working as a receptionist for the Brooklyn Urban League and his children, Jon, 10, and Barbara, 7, are attending public school No. 54.

As Killens talked exuberantly about his children, he recalled his own youth in Macon, Ga., where his father owned a small restaurant. "Even in Georgia," he said softly, "Negro and white kids played together beautifully."

"It was different only when they grew up," he added with a regretful note.

About 3 miles south of the Killens' home lies Brooklyn College, with its pretty green campus and its red brick buildings wearing plushy ivy aprons—a sign of a maturing academic institution.

OPPORTUNITY AT BROOKLYN COLLEGE

The borough college, rated among the highest in academic achievement in the country, is only a youngster as colleges go, but an oldtimer when it comes to providing opportunity to Negro students and Negro teachers.

Minnesota-born Marian Cuthbert is one of the prime examples of academic talent that has been drawn to Brooklyn. Dr. Cuthbert, an associate professor of sociology, recently moved to a Brooklyn address—the downtown YWCA—but she has been on the college faculty 10 years.

In marked contrast to the background of Dr. Cuthbert, a handsome woman who was reared in an all-white community in St. Paul, is that of her colleague in the sociology department, Dr. Charles Lawrence.

Dr. Lawrence is a Mississippian by birth who later relocated to Atlanta, where he attended Morehouse College, part of Atlanta University.

The husky, young teacher has drawn upon his experiences in the South and his training as a sociologist to look upon the problems of the Negro with sensitive understanding and a generous helping of warm humor.

He illustrated a point, for example, by recounting a story about a Negro friend, John Roberts, who attended Cornell University.

"Roberts had a good Scotch-English name," Dr. Lawrence explained, "but a very dark skin. He had befriended a schoolmate—a chap named Cohen—and both had found themselves without decent living quarters because better apartments in Ithaca were not available to Negroes or Jews.

"Things looked bad for them until they hit upon a sterling idea. John would get on the phone and call a landlord. 'This is John Roberts, I'd like to see your apartment.'

"The landlord would invite him down, only Cohen would show up and take the apartment."

By strange coincidence, one of Dr. Lawrence's former teachers at Morehouse is now a member of the Brooklyn College English department. Vivacious Marian Starling has become truly a part of the community since she took up residence at 440 Washington Avenue shortly after World War II ended.

"My chief concern, as an educator," she smiled, "is the children in the community. Once they grow up, I'm not interested in them any more."

As a counselor of youth, Dr. Starling said her chief problem is instilling "a sense of destiny and importance" in young Negroes.

"There is too much self-defeatism in the North," said the veteran of 14 years' teaching at Atlanta University, "there's not enough aggressive, creative living."

"It seems strange," she remarked, "that the South is better along those lines. Up here, too many Negroes seek security jobs—civil service and such—they're not investigating or dreaming."

Dr. Starling said she was anxious that her teen-age daughter, Earlyn, a sophomore at Midwood High School, spend some time down South before she completes her education.

"I think she would appreciate Brooklyn all the better," the smiling teacher declared.

Mr. Speaker, the following article is the sixth in this series. It appeared in the Brooklyn Eagle of July 30, 1954:

Negro Furniture Dealer Won Gamble in All-White Area

(By Sid Frigand)

Private enterprise is a cherished institution in this country. It stands as a bulwark against Communist arguments for State ownership and State enslavement.

The taste of social enslavement is still bitter on the tongues of America's Negroes—but they won't exchange it for State slavery. Instead, more and more, they are seeking the outlets of private enterprise to win a secure niche in our economic life.

In Brooklyn, the Negro businessman is no longer an oddity. Like any other group with social and cultural ties, the Negroes in Brooklyn have needs which the Negro businessman can best satisfy.

Insurance brokers, morticians, beauticians and greengrocers—they've all found places in our community and are doing well.

Other organizations, such as the Paragon Progressive Federal Credit Union with thousands of members, can boast assets approximating $1 million.

Charles Kellar, an attorney and officer of the credit union, has earned the reputation of being one of Brooklyn's wealthiest Negroes, with multiple real estate holdings, foreign trade interests and an elegant restaurant—the Town Hill—at Medford Avenue and Eastern Parkway.

The thriving mercantile Negroes, however, still largely bank their incomes on funds from Negro patronage. But what about integrated businesses? Can they exist in Brooklyn?

The answer is not hypothetical; it can be provided practically by Al Thompson, a furniture dealer, who owns and operates a large establishment on Rogers Avenue near Linden Boulevard—in the heart of Flatbush.

Mr. Thompson, a 45-year-old Howard University man, has been operating his store on Rogers Avenue for the past 11 years. He is the only Negro member of the New York Furniture Exchange.

Al Thompson's story is the story of a gambler and a fighter. He gambled in an "all-white" community and fought to keep what he won.

Net result: He is now operating a flourishing business (about 95 to 98 percent white patronage); he, his wife and two children live in a beautiful house at 34th Street and Avenue L; and he is accepted warmly by his neighbors and business associates.

These accomplishments were not easily won. Each step of the way posed indignities and discouragement, but, fortunately, these only served to mold—not embitter—the Flatbush merchant.

STARTED IN TRUCKING BUSINESS

Mr. Thompson had been in the trucking business since 1932, when he left Howard University and bought a used truck for $150. In the years that followed, his furniture delivery business flourished, and his knowledge of furniture increased to a point where he was sure he could make a success at selling.

Hurdle number one was to find a good location for a furniture business. "I didn't want a sectarian business," he said. "I wanted to make my place available to everyone."

In 1943, Mr. Thompson saw a "Store for Rent" sign on Rogers Avenue near Martense Street. He was rebuffed several times but finally rented a dilapidated little place, where he set up his trucking office.

Within a few years, however, he had purchased the building in which he was a tenant and two adjoining buildings. His modern, rambling store occupies the three buildings today.

WARNINGS STIRRED FEAR

His business successes didn't automatically smooth the way for social acceptance in his new neighborhood. When he first moved into his corner home last November, Mr. Thompson feared his stay there might be short-lived.

First there was an unsigned letter, merely bearing a newspaper clipping about a Negro family that was forced to leave a Long Island community. It worried the Thompsons enough to call on the police of the Brooklyn Avenue precinct.

Next came a phone call to Thompson's store, warning him to get out of the neighborhood; and then, as a crowning gesture, some one left a newspaper containing dog droppings on the patio of his pretty brick home.

"I knew most of the police from my store," he said, "and they assured me that these incidents were the work of crackpots and not my neighbors.

"In fact, the cops told me that some of the people living in my vicinity set up a committee to investigate me when they heard I intended to buy the house—and that they were apparently pleased.

"I guess the cops were right, because we've never had anything but kindness from our neighbors. I'm happy there now, and my children and wife are happy."

Mr. Thompson's experiences in living in "white neighborhoods" dated back several years ago when he purchased a summer home near Belmar, N. J.

"We moved into a house next door to a Jewish family," he recalled. "They were angry because they had wanted to purchase the house for a daughter. But they didn't take their anger out on us.

"Instead, we became fast friends. I even decorated his daughter's new home and sold her a house-full of furniture." He grinned a businessman's grin.

The prematurely gray-haired furniture man wanted one point clear. He wasn't attempting to run away from his people by living in a white community.

"I love my people deeply," he said. "But in order to advance, we must spread out.

"My only consideration when I was shopping for a home and store was to find places I liked. I found them, I bought them and I hope to use them happily for many years to come."

The Numbers Game—Part V

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 26, 1954

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following excerpts from hearings on the 1955 appropriation bills:

INFORMATION CONCERNING THE OPERATION OF THE FEDERAL EMPLOYEES SECURITY PROGRAM AS PRESENTED BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES IN HEARINGS ON THE FISCAL 1955 APPROPRIATIONS

(Pt. IV. U. S. Information Agency, Department of Defense, Department of Agriculture, and Department of the Interior)

UNITED STATES INFORMATION AGENCY

(From hearings on February 1, 1954)

Theodore C. Streibert (Director): "Our Security Division has been ardous in going over the security files. As you realize, Public Law 402 always has required a full field investigation so that everyone on the staff, all Americans, have been field investigated in the past.

"As the result of a new presidential order and the review there were 31 people dropped for security reasons. Most of those were on matters of instability, moral factors. The examination and reexamination of the files is going on currently. We employ about 70 people in the Security Division. It is a question of how much money you want to take from the program to put into security and how fast we can do this job. We have gone over the most sensitive spots. We have recleared people in connection with our relations with intelligence work and with other agencies, and I feel that we have very well screened our staff. We are certainly screening the new employees under these new standards which have been set up.

"Is that responsible enough?"

Representative FRANK T. BOW (Republican, Ohio): "That is what I wanted to get."

[Omission.]

Representative JOHN J. ROONEY (Democrat, New York): "How many Communists have you found in the past year?

Mr. Streibert: "I reported earlier in discussing the personnel matter that we had discontinued and terminated 31 people."

Mr. ROONEY: "The question was: 'How many Communists did you find?' "

Mr. Streibert: "I am going to answer it, sir, in this way: We discontinued 31 people for security reasons, but we have no breakdown to offer the committee as to the security reasons within the 31."

Mr. ROONEY: "I must repeat the question: 'How many Communists did you find in the past year, if any?' "

Mr. Streibert: "None to my knowledge."

Mr. ROONEY. "Well, that is you answer."

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

(From hearings on February 2 and 15, 1954)

Representative HARRY R. SHEPPARD (Democrat, California): "In your discussion you [Charles E. Wilson, Secretary] referred to the fact that you had reduced 150,000 civilian personnel. I would like to ask you at this time if you can and will supply me with the amount of bodies in the total of 150,000 who were dismissed from the Federal service because they were security risks, for membership in the Communist Party; covering those two factors."

Representative JOHN TABER (Republican, New York): "He did not say that."

Mr. SHEPPARD: "Mr. Wilson made the statement before the committee, and repeated to Mr. MAHON, that they had removed from the Federal payrolls 150,000 civilian personnel."

Mr. TABER: "Yes."

Mr. SHEPPARD: "I am asking him if he will supply the information to this committee as to out of that total of 150,000 how many were removed on a security-risk basis."

Mr. Wilson: "That is a hard figure for me to try to dig up. I did not start the thing on that kind of a basis.

"Much of this reduction was achieved by not employing people, and by personnel reductions all over the country. This did not only happen in Washington. There were only 5,000 here in Washington. I had to get the help of the people out in the field.

"I am proud of the way it was done.

"I am not proud about laying off people; I do not mean to say that. But it was done well.

"I am sure that if there were any security risks they were dismissed. The organization was not as bad in that regard."

Mr. SHEPPARD: "I am frank to say I have no feeling about that at all. I am merely inquiring into the question as to whether or not we found ourselves in the military function involved in that field which has been so highly publicized. If we find ourselves in that field to what degree.

"I am under the impression that you have had a team of people working in that category, have you not?"

Secretary Wilson: "Certainly we have."

Mr. SHEPPARD: "I mean, in the security part of the military where Commies might be working."

Secretary Wilson: "Certainly."

Mr. SHEPPARD: "I want my inquiry to be reflected on the record to the degree and understood that I have no solicitation or comfort for those who have been removed for legitimate purposes; to wit, because of subversive ideas or connections therewith.

"I would like to have the information presented to the committee, if you can accumulate it, please, as to the amount of the total 150,000 who were removed for security reasons, under the terminology of our present laws that have to do with the definition of security."

Secretary Wilson: "Well, since you have asked me to, I will look into it. We will do the best we can. If it is too difficult, for any reason, I will come back and explain it to you."

Mr. SHEPPARD: "Thank you."

(The information follows:)

"Based on information reported and currently available in the Department of Defense in Washington during the year 1953, 118 security risks in the Department of Defense were either removed under the procedures of Public Law 733 or would have been processed under that act had they not resigned. One hundred and eleven of these cases involved actual or alleged membership in the Communist Party, or affiliation or sympathetic association with communistic organizations or persons, or communistic inclinations. Forty-two of the 118 were separated prior to May 27, 1953, which is the effective date of Executive Order 10450, and 76 were separated during the remainder of the year. With regard to the 111 figure mentioned above, 38 were separated before May 27, 1953, and 73 after that date.

"There were many additional resignations and separations which involved security reasons but which were not reported to the Department of Defense in Washington as they were removed under other administrative removal procedures. In order to verify and complete the overall Department of Defense statistics relative to this program, approximately 1,300 field activities are being circularized on a worldwide basis. These statistics, which should be available within the next 60 to 90 days, will show all removals and resignations involving adverse security information, including specifically the number involving communistic activity, association, or affiliation, for the period May 27, 1953, to December 31, 1953."

On February 15 the committee resumed consideration of security risks:

Mr. SHEPPARD: "What I am directing my inquiry to is the question that I propounded to the Secretary of Defense when he was before this committee, and it is now obvious to me, that he would have to come to your [addressing John A. Hannah, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower and Personnel] organization to get the information that I requested.

"Are you prepared at this time to tell me how many out of the total of 150,357 dismissals were removed because of a security-risk basis?"

Mr. Hannah: "No, sir."

Mr. Sheppard: "Why not?"

Mr. Hannah: "Your question has been raised in recent weeks and we are in the process of getting that information. We have the information only for the people whose cases were forwarded to Washington for handling."

Mr. Sheppard: "From your statement I assume that you have not been called upon, and had you been called upon, you have not furnished information on the category to which I directed my question because of your inability to supply the information?"

Mr. Hannah: "I will answer the question this way: According to the records forwarded to Washington, there were separated in the calendar year 1953, 118 persons as security risks. We are in the process now of sending out to the field to get complete information from the military services, but there are 737 different places we have to go in the Navy, 300 in the Army, and 253 in the Air Force, or about 1,300 different places where we have to get this information, and it is going to be some weeks before we have it."

Mr. Sheppard: "I think that is obvious.

"Out of the 118 that you are familiar with can you give this committee the information as to those who have been removed because of their communistic inclinations, memberships in the Communist Party, and so forth?"

Mr. Hannah: "I do not know."

Mr. Sheppard: "How many names have you turned over to the Department of Justice where you had knowledge of them?"

Mr. Hannah: "I would have to get that figure. I do not have it. That information is obtainable."

Mr. Sheppard: "Will you insert in the record those that fall into the category that I have just referred to?"

Mr. Hannah: "Yes."

(The information requested is as follows:)

"A review of the 118 cases heretofore mentioned reflects that 111 were cases in which the person involved had communistic inclinations, or membership in the Communist Party, or affiliation or sympathetic association with communistic organizations or persons.

"Regarding the question as to how many names have been turned over to the Department of Justice—in all cases in which derogatory information is developed indicating activities in connection with espionage, counterespionage, subversion, or sabotage, the matter is immediately referred to the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

"If, however, the question was intended to determine how many cases this Department has turned over to the Department of Justice for prosecution—the answer would be "none" for the reason that in many instances the derogatory information emanates originally from the Federal Bureau of Investigation. When such information is brought to light by the investigation agencies of the Department of Defense, it is referred to the Federal Bureau of Investigation, as indicated above. Therefore, in every case the information is in the possession of the Department of Justice, and if there is a violation of any Federal law, the determination as to whether or not there will be a prosecution rests with the Attorney General."

Mr. Hannah: "With regard to the 118, there are some still in the process of being appealed."

Mr. Sheppard: "That would not change the result. An appeal would take care of itself whether good, bad, or indifferent."

Mr. Hannah: "That is right.'

Mr. Sheppard: "I do not want you to misconstrue the question because your entire statement has been very educational. I want to commend you for the way that you have responded to the interrogations of the other members of the committee, and I know that you are exerting every possible effort to do a good job. I would not enjoy your job. I think mine is a lot easier.'

Mr. Hannah: "I do not envy myself. I wonder sometimes why I am not back at Michigan State College."

Mr. Sheppard: "I compliment you on the manner in which you have made your presentation."

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

(From hearings on February 3 and March 10, 1954)

Representative Jamie L. Whitten (Democrat, Mississippi): "Mr. Secretary [addressing Ezra Taft Benson, Secretary] can you place in the record at this point a statement showing how many Communists you have found in the Department of Agriculture since January 1953, and how many you have removed since that date?"

Secretary Benson: "We have removed one employee whose investigative file showed actual membership in the Communist Party. Of course, we have had removals for other security reasons falling with section 8 (a) of Executive Order 10450. We have also had a number of employees who have resigned during or after investigation and prior to the preferment of charges and a security determination."

On March 10 the committee again considered the subject of security risks:

Mr. Whitten: "Mr. Chairman, earlier, I requested a report to any employees fired by reason of being determined to be Communists or security risks in the Department of Agriculture. A reply was placed in the record because we had already completed the hearings. The reply answered the question I raised. The Secretary's report stated there had been one employee removed because of being a card-carrying member of the Communist Party. However, the report went further and indicated that many other persons had been let out of the Department for security reasons. The exact words of the Secretary appear on page 134 in which he says 'We have had removals for other security reasons falling within section 8 (a) of Executive Order 10450. We have had a number of employees who have resigned during or after investigation and prior to the preferment of charges and a security determination.'

"Now, that just would indicate there were many more removed for security reasons.

"My attention has been called to the fact that the U. S. News & World Report indicated that 74 such individuals had been let out of the Department of Agriculture.

"I would like for you to tell us just what Executive Order 10450 covers. Some of the reports I get are to the effect that some folks may have resigned because the Department was investigating whether they went to the Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner, rather than for these other reasons. I just wondered which is which."

Ralph S. Roberts (Administrative Assistant Secretary): "Mr. Chairman, I am sure that none of the cases that you have in mind regarding the Jefferson-Jackson Day dinners had anything to do with the security figures you have just referred to. Let me also say that at the time the Department prepared the answer to your question in the earlier hearing, the figures which are now available to us were not then completed. We had certain total figures, but did not have a complete breakdown of the original figures released by the Civil Service Commission. Regarding the 74 employees mentioned in the U. S. News & World Report, the source of that information was undoubtedly the Civil Service Commission report which Chairman Young made to one of the committees of Congress recently.

"Let me review briefly for you the types of cases that are covered in the reporting under Executive Order 10450. Then I can give you a breakdown of those 74."

(Explanation of the order omitted.)

"Those include all the actions which are considered as involving security under Executive Order 10450. And they are reported accordingly. The 74 people you referred to in your question, Mr. Whitten, are broken down as follows and represent actions between May 28 under this order when it began, and December 31, 1953. Of the 74, 33 were terminations, broken down as follows: One subversive, which comes under sections 2 through 8 that I read. One sex perversion which comes under section 8 (a) (iii). And 31 cases which fall under the types of conduct or actions referred to in section 8 (a) (1). They include convictions for misdemeanors or felonies, falsification, and so on. The remaining 41 of the 74 cases were resignations during the same period of time. Three of those resignations were sex perversion cases. Thirty-eight of them were in the group of cases that include convictions for misdemeanors, felonies, falsification, and so on. All 41 of the resignations occurred before a determination was completed but when the files were known to contain unfavorable information under section 8 (a) (1) of Executive Order 10450—"

Mr. Whitten. "I thank you for that information in detail, Mr. Roberts. I have always felt that Government employment was a privilege and not a right and certainly we approve actions to prevent those not fitted for Government service from being retained and I believe those who constitute any kind of security risk should be removed.

"I did want the record to show the real facts as against the implication that might be drawn from any press releases.

"Out of this 74, how many employees did the Department have during that period?

Mr. Roberts: "Well, during those months the total employment must have ranged from 60,000 to 80,000 with the summer months running high because of seasonal employment."

[Omission.]

Representative Carl Andersen (Republican, Minnesota): "I want to say for the record, Mr. Roberts, that I feel that it is to the credit of the Department of Agriculture that only one subversive has been found in that organization during the period under consideration."

Mr. Roberts: "I am sure, Mr. Chairman, that the person referred to who was separated for that reason had no relationship to matters which Mr. Whitten has jokingly referred to. He was a field employee who was in a nonsensitive position."

Mr. Whitten. "We do appreciate the efforts of the Department in connection with this subject matter of this Executive order. I think the whole effort is wholesome. I am pleased that the record will show the true facts."

Mr. Andersen. "Thank you, gentlemen."

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

(From hearings on February 8, 1954)

Representative W. F. Norrell (Democrat, Arkansas): "Mr. Dexheimer [addressing W. A. Dexheimer, Commissioner, Bureau of Reclamation], I would like to ask you a question for the record concerning something which I think should be in the hearings.

"Mr. Chairman, this is not directly related to the other matter but I would like to inquire about it if I may."

Representative Ben F. Jensen (Republican, Iowa): "Go right ahead, Mr. Norrell."

Mr. Norrell: "Mr. Commissioner, I have noticed quite a lot is being said in Government circles regarding security risks in Government service. I am just as much against Communist infiltration in Government as anybody else, but I would like to ask you what do you know regarding the security risks in the Reclamation Service? Are you advised or brought up to date on that? I think the hearings ought to indicate something about that, not only in the Reclamation Bureau, but of the whole Department of the Interior. I suppose your knowledge would be confined more to your own area of the Department of the Interior, but would you mind giving us a statement on that?"

Mr. Dexheimer: "I will be glad to do so, Mr. Norrell.

"I am the security officer for the Bureau of Reclamation. Security is my responsibility, among others. The Interior Department has a security officer and a committee. They are making a check of all our employees in conformance with the new Executive orders and many cases which were cleared before are being given another investigation or review. Up to the present time, there are indications that approximately 15 of the Bureau of Reclamation employees, out of a total of some 11,000, are possible security risks.

"The investigations up to this time and determinations by the Department have only brought up two of those which they felt were security risks, and should be gotten off our payroll—Government payroll. There are others under investigation; I do not know what the determination will be on those. But everybody is being given a very critical review. We have guards at some of our major power installations. A part of their duties is more or less guide functions, you might say, but they are essentially guards there to protect the facilities from either sabotage, where sabotage might be easily carried out.

"We are in the process here of getting the security risks off the payroll, or, if it is determined they are just possible risks, we are moving them out of what we call the sensitive areas and putting them in jobs where they will not have any contact at all with security matters, confidential matters, or will not be in position where they could have, possibly, any effect on sabotage or the permission of sabotage."

Mr. Norrell: "Have you discharged any employees, so far, as security risks?"

Mr. Dexheimer: "So far we have not had to actually discharge any. When they learn that the Department is ready to prefer charges on the basis of information obtained, they have an opportunity to resign if they so choose, or stay on and face those charges. They have resigned. Those people, however, are told, and we are following up to see that the records show that they did resign under that pressure."

Mr. Norrell: "How many are there of those who resigned because of possible charges?"

Mr. Dexheimer: "Two up to this time."

Mr. Norrell: "Two?"

Mr. Dexheimer: "Since I have taken over."

Mr. Norrell: "And you have now under rather close observation about 15; is that right?"

Mr. Dexheimer: "The Department has advised me they are considering about 15—I do not know how closely they are being observed."

Mr. Norrell: "And that is the summary of security risks investigations of the Reclamation Service?"

Mr. Dexheimer: "Well, in addition to that, the Bureau has recently received information that we will have to go through a more careful investigation of the list of so-called sensitive positions and to make a wider category of sensitive positions. But the people occupying those positions at the present time, have been very carefully investigated, and we have a very clean record so far."

Mr. Norrell: "Do these numbers that you have referred to, both the 2 who resigned and the 15 you now have under rather close observation—are they in the Washington headquarters or in the field, or are they mixed between the 2?"

Mr. Dexheimer: "The only ones that have come to my attention so far have been in the field. The review of the Washington people up to this date has not brought to light any doubtful case."

The Numbers Game—Part VI

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 26, 1954

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following excerpts from hearings on the 1955 appropriation bills:

Information Concerning the Operation of the Federal Employees Security Program as Presented Before the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives in Hearings on the Fiscal 1955 Appropriations

(Pt. V. Department of the Air Force, National Security Council, and Office of Defense Mobilization)

AIR FORCE

(From hearings on February 11, March 15 and 18, 1954)

Representative George H. Mahon (Democrat, Texas): "Mr. Secretary (addressing James H. Douglas, Under Secretary) there has been a lot in the press about the removal from the Government during the past year of 2,200 civilian personnel who were considered unsuited for one reason or another by the administration. Do you know how many of those were removed from the Air Force?"

Mr. Douglas: "I think we had better come up with that information."

Harold E. Talbott (Secretary): "Very few. We would be glad to come up with that information. Very few."

Mr. Mahon: "Very few security risks of any kind?"

Secretary Talbott: "Compared to the total. I would like to get those things, if you would like to have them, sir."

Mr. Mahon: "Have any of them been removed because they were Communists?"

H. Lee White (Assistant Secretary for Management): "I would rather say they have been removed because we think they might be security risks. Some of them, yes. By security risks I do not mean a drunkard. I mean there is enough of a suspicion they might be Communist or Communist sympathizers."

Mr. Mahon: "I believe the law provides for prosecution of people who make false oaths that they are not Communists and so on."

Mr. White: "That is right."

Mr. Mahon: "I take it you have not found any Communist on your payroll, because otherwise you would have sought prosecution."

Mr. White: "Not necessarily. It depends, you see, whether or not they are out-and-out Communists. We would not know whether or not they were out-and-out Communists, but there might be some evidence that would indicate leanings that way, and the Defense Establishment would be better off without them."

Mr. Mahon: "I can understand that you would like to remove people whose loyalty was in any way questioned, even on a far-fetched basis. What I am getting at is this question of whether or not you have discovered any Communists, whether you have been able to identify them, and whether you have prosecuted them, or what the facts are."

Mr. White: "Not that I know of, narrowed to that point as to out-and-out Communists. That does not mean there are not any. I just do not know."

Mr. Mahon: "I see. We do not know in all cases whether people are loyal or not. We just have to do the best we can.

"Will you give us for the record, Secretary Talbott, what your information is on that? Be sure to give us the information as to those you were able to prove were Communists, and then a breakdown as to the types, as has been requested. I think that information is, no doubt, in the making in the Government, and I think it ought to be provided for the Congress, and I think it will be."

Mr. White: "It will be some time, Congressman. We are trying to get that now. You are right on that.

"Some of the records are in our field offices, in our bases. We are trying to get it together. When, I do not know; it is quite a job to bring them all in."

Mr. Mahon: "I thought you had only a very few people involved?"

Mr. White: "You mean people we have found guilty, or people that have been discharged? The 2,200, as I understand it—though I have not followed it too closely—includes people who were given a chance to leave as well as against whom proceedings were brought."

Secretary Talbott: "You see, sir, we have in our security group over 1,000 men who are studying and taking care of our internal security in the Air Force. That is scattered all over the world. There may be instances of all kinds all over.

"I know we have been discussing it. We have not really got a summary of it. We will bring you what we have up to date."

Mr. Mahon: "Give it to us at this point in the record."

Secretary Talbott: "Yes."

(The information is as follows:)

"Based on information reported and currently available in the Department of the Air Force in Washington during the period from May 27, 1953, the effective date of Executive Order 10450, to December 31, 1953, 25 security risks in the Department of the Air Force were either removed under the procedures of Public Law 733 or would have been processed under that act had they not resigned. All of these cases involved actual or alleged membership in the Communist Party or affiliation or sympathetic association with communistic organizations or persons or communistic inclinations.

"There were many additional resignations and separations which involved security reasons, but which were not reported to the Department of the Air Force in Washington, as they were removed under other administrative removal procedures. In order to verify and complete the overall Department of the Air Force statistics relative to this program, approximately 250 field activities are being circularized on a worldwide basis. These statistics, which should be available within the next 60 to 90 days, will show all removals and resignations involving adverse security information, including specifically the number involving communistic activity, association, or affiliation for the period May 27, 1953, to December 31, 1953."

Mr. Mahon: "Do you have the approximate number now?"

Secretary Talbott: "I would rather not guess at it."

Mr. Mahon: "No doubt there will be some sort of a clarifying picture given on the whole thing. Otherwise, there would be some misunderstanding.

"I hesitated to bring up this question, but I felt I should, under the circumstances."

Representative John Taber (Republican, New York): "Off the record."

(Discussion off the record.)

On March 15 a rather lengthy discussion took place about the methods used in the Air Force to determine whether an individual being processed for officer status had Communist connections. The loyalty certificate forms were introduced, and Representative MAHON questioned the Air Force officers closely on the possibilities that such an individual might be commissioned. Representative ERRETT P. SCRIVNER (Republican, Kansas) and Representative MAHON continued questioning the adequacy of the background investigations both of officers and of enlisted men. Brig. Gen. W. S. Stone, Deputy Director of Personnel Planning, submitted a statement describing the procedures and presenting certain problems of administration.

On March 18 the problem of persons with Communist connections in the Armed Forces was discussed again; with Maj. Gen. Joseph F. Carroll, Director of Special Investigations, Inspector General, Headquarters United States Air Force, present. A part of the discussion is quoted:

Mr. MAHON: "If any question is raised as to one's loyalty, do you mean to say the case is referred to the Secretary of the Air Force?"

General Carroll: "Ultimately, yes."

Mr. MAHON: "How many cases in the last year, cases of this type, have been referred to the Secretary of the Air Force for ultimate decision?"

General Carroll: "We have had 54 who were discharged. They were discharged only upon approval of the Secretary of the Air Force of the recommendations made to him, or upon his own determination as to the need for separation, regardless of the nature of the recommendations that may have been made.

"We have 727 such cases which, in the opinion of the Office of Special Investigations which did the investigative work, warranted review by military personnel security boards, which are set up within the framework of Deputy Chief of Staff, Personnel. They review these cases in accordance with the prescribed criteria and standards, and determined in 167 instances, charges should issue, a statement of reasons being afforded the individual, and he thereafter being afforded an opportunity to appear before a board which was constituted to hear his case and thereafter make recommendations. The recommendations of the board would be processed back to the Deputy Chief of Staff, Personnel, to the Personnel Security Board, and the recommendations from that board would go to the Secretary."

Mr. MAHON: "The Secretary has acted one way or the other on 727 cases?"

General Carroll: "Not directly. Out of that only 54 moved in to him necessitating his approval. As to the others, out of 727, only 167 of those were deemed to warrant this sort of affirmative action. All of the cases which come within the framework of our Air Force Regulation 35–62 are referred to this screening unit in the Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff, Personnel.

"That is done for two reasons. It is done, first of all, to insure that all cases in which some derogatory information bearing on loyalty has been developed is given review by more than one board or person. Secondly, it is necessary, even where it is not felt by the initial reviewing authority there is any subversive problem, that this be resolved once and for all to the benefit of the individual so he does not have a little piece of derogatory information tagging him around during the remainder of his military career.

"Once it goes through this system, whether affirmative or negative insofar as the individual is concerned, the case is considered closed until such time, of course, as some subsequent development may necessitate reconsideration."

Further discussion followed this statement, with Repreeentative SCRIVNER, who indicated continued concern that Communist sympathizers might be found in the Armed Forces, making the following statements:

"Members of this committee do not treat these situations lightly, and while these figures may be picked up when the hearings are printed and a great to-do made over them, the figures would show two things: First,fi where you have almost 1 million men in the Regular Air Force, together with many thousands in the Reserve, this does represent a small percentage, but even that is not too much consolation because we recall when the revolution in Russia came it was just a very small percentage of the Russians who were involved, and even now, a very small percentage of the entire population of Russia and its satellites are actually members of the Communist Party.

"It might well be, Mr. MAHON, that this committee, in order to make sure in our own minds so we in turn could assure the public that the Office of the Special Investigations is alert to the danger, and that they are taking all possible precautions, make a visit to General Carroll's office. There, with him, we should go over the files on a few cases without specifically identifying the individuals involved and satisfy ourselves as to exactly what the charges have been, what action was taken to verify the charges, what other action might have been taken in the review. We should learn what showing or investigation made it possible for the Air Force authorities to determine that the others charged were not subject to separation. That should be done as a matter of gathering information and not as a matter of investigating. It is something that is of very deep concern to all of us. What would be your comment on that, Mr. MAHON?"

Mr. MAHON: "I am in complete sympathy with the thinking of the chairman. There is some question in my mind as to the confidential nature of these files in the hands of the executive branch. I do not know that these files generally have ever been made available to congressional committees. I do not know the details. We would have to look into that."

Mr. SCRIVNER: "That is why I said we would look at them as a matter of gathering information and not as a matter of investigation.

"The records will disclose that there has never been any disclosure of any secrets, top secrets, or even higher than that, by any member of this committee. It would be understood that any information that we did glean would be held in just as strict and high confidence as any information which has been given us in the past few days or the past years in relation to a lot of our atomic and other classified programs.

"This subject, subversives in Government, is almost as explosive as the atom itself. In some instances, while the damage would not be so far reaching, to those affected it would be just as devastating as an atomic explosion.

"Any inspection made, of course, will have to be done within the framework of the regulations and standards of procedure that the Air Force has developed in order to prevent any harm or damage to the name or character of any person involved.

"In many instances his reputation is the most valuable thing that a person has—and some thoughtless act or false word that ruins a man's reputation is usually irreparable.

"I expect that this should be a matter of discussion, not only with General Carroll, but also the Secretary of the Air Force, the Chief of Staff of the Air Force, and with the Secretary of Defense."

Mr. MAHON: "I think that is a good statement."

Mr. SCRIVNER: "General, you are the top man in this particular field; are you not?"

General Carroll: "Yes, sir."

Mr. SCRIVNER: "We will not have to consult with the Inspector General at all, unless he desires to be present at the time."

[Omission.]

Representative ROMAN L. HRUSKA (Republican, Nebraska): "Mr. Chairman, some reference is made to the effect that those files, or the work of this particular activity, and the scrutiny thereof, should be subject to such regulations as would be appropriate, and with that I would fully concur.

"However, I would be inclined to take a dim view of any regulations which would prohibit this committee viewing objectively specimens and spot checks of the work of this particular department or branch. Certainly, if this committee cannot do it—and I do not know why we would not be capable of an objective viewing of it—nobody could do it, and that would mean the Department people would become so inbred that after a while we would reach an impossible situation. I put that in the RECORD for whatever it is worth."

Mr. SCRIVNER: "I agree with you. My own personal reaction is that this committee has proved time and time again that it is just as honorable, just as loyal and close lipped as any other group in Government starting at the top and going on down. Certainly we are capable of looking objectively at this information and passing upon it as information especially as to procedure practices and results, and not going into it as an investigation. I am quite sure that General Carroll is an honorable man, but I also am sure that he cannot be any more honorable than the three members of this committee. I will say that we are all on a par. If those who work with General Carroll can be trusted with this information, so can we.

"Just what the regulations will develop, and what roadblocks we might run into, is pure conjecture, and we will have to meet that when the situation arises."

NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL

(From hearings on February 16, 1954)

After discussion of the work of the two internal security committees of the Council, and of the Council's statutory powers in relation to the initiation of Executive Order 10450, the following discussion on investigations under the order took place:

Representative SIDNEY R. YATES (Democrat, Illinois): "When the Civil Service Commission was before the subcommittee, it was testified there were 3,300 pending investigations of cases under the latest security order. I forget which number that was."

Robert Cutler (special assistant to the President for National Security Affairs): "The order of last spring is No. 10450."

Mr. YATES: "Do you know how many of those people are still working in the Government, and how many have been dismissed?"

Mr. Cutler: "The only function which the Council has with reference to that order is as stated in section 14 of that order. We receive from the Civil Service Commission periodic reports as described in the order. Those periodic reports relate to two topics. One is deficiencies in the departments' and agencies' security programs established under this order which are inconsistent with the interest of, or directly or indirectly weaken national security, and (2) tendencies in such programs to deny to individual employees fair, impartial, and equitable treatment at the hands of the Government in their rights under the Constitution or laws of the United States, or this order.

"In due course, I suppose, we are going to receive from the Civil Service Commission a report in accordance with this section 14."

Mr. YATES: "Has the Civil Service Commission furnished you with a report which would show the reasons for the firing of the 2,200-plus employees who were dismissed for security reasons?"

Mr. Cutler: "No. Its report would be due, I think, in March. We would expect to get a report from them in March."

OFFICE OF DEFENSE MOBILIZATION

(From hearings on February 23, 1954)

Arthur S. Flemming (director): "We follow the practice of not putting anyone on the payroll of ODM without a security check.

We feel there is too much of a highly sensitive nature circulating around ODM to take a chance."

Representative Norris Cotton (Republican, New Hampshire): "You complete the check before you put him on the rolls?"

Mr. Flemming: "Yes; that's right."

Representative Sidney R. Yates (Democrat, Illinois): "Does that mean that none of the so-called 2,200 security risks included people dismissed from ODM?"

Mr. Flemming: "Mr. Young can give you the figures."

Mr. Yates: "Presumably, you did not dismiss anybody."

Mr. Cotton: "I am talking about new employees."

Mr. Yates: "ODM is a new organization, is it not?"

Mr. Flemming: "We inherited a great many employees, It was created in 1951. Then people were transferred to us under the reorganization plan from the old DPA, old NSRB, the Munitions Board, the Department of Defense, and so on."

Mr. Yates: "You mean they were not checked before they came into this superior organization?"

John D. Young (executive officer): "You are correct. IRAC [Interdepartmental Radio Advisory Committee] was picked up when it was transferred to us by Executive order. We held those aside and began immediately the investigation."

Mr. Yates: "Are you saying that IRAC was not subjected to a check?"

Mr. Young: "As far as we know, it was not, until we took it over."

Mr. Yates: "Am I wrong in what the civil service told us that every Federal employee was subject to an FBI fingerprinting check and this did not apply to IRAC?"

Mr. Young: "Every employee has to have a fingerprint check."

Mr. Flemming: "Not only that, but a name file check."

Mr. Yates: "What is the nature of this investigation."

Mr. Flemming: "Full field investigation."

Representative John Phillips (Republican, of California): "Are you suggesting that the previous administration was remiss in its security check on the employees in the White House?"

Mr. Flemming: "These people, the IRAC people, were not employees of the White House."

Mr. Young: "That is correct, sir."

Mr. Flemming: "They were housed in the Federal Communications Commission and the Department of Commerce. But, in our judgment, when they came into ODM they should be and they have been subjected to a full field investigation."

Mr. Yates: "How many employees did you have who were dismissed as security risks?"

Mr. Young: "One. Two resigned while under investigation."

Mr. Yates: "Two resigned while under investigation."

Mr. Young: "Check."

Mr. Yates: "In other words, then the 3 that you are speaking of go into this 2,200 total, presumably as having been——"

Mr. Young: "Two would go into the 2,200 and 1 would not because it was past the reporting period."

Mr. Yates: "My question was, How many were dismissed under the security order?"

Mr. Young: "One. One since the reporting period, since the last report was sent in, which was the end of January."

Mr. Yates: "Was he or she a Communist?"

Mr. Phillips: "Security risk."

Mr. Young: "He was a security risk."

Mr. Yates: "I still want to know was he or she a Communist, was he dismissed as being a Communist?"

Mr. Young: "We don't know whether he is a Communist."

Mr. Yates. "Who dismissed him?"

Mr. Phillips: 'Off the record."

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. Yates. "Was the person who was dismissed a member of the Communist Party?"

Mr. Young: "The person dismissed was not a member of the Communist Party.

Mr. Yates: "What about the other two people who were dismissed?"

Mr. Young: "They resigned while the investigation was going on."

Mr. Yates: "Were the charges that were placed against them concerned with their loyalty to the Government of the United States?"

Mr. Young: "No charges were placed against those people. They were being checked."

Mr. Yates: "Did they know they were being investigated?"

Mr. Young: "They certainly did."

Mr. Yates: "Were they being checked or investigated because they were disloyal or possibly disloyal to the Government of the United States?

Mr. Young: "They were being investigated because they were employees of the ODM and all our jobs are sensitive and we investigate all people who work for ODM."

Mr. Yates: "You have stated just now that all employees of the office are investigated. You have just stated that two resigned during the course of that investigation."

Mr. Young: "That is correct, sir."

Mr. Yates: "All employees of the Office of Defense Mobilization then are being investigated and therefore"——

Mr. Young: "All employees of ODM are investigated, correct, because that is in our regulations."

Mr. Yates: "The impression I got from your previous answer was that there was something special about these two employees and that was the reason for their resigning; am I wrong in that?"

Mr. Young: "They resigned during the investigation when they did not wish to answer questions which we raised."

Mr. Yates: "Touching upon their loyalty to the Government of the United States."

Mr. Young: "Suitability."

Mr. Yates: "Suitability?"

Mr. Young: "Right."

Mr. Yates: "You draw a distinction between suitability and loyalty and security?"

Mr. Young: "Yes."

Mr. Yates: "Not security?"

Mr. Young: "The two people who resigned were not loyalty cases."

[Omission.]

Mr. Yates: "Have all 311 now working for you had their full field check completed?"

Mr. Young: "No. I think full field investigation"——

Mr. Yates: "You said all of your employees were being subjected to a full field investigation."

Mr. Young: "Right. I do not think some of those for IRAC are completed."

Mr. Yates: "How many employees are there at IRAC now?"

Mr. Young: "Twenty-two with six commitments."

Mr. Yates:"Would you say you have completed 300 of your full field investigations?"

Mr. Young: "Many of those had been completed previously because when we picked up the old ODM we had about some 100 employees that had previous full field investigations. I think there were a few of those that had to be brought up to date because they were dated as far back as 1947–48. There were some investigations in process for the staff of Defense Production Administration which were not completed, and we completed all those."

Mr. Yates: "All your new employees are given a full field investigation?"

Mr. Young: "That's right."

Mr. Yates: "How long does it take? Do you find it hampers you at all?"

Mr. Young: "It depends on the workload that the Civil Service investigators have."

Mr. Yates: "Are your full field investigations conducted by the Civil Service Commission?"

Mr. Young: "Yes, except where there has been a previous investigation by the FBI we usually have the FBI bring it up to date if it needs updating. I would say about 99 percent of our investigations that we are doing now are done by the Civil Service Commission. The period runs from 30 to 60 days."

Mr. Yates: "Out of the some 300 employees that you have on hand, 2 have resigned while the investigations were pending for reasons other than loyalty and 1 was dismissed. With respect to that 1, you stated he was not dismissed because he was a member of the Communist Party. Was there a question of loyalty involved in his dismissal?"

Mr. Young: "Yes; there was."

The Japanese Trade Agreement and GATT

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. BRICKER

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 2, 1954

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an address by Mr. O. R. Strackbein, chairman of the nationwide Committee of Industry, Agriculture, and Labor on Import-Export Policy, delivered before the International Brotherhood of Operative Potters, at Atlantic City, N. J., on July 8, 1954.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

JAPANESE TRADE AGREEMENT AND GATT

(Address of O. R. Strackbein, chairman, the Nationwide Committee of Industry, Agriculture, and Labor on Import-Export Policy, before the International Brotherhood of Operative Potters, Atlantic City, N. J., July 8, 1954)

This year marks the 20th anniversary of the trade agreements program. The law was first enacted in 1934 for a 3-year period and has been extended for additional periods of 3 years or less, successively, upon expiration since that time. The last two extensions have been for a 1-year period each. Only 10 days or 2 weeks ago the latest extension was adopted for 1 more year by Congress. The present administration had sought a 3-year extension but settled instead for a 1-year lifesaver.

Under this program our average tariff levels have been reduced very drastically. Today our average duty on dutiable items is only a little over 12 percent. This is a good 75 percent less than it was during the 1931–35 period, when the average rate was 50.02 percent. However, since nearly 60 percent of our total imports are free of duty altogether, the total duty collected on all our imports, free and dutiable, is only a little over 5 percent. The upshot is that the United States is one of the low-tariff countries of the world. Yet we find constant denunciations of our so-called high-tariff wall and our refusal to trade with other countries. This represents distortion and nonsense.

High praise has been heaped upon the trade agreements program by editorial writers, by columnists, by speakers, and politicians, especially the most eager and foremost internationalists among them, ever since its adoption in 1934. The State Department has very diligently propagated the supposed virtues of the program in official statements, speeches, and brochures noted for their extreme one-sidedness. Women's organizations, such as the League of Women Voters and the General Federation of Women's Clubs, well tutored through State Department efforts, have given it their heartiest support. Great farm organizations have given testimony in its favor. So has the CIO. The A. F. of L. has in its official position, as determined by convention action, endorsed the system with strong reservations. The executive council of the American Federation of Labor, in its report to the 1953 or last AFL convention, said:

"We cannot look on with indifference when our wage and labor standards are undermined by competition from abroad that derives its advantage from low wages and inferior working conditions. * * *

"* * * Where tariff rates have been reduced to a point below which unfair competition sets in, a workable remedy should be available to the workers and industries injured thereby."

The statement adds that "at the same time we recognize the need of a maximum of foreign trade that can be carried on without destroying the standards that have been so laboriously built up through out efforts of many years."

What could then possibly be wrong with the trade agreements program? If it is praised by so many diverse groups must it not be a marvelous undertaking? Or is the picture out of focus?

Let us recall first that the program was sold to the public as a great instrumentality of world peace. The lion and the lamb were to lie down together and enjoy between themselves the disarming blessings of free trade. No longer would commercial competition cause friction and conflict among the rival nations. Freer trade would progressively dissolve the hostilities of countries as they eyed each other. Greed would not flourish alongside of bountiful trade.

Unfortunately several years after the program's adoption the worst war in recorded history struck the world. Today the outlook for peaceful international relations is not of the brightest. Evidently there was something wrong with the claims for peace through trade. On this point the propaganda is silent.

As matters now stand the trade program has become something of an instrumentality of appeasement in our foreign relations and of rank favoritism and economic discrimination at home.

The plan today is to enter into a trade agreement with Japan. Otherwise it is said Japan will go communistic. This confronts us with a hard choice since the United States insists that Japan must not carry on trade with China. In other years nearly a quarter of Japanese exports found a market in China, now sealed off. The problem is real and it is hard.

Nevertheless, the fact that we have a problem does not of itself point to a particular solution. What, for example, can we offer to Japan by way of further tariff reductions on imports from that country? Already a number of industries are being injured by Japanese imports. Pottery, I need not tell you, is one of them. Just this week the Tariff Commission set aside an application for higher duties on Japanese pottery imports. Was this plea set aside in order to make way for a tariff reduction?

Glassware, bicycles, plywood, microscopes and binoculars, toys, cotton textile, gloves and mittens, tuna, buttons, and hundreds of other items are already the object of great concern and even of distress because of Japanese competition. How then can we hope to enter into a trade agreement that calls for yet more concessions to Japan?

Don't forget that in all these years of trade agreements all concessions that we made to other countries were automatically extended to Japan. Japan did not have to reduce a single duty on imports from us. She did not enter into a trade agreement with us. That was unnecessary. She merely had to sit out any agreements that we made with other countries. If we cut the duty on any article that we also happen to import from Japan, that country, under the operations of the unconditional most-favored-nation clause, to which we adhere, automatically received the cut; and this happened in a number of instances.

Should we now enter into a trade agreement with Japan, other countries would get the benefit of any cuts made in the tariff on Japanese imports. This is what is called nondiscriminatory treatment and can and does lead to much economic mischief—for the reason that not all countries are on the same competitive level.

Frankly, the question of a trade agreement with Japan poses a dilemma. It is entirely true that Japan is far from self-sufficient; that she needs to import much of her food and textile fibers, no less than other products, and that in order to pay for these imports she must export. It is also true that this country is an important market for Japan and that Japan has been cut off from China and Korea. Moreover, she is by way of being cut off from Indochina.

All this adds up to the extreme pressure now developing to open wider our gates to Japanese imports. But how can we do this without exposing to ruin a number of our own industries and their workers?

There is only one possibility but unfortunately the State Department closed the door to that approach ahead of time. The wisdom of that Department has often been called into question but its absence has seldom been demonstrated more clearly than in the present instance.

For example, it is proposed that we enter into a trade agreement with Japan through the general agreement on tariffs and trade, the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, known as GATT, from its initials. If we do that, what we have pointed out above will happen—or worse. It is now suggested by those who recognize the difficulties that if we cannot offer sufficient concessions to Japan ourselves we should induce the British and French through their overseas appendages to grant Japan trade concessions in their areas, such as India, Australia, French Indochina, etc.

How could we bring this about? That is a hard question, but the answer is given that we should reduce our own duties on British and French products to compensate those countries for the concessions that they would make to Japan. In other words we must pay these other countries to make concessions to Japan. Among such concessions might well be a further tariff reduction on our imports of bone china, which is made in England.

It is doubtful, of course, that Japan would find such a proposal acceptable, well knowing as she does, that such concessions, particularly if part of a forced play, can readily be nullified.

A much better arrangement, if we must have a trade agreement with Japan, would obviously be to guard our concessions with import quotas. In this way the damage that could be inflicted on our industry and workers might be contained within acceptable limits. If the duty on pottery, for example, were reduced, a limit could be set on the number of pieces that could be brought in within any 1 year or even quarter year.

The trouble is that such quotas could not be established under GATT. This is the result of State Department insistence on outlawing quotas in that agreement. That Department was overcome by its emotional attachment to certain theories and just could not wait to see what effects would be produced by its passion against import quotas, and stubbornly insisted on the outlawry. The other nations were more realistic and succeeded in having exceptions written into the ban. Naturally, these exceptions were tailored to fit the conditions prevailing in those countries rather than the United States.

The result is that quotas cannot be placed by the United States on imports of industrial products, except as a national security measure. Other countries, of course, can do so for several reasons, such as balance of payments difficulties, that apply to them but not to us.

In order to avoid this ban on quotas it follows that we should make an agreement directly with Japan without going through GATT, if we are bound to make an agreement. In other words, we should bypass GATT which, in any case, is not a legitimate organization so far as this country is concerned since it has never been brought before Congress for ratification. The only explanation is the great fear of its sponsors that Congress would reject it. Consequently GATT works its will silently, in the dark, so that its operations are almost completely unknown to the American people.

It is even a question whether we are free as a member of GATT to make a trade agreement with Japan alone. Under that agreement we tied our hands in many respects, only some of which are coming to view. The provisions of the agreement have never been aired thoroughly and I may say that some of them will not bear a good airing. The State Department ran so far so fast under this agreement by way of usurping congressional authority for the sake of world economic planning that there would be extreme embarrassment if all the facts were spread upon the record for the American people to see. We are by way of surrendering so much sovereignty in the highly important field of tariffs and trade, without so much as "by your leave" from the State Department, that the time for an open look is overdue.

The proposed Japanese trade agreement only brings to light some of the knots that the Department has fashioned for our hands. These knots should, of course, be cut straight through and undone as quickly as possible. There is a glimmer of a hope that GATT may be brought before Congress for review. The demand for such a going over is rapidly growing.

If a trade agreement with Japan is to be negotiated under GATT you may be sure that more will be heard on the subject, and I hope that many of you will add your voices to the protests.

In the beginning we said that the trade-agreements program had become an instrumentality of favoritism and discrimination at home. This simply means that under this system of tariff administration some industries, mostly export interests, are benefited at the expense of other industries, such at pottery manufacturing, to allow themselves to be exposed to ruinous import competition so that we may more readily sell abroad more cotton, wheat, automobiles, and other products; and we find the cotton and wheat interests among the strongest supporters of freer trade.

It may surprise you to know that we find something else, namely, that cotton and wheat are both thoroughly and completely protected by import quotas. Imports are restricted so tightly that they can make no possible headway in this market beyond the very small trickle allowed to come in. Yet we are treated constantly to statements, speeches and pronouncements from the cotton and wheat interests singing the praises of lower tariffs and more imports of everything, except of course cotton and wheat.

Cotton and wheat, moreover, are heavily subsidized under the price-support system. As for the automobile industry: The tariff on automobiles has not been touched under the trade-agreements program. Does this add up to fair and equal and nondiscriminatory treatment of American producers? Apparently the trade-agreements program, in calling so loudly for non-discrimination abroad, is blinded to discriminatory treatment at home.

The time has come when our whole tariff administration of the past 20 years should be reexamined and thoroughly overhauled. It is completely clear now that so long as administration of the tariff remains in the White House with the State department advising the President, just so long will it be virtually impossible for American industry and its workers to obtain relief under the escape clause of our trade agreements. The record is a dismal one and is getting worse with every new decision. The White House is effectively nullifying the will of Congress in this field. The system has been tried and found inequitable, harsh and relentless.

What is needed is a withdrawal of the power from the President to enter into new trade agreements, thus leading to the abolition of the abominable system of favoring one industry at the expense of others.

The power to adjust our tariffs should be returned to Congress, where the Constitution squarely lodges it. This does not call for tariffmaking by Congress itself. It calls for an agency that is responsible to Congress, rather than the President, to make adjustments when imports can be shown to injure materially American industry or workers. No general increase in the tariff is called for—only a remedy against genuine import injury or impending injury.

To that we are entitled, and we should not settle for less. Most important of all is to wrest from the State Department its strangling grip on many of our industries through its power and influence over tariff administration. That Department, by the nature of its work, is more interested in foreign relations than in our domestic economy. While foreign relations are of great importance, the tail should not wag the dog.

How Naval Academy Was Born—Buchanan First Superintendent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 24, 1954

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, through the courtesy of yourself and all the other Members of this distinguished legislative body, I have heretofore been granted unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to accompany same with the following text of a historical article which I was pleased to read in the Navy Times. It deals with the establishment of our own United States Navay Academy at Fort Severn, Annapolis, Md., on October 10, 1845.

I know that every Member of this great legislative body will be pleased to read this article about our great Naval Academy. You will note its 110th birthday will be on October 10, 1954.

The article follows:

HOW NAVAL ACADEMY WAS BORN—BUCHANAN FIRST SUPERINTENDENT

(By George W. Grupp)

On October 10, 1845, Comdr. Franklin Buchanan, the first superintendent, together with a teaching staff of 7 instructors, formally opened the United States Naval Academy at Fort Severn, Annapolis, Md., with less than 50 students 18 to 27 years old.

This was the first real beginning to train young men to become efficient Navy officers.

When the Navy Department was established in 1789, lower-ranking officers were selected from our merchant-marine service, but the top high-ranking officers were usually former merchantmen who had served the Navy with distinction during the Revolution.

At the same time, to develop officer material, eight midshipmen were usually signed on each ship. These midshipmen were appointed by the President without regard of their age, educational background, or natural fitness to pursue a sea career.

Since there was no regular system of training, these midshipmen were left to their own devices to learn by observing and asking questions. It was not until 1802 that a naval regulation was issued, directing the commanding officer of each ship to see that midshipmen were properly instructed.

The idea of creating a naval academy was not brought out into the open until the War of 1812. That occurred when, on November 15, 1814, Secretary of the Navy William Jones wrote a letter to the Senate and to President James Madison in which he said:

"I would suggest the expediency of providing by law for the establishment of a naval academy with suitable professors for the instruction of officers of the Navy in those branches of the mathematics and experimental philosophy and the sciences and practice of gunnery, theory of naval architecture, and the art of mechanical drawing, which are necessary to the accomplishment of the naval officer."

Nothing came of Secretary Jones' recommendation and that of many others until George Bancroft became Secretary of the Navy. The only educational facilities which had been set up for the training of naval officers were little schools in the navy yards at Boston, New York, Philadelphia, and Norfolk, each with one instructor. These separate schools unfortunately were not under intelligent supervision or cordination.

Soon after Bancroft became Secretary of the Navy he vigorously pushed the Naval Academy idea. By July 1845, he was determined that the Naval Academy should be established at Fort Severn, Annapolis. With this in mind, he decided that Comdr. Franklin Buchanan should be the first superintendent because of his ability as a naval officer, and because of his ability as a skillful, energetic, systematic organizer.

Buchanan, a native of Baltimore, in 1815—at the age of 15—entered the Navy as a midshipman and rose to the rank of Commander, and Chief of the Bureau of Navy Yards and Docks before Bancroft had selected him to be the first superintendent of the Naval Academy.

Buchanan, a stern disciplinarian, had an inflexible will. And his hands were strengthened during the first days in organizing the Naval Academy by the prompt and friendly support of Bancroft and other high-ranking Navy Department officials.

On August 7, 1845, Bancroft wrote to Buchanan that the War Department would transfer Fort Severn to the Navy Department. At the same time he wrote Buchanan:

"Having thus expressed to you some general views, I leave you, with such assistance as you may require, to prepare and lay before this Department for its approbation a plan for the organization of the Naval School at Fort Severn, Annapolis."

A week later, with the assistance of Commanders McKean and Dupont, Buchanan presented to Bancroft a plan which outlined the duties of the superintendent and faculty, the courses of studies which should be taught, and the cadet requirements. After making a few minor changes, Bancroft approved Buchanan's plan.

Upon opening the Naval Academy, the houses formerly used by the commandant and subalterns of the post were occupied by Superintendent Buchanan and the teaching staff. The midshipmen were housed in various frame buildings on the grounds of the old post. The two barracks were used for classroom, kitchen and mess hall purposes.

At Commander Buchanan's own request, he was relieved of his duties as superintendent on March 15, 1847, to enable him to take command of the U. S. S. *Germantown* and to take an active part in our war with Mexico.

In the War Between the States, Buchanan took up the cudgels for the South. He was in command of the *Merrimac* in her famous engagement with the *Monitor*. Next he was in command of the ram *Tennessee* in the Mobile naval battel of August, 1864. In this naval engagement he was wounded and taken prisoner. After the war he was for some time president of the Maryland Agricultural College. And on May 12, 1874, he "crossed the bar."

The Trout Labeling Bill, S. 2033

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAMER H. BUDGE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 26, 1954

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Speaker, in view of certain misunderstandings concerning the intent of and the importance of S. 2033, the following statements from the National Board of United States Trout Farm Associations and from Mr. Carl D. Shoemaker, conservation consultant of the National Wildlife Federation, are quoted herein:

TEMPEST IN A TEAPOT OVER TROUT LABELING BILL—STATEMENT OF THE NATIONAL BOARD OF UNITED STATES TROUT FARM ASSOCIATIONS IN REFERENCE TO THE TROUT LABELING BILL, S. 2033.

The following facts were gleaned from the Izaak Walton League, the National Wildlife Federation, and Sports Afield, who have actively supported the passage of the trout labeling bill against the opposition of the hotel and restaurant associations:

Our fish and recreational experts selected the fresh-water trout from all our game fish to be the basis of by far their largest national sports fishing and recreational programs. If hunting is classed first, then trout fishing is our second largest participation sport (baseball is 16th). We have trout fishing in 43 States, largely supplied by the live-stocking program of the 300 trout hatcheries maintained by the trout-fishing States, the 50 Federal trout hatcheries, and the 325 commercial trout hatcheries. In consequence, the commercial food use of trout in this country is small in comparison to the sports use. In fact, some States, like Virginia, feel the sports use is completely paramount, and they legally ban the food use.

Our commercial trout growers play an important part in this national sports fishing and recreational program in that they supplement the efforts of the various States to provide good trout fishing to their people by (1) supplying trout eggs to over 30 of the States; (2) supplying fry, fingerlings, and legal-sized trout to other States; and (3) being the only legal source of stocking trout for private streams and lakes, which amount to approximately 20 percent of this program. Sales to private fishing waters takes fishing pressure off our already heavily loaded trout streams. So the services of our commercial trout growers are not only needed by our State fish departments (over 30 of them have endorsed the bill) but also by our trout fishermen.

Caught in a double squeeze our commercial trout growers are being slowly strangled. The mounting fishing pressure on our streams has resulted in a shorter fishing season (now averaging about 3 months), and in an increasingly smaller daily limit. So as a result of the many laws passed to protect trout fishing, their livestock market has been restricted and limited. Yet to grow a single live trout requires year-round operation. So to keep going our growers built up a supplementary table trout market. All went well until about 5 years ago. Then foreign frozen table trout began to be imported at a price lower than the domestic cost of production. This was the cumulative result of devalued currencies and lower standards. However, the foreign trout, grown only for food, could not match the eating quality of our domestic trout. So in their efforts to win sales for their inferior foreign product—and overcome their quality handicap, the restaurants handling the foreign trout listed them on their menus under domestic names. For instance, in the East the menus read "eastern brook trout" and the public were served a foreign rainbow. In the West the menus listed "Rocky Mountain rainbow" and the public were served a foreign rainbow. Thus the public were royally deceived and our domestic growers given a terrible drubbing.

Congress has been quick to recognize the underlying economic law that whenever you have a lower priced, lower quality product that can readily be substituted for a higher priced, higher quality product, then the market for the higher priced and higher quality product is destroyed. This is true because the seller of the lower priced, lower quality product can make an equal or greater profit on the lower priced, lower quality product and at the same time undersell his competitor who is handling the higher priced, higher quality product.

Congress has also been quick to perceive that under these conditions our trout growers are far from being on an equal competitive basis with their foreign competitors. The enactment of the trout labeling bill would not only protect the public but would also restore competitive equality other than in price to our domestic trout growers. They also recognize that it cannot affect the friendly relations this country has with the exporting countries.

It does not restrict the importation of foreign trout in any way—but by requiring honest labeling it will stop the improper trade practices of misrepresentation and substitution.

The restaurant and hotel associations object to the menu-listing part of the bill. However, it is at the restaurant level where the misrepresentation and substitution takes place—the other provisions of the bill protect the restaurant buyer. The associations claim it sets a precedent for other foods. This contention is not borne out by the facts. The listing they have given domestic trout for many years indicated place of origin; i. e., eastern brook trout, Rocky Mountain rainbow, etc. Again they are quick to list a food by place of origin whenever they feel it will help the sale of the product. For example: Russian caviar, English sole, Idaho potato, Maine lobster, etc. In this instance they hesitate to use the true name of the foreign product, preferring to cash in on the reputation of domestic trout.

Congressmen have pointed out that foods having a dual use are scarce as hens' teeth—and especially those where the other use is far more important than the food use. They do not believe a precedent has been set for other foods.

They have suggested that it would be far more constructive for the restaurant and hotel associations to recognize the sports use of trout and join with the domestic trout growers and our 10 million trout fishermen in correcting this situation which has been one of the most blatant deceptions in the hotel and restaurant field. Also many of their own members are just as anxious as the domestic growers to see it corrected for they want to handle the higher quality domestic product. Also these associations should be interested not only in preserving but in fostering the sale of domestic trout—for it is one of the few genuine American delicacies we have. And certainly they should be interested in protecting the public.

The trout labeling bill has passed the Senate unanimously. Given a hearing in the House it was reported out unanimously. Objected to on the Consent Calendar it was given another hearing before the Rules Committee. A rule was granted. Both committees who heard both sides of the controversy overwhelmingly supported the enactment of the trout bill. Congress definitely does not wish to put its stamp of approval on the dishonest trade practices in question—still less do they wish to take part in eliminating so important a domestic industry.

Statement in Reference to the Trout Labeling Bill, S. 2033, by Carl D. Shoemaker, Conservation Consultant, National Wildlife Federation

I have carefully read the statement entitled "Tempest in a Teapot Over the Trout Labeling Bill" and consider it to be both fair and correct as to the facts.

Two points however are not sufficiently emphasized. They are:

1. The bill does not and will not stop the importation of trout. All that it does is to provide that such trout, when imported to this country, shall be labeled as to point of origin. It cannot possibly affect the friendly relations this country has with the exporting countries.

2. The objections raised by the restaurant and hotel associations do not support their conclusions. The precedent will be established and it should be no more difficult or costly to place on their menus the name of the exporting country in front of the word "trout" than it now does to place there the words "Rocky Mountain" or "Eastern Brook."

This is a most worthwhile bill, which will give protection to one of our growing enterprises of trout propagation and to the great body of sportsmen—conservationists—interested in fair play.

Respectfully submitted.

Neatest Trick of 1954

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 28, 1954

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, last Wednesday I called the attention of my colleagues to an attempt in the other body to tack the modified uniform grazing bill, which never could stand on its own feet, to the Agricultural Act of 1954.

I cited this as an example of the evils of attaching riders to bills that are not directly concerned with the subject matter of the principal legislation.

It would be most unfortunate if this move were to deprive the House of the opportunity of giving full consideration to a piece of legislation involving the administration of about 200 million acres of our national forest and Bankhead-Jones lands—in the face of such widespread public opposition.

The Denver Post in an editorial on August 1 says the grazing bill "deserves to go into the deepest pigeonhole Congress can find."

I include that editorial from one of the most influential newspapers in the intermountain West:

Neatest Trick of 1954

As this is written, the Senate is preparing to consider the farm support program and Senator Anderson, Democrat, of New Mexico is hoping to pull off a coup on behalf of a small group of stockmen by attaching their pet grazing proposal to the support bill as a rider.

The pet project is the Hope-Thye-Aiken bill. Its purpose is to divest the United States Forest Service of much of its authortiy over the national forests and to turn final forest decisions over to the courts.

Other purposes as to perpetuate valuable forest grazing privileges which a relatively few stockmen enjoy and to make it possible for ranchers to gain additional provileges by buying up the grazing permits of their neighbors.

The Senate passed the Hope-Thye-Aiken bill a good many weeks ago but popular protests against the measure were so strong that it never got out of committee in the House of Representatives.

Stockmen are now hopeful of bypassing the regular legislative procedures and getting the special privilege grazing proposal before the House through the strategy of attaching it to the support bill which is considered to be "must" legislation.

It is obvious that the grazing proposal has no chance for enactment on the basis of its own merits. If the stockmen can slip it through as an appendage to the all-important support bill, it will be one of the neatest tricks pulled off in Congress in many a day.

The whole issue here is whether the public interest in the national forests is to continue to be superior to the personal interests of livestock permittees. One way and another, permittees have been trying for years to strengthen their hold on the forests.

The Hope-Thye-Aiken bill represents a new approach but the objectives of the permittees are still the same.

This is a bad bill—whether considered by itself or as a shirttail to a farm bill. It deserves to go into the deepest pigeonhole Congress can find.

Professional Witnesses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 27, 1954

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to direct the attention of our colleagues to the following article written by Joseph and Stewart Alsop. It appeared in their column Matter of Fact in the July 11, 1954, edition of the New York Herald Tribune:

The employment of professional informers and witnesses by the American Government is such a novel practice that its full import, and even the fact of its novelty, are not widely understood.

Yet any sharp departure from American tradition deserves to be studied and understood before it is accepted or rejected, as the case may be. Here, then, are the essential facts about this unprecedented group of public servants who are now to be found on the Justice Department's payroll under the classification of "consultants to the Immigration and Naturalization Service."

These persons are, first of all, entirely different from the tipsters and undercover agents that the Customs, the FBI, and other police arms of the Government have employed from time immemorial. Their jobs are not the same. For the main job of these socalled consultants of the Immigration Service is to appear as witnesses in court or other proceedings involving charges of communism or subversion, and by their testimony to win convictions for the Government.

The distinction between the tipsters and undercover agents, whom we have always had with us, and the professional witnesses, who have now appeared among us, may seem rather finely drawn unless you think about it. But consider the personal position of this new breed of Government workers and the distinction will be plain enough.

Mr. X, let us call him, is an ex-Communist of very slender talent and small ordinary earning capacity. Until he discovered that ex-communism could become a profitable trade, he was making something between 80 cents and $1.50 an hour at a shabby succession of odd jobs. Then he makes his break with the party, tells his story to the proper authorities, and is taken on by the Justice Department as a consultant to the Immigration Service.

For this new work Mr. X receives $25 per diem, plus an additional per diem in lieu of subsistence, and reimbursement for transportation when called to work away from home. He is not really a consultant at all. Even his value as an informer is greatly diminished by the fact that he left the Communist Party some time ago. His chief task is to appear on the witness stand and to win convictions for Government lawyers.

It is for appearing on the witness stand, remember, that Mr. X gets the $25 per diem, which is either his main source of income or a very important supplement of his other earnings. Other witnesses called by the Government are paid a trifling $4 per diem, but in order to allow Mr. X to make his living by appearing as a witness, the Justice Department has thoughtfully given him his title of "consultant to the Immigration Service," and has thus legalized his reimbursement at the higher rate.

So what happens when Mr. X, the professional Government witness, is approached by Mr. Y, of the Criminal Division, who has a difficult Smith Act case, or deportation case, or something similar, on his hands? Mr. Y asks Mr. X whether he knows the defendants in the case and can testify against them. If Mr. X says "Yes," he does know them, he gets his $25 per diem and earns his living. If he says "No," he doesn't know them, he does not get his $25 per diem and skips payment on a new television set.

That, roughly and crudely, is the nature of the position of this new breed of public servant. The resulting temptations, both for the professional witness and the eager-beaver Government lawyer, are too obvious to need underlining.

Fifty or so persons are now classified as Immigrantion Service consultants. Although it is questionable practice to pay these persons much more than other Government witnesses, only a minority are in the professional category. There are 12 who have earned enough so that one may reasonably presume the sums were meaningful to them, and they can thus be fairly called professionals. Of these 12, 3 are now under investigation by the Justice Department for possible perjury.

The Daily Worker has announced its delight that some of these persons are now being investigated, which is proof positive that the original purpose of their employment was a good purpose.

But in the first place, by no means all those accused by the professional witnesses come from the Communist underground. An attempt was made by two of them on the distinguished Dr. Ralph Bunche.

And in the second place, the desire to root out the Communist conspiracy does not excuse gross impropriety, or even radical departure from the great American tradition of law and justice. That way, the enemy will win by indirection.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized book dealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by book dealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the Congressional Record is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Frank Brodie is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the Record at $1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. The money derived from such sales shall be paid into the Treasury and accounted for in his annual report to Congress, and no sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRICE OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

The Public Printer is authorized to furnish to subscribers the daily Record at $1.50 per month, payable in advance.

Remit by money order payable to Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Printing and binding for Congress, when recommended to be done by the Committee on Printing of either House, shall be so recommended in a report containing an approximate estimate of the cost thereof, together with a statement from the Public Printer of estimated approximate cost of work previously ordered by Congress within the fiscal year (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 145, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on Printing, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

DISTRIBUTION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

To the Vice President and each Senator 100 copies; to the Secretary and Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, each, 25 copies; to the Secretary, for official use, not to exceed 35 copies; to the Sergeant at Arms, for use on the floor of the Senate, not to exceed 50 copies; to each Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress, 68 copies; to the Clerk, Sergeant at Arms, and Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives, each, 25 copies; to the Clerk, for official use, not to exceed 50 copies; and to the Doorkeeper, for use on the floor of the House of Representatives, not to exceed 75 copies; to the Vice President and each Senator, Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress there shall also be furnished (and shall not be transferable), 3 copies of the daily Record, of which 1 shall be delivered at his residence, 1 at his office, and 1 at the Capitol.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the Congressional Record, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the Record.

PRINTING DOCUMENTS AND REPORTS

Documents and reports of committees with the evidence and papers submitted therewith, or any part thereof ordered printed by Congress, may be reprinted by the Public Printer on order of any Member of Congress or Delegate, on prepayment of the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 162, p. 1940).

IN

M
leav
ORD,
ered
of C
my
T
by I
con
on
I
Hou
this
Mac

A
nov
sele
not
ask
was
it?
"T
you

of
We
abo
pu
Ci
le
dr
en
w
re
kn
bu
"C
B
gl
w
ri
c
li

n
n
d
h
d
a

v
s
c
c

Appendix

Drums and Bugles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN L. McMILLAN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 3, 1954

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a copy of a speech delivered by Rev. Dallas L. Mackey, chaplain of Civitan International, who resides in my district at Lamar, S. C.

This speech was delivered at St. Louis by Reverend Mackey to the 34th annual convention of the Civitan International on June 21.

I hope that every Member of the House will have an opportunity to read this enlightening speech by Reverend Mackey:

WITHOUT DRUMS AND BUGLES

(By Dallas L. Mackey)

An aspiring writer approached the great novelist, James M. Barrie and asked him to select a title for his book. Mr Barrie did not have any time to read the book but asked, "Does it have any bugles in it?" "No," was the reply. "Does it have any drums in it?" The answer was likewise in the negative. "Then," replied Mr. Barrie, "I suggest that you call it 'Without Bugles and Drums.'"

The theme of our convention—the theme of Civitan is Builders of Good Citizenship. We are all well aware of the chaos that exists about us, but how well aware are we of the purpose and will of God as it relates to our Civitan endeavors. Have we heard the challenge of bugles? Have our feet marched to drum beats of love and loyalty? It is not enough to subscribe to a creed, sense the world's need, dream of a noble deed. It is required of those who are Civitans that they know something of bugles and drums. By bugles we mean the call of the Galilean, "Come follow me. Take my yoke upon you." By drums we mean our hearts beating in glad response to this call, our lives pulsing with devotion to his service. We have no right to the name Civitan until we have become captivated by the Galilean and our lives motivated by him.

Facing man's present disorder, one cannot find as much to encourage him as he might well hope for—but in back of man's disorder there is a design by God and somehow I feel that Civitan is a part of God's design. If that be true then Civitan faces a great challenge.

If we are to effectively accomplish this role we must find wisdom for every act and deed. Someone has said, and said well. The wisdom of the ages is to find out which way God is going and move with him.

As we move (we are challenged) to take three looks: (1) Retrospective look, a review of the past; (2) into spective look, a look within; (3) prospective look, what's ahead.

I remember hearing Bishop C. C. Selecman, grand old man of Methodism, deliver an address before a youth convention. I was taking notes and getting ready to use the material in a sermon for my own congregation. His subject was Our Forward March. He was really marching. I kept my pencil busy. "You must go forward." I wrote it down. "Youth must catch step with the days ahead." Great stuff. I could hear myself marching in my pulpit on my next Sunday at home. "Youth must no be afraid of new days, new ways and ney truths and new experiences." We marched hip, hip, hip. Then he said, "This is no time for youth to go back to the graveyard." I wrote it down, "No Graveyards," and underline the words three times. I was impressed—then on and on we marched.

As I went home, riding on the train, I got out my notebook and decided to prepare a sermon for my congregation. They would be expecting something on youth so I turned to Selecman and Our Forward March. I would give him credit, of course. Then I slowly read over my notes and for the first time I really discover the graveyard. There it was in the very midst of marching. Everytime I tried to march I ran right into the graveyard. Marching through a graveyard is something. When I began to think of vision and progress and the limitless future and new truth and modern times up loomed the graveyard with its white marble slabs and its solemn epitaphs slowly hut certainly I drew a black line through my subject. Who could make a sermon on Our Forward March with a graveyard blocking the way. So I made a sermon on the graveyard and preached on it next Sunday morning. I remember that, I said this, "Wherever we march and however we march and before we dare march at all, we must go back to the old graveyard where lie the dust and ashes of our fathers—men who dared to march against odds such as we have never known, and whose glorious march made history such as we are failing to make and falling on our faces, pray their God and ours that he will give us something of that which possessed their souls when they built the mightiest nation of the earth and sent forth to conquest—a church that in it's day swept hundreds of thousands into the Kingdom of God and whose noble influence still abounds.

Yet those who handed to us this torch were weatherbeaten with time and tested with the tides that never ceased to beat upon them. But they knew in whom they believed and were persuaded that all Hell could not shake them from the solid rock on which they stood. They had little education such as I sometimes fear has softened us, but they knew Christ. They walked with God, and they marched. God was their source. No other foundation can be laid by even the wisest of man.

And so—as we look to the past it must not only inspire a day of memories but must give power and strength for the present.

Observe the pilgrims landing at Plymouth Rock against all odds—searching for a land of freedom—pass on them and watch great men striving for independence—on and on they marched to frame a constitution that still stands today—see the 13 unrelated Colonies—watch those hardy heroes blaze a trail to new and uncharted lands in the West and finally there emerges on the horizon a great republic of 48 integrated States to make the most powerful Nation in the world. We have a great heritage.

See again the bloody battle fields and all they imply—Malmedy. The beaches of France, crossing of the Rhine, Okinawa, Coventry, Dunkerque, Korea—the white crosses and stars of David marking the graves of heroes in the Flanders fields of many a land.

In this, we see the clear pattern of great hero shadows bridging the generations to this day. These lay before us an open book whose remaining chapters you and I must write. What we write in actions, ink will be reflected in the total world picture and will live on. John Donne puts it well:

"Any mans death diminishes me, because I am involved in mankind. And therefore never send to know for whom the bell tolls. It tolls for thee."

Does this not inspire us and challange us to dedicate ourselves to finding a formula wherein men of every land may walk the pathway of peace together.

With that will you accept the challenge of the introspective look?

As we look within may I question you on several counts.

1. Have we a true appreciation of others' sacrifices?

A. The unendurable trials of the Pilgrim at Plymouth Rock.

B. Washington and his colonial soldiers leaving bloody footprints in the snows of Valley Forge.

C. The Apostle Paul, who fought through peril, toil, and pain. Yet, from behind prison bars sent out letters of love and hope to cheer the millions through all time.

D. Men who fought, bled, and died in all our wars.

Ours must be the appreciation of the Prince of Wales as he visited a hospital in Southern England during World War II. He talked with each patient. The nurse said the tour was completed but the Prince said according to his calculation there was one more. "Yes," said the nurse, "but he is torn beyond recognition and you would not want to see him." "I do," affirmed the Prince. He was shown into the darkened room and there saw a legless, armless, sightless, torn mass of one of the King's subjects—one who had given almost all in the battle for freedom. The Prince bowed low over his bed and kissed his body. Real appreciation.

2. Are we guarding our heritage of freedom?

Today—for months past and for months to come—our newspapers have been, are (and will be) filled with discussions of our Nation's survival. Radio, television, also major on these and kindred items. In these times our country and Christian religion are inseparably bound—I do not hesitate to go to the rescue of my country in an attempt to save the church, Civitan, and all things good.

Of some things I am not certain—but of these I am.

First, though control and brainwashing are now at high tide in America and the most sincere and honest men are being conditioned and misled.

Second, men whom we have trusted have succumbed to the seeming necessity of camouflaging and engaging in doubletalk in order to sustain their contentions and hold their positions.

Third, all about us men are building strawmen for the purpose of deception. It is no longer considered wrong to engage in actual fraud in debate.

One of the greatest evils that threaten us today is communism. Communism is after your church, school, club, etc. The FBI says that churches and schools are top targets. It is a disease that fights for the whole man—body, mind, and soul.

Congress has set up certain committees in an effort to check this evil trend that threatens. No man ever headed one of these committees upon whom the most vicious onslaught was made. Many men used to discredit these men and committees are innocent dupes of a system of midnight madness. They are being used. But the tragedy is that through Russian intrigue and treachery such opposition is stirred as to scare our national leaders and cause them to desert the very men they sent out to drive back this poisonous and destroying ideology, that seeks to enthrone itself by undermining not only American standards and doctrines but the guards we have placed at the gates for the protection of American ideals.

The survival of America is at stake. This is no hour for political opportunity. This is a moment for firm and stubborn decision. We need men like Teddy Roosevelt who could stand without flinching, whatever the opposition. America has not in a hundred years seen an hour when she needed a Hickory Jackson as now.

Somehow we have stood the fierce storms of the past as they lashed across our bow from every side—but today our alertness must be in the direction of the little bug that gets under the bark and causes a blight—the end in death.

If ever this Nation shall save herself from Russian chains and her people from the horrors of blood and hell that shall attend she must somehow or other return to honor, sobriety, and truth.

Still on the inside, look at crime and delinquency; in the last decade we have had a 5-percent population increase—but a 20-percent crime increase.

Add this: That 1 out of every 3 marriages end in divorce paralleled by the challenging fact that only 1 of every 57 Christian marriages end in divorce. What a place to build good citizenship.

Still further—$100 million was spent last year for comic books. More than was spent for all text books for the elementary and secondary school of the entire Nation. Or 4 times as much as was spent for all new books and library services in the United States of America.

Observe our giving to the world, widespread, of the gospel as against other expenditures. In a 12-month period all Protestants in the United States gave $30 million to missions while in a 27-day period 625,000 plunked down at one racetrack alone the terrific sum of $57 million or nearly twice as much as the millions of Protestants gave for missions in 1 year.

Never in our history has the state of public and private morals been so desperately low as at present. We can prove our love of God and country by our everyday behavior and appreciation of the fact that, despite our present darkness in the world, there is a divine guidance if we but seek it.

In recognition of the supremacy of God lies the security of our Nation and the peace of mind of its people.

Remember the task ahead is never greater than the power behind. Lincoln ably said, "It is rather for us to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us, that from these honored dead we take increased devotion to the cause for which they gave the last full measure of devotion."

In the light of that noble pronouncement let us approach the prospective look or that which is hoped for.

Civitan challenges us to be better men in body, mind, and soul, as we strive to live our whole creed and draw others into our marching army that together we may build that better world.

Civitan challenges us to be persistent in our efforts as the little girl who lived with her father and brother in a lighthouse of our shores. The father one day went to the mainland for provisions. While away a storm raged and night came on. Frightened, the little lady climbed the many steps to turn on the giant light, but she was not tall enough. Down she went, and with the help of brother dragged a chair all the way to the top, only to find even this was not enough. She remembered an old kerosene lamp used for emergencies. It was lighted. She stood on the chair on her tiptoes, the lamp barely touching the great reflector, yet casting some small rays out across the ways, and after 2 hours father came home—but for the persistent effort he would have been lost. We can be no less persistent than she.

Civitan challenges us to expand and extend. Expand our efforts and extend our lines to all needy places. Our eyes must search for good men to help in the great offensive. I John 3 says "the more the fellowship increase, the greater joy it brings to us who are already in it." Lengthen the ropes and strengthen the stakes.

Civitan challeneges us to serve our community, State, and Nation; our church, school, and club. Working thus, we could rebuild this world as quickly as the Germans rebuilt their blasted little nation in the thirties. The time is ripe for a fire of consecration and devotion to break over our world.

Civitan challenges us to be loyal to our country and uphold the American way of our forefathers.

Civitan challenges us to lay a firm foundation for youth of our land to build upon it an enduring structure of peace and brotherhood.

Civitan challenges us to recognize the home as the soul of the Nation where God is supreme and mothers and fathers are mothers and fathers in the good old-fashioned way.

Henry Grady, the great newspaperman, left his office one day and went back to his old home to see his mother. He was confused. "Mother," said he, "I've lost my religion, and I've come back to you, where I first found God, that you might lead me to Him again."

She gave him bread and milk as she had done in the yesteryears; then she tucked him into bed and helped him pray, "Now I lay me down to sleep." In the morninng he said, "It's all right, mother; I'm back with God again."

But wait a minute. Will there be a place for the children of today to go back to find God in the world of tomorrow?

Civitan challenges us to be builders of good citizenship. We must build a bridge that will span to the tomorrow.

"THE BRIDGE BUILDER

"An old man going a lone highway,
Came at the evening cold and gray,
To a chasm vast and deep and wide,
The old man crossed in the twilight dim,
The sullen stream had no fear for him;
But he turned when safe on the other side
And built a bridge to span the tide.

" 'Old man,' said a fellow pilgrim near,
'You are wasting your strength with building here;
Your journey will end with the ending day,
You never again will pass this way;
You've crossed the chasm, deep and wide,
Why build this bridge at evening tide?'

"The builder lifted his old gray head;
'Good friend, in the path I have come,' he said,
'There followed after me today
A youth whose feet must pass this way,
This chasm that has been as naught to me
To that fair-headed youth may a pitfall be;
He, too, must cross in the twilight dim;
Good friend, I am building this bridge for him.' "

Civitan challenges us to be men that the spoils of the world cannot buy, men with strong minds, kindly hearts, willing hands.

A Roman Emperor said to a Greek architect, "Build me a coliseum the like of which the world has never seen and I'll crown you before the vast throng."

The coliseum was completed—the throng filled it to capacity—then the emperor gave the command to put the Christians in the arena, "Loose the lions," he ordered. A tragic scene ensued—at the height of this outrage—the emperor ordered the architect to stand while he place a laurel wreath upon his head. At this the architect stepped forward without fear and affirmed, "I too am a Christian."

Civitan, when in life's arena the rowing is rough and the tempest tears at the tents of life do not waver, march manfully onward, work while it is day, then light your lamp and work on; then when the sun rises out of the east stand with free man everywhere and say:

I am Civitan: as old as life, as young as the rainbow, as endless as time.

My hands do the work of the world. They uphold the temple of industry and make clean the market place.

My ears hear the cry of children, the prayer of women for peace, the appeal of man for guidance, the call of the race for progress, and the song of the poet for unity.

My eyes search for good men that I may with them be a Civitan and brother.

My mouth utters the call to daily duty, and speaks the prayers of men in every tongue.

My mind teaches me respect for the law, unqualified allegiance to our Government, and love and respect for the flag of our country.

My heart beats for every friend; bleeds for every injury to humanity; and throbs with joy at every triumph of truth.

My soul knows no fear but its own unworthiness.

My hope is for a better world and a better city, through better men and Civitans.

My motto: builder of good citizenship.

My creed was proclaimed by the man of Galilee when declared, "Whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them."

My pledge: to practice this Golden Rule; to make it pay dividends, material and spiritual; to bridge with it the chasm between employer and employee; to build upon it a better and noble citizenship.

Transcript of Statement by Lt. Genevieve de Galard Terraube, the Angel of Dien Bien Phu, as Broadcast on the Hazel Markel Show, Coast to Coast Over the Mutual Network (WWDC), July 29

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 3, 1954

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following:

Mrs. Markel. Mademoiselle de Galard, please give us your impression of your visit and anything you would like to tell our Mutual listeners.

Mademoiselle Terraube. Well, Mrs. Markel, I am looking forward to meeting your President and I must tell you I am deeply moved by the great honor he gave to me in inviting me to come to America. I've been very deeply impressed in arriving, here and in New York, by the warm and spontaneous welcome I received. I thank very much all the American people. I was very much impressed by my visit to Walter Reed. The sick and wounded there are cared for under the best possible conditions. Unhappily, in Dien Bien Phu, we were obliged to work under the most difficult conditions. But the devotion and competence of the French medical personnel contributed to the saving of as many lives as was humanly possible. I want to say, too, that the honors I have received here are directed not to me but to my companions of Dien Bien Phu and to all nurses of the world everywhere who devote themselves to the care of the sick and wounded. I was especially impressed by the work of the American nurses I saw yesterday at Walter Reed.

France's Ambassador and Madame Henri Bonnet hosted a big brilliant reception in Mademoiselle de Galard's honor last night at the French Embassy where guests chatted with the gallant little lady, admired her crisp white uniform with the ribbon of France's famous Legion of Honor worn just above the heart. Directly below it she wore the heroism award of the American Legion Auxiliary of Massachusetts, presented her by another gallant lady—faithful friend to all our boys and girls in service—dean of Congresswomen, Edith Nourse Rogers.

Bill Lantaff

SPEECH

OF

HON. GEORGE MEADER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 30, 1954

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to pay tribute to my colleague on the Committee on Government Operations, Bill Lantaff. I join with those who are participating here today in expressing the friendship we hold for him and our regret in his decision to end his career in Congress after such a short period of time. We all wish him well in his endeavors on returning to his home in Miami for the resumption of the practice of law.

Mr. Speaker, I, perhaps, have been as closely associated with Bill Lantaff in committee work as any of the other Members of the House. I had the good fortune to serve with him on the so-called Hardy committee in the 82d Congress and again in this Congress upon the Committee on International Operations under the chairmanship of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Brownson].

I would like to say, in addition to all of Bill's other fine qualities mentioned here this afternoon, that Bill has displayed in the Committee on Government Operations that rare talent of helping us to arrive at an acceptable conclusion where there are rather wide and sometimes bitter differences between the members of the committee. In this great art of compromise—legislation—Bill Lantaff furnished in the Committee on Government Operations a very sound and balancing influence. I am sorry to see him leave the Congress, and I wish him well in his career.

The Bryson Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 3, 1954

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I submit by request the following petitions and list of signatures of citizens of my district in support of the Bryson bill, H. R. 1227, which would place certain restrictions on the advertisement of alcoholic beverages:

Hon. Joel T. Broyhill,
Congressman From Virginia:

The undersigned citizens of northern Virginia urge you to support the Bryson bill (H. R. 1227), which would prohibit the advertising of alcoholic beverages in interstate commerce, including newspapers, magazines, radio, and television:

E. B. Whitten, Azy L. Smith, D. D. Green, V. E. Burner, R. E. Naugher, Ralph M. Alexander, E. S. Barber, R. M. Loomis, Roger R. Jackson, Nelson C. Michael, Leonard Ambler, H. A. Brentlinger, James A. Cunningham, Joe Elliott, Robert E. Altenhofer, W. B. Davidson, Walter M. Whitlock, J. L. Manning, J. A. Woodward, F. R. Golden, A. W. Harrell, H. L. Caton, W. H. Lewis, A. W. Eddins, J. A. Woodward, Jr., Harold D. Bankson, Howard R. Cavil, J. F. Cousins, John A. Bettenlen, Jr., Oscar Hohein, John E. Harris, John V. Sasher, E. N. Hauber.

To Our Congressman:

We, the undersigned citizens of Virginia, in view of the appalling toll of murder on our highways called to our attention by the President, and of the recent frightening disclosures of the Senate hearing on juvenile delinquency, urgently beg you to remove unfair inducement to drivers to drink and the dangerous influence of sales talk for alcoholic beverages being channeled into our very homes over the air to the eyes and ears of our children by voting for and passing the Bryson bill (H. R. 1227):

Robert D. Moore, Thomas Hassler, Bob Banner, Lula Usher, Carolyne M. Frame, Ellen Craig, W. D. Frame, J. Lovell Deny, Mrs. H. Elgen, H. D. Bankson, Wm. G. Douglas, Mr. and Mrs. H. D. Bankson, Mrs. Roger R. Jackson, Otto G. Williams, Rachel Mathis, Herbert D. Miller, Marion Y. Miller, Judie Watson, Barbara Eisenlohr, Ruth White, Larry Pope, Roger C. Bakcom, Delta Dieffenbach, Coral Wigent, Hanley N. Collins, Jr., Mike Durfee, Orrel Paul Glover, Richard Smalley, Charles V. Cummings, David McBride, Tim Allenhofen, Margie Elliott, Martha Fisher, Dorothy Dembork, Mary Jane Howe, Joan White, Mrs. J. B. Laplace, Mary E. Tarpley, Elisabeth S. Carrol.

J. Allan Dieleson, Christine M. Stockard, Kathleen B. Engestrum, Ida V. Johnson, Harry U. Garwood, Mrs. E. B. Whitten, Paul R. Glover, Frank E. Cook, D. L. Grantham, Margaret Eisenlada, B. F. Brown, Mrs. H. P. Myers, Mrs. C. H. Greve, Mrs. Edward S. Barber, Mrs. John Muino, Mrs. Forrest Keels, Mrs. Elizabeth Donahue, Mrs. A. N. Eddins, Mrs. R. A. Martin, Mrs. E. N. Hanber, Mrs. L. H. Powell, Mrs. H. Demboski, Mrs. D. C. Ritchie, Mrs. Dorothy Alexander, Mrs. R. B. Baker, Mrs. M. D. Miller, Mrs. A. A. Poard, Evelyn R. Potterton, Charlotte Tucker, J. W. Tucker, G. M. Hull, Julia F. Fox, William E. Moore, Geraldine F. Gaskins, John B. Platt, Steve P. Enshin, Jr.

A. J. Barton, Mrs. C. M. Littlejohn, Edward P. Davis, Jean T. Crist, Della H. Bowman, R. M. Bowman, L. H. Blevins, Mary Kay Hudson, Eva Ensign, D. Eugene Brown, Mrs. C. H. Deacon, Rebekah Glading, Irene Thompson, Lawrence N. Morscher, Jr., Mrs. Alice Morscher, Grace Boyle, Ellen Boyle, Martha Carter, Mrs. Frank Inebodeu, Mrs. D. L. Powell, Mrs. M. L. Schriver, Mrs. Lucie Mummaw, Mrs. Ruby Burner, Mrs. Florence Solomon, Mrs. Zelda G. Glover, Florence E. Yeatman, C. D. Ford, Mrs. Russell Kendall, Mrs. C. E. Swenson, Mrs. G. F. Hooven, Lt. F. J. Wilder, USN, Anne Knight, Mrs. C. D. Ford, Pauline F. Eisenlohr, Carrie Louise Tonne, Charles Toone, Mrs. R. W. Kruser, Pearl Long, Mrs. N. L. Dungan, Connell Wade, Jack Zirkle, Vaughan Tweedy, Allan B. Ensign, Mary E. Janes, Esther V. Steinert, R. M. Crowe, Lucille Schilder, Mildred McInnis, Florence C. Fleischer, Clarice Wade, Allen S. Goff, Pearl Watt, Kathleen Van Horn, Lewis F. Garrett, Anna M. McCormick, Willis H. Wheeler, Margery Lowdenslager,. Barbara J. Tillson, Wm. P. Davidson, J. L. Robinson, Jr., Margaret S. Robinson, James A. Payne, Mabel A. Long.

Lillian E. Jussing, Eva Ensign, H. N. Worthley, Sarah H. Dickson, George C. Otterson, Ivy L. Rollins, Wm. P. W. Bowman, Mrs. O. G. Barber, Mrs. R. M. Loomis, Mrs. Wm. L. Gray, Mrs. J. O. Carpenter, Mrs. T. N. Berdeen, Mrs. J. G. Kendrick, Evelyn R. Pollecton, Lola L. Long, Anna M. McCormick, George F. Hoover, Mary McCormick, Sarah McCormick, Robert E. Ayers, Agnes Harrison, Elsie B. Collins, Ernestine Eudy, Bruce A. Eudy, Bobbie L. Synan, Mildred B. Payne, Viole Dickson, John H. Dickson, Henry H. Ellis, Heyward H. Cook, R. E. Grinder, Ann Evans, Mrs. L. F. Williams, Mrs. Rosa Strickland, Mrs. G. H. Richert, G. Henry Richert, Byron C. Sarnes, Irene Pape, Mrs. J. C. Boss, Cora Mae Fritz, Dorothy C. Sires, Inez Whitney, H. E. Sires, Mable Platt.

Increased Benefits Under the New Social-Security Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GARDNER R. WITHROW

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 3, 1954

Mr. WITHROW. Mr. Speaker, during the 83d Congress which is now coming to a close, I have worked for and supported legislation to increase the benefits under the social-security program.

I believe every person in the United States should come under social-security protection. The benefit age should be reduced from 65 years to 62 years.

Social security should be so improved that it will take the place of our present outdated and shameful old-age pension system.

Social-security payments at the age of 62 should not be denied on account of any other retirement or income benefits a person may be getting.

Although all the benefits I have worked for have not been enacted into law, I do believe this Congress has made a step in the right direction.

For the benefit of the citizens of my district, I would like to outline the benefits under the social-security program enacted by this Congress which I have supported and worked for during the past years:

INCREASED BENEFITS UNDER THE NEW SOCIAL-SECURITY PROGRAM

First. Average monthly wage: Your average monthly wage determines the amount of your benefits. The following chart will apply only if you worked at least 1½ years under the program since January 1, 1951.

(a) List by years all your earnings covered by social security, plus an estimate of your covered earnings up to the time you retire at age 65 or later. To realize the largest possible average monthly wage you may use either 1937 or 1951 as the starting date in your computation. Maximum covered annual earnings are as follows: 1937 through 1950, $3,000; 1951 through 1954, $3,600; after 1954, $4,200.

(b) In computing your average wage, you may cross out four of the lowest income years listed. You can cross off an additional year if you have more than 5 years of covered employment at any time. You can also cross off years in which you were under an extended total disability.

(c) Next, add the total wages earned in the years not crossed off. Divide by the number of months involved in the remaining years. This will give you your average monthly wage. Now locate this amount on the chart below under the heading "Average Monthly Wage."

Second. Monthly retirement pay: You and your wife, if both 65, will receive benefits as shown on the chart below. If your wife is under 65 when you retire, you will receive the benefit of a single person until she reaches 65. Your widow, at 65, will receive payments indicated whether or not you retire before your death. A woman with a wage record receives benefits in her own right if a higher amount will be realized.

INCREASE FAMILY SECURITY (SURVIVOR'S MONTHLY BENEFITS)

Third. Surviving widow: Your widow, if you leave children under age 18, is entitled to benefits shown on the chart below, regardless of her age as long as any child is under the age of 18 years.

Fourth. Surviving parents or orphans: Your mother or father who are dependent on you are eligible for benefits only if there is no surviving widow or child. Benefits for a parent, age 65, and also for one orphan under 18 years, are shown on the chart. Two parents, or two or more orphans receive correspondingly larger amounts.

Fifth. Lump sum at death: Lump-sum payments are in addition to benefits to eligible survivors. In the event there is no widow or widower surviving, the payment is made to the person paying burial expenses.

Now find the amount payable in your case in the columns opposite the amount you have determined to be your average wage:

Estimated average monthly earnings to age 65	Monthly retirement payments at age 65			Monthly payments to surviving widow with—			Monthly payments to dependent parents or orphan	Lump-sum payment at death
	Husband and wife	Single	Widow	3 children	2 children	1 child		
$54	$45	$30	$30	$60	$60	$45	$30	$90
$80	66	44	33	66	66	66	33	132
$100	82	55	41	82	82	82	41	165
$120	93	62	46	96	96	93	46	187
$140	99	66	49	112	112	99	49	199
$150	102	68	51	120	120	102	51	205
$160	105	70	52	128	128	105	52	211
$170	108	72	54	136	136	108	54	217
$180	111	74	55	144	144	111	55	223
$190	114	76	57	152	152	114	57	229
$200	117	78	58	160	157	117	58	235
$210	120	80	60	168	161	120	60	241
$220	123	82	61	176	165	123	61	247
$230	126	84	63	184	169	126	63	253
$240	129	86	64	192	173	129	64	255
$250	132	88	66	200	177	132	66	255
$260	135	90	67	200	181	135	67	255
$270	138	92	69	200	185	138	69	255
$280	141	94	70	200	189	141	70	255
$290	144	96	72	200	193	144	72	255
$300	147	98	73	200	197	147	73	255
$310	150	100	75	200	200	150	75	255
$320	153	102	76	200	200	153	76	255
$330	156	104	78	200	200	156	78	255
$340	159	106	79	200	200	159	79	255
$350	162	108	81	200	200	162	81	255

Our Vanishing Ships

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 3, 1954

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Boston Traveler of July 29, 1954:

OUR VANISHING SHIPS

Unless Congress does something about it mighty soon, we're going to wind up with an American merchant marine somewhat comparable to the swan boats in the public garden.

The blunt fact is that our shipbuilding industry is squarely up against a real crisis. At the same time, our active merchant ships are plunging headlong toward a state of hopeless obsolescence.

This situation comes as a sharp jolt to us here in New England, where American shipping once grew to a height of world dominance. In a lesser degree, but no less real, it affects the welfare of every family in the United States. We're still enough of a seafaring nation to have that fact hold true.

Since November of 1952, not a single order for the construction of an oceangoing merchant ship has been placed in an American shipyard. At the moment, about a score of merchant ships are now in various phases of construction, but all except two of these vessels will have been completed by the end of this year.

What happens then to the skilled shipbuilding crews that could produce the greatest merchant fleet in the world? Already, the number of workers in the big coastal shipyards are being sliced away month by month.

Ironically enough, while the shipbuilding slump grows worse the obsolescence danger grows sharper.

Some four-fifths of the ships that we now have at sea were built during the crowded years of World War II, and were conceded a useful life of about 20 years. That means that in less than a decade, they'll all start heading for the scrap heap at roughly the same time. And as we stand now, there'll be nothing coming along to replace them.

A few attempts have been made to correct this situation. Recently a Commerce Department-Maritime Administration report urged the building of 60 ships a year to replace existing tonnage. Another proposal called for the Government to finance construction of 20 ships a year. So far, though, no real action.

One of these days, we're going to need that action in a hurry. Foreign operators are giving American ocean shipping stiff competition today. As for tomorrow, who knows when we'll need a fleet of good, fast merchant ships for national security?

Congress should grab this one fast and correct it.

Echo Park Dam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. DAWSON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 3, 1954

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, Echo Park Dam, a key structure in the billion-dollar upper Colorado River project, has been under attack by conservationists who falsely maintain that its construction will flood Dinosaur National Monument.

The difficulty we in the West have in answering these attacks is finding someone who has visited this inaccessible section of the country. A letter from the managing editor of Utah's leading evening newspaper vividly explains the terrain.

I hope other Members of Congress will take the time to read the following letter from Mr. Theron Liddle, of the Deseret News-Salt Lake Telegram:

JULY 29, 1954.

Mr. JOHN B. OAKES,
Editorial Writer, the New York Times,
New York, N. Y.

DEAR MR. OAKES: You will recall that you and I discussed the Echo Park Dam situation in your office a few months ago. You will also recall that I was attempting to change your viewpoint opposing Echo Park Dam as expressed in your editorials and news articles. Your writings since that time indicate that you have not changed that viewpoint.

When I was in your office, I told you that we had little to fear from persons who visited the Echo Park area and obtained all the facts. I recalled our conversation vividly when I visited Echo Park this past weekend, and I sincerely wished you could have been with us. We visited the area in jeeps and station wagons provided by the Vernal Chamber of Commerce.

Words cannot describe the ruggedness of the overland trip, but I will outline it to you briefly. In addition, I am enclosing a few pictures which I am certain you did not find in the packages mailed to you by the Sierra Club.

The road into the area is so rough that at one point it took us 1 hour and 20 minutes to go 12 miles. In that 12 miles we were stuck in the sand and rocks on three occasions. It would be foolhardy to attempt to drive a passenger car into the area. I also think it would be foolish for 1 car to enter the area alone, inasmuch as on 2 occasions when we were stuck it took the combined manpower of 2 carloads to get the vehicle free. When we returned to Vernal, we found that one of the truck tires with which our vehicle was equipped had been cut through and was leaking air rapidly. Another car lost a bumper and muffler. The enclosed pictures will help you understand why.

The scenery at the end of the road is beautiful but it most certainly is not unique in the area. It is not another Zion Canyon National Park, Bryce Canyon National Park, Capitol Reef National Monument or Arches National Monument, all of which are in this same Mountain West area.

There has been much discussion of the fact that Steamboat Rock will be partially submerged by the water of Echo Park Dam. This is true. However, when you see Steamboat Rock in its true perspective to the rest of the area, you realize that it is not the unique structure that it has been pictured by the Sierra Club. I am enclosing a picture of Steamboat Rock as it appears from the road. You will notice that the rock mountains on either side are equally as high as Steamboat Rock.

A New Yorker's objection to the altering of the face of Steamboat Rock a bit would be similar to my objection to removal of one 20-story building from New York City on the grounds that it would ruin the famous skyline. You have more buildings than you can count—we have more stone mountains that we can count.

True, the entire Echo Park area is very scenic. Certainy it is beautiful enough that it should be made available to thousands or hundreds of thousands instead of to the few hundred who now see it annually. Construction of Echo Park Dam would open up the area to these thousands and at the same time would assure to the Upper Colorado River Basin States their share of the Colorado River water as allotted in the 1922 compact.

When we reached the Steamboat Rock area, we met a lone river runner who had just arrived there after coming down the Yampa River from Lily Park in Colorado. His name was George Harris and he lives at 1009 Girard Avenue SE., in Albuquerque, N. Mex. Mr. Harris was a true western outdoorsman who had run many rivers in the western States. He said that he had received several pieces of literature asking him to write his Congressmen seeking their opposition to the Echo Park reservoir. He decided to see for himself, which we wish thousands of other persons would do.

Mr. Harris said the descriptions which he had been given of the river described it as almost rock-free. Instead, he found that he had hit so many rocks with his rubber boat that he was forced to leave the river at Steamboat Rock instead of going on down to Jensen, Utah, as he had originally planned. He told us, after having seen the area as he did, that he would have no opposition to construction of Echo Park Dam. He was not going to write his Congressmen to protest the dam.

There is another fallacy about the Echo Park situation which has gained wide circulation—that all conservation and wildlife groups have opposed the park.

That is not so. For example, the fish and game commissioners and directors of the 11 Western States unanimously supported the entire upper Colorado River project, including Echo Park, in official action at Las Vegas, Nev., on May 5, 1954.

The California representative, Seth Gordon, not only voted for the Echo Park but aided in wording the resolution.

"I know I'll get a lot of abuse from the Sierra Club in California," Mr. Gordon said. "However, when a thing is right, it is right and I have to stand up for it—abuse or no abuse.

"When Dinosaur Monument was enlarged, it was promised that it would not interfere with future water and power development, and we cannot go back on a bargain."

When I was in your office, you told me that you felt that the Echo Park project had a good chance of winning in Congress despite the heavy opposition to it. I explained to you that the people of the upper basin States were interested not only in winning but also in convincing the people of the United States that it was right that they should win.

I told you that the Sierra Club and other so-called conservation groups in California are not mainly concerned about Echo Park and Dinosaur National Monument. Their main concern is to let that water flow on down the river so California can continue to use it, even though it rightfully belongs to the upper basin States by virtue of the 1922 compact. As the battle continues, the Californians are making it more and more clear that this is their true purpose.

I would like to refer you to some quotes on the upper Colorado River project by Representative Craig Hosmer, from California's 18th Congressional District, as reprinted in the Congressional Record of July 19. These quotes appear on pages 10325 and 10326. Each quote is a complete paragraph from the Congressional Record. Mr. Hosmer stated:

"The action by the County Supervisors Association of California Board of Directors, with every county in the State officially represented by the board's action, presents a united defense against the proposed bills which threaten California's rightful share of Colorado River water."

"California's agricultural, industrial and population growth is rooted in water and we must protect its sources to meet our present and future expansion and employment." This quote was attributed by Representative Hosmer to Roger Jessop, president of the California County Supervisors Association.

Despite the terrific opposition which the California water interests have been able to build up against the upper Colorado River project, the bill won an 11-to-1 vote of confidence from the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee. The only opposition vote was by a California Senator. I believe this should be further proof that persons who have given this matter a great deal of study realize that the project is fair and just in giving the upper basin States the water to which they are entitled under the 1922 compact.

Once again, I hope that you and your paper will reconsider your stand in this matter. As I said before, we not only want to win the battle for the upper Colorado River project but we want to convince you and other Americans that we should win.

Sincerely,

Theron Liddle,
Managing Editor, Deseret News and Salt Lake Telegram.

Secretary of Interior Recommendations Threat to Mine Safety

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 3, 1954

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I am greatly concerned over the report recently released by the Secretary of the Interior, Mr. McKay, on the reorganization of the Bureau of Mines. I am concerned principally because of the threat to circumvent the action of Congress 2 years ago in placing teeth in the Federal mine inspection law.

I am pleased, however, that the Congress itself appears to be alert to the danger contained in the recommendations of Secretary McKay that the responsibility of mine safety inspection gradually be turned back to the States. The survey team appointed by Secretary McKay showed little awareness of the long fight in Congress for enforcement of Federal mine safety standards. The survey team discussed safety education of miners and mine owners as though this were a new idea and could supplant enforcement of mine safety laws. In this regard, the team performed either as a "stacked" group or most certainly a naive group.

I call to the attention of my colleagues in the House a very fine editorial on this subject, which appeared this morning in the Washington Post and Times Herald:

WEAKENING MINE INSPECTION

The long battle for enforcement of Federal mine-safety standards finally culminated, 2 years ago, in a law with teeth in it. Tragedy after tragedy occurred in the Nation's coal mines before Congress finally acted to give Federal inspectors authority to close dangerous mines and insist on compliance with their recommendations. In light of this history, it comes as something of a shock to have Interior Secretary McKay recommend that the responsibility for mine-safety inspections gradually be turned back to the States.

Secretary McKay's recommendation stems from the report of a Bureau of Mines survey team. The report, as we understand it, looks toward the safety education of miners and mineowners so as to bring State mine-safety practices up to Federal standards. This is a tenable objective; but if past history is any guide, it will take many, many years to achieve. Meanwhile, talk of turning mine-safety enforcement back to the States merely serves to arouse old fears, sharpened by recollections of one disaster after another in which the recommendations of mine inspectors, State and Federal, had been ignored.

In point of fact, since the Federal law took effect, there has been a notable reduction in the number of major mine disasters. Compliance has been better and State cooperation with the Bureau of Mines has improved. But politics continues to infest some of the State inspection setups. Pennsylvania, West Virginia, several of the Western States, and, more recently, Illinois, have developed relatively effective systems; but those in a number of other States, including Kentucky and Virginia, leave much to be desired. It makes no difference how good the State law is, of course, if enforcement is lax. In view of the lack of uniformity in State laws, the antiquated codes and the indifferent enforcement, Federal supervision is clearly a necessity for the foreseeable future. The chilly reception which the McKay proposal has received in Congress, fortunately, indicates that legislators understand the problem and are not eager to make any change.

Resolution Adopted at the General Assembly of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America on October 11, 1953

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 3, 1954

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I enclose a letter dated August 2, 1954, which I received from Hon. Thruston B. Morton, Assistant Secretary of State. I also enclose a letter dated June 20, 1954, which I received from Stephen J. Jarema, executive director, Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, Inc., New York City, together with a copy of the resolution adopted at the general assembly of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, on October 11, 1953. I forwarded Mr. Jarema's letter and the resolution to Secretary Dulles, in consequence of which I received the abovementioned letter from Assistant Secretary Morton.

The correspondence follows:

August 2, 1954.

The Honorable John W. McCormack,
House of Representatives.

Dear Mr. McCormack: I refer to your letter of July 19 to Secretary Dulles, acknowledged by telephone on July 21, enclosing a letter and resolution from Mr. Stephen J. Jarema, executive director of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, Inc., regarding religious persecution, especially the imprisonment of Archbishop Joseph Slipyj.

The Department of State regards the acts of the governments of the Soviet Union and the Soviet satellite states against religious groups and other anti-Communist elements of the population as significant manifestations of the oppressive policy which these totalitarian regimes have generally pursued toward peoples living within the territories under their control. During the past years the free world has witnessed the actions of the Soviet-dominated governments directed at different times to the persecution of members of numerous religious faiths as well as the elements of the population which do not accept and conform to the Communist program.

The Government of the United States is deeply concerned about the inhumane actions which the Soviet Union and the Soviet satellite states have directed toward the peoples under their domination. Since these actions arise from the internal domestic policies of the Communist states, the possibilities open to us for taking direct steps which would be effective in changing such policies are extremely limited. We believe, however, that the force of world opinion can be an important factor in causing a change in Communist policies, and we have attempted through every available means to bring the oppressive actions of the Communist regimes to the attention of the public in order to mobilize world opinion.

The Government of the United States has exerted its efforts to this end in its relations with foreign governments and in the United Nations. Our representatives to the United Nations are fully informed regarding Communist acts of oppression and, as in the past, will seek appropriate occasions in General Assembly debates to direct attention to the violations of human rights in the Iron Curtain countries in the hope of bringing about a change of policy in the Communist-controlled countries and relief to those unjustly imprisoned.

As you requested, I am returning Mr. Jarema's letter and resolution.

Sincerely yours,
Thruston B. Morton,
Assistant Secretary.

Ukrainian Congress Committee
of America, Inc.,
New York, N. Y., June 20, 1954.

Honorable Sir: I am enclosing herewith a copy of a resolution which was adopted by the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America at its last annual convention. The committee represents organizations of Americans of Ukrainian descent, whose combined membership is over 1,500,000.

The committee would be deeply appreciative of an expression of your comments in respect to the resolution.

Very truly yours,
Stephen J. Jarema,
Executive Director.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED AT THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE UKRAINIAN CONGRESS COMMITTEE OF AMERICA ON OCTOBER 11, 1953

Whereas the members of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America and the people of the United States and throughout the world are shocked by reports appearing in the press and elsewhere concerning the program of the government behind the Iron Curtain directed toward the eradication of churches and other places of worship, brought to the attention of the world so dramatically by the recent imprisonment of His Eminence Stefan Cardinal Wyszynski, archbishop of Warsaw and primate of Poland; and

Whereas many acts of terrorism, confiscation, and persecution have already been committed in what is now called the Ukrainian Republic of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Poland, Czechoslovakia, and other countries behind the Iron Curtain, against the Ukrainian Catholic Church, Ukrainian Orthodox Church, and other churches and persons of religious belifs; and

Whereas such acts have resulted unjustly and unwarrantedly in the confiscation of property and the deprivation of rights and privileges possessed by those people in the pursuit of their worship of God; and

Whereas, through his efforts constantly to uphold and champion the ideals of freedom, tolerance, and humanity, His Excellency Archbishop Joseph Slipyj, metropolitan of Halych, has been an inspiration to all mankind; and

Whereas His Excellency Archbishop Joseph Slipyj was unjustly condemned by the Soviet Union to hard labor in 1945 for 8 years for his religious teachings and beliefs as above stated; and

Whereas the Soviet Union has recently increased the term of imprisonment of His Excellency Archbishop Joseph Slipyj for 9 additional years; and

Whereas the Government of the United States, because of its humanitarian interests in the various peoples of this country and their interest in the persecuted clergy behind the Iron Curtain, should register emphatic protest with the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics with a request that it should cease and desist in its program of religious persecution; and

Whereas the Government of the United States has, on other occasions, intervened and interceded in behalf of persecuted leaders of the church in other countries: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Secretary of State of the United States of America be and he hereby is respectfully petitioned to lodge an official protest on behalf of the Government of the United States with the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Czechoslovakia, and Poland, against the concerted attack which long has been and presently is being made directly and indirectly by the latter Governments toward the Ukrainian Catholic Church and other hierarchy of the Catholic church, residing in such countries, and that the Department of State be and it hereby is respectfully further petitioned to employ its best diplomatic efforts in an attempt to persude said Governments to desist from any further religious persecution, acts of terrorism, and confiscation, complained of in this resolution, and that they further set free His Excellency Archbishop Joseph Slipyj and other members of the clergy; and it is further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States and to the Secretary of State of the United States and to each Member of Congress and the Senate of the United States, and that they be urged to do everything possible to accomplish the purposes of this resolution.

Brig. Gen. Roy F. Farrand

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN R. DAVIS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 3, 1954

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, sometime ago my colleague from Massachusetts, Mr. McCormack, the distinguished minority whip, inserted some very appropriate remarks concerning the significance of the small towns of our Nation. As part of his remarks, the gentleman from Massachusetts included an item from the Galesville Republican, a weekly paper from the northwest part of Wisconsin.

I insert herewith, Mr. Speaker, the text of an editorial which subsequently appeared in the Galesville Republican which refers to Mr. McCormack's remarks, obviously with satisfaction and approval.

The editorial which I insert herewith pays a deserved tribute to a neighbor and valued friend of mine, incidentally a native of Galesville, who now is, and for many years has been, the president of St. John's Military Academy at Delafield, Waukesha County, Wis., Brig. Gen. Roy F. Farrand.

The editorial was written by Bert A. Gipple, the founder of the Galesville Republican, who believes, and I quote Mr. Gipple, "in flowers for the living rather than heaped on the bier."

The editorial follows:

But with us here at home the truth of the words of Congressman McCormack stands out. Among the thousands attending Galesville's Centennial was a man not city born, one whose boyhood days were passed here. More than 60 years ago, when still in his early teens, he was enrolled in a military school, where he was but one of 400 or more cadets. With no pull to advance him, but by perseverance and aptitude his progress was steady. He obeyed orders—the first requisite of a soldier. As a lieutenant he served his country in World War I, coming out of it a major. For meritorious service in World War II he was awarded the rank of commander of a brigade. Today, and for some years, he has been the head of the school in which he enrolled as a cadet—a school of high repute the world over.

His hometown as of today is a small Wisconsin town, where his heart is in his schoolwork and in the welfare of the Nation as a whole, to which he gives of himself unstintedly. But his hometown aside from that is Galesville, and ever will be—the small town of his boyhood, where he tramped the fields and woods and coursed the streams. And there is not the shadow of a doubt, were it not for the responsibilities he has assumed, he would like to return here for his remaining years to relive those happy days.

Such is Brig. Gen. Roy F. Farrand, president of St. John's Military Academy at Delafield—a smalltown boy, nationally known for public service well performed.

Jack Webb Performs Public Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 27, 1954

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, much of the fine public service performed by leaders in the theatrical profession is lost sight of because it does not make sensational headlines. As an example, few people know about the educational films made and distributed free as a public service by Mr. Jack Webb.

Only a few years ago Jack Webb was struggling to gain a foothold as an actor in Hollywood movies. Today, there is not a city or hamlet in the United States, boasting of a radio set or a television receiver, where he is not known to every man, woman, and child. His radio and TV series Dragnet, has become one of the Nation's No. 1 listening and viewing programs. It is soon to take its place as an important motion picture released by Warner Brothers.

Jack Webb's character of an ordinary cop, Sergeant Friday, is an unvarnished picture. It does not glorify police work, but it has taught millions of people a better understanding of law enforcement and respect for law enforcement's honest agents. I do not know of any better means to combat communism than by promoting a respect for government.

I want to call attention to a phase of Jack Webb's life of which the public knows little. Through investing thousands of dollars of his personal fortune, Webb is doing an excellent job combatting juvenile delinquency throughout the Nation. He is helping to curb reckless driving on our highways—particularly among minors and is helping the CIA, our Armed Forces and police departments throughout the Nation do a better job of training their law enforcement officers. This has been accomplished through the unselfish production and distribution of many training films, made without cost to these agencies by Mr. Webb.

The National Safety Council, with headquarters in Chicago, continuously uses Jack Webb's film Big Trio for release among its chapters across the country, in schools, churches, juvenile welfare centers, and service clubs, as well as authorized traffic bureaus. The movie discourages reckless driving by juveniles and adults; it also tells the story of the hit-and-run driver and it exposes that dishonest segment of the population who prey upon insurance companies. Many prints of Big Trio are constantly in circulation. The cost of making these, as well as distributing them, are born by Jack Webb.

Our own CIA here in Washington uses regularly three training films to show its operators, which Webb donated. These are Big Casing, Big Cast, and Big Phone Bill.

The Los Angeles Police Department, with free access to all Jack Webb films, continually draws upon them as training aids for its rookies as well as veteran officers. So does the New York Police Academy, the State of New Jersey and police departments in Boston, Denver, Toledo, Lansing, Wichita, New Orleans, and elsewhere. In all these places Webb's films, Big Cop and Big Fire serve as part of the standard training curriculum.

In training military police, the United States Army uses these films. Various local departments in the District of Columbia regularly use them.

The National Parent-Teachers Association and PTA groups all over America are constantly showing 22 Rifle, a Jack Webb documentary movie which reveals the mistakes some parents make by giving firearms as gifts to their children.

Thousands of our Nation's school principals have made it mandatory that students view at least one Jack Webb documentary made for juveniles and entitled "Big Layoff." This is the story of the growing use of narcotics among minors and how the drugs have wrecked the lives of teen-agers as well as adults.

All these important motion pictures are available to any recognized private, civic, State, or Government agency without cost. Each was conceived, produced, and acted, as well as paid for, by Jack Webb.

Mr. Webb has done more than repay his public for its loyalties and support of him. He has done more than aid in the training of law enforcement officers, help abate crime and disaster, and expose dishonesty.

Mr. Webb deserves a great deal of credit for his splendid contribution to good citizenship.

It Took 13 Days

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 3, 1954

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, on July 29 the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, that outstanding middle western newspaper founded by Joseph Pulitzer, published an editorial commenting on our recent debate on atomic energy.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial, which I consider a very fine one, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IT TOOK 13 DAYS

Two appraisals of the 13-day debate in the Senate over the Eisenhower administration's atomic-energy bill stand out in marked contrast.

Majority Leader KNOWLAND called the opposition to the bill obstructionism. He said it was a filibuster taking place "at a critical time in the Nation's history." Senator PASTORE, of Rhode Island, saw the issue differently. He said: "Nothing during this session that will come before us will weigh heavier on what our destinies may be."

As between the two, Senator PASTORE is far closer to the mark. The issue was the vital one of safeguarding the interests of the American people in the application of atomic energy to the production of power. The debate of the Senators who opposed the administration bill as a new and worse giveaway was a liberal education in the history of electric power. Any American, from the humblest citizen to the President, should profit from reading the discussion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Like the Senators who opposed the offshore oil giveaway last year, the determined band that forced beneficial changes in the atomic-energy bill had to punish themselves to do it. The Senate was in continuous session for approximately half the 180 hours when the bill was under consideration. That was gruelling business.

Leading this effort were GORE and KEFAUVER, of Tennessee, EDWIN C. JOHNSON, of Colorado; LEHMAN, of New York; MORSE, of Oregon; LANGER, of North Dakota; MAGNUSON and JACKSON, of Washington; ANDERSON, of New Mexico; HUMPHREY, of Minnesota; HILL and SPARKMAN, of Alabama; DOUGLAS, of Illinois; MONRONEY and KERR, of Oklahoma; STENNIS and EASTLAND, of Mississippi; MURRAY, of Montana; and OLIN JOHNSTON, of South Carolina.

Anyone who thinks that the Senate time was wasted by the 2-week presentation of the case against the bill, as submitted, needs only to review the amendments that were adopted in the process. Most important among the amendments are those that—

Enable the AEC and some other Government agencies to produce and sell atomic electric power.

Retain the preference clause which for half a century has given municipal and cooperative power distribution systems first call on federally generated electric power.

Bar the AEC from complying with that part of President Eisenhower's directive which would have required it in effect to pay some $800,000 a year in Federal taxes for a private syndicate formed to contract with AEC and supply a large block of power to TVA.

Stipulate that AEC must not grant a license to a private applicant to produce atomic electric power if the privilege might be used to promote monopoly.

Simultaneously in the House, a group led by Representative HOLIFIELD, of California, was also demonstrating that information gets around when the effort is made.

The country has Representative HOLIFIELD to thank for his analysis of the terms of the President's directive. The directive won out in the Senate vote, but the country knows much more about its terms than was known 2 weeks ago.

Senator MAGNUSON is to be thanked for an instructive and interesting summary of the history of regulation; Senators GORE and

Hill for an explanation of the impact on TVA; Senators Lehman and Langer for an exposition of the setbacks which have been administered to the public-power program during the last 2 years; and Senator Morse for an unusual survey of the many agencies of Government that have responsibilities for preventing monopoly.

Everyone in Washington knows the Securities and Exchange Commission, the Federal Power Commission, the Federal Trade Commission, and the Federal Communications Commission possess antimonopoly functions. But how many know that the Post Office, Treasury, Commerce, Agriculture, and Interior Departments, the TVA and REA and the Federal Reserve System are charged with those responsibilities?

Now, it is up to the Senate to stand firm for its safeguarding amendments. If the bill, as approved by the House-Senate conferees, does not contain the amendments written into it at such great effort, the course of the protesting Senators is clear. They will have no choice but to oppose the conference report as vigorously as they opposed the bill in its original form.

It is important to bring the Atomic Energy Act of 1946 up to date, and this Congress should do it. But it is far more important that the rights and interests of the American people should not be trampled in the process.

Lou Riley, of Allegany County, Md.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. GLENN BEALL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 3, 1954

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, there are times these days when I think that we have lost our appreciation of individualism, and that our mass production standards tend to force mass standards of conformity on people.

In my particular section of Maryland there were a group of men who were each very personable, but they refused to conform to anybody's standards. They were witty and entertaining. Such people now seem to be a lost breed of men.

One friend, who still remains his own inimitable self, is Lou Riley. In reading the Cumberland Sunday Times, I noticed that the health department is trying to impose standards of sanitation on Lou's place of business which he finds objectionable and unnecessary.

Lou is being defended by a very capable lawyer, and a good friend of mine, William A. Gunter. I request unanimous consent to have printed in the Record the account of this incident as written by J. William Hunt.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Across the Desk

(By J. William Hunt)

LEGENDARY "BIGGA DA LOU" RILEY, WHO REALLY LIVES IN FROSTBURG, HAS THREE COUNTY AGENCIES BREATHING DOWN HIS BACK, BUT HIS CHIEF COUNSEL SPRINGS TO THE DEFENSE—USES EMPTY SLOT MACHINES AS RISING AID IN THE MORNING

One of the almost legendary figures of Allegany County, although he is a very real individual, is Louis Riley, Frostburg, better known (due largely to his attorney, publicity representative and discoverer, William A. Gunter) as "Bigga da Lou" Riley.

At the present moment Lou is in bad because of alleged violation of sanitary regulations at his premises, 84 East Main Street. To date he has the county health department, the board of license commissioners of Allegany County and the mayor and city council of Frostburg breathing down his back.

Almost totally disabled (he has only 1 arm and 1 leg) Bigga da Lou decided some 30 years ago to make his home into a lunch and beer place in order to support himself. When prohibition was ended in 1933 he procured a beer license and has held one ever since. Some vague reports that he harbored a couple of slot machines in good working order have persisted down to the present time. But, according to his chief counsel (Mr. Gunter) the machines have no inside works and are used by Bigga do Lou merely as something to grasp with his one good hand when he pulls himself out of his rollaway cot in the morning. Weighing close to 200 pounds, well past 70 years of age and ill with diabetes, Lou recently suffered another handicap when a lighted match set fire to the lower part of the trousers of his good leg and inflicted burns that have not healed.

In a letter to the license commissioners, charges are made by the health department that Bigga da Lou's premises "meet none of the sanitation requirements. * * * In the room containing card tables and slot machines there were signs of roaches, rats, and bugs. * * * We cannot anticipate getting much help from Mr. Riley to clean up the premises as he is a man with only 1 arm and 1 leg, and he is sick." A similar report from the health authorities went to the mayor and councilmen of Frostburg.

Bigga da Lou's list of counsel is hardly surpassed by the legal staffs of the largest and richest corporations in the Cumberland area. In addition to former Senator Gunter his attorneys include former Chief Judge D. Lindley Sloan, of the Maryland Court of Appeals and William L. Wilson, Jr., a law partner of Edward J. Ryan, Frostburg city attorney and Democratic candidate for Congress in the Sixth Maryland District. Wilson is a candidate for State senator from this county.

In a letter to Dr. Winter R. Frantz, Deputy State Health Officer for Allegany County and also Cumberland City Health Officer, Gunter writes as follows:

"Bigga da Lou, as he is known to most of us, has occupied the premises at 84 East Mechanic Street, Frostburg, for over 25 years. * * * He may not be much for looks, but inside he has a heart of gold and a sense of humor unequaled, I dare say, by the health department. His only pleasure is to sit at his table, look out the window and talk with his friends who come in to drink a bottle of beer and pass the time of day. Despite his handicaps, Lou takes a greater interest in politics than most of our two-legged citizens. Only a month ago he had some of his friends carry him to the primary election booth in order to exercise his American right of suffrage. Whether any of the roaches or rats got into the election booth to mar the ballots and justify a recount, I do not know. * * *

"In your letter, Doctor, you state: 'It would seem a disgrace to have a place of this kind in existence.' But Doctor, I want you to know that Riley's Place is not a place—it is an institution. In fact, Mr. Louis Riley is a better-known man throughout the United States than your own Dr. Robert H. Riley (no relation) who heads the Maryland State Health Department. In fact, he is almost as well known as William Bendix, the television star, whom we watch every Friday night in the 'Life of Riley.' Moreover, our Mr. Riley was the bosom friend of our former county health officer, the late Dr. Joseph Franklin; and, what is more, he is the bosom friend of Senator J. Glenn Beall, who lent Lou $50 in cash to secure his first beer license, and of whom Lou affectionately says: 'Glenn lent me that money without even the pen of a scratch.'

"No, Doctor, Riley's Place is not a disgrace. He has entertained at his establishment such distinguished persons as the late Governor Albert C. Ritchie, the late Dr. Albert Cook, superintendent of the Maryland Board of Education, and Wendell Allen, president of the Maryland State Department of Education. These distinguished guests came not to look for roaches, rats and bedbugs but simply to catch the philosophical bits of humor that emanate from the lips of this most unusual smalltown character.

"I made a professional call on Lou last week. He told me of your visit—your inspection—upstairs and downstairs and even in his chamber; but he says you didn't talk with him. Why not? If you had, I am sure you would have discovered the same unforgetable character that I have uncovered. For instance: I asked him whether you had told him who you were, to which he replied: 'No, they didn't even show me their prudentials.' You see, doctor, he must have thought you were an insurance agent trying to sell him rat insurance. I then asked him about the rats. He said that the night before one of his customers complained about two big rats fighting in the middle of his kitchen, to which he replied: 'Hey, you buy one bottle of beer. What do you expect for 15 cents—a bull fight?'

"Doctor, you and I are both interested in the crippled children of Allegany County. I know we are both also interested in this lonely, crippled adult. To his credit, it must be said that not once in his 40 years' residence has he ever been the recipient of 1 penny's aid from Allegany County, or from the State of Maryland, or from the Federal Government; and I go further than this and say he has never been the recipient of any charity from any of his acquaintances or friends. Two weeks ago I made all arrangements to have him admitted to the Allegany County Infirmary; but when I sent the ambulance down to get him, he refused to go stating that he wanted no charity but simply wanted to spend the rest of his days in Riley's place, looking out the window and talking with his half dozen remaining customers.

"Now I ask you: What are you going to do with a stubborn, free-thinking American businessman like Lou? I am sure I don't know, except to let him sit and spend the rest of his few remaining days in peace and quiet and quit bothering about the fact that he has no place to wash the beer glasses except in the kitchen sink. As a matter of fact, all of Lou's customers drink their beer directly from the bottles. Lou tells them that the beer is better that way, because then they get all the gas. Lou's customers are few, but his friends are legion. So if the rats, roaches, and bedbugs don't bother them or Lou, why let them worry me or you?

"Only last week I asked Lou how business was. He replied: 'Business is even.' 'Well,' I said, 'that's fine. You are at least holding your own.' To which he replied: 'No, Bill, you don't understand. I mean that business is even worse that it was the week before.'"

Although Lou has a restaurant license—he calls it a "lice," which has no connection with the roaches or the rats—he has not served anything to eat in his place since 1933, when he gave a free crab feast celebrating the exit of prohibition. On that occasion, the crabs were rather small, and we kidded him about their size. Lou took the kidding to heart, and the next day wrote the following letter to the concern from which he had purchased the crabs:

"'Mr. CRAB MAN,
"'*Baltimore:*

"'Those damn crabs you sent Bigga Lou at Frostburg, last week were too damn small, see. I tella you the truth. Big Lou in his bed at Frostburg, has got bedbugs bigger than those damn crabs you sent. Now, listen to me, don't you send Big Lou in Frostburg, Md., any more crabs unless they be No. 1, double A, jumbo-selects.'

"So you see, Doctor, the present complaint about bedbugs is by no means a new one. In my book, Louis Riley is No. 1 double A, jumbo-select. He has been the original source of many of my stories for the past 30 years. Shut him up, and you shut me up. Tear down the sign on his premises at 84 E. Mechanic Street, Frostburg, Reading: 'Lou Riley—Crab Beer'; and, like Oliver Wendell Holmes, I shall sob and cry out to you:

"'Aye, tear his tattered ensign down
Long has it waved on high
And many an eye has danced to see
That banner in the sky.'

"Finally, Doctor, if you are really worried about Lou, I will tell you what to do: Get me an antiseptic gown, some rubber gloves, some roach powder, a bellows, and a rat trap; and let you and I enjoy a real safari up in Riley's Place."

The Federal Trade Commission's Report on Coffee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 30, 1954

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I suppose there is always some satisfaction in being proved right on something as important as this coffee controversy has been, but I cannot get over my feeling of indignation about being so right on this matter. The report of the Federal Trade Commission proves conclusively that the American consumer has been taking a merciless beating on coffee prices based on a phony shortage which never existed and has never occurred.

When I raised the charges on January 18—a week before the FTC investigation began—I based them on a jigsaw puzzle pieced together of bits and pieces of news in the financial pages of the newspapers. As this report shows, something is radically wrong with our statistical information. And while I hate to say it, there does appear to have been a determined effort on the part of apparently powerful interests to keep the facts from being known about the vast stocks of coffee on hand.

The bill to regulate the coffee exchange in the same way other exchanges are regulated has been bottled up in the House Agriculture Committee most of this year. The amendment I got through the House to renew the compilation of monthly statistics on stocks of coffee on hand was killed in the Senate Appropriations Committee and knocked out of the Commerce Department appropriations bill in conference. I have never been able to find out why, for the Senate committee claimed it wanted these studies made but it failed to provide funds for them.

The Federal Trade Commission has done a great public service in bringing the documented facts to light. I congratulate the President for having assigned this investigation to the FTC, and I urge him and his party leadership in the Congress to follow through on this matter immediately—before Congress adjourns. The report shows there is absolutely no legitimate reason why the American consumer should have been paying from $1.18 to $1.35 for a pound of coffee. I just wonder whether those prices will come down if the Government does not take affirmative steps to bring them down.

Following is the press release issued for today's papers by the Federal Trade Commission, summarizing the findings of this 6-month investigation:

FTC REPORTS ON COFFEE PRICE INVESTIGATION

The Federal Trade Commission reported today that the coffee price spiral of 1953–54 "cannot be explained in terms of the competitive laws of supply and demand."

In a comprehensive report transmitted to the Congress, the Commission declared that while the July 1953 frost in Brazil "had no significant effect upon the 1953–54 crop," it did "reduce the prospective Brazilian crop for 1954–55" but, even so, the world crop will be "slightly larger" than in 1953–54. It found "no actual current shortage in the volume of coffee moving to market which would fully explain the price increase," and "no basis for finding that present prices of coffee are justified by either present or prospective conditions of demand and supply."

"Moderate increases in coffee prices were an inevitable response to the reports of severe frost damage in Brazil," the Commission said, "but the upward spiral which began in early December appears to represent market reactions which are inconsistent with freely competitive markets where all traders are fully and accurately informed with respect to supply and demand."

The Commission attributed the spectacular rise in green coffee prices between December 1953 and April 1954, together with the corresponding increase in average retail roasted coffee prices, to a variety of factors, including "market imperfections and restraints, and trading irregularities."

The specific causes for the price spiral and the continuing high price are listed in the report as follows: (1) inadequate crop reporting; (2) speculation on the New York Coffee and Sugar Exchange by private Brazilian interests who enterd the market and bought heavily just before the public announcement of the Brazilian Government's increased coffee loan rate from 1,200 to 1,500 cruzeiros per bag; (3) American speculation and abnormal buying for inventory by United States importers and large United States roasters; (4) the announced increase in Brazil's minimum export price from 53 cents to 87 cents per pound effective July 1, 1954; (5) the restrictive contract used in futures trading on the exchange which limits trading to only about 10 percent of the annual United States coffee consumption and which in turn creates an unduly maneuverable market; and (6) trading irregularities on the exchange.

Some of these conditions might be corrected by FTC or judicial action, the report says. It adds, however, that the remedies are principally legislative, and recommends congressional action.

Hope for lower coffee prices in the future was seen by the Commission if the law of supply and demand is permitted to operate. It said:

"With production increasing and consumption decreasing at present coffee price levels, prospect are for lower coffee prices in the future barring excessive crop damage and provided supply and demand are permitted freely to run their course."

A basic cause of the 1953–54 price increase, according to the Commission, was the "inadequacy of present crop-reporting systems in coffee-growing countries." This condition, it stated, "permitted other forces to operate on price."

The Commission listed these other factors as follows:

1. Activities on the New York Coffee and Sugar Exchange, including operations of private Brazilian speculative interests, which produced an upward price spiral.

2. Unseasonable inventory accumulations by United States importers and roasters.

3. Imperfections in the domestic coffee market, with the concentrated state of the coffee-roasting industry placing considerable power in the hands of a few large roasters to influence price.

4. The "restrictive contract used in futures trading on the New York Coffee and Sugar Exchange," with the result that "the coffee futures market is unusually 'thin' and restricted, and hence unduly maneuverable and subject to wider price swings under abnormal speculative and commercial trading than are consistent with the actual conditions of supply and demand."

5. Amplification of the "sudden and unreasonable price fluctuations intrinsic in a 'thin' market" by the failure of the Exchange "to institute proper safeguards followed by regulated exchanges and to prevent trading abuses and irregularities."

In addition, the report refers to the Brazilian Government decree of December 2, 1953, advancing the loan rate on coffee from 1200 cruzeiros per bag to 1500 cruzeiros per bag. It states:

"This event, in a market which was already nervously reflecting higher prices as a result of downward estimates in the 1954–55 crop, together with the heavy trading in futures by Brazilian nationals on the New York Coffee Exchange and the accumulation of green coffee inventories in the United States, appears to have precipitated the upward spiral of coffee prices which began in December."

The report also points out that the downward price adjustment noted in the spring of 1954 "was brought to an end when the Brazilian Government announced its new minimum export price of $0.87 per pound." The report adds:

"The price of green coffee in the spot and futures market has remained in the neighborhood of Brazil's minimum export price since that date."

This minimum export price, according to the report "undoubtedly will tend, if world prices weaken, to hold the price of coffee above the level dictated by world production and consumption."

On the question of what remedial action the Commission should take, or recommend that the Congress take, the report says "it appears that such remedies, if they are to be comprehensive, are principally legislative." This view is based on "the nature of the specific interferences with the free interplay of supply and demand" developed in the report.

Accordingly, the Commission recommended that the Congress enact legislation designed to remedy the following "market imperfections":

"1. The narrowness of the futures contract.

"2. The inadequacies of basic marketing information.

"3. The trading irregularities, consisting of unpoliced pass-outs, ex-pit transactions, and breaches of broker-customer confidential (fiduciary) relationships."

The Commission also recommended "that Congress appraise the adequacy of present margin requirements against the facts developed in this report."

"In view of the complexities of the coffee market," the report urges that Congress take action to provide the recommended remedies "only after appropriate committee hearings at which representatives of the coffee trade, the New York Coffee and Sugar Exchange, and the Commodity Exchange Authority, be heard."

In its discussion of possible corrective measures, the Commission pointed out that coffee supplies and the price at which these supplies move to market are affected by factors which "patently lie beyond the judicial and legislative powers of the United States Government." It stated that while legislative or other action to remove certain "market restraints, imperfections, and irregularities" cited in the report "would probably prevent in the future such excessive coffee price movements as the price spiral of 1953–54, such action will not make the coffee market freely competitive.

"The supplies of coffee, and the price at which these supplies move to market, are affected by minimum export prices, domestic price supports (similar to those in effect in the United States), exchange regulations, and other policy measures of the coffee-growing countries. These patently lie beyond the judicial and legislative powers of the United States Government."

Concerning contracts, the Commission said "there appears to be no unanimity of opinion, or even an overwhelming majority opinion, in the coffee trade that any particular contract yet devised will incorporate the factors necessary for the desired broadening of the basis of trade. Coffee, because of its taste and other attributes, is a heterogeneous commodity. Hence, while the contract can easily be broadened, much study will be required before it can be broadened enough to create a broad competitive futures market." The report adds:

"Nevertheless, the adoption of a satisfactory contract should be made mandatory. The contract must be made attractive to the entire trade, and if conflicts exist the needs of those who use the Exchange for hedging should be preferred over those who use it for speculative dealings. Hedging offers a better prospect for creating a broad market than does speculation. If the contract is to be adapted to the needs of the coffee trade, it must be a universal contract; it probably should provide for commercial differences between grades and growths and allow for deliveries at New Orleans and San Francisco as well as at New York."

The report emphasizes that "The fundamental problem of inadequate and sometimes misleading market information cannot * * * be easily or unilaterally solved." Since coffee is produced outside the poltical jurisdiction of the United States, the report points out that "an adequate (or improved) crop-reporting system requires cooperation by the coffee-producing countries."

The report recommends, "as a first step," that "Congress provide for increases in the staffs of United States agricultural reporting officers stationed at Embassies in the principal coffee-producing countries."

The Commission said that certain of the irregularities and restraints it found "can perhaps be remedied through Federal Trade Commission or judicial action as well as by legislation." It said it "is now considering the question as to whether action can be taken, under present statutes, to correct certain of these irrgularities—for example, use of retrictive contracts by agreement, and beaches of broker-customer fiduciary relationships."

But because "such remedies would be piecemeal and partial in nature and would not strike at all the basic causes of the price spiral, it is recommended also that Congress give concurrent consideration to these trading irregularities in its comprehensive study of the entire problem."

The Commission's investigation was designed to determine the reason for the increase in green coffee prices from $0.58 to $0.96½ which occurred between December 1953 and April 1954, and the corresponding increase in average retail roasted coffee prices from $0.91 to $1.18, with popular brands increasing to $1.32.

The report discusses the effect of the July 1953 frost in Brazil which has been advanced as a basic reason for the price increase.

"While frost damage may reduce the 1954–55 Parana [Brazil] coffee crop by 3.5 million bags as reported," it says, "this damage was as—perhaps more—important psychologically than materially."

In finding that the frost had no significant effect upon the 1953–54 crop but did reduce the prospective Brazilian crop for 1954–55, the Commission stated:

"It would, therefore, be normal to expect higher prices during the closing months of the 1953–54 crop year, to meet the anticipated deficiency in the 1954–55 crop. However, the price rise was far in excess of what might be expected under the competitive laws of supply and demand—greater than was necessary to accomplish the carryover."

The Commission said that an examination of price behavior and crop forecasts "reveals the unrealistic behavior of all factors in the coffee trade." In support of this comment, the report sets forth the following facts:

"Brazil appears to have produced a little over 19 million bags of coffee in 1953–54. Giving full weight to the announced curtailment of production in Parana where the frost damage was most severe, it appears that Brazil's coffee crop in 1954–55 will amount to 18 million bags, or a reduction of less than 8 percent.

"World coffee production in 1953–54 appears to have been between 41.5 and 41.9 million bags; if there were no increase in production elsewhere, the predicted decline in Brazilian output would amount to less than 4 percent of world production.

"Yet during the year ending July 1, 1954, the spot price of green coffee in New York advanced 57 percent, and on the New York Coffee and Sugar Exchange the price of the September future advanced 61 percent.

"What is known with respect to the nature of the demand for coffee in the immediate past would indicate that a price increase of less than 15 percent would have accomplished any reduction in consumer purchasing necessary to equate demand with supply. If due allowance is made for a higher sensitivity of price because stocks were lower at this time than in previous years, the expected price increase could scarcely have exceeded 20 to 25 percent.

"Furthermore, estimated increases in coffee production in other areas of Brazil, other Western Hemisphere countries, and elsewhere will more than offset the estimated reduction in output in Parana.

"Hence the world supply outlook, barring future frosts and droughts, is for about 42 million bags for the crop year 1954–55—a slightly larger crop than in 1953–54—and for continuing large crops thereafter."

The Commission declared that the 1953–54 price spiral cannot be explained, either, "in terms of increased world demand." It said that for the past several years per capita consumption in the United States has declined in the face of rising prices. Up to now, this decline has been offset by increased consumption in Western Europe.

Now that per capita consumption in Europe has just about regained its pre-World War II level, the report says it is unlikely that henceforth it can increase sufficiently to offset the reduction in United States consumption that will result from current high prices. On the contrary, it adds, nearly all Western European countries except Western Germany anticipate reductions in consumption following recent price increases.

It is on the basis of increasing production and decreasing consumption that the Commission foresees lower coffee prices in the future. It made clear, however, that this prediction is contingent on supply and demand being permitted freely to run their course.

In its discussion of the inadequacy of present crop-reporting systems in coffee-growing countries, the Commission stated that in the absence of a reliable reporting system producing countries historically have tended to estimate their annual crops with a conservative bias, which explains why they have generally tended to overstate the severity of crop damages. It reported that members of the coffee trade in consuming countries appear in the past intuitively to have adjusted themselves to discounting these biases in crop reports.

Accordingly, it says, when reports from Brazil indicated severe frost damage to coffee trees in Parana in July 1953, it brought scarcely any reaction from the coffee trade in consuming countries.

But when it became evident in December 1953 that some, perhaps all, of the reported July frost damage was real, members of the coffee trade in consuming countries apparently expected the worst and, going to the other extreme, acted as though world coffee supplies would be less in 1954–55 than in 1953–54 by 3.5 million bags, the predicted loss in Parana due to the July frost. The absence of reliable data on the world coffee crop was a basic factor in this unrealistic behavior, according to the report.

Simultaneously, the report says, activity on the New York Coffee and Sugar Exchange produced an upward price spiral that appeared to confirm the trade's worst expectations. The report described these developments as follows:

"On December 1, 1953, a small group of Brazilian speculators entered the futures market, and by December 2, the day on which the Brazilian Government decreed that coffee farmers would be financed at a loan rate of cr. $1,500 rather than cr. $1,200 per bag, they had taken over a substantial percentage of the total long position. The price of December futures on that date was $0.5840 per pound.

"Immediately the price of green coffee futures began an upward spiral, and was followed closely behind by green coffee spot prices.

"Private Brazilian speculative interests, which comprised this initial group and two succeeding small groups, held substantial long positions in the coffee futures market until January 13, 1954, by which time the price of near futures had risen to $0.725 per pound. In the meantime unusually large long positions were taken by United States speculative interests.

"Throughout most of December coffee futures prices were slightly above spot prices. The price spiral continued with only momentary interruptions until April 2, at which time the price of July futures stood at $0.9635 per pound. Thereafter, as expectations with respect to the 1954–55 crop were adjusted in the light of increased crop forecasts, spot and futures prices declined until by May 6 the price of July futures had fallen to $0.8340 per pound.

"This downward adjustment was brought to an end when the Brazilian Government announced its new minimum export price of $0.87 per pound. The price of green coffee in the spot and futures market has remained in the neighborhood of Brazil's minimum export price since that date."

In the face of rising coffee prices, United States importers and roasters commenced accumulating coffee stocks by early December, the report states. It adds:

"These unseasonable inventory accumulations created in the immediate market the shortage that the trade expected in the light of December reports of the frost damage, and were reflected in unseasonably high monthly imports into the United States from December until March 1954."

It was during this period of rising coffee prices that "Imperfections in the domestic coffee market also became apparent," the report states. It continues:

"The concentrated state of the coffee roasting industry places considerable power in the hands of a few large roasters to influence price.

"Indeed, the changes in the overall pattern of industry activity appear, during the period studied, to be assignable almost wholly to the activities of the five large coffee roasters."

The report identifies the five largest roasters as A. & P., General Foods, Hills Bros., Standard Brands, and Folger & Co. of Kansas City.

According to the report, "The increased buying and inventory accumulation of these and other firms, especially the Nestle Co., contributed to and helped sustain the spiral in the spot prices of green coffee.

"Accumulations of coffee purchase contracts and inventories by the large roasters after July 1953 were on such a scale, and were accomplished with such rapidity, as to have been a significant factor in translating the expectations of shorter supplies and higher prices into an immediate market shortage in 1953–54.

"In particular, the increased purchases by General Foods were of startling proportions."

The report explains that in a less concentrated industry, "there presumably would have been a less extreme reaction to the news of the impending shortage."

"At least," it says, "the smaller factors in the coffee industry would not have possessed sufficient working capital to have bought on a comparable scale, and this stimulus to rising prices would have been absent."

The report states that one of the possible consequences of the 9-month coffee price spiral "may be an even more concentrated domestic coffee industry." It says that "most roasters found their costs mounting faster than they were able to advance prices and remain competitive with producers of the large-selling national brands."

The restrictive contract used in futures trading on the exchange is described by the Commission as "next in importance to inadequate crop reports, and the attendant expectations they generate, among the basic causes of the 1953–54 coffee price spiral."

It explains that the "Santos 4 (new) contract," as a practical matter, "permits delivery of only those coffees shipped from the port of Santos to the port of New York." This amounts, the report says, to about 10 percent of the coffee consumed annually in the United States.

Since the exchange has provided no effective means whereby other coffees can be readily substituted for Santos coffee, the report says the contract is not a useful hedging device for the coffee trade. For example, during the months of December 1953 and January and February 1954, when trading on the exchange was unusually heavy, only 615 individual accounts traded in coffee futures; and only 121 of these accounts represented domestic coffee trade interests.

With the coffee futures market thus unusually thin and restricted, the report says it is "unduly maneuverable and subject to wider price swings under abnormal speculative and commercial trading than are consistent with the actual conditions of supply and demand."

In its findings concerning the New York Coffee and Sugar Exchange, the Commission said:

"Sudden and unreasonable price fluctuations intrinsic in a 'thin' market are amplified by the failure of the * * * exchange to institute proper safeguards followed by regulated exchanges and to prevent trading abuses and irregularities.

"Unlike regulated exchanges, no limit is placed on speculative trading so as to restrict the manipulative capacity of speculative accounts. Moreover, the Exchange Control Committee mechanism is inadequate in that it fails to provide adequate safeguards for the prevention of manipulation of prices and the cornering of a commodity."

Declaring that the exchange "has failed adequately to police its members and enforce established trading rules and procedures," the report cites these examples:

"Condoning the practice among floor brokers of exchanging information of a confidential nature, and thereby violating a confidential relationship to the detriment of the agent's principal and other traders to whom the information is not made available.

"Permitting ex-pit transactions, i. e., trading off the ring without benefit of public outcry, which is a form of bucketing and considered an illegal practice on regulated exchanges.

"Condoning 'pass-outs' when not permitted by the rules and failing to take disciplinary action against a member for misusing 'pass-outs.'

"Permitting a member to take the other side of an order, i. e., to act as an agent and principal in the same transaction, without prior consent in each transaction of the party for whom he acts as agent."

The report states that the exchange's rule concerning margin requirements is "loosely drawn in that speculators can be classified under the rules as 'members of the trade' and hence post lower margins." It adds:

"Although margin requirements compare favorably with those of regulated exchanges in terms of percentage, the facts developed raise serious questions as to adequacy of margin requirements in view of the sudden and unreasonable price fluctuations which are inherent in a thin market."

The Commission said that it had assigned its full resources to the investigation of coffee prices pursuant to its resolution of January 26, 1954. It reported that for 4 months a team of attorneys, attorney-investigators, economists, statisticians, and accountants devoted full time to the coffee investigation. In addition, the Bureau of the Census assisted in preliminary machine tabulations, and other divisions of the Commission also provided assistance and overtime work.

"Indispensable assistance and consultation" have been furnished throughout the investigation by the State Department, and by the Department of Agriculture, especially by members of the Commodity Exchange Authority and the Foreign Agriculture Service.

(NOTE.—Copies of the text of the summary and conclusions are available from the Commission on request. The full text of the report is in the hands of the printer, but manuscript copies are available for inspection and use in the Commission's Office of Public Information. When printed, the full text of the report will be available by purchase from the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C.)

O'Fallon, Ill., Observes 100th Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 3, 1954

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, on August 25, 26, and 27 of this year, the city of O'Fallon, in St. Clair County, Ill., will conduct a celebration and pageant commemorating its 100th anniversary.

O'Fallon is a community of more than 3,000 population. Its history, the man for whom it was named, and its changing economy typify the story of the growth of the United States.

The town was named for Col. John O'Fallon, a soldier, businessman, real-estate owner, and principal developer of the railroads in the area. He first came to St. Louis after fighting in the War of 1812, to become an assistant Indian agent.

O'Fallon was established as a railroad town, along what was then known as the Ohio & Mississippi Railroad. It is now a part of the Baltimore & Ohio system. Later coal fields were discovered and O'Fallon was a leading coal producing center. The coal mining activity has diminished, and O'Fallon is now principally a residential area. It is noted for having one of the most extensive of small town parks.

The centennial will open with an old timers parade, and the coronation of the queen. A 2-day pageant will be presented, depicting the history of the town, with a completely local talent cast.

The Numbers Game—Part VII

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 26, 1954

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following excerpts from hearings on the 1955 appropriation bills:

INFORMATION CONCERNING THE OPERATION OF THE FEDERAL EMPLOYEES' SECURITY PROGRAM AS PRESENTED BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES IN HEARINGS ON THE FISCAL 1955 APPROPRIATIONS

(Pt. VI. General Services Administration, Department of the Navy, Housing and Home Finance Agency, Veterans' Administration, Department of Labor, and Atomic Energy Commission)

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

(From hearings on February 24, 1954)

Representative SIDNEY R. YATES (Democrat, Illinois): "Mr. Mansure [addressing Edmund F. Mansure, Administrator], how many employees are there in the General Services Administration?"

Max Medley (Comptroller): "As of December 31, 1953, there was a total of 27,607 employees."

Mr. YATES: "How many dismissals have there been to date under the terms of the Executive security order?"

Mr. Mansure: "I would like Mr. Baron Shacklette, the Director in charge of the Compliance Division, to answer your question."

Mr. YATES: "I refer to the present security order, No. 10450, Mr. Shacklette."

Mr. Shacklette: "There have been a total of 168 individuals who have either left the agency or been terminated under circumstances which involved a security consideration such as is listed in the Executive order."

Mr. Yates: "How many of the 168 were dismissed for having been members of the Communist Party?"

Mr. Shacklette: "Ten individuals either left or were dismissed because there was an issue of disloyalty in their cases or an issue of subversion. I don't know that any one individual was a member of the Communist Party, sir."

Mr. Yates: "Does your investigation disclose that any one of them was a member of the Communist Party?"

Mr. Shacklette: "I don't think so, sir."

Representative Norris Cotton (Republican, New Hampshire): "To keep the record straight, when you say "have left," you mean they voluntarily resigned while they were under investigation; is that what you mean?"

Mr. Shacklette: "That is right. Those who were not terminated either voluntarily resigned or died or were caught in a reduction in force, or something of that nature."

Mr. Cotton: "If they died, it would have nothing to do——"

Mr. Shacklette: "That is right."

Mr. Yates: "You mean, of the 168 there is included those who died while the investigation was going on?"

Mr. Shacklette: "There were 100 terminations, 50 resignations for their own reasons, and 18 separations for other causes, among which there would be reduction in force and 1 or 2 deaths. I don't know exactly how many."

Mr. Yates: "I don't know that you and I are seeing this thing in the same way, Mr. Shacklette, for this reason: You said they were separated for reductions in force. I was under the impression that reductions in force were not included within the purview of the security order. Am I wrong in that?"

Mr. Shacklette: "No, sir. You may have an individual who is being investigated under the Executive order, and some disloyalty information comes up. Through an entirely different operation, a personnel action, that individual may be off the payroll because of a reduction in force before any positive security action can be taken other than the imposition of à security restriction."

Mr. Medley: "As an example, Mr. Yates, I might have an accounting clerk in my office and, because we are trying to cut down on our costs we run a reduction in force. Let us assume Joe Doakes is being investigated. However, before the investigation is finished, this clerk is separated because of a general reduction in force."

Mr. Yates: "Does this mean, then, with respect to the type of employee that you specify, Mr. Medley, there is no confirmation made of the information that would cause you to investigate it more carefully if he leaves your employment?"

Mr. Shacklette: "The investigation would terminate at that point when he leaves the agency. If there was any disloyalty information that had come to our attention and the FBI didn't know about it, we would send it to them and to the Civil Service Commission.

"Let me be more specific as to the 10 cases of the 168. Three of those cases were involuntary separations."

Mr. Yates: "After hearing?"

Mr. Shacklette: "No, sir; not after hearing. There have been no separations after a full hearing to date in GSA. None of them has gone the full route as provided in the Executive order."

Mr. Yates: "None of the employees you have separated have asked for a hearing?"

Mr. Shacklette: "There are 2 hearings underway at present, being set up, but they are not included in this 168. The 168 figure is the figure of those who have left the agency for one reason or another."

Mr. Yates: "Of the 168, there are 10 who left because of disloyalty reasons, and of the 10 there are 3 who——"

Mr. Shacklette: "Who have been involuntarily separated, and an additional six resigned. That is nine. Then there was one in this other category who was terminated under a general reduction in force."

Mr. Yates: "Let us go off the record."

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. Yates: "That means that you have 158 separations under the Executive order for reasons other than disloyalty?"

Mr. Shacklette: "That is right, sir."

Mr. Yates: "Is the information concerning such separations given to the Civil Service Commission for their master file?"

Mr. Shacklette: "Yes; they are completely advised."

Mr. Yates: "Do you still give them the information in the event there is a resignation or a separation prior to completion of your investigation?"

Mr. Shacklette: "Yes, sir."

Mr. Yates: "You tell the Civil Service Commission that this information has come to your attention, the employee has been separated, and leave it to CSC's discretion whether they want to continue the investigation further; is that correct?"

Mr. Shacklette: "Yes; if he were an employee of the Civil Service Commission, or an employee of the Government, they would probably continue the investigation; if not, the FBI would be the only people interested."

Mr. Mansure: "Congressman Yates, in fairness to this, I think we should explain that because of the type of employment of some of our people in more or less menial jobs—and I say that not in any reflection whatsoever on the work they are doing—we have more of a problem of the ordinary police-blotter case than many agencies do. Would you explain that, Mr. Shacklette?"

Mr. Shacklette: "Well, we have a lot of char people in the Public Buildings Service laboring force. It is very difficult for the personnel offices to recruit people to do this work with the rates of pay that they have. A large number of those people have arrest records. We will say that in any 1 quarter we have 100 individuals coming into the security operation and going out. We process that many per quarter, individuals who are either drunks, narcotic users, addicts——"

Mr. Mansure: "Numbers operators——"

Mr. Cotton: "You aren't counting traffic violations in that total, are you?"

Mr. Shacklette: "No, sir. Arson, assault, burglary, crimes against the family and children, aggravated disorderly conduct, embezzlement, falsification of Government documents, forgery, gambling, homicide, larceny, narcotic offenders, robbery, sexual perversion. At the end of December we had 17 cases of sexual perversion against whom we had issued security restrictions. Five rape cases. At that time we had 583 individuals in our agency in connection with whom we had received allegations which would come under the President's Executive order as constituting a security risk.

"Of that number, 144 involved loyalty allegations."

Mr. Yates: "How many of those were cleared?"

Mr. Shacklette: "They are in process now."

Mr. Yates: "How long does it take"——

Mr. Shacklette: "You see, the General Services Administration"——

Mr. Yates: "What happens in a case like that, when you get word there is a question of loyalty involved? Do you give them a copy of their charges? What is the procedure?"

Mr. Shacklette: "A copy of the charges is given to the individual."

Mr. Yates: "Are they suspended?"

Mr. Shacklette: "In some cases they are suspended; in most cases they are. In a very few cases they are not suspended. It is up to the operating official.

"In the case of an individual in headquarters, Mr. Mansure might decide not to suspend or to suspend. We have two cases right now that are in the hearing stage. Let us take one of those cases. A man was a guard. You know our guards have authority to arrest. They carry guns, and there is a certain amount of security connected with their jobs. This chap walked into a police raid uptown here on his off-duty hours. He was reporting in. He was one of the collectors of the numbers racket in town. He had a pocketful of numbers slips and the police picked him up.

"The Metropolitan Police notified us immediately and we suspended him immediately. Then a statement of charges was given to him. He responded and indicated that he wished a hearing. A hearing was arranged. The hearing was held within the last week, I think, and we are at any moment now to get the decision of that board."

Mr. Yates: "You listed a fairly complete set of crimes. Is any one of those a reason for dismissal under the security order?"

Mr. Shacklette: "I think all of them are, sir."

Mr. Yates: "You stated also that there were 144 investigations pending for loyalty reasons?"

Mr. Shacklette: "That is right."

Mr. Yates: "Is this outside of the figure of 168 that you have given me?"

Mr. Shacklette: "That is right."

Mr. Cotton: "That 168 was security and this 144 is loyalty. You have only named 10 out of the 168"——

Mr. Shacklette: "The figure of 168 had nothing to do with the figures I am quoting now."

Mr. Cotton: "I wanted to be sure you were straight on the record. You said you had 168 that had been dismissed for security reasons and that 10 of those were on grounds of some kind of disloyalty."

Mr. Shacklette: "That is right."

Mr. Cotton: "Now you have said that you have pending 144 cases involving disloyalty. You mean 'disloyalty' and not just 'security'?"

Mr. Shacklette: "There were 583 involving security, of which 144 had a loyalty issue."

Mr. Medley: "These are merely allegations; is that correct?"

Mr. Shacklette: "These are allegations received; yes."

Mr. Yates: "Is it correct to say, Mr. Shacklette, that the 10 cases that you spoke about of dismissals should be added to the 144 as combining the total cases involving charges of disloyalty, that the 10 are disposed of and the 144 are not disposed of?"

Mr. Shacklette: "They are disposed of as of the end of December, and at the end of December we were carrying through an inventory of 144 loyalty cases."

Mr. Yates: "Have any of the 144 cases been cleared or disposed of yet?"

Mr. Shacklette: "They must have. I don't have that information."

Mr. Yates: "Who would have it?"

Mr. Shacklette: "I have it in my files. I have to check my records as of now. We assemble these statistics quarterly."

Mr. Yates: "Can you furnish for the record——

Mr. Shacklette: "Would you like to know it as of any particular date?"

Mr. Yates: "You have 144 cases pending for which you should have the statistics on the determination of the cases?"

Mr. Shacklette: "That is right."

Mr. Yates: "In other words, what you have given me is 10 cases of dismissals for loyalty?"

Mr. Shacklette: "That is right."

Mr. Yates: "You have 144 cases pending. Those 144 cases may swell the number of 10 total, or there may be none at all. I would like to know what that total is."

Mr. Shacklette: "Certainly. As of what date?"

Mr. Mansure: "Shall we take it as of the end of January or February?"

Mr. Yates: "As of the present time. I asked Mr. Medley as to how many people he had employed. He told me some 27,000."

Mr. Medley: "As of December 31."

Mr. Yates: "Is that about the number you have employed at the present time?"

Mr. Medley: "Just about. We can convert that figure to January, and then let Mr. Shacklette's figures tie into that date."

Mr. Shacklette: "Whatever date you say you can have."

Mr. Yates: "I would like to get the figure that corresponds to the 2,200 dismissals that has been used by some people."

Mr. Shacklette: "I can't give you that because I don't know where those figures came from. That is a civil service statistic."

Mr. Cotton: "In order that this request may not hold up the printing of the record, what date would be the most convenient date that you could use without undue delay?"

Mr. Medley: "January 31, 1954."

Mr. Yates: "All right. That will give me the complete picture on what the cases have been under the security order as of that date?"

Mr. Shacklette: "As of that date, yes, sir."

Mr. Yates: "Thank you. Those are all the questions I have."

(The information requested follows:)

"Cases on hand as of Dec. 31, 1953	144
Less cases closed during January 1954:	
(a) Cases in which subject was involuntarily separated for disciplinary reasons	2
(b) Cases in which subject resigned	16
(c) Cases in which subject was separated as a result of routine personnel operations (reductions in force, retirements)	21
(d) Cases in which favorable adjudication was made	1
Total	40
Balance	104
Plus new cases received during January 1954	7
Cases on hand as of Jan. 31, 1954	111

"Note.—None of the cases has been separated on the specific basis of loyalty charges, as provided by section 6 of Executive Order 10450."

Mr. Mansure: "I want to bring out the point that we don't want this to be indicative of the whole GSA setup. We do have a certain type of personnel where this type of thing will arise which other agencies do not have."

Mr. Shacklette: "That is very true."

Mr. Mansure: "This is a very small percentage of our whole personnel that we are talking about. What I mean is, this situation does not run clear throughout our operations. It runs in this one phase of our operations."

Mr. Yates: "But the figures that he is giving, that Mr. Medley is giving, is of the whole GSA operation. The point you are making is that the great preponderance——"

Mr. Mansure: "This doesn't honeycomb our whole operation. This runs into one small phase of the GSA operation, where this keeps arising, on account of the type of personnel we employ. We don't want to cast reflection on all people of GSA, that they are doing these things, because they are not."

NAVY

(From hearings on February 24, 1953)

Representative Harry R. Sheppard, Democrat, California: "In response to one of my colleague's interrogations, relative to undesirables, how many have been removed from the naval service because of their connections, either directly or indirectly, with Communist activities, as defined under the formula which is applied within the Navy, under which you dispense with the services of that kind of people?"

Vice Adm. James L. Holloway, Jr. (Chief, Bureau of Naval Personnel): "Mr. Sheppard, we will supply that information, but I believe the number is small."

Mr. Sheppard: "Is there any source within the Navy, other than the Bureau of Personnel, which I understand has a pertinent part in the removal of persons in the Navy?"

Admiral Holloway: "Mr. Sheppard, as Chief of Naval Personnel, I am the Secretary's alter ego in personnel matters."

Mr. Sheppard: "What I am trying to establish here is whether the records—as you are representing the Bureau of Personnel, where security risks are involved—whether the record would be available within your department?"

Admiral Holloway: "Yes."

Mr. Sheppard: "Then you could have that information?"

Admiral Holloway: "I do. I can get the information."

Mr. Sheppard: "Have you been called upon heretofore to provide figures to any source of Government?"

Admiral Holloway: "No."

Mr. Sheppard: "Will you be good enough to supply that information for the record at this point?"

Admiral Holloway: "Yes."

Mr. Sheppard: "At some later date but before the record is closed?"

Admiral Holloway: "Yes."

(The information requested follows:)

"Since 1950, 21 officers and 4 enlisted men have been discharged or resigned from the naval service under other than honorable conditions because of connections with Communist activities."

On February 24 and March 15, 16, and 18, 1954, the committee discussed with representatives of the Navy the problems of screening naval personnel.

HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY

(From hearings of February 26, 1954)

Representative Sidney R. Yates (Democrat, of Illinois): "How many dismissals occurred under Executive order known as 10450?"

Albert M. Cole (Administrator): "There have been 11 suspensions and in addition 4 have resigned after charges by the security officer."

Mr. Yates: "Have there been any dismissals as such? You say 11 suspensions."

Mr. Cole: "No."

Mr. Yates: "When you say 11 suspensions, does that mean that the hearings are still going on in the 11 cases?"

Mr. Cole: "In nine of the cases."

Mr. Yates: "What about the other two?"

Mr. Cole: "One resigned and one has been restored."

Mr. Yates: "Is the resignation of the 1 that resigned included in the 4 resignations that you spoke of, or is it in addition?"

Mr. Cole: "In addition."

Mr. Yates: "In connection with the resignations and the suspensions, were any of those suspended, or those resigned, members of the Communist Party?"

Mr. Cole: "That I do not know. Seven of those cases involved loyalty."

Mr. Yates: "Seven of the fifteen?"

Mr. Cole: "Seven of the eleven."

Mr. Yates: "Involved loyalty?"

Mr. Cole: "Yes."

Mr. Yates: "Apart from those cases, have all of your security checks been completed?"

Mr. Cole: "No, sir."

Mr. Yates: "Are they still going on?"

Mr. Cole: "Yes."

Mr. Yates: "How many checks have been completed?"

John M. Frantz (Director, Budget and Organization Staff): "As of December 31 we have had completed 61 full field investigations and have 31 pending."

Mr. Yates: "You now have 31 full field investigations pending?"

Mr. Frantz: "Correct."

Mr. Yates: "Does this mean that you have gone through all of your employees to the point where you feel these are all the field investigations that will be required?"

Mr. Frantz: "No, sir. Those are the full field investigations that have been requested so far in connection with sensitive positions. There will be additional ones."

Mr. Yates: "How many employees have you examined out of 11,000?"

Mr. Frantz: "The figures that I gave you were for the full field investigations. In addition to that there have been so-called national agency checks, which is a more abbreviated form of investigation—the number is 292 for the national agency checks which have been completed, and 112 pending."

Mr. Yates: "Of the 11,000?"

Mr. Frantz: "That is correct."

Mr. Yates. "You have done very little then relatively."

Representative John Phillips, Republican, of California: "Just getting started."

Mr. Frantz: "We do not have 11,000 cases to handle——"

Mr. Yates: "Have all the 11,000 been checked previously? Have all undergone the FBI fingerprint check?"

Mr. Frantz: "No. All of the 11,000 have been subjected to such checks as were required at the time. That has been done over the past several years."

Mr. Yates: "That is on the same basis as the employees of other agencies?"

Mr. Frantz: "That is right."

Mr. Yates: "In connection with the checks of those employees, you have just this number of full field investigations that you testified to?"

Mr. Frantz: "That is correct."

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

(From hearings on 3d supplemental appropriation bill, 1954, on March 1, 1954)

Representative Sidney R. Yates, Democrat, of Illinois: "Mr. Stirling [addressing H. V. Stirling, Deputy Administrator], I wonder whether you could provide for the record in the hearing on your request for funds for the fiscal year 1955 the number of dismissals that took place in the Veterans' Administration under Executive Order 10450?"

Mr. Stirling: "We do not have a breakdown."

Mr. Yates: "Do you have a breakdown of the number found to be members of the Communist Party?"

Mr. Stirling: "I do not think so. We do not have those records."

Mr. Yates: "Who would have them?"

Mr. Stirling: "The regional offices and the hospitals have the records."

Mr. Yates: "Every other agency has them."

Mr. Stirling: "We will do everything in our power to provide it."

Mr. Yates: "We would like to have the figures showing a breakdown of dismissals of those who were dismissed for being members of the Communist Party, if any, and those dismissed for loyalty reasons."

Mr. Stirling: "Yes, sir."

(The following information was submitted later:)

"This information is submitted in response to Congressman Yates' request to Mr. Stirling during hearings on the third supplemental appropriaion bill, 1954, that we provide for the record in the original hearing on the 1955 request the number of dismissals from the Veterans' Administration under Executive Order 10450.

"The following VA security figures have been extracted from a table of overall governmental security figures presented by Mr. Philip Young, Chairman of the United States Civil Service Commission, to the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee on March 2, 1954, in connection with his testimony pertaining to the administration of Executive Order 10450.

"Termination for information under 8 (a)	92
Resignations with security information under 8 (a)	210
Number under 8 (a) 2 to 8	45
Number of sex perversion	21
Number of felonies and misdemeanors	160
Number of all others under 8 (a)	76"

This statement was included in hearings on the appropriation bill for 1955, page 1036.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

(From hearings on March 2, 1954)

Representative John E. Fogarty (Democrat, Rhode Islands): "Mr. Secretary [addressing James P. Mitchell, Secretary], I do not know whether you can answer this or not, but since January of 1953, how many Communists have been fired by the Department of Labor?"

Secretary Mitchell: "Well, since May 28 of 1953, which was the effective date of the President's security order, to January 1, 1954, there were two employees removed whose files contained unfavorable information under the standards set in section 8a of the Executive Order 10450. Both of these cases involved falsification of application and were handled under the regular civil-service procedure.

"During that same period, that is May 28 through January 1, 15 employees regarding whom there was some unfavorable information resigned before any determination—favorable or otherwise—was made in their cases.

"In addition, in the period from January 20 to May 28, 1953—that was before the Executive order—three employees were removed for falsification of application. Two other employees with questionable records resigned before a final determination was made in their cases.

"That is the whole story on the operation of the President's security order since May 28, 1953."

Mr. Fogarty: "I think that is a pretty good record for the Department of Labor. I think the Department of Labor has always had a good record as far as that is concerned."

Representative Fred E. Busbey (Republican, Illinois): "May I concur in the judgment of the gentleman from Rhode Island."

(Omission.)

Representative Antonio M. Fernandez (Democrat, New Mexico): "You mentioned that 15 employees resigned against whom there was some unfavorable information."

Secretary Mitchell: "Yes, sir."

Mr. Fernandez: "You don't mean to intimate, do you, that they resigned because of unfavorable information?"

Secretary Mitchell: "Well, there was unfavorable information in their record. How many of them resigned because there was information in the record I don't know."

Mr. Fernandez: "Would you say that they knew about the information?"

Secretary Mitchell: "I believe that most of them did; yes, sir."

Mr. Fernandez: "So the inference is then that they might have resigned because of that?"

Secretary Mitchell: "That is the inference; yes, sir."

ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

(From hearings on March 8 and 10, 1954)

Excerpt from a general statement by Lewis L. Strauss (Chairman): "The cost of security investigations which must be performed for AEC by the Civil Service Commission and the Federal Bureau of Investigation is strongly influenced by the volume of construction to be performed and the operation of new production facilities. The transfer of cleared personnel among projects and the reinstatement of previously cleared personnel has permitted us to reduce the number of security investigations we expected this year. The cost of investigations required next year is expected to be still lower."

On March 10 the following discussion took place:

Representative Sidney R. Yates (Democrat, Illinois): "How many employees have been dismissed under Executive Security Order 10450?"

K. D. Nichols (General Manager): "One has resigned."

Mr. Yates: "When you say 'resigned,' you mean resigned as the result of charges placed against him?"

Mr. Nichols: "After proceedings had been initiated."

Mr. Yates: "Was it because of a loyalty case?"

Representative John Phillips (Republican, California): "Will you accept my usual amendment there and use the words 'security risk'?"

Mr. Yates: "I am using the word that was used in the Senate."

Mr. Nichols: "May I defer the answer to that question until I find the item here?"

Mr. Yates: "Yes, surely. Are all of your employees given full and complete investigation before you hire them?"

Mr. Nichols: "We do give them, and so far as we can, full and complete investigation before we hire them.

"However, there are cases where we have been allowed to grant emergency clearance, and that is done after a file check with local police, the FBI, and everything of that kind. Where they give you favorable results and everything in the file and their record on the face of it looks good we give emergency clearance, but we are trying to keep that to the minimum and for our normal employment have the full Agency check, either by the FBI or Civil Service prior to employment."

Mr. Yates: "Even with respect to those employees who are employed before the full check is made do you subsequently complete the check on them?"

Mr. Nichols: "Yes. In other words, we complete the check."

Mr. Yates: "After they are employed?"

Mr. Nichols: "Yes; after they are employed. I have this data you are asking for, Mr. Yates."

Mr. Yates: "Fine."

Mr. Nichols: "I have data here, and this is from the issuance of Executive Order No. 10450 up to this date, March 6, 1954, and security-clearance review by AEC discloses derogatory information sufficiently serious to require additional proceeding in 9 cases under the Executive order and the order of the Atomic Energy Commission. They are quite similar. Whether we are proceeding under one or the other it is difficult to state.

"The status of these cases is as follows:

"(a) Cases now in the initial stage of administrative review, two.

"(b) Cases about which hearings are now in process.

"(c) Case in which clearance was suspended and hearing authorized, one.

"(a) Cases now in the initial stage of administrative review, two.

"(e) Cases in which clearances were reaffirmed without hearing—that means after we made a review of some question—two.

"Now, the case in which clearance was suspended and the hearing authorized, that one case was a loyalty case, and also the last one where we reaffirmed without hearing it was a loyalty implication, as distinguished from these other factors."

Mr. Phillips: "This committee has been trying to get Mr. Yates to use the words 'security risk.'"

Mr. Nichols: "Hhat is a better term."

Mr. Phillips: "He wishes to use the words, 'loyalty case.'"

Mr. Yates: "In my opinion the term 'security risk' carries a derogatory meaning in terms of loyalty. I think you have to use a better term."

Mr. Phillips: "I do not think they do any more."

Mr. Nichols: "I am using 'loyalty' here as distinguished from sex cases, and so forth."

Mr. Yates: "Were any of those employees about whom you have just testified members of the Communist Party?"

Mr. Nichols: "I do not know, but I do not believe they were. I do not know. I am familiar with some of them, but I do not think they were."

The Numbers Game—Part VIII

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 26, 1954

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following excerpts from hearings on the 1955 appropriation bills:

INFORMATION CONCERNING THE OPERATION OF THE FEDERAL EMPLOYEES SECURITY PROGRAM AS PRESENTED BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES IN HEARINGS ON THE FISCAL 1955 APPROPRIATIONS

(P. VIII. Federal Mediation and Conciliation Board, Railroad Retirement Board, and Department of Health, Education, and Welfare)

FEDERAL MEDIATION AND CONCILIATION BOARD

(From Hearings on March 11, 1954)

Excerpt from general statement by Whitley P. McCoy, Director:

"The committee will be interested to know that I have designated all mediators, regional directors, and national office staff positions as 'sensitive positions' within the meaning of the President's security program, in order that we may be assured of the loyalty and suitability of our employees. The designation of a position as sensitive requires the investigation of an employee's former and present activities and associations by another agency of the Government, for which a charge is made against our appropriation. Our present budget did not anticipate this expense. However, I have authorized some investigations this fiscal year and if further savings permit will authorize still more this year. You will note that our 1955 budget includes provision for completing this work."

(Omission.)

Representative Fred E. Busbey (Republican, Illinois): "The first sentence in the last paragraph on page — is as follows:

"The committee will be interested to know that I have designated all mediators, regional directors, and national office staff positions as 'sensitive positions' within the meaning of the President's security program, in order that we may be assured of the loyalty and suitability of our employees.

"Then skipping one sentence, you say:

"However, I have authorized some investigations this fiscal year and if further savings permit will authorize still more this year.

"How many investigations have you authorized, Mr. McCoy?"

L. E. Eady (Director, Administrative Management): "One hundred and twenty-two."

Mr. McCoy: "We have effected considerable economies this year, so we did have a little more money for starting more of those this year than we had at first thought we might. We are getting through with it just as fast as we can. Whether we can get them all started this fiscal year depends on what happens in the general labor-management relations field. If we should have an upsurge of disputes and strikes, that took more of our money than they are taking right now, we would find ourselves short for this sort of thing."

Mr. Busbey: "I was especially interested in this one sentence:

"I have authorized some investigations this fiscal year, and if further savings permit, will authorize still more this year.

"What other activities are there that in your estimation are more important than seeing that this job is completed and done in a correct manner?"

Mr. McCoy: "That is a rather difficult question to answer, I will have to admit, Congressman. I think the subject is tremendously important, but at the same time"——

Mr. Busbey: "In other words, you are not trying to minimize the importance of this by any means?"

Mr. McCoy: "No, sir; I think it is tremendously important. As a matter of fact, I personally, since I took office, took it on myself to make all these jobs sensitive. They were not sensitive when I took office. I changed it because I saw the importance of it."

[Omission.]

Mr. Busbey: "For the record, would you give the committee what your up-to-date situation is in regard to your security investigations and actions resulting from them?"

Mr. McCoy: "Mr. Eady has prepared a tabulation of that. Have you got copies for each member of the committee. Mr. Eady?"

Mr. Eady: "Unfortunately, I do not have."

Mr. McCoy: "Give it to the chairman and he can pass it along."

Mr. Busbey: "I have no questions on it. I merely wanted it for the record, Mr. McCoy, because we are asking the same of all the agencies that come before the committee.

"*Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service—Status of employee-security program, Mar. 8, 1954*

"I. The evaluation of full field cases:	
Number of Executive Order 9835 cases on hand May 28, 1953, for review under Executive Order 10450	9
Number of Executive Order 10450 case reports received	30
Total cases for review	39
Disposition of cases:	
Number of cases closed, satisfactory	23
Number of cases closed by resignation	7
Number of cases pending review	8
Number of cases, further action pending	1
Total cases	39
"II. Status of program:	
Number of positions designated sensitive in FMCS	268
Number of full field investigations completed or in process	122
Number of sensitive cases not scheduled because funds not available	146"

Mr. McCoy: "If I may be indulged in a little bragging, I think I have done a pretty good job on this security program up to date. We do not have very many employees, and there is no reason to think that any great number would be of questionable loyalty. We have had some resignations because of the attitude that I have taken. These resignations have not been because we had anything on them, but simply because there was enough there to cause an investigation, and rather than face the investigation, some people have resigned. I really think we have done a good job."

Mr. Busbey: "I am glad to know that. I might say that the fact that I am not bringing up any new cases at this time indicates that your statement, in all probability, is true. In this committee I have had occasion to bring up a few situations. It has taken time, but in the final analysis they have been separated from the service one way or another. I have not been wrong on one yet."

[Omission.]

Representative John E. Fogarty (Democrat, of Rhode Island): "Regarding the disposition of cases investigated under the security program—'number of cases closed, satisfactory, 23.' What does satisfactory mean?"

Mr. McCoy: "It means that we reviewed the records and found no reason to suspect a man's loyalty."

Mr. Fogarty: "Number of cases closed by resignation, 7. What about those 7?"

Mr. McCoy: "Those were men whose old loyalty files we had pulled out to re-review to see whether there was any reason why we should take different action from what had been taken previously in view of the different security program that we now have under President Eisenhower from what they had under the old program. When the man involved learned that he was up for review and might be in trouble, sometimes he resigned."

Mr. Fogarty: "You do not know for what reason?"

Mr. McCoy: "I do not know whether he was guilty"——

Mr. Fogarty: "You do not know whether it was for immoral purposes or false affidavits or what? You do not know that?"

Mr. McCoy: "No, sir. They were mostly questionable associations, I think I can say that. Is that not true, Mr. Eady?"

Mr. Eady: "Yes."

Mr. Fogarty: "You have eight pending review now?"

Mr. McCoy: "Yes, sir. That just means in the case of our field examinations, which are going on now, the Civil Service Commission or the FBI is feeding us reports."

Mr. Fogarty: "'Number of cases, further action pending.' What does that mean?"

Mr. McCoy: "That is a man who has been suspended and who has filed an appeal notice and I will have to make a decision as to whether the suspension should stand or be set aside. If I rule that the suspension was justified and—then he is either out or he takes an appeal."

Mr. Fogarty: "Do you think he is a Communist?"

Mr. McCoy: "I hesitate to express an opinion on the merits of that case, because the appeal is pending before me now."

RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD

(From hearings on March 11, 1954)

Representative Fred E. Busbey (Republican, of Illinois): "Mr. Kelly (addressing Col. Raymond J. Kelly, chairman), what has the Board done under the new security order? I presume you have a statement like the Department of Labor had on the situation."

Mr. Kelly: "I received just today this statement which came from our personnel security officer to the Chief Executive Officer. A copy was given us this morning. I think the whole thing should probably go in the record. It is very brief and I can read it if you wish.

"'All sensitive positions have been cleared by full field investigations except the two secretarial jobs recently established by the Board. The action necessary to these clearances has been initiated. All new employees, except those whose appointments were for less than 90 days and certain other jobs such as national reporting officers and railroad claims agents, have been investigated in accordance with the provisions of Executive Order 10450, as amended. At the start of the program, May 12, 1953, we had on our rolls 12 employees who had been investigated and cleared under Executive Order 9835. These cases have been reviewed and, with one exception, have been disposed of either through clearance or preferring of charges. Charges are outstanding against two of these people. In addition to those cases mentioned above, from May 12, 1953, to the present, we have taken adverse action under Executive Order 10450 as follows:

"'One employee resigned while charges were being prepared—loyalty. Two employees resigned prior to evaluation of files which contained adverse information—arrest records not shown on application for employment. One employee who resigned prior to evaluation of file which contained adverse information—immorality.'"

Mr. Busbey: "That takes care of all investigations in the Railroad Retirement Board?"

Frank J. McKenna (Chief Executive Officer): "Except one. There is one case which we still have subject to review. We just have not gotten to it."

Representative John E. Fogarty, (Democrat, of Rhode Island): "Mr. Chairman, you have been on the job now since September."

Mr. Kelly: "September 1, 1953."

Mr. Fogarty: "I do not think I have any questions to ask, Mr. Chairman. I think the statement submitted by the Chairman and the Board speaks very well for your work this fiscal year that we are operating in. I want to go along with the chairman; I think the savings that have been made by the Board should be commended. I think you are doing a good job."

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

(From hearings on March 23 and 26 and May 18, 1954)

Representative Fred E. Busbey (Republican, Illinois): "Mrs. Secretary [addressing Oveta Culp Hobby, Secretary], I think it is customary this year for each of the various departments and agencies of the Government, as they appear before subcommittees of the Committee on Appropriations, to give a statement of the situation under Executive Order 10450, about which there has been so much discussion in the papers. What are the facts concerning the situation in your Department?"

Nelson A. Rockefeller (Under Secretary): "We can submit that information."

Secretary Hobby: "Mr. Chairman, I apologize for not having it here, but I can get it and submit it for the record."

Mr. Busbey: "I have not seen any figures except those that appeared in the Washington Post on March 11, 1954, for the period ending December 31, 1953. There seems to be some discrepancy in those figures because they had a statement to the effect that 11 had been fired and 67 had resigned, making a total of 78. Then they had another list showing that there had been 27 subversives eliminated from the Department, 12 sex deviates, 34 for felonies or misdemeanors, and 32 for other unfavorable information.

"One set of figures totals up to 78 and the other totals up to 105. What is the correct situation as far as your Department is concerned?"

Secretary Hobby: "Mr. Chairman, in regard to the numbers, I do not know where they come from—whether they came from our office or the Civil Service Commission—but as of almost any date you can get a different figure."

Mr. Busbey: "Well, this article was for the period ending December 31, 1953."

Secretary Hobby: "Could I see that, because I am eye-minded, sir."

Mr. **Busbey**: "Surely."

Mr. Rockefeller: "We can have the information up here very shortly."

"(The matter referred to appears beginning at p. 101.)"

[Omission.]

Mr. **Busbey**: "Mrs. Secretary, I desire to explore briefly the situation as it exists in your security office. The other day I asked for some figures which you were preparing."

Secretary Hobby: "I have them here, sir, and I will submit them for the record."

Mr. **Busbey**: "We will insert them in the record at this point."

(The matter referred to is as follows:)

"*Department of Health, Education, and Welfare*

"I. SECURITY ACTIONS UNDER EXECUTIVE ORDER 10450—MAY 28-DEC. 31, 1953

"A. Total number of suspensions effected for security reasons under Public Law 733 and Executive Order 10450 during reporting period (category I, 2)	2
"B. Total number of terminations effected because of information coming to the Department's attention which falls within the purview of sec. 8 (a) of Executive Order 10450, regardless of whether the termination was effected under Public Law 733 or by other procedures (category I, 5; category II, 7)	[1] 12
"C. Resignations before security determination completed:	
"1. When file was known to contain unfavorable information (category I, 23; category II, 44)	67
"2. When file was not known to contain unfavorable information at time of resignation but in each case the investigation resulted in unfavorable reports based on criteria outlined in sec. 8 (a) of Executive Order 10450 (category II, 16)	16
"D. Other separations (except resignations) before security determination completed: [2]	
"1. When file was known to contain unfavorable information under sec. 8 (a) of Executive Order 10450 (category I, 37; category II, 2)	39
"2. When file was not known to contain unfavorable information at time of separation but in each case the investigation resulted in unfavorable reports based on criteria outlined in sec. 8 (a) of Executive Order 10450 (category I, 1; category II, 10)	11
"Total	147"

"[1] Includes 1 termination directed by Civil Service Commission

"[2] Separations include retirements, reductions-in-force, abandonment of position, expiration of appointment, etc."

"CATEGORY I

"Category I refers to the number whose files contained information indicating in various degrees subversive activities, subversive associations, or membership in subversive organizations.

"CATEGORY II

"Category II refers to the number whose files contained information indicating any other type, or types, of derogatory information falling within the purview of Executive Order 10450 which established security requirements for Government employment.

"Category II includes: (1) Any behavior, activities, or associations which tend to show that the individual is not reliable or trustworthy; (2) any deliberate misrepresentations, falsifications, or omissions of material facts; (3) any criminal, infamous, dishonest, immoral, or notoriously disgraceful conduct, habitual use of intoxicants to excess drug addiction, or sexual perversion; (4) an adjudication of insanity, or treatment for serious mental or neurological disorder without satisfactory evidence of cure; (5) any facts which furnish reason to believe that the individual may be subjected to coercion, influence, or pressure which may cause him to act contrary to the best interests of the national security."

Secretary Hobby: "Mr. Chairman, would you like me at this time to bring the Director of the Office of Security in?

"He is here if you need him."

Mr. **Busbey**: "No; I thought I would wait and go into this in detail when we hold hearings on the budget for your office, of which the Office of Security is a part."

Secretary Hobby: "All right, sir."

Mr. **Busbey**: "I do not propose to go into the details of the Office this morning at all, but I think it might be interesting, Mr. Rockefeller, if you would explain for the record what I think has been guessed about and misrepresented around the city in the press; that is, the probable reason why the various departments are releasing their figures as they come before the subcommittees of the Committee on Appropriations. I am referring now to the request I made of the Security Office for certain information, out of which a conference developed, and a policy was laid down for all the departments of Government on this matter.

"Would you state briefly just what the situation was, and what has developed, which I think has been a good thing for everyone?"

Mr. Rockefeller: "Well, Mr. Chairman, as you know, the President from the very beginning and all the members of the Cabinet have been deeply concerned to protect the individuals who are involved either as security risks, or people concerning whom there might be some suspicion as to their security problems.

"They have been desirous to protect these people from having any unjust allegations made that might get in the press, or might get out around the Government, which might unfairly hurt their reputations, and future opportunities for employment."

Mr. **Busbey**. "I will subscribe to that."

Mr. Rockefeller: "This whole thing is such a serious question and such a difficult one to deal with that they have leaned over backward to watch out for the interests and the rights of individuals.

"Actually, as a background to the issuance of the new security order under which the action was taken, which was presented to you by the Secretary in this memorandum, each department then proceeded to set up their own regulations which were designed to carry out that order in the departments.

"The action which is reported here is the evidence of the program carried out in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare under the Secretary's leadership.

"The President had given some overall figures, and then you asked, in connection with the study for our department to release to you in the breakdown of our programs, and the reasons for the programs in HEW.

"That immediately raised the question as to what information should be given out which (1) would not in any way do what I said in the beginning—that is, jeopardize the rights of individuals involved—or (2) prejudice them, and which would set a pattern or precedent for other departments where we might take some action in our case which would be perfectly simple, and which would be in no way prejudicial to the interest of anyone, but which in another department without our knowledge might set a pattern or a precedent which could be very embarassing to them, and their people, because of an entirely different situation.

"Therefore, your request was discussed with the central authorities in Government, and as it was a very logical one and a very reasonable one, a procedure was developed and a standard pattern was developed on the basis on which information was then made available to the various committees, on request, and the departments were then permitted to give it out within that framework for public knowledge."

Mr. **Busbey**. "I may say, for the record, that I have given strict instructions to the Appropriation Committee staff that, in any checking which they do, they are, under no conditions, to ask for anything in the personnel files which is of a confidential nature."

Mr. **Rockefeller**. "I would like to say for the record that the Secretary is very appreciative of the way in which you handled this matter, and in the way your staff representatives handled it. They were most considerate and helpful throughout."

Representative **John E. Fogarty** (Democrat, Rhode Island) had previously submitted to the Department several questions concerning the security program, and Secretary Hobby presented written replies which were inserted in the record of March 26. Relevant excerpts follow:

"QUESTION

"How many of the 78 security risks contained in the Civil Service Commission's breakdown for your Department were persons hired by the previous administration?

"(a) Were any of these 78 persons hired while you were in office?

"(b) Were all of the 78 removed under the provisions of Executive Order 10450?

"(c) Were all of the 27 listed as subversives removed under the provisions of Executive Order 10450?

"(d) Were security determinations made in all of the 78 cases?

"ANSWER

"Inasmuch as our personnel files were maintained on a decentralized basis we do not have complete records readily available in our central files as to the exact date of hiring in each individual case. The personnel files in which this type of information is recorded are located in scattered personnel offices throughout the country, and it is therefore necessary to communicate with these various personnel offices to secure the requested data.

"Questions 4, and 4a, will therefore be answered just as soon as we are able to obtain this type of information."

(The information will be found beginning on p. 785.)

"(b) The 78 figure includes terminations effected because of information coming to the Department's attention which falls within the purview of section 8 (a) of Executive Order 10450 regardless of whether the termination was effected under Public Law 733 or by other procedures and also includes resignations which occurred before the security determination was completed when the file contained unfavorable information under section 8 (a) of the order.

"(c) The same situation as in 4b above applies to the 27 whose files contained information indicating in various degrees subversive activities, subversive associations, or membership in subversive organizations.

"(d) As noted above, the 78 figure includes resignations which occurred before the security determination was completed. In each case the file contained unfavorable information under section 8 (a) of the order.

"QUESTION

"How many cases did you report to the Civil Service Commission as your portion of the 1,456 security risk figure released on October 23, 1953?

"(a) Were all of these cases counted in your subsequent report of 78?

"(b) Were any of these ——— persons hired while you were in office?

"(c) Were all of the —— removed under the provisions of Executive Order 10450?

"(d) Were all of these persons listed as subversives removed under the provisions of Executive Order 10450?

"(e) Were security determinations made in all of the cases?

"ANSWER

"In accordance with established procedure, this Department notifies the Civil Service Commission of action taken on each security investigation. This notification is supplied to the Civil Service Commission on a form supplied by that agency.

"The only agency-by-agency breakdown that is available is the breakdown released by the Civil Service Commission in March 1954, which is referred to in question 4 above. Therefore, no separate statistics are available to this Department as to the items listed under question 5.

"QUESTION

"How many of the 27 subversive cases credited to you by the Civil Service Commission were actually fired by your agency?

"(a) For what reasons were these people fired?

"(b) Would any of these people have been cleared of the subversives charge had they been aware that such charges existed in their files and had exercised their right of appeal?

"(c) In other words—was the derogatory information of a subversive nature strong enough to have fired the employee through the channels of Executive Order 19450?

"ANSWER

"The total number of terminations effected because of information coming to the Department's attention which falls within the purview of section 8 (a) of Executive Order 10450 regardless of whether the termination was effected under Public Law 733 or by other procedures during the period from May 28, 1953, to December 31, 1953, was 12. The figure of 12, includes 1 termination directed by the Civil Service Commission, which was not listed in the release by the Civil Service Commission in March 1954. Of the above total, the files of five contained information indicating in various degrees subversive activities, subversive assocations, or membership in subversive organizations.

"(a) The above terminations were effected because of information coming to the Department's attention which falls within the purview of section 8 (a) of Executive Order 10450.

"(b) and (c) The files of 27 contained information indicating in various degrees subversive activities, subversive associations, or membership in subversive organizations. With respect to those who resigned before final security determination was completed, the derogatory information relating to the above matters would necessarily have had to be evaluated before a positive determination could have been made as to the necessity for suspension of the employee in the interests of the national security.

"QUESTION

"Have you sent any cases to the Department of Justice for prosecution?

"ANSWER

"Cases involving a possible violation of Federal statutes are being reported directly to the Federal investigative agency which has investigative jurisdiction over the Federal statute involved. No separate statistics have been maintained on the number of cases so reported since the further investigation conducted as to possible criminal prosecution is entirely handled by the agency having investigative jurisdiction."

On May 18 the committee again considered the subject of the number of security risks in the Department:

Mr. Busbey: "During the opening statement of the Secretary before the committee there were certain questions asked as to the results of investigations regarding security, loyal, and so forth, and certain information was furnished at that time. Has there been any appreciable change in the figures or statistics since then?"

Mr. Rockefeller: "If I am correct, the chairman is referring to questions Mr. Fogarty asked?"

Mr. Busbey: "Mr. Fogarty and myself, too, both asked some questions, and he submitted a list of questions."

Mr. Rockefeller: "That related to the original figures given out by the Government and Civil Service; is that not correct?"

Mr. Fogarty: "Yes."

Mr. Rockefeller: "To tell you the honest truth, I cannot tell you what date those were. Did those run to the end of the year, or currently? I have forgotten what the dates were."

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. Rockefeller: "They ran to the first of the year.

"I think the total, according to what Mr. Schmidt said, that was given to you was May 28 to December 31, 1953, and the total was 147."

Mr. Busbey: "What changes have taken place since that?"

Mr. Rockefeller: "To that should be added 91 actions."

Mr. Busbey: "I think it might be well at this point in the hearing to revise this table that was put in back at the time the Secretary appeared and bring this up to date showing all the actions."

Mr. Rockefeller: "Giving the totals?"

Mr. Busbey: "Yes."

Mr. Rockefeller: "That would be 238, with the same breakdown."

(The statement referred to follows:)

"Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

"I. SECURITY ACTIONS UNDER EXECUTIVE ORDER 10450, MAY 28, 1953, THROUGH APR. 30, 1954

(a) Total number of suspensions effected for security reasons under Public Law 733 and Executive Order 10450 during reporting period (category I, 13)	13
(b) Total number of terminations effected because of information coming to the Department's attention which falls within the purview of sec. 8 (a) of Executive Order 10450, regardless of whether the termination was effected under Public Law 733 or by other procedures (category I, 10; category II, 19)	[1] 29
(c) Resignations before security determination completed:	
1. When file was known to contain unfavorable information under sec. 8 (a) of Executive Order 10450 (category I, 37; category II, 59)	96
2. When file was not known to contain unfavorable information at time of resignation but in each case the investigation resulted in unfavorable reports based on criteria outlined in sec. 8 (a) of Executive Order 10450 (category II, 25)	25
(d) Other separations (except resignations) before security determination completed:	
1. When file was known to contain unfavorable information under sec. 8 (a) of Executive Order 10450 category I, 53; category II, 5)	58
2. When file was not known to contain unfavorable information at time of separation but in each case the investigation resulted in unfavorable reports based on criteria outlined in sec. 8 (a) of Executive Order 10450 (category I, 1; category II, 16)	17
(Separations include retirements, reductions in force, abandonment of position, expiration of appointment, etc.)	
Total	238"

"[1] Includes 1 termination directed by Civil Service Commission."

"CATEGORY I

"Category I refers to the number whose files contained information indicating in various degrees subversive activities, subversive associations, or membership in subversive organizations.

"CATEGORY II

"Category II refers to the number whose files contained information indicating any other type or types, or derogatory information falling within the purview of Executive Order 10450, which established security requirements for Government employment.

"Category II includes: (1) Any behavior, activities, or associations which tend to show that the individual is not reliable or trustworthy; (2) any deliberate misrepresentations, falsifications, or omissions of material facts; (3) any criminal, infamous, dishonest, immoral, or notoriously disgraceful conduct, habitual use of intoxicants to excess, drug addiction, or sexual perversion; (4) an adjudication of insanity, or treatment for serious mental or neurological disorder without satisfactory evidence of cure; (5) any facts which furnish reason to believe that the individual may be subjected to coercion, influence, or pressure which may cause him to act contrary to the best interests of the national security.

"Question 4: How many of the 78 security risks contained in the Civil Service Commission's breakdown for your Department were persons hired by the previous administration?

"(a) Were any of these 78 persons hired while you were in office?

"Answer: The agency-by-agency breakdown released by the Civil Service Commission in March 1954 included 11 terminations effected in this Department because of information coming to the Department's attention which falls within the purview of section 8 (a) of Executive Order 10450 regardless of whether the termination was effected under Public Law 733 or by other procedures, and 67 resignations which occured before the security determination was completed when the file contained unfavorable information under section 8 (a) of the order, a total of 78.

"The 78 figure includes 45 persons who were hired by the Federal Security Agency prior to January 22, 1953, during the previous administration. Thirty-three of the 78 were hired since January 22, 1953, and of this number, 20 were hired prior to May 28, 1953, the effective date of Executive Order 10450, and 13 subsequent to May 28, 1953.

"Since May 28, 1953, the effective date of Executive Order 10450, all appointments made are subject to investigation. Where the investigation required by Executive Order 10450 develops information indicating that the retention in employment of any employee so hired may not be clearly consistent with the interests of the national security, such information is reviewed and evaluated and a determination made as to whether or not the continued employment of the individual concerned is clearly consistent with the interests of the national security."

Dorchester Day, 1630-1954

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 3, 1954

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include an article written by me entitled "Dorchester Day, 1630-1954," together with an excellent poem entitled "Mother Dorchester Towne," written by John Meade.

The town of Dorchester, Mass., now a part of Boston, Mass., is one of the most historic communities in North America.

The above-mentioned follows:

DORCHESTER DAY, 1630-1954

(By Hon. JOHN W. McCORMACK, of Massachusetts)

One reason I like so much to write this article is because in Congress most of us are caught up in the stream of current and crisis history. Our grasp of the essentials has a tendency to become blurred unless we return to our origins, our roots, so to speak, and replenish our understanding of the United States of America by going back to its sources. Dorchester Day brings to the surface of our time an abundant and a very special kind of typical American history. If you were with me in Washington from day to day and hour to hour—and I wish you could be—you would be, I am sure, amazed to recognize how closely knit are the decisions of this moment with the principles and the traditions of our country, as they developed from the days in 1630 when Dorchester was founded.

Like the sound and solid guidance for life we learn at our mother's knee and in the home, so in the halls of government, where sometimes grave decisions have to be taken, we get our sense of direction, our insistence on integrity, our strength of conscience, from familiarity with the circumstances of America's beginning and America's growth. That is why I am so happy to prepare this article because it affords the opportunity to steep again in the historical folklore of our country. One reason I believe that the American people have been so wise in their judgments through the decades is because they have maintained their reverence for history and the past, as exemplified by this ceremony today. Their judgments have been imbedded deep in their knowledge of what went before and their respect for it—and by the past I mean not only our past in relation to 1630, but also, their past, in relation to the story of American justice, and to the Old and New Testament to which they were so profoundly devoted.

We are a religous people, and what we celebrate on this anniversary of the establishment of Dorchester seems to me to be a part of the design of an infinite will. Surely the long, often peaceful, sometimes violent, story of Dorchester is not just a happenstance that occurred as one might turn a street corner either to the west or to the east; an event in time and space unrelated to anything else and alone. No; as we examine the pattern, we must find the finger of God tracing the story: We see how intimately the story of Dorchester is interwoven, and how subtly, with the rest of the early history of our country. We see how it is practically one with the landing of the Pilgrims in 1620. We cannot miss its remarkable involvement with the events of the American Revolution, with the adoption of the Constitution of the United States and its Bill of Rights, and with the expansion to the West and the building of our country. We must see how robust and adamant the Colonies were in the conquest of nature itself on this rockbound coast, and how forbearingly they contended with the Indians.

All of this gives us this day evidence of the patient and paternal touch of the divine will.

But there is also testimony even more concrete. It was, after all, religious men and women who played what, I must believe, is the chief role in the organization of the founders of Dorchester even before they left England for the American shore. It was a Rev. John Warham and a Rev. John Maverick who were the ministers and leaders of the little group that met in Plymouth, England, and constituted themselves a church community. In reaching out for this historical material I am in great part indebted—and very much so—to the Dorchester, Mass., tercentenary committee of 1930, and to the subcommittee on the historical booklet, of which Patrick J. Connelly, former postmaster of Boston, Mass., was chairman, and Richard P. Bonney was editor, and which included Mary B. Corr, Edward A. Huebener, and Carrie M. W. Weis. The research they did, the information they compiled, the story they organized and presented is for me an excellent piece of workmanship, fashioned with an affectionate objectivity, and I am proud to employ a good deal of it in writing this article. I think we would do well—if this has not already been done—to put out a reissue of this booklet so that every home in Dorchester, perhaps every home in Boston, might have a copy.

For our world is caught—as if suspended—in a dreadful impasse of history, a unique state of tension, which has been described as a "cold war" and which is marked by "hot war" interludes—Korea and Indochina. The struggle that is now clearly defined between a free and a slave world depends for its success, for either side, on the winning of the support of mankind. The historical product we have, so to put it, to sell to the human race, is well told by our contemporaries as it was magnificently lived by our forbears. It is this we need to propagandize first among ourselves, by the distribution among us, of material like this splendid booklet, and then among the peoples of the world by acquainting them with the history of freedom as we struggled for it and won it on these shores. If the masters of the Kremlin knew this history only half at well as we know it, they would recognize the folly of presuming that a people in possession of so sacred a treasure as the American credo would ever permit its betrayal, or would ever submit to a tyranny that strikes to the very heart of the edifice our people created on this soil.

Let us, therefore, no matter how well we may know it or how often we have heard it repeated, review again in brief this mite of history, as we would repeat a sacred and familiar prayer, not because it is new but because it is loved. And we can thank our enemies, actual or potential, for reminding us that this liberty, this democratic government, this Bill of Rights, this dignity of the individual, this system of free schools, this election freely by secret ballot, this equal justice under law, this right of petition, this "We, the people," this "Nation, under God," cannot be taken for granted except at our peril. We can thank the enemy for reminding us that as it was won by endless effort and endless combat, so it can be lost by shameful neglect and slothful indifference.

A people intensely devoted to Dorchester's partiotic past, as we who celebrate Dorchester Day, can be expected to follow in the footsteps of those whose deeds we honor. I do not believe we will let ourselves forget that Dorchester is derived from Dorsetshire in England, afterward called Dorchester, and that the early settlers largely came from there, founding the Dorchester which is now a historical community on this continent. There was in England's Dorchester a Rev. John White, rector of St. Peter's Church in that city, who well before the sailing of the *Mayflower* dreamed and planned a settlement in the New World that would be guided by the precepts of religion. As you see, the religious influence was invariably predominant, even as it was with the great Jesuit Fathers whose explorations opened up to civilization and to Christianity other great teritories on this continent; and as it was, of course, predominant in the life of Columbus himself, the first and the greatest explorer of them all.

The religious and political persecutions of James I and his son, Charles, hastened the plan. The Reverend Mr. White associated himself with other leading Puritans. The Massachusetts Bay Company was organized and John Endicott was sent here to found Salem in 1628. With the help of a Lord Dorchester, a courtier of King Charles I, a liberal charter was secured by the Massachusetts Bay Company. This permitted them to settle and govern the area on these shores between the Charles and the Merrimac Rivers, and that, it may be said, from a real-estate standpoint, is the practical beginning of the great project. It will be noted that many historic communities were included in the original grant, including what is now the South Boston section of Boston. Like Moses, who also dreamed and planned and administered much but never, himself, got to the Holy Land, so the Reverend Mr. White never left the Church of England, though sympathetic to the Puritans, and in fact never left England. His achievement, in the practical sense, consisted in seeing to it that one of the ships in the fleet sent out by the Bay Company carried a considerable group of his own parishioners to the new land. This ship was called the *Mary and John* and the two churchmen I mention before, the Reverend Mr. Warham and the Reverend Mr. Maverick, headed the expedition. I am told that visitors from New England to Dorchester, England, make it a point to visit the grave of the Reverend Mr. White in the porch of St. Peter's as one visits a shrine. The two ministers I mentioned whom he had selected to head the mission were permeated with his views on religion and education and the spirit of self-government.

The voyage in this 400-ton vessel began on March 20, 1630, and ended 70 days later. Actually they landed at what is now Hull. With the help of settlers who had been here before them, they moved their goods and cattle to better ground, pending the findings of exploring parties sent out in quest of a permanent settlement. One exploring company followed the Charles River to what is now the arsenal at Watertown. The second company was delighted with a spot the Indians called Mattapannock. They especially liked its salt marshes for pasturage and its rocky hill for defense. The Mattapannock of the Indians was, of course, South Boston, and the marsh, as you know, is called the cow pasture to this day. That rocky eminence is today Savin Hill. It has been a rather reliable guess that they set foot at first at what is now the junction of Pleasant and East Cottage Streets in the area that came to be identified as Allen's Plain.

This was Dorchester as of 1631.

Under conditions that we today would consider rude and inhospitable beyond endurance, they built their thatch-roofed cabins and their meeting house in a close community as a common protection against possibly hostile Indians. With the Indian threat later eliminated the area of occupation widened.

I quote an interesting bit of this history from the tercentenary document. It says:

"The first houses were built along a road stretching from the first meeting house to the Rock Hill of the settlers, the Savin Hill of today, where a fort was located. It followed the line of Pleasant Street and Savin Hill Avenue. Another early road covered the route of Pond Street and Crescent Avenue to the cow pasture. From the five corners at the end of Pond Street, a lane ran toward the neck (Boston Street). Jones Hill was circled by a road following the lines of Stoughton, Hancock, and Pleasant Streets to Savin Hill Avenue. Access to Roxbury and Boston was over a road running from the meeting house along Cottage, Humphrey, and Dudley Streets to the center of old Roxbury at Eliot Square. When Israel Stoughton set up his grist mill at the falls of the Neponset in 1633, it was necessary to build a road across the great lots. This left Hancock Street at the foot of Meeting House Hill, and followed Winter and Adams Streets to the lower mills. It became an important route from Boston to the Plymouth colony, and was known as the Lower Road."

For me these data hold an intriguing quaintness because, like all of you, I know these names and these places so well, and what I am relating goes back more than 300 years.

These names and these places, down through the centuries, are a part of the fabric of the Nation's history. The first church, at Cottage and Pleasant Streets, was not only a house of worship but a civic center, a school, a storage place for valuables, and a powder magazine. From time to time it was enlarged and improved and finally moved to a better site, the east side of Winter Street, at what has as a result become Meeting House Hill. The church was the heart of the community, the source of its leadership. In fact, church membership was an indispensable qualification for citizenship. There are many examples of church decisions enforced by the secular arm.

It has been recorded by our tercentenary historians that Dorchester was first to organize local government by the town meeting, and that it was first to establish a free school supported by public taxation. No contradicton of these claims has come to my attention. No doubt other communities in New England would have adopted these ideas for education and self-government, even if there had never been a Dorchester settlement. But I am proud to shout from the hilltops Dorchester's claims in this respect. Again in refreshing one's Americanism at the fountain source of American tradition, in determining questions on public aid to education, in seeking out the nature of free government, and official decision democratically arrived at, one must feed one's thinking in just such history as that of Dorchester. For the very heartbeat of American life goes back directly to what our forebears did in Dorchester when they established—for the first time on this soil—the town meeting and tax-supported education.

The memorable date of the first town meeting was October 8, 1633.

The founding fathers then stipulated that "the men of the colony should meet on every Monday evening, at the meeting house, there to settle and set down such orders as may tend to the general good, and every man to be bound thereby without gainsaying or resistance."

It might be helpful, in the light of the appropriation facts of our own time, to recall that the town's appropriation proved inadequate to run the first free school in Dorchester, so that perhaps it is not correct to say that it was wholly free, for a small tuition fee was charged to make up the difference. On the other hand, I do not believe it can be said that education was in any way frustrated because of this fee, for our founding fathers were wise and liberal enough to make it payable, if necessary, in firewood. And it would seem to me that just about the most abundant product in the whole wide world at that time was firewood from the vast wilderness that enveloped the early settlers. What the taxation failed to provide in the way of education for the young, came from the sweat of the brow that produced the necessary amount of firewood. Thinking of this hour and looking back, as one called upon to help decide appropriations in the Congress of the United States, I must say I can find precious little fault with that arrangement.

The process may not be suitable to our time but the principle, it seems to me, is ideal.

Dorchester deserves another singular preeminence in history, which I do not believe has been properly noted, probably because of the greater scope of an achievement along kindred lines by William Penn, the founder of Pennsylvania. The people who founded Dorchester dealt fairly with the Indians, and both settlers and Indians profited accordingly. When the two groups first met, the Indians held up a fish to show their peaceful intentions and the pioneers held up a biscuit. Back in 1657 some 6,000 acres of land were given over to the Indians as a reservation at a place then called Ponkapoag and now known as the town of Canton. We can only guess how many American scalps and Indian lives were saved as a result of the intelligent and Christlike relationship the Dorchester settlers maintained with the Massachusetts Indians. When the citizens of Dorchester girded their loins to fight the Indians, it was against the Pequots of Connecticut in 1636, and the Narragansett tribesmen of King Philip in 1675. Their participation was rather as the result of an alliance, and not as the consequence of direct relationship of the citizens of Dorchester with the Indians who had become hostile.

In our relationships with less advanced portions of the earth today I believe we can take a page from the book of the early Dorchester settlers.

American character, independence, and just plain raw courage, run through the whole story of Dorchester participation in the American Revolution. They did not like the Stamp Act, and they said so. They instructed their representative, one John Robinson, to do all he could to secure the act's repeal. In 1770 they went so far as to pass resolutions pledging themselves to boycott goods of British origin. The Dorchester Committee of Correspondence met with other committees in Faneuil Hall in 1773 to discuss what should be done about British ships loaded with tea in Boston Harbor. Dorchester, through its representative, defied the British Parliament, when the British destroyed the independence of the Massachusetts General Court. Dorchester's voice was strong in the Suffolk Resolves which carried in their temper and meaning some of the thinking that later emerged in the more historic Declaration of Independence. An important group of Dorchester citizens risked their lives in adopting the Suffolk Resolves at the home of a Daniel Vose, which was across the Neponset River in Milton Lower Mills.

Dorchester both before and during the revolution was in the midst of its danger and its fury.

There were 350 Dorchester men who fought under Washington. They participated in the brilliant series of maneuvers by which General Washington drove the British from Boston, and in the course of which Dorchester Heights played so prominent a role. Support from Dorchester to the revolution was loyal and constant. On May 23, 1776, the town passed a resolution pledging the Continental Congress its support should the decision be made to declare the Thirteen Colonies independent.

There is a vast history that cannot be touched in this brief pointing up of the highlights. There was the role for example that Dorchester citizens played in the Civil War contributing 1,342 men out of a population of 10,000 and losing 97. There was the incredible growth of trade and industry, and the concurrent increase of population to more than 200,000 in our own time. It was in Dorchester that for the first time in New England corn was ground by power. Dorchester gave the Nation its first playing cards. It furnished great names to the Nation: Edward Everett, United States Senator, Ambassador to England, writer and orator; the industrialists James Baker and Rosswell Gleason; Joseph Lord who founded Dorchester, South Carolina; John Lothrop Motley, the historian; Samuel J. Barrows, editor; Maria Cummins and William T. Adams, poets; Josephine Preston Peabody, the poetess; Lucy Stone; the Reverend Hugh Blunt, poet. Dorchester gave us Henry L. Pierce and George Hibbard, notable in the field of public service, and John F. Fitzgerald, a Dorchester resident, all three having been mayors of Boston. Marshall P. Wilder, merchant, philanthropist and statesman, the founder of the Massachusetts Horticultural Society, was a citizen of Dorchester. And there were other great preachers, writers, and publicists. In passing I might say the late John F. Fitzgerald was grandfather of United States Senator John F. Kennedy.

Dorchester diminished in territorial size from time to time, and this in itself is a sign of the thirst for self-government and independence; for it was the very desire for independence in New England that led to the breaking up of the large towns for smaller self-governed units.

In line with this spirit, Dorchester at first fought annexation to Boston. But as community life became more complex, as communication media developed, and as transportation provided greater concentration without any real loss of autonomy, sentiment changed, and in 1869 the people of Dorchester voted for annexation to Boston, by a vote that nevertheless showed a strong remaining sentiment for separation. By January 4, 1870, Dorchester's existence as a town ended.

Time and again I have thought of the significance of Dorchester as a precious fragment of my country. The vast industries it now supports; its teeming and active population. Its cultural life, its religious life—Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish—its schools and its theaters. Its alert publications. Its extraordinary aliveness; its throbbing Americanism.

Yes, it gave us our first town meeting and it gave us our first tax-supported school. It fought in ever war and it dealt fairly with its neighbors.

What, you may ask, is its significance? What does it add up to? It adds up to this: It makes for the greatest comfort that can come to the American soul in the hours of long and bitter tension the world is experiencing today. For what is true of Dorchester is true, in essence, of the thousands of other American communities, and it is true of the whole of the United States. Philadelphia has its Constitution Day, and Texas remembers the Alamo. Just as Dorchester dealt fairly with the people the settlers found here in 1630, so the United States dealt fairly with Cuba and Puerto Rico and the Philippines; so the United States needs no fortified frontiers either at the Mexican or the Canadian borders.

The United States as a nation has a character that gets its strength from faith in God and from the education and the enlightenment of its people.

Today, we are confronted with a menace that is without parallel in all of human history. The story of Dorchester explains why an almighty providence has put us—this great Nation—in position, through a divine plan, for leadership of the free world. The story of Dorchester explains why—thank God—the cleavage between the free and the slave world today is so clear, is so undisputable, that we can accurately and truthfully identify the two great contenders, one as free, the other as slave.

Never has the line been more clearly and plainly drawn.

What our forebears have done for us is to help us with their example to see the path we must follow. They wanted freedom enough to dare and suffer anything. They have given us that heritage.

There is in Dorchester a sample of the strength and the character of this Nation. This gives hope not only to us, but to the whole free world. We have tremendous strength in being: economic strength, military strength, the strength of leadership in statecraft, in science, in just sheer energy and initiative. It has been built in us through the centuries and it is now in full growth. But we have above all the vigor that comes from the faith that gave such power to the heart and the sinews of the early settlers, and that is the source of our great inner might today. These are the forces that guarantee our security. With might resting on these foundations, the enemy cannot destroy us—and I believe that the Kremlin knows it.

We have a sublime faith to live by, and I hope to see and participate in many Dorchester Days yet to come, in a strong and peaceful and a happy America and in a peaceful world.

Mother Dorchester Towne

Proudly we gather to celebrate here;
The birth of a town that we love and revere;
Dorchester, where highlights of history were made;
Deserves every tribute that now can be paid.

Here stands the site of the first public school;
Where "Free to the Rich and the Poor" was the rule;
Here where the Pilgrims assembled and planned;
Dorchester's town meetings the first in this land.

Her sons helped to fortify Dorchester Heights.
They helped too to draw up our famed bill of rights;
They also made plans to throw into the sea;
A cargo of Britain's much overtaxed tea.

By giving this Nation great men of renown;
They earned the name "Mother Dorchester Towne,"
Where the good neighbor spirit is still to be found;
God bless every inch of her dear hallowed ground.

—By John Meade.

Isn't It Wonderful: Back to the Spoils System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 3, 1954

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I herewith include an article written by Jerry Kluttz, which appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald of August 1, 1954. The article, CSC Action Opens Path To Control of Many Jobs by Patronage Forces, follows:

The Federal Dairy

(By Jerry Kluttz)

CSC ACTION OPENS PATH TO CONTROL OF MANY JOBS BY PATRONAGE FORCES

The Civil Service Commission has, by a recent action, helped clear the path to partisan political control over many thousands of Federal jobs which are supposed to be under its merit system.

The agency was created to strengthen the merit system in Government; it is supposed to be divorced from political considerations in the appointments and promotions of Federal personnel.

In an unpublicized move, however, CSC directed each of its 10 regional offices and the 800 agency boards of examiners to send a copy of each authorized job opening to the head of the appropriate agency here. Officially, it now maintains this step was taken for another purpose—to keep a closer check on the direct hiring of agencies.

However, once the lists of civil-service jobs to be filed are sent here, political wheels begin to grind. Many of the jobs are referred to the Republican National Committee and to other GOP political sources, and candidates who are cleared politically are given preference for the appointments.

As revealed here on July 19, agency heads have been directed by the White House to clear appointments to these and to other Federal jobs with the Republican National Committee. The recent CSC action makes the task of spotting vacant Federal jobs, and of clearing them, much easier for politicians.

In fact, a top Federal official conceded to this reporter that the CSC order was for the dual purpose of supplying Federal job information to GOP patronage forces and also to provide CSC with information on the effectiveness of its job examining program.

The jobs involved are referred to as 303 authority positions by Government people. These positions are under Civil Service, but are ones which CSC is unable to fill from a list of eligibles who qualified for them through competitive tests. In such cases, CSC authorizes the agencies to fill the jobs from the open market, provided the people selected meet its minimum standards for them.

An estimated 40,000 jobs were filled last year through the direct hiring, or "303," authority. Despite the slowdown in Federal hiring, the number this year could be even larger for these reasons:

1. CSC has a smaller operating budget; it has fewer dollars to spend on competitive tests, and that would indicate more CSC jobs will be filled through direct agency hiring.

2. However, there is a deep suspicion in reliable quarters that some agency officials in the field have yielded to political pressures and are deliberately not holding tests for some jobs in order to open the door for appointments to them from political sources.

The extent to which CSC will enter the partisan political arena is likely to be determined by the method used to fill its several vacant regional director positions.

Reportedly, Chairman Philip Young, who has the power over them, wants to fill them with career civil servants on a merit basis, a system followed many years by the agency which is charged with promotion of a career system in Government.

However, there are those in powerful places who are said to be insisting on GOP political clearances for the jobs. Also, the same sources are reported to be after the jobs of several CSC officials here and in the field.

Young reluctantly agreed to provide GOP Members of Congress with details on the many thousands of non-civil-service jobs which could be turned over to patronage after they had threatened to get his "scalp."

An Amendment to Article V of the Constitution of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 3, 1954

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, on July 26 the highly respected gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Reed], chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, and I introduced House Joint Resolutions 568 and 569, respectively.

The resolutions are identical. They propose an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide procedure for proposing amendments to the Constitution by the States and to make secure in the States their power to amend the Constitution.

The remarks of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Reed] made in connection with the introduction of House Joint Resolution 568, appear in the Record of that date on page 11484, and include an explanation of the new procedure for the proposal of amendments by the States and the text of the amendment. Under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to add brief observations.

As was pointed out by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Reed], it was not intended that these resolutions be acted upon by this Congress as they will again be introduced in the early part of the 1st session of the 84th Congress. Meanwhile, the proposed amendment may be studied by the Members, as also by the members of the State legislatures and the attorneys general of the several States, by State and national bar associations and citizens organizations, and by the people generally.

It is the desire of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Reed] and myself, that the resolutions be regarded as a joint introduction as, if House rules had permitted, we would have joined in the introduction of a single resolution. The purpose of having the introduction so regarded is to establish for the legislative course of this amendment its fundamental nonpartisan character, and to recognize and preserve its nonpartisan origin later mentioned in my remarks.

Research during recent years appears to disclose that the practical operation of the power of the States to propose amendments may have been rendered uncertain as an indirect result of judicial decisions in other areas and changes in legal aspects occurring over the years since the adoption of the Constitution. This development has been gradual and generally unobserved. It is not the time in the closing days of the Congress to enlarge into a discussion of this, which can better be done during the 84th Congress when the resolutions are being considered.

The proposed amendment is designed to overcome such adverse effect by providing clear procedure for the proposal of amendments by the States.

The development mentioned has been brought to attention by the Committee for the Preservation of State and Local Government, a nonpartisan, nonprofit, citizens' educational organization incorporated under the laws of Illinois, with offices at 332 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago 4, Ill.

Author of the proposed amendment is John B. Ebinger, Esq., of Klamath Falls, Oreg., a member of the Oregon bar and a former member of its board of governors, whose original research was made some years ago and who, in January 1953, formed the above-named organization and is its executive director. He is referred to by the Honorable Herbert Hoover, former President of the United States, as "an Oregon attorney of substance, who has developed an amendment to the Constitution which seems to me to have real value."

It is appropriate to note that in their 1953 sessions the legislatures of three States have already considered and adopted resolutions looking toward this amendment, namely, South Dakota, Illinois, and Alabama, in the order named.

It is hoped that throughout the process of the proposal and ratification of this amendment it may be kept free from partisan politics so that all who will may support this basic amendment, irrespective of political affiliation and regardless of party lines, to the end that State position may be reestablished in line with the intention of the founders, so that the States may, by constitutional amendment, if necessary, protect the reservation of power under the 10th article of the Bill of Rights, by which, and, I believe, only by which, the union of sovereign States may survive, and the local controls of government that are traditional to the American people can be made to endure.

As it may serve the convenience of the Members, as well as the public who may be interested in these resolutions, I include as part of my remarks the text of House Joint Resolution 569:

House Joint Resolution 569

Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the procedure for amending the Constitution

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That in lieu of article V of the Constitution of the United States, the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which, when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States, shall be valid, to all intents and purposes, as part of the Constitution:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. The Congress, whenever two-thirds of both Houses shall deem it necessary, shall propose amendments to this Constitution, or on the application of the legislatures of two-thirds of the several States shall call a convention for proposing amendments; or the legislature of any State, whenever two-thirds of each house shall deem it necessary, may propose amendments to this Constitution by transmitting to the Secretary of State of the United States and to the secretary of state of each of the several States a certified copy of the resolution proposing the amendment, which shall be deemed submitted to the several States for ratification when certified copies of resolutions of the legislatures of any 12 of the several States by two-thirds of each house shall have been so transmitted concurring in the proposal of such amendment; which, in any case, shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of this Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States: *Provided*, That no State, without its consent, shall be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate.

"SEC. 2. The act of proposal, concurrence in a proposal, or ratification of an amendment, shall not be revocable.

"SEC. 3. A proposal of an amendment by a State shall be inoperative unless it shall have been so concurred in within 7 years from the date of the proposal. A proposed amendment shall be inoperative unless it shall have been so ratified within 15 years from the date of its submission, or shorter period as may be prescribed in the resolution proposing the amendment.

"SEC. 4. Controversies respecting the validity of an amendment shall be justiciable and shall be determined by the exercise of the judicial power of the United States."

SEC. 2. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years from the date of its submission.

Joseph E. Ransdell

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 3, 1954

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newspaper article:

JOSEPH E. RANSDELL

The long life and the scintillating public career of Senator Joseph E. Ransdell exemplified many fine traits and appealing qualities. But he was particularly noted for the nobility of his character.

Public office and the political activities incidental to it covered most of his life span. In all of these trusts he acquitted himself not merely creditably. He honored every office he held. He held to a pattern of integrity in an age when the politician was too often the theme of cynics and scoffers and harsh critics. Senator Ransdell as a politician demonstrated that there is a place in this vicarious field for the man who does not yield his principles.

Senator Ransdell would be given a high place in any list of Louisiana's most eminent statesmen and public servants of the last century. His contributions to the general good and welfare of his native Louisiana and of the Nation have been many and notable For many years his voice was strong and effective in behalf of flood prevention and control in Louisiana and for harbor and river improvement. In the United States Senate his influence and vision carried the day for the establishment of the National Health Institute, which has since been expanded into one of the worthiest of United States bureaus.

Senator Ransdell was retired from public life in 1930, by a vote of the people of Louisiana as he sought reelection to his fourth term in the Senate. The State and its people, not Senator Ransdell, suffered by that decision.

The Senator passes on at 95 full of honors and the riches that really count: the general respect and admiration of the people of Louisiana and the esteem of many old colleagues in Congress and the National Government. His memory will live in the hearts of a grateful people.

United States Vexes Allies on German Assets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 3, 1954

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following article written by M. S. Handler is very enlightening. It appeared in the New York Times of July 30, 1954. I commend it to the attention of our colleagues:

UNITED STATES VEXES ALLIES ON GERMAN ASSETS—PROPOSAL TO RETURN PROPERTY SEIZED IN WAR IS VIEWED WITH MISGIVING IN EUROPE

(By M. S. Handler)

BONN, GERMANY, July 29.—A bill approved by the Senate Judiciary Committee authorizing the return of seized property to its former German owners has caused misgivings among Western allies of the United States.

The bill sponsored by Senators Everett M. Dirksen, of Illinois, William E. Jenner, of Indiana, and Hugh Butler, of Nebraska, calls for the return of physical assets still vested in the United States Government and financial compensation for those properties liquidated since World War II and sold to persons in the United States. The properties are said to be worth $450 million.

It was estimated here that Congress would have to appropriate approximately $200 million to reimburse the former German owners for properties already liquidated. Of this sum $190 million would be distributed to West German corporations that once owned industrial plants, patents, and trade-marks in the United States. The remaining $10 million would cover the claims of many persons for insurance policies, pensions, and other items lost during the war.

It is argued that the Senate Judiciary Committee's bill not only would invalidate unilaterally a series of solemn agreements on assets with the wartime allies of the United States, but also would give the West German Government and the industrialists a powerful instrument with which to force such small countries as the Netherlands to surrender German assets seized in lieu of reparations.

1945 AGREEMENT CITED

In 1945 the United States Government entered into an agreement with its allies at the Paris reparations conference to forego reparations from current production on the theory that such reparations would ruin Germany permanently.

The Allies undertook to regard the German assets seized in their respective countries and the machinery dismantled in West Germany as token payment in lieu of reparations. Such payments collected after World War I were regarded as serious economic and political errors.

The next chapter in the history of the seized assets was written near Bonn during the negotiations with the West German Government on the European Defense Community treaty and the Bonn peace contract.

The West German Government agreed that the case of the seized assets was closed and that it would not raise the question in view of the fact that the Allies had foregone reparations. This was put into the peace contract.

The third chapter was written in Allied Occupation Law 63, which stiplated that in the interval between the signing of the peace contract and their implementation the question of the assets was to remain closed until the provisions in the peace contract would bceome operative and put an end to the question.

UNITED STATES WROTE OFF $2 BILLION

The United States Government wrote off $2 billion of West German debts in the London debt agreement last year taking into account the fact that Germany's productive assets in the United States had been seized and would not be returned.

Meanwhile the United States Government has been using some of the earnings from the seized assets to reimburse owners of ships torpedoed during the war, American owners of factories in Germany destroyed during the bombing and fighting, and factories converted into munitions plants by the Nazi Government.

The West Germans could go to the Dutch, the Belgians, the French and others and insist on their doing likewise, although they have given up their reparations claims.

Some of the countries, and in particular the Netherlands, have been able to recover only a minute fraction of the gold and other valuables looted by the German armies of occupation. German negotiators in the case of the Netherlands have contended the seized property was legitimate war booty.

This claim of developments would mean in the end that the allied countries would be heavily indebted to the Germans without any hope of collecting even a part of the losses they suffered from invasion and occupation by the German armies.

Understanding the Enemy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 26, 1954

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, appended hereto is a most informative editorial from the New York Herald Tribune:

UNDERSTANDING THE ENEMY

The American Bar Association's committee on American citizenship has proposed that the theory and practice of communism be taught "in appropriate forms" in all American schools. This instruction, the committee suggests, should be given in conjunction with the teaching of the theory and practice of the United States Government under the Constitution. The association's house of delegates will be asked to approve this proposal at its forthcoming convention in Chicago. It is among the most sensible suggestions for meeting the Communist threat to be advanced in recent months. As the committee says, the nature and danger of the Communist conspiracy could be much better understood if all students were given access to the basic facts.

How well acquainted are Americans with these facts now? Not too well, say sociologists and public-opinion pollsters. Too few of the rising generation are being told the causes and teachings of 19th-century Marxism; how it was perverted by power-thirsty cliques around Lenin, Trotsky, and later Stalin into a monstrous negation of even its own principles; how discontented people everywhere have been duped into accepting its iron dehumanizing discipline.

Not teaching the facts of communism to growing citizens is comparable to excluding medical students from a knowledge of the causes, prevention, and cure of tuberculosis. Public approval of such instruction would follow more public awareness of the problem. Then educators could work out their own curricula along such lines as the bar association committee urges. They will find the best means to a vital end—understanding the enemy.

The Price of Enforced Medical Conformity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. ROBSION, JR.

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 3, 1954

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a statement by Dr. Alfred Rosskamm Ross. He is currently with the United States Army at Fort Knox, Ky., and is a licentiate of the Royal College of Physicians, the Royal College of Surgeons, and the Royal Faculty of Physicians and Surgeons. He has given considerable research and study to the problem of infantile paralysis and has announced a theory of that disease which should be of interest.

THE PRICE OF ENFORCED MEDICAL CONFORMITY

I. INFANTILE PARALYSIS

In my paper Prevention of Infantile Paralysis Epidemics of August 1945, inserted into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 22, 1953, I advanced my theory that overexposure to sunshine is the major cause of infantile-paralysis epidemics. As a camp physician in Sullivan County, N. Y., during the 1944 poliomyelitis epidemic, I kept my children's camp absolutely free from infantile paralysis by strictly preventing the campers from exposure to the sun between 10 a. m. and 4 p. m.

During the 1953 polio epidemic in Allegany County, N. Y., no member of any family, carrying out the following rules, was hit by infantile paralysis:

"Keep out of the sun. Whosoever has to walk or work in the sun must wear a wide-brimmed hat or kerchief and light clothing covering the whole body."

A number of children, who, instead of carrying out these rules, had received antivirus injections, were paralyzed by infantile paralysis. Mr. Charles Caple, mayor of Andover, N. Y., and Mrs. Charlotte Caple can attest to the truth of these statements.

Mr. Fred Shear, chairman of Allegany County supervisors, and Mrs. Hazel Shear can testify that I correctly foretold the uselessness of the mass inoculations fostered by the medical authorities.

In my paper of August 1945, I suggested silver treatment of acute infantile paralysis. I repeat my appeal for its fair clinical trial. In spite of all my efforts, no American Medical Journal has ever negatively mentioned my theories of prevention and cure of poliomyelitis during the last 8 years.

II. PREVENTION OF RHEUMATIC FEVER AND ABUSE OF ANTIBIOTICS

In my paper, Prevention of Rheumatic Fever, of January 1946, inserted into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 17, 1953, I outlined my theory that a diet rich in meat prevents rheumatic fever. In 1950, I repeatedly urged the medical authorities to warn against the indiscriminate use of the antibiotics. Instead of doing so, they countered with the doctrine that the antibiotics are "harmless to man," as printed in the 1952 edition of the Encyclopedia Americana.

On the assumption that rheumatic fever is a sequel to streptococcal infection, the medical authorities advocate the oral administration of penicillin for long periods of time as a precaution, though it has been well known in obstetrical circles that prophylactic administration of penicillin during confinement does not only not prevent streptococcal infection, but on the contrary, increases the morbidity. The continuous administration of penicillin causes hypersensitivity against it, and quite a few of their victims die suddenly when they get a much needed penicillin injection, which ought to have been lifesaving.

As I have found it impossible to have these matters discussed in medical meetings or professional journals anywhere in these United States, I should like to have this statement placed into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, so that my theories might be openly discussed and thoroughly tried out before they could possibly be accepted.

Herbert Hoover

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS E. MARTIN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 30, 1954

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, Congress has paid a highly deserved honor to one of America's greatest statesmen, the Honorable Herbert Hoover, 30th President of the United States, by passing the following resolution:

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States hereby extends to the Honorable Herbert Hoover its greetings and felicitations on the 80th anniversary of his birth, August 10, 1954.

SEC. 2. The Congress expresses its admiration and gratitude to Mr. Hoover for his long years of devoted service to his native land and to the world in general in many different capacities.

SEC. 3. The Congress is especially appreciative of his willingness to accept cheerfully the heavy burden of serving as Chairman of the Second Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, which is an arm of the Congress, in order to complete the work so well begun a few years ago by a similar commission under his chairmanship.

SEC. 4. The Congress expresses the hope and desire that divine providence may permit Herbert Hoover to be spared to give many more productive years of honored service to humanity and to his beloved country.

SEC. 5. A copy of this resolution shall be transmitted to America's elder statesman, the Honorable Herbert Hoover.

President Hoover was born and spent his early years of childhood in West Branch, Iowa. I am proud indeed that President Hoover's birthplace is in the congressional district it has been my privilege to represent in Congress for the past 16 years.

It was my privilege to attend the great celebration of President Hoover's birthday at West Branch, Iowa, August 10, 1948, when some 20,000 friends, neighbors, and admirers of President Hoover gathered together to honor him on that occasion.

Last winter the Iowa State Legislature established a special commission to plan a fitting celebration of President Hoover's 80th birthday and present indications are that one of the greatest throngs ever to assemble in the Middle West will meet at West Branch, August 10, this year to honor President Hoover and extend him their best wishes for many happy returns of the day. I look forward with great pleasure to joining with his host of friends in extending our high regard to Herbert Hoover—Iowa's distinguished son who has established such a magnificent record as one of the most outstanding leaders of our time.

GM Net Earnings Soar to $425,250,383 in Half

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 3, 1954

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article which appeared in the New York Times entitled "GM Net Earnings Soar to $425,250,383 in Half":

GM Net Earnings Soar to $425,250,383 in Half—Profit a Year Earlier Was $312,854,787—Tax Bill Cut From $764,446,000 to $457,948,000—Sales Off 7 Percent

The General Motors Corp., world's largest manufacturing enterprise, rolled up a record $883,198,383 in earnings before taxes in the first 6 months of this year. This exceeded the previous peak of $803,673,389 reached in the initial half of 1950.

Sales for the 6 months this year were 7 percent below the record volume of the 1953 period, largely because of a 22 percent drop in defense business.

Net income after taxes was $425,250,383, equal to $4.79 a common share. In the corresponding half of 1953, the net was $312,845,787, or $3.51 a share.

Provision for taxes totaled $457,948,000, in contrast to the $764,446,000 tax bill a year earlier, which included excess-profits taxes.

Net sales totaled $5,066,028,511, against $5,440,545,856. Of the total, sales of civilian products were $4,328,000,000 and defense, $738 million, against $4,499,000,000 and $942 million, respectively, a year ago.

In the report issued for publication today, Harlow H. Curtice, president, and Alfred P. Sloan, Jr., board chairman, said the level of sales in the first half had confirmed the confidence in the business outlook expressed by the company last January. At that time, Mr. Curtice said, G. M. announced a billion-dollar expansion program, while many pessimistic statements were being issued. This confidence, the report noted, is now being reflected by many others.

Sales for the second quarter were close to the record levels of the June quarter a year ago. The total was $2,655,870,957, against $2,893,691,134. Civilian sales were $2,309,000,000 and defense $347 million. A year ago they were $2,408,000,000 and $486 million, respectively.

Net income for the june quarter * * * $2.66 a common share, compared with $161,583,911, or $1.81 a share. The tax bill was a major factor in the substantial gain. It was cut to $256,084,000 from $418,882,000 for the 3 months to June 30, 1953.

The 1954 second-quarter earnings before taxes were at a record for the period, totaling $492,167,050. This exceeded the previous record of $469,314,624 earned in the second quarter of 1950. The net for that period was $272,889,624, with taxes taking $196,425,000.

Sales of passenger cars manufactured in the United States in the 6 months totaled 1,525,046, against 1,539,868 last year, while trucks and coaches were 229,930, against 285,146. Total sales of all motor vehicles manufactured in company plants in the United States, Canada, and overseas came to 2,020,421 units, against 2,077,335.

Second-quarter sales of passenger cars manufactured in the United States were 819,745 against 848,383, while the total from all sources was 1,063,817, against 1,120,276.

"Currently, the market for new cars after many years of shortages is characterized by a return to the normal competitive conditions which prevailed in the years prior to 1942," the report said. "Car buyers have the opportunity, in most instances, to be selective in their purchases."

More About Salaries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 3, 1954

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to commend to the attention of our colleagues the following editorials which have appeared in various newspapers throughout the country, urging salary increases for Members of Congress and our Federal judges. They were enclosed with a letter I received from Morris B. Mitchell, chairman of the committee on judicial selection, tenure, and compensation of the American Bar Association which has already been made a part of the Record.

The editorials follow:

[From the Trenton (N. J.) Trentonian, May 3, 1954]

Howell Questionnaire Results Are Revealed

(By Charles R. Howell, Congressman, Fourth (Mercer-Burlington) District)

Tabulations have been made of the first 2,000 returns of my sixth annual legislative questionnaire, and the results are given below. When the poll is completed, I will probably have in the neighborhood of 4,000 questionnaires to report on. The results of this questionnaire are always of great value to me in understanding how the people of Burlington and Mercer Counties feel on the important issues of the day, and I hope all of you who have received questionnaires will fill them out and return them to me so that I can have the benefit of your opinions.

1. Increase postal rates on following to put post office on self-supporting basis:

a. First-class mail (letters): Yes, 866 or 46 percent; no, 1,019 or 54 percent.

b. Second class (newspapers): Yes, 1,388 or 75 percent; no, 451 or 25 percent.

c. Third class (circulars): Yes, 1,780 or 89 percent; no, 213 or 11 percent.

2. Have United States Steel pay part of cost of deepening Delaware River Channel to 40 feet. Yes, 1,497 or 81 percent; no, 361 or 19 percent.

3. Continue program of Federal loans to build public-housing units for low-income families. Yes, 1,487 or 74 percent; no, 513 or 26 percent.

4. Change Taft-Hartley labor law in following way:

a. Give greater rights to employers: 382 or 21 percent.

b. Give greater rights to workers: 410 or 22 percent.

c. Repeal completely: 323 or 18 percent.

d. Leave it as now stands: 718 or 39 percent.

5. Believe the program of Federal support for farm prices should be:

a. Continued at present level: 402 or 20 percent.

b. Continued, but at lower level: 1,133 or 57 percent.

c. Discontinued completely: 457 or 23 percent.

6. United States should join with Canada in construction of St. Lawrence seaway. Yes, 1,674 or 84 percent; no, 319 or 16 percent.

7. United States join with other nations in pooling some nonmilitary atomic data to initiate peaceful uses of atomic energy. Yes, 1,480 or 74 percent; no, 519 or 26 percent.

8. Strengthen United Nations into a limited world federation without authority in domestic affairs. Yes, 1,401 or 72 percent; no, 544 or 28 percent.

9. Favor the new United States military policy of main reliance on atomic weapons and air power and less on ground forces and conventional weapons. Yes, 1,232 or 66 percent; no, 637 or 34 percent.

10. Change Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act and tariff laws to:

a. Permit more trade between United States and other countries: 1,539 or 78 percent.

b. Permit less trade between United States and other countries: 73 or 4 percent.

c. Leave as it now stands: 357 or 18 percent.

11. Favor proposal to increase salaries of Congressmen, Senators, and Federal judges. Yes, 1,320 or 69 percent; no, 600 or 31 percent.

[From the Arkansas Gazette of April 27, 1954]

Public Pay

The reluctance of any Congressman to vote himself a pay raise during an election year is understandable—even though most thinking people today would agree that our Federal legislators are underpaid. But it is particularly unfortunate in view of the timing involved that the proposal to raise the pay of the Federal judiciary is coupled with pending boosts for the legislative branch, and thus is also stalled.

In 1953, Congress authorized a salary study by an 18-member Commission which reported back in on January 15. It recommended a boost in congressional salaries from $15,000 (including a $2,500 allowance as well as tax benefits) to $27,500. It also recommended raises for the Vice President and Speaker and suggested increases for Federal judges ranging from $12,500 for district judges (for a total of $27,500) to $14,500 for Justices of the Supreme Court (for a total of $39,500). Still another measure, now in committee, would call for flat $10,000-a-year raises for Members of Congress and comparable boosts for Federal judges.

If, as appears probable, the Congressmen are going to continue to shy off from any pay increase for themselves, it would appear logical that the judicial pay item be placed in a separate bill and the recommendations of the 1953 Commission followed. Its report pointed out clearly that neither congressional nor judicial salaries have kept pace with the increased responsibilities and workloads of the offices. It also pointed out that substantially higher salaries are paid by industry to executives in positions of less responsibility, and that the pay of both legislators and jurists is well behind the rise in the cost of living. As an example the case of the late Chief Justice Vinson might be cited. After many years of distinguished service to the Nation, both in Congress and the Federal judiciary, he left a total estate of $7,163—against which were outstanding debts amounting to $6,000. Our public servants deserve better than that.

[From the New Orleans States of April 26, 1954]

Pay Bills Stalled

Why Congressmen should be reticent in asking more pay this year is apparent, with political campaigning what it is. But their feigned election-year bashfulness has tied up a prospective salary increase for Federal judges. Pay for jurists and lawmakers is combined in a single bill.

More than 3 months ago an advisory commission of 18 men filed with the National Legislature a report embodying these recommendations, among others: Raises ranging from $12,500 annually for Federal district judges to $14,500 for Supreme Court Justices and an increase of $12,500 in congressional pay.

The House bill covering the higher pay is gathering dust in the Judiciary Committee. Members of the lower House are reluctant to press for action because all must stand for election. In the upper House, where one-third of the Members face the electorate, there is the same reluctance, heightened by the fact that congressional pensions were upped this year by $7,500.

A last year's bill on the Senate Calendar is also stymied. It would give a flat $10,000-a-year increase to lawmakers and judges alike.

It doesn't seem to make much difference that the advisory committee's report in January pointed out that legislative and judicial salaries have not kept pace with living costs, nor have they matched salaries in private industry. What some inventive American should come up with is blinders that will work on skittish Congressmen like they work on skittish horses.

[From the Baton Rouge State-Times of May 22, 1954]

Capital Buzzsaw

(By Bascom Timmons)

Washington.—It's a wonder to behold what some Members of Congress will sacrifice for the privilege of sitting for another 2 years or more in the leather-covered seats on the Senate and House floors.

Most Members of the House already have decided to toss a $12,500 a year pay raise out the window in favor of appearing before the voters this fall with hands untainted by the added salary.

Congressmen, like corporation directors, shy away from boosting their own salaries—especially during an election year—and they're the only ones who can do it.

This understandable attack of cold feet apparently has doomed recommended pay raises for Senators, Representatives, Federal judges, members of the Supreme Court, and Vice President Richard Nixon, at least for the current session of Congress.

It's still too early to flatly predict that pay raise legislation is dead because there is considerable agitation for more money by many Congressmen without an outside source of income.

The House has passed the buck to the Senate, preferring to let the more select body initiate any pay raise legislation. The House leadership is aware that only one-third of the 96 Senators must go before the voters in November, whereas every House seat is in dispute.

Already on the Senate Consent Calendar is a bill which would increase congressional salaries from the present $15,000 a year to $25,000.

The last time it came up for consideration on a call of the calendar—earlier this month—Senator Wayne Morse, Independent, Oregon, objected to it. Bills on the Consent Calendar can be blocked by one objection or a request that they be passed over without prejudice.

As long as Morse is around the Senate, the measure has no chance of passage on the Consent Calendar. Morse has made his position on proposed pay raises clear on a number of occasions.

Senator Pat McCarran, Democrat, Nevada, has introduced amendments to the measure which would bring it in line wth the recommendations of a salary commission set up last year to study the question of judicial and congressional salaries. The Commission recommended that the pay of Representatives, Delegates, and Senators be boosted to $27,500 per year, with the Government also paying the cost of six round trips per year between Washington and the home district for each Congressman.

One interesting feature of the whole ticklish situation grows out of Congress' attempt to prod itself into quick action on what some impartial observers term a "badly needed" pay boost.

With as much conviction as a confirmed alcoholic ordering himself to stay on the wagon, Congress in passing the resolution setting up the commission ordered itself to consider the commission's findings and "enact legislation" implementing them within 60 legislative days.

Without much notice, the 60 legislative days slipped by the other day. The Congress collectively now finds itself in the position of violating a law of the land by not acting within the allotted time.

The reason? A resoution passed by Congress and signed by the President becomes the law of the land and the word "shall" has always been interpreted as exclusive of congressional intent.

Congress, of course, isn't going to prosecute itself for ignoring its own edict. In fact, the words "shall enact" were put in the resolution to avoid a more strongly worded Senate provision.

The Senate resolution setting up the salary commission originally provided that if Congress did not act on the group's recommendations within 60 legislative days, the recommendations would become law.

House legal experts raised their constitutional eyebrows at this wording and got the House to strike out the Senate provision. In a subsequent conference, the Senate agreed to accept the much milder "shall enact" wording, which in effect meant nothing.

The ticklish question of raising congressional salaries is not a party issue. It's a two-horned dilemma which is summed up by one member in the following: "I need the raise, I deserve it, but what's the sense of voting for it if the man who beats me because of it is going to get the gravy?"

[From the Springfield News of May 29, 1954]

Pay of Congress

It is regrettable—though understandable that Members of Congress are reluctant to raise their own pay, for fear of disfavor with voters.

Talk has been heard around Washington for years of raising the pay of Members of the House and Senate, along with the salaries of Federal judges; but so far, bills along that line never have been considered on the floor of either House.

For a time, it appeared a bill calling for a congressional pay hike from the present $15,000 to $25,000 might come up in the House this year. But the bill is being allowed to die in the Judiciary Committee with no action in sight.

Members of the House, practically all of whom face reelection this year, will not take the leadership for a pay raise. Members of the Senate, about a third of whom face voters in 1954, also are hesitant. Congressmen are in the awkward position of being the only government officials who vote on their own salary.

Hardly anyone can doubt that legislators—and Federal judges need a raise. Even an increase to $25,000 would give Congressmen a salary of less purchasing power than they had in 1939. Congressmen and judges have had no pay raise since 1946.

Certainly it is to the advantage of the whole nation that Congressmen and judges are paid enough to encourage the highest caliber seekers for those positions. No one expects government service to be remunerative, but it is important that no one be denied the opportunity to serve simply because he does not have private means of support.

[From the Waco Farm and Labor Journal of May 28, 1954]

More Pay for Our Congressmen

The Federal Treasury must be full. The House Appropriations Committee voted Wednesday to give House Members $5,600 a year each in additional expense funds but pointedly ignored proposals to raise congressional salaries.

In addition to the increased expense allowances for House Members, the measure would provide a modest hike for the Federal judiciary and cuts in requests by the Library of Congress, Government Printing Office, and Office of the Capitol Architect.

The House group, in accordance with custom, voted no funds for the Senate. The Senate will put its own money into the bill.

While no legislation has been approved, the committee could have included in the bill to carry out proposals to raise congressional salaries to as much as $25,000 a year. Congressmen and Senators now get $12,500 plus $2,500 in expenses, all taxable.

And maybe the new salaries proposed are not too much. We have a friend in Washington, D. C., with a salary of $10,000 a year. He said he paid $2,500 income taxes or thereabouts and $2,500 rent each year. He said the National Capital was the most expensive place to live in the Nation. So maybe a good Congressman is well worth the money.

Overwhelming Victory Acclaims Senator Johnson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER THORNBERRY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 3, 1954

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, July 24, the people of Texas, in their Democratic primary, expressed a great vote of confidence in Senator Lyndon B. Johnson, senior Senator from Texas, and Democratic leader of the Senate. In this Democratic primary Senator Johnson was renominated by a vote of approximately 875,674, representing 72 percent of the total votes cast. He led his opponent by more than half a million votes.

I have the privilege of representing the 10th Congressional District of Texas, the district which was so ably represented by Senator Johnson prior to his election to the United States Senate. In the July 30 issue of the Austin American, Austin, Tex., there appears an editorial acclaiming this great victory for Senator Johnson. In my opinion, the editorial effectively points out why the people of Texas have expressed such confidence in Senator Johnson, and I therefore insert it in the Congressional Record for today:

Overwhelming Victory Acclaims Senator Johnson

The voters' verdict last Saturday was a measure of the stature of Texas' senior United States Senator, Lyndon B. Johnson.

It was a recognition of his services to Texas and to the Nation, an acknowledgment of the prestige he has gained by ability and arduous work in his post of public service.

Johnson was a candidate for a second term. He had as his opponent a wealthy Texan of a long-established and well-known family. His opponent embraced a ticket of extreme nationalism and isolation, whose overtone, of course, is a play to patriotism.

Approximately 3 out of 4 of all Texas voters went to the polls and recorded their approval of Lyndon Johnson, their confidence in his leadership in Washington, their desire that he continue to serve Texas in the Senate.

This victory—Johnson received 72 percent of the votes, and led his opponent by over 508,000 votes—was even more impressive in that Johnson did not leave his post of duty in Washington to make a political campaign. By reason of his ability and his energy, his devotion to the Democratic Party and the principles for which it stands, he had been elevated to the post of Senate Democratic leader. He is the youngest ever to hold that post. Congress has been in a session of extreme importance to the Nation and its security, and to the future peace and security of the free world.

The Senate is evenly divided between Republican and Democratic members. Many measures relating to foreign affairs and America's relation with the free nations and their common defense against Red aggression, were to be considered. Johnson disregarded the possible political consequences of ignoring his opponent. He stayed on the job in Washington. That, as well as his record over the past 6 years, obviously met with overwhelming approval of his constituents.

Johnson will begin his second Senate term in January, strengthened and backed up by the overwhelming vote of confidence of the Texas citizenship.

Two factors exemplify his statesmanship. One points back to his home State, the other reaches into the realm of world security.

He has avoided being drawn into the deep and hurtful cleavage of Democratic Party factionalism in Texas. His support and overwhelming majority of votes came obviously from all segments of the Texas electorate. He has been, and continues to be the Senator of all Texas, not merely one side of an intraparty dispute.

No major legislation could get through Congress without support of Democrats. Senator Johnson is the recognized spokesman of the Democrats in the Senate. His attitude has been that America's future security and welfare is not a politically partisan matter. He has looked upon internal legislation as well as foreign affairs from the viewpoint of the Nation's welfare, rather than a political party's advantage.

His Texas constituents told the Nation how highly they regard Lyndon Johnson by their vote Saturday.

Brooklyn's Negroes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 3, 1954

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to direct the attention of our colleagues to the following very interesting articles on the progress of our Negro citizens in Brooklyn.

These articles are part of a series, which began in the Brooklyn Eagle of July 25, 1954. The following article is the seventh in this series and appeared in the Eagle of July 31, 1954:

Church Attendance Among Negroes Soars in Brooklyn

(By Sig Frigand)

Rising high above the corner of Marcy and Putnam Avenues in Bedford-Stuyvesant is the impressive framework of the new Concord Baptist Church.

The steel lattice-work, soaring skyward, is most symbolic of the renewed spiritual faith among Brooklyn's Negroes.

Historically, Negroes have vigorously supported their churches; and their churches, like the African Methodist Episcopal Church, the A. M. E. Zion and the African Orthodox, are among Brooklyn's oldest.

The African denominational churches still flourish here, as do other Protestant churches with which our Negroes have affiliated themselves. The Brooklyn division of the Protestant Council estimates there are more than 100 Negro churches in Brooklyn and countless more that are interracial in membership.

Despite a rich church tradition, the Negroes' disillusionment and privations through the centuries took its toll—especially among young people—with the result that there was a falling off in church attendance during the 1930's and 1940's.

Today, Brooklyn's Negroes are going to church in ever-increasing numbers. The reasons for the increased attendance are many; but the underlying pattern seems the same—a revitalized faith in God, born out of the accomplishments of the Negro in Brooklyn during the past decade.

Reflecting the renewed religious stirrings are Brooklyn's young Negro ministers—men who have bolstered their Bible training with sociological study, giving them an acute awareness of the material as well as the spiritual needs of their parishioners.

The Reverend Dr. Gardner C. Taylor, who will grace the pulpit of the newly rebuilt Concord Baptist Church, is typical of the young, aggressive Negro ministry in Brooklyn.

Since taking over the clerical chores at Concord Church 6 years ago, Dr. Taylor has watched his congregation increase 25 percent—with the staggering total of 8,400 members on the church rolls and about 5,000 actively attending church.

The tall, meticulously dressed minister, trained at Leland and Oberlin Colleges, can chat with equal facility about things theological or Junior Gilliam's ability to make the double play for the Dodgers. His chief concerns, however, are the problems facing the members of his congregation.

Dr. Taylor explained that he feels it important to use his pulpit to help his parishioners help themselves, not only spiritually, but to make them aware of their civic and political responsibilities.

One of Brooklyn's clerical pioneers in civic participation is the Reverend John M. Coleman, rector of St. Philip's Protestant Episcopal Church, who for more than two decades has spotlighted the importance of the minister's role in the body politic.

Since 1946 Mr. Coleman has been active in making educational policy—first on the board of higher education (he was the first Negro to serve on that board) and 2 years later on the board of education, where he still serves.

The St. Philip's rector, a former redcap at Grand Central Station, recently realized one of his ambitions to better serve the youth of his community with the dedication of a new, modernized parish house at 265 Decatur Street.

With the help of his congregation—which has multiplied many times over since he became rector—Mr. Coleman has provided more clubrooms and other facilities for the youth of the community.

ACTIVITIES FOR THE AGED

The needs of youth are not unlike the needs of the aged, whose free time can prove to be a liability unless correctly channeled.

In this department, Rev. Milton A. Galamison, 31-year-old minister of the Siloam Presbyterian Church, has shown the way with the establishment recently of a community program for the aged at the church.

The program, sponsored by seven fraternities and sororities with the encouragement of the Department of Welfare, is nonsectarian, interracial in scope, and provides facilities for older folks to pursue hobbies and crafts.

The handsome young minister came to Siloam 6 years ago, when he was 25 years old. Since that time, his congregation—made up of a large percentage of professionals and white-collar workers—has doubled in size.

Mr. Galamison was gratified that the congregation's size had swelled because "the church is the chief social area in this community * * * the chief platform for adult education."

The Presbyterian minister, like Dr. Taylor, named housing as the greatest single problem facing the Negroes in Brooklyn.

"As long as there is an iron band of residential segregation around us," Dr. Taylor said, "the same situation will be reflected in our schools, our churches, and other institutions. * * *"

"A new home just isn't available to the Negro," Mr. Galamison said with some bitterness. "Second-hand homes, second-hand churches; that has been our history.

"The Negro is often the butt of jokes," he continued, "because he'll spend all his money to purchase a big, flashy automobile. It doesn't occur to many people that the big car is the only new thing of appreciable value that he can buy.

"Second-handedness" has become a spiritual problem, too, the young minister revealed. "After a degree of time, a feeling that you are inferior develops along with a contempt for yourself." It takes hard work and a long time to shatter this distorted self-portrait, he added.

MANY CATHOLICS, TOO

Although Brooklyn's Negroes constitute one of the largest Protestant blocs in the borough, the Catholic Church has gained many worshippers among the Negroes.

The Reverend Archibald V. McLees, pastor of Holy Rosary Church at 141 Chauncey Street, estimates that 3 percent of Brooklyn's Negro population are now Catholics.

Father McLees, a pleasant, cigar-smoking Irishman, whose congregation is about 95 percent Negro, is one of the most active fighters for interracial harmony and understanding in Brooklyn.

Aware of the pressing needs for good schooling, Father McLees has opened the doors of the Holy Rosary Parochial School to Protestant as well as Catholic children. The school now has about 800 children in attendance under the direction of Sister Mary Edmond.

As a member of NAACP, the Urban League, the Catholic Interracial Council, and the Brooklyn Human Relations Council, Father McLees is well equipped to spread the concepts of understanding and harmony among fellow Brooklynites.

"You must face the fact," he said, "that Negroes are, and will continue to be, your neighbors."

Mr. Speaker, the following article is the eighth in this series. It appeared in the Brooklyn Eagle of August 1, 1954:

Negroes in Search of Decent Housing Caught in Squeeze

(By Sid Frigand)

If you're a Negro living in Brooklyn, you have two types of housing available to you: helping-hand or hand-me-down.

The Government-subsidized helping-hand housing is available to a proportionately small number of persons who qualify for low-cost or middle-cost developments. There are many, many Negroes who meet the requirements for such housing, but there just aren't enough of the new buildings around to meet the demand.

According to the Housing Authority, the waiting list for new and existing projects far exceeds all available dwelling units.

As a result, Brooklyn's Negroes (whose average yearly income is almost $1,000 a year lower than the Brooklyn average) must bide their time in substandard slum sections or pay exorbitant rent for more desirable dwellings.

The city housing authority has performed yeoman service in providing decent homes for many of Brooklyn's housing-starved Negroes. According to the latest available figures, 8,411 (or 37.6 percent) of the 22,369 families living in Brooklyn city-run projects are Negroes.

If the breakdown is focused on low-cost developments, the percentage of Negroes rises to 44 percent.

This percentage, although proportionately high as compared to the fact that Negroes comprise only 10 percent of the borough population, more nearly reaches the ratio in our slum areas—where roughly half of all blighted housing is occupied by Negroes.

Slum areas are not peculiar to any one race of people—many a Brooklynite who came here from Manhattan's teeming East Side can attest to that.

Slums are created through the unholy wedlock of poverty and neglect; impoverished tenants and neglected homeowners, whose wretchedness is nurtured by lax enforcement of housing laws. This wedlock has proved prolific, with its blighted off-spring spilling into new areas each year.

Virtually all of our recent immigrant groups—the Irish, Jews, Italians—have known and inhabited substandard houses.

Nearly all of these have gone on to better housing as their incomes improved and their status in the community accepted.

Many Negroes living in desperate housing conditions are financially able and quite willing to move to better homes. But, unlike their predecessors in the slums, have no place to go, despite the fact that Brooklyn is considered a good place to live by most Negroes.

A Negro, for all practical purposes, still can't purchase a new house in Brooklyn.

A Negro still has no access to the free private housing market in Brooklyn.

A Negro can purchase a hand-me-down house—but only at the risk of being financially hog-tied by avaricious speculators.

A Negro can rent in limited areas—but only at the cost of enormous rentals, crowded conditions or poor service.

The National Association for the Advancement of Colored People and the Urban League are acutely aware of the dilemma. They have been exerting unyielding pressure on our legislators and administrators to meet the problem head-on.

Nathan Burnett, youthful director of the Brooklyn Urban League, pointed out that the middle-income Negro is caught in a squeeze.

"Where can we get houses for Negroes," he asked, "when the only access to the free housing market is closed by private owners' segregation policies?"

Limited housing, of course, leads to lucrative sources of income for the few who are in a position to benefit.

"See that building?" Mr. Burnett pointed through his office window to the rear of a building fronting on Pacific Street. "You can rent a 2-room apartment there for $110 a month. That's a rent comparable to Prospect Park West."

What about the Negro who has saved a little money and wants to buy a house? He can't "shop around" in new housing developments in the borough and pick out a suitable house. Builders, many of them sympathetic, have "business reasons" for not selling to a Negro.

Most Negroes avoid looking at new houses for this reason—they expect refusal and want desperately to avoid embarrassment to themselves or to the builder. No one likes to be spurned and the best way to prevent it is to avoid the situation that might provoke it.

What's left? Plenty of used houses. The Eagle classified ads are filled with them. Half of these houses can be eliminated immediately on the same grounds as new houses. The other half may be available—but chances are the speculator will get there first.

Approximately one-third of Brooklyn is now termed a speculator's area—where buying and selling of houses for huge profits propagates new slum areas year after year.

The speculator successfully earns his living by buying shabby, rundown houses within slum sections and reselling them—violations and all—to house-hungry buyers at huge price markups.

Even more frightening is the speculator's role in so-called fringe areas, where 1 or 2 Negro families live among whites. Here his success formula is based on man's lack of understanding of his fellow man—an ugly word, "prejudice."

The speculator begins by softening up the neighborhood home owners with a barrage of postcards—"Your neighborhood is changing. I have a cash customer for your house"—or, he sends little Negro boys bearing circulars on a doorbell-ringing tour.

The so-called panic is on, with the latent fears of homeowners fired by the high-pressure spiel of the speculator. From here on it's easy pickings. The speculator, usually working through a dummy purchaser, buys house after house from panicked owners and resells them to eager buyers at an average profit of $5,000 per sale.

The high price and the strangling mortgage terms immediately put the purchaser in a position that compels him to let his newly acquired house deteriorate.

Furthermore, the speculator will suggest that the new owner can meet high costs by renting out a room or two—$20 a week is standard. Soon a healthy block deteriorates into poorly maintained rows of boarding houses.

The holdouts—those that didn't panic—give up in disgust. They wearily subscribe to the story that Negroes devaluate property and move on to a new neighborhoods, leaving a bona fide slum section in their wake.

There are sections of Brooklyn that are not giving in that easily to the siren song of the speculators. Negroes have moved into so-called white neighborhoods with little fanfare and much success.

Wherever homeowners have refused to panic, property values have remained normal—or even risen.

Some city authorities, cognizant of this situation, warned that unless the speculator is checked he will "create a vicious cycle that will cause enormous destruction to entire communities in Great New York."

Mr. Speaker, the following article is the ninth in this series. It appeared in the Brooklyn Eagle of August 2, 1954:

Obstacles to Decent Housing for Negroes Begin To Give Way

(By Sid Frigand)

The great middle class always has had to shift for itself in this town.

The city, for some time now, has recognized its responsibilities to provide decent shelter for its low-income families, but the middle-income groups have traditionally scratched around for housing on their own—and fared pretty well.

Our ever-expanding Negro middle class, however, has not met with such success; first, because of a closed-door policy on the part of most private homeowners; second, because of a similar policy by house builders, and third, because of the high financial toll exacted for second-hand houses by real-estate speculators.

Each of these stumbling blocks is proving to be vulnerable—either to legislation, education or, most important, good business sense.

Our legislators' growing concern over this problem has been most active in city council, where our councilmen have been working industriously to turn back the blighted housing tide, and, at the same time, create more housing opportunities for those who have been denied in the past.

The latter concept was dealt with courageously last July 6 when the Charkey-Brown-Isaacs law forbidding discrimination in FHA-insured housing was signed. The new law is expected to cover about 12,000 new or rehabilitated houses in New York City each year.

Mrs. Hortense W. Gabel, director of the New York State Committee on Discrimination in Housing, pointed out that 82,841 new multifamily units, representing more than 85 percent of the apartments built in the city, were insured by FHA during the period 1946–52. Brooklyn and Queens, where most of the building has been done, had about 95 percent of their housing FHA insured.

Mostly for Whites

"Only 893 of these FHA-insured units had been made available to nonwhites," Mrs. Gabel declared. "All of these were tenanted on a segregated basis and only 1 project, comprising some 200 units, was built in areas of predominantly white occupancy."

The city council has also taken up the cudgels against the real-estate speculators who have made fortunes from our slums—and who have manufactured more slums to make more fortunes.

The slum makers have capitalized on two important frailties of our Brooklyn environment—the desperate housing situation of the Negro and the fear of invasion by nearby white homeowners.

Within the blighted areas speculators buy and sell dilapidated buildings, filled with violations and broken down into rooming houses, at spectacular profits. The purchasers are usually paying second, third, or fourth mortgages to keep the property and have little ability to improve or maintain the building. It soon falls into utter disrepair—a hopeless slum, a firetrap.

In the nearby fringe areas speculators will seek out blocks where 1 or 2 Negro families live and attempt to panic the other homeowners into selling their houses. Too often they succeed and the houses, in turn, are sold at higher prices to families that can less afford to buy them.

Brooklyn Councilman Joseph T. Sharkey, in introducing a resolution calling for the investigation of these speculative practices, said it created a vicious cycle which, "if not stopped by appropriate legislation * * * will grow and multiply, causing enormous destruction to entire communities within Greater New York."

A committee, headed by Queens Councilman Eric Treulich, has quietly set about to investigate the machinations of the slum makers.

City Hall observers have reported that several brokers and real-estate agents—some who have earned more than a half-million dollars through speculation—have been subpenaed or invited to testify before the committee.

It is believed that much of the committee's findings will be made public this fall in open hearings.

REMEDIES NOT ADOPTED

Assemblyman Bernard Austin, who is serving as counsel to the council committee, has already introduced 13 bills in the State legislature aimed at curbing some of the evils described earlier. Unfortunately, none of the bills was passed.

The obvious legislative approach to curbing speculation in slum and fringe areas is to take the profit out of such practices and to set up sale-transaction machinery that would discourage the speculator.

Other stopgap laws could prevent conversion of buildings to rooming houses; stop mortgage foreclosures on properties where the owners are paying huge payments—sometimes almost equal to his rent income; prohibit the "as is" sale of buildings having serious violations or illegal occupancies, and set up stricter supervision and investigation of buildings changing ownership.

For years, it has been axiomatic that the colored dollar could buy anything except housing. Recently, however, the building industry has become increasingly aware of that colored dollar, which represents a large percentage of the dollars being waved in the face of the industry for low and middle-cost dwellings.

A few faint lights on the horizon are beginning to appear in the building industry, which may be the vanguard of progressive building programs for the nonwhite minorities.

Just last year the National Association of Home Builders established a minority housing committee with an ambitious goal of constructing 150,000 units this year. Regional committees have also sprung up—the Long Island Association of Home Builders being among them.

An even more important development along these lines was the establishment of a minority housing committee by the influential Mortgage Bankers Association. This new committee will work to channel mortgage credit into housing for minority groups.

In the past, the reluctance by financial institutions to invest in minority housing has proved to be one of the biggest bars to construction of new dwellings. Many banks in Brooklyn have since opened up and are willing to finance new or rehabilitated dwellings for Negroes.

As the Negro wins more and more permanent places in our economic structure, he becomes less and less of a financial security risk. Hard-headed businessmen appear ready, at long last, to consider him a good investment.

Washington Attorney's Attitude Toward Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL ELLIOTT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 3, 1954

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I am anxious to include an address delivered by my friend Mr. T. S. Settle, attorney and counselor at law here in Washington. Mr. Settle delivered this address entitled "Why I Respect and Admire the Congress of the United States," before the Federal Bar Association in Washington, D. C., on March 24, 1937. I commend its reading to every Member of Congress.

The address follows:

WHY I RESPECT AND ADMIRE THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES

(By T. S. Settle)

"I respect and admire," those are strong words to use portraying one's attitude toward the 531 men and women on Capitol Hill, elected by the people to represent "We, the people of the United States." They were chosen deliberately, however, by the speaker who has been appearing before committees of Congress for the last 20 years, advocating civic and welfare legislation; who was reared within 75 miles of the Capitol; who was educated at the university founded by the statesman who did so much to found this Nation—Thomas Jefferson; and who in his studies in logic and in law, believes that he got some training in separating the wheat from the chaff. These personal experiences with Congress have been in 2 Democratic and 3 Republican administrations, and are, therefore, strictly nonpartisan.

The speaker respectfully submits four reasons as the basis of this respect and admiration. They are:

1. I respect the high, holy, and powerful office of the Members of Congress;
2. I respect and admire them for their favorable comparison with the people whom they represent;
3. I respect and admire them for their diligent, honest, and patriotic labors;
4. I respect and admire them, because Congress, under the Constitution, is the "city council" of the Nation's Capital—the District of Columbia.

In the short time at the disposal of the speaker, it will be impossible to adequately prove the four reasons given above. He will therefore follow the tip of a certain lawyer wit who said in his own case, "I don't have to prove this, I admit it; let the other side disprove it." The speaker will, however, submit a few favorable exhibits.

I respect their high, holy, and powerful office. I am one of those who believe that an all-wise Divinity brooded over the founding of the United States of America, and especially over the deliberations of the Constitutional Convention of 1787. A Divinity has shaped our ends, rough-hewn them though we have. A farsighted and much harassed band of patriots drew our Constitution, and in the forefront of that document stated, "All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States." When I read further that this Congress is empowered to declare war and make peace; to regulate our foreign commerce; to tax both directly or indirectly; coin money; to regulate our interstate commerce, growing so rapidly through the coming of the railroads, improved highways, telegraph, telephone, and radio; and that they are empowered to provide for the general welfare and "empowered to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution these powers," I tremble at the power reposed in these 531 officials. They literally carry in their legislative power the welfare, prosperity, the happiness, and the destiny of 130 million people. I thank God that their daily ressions are opened with prayer to the Ruler of the Universe. The substance of all such prayers should be "for wisdom to properly cope with their gigantic and perplexing problems and courage to always do the right as revealed unto them."

Yes; I admire them as representatives of the people. It is my good fortune from year to year to appear before and mingle with many diversified groups of people. Sometimes bar associations, local, State, and national; sometimes conventions of local and national planning experts; sometimes church groups, composed of bishops, ministers, and laymen; sometimes citizens' associations; and I say, unhesitatingly, that those on Capitol Hill compare very favorably with any of the above-mentioned groups. I would trust the average Member of Congress under severe temptation, under severe pressure politically, financially, and lobbying equally as far as the average member of any of the above-mentioned groups.

Here I submit exhibit A: This Federal Bar Association in the last several years has had many speakers appear before it—attorneys general, presidents of bar associations, and others. Within the past month, there appeared before this association, Senators Barkley, O'Mahoney, Bailey, and Representatives Bloom and Harlan. I ask you, "How do these gentlemen from Capitol Hill compare with other speakers I have cited?" I might also submit as exhibit B our honored and distinguished vice president, Addison D. Smith, who for 20 years served in the House of Representatives, and voted for much of the legislation that I will discuss later.

Allow me to submit another exhibit. Last week, I received a peremptory call to appear before the House Committee on Military Affairs. The committee was called to order promptly at the appointed hour, and the chairman stated about as follows:

"Gentlemen, we have with us Mr. Settle, secretary and legislative representative of the National Capital Park and Planning Commission. He informs me that his Commission is meeting at this hour on very important matters, so in order to accommodate him, if there is no objection, we will rearrange our program, skip to item 5, and take up the Lee Boulevard bill. The committee readily agreed. The chairman then asked if the National Capital Park and Planning Commission approved this legislation.

"They do.

"Will you then explain why and the purpose of the bill?"

I explained that the Commission was directed by Congress to make plans both for Washington and its environs; that the Commission had several years ago envisioned and planned a great highway, extending from the Lincoln Memorial across the bridge leading to the former home of Robert E. Lee, skirting the historic Arlington Farm, passing through the northwest corner of that farm along the Fort Myer Military Reservation, and extending through Virginia, Tennessee, across the Mississippi to the Pacific Ocean, thus connecting the Nation's Capital with the South and West. With the aid of representatives of the War Department the exact route was shown, the survey data, etc., and the exact acreage involved given. It was further explained that the county of Arlington and the State of Virginia had cooperated in purchasing the rights-of-way, and the State of Virginia had agreed to build a road, and all that remained to be done was for the Federal Government to deed to the State of Virginia for highway purposes this narrow strip of the military reservation. A number of very intelligent questions were asked which brought out not only the historic and patriotic appeal, but also certain local utilitarian values, such as providing a new traffic route to the Capital, thus relieving present congestion and enabling Government employees, including the secretaries of some of the Congressmen, who live on the Virginia side of the Potomac, to get to work on time. The committee then unanimously reported the bill and placed it on the House Calendar.

Believe it or not, I came away with high admiration for that group of Congressmen.

I decided to investigate the background of this very intelligent, courteous, and accommodating chairman, so I opened the Congressional Directory at the biographical section, and this is what I found:

"Lister Hill, Montgomery, Ala.; bachelor of arts, University of Alabama; bachelor of laws, University of Alabama; post graduate in law at Columbia University and Michigan University; president, Montgomery Board of Education, 5 years; Phi Beta Kappa; World War veteran; elected to Congress 14 years ago; reelected every 2 years (despite many other aspirants)."

Realizing that we would have to get the companion bill through the Senate Committee on Military Affairs, I looked up the background of the Senate chairman and found:

"Morris Sheppard, Texarkana, Tex. Dean of Congress by virtue of having the longest continuous service than that of any other living Member; elected to the House in 1902; in the Senate in 1912; and after serving in the two Houses for 34 years, was reelected for 6 more years November 1936. Graduated from University of Texas, academic department, 1895; law department, 1897; Yale Law School, 1898; and LL. D. Southern Methodist University."

These backgrounds are not exceptional, but rather typical of the training of the committee chairmen and ranking Members of the minority group of the various committees of Congress, and who are the real leaders of that body and largely shape its legislation.

Yes; I respect and admire them for their diligent and honest and patriotic labors. The procedure that I described before one committee is going on daily on Capitol Hill before many committees. An average of about 20,000 bills are introduced in each Congress. These bills, referred to the various committees, are sifted; hearings are held on the more important ones; and about 1,000 are enacted into law. About half the bills introduced, and about half passed, are of public concern, and about one-half are private or special bills.

I am glad that our Congress is so democratic that it is easy for almost anyone to get almost any kind of a bill introduced, and thus secure consideration of it. I am glad that there is a careful sifting process and that many of these bills die in committee. In this way Congress renders a great service. You will recall that I appeared before this bar association about a year ago very much "het up" over the District of Columbia Boundary Bill that was then before the House Judiciary Committee. After several days of hearings, pro and con, the Judiciary Committee decided to let the bill die in committee. In my mind, it was a real public service to the State of Virginia and the Federal Government and the citizens of America. Congress had previously, however, enacted a law allowing equitable adjustments of the property claims along the Virginia shores of the Potomac. Thus equitable adjustments under this law are now being satisfactorily worked out.

I know that Congress has had much criticism heaped upon it from time to time ever since its first session. I hold in my hand a copy of the Washington Post, published 100 years ago, vigorously criticizing Congress. On the other hand, I recall hearing Speaker Champ Clark state that after 25 years of service in the House, he could say that the average Congressman was a man of high integrity, honor, honesty, and diligence, and that he was proud to have been associated with such men.

I respect and admire the Congress of the United States for the way in which it has discharged its duties as "city council" of the Nation's Capital. My exhibits will be submitted chiefly from our experiences with Congress in relation to the work of the National Capital Park and Planning Commission. In 1924 and 1926, a committee of 100 of Washington citizens, headed by Hon. Frederic A. Delano, appeared before the proper committees of Congress and said something like this:

"Don't you recall that the Constitution of the United States provides Congress shall have power. * * *

"'To exercise exclusive legislation, in all cases whatsoever, over such district (not exceeding 10 miles square) as may, by cession of particular States, and the acceptance of Congress, become the seat of the Government of the United States. * * *' L'Enfant laid off the original city lying between the Potomac and Anacostia Rivers, Rock Creek, and Florida Avenue, comprising a little less than 10 square miles of the original 100 square miles of the District of Columbia.

"Don't you recall that it provides this area with abundant parks, large and small, paying only $35,000 for there park areas, which are now appraised at $130 million, or $67 per acre for land that is now appraised on the average of $325,000 per acre?

"Don't you recall that they provided this original city, with broad streets and avenues, made certain building regulations, and other space to make the new Capital of the Nation an ideal city for surpassing the other cities of the New World and the Old World which had been started without any plan?

"Don't you see that the remainder of the District is developing in a hodge-podge fashion with inadequate planning, inadequate park and playground areas, and with little relation to the original city?"

Congress replied, "We do, and we will meet this situation by creating a National Capital Park and Planning Commission. We will place upon the Commission the Chief of Engineers of the Army, the Engineer Commissioner of the District of Columbia, the Director of the National Park Service, the Chief of the Forest Service, the chairman of the Senate Committee of the District of Columbia, the chairman of the House Committee of the District of Columbia, and four eminent citizens well qualified and experienced in city planning.

"The act provided that these gentlemen should serve without compensation. Their very valuable and arduous services are rendered as a patriotic contribution. The Commission was supplied with a trained technical paid staff.

"The powers and duties of the Commission are summarized in the following sentence of the act of 1924, section 1 (b):

"'That the said Commission is hereby charged with the duty of preparing, developing, and maintaining a comprehensive, consistent, and coordinated plan for the National Capital and its environs.

"'Recommendatory powers and duties:

"'The major part of the work of the Commission, as with most planning commissions, is to make studies and recommendations. The act of 1926, section 1 (b), provides that the Commission shall make recommendations to the proper executive authorities as to (1) traffic and transportation; (2) plats and subdivisions; (3) highways, parks, and parkways; (4) school and library sites; (5) playgrounds; (6) drainage, sewage, and water supply; (7) housing, building, and zoning regulations; (8) public and private buildings; (9) bridges and waterfronts; (10) commerce and industry; (11) and other proper elements of city and regional planning.'"

The Commission proceeded to make studies of the needs of the District as required by law, and the results of these studies with recommendations to Congress from that day to this. Acting upon one of these recommendations, Congress passed on May 29, 1930, an act providing for a comprehensive park, parkway, and playground system of Washington and environs. This act provides for parks and parkways within the District of Columbia; also for a playground within one-fourth mile of every child and a recreation center covering from 5 to 30 acres within a mile of every citizen. It provides the remainder of the District with some kind of neighborhood park that L'Enfant provided for the "Original City." Acting under this authority, the Commission has acquired or begun to acquire lands in 84 different projects. For some of the outlying areas it has paid as low as $1,000 per acre. In some of the congested areas built before 1924 with no provision for playgrounds, it has had to pay as high as $100,000 per acre.

The act provides for the entire valley of the Potomac from Mount Vernon to Fort Washington to above Great Falls to be acquired, to be named George Washington Memorial Parkway, and dedicated to the health and happiness of the individuals of the city of Washington and of the Nation. Considerable progress has been made in these acquisitions. Much more remains to be done. The act provides acquisition of lands beyond the District line in Rock Creek, Cabin John Creek, and headwaters of the Anacostia River valleys. Considerable progress has been made along that line. One can now drive through parklands from Hains Point to Connecticut Avenue, Maryland.

Some valuable acquisitions have been added to the parks without additional cost. Congress passed the so-called Land Transfer Act in 1924. Under this act, the park office, upon the recommendation of the Park and Planning Commission, exchanged some lands along the Anacostia River for aboretum purposes for Canal Street. The undeveloped area formerly occupied by a canal and extending from below south of the Capitol Grounds to the Army War College. This land runs through one of the most congested sections of the city. It was filled with rubbish, weeds, broken-down automobiles, and other unsightly things. It is being cleared off and with additional land added by the Park and Planning Commission is being developed into splendid recreation areas for that congested section.

The Commission was required to make recommendations as to housing and building. It looked over the site and found that there were 200 squares with rather attractive exteriors, but containing rotten hearts; that is, inhabited alleys, for the most part, unsanitary, disease-breeding, and crime-breeding. For 50 years civic and welfare agencies of the city have been trying to cope with it. The Commission made a careful survey and asked Congress to pass the Alley Dwelling Authority Act. It was the speaker's privilege to be named the quarterback in the last quarter of that great drive to the goal, call the plays, pass the ball to the individual who could go the furtherest on the particular play, and sometimes carry the ball himself. The act was passed, the Alley Dwelling Authority was set up; money allocated by the President from public-works funds; and a good beginning has been made. Seventeen alleys already are in process of rehabilitation. Hopkins Place is a splendid example of before and after. These families of low income are supplied with homes, have their light, heat, ventilation, water, sewerage, and baths. In other words, we believe that every child born under the Stars and Stripes especially in that area over which Congress exercises exclusive legislation shall have at least the necessities and the decencies of life. If that be treason to "King Laisez," well, make the most of it.

One reason the Nation's Capital was so placed was because of the Potomac and Anacostia Rivers. These rivers cover over 3,000 acres in the District of Columbia. The Commission noticed that it was directed to make recommendations as to drainage, sewerage, and water supply, and found that the sewage from a population of over 700,000 was piped down the hills and emptied into these waters, changing them from their original purity to foul pollution.

At the Commission's request, the Senate passed a resolution directing the Public Health Bureau to make a survey of conditions. This has been remedied by connecting the sewerage discharge pipes near their mouths with a main sewer running to Blue

Plains to connect with a sewage purifying plant, and it has resulted in the Bureau of Public Works lending to Arlington County sufficient money to install a sewerage and disposal plant system, so Congress is gradually restoring these waters to their original purity.

We believe that Congress should make this area directly under its authority a fit place for every individual in which to live with decent housing, adequate parks, playgrounds, schools, and other necessary services. Congress has recently authorized the dredging of the Potomac and Anacostia Rivers to a depth of 24 feet to provide for better commercial development. It has also authorized the improvement of Washington Channel as a great commercial and recreation body of water. It should be a practical demonstration for the rest of America.

You ask, "Can America afford these things?"

I reply, "Yes."

When I think of how through the guidance of the Department of Agriculture, boys in my own Virginia County have taken acres and acres of farmlands and increased their yield many fold; when I think of how through the aid of chemistry they have taken our forest trees and transferred them into silk shirts and silk hose; and how our rivers crossing from the mountains to the sea are to be harnessed to work for us and furnish us with light, heat, and power; of how during the recent little-anticipated financial crisis, that if the factories as they stood in 1929 had continued to operate with the operators then at the wheels, since then walking the streets, that every family in America could have been supplied with a new $6,000 home, I say to you America is potentially rich, potentially powerful. Its best and richest years lie ahead. God give the people of America and their Congress the wisdom, vision, courage, and patriotism to bring this life more abundant to each and every one of us.

L'Enfant's Uncanny Vision Allowed District of Columbia Growth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEROY JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 3, 1954

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, about 20 years ago I was appointed chairman of the Planning Commission of the City of Stockton, Calif. In that capacity I learned something about city planning. The city of Stockton selected Harland Bartholomew as the man to help the planning commission draft a plan for our city. Mr. Bartholomew was then a city planner with a nationwide reputation. He is now Chairman of the Capital Planning Commission.

We have all heard about L'Enfant's work in planning the city of Washington. In the Washington Post last Sunday was a very interesting article concerning the work of this Frenchman whose name has left an indelible imprint on Washington. The article was written by Richard J. Neutra, who is a noted architect and whose activities are known throughout the United States.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the interesting article referred to. It is well worth reading, and it demonstrates that planning of the proper kind can have a very profound and beneficial influence in the future. Following is the article:

L'ENFANT'S UNCANNY VISION ALLOWED DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA GROWTH

(By Richard J. Neutra)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Vienna-born Richard J. Neutra, author of this article, has been ranked second only to Frank Lloyd Wright among architects who have made their reputation in this country. His gospel is functional architecture and his materials are glass, steel, and concrete. He has designed fabulous mansions for millionaires in the Western deserts, but his greatest monuments are the homes he has built for low-income families. His Los Angeles firm is currently working on projects as various and widespread as an American Embassy in Pakistan and a school building at Annapolis, Md. Neutra's latest book, Survival Through Design, received wide critical acclaim when it was published by Oxford early this year.)

From nearby hills, including the one in Arlington on which he now lies buried, Pierre Charles L'Enfant looked down upon the wildlands flanking the Potomac River and envisioned a Capital City designed to expand with the growth of the new American Republic he had championed so ardently.

The idea of future expansion was ever uppermost in his mind. His thoughts were of a city planned on such a scale "as to leave room for that aggrandizement and embellishment which the increase of the wealth of the Nation will permit it to pursue at any period, however remote."

In the light of the subsequent growth of Washington, D. C., and of its suburban development problems today, L'Enfant's foresight in this respect seems to heve been uncanny. Certainly he was far ahead of most of his contemporaries.

Even Thomas Jefferson, no mean expansionist himself considering his consummation of the Louisiana Purchase, thought an area of less than 3 square miles could contain the projected Capital. A fine architect but an amateur at city planning, Jefferson had sketched a "grid" pattern for the city's streets, which would have extended from what is now H Street to the Mall and from 14th Street to the Potomac River.

It remained for the balanced and restrained—but propertywise—thinking of George Washington to burst out with the flaming imagination of a grand realtor. He advocated acquisition of 100 square miles, although there was probably not a city that big anywhere in the world at that time.

In ancient Rome, it was the custom to appoint a dictator in times of emergency. George Washington saw an emergency in the founding and planning of a Nation's Capital. He decreed in simple and sincere language worthy of Alexander the Great: "The President shall have the sole power of directing the Federal City to be laid off in what manner he pleases."

It was decided to expropriate land for the streets. Property for public buildings was to be acquired for about $100 an acre, a handsome price at that time and considering the location. With a view toward architectural impressiveness, Washington laid down building restrictions. But he realized the need for an expert to do the actual planning of the city.

The newly liberated Colonies offered little promise of any such talent. Only one city, Philadelphia, had been laid out somewhat on the "grid" pattern of an Ottoman military camp. (At the time Philadelphia was being planned, 1683, the formidable Ottoman Empire armies were laying siege to Vienna.)

Savannah, Ga., might have served as a fine example of city planning such as Englishmen had brought to fruition in the Colonies, having had little chance to express their ideas in the old country. But the new National Capital, then mostly marsh and wilderness, presented a challenge calling for engineering and architectural ingenuity on a far grander scale.

Although he is said to have maintained a confidential correspondence with his London cabinetmakers all during the Revolution, if George Washington had even considered calling upon a British expert for the city-planning job, the idea would have been ruled out immediately. It was too soon after the soldiers of George III had been driven from the country.

It was just about that time when L'Enfant—"The Child" of Paris—set up his drawing board and hung out his professional shingle in New York City. L'Enfant, whose 200th birthday anniversary will be observed Monday, was born in Paris, August 2, 1754. His enthusiasm for the American cause led him to join the struggle at his own expense when he was 23.

Commissioned as a captain in the Continental Army, L'Enfant's rigid adherence to discipline and his engineering skill, especially in the construction of fortifications, won General Washington's admiration in spite of his foreign accent. Congress made him a major in 1783. When the war was over L'Enfant chose to remain in the new country for which he had fought.

Thus it was that President Washington called upon Major L'Enfant for the task of planning the Capital City. The appointment was made official in March 1791, and the young Parisian-turned-American began an on-the-spot study of the District of Columbia.

L'Enfant went about his task with his gaze 3 feet higher than that of any pedestrian. No armchair dreamer, he mounted a horse and trotted over the 100 square miles to examine the terrain firsthand. He mounted the hills and gazed in all directions. He thought, as I do, that the landscape was lovely, with hilltops beyond the wide water areas.

Slapping at mosquitoes, he made notes in a sketchbook of the vantage points around which he decided to crystallize a city. In other words, he worked from earthly and human-vision lines, not "plan-metrically" looking down from heaven or out of the clouds onto a sheet of paper.

Two focal points caught his imagination. One was the hill on which the Capitol now stands; the other was what is now the area of Lafayette Park. These he conceived as "star centers" for the whole vast countryside. He pictured them radiating avenues, enriched by vistas, and linked together by a mall.

Visionary though he was, L'Enfant had brought to America in his Parisian baggage some French geometrical logic. Moreover, he had been born under a king who preoccupied himself with the magnificent planning of Versailles, from which L'Enfant got ideas of wide avenues and large tracts for landscaping. The geometric and the esthetic were one in his plans for the new Capital.

L'Enfant was caught in the heyday of Euclidean geometry. Originally a utilitarian surveyor's device and later a respected science, geometry worked its way into creative French planning when Andre Lenotre was both geometre royal and landscape architect to Louis XIV, late in the 17th century.

The human and social life of a metropolitan community now can draw on a vast array of modern sciences hardly foreshadowed a hundred and fifty years ago.

Modern Washington suffers in some respects from the adoration of geometry in former centuries, particularly in the 18th. An example is the glorious intersection at the Capitol, with Pennsylvania, Maryland, New Jersey, and Delaware Avenues, East Capitol Street, and West Mall, North Capitol and

South Capitol Streets, all crossing at one point.

Another example is the White House area, where meet New York, Pennsylvania, Connecticut, and Vermont Avenues and 16th Street—with some overleaping by E, F, G, and H Streets thrown into the confusion.

In mapping these and other conjunctions, L'Enfant must have gloried in twirling his compass and clacking his T-square and triangle. Farsighted though he was in other things, he could not have foreseen the traffic bottlenecks he was contriving so ingeniously and with such glee.

Even worse than his willful enthusiasm for geometric stars are his strange accidentalisms. For an example of what I mean, look at the intersection of Massachusetts and New Jersey Avenues NW., and marvel at what becomes of 1st and G Streets.

However, it is easy to be critical in the light of all we have learned since L'Enfant's time. Indeed, it is amazing how his ideas have endured. He had little personal supervision to start with, and he remained at his task for only 1 year. His master plan was accepted, but he actually mapped only 11 of the 100 square miles—the area bounded by Florida Avenue on the north, Rock Creek Park on the west, and the river on the south and east.

President Washington, having reserved sole power for himself, discovered in L'Enfant an untoward disposition to fixed ideas. L'Enfant's resignation was accepted in March 1792, with somewhat mitigated disappointment, and the completion of his work was left to others. He died a poor idealist in Prince Georges County, Md., on June 14, 1825.

Eighty-four years later, the Nation got around to paying him long-overdue and well-deserved tribute. His body was removed to Arlington National Cemetery where, by act of Congress, a monument was erected in his honor. I like to think of this monument as a memento for coordinated thinking versus muddling through.

Despite attacks and pettifoggings of bureaucrats and politicians over the years, L'Enfant's grand vision in the main has been preserved. The actual surveying and laying out of streets went forward for a time under Maj. Andrew Ellicott, an engineer from Bucks County, Pa. But President Jefferson decided Ellicott was charging a dollar a day too much for his services and the engagement was terminated.

The general scheme received a major setback in 1846, when Congress retroceded to Virginia the area that State had contributed to the District of Columbia. City planning came to a halt, while Congressmen shouted from the floor that the Nation's Capital should be moved to some more accessible and attractive location.

Planning was not resumed in earnest until after the Civil War, which had brought a sudden, large increase in Washington's population. In the final one-man show of District planning, Gov. Alexander R. Shepherd (whose statue now stands in front of the District Building) launched upon an ambitious public-works program. That came to grief in the financial panic of 1873, leaving the District deeply in debt.

Since then, city planning projects have been controlled by commissions, and the result often has been more talk than achievement. The National Commission of Fine Arts, created in 1910, brought to the District, rather belatedly, some ideas from the Columbian Exposition in Chicago. The National Capital Park and Planning Commission, established in 1926, has made commendable piecemeal progress, but it has never inspired Congress to the point of magnanimity in appropriations.

Moreover, the Washington area now to be planned encompasses large adjoining areas. The various commissions responsible are not truly metropolitan in scope and thus are unable properly to tackle the overall problems.

Putting aside past mistakes, timidity and disorganization, what about the future of the Washington area?

Nobody in his senses considers thorough decentralization of the Government as an easy answer to the threat of atomic attack. That would be an abdication of the concept of a capital city. In any great city, investments and traditions are not abandoned at the drop of a hat, certainly not before it has been made sure the dropping cannot be prevented.

Washington, even with a metropolitan population of 2 million, is smaller and less populous than Brazil's capital, Rio de Janeiro. We now have the know-how to develop transportation so efficiently that Government personnel could reach any point in the administrative establishment within 15 to 30 minutes.

But we must clean out the ugly, wartime temporary buildings in the center of the city. They add to traffic and parking problems where space is precious.

One solution might be locating Government buildings at intervals along a road circling the inner city, say about 4 miles out. Commuting by personnel would be reduced by adjoining to this belt road commercial centers and open, landscaped residential neighborhoods. That, it seems to me, would be much more desirable than towering downtown buildings, with traffic crawling underground.

Washington's neglected waterfront also could be transformed into the most attractive part of the city. This could be done under existing legislation providing for the acquisition and wholesale redevelopment of obsolescent land. Such a project should be a strong magnet for salubrious investment, converting sadly blighted areas into riverside esplanades, with quais instead of wharves.

This Nation's capital should be a model city reflecting the urban ideals of Americans. It should be modern in every sense. Moscow, for example, is being dressed up with Woolworth towers of 1920 vintage, which impress visitors from Indonesia, Vietminh and Peiping no end.

But let us not ourselves seek to impress foreign observers with our urban achievements until we have done away with slums and traffic jams—or at least until we can show well-conceived plans drawn by competent planners and stimulated by consultants of cosmopolitan experience such as L'Enfant was in his day.

Asia Today May Borrow Wisdom from the West

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 3, 1954

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial entitled "Asia Today May Borrow Wisdom from the West," which appeared in the July 30, 1954, issue of the Courier-Journal, of Louisville, Ky.

The editorial is as follows:

For years the chief objective of Russian policy has been to divide and destroy the western alliance against Communist aggression. Its biggest bait, dangled in February of this year, was the offer of a 50-year European security or nonaggression pact. Now Communist China is attempting to ward off an eastern alliance against Communist aggression with similar bait, a 20-year nonaggression pact that among other things would bar India, Indonesia, Ceylon, Burma, and Thailand from joining the Western Powers in the proposed Southeast Asia Treaty Organization.

In Europe the Russians made little impression with their security pact offer for the simple reason that Europe was too appallingly familiar with Russia's past record. Currently Moscow has revised the offer to propose the neutralization and unification of Germany, and they are still working to banish the strength of the United States from a Europe that would then fall easy prey to Soviet domination.

Most Europeans still remember, however, that Russia's word is worth only what the Russians want it to be worth, that her record of treaty violations is unsurpassed. The classic and tragic examples, of course, are the east European satellites, promised free elections by Russia and the other Great Powers, but by Communist manipulation enslaved with the freedom to elect only those the Communists nominated. Iran is another example; as recently as 1943 Moscow pledged her independence, sovereignty, and territorial integrity. But in 1945 Russian agents set up an autonomous Communist government in Iran's northernmost province, while Soviet troops overstayed their treaty deadline in Teheran and Moscow sternly warned against any Iranian troop movements to Azerbaijan lest they cause disturbances. With Western help Iran weathered the storm—but with no thanks to Russian honor.

The remaining free peoples of Asia would do well to remember these events, particularly those of the great nation of India. They might well recall that Great Britain and France in 1944 both signed 20-year mutual assistance pacts with Russia—only to have them denounced by Russia the moment Paris and London, frightened by Russia's postwar expansion, allied themselves with the United States to resist aggression.

But if these events seem too far away from Asia, the Asians need look no further than China itself for the crowning example of the worth of nonaggression or mutual security pacts with a Communist power. Moscow signed a 30-year pact with Chiang Kai-shek in 1945—but the ink on it was scarcely dry before Soviet-backed Chinese Communists had chased Chiang and his Nationalists out of China.

What the Communists seek is clearly shown by the record. It is, as Winston Churchill has said of the Russians, "the fruits of war without desiring war itself." Their expansion has been halted only by war, as in Korea, or by manifest strength and the readiness to use it against further aggression, as in Turkey and Greece and Europe.

Now the West proposes, in partnership with free Asia, to show that same strength and readiness in southeast Asia. It does not propose war except against open aggression, despite the lies of Communist propaganda; Prime Minister Nehru, and his colleagues can read a world of meaning into the eloquent silence with which an otherwise applauding American Congress greeted Syngman Rhee's invitation for us to attack Communist China. The applause was for a patriot who wants to keep his people free; the silence stemmed from the almost universal American passion for peace, a passion as great as India's own. But it is passion trained by the wisdom of events in the knowledge that a readiness to fight for freedom is itself the greatest deterrent to those who desire the fruits of war without desiring war itself.

Swiss Watches

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. SMITH

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 23, 1954

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include the following article by Sylvia Porter:

SWISS WATCHES

(By Sylvia Porter)

The Swiss watch is a symbol of America's devotion to freer world trade—the cornerstone of our entire foreign economic policy.

At midnight this past Tuesday, President Eisenhower tore down that symbol.

He did it by ordering tariff boosts of up to 50 percent on specified imported watches and thus lifting the watch tariff back to the level that existed in the record-high tariff year of 1930.

The President did so reluctantly—strictly on the basis that the skilled workers in the domestic watch industry are essential to our national defense, that the industry was being seriously injured by intense Swiss competition and that this was a special case.

He did so only after tortuous soul-searching—obviously in deference to the tremendous pressures brought on him primarily by three domestic watch companies located in the politically strategic States of Pennsylvania, Massachusetts, and Illinois.

But he did it. He ordered the first change in the watch tariff in 18 years. He lifted the watch tariff to the maximum allowed under today's law.

The dilemma facing the President was this:

Whether to stand up for the ideal of "trade not aid," let the watch tariff remain as it was, find a solution to our watch industry's problems via more direct subsidies (i. e., more military orders).

Or to bow to the pleas for a watch tariff hike, let the free world believe that despite all our lipservice to private enterprise and competition we again are going "protectionist."

President Eisenhower unhappily slipped out of his unhappy dilemma by bowing to the arguments of the protectionists.

This was the test case of our trade-tariff policies and all the second-day explanations by the President that this was a "special case" involving national defense do not alter this fact.

It was easy to favor free trade in the postwar years when foreign competition was a joke and anyone could sell anything he had. It's not so easy to stand up for it in today's competitive era.

In the battle between the low- and high-tariff forces, this one decision is of far greater significance than the President's initial requests for a more liberal trade act or Congress' grudging 1-year renewal of the old Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act.

The floodgates are open to hundreds of other American industries to demand more protection against foreign competition. These industries also are capable of arguing their operations are essential to national defense. I take no risks in forecasting they will so argue.

The key centers of Europe are stunned by the economic implications of this one move. To the Swiss this is a national disaster; watchmaking is Switzerland's major industry; of all of her watch exports, 80 percent have been going to the United States.

Of course it will mean Swiss watches will cost you more. Hopefully, it will give our watchmakers a better competitive position.

But the meaning goes far beyond this.

Between 1934 and 1951 we led in the drive for freer trade.

Between 1951 and mid-1954 we stood still.

On July 27, 1954, we took a great step backward.

The Swiss watch is now a symbol of retreat on the trade front. Long after some of our seemingly more critical military and diplomatic decisions have been forgotten, this "watch case" will be haunting our spokesmen as they go around the world seeking alliances and friends.

The Detroit College of Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 30, 1954

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, as one of those who was privileged to attend the Detroit College of Law in my youth, and, as did many others, make time to do so at the end of a long working day, I am happy to include in the RECORD an article from the Detroit Times of Sunday, August 1, telling of my alma mater.

This fine institution was originally begun by a small group of lawyers whose desire it was to help further the education of young men who worked in Detroit area factories and elsewhere during the daylight hours, and who consequently had only their evenings in which to study. Her splendid record is being written anew daily in the accomplishments of her many graduates who have distinguished themselves in local and national affairs. The school has added immeasurably to the betterment and prosperity of Michigan. I am proud to be one of her sons.

The article from the Detroit Times follows:

DETROIT COLLEGE PROUD OF SONS

Founded in 1891, the Detroit College of Law is the oldest and for many years was the only law school in the metropolitan Detroit area.

It also enjoys the distinction of being the only fully accredited college in the country devoted exclusively to legal education.

The college is located at 130 East Elizabeth, near Grand Circus Park, in one of the finest law-school buildings in the country.

Living graduates of Detroit College of Law number almost 3,000. For more than 60 years alumni have contributed in large measure to the legal, commercial, and industrial progress of Detroit and Michigan. Many of the State's most eminent lawyers, judges, public officials, and business executives are graduates of this famous college.

THREE-YEAR COURSE

The college offers a 3-year day course and a 4-year evening course. Entrance, scholastic, and graduation requirements, the course of instruction and the faculty are virtually identical, in both the day and the evening schools.

Degrees of bachelor of laws and juris doctor are awarded to both day and evening graduates, the latter degree being awarded to those graduates with especially high records.

The faculty consists of resident professors who devote their full time to the teaching of law, together with members of the bench and bar of metropolitan Detroit who teach on a part-time basis those subjects in which they are specialized practitioners.

FULLY APPROVED

The academic viewpoint of the teacher and the practical approach of the lawyer and judge are thereby blended into a sound, well-balanced legal education.

The faculty is headed by Dean Charles H. King.

Detroit College of Law is a member of the Association of American Law Schools and fully approved by the section on legal education and admission to the bar of the American Bar Association.

Its graduates are qualified to take the examination for admission to the bar in any State of the United States.

Harvey McPhail, Outstanding Electrical Engineer, Retires From Interior Department

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR ENGLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 30, 1954

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, the Reclamation Era of August 1954, carries the announcement that Harvey F. McPhail, the Assistant Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation, has retired effective July 31. For a period of nearly 10 years Mr. McPhail was Director of the Bureau's Branch of Power Utilization, and is one of the best recognized authorities in the field of electrical engineering. He was an able and conscientious public servant. I had occasion to deal with him frequently, and always found him competent, conscientious and responding to every congressional request with unfailing courtesy. I am sorry to see him leave the Bureau of Reclamation, and wish to include as a part of the RECORD the article which appeared in the Reclamation Era of August 1954 in regard to his retirement:

ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER MCPHAIL RETIRES

As this issue went to press, Secretary of the Interior Douglas McKay announced that Harvey F McPhail, Assistant Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation since 1952, would retire, effective July 31.

Mr. McPhail, an internationally known electrical engineer, has been a key figure in the reclamation power program. He has been with the Bureau 35 years, and after his retirement plans to join a private firm as a power consultant.

He joined the Bureau in 1919 as powerhouse foreman at the Lingle powerplant on the North Platte project in Wyoming. Previously, he served as an engineer for the Nevada Power Co. at Lovelock, Nev., and in electrical contracting and other business there. After a tour of duty at Lingle, he transferred to Cody, Wyo., as resident engineer on the Shoshone project. In 1924 he became assistant chief electrical engineer at the Bureau's Denver office. In this position, he was in charge of electrical designs for such world-renowned projects as Hoover, Grand Coulee, and Shasta powerplants of the Bureau, and Norris and Wheeler powerplants of the Tennessee Valley Authority. He received the Department of the Interior citation for distinguished service in May 1953 for his role in formulating the reclamation power program.

Mr. McPhail became Director of the Bureau's branch of power utilization when it was established in Denver in 1943, and served in that post until he took over as Assistant Commissioner.

He is a native of Santa Barbara, Calif., and received his bachelor of science degree in electrical engineering from the University of Nevada. He was chairman of the United States delegation to CIGRE (International Conference of Large Electrical Systems) at Paris in 1948. He became a Fellow in the American Institute of Electrical Engineers in 1942.

Mr. McPhail married Ruth James in 1912. They have two children and live in Washington, D. C.

The Effect of Coal Production in the U. S. S. R. on United States Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED E. BUSBEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 3, 1954

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, having recently been in Europe as a member of the Kersten committee which held hearings on Communist aggression in the satellite countries, and having listened to testimony of eyewitnesses concerning the coal which the Soviet Union is mining by the use of slave labor, I was particularly impressed with the information contained in the following bulletin issued on July 29, 1954, by Appalachian Coals, Inc., of Cincinnati, Ohio. The bulletin gives so many facts which are of importance to the future security of our Nation that I thought it should be made available to not only the Congress, but to the public generally. Therefore, under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to insert at this point in the RECORD the bulletin which is entitled "Taking the Problem Apart":

TAKING THE PROBLEM APART

Leaders of industry, State and Federal administrators and legislators, subconsciously realize the basic importance of the bituminous-coal industry to the Nation.

It is time now for these men, who are the architects of America's industrial might, and its place in the free world, to apply their conscious thinking to the well-being of this indispensable but not indestructible industry.

They know of the economic chaos caused in England by the disintegration of its coal industry and the failure of nationalization to revive it.

They know of the rapidly expanding cold war between the Communist and free nations which threatens to become hot at any moment. But do they know that Soviet coal production, which was nearly eight times the 1928 figure in 1952, exceeded British production in that year by 30 percent and that Soviet rulers plan to push production in 1955 to 416 million, which figure will probably be higher than United States production in 1954?

While coal production has been growing rapidly in the Soviet Union and its satellites, United States production has fallen off sharply from 630 million tons in 1947 to around 400 million tons, or more than one-third, in 1954.

The Iron Curtain countries are not only gearing up for military but also for economic warfare in strengthening their ability to produce coal for their own requirements and for export.

WHAT HAS HAPPENED?

The United States coal industry, which has spent hundreds of millions of dollars since World War II in a gigantic modernization program, now finds itself in an unprofitable position due to loss of markets and rising costs. It has suffered too many serious blows within too short a time such as—

1. Loss of much export business to foreign competition.

2. Loss to imports of foreign residual oil sold at dump rates to United States steam plants.

3. Uneconomic exploitation of limited natural gas reserves.

4. Decrease in normal use of coal by 75 percent by railroads through dieselization in last decade.

5. Increases in freight rates with coal carrying the losses of passenger and dining-car traffic and other commodities.

6. Increases in wage rates and fringe benefits which greatly exceed those paid by the oil, natural gas, and other industries.

WHAT DOES IT ADD UP TO?

Should the hot war come, these things would occur:

1. Submarine menace would halt importation of foreign oil.

2. Demand for oil products for military use would skyrocket.

3. The oil industry could not possibly supply the demand for both military and normal requirements.

4. Demand for natural gas for special industrial processes and normal requirements would exceed the capacity of the pipeline systems.

5. Coal, in addition to its own step-up in demand, would be called upon to quickly make up the deficit in total national energy requirements, which would be much greater than in World War II.

6. Coal demand, it is estimated, would be one-third higher than in World War II, or 800,000,000 tons versus 620,000,000 tons.

COULD THE COAL INDUSTRY MEET THE SITUATION?

This depends upon:

1. From what to what tonnage?

2. Whether the industry is economically healthy.

3. Whether it attempts to expand from a position of strength rather than weakness.

4. Whether leaders of industry and government recognize certain responsibilities and take realistic action.

Coal's ability to expand from a retracted position depends on from what-to-what volume. If the industry's volume has shrunk to and held at an unprofitable level for some time it will not be in position to greatly expand its productive capacity. It will be short of working capital, equipment, supplies, and trained personnel and the opening up of closed mines is a great gamble, often unsuccessful, because of deterioration of underground workings.

Authorities agree that the bituminous-coal industry—in order to put itself in a safe position to serve the country—must maintain present developed mines at or near their present capacity and to do this the coal industry needs to produce approximately 550 million tons of coal per year. This can be done logically by—

1. Congress restricting the importation of foreign residual oil which will displace about 50 million tons of coal per year at present rates.

2. The administration arranging for Marshall-aid countries to buy American coal. (Why should Western Europe buy millions of tons of coal from Iron Curtain countries when American coal is competitive?)

3. Amending the Natural Gas Act to permit and encourage natural gas to sell at its true economic value in the markets. (It is selling today at the well for one-fifth the price of crude oil and two-fifths the price of coal at the mine.)

4. The railroads, in cooperation with the Government, reduce their freight rates on coal so that they will return not more than the cost of hauling plus a reasonable profit. (Today they are set up to carry the losses of passenger and dining-car traffic and on other commodities.)

5. Adjusting wage rates and fringe benefits to be competitive with other industries, particularly the oil and natural-gas industries.

6. Providing additional sound leadership in the industry itself.

7. Combining more productive capacity under single well-managed units.

8. Better selling through larger units, including regional marketing agencies.

9. Realization by utility and industrial executives that it is in the national and their own companies' interest to pay the cost of production plus a reasonable profit for the coal they buy.

These nine logical steps, if effectuated, will strengthen the coal industry while doing no harm to any other industry and will enable it to meet the high energy demands which may be placed upon it without warning.

Now, there is just one thing more important than the support of coal, and that is coal's support of the Nation. Although not so often stated, the survival of a nation in today's world finally depends on its ability to deliver the greatest amount of energy to the point when and where it is needed.

Coal is this Nation's No. 1 energy source. A strong, prosperous, privately owned coal industry is the best defense policy this country can have.

Management's Failure To Modernize Cause of Textile Industry Depressed State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 3, 1954

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article from the Journal of Commerce, New York, Thursday, July 22, 1954, concerning the remarks of Mr. Solomon Barkin, Textile Workers Union of America, CIO, director of research:

WOOL MILLS, CIO SAY MODERNIZATION OFFERS SOLE SOLUTION TO INDUSTRY ILLS

(By Charles F. Davis)

Wool cloth mill management's failure to modernize manufacturing methods, styling, and merchandising is more directly the cause of the industry's present depressed state than the wage demands of organized labor, according to an executive of the Textile Workers Union of America, CIO.

While few cloth producers will go along with the premise that wages are a secondary problem, many of them will admit that the industry has been remiss in the development of new products, textural effects, and in other respects has been hidebound.

If there is anything incongruous in this near agreement on the part of organized labor and management, it is no less so than the fact that one of the most important divisions of the United States textile industry may well be disappearing, at least in its present concept.

Solomon Barkin, TWUA's director of research, pointed out to the Journal of Commerce in an interview that the woolen and worsted industry has in the past decade shrunken drastically and will shrink even more unless management takes corrective action.

MANY MILLS LIQUIDATED

In 1947, he pointed out, the industry employed about 167,000 workers and now the figure is between 58,000 and 60,000. Since the end of World War II about 50 mills have been liquidated, he added.

The worsted end of the business has been the hardest hit and is the most culpable, Mr. Barkin stated.

Although Government fabric needs during the Korean war provided worsted producers with a reprieve, their products even then were losing ground to cottons, particularly in regards to lightweight cloth and more recently it has been even more overshadowed by various types of synthetics.

This business was forfeited by management almost without a struggle, according to Mr. Barkin.

In contrast to the worsted division, woolen fabrics have more than held their own due to a growing demand for casual wear which, for the industry, manifested itself in calls for new textures in sport coatings, and a willingness on the part of woolen-cloth producers to develop new designs.

Woolen-cloth producers were quick to grasp the significance of the casual wear trend and the new emphasis on sport coats, among other things, having been made acutely aware of the call here for cloth to be thus used by British exploitation of the market, Mr. Barkin pointed out.

More serious in Mr. Barkin's view, than the tendency for the wool-cloth industry to move South where labor is mostly unorganized is the possibility that in doing so wool-cloth production will come into the hands of interests who are essentially cotton or synthetic fiber-fabric producers. This will tend to further reduce emphasis on wool as a self-sufficient, adaptable and desirable apparel component, he believes.

To the extent that from January 1951, through June 1953, about 140,000 American system spindles have been installed by the industry, this is already coming about, he said. The American system is an adoption of cotton-spinning techniques and is of southern origin and development.

Recently announced and pending mergers of old-line New England wool-cloth mills with cotton and synthetic-fiber interests is the latest and even more ominous sign that wool may be relegated into a secondary position, he added.

While admitting that the TWUA's most immediate concern is and has been the continuation of "equitable" wage scales and working conditions, Mr. Barkin said that it has long been appreciated by the union that these cannot be maintained unless the industry is healthy.

Questioned as to whether or not the union's willingness to take a wage cut this year—which in most instances came to about 9½ cents per hour—was not an admission that its wage demands in the previous 2 or 3 years were unreasonable, Mr. Barkin strongly denied it.

"Last year the arbitrators turned down a reduction sought by management, stating that the mills must face and solve its own problems of marketing deficiencies, sales, and administration, Mr. Barkin said.

"By 1954, the arbitrators found that management had not solved the problems but in the interest of the industry's survival the reduction was essential. Fundamentally, however, the problem of finding new markets and buyers are still the key issue which must still be solved by management," he added.

Referring to a 11-point program the union recently formulated and forwarded to Secretary of Commerce Sinclair Weeks, Mr. Barkin said that it stressed Government contracts and relief work in order to give management more time to solve these problems.

Mr. Barkin said that the program also included Government assistance in research comparable to that which has proven so successful in the cotton industry and to otherwise provide Government facilities by which management can expand the market for wool cloth.

Need for Mental Hospital at Newington, Conn.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 3, 1954

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, in recent weeks an increasing number of complaints has come to my attention concerning the lack of neuropsychiatric facilities for the treatment of veterans, not only in my district, but throughout the whole State of Connecticut. Not a weekend passes that pleas are not made to me for assistance to mentally ill veterans. I am greatly concerned as the number of these requests increases and there is no concrete evidence that conditions will be alleviated in the near future.

The need for more facilities to care for the mentally ill in the area is not in dispute. With little cost, existing facilities of a veterans' hospital can be made available. To fail to do so is an economic waste, and in the presence of the human hardship and suffering involved, would shock the conscience of our people.

I am bringing this to the attention of the House membership, and especially to the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, because the situation that exists in Connecticut is opposed to ordinary commonsense. This hospital, located at Newington, Conn., is in danger of being declared surplus and, as a result, would lose its identity as a veterans' hospital, in spite of the obvious need for additional facilities to care for mentally ill veterans within the State.

At this session of Congress, I introduced a joint resolution—House Joint Resolution 299—directing the Veterans' Administration to survey and study the 300-bed veterans' hospital at Newington to find if it is possible to convert this establishment for use as a neuropsychiatric facility. At the present time, 40 of the 300 beds are in use for the treatment of mentally ill veterans. I am reliably informed that only about half of the remaining beds are in use for medical and surgical cases.

During the first half of this year, there were 640 mentally ill veterans from my State being treated in veterans' hospitals outside of Connecticut. In addition, 773 veterans were being treated in State hospitals and 8 in private institutions. This is a total of 1,421 Connecticut veterans unable to be placed in veterans' facilities within the State where they reside. That the problem is growing is shown by the fact that last year, at this time, the total was 1,008. Medical authorities confirm what our own good sense tells us—that treatment of a mentally ill patient is helped and accelerated if he is located in an institution close to his home and is visited frequently by members of his family.

The new veterans' hospital at West Haven, Conn., opened last year, is equipped only to handle emergency mental cases and then only on a temporary basis. The cost of converting the Newington Hospital would be far less than that of erecting a new building, or even adding to the West Haven facility. Furthermore, a new hospital erected in New York or Rhode Island would likewise cost more and would do nothing to alleviate the hardships being endured by the parents and wives in Waterbury, Torrington, Ansonia, and in other cities and towns in my district and the State of Connecticut who are obliged to travel many hundreds of unnecessary miles to visit their loved ones.

If my recommendation called for a completely new building, other New England States would have legitimate reasons for demanding such construction in their respective areas. The question of whether those areas do need additional facilities is not the issue in this case; and if their situation is similar to the one which faces my district, and I suspect it is, I certainly will support any movement which would tend to bring relief to those areas. But here in Connecticut we already have a suitable building—not in full use—which could be readied in short order and with little expense for occupancy as a hospital solely for mentally ill veterans.

The shocking fact is that many of our boys are not receiving mental treatment of any kind at the present because of the long distances between their homes and veterans' hospitals outside of the State and the difficulty they encounter in securing admittance there because of the overcrowded conditions. The delay is tragic because time is all-important in the treatment of any mental case.

For example, last week I learned of a case where a veteran's wife and parents hesitated placing him in a hospital so far from their home in Waterbury. The parents are aging and the extensive travel would work a hardship on them. The wife and children would indeed be fortunate if they could see their husband and father several times a month. This is not an isolated case, and I could not help but wonder if this young man and others in similar circumstances had to travel the same distance to present themselves before selective-service boards not so many months previously.

There have been suggestions and recommendations made by various Veterans' Administration officials which add up to nothing but delay and more delay. Meanwhile, life moves on for those people and the hardships continue. I have yet to hear what I consider a valid reason why a mental hospital in the center of Connecticut is not established and operating to rehabilitate our veterans. I have been told that recruitment of sufficient psychiatrists for

Newington is difficult, but that general medical and surgical personnel can be obtained from nearby Hartford. I do not think I need to point out to the Veterans' Administration that Yale, Harvard, and Columbia, as well as many other famous educational institutions in New England, have noted and extremely accomplished psychiatrists on their staffs, as well as those on the staffs of the State hospitals in Connecticut itself. Moreover, there is a long list of eminent neurosurgeons in and about the State, some of whom are now available as consultants to veterans hospitals. Surely this is a situation where good will and a bit of thinking and accommodation would combine to bring about a remedy.

The conversion of Newington has the support of all veterans organizations in my district and, to my knowledge, there is no opposition from any organized or individual veterans to this project.

A humane regard for the veterans who desperately need mental care demands that the Government take effective action in their behalf. True economy forbids us to let facilities stand idle when veterans require care. I shall exert every effort to bring about the use of the Newington facilities for men whose care is one of the first responsibilities of the Government of the United States.

UNESCO: A State Department Agency Created To Put the United States Into a World Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. USHER L. BURDICK
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 3, 1954

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, the State Department during the tenure of office of Dean Acheson was and still is the propaganda mouthpiece of UNESCO in this country. The bill creating the United States National Commission for UNESCO was passed by the 79th Congress and was designed by the State Department to be the propaganda agency to sell UNESCO to the people of the United States. Being controlled by the State Department nothing was done by it except to carry out the instructions of the State Department. That condition still prevails and the State Department is in the process now of selling this system to the people.

UNESCO means the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, and its purpose is to unite all people under one government, a world government. It makes no difference how wide apart the purposes of governments are, all are to be brought under one parent authority. Our theory of government is that our Government exists for the people, but in Russia the people exist for the Government. This is true, not only in Russia, but in the majority of the countries of the world. To amalgamate these two divergent theories into one is not only impossible, but it is assinine to try.

We here in the United States believe in capitalism as our theory of business operation, while Russia denounces capitalism and supplants it by communism. These two theories are as wide apart as the poles, and they cannot be brought together in one single purpose any more than water and oil will stay mixed. Yet UNESCO is out to build a world government that will accomplish this impossible thing.

We here in the United States believe in the Christian religion as the very basis of all our strength in government, opportunities of the individual, our educational and cultural systems, while the Russians reject the story of Jesus Christ and scoff at the Christian religion. Yet UNESCO undertakes to harmonize these religious views, and present to the world one harmonious group of people under a one-world government. To attempt such a thing is, on the face of it, about as sane as was the notion that Knute, because of the power from on High possessed by him as King of England, could command the tide to stand back.

Of course the fact that Russia has joined UNESCO makes news. Luther Evans, former librarian of Congress now representing UNESCO, is credited with getting Russia and some of her satellites into the one-world frameup. If anyone in the United States could convince Russia that she should come in, Evans could do it. He has always been held in high esteem in Russia, and while librarian here had the Library of Congress stacked high with Russia propaganda. Much of this propaganda was sold by the Library to the public. I personally purchased an armful of it and delivered it to the proper committee investigating un-American activities.

Russia is smart enough to know that she will occupy the most powerful position under this new world government. The lower house of the world government is to be elected on the basis of population, hence Russia and China and their slave satellites will control that congress. We can have a world government all right if we will let Russia run it.

To bring this country into line to accept world government many things must be done by the United Nations and her agencies, such as UNESCO. First of all, love of country on the part of the people of the United States is found by these conspirators to be very deep and hard to destroy. Here UNESCO comes into play, and out it goes among the school children of the United States with specially trained teachers from Columbia University who teach those children that love of country—like that we have in the United States—interferes with a loyalty to a world organization; that they must be fitted, educationally, and temperamentally, to forget love of their own country and transfer their loyalty to the world organization. Washington's birthday ceremonies, Lincoln's birthday ceremonies and veneration of all our great men are to be abandoned, and are abandoned by those teachers trained at Columbia. If this succeeds, the next event that will be outmoded will be Christmas. In fact, propaganda is actually now going the rounds that Christmas is a myth.

Of course this world organization cannot afford to leave in the hands of the people the rights of free speech, a free press, and free religion, because the exercise of these precious rights will have the power to prevent what these conspirators want. That has all been taken care of in the Convention of Human Rights, in which free speech, a free press, and free religion as expressed and defined in the Constitution of the United States is redefined and limited to suit the designs of the enemies of our Republic.

It will not suit these enemies if persons who are charged with crime by the world organization are to be tried in our courts, in our own country and under own own laws and Constitution. To overcome this they are to have courts of their own, they have a charter of their own; and if a citizen of the United States is charged with the violation of a United Nations law he can be tried in any foreign country by a court foreign to the nationality of the prisoner, and under such rules as their court shall make. And UNESCO was granted by the United Nations Charter "legal capacity," "privileges and immunities" above and beyond our laws, to carry out its program of world government throughout our Nation.

The State Department is right now supporting UNESCO through its United States National Commission for UNESCO, and its propaganda is designed to hide the truth from the people. Is the President aware of this situation? It is perfectly useless for us to spend our money, our resources, and the lives of our American boys, to stop the spread of communism eight or nine thousand miles from here while we permit the same intent and purpose to prosper here in the United States through this intellectual tool of communism. Those teachers, and the people sponsoring such teachers in their purpose to destroy love of country among our children here in United States are enemies of this Republic. The least I can do for this country is to use the free speech guaranteed by the Constitution while it lasts to warn the people of these United States that dangerous forces are at work here and now to destroy our constitutional Government.

Due to facts brought out before the McCarran committee in June of 1952, Public Law 495 was passed by the 82d Congress. Section 112 of the law provides:

> None of the funds appropriated in this title shall be used (1) to pay the United States contribution to any international organization which engages in the direct or indirect promotion of the principle of one world government or one world citizenship; (2) for the promotion, direct or indirect, of the principle or doctrine of one world government or one world citizenship.

Why do we not use this law? By enforcing it we could cut off the funds which keep UNESCO going, and summarily put a stop to its vicious propaganda which is designed to pervert the minds of our children, to deny our freedoms and to destroy our national sovereignty and constitutional form of government by forcing us into a world government where we would be only a subservient unit, subject to the will of the Communist-controlled majority.

Farsighted Statesmanship at Suez

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER

OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 3, 1954

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial entitled "Farsighted Statesmanship at Suez," which appeared in the July 29, 1954, issue of the Courier-Journal, of Louisville, Ky.

The editorial is as follows:

FARSIGHTED STATESMANSHIP AT SUEZ

Another act of farsighted statesmanship on Great Britain's part has strengthened the free world's position in the Middle East. That is the agreement to remove all of Britain's 83,000 troops from the Suez Canal Zone, with the accompanying provision that the West may still use the great defense base in case of aggression against Turkey or any of the 8 Arab States.

Thus for the first time since 1882, once the 20-month changeover is effected, there will be no British troops on Egyptian soil, the irrepressible demands of nationalism will have been appeased, and the chief cause of the corrosion of western relations with Egypt and her friends will at last vanish. But the essential interests of the West are protected, as Britain and the United States long had argued that they must be protected, by the agreement permitting them to man the zone in case of aggression.

The solution represents sensible compromise on several points. British troops will remain longer than Egypt desired but will have cleared out 4 months earlier than Britain had suggested—to Cyprus, Malta, British East Africa, and the United Kingdom. The facilities of the base, which cost Britain $1.2 billion to build, will be manned for 7 years after 1956 not by troops but by the civilian technicians of a British contracting firm. Britain, naturally, will remove most of her $700 million worth of military supplies. Britain has already begun the progressive release of Egypt's $270 million in blocked sterling, and Egypt has reciprocated by removing almost all restrictions on imports of goods from the sterling area. Britain and the United States, unable to get Iran included in the antiaggression understanding but pleased by Turkey's inclusion, will provide Egypt with military aid, and the United States will unfreeze $20 million in economic aid held up at London's request until the Canal Zone dispute was settled.

The prospects thus are brightened for Egypt's ultimate adherence to the long-hoped-for Middle East Command of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. This understandably will be viewed with no enthusiasm in Israel until the West can diminish the possibility of renewed Israeli-Arab hostilities. But the clearing of the air in Sues is basically good news for the West, and for Egypt, hardly 2 years ago the suspicious recipient of Soviet Russian messages of sympathy in her struggle for freedom and independence and of Russian offers of economic aid.

The dispute in its latter-day terms had raged since 1945, complicated by riots, bloodshed, and the highly emotional politics of a nation torn by revolution and instability. Its resolution owes a good deal to American statesmanship, including the wise efforts of our Ambassador to Egypt, Jefferson Caffrey. But it is in line with the full postwar British pattern of adjustment to nationalistic demands. The pattern has freed India, Pakistan, Burma, and Ceylon, yet strengthened Britain's ties and influence with them all and therefore protected the basic interest of the West in halting Communist expansion. There is every reason to believe it will have the same effect in Egypt.

This will not, of course, make it any less bitter medicine to Britain's vanishing race of Colonel Blimps and mourners for the Old Empire. But even without Sir Winston Churchill's instruction, it must occur to them that the advantages of retreat far outweigh those of stubbornly clinging to a temper-corroding strip and seaway that a single hydrogen bomb could blast into seafaring uselessness.

Nation Soon To Enjoy Roadbuilding Boom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. RUSSELL V. MACK

OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 3, 1954

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, motorists soon will get better, wider, and safer highways.

They will get these better roads because of legislation enacted by the present Republican Congress.

The Federal Government has been collecting about $875 million a year from its Federal 2-cents-a-gallon gasoline tax. The Federal Government, however, has not been spending all of this gas tax money on building roads. The fact is that in recent years Congress has appropriated only about $575 million a year for highway building. Congress has been diverting about $300 million of its 2-cents-a-gallon gas tax revenues to other purposes than road building—such purposes as foreign aid.

Substantial sums of this diverted gas tax money actually has gone into building highways in foreign countries rather than in our own.

The House Public Works Committee, of which I am a member, this year, reported and Congress enacted a bill which provides that during the next 2 years $875 million a year shall be given by the Federal Government to the States for highway building purposes.

In effect this bill assured that all of the Federal 2-cents-a-gallon gasoline tax revenues will go into road building and not be diverted to other purposes such as foreign aid.

HELPS COAST STATES

This bill grants to the States, from Federal gasoline taxes, $300 million a year more money for road building purposes than the Federal Government ever has given the States heretofore for highway building.

These additional $300 million which will be spent each year on highway construction means better and safer roads for motorists, more jobs and steadier employment for construction workers and a general increase in the Nation's prosperity due to the business and employment this additional huge construction program will generate.

The three Pacific Coast States as their share of larger highway appropriation will receive more than $25 million a year in Federal highway funds than these States ever have received in any previous year.

Under this new law, California has been allocated $47,108,037 of Federal funds for the coming year compared to $30,269,269 last year or an increase of $16,838,768.

Washington has been allocated $14,061,986 for the coming year compared to $9,240,247 for last year or an increase of $4,821,739.

Oregon has been allocated $12,889,469 for the coming year compared to $8,661,811 or an increase of $4,227,658.

States now can plan a big step-up in their road-building programs. The Nation, thanks to the highway legislation of this Congress, is about to enter upon the biggest road-construction program in its history.

This highway bill which came from my committee with the approval of President Eisenhower is a good bill.

All gasoline tax money, in my opinion, should go into building better and safer roads. The motorists and the motorists alone pay these gasoline taxes. The gas-tax money should be used for their benefit by employing it to provide better and safer highways. The Washington State Grange supports this idea.

The people of our Nation will pay for better and safer highways whether these roads are built or not. If better and safer roads are built these will cost money and the taxpayers will pay it.

However, if the roads are not built the taxpayers will pay for them just the same. They will pay for them in increased medical and hospital bills, in increased auto-repair bills, in increased consumption of gasoline and in greater wear and tear on tires and equipment. They will pay for them in the higher automobile insurance rates they will have to pay.

Building better and safer roads and the using of all gasoline tax revenues to do so is good sense and good economics.

Celler Repeats Demand for Action Against Saudi Arabia-Onassis Oil Monopoly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 13, 1954

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, the Saudi Arabia-Aristotle S. Onassis oil tanker agreement—with its monopolistic and discriminatory features—may initially cost the American consumer directly, or the American taxpayer indirectly, a minimum of $16 million a year. Before long, this excessive and unnecessary drain may rise to $100 million a year or more.

It is inconceivable, therefore, that our Government can stand by and permit this agreement to operate.

The nature of these exorbitant charges and the damaging features of this unfair contract were first cited in my statement of May 18, 1954. They were announced in more detail in my statement of June 24, 1954, when I urged the Department of State and the Foreign Operations Administration to review this unpalatable agreement and to do something about it.

More than a month has passed since my last statement was issued. Yet, I have received no further report from these agencies; nor have I learned of any real action which they have taken to put a stop to this unwarranted discrimination against American interests and against nationals of a friendly power.

The present oil concession in Saudi Arabia is an American one. In the long run, British and other foreign interests will not be affected nearly as much as our own. Nevertheless, Britain has made a strong démarche to the Saudi Arabian Government. So have Finland, Norway, and Denmark.

As far as I can tell from the meager public information on action taken by our own Department of State, there has been only one official statement on this matter. Made to the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, it consisted of 13 words:

> The Department has protested this agreement as a violation of the concession rights.

These 13 words will scarcely prove very reassuring to the American public.

By way of contrast I append to my statement a report of the far more forthright British stand, as reported in the Times of London on July 20, 1954.

Clearly, it is "time for a change"—strong American action in this matter is imperative.

Rather than repeat the details of my previous statements, I shall confine these remarks to an explanation of three points:

First. An estimate of the inordinate burden which would be exacted from American consumers or taxpayers;

Second. A reference to the specific responsibility of the Department of Justice to examine the Saudi Arabia-Onassis agreement in accordance with the provisions of our antitrust laws—especially as they apply to American firms which elect to import articles—in this case, oil—from such an international conspiracy in restraint of lawful trade as this one appears to be; and

Third. A mention of the definite obligation with which the Federal Maritime Board is charged to investigate the action of any foreign government where it appears that United States vessels "are not accorded equal privileges in foreign trade with vessels of such foreign countries or vessels of other foreign countries."

THE COST OF THIS MONOPOLY

It is not my intention to provide here an unduly detailed breakdown of each of the factors that make up the exorbitant potential profit for Mr. A. S. Onassis from this negotiation which has such serious overtones for Americans.

It is my intention, however, to urge once again that the rightful authorities carefully examine this matter. If the facts are as I believe them to be, appropriate measures should be taken immediately to stop an unmitigated raid upon the purses of American consumers or taxpayers.

The carriage rate, which is provided in the Saudi Arabia-Onassis contract, is stated below in summary as being "in accordance with the rates announced monthly by the London Tanker Brokers Board, provided that this rate shall not be less than the average rates of the London Tanker Brokers Board during the last two years starting April 1952 through March 1954."

The London Tanker Broker Board rate fluctuates with the market. For the principal tanker run involved—United States to the Continent—the two-year average specified in the agreement as a minimum works out at what the shipping trade calls USMC minus 15—that is, 15 percent less than the rates established by the United States Maritime Commission during the war.

In dollars this would mean payments of $9.26 per ton to Mr. Onassis. The actual present market rate is much lower—USMC minus 55, which means $4.90 per ton.

Hence, Mr. Onassis will receive an estimated $4.36 per ton more than the market—in fact only 54 cents less than twice the present rate.

The contract initially calls for Mr. Onassis to supply a minimum of 500,000 deadweight tons of tanker capacity to Saudi Arabia. Let us make some assumptions: that eight round trips can be made by a vessel each year and that 500,000 tons of deadweight capacity would permit carriage of 460,000 tons of oil, and that the rate for United States-Continent carriage would be used—then Mr. Onassis would receive excessive amounts of gross profit as follows: $4.36 per ton times 460,000 tons of oil times 8 trips per year. This would amount to around $16 million per annum. It is only one estimate of the basic profit. There are, of course, various other contingencies, which I have not included, but these computations give us a rough indication of the scope of this pernicious agreement.

In return for the monopoly, Mr. Onassis would pay the Saudi Arabian Government 21 cents per ton, or approximately $700,000. Also he will pay for the expenses of a Saudi Arabian naval academy, estimated at $50,000; and he will also transport an estimated 50,000 tons of oil locally free of cost, the cost of which is estimated to be another $50,000. He is further expected to build drydock facilities at Jidda. These might be expected to amortize their own cost. Hence, in total, he will pay the Saudi Arabian Government roughly $800,000 per annum.

In my opinion this $800,000 is just an initial bite. More likely we will find that the $800,000 per annum will be nothing more than the camel's nose coming under the tent.

The figures I have projected above represent the minimum benefit under the terms of the contract. Should the Onassis monopoly succeed in cornering 60 percent of the total Saudi Arabian output, the increase in cost of oil would probably approach $100 million per annum.

If the monopoly should succeed in cornering the total Saudi Arabian output, the excess in price would be in the neighborhood of $150 million to $200 million per annum.

I do not purport to say that my estimated computations are wholly accurate. There are too many variables, including among others: the carrying capacity of the vessels, their speed, the turnaround time, and many others. However, those computations which I have made indicate the magnitude of the profit which Mr. Onassis and the Arabians would make.

But I do say that these estimates are not unfounded projections. They are written right there in the terms of the contract.

Insofar as the American consumers are affected, they would end up paying the bill for the price increases on perhaps 15 or 20 percent of the Arabian oil—that being more or less the proportion which comes to the United States.

But that is only the beginning. If the other nations of the free world are forced to draw down their scanty foreign exchange reserves to pick up the bill for the balance of the oil—perhaps 80 or 85 percent—it will mean that there will be less foreign exchange in their coffers. Hence, requests for increases in the grants and loans annually sought from the American taxpayer will no doubt appear in due course.

My conjecture is that, if this agreement is permitted to stand, the American consumer and/or the American taxpayer will end up paying these gigantic sums for the support of Mr. Onassis and for the support of this nationalistic Arab nation.

LEGAL STEPS WHICH THE AMERICAN GOVERNMENT CAN TAKE

After further study of what appears to be a serious international conspiracy, I have found that two additional agencies of the Federal Government—the Department of Justice and the Federal Maritime Board—are charged with responsibility in matters such as this one. This agreement appears to be in violation of our antitrust and shipping laws. It is, therefore, high time that American consumers and taxpayers receive affirmative assurance by appropriate Government officials that their rights are being protected. Their rights must not be abused by indecision, ineptness, or unwillingness to investigate and prosecute a flagrantly unfair and monopolistic trade agreement.

I trust that the Department of Justice has reviewed or will review promptly this Saudi Arabia-Onassis agreement in light of the specific wording of our antitrust laws.

RESPONSIBILITY OF THE FEDERAL MARITIME BOARD

With reference to the responsibility of the Federal Maritime Board, section 26 of the Shipping Act of 1916 states:

> The Board shall have power, and it shall be its duty whenever complaint shall be made to it, to investigate the action of any foreign government with respect to the privileges afforded and burdens imposed upon vessels of the United States engaged in foreign trade whenever it shall appear that the laws, regulations, or practices of any foreign Government operate in such a manner that vessels of the United States are not accorded equal privileges in foreign trade with vessels of such foreign countries or vessels of other foreign countries, either in trade to or from the ports of such foreign country or in respect of the passage or transportation through such foreign country of passengers or goods intended for shipment or transportation in such vessels of the United States, either to or from ports of such foreign country or to or from ports of other foreign countries.

While the number of United States-flag vessels engaged in this trade may not be numerous, 40 percent of the oil is carried by vessels controlled by Aramco companies; and the United States Navy in the Mediterranean may be dependent upon this oil.

SUMMARY

In short, I think that the American people should now demand that these four agencies of the Federal Government—the Department of State and the Foreign Operations Administration, to which I referred previously, and the Department of Justice and the Federal Maritime Board, which I have mentioned herein—report on this trade agreement with respect to, first, its monopolistic and discriminatory provisions; and, second, what steps are being taken, or will be taken, to protect American interests.

I repeat once again the need for an awareness of the serious aspects of this matter. I would again urge the oil companies not to compromise in any such conspiratorial and probably illegal arrangements. I restate my earlier remark that this Middle East oil-tanker agreement "militates against the best interests of our national security, our traditions of free trade and fair play, and our time-honored guaranties of justice and equity to friendly countries and the American consuming public."

The American people are entitled to action and to results.

[From the London Times of July 20, 1954]

SAUDI ARABIAN OIL—BRITISH CONCERN OVER ONASSIS AGREEMENT

Mr. James Hoy (Edinburgh, Leith, Laborite) and Mr. Grimond (Orkney and Zetland, Laborite) asked for a statement on the agreement reached between Saudi Arabia and Mr. Socrates Onassis.

"Mr. DODDS-PARKER (Under Secretary, Foreign Office (Banbury, Conservative)). The Government have now studied the agreement between the Saudi Arabian Government and Mr. Onassis. There is no doubt, in their view, that this agreement constitutes flag discrimination by seeking to force buyers of oil to use tankers of one particular flag. It is therefore contrary to accepted maritime practice. Her Majesty's Government deplore such interference by a Government with the shipper's freedom of choice of vessel, and it is clear that British interests will be adversely affected by this agreement. We have been in the closest touch with the United States Government and with other governments and commercial interests, whose objections to this agreement are as strong as our own. The Foreign Secretary has expressed to the Saudi Arabian Ambassador his grave concern at this agreement, and his hope that the Saudi Arabian Government will think very carefully before pursuing a course which seems calculated to lead them into difficulties with friendly powers."

He added that no reply had been received yet from Saudi Arabia.

"Mr. HOY. Is it intended to take this matter before some international organization?

"Mr. DODDS-PARKER. We hope to reach an agreement with the Saudi Arabian Government, with whom we have friendly relations."

Semantic Trick

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 3, 1954

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, freewheeling demogog will be out to fool the voters with their bag of verbal tricks during this season's campaign. The Guaranty Survey for August 1954 presents an interesting exposure-explanation of one of their slight-of-vocal-cord stunts under the title "Trickle Down: Theory or Semantic Trick?" It is as follows:

TRICKLE DOWN: THEORY OR SEMANTIC TRICK?

Many if not most of the attacks on the omnibus revenue bill now before Congress describe the measure as a product of the "trickle-down theory." This semantic monstrosity is oddly reminiscent of its counterpart, "pump priming," which gained even wider currency during the 1930's. Both expressions are or were used by spokesmen for the same school of thought—the advocates of governmental hypodermics for the economy. Both are equally misleading. The first, however, is used in derision, whereas the second is apparently no longer used at all, thought the idea it exresses is still as widely held as ever, if not more so.

CONFUSION OF MEANING

What is this "trickle-down theory," so often disparagingly referred to but so rarely stated in broad and intelligible terms? Users of the phrase are not fully agreed on what it means. As far as the tax bill is concerned, Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS and Representative RICHARD BOLLING of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report think the "trickle-down theory" means "to give tax relief to the upper brackets, who will save more, invest more, expand industrial plant, create more jobs, and therefore expand purchasing and consumption." In other words, the theory is that such governmentally bestowed prosperity "trickles down" from the upper brackets to the lower brackets.

To other commentators the expression implies tax concessions to business and recipients of business income—categories quite different from the "upper brackets."

Former President Truman defines it more broadly but less explicitly as the idea that "the tree" (meaning, presumably, the economy) "can be fertilized" (by political action) "at the top instead of at the bottom."

Here the similarity and the difference between the two "theories" becomes apparent. Both are held to imply that the tree must be fertilized. The "pump primers," however (at this point the metaphors become somewhat mixed), insist that it must be fertilized at the bottom, not at the top.

It is interesting to observe that politicians tend to define the problem in terms of such taxpaying and voting minorities as the "upper brackets" and the "top," whereas spokesmen for labor organizations tend to think in terms of "business management" and "ownership"—that is, employers. The confusion between the two groups is fatal to clear thinking. For example, farmers are businessmen and employers, but do they on that account necessarily fall into the upper brackets? What about the small proprietors? What of the aged, the disabled, and others who subsist upon low incomes derived from business earnings? Any attempt to identify a type of income with a level of income is at variance with reality.

The words "trickle down" would seem to imply a difference of level. Yet the controversial features of the tax bill have nothing to do with income levels as such. They deal with depreciation of business properties and dividend income received by individuals, regardless of income levels.

Identification of business income with higher income brackets is perhaps accurate enough for purposes of broad economic analysis. It assuredly is not accurate enough for considerations of equitable treatment of individuals.

EMOTIONAL OVERTONES

Yet the "trickle-down" concept is loaded with implications of inequality. It invidiously suggests the beggar receiving the crumbs from the rich man's table. Those who use it do so in a tone of moral indignation, as if the Government were proposing to exercise its powers in perpetrating some iniquity, bestowing benefits upon a privileged few and consoling the neglected many with the promise that some of these benefits would "trickle down" to them.

Unrealistic as it is, the phrase is emotional enough to be a strong instrument of persuasion in the sort of contest for political favor that inevitably arises when government allows itself to become too deeply involved in the people's economic affairs.

As for the implied comparison between government's role in the economy and fertilizing a tree, the fallacies are numerous and glaring enough to provide an object lesson against such analogies. To begin with, a healthy economy does not need and cannot benefit by governmental "fertilization." Its fertility comes from within, not from without. "Fertilization" is only another name for inflation. In the second place, fertilization is applied at the roots, but air and sunlight are just as necessary at the top. In the third place, where are the "roots" and where is the "top" of our economic system? Are these localities determined by income levels or by economic functions? Would it not be more realistic to regard the individual business enterprise, rather than the low-income receiver, as the "root" of the economy, the producer of sustenance that nourishes the whole organism?

The entire analogy is false and leads only to confusion of thought.

THE TRUTH BEHIND THE WORDS

What is the kernel of truth in the much-abused "trickle-down theory"? Just this: Business is not a class or group that can be penalized or exploited for the benefit of other groups. Business, in the broad sense, is the organized economic life of the people. It is the source of all the necessities, comforts, benefits and satisfactions which are not provided by nature and for which men therefore must work. It is the direct or indirect provider of all incomes, public and private, large and small, whether in commerce and industry, the arts, professions, philanthropies, or government. Aside from the small output by amateurs, everything that is consumed by anyone must first be produced by business.

The mainspring that energizes this mechanism is the incentive of profit. In the drive for profit, business creates jobs, absorbs savings, and pays wages, interest, and taxes to support government. When the opportunity for profit is adequate, business activity runs high and these various types of payments are available in large volume. When the opportunity for profit is restricted, whether by excessive or one-sided taxation, by hampering legal regulations, or by maladjustments within the business structure itself, the mainspring is weakened. Then the mechanism slows down, and all forms of income tend to shrink.

It is inaccurate and misleading to call this basic principle a trickle-down theory. In the first place, it is not a theory but a constantly demonstrated fact. In the second place, the flow of incomes originating in and radiating from business is—when conditions are right—not a trickle but a torrent. In the third place, the flow is not down any more than it is up. It might be more aptly described as an emanation or pervasion, a spontaneous distribution of the goods and services produced by the people for their own use, under the spur of profit and subject to the regulatory action of price and competition.

The frequency with which the essential role of profits in our economy is overlooked or ignored, even by professional economists, is difficult to understand. It is often and correctly pointed out that production and employment are limited by the volume of demand. Yet it is forgotten that the prospect of profit is the active force by which the demand gives rise to the production and employment. Demand does not create production automatically. It results in production only when and insofar as it promises a market profitable enough to justify risks, repay costs, and attract capital. In a system of free enterprise, it is only through the activating force of profit that the economic needs of individuals bring forth the goods and services to satisfy them.

THE TESTIMONY OF EXPERIENCE

Senator Douglas and Representative Bolling are of the opinion that the trickle-down theory was tried in the period 1926–30, and everyone knows the results. They were disastrous. Rarely does one find such a pat explanation of the great world-wide economic upheaval of the 1930's. Everyone does indeed know the results, but the results of what? Are we seriously asked to believe that the global collapse was due solely, or even primarily, to the failure of tax relief to trickle down in sufficient volume? What about the financial and industrial dislocations following World War I, the trend toward closer governmental controls, arbitrary exchange rates, the suppression of competition, unwise reparations policies, ill-advised international lending, the greatest speculative orgy in history, and a number of other well-known factors? Did these have nothing to do with it?

These same congressional authorities concede that in normal times the trickle-down concept has a reasonable working validity. They quickly go on to point out, however, that these are not normal times (their report was written this year), with the implication that the theory would not work now. By their own explicit statement, it failed disastrously in the later 1920's. It would be interesting to know under just what conditions the theory might be expected to succeed.

The crowing irony is that neither the trickle-down theory nor the pump-priming theory is properly applicable to the tax bill against which they have been invoked. The bill was never intended to be an antirecession device. It was designed to correct manifest defects and inequities in the Federal tax system. Nor has the Government yielded to the persistent cry that drastic business stimulants are needed. Fortunately, the recent course of economic affairs seems to have swept away any immediate possibility that such dubious counsels will prevail.

Public Laws 451 to 480, Inclusive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 28, 1954

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, since the convening of the 83d Congress I have reported to my constituents the new laws we have enacted as promptly, after their signing by the President as was possible under the pressure of other congressional duties. I trust that the reports have justified the time and effort required for their preparation and mailing by affording my constituents a better grasp of the extent and nature of our work in the Congress.

As my vote is actually the vote of my constituents that they have delegated me to cast for them, I feel they are entitled to the same accounting that in civilian life would be required by a principal of his agent.

By unanimous consent, I am extending my remarks to include my report in Public Laws 451 to 480, inclusive, the first 450 public laws of the 83d Congress all having been covered in previous reports appearing in the Congressional Record:

PUBLIC LAW 451

S. 3318, Trust Territories of the Pacific Islands

World War II left us with three groups of former Japanese mandated islands, now known as the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. They are separated 2,727 miles east and west, 1,477 miles north and south. All told, the population is under 58,000. The Appropriation Committee turned thumbs down because the islands have no organic legislation. Yet the United States has the responsibility.

Public Law 451 seeks to fill the gap by providing (a) that until Congress enacts organic laws the islands shall be governed by such officials as the President of the United States designates, and (b) that an annual appropriation of $7,500,000 is authorized for the expenses of government of the three groups of islands. That is at the rate of about $112 a year for governing each inhabitant of the islands World War II placed in our basket. What price victory?

PUBLIC LAW 452

H. R. 7709, import tax on copper

This extends until June 30, 1956, the suspension of the 2 cents per pound import tax on copper. Reason: continuing shortage of refined copper necessary to American industry. In 1953 United States consumption was 1,840,000 tons, domestic production only 1,336,000 tons.

PUBLIC LAW 453

H. R. 8637, appropriations civil functions

Appropriation measures will be covered in a separate and later report.

PUBLIC LAW 454

S. 1665, Federal credit unions

This merely liberalizes some of the provisions of the Federal Credit Union Act. Hereafter the directors of a Federal credit union may make an interest refund to borrowers if earnings for the year are sufficient; really a readjustment of the interest rate.

I was interested by the testimony before the Banking and Currency Committee—of which I am a member—showing the rapid growth both of State and Federal credit unions. It was the conclusion of our committee that the credit unions—State and Federal—are doing a splendid job.

PUBLIC LAW 455

S. 2845, pennies and nickels

Since 1941 the demand for pennies and nickels has increased 126 percent, the price of copper has gone up 142 percent and that of nickel 88 percent. Result: The million-dollar fund for the purchase of metal for the minor coins is no longer sufficient. Public Law 455 raises it to $2 million.

This is the way it works: The mint buys the metal with a check on the fund; when the metal is molded into coins it is credited as cash, thus replenishing the fund. About a billion and a half pennies and nickels are coined annually. This means the mint must have a working reservoir of many million tons of metal.

PUBLIC LAW 456

H. R. 4030, Commonwealth of Puerto Rico

In 1934 Congress established the Model Housing Board of Puerto Rico to construct and sell on easy terms modern homes to the islanders. In 1952 Puerto Rico became a commonwealth with its own legislative body. Public Law 456 recognizes the commonwealth independence of Puerto Rico by repealing the act of 1934, leaving Puerto Rico to establish its own board under its own authority if it so wishes. Since Puerto Rico is our first and only commonwealth, possibly a pattern for others in the future, I am much interested in following the development of the commonwealth status.

PUBLIC LAW 457

H. R. 9505, war risk hazard and detention benefits

Large construction projects of our Government are presently under way in Turkey, Saudi Arabia, Tripoli, Morocco, the Azores, Iceland, Greenland, Newfoundland, Laborador, offshore Korea, and elsewhere the world around. Many Americans are employed, many more needed. Insurance companies refuse to insure against unusual hazards incident to employment in these areas. Hence pending future permanent legislation, Public Law 457 extends until July 1, 1955, the wartime measures granting compensation benefits to employees of the Government and of American contractors injured, killed, or captured as result of war-risk hazards.

PUBLIC LAW 458

H. R. 8873, 1955 Defense Appropriation Act

Appropriation measures will be covered in a separate and later report.

PUBLIC LAW 459

S. 932, Veterinary Corps officers

In 1948 schools of veterinary medicine raised college training requirements. Public Law 459 follows up by providing that hereafter Army officers entering the Veterinary Corps will be commissioned first lieutenants instead of second lieutenants, get a 3-year period of constructive service instead of the former 2-year period to compensate for time spent in professional education.

PUBLIC LAW 460

S. 3481, Federal Reserve banks

This clarifies the right of a national bank or member State bank to invest up to the amount of its capital stock either outright in its own bank building or in the securities of an affiliate corporation owning the building. Some banks, as several in Chicago, are housed in multistoried buildings, the bank occupying only a few stories. An affiliate corporation, existing exclusively for ownership and management of the building, is sometimes a preferable setup. The House Banking and Currency Committee unanimously approved this as clearing up confusion occasioned by an inadvertent conflict in two provisions of existing law.

PUBLIC LAW 461

H. R. 3413, Fort Peck Indians

Another law recommended by the committee as furthering the "policy of granting an increased measure of responsibility and self-government to our Indian citizens." It grants to certain individual Indians oil and gas rights now held by the tribe on the Fort Peck Indian Reservation in Montana; subject however to a referendum by the tribe members.

PUBLIC LAW 462

H. R. 6487, Roza Irrigation District

At an expense of $25 million the United States constructed a dam, canal, pumping plants and a distributing system for the Roza Irrigation District in the Yakima Valley in Washington. Repayment contracts, covering a period of 40 years, required payments more than the water users could meet. Public Law 462 authorizes a new schedule under which it is expected the debt will be lifted in 63 years. Anticipated profits from a new $2,677,000 power plant figure in the calculations. I am learning that irrigation adventures, like other business adventures, do not run always according to blueprints.

PUBLIC LAW 464

H. R. 9474, extension of trade agreements

At the best this was a compromise with the high tariff forces in the Republican Party. It extends for 1 year only the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements in furtherance of the "trade not aid" program. It was charged in debate, and not strongly denied, that during the period of the year's extension few if any new agreements actually would eventualize.

What it does is to leave the entire question in status quo pending further study of the sweeping recommendations of the Randall Commission—submitted January 25, 1954—and the convening in 1955 of the 84th Congress.

I very much regret the delay since it will work out to the advantage of Russia, which since the beginning of the year has signed 10 new trade agreements with Latin and Asian countries with trade potentialities in excess of $100 million annually. During this period we have negotiated no new trade agreements. To that extent we have slipped back.

The President, as well as the Randall Commission, recognized the seriousness of the situation. But the best that they could work out with the leadership in Congress was a compromise that made no step forward on a vital front but at least prevented the immediate destruction of the program.

As it was, the rule bringing the bill to the floor of the House received only 273 votes to 63 no's and 98 Members finding it necessary or convenient to be absent. On final passage 281 voted yes, 53 no, 3 present, and again there were many absentees, this time 97.

Your vote was cast for an extension of the agreements. I am convinced that an avoidance of world war III hangs on the way we handle our tariff policy. Furthermore, the high tariff policy of the Hoover administration is generally accepted as one of the major contributing causes of the great depression.

You would have found, as I did, the debate on this measure among the most intellectually illuminating of the debates of the 83d Congress. Here are a few of the many facts brought out:

First. Over 4 million Americans depend on international trade for employment.

Second. Since World War II farmers and factory workers have had their markets and employment sustained by the Marshall Plan and its successors to the extent of $33 billion.

Third. In 1952 48 percent of the wheat production of the United States was exported, in 1953 only 24.5 percent.

Fourth. One dollar out of each $8 of farm income is accounted for by exports, $9 out of each $100 of all our wares and farm products combined.

Fifth. The United States currently sells abroad 21 percent of its tractors, 30 percent of its graders, 20 percent of its textile machinery, 15 percent of its trucks, and the narrowing dollar buying power in foreign markets is responsible for the present wide unemployment in such farm machinery centers as Rock Island, Ill., and Davenport, Iowa.

Sixth. Through our aid the war-bankrupt nations of Europe are now 40 percent above prewar industrial production, 20 percent in excess of prewar farm production, and these nations must increase international trade in order to survive.

Seventh. While we are lagging on a tariff front equally important with that of atomic weapons the Soviet is pushing on a tremendous scale among its satellite nations a point 4 program similar to our own and strengthened by trade agreements that already have increased the export markets of those countries from 12 percent to 83 percent of entire production and now are threatening our own markets.

I have attempted to highlight the importance of the reciprocal trade agreements. Atomic bombs get more dramatic attention. The real fight of the free world with the slave world well may be on the tariff front. We are dragging our feet.

PUBLIC LAW 465

H. R. 8680, 1955 appropriations for the Interior Department

Appropriation measures will be covered in a separate and later report.

PUBLIC LAW 466

S. 2802, fishery products

Something is happening to our fish. The whitefish of the Great Lakes is not the sole participant in the disappearance act.

Salmon production in Alaska declined from 8.5 million cases in 1946 to 3 million cases in 1953.

At Gloucester, Mass., mackerel in 10 years dropped from 32 million pounds per year to 2.6 million pounds and ocean perch from 177 million to 88 million pounds.

Sardine production in Maine is off 50 percent. Oyster production in the Gulf States is about a fifth of former figures. Redfish fishermen of New England now have to go 1,200 miles to sea; a few years ago only 30 or 40 miles.

There are economic repercussions since 550,000 persons are employed in the fisheries industry, annual receipts from fish landings about $360 million.

Public Law 466 earmarks 30 percent of the custom receipts on fishery products for (a) biological, technological, and other research and (b) developing and increasing markets.

You may be interested to learn that "fishery products" includes such marine animals as whales and seals, aquatic reptiles like turtles, aquatic plants such as kelp, Irish moss and agar, also sponges.

PUBLIC LAW 467

H. R. 8488, payments to German and Japanese citizens

This removes a wartime ban on payment by the Veterans' Administration of compensation, pension, or other gratuities to German and Japanese citizens residing in Germany or Japan.

PUBLIC LAW 468

H. R. 9517, 1955 appropriations for the District of Columbia

Appropriation measures will be covered in a separate and later report.

PUBLIC LAW 469

Senate Joint Resolution 72, sale of Philippine vessels

The United States owns eight vessels presently in the Philippines. Public Law 469 authorizes their sale to citizens of the Philippine Republic for development of interisland commerce.

PUBLIC LAW 470

H. R. 9203, 1955 appropriations for the legislative and judiciary branches

Appropriation measures will be covered in a later and separate report.

PUBLIC LAW 471

H. R. 8067, 1955 appropriations for State, Justice, and Commerce

Appropriation measures will be covered in a separate and later report.

PUBLIC LAW 472

H. R. 9447, 1955 appropriations for Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare

Appropriation measures will be covered in a separate and later report.

PUBLIC LAW 473

House Joint Resolution 458, site for a school building in Georgia

This authorizes the quitclaim to Irwin County, Ga., of some 8 acres as a site for a school building. The Federal Government has no further use for the land.

PUBLIC LAW 474

H. R. 9315, trade with Philippine Republic

Under the Philippine Trade Act of 1946 imports from the islands became subject on July 4, 1954, to United States custom duties on a graduated scale. Public Law 474 extends the time to January 1, 1956, on a reciprocal basis. Meanwhile Philippine products will continue to come in duty free.

PUBLIC LAW 475

House Joint Resolution 552, temporary appropriations for 1955

The fiscal year of 1955 starts on July 1, 1954. An appropriation bill for the Mutual Security Program and a few agencies still awaiting passage in the Senate, Public Law 475 provides temporary funds for July operation.

PUBLIC LAW 476

S. 119, Markham Ferry in Oklahoma

Public Law 476 gives the green light to the Grand River Dam Authority, an agency of the State of Oklahoma, to go ahead with the construction of the Markham Ferry Dam and Reservoir. The Federal Government will contribute $6,500,000 from flood-control funds. Remainder of the $38,450,000 cost will be borne by Oklahoma through a bond issue to be retired from earnings from the sale of power.

The Grand—Neosho—River drains an area of 12,660 square miles in Kansas, Missouri, Oklahoma, and Arkansas. It is one of the principal flood-producing tributaries of the Arkansas River. The expectancy is that the addition of Markham Ferry Dam to existing Federal facilities will solve the flood problem in that area. Uncle Sam escapes most of the construction cost through the proposed participation of Oklahoma.

PUBLIC LAW 477

S. 2217, disbursing officers of National Guard

Each State has a property and disbursing officer to receipt and be responsible for all property issued to the National Guard. Public Law 477, first, continues such officers on an active-duty status—instead of in civilian capacity; second, provides for their appointment by the State governor instead of the Secretary of the Army; and, third, restricts them to officers of the National Guard, excluding Regular Army officers.

PUBLIC LAW 478

H. R. 2231, Fort Randall Dam

In constructing the Fort Randall Dam in South Dakota, lands—some 10,000 acres—on 3 Indian reservations were necessarily condemned. Public Law 478 provides for compensation to the Indians, including, first, reimbursement of moving and resettling expenses; and, second, costs of relocating Indian cemeteries, tribal monuments, and shrines. The Indians are permitted to retain oil and gas rights.

PUBLIC LAW 479

H. R. 6465, rubber-soled footwear

Rubber-soled footwear—tennis shoes, sneakers, and so forth—since 1933 has been subject to a customs valuation based upon the American selling price. Recently foreign producers started inserting a leather filler between the insole and the outsole, thus changing the customs classification of a rubber product to one of leather. Public Law 479 sets things right by emphasizing that a rubber shoe is a rubber shoe, no matter what is stuffed in away from the walking surface.

PUBLIC LAW 480

S. 2475, Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954

I would say this is one of the better acts of the 83d Congress. It provides a sensible program for disposal of our surplus farm products, now shamefully piling up considering there are so many hungry mouths in the world.

It authorizes reimbursement to CCC to the extent of $700 million for the next 3 years for surplus farm and dairy products which in the determination of the President may be used in improving our foreign relations and in relieving distress at home.

I especially was pleased by the inclusion of school-lunch programs, hospitals and charitable institutions in the United States caring for the needy.

The greater volume of the products will be sold in friendly foreign countries and paid for in the currencies of those countries at the prevailing world rate of exchange. This in return will give us local currencies with which to purchase products for import into our country. It is really a barter and exchange arrangement matching or excelling that of the Soviet. Russia, for illustration, gets forestry products from Finland in exchange for wheat, rye, rice, barley, and sugar; gets butter and steel from Sweden in a direct swap for corn. One purpose of Public Law 480 is to assist friendly nations to be independent of trade with U. S. S. R.

The act also provides for emergency assistance to friendly nations by gifts of food in times of famine and other relief requirements.

Veterans' Administration Hospital, Perry Point, Md.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 3, 1954

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a telegram concerning the patients at the Veterans' Administration hospital at Perry Point, Md. I have asked the Veterans' Administration for complete information in the matter, and I shall personally investigate and help in every way to secure remedial action. I shall also ask the Subcommittee on Hospitals of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee to investigate the matter.

The telegram follows:

ARLINGTON, VA., *July 31, 1954.*

Hon. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,

Member of Congress:

Patients in Perry Point, Md., veterans' hospital asked me tonight to appeal to you for immediate help in obtaining better food and hot-weather privileges now being denied them. Half-cooked potatoes and unfit meat served them today. Canteen closed at 4 p. m. after which they were not allowed to send for ice cream to augment slender diet. Are hungry, hot, and in pain. Some are postoperative cases and need nourishment. This did not refer to mental patients at hospital, but men in general medical and surgical wards. Chief complainant is former radio broadcaster of New York and Texas. Will appreciate your efforts.

SARAH MCCLENDON,
News Correspondent.

Communists Lead Strike in Detroit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES J. KERSTEN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 3, 1954

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the danger to the security of the United States of Communist dominated labor unions is demonstrated by a strike now going on in Detroit, Mich. Since June 15th more than 1,200 production workers in the main plant of the Square D Co., in Detroit, Mich., have been idle because of a strike called by the Communist-dominated United Electrical Workers Union.

The Detroit plant of the Square D Co., manufactures switches, circuit breakers, and electrical control panels for industrial and commercial applications. It also produces electrical components for military aircraft, supplies products to the Atomic Energy Commission and manufactures elements used in the Nation's guided missiles program.

In time of war the Detroit plant becomes 100 percent defense production. But in both war and peace, the company's products are vital to every basic industry in the United States.

PUSH-BUTTON STRIKE

The UE contends that the present strike at the Detroit plant is a result of the failure to reach an agreement on a new labor contract. The UE contends it must have a contract which will "improve working conditions."

But there is ample evidence to indicate that this strike in Detroit was not called because of any bonafide complaint about pay or working conditions in the Detroit plant, but rather was push-buttoned into action by the Communist dominated UE national headquarters in New York.

Square D Co. has 6 other United States plants, including 1 in my home city of Milwaukee, and also 1 in Canada and 1 in Mexico. In the 51 years that the Square D Co. has been in business, it has never had a strike at any of its other 8 plants. The UE does not represent the workingmen in any of the other plants of Square D Co. except a smaller factory at Peru, Ind.

OUTSTANDING RECORD

Yet, despite this outstanding record of the Square D Co. in its 8 other plants, they have had 3 strikes called by the UE in Detroit in less than a year. Altogether there has been almost 100 wildcat strikes and production interruptions in the Detroit plant since the last contract was signed with the UE 2 years ago.

The UE itself admits that the pay and working conditions at the Detroit plant of Square D are excellent. Before the last representation election at the Square D Co., on May 19, 1954—which unfortunately UE won—the UE's local at the Detroit plant—local 957—boasted of the fact that the plantwide straight-time average pay rate was $2.25 per hour. Here is what a UE handout stated:

> UE Local 957 is mighty proud of its achievement in colective bargaining. UE has built the best standards of wages, seniority, and other benefits here at our plant, as well as in the other UE plants of Square D Co.

And the national UE News had this to state about the situation:

> But employees of Square D weighed their union's performance against phony propaganda. The average straight-time hourly earnings here are $2.25 an hour. This includes incentive and nonincentive workers.
>
> Average wages of Square D are higher than those in the auto industry. Besides, the UE members have a contract which they did not want to be tampered with. It includes such things as a clause which gives retired workers a company-paid health plan for themselves and their wives.

Yet, less than a month later the UE was out on strike.

STRIKE'S REAL CAUSE

It would appear that the real cause of the strike at Detroit is the fact that in March 1954, Square D filed suit in Federal court against the UE, asking $210,000 damages for losses the company suffered as the result of the two illegal strikes called by the local during the preceding 6 months. The company contends that these strikes were in violation of the no-strike clause in the labor contract.

Shortly after the filing of this suit, the company began withholding check-off dues from UE to offset the damages claimed in the Federal suit. Cutting off the flow of funds to the UE was regarded as an unprecedented step in the company's determination to have the UE legally and financially responsible for its actions. UE national headquarters, acutely aware of delicate situations in other UE plants around the Nation, no doubt viewed the Square D Co.'s decision with considerable alarm.

Because of these illegal strikes, the company insisted when contract renewal time arrived that a stronger no-strike clause be inserted in its contract with the UE. UE, however, refused to approve of a stronger no-strike clause in the contract. It would thus appear that the no-strike issue in the company suit against local No. 957 of the UE is more of a factor in the present strike than the desire for "improved working conditions."

The Square D Co. is the last major outpost of the UE in Detroit. Not long ago the UE lost its position at Vickers, Inc., in Detroit.

Entirely apart from the almost unbelievable series of strikes and other production interruptions that have hit the Detroit plant while the most recent contract was in effect, is the UE's resistance to a strong no-strike clause in setting the course for future operations. Is flexibility to shut down strategic electrical plants, without legal recourse, during wartime or buildup for war, a key factor? Only the UE or the Communist Party, or both, has the answer to this and other puzzling questions involving the strike now on against the Square D Co.

COMMUNISTS IN CHARGE

One of the key figures in the present strike is Philip Saba, a prominent Communist functionary from Philadelphia. Saba, a UE International representative, has been imported from Philadelphia to take charge of the picket lines at Square D. It is reported to me that Saba's record is as follows:

August 1941: Saba was subpenaed in Philadelphia in connection with frauds in Communist Party election petitions. He was unable to produce a draft registration card when picked up. Under oath he admitted being a Communist Party member since the mid 1930's. Saba's wife, Velma, is also registered as a Communist Party member.

December 1943: Saba named labor secretary of the 33d ward branch of the Communist Party's section 5 in Philadelphia.

April 1944: Saba was active as member of Northeast Club of the Communist Political Association. Remained through March 1945 while then employed as a UE organizer.

1946: Saba assigned to Club 155, Philadelphia, comprised of Reds who were members of local 155.

May 1947: Saba named membership director of the Tom Paine Club on the United States Attorney General's list as a subversive organization.

September 1948: Saba participated in the Philadelphia County Communist Party Convention.

ARRESTED FOR VIOLENCE

April 1949: Saba arrested in Pennsauken Township, N. J., as leader of strike violence at which 1 man was beaten and car containing 6 workers overturned.

May 1949: Saba jailed in Camden County Prison, N. J., for criminal contempt. Earlier the same court convicted Saba for violating an injunction against rioting and for using vile and obscene language.

October 1952: Saba identified as Communist Party member in sworn testimony before the House Committee on Un-American Activities—while serving as a UE organizer and also as the organizer for the metal trades section of the Communist Party in Philadelphia.

August 1953: Saba produced cash funds to bail out Dave Davis, UE organizer and national Communist Party leader, picked up in FBI roundup of Reds.

June 1954: Saba drove to Detroit to help on picket lines of Square D strike, carrying a supply of Communist literature in the trunk of his Chevrolet.

Immediately above Saba in the UE chain of command is Dave Mates.

DAVE MATES' RECORD

Dave Mates is the man to whom Saba currently reports. Mates, a UE international representative, is sitting in on the negotiations with the company. The Daily Worker records the long-time identity of Mates with Communist activities in this country. He was labeled a suspect Red in sworn testimony before the House Un-American Activities in Detroit in 1952.

Next above Mates in the UE chain of command are the well-known Communist promoters, James Matles and Julius Emspak. Matles, the UE organizational director, and Emspak, the secretary-treasurer of UE, run the national UE which has infiltrated its Red tentacles into more than 100 defense plants in the United States.

MATLES' TESTIMONY

I include herewith excerpts from hearings before a special subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor of the House of Representatives of the 80th Congress in 1948, of which subcommittee I was chairman:

EXCERPTS FROM HEARINGS BEFORE A SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, 80TH CONGRESS

(Tuesday, September 28, 1948, Washington, D. C.)

Hon. Charles J. Kersten (chairman of subcommittee). Will you state your full name?

Mr. Matles. James J. Matles.

* * * * *

Mr. Kersten. And your position.

Mr. Matles. Director of organization of the UE (p. 94 of hearings).

* * * * *

Mr. Kersten. Will you state, Mr. Matles, whether you are now or ever were a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. Matles. I will answer that question to you, Mr. Chairman, as an officer of this union and as a citizen, as officer sworn to uphold the constitution of my union and a citizen who swore to uphold the Constitution of the United States. And today your committee has blacklisted and fired men in Evansville, Ind., because they refused to divulge their political or religious beliefs.

You have fired them. You have blacklisted them, and I object to that question on constitutional grounds. I object to that question. And I will not permit you, Mr. Chairman, to get me, as an officer of this union, to do less than what my members are doing in the defense of the constitution of this union or the Constitution of the United States.

I am glad that the various provisions of that Constitution of the United States permit me to have my politics and my religion to be my own business, and not to permit you to try to frame me in any way (p. 112).

* * * * *

Mr. Kersten. Now, on April 23, 1940, Thomas O'Shea testified before a House committee that he had attended meetings of the Communist Party with you. Is that correct?

Mr. Matles. Are you asking my associations?

Mr. Kersten. I am asking you whether or not O'Shea's testimony that he attended meetings of the Communist Party with you are correct?

Mr. Matles. I have answered that question before. I have said to you that I am not going to give you the opportunity to dig into my politics, my religion, my associations, on constitutional grounds.

Mr. Kersten. In other words, you refuse to answer that on constitutional grounds?

Mr. Matles. I refuse to answer under the first and fifth amendments (p. 114).

* * * * *

Mr. Fisher. You are not willing to testify publicly here whether you do or do not know William Z. Foster, the chairman of the Communist Party of the United States?

Mr. Matles. I am not willing to testify on my associations with anybody.

Mr. Fisher. What is your objection to testifying to that?

Mr. Matles. I believe that my associations are my own business, sir, and I believe that you are invading my rights under the Constitution.

Mr. Fisher. Which particular rights are you talking about?

Mr. Matles. The first and fifth amendments to the Constitution.

* * * * *

Mr. Fisher. You refuse to say whether you know William Z. Foster or not. Do you know Eugene Dennis, the secretary of the Communist Party?

Mr. Matles. I have answered the question that I do not care to discuss my associations, whether with the employers, with people in the country at large, or with Members of Congress.

Mr. Fisher. You have told us a number of people you know. You said you knew Mr. Murray and Mr. Conroy and quite a number of others.

Mr. Matles. People in our union.

Mr. Fisher. When I ask you about these Communists you do not want to tell me.

Mr. Matles. When you ask me about anybody outside of my union, those are associations—those are private associations.

Excerpts From Testimony Before a Special Subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor of the House of Representatives, 80th Congress

EMSPAK TESTIMONY

(September 28 and 29, 1948, Washington, D. C.)

Mr. Kersten. Your full name.

Mr. Emspak. Julius Emspak.

Mr. Kersten. You are secretary-treasurer of the UE; are you?

Mr. Emspak. That is correct (p. 137).

* * * * *

Mr. Kersten. Do you know William Z. Foster? (Chairman, Communist Party, United States of America.)

Mr. Emspak. Well, chairman, I feel that you are approaching again the question of whether or not a person has certain rights insofar as his personal rights are concerned on a social-political belief, and so on, and under those circumstances, I am afraid I will refuse to answer you (pp. 137–138).

* * * * *

Mr. Kersten. Are you a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. Emspak. I refuse to answer that without the advice of my counsel (p. 138).

* * * * *

Mr. Kersten. Is it not a fact, Mr. Emspak, that you were present at the trial of Earl Browder by the executive committee or by one of the committees of the Communist Party?

(Consultation between the witness and his counsel.)

Mr. Emspak. Mr. Chairman, because of the character of the question involving the question of my association with whomever I may choose to associate, I feel that I cannot answer your question. I feel that it is an intrusion on my personal life, my activities, an unwarranted attempt to impose a certain kind of censorship, you please; and under the circumstances, I reserve my rights not to answer the question (p. 154).

* * * * *

Mr. Kersten. I will ask you once again: Are you now or have you ever been a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. Emspak. Mr. Chairman, that is the question we broke off on last night, if you recall, yesterday afternoon.

Mr. Kersten. That is right.

Mr. Emspak. And I suggested that I wished to discuss this matter with counsel, and, of course I did.

Mr. Kersten. Yes.

Mr. Emspak. And I have come prepared to answer that question.

Mr. Kersten. All right, what is your answer?

Mr. Emspak. My answer to that question is—and I would like to quote, I think, as good an authority as there is on the——

Mr. Fisher. I object to his quotation.

Mr. Kersten. The question is simple. Just a minute——

Mr. Emspak. My answer to that question is that I reserve my rights as an American citizen, under the first and fifth amendments, to refuse to answer that question because——

Mr. Kersten. All right, you do not have to give us the reasons (pp. 157–158).

* * * * *

New York City, N. Y., October 6, 1948.

* * * * *

Mr. Kersten. Have you ever been to a Communist Party headquarters here in New York City?

Mr. Emspak. That, Mr. Chairman, I refuse to answer, because I believe you are invading certain basic rights and privileges of individuals.

* * * * *

Mr. Kersten. Is it not true, Mr. Emspak, that you attended the sessions of the Communist Party at the Communist Party headquarters here in New York, during the hearing on the status of Earl Browder in June 1945?

Mr. Emspak. I think I answered that, didn't I, last week?

Mr. Kersten. What is your answer today?

Mr. Emspak. The same as I had last week.

Mr. Kersten. What was that?

Mr. Emspak. I don't believe that the committee should go into the question of association for the purpose of trying to impute certain beliefs to individuals, and I think that our Constitution protects us against that kind of an intrusion.

Mr. Kersten. Do you recall that on this occasion, during the secret trial of Earl Browder by the Communist Party, in June of 1945, that Mr. Krumbein presided?

Mr. Emspak. I refuse to answer that question, on the same grounds.

SQUARE-D STRIKE: "DRY RUN"

Mr. Speaker, perhaps one of the reasons the UE has called the strike at Square D, is to have a dry run on their ability to close plants vital to American defense efforts. By thus keeping their lines of power in good working order, they know they can cripple the entire American defense industry in time of crisis. For the UE is the bargaining representative throughout much of the American electrical industry which is indispensable to all American production.

HOOVER TESTIMONY

On December 9, 1953, Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, head of the FBI, testified before a House Subcommittee on Appropriations and asserted that the Communist Party operation in the maritime, mining, electrical, and communications, constituted a major and dangerous threat to our national security. I include herewith an excerpt from the testimony of the Honorable J. Edgar Hoover before this subcommittee:

Extracts From Testimony of Hon. J. Edgar Hoover Before the Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations

In regard to the infiltration of labor, the Communists regard labor unions as instruments to be controlled and used to develop the Communist revolution.

A national conference held in August of this year of the Communist Party reaffirmed the time-honored premise that control of the labor union is of primary importance to the development of the Communist revolution in this country.

They designed, particularly, the automobile industry as being the prime target because it is well known that it is one of the most vital industries to our national defense production.

In New York, the party has set a goal for 65 percent of its membership to become employed in the basic industries of the country. Instructions were issued for the reorganization of the Communist Party in Los Angeles recently to organize on an industrial basis and party members were requested to secure work in the basic industries in that area, thus showing the trend of placing as many members as they can in the key industries of the country—the basic industries which if disrupted would materially affect our national defense.

Currently, some trade unions operating in the maritime, mining, electrical, and the communications fields are chief strongholds of the Communist Party. The Communist Party still maintains its strongest bases in those unions, which were expelled from the CIO during 1949 and 1950. All of this poses a major and dangerous threat to our national security, because it involves these various unions that were expelled by the CIO. One of those unions represents a large portion of all employees in the electrical industry of the United States. Another union that was expelled exercises life-and-death control over our Pacific coast commerce; another union has members employed in the production of copper and zinc which are essential to the national defense efforts.

BILL TO CURB REDS

On February 17, 1954, I introduced into the House H. R. 7950. This legislation which I proposed would prohibit the Federal Government from placing war contracts with companies where the Communist UE or other Communist unions prevail.

This bill would also amend the Taft-Hartley Act by redefining the term "labor organization" to exclude organizations which are Communist-dominated. Any Communist-dominated union would thereby cease to have any right to act as a bona fide union or representative of employees. This bill specifically empowers the Subversive Activities Control Board to investigate and determine if a labor union is a Communist-action or Communist-front organization as defined in the Subversives Control Act of 1950.

The bill also expands the Taft-Hartley non-Communist oath by requiring both labor officials and employers to execute such an oath annually and extends the oath to cover not only the Communist Party but also any other organizations determined to be Communist organizations by the Subversives Activities Control Board.

Six Hundred and Sixty-Third Anniversary of Swiss Independence Day Was Observed August 1, 1954, by the Swiss Club of Altoona, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 3, 1954

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, it was a distinct honor to participate in the celebration of the 663d anniversary of Swiss independence which was observed in an appropriate manner by the Swiss Club of Altoona, Pa., on August 1, 1954.

As principal speaker, I delivered the following address using as my subject the Swiss motto "One for all and all for one":

ADDRESS DELIVERED BY HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, 20TH DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA, IN CELEBRATION OF SWISS INDEPENDENCE DAY, AUGUST 1, 1954, SPONSORED BY THE SWISS RIFLE CLUB OF ALTOONA, PA.

It is a real pleasure to be present here today and I appreciate the kind invitation to participate in this happy occasion.

Even though we are all glad to be here today I wish that just for this day we might be transported to Switzerland.

For today in Switzerland the steep valleys will echo with the music of church bells and the lusty blowing of horns.

Today the yodeling villagers will add their gay note to the music of celebration, and tonight in Switzerland the mountain slopes will be jewelled with brightly burning bonfires.

This is the day when the citizens of one of the oldest republics gather to celebrate their 663d Independence Day.

The story of the coming together of the 22 cantons of Switzerland is unique.

The history of Switzerland is conspicuously different from that of any other European country.

A brief review of the essential facts will serve to bring to mind again the marvelous story of this small country which is located at the very pinnacle of the European Continent.

More than 650 years ago, on August 1, 1291, the mountaineers of three cantons met in a beautiful meadow on the shores of Lake Lucerne to proclaim their independence from the house of Hapsburg.

This was at the time of the decline of the Holy Roman Empire, and the Hapsburgs were one of the ruling families.

During the 13th century the Hapsburgs had obtained control of these cantons.

Their harsh rule, together with the weakening power of the nobles, had resulted in a struggle between the people and their rulers.

The result of this struggle was that the three cantons were freed.

These three cantons united in a defensive league against their Hapsburg rulers, and this was the first step toward a Swiss confederation.

Between the years of 1332 and 1353 five more cantons joined the confederation.

By the 16th century the number of cantons increased to 13 and remained at that number until 1798.

At the beginning of the 16th century Switzerland appeared strong externally, but was actually suffering from great struggles internally.

The principal conflict had its roots in the religious-reform movement started in 1519 by Zwingli in Zurich and continued after Zwingli's death by John Calvin in Geneva.

But religious dissension was not the only divisive factor.

There were disagreements between the aristocrats and the democrats.

These internal religious and political dissensions lasted for almost 200 years, ending with the Battle of Villmergen, July 25, 1712.

Then came a long period of peace, and during this peaceful interlude there were great strides made in every phase of Swiss life—in commerce, industry, agriculture, the arts and sciences.

This pleasant state of affairs was interrupted, however, by the French Revolution, which left its impact on most of Europe, including Switzerland.

The cantonal system was abolished for 5 years.

Then, on February 19, 1803, Napoleon restored the confederation, and by the addition of six new cantons extended the country to include 19 cantons.

Some 10 years later 3 new cantons were admitted, bringing the number up to 22.

Then, on June 19, 1815, by the final act of the Congress of Vienna, the Swiss Confederation's independence was confirmed by the great powers and its neutrality was guaranteed.

A further step was taken on September 12, 1848, when a new constitution was proclaimed, establishing a Federal assembly composed of two chambers.

At the same time, Bern was made the capital of the country.

In the late 19th and early 20th centuries the main phase of Switzerland's industrialization took place.

The rural population showed little increase, but the population of the cities grew steadily because of the country's industrial development.

Workers even came from neighboring countries—France, Italy, and Germany—in search of employment.

Although through both World Wars Switzerland remained neutral, the country was faced with great difficulties.

During World War I, the people of Switzerland depended on both the Allies and the Central Powers for food supplies and raw materials.

Switzerland early became a haven for political refugees.

Besides serving as a clearinghouse for refugees, wounded, and prisoners of all the belligerent nations Switzerland was also the headquarters for many international diplomats and some of the exiled rulers.

Following the war Switzerland became a member of the League of Nations, which established its permanent quarters at Geneva.

World War II saw Switzerland again acting as a refuge for emigrants, escaped prisoners of war, and others who sought a haven from the horrors of war.

We have seen, therefore, how Switzerland became a nation by a welding together of various peoples speaking different languages into one political whole.

We have seen how over the centuries Switzerland has provided a place of safety where life could be lived and industry developed relatively undisturbed by the strife in neighboring countries.

The marvel of Switzerland is not its form of government, however, or even its 650-year-old record of freedom.

The marvel of Switzerland is that the Swiss have created one of the most united nations of Europe out of different races that outside its borders have time and again fought one another.

These races continue to speak different languages without quarreling in any of them.

Here is a federated state built up of elements which greatly differ yet which live at peace with each other.

The peoples which make up Switzerland have experienced all the troubles which serve to separate countries from each other.

They have had their own individual histories, their economic rivalries, their customs barriers, and their religious dissentions.

Yet the Swiss Confederation exists today based on an oath sworn more than six and a half centuries ago.

The record of your forefathers is a record of which you may well be proud.

It is not a lucky accident that Switzerland a tiny country which has almost no natural resources except scenery and waterpower, is so much more prosperous and stable than many nations that are larger and more richly endowed.

Switzerland has no ore to speak of, no surplus foodstuffs, no material resources whatever except waterpower and the ability of its people.

But this ability is so great and so wisely employed that barren Switzerland probably has the highest average living standard of any country in the world.

In the just and balanced distribution of its wealth Switzerland has had few rivals in the history of mankind.

There are no slums, no beggars, no sharecroppers, no illiterates, no destitute persons.

There are mountain peasants, very poor because the land they live on is poor, but they are not paupers.

Almost everything in Switzerland is done on a local level, on the level of the canton.

Switzerland has the nearest thing to a free economy that exists in Europe.

The Swiss people's abiding sense of tolerance and understanding of the variety of human character can be seen in the school system which permits each principal national group to have its own schools.

In German Switzerland there are German schools.

In French Switzerland there are French schools.

In Italian Switzerland there are Italian schools.

The Swiss believe that effective self-government must be kept alive and vital on the local level.

One wholesome feature of the Swiss economy is the location of many factories in small communities where the workers own their own homes and pieces of land.

In no one city will you find a concentration of many factories.

Yet Switzerland is a united country which permits the Swiss to identify themselves with their separate cantons as strongly as with the country at large.

I have said little about the wonderful glory of the Swiss landscape of which all of you must be proud.

It has been said that the Swiss Alps are like a beautiful song that the whole world sings.

The Swiss love their great out of doors, their snowdrifts, and the wild flowers.

Even their cities are exquisitely set beside lakes or along swift flowing rivers as if they had been built to adorn the natural setting of the countryside.

Attracted by the charm of the country a million and a half tourists visit Switzerland every year.

Before they came seeking only the beauties of nature, but more and more it is said that they come seeking a human life that is still natural.

Switzerland has come to be regarded as a country which works in a unique way for international peace and cooperation.

Peace seekers the world over have made of Switzerland a meeting place for their conferences.

The Holy Alliance after the wars of Napoleon, the League of Nations, the United Nations, and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization have all met on Swiss soil.

The small size of Switzerland belies its significance on the international scene, for Switzerland in many ways has played an international role of great importance to the United States and to the entire world.

The founding of the International Red Cross by Henri Dunant and its ratification by the Geneva Convention of 1864 represents a permanent achievement in international unity.

A number of other measures for the care of the sick and wounded on the battlefield have been promoted by Switzerland.

Many international conventions for the promotion of economic relations, such as copyrights and standard labor contracts, were suggested by Switzerland and concluded on Swiss territory.

The Swiss Government accepted the United States invitation to participate in the realization of the Marshall plan.

Switzerland has a technical-assistance program of her own and has sent a mission to Nepal for the purpose of administering this program in that country.

The Swiss have also cooperated with the United Nations in their technical-assistance program, even though Switzerland is not a member of that organization.

Switzerland has done much for peaceful cooperation among nations and has not taken part in recent European wars.

This does not mean, however, that the country is a pacifist nation.

Switzerland has created an unusual military force based on compulsory military service but not involving a large standing army.

In fact, Switzerland in proportion to its population is said to have the largest army of any country.

The army is the whole able-bodied male population, every one of whom is a trained soldier with a well-oiled gun, cartridges, and a uniform in his home.

It is claimed that within 24 hours of a warning signal the Swiss Army could be assembled and ready to march if the need arose.

Such a compulsory military service as Switzerland's might very well be used as a model for other countries, perhaps even our own, which are considering some method of universal military training.

In closing, I would like to say to you Americans of Swiss descent, as you look back today on the way of life that your ancestors have chosen, you can be both proud and thankful that they built a nation which has truly become one of the great benefactors of the world.

Government Regains Respect

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CECIL M. HARDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 3, 1954

Mrs. HARDEN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I wish to call to the attention of the House, particularly of my friends on the other side of the aisle, to a column published in the July 31, 1954, edition of the Noblesville (Ind.) Ledger. Permit me a few words of explanation. The Noblesville Ledger is one of Indiana's oldest and finest dailies, located in one of Indiana's finest communities. The Ledger is the voice of Hamilton County and Hamilton County is the voice of Republicanism in Indiana, for it is to Indiana what Vermont is to the Nation so far as Republicanism is concerned. Its editor, and the author of the column printed below, is James Neal, a young veteran of World War II, who is known throughout State newspaper circles as a man of great promise in his field. Jim is, moreover, an active Republican who knows his party and comments from time to time on its strengths or its weaknesses. The column which is printed below does not represent only Mr. Neal's views but the views of thousands of Republicans throughout the Sixth Congressional District. I commend it to the attention of this House:

The Political Pulse

(By Jim Neal)

GOVERNMENT REGAINS RESPECT

> "POLITICS I CONCEIVE TO BE NOTHING MORE THAN THE SCIENCE OF THE ORDERED PROGRESS OF SOCIETY ALONG THE LINES OF GREATEST USEFULNESS AND CONVENIENCE TO ITSELF." (WOODROW WILSON)

The Republican Party under the leadership of President Eisenhower is establishing a remarkable record, not only in Congress for its legislation but in the Federal Government for the fresh, energetic policies it is expounding.

It is becoming more and more evident all the time that the goals set by the President when he took office 1½ years ago can be reached under the intelligent and steady direction of Mr. Eisenhower.

Faced with a lack of Federal patronage with which to reward GOP workers and a Congress so evenly divided that the Democrats once held the balance of power in an Oregon Independent, the administration has plunged ahead both in the foreign and domestic fields marking up one success after another.

A recession expected to follow the end of the Korean war has never materialized to the degree hoped for by the Democrats, who were counting on that alone to thrust them back in office this fall and back into the Presidency in 1956.

Even in the foreign policy field where the free world has taken licking after licking, the United States has shown a greater determination to stand firm against Communist aggression. In fact, its greatest setback in the Communist arena came not so much at Geneva as in Washington in the Army-McCarthy hearings.

Although it will have less effect on the voters in November than the GOP would like, the administration also has made great strides toward balancing its budget, rectifying tax inequalities and economizing.

While no solution has been reached in the farm program a decade of controls and subsidies has so entwined the farmer that even he is confused as to what to do. However, Secretary of Agriculture Benson has laid down firm principles which promise to right a condition which has seen control built on control and surplus built on surplus.

But more than anything else, the Eisenhower team has restored respect and normalcy to Government and renewed the people's confidence in their leaders. A healthy atmosphere exists in Washington today reassuring the public that big Government is not going to swallow them.

Eisenhower is truly returning the Government to the people. He is forcing bureaucracy to pull in its horns to permit industry, business, and the farmer to make their own decisions and stand on their own ability and their own ingenuity without Government interference.

At the same time he has not forgotten that the best interests of the Government are the best interests of the people. He is attempting to expand the health and welfare programs and social security coverage and is devising voluntarily means whereby the Nation's economy can remain sound.

And what's most amazing about the President's approach has been its consistent, unhurried development. No one would have dreamed so much could have been accomplished in only 18 months.

Yes, Mr. Eisenhower has confirmed the public's faith in him. His popularity no longer need rest on his great war record. His administrative ability was simply converted from managing a huge war machine to running a complex political organization. Those who knew him never doubted in his success.

James A. Hagerty, a Great Political Reporter, Retires

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 22, 1954

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, appended hereto is an editorial from the New York Times on the retirement of Jim Hagerty. It speaks for itself. He is a great reporter and one of the most beloved men in American journalism.

Jim Hagerty Retires

One of our favorite newspapermen turns in his typewriter tonight, retiring after 55 years of reporting and a third of a century on the Times. James A. Hagerty has made his byline one of the most respected names in American journalism and a cherished feature of this newspaper by the fairness, the objectivity, the integrity, the reliability with which he wrote the news of politics and government. He knew the Presidents of the United States from McKinley on. He knew New York's Governors, its Members of Congress, this city's mayors, its aldermen, its party bosses. From the Bull Moose days he covered the national political conventions, rode the presidential campaign trains.

He was first with the most on many page 1 stories, of course. It is a well-established legend that the safest way to avoid being scooped on politics was to cover Hagerty. He is and always was a modest, even diffident, man, with a fabulous memory and a disdain for modern substitutes for legwork. He pretended sometimes to use the telephone, but the sound of his bellowing voice roaring through the newsroom made you wonder why he bothered with dialing, or whether he really did. He never wrote a story—or played a bridge card—without careful meditation and deliberation. There was no meanness, pettiness, no malice in him.

Sometimes it seemed that there was a conspiracy among politicians and public officials to be nice to Jim. They were always calling him to give him the news first, as a respected confidant. He never broke faith, and it paid off handsomely, just as the copybooks say it should. We suppose they will keep on calling him, at home, because his sound political judgment has made him an oracle sought out by leaders and political writers far and near.

We shall miss "Old Jim"—an implausible title granted some years ago to distinguish him from his son, who has a job somewhere down in Washington—and never so much as on election nights. It sometimes seemed as though Jim Hagerty could look at early returns from a ward in Manhattan and tell you how things were going in Kansas. It looked like magic. But it was simply that, as a reporter, he knew his "beat." A great newspaper man, Hagerty. We wish him the best of everything.

Pardon the Inconvenience

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 3, 1954

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following excellent article that appeared in the Boston Post on Tuesday, August 3, 1954.

Let us hope that this move on the part of the administration will continue so that further protection may be initiated in the support of other domestic industries.

PARDON THE INCONVENIENCE

The President's decision to increase the tariff on imported watches caused an anguished wail of protest from the Swiss manufacturers and from some of our own easy-wailing internationalists. The rafters are still ringing and the salt tears flowing in streams.

At least 600 jobs have been saved in Waltham and thousands of others in other watchmaking centers of America, by the President's act. More than that, the special skill of the watchmakers has been preserved for the national self-defense. Yet this was apparently a terrible thing, according to those who howl.

The Swiss say we have injured their watch industry. The internationalists say we have caused alarm in Europe among vast throngs of heavy thinkers who are now worrying about what we may do next in the way of increasing other tariffs and thus injuring their plans to make a few more Yankee dollars.

The fact is, of course, that nobody is going to be damaged seriously and Americans are going to be helped by the tariff boost. Is that so very bad?

The increase in the price of imported watches will be passed along to the American consumers. Those who want to pay 50 cents to $4 apiece more for such watches will have to do so. If they don't, they can buy American watches instead.

Why, then, do the Swiss protest? Because their profits will be lowered slightly. Also, because they know that if they join any group protesting against a policy that benefits the United States there will be some citizens here ready to join them.

It's a good thing that we've taken a firm, bold stand in this case. It doesn't mean that we will now erect high trade barriers against all European goods. It just means that we have courage enough to protect our workers against unfair competition when that is necessary.

The point has been made that the Swiss are friendly, a Nation like us, operating on the same system of free enterprise, and therefore we should do nothing to annoy them. Also, we are pledged to free trade; therefore we should not suddenly increase any tariff, else we will frighten all the free-traders.

The answer to this is that in rare cases like this our first obligation is to protect our own workers, and their standard of living; also the national security.

The Swiss are reported to have the highest standard of living of any people in Europe. The reason they have, of course, is that they sat out the last two wars, busily making profits.

Even so, their skilled workers get about 60 percent lower wages than do ours in Waltham and such American cities.

We hope the Swiss—and the busy internationalists—will pardon the inconvenience of this new tariff law. It just so happens it was necessary and important to American welfare. For just this once—if they don't mind—we'd like to think that this is of some consequence.

What America Means to Me

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACKSON E. BETTS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 3, 1954

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, the following essay was written by Miss Suzanna Lovett, who attends the New Bloomington School near LaRue, Ohio. It ranked first nationally among elementary school winners of a contest conducted by the Federation of Women's Clubs of America, the prize of which was $100 The young lady who wrote it is only 12 years old, and I feel that it is interesting in that it reveals the thinking of a child of that age on the subject of What America Means to Me.

The essay follows:

WHAT AMERICA MEANS TO ME

America—the land of the free and the home of the brave. Those are precious, melodious words, dear to the heart of every American schoolchild. America is a land of endless opportunities and privileges—a land blessed with liberty, equality, happiness, and democracy for each and every citizen.

What a rich and beautiful continent we are privileged to inhabit. We have the greatest heritage of natural resources to be found upon the face of the earth. At sunrise, we can gaze upon vast fields of grain, beautiful forests, farms, and ranches. During the day, it might be our pleasure to visit some of the seaports, mines, or gushing oil wells. At sunset, the glorious beauty of our America may rest upon our mountains, canyons, lakes, and rivers.

The glorious beauty of nature again appears in our rich manmade American resources. Those include our vast rail, air, and waterway systems; our inventions, buildings, and organizations; our system of good roads, factories, schools, and churches. America grants these privileges ot the beggar or to the wealthy industrialist. The ideals which guided our ancestors to attain these goals inspire us to sing in praise of our land. In America, our excellent work and play facilities, united with impressive church systems, built upon the foundations of good schools, grant unlimited means for advancement in a life based upon hope for the future. It is my duty to help to protect both our natural and manmade resources. Youth today is building for life tomorrow.

My revolutionary ancestors suffered many hardships to give me citizenship in this free Republic. My Civil War ancestors fought to regain this privilege for me. Liberty, justice, and equality again were the privileges for which our fathers and brothers were fighting for in World War I and World War II. Therefore it is my duty to be loyal to my America and defend freedom, loyalty and opportunity. America grants plenty to all, and it is my duty to share with others in preparation for a brighter tomorrow.

Preceding the signing of the Declaration of Independence, we see one of the most vivid examples of American patriotism. Why were Americans so anxious to obtain victory even at the cost of death? Because they were striving to completely open our church doors, to keep our school bells ringing, to keep our families united and to obtain liberty for all. I see a very vivid example between what they were trying to do and what the General Federation of Women's Club is trying to accomplish by inviting students to express their opinion of America. Spirit is the backbone of true American life and we find that it was the keynote of the struggles before we obtained our freedom.

The main reason for the real vitality of America was the adoption of the Constitution of the United States of America. It produced a great literature of its own and provided untold advantages for many years to come. The adoption was a great living thing and event, involving numberless men and great events. Our Constitution is now our guiding light. It is the basis for American decisions, crises, and conflicts. The Constitution was made by men, made for men, and made for men to cherish now and forever.

Foresight and hours of planning and preparation by candlelight provided us with the many freedoms which we now can rightfully claim, cherish, and carefully protect for our children. The American way of life, because of the freedoms provided by our Constitution, means freedom from want, freedom from fear, freedom of wisdom, and freedom of speech.

The Constitution clearly states that we are to be free to worship as we please and talk and write about matters that interest us. We are to be free to meet and discuss various items without fear of persecution. They gave us the right to petition the Government to remedy some wrong or grievance. It is now our privilege to hold property and not be deprived of it unlawfully. When accused, we have the right to be tried by a jury or when arrested, to be told in court of the charges against us. Unlawful entry of our homes is prevented.

Americans, do you realize the many opportunities and privileges which our constitutional forefathers prepared for our welfare? Openmindedness, faith, unity, the four freedoms and responsibility awaken the deep spirit within us and urge us to protect our American way of life. There are no Iron Curtains, nightmares of fear in our lives today. Our forefathers suffered that we might have homes of our own, safe from intrusion, where our loved ones may gather for prayer or companionship.

America is the home of living by the Golden Rule, the home of respect of all religious rites, and the home of opportunity for the development of all individual talents. Living in America means individual responsibility and cooperative action in securing protection against crime, accidents, and disease and the opportunity for reaction and for earning a living. The possibilities before us are measured by the determination within us. Our ancestors prepared the way for democracy but we, alone, can preserve it.

Each generation starts where its predecessor ended, adding its bit to our common heritage. Each of us, privileged to stand at this point in time, is indebted to the generations which have gone before. America's strength stems from the quality of being a community as well as a commonwealth, using head, heart, hands to hear the call of the needy.

America's year-round scenic beauty, its present opportunities for education, recreation, industry combined with its promise for even greater achievements in the future, supported by rich historical background, give me assurance of preservation of dignity, enterprise, hospitality, tradition, a promise of rich life, full of hope for the future.

The Tax Revision Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. BONIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 3, 1954

Mr. BONIN. Mr. Speaker, the Republican 83d Congress culminated one of the most monumental legislative tasks ever undertaken by Congress in the past 75 years. This task represents the fruit of hundreds of thousands of man-hours of work, spread over many months of study, weeks of public hearings, and many, many weeks of committee conferences.

I am of the opinion that the new tax-revision bill represents a splendid achievement. It makes the year 1954 under the Eisenhower administration a landmark in our tax history. To individual taxpayers throughout the country, this new tax-revision bill means an end to numerous inequities and hardships which have grown up over the years. Moreover, this bill closes many loopholes through which skillful taxpayers have avoided paying their just share of the tax burden. This bill will serve as an immediate stimulus to the economy of the United States. It will provide new businesses and new jobs for the growing population of the United States of America.

Here are the highlights and features in condensed form of the Republican tax-revision bill giving $1,400,000,000 in tax relief to the American people:

DEPENDENTS

1. A parent can claim deduction of $600 for each child regardless of the child's earnings if the child is under 19 and the parent continues to furnish more than half the child's support.

2. A parent can also claim the $600 dependency deduction for a child over 18 regardless of the child's earnings if the child is attending school or college, or receiving on-the-farm training, and the parent continues to furnish more than half the child's support.

3. An aged parent or other dependent cared for by several members of a family can be claimed as a deduction by one of the members of the family.

4. A taxpayer can claim a $600 dependency deduction for a foster child.

5. A taxpayer can claim a $600 dependency deduction for a child awaiting adoption.

6. A taxpayer can claim a $600 dependency deduction for any other person, regardless of relationship, if the taxpayer supports that person in his home.

7. A taxpayer can claim a $600 dependency deduction for a cousin who is institutionalized because of physical or mental disability.

Savings to taxpayers, $85 million.

CHILD-CARE EXPENSES

1. Single working parents, such as a widow, are allowed a deduction up to $600 for the expense of child-care for children up to 12 years of age.

2. The same deduction is allowed for a married woman who must work because her husband is incapacitated.

3. The same deduction is allowed with respect to any dependent, regardless of age, who is mentally or physically incapable of caring for himself.

4. A similar deduction is allowed a married woman if the combined income of her husband and herself does not exceed $5,100.

Savings to taxpayers, $130 million.

MEDICAL EXPENSES

1. Medical expenses can be deducted when they exceed 3 percent of income (instead of 5 percent as under present law).

2. Example: A family with $3,000 gross income and medical expenses of $150 will be able to deduct $60. The same family can deduct nothing today.

3. Doubles the present maximum limit on the amount that can be deducted.

Savings to taxpayers, $80 million.

HEAD OF FAMILY

1. A single taxpayer who has a dependent son or daughter will be entitled during the first 2 years after the death of his spouse to the same income-splitting privilege as is accorded married couples.

2. A single individual can receive half the benefits of income splitting if he has a dependent parent and if the taxpayer maintains a household for the father or mother.

Savings to taxpayers, $11 million.

RETIREMENT-INCOME CREDIT

1. All retired people 65 and over, including schoolteachers, firemen, policemen, and civil servants, will in effect be exempt on all retirement income up to $1,200. This will means a tax reduction for these retired people of up to $240 a year.

2. Example: A retired single individual over 65 who has a total retirement income of $3,000 today pays about $300 in income tax. Under the bill, his tax is reduced to $60—a saving of $240.

3. The same exemption will extend to individuals under 65 if they receive a pension from a public retirement system, such as do teachers.

Savings to taxpayers, $141 million.

CREDIT PURCHASES

Allows a deduction for interest up to 6 percent on installment purchases.

Total saving to taxpayers, $10 million.

CHARITABLE CONTRIBUTIONS

Increases from 20 to 30 percent the allowable deduction for charitable contributions to churches, hospitals, and educational institutions.

Total saving to taxpayers, $25 million.

AID TO FARMERS

1. Deductions up to 25 percent of farm income allowed for soil and water conservation.

2. Permits more rapid writeoff of the expense of farm machinery, equipment, and construction.

3. Removes tax on the proceeds of the sale of cattle when the sale is necessitated by disease.

Savings to taxpayers, $10 million.

SICKNESS AND ACCIDENT PLANS

1. Premiums paid by employers to health and accident plans will not be taxable to their employees.

2. All accident and health benefits paid as reimbursement for actual medical expenses to employees, their wives, or children, are completely exempted from tax.

3. Payments to employees for loss of wages due to injury or illness are exempted up to $100 a week.

Savings to taxpayers: No estimate possible.

DEATH BENEFITS

Exempts all death benefits up to $5,000 paid by an employer to the widow or other beneficiary of an employee.

Savings to taxpayers: No estimate possible.

PENSIONS AND ANNUITIES

In addition to the $1,200 exemption extended to retirement income, the bill also provides a simpler method for taxation of pensions and annuities. Ends annual 3 percent tax paid on annuities and provides instead a method of computing tax on basis of cost divided by years of life expectancy.

Savings to taxpayers, $10 million.

DIVIDEND CREDIT

1. Excludes first $50 in dividends from taxation and provides a credit against tax equal to 4 percent of the balance.

2. Example: An individual with $50 or less in dividends from his savings will be entirely exempt from tax on that amount.

3. Example: An individual with $250 in dividends from his savings will exclude the first $50 entirely, and then reduce his total tax by $8 (4 percent of the balance of $200).

Savings to taxpayers, $204 million.

DEPRECIATION

Bill will permit the more liberal writeoff of the cost of new equipment. For example, in the first year of life of new equipment, the taxpayer will be able to write off twice the amount now allowed.

Savings to taxpayers, $375 million, of which $75 million represents savings to individuals such as farmers, shopkeepers, and salesmen.

DECLARATIONS OF ESTIMATED TAX

Requirements eased for filing declarations of estimated tax. Upwards of a million taxpayers will be relieved of the present requirement for filing.

FILING TAX RETURNS

Tax returns will be due April 15 instead of of March 15, giving taxpayers 1 additional month in which to prepare their final tax returns and make their final tax payments.

RESEARCH AND EXPERIMENTATION

Grants taxpayers an option to either deduct as an expense or to amortize research and experimental expenditures.

No revenue estimate possible. Designed to encourage business research with the objective of creating new products, new processes, and new jobs.

METHODS OF ACCOUNTING

Brings tax accounting rules into harmony with business accounting, thereby eliminating to a great extent the necessity for taxpayers to maintain two sets of books. Provides realistic computation of net income for tax purposes in conformity with sound business practices.

Savings to taxpayers, $47 million.

DEPLETION

Increases the rate of percentage depletion on a variety of critical and strategic minerals in order to encourage the development of domestic sources of supply.

Savings to taxpayers, $34 million.

PARTNERSHIPS

1. Adopts comprehensive provisions concerning the tax treatment of partners and partnerships in order to remove confusion of existing law. Principal objectives are simplicity, flexibility, and equity between partners.

2. Certain proprietorships and partnerships are given the option to be taxed as corporations.

Savings to taxpayers, $20 million.

INVENTIONS

Extends capital-gains treatement to proceeds realized by an inventor on the sale or exchange of a patent.

No revenue estimate possible. New provision is designed to encourage invention and thereby promote a healthy economy and an improving standard of living.

NET OPERATING LOSS

Extends net operating loss carryback to 2 years, and makes certain other adjustments.

Savings to taxpayers, $120 million.

LIFE INSURANCE

Lessens estate tax on proceeds of certain life insurance policies.

Savings to individual taxpayers, $25 million.

CONSOLIDATED RETURNS

Removes the 2 percent penalty tax with respect to consolidated returns filed by regulated public utilities.

Savings to taxpayers, $35 million.

IMPROPER ACCUMULATIONS

Eases the penalty tax on certain accumulated earnings in order that business, especially small businesses, may have greater freedom in retaining their funds for legitimate business purposes.

Savings to taxpayers, $10 million.

CORPORATION INCOME TAX

Bill extends for 1 year the present 52 percent corporation income tax.

Total increase in revenue, $1.2 billion.

REPUBLICAN ACTION FOR TAXPAYERS

The 10-percent reduction in Federal income taxes which went into effect last January 1 saves individual taxpayers a total of $3 billion annually. This tax cut would not have been possible if the Congress and the administration had not cut the Truman budget for fiscal 1954 by $12 billion.

Nor would the $2 billion tax saving by elimination of the excess-profits tax have been possible without this budget cutting.

The Republican excise tax reduction law saves taxpayers an additional $1 billion.

The tax revision act will save taxpayers $1,400,000,000.

A total of $827 million of this tax saving is for individuals. The remainder, $536 million, is tax relief for business.

The overall tax cut program will save $7,400,000,000. Of this amount, individuals receive an overall total tax saving of $4,700,000,000. The tax savings so far surpass any previous total in the history of Congress.

The Allegheny National Forest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEON H. GAVIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 30, 1954

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, the national forests are important to all of the people of this Nation. There are 180 million acres in these Federal forests, and many of you Congressmen, like myself, have national forest areas in your districts. You and I know of the contributions public lands make to the economy. But I should like to tell you something of the Allegheny National Forest in my district. I think it illustrates very clearly the importance of the national forests and the need for expanded management programs which are in the public interest.

The Allegheny National Forest is in northwestern Pennsylvania. As national forests go, it is comparatively small, being about a half million acres of public land. It is easily reached by Federal-State highways, and is made accessible by a system of forest roads.

The wood products are very important and can yield in the neighborhood of 7 million board feet of saw timber and 125,000 cords of wood annually. In all there are probably 25 sawmills, several chemical wood plants, and 1 pulp mill drawing timber from the Allegheny National Forest. It is obvious that the water from these public lands is of vital importance to the local communities as well as to populations at distant points.

But what I want to emphasize is the contributions the Allegheny Forest makes to the people for outdoor recreation. It is estimated that there are nearly a million recreation visits to this forest each year. Nearly half of these are in connection with wildlife resources, since these people are hunters and fishermen. There is a large herd of deer, and approximately 500 miles of fishing streams. This is not a surprising recreational use when it is realized that within 300 miles of the forest there are about 15 million people.

The Forest Service has done its best to take care of this public use. They maintain scenic drives, hiking trails, picnicking areas, camping areas, and related facilities. In detail, this requires the construction and maintenance of trails, fire grates, tables, storm shelters, water systems, and toilets, and collection of fire wood. Except for two camp grounds where a small fee is charged, these services are free to the public.

I know that the Forest Service is stretching its funds even farther than we have any right to except them to do. They are having an extremely difficult time taking care of the nearly a million people who enjoy the Allegheny National Forests. The funds available to the forest to handle recreational use have not increased whereas the public use keeps going steadily higher. It is not fair to expect the Forest Service to maintain clean and sanitary facilities under their limited appropriations—nor is it fair to the people, who after all are the owners of this national forest.

I do not see relief through regular appropriations. I think we will have to see that the Forest Service gets its money for recreational and wildlife from other sources than through appropriations. I feel that way because it seems to me that the money is appropriated for income-producing activities, like timber sales, and for protection measures, like fire control. But things such as camping, picnicking, and general public uses are continually bypassed from an appropriation standpoint.

For several years now there have been bills in Congress which would take 10 percent of national forest receipts and make them available to the Forest Service for recreational facilities and cleanup and for wildlife-habitat management. In 1953 I appeared before the House Agriculture Committee in support of such a bill. There has been widespread recognition of this need and the testimony and the communications in favor of such legislation have proved beyond any reasonable doubt that there is both a need and a public desire for such legislation. At the present time Congressman BAKER of Tennessee has such a bill, H. R. 8225, before the House Agriculture Committee. I support this bill. It provides that 10 percent, but not more than $5.5 million of national-forest receipts, will be set aside in a special fund for recreational use and wildlife-habitat development. It also provides that these funds will be made available by appropriation.

I understand there has been some objection to the earmarking of these funds. This is also the attitude of the Budget Bureau. However, so far as I know, everyone recognizes the need for the work. I think the objection to the method is unreasonable because the earmarked funds are still only available by appropriation. The public has demonstrated in their overwhelming support for this legislation, and it is everywhere recognized that picnicking, camping, fishing, and related outdoor recreation is a desirable and growing use of the national-forest lands. Therefore, I am personally going to do everything I can to see that the type of legislation contained in H. R. 8225 is given favorable consideration.

The Worcester Foundation for Experimental Biology Reaches a Milestone

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 30, 1954

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, up in my home area we are all very proud of the excellent work being done by the devoted scientists attached to the Worcester Foundation for Experimental Biology. I am pleased to include at this time a fine editorial appearing in the June 14, 1954, issue of the Worcester (Mass.) Evening Gazette, commenting on the occasion of the 10th anniversary open house program.

The article follows:

THE BIOLOGY FOUNDATION REACHES A MILESTONE

The open house program Saturday at the Worcester Foundation for Experimental Biology gave new public emphasis to the remarkable work accomplished there. This was the 10th annual open house of the foundation. All who read of the proceedings, as well as the many who were privileged to be present, must be impressed with the great strides that have been made in so few years since the foundation's establishment.

We have had occasion many times to note these things in editorial comment on these pages. Naturally we take especial pleasure in remarking the significance of this year's events because of the dedication of the main laboratory building at the Shrewsbury institution to the late Lincoln W. Stoddard, who was associate editor of these newspapers until his death in October of 1952. Colonel Stoddard maintained a steady and devoted interest in many good community enterprises, but the Biology Foundation was one of his particular concerns. He would have rejoiced at the evidences of continuing growth and progress.

It is, of course, a genuine pleasure to the whole community to have Rabbi Levi A. Olan back in Worcester for a few days. His address at the foundation program demonstrated that he has lost none of the eloquence, none of the inspiring quality, and none of the sense of public responsibility which made him an outstanding citizen of Worcester for years prior to 1949 when he was called to Dallas.

Everything at the foundation's annual event seemed to underline the fact that the institution is identified with this community. Its work, to be sure, is of national importance. It serves Government and private enterprise. It serves education and industry. It serves mankind in the broadest sense, and at the same time contributes to the individual hope and welfare of every human being.

But its genius is local. Its roots are here.

And it is to this community that the foundation must continue to look for its substance and spirit. Saturday's fine occasion gave new strength to a great undertaking.

Tenth Anniversary of the Warsaw Uprising

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. BONIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 3, 1954

Mr. BONIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to commend the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KLUCZYNSKI] for having set aside this hour to commemorate the 10th anniversary of the Warsaw uprising. Ten years ago, on August 1, the underground army of Warsaw fought the Nazi Army. For 63 days these brave people fought and sacrificed their lives that the Allies of World War II might be victorious. In the end, 300,000 Polish patriots sacrificed their lives with the hope and expectation that Poland would once again be free. This is but one of many battles in which Polish warriors sacrificed their lives for freedom and independence.

As a member of a select committee of the House of Representatives to investigate Communist aggression throughout the world, I had the honor and privilege to hear the direct testimony of General Bor-Komorowski and General Anders. Their testimony was taken in London, England. We also heard other Polish patriots, now living in exile in England, Germany, and Italy, vividly describe the pain, suffering, and death occasioned by the infamous betrayal by the Soviet Army that promised to aid them in their uprising. Their testimony revealed the perseverance of the Polish people to defeat the war machine of Adolf Hitler.

Even today, we discovered that the fight against communism and bolshevism continues at this moment. The success of the Kremlin is based on fear, torture, massacre, and murder of their enslaved people. Our committee heard that there are 20 million innocent people in concentration camps in northern and eastern Russia. People of Poland, Lithuania, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, Hungary, Bulgaria, and even citizens of Russia are confined in these slave labor prisons contrary to the most elementary concept of human dignity.

The policy of the United States during and after World War II bears a part of the responsibility for the plight of the Polish nation. The Yalta and Teheran agreements deprived eastern European nations of their rightful place in the family of free nations. The nations of eastern Europe were not consulted about these agreements and did not participate in these conferences. The secrecy of these agreements did not become public until the U. N. conference assembled in San Francisco. For the first time, the American public discovered the great betrayal of the Polish people. The United States has a duty and an obligation to redeem itself from this great betrayal. I have said before, and I repeat now, that the United States should repudiate these agreements and do everything in its power to restore freedom to these enslaved nations.

The people of Poland will revolt again. They will fight their oppressors just as they fought 10 years ago. When that time comes, the United States must show her determination to help these millions of oppressed people to eradicate the tyrants of Moscow. This blow must be a final one. Then, and only then, will the world be in peace.

Poland will once again be free and independent. When a desire for freedom burns in the hearts of men, no dictator can extinguish that desire even with fear, torture, massacre, or slave labor camps. The present oppressors of Poland will never destroy the desire of freedom of the Polish people.

Investing in School Facilities Is in the Best National Interest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 30, 1954

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, no one will deny, I am sure, that an investment in our youth is in the best national interest and security. I am, therefore, pleased to include at this time an excellent editorial entitled "Classroom Shortage" which appeared in the June 14, 1954, issue of the Waltham (Mass.) News-Tribune.

The article follows:

CLASSROOM SHORTAGE

A Government survey shows that in the school year just closing there was a deficit of nearly 350,000 classrooms. The likelihood is the situation will get worse as the children of World War II marriages stream through the school doors.

Currently before the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee is a proposal authorizing Federal aid to the States for new school construction. If this measure were to be approved by Congress, and implemented by direct appropriations, a healthy start could be made toward licking this problem.

However, Secretary Oveta Culp Hobby, of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has asked that action be delayed. She wants to wait until planned White House and State conferences on the situation can be held, so a more accurate gage can be put on the ability of local communities to meet construction needs.

There would seem not the slightest reason to doubt Mrs. Hobby's good faith in this matter. Her request for a postponement does not make her an enemy of new school construction, as some of her critics seem to suggest.

But, assuming the best of motives, the effect of a postponement by Congress on Federal aid would be to increase the classroom deficit through the 1954–55 season, with damaging result upon the educational opportunities of hundreds of thousands of youngsters.

There is always a certain lag between the voting of appropriations and the start of authorized projects, and obviously school buildings cannot be thrown up overnight like tents. If Federal action is put off until the 1955 session of Congress, the prospects are that the benefits of any aid will not be felt in the form of new classrooms until sometime in 1956—possibly even later.

In and around Congress are some pretty ingenious bill-drafters. If one of these cannot come up with a Federal-aid formula flexible enough to accommodate to later information on local community resources, then the craft of lawmaking is sagging badly.

The Senate and House ought to approve now some such flexible plan, and initial appropriations should be voted. Cramped quarters can produce cramped minds. Delay may put an ineradicable scar upon our youth.

It is better to move fast and err on the side of spending too much than to delay and deprive America's young people of an opportunity that, for them, may never come again in quite the same way.

Speech of Hon. Wingate H. Lucas, of Texas, on the Dedication of the Major K. M. VanZandt Memorial Armory in Fort Worth, Tex., May 15, 1954

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WINGATE H. LUCAS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 3, 1954

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by me on the dedication of the Major K. M. VanZandt Memorial Armory in Fort Worth, Tex., on May 15, 1954:

Thank you, Mr. Marshall Kennady, for your very generous words of introduction. Mr. Kennady and I have been friends for a long time, and I take pride in the work that he has done, along with the other members of the military affairs committee of the chamber of commerce, Dr. W. J. Danforth and Mr. Herbert Joseph, in making our Armed Forces day in Fort Worth of national consequence.

Members of the Maj. K. M. VanZandt family, distinguished officers in the United States Army, United States Air Force, Marine Corps, and Navy, ladies and gentlemen, it is a high honor to me to be permitted to participate in such a program as this. When we are assembled to pay our respects to one who has contributed so much to the high civilization enjoyed by our country, it is appropriate for us to consider why this man was so outstanding. Maj. K. M. VanZandt was outstanding primarily because of his sense of civic responsibility. He possessed those virtues which made of Texas and the West an integral part of the United States. He came here as a pioneer. At his death the frontier had been pushed far to the West and almost obliterated.

When I was a boy in school one of my teachers asked my class, "Why do we celebrate George Washington's Birthday?" I hastened to answer that it was because he was the Father of our Country. I was surprised at her reply that I was wrong; that it was not simply because George Washington was the Father of our Country that we celebrated his birthday but that it was because George Washington possessed all the great virtues that are so typically American. His honesty, his rugged integrity, his courage, his vision, his simple Christian faith—all of these virtues were encompassed in one human being, and my teacher told our class that it was because we wanted these virtues to be brought constantly to the attention of the people that George Washington's Birthday is celebrated.

I make no apology for comparing in this illustration George Washington with Maj. K. M. VanZandt. It is true that Major VanZandt himself possessed these virtues. He was determined, he was a man of vision, he was a leading Christian practitioner, his integrity was unquestioned, and his honesty and honor were even in his day held up to young men as worthy of emulation. His courage in coming to Fort Worth is a story in itself.

Let's look at the life of Maj. K. M. VanZandt. Khleber Miller VanZandt was the son of a great father, Khleber Miller VanZandt, Sr., who served the Republic of Texas as minister to Washington in the 1840's. K. M. VanZandt was born in Harrison County, Tex., near Marshall. He attended the local schools and went away to Franklin College in Tennessee. He returned to Marshall to study law and was admitted to the bar in 1858. He practiced in Marshall until the beginning of the War Between the States, when his patriotism led him to abandon his law practice and leave his wife and children to carry a company which he organized to the battlefront in northern Tennessee. He was captured at Fort Donelson and spent more than a year of rugged privation in northern prison camps. Later he was exchanged at Vicksburg, and his superior officers, knowing of his natural capacity for leadership, promoted him to major and placed him in command of a fighting regiment which glorified itself during the Mississippi campaign at Jackson, Vicksburg, and at a number of other battles and skirmishes. It is said that after the war was over he walked every step of the way back to Marshall from Mississippi. At home he took up the lost threads of his once prosperous law practice, but his community was under the heels of northern carpetbaggers and scalawags, and the depression of defeat caused Major VanZandt to look west for a place for himself and his family to live.

He chose Fort Worth as his new home. He reached this locality in December 1865 and found only desolation. The fort was abandoned and the few stores once serving the military and the Indian traders were closed and boarded up, and the courthouse, started before the war, was still without a roof, and empty. The major saw the need of a mercantile business and, because of his known integrity, he had no difficulty in buying supplies on credit from the East. The store was an immediate success. He acquired for his home the land now occupied by businesses in the square bounded by Third and Fourth Streets and Main and Houston. He subsequently purchased a farm west of Clear Fork which is the very soil on which we now stand and on which we have erected this armory in his memory.

The major was at once recognized as a civic leader. The very first thing he did was to join with Dr. Carroll Peak, Milt Robinson, and W. H. Willwee in building the first school, in 1846. His contribution to our educational system was not ended there, because it was his leadership that carried the Fort Worth school into the Texas State public-school system in 1879. This is a story in itself, and I may say that it was only because of the determination and the unselfishness of Major VanZandt that our schools here in Fort Worth became a part of the State system. Later, Major VanZandt was instrumental in bringing Ad-Ran College, now TCU, to Fort Worth and served on its board of directors for many years.

Major VanZandt helped to purchase the equipment of the old Quitman Herald and moved it to Fort Worth. There is a story about how this paper began. One day a young man alighted from his horse in front of Major VanZandt's store, dusted himself off and came inside and introduced himself. He said that he intended to make Fort Worth his home. When Major VanZandt asked him what he intended to do, he replied that he was a newspaperman, and Major VanZandt said, characteristically, "We have a newspaper here, but no one to run it. If you will take it, it is yours." That is how Burton B. Paddock came to establish the Fort Worth Democrat, the first of many good newspapers which have graced our town. Burton Paddock is another of those to whom we in Fort Worth owe a debt of gratitude for his unselfish civic services.

Seeing the need of a bank Major Van Zandt joined with Tom Tidball in founding Tidball, Van Zandt & Co., a private bank, at what is now 109 West Weatherford Street. This later became the Fort Worth National Bank with Major Van Zandt as first president, a position he held until his death in 1930. The Fort Worth National Bank is, as you know, our largest banking institution and its greatness is the result of the vision of Maj. K. M. Van Zandt and those he selected to serve with him in its operations.

When Fort Worth became entitled to a representative in the legislature at Austin, it was to Major Van Zandt that his neighbors turned. He was elected without opposition, and tradition has it that he never asked a citizen to vote for him. He believed that public office should seek the man, not man the office. He was serving as legislator when Fort Worth received its State charter of incorporation on March 1, 1873. If for no other reason, his work in the legislature in bringing about the incorporation of the city of Forth Worth would entitle him to honor as one of our civic fathers.

It was Major Van Zandt who foresaw the need of a railroad into Fort Worth. He initiated efforts toward attracting the Texas & Pacific to come here. He led the fight to bring the rails westward from Eagle Ford over in Dallas County into this city. He started contributions to obtain 320 acres in the southern part of the city as a donation to the Texas & Pacific. That is a part of the track on which the Texas & Pacific Station now stands. The day the Texas & Pacific ran its train into Fort Worth, on July 19, 1876, was the real beginning of the growth of our town. Fort Worth became the trading post for the West. Here mule trains of goods started to the growing settlements on the western prairies. Here stagecoaches started for California; here all the produce of the West was brought for shipment to the markets of the East.

Major VanZandt saw the need of a permanent market here in Fort Worth for the cattle of west Texas and initiated and brought to Fort Worth the great Armour & Swift packinghouse. He organized the first street railway company in 1876. He helped raise the first $75,000 to attract the Santa Fe into Fort Worth as it brought its rails north from Belton to Cleburne. He brought to Fort Worth many of our early merchants through his activities in the bank. He never failed to exercise wisdom in foreseeing the future growth of this area. When oil was first brought to the surface west and north of Fort Worth it was he who encouraged the establishment here of the headquarters of the first great Texas oil companies. He did much to bring the first grain elevators, which have resulted in Fort Worth being the great market for all grain in west Texas. He was a founder of the First Christian Church, and the leader among its worshipers until the time of his death.

Major VanZandt was married three times. He fathered 15 children, and they and their children are among our foremost citizens of Texas today. At one time Major VanZandt had 32 children and grandchildren in the Fort Worth public schools. His interest in the school system during the latter part of his life caused him to meet Miss Octavia Pendleton, his third wife, who was a schoolteacher here.

It is most appropriate that we use Major VanZandt's name to grace this building. Not only was he a great military figure, but because his sense of civic responsibility made of him a figure worthy to be imitated, may we well borrow from his fame. He was industrious, kindly, honorable, wise, tolerant, godly, loyal, and farsighted. Where could we find another holding all these virtues? Thus, as with George Washington, we honor the man who held such qualities in order that all the young men who will enter these doors may use him as an example. That we may in some small measure show our indebtedness to Maj. K. M. VanZandt and at the same time learn from the example of his life, we take pride in designating this edifice the Maj. K. M. VanZandt Armory. May the good Lord lead us to be worthy of the contributions he has made for us in order that we may in our own time do something worthy to be remembered.

Two Resolutions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARK W. THOMPSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 3, 1954

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I have just received from 1 of my leading electric cooperatives 2 resolutions of far-reaching significance. This particular cooperative is one of the strongest in my congressional district, having more than 2,400 members. The resolutions deal with farm price supports and with the control of atomic energy. They are grassroots opinions and merit thoughtful study by every member of Congress:

Resolved, That Congress be urged to continue in force present farm price supports of not less than 90 percent of parity. The welfare and prosperity of the Nation as well as of farmers depends upon farmers obtaining a fair price for farm products and the maintenance of a stable market for these products.

Resolved, That we urge Congress to retain, for public welfare, control of atomic energy.

as the people have expended $12 billion for its development; that cities and cooperatives be granted preference in purchase and development of atomic power; and that Congress prevent a few large corporations from obtaining a monopoly through patent rights or otherwise on atomic energy and power.

Wharton County Electric Cooperative,
Verner E. Petersen, *President.*
C. M. Hansen, *Secretary.*

A Fine Example of Local Community Self-Reliance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 30, 1954

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to include an excellent editorial which appeared in an April issue of the weekly review, America, revealing the importance of local community cooperation and self-reliance in promoting area economy.

The article follows:

A string of little New England towns has over the past few years been demonstrating that Yankee self-reliance which the rest of the Nation so much admires. In each case, what occasioned the display is the flight of another textile mill southward, leaving behind a serious unemployment problem.

Latest to figure in these sink-or-swim stories are Maynard, Mass., and two towns in Maine, Pittsfield, and Dover-Foxcroft. They are among nine New England communities where the American Woolen Co. had decided to close mills in a retrenchment move.

Pittsfield's "operation bootstrap" is typical. Hardly had the mill closed than the townspeople got together to form the Pittsfield Development Association. About 500 farmers, millworkers, merchants, and professional men bought an initial $55,000 worth of stock in the association, at $10 a share, with the purpose of reactivating the vacated mill.

With the townspeople willing to sink their money into a second mortgage to reopen the plant (and the banks to take a first mortgage), American Woolen stepped back into the picture. It agreed to assume a third mortgage giving it full ownership in 20 years. This 3-way financing was used to replace, by a new integrated structure with the latest textile equipment, the old wooden structures built in 1868.

According to a New York Times account on April 3, it was partly as a result of Pittsfield's demonstration of community interest that American Woolen reversed its policy of liquidation in all the nine towns. The company will now go along with any community that shows an interesting in making use of the abandoned mill property.

If it can produce textiles at a profit, the company is willing to finance resumption of operations up to the amount of whatever output it can market. But where a town decides that textiles are no longer a profitable operation, the company will assist the community in attracting outside industries.

Both Maynard and Dover-Foxcroft, after initiating community-wide action to meet their similar crises, agreed that they no longer wanted to be tied to the uncertain textile industry as their principal source of payroll income. Maynard folk raised $50,000 in working capital to attract diversified industries into their town's million square feet of abandoned mill property. A group of outside businessmen, impressed by this spirit of community cooperation, decided to purchase outright the American Woolen property. They have already succeeded in filling half the floor space with new, small industries. In Dover-Foxcroft, too, a town committee is seeking to acquire possession of mill property with a view to inviting diversified manufactories to locate there. The town committee has already had feelers from outside business groups, attracted, as in the case of Maynard, by the evidence that this is a good place to do business.

It would be a mistake to think that such local self-help is a complete answer to economic dislocation. Indeed, some of these efforts would not have got far without support from the New England Council, which works for regional development. At the same time, State, regional, or Federal assistance can accomplish little unless they can build on local community self-reliance and cooperation.

Service All Around

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON H. SCHERER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 3, 1954

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of pride that, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith a well-deserved tribute to my colleague in the House and my fellow townsman, the Honorable William E. Hess. Representative Hess has done an outstanding job as chairman of the Subcommittee on Defense Activities of the House Committee on Armed Services. With no fuss or fanfare he has saved the taxpayers of this country a vast sum of money. At the same time he has been scrupulous to guard the constitutional rights of all witnesses who appeared before his subcommittee.

The editorial, which appeared in the Cincinnati Times-Star for Thursday, July 29, reads as follows:

SERVICE ALL AROUND

The Keco Manufacturing Co., a small Cincinnati concern employing about 100 workers, is currently engaged on a Government contract for $250,000 worth of refrigeration equipment. It appeared for a while that this company might have difficulty filling the order because a Minnesota manufacturer was reluctant to furnish certain parts. (A Keco competitor seems to have been pulling strings in the background to block these deliveries.)

Now, thanks to intervention by the Subcommittee on Defense Activities of the House Armed Services Committee, this equipment is coming through and the Government will have its order filled at the lowest and best bid.

Some months ago, the Air Force declined to accept a bid of $1 million worth of equipment from Keco because the Air Force said the Cincinnati company was not large enough to handle the order. Again this congressional committee acted; Keco got the contract and the Air Force (and the taxpayers) saved $250,000.

The chairman of this energetic, money-saving subcommittee is Representative William E. Hess. He has been demonstrating how a Congressman can fight for the interests of his constituents and at the same time save money for all the taxpayers. Incidentally, Representative Hess and the Keco president met for the first time 2 weeks ago.

Eighty-six Thousand Dollars, but Why Not? It's a Kentucky Colt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 3, 1954

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include herewith an editorial entitled "$86,000, But Why Not? It's a Kentucky Colt," which appeared in the July 30, 1954, issue of the Courier-Journal of Louisville, Ky.

Mr. Speaker, the sale of this yearling thoroughbred is just one more event that focuses well-deserved attention to the State long noted for its beautfiul women, fine horses, and Kentucky colonels. It is also a State fast becoming one of the leading vacationlands of the United States. What with Mammoth Cave National Park and other beautiful small caves in the western area, the renowned Kentucky Lake and Gilbertsville Dam as you travel east, the famous bluegrass horse farms of central Kentucky, and the mountains of the east, there is an attraction for every visitor.

Kentucky has always had her fair share of leaders in the affairs of our Nation and in the literary and cultural fields. New industries have continued to locate in the State in recent years until Kentucky is progressing rapidly as an industrialized State. So, in the words of this editorial, we say, "Why not, if it's bred in Kentucky?"

The editorial is as follows:

EIGHTY-SIX THOUSAND DOLLARS, BUT WHY NOT? IT'S A KENTUCKY COLT

A great deal is made of that $86,000 a Texas oilman paid for a yearling thoroughbred over at Keeneland. If you ask us, it looks as if Texas oil is now being turned to a very constructive purpose, the same being at last a proper demonstration of what a Kentucky colt is worth.

To be sure, nobody before in this country ever paid so much for a yearling—racing record naturally nil, performance uncertain. But then, Texas has never seemed so eager or, if half we hear of her wheeler-dealers nowadays is true, so able to endorse magnificent horseflesh in the manner it deserves.

It must be quite a colt, at that, to judge by the photograph of sleek chestnut beauty, the frame and lines of strength. We can just see the well-heeled gentleman from Texas and the probably equally well-heeled gentleman from Ohio, though nothing is said of his oil connections, who entered the bidding with a will—we can just see the gleam in their eyes.

We can imagine their dapt visions, for along with the actual lines there was the aura of blood brotherhood with the great Noor, both this colt and the speedy conqueror of Citation on four occasions over the hard tracks of California being sons of Nasrulah. Nor was this all, for the $86,000 beauty was from the Mooers farm, and nobody can be forgetting this year that Hasty Road came forth also from those preserves. But with all that, neither are we forgetting that the Texan and the Ohioan, sensible of tradition, looked upon a Kentucky colt and saw it mainly in that light of breeding, the perfect distillation.

June 17 Freedom Day in Honor of East German Patriots Who Revolted Against Communist Tyranny

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES J. KERSTEN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 29, 1954

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of the House the commemoration of the anniversary of the revolt of East Berlin German workers and of the Poles and Czechs against communism in June 1953, which commemoration took place in Berlin, N. H., on June 17, 1954.

Governor Gregg, of New Hampshire, proclaimed June 17 freedom day in honor of these patriots behind the Iron Curtain who revolted against tyranny. The town of Berlin, N. H., dedicated a plot of ground for the erection of a monument to these stalwart fighters for freedom.

This commemoration is an example of what is possible to achieve in the field of unconventional psychological warfare against communism through imagination and private initiative.

The author of the project is Nicholas de Rochefort, a Frenchman, who has resided in America since 1949 and teaches in political science at the American University. He was born in Russia and lived there 19 years. In 1919 and 1920, while working as a stoker in a powerplant in Leningrad, he witnessed the Communist revolution and was deeply impressed by the effectiveness of the Communist methods of mass agitation and of word-of-mouth propaganda. Later, upon the completion of his studies at the School of Law of the University of Paris and at the School of Political Science, Paris, he dedicated himself to learning and fighting communism. He wrote in French newspapers and reviews and was an active member of anti-Communist organizations.

Last year, De Rochefort conceived of the plan to celebrate the first anniversary of the uprising of the workers of East Berlin against the Communist regime in order to bolster resistance to communism behind the Iron Curtain by a demonstration of the solidarity of the Free World.

But with one single exception he found no support for his idea. Federal agencies, newspapers, private wealthy individuals, and large national organizations praised him for his idea, warmly encouraged him to carry his project on but refused any specific help. Finally, he spoke of his plan to Dr. Charles W. Lowry, chairman of the Foundation for Religious Action, Washington, D. C., another vigorous fighter against communism. Dr. Lowry understood the importance of his idea, and sharing in his enthusiasm, helped De Rochefort in carrying it out.

On June 1, 1954, Mr. De Rochefort appeared before the Town Council of Berlin, N. H. He asked the Town Council of Berlin to give a plot of ground on which to erect a monument to resistance to communism, in glorious memory not of the Germans alone, but of all those men and women who fight and die for freedom in the Soviet dominated countries.

The substance of his request was not even questioned. Upon a short deliberation which bore solely on the choice of the site, the Town Council unanimously voted the grant of the ground.

Mr. De Rochefort saw in Concord the Governor of New Hampshire, Hugh Gregg, and asked him to proclaim June 17th Freedom Day in New Hampshire. Gregg jointed wholeheartedly in the spirit of the undertaking. His proclamation was issued on June 17. The ceremony of groundbreaking took place in Berlin, N. H., on the same day.

Even as it took place, the first reactions heard from abroad gave full evidence that De Rochefort's plan was achieving its purpose. Messages and telegrams arrived in Berlin, N. H., on the day of the ceremony, notably a telegram to Mayor Aime Tondreau from the Federation of the German Trade Unions:

> We workers of Berlin hail the decision of the city of Berlin, N. H., to erect a monument to the memory of the revolt of East Berlin workers on June 17, 1953, against tyranny and terror. This gesture of solidarity from the part of American citizens gives us new strength in our fight against the inhuman Soviet regime.

De Rochefort and Lowry are now forming a national committee which will raise the funds for the monument. The Foundation for Religious Action has undertaken to receive and to administer these funds. It is planned to offer a replica of the monument to the city of Berlin, Germany. The unveiling of the monument in Berlin, N. H., is to take place on the second anniversary of the Berlin uprising, on June 1, 1955.

A lesson can be drawn from this experience.

Two men of small financial means, but armed with imagination, perseverance, and knowledge of methods and techniques of phychological warfare were able to plan and carry out an operation of this nature, in finding assistance and aid from the part of the American people.

Such projects as this, staged in America, implemented by American citizens and groups of citizens, can better be worked out prepared and initiated by private initiative than by the Government.

It would therefore be desirable to create a private organization for this very purpose, the members of which could devote all their time and their skill to devising actions of unconventional psychological warfare, inspire and coordinate them. It would not require millions of dollars; relatively modest funds would suffice.

Such a group would effectively promote anti-Communist agitation—a sector of the cold war in which we have achieved so little and suffered so many defeats.

I include herewith an account of the Berlin, N. H., ceremony on July 17, 1954, from the Berlin (N. H.) Reporter of June 24, 1954, and an account of the June 17 Freedom Day by Mr. De Rochefort:

[From the Berlin (N. H.) Reporter of June 24, 1954]

CITY ENJOYS IMPORTANT ROLE IN FREEDOM DAY CEREMONY

Those who watched last Thursday's Freedom Day ceremonies in connection with the memorial to commemorate the uprising of East Berliners against the Reds, have been assured that "this isn't something that will be over and done with."

Mayor Aime Tondreau, in his speech at the ground breaking, told the large crowd that Berlin is happy and proud to play such an important role in the dedication, and it would become a memorable anniversary to be marked each year.

MANY LITTLE SECTIONS

Newcomers and youngsters learned that Berlin, N. H., had at one time many little sections peopled by residents of varied national extraction. Tondreau recounted his early years in the town and struck a note of humor when he explained that good healthy fistfights were often the order of the day between boys from opposing districts.

New Hampshire's active recognition of Freedom Day actually began on Sunday, June 13, when prayers were said in the community churches. On June 17 a proclamation from Gov. Hugh Gregg officially marked that day to be set aside to honor those who fought and died in the name of freedom.

Gregg recognized the fact that 1 year ago the workers of East Berlin, Germany, rose up against their Communist puppet masters forced on them by Soviet military might.

DEMONSTRATE RIGHTS

In his proclamation the Governor said: "Unarmed, barehanded, they demonstrated for their inalienable rights. * * * this uprising was followed by similar acts of revolt in other parts of captive Germany. The chain of events thus touched off was the capstone and symbol of unnumbered other acts of resistance against Communist totalitarianism by freedom-loving Poles, Czechs, Slovaks, Magyars, Rumanians, Bulgarians, Albanians, Latvians, Estonians, Lithuanians, Ukrainians, and Russians."

He noted that although this heroic revolt of June 17 was crushed in blood by Soviet armed forces * * * "truth on the scaffold was victorious, and communism was unmasked for what it is—the shameless exploitation and trampling of all human rights and values."

The Governor called upon the residents of New Hampshire to remember and pray for all those throughout the Soviet-controlled world who have fought and died for freedom. He repeated the words of Revolutionary War Gen. Johnny Stark, who led Granite State troops against similar oppressors on June 17, 1775, at the Battle of Bunker Hill. Stark's words are now the State motto, "Live free, or die."

ONE THOUSAND WATCH RITES

More than 1,000 persons watched the ground-breaking ceremonies and colorful parade that preceded the rites at the triangle of ground at the intersection of Main and Pleasant Streets.

The pealing of church bells and the sounding of factory whistles at 6:56 p. m. heralded the program's official opening. The units in the line of march included veterans, military National Guard, various auxiliaries, Boy and Girls Scouts, the clergy, city government, and a host of others.

As the parade wound its way from the starting point at the Brown Co., parking lot opposite First Street, hundreds of watchers lined Pleasant Street to cheer the procession on its way.

Freedom Day Chairman Alf Halvorson introduced Count Nicholas de Rochefort of Sunapee and Washington and told the crowd, "Here is the man who first suggested the idea of a monument and started this movement toward its present national proportions."

CAUSE NOT FORGOTTEN

Rochefort said the revolt of June 17 is not a forgotten cause and the dedication in Berlin, N. H., was the first tangible expression of the American people toward a concrete recognition of a brave deed. "We will always remember the gallant effort by men of courage who fought tanks with sticks and stones."

Jan Hvasta, whose recent brush with the Reds in Czechoslovakia is so well known, recounted some of the harrowing experiences he had while escaping from the Communist secret police. "All during that long 21-month period I was buoyed by faith—a faith as strong as that evidenced by the East Germans. We Americans don't realize how important and sacred freedom can be until it is taken away from us. The East Germans and other Europeans have lost theirs to the Reds, but they have not lost courage. Their revolt shows that."

TOKEN AND A PLEDGE

Dr. Charles Lowry, chairman of the Foundation for Religious Action, said "The events of June 17 will be forever to the glory of the German people, and are a token and pledge that Hitler and national socialism were an aberration and not a normal expression of the Teutonic spirit. The day of the rebellion is one never to be forgotten—perhaps it was the turning point of contemporary history.

"I repeat what I said 1 year ago when news of the revolt first became known: 'Workers of the world, unite. You have nothing to lose but your chains.' For 105 years this has been the battle chant of communism. The workers of Germany have at last decisively and heroically rejected this cry as deceitful and lying propaganda. They have shouted, to the thunderous accompaniment of a majestic deed:

"Workers everywhere, take heed. Here you have nothing to win but your chains."

LET AMERICA SHOW FAITH

He continued: "Let America, beginning with us, put her hand to the mighty enterprise of visualizing and stating a true ideology over Marxism-Leninism. When this happens, our great country will show mankind the way to return to the dream of freedom of our ancestors."

Dr. Lowry pledged the best efforts of himself and his colleagues in Washington to complete the unfinished task of soliciting funds for the monument. "Within a year I will return with the means to erect here a monument to which lovers of freedom everywhere may repair."

Adm. Ellis M. Zacharias and Mayor Aime Tondreau were the last speakers and both dwelled on the courage and faith displayed by those bowed under the yoke of Red slavery.

Before the misted eyes of the German consul from Boston, Mayor Tondreau turned the shovelful of earth and the first phase of a great anniversary had ended.

ON SPEAKER'S PLATFORM

Others on the speaker's platform were Rev. J. W. Schmalstieg, who gave invocation at the start of the program; the Reverend Francis Greene, benediction; State Representative Seth A. Lamson, New London, N. H., representative as a delegate from the State government; and Mr. and Mrs. Otto Meyer-Cuno of the German Consulate, Boston, in the commercial attaché office. From the Voice of America in New York City were the following: George Czuczka, Walter Kohl, and Margot Mertens.

They recorded the event for rebroadcast to Europe. The program was prepared in three foreign languages and relayed to New York City Friday morning from the local radio station. Representatives from Life magazine were Peter Bunzil, writer, and photographer Grey Villet, both of the New York office.

Units participating in the parade were: Camp Dodge soldiers; National Guard drum and bugle corps; VFW post and auxiliary; American Legion and the 40-and-8; the Gorham Dupont-Holmes Post, American Legion; several Boy and Girl Scout troops; and a full delegation from the city council headed by City Clerk Gaston Cournoyer.

HALVORSON HONORED

Halvorson was named, while on the speaker's platform, as national vice chairman for the campaign to raise funds for the monument.

First Berliner to contribute toward the fund was Leo Chatigny, 567 Hutchins Street. Dr. Lowry gave Halvorson a check for $100 to start the ball rolling from the national angle.

JUNE 17 AS FREEDOM DAY

(By Nicholas De Rochefort)

BACKGROUND

The bloody events of June 17, 1953, in Berlin and in East Germany could have been used as a major theme of a worldwide agitation campaign against communism and the Soviets in attacking them as enslaving the labor and maintaining puppet governments in conquered countries by the sole force of bayonets.

On this double theme, it would have been easy to obtain the cooperation, on the one hand of the American labor organizations, and on the other hand of exilees' groups in America and of ethnic American associations of east European descent—German, Polish, Hungarian, etc.—while having started on a broad basis in America, the campaign would have spread in other countries.

In fact, when in September I asked some officials of the American Federation of Labor why they have not organized on that occasion some major manifestation of workers in Madison Square Garden or elsewhere, or some other manifestation of protest against the repression of strikes in East Germany, shootings, and persecutions, they told me candidly "that they would have done it if anybody had given them the idea."

Instead, here and there statements were issued which indeed were mentioned—in short—in the press, some messages were addressed by the top organs of various organizations, all of which could create no popular stir.

The accounts of and comments on the events published by the press might have brought about some feelings of indignation or of sympathy, individually, among many millions of Americans, but they too were unable to give place to any collective gesture which would reverberate internationally. Agitation—that is, action on and by masses—is a major weapon in psychological warfare (compare the Stockholm peace petition or the Rosenberg case used by the Soviets for agitation campaigns). No agitation was created by us on the very favorable occasion of the Berlin events.

As a consequence, instead of giving the East Germans at least a moral support and comfort in making them feel in communion of aspirations with the nations of the free world, we allowed them to believe in our complete indifference in their plight. The press of West Germany reflected the bitter disappointment which resulted. The distribution of food parcels was not an answer to the problem of agitation. It was a gesture of the American Government, not of the popular masses.

It seems that some causes of a permanent character prevented the planning and undertaking of an agitation campaign on the occasion of the Berlin events.

MAIN CAUSES OF ABSTENTION

Occasions for mass agitation against communism are systematically supplied by the policies and actions of the Soviet Government, the puppet regimes in the satellite states and the Communist Parties at large. But they must be watched, noted timely and reported without delay, together with adequate suggestions, to the organs responsible for the operations of psychological warfare. Often, the best opportunities are the most fleeting ones. They are lost if the decision requires long deliberations.

This requires in the first place the existence of a laboratory of experts who have an extensive knowledge both of communism and of world problems, are trained in techniques of unconventional (people's) warfare, namely in agitation, in word-of-mouth propaganda, etc., and who posses a vivid and quick imagination. As far as I understand, such a specialized unit assigned exclusively to that work, 24 hours a day, does not exist.

I assume that detail units of various competent agencies study psychological strategy problems in the framework of area research (my assumption is based on a comparison with the academic setup of area studies, strictly delimited geographically. This seems to be the pattern of the political science studies in America).

Such area studies, made by area technicians rather than by technicians of psychological warfare, offer furthermore but local solutions. The very principle of vertical (area) integration precludes the planning of any worldwide action. Thus, by hypothesis, the Berlin events were the object of a study by a group of specialists on Germany which sought solutions who would have effect and bearing in the area with which they were concerned since the events occurred in that area. It was not in their province to make plans destined at being implemented in, or having effect on, say, France, Australia, India, or Israel.

Contrariwise, the units handling respectively French, Australian, Israeli, or Indian problems were not concerned with events in Berlin.

However, the war against communism is a global war not only in that it is waged the world over and in every domain of human thought and activity, but also in that the operations of pyschological warfare (as well as of the diplomatic one, for that matter) which it involves overstep in many cases any area limits. Thus, the Stockholm Conference which resulted in the Peace Petition campaign might have been studied by the specialists of the Swedish, or of the Scandinavian area while it lasted. The operations which resulted, however, took place in many other areas. The distribution of food parcels in Berlin affected the Germans. Yet, it had also important psychological effects in India as in South America which were or ought to have been exploited in the overall strategy planning.

This is particularly true as regards operations of mass agitation which can only attain full effectiveness if they are carried out on a worldwide scale, combining and interlocking area operations.

There should, therefore, exist a horizontally integrated team for the planning (and in the first place, for visualizing) agitation and other psychological warfare operations articulated on a worldwide level.

Yet, the decision concerning the operations planned by this team could only be decided by a policymaking body which, too, should have a horizontal competence in a double sense:

(a) It should be able to order the execution of operations (such as mass agitation) to be carried out simultaneously in several areas, and by various State agencies.

(b) It should be able to handle unconventional operations to take effect in the universality of given ethnic, religious, professional, or other groups, such as the Catholic Church, the labor, nationalities scattered over the world, war veterans, racial minorities, etc.

The unconventional operations of psychological warfare resort to the techniques of people's war, the principles of which were set by Marx and are systematically applied by the Soviets. The people's war implies action on the masses; but it also implies action by, or rather through, the masses. In particular, operations of mass agitation must be not only channeled through, but also initiated by large human groups. In our case they must be apparently initiated by mass organizations in America. This would be the case, for instance, of the Berlin events of June 17, 1953, which would have required the initiative of labor organizations and of ethnic groups.

Very often many mass organizations would readily cooperate if they were given suggestions, as it is exemplified by the statement of AFL officials mentioned above.

In this democratic Nation there can be, and there should be no process of official guidance, directives, or even supervision of such unconventional operations originated in America. However, there can be and there should be an entirely informal inspiration and coordination.

Most of the organizations ready and willing to combat communism, even those which make of it their purpose lack both of any practical knowledge of methods and techniques of psychological warfare and even of a true knowledge of communism, which makes them unable to carry out, perhaps even to conceive, on their own any effective major operations on this battlefield, on which the initiative constantly remains with the Soviets. The offensive belongs to them; they act, we merely react, feebly.

The inspiration, in the form of discreet suggestions, can be exercised by the competent policymaking body entirely unofficially and informally, through some trusted members of its staff which would act apparently in their own behalf, in using personal relations which they must possess respectively in various major mass organizations, such as churches, labor unions, ethnic groups, etc.

Coordination, however, and occasionally technical assistance require more elaborate techniques.

It ought to be possible to set up a private institution which would take for a cover some research in international problems, problems of democracy, or any other purpose of the same innocuous nature, closely related, however, to its main activity. It would publish a bulletin of information and make its services available to the veterans organizations concerned bringing about amongst them a habit of seeking mutual information, which eventually would develop into cooperation, and finally into advance coordination.

However, through its leadership which would be carefully chosen in view of that purpose, the institution would receive confidential directness from the policymaking agency with the above described competence.

It must be possible to create such an institution on a pattern analogous to that of Rand, or else through a foundation, of even by a private group of men of means willing to invest money in such an organization.

CELEBRATION OF THE ANNIVERSARY OF THE BERLIN EVENTS

As an example of a possible operation of unconventional mass agitation, I would like to refer again to the events of June 17, 1953. The opportunity for exploiting them is not entirely lost. I propose that June 17 be proclaimed "Freedom Day" and that, in celebration of democratic freedoms it be dedicated to commemorate the struggle of the East Berlin workers for their freedom and their rights, including, however, in this commemoration, all sets of resistance to communism aid to the Soviets accomplished before or after that date in the enslaved countries.

The direct participation of the Government in this celebration would be a limited one: June 17 would be proclaimed a holiday, or a half-holiday; the President would address a message to the Nation; this message would be immediately broadcast to the other countries by Voice of America or by Radio Free Europe.

The essential part of the operation would rest with the labor organization, the exile groups and the associations of Americans of various east European descent.

To all these groups suggestions can be made most informally and confidentially, with a quasi-certainty that they will be wholeheartedly accepted.

The labor organizations can organize mass meetings of workers at which adequate resolutions will be voted, addressed to the Labor organization of the U. N. and to the Free World Labor Federation, and broadly publicized.

The exilees and Americans of East European descent organizations can organize similar manifestations. They can also organize a public collection of funds, selling on that day some symbol of freedom (perhaps the Freedom Bell). The product can be offered to Crusade for Freedom or for any other similar purpose. The collecting teams would be dressed in national costumes of the countries dominated by the Soviets.

The cooperation of the press, radio, and television would be requested for a broad coverage of the events and for adequate editorial comments.

The whole staging of the celebration must be calculated in such a way as to start an international mass agitation campaign against communism. Therefore, it must appeal to collective emotions, not to reason alone.

There can be no agitation without emotion. In order to be successful, propaganda must appeal not only to the mind but essentially to the heart of people.

Hon. Bill Lantaff, of Florida

SPEECH

OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 30, 1954

Mr. HAGEN of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I wish to join in with the many friends of Bill Lantaff in paying tribute to his fine record as a Congressman from the Fourth District of Florida.

I consider it a privilege and an honor to have been associated with the distinguished gentleman from Florida. It is men like Bill Lantaff who have made this House of Representatives what it is today—the finest legislative body in the world.

Bill Lantaff served with me on the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee during the 82d Congress. I was greatly impressed by his keen insight into legislative problems and with his sound judgment and commonsense approach to their solution. In my considered opinion, the people of the Fourth District of Florida can indeed feel fortunate in having had their interests so capably represented in the Halls of Congress for the past 4 years.

It is with deep regret that I learned of Bill Lantaff's decision to return to private life, because I feel that the Congress can ill afford to lose the services of a man who possesses such high ideals and who is so greatly imbued with devotion to duty. Bill Lantaff has served his people with distinction, both in war and in peace. I sincerely hope that his decision to leave Congress at this time will not mark the close of Bill Lantaff's distinguished record of public service. Perhaps he will see fit to again serve the interest of the people of the great State of Florida in another capacity. He would be a great and outstanding governor of his State. I feel confident that his people will welcome Bill Lantaff's return as a public servant, because they all recognize his sterling qualities of high integrity, outstanding ability, and fine statesmanship.

I am proud to be a friend of Bill Lantaff, and I shall always remember and value our personal friendship. I know that Bill Lantaff will be successful in whatever course he pursues, and I wish him and his fine family the best of luck and a future blessed with good health and filled with much happiness.

A Lieutenant Governor Speaks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. H. FOUNTAIN

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 3, 1954

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert in the Record the attached article from the Carolina Kiwanian, July 1954, entitled "A Lieutenant Governor Speaks," by Jasper L. Cummings, of Rocky Mount, N. C., lieutenant governor of division VI of the Carolinas district of the Kiwanis International:

A Lieutenant Governor Speaks

When I was a boy and lived in the country, I looked forward to tobacco-curing time. I enjoyed sitting up with my father while he tended the furnace. He'd always get around to telling me some tall tales about things that happened to him when he was a boy.

One night the conversation lagged while he opened gun shells, refilling them with just the right amount of powder and buckshot to be used in deer hunting the following season.

We noticed a toad hopping around the furnace. He was out in search of insects and had been attracted by the light from the open fire.

"Son, don't tell your mother, but I'm going to try something on that toad—something I heard when I was a boy."

Father rolled a buckshot toward the toad and he lapped it up. He continued to roll shot and the toad consumed so many he could hardly move. Rolling some gunpowder tightly in a cigarette paper, he pitched that to the toad and it was taken with relish.

Then to my amazement, Father reached into the furnace with a shingle and brought out a red hot coal. "Move back, son, this may be as much of a surprise to us as to the toad."

He tossed the red hot coal to the toad and as soon as it was gulped, everything seemed to happen. A booming, splashing, splattering sound with buckshot singing in the air, sent me flying to the house.

Fortunately, father and I were not hurt, but it was a lesson for both of us, and to this day, it's been our secret.

There is a far greater lesson for all of us in the Tale of a Toad.

Don't be like the indiscriminate toad; quick to accept a handout, something for nothing, without questioning or counting the future cost. The toad continued to accept a handout until the habit of receiving something for nothing, rendered him vulnerable to the spark that brought self-destruction.

Let's work and work hard at strengthening our democratic way of life. Through our sound thinking and courageous actions, we hold the key to peace in our time and a more effective, efficient, and representative government.

Remember, with the privileges of freedom, there are great responsibilities.

Rear Admiral Urges Liberation of Communist Oppressed Peoples

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES J. KERSTEN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 29, 1954

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, Msgr. Maurice S. Sheehy, rear admiral, USNR, at a recent speech in Detroit, urged that America "launch a crusade of faith to roll back the Red tide and restore liberty to the tortured oppressed millions who are our brothers in Christ." Monsignor Sheehy pointed out that the Communists' concept of life and the Christian concept of life are opposed and must meet in a battle which extends to all areas of life.

Monsignor Sheehy's forceful statements deserve our careful attention. Any attempts to coexist with communism in the world will be doomed to failure. But worse still, every moment that we try to coexist with the Communists makes the inevitable job of defeating communism that much more difficult. If we delay longer in setting about our efforts to destroy communism as a force in the world, we may some day be faced with the condition that we shall no longer have the power or ability to overcome communism. When that day comes our country is doomed for if we no longer have the power to overcome communism in the world, it will surely overcome us.

I include herewith a report of Monsignor Sheehy's speech as it was reported in the Michigan Catholic newspaper of July 16, 1954.

PRIEST-ADMIRAL WARNS: WATCH OUT FOR REDS IN PRESS, RADIO, TV

"The all-out effort of Communists to influence American radio, press, and the television industry" must not be taken lightly, Msgr. Maurice S. Sheehy warned 600 men at the luncheon meeting of the First Friday Club, July 9, in the Sheraton-Cadillac Hotel.

"One Communist columnist," said Monsignor Sheehy, "1 Communist headline writer, 1 Communist news commentator can transform into a Moscow mouthpiece a medium 99 percent of whose personnel is loyal to America."

Monsignor Sheehy, who has the Reserve rank of rear admiral, is director of the religious education department at Catholic University, Washington, D. C. He was a chaplain on active duty 56 months in the last war and has been a Reserve chaplain for many years.

Monsignor Sheehy stated that a former Attorney General recently told him that "the Communist party was making ready a smear campaign against all witnesses who helped to send Communist leaders to jail." The speaker asserted that "one American newspaper has taken as its special target Paul Crouch" and he recalled the numerous attacks made on Louis F. Budenz and Elizabeth Bentley.

"From the same sources," continued Monsignor Sheehy, "I have been informed that the next Red target is to discredit the FBI and to smear J. Edgar Hoover, who has been ruthless, they say, in his exposure of Red treachery and perjury."

The speaker recalled that the Velde committee was roundly abused because it said that the Communists were "trying to infiltrate the clergy of this country.

"J. Edgar Hoover said the same thing before the Military Chaplains Association in May and no one questioned his word," the priest added.

In opening his talk, Monsignor Sheehy declared that "whatever Mr. Churchill or others may say about 'peaceful coexistence with the Communist world,' the idea back of atheistic communism and the Christian concept back of our way of life must meet in battle, and that battle extends to all areas of life."

In a short time, he asserted millions of persons in Indochina, Thailand, and Malaya may find themselves behind the Iron Curtain, and the "shadow of Moscow hovers over Japan, Australia, India, and the Middle East."

The Navy chaplain said he approved Senator KNOWLAND's demand that if Red China is admitted to the United Nations, the United States should leave the U. N.

"But the Senator should have added that Russia and its satellites should be thrown out of the U. N. and the U. N. made the citadel of the free nations."

Monsignor Sheehy recalled that Pope Piux XI gave a detailed outline of Communist tactics and progress as early as 1937, "yet our own leaders refused to admit the danger of communism until after World War II."

Turning to means for effectively fighting communism, the speaker declared that in this war "military power plays only an incomplete role." The Soviets, he explained, hold that basically the cold war is ideological and theological. Hence, he said, the Reds assault our ideological foundation and seek to speed up the breakdown of our moral order but try to divert our attention to material things such as capitalism, world markets, colonialism, etc.

Our defense against these Red tactics is weak, continued Monsignor Sheehy. Spokesmen for the west "childishly urge the sale of a democracy they can't define except in terms of material goods or vague sentimentalities. * * * Our country mans the ideological front with huckster radio executives and hack newsmen whose understanding of Soviet communism * * * is largely limited to a businessman's innate rejection of violent political action."

Monsignor Sheehy urged America to launch a "crusade of faith to roll back the Red tide and to restore liberty to the tortured, oppressed millions who are our brothers in Christ." He added we would not allow our next-door neighbor to torture his son. "Why, then, should we permit the continuous torture and rape of 800 million of our neighbors abroad?"

In conclusion Monsignor Sheehy recalled this declaration of Pope Pius XII: "There is no other solution to humanity's problems but to build the world anew in the spirit of Christ."

Declaring that there is a spirit of defeatism abroad, the speaker reminded his hearers of these words of Chirst, "Take courage, I have overcome the world." Truth, added Monsignor Sheehy, cannot fail, and Christ cannot fail.

Army Economies Found Unrealistic in Atom Era

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 27, 1954

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Roland Sawyer, the excellent correspondent of the Christian Science Monitor, has written an article on the so-called New Look, which merits attention. Mr. Sawyer calls the New Look just what it was, "a policy of risk." As things have turned out, it was a reckless risk, based upon fiscal considerations instead of sound defense principles. Since its inception, we have lost ground in our fateful struggle with Communist imperialism.

The article follows:

[From the Christian Science Monitor of August 2, 1954]

ARMY ECONOMIES FOUND UNREALISTIC IN ATOM ERA

(By Roland Sawyer)

WASHINGTON.—The New Look, it turns out, was only a mirage.

When the Eisenhower administration took office 18 months ago, hope was high that with the new atomic weapons, military costs could be reduced substantially without reducing military security.

It was widely and genuinely believed by many members of the new Republican administration that there could, indeed, be "more for less."

There was precedent for this belief, notably a speech by the late Democratic Senator from Connecticut, Brien McMahon, who was chairman of the Joint Congressional Atomic Energy Committee.

He made a memorable speech stressing how cheap atomic explosives would be in comparison to conventional TNT explosives. He said, on September 18, 1951:

"For every dollar spent on atomic defense, we can save $5 on conventional defense."

The New Look probably had its inception in that speech.

In any event, this was what the Eisenhower administration was not only committed to, but believed, when it took office in January 1952.

BUDGET WARNING

The word went out from the office of Budget Director Joseph Dodge to the Defense Department to hold its 1954 and 1955 budgets at a dollar figure, and to rebuild the military structure on that basis. This is always denied officially, but it is virtually sworn to in private conversation as the fact by topmen, Army and Navy particularly, at the Pentagon.

Policy for the first year and a little more of the Eisenhower administration reduced traditional military expenses for manpower and traditional firearms, such as artillery, and built an enormous stockpile of atomic weapons. The Truman administration had laid the foundation for the A-bomb program but, with a Korean war on its hands, had not cut down on conventional military spending.

The end of the Korean shooting gave New Look proponents further inducement. Not long thereafter, Secretary of State John Foster Dulles announced the policy of instant, massive retaliation, a military program based upon a policy of saturation atomic bombing.

ARMY BALKS

While this was going on, the Army was behaving in the manner of its famed escort, the mule—balking. The Army had had time to make careful studies of what atomic weapons meant in terms of probable cost, upon an actual battlefield, Korea, and what massive retailiation meant in terms of the cost of World War III, which such retaliation would insure.

Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway's staff for months carried on an educational campaign in the Pentagon and the Joint Chiefs of Staff to show how even the use of atomic bombs on the mountainous front in Korea probably would not have shortened that war materially, unless a tremendous number of these bombs had been employed.

And this campaign was designed to show that massive retaliation would bring on a war which the United States did not have the manpower to fight, even if such a war should require less manpower than other wars, which the Army very much doubted.

It was the contention of some of General Ridgway's planners that such a war would require more, not less, manpower, with combat units stretched out over combat areas far greater than had been contemplated.

HEADWAY MADE

It has taken a time for this thesis to be accepted, but headway has been made. This is the background for current headlines stating that a defense goal of 6 million men under arms, or in a new, trained reserve, is planned and that the Army is now seeking ways to regroup its units into more effective fighting divisions.

It means that the New Look was taken too quickly, that a reserve of 3,055,000 men is planned, at least half of which would be actively organized, constantly in training, and fully equipped in divisions that will become a National Guard of the United States, in the words of Assistant Defense Secretary John A. Hannah. Expenses for this would be doubled for this reserve from the present $1.5 billion to $3 billion.

Legislation to set up this reserve will be introduced in Congress in January.

The Army, meanwhile, will not be cut below 1,100,000 men after June 1955, as has been planned. It will level off at this figure and be held at least at this level for the foreseeable future, Mr. Hannah announced July 31 as he departed from his post to return to private life.

ONE MILLION ONE HUNDRED THOUSAND MEN SLATED

This is a victory for General Ridgway, though it is undoubtedly substantially less of a gain for the Army than what he sought. It is more of a victory in principle than in figures.

It is a recognition of his thesis that the New Look really meant spending for weapbns that the policy of the Nation would not use—the atomic arsenal—and a cutting in weapons that the policy of the Nation would and had used, conventional explosives and manpower.

Korea and Indochina had sufficiently demonstrated, General Ridgway's side argued, that what the United States needed was more manpower than could be applied in local wars, thereby leaving a sufficient reserve in the United States for further emergencies.

There was not this sufficient reserve at the time of Korea, but the risk was deliberately taken anyway. There was not this reserve at the time of Indochina, and this time the risk was not taken, for this and other reasons.

Now the Army has won tacit recognition that the country in this cold-war era cannot skimp its military manpower further and cannot have either mobile forces ready for instant action or massive retaliation, without a program that will guarantee larger forces in being or within a month of readiness than now exist.

BETTER USE OF MEN

The new National Guard Reserve contemplates that 1,600,000 men will be ready for field action within a month, whereas, under present organization, it takes a year to put a National Guard division in the field. A year is an absurd time scale in the atomic age.

So it is now understood, as it was not before, that the New Look policy has been actually a policy of risk.

The Army is planning now to redesign its division strength, which varies from 15,000 to 20,000 men; and this probably really means that the Army is being compelled again to make more effective use of the men that it has, the military being notoriously relaxed in its manpower methods.

This will help, of course. The Reserve probably will be tremendously strengthened. This will help even more.

If these plans materialize, the New Look will become more realistic to the staggering task of building a military system that is elastic but consistently strong for the duration of this period of an atomic arms race between the United States and the Soviet Union.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Frank Brodie is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. The money derived from such sales shall be paid into the Treasury and accounted for in his annual report to Congress, and no sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Printing and binding for Congress, when recommended to be done by the Committee on Printing of either House, shall be so recommended in a report containing an approximate estimate of the cost thereof, together with a statement from the Public Printer of estimated approximate cost of work previously ordered by Congress within the fiscal year (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 145, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on Printing, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

DISTRIBUTION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

To the Vice President and each Senator 100 copies; to the Secretary and Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, each, 25 copies; to the Secretary, for official use, not to exceed 35 copies; to the Sergeant at Arms, for use on the floor of the Senate, not to exceed 50 copies; to each Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress, 68 copies; to the Clerk, Sergeant at Arms, and Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives, each, 25 copies; to the Clerk, for official use, not to exceed 50 copies; and to the Doorkeeper, for use on the floor of the House of Representatives, not to exceed 75 copies; to the Vice President and each Senator, Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress there shall also be furnished (and shall not be transferable), 3 copies of the daily RECORD, of which 1 shall be delivered at his residence, 1 at his office, and 1 at the Capitol.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized book dealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by book dealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

Report of Projects Committee to Rivers and Harbors Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. SID SIMPSON

OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 4, 1954

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD the report of the projects committee, which was unanimously adopted by the recent 41st national convention of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress held in Washington on May 24–26, 1954.

The permanent projects committee of the congress consists of an outstanding expert on water-resource problems from each of the major drainage basins of the United States. They serve without compensation of any kind whatsoever and bear all of their own expenses when coming to Washington and while here serving on this committee.

The committee's purpose is to assist the sponsors of projects in preparing and presenting their data, so that they may be placed in line for approval. The projects recommended by the committee and endorsed by the congress are vigorously pressed for inclusion in the Government's public-works program, and appropriations or allocation of funds sought therefor.

We are grateful to the members of this committee for their public-spirited service in an effort to assist the Congress of the United States and the governmental agencies charged with the responsibility for these public works, as well as the people in the areas to be served thereby.

The members of the committee who served at its recent session follows:

NATIONAL RIVERS AND HARBORS CONGRESS PROJECTS COMMITTEE

Representative SID SIMPSON, of Illinois, chairman.

New England division: Capt. Herbert S. Evans, president, Maritime Association of the Boston Chamber of Commerce, Boston, Mass.

North Atlantic division: Brig. Gen. James H. Stratton, United States Army (retired), consulting engineer, New York, N. Y.

South Atlantic division: H. H. Buckman, consulting engineer, Jacksonville, Fla., vice chairman.

Southwestern division: Dale Miller, executive vice president, Intracoastal Canal Association of Louisiana and Texas, Dallas, Tex.

Lower Mississippi Valley division: Hu B. Myers, chief engineer, department of public works, State of Louisiana, Baton Rouge, La.

Upper Mississippi Valley division: Al Hansen, comptroller, city of Minneapolis, Minneapolis, Minn.

Missouri River division: John B. Quinn, executive director, Missouri Valley Development Association, Lincoln, Nebr.

Ohio River division: Kenneth M. Lloyd, treasurer, Ohio Valley Improvement Association, Youngstown, Ohio.

North Pacific division: George E. Thomas, assistant general manager, Seattle Chamber of Commerce, Seattle, Wash.

South Pacific division: W. G. Stone, port director, port of Sacramento, Sacramento, Calif.

Western intermountain region: E. W. Rising, Washington representative, State Water Conservation Board of Montana, Nampa, Idaho.

The report follows:

REPORT OF THE PROJECTS COMMITTEE TO THE 41ST NATIONAL CONVENTION OF THE NATIONAL RIVERS AND HARBORS CONGRESS

MAY 26, 1954.

Hon. JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
President, National Rivers
and Harbors Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: In pursuance of the call of the president, your projects committee met on May 24, 1954, to consider the projects submitted since the last session of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress. Hearings were afforded all who made appearance.

The committee at this session has examined 73 proposals embracing all resource improvements with which this Congress is concerned, including navigable waterways, harbors, flood control, soil conservation, reclamation, and water conservation.

Of the proposals examined, this committee is convinced that 39 constitute projects sound in conception, needful, and sufficiently advanced in status to warrant endorsement, involving a total estimated cost of $954,739,400. Eleven proposals appear to be without sufficiently advanced development to warrant project endorsement at this time, but are believed to be meritorious and entitled to further consideration by this committee, if and when additional information may be adequate to warrant an endorsed status. We find that on 11 proposals, surveys have been authorized but the reports on such surveys have not been completed and we therefore recommend in these cases that the Congress request the appropriate authority to complete reports of its investigations and surveys as soon as practicable in order that action may be taken toward classification by this Congress. We find seven proposals, which on preliminary examination appear to be desirable and needful, and we accordingly recommend that engineering and economic investigations of survey scope be made in these cases with a view to developing projects for subsequent authorization. Of the proposals investigated, we find five are without necessary data or sponsorship to enable the committee to reach a reasonable conclusion on their worth. However, we desire to give the applications sympathetic consideration, and, if possible, offer to the proponents the services of this Congress in reaching a solution to their problems. We have, therefore, not classified these but have suggested that the Secretary communicate with the applicants concerned and request additional data upon the receipt of which further consideration will be given to their proposals.

Appendix A of this report sets forth in detail a list of all proposals and projects examined and the action taken thereon.

As the members of this convention know, the Committee on Public Works of the House of Representatives is currently holding public hearings on navigation, flood control, beach erosion control, and multiple-purpose survey reports, submitted to the Congress of the United States by the Chief of Engineers since enactment of the 1950 omnibus bill. These reports contain proposals for the construction of water resources developments located throughout the Nation, including Hawaii and Alaska. Formulation of these proposals into an omnibus rivers and harbors and flood control authorization bill and ultimate enactment into law will be a valuable addition and supplement to the presently authorized program. The committee urges that the Congress and the President of the United States give every consideration to early approval of this highly important legislation.

Since we met in convention more than 4 years ago, many events have happened which affect this great organization of ours. The Nation became involved in a conflict in the Far East which necessitated the curtailment of many water resources improvements not considered vital to our national defense. The committee recommends the reactivation of these projects at the earliest possible date. Floods, however, continued to occur on many of the river basins throughout the land. Droughts were in evidence in many areas, and sufficient water for navigation, industrial, and domestic use and the generation of much needed hydroelectric power was lacking. It is evident, therefore, that conservation and development of our water resources are of paramount importance. In this connection we must never for one moment lose sight of the objectives of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress. The founders of this great organization were aware that the development of our water resources presented a great problem for the Nation. We, here today, must strive to continue the progress that has been made in the past 25 years, proving that the problem, although of tremendous size, is not insurmountable.

Although much work remains to be done in the field of water resources development throughout the country, your committee feels certain that the problem is being expertly handled by all concerned. The Corps of Engineers as well as other Federal agencies, including the Department of Agriculture, the Bureau of Reclamation, and the Public Health Service, have prepared comprehensive plans for the conservation and development of the water resources of the major rivers of the United States. The benefits and advantages which will accrue from such a long-range program of water resources development will far exceed the cost. In this connection, your committee again desires to make the recommendation that the National Rivers and Harbors Congress actively and forcefully foster the early completion of those projects essential to the future well being of the Nation. We are in full accord with the plans of improvement presently contemplated by the various Federal agencies concerned. In order for these agencies to carry on their respective water-resources program in an orderly fashion, it is necessary that sufficient funds be made available for that purpose. The committee recommends that not less than $1,500,000,000 be made available at this time to the various Federal agencies for continuing the plan of development for conservation and use of the Nation's water resources previously approved by the Congress of the United States, including the work of investigation which is so vital to the formulation of a sound and well integrated program of river basin development.

Respectfully submitted.

SID SIMPSON, *Chairman*.

NOTE A.—A project which has been placed in class II, III, IV or V by the committee may be reexamined from time to time upon due application and the submission of material supplementary information, with a view to advancing its classification; but no project will be reported upon by the committee more than once in each year.

NOTE B.—Attention is called to the fact that when a project is once put in class I—Endorsed, such status continues and it is unnecessary to follow up at subsequent sessions with new applications. All projects endorsed by the Congress, upon the recommendation of the committee, retain their status until finally constructed, unless such action is rescinded by the Congress, and the Congress stands pledged to do everything possible to assist in reaching that goal.

APPENDIX A.—*Applications for approval of projects received by the Projects Committee*

(Letter "R" following the project number indicates revision of a previous application)

CLASS I—PROJECTS ENDORSED

Endorsed: This means that the committee is convinced that the project is sound, needful, and sufficiently advanced in status, and should be promptly constructed in the public interest.

Project No.	Name of project	State	Division
487-R (914)	Mansfield Reservoir	Indiana	Ohio River.
566-R	Calumet-Sag navigation project	Illinois and Indiana	Great Lakes.
663-R	Intracoastal Waterway from Jacksonville to Miami	Florida	South Atlantic.
736-R-3	Taylor's Creek (Beaufort Harbor)	North Carolina	Do.
745-R-4	Masonboro Inlet and connecting channels	do	Do.
790-R-3	Hudson River	New York	North Atlantic.
819-R	Kalamazoo River at Battle Creek and vicinity	Michigan	Great Lakes.
836-R	Cape Fear River at and below Wilmington	North Carolina	South Atlantic.
837-R-2	Mobile Harbor	Alabama	Do.
839-R	Sabine-Neches Waterway	Texas	Southwestern.
852-A-R	Norfolk Harbor	Virginia	North Atlantic.
852-B-R	Thimble Shoal Channel	do	Do.
853-R	Town River, Quincy	Massachusetts	Northeastern.
870-R	Delaware River: (1) Philadelphia to the sea, (2) Philadelphia to Trenton and urge Congress to adopt a resolution for a restudy of the local contribution.	Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Delaware.	North Atlantic.
875-R	Whitewater River, East Fork, at Brookville	Indiana	Ohio River.
880	St. Charles-Portage des Sioux levee	Missouri (9th Congressional District)	Missouri River.
882	Oklahoma City Floodway	Oklahoma (6th Congressional District.)	Southwestern.
885	Manteo (Shallowbag) Bay	North Carolina	South Atlantic.
886	Pasquotank River (flood control)	do	Do.
887	Far Creek	do	Do.
892	Port Aransas-Corpus Christi Waterway	Texas	Southwestern.
893	Barre Falls flood-control project	Massachusetts	Northeastern.
894	Mahoning-Grand River diversion project	Ohio	Ohio River.
895	Rio Grande and tributaries, Albuquerque and vicinity (modification of authorized project).	New Mexico	Southwestern.
896	Two Rivers Reservoir project (Rio Hondo at Roswell, N. Mex.)	do	Southwestern.
898	Kalamazoo River, flood control, with particular reference to Kalamazoo and vicinity.	Michigan	Great Lakes.
899	Ashtabula Harbor, improvement for navigation	Ohio	Do.
904	Bluff unit, Bighorn Basin division, Missouri River Basin project; Hanover unit, Bighorn Basin division, Missouri River Basin project.	Wyoming	Missouri River.
905	Snake River and tributaries Jackson Hole (flood control)	do	North Pacific.
907	Yellowtail unit, lower Bighorn division, Missouri River Basin project	Montana and Wyoming	Missouri River.
908	Shoshone extension unit, Bighorn Basin division, Missouri River Basin project	Wyoming	Do.
912	Kansas River Basin flood-control plan	Kansas, Nebraska, and Colorado	Do.
913	Osage River Basin flood-control plan	Kansas and Missouri	Do.
915	Weymouth Fore River-Nantasket Gut	Massachusetts	Northeastern.
916	Weymouth Fore River	do	Do.
918	Mystic River	do	Do.
919	Town River	do	Do.
920	Boston Harbor	do	Do.
921	Reserved Channel	do	Do.

CLASS II—PROJECTS CLASSIFIED AS MERITORIOUS

Meritorious: This means that the committee believes that although the project is not sufficiently advanced in status to warrant its present endorsement, it is meritorious and open for further consideration by the committee.

Project No.	Name of project	State	Division
728-R-4	Morehead City Harbor	North Carolina	South Atlantic.
779-R-2	Wallace Channel	do	Do.
781-R-3	Juniata River and tributaries, flood control	Pennsylvania	North Atlantic.
793-R-3	Cleves flood-protection project	Ohio	Ohio River.
809-R	Smith's Creek (Oriental, Pamlico County)	North Carolina	South Atlantic.
811-R	Hatteras breakwater (channel from Hatteras Inlet to Hatteras, and Rollinson Channel).	do	Do.
860-R	South Channel, New York Harbor	New York and New Jersey	North Atlantic.
889	Nawiliwili Harbor improvements	Hawaii	South Pacific.
906	Lyman project	Wyoming	Intermountain region.
909	Seedskadee project	do	South Pacific.
910	LaBarge project	do	Do.

CLASS III—EXPEDITIOUS REPORT ON AUTHORIZED SURVEY REQUESTED

Expeditious report on authorized survey requested: This means that the committee believes the Congress should request the engineering authority to expedite the report of its investigation and survey of the project to the end that appropriate further action may be had thereon in regard to classification by the Congress.

Project No.	Name of project	State	Division
723-R-2	Cape Fear River (flood control, etc.)	North Carolina	South Atlantic.
725-R-4	Carolina Beach (navigation, pollution abatement, etc.)	do	Do.
727-R-2	Neuse River and tributaries (flood control, drainage, etc.)	do	Do.
810-R	Holden Beach (Lockwoods Folly Inlet)	do	Do.
813-R	Pantego and Cucklers Creeks, Pungo River Basin: (flood control and drainage)	do	Do.
830-R	Palm Beach Harbor (formerly known as Lake Worth Inlet)	Florida	Do.
857-R	Cache River-Bay Creek Basin development	Illinois	Ohio River.
888	Long Beach, Plymouth Harbor	Massachusetts	Northeastern.
911	Savery-Pot Hook project	Wyoming and Colorado	South Pacific.
917	Boston Harbor, Chelsea Creek (35-foot survey) should be expedited	Massachusetts	Northeastern.
922	Atchafalaya Bay ship channel	Louisiana	Lower Mississippi Valley.

APPENDIX A.—*Applications for approval of projects received by the Projects Committee*—Continued

CLASS IV—PROJECTS RECOMMENDED FOR SURVEY

Recommended for survey: This means that the committee believes that sufficient showing on behalf of the project has been made to warrant further examination in the form of an adequate survey by an appropriate agency of the Federal Government.

Project No.	Name of project	State	Division
881	Chariton River, East and Middle Forks (Chariton and Randolph Counties)	Missouri (2d Congressional District)	Missouri River.
883	San Juan Harbor, improvements to channel and turning basins	Puerto Rico	South Atlantic.
890	Kahului Harbor improvements, Kahului, Maui	Hawaii	South Pacific.
891	New Haven Harbor (review and restudy)	Connecticut	Northeastern.
900	Sewage treatment plant improvements, city of San Antonio, Bexar County	Texas	Southwestern.
901	Leon Creek sewage treatment plant and addition to the sanitary sewerage system, city of San Antonio, Bexar County.	do	Do.
923	Belhaven breakwater	North Carolina	South Atlantic.

APPENDIX B.—*Supplemental list of applications for approval of projects received by the Projects Committee*

(Letter "R" following the project number indicates revision of a previous application)

CLASS I—PROJECTS ENDORSED

Endorsed: This means that the committee is convinced that the project is sound, needful and sufficiently advanced in status, and should be promptly constructed in the public interest.

Project No.	Name of project	State	Division
854-R	Central and Southern Florida Flood Control project (authorization of the entire project).	Florida	South Atlantic.
924	Carrabelle Harbor, Interior Channel	do	Do.
925	East Point Channels, Apalachicola Bay	do	Do.
926	Hillsboro River, Tampa Harbor (modification of existing project)	do	Do.
927	Port St. Joe Harbor (Saint Joseph Bay)	do	Do.
928	Rice Creek	do	Do.
929	St. George Island Cut, Apalachicola Bay	do	Do.
930	Scipio Creek Channel and Basin, Apalachicola Bay	do	Do.

Address by Hon. Leverett Saltonstall, of Massachusetts, Before Conference of Small Business Administration Regional Directors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. THYE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 4, 1954

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I desire to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] before the conference of Small Business Administration regional directors, in Washington, D. C., on June 2, 1954.

I wish to state that the distinguished senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] has always striven for the retention of small business in our country, and has consistently supported measures and actions which would serve to expand small business as an integral part of our national economy. As Governor of the State of Massachusetts, as United States Senator, and as a leading citizen of Massachusetts, he has been a leader for the cause of the small-business man.

He has been a proponent in the effort to strengthen Office of Defense Mobilization procedures for allocation of defense contracts to surplus-labor areas. He has sought to assist small firms in competing for Government contracts, through the use of setasides in surplus-labor areas. He was one of the sponsors of Senate bill 1523, which established the Small Business Administration, and he has been effective in attempts to remove the Government from competition with business in areas where competition is unnecessary and unjustified. Very recently he joined in an attempt to give the Senate Small Business Committee the status of a permanent standing committee of the Senate.

So, Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent to have the address delivered by the Senator from Massachusetts on June 2 printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It was kind of Wendell Barnes to ask me to participate in this meeting of SBA's regional personnel. I have been a member of the present Small Business Committee of the Senate since it was created in 1950. That is one reason why I am glad to be here to talk shop with you. Another reason is that I represent a State and come from an entire area, New England, where the concentration of the small-business population is heavier than anywhere else in the country. We in New England realize how important a mission you have undertaken.

A few days ago I happened to notice a cartoon in a widely circulated magazine. The first picture showed a bearded castaway being rescued from a desert island by the crew of a large ship. In the second illustration this castaway was sitting in a cabin eagerly reading a newspaper and listening to the radio to catch up with the latest news. The final cartoon showed the castaway diving overboard to swim back to the peace and quiet of his desert island.

There are times, I am sure, when all of us feel somewhat like the castaway, that we would like to escape, if only for a short time, from the crisis-a-day atmosphere which seems to afflict the entire world today. These occasional impulses to run from reality are natural reactions. We live in the midst of tension and the so-called "good old days" seem very remote indeed.

The world leadership we have been called upon to exert in the cause of peace carries with it heavy responsibilities. Anyone sitting down to draw up an agenda for America would have no trouble in agreeing on the item that tops the list. Our No. 1 duty is to keep ourselves strong. A stalwart America is our best, indeed, it is our only safeguard against those who are working, openly and secretly, to enslave the bodies and minds of free men and women. That is why, as we all know, every action of the present administration is designed to increase our national strength.

The newspapers are full of speculation about the destructiveness of new and terrible secret weapons. My comfort, however, is based on the awareness of a nonsecret weapon, in fact, of a very public weapon indeed. To me the most important weapon in the arsenal of democracy is the American small-business establishment. The symbol and the very heart of our free enterprise system, the source of our strength, is small business—all four million plus of them.

Is that the same as saying that your job is of vital importance? My personal belief is that no group of men in Government today has been entrusted with a greater responsibility. Every time in behalf of a small independent company you make a phone call, write a letter, arrange a conference, and give advice, you are helping to strengthen our entire economy.

It is true that our economy has never been more vigorous than it is today. Since 1946 there have actually been, on a percentage basis, more new businesses born than new babies. The business population has increased by 35 percent contrasted with a 14 percent increase in our human population. That means that there are now about 1 million more business concerns providing goods and services than there were 9 years ago.

When it comes to helping small business, Congress has always shown a fine spirit of nonpartisanship. Nonetheless, I am particularly proud of the direction which the present administration has given to these efforts. The existence of the Small Business Administration itself is eloquent evidence that the Republican leadership is offering a guaranty to America that small-business men will not be slighted.

You men have your work cut out for you. From my own observations I know that you will receive enlightened and program direction from your Washington headquarters. I say this because I know that Wendell Barnes and his staff associates have a very sensitive awareness of the basic problems of small-business men. But the daily operational burden is on you.

The thought that I want to leave with you is that every step of the way, be the going smooth or rough, you will have a Congress standing foursquare back of you. We shall see to it that you have the tools to do the job.

Speaking from personal knowledge, I can tell you that a splendid understanding and relationship now exists here in Washington between the Small Business Administration and the Senate Small Business Committee. With this type of teamwork, I am sure that the future of American small business will be in safe hands.

Thank you.

Private and Public Atom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 27, 1954

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call attention to a well-written editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch. It seems utterly inconceivable that Congress would seriously consider permitting a monopoly of atomic power. On this subject I am very pleased to note that the editorial refers with approval to the views of a distinguished Californian, Mr. Samuel B. Morris, general manager of the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power.

The editorial follows:

PRIVATE AND PUBLIC ATOM

There is general agreement that the abilities of private enterprise should now be joined with those of Government to develop atomic energy for the production of electric power. That is, roughly, a chief stated purpose of the amendments to the Atomic Energy Act about which debate is raging in the Senate.

Government and business, working together can be expected to make atomic power economically feasible much sooner than either could do it alone. Opponents of the administration's bill do not object to the general purpose of enlisting private enterprise. Their objection is to the manner in which the bill would do it.

They believe the administration bill would fail to protect the public interest in atomic power and would therefore lead to private monopoly. What basis, if any, is there for this concern?

The administration bill, for all practical purposes, prohibited any agency of the Federal Government from producing and selling electric power generated from atomic energy. Senator PASTORE, of Rhode Island, a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, was quite explicit upon this point. "We are trying to keep the Federal Government out of the power-producing business," he said.

An amendment by Senator JOHNSON of Colorado, authorizing the AEC and some other Federal agencies to generate atomic power on a commercial basis, was narrowly approved by the Senate, 45 to 41. A similar amendment offered in the House by Representative HOLIFIELD, of California, was resoundingly defeated, 146 to 72.

The prospects for Government participation in the production and sale of atomic power are therefore precarious, to say the least.

Is it desirable—or undesirable—for the Government to produce and sell some atomic power at the same time as private companies would be producing and selling most of it?

The question is one of effective regulation. The Federal Power Commission would have responsibility for determining what was a fair price at which the private companies should be allowed to sell their atomic power. Yet FPC says in its analysis of the bill that "there is not and probably never will be a free market to provide a standard of what a fair price would be."

If there were no public production of atomic power, FPC would be in the position of trying to measure without any yardstick to measure with. Its regulation of prices would therefore be impaired or destroyed, at the expense of consumers throughout the Nation who depend upon it to protect them from exorbitant rates. The only way for FPC to learn what a fair price would be is for the Government to produce and sell some atomic power as Operation Yardstick.

This would be reason enough by itself for the Government to produce and sell some atomic power. But there is still another reason which also would be enough by itself. That is the prevention of private monopoly.

It is to end a Government monopoly in atomic energy that the present bill is being considered. Would it not be ironic indeed to establish a private monopoly in an act which abolished a Government monopoly?

Private development of atomic power could easily and quickly become a monopoly. Few plants will be licensed, for few companies have enough money to build one large enough to produce low-cost power.

Government operation of a portion of the total atomic power system is one way in which the private part of the operation can be kept under control and prevented from growing into a monopoly. It is not the only safeguard that is needed. Patent regulations are among the others, and as respectable an authority as Samuel B. Morris, of Los Angeles, one of President Eisenhower's choices for chairman of TVA, says the administration bill would "not merely permit but would invite the creation of a patent monopoly." The exclusive private right to produce and sell atomic power, coupled with uninformed and therefore ineffective regulation, would make monopoly so easy, however, that other measures against it could hardly prevail.

What is wanted is neither the present Government operation, exclusive of private industry, nor the proposed private industry operation exclusive of Government. What is wanted is an arrangement in which each can contribute what it best can toward a joint effort.

Old-Age Assistance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MORGAN M. MOULDER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 3, 1954

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Speaker, I think that all Members of the 83d Congress should be proud, as am I, of our action in regard to the extension of the Federal social-security program. The House of Representatives passed the social-security bill almost unanimously. The Senate Finance Committee has reported favorably upon the bill which will extend social-security protection to several million additional persons not now entitled to benefits under the program, and which will increase benefits to all persons now receiving old-age and survivors insurance.

As I review the accomplishments of the 83d Congress, I am particularly proud of our progress in this humane field. However, I have sought in vain to find any action which this Congress has taken to increase benefit payments to those persons who receive Federal-State old-age assistance under title I of the Federal Security Act. There are in the United States today, almost 2½ million persons who receive old-age assistance benefits. The maximum amount of payment in which the Federal Government will participate is a grant of $55 per month per individual. Under the present matching formula, the Federal Government contributes $35 per month and the State $20 per month on a maximum payment of $55.

Since 1946 every Congress has increased the Federal share of assistance payments by $5 per case, which has enabled the States to pass on this $5 additional monthly benefit to those persons who can qualify for old-age assistance. The 83d Congress, 2d session, has not taken recognition of the inadequacy of the present payments to the old-age assistance recipients, although we all recognize the fact that living costs are soaring, and that any person attempting to live on $55 a month is hard pressed indeed. In my own State of Missouri, 133,732 received old-age assistance grants in the month of June. The majority of these persons received the maximum payment of $55 a month. In my own congressional district, the 11th District of Missouri, there are 14,981 persons who receive old-age assistance under the State-Federal program. Unless some action is taken by the Congress in the closing days of this session to revise the Federal formula and provide additional money to the States, the 2½ million persons in our country over 65 years of age now on old-age assistance will have nothing to look forward to in the next 2 years as far as increased assistance checks are converned. These fine old citizens of the United States have paid taxes, have reared and educated their children, and have made our Nation strong.

It is my earnest belief that the Congress should move at once to rectify this situation and to provide legislation and appropriations to substantially increase the old-age assistance checks for all of the 2½ million persons who now receive monthly assistance grants, so that they will be better able to provide themselves with the necessities of life and will have a brighter, happier old age as they go down the sunset slope of life.

The following table shows information by counties in my congressional district:

11th congressional district

County	Number of old-age assistance recipients June 1954	Number of old-age insurance recipients Jan. 1, 1954
Total (17 counties)	14,981	5,573
Benton	597	154
Boone	1,328	821
Camden	543	175
Carroll	659	255
Chariton	921	179
Cole	677	579
Cooper	783	276
Dallas	779	156
Hickory	419	55
Howard	706	164
Laclede	1,130	314
Miller	810	182
Moniteau	754	208
Morgan	506	210
Pettis	1,682	740
Randolph	1,433	598
Saline	1,254	507

The Farmer's Share Dwindles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 4, 1954

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, the appended editorial from the August 4, 1954, edition of the New York Herald Tribune clearly points out arguments for the flexible parity program. I believe it reports the considered views of the great majority of the people of the State of New Jersey:

THE FARMER'S SHARE DWINDLES

Most consumers would probably greet with an acquiescent nod the report by the staff of the House Agriculture Committee that household food buyers have not gained what the farmer has lost in falling farm receipts since 1951. It could afford litle surprise to read that farm prices have dropped 18.8 percent in the period while retail food costs have gone up 1 percent. Or to learn that the farmer who got 54 cents of the consumer's dollar in 1945 gets only 44 cents out of it today. Rising costs of processing and distributing the products of the farm are the traditional and at least partly persuasive answer. There can be no joy for either farmer or consumer in the prospect that abundant farm and range output may bring a further distressing expansion of the gap. Up to this point in the story, the city consumer could hardly respond with anything but chagrined agreement.

The House Agriculture Commitee, which received the report, went on, however, to approve the retention of high, rigid supports on farm products.' In releasing its staff report, the commitee evidently intended to suggest that retail food costs will not fall no matter what is done to farm price supports. In particular, it evidently viewed its price study as an argument against flexible price supports.

The logic is deficient. One of the strategic factors in the decline of farm receipts has been loss of export markets. Farm products shipped abroad are not subject to the elaborate processing, packaging, and advertising that goes into food and fiber destined for home consumption. High price supports have kept many farm products out of volume sale on world markets. Another strategic factor is oversupply of the raw products of the farm. While it is perfectly true that processing and marketing costs have been rising independently of farm prices, it does not follow that those costs have alone been a drag on domestic consumption. The April cuts in dairy support prices were followed by marked retail price cuts and an increase in consumption. To adopt rigid, high support prices across the board would simply preclude such beneficial cuts in the future. Surpluses would continue to pile up, exports to fall off, and burdens on the taxpayer to accumulate beyond endurance.

Any progress that can be made in trimming the costs of distribution will be all to the good. But flexible price supports remain the one real hope for correction of the basic difficulty.

Long Beach's Pot of Gold

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 3, 1954

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, legal technicalities with respect to a grant by the State of California in 1911 to the city of Long Beach of certain tidelands, together with subsequent grants, have resulted in litigation now that Congress has confirmed and established to titles of the States in and to the submerged lands on our coasts. Despite all reasonable interpretations to the contrary, certain elements in the State of California now seeks to deprive the city of Long Beach of the benefits of these grants.

Much misinformation has circulated nationally with respect to this legal action and the factual background thereof. The misinformation recently was exposed, and true facts set forth, in a letter to the editor of the Christian Science Monitor by Assemblyman Herbert Klocksiem, of Long Beach, Calif.

Assembly Klocksiem is one of California's most distinguished, able, and honored statesmen. His words deserve the consideration and respect of all who read this RECORD. They are as follows:

To the Christian Science Monitor:

I write regarding Harlan Trott's June 29 article entitled "Long Beach's Pot of Gold," to point out some misstatements of fact, which were obviously unintentional.

Long Beach in 1911 was granted by the State of California all the submerged lands within the city's limits extending 3 miles into the ocean. This grant was similar to those which the legislature has made to practically every coastal city in the State. The purpose of all these grants was to assure the quickest and soundest possible development of these lands for harbors, fisheries and navigation. The legislature recognized that local citizens have the greatest incentive, knowledge and ability to develop these lands. As a result, California achieved its world renowned coastal facilities.

In subsequent years, the purposes of the Long Beach grant were enlarged to include parkways, parks, highways, commerce and recreation. Even after oil was discovered in the granted lands, the legislature amended the grant without making any effort to regain title to the oil. The California Supreme Court has ruled (*Long Beach* v. *Marshal*) that the city received all the right, title and interest the State had and that the city had the legal righ to develop and produce the oil resources existing in those lands.

By 1951 the city's tideland oil revenues had become so large it was obvious that more than enough monies would be available to carry out the purposes of the grant. The legislature, at the city's request and without a dissenting vote, freed half the oil and gas revenues from the terms of the trust. The legislation was ruled constitutional by the legislative counsel and was signed by the Governor. The city amended its charter to permit the expenditure of these freed moneys on such upland projects as the voters approved.

A taxpayer (Mallon) sued to enjoin such upland expenditures on the theory that they would be unconstitutional. The Superior Court ruled against the taxpayer and for the city. The matter has been appealed to the California Supreme Court where it is now pending.

This is where the Tulare County Farm Bureau appeared and filed a petition, which the Supreme Court granted, to enter the case as an amicus curiae. The bureau contends that these freed moneys should revert to the State of California.

We are confident the Supreme Court will uphold the city's position because previous actions by the legislature in freeing portions of tidelands granted to other cities from the terms of their tideland trusts have been upheld by the court. For example, San Diego built its city hall on filled-in tidelands which were declared by the legislature as no longer necessary for the purposes of that city's tidelands grant.

In fact, if public opinion throughout the State were convinced that Long Beach has acted illegally and that the tidelands it has developed should revert to the State, chaos could engulf every coastal city which has received similar grants.

Mr. Trott reported merely a few of the false statements being circulated against Long Beach. He implied that our "$5 million airport, $16 million hospital and $2 million auditorium" have been built with tideland funds. Instead, the airport was built entirely by funds other than tideland revenues. The city has not built a hospital. Its auditorium was built by a bond issue.

Certainly Long Beach has achieved great revenues from its development of tideland oil and gas. But the mere size of those revenues has nothing whatsoever to do with whether or not the city is legally entitled to them.

HERBERT R. KLOCKSIEM,
Assemblyman, 44th District.
LONG BEACH, CALIF.

The Air Force Academy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEO W. O'BRIEN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 4, 1954

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I should like to include in the RECORD a very fine suggestion for the naming of the New Air Force Academy in Colorado. The suggestion was contained in a letter to me from Mrs. John E. Dinan of Cohoes, N. Y. She wrote:

It was with a great deal of interest that I read in our local paper that no name has yet been decided upon for the new Air Force

Academy to be built in Colorado. I know that many suggestions will be received, but I am humbly submitting mine anyway.

Remembering our own Billy Mitchell, who, against great pressure, advocated a powerful air force, independent of the other services, I feel that the Government has been given a wonderful opportunity to commemorate his memory.

West Point and Annapolis have perfect sounding names. I do not suggest that the new Academy bear Billy Mitchell's name but, back in 1925, the year I was born, he wrote a book titled "Skyways." In it he expressed all the hopes that he did not live to see fulfilled.

I deeply feel that Skyways would be a most appropriate name for the Academy.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the suggestion by Mrs. Dinan has a great deal of merit. There is a bold sweep to the name she proposes, and it would be a most fitting way to honor the memory of a great pioneer of the airways. I commend it to the consideration of our Government.

The Betrayed Farmer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MORGAN M. MOULDER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 3, 1954

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Speaker, next Tuesday, August 3, I will be nominated without opposition as the Democratic candidate for election to Congress from the 11th District of Missouri, for which I am honored and deeply grateful. The 11th Congressional District is generally regarded as a close district, and it would naturally be my desire to return to the district as soon as possible to conduct my campaign.

On the 2d day of next November the voters in our respective congressional districts will have their first opportunity to express their opinion of the Republican administration now in power and to also vote for or against their representation in Congress.

Mr. Speaker, although like every other Member in Congress, I am concerned with thoughts of my opponents now campaigning against me, it seems of far greater importance that every Member of Congress should remain here until the full discharge of our duties to the people we represent here in Congress. This is our solemn obligation and duty to the the people back home and is of vastly greater importance than the early return home to engage in a campaign.

Mr. Speaker, I am taking this time and opportunity of serving notice that I shall vote against any resolution for adjournment until Congress has had an opportunity to consider and vote on many important bills now pending, bottled up, and undisposed of. I sincerely hope the Republican majority leadership will provide such opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, I particularly refer to my bill, H. R. 10058, to provide emergency assistance and relief in the drought-stricken areas of the United States, and for other purposes. This bill reads as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in order to provide emergency relief for the victims of the widespread drought presently existing in the United States, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $1 billion, to be used in the discretion and under the direction of the President in—

(1) establishing a program for the purchase of beef and cattle in drought-stricken areas for distribution to schools, hospitals, and the Armed Forces with adequate provision to asure the farmers at least $10 per 100 pounds for utility grade cattle;

(2) purchasing grains and feeds from the Commodity Credit Corporation for distribution in drought-stricken areas;

(3) establishing a program of 30-year loans to assist in drilling wells in areas where the water supply is exhausted; and

(4) providing such other forms of assistance as he may deem appropriate to combat the effects of the drought.

Mr. Speaker, if we are financially able to appropriate billions of dollars, as is now being done, for relief and assistance to the economy of foreign countries, then for the sake of America, why cannot we afford one of such billions as provided in my bill for our own taxpaying American citizens who so sorely need and deserve such assistance as never before, in the drought-stricken areas.

Mr. Speaker, in the August 1954 publication of the Missouri Farmer there is an article entitled "Will Congress Legislate Nation Into a General Depression?" This article was written by Fred V. Heinkel, president of the Missouri Farmers Association. Mr. Heinkel is closely associated with and among the best informed on the problems and needs of the farmers. He has a national reputation as a great leader of the farmers of America, and no person is more admired and highly respected for his integrity and ability than Fred V. Heinkel. This is what he says in the article published in the Missouri Farmer:

WILL CONGRESS LEGISLATE NATION INTO A GENERAL DEPRESSION?

(By Fred V. Heinkel, president, the Missouri Farmers Association)

The bitterest fight seen in Washington for a long time is that which has been occurring lately over the farm bill which passed the House a few days ago. And well might it be a bitter fight, for involved along with the political skins of numerous Representatives and Senators is the future standard of living for millions of rural people.

The big fight was begun at a time when net farm income was sharply declining. Farm prices had plunged downward 4 percent in June, dropping the parity ratio to 88 percent. Net farm income has declined 13 percent in the last 2 years, at the same time that other parts of the economy have been chalking up new income record highs. Income for farmers will suffer another cut of about 5 percent on 1954 crops, while as a result of cross-compliance, 1955 farm income is expected to drop as much as 15 percent overall. Some individual crops are likely to show even greater declines.

This is being written before the farm bill has been dealt with by the Senate. Because of disagreement between House and Senate, the chances are the final bill will be written by a conference committee of the House and Senate. It is too much to expect that a real good farm bill will be enacted into law, in view of the House action and the weakness of farm sentiment in the Senate.

The House bill was weak enough when it started out. It was practically destroyed by the Harrison amendment, which was a compromise calculated to please the administration and make the bill acceptable to the President.

That this was accomplished was proven by the statement of President Eisenhower in which he hailed the House vote as a great victory for the administration. The victory was also hailed by the United States Chamber of Commerce and the American Farm Bureau Federation.

When the bill came on the House floor, the Farm Bureau deluged Congressmen with letters and telegrams urging them to establish flexible supports at from 75 to 90 percent of parity.

The administration, with the President himself taking part, really put the heat on Republican Members of the House to defeat the bill or at least modify it, as was done with the adoption of the Harrison amendment. As one writer in Washington stated it:

"A little band of only 23 Republicans, led by Representative CLIFFORD HOPE, chairman of the Agriculture Committee, stood fast against bone-crushing pressure exerted by the administration and its lobbying allies. Many other GOP Congressmen who had voted for 90 percent of parity in every previous test deserted in the July 2 rollcall.

One thing that happened was that some Republican Members from dairy States like Wisconsin were unable to agree upon a strong dairy provision, which left them with nothing to fight for at the showdown. In confusion, they finally voted largely with the low-price crowd. Most Midwest Republicans, including COLE, of St. Joseph; SHORT, of the 7th District; and HILLELSON, of the 4th District of Missouri, deserted the cause of parity under strong party pressure.

(Incidentally, the way party pressure is exerted is that if you don't stand hitched the party won't help you get reelected.)

The Democrats gave about the same backing to 90 percent of parity as they did in 1952.

Secretary Benson's campaign to turn city Congressmen against price supports was successful in many cases. Of 88 Democrats from city districts, 34 voted for the cut in supports. Every one of the 98 Republican Congressmen from city districts, including CURTIS, of St. Louis, voted for the cut in supports. Everyone of the Missouri Democrats, including the city members, voted against the Harrison amendment and for 90 percent of parity.

If the Harrison amendment, which fixes supports at between 82½ to 90 percent of parity, is sustained by the Senate, and the bill is signed by the President, farm income will be cut another $3 billion below the $13 billion realized in 1952. Had the administration-Farm Bureau-chamber of commerce 75 percent of parity provision been sustained farm income would have suffered a slash down to $7½ billion.

The United States Chamber of Commerce, while deploring the fact that 75 percent of parity was displaced by a low of 82½ percent in the House, termed the bill a "heartening victory"; and President Ike called it a "sweeping victory." Allen Kline, president of the American Farm Bureau, said, "The action of the House in voting to terminate the rigid 90 percent of parity price supports * * * was a good one."

Thus, as your farm income continues to decline, aside from the ravages of drought and grasshoppers, you will know whom to blame. I am proud that your MFA has fought every step of the way for higher farm income. Your officers would certainly have been derelict in their duty had they not done so. You will never see your Missouri Farmers Association advocating lower income for farmers, or suggesting that any gains made by farmers be given away.

The farmers of America have been feeding the American people better and more cheaply than any other people on this earth have ever been fed at any time. I, for one, cannot see how we can keep on doing this much longer without receiving our just share of the national income. Unless the American people are willing that farmers receive a just return for their sweat and toil, then surely the time will come when they will be haunted by food shortages. Then they will look back on these times as the golden days of abundance when our biggest worry was huge surpluses of good things to eat.

There will be another Congress next year. Another farm bill can be passed at that time if Congress so wills. But Congress won't listen next year unless farmers and their wives register their sentiments at the polls in November. I suggest that the ballot box is the only recourse farmers have now. I think that on election day it will behoove farm people to remember their friends, as well as their enemies—and this regardless of political party.

Unless there is a radical change, totally unexpected by all observers on the Washington scene, the farm bill that comes out of this Congress will practically legislate a general depression. For general depressions are always preceeded by a farm depression, and no one knows better than the farmer and his wife that a farm depression is here now.

It seems to be a favorite indoor sport of economists and certain politicians to sit in swivel chairs in air-conditioned offices and tell about how prosperous our country is at the present time. But farmers and their wives have been hit in their pocketbooks and hard; and the words of the ivory tower prognosticators are falling upon deaf ears throughout rural America.

Mr. Speaker, I was one of the Missouri Democrats referred to in this article by Mr. Heinkel as voting against the Harrison amendment and for 90 percent of parity. I am proud of my consistent stand and fight for the farmers of America; they are the backbone and foundation of our great Nation. Without their prosperity, production, and purchasing power, grass would grow in the streets of the cities."

Suggested Statement on Tax-Practice Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 4, 1954

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced H. R. 9922 to clarify and extend the authority of the Treasury Department to regulate the practice of lawyers, certified public accountants, and others who assist the public in the determination of Federal-tax liabilities, preparation of tax returns, and in the settlement of cases in dispute with the Internal Revenue Service. This bill has three purposes:

First, to clarify the responsibility and authority of the Treasury Department to protect the Government and the public from incompetent or unethical tax practitioners;

Second, to establish the fact that control of Federal-tax practice must lie with the Congress and the Federal Government;

Third, to guard against the danger that qualified professional assistance may not be available to all taxpayers at reasonable cost.

After extensive hearings, two subcommittees of the Ways and Means Committee have recently recommended that the Treasury Department should be authorized by the Congress to exercise stricter control over individuals who assist others in income tax matters for a fee. The present authority of the Treasury Department to regulate tax practice rests upon an old statute which was enacted long before the income-tax amendment of 1913. While this authority has not been questioned, it is not sufficiently explicit in some respects. It seems desirable that the Internal Revenue Code should clearly set forth the authority and governing policy with respect to the regulation of such practice.

In recent years, State courts in a number of jurisdictions have entertained suits in which the right of individuals to engage in various phases of Federal-tax practice has been questioned on the grounds that such activities should be restricted to lawyers. It is obvious that the whole field of Federal tax practice would be thrown into chaos, to the detriment of both the Government and taxpayers, if practitioners were subject to different rules in 48 States, the District of Columbia and the Territories, and if hundreds of thousands of accountants and others who have been giving satisfactory service to taxpayers for 40 years, were expelled from this field of work.

Congress has already established a precedent in keeping practice before the Tax Court open to nonlawyers as well as lawyers. In the Revenue Act of 1942 it was provided that no person should be denied the right to practice before the Tax Court by reason of failure to belong to any particular calling or profession.

It seems to me of even greater importance, since it would affect millions more taxpayers, to prevent unwarranted restrictions on preparation of tax returns, advising taxpayers on Federal tax matters, and representation of taxpayers before the Treasury Department.

The determination of taxable income is primarily an accounting matter. The Internal Revenue Code specifies that taxable income shall be determined in accordance with the accounting methods regularly employed by the taxpayer, so long as they clearly reflect the income. In this year's general tax bill (H. R. 8300) we have brought tax accounting into closer conformity with generally accepted accounting principles. It would be contrary to the public interest if at the same time there should be any curtailment of the role that professional accountants have occupied in tax practice for 40 years.

Officials of the Internal Revenue Service for many years have emphasized the fact that orderly collection of taxes requires the availability of all possible expert assistance to taxpayers, where such help is needed. However, the public should be protected against fraud and incompetence by such supervision as the Treasury considers appropriate.

Obviously, adequate standards of competence and responsibility of Federal tax practitioners should be maintained by the Treasury. My bill so provides.

The intent of the bill is that agents and attorneys shall have equal standing in tax practice before the Treasury Department and that the public shall not be required to employ either or both.

Naval Reserve Officers Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ANTONI N. SADLAK

OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 4, 1954

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, last September Rear Adm. R. H. Hillenkoetter, USN, Commandant of the Third Naval District, with headquarters in New York, selected the city of New Haven, Conn., as the location to test a program of the Navy designed to keep Naval Reserve officers abreast of current technological and scientific developments through college level courses conducted close to their hometowns.

On June 14, after 10 months of operation, almost 100 officers who had completed 24 two-hour instruction periods in navigation, gunnery, operations, engineering, and seamanship were awarded certificates of satisfactory completion of the courses by Capt. Clarence Broussard, USN, Admiral Hillenkoetter's assistant chief of staff for reserve.

The faculty of the New Haven school was selected from the best qualified naval reservists who lived in the immediate vicinity of the site of the school and Comdr. H. A. Peterson, USNR, of Guilford, Conn., a holder of the Navy Cross, was selected as the Director.

On the basis of the satisfactory test made in New Haven, the Navy decided to expand the program to 27 other locations so that officers in other areas could take advantage of the program which would qualify them for immediate duty in the event of war, without the customary training period which, it appears under present world conditions, might not be available.

To permit officers who had been designated as directors and assistant directors of the Naval Reserve officers schools which were to be established elsewhere in the Nation to profit by the experience and leadership of the excellent administrative staff and faculty of the New Haven school, a seminar was held in New Haven on July 12, 13, and 14 with almost 100 Naval Reserve officers participating.

Capt. Clarence Broussard opened the affair with well-chosen remarks when he told the officers gathered that the Navy must have a well-qualified Reserve, ready for immediate duty, and Naval Reserve officers schools were looked on as a major means of attaining that objective, within the bounds of economy that our domestic condition dictated.

Capt. Harold B. Roberts, United States Coast Guard, Reserve director of the Third Coast Guard District, which is headed by Rear Adm. Louis B. Olsen, United States Coast Guard, addressed the group and stated that the Navy's general policy of training Coast Guard

Reserve officers to occupy billets with the Navy had been utilized to the fullest extent at the New Haven Naval Reserve Officers School. It is expected that the new schools will also be attended by Coast Guard Reserve officers elsewhere in the Nation, when the expanded program commences operation next September, inasmuch as the Coast Guard, like the Navy, desire their Reserve officers to be ready, should their services be needed. The Coast Guard is operated under the Treasury Department during peacetime but becomes a part of the Navy during wartime.

It is appropriate that both the aforementioned officers should take cognizance of our need for having a qualified Reserve, ready at very short notice, within the bounds that our national economic condition warrants.

President Eisenhower's New Look Reserve force is beginning to take shape, and we in Connecticut, especially those in the New Haven area, are highly gratified that Admiral Hillenkoetter selected that location to test the Navy's program.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the New Haven Register of July 7, 1954, relative to the Navy seminar held in New Haven to acquaint officials of the Naval Reserve officers schools to be established elsewhere in the Nation with the background and information on the New Haven test program:

Navy Seminar

The opening of a Navy seminar here next Monday to acquaint commanding officers with the operating system of the Naval Reserve officers' schools once again calls attention to the trail-blazing work that was done right here in this city. The New Haven Reserve Officers' School, opened here last September, was a test program. It has proven its work and has proven worthwhile. From it now will come some 29 similar schools to train Reserve officers in the latest in scientific and technological developments without disrupting their normal civilian duties and employment.

New Haven thus may feel honored in the part it may well have played in setting in motion President's Eisenhower's New Look Reserve program. The citizen-sailors of this area again have demonstrated their interest and their loyalty. They have played a part, and an important one, in pointing toward realization of a sound national defense within proper economic limits.

From this limited beginning it is expected that these programs ultimately will be established in some 100 major cities around the Nation. And the Nation will be the stronger and safer because of this launching made right here in our own community because some men had vision and others had the perseverance to stick by the charts.

The Shadow Before

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 30, 1954

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, without any comment on my own part I should like to call attention to an editorial note which appeared in the August 1954 issue of Harper's magazine and an article which appeared in the Anchorage (Alaska) Daily Times of July 1954, headed "Secretary Writes Off GOP Election Hopes."

The note from Harper's follows:

Tip for Gamblers

If Mr. White's article on the Senate races leaves you in some doubt about how to place your bets in November, you might do well to watch the outcome of the Alaska territorial elections in October. From the record, they seem to be the most reliable political barometer available. The old saw that "as Maine goes, so goes the Nation" is, of course, notoriously inaccurate; but if you substitute "Alaska," the proverb becomes a pretty safe guide. Ever since 1916, the Alaskan voting has accurately foreshadowed the results of the subsequent national elections—even in the off year congressional races—with the exception of only 3 out of the 19 contests. A batting average of 0.842.

The Anchorage Times article said:

Secretary McKay wrote off Alaska so far as a Republican victory is concerned in the fall elections, according to political leaders who met with him Saturday afternoon.

Those who attended said the Secretary sidestepped the issue of why Wally Hickel has not been recognized as national committeeman even though elected to that office by the people.

He also termed as "silly" the action of Alaskans in opposing the partition plan that was proposed last May in connection with statehood.

Twelve persons met the Secretary in KENI studios for the conference. Larry Smyth, publicity director, accompanied the Secretary. Absent were William C. Strand, Director of the Division of Territories, and Governor Heintzleman.

Some of those attending reported that the meeting got off to an awkward start. Invitations had been sent by the Governor but he was not there.

They said Secretary McKay convened the meeting and asked for questions. Herald Stringer pointed out that those attending had not been advised as to the purpose of the meeting. The Secretary said it was customary for him to meet with political leaders on his trips.

Cash Cole, of Fairbanks, cited the failure of the national party to recognize Hickel after the election in Alaska. The Secretary was reported to have said that Leonard Hall, chairman of the national party, takes care of that and perhaps it would be a good plan to get him to come to Alaska.

Cole also suggested that he, as chairman of the central committee, should accompany the Secretary on his trip and introduce him to political leaders in the various cities. This led to a discussion of the McKinley Park convention and the committee elections there.

Secretary McKay was said to have termed the McKinley meeting a caucus instead of a convention and commented that he could not recognize Cole without offending 40 other persons.

Carl Rentschler told the Secretary that recognition of certain persons, or other party problems are not of concern to the average Alaskan. He asked how Republicans be elected in the general election next fall.

Those who attended gave various wording to the Secretary's comments, but there was agreement that he wrote off the party so far as the election is concerned. He indicated his belief that few, if any, Republicans stand a chance of election.

Rentschler termed statehood the most important issue and Barbara Dimock, GOP delegate candidate, was reported to have taken issue with him.

The Secretary told the group he was bombarded with telegrams protesting the partition proposal. He asked various questions about the attitude of Alaskans and several participants in the discussion said he commented that opposing partition is "the silliest thing they could do."

The meeting terminated when Elmer Rasmuson said that the Interior Department's program is more important than partisan politics. He asked how hydroelectric development, highway construction, statehood, and other basic requirements could be brought about.

Those attending said that the questions went unanswered. Smyth noted that the Secretary had to leave to attend a public reception and the meeting adjourned.

Those attending were: Olga Doheny, Carl Rentschler, Ralph Cottis, Herald Stringer, Margaret Rutledge, Cash Cole, Wally Hickel, Barbara Dimock, Sally Gorsuch, E. Wells Ervin, Elmer Rasmuson, and Paul Robison.

Rumors of Cuts in New England Railway Postal Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 4, 1954

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an article which appeared in the Boston Globe of July 28, 1954, dealing with the rumored cuts in railway postal service in the New England area.

The article is of particular interest to me because of the statements concerning specific curtailment of service in the Fifth District of Connecticut. I have repeatedly protested any curtailment of mail service and have been reassured by the Post Office Department that no such curtailment has been authorized. In spite of this stand by the Department, the rumors still persist, and I continue to receive many requests from my district that no change in the present service be made. Naturally, I agree with any movement that tends to bring economy in Government spending, but I sincerely believe that it would not be economy of any kind to sacrifice mail deliveries such as rumored.

The article follows:

Postoffice To Cut 25 Mail Trains, Union Reveals

Despite repeated denials from Washington of any curtailment in New England's postal transportation service, the discontinuance of service on 25 trains on the New Haven, Boston & Maine and Boston & Albany Railroads has already been recommended by the Postoffice Department.

This was disclosed today by John J. Kennedy of the Back Bay, an official of the National Postal Transportation Association, an organization of postal employees affiliated with the A. F. of L.

Kennedy is the association's special representative on mail allocation.

Last week Kennedy disclosed that the Post Office Department planned to curtail postal transportation in New England by 50 percent. He described cutdown plan as the "most drastic proposal ever to hit the postal transportation service in New England."

The Office of Postmaster General Arthur W. Summerfield in the past few days has repeatedly denied any such planned curtailment. He has conceded only that the Department is conducting a survey designed to abolish dual service in some spots in the interest of cutting down the huge deficit under which the Department is operating.

But Kennedy and other officials of the association are in possession of copies of letters from various district superintendents in the postal transportation service in New England to railroad officials advising them of the Department's intention to discontinue mail cars on certain trains.

(Postal Transportation was formerly Railway Mail Service.)

LIST OF TRAINS

Following is a list of trains on which Kennedy says discontinuance of RPO service has been recommended:

New Haven Railroad:

Trains Nos. 49, 54, and 554 operating between Boston and Springfield and New York.

Trains Nos. 130, 135, 131, and 136 operating between Boston and Waterbury, Conn.

Trains Nos. 50 and 405 between Grand Central Station and Springfield and return.

Trains 150 and 157 between Winsted and Bridgeport and Waterbury, Conn.

Boston and Maine:

Trains 305 and 308, between St. Albans, Vt., and Boston (representing a 20 percent cut).

Trains 717 and 732, between Newport, Vt., and Springfield (representing a 25 percent cut).

Trains 217 and 236 (east division) between Boston and Portsmouth.

Trains 19, 123, 14, between Boston and Portland.

Trains 2917 and 2914, to Intervale, N. H.

Boston and Albany: Trains 36 and 6 to Albany.

Kennedy said that if train No. 36 which leaves at 3:30 p. m. is curtailed, then there will be no mail transportation to Albany and the West by rail from 1:45 a. m. to 5 p. m. on any given day.

Kennedy said that a representative of the Post Office Department in Washington was in Boston last July 12 and briefed the general superintendent and district superintendents throughout the first division (New England) regarding the planned curtailment.

"The representative made it clear that the cut-down action was mandatory," Kennedy stated.

Kennedy pointed out that the curtailment of service on trains where the mail used to be worked, or processed, en route will result in an accumulation of mails for long periods and, he said, business mails to and from Boston will be hit hard, especially since business establishments have more than one delivery a day.

A Case of Hindsight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 4, 1954

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, in the interest of providing additional information about the highly controversial coffee investigation, I am including, under consent, two editorials from the Journal of Commerce dated August 2, 1954, and August 3, 1954.

The editorials follow:

[From the Journal of Commerce of August 2, 1954]

A Case of Hindsight

The report of the Federal Trade Commission on its long drawn-out coffee investigation represents a curious mixture of fact and fiction. It can perhaps best be described as a brilliant case of hindsight and, despite its 1,100 typewritten pages, the report generated more heat than light as far as an understanding of the coffee situation is concerned.

The story in a nutshell is that the Federal Trade Commission was suckered into a political investigation. Small surprise then that it came up with a predominantly political report. Most of the blame for the sharp increase in coffee prices since mid-1953 was laid at the doorstep of Brazil and of coffee speculators and, even more specifically, of Brazilian coffee speculators.

Domestic speculators do not have many votes and Brazilians, of course, have none. Even a Democratic Federal Trade Commission could not have done better. And the irony of the whole setup is that, despite the fact that it was a Republican FTC Chairman who signed the report, the political benefits will accrue to the Democrats because most of the voters who can be swayed by such things at all simply won't believe that the Republicans can be so pure in condemning the coffee speculators.

It probably was inevitable that the Federal Trade Commission in carrying out its coffee investigation plunged deeply into the field of commodity price forecasting.

Yet instead of recognizing the difficulties of commodity price analyses and forecasts, it came up with a set of specific answers, including (1) a rather specific forecast of the size of the 1954–55 coffee crop differing from the latest Brazilian estimate; (2) the conclusion that the 1953–54 increase in the price of coffee should "scarcely have exceeded 20 to 25 percent"; and (3) the admonition that the trade should have known that the boom would not last because "any given percentage change in the price of coffee is accompanied by approximately one-half that percentage change in the quantity consumed."

These conclusions were backed up by as neat a stack of equations, formulas, charts, and cycles as you may want to see. But none of these devices was quite as helpful in arriving at the final FTC conclusion as the now available information that the 1954-55 crop initially had been overestimated and the fact that since April there has been a sizable correction on coffee prices.

These two factors obviously were the real clinchers. They enabled the FTC to point a finger at the big bad speculators.

The only thing wrong with this attitude is that in mid-1953 and even late in 1953 no one could be sure that the reports of the 1953 crop damage were nothing but another one in the series of what the FTC decries as typical Brazilian crop damage exaggerations.

It would be an easy job to pick the FTC coffee report to pieces bit by bit. But nothing could be gained by such an attitude. The report is full of contradictions and, particularly as far as the functions of commodity futures exchanges are concerned, shows a complete lack of understanding.

The "team of FTC attorneys, attorney-investigators, economists, statisticians, and accountants" that devoted its full time to the coffee investigation for 4 months may have gotten "indispensable assistance" from members of the Commodity Exchange Authority, but the report forces us to the conclusion that the FTC team did not understand what the CEA representatives were talking about to them.

The best—and we believe, fairest—way to describe the FTC report is to say that its conclusions were based on false premises.

One just cannot judge last year's price movements on the basis of today's knowledge.

Behind the FTC reasoning lurks a rather curious concept of what constitutes the functioning of supply and demand in a free and competitive market.

Actually, the coffee markets from mid-1953 through now behaved exactly as one should have expected under such a market system.

Of course, there was excessive inventory buying; only we would not call it "excessive," but rather "precautionary." There is one striking difference between the FTC coffee "team" and members of the coffee trade. The coffee trade, in order to stay in business, had to make sure of obtaining the necessary coffee stocks to supply its customers. The FTC coffee team had no such worries.

Of course, there was speculation in the coffee markets after the July 1953 severe frost. And even the FTC report admits that the 1953 frost damage was "extremely severe" (p. 87 of the report).

If price is to act as regulator in a free and competitive economy, it will at times overshoot its mark either on the upside or on the downside.

The FTC seems to feel that there is something unethical about the fact that some people made money on the 1953–54 rise in coffee. But this is exactly what makes our market system tick. What happened cannot just be condemned as the reflection of "inside information" as done in the FTC report.

There can be no functioning futures markets without speculation. And speculation, by definition, includes the elements of possible exaggeration and frequent margins of error.

That much concerning the basic fallacies of the FTC coffee report. There are a number of other aspects to the report which will be taken up by us separately. They have to do specifically with Brazil's more recent policy of "protecting" her coffee growers against price declines and the FTC "conclusions" with respect to the role played by the New York Coffee and Sugar Exchange this past year.

[From the Journal of Commerce of August 3, 1954]

FTC's Whipping Boys—The Coffee Investigation Report II

The increase in coffee prices since mid-1953, according to the Federal Trade Commission report on its 4 months' investigation of the coffee market, was due to speculation rather than to competitive laws of supply and demand.

That makes the speculators the bad boys in the picture. But the FTC investigating team went one step further and decided that the final responsibility for the excessive speculation in the coffee market rests with the Brazilian Government and with the New York Coffee and Sugar Exchange.

These, in its opinion, are the two real villains in the play.

The Brazilian Government is being blamed for two things: The inadequacy of the Brazilian coffee crop estimates and, of all things, its attempts to prop the price of coffee against declines.

The argument that crop estimates could and should be improved is one that is ever prevent where and when such estimates are made—by official or private sources.

The only valid argument in this respect is whether or not crop estimates are being deliberately doctored up, not to say falsified. Such claims are nothing unusual. They usually come from parties caught on the wrong side of the market.

The FTC coffee report does not come right out and accuse anybody of deliberate lying, but it speaks of a perpetual (price-bullish) bias in the coffee-crop estimates and hints that a small group of Brazilian speculators usually are in possession of valuable inside information.

That is a pretty rough accusation, particularly in the light of what all too often has happened with official corn, wheat, and cotton crop estimates in this country.

But be that as it may, the increase in United States Embassy staffs in coffee-producing countries certainly is not the answer.

One of the most intriguing FTC arguments is the statement that the Brazilian Government aided and abetted the rise in coffee prices because it raised coffee export minimum prices from 53 cents to 87 cents per pound, effective July 1 of this year. That was a good 2 months after coffee prices had passed their peak and the anguish of the FTC investigators was probably due to the fact that the Brazilian Government helped to make the FTC prediction of lower coffee prices ahead come out wrong.

This Brazilian step, as well as the increase in the coffee-loan level that preceded it, was clearly designed for the purpose of protecting Brazilian coffee growers against sharp price declines following the 1953–54 price increase.

If Brazil wants to run the risk of losing part of her export markets to other coffee-producing countries by putting artificial props under prices for Brazilian coffee, that is strictly her affair. We can point out the danger in such an undertaking because we have frittered away part of our own agricultural export markets by the very same device.

But it sounds slightly hypocritical for an agency of the United States Government to wax indignant over such practices in another country. The best way to put it is that the Brazilians have been apt pupils of ours and may have to pay the same price for their mistakes that we did if they persist in such a policy.

As far as the New York Coffee and Sugar Exchange is concerned, the FTC report is trying hard to whip up the same old resentment that has been kindled by previous coffee investigations, particularly the so-called Gillette Senate investigation some 4 years ago.

The report shows very little appreciation of the difficulties in regulating trading in any commodity that is strictly an import commodity and consequently is largely outside the exchange's jurisdiction.

In order to fortify its case against the coffee futures market, the FTC, in addition to warming up the old turkey that a futures contract, because of its limited delivery feature, may fall into the category of monopolistic trade practices or even restraint of trade, came up with a new "general theory of futures trading that differs from more conventional treatment." That is really digging deep.

The FTC report states that in appraising the coffee futures market it followed the ideas developed in a study of futures trading by the twentieth century fund. As this study has not yet been published, we cannot judge the FTC claim. But it may well be that the Washington research organization later on will have something to say about this.

The FTC researchers apparently had difficulties in understanding the functioning of futures markets and particularly the relationship between hedging and speculation.

The FTC no doubt was correct in the statement that the coffee futures market is a rather thin market and hence, at times, subject to sharp price fluctuations. What the FTC does not understand, however, is the fact that you cannot legislate a broader market. Its attempt to prove that a change in the futures contract could do the trick is weak, particularly in view of the fate of the so-called universal coffee contract that was adopted in 1950 at the insistence of the Gillette investigating committee—and did not get anywhere.

The FTC report tries to crucify the exchange because of a number of technical violations of trading rules it discovered, and comes up with the pat answer that the only solution is to put the exchange under Government supervision.

This has always been the aim of the New Deal crowd, despite the fact that erratic and excessive price movements are nothing unusual in futures markets under Government control as well. It is a fallacy that Government control is a panacea. The surprising part is that a top agency of a Republican administration has been suckered into the same ideas.

Regardless of the gravity of these technical violations of trading rules, it is utter nonsense to give the impression that these so-called irregularities were responsible for even part of the 1953–54 rise in coffee prices.

Actually, we are inclined to take a much more serious view of one factor brought out in the official answer of the New York Coffee and Sugar Exchange to the FTC charges.

In this release it is stated verbatim: "It is significant that, while the exchange gave the FTC the fullest cooperation, the agency raised no questions about the so-called irregularities, but issued them without giving us an opportunity to explain or answer them."

The FTC had better come up with a satisfactory explanation for this attitude unless it likes operating under the stigma of still being a New Deal island in Washington.

Tax Relief for a Few

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 4, 1954

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include a sound interpretive editorial on the tax bill entitled "Tax Relief for a Few," appearing in the August 2, 1954, issue of the Boston Post of Boston, Mass.:

TAX RELIEF FOR A FEW

The tax bill which Congress passed last week runs to nearly 1,000 printed pages. This makes it somewhat longer than Gone With the Wind, if somewhat less entertaining.

Now that both branches of Congress have had a hand in chopping, altering, and amending the bill, it will take a team of experts about 10 days to put it into final correct form so that the President will be able to read and then sign it—and still get in a few holes of golf.

In the course of congressional debates and conferences, the bill was revised in almost all its provisions. The Congressmen changed everything but the main plot, which is, of course, political.

The Republicans, who wrote the original version, are anxious to keep their seats in the coming midterm elections. And President Eisenhower, who finds this Republican Congress difficult enough to deal with, is afraid that if some of his boys are replaced by wicked Democrats, things will be terrible for the next 2 years.

On their side of the congressional aisles, the Republicans were voting to do things they can present to the voters next fall as great tax benefits. On the other side, the hungry Democrats were looking for a chance to bring home a few benefits for their side, to be orated to the "peepul" in October.

The tax bill which the two parties finally completed is aimed to please two groups: (1) The rich, and (2) the rest of us.

The rich are favored because they have money and influence, and the Congressmen need both of these in time of crisis—which is to say in the next campaign.

The rest of us get some attention because we have the votes, and although the politicians believe you can fool most of the people most of the time they get a little nervous when elections loom.

The rich got income-tax relief in one provision of the tax bill which allows a special exemption on income received from stock dividends. It is estimated that 7 million people of the country—about 4 percent of the total population—own some stock. These will save $200 million this year.

The rest of us get relief only in special ways. For instance, those who have heavy medical expenses can write these into their income-tax reckoning if the amount spent is 3 percent of the taxpayers' income. Until the new bill was passed, such expenses had to amount to 5 percent of the income before they could be deducted.

There are other benefits, some to business, some to individuals. And there is no question that many of them are good, giving relief to hampered businessmen or to special groups within the public who were unfairly burdened. The wise changes will, of course, benefit the national economy.

On the other hand, Congress lacked either the courage or the wisdom to make broad revisions which would have benefited all the taxpayers. An increase, for instance, in the amount of personal exemption for everyone would have helped those elite dividend payers—and at the same time millions of others not fortunate enough to own securities. Furthermore, it would have increased national purchasing power and thus stimulated all business.

Of course, Congress couldn't do anything like that. In the first place, it's too simple, and Congressmen don't like simple plans when they can have a nice complex one instead.

In the second place, the Democrats proposed just such a bold proposal to benefit the most people.

You can't expect a Republican Congress to accept a Democratic idea merely because it would be to the people's advantage. What sort of politics would that be?

No Gamble—Everybody Wins

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS E. DORN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 4, 1954

Mr. DORN of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to have inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial which appeared in the New York Daily News on Monday, August 2, 1954, entitled "No Gamble—Everybody Wins." This editorial gives an appraisal of Congressman PAUL A. FINO's bill for a national lottery. It makes very interesting reading and I urge every Member of the House to read this editorial comment:

NO GAMBLE—EVERYBODY WINS

The News for years has been in favor of a national lottery, as an institution which would combine a lot of fun for a lot of people with a painless, voluntary form of taxation which ought to raise big revenue.

It's a pleasure to note that we have some distinguished company in our lottery camp. The company is Representative PAUL A. FINO, a Bronx Republican. In the current (August) issue of the American magazine, Congressman FINO has a detailed and we think extremely appetizing article explaining why he has introduced a national lottery bill in the House of Representatives.

"No gamble—everybody wins" is the line in which Mr. Fino sums up his whole lottery philosophy. He feels that, even if you don't win a prize, you do buy a beautiful dream of wealth and happiness with each lottery ticket, and the dream lasts until the drawing.

Before introducing the bill, Fino conducted extensive researches into all angles and aspects of the lottery question. "I learned," he said, "some astonishing things"—which we'd call an understatement.

One of these things was that, as nearly as can be estimated, gambling in the United States is a $30-billion-a-year industry—30 billions, we said. This includes all forms of gambling, legal and illegal.

It is also estimated that 57 percent of all the grownups in the United States gamble regularly on a multitude of things—horse races, numbers, sports events, clubs and church raffles, office pools, slot machines, etc., etc. You can't stop 'em. The fact that so many of our laws attempt to stop 'em is what keeps the gambling industry crawling with racketeers and highbinders, and paying few taxes.

THIRTY BILLION DOLLARS WORTH OF GAMBLING

Few, that is, as compared with what a $30 billion industry ought to pay. Even so, the 24 States that permit parimutuel betting at race tracks gather a total of $100 million a year from this source.

Fino points out that United States taxpayers now put out about $4,500,000,000 a year to care for disabled veterans, old age pensioners, blind people, and others in need of public support. The lottery he proposes would turn much of its earnings over to the Government agencies caring for these people—and "I am confident * * * would not only make these services less of a burden on the budget, but would also provide additional billions for general tax relief."

* * * * *

The most shocking single thing he discovered in his researches, says Fino is that Americans spend somewhere between 4 and 6 billion a year on foreign lotteries. It's illegal, of course; but again, try and stop it.

For our dough, Fino discovered at least one thing more shocking than that. It was that an estimated 50 percent of all foreign lottery tickets sold in the United States are counterfeits, fakes, complete phonies. Homegrown crooks get all this money.

PAINLESS TAXATION

The United States dollar spent for genuine foreign lottery tickets go, in part, to lighten the tax loads of people in Ireland, Australia, Spain, France, and numerous other countries.

Suppose we should set up a national lottery. How big could we reasonably expect it to be? Based on the experiences of nations running such lotteries, the amounts our own people spend in gambling, and the United States' population of 162 million, Fino's estimate is that a United States lottery would turn over at least $10 billion a year.

Average this sum out among our 41 million Federal income taxpayers, and you get a tax reduction of $250 per year per person—plus a barrel of painlessly raised revenue for veterans, pensioners, et al.

Fino's bill calls for creation of a commission of respected Americans, to be appointed by the President with the Senate's advice and consent. This group would draw up rules, regulations, and safeguards for a national lottery, including provisions for periodic drawings and sale of tickets—the latter preferably through the post offices. Citizens of each State would decide by referendum whether or not they wanted the tickets sold within their borders.

Presumably there is no chance of this bill's passing at the current session of Congress, now winding up. But we hope Fino will keep it alive, and keep hammering for it. Some day, we also hope, Americans will get hep to themselves, set up a national lottery, and enjoy this form of painless taxation forever after.

Thoughts on the Warsaw Uprising

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 4, 1954

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, war is not and never can be one of mankind's most elevated and enlightened occupations. For war is a wicked thing which, arousing man's most destructive and combative passions, bequeaths to the days thereafter the unpleasant human distress of pain, sorrow, and misery.

War always calls forth splendid qualities of courage, self-sacrifice, endurance, and heroism. These, in some measure, help to compensate for its destruction and misery.

In World War II there were many moments of splendor and heroism; there were also many moments of misery and pain. But surely there were few instances in this great universal conflict when both pain and heroism reached such heights as in the Warsaw uprising of August 1944.

Under the leadership of a great Polish patriot, General Bor-Komorowski, the Polish secret army rose in rebellion against the Nazi forces located in Poland. With a display of heroism that has long excited the admiration of the free world, the Poles fought relentlessly for 63 days until at last, their ammunition and supplies dwindling and their forces reduced by 300,000 casualties, they were compelled to surrender.

Polish courage, self-sacrifice, endurance, and heroism were not wanting in this terrible incident. Nor was Soviet treachery wanting; for if ever there was an instance during the last war that proved beyond a shadow of a doubt Russian treachery it was their failure to support the Polish insurgents of Warsaw in August 1944. The revolt of the secret army was timed with the arrival of Soviet forces at the gates of Warsaw. General Bor gave the signal to attack, but the Soviet Russians, in a manner reminiscent of prior and subsequent treachery, lay back upon their silenced guns, refusing to join in the Polish effort until the German Army, reinforced, had destroyed the secret army, and along with it had weakened the force of Polish resistance and Poland's great hope for freedom and democracy. What is more, the Soviets refused permission to the Allies to fly in supplies to beseiged Warsaw. Thus, isolated and battle-weary, General Bor and his gallant troops were compelled to accept defeat.

That the Warsaw uprising brought added misery to Poland goes without saying. The loss of 300,000 men is a formidable loss to any nation and who is there that can measure the pain and grief visited upon the friends, relatives, and associates of these martyrs for freedom's sake. More than that, the great tragedy of this defeat lies in the fact that Poland had now no longer a force with sufficient strength to keep her from falling within the Soviet orbit.

However distressing the suppression of the ill-fated Warsaw uprising may have been, however much sorrow its failure had wrought in Poland, and however grave have been its consequences, no one—not even the Communists—can detract from the splendid example of heroism, courage, and endurance that was demonstrated to the world on this historic occasion by General Bor and his secret army. The glory that was theirs was the glory of Poland; and for all the world may this heroic effort remain forever more a lasting monument to a people who loved freedom so much that they died for it.

Reply to Arnold Toynbee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 28, 1954

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including a reply to the article by the historian, Arnold Toynbee, entitled "The Revolution We Are Living Through." This article was published about a week ago and the reply thereto has been prepared by my friend Mr. Carl Neprud, of Coon Valley, Wis. I commend it to the attention of all Members:

COMMENTS ON ARNOLD TOYNBEE'S ARTICLE, THE REVOLUTION WE ARE LIVING THROUGH, FOUND IN NEW YORK TIMES, ISSUE OF JULY 25

In his article the Revolution We are Living Through in the July 25 issue of the New York Times magazine the British professor, Arnold J. Toynbee, asks "when is a 'native' not a native" and answers his own question by saying "when he is a Communist."

In amplification, Professor Toynbee adds: "The Chinese, the North Koreans, the Vietminh were 'natives' yesterday but as Communists they are human beings again today."

The learned professor says that by definition a "native" is a "human being to whom Western members of Parliament and Senators do not have to pay attention" but, on the other hand, "a Communist is a human being who makes Senators and members of Parliament sit up and take notice," adding that "such notice is, of course, unfriendly and uncomplimentary but, being human, we will, all of us, choose to be excommunicated as satanic human beings if the only alternative is to be branded as livestock or to be seen as trees walking."

Were the above remarks to have been written by some Red propagandist wanting to deceive the American people and thereby to win friends for communism, it would all be understandable but, instead, they come from the pen of an internationally known professor of history. One does not have to be much of an historian to have some knowledge of Red practices, both past and present, such as sending cattle trains

> full of innocent, decent people into slavery or something worse; or purging people high and low with or without any pretext or semblance of reason or justice; or subjecting American and other United Nation prisoners-of-war to ghastly torture or horrible forms of death.
>
> This is indeed an age of revolution and it apparently affects even connotation of words as, in this case, the meaning of the word "native." The undersigned, who is a "native" of the United States, is not insulted by being called a native. Nor, in his opinion, is a Chinese, or a Czech, or anyone else insulted by being called a "native" of the country which was his homeland before it came under control of Communist aggressors.
>
> In understanding Professor Toynbee one must remember that he is a Britisher and that by British usage the word "native" may carry with it some low connotation but surely that is only in the minds of Britishers and no similar meaning obtains in the minds of other people—not even in the minds of Americans who to this day may still be looked upon by certain classes of Britishers as being some type of former British colonials. It is noted that same gratuitous remarks are offered to us all by Professor Toynbee who declares that we are slow in recognizing the existence of a Communist China.
>
> The British like to think of themselves as realistic. On the score of freedom, however, it is America that is realistic for America does not lose track of the hundreds of millions of innocent people who are now slaves of Communist dictators. Reversing the picture by telling those people that they would be livestock if they were back in their own native countries can surely serve but to destroy their last vestige of hope of ever getting out of the servitude which is now their lot. Professor Toynbee wants America to join in sealing the doom of the hundreds of millions who have been enslaved by recognizing Peiping and thereby condoning the outrageous treatment the Chinese Communists gunmen have accorded not only the Chinese people but American citizens and others who have become their victims.
>
> As a historian with the task of keeping abreast of events, Professor Toynbee should know that one of the cornerstones of American policy, as asserted with respect to Korea, Indochina, and other areas subjected to Communist aggression, is that of peoples' self-determination by fair elections.
>
> CARL NEPRUD.
>
> COON VALLEY, WIS., *July 26, 1954.*

Is Dulles Inviting Red Conquest of Quemoy and Other Nationalist Islands?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 27, 1954

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, press reports today indicate that Secretary Dulles yesterday set forth American policy toward Nationalist China as follows:

> The United States is committed to use air and sea power to defend Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek's Formosa and the nearby Pescadores even though there is no formal treaty. Thought has been given to such a treaty and to a northeast Asian security bloc to include Formosa, Japan, and Korea, but no decision has been reached.

Former Secretary Dean Acheson was severely criticized for omitting South Korea when listing areas of the Pacific, the defense of which he considered to be of primary interest to the United States, as contrasted with areas dependent for defense upon the United Nations. Mr. Acheson was accused of inviding Red aggression against South Korea.

Secretary Dulles has now seen fit to emphasize that the United States is not committed to defend Quemoy and the other Nationalist-held islands, which stretch out in a long chain close to the Chinese mainland. Loss of these islands would make the defense of Formosa and the Pescadores much more difficult. It was on these islands, not Formosa, that the Formosa-bound Red tide was stopped.

Whether or not we would consider it feasible to help prevent these valuable outposts from falling into Communist hands, there appears to be no sound reason for the Secretary to practically invite the Communists to try to seize them.

Conmar Plant in Mississippi

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. SMITH

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 3, 1954

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I point to Greenwood, Miss., my own home town and the home of many of my constituents, as a prototype of the remarkable industrialization that today is taking place in the South.

Historically an agricultural community, 6 months from now Greenwood will also be an important center of the rapidly growing southern apparel industry.

This great development in the economic nature of Greenwood will be the result of an all-out effort by the up-to-date civic leaders and citizenry of the community and of the foresight of one of the Nation's leading manufacturers of slide fasteners.

It is my pleasure to report that ground has been broken in Greenwood for the largest zipper manufacturing facility below Mason and Dixon's line by Conmar Products Corp., of Newark, N. J.

An ultramodern $750,000 building will house $500,000 worth of Conmar-designed and built production equipment, will eventually employ about 300 Greenwood people, and will bring an annual payroll of about $1 million to the area. This major industrial enterprise will produce 50 million zippers annually for the fast growing southern work clothes, textile, and women's wear industry.

We of Greenwood have great confidence that this is only the beginning of an era of prosperity for our community, because the company we have chosen—and which has chosen us—has an outstanding record of achievement and is headed by an outstanding American of unusual abilities and accomplishments.

The founder and president of Conmar Products Corp. is Alexander Konoff, a man who in the best American tradition came to this country a penniless immigrant boy with no formal education, and who today holds a doctorate in mechanical engineering and has built two multimillion-dollar manufacturing companies.

Mr. Konoff founded Conmar 21 years ago in 1933, in the midst of the depression, and in 5 years had established his company as second ranking in the slide fastener industry. Conmar's Greenwood plant, which will be completed next spring, will be its third factory. Conmar's new nonjamming slider, called Conmatic, which is so engineered that it will not snag or become stuck, is making zipper history.

Both my constituents and the management of Conmar have great plans for Greenwood's first factory. It is an ultramodern plant, which was designed to facilitate expansion as the fortunes of Conmar and Greenwood continue to grow hand-in-hand. Conmar's southern branch will provide the quickest possible service to the expanding southern apparel industry.

Mr. Konoff is a man of great sincerity. Before he would consider bringing his company's new plant to Greenwood, he invited leaders of the community 1,305 miles to Conmar's Newark, N. J., headquarters because he felt it only fair that they should see what kind of company they were inviting to their community.

He is a compassionate man who has never forgotten his early days of hunger and poverty and whose deep sense of responsibility for the welfare of his fellow men has resulted in the design of many features for the comfort of his Greenwood employees in the new building.

I would like to read into the RECORD the address Mr. Konoff made to Gov. Hugh White, of Mississippi, Mayor Allen Saffold, and the citizens of Greenwood during the recent ceremonies connected with the ground breaking, because they symbolize the whole philosophy of this great, philanthropic, humanitarian American. His remarks follow:

> I would like to take a moment to express my appreciation for the welcome you have given my associates—and myself.
>
> When our customers moved to the South, we knew that we would soon follow them. Our search for a suitable location took us to many towns and cities but—from the time I first saw Greenwood I knew that Conmar belonged here. The friendly spirit of your community as reflected by your mayor—the members of the chamber of commerce—and all your citizens—appealed to me. You made us feel at home from the start and today's ceremonies are only a symbol. We have long since become a part of Greenwood, a town in which we want to live—and work—and build.
>
> I am sure that Conmar will flourish in your southern soil as it has elsewhere. I am equally sure that Greenwood will continue to grow with us and that our association will be a long, happy, and prosperous one.
>
> This is not the first time that I have participated in the creation of a new and successful enterprise. About 40 years ago I

founded an industry that was entirely new in the United States—the manufacturing of moving eyes for dolls. Today our associate company, the Margon Corp., is the largest of its kind in the world, employing nearly 1,000 people in Bayonne, N. J.

About 20 years ago I established Conmar Products Corp. I recognized the need for developing the zipper which, at that time, was regarded as a mere novelty.

Today the zipper is a staple necessity. Billions of slide fasteners are used annually for clothing, leather goods, and a wide variety of other civilian and military articles. New uses for the zipper and improvements in the mechanism are constantly being introduced. As a result, the demand for zippers increases year after year. The technical know-how of our company is contributing to the continuing growth of the industry.

Our insistence on precision workmanship has made the name "Conmar" synonymous with the highest quality standards. These are some of the reasons why we are one of the leading producers in the country today.

Mayor Saffold and some members of the chamber of commerce have visited us in Newark and have seen—firsthand—our modern plant and its technically advanced equipment, which we designed and built. You will be pleased to know that our new plant here will be even more modern and will be equipped with our latest machinery.

My recent participation in the industrialization of the State of Israel is another example of my interest in new undertakings. I had the privilege of helping to organize two new companies, a textile concern and a plastics firm. Both organizations are already thriving and giving employment to many Israeli citizens. In the same manner, I trust we shall be pioneers in the industrialization of Greenwood.

Many people ask me why I continue to open new enterprises and why I don't take life easy instead. All my life I have worked hard and I pray that I will have the strength and the courage to continue to do so. I can find no better explanation of my feeling and no better answer to the questions of my friends—than the words of the great English philosopher, John Ruskin, who said: "When we build—let us think that we build forever. Let it not be for present use alone. Let it be such work as our descendants will thank us for, and let us think, as we lay stone on stone, that a time is to come when those stones will be held sacred because our hands have touched them, and that men will say, as they look upon the labor and the wrought substances of them: See, this our fathers did for us."

This is why it is a thrill for me to be here today and why I look forward with confidence to the growth of Conmar in Greenwood.

Thank you.

Fantastic Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. HART

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 4, 1954

Mr. HART. Mr. Speaker, I submit herewith an editorial which appeared sometime ago in the Jersey Journal, a leading newspaper in the State of New Jersey. I make no comment upon its content. It speaks for itself:

FANTASTIC STORY

The revelation by former Gov. Harold Hoffman, in a posthumously opened letter, that he took $300,000 from his South Amboy bank is at once a fantastic, a tragic, and a sad story as well as a last effort at atonement.

It is fantastic to think now that all through his era of political prominence, a period of more than a quarter of a century, that Harold Hoffman was guilty of taking money from a bank. Certainly, no one would ever have suspected that this most genial of story tellers and most enchanting of toastmasters was living all these years under such a cloud.

It is a tragic story because it started so early in his career and continued so inexorably until his death and after. It started when he went into debt in his first campaign for Congress in 1926. What seemed then to be only a new height for the World War I hero who had been mayor of South Amboy really was the opening chapter of the tragedy. It continued through his period as motor vehicles commissioner, through his governorship, and through his many years as director of the State unemployment compensation commission. Posthumously his letter tells of his frustration when he turned to another State official for help and says that that person led him to take another $150,000 in a plan to gamble the way back to solvency.

It is a sad story because Harold Hoffman was one of the most likable personalities ever in politics anywhere. He was a fun-lover. His shenanigans at the circus saints and sinners were known everywhere that politicians gathered and where people appreciated a good laugh. It is sad because a man who was on the surface a most happy man will now be remembered largely because of an embezzlement rather than his laughter.

The letter, however, does make some atonement for the past. Certainly it is a swift justification of Governor Meyner's position with regard to the UCC. The Governor was sharply criticized after the former Governor's death. The faithful Hoffmanites around the State were quick to feel that the suspension of Hoffman from the UCC had contributed to his death through strain and worry. Now the letter shows what really was the strain and really caused the worry.

There are few political stories more fantastic or sadder in their endings.

Who's Selling Us Down the Colorado?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BYRON G. ROGERS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 4, 1954

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the Record, I include an excellent editorial that appeared in the Denver Post, Denver, Colo., August 1, 1954:

WHO'S SELLING US DOWN THE COLORADO?

The Republican Party in the House of Representatives stands indicted in the eyes of the upper Colorado River Basin States for selling out our economic interests in behalf of California and such coconspirators as the Californians could enlist to torpedo our water storage and diversion projects.

The rejection by the House of the Arkansas-Fryingpan project was a scurrilous compromise. The responsibility rests with the Republican membership and the leadership of that body.

It is vaporous nonsense for Representative Edgar Cheonweth, Republican, of the Third Congressional District of Colorado, to bleat about Democratic opposition. Mr. Chenowith fought for the project and deserves credit for that much. But the failure was the failure of his party. And some share of the blame must rest with the Eisenhower administration, although the Department of the Interior urged acceptance of the project and asked for authorization of the upper Colorado storage program—which is also a dead pigeon. The leadership of the Department of the Interior in both causes has been somewhat short of inspiring.

When the Boulder Canyon Project Act was passed in 1926, permitting the construction of Boulder Dam which was the key unit in the storage and power system provided for California's benefit, Representatives of that State assured those of the upper basin States of California's cooperation when the time came to engineer the upper Colorado for beneficial use. That time is at hand. But the Californians have run out on their pledge.

Because California is a politically potent State, with a slug of votes in Congress and at the polls, and with a Vice President and a majority leader of the Senate, California is strategically favored in making deals and trades with such other vote-rich States as Texas and New York.

The Republican Party and the Eisenhower administration are supposed to be interested, however, in the economic and social welfare of the whole country. That imposes an obligation to apply the same degree of party responsibility and the same disciplines of leadership to such a vital project as the Arkansas-Frying Pan as it has, for example, in the revisions of the Atomic Energy Act of 1946. But has it worked out that way? It has not.

The Denver Post has said many times that regardless of the stated motives of the present administration and the party in power, its inaction in authorizing new and feasible water projects is slowly strangling the Bureau of Reclamation and costing the GOP the support and respect of the West. There is no way for the controlling party to evade responsibility for its failures. It will either deliver on its professed devotion to continued western water and resource development, or it will not. To date the Republican Party has not delivered.

The Arkansas-Frying Pan project was to have cost $173 million. Power purchasers, municipal water users and irrigators would have repaid the Government all but $23 million. The total benefits from that project were estimated to be $1.48 for every $1 invested. And of the $23 million in nonreimbursable costs, $20 million was to have been charged for flood control on a river which did $29 million worth of damage in the Pueblo area in 1921 alone.

That project would have carried water from the 10,000-foot elevations west of the Continental Divide to more than 300,000 people (1) to provide 185,000 acre-feet of water for supplemental irrigation of 322,000 acres of land, (2) generate 505 million kilowatt-hours of electricity a year, and (3) supply 15,000 acre-feet of water for Pueblo, Manzanola, Rocky Ford, La Junta, Las Animas, Lamar, Crowley, Wiley, Eads, and other towns in the Arkansas Valley.

A great majority of the myopic Members of Congress who voted against that project have not been within 1,000 miles of the area it would serve. Nor have they ever seen the multi-million-dollar benefits accruing to the region and the Nation at large from the Colorado-Big Thompson transmountain diversion which today is saving the economic life of farmers and towns suffering from the attrition of protracted drought.

No; the Congressmen who voted against the Rocky Mountain West on this one are men of little vision, less faith, and no curiosity. They let themselves become pawns in a dirty game of interregional political controversy by which the people of one area would overpower and profit from the people of another. And the vehicle for this sellout, this doublecross is, unfortunately, a party which has a great stake in the orderly prosecution of western development as an answer to critics who have resented what they consider to be reckless plunder of the Treasury in the past.

Panama Canal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. ALLEN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 4, 1954

Mr. ALLEN of California. Mr. Speaker, a subcommittee of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee has been conducting hearings with regard to the Panama Canal and the manner in which Public Law 841 of the 81st Congress which provided for the reorganization of the operation of the canal has been carried into effect.

The final report of the subcommittee should be available in about 3 months. Meanwhile, there has been sufficient interest in the probable views of the subcommittee with regard to some phases of the investigation that an interim report has been prepared and made to the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee and is now available.

The report reads as follows:

INTERIM REPORT RE PANAMA CANAL

In 1948, the Panama Railroad Company was reincorporated as a Federal corporation and the functions of operating the Panama Canal with all of its adjuncts was assigned to it. Subsequently, by Public Law 841, 81st Congress, the reorganization of the two entities existing in the Canal Zone, the Canal Zone Government and the Panama Canal Company, was completed, and on July 1, 1951, operation under the new arrangement was begun. The fundamental change effected by these two laws was the change of the theory of operation of the canal from a spending agency of the Government into a business corporation charged with the necessity of earning enough money through its operations to meet its expenses, including interest and amortization on its cost.

United States citizen employees of the Canal Zone Government were paid wages at the rates prevailing in the United States plus 25 percent and comparable pay scales have been established for employees of the Panama Canal Company by action of its Board of Directors. During the 82d Congress, the Appropriations Committee cast critical eyes upon the premium and directed that the Governor have a study made to determine the reasonableness of the rates of compensation and related benefits in the zone. Accordingly, the firm of Booz, Allen & Hamilton were retained to conduct a study and its report has been submitted to the committee.

During the present session of Congress, the committee, through its subcommittee on the Panama Canal, untook a study of the operation of Public Law 841. Extensive hearings were held at which steamship operators using the canal, representatives of the Canal Zone employees, General Accounting Office and the Governor were heard. In the course of the hearings, a large amount of information was assembled and it is the intention of the committee to prepare a full report embodying much of this data for use in preparing such legislation as may be proven to be desirable in the light of the facts adduced. As might be expected, the various groups interested in the efficient operation of the canal presented various ideas for improvement both in existing legislation and administration. These will be treated fully in the report.

However, there were certain facts upon which there was substantial agreement. As to tolls, while the figures on the transfer valuations have not been completed by the Bureau of the Budget, nevertheless, the data at hand indicates that the present rates are adequate to meet the expenses and obligations of the Panama Canal Company and the Canal Zone Government, and that there is no justification for any increase under the provisions of existing law.

As to administration, most of the witnesses were agreed that considerable improvement had been accomplished and further improvement was possible, although they differed widely as to methods. As to the employees, all were in agreement that the compensation, whether in the form of wages or benefits, must be adequate to assure a competent working force of United States citizens in the zone. In view of the fact that living conditions, by reason of climate and isolation, are less attractive than in the United States, sufficient inducements must be offered to attract and keep necessary employees so as to minimize the expense of labor turnover. There was no disagreement as to the necessity of maintaining the present 25 percent differential over United States wages. Nor was there any disagreement that benefits in addition to those enjoyed in similar employment in the States are required.

It appears that the recurring uncertainties created by the various changes in income are likely to be as damaging to morale as its possible inadequacy. The average person requires a degree of security, with some opportunity to make plans for his future based on his income and the many changes during the past few years without hearing or, for that matter, without notice, have been damaging to morale. Income tax was extended to wages in 1951, rents have been increased, commissary prices have been increased to cover a portion of Canal Zone Government costs now allocated to the employees, and an effort has been made to effect a reduction in the wage differential. These and similar factors have contributed to an unsettled atmosphere and no doubt have contributed materially to the increased rate of turnover among recent employees.

• • • • •

The committee intends, prior to the issuance of a complete report, to obtain the views of the Department of State, Department of Labor, and the Civil Service Commission regarding employee compensation.

It is the hope of the committee that recommendations to be embodied in its report will be studied by the committees and agencies charged with the responsibilities of maintaining the efficiency of operation of the Canal Zone to the end that basic principles can be established and maintained for a reasonable period of time and that drastic changes affecting employee morale will not be made without adequate notice and mature consideration as to their possible effect on efficient operation of the Canal. It is expected that a final report will be issued in the course of the next 3 months.

JOHN J. ALLEN, Jr.,
Chairman.
WALTER M. MUMMA.
FRANK C. OSMERS, Jr.
FRANCIS E. DORN.
EDWARD A. GARMATZ.
MARTIN DIES.
Mrs. JOHN B. SULLIVAN.

A Constructive Idea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 4, 1954

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, the great American dairy industry is one of the mainstays of our agricultural economy. Its basic product, milk, has been truly described as "the most nearly perfect of all foods." Yet we are faced today with surpluses of that food—surpluses which are entirely artificial when we consider the tremendous real needs of the American people for milk and milk products.

Last year some 8 million pounds of surplus milk and milk products were purchased by the Federal Government because they could not be sold to consumers. Yet—to quote a Department of Agriculture spokesman:

> If the full dietary needs of our people were being met, we would actually not have enough dairy products to meet the demand.

And surveys have shown that there would have been almost no milk surplus last year if the average American were drinking as much milk as he did in 1945. All of us who are concerned with the preservation of the Nation's health and the success of our dairy industry have an interest in bringing it up to—and beyond—the 1945 level. This can be done by tapping the vast potential market for milk, by instilling the milk-drinking habit in people.

As a member of a New Jersey family long interested in dairying, I should like to associate myself strongly with the campaign of leading Federal and State officials and dairy associations to spur the sale of milk by the use of a new distribution tool—the automatic vending machine.

At the same time I want to applaud the scientific and technical know-how of a leading industrial company of my own fifth congressional district—the Rowe Manufacturing Co.

Some 4 years ago the Rowe plant, located in Whippany, N. J., developed and perfected the automatic milk vendor, which promises to spur milk sales to heights never before reached. That this can be done is indicated by the history of other products which automatic merchandising has made more accessible to the consumer. Only a little more than a quarter of a century ago Robert Z. Greene, now president of Rowe, introduced the first practical cigarette vending machine. He thus started an entirely new industry. Today modern vending machines account for 1 out of every 6 or 7 packs of cigarettes purchased. Without constant plugging and persistence in those early years, when few believed in the potentialities of automatic merchandising, these conveniences of modern life might well be nonexistent. Over the years Mr. Greene continued his single-minded crusade for newer and better machines and for greater public acceptance of them. In every major development in the industry—whether in building new types of "mechanical salesmen" or finding new fields of endeavor for them—the Rowe company led the way.

Last year the modern marvels of automatic salesmanship sold $1,500,000,000 worth of products including cigarettes, milk, soft drinks, candy, sandwiches, ice cream, pastry, and some 20 other items in daily use by the consuming public. These machines made some 19 billion individual sales. Many, if not most, of their sales would not otherwise have been made. This is equally true of milk. As more and more of these "mechanical milkmen" have gone into industrial plants, schools, colleges, business offices, and Army and Navy installations, dairymen have found that they build up extra milk consumption by making milk so easily available.

Sales of milk through vending machines are "plus sales" which would not otherwise have been made, since thirst soon passes or is otherwise quenched if milk is not handy. As one example: At Cornell University, 10 milk vendors are selling 20,000 to 30,000 half-pints of milk a month—and this without cutting into campus restaurant sales.

Today, automatic milk vendors are not only fully accepted but their use is increasing. I should like to see them spread faster, for I believe both our national health and our dairy industry will benefit.

To spur the drink-more-milk campaign, Secretary Benson recently installed 4 of these Rowe "mechanical milkmen" in the Agriculture Department Building, serving some 8,000 employees. For the past year also one of these automatic vendors has been providing cold, fresh milk for thirsty White House staff members and the press corps in the west wing. Others are to be found in several Federal buildings and in nearby military installations.

In my own State of New Jersey a number of forward-looking dairymen, using the latest development in these milk vendors, have gone one step further. They have moved these "automatic milkmen" outside. Now at gasoline stations, suburban residential areas, at transportation centers, outside food stores, these vendors—weatherproofed and perfectly refrigerated—are selling milk 24 hours a day, winter and summer.

I have been advised that one New Jersey dairyman has increased his sales by almost 2,000 containers of milk and chocolate milk with one machine in a single month, and that his sales are doubling and redoubling. This particular vendor was installed at a gasoline station, serving both motorists and neighborhood families.

This new method of distribution, it seems clear, can help the dairy industry throughout the country to put more milk within the easy reach of more consumers—and at the same time—sell milk which would otherwise remain a shameful surplus.

Cuba's Sugar Surplus Is Stirring Up a Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARK W. THOMPSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 4, 1954

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the problem of the new sugar agreement between Cuba and the United States will be considered in the Congress during the next session. It is a complicated matter and one of extreme importance to Cuba and to the United States. As a member of the Committee on Agriculture, I have been studying available information which will be useful to me when this subject comes before our committee. I have just read an enlightening article in the Washington Daily News written by Mr. Edward Tomlinson from Havana on July 26. The article outlines the economic impact of sugar on the people of Cuba and it points out some of the dangers which confront this particular good neighbor of ours along with other neighbors in Central and South America. The article is worthy of careful consideration by every Member of Congress:

MARKETS DROP, PRICES FALL—CUBA'S SUGAR SURPLUS IS STIRRING UP A CRISIS

(By Edward Tomlinson)

HABANA, CUBA, July 26.—For years they have had a sweet time down in Cuba, but the situation is beginning to turn sour. Again there's too much sugar.

When there is too much sugar the Cubans get uneasy and restless. Labor becomes unruly. Planters and mill owners have to cut wages and pinch pennies or go broke. The Government becomes unpopular, no matter who is in office, and talk of revolution fills the air.

Things are not too bad yet. But they are far from good. Apparently it has not yet dawned on the public, but businessmen and officials already see trouble. Sugar sales in the world market are falling rapidly, and so are prices.

The term "world market" means everywhere else except in the United States.

Under a treaty between the two countries, Uncle Sam buys a fixed amount of Cuban sugar each year and at an agreed price.

FIXED IMPORT

This price is usually much higher than the world price. The amount we import is set by the Agriculture Department at the end or beginning of each year. In 1953 we bought 2,418,792 tons at 5.34 cents a pound.

But the industry depends upon the world outside of the United States to get rid of its surpluses. During two world wars the Cubans have been urged to produce more and more sugar.

Ever since the last war, there have been huge carryovers. These have proven so great that in 1953 the government limited the crop to 5 million tons. The output the previous year was 7,900,000 tons, an all-time high. This year's crop was cut to 4,750,000 tons, and still the surpluses pile up.

In the first 6 months of 1954 they have sold 700,000 tons less in the world market than they did in the first half of 1953. Prices were fairly steady until about the middle of June. But between June 17 and July 12 they fell from 3.30 cents a pound to 3.10, or nearly $4.48 a ton.

COMPETITION

Many things helped to bring about this critical situation. Sugar-producing countries riddled by the world conflict, particularly the Philippines, the Balkans and southeast Asia, are now back in production. Other countries are producing more and competing with Cuba. Mexico used to buy Cuban sugar. Now Mexico sells sugar abroad. This is happening all over the world. In short, there is a sugar glut.

ONE-CROP ECONOMY

Although the United States must still import the bulk of the sugar it consumes, domestic production has been stepped up. Some Congressmen from beet and sugarcane States are demanding larger quotas for home producers. Puerto Rico insists we should buy more from her. The Dominican Republic, Peru, and a number of other Latin American countries also want to sell in the United States market. To accommodate all these demands, we would have to cut down Cuba's quota drastically.

The outlook for Cuba is not only gloomy but grim. Cuba's economy is based on sugar. It's the lifeblood of this proud nation of 5 million people, a people who enjoy a higher standard of living than most of their Latin American neighbors.

A sugar crisis will not only play havoc with the Cubans, but it will affect thousands of American citizens who have more than $600 million invested in the enterprise. Some of them will face bankruptcy.

Cuba is one of our largest and most profitable customers. She has been buying nearly $500 million worth of our products a year. Practically every dollar we pay for Cuban sugar comes back to purchase wheat and lard, automobiles and shoes, and the thousand and one other things we produce.

POLITICAL EFFECT

Worst of all, such a crisis will, as in the past, bring about social and political unrest right on our very doorstep. Such a situation would be ducksoup for the Communists.

Until recently communism was a serious threat to the Cuban nation. When the party was outlawed over a year ago it boasted nearly 120,000 registered members, the second largest that ever existed in the hemisphere. But the Batista government has dealt the movement a staggering blow. Only a month ago it began a new drive against the Reds in the all-powerful labor unions, where they were the strongest.

Communist domination of Guatemala would have been a menace to the United States and to the other Americas. Red control of Cuba would be a catastrophe.

John Marshall Bicentennial Month

SPEECH
OF
HON. GERALD R. FORD, JR.
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 3, 1954

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I notice in this particular proposal there is no limitation on the amount of money that will be made available, whereas in the several other bills that follow of the same category there is such a limitation. Could the gentleman from Ohio explain why there is such a limitation in two and not in this particular bill?

Mr. McCULLOCH. The limitation on the authorization inadvertently was not carried in House Joint Resolution 340. I say "inadvertently" because that is the fact. The sponsor of the resolution and the Judiciary Committee would like the Record to show at this time that it is the understanding, the unanimous understanding that there will be no more than $10,000 used under this authorization, and it is hoped as a matter of fact that no money will be used whatsoever, because the various bar associations of the country are interested in this celebration and it is felt that they will contribute all the money necessary for the plans. I would like to say that if there is any request by anyone to the Appropriations Committee for more than $10,000, I hope it will not be granted.

Politics Is for Everyone

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANTONI N. SADLAK

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 4, 1954

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, the Rockville Leader is 1 of 2 papers published every Thursday in my hometown. In the last issue, Thursday, July 29, 1954, the Leader published a most interesting editorial revealing the transition of interests in politics and in Government by young and older voters. The caption is somewhat analagous and, in my belief, has the same meaning as the phrase used extensively today, namely, "Government Is Everybody's Business." This article reveals the thoughts of politicians and city fathers, as the community managers are sometimes called, and pertains more to smaller communities, smaller cities, than to large municipalities.

With the interest in Government that each of us tries to generate among young people, especially those in high schools and colleges, I am sure that this fine editorial emphasizes the apparent fact that such encouragement was not given a half century ago.

Under leave to extend my remarks I include the article:

POLITICS IS FOR EVERYONE

In checking over a copy of the Leader for 50 years ago, an article was discovered about the naming of a committee to form a Republican club in Rockville, with over 25 names listed on the committee in charge. A careful check indicated that not one of these men is still living.

Fifty years, it must be admitted, is a considerable period of time, but it is certainly to be hoped that some of the people figuring in politics today will still be around 50 years hence.

This article, written a half century ago, leads one to believe that in those days there were no Young Republicans or Young Democrats and that the only people considered deserving of a place in formulating party politics belonged to at least a middle-aged generation. And, of course, there were no women on the list, as the idea of women having the vote was then only a subject for the comic page.

Perhaps young people then showed no interest in politics and not only did not attempt an active part but may not have even registered as voters. It is also possible, unfortunately, that any interest shown by them may have been met with a cold shoulder by party leaders who considered they had a monopoly in the field.

The situation today is quite different, and from our viewpoint shows a great improvement. Young people not only have their own party groups which are active, but they also are allowed to play a part in either the parent organization, or the party itself. Generally speaking, they are given necessary work to do, especially as election day draws near.

By being allowed to work within the organization, young people feel that they are really a part of it, and their interest in politics in its best sense is increased. Some of them even start their activity before they are 21, so that when they are eligible to vote they really know something about the subject.

It has long been our contention that any party in any town which reserves for the middle-aged and up, especially males, any share in forming or carrying out party policy is doomed to an eventual defeat at the hands of that party which has had the commonsense and foresight to include in its inner circle both women and young people. When defeat comes for this reason, it is deserved.

Here in Rockville, we are glad to note, there is a healthy situation. We have active groups of women and young people in both parties, ready to help to the best of their ability the town committees upon which men, women, and young people share the membership. Such a situation, we are quite sure, would have appalled political leaders of 50 years ago.

North Unit Irrigation District Haystack Reservoir on the Deschutes Federal Reclamation Project

SPEECH

OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 3, 1954

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

I am glad of the colloquy that has taken place between the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Gavin] and the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. Dempsey], because I have said all along in connection with these flood control projects, of which Pennsylvania is now getting a tremendous sum, that they pay nothing back, not a penny of the cost, neither principal nor interest. These irrigation projects do pay back the principal.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Gavin] has been in error so many times, that I should like to make this effort to correct him. He refused to yield for the correction. He refers to this $12 million bill; there is only $1,600,000 of new money with which to build a reservoir. The rest of the money was appropriated a long time ago.

The gentleman spoke of 174 people who would benefit. The vote of the people was 155 to 19. But the number of acres involved here is 50,000. Under the 160-acre limitation, that takes care of a great many more people, perhaps a thousand to fifteen hundred people in this area who would be affected by this irrigation project.

It is true that they have been in some financial trouble and this bill is brought here in order to correct or to help some of their problems and the conditions with which they are faced. The committee gave consideration to this bill and I think it ought to be passed by the House. The bill provides additional water for 50,000 acres of crops.

At this time I should like to yield to a gentleman of the committee who has been a very valuable member of the committee and has done very much work on these irrigation projects, the gentleman from California [Mr. Engle].

Safeguarding the Rights of Certain Landowners in Wisconsin

SPEECH

OF

HON. GERALD R. FORD, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 3, 1954

Mr. FORD. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire of some member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs who will pay for this survey. Will it be the requirement of the Federal Government to pay for the survey or the people who are seeking the relief?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I believe the Federal Government will pay.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Where this problem really arises is where the Government does come in and make a survey which shows the lakes and the land to be different than the original survey that was made probably a hundred years ago. Thus there are questions as to the title of the land involved in the differences between the two Government surveys. This is to correct that situation in which some of these landowners find themselves. Going on the basis of the original Government survey, which was made at a time when most of this area was grown up with timber, it was difficult to make accurate surveys. They were made hastily. They were made primarily for the purpose of selling the timber, and the surveys were not completely accurate. Yet on the basis of those surveys the land was sold and patents issued. It might appear for instance, as it has in many cases, where an owner has property abutting a lake, according to an old survey.

It now appears under the new survey that he does not own that property at all. According to the present description he owns property now a hundred yards from the lake.

Who owns the property in between? Basically the Government does.

This bill is to assure that those persons can have an opportunity to come in, pay a fair value, and get the property they originally thought they were purchasing. So it really arises out of two Government surveys, both being different, and we accept the latter survey as being the accurate one.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Will New Orleans Lose the Mississippi?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 3, 1954

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including an article by Arthur W. Baum, entitled "Will New Orleans Lose the Mississippi?" which appeared in the July 31 issue of the Saturday Evening Post:

WILL NEW ORLEANS LOSE THE MISSISSIPPI?

(By Arthur W. Baum)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Engineers have tamed the Mississippi flood menace only to face another fearful threat. Unless we act immediately, the mighty river will change its course, transforming the heart of the South and ruining Louisiana's largest city.)

In the later months of World War II approximately 3,000 prisoners from Rommel's routed Afrika Korps were housed at a camp lying between Jackson, Miss., and the nearby small town of Clinton. The prisoners' reaction to this predicament was clear. They didn't like it. They particularly resented the grading and ditching work to which they were assigned in the upland fields of the camp area. They nurtured a stubborn conviction that in defiance of convention they were being used by the American enemy to construct a warlike and threatening device, quite probably a military airport or missile center.

They could hardly have been more mistaken. The 220-acre area whose face they helped to alter was to be a laboratory for life and property saving, part of one of the major safety programs of our modern years. The site was chosen because it happened to be, on a small scale, a nearly perfect natural replica of one-third of this country, the rich but sometimes afflicted drainage fan of the Mississippi River, which funnels waters from all or part of 31 States into the Gulf of Mexico. The only hostility existing on this plot is toward the immensely ruinous habits of one of the world's most vital rivers, a form of enmity man has long felt against unstable alluvial rivers everywhere, from Egypt's Nile to China's Yellow.

The laboratory is an experimental model of the big river and its tributaries. Known as the Clinton Waterways Experiment Station, it is one aspect of a quarter-century-old flood-control program of the Corps of Engineers, United States Army. It is not yet finished. But already Omaha can thank it for savings of $65 million, Sioux City may owe it a few lives, and Kansas a few thousand livestock, and a western railroad owes it the price of a couple of new bridges. It is unique only in scope and up-to-date equipment. Otherwise it is an extension and enlargement of the original waterways laboratory about 40 miles west, at Vicksburg, which has been functioning so well for 20 years that it proved the possibility of an operating model of the entire heartland of the country, the Mississippi Basin.

For a model, the Clinton area looks big. Standing at theoretical New Orleans, theoretical Great Falls, Mont., seems to be a stiff 10-minute climb uphill to the northwest. Pittsburgh is 5 minutes away to the northeast. Yet this is the minimum scale on which the Engineer Corps believes that fully accurate results can be obtained in simulating and forecasting the behavior of the real watershed. On this scale an ankle-depth flow equals a sizable river, and the Mississippi itself is only shin deep. And when the miniature river is flowing down its miniature bed, 5 minutes represents a day.

The function of the replica is to give answers to specific problems, both in visible behavior of the ankle-deep streams and on the batteries of instruments which record what is happening on the model, and hence what will happen on the real rivers across a wide section of this country. Vicksburg will eventually treat only special problems. It can and has set up such replicas as the harbor at Gary, Ind., to study the effect of a new pier, or a little Niagara Falls to study power availability.

Clinton's function will be broader, often basinwide. What happens when an Ohio flood coincides with a Missouri flood and perhaps the Cumberland, the Tennessee, and the Arkansas join in? Suppose, in the language of cards, nature deals the Mississippi a whopper like 13 spades in high water? How many levees will overtop and where, how many towns drown, how many miles of country will be covered?

Most of us have never held 13 spades, and perhaps the Mississippi won't either. But just in case, the engineers have had this watery hand laid out for 26 years, ever since periodic valley ruin became a matter of Federal control under the Flood Control Act of 1928. The engineers live with this flood in mind and aim their major defenses at it. It is 1 of the 2 big river problems of the basin today that concern many States and millions of citizens. The second of these is not a flood problem at all, though it is intertwined therein, but a potentially disastrous condition that has been shaping up for 400 years and simply happens to be approaching climax in our time.

No. 1 is the once-in-a-lifetime flood. It is called project flood in the Engineer Corps book and it calls for the worst the meteorologists are willing to look for, a volume of water roughly one-fifth more than has yet been recorded in middle America. Those who remember the 1927 flood, which led directly to the 1928 control legislation, may properly shudder at the thought of this much water. In 1927 about one-third of Louisiana was drowned land. Between Cairo, Ill., and the Gulf of Mexico only one railroad crossing of the Mississippi Valley remained in operation. At Vicksburg they remember with wonder that "there was water from here to Monroe." They are talking about Monroe, La., to the west. It is 80 miles from Vicksburg. In 1927 a fleet of more than 7,000 boats sailed above submerged roads, farms, and towns over thousands of square miles.

The superflood calls for 20 percent more water than that. It envisions 93,000 tons every second of every minute passing Greenville, Miss.—imagine a front of 10,000 loaded trucks passing a given point with endless ranks following bumper to bumper. It only half that incredible volume ever reached New Orleans, it would be right at the top of the levees, and the top of the levees is about the same as the third-story windows of many of the city's homes.

But there is good news. The superflood may never occur at all. And if it does, the present river system, buttressed now with thousands of miles of good levees, the major part of 200 proposed upstream reservoirs, 4 huge bypasses and other controls, can carry it off without disaster. Those who flatly predict that never again will the big river run amuck have a reasonable basis for their hope.

In 1927 the river spread 100 miles across the valley. How can it now take, at its width of a single mile, the much greater project flood? Because it has already done so—on the models at Clinton and Vicksburg. The models forecast no disaster on the river, and so far the models have been right.

Take April 1952. Early in that month word came down from the Dakotas to the engineers at Omaha that unseasonable weather was making up a flood in the Missouri River watershed. Sioux City, Omaha, and Kansas City would be endangered. Omaha thereupon notified the waterways station at Clinton, Miss., and began to forward upriver measurements as it obtained them.

Clinton could set up a facsimile of the approaching flood only as far up as Sioux City, since its model was completed only to that point. But as the slope-chested waterfall moved down from Mobridge to Pierre, its probable size was fed into the Clinton model at the simulated Sioux City. Clinton began to work 24 hours a day. Seven days ahead of actuality a crest figure was arrived at for Sioux City, then 4 days ahead, then 2 days. The Sioux City crest forecast was corrected. It was three feet too low. Rain was expected. Its probable effect was added in. There were some breaks in the banks. As each was reported, it was duplicated in Clinton, not only for its effect on the model flood at Clinton but because real people behind the levee breaks up north had to be warned.

Clinton ran the 1952 flood over and over again before it occurred, and while it was actually occurring. The model doesn't pretend to look exactly like a river basin. But the bed is accurate, the banks and levees are accurate, the flood plain, embankments, roads, and bridges are accurate. The forests along the flood course are only folded hardware cloth, but their frictional effect on the flowing water is identical with the real trees of the river course. Obstructions are only concrete nubs, bits of steel or loose stones. Yet they equal the actual obstructions in the river trough.

The model spoke. It said a small off-river town would not be inundated. The residents left anyway. They returned later to a dry community and were glad they were wrong. The model said several feet of additional levee height was needed at Omaha, that the Carter Lake area of the city had to have more. How much time was left for heavy machines to get in and raise the protective banks? About 70 hours. It was just enough. Omaha's only serious mishap was the backup into center-city through a drain left unblocked. The model said the Chicago & North Western Railroad embankment on the east side of the river between Sioux City and Council Bluffs would serve as a levee and would not be overtopped by the flood crest. It held, protecting thousands of Iowa acres.

That was 1952. Now the model says that the superflood which has never occurred will be carried safely off to sea, and it is entitled to confidence.

The master plan is clear enough. The big gathering of the river for the fall to the gulf is at Cairo, Ill., after the Missouri and the muscular Ohio have joined the main stream. Superflood will see 76,000 tons of water per second rolling down at this point. Almost immediately there is a drain that may be blown open—the New Madrid floodway. It will take a fifth of the stream for temporary storage, but the water entering at Birds Point returns to the main stream at New Madrid.

Opening this first vent will not be nice, because there are farms and people in the floodway. They have been paid to permit the emergency flooding of their land, but they won't like the bargain. They objected in 1937 when Cairo, nearly rimmed by waters at its levee tops, just barely skinned through. It was this touch-and-go in 1937 that led Maj. Gen. Eugene Reybold, as Chief of Engineers 5 years later, to press for construction of the Clinton model. It was his job to direct the 1937 dynamiting of the levee at Birds Point and later to direct the rescue of those who refused to leave and who lived to be rescued.

Superflood will build up as it rolls south, thanks to the St. Francis, White and Arkansas Rivers. It will top 93,000 tons per second at Greenville, then drop a little to its own channel filling and to backwaters, gain a little from the Yazoo. At the Mississippi-Louisiana State line, the southwest corner of the State of Mississippi, superflood will have the driving power of 5 million tons a minute pushing downhill. The grade from there to the gulf is normally mild, only a dozen feet or so, but superflood at this point will be piled up 60 feet high, multiplying its downward pitch.

A trifle below the State line a connecting river appears in the west bank of the Mississippi. This is Old River. Remember it. No matter where you live, you may one day have reason to remember Old River. Remember that it flows west, out of the Mississippi. It will take a fifth of project flood and lead it away. Soon, below Old River, is another break, guarded by a long series of steel gates. This is the entrance to Morganza floodway, not quite finished, but able to function. It, too, will take a fifth of superflood and carry it off westward. Finally, just above New Orleans on the east bank is a similar structure, the Bonnet Carre spillway. Bonnet Carre will take a sixth of what now remains and lead it into Lake Pontchartrain and thence to the gulf.

Thus more than half the immense flood crest that existed at Greenville has been shunted to one side or the other. The levees of New Orleans can contain the remainder. It is well that they can. The Chamber of Commerce of New Orleans estimates metropolitan property valuations at $12½ billion. The margin of protection for this jackpot at high water is about 24 inches.

And what happened to the half a flood that was turned off at Old River and Morganza? It moved down the Atchafalaya River channel and down among the dark, silent, moss-hung trees on the floodways paralleling the channel. It flooded through forests already carpeted with water, through secret bayous, into and out of lakes. Gathered together again in one channel, it passed between the towns of Morgan City and Berwick and out to the gulf at Atchafalaya Bay. A small part also used the outlet of Wax Lake. Remember the Atchafalaya. It is pronounced A-chaff'-a-liah.

The model says that in this way the superflood will be controlled. The implication is that never again will the Lower Mississippi Basin suffer creeping, relentless drowning.

But there is one looming hitch in this man-made mastery of the daddy of rivers—a mastery which has cost the major part of a billion dollars and eventually will cost more. A large share of the good in this investment lies under the shadow of a potential disaster which could stun in various degrees all up river cities on navigable channels and throw deadly blows at New Orleans and Baton Rouge, among others. This is the second great problem of the Mississippi Basin. It is a case of thievery.

The object being stolen is the Mississippi River. The bare-faced culprit is Old River. Geologically, the theft is neither unnatural nor criminal. Hernando de Soto, gazing with wonder at the inland sea of a Mississippi flood, probably missed seeing a similar theft by only a generation or two. A prior nabbing of the Mississippi channel by an intersection with a seductive stream offering a shorter way to the sea occurred about the time the Battle of Hastings was being won by Norman archers. The quiet stream beside which Evangeline mourned for Gabriel, now known as Bayou Teche, was once the Mississippi—until Bayou Lafourche stole it and in turn lost it. The engineers have a beautiful map of these ancient geological misdemeanors in which the Mississippi is shifted east and west and its mouth moved as much as 100 miles.

The present Mississippi is an alluvial river wriggling downhill on a bed of muck that covers a deep gorge scoured by a melting ice cap. Rivers like this meander. They chew up their banks, throw out wide loops and then cut them off. The Mississippi once threw out such a loop westward and caught the Red River, which promptly gave up and flowed into the channel of its captor. Old River is the remnant of part of that loop. But the Red, rusty with dust from the Texas Panhandle, also had another occasional outlet, a flood time exist to the south just 8 miles from the Mississippi at Old River. This minor passage into the watery swamps was the Atchafalaya, so choked with debris 100 years ago it was called a raft and not a river.

There was thus presented some time ago a confluence of waters in the shape of the letter H, an accidental representation of hell and high water. The H is still there. Its eastern upright is the Mississippi. Old River is the crossbar. The top part of the western upright is the Red and the bottom part, from the crossbar down, or where the Red and Old River combine to form it, is the Atchafalaya. More than 100 years ago settlers along the Atchafalaya set fire to the raft and the Atchafalaya became a river. Gradually it snatched the Red River away from the Mississippi. The last time Old River flowed east into the Mississippi carrying a Red current was in 1942. The duration of that flow was 9 days.

Now Old River, continually flowing West out of the Mississippi, is also delivering into the Atchafalaya a steadily increasing portion of the Mississippi itself. The little crossbar of the H has become the key to trouble. Let's look at this oddly powerful few miles of diversion which affects thousands of miles of watershed and holds New Orleans in the hollow of its yellow-gray, wet hand. It lies just over the levee from the gravel road between Torras and Simmesport, La. The levee is grass-covered; cows graze on its peaceful banks sloped at toboggan pitch. If a ship were going by at high water you would look up at it from the road, a strange experience. A trusting house sits at the roadside, its chimney about level with the levee top.

In the neighborhood of True Vine Church a little road curls up over the top of the levee and drops down among a half dozen frame houses even more trusting than the one on the off-river side. They side on a shelf and just beyond them is the drop to the river, at low water now, and to a cluster of outboard motors and fishing skiffs. This is no resort, but a fisherman's landing. The fisherman in the blue cap, no longer young, crinkles his red-rimmed eyes and talks about this river, about catfish, buffalo and boats. He points to the junction of the Red River with the Old, about a mile to the left. "Red don't come this way no more. Been about a dozen years since, and then only a few days."

Does he remember 1927? Indeed. "Must have moved 17, 18 times, with the river chasing me. Wound up in an Army tent gettin' fed by the Red Cross over on the Mansura hills, 20, 25 miles." Simmesport, small and flood-beaten, lies just around the bend. "Simmesport?" the fisherman says. "Whole town was afloat, just like all the houses here, floating away. Didn't lose the bridge at Simmesport because it was just being built. Lost theirs down at Melville, though, just below. Don't believe they ever found it. Sinks in the bottom mud, you know."

Old River's thievery is not visible. It is calm. The north bank is bare and appears to be cracking in what the river engineers call slump blocks. There is no levee on the north bank. On that side is backwater area of the Red. Old River simply rolls along. Bnt in the 10 years between 1935 and 1944 Old River was carrying 15 percent of the Mississippi into the Atchafalaya. Now it is grabbing 25 percent, perhaps at times as much as 28 percent.

Why worry about it? It has been predicted for 70 years that the Atchafalaya would sooner or later steal the Mississippi via Old River. But time is now running out. At a certain point, rivers in this condition may flip rapidly, and just as rapidly start the silting up and disintegration of their former channels.

The case of the Mississippi's approaching diversion became the subject of intense study beginning in 1950 under General Feringa, of the engineers, with Dr. Harold Fisk, Humble Oil geologist, and formerly geology professor at Louisiana State University, as chief consultant. When Brig. Gen. John R. Hardin succeeded Feringa as division chief in the lower valley, the river-diversion problem became his first and deepest concern. By 1952 the Fisk report was published, and the engineers subsequently issued another one. The gist of these reports was this: When Old River begins stealing as much as 40 percent of the Mississippi the main river is almost certainly lost. Diversion must either be checked before that time or it will become practically impossible except at a prohibitive cost, and with good luck. In 10 years the Old River diversion should be right at the critical point. Any delay in completion of preventive action beyond that time will be foolhardy.

The danger is real, and it is twofold. If the Mississippi should shift over to the Atchafalaya the latter stream would require approximately triple the channel width it now maintains. Although its basin is lightly populated, this would nevertheless mean the bodily removal of all or parts of towns like Simmesport, Melville, Morgan City, and Berwick, and a major widening of all Atchafalaya crossings, including important highways, railroads, and pipelines. Even if this were done at an enormous cost, outer levees of the floodway areas would have to be heightened, and it is doubtful that this could be done in swampy sections where present smaller levees already tend to sink.

The abandoned Mississippi channel would face different, but probably even greater problems. New Orleans, for example, has been growing rapidly and is now, according to Mayor de Lesseps Morrison, one-third industrial. Many of the industries here have been attracted by the city's unlimited fresh-water supply from the river, an asset that grows in importance as water tables in other parts of the country decline. New Orleans can easily remain a salt-water port without the Mississippi, and has a canal project on its books which ignores the river. But it could also go broke reaching way north for drinking water, revising its sewage disposal entirely, and losing industries to which quantities of fresh water are vital.

New Orleans now functions as a terminal and transfer point for a gigantic inland-waterway traffic. It could do so no longer if the Mississippi were stolen. In fact, the traffic of the whole basin would be chaotic until the Atchafalaya was bedded down as the new Mississippi, which could take years. Morgan City would probably take the place of New Orleans eventually as a new junction point for breaking up and reassembling big river towns bound between gulf ports and places like Pittsburgh. But

It would have to be a new Morgan City too.

Certain changes have already occurred. The reason big Mississippi is becoming so soft a victim for little old river and the Atchafalaya is basic. The old river route is only 100 miles long to the gulf, about one-third the distance via New Orleans, and alluvial rivers are always willing to adopt shorter, and consequently steeper, routes to the sea, although they have the curious habit of trying to add an equal distance upstream whenever they do make a saving through a downstream short cut. In this case, however, the engineers have kept the Mississippi from regaining length lost to artificial cutoffs and the river is actually shorter and faster than it formerly was.

Old river now offers the most impressive short cut of all, and captains of river tows are just as fond of cutoffs as is a river. Consequently, beginning about 1947, waterway traffic coming from west of Morgan City on the gulf and bound for Baton Rouge began to use this shorter Atchafalaya route whenever water heights permitted. Why not? It has been pointed out by one river operator that a big river tow—a tow is actually pushed—using the Atchafalaya would be 243 miles ahead of a similar tow using New Orleans when it reached the Old River-Mississippi junction. This equals a saving of $15,000 on a round trip. It is thus clear why the engineers, who tabulate the traffic, recorded one-sixth of all this class of river traffic in 1953 using the Atchafalaya cutoff. In other words, the swampy raft of 100 years ago in only the last half dozen years has lifted one out of every 6 tons of through river traffic from west to north and vice versa.

At the moment, New Orleans doesn't care much, since the river and Intracoastal Waterway are congested at that city anyway. But losing the whole Mississippi is quite another matter, and when Dr. Fisk's first reports sounded the Old River alarm the first inclination of New Orleanians was to blush and shove the nasty thing under the carpet. But it was too vital, so the city shifted to attack and formed a civic committee headed by George Leppert, of Freeport Sulphur, one of a host of companies to which the great river is extremely important.

One of the earliest and doughtiest battlers for action was a New Orleans patriot named William Zetsmann who had been forced to build an expensive water-purification plant for his soft-drink company and thus had already had a taste of Mississippi trouble. Zetsmann's difficulty was occasioned by neither flood nor mud, but by an invasion of salt from the Gulf of Mexico which had crept up the bottom of the river channel for 170 miles.

The peak of the salt invasion coincided with unusual drought in great parts of the Mississippi Basin last year. As a result, the river was so enfeebled that water had to be released from as far away as Fort Peck, Mont., to keep a reasonable flow along the lower valley. It did not take much of this to remind the whole lower valley that diversion at Old River could increase these troubles a thousandfold. Everybody got aboard a demand for protection.

What form could defense take? Why not shut off Old River completely, cracking the nut at one stroke? Utterly impossible. In the basinwide defense against potential superflood the Atchafalaya is a vital part. Also it is a river in good standing, important to navigation, and important to the residents of its basin. Moreover, the Mississippi below Old River couldn't handle its own floods plus the extra burden if Old River were closed.

Obviously some regulation was necessary to fend off either high or low water and to save the Mississippi from total diversion. The Engineers have such regulation mapped out. It calls for a big spillway across to the Red River above the head of the Atchafalaya, a navigation lock replacing a portion of Old River, and closure of Old River except for passage through the lock. Operation of these structures will stabilize both routes to the gulf in high or low water.

Authorization for this work has been requested of Congress this session. Money will be sought in 1955, and considering the chunk of America involved, the millions needed will be relatively few. On the day the control structures are completed at Old River the mighty Mississippi should be a pretty tame and useful river. Flood crests everywhere have already been lowered—by 12 feet at Omaha, 10 feet at Pittsburgh—touchy bank sections in large numbers secured by revetment, and more rapid runoff obtained from Cairo down.

There remains the question of time on stopping the thievery at Old River. General Hardin at Vicksburg is a calm, soft-spoken man showing little sign of his vast Army construction experience. He appears to take the shadow at Old River quite coolly. But he says, "Although 40 percent diversion of the Mississippi at Old River is a logical figure at which rapid additional shifting and equally rapid disintegration below Old River will occur, I would not like to be committed to that precise percentage. Critical diversion could occur earlier."

There is good basis for this sign of worry. The engineers have studied two small-scale parallels—and in one of these the crucial point was 30 percent, not 40. If that should happen to the Mississippi, then time is very short indeed. About 8 years will be needed to finish the control structures once they are started, which brings us to 1963. The year 1963 is very close to the danger point of 1965.

One thing can be depended upon. The big river will not change its mind. The diversion habit is ingrained and its historic leaps have a sort of cycle. They occur about every 450 years, and they are perfectly natural. But this time it is different. As the New Orleans Times-Picayune pointed out last year, this is the first time we have been around to object.

Amend and Supplement the Reclamation Laws To Provide for Federal Cooperation in Non-Federal Projects, and for Other Purposes

SPEECH

OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 4, 1954

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the position the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ROGERS] finds himself in in relation to larger loaning power under this bill. The original bill called for $1 million instead of $5 million. He did offer an amendment to raise the limit to $10 million. I am in sympathy with what he wants to do, but I think it might destroy the small project feature of the legislation. I believe he is in favor of this bill, although he would like to have included a much larger sum for loaning purposes.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ASPINALL. I think we should advise our colleagues that we do have a definite authorization for funds in this bill and that it will be necessary to bring this matter back to Congress and its committees for a restudy in a certain length of time to see whether or not this program, which we believe to be so desirable, is working as it should work.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. That is right. The bill has had some study for 2 years; this and similar legislation, and it is part of the President's program. The National Reclamation Association has worked hard to protect certain features, and we believe it is legislation in the right direction.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. D'EWART].

Los Angeles Keeps Right On Growing and Expanding

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 20, 1954

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, the city of Los Angeles with its numerous suburbs, suburbs which are cities of many thousands in their own right, originated in and spread over the Los Angeles Basin, an extensive area stretching from the sea over lowland areas to gentle rising slopes which suddenly plunge upward to the sky forming a magnificent background of lofty mountains rising to a height of 10,000 feet above the sea.

Modern roads climb the mountainous terrain back of the city affording birdseye views that are spectacular and brilliant. Viewed from a high vantage point the city stretches for miles in every direction and to the very edge of the blue Pacific itself.

Looking across this vast metropolis, it is difficult to realize that the first expedition of white men to visit this area arrived in 1769. The area was described at that time as a "very spacious valley, well grown with cottonwoods and sycamores, among which ran a beautiful river."

Los Angeles was settled with 44 colonists in 1781, just a scant 171 years ago, and named El Pueblo de Nuestra Senora la Reina de Los Angeles de Porciuncula. By 1790 the name was shortened to Los Angeles, and the population had increased to 139.

Originally under the Spanish standard, Los Angeles later became part of Mexico, and in 1847 when Mexico surrendered the territory of California to the United States, Los Angeles was the capital and chief metropolis of the territory with a population of 5,000. In that year San Francisco, known as Yerba Buena, was only a tiny mud pueblo.

With the discovery of the first nugget in northern California, the gold rush was on, and the growth of Los Angeles halted, but this was only a temporary set-back. For Los Angeles had a glorious destiny to fulfill and would not be denied.

By 1890 the population of Los Angeles had swelled to 50,000. In the next 10 years, at the turn of the century, it reached 102,000. Ten more years saw the population reach over 300,000 as Los Angeles became the 16th largest city in the United States.

Today more than 7 million people live in the "economic sphere" of the Los Angeles area, and the latest figures resulting from a special census of September, 1953, place the population of Los Angeles at 2,104,663.

The following summary of the economic sphere of the Los Angeles area, and the city's growth, clearly outlines the important part Los Angeles has in the economy of the State of California and of the Nation:

MORE THAN 7 MILLION PERSONS IN THE LOS ANGELES AREA'S ECONOMIC SPHERE

California has 2 of the 10 largest centers of population and business volume in the United States. With respect to most of the important measures of economic size, the Los Angeles metropolitan area ranks third in the Nation and the San Francisco-Oakland metropolitan area ranks sixth.

The economic life of the southern portion of the State naturally tends to center around the Los Angeles area, and the northern portion around the San Francisco area—although there are a number of other communities such as San Diego, Fresno, San Jose, Sacramento, Bakersfield, and Santa Barbara which constitute large consuming markets and which are substantial centers of production and distribution in their own right.

For many years there has been recurrent discussion as to the extent and bounds of the territory which is in the Los Angeles economic sphere. What are the limits of the territory which can be served more economically and more advantageously from the Los Angeles area than from the San Francisco area? In marketing their agricultural, mineral, and factory production, which communities are oriented more toward the southern metropolis and which toward the northern center? What, in brief, are the geographic boundaries of the territory in which the Los Angeles area has a greater economic stake than her sister metropolis to the north?

Over the years, these and related questions have been considered by sales managers, economists, market research analysts, and others. The answers reached have not always been in agreement. This has been due in part to the fact that for many years the extent of the Los Angeles economic sphere has been gradually expanding. And, in any locality, it takes time for changes in the economic environment to alter business relationships and ties which have had a long historical basis.

San Francisco was a large city when Los Angeles was still a small town. In 1870, for example, the Bay City's population was 149,473 as compared with 5,728 for Los Angeles. Over the decades, rapid growth continued in both areas, but particularly in the south. The Los Angeles area eventually moved into the lead in population and in volume of business—and has continued to extend that lead.

According to estimates by the State department of finance, the population of the Los Angeles metropolitan area on July 1, 1953 was 4,965,900—double the total of 2,450,700 for the San Francisco-Oakland metropolitan area.

The United States Bureau of the Census has conducted 84 special population counts in the southern half of California since the nationwide census of April 1, 1950.

All of these special censuses have been at the request and at the expense of the communities involved. They have been prompted principally by the desire of the various communities to obtain more current—and hence larger—official population figures to be used in connection with the distribution of State gasoline tax funds.

	Date of latest special census	Apr. 1, 1950, census	Special census	Percent change
Los Angeles County:				
Alhambra	Sept. 25, 1953	51, 359	53, 558	+4.3
Burbank	June 25, 1953	78, 577	88, 043	+12.0
Claremont	Apr. 15, 1953	6, 327	7, 814	+23.5
Covina	Apr. 28, 1953	3, 956	6, 452	+63.1
Culver City	Feb. 12, 1953	19, 720	28, 186	+42.9
El Segundo	Apr. 10, 1953	8, 011	9, 890	+23.5
Gardena	Feb. 17, 1953	14, 405	17, 415	+20.9
Glendora	Jan. 28, 1953	3, 988	5, 290	+32.6
Los Angeles	Sept. 26, 1953	1, 970, 358	2, 104, 663	+6.8
Hawthorne	June 4, 1953	16, 316	21, 098	+29.3
Hermosa Beach	July 21, 1953	11, 826	14, 004	+18.4
Manhattan Beach	Apr. 3, 1953	17, 330	26, 315	+51.8
Maywood	Apr. 29, 1953	13, 292	13, 483	+1.4
Monrovia	Jan. 8, 1953	20, 186	23, 408	+16.0
Montebello	Nov. 17, 1953	21, 735	26, 087	+20.0
Monterey Park	May 14, 1953	20, 395	25, 467	+24.9
Pomona	Oct. 5, 1953	35, 405	44, 669	+26.2
Redondo Beach	June 30, 1953	25, 226	35, 706	+41.5
San Fernando	May 8, 1953	12, 992	14, 299	+10.1
South Pasadena	May 7, 1953	16, 935	18, 025	+6.4
West Covina†	Apr. 30, 1953	4, 499	13, 068	+190.9
Inglewood	Oct. 28, 1953	46, 185	50, 346	+9.0
Lynwood	Nov. 4, 1953	25, 823	28, 124	+8.9
Santa Monica	Nov. 4, 1953	71, 595	75, 132	+4.9
Torrence	Nov. 4, 1953	22, 241	44, 914	+101.9

Interior Recommendations Threat to Mine Safety Enforcement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 30, 1954

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I herewith include an article written by George H. Hall, Washington correspondent for the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, entitled "Mine Safety Enforcement—Federal Versus State Issue Is Revived." The article, which appeared in the August 1, 1954, issue of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, follows:

MINE SAFETY ENFORCEMENT—FEDERAL VERSUS STATE ISSUE IS REVIVED

(By George H. Hall)

WASHINGTON, July 31.—The evidence in 2 major mine disasters that killed 230 men, 5 years of strenuous effort, thousands of words of testimony given in weeks of legislative hearings, and Public Law 552 seem to have been overlooked by the Department of the Interior when it approved recommendations designed to lead the Federal Government away from enforcement of coal-mine safety regulations.

The recommendations were made by an official survey team appointed last November by Interior Secretary Douglas McKay. The team's report was approved almost in its entirety by McKay, Under Secretary Ralph A. Tudor, and Assistant Secretary Felix E. Wormser. The survey began December 14 and the report was handed to McKay on May 20.

Publication of the report last Wednesday surprised and shocked Congressmen who fought for years to achieve a mine-safety law with teeth in it. They foresaw the possibility of a return to the very conditions the law was designed to overcome, and promised that Congress would step in if the Interior Department tried to implement the proposals.

Representative MELVIN PRICE, Democrat, of East St. Louis, sponsor of mine safety legislation, charged the survey team was stacked and that its report represented a sneak attack on the Federal law. Representative AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, a coal operator for 42 years and a strong backer of Federal legislation, said "McKay doesn't know what the hell he's talking about; this recommendation would completely destroy the effectiveness of the act."

Senator MATTHEW M. NEELY, Democrat, of West Virginia, an author and advocate of Federal enforcement laws, said he planned to issue a statement when he concludes a primary fight Tuesday. Representative SAMUEL K. MCCONNELL, JR., Republican, of Pennsylvania, chairman of the House Labor Committee and a man largely responsible for the present law, said he intended to see to it that there was no scuttling of the statute.

The philosophy enunciated by the survey team is consistent with overall administration policy, which is to encourage the States or private industry to take over some of the functions now exercised by Washington. President Eisenhower expressed it this way in a campaign speech in Indianapolis September 9, 1952:

"We shall cast away the agents of centralization who would destroy the vitality of State and local government by assigning all power to the Federal Government. * * * Let that trend to centralized government continue and in every State you will have a Federal governor-general, not an elected governor."

This philosophy fails to recognize the simple fact that during the many years when the States had full control of the enforcement of mine safety they failed to do the job. It was this failure that made a Federal law imperative. The legislation was signed by President Truman July 16, 1952. The survey report suggests an eventual return to State control. Here are the pertinent sections:

"It is recognized by industry and by the Bureau of Mines that education is the best method to promote safety in mining. It is recommended that in health, safety, and coal-mine inspection a major effort be directed to educational work. * * * This educational work can be accelerated without additional funds if changes are made in inspection activities as provided in recommendation No. 4 (following):

"Public Laws 49 and 552 require the Bureau to inspect coal mines. In addition, Public Law 552 gives the Bureau police power in regard to certain specific hazards. Police powers for coal-mine inspection have been exercised by lay in practically every coal-producing State for many years.

"It is recognized that in certain coal-mining areas, where State laws and their enforcement have not been of a high standard, the Federal Coal Mine Inspection Service has materially aided in reducing coal-mine accidents. It should continue to do so until these areas reach the proper safety standards.

"It is recommended (No. 4) that the Bureau increase its cooperation with State mine inspection departments, miners, and operators, to bring all State inspection services up to the general standard of the Bureau's coal mine inspections.

"As this change in State inspection work is accomplished, the need for Federal coal mine inspection will decrease and eventually cease to exist. Any part of the appropriation not required for inspection should be used for educational work as needed. It appears that this change in activity, which is underway to a small degree, can be accelerated at the present time. This statement is based on the fact that although there are fewer coal mines, fewer coal miners, and less coal production today than at any time since Federal inspection was first required, there are currently more Federal inspectors than at any previous time.

"Apparently there is a feeling within the Bureau that the present staff of inspectors should be held intact in spite of fewer coal mines and miners, and that more inspections should be made per year. Unless the need for increased inspections can be clearly demonstrated, it is poor business and unfair to taxpayers to follow such a policy."

Price, who said he and others who have advocated the Federal law would fight any effort to circumvent it, put his finger on what seems to be a weakness in the survey team's position.

"State inspection services that are brought up to bureau standards will in many cases reach that point because of the police power now exercised by the bureau," he said. "There is no reason to think that if that police power is removed the State services would not revert to the historical pattern. That pattern is that State inspection often is lax and subject to political pressures. You can't take away the policeman because there is no crime; there is no crime because the cop is on the job."

Price said he regarded the survey report as a sneaky operation because the authors suggest nullifying a Federal law without resorting to the painful, perhaps impossible, process of getting Congress to repeal it.

None thought the survey team was composed of men who have earned the right to speak objectively or with authority on a subject which Congress has studied exhaustively for many years. The membership consisted of:

Dr. Curtis L. Wilson, dean of the Missouri School of Mines, Rolla, chairman; John C. Kinnear, former vice president of the Kennecott Copper Corp.; Dennis L. McElroy, vice president of the Pittsburgh Consolidation Coal Co.; J. R. Butler, a petroleum consultant of Houston, Tex., and Spencer S. Simon, former director of the materials office of the old National Security Resources Board.

The groups that over the years have advocated a strong Federal law were not represented on the team. These include Federal mine safety experts, Congressmen, and the United Mine Workers. UMW officials have been studying the report but have made no comment. The groups that have opposed a Federal law, sometimes violently, include State inspection agencies and associations of coal producers and mine owners.

There is a long history and a voluminous record of efforts to enact a strong Federal inspection statute. These efforts resulted in passage in May of 1941 of a law requiring coal mine operators to admit Federal inspectors to their mines. The inspectors were authorized to go underground, inspect, report, recommend and publish findings. They had no power of enforcement.

A detailed and strict Federal coal mine safety code went into effect July 29, 1946, as part of an agreement by which the Federal Government took over and operated the mines to end a 59-day strike. This agreement was signed May 29, 1946, by John L. Lewis, president of the United Mine Workers, and Julius A. Krug, Secretary of the Interior. This was a step forward but it applied mainly to a specific condition of operation.

The long drive for the law had no real power until 1947. On March 19 of that year the St. Louis Post-Dispatch published a news article which stated that the Illinois State Department of Mines and Minerals had conducted a virtual shakedown of Illinois coal mine operators to raise funds for a Republican mayoral campaign in Chicago.

This was an illustration of the historic pattern to which Representative Price referred. The race was an important one as it pitted the organization of Republican Gov. Dwight H. Greeen against the Cook County Democratic organization of Mayor Edward J. Kelly. It is possible that no more would have been heard of the "lug" if it was not for the fact that on March 25, less than a week after the article appeared, the Centralia (Ill.) Coal Co.'s mine No. 5 blew up and killed 111 men.

The aftermath was sensational. It was disclosed that of 60 alleged violations of the Federal code found in November 1946, some 51 still were uncorrected 5 days before the blast. It was disclosed that a year before the explosion workers in the mine petitioned Green to "please save our lives" by enforcing State laws.

Driscoll Scanlan, a State mine inspector, said he had tried to have the mine closed because of dangerous conditions but had been overruled by his superiors. He quoted Robert M. Medill, director of the Illinois State Department of Mines and Minerals, as saying, "We'll just have to take that chance" of an explosion. This reply "probably was due to favoritism to the coal operator," Scanlan asserted.

Medill denied some of a list of charges by Scanlan, but he was forced to resign "for the good of the service." State and Federal investigations of the tragedy were conducted and it was found that the explosion was caused by coal dust "raised into the air and ignited by explosives fired in a dangerous and nonpermissible manner." The coal dust could have been and should have been rendered virtually harmless by so-called rock dusting.

Among other effects the scandal attending the Centralia disaster contributed largely to the 1948 defeat of Governor Green by Adlai E. Stevenson, Democratic presidential candidate in 1952.

The result of investigations by Senate and House was passage of a law requiring the Bureau of Mines to submit four reports in a period of a year on the degree of cooperation Federal inspectors received from mine operators. No great improvement was shown and in 1948 Neely and Price introduced legislation. Extensive hearings were held in 1949 but no action was taken.

Despite the evidence, nothing further was done until a disaster even worse than Centralia occurred. On December 21, 1951, the Orient No. 2 mine at West Frankfort, Ill., blew up, killing 119 miners. It was pretty much the old story—not enough rock dust had been applied to prevent propagation of the explosion, which started with a blast in the ventilation system. The mine was not in compliance with Federal ventilation requirements. It contained excessive methane gas by Federal but not by Illinois standards.

"There was nothing inevitable about this disaster," commented Interior Secretary Oscar L. Chapman. "It could and should have been prevented. Evidence is clear that State governments, taken as a group, have not done enough and are not doing enough to assure this country against disasters in our coal mines. The tragedy at West Frankfort clearly demonstrates the inadequacy of an approach which leaves all responsibility to the States."

Senate and House hearings again were held early in 1952. As in the past opponents of a compulsory Federal statute were State mine departments and coal operators and associations, supporters were UMW officials and Senators and Representatives.

A unanimous report of the Senate Labor Committee said:

"The failure and refusal of the coal mining industry to comply with the safety standards and recommendations of the Bureau of Mines is a national disgrace and an industrial calamity."

The 1952 law was a compromise aimed at preventing major disasters. It was not all the UMW wanted, but was acceptable. It empowered Federal inspectors to close mines if they found a condition of imminent danger, and to close mines not in immediate danger if operators failed to correct safety violations.

The act exempted all strip mines and underground mines employing no more than 14 persons; it required a minimum of 1 inspection a year for conditions that could cause disasters; it set up a board of review (which has been called on to handle only 6 cases) and provided for appeals; it set up safety regulations and penalties, and specified procedures for coordinating Federal and State activities.

It is not yet possible to say just how successful the act has been, although fatality rates are down. The UMW and Congressmen say there has not been time to evaluate it. Also, conditions in the coal industry have changed. Marginal and high-cost mechanized operations have been shutting down. Bituminous coal production during the week ended July 24 was 7,025,000 tons as compared with 9,172,000 tons during the same week in 1953. Employment last March was 258,000 men, as against 311,000 in March of 1953.

The act was directed mainly at major disasters, which in Bureau of Mines terminology means disasters in which 5 or more persons are killed. In 1949 and 1950 there were no major disasters. In 1951 there were 5 major disasters killing 157 persons; in 1952 2, killing 11 persons, and in 1953 1, killing 5 persons. There were no major disasters in the first 6 months of 1954.

In the 1953 disaster, incidentally, a temporary restraining order issued by a State court had prevented the Federal inspectors from enforcing the bar on black blasting powder. A blown-out charge or black powder set off the blast.

Percentage of compliance with recommendations of Federal inspectors showed a considerable increase in 1953 over earlier years. On recommendations having to do with disaster prevention the percentage was 46. In the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952 the overall compliance percentage was 27.

The Bureau of Mines has about 240 inspectors now. It is authorized to employ 273 and increased the staff membership to that figure after Public Law 552 was enacted. Due to the depression in the coal industry, however, jobs left open by resignations and transfers and for other reasons have not been filled.

Putting Words in the Constitution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 23, 1954

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, a constituent of mine, Charles E. McGinley, of Los Angeles, Calif., a serious student of our Constitution, has written an excellent article entitled "Putting Words in the Constitution's Mouth."

Mr. McGinley points out some important facts about the Constitution and efforts to change its original interpretation in the following article:

PUTTING WORDS IN THE CONSTITUTION'S MOUTH

(By Charles E. McGinley)

When the Founding Fathers, Washington, Madison, Hamilton, Franklin, et al., drafted the Constitution, the supreme law of the land and the greatest rulebook in all human history to be handed down to a people for their guidance, they put it into words so plain there could not be any mistake as to its meaning. Almost any child could understand it.

A very famous English statesman said:

"The American Constitution was the greatest document ever given to people."

There certainly isn't anything mystifying about the purpose of the Constitution of the United States. Its true meaning is as plain as the nose on one's face.

However, it would seem that some of the modern justinians have been endeavoring to squeeze out of the Constitution certain powers which the drafters of the Constitution in their wisdom definitely never put in nor did they ever want in. This is especially true of the power to declare and engage in wars, and to make treaties—powers stretched beyond any reason.

The fathers of our country never intended any one man to have the power to fly off blind, half-cocked, and shamefully unprepared into a war, when there wasn't any immediate danger to our country, thousands of miles away, costing billions of dollars and in which thousands of our boys were shot down by bullets coming from Russia, a member of the United Nations, without first discussing the matter with Congress with a view of determining the advisability of engaging in an act of war.

Further, the matter should have been gone over in detail with the members of the United Nations in order to ascertain with certainty what each peace-loving nation proposes to do about it—in other words, a concrete commitment.

The Constitution of the United States specifically states:

"Only Congress has the power to declare war."

There isn't any doubt that when the drafters of the Constitution used the word "declare" they intended it to also mean "engage."

The Constitution also states that:

"The President shall have the power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur."

If this had been followed, and we had paid heed to the warnings of Washington and Jefferson, there may not have been a Teheran, Yalta, and Potsdam.

Of course, the boys of today are much smarter and wiser than the fathers of our country—they seem to think our grandpappies were a little old-fashioned.

The men who wrote the Constitution took great pains to put a check on the powers of the President.

(a) Congress can refuse him adequate funds.

(b) Congress can limit the size of the Armed Forces by legislation.

(c) Congress can, in the last analysis, impeach him for conduct endangering the country.

Absorb into your system the Constitution of the United States so as to keep in your mind the dignity and the consciousness of your Americanism and what it really means to you.

Every man, woman and child should read and study the Constitution—live it—love it—distrust any man or woman who reviles it—defend it as one sure means of preserving to you and your children all you hold dear and true and sacred.

Lincoln said:

"Love of the Constitution should be the political religion of the Nation.

"Let it be taught in schools, in seminaries and in colleges.

"Let it be written in primers, in spelling books and in almanacs.

"Let it be preached from the pulpit, proclaimed in legislation halls, enforced in courts of justice."

Both Right and President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 4, 1954

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the article in the Washington Star on Syngman Rhee by Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, Chaplain of the United States Senate, is worthy of the attention of every American citizen. Dr. Rhee will not compromise with evil, he will not attempt to coexist with gangsters. Appeasement with aggressors and torturers is repulsive to him. He is well aware that our Christian civilization cannot serve God and mammon. I agree with Dr. Rhee that we must chart a straight course and anchor our foreign policy on principle. We must look ahead and plan for 1970, 1980, and the century 2000.

The article follows:

BOTH RIGHT AND PRESIDENT

(By Frederick Brown Harris, minister, Foundry Methodist Church; Chaplain, U. S. Senate)

"I'd rather be right than President" is the familiar statement of a famous American statesman who never reached the presidential pedestal.

America is acclaiming a rugged personality who by the will of his people is President of the Republic of Korea and who admiring and approving multitudes around the world believe is right. It is a notable event which history records this summer of 1954 as the United States unrolls the official red carpet for a man who has been slandered as much as Washington, vilified and ridiculed as much as Lincoln, feared as much as Cromwell, and loved as much as Phillips Brooks. All this is a tribute to Syngman Rhee who, after great tribulation, in this high hour of global destiny is both right and President, and President because he is right.

By some sections of the press his steadfastness is labeled stubbornness, his being logical is being called unpredictable. He was right during the long, dismal years of hopes deferred as he insisted that America had a vital stake in atoning for the wrong that she did Korea in consenting to her captivity. He has the bitter remembrance that about half a century ago America stood aside and allowed his ancient land, with a culture older than our own or of her captors, or of China, to be enslaved by an aggressive empire so close to her shores. He was right when, after years of torture with a price set upon his head, a self-exile he came to this free land to lift his voice with all the vehemence of Moses before Pharaoh, "Let my people go."

Here, with Spartan discipline, he conditioned himself, training in great universities as a scholar and a statesman. Here, at the clear springs of democracy, he drank the elixir of freedom under the personal tutelage and friendship of Woodrow Wilson. As the years of his exile lengthened deeper and deeper, there was etched on his heart a detailed map of his manacled land, in whose soil, in season and out of season, he was intent on planting the grapes of wrath. Here, across the years, he bound to himself as with bands of steel Koreans and Americans who dreamed of "The Day."

From the first he was right in his appraisal of the communistic menace. He sensed the utter heinousness of that diabolical system which has no pity or conscience. With a detestation which possesses him, he loathes its motives and its methods. From the beginning he discerned with a sort of sixth sense that its motives are always base, as it plans, not freedom, but plots fetters for the humanity it defiles and degrades. Never deceived by superficial pratings about peace in our day, he has seen clearly that the Soviets' methods of aggression and subversion contemplate but the one goal toward which that monolithic juggernaut moves—the destruction of the United States and domination of the globe by itself.

While the free world slept, he was right as he shouted from the houstops that any appeasement of this federated iniquity is surrender on the installment plan. He is right now in his solemn warning that the terror which has been inflicted upon his devastated country presents a vivid microcosm of what its sinister design has in store for the whole earth. He is right in his assumption that every advantage given to the now snowballing universal state is but an impetus for similar victories everywhere. Who can gaze at the reddening map today without knowing that he is frighteningly right? He is but realistic in saying that it is either a stand now or an Armageddon a little later under more formidable circumstances. He is right in refusing to accept that weasel word "coexistence" in his vocabulary.

When this vile thing was only half as strong as it is today and the policy of cooperation with agrarian reformers was advocated in high places, Syngman Rhee was declaring that a lamb cannot coexist with a lion; that if the Soviet lion ever lies down with the free lamb, the lamb will be inside the lion. He is right in his conviction that the pooled forces of freedom in the world are mightier, much mightier, than the organized hordes of tyranny, and that united they would be unconquerable and would batter down the refuge of lies now protected from the explosive power of truth by the self-accusing curtains set up by those who fear the light. He has nothing but scorn for policies of putty, instead of iron, meekly adopted for fear of irritating an enemy out to destroy freedom.

But, above all, he is right in the faith which has sustained him, a confidence which ruthless brute force can no more sever than a sword can sever a sunbeam. That faith is that the spiritual verities for which our enemies substitute the blasphemies of denial are the most potent weapons in our hands. For him "in God we trust" and "under God" are no mere pious slogans. To him, prayer is more potent than any bomb, and more things are wrought through its imponderable power than this world dreams of.

Syngman Rhee is a God-intoxicated man, praying with Christian love even for his enemies. The God which Marxism would banish from the universe is for him the reality behind every sham, the dynamic behind every thought of his brain, every beat of his heart, every breath of his body. He looks at the atheistic system we face with pity and sorrow, knowing that a pagan denial does not change the final, irreducible, inescapable denominator of the universe—God. Thus has he been sustained across the years which have tried his soul by a faith which has shone only more brightly in the darkness: "The Lord is my light and my salvation. Of whom shall I be afraid?"

His return to the shores of the strongest nation on earth, which backed his cause, and ours as well as his, is one of the most striking reversals of all history, as one gazes almost incredulously at the now open doors at which he once knocked in vain. We hail him now as President of a nation whose future is woven into the fabric of our own destiny with crimson strands of mutual sacrifice. The soldiers of King Charles I said of George Fox, founder of the Quakers, that he was "stiff as a tree and pure as a bell." That tribute was from one of his enemies. Beaten and bruised in many a prison and by many a scourge of lies, that apostle of the inner light could not be bent. We salute with pride and admiration the stalwart, rugged President of Korea, stiff as a tree and pure as a bell, a tower of strength for the free world.

An Opinion on the Oppenheimer Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 23, 1954

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I submit herewith the following studied opinion of the Oppenheimer case by Rt. Rev. W. E. North, editor of the Tidings of Los Angeles:

DR. OPPENHEIMER

He was not in the top echelon of American physicists. Contrary to popular belief, he had not made, before Los Alamos, any major contributions to scientific progress in his chosen field. He was available when the Government decided to gamble billions in exploring the possibilities of nuclear fission, and so he was selected to direct the vastly complex and highly secret operations in the recesses of New Mexico. The mass of Americans knew nothing of the work until the skies rained death upon terror-struck Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

With the lever of the atom, he eased himself into Government affairs, hob-nobbed with the highest ranking officials, presumed to influence even top-level decisions, found a place not only in the field of atomic energy but in areas of the military, intelligence, and diplomacy. He had an ear if not a voice in the crucial decisions of every key department of Government in a time of crisis. He was omnipresent as he was presumed to be omniscient.

Yet Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer admits that for years he contributed to the coffers of the Communist Party, that his devotion to the cause survived even the pact with Hitler, that his wife and brother were members of the conspiracy, that he compromised himself morally with an avowed Communist, that he was a persistent fellow-traveler in the front of Red causes, that he brought to Berkeley and to Los Alamos men, even nontechnical, whom he knew to be party members.

But this is not all. Dr. Oppenheimer admits a fabrication of lies to shield a Communist who pressed him for atomic secrets, the same Chevalier with whom he dined in Paris as late as last year. Meanwhile he insinuated his ideas into the military against the feasibility of strategic long-range air bombing, and strove mightily with all the contacts at his command to delay what he could not ultimately prevent—the development of the hydrogen bomb.

In December 1953 he was up again for security clearance, and he released to the New York Times an emotional response which shrugged off the early devotion and affinity to communism as foibles of a mind lost in the abstractions of science. It was the temper of the times, he protested; it was the mood of the moment. Why, not for years did he know of the great depression, he confessed, he who later was to be so cognizant of the strife in Spain. He was beset, he pleaded in wide-eyed innocence, with economic and moral and scientific scruples. These obsessions induced a few errors of judgment, he said, as his words enfolded him in an aura of ethical greatness.

There were no cries of "witch hunt" or "McCarthyism" as the matter was turned over to a special board for adjudication. Messrs. Gray, Morgan, and Evans ruled in a split decision that while there was no question of Dr. Oppenheimer's loyalty, his past sensibilities and present proclivities constituted a security risk—one who was no longer to be trusted with the vital secrets of a Nation at bay. The Atomic Energy Commission has now ratified these findings with scant attention to the board's soothing recommendations, and Dr. Oppenheimer is henceforth excluded from the councils of science in government.

Immediately there is the wail of the professors and even so responsible a scientist as Dr. DuBridge, of Caltech, deplores the "dire disaster" that awaits a people who will not heed even the extracurricular advice of its physicists in a thermo-nuclear age. There are other scientists, too, aghast in pontifical pronouncements, prompted by a kind of Pavlov conditioned-reflex, with cries of persecution and intellectual obscurantism. It would seem that hysteria threatens the free and unfettered sway of science in its measured and relentless search.

It doesn't matter that this investigation has been an ordered and dignified and disinterested inquiry, patient and painstaking. It doesn't matter that a sound decision has been given in the balance and prudence of a new maturity. It doesn't matter that now we know the carelessness and laxity by which the men in the Kremlin knew our atomic secrets before the men of Albuquerque. We must only shudder with the fear that science is in a state of siege.

What Is a Tariff?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 13, 1954

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I herewith insert in the RECORD the following advertisement from the Washington Post and Times Herald concerning the distilled spirits bonding period:

WHAT IS A TARIFF?

Answer. A tariff is a law to protect American business and labor against foreign competitors.

Question. What is a new kind of tariff?

Answer. A new kind of tariff is a law to protect foreign competitors who do business here against American business and labor.

Question. Have we ever had this new kind of tariff?

Answer. Never, this way. Now it is proposed to the United States Senate, in a bill called H. R. 5407.

Question. What is an added new wrinkle in this new kind of tariff?

Answer. A requirement that the American businessman lie about his product while the foreigner tells the truth about his.

Question. What constructive suggestion can you make about this?

Answer. Draft a law which gives American industry the same rights that foreign competitors enjoy in this country. Pass it at the next session of Congress.

Defer action on H. R. 5407. It's worse than what we have now.

SCHENLEY INDUSTRIES, INC.

NEW YORK, N. Y.

Subversives in Defense Plants

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 21, 1954

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, Secretary of Defense Wilson and the gentleman from Wisconsin seem to be in accord. Mr. Wilson, whom we all admire for his ability, his integrity, and his willingness to make sacrifices for the good of the service, seems, according to David Lawrence, to be carrying out a part of the McCarthy program. Note the following statement from Lawrence:

SECRETARY WILSON, IN CANDID STATEMENT TO SENATE GROUP, STRESSES NEED OF LAW TO GUARD WORK ON SECRET PROJECTS

Charles E. Wilson, Secretary of Defense, is a man of candor. He has just made a statement to the Senate Armed Services Committee which tells more than all the days of the television hearings in the McCarthy-Stevens feud ever did about the dangers of Communist infiltration that face all the armed services and defense plants.

Evidently American public opinion has not yet been sufficiently aroused on this issue and there has not been enough pointing up of the whole situation in defense plants by congressional committee investigations because Senator LANGER, of the Senate Judiciary Committee, has not yet felt obligated to report to the Senate a bill that is aimed at subversives in the defense plants. And Secretary Wilson says a law of that kind is badly needed.

Mr. Wilson says, with reference to Communists who are working in defense plants, that, while those engaged in secret work can be fired, there is no way to enable private contractors to prevent them from working in other parts of the same plant and maintaining personal contacts with those who do work on secret projects. The head of the Department of Defense says in his prepared statement:

"In our opinion we do not have sufficient legal authority to fully protect all industries vital to national defense from the danger of subversives and security risks. We hope that the legislation that has been proposed to take care of an important part of this problem will receive the consideration we are sure it deserves."

Senator SALTONSTALL, Chairman of the Armed Services Committee, told Secretary Wilson "it might be proper" for Mr. Wilson to urge Senator LANGER to get the Judiciary Committee of the Senate to act speedily on it.

When Assistant General Counsel Stempler, of the Defense Department, who also testified before the Armed Services Committee, was asked about this lack of authority, he said that "a fairly large number" of subversives are known to be working in defense plants. But nothing can be done about it until a new law is obtained.

So it is apparent now that, after all, the "let the FBI do it" doctrine doesn't cover cases like this at all.

Incidentally, this is precisely the point that Senator MCCARTHY has been making—namely, that his congressional committee was exposing the presence of such subversives and making an issue of it before the American people when some one in the administration with less sense than emotion succeeded in forcing a suspension of the regular work of the committee in order to deal with the charges about a loyal American, an anti-Communist who happened to be drafted for Army service and who, like thousands of others in past years, had some one on Capitol Hill try to get him a commission in the Army.

Speaking of commissions, the Secretary of Defense in his formal statement has conceded that Major Peress should never have been commissioned and that the case was badly handled. He says:

"A study of the Peress case indicated, among other things, that the undesirable results were due, in part at least, to lack of correlation of information in security cases."

Mr. Wilson tells of a new order, issued by him on April 8, 1954, which requires that "personnel records and all investigative records in regard to the security of personnel not now effectively correlated shall be correlated without delay in each of the military departments to insure that full facts are available for prompt and fair administration of all personnel matters."

Mr. Wilson then adds significantly:

"I have asked the Assistant Secretary of the Army to tell this committee what action has been taken to carry this out and to avoid as far as humanly possible a repetition of what occurred in the Peress case."

Mr. Wilson goes somewhat further in emphasizing what the public furor over subversives in the armed services has led to when he says: "As I reported to you at our last meeting (Mar. 1, 1954), we have taken more effective steps not only to rid the services of undesirable security risks who might be found in the Armed Forces but also to block off at all points the entry of such persons into the military services."

The Defense Department Secretary sums up what really might well be described as the value of the exposures made during the last several months by Senator MCCARTHY's Committee on Governmental Operations, for Mr. Wilson says:

"Aside from these specific actions, which I have outlined above, there is another result which I think is perhaps the most important one. That is a revitalization of the entire department from the top echelons down with respect to strengthening, accelerating, and making more effective our machinery to protect the security of the Nation within the Department of Defense."

It will be conceded, therefore, by all fair-minded persons who are not interested in political combat or in personality prejudices but in stamping out Communist agents, sympathizers and fellow travelers from the Government, that only by the fullest publicity and immunity from libel prosecutions—which a congressional committee is privileged to get—can public opinion be sufficiently informed on all these delicate issues affecting the security of the United States.

University President Warns of "Cultural Uneasiness" in Foundations Inquiry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE L. HAYS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 28, 1954

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a news release from the National Catholic Welfare Conference news service, dated July 16, 1954. Father Reinert's views on the Special Committee to Investigate Tax Exempt Foundations coincide largely with my own, and I therefore commend this story to the attention of the House.

Mr. Speaker, one of the basic things which I fought against in the committee hearings was what the St. Louis University president has called "the too-common practice of attributing the ideas or errors of an individual to a whole group or association."

The release follows:

ASKS EDUCATORS TO HEED "CULTURAL UNEASINESS" SEEN IN HOUSE HEARINGS

ST. LOUIS, MO., July 16.—Congressional investigators of tax exempt foundations and their influence on United States education reflect a "cultural uneasiness" that should be of concern to all educators, Father Paul C. Reinert, S. J., president of St. Louis University said here.

The Jesuit educator said that a staff report by a House of Representatives committee suffers from "overgeneralization" in its examination of United States educational groups. But he said the report calls attention to "an overemphasis on science and its advancement, and a neglect of the study of cultural goals and values, which should concern educators."

Father Reinert defended the American Council on Education, one of the organizations cited by the committee staff as fostering changes in educational curricula "to the point where they sometimes denied the principles underlying the American way of life."

The Jesuit educator, who is a member of the executive committee of the council, said, "I have seen no evidence that the council, on policy, was endeavoring to promote * * * un-American social ideas."

He criticized the committee staff report for projecting individual instances "into a whole system of motives and purposes that do not exist at all."

He said, however, that the report gave expression to "a vague worry about the loss of a traditional system of values in this country," and he called upon educators to ask themselves "what our institutions of higher learning and our research foundations are doing to advance the study of cultural values and goals."

"A society can endure only if there is some basic consensus on fundamental goals and values, and these must be constantly reapplied to changing situations," Father Reinert said. "Basically, this reduces itself to asking what is being taught on the nature and destiny of man and of society."

The St. Louis University president scored the report for overgeneralization resulting from "the too-common practice of attributing the ideas or errors of an individual to a whole group or association."

The House committee which has been conducting the investigation under the chairmanship of Representative CARROLL REECE, of Tennessee, has been recessed after a series of stormy sessions and public hearings.

Dr. Oppenheimer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 21, 1954

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, as usual, certain editorial writers, columnists, and radio commentators, who set up a squawk about methods whenever a Red, a pink, or an intellectual is criticized, have rushed to the aid of Oppenheimer. From the Saturday Evening Post of last week comes an editorial, which reads as follows:

WAS THE OPPENHEIMER DECISION SO TERRIBLE?

The controversy now reaching fever heat over Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer and his right to access to restricted atomic information underscores the fact that atomic scientists are not as other men are. Men who are concerned with the devising of weapons capable of annihilating millions must expect that their political associations and personal friendships will be scrutinized more closely than those of ordinary people.

Some atomic scientists and their "liberal" supporters, in their zeal to defend not only Doctor Oppenheimer but fredom of inquiry and opinion, seem to have forgotten this. Many of them condemn the majority opinion of the Atomic Energy Commission's Personnel Security Board as the work of inquisitors bent upon stamping out human freedom in the United States. Dr. Edward Shils, in the Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, described the report as indicating "a brutal eagerness to assert that all those who disagree with us must be communists or in league with them." Doctor Shils is not the only one who insists on believing that Doctor Oppenheimer is being perceuted on account of his opinions.

The attacks on the board's action add up to the assertion that (1) Doctor Oppenheimer's past associations, while regrettable, were his own business and that (2) his reported lack of "enthusiasm" for development of the hydrogen bomb was shared by many others, including eminent scientists, and should not be interpreted to mean that he was indifferent to efforts to produce maximum weapons needed for the defense of the country.

In 1945 one need not have been a sentimentalist or even a humanitarian to agree with Dr. Fermi and Dr. Rabi that the hydrogen bomb as then discussed was "necessarily an evil thing considered in any light" and that refusal by the Government to sponsor work on a superbomb might provide "some limitations on the totality of war." Millions wish that the H-bomb had never been made, and bemoan the fact that Dr. Albert Einstein was not denied access to a blackboard before he worked out his famous formula.

However, those who have come to Dr. Oppenheimer's defense, including his learned counsel, seem to us to make the mistake of considering Oppenheimer's opposition to the H-bomb apart from his past Communist associations. Obviously, they must be considered together. There would be no more reason to complain of Dr. Oppenheimer's objections to working on the superbomb than to similar objections by many humane people, except for the fact of his admitted association with Communists over a period of years and reported statements by various Communist leaders indicating that he had been a member of front organizations and a contributor to their funds.

In other words, what might well worry the Atomic Energy Commission about Dr. Oppenheimer is not his natural human feeling that destructive weapons have been carried far enough, but the possibility that his attitude might have been influenced by Communists who had quite other reasons for opposing an American development of the superweapon. Surely, any body of men having such a ticklish matter to decide would have difficulty in reaching any conclusion other than that arrived at by the AEC's Security Board—namely, that Dr. Oppenheimer is a loyal American, but they would feel more comfortable if he were kept away from whatever atomic secrets are still secrets to him.

The whole ball of wax has now been dumped in the lap of the American people, and, although it is difficult to put 900 pages of technical testimony on television, the public has at least the means of forming a judgment of its own on this affair. Some who dip into the testimony will conclude that he is a political illiterate, but a man of good will and ipso facto a sucker for frauds who describe themselves as humanitarians. Others would feel more comfortable if the record showed that Oppeheimer had at any time done a Whittaker Chambers and definately repudiated his former Commmunist associations. Perhaps Dr. Oppenheimer is a man who should not be held responsible for his past political associations any more than Babe Ruth should have been expected to master the theories of Plotinus. Nevertheless, many people would be grateful for more evidence of a change.

As far as the Board's action is concerned, it is important to remember this: To express a drawing-room opinion about Dr. Oppenheimer is one thing; to act as a responsible member of a security board dealing with matters as grave as these is quite another thing. No one rejoices over the suspicions which have been aroused concerning certain episodes in the career of Dr. Oppenheimer, but not even the reputation of an American as distinguished as he can outweigh the importance which any responsible board of inquiry must assign to the security of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as it seems to be admitted that one who uses intoxicating liquor or stupefying drugs to excess or one who gambles, or lives beyond his means, is subject to pressure and should not be entrusted with secrets which affect the security of the country, why so much fuss over denying Oppenheimer access to Federal security data? If I read his testimony correctly, for several years, by choice, he associated closely with a rather large group of Communists and Communist sympathizers, not occasionally but usually. That is, his intimate friends were not Communists he met casually or just occasionally, but individuals with whom he spent perhaps a larger part of his time. It is my understanding that he also contributed financially over a period of years to the Communist cause.

If the record quotes him correctly, he admitted that for some time he had a Communist mistress. Seems to me that I either heard or read somewhere that Julius Caesar and Mark Anthony lost some of their integrity by fooling around on the Nile with a reputedly good-looking woman. Then Samson had his hair trimmed by another lady, so why should Oppenheimer's friends who know these things now complain so continuously when Oppenheimer gets his knuckles rapped? Oppenheimer might talk in his sleep and if his Communist mistress overheard him, it is just possible she might leak the information to her bosses. Let us worry about someone less vulnerable.

Tolerant America, Land of Liberty—Keep America Tolerant—Without Question of Race or Creed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 30, 1954

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, I am pleased to herewith present to your attention and that of my distinguished colleagues the text of three statements furnished me by a distinguished friend who requested that the messages therein contained and emphasized upon these topics be included in the daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I am pleased to comply with this request.

The statements follow:

TOLERANT AMERICA, LAND OF LIBERTY

The greatness of this country and its standing among the nations of the world has been built upon religious and racial tolerance. Our freedom of worship has always remained unmolested.

In other parts of this civilized world today, barbaric brutality stalks in persecution of those whose religious beliefs or ancestry displeases the political power. We read and hear about the atrocities of intolerance, little realizing that the same unseen forces are reaching to destroy America.

Shall our churches also be closed? Must free speech be taken from us? Will free American minds become festered with transplanted germs of religious and racial intolerance? God forbid.

America can survive only if the people of America determine to keep it free from destructive forces of intolerance that seek a foothold here.

Now is the time for all America to unite and stand shoulder to shoulder in protection of religious liberty. Destroy tolerance in these United States, and you will destroy the Nation.

KEEP AMERICA TOLERANT THAT THIS NATION SHALL NOT PERISH FROM THE EARTH

One hundred and sixty-three years ago, 13 American Colonies fought a war of independence to establish a God-fearing Nation, free from religious and racial intolerance.

The United States of America was born. Destiny and sound guidance has made it one of the great nations of the world. Our Declaration of Independence laid down the fundamental principle of tolerance with the simple statement that "all men are created free and equal."

Today intolerance stalks a topsy-turvy world. Will it gain headway in America? To crush our churches? Destroy our religious freedom? Outlaw our right to worship God?

We can keep our America a land of liberty only by united resistance to sinister efforts of those who are determined to undermine our economic stability and destroy our American birthright of religious and racial freedom. Tolerance has made America a great Nation. Resist now any attempt to destroy it.

WITHOUT QUESTION OF RACE OR CREED

In our American cemeteries in France, in Flanders fields, lie thousands of America's sons. They came from every walk of life. The rich and the poor of every creed and every race met on common ground to serve their country's need.

When President Wilson called American manhood to the colors, no lines of racial or religious prejudice were drawn.

Why then, today, should religious prejudice or racial intolerance be permitted in free America?

Through subtle means, alien forces of coercion are seeking to inoculate America with poisonous propaganda and are attempting to plant in America un-American prejudice and hate.

These forces would destroy our religious freedom and close our churches—your church and mine. They would throttle free speech to make us subservient to an intolerant dictatorial power.

Sane-thinking Americans must unite to resist intolerance that America shall not be robbed of her birthright of equality and freedom.

Group Life Insurance for Federal Employees

SPEECH
OF
HON. JOHN E. MOSS, JR.
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 3, 1954

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, I favor very strongly the action yesterday approving S. 3681 to establish an insurance program for Federal employees. I think such a program is excellent, but I have one reservation about the action. This most important legislation was accorded a hearing lasting only one-half hour by the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee. I fear most of the committee members have not even had the opportunity to read the legislation carefully. Such a hasty hearing denies possible consideration of improvements in the proposal and denies a full opportunity for a public hearing on the plan. In spite of the short hearing, the insurance proposal has my full support, for I believe it puts into effect one of the better practices adopted by many private employees. The excellent work done by civilian employees in the Government is too seldom given full recognition. This insurance program will add to the benefits accorded Federal employees.

I trust the House will, during the 84th Congress, make a careful review of the program to be absolutely certain all provisions are equitable and that it provides the best possible plan for Federal employees.

Educators Approve Position of Representative Wayne L. Hays, of Ohio, on Foundations Investigation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE L. HAYS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 30, 1954

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, as ranking minority member of the Special Committee To Investigate Tax-Exempt Foundations, it has been my duty and my privilege to defend the spirit of free inquiry against what I have considered unwarranted attack.

Among the expressions of support which I have received for my position from all over the United States, I value none more highly than those on behalf of the educators of America.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include correspondence from representatives of the teachers of Ohio and the United States. I was formerly a public-school teacher in Belmont County, Ohio, and am therefore particularly appreciative of their commendation.

The correspondence follows:

Ohio Education Association,
Columbus, Ohio, August 2, 1954.
Hon. Wayne L. Hays,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Congressman Hays: I have been very much pleased to learn through the NEA division of legislation and Federal relations of your fine work as a member of the House Special Committee To Investigate Tax-Exempt Foundations. Certainly your services have been the contributing force against a rather patent attempt to impose preconceived ideas on this committee. Educators in Ohio have every reason to be enthusiastic about your calling the turn in this connection. The failure of this committee to give the various foundations a chance to answer publicly the biased representations made against them is a sad commentary upon the committee's work.

It is good to know that you continue the same interest in educational affairs that you manifested when you were a member of the Ohio Senate more than a decade ago. Of course, your present position goes further than that and represents solid effort to maintain the dignified position of representative government.

With kindest personal regards, I am,
Yours very truly,
Walton B. Bliss.

National Educational Association
of the United States,
Steubenville, Ohio, July 30, 1954.
Congressman Wayne L. Hays,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Hays: I have been following the work of the House Special Committee To Investigate Tax-Exempt Foundations, commonly known as the Reece committee. I have noticed your serious questioning of the validity of staff reports and testimony presented to the committee alleging an attempt by foundations and educational organizations to undermine and subvert our public schools.

I have noticed your insistence on the use of correct procedure according to the rules governing House committees and your effort to see that both sides of the question were aired in the public hearings.

I am anxious to see what new turns such investigations may take. In the meantime, I am writing to thank you for your constructive and courageous effort to maintain the dignity of our tradition of representative government while at the same time opposing the efforts of those who would weaken and destroy our public schools.

Please know that many of us appreciate the fine contribution you have made to the cause of education during this session of Congress. I hope we may have the pleasure of seeing you again either as a speaker at our high school or education association, or in some community activity in Steubenville. We feel you are representing the 18th Congressional District in a very fine manner.

Very truly yours,
Margaret Boyd, *NEA Director.*

National Education Association
of the United States,
Washington, D. C., July 23, 1954.
The Honorable Wayne L. Hays,
United States House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Congressman Hays: As the 83d Congress draws to the close of its 2d session, I wish to take this opportunity to thank you for your efforts to secure a fair and objective hearing for the representatives of tax-exempt foundations and professional organizations who were the subject of the recent inquiries by the House Special Committee To Investigate Tax-Exempt Foundations. We regret that a majority of the committee voted against further public hearings, thus denying the National Education Association an opportunity to appear before the committee and reply to the sensational charges made against it. Your efforts to have the committee pursue a course of action in keeping with the dignity and prestige of the United States House of Representatives have not gone unnoticed either by us or by other members of the organized teaching profession.

For your information I enclose a copy of a letter to Mr. Walton B. Bliss, executive secretary of the Ohio Education Association, setting forth some of the views I have expressed to you.

Sincerely yours,
J. L. McCaskill,
Director, Division of Legislation and Federal Relations.

Railroad Retirement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 30, 1954

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, as is pretty generally known I have always taken a deep interest in the welfare of our railroad employees and have devoted much time and effort in securing for them the benefits to which they are justly entitled. I was glad to have been able to be of help to the approximately 36,000 annuitants affected for whom this legislation will grant an increase of an average of $24 a month, or 20 percent of their average annuity retroactively to October 30, 1951. The changes in the railroad retirement and unemployment insurance systems which the pending bill provides have the approval and commendation of all the standard railroad unions, who have been reasonable, understanding and conscientious in their support. I urge you, my colleagues, to join in the enactment of this worthy legislation.

Railroad Retirement Amendments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM C. WAMPLER

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 4, 1954

Mr. WAMPLER. Mr. Speaker, on Friday last the House of Representatives by a unanimous vote passed H. R. 7840, a bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act, the Railroad Retirement Tax Act, and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act.

I voted in favor of this bill because I felt there was a real need for its passage. The very fact that there was not a single dissenting vote against it is evidence of the need for the legislation.

During my service in the House of Representatives, I have received many letters from retired railroad annuitants and pensioners, active railroad workers, and widows of railroad workers urging that action be taken to improve certain provisions under the railroad retirement system and the railroad unemployment insurance system.

Mr. Speaker, I felt that this bill, H. R. 7840, represented a sincere effort on the part of the great Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to be helpful to retired workers and their dependents. I want to pay tribute to the chairman of the committee, Hon. Charles A. Wolverton, of New Jersey, and the entire committee for reporting this bill for consideration by the House of Representatives.

I am in full accord with the committee that, regardless of the desirability of certain proposals for the liberalization of benefits under the Railroad Retirement Act, no amendments to the law should be made which would jeopardize the financial soundness of the Railroad Retirement System. The Congress should always adhere to this fundamental principle.

Last year, Mr. Speaker, I introduced H. R. 4171 in the House of Representatives. This bill was designed to repeal the provisions of the Railroad Retirement Act amendments of 1951 that prohibited an increase in railroad retirement benefits to those persons who also have coverage under the Social Security Act.

The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce held hearings on H. R. 356 and 17 similar bills, of which my bill was one, and reported favorably on H. R. 356, providing for the repeal of section 7 of Public Law 234, retroactive to October 30, 1951, the date it became effective. This bill passed the House on July 24, 1953, and passed the Senate on June 2, 1954. It was signed by President Eisenhower on June 16, 1954, and is now Public Law 398 of the 83d Congress.

It Would Be Amusing, If It Were Not So Confusing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 3, 1954

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the New York Herald Tribune for July 30, 1954, carries an article by Edwin L. Dale, Jr., entitled "Weeks Says United States Speeds Contracts." This article provides a good basis for doubting Mr. Weeks' statement that there is a "conscious administration policy" to stimulate the national economy through effective Government action. I am happy to call it to the attention of our colleagues:

WEEKS SAYS UNITED STATES SPEEDS CONTRACTS

(By Edwin L. Dale, Jr.)

WASHINGTON, July 29.—Secretary of Commerce Sinclair Weeks said today there is a "conscious administration policy" of stepping up Government procurement to help out the economy, but he said he doesn't know whether it applies in the one place it counts most, military buying.

A Defense Department spokesman said it doesn't.

Mr. Weeks, seeming to contradict himself several times under intensive questioning at a press conference, said the Government was trying to "nudge" the economy by "doing a little earlier" things which are already planned. In his own area, he said, this is true of maritime and highway programs.

He revealed the final aspects of an overall $385,000,000 shipbuilding program, some of which is still being considered by Congress.

CITES HIGHWAY ACTION

The only specific evidence Mr. Weeks was able to cite on the new "policy" was his own department's decision to allocate earlier than usual this year the Federal-aid-to-highways funds approved by Congress. The maritime program had to await Congressional enactment, but Mr. Weeks said the contracts will be let as soon as possible in order to stimulate the sagging business of American shipyards.

The subject of the new buying policy arose as a result of a question from a reporter on a rumored directive from the Budget Bureau to all Government agencies to speed their procurement in the current 3-month period. After much questioning, Mr. Weeks ultimately said there was no such directive.

He also denied that the "word" had gone out to procurement officers to "speed things up." But he did say this:

"We're not trying to think up things to do. But where we know that something is going to be done, then we try to do it a little earlier."

DEFENSE POLICY UNCHANGED

A Pentagon spokesman said that the Defense Department's policy remains as it has been—not to buy anything until it is actually needed. In fact, the regime of Defense Secretary Charles E. Wilson has stressed this point more than ever before, as an economy move, and under Mr. Wilson's directives the military services failed to obligate more than $10 billion of procurement funds which Congress appropriated for the fiscal year just ended. Some of those funds will ultimately be used, of course, but no orders are being placed until necessary.

The result of the afternoon's probing left reporters confused as to whether the Government has a new buying policy or not.

Average Man Benefits by Elimination of Waste From Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RUSSELL V. MACK

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 3, 1954

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, the national deficit for President Truman's last year in office was $9,400,000,000. The national deficit for President Eisenhower's first year in office was $3,029,000,000. In a brief 12 months President Eisenhower and an Eisenhower Congress brought the national budget over $6 billion closer into balance. The apostles of doom and gloom said it could not be done, but it has been done.

How did President Eisenhower and his Congress accomplish this improved national financial condition? Did they do it by lessening or eliminating needed and desirable services to the people? No.

Needed and desirable public services to the people have not been decreased. Instead, desirable services to the people have been expanded.

For example, 50 million motorists want better and safer roads. This Congress has authorized the expenditure of $300 million a year more money on Federal highway construction than ever was authorized by any previous Congress in any previous year.

Before Congress adjourns, social-security pensions will have been increased and more citizens given the protection of this wise law, thereby making life a little more enjoyable for the elder citizens.

Pensions and compensation have been increased by $109 million to service-connected disabled war veterans and to the widows or the parents who lost their husband or son in any war due to death on the battlefield or from war-inflicted disease or wounds. The increase may not be as large as some wanted or expected, but it is $109 million a year more than ever was granted heretofore.

Congress also has provided funds for the operation of 103,000 veterans' hospital beds, which is the largest number of VA hospital beds operated anytime in the history of the Nation.

The Congress has made available, during the coming year, an additional $100 million of loan funds to help veterans acquire homes of their own.

The money for financing the rehabilitation of disabled citizens, veteran and nonveteran alike, to equip them to become employable and again self-supporting has been increased by 50 percent.

These better services to the people have cost additional hundreds of millions. Despite these added expenditures to provide this better service, the budget is nearing a balanced condition.

How did President Eisenhower and the Congress achieve this great record? They achieved it by keeping their election promise that they would eliminate waste and extravagance anywhere and everywhere they found it and thereby provide the taxpayer with better Government services at less cost.

President Eisenhower and this Congress have provided the Nation with more efficient and effective Government than our country has known in a long time. This Congress has demonstrated that the people can have better service from Government and lower taxes too.

H. R. 1227

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 3, 1954

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a petition from members of the Training Union of Alta Woods Baptist Church, Jackson, Miss., with reference to H. R. 1227:

We, the undersigned, recognizing the great damage being done to our Nation by liquor advertising, including beer casting, and believing that Congress has the power to prohibit such advertising, do respectfully petition Members of Congress to pass H. R. 1227 or a similar bill during this session of Congress.

We ask also that this petition be presented to the House, recorded in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and given to the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, which has the bills in its files.

Percy M. Cooper, Mrs. Delma Johnston, Mrs. Owen Williams, Mrs. M. V. Sigrest, Julia O. Wallace, Mrs. Fred Thompson, Mrs. E. T. Morgan, Mrs. Eva Wise, Barney R. Cook, Mrs. Talmadge Barnett, Mrs. Arthur W. Lewis, T. B. Barnett, James Melton, Mrs. Ben Terry, E. A. Gaulding, Frank Rogers, Mr. and Mrs. De Haven Hodges, Mrs. Frank Rogers, James W. Schultz, H. A. Magee, Mrs. H. A. Magee, C. J. Harris, Mr. and Mrs. Virgil Burt, Mr. and Mrs. Robert B. Jones, Jr., Mr. and Mrs. J. B. Galloyz, Mr. and Mrs. W. G. Parker, Mr. and Mrs. C. G. Burnham, Mrs. J. O. Roberts, J. O. Roberts, Mrs. R. M. Ricker, Mr. and Mrs. Milton Quinn, Mr. and Mrs. Otto Wise, Mr. and Mrs. Claude Jackson, Mr. and Mrs. Shelby Stegall, Mr. and Mrs. Robert L. Cook, Mr. and Mrs. O. R. Sebren, Mr. and Mrs. Willie G. Runnels, Mr. and Mrs. R. B. Ross, Jr., Mrs. C. M. Woods, Mrs. Allen J. Harvill, Mr. and Mrs. Floyd Harris, Jr., Mrs. V. L. Berry, Mrs. Winford Areley, J. S. Turner, Mr. and Mrs. James B. Davis, Mrs. L. R. Williams, Mr. and Mrs. C. R. Patton, Mr. and Mrs. Sydney Berry, Mrs. J. H. Hanna, Mrs. Marshall Turner, Marshall Turner, S. L. Palmer, Walter L. Shows, Russell A. Scofield, Mr. and Mrs. R. K. Jordan, Mr. and Mrs. E. E. Parker.

In Support of House Concurrent Resolution 58

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT P. MORANO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 4, 1954

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include in the Appendix of the Record, two resolutions favoring the passage of House Concurrent Resolution 58, which would establish diplomatic relations between the Soviet Republics of Ukraine and Byelorussia and the United States. These resolutions were sent to me by two organizations in the State of Connecticut, the Ukrainian-American State Political Organization, Inc., and Ukrainian Congress Committee of America Affiliated, New Haven; and the Organization for the Defense of Four Freedoms for the Ukraine, Inc., Hartford:

New Haven, Conn.

Hon. Albert P. Morano,
House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman: It is our understanding that House Concurrent Resolution 58, advocating the establishment of diplomatic relations between the Soviet Republics of Ukraine and Byelorussia and the United States, is soon to be brought before the House Foreign Affairs Committee for final consideration.

This resolution won the unanimous approval of the subcommittee assigned to study the proposal under the chairmanship of the Honorable Mrs. Francis P. Bolton.

There are many benefits to be derived by America from such an exchange of diplomats. Assuming that the Soviet Union would accept the offer, we would have an access, formerly denied us, to the capitals of the most important and largest non-Russian republics in the Soviet Union. (The most astute observers and students of the Soviet Union have all concurred on the constantly growing importance of Ukraine in Soviet affairs.)

Such a move would also provide new hope and faith for the Ukrainian and Byelorussian people that their miserable plight under the Soviets and their aspirations toward independence from Moscow are fully appreciated by the United States.

A Soviet refusal of this diplomatic proposal would expose once again not only the well-known fact that the Ukrainians and Byelorussians in the Soviet Union are not free to govern themselves as they choose, but would also disprove Moscow's fraudulent claims of a desire for friendly, peaceful relations with the West.

We urge favorable action on the resolution for it is of vital importance to American security, and necessary for achieving success in America's dealings with the Communist threat.

Very sincerely yours,
Dr. Wasyl Nebeluk,
President, Ukrainian-American State Political Organization, Inc., State of Connecticut, and Ukrainian Congress Committee of America Affiliated.

Organization for the Defense of
Four Freedoms for Ukraine, Inc.,
Hartford, Conn., June 24, 1924.

Congressman Albert P. Morano,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Congressman: We believe there is before the House Foreign Affairs Committee a resolution to establish diplomatic relations between the Soviet Republics of Ukraine and Byelorussia and the United States.

These two Republics are known for their large non-Russian population and anti-Communist feelings. A majority of people have also been noted for opposing Communist ideals. They have fought openly against communism from the start and though they have felt the full fury of the Communist government, still oppose it to this day.

To be able to exchange diplomats with these two Republics, the American people will have an opportunity to see more closely that communism is not embraced by all of the people under its rule.

Although it is doubtful the Communist government will accept this exchange of diplomats, nevertheless it would show the weakness of the Communist government control over the minds of the people it rules.

Though the Communist government preaches words of peace and understanding we would like to give them an opportunity to fulfill those ideas by exchanging diplomats with people we know are not, even remotely, fully behind them.

We deeply wish that the House Foreign Affairs Committee would pass final approval on this resolution so that we will be one step closer to winning the cold war with the Communist government of Russia.

Very sincerely yours,
Tymish Melnyk,
President.

A Letter to the Editor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 3, 1954

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, among the Letters to the Editor in the July 28, 1954, edition of the Brooklyn Eagle appeared the following letter which I direct to the attention of our colleagues:

More About Local M. C.'s Voting Against Consumers

To the Editor of the Eagle:

It seems strange to me that you should suddenly have discovered that all the Brooklyn Democratic Members of Congress, with the exception of one, are playing politics with the farm program. In arriving at that conclusion you overlook several important factors.

It was not those Democrats but Candidate Eisenhower who promised the farmers 100 percent of parity, and it is President Eisenhower who now recommends cutting that parity back to 75 percent or, as he puts it, flexing it between 75 and 90 percent.

In charging the Democrats with playing politics with the issue you overlook the fact that Governor Dewey must also be playing politics with the issue because he takes the same position as they do. Is it not just as political for Governor Dewey to oppose the President's program as it is for a Democrat to oppose it?

On July 3, 1954, Governor Dewey said, "The New York farmers are entitled to a 90-percent parity for dairy products." The present milk parity is 75 percent. It is 75 percent because on dairy products we have a flexible price support program, with a low of 75 percent and a high of 90 percent, and it is Secretary Benson who has cut it back to 75 percent.

You charge politics because the Congressmen should represent the consumers. Very few New York Congressmen ever vote sectionally. Too bad we can't get many of the farm delegations to give up sectionalism on other problems. But you must admit that if the farmers can't prosper the consumers can't prosper.

It seems to me, however, that the President must be wrong on this issue because under the program of flexible price supports as administered by the President's Secretary of Agriculture the dairy farmers, and particularly those in New York, are getting less for their milk while the consumers are paying more for that same milk.

There is something radically wrong either with the flexible price support program or with its administration. No matter which it is President Eisenhower and his Secretary of Agriculture must accept the responsibility.

Nat Koeppel.

The Watch Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 27, 1954

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the Record, I include herewith an editorial from the Reading (Pa.) Times:

The Watch Case

It is to be regretted that President Eisenhower saw fit to raise watch tariffs. Acting under the escape clause in the United States reciprocal trade agreement with Switzerland, the President followed the recommendation of a majority of the Federal Tariff Commission and increased, up to 50 percent in some categories, the tariff on nonjeweled watches and on watches with not more than 17 jewels.

In doing so, the President reversed the policy he followed on brier pipes, groundfish fillets, and shears and scissors, concerning which he declined to use the escape clause and the tariffs on these commodities remained low. In making watches an exception to his trade, not aid doctrine on foreign economic policy, Mr. Eisenhower said he decided that in the case of watches, the weight of the evidence was on the side of a tariff increase. He laid heavy stress on the fact that the watchmaker's skill is necessary to our defense and that, under a low tariff, the pool of watchmakers was rapidly being depleted.

It seems to us, however, that much can be said for permitting the tariff on watches to remain low. In the first place, American watch manufacturers upped their production in 1953 and made substantial profits in spite of the fact that the Swiss companies made some inroads on the total American watch business. In the second place, Switzerland, whose principal export is watches and whose best watch customer is the United States, now will proceed to increase her tariffs on American agricultural products she buys in considerable quantity from us, principally cotton, wheat, tobacco, and lard.

None can disagree with the President that the skills of American watchmakers are needed in making precision instruments necessary to the defense of the United States and that, therefore, we cannot have our pool of watchmakers depleted. But is a higher tariff on watches the only answer to the problem? We think not. Our Government subsidizes many private enterprises vital to defense and many, indeed, not so vital. Could we not devise a subsidy plan that would insure an adequate pool of watchmakers? This, is seems to us, would have been greatly preferable to upping the watch tariff.

For the increased tariff has had and will increasingly have injurious effects. It has alienated the Swiss, long our friends. It is estimated that the higher tariff will add $60 million to the annual bills of Americans who buy watches. It will have a deleterious effect on our agricultural economy by making it more difficult for the American farm product to get across the higher tariff wall the Swiss almost certainly will raise.

More importantly, it seems to us, the increase in watch tariffs will have two additional effects. Our friends round the world are already raising their eyebrows and wondering whether or not the United States is turning protectionist again, in spite of Mr. Eisenhower's long devotion to the principle of low tariffs. And the upping of the watch tariffs inevitably must start to Washington a long line of other American manufacturers and processors asking for the same treatment the watch manufacturers got.

If there is—and there is bound to be—a parade of American manufacturers to Washington to plead for higher tariffs on their own products, it will be most difficult for the Tariff Commission and the President to say them nay, in view of the watch case. If this case leads to a trend, the United States may soon find itself economically isolated at a time when a free flow of our goods throughout the world is most greatly needed for our own and the free world's prosperity.

Actions Speak Louder Than Words

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 3, 1954

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial which appeared in the July 28, 1954, edition of the Brooklyn Eagle very ably tells of another campaign pledge which the Republicans have failed to keep:

TABLING OF HAWAIIAN STATEHOOD BREAKS PLEDGE OF REPUBLICANS

Refusal by the House Rules Committee of a request to let separate Senate and House bills to grant statehood to Hawaii and Alaska go to conference means that the Republican majority in Congress will fail to produce on a major platform pledge.

This is a failure which administration leaders will find it difficult to explain or defend. There may be an attempt to attribute it to the successful Democratic strategem in the Senate of tying the Alaska bill to the Hawaii bill. Standing alone, the Hawaii bill could have been passed.

An attempt to shift responsibility would be unimpressive, however, in view of the fact that it was well within the power of the Republican majority to enact the legislation. In addition, the platform pledges of both parties applied to Alaska as well as Hawaii.

In 1950 President Eisenhower was unequivocally in favor of admission of both Territories as a demonstration that "America practices what it preaches." More recently, however, his statements on the issue have conformed to the Republican attitude that Alaska is not ready.

Both Hawaii, which would in all probability send Republican representation to Congress, and Alaska, where Democratic strength is believed to be predominant, have long been ready for statehood. Hawaii is a bastion of military strength in the Pacific and is qualified in all ways to fulfill the responsibilities involved in statehood. This is true also of Alaska, which might some day have to bear the brunt of attack from across the strait separating the Territory from Soviet Russia.

As matters stand, America does not practice what it preaches and Congress has missed an opportunity to give an impressive demonstration against the spirit of colonialism which we criticize so freely when found in other nations.

Pierre L'Enfant: The National Capital Is His Monument

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 4, 1954

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very interesting article entitled "The National Capital Is His Monument," written by William A. Millen, and published in the Washington Star of August 2, 1954.

The article contains a most interesting discussion of the work done by Pierre L'Enfant, who designed the city of Washington.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NATIONAL CAPITAL IS HIS MONUMENT

(By William A. Millen)

Just 200 years ago today, there was born in Paris the man who was destined to fashion this National Capital.

Pierre Charles L'Enfant, son of an artist, grew up to become a major in the American Revolution and to be chosen by President George Washington to design the Federal city. It still bears his mark.

L'Enfant designed Washington for a population of 800,000—the size of the Paris of his day. But he made provision for expansion, and latter-day planners, the National Capital Planning Commission, the McMillan Commission, the Fine Arts Commission and others, have been guided by the charts he drew to keep pace with the city's growth. Yet the city has not yet achieved all the features of which he dreamed.

For designing the Federal city, he received $2,500 and a lot near the White House. In his latter days, he lived at Chillum Castle, rsidence of Dudley Digges, near Bladensburg, Md.

Frequently, he waited on Congress in an effort to get what he thought was his just reward for his services. He died, poor and disappointed, on June 4, 1825.

Nearly 79 years later, on April 28, 1909, his body was taken from a forgotten grave and reinterred in Arlington National Cemetery. His tomb is in front of Arlington House, and on it is inscribed his plan for Washington.

L'Enfant's skill as a designer of military construction, his services as a soldier (he was wounded in the battle of Savannah in 1779) and his renown as a drill master and disciplinarian brought him to the attention of General Washington. He designed, among other fortifications, Fort Washington, on the Potomac River opposite Mount Vernon.

Washington, Jefferson, and L'Enfant projected the new city with a magnificence that would have done credit to Louis XIV. L'Enfant foresight saved District taxpayers of today many millions of dollars.

For if the District had to provide now for widened thoroughfares for the motor age, as many cities have had to do, by tearing down blocks, it would cost millions. And to provide for the parks which L'Enfant arranged from the beginning would cost many millions more.

The Federal Government moved into the newly built Capital in 1800. Now, 154 years later, what has become of L'Enfant's dreams?

The lines on a map that L'Enfant drew have blossomed into full reality—mighty Government buildings, business houses, dwellings, all the panoply of a modern city.

L'Enfant fitted his plan to the topography, selecting the dominating sites. The White House and Capitol were the key points. And the streets and avenues he envisioned are traveled today by the world's great and near-great, by automobiles from all over the Nation, and not a few from abroad.

The parks he laid out are enjoyed by the multitudes—the apartment dwellers, the office workers, and others. His diagonal avenues speed traffic across town, although his circles do create a problem, but several have been tunneled under to speed the vehicles.

William T. Partridge, consulting architect of the National Capital Park and Planning Commission for many years, made a detailed study of the L'Enfant plan and its ramifications.

Dr. H. P. Caemmerer, Secretary of the Fine Arts Commission, made a special trip to France for research and wrote a noted life of L'Enfant and explained his contributions to the upbuilding of this city.

L'Enfant's equestrian statue of George Washington, a monument voted in 1783 by the Continental Congress, has been replaced by the Washington Monument.

It was moved to the southeast to secure a better foundation location than was available at the spot L'Enfant originally picked. Of course, there is an equestrian statue of General Washington in Washington Circle, but this was not what L'Enfant had in mind.

L'Enfant's historic column, from which distances were to be measured, is not at Lincoln Park, as he envisioned. The projected column has taken the form of the zero milestone designed by the architect Horace W. Peaslee, just south of the White House.

L'Enfant's column, on the banks of the Potomac, to commemorate the rise of a Navy has not yet materialized.

The famed Frenchman's "five grand fountains" with a "constant spout of water" have not been achieved either. The springs which he envisioned as feeding them have vanished or swerved into sewer channels. Yet Washington today does have its fountains, some of them fabulous, such as the Dupont Fountain, those of the National Art Gallery, Columbus Memorial, and the black ones in front of the Federal Reserve Building on Constitution Avenue. But they do not attain the general magnificence or the number or locations which L'Enfant, the master planner, saw in his mind's eye.

The Frenchman envisioned a bridge spanning the Eastern Branch (Anacostia River) at the end of East Capitol Street. After these many years, it is now under construction.

The canals and Tiber Creek of L'Enfant's day are gone. And his plan for a bridge across the Potomac above Georgetown at Three Sisters remains to be fulfilled.

His public walk "through which carriages may ascend to the upper square of the Federal House," as he called the Capitol, has its counterpart in the Mall and in the improvements to those grounds.

L'Enfant's "grand avenue 400 feet in breadth and about a mile in length" has found realization in the Mall, great central composition of the city. So has his "President's Park," now known as the Ellipse, just south of the White House. L'Enfant planned well, for he stimulated others to make this an even finer place—truly a world capital.

Veterans Better Get Smart

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HARLAN HAGEN

OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 3, 1954

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Speaker, journalistic candor is a commodity which has too small a place in the market place of modern journalism, particularly when that candor is exercised on behalf of people who do not have great wads of money and the other impedimenta of price or prestige which so greatly influence a large segment of the kept press in this country.

It is for this reason that the editorial comment of Mr. Edward Inman, publisher of the National Tribune-The Stars and Stripes, is so refreshing. Mr. Inman calls a spade a spade and he calls it on behalf of the disabled and widows and orphans; moreover, he does it in very able and informed fashion.

I submit herewith for consideration his latest editorial on the subject of veterans' benefits entitled "Veterans Better Get Smart":

On July 27, less than a week after the House of Representatives had knuckled down to its leadership and passed a sham cost-of-living pension increase for the country's war disabled and for the dependents of service dead, the Senate Committee on Finance met quietly and approved the bill without dotting an "i" or crossing a "t." And so, roughly, two-thirds of those on Veterans' Administration rolls—most of them victims of World War II—are probably in line for a slight boost in payments while the other third who need the increase most must do without.

In order to meet convention schedules, this comment must be written some hours in advance of the deadline. Barring another of those lengthy debates commonly known in the upper House as filibusters, or failing some other unexpected change in program, the gentlemen of the Senate were expected to approve H. R. 9020 in the same fashion as it went through the House. It was anticipated that there might be voiced a few mild and half-hearted protests but, looking forward to an early adjournment, it was general belief that the bill would go through without alteration and some two million veterans and dependents of veterans could look for a small additional stipend each month while the other million suffer keen disappointment.

To be perfectly honest and to give the devil his due, it should be stated that the representatives of major veterans organizations did what they could in both Houses to exact a more equitable piece of legislation from the Congressmen, but they were up against a cagey Republican leadership that used every wile and trick at its command. We have told most of the story in gruesome detail in two previous issues, and yet some added emphasis should be given to the lurid tale if the finale is to be fully understood. Despite the promises to grant increases in both service-connected compensation and nonservice-connected pensions in accord with ever rising living costs, and regardless of the fact that President Eisenhower amplified those promises by the written word, the GOP broke faith with the Nation's heroes and their hapless loved ones. Unfortunately it will be impossible to name all of the wayward, but that is something that every voter can find out for himself before next November by interrogating congressional candidates either directly or by letter, and, if he or she fails to do so in self-defense, no howl should go up when the next blow falls. And another one is coming.

Each and every spokesman for the veterans' groups appeared before the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs and presented convincing evidence. The committee reported a bill giving a fair increase to most classes, even though the measure did fall short in a few instances, and it appeared as if a modicum of justice would result. Chairman Rogers had a right to expect House action, and she cannot be charged fairly with neglect because she played the game honestly and reasoned she would receive like treatment from the House leadership. Looking back over the last month, each move in the tragedy is now clear. The majority leader, that great World War I veteran from Indiana, Charlie Halleck, hoped for a July 31 session end so kept quiet and stalled. Leo Allen, of Illinois, the Rules Committee chairman, another World War I veteran and equally as faithless, would not answer inquiries nor let the bill be considered, regardless of the fact that a majority of his powerful committee was on record for approval. They just waited long enough to let time take care of the situation, and they did it under White House direction. The whole administration strategy was to lead the hopeful to believe everything would come along in due time, and then apply the bullwhip and crucify the veteran class.

Had not that July 31 adjournment deadline been stressed so much by Speaker Joe Martin, it is certain that more Congressmen would have signed the Radwan discharge petition, and if the House leadership had not promised a quick compromise bill, the 218 signatures needed would have been obtained and the original bill would have gone to the Senate anyway, but the leadership resorted to deceit and, with the approval of party big-wigs, the watered down, pickayunish 5 percent sellout was forced down the throats of the House. We want our veteran friends and their families to remember this as the weeks go on. Our reaction is not one of bitterness so much as it is of resentment against faithlessness and broken promises. Never in all our experience have we witnessed a brokenhearted committee so beaten back with trickery that most of them took the floor to complain about the treatment meted out to them and expressed the wish that the Senate would do a better job. We have said, and we repeat here, that we cannot support any political party whose word is worth nothing.

We had hoped that representations made to all Senators and to the Senate Finance Committee by the veterans' organizations might have had some effect, but it is apparent as this is written, White House orders have cowed the Republicans over there too. Nobody knew that group was going to meet when it did, and for the purpose of acting on H. R. 9020. It would have done no good if they had. Mr. Eisenhower's spokesmen had given their orders and the Senators obeyed. We know that some futile efforts were to be made to seek amendments on the floor of the Senate and we hope that at least some of the solons might have at least had the courage to speak their minds but when we left town, having done all that was humanly possible to obtain simple justice for all former servicemen and their dependents, and when with heavy hearts we knew that common decency no longer motivated the congressional leadership in spite of all of its lofty claims, we did not anticipate any change in this touted relief bill would take place during Senate consideration. Even leaders of organized veterandom had been forced to give up in disgust.

Of course we are glad to know that the service-connected group—most of them, at least—were given a weak pat on the back and a few dimes to buy an extra cup of coffee once in a while. They always have come first in our book and they deserve primary consideration, but we wonder how much they will enjoy their bonanza when they count its value and when they realize that many thousands of others, whose ailments originated in uniform are to do without only because exacting proof is lacking. We wonder also how they will feel about it when they understand that all of the remainder of those veterans are totally disabled and are in need and that the widows and minor children in that class were forsaken by the Congress when they do not have enough to keep body and soul together. We wonder, too, how a few hundred prosperous Congressmen are going to feel when they stop long enough to realize how much relief is tied up in that 5-percent boost they gave to the service-connected veterans—78 cents a month to the 10-percent impaired and on up to less than 30 cents a day to the permanently and totally disabled. We have a sort of hunch that continuing inequities in the law enacted 2 years ago and the miserly treatment accorded in this act, to say nothing of the omission from benefits of those who most required relief is not going to set very well with any of them.

Above all, and while we know that every veteran in the land will utter up a prayer for the valiant lady from Massachusetts, Mrs. Rogers, who led their fight, and will be grateful to the minority of Congressmen who had enough loyalty in their hearts to battle for the defenders of their country, we wonder how many of our veterans and their families are going to take this sort of treatment lying down. If ever there were need for them to organize more strongly, and for the veterans' societies to join together in legislative action more harmoniously, that time has arrived. This administration has some great plans in the making for them. We intend next week to discuss another startling proposal aimed right at their hearts. Sadness should give birth to wisdom, and we admonish all veterans that from here on out they'd better begin to get smart.

Amending Section 413 (b) of the Foreign Service Act of 1946

SPEECH
OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 3, 1954

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, during my experience as a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee I have had the opportunity to come in contact with many officials of our State Department, and with members of our Foreign Service. Being deeply interested in an effective and efficient execution of our foreign policy, I could not help becoming concerned about the personnel problems of the Department of State.

Many authorities have testified as to the need for some overall changes in the personnel system of the Department. Under current conditions, there is poor utilization of manpower resources, and poor morale within the Department and within the Foreign Service. These factors hamper and detract from the proper execution of our foreign policy.

The bill which is before us is intended to alleviate this deplorable situation to a small extent. It would adjust salary rates so that persons entering the Foreign Service from the State Department will not have to take a loss in salary. I believe that this proposal, based on the recommendations of the Wriston committee, is meritorious and constructive. It ought to receive our full support.

It is my earnest hope that the passage of this bill will be but the initial step in the new series of constructive improvements which will give our Nation and our Government the best possible representation abroad. The Wriston committee has made a number of other recommendations which may require, and ought to receive, congressional approval. Early progress in this respect will benefit our entire Nation.

I should like to mention at this point that while I support the bill before us and favor many of the other recommendations of the Wriston committee, I feel that they fall short of the objectives which we should strive to attain. It has been my conviction that a Foreign Service Academy ought to be established by Congress in order to provide our Government with an adequate reservoir of able, especially trained, young men and women for overseas assignments. I had introduced bills in the 82d and 83d Congresses which provide for the establishment of such an academy, and I hope that this legislation will eventually receive favorable consideration from this body.

The execution of our foreign policy will always depend to a great extent on the caliber and morale of our Foreign Service personnel. We should strive, therefore, to assure that our Nation have the best possible representation abroad.

The approval of the bill before us will be a step in the right direction.

To Reorganize the Capitol Police Force

SPEECH

OF

HON. WAYNE L. HAYS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 29, 1954

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 9413) to reorganize the Capitol Police force in order to increase its efficiency in the performance of its duties.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, this amendment simply makes this a hybrid affair instead of being a strictly professional police force. It has been pointed out that it might be necessary to have professionals placed in strategic places in the galleries, and so forth, but I do not really see any necessity for having a well-trained professional policeman out directing traffic here in the Capitol plaza, where numerous ones are, at the street crossings, and so on. I am very serious about this. A lot of Capitol policemen have been college students who have come here and worked for 3 or 4 years directing traffic and doing various chores for which they really do not need any special training other than that which they can get in a couple of weeks. This would give an opportunity for some of those boys still to be employed. At the same time, you can have 50 percent of the police force on a professional basis to do the actual professional police work that you need done around the Capitol and the other buildings.

I shall not take any further time. That is what I have in mind by the amendment.

The Housing Scandal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 4, 1954

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record paragraphs 12 to 17, inclusive, of the Whaley-Eaton American Letter, of September 24, 1949, relating to the housing scandal. These paragraphs point out many of the very things which are now being developed in connection with the FHA investigation which is being so ably and thoroughly conducted by the distinguished senior Senator from Indiana, who is chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency.

There being no objection, the paragraphs were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

THE HOUSING SCANDAL

(Whaley-Eaton American Letter, September 24, 1949, pars. 12–17)

The boom in rental housing has Washington worried. The situation has the makings of a national scandal, in terms of profits to speculative builders. They are reaping a dollar harvest because of a guaranty system under which they cannot lose. FHA can hardly refuse mortgage guaranties on new housing so long as another Federal agency, the Rent Control Administrator, is constantly crying shortage. Politically, every argument favors helping the boom along. Yet there is evidence that it has already gone too far in some areas.

Danger spots are Washington, D. C. and New York City, but other possible boom centers are Los Angeles, northern New Jersey, and Miami. Hardly a week passes without announcements of tremendous new projects in the two major cities. This is high-cost, high-rent construction.

The apartment-house builder is fully covered. He can try to outguess the building market a year or two hence. If he is wrong he has 100-percent protection from an FHA guaranty (under sec. 608 of the FHA Act) on a mortgage which presumably covers 90 percent of necessary current cost or December 1947 cost, whichever is lower.

Congress has played into the builders' hands. Five times this year, FHA's authority to make these so-called section 608 mortgage guaranties has been on the verge of expiring, and five times the deadline has been extended. Each time a new flood of applications developed. While the latest deadline is October 31, the important point is that FHA gives the builder a future commitment.

FHA has already, in 8 months of 1949, agreed to guarantee multiple mortgages covering 135,000 housing units. The total is almost double that for the full year 1948. Safeguarded by his FHA commitment, the builder could go ahead with construction even after the boom collapsed.

The mortgage lender is equally shielded. The RFC's mortgage-buying subsidiary, Federal National Mortgage Association, has now bought or committed itself to buy at par some $250 million of these section 608 multiple-housing mortgages.

Private United States Technical Assistance Exceeds Government Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 26, 1954

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, the Subcommittee on Foreign Economic Policy of the House Foreign Affairs Committee—Jacob K. Javits, chairman; Hon. Donald L. Jackson, Hon. Karl M. LeCompte, Hon. Laurie C. Battle, and Hon. Burr P. Harrison—has released a Survey of United States Private Technical Assistance. The survey shows that the technical assistance programs carried on by United States business concerns, foundations, trade unions, farm organizations, and educational institutions, as well as by the missionary and other religious organizations working in this field, aggregated directly at least an estimated $148 million in measurable terms for 1953 and in technical assistance which could not be monetarily evaluated an amount in terms of value substantially exceeding this amount—certainly a total materially greater than the technical cooperation program of the United States which, including its contribution to the United Nations program, totaled approximately $109 million for the fiscal year 1954. United States consulting, engineering, and contracting firms under contract with foreign countries for technical assistance and economic development purposes rendered technical assistance valued at approximately $242 million over the period 1950 to 1952.

The conclusions contained in the report are as follows:

First. Because of the magnitude and importance of United States private technical assistance, continuing study should be made of this endeavor.

Second. Government agencies charged with technical assistance responsibility, like the Foreign Operations Administration, Department of State, Department of Agriculture, and Department of Commerce, should review their technical assistance activities to determine how best to stimulate and coordinate their technical assistance activities with those of the private groups.

Third. Managers, trustees, directors, and owners of private establishments of all kinds, capable of providing United States foreign technical assistance, should consider expanding existing, or undertaking new activities in this field as an outstanding contribution to the success of United States foreign policy.

Fourth. The House Foreign Affairs Committee has, since the beginning of the technical cooperation program, recognized the importance of the contribution of private groups to the attainment of the foreign policy objectives of the United States. While many private groups make such a contribution, perhaps the most significant is made by United States private investment. In its report on the Mutual Security Act of 1952, the House Foreign Affairs Committee stated:

> One of the basic principles which the Congress has emphasized in the statutes governing the mutual security program is the importance of private capital investment as a potent force in raising the economic and social standards of underdeveloped areas. Not only does private investment bring capital, but it also brings with it technical knowledge and management experience, so sorely needed. Further, it relieves the American taxpayer, in the long run, of the burden of governmental foreign aid where cooperative aid can be appropriately handled by private sources. Moreover, private capital offers a natural vehicle for close cooperation between private citizen and private citizen rather than between government and government, and hence is of special importance. (H. Rept. No. 1922, 82d Cong., p. 62.)

It is this "cooperation between private citizen and private citizen" which should be encouraged, because it represents a true expression in tangible terms of the desire of the people of the United States to share their knowledge and skills with the peoples of the free world.

Of the estimated ascertainable amount directly expended by United States voluntary agencies for foreign technical-assistance programs in 1953, $17,560,000 was expended by the voluntary agencies, $10 million by foundations and $120 million by religious groups. An estimate of expenditures by private industry and farm, labor, and similar organizations would be misleading, as most of this is in kind or incidental to the operations of business enterprises. Although the exact dollar value cannot be ascertained, it clearly represents a very appreciable total.

The report emphasizes the fact that the aggregate United States technical-assistance effort, private and governmental combined, has become a major aspect of United States foreign policy. It represents an important part of the offensive against communism in terms of economic and social improvement in the countries of the free world undertaken under the leadership of the United States. It is the intensification of this kind of offensive behind an effective shield of military power through regional organization and an effective United Nations, which has the best chance of avoiding world war III and repelling the mortal Communist threat.

The report also shows the need for the integration of the free world, especially in terms of production, marketing, and trade.

I am confident that with the broad-scale technical-assistance and economic-development effort, the free world can be integrated, the need for any trade with the Communist bloc obviated, and such a powerful economic attraction set up for defections from the Communist bloc as to mark a major recession in the number of nations and peoples which it dominates and controls.

Recommendations for the Improvement of the Diplomatic Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 4, 1954

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, not long ago there came to my attention a discussion of the problems relating to the United States Foreign Service. The statement is not of my own writing, but was made by one who has given a great deal of thought and attention to the subject. Because it is interesting and thought provoking, I ask unanimous consent that the statement may be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Problem

To strengthen the diplomatic corps institutionally in order that it may effectively function as a political instrument of national policy in the cold war.

FACTS BEARING ON THE PROBLEM

1. The armed services have an educational system which trains its officers at every important step in their career. Selection of cadets by Members of Congress insures nationwide representation from every congressional district and enables the services to establish roots in the national conscience; these constituting important backstops for winning the confidence of the American public. There are the service academies for the cadets, tactical schools for promising junior officers, service war colleges for enterprising officers of the middle ranks, and the facilities of the National War College and Industrial College of the Armed Services for senior officers looking toward flag and field rank. From the beginning of his career, each cadet is subjected to a thorough development and scrutiny in the classroom, in the living quarters, on the drill and recreational fields. This applies not only to his mental processes but equally to the human factors of dedication to duty, ability to get along with his fellow man, emotional stability, sense of honor and fair play, and other attributes of common sense and integrity and reliability so essential to military leadership. Those failing to meet high standards mentally, morally and physically are weeded out and those destined to set the standard move ahead through the ranks.

2. A substantial number of senior officers matriculating from the educational system each year are assigned to the Joint Staff of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. There they have a further opportunity to increase their efficiency in the planning function so essential to the formulation of policy. In the process of probing all important aspects of major problems of national strategy, they are encouraged to organize their thinking processes in an orderly fashion.

3. The diplomatic corps has no comparable facilities for a nationwide selection or comprehensive training of its personnel at this critical juncture when it must be relied on as our principal instrument for foreign policy recommendations, political negotiation and intelligence. The corps must be strengthened if it is to have the confidence of the American people and if the Nation is to be understood and enjoy prestige abroad so essential to the fulfillment of its cold war role of free world leadership. Should the United States fail in this role, the cold war will be lost and the ugly alternative of global conflict posed with all the devastating implications of the thermonuclear era.

4. The following situation was observed to exist in a key country of the free world. When asked by a senior member of his staff, "What is the United States policy in this country," the Ambassador angrily replied, "Ask the Secretary of State." These are words of one who fulfilled the public trust of high diplomatic office by devoting his attention primarily to writing his memoirs over a period of 7 months. The senior political officer refused to undertake travel to cover important political developments because of personal inconvenience. Another key officer proposed characterizing to a large public audience the American capitalistic society as a "classless state" more accurately personifying Marxist theory than communism. Still another key officer submitted no political or other reports on his important district over a period of 17 months, despite instructions calling for fortnightly reports. Another key officer was not competent to report important political developments in his district. Neither the Ambassador, the senior political officer, or other key officers in question made any real attempt to obtain from the agricultural community the aspirations of its people, even though the government relied on the rural constituencies for its chief source of support and the nation was becoming increasingly susceptible to Communist subversion. Despite records of foreign experience, each ranging from 15 to 25 years, these officers had never been properly indoctrinated for service in the country in question.

5. The Kremlin addresses its efforts toward subverting and controlling the political institutions of other nations by dealing directly with the labor unions, dissident minorities, the churches, the intellectuals, the impoverished, the schools, and other aspects of national life. Our diplomats can hardly expect to counter the spreading influence of communism if they confine their efforts to the foreign office, a small circle of other government officials, members of the diplomatic and consular corps, and dowagers who measure social prominence by the number of diplomats attending their functions. A grassroots program on our part is urgently needed to ascertain the aspirations of others and to convey an understanding of our aims.

6. There is little wonder that the loss of China and Czechoslovakia came to us somewhat as a surprise, that Indochina is rapidly slipping, that France and Italy are at the crossroads, that Guatemala is leading the vanguard south of the border, and that vital areas in Africa and elsewhere are inflamed with racial strife and struggles of nationalism and colonialism.

7. The first Hoover Commission report suggested that the operational function of the Department of State be strengthened primarily by the establishment of geographic bureaus. The planning function was not sufficiently emphasized. A policy planning staff was established but its director and small staff became so valuable to top departmental officials in handling overall operational problems that the staff never performed effec-

tively as a counterpart of the Joint Staff of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Even had the staff been permitted to so function, there would have been the difficulty of finding officers trained in the planning function. It is not surprising that some of our key officers abroad ask "What is our policy?" and their superiors do not know the answers. Nor is it surprising that senior Government officials recently issued conflicting statements on national policy in respect to Indochina.

8. Other measures for increasing the effectiveness of the diplomatic corps should include a unification of the two personnel systems and numerous officer classifications, the establishment of a competent independent inspection corp, and an effective exercise of the "selection out" provisions applicable to the diplomatic corp.

9. The existence of one personnel system for the Department of State and a second for the Foreign Service, of two categories of officers at home and three more abroad tend to have a divisive effect at a time when unity of purpose is paramount. The inspection corp is staffed largely with officers of the Foreign Service junior to those whose operations they review and often without any special training or experience in sound business practices or administration. It could more effectively detect incompetence, waste, and poor administration if its key personnel were drawn from the executive level of industry or government, and its findings could be brought directly to the attention of top departmental officers in charge of administration.

10. As rapidly as competently trained officers can be brought to the fore, selection out and retirement provisions should be applied to those who fail to meet high standards of competence and integrity. The need for winning the confidence of the American people and for building up our prestige abroad is paramount. It follows that the efforts of the many fine officers in the diplomatic corps should not be permitted to be overshadowed by the shortcomings of the incompetent.

CONCLUSIONS

1. At a critical stage in the cold war when the diplomatic corps must be relied on as the principal instrument of national policy for collecting intelligence, conveying understanding, and forging unity and defensive arrangement among the free nations, it has no adequate facilities comparable to those of the armed services for the nationwide selection and comprehensive training of its officers nor for the exercise of the important function of planning.

2. An educational system should be established for the diplomatic corps comparable to that created for nationwide selection and comprehensive training of the officers of the armed services.

3. As a further means of increasing the effectiveness of the diplomatic corps, the Department of State should have an office to handle the planning function comparable to the Joint Staff of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

4. Other measures to strengthen the diplomatic corps should include a unification of the personnel systems and officer classifications, the establishment of a competent inspection corps, and an effective selection out or retirement of personnel failing to meet high standards of competence and integrity.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. That Congress be requested to provide authority and funds for the establishment of a Diplomatic Academy of the United States providing for nationwide selection of candidates by Members of Congress, for their comprehensive training and indoctrination, and for commissioning as officers in a unified diplomatic corps graduates from this academy;

2. That arrangements be made, including the enactment of new legislation as necessary, for the establishment of a unified diplomatic corps, a planning office in the Department of State patterned after the Joint Staff of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and a competent inspection corps at a sufficiently high level in the administrative chain of command in the Department of State for it to function effectively; and

3. That commensurate with the availability of competently trained and indoctrinated officers in the unified diplomatic service, selection out and retirement provisions be exercised to bring the corps to the highest possible level of efficiency.

S. 16: Loosen His Tongue?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI

OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 4, 1954

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, from the hemlock cup of Socrates to the screams at Salem, from the cries of the French Huguenots to the curses at Cromwell's cruelties, history appears to caution against use of the methods called for in S. 16, a bill to loosen a man's tongue when charged with endangering the Nation's security, a bill to loosen his tongue when he will not talk by granting him immunity from punishment, no matter how dastardly to others his actions in crime have or might have been.

The bill seems to spare the mastermind and condemn the jackal. The "brain" has henchmen on whom to squeal, fingermen rarely do. Has anyone yet heard who masterminded the disappearance and distribution of 500 tons of opium which vanished off the world's market in 1950, and which, watered down for sale by pushers, grossed, if completely sold, over $2 billion? The papers have been filled with wholesale arrests and convictions of dope peddlers. Applied to narcotics, this bill could serve as a green light to the big-time brain. Applied to treason, sedition, and conspiracy to overthrow the Government, be it by fraud, force, violence, or deliberate and unwarranted division, this bill holds out hope for the brain and condemns the jackal.

Lucky Luciano? Perhaps he saved considerable lives at Salerno by his intimate knowledge of the terrain in Sicily, which he is reported to have given to the military in exchange for pardon and exile. A devil's brew. The lives lost at Anzio, at Rapido, and at Monte Cassini seem to have balanced those saved at Salerno. And Luciano is reported carrying on his game from abroad. What was gained? Italy for the free world? Perhaps. Who can say?

Christendom? Forty percent of the world's population. In 1,954 years, how it has wept with man's inhumanity to man. And before Christendom, in Greece, the hemlock cup of Socrates. By our standards, his trial was a mockery of justice. Charged with endangering the national security, he was arrogant, defiant. The Greek counterpart of the Congress of the United States, in open vote, by overwhelming majority, condemned him to death. His teachings inflamed sensibilities, insulted the gods. His prosecutors, because of his renown, wanted to exile him, grant him immunity. He scorned them, openly, defiantly. He would not talk, or recant. Only the hemlock loosened his tongue; in a dying gasp, it curled back, down his throat.

Today, Socrates, in some quarters, is said to have given Europe its sense of soul; our Lord Jesus Christ showed man its beatitude in redemption. Both were killed. Man inflamed; how mortal, how weak.

And before Socrates, and before our Lord Jesus Christ, 40 centuries ago, at Jericho, is revealed the cruelty of man against man. Slaughter. Slaughter. Fear. Ignorance. Bedevilment.

Then there was Saladin, pride of Islam. In the crusades, he made the Christians reel, turned them back from the promised land. Islam? To deviate from its belief in the one and all-powerful God, meant death, not excommunication or exile, but death.

Then, after five or six hundred years of Islamic domination, the Christians in Spain threw off Moslem rule, with its concept of women as chattel. And in that fight for liberation, the kindly Christians, hardened like steel to the sensibilities of others and inflamed by the arrogance and defiance and invidious display of others, cast aside the municipal laws which guaranteed utmost protection to the individual. Blood flowed. Islamic influence was driven out of Spain. At what price?

What of the Orient? And its attempt to loosen men's tongues? In November of 1950 in Hamhung, North Korea, the following story came into X Corps headquarters: A traitor—North Korean—was captured. He would not talk. His captors stretched him out on the ground, ripped open his clothes and on his stomach, placed a live rat; then they covered the rat with a pan, on which they put burning coals. The man still would not talk. The rat had only one way to go. It dug into the entrails of the man.

Man. How weak, when inflamed.

The organizations of man have gone full cycle, each split down the middle by man's haste with man. First there was big family, with its feudalism and serfs; then there was big church with its struggle against Islam; then there was big business, with its struggle against the concepts of family and church in its quest for profit and production, with labor expendable; then came big government with mass participation, in democratic America; in name and mockery in Soviet Russia. Each has been to the fore in claiming the allegiance of man—big family, big church, big business, and big government. And each time man has been frightened, and panicked, indiscretion followed, with bloodshed in its train. Will we ever learn?

Can we ameliorate with promises of immunity the harm done by the guilty? Does not the manliness of America speak up to say: "To each his just deserts, so help him God"?

Why do we try to release our moral brakes, as this bill does, at a time when absolute standards of honesty, purity, unselfishness and love beckon us here on earth?

The measure should not pass. Let us apprehend the guilty, try them, one by one, if need be, firmly and with surefootedness and the ages will not mock us as they do the Greeks because of Socrates the Romans because of Christ and the men at Jericho. And as they will the men of the Kremlin.

Vessel Replacement Under the Merchant Marine Act, 1936

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 26, 1954

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, in my remarks of July 26 on Government support for shipbuilding, I referred briefly to the provisions of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, which call for replacement of overaged vessels in our subsidized merchant fleet. I now wish to develop that point at greater length and to indicate the reasons why strict adherence to the provisions of law in that regard is necessary to the national well-being.

In the debate on H. R. 9936, the supplemental appropriation bill for fiscal 1955, a considerable amount of oratory was expended in denouncing the appropriation request for $44,500,000 for payment of construction-differential subsidy and national defense allowances on 4 passenger-cargo vessels; 2 for Moore-McCormack Lines and 2 for Grace Line. During the debate on H. R. 9936, and later in my remarks of July 26, I undertook to answer some of the objections which were raised. A fuller explanation is, however, apparently in order.

The Moore-McCormack and Grace Line ships represent only a small part of the overall problem. Ships, like most man-made machinery, are subject to wear and physical depreciation; and more important from the standpoint of national security, they rapidly become obsolete as technological improvements in design and construction are developed and, for wartime service, as the speed and efficiency of submarines increases and as other antishipping weapons become more potent. That fact was very much in the minds of the authors of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, when they inserted into the act some very specific provisions requiring that vessels operating under subsidies should be replaced no later than 20 years after the date of construction, and also providing for construction subsidies to encourage the replacement of obsolete vessels.

Throughout the Merchant Marine Act a 20-year period of operation is recognized as the maximum, efficient, economic life of a merchant vessel; however, the act also offers special inducements to encourage earlier replacement by authorizing the Maritime Administration to purchase vessels from the operators before the 20-year period is up, with the purchase price to apply against the construction cost of replacement vessels. Sections 507 and section 510 (b) of the act make such provisions. Section 510 (g) of the act specifically prohibits the commercial use of any Government-owned vessels over 20 years of age except during periods of emergency.

For vessels operated under operating-differential subsidies, section 605 (b) specifically states that "no operating-differential subsidy shall be paid for the operation of a vessel that is more than 20 years of age" except under very special circumstances, and adds the requirement that in each such case a report shall be submitted to Congress justifying the exception. In various other provisions of the operating-differential subsidy sections of the act the intent of Congress that the subsidies shall be used to encourage maintenance of a modern merchant marine is made quite clear.

Pursuant to this purpose both the old Maritime Commission and the present Maritime Administration have written into their operating-differential subsidy contracts with subsidized American shipping lines a requirement that vessels in the subsidized service be replaced by the time they are 20 years of age. The requirement is clear and specific, and it imposes on both the Government and the operator a definite obligation to insure timely replacement of vessels. These contracts are legal and binding on the shipping lines—they should certainly be no less legal and binding on the Government.

The recent debate on inclusion of $44,500,000 of appropriations for such replacement passenger-cargo vessels for Grace Line and Moore-McCormack Lines emphasizes the manner in which this obligation on the part of the Government has been disregarded in a short-sighted attempt to economize. To highlight the importance of this problem I wish to place in the Record at this point a copy of a letter written in April of 1953 by Mr. Emmet J. McCormack, chairman of the board of Moore-McCormack Lines, Inc. Mr. McCormack's letter addressed itself to the request for funds for vessel replacement which was then before Congress. The points he stresses, however, are equally applicable to the similar situation which prevailed again this year on both the Moore-McCormack ships and Grace Line ships—and, more important now that funds for these vessels seem assured, they apply just as strongly to the appropriations which we must make in the near future for other ships for other companies.

Moore-McCormack Lines, Inc.,
New York, N. Y., April 14, 1953.

Hon. Leverett Saltonstall,
United States Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

My Dear Senator: Pursuant to my conversation with Mr. Minot, I desire to outline the various phases of our problem with respect to the building of our ships:

We realize that a new administration must reaffirm for themselves the answers to some of the serious questions which confront us, and that this takes time. Only the urgency of our problem could force us to press for its early decision. Contrary to testimony, as to the urgency, I would say that in view of the present good neighbor fleet being 25 years old—notwithstanding the fact that they are seaworthy in every respect—there is a very urgent need of replacement. The foreign passenger ships coming into our trade are offering serious competition because of their newness and modern design, and it can easily be appreciated how difficult and uneconomical it is to try to operate ships 25 years of age.

With respect to the appropriation for new ships, you will note that a total of $107 million was requested in the 1954 budget. This amount has been requested yearly for 4 or 5 years but because of the controversy over the building of passenger ships, there were no applications before the Federal Maritime Board for the use of these appropriations.

The need of new passenger ships has been present all this time. The Merchant Marine Act, 1936, requires that we obtain and operate such vessels as will enable us to meet foreign competition and our operating subsidy contract with Federal Maritime Board contains a clause that we must replace the present passenger ships with newer ones. Under the law the ship could either be built under section 501, or section 504. Some operators may be able to finance their share of the costs entirely out of reserve funds; others may find it necessary to require financing under section 501. In my judgment, by reason of the large amount of reserve funds, and provided we were permitted to use the entire fund, we could build under section 504, and in that case the amount of funds required would be as follows:

In case the full estimate of $67 million is needed for the building of our 2 ships, and provided a construction subsidy was allowed of a minimum of 40 percent, the total amount required to be appropriated would be $26,800,000. Inasmuch as the payments would no doubt be spread over 2 years, the amount to be appropriated for the fiscal year currently under consideration (1954) would probably be about $13 million. However, our estimate as to the cost of these 2 ships is considerably less than $67 million and it is quite possible that the appropriation would be less than $12 million for the fiscal year 1954.

If in the judgment of the Maritime Administration the financial structure of the company would be too greatly weakened by utilization of its entire reserve funds for this purpose, the difference between what they do permit to be used and the total cost should be made available under section 501.

I would also like to point out that our reserve funds in 1955, allowing for depreciation deposits only will exceed $39 million. These funds have been an accumulation, to a great extent, of deposits of depreciation.

It would be unfortunate if companies conserve their funds in compliance with the act of 1936, only to find that the Government will not carry out its share of the provisions of the act of 1936.

I am, therefore, ready to recommend to our Board of Directors that we proceed under either section 501 or 504, subject to the Maritime Administration determining the amount that we can withdraw and the balance if needed to be obtained on mortgage under provisions of section 501. From what I can observe the maximum amount required by us will be $35 million, leaving an estimated amount still in the fund of $4 million to $5 million. Of course this will be subject to review by the Maritime Administration.

I have not mentioned the problems of the shipbuilders who, I understand, are being confronted with little or no backlog for 1954 shipbuilding. I am sure they have also brought this to your attention.

I thank you most sincerely, dear Senator, for your interest in this matter and I place myself at your disposal at any time for any further information that you may desire.

Respectfully yours,
EMMET J. MCCORMACK,
Chairman of the Board.

Mr. Speaker, we find ourselves currently in a situation where practically all of our operating ship tonnage, passenger, cargo, or passenger-cargo combinations, was built during the war years. They are fast approaching the end of their recognized 20-year period of efficient use. The existence of this large fleet of comparatively modern vessels during the immediate postwar years resulted in a dearth of new shipbuilding in our shipyards. During those years the need for converting war-built vessels for practical commercial operations took up much of this slack. However, we are now at a point—actually we are past it—where we must put new ships on the ways for three solid reasons. First, our shipbuilding capacity, both in terms of facilities and personnel, will shortly disintegrate completely if we do not give it work. It is already in an extremely bad way. Secondly, a terrific number of newly constructed vessels built in foreign shipyards and operating under foreign flags, are putting our merchant marine to shame and placing it in a position where it will soon be noncompetitive unless we do something to build vessels to keep pace. Thirdly, these first two conditions add up to the most serious possible threat to our continued existence as a free nation. This statement has been made time and time again by myself and by the recognized authorities in the field; by every committee or commission set up to study the problem; by the Department of Defense, the Department of Commerce, by agencies set up to assess our mobilization possibilities and needs, and every other branch of the executive concerned with the problem.

We must have an operating and reserve fleet of fast, modern vessels of all types if we are to be prepared to meet the immediate mobilization needs for troop and supply transport if and when war comes. We must have a strong, active, and well dispersed nucleus of going shipyards ready to expand at a moment's notice into a full-fledged wartime operation to provide replacements and heavy additions to that fleet immediately upon the outbreak of war. I am not saying we should, or that we would like to, or that it would be nice if we did have such a fleet and such a group of active shipyards. I am saying that we must have them if we want to win any war in which we may be forced to fight. We do not have them now. I, as an individual Congressman, or any commission, can do little more than make such a statement. It is up to the executive agencies and to Congress to put into being a program which will give us those ships and those shipyards.

The American Bureau of Shipping in June of this year reported some very interesting and very discouraging facts on present and future merchant ship construction throughout the world. Discouraging that is from the viewpoint of the United States and our pretensions as a leading maritime nation, but certainly encouraging to those nations with whom we must compete for world trade. They were also undoubtedly encouraging to Soviet Russia and its satellites, who know if we do not that in any future war it must be the United States to whom the free world must look for ships just as in World War II—statements of dogooders anxious to build up foreign shipyards at the expense of our own to the contrary.

The ABS report shows that in April 1954, there were building or on order in shipyards of the world, exclusive of Russia and its satellites, a total of 1,350 merchant vessels of 1,000 gross tons of over. Of that huge number only 35 were under construction in the shipyards of the United States, and there was not a single new contract for American construction. Further, of those 35 vessels all but 2 will have been completed by December of this year, and there are still no contracts signed for new ships at this time.

The 35 ships being built in United States shipyards will total 515,885 gross tons—only 4.2 percent of the 12,395,000 total gross tonnage under construction in the non-Communist world. That puts us in seventh place among the shipbuilding nations represented. Great Britain was far in the lead with 38.4 percent of all ship tonnage under construction; next were Sweden with 12.5 percent; our erstwhile enemy, Germany, with 10.8 per cent; Holland with 9.1 percent; France with 6.3 percent; and Norway with 4.7 percent. Japan followed the United States with 3.6 percent of the total tonnage.

Under construction in the United States are 13 dry-cargo vessels and 22 tankers. As I pointed out previously, construction of all but 2 of these vessels will have been completed by December of this year. The recently authorized programs for construction of tankers will, let us hope, result in awards of contracts for up to 30 such vessels to afford a start on the program the Department of Defense has outlined as their estimate of the minimum requirements for that class of vessel in our merchant fleet. In testimony before the Potter subcommittee of the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee in June of last year, Rear Adm. R. E. Wilson, Deputy Commander of the Military Sea Transportation Service, furnished the Department of Defense officially approved estimates as to the minimum requirements for each class of vessel considered to be necessary components of the existing merchant fleet and recommended the start of a phased program "to bring the active operating United States merchant fleet possessing acceptable defense characteristics up to the numerical limits required to meet the initial needs of the Department of Defense" in the event of emergency. In the tanker category, Admiral Wilson stated that we should have on hand as active operating units at least 7,060,000 deadweight tons capable of a sustained speed of 20 knots. Relatively few of our present tankers meet that requirement. The danger to be feared in the tanker-construction program is that this first approved phase of the recommended "phased program" will be the last. We must be on the alert to prevent that happening, either through refusal of those responsible for appropriations to approve whatever funds may be necessary if private industry cannot bear the load alone or through such continued procrastination in making necessary plans or recommendations as we have observed in the responsible executive agencies during the past few years.

With regard to a dry-cargo ship-construction program, the situation is far more serious. The last of the 35 Truman administration mariner ships will soon be completed. No new contracts have been let. As far as has been announced no contracts are under consideration, either by private industry or by the Maritime Administration. The Mariners were constructed under the provisions of title V of the Merchant Marine Act as an important step in permitting the act to perform the job it was intended to do as outlined in the declaration of policy which is title I of the act. That declaration is the official policy of the United States on merchant marine matters. It states in part that—

> It is necessary for the national defense * * * that the United States shall have a merchant marine * * * capable of serving as a naval and military auxiliary in time of war or national emergency * * * composed of the best-equipped, safest, and most suitable types of vessels, constructed in the United States and manned with a trained and efficient citizen personnel.

In his testimony before the Potter subcommittee Admiral Wilson outlined the official view of the Defense Department as to the requirements for cargo vessels to meet such war or emergency need. He stated that "there is a requirement for 13,899,600 deadweight tons" possessing a sustained speed of at least 18 knots. Our present fleet of freighters, active and inactive, includes 2,642 vessels totaling 27,402,000 deadweight tons. However, 1,781 of these vessels totaling 18,375,000 tons are in the laid up fleet and over 1500 of these are badly outdated Liberty ships with a speed of only 10 knots and under. The greater part of the remainder are Victory type vessels with speeds of 14 to 16 knots. Very few of the dry cargo vessels in our active privately operated fleet or in the Military Sea Transport Service fleet meet the 18-knot speed requirement set up by the Defense Department in the light of military requirements.

We are, therefore, sadly deficient in cargo vessel tonnage adequate for defense needs or to keep our fleet in a competitive position in the face, as an example, of the 292 modern ships Great Britain now has on her ways or of the remainder of the 725 new cargo vessels under construction elsewhere in the world. Yet we are doing nothing about it and we even find responsible Members of this House quibbling about spending a paltry few dollars in a makeshift program designed to patch up some of our obsolete vessels to put them in condition to be at least partially capable of efficient performance.

The Merchant Marine Act of 1936 in titles V and VII contains ample authority for the Maritime Administration to put into high gear a program of cargo vessel construction to remedy the deficiencies in our fleet, either by encouraging private operators to replace their aging vessels through adequate construction subsidies, or by Maritime Administration construction of vessels for sale or charter. Such a program is now overdue in order to give the United States Merchant Marine the fast, modern vessels it needs, and to provide an orderly start in the replacement of the war-built fleet which will become obsolete en masse during the years 1960 to 1965. Everybody agrees that it should be done, but the administration has failed even to accept as its official program the minimum 60 ships per year suggestion recently advanced by the Under Secretary of Commerce, much less come forward with detailed blueprints for congressional approval. With the critical situation in which our shipyards find themselves for lack of work and with the increasing weakness of our position in international affairs, there can be no excuse for delay in putting the Merchant Marine Act to work to remedy the growing deficiencies of our merchant marine. If the executive agencies of the Government do not come forward with an intelligent, adequate, and coordinated plan to do so, then the Congress should do it for them rather than meekly accepting such hit-or-miss proposals as were presented to us this year—proposals which do not even pretend to meet the problem squarely.

The third major category of vessels required for our national defense is that of passenger vessels suitable for use as speedy troop transports. In this category we are also far from meeting the minimum requirements outlined by Admiral Wilson in his testimony before the Potter subcommittee. The Defense estimate is that we should have an aggregate gross tonnage of 250,900 in this class of vessels with a sustained speed capability of 22 knots or greater. Despite the howls of protest raised in uninformed quarters, through the determined action of the previous administration we do now have available three postwar-built modern passenger liners capable of conversion into troop carriers. However, let me recall again Mr. Emmett McCormack's letter pointing out the resistance and delay encountered by his company in their negotiations with the Maritime Administration for replacement of the passenger-cargo vessels on the South America route—a delay which might have been and might still be extremely costly to the people of the United States if we are faced with a war situation and an immediate need for fast troop transports. The Government's prolonged refusal to honor its obligation to assist in construction of vessel replacements as provided in the Merchant Marine Act and in contracts with the operators was an invitation to disaster. It should not be repeated on the many vessel replacements which will be up for negotiation in the immediate future. Rather, and in conformity with the intent of the Merchant Marine Act and with the national interest in speedy modernization of our merchant marine, the Maritime Administration should encourage private shipping lines to the greatest extent possible and with all of its authority under the act, to replace their aging vessels before they become 20 years old.

The Department of Defense 1953 analysis indicates that we need right now at least an additional 165 cargo ships, 43 tankers, and 6 passenger vessels with the speed and other characteristics required to make them an asset rather than a liability in a war effort. In addition to a fleet of the size indicated national security requires continuously active shipyards and a fully employed nucleus of skilled shipyard workers, and we do not have them in sufficient quantity. The solution is inescapable. We should be signing contracts and laying new keels right today and bringing these two minuses together to make a plus. Why are we not doing so? The answer to that is also inescapable.. The administrative officers of our Government, charged with the duty of implementing their authority under the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 to preserve the safety of the people of the United States as far as shipping preparedness can do so, have failed to discharge their legal and moral responsibility—either specifically under the provisions of law or generally as servants of the people. That failure should not be taken lightly.

It is encouraging to note that the present Chairman of the Federal Maritime Board, as shown by recent testimony before the Merchant Marine Committee, is apparently not taking it lightly. He, at least, seems to have developed a realization of just how serious a situation we are facing. It is to be hoped that his constructive attitude will be reflected in the decisions of his superior officers in the present administration, who up to this point have let the national security get in a state of dangerous unbalance because of considerations of political expediency in balancing the budget. Red ink on the Government's books is not as important to me as red blood needlessly shed through unpreparedness, and while some may think an unbalanced budget means political suicide I prefer that to the national suicide we are now committing by failure to support our merchant marine.

Spirit of the Plains—Song of the Islands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 29, 1954

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, spirited as we are, in our history, by the message of the plains and the song of the islands, one wonders how it will ever be possible for anyone to subdue our people, be it by fraud, force, violence, or division.

On Hawaii in the office of the Governor, on the wall, a colorful shield seems to symbolize the song of the islands when it says:

> The living land shall be preserved by righteousness.

Recently, deep in the plains of the West, one of the few survivors of the Dieppe raid, had this to say of our people:

> America will give you the shirt off its back if you are man enough to earn it; it will take the hide off your back if you are not man enough to keep it there.

Fraud, force, violence, or division. Can they long succeed against the spirit of the plains, or the song of the islands?

Production Junk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 27, 1954

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the Record, I include herewith an editorial from the New Era, Reading, Pa.:

PRODUCTION JUNK

A writer for the Wall Street Journal advances an interesting speculation as to the need for an occasional economic slowdown in the Nation.

Thinking in terms of material things and ignoring the human element, he suggests that recessions stimulate competition and thus force producers to become more efficient, invent new products for manufacture, and to replace old machinery with new.

In a moment of near exhilaration over the prospects of continued economic stagnancy, he concludes: "If business, instead of surging up this fall as so many expect, persists for some months longer in remaining below 1953's best levels, the Nation may actually benefit by ridding itself of some of its production junk."

Although the author obviously is referring to inefficient machinery, we could not help wondering whether he realized that the materialistic mind might also encompass labor within the meaning of "production junk." Unfortunately, many economists in high places are so preoccupied with the charts and curves, statistics and graphs, that they frequently forget that people are involved.

What the Wall Street writer is saying is that our current unemployment of 4 million is somehow beneficial to the Nation. Furthermore, he says that a little more unemployment won't hurt us. It will force replacement of machinery, he says.

Now it is obvious that such ideas could come only from someone who is not unemployed. Mr. Wall Street Journal could hardly sell his philosophy to the wives of the 4 million unemployed who have heard so much from the right-to-work advocates. Nor is unemployment a pleasing thing to the children in such families. Mothers and fathers have heard much of this Nation's greatness, our world's highest standard of living, and other glowing tributes. Unemployment is a swift disillusioner.

What we need is less concern for economic charts and graphs and more effort on the part of the Eisenhower administration to end this Republican recession. Merely to increase production efficiency is a poor substitute for idle hands and damaged morale—especially at a time when we are embroiled in a global conflict with an alien ideology that breeds on unemployment and similar social cancers.

Forester Joe Elliott

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARLAN HAGEN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 4, 1954

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Speaker, there is an old saying that virtue is its own reward. I am certain that persons who work for the Government cherish that phrase because in most instances other rewards for them are ignored. It can reasonably be maintained that all competent people who work for the Government do so because they want to perform a public service and it is rarely that that public service is recognized. It is a great pleasure for me to announce that I have a constituent, a retired public employee whose virtue has been recognized. He is Joe Elliott, of Porterville, Calif., a personal friend of mine and a splendid citizen. Joe has recently retired after a long period of duty with the Forest Service, that agency which has done so splendid a job in protecting our mountain resources. The Bakersfield Californian, of July 22, 1954, has this apt comment about my friend, Joe Elliott:

JOE ELLIOTT TREE GETS WIDE RECOGNITION

For his work of almost a half century in guarding the forests of California, Joe Elliott, former Forest Service official now retired, has won many plaudits, but it is not generally known that there is in southern California a living monument to him, a giant sugar pine in the San Bernardino National Forest with a bronze marker designating it as the "Joe Elliott Tree."

The story of the marker begins when Elliott, then supervisor of the San Bernardino National Forest, was directing a crew building a fire road during a tough fire in the San Bernardino Forest. When the crew came upon the tree, a magnificent specimen of sugar pine, Elliott directed them to swerve the road and save it.

The action was typical of Elliott, because he has spent his life in saving the forests of California from fire, from predatory interests, and from other enemies. He joined the Forest Service in 1908, and held the job of supervisor on several California forests, retiring from the service while supervisor of the Sequoia National Forest.

He is still at his favorite job, directing the proper use and conservation of forests, but in private industry, and his fame is known wherever foresters and outdoorsmen gather. Few men have done so much to advance the cause of proper forest use and no man has won more respect from professional foresters, conservationists, and lumbermen.

In a notice sponsored by the Hammond Lumber Co. this week, the story of the Joe Elliott Tree was told again, and mention was made of the fact that Joe Elliott is still pursuing his effort to preserve the national resources of California and to encourage their proper use for the benefit of all the people through wise management.

Kern County has known Joe Elliott for a long time, and joins in tribute to this fine forester whose name is marked appropriately on a massive tree he saved for future generations.

Amending Section 413 (b) of the Foreign Service Act of 1946

SPEECH

OF

HON. EDNA F. KELLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 3, 1954

Mrs. KELLY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I support H. R. 9910 and urge its passage. The increased responsibilities thrust upon the United States in world affairs make it imperative that constant attention be given to our Foreign Service. We cannot expect our Government to discharge its obligations abroad if that body of Government servants is not operating at maximum efficiency.

In the last 30 years Congress has been concerned about the defects in the Foreign Service. As recently as 1946 the Committee on Foreign Affairs reported out a measure for the complete reorganization of the Foreign Service. That bill was enacted into law and is the cornerstone of the service today. As the committee noted in its report, the bill—and now the law—is based upon a few fundamental principles.

First. The concept of a professional service should remain paramount.

Second. A disciplined and mobile corps of trained men should be maintained through entry at the bottom on the basis of competitive examination and advancement by merit to positions of command.

Third. Political influence should be excluded, while loyalty and esprit de corps should be sustained at a high level as essential elements in the efficient operation of the service.

Fourth. Compensation should be sufficient to attract able men regardless of the possession of private means.

In 1940 the Foreign Service had 826 officers. When the 1946 act was passed, the Service had 820—a reduction at the very time that we needed more people in the Foreign Service. Recruiting had been suspended during the war, thus interrupting the orderly entrance of individuals who could work their way to the higher positions. The only way to meet the need for additional strength in the middle and upper classes and still retain the principles of a career service not susceptible to political influence was to encourage the transfer of individuals from the State Department to the Foreign Service.

The 1946 act contains a provision for so-called lateral entry that permits their transfer to the Foreign Service from the State Department. Under this provision a State Department officer in the higher civil service classes could enter the Foreign Service at other than the lowest class after passing written, oral, physical and other examinations that would determine his fitness and aptitude for the Foreign Service. His age, qualifications and experience would determine the Foreign Service class he would enter. In any case he would receive the lowest salary for that particular class.

Contrary to the fears of many that there would be an unprecedented rush to join the Foreign Service through lateral entry, between 1946 and the spring of 1954—this past spring—only 51 entered. The Under Secretary for Administration, Charles E. Saltzman, told our committee that one obstacle was the requirement of entry only at the lowest salary level. For many individuals this would mean a salary cut—in some cases as much as $1,620.

The bill now before the House does only one thing—it permits lateral entry at a salary other than the lowest of the class. All the other requirements that are presently in the law remain. The Department is still engaged in analyzing what this amendment may mean to individuals in various civil-service classes. In response to the committee's request, it ran a sample of one bureau and told us that the estimated additional cost of the Government in salary would be about $130 for each person transferred.

Mr. Speaker, I have no doubt that if this amendment is adopted, it will help strengthen the Foreign Service. But I am under no illusion that this amendment is all that is needed. Many of the problems of the Foreign Service stem from poor administration of the law. Until the Department itself undertakes to improve its administration there is little need for congressional action.

I think my colleagues on the Foreign Affairs Committee recognize that poor administration lies at the root of the problems both of the Foreign Service and of the Department. One way that we can find out how matters are going is to require the Department to come back early next year to explain the operations of the law.

That is the reason we have put in a limitation as to the number that can be admitted—500—by the end of next March. And let me emphasize here that this is not an increase of 500 on the government payroll. This amendment permits as many as that number to transfer from the civil-service system to the Foreign Service System. By rotating more people between the field and Washington it will enlarge the experience of more individuals and place at the disposal of the Secretary of State a larger reservoir of trained personnel.

By next spring we will know whether the Department's explanation is vaild that the salary differential has been a real barrier to lateral entry. Then the Foreign Affairs Committee can examine more carefully the whole range of problems confronting our Foreign Service.

I have always favored as strong a Foreign Service as our Government can obtain. It is not a matter of party or of politics—it is just plain commonsense.

T

IN

M
15, 1
vide
stam
anni
light
M
tant
and
daily
anni
light
this
trod
of, t
It
in t
and
Depa
men
in c
hope
Offic
celel
Th
been
seve
were
1879
stall
also
one
subs
was
the
or n
city
stan
were
the
ligh
It
Mar
ligh
ishn
Wal
The
turn
the
new
acle
T
mon
tion
for
day
curr
S
and
Plai

Appendix

The First Electrically Lighted City

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN V. BEAMER

OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 30, 1954

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, on July 15, 1954, I introduced H. R. 9912 to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the 75th anniversary of the first electrically lighted city in the world, Wabash, Ind.

March 31, 1955, will mark an important event in the advancement of science and in its practical application to our daily lives. This date will mark the 75th anniversary of the first electrically lighted city in the world. It was for this reason that the resolution was introduced in behalf of, and at the request of, the many citizens of Wabash, Ind.

It is hoped that the information given in these remarks and also information and data submitted to the Post Office Department, will result in the recommendation that a special stamp be issued in commemoration of this event. It is hoped that the Congress and the Post Office Department will cooperate in the celebration of this event.

The claim for this distinction has been proven. It has been learned that several blocks of a street in Cleveland were illuminated by electric lights in 1879, a year prior to the Wabash installation. The city of Appleton, Wis., also had installed an electric light in one locality. However, the historians substantiated the claim that Wabash was the first electrically lighted city in the world by stating that not one street, or neighborhood, or store, but the entire city was lighted. This is further substantiated by the fact that four lights were installed on the very pinnacle of the courthouse from which the rays of light would be shed over a large area.

It was on a cloudy, rainy evening, March 31, 1880, that the new electric lights here were turned on to the astonishment of the people who gathered in Wabash for the breathtaking event. The rapture and awe shown in the upturned faces was vividly described by the correspondents of metropolitan newspapers assigned to the modern miracle.

The installation in Wabash, Ind., was more or less an experiment. Illumination for large areas had been discussed for several years but the common everyday use of electric power had not occurred.

Several civil leaders in the community and the local newspaper, the Wabash Plain Dealer, had been agitating for the trial operation. The Brush Electric Co., of Cleveland, made investigations and estimated that the project would cost $1,800 for the fixtures and work, and $1.15 per night operating expense. Inasmuch as this sum was less than that required for a similar amount of illumination derived from gas—this was a few years before the Indiana gas boom which exhausted itself in a comparatively short time—the city council influenced by the economy of the idea, signed on the dotted line.

A guaranty was made by the Brush Co. that the 4 lights to be placed on the flagpole would furnish illumination, which at a distance of 1 mile from the courthouse would be equal to the light from a gas fixture at a distance of 100 feet.

On the date set for the turning on of the lights people began to swarm into Wabash from all over the Middle West. Mayors and councilmen of other cities interested in the subject of street lighting arrived in large numbers. Nearly everyone within driving distance arrived and the streets were closely packed with thousands of people.

The lights proved very successful and even more so than was anticipated by the most optimistic people. Reporters who attended the celebration went to some exaggerated lengths to describe the historic event. One journalist excitedly noted, "the faraway river glowed like a band of molten silver." The Elkhart Review observed, "one could not look directly at the lights without blinking his eyes." The prediction was made in a number of publications that this system of lighting which was so successful in Wabash, Ind., eventually would be the only light of the future.

Residents of Boston, Mass., were so impressed with the accounts of the Hoosier contraption that plans immediately were made to construct several bases as lighting points in that city.

The Fort Wayne Daily Sentinel commented "that the light throws a sort of ghostly glow over things so that anyone inclined to spooks and kindred maladies would naturally shudder."

The editor of the Wabash Plain Dealer, Wabash, Ind., wrote that his staff was kept busy far into the night sending out dispatches which newspapers in such large cities as New York, Chicago, and St. Louis had requested. It is unfortunate that the bound volume of the Plain Dealer for the year 1880 was lost in latter years by a careless and unscrupulous Indianapolis bookbinder, who apparently sold the book as a collector's item, although this cannot be proved.

Charles Clupper, then of Treaty, was quoted as saying that when the light 5 miles distant was burning he could pick his way about the barn lot with ease on the darkest nights.

Energy for the fixtures was produced by a steam-driven generator in the basement of the courthouse, and wires carried the power to the lights, which were encased for protection in glass globes.

The Brush lights were used in Wabash until 1888, when an improved system of illumination was adopted. The original equipment was stored and nearly forgotten. Later, when the founders of Greenfield Village—historic museum of the Edison Laboratory, Dearborn, Mich.—were making requests for these items for their collection, the local people in Wabash became interested and recovered some of this original equipment. Fortunately, one of the fixtures was in a condition of preservation that would permit it to be exhibited.

In 1933 the Wabash Rotary Club encased this restored electric light that was used for the first city illumination in a glass case, which now stands in the corridor of the county courthouse.

This is only a brief history of the first lights that were used for city illuminating purposes. My resolution requests that a stamp commemorating the 75th anniversary of this event on March 31, 1885, be ordered. I have submitted to the Post Office Department; Robert E. Fellers, Director of the Division of Philately; Albert J. Robertson, Assistant Postmaster General; and to Arthur E. Summerfield, Postmaster General, an outline of the material and other proof that would serve as evidence of the first electrically lighted city. This list is as follows:

EVIDENCE: FIRST ELECTRICALLY LIGHTED CITY

Miss Mary O'Hair, curator, Wabash County, Ind., Historical Museum, presents references by Gertrude Hassler, assistant librarian:

1. Scrapbook of Mr. Brush, manufacturer of Brush arc lights.
2. Scientific American, April 2, 1881, page 212, Brush System of Lighting.
3. Beloved Scientist, Elihu Thomson, by David O. Woodbury (1944), page 84.
4. Men and Volts, the story of General Electric, by John Winthrop Hammond, 1941, page 31.

Miss Mary O'Hair, curator, Wabash County, Ind., Historical Museum: (1) Letter giving copy of newspaper article in the Wabash County Historical Museum.

The Henry Ford Museum and Greenfield Village: (1) Letter by Roger Van Bolt, historical research specialist.

General Electric Co., Nela Park, Cleveland, Ohio: (1) Letter by C. Dudley Foster.

The Library of Congress: (1) Letter by Julius W. Hobson, economics division, quoting information secured from the Smithsonian Institution, Chronological History of Electrical Distribution (published by the National Electrical Manufacturers Association).

Indiana Historical Bureau, Indianapolis, Ind.: (1) Letter by Hubert H. Hawkins quoting:

(a) Indiana History Bulletin, October 1924.

(b) Famous First Facts, by Joseph N. Kane, 1934, and including copies of (1) First

Beacon Kept as Wabash Memento, by Wayne Guthrie in Indianapolis News, April 5, 1951; (2) Pioneer in Modern Street Lighting from History of Wabash County, Ind. A narrative account of its historical progress, its people, and its principal interests, by Clarkson Weesner (vol. I, pp. 311–314); (3) Indiana History Bulletin, vol. II, No. 3, December 1924, pages 45–47.

Fort Wayne News Sentinel: (1) Clipping of article by Ken Weaver with rotogravure photographs.

Wabash (Ind.) Plain Dealer: (1) Tearsheet of 90th anniversary edition of August 9, 1949.

Photograph of 1 of the 4 original arc lights now in glass case in courthouse, Wabash, Ind.

Wabash Chamber of Commerce:

1. Letter resolution requesting this commemorative stamp.
2. Copy of First Electric Lamps Used for Street Lighting from Helm's History of Wabash County, 1884.
3. Miscellaneous copies of news articles excerpts.
4. Portion of original newspaper dated 1880.

Immunity on Congressional Investigations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. McCARTHY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 5, 1954

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the House without adequate debate, without consideration of any amendments, passed the so-called immunity bill. I am including in the Appendix these excerpts from a report of the committee on Federal legislation of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York. This is the kind of material which, in my opinion, should have been heard and considered before the House acted yesterday. The argument of urgency, and lack of time, has even less weight today than it was given yesterday, since more than an hour's time has been allowed for debate on the insignificant trout labeling bill.

The excerpts follow:

Excerpts From Report of Committee on Federal Legislation, the Association of the Bar of the City of New York

IMMUNITY ON CONGRESSIONAL INVESTIGATIONS

The proposal to authorize immunity grants by a House of Congress or a congressional committee, even when the grant has been approved by the Attorney General, ignores the important differences between the functions and procedures of a grand jury and those of a congressional committee.

The inherent congressional power of investigation exists for the purpose of enabling the Congress to ascertain facts to aid it in the legislative process. It is "an essential and appropriate auxiliary to the legislative function." *McGrain* v. *Daugherty* (274 U. S. 135, 174 (1927)). We do not wish to minimize the importance or value of such investigations. If it is to serve its purpose effectively, however, the investigative power must be protected not only from those who would defy it, but also from those who would subvert it to other ends. The great scope of the power (see, e. g., Landis, Constitutional Limitations on the Congressional Power of Investigation (40 Harv. Law Rev. 153)) and the uncertainty as to constitutional limitations upon the subject matter which it may reach (see *United States* v. *Rumely* (345 U. S. 41 (1953)) accentuate the importance of keeping its purpose clearly in view.

It is not a function of the Congress either to prosecute an individual, or to determine whether he should be prosecuted for a past act. A grant of immunity constitutes a determination that an individual shall not be prosecuted. There is no doubt of the constitutional power of the Congress to authorize its committees to make that determination in the interest of obtaining facts to aid it in the legislative process. However, it would require a greater sense of self-restraint than has been shown by some committees to confine the making of such determines to that legislative purpose. Neither tradition nor procedural safeguards impose any effective limitation upon wide departures from that purpose.

In the passage which has been quoted from the opinion in *Hoffman* v. *United States*, supra, the Supreme Court referred to the "most valuable function of the grand jury * * * to stand between the prosecutor and the accused." In congressional investigations there is no agency which performs that function. Furthermore, while grand jury proceedings are secret (rule 6 (e), Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure), they are under the control of the court. Whatever may be the technical standing of a witness to object to questions on the ground of irrelevancy, as a practical matter he has a genuine measure of protection. If he refuses to answer a question on the ground that it is irrelevant, a judge is always at hand to determine, after hearing him and his counsel, whether the witness is to be directed to answer the question and whether the line of inquiry which the prosecutor is following should be curtailed; the recalcitrant witness in fact receives a full judicial consideration of his position, and a further opportunity to correct it, before he is found guilty of contempt. In congressional investigations, the witness has no such protection. Although he may in good faith believe the question to be irrelevant or beyond the scope of the inquiry, there is no impartial judge immediately available to pass on that isuse. If he refuses to answer on any such ground, he construes the law at his peril. As the Attorney General himself pointed out in his statement in support of the Keating bill: "If mistaken, his good faith error of law constitutes no defense to fine and imprisonment."

Moreover, it is entirely proper that the standards of competence which apply in the courts should not restrict congressional inquiries. Hearsay reports, opinions, and writings are understandably an important part of what is presented to legislative committees. Committee reports, unlike court determinations, need not be based solely on the evidence in the record. Political considerations necessarily enter into congressional determinations and the historical bases of individual protection, such as the presumption of innocence and the requirement of proof beyond reasonable doubt, are lacking.

We do not believe that need for the proposed legislation is established by the recent cases in which witnesses before congressional committees have refused to answer allegedly self-incriminating questions. Both in the investigations of subversion and in that of interstate crime, the questions which have gone unanswered have related for the most part to the past associations of individuals. Even if it be assumed that every such question was a permissible one, it does not follow that the committees' failure to obtain an answer materially interfered with the accomplishment of a legitimate end of the investigation.

It may be claimed that the power to grant immunity should be vested in congressional committees because many of their investigations are concerned with activities of the executive branch of the Government. See, for example, *McGrain* v. *Daugherty* (273 U. S. 135 (1927)), upholding the power of the Senate, in an investigation of the Department of Justice, to subpena the brother of a former attorney general who had resigned. Even in such a case, however, the congressional function is not to detect criminals or prosecute for crime. In the McGrain case, where power to investigate an executive department was fully upheld, the Court declared that "the only legitimate object the Senate could have in ordering the investigation was to aid it in legislating" (273 U. S. 178). Furthermore, we do not believe that such an investigation is likely to be materially hampered by a plea of self-incrimination on the part of an executive official. Certainly no such official can expect to retain his office after invoking the privilege. And it is inconceivable that the Attorney General could remain unmoved in the face of the public clamor that such a situation would inevitably create.

We think it important not only to maintain the separation between the functions of the Congress and those of the Executive, but also to restore the public understanding of that separation which some recent hearings have tended to obscure. It seems highly likely that even if the immunity power were sparingly exercised by congressional committees, the mere passage of a bill giving them that power would add to the public confusion between the purpose of a committee hearing, with or without television cameras, and that of a criminal trial in a law court.

In summary, we believe that recent events have not demonstrated the need for congressional power to grant immunity, but have underlined the necessity of reaffirming the distinction between the functions of the different branches of the Government. In no area is that distinction of greater importance than in that of criminal prosecution. Legislative grants of immunity would lead to invasion of that area by the Congress. And the proposal in the Keating bill that this be authorized only when approved in advance by the Attorney General would further break down the division by giving to that executive officer a control congressional action.

If the Attorney General receives authority to grant immunity by compelling testimony in any court or grand jury proceeding, the Government would be enabled to get required evidence from any witness. Should a congressional investigation point to the likelihood that evidence of crime might be uncovered by an immunity grant, the Attorney General could present the matter to a grand jury, where the rights of both the Government and the witness would be fully protected. This would bring about a salutary restoration of balance between the two branches of the Government while maintaining the procedural safeguards of the criminal law.

Innocents Abroad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. SMITH

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 3, 1954

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include the following short article taken from a recent newsletter published by the Committee on Foreign Trade Education, Inc.:

INNOCENTS ABROAD

If you're an American living abroad, you don't have to take courses in the economics of international trade. You are constantly seeing new examples of how a high-tariff protective policy affects you as a consumer, and how America loses business.

Item: "While you're at it, could you install a set of Champion or A-C spark plugs?"

"Sorry, sir, we can't get American spark plugs, but I'll put in a set of plugs we manufacture in this country."

The bill comes to three times the American price. And before a month passes you have had to replace two of the plugs, and not one lasts over a year.

Item: "We'll be glad to fix you up with a small radio. We make them in this country. Matter of fact, I'll give you a good discount. That'll come to—let's see—$55."

"But in the States we wouldn't pay more than $20 for a tiny little table job like this."

"Sorry, that's my rock-bottom price. We can't make things like this as cheap over here as you make them in the States."

News item: "Bids for equipment on new hydroelectric project. Local firm gets contract. American bid rejected because of 'Buy your own' policy.

"The XYZ Co. was awarded the contract for two new turbine generators on the Massey River project today. It will deliver the equipment in 2 years at a cost of 5 million guilders. An American bid of 4,450,000 guilders, delivery within 6 months, was rejected by the authorities under the government's new 'Buy your own' policy."

Item: "Sure, we know the American tinplate is cheaper and a lot better quality for canning. But we don't have near enough dollars to buy what we need to put up our fruit crop, we can't even consider giving you an order."

This is what it's like when the shoe is on the other foot.

Many people abroad have no idea of what they are missing. Better, cheaper American goods can't come into their country, or come in only after paying high duties, with resulting high prices to the consumer.

But let's take a look at the other side of the picture as well. While you are living abroad, you find dozens of real bargains—Brussels lace, German cameras, Swiss watches, British worsteds, and many other articles which are cheaper, sometimes better, or with some special quality the American product does not have. You pay much more for them here in the United States.

Fortunately, in most cases the United States imposes no quotas which would expressly forbid the sale of foreign goods here. So most of us have at least seen these goods in the stores. But tariff charges and customs red tape so raise the price to the customer that we pay far more than we otherwise would, and fewer of us can buy.

When governments buy higher-priced goods from their own manufacturers and reject American bids at a lower price, we feel it is wasteful and shortsighted. But we have our own Buy American legislation that requires us to do the same thing.

And when a foreigner places orders for industrial supplies in, say, France, rather than the United States where the supplies may be cheaper and better, we feel this is unfair to the American producer. But it stems from the need of the foreigner to ration his supply of dollars. The most sensible way to solve this problem is obviously to let him earn more dollars by selling us all the goods he can. But now our tariff rates and other trade barriers stand in the way.

Barriers to trade both here and abroad mean that you do not get your money's worth at home and the foreigner does not get his money's worth in his own country. This is what protectionism does to consumers everywhere, and everybody is a consumer.

Sale of Sole Leather Taps by the Army

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 3, 1954

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include a telegram received from the Howes Leather Co., of Boston, Mass. The Howes Leather Co. is a long-established, reputable firm in Boston, and the views of the officials of this company, expressed in the telegram, are worthy of profound consideration by the Secretary of the Army and his associates who have charge of the disposal of sole leather taps.

The telegram sent to the Secretary of the Army by the Howes Leather Co., Inc., states that the sale of these sole leather taps in the past, and in the near future, is, and will, "completely disrupt the domestic commercial market for these products." The request is a fair one, "to withhold sales until the economic situation in this country is much better." The telegram also discloses that this reputable company in its telegram to the Secretary of the Army states:

> So far this year you have already disposed of approximately 6 weeks' total production of the entire industry. In addition to this, the quantity of goods now up for sale equals another 2 to 3 weeks' production, plus other quantities to be offered.

The telegram states that—

> The sale of this material has already caused us to close our cutting plants and additional quantities will mean further curtailment and loss of work by our employees. No doubt it will effect others.

It seems to me that the request of the Howes Leather Co., Inc., is a fair one and it should be complied with by those in charge of this matter in the Department of the Army.

The telegram follows:

BOSTON, MASS., *August 4, 1954.*

Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

The following is a copy of telegram we sent today addressed to the Department of the Army, G-4, Pentagon Building, Washington, and is a true picture regarding this whole situation. In fact, it will create a worse condition than outlined in this wire to the Army. Because these goods do not deteriorate and can be held indefinitely, there is no excuse not to withhold sales until the economic situation in this industry is much better.

"The tremendous amount of sole leather taps that you are offering in your various depots throughout the United States, plus the large quantities you have already sold, is completely disrupting the domestic commercial market for these products. There is a sale scheduled at Ogden, Utah, August 6 and August 9, also at Belle Mead, N. J., August 10, and additional quantities scheduled for sale in Schenectady in September. So far this year you have already disposed of approximately 6 weeks' total production of the entire industry. In addition to this, the quantity of goods now up for sale equals another 2 to 3 weeks' production, plus other quantities to be offered. The sale of this material has already caused us to close our cutting plants, and additional quantities will mean further curtailment and loss of work by our employees. No doubt it will affect others. We don't think you should go through with the sales scheduled or dispose of any further quantities for the balance of this year, these goods will not deteriorate in storage so they can be held indefinitely."

HOWES LEATHER CO.

The Idea of Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. McCARTHY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 5, 1954

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, the following article, in my opinion, points out the great importance of full understanding of the Communist threat so that it can be effectively opposed in every place and in every form in which it manifests itself:

[From the Commonweal of August 6, 1954]

THE IDEA OF COMMUNISM

Communism is a three-way danger. It is, first of all, an idea that has won the allegiance of millions throughout the world. As an idea, communism presents a more or less coherent philosophy of life and of man rooted in dialectic and historical materialism. Secondly, communism is a political conspiracy; as such it is an internal threat wherever it has followers to carry out party orders. Thirdly, communism is a worldwide military force embarked on a program of expansion and aggression.

The three aspects of communism go hand-in-hand. The idea comes first the party is able to enlist from convinced ideologues followers ready to carry out subversion or, when the climate is right, to change social disorder and discontent into the coin of mass political action. This latter activity is hopeless in the United States, at the present time, but such was not the case during the bleak depression years and in countries like Italy and France the unhappy social scene is still a fruitful vineyard for Communist apostles. In both these countries communism is able to command a large number of votes. The votes come not from convinced ideologues but from dissatisfied people who take that way to express discontent with their lot.

The problem of fighting communism is to keep each of these three avenues of Communist approach closely guarded. It would not do, for instance, to concentrate so exclusively on counteracting communism as an idea that the avenue of internal subversion was ignored. It would not do to concentrate so completely on the problem of subversion as to ignore the military aspects. In this place or that, one or the other danger may be greater than the others, but the 3-way attack must be met by an alert 3-way defense.

Communism as an idea has probably been the most neglected of all three, both here and abroad. Both leftwing and rightwing opinion in the United States has been guilty of obscuring the real nature of communism as an idea. For years—with notable exceptions—many patriotic liberal Americans neglected to take a good hard look at just what communism means in terms of ideas. The rude awakening that came after the war was really unnecessary. In the glow of the wartime alliance with Russia even stalwart generals were saying that the difference between communism and democracy was just about as crucial as the difference between American Democrats and Republicans. If the philosophy of communism had been seriously examined, we might have avoided many well-meant but disastrous moves. Too many Americans felt that communism was undoubtedly "foreign" and perhaps even on the screwball side, but were not yet sufficiently oriented to the ideological age to believe that the future of the world might actually be dependent on the abstruse dialectics found in dull, barely readable Marxist tomes. By and large, we were pushovers for the sentimentality that colored so many of our attitudes toward Russia when we fought a common enemy. That sentimentality afflicted all strata of society. It is as easy to find it in back issues of Life magazine as in the glowingly "liberal" opinion weeklies. * * * A more general knowledge of the idea behind communism would have saved Americans from many of the illusions that drugged the Nation at the time.

On the other hand, there is a segment of American society which still stands in as much need of education about the idea of communism as those who thought about the subject so hazily in those days. This is a group which is ready to bracket every idea which does not conform to its own hardy rightwing convictions as "communistic."

There is no more affinity between communism and the kind of liberalism espoused, say, by the ADA or the American Veterans Committee than there is between the native fascism of Gerald L. K. Smith and the stanch Republicanism of the late Senator Taft. But, for political and propaganda purposes, this group is forever ready to attribute every idea left of Dwight Eisenhower's fictitious dead center to Karl Marx. These terribles simplificateurs have created all kinds of mischief by consistently tarring patriotic and idealistic people with the Communist brush. * * * A good example of this sort of thing was found recently when a supposed authority on communism before a congressional committee identified the writings of two Popes as communistic. As long as good people and good ideas are arbitrarily associated with communism for partisan gain the essential wickedness of communism as an idea will be obscured.

There are proposals now for a more general education in communism, notably a widely publicized plan offered by the American Bar Association. We heartily approve such a program, provided it truly means education about communism and is not used as a means for partisan propagandists and lobbyists to include as communistic the teachings and beliefs of just about everyone who disagrees with them, from the Popes who wrote the social encyclicals to the liberals of Americans for Democratic Action.

The so-called rightwing cannot alone defeat communism in America. The attack of the Communists is directed against Americans of both parties and from every shade of the political spectrum. We need to fire our volleys against communism from both left and right. The sooner this simple fact is generally understood the better all around. No group of Americans is the special target of communism, and none has a monopoly on anticommunism. With wider understanding of the Communist idea, it might become clear to all that however we Americans may disagree among ourselves we face in communism a common enemy and will either have to hang together or hang separately.

Crumpacker Plans Official Tour of 22 Communities in Third Indiana District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. S. J. CRUMPACKER, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 5, 1954

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Speaker, following a practice established in 1950 of making the services of my office directly available to constituents at least once each year, I am planning an official business tour of 22 cities and towns in the Third Indiana District soon after the adjournment of Congress.

My 1954 grass-roots tour—the fourth in as many years—has been scheduled for August 30 through September 3 and will include visits to 7 communities in Elkhart County, 6 in La Porte County, 6 in Marshall County, and 3 in St. Joseph County.

A temporary office will be established at a central location in each community and local citizens will be afforded an opportunity to confer informally with their representatives in Congress.

No formal appointment will be necessary, and I will welcome the chance to be of any possible service to any and all callers. As in past years, I will be accompanied and assisted by a member of my Washington office staff.

I have learned from experience, Mr. Speaker, that these tours are of value for many reasons. Not only do they afford me an opportunity to bring the services of my office directly to the people in their home towns, but they serve another useful purpose.

As a supplement to the opinion polls I conduct annually by mail, they enable me, through personal contact, to keep informed of the views and attitudes of my constituents on legislative issues. With this in mind I am looking forward with eagerness to my 1954 Third District tour.

The complete tour schedule follows:

MONDAY, AUGUST 30

Osceola, fire station, 9 a. m.
Elkhart, courthouse, 10 a. m.
Middlebury, First State Bank, 2 p. m.
Bristol, town hall, 3:30 p. m.

TUESDAY, AUGUST 31

Wakarusa, Exchange State Bank, 9 a. m.
Goshen, courthouse, 10 a. m.
New Paris, State Bank, 2 p. m.
Nappanee, city hall, 3 p. m.

WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 1

Lakeville, town hall, 9:30 a. m.
La Paz, Farmer's State Bank, 10:30 a. m.
Bremen, town hall, 11:30 a. m.
Bourbon, News-Mirror office, 1:30 p. m.
Argos, town hall, 3 p. m.
Culver, Citizen office, 4 p. m.

THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 2

Plymouth, courthouse, 10 a. m.
Walkerton, town hall, 1:30 p. m.
Kingsford Heights, fire station, 3 p. m.
Wanatah, H. W. Welkie office, 4 p. m.

FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 3

Westville, public library, 9 a. m.
Michigan City, courthouse, 10 a. m.
La Porte, courthouse, 2 p. m.
Union Mills, fire station, 4 p. m.

Agriculture and Tobacco

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. WATTS

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 5, 1954

Mr. WATTS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting a timely address delivered by Mr. Randolph S. Taylor to the membership of the Agricultural Council of Kentucky during their annual meeting in Louisville, Ky., on August 3, 1954.

Mr. Taylor is Washington representative of the Burley and Dark Leaf Tobacco Export Association and is an outstanding authority on tobacco. His analysis of the present agricultural situation is worthy of earnest consideration by all who are interested in agriculture and tobacco:

AGRICULTURE AND TOBACCO

I would be something less than honest with myself, and with you, if I did not express at this time my heartfelt appreciation for the honor you have bestowed upon me in extending the kind invitation for me to address this annual meeting of the Kentucky Agricultural Council.

I am always grateful for an opportunity to return home and to again meet with folks who are deeply interested in the welfare of Kentucky agriculture. I am now entering my 20th year of direct service to agriculture in our State. From my viewpoint it has been a most pleasant and satisfactory association. My only regret is that my present duties are such as to require my residence in Washington.

Your attendance here today representing as you do many segments of Kentucky agriculture and business life is in itself, a testimonial to the importance of agriculture to our State. Moreover, as I see the overall agricultural situation at the moment and for reasons which I shall discuss later it is exceedingly fortunate that you have in existence an organizaiton of this kind. Those who envisioned the organization and who have worked to make it what it is are due sincere congratulations.

Your program committee has asked that I devote some time to a discussion of the general current agricultural situation and its relationship to tobacco. I shall be glad to do this and at the same time pass on to you some of my personal observations in that respect.

I would like to discuss with you some recent developments in agriculture generally—developments which I feel are especially related to our tobacco program. Unfortunately, it is quite difficult at the moment to comment publicly on agricultural problems generally without becoming involved in partisan politics. May I say to you quite emphatically that I have no such desire nor am I attempting to become so involved in an issue which in the final analysis must be resolved as it always has been on a bipartisan basis.

Frankly, I am quite disturbed over some recent developments in agriculture. I think we are in serious trouble. Without in any way attempting to go into the merits or the demerits of the present controversy raging over flexible or rigid high price supports—although I might add I think that both are flexible and neither is high—the recent votes in the House of Representatives clearly show two important presently existing facts: (1) The so-called farm bloc as an effective unit no longer exists, and (2) the city vote is at the present time the controlling factor in future farm legislation.

As an example of some of the things now going on, I would like to read to you a statement made on the House floor by a member of the House Agriculture Committee:

"Farm legislation emerging from the Agriculture Committee has repeatedly provided for a farmer vote or so-called referendum to determine what the farmer wants from the Government. Such votes are touted as being ultrademocratic. Supposedly freedom is preserved by giving a producer a choice between two methods of getting the Government to guarantee his own profitable security.

"The real fact is that there is nothing democratic about the whole scheme. Giving farmers a choice as to which way they can get the most from the Government is nothing but a socialistic subterfuge. Real democracy would provide that consumers and taxpayers vote, along with the farmers, on these propositions. Real democracy would demand that all affected persons of the country be permitted to vote on the issue.

"And how are consumers and general taxpayers affected by Government subsidy and guaranties to food producers? I need not restate the details as to how the general taxpayer in 20 years has dumped about $20 billion into the overall farm-subsidy program. About half of this $20 billion is attributable to price supports and Government purchase programs. Don't you think that $1 billion a year in taxation is full justification for the right of the taxpayer to vote on these farm propositions?

"And how about the consumer? I know that consumers have shown very little interest in this farm program because they do not understand what has been happening to them. Only in the last year or so, when butter accumulations began to get in the news, have they begun to comprehend what the price support and Government purchase programs mean to their food costs.

"What the price-support program has cost consumers at the retail stores is beyond calculation. Since a free market has been completely destroyed on the basic crops, no one can determine what a free market would have produced as a price level at retail. But anyone with the slightest understanding of economics can be assured that Government purchase for hoarding has created an artificial price at retail which has cost consumers billions."

And as a finale this Member of Congress added:

"Is there any wonder that the Communist Party in their latest official pronouncement of policy emphasized the importance of maintaining rigid price supports on farm products?

"Now, mind you, I have no idea that any of the congressional supporters of this bill are even tinged with communism. But it is significant that the extension of rigid price supports fits perfectly into their openly declared purpose of socializing the American economy by first socializing the farm economy."

I could cite several other instances of a similar nature during the recent farm debate.

Out of the 435 congressional districts in the United States 190 are definitely classified as city districts. About 140 of these are located in the industrial North and East with the remaining 50 scattered throughout city areas in the rest of the country. Seventy-nine percent of the Members of Congress from the 140 industrial North and East city districts deserted the farm bloc Congressmen in recent farm price support votes while 64 percent of the remaining 50 city districts did likewise.

The so-called farm bloc represents a loosely held together coalition of Members of Congress representing rural areas in some 32 States principally in the West, Middle West and in the South. As many of you will perhaps remember this coalition first came into being in the middle of a distressing agricultural situation following World War I. It had as its background then, and today basically retains, the interests of the producers of the commodities of wheat, cotton, tobacco, corn and hogs. It was the influence of these same commodities which in one way or another largely led to the development of the original AAA programs.

There were at that time, and there still are, important segments of agriculture which never completely joined this group. With some exceptions they were the producers of cattle, wool, and dairy products. Many of the Members of Congress who presently represent producers of these latter three commodities also deserted the so-called farm bloc in recent votes in the House on price-support issues. I am sure that your immediate reaction will be to question the reasons for this action. They are many and varied. Some of the commodities just mentioned are not storable for any long period of time, and in many other ways do not fit into a price-support program designed for the basic commodities. In others, the producers have not been favorably inclined to price supports for the basic crops for a considerable period of time. Perhaps it is only fair in passing to state that the producers of these commodities, however, to my knowledge, have never objected to governmental aid for their products through adoption of many devices which have been used in the past and which in effect have provided at least for certain periods of substantial price-support action. Perhaps, too, there has existed among the producers of these commodities a little something with which we are all afflicted at times and that is the attitude that if we can't have something you shouldn't have it either.

There are of course other possible reasons. The woolgrowers had specific legislation otherwise provided for in the legislation under consideration. The dairy groups have already taken what they thought to be discriminatory treatment in the matter of price supports. I ask you to examine with me some of the factors which I feel have led us into our present troubled situation. As an individual interested in agriculture I cannot be optimistic over developments which presently include a situation where we find officials of prominent farm organizations and commodity groups publicly battling one another over issues which they think are good or not good for the farmers they represent. The situation becomes somewhat more ironical when you consider the fact that in some instances these conflicts arise through an expression of interest for farmers from the same general area, the same State, the same county, and, I suspect in a lot of instances, the same farmer.

I am not happy over the fact that the northeast 75 percent of parity support-price dairy producers are openly antagonistic with their midwestern 90 percent of parity grain-producing farmer friends whose products they purchase.

I am also disturbed that the southern and western cotton producers are quarreling over their program in view of the problems arising from a recent definite shift of cotton acreage production to the west.

I cannot feel good about the problems that are arising between the wheat and corn producers of the West and the producers of other substitutable feed grains. This is a particularly perplexing problem for the reason that in many instances all of these commodities may be produced in the same general area or on the same farm.

Perhaps you will comment that some of these differences I have just noted have been going on for a long time. I would certainly agree that this is true but at the same time comment that it is my opinion the differences when considered in light of other circumstances now represent more of a threat to a unified agriculture than we have ever before experienced in our history. Aside from the disturbing differences just mentioned the factor about which I am most genuinely alarmed is the presently existing division which has arisen between the consumers and the farmers in this country. As a city dweller in one of the higher average income areas of the Nation I am sick and tired of hearing the farmer being labeled as the villain of high prices who is quietly robbing the housewife each time she visits the neighborhood marketplace for food.

I think I have talked long enough about the troubles we are in. What can we who are interested in agriculture do to improve this situation?

To begin with as a Washington representative of a commodity group I think it is important that I do everything within my power to obtain a good constructive understanding working relationship with Members of Congress.

I feel that that relationship can best be obtained through actions of mine and the people I represent which will never place me or my organization in the position of dictating to them. In my limited experience I have found Members of Congress to be two things—one, exceedingly grateful for constructive help, and two, expert appraisers of public opinion. As to the last item I suspect that each of us would develop similar talents if our continued success was entirely dependent on our judgment in that respect.

Again as a Washington representative of a commodity group I feel that there is room for improvement in the field of compromise and cooperation for all of us. Perhaps a little more interest in that which is good for agriculture as a whole rather than for us individually would be helpful.

I suggest to each of you that as an official, leader or member of any group directly or indirectly concerned with the production, processing and marketing of farm commodities or as a person directly interested in labor, that it is appropriate that you insist that all available means be used to eliminate the erroneous damaging opinion now prevailing among consumers that higher food costs are the direct result of more money going into the farmers' pockets. I suggest to you to publicize the well known fact that the welfare of city and farm groups will invariably take the same road and that any successful attempt to separate their interests can only result in trouble for both.

I believe that each of us should become acquainted with the facts. These facts are available and from a source which we have always considered reliable, the United States Department of Agriculture. I will discuss with you only a few of these facts most of which I have taken from the May 13 issue of the Marketing and Transportation Situation which is published by the Agricultural Marketing Service of the United States Department of Agriculture.

Fact No. 1: While retail prices for food have increased the farmer's share of the consumer's food dollar and his total income both have declined. His total income has gone down 13 percent in the last 2 years. While the explanation of this situation is relatively simple it is not easily understandable. The fact is that the margin representing the difference between the price the farmer receives for his raw material and the retail price of food purchased by the housewife has increased, not suddenly, but over a considerable period of time. For example, this margin, again I repeat the difference between what the farmer gets and the housewife pays, is now three times larger than it was in 1932. The Department of Agriculture states that the reason for this is as follows, and I am now quoting from the

Market and Transportation Situation mentioned earlier:

"This increase resulted from an expansion in the quantity of food marketed, an extension in marketing services per unit of products handled, and advances in costs per unit of labor, plant, equipment, mechanical power, supplies, et cetera. Profits too, were larger.

"Direct labor costs, the largest single item, were more than four times larger in 1953 that 1932. The number of workers increased nearly three-fifths and average hourly earnings more than tripled. Labor costs accounted for about 53 percent of the marketing bill in 1952 and 1953 compared with an average of 47 percent in 1935–39."

Again using the Department's figures we learn that the farmer's share of the food dollar in the 3-year 1947–49 period was 49 percent. In the October–December period, 1953, as well as the January–March period in 1954 it had gone down to 45 percent. There are some good and logical reasons for this seemingly impossible situation wherein we find unquestioned statistical evidence showing food prices going up and farm income going down. I shall mention a few:

1. Over the past number of years the number of persons engaged in providing the services of assembling, processing, and distributing food products has vastly increased as have their wages.

2. Mrs. Housewife has demanded and accepted and the processor has furnished many desirable refinements in manufactured food. As an example among many others we have seen tremendous increases in the field of frozen-food products. We have seen advancements in packaging and in processing such as foods previously cooked or baked, cake mixes, et cetera. As many of you will recall most of the wheat marketed years ago was returned to the consumer as flour with only the storage and milling process involved. Today we find wheat moves to the consumer in the form of bread, cake, cake mixes, pies, and other bakery products. This change in consumer demand has involved many additional processing, distributing, and marketing procedures. Undoubtedly the appearance of fresh frozen, already cut up poultry, or frozen, already cooked poultry, prewashed, already prepared, ready to cook, frozen vegetables is highly attractive to Mrs. U. S. Housewife. There are, of course, many others that I could mention. Convenient; yes. Good; yes. Expensive; certainly. In fact, about one-third higher in price to the housewife. The fact in this connection which must not be overlooked is that the chicken the farmer sells brings the same price to him without regard as to route it takes in appearing on the consumer's table. I repeat, the price to the farmer in either instance is the same but the price to the consumer is necessarily considerably different. A bushel of wheat which a farmer may market brings the same price to him without regard to its ultimate use but the price to the consumer can vary tremendously.

Fact No. 2: United States consumers today get more and better food with an expenditure of a smaller percentage of their total income than in any other period of our history. Data prepared by economists for the Department of Agriculture show that in 1914 the average factory employee could buy 3½ pounds of bread with 1 hour's earnings, in 1939 he could buy 6.4 pounds of bread with 1 hour's earnings, and in 1953 he could buy 10.7 pounds. For the same periods he could buy 0.9 pound of round steak in 1914, 1.2 pounds in 1929, and 1.9 pounds in 1953. Numerous other like examples could be cited.

The fact is that the largest reduction in the price of food in comparison with wages has occurred in the years during the development of the price-support programs which have had as their aim parity of income for agriculture and fair price for consumers. It is evident that consumers have obtained their greatest concessions in prices of food during the time of the growth of an overall farm stability. Those are some of the facts I think you should be talking about and I expect that you are wondering what I might consider their relationship to be to us who are interested in the welfare of tobacco.

I had considerably mixed reactions upon sober consideration of the President's recommendation to the Congress that the tobacco program remain unchanged. Mixed reactions because I found myself quite happy to see a recommended continuation of our successful program which I felt was in itself a tribute to all of those involved in the program since its original conception. Mixed reactions because I found myself with some serious reservations of our ability to travel the road alone. Some 7 months have passed since the President's recommendation and we are now about to see a 1954 farm program enacted by the present session of Congress. Whatever that program is to be it will contain, by exception, special treatment for tobacco in the field of price support.

Just as sincerely and honestly as my abilities will permit I say to you today that that situation will continue only as long as tobacco people keep their own house in order and then only as long as the question of the preferred status of tobacco in an overall farm program is not presented directly to the Congress for recorded action. It is my firm conviction that the Members of Congress from nontobacco producing areas who in total are overwhelmingly in the majority cannot continue in good grace to express by public vote a continued preference for tobacco while they are at the same time voting for reduced protection to the producers of agricultural commodities in their own congressional districts.

We who are interested in tobacco have been fortunate in having many favorable factors to talk about. Among these are—

First, the acreage of tobacco production on any given farm is relatively small, and adjustments required to bring supplies in line with demand do not present a serious land-use problem.

Second, the quality of a given kind of tobacco is associated closely with the soil, climate, and other physical conditions affecting the plant. These factors tend to limit the shifting of tobacco production from one area to another.

Third, since most tobacco products are blends of different kinds and qualities, the substitutability of one kind for another is limited. Therefore, the demand for a particular kind of tobacco is mostly dependent on the consumer demand for the different products.

Fourth, there are no known substitutes for tobacco and tobacco does not directly compete with other agricultural commodities.

Fifth, tobacco is storable for fairly long periods and its value is enhanced through age. Tobacco is normally stored from 1 to 3 years prior to manufacturing. Since tobacco is storable, variations in quality and supply from 1 year to another do not present a serious problem because there is time to make gradual adjustments in production and to balance out the grade compositions over a number of crops. The enhancement of value through aging in storage largely offsets the storage costs and interest on Government loans. This factor is not applicable to any other agricultural commodity.

Sixth, the retail price of tobacco products has increased less than the retail price of most other agricultural products.

Seventh, since World War II, exports of United States tobacco have remained steady without large fluctuations from 1 year to another.

Eighth, the commodity, through taxes, contributes in excess of $2 billion annually to the United States Treasury.

Ninth, the program has operated at a profit to the Government.

In closing, may I say that I have not made these remarks to you in the spirit of a confirmed pessimist who endeavors to find something bad in everything. On the contrary, I am optimistic that, with understanding tolerant cooperation of us all, that we can and will successfully meet the issues which are facing us.

The Sudeten German Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. RHODES
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 5, 1954

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, the interesting manner in which the following article presents a very important part of history has impelled me to make it available to the Members of Congress. The area which is the subject of this article is part of the heartland of Europe, and as such is important to the future of Europe and the world:

THE SUDETEN GERMAN CASE

PROPAGANDA VERSUS TRUTH

We read with amazement Dr. Walter Becher's article on The Sudeten German Case presented on March 25, 1954, as published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Appendix, page A2284, of March 25, 1954.

Dr. Becher, secretary general of the Association for the Protection of Sudeten German Interests in Munich, Germany, asks that "the plight of his people be brought to the attention of the Congress and the public of the United States through this article with a view to an investigation of the expulsion of the Sudeten Germans, and the hope that justice may be obtained." At the same time he complains that "a false propaganda * * * pictured the Sudeten Germans from a standpoint so completely distorted and untrue" and expressed the hope "that the time of truth is beginning."

Czechoslovak democratic exiles who have fought both the Nazis and the Communists, deem it their duty to call the attention of the Congress and the American public to the fact that the picture of the Sudeten Germans presented by Dr. Becher is a product of false propaganda operating with flagrant distortions of facts and downright falsehoods.

As the question is far more important than merely a Czech-German case, touching as it does the very core of peace and security in Europe, we earnestly ask that Congress and the American public give our exposé their kind consideration, inasmuch as they have always shown effective and friendly interest in the democratic Republic of Czechoslovakia.

We shall answer Dr. Walter Becher's propaganda by facts which can easily be verified.

First we shall point out the fallacy of his historical interpretation and then we shall proceed to show how the policies of the Sudeten Germans have led as a direct consequence to their transfer from Czechoslovakia to Germany.

THE NATIONALISTIC CONCEPT OF GERMAN HISTORY

At this time we shall limit ourselves to examining solely Dr. Becher's most flagrant distortions of historical facts.

Dr. Becher accepts the nationalistic concept of modern German historiography which presents the medieval Holy Roman Empire as a German Empire. In reality, the Holy Roman Empire was a supranational, universalistic empire which aimed to emulate the Roman imperial concept.

The German Reich of the 19th and 20th century was founded, however, on the German national idea which differs basically from the universalistic concept of the Holy Roman Empire; hence the imperialistic expansionism of William II and Hitler, propelled as it was by the hypernationalistic idea of pan-Germans, was essentially different from the imperial idea of the Holy Roman Empire.

The fact that the medieval Kingdom of Bohemia, like other non-German countries, had been a part of the Holy Roman Empire has been used by the pan-German imperialists of the modern age to lay claim to Bohemia (i. e. Czechoslovakia) as well as to Austria, Alsatia, and other countries. This pretense, conflicting sharply with historical facts, is indicative of the lust of pan-German expansionism.

BOHEMIA INFLUENCED NOT ONLY BY GERMANY BUT ALSO BY THE WEST

We do not wish to detract from the credit due the Germans for their contribution to the cultural and economic development of the Kingdom of Bohemia in the middle ages, but we must protest against the one-sided interpretation of modern German nationalists, who in their conceited role of Kulturtrager pretend that the Germans are solely responsible for the higher cultural level achieved by the Czechs. Bohemians (the Czechs) came under the influence of the Italians, the French, and later the English, not only the Germans. Aside from that, as early as the 10th and 11th centuries, in the time of St. Wenceslas and St. Adalbert, the Czechs already had a culture of their own; by the 13th century they had made of their Bohemian kingdom a strong and independent state which at times played the part of a European power in continental affairs.

WHEN DID THE SUDETEN GERMANS EXTEND THEIR HOLDINGS?

It is incorrect to say, as does Dr. Becher, that the region (settled by the Germans in the 12th and 13th centuries) was coextensive with that now known as the Sudetenland. In that early period German colonists went inland and founded towns in the interior. Regions known today as the Sudetenland were settled by newcomers in the 17th and 18th centuries—after the Czechs had lost their independence in the battle of the White Mountain. Better said, the Sudeten Germans proceeded to take over and to extend their holdings in the Czech lands at the time the Czechs were reduced to a status of bondsmen by the victorious Hapsburgs.

DEFAMING THE HUSSITE MOVEMENT

Dr. Becher's enmity toward the Czechs stands out most glaringly whenever he mentions the Hussite period.

The Hussite revolution had strengthened Czech national consciousness (Slovak, too) so powerfully that it could not be extinguished even in the darkest period of Czech decline following their military defeat in the 17th century. In this respect the Hussite revolution was to the Czechs what the English Revolution was to the English, the American Revolution to the Americans, and the French Revolution to the French.

Yet this Jan Hus, considered rightfully the spiritual light of Czech nationalism, avowed the principle that he preferred a good German to a bad Czech. It meant that inspired Czech nationalism sought its justification in the supranational, universal idea of humaneness which through Chelcicky and the Bohemian brethren later found its true expression in the idea of brotherhood. The French historian Ernest Denis explains that this idea was then passed on, chiefly through Comenius, to the spiritual workshop of the enlightenment movement and of the French Revolution.

Dr. Becher in his narrowminded nationalism overlooks the European significance of the supranational Hussite movement and rejects it with this irate commentary: "It is difficult to see anything positive in the chauvinistic nationalism and mass hysteria of the Hussite period. And, curiously enough, the expulsion of the Sudeten Germans in 1945 and 1946 produces the same symptoms of nationalistic hatred and chauvinistic communism on the part of the initiators (Benes, Ripka, and others) as were evident in the Hussite time."

It is not necessary to defend against the charges of alleged chauvinistic communism such men as Benes, Ripka, and others of the Masaryk school of thought, who tried to live with the Germans in friendship in the period between the two world wars and who have always openly rejected not only communism but Marxism as well.

Insofar as one would search for an analogy between the Hussite period and the years after the Second World War, one would find it—curiously enough—in the striking similarity in the attitude of the Germans then and now and of the Czechs and Slovaks. In the Hussite period the great majority of Germans opposed religious and social reformation as sought by the Czechs and also the Slovaks; in the last war, Hitler, supported by the great majority of Germans, especially the Sudeten Germans, tried to destroy democracy, the modern form of social reform, as advanced and defended by the Czechs and Slovaks.

WHAT DR. BECHER DOES NOT SAY

It is truly amazing what Dr. Becher does to historical facts: Either he distorts them, as already shown, or he simply ignores whatever does not fit into his propaganda scheme. "The 30 years' war," he writes, "did not concern the German-Czech problem. It was a war between the Catholics and the Protestants * * * and Czechs as well as Germans fought on both sides. The reconstruction after the war brought the Czechs and the Germans closer together again."

It was of course a war between the Catholics and Protestants, and Czechs as well as Germans fought on both sides (though the preponderant majority of the Germans fought on the side of the Catholic Church). But it must be stressed that in this war the Czechs finally lost their independence in 1620 in the Battle of the White Mountain to the victorious Hapsburgs. The executions, imprisonment, confiscation of Czech property, expulsion of "heretic rebels" from their homes, the systematic destruction of "heretic Czech" books and the persecution which followed on a huge scale, resembling in many ways in its viciousness and brutal methods the totalitarian regimes of the 20th century, wrecked the entire social and cultural structure of the Czech society. The Czech nobility, the bourgeoisie, and the intelligentsia were liquidated. The Czechs became a nation of peasant vassals, lowly craftsmen, and laborers. Positions of members of the liquidated Czech society were usurped by privileged foreigners, mostly Germans. The German language soon suppressed the Czech which became the language of only the lower classes, of the serfs. Later, in the latter part of the 18th century, when the Hapsburgs began to germanize systematically in an effort to enforce the centralization of their conglomerate empire, it seemed the Czech nation was doomed to disappear entirely.

It was at this time, when the Czech nation was experiencing its most abject subjugation and social, spiritual, and moral misery, the Sudeten Germans greatly increased their holdings not only in the border regions of Bohemia and Moravia but even in the interior (many Czech cities, even Prague, were germanized); thus the Sudeten Germans became the privileged Herrenvolk, the master race which ruled over the Czech majority.

SUDETEN GERMAN PAN-GERMANISM AGAINST CZECH FEDERALISM

Naturally a German nationalist such as Dr. Becher cannot reconcile himself to the fact that the process toward the obliteration of the Czech nation after the Battle of the White Mountain was at long last arrested in the latter part of the 18th century by an awakened Czech national consciousness; that Czechs and Slovaks, like other European nations inspired by the Revolution of 1848, began to demand their national rights.

In this historical period, charged with new dynamic forces of nationalism and democracy, conflict between Czechs and Germans was inevitable. From the outset in 1848 the Sudeten Germans felt the threat to their privileged position. Some sought to save their Herrenvolk status by supporting Pan-Germanism which was to join all Germans in one great German Reich, while others leaned on Vienna in the hope that the Hapsburgs would preserve the German, respect the German-Hungarian supremacy over the other nations of their empire. There were also other Sudeten Germans who advocated a rapprochement with the Czechs. But, in the words of Professor Thomson (Czechoslovakia in European history, p. 180): "The voices of these prophets pleading for rapprochement and understanding seemed to cry in the wilderness."

From 1848 until World War I the Czechs followed in principle the program formulated by their great leader Frantisek Palacky; consequently, they rejected Russian imperialistic pan-Slavism no less resolutely than the pan-Germanism proposed at the Congress of Frankfurt. The Czech leaders of 1848 asked that the Hapsburg monarchy be reconstructed as a democratic federation of equal nations. In essence, the Czechs struggled for this program until World War I. This program was opposed chiefly by the Sudeten Germans and the Hungarians. Several attempts at Czech-German rapprochement failed because of the Sudeten Germans who persistently clung to their privileged positions, hoping to keep down the Czechs.

SUDENTEN GERMAN RADICALISM

T. G. Masaryk did not decide on the policy of breaking up Austria and Hungary until in 1914, when war broke out leaving no doubt whatosever that the Hapsburgs had become the willing tools of the German Reich in its imperialistic ambitions, and when it became clear that it was useless to hope for a democratic federalization of the Hapsburg monarchy. The Sudeten Germans, hoping to check the Czech rise, welcomed war enthusiastically for a German victory meant continued domination over the Czechs and "Mittel Europa" as well.

WHEN DID THE SUDETEN GERMANS DISCOVER DEMOCRACY?

Not until the defeat of Germany and Austria-Hungary, a defeat which surprised them more than anyone else, whereupon the Sudeten Germans promptly changed from imperialists to radical democrats, demanding the right to self-determination. After the war, the Sudeten Germans used with great effectiveness "democratic means" to wreck democracy in the name of democracy by misusing democratic freedoms (the same method was used also by Fascists, Nazis, and Communists).

At the Paris conference the Allies, including the Americans, after a thorough study by experts (Mr. Allen Dulles was one of them) realized that Bohemia and Moravia form an integral and organic whole which cannot be disrupted according to nationalities, inasmuch as these are so very intermingled. Therefore the Allies sanctioned the old historic boundaries between the Czech state and Germany, boundaries which have existed uninterruptedly ever since ancient times.

"SUDETENLAND" AS A STATE—POLITICAL NONSENSE

In fact, the Sudeten Germans themselves contributed to the decision. After their defeat in 1918, they proclaimed the annexation of the German regions in Bohemia and Bohemia to a new Austrian Republic (obviously they did not dare at that time to hitch their fate outright to a defeated Germany). But only the southern regions in Bohemia and Moravia had a common frontier with Austria and of these only a number of them had a German majority whereas the other so-called Sudeten German regions were separated from Austria by several hundred miles—by purely Czech regions; furthermore, the Sudeten German regions did not even have a common frontier with one another within Bohemia and Moravia.

A prominent Sudeten German leader, Joseph Seliger, a Social Democrat, though opposing strongly the subjugation of the Germans by the Czechs, admitted in 1918–19 that it was impossible to separate the Sudeten German regions from the rest of Bohemia and Moravia. He said: "The 8 territorial fragments in which Germans are settled, 8 territorial fragments separated from each other by a wide gulf of Czech lingual districts, cannot form a single state or a single administrative area, for such a state or area must after all be a united economic area. To form the German districts into a unit would be without parallel in the whole world and would be the greatest political nonsense."

The absurdity of trying to divide Bohemia and Moravia according to the principle of nationalities was demonstrated very clearly by Hitler himself. After Munich over 2 million Sudeten Germans were added to the Reich by the annexation of the Sudeten German area; along with them 800,000 Czechs were handed over to Germany, roughly one-third of the annexed population. The new frontiers of the so-called protectorate of Bohemia and Moravia, proclaimed by Hitler after his seizure of Czechoslovakia in March 1939, proved utterly impossible from the standpoint of transportation, food distribution, and economy. Hitler solved the newly created great problems simply by incorporating the entire Protectorate of Bohemia and Moravia into the Reichs; in other words, he took all of Bohemia and Moravia, along with the Sudetenland.

The above facts show that for centuries Bohemia and Moravia have formed a complete political, economic, and indivisible entity; the so-called Sudetenland (as a matter of fact, there never was such a thing) would be an artificial and unviable construction; in the words of Seliger, as a state it would be the greatest political nonsense.

THE FREEDOMS OF THE SUDETEN GERMANS IN CZECHOSLOVAKIA

Dr. Becher repeats the accusation that the promises given the allies by Masaryk and Benes in 1918 that Czechoslovakia would be a state after the manner of Switzerland were not carried out; he likewise repeats the well-known charges of German propaganda that Czechoslovakia treated the Sudeten Germans as second-class citizens, only a minority.

On the contrary, facts clearly show that Czechoslovakia not only fulfilled strictly the obligations assumed by the Paris peace agreements on the protection of national minorities but actually accorded far more rights and privileges to her minorities, namely the Sudeten Germans, than required by the international agreement.

Had it been possible to preserve peace in Europe for 50 or 60 years after World War I, Czechoslovakia, as to nationalities, would undoubtedly have become a state such as Switzerland. Masaryk, Benes, Hodza, and other Czechoslovak leaders in political life tried faithfully to achieve this goal, in cooperation with a number of far-seeing Sudeten Germans.

By contrast, such German nationalists as Dr. R. von Lodgman, the present leader of the Sudeten Germans in Germany, never reconciled themselves to the Republic of Czechoslovakia.

SUDETEN GERMANS UNDER THE NAZI BANNER

The promising development, which could have made of Czechoslovakia another Switzerland, was unfortunately wrecked by the victorious rise of Nazism in Germany. As soon as Hitler came to power in 1932, nationalistic German passion took hold of the Sudeten Germans and abruptly forced the moderate German politicians to the wall. Two years after Hitler's rise to power, in the elections of May 1935, 62 percent of the Sudeten Germans enthusiastically cast their vote for the new radical nationalistic Sudeten German Party. Although the party leader, Konrad Henlein, did his best to mask the real aims, it was nevertheless apparent from the very start that it was a Nazi Party acting under the direct orders and guidance of Hitler and his cohorts. When it came out openly as a Nazi Party in local elections in the spring of 1938, over 92 percent of the Sudeten Germans voted for it.

At the time Hitler's victory seemed assured, Konrad Henlein publicly admitted in Vienna on March 4, 1942, that his party had from its very conception worked for "the homecoming (of the Sudeten Germans) into the great German Reich," but that for tactical reasons, "to avoid being rounded up and liquidated by the Czech authorities, we (the Sudeten Germans) had to deny our allegiance to national socialism." Whereupon he spoke to the point: "With their steadfast confidence in me, my comrades understood what was up; they perceived, beyond the tactical moves of the policy forced upon me, the great goal at which we were aiming, namely, our homecoming into the Reich of Adolph Hitler."

Officials documents on Nazi policies published in recent years show that the Henlein Party, for which over 92 percent Sudeten Germans voted months before Munich, acted strictly upon Hilter's orders and in line with his aim to wreck Czechoslovakia and to bring it under Nazi domination.

SUDETEN GERMANS RESPONSIBLE FOR THE PERSECUTION OF THE CZECHS

There is no doubt but that the Sudeten Germans are responsible for the policy of brutal force and aggression. Yet Dr. Becher is so bold as to say that the Sudeten Germans "are not responsible either for the Munich agreement (which was made by the four great powers only) or for the further imperialism of Hitler who later occupied also the Czech central part of Bohemia and Moravia, now violating the right to self-determination of the Czechs." And as the Sudetenland was separated from the Czech parts of Bohemia and Moravia, Dr. Becher concludes that "the inhabitants of the Sudetenland and those of the Czech parts of Bohemia and Moravia had nothing to do together."

Incredible as it may seem, Dr. Becher hopes to mislead Americans with such crude falsification of recent and well-known historical events.

One should be reminded that—

(a) When Hitler gave the word on September 12, 1938, the Sudeten Germans led by Henlein revolted openly against Czechoslovakia;

(b) The Munich agreement formally agreed upon, was to grant the right to self-determination to the Sudeten Germans; thereupon Hitler solemnly assured England and France that the incorporation of the Sudetenland was his last territorial demand fulfilling his aim "of uniting the Germans";

(c) No sooner had Hitler taken over in Germany, the Sudeten Germans turned their backs on democracy and flocked in great haste under the swastika banner. From the beginning they supported enthusiastically Hitler's pan-Germanism; they participated actively in the Nazi destruction of democratic Czechoslovakia and after Munich welcomed Hitler in a frenzy of wild delight wherever he appeared;

(d) The Sudeten Germans took an active part in preparing and carrying out the occupation of Czechoslovakia in March 1939 not only in the Czech lands but also in Slovakia (where they exerted such great pressure that the Nazis succeeded in bringing about Slovakia's secession);

(e) Sudeten Germans, headed by "State Secretary" Karl Hermann Frank, a very brutal Nazi and one of Henlein's most radical men, held very high positions in the "Protectorate of Bohmen und Mahren"; throughout the war they shared fully with the Reich Germans in the exploitation and liquidation of the Czechs; they behaved in much the same way in Slovakia;

(f) Sudeten Germans actively and enthusiastically supported Hitler's imperialism until his defeat—and like in 1918—were caught by surprise more than anyone else by their downfall.

Although Dr. Becher reasserts his assurances that the Sudeten Germans are in no way responsible for Hitler's policy, his statements are but flagrant lies intended to rid the Sudeten Germans of the terrible stigma for the violent acts of destruction perpetrated willingly in the service of pan-German imperialism.

THE LIE ABOUT THE 300,000 MURDERED GERMANS

Dr. Becher, obviously agreeing with Hitler and Goebbels that the more brazen a lie the more effective it eventually becomes if repeated sufficiently, repeats the lies of Sudeten German propaganda that "300,000 Germans lost their lives during the expulsion" (to Germany).

A young Czesh lawyer Radomir Luza, whose father General Luza, a brave leader in the Czech anti-Nazi resistance, died at the hands of the Nazis for the cause of liberty, subjects Dr. Becher's statistics to careful scrutiny in his study The Transfer. Dr. Becher asserts that 300,000 Sudeten Germans lost their lives in the transfer, but Radomir Luza proves, among other things: that among the allegedly murdered Germans, Dr. Becher has included 34,000 German Jews, whom the Nazis liquidated; that in the number of 300,000 he has also included imaginary nonexistent Germans, Germans who are still alive, and Germans the Nazis themselves disposed of in the gas chambers.

Naturally Dr. Becher carefully hides the fact that the Nazis, ably supported by members of the Sudeten German Henlein Party, dragged off 240,000 Czechs to concentration camps and killed outright 180,000 Czechs. He ignores the fact that 45,000 Czechs are still listed as missing and that 114,000 are permanently disabled. The economic losses suffered by Czechoslovakia under Nazi occupation were estimated by the Czechoslovak Government in 1945 (as submitted to the Paris Reparation Commission) at 350 billion Czechoslovak crowns at 1938 values (roughly $10½ billion at prewar level).

THE TRANSFER—A DIRECT RESULT OF SUDETEN GERMAN POLICY

The Sudeten German policy of avid servitude to pan-German imperialism, espoused ever since 1848 and flagrantly supported and carried out in the Nazi era, inevitably brought on their transfer to Germany after World War II.

Unfortunately, even many Sudeten German Democrats, for instance Wenzel Jaksch, who until Munich had stood on the side of the Czechoslovak Democrats in brave opposition to Henlein, switched during the war in London to the pan-German policy of expansion and domination. When the British Government revoked the Munich agreement in 1942 as no longer binding, Jaksch went so far as to protest against the British decision in an attempt to save for the Sudeten Germans the gains seized by Hitler in 1938-39. This would have meant total subjugation of the Czechs and Slovaks. In the case of Jaksch and other Socialists and Democrats, pan-Germanic nationalism eventually drowned out their democratic ideas.

In view of these conditions, through the fault of the Sudeten Germans, there was no longer any reason to believe in any possible peaceful coexistence between Germans on the one hand and Czechs and Slovaks in Czechoslovakia. No other alternative remained but the drastic transfer. Since the organic entity of Czech lands must not be upset, it remained to separate the Germans from the Czechs by removing them to Germany.

THE WEST WAS THE FIRST TO AGREE TO THE TRANSFER

In an attempt to profit from the present struggle of the United States of America against Soviet imperialism and communism and to misuse it for other purposes, Dr. Becher repeats the wornout false charge that President Benes, whom he derides as the best tool of the Kremlin, acted in agreement with or upon the wishes of Moscow when demanding the Sudeten German transfer.

Actually Benes' war government in exile in London first reached agreement with the British Government and then with the United States Government. The Soviet Government still hesitated and gave its approval only when it became known that America had already approved the idea of the German transfer.

The Soviet Government vacillated for so long because it wished to keep open to the last moment the means of exerting pressure through the Sudeten Germans on the Czechs, for it mistrusted the Czechs for their liberal and democratic thinking, as had their predecessor, the czar's regime in World War I.

Dr. Becher claims that the communization of Czechoslovakia was only possible after the expulsion of the hard-working Sudeten Germans, dedicated to free enterprise.

The absurdity and falsity of the charge stands out glaringly for it is self-evident that—

(a) Under Soviet pressure the other Central European countries (Rumania, Bulgaria, and Hungary) from which the Germans had not been expelled (or only in inconsequential numbers) were nevertheless communized;

(b) The Czechs were no less hard-working and no less dedicated to free enterprise than the Germans;

(c) Until the coming of Hitler there were proportionately far more Marxist Socialists and Communists among the Sudeten Germans than among the Czechs; the Communist Party, penetrating into all the nations of the Republic, was never as strong in the Czech as in the German districts; Henlein's Sudeten German Party won over an unusually large number of those who had previously given their vote to the Communist Party. These facts encouraged the Sudeten German Communists during the last war to believe that after the war they stood the chance of being the strongest party. Had the Sudeten Germans remained in Czechoslovakia, in all likelihood the Communist Party would have found strong support among the Sudeten Germans.

(d) Since 18 million Germans, placed in the Soviet sphere, for all their brave opposition were unable to prevent the communization of East Germany, how could a mere 3 million Sudeten Germans accomplish what 18 million had failed in?

Czechoslovakia was communized not because of the Sudeten German transfer but because she, together with the other countries of East Central Europe, had been placed in the Soviet sphere.

Finally, it must be underlined that President Benes and the Czechoslovak democratic parties never stopped fighting the Communists until the day of the brutal liquidation of Czechoslovak democracy in February 1948. It must also be reaffirmed that they always condemned the improprieties during the transfer, committed largely by the Communists. It was the Czechoslovak democrats, reviled today by the Sudeten Germans and their allies, who put through a parliamentary investigation of the transgressions. The investigations could not be completed because in the meantime the Communists had carried out their putsch.

Although we have condemned (and continue to do so) the transgressions and humiliation, we nevertheless must make it clear that these acts occurred in the first weeks after the war, when the people were understandably and justifiably still bitter and their minds were stirred by fresh memories of the brutalities endured for 6 years at the hands of the Reich Nazis and the Sudeten Germans. Moreover, the administration of the state had not as yet been re-established. Despite these conditions, Czechoslovakia did not experience at any time such a bloody reckoning with Nazi collaborators as went on in other countries, not excepting the Western democracies, for instance France and Italy.

Following the decision of the Potsdam Conference on the German transfer from Czechoslovakia, Poland, and Hungary, the transfer of the Sudeten Germans was carried out in an orderly manner. When the transfer was completed the American occupation headquarters sent the Czechoslovak Government a note acknowledging Czechoslovakia's strict observance of regulations and decency.

CZECHOSLOVAK DEMOCRATS SLANDERED

We do not intend to go into the improper charges of Dr. Becher, who in line with current Sudeten German propaganda proceeds to depict the late President Benes and the Czechoslovak democrats, especially those who openly admit they were for the Sudeten German transfer, as "willing Communist collaborators" whom the Communists allegedly permitted or even helped "to flee to the West" (after the Communist putsch in February 1948). It is not difficult to ascertain that the Czechoslovak democrats fought communism from the day the war ended and that they were increasingly successful in the struggle; that Moscow, fully aware of the growing strength of the Czechoslovak democratic forces and the receding power of the Communists, was compelled to put an end to the dangerous development by ordering the Communist putsch; that in its second great crisis within 10 years, Czechoslovak democracy, standing again alone and abandoned, succumbed in 1948 to Soviet power as it had fallen to the Nazis in 1938. Czechoslovak democracy remained steadfast notwithstanding and fought for the ideals of the western democracies to the very last moment. It has never given up these basic political ideas.

NAZI COLLABORATION WITH THE SOVIETS

The Sudeten Germans, the preponderous majority of whom willingly and eagerly accepted nazism, are the least qualified to criticize the Czechoslovaks for their alliance with the Soviet Union. While the Czechoslovaks, maintaining friendly relations and cooperating fully with their western allies, concluded with the Soviets a pact of assistance only to protect themselves against German imperialism, Hitler, the Sudeten German idol, had concluded earlier a pact with Stalin which opened the way to a war of conquest. Had not Hitler plunged the world into war, the Soviet Union would not be at the River Elbe on the western border of Czechoslovakia and Austria.

Had not Hitler been defeated, the Sudeten Germans would have continued to scoff at American democracy "grown degenerate by the niggers and Jews." They would not be looking for or finding any "deep similarity between the Americans and Germans"; they would not have "unlimited belief in the justice of the American people," for true to their tradition they would be depending solely on the "justice" of the German sword.

History repeats itself in painful analogies: In the First World War the Sudeten Germans ridiculed the apostle of democracy, Woodrow Wilson, and reserved their blind admiration for Kaiser Wilhelm, Hindenburg, and Ludendorf. After their defeat in 1918 they laid claim to Wilson's principles in order to save their privileged position in the state; correspondingly in the Second World War they had implicit faith in Hitler and felt only bitter hatred for American democracy. However, as soon as Hitler's Reich crumbled—the Reich which was to last a thousand years—they promptly discovered deep similarities between the Americans and the Germans.

SHOULD AMERICANS LEND ASSISTANCE TO PAN-GERMANISM?

In reality, the Sudeten Germans are not basing their plans on the justice of the American people; rather they are hoping that Americans, engaged in a great struggle with communism, will help them realize German ambitions entertained under Hitler.

Dr. Becher attempts to convince the American public that in the common struggle against the Communist enemy the Sudeten Germans have joined with the freedom-loving Slovak people, the decent anti-Communist Czech politicians and parties, and the Hungarians on the road toward practical cooperation and ever stronger mutual and friendly understanding.

Who are these very able allies of the Sudeten Germans?

The freedom-loving Slovak people Dr. Becher has in mind are the former Slovak collaborators with the Nazis who served them blindly during the war and link their fate today not to a German democracy but to radical German nationalists. The decent anti-Communist Czech politicians are a handful of adventurers, Fascists, and deracines, who hope to be given high positions in Czechoslovakia for services now rendered, although the Czech people barely know them. The Hungarians, whom Dr. Becher quotes, are the ones who believed that Hitler would break up Czechoslovakia and reestablish Hungarian domination over the Danubian basin.

The Sudeten Germans hide their real aims as carefully as Konrad Henlein did before the war when courting the favor and sympathies of Great Britain. Today his successors are trying to win over the United States; with this goal in mind, they profess to uphold the principles for which the American democracy has always fought. In reality they are addicted more than ever to aspiring, rapacious, and aggressive Pan-Germanism.

Henlein succeeded in bluffing many people in Britain. We hope, therefore, that with sufficient evidence on hand, Americans will avoid the pitfalls planted by Henlein's successors.

REMOVING THE GERMAN MINORITY A PRE-CONDITION FOR FRIENDLY RELATIONS BETWEEN GERMANY AND CZECHOSLOVAKIA

Dr. Becher writes that the position of the Sudeten Germans in former Czechoslovakia was of utmost importance for the development of central Europe and that the solution of the Sudeten German and Czech problem is of decisive importance for a future peaceful development in that part of Europe when once it will be free again.

We agree fully on the importance of the problem of the Sudeten Germans not only to Czechoslovakia but to all of central Europe. Hitler gave convincing evidence: the Sudeten Germans made it possible for him to break off Czechoslovakia and to enslave the Czechs and Slovaks. With the fall of Czechoslovakia, the gates were flung wide open to German imperialism for the control of all of east-central Europe and for future aggression not only against Russia but also against the West.

The Sudeten Germans hope that the struggle of the United States against the Soviet Union will help them to achieve the goal in which Hitler failed them.

They know full well that could they but return to their Sudentenland, with the help of Americans, they could seize powerful key positions enabling them to wreck the reestablishment of Czechoslovakia. Upon their return to their homeland they would immediately demand annexation to the Reich and, together with Hungarian nationalists, would provoke the secession of Slovakia from Bohemia and, it goes without saying, of Subcarpathian Ruthenia.

EUROPE NEEDS A FREE CZECHOSLOVAKIA

For the very reason that we, Czechoslovak democrats, earnestly desire friendly relations with our neighbor the German Reich, we are firmly convinced through bitter and tragic experience that such cooperation calls for, as a fundamental prerequisite, the removal of friction caused in the past by the presence of a strong German minority in Czechoslovakia. The same friction would arise again in the future.

We believe the moving out of the Sudeten Germans from Czechoslovakia to Germany was the only practical, fair solution of the centuries-old problem. It was the only way how to save the Czech and Slovak nations and how to achieve friendly coexistence with Germany.

Czechoslovak democracy, of this we have not doubt, would most assuredly be willing to compensate individuals for transgressions committed during the transfer in the hope that the German democracy would likewise be willing to make good the losses and injuries suffered by the Czechs and Slovaks during the Nazi occupation.

We fervently hope that the great American democracy will understand and support the stand here presented, not alone because of old ties and sympathies which Americans have always bestowed generously on Masaryk's republic, but above all because of its paramount importance to a future European order founded on principles of freedom, rights, and security.

Our hope is further strengthened by the fact that the American democracy is working toward the liberation of Czechoslovakia and the other countries of East Central Europe through peaceful means. In our opinion, it hardly seems possible that America would undermine the anti-Communist resistance of the Czechs and Slovaks, who look to the American people with faith and hope, by lending her support to Sudeten German Pan-Germanism.

In harmony with T. G. Masaryk's declaration in World War I, we his faithful followers do also declare: We are not deluding ourselves with the false hope that the future of the world depends on the fate of the Czechs and Slovaks. Nevertheless, we do believe we should point out to the free world in no unmistakable words: that Europe, if it is not to be endangered by German or Russian domination, needs at its very core, in the heart of Europe, a free and internally consolidated Czechoslovakia.

(Dr. Josef Lettrich, former chairman, Slovak Democratic Party; president, Slovak National Council (Nation Assembly); Member of the Czechoslovak Parliament. Dr. Hubert Ripka, former member of the Czechoslovak Parliament and of the Government. Dr. Peter Zenkl, former member of the Czechoslovak Parliament, Mayor of Prague, Vice Premier and chairman of the Czechoslovak National Socialist Party.)

Candidacy of James A. Farley for Governor of New York—Democrats Miss the Boat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 5, 1954

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an editorial published in the Nyack (N. Y.) Journal-News of July 9, 1954.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Democrats Miss the Boat

(By Frank Ernest)

I was very disappointed at the action—or lack of it—taken by the Rockland County Democratic Committee at its meeting at the Tallman firehouse last Tuesday night. I thought that there was an opportunity for Rockland to come forward as the first county in New York State to endorse James A. Farley as the Democratic nominee for governor.

It would have been quite natural for such an endorsement to come from Rockland, where Mr. Farley was born and brought up, where he got his first experience in politics, where he started out as a Democratic committeeman in his own Grassy Point district and then came up from there to become a maker of Presidents, a wonderful American who, when American traditions were thrown overboard, broke with those who without his aid would never have been anywhere. Rockland could have carried the ball for him into the "straw vote" the Democrats are taking to determine who may be the candidate, and Mr. Farley's name is included in the list of possible candidates.

Instead of taking forthright action in that respect, the Rockland County Democratic Committee went smug. It nominated its own candidates and its own delegates. And, as far as I have been able to discover, the delegates to the State convention weren't instructed to do anything or support anybody.

COMMITTEE MISSED THE BOAT

I am a Democrat. I have read over the list of all the names that will be submitted to the voters on the straw poll. I am a Farley man from start to finish in this thing and I think the committeemen—I guess I have told you this on many occasions before that, in my opinion, the committeemen of any given party in Rockland County are like a herd of cattle heading into a stockyard somewhere to have their noggins caved in—missed the boat completely when they didn't give Mr. Farley their endorsement.

The only good reason I can see for such an omission is that the leadership of the committee might have been waiting for word to come down from higher up that somebody else might be the choice of the State committee. I can't excuse the Rockland leadership for not making an endorsement unless, perhaps, ulterior motives might be involved and they can see a chance of better patronage by playing along with the State committee until such time as nominations are made.

And I'll make a flat prediction here and that is that, unless they do nominate Mr. Farley, Governor Dewey will beat back the ears of whomever they nominate as a candidate.

There is nobody in the Democratic Party as well qualified to serve as governor of New York State as Jim Farley. The rest of the potential nominees, with the possible exception of Mr. Harriman, are just also-rans in a horse race. And I wouldn't pass out so many cudos to Mr. Harriman, either. He might come out of the paddock looking like a winner, but I think I should back Dewey when it comes to the homestretch.

But let's take the boy from Grassy Point. Here's a man who has pulled himself up to high position by his own bootstraps. Here's a man who is respected by both Democrats and Republicans throughout his own State. He is known by more people and knows more people throughout the United States and throughout the world than any other living man. I am sure nobody will challenge that statement.

HAS REMAINED LOYAL

He has had good reason to give up the Democratic cause, but he never has done so. He has remained loyal and firm in his adherence to the party. And that's the difference between him and some of the others. Mr. Farley made the party when it was "out." Never was a nobler job done.

On the other side of the fence, the "party" made those who are on the "in" now. I don't know what they are going to do but, in the "straw vote" poll that is being sent out, there are candidates who, as far as I am concerned, don't stack up at all. For instance, there are liberals. "Junior" Roosevelt is one of them. There are others who seem to straddle lines here and there—not exactly party lines but some things that shake my Adam's apple and make me sure that this isn't what I like.

Democrats pay homage each year to Jackson and Jefferson. I think in many cases it's lip tribute. All I can say is that if the Democratic Party has the idea of nominating a real Democrat for governor, a Democrat whose integrity is unchallenged—even under the rough deal of Farleyism when he was Postmaster General and under the stigma of the "three dumb dukes" when he was chairman of the New York State Athletic Commission—they had better select James A. Farley. Throughout the years, despite personal attacks, nobody can challenge his innate honesty or his loyalty.

Rockland Democrats have missed the boat up to this point. I hope the delegates to the State convention will wise up to themselves when they attend the convention which will nominate candidates I hope they won't listen to the message of State Chairman Richard H. Balch, which was read at their sparsely attended convention. Mr. Balch has a swell political message, but, as far as I am concerned, it's a story from a guy who doesn't give a whoop about anything as long as he can convince somebody that he's really interested. Mr. Balch wants to win Rockland County and New York State. But he can't do it with any other candidate than James A. Farley.

How Long Do We Play Santa Claus?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALTON A. LENNON

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 5, 1954

Mr. LENNON. Mr. President, an editorial published in the Charlotte (N. C.)

Observer of Saturday, July 31, 1954, entitled "How Long Do We Play Santa Claus?" expresses my position with respect to foreign economic aid. The Charlotte Observer is one of the foremost newspapers of the South and of our Nation.

I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

HOW LONG DO WE PLAY SANTA CLAUS?

The foreign aid bill passed by the House, providing $2.9 billion in new money and $2.3 billion in unobligated balances, leads to some pertinent questions.

What, for example, becomes of all the military equipment we sent to Indochina? Nobody seems to know exactly how much there is of it, but the total is probably between $1 billion and $2 billion. How much of it we can get out before the Communists move in is anybody's guess, but there probably will not be much.

Then we should recall that in conquering China the Communists made good use of American military material that fell into their hands. And this raises the next question: How much more military equipment are we going to send to places that cannot be held, only to see it also fall into the hands of the enemy?

Moreover, with the chances for the European Defense Community getting slimmer by the day and NATO tottering on the verge of collapse, will the military material we are sending to Europe ever be used for the common defense?—or will it be used to build up national armies that will go their own separate ways when and if NATO finally collapses?

The proper course, it seems to us, would be to get the defense system organized first and then equip it. Otherwise we may be just storing up treasures for the Communists.

As far as economic aid is concerned, it should be stopped entirely, with a few possible exceptions. Most of the countries receiving such aid have so far recovered that they can well take care of themselves.

Resolution of Yonkers Committee To Rewrite the McCarran-Walter Immigration Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 5, 1954

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, the Yonkers Committee To Rewrite the McCarran-Walter Immigration Law, an organization established to carry on an educational program for the revision of our present immigration and citizenship laws, held a conference on July 16, attended by representatives of 24 organizations. The officers of this organization are as follows: president, Mr. Milton L. Romm, 30 South Broadway, Yonkers, N. Y.; and corresponding secretary, Mrs. Marion Slater Goodman, 2 Wainright Avenue, Yonkers, N. Y. The conference passed a resolution on this subject, and I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Whereas President Eisenhower has said "The McCarran immigration law must be rewritten. A better law must be written that will strike an intelligent balance between the immigration welfare of America and the prayerful hopes of the unhappy and the oppressed"; and

Whereas former President Truman stated in vetoing this law "This bill * * * taking all its provisions together would be taking a step backward and not a step forward"; and

Whereas the law is unjust, antidemocratic, and discriminatory against many national, racial, and religious groups and undermines American efforts to win the support and friendship of peoples abroad;

Whereas we, the Yonkers Committee to Rewrite the McCarran-Walter immigration law; therefore

Resolve—

1. The McCarran-Walter immigration law should be rewritten so as to correct its injustices consistent with principles of fair treatment for all national, racial, and religious groups;

2. That we call on all interested organizations in the city of Yonkers to approve this resolution and join with the Yonkers committee to rewrite the McCarran-Walter immigration law in calling a citywide town meeting in October or November 1954 to further implement this resolution:

3. That a copy of this resolution be filed with the United States Senators from the State of New York, the Honorable Herbert H. Lehman and the Honorable Irving Ives, with our Representative in Congress, the Honorable Ralph W. Gwinn, and with the appropriate committees of both Houses of Congress.

Patronage and Civil Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 5, 1954

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following editorial from the Washington Evening Star of August 4, 1954:

PATRONAGE AND CIVIL SERVICE

The White House has "clarified" an unsigned memorandum regarding patronage that had been widely criticized by defenders of the merit system in the Government. Not clarified, however, was the mystery of why such a statement was issued in the first place. As worded, it was in direct conflict with long-standing civil-service regulations protecting career employees from patronage raids.

The memorandum, on White House stationery, advised departmental heads to clear with the Republican National Committee all appointments to Federal jobs in grade 14 ($9,600 a year) and higher. Many of these high-level jobs are held by career employees selected under the civil-service competitive system. It is a cardinal rule of this system that appointments to career jobs "must be on the basis of merit and fitness and without regard to political or religious affiliations, marital status, or race."

When the memorandum came to the attention of civil-service organizations, protests were made to the Civil Service Commission. As a result, the White House has revised the statement to make it clear that only non-civil-service jobs are involved in the order. The alarm of some civil-service employees is understandable, in view of past efforts of the administration to put some of its "own people" in key policymaking posts. Granting the right of the administration to surround itself with trusted lieutenants, special care should be taken to see to it that the merit system is not weakened by patronage inroads or loosely worded orders that impair morale of civil-service workers.

CSC Action Opens Path To Control of Many Jobs by Patronage Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. MOSS, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 7, 1954

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, another recent article, published on August 1, 1954 in the Washington Post and Times Herald, discusses further moves to open civil service jobs to political patronage.

This report, in a newspaper noted for its fairness toward the party now in the majority, emphasizes the dangers which are inherent in any move to reinstitute the spoils system in Government employment. If political affiliation becomes a requirement for getting a Government job, we will no longer be able to benefit by the valuable services which are rendered by loyal Federal career workers. Government service should not be and is not a mere job to provide subsistence. It should be and is a dedicated service by employees who are too seldom adequately compensated for their work.

I hope, for these reasons, that the move to replace true civil service with political patronage will be halted.

The article follows:

CSC ACTION OPENS PATH TO CONTROL OF MANY JOBS BY PATRONAGE FORCES

The Civil Service Commission has, by a recent action, helped clear the path to partisan political control over many thousands of Federal jobs which are supposed to be under its merit system.

The agency was created to strengthen the merit system in Government; it is supposed to be divorced from political considerations in the appointments and promotions of Federal personnel.

In an unpublicized move, however, CSC directed each of its 10 regional offices and the 800 agency boards of examiners to send a copy of each authorized job opening to the head of the appropriate agency here. Officially, it now maintains this step was taken for another purpose—to keep a closer check on the direct hiring of agencies.

However, once the lists of Civil Service jobs to be filled are sent here, political wheels begin to grind. Many of the jobs are referred to the Republican National Committee and to other GOP political sources, and candidates who are cleared politically are given preference for the appointments.

As revealed here on July 19, agency heads have been directed by the White House to clear appointments to these and to other Federal jobs with the Republican National

Committee. The recent CSC action makes the task of spotting vacant Federal jobs, and of clearing them, much easier for politicians.

In fact a top Federal official conceded to this reporter that the CSC order was for the dual purpose of supplying Federal job information to GOP patronage forces and also to provide CSC with information on the effectiveness of its job examining program.

The jobs involved are referred to as "303 authority" positions by Government people. These positions are under Civil Service, but are ones which CSC is unable to fill from a list of eligibles who qualified for them through competitive tests. In such cases, CSC authorizes the agencies to fill the jobs from the open market, provided the people selected meet its minimum standards for them.

An estimated 40,000 jobs were filled last year through the direct hiring, or "303", authority. Despite the slowdown in Federal hiring, the number this year could be even larger for these reasons:

1. CSC has a smaller operating budget; it has fewer dollars to spend on competitive tests, and that would indicate more CSC jobs will be filled through direct agency hiring.

2. However, there is a deep suspicion in reliable quarters that some agency officials in the field have yielded to political pressures and are deliberately not holding tests for some jobs in order to open the door for appointments to them from political sources.

The extent to which CSC will enter the partisan political arena is likely to be determined by the method used to fill its several vacant regional director positions.

Reportedly, Chairman Philip Young, who has the power over them, wants to fill them with career civil servants on a merit basis, a system followed many years by the agency which is charged with promotion of a career system in Government.

However, there are those in powerful places who are said to be insisting on GOP political clearances for the jobs. Also, the same sources are reported to be after the jobs of several CSC officials here and in the field.

Young reluctantly agreed to provide GOP Members of Congress with details on the many thousands of non-civil-service jobs which could be turned over to patronage after they had threatened to get his scalp.

Gen. George C. Marshall

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALTON A. LENNON

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 5, 1954

Mr. LENNON. Mr. President, Gen. George C. Marshall spends a number of months of each year in North Carolina. We in North Carolina have come to know and respect him and believe him to be one of the greatest Americans of our time.

When President Eisenhower, at his press conference of August 4, made a statement giving his high opinion of General Marshall, I felt immeasurable pride, as I believe most Americans did.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record a press story headed "President's Testimonial," and also an editorial entitled "Marshall: Another View," published in the Washington Post of Thursday, August 5, 1954.

There being no objection, the article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PRESIDENT'S TESTIMONIAL

(Editor's Note.—The White House authorized direct quotation of President Eisenhower's news conference remarks in praise of Gen. George C. Marshall, as follows:)

Question by Edward T. Folliard, the Washington Post and Times Herald: Mr. President, Senator McCarthy put a letter in the Congressional Record the other day. It was from Harry Woodring, former Secretary of War. Mr. Woodring had this to say about Gen. George C. Marshall, quote: "He would sell out his grandmother for personal advantage." He went on to say other things in that same vein. Mr. President, what do you think of that appraisal of General Marshall?

The President: Ladies and gentlemen. There are some things that cause me to be almost emotional. Now, I believe that there are many of you here who know General Marshall well yourselves—all during his war years, the work he did, and the way he did it. I happen to be one of those Army officers that did not meet General Marshall except in the most casual way until the war started. I think I had seen him twice in my life—in either case not over a minute or two at the time. I was brought in and my relationships with him have been largely, almost exclusively, official.

But I would like to say—and I have been saying that ever since I first knew him well—that he, to me, has typified all that we call—or that we look for—in what we call an American patriot. I saw many things he did that were proof, to me at least, of his selflessness. I am quite certain that he did not want to sit in Washington and be a Chief of Staff. I am sure he wanted a field command. But he wouldn't even allow his chief to know what he wanted because he said, "I am here to serve and not to satisfy personal ambition."

Now, later on, of course, after the war was over, he went to a different post. What the circumstances were of that post, I know nothing. What were his judgments, what were the things that could have been done and were not done, or what things were done that should not have been done, I don't know.

But I do know that General Marshall served according to his conceptions of his duty to his chief. I tried to put this in a book that I wrote once and maybe some of you heard about. I tried to say what I thought about him. I have been saying it ever since, and I shall continue to say it until there is evidence—that I just don't believe exists in the world—that I am wrong.

If you go back through his record, you will find that it was a brilliant record, always serving to the best of his ability; I believe as a first lieutenant, if I recall, they picked him out to serve as a chief of staff for the greatest maneuvers ever held in the Philippines at that time, as indicative of his ability and his dedication to his job.

And all the way through his record is studded with that kind of performance. I think it is a sorry reward, at the end of at least 50 years of service to this country, to say that he is not a loyal, fine American, and that he served only in order to advance his own personal ambitions.

I can't imagine anyone that I have known in my career of whom this is less so than it is in his case.

I am sorry if I have made a speech, but that is the way I feel.

MARSHALL: ANOTHER VIEW

Former Secretary of War Woodring, as quoted by Senator McCarthy, charges that Gen. George C. Marshall "would sell out his own grandmother for personal advantage." President Eisenhower yesterday gave the appropriate answer to this attack by stating with heartfelt eloquence his own unbounded admiration of General Marshall. The President's observations closely parallel those of another Secretary of War, Henry L. Stimson, who had occasion to appraise General Marshall closely during the peak of his responsibilities. Mr. Stimson's comments are taken from a farewell interview by Edward T. Folliard, published in this newspaper on September 20, 1945:

"I spite of the great prestige which General Marshall justly holds among his countrymen, I doubt that many fully realize how his leadership has counted. I know, because we could talk freely of it in private, how clearly he saw the inevitable involvement of this Nation in the war and tried by every means at his disposal to prepare us for it. * * *

"General Marshall's leadership takes its authority directly from his great strength of character. I have never known a man who seemed so surely to breathe the democratic American spirit. He is a soldier, and yet he has a profound distaste for anything that savors of militarism. * * * His devotion to the Nation he serves is a vital quality which infuses everything he does. During the course of a long lifetime, much of it spent in positions of public trust, I have had considerable experience with men in Government. General Marshall has given me a new gauge of what such service should be.

"The destiny of America at the most critical time of its national existence has been in the hands of a great and good citizen. Let no man forget it."

"Operation Kid Knit"—"Operation Can't Knit"—"Operation Socks"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 5, 1954

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, there are two residents in my district who have made a notable contribution to the relief of the distressed victims of the Korean war and I am pleased to have the permission of the House to insert in the Record a summary of their activities.

Mr. and Mrs. William J. Sneider, of Asbury Park, N. J., were so impressed by an appeal for clothing for Korean orphans made by Lt. Edwin C. Doe, then stationed in Korea, that Mr. and Mrs. Sneider went right to work to fulfill this request. A description of their activities is completely set forth in a statement which I have received from Mr. Roy Sager, of Long Branch, N. J., as follows:

In August of 1952, the Asbury Park Press carried an appeal for clothing for Korean orphans from Lt. Edwin C. Doe, who was then stationed in Korea. The only ones to answer this appeal were Mr. and Mrs. William J. Sneider, owners of a knitting shop in Asbury Park, N. J.

Mrs. Sneider originated the idea to knit up scrap yarns into sweaters, socks, hats, scarves, mittens, and afghans to warm the hearts and bodies of the little Korean unfortunates. The Sneiders offered to donate yarn from their shop to anyone who would knit for Korea and within a very short length of time they were swamped with hundreds of volunteers.

The Asbury Park Press began to publicize the project and the increase of volunteers for free yarns soon outgrew the confines of the Sneiders' shop. Information through friends to the New York Times brought their story into print and with it the beginning of what has become nationally known as Operation Kid Knit. By September of 1952 the project was made known to approximately 50,000 women. The continued growth and expansion of the project is briefly outlined in the following:

October 1952: A feature story appeared about the Sneiders in Notions and Art Needlework magazines. Five thousand art and needlework shops and department stores were asked to follow their plan.

November 1952: A coast-to-coast broadcast over radio station WOR by Mrs. Sneider and Col. Ben C. Limb from Sardis, New York City, at which time Mrs. Sneider made an appeal for 1 million knitters for Korea.

December 1952: Commendation from the United States Marine Corps.

January 1953: A letter written by Mr. Sneider for the Ladies' Home Journal brought some 40,000 requests for knitting-instruction fliers. Mrs. Sneider prepared these instruction fliers for all types of knitted garments which she had designed in the native Korean style.

April 1953: As guests of the Ladies' Home Journal, the Sneiders addressed the Berks County Womens Clubs in Reading, Pa. At that time they made radio appeals for knitters for Korea and inaugarated a national knitting project for the Federated Womens Clubs of America. At this time the Ladies' Home Journal composed a special brochure on the Sneider's knitting project proclaiming it the largest reader response to any project in the history of the Journal.

June 1953: Seventeen magazine used three full pages to tell the story of the knitting project with photographs of Korean styled knitted garments which were designed and prepared by Mrs. Sneider.

July 1953: The National Headquarters of the Girl Scouts of the United States of America officially adopted Operation Kid Knit as a work project for all Brownie and Girl Scout groups.

August–September 1953: The Scouts official publications, the Leader and the American Girl, announced the knitting project to all Girl Scouts in the United States and Canada.

August 1953: Knitting groups started in Alaska, Canada, England, Switzerland, Argentina, Belgium, and other countries as a result of the appeals.

September 1953: The Associated Press released a feature story about the Sneider's project to 1,700 newspapers throughout the United States. Other national magazines covering the project were McCall's, Woman's Home Companion, the New England Homestead, and Quick.

From August 1952 until November 1953, the Sneiders shipped over 6,000 knitted garments to Korea from their small shop, defraying all mailing costs and other expenses themselves.

November 1953: Commendations from Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor via a letter through Government channels. The International News Service relase from Seoul contained General Taylor's letter.

November 1953: The inauguration of "Operation Can't Knit," a project also devised by the Sneiders to aid Korean war widows and their families.

November 1953: B'nai B'rith women of Monmouth County name Mrs. Sneider "Woman of the Year."

November 9, 1953: The mayor of Asbury Park designated November 9 as Rose Sneider Day. Letters and telegrams of commendation were received from Gov. Alfred Driscoll, Eleanor Roosevelt, and many Senators and Congressmen.

December and January 1954: Appeals were published in the Woman's Home Companion for women to knit for Korean waifs and all readers were requested to send for the Sneider's instruction flyer. A feature story was also published in the Honolulu News.

January 1954: A story written by Mr. Sneider was published in the New England Homestead publicizing "Operation Can't Knit." This was a program of aid in which yarns, knitting accessories, and sewing materials were sent to Korean war widows enabling them to make up garments for themselves and their families plus additional items to sell to obtain money for food.

February 1954: The Newark Evening News ran a feature story on "Operation Can't Knit."

February 1954: The Ladies Home Journal devoted two columns to a new appeal arranged by Mr. Sneider for "Operation Can't Knit." The reported results of this project indicated that at least a ton of knitting yarns and materials were delivered to Korean widows.

March 1954: Mr. and Mrs. Sneider appeared on a CBS–TV program, Journey Through Life on which they told the story of their now famous international humanitarian projects for the relief of Korean destitutes. As a result of this broadcast the Sneiders were voted "Couple of the Week" by the listening audience.

April 1954: The Girl Scouts officially adopted "Operation Can's Knit" as a second national work project.

May 1954: Feature stories were published in the Miami Daily News and the Miami Sun. The Sneiders appeared on a TV broadcast for Korean relief on WRTV.

June 1954: The Sneiders originated a third relief project for Korea "Operation Socks" in collaboration with Mrs. Ellis O. Briggs, wife of the United States Ambassador to Korea. This project calls for the soliciting of knitted woolen socks for the frost-bitten feet of the Korean orphans. This project has been publicized in the New England Homestead and stories will appear in the same national publications that carried the previous projects.

July 1954: The Sneiders were invited to and attended a reception in Washington, D. C., for President and Madame Syngman Rhee who warmly thanked the Sneiders for their noble efforts in behalf of Korea.

It is estimated that through the Sneiders' efforts they have influenced approximately 20 million people throughout the world, convincing them to help in some way to alleviate the suffering of the South Koreans. In the course of the past 2 years they have received some 5,000 letters of inquiry with reference to aid for Korean orphans. Every letter was personally answered. Col. Ben C. Limb, Korean Ambassador to the United Nations, has frequently commended the Sneiders for their humanitarian efforts in his country's behalf. Many chaplains stationed in Korea have written to the Sneiders telling them how the warm knitted garments have kept countless numbers of Korean children from freezing to death. Newspapers throughout the free world have written about the Sneiders and publicized their humane projects.

During all this time the Sneiders have carried on their work without the affiliated help of any group or organizations and have personally financed their efforts from limited funds. No two people have ever worked harder for personal gain or profit than these two folks have worked for charity.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. and Mrs. Sneider have been honored in their work but the greatest reward which they have received is from the letters which come from chaplains, relief workers, and others telling about the results of their labors. They have brought to the unfortunate people of this part of the world a warm beam of sunshine which expresses the great heart of America.

Political Repercussion To Follow Betrayal of Vets, Says One Writer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY W. WIER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 5, 1954

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article from the National Tribune—the Stars and Stripes of Thursday, August 5, 1954, by Mr. Jack Kyle, of the 1902–14 Philippine Command Committee, Washington, D. C., entitled "Political Repercussion To Follow Betrayal of Veterans."

The article follows:

EDITOR, NATIONAL TRIBUNE:

President Eisenhower and the Republican leadership in the House of Representatives having turned their backs on the Moro-Leyet-Samar veterans, H. R. 5380 is apparently as dead as some expect the Republican Party to be after November 2.

Thus, once again these old unpensioned veterans have lost a battle but not a campaign. Being made of the sterner stuff, they will fight on to the last man to remove a conspicuous black spot upon the Nation's honor.

The facts are that the Eisenhower administration was opposed to H. R. 5380 from the very beginning. Soon after the bill's introduction, the old anti-regular clique in the Veterans' Administration submitted the customary biased report on the bill to the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs containing the timeworn statement that enactment of the bill would not be in accord with the program of the President. That report put the President squarely on record against the old combat veterans and thereby qualified him for membership in the exclusive Anti-Regular Club formerly headed by his fellow Army generals, Hines, Bradley, and Gray, in the order named.

But the VA and the Bureau of the Budget did not sway the 28-member nonpartisan Committee on Veterans' Affairs. After an adequate public hearing, the bill was unanimously reported to the House on June 20, 1953, when it was placed on the Consent Calendar, but a lone Republican, Representative JOHN W. BYRNES of Green Bay, Wis., singlehandedly blocked its passage on every call of the calendar during the entire first session of the 83d Congress. BYRNES, of course, is not a veteran.

After the Congress reconvened last January, objector BYRNES took up where he had left off and prevented the bill's passage on each calendar day, so, after the third call, the Committee on Veterans' Affairs removed the bill from the Consent Calendar, and Chairman EDITH NOURSE ROGERS, addressed a letter to Rules Committee Chairman LEO E. ALLEN of Illinois, asking that the bill be cleared for floor action. That was on April 26. After several weeks, not having heard from Chairman ALLEN, Mrs. ROGERS sent a second letter to him urging early consideration of the bill, but like the first, that letter was never answered.

REPUBLICAN MONEY PLENTIFUL

Sensing trouble ahead and recalling that the President had made absolutely no recommendation for any veterans' legislation in his several messages to Congress, we made a strong appeal to our old friend, Speaker MARTIN, and to others high in Republican councils. While the Speaker gave us much encouragement, and other Republicans gave us lip service, not a single Republican of any importance would let go of the Eisenhower coattails long enough to strike a single blow for these old forsaken veterans.

In the meantime, numerous Members of Congress, veterans' organizations, and scores of interested veterans and widows, had sent letters to Speaker Martin, Majority Leader Halleck, and Chairman Allen, expressing their interest in the bill, but like those of Chairman Rogers, their letters were never answered. I deeply regret to write this about my old friend Speaker Joe Martin, but the naked truth must be told.

Now another important bill must enter into this story. In keeping with Republican campaign pledges—heretofore printed in the National Tribune—on May 28 the Committee on Veterans' Affairs unanimously reported H. R. 9020, providing a 10-percent cost-of-living increase for all those on the VA compensation and pension rolls, and, on the same date, Chairman Rogers directed a letter to Rules Committee Chairman Allen, asking that H. R. 9020 be also cleared for floor action, but in violation of traditional congressional courtesy, that letter as well as a second one on the subject was never so much as acknowledged. The Republican leadership ruled with an iron hand.

From late in June the Republican strategy was glaringly apparent. Among other things, they had planned to put through the $4.3 billion foreign-aid bill and other Eisenhower "must" legislation and slip out of Washington to get themselves reelected, leaving these important veterans' bills to die a silent death in the Rules Committee.

It was at about that time that Chairman Rogers, the National Tribune, and the veterans' organizations began to force the leadership to show its hand. While holding these bills up in the Rules Committee, they passed the $4.3 billion foreign-aid bill, and a farm-subsidy bill, along with others appropriating the usual election-year pork, and while the President himself joined in and rolled a $50 billion Federal-State highway pork-barrel program into the midst of the Governors' Conference. Republican money was plentiful then.

SIXTY-FIVE MILLION VOTE POTENTIAL

As was so forcefully reported in last week's National Tribune, Majority Leader Halleck was finally forced to retreat to the White House for reinforcements from whence he returned to the Capitol with the surprising statement: "We are in difficulties in managing our finances." That, of course, was after the $4.3 billion foreign aid bill had been passed. Then we were bluntly told that President Eisenhower positively would not sign any non-service-connected legislation and were given to understand that he interpreted the 1952 Republican campaign promises to apply only to the service connected. Reluctantly, therefore, the Committee on Veterans' Affairs rewrote H. R. 9020 to conform to the President's ultimatum. Section 3, providing increases for the nonservice connected, was stricken and with that section H. R. 5380 went into oblivion.

It is said that our veterans now represent a 65 million vote potential, but that potential appears to be of no significance to the Eisenhower administration. However, this writer is hopeful that a thoroughly aroused veteran class will soon rise in its own vigorous defense and, further, help end the crazy plagues of one worldism and fanatical give-away programs. If these instruments of national suicide are not abandoned, very soon little will be left to give. On the very day that the emasculated H. R. 9020 passed the House, Representative Daniel A. Reed of New York, chairman of the powerful taxwriting Committee on Ways and Means, placed statistics in the Congressional Record showing that we have spent more than $50 billion, not counting interest, for foreign aid since World War II. That $50 billion, according to present estimates, would meet the total expenditures of the Veterans' Administration, including all compensation and pension payments, for the next 15 years. That's something to think about.

For and on behalf of the 1902–14 Philippine Command Committee—Jack Kyle, Post Office Box 1520, Washington 13, D. C.

William Crawford Gorgas, 1854–1920

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARMISTEAD I. SELDEN, JR.
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 5, 1954

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of the Members of Congress that October 3, 1954, will mark the 100th anniversary of the birth of that great Alabamian, Gen. William Crawford Gorgas, whose career won him the title "A Soldier of Humanity."

In 1950 General Gorgas was elected to the Hall of Fame for Great Americans, and the following sketch of his life appears in the Hall of Fame handbook:

WILLIAM CRAWFORD GORGAS, 1854–1920

"If there were no way to control yellow fever and malaria, the hot countries would be left to the inertia of the ages."

William Crawford Gorgas, physician, sanitary engineer, and Surgeon General of the United States Army, was born at Toulminville, near Mobile, Ala., October 3, 1854, and died in London, England, July 4, 1920. In his youth, Gorgas wanted to attend West Point, but circumstances prevented this. Failing to enter the academy, he decided to study medicine in order that he might join the Medical Corps of the Army. He was graduated from the University of the South, Sewanee, Tenn., in 1875, and received his M. D. from Bellevue Hospital Medical College (New York University) in 1879. He was appointed surgeon in the Army in 1880, and in 1882 was transferred from Fort Clarke, Tex., where he was stationed, to Fort Brown in the same State. A few days after his arrival, he was called to look after the sister-in-law of the commanding officer of the post, Miss Marie Doughty, who had a severe case of yellow fever. In looking after her, Gorgas himself contracted the disease. Both convalesced together, fell in love, and were married in 1885. In 1898 he was sent to Habana, Cuba, as chief sanitary officer, and subsequently joined Walter Reed and the Yellow Fever Commission. In the year preceding the actual occupation by the Army, Habana lost 100 out of every 1,000 persons. Soon after it was discovered by the Commission that the Aedes Aegypti mosquito was responsible for the transmission of yellow fever, Gorgas learned that these mosquitoes would only lay their eggs in man-made vessels which contained fresh water. This discovery ultimately led to the eradication of yellow fever. When President Theodore Roosevelt appointed his first Panama Canal Commission in May of 1904, he realized that the building of the canal was as much a health problem as one of engineering and sent Gorgas down that same year to study and prepare methods of sanitary control. Long before Gorgas went to the isthmus, Ferdinand de Lesseps, who helped build the Suez Canal, was sent by the French Government to Panama to build a canal. This was in 1881. What De Lesseps failed to consider in his attempt to build the Panama Canal was the sanitation problem. The French lost over 22,000 workers from disease during their 9 years in the isthmus, and at all times nearly a third of their workers were sick. Gorgas' work in combating mosquitoes in the Canal Zone and ridding the area of yellow fever made possible the building of the canal. Gorgas was offered the presidency of the University of Alabama in 1911, but declined this honor to further serve the Army in his capacity as a physician. In 1913 he was called to the Rand gold mines in South Africa to wipe out influenza, and in 1914 was appointed Surgeon General of the Army. He retired from the Army in 1918 and became director of yellow fever research and permanent director of the international health board of the Rockefeller Foundation. He died in London, England, and his body was brought back for burial in Arlington National Cemetery at Arlington, Va.

Seventy-nine years ago today, on August 5, 1875, William Crawford Gorgas graduated from the University of the South at Sewanee, Tenn., with the degree of bachelor of arts. On Sunday, October 3, 1954, the University of the South will commemorate the centennial of the birth of General Gorgas, and I am certain there will be other appropriate observances of this great American's birth.

The Senate and The McCarthy Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, August 5, 1954

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record a very interesting editorial entitled "Stalling in the Senate," which was published in the New York Herald Tribune of August 4, 1954.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

STALLING IN THE SENATE

Vice President Nixon faces the unenviable task of appointing a bipartisan committee of 6 Senators, 3 Republicans and 3 Democrats, to investigate the charges against Senator Joseph McCarthy and presumably express some opinion as to what ought to be done. While we have great respect for Mr. Nixon's fairness, it seems plain that the political pressures and reluctance of Senators to serve make this a difficult assignment.

It can hardly be hoped that the present maneuver will accomplish much that is useful. Little can be gained from another wearisome rehashing of the grounds for the multiple allegations that the man from Wisconsin has engaged in unbecoming conduct and through his abuse of investigative procedures has brought the entire Senate into disrepute. Yet, there the thing stands. Whatever may be the Senators' private thoughts, they have preferred to avoid taking a stand on McCarthy. It is a stall pure and simple, the result of elaborate rationalization. The real reason, as everyone understands, is that many Senators are averse to committing themselves with an election coming on. And so, by 75 to 12 vote, the overgrown problem has been sent to a special committee.

This is the traditional way of dealing with any ticklish situation where time is wanted. There can always be the hope that the dilemma may even die of its own weight. It is a safe, even though less than forthright, procedure. The Senate is spared a colossal embarrassment, for even if the committee should report back promptly with any solid conclusions it is extremely unlikely that the Senators would feel any new compulsions to put themselves on record at once.

No popular respect can accrue from such evasive behavior. It is only another sad piece of evidence that the Senate, by long lack of attention to the rules of fairness and dignity, has made the McCarthy situation far more of a riddle than it deserves to be.

Mr. Woodring Hasn't Forgotten

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ROONEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 5, 1954

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following article by Doris Fleeson from the Washington Evening Star of August 4, 1954:

Mr. Woodring Hasn't Forgotten—General Marshall Was Chief of Staff in a Hot Spot When Kansan Was Secretary of War Under Roosevelt

When Navy Under Secretary Dan A. Kimball was promoted to Navy Secretary in the summer of 1951, he said to his superior Defense Secretary George Catlett Marshall, "General, have you any suggestions about filling my old job?" General Marshall's reply was prompt and powerful.

"Kimball," he barked, "get your own Under Secretary. I don't want any part of it. Get somebody you can work with who will be loyal to you and I'll fight for him all the way to 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue and back to the Pentagon.

"I had to be Chief of Staff to a Secretary of War and his first assistant who weren't speaking to each other. They not only didn't make any secret of how they hated and despised each other, they ran to the President behind each other's back. Then the President would send for me to get the facts.

"It was the most miserable experience of my life. If we hadn't been trying to prepare for a war I knew was coming, I don't think I could have stood it. I don't want any one around here to have to go through anything like that again, and if anybody does, it will be their own fault, not mine."

The Secretary of War who wasn't speaking to his first assistant was Harry H. Woodring, whose bitter letter asserting that General Marshall "would sell out his own grandmother for personal advantage" was made public by Senator McCarthy. The first assistant was Louis Johnson, who much later became for 1 controversial year President Truman's Secretary of Defense.

Franklin D. Roosevelt was the President who umpired the Woodring-Johnson hassle, which was one of the most open secrets in Washington during the tense pre-World War II era. It always seemed rather to amuse him, though it was hard on the conscientious and dignified Marshall.

In the end Mr. Roosevelt pulled the rug out from under both Mr. Woodring and Mr. Johnson, and the Republicans as well. As Republicans were gathering in Philadelphia to nominate their 1940 ticket, Mr. Roosevelt explained that the Nation's defense must have bipartisan support, so he was naming Republicans—the late Henry L. Stimson and the late Frank Knox—as Secretaries of War and Navy.

Mr. Woodring departed from Washington for his native Kansas in a rage which time has only served to inflame. He has fought Democrats and Democratic policies with harsh zeal and once associated himself with the effort to organize a splinter party.

Mr. Johnson, actually the more badly used as he had been promised by Mr. Roosevelt he would get Mr. Woodring's job, left quietly but lived to rule—albeit briefly—at the Pentagon again.

Mr. Woodring was never considered one of the brighter ornaments of the New Deal, but he had one enormous asset—he was FRBC: For Roosevelt Before Chicago. As he was then Governor of Kansas, his support counted in the 1932 convention and Jim Farley put him on the must list for a job.

Mr. Roosevelt, as indifferent to the Army as he was devoted to the Navy, named Mr. Woodring Assistant Secretary of War. When the War Secretary, George Dern, died in 1936, Roosevelt was in the midst of another campaign for the Presidency, absorbed in his plans to reorganize the Supreme Court and make the New Deal stick; also, he was running against a Kansan, the then Governor, Alf Landon.

Aboard the Dern funeral train, he explained his conscience pricked him a little, but after all, the generals ran the War Department. He promoted Mr. Woodring—and he carried Kansas.

As the late Adolf Hitler's plans began to loom menacingly, the Roosevelt conscience began again to bother him on the subject of the War Department and its readiness for trouble. Hating always to fire anybody, he adopted his curious organizational scheme of putting in a rival executive to do the hard work. Mr. Johnson was summoned into the presence with the late Steve Early and told to get the Army in shape and the production lines for military equipment—including airplanes—moving.

By this time Mr. Woodring had also developed isolationist leanings in opposition to what Mr. Roosevelt felt must be done. Mr. Johnson bulled ahead and accomplished much, as even his enemies admitted, but the climate of the Department—as General Marshall told Mr. Kimball in an unusual outburst of candor—was memorable.

The language of the Woodring letter shows he hasn't forgotten it either, though his apportionment of blame is distinctly unfair.

High School of the Air

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VERA BUCHANAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 5, 1954

Mrs. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, on April 1 of this year, WQED, metropolitan Pittsburgh's educational television station, went on the air for the first time. I am including today in the Record an editorial from the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette of August 4 on the high school of the air programs which this station, dedicated to the public interest, will start on September 27. These programs will be an impressive fulfillment of the high hopes expressed for educational television when WQED went on the air last April.

High School of the Air

Those who have envisaged educational television as a medium for substantially expanding the learning opportunities of the people will soon see their dreams translated into reality in this area. On September 27 Pittsburgh station WQED will telecast the first of a series of evening programs designed to enable TV viewers to qualify for high-school diplomas, college entrance, or both.

As WQED's high school of the air begins, it will represent a national first in secondary education for licensed educational television stations. Subjects to be covered in the 3½-hour telecasts each week during the first semester are English, algebra, and world history. Other subjects will be offered in the second semester, and the schedule may be expanded to five evenings a week. The WQED courses, taught by highly recommended certified teachers, will provide an excellent program of directed study for adults and for youths unable to attend school because of physical handicaps.

By registering at a fee of $5 a semester (assessed to cover the cost of guidance materials and student records), TV students may obtain credit which will be recognized by the State department of public instruction. Those who want to study without enrolling will have the satisfaction of broadening their understanding and knowledge.

WQED's experiment in education via the air waves deserves enthusiastic support from its 10-county potential classroom.

Farm Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 5, 1954

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, in the Congressional Record for July 30, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Vursell] attempted to show the American farmer that he was doing pretty well under the present administration—and if he was not doing very well it all came about because the Democrats had been running the country a couple of years ago, when the farmer was doing pretty well.

I can sympathize with the gentleman from Illinois in his attempts to make the American farmer think he is doing well under the present administration. It was an almost impossible task the gentleman undertook to accomplish.

Let me relate the experience of Mr. L. W. Boley, a cattle farmer in Nicholas County, W. Va., who also happens to be the current sheriff.

In the spring of 1952, Mr. Boley sold 31 yearling steers at $230 a head.

In the spring of 1953, Mr. Boley sold 24 yearling steers at $145 a head.

In the spring of 1954, Mr. Boley sold 24 yearling steers—bigger and fatter than the 31 sold in 1952—at $114 a head.

The man to whom Mr. Boley sold 31 yearling steers at $230 a head in 1952 still has some of those animals. He recently offered to sell them back to Mr. Boley at much less than he had paid for them, even though he has fed them for 2 years.

Mr. Boley recently wanted to buy some steaks. He went to a chain store, where the price was $1.14 per pound, a price the butcher said was the equivalent to the all-time war-period high.

The sheriff said that farmers in Nicholas County, W. Va., are paying higher-than-ever prices for fertilizer, seed, feed, and farm machinery.

This administration can explain and explain and sloganize and sloganize until its spokesmen are blue in the face, but neither Mr. Boley, nor any other farmer, looking at these realities eye to eye, will be convinced his lot is better now than it was under the Democratic regime.

Toward Full Employment and Full Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 5, 1954

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, because I believe that a summary of the first study for public distribution made by the Conference on Economic Progress entitled "Toward Full Employment and Full Production," contains material and conclusions which will be of interest to Members of Congress, I am including in the RECORD a copy of the release issued on August 1, 1954, by that conference:

The Conference on Economic Progress, a newly formed nonprofit, nonpolitical group engaged solely in economic research and education, today issued its first study for public distribution entitled "Toward Full Employment and Full Production," with a subcaption "How To End Our National Economic Deficits."

The conference will at regular intervals issue more specialized studies of national economic problems, including such matters as full employment for agriculture; the economics of social security and retirement; technology and employment; private and public investment needs; international economic adjustments, etc.; and will also at recurrent intervals issue studies similar to the first one being issued today, dealing with the overall economic situation and proposals for economic stability and growth.

The conference will also seek, through meetings of people drawn from agriculture, business, and labor, as well as others interested in national economic problems, to enlarge the areas of agreement in order that economic progress through the methods of freedom may be facilitated.

The ad hoc National Committee of the Conference, for the purpose of the first study issued today, includes Morris Llewellyn Cooke, construction engineer, former Administrator, Rural Electrification Administration; William H. Davis, attorney, former Director, Office of Economic Stabilization; Abraham Feinberg, chairman, Julius Kayser Co.; Richard H. Frost, executive vice president, National Pneumatic Co.; A. J. Hayes, president, International Association of Machinists, vice president and member of executive council, American Federation of Labor; J. M. Kaplan, president, Welch Grape Juice Co.; Leon H. Keyserling, economist, former Chairman, President's Council of Economic Advisers; Murray D. Lincoln, president, Farm Bureau Insurance Cos.; James G. Patton, president, National Farmers Union; Miles Pennybacker, president, Voltarc Tubes, Inc.; Walter P. Reuther, president, Congress of Industrial Organizations; Marvin Rosenberg, chairman, Cameo Curtains, Inc.; E. G. Shinner, merchant and banker, chairman, Shinner Foundation; M. W. Thatcher, president, National Federation of Grain Co-ops.

The staff work in connection with this first study, directed by Leon H. Keyserling, has benefited by an ad hoc technical advisory committee including: John A. Baker, Wallace J. Campbell, Seymour E. Harris, Roy F. Hendrickson, Robert A. Rennie, Stanley H. Ruttenberg, Boris Shishkin, Elmer E. Walker, and Nat Weinberg.

The first study Toward Full Employment and Full Production, issued today, is summarized as follows:

"Due to the recession starting in mid-1953, our total output is now at an annual rate at least $27 billion below the full-production level. The true level of total unemployment—including reduced hours of work and unrecorded temporary unemployment—is no wequivalent to full-time unemployment of about 5 million.

"The irregular leveling off of recent weeks is not good enough. The average worker's output per man hour is increasing. The labor force is growing. Thus total production must expand steadily to avoid excessive slack. If total output in the first quarter of next year were to be no higher than in the first quarter of this year (which was about $2 billion above the second quarter), the annual rate of output by early 1955 would be at least $37 billion below the full-production level. The true level of unemployment in that event might be near 7 million. Hence, we need to raise the annual rate of total output by at least $39 billion by early next year. We need by then the equivalent of 4½ million additional full-time jobs to reduce the true level of unemployment from 5 to 1½ million and to absorb 1 million new workers.

"An increase in Government outlays by about $3 billion to meet gaps in our defense or domestic programs, and a further $4½ billion reduction in taxes now imposed on lower-income consumers, would powerfully stimulate business investment and consumer buying. Even so, the Federal deficit in a full economy would be smaller than now. Additional steps to lift consumer buying by about $20 billion include: improved farm income through creating wider markets for surpluses; wage increases and a higher minimum wage base; selective price adjustments; and expanded social security. Business investment, which would benefit from expanding consumption and from some tax changes already made, should be further stimulated by a housing program aimed at 2 million new homes a year, and by inducements to overseas investment.

"We must register year by year a minimum annual growth rate of 4.2 percent in total output to maintain a full economy except insofar as we increase leisure. This would lift our total annual product to $500 billion by the end of 1960, raise the average standard of living by about 35 percent, and eliminate mass poverty. We could, with somewhat slower domestic progress, greatly enlarge our defenses against the Communist menace and extend more economic assistance to underdeveloped parts of the free world.

"But our tasks and prospects may well be far greater. The average annual rate of productivity increase during the 3 years preceding the 1953–54 recession has been calculated at about 5½ percent, and the average annual expansion of total output at about 7 percent. This contrasts with 3⅓ percent and 4⅓ percent, respectively, for the 7 years preceding the recession; and 2¾ percent and 3 percent, respectively, from 1929 through 1953. Even allowing for uncertainties in such calculations, we may need to expand total output by as much as 6½ percent a year to avoid idle manpower and other wasted resources. This could bring us close to a $600 billion economy by the end of 1960."

Questions and Answers on the Dividend Provision of the Tax Revision Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 4, 1954

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the provisions of the tax revision bill which I sponsored, H. R. 8300, which give some small relief from the double taxation of dividends, have been the subject of so much misunderstanding and actual misrepresentation that I have collected some questions which I have received and have prepared answers concerning them which I believe will assist in reaching a true understanding of these important and meritorious amendments. These questions and answers follow:

Question. What is meant by the "double taxation" of dividends?

Answer. The present double taxation of dividends exists because dividends are subject to income tax twice—once in the hands of the corporation which earns them and then in the hands of the stockholders to whom they are paid. Of course, a dividend is simply an amount which a corporation pays out of its earnings to its owners—that is, its stockholders—as a return on their investment. Since corporations pay a 52 percent income tax, the earnings available for distribution to their owners are more than cut in half before they can be distributed as dividends. Then, when the stockholders receive what is left—and, of course, the company must keep some of its earnings itself in order to finance its operations—they themselves must pay an income tax of from 20 to 91 percent, depending on their individual incomes, on these same earnings which have already been more than cut in half by taxes. As a result of this double taxation, the combined tax burden on the distributed earnings of a corporation ranges from a little over 61 percent for persons in the lowest income tax bracket (such as a widow living on a $2,000 income) to a little over 95 percent for persons in the highest bracket. Of course, this double burden hits the persons of small means the hardest. The combined corporate and individual income tax load borne by the dividends received by such a person from his savings is over 3 times the 20 percent rate which he pays on any other type of income.

I should also point out that it is only corporation earnings which are subject to this discriminatory double taxation. Individuals who operate their business as a partnership rather than as a corporation pay only one tax, their individual income tax. The partnership is not taxed first on its earnings before they are distributed to its partners. Furthermore, if a person operates a business, such as a grocery store, as an individual proprietor, he too is taxed only once.

Question. Aren't wages subject to the same double taxation?

Answer. Absolutely not. When a business figures its income for tax purposes, it first deducts out any wages it pays its employees. Therefore, it pays no income tax at all on this amount. The only income tax paid on wages is the tax paid by the employees themselves.

Just suppose that wages were subject to the same unfair tax treatment as are dividends today—here's what would happen: A corporation would have to pay a 52 percent tax on its employees' wages before they were even paid. Such a tax would reduce by more than half the amount which the corporation could pay out in wages. In other words, payrolls in this country would be cut by more than half. I think that you would agree that such a tax system would be indefensible and disastrous. Yet that is exactly what has been happening to dividends. All the tax revision law tries to do is remove a small portion of this present unjust discrimination.

Question. Does the new tax law give the same type of relief to interest on bank deposits, savings bonds, and other forms of interest?

Answer. No, it does not—for a very simple reason. Interest is not subject to double taxation. Just like wages, a bank can deduct the interest it pays before figuring its income tax. In fact, any taxpayer is entitled to deduct his interest payments. Of course, the Government pays no income tax so the interest on its bonds is also free from double taxation.

Question. Do you think it right that dividends pay a lower income tax than wages?

Answer. Of course not. The tax-revision bill will not result in dividends getting a better tax break than wages. I have already pointed out that the lowest combined corporation and individual income-tax burden on dividends is 61 percent, while that on wages is only 20 percent. Therefore, the average taxpayer, the man with a small income, must bear over three times the tax burden on dividends that he does on wages. Thus, dividends already bear a much higher taxload than do wages. All the new tax law does is cut down this extra burden by a very small amount. The 4-percent dividend tax credit which it provides will merely cut from 61 percent to 57 percent the combined tax burden on dividends. As a result, dividends will still be taxed almost three times as much as wages.

Question. How does the new law relieve double taxation of dividends?

Answer. Very simply. First, every taxpayer can completely exclude from his income up to $50 of dividends. This does not mean that he can exclude any dividend payment which is $50 or less, but merely that out of his total dividend receipts he can exclude a total of up to $50. Therefore, a taxpayer whose total dividends from all sources do not exceed $50 pays no tax whatever on his dividends. This will be a tremendous benefit to small stockholders, to individuals who have invested a small portion of their savings in stocks.

Secondly, in addition to the $50 exclusion, a taxpayer is given a tax credit equal to 4 percent of any dividends in excess of the exclusion. Here's how it works: Take as an example a widow with a total income of $2,000, of which $150 consists of dividends. First, she completely excludes $50, as I have already explained. Then she figures her income tax on the remaining $1,950 just as usual, including the $100 of her dividends still subject to tax. Let's say that her tax on this whole amount comes to $120. Then she figures 4 percent of her taxable dividends of $100. That comes to $4. She simply deducts that $4 from the $120 tax she has already computed. Her final tax will be $116—a $4 reduction.

Question. Why does the new law provide a credit which comes off the tax rather than a simple deduction to be taken in computing taxable income? Doesn't this method favor well-to-do taxpayers?

Answer. Just the contrary is true. The deduction method would favor wealthy taxpayers. For example, a $100 deduction would mean a tax saving of only $20 to a person in the first bracket but it would mean a saving of up to $91 for individuals in the upper brackets.

The tax-credit method adopted in the new law means that every taxpayer, no matter what his income, will receive exactly the same amount of tax relief with respect to the same amount of dividends. For example, the 4-percent tax credit will give a person in the first bracket a $4 tax cut on $100 in dividends. A person in the top bracket will receive exactly the same $4 tax cut, and no more.

As a matter of fact, the method contained in the new law will give proportionately much more relief to lower-bracket individuals than to upper-bracket taxpayers. An individual in the first bracket today pays a $20 tax on $100 in dividends. The 4-percent tax credit will cut that $20 tax to $16—a 20-percent reduction in his tax on those dividends. On the other hand, a top-bracket taxpayer today pays a $91 tax on the same $100 in dividends. The 4-percent tax credit will reduce that $91 tax to $87—only about a 4-percent reduction in his tax on those dividends, instead of 20 percent.

Question. Why doesn't the new law reduce double taxation by allowing a corporation to deduct all or part of its dividends in figuring its tax, just as it can wages?

Answer. This is undoubtedly one method by which double taxation of dividends could be reduced or even eliminated, and it was given careful study. The trouble is that, if you give a corporation a deduction for dividends you create a tremendous pressure on management to distribute earnings. Therefore, it was felt that such a tax system would interfere with sound business judgment as to how much of a corporation's earnings can safely be distributed and how much should be retained in the business. It was also felt that such a system would discriminate particularly against small, new companies who are most dependent upon retained earnings to finance their growth.

These reasons, plus our previous unfortunate experience with an undistributed profits tax, led to the decision to give relief at the individual shareholder level.

Question. Do any other countries in the world give relief from double taxation of dividends?

Answer. They certainly do. England has given such relief for well over 100 years. Under the British system, a taxpayer can claim a credit for the amount of tax actually paid by the corporation on his dividends. The fact that England has given such relief for over a century is significant in view of the fact that we usually think of the British income tax as especially heavy.

Canada already gives a 20 percent tax credit for dividends. This is exactly the same method contained in our new tax law except that our credit is to be only 4 percent. Thus, Canada already gives 5 times the dividend tax relief that we are going to provide. Of course, our new law will also give a complete exclusion of up to $50 of dividends in order to help small stockholders. Canada does not do this.

Sweden, which is usually considered to be one of the most progressive countries in Europe, also gives relief from double taxation of dividends.

In fact, not only is the new dividend provision not something revolutionary, but it is actually simple equity which other countries have recognized years ago. The truth is that the United States has been extremely backward in this regard.

Question. Even assuming that other countries have given relief from the double taxation of dividends, isn't such a proposal still pretty revolutionary in the United States?

Answer. Just the contrary. Our income tax was first adopted in 1913. It was provided then that dividends should be taxed only once. To accomplish this, dividends were exempt from the normal tax in the hands of individuals. In the early days of low taxes, this meant in effect that dividends did not bear the burden of double taxation. In 1918, the exemption was as high as 12 percent on some income. The exemption from normal tax continued for 23 years, right up to 1936. It is interesting to note that the exemption in 1936 was 4 percent—exactly the same amount of relief which the new tax-revision law will provide.

In 1936, President Roosevelt recommended the complete elimination of double taxation by exempting from the corporate income tax any earnings which were distributed in dividends. In his message accompanying this recommendation that the corporate income tax only be imposed on undistributed income, the President stated that his proposal "would constitute distinct progress in tax reform."

Since that time, prominent individuals from all parts of the country, both Democrats and Republicans alike, have recommended immediate steps to remove double taxation of dividends.

In 1944, for example, a special committee of the then Democratic Congress, made the following recommendation:

"Consideration should be given to the elimination of the present double taxation of dividend income, either by treating the tax on corporate income as a withholding tax and exempting dividends from the personal normal tax, or by some equivalent provision."

The chairman of that group was Representative Jere Cooper, of Tennessee, now ranking Democratic member of the tax-writing House Ways and Means Committee.

In 1947, all 10 Democratic members of the House Ways and Means Committee strongly criticized the Republican majority for not taking up the question of double taxation of dividends.

Therefore, you can see that, not only is this type of provision not unusual in other countries, it represents a concept which is far from new in our own country.

Question. Is it true that most of the tax relief contained in the new tax revision law goes to stockholders?

Answer. This is absolutely not true. The tax revision law will give $827 million tax relief this year to individual taxpayers and $536 million tax relief to business. Of this total tax relief of $1,363,000,000, stockholders will receive $204 million—or only about one-seventh of the total—because of the partial relief from double taxation. Moreover, more liberal deductions for dependents, deductions allowed working mothers for the expense of child care, bigger allowances for medical expenses, and tax reduction for retired people—these alone add up to well over $400 million relief for individual taxpayers, more than twice the relief given from double taxation of dividends. In addition, there are close to $200 million of other individual relief provisions.

One other fact is frequently overlooked and that is that the new law extends for 1 year the 52 percent corporate income tax which would otherwise have gone down to 47 percent last April 1. This means an additional $1.2 billion tax burden which will be borne indirectly by corporation stockholders—a tax load which is approximately six times the relief these same individuals will receive from the double taxation of dividends.

Question. Who are the stockholders who will benefit from the new provision? Aren't stockholders the wealthiest group in the country?

Answer. There are some 6,500,000 stockholders in publicly held corporations. Certainly, some of them are wealthy, and some of them are poor. However, on the whole, they are about average Americans. They represent a pretty fair cross section of our people.

Let's take a look at some figures which show who the stockholders of this country are:

Four and three-tenths percent of American stockholders have combined family incomes of less than $2,000 a year.

Almost 10 percent of American stockholders have combined family incomes of less than $3,000 a year.

Almost 20 percent of American stockholders have combined family incomes of less than $4,000 a year.

Over 30 percent of American stockholders have combined family incomes of less than $5,000 a year.

Finally, over 75 percent of American stockholders have combined family incomes of less than $10,000 a year.

Thus, the great majority of the stockholders of this country are in the low- and middle-income groups.

One of the biggest companies in the country is the United States Steel Corp. I think it safe to assume that its stockholders are fairly typical. Here are some facts about United States Steel's stockholders which a recent survey brought out:

Only 10 percent of its stockholders have incomes over $25,000.

Nearly three-fifths of them—56 percent—have incomes of less than $5,000 a year.

It has as many stockholders with incomes below $4,300 as there are with incomes above that amount.

Finally—and this is the most interesting figure of all—53 percent of United States Steel's stockholders have incomes below the average wage paid to the company's steelworkers.

Now, let's take a look at the number of tax returns which show dividend income. For 1950, the latest year for which the figures are available, 3,668,000 returns were filed which showed dividends as part of the taxpayer's income; 1,891,000 of those returns—over 50 percent of the total—reported adjusted gross income from all sources of less than $5,000.

Therefore, those who try to tell you that the dividend provision helps only the rich either do not know the facts, or they are trying deliberately to mislead you.

Hundreds of thousands of housewives are stockholders. Many thousands of elderly retired people depend upon their small stockholdings for their livelihood. Most important of all, let us not overlook the many thousands of thrifty workers who every day, more and more, are purchasing small amounts of stock in their employer's business through payroll deductions. This wholesome trend means that a growing proportion of our country's wage earners are acquiring a direct stake in our free-enterprise system through stock ownership.

Question. Why should we encourage people to buy stocks?

Answer. The answer is simple—in order to create jobs for the American people. To put a man to work, there must be a plant for him to work in. There must be tools and machinery for him to work with. It takes money to provide those things. It is estimated that it takes between ten and fifteen thousand dollars of new capital to create one new job. When you realise that upward of 600,000 young people come into the labor market and seek employment for the first time every year, you get an idea of the tremendous amount of new capital investment that we need every year if we are to provide the job opportunities these young Americans deserve. There is only one fundamental source of this new capital and that is the earnings of our people. The savings from those earnings must provide the capital out of which new jobs and a higher standard of living can be created. When a thrifty individual saves a part of his earnings and invests those savings, he is not only providing for his own security but he is helping to build a strong future for America.

Question. Why can't corporations raise new capital by borrowing instead of by selling stock?

Answer. They can—at least large, well-established businesses can.

Of course, small businesses, especially those just being started, frequently are not in a position to borrow. Just because their businesses are new and not yet established, they are usually considered too risky for bank loans. Therefore, new business must depend to a very large extent upon capital raised through the sale of stocks. This is of great significance, because it is these new and relatively small concerns of today which will provide the strength of our economy tomorrow.

Big business usually can borrow to meet its capital requirements. In fact, it is advantageous for it to borrow because the interest is deductible for tax purposes while if it raises capital through the sale of stock it gets no deduction for any dividends it pays. This present discriminatory treatment of equity (stock) financing is one reason why business generally has become more and more dependent on debt financing. For every dollar raised since the last war by new stock issues, industry has raised about $3.20—over three times as much—by debt financing and suppplied $9 from retained earnings and depreciation reserves. To provide these capital funds, industry found it necessary to double its debt and to reduce the percentage of earnings paid out in dividends from about 75 percent before the war to less than 50 percent in recent years. The result has been that total corporate debt at the end of 1953 was more than $190 billion, double what it was at the end of World War II. New debt was being incurred by our corporations last year at almost three times the rate at which new equity (stock) capital was obtained.

This is a very unhealthy situation. Borhowed money has to be used in relatively safe undertakings. It cannot be used ordinarily for experimentation, for carrying out new methods and processes, for developing new products. These things take "risk" capital, capital which is willing to take a chance. If we were perfectly satisfied to let this country stand still, then it might be all right to have business depend on borrowed money in this manner. But if we want our American economy to expand and to provide a steadily rising standard of living for our people, then we must encourage the raising of capital through the sale of stock rather than through borrowing.

These therefore are the two major objectives of the dividend provision contained in the new tax law:

First, to give some relief from discriminatory double taxation; and

Second, to encourage the development of risk capital—capital which is willing to take a chance on the future of America.

Military "Look" Losing Its "New"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 5, 1954

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I herewith include an article written by Drew Pearson which appeared in today's issue of the Washington Post and Times Herald. The article titled "Military 'Look' Losing Its 'New,'" follows:

While Congress has been sweating out its last hot weather convulsions, vitally important decisions are being made backstage in the Pentagon which will affect your pocketbook and future taxes.

The New Look for the military definitely has been abandoned. Further military cuts are out the window. The Eisenhower hope of balancing the budget is being chalked up privately as a sincere but hopeless hope.

The drastic revision in military planning has been made as the result of some gloomy reports on the international picture, plus the consistent hammering of Gen. Matt Ridgway that foot soldiers must continue to be important, despite the A-bomb.

One gloomy report comes from Gen. James Van Fleet, former United States commander in Korea, who has been making a far eastern survey for Mr. Eisenhower. His military thinking coincides with that of Dr. Syngman Rhee—namely that the United States should resume war in Korea. This, of course, has been turned down.

But what cannot be ignored is Van Fleet's warning that the Chinese Reds are going to invade Formosa. If successful, this would mean that the last vestiges of the Chinese Nationalists would disappear and that the United States would have far less chance to bar Red China from the U. N.

Also, such an invasion would make ridiculous the much-publicized White House announcement last year, in fulfillment of a campaign promise, that the United States Seventh Fleet was being relieved of its job of keeping Chiang Kai-shek from attacking the mainland. Henceforth he would be free to attack.

Now it develops, according to Van Fleet, that Formosa will have to be protected again after all, and that the idea of using Chiang's troops either in Korea or Indochina was pure politics.

Should We Recognize Red China?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL

OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 3, 1954

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I should like to include an article from the latest issue of the New Leader magazine, entitled "Should We Recognize Red China?" This article was written by the Honorable Stanley Hornbeck.

Mr. Hornbeck has had a distinguished career in the Foreign Service of our country. For many years, he served as Chief of the State Department's Far Eastern Division. He was special assistant to the Secretary of State and political adviser to the Director of the Office of Far Eastern Affairs. From 1944 to 1947 Mr. Hornbeck was the United States Ambassador to the Netherlands.

Mr. Hornbeck presents his views on one of the most vital questions of foreign policy facing our people at this time. Ambassador Hornbeck's forceful analyses of the implications and possible results of such recognition deserves the thoughtful consideration of all students of foreign affairs. I recommend this well-thought article to my colleagues and to my fellow citizens.

The article follows:

SHOULD WE RECOGNIZE RED CHINA?

(By Stanley K. Hornbeck)

When in 1912 the Manchu rulers of China capitulated to a handful of revolutionary leaders who declared their country a republic, the United States was among the first of the powers to accord recognition to the new republican regime. When in 1928

China's Nationalists brought into existence at Nanking the National Government of the Republic of China, the United States was the first country to recognize it. When in 1942 the Declaration by the United Nations was formulated in Washington, the Republic of China was one of the first of the original signatories. When in 1943 the Moscow Declaration was negotiated, the Republic of China became one of the four signers. When in 1945 the charter of the United Nations was drawn up, the Republic of China received a permanent seat in the Security Council. When, later in 1945, a treaty of friendship and alliance between the Republic of China and the Soviet Union was signed at Moscow, the Soviet Union pledged that it would give China moral support and material assistance, "it being understood that this support and assistance will go exclusively to the National Government as the Central Government of China."

When in the next year the Soviet Government, turning its back on that pledge, gave its moral support and assistance not to the National Government but to the latter's moral enemy, the armed Communist opposition, and simultaneously the United States assumed a position of neutrality in regard to the civil strife in China, the Communists began a massive military operation which within 3 years gave them physical possession of mainland China and caused the National Government to withdraw to the island of Formosa.

When in October 1949 the Communist Party in China announced the creation in Peiping of the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China, that new turn in Chinese affairs confronted every other country in the world with a new problem: Whether or not to recognize this new governing entity and what to do in regard to China's National Government, still functioning on Formosa.

Since October 1949, some 25 countries—the Soviet Union and all other Communist states, as well as the United Kingdom and a dozen others—have transferred their recognition from the National Government to the People's Government. A larger number, including the United States, still recognize the National Government. Several of those which have made the transfer, conspicuously the Soviet Union, India and the United Kingdom, have urged both that other countries—especially the United States—do likewise and that China's seats in the United Nations be taken from the National Government and given to the People's Government. The United States, after some early wavering, has stood pat on its recognition of the National Government, has withheld recognition from the People's Government, and is opposed to admitting the latter to the United Nations. Why?

It would seem that most Americans who give thought to such matters have fairly well made up their minds; but, by way of reviewing some of the facts pertinent to an intelligent comprehension of the American position, and incidentally toward disposing of some falsehoods and fictions that are constantly uttered to the confusion of the uninformed and the unwary, it may be not amiss to submit a few clarifying affirmations.

Recognition is the action or procedure in international relations by which an established state or government manifests its willingness to deal with a new state or government as a legal entity and on an official basis. That action or procedure, diplomatic recognition or according of recognition, is a matter of affirmative official decision by political authorities in pursuance of political objectives, and it has substantial legal and political consequence. It is a phenomenon very different from and much more significant than that of merely manifesting awareness or taking cognizance.

In the situation which now prevails in and regarding China, the question of according recognition has peculiar angles. The state, China, has long been a member of the family of nations, and the Republic of China and its National Government have been recognized for many years. The Republic of China was a member of the League of Nations and is a charter member of the United Nations. In the United Nations, it is a permanent member of the Security Council and, represented by appointees of its National Government, has been and is active. Within China, however, the Communists have in recent years produced a new regime, a new constitution and new names; and they are demanding that the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China be accorded recognition. In these circumstances, whatever may be the technicalities—and there can be contention over them—the practical problem for the United States is whether to accord recognition not to a new state but to a new regime which is exercising in an old state an extensive but less than nationwide and still disputed authority.

There exists no rule of international law or convention requiring that any state or government accord recognition to another. In practice, decisions for or against recognition are made by political authorities and are based for the most part on political considerations. Where there exist within a state—as there do in China now—two contending governments, one old and recognized, the other new, exercising a still disputed authority and asking for recognition, third parties have more moral and legal obligation toward the former than toward the latter.

Recognition is, however, a function of political authorities, and each state makes its own decisions in the light of its own interests and purposes. Historically, various inconsistencies are discernible in United States practice, but there has been throughout a tendency to inquire as to the extent and quality of the authority of new governments and whether they govern by and with the consent of the governed. During recent decades, a tendency has developed to apply three tests: Is the new government's authority comprehensive and effective? Is it able to fulfill the international obligations of the country in which it exercises control? Is it disposed to fulfill those obligations?

The frequent assertion that recognition does not signify approval, either moral or political, is not to be relied upon; it is in fact misleading. While probably true in most cases, it is false in many. Whatever else withdrawal of recognition from one government and its transfer to another involves, it does constitute a political choice; it takes from one and gives to the other a thing of great value, the stamp of political acceptability and legal acceptance; it does great damage to the one and confers great benefit upon the other.

Recognition facilitates but is not essential to maintenance of contact and carrying on of business; nor, if given, does it insure either of these. Witness the history of relations between the United States and the Soviet Union and among nationals of the 2 countries for 15 years before the United States recognized the Soviet Government. Witness the history of relations with Communist China, which some countries recognize and other do not.

The reasons given by several successive American Secretaries of State for not recognizing the Soviet Government were to the effect that it did not meet the standard tests of qualification for recognition. Ultimately, a new administration in the United States, having asked for and been given pledges, accorded the Soviet Government recognition; but recognition has not resulted in honoring by the Soviet Government of either its general legal obligations or its particular pledges.

There is seldom need for hurrying to recognize. Generally speaking, the more hurried is recogition, the more speculative is its advisability and the more suspect its motivation. Recognition can be accorded at any time and easily; but, once given, it can only with difficulty be withdrawn.

All Communists and all Communist regimes are committed to the objective of world domination; and the Chinese Communists and their regime, whether or not controlled by the Kremlin, imitate the Russian Soviet system, use its methods, follow the made-in-Moscow party line, and are engaged in operations of forcible conquest. The Communist regime in China is, as Prof. H. Arthur Steiner has put is, "organized and motivated by a revolutionary ethic thoroughly incompatible with the existing structure of international law. * * * International law does not even receive its lip-service." Many of the contentions advanced by advocates—especially the early advocates—of recognition of the People's Government have been refuted by the acts and utterances of that government and its functionaries.

For the United States, the question of what to do about that regime is only one of many questions currently implicit in the problem of relations with China, with the Chinese people, with their neighbors, and with other countries—in a world setting. Consideration of that problem calls for consideration in full perspective of our major and constant objectives of security and peace with justice. There is little that the United States could reasonably expect to gain by according recognition to a regime which is committed to the destruction of the free world and has declared the United States its No. 1 enemy. The fact that we have in the past recognized Communist governments and have not withdrawn our recognition of them imposes no obligation whatever on us now to recognize another.

A decision on our part to recognize China's People's Government would presumably be accompanied by a decision to withdraw recognition from the National Government. Circumstances and implications being considered, we cannot afford now to take either of those steps. In the light of our traditions, our commitments, and our current overall policies of resistance to aggression, we should be the last to declare China's National Government defunct; and, in the light of communism's basic policy of conquest, we should be the last to declare the People's Government the Government of China.

It is questionable whether any Communist government is capable of discharging the international obligations, actual or prospective, of the country for which it professes to speak—this because communism's fundamental concepts and its fixed objective, world domination, stand in the way of its doing so. It is certain that the People's Government which now seeks recognition as the Government of China does not intend to discharge those obligations—this by its own testimony, in its words and deeds. There is no justification for any step by the United States the net consequences of which would be to diminish the strength and extent of the free world and increase that of the Communist empire.

The conflict which has developed over Chinese representation in the United Nations presents a thorny issue. The United Nations itself has seemed more concerned about the embarrassment to it of Soviet Communist pressures than about the menace those pressures pose to the world by way of China. Many of the United Nations' members seem to think that all or most of those pressures would be relaxed if only the People's Government were admitted to China's seats in that organization. Recognition of the People's Government by the United States would probably lead directly and promptly to that admission. That, in turn, might conceivably result in temporary relaxation of some pressures. More probably, however, it would open the way to new pressures. It would surely create new difficulties for the United States. It would increase the capabilities of the Communist world and diminish those of the free world. It would add to the apprehensions of multitudes of men who are being driven by each day's bad news to greater skepticism regarding the efficacy of treaties and international law as instruments of security and justice.

The United States has in recent years lost heavily in the courses we have pursued in regard to China. Recognition now of the People's Government would not put an end to our losses; it would insure further losses.

In the light of experience and in a situation wherein our Government has rightly declared that governments are to be judged by their deeds rather than their words, it is the part of wisdom for this country to be suspicious of every proposal that we transfer our official favor from a government and people that have long shown themselves favorably disposed toward us to a new government which has shown itself—in ideology, in words and in deeds—utterly hostile to us and to freedom. The Communist governments and agents who demand that the United States recognize China's People's Government and cease to oppose admission of that government to the United Nations do so in pursuit of ends that are obviously theirs. Non-Communist governments and spokesmen who urge that the United States take those steps do so not in the service of principles and interests that are ours but in the service of what they conceive to be the national interests of their respective countries. Recognition of the People's Government by the United States would greatly benefit the Communist world. So long as we withhold that recognition, we have at our disposal a diplomatic asset. We should not give away or cheaply bargain away that asset. We should not trade it for mere promises. We should not expect to win new friends or hold old friends by abandoning any friends. We should expect of any government which asks for our recognition and our assent to its admission to the United Nations that it demonstrate its willingness to fulfill the international obligations of its country and support the purposes and provisions of the United Nations Charter. We should enter into no deals with any government at the expense of unconsulted and unassenting third states or governments or peoples that are committed as are we to the thesis that human beings should be free and law-abiding nations should be secure.

Our Government has declared our national views on these matters. If and when China's People's Government alters for the better its purposes and methods, and when our people conclude that it is qualified on its own merits for American official favor, then, and not until then, will there be grounds for considering requests—as distinguished from demands and pressures—that the United States accord that government its recognition.

The Details of World Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. USHER L. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 5, 1954

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, for 3 years I have been trying to alert the people of the United States to the sinister clouds of desolation now forming to destroy this great Government. I have had to weave together bits of evidence coming to light here and there which in my judgment clearly spelled out the purposes of those citizens of the United States who desire and strive to substitute for our Government a world government by placing over it a world organization which would destroy our sovereignty and make this Government subservient to it.

The excuse which these misguided citizens make for this treasonable program is that it is being done in the name of peace. Peace would be the easiest thing in this world to accomplish if we were to surrender our means of protection and kneel down before the altar of peace and surrender our freedom and liberties. People behind the Iron Curtain have this kind of peace, but where is their freedom and liberty? I am just as much an advocate of peace as anyone can be, but the peace I want is not a slave's peace, but a peace with freedom and liberty. I do not want to be driven into slavery in the name of peace.

Just what is intended by the one-worlders is now definitely outlined. The people no longer have to go over the facts we have gathered here and there to prove this treasonable act, for now directly before us is the written plan with the specifications of this sinister world government.

The American Public Relations Forum, Inc., of Burbank, Calif., in its bulletin No. 31 of June 1954, outlines the whole scheme to destroy the sovereign power of the United States.

In 1955 it is planned to amend the Charter of the United Nations, with the design, it is said, "to produce a genuine, and, as we believe, a workable scheme of world government."

> Membership: Membership should be open to all states, and all must be urged to join. Once membership has been accepted, continued membership must be compulsory. There must be no right of secession.

If the United States can be lured into this snare by these sirens of world government, we cannot get out except by revolution. Do the free citizens of the United States want any such contrivance merely because misguided peace advocates tell us this is what we want?

> Disarmament: The charter will provide for the complete, simultaneous, universal, enforceable disarmament, enforceable by the United Nation's police.

In other words, if this great Nation thinks it is best to keep prepared to defend our institutions of freedom, we are to be forced into a position of no protection and are to be subjugated by the police force of the United Nations. Do these weakminded disciples of world government believe for a single moment that here, in the cradle of liberty, where we have maintained the greatest government on earth for nearly 170 years, we are going to meekly surrender and turn our affairs over to a bastard child of the United Nations? Instead of this scheme's bringing peace it will bring war—war right here in the United States.

> Judiciary: The International Court of Justice should be given jurisdiction to:
>
> (a) Decide disputes between states.
>
> (b) Disputes between a state and citizens of another state.
>
> (c) Disputes involving members of the UNO and in particular its police.
>
> (d) Any matter concerning the interpretation of the U. N. Charter, including the validity of laws passed by the world legislature.

This provision makes certain that the Supreme Court of the United States will not be permitted to pass upon the Charter of the United Nations. If this court decides that the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations supercedes the Constitution of the United States, then our courts have no power to decide the matter, and we must accept the world court's decisions.

> The world legislature:
>
> A. Shall consist of two chambers, the lower chamber shall be represented by the selection by states of the members according to population.
>
> B. Have power to raise revenue for U. N. purposes.

Here we at once notice that Russia, Red China, and their satellites will control the lower chamber. Just where would we be in this organization with Red forces controlling the world congress? Anyone who thinks this is not a Communist-inspired scheme certainly is completely dumb or at least weakminded.

> The executive:
>
> The two chambers shall select an executive committee to run the business, so here again the Communists would control. There is to be no veto power over the legislature in any way.
>
> World citizenship:
>
> Every person in the world should be a citizen of the United Nations, and the charter and laws should bind each individual.
>
> Bill of rights:
>
> A new bill of rights is to be set up under the terms of the Charter of the United Nations. This means a new definition of free speech, a free press and free religion.
>
> Power shall be given by the Charter of the United Nations to legislate in order that states shall be governed by international law.

Here we have the direct challenge that the United States shall henceforth be governed by this world government legislature, no matter what a citizen of this country may think of it.

The following suggestion as to how Russia will come into this organization is enlightening:

> America must disarm to show we are proving democracy means what it says.

It is implied "that then Russia will be so ashamed that she will lay down her own arms and come in and be good." Did you ever hear such assinine nonsense? When has Russia ever been ashamed? If the United States disarmed as here recommended, Russia would not be ashamed, but delighted that we were naive enough to believe her, and her word would be as worthless as it has proven to be in all our dealings with the Soviet.

This is a plan of government hatched up by a band of world peace advocates who are willing to sell out their own country, lock, stock and barrel, if these peace-lovers can have peace. "Peace, peace," is their cry, and the certainty of the loss of freedom and liberty under that kind of peace has never dawned on their incompetent brains.

I want the people of this country to know just what kind of people are fomenting the sale of our sovereignty.

They are intentionally trying to do it—or they are to ignorant to understand freedom and liberty.

Many good people in the United States have been captivated by this cry of peace, but here in this speech are the facts that demonstrate how demented some people can get. They are either absolutely demented or they are traitors to the Republic of the United States. In either case they should be halted in their perfidy before they can complete the sale of the free institutions of the United States of America.

These conspirators propose to have the atomic and the H-bomb, and all stockpiles of completed bombs, turned over to the United Nations. While they do not in this outline of world government say so, it can logically be inferred that the purpose of having these bombs is to awe the various states into submission.

It may well be that the taxes assessed by the world legislature would not suit the people of the United States, whose Representatives in Congress were not consulted about this tax. In that event the police force of the world government will go into action and forcibly collect the tax—that is, any tax the world government may assess. Should that police force be unable to forceably collect the tax, the possession of the atomic bombs by this police force might conceivably be used against the United States or any other state in the world government.

Thus, we see that while these skim-milk-brained advocates of world peace want peace, and peace at any price, at the same time they want weapons enough to force the people of the world into submission. They want the United States to disarm, but insist upon arming themselves. Nothing could be more cowardly than this.

I do not believe these world-peace advocates should be arrested for treason, but they should be taken before the nearest sanity court, and if as demented as they appear to be in backing this plan of world government, they should be locked up as a protection to the public.

As soon as the people of the United States fully understand what the world government plan is, the fighting spirit of the partiots who started this Government will be aroused.

My oath of office reads that "I will protect the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic," and while serving into this Congress, or living in this Republic, I propose to carry out to the letter the provisions of that oath.

Emergency Credit

SPEECH

OF

HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 4, 1954

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Hagen] has asked me to state whether this bill would operate to give farmers in his area who were suffering from economic difficulties because of insect infestation and grasshoppers an opportunity to secure loans. I will say to the gentleman that that is the purpose of this legislation. It is to operate in areas which have not been declared disaster areas by the President but where farmers have suffered economic loss due to any cause.

Mr. HAGEN of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, in other words, will the farmers in northwestern Minnesota, who have lost crops because of the armyworm infestation this year and last year because of floods, have the opportunity of securing these emergency loans?

Mr. HOPE. Yes. Of course, if the area had been declared a disaster area, they would have been given relief under that program, but this gives relief to those areas which have not been declared disaster areas, but where farmers are in economic difficulties.

Celler Asks Dulles Some Questions Concerning United States Arms to Egypt and Egypt's Blockade of Israeli Goods Through the Suez Canal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 13, 1954

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following letter:

August 4, 1954.

Hon. John Foster Dulles,
Secretary of State, Department of State,
Washington, D. C.

My Dear Mr. Secretary: Now that Britain has agreed to evacuate the Suez Canal Zone in view of the tensions between Israel and Egypt, it is pertinent to ask your answers to the following questions:

1. Did Egypt express any intention in the Suez Canal settlement to improve her relations with Israel?

2. The State Department has ordered the expediting of plans to provide Egypt with free American munitions not unlike the grant of arms given to Iraq. Soon after our Ambassador Jefferson Caffery recently called upon the Egyptian Foreign Minister Lieutenant Colonel Nasser and offered, it is reported, on behalf of the United States such military (and as well economic) aid, said Foreign Minister thereupon announced the decision of Egypt to build a powerful national army. Will the United States award a similar grant of arms to Israel, so that the balance of military power in the Middle East will not be disturbed to Israel's disadvantage?

3. Israel's application for military aid from United States has been pending since 1952. Should not such application be now granted? It has been stated that Israel's application would be granted "eventually." "Eventually," but why not now? This is the historic moment to grant equality of arms treatment to Israel, Iraq, and Egypt.

4. Would not the removal of British restraint in the Canal Zone and the granting of new military strength to Egypt without corresponding aid to Israel and without the Arab State being obligated to regularize her relations with Israel, be interpreted by the rulers of Egypt as a spur to new aggression? I emphasize the truculence of the Egyptian leaders toward Israel. Lieutenant Colonel Nasser, Egypt's Prime Minister in a recent speech indicated clearly that he regarded Israel as Egypt's chief enemy. Certainly arms would not be used by Egypt against any Russian threat. Egypt recognizes none. Would they not be used against what Lieutenant Colonel Nasser calls Egypt's chief enemy—Israel?

5. Did the United States seek to have Egypt abandon the blockade of cargoes moving through the canal to and from Israel? Such blockade is in violation of the Treaty of 1888 originally signed by Egypt, when the canal was built. The blockade also has been condemned by the U. N. Security Council resolution dated September 1, 1951. The United States might well demand compliance with the council's resolution of condemnation.

6. Is it proper for United States to arm Egypt as long as she continues such illegal blockade?

7. Has the United States taken cognizance of the statement of the Egyptian Minister of National Guidance, Major Salem, that as soon as British troops are removed from Egypt the Egyptian army would be in a position to attack Israel? In the light of such and additional inflammatory threats of other Egyptian officials, will the United States as a signatory with France and Britain of the so-called Tripartite Agreement of May 25, 1950, reaffirm its intention that any act of aggression of any of the countries of the Middle East, including Egypt, would be resisted? France and Great Britain have publicly stated they are considering reaffirmation of their obligations under the treaty. Also, it is well to note that Britain's Foreign Secretary, Mr. Anthony Eden, in the House of Commons a few days ago, took note of the fact that the tripartite declaration stressed the fact that no arms should be supplied to any of the Arab states without firm assurance that such arms would not be used for the purpose of aggression against any other Middle East state.

8. How would such aggression by Egypt against Israel be resisted? Would resistance be limited merely to political intercession or would political pronouncements be implemented by force of arms?

9. Should there not be firmer guaranties of the Middle East status quo by the three powers? Should not military sanctions be imposed upon any Middle East nation, Arab, or Israel, guilty of aggression and hostile invasion?

10. Equally important is the question of whether Egypt will interfere with shipping passing through the Gulf of Aquaba towards and from the Israeli port of Elath. The Egyptians hold two islands commanding the entrance to the gulf. Has the United States considered this possible handicap to Israel?

It is to be noted significantly that upon learning that Egypt had entered into an agreement for the purchase of light weapons and munitions worth $3½ million with Spain, the British voiced deep objection in an aide memoire to Franco. Naturally the British were apprehensive since they have agreed to haul down their flag in the process of concluding an evacuation of British military forces from the Suez area.

11. It is of double ironic interest that the United States Defense Department also expressed its concern to the Spanish general staff. Both the British and our Defense Department understandably question to what use these arms would be used. Now Spain agreeable to protest has agreed not to supply arms to Egypt. When we, citizens of the United States asked the question to what use the United States arms granted to Iraq

would be put, we were told that our fears were merely neurotic. Hence we must conclude what is sauce for the goose is not sauce for the gander.

Now arms are to be supplied to Egypt by us. Apparently we express concern when Spain aspired to send arms to Egypt but have no qualms in sending them ourselves.

May we have an explanation of this inconsistency?

12. The Heads of Agreement concluded between Egypt and Great Britain dated July 27, 1954, pertaining to the Suez military bases contains the following:

Agreement will recognize that the Suez Maritime Canal which is an integral part of Egypt is a waterway economically, commercially, and strategically of international importance, and will express the determination of both parties to uphold the 1888 Convention guaranteeing the freedom of navigation of the canal."

Egypt has repeatedly failed to abide by these guaranties concerning free accessibility of the Suez Canal.

Has the United States made any representations to Egypt concerning her default in this regard? If not why should not strong representations be made now?

With assurances of highest esteem, I am,

Sincerely yours,

EMANUEL CELLER.

All Taxpayers Benefit Under New Republican Tax Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 3, 1954

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, without attempting to give a technical interpretation of the provisions of the tax-revision bill, I am setting forth hereafter the salient features so that my constituents may know what this important legislation does for them personally. This is the first tax bill in more than 50 years, and the Republican 83d Congress has given the taxpayers of this country more tax relief than at any time in the history of our country.

DEPENDENTS

First. A parent can claim a deduction of $600 for each child regardless of the child's earnings if the child is under 19 and the parent continues to furnish more than half the child's support.

Second. A parent can also claim the $600 dependency deduction for a child over 18 regardless of the child's earnings if the child is attending school or college, or receiving on-the-farm training, and the parent continues to furnish more than half the child's support.

Third. An aged parent or other dependent cared for by several members of a family can be claimed as a deduction by one of the members of the family.

Fourth. A taxpayer can claim a $600 dependency deduction for a foster child.

Fifth. A taxpayer can claim a $600 dependency deduction for a child awaiting adoption.

Sixth. A taxpayer can claim a $600 dependency deduction for any other person, regardless of relationship, if the taxpayer supports that person in his home.

Seventh. A taxpayer can claim a $600 dependency deduction for a cousin who is institutionalized because of physical or mental disability.

Savings to taxpayers, $85 million.

CHILD-CARE EXPENSES

First. Single working parents, such as a widow, are allowed a deduction up to $600 for the expense of child-care for children up to 12 years of age.

Second. The same deduction is allowed for a married woman who must work because her husband is incapacitated.

Third. The same deduction is allowed with respect to any dependent, regardless of age, who is mentally or physically incapable of caring for himself.

Fourth. A similar deduction is allowed a married woman if the combined income of her husband and herself does not exceed $5,100.

Savings to taxpayers, $130 million.

MEDICAL EXPENSES

First. Medical expenses can be deducted when they exceed 3 percent of income, instead of 5 percent as under present law.

Second. Example: A family with $3,000 gross income and medical expenses of $150 will be able to deduct $60. The same family can deduct nothing today.

Third. The bill doubles the present maximum limit on the amount that can be deducted.

Savings to taxpayers, $80 million.

HEAD OF FAMILY

First. A single taxpayer who has a dependent son or daughter will be entitled during the first 2 years after the death of his spouse to the same income-splitting privilege as is accorded married couples.

Second. A single individual can receive half the benefits of income splitting if he has a dependent parent and if the taxpayer maintains a household for the father or mother.

Savings to the taxpayers, $11 million.

RETIREMENT INCOME CREDIT

First. All retired people 65 and over, including schoolteachers, firemen, policemen, and civil servants, will in effect be exempt on all retirement income up to $1,200. This will mean a tax reduction for these retired people of up to $240 a year.

Second. Example: A retired single individual over 65 who has a total retirement income of $3,000 today pays about $300 in income tax. Under the bill, his tax is reduced to $60—a saving of $240.

Third. The same exemption will extend to individuals under 65 if they receive a pension from a public-retirement system, such as do teachers.

Savings to taxpayers, $141 million.

CREDIT PURCHASES

This bill allows a deduction for interest up to 6 percent on installment purchases.

Total saving to taxpayers, $10 million.

CHARITABLE CONTRIBUTIONS

This bill increases from 20 to 30 percent the allowable deduction for charitable contributions to churches, hospitals, and educational institutions.

Total saving to taxpayers, $25 million.

AID TO FARMERS

First. Deductions up to 25 percent of farm income are allowed for soil and water conservation.

Second. The bill permits more rapid writeoff of the expense of farm machinery, equipment, and construction.

Third. Removes tax on the proceeds of the sale of cattle when the sale is necessitated by disease.

Savings to taxpayers, $10 million.

SICKNESS AND ACCIDENT PLANS

First. Premiums paid by employers to health and accident plans will not be taxable to their employees.

Second. All accident and health benefits paid as reimbursement for actual medical expenses to employees, their wives, or children, are completely exempted from tax.

Third. Payments to employees for loss of wages due to injury or illness are exempted up to $100 a week.

Savings to taxpayers: No estimate possible.

DEATH BENEFITS

The bill exempts all death benefits up to $5,000 paid by an employer to the widow or other beneficiary of an employee.

Savings to taxpayers: No estimate possible.

PENSIONS AND ANNUITIES

In addition to the $1,200 exemption extended to retirement income, the bill also provides a simpler method for taxation of pensions and annuities, ends annual 3-percent tax paid on annuities, and provides instead a method of computing tax on basis of cost divided by years of life expectancy.

Savings to taxpayers, $10 million.

DIVIDEND CREDIT

First. Excludes first $50 in dividends from taxation and provides a credit against tax equal to 4 percent of the balance.

Second. Example: An individual with $50 or less in dividends from his savings will be entirely exempt from tax on that amount.

Third. Example: An individual with $250 in dividends from his savings will exclude the first $50 entirely, and then reduce his total tax by $8—4 percent of the balance of $200.

Savings to taxpayers, $204 million.

DEPRECIATION

The bill will permit the more liberal writeoff of the cost of new equipment. For example, in the first year of life of new equipment, the taxpayer will be able to write off twice the amount now allowed.

Savings to taxpayers, $375 million, of which $75 million represents savings to individuals such as farmers, shopkeepers, and salesmen.

DECLARATIONS OF ESTIMATED TAX

The requirements are eased for filing declarations of estimated tax. Upward of a million taxpayers will be relieved of the present requirement for filing.

FILING TAX RETURNS

Tax returns will be due April 15 instead of March 15, giving taxpayers 1 additional month in which to prepare their final tax returns and make their final tax payments.

RESEARCH AND EXPERIMENTATION

The bill grants taxpayers an option to either deduct as an expense or to amortize research and experimental expenditures.

No revenue estimate possible. The provision is designed to encourage business research with the objective of creating new products, new processes, and new jobs.

METHODS OF ACCOUNTING

The bill brings tax accounting rules into harmony with business accounting, thereby eliminating to a great extent two sets of books. It provides realistic computation of net income for tax purposes in conformity with sound business practices.

Savings to taxpayers, $47 million.

DEPLETION

The bill increases the rate of percentage depletion on a variety of critical and strategic minerals in order to encourage the development of domestic sources of supply.

Savings to taxpayers, $34 million.

PARTNERSHIPS

First. The bill adopts comprehensive provisions concerning the tax treatment of partners and partnerships in order to remove confusion of existing law. Principal objectives are simplicity, flexibility, and equity between partners.

Second. Certain proprietorships and partnerships are given the option to be taxed as corporations.

Savings to taxpayers, $20 million.

INVENTIONS

The bill extends capital-gains treatment to proceeds realized by an inventor on the sale or exchange of a patent.

No revenue estimate possible. The new provision is designed to encourage invention and thereby promote a healthy economy and an improving standard of living.

NET OPERATING LOSS

The bill extends the net operating loss carryback to 2 years and makes certain other adjustments.

Savings to taxpayers, $120 million.

LIFE INSURANCE

The bill lessens the estate tax on the proceeds of certain life-insurance policies.

Savings to individual taxpayers, $25 million.

CONSOLIDATED RETURNS

The bill removes the 2-percent penalty tax with respect to consolidated returns filed by regulated public utilities.

Savings to taxpayers, $35 million.

IMPROPER ACCUMULATIONS

The bill eases the penalty tax on certain accumulated earnings in order that business, especially small businesses, may have greater freedom in retaining their funds for legitimate business purposes.

Savings to taxpayers, $10 million.

CORPORATION INCOME TAX

The bill extends for 1 year the present 52 percent corporation income tax.

Total increase in revenue, $1.2 billion.

REPUBLICAN ACTION FOR TAXPAYERS

The 10 percent reduction in Federal income taxes which went into effect last January 1 saves individual taxpayers a total of $3 billion annually. This tax cut would not have been possible if the Congress and the administration had not cut the Truman budget for fiscal 1954 by $12 billion.

Nor would the $2 billion tax saving by elimination of the excess-profits tax have been possible without this budget cutting.

The Republican excise tax reduction law saves taxpayers an additional $1 billion.

The Tax Revision Act will save taxpayers $1,400,000,000.

A total of $827 million of this tax saving is for individuals. The remainder, $536 million, is tax relief for business.

The overall tax-cut program will save $7,400,000,000. Of this amount, individuals receive an overall total tax saving of $4,700,000,000. The tax savings so far surpass any previous total in the history of Congress.

The Congress That Gives More Time to Protection of Fish Than of Humans

SPEECH

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 4, 1954

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the only agreement, I think, as to this bill is that it is a very important bill. I cannot understand how this House will undertake to pass upon a bill of such tremendous importance, touching upon one of the very fundamental principles of our Constitution, that of requiring witnesses to testify against themselves without even having copies of the hearings before it.

It was not until this morning that we got the report of the committee. I doubt whether very many Members have had an opportunity to read either the majority report or the minority views on the bill. None of us has had an opportunity to read the hearings on this bill.

Under date of July 28 I placed in the Appendix of the RECORD the report on pending immunity bills written by the committee on Federal legislation of the association of the bar of the city of New York. I need not comment on the reputation of that bar association or of the 28 members of the New York bar who constituted that committee, all of them eminent and prominent lawyers of high repute. If you will refer to that report in the RECORD, you will find that this bill even in its present form does not meet the objections that were urged against it by 20 of the 21 members who signed that report. One of those members is opposed completely to giving authority to the Congress to grant immunity to witnesses. The others approve the principle in part and then only if safeguards are written into the law which you will not find in this bill.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. The only difference between the bill and that committee's report is that this bill requires notice to the Attorney General and a court appearance. Does the gentleman believe that makes any difference in the principles enunciated by the Bar Association?

Mr. MULTER. It does not affect the principles involved. If this bill is so urgent and so important, let us bring it before the House under an open rule. Let us consider it completely, debate it thoroughly, amend it and make it a good bill. This Congress can never justify passing upon legislation of this kind with only 40 minutes of debate, and with no opportunity to offer amendments. No one has yet given a single reason as to why this bill must be passed during the closing hours of this session of Congress. If any reasons exist, then the protection of the liberties and freedoms of the American people require that this Congress remain right here on the job until we have fully and fairly and completely discussed this bill and acted upon it, but only after due and careful consideration.

To pass this bill at this time in its present form will make us ludicrous.

Labeling bills antisubversive will catch no Communists and convict no criminals, and will not bring about the enactment of any good legislation.

Not a single sponsor of this legislation can point to one instance when the Congress has been prevented from legislating upon this very important subject because any one or more witnesses have refused to testify.

No one in or out of this Congress can think of, suggest, or imagine any kind of legislation that should be proposed, or that has not been proposed on the subject which should be proposed or could have been proposed or will be proposed if some recalcitrant witness is compelled to testify.

Every legislator worthy of the title must concede that the enactment of this bill will not adduce a single fact that will help this or any other Congress to legislate.

The only other purpose of this bill then, can be to uncover criminality and prosecute the guilty.

That part of this bill which gives the right to the Congress to grant immunity to witnesses in order to compel them to testify can only have the opposite effect.

The moment any witness refuses to testify because of the privilege accorded to him by the fifth amendment, even though presumed innocent until proved guilty in our law courts, in the court of public opinion he is presumed to be guilty, and no amount of argument, however logical or legalistic, eradicates that opinion from the public mind.

At the same time, however, every time a witness invokes that privilege, by that very act he alerts the prosecuting agencies of our Government to the fact that here is someone whose conduct requires criminal investigation. Hundreds of such persons who claimed the privilege have since been indicted and convicted and sentenced to jail. This bill will stop that.

Any time and every time a congressional committee or a subcommittee desires to grant immunity to a witness from criminal prosecution it can effectuate that purpose under this bill. Instead of catching criminals, congressional committees will be accorded the executive right to grant pardons. The only difference will be that whereas even the President cannot grant a pardon until the criminal has been convicted, by this bill, the Congress will give itself the right to grant pardons even before indictment.

The enactment of this bill will be a step further in the direction of destroying the separation of powers which has been the strength of our American Government.

Heretofore the Congress enacted the legislation making criminal such conduct as is against the public interest and in such legislation it set forth the punishment to be imposed upon those found guilty. The investigation and prosecution of criminals up to now has been left to the executive departments, with the right of pardon if the third branch, to wit, the judiciary, has conducted a trial which resulted in the conviction.

By this bill we roll the three functions into one. The Congress will now investigate, not for the purpose of legislating but for the purpose of exposing crime, and it will then, with or without the aid of the executive departments, seek a court order to immunize the criminal from prosecution even before adducing the facts concerning the crime.

Our theory of justice has heretofore been "let a hundred criminals escape prosecution rather than convict a single innocent person." This bill changes that philosophy to "let the guilty be excused from prosecution rather than follow the time-tested methods of indicting those against whom proof of a crime exists."

Let me again direct the attention of our colleagues to the fact that this Congress makes itself a laughing stock when a bill of this tremendous importance is pushed through with only 40 minutes of debate and with no opportunity to offer amendments, while a bill of so little importance as the labeling of imported trout is brought before the House under an open rule, permitting 1 hour of debate, and without limitation as to amendment. Truly this Congress, by this kind of action convicts itself of being more interested in protecting trout than in protecting the hard-won liberties of the American people.

First Ingot Cast at Kitimat Plant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1954

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to submit a news item from the New York Times by Raymond Daniell concerning Canadian aluminum plant:

Kitimat, British Columbia., August 3.—Another step was taken toward man's conquest of the mountain fastness of northern Canada when the first ingot was poured at the new smelter of the Aluminum Company of Canada here today.

The historic event took place before the eyes of the Duke of Edinburgh, who is touring Canada. He came here this afternoon after visiting the company's new hydroelectric powerplant at Kemano, deep in the heart of Mount DuBose, named after a company executive. Later he flew back to Vancouver.

The casting of the first ingot at the smelter marked the end of a 3-year struggle against nature by 10,000 men and machines. They turned a river in its course, hurled its waters into a chain of lakes tunneled 25 miles to the coast and sent the waters pouring down giant pipes into generators half a mile below.

They have built what is one of the most powerful generating stations in the world to provide the electricity to transform ore and chemicals into aluminum, one of the most important of modern strategic metals.

FIFTY-FIVE MILES FROM SMELTER

The powerplant is at Kemano, some 55 miles down the rugged British Columbian coast from here. The great Kenny Dam, the third largest earth-filled one in the world, is at the canyon of the Nechako River about 125 miles to the east of Kemano.

CHEAP POWER IS LURE

It was the promise of large blocks of uninterrupted hydroelectric power at an economic cost that brought the aluminum industry to British Columbia.

Every pound of aluminum requires 10 kilowatt-hours of electricity, besides 3 pounds of various raw materials. To produce this power, the world's most powerful impulse turbines have been built in a huge manmade cavern 50 miles away at Kemano.

More than a million cubic yards of solid granite were dynamited and removed in tunneling to bring water to the Kemano power house. A tunnel 10 miles long and 25 feet wide brings water from the vast reservoir created by the Kenney Dam to the turbines inside the base of Mount DuBose, half a mile below.

Through this tunnel and into the penstocks leading to the turbines, water drops 2,500 feet, creating a head that is 16 times greater than Niagara Falls.

There were many reasons for Alcan's locating the Kemano powerhouse underground. Some of these considerations were: freedom from possible enemy air action; more economic foundations for massive powerhouse equipment; building exposed penstocks on a steep mountain slope would be treacherous in winter and subject to landslides, and tonnage of steel and concrete would be considerably reduced by the underground construction.

Helicopters played a major role in the building of Alcan's Kemano-Kitimat project. The transmission lines from the powerhouse to the smelter at Kitimat traverses 50 miles of rugged mountain terrain. Towers were fabricated, tested, and then broken down into sections small enough to be transported by helicopter. At the erecting site, construction crews put them together while the fleet of helicopters carried on a continuous airlift.

A special aluminum cable wound on a steel core was strung between the towers by helicopter over the top of the mountains at Kildala Pass. Although the area is subject to warm, moisture-laden winds from the Pacific, the general climate is that of nearby snowfields and glaciers and an iceload of 40 pounds a foot was finally decided upon as the ultimate load on the cable.

The newly built seaport at Kitimat, adjacent to the smelter, has been steadily receiving the various materials—such as petroleum coke, pitch, cryolite, and alumina—to be consumed in the smelter.

The company's own ships are on a regular schedule bringing alumina through the Panama Canal from Jamaica, where another Aluminum, Ltd., subsidiary was the first to acquire bauxite properties and to extract the refined alumina from the bauxite ore. About $30 million has thus far been invested in Jamaica, mainly to support the Kitimat smelter.

NEW TRANSPORT PLANNED

At present the only access to Kitimat is by water and air. But to service an industrial community the size of Kitimat, new transporation facilities will have to be opened up. The harbor installation is now complete and is fully adequate to supply the needs of the area for the foreseeable future.

A railroad connection to the north is nearing completion and is expected to be in use by the end of the year. This line, built by the Canadian National Railway, will connect Kitimat with the town of Terrace, 43 miles to the north.

"A terrible silence, broken only now and then by the dreadful crash of some falling avalanche, reigned over this scene of desolation." Thus wrote Charles Horetzky, surveyor for the Canadian Pacific Railway Co., in 1874 when searching for a pass through the mountains.

Today, on the spot where Horetzky stood, tons of water hurtle down tunnels cut through the mountain to turn the turbines at Kemano. One hundred miles to the east a great rock dam has impounded the water of many lakes and backed them up against the coastal mountains. Half a mile below Tahtsa Lake, a vast man-made cavern, hewn out of solid rock, reverberates with the whine of three great electric generators.

It was in April 1951 that it was decided to build Kitimat. Three years and 3 months later—after millions of cubic yards of earth and rock had been moved; thousands of tons of aluminum and steel used in construction; docks, railways, roads, and airports built—the first aluminum ingots were poured.

Dilemma in Politics—Senators Have One Eye for Principles, Another for Voters in McCarthy Dispute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 5, 1954

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the Record a very interesting article written by Mr. James Reston, chief of the Washington bureau of the New York Times, and printed in the New York Times of Tuesday, August 3.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Dilemma in Politics—Senators Have One Eye for Principles, Another for Voters in McCarthy Dispute

(By James Reston)

Washington, August 2.—The debate in the Senate on Senator Joseph R. McCarthy has proved one thing: that the Wisconsinite is still a very influential man in the United States Senate.

The polls may be right in suggesting that Senator McCarthy lost support during the televised Army hearings, but he still has working for him one rule of politics, which all politicians hesitate to break.

That is that a politician never antagonizes any group of voters in an election year—if he can avoid it.

Last week many Senators on both sides of the aisle were trying to avoid a vote on the resolution to censure Senator McCARTHY's actions on the ground that the resolution lacked a bill of particulars.

Now the generalized Flanders resolution has been amended by Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT so that it has a most specific bill of particulars against the Senator from Wisconsin.

But many Senators are still hoping to find ways and means of avoiding a direct vote on the issue.

And though the question has been sent to a special committee for study, it is still not certain that the Senators will have to commit themselves before the Congress adjourns for the summer recess.

If the bipartisan committee, to which the censure motion has been referred, does force the Senate to make a decision before adjournment, the chances still are that it will choose to vote for McCARTHY rather than against him.

Senator WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND, of California, the leader of the Senate Republicans, would rather take a chance on antagonizing the anti-McCARTHY Senators than the pro-McCARTHY. Anti-McCARTHY Republicans such as Senator RALPH FLANDERS, MARGARET CHASE SMITH of Maine, and JOHN SHERMAN COOPER, of Kentucky, might forgive the majority leader for forsaking them, but the pro-McCARTHY bloc would never forgive or forget.

Perhaps the most significant and certainly the boldest speech of the debate was made by Senator EVERETT DIRKSEN, of Illinois. It was significant because he is the chairman of the Senate Republican Campaign Committee, charged with responsibility for helping the Republican Senators up for election in November, and he seemed more than willing to make defense of Senator McCARTHY a major campaign issue.

Unlike many of his colleagues, he did not try to evade the vote. He was cocky. He demanded a vote on the censure motion. He challenged the Democrats to vote against Senator McCARTHY. He taunted and goaded the liberals, roundly condemning the Congress of Industrial Organizations, the Americans for Democratic Action, and even a most distinguished group of liberal Republicans who had called on the Senate to vote for the censure resolution.

The Senator from Illinois even produced a biblical text for his defense of the Wisconsin Senator: "Thou shalt not follow a multitude to do evil." His point was that since the Communist Party, the Daily Worker, and a host of liberal groups were for censuring Senator McCARTHY, all decent folk should be against such a resolution.

Senator DIRKSEN said he had heard this quotation in an invocation at the 1952 Republican National Convention, delivered by a very eminent rabbi. "Let us remember what the equities and the verities are," said the Illinois Senator: " 'Follow not a multitude to do evil'."

THE REST OF THE QUOTATION

This biblical theme seems to have impressed the orators, particularly on the Republican side. Senator HERMAN WELKER of Idaho picked it up again today and kept throwing it at the Democrats, but nobody apparently looked up what Senator DIRKSEN's "very eminent rabbi" really said in Chicago.

The invocation that impressed Senator DIRKSEN in that convention was made by Rabbi Louis L. Mann, of the Sinai Temple of Chicago. He said several things that Senator DIRKSEN omitted.

"May freedom of assembly," he said, "not sink into the depths of mob action, but be utilized for high and noble purposes. Recalling the words of our Scriptures, 'thou shalt not follow a multitude to do evil.'

* * *

"We thank Thee for the gift of righteous indignation, and we are humbled, aye humiliated, by the crime, corruption, the dishonesty and faithlessness of those who have brought shame to our country. * * *

"We pray:

" 'God give us men! A time like this demands
Strong minds, great hearts, true faith and ready hands;
Men whom the lust of office does not kill;
Men whom the spoils of office cannot buy;
Men who possess opinions and a will;
Men who have honor; men who will not lie;
Men who can stand before a demagogue
And damn his treacherous flatteries without winking;
Tall men, sun-crowned, who live above the fog
In public duty and in private thinking.
God, give men.'
"Amen."

Pentagon Bottles Up United States Good-Will Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 4, 1954

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that most of our colleagues will agree with Ray Tucker that the story he tells in his column which appeared in the Brooklyn Eagle of August 3, 1954, is deserving of the widest publicity. I for one, believe that a humanitarian act is good and is deserving of praise, even when performed by the United States Navy, and especially so when not in the line of duty.

The story follows:

CAIRO, August 3.—The United States Navy has succeeded in bottling up for more than a year a story of American humanitarianism which would—if it had become generally known—have created more good will throughout the Arab lands than several millions of "Stassen money," as foreign-aid funds are called here.

The hatcheck girl at the Hotel Semiramis knows of it, but Arabians and Americans generally do not. And it took a trip to Cario for six hard-working Washington newspaper correspondents to learn of it.

Om Kalsoum, the first name meaning "mother" in Arabian, is not even a name to Americans. But, although she is 45 years old and not especially beautiful—so they tell me, for I have yet to see and hear her—she is a legendary figure in every Arabian land, from Algiers to Indochina.

A singer of rare quality and personality, she commands from $1,500 to $3,000 for a personal or radio performance. And, although television is stil to be introduced here on the American scale, every bazar blares out her radio message of music.

POPULARITY PLUS

Om Kalsoum, in short, is a combination to the Arab audience of Bing Crosby, Jack Benny, Rosemary Clooney, and even Willie Mays. She is beloved as a gal who brightens their drab lives with her singing, especially of foreign and classical pieces. She brings the unknown and outside world into their desert tents and Cairo hovels, to the rulers and the ruled alike.

Several years ago Om Kalsoum became stricken with a thyroid ailment that threatened to end her career. Her illness was the inspiration for the same sort of tragic stories that accompanied the retirement of some American athletic stars.

The ousting of King Farouk, the great lover boy, did not cause half the journalistic fanfare that Om Kalsoum's attack did. The newspapers from here to Calcutta—I have seen them—bordered their reports of her suffering with black, mourning lines.

The musical mother tried every noted physician, clinic, and hospital in Europe and the Middle East, but to no avail. They could neither diagnose nor cure her peculiar form of disease.

Through Jefferson Caffrey, our Ambassador to Egypt, and one of the ablest diplomats in the service, Om Kalsoum was transported by the Navy to the skyscraper hospital at Bethesda, Md., which F. D. R. himself designed in a broad and general way.

CURED BY AMERICAN MEDICAL MEN

Om Kalsoum was cured completely by America's finest physicians, private and governmental. She is back again in the singing business, and at the moment is chorusing her way through India. Her friends inform me that she usually winds up her program by singing The Star-Spangled Banner, which the people here think to be a sort of a church chant. They like it.

But not a word of this apparent miracle would the Navy permit to be published. Our friends in the Arab world, diplomats and newspapermen, tried to obtain its publication for the effect it would have had on so many key nations in the cold war, but the bureaucrats at the Pentagon refused.

Their explanation was that Congress would protest against the spending of this money on an Egyptian "It" girl, even though she is a sort of theatrical saint to hundreds of millions—the cost could not have exceeded $2,000. Om Kalsoum happens to be extremely wealthy. She could probably buy and sell some of America's popular singers, especially as she is probably a smarter trader. All Egyptians excel in that line.

WE ARE LIKED BUT SUSPECTED

We think that we are so honest, so decent, and so straightforward in our contest for men's minds with Russia that nobody can misunderstand or misjudge us. Well, they do.

I have found too much evidence to that effect on this safari, from official and unofficial Americans and from foreign diplomats, newspapermen, and businessmen. They like us, but they suspect us.

Om Kalsoum—Mother Kalsoum, if you can imagine such a monicker for a jazz and classical singer—is a great and beloved personality throughout the Arab world.

She might become an interesting personality to Americans, if the Navy bureaucrats at the Pentagon would release the story of her recovery at Bethesda, which, incidentally, was named after the Biblical pool for working good will and spreading Christianity through the then skeptical universe.

Emergency Credit

SPEECH

OF

HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 4, 1954

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, an identical House bill passed the House on June 7. This bill provides for emergency credit, authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to make available emergency loans in the amount of $15 million in situations arising out of an economic emergency. If the funds are not needed for that purpose they will be available for other loans made by the Farmers' Home Administration. I am advised by the Secretary of Agriculture that with the drought situation becoming worse every day it is anticipated they will need these funds, and that in making their calculations as to their ability to handle the drought situation they are taking these funds into account.

In view of the fact that a similar bill has already passed the House, I do not believe any further explanation is needed at this time.

House Judiciary Committee Tables Butler Resolution, Senate Joint Resolution 44, Amending Constitution Relating to Number of Supreme Court Judges, Etc.—Celler Opposed Restrictions on Supreme Court

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 13, 1954

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, Senate Joint Resolution 44 is a four-pronged constitutional amendment. First, it freezes the number of Justices of the Supreme Court to nine. As a member of the Committee on the Judiciary at the time of President Roosevelt's proposal to pack the Supreme Court, I protested with such vehemence that Roosevelt never forgave me for it. I cannot say, however, that the Court-packing proposal of 1937 justifies this proposed constitutional amendment. We force upon ourselves a rigidity which can in the future make much mischief. It is in the flexibility of the Constitution that we can lay claim to a government that moves with history. Members of Congress do not have the gift of clairvoyance. In the event there is another such move to increase the members of the Court, the then Congress, in the final analysis, can approve or reject, as is deemed best in the national interest. This attempt to mortgage the future when no good reason exists for doing so is begging for trouble.

Secondly, Senate Joint Resolution 44 compels retirement of Justices of the Supreme Court at the age of 75. Again, this is the kind of rigidity and generalization which is unhealthy in constitutional amendments. Judges may now retire at 75 if they wish. Some of our best judicial activity was performed by judges over 75 years of age. I point to Justice Holmes, Hughes, Brandeis, and Judge Learned Hand. There are scores of others. There are judges today over the age of 75 who are serving with great distinction.

Thirdly, the House Judiciary Subcommittee seeks to propose another section which was wisely discarded by the Senate; namely, that no Justice of the Supreme Court shall be eligible to serve as President or Vice President of the United States until 5 years have passed after the termination of such service. What is the compelling need for such a provision that makes it constitititutional matter? What if one of the Justices of the Supreme Court were of presidential caliber? Is the country to tie its hands from seeking the best possible man for the highest elective office in our land? There is an ugly implication in such a provision that the possibility of attaining a presidency or vice presidency can mar the integrity of the future members of the Supreme Court.

Fourthly, Senate Joint Resolution 44 seeks to prevent Congress from cutailing the appellate jurisdiction of the Supreme Court. While I do not oppose such a measure I can see no need for its present enactment at the end of a session when time is so pressing. True, Congress has the power to cutail this appellate jurisdiction, particularly in cases involving constitutional questions. Only once did such a situation arise and that was in the tremendous upheaval of the Civil War.

Unless the reasons are compelling, I cannot approve such amending of the Constitution. This almost casual approach to so far reaching a process is contrary to our best interests. Three of the four provisions in Senate Joint Resolution 44 are actually placing us in a box within a box within a box. In a similar connection it was once said, "striving to better, often we mar what's well."

Who's Due To Pay for Colorado Storage Project?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE L. HAYS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 28, 1954

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the Colorado storage project bill, H. R. 4449, is now in the House Rules Committee, where I hope it will remain. The Senate version of the same project, S. 1555, which is much larger, recently was approved by the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. This great project would cost the taxpayers of my State an estimated $59 million, an unjustified burden which Ohio taxpayers should not be forced to bear.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article from the editorial page of the Cleveland Plain Dealer, of July 20, 1954:

> Almost unnoticed under cover of the storm over the atomic energy bill the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs approved a huge pork barrel known as the upper Colorado storage project. It is notable that those Senators who were at the moment screaming about Eisenhower's "handout" to private utilities, made no mention of another sort of gratuity to favored sections or States which is possible under the rules and organization and customs which they themselves have created.
>
> As this proposal came from the Interior Department with the President's blessing, there were to be two large power dams and storage reservoirs, at Glen Canyon and Echo Park, with 12 so-called participating projects for minor power, storage, and irrigation. These were carefully scattered among four States—Colorado, Utah, Wyoming, and New Mexico. The construction cost was estimated at something less than $1 billion.
>
> However, since the proposal was introduced it has been almost impossible to determine at any given time the number of the secondary projects in the bill. New ones have been added and subtracted with the rapidity of magic. At one stage it was reported in a newspaper in Utah that Senator ANDERSON wanted another project in New Mexico, and presto, the project was added.
>
> The Senate subcommittee, in fact, became so lavish in tossing projects into the pot that the construction cost was raised to $1.5 billion. The full committee showed somewhat more restraint, but, at that, it has included projects never approved by the administration—projects on which the Interior Department did not, at least in the original proposal, offer Congress genuinely informative data.
>
> The burden of such an enormous project will, of course, be sustained by States whose interest or benefit is remote. The four States directly benefited would pay in Federal taxes less than one-fiftieth of the cost. The total of their taxes will be only a little larger than that of Connecticut. The seven States paying more than half the cost will be, in this order, New York, California, Pennsylvania, Illinois, Ohio, Michigan, and Texas.
>
> New York would pay, if the construction cost is kept to a billion dollars, $123,400,000. California would contribute $93,200,000; Pennsylvania, $69,400,000; Illinois, $69 million; Ohio, $59 million; Michigan, $49,100,000; Texas, $48,600,000. Only two of these States, California and Texas, have representatives on the Senate committee that approved this expenditure, and KUCHEL, of California, cast the only vote in opposition. New York, Pennsylvania, Illinois, Ohio and Michigan would pay more than a third of the billion dollars and have no representative on the committee.
>
> In fact, there is not a single Republican Senator from east of the Mississippi on that lavish and expensive committee. And the only Democrats are from Florida and Kentucky.
>
> In all this welter of heedless spending, it is hard to find anyone who is looking after the overburdened taxpayer or, in fact, the general interests of the United States. This is politics, special interest, bad Senate organization, and sectional selfishness at its worst.
>
> The last hope for stopping this vast and reckless measure is in the House. There, at least, the taxpayers have a few friends.

Echo Dam Would Open Superb Recreation Area

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 5, 1954

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, much misinformation has been widely distributed about the proposed development of the upper Colorado Basin. The target for the brunt of these attacks is

Echo Park Dam. Statements have been made to the effect that if this dam is built, it would flood the Dinosaur National Monument. Those who have made a careful study of the plans know this just is not true.

In fact, the director of the Colorado State Game and Fish Department, Mr. Thomas L. Kimball who is a well-known conservationist, contends the reservoir will enhance the beauty of the area and make it accessible for our people to see it.

One of the finest articles I have read on this subject was written by Mr. Nello Cassai, a Denver (Colo.) Post staff writer. I am quite certain my colleagues will find this article most interesting and factual. For this reason, I submit it for their consideration. The article:

Dinosaur Adventure: Echo Dam Would Open Superb Recreation Area

(By Nello Cassai)

Trout and bass fishing supreme are envisioned by the State game and fish department if and when controversial Echo Park Dam is built in Dinosaur National Park.

Department Director Thomas L. Kimball expressed the conviction Saturday that with proper planning the sequestered desert and canyon country could become one of the most popular playgrounds of the West.

With 14 others, Kimball took a 4-day float trip down the beautiful but treacherous Green River and insisted (after an almost deliberate dunking) that the silt-laden waters could produce fish—beautiful, fighting fish.

Furthermore, he said, the huge impoundment of the Green and Yampa Rivers would prove highly beneficial to wildlife that now abounds in the vast but secluded reservation in northwestern Colorado.

Some wildlife pasture will be flooded, he conceded, but more than compensating for this will be new grazing areas created by an expanded waterline.

Ducks, geese, and other migratory fowl—which now use the park as a major nesting area—also should find additional breeding grounds in the back swamps of the impoundment.

A fundamental conservationist, Kimball has heard the cries of certain groups which charge that construction of the giant dam will destroy the scenic beauty of the park. But he doesn't agree.

RECREATIONAL PARADISE

Although he is taking no active part in the argument, he privately sides with those who contend the reservoir will enhance the beauty of the area—while making it accessible to the thousands of Americans who spend millions annually in search of new thrills and adventures.

"Beautiful, unspoiled country," Kimball admitted. "But with the roads and geography what they are, how many people can get in here to see it? A handful.

"Right now, the canyon section (in which the reservoir will be built) is almost wholly undeveloped for recreational use."

Tentative plans call for expenditure of $21 million in Federal funds for the recreational program alone—a program providing facilities for fishing, boating, swimming, hiking, riding, camping, and sightseeing.

A seine and fly rods were taken along on the research expedition, conducted on 3 big rubber rafts, yet the 2 rivers yielded only squawfish, bonytails, bullheads, and some channel cats. Few people fish for sport in the little-visited area.

Kimball likened the situation to that of the Colorado River before Hoover Dam was built. The Colorado in Nevada and Arizona, too, was worthless as a fishing stream because of silt and high temperature of the water.

"Today," Kimball pointed out, "Lake Mead is recognized as the Nation's best bass fishing site, while the river below it—thanks to silt control and the release of cold water from the base of the dam—is one of our finest streams.

AWESOME BUT RELAXING

Dinosaur Park is indeed an awesome piece of real estate when viewed from a throbbing rubber raft on the Green River. Palpitating ulcers nurtured carefully through years of regimented city living doze quietly as you slowly approach the gates of Lodore Canyon.

But here, ages ago, nature had convulsions and then fashioned a work of unforgettable beauty. Here, after a long rest through the rolling desert country, the river springs to life and thunderously roars its defiance at the sheer, multi-colored walls which seek to contain it.

And here is excitement as the 3 boats, 5 men to a boat, churn dizzily into the first rapids, known apprppriately as Disaster Falls.

The roar is deafening, jagged rocks loom ahead, and everybody gets a firmer grip as the boat veers wildly through clouds of spray. But—two men overboard.

WET ADVENTURING

They manage to cling to the sides of the bouncing raft, pleading wordlessly, and are finally pulled aboard. "Wet," is the relieved pronouncement of State Representative Oakley Wade, of Las Animas, and Bob Kinghorn, of Denver.

The chow stop calls for swimming and maybe a water fight.

Around each bend there is a different scene, a new experience, and a challenge—such as shoot Schoolboy Rapids on a tiny one-man raft. (Cold, isn't it, Mr. Kimball?)

But despite the reasonable rates charged for such a trip by River Rat Bus Hatch, of Vernal, Utah, few people will risk it. And the canyons can be explored no other way by the average tourist.

IMPROVEMENT COST SET

Based on studies and estimates of the National Park Service, here's the way the $21 million recreational fund would be spent: $6,800,000 for 85 miles of roads; $4,100,000 for 6 area campgrounds; $2 million for park headquarters; $1,410,000 for guest lodges and restaurants; $1,800,000 for picnic areas for 2,000; $900,000 for 200 miles of trails and bridal paths; $380,000 for a central and 8 secondary museums; $20,000 for 7 boat docks; $260,000 for 7 beaches; $2,500,000 for archeological studies and excavations.

Safeguard in "A" Bill Is Threatened

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 5, 1954

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the Appendix of the Record an important article by Michael Amberg in Labor's Daily regarding the Senate amendments to the atomic energy bill and in particular the effect of the so-called Ferguson amendment on the Dixon-Yates contract and the pattern it sets for at least four additional Dixon-Yates type of contracts in the Tennessee Valley Authority area:

Safeguard in "A" Bill Is Threatened

Washington.—A labor-backed antimonopoly provision written into the Senate version of the atomic-energy bill by Democratic efforts has been marked for junking by the Senate-House conferees.

The conferees voted to gut the safeguard following the appeal of the United States Chamber of Commerce to delete it.

The affected safeguard is Senator Hubert H. Humphrey's (Democrat, Minnesota) amendment to prohibit the AEC from licensing a private firm to build an "A" plant when the Attorney General advises that such a license would create or maintain a monopolistic situation.

The conferees also adopted the Senate's Ferguson and Gore amendments dealing with the Dixon-Yates contract.

Senator Homer Ferguson's (Republican, Michigan) amendment would legalize any contract AEC makes with a private utility for that utility to furnish power to TVA for replacement of power sold by TVA to AEC.

The Ferguson amendment would pave the way for more deals like Dixon-Yates—very profitable for utilities, costly for the taxpayer, and destructive of TVA, TVA supporters claim.

COULD BUILD RING AROUND TVA

As of April 1953, TVA furnished to AEC's Oak Ridge, Tenn., plant the output of 700,000 kilowatts generation capacity and to AEC's Paducah, Ky., plant 400,000 kilowatts. TVA was further contracted to furnish Oak Ridge 1,030,000 kilowatts additional and Paducah 805,000 kilowatts more. Thus TVA has been selling AEC the output of 1.1 million kilowatts capacity. However, currently planned total future TVA power to AEC amounts to 2,935,000 kilowatts.

The way is opened by the Ferguson amendment, its foes charge, not only to legalize the 600,000-kilowatt Dixon-Yates contract for which no authority was on the statute books when the President ordered it, but also to permit a ring of such contracts all around the TVA area.

If the administration uses the Ferguson amendment to its fullest extent by having AEC make contracts like the Dixon-Yates one for private utilities to sell to TVA replacement power for all the power TVA furnishes to AEC, and if these deals are as costly as the Dixon-Yates, the Government stands to lose between $358.8 million and $546 million over a 25-year period.

That figure is over and above the $92 to $140 million that AEC and TVA have estimated the Government would lose by having Dixon-Yates rather than TVA build the steam plant to furnish power to TVA customers in replacement of power TVA furnishes AEC.

Altogether, TVA is to furnish AEC 2,935,000 kilowatts while private plants will directly supply AEC with 2,535,000.

The amendment by Senator Albert Gore (Democrat, Tennessee), adopted by the Senate and approved by the conferees, would bar such a contract from providing that AEC repay the private utility for any Federal taxes it must pay on profits from the contract.

WOULD HAVE NO LEGAL WEIGHT

The conference action on the junking of the Humphrey amendment was opposed by Representative Chet Holifield, Democrat, of California.

The conferees' tentative decision called for deleting the prohibition on AEC's granting the license, and instead merely permitting the Attorney General to insert his findings in the Federal Register.

The Federal Register is an official publication of the Government usually confined to publishing the texts of various executive agency regulations which must be obeyed.

But in this case, if the conference proposal becomes law, the publication merely would be carrying an interesting expression of the Attorney General's opinion having no legal significance, observers noted.

Not all conference decisions went against the public interests amendments adopted by the Senate during the long debate when Democratic Senators and a few Republicans together with WAYNE MORSE (Independent, Oregon) fought for safeguards demanded by labor and other consumer interest groups.

The conferees retained the gist of the Humphrey amendment:

1. Requiring A-plant licensees selling power in interstate commerce to fall under Federal Power Commission accounting rules designed to avoid padded costs leading to inflated rates charged consumers.

2. Requiring AEC to furnish adequate notice to interested parties before granting licenses.

3. Setting up a division or divisions of civilian applications of atomic energy within AEC.

They retained the intent of Senators GUY M. GILLETTE's (Democrat, Iowa) and EDWIN C. JOHNSON's (Democrat, Colorado) amendments that public and nonprofit cooperative groups are to get first crack at buying A-power production by Government plants.

YARDSTICK NOT ENTIRELY LOST

But the Johnson amendment provision that would allow AEC to enter into full-scale A-power production and sales, limited only by appropriations, was modified in conference. The conferees voted to permit AEC to build reactors for power production and sales, on an experimental, demonstration, and developmental basis only.

The plants could be used for "yardstick" purposes, conferees indicated. However, other federal agencies like TVA and Bonneville could apply to AEC for licenses if Congress approves such applications, the conferees provided.

JOHNSON said he might not be "satisfied" with the conference action on his amendment but he "probably had to be content with it." Other liberal Congressmen similarly expressed the feeling that they hadn't come off entirely on the short end of the stick on the Johnson amendment issue though they were not entirely happy.

Why Ike's Tax Bill Is Called Cornerstone

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 27, 1954

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, there can be little doubt among informed people that the Eisenhower program is a plan to enrich the few at the expense of the many. It is a program which puts special advantage for the very rich above the welfare of the average citizen. Uncle Sam, under GOP leadership, is playing Santa Claus to big business and monopoly interests while reducing the living standards of the people through planned adjustment. Adjustment of millions of workers and their families means unemployment and reduced income, while to the monopoly interests it means big profits and increased power over the economic life of the Nation.

Under leave to extend my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I include herewith an editorial from Labor, the official publication of the railway labor organizations, which points out how the administration tax bill is the cornerstone of the President's legislative program:

WHY IKE'S TAX BILL IS CALLED CORNERSTONE

Congress this week passed the "rich men's tax bill," which President Eisenhower called the cornerstone of his legislative program. Ike called it that because his big-business advisers sold him on the "trickle-down" theory, which is this:

Giving an incentive to a few top men and corporations, by fattening their incomes and profits and cutting their taxes. Then they will invest more money, provide more jobs and production, and make the country prosperous. Thus the benefits will trickle down to all the people.

Critics of that theory point out that the automotive industry, for example, is producing far more cars than it can sell. How would that be remedied by fattening the profits of the auto magnates and reducing their taxes by the "rich men's tax bill?" Investing more money in the auto industry would simply increase the overproduction.

The only real remedy is increasing the incomes of workers and the people in general so they can buy more cars. The benefits of this would "trickle up" and create genuine and permanent prosperity.

Ike's advisers, however, were right when they told him the tax bill is the cornerstone of the program which the administration has been pushing through Congress. Without the tax cuts, wealthy men could not cash in so hugely on the rest of the program. Here's why:

Already given away are offshore oil worth countless billions of dollars, some of the people's rivers, and atomic electric power made possible by $12 billion of the people's money and having a future value beyond computation. More giveaways of public property are still to come. The program also includes other legislation, some of it already passed, to enrich big special interests.

How do Oil Trust, Power Trust and other magnates cash in on all these giveaways? They cash in through corporations, mostly through dividends paid by corporations. That's why the rich men's tax bill is the "cornerstone" of the administration's program.

The cashing in will be helped by the tax bill in many ways, but the most shocking is the "dividend deduction." This, as originally proposed by the administration, would have cut stockholders' income taxes by $1.2 billion a year. They will get a cut of more than $300 million a year under the bill finally passed by Congress.

The bill will give wealthy men and corporations a total tax cut of $3 billion a year, when fully in effect after the first year, while wage and salary workers continue to pay full taxes on their hard-earned incomes.

The dividend deduction, alone, will produce outrageously unfair results like this:

Take two families, each with husband, wife and one child, and an income of $5,000. One's income is entirely wage or salary. Its income tax will be $420.

The other family's income is entirely dividends. Its income tax will be only $328. Thus "unearned" income is taxed $92 less than "earned" income of the same size.

In the "higher brackets," of course, the tax on unearned dividend income is cut still more by the rich men's tax bill. And all this is just a start. Now that the "principle" of the dividend deduction has been established, Congress later will be asked to completely abolish taxes on dividends.

Then, because of the dividend deduction and other favors and loopholes in the tax law, wealthy men will pay practically no taxes on the profits from the giveaways they are getting from the administration and Congress. No wonder the rich men's tax bill is called the cornerstone of Eisenhower's legislative program.

Coffee Facts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 5, 1954

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, an awful lot has been said and written about coffee and the reason why the price is so high. Much of this talk sounded baseless to me, so I decided to get the facts, from a man who knew the facts.

Hugh Bennett, who is the daddy of soil conservation and is known and respected far and wide for his truth and veracity and his ability to get the facts and explain the facts without fear or favor, has recently returned from a 2-month inspection tour in Brazil.

About a week ago I asked Mr. Bennett if he would please send me a statement about the coffee situation, which he said he would be happy to do.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert Mr. Bennett's statement in the RECORD so that all who read this statement may read these facts:

OBSERVATIONS ON COFFEE

(By Hugh H. Bennett)

In 1950 more than half of our coffee came from Brazil—1,504,000,000 pounds of a total importation of 2,815,000,000 pounds (agricultural statistics, United States Department of Agriculture). Brazil is a big country with a large area of excellent coffee land. In size it exceeds the combined extent of our 48 States and its population of some 60 million is greater than that of all the other South American countries combined. Climatically, the range is from humid-tropical in the north to subtropical to mild-temperate in the general region of São Paulo and adjoining states. In some respects the weather is like that of Florida.

On July 4, 5, and 6, 1953, an act of God struck viciously at Brazil's coffee industry. This was a frost that killed to the ground millions of newly planted and bearing coffee trees. The event failed to make the front pages of our newspapers immediately. Its significance was not clearly understood at first. And this was true in some degree in Brazil.

Heaviest damage was in low places. Great quantities of fruit were killed on the tree by cold winds, even on high ridges.

Northern Parana, in the heart of the greatest coffee-producing area on earth, was hardest hit. Later, when the price of coffee was soaring from day to day, the newspapers began to take notice. When the price moved beyond a dollar a pound nationwide, interest was aroused in the United States. Still later, at around $1.25 the pound, some people were so excited they threatened to stop drinking coffee altogether, insisting it was only a habit. But the price moved on up. Some housewives undertaking to ease the pressure, personally, resorted to panic buying. Others talked of boycotting Brazilian coffee. Newspaper people flew down to the coffee country to check first hand on the situation. Some wanted to see if there really had been a frost that far south; or whether or not the advancing price had anything to do with gigantic schemes engineered to corner the market by storing coffee in warehouses. Some were maintaining the advance was due entirely to speculation. Others went after news stories for their papers. The price of coffee had rapidly grown into big news and reporters were in the business of gathering news for their papers.

Much of the excitement seemed to me a normal sort of reaction to a momentous event. Some seemingly inclined to leap before looking talked too much or too critically it appeared to me. They got the germ of an idea and immediately made a mountain of it. Actually the situation was not an easy one for foreigners to get to the bottom of, or some of the Brazilians, for that matter. There were a variety of handicaps, for North Americans, such as distance, language difficulties, and their almost complete ignorance of the coffee industry.

People occasionally seem to lose sight of the fact that south of the Equator cold weather is to the south. In Parana and southern São Paulo the general rule is not to plant coffee in those low positions where cold air tends to settle. In such situations frost occurs quite frequently. Last July frost reached well above the line recognized as marking the contour below which coffee culture is considered too hazardous. On some plantations all trees are reported to have been killed or damaged.

TOO MUCH LECTURING.

Before talking overglibly about the economy of producing and marketing coffee, we should have been sufficiently realistic to understand that neither individuals nor small groups can do very much about such problems, beyond stirring up misunderstandings. The coffee industry has wide and complicated ramifications of supply, demand, and world competition.

I am not a specialist in the field, but some aspects of the situation seem clear. For example, boycotting a billion pounds of Brazilian coffee off the shelves of groceries serving 165 million people, most of whom—of the grownups, at least—are confirmed coffee drinkers, obviously would be no small undertaking. It seems much more of an improbability—or impossibility.

Consider the ways of our confirmed coffee drinkers. Would boycotting interfere very much with their coffee drinking habits? Most of them are probably so firmly set in their ways they couldn't change if they wanted to. They get up early every morning with an irresistable inner urge for a steaming cup of coffee. Working their way quickly into the kitchen long before breakfast time, they brew a whole pot of coffee for themselves. And later at regular breakfast they call for more. It might be practicable to slightly modify such habits but probably not for long.

PREVIOUS EXPERIENCE

We have had high prices before for a variety of commodities—and low prices, too. My own experience has been that both kinds can hurt, depending on one's bank balance and whether or not he is buying or selling.

Remember 1920? I do, and painfully. Like most growers of cotton I had planted little but that crop on my North Carolina farm that year. The year before shortstaple cotton had sold for 40 cents a pound or better. At harvest time in 1920 the price was down to 7 cents. I couldn't afford to have mine picked. Later on—too late for many—the price improved considerably, then it dropped to a lower level and remained there so long most growers, urged by our Department of Agriculture, plowed under a substantial part of their almost-matured crop. Some claimed it was pure nonsense, but went ahead with the plowing under, nevertheless. I quit cotton farming during that period—went into tree farming, growing loblolly pine for lumber, poles, and pulp.

Recently beefsteak put on a price show that surprised all of us. At $1.50 a pound for choice cuts at the meat counter and $4.50 per steak (usually weighing less than a pound) in select restaurants, some of us asserted we were having nothing more to do with such unconscionable charges. We got sore enough about it to go on through with the resolution for a little while at any rate.

Housewives marketed for the cheaper cuts and served chopped steak—commonly known as hamburger. I had forgotten how really tough beef could be. This turn of events revived old memories.

City folks began complaining that farmers were taking unfair advantage of their urban cousins, overcharging them for purely selfish purposes. So we moved from beef to pork and when that too skyrocketed, we turned to chicken, then to turkey and from there to fish and back again to the special cuts.

There has since been some change in the price of meats—a little change that is. Some of us are again calling for charcoal-broiled steak. It still costs more than it used to, but perhaps it is a little better, especially with a few cups of coffee.

GOOD NEIGHBORLY RELATIONS

Some of the news articles about coffee emanating from São Paulo were interesting and quite reasonable. An occasional one, however, seemed ill-considered. In tone these seemed to carry the implication that there had been more speculation for selfish purposes than damage by frost. Brazilians didn't like that kind of criticism. They, too, were paying high prices for coffee, right alongside the great fazendas.

Coffee is big business in Brazil. Any overdose of criticism of the industry is likely to hurt somebody's feelings.

The country has long been our biggest good friend in Latin America. Her troops fought by the side of ours on some of the recent battlefields. Our trade relations have been excellent, according to my understanding. There is every reason why we—all of us—should be cautious always in appraising the affairs of good neighbors. That is a matter of ordinary courtesy.

Much of the publicity about coffee appeared to have been based on facts and pertinent field observations. The exceptions caused the hard feeling.

I don't think we know our Brazilian friends well enough. We have good business contacts, but in other matters not enough of us go beyond Rio. During my entire stay in the country the people I came in contact with could not have been kinder or more understanding, considerate, and cooperative. They are the kind of people we should strive to be friendly with—at all times.

FROSTY WEATHER

It usually takes a coffee tree 3 to 4 years to come into good bearing. Seedlings transplanted from nurseries are set in excavations about a foot deep and kept shaded for several months. As the plants grow the hole is gradually filled up with hoe cultivation employed in controlling weeds. There may be considerable fruit the third season but more the fourth. Some of the new varieties now being planted may move into production quicker than the old strains.

Tens of thousands of trees which have sprung up from plants that were frosted to the ground are out of production this year and are not expected to yield very much until 1956. Trees whose fruit was killed by cold winds should give a good yield in 1955, barring more frost. Frosts severe enough to kill trees have occurred only at long intervals. In São Paulo, former center of production, you still hear about the destructive frost of 1918. That disaster, coupled with low prices, induced many growers to destroy their coffee trees to make room for cotton, rice, and other crops.

Coffee reported as having been dispatched from São Paulo in 1918 amounted to seven and a quarter million bags, as I have been informed, and the following year, only 4,155,000 bags.

Frost damage was heaviest in north Parana, present center of production. An estimate commonly heard puts the damage at about 35 percent of the trees killed to the ground.

Large quantities of fruit were destroyed by cold winds on additional millions of trees. These should bear a good crop in 1955. An estimate frequently heard is that Parana's frosted area will have something like a 40-percent crop this year. Next year the expectation seems to range around a 75- or 80-percent crop. Next big crop is expected in 1956.

In São Paulo damage was not nearly so great except in the southerly zone bordering Parana. North of this zone the damage that I encountered was seldom more than 15 to 18 percent of the trees killed or partly killed (top branches deadened).

Summarizing the general coffee outlook it appears that Brazil's crop will be larger in 1955 and much larger—a big crop—in 1956.

Brooklyn Navy Yard To Build New "Forrestal" Class Carrier

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 4, 1954

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to commend to the attention of our colleagues the following press release regarding the Navy Department's announcement of July 29, 1954:

Borough President John Cashmore expressed gratification today (Thursday) at the announcement that the Navy Department has ordered an additional aircraft carrier of the *Forrestal* class to be built in Brooklyn.

The award of this important construction project to the Brooklyn Navy Yard was urged recently by the borough president in messages to the members of the Brooklyn congressional delegation.

When informed of the Navy's announcement Borough President Cashmore issued the following statement from Long Island College Hospital, where he has been undergoing a medical check-up and treatment of a bronchial condition:

"The Navy Department's announcement that the additional *Forrestal* class carrier will be built in Brooklyn is gratifying news. This is renewed recognition of the Brooklyn Navy Yard's superior facilities and manpower skills and assures substantial employment for our Brooklyn workers for a period of several years.

"I want to congratulate the members of our Brooklyn congressional delegation on their success in having this great naval construction project awarded to Brooklyn. I want also to congratulate Rear Adm. Roy T. Cowdrey, his staff and the men working under his supervision for having been selected to build this new and important vessel for our national defense."

Mr. Speaker, the following is a letter I have received from Eugene A. Thiele, secretary of the Master Mechanics & Foremen's Association:

MASTER MECHANICS &
FOREMEN'S ASSOCIATION,
Brooklyn, N. Y., August 2, 1954.

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The Master Mechanics & Foremen's Association of the New York Naval

Shipyard and the 16,000 employees whom they supervise are deeply grateful to you for your aid in having assigned to the New York Naval Shipyard the aircraft carrier *CVA-62* for building.

Please be assured that no stone will be left unturned by the New York Naval Shipyard to build our Navy a first-class ship of the highest quality at the lowest possible cost.

It will be our goal to give our country top value for every dollar spent in the building of this additional unit for our national defense.

May we again say thank you for your interest in our behalf.

Yours in the interest of national defense.

EUGENE A. THIELE,
Secretary.

Stevenson Speaks in Alaska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK M. KARSTEN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 5, 1954

Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, Adlai E. Stevenson has recently returned from a trip through Alaska. In Anchorage, on July 25, he made a speech which attracted the largest audience ever gathered there to hear a speaker. I take pleasure in presenting here the text of Governor Stevenson's Anchorage address:

Ladies and gentlemen, while I am not an official and cannot express an official opinion, I can express my personal opinion that your manners are very good and that you evidently learned to act like ladies and gentlemen a long time ago, possibly even before I was born. I found out in Fairbanks, speaking of being born, that I was discovered in Los Angeles just about the same time gold was discovered in Fairbanks, which, by the way, was my only connection with gold until one of your Democratic leaders presented me with a nugget and some old prospectors panned out some gold dust for me, and now I feel so rich I'm afraid I'll begin acting like a Republican.

So much for your manners. But as to the hospitality and cordiality of the inhabitants of this beautiful, spectacular, and friendly Alaska there could be no dispute whatever. Perhaps the warmth of your welcome is a measure of your affection for my traveling companion and Alaska's great and beloved friend, Bob Bartlett. But everywhere—Ketchikan, Juneau, Fairbanks, and now in this splendid city of Fairbanks—we have been greeted with a warmth and friendliness that moves me deeply. In Fairbanks there were even six large elephants—something that had not happened to me since I was in the steaming jungles of south Asia—and something that I had hardly expected to see in Alaska. Indeed, it never occurred to me that a Republican administration could be in such a big way courteous and so aggressively symbolic, shall we say? And then I discovered it was all a mistake; that I wasn't expected to ride a GOP elephant in the parade after all (a sport I rather like) and that there was a circus in town.

I'm sure those elephants were a much more welcome sight to my old friend and former gubernatorial colleague, the Secretary of the Interior, or the secretary of the terrorists, as some say. I'm told, by the way, that after what happened down here in Anchorage while we were having a circus up in Fairbanks the Republicans are going to bring the elephants back here to trample the ground and prevent the further southward spread of political permafrost. Speaking of political matters, I understand that henceforth the GOP is to be known locally as the grand old partition, in view of some recent proposals to lighten your burdens by cutting off your head.

But I hope you are not without understanding of Secretary McKay's predicament. He too was for statehood for Alaska; to my personal knowledge he voted for it repeatedly in governors' conferences, following eloquent and moving pleas by your former governor, Ernest Gruening, whose speeches will live long in the memories of all who heard them. But you see it was time for a change, and everything changed after the change of 1952, including, evidently Secretary McKay's mind about statehood for Alaska. But his wasn't the only mind that changed. In 1950 President Eisenhower of Columbia University said at Denver: "Quick admission of Alaska and Hawaii to statehood will show the world that America practices what it preaches." But in 1953 President Eisenhower of Columbia "the gem of the ocean" strongly recommended statehood for Hawaii, but said not a word about Alaska. Later he said your Territory was not ready for statehood.

It's all a little perplexing. But it is just a small part of the great mystery of what happened to the great crusade and all the practices that were preached when it was time for a change. Two years ago—I have reason to remember it—the Democratic Party pledged immediate statehood for both Alaska and Hawaii. The Republicans promised as much for Hawaii and almost as much for Alaska—or so it seemed. Then came your Territorial elections and the devastating news—Alaska had changed too; it had jilted the Democrats and eloped with the Republicans. Surely such romantic devotion entitled Alaska to expect honorable treatment from her new suitor. And just as surely the world has seen no more touching or prolonged a case of unrequited love.

But there is an even stranger side to this sad story. Didn't this gay deceiver, this Republican Party that now stands charged with breach of promise to fair Alaska, say a lot of other things that sounded good, too? Weren't we told that the Nation's woes were caused by a meddlesome and arrogant Federal bureaucracy, that henceforth self-reliance and self-government would take the place of paternalism and centralism? And didn't these words seem especially relevant to Alaska, the private domain of the Interior Department? What was more logical, then, than to expect that Alaskans would be released from their serfdom, invited into the house and given a voice in the management of the household?

Instead not only have Alaskans been barred from the warmth of the family hearth, but their new overseers have cut their rations and rebuked their impertinence and belligerence—which is evidently a new Republican word for an old American virtue.

All this, as I say, is most perplexing and disturbing, and the best explanation I have heard for the statement by the present head of our household that quick admission of Alaska would show the world that America practices what it preaches is that he made that statement when most people thought he was a Democrat.

As a Democrat I am proud of my party's record on Alaska. I am proud that the Alaska Railroad, which has done so much to open up the interior was authorized and initiated by Woodrow Wilson's administration. The Matanuska colony which gave agriculture a needed lift and publicized Alaska to the world as a new frontier of promise and opportunity was a product of the Roosevelt administration, and so was the Alaska Highway, which supplied the first land link between the States and the Territory and which will bring you more and more traffic and tourists. And I am proud that Alaska and Hawaii never had a greater champion of statehood than Harry Truman. Moreover, it was under his administration that Alaska got needed housing, schools, municipal utilities, airports, and the first real highway program.

I hope it is not unfair to ask what our Republican friends have done since a Republican and a great Alaskan, James Wickersham, introduced the first statehood bill way back in 1916? Well, I've made some inquiries. Perhaps I've talked to the wrong people, but about all I can discover is that it was a Republican administration that passed the so-called Jones Act, with its unique discrimination against Alaska.

I can even point with indelicate pride to some words of my own uttered in Seattle a couple of years ago: "The development of Alaska has meant traffic, commerce, profits, population for the Northwest. Now, if you and I have our way, Alaska will soon be a State." I went on to say: "Think of what Alaska has already meant, think of what the continued development of its natural resources will mean to the Northwest and to the United States at large. Think of the watchtower and fortress it is against the Communist threat, and how close to the heart of our economy that threat would be if it had remained in Russian hands. Seward's folly has become our wealth and our security."

There is much that I should like to talk about here in this vast empire of the North which stirs the imagination and the spirit of Americans. But let me say just a word about our affairs abroad because your nearness to those Russian hands, to Soviet Siberia, makes Alaskans perhaps even more keenly interested in the Pacific and aware of the serious nature of what is transpiring in Asia than other Americans.

I know developments with respect to Alaska have disappointed you. And I know that McCarthyism as a symptom of America's nervous mood and as a startling revelation of a constitutional crisis, has been profoundly disturbing to many more of us. And so are the legislative impotence, the executive confusion, and the paralyzing divisions within the majority party which is charged not only with governing us but with leading the great coalition of the non-Communist world in this perilous period. Even our career services have been undermined by the ravenous appetite for jobs for the faithful, and partisanshap of a virulence hitherto unknown has imperiled the hope of bipartisanship at this critical time. (Indeed, they do not seem to be able to practice bipartisanship within the Republican Party.)

But far more disturbing than what is happening in Alaska or in the States is the disintegration abroad. The shooting has stopped, but Korea is still divided and there is no peace or unification in sight. And this week in Indochina the West suffered its worst disaster since the loss of China. Again the shooting has stopped but Communist China has staked out another menacing salient into free Asia and enveloped 13 million people and one of the richest rice-growing areas in the Orient.

This is the sorry sequel of all the foolish, boastful Republican talk about liberation of the enslaved nations, about unleashing Chiang Kai-shek, seizing the initiative, a new look in foreign policy, no more little wars as in Korea, and, finally, that threatening talk by the Secretary of State and the Vice President about massive atomic retaliation which scared our allies half to death if not our enemies.

All those bold words and ringing slogans of the past 2 years sound a little hollow now. The New Look collapsed at the first test. The administration was not prepared to fight, nor could it negotiate, because the right-wing Republicans have successfully identified negotiation with appeasement. Unable to fight, unable to negotiate, unable even to speak with a coherent tongue, United States policy defaulted, France salvaged what she could out of the endless, weary war in Indochina, and the Communists not only added valuable and strategic territory but threw the western alliance into confusion and dissension which is Russia's greatest goal and dearest dream.

The blame for this misfortune, the original sin, it seemed to me at the time I visited Indochina and the Red River Delta battlefields last year, must be laid to France. It was clear to all with eyes to see that colonialism in Asia died with World War II. Britain and then Holland granted independence to their vast Asian possessions—India, Burma, Indonesia, and so forth—and thereby prevented the nationalist uprisings which the Communists could exploit. Had France done likewise and granted genuine independence in orderly, sincere stages to Vietnam there very likely would have been no war in Indochina.

But the blame for the collapse of our policy in Asia remains our responsibility, and we shall fail again and again unless we profit from this experience. The fact is that our thinking since the war has been nourished on myths—the myth, for example, that Truman and Acheson and a few sinister men in the State Department caused the Chinese Communist revolution; the myth that Roosevelt gave Eastern Europe to the Communists at the Yalta Conference; the myth that other peoples have to be for us or they are against us, and so on.

One of our political parties created and cultivated these myths to discredit the other. Now it is in power and the victim of its own mythology—and about the only policy they can agree upon is fashioned of words, slogans, bluff; yes, and defense cuts just when we gesture belligerently and talk the loudest. But the stuff that dreams are made of collapses when it meets hard reality. Until we learn to distinguish words from reality and foolish elocution from effective action we will be in trouble and our alliances, our security, in jeopardy.

To avoid such misleading confusion, to face reality, to enlighten the people, as I see it, is the function—the responsibility—of leadership at a time like this. Will the leaders of our Government lead this way? Will they eschew mythology and demagogery? Will they enlighten the people, or will they continue to confuse words with reality, myths with truths? I'm afraid so. I'm afraid there are too many people who value public office above public understanding and even public security.

I suspect in the forthcoming campaign Communists at home will get more attention than communism abroad, yesterday more attention than tomorrow, and myths more support than truths. Already close associates of the President, over whom he seems to have little influence, have impugned the very loyalty of President Truman, spread wild falsehoods about subversives in the Government they inherited, sponsored lectures on "20 years of treason" under the Democrats, and now the Vice President, if you please, is blaming the failure of the French in Indochina on the Democrats, while the President depends on Democratic help to accomplish anything—and talks plaintively about bipartisanship. Having little to talk about in the way of legislative accomplishments in two sessions of Congress and much not to talk about at home and abroad, I suspect the Republican campaigners will all be wildly waving the red shirt before long and outdoing Senator McCarthy, while the President says "tut, tut," and pleads for the election of more good Republicans to sabotage his proposals, as they did his housing bill last week.

In short, when we ever needed clarity, honesty, and reality more, I fear we are in for another deluge of epithets and nonsense. I only hope the Democrats can keep their equilibrium and see and say things clear and straight because they will soon inherit a larger responsibility for our leadership and, I pray, for the restoration of the dignity, the reason, and the calm confidence of our great Nation which is the last hope of free men in a shrinking world.

And I hope, too, that we Democrats will see clear and straight about Alaska. While as a Democrat I note with no surprise that the pious talk about a great crusade has vanished without a trace, as an American I can find no comfort in the state of our national affairs, and no reassurance in the reckless partisanship with which this administration approaches many problems of vital concern to all Americans.

Surely the question of statehood for Alaska and Hawaii is not a partisan issue, to be considered in the light of its possible benefits to one party or the other. You gave solid evidence that this was not a partisan issue when you voted strongly in favor of statehood in 1946. And I am reliably informed that if a referendum were held now the endorsement would be even more emphatic. For my part that should be decisive. If the people of Alaska in the present state of development want statehood, they should have it. That's the way the other Territories were treated, and I see no reason for discriminatory treatment for Alaska or Hawaii, and certainly not on any such grounds as their probable political alinement.

I don't hear it said at home that Alaska with 180,000 should not have the same representation in the Senate as my State of Illinois with 9 million, for example. But I do hear it said in Washington that Alaska is not ready for statehood. I think I have heard most of the arguments against statehood, and the only one with any plausibility seems to be that you can't meet the costs of proper self-government and development. I spent 4 years worrying about how to meet the costs of running the State of Illinois, and I would be the last person to underestimate the problem of financing State government in these days of high Federal taxes. But I seem to recall that most of the 35 States taken into the Union were pronounced insolvent or worse before their admission, and look at them now.

I confess I've almost drowned in rain outdoors and in figures and arguments indoors during my exciting visit here. And the truth is, I suspect, that no one can foresee just how Alaska will fare as a State. What we do know is that self-government leads to self-development just as surely as faith leads to salvation.

You who have staked your futures here in Alaska understand far better than I the manifold problems which now stand in the way of your further development. And you have convinced me that Alaskans do not look upon statehood as a simple solution to all difficulties, past, present, or future. What most of you seem to believe is that only the rights and responsibilities of self-rule can give impetus to the greater growth of which this land is so manifestly capable, and that, firm in that faith, you are willing to risk the gloomy predictions of some of the statisticians.

There is little that I can add to a discussion with which you are all so familiar. But perhaps you will indulge a visitor from outside (a rather exclusive phrase that I don't altogether like) in some notions on the reasons why the United States needs the State of Alaska.

First, I believe that statehood will contribute to the greater security of the United States. A decade of technological advances and political setbacks has turned Alaska into our No. 1 strategic frontier. Much as we all recoil at the thought that global war may be forced upon us, none of us questions the need to build up adequate defenses. Our military commanders have long since recognized the significance of Alaska's geographical position—a bare 50 miles from Soviet Russia. While I know President Eisenhower prefers territorial status for defense and I must defer to his special competence in this field, it seems to me that a sparsely populated outpost, no matter how stoutly fortified, is a poor substitute for a vigorous, growing community of freemen, dedicated to the defense of their homes and their country.

A second reason for the State of Alaska is that it offers greater economic opportunity for all. Every American schoolchild, I suppose, has learned that Alaska has paid for its purchase price many times over. Fewer realize that most of the wealth produced by Alaska's gold, furs, and fish has been pumped out and little reinvested in the development of the Territory itself.

I have seen the great new pulp plant at Ketchikan. A promising beginning is now being made to tap Alaska's great reservoir of timber, and also of waterpower. No one knows the true extent or variety of its mineral deposits. But statehood can provide a framework within which to build a stable, integrated economy, based not on a colonial policy of exploitation but on a democratic policy of joint endeavor and self-improvement.

Alaska has been called America's last frontier. It is certainly our present frontier. And its challenge has attracted thousands of Americans, many of them equipped with little more than a spirit of adventure and native resourcefulness when they arrived. It is in the nature of our people to migrate in search of greater economic opportunity. The State of Alaska would, I am convinced, hold out that prospect to scores of thousands of other venturesome Americans once its great economic potential is freed for orderly development.

And finally, there is, in my judgment, another reason why we need Alaska in the Union. We all stand to profit from the counsel and experience of two Alaskan spokesmen in that greatest of all deliberative bodies—the United States Senate. I can understand that you will think of your representatives in Congress first in connection with your own interests. But I prefer to think for a moment of the benefits that would accrue to all Americans if the voice of Alaska were joined to the voices of the other 48 States.

I would expect, for example, that a congressional delegation from Alaska would help to demolish the myth that foreign and domestic policies are unrelated and mutually exclusive. Alaska's proximity to Asia as I have said gives you a special interest in and awareness of not only the problems of national defense, but also the entire range of American policy in the Pacific. I do not think it facetious to add that your long tutelage as second-class citizens should enable your spokesmen to discuss with rare understanding some of the problems of colonial areas in other parts of the world.

On the domestic side, Alaska's deep concern with the management of her vast store of natural resources should equip her spokesmen to deal wisely and progressively with some of the biggest issues facing the United States today. Whether it concerns waterpower, minerals, or land, the question of resources policy is the same—how shall those irreplaceable national assets be administered and used in a fashion to improve the well-being of America and Americans.

You know how, in the early days, ruthless exploitation decimated the Alaskan seal and otter population. You have seen how inadequate regulation of the fisheries has affected your economic life. And you know how development of your forests and abundant waterpower would stimulate the growth of industry, with all its attendant benefits. Against a background of such experience, an Alaskan congressional delegation could, I should think, make a constructive contribution to the national debate on how to make the most of our precious resources.

I do not begrudge the Republicans the right to put forward their own policies, or even to put forward Democratic policies and call them Republican. But like many others I am distressed to see our Republican friends defer in so many fields the difficult job of formulating national policy in favor of irresponsible and divisive partisan recrimination, and accusation.

"It's time for a change," said the Republicans in 1952, and the American people agreed. Many did so in the belief that the responsibility of leadership would serve to sober and unite a party too long frustrated and united only by ambition for public office. I confess that, once the verdict was in, I too found some solace in this hope.

I find little solace today. The patient and effective effort to build up the strength and unity of the free world has given way to a bluff and bluster which threatens to leave us with few friends and no security. At home, two decades of progress and reason have been labeled 20 years of treason, under the official imprimatur of the Republican National Committee, which is possibly the greatest slander of the intelligence of the American people ever uttered. And still—after 2 years—the only area of agreement among Republicans is their old hunger of public office and their old habit of blaming everything on the Democrats.

I am heartened by the fact that the Democratic Party has kept its head under this continued torrent of abuse, and has provided the Nation with a responsible and loyal opposition in our greatest parliamentary tradition. But it is neither the responsibility nor the privilege of the minority party to lead the Nation. Effective, meaningful bipartisanship is impossible without a leadership which understands that the welfare of the Nation is nonpartisan and that no one party holds a monopoly on wisdom or loyalty.

Nor are we justified in thinking that today's problems are vastly more difficult than those of our predecessors. What we do know is that the margin for error has been reduced. Great decisions must be made in the knowledge that they may change for all time the course of our Nation, possibly the course of civilization itself.

There are no panaceas, slogans, or catchwords which will fend off danger or bring about progress. Nor can any of us foresee the future. We must rely, as those before us, upon industry, intelligence, and, above all, faith. Americans of both parties and of no parties will put their heads and hearts together when inspired by leadership endowed with humility and courage, wisdom and conviction. They will not and cannot do so when they are fed on the harvest of suspicion and watered by the fountain of recrimination. For the future belongs to all of us or none of us. And "us" includes the warm, stout hearts and the breathless majesty of Alaska.

Emergency Credit

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 4, 1954

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, there is no question but that this bill is an emergency measure. It is a bill which, of course, is brought up under suspension of the rules, because it was on the Consent Calendar yesterday and for some reason or other it was passed over without prejudice. Bringing up a bill of the importance of this one under suspension of the rules is a procedure of which I approve, and which I think the leadership is wise in following.. There are other emergencies besides this particular emergency. There is the emergency confronting the American people with reference to the price of coffee. I had an interesting colloquy with my friend the gentleman from Kansas yesterday, the distinguished chairman of the committee, and also my distinguished friend the gentleman from California [Mr. Jackson] on the subject of coffee and whether or not a bill which is on the Speaker's desk would be called up for the purpose of enabling the House to pass on the question of a Senate amendment including coffee as subject to the Commodity Exchange Act. I know of no subject which, from the domestic angle, attracts more keenly the interest of the American people. Anyone who uses coffee is a consumer. As I say, there is no subject which attracts more keenly the interest of the American people than the question of coffee and the speculation in coffee. With all due regard to what my friend the gentleman from Kansas said yesterday about there being a doubt whether the speculation caused an increase in the price of coffee—the sharp increase that has taken place, the American people think, and I think they are pretty nearly right, that speculation in the United States has played a very important part in the sharp increase in the price of coffee to the American people. There is no question that the American people have been compelled to pay probably tens of millions of dollars more for coffee during the last year and one-half than they would if speculation had not taken place. This bill is an emergency bill which I favor. The question of coffee, and including it in the Commodity Exchange Act, seems to me also to be an emergency, and I hope before this session is over, the bill will be brought up and the Senate amendment concurred in.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I would like to direct a question to the chairman of the committee. I understood him to state that this bill does not make any provision for refinancing loans and that refinancing loans are excluded from the provisions of the bill.

Mr. HOPE. That is correct. Of course, where the borrower is in financial difficulty and has loans from other lending agencies, there is always an effort made to take care of that indebtedness by getting a standby agreement from the other creditors. But it is not the thought that this legislation would be used for the purpose of bailing out other creditors. We want to make these funds go as far as we can to those who need the funds. It does not make any provisions for refinancing.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I want to state my personal appreciation, and I am sure the appreciation of my constituents for this legislation being reported out. I am for the bill and I intend to vote for it. But I wonder if it would be in order for the chairman to tell us if there are any plans to bring out legislation for refinancing loans. The information I have from my district, which is in a drought area, is that we are in danger of a real siege of foreclosures down there and that our farmers and stockmen have been so hard hit by 3 straight years of drought that unless there is some provision made for refinancing along the lines of the Andersen-Schoeppel bill that passed the Senate the other day and which is now in the committee headed by the distinguished gentleman from Kansas, we are going to have a major disaster that could affect the entire Nation in its ultimate effects. I just wonder if it would be in order for the gentleman to tell us whether the committee has any plans to bring out legislation for refinancing loans to meet this emergency at the base of the problem on the financing of these farms and cattle ranches.

Mr. HOPE. I will be very glad to tell the gentleman what the committee has done. The committee had a hearing on the bill to which the gentleman referred earlier this week. At that hearing, we heard from the head of the Farmers Home Administration and also from a representative of the Farm Credit Administration. It was the conclusion, after hearing that testimony, and after hearing from those who were in favor of the legislation, to which the gentleman has referred, that it was not necessary at this time to pass refinancing legislation.

The head of the Farmers' Home Administration, Mr. McLeish, stated that in practically all cases they have been able to get standby agreements with creditors, and in that way they can make Government money go a great deal further than if they have to use it to refinance existing indebtedness. It may be later on the situation will develop where refinancing is needed, but the committee felt that for the time being this bill, together with other funds that have been made available, would be sufficient to take care of the situation. But when the Congress returns if the situation appears to be different, I know the committee will take up the matter.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I thank the gentleman.

Foreign Aid Is No Bargain for Wisconsin Taxpayers

SPEECH

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 5, 1954

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, in matters relating to foreign policy, my friend the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Wiley] and I have held opposite views. On July 28, in the Senate, he opened the debate on the mutual security bill of 1954—foreign aid. It was an able presentation in support of the full amount provided in the measure and generally expressed the views of those who have supported that legislation. I respect that point of view but differ almost wholly with it in view of present world conditions. I have asked for this time to answer in part the argument that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] has made, namely, that the foreign-aid spending has been of great benefit to the people of the State of Wisconsin.

He says that Wisconsin agriculture in the past 5 years has exported $175 million worth of farm products. Industry, he states, for that same period has exported about $111 million of industrial or manufactured items, or a total of $286 million of income for business and agriculture. So much for what we received in my State, and I do not minimize the amount my State has received and the work it has provided for Wisconsin people.

But, Mr. Speaker, the Senator did not mention what the foreign aid spending is costing the taxpayers of Wisconsin. This is a glaring omission, in my opinion, because it fails to give the people in my State the true picture, but only one side of it. I shall attempt to answer the important question as to what Wisconsin is paying for this program and submit some pertinent facts.

Mr. Speaker, it is my opinion that foreign aid is no bargain for the taxpayers in my State, in spite of $286 million of goods sold under it. The record is clear.

We have engaged in foreign-aid giving from July 1945, for 9 long years, and the total net aid provided in that period has been in excess of $59 billion. For economic aid we have advanced more than $38 billion, and for military assistance more than $21 billion.

This program for the period that I have mentioned cost the taxpayers of my State $1,223,680,000. Only 11 other States paid more than Wisconsin.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what has been the charge upon Wisconsin for the 5-year period mentioned in the Senator's speech? Keep in mind that the income, according to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], amounted to $286 million.

However, the cost or charge upon the taxpayers of Wisconsin was actually $504,370,400. It is my contention that the foreign-aid program has not helped the people in Wisconsin but actually they have paid almost twice as much to support the program than they have received. I repeat again, Mr. Speaker, that the program has been no bargain for Wisconsin taxpayers.

Mr. Speaker, proponents of the foreign-spending program justify their positions with the argument that our dollars will prevent the onward march of communism in Europe and Asia.

The record is abundantly clear that the expenditure of money is not stopping aggressive commuhism. Here is the record and it cannot be successfully refuted.

Before World War II, the world's only Communist country was the Soviet Union, containing 170 million people in 8.1 million square miles.

During World War II, Soviet Russia swallowed up Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, plus parts of Finland, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, China, and Japan.

Just after World War II, Communists directed by Moscow took over all of Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, Rumania, and Yugoslavia. Soviet troops occupied East Germany and East Austria. Later, Yugoslavs broke with Moscow.

By 1950, Chinese Communists backed by Russia had conquered all of mainland China. In that year, Communists in North Korea attacked South Korea on Moscow's orders. Later, truce terms left North Korea in Communist hands. In 1951, Communist China conquered Tibet, on India's borders.

Now, in Indochina, Communists take over another 12 million people or more.

Net result: In 15 years, Communists have taken an additional 5.5 million square miles of territory and nearly 600 million people. The Communist empire today embraces 13.6 million square miles, one-fourth of the earth's land surface, and 800 million people, a third of the population of the earth.

In all sincerity, Mr. Speaker, these facts are a complete refutation of the argument that American dollars have stopped communism militarily or politically.

H. R. 8193

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. BARRETT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 5, 1954

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, approximately a year and a half ago the President urged the Congress to enact emergency legislation to admit 120,000 refugees, escapees, and distressed persons in friendly European countries to the United States. The President pointed out that it is imperative that we join with other nations in helping to find a solution to the grave problem of homeless and distressed persons and population pressures. He stated:

> These refugees, escapees, and distressed peoples now constitute an economic and political threat of constantly growing magnitude. They look to traditional American humanitarian concern for the oppressed. International political considerations are also factors which are involved. We should take reasonable steps to help these people to the extent that we share the obligation of the free world.

The Congress promptly enacted such emergency legislation and on August 7, 1953, the President signed into law the Emergency Migration Act of 1953. We read in the newspapers daily of families arriving in the United States from various European countries as a result of this special legislation.

In Italy an unusual and unexpected situation has developed. The Emergency Migration Act of 1953—also referred to as the Refugee Relief Act—provided for the issuance of 15,000 special nonquota visas to Italian nationals who have immediate relatives in the United States—sisters, brothers, and adult children of American citizens. It also provided for the issuance of 45,000 special nonquota visas to Italian nationals who could qualify as refugees or escapees. I believe that the drafters of this emergency legislation now realize that the special nonquota allocations for Italian nationals should have been reversed. In other words, the 45,000 visas should have gone to the relatives of American citizens and the 15,000 to those who qualify as refugees or escapees. It has turned out that comparatively few Italian nationals qualify in the latter category as very few individuals who fled their homelands to escape political persecution resettled in Italy. On the other hand, many, many more relatives of American citizens have applied for nonquota visas under provisions of the Refugee Relief Act than can possibly be accommodated with the meager allotment of 15,000 visas. To date the American consular officers in Italy have on file approximately 44,000 approved petitions filed by American citizens for their relatives in Italy. Latest information from the visa office of the State Department is that only approximately 1,000 Italian nationals have applied for admission to the United States under the refugee-escapee provisions of the Refugee Relief Act.

The Senate Chamber has an opportunity to correct this situation and I sincerely hope that this will be done before the 83d Congress adjourns in the next week or so. H. R. 8193 which was approved by the House of Representatives on March 15, 1954, and reported to the Senate by the Senate Judiciary Committee on August 2, contains a provision for permitting the issuance of nonquota visas to Italian nationals who are immediate relatives of American citizens but do not qualify as refugees or escapees. In other words, it throws open to Italians with approved visa petitions on file in their behalf any portion of the 45,000 nonquota visas which are not utilized by Italian nationals qualifying as refugees or escapees.

The excerpt quoted previously from President Eisenhower's letter of April 22, 1953 gives strong evidence of the importance of opening our doors to the oppressed and needy of friendly countries.

Our Government has pledged itself time and again to aid friendly countries who are in need. We have learned that outright appropriation of funds alone cannot totally relieve economic distress and the threat of communism. One of the friendliest and most helpful gestures we can make to Italy is to ease her burden of overpopulation and arranging for the reuniting of loved ones in the United States. Italy's major problem—unemployment—is caused by overpopulation.

Of a total population of 47 million, Italy's unemployed consistently exceeds 2 million. The United States and other countries of the Western Hemisphere could absorb most of these people without disrupting their economies. In fact, they would have everything to gain by taking in these people who are renown for their special skills in arts, science, industry, culture and spirit. The role of Italians in the heroic drama of the building of our own Nation is written across the land and in the pages of our history books.

I hope other Members here today will also urge the Senate leaders to schedule H. R. 8193 for consideration within a day or two in order to ensure enactment before the 83d Congress adjourns.

Suez: Blow to Reds or Step Toward War?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 3, 1954

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Edgar Ansel Mowrer:

Only time can show whether the British decision to evacuate the big military base near the Suez Canal was wise or unwise.

In judging the results one must remember that, having got the British out of the base, the Egyptians will almost surely refuse to renew their present contract with the Suez Canal Company that expires in 1957. From then on, they will claim undisputed authority over the most important international waterway in the world.

Here are some of the arguments on both sides.

Partisans of the agreement: British evacuation of Suez is merely the application of the Anglo-American principle that every people has a right to govern (or misgovern) itself. Its first effect was a burst of joy among the Egyptians. Radio Cairo began its announcement with the lyrical words:

"O free and glorious, it pleases the Egyptian radio at this historical moment, the moment of happiness, joy, dignity, and freedom," etc.

RED PROPAGANDA

The Anglo-Egyptian agreement demonstrates that the free world is backing the new Asian nationalist movement, thereby cutting the ground from under Communist propaganda.

It makes it possible for Egypt and the other Arab countries to join with Turkey and Pakistan and Iran in the real defense of the Middle East.

The withdrawal of British troops from Suez actually, in the atomic age, strengthens Britain militarily.

It is therefore in every sense a factor making for peace and greater strength of the free.

Critics of the agreement: Rubbish. Britain's surrender to Egyptian (and American) pressure is another instance of the West's unrealistic preference for abstract ideas above self-preservation.

Making the Egyptians happy is not going to make them allies of the West. It is far more likely to create more pro-Communist "neutrals" like liberated India and Indonesia. Not all nationalist movements are helpful to the West.

An immediate result of handing Suez unrestrictedly to Egypt is going to be a vast recrudescence of demands for complete independence from France on the part of Tunisians, Moroccans, and ultimately Algerians. This will further weaken France without strengthening the West. These underdeveloped countries—like Egypt—are going to become more happy hunting grounds for communism, not bulwarks against it.

POLITICAL WEAPONS

Furthermore, the Egyptians are not going to run the Suez Canal impartially, but selectively as a political weapon. Just as they are now keeping it closed to Israeli goods and shipping on the pretext that they are still "at war" with Israel, tomorrow they will close it to British or American ships. It is questionable whether they can even keep the canal in technical repair.

Moreover, now that the we have granted the Egyptians the right to control an international waterway because it cuts Egypt's soil, how are we going to prevent the Panamanians from taking control of the Panama Canal on the same grounds?

To imagine, moreover, that Egypt will use any arms it gets to oppose communism is childish. The Egyptians are unaware of the existence of a Communist danger. They will use whatever arms they get to threaten and perhaps actually to attack Israel, along with other fanatical Arab countries. Only yesterday Premier Jamal al-Nasir of Egypt said publicly:

"We wish to say that unless Israel is pushed back at least to the boundaries determined by the United Nations the situation in the Arab East threatens to explode."

TOWARD WAR

To imagine that the Israel will return part of the Promised Land without fighting is absurd. Therefore giving arms to Egypt is a step not toward peace but toward a new war. No three-power declaration by the United States, Britain, and France is going to stop this.

Britain's decision to move its air and naval command to Cyprus is equally dangerous. For Greece is properly claiming the overwhelmingly Greek population at Cyprus. Therefore in leaving a dubious Arab country, Britain is mortally offending a reliable ally. Does this make for peace?

Finally, it is doubtful if British troops in Britain are as much a deterrent to further Communist aggression as British troops at Suez—unless, of course, Sir Winston Churchill intends to seek "peaceful coexistence" with the Communists right to the point where they attack Britain itself.

Well, there you have the gist of the two arguments. Time alone—and Egypt—can prove the critics to be wrong.

Our Mixed-Up Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 5, 1954

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, in the recent debate on the atomic energy legislation, the concept of free enterprise, which has contributed so forcefully to the growth of our national economy, was extensively illuminated. The columnist George Sokolsky has written an excellent article on this subject entitled "Our Mixed-Up Economy," which appeared in the July 30, 1954, issue of the Washington Post and Times Herald, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THESE DAYS

(By George Sokolsky)

OUR MIXED-UP ECONOMY

The great debate over atomic power which frightened so many politicians is, in reality, a struggle over whether the economy of this country is to remain capitalistic, to become socialized, or to be what is sometimes called mixed. A better phrase would be mixed-up.

Ultimately all power, light, and heat for the United States ought to come from atomic fission. Into the production of this unit of industry, the Government of the United States has poured approximately $5 billion of the taxpayers' money. It can, therefore, be argued that this product of the Atomic Energy Commission is the property of the Government of the United States.

A little foresight, however, will undoubtedly frighten those who believe in capitalism, because if the atomic energy industry is capable, at low cost, of providing power, light, and heat, the coal and electricity industries will sooner or later go out of existence. This means that those who invested their private earnings in these industries will suffer a loss due to competition by the Government of the United States, unless the Government purchases the plants and equipment.

It can be said that new inventions make old industries obsolescent; that as new ideas and new methods prevail, they take the place of existing means of production and distribution, as the automobile replaced the horse and carriage. In the changeover from one type of production and distribution, private enterprise has some opportunity for readjustment. Those who owned railroad shares could purchase automobile company shares. Very few such enterprises are monopolies owned by single individuals, but represent a wide distribution of ownership which amounts to public participation in the risk for profit or loss.

Whatever the Government owns is a monopoly, held by the political power of the state. The combination of political and economic power, controlled by a bureaucracy that is impervious to the shifts in the elected echelons of Government, leads inevitably to fascism, which is the Government control of both the political and economic power.

Capitalism is an economic system in which the individual is able to invest his surplus earnings in enterprise according to his private judgment and at his own risk. Capitalism in the United States has been modified by the tax system which limits the accumulation of the individual's earnings, first by a graduated income tax and secondly by a graduated inheritance tax.

These limitations have not served to end the period of expansion of American industry, but there is a constant fear in this country that the reservoirs of privately owned capital will decrease. The Government, during the war years, and subsequently, made large loans to private enterprises, some of which came into existence and expanded on Government loans rather than by public participation in the enterprise.

The TVA and some other enterprises are owned by the Government in competition with private companies producing power and light. Such Government enterprises enjoy the advantage of not paying for the capital they use and of not paying taxes. The development of atomic energy for power and light as a Government enterprise will eliminate private capital from this phase of industry altogether. It could mean that the basis of all production will be socialized. As every other industry is dependent upon light and power, all industry will, in a measure, be dependent upon the willingness of Government to provide the product, not competitively in the market, but politically.

Why Support Unwanted Food?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 5, 1954

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article appearing in the Minneapolis Star of July 26, 1954:

WHY SUPPORT UNWANTED FOOD?—OUR SHIFTING DIET HELPS EXPLAIN AGRICULTURE'S PROBLEM

(By Arthur Upgren)

LOGAN, UTAH.—No one has done a better job of explaining the shift in the diets of American families than Roy L. Pratt has here in Logan, seat of Utah's agricultural college. Pratt is board chairman of the California Packing Co., which operates pea- and corn-canning plants near here.

Pratt pointed out that we are eating less potatoes and cereals, and likewise are eating more dairy products, fats and oils, meats, poultry and fish. This of course, we already know. The surprising thing is his statement that we are eating less fruit and vegetables in fresh form and much more in canned form. The table at the right, showing changes in consumption for major food classes over the last 15 years, clearly reflects this increase.

It is easy to see from this why we have had our greatest agricultural "problem" in potatoes and wheat. We have lost huge sums of potatoes and have huge surpluses of wheat.

This potato and wheat shift in our diets poses an interesting problem: Is agriculture entitled to price supports for foods obviously in low demand?

Americans have shown unmistakably over the years that they want less wheat and potatoes. We are a rich enough country to be able to eat better just as the farmers have become rich enough to use the automobile and tractor instead of the horse, electricity instead of kerosene and the gas engine.

No one expects the farmer to continue the old, back-breaking way of life. Likewise he does not require that we eat any specific farm products.

Yet we have had laws supporting high prices for potatoes and wheat, prices which encourage farmers to produce more of both. Somewhere that system must be 200 percent wrong.

Meats, poultry, and fish, as well as fruits and vegetables, have no price support. This is largely because American families want more of these foods.

Dairy products have become largely a victim of technology. Speaking with Pratt here were Merrill N. Warnick, president of the Dairy Association of the United States, and Paul Logue, manager of a Monsanto chemical plant in Utah.

Warnick pointed out how larger fresh-milk consumption would sooner or later solve our dairy-surplus problem.

Logue told how the butter-surplus problem came into existence. Back in the war years our allies needed food, especially fats and oils. So the chemical industry, trying to save on the huge amount of fat which had been going into soap, invented the materials for soap substitutes. As a result, we now have detergent soaps. Today their use is larger than the use of soaps made with fats and oils.

This, coupled with the great growth of soybean production, has given us a huge surplus of fats and oils. We now are very big exporters of fats and oils.

All this gave a cheaper raw material for margarine. Margarine has stayed cheap—another blow to butter.

The difficulty is that we cannot and certainly do not choose to stop the hands of progress. No one has benefited more from technological advance than the American farmer. He has powerful tractors, power-driven implements of all kinds, hybrid corn, and soil-conserving fertilizers, good roads, more leisure, better schools.

To all this he has responded with the greatest advance of all in productivity. He has increased productivity since 1940 more than the workers of any other leading industry.

The consumer should benefit from this increase in productivity just as the farmer has benefited. The benefits should come in lower prices and better products. Rigid supports stay the hand of this progress.

The prices of many agricultural products were too low in the last half of the 1930's. This no doubt should be given some weight in having them a little higher now. Then, too, as a nation, we should rejoice in the adequacy of our food supplies. That rejoicing might well be converted into effective policies for carrying over adequate supplies of foods to meet foreseeable emergency conditions.

After these allowances have been made, freedom and flexibility become as desirable for agriculture as for the industries which have helped agriculture make its abundant progress.

Changes in United States per capita food consumption, 1935–39 to 1953 [1]

	Percent
Potatoes, including sweets	−25
Cereals and grains	−18
Fresh fruits and vegetables	−8
Sugar	−1
Dairy products	+6
Fats and oils	+22
Meats, poultry, and fish	+27
Canned fruits, canned vegetables, canned fruit juices of single strength	+59

[1] From Department of Agriculture figures, excluding concentrated juices (thus the rapidly expanding orange juice does not influence figures).

David MacGregor Cheney and His Prophecy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 5, 1954

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a recent excerpt from the Clinton Daily Item containing a very interesting and ably written letter by my good and distinguished friend, Prof. David MacGregor Cheney, from Clinton, Mass. It deals with current international problems in relation to the background of World War I and is a timely and thoughtful treatment of the subject.

Dr. Cheney is a learned scholar, intellectual, an author, who is widely esteemed. He is now completing a monumental dictionary type work known as the Index to Knowledge, which I and many others believe will revolutionize the dictionary and reference-book field.

The above-mentioned follows:

[From the Clinton (Mass.) Daily Item of July 31, 1954]

"EXPEL RUSSIA FROM THE U. N.," SAYS DR. DAVID M. CHENEY IN REPLY TO NEAL O'HARA'S QUERY

The Item, in its June 29 issue, carried the following excerpt from Neal O'Hara's "Take It From Me" column which appeared in the Boston Traveler, the previous night:

"Thoughts while shaving: 1. Just 40 years ago today, while we were laboring as a cub reporter on the New Bedford Standard, a bulletin came over the news wires that Archduke Ferdinand, heir to the Austrian throne, had been assassinated at Sarajevo in Bosnia. Few of us newsmen had ever heard of Ferdinand, and fewer still know where Sarajevo or Bosnia was located. It was just another news item from Europe. 2. But a young Standard reporter, David M. Cheney, a Harvard alumnus and later a professor at Tufts, overheard the telegraph editor relay the bulletin to the managing editor, George A. Hough, and shouted, 'This means a European War.' (We all though he was nuts.) 3. No one else was much excited about it at the moment. The assassination was reported in the next edition as more or less routine news, But young Cheney knew his stuff. Before another 6 weeks had passed, World War I was on in full fury—Germany, Austria, France, Britain, Russia, the whole bunch of them. 4. Well, quite a lot of unexpected and world-shaking events have occurred in these past 40 years. And we wonder have these unfolding events surprised David M. Cheney? (Now tossing away the blade.)"

The editor of the New Bedford Standard-Times asked Dr. Cheney, who resides at 130 Prescott Street, this town, to answer Mr. O'Hara's question and in the issue of that newspaper, Sunday, July 11, appeared the local man's reply to the invitation and a convincing analysis of the genesis of World Wars I and II which ought to be read by every American.

The Standard-Times article is as follows:

"To the EDITOR OF THE STANDARD-TIMES:

"I have taken advantage of your invitation, in answering Neal O'Hara's question for the great newspaper that I still call mine, to review the cogent facts, the terrible facts, that enabled me to foretell accurately our two World Wars. And I have indicated what I read from the tragic story of man: The ailment that holds him back on his eon-old struggle upward on the path of destiny—and what, considering the reiterated patterns of the conflicts, man should and can do about it.

"An understanding of history-on-the-run may be wisdom of a sort but for God's sake, what use is it, if nobody knows of it, and nobody listens; and listening, believes, and believing, acts.

"It's time to close up the ranks of the United Nations, to put the criminal nation out, and to shut her in with a wall of iron set up by the free, Christian nations of the world until she'll behave herself and join us. We've been yellow long enough. This is no time to flinch from the big, bullying bogie.

"Yours sincerely,

"DAVID MACGREGOR CHENEY."

Neal O'Hara: "And we wonder have these unfolding events surprised David M. Cheney?"

(By David M. Cheney)

"Magician, can you take a rabbit out of a hat? Or if I cross your palm with silver, tell me whom I'll marry—and will he beat or kiss me when the service's done?"

Am I, then, Neal, reincarnation of a sibyl of Delphi, mouthing ambiguous oracles, or of Merlin, doing magic with a polished stick? A sybil of Delphi! Indulge me, while indulge my fancy!

Nilo Hara, an actor in drama from Athens, journeyed to Delphi in Phocis, to ask the oracle what the world is coming to.

At Delphi, as everybody knows, Pythian Apollo speaks from a smoking pit (to those who bring the god votive offerings) through the mouth of his servant of the shrine. And Nilo Hara donned his long chlamys of white wool, and concealed his countenance in his best comic mask for much acting in comedy had made it sad.

Dim in the altar smoke, the priest Davechini, all in white also, lifted thin arms to Pythian Apollo. He besought the god to speak to Nilo of tomorrow; and Apollo was silent. Then Davechini swung around in the dimness of that smoky place and cried out to Nilo Hara in a loud voice,

"Why comes the comedian to Delphi to seek knowledge of that which is to come? Has he brought the customary gifts for the god?"

And Nilo Hara placed upon the altar of Apollo a bronze situla in the form of the head of Georgio Huffo, the philosopher, whom both Nilo, the comedian, and Davechini, the priest of the future, had had for their master in the elder days; and the situla was brimming with golden obols as a votive offering.

And Apollo's priest proclaimed: "When Nilo Hara was young and the mouthpiece of Apollo also but a lad, did not Nilo beseech the oracle? And when the oracle spoke of war and death and woe to the world even then at hand, did not Nilo laugh?

"If the comedian laughed then—even though in all brief time befell as the oracle prophesied: If this second time Apollo speak through his humble priest, will not Nilo Hara laugh again?"

And Nilo Hara cast upon the floor of the sacred cave his mask of comedy, and went forth to breathe the clear air of reality. For he knew in his heart he had not listened in his youth; and he knew that, this second time, had the oracle spoken he would have gone forth laughing.

For if the gods tell us in sharp terms that which is to come to man, will man believe?

And after Nilo Hara has departed for that black and white column he had raised in Athens, by which he eats and lives, the priest stooped, picked up the mask of comedy that Nilo had cast upon the cave floor, and set it over his own face.

And in his turn, the priest Davechini laughed.

HONORED THREE TIMES

This is the third time that Neal has honored me in his justly famous column by telling how I foretold World War I. Long time has dimmed his memory, perhaps, but on the whole, he has stated the salient fact.

It is amusing, however, to note that there should be a member of his own newspaper staff, an editor, who could answer Neal's question—if he chose to speak; and that there are in Neal's own city of Boston many scores of leading businessmen who heard me foretell in detail the horrors of World War II, and that as early as Italy's first threat to Ethiopia.

Henry Cabot Lodge could testify, if he would, that he wrote me a two-page reply, in longhand, in answer to a letter of mine, to convince me how silly I was to declare that France would fall, and England might, and American boys die bloody deaths all over the world unless the United States took a firm stand and made known to Germany and Italy that, on any further aggression, this country would jump into the fight.

I recall that it was about this time—when I spoke on Ethiopia before the Boston Rotary Club and a city editor of the Boston Traveler sat on the platform beside me, the Traveler's supreme jest was accidentally printed. I foretold World War II as it befell, and heard afterwards that some called me a fool, and some laughed, and some said I was a warmonger trying to be dramatic. The city editor alone informed me that he believed I was right, but could not say so in print, because public opinion was so hostile to the possibility. It was about this time, then, that Neal's own paper perpetrated as riant a jest as Neal has ever committed at his best.

HE WARNED ITALIAN AGGRESSION THREATENED CIVILIZATION

That was in 1935. On October 8, of that year, as a sort of preliminary, if I remember correctly, to my Rotary Club speech, the Boston Traveler published, under my cut, a column interview, on Ethiopia. I note that I am quoted in that interview as saying, "If one member can swallow up another member of the League of Nations—and Ethiopia, sponsored by Italy, is a member of that League—in violation of its oath, then there is no nation on the face of the globe that is safe. Civilization is at stake."

But it took the inspiration of the crowd at the Rotary Club for me to issue the warning that went unheeded. And it was later, if I remember correctly (I have mislaid the clipping), that the Traveler reported either the Rotary Club speech or some other I had given on world conditions, and reprinted my two-column cut at the head, with a cutline quotation from the talk. The meaning of that quotation was then clear.

In a later edition, however, the position on the back page where this report was published, was needed for late and, to the editor, more momentous news; and the report was switched to an inside page. But my cut was left alone, and without meaning, on that back page, and under it was the cut line (referring to Hitler, of course), "More dangerous than 10,000 savages."

CALLED MANY THINGS

I have been called many things by the press: As a professor at Harvard, where my position, though that of teaching a course in advanced English composition, was humble; "the man of 1 million words," by the Worcester Telegram, and so on; but it required Neal's newspaper—influenced, no doubt, by his own witty column, to dub me more dangerous than 10,000 savages. And that, through a fluke. (I'm glad I explained the cutline referred to Hitler.)

To return to this question of prophecies and of surprises to Cheney. In 1914 and again in 1935, when I had the temerity to foretell the future, my success may be explained by the fact that unfolding history nearly always follows a pattern.

Thus, during tumultuous events leading up to World War I, and during events erupting from the quiescent volcano of that war, leading up to World War, the history of the world was following the anticipated pattern.

Now, history may not, though it generally does, follow similar patterns as it evolves. It will, unless the troublemaking nation, the outlaw nation, does the unexpected and back of all the world troubles, at least as early as 1914, surged the outlaw nation. That is the difficulty today facing prognostication (or, speaking in medical terms, prognosis of the sick world).

RUSSIA: THE UNKNOWN QUANTITY

Russia is the X, the unknown quantity. She has created her own pattern; but she has in her past violently destroyed her old patterns of action. Civilization came to her late—later than it affected any other nation of Europe, and her masses have never become quite civilized. Russia is an atavism, today, because underlying her seeming religious nature, her people have remained half pagan. Therefore, we cannot now count on X following the patterns she has established since World War I. She is liable, because of the little gang of desperate degenerates and madmen who control her, to adopt any imaginable line of action at any time.

RUSSIA WILL ATTEMPT TO DESTROY THE UNITED STATES

One aspect of Russia's pattern, however, we may be sure, will be grimly and madly adhered to: Her published resolve to destroy her arch enemy, the United States. This, she has set about accomplishing by making war upon us following a pattern new among nations and to this hour we are losing that war.

Russia reserved her strength in her war against us (whatever that strength may actually be), by fighting us with stooges: Korea, Indochina, and recently and ominously, Central America. I am reminded of Rome's Punic Wars, when Rome was struggling against a more open foe, and of Cato the Censor's repeated cry: "Delenda est Carthago" (Carthage must be destroyed). Remember Cato. Unless the present regime in Russia perishes of some internal rot—a feeble hope—"Delenda est Carthago."

HOW THE "PATTERN" WORKED

Now, let us see how this "pattern" worked during the hectic period leading up to World War I. In the first place, from 1900 on, Europe was divided into two great armed camps: The Triple Alliance, a pact of mutual aid in case of attack between Germany, Austria, and Italy (from which Italy withdrew in the 11th hour); and the Triple Entente, a similar pact between England, France, and Russia. The boy Cheney knew about those international agreements.

In the second place, in this "pattern," Germany, jealous of England's rich trade with the East, had been building the Berlin to Bagdad Railway which was designed with twin rods of steel to tap the wealth of the Orient. Austria, ever the conniver, had been helping. The railway must pass across the Balkan States.

Aptly indeed have the Balkans been called "the Whirlpool of Europe." Following the three centuries of domination by the Turks, the Austrian and the Russian influence had gradually forced back Mohammed from the Adriatic coast. And Austria had succeeded through her plotting to get clearance for the Berlin-to-Bagdad Railway across all the states but little Bosnia, a Serbian territory. Bosnia lay across the projected railway, and under Russia's influence, no doubt, had stubbornly refused to let the new line through.

INCIDENT CREATED

It became necessary for the Triple Alliance, insofar as it included Austria and Germany, to intervene, to force the issue. But the European nations, in 1914, though nearly as Macchiavellian in their diplomacy as atavistic Russia is today, felt they must "save face" in the eyes of the world. They must have an excuse for intervention that would have at least some elements of plausibility. Therefore, an incident must be created.

As I saw the situation in 1914, and as I still believe today, the Kaiser and Austria's Emperor put their heads together. The great Archduke Ferdinand of Austria must visit Bosnia. There would be an august procession. An anarchist must be found and hired to bomb the procession. It was no part of the plot, of course, that the archduke should die. But in the open carriage just behind the royal one, were placed lesser nobility that were deemed expendable. The irony of fate was that on June 28, 1914, the anarchist struck the wrong carriage.

He killed Francis Ferdinand, Archduke of Austria, and his wife beside him.

EXCLAMATION O'HARA RECALLS WAS NATURAL

It was my reaction to that flash over the wire that my famous friend Neal O'Hara remembers. And the reason for my exclamation that the assassination would plunge the world into a great war, was that I had taken time to study the pattern and was simply waiting for the incident which, as a part of that pattern, was certain to follow. I had to do this. At the time, I was giving a series of lectures on current events before the Colonial Club, of Fairhaven—and it was at my next lecture there that I told—and the great George A. Hough reported it rather fully, as I recall—the order in which the nations of Europe would be involved, and that the United States would be forced into the conflict.

WE HELD ALOOF

Next, in the pattern, came Austria's ultimatum, obviously and imperiously proclaiming terms that no state with any pride could accept. Little Bosnia was brave enough, but she had Russia behind her. And if Russia were involved, would that not mean she had also France? And if France, England?

So Bosnia refused to accept, and Austria declared war. Then Russia, sworn to protect Balkan freedom, mobilized. Germany declared war on Russia, in defense, as she avowed, of her ally Austria, and declared war on France on August 3. Germany invaded Belgium, and Belgium rushed to arms. But England had pledged herself to defend the neutrality of brave little Belgium, and on August 5 declared war on Germany. And the United States held aloof. That's the tragedy of it. That's a part of our pattern in America. We held aloof, then.

CARVING UP THE UNITED STATES

Germany was confident we would not enter the war. She could lick her enemies one at a time; she would in the end lick her old rival, England. Then, holding all Europe, she would conquer the United States. An admiral of her navy, indeed, published a book in which he actually produced maps showing how the United States of America would be carved up and controlled. I have seen a copy of that work.

Had we announced to the Kaiser at the moment Germany began the invasion of Belgium: "Go back. Enter Belgium and we fight by the side of England and France," the odds would have been too great; the Kaiser and the Emperor would have found excuses. There would have been no World War I.

As it was, we waited until Germany was victorious on the field before we entered. We followed the same pattern in World War II. We are following the same pattern toward world war III, of which the tragically absurd war without victory in Korea was the opening struggle.

THE SAME TACTICS

We sent a host of our finest youth to die in Korea, but forbade them to pass a silly river or to bomb enemy's bases. The same tactics. Would not the orator Stevenson have us be kind to Russia? Trade with them. Pat the coiled rattlesnake on the head; feed it butter. We were kind to Germany and our young men were slaughtered. We were kind to Hitler and a host died again. Be kind to the rattlesnake, coiled to destroy us. Keep her in the United Nations, where the archcriminal nation may cast the veto vote against her own evident and incredible guilt. Pat the snake on the head; it will uncoil, it will glide back to its den.

UNITED STATES SLOWNESS SEEN LEADING TO WORLD WAR II

World War II was made possible only by World War I, and by our tragic slowness in recognizing the danger. Hitler, madman and racketeer, was possible only in a Germany weakened by a great, lost war. He took up where the Kaiser of the withered arm left off. Italy returned to the old alliance, Mussolini, crazed by power, was Hitler's abettor and guide. With only the excuse the Italy needed colonies, he attacked the ancient Christian state of Ethiopia. It was the hour when we should have acted, when we should have made known to the world our stand. We held aloof.

SLAIN BY UNITED STATES POLITICS

We waited until Hitler was winning on the field. We went in late and a host of American youth perished again—slain by American politics.

Of course, some events have surprised me, Neal. But those events which follow the pattern do not surprise. I watch grimly while ignorant diplomats seek to placate the implacable. I see the old worn reed of appeasement tried and tried and tried again as a prop—and break, time and time again. I hear the oily, smooth accents of diplomats wasting our opportunities in the same immemorial and yellow way. There are times in the course of history when the only reply to insulit and lies and surreptitious attack within, and to attack, through stooges or otherwise, from without, is Teddy Roosevelt's big stick.

Man, according to the latest discoveries of the scientist—in part at least through the indisputable evidence of the carbon test—has been on earth as Homo sapiens, at least 500,000 years and as man of a sort perhaps 1 million. During all that incredible time, man has had his face turned toward the stars; he has dreamed of gods and pressed on obstinately toward a divinity for man.

I see in man's long struggle upward on the path of destiny evidence of a divine will; of a plan, in man's behalf, by his maker. Gradually, as man earned the right, he has been given light.

IMPETUS TO MAN'S ASPIRATION

In the year 1900, God gave impetus to man's aspiration. From that time on, a great change has come over man's thinking: The airplane, electrical appliances, the auto, the radio, TV—to name only a few miracles of divinity—have been given to man. Yet in a single war, man often sets himself back for centuries on his upward path to destiny.

For one-quarter of the wasteful cost of war, science can end disease, give man an incredible length of life, send him shooting among stars for elements and metals, and produce, indeed, on earth conditions almost celestial. The time has come for man to understand that he cannot permit any criminal nation to endanger his peace. The time has come when man must outlaw war, and keep the world's peace with an international police force, that all men may be free, and that man's progress on the path of destiny may no longer be jeopardized by criminal and selfish nations. For all people, give us peace and the open road to progress.

This can be done, Neal. It can't be done by appeasement. It cannot be done by permitting the guilty nation to continue its crimes. We have the power—it can be done.

On the whole, Neal, Dave Cheney is not surprised.

Answer to Red China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 5, 1954

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Answer to Red China," which appeared in the Baltimore News-Post on July 31, 1954.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ANSWER TO RED CHINA

The United States aircraft which successfully repelled an attack by Mao Tse-tung's Red China planes were engaged in a legitimate, humanitarian mission on behalf of this country's nationals. They were searching the South China Sea for possible survivors of the British airliner shot down by the Chinese last Friday.

Among the 10 mission victims of that murderous attack are 3 Americans.

The American mercy fliers had every right, legally and morally, to be where they were when they were jumped by two Red fighter planes. Fortunately, our airmen were under orders to shoot back when attacked. This they did, with accuracy.

This, unfortunately, is the type of diplomatic exchange which the Communists can best understand and are most likely to respect. In fact, we can be certain that the free world's relations with the Communist world will improve when the Reds are convinced we mean business and will be pushed no farther.

The incident demonstrates Red China's technique of talking out of both sides of its mouth at the same time.

Almost at the very moment it was telling Britain how badly it felt about shooting down the airliner, Red China tried the same barbarous stunt with American rescue planes.

Despite the Peiping government's explanation that the attack on the British airliner was a mistake, there can be little doubt that this action, as well as the attack on the rescue planes, was deliberate and suggests a planned pattern, similar to past Communist behavior.

It will be interesting to see how the United Nations reacts to Red China's unprovoked attacks.

The U. N., if it remains silent, would then countenance such lawless actions. If it speaks out in condemnation of such acts, it would at least be gratifying lipservice to the principles on which it was founded.

But the likelihood of the U. N. doing or saying anything is remote. There are still too many pressures for admitting Communist China into the U. N. But so far as Americans are concerned, additional proof has been provided that Red China cannot be trusted in—or out—of the United Nations.

There is no denying that United States fliers' quick, determined action on their rescue mission thrilled Americans everywhere after years of apparent noninterest on the part of the United States State Department in what happened to its nationals or their property.

Statement Issued by National Federation of Independent Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT GORE

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 5, 1954

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, on behalf of the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement issued by the National Federation of Independent Business.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Independent business, both at the production and distribution levels, are considerably alarmed by the reports appearing daily of consolidations and mergers taking place in many of our leading industries. Many hold to the view, wondering whether the present trends of mergers and consolidations will equal or exceed similar action which took place in the "roaring twenties."

Many also hold to the view, and put the question to us, says George J. Burger, vice president of the National Federation of Independent Business: "When do the antitrust laws start to function, or do we have laws on the statute books that would prohibit these mergers and consolidations where such action will eventually lead to monopoly in the various industries?" Burger adds: "We have noted the mergers and consolidations taking place in the motor industry, textiles, steel, hotel managements, and in other industries reporting considering such a move." If the trend continues and no action is taken by the administration to check into this situation it could result in greater unemployment and controlled economy, with resulting higher prices to the consumer.

It is to be noted that Mr. Henry Ford, Jr., recently speaking at Bonn, Germany, said: "We believe that monopolies cause stagnation." He further said: "We believe that our country could not prosper as it has without the benefit of sound antitrust legislation which has helped to keep us competitive over the past century." Ford concluded his comments by stating: "Independent American businessmen may complain about the interpretation or administration of these laws, but we know that, like spinach, they are good for us."

Small business of this Nation, concurs with these important findings of Mr. Ford, Jr., and we in the federation, under direct nationwide mandate poll of our members have repeatedly urged this administration and its predecessor for the fullest enforcement of the antitrust laws, and less emphasis placed on so-called study groups.

Finally, Congress recently adopted legislation commonly known as the Antimerger Act. We ask, "When does the law become effective?" And we are calling on the Small Business Committees of the Congress and also the Antimonopoly Subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary to make an immediate inquiry to the Federal Trade Commission what action, if any, they are taking on this present merger trend where such action tends to foster monopoly.

Just a Minute, What Is Costing How Much?—Or, People Who Live in Glass Houses Should Not Throw Stones

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 5, 1954

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, there are in the United States today certain groups and individuals who are severely criticizing the reclamation program on the assumption that it is costing the taxpayer a lot of money, and becomes an everlasting burden upon them.

Naturally, in these times of high cost-of-living anyone who talks about cost to the taxpayers finds a receptive audience whether the presentation is misleading or whether it is representative of the true situation. It has been pointed out time and time again that reclamation projects when studied in their true perspective yield benefits to the nation that are national in scope as well as local, and that the projects pay for themselves many times over in the form of newly created income and of tax revenues made possible by the reclamation project, and that these and many other benefits continue indefinitely into the future.

Critics of the Federal reclamation program, on the ground that it will constitute a burden on the Federal taxpayers, should take a good look at H. R. 9859, the omnibus river and harbor and flood control bill. Here is a bill that, under the arguments advanced by opponents of reclamation projects constitutes a real giveaway. The cost to the Federal Government is entirely nonreimbursable, and no interest is charged the beneficiaries on the original cost either.

In the case of Federal reclamation projects, interest is paid on the investment in power and municipal water features, including interest accruing during the construction period. This part of the cost of the project is, then, returned to the Federal Treasury with interest in 50 years. Interest is not charged on the costs allocated to irrigation features in accordance with reclamation law. The capital investment in irrigation features is, however, returned to the Federal Treasury in 50 years partially from the irrigation farmer, partially from taxes levied by the required conservancy-type districts, and the remainder from power revenues. After full pay out there will flow into the Federal Treasury millions of dollars per year for the life of the project, from power revenues, which may be for hundreds of years or longer.

One of the arguments currently being employed by opponents of reclamation projects in general, and of the Colorado River storage project in particular is to point and accusing finger at the interest on the amount assigned to irrigation features, the principal of which is returned from power revenues. For instance, Mr. Leslie Miller, one of the severest of critics of H. R. 4449 points out that the Nation's taxpayers will be called upon to pay interest for 44 years at 2½ percent on $231,041,900, the estimated amount assigned to irrigation and to be repaid from power sales. He further points out that this amount at interest compounded annually would grow to $780 million, and that interest on unpaid balances over the 6-year period would amount to $23 million; the total cost then being $803 million from which the principal is subtracted, because it is repaid, leaves $540 million to be paid in interest by the taxpayers.

Now, let us take a look at the cost of those projects in the omnibus rivers, harbors, and flood control bill. Remember, the figures quoted are costs to the Federal Government. They are nonreimbursable gifts. No interest is paid by the beneficiaries on the capital investment. No part of the principal is returned.

In the current omnibus bill under titles I and II, we note the following. There are:

1. 85 rivers and harbors projects at a cost to the Federal Government of	$212,915,100
2. 22 beach erosion projects	14,003,664
3. 39 flood-control projects	663,352,750
Total cost to the Federal Government	890,271,514

This $890 million is not the total cost of all rivers, harbors, and flood-control projects. It represents only the cost of projects for which authorization is sought in H. R. 9859 for this session of Congress.

To illustrate the ridiculousness of the argument of those opposed to reclamation projects on the grounds of the interest argument illustrated above, let us now apply that same argument, that someone, the taxpayer, has to stand the cost of the interest charges paid by the Federal Government on borrowed money, to the cost of those items sought for authorization in the omnibus bill. First, we should note that it is very significant that those opposed to the Colorado River storage project figured their interest for a 50-year period. This is significant because at the end of the 50-year period all of the principal is repaid and power revenues continue into perpetuity to pour $20 million per year into the Federal Treasury. In the case of the projects in the omnibus bill the interest need not be computed for only 50 years. It could be figured for any period into perpetuity—50 years, 100 years, 200 years, 1,000 years—infinity.

For the sake of this illustration it is sufficient to point out that in 50 years at 2½ percent interest compounded annually the $890 million will add $3.06 billion; in 100 years $10.5 billion; and in 200 years $124.2 billion to the current national debt.

For the city of Los Angeles, Calif., there is a flood-control plan now underway that is estimated to cost the United States taxpayers $363,265,500. By this project alone at 2½ percent interest compounded annually in 50 years there will be added to the national debt $1.25 billion; in 100 years $4.3 billion; and in 200 years $50.7 billion.

For the city of Los Angeles, Calif., and environs, there are also planned three harbor improvement programs with a total estimated cost to the Federal taxpayers of $14,071,500. At the same rate of interest in 50 years the total cost will be $48.4 million; in 100 years $166.2 million; and in 200 years $1.96 billion.

Current plans for the city of Los Angeles and environs for flood-control and harbor improvements will cost the Nation's taxpayers in 50 years $1.3 billion; in 100 years $4.5 billion; and in 200 years $52.7 billion. These figures do not take into consideration the immense expenditures that have been made in these categories for the city of Los Angeles in past years, nor the fantastic nonreimbursable expenditures undoubtedly expected in the future from the Federal Treasury.

In House Report No. 2247 to accompany H. R. 9859, the omnibus bill, we note in title I that—.

Cost of completed navigation program	$856,000,000
Cost of projects now underway not completed	1,409,000,000
Cost of projects authorized but not yet started	911,000,000
Total cost of active navigation programs (does not include multiple-purpose projects)	3,176,000,000
Cost of completed flood-control projects	545,000,000
Cost of projects now underway	2,945,000,000
Cost of projects authorized but not started	1,371,000,000
Total cost of active flood control projects	4,861,000,000
Total cost of active rivers, harbors, flood-control projects	8,037,000,000

To further illustrate how ridiculous this argument about interest can become at 2½ percent interest compounded annually the total cost of the active rivers, harbors, and flood-control program in 50 years would grow to $27.6 billion; in 100 years to $94.9 billion; and in 200 years would add $1,121.6 billion—over a trillion dollars—to our national debt.

In spite of the stupendous figures that can be derived by this method of considering interest we all realize the benefits to be gained from the programs in question. We realize that both the principal invested and the interest that could be computed thereon are expendable items from which benefits are derived into perpetuity and ad infinitum. We as Americans cannot condone the attitude of the man who starved himself to death because he realized that if he did not eat at the rate of $1,500 per year at the end of 50 years his $1,500 would grow to $5,155; in 100 years to $17,721; and in 200 years to $209,340.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

Code of Laws of the United States

Title 44, Section 181. Congressional Record; arrangement, style, contents, and indexes.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the Congressional Record, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the Congressional Record semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

Title 44, Section 182b. Same; illustrations, maps, diagrams.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the Record without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the Congressional Record the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily Record as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided*, That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the Record with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the official reporters of the Congressional Record, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the Record shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the Record issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the Record for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the Record of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the Record shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the Record style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the Record.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the Congressional Record any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided*, That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix, but this rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided*, That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the Congressional Record.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the Congressional Record Appendix the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed.

10. *Official reporters.*—The official reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the Congressional Record by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this restriction shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. The Public Printer or the official reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the Congressional Record which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Illustrations.*—Pursuant to section 182b, title 44, United States Code (as shown above), requests for authority to insert an illustration in the Record should be submitted to the Joint Committee on Printing through the chairman of the Committee on Printing of the respective House in which the speech desired to be illustrated may be delivered. Illustrations shall not exceed in size a page of the Record and shall be linecuts only. Copy for illustrations must be furnished to the Public Printer not later than 12:30 o'clock p. m. of the day preceding publication.

13. *Corrections.*—The permanent Record is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided*, That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further*, That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

PRINTING DOCUMENTS AND REPORTS

Documents and reports of committees with the evidence and papers submitted therewith, or any part thereof ordered printed by Congress, may be reprinted by the Public Printer on order of any Member of Congress or Delegate, on prepayment of the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 162, p. 1940).

PRICE OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

The Public Printer is authorized to furnish to subscribers the daily Record at $1.50 per month, payable in advance.

Remit by money order payable to Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the Congressional Record, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

Appendix

Foreign Assistance Through Export-Import Bank To Enable Foreign Producers To Compete With American Producers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 5, 1954

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, when will we as a nation awaken to the fact that American industry and our own workers must be protected against foreign production and the low standard of wages paid to workers in foreign countries?

For years we have been pouring American taxpayers' money into countries all over the world to enable such countries to rehabilitate their broken-down economies In some countries the result has been to increase their production even beyond what it was before the war, but, we still keep on giving. Today, our situation is such that Congress will be asked to increase our debt limit. It seems to me it would have been more sensible to have cut down our expenditure at home and abroad and thereby eliminated the necessity at this time of increasing our debt limit to accommodate our spending program.

The foreign-aid program has added greatly to our present indebtedness of $270 billion, but even that program of spending is not all that we are doing in the line of spending. The Export-Import Bank is now expected to do its part in spreading American dollars around the world. The latest request for a loan comes from the Brazilian National Steel Company, which I understand, is controlled by the Brazilian Government.

It is my understanding that this Brazilian company is attempting to obtain a loan of $40 million from the Export-Import Bank to increase its capacity. This company was originally financed by a loan of $70 million from the Export-Import Bank. The proposed new loan would serve to make a substantial increase in the capacity of that company.

I am sure that I need not tell you that the steel industry in our own country is now operating at a rate which is considerably below its capacity; in fact, it is operating at less than 70 percent of capacity; with resultant large-scale unemployment and much part-time employment.

South America is a natural export market for the United States steel industry. The encouragement of the production of steel by South American countries in order to make those countries self-sufficient will result in serious disadvantage to the American steel industry. It is recognized that if those countries are able to obtain capital elsewhere, there is nothing we can or should do about it. However, I believe that the expenditure of American tax moneys to build up competition for American industry in foreign countries for a commodity which is already in oversupply in the world markets is not justifiable and is grossly unfair to American producers and American labor.

It is the duty of Members of Congress to use whatever influence they can exert on the Export-Import Bank to prevent the proposed loan to the Brazilian National Steel Co., and all other loans of a similar character. We owe it to American industry and our own workers to oppose all loans that enable foreign producers to complete with us on a low-wage basis.

Accomplishments of the 83d Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 5, 1954

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, as you may remember, it has always been my policy to tell of what I thought were the major accomplishments of each Congress since I was first elected to serve in the House of Representatives in 1942. This year, I am quite proud of our accomplishments.

Friends, during my 6 terms in Congress, I have followed the policy of sending you a report of its accomplishments and giving you an account of my stewardship as your representative. I wish I could write each of you individually, but that would be impossible. However, I do hope you will take the few minutes necessary to read this; and if you have any comments or questions, I would appreciate your writing me either at Kimball, Nebr., or 1025 House Office Building, Washington 25, D. C.

This is not a political report, but rather an objective review of the accomplishments of the 83d Congress and the Republican administration. As the Representative of the Fourth Congressional District of Nebraska, it is my responsibility to represent the views of both Republicans and Democrats, realizing that what is best for Nebraska is best for both political parties and the Nation.

First off, I will tell you of a few of the actions which are of direct and primary interest to you—the people of the Fourth Congressional District of Nebraska.

SARGENT PROJECT APPROVED

The Sargent irrigation project was approved by my Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and, at my insistence, a supplemental appropriations bill was passed containing $1 million to start actual construction of the project. This project has been hanging fire for many years and to many it is a dream come true.

Western Nebraska irrigators and REA groups are quite familiar with my efforts to get money appropriated for the Glendo multipurpose dam which would firm up the water supply in the North Platte Valley and provide critically needed hydroelectric power for the entire area.

Legislation placing the Niobrara irrigation project under the Missouri Basin plan passed my committee and the House. It is now pending before the Senate.

In another closely related field, when REA groups became uneasly about the new power marketing criteria for Federal power, I called a special meeting of my committee to study it and insure that your interest would be protected. These hearings brought out some very interesting and startling facts. Testimony pointed out that, in many instances during the past administration, public power was being sold to private power groups with complete disregard for the preference clause, and at a price below the cost of production.

Upon my recommendation, the criteria were clarified to insure that the REA's and other preference customers' position would be retained. In fact, I believe the amended criteria place them in a much better position.

ON FORT ROBINSON

When the General Services Administration announced it was selling the buildings at Fort Robinson for scrap, I introduced legislation and stopped the sale. The bill would authorize transfer of the fort to the State. Now, the next move is up to the State, if the legislature finds a use for it—many recommendations have been made—and favorable reports come from the State. I am quite confident "Fort Bob" will be transferred to Nebraska.

Now for a look at the national scene. I want to point out that on the national and international questions, I have always acted in what I thought was your best interests. In order to maintain your fresh outlook, I conducted two polls on the major questions facing Congress, and held Government clinics in the county seat towns of the district. Your views guided my vote, and that is why I could not go along with the administration's foreign-aid program or its opposition to the Bricker amendment.

As for my contribution to the President's program, I introduced a bill to govern the use of new chemical additives in pesticides. The bill, recently signed into law by the President, has been hailed as one of the finest public health measures of recent years.

Another major bill which I introduced is the small projects bill which provides for Federal participation in non-Federal irrigation projects. I have been working on this bill for several years, and it has acquired national importance in the field of irrigation and reclamation. It would place more control and responsibility with the local people.

Naturally, I introduced several other so-called minor bills. One which attracted national interest was the drug addict bill. Now on the statutes, it serves as model legislation, and many States are considering it for their use.

RESULTS, 83D CONGRESS

Many of you have often asked, "Doctor, what did the 83d Congress do?" Well, I am quite proud of its accomplishments, because much far-reaching, realistic legislation has been enacted.

It stopped the war in Korea. At this writing, August 5, no war is going on any place in the world—the first time in 17 years.

Under President Ike and the Republican Congress the Nation has a much stronger economy. There has been no depression, as has been so often forecast by the prophets of gloom and doom.

More than 62 milloin are gainfully employed—employed in national production which amounts to more than a billion dollars a day.

The 83d Congress saved over $14 billion during the first 17 months out of the moneys that Truman had planned to spend.

There was a big tax cut, the biggest in our history, amounting to nearly $7½ billion.

The tax laws, for the first time in 78 years, were given a general overhauling and revamping to remove the inequalities.

We established a new Hoover Commission, as we did during the 80th Congress, to study reorganization and the overlapping functions of State, county, and Federal Governments. I am confident this, as the first Commission did, will save billions of dollars.

Then, another thing, this business of communism has been kicked around a lot by the 83d Congress. It has already passed some laws that make it possible to deal with communism and subversion here at home. I have been asked about Senator McCarthy. In a nutshell, while I think his methods have not always been good, I would rather have someone investigating and kicking the Communists out the McCarthy way than not to have it done at all.

More than 2,200 security risks have been removed from their Federal jobs, and many, many prosecutions and deportations which had been hanging fire for too long a time were carried out. New charges and prosecutions were also quickly disposed of.

The President supported, and the Congress passed, a broadened social-security law.

A far-reaching Federal-aid program has been enacted.

Over 180,000 unnecessary Federal jobs were abolished.

It has moved to get Government out of competition with private business.

Veterans' benefits have been increased and improved.

It provided for an adequate national defense. The armed services and the national defense have been streamlined and strengthened with much waste eliminated.

The President has insisted that outstanding men head up Cabinet posts.

Yes, it appears President Eisenhower will meet about 75 percent of his program during the first 2 years, and that is quite an accomplishment. He has an excellent program—one that is building a stronger America.

He does not want to remake America into a socialistic state with everyone dependent upon the Government. That is why the leftwing group is not supporting him—this group tied up legisaltion with filibusters in the Senate.

President Eisenhower realizes that no one can repeal the 20th century, yet expansion of Government in business must be halted. He is making a determined effort to get the Government out of business that private enterprise can and will do more efficiently and, at the same time, takes a realistic approach to the fundamental responsibilities which the Government cannot escape in maintaining basic programs for the general good.

WASHINGTON'S NEW ATMOSPHERE

There is truly a new atmosphere in Washington—new in recent years but old among American traditions. There has been cooperation with the President—he has not tried to jam legislation down the throats of Congress. Both parties join in passing many measures.

Yes; there is a Christian atmosphere in Washington. You know, there has not been anyone in Washington who has received a mink coat or deep freezer since the Republican 83d Congress came into being. All I can say is thank goodness we have a President who stands four square on the proposition that anyone having a Government job must give full service for the dollar received.

With the record we have compiled it will be most difficult for grafters to label this as a "do-nothing" Congress. They will try, for they do not like the investigations which are uncovering graft, corruption, and communism. They know if this Congress succúmbs to those charges, it will mean they will return to power.

NO DEPRESSION IN SIGHT

On the national scene everything seems to be in pretty good shape. There was no depression as many antiadministration people almost hopefully predicted. Actually business is good, unemployment is low and inflation has been stopped—and it did not take a war to pick up the slack.

And on the same subject, in 1950, just before Truman sent troops to Korea without the consent of Congress, about 5 million were unemployed and we were in the midst of a very strong recession, one that had all the markings of the beginning of a depression.

AGRICULTURE

On the agricultural scene at that same time prices were down 17 percent, and, to make matters worse, the slide was not being stopped. The new administration, fully realizing all new wealth comes from the soil, took positive action to stop the rapidly descending prices. And it was done without the false supports of a war economy. The bloodshed was an outrageous price, especially since nothing was gained in that stalemated war.

Contrary to the thinking in some quarters, the Republican administration is convinced that it can make the transition from an economy based on war to a lasting one based on peace without a depression. It will be difficult, but under the leadership of President Eisenhower and the enactment of his program, I feel confident this transition will be made without any financial setbacks. For this reason, the President needs a working majority in Congress.

As long as we continue to work toward a basic farm program, with a foundation of rock rather than sand on which to build our Nation's economy, I feed confident we will have real prosperity. Toward that end, I recommended that allotments be based on bushels rather than acres. We all know it is not the number of acres planted, but rather the number of bushels harvested that count.

HOME VISITS

As I have said, I am quite proud of the accomplishments of the Republican 83d Congress. When Congress adjourns, I will be out home attending county fairs and visiting with civic and church groups. I will continue my question-and-answer periods, for I feel this is the best way to learn your views.

I will want to discuss with you, in an honest, forthright manner, just what has been accomplished by the 83d Congress, and you have the right to know my views on all these subjects. The views I state and the votes I have made represent my honest thinking on what was best for the Nation and the people I represent. The only rollcalls I have missed were those which occurred when I attended the funerals of several of my colleagues, including Senators Butler and Griswold.

I regret that I have not been able to be in Nebraska more often, but I felt the legislative schedule here in Washington demanded that I be on the job. Also, as chairman of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, 1 of 19 committees, I had to be on the job guiding legislation through Congress.

It will be good to be back home. I am looking forward to seeing as many of you as possible. My schedule will be announced in all the local newspapers and by the radio stations of the district.

Hon. Laurie Battle

SPEECH

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 5, 1954

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I want to associate myself with those who have spoken so favorably of my colleague, a member of my own committee, the Committee on Foreign Affairs. I have had a real opportunity to know Laurie Battle. While I cannot speak for the committee, I feel that I express the sentiments of the committee when I say that we are all going to miss him. I know of no individual member of that committee who has been more diligent in the tasks assigned to him. The Battle Act will stand as a monument to his work here.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope that the day will come when he will again be associated with us here or in some other body, because we need young men like Laurie Battle in the service of our country.

Hon. Laurie Battle

SPEECH

OF

HON. GEORGE M. GRANT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 5, 1954

Mr. GRANT. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Alabama [Mr. Boykin] for yielding to me. It is not so often that we stand on this floor to pay tribute to a young man, but this afternoon such is the case because Laurie Battle is still a young man.

Laurie Battle's service in this House is a matter of history. I want to say that he is a self-made man. Laurie came up the hard way; that is, in part, he worked his way through college and by his grit, by his self-determination and by his desire to better himself in life, he attended several colleges, among them being the Birmingham-Southern College in his home town of Birmingham, the Vanderbilt University, and Scarrit College, Ohio State University, and the University of Alabama.

Laurie soon saw the need of national defense in this country and he attempted to do something about it. He offered his services to the Alabama National Guard and served an enlistment in the National Guard of the State of Alabama. Then in World War II he enlisted as a private and by that self-determination and by his desire to serve his country and his fellow man he served with distinction in the Pacific and in other areas during that awful conflict of World War II. When he was discharged, by his integrity and by his work he was discharged with the rank of major.

He entered the 80th Congress here in 1947 and applied himself to his committee work. He soon secured membership on the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House. We all know the work that he did on legislation which I think has meant much to this Nation and to the cause of democracy in the world. The legislation that he sponsored has become known in legislative history as the Battle Act. I am not going into the history of that act, but I do believe when a final history is written of this period a great deal of credit will be given to Laurie Battle for his sponsorship of the resolution and bill through the House which provided that this Nation would not sit idly by and see nations that we were helping, nations that were supposed to help us in securing democracy in this world, trade with the enemy. So, this House passed the bill which, in the final analysis, meant cutting off military, and financial aid, and economic aid to nations who violated the Battle Act.

I think a rather delightful thing concerning this Battle Act was due to the fact that the day this act was passed by the House, within 24 hours of that time, Mr. and Mrs. Battle had born to them a little Battle No. 3, and Laurie, in making his remarks upon the floor at that time stated that it had been suggested to him that he name the baby H. R. 4550. Since that time there has been another child born to that happy union.

Laurie, in closing these few remarks, I want to say to you that you leave the Halls of Congress here with the admiration and the love not only of your fellow colleagues from the State of Alabama, but I am sure that I speak the sentiments of this whole body when I say to you and your lovely family that we wish for you in the years to come every happiness, health, and prosperity.

Governor McKeldin's Proclamation of Land Week in Maryland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. GLENN BEALL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 6, 1954

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, this week is Land Week in Maryland, a time when we turn our attention to the source of our sustenance.

Throughout this week there will be tours of farms in Harford, Baltimore, Howard, Montgomery, and Carroll Counties, and the theme will be water conservation. Care of our land and conservation of our soil resources is worthy of our attention the full year through, but I think it is very helpful that the program be dramatized through such recognition as Land Week, and this Governor McKeldin has done by proclamation.

I request unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record Governor McKeldin's proclamation of Land Week as it appears in the August issue of the Maryland Farm News.

There being no objection, the proclamation was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

> The great strength of America is rooted in the land.
>
> The health of our people comes from the products of the land.
>
> Millions of less fortunate nations survive because of the largess of American soil.
>
> The prosperity and welfare of urban dwellers as well as rural are extensively dependent on the land and its resources.
>
> We must be wise in the use of this greatest resource and those related to it
>
> Maryland is proud of its fertile land and of the accomplishments of such agencies as those in our soil-conservation districts.
>
> Our progress must be continued. We must halt the destruction of land which still goes on as a result of abuse, misuse, erosion, and lack of proper drainage.
>
> To assist in calling attention to what has been done and what needs to be done, I, Theodore R. McKeldin, Governor, do hereby proclaim the week of August 1 through August 7 to be Maryland Land Week. I urge the interest and participation of all our citizens in the observance and its activities.

Excerpts From Paul Harvey Broadcasts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. BRICKER

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 6, 1954

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have published in the Appendix to the Record excerpts from the Paul Harvey news broadcasts on July 18 and August 1, 1954.

We have heard it frequently said during the past year that the President and the Senate can be trusted not to make a dangerous treaty. The President is not infallible. The Senate is not infallible. The proof of this is contained in the Paul Harvey broadcasts concerning what has happened under the NATO status of forces agreement.

I am proud that I voted against this treaty which gives away the inalienable constitutional rights of American soldiers on foreign soil. Of all the people whom we ought to protect in the enjoyment of those rights are the men who wear the uniform of our country and who are pledged to defend those rights with their very lives.

In advising and consenting to the ratification of the NATO status of forces agreement, the Senate forgot the basic constitutional rights of Americans in uniforms, many of whom have been drafted, and who are stationed without their consent in approximately 40 countries all over the world.

Very few questions were asked by the people when the NATO status of forces agreement was before the Senate. Make no mistake, Mr. President, questions are being asked today. They are becoming louder and louder and louder.

The State Department has taken care of its representatives. They have immunity from prosecution in local foreign courts. They are paid good salaries. Their employment is entirely voluntary. Many of them obtained their positions because of political "pull" or because of personal contacts. They will not be called on to fight to defend foreign soil. The Constitution goes with them wherever they go, and the flag folds over them in full protection. Yet, the men who defend their right to represent this country are denied the same immunity.

I could not cast my vote to barter away the rights of United States soldiers who are offering their lives to preserve the country we represent, who are offering their lives, if need be, to defend the very Constitution that I, as a Senator of the United States, am dutybound to support. The flag follows our soldiers abroad. The Constitution must likewise follow them. I cannot acquiesce in, or regard as permanent, the dangerous procedure established by the criminal jurisdiction provisions of the NATO status of forces agreement under which, for the first time in American history, American soldiers abroad are subject to trial under foreign law and denied the constitutional protections to which they are entitled.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Excerpt From Paul Harvey News, July 18, 1954

Now, the rest of the story:

I keep wishing—hoping and wishing for a day when I may send you off to bed with some gentle truth.

I keep planning for and promising myself a pleasant respite from crises when you and I may share a little simple story of people loving one another for a change.

Then something happens like tonight.

And I'm on my way to being gol-durned mad and I'm going to have to take you with me.

You see, it's about your boy.

The newspapers have told you that the NATO Status of Forces Treaty, negotiated by Dean Acheson in 1951, was approved by the United States Senate July 15, 1953.

You said, "That sounds too involved for me," and didn't bother to find out what it meant.

Neither did your Senator.

I'm going to tell you the rest of the story.

Dick Keefe and Tony Scaletti were just two American GI's among the million overseas and Christmas was on the way. They were homesick, lonesome, bored, and with a belly full of Orleans, France. So they had a few drinks together to celebrate nothing.

Dick and Tony were homesick.

Sometime during the celebration they decided to see Paris. They swiped a taxicab and headed for Paris.

They were homesick and they had a few drinks and they swiped a taxicab. It was a prank but it was a crime.

And a French civil court gave each of those boys 5 years in solitary confinement.

Now, wait a minute. Don't tell me that in your town you let a drunk sleep it off and then set him free. Don't tell me he'd maybe get 90 days or, at most, a few months back in Oshkosh or Sand Springs or Dubuque. You're talking about what Americans consider proper punishment.

These lads—Dick and Tony—are no longer enjoying the protection of American citizenship, because you gave theirs away.

You and I and every Senator who said "aye" to that infamous Status of Forces Treaty took our boys out from under our law and put them at the mercy of foreign courts in a foreign land.

You remember Dick Keefe and Tony Scaletti. Remember them well. They spent last Christmas in a dark hole called Melum Prison, the Alcatraz of France, each, alone, in solitary confinement. And there'll be four more Christmases for them in that dark darkness, if they survive. They're there tonight. Alone in the dark at this moment. At this very instant. And for more than 4 more years, because you and I figured this newest NATO maneuver sounded too complicated and we didn't bother to find out what it meant.

Look, Americans, and turn up your Beltone, I want you to hear this real good.

I can't get figures for this year, yet; but last year—1953—more than 400 Dicks and Tonys—American boys—were sentenced by foreign courts.

Many are stationed where Islamic law applies.

I hope none of them got caught stealing even a chicken, because you touch stolen food under Moslem law they chop off your hands.

And hear this: our own MP's are required to arrest the offender and then turn him over to the foreign authorities for punishment in accord with the caprice of that court and the custom of that land.

But let me get back to Dick Keefe and Tony Scaletti. In solitary confinement in a French dungeon while our State Department flits back and forth across the oceans looking out for the best interests of Frenchmen in Indochina.

Mrs. Gladys Keefe, Dick's wife, has two youngsters—2 and 3. Our Department of the Army has notified Gladys that she will no longer receive the basic allowance for quarters, which Congress through it had provided for the families of all our servicemen. She has moved in with her mother in Maryland so she can work so her babies can eat. And the French write to her in French telling her "no," she may not communicate with her imprisoned husband, neither to send letters nor to receive them.

Now comes the chorus of offended canary birds trying to sing bass. I can hear already the yapping and whining of the mongrel patriots of the United Nations that we have to allow foreign courts jurisdiction over our boys if our courts are to have jurisdiction over theirs. That it's an even swap to our mutual advantage. Get off that. You know well that Americans on foreign soil outnumber their handful of soldiers over here by a 100 to 1. And more, that we here guarantee ourselves and our guests the protection of our Constitution, our trial by jury, our civilized American system of jurisprudence. It is supposed to be an even swap when we, in turn, submit our sons to getting their hands chopped off.

There's more to this diabolical plot.

And here this: every individual on either end of Pennsylvania Avenue who opposed the Bricker amendment—and on Main Street, too—any who saw no reason to curtail this frightful treatymaking power of our Executive, there's more to what the one-worlders have in store. Because under treaty law you don't have to have a crime to make an arrest. Under treaty law you need no crime. Under treaty law our MP's are obligated to arrest anybody the foreign official asks to have arrested and turn him over. So what is to prevent that gang of Communists, who outnumber any political party in France, suddenly one day seizing control and promptly ordering the arrest of every American in sight, trying him in secret, and throwing him into a dungeon alongside Dick and Tony in Melum prison.

You got a friendly judge, Dick and Tony. You got the minimum under French law. He might have given you life. Though I'm sorry, but someday you'll have to know, that while a French judge gave you 5 years in solitary for a joyride, another French court was giving only 5 years to a Frenchman who murdered an American soldier. And the murdered man's name is James Wilkins. And the murdered is not required to serve his 5 years in solitary.

Let's not pussyfoot past who's responsible and blame it all on Acheson again. Americans, a letter from your President Eisenhower specifically urged approval of this troops treaty on July 14, 1953. Do you wonder that Senator Bricker jumped to his feet waving this frightful document in his hand pleading for help? And Dirksen alongside him; and Dworshak and Frear, Jenner and Johnson, Long and Malone and McCarran and McCarthy, Russell and Schoeppel and Smathers and Welker and Williams and that was all. This handful fought it. The rest let it go without protest. They figured surely somebody on the Foreign Relations Committee must have read the fine print, so they made your son eligible to be tried by a Communist court.

Oh, yes; they did. Tito is our "ally." We have soldiers on his soil. And they are men you and I drafted and sent overseas with an Army manual in their pockets which says they are subject to American law and have the protection of the American Constitution. And now this new treaty says that's a lie, that they may be left to the tender mercy of a Communist court.

Do you wonder that Lucile Vogeler told me she will not allow her sons to be drafted while this NATO treaty supersedes our law. Her sons will take their chances in our jails. Her husband suffered for 15 months in a Hungarian dungeon while our State Department poured pink tea for our so-called allies who aren't even drafting their own sons for their own wars. And Mrs. Vogeler means it. She will not permit her sons to serve under the American flag unless they are guaranteed the protection of that flag.

Do you realize, Americans, that our own loyal sons have fewer rights than those who betray their country? Here we allow spies, traitors, even murderers to refuse to testify against themselves while American boys are being tried in foreign courts where they are assumed guilty until they prove themselves innocent. And they have to prove it through an interpreter, at that.

In behalf of that three-quarters of a million Americans who are over there where they cannot protest tonight, I protest. In behalf of the wives and mothers whose husbands and sons may now be killed by the enemy, kidnaped by the Communists, or imprisoned by our allies, I protest. Let no man merit your vote in this upcoming election until he has made plain exactly where he stands on treaty law.

Richard T. Keefe, Anthony Scaletti, may the good Lord abbreviate the agony of this awful hour in your lives. And may He somehow, with that infinite mercy which exceedeth all understanding, forgive us for what we have done to you.

I'm sorry to have disturbed your peace, Americans, but I thought it was time somebody told the rest of the story.

Excerpt From Paul Harvey News, August 1, 1954

Now, the rest of the story:

Two weeks ago you and I visited on the subject of the NATO Status of Forces Treaty.

I told you that American servicemen overseas are under the jurisdiction of foreign courts. That men drafted to defend our Constitution are no longer afforded its protection.

I cited the cases of Privates Keefe and Scaletti, who stole a cab in Orleans, France, and were sentenced by a Paris court.

In these past 2 weeks I have the assurance of the State Department that Privates Keefe and Sacletti are not in solitary confinement. They are now confined in cells 7 feet by 4½ feet. The cells are unheated. But each cell is lighted by a small bulb. There is no plumbing. They are permitted to write letters, 50 lines per week and subject to French censorship.

That State Department wants it known that, after all, these men also administered a beating to the cab driver from whom they stole the cab. In the very letter in which the State Department seeks to justify this sentence, the State Department official admits "their facilities are vastly superior to those which exist in other parts of the world." And the State Department further seeks to explain away this case by saying that, after all, our tourists are subject to the jurisdiction of foreign courts.

Gentleman, our tourists were not drafted and forced to go over there. Not yet, anyway. But since officially we apparently consider this a fair sentence and the punishment proper, since officially we apparently intend to shrug off all complaints about these two individuals because they are not now in solitary confinement, I am forced privately to reopen this subject tonight and tell the rest of the story.

I have a letter signed by Mr. H. Struve Hensel, of the Defense Department, stating that the Department of Defense "does not require a report to Washington on each individual case." That the reports are prepared in a bunch semiannually.

I have a better way of finding out what's happening to our servicemen overseas—from their families. And lest the opposition to this unprecedented treaty which abridges the constitutional rights of Americans hangs too heavily on two privates, may I introduce Mrs. Antonie Pierre, wife of an American serviceman in Japan.

Mrs. Pierre has been indicted by Japanese authorities because her rented house accidentally caught on fire.

This is not a criminal offense under the law of any of the 48 United States. But when our rear admiral wrote to the Japanese authorities, he begged a dismissal of the suit. Then turned right around and said, "Such action as may be taken is, of course, your government's decision fully and completely."

Japan gets the same deal as offered the NATO nations in this matter of jurisdiction over our servicemen.

And Japanese jails are not fit for your worst enemies, much less your sons and husbands.

And in Japan where a case is frequently adjourned from time to time, the defendant stays in that jail even if he's innocent until the verdict comes in.

Corp. Dennis Chaney would know about that. So would Afc. George Thomas Jones.

I want it understood that the case against the NATO Status of Forces Treaty and any similar act of desertion by our Government does not stand solely on the cases of Keefe and Scaletti.

Two privates, Scott and Crews, in a beer hall brawl in Sapporo, Japan, last April 18, haven't been tried yet.

And in Bermuda, Capt. William Powell, of the United States Air Force, has been sentenced to jail for 2 months for "driving without third-party insurance."

Bermuda gets her authority over United States servicemen by virtue of an agreement made by President Franklin Roosevelt without the consent of our Congress.

It's this whole treatymaking authority which should be stepped on and stopped by a constitutional amendment.

So this Captain Powell violates a law which he does not know exists. He gets 2 months, but automatically this means he is court-martialled. He loses all rights as a United States serviceman. He's 5 years away from retirement, but faces instead dismissal from the service with no retirement benefits whatever. And this is the fate of an American, who once was a member of the Connecticut Legislature, was shot down over Germany in the last war, and was imprisoned in the Nazi's notorious dungeons at Buchenwald. And now, after this magnificent record of service to his country, we have let the caprice of a foreign court send him home broke, busted, and disgraced.

Other Americans are being tried in Iceland, where the second largest newspaper is published by the Communists.

But turn this thing around, as it was during World War II when there were foreign servicemen in the United States. And apparently Gen. Walter Bedell Smith of our State Department does not know this, because he says in writing, "It is not conceivable that Congress would deprive our local courts of jurisdiction over a crime committed by a foreign soldier on leave." General Smith, pursuant to a specific act of Congress, all foreign forces stationed in the United States were allowed trial in their own military courts.

Now—and I'm sorry to have to add this—I told you earlier that our Defense Department is not keeping a running check but promises to report on all cases in a bunch semiannually. The Defense Department specifically promised the distinguished Senator, JOHN BRICKER, a copy of this semiannual report. Now, however, they've told him the report is classified "top secret." You and I can't see it. That's real convenient for somebody.

The parents and the taxpayers have no way to know what is happening to American servicemen in foreign courts.

Why has this document been classified top secret? Presumably that classification indicates that it might jeopardize our national security if the document were made public. This is silly, of course, but it certainly might jeopardize somebody's political security if the whole truth were to be known between now and election day so the report was lumped with some other stuff and stamped top secret.

Well, listen Americans, if a Communist court in Yugoslavia should sentence your son to die, our State Department would make no protest. It can't. Because under this infamous document our administration has taken the position that the treaty involves no surrender of American rights under international law. We've therewith surrendered our right of appeal even with those countries with whom we have no NATO agreement. All Tito would have to do is cite the argument that the host country has absolute and unqualified jurisdiction over our forces and since that is our own administration's published argument, we're stuck with it.

If you have any personal knowledge of any American serviceman or his dependent who has been indicted or convicted under the laws of any foreign country, please write immediately to Senator JOHN BRICKER, Senate Office Building, Washington, or write to me and I'll pass it along.

We do not intend to let this matter rest.

They can stamp the Defense Department's report top secret, but they can't prevent some of us from garnering our own facts.

Senator BRICKER has graciously offered to enter this broadcast and a previous one on the subject in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this session. Then perhaps you can pass the ammunition between now and next session.

From the beginning of our Republic down through the Second World War no American soldier serving abroad was ever subject to trial under foreign law in a foreign court. Never.

This sudden callous disregard for the rights of Americans is an unhappy inheritance for our sons.

In the amphitheater behind the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier up there in Arlington overlooking the loveliest city man ever made these words are engraved in the marble overhead: "When we assumed the soldier we did not lay aside the citizen."

We did not lay aside the citizen. See it up there right in front of you, and behind you, all about you in those green hills, white crosses. I think they rest restlessly tonight.

So much for the rest of the story.

The United Nations "Achilles"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 3, 1954

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, if I understand the purpose and objective of the United Nations, it was to have been a cooperative effort on the part of member nations to preserve the peace. If that is true, how can the nations who desire peace so much, tolerate the presence of aggressor nations such as Russia and her satellites? Are we to continue the travesty of maintaining the U. N. as it is now constituted? Will the American taxpayer be called upon to continue in the future the payment of one-third of the operating costs of the U. N.? What we need, Mr. Speaker, is the application of common sense to a problem within the U. N. which is primarily abhorrent to a great majority of American people. Certainly the United States should not rely upon the United Nations as the cornerstone of American foreign policy.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including a pertinent editorial from the Wall Street Journal entitled "Pious Theories," which states the case on this subject better than I can do it:

PIOUS THEORIES

The American Assembly decided the other day that the United States must make the United Nations the cornerstone of its foreign policy, "in fact as well as in pious theory."

Since the members of the assembly—a private group set up to discuss questions of importance to Americans—are distinguished in business, government, labor, and other fields, their words merit consideration. And they do advance some ostensible reasons for insisting on the United Nations as the cornerstone of American foreign policy.

They believe the United Nations can be made a more effective instrument for collective security. In the meantime they think it is an asset for the United States to be in an organization where Soviet cynicism and obstructionism are constantly held up to world view and where the United States, by word and deed, "can rally and unify the free world."

These are commendable, if somewhat misty, aims—however accomplished. They perhaps constitute an argument for the United States to remain in the United Nations as long as that organization makes it morally and practically possible for the United States to do so. But they do not add up to a reason for making the United Nations the cornerstone of American foreign policy.

The cornerstone of a nation's foreign policy, clearly enough, is something on which can be built the means of effectively accomplishing the nation's international objectives. The United Nations by its very nature cannot qualify.

The essential assumption of the United Nations is the cooperation of the great powers in preserving peace. From the beginning the Soviet Union has demonstrated the falsity of that assumption, and the Soviet Union has the power, in the Security Council, to frustrate any United Nations attempt to preserve peace or resist aggression. How can the United States build a foreign policy on an organization whose elementary steps can be thus thwarted?

The United States and some other nations of the non-Communist world long since recognized, if they do not always admit, that they could construct no effective security on this collapsible cornerstone. They sought other means, notably regional alliances. True, these are sanctioned by the United Nations Charter, but it is difficult to reconcile their present status with the spirit of the charter. They, and not the United Nations, have become the cornerstones, and that is not what the men who drafted the charter in 1945 had in mind at all.

The American assembly also recognizes this fact of life; its declaration says the United States must preserve its military strength and alliances—until such time as the United Nations has the power in being to enforce the peace.

Until such time? That is to say, until such time as the Soviets, who define aggression as peace and slavery as democracy, accept our dictionaries and behave accordingly; until such time as they cease to be Soviet Communists. When that millenium arrives, the free world will not have to fear for its security.

But until such time, to talk about the United Nations as the cornerstone of American foreign policy is simply to propagate one more pious theory.

The Reinsurance Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 4, 1954

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following letter to the editor of the Brooklyn Eagle appeared in the August 1, 1954, edition. Mr. Browdy's letter certainly tells the story as to why the House rejected this legislation.

MR. BROWDY HITS IKE'S REINSURANCE BILL

To the EDITOR OF THE EAGLE:

I noted with interest your editorial entitled "Defeat of Health Plan Aids Socialized Medicine."

It occurs to me that you have not read either the hearings before the congressional committees nor have you had the time to read the bill.

There is nothing in the bill which even attempts to socialize medicine as urged by the American Medical Association.

It is hard to understand how anyone can come to the conclusion that defeat of the bill aids the socialization of medicine when the argument was being made that passage of the bill was socialized medicine. Both arguments are fallacious.

The important thing about the bill is that the President's assertion that this bill would furnish medical care to those who otherwise could not afford it, was completely destroyed by the witnesses who testified before the congressional committees. The one thing established by the hearings beyond a peradventure of a doubt, was that this plan would not make available a single dollar of health insurance to any person who could not now afford such insurance. The bill called for nothing more than Government subsidized reinsurance of insurance company risks. The incontrovertible fact is that today any insurable risk is reinsurable, and there are private companies with over $2 billion of assets throughout this country which are reinsuring the very risks sought to be reinsured by this bill.

The insurance companies, stock and mutual, both are anxious to earn premiums writing every type of insurable risk. They control billions and billions of dollars. If the President's plan was at all feasible, they could themselves set up a $25 million reinsurance fund. There can be no reason and no justification for the United States Government setting up a $25 million insurance fund out of taxpayers' money for a business that is strictly private enterprise and which should remain so.

The only public health in the President's plan and in the President's bill was in the title. There wasn't a word or a principle written into the bill that could possibly improve the public health.

It was an insurance bill dealing with the sole purpose of guaranteeing insurance companies against loss. No one who has read the bill, the reports, or the hearings can contend otherwise.

BENJAMIN G. BROWDY.

Mr. Speaker, in this connection I am also pleased to direct the attention of our colleagues to the following letter to the editor of the New York Times, written by Mr. Seymour E. Harris. It appeared in the July 25, 1954, edition of the Times:

SCOPE OF HEALTH PROGRAM—INADEQUACY OF ADMINISTRATION'S BILL HELD REASON FOR HOUSE REJECTION

(The writer of the following letter is professor of economics at Harvard University.)

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

A question has been raised in an editorial in the New York Times and elsewhere: Why did the liberals in Congress vote against the administration's health reinsurance bill in the test House vote?

I believe that the answer lies largely in the unjustifiable claims made for the bill, which liberals just could not swallow. This is aside from the fact that little was revealed concerning the precise effects of the reinsurance programs. If the liberals had accepted this bill, they would have endorsed the view that this bill would make a significant contribution toward the solution of the medical problem which at best would offer very little to the solution of our medical economic problems.

Could Secretary Hobby have been quoted correctly in her recent press interview when she was reported to have said that this bill would make health insurance available to 65 million additional Americans? This is a most absurd and unsupportable claim, if made.

How can anyone believe that a Government loan of $25 million is going to solve the problem of medical organization when our medical bill exceeds $10 billion yearly? Or that this loan will significantly improve private insurance plans that now pay out $1.5 billion yearly? Or provide insurance coverage for 85 percent of medical bills not now covered by insurance, or even a substantial part of the 85 percent?

COSTLESS APPROACH

Then why has the administration come up with this innocuous but not very helpful proposal? (Could President Eisenhower also have been misled by official propaganda, for the reports of his press conference were that he was very much upset by the rejection of the bill by the House and he would continue to fight valiantly?)

I believe the explanation of excessive claims made for the administration's health reinsurance program lies partly in the administration's anxiety to give the people what they want but at no cost to the Treasury. The costless approach has been popular the last 2 years; but what is worth doing is likely to involve monetary sacrifices.

One can understand why the administration did not undertake a campaign for national health insurance, which the American Medical Association, through a well-organized campaign, at least temporarily killed and which the President repudiated. But the Presidential Magnuson Committee early in 1953 had outlined a program for improving medical facilities and expanding private comprehensive insurance; and Senators IVES and FLANDERS had written a bill incorporating most of the important recommendations of the committee. But apparently these Senators pressured to abandon their bill so that S. 3114 and a similar reinsurance bill in the House might go forward.

Any amateur in medical economics knows that what is poltically possible and medically and economically desirable now is a genuine private medical prepayment comprehensive insurance program involving subsidies or grants-in-aid which would make possible a gradual buildup of comprehensive health insurance, now, unfortunately, covering but 3 percent of the population. With it we need a gradual expansion of facilities and personnel required to serve these plans, so that in 10 years we would have a genuine comprehensive private insurance program. The cost (as I suggested in testimony to the Senate committee considering the reinsurance bill) would gradually rise to about $2 billion in 10 years, with State and local governments sharing the costs.

EXPANDING COVERAGE

Is it excessive to put a burden of $100 millions yearly on the Federal Government now and $1 billion in 10 years for subsidizing comprehensive insurance so that coverage might be almost universal, when it is considered that in the current year we could afford tax reductions which may ultimately cost as much as $10 billions a year, when we can expect a rise of more than $100 billions in our annual national product over 10 years and when allowance is made for the billions yearly of additional income likely to result from improved organization of medicine?

What we need now is some help to medical and other health schools, more medical research, subsidies for starting comprehensive programs and assuring entry for all, adequate hospital construction programs, etc. But what we have received in the last 2 years have been cuts all along the line for medicine and much nonsense about what we might expect from the administration's health reinsurance bill, now happily rejected. Is it any wonder that the liberal Congressmen refused to endorse this bill?

SEYMOUR E. HARRIS.

CAMBRIDGE, MASS, *July 22, 1954.*

Blow to the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. MOSS, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 7, 1954

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, many of the people in California—particularly those in the Sacramento Valley who know the importance of multipurpose reclamation projects—are worried by the recent move to prevent the TVA from providing inexpensive power for use by the Atomic Energy Commission.

They are surprised at the directive requiring the Atomic Energy Commission to build a powerplant for a private utility, then buy back the power, at a handsome profit, from the utility. They fear this is an attempt to bypass TVA which could easily provide inexpensive hydroelectric power.

In the Sacramento Valley farmers, electricity customers, businessmen and all others have benefited by the development of the Central Valley project. They are apprehensive that the recent action in connection with TVA may herald a similar move affecting the Central Valley project to the detriment of the welfare of the valley, the State, and the Nation.

In this connection, I call attention to a recent editorial in the Sacramento Bee commenting on the AEC directive. The editorial follows:

BLOW TO THE PEOPLE

Fifty-five Members of the United States Senate have backed President Dwight D. Eisenhower in his directive to the Atomic Energy Commission to enter into an amazing power contract with a privately owned utility in the Tennessee Valley.

In effect the AEC is to build a powerplant for the private company, buy the energy for distribution through the TVA system, even pay the company's taxes on the property, and at the end of 25 years the company is to own the plant outright.

The administration turned down the TVA's request for an appropriation for a new steam plant which could have supplied the power and would have saved the taxpayers, over the life of the contract, between $90 million and $130 million—and the people still would have owned the plant.

By validating this strange and preposterous contract, the 55 Senators became parties to a gigantic giveaway contrary to the best interests of the American people.

No one went on record as disputing the huge estimated savings to the Government from purchasing the power from TVA. Even the AEC itself balked on entering into the contract and the Director of the Budget suggested open bids be called for through which TVA could have submitted its lower offer.

The President's directive was a stab at the heart of TVA which has served as a model throughout the world for regional redevelopment. The Senate vote was the power lobby's greatest triumph.

High Bid for Control of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 3, 1954

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] recently called attention to the huge Republican slush fund of almost $4 million collected for the purpose of electing Republicans to the 84th Congress.

Several newspapers commented on the dangers to free government arising from this cynical attempt to put control of the Government of the United States on the auction block for sale to the highest bidder. I call attention to an editorial on this subject which appeared in the June 5, 1954, edition of the Capital Times, Madison, Wis.:

HIGH BID FOR CONTROL OF CONGRESS

In adjoining columns today the Capital Times reprints from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD some remarks entered into the RECORD by Representative JOHN W. McCORMACK, of Boston, the Democratic whip in the House of Representatives. Representative McCORMACK's remarks were made in connection with his insertion into the RECORD of a portion of a recent "Hello, Wisconsin" broadcast by William T. Evjue, editor and publisher of the Capital Times.

This broadcast concerned the announcement of the finance committee of the Republican National Committee that it would spend almost $4 million to elect Republican Members of Congress this year. Representative McCORMACK points out that this slush fund activity will be far more serious than we realized when we originally called attention to it.

At that time we calculated that the GOP National Committee would spend $10,000 on every candidate for Congress. Representative McCORMACK explains that it will be closer to $30,000. Neither party, he points out, will contribute to hopeless campaigns or to campaigns in districts that are certain. The money of both parties will be concentrated in the close districts, which number between 100 and 120, as against the figure of 435 total Members to be elected. This means, as Representative McCORMACK points out, that the huge Republican slush fund will be divided in such a way that approximately $30,000 will be available for GOP congressional candidates in the close districts.

We repeat what we said in the remarks Representative McCORMACK inserted into the RECORD:

"You may think that $3,800,000 is a lot of money to spend to bring about the election of a Republican Congress. It is chickenfeed, however, as compared with the huge dividends that will be received on this investment by the powerful financial and economic interests that contribute to the Republican campaign kitty."

Isn't It Wonderful—Back to the Spoils System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 5, 1954

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call my colleagues' attention to a very enlightening article dealing with the scuttling of the merit system in Government employment by the Eisenhower administration. The article indicates that the White House itself is involved in this raid on civil-service jobs within the Government.

Certainly the Washington Star cannot be considered a Democratic newspaper. My observation indicates that it has always leaned more the other way. The article to which I refer appeared, however, in the Washington Star of Thursday, August 5, 1954, and was written by their authority on Government affairs, Mr. Joseph Young. Mr. Young has had long years of experience of covering news involving Government agencies and civil-service employees. He is well qualified to present a true and factual picture on this matter.

It would seem to me that the nonpartisan National Civil Service League should show its nonpartisanship and give vigorous support now to the protection of the merit system in Government. It is difficult to explain the reason for the tardiness of this organization in failing to criticize the Eisenhower administration in its effort to return to the spoils system in Government employment.

The White House itself is directly involved in this effort to destroy civil service. Only the adverse publicity given to a White House order prevented a major patronage raid on civil-service jobs. Perhaps a little more adverse publicity will serve to protect the civil-service system from Republican attacks.

REPUBLICANS GAINING CONTROL OF TOP CIVIL SERVICE JOBS

(By Joseph Young)

A White House clique and the Republican National Committee are taking over control of a sizeable number of Federal jobs intended by law to be under the protection of the Civil Service Commission.

The Republican high command's continuous pressure for more Federal job patronage has resulted in the Civil Service Commission yielding on many jobs under the civil-service system. Many of these jobs are in the lower and middle-salary brackets.

Furthermore, agency heads acknowledge that any civil-service job appointment that pays $10,000 a year or more must be cleared with the Republican National Committee. This doesn't necessarily mean the committee's candidate is selected. It means that any candidate selected from the civil-service register must receive the GOP nod before he gets the job.

The White House, during the last few months, has also been getting into the act. Handling much of the patronage is Charles F. Willis, Jr., an assistant to Presidential Assistant Sherman Adams.

Mr. Willis is the one who is reported to have drafted the ill-fated short-lived unsigned memo to agency heads that appointments and promotions to all Federal jobs in grade 14 ($9,600 a year) and above had to be cleared with the Republican National Committee.

Chairman Philip Young, of the Civil Service Commission, who is supposed to be President Eisenhower's representative on Government personnel matters, told the Star he knew nothing about the White House directive regarding political clearance of civil service jobs. Apparently this important policy decision was reached without even consulting Mr. Young or the Civil Service Commission, which has the duty of operating the Government's merit system.

The White House order was withdrawn after the adverse publicity it received. Legal officials also pointed out that the civil service laws expressively prohibit any political consideration in the appointment and promotions to civil service jobs. A new order was issued this week to the effect that only non-civil service jobs in grade 14 and above must be cleared with the Republican high command.

But many career officials feel the damage already has been done. They feel the original order expressed the White House's real intent and that the new and modified order was issued reluctantly. They feel the entire incident has tended to lower morale among career people.

Another device: The Republican high command has not given up in its fight to win control over a sizable bloc of Federal jobs.

Apparently with some success, the GOP politicos are getting jobs for the party faithful among the so-called 303 jobs. There are about 200,000 of these jobs, which are under civil service, but which are filled directly without competitive exams being held. The candidates, however, are supposed to meet minimum civil service standards for the jobs.

The authority to fill the jobs in this manner is given by the Civil Service Commission in cases where there are no current civil service registers, where the jobs are hard to fill or where they are temporary ones. The authorization form is numbered 303, hence the 303 designation.

This type of authorization has long existed and is nothing new. However, the CSC, several weeks ago, put a new wrinkle into the program and this has caused much concern among supporters of the merit system.

The Commission directed each of its 10 regional offices and the 800 agency boards of examiners in the field to send a copy of each authorized job opening to the head of the appropriate department or agency here in Washington.

The Commission says this step was taken to acquaint agency heads with their hiring problems and to have them order their agency boards to hold more exams and thus cut down on this type of appointments.

Commission officials said this was a major step to strengthen the merit system. Yet the move was done in secrecy. No press release was put out on it.

Many feel that the Civil Service Commission's move was taken for just the opposite effect—to supply Federal job information to the Republican National Committee and other GOP patronage sources so these job vacancies can be filled by the party faithful. Reports are that the Civil Service Commission was not too happy about taking this step but that it was pressured into doing so by the Republican high command. Mr. Young denies this.

The Republicans lost no time in taking advantage of the revised "303" order. The New York Republican State Committee printed standard forms for the party faithful, giving details on how to apply for these positions, together with information on current job openings. The applicant turns in this form with his political endorsement, together with his regular job form 57.

An example of the current trend away from merit-system principles can be seen by the attitude of the business-supported nonpartisan National Civil Service League. The league, during the last 20 months, has taken a wait-and-see attitude, preferring to give the administration a chance to adjust itself regarding patronage problems and the civil service.

But officials of the 75-year-old league say the present situation is very bad, and they disclose that their organization, within the next week, will sharply criticize the administration and demand that true merit principles be restored in Government.

Justice and Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 6, 1954

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the Record a number of resolutions on justice and peace adopted by the Central Conference of American Rabbis at its 65th annual convention on June 22–27 at Pike, N. H.

These resolutions were adopted on the recommendation of a commission of justice and peace established by the conference, following a workshop on social action held as part of the conference.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Central Conference of American Rabbis, apprehensive that in our quest for national security, our basic American freedoms are being jeopardized, urgently commends the following resolutions to the people of the United States:

1. We applaud those religious leaders of all faiths as well as those university teachers and administrators who have courageously resisted the pressures toward conformity which threaten our freedom. We recommend a convocation of distinguished religious leaders who will apply the ethical insights of Judaism and Christianity to the problems confronting us. We urge the Central Conference of American Rabbis and the Joint Commission on Social Action to encourage the calling of such a convocation as soon as possible. We also recommend to our colleagues that wherever possible on the local level they cooperate with liberal religious leaders of all faiths by setting aside one weekend on which all liberal pulpits will be devoted to the flagrant abuse of moral principles on the part of many who presume to be protecting American democracy.

2. We deplore as a great danger to our free institutions the encroachment of one branch of government on the prerogatives of another. We believe that only the judiciary has a right to determine the innocence or guilt of any individual and that congressional committees properly possess the power of investigation only for the purposes of legislation. We hold that in conducting such hearings these committees must scrupulously abide by the following measures intended to preserve the rights of the individual:

(a) One-man investigating committees should be prohibited. All phases of an investigation, including the authorization of subsidiary inquiries, the hiring of staff, the scheduling of hearings, the subpenaing of witnesses and the releasing of public statements and reports, should represent the considered judgment of the majority of the committee. Sworn testimony should be taken only in the presence of at least two members of a committee.

(b) To insure full deliberation, all members of investigating committees should receive due notice of meetings and other committee action. Adequate provision should be made for minority reports.

(c) Material reflecting adversely upon persons living or dead should not be made public before an opportunity has been afforded such persons or their representatives to refute derogatory or defamatory statements. Rebuttal testimony should be released simultaneously with publication of such material. We are shocked at the irresponsible attacks of demagogues on such religious leaders as John Haynes Holmes and the late Rabbis Stephen Wise and Judah Magnes and insist that adequate safeguards must be adopted to prevent such abuses in the future.

(d) Persons or organizations against whom charges are made in public hearings should be afforded an opportunity to present their side of the case publicly as soon as possible after the making of the charge and in circumstances as public as those in which the charge was made. This opportunity should include the right to cross-examine witnesses for a reasonable time.

(e) Material in the files of an investigating committee, not previously released by the committee in the form of an official report, should be kept confidential and made available only to Federal investigative agencies for their official purposes.

(f) Committee members or employees should not issue any public evaluation of a person under investigation until the inquiry relating to such person has been completed and a committee report thereon adopted.

(g) No hearing of a legislative investigating committee should be photographed, televised, broadcast or recorded for radio over a witness' objection.

(h) The Rules Committee of each House of Congress should be empowered to receive and investigate complaints of abuses of congressional investigating committees and to report its findings and recommendations to the Congress.

3. While we recognize that the hysteria commonly known as McCarthyism goes beyond the evil of any one individual, yet because Senator McCarthy himself has become the most flagrant and immoral symbol of McCarthyism, we believe it essential to strip him of his committee chairmanships.

4. No free society can long survive if its citizens are encouraged or permitted to inform indiscriminately on one another. By creating an atmosphere of suspicion and fear, such informing inevitably becomes a vestibule to the police state. The repeated use of professional informers, motivated either by personal grudges or psychopathic needs of their own, destroys the morale of Government officials and the confidence of the people.

5. The fifth amendment is an integral part of those civil liberties guaranteed to the American people by their Constitution. Like all freedoms, it can be abused. The abuse of freedom, however, must never be accepted as an excuse for abrogating it. It must never be assumed that one who invokes the fifth amendment is necessarily guilty of crime. The phrase "fifth-amendment Communist" is a vicious and unjustified perversion of a law intended as a basic guaranty of American freedom. We look hopefully for further court tests resulting ultimately in a Supreme Court decision which would reaffirm the intent of the fifth amendment as envisioned by our Founding Fathers.

6. Teachers and clergymen who are especially concerned with the moral and ethical principles on which our democracy is founded have a special responsibility for the preservation of those principles. We are heartened by the number of our own colleagues who have courageously brought the message of prophetic Judiasm to bear on the problems of contemporary society, and we urge this conference, as well as the Union of American Hebrew Congregations, to uphold and encourage these men.

7. However important the pronouncements of this conference may be, the acid test of of our effectiveness in the field of social action will be the extent of activity in this area wtihin our congregations. We are heartened by the increasing number of congregations which have established social action committees under the dynamic leadership of Dr. Maurice Eisendrath, president of our union; Mr. I. Cyrus Gordon, chairman of the Joint Social Action Commission; Rabbi Eugene Lipman; and Mr. Albert Vorspan, director and secretary of that commission. We are convinced that the activity of the Joint Social Action Commission can continue successfully only if both the Union of American Hebrew Congregations and the Central Conference of American Rabbis meet their full share of financial responsibility. We, therefore, emphatically urge the executive board of the Central Conference of American Rabbis to appropriate the full sum requested by the Joint Social

Action Commission as our share of its budget for the coming year.

In accordance with the recommendation as contained within the president's message of this conference rejecting the compulsory imposition by Government of an oath of loyalty to men and women who administer religious institutions, be it resolved that no political loyalty oath be imposed by our congregations upon those who seek affiliation with them.

8. We heartily recommend the cooperation and leadership of our colleagues in establishing social action committees in their congregations. Toward that end we recommend generous use of the publication Social Action in Review in the columns of our temple bulletins, regular pulpit messages in this area, and emphasis on social action in regional conferences or conventions of the Central Conference of American Rabbis and the Union of American Hebrew Congregations. We also request our colleagues to maintain regular liaison with the Joint Social Action Commission, reporting their progress as well as their reactions to the work of the commission.

Brooklyn's Negroes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 5, 1954

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to direct the attention of our colleagues to the following very interesting articles on the progress of our Negro citizens in Brooklyn.

These articles are part of a series, which began in the Brooklyn Eagle of July 25, 1954. The following article is the tenth in this series and appeared in the Eagle of August 3, 1954:

Families of Negroes Live Amicably with White Neighbors

(By Sid Frigand)

(Tenth in a series)

Prominence, by its own definition, cannot come to all Negroes—let alone all persons—in any one community.

We have read about many prominent Negroes living in Brooklyn and perhaps know of others who seek prominence. But the rank-and-file Negro Brooklynites seek the very antithesis of prominence—they just want to be rank-and-file Brooklynites.

The desire to live inconspicuously, a seemingly unpretentious ambition, has proved elusive goal for many Negroes in the past; but today, scattered in various sections of the borough are hardly little bands of ambassadors living in so-called white neighborhoods in happy anonymity.

One of the heretofore unheralded Negro families that has crossed the boundaries of segregation lives in the shadow of Ebbets Field,, at Carroll Street, between Franklin and Bedford. The Lawrence family moved in 2 years ago expecting the worst—and were happily disappointed.

Geoffrey Lawrence is a good-looking, brawny man who looks like a cop, but is, in reality, a clerk in a supermarket in Flushing. He confided, however, that he wanted to be on the force, but gave up the idea when steady work with the grocery chain came his way.

Lawrence and his brother-in-law, James B. Farley, purchased the brick, attached house on Carroll Street in May 1952. They bought the house in an all-white neighborhood not for any other reason than it was a house they liked and cost less than a comparable dwelling in a Negro neighborhood.

Lawrence's wife, Girlena, who is a registered nurse at Israel Zion Hospital, recalled that many of her friends advised her to walk into her house with her head high and ignore everything and everyone on the block.

"You're going to be resented anyhow," Mrs. Lawrence quoted her friends, "so ignore them in the first place."

"I'm just not cut out to ignore people," Mrs. Lawrence said with a winning grin, "so we moved in that day with smiles on our faces, and we've never had any trouble at all."

"Can you imagine our surprise," she added, "when the day we moved in Mrs. Cooper next door (at 1011 Carroll Street) invited us in for coffee."

Since that day the novelty of a Negro neighbor has worn to a point where the Lawrences and the Farleys are just two more families on the block.

Mrs. Lawrence now is called upon to mind a neighbor's child, and doesn't hesitate to ask a neighbor to look after her 2-year-old son, Geoffrey, Jr.

Mrs. Farley's 5½-year-old daughter plays with the kids on the block and is taken to school each morning by her friend's mother.

The Lawrences and the Farleys are not isolated examples; all over Brooklyn similar experiences are unfolding, much to the amazement of both Negroes and whites.

In the past the greatest factor in souring these pleasant relationships has been the myth—created through misunderstanding and exploited by avaricious real-estate speculators—that Negroes living on a block cause realty values to drop.

Noticeable progress has been made in combatting this myth in the very section of Crown Heights where the Lawrences live. An organization, the Crown Heights Owners Association, has been active in allaying fears of homeowners and, at the same time, urging legislation to prevent conversion of 1- and 2-family houses into multiple dwellings or rooming houses. The latter is usually the fate of a neighborhood that panics when a Negro family moves in.

Special Sessions Justice Myles A. Paige, chairman of the board of directors of the Brooklyn branch of the NAACP, has been a vigorous campaigner in helping to educate homeowners.

Judge Paige said he has seen gratifying results—he and his family live at 1294 Carroll Street—through the work of organizations like the Crown Heights Owners Association.

Another group that has worked out the problems of the community with a large measure of success is the Community Association of Districts 25 and 27.

The association, made up of school authorities, parent-teacher groups, and other interested residents, has worked diligently to instill interracial harmony among school children, as well as their parents.

Judge Paige has taken up the chore of speaking to PTA groups, taxpayers organizations, and other interested groups about the appearance of Negro neighbors in Crown Heights.

"Negro and white speculators have stirred up trouble," Judge Paige asserted, "when they come around telling homeowners to sell out because the 'neighborhood is changing.'

"It is especially painful," he added, "to see Negro brokers carrying on these projects; they're doing a disservice to their race and to the community.

"You can't keep running away," the judge tells the homeowners. "These are your homes; stay put, live in them, enjoy them. All you know about your new neighbors is what you fear—give them a chance, they'll probably be as good or better neighbors than the family they're succeeding."

Mrs. Hortense Gabel, director of the State committee on discrimination in housing, described the Crown Heights section as one of the most important proving grounds of Negro integration in the Nation.

Sociologists, housing experts, and city planners are watching the section with interest. Here, for the first time, Negroes are moving into a white neighborhood where the buildings are not showing signs of decay, nor are the homeowners anxious or panicky.

"We are holding our breath," Mrs. Gabel declared, "while we watch the developments in Crown Heights. The results there could well pave the way for the rest of the country."

Mr. Speaker, the following article is the 11th in this series. It appeared in the Brooklyn Eagle of August 4, 1954:

Does "Jim Crow" Plague Borough Schools?—Two Leaders Offer Differing Opinions

(By Sid Frigand)

(Eleventh in a series)

Recently a great deal of attention has been focused upon the public schools of Harlem and Bedford-Stuyvesant, where, it has been charged, segregated schooling exists.

The National Educational Association has been invited by the board of education to study the question and report whether the allegations of "Jim Crow" schools stand up.

The findings of the association notwithstanding, it must be assumed that the school situation in Bedford-Stuyvesant can only be an offshoot of the housing situation which finds large groups of Negroes living in one area.

Whether Negroes live in Bedford-Stuyvesant through choice or restriction is a point of argument among many. The Urban League and the NAACP, for example, feel that there would be greater dispersal and integration if the restrictive housing barriers were lifted.

On the other hand, responsible Negroes such as Assistant Superintendent of Schools John B. King, feel that Bedford-Stuyvesant is a product of concentration and not segregation.

Superintendent King, in charge of districts 26 and 28, argued that schools in Bedford-Stuyvesant have large Negro student bodies just like schools in other neighborhoods have almost all-Jewish or all-Italian student bodies.

THEY LIKE TO LIVE THERE

"Negroes live in Bedford-Stuyvesant because they like to live among their own people," Mr. King declared, "just as other groups of people choose to live with each other."

Nathan Burnett, director of the Brooklyn Urban League, agreed that Negroes, like any other group, feel more comfortable living among people of their own socioeconomic backgrounds. There were, however, evils existing in Bedford-Stuyvesant schools, he charged, that do not exist in other neighborhood schools.

"Children in Bedford-Stuyvesant schools," he said, "come from families whose incomes are far lower than the average for Brooklyn.

"Poverty makes way for family insecurity," he continued, "and that in turn produces problem children."

Mr. Burnett maintained that many teachers are content to avoid problem children, and therefore avoid Bedford-Stuyvesant like the plague. The result, he said, is a situation where veteran teachers with tenure transfer from the schools in Bedford-Stuyvesant, leaving the schools there staffed by teachers with less experience and decidedly less enthusiasm.

CITES SON'S EXPERIENCE

As an example, the young urban league director cited the experience of his own son, who had 5 different teachers in 5 months during the past term.

There are growing complaints, he added, that schoolteachers and even principals have lower standards for the Negro students. For some reason they don't expect as much from the Negro child and do not explore his full potentials as a student.

Mr. Burnett added that another problem stemmed from apathetic parents in the lower economy areas of Bedford-Stuyvesant. The lack of PTA pressures can breed indifference in the school staff, he asserted, and paves the way for schooling that covers the ground and cultivates nothing.

As a net result, the Negro child with average intelligence enters schools of higher learning less equipped than the average child who is the product of a more stable school environment.

"This bolsters the myth of superiority among his white schoolmates, as well as his own feelings of inferiority," Mr. Burnett declared.

John King, whose 27 years in the school system qualifies him as a veteran observer, said many of these charges are contrary to the fact.

DISPUTED BY KING

Citing his own career as principal of public school 70 in the Bedford-Stuyvesant section, Mr. King found his teacher turnover to be very slight and the PTA very interested.

The trim-mustached educator recalled how the parents in his school dedicated themselves to raise funds, clothing, and food for the underprivileged children in the school.

As for the teachers, he said "there's a shop teacher I know at public school 26 who best sums up their attitude. He's been teaching at that school for 25 years, and commutes daily from his home quite a distance away.

"When I asked him why he didn't put in for a transfer he replied, 'What's the difference, kids are kids all over'."

Mr. King, himself, is a product of Bedford-Stuyvesant. He now lives on East 49th Street, between Avenues J and K, in the East Flatbush section—which he cited as an example of Negroes not being obliged to live in Bedford-Stuyvesant.

His kid brother, Dolly King, distinguished himself in the athletic world of 15 years ago as one of Long Island University's greatest all-around athletes.

"I think Dolly and I are both convinced that it is a privilege to be a member of a minority," the educator declared. "There's a satisfaction derived from getting somewhere that others can't possibly enjoy.

"To be born rich is a strike against you."

Mr. Speaker, the following article is the 12th in this series. It appeared in the Brooklyn Eagle of August 5, 1954:

Negroes Gain in Battle Against Disease—Hampered by Crowded Living Quarters

(By Sid Frigand)

(Twelfth in a series)

Take 311,000 persons and cram them into 4 square miles, and you're going to have a health and sanitation problem. Take into consideration that most of the persons have low incomes and live in substandard housing, and your problem multiplies many times over.

The teeming area just described is the Bedford health district, whose staff has the herculean task of insuring reasonable health conditions in the Bedford-Stuyvesant section.

Headquarters for this gigantic operation is located in an unpretentious walkup office on Fulton Street, overlooking the marquee of a local movie house. In January, however, the new base of operations will be a spanking new million-dollar structure at Madison Street and Throop Avenue.

Despite current lack of space and facilities, the Bedford health district managed to service 137,483 persons during 1953. At the helm of this vast operation are Margaret Reed, executive secretary of the Bedford health committee, and Dr. Jacob Glaubach, district health officer.

Miss Reed, who received her training at the University of Michigan's School of Public Health through a United States Public Health Service fellowship at Columbia University, is another typical example of young Negroes working to improve living conditions in the Brooklyn community.

For the last 6 years Miss Reed has worked diligently—sometimes around the clock—to organize, instruct, lecture, and otherwise carry her health message to the residents of the Bedford district.

The energetic woman is well aware that she faces apathy among large numbers of the population; and so she works on the theory that if they won't come to her for help, she will go to them.

It is not uncommon, therefore, to see Miss Reed march into a bar and grill or a poolroom and make provisions to show films to the elbow benders and cue chalkers on personal hygiene or control of disease.

Through parent-teacher groups, church organizations, and the schools these same messages are constantly being filtered to the public. As a result Miss Reed can point with pride to notable successes in the last few years.

The two greatest menaces in Bedford-Stuyvesant, according to health department statistics, are tuberculosis and infant mortality. In both cases great progress has been made in arresting the factors leading to these killers.

"Since March 1," Miss Reed said proudly, "more than 6,400 chest X-rays have been taken in the Bedford district by a mobile unit of the Brooklyn Tuberculosis & Health Association.

"Since 1950 we have been running a maternity clinic as well, providing prenatal care for mothers—including diet conferences, physical checkups, and psychiatric guidance for those with emotional problems."

The maternity clinics, located at several hospitals, are not overcrowded, Miss Reed explained, perhaps because Bedford-Stuyvesant is not close to any hospital and expectant mothers find it difficult to travel for care each week—especially when their finances are low and there are other children to look after.

The cry for a new hospital to service Bedford-Stuyvesant has been taken up by almost every responsible agency in the area, but as yet the procrastinating city fathers have not reached any decision about the pressing need.

Organized pressure for a hospital has stemmed from several sources, but the drive lacks coordination, unfortunately, because of political and ideological overtones. One group distrusts the motives or the politics of the other and shies away; another group suspects that radical elements have taken charge of the drive and drops its support of the hospital plan out of fear of leftwing onus.

Special Sessions Justice Myles A. Paige, a member of the City Hospital council, has been active in the infighting for a hospital. "We don't want a segregated Bedford-Stuyvesant Hospital," he explained, "all we want is a hospital close enough to Bedford-Stuyvesant to serve all the people in that area."

Dr. Glaubach, the district health officer in that section, said that the constant discovery of new drugs has relieved the pressure on the hospitals as far as tuberculosis was concerned.

"This creates a new problem, however," he explained, "in that there is a need for more control and surveillance as the death rate from tuberculosis drops and more and more TB victims leave hospital beds for home. This will create a big welfare and nursing problem that only additional personnel can solve."

"Our main efforts," the doctor continued, "are being turned toward the children of the community. They are most important because here we can practice preventive medicine."

With the full cooperation of the schools, the health department has been able to keep careful checks on the youngsters in the community and jump in when any trouble arises.

"One of the jewels in our crown," Dr. Glaubach added poetically, "is our wonderful bureau for handicapped children."

There was no hesitation on the part of Miss Reed or the doctor to name the largest single problem facing the people in their health district—housing.

To point up how desperate conditions are in some sections north of Atlantic Avenue, Miss Reed cited a recent report by a visiting nurse, who found her patient—with an active case of tuberculosis—living in 2 rooms with 14 other persons.

"Solve the housing problem," she said, "and you'll solve the health problem, too."

Grassroots Educational Program on Legislative Issues

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 6, 1954

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, in a recent issue of the monthly publication of the International Association of Machinists, there appeared a very interesting article about a grassroots educational program on legislative issues being conducted by District Lodge, No. 137, of the Machinists Union, which I am proud to say is established in Watertown, N. Y.

I ask unanimous consent that this article, Brushfire at the Grassroots, written by Mr. Christopher Lake, in the August issue of the Machinists Monthly Journal, be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Brush Fire at the Grassroots

(By Christopher Lake)

It gets mighty cold up in Watertown, N. Y. According to the United States Weather Bureau, the average mean temperature of January in Watertown is 21.3. And the mercury drops much lower—down to 39 below sometimes. But cold as the winter weather is, it is no colder than the attitude of Watertown machinists toward political action. Until last year that is, for early in 1953 something happened which pulled the members of IAM district 137 out of their lethargy and sparked a legislative activity which put the district on the map so far as their representatives down in Albany and Washington are concerned.

LOCAL IAM LONG ACTIVE CIVICALLY

Watertown is a city of some 34,000 people in roughly the north central part of New York State. It is 22 miles due south of the famed Thousand Islands, and 45 miles southwest of the Adirondacks. A good location, despite the winter's cold, and especially during the summer months.

But Watertown has been blessed by man as well as nature. And the two working together have made the city a progressive industrial center. The city was incorporated in 1800 and named after the water power which has been used since 1802. In the course of its history, Watertown has been the scene of some events which changed the face of America.

In 1847, for example, the first portable steam engine in the United States was made in Watertown. And 31 years later a young clerk in Moore & Smith's store conceived the idea of setting up special counters for goods priced at 5 and 10 cents. The clerk's name was F. W. Woolworth, and his idea was a milestone in the history of retail merchandising.

From a civic viewpoint, Watertown has been progressive. The voters installed the city manager form of government in 1920. The public parks are extensive and cover playgrounds for the children, a public golf course, athletic fields and swimming pools. There's a municipal airport, too. And the public library, named after a former Watertown boy who became governor of the Empire State, is rated high. In 1927 the city opened a municipal hydroelectric plant, which may make it suspect of creeping socialism in some quarters, but certainly not in the minds of the solid conservatives who live and vote there and who merely wanted ample power at reasonable rates.

Watertown's industries are many and varied, covering papermaking machinery, railroad air brakes, paper, fabrics, knitted garments, women's dresses, electrical machinery, flour and breakfast foods, thermometers and optical goods.

It's the kind of industrial center in which you would expect to find machinists, and you would not be disappointed. IAM district 137, made up of 6 local lodges—355, 761, and 1918 in Watertown, and 1009, 1766, and 1797 in the neighboring cities of Deferiet, Carthage, and Clayton, respectively—has a membership of some 1,600. But until a year ago, the membership was asleep at the political and legislative switch.

Not that the members of district 137 were not alert and active in the community. Their community relations and participation programs could serve as models for other unions. The district has for some time been represented in such worthwhile community agencies as the Community Chest, Council of Social Agencies, Red Cross, Salvation Army, and National Safety Council. The Watertown Chamber of Commerce has several representatives from organized labor, including district 137, one of whom is in charge of the chamber's industrial development committee.

Such notable associations did not just happen. As Clarence Rice, president of district 137 put it recently: "This recognition and representation did not come easily. We had to work for it." And Business Representative John Wood nodded in agreement.

JUST COMING TO LIFE POLITICALLY

But, when it came to politics, well, after all the machinists were part and parcel of Watertown, and politically speaking, Watertown is solidly conservative. Conservatism is a tradition in the community and tradition is very hard to break.

Back in 1948, after the enactment of the Taft-Hartley law had convinced organized labor in general that political action was essential to preserve and protect hard-won gains on the economic front, district 137 made an effort to go along. But it was no use.

The officers of the district, from the vantage point of experience, sum it up this way:

"Our membership was very resistant to any attempt to develop a political-action program.

"To them it was an effort to change their traditional voting habits.

"This they naturally resisted. When the subject was brought up in lodge meetings, they clammed up and froze."

As a result of the district's approach and the members' attitude, Watertown machinists didn't really support political activity. The most that was collected for political action from among them in any year from 1938 through 1952 was $80.

This is how the officers of the district analyze their initial attempt:

"The money came hard because our first approach was wrong. We took too much for granted. As a result we failed.

"The membership was not yet ready for politics. To them the word smacked of doubledealing, doublecrossing, unsavory characters, and dirty politics. They wanted no part of it. Their political beliefs were as personal to them as their religion. These things they did not discuss with outsiders."

That is a healthy attitude. Most machinists and most Americans have it. They do not want to be ordered about. Not in public life; that is why we have a democratic form of government. Not in economic life; that is why we have unions. And not in their selection of public officials.

Yet the fact remains, as Robert Hansen, president of the New York State Council of Machinists put it, that "Our legislative negotiations are just as important to our membership as our wage negotiations."

Note the word political was not mentioned by Brother Hansen. The word is legislative. And properly so, for the interest of workers in government is to be sure that their rights to organize and negotiate are protected, rather than denied or curtailed, by law and that their successes at the bargaining table are not offset by restrictive legislation.

"Our legislative negotiations are just as important to our membership as wage negotiations." That sums it up. That puts the finger on the primary issue, that the proper interest of a union is not politics for the sake of politics, but the gaining of sound social and labor legislation.

In their previous preoccupation with political objectives, the district leaders had failed to make this clear to the membership. And failing to discern the relationship between politics and legislation, the membership had rebelled. By placing the subjects in their proper perspective the district has turned 5 years of dismal failure into a solid foundation for future success.

Realizing the fundamental error of the old approach, the officials of district 137 decided to pitch their future efforts on legislative rather than political action.

They went to the New York State Council of Machinists, outlined their problem, and sought advice and assistance. The council listened to their story then made its secretary-treasurer, Harold Fitzgibbon, available to attend a meeting in Watertown.

Plans for the meeting were carefully prepared. The meeting was announced as an open meeting of all lodges affiliated with the district, to hear Fitzgibbon report on legislation and on the problems faced by the IAM on the legislative front in Albany and Washington.

The president of each affiliated local lodge made a special effort to extend a personal invitation to all the men and women in his organization who had indicated an interest in legislation, and asked them to agree to devote time and effort to legislative affairs if a worthwhile program were developed.

In this way the district and local lodges assured a successful launching of the new program. The first meeting was well attended. Those in attendance were alert to the subject under discussion. Their existing interest was fired by new-found information. They carried their informed interest back to their fellow machinists in the shops and plants, and helped distribute legislative reports put out by the district and the State council.

"Most amazing to all the local and district lodge officers," reports Business Representative Wood, "has been the interest we have been able to stimulate and to maintain. We have a legislative committee which actually works and studies and has become expert in the various areas of legislation to which they have been assigned."

Expert is the word of district 137's legislative committee.

Last winter the committee had a meeting with the State senator from the Watertown district. A conservative by nature and as a representative of a like-minded population, the senator was not known as a friend of labor. And, politically speaking, he owed nothing to labor, for he had not been elected with labor's support.

Yet, he was so impressed with the legislative committee of IAM district 137 that he agreed to cooperate with it on measures in which the machinists were interested.

"This represented quite an advance for us," Business Agent Wood reports. "Our people on the committee made an impression on the senator. They were competent to speak. They had spent as much as 3 or 4 days in studying the various measures, such as unemployment compensation, which had been assigned to them."

The legislative committee is large, but that is an asset. Its very size helps maintain the interest and enthusiasm of more members, and makes possible a useful division of work among them.

This is how the committee works, in the words of the district and local lodge officials:

"Our local lodges appoint our regular delegates to the district council. To these delegates we have added 5 to 10 additional delegates on legislation. Collectively the latter group comprises the district legislative committee.

"Originally we planned to hold the legislative committee meeting on a night other than our regular meeting night. However, there are a limited number of nights in the week so we decided to hold both meetings on the same night. We hold the legislative committee meeting first for the convenience of that committee in case members wish to leave at the end of their session. However, we have found that their interest carries over and the legislative committee members stay on for the regular district meeting.

"The State council's legislative bulletin is issued twice monthly. We put it out for all members of the legislative committee and all officers of the district. The state secretary sends us 75 copies each time so we don't have to reproduce it locally. However, we do have a mimograph machine and a secretary who is kept busy getting out supplemental materials.

"We have various members of the committee study different portions of the bills in which they are interested. We may have as many as 15 or 20 members study 1 bill, each taking a specific section and analyzing it. In that way we get a very intelligent and penetrating analysis of legislation which sometimes appears to be purposely complicated."

Well, that's the way they worked in Watertown, N. Y., to turn a deep ingrained dislike of political action into a burning enthusiasm for legislative action, which, after all, is the end of labor's interest in politics.

What the final results will be no one can yet tell. But there have been results already. The interest and respect of a formerly unfriendly State senator for the viewpoint of district 137 is one important result. Then there is the fact that in the first year of the new program, membership contributions were more than 12 times higher than in any previous year.

There have been other results which have little to do with the legislative program but which have served to make the district's membership more alive and alert to the regular problems of unionism. Legislative committee members have swelled attendance at district lodge meetings to such an extent that the meetings have been moved to new and larger quarters. And this broader interest and participation means a stronger, better informed union.

The machinists in and about Watertown have made a good start. What happens from now on depends upon their sustained enthusiasm for the worthwhile objectives they have set up. If they persist, they, and organized labor throughout New York State, will benefit in terms of improved legislation and more friendly legislators.

Editorial Tribute to Hon. George A. Smathers, of Florida

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SPESSARD L. HOLLAND

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 6, 1954

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very interesting editorial which pays a well-deserved tribute to my distinguished colleague the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS]. It was published in the Latin-language newspaper, the Americas Daily, of Miami, Fla., on August 6, 1954. This newspaper has an English sheet, so that the particular editorial to which I refer is in the English language.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A CONGRESSMAN WHO HAS CONTRIBUTED POSITIVELY TO HEMISPHERIC UNITY

Several days back this paper published an editorial in connection with a Congressman whose influence on the cause of inter-Americanism has been, to say the least, negative. The gentleman we had in mind at the time is one of West Virginia's Representatives in Washington who addressed appeals to both the President of the United States and the chief executive of the Export-Import Bank in an effort to secure unfavorable action on a request by Brazil for a $37 million loan which would be used to expand that country's steel industry. The Congressman from West Virginia said that any expansion in Brazilian steel output would directly curtail steel production in West Virginia and would harm that State economically.

Consistent with our policy of advocating the cause of genuine inter-Americanism as is to be found in the existence or close cooperation among the various hemispheric nations, we pointed out that if the United States were to predicate its inter-American policies on a dollars and cents basis alone, this could produce most unfortunate consequences.

Today, however, we are happy to note that there are others in the halls of Congress who have a true appreciation of the worth of Latin American friendship.

Last week, Senator GEORGE SMATHERS, of Florida, a man who has unflinchingly labored in behalf of strong inter-American solidarity, made a stirring address on the floor of the Senate, telling his colleagues, who at the time were considering the foreign-aid bill, that the appropriation for technical aid in the Latin American area should be increased.

In response to the feelings of his home State toward the need for closer relations with Latin America, Senator SMATHERS persuaded the upper house of Congress to raise by $10 million the value of technical aid meant for Latin America.

Senator SMATHERS is only one of a number of Florida Congressmen who have spoken ably and convincingly on behalf of close ties with Latin America. The speech which the Senator delivered to substantiate his request evidently swayed his audience, for the final, favorable vote on the amendment introduced by Senator SMATHERS was recorded as 82 to 2.

The success of GEORGE SMATHERS' activity is but another in a long line of contributions to the cause of inter-American unity which have been made by citizens of Florida, a State which has so many historic ties linking it to the nations of Latin America.

That same success gives reason for optimism and hope on the part of those of us who are anticipating the day when the Inter-American Trade and Cultural Center in Miami will become a palpable reality and an instrument for tightening bonds of friendship and understanding between the United States and Latin America. And closer relations in the fields of cultural and commercial activities will mean closer political relations as well.

This paper is happy to join in congratulating Senator SMATHERS on the success of his amendment to the foreign aid bill. We are sure that his efforts directed toward a strong hemisphere have not been in vain and that they have effectively contributed to the security of this hemisphere.

The Forgotten Factor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 29, 1954

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the question is, Do we learn anything that we can use with profit if we discover a possible forgotten factor in the conduct of nations to forestall military operations when they threaten?

Does the factor of strategy play any role in the minds of the people to help them understand the conduct of nations? Not to excuse the conduct of nations, but to understand why nations have behaved as they have, and are likely to behave as they have unless more overriding forces come into play.

Specifically, can we discover the precise factor that triggered the action that shot Chinese troops into North Korea, across the Yalu, twice in 56 years, once in 1894 and again in the fall of 1950?

And would knowledge and use of this factor have guaranteed the unification of Korea when U. N. forces pursued the aggressor above the 38th parallel to the Yalu?

Victory in the military unification of Korea slipped from the hands of the United Nations in November of 1950 when the Chinese launched their surprise attack in the Chosen reservoir area.

Need the attack have been a surprise had the element of strategy, Chinese strategy, weighed more heavily in U. N. plans above the parallel?

Perhaps the action of the Chinese in 1894 can provide a clue that seems to have been overlooked in the fall of 1950 when the U. N. decided to pursue the aggressor above the parallel to the Yalu.

In 1894, there were no Reds in power in China or in Russia. The czar ruled Russia. In 1894, when 10,000 Japanese troops landed in South Korea and moved northward toward Seoul, 30,000 Chinese troops were promptly dispatched across the Yalu to blunt the Japanese thrust. Russia sat on the sidelines and watched the fight. Did China consider North Korea to be as strategically vital to her as we consider a friendly Guatemala or a friendly Mexico is to us? Did she feel that unless the Japanese were stopped below the Chosin, they would spill over the Yalu into the plains toward Mukden as they did 10 years later, when five Japanese armies whipped the Russians on the plains of Mukden in 1904? And as the Japanese spilled across the Yalu in September 1931 when they touched off the Sino-Japanese war at Marco Polo Bridge?

In 1894, when the Chinese dispatched 30,000 troops across the Yalu into North Korea were they playing "heads up" ball, as they saw it? The next 40 years seems to say they did if preventing suffering to their interests is a yardstick.

In 1950, when the North Koreans held the United Nations in the Pusan pocket, it is reasonable to assume that Chinese forces were still on the China side of the Yalu.

However, is it not reasonable to assume that as soon as United Nations forces broke the back of the North Korean attack on the Pusan pocket by landing at Inchon, and liberating Seoul, that the Chinese, as they did in 1894, started their troops south across the Yalu? So, that as General MacArthur was turning the capital over the Syngman Rhee on October 2, 1950, the Chinese were even then slithering their way down the finger ridges toward the Chosen, in the middle of North Korea.

History says they were. Strategy says they would. Events proved they did.

Forgotten factor? Strategic considerations? "Isms"? They can get you mad. But when the chips are down, as they were in Korea, they can turn out to be the flag and not the matador, especially in foreign affairs; no?

Highways and Skyways Ahead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 3, 1954

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, some comedians are semiseriously suggesting that by the time we complete the road-building program, we should have to meet our automobile needs, highways may be obsolete and our people will be using skyways instead. This view may be prompted by the slowness with which our highway needs are being met in many parts of the country today. Two-lane roads which were constructed more than 30 years ago are still in use, sometimes as main traffic arteries between large communities. Turnpike construction, speeded up in many parts of the country, is still available in only relatively few areas by contrast with increasing traffic demands.

President Eisenhower's proposal that the Nation ought to plan on a $50 billion highway development in the next 10 years is realistic approach with everything to commend it. From the viewpoint of civilian traffic, every motorist understands the personal satisfaction of traveling safely and reasonably rapidly over six-lane highways, and the frustration of crawling home at peak hours over incredibly slow-moving clotted roads. This factor is only one element of the total picture. Military needs, preparation for any eventuality, certainly dictate prompt action and the expansion of cities into suburban areas which has been proceeding at an amazing rate everywhere makes the job mandatory. Americans like to do what has to be done quickly and efficiently. Now is the time for highways. Skyways will take care of themselves a little later.

Historic Boundaries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 3, 1954

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, there seems to have arisen some dispute as to the meaning of historic boundaries in connection with the submerged lands offshore from our coasts, and with particular reference to the three marine leagues phraseology contained in Public Law 31 of the 83d Congress, 1st session.

The Board of Harbor Commissioners of the Port of Long Beach, on July 29, 1954, made an expression in this connection which I believe is important in this connection. The expression, in the form of a resolution, is as follows:

"Resolution HD-552

"Resolution of the Board of Harbor Commissioners of the City of Long Beach expressing its vigorous support of the clear intent of the Congress of the United States in enacting the Submerged Lands Act to not in any way prejudice the claims of States along the Gulf of Mexico in connection with their historic seaward boundaries and asking United States Senators William F. Knowland and Thomas H. Kuchel, Representative in Congress Craig Hosmer, and United States Attorney General Herbert Brownell to support vigorously such congressional intent

"Whereas Public Law 31 (known as the Submerged Lands Act) enacted by the Congress of the United States at its 83d session, recognized, confirmed, established, and vested in the respective States the complete ownership of the submerged lands beneath navigable waters within their historic boundaries; and

"Whereas said law specifically provides that the seaward boundaries of States along the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans should not extend more than 3 geographical miles from the coastline; and

"Whereas in the case of States along the Gulf of Mexico, however, said law specifically provides that their seaward boundaries should not extend more than 3 marine leagues into the Gulf of Mexico; and

"Whereas this distinction by the Congress between the seaward boundaries of States along the Gulf of Mexico and States along the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans was deliberately drawn to prevent any possible prejudice against Gulf Coast States which claim historic seaward boundaries of more than 3 geographical miles; and

"Whereas section 4 of the Submerged Lands Act states, 'Nothing in this section is to be construed as questioning or in any manner prejudicing the existence of any State's seaward boundary beyond 3 geographical miles if it was so provided by its constitution or laws prior to or at the time such State became a member of the Union, or if it has been heretofore approved by Congress'; and

"Whereas recent newspaper reports indicate there may be attempts by Federal agencies, through administrative action, to prejudice claims by States along the Gulf of Mexico to boundaries extending more than 3 geographical miles seaward; and

"Whereas the Board of Harbor Commissioners of the City of Long Beach deems it fitting to reaffirm its vigorous support of the clear intent of Congress in enacting the said Submerged Lands Act:

"Now therefore, the Board of Harbor Commissioners of the City of Long Beach resolves as follows:

"SECTION 1. That the Board of Harbor Commissioners of the City of Long Beach, by these presents, expresses and reaffirms its vigorous support of the clear intent of Congress in enacting the Submerged Lands Act to not in any way prejudice the claims of States along the Gulf of Mexico in connection with their historic boundaries.

"SEC. 2. That the board urges United States Senators William F. Knowland and Thomas H. Kuchel, Representative in Congress from the 18th Congressional District of California Craig Hosmer, and United States Attorney General Herbert Brownell, as well as all others in positions of authority and influence in the Government of the United States, to support vigorously the aforesaid congressional intent.

"SEC. 3. The secretary of the board shall certify to the passage of this resolution by the Board of Harbor Commissioners of the City of Long Beach, and it shall thereupon take effect.

"SEC. 4. The secretary of the board shall cause this resolution to be published once in the Long Beach Independent, the official newspaper of the city of Long Beach."

I hereby certify that the foregoing resolution was adopted by the Board of Harbor Commissioners of the City of Long Beach, at its meeting of July 29, 1954, by the following vote:

Ayes: Commissioners Sullivan, Martin, Reider, Daubney, Davis.

Noes: None.

Absent: None.

FRANCIS D. REIDER,
Secretary, Board of Harbor Commissioners.

Red China's Formosa Line and Ours

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 3, 1954

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, the United States under Democratic foreign policy suggested that it did not regard the western reaches of the Pacific as part of our concern. Historians will some day determine whether or not this attitude gave rise to the Korean war, but it will not be necessary to wait for history to realize that this position did not deter the North Koreans or the Red Chinese from invading South Korea.

We are about to witness a demonstration of the effect of our new State Department pronouncements on Formosa on the same aggressor. Secretary of State Dulles and President Eisenhower have left nothing unspoken in their determined stand on Formosa. We are prepared to prevent this island from falling into the hands of the Reds, if it means active military intervention. The Red Chinese have said nothing further about their announced intention to seize Formosa since Uncle Sam stated his position. We mean business, and if the Chinese of Chou En-lai think that we are bluffing, they are as wrong in their estimate of our position as Acheson was in his estimate of theirs in 1949.

Conference for Woolen and Worsted Restricted to Industry Representatives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 5, 1954

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following letter of Mr. William Pollock, executive vice president, Textile Workers Union of America, affiliate of the Congress of Industrial Organizations, to the Secretary of Commerce, pointing out the need of the coordinated efforts of all groups together with Government in finding a solution to severe problems:

TEXTILE WORKERS UNION OF AMERICA,
New York, N. Y., July 29, 1954.

Hon. SINCLAIR WEEKS,
Secretary of Commerce, United States Department of Commerce, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WEEKS: We have your letter of July 16 in which you note that the conference for the woolen and worsted industry has been postponed until the latter part of September.

I am taking this opportunity to elaborate on part of your letter. You indicate that the conference is to be restricted to "industry representatives." In making this reference you apparently infer that the term is applicable solely to employers. This interpretation is singularly unfortunate and at variance with prevailing practice in this industry and American industry as a whole.

The term "industry" is conceived as referring to a pursuit. The people who engage in this pursuit are both those who provide the capital and management and those who provide the labor. The well-being of the industry is determined by the fortunes both of management and labor. The success of the venture depends upon the cooperative understanding of the two groups. The current trend in industrial organization is to bring closer relations between management and labor. Your approach, which would restrict discussion of industry problems to one group, could constitute an unfortunate setback to the development of rational relations in this country.

May we also point out that this joint approach to problems has become traditional in our industry. We refer you to the enclosed copy of an editorial appearing in the

New York Times on July 18, 1954, which underscores past practice and the desirability of such joint action.

Our representation at any Government meeting dealing with this industry is particularly important since it is facing severe problems which require bold action. No such action can be undertaken without the coordinated efforts of all groups together with Government. The future of some 150,000 people and an industry vital to the military defense of our country is at stake. You need the accumulated experience of all groups in finding a solution. This should not be looked upon as a routine meeting; it must be a vital effort to find answers to our problems.

Very truly yours,

WILLIAM POLLOCK,
Executive Vice President.

Question of the Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 3, 1954

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, with the depression theme played out, what will the Dems sing in November?

New Housing Law Called Major Gain by President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 5, 1954

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, the President's housing program indicated his very real and sincere desire to do something to improve housing conditions. It is unfortunate that the legislation as passed did not accomplish all that he desired. However, with the exception of the public housing section, which fell short of what the President desired, the law did establish many worthwhile features that will greatly benefit citizens of modest income and be helpful to them in procuring either new or used homes.

The law goes further than any previous legislation in providing ways and means that will facilitate the financing of homes for those whose income has not heretofore been sufficient to meet the requirements. The President rightly refers to this as a major advance toward meeting America's housing needs.

In my judgment, good housing constitutes one of the most essential elements in building a strong America. Consequently, all through the years I have given my full support to every effort that has been made to improve living conditions, and with particular reference to slum clearance. It is regrettable that in this latter category so little has been accomplished, considering the many years the subject has been before Congress. Even today some conditions exist in our cities, large and small, that are unbelievable.

Too many individuals have a feeling that all is well because in their own little world everything is all right. But, seeing is believing, and I have seen. I have made it my business to see. I have been astounded by some of the unbelievable conditions that I have found to exist in my own city of 125,000 population. Having seen the need with my own eyes, I became zealous in my endeavor to improve these living conditions, and I shall continue to support all legislation that will help eradicate such unhealthy and crime-breeding conditions. Likewise, I will continue to support all legislation that seeks to make it easier and possible for our people to own their own homes.

The Courier-Post newspaper, of Camden, N. J., has always been in the forefront of the battle for better housing. I include as part of my remarks an editorial appearing in that paper August 4, 1954, in which it makes an analysis of the new housing law. The editorial reads as follows:

NEW HOUSING LAW CALLED MAJOR GAIN BY PRESIDENT

In respect to public-housing construction, the new law President Eisenhower has just signed falls far short of what he asked and what many authorities say is needed.

Mr. Eisenhower asked for a program of 140,000 units, to be built over a 4-year period. Instead, Congress has given him only 35,000 units on a 1-year basis. In addition, construction of the 35,000 units is hedged about with so many restrictions that some critics of the bill say none at all will be built under it. Units can be built only in cities where families are displaced by federally aided slum clearance projects.

The public-housing section of the new law is a compromise between Senate and House versions of the legislation, more closely following the House version than that of the Senate, which would have provided for the full 140,000-unit program asked by Mr. Eisenhower.

On the decisive vote in the House, 155 Republicans and 79 Democrats (mostly southerners) joined together to defeat the President's program with only 50 Republicans, 105 Democrats, and the lone Independent voting for it. (The entire New Jersey delegation, however, both Republicans and Democrats—with the exception of Representatives SIEMINSKI and OSMERS, who were not recorded—voted for the President's program.)

Mr. Eisenhower has refrained from criticizing Congress for this weak action on public housing, although it may be assumed that this is one of several provisions of the new law with which he has let it be known he is not satisfied. He has indicated that next year he will again try to get his full 140,000-unit program adopted. Whether Congress will be more willing then than now to grant it is doubtfull and will hinge partly on the outcome of the November elections.

But the highly controversial public housing section is, after all, only a part of the new law which in most other respects more closely follows the President's recommendations and which he considers to be "a major advance toward meeting America's housing needs."

Among these "plus" features the President enumerates:

Liberalized down payment and installment payments for homes with Government-insured mortgages under which "millions of our families with modest incomes will be able, for the first time, to buy new or used homes."

Strengthened private mortgage credit facilities.

Safeguards against future windfall profits for builders.

Expansion of Federal-State cooperation in slum clearance and urban redevelopment.

The new law, says Mr. Eisenhower, "will raise the housing standards of our people, help our communities get rid of slums, and improve their older neighborhoods, and strengthen our mortgage credit system. In coming years it will also strongly stimulate the Nation's construction industry and our country's entire economy."

It is to be hoped that the President's evaluation of the law proves correct, and if it does, the law will rank as one of the major achievements of this Congress.

Public Always Paid for Rackets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 3, 1954

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, one of the most shocking aspects of the recent investigations launched into FHA building negotiations and labor racketeering is the degree to which those who participated in these shenanigans accepted them as ordinary. Some of those questioned have become highly indignant at being examined. They have repeatedly insisted that these payoff deals, or substantial markups in land valuations and estimated costs of construction were taken for granted. To insure delivery of materials or to prevent work stoppages for any one of hundreds of possible reasons, business people from the docks of New York across the Nation have paid off to so-called labor-business agents in routine fashion. In the FHA scandals, Government representatives quite obviously knew—perhaps even suggested—methods of enrichment for builders.

These practices invariably lead to one inevitable result. The public, the consumer, the taxpayers at large get stuck with the bill. FHA loans made to labor racketeers mean that the producer increases the costs of his product to cover his costs of operation. These things are morally wrong. They must not be permitted to go unchallenged, year after year, because they make dishonesty into a virtue and breed cynical disrespect for decency in our society.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. The money derived from such sales shall be paid into the Treasury and accounted for in his annual report to Congress, and no sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

Appendix

Salute of the American Woman to the United States Flag

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALTON A. LENNON

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, August 7, 1954

Mr. LENNON. Mr. President, a very fine North Carolina woman is credited with having originated the salute of the American woman to the United States flag. She is Mrs. Robert C. Cantwell, of Wilmington. I know of her untiring efforts in behalf of a better country. I ask unanimous consent that a newspaper article from the Wilmington (N. C.) Star-News of July 4, 1954, entitled "Wrightsville Beach Woman Originated Old Glory Salute" be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WRIGHTSVILLE BEACH WOMAN ORIGINATED OLD GLORY SALUTE

(By Jack Williams)

As the United States prepared feverishly for World War I a new stimulus was given to the American spirit. Everything of importance seemed to be cherished all the more. The American flag stood for a new fighting spirit, supreme sacrifices and a proud people. Overnight the colors in the Stars and Stripes seemed to become more vivid and Americans began to choke up, holding back tears as the glorious ensign passed by.

The womenfolk knew that much would be expected of them as it was from the fighting men. Mothers, wives, and sweethearts prepared to give the greatest aid or suffer the greatest loss. But one young woman discarded temptations of worry and anxiety, welcomed the challenge of the times and devoted her thoughts to new signs of respect for the grand old flag and the honor it represented.

This emotional young woman was a schoolteacher from Wilmington. Her name was Elizabeth Cantwell, wife of Robert C. Cantwell, Jr., naval aviator No. 341. Each evening her husband paraded on Correy Field with the other naval airmen. As the color guard marched by, Elizabeth gave little though to the customary military salute which was rather awkward for women dressed in their finery and variously-shaped hats. Instead of raising her right hand to her forehead, she instinctively stood at attention and placed her hand over her heart. It became a habit with her to show that personal tribute as the flag was lowered at sundown. It just did something to her.

IDEA GERMINATES

Elizabeth thought at that time what a wonderful thing it would be if the American woman had that natural gesture for a salute to the flag. The heart is the symbol of womanhood—love, tears, and devotion. A woman always salutes from the heart.

Later on, back in Wilmington where Bob Cantwell started the successful real-estate business he now enjoys, Elizabeth taught school, became president of the PTA at Hemenway School, helped organize the Cape Fear Garden Club, joined the Red Cross, and helped in all sorts of community service. But the one thing which is not widely known nor seldom recognized was encouraged by her work in the American Legion Auxiliary.

This little thing, like so many little things which mean more to us that the earth itself, was the suggestion of a fitting woman's salute to the flag. Elizabeth was sitting at the second annual convention of the Department of North Carolina American Legion Auxiliary, held at Greensboro, September 8–9, 1922. Many wonderful suggestions were introduced and approved for their noble purposes and practical application. Finally Elizabeth was given the floor and in much the same manner as she writes poetry she described how her heart beats faster as veterans carry the flag in traditional ceremonies. She said, "Surely, the flag is near the woman's heart."

EFFECT ELECTRIFYING

The effect was electrifying. Such a simple idea for the proper woman's salute to the flag—her right hand over her heart as she stands at attention. How easily pleased women are with simple things, beautiful things. The idea became official in North Carolina and obviously was most gratifying to the president of the auxiliary, Mrs. Edward W. Burt, and Miss Marie Torrence, secretary-treasurer, as well as Mrs. Cuthbert Martin, president of the Wilmington post.

Mrs. Cantwell and Mrs. Gabe Croom were delegates at the national convention in New Orleans a few months later. The wonderful new salute was introduced and it appealed to the entire gathering. Thus was born the significant salute of the American woman of today. The showing of proper respect to the flag has been a major concern of the American Legion Auxiliary since that time, as has been evidenced by its American programs.

The pride that Americans have for their individual achievements generally runs a little deeper when it concerns something they have done for their country. Elizabeth Cantwell certainly is entitled to a bit of self-satisfaction for her patriotism. She never received any medals for it, or any special honors and probably never gave it any thought. But it seems fitting that some bit of recognition be given her someday. Few people can ever accomplish the adoption of such a symbolical gesture as a national salute to the flag from the heart of America—its women.

STILL ACTIVE

"Liz" Cantwell, or "Mama Liz" as her countless friends call this dynamic woman, now lives at Wrightsville Beach, and is still active in charity affairs. She is welcomed everywhere by the rich and the poor. Where she goes, laughter goes. And sometimes a bit of her poetry. Her husband, Bob, who is still in real estate and equally popular, can awe an audience with quaint, old, southern, country tales. Bob was a commander in the Navy Bureau of Yards and Docks during World War II. He has an amazing memory for the most humorous events of his life.

The jolly Cantwells were married November 1, 1911. Elizabeth was a native of Jacksonville, Fla. Christened Elizabeth Clark Ashmead, she was the daughter of C. H. Ashmead and Elizabeth Clark. She is a granddaughter of the Florida pioneer, John Clark, and a cousin of Henry Van Dyke. The Cantwell's son, Robert III, is, like his father, a veteran of two wars. Bob the Third served as an Army captain in Africa, Sicily, Naples, and France in World War II and also saw action in the Korean war. He not only shares his father's real-estate business but displays a similar and enviable, dry sense of humor, which hopefully has been inherited by his own son, Robert IV. Bob the Third's wife, Betty, is a helpmate in office as well as at home.

Without the Cantwell's Wilmington and Wrightsville Beach would have a lot less activity, less humor, and less public service. And without Mama Liz Cantwell, the American woman might still be giving the awkward military salute rather than the straight from heart salute to the Stars and Stripes.

Facets of Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, August 7, 1954

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, there was published in the New York Times of August 2, 1954, an editorial entitled "Facets of Defense." The concluding paragraph reads:

> Defense means more than airplanes, tanks and guided missiles. It means more than universal military service. It means more than loans and grants. It means all of those, it is true, and in addition it means the mobilization of the mind, the spirit and the will.

I suggest to every Senator that he read the editorial, because, as President Eisenhower recently pointed out, our whole concept of defense must have its moral aspect. That aspect, moreover, must be positive. He said that we are not merely crusading against communism and all its evil works; we are and we must be, crusading for its antithesis. That means crusading for human liberty and dignity.

I had a remarkable visit this morning with two gentlemen who returned from Italy and France, and who indicated very clearly the significance of the fight of ideas that is going on, and how the great ideas of freedom are meeting head on with the ideas of the Kremlin. Again, I state that I trust the editorial will be found to be good reading by my associates.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FACETS OF DEFENSE

John A. Hannah, who is just leaving his post as Assistant Secretary of Defense, may have brought many persons up rather sharply with his announcement that the National Security Council has approved a plan under which all qualified young men in this country would be called upon for military service. Such a plan is contrary to our traditions and contrary to our desires. It may face hard sledding when it reaches Congress next year. We simply don't like it.

In this case, however, the necessity is not of our making. It would be far more agreeable if we lived in a different world, but we do not. Our security, our liberty, our basic insitutions are threatened. We must examine every aspect of our defense against that threat and, both on our own behalf and on behalf of the others in the free world who are equally threatened, take what measures are required, even if they are unpleasant.

At the same time, while we are planning a defense conference for southeast Asia in the near future, a broader concept of the free world's defense is taking shape. That defense must have several facets. The military aspect, as symbolized both in the plan for an alliance in Asia and the plan for universal military service in this county, is obvious. We face a military threat and an adversary that has shown that there will be no reluctance to use force against us or against any other who is weak. The answer to that threat is obvious. We must be strong.

A second aspect of this New Look at defense, as seen in Washington, is the need to build up more effective forces in the still free nations against domestic subversion and infiltration. That means, for example, continued aid to the gallant Koreans and further help to the Philippines to carry to its final conclusion the thus far successful campaign against Communist dissidents. Even more critical, at this point, is the need for our further assistance to make the free Vietnamese, the Cambodians and the Laotians domestically strong. That means the training of more men and the supplying of means by which they can be equipped.

The truce in Indochina has put an end to our direct military aid. That does not mean, however, that we are obliged to condemn those still free states to a critical weakness that would be the open invitation to disaster. It would be the height of folly, at this point, to assume that the truce had ended the need for our assistance. On the contrary, it has made the need more acute. The French Union forces will be obliged to remain in Indochina if anything of freedom is to be saved, and we will be obliged to see to it that it is possible for them to do so.

This involves, also, a third aspect of defense, the economic. What southeast Asia, no less than Africa or Europe, requires for an effective defense against the Communist onslaught, is a higher degree of economic and social stability. Poverty, ignorance, low standards of living, and confusion add up to weakness, and this weakness invites the invader. The underdeveloped situation does not in itself create communism. It does, however, provide conditions of which the Communists can and will take advantage.

For this reason, our various economic aid programs should not be curtailed at this time. Indeed, we should make every effort to give greater effectiveness to our assistance. It isn't enough just to sit back and authorize and appropriate required sums of money. We must see to it that the money is put to work, efficiently, at the levels where it will do the most good. That goes for the whole of east Asia, and it is particularly pertinent in the case of Vietnam.

Finally, as President Eisenhower has pointed out, our whole concept of defense must have its moral aspect. That aspect, moreover, must be positive. We are not merely crusading against communism and all its evil works. We are and must be, crusading for its antithesis. That means crusading for human liberty and dignity. It means our continued dedication to the things that make for that liberty and dignity. It means a better understanding on our part of the values that lie within the things that we treasure in the world of the spirit and a more diligent and intelligent effort to convey some of that sense of values to others.

Defense means more than airplanes, tanks, and guided missiles. It means more than universal military service. It means more than loans and grants. It means all of those, it is true, and in addition it means the mobilization of the mind, the spirit and the will.

End Run on Grazing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 3, 1954

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, a recent editorial in the Denver Post called attention to the attempt to attach the latest version of the uniform grazing bill to the Agricultural Act of 1954. The Denver Post said:

> It is obvious that the grazing proposal has no chance for enactment on the basis of its own merits. If the stockmen can slip it through as an appendage to the all-important support bill, it will be one of the neatest tricks pulled off in Congress in many a day.

In the Washington Post and Times Herald there was another editorial pointing out that the grazing bill should stand on its own merits and should not be slipped through as a rider on nongermane legislation. The editorial is as follows:

END RUN ON GRAZING

Spokesmen in the Senate for a small group of western stockmen have pulled a fast one by tacking the Hope-Thye-Aiken grazing bill onto the farm bill. The Hope-Thye-Aiken bill is the measure that would give cattle raisers who have been granted permits to graze their stock in national forests what amounts to property rights in those lands. It is a thoroughly unnecessary bill, and one which would make more difficult the equitable administration of the forest lands in the interest of other national objectives—watershed and timber protection and recreation, in addition to grazing. The large majority of stockmen who must pay higher grazing fees on private lands would not benefit at all from the bill. This is clearly a case in which Congress is being asked to place a narrow private interest above the broad public interest.

Although the Hope-Thye-Aiken bill passed the Senate last spring, opposition to it became so intense that action in the House has been stopped cold. Promoters now hope to slide it through in conference over farm-price supports. The bill instead deserves an early death, not only because of its undesirable features, but also because is furnishes a graphic example of the vicious practice of attaching nongermane riders to important legislation.

Educating and Rehabilitating the Mentally Retarded

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, August 7, 1954

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, down through the years I have spoken on many occassions with regard to educating and rehabilitating the handicapped. To parents and loved ones there is no group among the handicapped who more deeply stir men's hearts than the mentally handicapped.

It is estimated that there are over 4½ million mentally retarded Americans, and among them, no single group more deserves our attention than the youngsters.

Fortunately, through Federal, State, local, and principally private efforts, more and more is being done for this group. But a great deal more must still be done. I am glad that under the vocational rehabilitation legislation which the Congress has approved much more can be done for the youngsters as they grow up and seek gainful employment.

Meanwhile, groups like the National Association for Retarded Children deserve every possible support on the part of our American citizens.

I was pleased to note in the current August 1954 issue of the Kiwanis magazine, a fine article on this overall subject. As a Kiwanis and former governor of a Kiwanis district, I am proud that Kiwanis is doing a great deal along these lines.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CHILDREN WHO NEVER GROW UP

Our neighbors, the B's are brilliant people. He is an honor graduate of MIT, widely respected in his profession and a leader in civic affairs. She also is a college graduate and is an intelligent, alert woman. They have 2 bright youngsters, but Tommy, their third child, is one of the estimated 4,800,000 mentally retarded Americans.

Although he is 11, Tommy cannot yet read or write his own name. He cannot be allowed to go too far from his own home or to do the simple tasks that his younger brothers accomplish easily. A handsome, sturdy boy who outwardly appears to be normal, Tommy, an imbecile, is doomed to go through life with a mentality that will never be more than 8 years.

Why did this tragic affliction—which hits about 3 out of every 100 babies born—strike the offspring of such gifted parents? Nobody, not even the geniuses of medical science, can explain it. For mental retardation can and does affect anyone—the progeny of doctors, businessmen and educators of high I. Q. as well as those of parents of inferior mentality.

The B's, people of insight and understanding, have faced up to their problem with calm courage. They have accepted the fact that Tommy's goals in life will have to be based upon his severely limited capacities. Through the help and advice of a local organization consisting of parents of mentally deficient children, the B's have managed to adjust the pattern of Tommy's existence so that his life will be a reasonably happy one.

By thus meeting the issue honestly while Tommy is still young, the B's have hurdled the first great obstacle of mental retardation: recognition of the inescapable fact.

"Too often parents go on refusing to admit to themselves that their child has an imperfect brain," says Dr. Leo Kanner, noted child psychiatrist of Johns Hopkins Hospital. "It is imperative for both parent and child that recognition be made early so that the child can be guided into channels with which his limited mentality can cope."

The enigma of mental retardation is perhaps the deepest, most baffling tragedy that any family could be called upon to face. One can understand and accept defects of a physical nature, such as a crippled foot or deformed arm. But the inexplicable affliction of a crippled brain is generally beyond the pale of ordinary understanding.

For this reason, mental deficiency is the last of the great problems in child health to be faced. While notable advancements have been made in treating the victims of polio, cancer, and cerebral palsy, those with crippled minds are still widely considered as hopeless. Their mysterious ailment is generally thought to be a cross for the affected parents to bear without outside help. And so mentally backward children have been hid away in their homes or "put away" in the few institutions equipped to handle them. One authority has graphically described our mentally retarded as "the attic Americans."

"The greatest handicap that mentally deficient children face," says the well-known medical journalist, Dr. Howard A. Rusk, "is not their low mentality, but the public's lack of understanding."

Experts working with the mentally retarded say that this point cannot be stressed too strongly. "Too often," contends Dr. Leo Kanner, "the retarded child is badly treated by normal people. This unfair humiliation may tend to make him antisocial and a potential delinquent."

Proper handling of the mentally backward can pay large dividends. Experts estimate that as many as four-fifths of America's mentally retarded children can become self-supporting adults, capable of managing their own affairs, under good conditions. The United States Office of Vocational Rehabilitation reports that persons with low I. Q.'s have been successfully placed in 60 types of occupations, including jobs in laundries, restaurants, factories, and on farms. With varying degrees of supervision, they can become competent, productive workers.

Thousands of case histories illustrate what can be done for even the most severely retarded. Allen, aged 29, is a low-grade imbecile with a mental age of 4. Originally he had been consigned for the human scrap heap. But the patient, sympathetic guidance of vocational teachers and counselors has made it possible for him to fill a useful role. Allen now is working in a laundry, transferring hot wash from vats to baskets. He is earning enough to support himself and his mother.

But rehabilitating the millions of Allens takes a specialized program of training. Unfortunately, very little is currently available. Only 10 percent of the almost 5 million mental deficients are receiving institutional care. The remaining 90 percent must live at home.

The challenge to the public is to see that retarded children do not spend their lives vegetating in unwholesome idleness. These youngsters badly need some home training. They need to be supervised by visiting case workers. They need special classes, vocational instruction, sheltered workshops, and other activities that will stimulate the fullest development of their limited capacities.

Across the Nation there are a number of encouraging portents. More and more people are coming to grips with this great social problem.

In Oregon the State legislature has approved a bill providing special training for the mentally retarded. Eighty thousand dollars has been appropriated to start the project.

The New York Medical School has opened the first clinic in America to deal exclusively with mentally retarded children. This clinic is analyzing every mental and physical condition that contributes to their problem.

Many States, including California, Texas, Pennsylvania, New York, Washington, Ohio, Illinois, Wisconsin, and others, have broadened the definition of their educational responsibilities to include mental deficients. Formerly most States refused to accept for public-school training children with very low I. Q.'s. But now many school officials are realizing that, while it costs more to train retarded children, the long-term results justify the extra expense and effort.

The value of this type of program has been clearly demonstrated by the few pilot projects that have been in existence for a number of years. A follow-up study of the graduates of St. Paul, Minn., Beta classes—which the school system there has been holding for mentally handicapped youngsters for 20 years—shows that about half are now gainfully employed.

Many of these heartening developments have come as a result of the educational work being done by the recently organized National Association for Retarded Children. This body, consisting of groups of affected parents in over 30 States, is engaging in an increasingly broad-scale campaign to create more public understanding. "Our job is to show that mental retardation is a matter for community concern and calls for new programs and a changing social attitude," says Lee J. Marino, of the NARC.

Into the association's headquarters at 129 East 52d Street, New York City, come tidal waves of letters every week. Most of them are from distraught parents looking for help and sympathetic understanding. Because many areas do not have any facilities for the mentally retarded, the NARC is the only place where these parents can turn. A sampling of the letters will give you an idea of the individual help that parents of such children are desperately seeking from doctors and social agencies.

"We have taken our daughter to doctors all over the West," wrote a mother in Idaho. "They all tell us that we must put her away in an institution. We can't bear to do this because we do not want to give her up. We love her. * * * Isn't there some way we can teach her at home so that she will be happy? We will do anything you suggest."

"We have been told that our son, 6, is a mental defective," wrote an Illinois mother. "We have always treated him like a normal child. * * * However, in our encounters with doctors they insist that we must realize he is mentally retarded. * * * We have never been offered any advice as to how to help him, except for one doctor who said, 'It would be a blessing for you if he were not to survive, as he is mentally and physically defective.' This we cannot accept. * * * We need sympathetic help and guidance."

Letters of this nature act as a spur to the officers of the NARC, most of whom have mentally retarded children themselves. In reaching out to help these groping parents, the association also is seeking to clear up the vast amount of ignorance about mental retardation and answer people's basic questions about it.

Questions such as the following are the most commonly asked ones about mental deficiency:

Question. What is the difference between mental retardation and mental illness?

Answers. The mentally ill person is one who has lost his emotional stability and who may have it restored with proper treatment. The mental deficient was born that way and can never acquire a normal mentality.

Question. Is mental retardation a hereditary trait?

Answer. No. Medical science has discarded the old theories about "the Jukes and the Kallikaks," families of the feeble-minded in which mental deficiency is handed down from generation to generation. Children with crippled brains can come from any racial stock, from any type of family background, from any economic group.

Medical authorities now estimate that heredity accounts for less than half of the cases. The majority are due to infection, birth injury or some unidentified but noninherited prenatal damage. The cells of the brain are delicate and damage done to them is usually irreparable; instruments and anesthetics used in childbirth can cause the permanent crippling of the brain.

Other recent investigations have indicated that German measles, mumps and possibly other viruses experienced by the expectant mother early in pregnancy can produce retarded children.

Knowing that their child's thwarted brain is not the product of heredity often makes it easier for parents to accept the facts. "It makes you feel less alone," said one mother. "You know it isn't a special tragedy plotted out for you."

Question. Are there different categories of mental retardation?

Answer. The range of mental deficiency and its resulting problems is very broad. The feeble minded usually consist of three classifications: idiots, imbeciles, and morons.

The idiot's intelligence is between 2 and 3 years of age. He often is unable to feed or dress himself or go to the toilet. He comes close to being helpless.

The imbecile, with a mentality ranging between 3 and 8 years of age, can take care of his personal needs, speak a few simple sentences, write his name, and read short sentences. With proper training and supervision he can perform simple, useful work.

The moron's mental ability never exceeds that of 12 years of age. Although he appears normal, he does not have the judgment of an adult and if not treated properly, he may be guilty of delinquency. With proper training, he can be taught to do unskilled or semiskilled work under supervision.

Question. Is there any possible cure for mental retardation?

Answer. No; science hasn't yet found a cure, although doctors are in in the infancy of their research on this problem. Medicine's main contribution so far has been the development of glutamic acid, a common chemical substance that holds enormous promise for backward youngsters. This little-known wheat derivative has been found to have a regenerative effect on the central nervous system and the cerebral cortex, the learning area of the brain.

Experiments with glutamic acid on many hundreds of backward children have demonstrated beyond question that both intelligence and emotional stability are substantially improved. Some mentally retarded children's IQs have increased as much as 20 points after treatment. At present this protein brain food can be administered only by well-trained experts. But its promise, especially in the borderline cases—children who are almost normal—is limitless.

Question. Are mental deficients inherently incorrigible?

Answer. Authorities deny this, with the exception of a very few whom certain types of brain pressure or damage have made highly excitable. Most deficients have pleasant, friendly dispositions. They are usually pushed into resentful, antisocial acts by their own frustrations and the taunts of smarter but unkind playmates. When the child with low IQ is placed only in situations which he can handle, he tends to develop to the best of his ability and is less likely to become a behavior problem.

Question. What is the greatest single difficulty in the field of mental retardation?

Answer. All experts agree that it is teaching the parents of such children how to meet their problem. Mothers and fathers tend to make one of two mistakes: either they are too strict with the child, punishing him for things which are not his fault, or they go to the other extreme and are overindulgent, spoiling him and making his problem even worse. The National Association for Retarded Children believes that one of its most important duties is to teach parents to steer a successful middle course between these extremes.

Mrs. Thomas A. Warner, officer in an NARC chapter in Gloucester, N. J. offers this advice to other parents: "Accept the fact that you have a retarded child, but don't resign yourself to it. Learn to live with the fact. That way will bring a better emotional life for the child and for the family. Too many parents are waiting for a miracle instead of doing something about the situation themselves."

In the larger context, there is no escaping the conclusion that society has a responsibility to these children who will never grow up. In many communities throughout America, public-spirited people are commencing to meet the challenge of this which is the most terrible of all human handicaps.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

Code of Laws of the United States

Title 44, Section 181. Congressional Record; arrangement, style, contents, and indexes.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the Congressional Record, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the Congressional Record semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

Title 44, Section 182b. Same; illustrations, maps, diagrams.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the Record without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the Congressional Record the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily Record as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided*, That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the Record with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the official reporters of the Congressional Record, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the Record shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the Record issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the Record for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the Record of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the Record shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the Record style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the Record.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the Congressional Record any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided*, That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix, but this rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided*, That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the Congressional Record.

9: The Public Printer shall not publish in the Congressional Record Appendix the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed.

10. *Official reporters.*—The official reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the Congressional Record by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this restriction shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. The Public Printer or the official reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the Congressional Record which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Illustrations.*—Pursuant to section 182b, title 44, United States Code (as shown above), requests for authority to insert an illustration in the Record should be submitted to the Joint Committee on Printing through the chairman of the Committee on Printing of the respective House in which the speech desired to be illustrated may be delivered. Illustrations shall not exceed in size a page of the Record and shall be linecuts only. Copy for illustrations must be furnished to the Public Printer not later than 12:30 o'clock p. m. of the day preceding publication.

13. *Corrections.*—The permanent Record is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided*, That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further*, That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

DISTRIBUTION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

To the Vice President and each Senator 100 copies; to the Secretary and Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, each, 25 copies; to the Secretary, for official use, not to exceed 35 copies; to the Sergeant at Arms, for use on the floor of the Senate, not to exceed 50 copies; to each Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress, 68 copies; to the Clerk, Sergeant at Arms, and Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives, each, 25 copies; to the Clerk, for official use, not to exceed 50 copies; and to the Doorkeeper, for use on the floor of the House of Representatives, not to exceed 75 copies; to the Vice President and each Senator, Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress there shall also be furnished (and shall not be transferable), 3 copies of the daily Record, of which 1 shall be delivered at his residence, 1 at his office, and 1 at the Capitol.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized book dealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by book dealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

IN T

Mr
Augu
Dam,
a par
syster
under
State
I a
tory c
have
a lon
peace
The
simple
Try."
our na
joined
Army
of the
Engine
of Eng
the u
forts
succes
anothe
peacet
ization
served
you in
a bett
For
years,
Corps
arose
eral n
Nation
it in t
closely
organi
contro
is an
trained
in war
compri
gaged
tion, i
work
meanw
ful fur
great
measur
Like t
of Eng
public
with t
times.
accomp
the Ar
Congre
istratio
Army
trained
pioneer
in the
underta
signme
and vi

Appendix

The Corps of Engineers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEON H. GAVIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 9, 1954

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, August 8, the East Branch, Clarion River Dam, Pennsylvania, was dedicated. It is a part of the Ohio River flood-control system and all of which work has been under the supervision of the United States Engineers.

I am including herewith a brief history of the United States Engineers who have turned in a fine performance over a long period of years, both in time of peace and in time of war:

The motto of the Corps of Engineers is a simple French verb, "Essayons"—"Let us Try." That motto goes back to the dawn of our national history when French engineers joined General Washington's Continental Army and that motto has since become one of the proudest heritages of your Corps of Engineers. For a long, long time your Corps of Engineers has been "trying" the difficult, the unique and the great construction efforts of our country and completing them successfully. We are today dedicating another engineer effort that illustrates the peacetime work of this great military organization that has faithfully and efficiently served you so long and will continue to serve you in peace and in war, to make this country a better and safer place in which to live.

For a very long time, in fact over 179 years, Congress had been looking to the Corps of Engineers whenever a problem arose that called for the spending of Federal money to improve, and preserve our Nation in time of peace, as well as to defend it in time of war. These two jobs are more closely related than you may think. The organization that does your peacetime flood control, dam construction and civil works is an "organization in being"—skilled, trained, and alerted for instant operations in wartime. This "Organization in Being," comprised of the officers and civilians engaged in civil works and military construction, is ready to swing over to full wartime work in a moment's notice, but in the meanwhile they perform the extremely useful function of carrying out for the country great engineering feats that bring immeasurable benefits to our great country. Like the Roman legions of old the Corps of Engineers has built roads, canals and public works during peacetime, and fought with the infantry and artillery during wartimes. I would like to review some of these accomplishments for you that were done by the Army engineers at the direction of your Congress and President. Successive administrations and Congresses have looked to the Army engineers as the logical groups of trained personnel to accomplish unusual pioneering missions. The Army engineers, in the spirit of their motto, "Let Us Try," undertook each and every one of these assignments with traditional thoroughness and vigor.

In the early days the Corps of Engineers had a virtual monopoly of trained engineer talent. The first, and for a long time only, engineer school, West Point, was established to train them and was actually administered by them until 1866.

Your Corps of Engineers helped to build this new continent into the great country that it is today. They surveyed the national boundaries and the boundaries of most of the States. They built lighthouses and constructed forts along the entire western seaboard. As the people of the country moved west the Corps of Engineers went ahead, locating the best routes and built roads, they cleaned out the rivers and built forts to protect settlers. They surveyed and build railroads. They completed the National Capitol, and the Washington Monument. Whatever the American people have wanted done, their Corps of Engineers stood ready to do it.

Some of the first Federal money spent on internal improvements was spent by the engineers on the repair and paving of the old National Road from Philadelphia to Pittsburgh and the Cumberland Road from Washington to Pittsburgh. The first iron bridge built in this country was designed by an engineer officer to cross Dunlaps Creek south of here. The engineers surveyed the Natchez Trace and the Oregon Trail, and with pick and shovels they built the roads that carried Scott and Taylor into Mexico. These engineers who labored with the problems of roadbuilding here at home during war and peace never even remotely suspected that more than a century later men of their corps would perform a roadbuilding miracle to permit our country to fight a war of survival on two fronts. Given any two points on land and the engineers can build a road between them. They built the Ledo Road to China, through country that almost defined road construction. More than 10,000 miles of roads were built in the southwest Pacific, where roads had never been before, and in Europe 7,500 miles of road were constructed or rehabilitated. Meanwhile at home they had completed the famous Alcan Highway, another long unaccomplished dream of a road to Alaska.

With railroads as with roads the engineers were there from the beginning. They worked out the details and surveyed the rights-of-way for the first Baltimore & Ohio railroad. As this new means of transportation began to push west, linking the old eastern seaboard with the new lands, the engineers located the routes for, and then helped construct, the early railroads.

As late as 1855, there was scarcely a railroad in this country that had not been built and sometimes operated by the Army engineers. In addition to the B. & O., they constructed, and occasionally managed, such well-known railroads as the Northern Central, the Erie, the Boston and Providence, the New York, New Haven & Hartford, and the Boston & Albany. Four of today's great transcontinental railroad routes were projected by the Army engineers: The Santa Fe, Union Pacific, Southern Pacific, and the Northern Pacific. It is impossible to measure the value of experience at railroad construction in time of war. The Civil War was fought along rail lines, restored and extended by the engineers. Nine engineer railroad regiments worked in France in World War I. In World War II they built and rebuilt enough miles of railroads to lay a double track line from New York to Tokyo. In the European theater of operation, 18,584 miles of single-track railroad and 538 railroad trestles more than 40 feet long were constructed, often near the heat of action. In Italy the 48th Engineer Battalion actually fought to clear the Germans from the rail line they were working on, while in France the engineers with the 45th Division used a captured railroad to push the spearhead of the division forward through the Alps to Grenoble. Some of those boys must have been the grandsons of those engineers who helped drive the Golden Spike in the Union Pacific Railroad in 1869. The heritage was there.

Your Corps of Engineers are the specialists who do the difficult jobs where others fail. After the Spanish-American War, Congress wished to raise the battleship *Maine* to recover the bodies of its famous dead, to examine the cause of its sinking, and to remove a serious navigation hazard, and called on the engineers to try that one. Investigation proved that the famous ship had been too badly damaged to raise by ordinary means. The ingenious engineers, therefore, constructed a large coffer dam by driving 75-foot steel piles around the ship, and then pumping the water out until the *Maine* lay in the dry. One of the unusual features of the operation was that only 50-foot piles were available then, and the engineers had to splice their piling during the driving operation. And it was the Corps of Engineers that came to the relief of the battleship *Missouri*, aground at Hampton Roads, and dredged it back to the channel.

While the engineers were working on the *Maine* they were also engaged in one of the greatest engineering undertakings of all time, the construction of the Panama Canal. After the finest engineers of Europe had tried and failed, the Corps of Engineers tried and succeeded. As early as 1550 the nations of Europe had considered a passageway through the Panama Isthmus as a short cut to the Orient. Spain, Portugal, Holland, and France all made plans to cut a canal, but all were forced through circumstances to relinquish this ambition. The French, under the great de Lesseps, fresh from completing the Suez Canal, initiated construction but, because of insufficient funds and the ravages of tropical fevers, were obliged to desist. The United States bought out the French and commenced in 1904. For 2 years the Americans were almost defeated, until President Teddy Roosevelt put Colonel Goethals of the Corps of Engineers in charge. Colonel Goethals talked with the French and Americans that had been there and found out where the trouble lay. He took Colonel Gorgas, of the Army Medical Department, to Panama with him. Together they routed out the mosquitoes and defeated yellow fever first. Then the dirt flew. The canal was opened to commercial vessels in 1914. The work of the Army engineers and the Medical Corps in Panama represents a conspicuous example of Army teamwork and what can be accomplished, under the worst tropical conditions, in sanitation, engineering, and construction.

Facilities for the development of perhaps the most important project of our time, the atom bomb, were constructed by the Corps of Engineers during World War II. This was accomplished while the Corps was at its greatest strength, with approximately 700,000 officers and men in uniform, and other thousands of civilians working on posts and camps throughout the United States.

Your Corps of Engineers is a unique service that always stands ready and able to serve in all types of emergencies. When State and other Federal agencies found themselves unable to cope with the mounting disaster caused by the great Midwest blizzards of 1948-49, the Fifth Army turned over relief work to the Corps of Engineers, which opened 115,000 miles of drifted highways and farm roads, freed 200,000 marooned families and provided feed for more than 4 million starving livestock. Whether it is a snowbound operation, a Texas City explosion, a gulf-coast hurricane, a Kansas flood emergency—wherever and whenever disaster strikes at the well-being of the American people—the Corps of Engineers, through its peacetime organization of division and district offices, is already functioning in that menaced area, ready to take on the job—any job—with the ability and technical skills to get the job done.

Eleven engineer divisions with 42 districts divide this county into convenient units for the supervision of whatever operations your Congress authorizes. Whether it is drought relief in Iowa or an obstruction in the Allegheny River; whether it is a new barracks at Camp Hood or the water supply of the city of Washington, whether dredging the harbor of Charleston or the building of an air base in Greenland, your Army engineers are at work around the clock to serve you. And by doing this type of work they gain the experience and keep the organization that is the backbone of the Corps of Engineers in time of war. Right now engineers are busy rehabilitating the ravaged areas of Korea, are at work constructing the radar screen across our great exposed northern flank, are building air bases from the Arctic waste of Greenland to the Arabian desert to protect and defend you. They are also watching the level of the waters of the Ohio at Louisville, and measure the accumulation of silt in the Houston Ship Canal. They are surveying new projects to control the Columbia River and are dredging in New York Harbor. Always your Corps of Engineers are working to make this country a better place to live in and a safer and more secure place in a troubled world.

Higher Price Supports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EVA BOWRING

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 9, 1954

Mrs. BOWRING. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an editorial entitled "Higher Supports?—Let's See Now," reprinted from the Omaha World-Herald by the Milwaukee Journal.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Higher Supports?—Let's See Now

The administration argues with what seems to be some logic that the way to start cutting back farm surpluses is to end rigid price supports and substitute flexible supports.

The majority of the Senate Agricultural Committee, however, has a different theory. It defends its action in rejecting flexible supports and in retaining 90 percent parity payments with a new argument. Actually, says the committee majority, if supports are lowered, surpluses will increase—for farmers earning less money would grow more.

If this is true, of course, there's no solution at all to the surplus problem except to increase supports. Under committee logic it should follow that if 90 percent rigid supports will create fewer surpluses than lower flexible supports, then 100 percent parity would create fewer surpluses than 90 percent parity, 110 percent less than 100 percent, 120 percent less than 110 percent, and so on. Perhaps the ultimate solution will be 200 percent parity payments.

On the other hand, it seems to us that the committee overlooks something. The higher parity payments, the higher the market price for food (unless the surplus is marketed at less than cost). The higher the price, the less food people will eat. The less food they eat, the greater the surpluses.

Only one thing seems obvious: There is no simple solution to this farm surplus problem.

A Basic Program for the Merchant Marine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 5, 1954

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker during the year a great deal has been spoken, and written, in support of the American merchant marine, and of the shipbuilding industry. Competent observers, imbued with the desire to promote the national interest, have urged that the Federal Government take such steps as are necessary to insure the preservation of these two allied industries.

Since the enactment of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, such a course has been the policy of Congress. It was clearly recognized then, just as it is now, that both the economic prosperity and the security of the United States are inextricably united with our merchant marine and shipbuilding enterprises. Part of our national strength lies in these activities.

For the purpose of insuring an adequate merchant marine and the maintenance of a nucleus of shipbuilding, there has been suggested a basic program which the Federal Government should adopt. I wish to go on record as earnestly supporting this basic program.

Some of the elements of the program have already been enacted into law. These include three separate requests by President Eisenhower totaling just over $100 million. The first is for funds to construct 10 fast tankers. The second is for funds for national defense features and construction parity for four passenger ships.

Third is the request for funds to conduct experimental work on ships in the reserve fleet. The purpose of such experiments is to determine if the slower, less efficient vessels can be modernized and speeded up to the point where they would be of use to the Nation during a national emergency. If it proves feasible to modernize these vessels, I recommend that we establish a program to extend the work to all vessels in the fleet for which such work would be practicable.

These parts of the basic program remain to be adopted: First, the Department of Commerce should be authorized to sell Government ship mortgages to provide funds for ship construction.

Second, the revolving fund authorized in the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 should be made available for use in connection with ship construction. It is expected that under such an arrangement the Maritime Board would have funds available to encourage the construction of new vessels.

Third, legislation should be enacted which would provide for accelerated rates of depreciation for new vessels.

Fourth, S. 3233 should be enacted into law. The bill, introduced by Senator Butler, of Maryland, requires that 50 percent of material shipped abroad under aid programs move in ships of American registry. Likewise, half of the material procured abroad for the Government's account must be carried in American merchant ships.

Finally, there should be enacted legislation which would clarify the existing language with respect to the determination of construction subsidy. Clear and specific responsibility for determining the amount of construction subsidy should be given to the Board. This would have the effect of removing the uncertainty which overshadows contract making at the present time.

These proposals have the support of Mr. Robert B. Murray, Jr., Under Secretary of Commerce for Transportation. In the interest of an adequate merchant marine and shipbuilding industry, in the interest of our national economy and national security I wholeheartedly endorse and support these proposals.

Drought Disaster Is Worse Than Many Realize

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 9, 1954

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, many people in Washington—and I am afraid that some of them are located in places of great responsibility—do not appear to realize the terrible gravity and threatening national implications of our drought disaster.

The third year of drought in our section of the country has placed in motion forces which are today breaking and lowering the already sagging cattle market in the Southwest and Middle West. We are seeing the forced liquidation of good herds and the actual financial ruin of many families. Pastures are gone, feed and hay supplies limited in our section, and many farms and entire towns are without water.

The final result could be national catastrophe.

I do not base this statement on any third-hand reports, but on a personal survey which I have just made, in the air and on the ground, of the farm country in Okahoma's Second Congressional District. Agriculture officials and farmers in the counties of this district agree that it is an emergency without parallel in our State—and I know from observation that the condition extends to many other congressional districts in our land.

Today, on the basis of the survey I have just made, I sent a letter of report and recommendation to the President, the Secretary of Agriculture and the Chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture. The same letter was sent to all three, and a copy of this letter follows, for the information and reference of other Members, as well as for the RECORD.

For the sake of many good citizens in Oklahoma, as well as for the well-being of the Nation, I trust and pray that our Government will respond to its grave responsibility:

AUGUST 9, 1954.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: This is a drought report and program recommendation, based on a 2-day survey, in the air and on the ground, which I have just completed in northeastern Oklahoma. On August 6, I flew over most of the counties in the Second District of Oklahoma, in order to observe conditions of pastures, crops, and other vegetation. On August 7, I flew over the balance of these 16 counties and also traveled by automobile through 4 of the 5 counties in my district which were not included in the Department of Agriculture's recent designation for the drought-relief program. The five counties not included are Haskell, Sequoyah, McIntosh, Okmulgee, and Osage Counties.

In the course of the inspection on the ground on Saturday, August 7, I talked to Department of Agriculture officials at Sallisaw, Stigler, Eufaula, and Okmulgee, and also met briefly with farmer committees in each of those communities.

The conclusions and recommendations which follow are based upon current firsthand observation and information, and in my opinion should merit careful consideration at this time.

THE ACTUAL DROUGHT CONDITION

During my lifetime in Oklahoma, I have never witnessed more critical crop and pasture conditions throughout northeastern Oklahoma, and definitely including the five counties not heretofore designated as a drought area. Pastureland has been seared brown throughout this area, corn and cotton are burned up, and farmers and cattlemen are already feeding meager hay supplies which ordinarily are not needed before late fall. Two weeks ago, the State drought committee at Stillwater reported that 90 percent of pasture in Sequoyah County was poor or short, 95 percent of pasture in Haskell County was poor or short, 48 percent of pasture in McIntosh County was poor or short, 80 percent of Okmulgee County was poor or short, and 85 percent of Osage County pasture was poor or short. Figures for supplies of roughage, hay, and feed grain were equally disturbing at that time, and I can assure you that these figures are much more alarming at this time than they were 2 weeks ago. For example, Okmulgee County officials agreed Saturday that there is now 100 percent of pasture that is poor or short, and the feed-grain supply has deteriorated to the point that only 20 percent of the farms in the county now have an adequate or good supply, as compared with a reported figure of 60-percent adequate or good supply 2 weeks ago.

There has been a similar deterioration of conditions in Sequoyah, Haskell, McIntosh, and Osage Counties. It is the result of 3 years without adequate rainfall, and I can report to you that livestock marketings are accelerating and literally thousands of farmers are facing financial ruin in this area. You will be interested to know that within the past 2 weeks, there took place at Muskogee the largest movement of cattle in a single day in a period of 22 years. Prices of $0.05 a pound on canners and cutters, and even less in some of the small markets, have been very, very common, and the livestock prices quoted in the larger cities of the Midwest do not accurately reflect the prices actually being received by the producers of cattle in this distress area.

It is imperative, I honestly and sincerely believe, that the actual drought-relief program be extended at once to the counties which I have above listed and mentioned, and I believe it is also imperative that certain improvements and enlargements of the drought-relief program which has been announced be instituted at the earliest possible date. According to all information which I have read, the new program will be less generous than that of last year in many important particulars, and this in the face of the fact that this is the third year of drought for many farmers, and their need for substantial assistance from their Government is more serious this year than last.

SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS FOR DROUGHT PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT

The following recommendations are based upon the suggestions and pleas of drought-stricken farmers, and are offered with the sincere hope that they may be of constructive help in this emergency.

1. The program should include protein feeds. If cottonseed cake is not available, soybeans or alfalfa or other proteins should be made available in the feed program in the disaster areas. The feeds which have been announced as available (corn, grain sorghums, oats, and barley) will not meet the farmers' need to carry them through this disaster period.

2. ASC regulations should be amended to make wheat, oats, and barley available at once as ASC practice for winter pasture and cover. This seed should be made available free if possible in the disaster area, or at least at a reduced cost. As an ASC practice, it would be accompanied by necessary fertilizers, and of course, it would be subject to the provision that the crop would not be harvested for grain but would be used to meet actual pasturing and feed needs on the farm itself. Such an amendment of ASC regulations, which would not require new law, should take place immediately, since the time for planting of winter pasture will soon be upon us in our section. Of course, this practice would require some rain this fall, but it is our best hope to secure a feed supply through the farmers' own efforts in this disaster area.

3. A Government buying program to strengthen the sagging cattle prices is a third "must." Some favor a purchasing brogram "on the hoof" while others believe that a meat-purchasing program such as the Government has followed in the past, but with provision in the program to insure that at least $0.12 a pound be paid to the cattle producer, would be preferable. Such a guaranty to the producer could be effected by requiring a certificate from the packer attesting to the fact that the producer had been paid at least $0.12 a pound for his animal. Farmers in my area are convinced that a purchasing program which does not guarantee some minimum price to the producer will do little good in this disaster period.

In conclusion, let me say that I cannot overemphasize the urgency of this problem. In our section entire towns are now without water, fine herds are being sacrificed, and farmers are cutting down trees in some areas to provide some feed. We are on the brink of a tragic disaster of major proportions, and I cannot urge too strongly the need for an immediate, generous drought relief program throughout the entire stricken area.

Respectfully yours,

ED EDMONDSON,
Member of Congress.

[From the Tulsa (Okla.) Tribune of August 5, 1954]

DROUGHT, HEAT HOLD KEY TO FARM ECONOMY—PASTURE LANDS ARE SEARED, CORN, COTTON DROOP

(By Robert H. Johnson, Jr.)

Farmers and ranchers are glum and dispirited in the vast drought country where corn and cotton droop and cattle graze on brown pastures.

"Unless we assist in every possible way," says Agriculture Commissioner John White, of Texas, "thousands of our rual people will have to abandon the land."

White speaks for only one State. But drought still rules all the great plains, in spite of recent rains and Federal aid already granted to six States.

Good rains in sunburned sections of the South and East have been more helpful—but not enough to save most crops.

The number of States eligible for Federal aid reached six this week when Oklahoma and Missouri were added to Colorado, Wyoming, New Mexico, and Texas.

Six more States—Alabama, Arkansas, Kansas, Kentucky, Georgia, and Tennessee—have asked to be included.

Still, as of today, the situation appears slightly better than it was 10 days ago, when nothing but heat soaked the country from Georgia to Wyoming and Canada to Mexico.

Since then, spotted rains have raised dabs of green in some of the driest States—Texas, Colorado, New Mexico, Kansas, and Oklahoma.

Even in the South, where the drought isn't as old and tough as in the Plains States, the rains of the past week weren't enough. For example, Kentucky received an average of 1.24 inches, the most in any week since April. The rain helped tobacco, but most other crops were too far gone to be saved.

Timely rains also were reported in Pennsylvania, Indiana, Illinois, and Minnesota. But in these States, too, the word was the same. More rain needed, and even that wouldn't revive some fields.

The Government's emergency program is aimed at helping livestock men hang onto their foundation herds. The Government has agreed to pay half the cost of shipping hay into the Federal disaster areas. The Agriculture Department also will pay a subsidy of 60 cents per hundred pounds for corn, oats, barley, and grain sorghums. The subsidy will go to the dealers, and ranchers can then buy these grains at cut-rate prices.

But this program will leave feed prices somewhat higher than they were last summer under a more liberal Federal emergency program. For example, you could buy a bushel of corn last year for $1. Now it will cost something under $1.50.

Farm spokesmen in some States believe more territory should have been included in the disaster program.

In Missouri, President Eisenhower declared 76 counties eligible for relief. Fred Heinkel, president of the Missouri Farmers Association, said he thought all of the State's 114 countries should have been included.

New Mexico ranchers have complained that the feed program is slow in getting started.

All of Oaklahoma, except for a few scattered spots, is dry. Experts said there is little difference between the 26 counties approved for Federal aid and the other 51. The recent rains gave cotton and peanuts a chance to make a fair crop but were too late to do much good, if any, for pastures and feed crops.

In Colorado, rancher Melvin Carlson of Johnstown, said "the Government should have some sort of program to keep cattle on the range, or a flooded market will result."

Winter ranges in southeastern Wyoming already are nearly grazed off.

J. E. Burleson, Farmers' Home Administration supervisor for Blanco, Mason, and Llano counties in the central Texas hill country, said: "Twenty-two people have come into my office since Monday inquiring about the hay program. Only two of them submitted applications for hay after reading the requirements. Most of them are disappointed in the limited extent of the program."

Tenth Anniversary of the Warsaw Uprising

SPEECH

OF

HON. JAMES B. BOWLER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 30, 1954

Mr. BOWLER. Mr. Speaker, the greatest threat to the United States and other peace-loving democracies is communism. It is easy for us today, with all of the current problems of the day, to forget the lessons of yesterday. On August 1, 1944, began one of the heroic episodes of modern history—the Warsaw uprising. It demonstrates the height of bravery and sacrifice that freedom-loving people will reach in their struggle for freedom. The Polish people have shown this on many occasions in their tragic history.

The Warsaw uprising evidences Communist treachery against Poland who was then their and our ally. It demonstrates to us Americans that communism follows a well-planned pattern of world conquest. There is no question today that when the heroic Poles in Warsaw dared to rise against the Nazis occupying the Polish capital city that the mighty Russian Army, equipped in a large measure by the United States, was on the outskirts of Warsaw. The Russian artillery was already shelling the German positions beyond Warsaw. After the Poles' revolt started the Russian guns were silenced and Russian fighting stopped in spite of pleas for help from the Poles. When it appeared that the uprising might fail President Roosevelt and Winston Churchill urged Josef Stalin to help the Poles. These pleas were met with a refusal. Instead of helping Poland, an ally who dared to fight a common enemy, the Russian Army remained in the outskirts of Warsaw and waited while the heroic Poles were slaughtered by the Nazi forces.

It is no longer a conjecture that the Warsaw uprising would have been successful had the Russian Communist Army entered Warsaw and helped the Poles. The Communist leaders in the Kremlin suspected that Poland, loyal to Christian ideals, would not espouse communism. Today it is obvious that the massacre of the anti-Communist Poles by the Nazis made it easier for the pro-Communist Russia was already training Polish puppets in Moscow to take over the government of Poland after the defeat of the Nazis.

The Polish Home Army in Warsaw fought heroically for 63 days without any appreciable help from the Allies. The efforts to help Warsaw by the United States and England met with unequivocal refusal by the Russians to cooperate. They would not permit our planes to land on Polish soil then occupied by the Russians to deliver food and medicine to the Poles and to refuel.

Some people who are not acquainted with the truth say that the Warsaw uprising was ill-timed and unwise. The facts clearly show that the Poles were led to believe that the time to strike the Nazis in Warsaw was right. This was one of the many examples of Communist perfidy and treachery.

It is well for us in the Congress of the United States to reflect deeply and consider the 10th anniversary of the Warsaw uprising in its true perspective. Our words will not bring to life the heroes of the uprising. They may awaken every American to the realization that this tyrannical force called communism is bent on destroying our American democracy. Let us be alert and united in our efforts to fight this totalitarian force. Let us reflect and recall August 1, 1944, a day of greatness in the history of Poland and civilization. May God grant that the heroes of the Warsaw uprising did not die in vain.

Twice as Many People in Minnesota Prefer Flexible to Rigid Price Supports for Agricultural Commodities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 26, 1954

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Minneapolis Sunday Tribune of August 1, 1954:

MANY PREFER FLEXIBLE TO RIGID CROP SUPPORTS

Among Minnesotans who voice general approval of Government support of farm crop prices, most of them consider flexible price supports preferable to fixed or rigid supports, a Minnesota poll survey indicates.

Farm sentiment differs, however. More farmers favor fixed supports.

Republicans, Democratic-Farmer-Laborites, and independent voters alike show pluralities for flexible supports.

The findings reflect July opinions of a representative cross section of Minnesota adults, who were asked first by poll interviewers:

"For a number of years the Federal Government has carried on a farm price support program. It guarantees to farmers that the prices of certain basic crops will not fall below certain levels. In general, do you approve or disapprove of Government support of crop prices?"

The replies:

	All	Men	Women
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*
Approve	70	71	70
Disapprove	21	23	18
Qualified	3	4	2
No opinion	6	2	10
Total	100	100	100

The qualified answers include: "I approve to a limited degree"; "I approve at certain times but not at all times"; "I approve if the supports are not too high."

Among city, town, and farm residents the opinions are:

	City	Town	Farm
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*
Approve	68	65	82
Disapprove	21	24	14
Qualified	3	5	2
No opinion	8	6	2
Total	100	100	100

Everyone expressing either approval or offering qualified endorsement of Federal crop supports then was asked:

"Two main ideas about price supports have been argued in Washington. Some people think crop supports should be on a fixed, rigid level. Others think they should be flexible, changing according to whether or not there are large surpluses of the particular crops on hand.

"Which system of price supports—the fixed level idea, or the flexible price idea—do you yourself favor?

The replies:

	All	Men	Women
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*
Favor flexible prices	48	48	49
Favor fixed levels	23	26	19
Other or undecided	2	1	4
Total	73	75	72
Disapprove of any supports, or no opinion on supports	27	25	28
Total	100	100	100

Views of city, town, and farm people differ markedly:

	City	Town	Farm
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*
Favor flexible prices	55	49	33
Favor fixed levels	14	18	49
Other or undecided	2	3	2
Total	71	70	84
Disapprove of any supports, or no opinion on supports	29	30	16
Total	100	100	100

And here are the opinions of Republicans, DFL voters, and independents:

	GOP	DFL	Ind.
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*
Favor flexible prices	50	49	48
Favor fixed levels	11	31	24
Other or undecided	2	1	6
Total	63	81	78
Disapprove of any supports, or no opinion on supports	37	19	22
Total	100	100	100

A Morris farmer thinks price supports should be rigid "as long as what we buy is on a fixed level," and a Carlton farmer says fixed-level supports are "better for the farmer because they're more definite." A Menahga farmer says, "Labor knows pretty much what they are getting, and the farmers should, too."

Comments of people preferring flexible supports follow these lines: "If the Government doesn't use flexible prices the whole deal will blow up a year or so—we have too much surplus now" (a Granada farmer); "with too high a fixed level, the surpluses would tend to be built up too high" (a Waseca farmer); "some support is necessary but farmers become too dependent on it" (a St. Paul man).

Quiet, Please, Bonehead at Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ALBERT THOMAS

OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 9, 1954

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks, I should like to call the attention of the House to an article by Mr. John O'Rourke, which appeared in the Scripps-Howard paper some 4 or 5 days ago, dealing with open defiance by the German people of Bremerhaven against an alleged United States housing project to be erected in that city.

We all know 2 or 3 basic things about Germany: First, perhaps one of the scarcest things in Germany is proper housing due to bombings in World War II; second, the Germans want our military forces to remain in Germany; and third, they want the civilian army of American Government employees to leave.

The Germans have been most friendly to Americans. We all know that. This housing incident has certainly hurt our prestige with them.

Mr. O'Rourke has written a very informative article. But, after all, there are two sides to every question. What it is all about, none of us accurately knows. I have written to the very distinguished gentleman from New York, John Taber, and the very able gentleman from Massachusetts, Richard Wigglesworth, who so ably handle military funds, asking them to investigate this matter also call it to the attention of Secretary of Defense Wilson and Secretary of the Army Stevens. I believe it is worthy of their consideration.

I do not know whether American funds are being wasted as they were a few years ago on a housing project near Bonn, where several thousand lush apartments were built with American money for use of American civilian employees. I talked with a good many Germans about these units, and they all said they were too expensive for Germans to ever use.

I do not know what the housing units at Bremerhaven would cost. I have heard it is said it would be in the neighborhood of twelve to fifteen thousand United States dollars per unit. If so, that cost should be investigated.

Anyway, it looks as if some of our people used poor judgment in letting the Germans become irritated and aroused over this matter. Such incidents should not be permitted to arise. We are spending too much money to build up good will, not only in Germany but all over the world, to let these instances ever happen.

If we are to stop Russian communism in Europe, it is evident, and has been for the past several years, that it will be by rearming Germany. We can depend on them to help. The cost will be not more than 25 cents on the dollar, compared to what we are now spending in other European countries without getting very quick results. We must keep Germany's good will.

[From the Washington News of August 6, 1954]

QUIET, PLEASE, BONEHEAD AT WORK

(By John T. O'Rourke, editor)

This is why I think that some American fathead in authority in Bremerhaven, West Germany, has pulled another one of those boners so costly to the United States.

This town has just staged the first serious anti-American demonstration since World War II.

First, let me try to describe the setting in which this riot occurred.

I was in Bremen and Bremerhaven, its port, at right about this time last year, both places were cruelly smashed by bombs during the war.

The concentrated, almost grim energy with which these silent, almost sullen, north Germans have rebuilt their harbor works, their monuments, and many of their homes, is almost frightening.

Many Guild halls and churches, beautiful relics of the Middle Ages which had been completely reduced to powder have been reproduced on the original sites with identical copies, even down to the antique patina on the goldleaf on the baroque carvings.

But there are acres, still, of dreary rubble. Miles of flat, treeless, weedy areas, where once were the homes of thousands of workers. Here and there a smashed church spire sticking up, to emphasize the emptiness.

However, the Germans have scoured these shattered areas and piled up the bomb-tumbled bricks into neat piles. These they chip, and clean, and use to make new places to live; little homes, and odd, rather bleakly pretentious little apartments, in modern style with lots of glass. Even broken bricks and shards of bricks are not wasted. Some clever German invented a machine which grinds broken bricks into brickdust again, and makes new bricks, on the spot. So even crooked brickbats also are put in neat piles, near the machine, and from them grow other neat piles of new bricks, made from old.

I was told—I never checked the figure—that around 20,000 men, women, and children were killed by our bombs. Still, the people stuck it out, pigheadedly enough, if you will. And one can see that with the same obstinant industry, they've been putting their place together ever since.

This had to be, of course, in addition to building back their economy—mostly shipping, shipbuilding and ship repair. And because that had to come first, there is still a bitter housing shortage.

We have put millions of American-tax dollars into Bremerhaven's industry, to help restore our beaten enemy's livelihood. But no matter how well we function, the fact still is, we are auslanders. It isn't our country. It's the Germans'. They didn't enjoy losing the last war. Their stolid pride is reminded daily that they did, by the empty streets going nowhere, brick piles where houses stood, church steeples you can see through, the grinding work, and the uncomfortable, hateful crowding in little workers' homes that the bombs missed.

Well, somebody decided to put up an apartment of 558 units in Bremerhaven, to house United States Army personnel. Cost, $7 million. It will undoubtedly help the economy of Bremerhaven and relieve housing by releasing living space now requisitioned.

But whatever good effect, good propaganda, or good will may come of all this is offset by some thickhead picking a site on which workers' homes stood, and which, therefore, would have to be destroyed.

Imagine the reaction on the ordinary man-in-the-Bremerhaven-street, and the political effects flowing therefrom:

The victorious loud Americans, not content with sitting in their country for the past 9 years and for God knows how many more, are now going to pull down poor workers' scarce houses, which the overworked Germans have been trying to rebuild.

There are indications that the German authorities knew that choice of this site was going to be a hot potato, passed the buck to American authorities, failed to tell the workers they would have to move or that they'd be paid for their homes.

And neither, apparently, did our people.

So, when appraisers, workers, and surveyors arrived 2 days ago, 500 landowners attacked them with pitchforks and sticks. And when they came back the next day with police 1,500 dockworkers joined the 500 and drove them off, police and all, with bulldozers.

Now, I happen to dislike and distrust Germans. I think there is a great danger that, rearmed, they will, with all their old wolf-like savagery, leap once again at Europe's throat, as they have 3 times in less than 100 years.

Nevertheless, the policy of making Germany strong again has been adopted; the calculated risk has been chosen. It was an intelligent, carefully weighed choice—indeed, with the Russian threat and the French weakness, it is hard to see any other.

But isn't it stupid to spend millions to accomplish something, and then kick it down with a bonehead play?

I know there are plenty of vacant sites in Bremerhaven.

I was there.

I saw them.

I say somebody ought to be fired.

If an American official picked this site, he doesn't belong in his present job.

If a German picked the site, the American who approved the choice ought to be punished.

If, by some unimaginable circumstance, no other site would do, the bobble which permitted the business to proceed without taking care of the householders first, is utterly inexcusable, and whoever allowed that to happen ought to get the ax.

And I'll bet nobody in Washington will do a damned thing about it.

[From the New York Times]

GERMANS ASSAULT APPRAISERS FOR UNITED STATES

BONN, GERMANY, August 5.—Two policemen were injured today in Bremerhaven in a scuffle with landowners and dockworkers who sought to halt construction work on a new United States Army housing development.

The trouble in the port city started last evening when 500 landowners attacked with pitchforks and clubs appraisers who had arrived to assess the value of the property requisitioned for the housing project. When completed the project will enable the United States Army to return a considerable amount of other property requisitioned after World War II.

The scene was reenacted today when the surveyors and their police escort appeared again. This time about 1,500 dockworkers joined the property owners in an assault on the police. The dockworkers used a bulldozer to drive the surveyors, the police, and construction workers off the premises.

DISORDER LASTS 3 HOURS

Work on the project was resumed after 3 hours of disorder. The project will consist of 558 apartment units costing about $7 million. All the money will be spent to benefit the economy of Bremerhaven.

The entire community of Bremerhaven is dependent for its livelihood and business profits on the United States ships that arrive with supplies for the United States Army in Germany. Commercial traffic is handled at the port of Bremen but all military cargoes pass through Bremerhaven, about 35 miles from the port.

The Bremerhaven project is part of the new housing policy in Germany under which the West Germany Government undertakes to participate in the construction of new dwellings in order to enable the United States Army to relinquish requisitioned property to its owners.

The West German Government undertook to obtain the necessary land near Bremerhaven for the Army and in return the Army agreed to pay the construction costs with the proviso that the new property eventually would be vested in the German Government.

GERMANS TO BUILD PROJECT

The building contracts for the project were let to German construction concerns as was the custom elsewhere in Germany. The Federal Government, however, found it difficult to obtain the necessary site and requested the United States Army to requisition the terrain.

Work on the Bremerhaven project was begun July 15, but the German authorities apparently had failed to notify the owners of the property about the requisition order and to inform them they would receive reasonable compensation.

Meanwhile, in Hamburg, the second day of the public service workers strike passed off without incident. However, the maintenance crews in the water and gas works reduced the pressures in the mains when the municipal government persisted in its refusal to grant an hourly wage increase of 2.3 cents.

The strikers are scheduled to vote tomorrow for or against a decision of an arbitrator that would grant 50 percent of the workers' demands.

Thousands of industrial enterprises in the Hamburg area were faced with the possibility of having to curtail their production.

The loss of industrial production would be very considerable should the strike continue much longer because Hamburg is the most important single industrial city in West Germany.

A sympathy strike occurred this morning in Cologne, the great Rhineland city near Bonn. Municipal bus drivers walked out in a lightning strike without the permission of their union leaders. They returned to their jobs at noon.

Retail Food Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARGUERITE STITT CHURCH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 9, 1954

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am enclosing a pertinent letter received last week from Mr. Franklin J. Lunding, chairman of the Jewel Tea Co., Inc. In the multitude of words which have been spoken on the important subject of lower retail food prices, the statement of Mr. Lunding speaks telling truth.

The letter follows:

JEWEL TEA CO., INC.,
Chicago, Ill., August 4, 1954.

Hon. MARGUERITE STITT CHURCH,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MRS. CHURCH: No doubt you have seen these headlines "Food Prices Up Despite Farm Drop—Farm Prices Down but Food Stays Up—Middleman Blamed for Food Spiral."

A study released yesterday by the House Agriculture Committee concluded:

"Thus far, almost none of the lower prices received by farmers since 1951 has been passed on to consumers in the form of lower retail food costs.

"Consumers can expect little benefit, however from these lower farm prices unless recent tendencies to increase marketing and processing charges are curbed."

The figures cited by the report are correct, but the truth is something different. Here are the figures, according to United States Government sources:

	February 1951 peak	June 1954	Percent increase
Retail food price index:			
United States [1]	112.6	113.8	+1.1
Chicago [1]	112.9	111.6	−1.2
Prices received by farmers [2]	313	248	−20.8

[1] 1947–49 average=100.

[2] 1939 average=100.

Other Government figures show that the farmer's share of the retail food dollar has dropped from 48 cents in 1951 to 44 cents at present.

But here is the truth:

1. This is a page out of the book, How To Lie With Statistics; 1951 was a very abnormal year with which to make comparisons. Prices were controlled at retail while the farmer wasn't bothered by controls, to put it mildly.

We should make a comparison with 1939—and it shows the following results:

	1939 average	June 1954	Percent increase
Retail food price index:			
United States	47.1	113.8	142
Chicago	45.9	111.6	143
Prices received by farmers	95	248	161

The farmer has fared very well since 1939 and the middlemen have softened the impact by reducing the costs of distribution.

2. Consumers have decided they can buy services built into the product more cheaply than they can get them elsewhere, or prefer to buy the services rather than perform them themselves. Examples are the cake mixes, small-size packages, even cooking that goes into present-day products. We talked about this in Jewel's 1953 annual report as built-in maid service.

3. By bringing these additional satisfactions to American families, in competition with Bel Air Chevrolets and 21-inch TV's, the food industry is attacting a larger share of the consumer's dollar. Consumers are now spending 26 percent of their income on food compared with 23 percent before World War II. But if they were buying the same things as they did before the war, in the same quantities, the cost would be only 17 percent of income.

4. By attracting the consumer to spend his money on food products, the farmer has also benefited. Despite the fact that in the retail price consumers are paying for an ever-widening number of services in addition to the basic product supplied by the farmer, the share of the retail dollar going to the farmer remains at 44 cents. This is higher than in any year of the prosperous 1920's—in 1929 the farmer's share was 42 cents, for example—and is well above anything in the 1930's.

5. Jewel receives 1.4 cents of the food dollar as profit.

The astounding record of the food industry in attracting the loyalty and fancy of consumers can continue if everyone—distributors, processors, and producers—will work to enlarge the market for the good of all by cooperating in providing the products and services consumers want.

Studies, such as this one by the House Agriculture Committee, with conclusions based on loaded statistics, may serve a useful purpose to this end. They offer an opportunity for us to present the true facts. Why should the food group that has done the alltime outstanding job in the reduction of distribution costs be picked on as a political whipping boy?

Sincerely,

FRANK LUNDING,
Chairman, Executive Committee.

P. S.—Please do not interpret the above remarks as indicating any lack of sympathetic understanding of current farm problems or as an attack upon farmers or as a complaint about the improvement in their situation since the prewar period, that is 1939. My complaint to you is directed against the effort to blame farm problems and price levels on distributors who years ago originated farm surplus promotions on a voluntary basis, have the best record on reduction of distribution costs, and are not responsible for the extreme interference with free market actions that has brought into being the surplus problems now plaguing everyone.

F. J. L.

Trading With the Enemy Act

SPEECH

OF

HON. EARL CHUDOFF

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 5, 1954

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (S. 2420) to amend section 32 of the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CHUDOFF].

Mr. CHUDOFF. Mr. Chairman, I want to take a few of the remaining seconds that I have to commend the members of the subcommittee for bringing this bill out. I understand that it passed the other body on three separate occasions, but has always been buried in the final log jam that confronts us at the end of every session. I think the bill is a fine bill and will go along way toward restoring much of the prestige of the United States in Europe that has been lost over the past few years. I know that now when it has passed the other body, there will be no difficulty in getting it passed in the House and to the White House where the President has already signified his approval of the bill.

(Mr. CHUDOFF asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Don't Kill the Goose

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 9, 1954

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following open letter from the Washington Post and Times Herald of August 6, 1954:

DON'T KILL THE GOOSE

MEMO NO. 1 TO MR. STASSEN, OF FOA

Today (Friday, Aug. 6), at GSA, bids from Italy, West Germany, Japan, Belgium, Sweden, Great Britain, possibly Austria—and the United States of America—will be opened.

The question is: who will build 100 steam locomotives for India—with most of the 20 million American FOA dollars granted by the United States Congress. Then, Mr. Stassen, FOA will make the decision. It will be one of lasting consequence. It can be the beginning of our era of economic realism.

From past experience, we know that the world's highest standards of living, highest wage scales, domestic taxes, and many similar salutary domestic factors make it literally impossible for us Americans to compete for this work created by our own money.

When our employment and production were at war-economy peaks, we encouraged the work abroad to help our friends. But—America now has unemployment, particularly so in our steam locomotive industry. We need this work created by our own tax dollars.

Thousands of our jobless draw unemployment benefits running into millions of dollars but ask only to work and to pay their taxes. The steam locomotive industry is a vital defense weapon and needs this business for actual survival. (Ask the Army's Chief of Staff and his Transportation Chief if a steam locomotive industry isn't as much a part of our delicate defense structure as a wrist watch.) If income taxes and industry taxes were taken into consideration; if work given to peripheral industries throughout the United States of America (and their taxes) were counted by you, America would win in a walk. It doesn't take a certified public accountant to figure it out. Why don't we count all these realistic economic items?

This case can be a symbol of a tomorrow of economic realism. One may claim that the locomotives are unimportant in the "long range." Maybe so. Maybe not. But every unemployed American workingman and his wife will want to know your answers—and the principles guiding your decision.

Let's be economically realistic. Our American bids will be higher—perhaps much higher. Our standards of living and wages for labor are rightfully higher. Should we ask American labor to go downhill to help others get strong? You cannot want this. We know that our President doesn't want this. Nor do we.

You may say that it is bad economics to select the highest bidder. Is it good economics to give American money to a foreign nation—and to give another foreign nation the work for our money—when some American donors themselves urgently need this work? It's not only a matter of economics, Mr. Stassen; but it's also a matter of common sense in free government. And we know that you will be the first to recognize it.

The first way to fight communism is to set our house in order. Unemployment cannot be measured only in scientific graphs and charts. Unemployment must be measured in terms of every individual American who needs a job; his wife who wants to hold up her head; their children who are entitled to their American heritage. If there were only one unemployed family of Americans, this principle should guide our Nation.

Ask Canada. Canada recently gave India $26 million in aid to buy steam locomotives. People don't know that she does this, too. But realistic Canada said: "You must buy them in Canada. We need the work." And India didn't look courageous Canada in the gift-horse mouth. Canada's locomotive industry and workingmen are now so busy that they notified you, Mr. Stassen, and GSA that they will not bid for this job. Why? Because they just can't handle it. (Note: Canada balances her budget.)

We plead not only for us of Pennsylvania in writing to you, who adopted our State as his own. We speak for every man, woman, and child of American management and labor—Democrat and Republican—who need work—and who nevertheless want to keep helping our friends abroad.

It's up to you, Mr. Stassen. We believe that you think first of America and our people, not in terms of fancy phrases which are unedible, but in terms of economic realism for your country.

The eyes of the world and our people are on you. This may be the crossroads for foreign aid. You ask Congress to help. All powers in this symbolic case lie in your own hands. Let's not kill the goose that lays the golden eggs.

We must keep working, if we are to keep giving.

THE COMMITTEE OF 100
OF WILKES-BARRE, PA.,
WILLIAM SWORD,
President, Industrial Development Fund of Wilkes-Barre.
VICTOR DIEHN,
President, Northeast Pennsylvania Industrial Development Commission.
CHARLES MINER,
President, Wilkes-Barre Chamber of Commerce.
PATRICK SHOVLIN,
President, CIO Council of Greater Wilkes-Barre.
CHARLES WEISSMAN,
Ex-officio, Northeast Pennsylvania Industrial Development Commission Task Force.

(Wilkes-Barre has been designated by the Department of Labor as a superdistressed area.)

The Supreme Court

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 9, 1954

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following very interesting and timely editorial from the Christian Science Monitor, Boston, Mass., Saturday, August 7, 1954:

WELL DISPOSED OF

The House Judiciary Committee has turned down a proposed constitutional amendment ostensibly aimed at blocking any future attempt, such as that in 1937, to "pack" the Supreme Court in favor of some particular philosophy of government. A similar bill had been passed by the Senate in May.

The aim of such a measure is one with which this newspaper has always been in accord. But we are not in accord with the method proposed. And the House group (which observed that so momentous an issue should not be acted on in the rush of a session's end) showed more wisdom we think, than did the Senate (which listened to but 10 witnesses, all in favor, and debated but 4 hours).

The measure would have written into basic law a rigid formula as to the Court's membership and tenure difficult to adapt to changing times and conditions. Will 9 Justices always be sufficient for the caseload? With the examples of John Marshall and Oliver Wendell Holmes in mind, should all justices be retired at 75? Recalling Charles Evans Hughes, should all Justices be barred from the Presidency and Vice Presidency for 5 years after leaving office?

As for the Court-packing danger: The House committee reportedly concluded that in event of a recurrence Congress and public opinion could be relied upon to take care of it as they did in 1937. To which sentiment we would add our endorsement.

A Legislative Portrait

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS
OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 9, 1954

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful for the permission accorded to me to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the labor newsletter issued by Herman and Conway Associates, dated August 5. Messrs. Herman and Conway Associates are a labor-management advisory organization, whose members are well-known to me, and they enjoy the confidence and respect of both labor and industry.

In this bulletin, No. 483, which was published by them, they review in a brief way the labor legislation program which confronted the 83d Congress and they have paid a well-deserved and appropriate tribute to the chairman of the House Committee on Education and Labor, our colleague, the Honorable SAMUEL K. MCCONNELL, JR., of Pennsylvania. I know that the many friends of the gentleman from Pennsylvania will appreciate this tribute because they are aware of his sincerity and recognize his straightforward manner and forthrightness in considering the very difficult and highly volatile subject of labor legislation. The article follows and is entitled "A Legislative Portrait":

A LEGISLATIVE PORTRAIT[1]

As the Washington scene closes on the 83d session of Congress and tired Congressmen and Senators plan the fall campaigns, there comes a lull between past performance and new promises that offers the serious student of labor legislation a contemplative period in which to quietly assess the scene—its successes and its failures.

---

[1] Seldom has this letter indulged in personalities. An exception is made in this particular case in the interest of our readers in the field of labor to give a perspective of labor legislation that would ordinarily not be gained by the general press or special publications.

Over the Potomac, in and out of the House and Senate Labor Committees, reams of Taft-Hartley drafts, redrafts, have been submitted, analyzed, corrected, deleted, testified, and debated upon.

From secret hotel meetings to public hearings, the labor law of the land named after two men no longer in office has survived the legislative hurly-burly without the change of one comma, period, or semicolon.

From Candidate Eisenhower's message to the American Federation of Labor convention in New York City at the Commodore Hotel in 1952 to the almost unnoticed resolution introduced this week—to curtail firing of economic strikes—the long pathway included landmarks like the secret meeting of AFL and Presidential advisers to draft a suitable compromise bill, then the famous—or infamous—leak to the Wall Street Journal, the Durkin resignation, the wrath of George Meany, the counterattack brilliantly executed by NAM legal experts—all coming to exactly nothing if one were to judge only by tangible results.

That both sides, labor and industry, were too one-sided seems a healthy generalization on the reason why no labor legislation passed. This is probably true.

It may also be true that Congressmen and Senators felt that no new issue between labor and industry would help in their districts and States—whether they were Republicans or Democrats.

It may also be true that AFL and CIO chose not to commit all of its resources in the face of an uphill fight, but preferred to bide their time.

All of this and probably more led to T-H, despite the thunder, staying in Washington for at least another term.

Yet this was not the real news—the big news of labor legislation.

It can here be stated categorically that the reason the really big news concerning labor legislation never was publicized—and probably never will be—is because of one man, Representative SAMUEL K. MCCONNELL, JR., Republican of Pennsylvania.

He is chairman of the House Labor Committee, and the reason for the withholding of his name from many pieces of labor legislation is because it has been his expressed desire to achieve the benefits of sound legislation rather than use them as a vehicle of personal aggrandizement.

That attitude was clearly expressed in his opening remarks at the first session of the Committee on Education and Labor, considering Taft-Hartley revisions, February 10, 1953:

"Experience and the passage of time have softened the attitude of many extremists on both sides of the argument. A better atmisphere seems to prevail than has existed for several years. I am very hopeful that adjustments and changes can now be worked out.

"I believe that certain fundamental ideas and principles should guide us as we consider any law dealing with labor-management relations. It shold be as simple, clear, and concise as it is humanly possible to make it. The rights of the public, the wage earner, the employer, and the union must be protected, blended, and balanced as well as is humanly possible in any law. Responsibilities must go hand in hand with rights and privileges. And last, but by no means least, interference by the Federal Government and its agencies in the relations of labor and management should be kept to a minimum."

When the hope he then expressed was not realized and when extremists on both sides made it apparent that it would be almost impossible to write a bill in which "The rights of the public, the wage earner, the employer and the union (would) be protected, blended and balanced," he refused to play politics.

Where, however, constructive labor legislation was feasible he worked effectively and anonymously to help its passage.

There are, for example, two cornerstone pieces of labor legislation just passed and signed by the President, the destiny of which was molded and guided by this quiet looking legislator.

Yet few people, however well versed in the field, could tell you what these were.

The first, the mine saftey bill; the second, the vocational rehabilitation of the physically handicapped.

On the first, it was natural that Mr. Lewis of the mine workers would comment. But such comments as "a new epoch in the enforcement of safety conditions," "brilliant personal capabilities," "sincere belief," personal salute and appreciation, are rarely elicited from the normally gruff miners' chief—and certainly these days very rarely for Members of the right hand aisle of the Congress.

Likewise, on the second bill, now law, organizations of national reputation served notice to their constituents of the cornerstone merits of the McConnell vocational rehabilitation bill.

But these signs, important as they were, represented other things as well.

It is significant, for example, that MCCONNELL, has never been vituperated as a Hartley—that instead he commands the respect, if not the affection of virtually every important labor leader in the country. They have usually known what many others have not—namely that whatever has come out of the legislative mill in the last 6 years was under the scrutiny of this Pennsylvanian, and that while he is unimpressed with their slogan of "slave labor law," he will fairly consider labor interests in balance with those of industry and the public.

Revision of the Taft-Hartley Act will again be a major issue in the 84th session of Congress.

Whether that Congress is controlled by Republicans or Democrats, Representative MCCONNELL will be a major force in arriving at a balanced rewriting of the law.

His large contribution is that channels of communication between labor and management have not been blocked by a Government spokesman. In his quiet manner, he has effectively managed to keep this vital working relationship alive and healthy despite a political stalemate which normally would have hardened beyond hope of resolution.

Publicly, of course, in the campaign, much may be made of the congressional inaction on labor legislation, but whatever this may bring, it is of value to the Nation that there is still friendly discussion and the parties concerned are still "at the table" working it out—a practical first step that every negotiator in the field recognizes as basic to any progress. This is, above all, a contribution of patience and determination that marks a man for the respect of his colleagues and of those few who are informed.

He Should State Fewer Such Facts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 9, 1954

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, the Exchange Clubs in the Ninth California District have been greatly exercised over the fact that the national organization has prohibited them from taking in members of their own choice. One or more chapters have given up their charters.

I am pleased to insert in the RECORD an editorial from the Redwood City (Calif.) Tribune of Tuesday, July 27, 1954, relating to this important subject:

HE SHOULD STATE FEWER SUCH FACTS

Many fair-minded persons were willing, a few weeks ago, to concede that the National Exchange Club had a right to limit its membership to "white business men" if it chose to do so. While they felt that the restriction was undesirable and sympathized with the clubs opposing it, they noted that these clubs had joined the national organization voluntarily, knowing that the provision was in its constitution.

Mr. Harold M. Harter, national secretary of the Exchange Club, is alienating such sympathy as rapidly as possible. He has done this by ousting the Palo Alto and Redwood City clubs, which have no nonwhite members but who have dared to criticize the racial restriction clause.

He has done so even more by offensive remarks.

In a press conference in San Francisco Sunday, Harter is reported to have said:

"This is a lot of trouble over just one Chinaman. I suspect it's the Communists starting it. They got orders direct from Moscow to infiltrate our clubs and stir up trouble. Our clubs'll send a Negro kid to camp, but that's no sign his old man can join."

He blamed the withdrawal of the Golden Gate Club on its allegedly 95 percent Jewish membership and added:

"I was just stating a fact."

Mr. Harter would do well to state fewer such "facts." In one brief discussion he succeeded in bracketing a Chinese graduate of Stanford with the pigtailed laundryman of half a century ago, branding local business and professional men as Commies or Commie stooges, patronizing the Negroes, and insulting the Jews.

Two other aspects of Mr. Harter's comments are disquieting.

One is to be found in his statements that he had secured wire recordings of closed meetings of dissident groups. This is a totalitarian technique out of harmony with service club ideals, out of harmony with American ideals.

That is not all. Referring to rejection of Robert U. M. Ting as a member of the Menlo Park club because he wasn't white, Mr. Harter is quoted as having said "After all, there's still a Chinese Exclusion Act." Informed that Congress has repealed this act in 1943, Mr. Harter closed his mind to the facts and said it wasn't so.

When the policies of a great national organization reflect racial intolerance, totalitarian methods, ignorance, and the closed mind, its activities become matters of general concern.

Dr. Ralph Newton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. M. (DON) WHEELER

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 9, 1954

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Waycross (Ga.) Journal-Herald of July 20, 1954:

DR. RALPH NEWTON

"Soft as fragrant leaves of roses,
One by one our loved ones fall."

Not in the history of this city and section has a death occurred that has brought more poignant sorrow to all classes of our people than is felt in the untimely passing of Dr. Ralph Newton, a beloved member of our staff and an outstanding leader in religious, educational, and civic circles.

Like a dream or a shadow that lingers but a moment and then passes on he went from the realm of the living to the wider realm of the departed.

Death found him in the grand hour of his highest personal worth—at a time when the public with whom he had served held him in the highest esteem, and when his rich background of experience and more leisure time permitted him to extend his friendly community service to broader fields.

He was perfectly at home before many congregations to whom he spoke in local churches and those in attendance left inspired, uplifted, and enriched. He was a deacon and a teacher in the Sunday school of the First Baptist Church and a lay leader in many of the local churches.

Beyond all he was a charter member of that infinite brotherhood of mankind whose inspiration comes from beyond the stars. It was based on that holy injunction, "Love thy neighbor as thyself"; and "Do unto others as you would have them do unto you."

On Saturday of last week all that was mortal of this devoted husband, loving father, and understanding friend returned from whence he came.

We claim the simple privilege of placing a flower upon his bier. We would have it to be a white rose. For us that would be in harmony with this dear friend we have known so long and loved with such deep affection.

His going has brought profound sorrow to this entire city and section. His wise counsel, friendly confidence, and sympathetic understanding will be missed and his memory will be tenderly and lovingly enshrined in the hearts of his devoted family and others who knew and loved him.

A golden-hearted gentleman and a prince of good fellows has fallen. God rest him in peace!

American Food and Medical Aid To Relieve Flood Suffering in Czechoslovakia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY

OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 9, 1954

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by Dr. Stefan Osusky, chairman of the central committee of the Council of Free Czechoslovakia:

> It is with deep gratitude that we welcome President Eisenhower's offer to ship American food and medical aid to relieve flood suffering in Czechoslovakia.
>
> We appreciate the offer, first, because it demonstrates so clearly the difference between the Soviet and the American way. Since its liberation Czechoslovakia has been systematically looted and despoiled by the Soviets, to make it materially and morally incapable of resisting its Soviet-Communist masters. By contrast, the United States is offering food and medical aid to the calamity-stricken and Soviet-exploited population of Czechoslovakia.
>
> We are grateful, secondly, that the President ostentatiously should draw a distinction between the Communist Government of Zapotocky and Siroky, which is hostile, and the people of Czechoslovakia, who are passionately friendly, to the United States.
>
> Finally, President Eisenhower's gesture offers a unique opportunity to the visiting churchmen from Communist-dominated Czechoslovakia, who are attending the World Presbyterian Alliance Conference at Princeton, N. J., and the World Council of Churches in Evanston, Ill., to give substance to their affirmation that there is religious freedom in Czechoslovakia.
>
> Dr. Joseph L. Hromadka, professor at the Jan Hus theological faculty at the University of Prague, and official delegate of the Evangelical Church of Czech Brethren, insists that Christianity and communism can coexist and work together.
>
> I invite Professor Hromadka and Jan Chabada, senior bishop of the Slovak Evangelical and Lutheran Church, to advise their Communist government of Czechoslovakia (which gave them passports to attend the church congresses in the United States) to accept President Eisenhower's offer, and to propose to their Prague Communist government that American Christian charitable organizations be entrusted with the distribution of the foodstuffs and medicaments offered by the President of the United States.
>
> If they are ministers of Christian mercy, and if they genuinely believe in the coexistence and cooperation of Christianity and communism, they now have a chance to prove it. In these free United States, they risk absolutely nothing if, on this unique occasion of their apostolate, they bear witness, before a confused and troubled world, to their genuine belief in Christ and to their Christian zeal.

Atomic Energy Under Private Enterprise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. W. STERLING COLE

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 9, 1954

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following remarks made by me before the leadership conference of the General Electric Corp., Association Island, N. Y., Friday, July 30, 1954:

> It would under any circumstances be a privilege to meet with the men of General Electric—the company which has contributed so much to our Nation's atomic energy program. It is a particular privilege to meet here on Association Island, in my home State of New York. From my standpoint, moreover, this visit could not have occurred at a more welcome time.
>
> You may have read in the newspapers that, over the past 3 weeks, the United States Senate has had a few words to say concerning the basic revision of the Atomic Energy Act of 1946. Let me assure you here and now that you are not going to be treated to a 12 hour speech either defending or attacking this new legislation. I am a Member of the House of Representatives—a body which prides itself both on its short speeches and its thorough but efficient consideration of legislation. Debate on the atomic energy legislation has run true to form. On the floor of the House, it took us less than 20 consecutive hours to examine, debate, and approve this bill. The Senate, however, required almost 200 hours—including 4 all-night sessions—to dispose of this legislation. The Senate and House versions of this bill will go to conference early next week and, assuming good fortune and a willingness to compromise, the revised atomic energy act should soon become the law of the land.
>
> A final estimate of the wisdom of these amendments must await the judgment of future historians. In my opinion, however, the legislation will speed atomic progress, both on the peacetime and military sides. It will encourage increased private participation in the development of atomic power. It will permit our Government to cooperate more closely with our allies in military planning involving atomic weapons. Equally important, this legislation will permit us to cooperate more closely with other nations in forwarding peacetime uses of the atom. I myself deem this of transcendental importance, since I believe we Americans have the moral duty of helping others help themselves in realizing the great material gains which can and will flow from beneficent applications of the atom.
>
> I would be the last to claim that this is perfect legislation. These amendments have raised real issues of substance—issues on which men of good will could entertain reasonable differences of opinion. It is unfortunate, therefore, that much of the debate concerning this bill has centered around two points which are only illusory issues. I refer to the charges that this legislation is an antipublic power bill and that it will pave the way for an "atomic giveaway," by permitting private industry to capitalize unfairly on the American people's $12 billion investment in atomic energy.
>
> Nothing could be further from the truth. In point of fact, this legislation has nothing whatsoever to do with the issue of public versus private power—it is completely neutral on the question of whether useful atomic power—which is not here today, but which will be with us some day—will be generated and distributed primarily by private utilities or by public power corporations. In point of fact also, this legislation—far from constituting an "atomic giveaway"—accomplishes precisely the opposite result. It will prevent private industry from achieving unearned profits at the expense of the general public.
>
> It cannot be emphasized too strongly that the current legislation aimed at hastening the technological development of atomic power—is not designed to lay down ground rules for the regulation of an atomic power industry. You in this audience know that many challenging scientific and technical problems must be solved before useful atomic power at commercially attractive prices is a reality. The experts say that another 5 or 10 years of hard work will be required to conquer these obstacles. They say also that it will be necessary to spend perhaps another billion dollars on research and development projects before atomic power is widely competitive with the electricity derived from conventional fuels. Under this legislation, the Atomic Energy Commission would continue its present ambitious program of atomic power development, just as it would continue to build prototype power reactors. However, the legislation would also enlist the skills, the dollars, and the competitive incentives of private enterprise on behalf of solving the technical problems of reactor technology with all possible speed.
>
> Five or ten or fifteen years from now, economical atomic power will be achieved. The Congress will then face the problem of drafting a national policy for an atomic-power industry. But the problem faced by the present Congress, and the present legislation, is entirely different. This legislation addresses itself—not to the academic

problem of how to regulate a nonexistent atomic power industry—but to the practical problem of how to bring such an industry into being at the earliest practicable date.

For this reason, I have strongly resisted any attempts to weight this bill either in favor of public-power corporations or in favor of privately owned utilities. I, of course, have my own convictions on the issue of public versus private power, but these convictions are properly not reflected in the current legislation. Those who interpret this bill as prejudging the question of public versus private atomic power completely misinterpret both its intent and its consequences.

Now what of the argument that these amendments would allow private companies participating in atomic-power development to reap windfall profits? The facts are these: This legislation permits private industry, using its own money, to design, build, operate, and own atomic-power reactors. It also permits the Government to license atomic materials for use by private persons. The bill does not permit any of the 15,000 firms which have been associated with our atomic enterprise to secure patents on inventions discovered while they have been working for the Government or a Government contractor. Neither could private corporations receive patents on future inventions discovered while working directly or indirectly for the Government or one of its contractors. Any patents granted under this legislation must be based solely on the expenditure of private effort and private moneys, in keeping with our normal American system of risk-taking.

Moreover, nobody in the least familiar with the state of the atomic art anticipates significant profits in the years immediately ahead. The next 5 or 10 years are the pioneering years of atomic power. And I remind you once more that probably another billion dollars will have to be spent before atomic power can stand on its own feet in competition with electricity generated from coal or oil or hydroelectric power.

In drafting this legislation, the Congress has therefore faced a simple question: Which course of action would be most fair to the American taxpayer—to require that the Government assume the entire burden of financing atomic development over the next several years, when profits will be infrequent and small—or to invite private industry immediately to take on a portion of these developmental costs? Which would penalize the taxpayer the most—keeping private industry out of atomic power development until such time as profits are fairly certain—or opening the way for private participation today, when profits are by no means assured, in return for the possibility of fair rewards in subsequent years? Which represents the real atomic giveaway—keeping private enterprise out of atomic power development until after Government money has seen us through the hard pioneering days—or urging private industry itself to become a pioneer, with the pioneer's burdens, in this field?

I have said before, and I will say again, that this legislation does no more than give private industry the right to go bankrupt. Some firms venturing into this new area of endeavor will no doubt win profits; others will fall by the wayside. In all honesty, it is therefore inconceivable to me that this legislation should be termed an "atomic giveaway" bill.

Permit me at this point to speak very bluntly. I am a fervent admirer of the free enterprise system under which our country has prospered and grown great. Yet I would oppose, with all the power at my command, any legislation which allowed private corporations to profit at the expense of the general welfare. That is precisely why I want the atomic development field opened to private industry today. During the coming years, private participation in atomic power development will be less a privilege of free enterprise than a responsibility. Unlike those who have maintained that this legislation paves the way for lucrative corporate profits, I myself know the real facts are quite otherwise. I therefore cannot—nor would I, even if I could—urge private entry into this field by holding out the bait of a handsome and certain return on money invested. This is simply not in the offing.

Now private corporations are not eleemosynary institutions, and boards of directors have obligations to their stockholders. Yet American industry has never established its policies solely with an eye toward balance sheets—particularly short-term balance sheets. Whenever there have been opportunities for service to the American people, and particularly where such opportunities have been associated with pioneering in a new industry, our free enterprisers have not ignored industrial challenges merely because large profits were not in prospect.

It is no doubt a trifle ungenerous that, having been invited to this conference by one of America's great corporations, I should now return the compliment by lecturing private enterprise on its responsibilities under this legislation. Yet I intend to do exactly that. For more than 2 years, the Congress has been accused of impeding atomic progress by keeping atomic power development a Government monopoly. I will not comment on the fairness of these charges. I will note simply that, if the current legislation becomes the law of our land, the Congress can no longer be called a roadblock to atomic progress. If you regard these words as a warning and a challenge to American industry, please be assured that is what they are meant to be. American industry now has the responsibility of demonstrating that it is ready, willing, and able to take on its fair share of the load in helping our Nation achieve practical atomic power.

I have no doubt that our business community will measure up to this challenge. This conviction is founded, not on naive hope, but on the past record of free enterprise in action. None of us can find pleasure in the fact that up to now, the tremendous contributions of American industry to our national atomic-energy program have chiefly taken the form of increasing our military strength. The stern necessities of national survival have required this. We must still continue our strivings to increase the efficiency of our weapons stockpile, and to accelerate the tempo of our work on nuclear propulsion of naval vessels and aircraft. Soviet science and industry represent formidable rivals in this military competition, and false national pride should not lead us to think otherwise.

Yet, in our understandable concern with the nuclear weapons race, let us not forget that we are in the midst of another worldwide competition—a competition for the allegiance of those peoples not yet firmly committed to the side of freedom or the side of tyranny. If all the world saw the present global ideological conflict in these terms—as tyranny versus freedom—there could be no doubt about its outcome. Yet countless men of good will have been deceived as to the nature of this struggle. Although the Soviets talk peace, they practice war. Although they speak of democracy, they practice dictatorship. Although they talk in the language of equality, they follow the rule that the one may lord over the many.

So also has it been in atomic energy. Having jettisoned the United Nations plan for the regulation of atomic weapons, the Soviets nonetheless parade as the champions of atomic disarmament. Having begun active work on hydrogen weapons before we did, the Kremlin nonetheless charges that we have launched the world on a thermonuclear arms race. Having erected an Iron Curtain between the citizens of the free world and the oppressed millions of the Communist world, the Soviets nonetheless accuse us of blocking international cooperation in peacetime uses of the atom. And let us not deceive ourselves: Untold millions of gullible but sincere people have been duped by the outpourings of the Kremlin propaganda machine.

We face, in the form of the Soviet dictatorship, a regime whose every act is founded on the principle that black is white, and white is black—if only you say they are. We live, moreover, in an age of semantic anarchy—when everyday words like peace, aggression, and democracy have been perverted by the Kremlin almost beyond recognition. In Asia and Africa particularly, men have grown cynical concerning the meaning and import of words. Therefore, let us not imagine that Communist slogans can be refuted simply by American counterslogans.

Affirmative and noble deeds must constitute our primary answer to Communist lies—deeds so compelling and so bold that only the totally blind can fail to understand their meaning. A score of speeches about the use of radioisotopes in medicine will not cure a single person who is infirm and suffering. A hundred speeches about building nuclear reactors in the underdeveloped areas of the world will not light a single home or power a single factory. A thousand speeches about the desirability of a peacetime atomic pool cannot substitute for an international organization actually in being—an organization actually doing something to bring the benefits of the peaceful atom to the world's peoples.

The current legislation permits peacetime atomic cooperation to get out of the talking stage and into the doing stage. It invites the President to negotiate agreements with other nations looking toward the establishment of an international atomic pool, and it provides a means whereby our country could join in such an enterprise. Our recent diplomatic conversations with the Soviet Government have made it abundantly clear that the Russian rulers are not now willing to enter into such an undertaking. This being the case, I fervently hope that the President will immediately concert with our free world allies, for the purpose of establishing an International Atomic Energy Agency with all possible speed—leaving the door open for Soviet entry if and when they are willing to take on the obligations of partnership which all members would be required to assume.

The idea of an international atomic pool is like every other great idea put forward in world affairs. Those of small vision can always prove, in advance, that these magnificent enterprises can never be consummated. The bare statistics, the so-called hard facts, are always on the side of the go-slow people and the hand wringers. I would recall to your memory the critical period at the beginning of 1951, when our President, then General Eisenhower, went to Paris and instilled new life and new strength into the tottering Western European defense system. Had we listened to the men of small mind at that time, all of free Europe might now be occupied by the Soviets. I therefore say to you most earnestly: Let us not view the idea of an international atomic pool through the wrong end of a telescope. The difficulties of establishing such an organization are great—yes. But the rewards would be far, far greater.

One word of warning, however. I know of no great humanitarian enterprise which has succeeded if carried out solely under governmental auspices. This will also be true of peacetime atomic collaboration.

Official cooperation, carried on through official channels, will, of course, be required between the governmental atomic-energy organizations of the various countries involved. Side by side with this, we need people-to-people cooperation—cooperation carried out under private, unofficial auspices, subject, naturally, to the requirements of security. American industry should now be searching out ways and means of exchanging ideas and skills in the peacetime atomic field with the business concerns of other nations. Our American scientists should now be endeavoring to cooperate more closely with their colleagues abroad in an attack on the problems of the peaceful atom. The International Conference of Scientists, to be held later this year in our country, is a promising step in this direction. Our American universities, once more through nongovernmental channels, should now explore the possibilities of more intimate collaboration with the universities of Africa and free Europe and Asia in the peacetime atomic field. American doctors and researchers concerned with medical applications of the atom should now aim at a closer exchange of ideas with their foreign colleagues working on these same problems.

I would not presume to tell you how such people-to-people cooperation can be best brought about; I only know it is urgently needed. Conceivably, we might begin by establishing, under private sponsorship, an atomic clearinghouse here in our own country. Similar national organizations, also under private auspices, might then be established in the other free nations. Wisdom might thereafter lie in setting up an international headquarters for the various national organizations. I would myself imagine that such a headquarters should not be located here in the United States, where it might be open to the charge of undue American influence, but rather in some other part of the free world. Financing such an organization should not present insuperable problems. The moneys required would not be great. As far as our own Nation is concerned, I am confident that our industrial corporations, our philanthropic organizations, our labor unions, and our universities would be willing to contribute generously to such an undertaking. It is my understanding that some of the most distinguished leaders of our American business community are now attempting to institute people-to-people international atomic cooperation. I wish them well.

I cannot believe that the genius of man, so magnificent in pushing back the frontiers of our physical universe, is now inadequate to the task of controlling atomic energy for the betterment of man. I cannot believe that the road the world is now traveling must end in atomic ruin and the destruction of all we hold dear. I believe, instead, that the atomic age is as full of hope as the threat of holocaust, as full of promise as of peril. Using the wisdom and the fortitude which God has given us, let us now meet and conquer the great challenge of this epoch—making the atom the touchstone to a better world of tomorrow.

The National Arboretum

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE CANNON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 5, 1954

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, most of the appropriations passed by the Congress are for strictly utilitarian purposes. Practically all Federal appropriations have their material and practical objective.

Technically speaking, there are perhaps only three items in the national budget which may be said to be even remotely for purely cultural, aesthetic, or altruistic activities. Those are the Smithsonian Institution—embracing the Frear Art Gallery and the National Gallery of Art—the Library of Congress, and the National Arboretum.

All three have been sadly neglected during the war years when national resources were being devoted to the war program and the National Arboretum especially has been maintained on the barest subsistence basis.

But life is more than meat and the body is more than raiment and it is reassuring to know that the materialistic and utilitarian demands of the times have not completely submerged public interest in the academic and the intellectual, as is evidenced by the following editorial in the Washington Star:

OPEN THE ARBORETUM

No doubt it has come as a surprise to many Washingtonians who have attempted to visit the National Arboretum to learn that it is closed on Saturdays and Sundays. This policy effectively denies enjoyment of a lovely tract of woods and shrubs in northeast Washington to most persons who must work for a living. The explanation of the Department of Agriculture, which operates the arboretum, is that insufficient personnel are available to maintain guard service on weekends. The arboretum is open to the public on weekends during the azalea season in the spring; but at other times it is open only by appointment on weekdays. The Department of Agriculture of course cannot be blamed if the staffing problem is a question of appropriations, but does not the matter call for some attention by Congress? The National Arboretum is a treasure belonging to the people. It ought to be available for public appreciation, not hoarded like Fort Knox gold.

Mr. Speaker, throughout recorded history the great nations have maintained and fostered institutional gardens and arboreta in which were grown and developed for scientific, cultural, and experimental purposes the widest collections of flowers, herbs, shrubs, and trees indigenous to the climate.

In ancient Greece the Gardens of Epicturus at Athens were widely noted and Pliny describes the botanic garden of Antonius Castor at Rome in the first century A. D. as one of the famous features of the city.

All modern nations have devoted both private and public funds to national arboreta and we have the Jardin Botanico Municipal, of Buenos Aires; the Australian Botanischer Garten at Vienna; the Belgian Jardin Botanique de L' Etat at Brussels; the French Museum National d'Histoire Naturelle established in 1635 in Paris; the Botanischer Garten und Museum established at Berlin in 1646; the famous Kew Gardens established near London in 1841; the botanic gardens of Tokyo Imperial University at Tokyo established 1684; the Netherlands Gardens Hortus Botanicus established in 1682 at Amsterdam; the Spanish Gardens, the Jardin Botanico de Madrid established at Madrid in 1755; the Russian Gardens, the Institute and Botanic Garden Botanitscheskij Sad established at what is now Leningrad in 1713 by Peter the Great; the National Arboretum established at Washington by act of Congress March 4, 1927; Shaw's Gardens opened to the public at St. Louis, Mo., in 1859.

Mr. Speaker, it is to be regretted that the United States, spending more money on research today than any nation in the world, with the possible exception of Russia, is so far behind the nations of the world in this respect.

The general interest in the National Arboretum, and the realization that it has been consistently neglected in recent years is further indicated by an article in the Washington Post and Times Herald, of August 2, 1954:

SHORT FUNDS LIMIT ARBORETUM'S VALUE

The cabdriver snorted and said: "I've been hacking for 20 years and there's just no such thing as a National Arboretum here."

But a drive to 28th and M Streets NE. proved him wrong. The Arboretum—our national treasure in trees—does exist even though its existence hangs by a shoestring.

Unfortunately, too few people are aware of the spectacular woodland where each spring nature puts on a show which outrivals our famed cherry blossoms.

Even more unfortunate is the fact that the Arboretum—established by an act of Congress back in 1927—is nowhere near ready to be opened to the public on a year-round basis.

The unhappy truth is that Congress, after years of prodding, recognized the wisdom of establishing the Arboretum, then has failed to recognize the need for supporting it.

This year, for example, the Arboretum was given only $156,000 to operate the 415-acre preserve.

"I wouldn't be surprised if it takes that much money to maintain the White House grounds," says Dr. Francis deVos, assistant director.

This meager sum does not permit the Arboretum to become in the field of living plants, the counterpart of the Smithsonian as it was intended.

In fact, in the current dry season, the institution's 18 maintenance men can't keep up with their ordinary housekeeping duties. Most of their time is expended on watering the plantings because there has been no money for an adequate irrigation system.

This means there is no time to pull up weeds, which now shrowd the quince blossoms and mingle with the prized azaleas. Nor is there time to mark the displays so that the uninitiated may know what they are looking at.

With only one man to patrol the grounds, fires also get a good start before they are spotted. That's how two acres of azaleas burned on the slopes of Mount Hamilton last fall.

Because there also are no funds for guides, guards and road improvements, the flowering woodland is virtually closed to public view.

During weekdays, it is open by appointment only. It is closed on weekends with the exception of 1 month, begining in mid-April. That's when the Arboretum puts on its greatest show—the main mass of azaleas, flowering dogwood, and crabapples are followed by native azaleas, mountain laurel and the huge blooms of the elephant-ear magnolia.

On those weekends, motorists are lined up bumper to bumper to view the blossoms. Even then, however, only about 60 of the 415 acres are open for inspection because of the absence of roads and trails.

This was not the intention of the Arboretum's founders. They envisioned a day when the National Arboretum, which is administered by the Secretary of Agriculture, would be many things to many people.

To the public especially, it was to provide a spot of striking beauty at any time of the year. To the school child, it was to be a zoological garden of plants, a museum of the woody growing things. And to the scientist, it was to be a laboratory for study and experimentation.

In 1948 the Public Buildings Administration was asked to prepare plans for permanent buildings and roadways to bring the institution to a point of maximum use to the public.

The plans were completed but only enough money was appropriated to make some road improvements and to build a small gatehouse which now is doubling as an office and information center. Work has yet to be started on the acutely needed administration building to house research facilities, laboratories and a herbarium.

These are just a few of the reasons why the Arboretum's director, Dr. Henry T. Skinner, still looks upon the institution as an infant, though a lusty one. And he foresees slim prospects for the situation to be changed in the near future.

"During the last depression," he said, "the Civilian Conservation Corps unit initiated many major improvements. Unhappily, it looks as if we'll have to wait for another depression before we get any real help."

For Them That Has—More

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER JOHNSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 9, 1954

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert in the Record an editorial from the August 5 issue of the Spring Valley (Wis.) Sun. Editor Alden Munson summarizes very well the attitude of many people on the Republican-sponsored tax bill which contains the tax-giveaway provision on dividend income.

I commend editor Munson's editorial to the attention of my colleagues. His editorial follows:

For Them That Has—More

If the present administration were seeking out a method of convincing the voters that they are definitely for big business at the expense of the ordinary citizen, two items in last week's paper would have gone a long way toward making their point.

The first appeared in Thursday's paper and was a report that General Motors' profit for the first half of 1954 had jumped 36 percent over the same period in 1953—this increase in spite of the fact that the amount of sales for the same period was down 7 percent from 1953 levels.

The 36 percent increase in spite of less sales was due directly to the fact that the excess profits tax was repealed effective January 1 of this year and GM's profit jumped $113 million to a net on common stock of $425,250,383. At the same time the tax bill to Uncle Sam dropped over $300 million.

As a consequence the shareholders in GM received $1.28 more per share than they did in 1953 while the Government took a third of a billion less in taxes.

As if this were not enough for the Wisconsin dairy farmer to swallow while his net income was dropping due to the cut in dairy supports, on Friday a second item in the daily paper told of the new tax bill which Congress voted into law.

An item in the tax bill was a whopping tax cut for these fortunate enough to be clipping corporation coupons—allowing a substantial discount on dividend income taxes.

No matter how strong the arguments may be for the need of investment capital and no matter how hard it is for big business to prosper and pay an excess profits tax, it leaves a decidedly foul smell in the air when the over $25,000 income bracket gets so much attention in the way of tax relief while the little man whose taxes are deducted every week out of a bare subsistance living remains at an all time high.

Without knowing all the intricacies of high finance or how "poor" the rich were getting by having to pay the excess profits tax and income taxes on their corporation dividends, we do know how much the employees of the Sun get nicked every week by income tax deduction and we get an awful strong itch to vote Democratic.

In addition to this itch we can see the glaring inconsistency of expecting the dairy farmer to take a cut in dairy support prices and the resulting drop in income with an eye to long-range benefits for the dairy industry while Congress is making it easier for corporate stockholders to clip more profit from their coupons.

While still believing that high price supports and mounting stockpiles of dairy surpluses are more of a threat to our dairy economy than a benefit, it seems as if we are engaged in a grab-bag race to see who can mooch the most of the taxpayers' dollars and if the dairy industry gets too far behind in the race by trying to keep an even keel without Government help, we may be expecting the dairy farmer to eat dry bread while the rest of the Nation has their greedy hands in the honey jar up to their elbows.

Tax favortism for those that do not need such relief—giving them that has, more, while still socking it to the little man on the street, could well ring down the curtain on the Republican Party for all time because there is nothing that burns us small-potato taxpayers more than the idea that we have to keep paying through the nose while the rich get richer through tax relief on their corporate stock—we would, in fact, welcome the opportunity to twist the knife in the Congressman's back who voted such measures.

Bipartisan Support in Our Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 9, 1954

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, we read and hear a great deal about the necessity of bipartisan support in our foreign policy, and I thoroughly agree with the importance and necessity of bipartisan support. But the leadership in the first instance for bipartisan support must come from President Eisenhower, and that leadership must be given in a more important manner—by action more than by words.

In a crisis such as confronts the world today, the best evidence of sincere, sound, and effective bipartisan action is in the appointments made to important positions, appointments based on ability rather than political affiliation.

During the administrations of the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt and former President Harry S. Truman, the bipartisan policy was established by them in fact as well as in name.

I include in my extension of remarks a list of some of the able Americans who are or were prominent Republicans appointed by the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt and former President Harry S. Truman to important positions in relation to foreign affairs and national defense. I also include the names of persons appointed by President Eisenhower who have had a Democratic background in the past, and one of whom, Hon. Martin P. Durkin, former Secretary of Labor, is the only one, so far as I know, who supported Governor Adlai Stevenson in 1952.

While I recognize the right of President Eisenhower to make any appointments he desires, and with no reflection upon any of the individuals named, they are not considered as Democratic appointments in connection with establishing a bipartisan policy in the field of foreign affairs or of national defense.

The matter referred to follows:

Some Republicans Appointed to Top Positions in the Federal Government During Democratic Administrations, 1940–52, With Special Reference to Foreign Affairs and National Defense

(Note.—No attempt has been made to list the Republican members of independent boards, bureaus, and commissions in the Federal Government. In most of these agencies, the board or commission operates under a statutory provision limiting the number of members of any one political party who may serve at a given time. For the same reason, we have not listed members of the U. S. Advisory Commissions on Educational Exchange and on Information or of the Public Advisory Board established under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1948.)

Austin, Warren R. (late United States Senator): United States representative to the United Nations, 1947–52.

Ching, Cyrus S.: Director, Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, 1947–52; chairman, Wage Stabilization Board, 1950–51; member, National Defense Mediation Board, 1941; member, National War Labor Board, 1942–43.

Compton, Wilson M.: Administrator, United States International Information Administration, Department of State, 1952–53; chairman, Psychological Operations Coordinating Board, 1952–53; with Office of Production Management, 1941; Office of Scientific Research and Development, 1943–45; United States Education Mission to Japan, 1946; American Commission to U. N. Conference on Conservation and Utilization of Natural Resources, 1949; United States representative to U. N. General Assembly (4th); member, Review Board, Atomic Energy Commission, Hanford, 1950; member, policy planning staff, 1951; NRA, 1933–34.

Coolidge, Charles A.: Assistant Secretary of Defense, 1951–53; with Department of State, 1951.

Cooper, John Sherman (now United States Senator): United States representative to U. N. General Assembly, 1949; alternate delegate, 1950, 1951; adviser to Secretary of State, 1950.

Draper, William H., Jr.: Under Secretary of the Army, 1947–49; United States special representative, Europe, 1952–53; with Control Council for Germany, 1945–46.

Dulles, John Foster: Member, United States delegation to San Francisco Conference on World Organization, 1945; United States representative, General Assembly of the United Nations, 1946, 1947, 1948, 1950; adviser to Secretary of State, 1945, 1947, 1949; consultant to Secretary of State, 1950; special representative of President to negotiate peace treaty with Japan, 1951–52.

Eccles, Marriner S.:[1] Governor, Federal Reserve Board, 1934–36; member, Board of Governors, Federal Reserve System, 1936–51 (Chairman, 1936–48); member, Board of Economic Stabilization 1942–46; advisory board, Export-Import Bank, 1945–48.

Eisenhower, Milton S. (brother of President Eisenhower): Director of Information, Department of Agriculture, 1928–40; Assistant to Secretary of Agriculture, 1926–28; Land Use Coordinator, 1937–42; Director, War Relocation Authority, 1942; Associate Director, Office of War Information, 1942–43; executive board, UNESCO, 1946; delegate to UNESCO conferences, 1946–49.

Foster, William C.: Deputy Secretary of Defense, 1951–53; Undersecretary of Commerce, 1946–48; deputy United States special representative, ECA in Europe, 1948–49; Deputy Administrator, ECA, 1949–50; Administrator, 1950–51.

Gifford, Walter S.: Ambassador to Great Britain, 1950–52; member War Resources Board, 1939; Board of War Communications, 1941–47.

Griffith, Paul H.: Assistant Secretary of Defense, 1949; special assistant to Secretary of Defense, 1949; member, National Selective Service Appeal Board. served on military and diplomatic missions, Selective Service, War Manpower Commission, Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion during tour of duty, World War II.

Griswold, Dwight P.: Chief of American Mission for Aid to Greece, 1947–48.

Hargrave, Thomas J.: Chairman, Munitions Board, 1947–48.

Hershey, Maj. Gen. Lewis B.: Director of Selective Service, 1941 to date; deputy director, 1940–41.

Hill, Arthur M.: Chairman, National Security Resources Board, 1947–48; special assistant to Secretary of the Navy, 1942–45.

Hoffman, Paul G.: Administrator, Economic Cooperation Administration, 1948–50.

Johnston, Eric A.: Administrator, Economic Stabilization Agency, 1951; member, Economic Stabilization Board, Economic Development Committee, War Manpower Committee, War Mobilization and Reconversion Committee, 1943; member, Defense Mobilization Board, 1951; member, Public Advisory Board, Foreign Assistance, 1949.

Knox, Frank: Secretary of the Navy, 1940–44.

Lovett, Robert A.: Secretary of Defense, 1951–53; special assistant to Secretary of War, 1940–41; Assistant Secretary of War for Air, 1941–45; Undersecretary of State, 1947–49; Deputy Secretary of Defense, 1950–51.

McCloy, John J.: Assistant Secretary of War, 1941–45; consultant to Secretary of War, 1940; president, World Bank, 1947; High Commissioner for Germany, 1949–53.

McNeil, Wilfred J.: Assistant Secretary of Defense and Comptroller, 1949–54; Fiscal Director, Navy Department, 1944–47; Special Assistant to Secretary of Defense, 1947–49.

Mead, George H.: Chiarman, Industrial Advisory Board, NRA, 1934–43; Business Advisory Council, Commerce Department, 1933–45, 1947–49; member, National Defense Mediation Board, War Labor Board, Price Control Board.

Patterson, Robert P.: Secretary of War, 1945–47; Assistant Secretary of War, 1940; Under Secretary of War, 1940–45.

Perkins, George W.: Assistant Secretary of State, European Affairs, 1949–53; ECA, Paris, 1948–49.

Petersen, Howard C.:[2] Assistant Secretary of War, 1945–47; assistant to Secretary and Under Secretary of War, 1945; Chief, United States delegation to London, Conference on Japanese Trade Relations, 1948.

Rabi, Isidor I.: United States representative, UNESCO, 1950; chairman, General Advisory Committee, Atomic Energy Commission; consultant, Research and Development Board since 1946.

Reed, Philip D.: Chief, United States Mission for Economic Affairs, London, 1943–45; deputy chief, 1942–43; Office of Production Management, 1941; War Production Board, 1942, member, various advisory committees.

Rockefeller, Nelson A.: Assistant Secretary of State, 1944–45; coordinator of Inter-American Affairs, 1940–44; Chairman, International Development Advisory Board (point 4), 1950–51.

Salomon, Irving: Delegate to UNESCO Conference, Paris, 1951.

Southard, Frank A., Jr.: United States Executive Director, International Monetary Fund, 1949; with Treasury Department, 1941–42, 1947–48; Federal Reserve System, 1948–49.

Stassen, Harold E. (former Governor): United States representative to San Francisco Conference on United Nations, 1945.

Stimson, Henry L.: Secretary of War, 1940–45.

Tobias, Channing H.: United States representative to U. N. General Assembly, 1951–52; member, President's Committee on Civil Rights, 1946.

Valentine, Alan: Administrator, Economic Stabilization Agency, 1950–51; chief, Netherlands Mission, ECA, 1948–49.

Wadsworth, James J. (late United States Senator and United States Representative): Deputy Administrator, Federal Civil Defense Administration, 1951; War Assets Administration, 1945–46; special assistant to Administrator, ECA, 1948; Acting Director, Office of Civil Defense, 1950; deputy United States Representative to United Nations, 1953.

Williams, C. Dickerman: General Counsel, Department of Commerce, 1951– .

Wilson, Charles Edward: Director, Office of Defense Mombilizatin, 1950–52; Executive Vice Chairman, War Production Board, 1942–44.

Winant, John G. (late Governor): Ambassador to Great Britain, 1941–46; Director, International Labor Office, 1939–41; Chairman, Social Security Board, 1935–37.

(Sources: Who's Who in America, 1940 to date; Current Biography, 1940 to date; Biography Index, 1946 to date; National Cyclopedia of American Biography, 1946– (current G and H); Who's Who in United States Politics; Who Knows—and What; Who Was Who in America, 1897–1950; American Men in Government; other biographical indexes; selected periodical and newspaper articles. Names were secured from United States Senate executive clerk, civilian nominations, 1940–52, annual.)

SOME DEMOCRATS APPOINTED TO TOP POSITIONS IN THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT DURING THE REPUBLICAN ADMINISTRATION, 1953–54

(NOTE.—No attempt has been made to list the Democratic members of independent boards, bureaus, and commissions in the Federal Government. In most of these agencies, the board or commission operates under a statutory provision limiting the number of members of any one political party who may serve at a given time. For the same reason, I have not listed members of the United States Advisory Commissions on Educational Exchange and on Information or of the public advisory board established under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1948.)

Anderson, Robert B.: Deputy Secretary of Defense, 1954; Secretary of the Navy, 1953–54.

[3] Byrnes, James F. (Governor of South Carolina): United States Representative to U. N. General Assembly, 1953.

Durkin, Martin P., former Secretary of Labor, 1953.

Hobby, Oveta Culp:[3] Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1953– .

Robertson, Walter S.: Assistant Secretary of State for Far East Affairs, 1953– ; service as economic adviser, minister, etc., in China and Far East, 1945–48.

(Sources: Who's Who in America, 1940 to date; Current Biography, 1940 to date; Biography Index, 1946 to date; National Cyclopedia of American Biography, 1946– (current G and H); Who's Who in United States Politics; Who Knows—and What; Who Was Who in America, 1897–1950; American Men in Government; other biographical indexes; selected periodical and newspaper articles.)

---

[1] Listed as Republican in Who's Who in America until 1936–37, since then no political affiliation given. Candidate for Republican nomination to United States Senate from Utah in 1950.

[2] Political affiliation not stated in published sources, but served as officer of national committee, Eisenhower for President, 1952.

[3] Political affiliation not listed in 1954 Who's Who in America, but generally considered a Democrat prior to 1952 elections.

South American Communists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 9, 1954

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial by Rev. John B. Ebel in the Denver Register of August 1, 1954, is another reminder regarding the Communist threat to the Western Hemisphere:

RED THREAT REMAINS IN LATIN AMERICA

(By Rev. John B. Ebel)

Ousting of the Red regime in Guatemala has by no means removed the Communist threat in Latin America.

It is estimated, said Representative RAY J. MADDEN, of Indiana, in a speech before the United States House of Representatives prior to the outbreak of hostilities in Guatemala, that "there are more than 200,000 Communists in Latin American countries who are willing to undertake job assignments of infiltration directed from Moscow."

Communist leaders in Guatemala and other South and Central American countries, he warned then, are being sent to Moscow for extended periods to be trained and indoctrinated in the Communist pattern of infiltration and peaceful aggression in free democratic nations.

Communist propaganda and infiltration headquarters, he said, were set up in Mexico City, Guatemala, and Buenos Aires. It is to be feared that the activities of the Guatemala junta have merely been transferred to some other advantageous spot.

Communist agents operated effectively in elections in British Guiana, Jamaica, and Trinidad. They also hold most of the important offices in Martinique and Guadeloupe, two French islands strategically located along the Caribbean shipping lanes.

Many labor unions to the south have come under Communist domination, particularly those controlling the mining of strategic metals, and in the oil fields and transportation.

What is even more to be feared is that the Communist activities in South America have been stepped up under a high priority directive from the Kremlin.

Whether the Guatemala victory will be a crushing blow to the Communists or merely a temporary setback remains to be seen, but only one of their Latin American centers has been blocked.

Mr. Madden suggested use of facts as a method of fighting Communist infiltration in South America. If these people only knew what communism is and what it does, as opposed to its rosy promises, he argued, there are few who would wave the Red banner.

The facts about two Soviet monstrosities, he said, should be broadcast to our southern neighbors by every possible means. They are the Katyn massacre, in which 14,000 Polish military officers and civilian intelligentsia were ruthlessly murdered en masse by the Soviets, and the martyrdom of the Baltic nations, Latvia, Estonia, and Lithuania, which have been all but wiped out as ethnic groups by Red rapacity.

And it is interesting to note, comments Mr. Madden, that the Baltic lands had the same sort of nonaggression pacts with the Soviet before their liquidation that the Red regime of Guatemala was negotiating with its neighbors before the Reds there were swept from power.

It is a mistake, warns the Indiana Congressman, to think that all peoples are as well informed as we are about the Soviet imperialists. In all too many cases they have heard only the Communist story.

It was no accident, we add, that the first Latin American land to come under Communist domination was likewise the one that had placed the greatest restrictions on the work of the Church and that was plagued by the greatest shortage of clergy.

There is no doubt that the Catholic Church is the greatest single obstacle to communism in Latin America, which is overwhelmingly Catholic. But the influence of the Church could be multiplied were there enough priests and religious properly to serve and instruct the great masses of people.

Throwing Away Our National Parks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 22, 1954

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I herewith include an editorial which appeared in the East St. Louis (Ill.) Journal on August 5, 1954. The editorial, entitled "Throwing Away Our Parks," follows:

Throwing Away Our Parks

The Congressman who led the fight to cut funds for the national parks now contends in the Congressional Record that criticism of the reduction has been unwarranted and the information has been erroneous.

Representative Ben Jensen, Republican, of Iowa, the chairman of the House Appropriations Subcommittee, says for the Record that "Congress has appropriated this year more than 6½ times the amount appropriated in fiscal year 1945."

This is true, but Representative Jensen should have been more honest in interpreting the figures.

When the 1945 appropriation of $4,813,610 is compared with the 1955 figure of $32,225,500, it is a fact that the appropriation has jumped 6½ times. However, the 1945 appropriation was made in 1944, a war year; the 1946 appropriation also was made in a war year.

In those years Congress and the American people were interested in winning the war. The national parks had to get by on as little money as possible.

But after the war ended, attendance jumped to 21 million visitors in 1946. In that same year Congress raised the park appropriation from $5½ to $26 million.

This year the national parks expect to set a record of 50 million visitors. That figure probably will be equaled next year, too.

Despite this record attendance, the 1955 Park Service appropriaton will be only $32¼ million or about 6 million more than in 1947 when there were only half as many visitors.

President Eisenhower realized that the Park Service needed more money and he requested as much money for the Service as the administration's budget would allow.

Nevertheless Representative Jensen reduced this amount by 10 percent and justified the cut as economy. This, of course, is false economy, for by niggardly maintenance we are throwing away our national parks.

Adm. John Grimes Walker, Principal Architect of United States Isthmian Canal Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS E. MARTIN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 9, 1954

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, my State has produced many illustrious sons, both native and adopted. But few have left greater marks in history than Rear Adm. John Grimes Walker, 1835–1907.

Born in New Hampshire, at an early age he moved to Iowa and lived with his uncle, James Wilson Grimes, later Governor and United States Senator. The latter aided his nephew in securing an appointment as a midshipman in the Navy.

In the naval service the youthful Walker soon proved himself to be one of its ablest officers. His active career was long and distinguished.

The story of his most celebrated contributions, made after retirement, is still classic, for then he gained a permanent place in the history of the United States as a leading architect of Isthmian Canal policy. This portion of his career was recently summarized in a statement by the well-known historian of the Panama Canal and authority on interoceanic canal problems, Capt. Miles P. DuVal, United States Navy, retired, in a professional discussion in the August 1954 issue of the Proceedings of the United States Naval Institute, volume 80, No. 8, page 927.

In order that Admiral Walker's great isthmian work may be better known to the Nation, especially Iowa, where he got his start, I include the indicated statement:

Adm. John Grimes Walker

(By Capt. Miles P. DuVal, United States Navy, retired)

It was indeed gratifying to read in the June issue of the Proceedings, what I believe to be its first mention of Rear Adm. John G. Walker in connection with the selection of the Panama site for the Isthmian Canal. This is most timely, for to those who have studied interoceanic canal history his name is significant. Please permit me, therefore, to supply additional information relative to the contributions of this distinguished naval officer.

Retiring from active service in 1897, Rear Admiral Walker started a second, and historically greater, career. In this he played leading roles in the investigations and studies that approximately preceded the choice of the Panama route.

His first interoceanic canal undertaking was as head of the Nicaragua Canal Commission (1897–99). This position naturally led to his appointment as president of the Isthmian Canal Commission (1899–1902) for exploring all proposed canal locations.

The work of these two commissions together supplied the technical bases for the great decision by the Congress and the President in 1902 for the Panama Canal.

After the Panama Revolution of 1903, President Theodore Roosevelt chose Rear Admiral Walker as the first chairman of the first Isthmian Canal Commission (1904–05) for constructing the Panama Canal.

Though this last assignment, in retrospect, may appear to have been somewhat anticlimactic in his outstanding career, it was during his chairmanship of this Commission (1904–05) that the Canal Zone was occupied, the Canal Zone Government established, and preliminary work on building the Panama Canal started.

This series of notable events (1897–1905), in which he was a responsible leader and ably assisted by many others, entitles him to a high place in history as one of the principal architects of the Isthmian Canal policy of the United States.

Since 1954 marks the 50th anniversary of the acquisition of the Canal Zone, appropriate recognition of Rear Admiral Walker, because of his outstanding contributions with respect to the Panama Canal enterprise would be eminently fitting.

The Administration of Public Lands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFTON (CLIFF) YOUNG

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 9, 1954

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, it has been apparent for a number of years that many changes are necessary in the numerous statutes governing the administration of public lands in this country. There are now nearly 5,000 laws on the statute books governing the administration and disposition of a vast area of public domain.

Not since the days of President Theodore Roosevelt has there been any comprehensive attempt to study and make a systematic improvement of this legislation. Even the officials of the Department of the Interior have difficulty interpreting and administering this maze of complicated and sometimes conflicting legislation.

I am pleased to report that in an effort to improve this legislative jungle I introduced at this session a bill to establish a commission to study our public land laws and make recommendations for improvement. Unfortunately, as is the case with so many worthwhile bills, Congress was not able to provide for its enactment this session and the limitations of time make it unlikely that anything will be done in this field prior to adjournment. I am hopeful that this groundwork which has thus been laid will result in such a commission being established when Congress next convenes, to carry on with this important mission.

In the meantime, a clearer understanding of existing laws will do much to answer the questions which many of our citizens have regarding their legal rights in matters of great concern to them. In the southern part of the State which I have the honor to represent, there has been a great deal of activity in the public land field. Many uncertainties have arisen which need clarification. A series of questions and answers has been prepared which I am hopeful will clarify some of these uncertainties until legislative and administrative improvements can be made. These questions and answers follow:

1. What is a small-tract lease?

A small-tract lease is a lease issued by the Bureau of Land Management under the Small Tract Act for 5 acres or less of public land for use as a home, recreation, or business site. Leases issued by the Bureau may be a lease only or may contain an option to purchase upon proper improvement of the land.

2. How do I obtain a small-tract lease?

A person must make application to the proper land office. Such application must indicate the legal description of the land desired. The Land Office Manager will issue a lease if the land applied for has been classified for small tracts and has not previously been filed on.

3. Where can I find out what areas are open for small-tract leases in southern Nevada?

Information regarding areas open for small-tract leases in southern Nevada may be obtained from the land office at Reno. That office also has copies of the necessary forms and instructions. The Bureau has established a temporary office in Las Vegas to assist the public in making proper application for small tracts. Any public land may be applied for under the Small Tract Act but issuance of a lease will depend upon whether the land is classified and open for small tracts. Most of the land in the immediate vicinity of the Las Vegas-Henderson area has been classified for small tracts but because of conflicts with other types of applications, not all of the classified land is open for leasing now.

4. Can I get this information by writing a letter to the land and survey office in Reno, Nev.?

The land office at Reno can give the information as to what lands have been classified and opened for small tracts. However, the small staff at Reno is now swamped with work. Furthermore, it is not the best practice to try to secure the information through the mail because the status of the lands changes daily. The land office might indicate to an applicant that a tract was open to application is of a particular time. However, it is possible for someone else to walk in and file on it even before such person received his reply. Therefore, the best practice for an applicant is to search the land office records and make application for land which he knows is available.

5. Where do I apply for a small-tract lease in Nevada? Is there a special form?

Small-tract applications must be filed in the land office at Reno. There is a special form for making application, form 4-776.

6. Must I file my application in person?

The application may be filed in person, by mail, or by friend or agent.

7. Is there an office in southern Nevada where I may file a small tract application?

There is a temporary office in southern Nevada as Las Vegas to assist the public in making proper applications. However, the application must be filed in the land office so that it may be properly recorded as to time and date and posted on the land office tract books. Priority of rights is based on the time the application is accepted at Reno.

8. What does it cost to file an application?

There is a filing fee of $10 which is not returnable. In addition, the applicant must pay $15 which is either returned if no lease is issued or applied against the rental.

9. Are preferences given to any class of applicants?

For applications filed on areas not under consideration for classification, preference for each tract is given to the first applicant. For areas already classified, veterans of World War II and of the Korean conflict are given preference under the Veterans' Preference Act.

10. What determines priority between applicants of the same class?

Depending on the circumstances, priority is determined either by a drawing or by the principle of first come, first served. Drawings are usually required when lands are first opened.

11. What steps are then taken by the Government in considering applications? How long does this take?

This question must be answered in two parts: (a) Under nonclassified areas, and (b) under classified areas.

(a) Applications filed on nonclassified areas are recorded and held in abeyance until such time as the area is examined and classified. If the area is classified as unsuitable for small-tract development, the applications are rejected. If the area is classified as suitable for small tract development, then the applications are allowed. Sometimes there are conflicting applications from other persons which must be settled before leases can be issued. The time that this takes is variable. In the Las Vegas area where there are many thousands of applications, it has taken from 6 months to a year to process the applications considering that the Land Office must first classify the land and settle all the conflicts.

(b) In classified areas, the problem is one of accepting the application, checking the status of the land, and issuing the lease. Normally, this takes but a short time but again in the case of the Reno land office this has been delayed by the many thousands of filings and the backlog of work due to the over 4,000 oil and gas leases suddenly presented to the office and yet to be issued.

12. Is it proper to secure a small tract lease by using the services of a private company or person?

It is proper to secure a small tract lease by using the services of a private company or person but it is not necessary and in no way accelerates action on the application. The Government, however, is not responsible for any representations such people may make.

13. Would such a company or person have access to information not available to me?

Land records are open to the public and are equally accessible to everyone.

14. Must I personally inspect the land sought in my small-tract lease?

An applicant may not only personally inspect the land but must make a statement on the application form whether or not he has done so. Many persons have applied for land without actually seeing it and later found that it did not meet their needs or desires. The Bureau accepts an application as signed by the applicant as evidence that he has inspected the tract. The requirements of the regulations are stated on the application, Form 4-776.

15. For how many years does a small tract lease continue?

A small-tract lease with leasing provisions only continues for 5 years with an option of renewal. A small-tract lease with option to purchase continues for 3 years unless the person sooner constructs the necessary improvements. Ordinarily, leases contain an option to purchase. When improvements have been constructed, application may be made for patent prior to the remaining years of the lease.

16. If my lease expires, can I have it renewed? What if someone applies for the same tract before I make application for renewal?

If the lease with option to purchase expires, it is not renewable except under certain strict conditions excusing nonperformance. Other leases are renewable if the lessee lives up to the terms of the lease. Failure to apply on time may lead to the loss of all rights. Applications for renewal must be filed at least 60 days before expiration of the lease.

17. Must I make improvements on my small tract area before being allowed to buy it?

Under the present regulations, improvements are required on the small tract before patent can issue. However, in some instances and in some areas, including the Las Vegas area, the Secretary of the Interior has waived the regulations requiring improvements and the applicant may apply for direct purchase. In some instances, under direct purchase, the Bureau has re-appraised the land resulting in a higher appraisal. In this case, the applicant is being given the option of proceeding under the lease purchase arrangement or purchase direct under the new appraisal.

18. What will be the sale price of the land if sold by the Government to me?

The sale price of the land will be the appraised price as stated in the original lease unless the situation as described in question 17 holds. Prices, of course, vary with the value of the land.

19. Are there any other ways of getting public land from the Government?

There are many ways of getting public land from the Government and the laws are too numerous to detail here. However, the principal laws are the general homestead laws and the public sale law. The homestead laws apply to lands which must be developed for agriculture.

20. What happens if there is a conflict between my small tract application and an attempt to secure land by another means such as through homesteading or a mining claim?

This question brings up a current situation existing in the Las Vegas area in regard to conflicts between the small tracts and the mining laws. There is no conflict between small tracts and homesteading once the land is classified for small tracts. Land leased for small tracts is not subject to subsequent mining locations. However, mining locations filed prior to the leasing of the land for small tracts may be valid. Prior to classification for small tracts, the Bureau examines the land to see if there are any evidences on the ground as to mining locations. If there are prespecting holes, mining locations, stakes, or other evidence indicating possible valid claims, we will not classify the land for small tracts. The Bureau has not, as a matter of procedure, searched the county records to determine if mining locations may have been recorded. The applicant, as a matter of protection, should search the county records to see if there is a recorded mining location on the land he seeks. This, of course, in most instances, has not been done and many applicants had no knowledge that this is a protection that they should seek. As a result of the situation now developing in the Las Vegas area, the

Bureau will take additional action on applications now pending for lease to search county records to determine if there are recorded mining locations. If there are, the Bureau will inform the applicant that he may accept the lease subject to this possible location. The Bureau may go further, all of which will take considerable time, to search the records and attempt to determine by inspection, publication, and hearings, the validity of the mining claim. It was determined that the Bureau is immediately taking the necessary steps to determine the validity of mining claims on small tract leases in the Las Vegas area.

Once the lease has been issued and the lessee finds that a prior location not formerly worked is now being prosecuted by the locator, the Bureau of Land Management may attempt to determine the validity of the mining claim. If the mining claim is in fact a valid one, it must proceed and take precedence under the mining laws over the small tract. If the mining claim is in fact invalid then the Bureau will proceed to void it as provided by the laws and regulations.

21. What constitutes a valid mining claim?

A mining claim is valid against the United States if the claimant has discovered valuable minerals in sufficient quantities and quality to justify a prudent man to mine and remove them for sale.

22. How can I determine whether there is a valid mining claim or other type of prior claim on a portion of the public domain?

An individual may not be able to determine whether a mining claim is valid as against his interest in the land. That is a responsibility of the Department of the Interior. However, an individual can search the county records to determine whether a mining location has been filed on the land he seeks.

23. Can a valid mining claim be canceled?

The chances are that a valid mining claim cannot be canceled. A great deal hinges on the definition of a valid claim.

24. Can an invalid mining claim be canceled?

An invalid mining claim may be canceled by Government adverse proceedings as provided by the regulations. Private individuals may institute such proceedings by filing charges against the claim.

25. Is there anything being done to check the validity of claims in southern Nevada?

The Bureau of Land Management is now proceeding through its area administrator at Salt Lake City to assist in every way to check the validity of mining claims in the Las Vegas area where there are conflicts with small tract applications. The Bureau will be in a position in the next few days to announce the steps that have been taken looking toward an immediate solution to the small tract mining location conflict now existing in the Las Vegas area.

26. What steps are being taken to speed up the procedure of processing small tract applications in Nevada?

The Bureau is adding additional personnel to the Reno office to process the oil and gas leases now pending so that it may proceed with the processing of small tract applications. In addition, a large land exchange which is in conflict with more than 3,000 small tract applications is now on appeal to the Secretary. The Secretary's Office has indicated that it will give this appeal a high priority. After the Secretary's decision, the Bureau will be in a position to process these applications, whether favorable or unfavorable to the applicants, depending upon the decision of the Secretary. If the permanent help now being added to the Reno land office does not overcome the backlog, additional temporary personnel will be assigned from other land offices.

Former President Hoover's 80th Birthday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 9, 1954

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow will be former President Hoover's 80th birthday. The following tribute to him by his friend, George Sokolsky, is timely and appropriate. This tribute contains no fulsome flattery, and nothing could be less fitting for Mr. Hoover. It is sincere, as he is sincere, and it points out the great qualities and unswerving kindliness in a man who certainly had good reason to be vindictive if any man ever had.

Today, at last, President Hoover is appreciated, as he should be; and all Americans who are worth their salt join to wish him a happy birthday and many more of them.

The article follows:

HAPPY BIRTHDAY, DEAR HERBERT

(By George Sokolsky)

To know Herbert Hoover, who celebrates his 80th birthday on August 10, at West Branch, Iowa, to be able to call him friend, is a cherished experience.

In many respects he is the biggest man I have ever encountered, and that is not because he was once President of the United States.

The bigness of Herbert Hoover is in his soul; in the gentleness of his nature; in his huge capacity to accept the barbs of antagonism without vindictiveness. I once brought a man to Mr. Hoover's apartment who had been very close to Franklin D. Roosevelt and who had attacked Mr. Hoover vehemently. Mr. Hoover welcomed him, discussed important questions, asked for enlightenment on some of their differences. They are now such warm friends that neither remembers that I had to assure the visitor that nothing unfortunate would occur and that I had told him that the Quaker in Hoover makes it impossible for him to remember personal enmities.

Harry Truman once delivered a speech, I think it was in Boston, attacking Hoover with some characteristic violence. Hoover was then on good terms with Truman, visited him at the White House, and held appointment under him. I asked him whether he was going to quit Truman. "No," he said, "if a job is worth doing, it ought not to be deserted on account of campaign oratory."

Perhaps Mr. Hoover has lived so long and has remained so young because of his optimism, which is based not on great faith in the works of man but in abiding faith in the mercy of God. Those who were brought up in any religious discipline will understand what this means; others never can.

At 80, Herbert Hoover is engaged in a task which has intrigued him ever since he became a public official at the end of World War I, namely, the organization of the executive branch of the Government. Except as provided for in the simple outline in the Constitution, the Government of the United States has never been organized. It just grew, layer upon layer, duplication upon duplication, until it is a sprawling mass of departments, bureaus, and offices.

First in the Truman administration and now in the Eisenhower administration, Herbert Hoover is devoting himself to an analysis of what exists, to overcoming the opposition of vested interests to change, and to establishing through congressional action, an orderly, systematic, nonduplicative scheme of operations. For such work his vast experience as an engineer, businessman, Cabinet officer, and President particularly fits him.

His great joy in this work is only equaled by the selfishness be discovers in those who would sacrifice the country to some little private benefit. But he works away at these picayune people and interests like a beaver cutting down a sapling.

Last year, when he was approaching his 79th birthday, he invited me to California because he said it would be my last chance to be there with him. He would die that year. Due to an illness in my family, I could not go. I recently asked him about his forebodings of death last year.

"This year, I have no time for that," he answered.

And so we all join the State of Iowa in celebrating the 80th birthday of a busy, an active, and a wise American.

What Could He Expect?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 21, 1954

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, if Syngman Rhee, a true patriot, has been aware of current events, just what did he expect when he came to America on his last visit?

He must have known that for several years a group of Americans, whatever may have been their intentions, are doing their utmost, by entangling us in the affairs of other nations, to destroy American independence.

They have succeeded in letting other nations shape our foreign policy, insisted that as the years went by, we build up the strength of potential enemies, one of whom, the Communists, they now say threaten world domination. We have given billions of dollars to other nations, more than a million American casualties to contain communism abroad, while here at home, through positions in the Federal Government, we have subsidized Communists in policymaking positions, in our National Government, fed, clothed, and sheltered them—yes, as American boys died all over the world allegedly fighting communism, until today it is doubtful if there is a country in the whole world where the body of some mother's son does not lie, the bones of some wife's husband lie buried in the sea—here in Washington the National Government has coddled, protected, and encouraged them.

Well do I recall the days when Martin Dies, Joe Starnes, yes, and the present Vice President, Richard Nixon, were fighting Communists; when members of House committees were bitterly, unceasingly and viciously assailed by the pro-Communist press and many an internationalist—by a press apparently financed by individuals and organizations which harvested fool's gold from the wars in which they involved us.

Today the picture is no different. A man from Wisconsin coming to Washington on a crusade against the Reds as came Dr. Wirt from Indiana some years ago, is, as was Wirt, most shamefully attacked.

Today the issue is the same as it was in Dr. Wirt's day. It is, are you for or against those who would destroy our form of government? Are you today for or against communism? The present real issue is, who in the Army promoted a man charged with being a Communist, gave him an honorable discharge, a man who took refuge behind the fifth amendment when asked whether he was a Communist or was affiliated with Communist organizations?

Yes, we may cry out against methods but we cannot becloud the basic issue. Ahe we for or are we against communism and the Communists?

Just as a committee of the House sent Dr. Wirt back to his home in disgrace where he died of a broken heart, so today, another man is being pilloried by the press, by some in authority who should know better.

And what have they against this man from Wisconsin? And who appointed anyone a judge over him or his conduct? He is for his country, his homeland. Oh, but he is rough and he is tough—so they say.

Assume that he is. Are the Communists who hold our men as prisoners of war, some 8,000 of them in Siberia or only God knows where, kind, generous and charitable in their treatment of our sons, fathers and husbands?

I know two wrongs do not make a right but when you flight evil, if you would win, there is no need of clothing the iron fist in a velvet glove.

Syngman Rhee, I repeat, if he was aware of current events in America, had no reason to expect that he would receive whole-hearted, all-out support in his efforts to protect the independence of his country. That you may know an accurate observer's and a truthful narrator's opinion of the situation, read the following by David Lawrence:

The Disillusionment of a Patriot—Korean President Rhee, Writer Says, Can't Understand Calls for Peaceful Coexistence With Red Killers of Americans

They finally announced last Monday the official casualty list of Americans in Korea—the dead: 33,417.

And Syngman Rhee came to Washington the same day to express his gratitude for the help the American people gave his country.

That's a lot of American boys—33,417—who gave their lives, and there also were 108,650 wounded, many of whom will be maimed for the rest of their lives.

Nobody but Syngman Rhee seemed last week to have these American boys on his conscience. It is true he came in a bitter mood. For nearly 2 million of his countrymen—civilians as well as soldiers—have been killed. But, coming from the battle zone to calm, peaceful, forgetful Washington, it was, indeed, a realistic if not an inexplicable, contrast.

For while Washington was polite and gracious to the President of the Republic of Korea, it was somewhat annoyed that he brought up the subject of what happens when you start to repel an attack in a war, kill and wound 142,067 of your young men, and then fail to finish the war or to do anything which gives the impression that you really care about the sacrifices that have been made.

This week Syngman Rhee will pay his respects at Kansas City to former President Truman, who ordered the American Army, Navy, and Air Force in June 1950, to help defend the Republic of Korea. It was a magnificent action and Mr. Truman deserves the greatest credit for this step. But then, after a few months, Mr. Truman faltered—he listened to the timid voices of the European governments who feared that a war in Asia might endanger the safety of Europe.

Instead of taking the calculated risks of a battle already begun, Mr. Truman acceded to the request of the allies and would not allow pursuit of the Chinese bombers to their bases in Manchuria. He refused to order a blockade of the coast of China, whose government had intervened in Korea with more than 2 million soldiers, and he failed to let the troops of Chiang Kai-shek, still the recognized head of the Nationalist Government of China, go to the mainland of China to fight against the Reds. Then he summarily fired General MacArthur—the Commander in Chief—for daring to advocate such a stern course. Mr. Truman has a lot to answer for in history.

Negotiations for an armistice had been begun under the Truman administration, so President Eisenhower felt it his duty to consummate them, because a commitment had been made to our allies to end the fighting. The plausible argument was advanced that aggression had been "repelled" and that the Communists had learned a lesson and that a third world war had been averted. Significant warnings against further aggression were then released by Washington in the hope of restraining the Communists from enlarging the war in Indochina. But the warnings went unheeded and the Indochina war was enlarged, with aid from Red China. The western countries in due time capitulated to the aggressor.

The 33,417 dead, moreover, are forgotten or ignored in Great Britain. Yet this is more than half the number of persons killed by the bombing of Britain during all of World War II. In spite of the fact that the United Nations has declared the Red Chinese government an "aggressor," the London government and almost the entire Parliament and the press want to accept the aggressor as a peace-loving member of the United Nations with a seat in the Security Council. Admission of Red China, of course, means that the Republic of Korea will be forfeited to the Communists.

Syngman Rhee, who has lived the last four years in an atmosphere of great sacrifice, in which the blood of the soldiers of many allied nations has been shed in the cause of human freedom, can't understand what's come over the free world, especially America. He has studied American history and has read of such patriots as Patrick Henry who said they preferred death to loss of liberty. He has read of how Abraham Lincoln said the Union couldn't survive half slave and half free. Yet he hears of "peaceful co-existence" with the murderers of his countrymen.

But it didn't take long for the Korean President last week to be disillusioned—to discover that official Washington is far more interested in finding ways and means of curbing McCarthy's "methods" than it is in restraining the methods of the Communists in Asia. Even when they have already killed 33,417 American boys and have tortured tens of thousands of others. He must have wondered about all this as he read of the debates in Congress where it seems more important to worry about whether some "Pinko" may possibly get a tongue-lashing before a congressional committee hereafter than whether 33,417 American boys died in vain in Korea.

Those 33,417 American boys had mothers and fathers and maybe sisters and brothers. Perhaps that's still a small number compared to the rest of the population, but there are millions of others who have been drafted to serve in the Armed Forces and are now in reserve. Will they be taught that America fights for an ideal—or just begins a fight and then quits when other governments, who send only token forces into the fray, get frightened and call quits?

It is going to be hard to indoctrinate the troops of the future and to convince them that the American flag stands for the idealism the officers will try to tell them it does. It is going to be hard to persuade many American parents that the several divisions of our troops now in Europe aren't being jeopardized. For all around them today in Europe and Asia are "peace-at-any-price" governments which are unwittingly telling the aggressor that aggression will not be punished.

The 33,417 American dead may not be on anybody's conscience in Europe, but what's much worse it is beginning to look as if they aren't on anybody's conscience here in Washington, either. What a way to destroy the morale of our Armed Forces in a world where aggressors hold sway.

Berlin, August 1914

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. DODD

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 9, 1954

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, the Chicago Tribune of August 4 carries a most interesting article marking the eruption of World War I in Europe 40 years ago. This article portrays the emotions of a native-born American boy, educated with his brothers and sisters in Germany, and how he viewed the events about him. That boy of 1914 is today one of America's leaders and heads a nationally respected public relations first—Gen. Julius Klein, of Chicago, Ill.—and his reminiscence and comments concerning that historic occasion of 40 years ago which saw the beginning of a global holacaust are both interesting and enlightening, especially in the light of General Klein's subsequent experience with the American Military Mission in Germany after World War I, as a combat veteran of World War II and as an international journalist.

The outbreak of World War I found young Julius Klein in Berlin, Germany's capital, where as an adolescent he had attended the high school of the Sophien College. Klein's father, Leopold Klein, was one of the leaders of the American colony in Berlin and the family were intimate friends of the late United States Ambassador, James W. Gerard. It was from this vantage point that the young Klein observed the historic happenings of 40 years past.

Forty years of hindsight lie between the outbreak of World War I and the present. The world has seen a second world war fought against German military imperialism. General Klein, mindful of the havoc wrought by Prussianism, fought its modern counterpart, nazism, as early as 1933 when it first attained power in Germany. Having long sounded the warning against the encroachments of German militarism, General Klein, too, has been in the vanguard in inviting attention to the perils inherent in the exploitation of this militaristic force by the Soviets and international communism, the world's foremost imperialistic threat. In East Germany, the General cautions, the hammer and sickle have replaced the swastika and the goosestep—but the underlying spirit remains the same.

Germany today is headed by a great statesman, Chancellor Adenauer, who is friendly to the United States and friendly to the democratic principles for which we and the free world stand and for which we and the free world have fought. August 1914—as did September 1939—meant for Germany following a path of delusion and folly which in both instances led to naught but destruction and defeat. The appended article from the Chicago Tribune of August 4, 1954, vividly recalls that day 40 years ago which marked the first step along that path; it contains lessons for today when "civilization is still on the brink of the unknown" and is recomended reading for every Member:

KLEIN RECALLS STIRRING SCENE AS WAR I BEGAN—IN CROWD THAT CHEERED KAISER IN BERLIN

(By John H. Thompson)

Forty years ago a teen-age Chicago boy stood wide-eyed among hysterically ecstatic Berlin crowds cheering the German Kaiser as he led his empire into a war which set the world aflame.

Brig. Gen. Julius Klein, of the Illinois National Guard, now 53 and head of a public relations firm, yesterday recalled the vivid impressions left on his schoolboy mind at that moment in history.

As a 13-year-old, educated for 7 years in German schools, Klein, although from a staunch American family, was as chauvinistic as any of his German classmates, most of them sons of German junkers or other aristocrats.

DESCRIBES SCENE IN ARTICLE

This uncritical teen-age enthusiasm was no more apparent than in an article Klein wrote that August for the gymnasium [high school] school paper of Sophien College, the semimilitary school he attended. It was later reprinted under the young journalist's first byline in the Chicago Staats-Zeitung and other German language newspapers here.

"There is a moral here for thousands of other American parents who are educating their children in foreign countries," said Klein. "In Berlin I was more pro-German than my classmates, just as the American children in London and Paris were pro-Ally."

The day war broke out Ambassador James W. Gerard, a close friend of Klein's father, Leopold, an international fur importer and financier, was in the Klein home at 4 Monbijou colony.

LAST NOTE UNANSWERED

Gerard—he died in 1951—told them how he had worked for months, unsuccessfully, to get Germany to enter peace negotiations to prevent war. His last note to the German chancellor, asking what the United States could do to prevent war, had gone unanswered.

On July 28, a month after the assassination of Archduke Ferdinand Austria-Hungary declared war on Serbia. Russia and Germany mobilized. Germany declared war on Russia August 1, and on France August 3. On August 4 Germany marched into Belgium and England declared war.

Klein's effusive story in the school paper described the milling thousands around the kaiser's palace, awaiting the declaration of war. He painted a word picture of the imperial family appearing before the crowds from a balcony and the kaiser's momentous words. Twenty-four hours after Russian rejection of a German ultimatum, it was war.

HAILS WORDS OF KAISER

"The kaiser spoke glorious words to his people in this dreadful hour of need," wrote the 13-year-old Klein. "I do not recognize parties any more. I only know Germans. In unity there is strength. Go to church and pray that God may look with favor upon our arms, and that we may come back victorious for righteousness.'

"No longer was the crowd composed of Jew and Gentile—Prussians and Bavarians—male and female. They were by those magic words blended into one entity—and that—one single unified Germany.

"Every one of them—man, woman, and child—raised his hand to seal his vow of fealty, as a quiet but terrible spasm of weeping ran through the crowd.

"Silently the emperor and family retired.

"Like magic the hundreds of thousands dispersed and disappeared. Silence reigned about the emperor's palace as he returned to work. * * *

"The curtain is up. The drama of 1914 has begun. The spark of resuscitated old hatreds is bound to inflame many other countries. No matter who the victor, this struggle will change the map and the social, economic, and political structure of the world.

"Civilization stands on the brink of the unknown."

Curious writing, even for a precocious 13 year old, but youg Klien was an avid listener to the conversations of his elders, he said.

THANKED BY GERARD

On August 19, with the assistance of Ambassador Gerard, the youngster received a Berlin press pass as a free lance writer for Chicago newspapers. Later, with his pass and a war correspondent's armband, Klein, who looked much older than his years, said he visited the fighting fronts in 1915 and 1916, becoming probably the youngest war correspondent in history.

In the Klein files is a letter from Gerard, thanking the youth for the tremendous help given by the young student. Klein explained, that as a school friend of the sons of German generals and admirals, he was able to pick up many important German military manuals and other information desired by the American military attache.

The Klein family was not molested in the early days of the war. After America declared war on April 6, 1917, they were interned as enemy aliens, restricted to their police district. Klein's father later contracted cancer and died.

Early in 1918 Klein escaped to Holland, and in France joined the American military mission as a clerk-interpreter. When the war ended he returned to Berlin with the mission, later becoming a foreign correspondent, before returning to his birthplace in Chicago. On Armistice Day, November 11, 1918, he was only 17.

Though pro-German in his early teens, Klein grew to hate Prussian militarism, was one of the earliest to warn against Hitler and fought in the American Army in the Pacific in World War II. Today he is concerned over the power of militant communism in East Germany.

Merchant Marine Seems Doomed to the Fate of the One-Hoss Shay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 9, 1954

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, a most timely article by Richard Fryklund appeared in the Washington Evening Star on August 8, 1954. I am placing it in the RECORD for the information of the Members.

MERCHANT MARINE SEEMS DOOMED TO THE FATE OF THE ONE-HOSS SHAY

(By Richard Fryklund)

The bulk of the United States merchant marine is scheduled to fall apart like the wonderful one-hoss shay some time between 1960 and 1965.

And, while the fleet sails nervously toward its doom, the American shipbuilding industry, instead of rejuvenating the merchant marine, is gradually fading away.

These two disasters are worrying a good many men in the administration, on Capitol Hill and in the maritime industry. There is general agreement that the maritime industry cannot be allowed to decline and disappear. The problem, however, is to meet the crisis in a way that Uncle Sam can afford.

The dimensions of the crisis can be grasped readily with a few figures:

Eighty percent of the 1,248 oceangoing merchant ships operated by American companies at the first of this year were built during World War II. The normal useful life of a merchant ship is about 20 years. So in a short span of half a decade, starting about 6 years from now, four-fifths of the merchant fleet will become too old and worn to be operated profitably.

SHIPBUILDING DECLINE

Meanwhile the shipbuilding industry is failing to turn out replacements for those aging ships. New ship construction is dropping rapidly. Just 1½ years ago 92 major merchant vessels were under construction. Six months ago only 48 ships were being built. And 1 month ago that number had dwindled to 23. At the end of this year it will be two.

Not one order for a privately owned, oceangoing merchant ship has been received by an American shipyard since November 1952.

Repair work, construction of inland vessels and Government contracts have kept some yards alive, but employment in all kinds of private shipyards declined from 128,000 persons to 106,000 persons in the past year. The number building merchant ships in the major coastal yards was 23,000 in 1953, will be about 10,000 this year and 1,200 next year.

All this is tough, of course, for men who have money and jobs invested in the maritime industry, but it also could be tough for the Nation if another war came.

Belief in the importance of the merchant marine is bipartisan. President Eisenhower has said:

"American industrial prosperity and military security both demand that we maintain a privately operated merchant marine adequate in size and of modern design to insure that our lines of supply for either peace or war will be safe."

And President Truman's Advisory Committee on the Merchant Marine said in 1947:

"A modern, efficient merchant fleet, and an effective and progressive shipbuilding industry are necessary economic adjuncts to the peacetime economy of the United States and are indispensable to national security."

If the maritime industry is so indispensable, why isn't it flourishing?

Simple—it costs too much.

To find markets for their products, shipbuilders must sell cheaper than their foreign competition. But they can't. Construction costs, particularly labor, run almost double that of the competitors. So, a modern 28,000-ton tanker which can be purchased at a foreign yard for about $4.5 million would cost around $7 million at Baltimore.

And once an American ship hits the high seas it is even less able to compete. It costs about $23,000 a month to operate a Liberty-type vessel with an American crew. A Norwegian shipowner with a Norwegian crew can operate the same ship for $5,100, an Italian for $4,250, and a Japanese for $3,000.

It adds up to this: The high-cost operators get fewer cargoes, make less money—and make do with old World War II vessels because they can't afford to modernize.

The problem of competition is an old one and has been attacked vigorously by the Government. The 1936 Merchant Marine Act provides for subsidy of both construction and operation of American ships used in regularly scheduled foreign service. With Uncle Sam chipping in generously, a shipping line is supposed to be able to buy an American vessel for about the same price that a foreign yard would charge, and the line is supposed to be given the difference in cost between operating that ship with an American and a foreign crew.

This 100 percent of parity support for the maritime industry has kept a good many American shippers in business, but it has not achieved the goal of a modern and ample operating and building program.

MORE HELP WANTED

The industry wants more help, and wants the help extended to tramp, coastal, and inland vessels.

The Commerce Department and Maritime Administration recently collaborated on a study to learn whether the Government could and should give more help. Its report is not official administration policy, but it shows how the President's advisers are thinking.

Conclusions of the committee were these: Construction of 60 merchant ships should be ordered each year so that (1) about 36,000 men could be kept busy on construction alone, and (2) ships becoming obsolete can be replaced. Annual cost to the Government would be about $400 million.

The report also recommended streamlining existing subsidy programs and encouraging more economical operation.

Congressmen have stepped in with bills to implement the committee recommendations. Representative THOR C. TOLLEFSON, of Washington, a ranking Republican on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, introduced a bill to authorize annual construction of 60 ships. Senator JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER, Republican, of Maryland, has offered a perhaps more realistic bill calling for 20 ships a year.

Neither bill has been acted on.

MAJORITY FAVORS AID

Inaction on these bills does not mean Congress is unsympathetic to the maritime problem. Some members of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee and the Senate Commerce Committee believe the maritime industry has all the help it really needs, but the majority sentiment is for more aid.

Congress this year appropriated $50 million to finance construction in private yards of several ships for the Military Sea Transportation Service.

Two other aid bills were just sent to the White House. One would permit the Government to buy old tankers provided the sellers used the money to build new ones. The other would permit the Navy to order 20 tankers at a cost of $150 million.

A bill to spend $25 million to start a program of repair and modernization of merchant vessels in the mothball fleet has passed both Houses and is in conference. Two measures to provide Government guaranties for ship-construction loans and to require that 50 percent of the foreign shipments made in connection with Government orders each have cleared one House.

With Congress swamped by the usual session-end workload, some of these and other pending bills are, of course, doomed. And bills which have passed but need appropriations will have to wait for later money bills.

There will be some immediate patching of the one-hoss shay, but a complete overhaul job is not yet in sight.

Granting Immunity to Witnesses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KIT CLARDY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 4, 1954

Mr. CLARDY. Mr. Speaker, I oppose this measure to grant immunity in certain cases for many reasons. Not the lease of these is the fact that it constitutes a still further surrender of the power and duty of the Congress. No legislative investigation and no legislative committee should subordinate its powers and authority to the other branches of Government as would be necessary under this proposal. I can never agree that it is wise for the Congress to act or withhold action at the word of either the executive or the judiciary. This is a step down the road to eventual dictatorship.

As a member of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, I feel strongly about the refusal of Communists to testify and to wrongfully invoke the fifth amendment. My experience tells me, however, that this measure will not do that for which it is supposedly designed—make these confirmed Communists talk and cooperate with the committee. The witnesses at whom this measure is aimed rejoice in martyrdom—this will not bring evidence on Communist Party activities. Why enact something that will not do the thing it is supposed to do?

The measure is loosely drawn and full of legal defects in my opinion. In my judgment it will be declared unconstitutional on several grounds. I doubt the right of Congress to grant the full immunity required if a witness is to be held in contempt for failure to answer after the provisions of this bill have been invoked and applied. I do not believe that we can cover State crimes—yet without that the immunity granted will not be broad enough to destroy the protection of the fifth amendment.

There are many other reasons why I think this bad legislation, but I shall cite only 1 or 2 more. I think this an invitation to graft and corruption. Venal politicians could whitewash criminals with complete safety. It is no answer to say that present officers will not succumb to temptation. We legislate for the long future.

Lastly, I am always disturbed over efforts of any branch of Government to whittle away the rights guaranteed the citizens by the Bill of Rights. I do not think it wise to attempt to circumvent the constitutional protections by legislative acts no matter how clever they may seem and no matter how serious the problem may appear. Here the 3 branches of Government would seem to combine in an effort to defeat the protective effect of the fifth amendment just because some enemies of the people improperly invoke the section. I am deeply apprehensive that in our zeal to get at those we know are enemies we may destroy something we cannot replace. For if the courts, contrary to my legal opinion, should uphold this measure it can do much more harm than its sponsors may imagine. I think we do not need this legislation for the safety of the Nation—yet that is really its only justification. I do not think it will produce more evidence—yet that is its avowed purpose. I hope it will be defeated.

Trout Labeling

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILL E. NEAL

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 9, 1954

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, S. 2033, would appear to propose limiting the importation of trout, but seems to be making the approach through the back door by placing the responsibility for its administration on the food dispenser rather than on the Tariff Commission, where it legally belongs.

Certainly, I am in sympathy with any trade or tariff agreement that serves to protect American industry against harmful competition from foreign sources. Perhaps this bill can be made to accomplish this purpose. However, the Tariff Commission has the authority to control fish imports through their customs officials at a relatively small number of ports of entry, where the objection could be met rather simply and with little cost.

On the other hand, to impose this duty on the operators of eating places throughout the land, not only will require additional enforcement personnel at great cost but will tend to eliminate trout from the menus of many eating places. It seems to me to be unfair to compel restaurants to become law enforcement agencies. This is the duty of the United States enforcement officials.

If the object is to limit imports and to prevent deceptive labeling, the duty should rest squarely on the shoulders of the Tariff Commission in its interpretations of the Trade Agreements Act.

Trading With the Enemy Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. BYRNE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 5, 1954

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege today to join with many of my colleagues in supporting the amendment of the Trading With the Enemy Act, S. 2420.

This bill has for its purpose the disposition of property which belonged to men and women persecuted by our enemies during World War II. The rightful owners of this property are unknown; either they have been killed, leaving no heirs, or the property is not in such condition as to be recognized as belonging to anyone in particular. At the present time, it is in the hands of the Alien Property Custodian.

We in this body feel that the United States Government has no lawful claim to this property. Since it is impossible to return it to its owners, we are proposing, under this legislation, to arrange for it to be turned over to certain organizations which would use it for the rehabilitation and resettlement in the United States of persecuted people.

Similar bills have been introduced in both the Senate and the House several times in the past few years. However, at no time was one of these bills passed by both Houses of Congress. S. 2420 has been passed by the Senate and, if it is passed here, will go to the President to be signed into law.

It is fitting that the assets of these persecuted people be distributed among those who suffered in like measure the atrocities and tortures of war. Approximately 90 percent of the owners of the property in question were Jewish. We feel that if they were living it would please them greatly to know that the property is to be disposed of by two Jewish organizations and that a great part of it will be used for the relief of deserving members of that proud people. Their cruel and irrational treatment by the Nazis will in part be avenged.

I would like to bring out, also, that this bill provides that such property, the value of which is not to exceed $3 million, is to be used for the relief of persecuted in need. Thus, it is not limited to members of the Jewish racial group. Knowing of similar work done under the United States Military Government in Germany, we may rest assured that this law will be administered carefully and fairly.

I heartily endorse the provisions of this bill and hope that it will soon become law.

Railroad Grade Crossings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES G. OAKMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 9, 1954

Mr. OAKMAN. Mr. Speaker, since President Eisenhower projected his grand plan for highway improvement, I have been working with road officials at all levels—Federal, State and local—in an effort to help develop a feasible line of attack on one of our most serious highway bottlenecks and danger points—railroad grade crossings.

I have discussed this matter with Public Roads Commissioner F. V. du Pont, with our Michigan Highway Commissioner, Mr. Charles M. Ziegler, and with Mayor Albert E. Cobo and other Detroit officials. I am encouraged to proceed with a concrete proposal I have developed which I believe eventually would reduce grade crossing accidents and fatalities almost to the vanishing point. Consequently, I am today introducing a bill to implement this proposal, and I hope it may receive very serious consideration in connection with the tangible plans now being drafted to carry out the President's proposed $50 billion 10-year highway program.

Dangers from grade crossings have been clearly recognized almost since the inception of the automobile and, although some progress has been made, we thus far have taken only half-hearted methods to combat these dangers. This has been due, not to any lack of foresight or planning on the part of highway officials, but to a lack of funds to provide an adequate program of grade crossing elimination. Now, for the first time, we have a real opportunity to take effective remedial action.

Under programs laid down by Congress and currently being carried out by the Bureau of Roads, important viaduct work is underway on the interstate and primary road systems. On these 2 systems the Bureau is authorized to meet up to 100 percent of the cost of grade-crossing elimination, with the railroads returning up to 10 percent of the cost where they benefit directly from a separation project. This program, however, makes no provision for grade crossings on other highways. My bill deals with this gap in the existing crossing elimination program.

Briefly, my bill would make available to any urban area, as defined in the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944, Federal-aid matching funds for the elimination of railroad-highway grade crossings. This bill would authorize the appropriation of Federal funds for this purpose in the amount of $175 million annually, this sum to be matched on the basis of 40 percent by State and local funds to 60 percent Federal money, thus providing a base allocation in excess of $290 million a year. Priority should be given to those crossings which are the most hazardous and cause the most traffic delay. However, each State could make its own traffic origin and destination studies to determine which projects should be given top preference. Federal funds are now available to assist in the necessary surveys. Traffic density, too, would naturally be a major criterion. The Bureau of Public Roads now provides for elimination of grade crossings on the national system of interstate highways and on the primary system where railroads are double tracked or where there are 6 or more trains daily on 1 track. It will provide, I believe, the incentive and the tools with which to round out a comprehensive program in order to accomplish this important phase of highway betterment and safety program.

Latest available figures show the country has 227,291 grade crossings, of which 8,248 are the most critical. While the cost of grade-crossing elimination varies widely from case to case, I am advised the average cost would run in the neighborhood of $400,000. With a $290 million plus annual program, we could eliminate about 725 crossings a year, or about 7,250 in the 10-year program of highway improvement envisioned by President Eisenhower, or the program could be accelerated anywhere along the line.

Mr. Speaker, I am concerned primarily with saving the lives being lost each year at grade crossings and with preventing the accidents which leave thousands maimed and injured. In 1953 traffic deaths at grade crossings numbered 1,419 and nonfatal injuries totalled 3,600. I was surprised to learn, from the National Safety Council, that 4 out of every 10 grade crossing accidents occurred at crossings protected by gates, lights, bells, watchmen, or a combination of these. This can only mean that the best protection methods we have been able to devise are ineffectual in providing a safe crossing of highways and railroads. Furthermore, 6 out of every 10 accidents involved trains that were traveling at less than 30 miles an hour or were not moving, while about half of the motor vehicles were traveling at 30 miles an hour or less. It is apparent, therefore, that the grade crossing itself represents a danger which we are unable to combat successfully either through protective devices or controlled speed.

I am certain we can all agree, Mr. Speaker, that one preventable death or injury is one too many and if the President's grand highway plan eventually results only in reducing these deaths and accidents virtually to zero it will have been amply justified.

While they are by far the most important aspect of the problem, the deaths and injuries at grade crossings are not the only justification for a bold approach to the problem of desperately needed viaduct construction. There are important safety factors involved in grade crossings quite apart from the actual collison of motor vehicles and trains. Ambulances, fire engines, police cars, and public utility repair equipment all can be, and often are, held up for vital minutes at grade crossings—minutes which can mean the difference between life and death or the difference between minor and major personal injury and property damage.

Furthermore, in the event of an atomic attack, grade crossings could choke to a standstill the flow of traffic through and from our cities, making the evacuation problem even more critical and perhaps costing untold lives.

These, Mr. Speaker, are some of the fundamentals of the grade-crossing problem. Meshed with them is the indeterminate but enormous economic waste of grade crossings. This is not only the waste of motor fuel at crossing delays but the loss of countless thousands of man-hours as well. The latter loss is not confined to those who sit impatiently in cars, trucks, buses, and streetcars, stopped at crossings but extends also to the time involved in slowing trains at crossings, with consequent slow delivery of passengers and materials (handled by the railroads).

Additionally, Mr. Speaker, there is still another economic factor to be considered—that of giving employment to our people. The grade-crossing program would be countrywide. It would put both skilled and unskilled labor to work in many places where unemployment is, or could be, a problem. It would create a demand for steel, electrical equipment, concrete, and many other materials. It would be an invigorating breeze to our Nation's economy. Best of all, this would be no leaf-raking, made-work proposition. The labor, the materials, the time, and the money poured into this program would funnel out in safety and economic benefits to our people for centuries to come.

Aside from its national implications, this program would represent sound Federal assistance on a partnership basis in my own city of Detroit. Detroit has 63 critical crossings which stand as a menace to our people, a barrier to the free flow of both rail and highway transportation. This is true in some degree in every city and every State in the Union.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind the Members that as President Eisenhower pointed out, it is estimated our population may reach 200 million by 1970. With a nationwide system of modern and adequate highways available within the next decade, it is not unrealistic to estimate that we may have a total automobile registration by 1970 of 80 to 90 million cars and trucks on our American highways. With these challenges before us, Mr. Speaker, I feel that this proposed legislation, together with all of the other major aspects of the President's "grand plan" for our highways, we will have profits in lives saved, time saved, reduced transportation costs, along with a greater and more abundant economy plus an improved system of national defense. If we fail to heed the warnings of our great President and continue to take an ostrich-like attitude about the ever-increasing problems of our public highways, I shudder to think of the price we may pay for our failure to take positive action now. However, as America has always done in times of great emergency the Representatives of this Republic, I feel certain, will face and squarely meet the requirements of this atomic age in which we live.

Charity Begins at Home

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 9, 1954

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, to the ordinary, uninitiated person the expression "50-50" may not convey a world of meaning, but to those Americans whose concern it is that our merchant marine remains up to a semblance of its former strength and that the maritime industry be given a fair break in the matter of work and employment, it means quite a bit.

For one reason or another, the administration has chosen to close its eyes to this problem of shipping. In my judgment, it is not a case of mere neglect but rather of premeditated disinterest. The maritime situation is an appalling one, and little effort is being expended by the President to rectify it. We hear on the one hand a pious declaration about the preservation of the American way of life, and of things that are being done to combat unemployment and the danger of recession. On the other hand, we have only to look at the record to know that in high administration places those who should care about our dying merchant marine could not care less.

Under permission, Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD at this time an editorial from the Detroit Times of Friday, August 6. The sum and substance of it is that though some of your best friends are your neighbors, nonetheless "charity begins at home."

The editorial from the Times follows:

WHY NOT ALL OF IT?

The President of the United States has been asked by the heads of two of the leading maritime organizations of the country, the Merchant Marine Institute of New York and the American Steamship Association, to do what he can to break the legislative logjam now preventing approval of a bill vitually important to the American Merchant Marine.

The bill, unanimously passed by the United States Senate and already having the unanimous approval of the merchant marine committee of the House of Representatives, is now unaccountably being help up by the House Rules Committee.

Its purpose is to require that at least half of the cargoes shipped under the foreign assistance program paid for by the American Government be carried in American ships.

It is urgent that this be done, because the foreign assistance cargoes comprise a great part of the total maritime traffic; and with foreign ships carrying most of it there is nothing left for American shipping lines to do but lay up their idle vessels—which is exactly what has happened to 171 ships very recently.

It would be a very reasonable requirement, and certainly a sound one, that American ships should get at least half of the maritime business for which the American people put up the money.

In fact, it would be an entirely proper requirement that all such cargoes be carried in American ships, since it seems rather silly that America should try to improve the prosperity of other countries and deliberately impair its own prosperity in the process.

War Is Self-Defeating and Suicidal—American Defense Commitments Now Circle the World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 3, 1954

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the world is still in a posture of paralyzed tension. Aggressive Soviet communism is proceeding on schedule. It is not satisfied with half a victory in Southeast Asia and it is only a matter of months when it will control Laos, Cambodia, and possibly Thailand. The exit of the white man from Asia is written in large letters so all the world may see.

In our own country, Mr. Speaker, there is a demand by some people that we should seize the initiative and beat the Communists to the the draw. This appeal is a seductive one but it is charged with a great responsibility and a considerable gamble.

What have three major wars in the last 35 years gained the free world—World War I, World War II, and Korea? Mr. George F. Kennan, a foreign affairs expert, said recently that "two world wars stand out today as tragic, colossal follies, from which no one has gained." "War," he says, "became self-defeating and suicidal." I agree with Mr. Kennan.

Today, Mr. Speaker, if another shooting war starts the United States will be in it without question. Our commitments circle the world.

I doubt that the American people fully realize that they are fully committed in writing to defend 694 million people and 21.5 million square miles of land in 39 nations on 6 continents and across 3 oceans. Yet there are only 161 million of us. As the U. S. News & World Report points out the United States is the military guardian of 29 percent of the world's population and 41 percent of its land area.

In addition to the above obligations, Mr. Speaker, we have mutual security and mutual defense assistance agreements with 25 other nations. These agreements do not bind us to go to war, it is true, but they imply a strong moral obligation to do so.

Thus, in effect, Mr. Speaker, the United States has undertaken to defend a total of 64 nations, of 28.3 million square miles, and with 1.5 billion people, or a total of 54 percent of the world's land area and 61 percent of its population. No mention is made here of the unknown obligations under the charter of the United Nations.

To summarize, Mr. Speaker, the United States with a population of about 161 million people and 3½ million square miles has obligated itself in writing to defend 694 million people over an area comprising 21½ million square miles. This is a gigantic task, and the American people must be fully informed about it.

Therein, Mr. Speaker, is the very great possibility that somehow in some way, a self-defeating and suicidal war might again engulf us.

Also contained therein is the possibility for economic collapse of the United States. Neither the human nor economic resources of this country are endless. There is a limit beyond which we cannot go. The time has come for that appraisal which was promised some months ago.

Deepening the Delaware River Channel a National Economic and Defense Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 9, 1954

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, it is difficult to understand the opposition to providing a 40-foot channel in the Delaware River. The Delaware River is a highway of commerce for 120 miles. There is no area in the United States that has had, and, is now having, such an unprecedented development of industrial activity. Along its shores on either side of the river, in the States of Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Delaware are located some of the most outstanding industries in all the world. Names that have made America known the world around.

On the New Jersey side of the river are such well known industries as the Du Pont plants at Deepwater and other locations along the river; Atlantic City Electric Power Co., that supplies all of south Jersey with electrical current; Socony-Vacuum Co.; Texas Co.; New York Shipbuilding Co.; Public Service coke plant; Campbell Soup Co.; RCA Victor plant; Cities Service Co.; Kieckhefer Container Co.; and many other great industries, and others being completed. On the Delaware and Pennsylvania side of the river are industries of such number and variety that it is impossible to mention them all by name, reaching from the lower Delaware River all the way to Trenton, N. J., including such important activities as the Philadelphia Navy Yard and Fairless Steel Co., at Bristol, Pa. Philadelphia, Chester, Wilmington and the surrounding areas, including Camden, Trenton, and other communities on the New Jersey side of the river, and the surrounding areas, constitute the Delaware River Valley, the most outstanding section of our Nation. Great piers, warehouses, and terminal facilities for ocean steamers are in great abundance.

All of this development is the result of the activities of public and private enterprises that have appreciated the advantages of this great highway of commerce, and, still they come. The last few years have seen tremendous development. It is without a doubt the most promising, as to future development, of any section of our entire country.

It is simply unbelievable that anyone should fail to see the importance, and, the justification, of deepening the river channel to accommodate this vast and rapidly increasing volume of trade that now moves up and down the river, and, will do so in even greater volume if given the opportunity. All that is needed at this time is Federal recognition and favorable action to enable the deepening of the channel to proceed.

The authorization of this program to deepen the Delaware River Channel is justified from every standpoint of consideration. First, over the years the Federal Government has wisely supported vast and costly public-works projects in other areas of the United States. A large part, in fact a very large part, of the cost has been borne by taxpayers in New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, and other Eastern States. Second, also our taxpayers and consumers have paid a big share of the wheat, corn, butter, and other subsidies which have greatly benefited the dairy and farm States of the Midwest. I mention this only from the standpoint of showing that we cannot base our actions for and against on purely sectional grounds. Thus, we must consider this proposed Delaware River improvement from the national standpoint, and not merely on a sectional basis. This is a vital economic and defense project that has wide national significance. We cannot rightly ignore the national advantages of a deep channel in this great and important river valley.

We must recognize that Federal support for the deepening of the Delaware River channel would provide facilities that will prove beneficial to many and important segments of our economy—steel, petroleum, chemicals and other basic industries in which the Nation has a vital interest would also benefit. Any attempt to fasten the cost, or, any part of the cost, on any one industry or any number of the industries would be unfair, unjustified and in total disregard of our past national policy in this respect. If such a policy is to be adopted, then we can expect a general curtailment of all river and harbor development. It would be unwise to adopt such a policy and unfair, when it is considered that other private interests have not been so charged in the past.

There has been a suspicion that some of the opposition that has developed is the result of fear that the deepening of the Delaware River channel would make it easier for iron ore to be brought into the Delaware River area, and, thereby prove harmful to the economic interests of the Midwest in the Mesabi Range, which has been a prime source of iron ore for the Nation in the past.

According to mining authorities, World War II used 340 million tons of the highest quality reserves out of the Mesabi mines. Several years ago, the President of Republic Steel declared that "no more wars were ever going to be fought off Superior's natural ores." Unfortunately, how true this will be.

The Venezuelan ore discovery and the mines in Labrador have completely reversed the gloomy prospects which faced our Nation at the end of World War II. Without these new sources of supply so necessary in times of peace, as well as in any war emergency that might come upon us, our situation could readily have been one of despair. However, instead of facing a disastrous depletion, we can now look forward to a new and even bigger era of steel. The deeper channel will aid the Nation in obtaining these valuable new additions to our physical resources.

I earnestly hope that Members of both Houses of Congress will consider the national economic and defense benefits of the Delaware River project and give it speedy and unequivocal support.

The Fiction of Bipartisan Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 3, 1954

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an editorial from the Wall Street Journal which discusses the so-called bipartisan foreign policy. The editorial points out that bipartisanship does not necessarily make for unity which is the credo of those who advocate such a policy. It takes the position that unity can come only through adequate debate when differences of views are thoroughly expressed. To allege a bipartisan foreign policy is to create a false impression of unity. I commend this editorial to the attention of the House Members:

IN THE NAME OF UNITY

This newspaper has been a good deal less than enthusiastic about that somewhat intangible thing know as the bipartisan foreign policy. That was our attitude during a Democratic administration and it continues to be our attitude now that Republicans are in power.

First let us make clear what we mean and do not mean.

We do not mean that a Democratic Senator or Congressman is bound to speak and vote against foreign policy proposals merely because their source is a Republican Secretary of State; if the Democrat believes the Republican proposal sound, then he should support the proposal just as he should oppose an unsound Democratic proposal.

But what we do mean is that no Democrat is obliged to commit himself to support a Republican proposal. On the contrary, the Democrat should at all times keep himself free to voice sincere criticism and to offer alternatives. And if he does otherwise, it seems to us he does a disservice because he ceases to play the part that a political opposition is supposed to play; he gives the people who elected him no basis for forming judgment.

The usual justification for bipartisanship is that fine-sounding word "unity." The real situation is that bipartisanship does not make for unity. It is destructive of unity. You can have real unity on any proposition only when people know about it, have had a chance of making up their minds about it, and reached a decision concerning it. This can come only through debate in which differences are thoroughly aired. Only in that way can the people be consulted; and if they are not consulted, then agreement and unity among them is impossible—except in the totalitarian conception of unity.

So it seems to us that bipartisanship, even when it has an honest and sincere basis, mistakes form for substance; it creates a false impression of unity which when the test comes is too likely to prove disunity of the most destructive kind.

Now we came to a proposal for bipartisanship which has the merits of neither honesty nor sincerity. Implicit in some speeches of the past few days, including that of former President Truman before the National Press Club, is this thought:

The Eisenhower administration has brought out instances—and it may bring out more—where the Democrats erred in keeping Communists and Communist sympathizers in Government positions. The revelations concerning Harry Dexter White are the outstanding instance; and because the Eisenhower administration did this, it thereby destroyed unity on foreign policy. There is the implication that if the Eisenhower administration will not do such things in the future it can save itself from criticism on its foreign policy.

Let us see just what sort of skulduggery this proposition contains.

Assuming that the Eisenhower administration has information on cases other than the White case, that information is to be withheld from the people.

And in return for the Eisenhower administration keeping from the country information to which the country is surely entitled, the political opposition withholds criticism of foreign policy.

In other words, the Democrats also withhold information from the country; instead of examining and testing foreign policy, the opposition would accept a bribe to be quiet about its possible flaws.

And that, we are to believe, is unity.

Well, it is not anything of the sort. It is a proposal the basis of which is a political deal that ought to bring blushes to the face of a ward politician.

Dubious Victory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES R. HOWELL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 9, 1954

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, the recent extended debate in the Senate on the provision of the Atomic Energy Act requiring the Atomic Energy Commission to purchase 600,000 kilowatts of power through the TVA system, but to be supplied by a private contractor was intended to point up a wholly unnecessary bypassing of the TVA in favor of higher-cost private producers.

An editorial in the Trenton (N. J.) Times of July 23 comments on this slight to TVA, an agency that has distinguished itself during the past 30 years in supplying inexpensive power to the people of the valley area. TVA has been accepted in the area by both the people and the industries of the Tennessee Valley region; there can be no question but that TVA has helped develop the resources of the valley to a great extent. In going out of his way to make contracts available to private power companies in the area, at the expense of TVA, represents a direct reversal by the President of his campaign pledges in 1952 to maintain TVA along the lines that it had taken in developing the valley during its previous period of existence.

The editorial follows:

DUBIOUS VICTORY

With the help of a handful of reactionary southern Democrats, the Eisenhower administration has scored a success in its fight to have the Atomic Energy Commission supply the Tennessee Valley Authority through a private contract.

It is a victory somewhat resembling the President's success in turning tidelands oil resources over to three Southern States for exploitation by private oil interests. It will not look well in the light of history.

In the Tennessee Valley area, which is vitally affected by this concession, the charge is openly made that President Eisenhower is being used as a front man for a scandalous bit of contract rigging.

President Eisenhower has explained the strange transaction by declaring that he does not want to expand the TVA until he has had a chance to study its operation. TVA has been in operation many years and the record, as known to everyone interested, is one of incalculable benefit to the broad area which it serves. Furthermore, the President has been in office a year and a half and has had ample opportunity to become familiar with the record.

The President has ordered the Atomic Energy Commission to sign a 25-year contract with a private utility syndicate for 600,000 kilowatts of power to be sold to TVA to replace the 600,000 kilowatts furnished to the AEC plant at Paducah.

Under this plan, the AEC will have to pay about $5 million a year more for private power than it would have paid for TVA power. This is one phase of the issue. Another, equally important, is the fact that private utilities will be enabled to secure a beachhead in TVA territory.

There may be some legitimate jutification for this shocking handout to a private utility; but none has been offered by the President or by Senators who voted for it. As time goes on, the great crusade is assuming rather shabby aspects.

Duck Stamp Receipts and Recommendations for Their Use

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER JOHNSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 9, 1954

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, on April 6 of this year when the Interior Department appropriation bill was debated in the House of Representatives, Congressman Lee Metcalf, of Montana, offered an amendment to bring up the Fish and Wildlife Service item of management of resources to $200,000 beyond what it received last year for the same item. This figure had been cut by $863,000 over last year's appropriation. We were defeated on this amendment.

On June 3, 1954, I called the attention of the House to the same matter and put into the Congressional Record a speech by Carl D. Shoemaker, conservation consultant, National Wildlife Federation and general counsel for the International Association of Game, Fish, and Conservation Commissioners.

When the Interior Department appropriation bill was up in the Senate on June 7, Senator Hubert H. Humphrey, of Minnesota, questioned Senator Guy Cordon, of Oregon, concerning the use of duck stamp funds.

As a result of the efforts of various Congressmen and Senators, the House Subcommittee on Public Lands of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee of the House, called a special hearing and invited various leaders of conservation organizations to appear. Carl D. Shoemaker was one of those called and, as a result of the public hearings on June 28 and 29, he was asked to submit his recommendations to the committee. Under date of July 27, 1954, Mr. Shoemaker submitted the following statement and recommendations which I am pleased to put into the Record at this time:

DUCK STAMP RECEIPTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THEIR USE

(Memorandum to the Subcommittee on Public Lands of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee of the House prepared by Carl D. Shoemaker, conservation consultant to the National Wildlife Federation and General Counsel of the International Association of Game, Fish, and Conservation Commissioners)

GENTLEMEN: At the public hearing held by your committee on June 28 and 29 with reference to duck stamp receipts and their use, there were several comments by members of the commitee to the effect that no clear recommendations had been made as to how these duck-stamp receipts could be used to better the waterfowl refuge program. The suggestion was made by Hon. Clair Engle that a specific program be presented, including proposed legislation necessary to implement it.

At the conclusion of the hearing permission was given to the undersigned to prepare such recommendations.

On March 31 of this year Secretary of Interior McKay, through Assistant Secretary Lewis, appointed John B. Turnbull, of Seattle, Ross L. Leffler, of Pittsburgh, John D. Pennekamp, of Miami, and George Goodrick and John B. Bennett, both of Washington, to make a study and survey of the Fish and Wildlife Service. The first three mentioned are private citizens; the latter two are attached to the Interior Department staff.

These gentlemen made an exhaustive study during a period of 6 weeks which covered the entire country. They looked into every phase of the activities, finances, and programs of the Fish and Wildlife Service. Their report, dated June 2, was only released about 2 weeks ago. In it there is a table which shows how the duck-stamp money has been spent during the fiscal years 1950, 1951, 1952, 1953, and 1954. Refuge Management and Development spent 49.19 percent of the total receipts in 1954. Land purchase, which is the prime objective of the Duck Stamp Act, counted for only 16.55 percent in contrast with 9.39 percent in 1950, 7.32 percent in 1951, 12.44 percent in 1952, and 18.52 percent in 1953. In commenting upon these figures and the refuge program itself the survey team made the following recommendation:

"We recommend that the Service map a long-range refuge program with particular emphasis on the needed pattern of breeding, resting, feeding, and wintering areas for the important migratory bird populations.

"As part of this program, all existing refuges should be subjected to a critical scrutiny to determine if they fit the overall objectives and responsibilities of the Service."

The vital need for land acquisition for waterfowl purposes is apparent throughout the excellent report.

I have been informed that the Fish and Wildlife Service will present a long-range program calling for the acquisition of approximately an additional 4 million acres of land at a cost for acquisition and development of approximately $40 per acre to cover a period of approximately 20 years.

This would mean that during a 20-year period the Service would expend an average of $8 million per year.

The present price of the duck stamp is $2 and brings in about $4½ million per year on the basis of the present-day number of waterfowl hunters. If the entire receipts from duck stamp sales were to be used for this long-range program they would fall short by about one-half to meet this requirement.

Therefore we are faced with a dilemma; either the program would have to be considerably reduced, or additional revenues should be provided. There is a possibility that both alternatives would have to be employed.

SUGGESTED PROPOSALS

1. Increase the price of the duck stamp from $2 to $5, or $4, or not less than $3.50, earmarking the entire increase of $3 or $2 or $1.50 for the land-acquisition program.

Would this be acceptable to the sportsmen? I believe that it would if the sportsmen were sure—and this earmarking would make it sure—that they were going to receive commensurate benefits for their purchase of the duck stamp. It is definitely certain that unless the waterfowl refuge program is expanded, the sport of waterfowl gunning in the United States will vanish within the next generation. Increased populations, the inroads of advancing civilization and industry, the draining of present-day marshlands for additional agricultural acreage (much of it ill-advised and not needed under better agricultural developments and practices) make this refuge acquisition imperative. Duck hunters come from every walk in life and are deeply concerned. They are willing, however, to meet their responsibility as they have in the past if they have assurance that their money will be wisely used in the development of a program which will not only insure the perpetuation of the sport but protect and greatly enlarge the population of waterfowl.

2. Additional appropriations by Congress: The Federal Government has a direct responsibility to maintain the waterfowl refuges heretofore acquired and which may subsequently be purchased. This natural resource is a Federal responsibility under the treaties with Canada and Mexico providing for the protection of migratory birds and waterfowl. Such a program of congressional appropriations was authorized in the Norbeck-Andresen Act of 1929. Congress, however, did not appropriate the authorized funds and in 1934 the Duck Stamp Act was enacted. The sportsmen, desiring to preserve their sport, were willing to tax themselves directly for this purpose through the purchase of the duck stamp, originally $1, but increased to $2 in 1949. The Government has a definite obligation to maintain these refuges once they have been acquired just as it has with national parks, forests, military installations, and many other phases of our national existence.

There is a well-defined Federal responsibility under the international treaty with Canada "to take the necessary measures for insuring the execution of the present Convention for the protection of migratory birds in the United States and Canada."

In the treaty with Mexico the language used to fix this Federal responsibility is even stronger than that in the Canadian treaty, for it says "it is right and proper to protect the said migratory birds, whatever may be their origin, in the United States of America and the United Mexican States in order that the species may not be exterminated."

In round numbers, there are 2¼ million duck hunters who contribute $2 each to the duck-stamp fund for a total of $4¼ million.

Under the present law, 15 percent of this goes for administration and enforcement. This amounts to $675,000, and reduces the amount available for acquisition of land and the development, operation, and maintenance of refuges to $3,825,000.

Forty-nine and nineteen one-hundredths percent, or $2,556,000, last year was used for refuge management and operation.

Eight hundred and sixty thousand dollars only, or 16.55 percent of the receipts, were used to buy land.

The remainder was used for research, river-basin studies, and waterfowl-management investigations.

On the basis of these figures, it would take more than 160 years to complete the acquisition and development program, if my information in regard to it is substantially correct.

There is immediate and pressing need for the Congress to increase (1) the price of the duck stamp, and (2) congressional appropriations to meet the maintenance and operation charges of the refuges. The appropriations should at least be as large as the amount realized each year from the increased price of the duck stamp.

It has been suggested that the Duck Stamp Act be repealed and that Congress provide the necessary funds to acquire, maintain, and develop the refuges. To this philosophy I do not subscribe.

I do feel, however, that the sportsmen are carrying their load and will go along with an additional increase in the cost of the stamp if they have congressional assurance that the funds so raised will be channeled in a well-defined program which will benefit not only the ducks but the sport as well.

Attached are suggested bills to meet the above objectives in part. They do not cover, of course, the proposal for additional direct appropriations.

A FURTHER PROPOSAL

Should the Congress decide that no increase in the duck stamp is desirable, another bill is suggested which will earmark not less than 40 percent of duck-stamp receipts for the refuge-acquisition program.

"A bill to amend the Migratory Bird Hunting Stamp Act of March 16, 1934 (48 Stat. 451; 16 U. S. C. 718b), as amended

"*Be it enacted, etc.*, That section 4 of the Migratory Bird Hunting Stamp Act of March 16, 1934 (48 Stat. 451; 16 U. S. C. 718b), as amended, is further amended as follows:

"'(a) Not less than 40 percent shall be available for the acquisition of land and water areas suitable for the breeding, nesting, and resting of migratory waterfowl to meet the obligation and responsibility for the protection of such birds provided for in the conventions with the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland and with the United Mexican States.'

"Change '(a)' to '(b),' and in the new subsection '(b)' change 'Not less than 90 percent' to 'Not more than 45 percent.'

"Change '(b)' to '(c)'."

"A bill to amend the Migratory Bird Hunting Stamp Act of March 16, 1934 (48 Stat. 451; 16 U. S. C. 718b), as amended

"*Be it enacted, etc.*, That section 2 of the Migratory Bird Hunting Stamp Act of March 16, 1934 (48 Stat. 451; 16 U. S. C. 718b), as amended, is further amended by deleting '$2' as it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof '$5.'

"That subsection (a) of section 4 as amended is further amended as follows:

"Delete 'Not less than 90' and in lieu thereof insert '50,' and after the words 'shall be available' insert the following: 'to acquire land and water areas suitable for the breeding, nesting, and resting of migratory waterfowl to meet the obligation and responsibility for the protection of such birds under the conventions with the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland and with the United Mexican States.'

"Delete the words 'for the location, ascertainment, acquisition' and insert in lieu thereof the following 'and not more than 35 percent shall be available for.'"

NOTE.—The figure of $5 in the above proposal should be change to $4 or $3.50, depending on the wisdom of Congress.

The City Versus the Smalltown Viewpoint

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 1954

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, recently, when Dr. Kenneth Small, of Detroit, found Jules Lack, who was attempting to steal his wife, at a summer home in Allegan County, Mich.—that is just across the lake from Chicago—he shot him.

City papers as far away as Washington and California took notice of the shooting, played up the story, not only as news, but some publishers wrote editorials.

Newspaper management is undoubtedly efficient, but when they indicated that the people in Allegan were greatly interested in the doings of Small or Lack, or Small's wife, they just missed the boat. The people of Allegan and vicinity were far more interested in their own affairs, the local doings in their own communities, the price and condition of farm crops, than in the affairs of the Small-Lack group.

That the city papers and their reporters grossly magnified the local situation is evident from an article by Joe Armstrong, managing editor of the Allegan Gazette, which was republished in some of the city papers.

That piece, as republished in one of the city papers, reads as follows:

ALLEGAN TAKES A BREATHER

(By Joe Armstrong)

"Little Allegan" was almost back to normal Monday after a harrowing 7 days at the hands of the Nation's press.

Whether residents of this county will ever be able to read a metropolitan daily again without thinking of the manner in which some of the reporters described "Little Allegan" during the Small murder trial is doubtful.

At any rate, "Little Allegan" was cheerfully returning to its smalltown ways.

The court house tower, which, according to the Chicago Tribune, swayed 20° in a high wind, stopped undulating as the Tribune writer and his charming wife headed westward toward their native city where buildings actually do away in the wind.

The ghost in the court house attic, brought to life by an imaginative Detroit News man, disappeared forever as the reporter packed his toothbrush and his other shirt for the return trip to the Motor City.

The natives were gradually ridding themselves of an inferiority complex acquired as a result of the word "little" being used as a prefix every time Allegan was mentioned in a news story regarding the trial.

The "shirt sleeved jury of farmers and laboring men" were back at their jobs of operating successful hardware stores, poultry businesses and prosperous seed businesses.

The "villas and luxurious summer retreats" on the lakeshore turned back overnight into comfortable cottages and summer homes.

The rickety county jail and the ramshackle courthouse looked normal again on Monday morning, almost as soon as the metropolitan reporters had left town.

The "excited townspeople" who thronged the rickety courthouse throughout the trial had almost to a man returned to their homes in Detroit, Grand Rapids, Kalamazoo and other suburbs of Allegan. (By actual count, there were only ten local residents in the courtroom during one session when it was reported that the room was jammed with Alleganites.)

Fords and Chevrolets had returned to their old parking spots around the courthouse as the cavalcade of Cadillacs aimed their chrome noses back toward Detroit.

And at the county jail, Dr. Kenneth Small, awaiting court action on Prosecutor Dwight Cheever's motion to have him committed to Ionia's hospital for the criminally insane, continued to enjoy those same "special privileges" which had amused the daily press so much—a window that opened and closed which allowed fresh air and sunshine to enter his cell, a cot with a mattress and blankets on it, a radio he shared with other prisoners, food three times a day, a washbowl and other similar refinements which, oddly enough, were also available to other prisoners.

And so, as the last fish-tailed Cadillac vanished into the rising sun, "Little Allegan" returned to its old familiar routines and relinquished its position on the Nation's front pages to fresh tales of violence and scandal without regrets.

Drought Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 9, 1954

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, on July 16 the Committee on Agriculture adopted a resolution with respect to the drought situation and the programs of the Department of Agriculture in connection therewith. This resolution reads as follows:

> Within the past several days there has come to the attention of the committee an increasing number of reports of serious drought conditions in many parts of the United States. It is the committee's information that conditions have already reached the point in some parts of the country where production of crops is being seriously threatened and the ability of livestock producers to maintain their flocks and herds is being impaired.
>
> In view of this situation the committee urges that the Secretary of Agriculture use to the fullest extent the authority and funds available to him for combating or alleviating the results of the drought as soon as conditions in the various affected areas warrant action on the part of the Federal Government.
>
> The committee respectfully suggests, in view of the fact that Congress will soon adjourn, that the Secretary review the authority and the funds now available to him for meeting drought and other emergency conditions in the agriculture of the Nation and report to the committee at the earliest possible moment any additional authority or funds which he believes he may require in order to meet as effectively as possible any need which may arise for action on the part of the Federal Government.

Following the adoption of the resolution and on the same day five members of the committee presented the resolution to Under Secretary Morse in the absence of Secretary Benson. The group had a very satisfactory conference with Mr. Morse with respect to the program which was then in the making.

I am now in receipt of a letter from the Secretary of Agriculture written in response to the resolution in which the Secretary states he believes that the Department has adequate authority and sufficient funds for the purpose of extending drought relief between the present time and until the next session of Congress.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the letter of Secretary Benson herewith:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D. C., August 6, 1954.

HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE,
Chairman, House Agricultural Committee, House of Representatives.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HOPE: In response to the resolution of July 16 of your committee regarding the ability of this Department to extend relief in drought designated areas, we believe that we have adequate authority and sufficient funds for this purpose until the next session of Congress. The situation may be summarized as follows:

Public Law 38, 81st Congress, approved April 6, 1949, abolished the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation of Washington and transferred its assets to the Secretary of Agriculture. The assets so transferred constitute a revolving fund from which emergency loans for periods consistent with the borrowers' ability to repay are made at 3 percent interest to farmers and stockmen suffering production disasters when the Secretary determines that the area or region involved has suffered a production disaster and finds that agricultural credit is not readily available from other sources (11 U. S. C. 1148). Loans are also made at 5 percent interest to bona fide fur farmers where necessary to protect the Government's interest in existing loans outstanding (62 Stat. 1183).

Public Law 115, 83d Congress, amended Public Law 38 to authorize additional loan assistance to farmers and stockmen as follows: (1) Economic disaster loans—loans at 3 percent interest may be made in any disaster area declared by the President under Public Law 875 (42 U. S. C. 1855), if the Secretary finds that an economic disaster has also caused a need for agricultural credit that cannot be met temporarily by regularly established lending institutions, including the regular lending programs of the Farmers' Home Administration. (2) Special livestock loans—For a period of 2 years subsequent to July 14, 1953, loans may be made at 5 percent interest to established livestock producers who are temporarily unable to secure credit from recognized lenders and who have a reasonable chance of working out their difficulties with supplementary financing.

According to our latest estimates, approximately $110 million will be available in the disaster loan revolving fund for the fiscal year 1955, as follows:

Unobligated balance, June 30, 1954	$44, 081, 741
Anticipated collection, fiscal year 1955	66, 000, 000
Total anticipated available, fiscal year 1955	110, 081, 741

Current estimates reflect anticipated loan requirements of approximately $72 million, as follows:

Production emergency	$32, 000, 000
Economic emergency	15, 000, 000
Special livestock	25, 000, 000
Total	72, 000, 000

Thus it appears that funds available are ample to most anticipated needs at this time.

EMERGENCY ASSISTANCE IN FURNISHING FEED AND HAY

In addition to the loan funds noted above, there is a balance of $15,257,747 available in the disaster loan revolving fund for emergency assistance in furnishing feed, including hay, pursuant to section 2d of Public Law 38, as amended by Public Law 115, 83d Congress. Section 2d was implemented by the appropriation of $40 million made in Public Law 175, 83d Congress, as amended by Public Law 357, 83d Congress, which increased to $50 million the amount which could be used for the feed program, including hay.

Since it is contemplated that the handling and transportation costs incurred in making Commodity Credit Corporation stocks of feed available for use in the drought emergency program will be borne this year by CCC under the authority of section 301 of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (Public Law 480, 83d Cong.), it will not longer be necessary to charge such costs to the disaster loan revolving fund. However, there are certain other costs (beyond the cost of the commodities to the Corporation, handling and transportation) in connection with the drought emergency program which Commodity Credit Corporation is not authorized to bear and which will have to be charged to the disaster loan revolving fund. Such costs include, for example, the administrative expense of State and county committees in connection with the operation of the feed program. Except for these costs, the balance of $15 million will need to be used only in connection with the hay program. The hay program is administered by the States under cooperative agreements with the Federal Government. Generally speaking, 50 percent of the cost of transporting hay to basic herds in the disaster area is paid for by the Federal Government. Since less than $5 million has been required in the hay program so far, it appears there are sufficient funds for this purpose.

EMERGENCY GRAIN PROGRAM

A program under which CCC stocks of feed would be made available for use in the drought emergency program is being developed under the authority of section 301 of Public Law 480, 83d Congress. Under this statute, the CCC is authorized, on such terms and conditions as the Secretary may deem in the public interest, to make commodities available from its stocks for use in relieving distress in connection with any major disaster determined by the President to warrant assistance by the Federal Government under Public Law 875, 81st Congress. We believe that this statute provides adequate authority for making feed available to meet the drought emergency.

WIND EROSION CONTROL MEASURES

The $15 million authorized by the Congress for wind erosion control measures has been allocated among 6 States to the extent of $13,280,000. The unallocated balance will be administered in keeping with the established policies of the Agricultural Conservation Program Service to take care of future demands during the period authorized by the legislation.

BEEF PURCHASE PROGRAM

The necessary preliminary steps have been taken so that if a beef purchase program becomes necessary, it can be put into effect immediately. Such a program would be carried out under the authority of section 32 of Public Law 320, 74th Congress.

Our conclusion that adequate funds, including funds for the beef purchase program, are available for extending relief in drought areas is based upon the drought situation as it presently appears. There could, of course, be drastic changes in the drought situation which would affect our conclusion.

Sincerely yours,

E. T. Benson,
Secretary.

President Ramon Magsaysay, of the Philippine Republic: A Natural Leader in Asia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 3, 1954

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, Gen. Bonner Fellers, brigadier general, United States Army, retired, is competent to discuss the problems of Asia. Writing in the current issue of Human Events, he sets forth a three-point program which deserves the attention of official Washington and the people of this country.

Mr. Speaker, General Fellers calls attention to the fact that in Ramon Magsaysay, President of the Philippine Republic, Asia has a leader with personality, character, and purpose. He is the Christian president of a Christian country, 20 million strong. He has been tested in war and in peace; and he is a man of energy, purpose, and conviction and has successfully resisted Communist penetration in his own homeland.

The article follows:

A Program for Asia

(By Bonner Fellers, brigadier general, U. S. Army, retired)

However welcome may be the announcement of the Indochina cease-fire agreement, the event has resolved none of the basic issues. The truce partitionment along the 17th parallel leaves Vietnam's rice bowl in Communist hands. This loss is as unfortunate for the Vietnamese as was separation of Korea's industrial and agricultural areas. As in the case of Korea, this new cease-fire is simply a convenient arrangement for the Communists.

Above all else, the United States must adhere to its present wise decision not to enter into a guarantee of the Indochina truce terms. To guarantee a line in southeast Asia is to make a heavy commitment a long way from home in a hostile country. Unless Americans are prepared to meet every eventuality which might arise, we will do well to keep American troops out of southeast Asia.

Nevertheless, the picture today is brighter than it was a few weeks ago. At that time only Sir Winston Churchill's unwillingness to join hands with us prevented American armed intervention in Indochina. While many Americans endorsed Sir Winston's stand, we must be wary of his thoroughly British attitude. Sure of the United States as a firm ally, it is to British interests to play one colossus (United States of America) against another (U. S. S. R.).

In the twilight of his distinguished and martial career, Sir Winston's passion is to ease world tension. He understands clearly that his country could be completely destroyed by bombing. Little wonder, therefore, that he counsels having a good long try at coexistence with the Kremlin—which commands the largest air force in the world.

Despite this soft attitude toward the Kremlin, Britain can be hard if her interest is at stake. If Malaya should be threatened, as is likely within 6 months, Britain might ask us to intervene. France would then probably join with Britain in the hope that somehow our presence would enable France to cling to the last vestige of her former Asian empire.

Southeast Asia is only one of a half dozen dangerous areas in which the ingredients for war already exist. There are many fuses in place, ready to ignite a series of explosions throughout the immense, turbulent regions of Asia, the Middle East, and North Africa.

The mere fact that Vietnam enjoys a cease-fire at the moment offers no basis for hope that the Communists will relax their expansion effort. It is Communist technique to absorb a state from within: First, local opposition is liquidated; then the Communists take over. From nearby satellites, weapons and Red volunteers are sent in to support the new Communist regime. Despite the present cease-fire, Thailand, Burma, and Malaya are vulnerable to this type of Communist penetration.

In Korea, the decision for war or peace does not lie in our hands. It is a responsibility of the Red Chinese and also President Syngman Rhee. Since the Korean cease-fire, so-called nonmilitary bases have been constructed in North Korea. Red China's air force has grown into the fourth largest in the world; continuous training has improved its effectiveness. Meanwhile, our best air crews and two infantry divisions have been removed from Korea. The Communists are stronger and we are not so strong as when the Korean shooting stopped.

If we were compelled to resume war against Red China, we might have to resort to use of the atomic bomb to overcome our numerical disadvantage in ground forces. Yet, except for her air force, Red China has few military targets worthy of the atomic bomb. But its use, of course, might slaughter Chinese by the hundreds of thousands. Then the cry would be raised, as in the cases of Hiroshima and Nagasaki—Americans will use the bomb only against Asian populations. What a golden opportunity for Kremlin propaganda. All Asia would be turned against us.

In all these teeming regions from Korea to Morocco, Red-kindled wars threaten world peace. And the United States could become involved, without the Kremlin's having committed a single Soviet soldier to battle.

It is no solution for America to join with Britain, Australia, New Zealand and France in the contemplated white man's collective security arrangement for Southeast Asia. A billion people, Communists and anti-Communists, in this vast, restless area are bitter against European imperialism. They are especially resentful against Australia, which permits only white citizenship. All Asia is sick of white domination. Our real problem with Asia is not so much ideological communism as it is racial and national. And the Kremlin ingeniously exploits this situation. Until these facts are recognized and taken into account all western programs for Asia are doomed.

Asia must and will find her own leadership; she will accept none other. But who will it be?

Syngman Rhee is not available to lead Asia because his energies are occupied by an uneasy peace. Japan, destined to become the arsenal of free Asia, could not assume this role. She has her own internal problems. Moreover, the hate engendered by the war atrocities of the Japanese militarists remains fresh in the minds of Asians.

Formosa hangs by a thread. Chiang Kai-shek is fighting for the life of Nationalist China. He has powerful friends including the support of 12 million overseas Chinese. But it is probable that he is too busy to head a free Asian movement.

We now come to the Philippine Republic, the envy of all Asia. In Ramon Magsaysay this new Republic has a leader with personality, character and purpose. He is the Christian president of a Christian country 20 million strong. He has been tested. Not only was he loyal to the United States during the war but as a guerrilla—with a price on his head—he resisted until the liberation came. A man of energy and purpose and conviction, he has quieted the Communist threat among his people. He possesses the attributes for leadership not only in the Philippines but throughout free Asia.

In the Philippines, free Asians have the leader and the sovereign state well suited to shape a Free Asia Treaty Organization (FATO). FATO could embrace all peoples who oppose dictatorships, aggression, and communism and who seek freedom and individual liberty. President Magsaysay would be free from charges of imperialism of racial antipathy, of economic or territorial aggrandizement. As the leader among free Asian peoples, he could cooperate with those western powers which are free from imperialistic ambition.

FATO could work no miracle. Asia was all but lost when China went Red. Nevertheless, under FATO, Syngman Rhee could continue his stand for Korean unification. Japan's greatest resource, the energy and talent of her people, could create with American aid most of the weapons for the FATO forces. It would ease the heavy burden on the United States. Chiang Kai-shek, no threat to the Chinese mainland so long as the Red Chinese air force exists, could launch a full-scale psychological war against the Red Chinese. Such a campaign would rivet attention of Red China's war lords on their own internal unrest. Also FATO would appeal to some borderline peoples now just slightly pink. In due course, FATO could muster and equip a ground force of several million. It would discourage local brush fires lighted by so-called "peoples volunteer" forces.

A FATO movement would constitute a moral force difficult for Red China to cope with or influence. Reliance on Asian rather than Western leadership has great psychological value. The West has always insisted on white leadership although it was repugnant to all Asians. Intervention by the United States, Britain, France, New Zealand, and Australia would be the very thing which the Communists could exploit. We would confirm their conviction that the white man seeks only to dominate. An Asian FATO, however, would rob Communist propaganda of its strongest appeal.

Coping with communism is not an insuperable task because communism contains self-destructive elements. It exists only by force. Communist powers are strongest on their frontiers; they are most vulnerable deep within their borders. Despite this fact, we continue to attack Red strength and overlook Red weakness. We continue to think of eradicating Communist ideology by force. We waste most of our energies endeavoring to match bayonet for bayonet, when the Communists already dominate a third of the world's population.

The ultimate solution to the Communist threat lies, not in Asia or southeast Asia, but in the Soviet Union itself. The Kremlin's greatest weakness lies in its intensely dissatisfied population, of which there are 15 million being worked and starved to death in slave labor camps. The entire population lives under its own military occupation. But since Stalin's death, the grip of the MVD police has become precarious.

In the Soviet Union there are two great fears; the Kremlin's fear of the people and the people's fear of the Kremlin. These fears are held in equilibrium by force. Once the Kremlin fears the people more than the people fear the Kremlin, then the end of tyranny will be in sight.

Likewise the Chinese are living under their own military occupation. Estimates indicate that no less than 15 million Chinese have been put to death by the Red regime.

It is these enslaved peoples behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains who are the real allies of the free world. Their struggle for freedom must be encouraged and they must be helped. Just as we are their hope, so are they our salvation.

Three steps are necessary if the Communist menace is to be eliminated:

1. Withdraw diplomatic representation from all Communist countries. This would deprive our Government of no worthwhile listening posts because our diplomats in Moscow are under the closest possible surveillance. It would be tangible proof to the enslaved populations of our opposition to Communist dictatorships. It would encourage them, when the time is ripe, to liberate themselves.

2. Assist anti-Communist underground organizations on every frontier of Communist-dominated territories. This would include educational programs to convince the enslaved peoples that we want peace—not war—and that we seek only the liberation of everyone under Communist dictatorships.

3. Create overwhelming American air supremacy. In war, success in psychological warfare is a function of victory. In the cold war success in psychological warfare is a function of military might. Our withdrawal of diplomatic recognition and our aid to the anti-Communist underground can lead to success only if the Kremlin is afraid to retaliate by resorting to war. Under present arms-expansion programs our current advantage over the Soviet Union will cease within 4 years. It is imperative, therefore, that our defense effort be shifted immediately to create overwhelming air and guided missile supremacy. These are the instruments of massive retaliation by deep penetration: first, to deter war; and, second, to win if war is forced upon us.

Let us, therefore, continue to avoid active participation in regional wars such as that in Indochina or the one probably impending against Malaya. Rather, let us immediately take steps to establish conditions which will bring about the internal destruction of this monstrous tyranny.

In Memory of William S. Prettyman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD H. VELDE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 9, 1954

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following in memoriam, William S. Prettyman, attorney at law, Velde & Prettyman, Pekin, Ill.:

The Illinois State Bar and the Tazewell County Bar Association has lost a great lawyer and public servant, as well as personal friend, in the Honorable William S. Prettyman, of the firm of Velde & Prettyman of Pekin, Ill., who passed away at the age of 73 last Sunday, August 8, 1954.

Bill Prettyman was known as a he-man's lawyer. He was a fighter always for the cause of his clients. While he knew the law well, he will be remembered by the members of the Illinois and Tazewell County bars as a person who could apply his knowledge of the law in a practical way. In addition to his service as a member of the bar, he was engaged in many activities of a charitable nature. Bill Prettyman was not only aggressive on behalf of his clients; he was aggressive for the right, as he knew the right to be be.

All of the Prettyman family were stanch Democrats of the old school; but while being stanch Democrats, Bill's ancestors always placed loyalty, principle, and right before partisan politics. Bill will be missed by his fellow lawyers in Illinois, and he will be missed by his multitude of friends. If there is one consolation in his passing for us who knew him so well, it is in the memory of the many fine and outstanding services has has performed which will live in our hearts for a long, long time.

Bill Prettyman came from a long line of distinguished American citizens. His great grandfather, Lewis Prettyman, was one of the first citizens of Illinois. It was Lewis' son, Benjamin, who first established the law firm which is now known as Velde & Prettyman. Benjamin Prettyman, attorney at law, was also a contemporary of Abraham Lincoln, and an opponent of his beliefs.

I am personally very proud of the fact that I became associated with the firm of Velde & Prettyman in 1937 and practiced law with them until after I was elected to Congress in 1948. The firm of Velde & Prettyman has a long and distinguished record as far as public service in the State of Illinois is concerned, being known as the second oldest law firm of the State.

I shall, therefore, after further research, place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as full and complete history of the firm as possible, before Congress adjourns this summer.

I join with the many friends and relatives in extending my most sincere condolences to the widow of Bill Prettyman, his daughter, and his two very fine grandchildren.

HAROLD H. VELDE,
Member of Congress.

WASHINGTON, D. C.

The Forest Service and Private Forestry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM K. VAN PELT

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 9, 1954

Mr. VAN PELT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to include an excellent article dealing with the Forest Service which appeared in the July issue of the Journal of Forestry. This article contains the text of an address delivered by Mr. W. S. Swingler, Assistant Chief, United States Forest Service, at the annual meeting of the Society of American Foresters at Colorado Springs, Colo. The article follows:

THE FOREST SERVICE AND PRIVATE FORESTRY

Sixty-two years ago, some 400 people scattered throughout the United States asked for and received from the old Bureau of Forestry one packet of conifer seeds. This represents the first recorded cooperative effort between what is now the U. S. Forest Service and private individuals. Earlier efforts in timber management had consisted of lectures on forestry to various farmers' institutes in western New York, and to the School of Economics at the University of Wisconsin.

Presumably, the practice of sending out these free packets of seeds continued, but the next item of record came in 1898, seven years later. In October of that year, the Bureau of Forestry issued Bulletin No. 21 which outlined the terms under which the bureau would cooperate with farmers, lumbermen, and landowners in promoting better forest management. At that time, management and advice were given free for tracts under 200 acres. On larger tracts, the landowner was expected to pay the traveling and field expenses of the technical forester. The avowed purposes of this early cooperation were: (1) to create examples of cooperative management; (2) to show the advantages of management to both forest and owner over methods then generally followed; and (3) through publications, to spread as widely as possible a knowledge of the work and its results.

The idea evidently caught on, for by 1900 applications had been received from owners of 2½ million acre of forest land. Then, as now, the requests exceeded the available facilities and only about one-third of the land was actually examined. By 1906, 1 year after the Bureau of Forestry had become the Forest Service, requests for assistance in preparing plans for management had reached nearly 12 million acres. Only 2 million acres were actually examined due to the small number of technical foresters available for the job.

Five years later a significant statement was made which initiated a shift of responsibility for management examinations from Forest Service employees to the States and to private consulting foresters. I quote from the Chief's report of 1910:

"In the early days of the forestry movement, when no other source of advice was open, the Service used so far as was practicable to send its men to examine private tracts and give advice upon the ground. Now many of the States have foresters, and applicants in such States are referred to them. There are now also consulting foresters whom private owners of large tracts can and should employ. It is, however, still the policy of the Forest Service to help all applicants in every proper way. This is chiefly done by correspondence or conference. When there are a large number of applicants in a State which has no forester, and especially when they are owners of woodlots or small holdings, advice as to methods of management may be given upon the ground. This work, however, is intended to be educational in its scope, and is done with the expectation that all the States will eventually have foresters to look after it."

By 1912, agreements had been made with 25 State foresters to refer to them all requests for field examinations and detailed information. In other States, work was continued directly with small owners. Big owners were referred to private consultants where they were available.

I have gone this far back in the history in order to emphasize and point up two things: first, that the Forest Service from its very beginning has been interested in promoting good management on privately owned land; and second, that the Forest Service believed almost from the very beginning that the best way to promote good management of privately owned forest lands was through the State foresters and consulting foresters.

Since apparently there was so much interest in good forest management at the turn of the century, one might wonder why more progress was not made and why more evidence of this early interest and early efforts cannot be found on the ground. I think the answer to that is fire. I can well imagine the reactions of the landowner, who had a management plan made up for his property and made every attempt to follow its recommendations for several years, only to see a forest fire come along and destroy his stand. And with the prevalence of fires in those days, it is probable that something like this happened rather frequently.

It is therefore easy to understand why during the period from 1912 to 1924, the emphasis shifted from management plans and technical advice to fire protection. It was simply a case of putting the horse before the cart; of putting first things first. In any event, during that period with a few exceptions, the State organizations spent most of their time and effort in building up a fire protection organization and, in some cases, building up a system of State forests. Chief among the exceptions were Austin Hawes of Connecticut and Fred Besley of Maryland, neither of whom at any stage of the game lost their interest in making available advice and assistance to the private landowner. The work of the Forest Service is assisting private landowners also was at a low ebb during this period, and consisted of the free-lancing of Austin Cary as he traveled around the country aiding and advising forest landowners. The national forest organizations also were of some limited help on those lands inside or adjacent to national forest lands.

This, then, was the picture of Forest Service and other public assistance to the private landowners at the time the Clarke-McNary Act was passed. Within a few years a new interest in management became evident. Section 5 of the Clarke-McNary Act expanded the system of extension foresters and these men were able to intensify their work of advising and assisting the farm woodland owners. Section 2 of the Clarke-McNary Act intensified protection from forest fires. As a result, the larger landowners, this time with little public help, again took an increasing interest in better management of their land.

Then came the depression and management activities on private land slowed perceptibly. I know of one coal company in the East that employed 12 foresters on its operations in 1929. In 1932, that company employed one forester. And so it went. No markets for the products, little income from the land, little efforts toward improved management.

Although things looked black during those depression days, several things happened that had a significant bearing on private forestry and on the contribution the Forest Service was able to make to the extension of better management of private lands. The first of these was the CCC, although the impact this program had on private forestry was not evident until some time later. The CCC served as a training and proving ground for many young foresters. The CCC also served as an inducement for other young men to study forestry. As a result, a relatively large pool of trained, capable foresters was available when the pulp industry began its expansion in the South, and when the large lumber companies decided to extend and intensify management on their forest lands. In fact, it was this large pool of men who did more than anyone else to sell the lumber companies and pulp companies on the idea that foresters and forestry had an important place in those industries. That they did have something to offer has been very well proved by the number who since have risen to the top or near the top of their organizations.

The second significant thing concerning the Forest Service and private forestry that occurred during this period was the creation in the Forest Service of a Branch of State and Private Forestry. Chief of the Service F. A. Silcox and Assistant Chief Ted Tinker presumably reasoned that with the great improvement in fire protection, the time had come to reactivate work in promoting good management on privately owned land. This was the period when Wahlenberg was engaged in his tax-depletion work in the West and when growth study plots and management plans were being prepared throughout the rest of the country. It was during this period that I joined up with the Forest Service and was assigned to the Northeast under the direction of Bob Evans and Gus Lentz. My job was to visit the brass of large land-owning companies and attempt to interest them in placing their holdings under management, and quite a job it was. In Maine, the work was relatively easy. There I could capitalize on the work Austin Cary did many years ago. In West Virginia and Kentucky, the going was really tough. There the lands were owned chiefly by coal companies and their main concern seemed to be to make the timber last until the underlying coal was exhausted. In spite of that, every report I submitted to the companies invariably ended with a recommendation to hire a forester to manage their holdings.

In 1939, there was as far as I know not a single industrially employed forester in West Virginia. According to latest reports, there are 30. I don't know how much credit for this can be placed upon my early work I hope some. For I worked too hard not to be permitted the pleasure of thinking I at least prepared the ground, even though I may be the victim of an illusion.

The third and probably the most significant event that happened during the 1930's was the enactment in 1937 of the Norris-Doxey Act. At that time the management assistance programs of all but a few States were nonexistent, or, at best, pretty weak. Prior to that time, a greatly understaffed Extension Service was practically the only agency doing any work with the small landowner. After a few false starts, while we were attempting to learn the difference between farm forestry and forest farming, the Norris-Doxey program emerged in the familiar pattern of Forest Service-State Forester cooperation and from then on its progress was swift and sure. Today, many States with excellent private assistance programs have built these programs on the foundation of the Norris-Doxey Act. Here there is no chance for delusion, no question of the tie-in. Practically everyone recognizes that the present State programs for giving aid to the small landowners are the direct result of the Norris-Doxey Act. Today, in surroundings much different from those in 1891, the Forest Service is continuing its work in private forestry—and not alone as was then the case.

Forty-three States now have Clarke-McNary Cooperative Fire Control programs. Non-Federal lands, 369 million acres, are receiving some degree of protection. The "Keep America Green," Smokey Bear programs, and many private citizens are all working together toward better protection of our private forests.

Forty-five States, and many landowners, are now involved in the Cooperative Clarke-McNary Tree Planting program. In 1952 over 300 million trees were distributed from State-operated nurseries. Pulp and lumber companies are distributing small trees to owners who want to plant idle acres. Some of these concerns own and operate nurseries. The Future Farmers, 4-H Clubs, Junior Chambers of Commerce, Garden Clubs, the More Trees Program, and Trees for Tomorrow are just some of the groups now interested in planting more of the 62 million acres of poorly stocked and denuded privately owned lands that should be growing commercial crops of trees.

Thirty-nine States with some 270 State-employed farm or service foresters are now providing on-the-ground technical advice and assistance in forest management and processing to owners of small forests and mills. In 1945, cutting was good on only about 4 percent of these small properties—it has been estimated that now somewhere around 15 percent of this small-owner acreage is under good management. There seems every likelihood that this improvement will continue at an accelerated pace, for within the past few years many others have been working with the small landowners. Consulting foresters, industry sponsored conservation foresters, programs such as Tree Farms, all are making a real contribution to better management on the small woodland.

Public participation in the protection of private forests from insects and disease has made slower progress than the other phases of private forestry I have discussed. Through cooperative efforts, several large outbreaks have been controlled recently. During the past several weeks the Council of State Governments has had under consideration a sample State law designed to strengthen State participation in this important filed. A copy of this proposed law persumably will be sent to each State's attorney general this coming winter for possible consideration by the State legislatures.

As I noted, most of the work of the Forest Service in private forestry is done through the State foresters. There are, however, a few special jobs that the Forest Service still does directly. For example, we do a contract job for the agricultural conservation program in the naval stores belt in the Southeast. There were are attempting not only to improve turpentine practices but also timber management practices. In Mississippi, we are doing a planting job in connection with flood prevention work. Probably the best known of our direct work is that done by that small group of highly specialized men working in very limited fields. We have a nursery specialist in the Southeast who is called upon by State foresters and industrial concerns to help with specialized nursery problems. In the Lake States we have a specialist presently working with 4 pulp companies owning some 800,000 acres in the adoption of an electrographic process for a continuous forest inventory. Everyone connected with these special jobs agrees that the work can best be done by the Forest Service, because no one State and no one company has full time need for such highly specialized talent.

Frankly, the Forest Service is happy that so many people and so many organizations are now interested in promoting better management on privately owned forest land. We have every reason to be interested in the programs of the State foresters, industry, 4-H Clubs, chambers of commerce, etc. This is a most natural interest because these programs are the very things the Forest Service has been hoping and working for these many years. The early leaders in the Bureau of Forestry have passed on. Were they alive today, I'm sure the present pattern of cooperation between Federal, State, and private agencies and landowners would please them. It would be especially pleasing when they realized that this present-day pattern has come about chiefly because all of us have insisted on following the policy of cooperation they first adopted back in 1910.

Farmer Is Being Shortchanged Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 9, 1954

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the American farmer is still being shortchanged. He is almost at the bottom rung of the economic ladder. It is a know fact today that the prices he receives for the food and fiber that he produces are lower than they were more than 10 years ago.

This is an incredible situation, Mr. Speaker, yet it is recognized that the farmer is paying 50 percent or more for the things that he buys to put his farm into production. Unless we come to grips with this situation the farmer will eventually be liquidated. When farm purchasing power decreases our whole economic system is threatened.

Is it reasonable, Mr. Speaker, to ask for some explanation for the difference between the cost of the bottle of milk that I buy and what my dairy farmer pays for it? The average price for a quart of milk is 22 cents, yet the farmer receives only 7 or 8 cents for that same quart of milk. Why this great discrepancy between the producer—the farmer—and myself, the consumer? I have never seen or heard a real answer to that question. It has been established, however, that the farmer gets on all food commodities about 43 cents of the consumer's dollar. It is much less than that for the dairy farmer.

Mr. Speaker, I am talking about the biggest business in this country—that is the food business. Is it not therefore the No. 1 domestic problem? I think it is.

In this connection I refer to a recent article by Mr. Louis Bromfield, farmer as well as an excellent writer, in which he points out that the total investment in land, livestock, machinery, and buildings by the American farmer is larger than the total investment in all of industry in this country. Further he says that 50 percent upward of the citizenry derives, directly or indirectly, its employment, income, wages, and purchasing power from an agricultural base. Agriculture is indeed the Nation's biggest business and food is its principal product.

Mr. Speaker, in Wisconsin, my beloved State, the dairy farm is the biggest business and I am very proud of it. The men and women who own and operate those dairy farms are hardworking, honest, conscientious, God-fearing people, who work from sunup and past sundown to complete their daily chores, aided by their sons and daughters.

My interest, therefore, Mr. Speaker, is chiefly in the welfare of my Wisconsin dairy farmers. A valuable report just issued by the House Committee on Agriculture is most illuminating on the subject of the price of milk and dairy products.

It points out that the farm price of milk and butterfat and the retail price of dairy products reached a peak in 1962. However, since that time farm prices have dropped 20 points while retail prices have dropped only 9 points. The report further points out that farm prices for milk and butterfat in June of this year—1954—were 10 percent below their 1947-49 average, while retail prices in dairy products were 3 percent higher than in the earlier period.

In my own congressional district, where considerable of the fluid milk goes into the Chicago market, my farmers have received 8 cents a quart, while farmers who supply milk for the New York City market received 12 cents a quart in June 1954 for fluid use which cost urban housewives 25 cents a quart to their doors. Again I ask the same question, What is the cause for this considerable spread between producer and consumer?

Mr. Speaker, perhaps the answer to this question is partially answered by this same report, which points out that every dollar spent by the American housewife for domestically produced goods 56 cents now goes for processing, marketing, and transportation charges. The farmer receives 44 cents, and out of this 44 cents about 30 cents goes to purchasing of tractors, trucks, plows, gasoline, fertilizer, and other supplies required by modern farming.

On that basis, Mr. Speaker, the farmer and his family have about 14 cents out of each consumer dollar spent for domestically produced food for their work and investment. The farmer's share, according to the latest figures, the consumer's dollar has dropped in recent years and months as farm prices have declined, while retail food prices have remained at 1952 peak levels.

This is the problem, it seems to me, that needs considerable study and attention by this Congress and those that are to follow. There is no good reason under the sun why the American farmer, and especially the dairy farmer who works so hard for what he gets in return, should be on the lowest rung of our economic ladder. Obviously the farmer is being shortchanged.

More Repercussions of Rigid Price Controls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JACK WESTLAND

OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 9, 1954

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, a situation which borders on the ridiculous and certainly is uneconomical has arisen as another indirect result of the unrealistic program of rigid price supports which is presently in effect.

Pacific Northwest farmers, whether dairymen, poultrymen, or producers of turkeys and meat animals, who are required to feed grain to their livestock and poultry have historically used large quantities of oats in their feeding program.

Insufficient oats are raised in western Washington to take care of requirements of these farmers and on many occasions it has proven necessary and desirable to import this feed material from western Canada.

Late in 1953 the United States entered into an agreement with the Canadian Government which limits shipments of oats from Canada to the United States to 23 million bushels during the period from December 10, 1953, to September 1954, in order to reduce the impact of imports on the domestic price-support program. This quota has now been used and it therefore is impossible for farm feeders to import any oats from Canada for the next 2 months. It is necessary therefore for these farmers to bring oats from as far away as Minneapolis, resulting in a $20 per ton freight haul.

There is no intention to criticize my good friends in Minnesota for their efforts to protect the markets for the products of their farms. However, it would seem more sensible to me if a reasonable import duty could be placed on Canadian oats which might be imported above the quota, thereby allowing the Treasury of the Government of the United States as well as the farm feeders of my district to profit from the purchase by them of feed oats in Vancouver, British Columbia, instead of what seems to me to be an unnecessary and ridiculous freight payment for the hauling of oats for 2,000 miles.

As long as high-rigid price supports are in effect, situations such as this are bound to arise. Dislocations of grain plantings and wasteful long hauls of produce are but two of the many evils of the present uneconomical and discredited price-support program.

Why Red China Should Not Be Admitted to U. N.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 5, 1954

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following declaration of Mr. Matthew Woll, first vice president, American Federation of Labor, and chairman, free trade-union committee, which appeared in the International Free Trade Union News.

Mr. Woll's statement follows:

Why Communist China Should Not Be Admitted to the United Nations

The question of admitting Communist China to the United Nations should be decided only in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations.

There exists a widespread notion that the United Nations is an organization which is open to all states which care to apply for membership. This assumption has no foundation in the present Charter of the United Nations. On the basis of the existing charter, only those states which fulfill certain conditions may be members of the U. N. As long as the charter has not been changed, its provisions regulating membership are binding.

The Charter of the U. N. contains no provision dealing with a case where the right of the government of a member to represent that state in the U. N. is challenged and another government claims the right to appoint representatives to the U. N. However, as already mentioned, the U. N. Charter does set conditions which a state must fulfill in order to qualify for membership in the U. N.

Since a state is represented by its government, it is evident that it is the government which must fulfill the conditions for membership in the United Nations.

The articles of the charter in regard to membership read:

"ART. 3. The original members of the United Nations shall be states which, having participated in the United Nations Conference on International Organization at San Francisco, or having previously signed the declaration of the United Nations of January 1, 1942, sign the present charter and ratify it in accordance with article 110.

"ART. 4. (1) Membership in the United Nations is open to all other peace-loving states which accept the obligations contained in the present charter and, in the judgment of the Organization, are able and willing to carry out these obligations.

"(2) The admission of any such state to membership in the United Nations will be effected by a decision of the General Assembly upon the recommendations of the Security Council.

"ART. 5. A member of the United Nations against which preventive or enforcement action has been taken by the Security Council may be suspended from the exercise of the rights and privileges of membership by the General Assembly upon the recommendation of the Security Council. The exercise of these rights and privileges may be restored by the Security Council.

"ART. 6. A member of the United Nations which has persistently violated the principles contained in the present charter may be expelled from the Organization by the General Assembly upon the recommendation of the Security Council."

The charter distinguishes between original members and future members. China is one of the original members. Article 4 enumerates the conditions a state has to fulfill to become a member of the U. N. These conditions are: (1) To accept the obligations contained in the charter; (2) to be a peace-loving state; (3) to be able and willing to carry out the obligations contained in the charter. That the Charter considers all original members as peace loving can be inferred from the fact that article 4 uses that formula—all other peace-loving states. In other words, the charter requires that all members, subsequent as well as original members, must be peace loving. It is evident that Communist China does not fulfill this condition.

QUALIFICATIONS FOR MEMBERSHIP

According to international law, the new government must fulfill the following requirements in order to be eligible for membership in the U. N.: (1) It must be independent. (2) It must be in effective control of the territory and the population of the member state.

Nothing has happened since Mao Tse-tung seized power, with the aid of Russian arms and leadership, to indicate that his regime is independent in its foreign policy or even in its domestic policy. Here one must raise the question: What does effective control mean? There is nothing in the U. N. Charter which implies, let alone provides, that control is synonymous with undestrained and savage terror. In reference to this, we point to the following evaluation of the Mao Tse-tung dictatorship by the Manchester Guardian Weekly: "He represents a government which has boasted of killing two and a quarter million of its subjects." (July 15, 1954.)

Similarly, according to international law, a so-called government-in-exile can be considered as the government of the occupied state as long as it continues its efforts to obtain, by means of war, control of the territory of the state concerned. There is no question that the Nationalist Government, momentarily having its official seat at Formosa, meets this qualification. Communist China's shipping has been hard hit by Nationalist naval action. Civilians, trade unionists, peasants, and even soldiers on the Chinese mainland are frequently being arrested, sent to forced labor camps, and being executed for their loyalty to the Nationalist Government and hostility to the Communist regime as a foreign-imposed dictatorship.

And lest we forget, on December 14, 1950, the General Assembly of the U. N. adopted the following resolution: "The General Assembly * * * recommends that, whenever more than one authority claims to be the government entitled to represent a member state in the U. N., the question should be considered in the light of the purposes and principles of the charter and the circumstances of each case.

Not even the most ardent apologist for the Mao Tse-tung regime could offer the flimsiest evidence that the Peiping dictatorship has shown any indication of acting in the light of the purposes and principles of the charter. It did not do so in Korea. It did not do so in Indochina. It is not doing so in its treatment of the Chinese people who are being subjected to brutal exploitation and savage persecution.

According to article 4, paragraph 2 of the charter, a state which fulfills the above-mentioned conditions can be admitted to membership in the U. N. only by a decision of the General Assembly upon the recommendation of the Security Council. According to the express provisions of article 18, paragraph 2, a two-thirds majority of the members present and voting is required for a decision by which the General Assembly admits a state to membership in the U. N. In conformity with article 27, paragraph 3, the above-mentioned recommendation of the Security Council shall be made by an affirmative vote of 7 members including the concurring votes of the permanent members. Since this recommendation is not a procedural matter, all permanent members must vote for it.

Consequently, no state can become a member of the U. N. against the will of one of the great powers. Actually, the Soviet Union has prevented the admission of a number of states to the U. N. by casting a veto in the Security Council, thereby making impossible the required recommendation of the Security Council to the General Assemby.

In his statement of July 9, 1954, made at his news conference, Secretary of State John Foster Dulles declared:

"In view of the fact that the charter tests as to eligibility obviously relate to governments, or can only be applied in terms of governments, it seems to me that if you look at the substance of the matter rather than the form, the question of the eligibility of a new government should be subject to the same voting tests as the admission of a new state."

The question arises then: Why should the United States not exercise its veto power to block the admission of the Communist Chinese regime to the General Assembly of the United Nations as well as to prevent its being seated on the Security Council of the U. N.—as announced by Secretary of State Dulles?

WHAT U. N. EXPERIENCE TEACHES

In dealing with this question, it will prove useful to review some cases where the applications of states to membership in the U. N. were not accepted. Some of the arguments which were advanced on those occasions apply just as much and are just as correct in rejecting the admission of Communist China to the U. N.

Article 3 and article 4 of the charter stipulate that only "states" can be members of the U. N. According to Hans Kelsen, the Law of the United Nations, London, 1950, pages 68 ff: "This point is of importance if the admission of a new state is at issue, which has not yet been recognized as such by all, or some, of the Members. The nonrecognition by a member of a community as a new state may manifest itself by the fact that no diplomatic relations exist between this member of the United Nations and the applicant community. Since general international law does not institute an objective authority to decide whether a community is a state in the sense of international law, it depends upon each member of the Security Council and of the General Assembly to answer this question according to its own discretion."

Thus, Poland refused to vote for the admission of the Hashemite Kingdom of Transjordan, because Poland did not consider the latter "a sovereign state" (Security Council, Official Records, 1st year, 2d series; Suppl. No. 4, p. 136). The United States refused to vote for the admission of the Mongolian People's Republic because "the United States Government had yet to receive information which convinced it that the Mongolian People's Republic was in fact an independent state" (Security Council, Official Records, 2d year, Special Suppl. 3, p. 11).

The representative of Australia made the statement that states occupied by foreign troops (such as Austria, Hungary, Italy, Rumania, Bulgaria) "could not be regarded as sovereign or independent" (ibid., pp. 20, 52). At the July 14, 1948, meeting of the Security Council Committee on the Admission of New Members, the representative of the Soviet Union suggested that the committee postpone consideration of the application of Ceylon pending receipt of information from the Ceylon Government establishing its position as a sovereign and indepedent state. (Doc. S/C. 2./S. R. 26.)

During the discussion of the application of the Outer Mongolian People's Republic in the Security Council, the delegate of China declared that the applicant was not a peace-loving state within the terms of the charter (Doc. S/479, pp. 39–46).

In the discussion of the applications for membership of Ireland and Portugal, the delegate of the Soviet Union stated that his government could not support these applications, because these countries had no diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union. (Doc. S/177.)

In this connection, it may also be worthwhile to quote from resolutions adopted by the General Assembly, in regard to Franco Spain.

On the motion of the Mexican delegation, Commission I of the San Francisco Conference decided to insert in the records of the Commission the following statement: "It is the understanding of the delegation of Mexico that paragraph 2 of chapter III (art. 4 of the charter) cannot be applied to the states whose regimes have been established with the help of military forces belonging to the countries which have waged war against the United Nations, as long as those regimes are in power." (Verbatim minutes of third meeting of Commission I, U. N., CIO doc. 1167 I/10, pp. 20–29.)

A GUIDING BASIC PRINCIPLE

At its 26th meeting, the General Assembly adopted the following resolution:

"1. The General Assembly recalls that the San Francisco Conference adopted a resolution according to which paragraph 2 of article 4 of chapter II of the United Nations Charter 'cannot apply to states whose regimes have been installed with the help of armed forces of countries which have fought against the United Nations so long as these regimes are in power.'

"2. The General Assembly recalls that at the Potsdam Conference the Governments of the United Kindom, the United States of America and the Soviet Union stated that they would not support a request for admission to the United Nations of the present Spanish Government 'which, having been founded with the support of the axis powers, in view of its origin, its nature, its record, and its close association with the aggressor states, does not possess the necessary qualifications to justify its admission.'

"3. The General Assembly, in endorsing these two statements, recommends that the members of the United Nations should act in accordance with the letter and the spirit of these statements in the conduct of their future relations with Spain."

At its 59th meeting, the General Assembly adopted a resolution in which it recommended:

"That the Franco Government of Spain be debarred from membership in international agencies established by or brought into relationship with the United Nations, and from participation in conferences or other activities which may be arranged by the United Nations or by these agencies, until a new and acceptable government is formed in Spain; * * * that if, within a reasonable time, there is not established a government which derives its authority from the consent of the governed, committed to respect freedom of speech, religion, and assembly and to the prompt holding of an election in which the Spanish people, free from force and intimidation and regardless of party, may express their will, the Security Council consider the adequate measures to be taken in order to remedy the situation. * * *"

The preamble to this resolution states, in part:

"The General Assembly, convinced that the Franco Fascist Government of Spain, which was imposed by force upon the Spanish people with the aid of the Axis Powers and which gave material assistance to the Axis Powers in the war, does not represent the Spanish people, and by its continued control of Spain is making impossible the participation of the Spanish people with the peoples of the United Nations in international affairs."

Most of the indictments made against Franco Spain can also be leveled at Communist China. The Chinese Communist regime was imposed upon the people of China with outside (Russian) help. It fought against the United Nations and was condemned by the U. N. as an aggressor. The moment it signed an armistice agreement with the U. N. in the Korean theater of its aggressive war, the Peiping dictatorship rushed its volunteer troops and vast stores of military equipment to Indochina where it resorted to new aggression and hurled its armed forces against the democratic Vietnamese and France, a member of the United Nations.

PREFERENTIAL TREATMENT FOR COMMUNISM?

But it might be argued that the free world should not apply against the Communist Chinese regime the same rules which it pledged to apply against the Falangist regime of Spain. This type of approach is unprincipled and impractical. It is dangerously unrealistic to give preferential treatment to one type of totalitarian usurpers (the Communist type) as against another brand (the Falangist). Imposition from without and usurpation from within should never be rewarded or legitimatized, regardless of their source, origin or flag. We know nothing more unrealistic than to give preferential and favored treatment to any particular form of totalitarianism.

It would be suicidal rather than realistic to give special privileges or preference to the Communist expression of foreign-imposed despotism and usurpation, particularly at a moment in history when it represents the gravest threat to world peace and freedom and on an occasion when it involves not a small and poor country but so great a people and so vast an area as China.

In this connection, we also stress that we do not have the slightest preference for Russian totalitarianism as against Chinese totalitarian dictatorship. In fact, since the founding of the U. N., the U. S. S. R. has become the principal aggressor. It is today the primary motive force directing and making possible Chinese aggression. If the Soviet Union were to apply today for membership in the U. N., it would be ineligible for admission under the Charter of the U. N.

LET CHINESE PEOPLE DECIDE

The Peiping regime does not represent the Chinese people. Through it has had absolute power as a totalitarian dictatorship for more than 5 years, the Mao Tse-tung regime has not dared to hold a national election—even of the so-called people's .democracy plebiscite type in vogue in the most backward Balkan lands under the Communist yoke.

To date, there has been only one occasion on which Chinese from the mainland have had an opportunity to vote on whether they desired or declined to live under a system of Soviet dictatorship. Of about 21,000 Chinese war prisoners in the Korean conflict who were polled by the International Commission—after considerable harangue, pressure and threats against them and their families by official representatives of the Peiping regime—more than 14,000 voted "no." They decided not to return to their homeland. The overwhelming majority decided that it chose not to live under the Soviet system. The International Commission which supervised this vote consisted of representatives of Communist Russian-dominated Polish and Czechoslovak governments and representatives of India, Sweden, and Switzerland.

This is all the more significant in view of the fact that in his letter to the All-China National Salvation League (1937), Mao Tse-tung pledged: "We even agree to submit to a democratic decision of the people of the whole country the question of whether the Soviet system of society is to be adopted by the whole of China or not."

We wonder why Prime Minister Nehru and others who are so eager to catapult Communist China into the U. N. have forgotten this pledge by Mao Tse-tung. Why do not these advocates of the Peiping Communist regime propose and champion the idea of holding such a U. N.-supervised democratic election throughout all Chinese territory? Can they think of a more peaceful, positive and constructive way of settling the Chinese issue, of reducing to a minimum all international tension emanating from this source, and of assuring the Chinese people a government which represents rather than represses them? Can Attlee, Bevan, Nehru, and their supporters conceive of a more realistic, more sound and more just way of bringing back into the community of free and peaceful peoples the entire great Chinese nation?

CONCLUSION

Finally, we do not say that everyone who seeks the admission of Communist China into the U. N. is a Communist or even an appeaser of Moscow-Peiping aggression. There are some who honestly believe that U. N. membership for the Mao Tse-tung regime will transform and reform the character of the Peiping dictatorship. This is nothing but wishful thinking. For years, five Iron Curtain regimes (U. S. S. R., Ukraine, Byelorussia, Poland, Czechoslovakia) have been in the U. N. Their active participation in the life of the United Nations and their continuous and close association with the other members of the U. N. have not served to reform them or change their character.

On the other hand, the granting of U. N. membership to the Communist Chinese aggressor, who has waged war against the United Nations, will serve to legalize and lend moral responsibility to the Peiping dictatorship. It will discourage and demoralize the democratic forces on the Chinese mainland and in every overseas Chinese community throughout Asia where they are of vital economic and political importance to the cause of democracy and peace. Such admission will strengthen the hand and sharpen the terror of the Communist regime within China proper.

Moreover, such international recognition of the Communist regime would have a disastrous effect on the democratic anti-Communist forces within the neighboring countries of Mao Tse-tung China. It would, thereby, jeopardize their national independence and greatly encourage the subversive forces seeking to undermine the democratic institutions and destroy the democratic rights of the people of Burma, Thailand, Malaya, Ceylon, Indonesia, and even India, itself. In short, such international recognition of the aggressor Communist regime in China would encourage and facilitate the Mao Tse-tung warlords to step up their terror campaign against the national independence and territorial integrity of all these non-Communist countries.

Let us not forget the lessons of the catastrophic experience the free world had with the Nazi totalitarian dictatorship. Every time the democracies accepted and honored any act of aggression and conquest by Hitler, they weakened inside the neighboring countries resistance to Nazi subversion and aggression and encouraged the Hitlerite warlords to resort to further military conquest and imperialist expansion. This false policy inevitably led to World War II. Let us not return to this false policy, for it can lead only to another and even more terrible world conflagration.

For God and Country

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON H. SCHERER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 9, 1954

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, July 4, 1954, the congregation of the Monroe (Ohio) Methodist Church listened to an outstanding Independence Day sermon delivered by its minister, Rev. W. E. Ballinger.

The sermon dealt so effectively with a number of phases of the Communist menace that excerpts therefrom were printed in many newspapers throughout Ohio.

I feel that this matter is of such national significance that at least portions of this splendid sermon should be made available to all through the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

FOR GOD AND COUNTRY

On the Fourth of July we naturally turn our thoughts to the freedoms of our country. It was on that day that "our fathers brought forth on this continent a new Nation, conceived in liberty, and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal." When Lincoln spoke these words, this country was "engaged in a great civil war, testing whether that Nation, or any nation so conceived and so dedicated can long endure." Our Nation survived that test and has since become a great Nation.

Now, another testing time has come. This time we are confronted by a world force that has become very powerful. It began in 1917 with a handful of revolutionaries in Russia. After World War II the Communists were ready to push rapidly toward new goals. Today their influence covers one-quarter of the world's territory and one-third of its population.

But its outward power is not its greatest danger. It is subtle. It is definitely anti-Christian. It has thousands of dedicated adherents who are as consecrated to their task of world revolution as the most devout Christians are to their task of converting the world. However, there is a difference in their methods. Christians are taught the methods of Christ: The golden rule; love of enemies. Communists are taught to do whatever is expedient for the moment: Perhaps the golden rule, perhaps sabotage or violence; perhaps truth or lie—whichever will bring the immediately desired results.

A sad thing is that, even today, many are not awake to the dangers of this subtle foe. Their words and deeds indicate it. My chief concern today is with those who are unaware of the dangers of communism. They are the people who could and should lead us out of the morass we are in—the intellectuals. If they do not lead, the radicals may take over. In arousing capable but indifferent people any leader is likely to overstimulate those who are more conscientious and wide awake. The minister has this problem. Thus, there emerges another extreme: Those who "have a zeal of God, but not according to knowledge."

The people are still asking many questions about Communist infiltration into high places. They have a right to know the answers.

The questions are: Why was Major Peress promoted and given an honorable discharge after it was known that he was a Communist? Who was responsible for that action? Why, in the eyes of certain ones of the elite press and of many politicians, is it so much worse for a duly elected Senator of the United State to have received a summary of a secret Federal Bureau of Investigation report, than it is for Communist stooges in the employ of the Government to rifle secret files almost without rebuke? Judging from the number of words that have emanated from certain sources, one would think that the Senator is the only offender.

The truth is that many of the liberal intellectuals were once so deceived by Communist promises and propaganda that they are yet stunned and confused. Do not misunderstand me. They are not Communists. They are genteel idealists whom we enjoy knowing. They are unsuspicious characters who are quickly influenced by a philosophy which is purported to be like their own. Thus, when the Communists advocated a new social order free from capitalism, that fit their philosophy. When they said they were for peace, it coincided with their great longing for peace. Many of them felt that out of the commingling of Communist doctrine with Christianity, or, in some instances, from the clash between the two, there would come a synthesis in which communism would drop its bad features, and Christianity would adopt the Communist economic theory and its avowed espousal of peace.

Let me quote a few things that will show you what I mean. These statements have been taken from the Christian Century unless otherwise stated. Kirby Page on July 10, 1934, wrote concerning capitalism, "The only Christian thing to do with the competitive struggle for self-interest is to end it." Jerome Davis in his contribution to the book, Preaching and the Social Crisis, on page 46, wrote: "We must fearlessly preach the doom of the existing order." And on page 54: "Such a religious faith * * * will probably recognize that capitalism is an evil as slavery once was." Jesse S. Dancy on March 25, 1936, asserted: "Capitalism has now generally succeeded slavery, but it demands a cheapening of human values equal to that imposed by slavery."

This economic ideology was so influential when the World Council of Churches met at Amsterdam in 1948 that communism and capitalism were equally condemned. In the October 1948, Christian Herald, Dr. Daniel A. Poling commented on this: "* * * to condemn (capitalism) equally with communism, which damns God and denies human personality while it liquidates religion and glorifies statism, is to to an overwhelming majority in all faiths (in America) rank hypocrisy."

In the current issue of his magazine (July 1954) Dr. Poling reminds his readers of that statement and then declares concerning the World Council meeting, to be held in Evanston, Ill., next month: "Evanston must declare communism anti-religious, anti-Christ, and utterly antagonistic to everything for which the Christian Church should stand, or Evanston will divide the American Protestant community."

The other issue that has caused many to be sympathetic with the Russian experiment is peace. On December 25, 1935, Harry F. Ward argued that Christians must work with Communists for peace. Communism is against war, is determined to abolish it by the elimination of its causes. Similarly, Kirby Page, a little earlier in the year (August 21) said that Communists do not advocate violence. They are a peace-loving people, bent on establishing a grand new order. It is strange that such a pacifist could be so completely fooled. The belief that communism was peace loving persisted. Because of it many of the liberals signed the phony Stockholm peace petitions.

Next, I must speak of some wishful thinking about Russia. Hugh Vernon White on November 23, 1932, expressed it in these words: "And yet one looks wistfully at Russia, and prayerfully. Will not God give success to that effort of a great nation to free itself from the exploitation of the many by the few * * *?" Jerome Davis, January 28, 1948, compared the two zones of occupation in Germany and concluded that the Russians were overcoming the hostility of the Germans, and the Western Allies were losing popularity. I wonder what Mr. Davis thought when the East German riots occurred last year.

Finally, it is our duty to be the best possible Christians. The layman should consistently take his place in the church at every service. He should be an influence for righteousness in his work, his business, or his profession. The world is looking for the man who is living a clean, honest life, and shows Christian love to all whom he meets. It is by the example of our lives more than by our words or our arguments that we influence others. Christianity is caught rather than taught.

The minister should heed the words of St. Paul: "It pleased God by the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe." It is the duty of the Christian minister to preach at every opportunity. It is a matter of record that the great spiritual revivals came as a result of increased preaching. It was true in the days of Jesus and the Apostles. It happened with St. Francis and St. Xavier. It was true in the days of the Reformation. The Methodist revival in both England and America followed the same pattern. Always great preaching has brought great revivals.

There are signs that renewed interest in preaching is taking place in America. One of the signs is the success of Dr. Billy Graham in America and England. His success in England should cause him to be welcomed home and used of God more than ever in this country. With this renewed interest in preaching God grant, as I am sure He will, that there shall come a turning to truth, honesty, and righteousness by our people from the top officials in Washington to the lowliest ones in the villages and the townships. There will then come genuine healing of our land. God promised Soloman and the people of Israel what He promises to all people of all time, "If my people which are called by my name, shall humble themselves and pray, and seek my face, and turn from their wicked ways, then will I hear from heaven, and will forgive their sin, and will heal their land."

Hon. Laurie Battle

SPEECH

OF

HON. ROBERT B. CHIPERFIELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 5, 1954

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, I wish to pay tribute to our colleague, LAURIE BATTLE, who is retiring as Representative from the Ninth District of Alabama which he has served so loyally, devotedly, and energetically since the 80th Congress. He served as a member of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee during the 80th Congress and was appointed to the House Foreign Affairs Committee on January 18, 1949, during the 81st Congress, and has served on that committee ever since.

During the 82d Congress, LAURIE BATTLE served as chairman of the Subcommittee on Foreign Economic Policy. Acutely conscious of his responsibilities and the importance of foreign economic policy in the foreign affairs of our Nation, he conducted a thorough study of the question of the trade of the free world with the Soviet bloc—East-West trade. As a result of this thorough and painstaking study, there emerged the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1949, which is known around the entire globe as the Battle Act, after the name of the distinguished author LAURIE BATTLE. The Battle Act has been successful in curtailing the shipment of strategic items by our allies to Iron Curtain countries. In June 1951, he served as chairman of the Economics Section of a Special Study Mission to Europe made up of members of the Foreign Affairs, Armed Services, and Appropriations Committees. Other members of this section included the Honorable Christian A. Herter, now Governor of Massachusetts, the Honorable Richard B. Wigglesworth, and the Honorable Frederic R. Coudert, Jr. He filed a report with the Foreign Affairs Committee just prior to its consideration of the Mutual Security Act of 1951. I know that much of the reorganization of the administration of our foreign aid program following the Mutual Security Act of 1951 resulted from the recommendations made by his group.

LAURIE BATTLE has always taken his responsibilities as a Member of Congress and as a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee very seriously. To him public service is a great opportunity and a high responsibility. This fundamental philosophy of LAURIE BATTLE'S has been constantly demonstrated during his service as a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee. No matter how small the bill being considered by the committee, LAURIE BATTLE has always given it just as much careful attention as he has the larger and more important measures. He brought to the Foreign Affairs Committee a sense of sincerity, a public consciousness, and a willingness to spend many arduous hours in bringing forth the best possible legislation in the public interest, all of which qualities will be sorely missed.

I know that with his retirement there go the best wishes of his friends, his colleagues in the Congress, and his associates on the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Today's Challenge to the College Woman in Professions and in the Community

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. VAUGHAN GARY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 9, 1954

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the address of one of our women leaders in international affairs, Mrs. Elisabeth Shirley Enochs, which was made at the recent celebration of the 40th anniversary of Westhampton College of the University of Richmond.

Mrs. Enochs gave to the Westhampton alumnae a penetrating insight into our relations with our world neighbors. The international education exchange program of this country is a vital factor in our work toward world peace. Mrs. Enochs' suggestions to college women on ways in which they can further innational understanding can, I believe, stimulate more interest as well as more active support of the exchange program.

Mrs. Enochs has such distinction as being the United States alternate delegate to the Inter-American Economic and Social Council. She is the United States delegate to the Inter-American Institute for the Protection of Childhood and she is chief of the international technical missions of the Social Security Administration of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The address follows:

TODAY'S CHALLENGE TO THE COLLEGE WOMAN IN PROFESSIONS AND IN THE COMMUNITY

(By Elisabeth Shirley Enochs)

It is a great privilege to have been invited to share in the celebration of Westhampton College's 40th birthday, and to participate in this panel discussion of the challenge presented to the college woman by the times in which we live.

The invitation extended to me on behalf of the president of the University of Richmond and the dean of Westhampton College by your anniversary chairman, May Thompson Evans, said: "The theme for the anniversary is Today's Challenge to the College Woman. A morning panel will develop the theme In Professions and in the Community, with the community including the city of Richmond and the world. We need you to speak from the world aspect."

This letter reached me just as I was returning from Caracas, Venezuela, where I served as a member of the delegation of the United States to the 10th Inter-American Conference, and was preparing to take off on a second international assignment—as United States delegate to the annual meeting of the American International Institute for the Protection of Childhood. This agency with the long name is one of the oldest and one of the most interesting of the specialized inter-American organizations of which our Government is a member. Its headquarters are in Montevideo, Uruguay. Attendance at the annual meetings of the Institute's directing council thus affords opportunity for stopovers in countries en route to confer with the technical experts recruited by our agency for assignment to missions of the Foreign Operations Administration, and with nationals of those countries who have studied in the United States under our auspices. My stopovers this time were made in Brazil, Peru, Ecuador, Colombia, and Panama. Within the last 3 months I have, therefore, been in 7 countries.

When I said that it is a privilege to have been invited here today, I was not merely attempting to make a polite introductory remark. It is not often that a returned traveler has an opportunity to review before such an audience some of the problems that challenge our country today and to enlist the cooperation of college women in meeting them.

Many years ago, as a special correspondent for the New York Times, I used to cover the institute of public affairs at the University of Virginia. Each year a Latin American round table was a prominent feature of the institute, and there statesmen and diplomats from our sister republics told us what they thought about us, and little of it was good. Then, gradually, the change that set in with the Seventh Inter-American Conference in Montevideo in 1933 began to make itself felt, and when, during the years of the Second World War, my work took me around South America 2 or 3 times a year, I observed that confidence was replacing distrust and friendship was replacing hostility. Since the end of the war the pendulum shows signs of swinging back. Some of the speeches I heard at the Caracas conference reminded me of those I used to hear in the old days at the Latin American round table at Charlottesville, and I realized that we face a new challenge—that of strengthening the bases of understanding between our country and other parts of the world.

On the evening of my arrival in Montevideo, I was spirited directly from my hotel to the home of a Uruguayan friend where a recently formed young people's club was holding its first meeting. The members were university students in their late 'teens and early twenties. One of them came up to me and asked, "Senora Enochs, to what do you attribute the organized campaign of detraction against your country that seems to exist in our universities?" As I had not been in Uruguay for 3 years, I did not know that such a campaign existed. But he and others assured me that the university students generally have little to say about us that is good and some of them are sorely troubled by the conflicting, and often derogatory opinions they hear about us.

On the plane that brought me from Panama to Miami, I found one of our leading women's magazines, and my eye was caught by a letter to the editors in which the writer spoke of a recent visit to Lima, Peru. At the Peruvian North American Institute she found that the directors had compiled a list of the leading myths about the United States held to be truths by many Peruvians. Here are a few of them. I have heard them many times, not only in Peru, but elsewhere:

Americans lead a frivolous life, without a spiritual side.

Americans have no family life.

Americans are interested only in dollars.

American women are not conscious of moral values.

To these I might add a few others, frequently mentioned by European, Latin American, and Far Eastern people:

Americans have no culture; they are interested only in the material side of life.

Americans always make us feel inferior.

Americans are less interested in learning about us and our problems than they are in boasting about themselves and their own progress.

I could go on almost indefinitely. But the most serious criticisms stem from a belief that we are a Nation of divorcees, with no feeling for family life, with little or no interest in spiritual, moral and cultural values, and with little sensitivity in dealing with people of other nations.

To some extent these views are the result of the movies we export to other countries. Nevertheless, we ourselves cannot escape all of the blame.

Some years ago a cousin of mine went to France to study at the University of Grenoble. She sent me clippings from a number of French newspapers describing the antics of a group of American students who were touring France in an old car. It was during a period of inflation when the French people were making great sacrifices to save their currency from further deflation. Imagine their reaction when the students gathered up what must have been a bushel of banknotes and pasted them all over the outside of their automobile in preparation for their tour of France. That one thoughtless act created many enemies among people who until then had been our friends, and millions of innocent Americans had to suffer as a result.

At the peak of United States interest in the good neighbor policy, a group of club women from our country undertook a so-called goodwill tour of Latin America. In Chile, a country which has pioneered in about every kind of social and labor legislation they asked such questions as: "Does Chile have labor laws?" Far from creating goodwill, this resulted in the following comment by a former President of Chile: "Those North Americans. First it was the marines. Now it's the club women.

Only a few evenings ago, many of you no doubt listened to the speech made by the President of the United States at the Columbia University national bicentennial dinner in New York.

In the course of his address the President said:

"We send professors, scholars, and students out to the schools of the free world to promote understanding of us even as they grow in knowledge and understanding of others. This practice must be accelerated.

"We find room in our own schools for tens of thousands of young men and women from other lands who, within the American community, learn the truth about us and give understanding of their own people. This effort must be expanded."

Although the President used the word "knowledge" 15 times in the course of his remarks, he warned that we must not define knowledge of the truth solely in the narrow terms of mere fact or statistic or mathematical equation, but that wisdom and human understanding are essential. Over and over he used together the words "knowledge and understanding."

This, I think, is the real challenge faced by college women with respect to that larger community that lies beyond the shores of our own country—the challenge of promoting knowledge and understanding of the kind of people we are, and of the kinds of things we do, and of helping our own people achieve greater knowledge and understanding of people of other lands.

In order to meet this challenge we do not have to be world travelers. Some of you may, at some time in the future, be among the professors, scholars, and students whom the President wishes to see go out to the schools of the free world in ever greater numbers. Some of you may go abroad on your own, as students or as tourists. Each of you can be an effective ambassador of the United States. And may I take this opportunity to suggest that your effectiveness in this role will be greatly enhanced if you have mastered the language of the country in which you are to work or study? On the basis of personal experience, I can promise you that the time and effort devoted to mastering a second language will bring rich rewards in knowledge, understanding, and personal friendships.

But many of you, perhaps even the greater number, may never go abroad. And it may surprise you to hear me say that those of you who stay at home will have the greatest opportunity to meet the challenge presented to the college woman by the world and the times in which we are living.

In order to understand why I say this, remember the myths about the United States to which I referred earlier. Unless we strengthen the bases of family life, reaffirm our sense of moral values, demonstrate the sincerity of our religious convictions and illustrate in our daily lives our acceptance of civic responsibility, we cannot hope to dispel them. And these things we can do only in our own homes and in our own local communities.

Let me give you some practical examples of how local communities right here in Virginia have helped in promoting international understanding.

Immediately after V-E Day, the American Association of University Women began to offer fellowships to women from certain European countries. One of the first to come was a young French girl who had studied law during the difficult days of the German occupation of Paris, and who was interested in learning about juvenile courts and child welfare. At that time I was Director of the International Division of the Children's Bureau, and we were asked to plan a tour for her. Here, in Richmond, she studied not only the juvenile court, but many other community agencies, and made many fast friends. Although she visited many sections of our country, Richmond retained first place in her memory and affection. When we asked her why, she said: "In Richmond the people were so understanding. They all seemed to work together like a big family, and they made me feel at home."

She had been so impressed by their attitude that she asked them how it was that they showed such sensitivity to the sufferings of her people under the occupation. Someone replied: "Perhaps it is because we in the South have experienced occupation, too." You see, they had a common basis of understanding, even though the experiences were separated in time by more than a generation.

Since then the Children's Bureau and the Social Security Administration, with which I am now connected, have continued to use Richmond as an orientation center for foreign students and observers. And we are most grateful for the hospitality shown them here. As you invite these visitors into your homes—and you cannot imagine how much it means to them to be in a real American home, they get so tired of hotels and clubs—you will make it possible for them to know and understand us better, and you, too, will learn much from them.

Just a few days ago I was visited by Miss Ruth Woodsmall, that remarkable American woman who lived and worked for many years in the Near East and has written extensively about the life of women in Moslem countries. She is about to start off on another long assignment to that part of the world as a representative of the Business and Professional Women's Clubs, to make a study of the interests of women in Egypt, Jordan, Syria, Lebanon, and Iraq. The project is being financed by a grant from one of the great foundations.

Miss Woodsmall asked me to supply her with material about community projects undertaken by women in the United States, especially reports of how things begin. I suddenly remembered the extension bulletin I had received from the University of Virginia, in which Jess and Jean Ogden tell of the remarkable way in which local club women throughout Virginia raised funds to give the State the artmobile, which is the first of its kind in any State of the Union. I promised to supply her with a few copies to take with her to the Near East, and you may be sure that the work of these Virginia women will soon be a topic of discussion among women in Baghdad and Beirut, Cairo, and Damascus. You may also be sure that the fact that women in local communities throughout our State organized bake sales and white elephant sales, silver teas, and similar fund-raising events to enable people in small communities from the Blue Ridge to the eastern shore to view masterpieces of painting—some of them loaned from important private collections—will do more to dispel the idea that we have no culture, that we are more interested in plumbing than in paintings, than reams of printed propaganda.

Such examples as this have been collected by the United Nations and the reports are included in kits of materials on community organization anad citizen cooperation which are now circulating all over the world. The smallest community in Virginia, or any other State, may thus become an example to the world. We look to the college women of our country for the leadership and for the integrity in daily life that will help to promote throughout the world the knowledge and understanding which are the keys to international friendship.

With the knowledge and understanding which the college woman carries from her alma mater back to her own community and in whatever profession she may have elected to follow, she will be able to meet the challenge of today's world if she bears in mind these words of Robert Louis Stevenson's:

"The best things are nearest; breath in your nostrils, light in your eyes, flowers at your feet, duties at your hand, the path of God just before you. Then do not grasp at the stars but do life's plain, common work as it comes, certain that daily duties and daily bread are the sweetest things of life."

Brushoff for Schoolchildren

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 5, 1954

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD an article from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch:

BRUSHOFF FOR SCHOOLCHILDREN

Many teachers felt that things were looking up for the public schools when the Eisenhower administration established the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare with Oveta Culp Hobby as its first Secretary. Never before had education been represented at Cabinet level.

But they were disappointed a few weeks ago when the administration, instead of meeting some of our school needs, decided to study them for at least a year. The announced series of State conference culminating in a big discussion in the White House in 1955 was described by the National Education Association as just a stall. No conferences are necessary to prove that the United States needs at least a quarter of a million new schoolrooms and the teachers to staff them.

Since the conferences might have been the idea of underlings, the NEA decided to take the facts of the case to the President in person. Maureen Walker, NEA president, first sought an appointment with Mrs. Hobby, but she simply could not get a hearing. Then deciding to skip this bit of protocol, Maureen Walker asked for a chance to talk to the President. No better luck. She was told that he is too busy. Yet he needed to delay the start of his weekend vacation just an hour or so.

Does Mr. Eisenhower, a proud grandfather, realize how this makes him look to the parents of America's schoolchildren? In fact, does he know that Maureen Walker has been given the brushoff?

The President's Shot in the Arm Will Not Help the Refugee Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 9, 1954

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, the President has finally realized that operations under the Refugee Act of 1953 have failed. He issued a proclamation asking aid from 48 governors. What the President did not reveal was that the Refuge Act is entirely too restrictive and that under its administrator, Scott McLeod, the goal of admission of 211,000 refugees will never be achieved.

One year has passed and only a trickle of DP's have actually arrived in the United States. Only 7,000 visas have been issued abroad but these primarily cover preferred classifications under the statute. Most of these are still in Europe. Only 2,200 refugees have arrived in this country.

The duration of the act is 3 years. One year has gone by already. What is 2,200 as against 214,000? At the present snail's pace of operation, it will take years and years for 214,000 to come in.

The rate of entry will not be acclerated by any Presidential proclamation for a number of reasons. First, there is the ridiculous attitude taken by McLeod who insists that his agents prowl around countries from whence come the DP's and question all and sundry concerning the character, habits, and associations of the applicant. The governments of these countries refuse to allow McLeod to invade their sovereignty and act as local police. His insistence has slowed down the process. He sees the subversive under every bed.

Secondly, he has made partisan political speeches around the country. His whole setup is riddled with politics. Welfare organizations whose help is needed for the full flow of refugees have condemned and shunned him and his works. They have lost confidence in him.

Thirdly, it is difficult, if not impossible, to get personal assurances for each refugee. Such assurances lays a heavy obligation upon the guarantor. Under the Celler DP Act, the previous refugee act under which we admitted with no delays over 400,000 DP's, assurances of jobs and homes were permitted by religious and welfare organizations like the Rural Catholic Life Conference, the National Lutheran Conference, the Jewish Joint Distribution Committee. These assurances were carried out and no difficulties ensued. Jobs and homes were provided.

Now the President calls attention to the current refugee program. He asks the aid of the States in implementing it. He laments the lack of assurances which stymies efforts to get 214,000 DP's into the country within the next 2 years.

The President's shot in the arm will not help. Two factors must be eliminated. First, McLeod must go. Second, the act must be liberalized.

What of Tomorrow?—Future of Chronic Disease Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDNA F. KELLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 5, 1954

Mrs. KELLY of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an interesting article by Arthur Feigenbaum, superintendent of the Jewish Chronic Disease Hospital which is located in my congressional district. Mr. Feigenbaum's subject, What of Tomorrow? is indeed a timely one as it points out the need for more hospitals for the treatment of the chronically ill:

WHAT OF TOMORROW?—FUTURE OF CHRONIC DISEASE SITUATION

(By Arthur Feigenbaum, superintendent, Jewish Chronic Disease Hospital)[1]

Despite a world of hustle and bustle and emotional instabilities, people continue to live longer and will live longer, but unfortunately will die longer.

Medical science assisted and aided by instruments and apparatus for a more accurate diagnosing, and with wonder drugs at its command to combat and eradicate infectious diseases, has added many years to life, but life must be added to these extended years.

The disturbing and distressing situation that faces the Nation is and will be the lack of hospital beds to meet the demands for hospitalization of the chronically ill man, woman, and child. Increase of life expectancy increases the demands for beds for the chronic patient.

More hospitals of this type, rather than the general hospital must be provided in adequate numbers throughout the country to meet the demand that will be placed upon them. Facilities must be placed preferably under the same roof to provide:

1. Beds in adequate numbers, both for today and tomorrow.
2. Rehabilitation.
3. Sheltered workshops to make people partially self-supporting.
4. Outpatient clinics for treatment and prevention of chronic diseases or their complications.
5. Teaching purposes.

In addition facilities under the same roof should be made available for (a) research, (b) recreational purposes.

Millions of Americans will be counted among those classified as victims of muscular dystrophy, multiple sclerosis, cerebral palsy, Parkinsonism, arthritis, degenerative vascular diseases and many others, and will require facilities either as inpatients or outpatients, as long-term patients for rehabilitation or restoration, and outpatient facilities for the ambulant.

A Paul Revere may be needed to arouse the Nation from its lethargic condition that building programs must be started and future plans must start at once and be ready for future use.

No State in the Union can boast of having sufficient beds to meet their present needs and will be totally unprepared to meet their future demands. Let us look at the record.

The President's program to make Federal funds available for the construction of hospitals and rehabilitation centers for chronic diseases is a great step forward in this direction.

Bed facilities, 1953

State [1]	Chronic diseases	Mental	Tuberculosis
Alabama	312	3,351	719
Arizona	127	2,360	929
Arkansas	116	4,450	1,653
California:			
Acceptable	5,303	38,881	6,760
Nonacceptable	377	1,852	1,354
Colorado	41	5,806	1,454
Connecticut	1,476	7,709	1,743
Delaware	336	835	116
Florida [2]	75	7,276	2,230
Georgia:			
Acceptable	572		
Nonacceptable	1,873	10,916	2,157
Idaho		1,278	90
Illinois [2]	2,904	27,379	5,145
Indiana	342	11,177	1,707
Iowa	127	5,671	773
Kansas		3,633	543
Kentucky	312	7,360	1,324
Louisiana [2]	226	5,805	1,349
Maine [2]	152	2,452	453
Maryland	450	7,368	1,718
Massachusetts	1,978	[5] 30,793	3,965
Michigan [2]	(4)	20,432	4,966
Minnesota	400	9,550	1,799
Needed	5,633	5,555	
Mississippi	27	5,573	650
Nebraska	[5] 1,083	5,115	290
Nonacceptable		77	
New Hampshire		2,799	133
New Jersey	1,120	17,789	2,100
New Mexico	84	784	592
Nonacceptable		443	
New York	8,318	72,696	12,437
North Carolina	415	9,138	2,748
North Dakota	60	2,006	350
Ohio	890	20,359	3,920
Oklahoma	482	8,741	1,135
Oregon	31	4,552	557
Pennsylvania	1,613	36,277	3,928
Nonacceptable	358	2,866	1,355
South Carolina	247	3,724	826
South Dakota	42	1,886	262
Tennessee	1,321	8,289	1,984
Texas	1,034	11,746	4,526
Nonacceptable	84		1,002
Utah		1,086	100
Vermont	(6)	1,933	173
Nonacceptable		232	3
Virginia	60	10,665	1,600
Washington	533	6,538	2,400
West Virginia	99	3,748	1,274
Wisconsin	1,175	11,621	1,525
Replaceable	192	690	595
Wyoming	105	700	50
Total	43,514	473,958	90,769
Nonacceptable	2,884	6,160	3,407
Alaska			788
Canal Zone	80	254	90
Guam	156	6	150

[1] 44 State survey, chronic disease beds exclude mental and tuberculosis.

[2] 1952 figure.

[3] Excludes 3 Federal hospitals.

[4] Unavailable.

[5] Includes convalescent homes.

[6] Survey in process.

---

[1] The writer is a member of the American Public Health Association, American College of Hospital Administrators, the American Hospital Association, the Hospital Association of New York City, the Greater New York Hospital Association, and the Hospital Council of Brooklyn, Long Island and Staten Island.

Serious Implications in Overseas Military Family Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. DEANE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 9, 1954

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, today I dispatched a letter to Hon. Charles E. Wilson, Secretary of National Defense, which I believe of great significance to the Congress in its deliberations on the subject of adequate family housing for our military personnel, particularly those overseas.

I herein produce the contents of this letter for the information and guidance of Members of the House:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., August 9, 1954.

Hon. CHARLES E. WILSON,
Secretary of Defense,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: As is evidenced by my previous correspondence with the Assistant Secretary of Defense, Franklin G. Floete, in letters dated October 30 and December 19, 1953, and January 15, 1954, I have a great concern for the provision of adequate family housing accommodations for members of our armed services in overseas areas.

As further evidence of my concern in this matter, I introduced in the House of Representatives on May 31, 1954, H. R. 8968, a bill authorizing the Defense Department to acquire family quarters by lease or purchase. I also presented to the House Armed Services Committee, to which H. R. 8968 was referred, a supporting statement for the adoption of this bill.

I note that the legislation sponsored by House Armed Services Committee, H. R. 9924 recently passed by the House of Representatives, contains only a few family units for overseas construction, and all of these are destined to go to the naval base at Port Lautey, French Morocco. I am somewhat surprised that a direct authorization has been provided in H. R. 9924 for family housing construction since, as far as I can ascertain, the existing authority for guaranteed rentals as contained in section 302, Public Law 534 of the 82d Congress, has not been fully exploited.

During some personal investigation which I made last summer at United States military basis in France, I found evidence which led me to believe that utilizing the guaranty as authorized by law of not to exceed 10 years would produce housing accommodations which would be acceptable to our field commanders. It is my belief that this will produce the housing which is needed today rather than seeking new legislative authority which will place the occupancy of the housing required 24 to 30 months in the future. The need for housing in these overseas areas is extremely critical. According to press accounts today out of Fort Lyautey, we see the increasing need for family quarters on the base rather than located in adjacent communities.

We are losing, as you well know, our key people every day because of the failure on our part to provide the accommodations that are so essential to the stability of the officer and the enlisted personnel of the Defense Department.

I would appreciate being advised as to the proposed method for meeting this criminal shortage, and a schedule showing the dates upon which it could be expected that occupancy would be available for this required housing in the areas of France and French North Africa.

Sincerely yours,

Charles B. Deane.

Compulsory Mislabeling

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 9, 1954

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I made a speech on the floor of the House about a year ago in opposition to the so-called Saylor bill because it contained a provision for compulsory mislabeling. I am pleased to note that the Washington Post and Times Herald now agree with me. I submit an editorial which appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald today, as follows:

Compulsory Mislabeling

A curious amendment to a bill now before the Senate would prohibit certain liquor distillers from telling the truth about their merchandise. It would forbid firms which kept liquor in bonded warehouses for longer than 8 years from labeling or advertising their product as more than 8 years old, even though the liquor might be 10 or 12 years old. This seems to us analogous to telling an antique dealer that he could not advertise a 100-year-old piece of furniture as more than 10 years old. It is a formula for deception.

The bill, sponsored by Representative Saylor, started out as a perfectly logical measure to relieve distress in the distilling industry. Because some firms were overstocked, they sought permission to increase the period of storage from 8 to 12 years before payment of the $10.50 a gallon Federal excise tax would be necessary. This was a legitimate request to which the Treasury did not object, and it was less than the concession granted competing distillers in Canada and Scotland. Foolishly, however, in order to get the bill out of committee most of the distillers agreed to the 8-year labeling and advertising limitation. This would have the effect of favoring distillers who do not have stocks of aged whisky at the expense of those who do.

To compound the difficulty, after the House passed the bill, Senator Edwin Johnson tacked on a penalty clause which in effect would make any distiller liable to payment of taxes immediately on all whisky over 8 years old, and forfeiture of storage rights, if any of the product should be represented as more than 8 years old. Obviously this provision could bankrupt a distiller whose agents or distributors indicated, even unintentionally, that any of the liquor being sold was more than 8 years old.

Navy Hero, 60 Years Old, Takes the Only Job Left: Death

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 9, 1954

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I call attention to a news story in the August 6, 1954, issue of the New York World-Telegram and Sun.

To those who continue to support the giving away of billions of dollars a year to foreigners, I ask, When will you give thought to the welfare of the George Albert Woodards?

Read the following and then try a little of the soul searching that is so often recommended when an effort is made to whittle a few dollars from the huge expenditures each year on so-called foreign aid:

"One man, a good friend in the old days, told George he might as well blow his brains out. Some of his friends confided to him that their corporations have an ironclad rule that nobody over 40 gets a job."—Mrs. Gesmonda Woodard.

(By David Snell)

Comdr. George Albert Woodard, United States Navy Reserve (inactive), a Navy combat veteran of three wars, specialist in navigational problems and peacetime master of merchant vessels, yesterday placed the muzzle of a revolver in his mouth at the Officers' Club of the Brooklyn Navy Yard and sent a bullet into his brain. He died an hour and a half later.

"They can say all they please and write all the articles they want about how they're going to help the old people," the widow said today. "But they're still not doing anything. They're just kicking them down."

Commander Woodard had served his country well. He had fought for her in three wars.

But he also had committed an offense against this country, an offense that cannot be condoned or forgiven—the offense of reaching the age of 60.

WIFE SOUGHT WORK

"I've loved my country," he had said recently to his wife, Gesmonda. "I have always been a patriot. But what's the good of it all? If they won't give a man a chance to work, then they should put him in the lethal-gas chamber. That way they'd at least relieve him of the responsibility of his end."

A man of talent and experience, Commander Woodard had been reduced in recent months to seeking hand-to-mouth jobs—and these were not to be had. His wife had tried to find employment as a menial, and everywhere had been told no.

"Here I am, 60, it's true, but able and healthy," he had told her. "And nobody will let me do anything."

ECONOMY-DRIVE VICTIM

The beginning of the end came last October, when Commander Woodard was relieved of his position as assistant to the president of H. Newtown Whittelsey, Inc., naval architects and engineers of 17 Battery Place. It had been a splendid position in normal times, but back-cuts in Government contracts had necessitated economy measures.

"He listed himself with every employment agency in town," Mrs. Woodard said today, fighting back the tears. "I know he spared me as much as he could, but once in awhile he'd have to break down and tell me how it was going.

"I tried always to cheer him up. I'd say, 'Oh, Darling, there'll always be a place for you. You have loved your country and honored her, and she won't forget it.' He'd just look away. I suppose he had done everything but get down on his knees and grovel—and maybe he had even done that."

MET BITTER FRIENDS

One place he visited frequently was the Forty-Plus Club at 220 Broadway, a foundation set up to help men like Commander Woodard find work.

"He kept running into old friends there," Mrs. Woodard said. "Many were bitter. Some wanted to kill themselves. Some wanted to turn to anarchy."

Some of his friends, though, were in a position to help. These were old associates who now have executive positions in New York corporations. But they turned their backs.

"One man, a good friend in the old days, told George he might as well blow his brains out," Mrs. Woodard said. "Some of his friends confided to him that their corporations had an iron-clad rule that nobody over 40 gets a job.

TRIES ONCE MORE

Yesterday, Commander Woodard kissed his wife goodby.

He had heard of some menial openings at the headquarters building of the United Nations.

He last saw her in the door of the little place at 427 West 21st Street, to which, because of their dwindling bank account they had had to move. He went out to try again.

Later that day, when the police went through the contents of his brief case, they found the bank book of the Woodard account. It showed a balance of $13.

"He was a fine man, a proud man, who always held his head high," said Mrs. Woodard. "But his heart had been broken."

And so today, from the caverns of her grief, Mrs. Woodard hoped that someone, somewhere, would reflect upon the sharp event of 2:45 p. m., August 5, 1954. She hoped that someone could salvage something from the life of Comdr. George Albert Woodard.

Resolution of the Oregon Independent Telephone Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 9, 1954

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record resolutions from the Oregon Independent Telephone Association.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Oregon Independent
Telephone Association,
Portland, Oreg., June 18, 1954.

Whereas the membership of the Oregon Independent Telephone Association, in annual convention at Portland, Oreg., on June 18-19, 1954, is aware of the official action of the National Congress in reducing the excise taxes assessed and collected on telephone communications to 10 percent of the said value of said service, both local and toll; and

Whereas the membership of the Oregon Independent Telephone Association is still of the opinion that the intent and purpose of the excise tax on telephone communcations have long since been accomplished inasmuch as it was a war measure designed to conserve telephone facilities by nonessential users; and

Whereas the telephone communications industry is performing a vital and necessary function of our society, and under no circumstances should it be classed as a luxury; and

Whereas the excise taxes now assessed and collected on the telephone communications is discriminatory in that other utility services such as electrical power, gas, and water are not required to pay similar excise taxes, and to that extent are not carrying their full share of the cost of Government: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this association urgently request the Honorable Senators Guy Cordon and Wayne Morse, and the Honorable Representatives Samuel Coon, Harris Ellsworth, Walter Norblad, and Homer Angell, to give careful and favorable consideration to the elimination of the excise taxes now assessed and collected on the telephone communications, or conversely take such action as will distribute this financial burden equitably upon all utilities; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the Honorable Styles Bridges, chairman, Senate Appropriations Committee, and to the Honorable Daniel Reed, chairman of the Ways and Means Committee of the House.

Oregon Independent
Telephone Association,
John H. Dillord, *President,*
Attest:
L. A. Gritten,
Secretary-Treasurer.

Oregon Independent
Telephone Association,
Portland, Oreg., June 18, 1954.

Whereas the membership of the Oregon Independent Telephone Association in session at its annual convention at Portland, Oreg., June 18-19, 1954; and

Whereas the membership in certain instances have experienced extreme interference due to direct radiation from the United States naval radio station transmitter NLK, located near Arlington, Wash.; and

Whereas many of the affected telephone companies had established land-line communications several years prior to the United States Government jurisdictional reservation as contained in section 305 (a) in the Federal Communications Act of 1934, as amended; and

Whereas the interference caused by the powerful transmitter of the United States Navy has rendered certain carrier frequencies unusable for commercial purposes, which have or will result in abandonment of certain equipment with concomitant heavy financial loss to said companies: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the membership of the Oregon Independent Telephone Association does hereby record its vigorous protest to the procedures and attitude adopted by agencies of the United States Government in refusing to develop a policy which would adequately compensate its citizens or institutions for damages resulting from the construction of such powerful installations as the United States naval radio transmitter near Arlington, Wash.; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the appropriate United States naval authority, Washington, D. C., to the Honorable Senators Guy Cordon and Wayne Morse, and to the Honorable Congressmen Harris Ellsworth, Samuel Coon, Walter Norblad, and Homer Angell.

Oregon Independent Telephone
Association,
John H. Dillard, *President.*
Attest:
L. A. Critten, *Secretary-Treasurer.*

H. R. 9245: "No Tickee, No Shirtee"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI

OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 9, 1954

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, during debate this afternoon on H. R. 9245, a bill to raise the pay of postal employees temporarily by 7 percent, some novel and interesting approaches on the problem of pay adjustments were made.

Those who opposed the measure appear to have based their opposition on the ground that a rate increase must accompany a pay increase. This resembles "no tickee, no shirtee" and assumes that the Post Office is now operating at maximum efficiency. It appears to overlook the admission of the bill itself, that the Post Office is not operating at maximum efficiency because the measure calls for a study to reclassify postal personnel. If maximum efficiency existed in the Post Office, there would appear to be no need for the reclassification of postal personnel.

Again, those who oppose the measure express concern that it would add to the deficit of the Post Office Department. They admit a deficit exists. Yet they do not champion, nor have they championed exclusively in the House, a pay-as-you-go rate bill for corporations or commercial users of the mails.

It would be interesting to see lobbying of a nature not yet seen in Washington, corporate lobbying that would buttonhole Members of Congress to sign a discharge petition calling on commercial users of the mails to pay their way. Postmaster General Summerfield tried the direct approach when he first came to Washington but was promptly slapped down by a congressional committee which heard with disfavor his recommendation for a pay-as-you-go postal rate scale. I wonder why the opponents of this 7 percent pay adjustment have dodged the stand-on-your-own-feet approach on the postal deficit, except for today, when they used it so conveniently as a club with which to slap a man down who seeks a pay adjustment? Would the opponents of the 7 percent pay adjustment speak so disdainfully of it if the issue involved putting corporations in step with fair rates? Why suddenly the cry "No tickee, no shirtee," "no rate increase, no pay increase"?

In American business, it seems to me, that top management is the one that must meet successfully the challenge, "increase my profits, else no dividends, bonus, stock, or pension grants." Employees, below top management, know only that the job they hold should meet all reasonable living standards and obligations, should be able to pay what it costs to live sensibly. Successful management is ever on its toes to keep employee needs reasonably satisfied; as it does customer needs. The problem is not easy.

In Government it seems to me that top management, which means the Cabinet and the Congress, must meet successfully the challenge "increase my pay to keep me in the game." Government employees, like business employees, are not responsible for top policy, fiscal policy, or management of overall operations. They have every right to expect the Cabinet and the Congress, like top-flight business management, to keep ahead of the needs of life. The problem is not easy.

It is more honest of the Congress and the Cabinet and the President to say, as the Congress said this afternoon in effect, "7 percent increase granted, even though temporarily, until October 1955"; by which time the Post Office Department should be operating at top efficiency, and by which time rate-increase requests should have been presented for action, as should any further adjustment of pay. The two issues are separate and distinct.

Does the Interstate Commerce Commission decide on employee pay for private industry? The Commission decides on ratemaking.

Ratemaking is a major Federal problem, as is wage payment. Each merits separate handling.

I trust we have heard the last of a bill to companion wage increase with rate increase. The corporations would always win, even though they rode high, wide, and mighty on the taxpayer's postal dollar.

Resolutions From the Oregon Bankers Association, Telegram From Oregon State Medical Society, and Letters From Jack De Ment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, August 9, 1954

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have published in the appendix of the Record two resolutions from the Oregon Bankers Association, a wire from the Oregon State Medical Society, and a letter from Mr. Jack

De Ment, of the De Ment Laboratories, accompanied by a copy of a letter which he wrote to the Colliers magazine. The latter letter should be very carefully pondered by each Member of the Senate.

There being no objection, the resolutions and correspondence was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Resolution of the Oregon Bankers Association—I

Whereas the National Bank Act provides that bank shareholders shall be entitled to cumulative voting; and

Whereas a sufficiently large group of banks have concluded it to be more desirable to eliminate this provision of the National Bank Act, leaving the discretion on this matter to individual banks and the provisions of their separate charters; and

Whereas Senate bill 3158 has been introduced to Congress with the approval of the American Bankers Association, Treasury Department, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation and the Office of the Comptroller: Be it

Resolved, That the Oregon Bankers Associaation approves Senate Bill 3158 and advocates its adoption by the 83d Congress; and be it further

Resolved, That the members of the Oregon delegation to the 83d Congress be asked to support this bill and that copies of this resolution be forwarded by the President and Secretary of this association to the Senators and Representatives from Oregon to the members of the appropriate congressional committees considering said bill.

Resolution of the Oregon Bankers Association—II

Whereas the Oregon Bankers Association, in convention assembled, commends the Declaration of Policy, written as section 2 of H. R. 8832, now pending before the House Committee on Government Operations of the 83d Congress, to wit:

"The strength of this Nation rests on the free enterprise economic system. The framers of the Constitution of the United States never intended that this Government should compete with its people in the carrying on of business activity. This Government is now engaged in over 100 business-type activities in competition with its people, such as the operation of hotels, railroads, tugboats, and banks; the manufacture of paint, rope, chain, fertilizer, ice cream, rum, clothing, spectacles, and false teeth; coffee roasting; radio and telecommunications and many others. Such Government competition tends to destroy initiative on the part of the people and to restrict the normal growth and expansion of private enterprise. It further deprives the people of opportunities for private employment and enterprise thereby reducing their ability to pay taxes without which the Government cannot exist": Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Oregon Bankers Association urges adoption by the Congress of this policy that the Government shall get out and stay out of business-type competition with its people wherever consistent with the national health and security; and be it further

Resolved, That the Oregon Bankers Association approves H. R. 8832 and advocates its adoption by the 83d Congress; and be it further

Resolved, That the Oregon Bankers Association joins the efforts of businessmen throughout the Nation to secure such legislation and executive action as may be necessary to sell to private, taxpaying companies all of the financial and commercial business enterprises that are now owned and operated by the Government, to the ends that the national debt may be substantially reduced, that the burden of taxation on present taxpayers may be lessened, that banks and other businesses may be given relief from the unfair competition of Government-owned businesses, and that the trend toward creeping socialism may be stopped; and be it further

Resolved, That the members of the Oregon delegation in the 83d Congress be asked to support this movement to get the Government out of competitive business and that copies of this resolution be forwarded by the president and secretary of this association to the Senators and Representatives from Oregon and to the members of the House Committee on Government Operations.

Portland, Oreg., *June 30, 1954.*

Hon. Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Understand Labor and Public Welfare Committee will vote on S. 3114, reinsurance bill, in executive session tomorrow morning. Greatly appreciate it if you will convey to committee strong opposition of Oregon State Medical Society to this bill. Federal Government invasion of field of health insurance is unjustified and unnecessary and would great retard progress of voluntary plans. Bill involves Government subsidy of these plans which is dangerous intermediate step toward national compulsory health insurance system.

Oregon State Medical Society,
Gordon B. Leitch, M. D.,
Chairman, Committe on Public Policy.

De Ment Laboratories,
Portland, Oreg., July 12, 1954.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: I am taking the liberty of passing along a copy of a letter I have just written to the editor of Collier's in regard to their story of July 23, Navy Versus the H-Bomb.

The letter is self-explanatory, and will readily show, I feel, that I have good reason to be irked with the Navy.

Perhaps some good might be accomplished if the letter were published in the Congressional Record.

Sincerely yours,

Jack De Ment.

De Ment Laboratories,
Portland, Oreg., July 12, 1954.

Mr. Roger Dakin,
Editor, Collier's Magazine,
New York, N. Y.

Dear Mr. Dakin: Bill Stapleton's Navy Versus the H-Bomb was mighty interesting. But it struck me as damned peculiar, to say the least. I'll tell you a little story, and let you judge for yourself.

Late in 1946, after I returned from the Bikini tests (as a consultant to the Secretary of War), I began independent work upon atomic countermeasures in my own laboratory. Remember, this was 8 years ago. On May 16, 1947 the first of a large series of patents was filed. The first disclosed a protective water screen for ships and buildings. Subsequent patent cases dealt with flowing layers of water, using deflecting vanes and spray nozzles; electrically charged water screens, after the electrostatic precipitation principle (U. S. 2,595,774, granted May 6, 1952); flowing layers of foam; steam at its cloud point; and others.

Abstracts of these patent applications can be found in the Official Gazette, United States Patent Office, June 24, 1952 (pp. 1104–1105), March 10, 1953 (p. 538), June 30, 1953 (p. 1497), August 18, 1953 (p. 836). They were given free to the American public.

These improvements were official secret until late 1951 and early 1952. However, while they were still classified, I sent copies to the Navy—this was in 1947. I was abruptly informed that the Navy was not interested. One Navy commander wrote that the proposals would not be practical in wartime military operations. Another military man stated "we do not feel that there will be enough interest in this phase of atomic welfare."

So now I learn—to my utter amazement—that the Navy is using the more primitive of my designs as a "dramatic—and effective—new washdown. system." Perhaps you can understand—to use Bill Stapleton's words—that my reaction is "explicit but unprintable."

Sincerely yours,

Jack De Ment.

The Truth About the Atomic Energy Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OAKLEY HUNTER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 9, 1954

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, debate on the atomic energy bill generated much sound and fury, not only in the Halls of Congress, but also in the press. I take this opportunity to call to the attention of the Members of the House and Senate two newspaper editorials concerning this bill. One editorial appeared in the Fresno Bee on July 29. The Bee is published in Fresno, Calif., which is in my district. It is a part of the McClatchy chain, which also publishes the Modesto and Sacramento Bees and, in addition, operates a network of radio and television stations. The other editorial appeared in the Oroville Mercury, of Oroville, Calif., on July 30. The Oroville Mercury, so far as I know, is an independent newspaper.

The Bee editorial castigates me and my good friend and colleague, Leroy Johnson, who represents the 11th District of California, for voting in favor of the bill. The Mercury editorial, on the other hand, congratualtes us on our good judgment. Personally, I prefer the Oroville editorial.

The Bee editorial follows:

Valley Congressmen Split in Public Power Vote

For a United States Congressman from the central valleys of California to vote to imperil public power is to vote against the welfare of his region and of those who sent him to Congress.

Yet Congressmen Oakley Hunter, Republican, representing Fresno, Madera, and Merced Counties, and Leroy Johnson, Republican, representing San Joaquin and Stanislaus Counties have done exactly that.

They voted for the House version of the atomic energy bill which forbade the Atomic Energy Commission and other Government agencies to produce commercial atomic power along with private companies.

Those men voted right down the line to bar the Government from this vast new source of power. They voted for a bill which in effect abandoned virtually every safeguard painfully constructed over the years to protect the public from private utility exploitation.

Congressman Harlan Hagen, representing Kern, Kings, and Tulare Counties, Clair Engle, of the Second, Sierra Nevada and val-

> ley district, and John E. Moss, Jr., of the Third, Sacramento Valley, district, all Democrats, stood steadfast for the welfare of the Nation and the valley. They voted against this outrageous giveaway.
>
> The irresponsibility of Hunter and Johnson to their constituents was emphasized by the successful struggle of some Senators to write safeguards into the Senate bill.
>
> There can be no ducking responsibility on this issue. It is clearcut. If the Government cannot produce commercial atomic power, there can be no comparative yardstick for rate fixing. New England for instance, has the highest hydroelectric rates in America. At the first suggestion of recession, New England is likely to become a depressed area. There are no public power projects in those 6 States.
>
> Hunter and Johnson voted to New Englandize the country with respect to atomic power. Under the plan they supported there could be no preferential treatment for Government bodies in the distribution of atomic power. They voted to place the modern, fabulous promise of the nuclear age in the framework of a discredited past.
>
> The stand taken by Hagen, Moss, and Engle indeed stands out in shining contrast. They deserve a resounding "well done" for their alert awareness of the public interest and their duty to their constituents.

Following is the Oroville Mercury editorial which appeared the next day:

> ### Is Punishment Due?
>
> Two Congressmen, Leroy Johnson and Oakley Hunter, who represent districts in the San Joaquin Valley, are denounced by a newspaper chain devoted to the socialism of public power, because they voted in favor of President Eisenhower's measure concerning atomic energy.
>
> The chain, which has papers in their districts, is going to try to defeat the two Congressmen on that issue.
>
> As a matter of fact, their vote was in favor of private industry, and against placing the Atomic Energy Commission in the commercial power business. Why should the AEC, just because it has discovered a new source of energy, be allowed to compete with private industry?
>
> The newspaper chain declares that a Government agency in the atomic power field is needed as a yardstick. This is an insincere statement. It first was made by President Roosevelt as an excuse for the Tennessee Valley Authority. TVA has become far more than a yardstick. It has become the biggest producer of commercial power in the United States.
>
> Nearly a billion dollars of taxpayers' money has been spent by TVA on power alone and 35 more powerplants for TVA are now in the works. In a few years the yardstick designed to control the price for hydro power, will be producing more power by steam than by water, thus showing how socialism creeps up on us. Thus have the taxpayers been led to favor one locality with money taken from them in all sections of the country.
>
> Now the advocates of this form of socialism are busting out all over trying to sew up atomic power, the great source of the future, in a socialistic straitjacket, from which private industry would be squeezed. If they could succeed, which they have not thus far, it would be the greatest single victory of socialism in the history of the world.
>
> Now it is up to the voters of the San Joaquin Valley to decide whether their Congressmen are to be punished for voting in favor of private industry, the source of America's great progress, or in favor of socialism, the curse of Europe.

Despite the Bee's charge that the bill places "the modern, fabulous promise of the nuclear age in the framework of a discredited past," it passed the House by a vote of 231 to 154, and the Senate, by a vote of 57 to 28. It was reported favorably by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy to the House and Senate by uanimous vote—after nearly a full year of hearings and deliberations. It constitutes a general revision of the present atomic energy law.

It provides for the following: First, industrial participation in the atomic energy program, particularly in the field of atomic power by licensees of the Atomic Energy Commission; second, a means of cooperation with our allies under adequate security safeguards; third, a means by which the President can implement an international atomic pool plan under adequate security safeguards.

It is readily apparent that whoever wrote the Bee editorial was either ignorant of the facts or attempting deliberately to mislead Bee readers.

The editorial states that I "voted right down the line to bar the Government from this new source of power" in the production of electricity. The statement is false. The bill I supported not only does not bar Government agencies which have historically produced electricity, but an amendment which I also supported actually gives preference to public bodies.

The editorial further states that the "House version of the atomic energy bill forbade the Atomic Energy Commission and other Government agencies to produce commercial atomic power." This statement is also false. There is nothing in the bill which prohibits other Government agencies from doing so.

The House version of the atomic energy bill forbade only the AEC from engaging in the sale or distribution of energy for commercial use, except such energy as may be produced by the Commission incident to the operation of research and development facilities owned by the Commission, or facilities for the production of special nuclear material owned by the Commission.

The reason for this is simple. The atomic energy bill is not a power bill. It is a bill to advance research and development in aid of the art of making atomic machines or of using atomic fuel for the generation of power. It was not the intention of the framers of this legislation to turn the Commission into a federally sponsored commercial electric power generating agency. The Atomic Energy Commission is basically a development and regulatory agency. Its only production is in connection with weapons.

The Atomic Energy Commission now has under way a 5-year program directed at solving some of the basic problems involved in the development of economic atomic power. It is unlikely that any of the plants built under this 5-year program will, in fact, produce competitive economic power, but it is also a fact that the Government and the Commission are committed to the continuation of the construction of whatever plants prove to be advisable in order to provide the necessary demonstration of economic practicability.

It is not probable that any atomic power plant can be constructed in the next decade which will not be essentially experimental. Any electric power produced by such plants built by the Commission will, in fact, be byproduct energy in the sense that it is incidental to the experiment. The experiment in these cases will be designed to contribute to the success and economic operation of large plants capable of direct adaptation for industrial and commercial use. The energy itself is closely interwoven with the nature of the experiment, but the emphasis throughout this program is on the development aspect of the effort.

The Senate filibuster and most of the talk in connection with the bill was over a side issue. President Eisenhower had ordered the Atomic Energy Commission to negotiate a contract with two private-utility companies, Middle South Utilities, Inc., and the Southern Co., to construct a $107,250,000 steam plant at West Memphis, Ark., which is across the Mississippi River from Memphis, Tenn. The administration proposed the contract as an alternative to a $100 million TVA steam plant at Fulton, Tenn., which is north of Memphis. Neither plant would be located near the atomic installation at Paducah, Ky. Power from either plant would be fed into TVA lines to replace power supplied to Paducah from other sources.

Democrat southerners in the TVA area and northern liberals protested the order to bring private companies into the power exchange and tried to amend the bill to ban such a move. This amendment was defeated in both the House and Senate.

The administration's proposal to contract for power from private utilities was strongly supported by Senator Fulbright, Democrat, of Arkansas, who has always supported TVA in the past and has also supported SPA—Southwestern Power Administration.

The proposed contract would, of course, result in expenditures of substantial sums of money in Arkansas. As one Member of the House aptly put it, the real issue is who is going to get the basket of peaches—Tennessee or Arkansas? Tennessee has been getting a basket regularly and now complains that Arkansas is about to get a basket instead of her.

The difference in cost between power purchased from the private utilities and power purchased from TVA, on the basis of existing TVA-AEC rates, would be $282,000 a year, or 1 percent of the total cost. The private-power companies, however, would have to pay some $1,499,000 annually in State and local taxes in Arkansas, which amount is far in excess of the difference in the cost of power. TVA does not pay such taxes.

If TVA built the plant, the Federal Government would have to appropriate $100 million, which money would be interest-free. TVA does not pay interest on money which it receives from the Federal Government for the construction of power projects. The Government would have to borrow the money at 2½ percent interest—this at a time when we are being forced to raise the public debt limit above $275 billion. Under the proposed contract, the private companies would do their own financing, largely through insurance companies and banks.

Another factor to be considered is the cancellation provision in AEC contracts. The AEC has insisted that all of its power contracts provide a means of cancellation in the event power requirements should decrease or be eliminated. The Commission has been conscious of the advantages of having diverse power sources. That makes sense. The proposed power contract provides a means for permitting the Government to rid itself of a substantial liability for excess power in the Paducah area if at any time it becomes desirable to cancel a portion or all of the AEC power contract.

The private power companies are taking a substantial risk, for the Government can serve notice of cancellation at any time, to be effective 3 years thereafter. In other words, if the AEC finds that it does not need power in the amounts contracted for, or if a more economic source of power becomes available, it can cancel its contract on favorable terms, and the private power companies will have the burden of taking over and operating this large plant. They are the ones that must find a market for the power. On the other hand, if this plant continues to be useful in the AEC's program, it can use it for the entire 25 years of the contract and have an absolute call on the facilities for 2 additional 5-year periods.

The issue at hand has been greatly distored and exaggerated by TVA advocates. The charge that this contract marks an attempt to destroy TVA is false. As Senator Fulbright has stated, TVA is not a weak reed to be broken by a waft of power blowing across the Mississippi River toward Memphis. It is the largest power system in the United States. The fact is that TVA has been buying power from across the Mississippi for several years—450 million kilowatt hours in 1953. Practically all of this power was delivered to the Memphis area from the same sources who are sponsoring the proposed contract with the Govenrment.

Congress has most certainly not been niggardly with the TVA. On the contrary, it has been extremely generous. Total appropriations by Congress for TVA through fiscal 1955 amount to $1,905,214,581. During the 4 years I have been in Congress, I have voted for appropriation bills which included a total of $882,962,600 for TVA.

TVA advocates have encouraged the mistaken impression that TVA is essentially a hydroelectric project involving solely rivers and dams. Actually, more of its power is produced by steam than by water. At the present time, 55 percent of its power is produced by steam, and 45 percent by water. It has 14 steam plants in operation and 26 under construction. By 1957, 70 percent of its production will be steam power and 30 percent hydroelectric. A steam plant can be built any place where fuel is available to heat the boilers.

It is the growing predominance of steam-generated power which is arousing opposition to Federal appropriations for further development of TVA with American taxpayers' money. During debate on the atomic energy bill, Representative Leo Gavin, of Pennsylvania, stated:

> I have no objection to water power in the TVA. I am concerned with the steam powerplants financed by the people of the Nation to the advantage of one particular area over other sections of the Nation. When you get along with waterpower in the TVA, that is all right, but when you come in and ask the American taxpayers to subsidize tax-exempt steam powerplants in the Tennessee Valley, I say that you are no more entitled to them than we are in Pennsylvania. * * * So, why do you come to the Congress, requesting authorization of federally subsidized steam-power plants, tax exempt, that my State will have to put up the money to build that will permit the TVA to attract industry into the valley away from the rest of the Nation? Is the Tennessee Valley a preferred area of the Nation? The attempt to continue this preferred class area just does not make sense to me. It is time the TVA stood on its own feet. * * * Build your own steam plants to meet your needs for increased power with your own money and don't ask the American taxpayers to foot the bills.

Mr. Speaker, the House, in passing this new atomic energy bill, reflected the sentiment of the majority of the American people. The nonmilitary potentials of atomic power are neither so strange nor so other-worldly that they cannot be developed within our traditional system of individual initiative and private industry.

At present, of course, the Nation's work with the atom still constitutes a Federal monopoly, which is a departure from our normal American pattern of free enterprise. But, this monoply, which could profoundly alter our institutions if made permanent, is not meant and has never been meant to exist in perpetuity. The continuance of complete Government ownership and control during peacetime application of atomic energy could produce a change in our society more radical than any that might result from the technical novelty of nuclear power.

That is why the Atomic Energy Commission unanimously agreed on the principle that nuclear power as it becomes economically attractive should be produced and distributed not by the Commission but by private and existing public power systems. There will, of course, always have to be large-scale Federal participation and regulation in this undertaking. However, restrictions necessary in the interest of our Nation's security can be reconciled with free enterprise, and numerous other problems involved can be solved without unfair advantage to any group and in harmony with the proper relationships between our Government and its citizens.

There are those who have seen in this atomic energy bill an opportunity to bring about the federalization of the electric industry. Personally, I subscribe to the philosophy that intrusion by the Federal Government into private, local, and State affairs should be limited to the extent necessary to assure national security and protect individual welfare, thereby leaving the largest possible area open for the free interplay of economic forces and for individual initiative and aspiration.

While I deplore the disregard for the truth evidenced by the Bee editorial, I am aware that the staff of that newspaper chain must accept a policy in regard to public power which may well be very much against their own best judgment. The will of the late C. K. McClatchy, former editor and publisher of the McClatchy newspapers, admonished those who have inherited his empire to support public power against private enterprise in every instance. Ironically, this prejudice against private enterprise does not embrace radio and television, which, like electric power, are public services. The McClatchy empire includes both radio and television stations.

This public power policy has been adhered to with an almost fanatical disregard for truth, modern development, or the fact that C. K. McClatchy never dreamed, when he wrote that will, that the atom would be split. In fact, the Bee's statement that I "voted to place the modern, fabulous promise of the nuclear age in the framework of a discredited past," could well be said to have been written by the dead hand of that same discredited past.

Hon. William C. Lantaff

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAURIE C. BATTLE

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 9, 1954

Mr. BATTLE. Mr. Speaker, I want to join his Florida colleagues and host of personal friends in paying tribute to Bill Lantaff.

Having served on the Foreign Affairs Committee with his able predecessor, George Smathers, I was naturally interested in the man that Florida would send to Congress in his place when George became a distinguished Senator. I soon found that Bill Lantaff was a worthy successor. He is an able, intelligent man with a warm personality and a fighter for what he believes is best for his district, State, and Nation.

I remember meeting him early in the 82d session when a small group of Congressmen got together to discuss possible solutions to some of the great problems facing our country. One of Bill's many important suggestions was about stopping the flow of military supplies from the free world to the Communist nations—a subject in which I was and had been vitally concerned. When permanent legislation was passed by the Congress which denied aid to any nation shipping war materials behind the Iron Curtain, Bill Lantaff was fighting for its adoption. He made a direct and worthy contribution to the original concept of this legislation. He was a strong and welcome supporter of its passage.

Mr. Speaker, this is just one example of Bill Lantaff's outstanding service during the past 4 years. I am proud to have had the privilege of associating with him and his fine family. My appreciation and best wishes go with Bill, Betty, and their children wherever they may be.

Resolutions of Oregon State Federation of Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 9, 1954

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have published in the Appendix of the RECORD a list of very sound resolutions passed by the Oregon State Federation of Labor at its recent convention.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION 21

Whereas the administration is proposing an income-tax law that would partially exempt income from dividends with the argument that this income has already been taxed by the tax on corporations; and

Whereas as we see it, it is not individual income until it is in the hands of the individual, we reject the theory of double taxation: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we are firmly opposed to any exemptions on individual income derived from dividends; and be it further

Resolved, That if a decrease in individual income taxes is compatible with the general welfare it should be made by raising the personal exemption of the individual; and be it further

Resolved, That we notify our delegation in Congress of this stand with a request that they notify the congressional committees handling this legislation.

RESOLUTION 25

Whereas the International Typographical Union has practiced benevolence and fraternalism for over 100 years; and

Whereas the International Typographical Union has paid over $100 million in pensions to its sick and superannuated members; and

Whereas the International Typographical Union pioneered in creating pensions for members unable to work because of age or disability; and

Whereas over 9,000 retired printers and mailers depend upon ITU pension payments for the necessities and little comforts of life; and

Whereas, in 1934, and for 20 years thereafter, the Department of Internal Revenue considered ITU pensions charitable and therefore not taxable; and

Whereas the administration now in office favors tax concessions amounting to billions of dollars for the wealthy holders of corporate stocks; and

Whereas this year the Department of Internal Revenue has officially ruled pensioners must include all pension payments received as taxable income when computing their income taxes for 1954; and

Whereas neither the national budget nor the scales of justice can be balanced by taking pennies from pensioners and giving millions to millionaires: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Oregon State Federation of Labor go on record as protesting as discriminatory, uncharitable and unfair the ruling made by the Internal Revenue Department which places taxes on union pensions; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be sent to President Eisenhower and to our Senators and Representatives in Congress.

RESOLUTION 28

Whereas disabled workers are finding it impossible to keep up with the American standard of living during disability: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Oregon State Federation of Labor in convention assembled at Astoria, Oreg., this June 21 to 25, 1954, go on record favoring amendment of the Social Security Act, so that benefits may be paid to workers who have been disabled; and be it further

Resolved, That the Oregon Members of Congress be petitioned to initiate a bill effecting such an amendment of the Social Security Act; and be it still further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the American Federation of Labor.

RESOLUTION 29

Whereas working people who are nearing retirement age are prone to infirmities and often lose much time due to sickness in the last few years of their employment; and

Whereas unemployment is a more likely hazard in later earning years; and

Whereas the consequent lost time under the act as now written, causes the person who falls within the above conditions to have their social-security retirement benefits cut down; and

Whereas this does not show a true picture of the contributions made by the individual over his earning years: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Oregon State Federation of Labor in convention assembled at Astoria, Oreg., June 21 to 25, 1954, go on record favoring amendment of the Social Security Act for the purpose of basing social-security payments upon a worker's most productive years; and be it further

Resolved, That the Oregon Members of Congress be petitioned to initiate a bill effecting such an amendment of the Social Security Act; and be it still further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the American Federation of Labor.

RESOLUTION 30

Whereas there are many families in Oregon and other States, who find it impossible to send their children on to college due to the added expense; and

Whereas there is no provision in the present income-tax structure recognizing this added burden on the family budget: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the State federation of labor in convention assembled at Astoria, Oreg., this 21st day of June 1954, go on record favoring an amendment to existing tax legislation to permit parents to claim dependency credits for children under 21 years of age instead of 18 as is now provided; and be it further

Resolved, That the income-tax exemption for college students be established at $1,000 per year; and be it further

Resolved, That the State federation secretary be instruction to inform our Senators and Congressmen the intent of this resolution and to request that they submit such an amendment; and be it further

Resolved, That the State federation legislative committee request such an amendment to Oregon's income-tax law; and be it further

Resolved, That the State federation secretary be instructed to send copies of this resolution to the American Federation of Labor headquarters, Washington, D. C.

RESOLUTION 31

Whereas workers today are having difficulty finding employment after reaching age 50; and

Whereas most union workers at age 60 have already worked 40 years or over: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Oregon State Federation of Labor in convention assembled at Astoria, Oreg., this June 21–25, 1954, go on record favoring amendment of the Social Security Act and the Railroad Retirement Act for the purpose of lowering the age limit for old-age benefits from 65 to 60 years; and be it still further

Resolved, That the Oregon Members of Congress be petitioned to initiate a bill effecting such an amendment of the Social Security Act and the Railroad Retirement Act; and be it still further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the American Federation of Labor.

An Emergency Public Works Program for the City of Milwaukee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 9, 1954

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, in approving the Housing Act of 1954, Congress provided for the resumption of Federal aid to assist in the advance planning of State and local non-Federal public works. Through the provisions of this legislation, the Housing and Home Finance Administrator was empowered to make interest-free advances to State and local authorities for the planning of public projects. The authorization amounted to $10 million, and it is my hope that it will be supplemented by an appropriation to that amount.

The city of Milwaukee, concerned about the high level of unemployment, has given close attention to the possibility of solving that problem with the help of the Federal Government, through the medium of an emergency public works propram.

Having given close and careful scrutiny to the provision for interest-free public works planning loans, embodied in the Housing Act, and to the appointment of a coordinator of Public Works Planning under the Council of Economic Advisers to the President, the Common Council of the City of Milwaukee has adopted the following resolution, containing its convictions and recommendations on this vital issue.

The resolution suggests that the Federal Government prepare a comprehensive program of emergency public works, to be put into operation in the event of an increase in unemployment or economic recession. It further suggests that the below listed Milwaukee City projects, scheduled for construction within the next 10 years, "could be advanced for early construction under an emergency public works program sponsored by the Federal Government.

If our Congress should decide upon an emergency program of public works to combat unemployment and other economic problems in the future, then the suggestions proposed by the Common Council of the City of Milwaukee will be especially important. But even barring the possibility of immediate congressional action on such legislation, the following resolution merits careful scrutiny:

Resolution relative to approving a list of projects for an emergency public works program for the city of Milwaukee, urging the Federal Government to create a reserve of plans for future projects, and to appropriate funds to participate in the costs of construction in the event of an increase in unemployment or economic recession

Whereas the President of the United States has indicated his interest and desire to reduce the severity of any possible recession by appointing under his Council of Economic Advisers a Coordinator of Public Works Planning covering Federal, State, and local public works projects; and

Whereas the both Houses of Congress have approved the Housing Act of 1954 (H. R. 7839) containing provisions for interest-free public works planning loans; and

Whereas the board of estimates has considered a statement and report concerning Federal financing of an emergency public works program and advance planning loans for the City of Milwaukee as prepared for it by a special committee appointed by His Honor the Mayor; and

Whereas this statement reads as follows: "Unemployment in the Milwaukee area and in many other large cities of the Nation had increased during the past winter season to the point where methods of countering a reoccurrence of such increase should be undertaken. The problem is national in scope and, therefore, requires Federal action rather than State or local action alone to be effective.

"The construction industry enters significantly into the whole problem of the national economy. In boom times it tends to lead the business procession, and in a depression it usually falls the hardest and intensifies the recession.

"Public works ordinarily account for nearly one-third of all construction. A well-developed public works program can contribute greatly to the stability of the construction industry.

"City property owners are already burdened wih high property taxes and cannot be expected to bear the added cost of an intensified public-works construction program without material assistance from Federal sources.

"A program of advance planning loans to local units of government would encourage and enable local communities to prepare construction plans well in advance of planned physical construction.

"Acquisition of land is as much a part of the preliminary processes involved in public works planning as are other phases of the work. It is economically advantageous to purchase sites for many projects well in advance of actual construction during planning stages at something near its unimproved value. Such advance acquisition of land from loan funds would enable projects to get under construction quickly during any regular or emergency public works program"; and

Whereas the attached list of projects which could be advanced for early construction under an emergency public works program contemplated by the Federal Government, totaling $140,295,000, has been prepared by the capital improvements committee and reviewed by the special committee and by the board of estimates: Therefore, be it

Resolved by the Common Council of the city of Milwaukee, That the following statements properly reflect the opinion of this body relating to the responsibility of the Federal Government to prepare an emergency public works program:

1. The Federal Government should prepare immediately a program of needed Federal public works projects which can be constructed in urban areas where critical unemployment has already occurred or is imminent.

2. The Federal Government should encourage State and local governments to initiate programs of public works construction which can be undertaken immediately and during the next 2- or 3-year period with Federal participation in construction costs.

3. The Federal Government should provide a sufficient appropriation to make possible a 65 percent or 75 percent participation in the costs of construction of such projects.

4. There be created a reserve of projects on which plans and specifications are in readiness for construction, and the Federal Government should provide an appropriation under the advance planning loans law and encourage local governments to contract for the preparation of construction plans and specifications for public works projects under the terms of such interest-free loan funds.

5. That provision should be made to enable cities to purchase land for project sites from advance planning loan funds, so that construction plans and specifications can be definitely related to a particular site and long delays avoided later when funds are made available for actual construction; and be it further

Resolved, That the attached list of projects totaling $140,295,000 be and hereby is approved for submission to the proper Federal officials to indicate the type of work projects scheduled for construction within the next 10-year period, which could be advanced for early construction under an emergency public works program contemplated by the Federal Government; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution and of the list of the approved projects be transmitted to the proper Federal officials or departments and to the Members of the House and the Senate representing Milwaukee residents as indicative of the kind of legislation required and the projects possible of construction.

Suggested projects for an emergency public works program for the city of Milwaukee

	Year presently	Estimated cost
Fire department, new buildings:		
North 8th St. and West Michigan St	1955	$300,000
North 69th St. and West Silver Spring Dr. combined with police department	1956	350,000
Vicinity of South 84th St. and West Howard Ave	1957	155,000
Repair shop	1957	250,000
Far South Side	1958	155,000
Total		1,210,000
Harbor Commission:		
1,872 feet of retaining wall to reclaim 21 acres of submerged shore land	1955	500,000
New drainage system for south harbor, raise tracks, etc	1955 to 1960	150,000
Total		650,000
Museum: New building	1963	7,167,000
Police department:		
New garage	1956	200,000
New Southwest Side station	1957	200,000
Total		400,000
Bureau of bridges and public buildings:		
New city hall annex	1955	3,900,000
South 35th St. Bridge, south of West Lincoln Ave	1955	925,000
South 1st St. Bascule Bridge	1955	1,100,000
East Clybourn St. Bridge	1957	1,400,000
East Wisconsin Ave. Bridge	1959	2,500,000
North Hawley Rd. Viaduct	1959	715,000
East Howard Ave. Bridge at South 6th St	1960	250,000
New playgrounds at 7 new schools	1955 to 1960	700,000
Additions to other playgrounds	1955 to 1960	1,500,000
Total		12,990,000
Bureau of engineers—grade separations:		
North 32d St. and West Hampton Ave	1955	750,000
South Clement Ave	1957	750,000
North Teutonia Ave. (2)	1961	1,000,000
North Sherman Blvd	1962	750,000
West Lincoln Ave. at South 43d St	1962	1,500,000
Total		4,750,000
Bureau of engineers—sewers:		
North 30th St., relief sewer		$5,000,000
North 48th St. and West Clarke St. relief		100,000
North 27th St., combined sewer repair		200,000
West Becher St., combined sewer repair		100,000
West Mineral St., relief		600,000
North 61st St., and West Congress St., storm		1,000,000
North 61st St. and West Capitol Dr., storm		200,000
North 80th St., and West Congress St., storm		1,000,000
North Hopkins St. and North 27th St., storm		200,000
South 51st St. and West Wilbur Ave., storm		300,000
North Lake Dr. and East Locust St. relief		750,000
East Edgewood Ave. and North Oakland Ave., relief		200,000
East and West Capitol Dr. and North 20th St., relief		1,000,000
North 47th St. and West Hampton Ave., storm		300,000
West Elliott Circle, relief		100,000
South 40th St. and West Morgan Ave., storm		100,000
North Pulaski St. and North Prospect Ave., relay		300,000
North 35th St. and West Florist Ave., storm		200,000
West Silver Spring Dr. and North 62d St., storm		200,000
South Pine Ave. and East Howard Ave., storm		100,000
West Center St. and North 76th St., storm		200,000
West Silver Spring Dr. and North Hopkins St., storm		300,000
North Hopkins St. and West Florist Ave., storm		200,000
South 26th St. and West Mineral St., relief		200,000
South 18th St. and West Grant St., relief		500,000
North 53d St. and West Vliet St., relief		100,000
North 61st St. and West Capitol Dr., storm		150,000
East Kenilwoth Pl. and East North Ave., relief		300,000
West Highland Ave., North 3d St. to North 6th St., and North 6th St. from West State St. to West Juneau, relief		250,000
South Clement Ave., south of East Howard Ave., storm		200,000
East Keefe Ave., west of North Humboldt Ave., relief		500,000
East Auer Ave., west of North Humboldt Ave., relief		300,000
North 76th St. from West Locust St. to West Burleigh St., sanitary relief		100,000
West Meinecke Ave. and North 53d St., relief		250,000
West Mill Rd. from North 35th St. to North Hopkins, storm		215,000
North Prospect Ave., north and south of East Brady St., relief		300,000
South 6th St., West Holt Ave. to West Morgan Ave., and West Morgan Ave. from South 6th to South 8th, storm		120,000

Suggested projects for an emergency public works program for the city of Milwaukee—Continued

	Year presently	Estimated cost
Bureau of engineers—sewers—Continued		
North 76th St. from West Villard Ave. to West Silver Spring Dr., storm and sanitary		$400,000
Area-West Congress to West Silver Spring, and North 27th to North Sherman, storm		1,200,000
Area-West and East Howard to West and East Armour, and South Clement to South 5th, storm		2,500,000
Drainage ditch improvements:		
South Branch of Kinnickinnic River, West Cleveland Ave. to West Forest Home Ave		200,000
Branch of Lincoln Creek from North 61st and West Fond du Lac to North 73d and West Capitol		150,000
Total		20,585,000
Bureau of forestry: Concealed lawn irrigation systems, etc.	1955 to 1965	470,000
Bureau of garbage collection and disposal: Refuse disposal plant for west side	1960	900,000
Bureau of municipal equipment:		
South side storage garage	1955	500,000
Repair shop	1956	750,000
Total		1,250,000
Bureau of street construction and repairs:		
Materials laboratory	1955	200,000
Building enclosure for asphalt plant and doct reconstruction	1958	100,000
Street improvements eligible for Federal highway urban aids (estimated construction cost excluding land):		
North side streets:		
North 6th St.-West Clybourn St. to West Wisconsin		161,000
West Silver Spring Dr.-North 42d St. to North 68th		585,000
West Silver Spring Dr.-North 68th St. to North 76th		183,000
North Teutonia Ave.-West Silver Spring Dr. to West Mill		540,000
North Prospect Ave.-East State St. to East Bradford		390,000
East Bradford Ave.-North Prospect Ave. to North Lake Dr		57,000
North 35th-West Burleigh-West Fond du Lac intersection		430,000
West Capitol Dr.-North 27th St. to West Atkinson Ave		365,000
North 20th St.-West North Ave to West Capitol Dr		685,000
North 76th St.-West Lisbon Ave. to West Capitol Dr		301,000
North 76th St.-West Capitol Dr. to West Silver Spring		740,000
South side streets:		
South 6th St.-West Florida St. to West National Ave		100,000
Bureau of street construction and repairs—Continued		
Street improvements, etc—Continued		
South side streets—Continued		
South 6th St.- West National Ave. to South Chase Ave		$500,000
West Oklahoma Ave.-South 49th St. to South 72d St		483,000
West Oklahoma Ave.-South 72d St. to South 100th St		672,000
South Kinnickinnic Ave. and East Bay intersection		150,000
South Kinnickinnic Ave.-South Clement to East Morgan		442,000
South 13th St.-West Oklahoma Ave. to West Montana St		130,000
South Howell and South Whitnall-East Lincoln to East Howard		685,000
West Lincoln Ave.-South 35th St. to South 60th St		810,000
East Erie St.-North Broadway to harbor docks		150,000
West Loomis Rd.-South 27th St. to West Howard Ave		217,000
South 27th St.-West National Ave. to West Forest Home		1,000,000
Total		10,076,000
Bureau of street sanitation: Additions and changes to ward yards and buildings	1956 to 1959	300,000
Bureau of traffic engineering and electrical services: Central fire alarm headquarters and fire department administration building	1956	2,300,000
Water department:		
Booster station and two 6-million gallon tanks South 37th St. and West Lincoln Ave	1955 & 1960	450,000
Booster station and 1 6-million gallon tank and land cost—vicinity of South Chase Ave. and East Morgan Ave	1957 to 1962	300,000
Water mains relating to street construction	1955 to 1958	5,000,000
Electrification of existing system	1955 to 1960	2,000,000
		7,750,000
Parking facilities:		
2 structures—east side of river		1,800,000
1 structure—west side of river (and site)		1,500,000
Total		3,300,000
Lake Shore Drive approaches:		
East Lincoln Ave	1955	3,000,000
East Kilbourn Ave		3,000,000
East Clybourn St		3,000,000
Total		9,000,000
Slum clearance and redevelopment: First and third ward projects		2,677,000
Subtotal (excluding schools)		85,275,000

Projects which might be built for the Milwaukee Board of School Directors under the program of emergency public works

	Estimated cost
Building needs which appear in the 1953 report of the 5-year building and future sites commission not yet under construction as of June 1954:	
Center and Pierce replacement	$1,200,000
Washington High music-room addition	120,000
Boys' Technical High improvements	1,000,000
West Division High School	4,000,000
North 84th St. Junior High	2,500,000
Allen and Field replacement	1,200,000
Bay View Area Junior High	2,500,000
12th St. auditorium-gymnasium, La Follette auditorium-gymnasium, Philipp auditorium-gymnasium	450,000
Kosciuszko Junior trade improvements	100,000
Modernization and enlargement of old schools	6,000,000
Custer High improvement and remodeling	550,000
Palmer replacement	1,000,000
Northeast Junior High	2,500,000
North 65th and Capitol Elementary	800,000

Projects which might be built for the Milwaukee Board of School Directors under the program of emergency public works—Continued

	Estimated cost
Building needs, etc.—Continued	
South 39th and Ohio Junior High	$2,500,000
North 37th and Hope Elementary Unit	200,000
North 80th and Nash Elementary	900,000
North 68th and Lancaster Elementary	1,200,000
South 67th and St. Francis Elementary	800,000
Other projects which will be urgent in the near future due to recent annexation:	
64th and Marion Junior-Senior High	4,000,000
North 66th Elementary School Addition	300,000
North 71st and Sheridan Junior High	2,500,000
North 80th and Hampton Elementary	700,000
North 87th and Fiebrantz Elementary	700,000
Congress School Replacement	800,000
Town of Lake elementary schools—3	2,100,000
Junior high to serve town of Lake	2,500,000
Senior high to serve town of Lake	4,000,000

Projects which might be built for the Milwaukee Board of School Directors under the program of emergency public works—Continued

	Estimated cost
Other projects, etc.—Continued	
2 elementary schools to serve southwest section of the city and portions of the town of Greenfield being annexed	$1,400,000
One junior high school	2,500,000
One senior high school	4,000,000
	55,020,000
Total for other city projects	85,275,000
Grand total	140,295,000

Appreciate Efforts To Get Carrier Job

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 5, 1954

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to direct the attention of our colleagues to the following letter to the editor. It appeared in the Brooklyn Eagle of August 6, 1954:

To the Editor of the Eagle:

The membership of the Columbia Association of the New York Naval Shipyard happily notes the recent announcement of the Bureau of Ships, United States Navy, designating the Brooklyn Navy Yard for the proposed construction of the new supercarrier of the *Forrestal* class.

Our membership views with deep appreciation and gratitude the position taken by the Eagle, the borough president of Brooklyn, John Cashmore, and Congressmen Multer and Celler, as well as the entire Brooklyn congressional delegation, for their efforts to bring the construction project to Brooklyn. Your support in persuading the decision to build the supercarrier in Brooklyn means that more than a thousand jobs have been saved and layoffs prevented, for which we give thanks.

Joseph Mazzarella,
President, Columbia Association of the New York Naval Shipyard.

Herbert Hoover: One-Man Task Force

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. ALEXANDER SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 9, 1954

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an article entitled "Herbert Hoover: One-Man Task Force," which was published in the New York Times magazine of August 8 and pays a worthy tribute to Herbert Hoover at the time of his 80th birthday.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Herbert Hoover: One-Man Task Force

(By R. L. Duffus)

When Herbert Clark Hoover attains his 80th birthday this Tuesday he will be the first ex-President in more than a century to reach that age. The last was John Quincy Adams, who died in 1848.

Mr. Hoover will have another distinction. He was fairly young, as Presidents go—58 years old—when he left office, and the years since then have not been years of retirement. He has maintained his energy and his interest in life; he has worked like a nailer; his opinions, expressed in speeches and occasional interviews or statements, have had a powerful—perhaps increasingly powerful—effect on public opinion; and his Monticello, which might have been a house in California, is actually the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel in New York City.

Today Mr. Hoover is not so much an ex-President, living on past glory, as he is an active and influential citizen, a sort of one-man "task force" working for what he conceives to be the welfare of his country. His name will be connected with many activities besides the trying labors of the White House between 1929 and 1933. He will be long remembered, for example, as the chairman from 1947 to 1949 of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government and of its successor agency, now a year old.

At 80, Mr. Hoover can scarcely be a human dynamo, and he does not try to be. With the Quaker conservatism which is his birthright, and which shows in almost everything he does, he spends his time and energy carefully.

His daily life is not publicized—indeed, for a man who has been in the public eye for 40 years or more, he hates publicity—but the general outlines of it can be indicated. Mr. Hoover's home is right here in New York, in his hotel apartment. For the summer months he goes to California. During a part of that time he may visit the Bohemian Grove, the famous summer club-grounds of the Behemian Club of San Francisco. When he crosses the continent he travels by train.

At the Waldorf-Astoria he lives, perhaps, a more quiet life than Jefferson did at Monticello or Washington at Mount Vernon. His meals come up by room service; except for the purpose of making or listening to speeches, he rarely goes to public restaurants in any city. He likes plain food, including roast beef. He avoids sweet desserts.

The waiters and others who have to do with him at the Waldorf find him quiet but genial. He is not now, and never was, the type of public man who instinctively tries to turn every contact into a vote. If he is more widely popular now than he was when he was President it is not because he has worked at it, but rather because a perception of his character and personality has percolated down to the man in the street. He has always had, and still has, devoted friends in whose eyes he has no faults and can do no wrong. He does not encourage this attitude, but there it is. Some of these older friends—naturally a diminishing band nowadays—go back to his college years at Stanford, others to his early mining career, still others to his terms of service in Belgium relief, as Food Administrator during the First World War, and in the unpaid public services of his later decades.

He does not, however, confine himself to old friends, nor does he live in the past. His chairmanship of the Hoover Commission is no purely honorary office. He works hard at it. As one friend put it, he commutes between New York and the Commission offices in Washington. Out of his long experience in executive positions he knows what he wants and at 80 has the energy to plug for it. Occasionally one hears of a controversy inside the Commission—not over personalities but concerned with ways and means or with objectives and purposes.

As one learns of these controversies they do not sound acrimonious but they show Mr. Hoover in pretty good fettle for a man of his years. In private conversation he can be pungent. He has judgments and firm opinions and does not hesitate to express them.

Yet the years have given him perspective and allowed him to see the humorous side of situations which were once deadly serious. For example, in an address last February, he touched on the matter of depressions: "I should be regarded as an expert on these subjects. At least, I was credited with having constructed one, all by myself—the entire world depression which lasted in the United States from 1931 to 1941. I even received the honor of having that depression named after me by various political candidates."

He believes that if the Government would follow all the recommendations of the Hoover Commission it might save from $5 to $7 billion a year. However, he is realistic. He doubts that all the reforms will go through, because, as he says, about 200 pressure groups "occupy themselves pressuring the Government for more spending or in opposing any reductions."

He is soberly hopeful. Last May he told a graduating class at the West-Town Friends School near Philadelphia: "We are not at the bedside of a nation at the death agony of its civilization. * * * Civilization will not fail where the people have dynamic optimism and religious faith."

He has never been afraid to take unpopular positions. Six months before Pearl Harbor he declared: "Statesmanship demands that the United States stand aside in watchful waiting, armed to the teeth, while these men [Hitler and Stalin] exhaust themselves."

When the rearmament drive following the the outbreak of war in Korea was getting underway he urged that we send munitions, not troops, to "other nations who show a determined will to defend themselves," that we cut back our ground forces in favor of air power and sea power, and that we revise "our relations to the United Nations Charter" so that it may not "dominate the internal sovereigny of our Government."

It has seemed to him that too great a preparedness effort might exhaust our economy, and he has repeatedly said so. He is on the side of lower taxes, private enterprise and individual initiative and he is against any form of socialism—creeping or otherwise.

Except for the activities of the Hoover Commission and other unpaid labors in the public field, Mr. Hoover's career since he left the White House in 1933 has been one of quiet work and a slow but steady growth in popular esteem.

The real answer to the old controversies was perhaps the vote in both Houses of Congress on July 21, when Democrats joined Republicans in passing a resolution in Mr. Hoover's honor, on the occasion of this approaching birthday. He will probably not want a fuss made over the occasion, though his heart cannot but be touched by the celebration at his birthplace, West Branch, Iowa. He does, however, like certain holidays, especially at the turn of the year.

Christmastime he has a big tree set up in his Waldorf apartment, and it is the family custom that his son Allan, who lives in Connecticut, and his son Herbert, who lives in California when he is not off on an economic mission to Iran or elsewhere, shall bring their families there to be with him. He delights in his four grandchildren.

His stay in California is in a way a vacation, but at last reports he had no thought of retiring. His personal secretary, Miss Bernice Miller (Bunnie her friends call her), who has been with him a long time, is probably sharpening her pencils. They will be needed to keep up with Mr. Hoover's rapid thinking at 80 as in early years.

Resignation of Assistant Postmaster General John C. Allen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 9, 1954

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, normally I would not ask unanimous consent to insert a laudatory editorial on a member of the opposition. However, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an editorial praising the accomplishments of Assistant Postmaster General John C. Allen, who recently resigned from office.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Idea Man

The resignaion of Assistant Postmaster General John C. Allen deprives the Post Office Department of one of its most versatile and imaginative executives. Mr. Allen brought fresh and challenging ideas to a Department long ingrown in its concepts of handling transportation of the mail. He sought to apply to the mail service some of the techniques he had used in private business as traffic manager for Sears Roebuck & Co., and he succeeded in some notable respects. Perhaps his outstanding accomplishment was the inauguration of first-class mail service by air on an experimental basis, using excess airline capacity, on Washington-Chicago, New York-Chicago, New York-Florida, and Chicago-Florida routes. The experiments have proved eminently worthwhile. Mr. Allen also helped draw up the plan to separate air subsidies from mail payments. His enthusiasm and determination occasionally created resentment among the carriers with which he worked, particularly when he questioned rate structures; but his questioning also served to impress upon industry the need to do a better job. There can be no doubt that he has materially benefited the Government and the taxpayers in obtaining speedier, more economical mail service. He deserves a vote of appreciation as he returns to private life.

Address by Charles J. MacGowan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 9, 1954

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a fine speech by retiring President Charles J. MacGowan, of the International Brotherhood of Boilermakers, A. F. of L. It is a speech by a man who has made a magnificent record as a labor statesman.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF RETIRING PRESIDENT CHARLES J. MACGOWAN OF THE INTERNATIONAL BROTHERHOOD OF BOILERMAKERS, A. F. OF L., JUNE 1954

International officers, representatives, business representatives of local lodges, international office clerical staff, guests, and ladies and gentlemen attending this international conference, a number of you have told me you have afternoon reservations to leave the city and have also expressed a desire to hear a few parting words from me. I want to just say a few words as a sort of swan song or whatever you may want to call it.

I have been deeply moved by the persons, individuals, who have come to me and shaken my hand and with voices filled with emotion indicate their agreement with my decision but their regret that it was necessary.

May I make it perfectly clear. There comes a time in every man's life when things don't come easy. When he has to flog himself to do his job. He is sapping his vitality; his mentality slows down and he is not able to cover the outfield like he used to. I don't think that any man should remain as the chief executive of any labor organization when he recognizes that the time is arriving, that he is doing an injustice to himself; he is burning himself out ahead of time; but more to be regretted than that is the fact that he is not furnishing proper competent leadership.

I don't desire any commendation and certainly I don't want any sympathy. I have done my job as best I could for the men who compose this organization. I might have been able to do more. Perhaps my thinking, my intellectual processes have not been as high as I would have liked them, but regardless of that, I bequeath to you, an organization founded 74 years ago, when it took courage, stability, and a willingness to sacrifice in order to lay the foundations of this great brotherhood and the rest of the labor movement.

I can recall the days of the blacklist. I can recall the days when I worked under what we used to call a flag or an alias, but the agents of antiunion employers always ferreted us out. Perhaps we could get a week here. We would move somewhere else and get 10 days or 2 weeks, but invariably they caught up with us. I can remember the days of the "yellow-dog contract" when, before you got a job, you had to sign away your life and your rights and you had to virtually become a chattel slave.

Those men down through the years are the men who built this brotherhood. They are the ones who built the foundations on which we now stand and what you and I have been able to do is to decorate that structure and add some more bricks and stones to the edifice. Some of these tributes are nice and they are appreciated, but if I were to accept the conclusions that I was alone responsible for this organization, I would be committing a fraud. I have only contributed my share to the magnificent job that was performed before me and you boys that are coming along now, the job is handed over to you younger men with clear minds, strong bodies, the firm determination to hold aloft the torch of human progress. I will leave this office with contentment and happiness, feeling that those who succeed me will do that. If you fail, you will make my declining days most unhappy.

I beg of you, keep up the battle and I mean a battle of intelligence, a battle of progress, a battle of achievement, and not physical battles.

I have pondered over what I might leave you. I pondered it a great deal and I want to read to you the following:

In addition to other things which I may have said, may I wind up my swan song with an effort to create in my own way, a trade unionist creed. I do this for the reason I would like to leave with each of you, and through you to our entire membership, some words of inspiration to convey conclusions which I have developed out of a ripe experience.

First. Trade unionism is an institution of men which, next to God and country, is the most important undertaking of mankind. It is an institution which is an honor to those who join and should be honored and respected by those who are members. Its virtues should be proclamed with pride and its faults, where they exist, should be corrected.

Second. Trade unionism must be of the heart and of the mind. It cannot be bought across the counter like a piece of meat or a pair of shoes.

Trade unionism cannot be purchased with an initiation fee or a job opportunity, but it must come from the deep-seated conviction on the part of a nonmember that a trade union is an honorable institution and the banding together of men with a common interest, who desire to improve their way of life by lawful means.

Third. Trade-union officials of all ranks must be men of integrity, intelligence, and courage. They should not lead their membership into costly or disastrous strikes as a substitute for competent bargaining at the conference table.

Fourth. The funds of a trade union, local, district or national, are sacred and must be so regarded. Every individual member has an equity in those funds and every salaried officer should be reasonably well paid, but he must not regard his position as an opportunity to either grow rich or create a sinecure for himself.

Fifth. Competent trade-union officials who have acquired experience should not be cast out lightly on the appeals of demagogues who are merely seeking office.

Sixth. Every dues-paying member has a share of stock in his local union. He should attend his meetings to protect his equity and make every possible intelligent contribution to his union's success. The absentee grumbler weakens, instead of strengthens, the trade-union movement.

Seventh. At the bargaining table, representatives of unions should obtain an acceptable agreement with employers and the agreement should be lived up to faithfully, both in letter and in spirit.

Eighth. Trade unions are a part of every community. The members should participate in community affairs and convince the world that they are good citizens, thus dispelling much of the manufactured propaganda which seeks to destroy all of us, because of the sins of a few.

Ninth. In a word, we should be men in all that the word implies, in our relations with each other, in our relations with our employers, and in our relations with the general public.

By adhering to this doctrine, we can increase our stature and become a more highly respected segment of society.

That, my friends, I bequeath to you in simple language, what to me is the heart and soul and sinew of trade unionism.

Now, I would like President-elect Calvin to assume the chair. One of the customary functions of passing the authority to your successor is to hand him the gavel. In the 10 years I have presided over conventions and meetings of this brotherhood, I have never used a gavel, so I haven't one to give you, Bill.

Farmers Get Less, Consumers Pay More

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 9, 1954

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Farmers Get Less, Consumers Pay More," which was published in the Miami Herald of Tuesday, August 3, 1954.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FARMERS GET LESS, CONSUMERS PAY MORE

When the next medals for fortitude are struck off, one of the first ought to be reserved for the long-suffering American housewife.

She has been remarkably patient and uncomplaining about bearing a disproportionate share of today's food costs. Too patient for her own good.

While the prices that farmers have received, for example, have declined 18.8 percent since 1951, retail food prices have actually gone up about 1 percent since that date.

The difference has gone primarily into processing and distribution charges passed on by middlemen. As a result the housewife has gotten little if any benefit from past declines in farm income and will get virtually none of the further declines that are ahead.

If Congress is interested in the welfare of consumers, it could well devote a full-dress inquiry into all the factors that tend to keep retail prices at their present high level.

The Federal Trade Commission discovered belatedly that a considerable part of recent coffee price increases was caused by market manipulations. A similar analysis is needed of retail food prices. There's something frightfully wrong when a decline of 18.8 percent in what farmers receive turns into a 1-percent increase in what housewives pay.

The Organization of American States and the United Nations: Rivals or Partners?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 9, 1954

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following address made by Mr. David McK. Key, Assistant Secretary for United Nations Affairs, before the Colgate University Conference on American Foreign Policy, at Hamilton, N. Y., on July 13, 1954:

The address follows:

THE ORGANIZATION OF AMERICAN STATES AND THE UNITED NATIONS: RIVALS OR PARTNERS?

(By David McK. Key, Assistant Secretary for United Nations Affairs)

I should like to talk to you today about the relationship between regional organizations and the United Nations. Are they rivals or are they partners? Put more specifically, what is the relationship between the U. N. as a universal organization and such a regional organization as the Organization of American States?

The U. N. was designed to be as nearly universal an organization as possible. It had a responsibility to seek to maintain international peace everywhere. It could therefore admit of no rival. But did that require that the U. N. should be an exclusive agency for maintaining international peace? Could there perhaps also be regional associations for peace?

The recent appeal of Guatemala's former government to the United Nations Security Council regarding alleged acts of aggression brought into sharp focus for the first time the questions of universality and regionalism which had previously been considered only on a purely theoretical basis at San Francisco when the charter was being drafted.

You will recall that on Sunday, June 20, the Security Council, after hearing a long and detailed statement by the Guatemalan representative, voted 10 to 1 to refer the Guatemalan complaint to the Organization of American States. The one negative vote was a Soviet veto—its 60th. On the same day a resolution proposed by France calling for immediate termination of action likely to cause bloodshed was adopted unanimously by the Council. Five days later, the Inter-American Peace Committee of the Organization of American States having meanwhile set in motion steps to get at the facts, the Security Council decided not to resume consideration of the Guatemalan matter at that time.

These actions by the Security Council raised certain questions which merit study and discussion. Was this a retrograde step on the part of the Security Council? Was it shirking its duty to enforce the peace? Was the Security Council denying a full hearing to a United Nations member? Could it be said that, to be consistent with our record in the Korean case, the United Nations was obligated to take immediate action in the Security Council?

I believe that a review of the background of this problem will show quite clearly that the Security Council was acting wisely and fairly, and in accordance with the true meaning and intent of the charter. The Security Council recognized that an issue was involved which was so fundamental that it brought into question the whole system of peace and security which had been created by the charter at San Francisco.

UNIVERSALITY VERSUS REGIONALISM

In the spring of 1945, with most of the major issues already settled, the question of the relationship and jurisdiction of regional organizations vis-a-vis the new international organization arose and had to be answered.

Basically, it was the veto provision in the Security Council in relation to the inter-American system that precipitated the crisis. Significantly, it was the Latin American Republics who asked, "What happens in case of aggression against any one of us? If the Big Five in the Security Council, disagree, are we powerless to resort to collective action in our own defense?"

What the Latin American countries wanted was a self-operating inter-American regional system, one that could act for peace without interference from a Security Council veto. It seemed for a time that the whole idea of the United Nations might fail to be realized because of the difficulty of reconciling the two concepts of universality and regionalism.

This question had the utmost significance at the time, for the Organization of American States has the longest continuous history of any regional agency. The distinctive relationship of the American states goes back over 130 years. Throughout this period there has been a progressive development of closer relationships between the 21 American Republics. This relationship has succeeded over the years in preserving relative peace and security in this hemisphere and a freedom from the kind of holocaust which has repeatedly devastated Europe and Asia. The Organization of American States is an organization founded upon the freedom-loving traditions of Bolivar and Washington. The 21 American Republics had a common experience in their heroic struggles for independence. They have ever since been determined to prevent the extension to this hemisphere of either the colonial domain of European powers or any despotic political systems of Europe. They have repeatedly pledged themselves to settle their own disputes peacefully and have established a system that has demonstrated increasing effectiveness to that end. It is for these reasons that it was absolutely essential that regionalism and universality be blended at San Francisco.

Just prior to the San Francisco Conference the 21 American Republics, including the United States, had met in Mexico City for a Conference on Problems of War and Peace. This conference had adopted the Act of Chapultepec, which reaffirmed the century-old pan-American solidarity and provided for the early conclusion of an inter-American treaty which would recognize the principle that an attack on any one of the American states would be regarded as aggression against all. In such event the proposed treaty would provide for collective action by the American Republics, including the use of force. It would also provide for collective action to deal with other threats menacing the peace and security of the American states.

When the United States adhered to the Act of Chapultepec, we realized that it involved a significant development of the principles of the Monroe Doctrine. It meant that in the event of a future aggression against any one of the American Republics, from inside or outside the Western Hemisphere, it was not just the United States which was committed to take action but all of the American Republics on the principle of all for one and one for all.

IMPLICATIONS OF VETO POWER

The late Senator Vandenberg, who was one of our principal delegates to the San Francisco conference, recorded in his private diary at the time his full realization of the implications of the veto power in the Security Council to collective security measures in the Western Hemisphere. He wrote: "In the event of trouble in the Americas, we could not act ourselves; we would have to depend exclusively on the Security Council; and any one permanent member of the Council could veto the latter action. * * * Thus little is left of the Monroe Doctrine." He went on to record: "I do not see how we could tolerate a possible situation in which [under the United Nations Charter] we could not deal with a bad pan-American situation at all because (1) we are not permitted to act under Chapultepec and (2) the Security Council is stopped by a Russian or a British or a Chinese or a French veto."

That the American Republics should be free to take appropriate action in such circumstances was and is of utmost importance because of the veto in the Security Council. Given the state of the world, it would have been too much the expect that all of the five major powers would agree to forego all use of a veto. While the veto did not doom the United Nations to futility, it did reflect difficulties in the way of action by a world organization which would not necessarily be found in the way of action of a regional association. For the Latin Americans it was of vital importance that the promises of Chapultepec not be nullified by subjecting American regional action to a Russian veto. A way had to be found to permit an inter-American regional agency to take necessary action regardless of the Russian veto.

This way was found when the United States and the Latin American Republics, over intense Soviet opposition, included in articles 51 and 52 of the charter provisions establishing the rights of regional organizations in matters of collective self-defense and pacific settlement. Article 51 recognized the inherent right of states to individual or collective self-defense. Article 52 recognized the existence of regional arrangements for dealing with such matters related to the maintenance of international peace and security as are appropriate for regional action. This did not impair the right of the Security Council to investigate any dispute or situation under article 34 which might lead to international friction. Any member of the United Nations might bring any dispute or situation to the attention of the Security Council under article 35. Nevertheless under article 52 members of the United Nations who have entered into regional arrangements are enjoined to make every effort to achieve pacific settlements of local disputes through such regional arrangements before referring them to the Security Council. Paragraph 3 of article 52 states, "The Security Council shall encourage the development of pacific settlement of local disputes through such regional arrangements or by such regional agencies either on the initiative of the states concerned or by reference from the Security Council."

By that formula a balance was struck between regional organization and world organization. The acceptance of that formula made it possible for the Charter of the United Nations to be adopted. Without that formula there would, in all probability, have never been a United Nations.

Just as the United Nations has developed since its founding, so has the inter-American system.

The Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance, signed at Rio de Janeiro on September 2, 1947, put into effect both the Act of Chapultepec and the provisions of article 51 of the United Nations Charter. The treaty bound the signatories to consult in the event of aggression either from within or without the Americas and provided for certain measures which, if approved by a two-thirds majority, would become obligatory on all states parties to the treaty. Thus, the Rio Pact, as it is commonly called, established a precedent which has been used in developing the North Atlantic Pact and other regional collective-security arrangements.

In 1948, at Bogotá, the Charter of the Organization of American States was drawn up and approved. It further defined the relationship of this regional organization to the United Nations. Article 20 of the Charter of the Organization of American States provides: "All international disputes that may arise between American States shall be submitted to the peaceful procedures set forth in this charter before being referred to the Security Council of the United Nations."

ROLE OF SECURITY COUNCIL

It is in this context and with this background that we should judge the action taken with respect to the recent Guatemalan appeal to the United Nations, which I mentioned at the beginning of my talk.

In the first place, there is no question that the Security Council has primary responsibility under the charter for the maintenance of international peace and security. The fact that the Security Council refused to give further consideration to the Guatemalan matter while an agency of the Organization of American States carried out its activity does not derogate from the authority of the Security Council in matters relating to the maintenance of international peace and security. On the contrary, in matters falling within the scope of a fully developed and actively functioning regional agency, the Security Council is under an obligation to promote pacific settlement through such an agency. This is just what it did in the Guatemalan case.

Secondly, there was no reluctance on the part of the Security Council to have the facts in the Guatemalan case fully aired. The Guatemalan representative exercised his right to bring a situation to the attention of the Council. The Security Council met at once, listened to his complaint, and acted upon it. The decision of the Security Council 5 days later not to resume its consideration of the matter when the regional agency involved was actively considering it cannot be deemed to be a denial of the right of a U. N. member to bring such a matter to the attention of the Security Council.

Thirdly, the Security Council was not shirking its duty to maintain peace and security. It was taking the most effective action under the circumstances by not depriving the regional agency in the first instance of an opportunity to promote a peaceful solution.

Fourthly, the action of the Soviet Union in the Security Council unfortunately confirmed the fears of the founders of the charter at San Francisco. In vetoing Security Council action designed to refer the Guatemalan matter to the Organization of American States, the Soviets had two purposes. By confining the matter to the Security Council, the Soviets hoped to retain a degree of control over the consolidation of their Communist bridgehead in Guatemala. At the same time they sought to cripple, and thereby discredit, the long-established inter-American system.

Fifthly, the Organization of American States was actively and effectively handling the Guatemalan situation. It was acting as the partner, not the rival, of the United Nations. As you know, for some time prior to the recent outbreak in Guatemala, it was apparent that the Communist Party in that state, acting in collaboration with the international Communist conspiracy, had come very close to exercising effective control of that Government, if it did not, indeed, exercise such control. The Communist menace in Guatemala had become so dangerous that the American States could not ignore it. At their 10th Inter-American Conference in Caracas last March they had declared that "the domination or control of the political institutions of any American state by the international Communist movement, extending to this hemisphere the political system of an extracontinental power, would constitute a threat to the sovereignty and political independence of the American states, endangering the peace of America, and would call for a meeting of consultation to consider the adoption of appropriate action in accordance with existing treaties."

When the Guatemalan Government made its accusations against its neighbors before the Inter-American Peace Committee, the Organization of American States promptly set its machinery into action. The Inter-American Peace Committee established a Committee of Information, composed of representatives of Mexico, Cuba, Brazil, Argentina, and the United States, to obtain the facts to enable it to suggest the most effective methods for reaching a satisfactory settlement. The committee has kept the Security Council informed regarding its activities. Its fully documented report has been transmitted to the Security Council. In this manner this agency of the Organization of American States has fulfilled its obligations under article 54 of keeping the Security Council informed.

Prior to the advent of the new anti-Communist Government in Guatemala, the Council of the Organization of American States had called for a consultative meeting of Foreign Ministers in Rio on July 7 to consider the Guatemalan situation. As a result of the change of government this meeting was postponed sine die, but it should be noted that the Organization of American States was prepared to see the matter through on the highest level. Thus, the Organization of American States by its actions has demonstrated that in the words of Secretary Dulles, "There was proof that our American organization is not just a paper organization, but that it has vigor and vitality to act."

Ambassador Gouthier, of Brazil, speaking before the Security Council at its second session, put it this way: "For more than 60 years the Organization of the American States has been a useful and efficient instrument for the solution of conflicts, disagreements, and strained situations confronting the American Republics. The Organization has adequate machinery, through the many organs and procedures established by it in order to solve such differences. The long record of achievement of the system of the Organization of American States is a striking demonstration of its capacity to deal with political situations similar to the one which confronts us. In the Organization of American States all the members have equal rights; whether a large nation or a small one, each has one vote on decisions, and the undemocratic principle of the veto is unknown."

GUATEMALA, A TEST CASE

The balance between universality and regionalism which was struck at San Francisco was put to a severe test in the Guatemalan case. The outcome, however, proved that under the San Francisco formula the Organization of American States could advance United Nations objectives by functioning effectively in a regional dispute. This was made possible because the Security Council recognized the right of a well-qualified regional organization to apply its own resources in dealing with such a dispute. It was made possible also because the oldest and largest regional organization the world has ever known faced up to its responsibilities squarely and undertook to carry them out. Fortunately, the circumstances which gave rise to the controversy were changed before action in either organization had been pushed to the ultimate limits.

The actions of the Security Council and the Organization of American States preserved the delicate balance between world and regional organization which was written into the charter at San Francisco. A successful effort to destroy that balance by depriving the active regional organization of the Americas of its responsibilities under the charter would have had the most serious consequences for the United Nations and for the Organization of American States. It would have constituted a heavy blow at peaceful settlement procedures.

The developments in the Guatemalan case broke new ground in the field of international action. It was new not only because it put the regional arrangements provisions of the charter to their first real test. It was also new in that for the first time the inter-American system had to grapple with the insidious mechanisms of the Communist movement, cleverly worked out so as to confuse and hamper effective regional or United Nations action to preserve the independence of Guatemala. The Communist designs have been foiled. The principles of regional and multilateral action have been upheld. The devotion of the United States, whether it acts through the OAS or through the United Nations, to the concept of the settlement of international disputes through joint action by peace-loving states remains unimpaired. New methods will undoubtedly have to be devised, new advances made, in the techniques and arrangements for attaining that objective. They must be adapted to the changing nature of the threat to international peace and justice. But the objective itself remains unchanged: To strengthen the community of law-abiding states, in the regional system and in the United Nations system, so as to build up stronger and stronger barriers against aggression and tyranny.

Drama Packs Amazing Oppenheimer Transcript

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 9, 1954

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD a very complete analysis of the Oppenheimer transcript by Alfred Friendly, the managing editor of the Washington Post and Times Herald. This important document has been the subject of much controversy as to both the material contained therein and the conclusions of the Gray board as to its meaning. Also involved in the release of this document, is the question as to whether security information of great importance has or has not been inadvertently revealed. I believe the analysis is worthy of printing notwithstanding its extra length and cost. I believe that serious students of this famous case will welcome the opportunity of evaluating Mr. Friendly's analysis:

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of July 25, 1954]

Drama Packs Amazing Oppenheimer Transcript

(By Alfred Friendly)

The Government Printing Office a few weeks ago turned up as the unlikely publisher of the most significant and controversial book of the year.

It is about the length of the Bible, has a plot more intricate than Gone With the Wind and has half as many characters as War and Peace. Depending on your reading speed, it takes from 20 to 30 solid hours to complete.

It reflects on the troubled social and political world about us perhaps more deeply and disturbingly than any other book published during the cold war.

It is a treasure trove for statesmen, moralists, scientists, and military intelligence officers on both sides ofthe Iron Curtain. It is a source book for a generation of historians to come. It is quite possibly the raw material for dozens of future dramatists, novelists, and social philosophers.

You can get it, all 933 pages, for $2.75 from the Superintendent of Documents. Its title is: "In the Matter of J. Robert Oppenheimer: Transcript of Hearing Before Personnel Security Board."

It is a typographical monstrosity, a prodigious task to read, a frustrating and infuriating document. It is also absorbing, every page of it.

Its drama is Aristotelian, in the sense that the principal figure of the tragedy is a king whose fate illustrates and illumines the life and problems of the spectators, which is to say all of us. The story is that of a towering figure, the father of the atomic bomb, the center if not the founder of the American school of theoretical physics.

The drama is also Shakespearean, in that the central problems are those of motive. As in Shakespearean drama, even after the play ends the audience can argue endlessly about just what the motives were of everyone concerned, the witnesses and the judges certainly as much as the judged. The delineation of character, as 40 persons come to testify, is also Shakespearean in its richness and variety.

There is a touch of Eric Ambler, too, in allusions to espionage, although the master of the spy thriller would never have been guilty of concocting such implausible fictions as the suggestions of some of Oppenheimer's detractors.

There is a bit of opera bouffe in the allegation that a mysterious cabal, with the sinister name of Zorc, plotted to siphon off the budget of the Strategic Air Command.

A TRAGIC LOVE STORY

There are a couple of love stories, both pathetic, ill-starred and told with merciful economy.

In one, the subject is Jean Tatlock, Oppenheimer's fiancee, seen searching vainly in communism for some solace or answer to a disturbed quest; shortly before she dies tragically she asks to see Oppenheimer again, because she still loves him.

The second tells of Mrs. Oppenheimer, immersed briefly in communism through love of a dashing and romantic Communist first husband. We see her, disillusioned with the party as early as 1936, follow him dreadily and wearily to Paris, only to receive word that he died fighting with the Loyalists in Spain.

There is a monumental amount of military and political and technical information in the book, despite the deletions of the security officers who went over the transcript. It contains probably more information on atomic and thermonuclear progress than any single volume since the Smyth report. It is the basis of a reasonably complete history of the hydrogen bomb, and some scholars and reporters are already at work compiling it.

There is in the book also one or two touches of buffoonery, with Gen. Leslie R. Groves, wartime head of the Manhattan Engineering District and Oppenheimer's boss when the atom bomb was made, playing the role of Falstaff.

THE TWO-BOMB GUESS

Groves, who is supposed to be testifying about Oppenheimer, gets off at once with the announcement that, before Yalta, he concluded that "we needed only two (atomic) bombs to win the war." With becoming modesty, he notes, "Of course, I also proceeded on the theory that I might be wrong."

He acknowledges that he consulted with Oppenheimer frequently during the life of the atomic-bomb project and used him at least on one tough theoretical problem, "not to tell me what to do but to confirm my opinion."

But, Groves concedes, Oppenheimer was most valuable, and "he did a magnificent job as far as the war effort was concerned. In other words, while he was under my control—and you must remember that he left my control shortly after the war was over."

At the outset of Groves' testimony he was warned by Chairman Gordon Gray, of the special Personnel Security Board, not to discuss classified matters. Don't worry, Groves replied in effect, "I will watch out for that. I have been watching out for that for so many years I don't think I will slip."

Asterisks in the transcript show that the security officers had to apply their scissors three times to the immediately succeeding 200 or 300 words of Groves' testimony.

SEVEN-HUNDRED-AND-FIFTY-THOUSAND-WORD DOCUMENT

With supporting documents, such as the decisions, briefs, and communications, the Oppenheimer case runs to some 750,000 words. Perhaps 100,000 words bear on a series of minor incidents. These were later made much of in the decisions of the Gray Board and the Atomic Energy Commission, but they are essentially secondary.

Some would see them as not much more than nit picking. It is impossible to conclude that the case against Oppenheimer rests in any large part upon them. Space does not permit their discussion here.

The central items which constitute the core of the case against Oppenheimer are two. In roughly equal proportions, they occupy the rest of the transcript.

One is the Chevalier episode. The other is the matter of Oppenheimer's views and activities with respect to the thermonuclear bomb (the superbomb or the hydrogen bomb).

In their majority decision, Gray and Board Member Thomas A. Morgan made much of the thermonuclear bomb item, finding that Oppenheimer delayed its development by opposing it and failing to be properly enthusiastic about it. It was principally this aspect of their report that provoked a storm of criticism and contempt among the Nation's press and other voices of opinion.

When the AEC made its final decision a few days later, the four members ruling against Oppenheimer loudly and vehemently protested that the issue had utterly no bearing on their findings (except for a question of Oppenheimer's candor in his testimony about it). One might gather from their intense disclaimers that the idea never crossed their minds that J. Robert's H-bomb views and actions might have security risk implications.

THE ESSENTIAL CHARGE

It may be assumed, however, that those views and actions crossed someone's mind, since the story occupies some 300,000 or 400,000 words of the transcript.

The charge against Oppenheimer on this point in the letter to him from AEC General Manager K. D. Nichols was essentially this:

That from 1945 to 1949 Oppenheimer thought the hydrogen bomb was feasible and realizable, but that after the Russians exploded their first atomic bomb, Oppenheimer opposed developing the thermonuclear weapon on moral grounds, because it was not feasible, because it was politically undesirable, and because there were not enough facilities and skilled scientists to push its development; further, that once it was decided by President Truman to push development of the H-bomb, anyway, Oppenheimer continued to oppose the project and did not cooperate fully with national policy.

In a roaring and exciting three pages of the transcript, Dr. Vannevar Bush, the grand old man of American science, told the Gray Board it should have refused to entertain such a charge. He said the board should have sent the letter back to General Nichols for redrafting.

The letter, he said, "is quite capable of being interpreted as placing a man on trial because he held opinions, and had the temerity to express them."

"If this country ever gets to the point where we come that near to the Russian system, we are certainly not in any condition to attempt to lead the free world toward the benefits of democracy.

"I think that in all fairness I ought to tell you my frank feeling that this has gotten into a very bad mess * * * we have been slipping backward in our maintenance of the Bill of Rights * * *.

"I think this board or no board should ever sit on a question in this country of whether a man should serve his country or not because he expressed strong opinions. If you want to try that case, you can try me. I have expressed strong opinions many times, and I intend to do so. They have been unpopular opinions at times. When a man is pilloried for doing that, this country is in a severe state."

ALLEGATION OF TREASON

Gray and Morgan apparently did not concur. To do them justice, it may be assumed that, after the charge was made, there were a couple of implications which, if read into it, might properly be the subject of examination. The implications deal with Oppenheimer's acts, not his opinions.

One was that Oppenheimer's activities had sinister and disloyal motivations. The other was that, regardless of motive, Oppenheimer, as a Government servant and consultant, betrayed his trust by deliberately trying to oppose a national policy already decided upon.

There is one direct allegation in the whole hearing that Oppenheimer, who did indeed oppose an all-out effort to make the H-bomb in 1949, did so because he was a Soviet agent. It was made in a letter of November 7, 1953, to J. Edgar Hoover. The letter, distributed by Hoover to top Government officials kicked off the whole investigation of Oppenheimer.

The author was William L. Borden, former executive director of the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy. He had access to derogatory information on Oppenheimer in the investigative files of the FBI and other agencies, but presumably had no other sources.

Borden demonstrated himself, to put the most charitable view on the matter, as an incompetent reporter. The evidence against Oppenheimer, which was surely spread in full on the transcript, comes nowhere close to his description of it; the essential conclusions he drew were as baseless as they were false.

His reading the evidence and his conclusions were given no credence, indeed no mention, by the Gray Board or the AEC in their final reports.

If there was no treasonable motive, the next question was whether Oppenheimer, regardless of motive, did indeed act against the national policy on the H-bomb, once it was adopted in the White House at the end of January, 1950.

There is no evidence whatsoever in the transcript of any positive acts that Oppenheimer took to delay the project once it was approved.

Gray and Morgan, however, went on to argue that since Oppenheimer did not wax publicly enthusiastic when President Truman overruled his recommendation against making the H-bomb, and did not try energetically to encourage scientists to join the H-bomb work at Los Alamos, he delayed the project.

It was this argument of lack of sufficient "enthusiasm" which aroused a storm of criticism from the Nation's press, scientists and public in general. It was the most vulnerable section of the Gray-Morgan report. The third member of the Board, Dr. Ward V. Evans, who favored restoring Oppenheimer's clearance, put the matter in a nutshell:

"He did not hinder the development of the H-bomb, and there is absolutely nothing in the testimony to show that he did."

MASSIVE RETALIATION

It is not enough for an understanding of the case to say that the AEC, even in ruling against Oppenheimer, rejected in its entirety this portion of the Gray-Morgan decision. The story of the H-bomb remains at the root of the case.

The hearing tells that story:

When the Russians exploded their first A-bomb in September, 1949, American expectations and American military strategy were knocked galley west. The basis of American defense, the atomic monopoly, was destroyed.

One school, which ultimately was victorious, reacted by calling for atomic superiority. It wanted bigger bombs—the H-bomb—and more bombs. Its ideas developed into what is now known as the policy of potential "massive retaliation" as a deterrent to war.

The other school, led by Oppenheimer, felt that this was a totally inadequate answer. Over and over again in his testimony and in that of such men as Vannevar Bush, I. I. Rabi, Hartley Rowe, David Lilienthal, George Kennan and many others, you find this reasoning, as of 1949:

A decision to make the H-bomb would lead America into believing that that was all it had to do to answer the Russian threat. Yet it is obvious much more needed to be done—in atomic defense, in revising the balance of our forces, in new political, economic, and social approaches to the world.

The H-bomb, if developed, would be vastly more valuable to the Russians, by reason of available targets, than to us. Yet our effort to make it would impel the Russians to do likewise.

Development of the H-bomb would end the possibility of any future agreement with the Russians on atomic control or disarmament.

The arguments may have been good or bad; they were at least arguable.

There were other reasons behind Oppenheimer's opposition in October 1949–January 1950, when he was chairman of the AEC's powerful general advisory committee. Militarily, it looked more sensible to build more A-bombs with available facilities. Technically, even if the H-bomb could be made, it would produce a lesser bang for a buck—or for a neutron, which was the limiting factor—than the equivalent number of A-bombs. Also, technically, the possibility of making an H-bomb did not look promising.

The general advisory committee went along with Oppenheimer virtually unanimously (one member took no position). So did 3 of the 5 AEC members, with Gordon Dean and the present Chairman, Lewis L. Strauss, dissenting. The military and the Joint Congressional Atomic Committee were almost unanimously in favor of the H-bomb project (a notable exception was Representative W. STERLING COLE, the present committee chairman).

If many scientists saw the matter the way Oppenheimer did, some did not. Notably, the brilliant but difficult Edward Teller, who had been working on the thermonuclear problem since 1942—with such fixity that he was removed from any work connected with World War II during the war—wanted a "crash" program at once. Of like mind was the famed Ernest O. Lawrence, at Berkeley, and the men around him.

The transcript shows an amusing, if weird, episode in this connection. To Lawrence and Dr. Luis W. Alvarez, it never occurred that our construction of the H-bomb would be anything less than automatic after September 23, 1949, when news of "Joe I," the Russian bomb, was announced. Checking with Teller, they dashed off into the most ambitious plans for staff and facilities, and decided, all on their own, that, although without experience in the matter, they would build the atomic reactors to produce the neutrons to make the tritium to go into the H-bomb.

They proceeded energetically and blithely on this plan, only to find out when they came to Washington a month or so later that they were the men who brought the bull fiddle to a party at which no one wanted to hear music, much less their bull fiddle. Professionals, not the Berkeley group, were ultimately employed to build the reactors.

IMPOSSIBLE CONCEPT

For a good 18 months after the White House decision, it looked as if Oppenheimer's views were even better founded than he knew. The H-bomb appeared increasingly more dubious; indeed, it is virtually certain that what was then contemplated can never be made. But in 1951, Teller came up with a "brilliant" invention or discovery or idea.

The classification officer's scissors leave us without knowledge of what it was, but one may guess. In any event, it is clear that the thermonuclear weapon now being made is a very different thing from the hydrogen bomb which people thought about in 1949.

With Teller's invention, Oppenheimer waxed highly enthusiastic and helped the project along, even by the testimony of Teller, who loses no love for J. Robert. In fact, Oppenheimer himself contributed an idea, "not very ingenious but * * * very useful," embodied in today's H-weapons.

Even so, Oppenheimer continued to insist that the H-bomb was not the whole answer. The hearing shows him fiercely energetic in projects pushing for continental defense, radar warnings and tactical, as well as strategic, use of A-bombs.

AIR FORCE ENMITY

It is here that the transcript makes evident the furious and increasing enmity against Oppenheimer by the Air Force, or in particular, the Strategic Air Command. What Oppenheimer was saying was that war plans based virtually exclusively, on mass retaliation, by H-bombing Russian cities and installations, were not the be-all and end-all.

He wanted, in short, a more versatile, flexible atomic arsenal. There are hints he was thinking even of atomic weapons to be used against oncoming flights of enemy bombers, and perhaps even atomic antisubmarine defense. But mostly he was insisting on vastly more attention to the tactical use of A-bombs and to continental air defense. The transcript shows that those who opposed him considered that point of view as first cousin to treason.

The transcript shows one active opponent in the person of Gen. Roscoe C. Wilson, former commandant of the Air War College. He testified at the hearings by order of the Air Force. Wilson told how Oppenheimer's pattern of action led him to go to the director of Military Intelligence to express concern.

Some of the pattern of action he worried about has fallen to the classification officer's shears. But General Wilson said that one thing which made him worry was "my awareness to the fact that Dr. Oppenheimer was interested in what I call the internationalization of atomic energy, this at a time when the United States had a monopoly."

ORIGIN OF ZORC

Most active of all, however, was David T. Griggs, chief scientist for the Air Force, who once admitted to Oppenheimer that he had impugned Oppenheimer's loyalty. Oppenheimer thereupon called him a paranoid, which doubtless did little to win Grigg's favor.

It was Griggs who say in the Lincoln summer study project in 1952 a plot, engineered by a secret junta, to undercut the Strategic Air Command and deny it the budget it might otherwise obtain. He testified that a Massachusetts Institute of Technology scientist, Jerrold R. Zacharias, wrote the mystic letters ZORC on a blackboard at a scientific meeting, and explained that they stood for Zacharias, Oppenheimer, Rabi, and Charles Lauritsen, another famous scientist. The implication was that this was a cabal of intriguers who plotted to damage SAC by the summer study.

Zacharias and others denied the story point blank over pages and pages of cross-examination. One may assume that every attempt was made to verify Griggs' account, but no verification appears in the record. Also, there is no explanation of why the cabal was not known as ZORL, with the L for Lauritsen instead of the C for Charles. ZORL would have sounded just as sinister as ZORC.

The ZORC story, incidentally, first saw the light of day in a Fortune article in May 1953. The material for the piece obviously came straight from the office of the late Gen. Hoyt Vandenberg, Air Force Chief of Staff. It was a bitter attack on Oppenheimer, and the first public one by the Air Force.

By that time, Teller's invention had put a new light on the H-bomb, and Oppenheimer was vulnerable by reason of his 1949 recommendation. The heat was on.

UNEQUIVOCAL STAND

In his separate opinion condemning Oppenheimer, AEC member Thomas E. Murray rejected with devastating argument the Gray-Morgan viewpoint about Oppenheimer's H-bomb position. He insisted that Oppenheimer had every right to oppose the program for moral, political, and technical reasons. In passing, however, Murray observed:

"Dr. Oppenheimer advanced technical and political reasons for his attitude to the hydrogen bomb program. In both respects he has been proved wrong; nothing further need be said."

Oppenheimer's technical opinion, as noted above, was both right and wrong: Right, in that the 1949 H-bomb notion has not been made into a bomb and probably cannot be; wrong in that Teller later came up with another idea for a different product, which could be made.

Other students of today's state of affairs are unable to share the dogmatic and doubtless comforting certainty that Murray enjoys about the wrongness of Oppenheimer's political reasons.

A TURNING POINT

Here, from the transcript, is Bush, referring to failure to use the prospect of a successful American superbomb as a basis for another attempt at negotiating with Russia. He is speaking of a second chance we might have had, just before the Eniwetok test:

"The test marked our entry into a very disagreeable type of world. * * *

"I still think that we made a grave error in conducting that test at that time, and not attempting to make that type of simple agreement with Russia. I think history will show that was a turning point that when we entered into the grim world that we are now entering right now, that those who pushed that thing through to a conclusion without making that attempt have a great deal to answer for."

And here is the testimony of former Ambassador George F. Kennan:

"It seemed to me at the end of this atomic weapons race, if you pursued it to the end—we building all we can build, they building all they can build—stands the dilemma which is the mutually destructive quality of these weapons, and it was very dangerous for us to get our public before the dilemma, that the public mind will not entertain the dilemma, and people will take refuge in irrational and unsuitable ideas as to what to do."

OUR TERRIBLE ABILITY

Gray asked him how he could make a distinction between the fact that he favored building A-bombs but opposed making the H-bombs in 1949. Kennan replied:

"It is because of the wonder on my part as to whether we did not already have enough of this sort of terrible ability to commit destruction. * * * What has worried me, Mr. Chairman, about going ahead with this is that we would come to think of our security as embraced solely in the mathematics of whatever power of destruction we could evolve, and we would forget our security lies still very largely in our ability to address ourselves to the positive and constructive problems of world affairs, to create confidence in other people.

"I am convinced that the best way to keep our allies around us is not to pay outwardly too much attention to the atomic weapons and to the prospect of war, but to come forward ourselves with plans that envisage the constructive and peaceful progress of humanity. * * *

"I have feared that if we get launched on a program that says the only thing we are concerned to do in the development of atomic weapons is to get as much as possible as rapidly as possible, that the attentions of the public and the Government will become riveted to that task at the expense of our ability to conduct ourselves profitably in positive aspects of foreign policy."

Oppenheimer was convicted by Gray and Morgan and by the four-man AEC majority primarily on the grounds of his association and dealings with Haakon Chevalier, a professor of French at the University of California, at Berkeley. Chevalier appears as an energetic parlor pink, to say the least, if not a member of the Communist Party. He was one of Oppenheimer's many Communist-tinged friends at a time when Oppenheimer himself was Red as a beet.

Here is the body of facts on which the transcript shows little or no disagreement:

In late 1942 or more probably early 1943, when Oppenheimer was doing secret work in Berkeley but before he went to Los Alamos, Chevalier made a startling observation to Oppenheimer. The scene was the pantry or kitchen of Oppenheimer's home.

Chevalier declared that a man named George Eltenton, a British scientist working in the Shell Development Co. had spoken to him about the possibility of transmitting technical information to Soviet scientists. This was a period when Russia was our gallant ally and when many people resented national policy which excluded Russia from a free and steady flow of knowledge of our secrets.

Oppenheimer replied to Chevalier in strong terms saying he thought this was terribly wrong. The subject was dropped, immediately and finally.

COCK AND BULL YARN

Some months later, in the summer of 1943, by which time Oppenheimer had gone to Los Alamos, Colo., John Lansdale, Jr., an attorney from a distinguished Cleveland law firm who had become chief intelligence officer of the Manhattan District, told Oppenheimer of a worry about security in Berkeley. Lansdale's concern had to do with activities of an organization in which, Oppenheimer knew, Eltenton was a member.

Shortly thereafter, on a return trip to Berkeley, Oppenheimer volunteered to the chief counter-intelligence officer of the San Francisco area that Eltenton would bear watching. He was pressed to say why.

At this point, in order not to involve his friend Chevalier and, admittedly, partly because he was reluctant to involve himself, Oppenheimer told the security officer, Col. Boris T. Pash, a cock and bull story. He said Eltenton had made two or three approaches to Berkeley people to get information for the Russians. He declined to give the names of those involved.

Oppenheimer later confessed he was an "idiot" to make up the story; his shame and contrition for the lie haunt the transcript.

Some time later Colonel Lansdale and General Groves pressed Oppenheimer for the whole story. Groves, apparently in no great hurry or dither, did not force Oppenheimer to come clean until December 1943. At that time Oppenheimer named Chevalier as the man Eltenton approached.

Even after this, intelligence officers still labored under the assumption that there had been three contacts. It is by no means clear, however, that Oppenheimer failed to tell Groves there was only one. Conclusive evidence one way or the other is lacking.

DINNER IN PARIS

After the war, Chevalier visited Oppenheimer for a couple of days at Princeton. Then, in December 1953, after President Eisenhower had ordered the "blank wall" erected against Oppenheimer—although Oppenheimer did not yet know it—he saw Chevalier again. He and Mrs. Oppenheimer were in Paris, where Chevalier was then living. Mrs. Oppenheimer phoned Chevalier and the three had dinner together.

Next day, they went together to lunch with Andre Malraux. A one-time Communist, Malraux has become a violent anti-Communist and served as the philosophical apologist and confidant of the fiercely anti-Soviet General De Gaulle. Chevalier was working with Malraux on translations.

Friends and foes of Oppenheimer agree that his temporary concealment of what was pretty clearly attempted espionage and his outright lie were inexcusable. But they differ deeply over the implications.

In a pounding and protracted cross-examination, Roger Robb, special counsel for the Board, made Oppenheimer admit some 13 times that he had told a lie about the story; finally he made Oppenheimer say he had told a "tissue of lies." The fact was, he told one lie.

CRUCIAL EVIDENCE

The AEC majority report denounced Oppenheimer for this matter in the bitterest and most violent terms. Between the lines of Commissioner Murray's separate opinion seems to be a rage that Oppenheimer visited Chevalier in Paris. A responsible newspaperman has reported that one AEC member said the case against Oppenheimer hinged on this point, and that the Commission felt that by his visit Oppenheimer risked being kidnaped by Russian agents.

One security officer at Los Alamos, Capt. (later Major) Peer de Silva, built up for his and his superior officers' edification in 1943 an elaborate argument to demonstrate that Oppenheimer, in volunteering the information about Eltenton, was playing an intricate game as a Soviet agent to throw the bloodhounds off the track.

It is interesting to note, however, developments 2 years later, by which time De Silva had come to know Oppenheimer well. He wrote Oppenheimer the warmest sort of goodby letter, thanking him for support and encouragement and saying that Oppenheimer contributed much to whatever success my office (the security office) has had in performing its mission."

Colonel Pash, who never had dealings with Oppenheimer in any degree after the one interview about the Chevalier affair, stuck to his doubts. In his testimony he indicated that he still questioned Oppenheimer's loyalty.

Moreover, he suggested that he believed Oppenheimer was lying in the hearings when he swore that he knew of only one contact by Eltenton, i. e., the approach by Chevalier to Oppenheimer. The first story Oppenheimer told, that there were three contacts, was more damaging to Oppenheimer if true, Pash argued. Therefore, by his logic, Opphenheimer was now faking a less damaging story.

The AEC majority picked this line of argument in its findings. "It is not clear today," Commissioners Strauss, Eugene M. Zuckert, and Joseph Campbell wrote, "whether the account Dr. Oppenheimer gave to Colonel Pash in 1943 concerning the Chevalier incident or the story he told the Gray Board last month is the true version."

From this, the Commissioners went on elsewhere in their report to question Oppenheimer's veracity.

On this point, however, it is interesting to note that the most diligent investigation of Colonel Pash and others never discovered that there were 3 contacts or even 2. There was, as far as is known, only 1, the 1 which Oppenheimer, himself, first revealed to Groves in 1943.

LANSDALE CHANGED HIS MIND

The testimony of Groves and his top intelligence officer, Lansdale, put a different light on the affair. Both vouched for Oppenheimer's loyalty.

Lansdale admitted that at first he was inclined to Pash's view and distrusted Oppenheimer deeply. But he emphasized to the Gray Board that it was Oppenheimer who took the initiative to tell, rather than hide, the Eltenton attempt. He said he believed Oppenheimer never lied about any other incident.

Groves' testimony made clear he felt it was very wrong of Oppenheimer to delay in telling the story, to refuse at first to name Chevalier, and to lie about the incident. But he indicated that the important fact was that Oppenheimer had done the essential thing in disclosing the source of the danger to security. Regardless of whether there were 3 contacts or only 1, "I felt I had gotten what I needed to get out of that."

Oppenheimer's own story, whether right or wrong, has been consistent since 1946, when he was questioned by the FBI. It remained so under all of Robb's cross-examination.

It was that he felt Chevalier was ignorant of what Eltenton was really trying to get him to do, and was in fact innocent of wrong intent. Accordingly, Oppenheimer tried to avoid implicating him in his interview with Pash and tried to protect him even later in not revealing his name to Lansdale or Groves until the bitter end.

Moreover, still feeling that Chevalier was innocent, he saw no reason why he should not have visited him in Paris last year. "I still think of Chevalier as a friend," said Oppenheimer.

UNUSED TO SNITCHING

In his dissenting opinion, AEC member Henry D. Smyth remarks that "if one starts with the assumption that Oppenheimer is disloyal," the incidents brought up in the hearings may arouse suspicion.

One could also start with the assumption that Oppenheimer was not disloyal, and come out with a perfectly logical picture of the Chevalier affair. For someone deeply immersed in the Communist movement, the process of coming out of it is not easy. In going to Pash with the news of Eltenton's espionage attempts, Oppenheimer was confronted with the prospect of having to snitch on a friend for the first time.

He made a botch of the job. One might guess that he was so naive that he thought the mere mentioning of Eltenton would be enough. Surprised that he was asked for more information, he began to improvise. It was a bad improvisation.

In describing Oppenheimer's attempt to conceal Chevalier's involvement, General Groves said he thought Oppenheimer was acting in "the typical American schoolboy attitude that there is something wicked about telling on a friend."

He went on: "I do know this: That he was doing what he thought was essential, which was to disclose to me the dangers of this particular attempt (of a potential spy) to enter the project."

Here is George Kennan, in somewhat subtler language, on the same point: "I also think it quite possible for a person to be himself profoundly honest and yet to have associates and friends who may be misguided and misled and for whom either at the time or in retrospect he may feel intensely sorry and concerned. I think most of us have had the experience of having known people at one time in our lives of whom we felt that way."

Kennan again, on Oppenheimer's later association with and visit to Chevalier:

"I don't like to think that people in senior capacity in Government should not be permitted or conceded maturity of judgment to know when they can see such a person or when they can't * * *. I would always like to have felt that my superiors in Government had enough confidence in me to let me handle the problem according to my own best conscience."

CLEARED BY AEC IN 1947

Except for the 1950 and 1953 visits with Chevalier and for some unclear data connected with the "nit picking" incidents, almost all of the significant derogatory information against Oppenheimer that was introduced at the hearing had been brought to the attention of the AEC in 1947. The five members took pains to study the data with great thoroughness. They got opinions from Groves, Secretary of War Patterson, Bush, and famed scientist, James B. Conant. All were favorable to Oppenheimer.

The AEC cleared Oppenheimer in August 1947. One member who cleared him, Strauss, now the AEC Chairman, was and is president of the Institute for Advanced Studies. He was responsible for Oppenheimer's appointment as director of that distinguished academy 2 months later, in October 1947.

In the Gray Board hearings, 5 former members of the AEC testified in his behalf, including the 2 previous Chairmen, David Lilienthal and Gordon. So did 10 former and present members of the General Advisory Committee, including the present chairman, Rabi. So did Norris Bradbury, Oppenheimer's successor as head of Los Alamos.

Gen. Frederick Osburn told how much tougher Oppenheimer had been in his outlook toward the Russians than Osborn was himself during the futile negotiations for international atomic control. Rabi even testified—he confessed to being surprised at it—to something he said he had seen in recent years, "a certain tendency of Dr. Oppenheimer to be inclined toward a preventive war," not that he went all the way, "but talking and thinking about it quite seriously."

The two outstanding public leaders of American science, Bush and Conant appeared for him. So did John J. McCloy, in effect the civilian head of the Manhattan project. Lansdale testified to his security, then and now. Groves vouched for his loyalty and said he had never had reason to regret clearing him for the top post in the A-bomb work (although he conceded he would probably not clear him under the standards of the AEC regulations).

Lansdale and Groves were the two men who had studied the security problem raised by Oppenheimer during the war years with the greatest intensity and who had the greatest responsibility in the matter.

NO HINT OF A LEAK

Save for Pash and Borden, no one alleged that Oppenheimer was disloyal. There was not one assertion, even by Pash, that at any time Oppenheimer was indiscreet. Oppenheimer has been under the most intense surveillance for 11 years, his phones tapped, his movements watched, his mail observed. There was no evidence or charge that he had spilled even a semidemi secret.

He was found guilty by the AEC majority of disturbing associations, continuing too long. This record shows his associations with dubious types after he left Los Alamos in 1945 were surprisingly infrequent—one had to search to find them. The record shows that his constant and close associates were scientists and statesmen, the ones who came to testify for him.

There have been persons who were far more deeply involved in the Communist conspiracy, as agents, spies, and traitors, than Oppenheimer. By acts of contrition and confession, they have won back the favor of many Americans who consider that they have expiated their sins and are now fit to serve and advise their Government.

The hearings went deeply into the question of whether this might not also be possible and proper for Oppenheimer. Witness after witness testified to the probity of his actions since his lie in 1943, and particularly to the enormous contribution he made to his country. If the AEC majority was not impressed, the Gray board was. The Nation owes Oppenheimer in particular, it wrote, "a great debt of gratitude for loyal and magnificent service."

Dr. Rabi perhaps put it best:

"We had an A-bomb and a whole series of it * * * and what more do you want, mermaids?

"This is just a tremendous achievement. If the end of the road is this kind of hearing, which can't help but be humiliating, I thought it was a pretty bad show. I still think so."

The transcript, as tense as it is thick, shows vividly who some of Oppenheimer's enemies were, and why they were out to topple him.

There was Borden, with a wild-eyed conviction which led him to write unprovable impossibilities which were—to use precisely that absured word—incredible.

There was Teller, shown as a disputatious fellow, removed from war work at Los Alamos during the war, mortally offended because his baby, the thermonuclear weapon, had not been blessed by Oppenheimer. Even he, however, did not question Oppenheimer's loyalty or security—only his judgment.

There were the scientists closely connected with the work at Berkeley. In the background, the record hints that the great E. O. Lawrence was miffed. Others—Alvarez, Griggs, W. M. Latimer, Kenneth Pitzer—may have felt that Oppenheimer grew too big for his britches after he left them back in 1943.

And throughout, as mentioned before, there were those in the Air Force, powerful figures, who loathed his ideas and feared his effectiveness in plugging them.

PHENOMENA UNEXPLAINED

All of these forces taken together, however, do not account for some of the startling phenomena that are part of the Oppenheimer case. The record shows they existed; it does not explain why or how. It raises the question but does not answer them.

Why, for example, was the huge transcript released at all, and suddenly, on a few hours' notice to Oppenheimer's lawyers? Gordon Gray had promised that the AEC would not take the initiative in making it public, yet the AEC did, after the Gray report appeared but before the decision of the AEC itself.

For months, wild horses—more explicitly, the press and public—had failed to drag out of the AEC even meager details about our atomic affairs. Suddenly the transcript, an Operation Candor a dozen times more detailed than anyone dreamed of getting, was made public, with a staggering amount of information on thermonucleonics.

Why was there the savagery of language by the four AEC members who condemned Oppenheimer, the bitterness of phrase, the violence of denunciation? The Gray report at least acknowledged Oppenheimer's loyalty and discretion and praised his gigantic contribution to his country. It expressed regret for the recommendation it found necessary. The majority AEC finding threw the man no crumb. It even left open the question of loyalty despite 900 conclusive pages about it.

Why was the hearing not an inquiry, according to the explicit rules of the AEC, but a trial, which the rules forbid? After the second day's testimony, it is clear to the reader of the transcript that Robb is a relentless prosecutor, out to get Oppenheimer, out to get into the record evidence that will destroy and degrade him.

Oppenheimer found himself in the worst of two possible worlds. An administrative inquiry would have lacked the adversary nature of a trial; a trial would have assured him and his witnesses and his counsel access to the documents used by the prosecution. Instead, Oppenheimer was repeatedly trapped by being called on to recount a conversation in 1943 or 1946 and, when he had finished, being confronted with a transcript of what he said then.

One little passage give a flavor, of the even-handedness of the Board's special counsel's examination. Attorney Robb is questioning the great physicist Hans Bethe, closely connected with the work of the AEC and against whom no question of loyalty or security has been raised. Bethe had testified strongly in Oppenheimer's behalf.

"Q. Doctor, how many divisions were there at Los Alamos?

"A. It changed somewhat in the course of time. As far as I could count the other day, there were 7, but there may have been 8 or 9 at some time.

"Q. Which division was Klaus Fuchs in?

"A. He was in my division, which was the Theoretical Division.

"Q. Thank you. That is all."

PROTECTION OR PUNISHMENT?

There is another, much deeper, question raised by the record and the decisions. It has to do with the nature and purpose of the security program. Is it meant to be preventive or punitive, protective or retaliatory?

In the light of a record of discretion and loyalty since 1943, did those who found against Oppenheimer remove his access to security documents because they were really afraid he might disclose secrets in the future, either by design or by accident?

And if they were really afraid, did their ruling solve the problem? Oppenheimer still has perhaps as much security information in his head as any man alive. Is he safe, running loose at Princeton?

Or did those who ruled against him do so because they felt he should be punished?

Were Oppenheimer's well-scrutinized actions for more than a decade being examined for what presumptive indications they could give on what his acts would be from now on? Or were his associations for the decade preceding 1943 being examined to determine what retribution they merited?

FROM "OPPIE'S" BOOK

By one of those ironic coincidences that history now and then turns up, a little book written by Oppenheimer himself was published on the same day the transcript was released, and offered for sale at the same price.

It is a collection of the six Reith lectures Oppenheimer delivered in 1953 over the British Broadcasting System, telling the story of the new physics of the last 30 or 40 years. It is the story of the monumental "breakthrough" of discovery and understanding that succeeded Newton's picture of the world. It is a discussion of the field of knowledge, from subatomic particle to cosmos, which is so intimately associated with Oppenheimer and to which he has so richly contributed.

The book, "Science and the Common Understanding," is technically difficult and for the most part hard going. But there are flashes in it that tell much about the man who wrote it, and his outlook. There is a quotation in it that may serve as a final word. It is from a letter written by a great man to a young friend:

"Science can never be retrograde; what is once acquired of real knowledge can never be lost. To preserve the freedom of the human mind then and freedom of the press, every spirit should be ready to devote himself to martyrdom; for as long as we may think as we will, and speak as we think, the condition of man will proceed in improvement.

"The generation which is bowing off the stage has deserved well of mankind for the struggles it has made, and for having arrested that course of despotism which had overwhelmed the world for thousands and thousands of years. If there seems to be danger that the ground they have gained will be lost again, that danger comes from the generation your contemporary.

"But that the enthusiasm which characterizes youth should lift its parricide hands against freedom and science would be such a monstrous phenomenon as I cannot place among possible things in this age and country."

Oppenheimer was quoting from a letter by Thomas Jefferson.

The Four B's

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ROONEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 9, 1954

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, under permission heretofore granted me by unanimous consent of the House, I include the following editorial published in the AFL News-Reporter of Friday, August 6, 1954:

THE FOUR B'S

"No one knows where we stand on Indochina. If you add up all the statements made by Eisenhower, the Vice President, the Secretary of State, the military, and assorted Republican leaders, the sum total is bluff, bluster, backdown and baloney."

Now who said that? Harry Truman? Adlai Stevenson? Dean Acheson? Steve Mitchell?

Nope, it was none other than John S. Knight, publisher of the Chicago Daily News, Detroit Free Press, Miami Herald, and Akron Beacon Journal—and a man who was 100 percent for Eisenhower in 1952.

Eisenhower Trade Bill Dead, Except One Item

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 9, 1954

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend the attention of our colleagues to the following article written by Edwin L. Dale, Jr. It appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of August 9, 1954:

EISENHOWER TRADE BILL DEAD, EXCEPT ONE ITEM

(By Edwin L. Dale, Jr.)

WASHINGTON, August 8.—President Eisenhower has lost, or is in the process of losing, all but one item in the package of new laws he requested last March to improve and expand foreign trade.

The package was supposed to supplement the most important measure in his trade-tariff program, a 3-year extension of the reciprocal trade law with several new kinds of authority for gradual reduction of American tariffs. He lost that measure, too, accepting in its stead a simple 1-year extension of the present law.

The one item in the supplementary package he seems likely to get is important, but its major provision has been greatly watered down in the process of congressional consideration. This is a catch-all bill designed to simplify classification of imports for customs purposes and improve customs procedures.

TRADE BILL BOX SCORE

The other items have been either lost irretrievably for this session or are buried in committee with no current prospect of action. Here is the box score:

1. The President asked that foreign investment be stimulated by a new set of tax incentives. The new incentives were to be incorporated in the big tax revision bill. The House went along but the Senate didn't. Senate-House conferees threw out the whole provision.

2. He asked another foreign investment incentive in the form of a Government guaranty against loss of property because of war, insurrection, or revolution, to supplement existing guaranties against expropriation of the property and inability to convert earnings into dollars. The House approved the new provision as part of the foreign-aid bill. The Senate didn't, and again the conferees threw out the provision.

ITEMS BURIED IN COMMITTEE

3. He asked that the Senate pass a bill already approved by the House to simplify the present methods of putting a dollar value on imports for customs purposes. This would be a major change and is designed to remove uncertainty both here and abroad. The bill is still buried in the Senate Finance Committee and is highly controversial.

4. He asked that the duty-free allowance for tourists be raised from $500 to $1,000. The bill is buried in the House Ways and Means Committee.

5. He asked that the "buy American" act be revised so as to remove the differential favoring American bidders on Government contracts in the case of those countries that have no differential favoring their own bidders on their own government procurement. Nothing at all has been done on this. Incidentally the President also said he would make certain administrative changes in the existing buy-American procedures, and this hasn't been done either, though the matter is still being worked on.

6. He asked for a combined set of measures to simplify customs, and later sent a bill to Congress incorporating the desired changes. This is the one bill he is likely to get. It has passed the House and was reported out of the Senate Finance Committee Friday. The key feature of the bill was a study by the Tariff Commission to simplify the often absurd set of classifications under which imports are assessed for tariffs (for example, men's dress trousers now must be classified as "braid"). As the bill was submitted the President would have the authority to put into effect the classifications resulting from the study, subject only to congressional veto. As now written, however, it only authorizes the study and gives the President no power whatever.

REQUESTED TWICE BY PRESIDENT

The other features of this bill would provide better procedures for classifying new items that are not listed in the basic tariff schedules, enacted 24 years ago; improve procedures under the "antidumping" act; and make several administrative changes in customs law. The President stands a good chance of getting these features.

The President asked for this package of new measures not once but twice. The first time was when he submitted his overall program to Congress March 30. The second was in his formal agreement May 20 to abandon the 3-year extension of the basic reciprocal trade law for this year. At that time, he listed the other items he wanted, saying "there is much else that should be accomplished at this session of Congress."

National Catholic Youth Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, August 9, 1954

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a clipping which appeared in Our Sunday Visitor on July 4, 1954, in connection with the National Catholic Youth Week.

There being no objection, the clipping was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEAST OF CHRIST THE KING TO OPEN CATHOLIC YOUTH WEEK

WASHINGTON.—National Catholic Youth Week will open on the Feast of Christ the King this October and every year hereafter, it was announced here. Previous Catholic Youth Week observances had closed on that feast.

The 1954 observances, in which over 6 million American youth will take part, will be held from October 31 to November 7 on the theme, "Youth—America's Richest Heritage," it was announced by Msgr. Joseph E. Schieder, director of the Youth Department, National Catholic Welfare Conference.

The event will be proclaimed by Pope Pius XII and special proclamations will be issued by President Eisenhower and State governors and city officials throughout the United States.

Television, radio and newspapers will feature Catholic youth activity with programs and stories.

Special letters on Catholic Youth Week are expected from Archbishop Amleto Giovanni Cicognani, Apostolic Delegate to the United States, and Archbishop John J. Mitty of San Francisco, espiscopal chairman of the youth department.

The youth department coordinates activities of more than 20 Catholic youth movements throughout the country. On a diocesan basis, Catholic Youth Week plans will be under the direction of the ordinaries and diocesan youth directors.

Events will be sponsored by youth organizations, schools and colleges. In addition to scholastic and athletic activity, the week will be climaxed by spiritual exercises in which millions of American youths, from the ages of 7 to 30, will take part.

Groups taking part in the observances, in addition to the National Council of Catholic Youth will include the council's college and university section comprised of the National Federation of Catholic College Students and the National Newman Club Federation.

By the Way

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 9, 1954

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following article entitled "By the Way," by Thomas Morrow, which appeared in the Chicago Daily Tribune of Thursday, July 15, 1954:

BY THE WAY

(By Thomas Morrow)

IN LINCOLN, IND., JIM FARLEY IS A HERO

LINCOLN, IND., July 14.—For many years the 142 residents of Lincoln, Cass County, Ind., believed James A. Farley was the greatest man in the world. Aunt Emma Watkins went to her grave with this thought and, until the final boxscore is made up, it is pretty hard to argue the thing.

As Edgar Guest once said, "Excuse me." This was right after he had stepped on a fat lady's foot and has nothing to do with the present case, except you get a poet's name into a piece and it adds some class.

The way they knew there were exactly 142 people in Lincoln was that there was a lady in Lincoln who counted people when she couldn't sleep. Mostly, she would doze off before she got the people counted on the other side of Main Street, but one night she made it, and that's the way the thing added up.

This whole thing happened back in the Roosevelt era, when Mr. Farley was Postmaster General, and the Roosevelts spoke to the Farleys and vice versa. The word got out one day the Lincoln postoffice was to be closed.

Lincoln held mass meetings, of course. There are politicians in Lincoln, like everywhere else, and you give a politician a few words, and a chance to say them, and the thing is going to get out of hand, and you are probably going to have to get a court order to halt the speaking.

Aunt Emma Watkins watched all this, and could see the project was getting nowhere.

So she wrote to her nephew, Everett C. Watkins, then Washington correspondent for an Indianapolis paper.

"They are going to close the postoffice," she said. "Go over and give that Farley man a piece of my mind."

Watkins, knowing Aunt Emma Watkins was a determined woman and would give him no peace unless he took action, sat down and penned an epistle to the Postmaster General.

"You do not know what you are doing if you close the post office in Lincoln," he wrote. "It is our place of forum. Most communities have the barber shop for discussion of current events, but, in Lincoln, the barber is also the carpenter and the paper hanger, and the barber shop is open only on Saturday afternoons, and is in his parlor, which does not lead to free expression of opinion. How would you feel if the post office got closed in your home town of Grassy Point, N. Y.?"

Mr. Farley, an openminded man, could see right off he had made a mistake. So he issued a ukase: "The postoffice in Lincoln shall not close."

They got up a celebration in Lincoln. The Republican and Democrat precinct captains went right out into the woods and cut down a tree. They trimmed it up and made a Jim Farley flag pole, which is still standing.

There were speeches and band music, and Aunt Emma Watkins climaxed the celebration. When they called on her, she stood up, looked around, and said, "I only done my duty."

It was not too long after this victory that Farley came out to Indianapolis to make a speech. He called on Aunt Emma Watkins. She was poorly by this time, but she got up out of bed, put on her best dress, and said, "Mr. Farley, have a glass of milk."

When Aunt Emma Watkins "passed," as they used to say in Lincoln, Farley sent some flowers to her funeral.

"If she knew it," said Everett C. Watkins, "it made her very happy."

The postoffice in Lincoln is gone now, as Mr. Farley is no longer postmaster general.

The postoffice in Grassy Point, N. Y.? It's closed, too. They couldn't get a Democrat or Republican who'd take the job.

How To Stay Young

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. ALEXANDER SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 9, 1954

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, tomorrow is the 80th birthday of ex-President Herbert Hoover. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record a brief statement by Mr. Hoover, entitled "How To Stay Young." The statement was published in the magazine This Week for August 8, 1954.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

HOW TO STAY YOUNG

(By Herbert Hoover)

The older I grow, the more I appreciate children. Now, as I near my 80th birthday, I salute them again. Children are the most wholesome part of the race, the sweetest, for they are freshest from the hand of God. Whimsical, ingenious, mischievous, they fill the world with joy and good humor. We adults live a life of apprehension as to what they will think of us; a life of defense against their terrifying energy; a life of hard work to live up to their great expectations. We put them to bed with a sense of relief—and greet them in the morning with delight and anticipation. We envy them the freshness of adventure and the discovery of life. In all these ways, children add to the wonder of being alive. In all these ways, they help to keep us young.

Balanced Budget Goes Way of All GOP Promises

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 9, 1954

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, under permission heretofore granted me by unanimous consent of the House, I include the following article by Milton Plumb, published in the CIO News of August 9, 1954:

BALANCED BUDGET GOES WAY OF ALL GOP PROMISES

(By Milton Plumb)

Like other GOP campaign promises, that $10 billion annual budget cut which Republican leaders were bragging they would make this year now seems to have just been quietly forgotten.

Appropriations experts on Capitol Hill have totaled up enough of the regular and hidden appropriations to say with certainty that the GOP-promised cut in Government spending hasn't been made.

And the deficit, they add, is going to be just about double the amount reported in the Eisenhower budget figures. That's just what House Democratic Leader Rayburn, of Texas, predicted would be the case at the start of the session.

Accurate analysis of appropriations totals is difficult because of two factors:

1. "Phony" GOP bookkeeping which, although allowing the Republicans to claim huge budget slashes, merely defers appropriations to some later date and thus isn't a real saving at all.

2. "Cover-up" appropriations practices, such as the many provisions in this year's money bills which allow agencies to engage in deficit spending.

"Deficit spending doesn't show in any appropriations balance reported by Congress," Representative Rabaut, Democrat, of Michigan, former chairman of the House Appropriations Deficiency subcommittee, pointed out. "Yet such spending throws the debt further out of balance, and it's still the people's money that's being spent."

This year was the first that President Eisenhower, who ran on an oft-repeated pledge to balance the budget, reduce the national debt, and end deficit financing, had full control in drafting the Government's fiscal program.

The Eisenhower budget, despite campaign talk, was frankly unbalanced the day he submitted it. It estimated this year's Government income at $62.7 billion and made initial Government spending requests which exceeded this amount by almost $3 billion.

This was the first time since the end of World War II and the second time in peacetime history that a President has recommended deficit financing and an unbalanced budget.

Although in some years under President Truman the Government had operated with unbalanced finances, every Truman budget sent to Congress recommended sufficient tax increases to balance outgo with income. The deficit came when Congress refused to levy taxes to offset its higher appropriations.

The Eisenhower administration, however, not only operated on the principle of an unbalanced budget and deficit financing, but also moved to reduce taxes for corporations and wealthy owners of corporation stocks.

The "relief for the rich" tax bill just passed over Democratic opposition is expected to reduce Government income—and add to the deficit—next year by about $1.36 billion.

Last week, however, the Senate—in voting on the President's request for over $2 billion in "supplemental" appropriations—heard Senator DOUGLAS, Democrat of Illinois, open up on the Eisenhower administration's "hokum" and "hypocrisy" in its budget practices.

Earlier Congress had voted 3 other supplementals totaling over $533 million. Included in these, and in the latest $2 billion request, were many items which the administration clearly should have known would require funds when the original budget was submitted. They weren't in the budget, however, and now they make the deficit, instead of almost $3 billion, most likely, somewhere between $5 and $6 billion.

DOUGLAS called the $2 billion "catchall" supplemental appropriation "extraordinary" and "very bad fiscal practice." He accused the administration of "withholding" items from the regular budget and then "rushing them through at the last minute."

"It raises the question of whether these items were withheld so the administration could claim a low figure" on its budget presented to Congress, DOUGLAS said.

Typical of the phony GOP "economy" was the slash of $300 million cut in 1953 from the Veterans' Administration fund for compensation and pensions, which are set by law. This year, the Eisenhower administration had to request $215 million additional for this purpose in an earlier supplemental.

Because of such "coverup" bookkeeping, however, the administration now is in real fiscal difficulties. It has asked that the present limit on the national debt be lifted from $275 billion to $285 billion.

Hon. Anthony J. DiGiovanna, Brooklyn's Man of the Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 9, 1954

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, under permission heretofore granted me by unanimous consent of the House, I include the following article by Alan St. James, published in the Brooklyn Eagle of August 1, 1954:

BROOKLYN'S MAN OF THE WEEK SERVES HIS CITY, STATE 25 YEARS

(By Alan St. James)

Exactly 25 years ago today Supreme Court Justice Anthony J. DiGiovanna received his first appointment to public office. He's been serving the city and State ever since, in increasingly important posts.

On August 1, 1929, at the age of 24, Mr. DiGiovanna was appointed deputy assistant district attorney by Kings County D. A. Charles J. Dodd, who later also became Supreme Court Justice in Brooklyn.

The jurist smiled when he thought back on his youthful entry into public office. "When I was first considered for the office, a few weeks before the actual appointment, I was only 23, and there was some doubt because of my youth. But at the same time a couple of other young men were appointed in the United States District Attorney's office and I turned 24 in the meantime, so everything was all right."

The only son of immigrant Italian parents, he worked diligently in the district attorney's office under Dodd and two other district attorneys who reappointed him. He had been admitted to the bar in the second judicial district on April 1, 1928, and had been graduated from Columbia Law School in 1927.

His earlier education had been at Public School 123, Boys High School, Cornell University and Columbia University, with a bachelor of arts degree in 1925.

Mr. DiGiovanna was head of the district attorney's homicide bureau for 2 years, and he investigated more than 100 murders during his 8½ years in the district attorney's office. He also headed the special sessions court bureau of the office and tried cases in all Brooklyn criminal courts at all levels. He estimates he prepared and/or tried some 5,000 cases during his tenure. On January 1, 1936, he was named a full assistant district attorney.

SERVED IN FIRST CITY COUNCIL

The new city charter adopted in 1936 called for the election of the first city council in 1937, replacing the old board of aldermen. Mr. DiGiovanna was elected a Brooklyn member of the first city council in November 1937, and was reelected for 3 2-year terms and a 1-year term.

He was chairman of the city affairs committee in the council, and authored and supported much of legislation for child welfare, slum clearance, and low-cost housing during his 8½ years on the council.

Mayor William O'Dwyer apopinted Mr. DiGiovanna a city magistrate in May 1947, and subsequently appointed him a justice of the Court of Special Sessions in February 1948.

Always an active campaigned for the Democratic Party since his early days in the old 19th District, Mr. DiGiovanna was nominated for the position of city court justice in 1946, but declined it when he was nominated on the State ticket for attorney general.

Although unsuccessful in the campaign, he got a great thrill out of the vigorous effort he made for the post, and gained valuable support which stood him in good stead two years later when he successfully made the run for justice of the supreme court of the second district.

OTHER OFFICES DECLINED

The judge indicated that he has been approached for other public offices since he became supreme court justice, but that he had declined all of them.

"I'm extremely happy in this position, and with 8½ years still to go on my term, I feel I owe it to those who elected me to finish it. And I've no thoughts of retiring after that either," he added.

"I'm convinced that justice can be done. But I try to be careful in exercising the letter of the law when such a step is indicated, or an interpretation of the law, when that is called for. Sometimes a judge has to split a law right down the middle, observing both the letter and the interpretation."

Probably the most widely known of Justice DiGiovanna's decisions on the supreme court bench was his upholding of New York State's "released time" program for religious instruction in public schools, which gives pupils the option of 1 hour a week to obtain the religious instruction of their choice.

Two Brooklyn citizens had contended that the program violated the first amendment of the Constitution, and Justice DiGiovanna ruled against them.

His decision was appealed all the way to the Federal Supreme Court and was upheld at each level. Of this, Justice DiGiovanna is still very proud. "I've received more than 350 letters from all over the United States commenting favorably on my decision," he said.

"My decision in the matter was based on my belief that the separation of church and state guarantees freedom of religion rather than freedom from religion."

A devout Catholic, he was taught the faith by Msgr. Ottavio Silvestri, now dead, who was pastor of St. Joseph's Church at 185 Suydam Street, in the neighborhood where Mr. DiGiovanna lived in his youth and young manhood. He considered the monsignor not only his religious mentor, but his friend and counselor.

He's a lifelong, and proud of it, resident of Brooklyn, residing at various times in the city line section, East New York, Brownsville, Williamsburg, Bushwick, Bay Ridge, and now at 9 Prospect Park West in Park Slope with his wife Tigelia, and three children.

The story of his marriage to Tigelia portrays a man of determined purpose. In 1936, he went all the way to Rome, where she was studying, to marry her. The story was news in this country because four different ceremonies were required in Italy before the union could be sanctioned by all authorities.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Printing and binding for Congress, when recommended to be done by the Committee on Printing of either House, shall be so recommended in a report containing an approximate estimate of the cost thereof, together with a statement from the Public Printer of estimated approximate cost of work previously ordered by Congress within the fiscal year (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 145, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on Printing, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. The money derived from such sales shall be paid into the Treasury and accounted for in his annual report to Congress, and no sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

A

IN T

Mr
of th
peop
bill,
vision
the s
busin
Th
Reve
years
the
work
highe
been
belie
this w
Un
8300,
$827
fit in
tax la
It
chang
will
8.5 m
divide
moth
tax cu
from
lion
rule,
annui
conse
easier
plus 6
The
filling
Gover
mit lo
Adm
made
made
tax cu
ary 1,
of $3
In a
tax re
reduc
1, 195
back
most
to 5 p
Eigh
billion
to in
hold—
cerns.
Eisenh
additi
pocke

Appendix

Analysis of the Tax Revision Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. GLENN BEALL
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 10, 1954

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, because of the great interest expressed by the people of Maryland in the tax-revision bill, I have prepared a digest of its provisions which are of specific benefit to the small taxpayers—individuals, small business, and farmers.

The revision of our entire Internal Revenue Code for the first time in 75 years was a mammoth undertaking, and the members of the committees who worked on that bill are deserving of the highest praise. Even if no other bill had been acted on by the 83d Congress, I believe it could truthfully be said that this was a successful Congress.

Under the provisions of House bill 8300, individuals will save a total of $827 million; and every citizen will benefit in some way from the revision of the tax law.

It is estimated that under the tax changes the following number of people will benefit: From medical deductions, 8.5 million people; from lower tax on dividends, 7 million people; from working mothers' relief, 2.1 million people; from tax cut in retirement, 1.8 million people; from changes on installments, 1.6 million people; from the new dependent rule, 1.3 million people; from change on annuities, 800,000 people; from the soil-conservation rule, 500,000 people; from easier depreciation, 9.6 million people—plus 600,000 corporations.

The Eisenhower administration is fulfilling its campaign pledge to "reduce Government spending and thereby permit lower taxation."

Administration economies and cuts made by Congress in the appropriations made practicable the 10 percent income tax cut which went into effect on January 1, 1954, with a saving to the public of $3 billion.

In addition to that 10 percent income-tax reduction, a billion dollar excise-tax reduction was voted by Congress on April 1, 1954. In general, excise taxes were cut back to 10 percent, although taxes on most household appliances were slashed to 5 percent.

Eight hundred million dollars of the billion dollars voted in excise cuts will go to individuals—about $20 per household—and $200 million to business concerns. All the tax cuts approved by the Eisenhower administration will put an additional $100 in the average taxpayer's pocket.

Mr. President, I request unanimous consent to have the digest of the tax revision bill, H. R. 8300, printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the digest was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

DIGEST OF H. R. 6300, REVISING THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE

The revenue revision bill, H. R. 8300, which revises our entire Internal Revenue Code, contains literally hundreds of provisions which will greatly alleviate the majority of hardships and inequities imposed by our present tax laws on taxpayers having small incomes.

Critics of the bill contend that it benefits only corporations and wealthy individuals and that practically no relief is given to the small taxpayer. It should be recognized that although this legislation is not designed as a tax-reducing measure, the taxpayer's bill, when computed, will be smaller through more and increased deductions. A greater portion of the taxpayer's income will be tax free. New rules have been designed to aid the taxpayer in working his tax costs down.

GENERAL BENEFITS TO INDIVIDUALS

The bill contains many provisions which are beneficial to individuals. Briefly, the more important changes from the standpoint of individuals are the new provisions concerning:

1. Retirement (policemen, firemen, teachers, and others): For retired individuals 65 years of age or over; or under 65, retired under some Federal, State, or local government pension plan other than military, there is provided a credit against tax liability equivalent to the tax at the first bracket rate amounting to 20 percent on the first $1,200 of annual investment income or private pension.

2. Children earning over $600: A parent is permitted to continue to claim a child as a dependent regardless of the child's earnings or investment income if he is under 19 years of age or away from home at school, as long as the parent, in fact, supplies more than one-half of the child's support.

3. Foster children: Foster children and children in process of adoption may be claimed as dependents.

4. Head of household: A taxpayer is permitted to head of household status and the partial income-splitting benefit if supporting a father or mother in a home of his or her own.

5. Medical expenses: A tax allowance is given for medical expenses in excess of 3 percent of adjusted gross income instead of only those expenses in excess of 5 percent of this income. Outlays for drugs and medicines may be included in medical expenses to the extent they exceed 1 percent of adjusted gross income. The transportation costs of a trip prescribed by a doctor may be deducted. However, the expense of meals and lodging incurred on such a trip may not be deducted. The present ceiling of $1,250 for a single person, with a maximum of $5,000 for a family, is doubled, allowing a ceiling of $2,500 for a single person with no dependents, and a maximum for a family of $10,000.

6. Working mothers: A working mother may deduct child-care costs up to $600 minus any amount which the adjusted gross income of the taxpayer and her spouse exceeds $4,500. Thus, if a woman and her husband have an adjusted gross income of $4,700 the deduction may not exceed $400 ($600-$4,700-$4,500 $400).

7. Working widows: A widow with one or more children under 12 years of age or handicapped children can deduct up to $600 for costs of child care while working. This relief is also provided for a divorced person, or legally separated person or a woman whose husband is unable to work providing that the taxpayer works and has child care costs as defined.

8. Death of spouse: A taxpayer suffering the loss of a spouse can continue for a period of 2 years the benefits of income-splitting if there are dependent children to support.

9. The allowance of an exemption where several individuals support a dependent: The bill provides that where a dependent is supported by two or more taxpayers they may agree among themselves on who will get the exemption. Under existing law, where an aged relative is supported by the joint contributions of a number of members of his family no one of them can claim the exemption.

10. Annuity income: The bill grants relief by providing that annuities are to be taxed under the life-expectancy method. Annual exclusions will be determined by dividing the total consideration paid for the annuity by the expected life of the annuitant. As a result, in the average case where the annuitant lives out his life expectancy he will completely recover his capital free of tax.

12. Home owners: In the event a taxpayer purchases a home the title can be in the names of husband and wife without incurring liability under the gift tax provisions.

The taxpayer who sells his home can, in computing the basis of the property, reduce the sales price by any sales commissions paid, painting expense, and other expenses incurred in making the property salable.

Another benefit to home owners is the provision which grants to persons living in co-op housing developments a tax deduction for their share of the interest and taxes paid by the development.

13. Personal injury and sickness: The bill provides for an exclusion of income up to $100 a week for payments for personal injury or sickness made under a plan financed by the employer where the payments are in lieu of wages. This exclusion will not apply to the first 7 days an employee is absent from work unless such absence is on account of personal injury or if the employee is hospitalized on account of sickness for 1 day during the period of absence.

Benefits which reimburse the employee for expenses incurred for his own medical care and for the medical care of his spouse or his dependents will also be exempt. In addition, the bill makes it clear that certain payments for injury if made without regard to the employee's absence from work are to be exempt. These are payments for the permanent loss, or loss of use, of a member, or function, of the body or for permanent disfigurement. These payments may be made with respect to the taxpayers, his spouse, or his dependents.

14. Alimony: Under this measure payments of alimony or separate maintenance constitute a tax deduction to the husband and makes the wife taxable on any payments made under a written separation agreement

even without a court decree where the husband and wife file separate returns. Payments to a wife under a court decree entered into after March 1, 1954, will be treated in the same way as alimony payments.

15. Inventors: More liberal treatment of income is provided for inventors.

16. Ministers of the Gospel: The cash paid to a minister by a church for the rental of a parsonage will be tax free.

17. Policemen: Generally subsistence allowance paid to Federal, State, or local policemen will be tax-free up to $5 per day.

18. Contributions: The amount deductible for contributions is increased from 20 to 30 percent, providing the additional 10 percent goes to churches, schools, and hospitals.

19. Installment purchases: A taxpayer can deduct the carrying charges on installment purchases up to 6 percent of the average unpaid balance even when such charges do not show the portion which is interest.

20. Employees and outside salesmen: Business transportation expenses such as bus, taxi, and other fares may be deducted by employees and outside salesmen in computing adjusted gross income even where out-of-town travel is not involved. The cost of automobile operation such as oil, gasoline, maintenance, and depreciation can be deducted to the extent such expenses are actually incurred in business. Such expenses can be deducted and the taxpayer will still be able to take the 10-percent standard deduction.

21. Death benefits: The law has been liberalized by extending the $5,000 exemption to death benefits paid without a contract and to distributions from qualified profit-sharing, stock bonus, pension, or employee annuity plans even though the deceased had a nonforfeitable right to the money while living.

22. Writers and artists: The bill provides that income from a 2-year project can be averaged over the years required for the job.

23. Insurance: A life insurance policy made payable to the wife or child of a taxpayer will not be included in the taxpayer's taxable estate if the taxpayer irrevocably assigned the policy to his wife or child.

24. Shareholders: An exclusion is provided for the first $50 of dividend income received by an individual in any taxable year ending after July 31, 1954. Taxpayers with dividend income remaining after this exclusion will be permitted to deduct from their final tax a credit of 4 percent of such dividends received after August 1, 1954.

25. Subdivided land: Taxpayers who are not regular dealers in real estate subdivide land in order to make it more saleable will receive more liberal treatment. Such taxpayers will be allowed capital gains treatment on most of their profits providing the property is held for longer than 5 years and that no improvements substantially enhancing the property have been made.

In addition to the many tax benefits available under this bill to small-tax payers, the following provisions are of particular benefit to small businesses:

26. Accelerated depreciation: The bill continues all depreciation allowable under present law, and in addition grants taxpayers the right, at their option, to use the diminishing-balance method of depreciation at double the rate available under the straight-line method, or to use any other systematic method which does not give greater aggregate charges than those available under the declining-balance method. This provision applies to all types of tangible depreciable assets, including farm equipment, machinery, and buildings, rental housing, and industrial and commercial buildings, as well as machinery and equipment. This provision will particularly help farmers in financing their machinery.

27. Business debts: Bad debts of a business nature can be taken as an ordinary business loss even if they become bad after the taxpayer is out of business.

28. Research and development expenses: Provision provides specifically that a business can either write off research and experimental costs in the year in which incurred or elect to treat them as deferred expenses to be written off over a period of 5 years or more.

29. Accumulation of earnings: Section 102 provides that the first $30,000 of accumulated earnings will not be counted in determining whether there has been an unreasonable accumulation. These provisions have been liberalized to provide greater protection for the taxpayer.

30. Corporate reorganizations: The tax law is amended to permit tax-free rearrangements of stockholders' interests in corporations, so long as no corporate earnings are withdrawn.

31. Loss carryback: The carryback provision is extended to 2 years. The 5-year carryforward provision has been continued.

32. Percentage depletion: The allowance for percentage depletion has been liberalized and a number of new nonmetallic minerals have been added to the 15 percent group. The strategic and critical minerals, if produced in the United States, have been increased to 23 percent. Other changes have been made in the groups now allowed 5 and 10 percent.

34. Partners and partnerships: The measure liberalizes and clarifies the law with respect to partners and partnerships. Payments by the firm of a guaranteed salary to a partner are taxable to him and deductible to the firm. The transfer of property to a partner from the firm usually will be tax free. Also certain partnerships may elect to be taxed as a corporation.

35. Sole proprietors: An individual who owns his own business as a sole proprietor may elect under certain conditions to be taxed as a corporation.

36. Prepaid income: The measure liberalizes the provisions relating to prepaid income by allowing a taxpayer to report such income as earned and to take expenses as incurred. This will result in less bookkeeping work for the taxpayer.

37. Business losses: The measure liberalizes the provisions relating to business losses by allowing such losses to be offset against profits of 2 prior years. Such losses may continue to be offset against 5 future years.

38. Losses from theft: Such losses may now be deducted in the year of discovery rather than in the year of theft.

39. Investment firms: Regulated investment companies will be permitted to invest in a greater amount of the stock of new and speculative development companies without loss of its special tax treatment.

40. Accounting definitions: Tax accounting is brought more nearly in line with accepted business accounting by allowing prepaid income to be taxed as it is earned rather than as it is received, and by allowing reserves to be established for known future expenses.

41. Administrative provisions: Parts of the law covering assessments, collections, interest and penalties, the statute of limitations, and other administrative provisions have been simplified and brought together in one place.

42. Returns and declarations of estimated tax: The bill provides a new set of requirements for the filing of declarations of estimated tax which will be beneficial to all taxpayers and will relieve a substantial number of individuals of the burden in preparing these returns. Moreover, the bill provides a uniform additional charge of 6 percent for unpaid installments of estimated tax and eliminates many of the penalty provisions.

In addition to the many tax benefits available under this measure to farmers as individuals, the following provisions are of specific benefit to them as a group:

43. Accelerated depreciation: The bill continues all depreciation allowable under present law, and in addition grants taxpayers the right, at their option, to use the diminishing-balance method of depreciation at double the rate available under the straight-line method, or to use any other systematic method which does not give greater aggregate charges than those available under the declining-balance method. This provision applies to all types of tangible depreciable assets, including farm equipment, machinery and buildings, rental housing, and industrial and commercial buildings, as well as machinery and equipment. This provision will particularly help farmers in financing their machinery.

44. Soil and water conservation expenditures: This provision is an extremely important feature of the bill and will be of direct benefit to about 500,000 farmers and of indirect benefit to all by fostering sound conservation practices. The bill will allow farmers to deduct expenditures for soil and water conservation, including those for leveling, grading, terracing, drainage, contour furrowing, eradication of brush, planting of windbreaks, and other expenses for treatment or moving of earth. The bill makes it clear that the provision applies to earthen dams not subject to depreciation and to the construction as well as the control and protection of water courses, outlets, and ponds.

The provision is also applicable for expenditures by farmers to satisfy special assessments of soil or water conservation districts. The annual deduction is limited to 25 percent of farm income, but amounts in excess of this limit may be carried forward to be deducted in subsequent years.

45. Declarations of estimated tax: The bill extends to farmers an extension of time for filing final returns to February 15. In addition the bill treats oyster farming as "farming" for purposes of the estimated tax.

46. Children earning over $600: This provision allows a taxpayer to claim the dependency exemption for children they support who are under 19 years of age or away from home attending school or college even though the children's earnings are in excess of $600 as long as he is in fact still supported by the parent (more than one-half of the support).

47. Accounting provisions: Under present law, there are numerous divergencies between the computation of income for tax purposes and the computation of income for business purposes, even though the business follows generally accepted accounting principles. The points of difference between business accounting and tax accounting are confined chiefly to questions of whether certain types of receipts and expenses should be taken into account in arriving at taxable income. Frequently picayune in nature, these differences are a constant source of irritation and hardship to business. The bill will bring tax accounting into closer harmony with sound business accounting. Under these provisions a farmer may use a hybrid type of accounting which may be more adaptable to the way he keeps his books.

Scholarships for Foreign Students

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 10, 1954

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Fifteen Foreign Students Get Scholarships," published in the Northwest Arkansas Times of August 6, 1954. It refers to the scholarship program of the University of Arkansas.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Fifteen Foreign Students Get Scholarships

Scholarships have been awarded to 15 foreign students for the coming year by the University Foundation for International Exchange of Students, Miss Mary Droke, president, announced today.

Latin American students will be included in the scholarship group for the first time since the foundation began awarding scholarships 5 years ago. In addition, there are scholarship students from Europe and Asia.

Those receiving scholarships and the fields they will study are: Eugenio Schieber, Guatemala, plant pathology; Ann Wilstermann—Grageda, Bolivia, English; Sara Perez—Jimenez, Costa Rica, education; Ana Malagro Consuegra, El Salvador, English and education; Jarwant Chandari, India, home economics; Michael Dertouzos, Greece, electrical engineering; Martine Descamps, France, business administration and English; Linos Dounias, Greece, architecture; Anneke Bernet Kempers, the Netherlands, speech and dramatic art; Seidi Lofstrom, Finland, English; Kirsten Petersen, Denmark, journalism; Else Sjorup, Denmark, arts and sciences; Matsuji Uechi, the Ryukyus, business administration; Yen Chor Lee, Hong Kong, electrical engineering; and Gilbert DuParc, France, business administration.

Scholarships are being offered through the foundation by individuals, churches, and other organizations. Groups assisting in the scholarship program for the coming year are the Arkansas Senior Federation of Women's Clubs; Delta Kappa Gamma; Fort Smith Junior Civic League; Roger Rotary Club, Fayetteville Rotary, Kiwanis, Lions, and Business and Professional Women's Clubs; Fayetteville branch of the American Association of University Women; World Affairs group of Fayetteville; the First Baptist and First Christian Churches of Fayetteville; and Wesley Foundation of the Central Methodist Church of Fayetteville.

Hon. Laurie C. Battle

SPEECH

OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 5, 1954

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. Boykin] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time to give the Alabama delegation and any other friends in Congress here an opportunity to say a word about a great man and a good man, a wonderful soldier and statesman, just an all-around good and great American, Laurie Battle, who is retiring from the Congress this session.

Laurie Battle, as you know, did not run for his seat here in the House this year and he will retire to private life in Birmingham, one of the great cities not only of Alabama but of the earth.

You men here who have served so long with this wonderful and fine man will miss just as we of the Alabama delegation will miss him. But I imagine he will be coming back very often and some day he make take his seat again, who knows, because in that district they love this man who has served so well, who has worked so hard, who has done such an outstanding job not only for his district and for his State but for his Nation.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOYKIN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I served with the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. Battle] on the Foreign Affairs Committee. He is author of the Battle Act for the control of the East-West trade. He has made magnificent contributions not only to the committee but to the policy of our whole Nation and I think the Nation owes him a debt of gratitude. I wish him God speed and the best in the days ahead.

Mr. BOYKIN. I thank the gentleman from New York for his contribution.

Representative Thomas E. Martin, Father of Our National Stockpile for Strategic War Materials

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL CUNNINGHAM

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 9, 1954

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to include my remarks in the Appendix of the Record, I insert four articles by Mr. Holmes Alexander, of the McNaught Syndicate, all of which appeared in the Los Angeles Times under the dates of March 8, 9, 10, and 11, 1954.

The articles follow:

[From the Los Angeles Times of March 8, 1954]

Whose Weird Hands Pull the Strings?

(By Holmes Alexander)

On March 7, 1944, the late Harry Dexter White addressed a memorandum to his chief at the Treasury Department, Secretary Henry Morgenthau, stating the premise that:

"Although our domestic reserves of petroleum, tungsten, and zinc may suffice to meet consumption requirements for the next decade, they will be almost entirely dissipated at the end of that period," meaning by the year 1954 or thereabouts.

From this premise Assistant Secretary White went on to draw the conclusion that:

"The necessity of growing United States dependence on foreign sources of supply * * * is inescapable."

On January 10, 1945, Secretary Morgenthau, following further conclusions by White, wrote to President Roosevelt that:

"I suggest consideration be given to a financial arrangement with the U. S. S. R. to provide * * * us chiefly in strategic raw materials which are in short supply in the United States. * * * An important feature of this proposal is that we will be conserving our depleted natural resources by drawing on Russia's."

On July 23, 1946, President Truman sent Congress a message blasting a newly passed proviso known and self-defined as the "Buy American Act." In this message Mr. Truman did several things which are of importance as of today.

He accepted the Harry Dexter White assumption that this country was getting dangerously low on natural resources. This assumption by hindsight makes no sense at all. In 1954 we are better off than ever in raw materials.

Mr. Truman, working from White's false premise, reached the shaky conclusion that we should rely on Soviet Russia and other foreign and faraway nations for our metals, minerals and fuels. While he couldn't veto the Buy American Act without destroying the whole stockpiling program of which it was a part, Mr. Truman used his executive authority to accomplish much the same result. He noted that there was a "serious conflict between these (Buy American) provisions and the foreign economic policy which this government is actively pursuing." He virtually instructed the State Department to find means of making an end run around the will of Congress.

This end run was attempted and partly accomplished through a series of interlocking agencies under full or partial control of the State Department. One of the early agencies was the International Trade Organization (ITO) which became stillborn when Congress declined to authorize American participation. With the outbreak of the Korean war, however, the State Department joined an outfit called the International Materials Conference (IMC) without benefit of congressional approval.

Last year the 83d Congress passed a measure (S. Res. 143) which authorized the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to look into the economics of our needed metals, minerals and fuels. A subcommittee, headed by Malone, of Nevada, worked all last summer and fall collecting data on the subject. This winter the subcommittee hoped to wind up its study with some testimony from the State Department.

At first the testimony was refused on grounds of security. Later it was admitted in secret session. There it developed that Ike-appointed officials at the State Department were signing letters and making speeches written for them by the same persons who had perpetrated the end run for Mr. Truman. We may now lift some dialog from hitherto classified testimony.

Chairman Malone. I know this President (Truman) and thoroughly disagree on practically everything he did. But he was a patriot. He was not a traitor to his country. He did not know who was writing these memos and releases, who was planting these ideas and concepts in his mind. That is the danger to the (Eisenhower) administration * * *. We are still carrying out the plans and schemes of Mr. White and his successors.

State Department Witness. Sir, are you saying that Mr. White's plans and schemes are mine?

Malone. I am saying that somebody is carrying out those schemes.

This provocative point seems a good place to suspend the story for today. There is a well-established maxim around town, "The hand which writes the memo in modern affairs of state often writes the policy, too."

[From the Los Angeles Times of March 9, 1954]

Whose Are the Hands?

(By Holmes Alexander)

In January 1939 the 76th Congress assembled and a freshman Representative named Thomas Ellsworth Martin, Republican, of Iowa, was assigned to the Military Affairs Committee—an obscure event which was, and is, to have some historical significance.

Representative Martin's qualifications for the Military Affairs Committee were not impressive. He had been in the Regular Army, 1917–19, and had served in France as an infantry officer in World War I. Afterward, along with being a young lawyer and tire salesman, he taught military science and tactics at the University of Iowa, 1921–23.

But these two experiences-at-arms gave him an abiding interest—indeed, a lifelong obsession—concerning the subject of national defense. To understand MARTIN's outlook it's necessary to stress the adjective "national" and to define it as meaning the United States Armed Forces plus the United States war-waging economy.

MARTIN was astonished to find, when settling down to work on the Military Affairs Committee, that the country had no law for stockpiling strategic and critical materials for war waging. This glaring lack of military thrift existed in the face of World War I experience with German submarines and of common knowledge that Adolf Hitler was building a new submarine fleet capable of blockading the seaports. MARTIN submitted his own bill of remedies and in June 1939 it became our first Stockpile Act, Public Law 117.

Then began for Representative MARTIN as strange an experience as any American lawmaker ever endured. From that day to this, 15 years this summer, MARTIN has witnessed—and has battled—the ceaseless and sly efforts of persons in the executive departments to pervert the will of Congress, to sabotage the Stockpile Act, to make America dependent upon faraway nations for her war-waging potential.

In February 1941 there was a House investigation which criticized the Roosevelt administration for failure to carry out "the spirit and intent of Public Law 117." But we had already become the "arsenal of democracy" and were exporting war materials at a great rate to our allies, including Russia, and for that matter to Japan. Soon we were at war, joining the ghastly death dance of alliances with its ever-changing partners, and the national stockpile became little more than a lend-lease depot.

When peace groke out, MARTIN tried again. He was in the forefront of the 79th Congress which established a new Stockpiling Act, Public Law 520, signed by President Truman, January 23, 1946. The purposes of the act were to encourage American production of strategic minerals, metals, fuels; to set these aside in a national storage; to "buy American" first and foreign goods only as they were needed for American self-defense.

But odd things began to happen. First, President Truman stated that this act of Congress, duly signed by him, ran counter to his plans of sharing American wealth with the world. Next, in November 1946, the State Department represented the United States at a London conference where a group of "planners" from 12 nations enunciated a share-the-wealth program. It soon became (and has substantially remained) the American policy of giveaway.

Early in 1947 there was chartered the International Trade Organization (ITO), but Congress declined to join up as the State Department urged. Even so, the stockpile languished at about 20 percent of capacity, while we purchased foreign raw materials under the Marshall plan and its successors. In January 1951, the State Department joined a 12-nation group called the International Materials Conference (IMC) for the division of raw materials among the have-nots.

Again, we'd gone a long way from the simple, primitive purposes of save America. How did it happen and why does the situation still prevail?

"I am convinced," Representative MARTIN recently testified, "that * * * the initiation of (foreign trade) policy stems from second and third echelon career employees * * * able to foist their plans and schemes on their busy superiors.

[From the Los Angeles Times of March 10, 1954]

WHOSE ARE THE HANDS?

(By Holmes Alexander)

Representative THOMAS E. MARTIN is "father" of our national stockpile for strategic war-making materials but you'd hardly guess it from his background.

MARTIN is a Republican from the First Congressional District of Iowa where corn-hog farming is the main industry and where there's next to no interest or investment in minerals, metals, fuels, and the like.

What turned MARTIN from a dilettante to an expert, from a casual politician to a torchbearer for national defense, was the dawning evidence of a creepy conspiracy against American military security and self-sufficiency. As a freshman Congressman in 1939, a member of the Military Affairs Committee, he initiated the legislation for military stockpiling. From that day to this—but let him tell it in formal testimony before a Senate subcommittee:

"Mr. MARTIN. I have been checking on the causes for the abysmal failure of the stockpile program ever since (it) started. I can come to no other conclusion than that they (some State Department "planners") had every intent in the world to by-pass and prevent the carrying out of the will of Congress as set forth in Public Law 520 (the Stockpile Act) * * * They (the same planners) * * * are using every means and device * * * to help them achieve that purpose * * * They were obviously trying to set up an international control that was supreme and above our own national plan of (military) operation, and they were doing it without the proper channels of authority * * * in defiance of our own law * * * emasculating the stockpile * * * forcing us to be dependent on long and dangerous sea lanes * * * to the end that we as a nation would be dependent upon this international organization and to that extent have surrendered a good part of our sovereignty."

(Who are "they"? What are some of their methods? Answers will be forthcoming if and when some once-classified testimony is released by the Senate subcommittee which is currently examining the subject. But meanwhile:)

"Mr. MARTIN. Policy frequently stems from second- and third-echelon career employees * * * still following the concepts of the old Acheson-Hiss policy. This group has exhibited undue interest in state trading * * * which negates American concepts of free, competitive, private enterprise. * * * Note that Willard L. Thorpe, then Assistant Secretary of State, and Thomas C. Blaisdell, Jr., then Assistant Secretary of Commerce for International Trade, were active. * * *

"The CHAIRMAN. Could this have been the same Thomas Blaisdell * * * responsible for the employment of William Remington by the Government?

"Mr. MARTIN. Yes. * * * At the London conference, Willis Armstrong. * * *

"The CHAIRMAN. The same Willis Armstrong who is still in the State Department?

"Mr. MARTIN. Yes. * * * He first entered Government service as a translator in the American Embassy at Moscow. He subsequently was connected with the Lend-Lease Administration. * * * He then became the director of the Russian shipping area for the War Shipping Administration. He has lectured at the Amercian University and has apparently been most interested in the Russian 5-year plans and in state trading rather than in our own free competitive economy. This is the kind of an individual who has played such an important part in the development of these plans."

(Much documentary material has been kept off the record by the simple device of classifying it as "secret." Earlier this year the then Under Secretary of State Donald Lourie sent a signed letter to a Senate subcommittee, refusing to reveal 34 secret documents. These subsequently proved to be not secret but just as embarrassing to the State Department.)

"The CHAIRMAN. When you wrote this letter to me, you did dictate the letter, did you not?

"Mr. LOURIE. It was dictated for me, and I signed it."

Lourie, second in command at the State Department, recently resigned and went back to his job in private business, a real loss to the Eisenhower team.

But the man who wrote that letter is still at the State Department helping to manage economic affairs.

[From the Los Angeles Times of March 11, 1954]

END RUNS AROUND CONGRESS

(By Holmes Alexander)

On March 21, 1952, Charles E. Wilson, then head of Defense Production Administration, recited a lengthy statement before the Senate Banking Committee, beginning with this sentence:

"Throughout the fall of 1950, the Government took a number of first steps to meet specific and general problems of raw materials shortages."

What a funny coincidence. Twenty-nine days before, on February 19, 1952, Edmund E. Getzin, a materials and metals staffer of the State Department, had made a public speech which opened with exactly the same sentence. In fact the several hundred words which followed that opening sentence were almost identical in presenting an argument for a share-the-wealth economy in warmaking materials.

This is one of many examples of how a little band of willful economists in the State Department dubbed their own sound track into the utterances of top-drawer Federal officials who passed along these ideas as their own.

On July 3, 1952, the House of Representatives, in rollcall No. 137, amended a State Department appropriations bill. The specific purpose of the amendment was to forbid the State Department to spend money on the International Materials Conference (IMC). This outfit was a multinational group to divvy up American natural resources among the have-not countries. Look what happened. Some 48 days later, on August 20, 1952, the Defense Production Administration announced that it was picking up the check for IMC, described in the House amendment as an international organization "to which the United States does not belong."

This is one of many examples of how the same little band of State Department economists—Armstrong, Evans, Getzin, Kalljarvi are some of the names—managed to make tricky end runs around the intent and purpose of Congress.

Most of the information in this series of columns comes from material soon to be made public by a Senate subcommittee.

I have debated with my conscience about the use of proper names. These are times in which it may be harmful to mention a person with a tone of disapproval or disagreement. The economists who have been named by me are much brighter and better trained in their field than I am. I presume that they are preaching and practicing what they believe is best for America, though I'm against all this globalissimo myself.

The questions I wish to raise are not concerned with loyalty but with fitness. Long ago the Federal departments became infiltrated with giveaway-tradeaway artists, some Communist and some not. But even presuming, as I prefer to do in this instance, that today's share-the-wealth planners are all loyal—what the devil are they doing in this free-enterprise administration, anyhow?

One answer, though by no means a satisfactory one, is that they came in with the Roosevelt administration and learned about giveaway then. Lend-lease, you'll remember, was a plan for share the wealth with our allies and friends, one of which was Russia.

Congressional figures show that we shipped about $9,500,000,000 worth of goods to wartime Russia, plus another $1,500,000,000 in services. But, according to a breakdown by one of the lend-lease expediters, George Racey Jordon, only 49 percent of these goods were munitions and weapons. The remaining 51 percent, over $4,800,000,000, was largely for the general build-up of the Soviet economy. For the purposes of this article, I note that over $3 billion, about 30 percent of the whole, took the form of industrial materials and products, including those relating to atomic manufacture.

No one would dispute, I take it, that this massive transfer of American wealth to a friend and ally in the 1940's has placed a murderous opportunity in the hands of an enemy here in the 1950's.

There seems to be an ultramodern idea that international amity lies at the foot of the giveaway rainbow, though nothing in our experiences of war or peace seems to bear it out.

A much saner proverb, it seems to me, is the old-fashioned one about trusting only God and keeping the powder dry. It'll do till a better one comes along.

Statement Condemning the Diversion of Veterans' Employment Funds Under the Labor Department Appropriations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 5, 1954

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, my attention has been called to the action of the Senate in changing the language in the Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriation Act, 1955—Public Law 472, 83d Congress, approved July 2, 1954—so as to make it possible to divert the funds appropriated for the Veterans' Employment Service, Bureau of Employment Security, Department of Labor, to other uses within the Bureau of Employment Security. I cannot but condemn this action; particularly as I am informed that there are now some 75,000 unemployed veterans in California. After their patriotic service to their country the least that can be done for them is to refrain from cutting down on the possibilities of employment help whereby these deserving men and women might support themselves and their families.

The specific matter in H. R. 9447, the bill which became Public Law 472, to which I refer appears in the first paragraph under the heading "Bureau of Employment Security." It provided, as reported by the House committee:

> Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the general administration of the employment service and unemployment compensation programs, including temporary employment of persons, without regard to civil-service laws, for the farm placement migratory labor program; and not to exceed $10,000 for services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); $4,650,000, of which $1,100,000 shall be for carrying into effect the provisions of title IV (except sec. 602) of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944.

The appropriations for this purpose for 1954 had been $5,300,000, later adjusted to $5,273,400, with $1,100,000 thereof for the Veterans' Employment Service under title IV, supra. The budget, fiscal year 1955, page 840, recommended that these figures be cut to $4,760,000 for the Bureau of which $700,000 was to be for the Veterans' Employment Service. As indicated by the quotation, supra, the House committee cut the appropriation for whole Bureau to $4,650,000 but kept the amount required to be used for the Veterans' Employment Service at $1,100,000 stating in its report—House Report No. 1756, 83d Congress, page 3—that—

> The bill includes $4,650,000, a reduction of $110,000 from the request, and $650,000 from the appropriation for 1954. The amount recommended includes $1,110,000 for the Veterans' Employment Service which is the same amount appropriated for 1954, but $400,000 above the amount recommended in the budget. It is the committee's opinion that the amount recommended is about the minimum necessary for an effective VES program. When the time comes that the program is not needed, it should be eliminated entirely, but to appropriate for the abbreviated and ineffective program proposed by the budget would have been a waste of funds.

The House passed the bill with the amounts recommended by the committee.

The Senate committee reported out the bill with the amounts as passed by the House but recommended that the word "shall", after the figures $1,100,000, be changed to "may." The Senate committee's report—Senate Report No. 1623, 83d Congress—does not comment upon this proposed change. The Senate accepted the word "may" and passed the bill with the total amount for the Bureau increased to $4,760,000.

The conference committee set the amount for the whole Bureau at $4,705,000 and retained the discretionary provision respecting the amount which might be used for the Veterans' Employment Service—House Report No. 1988, 83d Congress, page 5—stating:

> Strikes language proposed by the House and inserts language proposed by the Senate to give the Department discretion in determining the total amount to be set aside for the Veterans' Employment Service.

The result of all this is that the bill enacted as Public Law 472 appropriates $4,705,000 for the Bureau of Employment Security of which any amount up to $1,100,000 may be used for the Veterans' Employment Service in the discretion of the Secretary of Labor.

Let me emphasize again my absolute opposition to this device whereby the funds needed to help make veterans self-supporting can be diverted to make up and modify cuts made in the funds for other nonveteran services of the Bureau of Employment Security.

A Report To My Constituents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRIS ELLSWORTH
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 9, 1954

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, since I have been a Member of the House of Representatives I have made reports regularly to the people of the Fourth Congressional District of Oregon. A weekly letter from Washington is sent to the newspapers in the district. That letter is regularly printed in most of them. This year, as I have done before at the conclusion of a term of Congress, I have prepared a summary or report on this, the 83d Congress, which includes a statement of my own activities. I now present this report to the House and I shall circulate it as widely as possible in the congressional district which I represent.

The duties and responsibilities of a Member of the majority party in Congress when that party also has won the Presidency are, I find, considerably heavier than when we were in the minority. In addition, several improvement projects in our district, which have been under study for years, came to the point of congressional authorization this year. These facts made the work of my office much heavier than in any previous year of my service here. It is with considerable pleasure and satisfaction, though, that I am able to report the passage by the House of Representatives of a sizeable number of bills which I introduced and which are of benefit to the Oregon Fourth Congressional District as well as to the whole country.

ELLSWORTH BILLS PASSED

Following is a brief summary of bills introduced by me in this Congress which were passed by the House:

H. R. 4541 authorizes the inclusion of power generation in the Cougar flood-control dam on the McKenzie and the Green Peter flood-control dam on the South Santiam—also the authorization of the construction of the White Bridge reregulating dam on the South Santiam. This bill was incorporated in the river and harbors and flood-control omnibus bill.

H. R. 4118, providing for the preparation of the rolls of several coastal Indian tribes and for the distribution of funds which had previously been awarded them by the courts and for which congressional appropriations have been made. This legislation will permit the distribution of nearly $3 million to Indians who have long been entitled to receive this money.

H. R. 5603, amending the Federal Reserve Act so as to permit banks to make loans on forest lands. Previously this right has been denied since banks could make loans only on improved real property, and forest area was not so classified. This law still be of considerable value in protecting the jobs of workers in mills where such financing is needed. It will enable many sawmill properties to be financed upon a more stable basis. Some loans have already been made under this law.

H. R. 5958 settles the long-standing dispute between the Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management regarding the jurisdiction over some 462,000 acres of forest lands in the O. & C. area of western Oregon. This bill provides for the distribution of some $5 million in impounded funds to the 18 land-grant counties, and eliminates the checkerboard pattern of jurisdiction which has been a plague to good forestry management and lumbering for years. The passage of this law will not only release to the counties money which is due them under the provisions of the 1937 O. & C. Act but protect and improve the management of Government-owned timber in the area.

H. R. 7473 authorizes the construction and maintenance of a harbor at the mouth of the Rogue River at Gold Beach. The greatest economic need of the Curry County area is improved transportation, especially the availability of water shipping. The construction of this harbor will not only directly benefit all of the south coast of Oregon, but it will be of national benefit since cargo shipping will make available the present locked-in natural resources of that great area. This legislation was included in the rivers-and-harbors flood-control omnibus bill.

H. R. 7815 provides for the construction of the flood-control dam on the McKenzie known as Cougar on a partnership basis between the municipally owned Eugene Water Board electric-power system and the Federal Government. The Federal Government will be saved nearly $11 million in the cost of constructing the power facilities and a portion of the flood-control dam. The people of Eugene will have a much-needed increase in generating capacity for their utility system.

H. R. 8074 provides for a water-use and flood-control survey in the Coos County area. Protective works are needed in that area but their nature and extent can only be determined by adequate study. This bill was incorporated in the omnibus bill.

H. R. 8384 authorizes the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Talent division of the Rogue River Basin reclamation project and provides for the rehabilitation of other irrigation works. Provision is thereby made for supplying water to 17,890 acres of land of which 9,250 acres will receive additional water and 8,640 acres will be newly irrigated land. The plan represents the extension and improvement of existing works of the Talent Irrigation District together with the rehabilitation of the Medford and Rogue River Valley Irrigation Districts. A 16,000-kilowatt power generating unit will be installed. This project is a much needed improvement and will greatly benefit the economy of the Rogue River Valley. Practically all of the Federal money advanced for this work will be repaid—most of it with interest—by the landowners and electric power users of the valley.

H. R. 8431: This legislation permits a transfer of surplus hay and pasture seeds held in storage by the Commodity Credit Corporation of the Government to the Forest Service, the Bureau of Land Management, the Fish and Wildlife Service, and the National Park Service so that such seeds may be used to restock wildlife and livestock feeding ranges on Government-owned lands. The passage of this bill served the double purpose of benefiting Government lands and saving storage costs and loss through deterioration of surplus seeds owned by the Government.

House Resolution 89: This House resolution passed early in the first session of this Congress directed the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to conduct an investigation of the Indian Bureau and Indian problems in general. Hearings authorized by this resolution were held in various parts of the country including a hearing in Eugene, Oreg. The committee prepared a voluminous report in which was incorporated the testimony given by Indians. It was one of the very few times in our history that Indians have been given an opportunity to talk for themselves to a congressional committee.

OTHER LEGISLATIVE ACTIVITIES

The record of legislation introduced or bills passed by the House is by no means a complete measure of the activities of your Representative in Congress and his office. My work involves many calls upon members of the Cabinet and their assistants and the various Commissions and Bureaus. For several years I have been a member of the Republican Policy Committee of the House. I am a member of the House Rules Committee which must pass upon all legislation before it is sent to the floor.

During the nearly 6½ months of this session of Congress I have been absent from the floor on only 1 day when roll-call votes were taken. I was absent that day on official business.

I have this year, as in the past, made appearances before appropriations subcommittees in support of appropriation items for the Willamette Valley flood-control project, forest access roads, the Bureau of Mines Laboratory at Albany, Bonneville transmission lines, harbor work, and other Federal activities in the district.

It is necessary for me to keep in constant touch with the Army engineers regarding project work and emergency work in our district. Under the heading of emergency work is the reconstruction of the south jetty at the Port of Bandon where two serious shipwrecks occurred last year. One hundred and seventy-four thousand dollars has been set aside for that work which will be completed next year.

THE ACCESS ROAD PROBLEM

For years I and other Members of Congress from forested areas have been urging better appropriations for forest roads. I have been especially anxious to see a long-range planned attack on this problem rather than a year to year piecemeal approach.

The forest economy of the Douglas fir region and other forested areas of the West depends upon the development of a system of access roads in and to federally owned timber. The future supply of wood products for the entire country is likewise dependent upon access roads. Proper accessibility is essential to the sound management of our great forest reserves.

Although the situation, insofar as the attitude of the Appropriations Committees toward the problem of access roads is concerned, has been much better these last few years it was not until this year that any legislation was enacted which would permit much more than 1 year of future planning by the Forest Service.

Soon after the 83d Congress convened last year I introduced the bill (H. R. 4929) to provide a system of forest access roads by means of Treasury loans. I had been working on the wording of the bill for nearly a year. It is based upon the premise that since the price paid for timber includes the cost of building a road to it, the businesslike way of providing an access-road program would be to borrow the money, build the road, and then pay back the loan from the proceeds of the timber sale. My plan was to set up a 5-year program on that basis using $25 million a year borrowed from the Treasury to be repaid with interest within a reasonable time.

My access road plan attracted considerable favorable attention but met with serious resistance by the Bureau of the Budget and by some members of the Appropriations Committee. While I was endeavoring to get committee consideration for my bill there was written into the big roads and highways bill a paragraph—section 6—which, if given proper administrative handling, will do almost as much toward providing a planned and adequate program of timber access roads as would my plan. Section 6 of the Highway Act authorizes the expenditure and contract authority for $24 million annually for 3 years. It remains to be seen whether or not the Bureau of the Budget, the Forest Service, and the Appropriations Committee will make adequate use of this law.

THE TIMBER EXCHANGE BILL

Congress has repeatedly passed legislation to encourage and protect perpetual or sustained yield forestry practices. The Federal Government has for years urged private lumber operators to adopt such forestry practices. However, the Federal Government, under long standing laws, sometimes finds it necessary to condemn such forest lands in private ownership with the result that the local forest industry may be seriously impaired, with resulting unemployment. For flood-control reservoirs or other Federal developments, private forest lands may be taken by purchase or condemnation. The local lumber industry may find that its entire planning for 50 to 100 years of sound forestry has been destroyed.

To reduce the damage in such situations to a minimum, I introduced H. R. 4646 to provide an alternative to existing laws under which, where private timber lands of a sustained yield operation were taken by the Federal Government, an exchange of similar suitable timber lands in the same area could be made. The Government thus would have the lands desired for a project and the private lumber industry would be able to continue its sustained yield production. There would be no alteration in the cut of timber. The planned steady production of lumber and consequent employment for the community would be preserved. Briefly this was a proposal to modify the old law of paying damages to the party owning lands so as to permit the exchange of comparable lands. The present condemnation procedure compensates the private land holder with cash but deprives workers of employment and disturbs the economy of the local community. The proposed change would not only compensate the land owner but also assure employees and the community of sustained yield production.

No timber owner could benefit in the slightest degree—he could not acquire a single foot of timber more than he already owned—if such a law were passed. As presented on the floor for final passage, land in national parks, monuments, wildlife areas and other reservations could not be exchanged. Complete safeguards were most carefully written in. Nevertheless this bill was attacked on the floor as a land grab and a timber steal. It was asserted that parks and recreation areas would be ruined, that the national forests were to be turned over to private interests. Even though such statements are clearly untrue and literally dishonest, sufficient doubt was aroused in the minds of farm-State and city Members of the House so that the bill was sent back to committee.

VETERANS

I have had several conferences with Veterans' Administrator Higley and the VA Medical Director regarding the establishment of additional general medical hospital beds at Camp White. This matter is still under study by the VA.

Legislation affecting veterans and their families has always had my support. I have voted for adequate appropriations and recently voted for compensation increases and other benefits.

Some statistics regarding benefits to Oregon veterans have just been given me by Mr. Harvey V. Higley, Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

In the last year for which VA has figures—July 1, 1952, to June 30, 1953—the State of Oregon received $44,265,000 in direct and indirect benefits to veterans or their dependents. That does not include certain life insurance payments and a few other expenditures of a minor nature which cannot be broken down by States.

Of this amount, $23,431,000 was paid in cash to 31,350 living veterans or dependents of deceased veterans in the form of compensation or pension payments.

The remainder covered such benefits as GI bill education or training, vocational rehabilitation for the disabled, hospitalization, medical care, death indemnity, burial benefits, and the like.

Mr. Higley said VA benefits the local communities of Oregon in another way. The GI loan program, he said, has brought the State of Oregon and its local communities many tax dollars in the 18,775 GI home loans totaling over $117,307,000 made to date.

THE CHANGE IN WASHINGTON

In January 1953, for the first time in 20 years, a Republican-controlled Congress convened and saw the inauguration of a Republican President.

The new government was inexperienced in the techniques of administration but well supplied with sincerity and determination. The new executives, veteran antagonists of New Dealism, socialism, corruption and starry-eyed confusion in Government, knew well enough what they wanted to get rid of in Washington. They knew also what should replace that which they discarded.

It was an enormous task to which they dedicated themselves. Part of it involving clearing away the rubble of the past and part—a large part—was to build a foundation for the future.

There was no fanfare about the attack on the problems. There was no effort toward frantic speed—no attempt to emulate the famous "100 days" of the New Deal with a new and startling law or plan every day. They raised no goblins of panic and emergency at which to scream.

The first months, the first year in fact, was a period of inventory, study and planning. There were first things to do first. For instance there was a hot shooting war in Korea—it had to be ended.

Many problems were inherited. It was necessary to deal with them while also preparing for a constructive future. The first year saw much accomplished, but effort was of necessity rather heavily weighted toward patching the leaks caused by the errors of the past. In other words, accomplishment for the first year may perhaps be judged better by comparing the situation at the end of that period with what might have been.

The real legislative work of the new administration did not get fully under way until the second session. Meanwhile work had begun in the congressional committees on some of the major proposals, including the St. Lawrence seaway project, statehood for Hawaii, a look at a revision plan for the farm program, the expansion of social security, and the huge tax revision program.

ATTACKING THE PROBLEMS

After naming his Cabinet officers, a group of men selected without reference to politics but on the basis of their known ability and integrity, President Eisenhower and his Cabinet, together with their newly appointed assistants and the Congress, set to work on 10 main objectives:

First, stop wasteful spending: The outgoing administration had submitted a budget to Congress. The President and his department people set about immediately to prepare a new budget which, when it was further studied and revised by the Appropriations Committees of Congress, brought a saving of more than $12 billion when compared with the appropriations recommended by President Truman. The first step was made in the reduction of wasteful spending.

Second. Balance the budget as soon as possible: On the basis of comparing appropriations with the estimated income for the first fiscal year of the new administration it could be claimed that the financial affairs of the country were in balance. Unfortunately, however, the term "balancing the budget" means a balance between the money received by the Government and the money actually expended by it. The new administration was faced with an accumulation of appropriated but unexpended balances, mostly in the form of contracts made by the Department of Defense. Billions of dollars' worth of equipment and supplies were being manufactured and delivered to be paid for out of appropriations previously made by Congress. The money used to pay for these things, of course, came out of current revenues, with the result that at the end of the fiscal year, June 30, 1954, expenditures had exceeded income by a total of $3,029,000,000.

Third, reduce taxes: Tax reductions made since the inauguration of President Eisenhower surpass any previous total in the history of Congress. The overall tax-cut program will save taxpayers $7,400,000,000. The 10-percent reduction in personal Federal income taxes which became effective last January 1 saves a total of $3 billion annually. This tax cut would not have been possible if the Congress and the administration had not cut the Truman budget by some $12 billion. Nor would the $2 billion tax saving by elimination of the excess-profits tax have been possible without that budget reduction. The excise-tax reduction law saves taxpayers an additional $1 billion and the great Tax Revision Act will result in a saving to taxpayers of approximately $1,400,000,000.

Fourth, remove controls: Within a short time after President Eisenhower was inaugurated, all price controls, wage controls, and rent controls, which had been on us almost continuously since the beginning of World War II, were removed. It was was freely predicted by our opposition that the removal of those controls would do dire things to our economy and to prices. Those predictions never came true.

Fifth, stop the trend toward a super Federal state: The new administration and the Republican majority in Congress does not believe in the domination by the Federal Government of the lives, liberty, and property of the people of our country. In other words, we do not believe in having a Federal super state. Cooperation between the States and the Federal Government has been established and is being expanded. Definite steps have been taken to remove Government from business activities in competition with private business in our free economy. The Inland Waterways Corporation owned by the Government has been sold to private interests. A great hotel in the Virgin Islands has been sold. Tin and rubber manufacturing facilities have been disposed of. A uniform factory in the Brooklyn Navy Yard has been closed. Paint manufacturing has been virtually discontinued. Sawmill operations which were conducted by the Government have been eliminated.

Sixth, establish a firm foreign policy: As the result of the failure of the heads of our Government to understand Russian policy from 1945 on, we attempted to persuade the Russian rulers to be friendly and decent by appeasing them. In China, for example, our policy was simply to wait and "let the dust settle." After the dust did settle we found another 450 million people behind the Iron Curtain or under Communist control. At the end of World War II the rulers in the Kremlin had control only of the population of Russia, totaling about 190 million people. When the Eisenhower administration came into power some 850 million people were completely dominated by the Russian Kremlin. In 7 years, the Communist dictator has literally conquered 650 million people without the use of a single Russian soldier in action.

Obviously, what was done in those 7 years could not be undone overnight. We had fallen heir to a phony truce talk procedure being carried on in Korea, a crumbling European defense system and at the same time there was in progress a war in Indochina between the French, supported by natives, and natives who were generally called Communist-inspired guerrillas. That conflict had been in progress for many years. This was not our war but it presented a threat to world peace.

The Eisenhower administration let it be known to Asia and to the whole world soon after inauguration that any further armed aggression against free peoples would be met with retaliation. A truce was promptly negotiated in Korea. This truce was by no means a victory but it did salvage the general situation which prevailed in Korea before the conflict began.

The Communist Chinese armies did not march down across the border into Indochina in armed aggression. It is now hoped that the remaining free countries of Southeast Asia can be organized to cope with future Communist activities and infiltration attempts in that area.

Meanwhile in Europe, the people behind the Iron Curtain have renewed hope which was clearly demonstrated in the uprising of the East German people against Russian control on June 17, 1953. I was in Germany earlier this year and I believe the situation behind the Iron Curtain is smoldering and can reach a point of eruption again unless Kremlin policies are relaxed.

Seventh, stop graft and corruption: Graft and corruption so far as the people who are now working for the Government are concerned is no longer a problem. The revelations and repercussions resulting from what went on in the previous administration are, however, still making headline news. The former head of the income-tax collecting department of the Government has been sentenced to jail. Scandals in the previous housing administration uncovered this year have rocked the Capitol. Investigations continue and it is quite likely other such situations will be revealed as time goes on.

Eighth, restore confidence: The best indication that confidence has been restored in the business world and that investors are again willing to take risks is proven by the fact that the depression which the opposition party predicted so freely last year never did develop. Business conditions in the country now are considered to be healthy, employment is higher—much higher in fact than it was in 1949 and before the outbreak of the Korean War in 1950. The year 1953, the first year of the Eisenhower administration, was the most prosperous year in American history. The year 1954, according to present indications, will be only slightly lower on the economic index than 1953. The outlook for business and employment in the future seems good.

Ninth. Take Government out of business: The trend toward socialism and socialistic control by the Federal Government is clearly ended with this administration. The Government is no longer engaging in new business enterprises and is ridding itself of federally operated facilities which, in fact, have been competing with private business.

Tenth. Get rid of doubtful employees: There is no future for any member of the Communist Party, or for anyone classified as a security risk for other reasons, in Government employment any longer. Executive department and congressional investigations have caused the removal of many such people, others have been frightened out of Government.

THE EISENHOWER PROGRAM

At the beginning of the 1954 session of Congress the President sent a message to Congress in which he gave a general outline of the legislative program which he thought should be enacted. This was followed over the next several weeks with a series of messages in which he outlined specifically certain legislative recommendations. The recommendations contained in the President's messages to Congress, taken together, constitute what is referred to as President Eisenhower's program. The 83d Congress has passed laws embodying most, but not quite all, of the President's recommendations. The items in the program which have been approved by Congress include the following: Approval of several reorganization plans, the St. Lawrence seaway project, the gigantic tax-revision bill, the reduction of excise taxes, establishment of a new Air Force Academy, establishment of a new Department known as the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, a stepped-up highway-building program, expansion of the Commodity Credit Corporation's borrow capacity, an extension of the hospital-building program to include medical centers and nursing homes, at least a partial approval of the President's housing recommendations and a decided improvement in the housing law, the creation of a privately owned atomic energy industry for generating electric power, a compromised version of the flexible farm price support program, the expansion of social-security coverage, and numerous other recommendations of a minor nature.

Presidential recommendations which have not yet been approved by Congress as this report is submitted include Hawaiian statehood, a health reinsurance program, and a boost in postal rates.

The votes I have made on these and other bills represent my own considered opinions. The standard upon which my voting on legislation is based is whether or not it is best for the people of our district and the whole country. Although I have always exercised my own independent judgment when voting on legislation I have noted with some satisfaction during this Congress that the philosophy of government expressed by President Eisenhower and his administration so closely resembles my own that in nearly all cases my votes have coincided with the views of the administration.

In this report it has been my aim to set forth just as fully and as frankly as space will permit not only a record of my own work but to report also the Washington scene as I have seen it and what has been accomplished by the 83d Congress.

YOUR WASHINGTON OFFICE

The Washington office of your Congressman is a busy place. Our mail will average about 50 letters a day. Many people from Oregon visit my office every year. We are always glad to see them, because they bring news from home. I have been called upon many times for assistance by our State, county, and local officials and by veterans and others in connection with their problems with the Federal Government.

I am always glad to be of help in any way that I can. I welcome letters commenting upon legislation and expressing opinions. I reply promptly to all communications. I hope the people of the Fourth Congressional District of Oregon feel free to call upon me at any time if they think I can be of help to them. Letters should be addressed: Congressman HARRIS ELLSWORTH, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

Honoring Massachusetts Indians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 9, 1954

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein a very interesting and educational proclamation issued by the Honorable Christian A. Herter, one of our former colleagues in the House, and now Governor of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, urging recognition of Indian Day, August 12. This editorial appeared in the Lawrence Sunday Sun of Lawrence, Mass., on August 8, 1954.

It is appropriate at this time that we pause and give some study and thought to the outstanding contributions made by these Indian tribes to the advancement and progress made to build up Massachusetts so that it now stands as a bulwark among the States of this Nation.

Let it never be said that we, who have derived so much and so many advantages, brought about by these Indians and early settlers, in our haste in our daily lives shall ever for a moment forget the sacrifices they endured and the accomplishments made by them. All of us owe a debt of sincere gratitude, thanks, and appreciation to these Indians, and this scholarly proclamation of Governor Herter will again help to refresh our memories of these admired and respected people.

Attorney Charles A. Mahoney, one of the leading barristers in the city of Lawrence, Mass., and publisher of the Lawrence Sunday Sun in which this editorial appeared, is to be also complimented and congratulated for his consideration and for his allotment of so much newspaper space to properly bring this important day to the attention of the American public.

The matter referred to follows:

Honoring Massachusetts Indians

Gov. Christian A. Herter has given long-deserved recognition to the contribution of the Masachusetts Indians to our State and land by naming next Thursday, August 12, as Indian Day. His scholarly proclamation in part is as follows:

"Man's measure of his status is, by necessity, fixed in terms of recorded history. It is the hallmark of civilization that progress and achievement, whether in a material or cultural way, are being constantly reevaluated in the light of new understandings of the past and their contributions to the life of the present. And it is obvious that present experiences and lessons help us to peer back upon history with a freshened and inquisitive perspective—to extract new appreciation.

"It is in this spirit of enlightened inquiry that we reexamine the contributions of the Indian tribes of Massachusetts to our history and our lives.

"No citizen of our Commonwealth, and certainly no visitor, can help but be aware of the incidence and variety of Indian names which designate cities and towns, streams, rivers, and hills—in fact every kind of geographic entity—in all parts of our State. The name of our State derives from a great and true friend of the earliest settlers. Massasoit's welcome to the English founding fathers, his half-century pact of friendship with an alien people who came to his shores, will remain a monument to ethical principles, toleration, and respect for the meaning of a treaty. Such other outstanding Indians as Samoset, King Philip, Weetamoe, Squanto, Hobomock, and such great tribes as the Mohawks and the Wampanoags—all of them looked upon with uncertainty by the white men—were found later to be genuine friends. Even though evil days did eventually come upon the white settlers in terms of their relations to the Indians, especially in the western reaches of our Commonwealth, when bloodshed, dissent, and distrust withered the warmth and trust which so clearly characterized the beginnings of the Massachusetts Bay Colony, nothing can be detracted from the laudable characteristics of the Bay State Indians and their valuable contributions to the establishment and security of the early settlers in our Colonies. The later struggles of our colonists against hostile Indians marked a period of transition which—the calm light of history now shows us—had merit on both sides.

"In the realm of the science of government, the Indians are only today winning long overdue credit for establishing some advanced forms of union and compact. These they developed before contact was made with the great traditions of western civilization. It is significant that in 1954 we are observing the 200th anniversary of the adoption of Benjamin Franklin's plan of union by the Congress of Commissioners, which was attended by 7 of the 13 Colonies at Albany in 1754. None of the Colonies, indeed, ratified the plan, but this foundation stone was implemented 35 years later when, in 1787, Franklin had the satisfaction of helping to draft the Constitution of the United States of America. Significantly, Franklin drew the inspiration for the Albany Plan of Union from the Iroquois Confederacy of the Five Nations, which included our own Mohawks. This confederacy, formed as far back as the middle of the 16th century, at a time of constant warfare between the Indian nations, established and maintained the Great Peace which never has been shattered.

"It gave women the right to vote centuries before such enfranchisement was accepted by the American Republic, and it carried on functions which demonstrated the high state of intelligent living and understanding that the Indians possessed as a people. It would be well for all of us to examine more carefully the life, mores, and government of the red men who inhabited our Nation before our own ancestors came.

"The student of Indian life and lore is acutely aware of and impressed with the variety of his talents, the dignity of his life and attainments within the sphere of his wants and needs, and the propriety and equity of the laws by which he lived. The Indian's mark is, indeed, on our land, and indelibly so; and the significance of his pioneer contribution to the American way should not be lost upon us."

Hon. Laurie C. Battle

SPEECH

OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 5, 1954

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. Rains] could not be here. He gave me a statement and asked me to read it. He says:

> Mr. Speaker, perhaps no man has ever made warmer friends among his colleagues in Congress than has our friend Laurie Battle. He is loved and respected by all of us, and we wish him, as he leaves us at the end of this session of Congress, every success in all his undertakings.
>
> Laurie has made an excellent record representing the great Ninth District of Alabama. In his quiet, calm, and dignified way he was written a record here in the Congress which will be long remembered. Those of us in the Alabama delegation are going to miss him greatly.

That is the gentleman from Alabama Albert Rains.

I am going to ask in a few minutes that Laurie Battle take some of this time that I have, but before I do I do just want to say that he could have stayed here as long as he wanted to. Although he might have been opposed he would have defeated the opposition by a tremendous majority, because the people in that great district love and respect him. His city of Birmingham is the greatest city in Alabama, maybe in the world, but certainly in the State of Alabama at this time now, for now they are bringing in iron ore from Venezuela and will have one of the largest steel developments there in the world, and that great river system—he has helped develop everything there. Since he has been the Congressman from that district it has practically doubled in size. So I say to you that Laurie Battle could keep on coming back here.

These men here, the men in the Congress of the United States, your colleagues, who represent every human being in America, hate to see you go, but whatever your undertakings happen to be they will be delighted and glad to help and work with you because we know you would never want anything except the things that would be helpful to the people of this great Nation.

I have known Laurie Battle ever since he came here. I have known his wonderful wife, Jan, and his fine children. I know his brother. I know his office force. He has one little girl there who is on the job all the time. I would like to mention her by name but the only name in the world I know her by is "Pat," but she sure stands Pat for Laurie and his great district and she has done a fine job, and I do not think there has ever been a better secretary in the Congress of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I could talk forever about this young man who has done so much and is such a young fellow, and who will have so many opportunities. If he puts in the same amount of time, the same thought, the same work in his future undertakings that he has here he can go to any length that he wants.

The good Lord knows exactly what is best for all of us, and I know he knows what is best for Laurie Battle. As one of our colleagues said, his father was a minister, and he said he was one of the greatest in the country. Well, I think that Laurie Battle is one of the greatest Representatives, in my judgment, who has ever served in the Congress of the United States—and I have been here a long, long time.

I hate to see you go, and if you should ever want to come back I hope you will come. God bless you forever.

Mental Health

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1954

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I am happy to insert in the Congressional Record an article written by Harry Spiegel, publicity director of the New York Post Office Clerks' Association, Inc., which will appear in the forthcoming issue of the Postal News:

MENTAL HEALTH

(By Harry Spiegel)

Mental-health education today is a live, vigorous activity, and this week the United National Association of Post Office Clerks with branches in most of the principal cities of the Nation has begun an educational program through its newspaper, magazines, and service publications to overcome an apparent apathy on the part of the public toward a national problem.

Robert P. Knight, medical director of the Austen Riggs Center, of Stockbridge, Mass., says, "Human resources constitute the great wealth of any nation. Problems of human behavior must be recognized and understood, and the frontiers of knowledge must be pushed forward, if psychiatry is to fulfill its opportunity and responsibility as a medical science."

Those who are responsible for the preparation and developing of avenues of approach to the general public for disseminating of facts regarding mental health feel very strongly a keen sense of civic duty in this work.

More than 8,500,000 people in the United States are suffering from some form of mental illness—the disturbed child, the juvenile delinquent, the anxious worrier, the despairing alcoholic. Such people can certainly be helped. Just stop and think that more than 50 percent of all hospital beds in the United States are occupied by mental patients. Nine times more Americans have mental disease than have cancer. One out of three men medically discharged from the Armed Forces during World War II were discharged for neuropsychiatric reasons. At least 1 million man-years are lost to business each year because of mental illness.

Here in New York State, under the guidance of Commissioner Newton Bigelow, of the department of mental health, outstanding progress has been made in the treatment centers and study of effective psychotherapy and diagnosis and treatment of maladjusted persons. All of the mental hospitals under State supervision and veteran care have been doing magnificent work, particularly in the institution known as Kings Park out on Long Island, N. Y. This well-known hospital for veterans and civilians alike has been creating for itself an enviable record and reputation for caring, curing, and returning to a useful life in society thousands of men and women. Under a driving pace set by the energetic director, Dr. Charles Buchman, and his assistant, Dr. De Witt Brown, the entire staff have been striving for greater harmony and understanding between patient and doctor and speedier rehabilitation for fathers and mothers to be returned to their loved ones by latest mental-health methods, sympathetic understanding, and therapeutics.

We of the governmental employee groups believe that this campaign to raise funds for further psychiatric research and education is most urgent and we ask that those who would like to combat and conquer America's most neglected health problem to contribute what they can. The funds will be used to get more qualified psychiatrists, more treatment centers, and more knowledge by research.

Contribute to your local collection group in behalf of mental health. In New York City send to Mental Health, 342 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.; in New Haven, Conn., send to Dr. Olga Little, chairman, Mental Health, 956 Chapel Street, New Haven, Conn. In Chicago to Irving B. Harris, president of the Corporate Foundation for Research and Training in Psychiatry. Throughout New York State contributors should send their share to Margaret M. Farrar, editor of the Mental Hygiene News, 1213 Court Street, Utica, N. Y.

Those doctors and nurses dedicated to the service in promoting and preserving the health of the community truly have earned the respect and heartfelt gratitude of the Nation, and world as well. Particularly more so in the understanding and treatment of those sick in mind and heart. These are ills which indeed need an understanding of behavior, patience, and a fine appreciation of mental dynamics.

We salute those who care for our mentally sick and it is for us to supply the means to gain the additional research. This we can do by generously contributing to our local Mental Health Council. You will be helping in the investigation into the ego-identify problems of adolscents, research in the origin, nature, and treatment of emotional sickness. There is still so much to learn of these subjects. Help those emerge from the valley of shadows by doing your share today.

Panama Canal: A Much-Neglected Waterway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 3, 1954

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the interoceanic canal question, which has been discussed extensively in the Congress during the past few years, was recently dramatized by a series of serious events in the Canal Zone. These were the disclosure in April 1954 of deep fissures in Contractors' Hill adjacent to Culebra Cut—first observed in 1938—award of an emergency contract for removing earth and rocks from its top and face in an effort to avert interruption of transit, and a later movement in July of the long dormant Cucaracha Slide from the opposite canal bank into the channel, for a time blocking its eastern side. These incidents attracted world attention.

It is indeed most timely that a highly illuminating statement on the Panama Canal problem was published in the July 1954 issue of Civil Engineering, a magazine of the American Society of Civil Engineers—ASCE. Its authors are independent men of established ability who took part in the construction of the Panama Canal.

An editorial note accompanying the article is quoted:

> Half a dozen years ago ASCE devoted an annual convention and 300 pages of transactions (vol. 114, 1949) to a symposium on the sea-level project for the Panama Canal. Since that time the matter has been largely dormant. H. R. 1048, 83d Congress, provides for the creation of an impartial body of 9 men, an Interoceanic Canals Commission, to make a constructive study of the problem of improving the capacity of the canal and to recommend a comprehensive policy. The statement which follows was prepared for the information of Congress and expresses the considered judgment of those whose names appear at right, all of whom have, in various capacities, participated in the construction of the Panama Canal.

The attention of the Congress is invited to the references in the statement to the special qualifications of Representatives THOMAS E. MARTIN, of Iowa, and CLARK W. THOMPSON, of Texas. Their many able contributions on canal matters, published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD over a period of years, are important parts of the legislative history of the Isthmian question. They merit careful examination in connection with the subject paper, which I urge be read by every Member Congress.

The text of the statement follows:

THE PANAMA CANAL PROBLEM

(As submitted to Congress by James T. B. Bowles, Baltimore, Md.; Ralph Budd, honorary member ASCE., Chicago, Ill.; Howard T. Critchlow, member ASCE., Trenton, N. J.; Roy W. Hebard, New York, N. Y.; Herbert D. Hinman, Newport News, Va.; William R. McCann, member ASCE., Hopewell, Va.; E. Sydney Randolph, member ASCE., Baton Rouge, La.; Hartley Rowe, Boston, Mass.; William E. Russell, New York, N. Y.; Caleb Mills Saville, member ASCE, Hartford, Conn.; John Frank Stevens, Brooklyn, N. Y.; Ellis D. Stillwell, Monrovia, Calif.; William G. B. Thompson, member ASCE., New Haven, Conn.; Robert E. Wood, Lake Forest, Ill.; Daniel E. Wright, St. Petersburg, Fla.)

The necessity for increased capacity and operational improvement of the Panama Canal—a much-neglected waterway, now approaching obsolescence—has long been recognized. The traffic volume is the highest since 1914. With the saturation point approaching, it is essential to provide, without further delay, the additional transit capacity and operational improvements required to meet future needs.

The two major proposals for increased facilities are:

1. Improvement of the existing canal by completing the authorized third locks project, adapted to include the features of the well-conceived Terminal Lake plan (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Apr. 21, 1948, p. A2449—approved in principle by the (then) Governor of the Panama Canal in hearings on H. R. 4480, 79th Cong., Nov. 15, 1945, p. 9). A total of $75 million was expended on this project, mainly on lock-site excavations at Gatun and Miraflores, before work on it was suspended. The Terminal Lake plan provides for removing all lock structures from Pedro Miguel and for regrouping of all Pacific locks at or near Miraflores, thus enabling uninterrupted navigation at the Gatun Lake level between the Atlantic and Pacific locks, with a greatly needed terminal lake anchorage at the Pacific end of the canal. As thus improved, the modified third locks project can be completed at relatively low cost—estimated at under $600 million. The soundness of this proposal has been established by 40 years of satisfactory operation of a similar arrangement at Gatun.

2. Construction of a practically new Panama Canal known as the Sea-Level Project, initially estimated in 1947 to cost $2,500,000,000, and which would be of less operational value than the existing canal it was designed to replace, but which, under present conditions, would likely cost several times that amount. The [then] Governor of the Panama Canal (a member of the Corps of Engineers) at that time definitely went on record as advocating none but the so-called sea-level project for the major increase of canal facilities, which action served to exclude what may be the best solution when evaluated from all angles. This report, under Public Law 280, 79th Congress, was transmitted to the Congress by the President December 1, 1947, and significantly, without comment or recommendation. The Congress took no action, and the report was not published.

The Terminal Lake-third locks project has been strongly urged as the proper form of modernization by experienced civilian engineers who took part in the construction of the present canal. They have spoken from personal knowledge of the original construction. Their views are shared by many independent engineers and navigators who have studied the subject. All these insist that the present lake-lock type should be preserved as supplying the best canal for the transit of vessels which it is economically feasible to construct. They, together with many of the leading atomic warfare authorities, stress the points that the defense of the canal is an all-inclusive Federal responsibility which must be met by active military and naval measures and by industrial planning in the United States; that passive protective features embodied in construction design are inadequate; and that the proper bases for planning canal improvements are capacity and navigational efficiency. Moreover it must be borne in mind that the effective destructive power of the atomic bomb has been tremendously increased since the formal recommendation for a sea-level canal. Any canal, whatsoever the type, can be destroyed by atomic bombing, if permitted to strike.

The recent authorization to expend funds for repairs and alterations of present lock structures at an estimated cost of $26,500,000 is, as we believe, makeshift in character, and is without real merit. Consummation thereof, in lieu of fundamental improvements, will inevitably delay the basic and long-overdue solution of the problems involved.

In addition to the Panama projects, there are urgent proposals for canals at other locations, some of which have strong support, particularly Nicaragua. In developing a long-range Isthmian Canal policy to meet future interoceanic transit needs, these should certainly receive full and unbiased consideration.

Transcending personal considerations, but nevertheless to state the matter candidly, we submit that the third locks project, as originally planned in 1939 by the [then] Governor of the Panama Canal, has proven most disappointing. We have every reason to believe that the insistently advocated sea-level project (which, as a matter of fact, would require tidal locks as well as vulnerable flood-control reservoirs and dikes) would prove to be a monumental boondoggle, costing the American taxpayer billions of dollars. Both of these efforts were directed by routine administrative agencies, and at heavy public expense.

We wish to stress the fact that, aside from the A-bomb, the recurrent discussions as to the relative advantages and disadvantages of the lake-lock and "sealevel" types of canal were exhaustively investigated, debated, and considered in 1905–06 when the Congress and the President decided in favor of the lake-lock plan—under which the canal was constructed, and (with the exception of certain operational defects in the Pacific sector) has been successfully operated. The operational defects, we believe, can be adequately corrected.

It must be always borne in mind that the greater the cost of increased facilities at Panama the heavier will be the load on the already overwhelmingly burdened American taxpayer; and that also such cost must be reflected in shiptransit tolls, with all that increased tolls imply.

We respectfully urge the early enactment of H. R. 1048, 83d Congress, introduced by Representative Thomas E. Martin, of Iowa, and supported by Representative Clark W. Thompson, of Texas, who introduced a like measure in the 82d Congress. Both of these experienced and highly competent legislators have been thorough students of interoceanic canal problems, which have grave diplomatic implications affecting all maritime nations and the relations of the United States with all Latin American countries, especially Panama. As to Panama, we would most strongly emphasize that among the features overlooked in the report under Public Law 280, 79th Congress, is the fact that the sea-level project recommended in that report is not covered by existing canal treaties and would necessitate the negotiation of a new treaty with a tremendous indemnity and greatly increased annuity payments involved. As evidence of this, it may be noted that upon demand of the Panamanian Government and the appointment by it of a commission for the purpose the United States Government has named a like Commission to negotiate various questions, including that of the present annuity of $430,000 (originally $250,000), which Panama insists should be substantially increased. These negotiations began in September 1953, when the President of Panama and members of the Panamanian Commission visited Washington in behalf of the indicated demands.

CONCLUSION

Because of these considerations, it would seem to be clear that the indicated Commission should be created without delay and put to work so as to develop a timely, definite, and wisely reasoned Isthmian Canal policy. Such a body should be made up of unbiased, broadgaged, and independent men of the widest engineering, operational, governmental, and business experience, and not of persons from routine agencies, all too often involved in justifying their own groups.

Fighting a Plant Pest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. T. A. THOMPSON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1954

Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, the water hyacinth is indeed a beautiful flower, but when one considers the terrible loss that is suffered by those who live in areas where it grows unchecked, the beauty should be foregone. It is a practical necessity that we rid ourselves of this flower, which is in reality the kiss of death to industry in parts of Louisiana. The following editorial from the New York Times indicates that the problem is being recognized, and it is my hope that Members of this House will join with us in whatever steps are necessary to accomplish this purpose:

FIGHTING A PLANT PEST

Congressional action is being mobilized by Representative Edwin E. Willis, of Louisiana to fight a serious plant pest in several Southern States. What has been called for is literally a war of extermination on a beautiful flower, the water hyacinth.

The borderline between flowers and weeds has always been a shadowy one. Some of the most prized denizens of our gardens have been developed from what were once regarded as common weeds. In the case of water hyacinth the progression has gone in the opposite direction. It was brought to this country originally as a lovely flower, a part of a horticultural display. It is still a lovely flower, but it is also a costly menace.

The water hyacinth is prolific. Indeed, it is virtually indomitable. When it closes in on a stream it shuts out light and air and kills off fish and water animals. It makes navigation almost impossible. The estimate of damage in Louisiana alone is placed at $50 million annually. This does not seem an exaggeration.

A Federal study is now in progress to find ways of controlling the plant. This study must be pushed if other life on the southern waterways is to survive. We shrink from the idea of war on a flower. There are times when it is wise and entirely right.

Church's Influence in Guatemala

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1954

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following editorial from the current issue of the Pilot, Boston, Mass.:

GUATEMALA'S RECOVERY

A tiny Central American country has been big news for some months in the United States. The Communist threat to Guatemala caused uneasiness among our top political leaders who sensed the danger to our hemispheric security if Red-controlled governments should establish themselves in our midst. However, the short-lived and successful revolution under the leaderhip of President Armas while removing some measure of fear from the minds of the Guatemalan people at the same time gave hope to all the nations of the Americas that communism could not plunge its roots deep into any part of the Western Hemisphere.

The new government of Guatemala is presently facing a task which is not easy in bringing together all the disparate elements of the country. Already efforts to restore law and order have been interrupted by clashes between the regular army and members of the liberation forces. This was not unexpected since the regulars who have professed loyalty to the new regime fought against the revolutionary forces. These latter soldiers have been maintained to safeguard the revolution, but the army has been urging the President to disband them.

It is hoped that this problem of dual armed forces will be settled soon allowing the government to undertake a program of sweeping economic and social reforms. Once again the strong voice of Archbishop Mariano Rossell Arellano was heard in his plea for a peaceful settlement between the two armies in order to speed up the country's total recovery. While playing a leading part in these conciliation efforts, the archbishop has taken time to reply to charges that the Catholic church is trying to run the new anti-Communist government. Denying the claim that the church in Guatemala is seeking special privileges the archbishop said in his statement issued shortly after the interarmy fray, "The church seeks only an atmosphere of freedom for the spread of its religious, moral, and social doctrine."

This courageous archbishop, who risked personal danger is his unyielding resistance to the Communist-dominated regime of Arbenz, is equally outspoken in his replies to the anticlerical and Marxist-inspired rumors. Repudiating the cries that the church has usurped the powers of the state in the past as well as now, Archbishop Arellano accuses the state of having interfered in the mission of the church. In his words, "it is the mission of the church to preach God to all people, with or without the approval of any worldly government. * * * It is the mission of the church to preach social justice in order to prevent communism even if it thereby strikes at the economic doctrines of liberalism and the traditions of conservatism."

Yes, just as there are roadblocks for the new government to overcome in Guatemala, it is not surprising to find the Catholic church in the role of the stumbling block for critics of the change in Central America. The usual charges will fly about the authoritarian religion, an abject people and the fertile ground for the real advance of communism in the future. After all, they know the church was the cause of all past problems, and what can they expect in the future? Wait a minute now, and take a look at the record of the church's influence in Guatemala in recent years.

The former government of Colonel Arbenz was extremely cordial to Protestant evangelical groups, continuing a policy in effect since Barrios, the dictator, ruled in 1885. Through the long series of anticlerical regimes naturally the men in power have enjoyed strong Protestant support (including Arbenz). The same supporters are apt to face some hardships now that their political leader has been ousted. But it will not be religious persecution, rather the price that must be paid when unsuccessful in the political arena. On the other hand, the archbishop's advice makes for good sense and all Guatemala stands to gain by it.

Mr. Chelf Indulges in a Fine Old Art

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1954

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to have this opportunity to pay my respects to my colleague, Frank Chelf, who so ably represents the Fourth Congressional District of Kentucky. He is loved, admired and respected by his constituents who have again paid tribute to his statesmanship, character and high ideals by reelecting him without primary or November opposition. He is a gentleman of unshakable poise, rapierlike wit and polished diplomacy who believes that a real representative of the people is not one who changes principles with every shift of the wind, but rather one who, while in close communication with his constituents, translates into practical form their opinions and wishes as revealed to his mature judgment and enlightened conscience. A true leader possessing to a remarkably high degree the great outstanding qualities of wisdom, of moderation, of justice and of patience. One who believes in fair play and is ready and willing to fight to maintain decency and honor in politics.

Believing as he does that no man should be deprived of his life, liberty, or property without due process of law and the right to his day in court, my friend, Frank Chelf, has only recently protested the ouster of Raymond Stigall as postmaster at Danville, Ky. Mr. Stigall is known throughout the Fourth Congressional District as a conscientious, loyal, energetic, honest, capable public servant. As pointed out by Congressman Chelf to Postmaster General Summerfield, this is simply a case of a Democrat holding a position that the Republicans want, and regardless of method, Mr. Stigall must be ousted to make room for a member of the Postmaster General's party. The fact that Mr. Stigall is a disabled veteran, an honest capable public servant plays no part apparently with the Postmaster General. To me, Mr. Speaker, this particular case is a serious blow to the thousands of decent career employees who have devoted their lives to our service, and naturally, Mr. Stigall will appeal his dismissal notice to the regional office of the Civil Service Commission at Cincinnati. I predict, Mr. Speaker, that before Mr. Summerfield finishes with this particular case he will understand full well why the people of the Fourth Congressional District of Kentucky believe in Frank Chelf.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith an editorial entitled "Mr. Chelf Indulges in a Fine Old Art," which appeared in the August 7, 1954 issue of the Courier-Journal, of Louisville, Ky.

The editorial is as follows:

Mr. Chelf Indulges in a Fine Old Art

As fanciers of the form-fitting simile—as tight, let's say, as a zipper—we are caught in admiration and envy by Representative Frank Chelf's virtuosity at manipulating that, alas, too-often overlooked figure of speech.

This accomplishment of Kentucky's Fourth District statesman shows up in a letter to Postmaster General Summerfield, protesting dismissal of the postmaster at Danville. You can just put it down that our Frank is as sharp as Shakespeare, as full of comparisons as a hive is of honey, as fast as a jet plane.

The department's excuses for giving the Danville man the air, writes Mr. Chelf, are "as phony as a $3 bill and as flimsy as a dickey bird's power dive." This, in case you missed the Kentucky Member's full outpourings, is just the beginning. Mr. Chelf has a million. The charges "have about as much weight as the glue on a second-hand stamp and about as much real truth as the wool in a chicken's tail."

But why go on? Why knock ourselves and you out by the fascination that lies in such poetic artistry as to say of the charges that "they are as fantastic as pink elephants doing a strip-tease dance on the northwest side of a plugged dime"?

Out of it all we gather that Mr. Chelf is as hot as a firecracker, as mad as a hornet, as unlimited in his fury as cosmic space. He is also as Democratic as Andrew Jackson and he doesn't care whether Mr. Summerfield is as Republican as Lincoln, he'll get him told. It's as refreshing as Chelf.

Two Strikeouts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VERA BUCHANAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1954

Mrs. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I wish to include the following editorial from the AFL News-Reporter of August 6, 1954:

Two Strikeouts

The 83d Congress, in its closing innings, has struck out twice with the bases filled with legislation vital to the interests of all Americans.

Take housing. It came up before Congress with two important issues at stake. First was the necessity, underscored by recent exposés of huge windfall profits to builders and the widespread cheating of homeowners, to tighten up regulations. This Congress failed to do effectively, as Senator Maybank emphasized, in the new housing bill it adopted. Second was the responsibility of providing an adequate program of low-rent public housing and slum clearance in accordance with declared congressional purpose and President Eisenhower's repeated recommendations. This, also, Congress failed to do, as both the Republican and Democratic Senators from New York State bitterly attested. Thus, the new housing law falls far short of meeting the Nation's needs.

The second strikeout came on the tax bill. If it is safe and practical in this critical phase of world affairs to reduce taxes, surely the people with low incomes who can least afford to pay heavy taxes—to whom it means bread and milk out of their children's mouths—should get the first break. But that's not the way Congress saw it. Instead, it provided substantial tax relief for coupon clippers. No higher deductions for families with lots of children, but big deductions for stockholders with lots of dividends to collect. And that wasn't all. Congress also voted accelerated depreciation allowances to corporations and bigger depreciation allowances to mining operators. So far as the man in the street was concerned, Congress provided only a few crumbs of tax relief in the way of allowances for working mothers who have to hire babysitters while they are on the job and additional deductions to retired persons over 65.

America's Challenge Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE S. LONG

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1954

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, the story is told of a village moron who, proceeding to his home one dark night, ran into a tree standing by itself in the middle of a broad pasture. Desperately he circled the tree—'round and 'round—becoming more distraught and panicky with each step. When, at last, a rescuer appeared and asked what was the matter, the poor fellow replied, "Can't you see. I'm lost in an impenetrable forest."

In times such as these in which we are living, there are, I believe, two clear lessons for us in this story. One of them is that we are sometimes prone to circle round and round an issue for so long that we lose sight of the realities and grow fearful. The other is the distortion which fear produces.

Underlying all of the issues which we have faced in our time has been the old struggle between fear and anxiety on the one hand, and faith and courage on the other. We have been greatly concerned with the threat of the international Communist conspiracy. We have been concerned, and appropriately so, with building a strong and adequate defense; with the development of weapons of great destructive force and long-range striking power; with questions of military and diplomatic strategy. But how often, I wonder, have we really understood that basically, the contest of today is one between one camp representing organized fear of other men, and the other representing organized faith in mankind. How often have we recognized that one of our best weapons against communism is genuine evidence that we recognize the worth of every man and woman and the right of every individual to seek his own best way of life?

Do we, on the other hand, genuinely understand that the technique of communism is to organize fear and mistrust among people to the point where all power is surrendered to the police state? This point is clearly demonstrated in the literature of international communism. Stalin wrote plainly:

> The state is a machine in the hands of the ruling class for suppressing the resistance of its class enemies.

In this diabolical view the most outrageous crimes against human personality are justified because, to use his words again, "solidarity and the internal unity of the party" cannot afford "to be too liberal or to permit freedom of factions." Earlier Karl Marx had written:

> The democratic concept of man is false because it is Christian. * * * This is the illusion, dream and postulate of Christianity, that man has a sovereign soul.

Now contrast, if you will, these cynical and suspicious statements with the words of Thomas Jefferson who, perhaps better than anyone else, has expressed the spirit of the founders of our way of life. Engraved upon his tombstone, at his own request, are the words: "Author of the statute of Virginia for religious freedom." Among the passages of this law are such notable statements as these:

> That Almighty God hath created the mind free, and manifested His supreme will that free it shall remain, by making it altogether insusceptible of restraint; that all attempts to influence it by temporal punishments, burthens, or by civil incapacitations, tend only to beget habits of hypocrisy and meanness * * * and, finally, that truth is great and will prevail.

Our first obligation, then, is to look squarely at the problems of our times with a full understanding that the threat of international communism is based on propagandized suspicion and organized fear. And to remember that this is an old trick. It was not new when the anger of hungry Romans was diverted from the monopolists of their time who were stealing the Egyptian corn, to the small band of men with Peter and Clement in the catacombs, scrawling their professions of faith on the rocks that underlay the Seven Hills. We all know the incalculable cost to mankind, in the thousands of years of history, of hate and despair. But we believe, too, that always, at some point, they must run headlong into the good sense and good heart of the common man.

One of those moments in the history of mankind took place in 1776 and the stirring years which immediately followed. The good sense and good heart of those patriots of our early years took the form of a liberal land policy which saw the vast continental domain as land to be shared by all people, rather than by the privileged few. Through the barrier of mountain and wilderness they expressed their faith in the future of our country by the development of pikes like the Cumberland Road or canals like the Erie—the forerunners of our great highways of today. Their belief in public education was reflected as early as 1785 when, with the passage of the land ordinance of that year—pertaining to lands in the Western Territory—the idea of land-grant colleges was born. These are just a few of the testaments of faith in mankind which have come down to us from our forefathers. They are a measure of the trust we hold for them and for the future of our country.

Their example has served us well in more than one dark hour in the history of our country. For the drama of our story is not all concerned with our successes. We have our villains, too. In every age and time one menace to freedom has been concentration in a few hands of some kind of power—political power or economic power—over men's bodies, minds, or souls. Ever since the Civil War monopoly has constituted one of the most dangerous threats to our freedom. The monopolies and cartels of Germany gave Hitler his chance—on his promise to protect them, in their positions of power, from the wrath of the people. Russian communism has combined economic monopoly with political monopoly. The golden thread that runs through the best traditions of our Nation is the struggle against monopoly, to realize the goal of "equal opportunity for all, special privilege to none." Every great political movement in American history has been based on that principle.

Indeed I am convinced that the special genius of the democratic form of government lies in its ability to translate good sense and a good heart into the everyday realities of life.

Let us look, for a moment, at another example of the fact that there are few of the problems which face us which cannot be solved by a little more democracy. On March 4, 1933, America was without any national provisions to protect its aged or disabled citizens, or its dependent children, against the unavoidable hazards of life in this modern machine age. We were wtihout any means whereby the purchasing power of these people could be maintained in the face of advancing age. We had no system of unemployment insurance.

I am happy to have been one of the first men who stumped the entire United States for old-age pensions and for insurance against such economic hazards long before there was ever a law on the statute books of any State or of the Federal Government. I believed then, as I believe now, that Americans were entitled to such pensions with no questions asked—not because they were ill, or because they were crippled, or because they were in dire need, but because they had been good citizens and had contributed to the program by paying their taxes during their working life. I remember, too, how some people laughed at the idea at the time. I remember how others did not laugh, but denounced it bitterly as "socialistic," or as a means of encouraging laziness and irresponsibility.

I hope you will permit me, then, a moment of pride as I read the statements now being made about our social-security system—and not infrequently by those interests which originally opposed it for the reasons which I have just suggested. It is still incomplete and inadequate in many respects, but this great legislation now stands for a principle which is accepted on all sides as an integral part of American life. Reporting the bill containing the 1954 amendments to the House of Representatives this spring, the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, in discussing the desirability of extending the coverage of the system, used the following words of endorsement:

> Extending coverage to these and other groups now outside the system [means that] * * * not only more of the aged but also more of the young widows and children will be receiving benefits without a means test. Accordingly, these old-age and survivors insurance beneficiaries are able to maintain a sense of their own continued independence and of their dignity and worth as individuals, even though their support from earnings have been cut off by the retirement and death of the insured worker. The knowledge that benefits will be paid irrespective of whether the individual is in need supports and stimulates his own thrift and initiative, since he can add his personal savings (including home ownership and insurance) as well as pensions he may receive as a result of his work, to the basic old-age and survivors insurance benefits.

Within the last 20 years, then, your Government has established a system of social security which now helps to protect 4 out of every 5 workers—and their wives and children—against the hazards of loss of wages caused by death or retirement. Four years ago, in the 1950 amendments, this system was substantially strengthened over the original bill when coverage was extended by some 10 million jobs and the amount of benefits for persons who would retire in the future was more than doubled. In 1952, the amount of the benefits was again increased, to meet further increases in the cost of living.

Again this year another long step in the direction of improving our social-security system will be made if the bill already passed by the House becomes law. For on June 1, 1954, by a vote of 355 to 8, the House passed and sent to the Senate the 1954 amendments to the Social Security Act. This House bill would extend old-age and survivors insurance coverage to about 9 million additional workers, and increase monthly retirement benefits by an average of around $6 per month. Minimum monthly benefits would be raised from $25 to $30 and maximum benefits for those now on the rolls would increase from $85 to $98.50. Among the groups newly covered by the system would be self-employed farmers, most employees of State and local governments, hired farmworkers and household workers, ministers, and certain professional men and women.

Now that it is working, it has become clear that it is good democracy and good Government to continue and expand a system by which the workers of this country can make tax contributions during their working life to a social security system which will, then, entitle them to a monthly check for the rest of their life with no questions asked. In simple terms, it is just a way of laying aside something for a rainy day that will be available when needed.

Simultaneously in 1935, the Social Security Act established public assistance programs to assist the least fortunate of our people who could not qualify for adequate old-age and survivors insurance benefits—those persons who have been unable to provide for themselves and are now aged, or blind, or disabled, widowed, or fatherless. Realizing that our children are this Nation's greatest resource, we also established a national policy of aiding States and localities through the Children's Bureau and other agencies, to insure needed maternity and child health services.

In Louisiana today, more than 70 percent of all people 65 and over are on the old-age assistance system. As the insurance system is broadened to cover more people, and as benefits paid become more adequate, the number of people subject to these "means test" pensions will decrease. The sooner we can eliminate the "means test" principle—with its endless questions regarding personal affairs, the better.

Already the effect of the 1950 amendments in this direction can be demonstrated in Louisiana. For example, within a 2-year period between December 1951 and December 1953 the number of people in my State receiving benefits increased from 52,100 to almost 70,000—69,800, or by more than one-third. During the same period the total amount of money received in benefits in the State has increased from $19.3 million in 1951 to $29.8 million for the year 1953. This means that social security benefits have increased income by around $11 million within a 2-year period. And bear in mind the fact that this is a self-financing system, without recourse to any general revenues from State or Federal Governments. With the further coverage and the increased benefits provided by the 1954 amendments, this trend will continue and more and more people in Louisiana—and in the United States—will be able to face the economic problems of declining years with the knowledge that they have established through their contributions an earned right to a regular monthly check when they retire.

John J. Corson, the well-known management counselor, has said:

> The evolution from meager charity to grocery orders, to cash grants, to work-relief wages, and finally to social-insurance payments marks social inventions of as great significance as Watt's steam engine, Fulton's steamboat, or Edison's electric light, because they progressively recognise the insecurity of presently self-supporting people, while increasing understanding of the rights and freedom of the individual who must ask for help. * * * Thus, the purpose of relief—putting essential cash into the hands of persons who need it—was accomplished while also preserving the individual's self-respect.

Our Social Security Act, therefore, stands as another benchmark of our ability to use the democratic process in adjusting to the irresistable trend of events. It was part of a great crusade which has as its goal the purpose of seeing that every child born in this country shall be assured of conditions making it fairly easy for him to live in a normal, wholesome atmosphere, with the opportunity for an education to prepare him for the burdens and responsibilities of life. Your Government demonstrated its concern with protecting our river valleys from waste and for preserving the wasting soil of our land. With the assistance of our Government the farmers of America have been encouraged to bring the boon of electricity into every farm home, lifting untold burdens from the backs of the farmers and their wives, and giving them the power with which to produce more of the good things of life.

If, then, we are facing alarming problems today, let us remember as well our amazing accomplishments. Shall we succumb to fear because we have produced a single bomb which could wipe out a city? Or because we have learned to build aircraft by the tens of thousands in our factories? No one would deny the almost unbelievable advances of science. But deep down in our hearts we are all conscious of the fact that, unless we learn how to use these scientific developments in line with our democratic ideals, they may lead to our destruction. We know that in overemphasizing force, efficiency, and speed it may be possible to lose those human rights and freedoms which are essential to long-term survival.

It is my conviction that in finding the answers to these hard problems we shall be required to take account of another facet of our national life which has contributed richly to all of our gains. I speak of the spiritual gifts of Christianity. For our religion, with its emphasis on the conviction that every individual is a child of God, has made the hunger and unhappiness of any man the great concern of the good Christian. The spread of education, the expansion of public services, the concern to secure an abundent life to all men are founded, basically, upon the contributions of the Christian philosophy to our economic life. That philosophy has fostered the kind of charity so well described by Maimonides when he wrote:

> Anticipate charity by preventing poverty; assist the reduced fellowman either by a considerable gift, or a sum of money, or by teaching him a trade, or by putting him in the way of business, so that he may earn an honest livelihood, and not be forced to the dreadful alternative of holding out his hand for charity. This is the highest step and the summit of charity's golden ladder.

We Americans have learned in our Sunday schools, in our homes, and in the thousands of churches dotted throughout the country not only the comfort which comes from an abiding faith in our Maker, but also the broad outlines of social and governmental institutions which a Christian should seek. We have learned that a Christian nation will establish institutions based upon respect for the dignity and worth of every human being. We have learned from the principles of Christian brotherhood the importance of basic equality before the law and in other essential areas. Freedom of religion, which has been so vital a part of the Nation from the beginning, is based on the concept that each of us must allow freedom of expression of conscientious beliefs and freedom for carrying out these beliefs. The social and governmental institutions based on Christian principles are those which have encouraged growth and development of the minds and spirits of our people.

We have learned these same lessons in our schools. In his speech at Columbia University, on May 31, 1954, President Eisenhower restated the vital role of our educational institutions in preserving and strengthening our way of life.

> Through knowledge and understanding—

He said—

> we will drive from the temple of freedom all who seek to establish over us thought control—whether they be agents of a foreign state or demagogs thirsty for personal power and public notice.
>
> Truth can make men free. And where men are free to plan their lives, to govern themselves, to know the truth, and to understand their fellow men, we believe there also is the will to live at peace.
>
> Here, then, in spite of A-bombs, H-bombs, all the cruel destructiveness of modern war; in spite of terror, subversion, propaganda, and bribery, we see the key to peace. That key is knowledge and understanding—and their constant use by men—everywhere. * * *
>
> If a university can find ways to share its perspective with every American, we shall never hear the hysterical clamor that all is lost when, in fact, the fight has just begun. We shall be steadfast in a manifold strength, knowing that the pace of history—despite Marxist pushing—is slow and that both setbacks and victories of today will be truly measured by the state of the world a generation hence.

In our concern with the short-range successes of organized fear and suspicion, as they are represented today by international communism, let us be profoundly aware of the ability of our free institutions and our democratic way of life to win the hearts of men. There is always the danger that we may begin to doubt our beliefs or to believe our doubts.

In this hour, as in other dark hours of our past, we must know that no overly simple or expedient solutions will work. No democracy can safely embark on a course of trying to put ideas in jail. On the other hand, those who advise that nothing need be done, fail to reckon with the clever tactics and the absolute discipline of communism. Cases of outright treason must, of course, be dealt with under the law. A democracy's best defense lies in exposing all the facts thus enabling its own people to pass intelligent judgments. But if this method is to be effective, it must create in the public mind the clearest possible distinction between Communists on the one hand, and all loyal citizens upon the other, however their views in some particulars may differ from our own.

In terms of winning the minds of men, it is perfectly clear to me that the most effective method for overcoming organized fear is to find continued expression for our faith in humankind and the innate dignity of the individual. This is the great lesson of our past and it is the challenge for our future. Our message is one of hope, of courage, and of magnanimity.

If I were to say what I believe to be the most important single need of the world today I would say it was this: for one people to give to all mankind a living proof and demonstration that they can, without loss of liberty, solve the economic problems of this power age, end poverty in the midst of plenty, and make the machine the servant of man and not his master.

There must be born again in the hearts of all of us a dynamic faith in America—the sort of faith that has sent out missionaries to work and perish in far-off lands. It must be a faith practical and realistic but with its sights fixed on the new kind of life we are beginning to build. It will draw on the conviction of a Jeremiah in his defiance of a coward king. It will draw on the example of men of great heart like Robert Rumboldt who, undaunted on the scaffold said:

> I could never believe that Providence had sent a few men into the world ready booted and spurred to ride, and millions ready saddled and bridled to be ridden.

It will rest on the premise that we can have dignity and security for all our citizens if we have the will to do so and the courage to do so. We can have freedom if we make the freedom of others our concern. We can move forward to that better future we all want for ourselves and our grandchildren if we learn a little more each day how to share the God-given rights of liberty and abundance. We cannot retreat from the knowledge that we are a tremendous force in the world today. Nor can we fail to meet the challenge of destiny which has cast for us the role of a formidable fortress on the frontier of freedom, struggling to realize the hope of mankind.

Amending Taft-Hartley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VERA BUCHANAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 10, 1954

Mrs. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following editorial from the CIO News of August 9, 1954.

AMENDING TAFT-HARTLEY

Lots of people have thought that, because Congress didn't act on it, the Taft-Hartley law wasn't being amended this year.

In fact, it's being amended every week—not by Congress, but by the National Labor Relations Board.

The latest decision by the NLRB says it's O. K. for a boss to ask a worker whether he's a member of a union. Of course, the Labor Board's 3–2 GOP majority protects itself a little bit.

It's wrong, says the NLRB, for the boss to ask that question if he really wants to intimidate or coerce a worker from joining; it's all right only if the employer just wants some information.

Perhaps, unions will find themselves hiring psychoanalysts to find out just what is on the boss's mind when he pops the question to the worker.

More realistically, though, the Labor Board's decision throws one more roadblock in the path of unions trying to organize the unorganized. There's not a student of labor relations over the age of 7 who doesn't know that a question from the employer can also be a command.

In its decision, the Labor Board has, in the words of CIO's lawyers, taken an outrageous backward step—one of very many, in recent months.

We Must Look Ahead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 10, 1954

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein a very interesting article, which is well worth reading and considering, by James G. Patton, which appeared in Labor's Daily of Tuesday, August 10, 1954:

WE MUST LOOK AHEAD

Not all of us remember the depression. We can all, however, read statistics about it, but as Frederick Lewis Allen has said, "statistics are bloodless things. They give no living impression of the jobless men going from office to office or from factory gate to factory gate; of the disheartening inevitability of the phrase: 'We'll let you know if anything turns up.' Of men thumbing want ads in cold tenements, spending fruitless hours, day after day and week after week, in the sidewalk crowds before employment offices; using up the money in the savings bank, borrowing on their life insurance, selling whatever possessions could be sold, borrowing from relatives less and less able to lend, tasting the bitterness of inadequacy and at last swallowing their pride and going to apply for relief—if there was any to be got."

That was the depression. Most of us remember it. But even though as Allen says, statistics are bloodless things, they are interesting. Particularly when we learn that the depression of 1929–40 cost us twice as much in terms of production as did World War II.

The war materials we produced were shot up or blown up, while during the depression we failed to produce goods and services desperately needed by the population. We can measure what the failure to use the idle hands and machines in the depression cost us in terms of milk which was not consumed, homes that were not built, automobiles which were not produced, just as surely as we can measure the cost of the manpower and machines used for war purposes. The cost—twice as much as World War II—is staggering.

To be prosperous we must grow. We cannot stand still. Right now the total of all the goods and services produced in the United States amounts to about $360 billion. Now suppose we continued to grow at the modest rate of 4 percent a year between now and 1960. What kind of country would we be living in?

In the first place there would be about 175 million persons.

In the second place, we'd have a national income of around $500 billion. Now what does that mean to your family and mine—a national income of $500 billion?

It means, first of all, that we could wipe out poverty. Every family in the Nation could have a minimum income of $5,000 a year, and there would be plenty left over to increase the incomes of those families who are now earning that much or more.

In 1952, some 41 percent of all American families—about 22 million—had incomes of less than $3,000 a year. If these families had a minimum income of $5,000, think of the tremendous demand it would create for consumer goods.

But here, in dollars-and-cents terms, is what a gross national product, or national income of $500 billion can mean to you and to me:

The Federal budget could be balanced and Federal taxes cut 20 percent.

We can have 70 million civilian jobs.

We can raise the living standards of everyone in the Nation by a minimum of 40 percent.

We can raise factory workers' weekly average wage from $71 in 1953 to $100 in 1960.

We can increase the amount of crops we grow by about one-fourth, and in such an economy there would be no such thing as surpluses because people would have money to buy all the food and fiber the American farmer could grow.

With a $500 billion economy, we can provide a minimum monthly retirement payment of $200 to senior citizens. Right now the average is around $50 a month.

And last, but not least important, we could increase business profits before income taxes from $44 billion in 1953 to $55 billion in 1960. And with a lower tax rate, business would be better off than ever.

Such an economy can be achieved, and easily so, if all of us—farmers, workers, and businessmen alike—will strive for it. America has reached the crossroads. It must must either go forward or backward. It cannot remain still.

By continuing to grow economically we will be able to shape the kind of nation all of us have dreamed of. But we can't go forward into the bright future by looking into the rearview mirror. We must look ahead.

East Side Youth Council Visits Washington on Historic Tour

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 10, 1954

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the East Side News of August 7, 1954:

EAST SIDE YOUTH COUNCIL VISITS WASHINGTON ON HISTORIC TOUR

Close to 30 teen-age boys and girls, members of the Youth Council of the Ninth Precinct, were guests last weekend, Saturday and Sunday, of the Presbyterian Labor Temple, 242 East 14th Street, on an historic heritage tour to such places as Washington, D. C., Mount Vernon, and Valley Forge.

The Reverend E. Evans, minister of Labor Temple, declared yesterday that "this venture was one of the finest factors we have employed in our efforts to check juvenile delinquency, combat communism, and to build character and citizenship."

"It was magnificently successful in every possible way," he added, "and gave these young people an insight into the great story of America and a firsthand knowledge of how our Government operates today."

TOUR RICH IN EXPERIENCES

Pointing out that the teen-agers will remember "this experience for the rest of their lives," Reverend Evans said that "this is only the first of many such tours that we are planning, and we feel it is one of the most effective programs that can be carried out to achieve these purposes."

The tour was made possible through the cooperation of friends of Labor Temple, Representative Arthur G. Klein, the local Congressman, and Representative Fred E. Busbey, Republican, of Illinois, a lifelong friend of both Reverend Evans and his foster mother. Mr. Klein, who was unable to be present due to illness, provided a guide for the young tourists, while Mr. Busbey and his wife entertained the East Siders at a luncheon held in the private dining room of the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

ATTEND LUNCHEON

Present at the luncheon, besides several distinguished guests, was United States Senator Alexander E. Wiley, chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, another personal friend of Reverend Evans. Inspirational speeches, addressed to the Youth Council, were delivered by Mr. Wiley and Mr. Busbey.

Following the luncheon, Congressman Busbey escorted his visitors through the entire Capitol building. The House of Representatives, not being in session, the boys and girls were permitted to sit in the congressional seats as well as in the Speaker's chair.

Expressing regret over Congressman Klein's illness, Representative Busbey paid high tribute to his colleague's ability and character. He explained that one of the great principles of democracy was that even though men in Government belong to different political parties, and voted differently on political issues, they could yet hold themselves in mutual respect and esteem as did he and Congressman Klein.

FINE LESSON IN TRUE DEMOCRACY

"This little interlude was one of the very finest lessons in real democracy that our young people could have received," said Reverend Evans, adding also that Mr. Busbey arranged for the young people to meet Vice President Richard M. Nixon.

The retinue last Saturday afternoon included a trip through Mount Vernon, ancestral home of George Washington and Arlington Cemetery, where they arrived in time to witness the ceremony of the changing of the guards at the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier.

The United Church Women of Washington, assisted by members of the B'nai B'rith, served as hostesses at supper last Saturday evening. The night was spent at the homes of several distinguished Washington residents.

Reverend Evans explained that arrangements had been made previously for the teen-agers to attend the church of their faith at Saturday and Sunday. Those of the Jewish faith attended services at the Washington Temple, those of the Roman Catholic faith attended St. Matthew's Cathedral, and many of them joined to visit the National Presbyterian Church of Washington, which President Eisenhower and his family attend.

The visit to the Nation's Capitol was ended following another escorted tour by Representative Busbey through the Lincoln Memorial.

From Washington, the group traveled through Maryland and Pennsylvania to see historic Valley Forge, where they were guests of the famous Freedom Foundation, which has national headquarters there.

"This high privilege had been arranged by two other good friends of mine, Paul Milling, president of the Wanamaker Independent Union and a member of the Freedom Foundation's Committee, and Gardner Osborn, chairman of our Labor Temple executive committee and director of the historic Federal Hall Memorial, at Wall and Nassau Streets," said Reverend Evans.

Thomas Sawyer, director of the Freedom Foundation, provided a picnic luncheon for his visitors from the Lower East Side, after which he explained the priceless historical significance of the spot on which they were standing. Richard Foltz, assistant to Mr. Sawyer, took the group through the Washington Memorial Chapel and other historic sites at Valley Forge.

E. F. Hutton is chairman of the Freedom Foundation and Dr. Kenneth Welles is its president.

After Valley Forge, the members of the Youth Council returned to New York late last Sunday night a tired but supremely happy party of young people.

Besides Congressmen Klein and Busbey, others who made the trip to Washington a success, to whom Reverend Evans is grateful are Miss Ida Werner, chairman of the Coordinating Council, the Reverend Paul Hostetter, an associate minister at Labor Temple, and Mr. and Mrs. Joseph Franco, who served as official chaperones.

The presence of Mr. and Mrs. Franco was one of the features that highlighted the interfaith character of the tour. Mr. Franco has been Labor Temple's music director for many years and is an elder in the Presbyterian Church of the Crossroads, while Mrs. Franco is a devout Catholic.

"In fact," Reverend Evans said, "the adult leadership of the tour, as well as the young people making up the party, represented all phases of Catholic, Jewish, and Protestant participation. Other older members who were most helpful on the trip were Sol Gordon, Labor Temple's recreational director, Harry F. Brown, travel consultant, and Mrs. Angela, Ansaldi, mother of two of the young people."

Voicing enthusiasm over the successful weekend, Reverend Evans said: "Too much cannot be said in praise for Miss Etta Mai Russell, secretary of the United Church Women of Washington, who did a miraculous piece of work in providing wonderful accommodations for the boys and girls. She was ably assisted by her friend, Miss Elizabeth Griffin, and by the Reverend Harold Meyers, associate minister of the National Presbyterian Church. Another Washingtonian who endeared himself to our boys and girls was Henry Hall, chief of the White House tour staff, whom Congressman Klein had thoughtfully provided to take our party through the White House, Mount Vernon, and Arlington Cemetery.

TEEN-AGERS PROVE GRACIOUS

"I want to mention one very gracious thing the young people did prior to leaving Labor Temple last Friday. They presented, through the youth council chairman, Miss Rosemarie Gawelko, a lovely gift to my foster mother, Miss Sarah E. Dickson, who is recovering, after several months in the hospital, from a broken hip. My foster mother, who spent many pleasant hours with Congressman and Mrs. Busby and Senator and Mrs. Wiley in Washington in previous years, knew what was in store for the young people, and told them of some of the wonderful things that they later experienced.

"I want to express my own pride in the fine way the youth council leaders conducted themselves throughout the journey. They were splendid representatives of young America, and proved that today, as always, the Lower East Side of New York can give to our beloved Nation some of its outstanding leaders in artistic, cultural, political, and religious areas.

"It was a joy to take them, and I know I speak for all our family at Labor Temple when I say we look forward to many more similar historic heritage tours in our common task of checking juvenile delinquency, combating communism, and building the finest attributes of character and citizenship in our American democracy."

Today's Challenge to the College Woman in the Professions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. VAUGHAN GARY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1954

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the address of a distinguished leader in the field of nursing, Mrs. Lucile Petry Leone. She addressed the alumnae of Westhampton College, gathered for the anniversary of the founding of Westhampton College of the University of Richmond. Mrs. Leone, during World War II, as Director of the United States Cadet Nurse Corps led in the recruitment of over 180,000 students for the nursing schools of the country. She is Chief Nurse Officer of the Public Health Service of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. She is also an Assistant Surgeon General of the Public Health Service, and is a preeminent leader in the nursing profession and in the advancement of national and international professional training of women. The message she carried to the Westhampton College women I am placing in the Record so that college women everywhere may have the benefit of what Mrs. Leone has said about today's challenge to the college woman in the professions:

TODAY'S CHALLENGE TO THE COLLEGE WOMAN IN THE PROFESSIONS

(By Lucile Petry Leone)

On an occasion like this we pause to think together about the provocative subject, Today's Challenge to the College Woman in Professions in the Community.

The founders of this college could probably have predicted some of our reactions and would surely not have been surprised to find us claiming that the challenge of our time is sharper and more complex than that of any earlier time. Making such a claim seems to be the prerogative of every generation.

To document our claim we state that the world has more people—millions more each year;, that communications are bringing us more comprehensive knowledge of worldwide human needs, and science is giving us evermore refined means of meeting some of these needs. In this complexity, services tend to become more specialized and the professions grow in number and size and in their capacity to meet the needs which called them into being. The professions become more highly organized. They develop new knowledge through research and convert this knowledge into more services which reach more people.

The challenge to the college woman in the professions lies in something more than the urge to develop new technical knowledge and skill. That progress could hardly be stopped in these times. The challenge lies in examining the values of what we do, in developing the human-relations potential in our fields, and in relating these larger goals of the evolving American culture.

Let us think of values. We expect the legal profession to define justice as a human value and to give meaning to this value in our daily living. We expect architects to capture beauty and functionalism in structure for our continuous use and esthetic enjoyment. We expect administrators of private and public enterprise to liberate the potential creativity of every worker. Looking on from outside these professions we have expectations of action to promote understanding of the human values inherent in these professions.

Speaking from inside one of the health professions, I would mention some of the values which are both the goals and guides to action by its members. Health, the value we wish to contribute to the culture of our times is given an ever expanding definition. Physical health alone is not our goal. Mental and spiritual well-being have been added. Not only restoration to health, but health maintenance and at ever higher levels. Not only curing diseases, but preventing diseases. Not treating the disease, but caring for the man who suffers the disease. Bringing not only a cure for his illness, but carrying him forward to emotional, social, and vocational rehabilitation—to optimum functioning. We strive for deeper understanding of the role of the emotions in health and disease. We strive not only to prolong life expectancy, but to augment the expectancy of vitality and vigor through a longer span of life. These are some of the human values in the health professions.

The challenge to the college woman in a profession lies in deepening the meaning of the values which are the basis of its existence and in establishing the human relations through which these values operate and are communicated. To illustrate human relations I should like to draw on nursing. It is a constant practice of the principles of democracy, for every person is to be understood by the nurse in relation to his own needs and purposes. Conscious and knowing practice of democracy in multiform human contact makes it live. I personally have been proud to hear administrators of the United States technical assistance programs in many lands say that nurse members of the health missions have been outstanding spokesmen for democracy as well as for health. We nurses strive not to do things to people as if we were their custodians, or to do things for people as if they were our dependents; but rather to do things with people leading them to ever increasing self-direction in their achievement of health.

Communication of nursing values comes through action and speaking and also through being. A revered philosopher after an illness said, "I was as much nursed by what my nurse was as by what she did." Another patient said of a nurse, "Her presence comforts me."

These humans relations are, of course, paralleled in every profession. Relations with clients, with colleagues, and with members of other professions become the means of vivifying and communicating values. Principles govern human relations and learning these principles as well as the values which become the purposes of professions is among the opportunities for the student in a college. Awareness of commonality of purpose among team members in professions generates power to act, and living and learning in college lays the foundation of this awareness.

One of the new challenges to higher education is analysis of common elements in the preprofessional and in the professional curricula for several professions. Learning these common elements together makes working together more productive. Elements common to several professions in biological and physical sciences and in social science are easiest to find. The social sciences particularly deserve more emphasis in most professional and preprofessional programs, as do the humanities, for these bring knowledge of the qualities of man, intelligence, and enterprise and taste, which link us with the past and to the future.

For the college student who is a prospective member of a profession, some learning can be professionally motivated. A few days ago I talked casually with three students in a collegiate school of nursing. One said that her work in the college theater had enhanced her expressiveness in her real role with patients. Another said that she was thinking of nursing as a plastic art now that she was studying design, the medium in her case being human comfort and welfare. The third said that she was more aware of the rhythm and form in nursing because of her enthusiasm for modern dance. For these students it seemed to me that professional correlation enhanced rather than detracted from learning something of the three arts they discussed.

General education in college gives students the matrix into which their professional education can be set. The beginnings of understanding of values and of human relations and of the relation of these to the larger goals of the evolving American culture are firmed and strengthened during the college years. Imagination and quest for discovery are stimulated. Responsibility for leadership is developed. The desire for a lifetime of building on the educational foundation achieved in college is instilled. These prepare a woman for her profession and for living.

Professional education also prepares for living over and beyond professional living. Disciplined thinking in the analysis of professional problems can create a pattern for solving family and citizenship problems, can increase the objectivity with which issues are dealt and the skepticism about superficial answers and demagoguery.

Perhaps no quality is to be so highly prized today as the straight thinking which both general and professional education strive to promote. Community, national, and world issues demand it if progress toward the freedoms man has dreamed of and worked for for centuries is not to regress. We sense a strong need for intellectual background for straight thinking because of the speed with which decisions must be made in what Fenton B. Turck in a recent article in the Scientific Monthly has called this age of explosion. He summarizes the economic, cultural, and productivity indexes since 1890 and plots them by decades. In two decades there was a slight decline, in others before 1940 there was gradual increase, but phenomenal rise after that. I quote only a few of his statistical facts:

"Americans increased their annual use of electric energy more between 1940 and 1950 than in the entire previous time since electrical power has been installed in America.

"The average American's real purchasing power was 53 percent greater in 1950 than in 1940.

"The average family diet improved sufficiently to help produce children 2 to 3 inches taller than children of the same age 50 years ago.

"Forty-five percent more Americans graduated from college in 1948 than in 1940."

In 1948 there were 65 television stations and about a million receiving sets. Both these figures have increased twelvefold in 5 years.

Health science research has produced phenomenal progress in medicine in the last decade.

In the decade 1940-50, 141 million people moved from one part of the country to another, from farms to industrial centers, or from one house to another.

Think of the adjustment of the individual to rapid change not only to surroundings but in relation to one's fellows, the disturbance of one's status, the entire response pattern of the individual. And the end of this explosive growth is not in sight.

Nor is this change unique to America. A man who yesterday was himself a beast of burden in some cultures may tomorrow find himself piloting an airplane. Can his political advance keep pace? I find it heartening to think that his yearnings for freedom are as keen as history has shown that of other peoples in any other times. The promises of what ideology will he cling to? Can he bypass the inquisitions and stifling of free thought as he bypasses the horse and buggy? The urge to self-preservation on our part as well as the desire to share our faith in the dignity of man makes us hope so. so.

The professions stand in a strategic forefront of this rapid progress and in such a time must guard against too narrow a focus on their own concerns. Herein lies another challenge to education.

In this age of explosion we think of new directions and goals of all education. The oldtime lag, often estimated as 50 years, between discovery of new knowledge and its effective general use can hardly be tolerated.

Let us think now of women in this age. Girls marry younger and have more babies than a few decades ago. American women have the highest life expectancy at birth of any known group. At the time her major responsibility for child rearing has ceased, she finds a third if not a half of her full adult lifetime ahead of her. What will she do with it? Will formal education come to her in 2 batches—1 before child rearing, and 1 after? Or will she "make do" with the first?" What informal adult education does she seek?

It is for the study of this and many other problems that year ago the Commission on the Education of Women was established under the aegis of the American Council on Education. The commission proposes to examine the impact of social change upon women and to define more clearly the American woman's expectancy for herself. The commission is not interested in securing special privileges for women. It is concerned with the welfare of the United States and that women may contribute more adequately to our society.

The commission will sponsor research and will also encourage cooperative research and experimental programs by schools, colleges, and organizations, and community agencies. It will collate results and disseminate them in ways to provoke critical thinking.

Studies of college women students indicate that there are basic contradictions in the concepts they have of their roles as women. Their goals for themselves are lower than their abilities. Too few women are doing significant creative work in the arts and in sciences. The dichotomy between those who believe in educating women for the graduate schools and those who think of the large proportion of them who will marry and may never be employed or study again has not been resolved.

Lacking answers to many of the questions regarding woman's nature, aptitudes, motivations, and society's expectations for her is a deterrent to sound educational planning at a time when educational progress should be accelerated and when its soundness is essential to national welfare.

The Commission has communicated with more than a thousand colleges asking what problems related to women and their education they are working on and want help on. It has reviewed the literature of the field extensively. It held a small but deeply effective conference at which seven outstanding social scientists from the fields of anthropology, sociology, psychology, and social psychology presented their conceptual approach to so large a problem. Several researches are underway, stimulated directly or indirectly by the Commission, and more are in prospect. Response has been enthusiastic and widespread. A monograph clarifying the problems and analyzing action for their solution is in preparation for publication.

In conclusion, I wish to emphasize that the challenges to the college woman in the professions lie above and beyond the responsibility to develop the content and methods of her profession. The challenge to college women lies in three fields: in deepening the meaning of the values within each profession; in capitalizing upon the high potential of human relations for making those values operative; and in relating both to the evolving American culture. Worldwide scope and rapidity of social change in these times calls for change in the education of women, and for straight thinking and action, on the part of the college woman. The heart and the will of American woman nourished at the source spring of self-renewal and fulfillment, which is in the American college, will through her thought and actions within and outside her profession push forward throughout our now unitary world the ideals of freedom.

Fight for Bricker Amendment on Treaties Has Just Begun

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. BRICKER

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 10, 1954

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an editorial from the Ohio State Journal for August 9.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Fight for Bricker Amendment on Treaties Has Just Begun

Senator Bricker has given early notice that he has just begun his fight for a constitutional amendment to limit the scope of treaties and international agreements so that they cannot override the Constitution in the field of domestic law.

ALMOST PASSED

In amended form, the so-called Bricker amendment was defeated by one vote in the Senate last winter. Requiring a two-thirds favorable vote in each branch of Congress before being submitted to the States for ratification, it fell just one vote short of attaining that majority on the Senate rollcall.

President Eisenhower, Secretary of State Dulles, and other members of the Cabinet have opposed the Bricker amendment on the ground that it would tie the hands of the President in dealing with foreign nations, although Mr. Dulles a few months before becoming Secretary of State had stated most cogently in a public address the need for just such an amendment.

SEAT OF DANGER

The great danger currently confronting the people of the United States in the use of the treaty power and executive international agreements is in adhering to international conventions, covenants, and charters whose contents are inimical to some of the basic concepts of the Constitution of the United States and the Bill of Rights.

The Bricker amendment would in nowise tie the hands of the President or of the Senate in the ordinary and traditional use of treaty powers—the negotiation and ratification of treaties dealing purely with relations between sovereign States.

It would, however, require action on the part of Congress or of the State legislatures (in case a constitutional amendment were required), before domestic laws could be superseded by provisions of treaties or international agreements, affecting such things as the right of American citizens to trial by jury, the presumption of innocence of American citizens until they are proven guilty in court, freedom of speech, and freedom of the press and the guaranty against seizure of property without due process of law.

RIGHTS IMPINGED

Some of these rights have been impinged directly or by inference in proposals made in, pending in, or even ratified by subsidiary groups of the United Nations. In the case of citizens of the United States serving in the military services in foreign lands, the basic guaranties with respect to prosecution for civil crimes already has been repudiated through an executive agreement which permits United States military personnel to be tried under laws of the foreign countries which do not give comparable protection to that provided by the Bill of Rights.

If the Bricker amendment would tie the hands of the President and of the Senate so that it could not by treaty or agreement barter away the rights of American citizens, that is argument enough for its adoption.

CAMPAIGN GOES ON

Senator Bricker does not expect, of course, that Congress will act on his amendment in its present session, now drawing to a close. But he has introduced it again in revised form for purposes of the record. He has announced that he will reintroduce it on the first day of the next session, next January. Meanwhile, Senator Bricker and his associates in behalf of the amendment will continue to campaign for it in every public forum and arena, as well as in Congress itself.

Early Impressions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. GLENN BEALL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 8, 1954

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, we are fortunate to have as the Solicitor General of the United States one of the most able men I have ever known. He is a competent attorney, but, more than that, he possesses a respect for law and a feeling for justice.

Simon E. Sobeloff had a brilliant and distinguished career in Maryland before becoming the Solicitor General. He is dedicated to the task of seeing that justice is done.

General Sobeloff recently addressed the judicial conferenec of the fourth circuit on his early impressions in office. I am advised that the printing of his address will require approximately 2¼ pages in the Record, at a cost of $191.25. I request unanimous consent that his interesting remarks be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Early Impressions

(An address by Simon E. Sobeloff, Solicitor General of the United States, before the Judicial Conference of the Fourth Circuit, Hot Springs, Va., June 29, 1954)

When Judge Parker graciously invited me to address this conference of judges and lawyers of the fourth circuit I accepted with appreciation and alacrity, but as the time drew near I was filled with deep misgivings. What could I say in the presence of the Chief Justice and other Federal judges, many of long experience and skilled in American jurisprudence and procedure, that would not sound presumptuous or trite?

Moreover, some of the most interesting ideas that came to me had to be scratched at the post, as it were, because for one reason or another they were on the lengthy list forbidden by considerations of discretion.

Obviously you would expect me to speak about the work of the Solicitor General's Office. Even so, I feel some diffidence in lecturing, out of the fullness of 4 months' experience, to men whose daily business is government litigation.

The dignity and importance of this conference entitle it to a more mature presentation than I fear I am able to make. It is hazardous to give expression to views which ought not to be more than tentative at this stage. So, instead of undertaking to supply the answers I shall share with you my early impressions and indicate some of my uncertainties and perplexities.

Here in my home circuit, among old and cherished friends, I will perhaps be permitted to speak more freely about these things than I would dare when I go abroad in the land.

On can hardly cross the threshold of the Solicitor General's Office without instantly sensing the wide range and entrancing interest of its business. A lawyer could spend a lifetime in active practice in Baltimore and never have occasion to think about the so-called aboriginal land rights of the Alaska Indians or the conflicting water claims of cities and States. He might never be called upon to decide whether the marriage of a 14-year-old girl in Arkansas is void or only voidable; or to consider a railroad's liability for burning a national forest, or what type of evidence is sufficient to prove the paternity of a Chinese claiming American citizenship; or whether giving away calves involves realization of taxable income. Hardly would he find it necessary to consider whether the Government is liable for the killing of Indian ponies and driving the Indians off certain grazing lands in Utah; or whether a forced sale of radar equipment to the American Army in the Philippines involves a condemnation for which just compensation is due. He might never give thought to what practices are appropriate in weighing cattle arriving at the Chicago stockyards; or whether the waters between the Island of Catalina and the mainland are a part of California; or what is the authority of the Federal Power Commission over natural gas production; or whether Congress has admitted liability of the United States to the State of California for recruiting expenses in the Civil War.

Nor is he likely to be called upon to try his hand at drawing a decree in anything resembling the segregation cases.

Yet these exemplify the typical nature of matters that arise in the Department. They also illustrate the vast expanse and diversity of our country and its operations throughout the world. The number of certiorari petitions to be considered—ours and our opponents'—runs to more than a thousand a year, and the number of requests for review in the courts of appeals is even greater.

Naturally there is a shift in perspective when one changes his position. The work in the Solicitor General's Office is different from that on the bench or at the bar in private practice.

The judges here will perhaps agree that one of the chief joys of their office is to be able to witness a good, stiff fight, sometimes even to participate tangentially, while decorously maintaining strict neutrality with no partisan anxiety over the outcome.

The Solicitor General is not a neutral, he is an advocate; but an advocate for a client whose business is not merely to prevail in the instant case. My client's chief business is not to achieve victory but to establish justice. We are constantly reminded of the now classic words penned by one of my illustrious predecessors, Frederick William Lehman, that the Government wins its point when justice is done in its courts.

When a lawyer in private practice advances an argument he feels free to drive as far as he can. He is out to win that case. He has, it is true, his professional ethics, but he has no responsibility for the future of the law. He is not fashioning a rule for later cases. Provided only that his contention is not so extreme as to arouse resistance, he is free to go as far as he will. But the judge writing the opinion must, as you know, be more wary. He must proceed with greater moderation and circumspection, realizing that what he says today will have to be faced tomorrow. He is aware that a rule declared in one case may be cited in the next. Unlike the lawyer, the judge is confined by his sense of responsibility for the symmetry of the law and by his obligation to maintain its continuity and conformity to basic principles and traditions.

The Solicitor General, too, though an advocate, must not forget that his client is the United States Government, which is dedicated to the same principles. Under our system, he has a special relation to the courts and in particular to the Supreme Court. It is out of this multiple relationship that the Solicitor General's perplexities arise.

A chief problem is how to reconcile legality with decency and justice. He has a delicate and not easily definable function in the development of the law. He must be mindful of all of these things in deciding which cases shall be appealed from district courts to the courts of appeals and which merit presentation to the Supreme Court.

I do not have the exact statistics and they are not necessary: It is sufficient to point out that only a small fraction of the cases lost by the Government are appealed. In the first place, Government lawyers, like those in general practice, may experience that marvelous adjustment of perspective which often comes to the most ardent advocate when he loses—that is, the realization that he really should have lost. Sometimes the realization comes with the suddenness of revelation. In this circuit, as I can testify, it may possibly come before the end of the inevitable inquisition from the bench. Sometimes, when the trial judge or the court of appeals seems to have deviated from the law, and it is nevertheless apparent that this was done in an understandable human effort to square what is legal with what is just, the Solicitor General, finding no great importance in the case as a precedent, may well look the other way and say no appeal or no certiorari.

A Government lawyer was telling me with a show of shock and dismay that in a certain case Judge Parker declared from the bench, "Well, if that is the law, any judge worth his salt will find some way to overcome it." I wasn't shocked, for if I must make a choice between a judge who is completely orthodox and applies without imagination or feeling a rigid rule—and another judge who is perceptive of the justice and commonsense of the case, even at the expense of some harmless departure from the strictness of the legal formula—I prefer the latter.

I know that you will not misunderstand my meaning. I am not counseling a group of experienced Federal judges to become anarchists. I merely say that if you find a way to do justice in a hard case, sometimes, not always, the Government may find a way not to appeal. I say "not always" for it often happens that despite our personal preferences in the instant case, we deem it necessary to appeal because of the harm apprehended from the operation of the prescribed rule in a wider orbit.

We can submit, in an appropriate case, without appealing or without seeking certiorari where the Government has lost below; but what do we do when we have won a bad case and the opponent carries the matter up on appeal or by petition to the Supreme Court? Do we resist, or do we confess error? In the nature of things we cannot often confess error, for even the passion for justice would not overcome the annoyance of the lower courts if we too often confessed error in cases where they had ruled in our favor. One district judge, reversed on appeal, suggested, when the solicitor general refused to seek certiorari, that he, the district judge, should have the right to personal vindication by applying for certiorari himself. District judges and appellate judges might view the matter differently.

There have been instances, and doubtless there will be more, where confession of error is not only in order but is a moral necessity. In this connection I may relate the experience of a young lawyer on the solicitor general's staff who went into court and confessed error, but the court nevertheless gave him an unwelcome decision for the Government. He came back moaning and gloating simultaneously, and said, "I can't lose a case even when I try."

What impresses me, and depresses me, is that so often neither Government counsel nor the court is given the necessary leeway to soften harshness and mitigate absurdities which are inexorably commanded by the law. What Federal judge has not been torn in his heart by the inflexible minimum penalty prescribed in certain statutes? Recently I attended the Judicial Conference of the Fifth Circuit. Half of an entire session was devoted to the recital of instances of unconscionable penalties under the Boggs Anti-Narcotic Act. One judge told of a case where a highly respected pharmacist, with no prior record, violated the law by giving someone a small quantity of a narcotic drug to relieve acute suffering. He did it for no personal gain, but for humanitarian reasons, expecting that a doctor's precription would follow. The evidence of the violation, however, was entirely clear and the jury was about to bring in a verdict of guilty. The judge related how he sent them back after explaining that if they convicted the defendant he would have no choice but to impose a minimum 2-year sentence. The jury then considered the matter further and brought in a verdict of "not guilty," to the immense relief of the judge. Of course, this is not an edifying story; but who can fail to sympathize with a judge put in such a difficult position by a rigid law passed by men of good motives who fail to foresee and understand the consequences of their legislation?

Similarly, in some of the immigration and naturalization cases, both the law and its administration have, I fear, gone far beyond what would appear necessary to carry out policy, and needless hardships are being inflicted. Admittedly, the remedy cannot be supplied by judges alone. The Congress has broad powers in this area. Insofar as administration plays a part, Attorney General Brownell is already moving to relieve the abuses in bail procedures and more will be done, I am sure, under the new Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization, General Swing, who combines with his army discipline a warm and understanding heart.

This brings me to the more general, still unresolved problem of the role of the courts in the review of administrative action. This I see exemplified again and again in the steady stream of papers that flow across my desk.

It is a difficult dilemma: On the one hand is the obligation to respect the separation of powers, for the disregard of this principle would itself lead to tyranny. Personalized judgments to meet particular cases are, we know, fruitful sources of future trouble. We must take care that that which satisfies the felt need today shall not breed confusion tomorrow. On the other hand is the limited but still broad role of the judiciary in determining whether fundamental rights guaranteed by the Constitution have been violated by the arbitrary exercise of power.

It has been pointed out that the due process clauses of our fundamental law are unique among national constitutions, even in the English-speaking countries. Yet this is an established feature of our constitutional system. In appropriate cases the power must be exercised with firmness and vigor, albeit with discretion. Experience has shown what is likely to happen when a court declines to interfere, out of deference to the separation of powers, even though the administrator has acted harshly, cruelly and outrageously. These are not my charterizations; the Supreme Court made them in a recent case, where it castigated the action under review but upheld its legality. In that case the action was mandatorily required by the statute, but sometimes administrators go to great extremes in what they think is a proper exercise of discretion. Only too often the administrator's ears tune out these denunciations; he hears only that his conduct is legal and he feels that he has been granted a license to continue in his course and go even further till checked. Each branch of our government is limited by the others, but each must on occasion check the others if justice is to be achieved. In deciding in a given case whether to appeal the action of the reviewing court, these are among the pertinent considerations.

The Southland Manufacturing Company case (201 F. 2d) in this very circuit illustrates well that the Administrative Procedure Act failed to supply the hoped for guiding test as to how the reviewing judge determines whether or not to substitute his judgment for determinations of fact by administrators. At you know, that case evoked sharply divergent views by two of our most respected jurists, Judge Parker and Judge Soper.

A sometime bothersome feature of the Solicitor General's duty of deciding what business to present to the Supreme Court is in dealing with the Government agencies concerned. His is the task of resisting their tearful importunities to seek review of cases they have lost. The loss seems to them calamitous. Their preoccupation is with the immediate result, or at least their purview is likely limited to their particular work. The Solicitor General must seek a broad perspective of the total law business of the United States, not merely the program of any single agency.

A principal task of the Solicitor General is to determine when not to press for a victory in court, for sometimes a victory may prove more disastrous than a defeat. And what lawyer of experience has not noted that there are occasions when it is wiser to leave a point obscure than to obtain clarification?

Dealing with the agencies is, however, the less difficult part of the job. After listening to them, we can "tell them." Our relation to the Supreme Court presents problems of greater complexity.

The Solicitor General decides in many instances finally what questions shall not come before the Supreme Court, and he must therefore address himself to the inquiry, "what kinds of legal problems does the Court wish to entertain?"

The Court, as you know, does not customarily declare its reasons for granting or denying certiorari. There are nine minds that have been known to disagree, and none has fully revealed itself. We know that different approaches are possible. One Justice may vote to grant or deny certiorari for one reason, and another may agree with him for an entirely different reason. We are told on the highest authority that denial means nothing more than that four favorable votes were not available. Under these circumstances, how is the Solicitor General to divine the overall plan of the Court in the selection of cases? There is no pat answer, for there are no clear criteria. What is a case for the Court is not precisely measurable. It has to be felt; it cannot be demonstrated. There are many surprises.

At the beginning of the last term the Federal Power Commission joined with the Phillips Petroleum Co. in petitioning for certiorari to settle an important question as to the jurisdiction of the Commission in the regulation of the natural gas industry. The petition was denied. Phillips then filed a motion for reconsideration. The Government declined to join in this motion out of deference for the rule which forbids motions for reconsideration except where new matter is to be presented. The Solicitor General's Office is perhaps more scrupulous in observing this rule than are some others. To the surprise of the profession, certiorari, though previously denied, was granted.

Again, a man convicted by the State courts of New York of murdering his parents sought to raise by certiorari the validity of his confession. He claimed that with the connivance of State officers a psychiatrist ostensibly called to treat him extracted the challenged confession. Certiorari was denied. Nevertheless, most unexpectedly the Supreme Court saw fit to review the same question when it was raised by the same defendant on habeas corpus in a Federal court.

Shortly after coming to Washington I paid courtesy calls on each of the Justices. No two seemed to have exactly the same standards for certiorari; most of them said frankly that the standards defy formulation. One Justice told me that the sum involved had little weight with the Court, but that he personally was influenced by that factor. I asked him what was the dividing line, and he answered quite seriously that when he saw the Government lose $20 million he thought the case might be worth looking at. He spoke this as one might confess a personal idiosyncracy.

The Court may reject a case, not because the question is unimportant, but because it thinks the time not ripe for decision. In our system the Supreme Court is not merely the adjudicator of controversies, but in the process of adjudication it is in many instances the final formulator of national policy. It should therefore occasion no wonder, if the Court seeks the appropriate time to consider and decide important questions, just as Congress or any other policymaking body might. For example, for several years before taking the school-segregation cases the Court repeatedly turned away opportunities to decide questions in that area, perhaps because they deemed them premature. Lately it declined to review a ruling on segregation in public housing, perhaps because the Court thought it best, after deciding the school cases, not to say more on other aspects of segregation at this time. Or the Court may think the record in the case at hand not adequate or otherwise unsuitable to raise and decide the point. We can only speculate. In the decision of great constitutional questions, especially those which are in the realm of political controversy, timing can be of supreme importance.

One can hardly fail to be impressed with the growing finality of the courts of appeals of the several circuits in the disposition of ordinary litigation. The Supreme Court has in late years steadily decreased the number of cases it will consent to hear, limiting the volume of business within its discretionary jurisdiction under the act of 1925. Last term it granted 88 certioraris, as compared with 193 in 1940. Only 8 percent of the petitions filed were accepted as against 22 percent in the earlier year. As to cases heard and submitted there were but 116, while in 1940 there were 204. Ten years earlier there were 267.

Of the 88 certioraris granted 52, or two-thirds of the total, were brought by or against the Government. Of certioraris sought by the Solicitor General only 40 percent were granted—a decline from 80 percent of such petitions granted only a few years ago. It is significant that the Solicitor General himself has severely culled the cases and applied for certiorari in substantially less than half of those in which some Government agency urged him to do so, in fact in about 12 percent of the total cases lost. Still the mortality in the residue was more than half. Private lawyers were successful in only 6 percent of their petitions for certiorari.

Plainly, the Supreme Court does not consider that it would make the best use of its time and energy if it were to serve merely as another appellate court. Almost a quarter of a century ago, Chief Justice Taft declared that a litigant is entitled to one appeal, not two. Even a conflict between the circuits is no infallible assurance of favorable action on a petition. Increasingly the Justices seem to regard their function as that of a gyroscope to keep the ship on an even keel, confining themselves more so than in the past to the consideration of grave national issues.

Tax litigation, so prolific a decade ago, appears now almost dried up. One Justice told me that the place to seek corrections in tax law is Congress, even when a court of appeals seems to have misinterpreted a statutory provision. Nevertheless, at the end of the term earlier this month the Supreme Court unexpectedly granted a whole series of certioraris in criminal net-worth cases and reinstated a number of such cases previously declined.

At the outset I told you that I would not undertake to give final answers, but would discuss the work and its problems. The office is not exempt, for there is no exemption, from the anxieties which attend any serious undertaking. Intertwined with these, however, are deep satisfactions, as you must perceive from what I have already said.

Mr. Justice Jackson, when he was Solicitor General, once told of a letter addressed to "The Celestial General," Washington, D. C., and he rejoiced in the fact that the post office had no difficulty in determining that it should be delivered to him. I do not lay claim to "celestial" recognition, but there are solid compensations here; among these are the opportunities for association with able high-minded men in the office and elsewhere in the Department of Justice.

I prize a letter which I received from Mr. William Marshall Bullitt, who was Solicitor General in President Taft's administration—over 40 years ago. This is what he wrote me:

"If a lawyer desires only professional work, there is not an office in the country, State or National, that is to be compared with the Solicitor General, in the range of subjects to be considered and studied, and in the rare opportunity to argue great cases before the Supreme Court under the most favorable conditions as the representative of the Government.

"It will bring you into relation with that great Court and its members in such a way as to color the rest of your professional life."

If the possibilities of this office are to be realized, the incumbent must strive to learn the meaning of the process he seeks to guide. He must try to discover the social tensions, the reverberations of strife and passion, the political issues, the clashes of interest that are dressed up in technical legal forms. With what wisdom he can muster he must endeavor to foresee the consequences of his acts upon the future course of the law. What is the essence of it all? What spirit can be perceived that stirs this variegated mass of litigation? What does it signify and what does it portend, for good or ill? As the lawyer for the Government and as an officer of the court acting within the proper limits of his special function, his constant endeavor must be, without falling prey to his own fetishes but obedient to the legislative policy laid down by others, to channel this mighty stream so as to strengthen the foundations of our society, to make freedom more secure and to promote justice between man and man and between the Government and its citizens.

Why Are We So Jittery?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1954

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, a former Member of this House, the Honorable Bruce Barton, had an interesting column last Sunday.

He asks a question that many have asked in recent months: "Why are we so jittery?" His answer seems clear and true. I believe especially that, "Sabers rattle most when held in trembling hands."

The above-mentioned follows:

WHY ARE WE SO JITTERY?

(By Bruce Barton)

"By the rude bridge that arched the flood,
Their flag to April's breeze unfurled,
Here the embattled farmers stood
And fired the shot heard round the world."

The "embattled farmers" were civilian citizens of a raw, sprawling country of less than 3 million inhabitants. They fired the "shots heard round the world" at the professional soldiers of the strongest empire in the world.

The "embattled farmers" and their families had plenty of reason to be afraid. But both then and in the 7 years of bitter fighting that followed, they never lost their faith. They knew they could lick the enemy and secure their freedom. And they did.

In the early 1800's, their sons and daughters showed equal courage. When the holy alliance of Austria, Prussia, and Russia set out with France to quash the rebellious Spanish colonies in South America, President James Monroe issued a stern message. In it he warned all the world that the Western Hemisphere was no longer to be considered open to colonization by foreign powers, and that Europe should keep out or else. At that time our population was around 5 million. We had no standing army, no navy of any consequence, and only the rudiments of national industry. But we were not afraid. And the holy alliance and its partner, France, did exactly what they were told.

I cannot remember how many times in subsequent history the Monroe Doctrine has been invoked. But I do recall at least two instances—once when the British threatened to send over their fleet to collect a South American debt, and again when the Kaiser threatened to send his. In the first case, President Cleveland let out a blast, and in the second, Theodore Roosevelt. As a result, neither fleet ever showed up.

In all the first 125 years of our history as a Nation we seemed never to have any fear. Then came the First World War, and we were told that "when the Kaiser licks the British and French, he will come over here." Subsequent history proves that the Kaiser never had the slightest idea of coming over here.

In World War II we were told again: "When he (Hitler) has won in Europe, he will come over here." All the secret papers of Hitler, his officials and his generals have now been captured and made public. They prove conclusively that what he wanted was to expand to the east and conquer Russia. He had not slightest notion of coming over here.

Now, for a third time, we are being panicked. While the Germans and the English remain comparatively calm under the very noses of the Russians, we have become the most fidgety and timid people in the world. As a consequence, our policies are muddled, our words contradictory, and our actions often reckless. We should have learned long ago that it is impossible to win a cold war by being hotheaded, or to establish peace with a policy born out of fear. Our recent saber-rattlings are not a sign of courage. Sabers rattle most when held in trembling hands.

Are We Using Our Brains?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1954

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, as a new Member of Congress, I feel fortunate that during the 2d session of the 83d Congress, I have had the privilege to serve as a member of the Military Operations Subcommittee of the House Committee on Government Operations, under the chairmanship of the able and distinguished gentleman from New York, Mr. R. Walter Riehlman.

The Military Operations Subcommittee has issued 11 intermediate reports to the Congress. These reports cover subcommittee activities ranging from investigations of specific programs, which pointed up irregularities in the business operations of the Government, to surveys of broad military programs. I believe these reports have been helpful in remedying many situations where excessive and unnecessary military expenditures were formerly found.

Recently the subcommittee issued its report on the organization and administration of the military's research and development programs. The subcommittee's report noted several shortcomings in both the organization and administration of the military research and development program, and noted that the relations between our Defense Establishment and the scientific community are not what they should be. The subcommittee hopes to see improvement in this most important program in the near future.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include an interesting article on this subject entitled "Are We Using Our Brains?" by Ernest K. Lindley, published in Newsweek, August 9, 1954:

A very disturbing report on the relations between scientists and our Military Establishment has just been issued by the Military Operations Subcommittee of the House Committee on Government Operations, under the chairmanship of Representative R. Walter Riehlman, Republican, of New York.

The subject is supremely important. In recent years warfare has been transformed by science and technology. The transformation already has brought obliteration within reach and is stil underway. In the race for new and better weapons, both of offense and of defense, we see the enemy catching up with us at a rate which has shattered our smug estimates of only a few years ago. At some points, he may already be ahead. The maximum employment of our scientific resources is essential to our survival.

The Riehlman report shows that our military services are not making maximum use of our scientific resources. It shows that the relations between our Defense Establishment and the scientific community are very far from what they ought to be. Although it does not specifically say so, it implies that these relations have been getting worse.

The report takes added weight from the care and high sense of responsibility with which it was prepared. It is based on testimony taken in executive session, at which were heard only witnesses with important experience and of the highest repute, supplemented by the written views of some 50 leading scientists. It deliberately avoids sensation. In all, it is a splendid example of the way in which a congressional committee should investigate a complex and delicate matter vital to our security, with a view to promoting constructive reforms. It is the antithesis of the McCarthy method. But the conclusions are potentially explosive. They are causing a stir in informed circles in Washington. It is a safe prediction that any top-ranking defense officials and military men who ignore them will eventually feel the explosion.

Among the significant points brought out in the Riehlman report are:

1. Generally, the military establishment has downgraded the scientists and is hampering their work in many ways.

2. Our top-level strategists get little or no direct scientific advice. In some cases, they have not known of new developments materially affecting the problems with which they are dealing.

3. In many cases, there is a serious failure to use new ideas and devices.

4. The exodus of key scientists, for whom replacements are not readily available, has been too high.

5. More must be done to stimulate more-or-less basic research, as distinct from the refinement and improvement of weapons, which the services usually do rather well.

6. Not only the scientists but contractors doing military work are hampered by restrictions on the interchange of information, due to secrecy requirements and other restrictions, such as the antitrust laws.

7. The loyalty and security risk procedures are having discouraging effects. This lay outside the Riehlman subcommittee's agenda but was noted in its report because of the great importance attached to it by some senior scientists with the widest experience.

This brief summary is inadequate. Another reader might attach equal or greater importance to other adverse finding in the report. The subcommittee makes many specific recommendations although not on all the serious problems which it locates. Its study did not even extend to the Atomic Energy Commission or the consequences of the Oppenheimer decision. But it uncovers far more than enough to justify alarm about the deterioriating relations between our defense program and our scientific brains. Significantly, the deepest anxiety is felt by the men who have had the most experience: The senior scientific administrators and weaponeers who are so largely responsible for the superiority in weapons we now have, or hope we have. They are men whose advice the Government, and all of us, can afford to ignore only at our mortal peril.

A Round for Ike and J. Taxpayer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN R. DAVIS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1954

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Wisconsin State Journal, Madison, Wis., discussing the atomic-energy bill, on which final action was taken in the House of Representatives yesterday:

A ROUND FOR IKE AND J. TAXPAYER

President Eisenhower and his party have nothing to apologize for in their victory on the so-called atomic energy bill, which recently cleared the Senate.

If any words of explanation are due, it is from the shameless breast beaters—northern radicals who have lost all faith in the private-enterprise system, and southern Democrats from the TVA area—who distorted the facts and wasted the Senate's time in an attempt to build an issue for the fall campaign.

For the key issue in the filibuster and debate was not on whether private initiative and capital are to be given a chance to develop (in partnership with the Government) the atom's power for peacetime use.

It was simply whether the vast Tennessee Valley Authority system should keep the monopoly it has had for several years as supplier of power to the Government's equally vast atomic-energy plants.

The answer, as spelled out by the Senate vote, is "No." Some phases still have to be threshed out in a conference on the differences in House and Senate bills; the Senate version carries amendments which still could freeze out private industry in some phases of power development.

Those are details. The chief thing is that the Republican administration has declared itself for private industry and less Government in business, as it pledged to do in its 1952 platform.

The public-power boys and some segments of the press have tried to haunt Mr. Eisenhower with his 1952 labeling of TVA as an example of creeping socialism.

The term, considered daring on the part of a presidential candidate in referring to such a sacred cow as TVA, was too mild. Federally sponsored public power, since TVA was born in 1933, has been creeping about like Roger Bannister.

TVA's announced goal, 21 years ago, was to reach a power production of 1 million kilowatts on an outlay of $150 million. Flood control, navigation, and soil conservation were all thrown in as protective coloration.

Current power output of the TVA system is more than 5 million kilowatts and plans call for stepping that up to 10 million.

Instead of $150 million, something over $1.6 billion of Federal tax dollars have gone into TVA.

The Government has got back about 8 percent of that investment, which pays no taxes and shifts much of its power-production cost to phony charges against navigation and flood-control functions.

It is true that Tennessee Valley residents use almost twice as much electric power as the national average, and pay only 60 to 80 percent of the usual kilowatt-hour rate.

It is just as true that taxpayers all over the country have been called on all these years to make up the savings enjoyed by TVA customers.

Only the viciousness of their attack kept Senators like Morse, Gore, Stennis, and Langer from being laughed off the floor.

Terms like "giveaway," "sellout," and "monopolistic bondage," applied to a measure that would permit private utilities to supply some of the Atomic Energy Commission's power needs—instead of tapping the Federal Treasury for another $100 million—are nonsense, and their authors knew it.

But they knew, too, that cheap power is a nice item in the campaign grab bag, and they worked it to the limit.

The fight against socialism in the power field isn't over yet, but John Taxpayer has had one of his few good rounds in the Senate action.

The Public Debt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MORGAN M. MOULDER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 3, 1954

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following article:

The Administration Is Indebted to a Gimmick

(By Andrew Tully)

In all this hassle about increasing the debt limit, don't try to get any consolation out of Government figures which appear to show the public debt as being less than it was under Presidents Roosevelt and Truman.

Actually, figured on the same basis as in previous administrations, the public debt is the highest in the Nation's history.

The reason is a bookkeeping gimmick—perfectly logical and legitimate—adopted by the Eisenhower administration to show the amount owed by the Government to people that have savings bonds.

The Eisenhower boys enter on the books only the current value of these savings bonds, whereas in the past the debt was figured on the basis of the bonds' maturity value. In other words, nowadays if you've just bought $100 war bond for $75, the Government figures it owes you only $75 instead of $100—since it would have to pay you only $75 if you cashed it today.

In previous administrations, the moment you bought a $75 bond, the Government acknowledged it owed you $100.

Thus the so-called peak debt year of 1946 wasn't the peak at all. The debt then was $279 billion, which is $5 billion higher than the present debt of $274 billion. But the 1946 figure included approximately $10 billion in interest which the Government figured it owed—or would owe—on savings bonds. Figured on the basis the Eisenhower administration uses, the public debt in 1946 was only $269 billion—or $5 billion less than the current debt.

Or, if you figured the Eisenhower public debt as they figured it in previous administrations, it would amount to $286 billion because the interest to be due on savings bonds has increased to $12 billion.

The public debt, incidentally, has increased $18 billion since Harry Truman left the White House. It was $266 billion then, but again you have to lop off $10 billion in savings bond interest in order to compare it fairly with the current debt. Lowest postwar debt was in 1949, when the debt was $252 billion or $242 billion if figured according to the Eisenhower system.

All these figures come from Edwin L. Kirby, Commissioner of Public Debt. Mr. Kirby sighs wistfully when he reminds you that there has only been 1 year in which the United States had no public debt.

That was in 1836 and the reason was a combination of a prosperity wave and a President named Andrew Jackson, who slashed Government expenditures with a meat cleaver. That was the year, incidentally, when the United States paid off the last installment of its $40 million Revolutionary War debt.

Although Americans are accustomed to thinking of themselves as creditors to the rest of the world, part of our public debt is owed to foreigners. The total is $6 billion, mostly held by banks and public institutions in Europe. Germany heads the list of creditors with $675 million in United States I O U's.

Brooklyn's Negroes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 9, 1954

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to direct the attention of our colleagues to the following very interesting articles on the progress of our Negro citizens in Brooklyn.

These articles are the last of a series which began in the Brooklyn Eagle of July 25, 1954. The following article is the 13th in this series and appeared in the Eagle of August 6, 1954:

Negroes Getting Bigger Political Plums as Party Leaders Realize Their Power

(By Sid Frigand)

The Negro's political history in Brooklyn dates back more than a century—but until the last few years it was a history of frustration and impotence.

Negro leaders of the past, like John Syphax, Wesley Young, Perry Wilson, and Edward Horne—grandfather of Brooklyn-born singer Lena Horne—had to be content to be big fish in a small, segregated pond.

The political plums relegated to Negro clubhouse devotees were small. Sumner Lark's appointment as Brooklyn's first Negro assistant district attorney, for example, was accompanied by much hoopla and dressed up to appear as a major accomplishment for the long-denied Brooklyn residents.

Since the beginning of World War II, however, the plum tree has matured as far as the Negro is concerned, and today the Negro can boast two men in elective office—Assemblyman Bertram L. Baker and Municipal Court Justice Lewis S. Flagg, Jr.—and two others—Special Sessions Court Justice Myles A. Paige and Domestic Relations Justice Clarence Wilson—in major appointive posts.

NEGRO'S POLITICAL POWER REALIZED

These men have won top positions in our courts and government because of the gradual awareness by the political powers-that-be that the Negro commands one of the largest voting blocs in the borough.

The bulk of Brooklyn's Negroes live in the section loosely called Bedford-Stuyvesant, whose boundaries mysteriously enlarge each year as the press of increasing population forces more and more Negroes to find homes in nearby fringe areas.

According to latest population estimates, more than 300,000 persons live within this 3- to 4-square-mile area, making it one of the world's most densely inhabited spots.

Translated into votes, Bedford-Stuyvesant has become a key factor. The politician's keen awareness of this was reflected in the last redistricting of Brooklyn, when a new sixth assembly district—almost all-Negro—was created.

The new wedge-shaped district nestles uneasily in the embrace of the 17th and 10th A. D.s, whose arms join to the north and south of the sixth in a sort of political ring-around-the-rosy.

GREETED WITH MIXED FEELINGS

This tight little island was greeted with mixed feelings by the Negro politicians—on one hand they'll be guaranteed representation in the State party committees plus an Assemblyman; on the debit side of the ledger, the district becomes a political ghetto—which doesn't sit right with the principles of many Negroes.

Our Negro political figures—like most political figures of any race, color, or creed—are hardened realists, however, and are accepting the new district enthusiastically.

Special sessions justice, Myles A. Paige, whose 18 years on the bench qualifies him as a veteran observer of the Negro political scene, took the view that the new district will bring about revitalized political leadership among Negroes.

"TWENTY-FIVE YEARS BEHIND MANHATTAN"

"The Brooklyn Negro is 25 years behind Manhattan politically," the tall, husky jurist declared.

"Until recently, the only leadership we had was dictated by the boys downtown.

"Now the Negro voter no longer has to choose a candidate designated by the party bosses if he wants to elect a Negro to office," he added.

Judge Paige's predictions seem to be materializing rapidly with threats of several primary fights in the offing in Bedford-Stuyvesant.

Wesley Holder, head of the recently formed Bedford-Stuyvesant Political League, announced he will oppose Assemblyman Baker for district leadership. The league is also running William Chisholm for Democratic candidate for State senate. To further complicate the picture, Baker disclosed he will designate Attorney Oliver D. William for the senate candidacy, thus paving the way for a possible 4-way race in the primary fight for the 11th senatorial district nomination.

The scramble among Negroes for political power is a healthy note, Judge Paige declared, and will bring about pressures in the district for more responsible leadership.

FIRST NEGRO ELECTED

Assemblyman Baker, a British West Indian by birth, was the first Negro elected to any public office in Brooklyn. Although heir to the district leadership by party designation, he confessed he was not pleased with the sixth assembly district setup but would do his best to work within the new boundaries.

Baker, a bespectacled, babyfaced man who belies the fact that he has 4 grandchildren, has been active in local politics for the past 30 years.

He has been a member of the assembly since 1948, and last year sponsored legislation which would ban segregated housing in buildings financed by Government funds and put housing under the jurisdiction of the State commission against discrimination.

Wesley McDonald Holder, also West Indian by birth, is a former newspaperman who scuffed at rumors that his political league is leftwing.

"We're an independent Democratic organization," said the tall, lean insurgent, "and are opposed to any method of achieving our goals except by democratic means."

Mr. Holder's political league is the child of an organization formed last year to back Lewis Flagg's successful bid for the municipal court nomination over the Democratic nominee.

Judge Flagg's success at the polls left his backers as a powerful factor in Bedford-Stuyvesant. Their ability to win votes against another Negro will be tested for the first time in the forthcoming primary.

Persistent reports that the league is being run by former American Labor Partyites was denied by Mr. Holder. "I'm the head of this group," he said, "and we are working to be accepted as the regular Democrats."

"We don't have the time or the facilities to scrutinize or investigate our members," he added.

The political arena in the sixth assembly district will not be confined to Democrats by any means. Louis J. Warner, prominent businessman, has been designated as Republican district leader and Richard Simon and Maude B. Richardson, veteran coleader of the old 17th assembly district, will serve on the State committee.

REPUBLICANS LOOK FORWARD

The Republicans look toward vigorous campaigns in the next few years and will undoubtedly prove to be a strong factor in the new district. Patronage from Washington has already led to the appointment of Henry Bromwell as Assistant United States Attorney.

Despite the many privations suffered by the lower-economic groups in Bedford-Stuyvesant, the Negro has remained comparatively unshakable against the overtures of the Communist Party.

Judge Clarence Wilson, who recently was appointed to the Family Court after serving as a magistrate, contributed this attitude to the Negro's "innate desire for democratic principles," citing the stubborn resistence of our Negro soldiers to Communist brainwashing in Korea.

The pleasant judge, who has been a member of Frank Sinnott's 22d A. D. clubhouse for the past 27 years, summed up Negro resistance to communism in this way:

"They dangle slogans and promises before us, but we won't join because they need us temporarily to gain power. Progress is permanent—they can't give us that."

Mr. Speaker, the following article is the 14th in this series. It appeared in the Brooklyn Eagle of August 7, 1954:

More Employers Are Hiring Negroes for Skilled Jobs and in New Fields

(By Sid Frigand)

Work—hard work—has always been synonymous with the Negro.

At the same time, we often hear the opposite being recited as the gospel.

Obviously, stereotypes go to extremes. Individuals guided by such generalizations often find themselves wallowing in contradiction.

There are lazy Negroes in Brooklyn—ask any Negro about his brother-in-law.

There are industrious, hard-working Negroes in Brooklyn—ask any Negro about himself.

Seriously, however, the impartial observer must conclude that Negroes are not apart from any other Brooklynites when it comes to desire to work. The difference lies only in jobs available.

In Brooklyn, the jobs available lists have swelled since World War II to a point where opportunities for the Negro are perhaps greater here than in any other community in this country.

OLD CONCEPT FADES

The opportunity has not been met indifferently. The zeal in which Negroes have tackled jobs which were heretofore barred to them is fast erasing the old concept about Negroes being "last to be hired, first to be fired."

Reginald Ingram, industrial relations secretary of the Brooklyn Urban League, expressed optimism about the number of different type of jobs becoming available. "Unfortunately," he said, "they are qualitative and not quantitive."

Mr. Ingram, a tall, charming man, has the sensitive job of contacting industry representatives and selling them the idea that Negroes can fill important jobs with competence and skill.

"We have been successful in many branches of industry in Brooklyn," Mr. Ingram said, "but the number of Negroes in these important jobs is small."

He explained that one goal of the Urban League is to place competent Negroes into key jobs, which in turn will open up new fields for Negro employees.

"One information clerk," he declared, "is worth 100 persons working on the inside, where they cannot be seen by the general public."

NEW DOORS OPENING

Through the efforts of the league and other interested organizations, industries in Brooklyn, long closed to the Negro, have opened their doors in the past few years.

One of the recent notable successes was with the local breweries. The league is currently planning talks with industry and union representatives in the baking field.

Mr. Ingraham explained that some unions have helped break down color barriers in some industries, but others are the chief source of segregation.

He named the craft unions as the toughest nuts to crack, especially some that are father-and-son type guilds which restrict membership to close relatives.

Kinship isn't the only restrictive barrier, Mr. Ingram explained. "Have you ever seen a Negro delivering milk or bread on a route?"

He placed a good portion of the blame on the A. F. of L. Teamsters Union for this ban.

MOST ORGANIZATIONS HELPFUL

On the whole, he found Brooklyn unions and businessmen very cooperative and willing to work with the league in taking on Negro help. "Unfortunately," he added, "some large firms will hire one Negro—as a token employee—and consider themselves cooperating."

Other organizations have taken a wholehearted approach to the matter and have seriously worked to integrate Negroes into their hiring scheme. He cited Greer Hydraulics, Murray Manufacturing, and Arwood Precision Casting Companies as a few examples.

Brooklyn's department stores and utility firms—such as the telephone company—have also given recognition to the Negro on higher job levels.

In the professional and semi-professional ranks, Negroes have made some noteworthy strides. The Squibb Laboratories recently opened their doors to Negroes on the professional level, pointing the way for other local chemical firms to follow suit.

The sales field has also been opened to the Negro, with the growing awareness that salesmanship has little to do with a man's color. A notable "pioneer" in this field is Joseph T. Brown, top salesman for Benson Chevrolet, who worked his way up after being hired 5 years ago as the first Negro to work in a sales capacity for an authorized auto dealer in Brooklyn.

GAIN IN PROFESSIONS

The professions have called more and more Negroes into their ranks, and here, too, the Negroes have responded with marked achievement. Dr. Phillips Brooks, a Park Slope dentist, is another example of a Negro making active contributions to his field.

Dr. Brooks has proved outstanding in the field of dental ceramics, and has many domestic and foreign patents to his credit for devices and techniques for using porcelain and plastics materials.

Dr. Brooks, past president of the Provident Professional Club—a group of Negro doctors, dentists and pharmacists in Brooklyn—estimated that there are close to 150 Negroes in Brooklyn who are eligible to join the club at present. Other professions—law, insurance, engineering, etc.—would multiply this figure many times over.

Perhaps some of the most noteworthy strides by Brooklyn's Negroes have been in the Civil Service setup, where the color barrier has been less of a factor for some time.

Brooklyn's own post office can boast of Senior Assistant Superintendent Henry R. Jackson, who is director of training for the borough's 7,000 postal employees.

BLUEPRINT TRAINING PROGRAM

Mr. Jackson, a veteran of 28 years with the postal service, has been in charge of a training program for the past 6 years that will most likely be adopted as a blueprint plan for the entire postal system.

The Jacksons, Browns, and Brooks are typical of countless number of Negroes, who, given the opportunity to work above the level of domestics and laborers, have proved their worth.

"Most persons have had interracial experiences in school or some other place," Mr. Ingram declared.

"Why is it then," he asked, "that some employers feel they have to shelter the public from exposure to Negroes?"

Mr. Speaker, the following article is the concluding article of this series. It appeared in the Brooklyn Eagle of August 8, 1954:

Brooklyn, With Its Climate of Freedom for Minority Groups, Haven to Negroes

(By Sid Frigand)

Brooklyn has a special sort of climate benficial to freedom.

It was this climate in 1860 that found the Reverend Henry Ward Beecher selling a little slave girl "Pinky" from the pulpit of his Plymouth Church in Brooklyn Heights in a dramatic bid for the abolitionist cause.

It was this same climate 87 years later that found James Roosevelt Robinson donning the uniform of the Brooklyn Dodgers—the first member of his race to play in major league baseball.

Since the dawn of this century Brooklyn has become home for ever-increasing numbers of individuals who were victims of oppression and poverty. Today, Brooklyn has become a city of minorities—even the old Brooklynites have become a minority.

This strange ethnic pattern—where the majority of our Brooklynites are members of minority groups in terms of the general American pattern—is perhaps most responsible for the "live and let live" way of life that predominates here.

This minority conscience has permitted the Negro to thrive in Brooklyn, to grow in social and economic status and community respect. The Negro's voice in the borough has increasing significance—and it is not the voice of a southerner or a West Indian. It is the voice of a Brooklynite.

When the Brooklyn Eagle undertook this survey of our Negro neighbors, there was the awareness that there might be criticism from some sources.

The criticism came in surprisingly small numbers, but the obvious questions were asked:

Why don't you write about Negro crimes?

Why don't you write about juvenile delinquency?

The answer seems equally obvious. Crime and juvenile delinquency are not "Negro" in nature. These problems are community problems, and, if any correlation can be found, they are linked to social and economic instability.

The Negroes have known more than their share of social and economic inequities, and these were among the problems the Eagle investigated.

Primarily, this series of articles sought to chart the course of the Negro in the community with representative sketches of some of the personalities living here.

It was only after these persons were interviewed that another story developed. This was a result of common agreement that there still exist in Brooklyn certain problems that Negroes, and very few others, face.

The way the Negro lives in Brooklyn directly affects the way every Brooklynite lives.

Evils existing in housing opportunities for Negroes cannot be hush-hushed in hopes they will go away like bad dreams; nor can they be accepted only as "Negro" housing problems.

Responsible city officials agree that these problems must be brought into the light and examined before they undermine the foundations of our community with spreading blight and dangerous over-crowding.

Fortunately, Brooklyn is built on solid ground, and its citizens are built of solid stuff.

Fortunately, Brooklyn's Negroes are not quitters, even at this late date. They have spurned attractive ideological offers from the extreme left and degrading disparagement from the extreme right to move doggedly down the middle to a place alongside other Brooklynites.

This unfaltering spirit, which is typically American, seems best described by Brooklyn's own Walt Whitman—a onetime Brooklyn Eagle editor—who set down these immortal lines:

"See my children, resolute children,
By those swarms upon our rear we must never yield or falter,
Ages back in ghostly millions frowning there behind us urging,
Pioneers! O pioneers!"

The Fulbright Oxonian: Some Impressions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 10, 1954

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an article written by Robert B. Looper, and published in the American Oxonian. It is a very interesting evaluation of the exchange program in the first 5 years of its operation.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

THE FULBRIGHT OXONIAN: SOME IMPRESSIONS

(By Robert B. Looper, University College)

(Editor's Note.—For the first time in this magazine a Fulbright scholar reports on Oxford and the Fulbright program. The author is a graduate of Yale, holds a degree in law from the University of Oklahoma, and is a candidate for a doctor of philosophy in the field of international law.)

Americanus Oxoniensis (as even the casual reader of this journal well realizes) is a genus with many species, of which the Rhodes scholar is but one. What the casual reader may not so well realize, however, is that the last 5 years have seen the development of a new and distinct species, the Fulbright scholar. It is my purpose here to describe this new category of American Oxonian precisely because it is not so well known as the Rhodes group. And though comparisons are always apt to be invidious and therefore odious, it may nevertheless be necessary to describe the similarities and differences between these two groups of Americans at Oxford.

The debt of the Fulbright scholarship program to its Rhodes counterpart is indicated by the name of its distinguished author. Every now and then, though, you may run across someone who wants to know "Who is this fellow Fulbright who endowed all these scholarships?" One must then explain that these scholarships were established by Public Law 584 of the 79th Congress, which amended the Surplus Property Act of 1944 so that part of the currencies and credits of other countries acquired by the United States through the sale of surplus property abroad might be used for educational exchanges. Quite appropriately this program is known by the name of the author of that act, Senator J. William Fulbright (Arkansas and Pembroke, 1925), who only last year was awarded an honorary D. C. L. by Oxford in recognition of his imaginative educational statesmanship.

Like the American Rhodes scholars, the Fulbright group at Oxford is only one part of a wider program. The Fulbright scholars at Oxford represent but a small fraction of the more than 180 Fulbright students in the United Kingdom, which in turn is only a small part of the 900 Fulbright scholars in all the 26 host countries. Readers of this journal will be primarily interested, however, only in the Fulbright contingent at Oxford and it is only this group which I propose here to treat.

Since the first Fulbright contingent came to Oxford for the year 1949–50, the program is now at the end of its fifth year. These years have added much to the stature of the Fulbright program in Anglo-American relations. Although some of the vast administrative difficulties associated with a new undertaking of such scope still remain, the program is now so well established that certain generalizations are possible, even if appraisal must await the future.

To begin with, the Fulbright group at Oxford is numerically much smaller than the number of American Rhodes scholars. They have averaged just under 30 during the first 5 years of the program's operation. (Naturally a much greater number of the successful Fulbright applicants put Oxford as first choice, but most of these are placed at other British universities.) Since geographical distribution is taken into account to some extent in the selection procedure, this group—like the Rhodes—represents a fair cross-section of American States and universities.

The composition of these two groups differs, however, since Fulbright scholarships are awarded without restriction as to age, sex, or marital status. The average age of the Oxford Fulbrighters consequently is nearly 25, which ranks them as somewhat older than the present Rhodes group. To accentuate the difference further, one need only point out that one-fourth of the Fulbright group are women—a ratio which has remained remarkably constant over the last 5 years and seems eminently satisfactory to all concerned. Thus far, only 1 marriage between 2 Fulbright scholars at Oxford has been recorded. Exogamous unions are more prevalent, however, and about one-third of the men are married. Needless to say a married student obtains a very different picture of English life, as the immediate postwar crop of Rhodes scholars well realize. It is equally platitudinous to say that the wives are the unsung heroes of the Oxford educational process.

The terms of award of the Fulbright grant provide the student with a much shorter tenure than his Rhodes counterpart. The awards are made initially for 1 year only. Early in the program it was realized, however, that the 1-year tenure of the scholarships prevented the student from gaining the most from British university life by taking a coordinated degree course. Accordingly a limited number of renewal grants have been made available to subsidize a second year's study for those students who can prove their merits. About one-third of the present Fulbright group at Oxford are renewal grantees; and it is probably safe to say that the renewal grants enable the really serious student to stay at Oxford for the 2 years necessary to get a degree.

Partially offsetting this shorter security of tenure, the Fulbright scholarship carries a stipend somewhat larger than that of the Rhodes scholarship, or indeed any other comparable grant. For the academic year the Fulbright grantee receives a total cash payment for maintenance and books slightly in excess of £500. In addition the Fulbright Commission pays all of his tuition and fees plus round-trip transportation expenses, both interstate and transatlantic. Single students find the scholarship stipend adequate; even married ones subsist on it.

All these characteristics—size and composition of the group and their conditions of tenure—are but surface features. What the reader will want to know, after all, is this: What do Fulbright scholars do when they get to Oxford, what kind of record have they made, what kind of impression have they left on the Oxford community? Although generalizations are always treacherous, one salient characteristic stands out immediately: the Fulbright awards are given in express terms to finance graduate study. Accordingly fewer than 25 percent of the Fulbright group at Oxford do schools for the bachelor of arts degree. The great bulk of the degree candidates take one of the "research" degrees (doctor of philosophy or bachelor of literature); some do one of the other "graduate" degrees (such as the bachelor of philosophy); a few more take one of the graduate diplomas. Perhaps as large a percentage of Rhodes scholars-elect have the initial intention of pursuing graduate research at Oxford, but certainly many of these are dissuaded from that pursuit and persuaded to "do schools" instead. Apparently not so many Fulbrighters are thus diverted. It is always a difficult thing for an Oxford don to suggest to a graduate of an American university that he read an "undergraduate" course. It is even more difficult to urge this course upon a man who has already done some postgraduate work, as the average Fulbright scholar has.

The selection procedure by which the Fulbright scholar gets to Oxford virtually predetermines this research emphasis. The central factor in the selection procedure, so it appears to most applicants, is the project. Instead of writing a fairly general subjective essay on his background, plans, and aspirations—as does the Rhodes applicant—the would-be Fulbrighter must put down on a printed form his research "project" or "program" of study. His references are required not to supply a general letter of recommendation but to write on the back of such a form a recommendation commenting specifically on the applicant's proposed "project." In addition to the candidate's project, his academic record and personal qualities are said to be taken into account. But the selection procedure is so labyrinthine, involving 3 or 4 agencies in addition to the State Department, and consuming over 6 months, that not much personal evaluation is possible. The applicant is interviewed only by an ad hoc committee of professors at his university. The actual selection board never sees the applicant and cannot know how much weight to give the recommendations of the disparate committees. Inevitably mechanical criteria of selection must be adopted in a mass program of this sort. Since personal qualities are mechanically nonassessable and academic records are perplexingly noncomparable, emphasis is inevitably placed on the project.

The project could be cynically described as an artful fiction, an elaborately contrived come-on, a carefully pitched appeal. The ingenuity and particularity with which some of these are proposed often attests to a fertile imagination. Few of these projects are followed very literally when the scholar gets to Oxford, and no attempt is made to hold the student to its specific terms. But the emphasis in the terms of the program on graduate study has led the average Fulbright applicant to believe that a grant will be awarded only to subsidize a specific research project. A student who says, "I want to go to Oxford to read P. P. E. in order to round out my liberal education" might, one surmises, be considered an intellectual dilettante, a dabbler, an educational tourist. Besides, is it graduate study? Happily the Rhodes people have avoided this semantic confusion. Of the many grants available to American students who wish to study in Britain, the Rhodes scholarship still remains one of the few which require no project and will avowedly subsidize liberal education as opposed to research.

The fact that the Fulbright Oxonian is typically engaged in graduate research raises the fundamental question whether such activity really exploits his Oxford opportunity to the fullest. I think that the intellectual pleasures and physical discomforts of researching in the Oxford libraries are too well known to need further comment here. The organization of graduate work at Oxford, however, presents another problem. For at Oxford a definite hiatus exists between undergraduate teaching and graduate research, a gap filled in America by graduate courses and seminars. Because of the specialized character of the B. A. course perhaps there is no real need for organized graduate teaching at Oxford, but it is this gap which the Fulbright scholar most frequently confronts with difficulty.

What kind of impression, in the first 5 years, has the Fulbright Oxonian made on the Oxford community, especially as compared with his longer-established counterpart? The stereotype of the Rhodes scholar is the all-American boy; that of the Fulbright scholar the intent single-minded research worker. Like most stereotypes, this picture has little correspondence with reality. The fact that the Fulbrighters' academic pursuits are largely research has apparently had little effect in restricting their participation in extra-curricular activities. The Fulbright scholars belong to the usual political, social, and artistic societies and have gained their share of blues and half-blues in sports. The group has produced a coxswain of the varsity crew, a captain of the university boxing team, and a captain of the university swimming team. A Fulbright scholar has captured the coveted presidency of the Union Society. Contrary to what one might expect from the somewhat narrower criteria of selection, then, the Fulbright scholars as a group have as wide a diversity of talents and interests as their Rhodes counterparts.

Academically the Fulbright scholars appear to have acquitted themselves equally well. Already they have won 2 chancellor's prizes, taken home a nice number of D. Ph.'s, copped a few firsts, and won various other distinctions. The record, both academic and social, of previous Fulbright scholars has provided an immediate entree for most of the present group. It was important to establish the academic prestige of the scheme, not because academic success is in itself the entire justification for an international educational exchange program, but because from it alone can grow the respect both here and in America that will produce broader results in the sphere of mutual understanding. These broader results will be cumulative and in time will be out of all proportion to the expenditure of funds involved.

The funds themselves set the only limitation on the indefinite continuance of the Fulbright program. In the original Fulbright Act it was provided that no scholarship agreement which the United States might make with a foreign government should permit an aggregate expenditure of more than $20 million of local currency or more than $1 million in any 1 year. It is this provision which presently establishes the duration of the Fulbright program in Britain at approximately 20 years. There is nothing, however, to prevent the program being placed on a continuing basis by congressional appropriations. In view of the growing murmur about an "Atlantic curtain" such a step would seem imperative.

Someone once said that the Rhodes scholarships were the best use to which diamonds were ever put. Undoubtedly the Fulbright scholarships are the best use to which war material has ever been put. Certainly the use of funds derived from the sale of United States surplus war materials for an educational venture of the magnitude of the Fulbright program is as stirring and imaginative a way to beat the swords of war into plowshares as any yet conceived. The Fulbright program is indeed an extension of the vision of Cecil Rhodes—well might he claim indirect coauthorship—and for this reason it is hoped that the Fulbright Oxonian will become as permanent a part of the Oxford scene as those scholars whose patron he is more directly. But precisely because the Fulbright program extends beyond Oxford, the indirect effects of Rhodes' vision may well prove greater than the direct.

Retail Food Prices Rise As Farm Income Drops

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. THYE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 10, 1954

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an article entitled "Retail Food Prices Rise as Farm Income Drops," published in the Christian Science Monitor of August 2, 1954.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Retail Food Prices Rise As Farm Income Drops

Washington.—Housewives have got almost no break in retail food prices despite sharp declines in farm income, the House Agriculture Committee staff reported.

Warning farmers to expect further declines, particularly in livestock, the staff said consumers could expect little benefit from these price reductions either, unless middlemen stop boosting their processing and distributing charges.

The statements were made in a report reviewing the extent to which recent farm price declines have and have not been passed on to consumers.

BEST BUYS ITEMIZED

Earlier, the Agriculture Department predicted that retail food prices would decline a little more than usual during the rest of 1954. It said in a national food situation report that heavy farm marketings are expected to push food supplies above last year's level.

The report said "best buys" for housewives in the months ahead will be pork, eggs, and turkeys, fats and oils, fresh vegetables, and dairy products such as butter and cheese.

It said the average American would probably eat slightly more this year than last with consumption of veal, beef, poultry, eggs, butter, fruit juices, and frozen vegetables showing the biggest rise.

The report predicted the average American would drink 4 percent less coffee this year than last, and that milk consumption would rise 1 percent and tea 3 percent. It did not speculate on whether the shift in drinking habits was linked to the big hike in coffee prices.

SLAP AT PARITY PLAN

The 7-page House committee staff report, released by Clifford R. Hope, Republican, of Kansas, committee chairman, said retail food prices have gone up about 1 percent since 1951 even though prices the farmer receives dropped 18.8 percent.

Implicit in the report was criticism of the administration's plan to abandon rigid 90 percent of parity price supports for basic crops next year, already approved by the House in modified form.

The report said:

"The city housewife today is paying the highest prices on record for bakery products and cereals, yet * * * farm prices of wheat are now at their lowest level for several years. In view of this record it is difficult to see how urban consumers expect to benefit from lower support prices on wheat."

LOWEST SINCE 1941

The report said the farmer is receiving only 44 cents of every dollar spent by the American housewife for domestically produced food. The other 56 cents goes for processing, marketing, and transportation charges. But it did not recommend any ways of curbing these middlemen costs.

Although the report did not say so, the farmers' share of the retail-spent dollar in 1951 was 50 cents and it reached a peak of 54 cents in 1945. Forty-four cents is the lowest share for farmers since 1941.

The Tax Bill: Benefits for Many

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN R. DAVIS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1954

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I would like to include an editorial which recently appeared in the Wisconsin State Journal, Madison, Wis., which now has the largest circulation of any newspaper published in my district, and the largest of any Wisconsin newspaper published outside the city of Milwaukee:

The Tax Bill: Benefits for Many

The new tax bill now on President Eisenhower's desk contains some saving or the ending of some inequity for almost every taxpayer in the land.

President Eisenhower got most of what he wanted in the measure as it finally passed. The tax revision—the first thorough overhauling in close to 80 years—was a formidable job, and the Chief Executive rightly called it the cornerstone of his whole legislative program.

But while there are important savings for many persons and many groups in the new measure, a serious reading of its provisions is enough to lay the shameless falsehood that it is a windfall for the big boys.

The medical deduction is made more generous.

A larger proportion of retired pay and pensions is exempt from income tax. Working mothers in low-income families are allowed deductions for child care.

Dividend payments, many of them to those in modest circumstances, get some tax relief.

But more important than any single provision of the new tax law is the attitude behind it.

This is a measure to raise revenue—and the revenues must remain very high for more years than we can predict—as fairly and equitably as possible.

It is neither a plan to buy the favor of the working man with inflation-breeding windfalls, nor to soak the rich beyond the point of diminishing returns.

It is neither trickle-down nor trickle-up. It is based on the belief that incentive to thrift and a fair return on invested capital are good business for both the Nation and the National Treasury.

And it is the end, for some time to come, to the New Deal theory of social revolution and group punishment by the heavy club of taxation.

By ending the excess-profits tax last January, and now easing the penalties on surplus accumulations, the tax laws give a fair break to the small concern struggling to match its big competitor.

We fail to see anything sinful about encouraging business, large or small, to buy new machinery that means more jobs, better goods, and lower prices for us all.

Nor is it a crime to give the farmer a business deduction for soil conservation or fertilizing programs.

Business, United States of America is just as much the corner grocery or the new soda-pop plant as it is General Motors or the Chase National Bank.

We don't begrudge a fair tax shake to either one.

Tax Law Changes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 10, 1954

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Tax Law Changes," which was published in the Washington Daily News on July 31.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TAX LAW CHANGES

As it finally passed Congress, the Eisenhower administration's tax revision bill came out a lot better than might have been expected on the basis of the political thunder from Capitol Hill when the debate first began weeks ago.

It is a weighty and complex measure, full of legal and fiscal lingo and not something a layman easily can understand without a Ouija board.

But it offers some justifiable breaks to most taxpayers, such as more deductible credit for medical expenses, more consideration for working mothers, some exemption for retirement income, and so on.

On the basis that the tax laws long have been a patchwork of confusion, loopholes, and ambiguity, this general revision was overdue. It does not finish the job, however.

On the basis of its effect on the Government revenues, the new law makes less sense. It will cost the Treasury about $1,300,000,000.

Tax changes to correct injustices are desirable at any time. But when the Government is up to the hilt in debt and running perennial deficits, any tax law amendment which cuts the income ought to be matched by another to replace the lost revenue.

The benefits to taxpayers in this bill will come back to haunt the taxpayers' children. The children can count on that.

Temporary Salary Increases and Reclassification Study of Postal Field Service Employees and Positions

SPEECH

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 9, 1954

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration of the bill (H. R. 9245) to establish a joint committee of Congress to study postal field service reclassification, to increase the rates of basic compensation of postmasters, officers, and employees in the postal field service pending reclassification pursuant to recommendations of such joint committee, and for other purposes.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, H. R. 9245, known as the Corbett bill, to increase postal workers' salaries, is a worthy bill and deserves the support of this Congress and the approval of the President. It is too bad that we could not have had a rule from the Rules Committee to hear this matter weeks ago. This has delayed the passage of this bill in the House until today.

It is regrettable that it was necessary for those of us who wanted to vote on this bill to sign a petition to discharge the Rules Committee from further consideration of the bill. It is true that all of us have not been in complete agreement as to the kind of a bill that should be passed in this Congress for postal employees. However, I do believe that it is the sentiment of this Congress on such an important issue, that we should have been able to hear it before today. This bill received approximately 55 hours of hearing in the committee. It was thoroughly debated there. Everyone who wished was given an opportunity to be heard. Some witnesses came back to testify a second time.

Some time ago I told the people of my district that I would support a post office bill providing that it contained certain basic requirements for improving postal service and the status of postal employees. These included a reasonable pay raise for postal workers, study of a plan for reclassification of employees, and some fringe benefits which employees have been needing for a good many years. This bill contains those three primary requisites.

There has been some information going out that postal employees generally would be opposed to a study of a plan for reclassification of employees. All postal workers that I know of have backed the Corbett bill, H. R. 9245, which does include a plan for reclassification of postal employees. To me there is considerable merit in the present bill in that it provides for definite improvements of the postal workers' status. Let me outline these one by one.

First, it provides a 7-percent pay raise within a $240 minimum and a $480 maximum on any single increase. This pay increase will go into effect the first full pay period after it is enacted.

Second, the bill provides for a joint Senate-House committee which would be set up immediately. This committee, between now and October 1, 1955, will make a thorough study of the postal job reclassification and come up with recommendations to the Congress. After thorough debate at that time, the Congress will have an opportunity to enact reclassification in the light of experience and the recommendations themselves.

Third, the bill provides for an allowance of up to $100 a year for postal employees who must wear a uniform on the job. Almost all of private industry that requires uniforms are now paying the cost of those uniforms for the employees. Most business union contracts now call for those extra expenditures not ordinarily required of the general employee. By this bill the postal department is merely matching private industry in this respect.

Fourth, a $100 longevity increase is provided for employees with more than 25 years of service. This is certainly a modest longevity to which, I am sure, there would be no general objection from anyone.

Fifth, for a long time postal employees have been objecting to the manner in which they have been paid. This bill provides for a pay day every other week, or 26 times a year, for all postal employees. This is merely a correction of a long-standing objection.

Sixth, for several years now, the Whitten rider has been in effect for all Government employees. This rider prevented additional permanent job appointments. The present bill modifies the Whitten rider to allow additional permanent job appointments where actually needed.

Seventh, there will be an increase from $6 to $9 a day in the travel allowance of postal transportation-service employees. The postal service must have been the last group in America to still be on the old $6 a day travel allowance. It is difficult to see how anyone could travel in recent years on that kind of allowance per day. The $9 per day at least will correct the situation partially.

The divergent views on this bill between the Post Office Department and the employees have chiefly arisen over the method of reclassification of employees, generally. The Post Office Department has had its survey made by an outside agency of what are ordinarily known as efficiency engineers. It does not appear to me to be unreasonable to have had such a survey made by an outside group. However, it does seem to me important that the members of the House and the Senate and the appropriate committees concerned with this legislation should go over these reports and give consideration to them. After this is done, however, the ultimate decision of what kind of reclassification should be made is up to the Congress itself. In this, I am sure, that Congress will give consideration to the public interest, the national economy, the problems of efficiency in the postal service and the welfare of postal employees in the postal system.

To me, the matters set out in this bill are much needed improvements for personnel in the postal field, generally. It has been 3 years since there has been any increase of salary to postal people. This increase is needed at this time, and something should be done about it before this Congress adjourns.

I think all the members of the House have realized for some time that in the civil-service system there exists a wage scale that keeps employees living on a marginal basis from year to year. This is now one of the more important matters under consideration by Personnel Boards here in an attempt to work some equity into the situation.

If we are to bring any realism into this situation we are going to have to get this bill passed today. I believe that it is a reasonable bill and in the best interest of everyone concerned. These are my reasons for supporting this bill today.

Postal Pay Raise

SPEECH

OF

HON. VERA BUCHANAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 9, 1954

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 9245) to establish a joint committee of Congress to study postal field service reclassification, to increase the rates of basic compensation of postmasters, officers, and employees in the postal field service pending reclassification pursuant to recommendations of such joint committee, and for other purposes.

Mrs. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I am very happy to be able to cast my vote today for the bill H. R. 9245, calling for a 7-percent increase in the salaries of postal employees, with a minimum of $240 and a maximum of $480 a year.

The effort to obtain a vote on an adequate postal salary increase bill has been one of the hardest fights in the session now drawing to a close. It has been only through resort to the discharge petition that this bill is before us today. This procedure was forced upon us because of the adamant and bitter opposition of the Postmaster General and administration supporters who expressed their firm determination that this legislation would not pass.

I was an early supporter of the bills H. R. 2344 and H. R. 2297 introduced by the gentleman from Michigan and the gentleman from Pennsylvania. These bills, as you will recall, provided for a postal salary increase of $800. As I pointed out to the Post Office and Civil Service Committee during the hearings last March, the postal workers of my district along with their fellow workers throughout the country are in urgent need of an adequate pay raise. The many letters received by me from postal employees in the 30th Pennsylvania District relate the difficulties they face in trying to maintain a decent standard of living on their present inadequate salaries. When it became apparent that we were never going to have an opportunity to vote on H. R. 2344 I accepted the compromise contained in the bill here today.

To those who are opposing the pending bill I ask, Are you proud of the present situation in which many employees of the Post Office Department, one of the largest businesses in the world, are forced to supplement their inadequate salaries with outside work in order to meet the increasing cost of living today? The Postmaster General has talked loud and often about his determination to decrease the deficit in his Department and it is obvious from his efforts to defeat this bill that he wishes to do so at the expense of the loyal and hard-working postal employees. There is no finer group in the Federal Service than the postal workers and they have waited long and patiently for a decent adjustment of their salaries. Such an adjustment is long overdue and so I say we should pass this bill without further delay and make this minimum increase a reality.

H. R. 8225

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 3, 1954

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, the Outdoor Writers Association of America adopted the following resolution at its annual meeting, held this year in Rolla, Mo.:

RESOLUTION CALLING UPON THE PRESENT CONGRESS FOR FINAL PASSAGE OF THE BAKER BILL, WHICH WOULD IMPLEMENT PUBLIC USE OF OUR PUBLIC LANDS

Whereas 180 million acres of national forest lands form the largest unposted areas for public hunting, fishing, and recreation for all United States citizens; and

Whereas H. R. 8225, by Representative HOWARD BAKER, would provide for multiple use of these areas, including the establishment of a national policy that recreation is a legitimate use of such forests, and would provide authorization for up to $5,500,000 to develop wildlife habitat and recreation facilities: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Outdoor Writers Association urges the Congress of the United States to enact the so-called Baker bill this session, thus implementing public use of these public lands; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent all Members of the United States Congress, and to those Federal officials and to all groups and individuals as it may be deemed advisable.

Mr. Speaker, a demonstration of the need for the passage of the Baker bill occurred recently in my own district. The following news item appeared in the Anaconda Standard, Anaconda, Mont., on July 24, 1954:

GEORGETOWN LAKE CLEANUP NETS 7,895 BEER CANS

Boy Scouts and Conservation Club members gathered a total of 7,895 beer cans and bottles along the shoreline of Georgetown Lake in a cleanup drive sponsored Friday by the Sportsmen's Association with the cooperation of the local Forest Service and interested residents, according to an official tally.

The general comment of persons witnessing the cleanup campaign was, "It's a shame children have to clean up the mess of adults," sportsmen reported. Outdoor writers, on tour of the State, were among the witnesses who took pictures of the work and made comments.

Forty children, members of local Boy Scout troops and the Conservation Club, were taken to the lake in a donated bus. At the end of the work party they stopped at Eccleston's camp, where they were guests of Oran Eccleston at a swimming party and picnic. Pop for the picnic was provided by the Anaconda Brewing Co.

The assortment of liquor bottles and beer cans and bottles were taken by trucks to a garbage pit after they had been gathered by the children in sackloads. Trucks were provided by the Forest Service and Bob Mitchell. Among those directing the operation were Bob Tyler and Jim Albertson, of the Forest Service, and Bill Smith, bus driver.

Sportsmen's Association officials extended their thanks to the children and others participating in the shoreline cleanup.

Persons using the lake are urged to use the garbage barrels placed at various locations for disposal of bottles, cans, and assorted garbage. The Sportsmen's Association has arranged for weekly disposal of garbage in an effort to keep the lake shore clean.

Mr. Speaker, the Forest Service has no funds for maintenance of these recreational areas. Resort to volunteers and Boy Scouts and others is the only way in which these recreational areas can be kept usable until some provision is made for upkeep of recreational areas.

Double Taxation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1954

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following sound and illuminating article from the Lynn Telegram-News, Lynn, Mass., Monday, August 9, 1954.

The editorial, entitled "Constructive Step," follows:

The House-Senate conferees who worked on the sweeping new tax bill are to be praised for their decision to do something constructive about double taxation of corporate dividends. They didn't cure evil by any means, but they took a step in the right direction.

The conferees agreed on a provision whereby taxpayers can exclude $50 of dividend income and, in addition, deduct from their final tax bill each year 4 percent of any remaining dividends received after August 1 of this year.

The way double taxation works is simple. First of all, any profits earned by the corporation are taxed—at very high rates if the profits are substantial. Then when remaining profits are distributed in the form of dividends, the personal income tax socks them again. So the investor, who has made the existence of productive enterprise possible, gets the short end of the stick, indeed.

Double taxation inevitably retards investment, which means that it acts as a brake on industrial expansion and employment. This consideration, doubtless, strongly influenced the House-Senate conferees. Finally, don't let anyone tell you that taxation of dividends is of direct interest only to the rich. Survey after survey has shown that the majority of stockholders are people with small and moderate incomes.

Postal Pay Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN R. DAVIS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1954

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, all of us on Capitol Hill know and admire Earl Godwin, news analysist and commentator for NBC radio and television in Washington, who has been looking behind the Washington scenes and interpreting news events longer than most of us in Congress have been in Washington.

Because Mr. Godwin's remarks on station WRC last evening were made before adjournment of the House, I realize that many of my colleagues did not hear his discussion of yesterday's House action on the postal pay legislation. For that reason, I desire to insert in today's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a transcribed report of that part of his Monday night program which dealt with this matter.

Mr. Godwin said:

The 500,000 postal employees won a victory over the administration today when the House passed, 251 to 29, a 7 percent pay raise bill for these workers in the face of administration warning that the President will not sign the bill, but I am rather inclined to think it will not get to the White House.

The course of the measure will be a good study to following the workings of a pressure group on Capitol Hill. The administration has tried in every way to ward off this bill to combine a postal employees' pay raise with a general bill for increasing the pay of all Government employees. But the Postal Employees' Union leaders fought day and night and, apparently, had 10 times as much influence as the administration at this moment. In this selection year, the chance to vote yesterday on this bill was too much, and such widespread union influence is one main reason why last week the House voted down Republican floor leader HALLECK's motion to adjourn and lay off while the Senate sweated. Members wanted to be sure to have a chance to be recorded in a roll call vote on this pay raise measure. Leader HALLECK assured them of a chance to vote. The bill, not yet passed by the Senate and may not be, would give a temporary pay raise of 7 percent to all postal workers, at least $240 and no more than $480, with 10 cents an hour more for part-time workers, creates a Joint Congressional Committee to study and recommend a permanent reclassification and salary system for postal employees. The administration had opposed the bill for several reasons, among them the plan to give the whole postal service an overhauling. The Postal Employees' Union had insisted on taking reclassification out of the hands of the Postmaster General, and if the bill becomes a law, they will have accomplished that.

Actually, the postal unions stepped on their own feet; there is hardly one chance in a thousand that the bill, the way they bulled it through, will pass the Senate, which will cut the 7 percent to 5 percent anyhow. Further, for reasons too complex to explain in a brief program, this postal bill's gyrations stalled and stopped the pay raise bill for five times as many other Government employees; and therefore, the action of the postal union leaders should be interpreted as a stupid flaw in a dog-in-the-manger maneuver which has prevented instead of legalized Government pay raises.

Atomic Energy Bill Compromise Disregards President's Request for Protection Against Monopoly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1954

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I herewith include an editorial which appeared in the current issue of America, the National Catholic Weekly Review. The editorial, entitled "Atomic Energy Compromise," follows:

ATOMIC ENERGY COMPROMISE

The version of the atomic energy bill which emerged from the Senate-House conference reminds us of Ovid's description of chaos in the opening lines of his Metamorphoses: rudis indigestaque moles—"a rough and undigested mass." The tragedy is that Congress, in the heat and hurry to adjourn, will swallow it.

The three-part bill was designed to enable the United States to give nuclear weapons information to its allies, to share peacetime information with friendly nations, and to turn over to private American enterprise industrial application of atomic energy. In the bill which came out of conference the rules for imparting information for both wartime and peacetime uses are so restrictive as to be almost meaningless, while those regulating the role of private utilities are so loose as to endanger the public interest.

Weapon information is limited to "external characteristics, including size, weight and shape, yields and effects, and systems employed in the delivery or use thereof." Allied personnel may be trained in methods of installing nuclear weapons in "delivery vehicles," but not in methods of assembling or disassembling them. The net impression is that we don't trust our allies much.

Attempts to iron out the inconsistencies in the section on "international activities" were beaten down in both Chambers. The bill was irremediably complicated by the addition of sections 123 and 124 on the international atomic pool, despite the President's reservation in his message of February 17:

"These recommendations are apart from my proposal to seek a new basis for international cooperation in the field of atomic energy. * * * Consideration of additional legislation which may be needed to implement that proposal should await development of areas of agreement as a result of our discussions with other nations."

If the President had been heeded, Congress would not now have to stultify itself by voting under section 124 power to the President which he already has, the power to make treaties, subject to Senate approval.

Most serious defect of the compromise bill, in terms of the public interest—already involved to the tune of $12 billion—is the absence of any reliable safeguard against exploitation of atomic power by private utilities. The bipartisan public power policy developed since 1902 is set aside. The original bill forbade the Atomic Energy Commission to build large-scale power reactors in order to sell electric power commercially. So Senator JOHNSON of Colorado got the Senate to adopt an amendment authorizing the AEC to construct such reactors to provide power to its own facilities and to other Federal agencies. The costs ascertained would provide a yardstick, as other public power projects have done, by which to determine the fairness of private utility rates.

The compromise bill shrinks this yardstick into invisibility. The AEC may build large-scale reactors but only to hasten industrial development. It may not operate in the commercial power field. In effect, the taxpayers will pay for further experimentation, from which the private utilities will ultimately benefit.

The compromise on patent provisions is alarming. The President had urged, as a protection against monopoly by Government contractors long in the business, that anyone who filed a patent within the ensuing 5 years would agree to license it to all comers. Representative COLE contended that compulsory licensing was "unconstitutional, unnecessary, un-American, and dangerous." It was "socialism run rampant." The Senate, on the other hand, adopted the Kerr amendment extending compulsory licensing to 10 years, on the commonsense ground that it would take that long to "broaden the base of industrial utilization of atomic energy," to quote the President.

The conferees threw out the Kerr amendment and devised an entirely new mechanism against atomic monopoly. The bill now gives preference in the issuance of licenses to patentees who agree to make their patents available to others. This seems to be an effective way to discourage groups not yet in the atomic-energy field, and therefore without patents to bargain with, from competing with those now in the field.

Normally, a major revision like this would call for extended floor debate. Unfortunately, in the rush to adjourn, that debate will not be held.

S. 16, Granting of Immunity to Witnesses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. MOSS, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 4, 1954

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, under authority to extend my remarks regarding

S. 16, I wish to point out that this is the first rollcall on an important issue during my service in the House of Representatives which does not clearly show the position I took on that issue. Since the rollcall on it merely shows that I am paired on the vote, I wish to state that had I been present when the roll was called, I would have voted "aye."

In approving S. 16, I do so with many doubts as to how far we should go in modifying the guarantees of freedom accorded to the individual by the Constitution and the Bill of Rights.

I feel this bill does approach the point beyond which we cannot go in the future without materially affecting our individual rights to resist probing by governmental inquiries.

I hope the bill does aid our Government in its efforts to root out acts of disloyalty and subversion. It is because of this hope that I have added my approval to the legislation.

Witness Immunity Legislation: S. 16 and H. R. 4975

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 4, 1954

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have sat through this debate on S. 16, the witness immunity bill, with a great deal of curiosity. I was curious to see how far 40 minutes of debate on one of the most controversial pieces of legislation which has come before the House could go in clearing up the doubts and fears in my own mind as to the wisdom of passing this far-reaching measure—a measure which in effect amends the Constitution of the United States. I was also curious to see whether in this short debate the Members of the House would be provided with a clear explanation of just what this bill does—an explanation on which all members of the committee would unanimously agree—or whether we would be given any sound reason why the House should abdicate its responsibility to use its soundest judgment and give most mature consideration before passing legislation as vital to our democratic processes as is S. 16.

Mr. Speaker, my own doubts as to the form of or the necessity for witness immunity legislation have not been resolved by this short high pressure debate. It is quite obvious that there is no unanimous agreement, even among our constitutional lawyers, as to just what this bill would do—particularly regarding the effect of immunity conferred through its provisions on actions in State or lesser courts, and whether the district court before approving a grant of immunity will pass on the advisability or inadvisability of such action. It is also quite clear, Mr. Speaker, that the only reason which has appeared for pushing this bill through at this time without adequate debate is that it is a matter of political expediency.

The right of an individual to protection against self-incrimination was not lightly written into our Constitution. I cannot and will not be a party to an action tampering with that right until I have been convinced that every aspect of the change has been exhaustively explored and until I know that we are not curing the temporary anoyance of witnesses' refusal to answer by killing a basic protection guaranteed to both the guilty and the innocent under the fifth amendment in the Bill of Rights. The Bill of Rights also prohibits star chamber proceedings. When we attempt to amend it through the kind of star chamber proceeding the leadership is forcing on us today, it makes me more than ever determined to insist on orderly procedures before approving the action. The extremely limited debate on S. 16 and the refusal to permit amendments does not constitute an orderly proceeding for legislation of such great importance, and I shall vote against the bill as a protest against that high handed procedure.

Although it may have become trite, I cannot help saying that I am as strongly opposed to communism and its methods as anybody here on this floor. But our weakest defense against that vicious system is for us to use the system ourselves in fighting the commies. Any action tending to deprive our citizens of their civil rights is a step in that direction. When this House permits itself to become a counterpart of the Russian Parliament, the supreme Soviet, and to meet simply to rubber stamp decisions or demands of the administration in power, we are also moving in the direction of action in the Communist pattern. We cannot adequately protect the people of the United States from attacks on their rights under our democratic system by yielding to political pressures to modify our system, no matter how urgent that pressure may be, unless we have assured ourselves that no fundamental principle is placed in danger through such action.

It is as frustrating to me as it is to every loyal American citizen to witness the spectacle of a procession of suspected subversives using the cloak of the fifth amendment in refusing to testify about their activities. But reasoned thinking should convince us that this situation has not yet reached a point where unreasoned emergency action on our part is necessary to provide the answer. The present bill might relieve some of our frustration, but 40 minutes of debate on a bill which was not available in its final form until today is not enough to give us assurance that it will do more than that as an instrument in a really effective fight against subversion.

Let us remember that an individual's testimony against himself, whether it be under immunity from criminal penalties or not, can bring with it far greater punishment than that which the law provides. The fifth amendment was written at a time when various forms of torture were still in common use as a means of wringing confessions from those charged with crimes. Some may be inclined to think that the Founding Fathers had no more in mind than protecting the innocent against such practices when the provision against self-incrimination was included in our Bill of Rights. But I am not sure that they were not also looking ahead to times such as these, when suspicion and fear, aroused by the inflammatory tactics of political demagogues, have caused a large segment of the public to try their fellow citizens in the newspapers and on the street corners rather than in the courts. I am not convinced that S. 16 in its present form offers protection against that kind of a conviction to those who may be forced to tell their story to congressional committees or to the courts—even though the story they tell would not in itself be grounds for criminal action.

Mr. Speaker, these are only some of the thoughts in my mind in connection with this bill and with H. R. 4975, the bill which we will shortly debate under these same limited conditions and which would invoke the aid of the United States district courts in compelling testimony by a witness before congressional committees. Let us not be stampeded into hasty action on these measures simply because the administration feels that it must have a record to point to on antisubversive legislation when they talk to the voters this fall. Let us remember that this is a democratic body with the primary purpose of insuring that this country continues as a democratic Nation with full guaranties of civil liberties to its people. For my part I shall not permit real or fancied threats of political punishment to force me to abandon consideration of those guaranties. I shall vote against this legislation now, and until the questions I have raised have been answered to the point where I feel that I can support it with personal and political integrity.

Invoking the Aid of Courts in Compelling Testimony of Congressional Witnesses

SPEECH

OF

HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 4, 1954

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. R. 4975, the purpose of which is to prevent Communists and near-Communists from hiding behind the fifth amendment of the Constitution when called upon to testify before the courts or congressional committees.

If this bill is passed, it will help unmask citizens of our country who are following the Moscow line in an attempt to spread Communist doctrine, espionage and sabotage, and advocating the overthrow of our Government.

It will give the courts an opportunity, in cooperation with the Attorney General of the United States, to grant immunity to a witness who will then be compelled to testify or go to jail.

Mr. Speaker, it has become a common practice for these traitors within our gates, who seek to destroy our Constitution and to overthrow our Government, to refuse to swear whether or not they are Communists before the committees of the Congress and the courts, and claim protection under the fifth amendment in order that they may continue their treachery and may continue to destroy the very Constitution that contains the fifth amendment, which they now hide behind.

I want to congratulate this administration, the Attorney General, and the Congress of the United States for the vigorous manner in which, from the opening day of this session, they have pressed forward in writing new laws that will strengthen the hand of Government against the most dangerous enemies with whom we have ever had to cope.

I also wish to congratulate the Un-American Activities Committee in the House, and both of the committees in the Senate who have been doing such splendid work in the defense of our country here on the homefront.

Mr. Speaker, I am not one who believes you should use kid gloves and the powder-puff approach in dealing with the Communist traitors who seek to overthrow the Government; who would destroy our freedom and liberty; and who would establish a reign of the godless totalitarian ideology of communism; who would destroy our churches and religion; who would deliberately kill millions of our people, and throw millions into concentration slave camps, as they have done in Russia and in China, should Russia succeed in conquering the world.

They have killed countless millions in both of those countries, and are now holding in these 2 countries over 15 million people in slavery.

Only a few weeks ago the Members of this House passed House Resolution 627, informing our allies and the nations of the world that we are opposed to Communist China being admitted to the United Nations. Since that time we have passed several bills in this House to make it more difficult for communism to live or grow in strength in this Nation of ours.

Mr. Speaker, never before in one session of the Congress has so much legislation been passed to protect our Government and to make it possible to convict these Communists and to deport alien Communists living within our gates.

One of the outstanding bills passed provides for the first time in our history that any person, Communist or otherwise, who spies in peacetime and gives such information to a foreign government is punishable by death, if tried and found guilty by the courts.

We also passed H. R. 7120, which gives the Government the right to take away the citizenship of individuals who advocate the overthrow of our Government by force and violence. Why not?

Then, we passed an important bill which would permit the use of telephone wire tapping evidence, in cases of subversion and kidnaping.

Mr. Speaker, one only has to recount some of the things Communist spies have done in our Nation in the past few years, to realize the great damage just a few of them have done.

They stole the secrets of the atomic bombs and passed them on to Russia, making it possible for her to develop the bomb 3 years earlier than she otherwise would have done. This has cost us billions of dollars in national defense to meet the threat of Russia, and if we get into another war, it may cost us the lives of millions of American soldiers and civilians.

The atomic bomb and the H-bomb have put Russia in a position where she may be able to conquer all of Europe and Asia, with their countless millions of people.

Yet, Mr. Speaker, when the committees of the House and the committees of the Senate and the law enforcement agencies of the United States Attorney General, and the Members of Congress come to grips with this terrible enemy within our land, you hear much unjustified criticism through the press and among the people, against the public officials who are trying to hunt out these Communists who seek to destroy our Government.

J. Edgar Hoover once said that the Communist sympathizers, the fellow travelers, and misguided people who are influenced by Communist propaganda, run into hundreds of thousands in our Nation, and said, in substance, the influence of these misguided people was adding great strength to the influence and the purpose of the real Communists.

Mr. Speaker, sometimes I wonder if good, well-intentioned people, who criticize congressional committees of dealing too harshly with those who refuse to say, under oath, whether or not they are Communists, or whether or not they are now engaged in subversive activity in an effort to overthrow our Government, have forgotten the crosses that mark the graves of over 25,000 of our fine young American boys who were killed by the Communists in Korea; it may be that they have forgotten the hundreds of our American boys who were captured and who were later found by the roadsides with their hands wired behind them, and brutally killed by their Communist captors.

Never has there been known in the history of the world such international banditry, rape, brutality, and violence as has been perpetrated by the Chinese Communists, and by the Communist government of Russia. Russia seeks to conquer the world, and will treat us in this same manner, if successful.

Make no mistake about it, there is one group of people whose joy increases as the criticism of our public officials, who are trying to expose the Communists, increases. That is the hard-core Communist group. It pleases them, beyond measure, and encourages them to continue their vicious work against our Government, and the freedom and liberty of our people.

Mr. Speaker, notwithstanding this interference, the Congress and the executive department, in a continued hard drive since this administration took over, 18 months ago, have kept the Communists on the run.

The American people, who were shocked at the cases of Alger Hiss and Harry Dexter White, and other so-called red herrings, have loudly applauded the efforts of the Eisenhower administration to dig out and expose and convict the Communists.

HERE IS THE RECORD TO DATE

The fight against communism by the present administration has resulted in the arrest of 116 top party officials and functionaries, up to May 29 of this year. Included in these 116, were top 12 Communist Party leaders in the United States, all members of the so-called politburo of the party.

Already, 72 of the big leaders have been convicted and 9 others are facing trial. In a little over a year and a half of the present administration, the Department of Justice has convicted 41 Communist leaders, and ordered 9 others to trial; deported 93 alien subversives; deported 1,399 alien criminals and racketeers, violators of narcotic laws and persons with immoral conduct records; issued orders for deportation of 268 persons with records of subversive activity or affiliation; barred entry to 127 into United States ports of entry; commenced denaturalization proceedings against 25 citizens who are deemed to be subversives; pushed through a stricter Government-wide loyalty-security program for Government employees, firing 2,429 Government employees up to December 31, 1953, in a drive to clean out Reds, pinks and other security risks.

We have relentlessly arrested, jailed, convicted and deported these enemies of the American way of life.

The Communist threat to our Government and our Nation is a challenge we met head-on as soon as we came into power.

We shall continue to arrest, jail, convict and deport these Reds as long as you, the American people, give us the authority and power to do so.

Amendment of Railroad Retirement Act

SPEECH

OF

HON. ROBERT CROSSER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 30, 1954

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 7840) to amend the Railroad Retirement Act, the Railroad Retirement Tax Act, and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CROSSER].

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Chairman, on this occasion it will be unnecessary to consume much time to the discussion of the bill now before the committee. I could probably talk for hours in regard to the subject of the bill but there is practically no opposition to the measure and it is unnecessary.

Mr. Chairman, all the railway labor organizations that have been interested in this subject from the very beginning are now in favor of this measure. They are unanimously in favor of the bill.

Mr. Chairman, it is more than 23 years ago since I first began to pioneer for the establishment of a Railroad Retirement

System. In my opinion we have now the best retirement in the whole United States and I believe it is highly desirable that this measure be passed.

Mr. Chairman, H. R. 7840 is a bill reported from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on June 21, 1954.

The main additional retirement benefits provided for by this bill are as follows:

First. Benefits to widows, dependent widowers, and dependent parents at age 60 instead of age 65.

Second. Benefits to widowed mothers with physically or mentally disabled children over age 18.

Third. Full survivor benefits to widows, dependent widowers, and dependent parents who are also eligible for a railroad retirement annuity in their own right.

Fourth. Increasing the creditable compensation subject to assessment from the present maximum of $300 a month to a maximum of $350 a month in the calculation of a retirement or survivor annuity.

Fifth. Disregarding the compensation earned after age 65, if the crediting of such compensation would diminish the annuity.

Sixth. Changing the disability work clause to a maximum of $100 in earnings for any month without loss of the annuity for that month.

The main increases in unemployment insurance benefits provided for by this bill are an increase in the daily benefit rates for unemployment and sickness and a guarantee that each eligible employee shall be entitled to receive a daily benefit equal in amount to half his daily rate of compensation for the last employment in which he will have been engaged during the last calendar year, up to the maximum amount of $8.50, daily.

The bill would also increase, for retirement and unemployment insurance purposes, the maximum amount, subject to taxation by employers and by employees, from the present maximum of $300 of the employee's monthly salary to a maximum of $450 of the employee's monthly salary.

The standard railway labor organizations are unanimously in favor of the bill. The Railroad Retirement Board, the Secretary of Labor, and the Bureau of the Budget also favor the bill.

This bill will provide some $55 million in retirement benefits to retired workers and their families in addition to the benefits that are now being paid. Approximately two-thirds of the active railroad employees who will retire in the future will obtain higher retirement benefits as a result of this bill. The widows of all railroad workers will benefit under this bill. It is reasonably certain that the payment of the additional benefits will not endanger the financial soundness of the retirement system.

Provision for the payment of the additional benefits stipulated in H. R. 7840 is made by the increase in taxable base as already explained.

I therefore recommend that my colleagues support H. R. 7840 by their votes.

The Eisenhower Farm Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 4, 1954

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, as a farmer for many years of my life, I know something of the gamble the farmers take.

The three greatest, in my judgment, are the gamble they take with the weather, surplus farm production, and the price for their products, grains, or livestock, when placed on the market.

However, with hard work and good business judgment, they have faced their problems with fortitude and, generally, with success.

The Eisenhower administration and the Congress, realizing the importance of agriculture, and the problems confronting the farmers including the disastrous drought last year and this in some parts of the Nation, including southern Illinois, the surplus crops which have piled up over the years, has made a constructive effort, that I think should be brought to the attention not only of the farmers but also to the citizens of the Nation.

In the 12 years I have been in Congress, I have never witnesseed quite so great an effort on the part of any administration to try to help meet the serious problems confronting the farmers.

Today, I want to review and catalog a part of this effort only during the past year, 1953, and including the first few months this year, 1954. I believe a rehearsal of some of the highlights of the efforts of the Eisenhower administration to aid the farmers will encourage them and increase their confidence that the Republican administration will not let the American farmer down.

ADMINISTRATION'S CATTLE PROGRAM

First. Soon after President Eisenhower took office, January 20 of last year, he issued an order removing price control from all meat products, and realizing the farm surplus on hand, ordered that military procurement of beef be stepped up.

Second. The Department of Agriculture started a program to buy 200 million pounds of beef for the school-lunch and foreign-aid programs.

Third. The importation of New Zealand beef into the United States markets, through Canada, was stopped.

Fourth. The Department of Agriculture launched an advertising program to increase beef consumption, which resulted in a one-third increase in the amount of beef consumed in the United States last year.

DROUGHT RELIEF IN THE SOUTHWEST

Fifth. The President immediately made $8 million available to stockmen in drought areas, and Congress enacted legislation to furnish feed for livestock and seeds for planting in disaster areas, and made direct loans to farmers who were unable to get immediate credit.

Sxith. The Secretary of Agriculture induced railroads to cut freight rates in half, to permit cattlemen to put their herds out of drought areas, and arranged with governors of 12 States to distribute hay to farmers at Federal expense.

PROGRAM FOR GRAIN STORAGE

First. We broke all records in providing farmers with grain storage: (a) Built 100-million-bushel capacity for 1953; (b) built 100-million-bushel capacity through April 1954; (c) Commodity Credit extended its credit of loans to farmers to build, or buy, 35-million-bushel capacity farm storage units; (d) provided occupancy storage 201-million-bushel capacity; (e) ship storage 69-million-bushel capacity; (f) provided greater tax amortization on farm-owned storage facilities.

Second. A million tons of Government-owned surplus wheat was made available to Pakistan and other friendly countries.

Third. Congress authorized the CCC to make $100 million worth of surplus agricultural commodities available to the President for use in meeting famine or other relief requirements of peoples friendly to the United States.

Fourth. Congress authorized the President to dispose of some $250 million worth of Government-owned surplus farm products to friendly foreign nations in exchange for foreign currencies, the latter to be used for United States expenditures in those foreign countries.

Fifth. A new International Wheat Agreement was entered into for the purpose of extending the disposal of Government-owned surplus wheat.

ACTIONS TAKEN TO IMPROVE DAIRY SITUATION

First. A promotion campaign to push the consumption of dairy products, especially during June dairy month, and the high-production period.

Second. A nationwide educational program to increase the culling of low-producing dairy cattle.

Third. Offers to sell CCC stocks of cheese and dried milk for exports at world market prices.

EMERGENCY DROUGHT PROGRAM

First. More than 1,200,000 tons of feed supplies have been made available to farmers in drought areas at reduced prices.

Second. At the request of the Agriculture Department, western railroads reduced freight rates 50 percent to ranchers moving Government-owned feeds into drought areas as well as a rate reduction on movement of livestock.

Third. Government made available emergency livestock loans.

Fourth. Under the hay-distribution plan, the Agriculture Department will set aside a definite sum of money for each State in the drought area.

WATERSHED PROTECTION

Congress appropriated $5 million for 50 watershed projects. This is a start on an expanded soil-conservation and watershed program.

FARM CREDIT

The administration has fulfilled its campaign pledge to make the Farm

Credit Administration a separate agency and to decentralize the administration of its credit programs by shifting more control over credit policies from Washington and vesting it largely in local production credit associations.

COMMODITY CREDIT

Congress increased CCC borrowing authority from $6.75 billion to $8.50 billion for the purpose of continuing price supports through 1954.

TRADE MISSIONS

The administration has sent several trade missions to foreign countries to investigate the possibilities of expanding our foreign markets.

IMPORT CONTROLS

Import controls under section 22 are in effect for eight groups of commodities: cotton, wheat, dairy products, oats, flaxseed, peanuts, rye, and shelled almonds. This administration has made greater use of this authority in 16 months than the previous administration did since its passage.

SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE

The Agriculture Department has streamlined the soil-conservation setup to improve the service and create greater efficiency. The farmers will now receive a large proportion of each conservation dollar in the way of technical service on his farm.

FOREIGN RELIEF

We have assisted the starving peoples abroad and created goodwill toward peace.

One hundred and eighty million pounds of dairy products were given to 17 United States private welfare organizations for overseas relief in 36 foreign countries.

Six hundred thousand tons of wheat went to Pakistan.

Eighty-four thousand tons of wheat went to Bolivia, Jordan, and Libya.

Five million and six hundred thousand packages of food went to East Berlin and East Germany.

Commodities furnished to institutions, welfare, Indians, and school-lunch programs:

Butter	63, 838. 398
Beef and gravy	124, 091, 100
Dried milk	23, 563, 160
Cheese	40, 874, 460
Potatoes	32, 218, 100
Shortening	17, 945, 964
Dried beans	5, 049, 900
Cranberry sauce	4, 689, 344
Frozen hamburger	47, 537, 500
Frozen beef	1, 250, 000
Honey	6, 149, 670
Pecans	594, 000

DAIRY SITUATION

In addition, the Government has disposed of 173,741,085 pounds of butter; 155,565,171 pounds of Cheddar cheese; and 328,803,438 pounds of nonfat dry milk solids through various Government outlets; such as noncommercial export sales, including United States Army sales and others.

This includes only a part of the greatest effort that has ever been made by our Government in the same length of time, to be helpful to the farmers of the Nation, and to stabilize at a profitable level the price of farm commodities.

Spanish-American War Veterans Benefits for Army Transport Service Seamen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 9, 1954

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, at the time the House considered H. R. 9020, the bill increasing veteran's benefits, I had intended to offer an amendment to the bill which would have extended veteran's benefits to certain seamen who served with the Army Transport Service during the Spanish-American War, the Philippine Insurrection, and the Boxer Rebellion. Unfortunately, because the leadership of the House insisted, H. R. 9020 was brought to the floor under a parliamentary procedure which prevented amendments. This move to prevent liberalizing the bill's provisions made it impossible for me to offer my amendment, thus keeping the very small and deserving group of individuals whom my amendment would have benefited from getting the consideration they deserve.

I wish now to insert in the RECORD a statement outlining the reasons why these veterans of service with our Armed Forces are entitled to special consideration in their old age, with the hope that my statement will help lay the groundwork for favorable action in the next Congress.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of my proposed amendment was to give long overdue relief and recognition to a very small group of survivors of active combat service with the United States Army during the Spanish-American War, the later Philippine Insurrection, and the Boxer Rebellion in China. As I say, these men are survivors of active combat service, but through a quirk of circumstance they have been pushed aside for over 50 years and have been denied any of the benefits Congress has provided for others who served in the Spanish-American War forces without ever getting close to the enemy.

In 1898 at the beginning of the war, the Army took over the operation of 50 privately owned vessels and operated them as troop transports in addition to 18 Government-owned troopships. When they took the vessels over they took the crews over as well, and every man whom this amendment will benefit volunteered for that service. They were put into regulation Navy uniforms for which they had to pay; they were subjected to the same military discipline as personnel of the Army, including courts martial; the crews manned landing boats putting military personnel ashore under enemy fire; they manned the guns aboard the vessels on which they served and many of them were killed or wounded in action; they were members of the Armed Forces in every way except that they were never formally sworn in, and for this service they received no more pay than that received by naval personnel in similar duties. Aside from that pay this Government has not compensated them in any way for the risks they took or the sacrifices they made.

The irony of this situation is that at the same time the Navy Commandeered several large ocean liners for use as Navy transports. The Navy, however, swore the crew members in as members of the Armed Forces, and because of that simple fact the men who served on Navy transports have ever since received the same pensions and benefits as every other veteral of the Spanish-American War. In contrast, the crews of Army transports doing an even more hazardous job have received nothing during the half century which has passed. That injustice can never be completely remedied. For the few men who remain alive, however, and for their dependents, this Congress should certainly do what it can to ease their last years and to make amends for the harsh treatment they have been given.

The total number of men serving aboard these vessels under the Quartermaster General of the Army during the war period was something under 4,800. Their average age was slightly higher than those who served in the regular military forces. While no actual count of the number living today is available, over 6 years ago it was estimated that only 380 were then alive with an average age at that time of 72 years. The last estimate I have, made in July 1953, was that there are now less than 200, including widows, still living. The cost of granting them some meager share of the benefits to which they have been entitled in all justice for years would be small. The compensation in terms of their gratitude and our self-respect would be great. With the death rate indicated it will soon be too late to earn that self-respect.

Mr. Speaker, the limited time I have available does not allow me to detail the many cases I know of personally who are now suffering hardship and whom my amendment would benefit. I have in my hand a photostat of the discharge the Army Transport Service awarded one of them on February 16, 1900, giving as reason for discharge, "hurt in service." Let me read a paragraph from a letter I have received from the man who received that discharge, Mr. Fred Kuhl, who heads an organization in San Francisco composed of survivors of this service. Mr. Kuhl writes:

> I take pleasure in enclosing a photostatic copy of my discharge from the Army Transport Service. It is self-explanatory. I shall only add that I have never received any compensation of any kind for the injuries received in line of duty and under enemy fire on June 29, 1899, off Iloilo, Philippine Islands, on board United States Army Transport *Sherman*. The result of these injuries have changed the whole course of my life. I have been progressively handicapped for 30 years. On October 25 I will be 75 years old.

That statement needs no comment from me.

My predecessor, the late Congressman Dick Welch and I have had bills in behalf of these veterans in Congress for many years. The Veterans' Administration has opposed them on the ground that enactment would be discriminatory to other civilian groups who have served as accessories to our Armed Forces in wartime. I am firmly convinced that the real discrimination lies in failing to enact such legislation. The case of these men is entirely different from that of the ordinary civilian who performs service with the Armed Forces in time of war. They were, in fact, soldiers in everything but name. Their counterparts in the Navy have enjoyed these benefits for years. In 1931 Congress set another precedent for adoption of this amendment by granting veteran status to civilian contract nurses who served between 1898 and 1902, and they did not undergo the risks these men took. If we adopt my amendment today there is no reason why it should be considered as a precedent for other civilian groups to receive veterans' benefits, as has been feared, since there is no other group which qualifies for them as do these men who qualified under enemy fire.

The Navy transport veterans who were in this service served no more than 6 months before they were released. In contrast, after the end of the Spanish-American War many of the Army Transport Service personnel were kept in the service and served through the Philippine insurrection, the Boxer Rebellion, and the China Relief Expedition. Yet the Navy men receive veteran's benefits and have had them through the years, while the Army men do not. I have a record of one such Army man who continued to sail aboard Army transports until captured by the Japanese at the fall of Manila—a record of service through three wars which ended with his death as a result of confinement in Santo Tomas prison.

Mr. Speaker, under the unanimous consent of the House, I insert the amendment I had intended to propose at the conclusion of these remarks:

AMENDMENT TO H. R. 9020, AS REPORTED
PROPOSED BY MR. SHELLEY

Page 13, after line 15, insert:

"Sec. 14. (a) The first section of the act of June 2, 1930 (38 U. S. C., sec. 365), is amended by inserting immediately before the period at the end thereof the following: ': *And provided further*, That the provisions, limitations, and benefits of this section are extended to and shall include any person who served 90 days or more during the period beginning April 21, 1898, and ending July 4, 1902, both dates inclusive, as a member of the crew of any vessel or vessels operated under the jurisdiction of the Quartermaster General of the Army for the transportation of troops or military stores, and who was honorably released from such service, or to any such person, regardless of length of service, who was released from such service before the expiration of the 90 days because of disability contracted by him while in such service in line of duty.'

"(b) Section 3 of such act of June 2, 1930 (38 U. S. C., sec. 365b), is amended by inserting immediately before the period at the end thereof the following: ': *And provided further*, That the provisions, limitations, and benefits of this section are extended to and shall include any person who served 70 days or more during the period beginning April 21, 1898, and ending July 4, 1902, both dates inclusive, as a member of the crew of any vessel or vessels operated under the jurisdiction of the Quartermaster General of the Army for the transportation of troops or military stores, and who was honorably released from such service.'"

And renumber the following section accordingly.

Republican Party Betrays Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1954

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, one of the most cynical political betrayals ever perpetrated is found in the Republican Party's unprincipled repudiation of its 1952 campaign pledges made to the American Labor movement. It will be recalled that during the last campaign Mr. Eisenhower and his party made several specific pledges to labor—they promised to repeal the worst provisions of the Taft-Hartley law and gave their word that they would go forward on such things as social security, unemployment compensation, and minimum wages.

Many good honest hardworking voters were deceived by this GOP doubletalk—they took these GOP promises at their face value and voted for the Eisenhower ticket. When the GOP took over the White House and control of Congress, these misled voters got a rude awakening. They found that the Eisenhower promises to labor were not meant to be taken seriously—that they were made for vote-getting purposes only, and that after election they were conveniently forgotten.

However, the time for an accounting is approaching. As Abraham Lincoln once said: "You can fool all the people some of the time and some of the people all the time, but you cannot fool all the people all the time." Now that another national election is approaching this is an especially appropriate moment to carefully examine the Republican majority's record on labor legislation, and evaluate this record in the light of the 1952 campaign promises. The people who relied on these promises when they cast their vote for the GOP in November 1952 have a right to know whether they got their money's worth.

BETRAYAL ON TAFT-HARTLEY AMENDMENTS

The most glaring example of the administration's betrayal of labor is found in the GOP repudiation of Eisenhower's campaign promise to relax some of the many antilabor features of the Taft-Hartley law. In 1952 Mr. Eisenhower appeared before the national convention of the American Federation of Labor and stated:

> I know the law (i. e., the Taft-Hartley Act) might be used to break unions. That must be changed. America wants no law licensing union-busting. And neither do I.

So spoke the Chief Executive before election. And after his election Eisenhower kept up his "I am a friend of labor" pretense for a few months. He appointed AFL leader Martin Durkin as Secretary of Labor and authorized Durkin to draw up a series of proposed amendments to make the Taft-Hartley Act less harsh on labor. Assuming that his superior was acting in good faith, Mr. Durkin appointed a 15-man committee to work up a set of proposed changes in the Taft-Hartley law. These amendments—which represented very reasonable and mild reforms of the Taft-Hartley Act—were prepared in due course.

Then came the sellout—President Eisenhower turned his back on Mr. Durkin and repudiated the proposed modifications. This "knife in the back" to himself and the labor movement gave Mr. Durkin no honorable choice but to resign as Secretary of Labor. This he did.

Since the Durkin resignation last September, the administration and the GOP majority have more and more been showing their true antilabor bias. The best evidence of this change of face is found in the administration's bill (S. 2650) which contained amendments to the Taft-Hartley law and which was brought to the Senate floor last spring with the blessings of the White House. This measure would have made the Taft-Hartley law still more antilabor—its overall effect would have been to place still more restrictions on labor's right to organize, to bargain collectively and to strike. Fortunately, the Senate on May 7 voted down this super Taft-Hartley law.

OTHER UNION-BUSTING MOVES

There are plenty of examples over and above the Taft-Hartley issue to show the administration's change of position on labor—and showing that the change was always for the worse. For instance, Eisenhower has adopted as a plank in his labor program the Goldwater States rights amendment—a proposal to legalize and encourage passage of State laws to outlaw picketing and labor strikes. By way of background it is interesting to note that this States rights amendment follows word for word a recent resolution adopted by the National Association of Manufacturers which read:

> That nothing in the Labor-Management Relations Act (Taft-Hartley) shall be construed to nullify the power of any State to regulate strikes and picketing within its borders.

Another union-busting proposal which has been advanced by the administration is the Brownell bill—proposed by Attorney General Brownell—which provides that the Federal Government should take over and dissolve any union or other organization which the Attorney General has reason to believe is a Communist-infiltrated organization. Since every labor organization is somewhat suspect as being subversive in the eyes of big business representatives, the passage of the Brownell bill would place the labor movement at the tender mercy of bigots like Attorney General Brownell. Both the CIO and the A. F. of L. have risen up to denounce the un-American Brownell proposals, and I am pleased to note that even the conservative Wall Street Journal has voiced its opposition.

Although these administration-sponsored proposals have not been passed, the Eisenhower administration has found ways and means of making the Taft-Hartley law much worse by administrative action—revision by administrative interpretation. During the last 2 years the National Labor Relations Act has been packed with the agents of management, and so we find that in cases before the NLRB these big-business stooges always side with the employer against the worker. Thus the new NLRB, by means of reinterpretation and reexamination of prior decisions, has made the Taft-Hartley law still more antilabor in actual practice.

REPUBLICANS IGNORE UNEMPLOYMENT PROBLEM

During the past 18 months many economic warning signs of recession have been appearing—our economy has been declining and economists have warned that we may be headed for economic trouble in the near future unless Congress acts in time. There are, for example, some 3.6 million unemployed right now and another 2 million workers are employed only part time. The rate of capital investment has slowed down, and inventories at the retail level are swollen. There have been cutbacks in the production of steel, automobiles, farm implements, and other hard goods. Consumer credit—which has been expanded to the enormous amount of $21.8 billions—is beginning to contract. These various economic trends spell recession unless they are halted and reversed by adoption of a sound and practical program to implement the Full Employment Act of 1946.

Business depressions are not inevitable—our political experiences show that recessions can be combated by appropriate Government action and that the way to prevent them is to maintain adequate purchasing power in the hands of the people. When consumer purchasing power begins to dry up, it can be restored by giving tax relief to the lower income groups, by promoting a high wage policy for labor, by giving full parity to the farmer, and by putting idle men to work by means of a public-works program.

The administration and the controlling majority in Congress have shown no real interest in establishing an effective antirecession program. Instead of planning a sound program of public works, GOP leaders tells us that full employment is just around the corner, and that the millions of unemployed have nothing to worry about. At a time when credit restrictions should have been relaxed to encourage investment, the administration established a hard-money policy with higher interest rates which benefits only the money lenders. As to tax policy, the GOP has railroaded through Congress a new tax law which gives huge tax reductions to the wealthy taxpayers and corporations—who do not need it—but gives only token relief to the lower income groups who need it most. The Republican majority has turned thumbs down on labor-backed proposals to raise the minimum wage from 75 cents to $1.25 per hour. Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Benson has opposed full parity for the farmer—the official position of the administration is support for lower flexible supports.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, the Republicans at the White House and in Congress have followed a do-nothing negative policy regarding our economic problems. Instead of taking decisive action, they are telling us that there is really no recession developing today, but that we are only witnessing a mild downward adjustment.

My conservative colleagues from the opposite side of the aisle have even refused to raise the amount of unemployment compensation payable so as to better protect those workers who lose their jobs. The administration's unemployment compensation bill which recently passed the House merely extends the present program to a few million more workers. It does nothing to increase the present inadequate level of unemployment benefits payable, nor does it extend the duration of the benefit period. To most unemployed workers the final passage of this administration bill will represent only an idle gesture.

WE NEED A PROGRAM FOR FULL EMPLOYMENT

Mr. Speaker, the present economic picture is not encouraging and swift action is needed to reverse the tide of recession and return our country to full employment. To meet the present unemployment situation and to prevent it from spreading, I propose the following seven-point program:

First. Tax relief should be granted to the low- and middle-income groups by raising individual and dependency exemptions from the present $600 to $1,000, and by eliminating unnecessary excises. All proposals for a national sales tax should be rejected.

Second. Congress should adopt a well-planned system of public works to provide for more jobs, and also meet the Nation's needs for more schools, hospitals, public roads, recreation centers, housing, and so forth.

Third. The minimum wage should be increased from the present 75 cents to $1.25 per hour, and the coverage of the wage-hour law should be extended to additional workers now unprotected.

Fourth. The Taft-Hartley law should be repealed as a means of strengthening collective bargaining, and in this manner raise wage levels generally.

Fifth. To prevent the present farm recession from turning into a wholesale depression, Congress should pass a farm program which establishes full parity on all farm crops.

Sixth. Small business enterprise should be encouraged and protected by means of tax relief to small firms, the adoption of a liberal program of Government credit to business, and the strict enforcement of the antitrust laws.

Seventh. To protect all Americans from the economic insecurity of old age, sickness, and unemployment, Congress should expand and liberalize the social-security system, extend the coverage, and increase the amounts payable under our unemployment compensation system, and develop a Federal program for health and hospital construction.

This seven-point program outlined above is not meant to be all-inclusive. Instead it is a limited, basic, national economic program designed to meet the most pressing economic problems of our people in this period of growing recession. It represents only the blueprint of a program of full employment, prosperity, security, and social justice. These, Mr. Speaker, are the goals which the American people desire, and which Congress should strive to achieve.

Judge Strum Honored Legal Profession

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 10, 1954

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Judge Strum Honored Legal Profession," which was published in the Florida Times-Union of July 27, 1954.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUDGE STRUM HONORED LEGAL PROFESSION

The death of Judge Louie W. Strum at the age of 64 finishes the record of one of the most distinguished and brilliant careers ever built in law in Florida. A member of the United States Court of Appeals of the Fifth District at the time of his passing, Judge Strum had been awarded virtually every office and honor his admiring fellow citizens could bestow in recognition of his truly remarkable talents. The record of his life exhibits in itself his complete dedication to the causes of order and knowledge as man's means to justice and truth.

His unusual gifts as a leader were confirmed in his young manhood when he became captain of cadets at St. Petersburg Military High School in 1906. A few years later, after he had received one of the first degrees in law awarded by Stetson University, he took up law practice in Jacksonville as the first step in a professional ascent that few have equalled.

His accomplishments are, of course, widely known beyond the circle of his friends which, itself, numbered in the hundreds. As a young lawyer, his ability earned him recognition in 1925 when Gov. John W. Martin appointed him an associate justice of the Supreme Court of Florida. Here he served with such distinction that the Republican administration in 1931 selected him for the United States district court bench here although his stand for the Democratic Party and its principles was well known.

His quick and accurate grasp of even the most complex legal affairs backed by extensive knowledge, won him the reputation of a "lawyer's judge" and made his counsel widely sought in particularly difficult matters of jurisprudence. This ability was afforded recognition time after time in such instances as his invitation to sit as a member of the Nuremberg tribunal judging Nazi war crimes (an invitation he had to refuse), and in his selection to assist in the rewriting of the Federal court rules of civil procedure and of criminal practice.

While serving in his various judicial positions, the last of which brought him to the court of appeals 3 years ago, he always managed to find time for participation in patriotic and fraternal orders, distinguishing himself with exceptional service in these as he did in the courts.

When the history of Florida's golden period of growth is written, Judge Strum assuredly will hold a place of honor. His fine work in the administration of justice to his fellow citizens is his own memorial.

Refugee Relief Act of 1953 Being Administered Competently and Ably by Mr. Scott McLeod

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT P. MORANO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1954

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, those of us who have followed closely the administration of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953 were astonished to read the statement of the gentleman from New York [Mr. Celler] in which he alleged that the immigration of refugees is being hindered and hampered and that the refugee relief program is foredoomed to failure.

If the gentleman from New York had ever read the Refugee Relief Act, which came out of his committee, he would realize how vastly different it is from the former Displaced Persons Act. The present act was adopted on an entirely different premise, to meet an entirely different situation, and its provisions are much more stringent than were those of the DP Act.

Nevertheless, despite the difficulties of administering an act which involves the cooperation of half a dozen departments of the Government, tight security regulations, and the necessity for negotiating and carrying out working agreements with about two dozen foreign governments, the results achieved to date under the Refugee Relief Act have most certainly amounted to a great deal more than a trickle, as the distinguished gentleman from New York has elected to characterize them.

Obviously, some time was required to get a program as big and as widespread as this rolling. Regulations and administrative procedures had to be developed—not unilaterally by the State Department alone, but in cooperation with numerous other participating agencies. Staff expansion had to be accomplished, and that involved recruiting good people for a temporary job, getting them security cleared, trained, transported, equipped, and set up in business. The mere matter of getting office space in which these people could work required 3 and 4 months in some instances because of the shortage of available space in Europe.

Another essential which could not be rushed was the negotiation of the agreements with foreign governments which the act requires. Some of these agreements have not yet been worked out, and one of them, I happen to know, was achieved just recently only after the personal intervention of President Eisenhower with the Foreign Minister of the country concerned.

Frankly, Mr. Speaker, I, myself did not understand these delays, and I was much concerned last March 1 when the target date for the issuance of visas in volume passed without appreciable results. Being genuinely and constructively interested in the success of this humanitarian program, I took the trouble to learn what the difficulties and delays were all about. Actually, there was very little delay. March 1 had been set as a target date for getting the program on the rails. This was achieved just 1 month late, on April 1.

Since then more than 8,000 visas have been issued. More than 800 applicants who could not qualify have been rejected; 32,813 applicants are in the pipeline.

Approximately 14,000 assurances of employment and housing have been received, and these will admit about 25,000 heads of families and dependents.

The administration of the act is now geared to continue production of visas in substantial numbers so as to get the job done by the time the act expires on December 31, 1956.

Until now, it would not have been possible to make use of larger numbers of job and housing assurances. With the program rolling at good speed, however, the time now has come when a steady flow of assurances is essential to continued progress, for the head of every refugee family must be guaranteed a job and a roof over his head. The act does not permit these people to come to the United States and wander around jobless, homeless, and as wards of haphazard charity.

It was for this reason that the Administrator of the act and the Secretary of State requested the President to solicit the cooperation of the governors just a few days ago. As you know, Mr. Speaker, the President asked the governors to establish local committees to help obtain assurances and assist in the resettlement problems of the immigrants. Far from being an admission that the act is a failure, as my unusually gloomy colleague from New York has seen fit to conclude, the President's action was a logical and constructive effort to assure the success of the refugee program. I am glad that our President has the personal interest in this project not only to want it to succeed, but to do something positive and constructive to see that it does succeed.

I cannot believe that carping criticism will contribute anything toward making it succeed.

When the gentleman from New York exposed his lack of knowledge of the stringent security provisions contained in this act, I was afraid to trust my own memory of how he had voted on the act. A check of the Congressional Record of July 28, 1953, at page 10205, Roll No. 112, reveals that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Celler] did vote for the act. Of course he had plenty of opportunity to know of its provisions because as already noted, it came out of his own committee.

I frankly do not pretend to understand the mind of my colleague. But one thing I do know. If I were in the Kremlin, and had people escaping and being driven from behind the Iron Curtain, I certainly would plant among them a considerable number of spies and saboteurs so that they could endeavor to reach the United States as refugees under this act. It was to guard against this possibility that the Congress imposed very strict security requirements upon the administrator of the act. These are requirements which permit of little or no administrative discretion.

It would be quite understandable to me to hear the able and competent Administrator Mr. McLeod criticized for relaxing these requirements and thereby taking the risk of admitting spies and saboteurs; I would be one of the first to demand his scalp if he did so. But it is incomprehensible to hear a conscientious public servant condemned for carrying out the will of Congress.

Because I am familiar not only with the act but with its administration as well, I know that it is most complex and difficult to administer. I personally admire the courage of those who are responsible for its administration, for they have determined to make it work despite its built-in handicaps. This they are doing speedily and effectively. The results speak for themselves.

New York Times Article Praises the Honorable Wayne L. Hays, of Ohio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SIDNEY R. YATES

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1954

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include an article from the New York Times of August 6, 1954. I wish especially to call your attention to the last paragraph, which is laudatory of our colleagues the Honorable Wayne L. Hays, of Ohio, and Gracie Pfost, of Idaho:

ANOTHER REPLY TO REECE

The answer of the Rockefeller Foundation and the General Education Board to the attacks on them, and foundations in general, by the ineffable Reece committee is an eloquent and convincing supplement to the replies already made by the Carnegie Corp., the Ford Foundation, the Fund for the Republic and the Council of Learned Societies. Thanks to the press, the case for the defense is now before the public, even though Chairman Reece denied the foundations the right to make their answers in the same forum of public hearings in which the attacks on them were launched. The cumulative effect of the replies has been to raise foundations still further in public esteem and completely to discredit the committee.

So absurd have been the charges made by its hand-picked witnesses that, as Dean Rusk remarks in the Rockefeller reply, it is hard to believe that the committee itself has taken them seriously. But Mr. Rusk may have overestimated the intelligence of the majority of its members. So we heartily endorse his suggestion that the foundations be allowed an opportunity to be heard on the draft of any report the committee proposes to submit. This is the least that could now be done to give them a fair hearing—especially if the committee staff members who acted as prosecutors in attacking the foundations should be given any hand, as judges, in drafting the report.

We also want to commend two members of the committee—Wayne L. Hays and Gracie Pfost—for their heroic efforts to inject some sanity and fairness into the committee's activities. It would be most unfair for the public to hold them in any way responsible for the sorry performance of their colleagues.

The Spiritual, Moral, and Economic Qualities of Citizenship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES J. KERSTEN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 3, 1954

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I wish to include in my remarks the winning speech in the CBS national contest for high-school valedictorians, made by a constituent of mine, Lawrence J. Bugge, of Milwaukee, Wis.

Lawrence Bugge graduated from Marquette University High School, Milwaukee, Wis., in June of this year. Milwaukee and Wisconsin are very proud of him and I believe a reading of his speech which is set forth hereinafter will show why it won the national contest.

It follows:

THE SPIRITUAL, MORAL, AND ECONOMIC QUALITIES OF CITIZENSHIP

(By Lawrence J. Bugge)

Certain spiritual qualities are necessary for good citizenship. A proof of this is the remarkable parallel, or, more accurately, the cause-and-effect relationship, between the opening lines of Genesis and the beginning of our Declaration of Independence. It is simply because "God created man to His own image and likeness" that "all men are created equal and are endowed with certain inalienable rights." Thus, the freedoms we should cherish so deeply, our "inalienable rights," we owe to a philosophy which recognizes and reverences the Supreme Being. This belief, the American philosophy, presupposes outward manifestations—that is—religious or spiritual practices. It is therefore not only the right of citizens, but also their duty to practice the religion of their choice, to lead healthy spiritual lives, and to teach their children of God and of the eternal principles upon which this country was founded. It is these practices that communism attacks first, for they are the basis of our way of life. Consequently, Americans must be strong and fervent in their use and in their defense. These spiritual qualities of diligence and fervor in religious practices, then, are the marks of good citizenship.

Closely allied to the spiritual qualities of good citizenship are its moral qualities. In his inaugural address President Eisenhower said, "America is great because she is good. If she ever ceases to be good she will cease to be great." This, the wonderful worth and renown of our country is directly due to her morality as a nation and as individuals. Because America and Americans guide their actions not by expediency but by the unchanging immortal principles of right and wrong they have become the greatest nation on the earth. To maintain this position, every citizen, drawing strength from an active spiritual life, must practice the eternal principles of right as dictated in the Decalog, and by his conscience. He must do this in spite of fear, scorn, and temptation to do otherwise. The moral qualities most necessary for this good citizenship are courage and perseverance.

Often underrated, but tremendously important, are the economic qualities of good citizenship. Today, in the face of the communistic threat, we must analyze our economic system, since it is this which communism ostensibly seeks to improve. It is clear that the value and success of free enterprise lies not in rugged individualism, but in teamwork. The fallacy of the class-war argument of the Reds is that the classes are not independent, but interdependent, and indispensable, to one another. Management cannot operate without labor, nor labor without management. Thus, it is only through cooperation and compromise that our economic system is most successful. On the other hand, it is through personal ambition and initiative that the wonderful technical progress of capitalism has been made. However, individual success and prosperity must necessarily be limited by morality—that is, it must never trespass the rights of another person or group. These, then, I believe, are the economic qualities of good citizenship: Cooperation, ambition, initiative, and morality.

Latin Americans Don't Love Us

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 10, 1954

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an article entitled "Latin Americans Don't Love Us," written by John W. White and published in the Washington Evening Star of August 5, 1954.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

LATIN AMERICANS DON'T LOVE US AND THE UNITED STATES GIVES PLENTY OF REASON, FOR WE IGNORE THEM AND KNOW LITTLE OF THEIR COUNTRIES, EXPERT DECLARES

(By John W. White)

We could not win any war without the Latin American countries and the strategic materials they produce. Yet history cannot point to any people who were as ignorant of the neighbors they needed for allies as we are of the countries south of the border.

A young woman phoned to the Chamber of Commerce of the United States recently. She said her husband had been offered a job in South America and she wanted some information about the country. "Do they have bugs? Can you drink the water? Do they have good doctors?"

The lady was asked to which country she and her husband were going. "To South America," she replied. It was explained that there are 10 countries in South America. "Oh, I didn't know that," she said.

The inquirer was then told that several of the capitals are more than a mile high; others at sea level. Some are hot; some are cold. She was told she would find the big cities cleaner than American cities; that Buenos Aires, for instance, has 3.5 million population, five subways, and no bugs. She kept exclaiming "Oh," like a child listening to a fair story.

It was suggested that she ask her husband to which country he was being assigned and call back. She didn't call back.

Mention to a Latin American diplomat in Washington the first radio and television address by John Foster Dulles after his appointment as Secretary of State. The Latino will shrug his shoulders in good old Spanish fashion and cross his two fingers across his lips. That's the Spanish signal for "Silencio."

Practically every Latin American diplomat in Washington that night heard the United States Secretary of State use the expression "South America" five times when he obviously meant to include Mexico and the Central American countries—in other words, all of Latin America. Even so, in an address of more than 3,000 words "South America" was disposed of in two brief paragraphs totaling 165 words, after long discussions of our relations with Asia, Europe, and Africa.

With blithe ignorance, business houses in the United States address their letters to Buenos Aires, Brazil, and Rio de Janeiro, Argentina. As for Uruguay and Paraguay, many Americans think they are two names for the same country. The owner of a shipping company once asked me whether Buenos Aires is east or west of the Andes.

This ignorance has built a reservoir of ill will. Washington officials frankly admit, off the record, of course, that our relations with our southern neighbors are at an all-time low.

The recent burning of American flags and the stoning of American Embassies in Latin America does not mean these people are Communists. It means only that their hot Spanish blood finally boiled over and their long-pent-up resentment against us exploded. They are sick of being fawned on as good neighbors when we need them and then dropped as soon as the emergency has passed.

Hundreds of thousands of Americans who scanned the headlines about those outbreaks would not know where to look on a map for the countries they were reading about. Worst of all, most of them were not sufficiently interested to look at a map.

Everything indicates that the nations of this planet are lining up into two camps—the free world and the Soviet satellites. The free world will not long endure if we allow the Soviet to annex that part of the Western Hemisphere south of the Rio Grande.

There are already as many people on the other side of that river as there are on this side. Most of them are democratic at heart. When they won their independence, they set up republics patterned after ours. They look to us for leadership. Yet, until we get into a jam and need them, we do not even know where they are.

PRINTING DOCUMENTS AND REPORTS

Documents and reports of committees with the evidence and papers submitted therewith, or any part thereof ordered printed by Congress, may be reprinted by the Public Printer on order of any Member of Congress or Delegate, on prepayment of the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 162, p. 1940).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the Record.

Addre
at
Bra

IN TH

Mr
imou
pendi
ered
of E
East
near
Th
was
as fol

(Add

To
great
syster
Reser
La
one o
go th
and i
of th
to th
Corp
uppe
Th
one
17 s
uppe
netw
the
bene
the
miles
W
some
of th
firml
troll
the
sipp
abou
ing
have
star
all,
its
T
tivel
so r
of t
belo
som
our
velo
U
a lo
Lou
peop
othe
not
ma
sha
Mis

Appendix

Address by Maj. Gen. S. D. Sturgis, Jr., at Dedication of East Branch Dam, Bradford, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. DUFF

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 11, 1954

Mr. DUFF. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Maj. Gen. S. D. Sturgis, Jr., Chief of Engineers, at the dedication of the East Branch Dam, on the Clarion River, near Bradford, Pa., on August 8, 1954.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RIPPLES ON THE POND

(Address by Maj. Gen. S. D. Sturgis, Jr., Chief of Engineers)

Today we meet in the headwaters of our greatest and most intensively developed river system to dedicate East Branch, Clarion River Reservoir, in northern Pennsylvania.

Large as this dam seems to us, it is not one of the Nation's great structures, as dams go these days. But it is an important one, and its major national significance arises out of the fact that it is another new unit added to the steadily growing network of Army Corps of Engineers dams now rising on the upper tributaries of the Ohio.

This new dam, East Branch, is the tenth one to be put to work out of a network of 17 structures planned in order to bring the upper Ohio under firm control. And this network is destined to play a vital part in the regulation of the Ohio River system, with beneficial results all the way downstream to the Mississippi Delta, over 2,150 winding river miles from here.

When all 17 of these dams are completed, some years from now, they will comprise one of the primary means for keeping the Ohio firmly on the leash; and, in turn, by controlling the Ohio, exert a major influence on the regulation of the Missouri and Mississippi Rivers. By count of the dams, we are about two-thirds done with our job of building reservoirs in the upper Ohio, yet we still have a long way to go; and have even to get started with the largest structure of them all, the giant, proposed Allegheny Dam, up on its namesake river now in a planning status.

The dedication of East Branch Dam, relatively small though this structure is, and so remote from the farthest potential reach of the influence of the network to which it belongs, is an appropriate time to discuss some of the major concepts of harnessing our rivers and explain why river basin development is a matter of national concern.

Up here in northern Pennsylvania, we are a long way from Cincinnati, Louisville, St. Louis, Memphis, and New Orleans. But the people of these communities, and of the other places along the way, might well take note of this dedication as another milestone marking progress toward the time when we shall have the Ohio, the Missouri, and the Mississippi under maximum control. For their interests are affected here, too, as well as those of you citizens of Johnsonburg and Ridgway, who live nearby and are the primary beneficiaries of East Branch Dam.

One of the significant things about this dedication is that in this day and time, when rivers must be brought under control by complex series of dams, no single dam in a well-planned system is too small to be ignored. Each one unit must be planned and built and operated so as to play a significant part, both locally and in its contribution to the broader task of controlling a vast river system.

As the waters released from behind East Branch Dam continue downstream they will mingle with those released from dams on other tributaries along the way; join the flows from the upper Mississippi and the Missouri, and ultimately find their way to the Gulf of Mexico.

And these comingled waters will affect the lives of the people all along the way, directly or indirectly, though to a diminishing degree, as they move downstream from here to the sea.

In this respect, the influence of networks of dams such as this one rising on the upper Ohio might be likened somewhat to that of a pebble thrown into a pond, creating ripples whose influence, though diminishing as they travel away from the point of origin, stop only when they reach the bank. Likewise, the influence of the upper Ohio network will cease only at the mouth of the Mississippi; and this influence, when added to that from other dams and networks of dams, built, rising, or planned on other rivers, will swell to a combined size that will achieve maximum control of the rivers all the way to the sea.

The experience of past generations reaffirms to us the fundamental truth that a river basin, such as the Ohio, is a natural unit; that the main river and its tributaries must be dealt with as one big system; and in turn, that the Ohio, big as it is, must be brought under control as an integral part of the greater system it comprises with the Missouri and the Mississippi.

Now, how does this system of major river control work? You are well aware, I am sure, how it will affect you locally, by holding back upstream floods in time of high water, so that the flows of the river can be released in an orderly manner when the channels can accommodate them, or so as to lower the peaks of the occasional great floods in order to prevent them from topping the floodwalls of downstream communities, and to diminish their devastation of the unprotected farms and smaller communities along the flood plains.

In addition to our work in the Ohio River Basin, other projects are built, or are under construction, or are planned on the Missouri River, reaching all the way into the Rocky Mountains of Montana. The main stem of the Mississippi River is now protected by levees from Cairo, Ill., to below New Orleans. And other water control and use projects have been built or are moving forward in the upper Mississippi River Basin.

Through the skillful operation of these river-control projects, we have already reached the point where great quantities of water can be held back on one of the major river systems while floods from another are bypassed. Though we are still far from the point of maximum effectiveness in the control of these rivers, and still are in danger of disastrous floods in many places, the works in operation are already proving their worth and are making greater and greater contributions each year as we progress toward ultimate completion of the master control program.

Furthermore, of increasing importance as the demands upon our streams increase with the growth of the population and the expansion of industry, is another aspect of river basin development to which networks of dams, such as the upper Ohio's, make a great contribution. And that is the fact that these dams provide for the storage of waters which can be released when the rivers are at low flows and more water is needed downstream to keep navigation moving, provide water supplies for urban areas and industries, and dilute and flush away the sewage and wastes of communities and industries along the way.

For instance, last summer, when the flows of many of our rivers were at an alarmingly low stage, waters released from behind Corps of Engineers dams on the Allegheny and Monongahela Rivers contributed one-third of the flow of the Ohio at Pittsburgh. Together with waters released from other dams, including Fort Peck Dam, on the Missouri River in Montana, some 1,400 airline miles away from here, the waters released from upper Ohio dams helped to prevent critical emergencies all the way down the river system to New Orleans. These releases of conserved water made it possible for navigation to keep moving, which otherwise would have stopped; they averted critical pollution problems; and, most dramatically of all, perhaps, helped to save the city of New Orleans from contamination of its municipal water supply by the invasion of saltwater from the sea.

Last summer, we were able to avert a critical emergency literally by the "skin of our teeth." Again, this summer, the Nation is plagued by drought and low water in many places. Though I cannot foretell today, what emergencies we may face this fall, last summer's experience serves to emphasize the fact that each new dam added to our river control systems is of utmost significance at this critical point in our river basin development program.

Programs for the development of our rivers must work in harmony with the laws of nature, rather than against them. Rain and snow fall; vegetation springs up and prospers; soils wash and floods take place; then the surplus water runs on to the sea, to restore the clouds in the cycle of transpiration and evaporation and precipitation, all in Nature's grand design. We cannot dominate these forces, but by working in harmony with them, we can lessen their destructive impact, achieve a large measure of prosperity ourselves, and pass on to future generations an improved heritage.

Geologists tell us that the present Ohio River system is not old, as rivers go; perhaps it achieved its present form only 40,000 or 50,000 years ago. When the white men found the main Ohio, some 300 years ago, it was in flood and was filled with snags, bars, rocks and other obstructions. It was never an ideal river, meandering through the primeval forest; it was a wild, unpredictable stream, carving its way to the sea in its own manner. And of significance to us today is the fact that there is evidence that some of the greatest floods in the Ohio River Basin occurred before there was ever a man-made soil conservation problem.

Bringing the Ohio and its tributaries up to their present state of control and development, with the main stem and certain of its tributaries comprising great avenues of commerce serving one of the world's largest, richest and most productive regions, was one of the major achievements of the American people. It comprised an epic of progress in which the Corps of Engineers played a historical and vital part.

While the needs of today's complex industrial society, with its growing river-bank concentrations of population, wealth, and activity, require that full attention be given to every aspect of water uses and water problems, the Corps of Engineers' earliest interest on the Ohio was navigation. And it was in the Ohio River Valley that the corps "cut its eye teeth" on civil-works improvements. Perhaps you may wonder how we got started there.

In 1824 Congress passed an act authorizing improvement of navigation on the Ohio and Mississippi Rivers and President Monroe gave the task to the same United States Army Corps of Engineers which serves you today. In those days a great part of the country's professional engineering talent was trained by and was a part of the United States Army. This act was also the beginning of the policy of using Federal funds under the commerce clause of the Constitution to build navigation works that were beyond the ability of individual efforts or local and State efforts, and were for the ultimate benefit of the entire Nation, including national defense, as well as the encouragement of commerce between the States. The $75,000 appropriated to remove "planters, sawyers, and snags" from the Ohio was the beginning of Federal expenditure for improving the Ohio, and it probably didn't go very far, even at 1824 prices.

However, it was also the beginning of a long and fruitful association between the Corps of Engineers and the people of the Ohio Valley. If I may digress into history a bit further, I should like to cite an example of early cooperation with the local people. In those days the Ohio River had a normal channel of about 3 feet. During low water, even the shallow-draft old packetboats could not pass the falls at Louisville, Ky., though some of their pilots claimed these boats could travel "on a heavy dew." The first Louisville-Portland Canal was built by a private company, with engineering advice from the Corps of Engineers and with the United States Government as a chief stockholder. That is interesting at this time because it illustrates the degree of cooperation among the local interests, the States, and the Nation, which is necessary to improve and regulate a river, which is as true today as it was in the 1830's. The ultimate full development of the Ohio River depends on this kind of partnership under a well-planned water-resources program that will return the ultimate for the investment and meet everybody's needs.

So, out of these beginnings on the Ohio River system have come today's Corps of Engineers program of storage dams, navigation dams and locks, flood walls, levees, and other works, to bring the Ohio and its tributaries under control and make the waters available to support growth and development.

River developments must keep pace with the demands of a rapidly growing population and expanding industrial enterprise, or else the strength and prosperity of the Nation and the welfare of our people will be impaired.

I can foresee the time when virtually the entire Ohio Valley, from the Allegheny and Monongahela Rivers on down to the mouth of the river at Cairo, will be the locale of industrial expansion that will make today's phenomenal growth appear relatively as backward as the days of the horse and buggy and the mule-team scraper now seem.

Such a development will require water in enormous quantities, tax even the vast navigation potential of the river, place a still higher premium on flood control, and create most difficult problems of disposing of urban sewage and industrial wastes, to say nothing of meeting the needs of a vastly larger population which will seek the recreational advantages of a potential water playground.

The importance of keeping pace with the Nation's water resources development requirements was recently emphasized by President Eisenhower, himself, who said, and I quote: "The conservation and use we make of the water resources of our Nation may in large measure determine our future progress and the standards of living of our citizens—we must make the best use of every drop of water which falls on our soil or which can be extracted from the oceans."

It requires years, and sometimes generations, to plan and carry out river-basinwide developments. Therefore, we must look far ahead in considering the kinds, capacities, locations, and functioning of the works to be built. Our rivers and the waters they harvest have become one of our greatest national resources.

So, the means of conserving and using our water and of correlating soil and water conservation measures, and the coordination of Federal, local and private endeavor, constitute one of our greatest, most difficult, and most vital national problems.

The Corps of Engineers is proud of the role it has played not only in water-resources development, for over a century and a quarter, but in the formulation of national water-resources policy. It was the first Federal agency to recognize the interrelationship of the various uses of water for flood control, navigation, irrigation, power, industrial and commercial use, municipal drinking water, soil conservation, fish and wildlife, and recreation. The corps has long advocated a comprehensive approach to watershedwide planning and execution of works to achieve the optimum benefits in these fields. It made the first countrywide comprehensive surveys of our national water-resources potential. These survey reports, known as the 308 Reports, were largely completed some 20 years ago and have formed a basis of subsequent development by the corps and other agencies as well. We are continuing our surveys and studies, bringing the 308 Reports up to date as rapidly as funds allow because the demands for water have grown manyfold during those years as our population and technical development expanded.

Since taking office as Chief of Engineers, I have steadily worked for better integration and coordination of water and soil-resources programs and policies and we have made great progress in that direction. In May of this year, President Eisenhower approved the proposed interagency committee on water resources, to improve the coordination of existing policies, programs, and activities of the Department of the Army, of the Interior, of Agriculture, of Commerce, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Federal Power Commission, with the Department of Labor as an associate member.

Above this committee, the President created a Cabinet committee on water-resources policy to review all aspects of water-resource policy and make recommendations by December 1 of this year for the strengthening, clarification, and modernization of water policies. This committee consists of the Secretaries of Defense, Interior, and Agriculture, as full members, with the Secretary of Commerce, the Director of the Budget Bureau, and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare participating as these agencies are involved in specific situation. Its Chairman is Secretary of the Interior Douglas McKay.

President Eisenhower's action has given powerful impetus to the movement for better Federal water policy and has provided means for preparing more economical and smoother working programs. It marks a milestone toward the orderly achievement of the Nation's water-resources objectives, so that we might expedite the efficient, economical completion of river-control developments such as this one in the upper Ohio Valley.

And now, as we dedicate the East Branch Dam, to your local protection and to the part it will play in the broader aspects of bringing our greatest river system under control, we also dedicate our efforts to the unfinished task of moving ahead with the development of our river basins to the end that the strength and prosperity of our country can reach its fullest achievement.

Seating of Red China in U. N.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 3, 1954

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following editorial from the Christian Science Monitor, Tuesday, August 10, 1954, entitled "Mr. Hammarskjold and Peking":

> Does the Secretary-General of the United Nations favor the seating of the Communist Chinese regime in the world organization in place of the Nationalists who are headed by Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek and recognized by the United States?
>
> This is the most explosive question likely to be raised by the annual report which the secretary-general has just made to the General Assembly. Nowhere in his report does Mr. Dag Hammarskjold say in so many words that Red China should be admitted to the U. N. But he has laid himself open to being interpreted as meaning this.
>
> In making his carefully worded observations Mr. Hammarskjold, it should be noted, keeps a firm toehold on the diplomatic tightrope he must always walk as impartial, Secretary-General of an organization which includes members of three worlds—East, West, and neutral. But already his position has been described by expert and well-informed U. N. observers as favoring membership for Red China.
>
> Quite aside from the international politics involved here, which Mr. Hammarskjold's job requires him to avoid, there is a legal question under the U. N. Charter which stands in the way of Peking's accreditation.
>
> This is that the U. N. has condemned Communist China as an aggressor in Korea. So far from making an attempt to disprove this charge, Peking has, as Secretary Dulles recently said, come very near to being also an open aggressor in Indochina, underscoring its role there by taking a major part in the Indochinese settlement at the Geneva Conference.
>
> Despite these facts there has been a noticeable softening of opposition to the eventual seating of the Communist Chinese regime. Mr. Hammarskjold's report is in line with this sentiment.
>
> The sense of this is that the barring of Peking may hamper the U. N.'s development and also disserve the West's long-run diplomatic interest. For it would tend to keep

Peking semidependent on Moscow in dealings with the Western World.

Meanwhile, extreme threats by American opponents of Peking to work for United States withdrawal from the world organization in the event of a U. N. vote for Peking have not helped the case against the Chinese Communists. Nor have other manifestations of alternating ebullience and uncertainty on the part of American leaders.

President Eisenhower, Prime Minister Churchill, and other western leaders seem in pretty close agreement that (1) the doors of the U. N. cannot be barred against Peking simply because it is a Communist regime, but (2) that Peking must give some sign of being willing to assume the responsibilities which go with U. N. membership before being admitted to that body.

One may assume that Mr. Hammarskjold for the sake of improving the U. N.'s operations hopes one day to see China's 600 million people represented there by whatever government actually controls China. We must also assume he could not envisage membership for Peking until it had cleared itself of the aggression charge and shown a readiness to pledge itself to U. N. purposes.

The next General Assembly session may well see first steps taken by Peking's supporters in the Soviet bloc to win a clearance of aggression charges for Peking. More than this effort will be necessary to convince the free world of Communist China's sincerity of purpose in seeking a U. N. membership. But, for better or worse, a move by Peking to signify this would now be a powerful argument in many ears for its admission.

The Newest Look

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 11, 1954

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial entitled "The Newest Look," appearing in the Boston Post of August 8, 1954:

THE NEWEST LOOK

The New Look was an Army name for an American defense plan designed to keep down the total size of our military forces while still packing plenty of power. So they said.

The plan required a great strategic bomber force, capable of hitting back with terrible atomic force at any enemy who dared attack us. That part of the plan was called solemnly "massive retaliation," and the phrase was meant to scare the dickens out of the Reds, who would presumably surrender the minute their translators were able to find suitably long Russian words to express it.

Maybe the translators were never able to find Russian words with the right ring. In any case, the Reds didn't scare. And they didn't choose their strategy to suit ours.

While our fliers were sitting back waiting to retaliate massively, the Russians held their planes at home and let the air and land forces of such willing neighbors as Red China, North Korea, and more recently Indochina operate in their interest. In the face of these operations, our New Look became a sad look.

When the Reds began their final big bid for Indochina, our strategists discovered that the New Look didn't fit that situation. We had the massive power to hit them with atom or H-bombs. But if we should, we knew that the Russians would retaliate right back at us, so to speak. This was risky.

The alternative would have been to throw troops, backed by sea and airpower, into Indochina as we had thrown them once into Korea. But the New Look didn't provide many land forces. We weren't supposed to need them. We had some in the Japan-Korea area. But if we withdrew these and moved them down to Indochina, the Reds would move some of their own millions of soldiers in there, too, and, at the same time, would send other forces into Korea, which they would then easily take.

The fact that we sat supinely by while Indochina fell to the Reds damaged our prestige in Asia badly. Our obvious inability to do anything was even more damaging. We were impotent, mighty in power of a certain kind, but power which couldn't reasonably be applied in the situation we faced.

Now, the defense planners are preparing a new New Look—a newest look, perhaps—although they appear to be in no violent hurry about it. They are going to ask Congress in its January session—it would be a shame to bother the Congressmen with such a little matter now—to provide for a vast army of trained reserves. This organization would train most of the able-bodied young men in the country. This, of course, is our old friend universal military training again—a very old look being offered as a substitute for the discarded new one.

The newest look, as it stands, is a makeshift, a hasty replacement for an old New Look that wasn't practicable. The old one was justified in part by those who believed we had some allies willing and able to provide manpower alongside of ours in a crisis. They learned the hard way that most of our allies have more heart for trading with the enemy than for fighting him, except perhaps with stern notes.

If the newest look ever gets to look like anything safe and reasonable, it will still have one marked weakness—the Reds may find a new strategy to counteract it. Then, of course, we'll have to figure out still another look.

We will, that is, if there are any of us left alive at that time.

Hon. Wesley A. D'Ewart

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1954

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, it is with keen regret those of us who have been associated with WES D'EWART in recent years see the end of his service in the House. He has been a splendid Representative, well informed as to the legislation under consideration and with the courage of his convictions. He has been intimately associated with the problems of the West. He knew the needs of his section of the country and guided with skill and wisdom legislation that would advance the West. A zealous champion of the West, he was more than a sectional leader. He believed in America and worked for its betterment, realizing that if America went forward his section would also go forward. The House has suffered a real loss in Mr. D'EWART's decision not to return. It is to be hoped the country can retain his services in another position of trust and responsibility.

Seely-Brown Reports to Constituents on Highlights of New Tax Revision Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HORACE SEELY-BROWN, JR.

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 11, 1954

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, the new tax revision bill is one of the most monumental legislative undertakings in the history of the Congress. This measure represents the first comprehensive revision of the internal revenue laws in over 75 years. Approximately a half of a million man-hours of work have gone into this gigantic achievement.

The basic provisions of this legislation are of vital interest and importance to all of those whom I have been honored and privileged to represent as a Member of Congress from the Second District of Connecticut. In general the purpose of the new law is to remove inequities, to end harassment of the taxpayer, and to reduce tax barriers to future expansion of production and employment.

I sincerely believe this legislation provides an important keystone in the free enterprise arch spanning the gap between a wartime economy and full employment for all our people in a peacetime economy.

The new law closes over 50 loopholes through which taxpayers today can avoid paying their fair share of taxes.

The new law contains $827 million relief for individuals and $536 million relief for business. In addition the new law will extend the present 52 percent corporate income for 1 year which means an additional $1.2 billion tax on business. This increased tax on business practically pays for all of the tax relief granted so that the net cost to the revenue will be only $163 million.

Without attempting to give a technical interpretation, the following represents some of the highlights of the new tax law. These changes in general are effective as of last January 1 so that the taxpayers will receive the benefit from them this year.

DEPENDENTS

First. A parent can claim a deduction of $600 for each child regardless of the child's earnings if the child is under 19 and the parent continues to furnish more than half the child's support.

Second. A parent can also claim the $600 dependency deduction for child over 18 regardless of the child's earnings if the child is attending school or college, or receiving on-the-farm training, and the parent continues to furnish more than half the child's support.

Third. An aged parent or other dependent cared for by several members of a family can be claimed as a deduction by one of the members of the family.

Fourth. A taxpayer can claim a $600 dependency deduction for a foster child.

Fifth. A taxpayer can claim a $600 dependency deduction for a child awaiting adoption.

Sixth. A taxpayer can claim a $600 dependency deduction for any other person, regardless of relationship, if the taxpayer supports that person in his home.

Seventh. A taxpayer can claim a $600 dependency deduction for a cousin who is institutionalized because of physical or mental disability.

Savings to taxpayers, $85 million.

CHILD-CARE EXPENSES

First. Single working parents, such as a widow, are allowed a deduction up to $600 for the expense of child-care for children up to 12 years of age.

Second. The same deduction is allowed for a married woman who must work because her husband is incapacitated.

Third. The same deduction is allowed with respect to any dependent, regardless of age, who is mentally or physically incapable of caring for himself.

Fourth. A similar deduction is allowed a married woman if the combined income of her husband and herself does not exceed $5,100.

Savings to taxpayers, $130 million.

MEDICAL EXPENSES

First. Medical expenses can be deducted when they exceed 3 percent of income, instead of 5 percent as under present law.

Second. Example: A family with $3,000 gross income and medical expenses of $150 will be able to deduct $60. The same family can deduct nothing today.

Third. The bill doubles the present maximum limit on the amount that can be deducted.

Savings to taxpayers, $40 million.

HEAD OF FAMILY

First. A single taxpayer who has a dependent son or daughter will be entitled during the first 2 years after the death of his spouse to the same income-splitting privilege as is accorded married couples.

Second. A single individual can receive half the benefits of income splitting if he has a dependent parent and if the taxpayer maintains a household for the father or mother.

Savings to taxpayers, $11 million.

RETIREMENT INCOME CREDIT

First. All retired people 65 and over, including schoolteachers, firemen, policemen, and civil servants, will in effect be exempt on all retirement income up to $1,200. This will mean a tax reduction for these retired people of up to $240 a year.

Second. Example: A retired single individual over 65 who has a total retirement income of $3,000 today pays about $300 in income tax. Under the bill, his tax is reduced to $60—a saving of $240.

Third. The same exemption will extend to individuals under 65 if they receive a pension from a public retirement system, such as do teachers.

Savings to taxpayers, $141 million.

CREDIT PURCHASES

The bill allows a deduction for interest up to 6 percent on installment purchases.

Total saving to taxpayers, $10 million.

CHARITABLE CONTRIBUTIONS

The bill increases from 20 to 30 percent the allowable deduction for charitable contributions to churches, hospitals, and educational institutions.

Total saving to taxpayers, $25 million.

AID TO FARMERS

First. Deductions up to 25 percent of farm income are allowed for soil and water conservation.

Second. The bill permits more rapid write-off of the expense of farm machinery, equipment, and construction.

Third. Removes tax on the proceeds of the sale of cattle when the sale is necessitated by disease.

Savings to taxpayers, $10 million.

SICKNESS AND ACCIDENT PLANS

First. Premiums paid by employers to health and accident plans will not be taxable to their employees.

Second. All accident and health benefits paid as reimbursement for actual medical expenses to employees, their wives, or children, are completely exempted from tax.

Third. Payments to employees for loss of wages due to injury or illness are exempted up to $100 a week.

Savings to taxpayers: No estimate possible.

DEATH BENEFITS

The bill exempts all death benefits up to $5,000 paid by an employer to the widow or other beneficiary of an employee.

Savings to taxpayers: No estimate possible.

PENSIONS AND ANNUITIES

In addition to the $1,200 exemption extended to retirement income, the bill also provides a simpler method for taxation of pensions and annuities, ends annual 3-percent tax paid on annuities and provides instead a method of computing tax on basis of cost divided by years of life expectancy.

Savings to taxpayers, $10 million.

DIVIDEND CREDIT

First. Excludes first $50 in dividends from taxation and provides a credit against tax equal to 4 percent of the balance.

Second. Example: An individual with $50 or less in dividends from his savings will be entirely exempt from tax on that amount.

Third. Example: An individual with $250 in dividends from his savings will exclude the first $50 entirely, and then reduce his total tax by $8—4 percent of the balance of $200.

Savings to taxpayers, $204 million.

DEPRECIATION

The bill will permit the more liberal writeoff of the cost of new equipment. For example, in the first year of life of new equipment, the taxpayer will be able to write off twice the amount now allowed.

Savings to taxpayers, $375 million, of which $75 million represents savings to individuals such as farmers, shopkeepers, and salesmen.

DECLARATION OF ESTIMATED TAX

The requirements are eased for filing declarations of estimated tax. Upward of a million taxpayers will be relieved of the present requirement for filing.

FILING TAX RETURNS

Tax returns will be due April 15 instead of March 15, giving taxpayers 1 additional month in which to prepare their final tax returns and make their final tax payments.

RESEARCH AND EXPERIMENTATION

The bill grants taxpayers an option to either deduct as an expense or to amortize research and experimental expenditures.

No revenue estimate possible. The provision is designed to encourage business research with the objective of creating new products, new processes, and new jobs.

METHODS OF ACCOUNTING

The bill brings tax-accounting rules into harmony with business accounting, thereby eliminating to a great extent the necessity for taxpayers to maintain two sets of books. It provides realistic computation of net income for tax purposes in conformity with sound business practices.

Savings to taxpayers, $47 million.

DEPLETION

The bill increases the rate of percentage depletion on a variety of critical and strategic minerals in order to encourage the development of domestic sources of supply.

Savings to taxpayers, $34 million.

PARTNERSHIPS

First. The bill adopts comprehensive provisions concerning the tax treatment of partners and partnerships in order to remove confusion of existing law. Principal objectives are simplicity, flexibility, and equity between partners.

Second. Certain proprietorships and partnerships are given the option to be taxed as corporations.

Savings to taxpayers, $20 million.

INVENTIONS

The bill extends capital-gains treatment to proceeds realized by an inventor on the sale or exchange of a patent.

No revenue estimate possible. The new provision is designed to encourage invention and thereby promote a healthy economy and an improved standard of living.

NET OPERATING LOSS

The bill extends the net operating loss carryback to 2 years and makes certain other adjustments.

Savings to taxpayers, $120 million.

LIFE INSURANCE

The bill lessens the estate tax on the proceeds of certain life-insurance policies.

Savings to individual taxpayers, $25 million.

CONSOLIDATED RETURNS

The bill removes the 2-percent penalty tax with respect to consolidated returns filed by regulated public utilities.

Savings to taxpayers, $35 million.

IMPROPER ACCUMULATIONS

The bill eases the penalty tax on certain accumulated earnings in order that business, especially small businesses, may have greater freedom in retaining their funds for legitimate business purposes.

Savings to taxpayers, $10 million.

CORPORATION INCOME TAX

The bill extends for 1 year the present 52 percent corporation income tax.

Total increase in revenue, $1.2 billion.

The 10 percent reduction in Federal income taxes which went into effect last January 1 saves individual taxpayers a total of $3 billion annually. This tax cut would not have been possible if the

Congress and the administration had not cut the Truman budget for fiscal 1954 by $12 billion.

Nor would the $2 billion tax saving by elimination of the excess-profits tax have been possible without this budget cutting.

The Republican excise-tax reduction law saves taxpayers an additional $1 billion.

The tax revision act will save taxpayers $1,400,000,000.

A total of $827 million of this tax saving is for individuals. The remainder, $536 million, is tax relief for business.

The overall tax-cut program will save $7,400,000,000. Of this amount, individuals receive an overall total tax saving of $4,700,000,000. The tax savings so far surpass any previous total in the history of Congress.

I shall make this report available to all in my district who wish to receive it so that each person may be fully and accurately advised as to the basic provisions of this all-important legislation which I was proud to support.

Question of the Year—Who Sponsored the Dixon-Yates Mess?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 11, 1954

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include herewith the following article by Drew Pearson which appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald on Wednesday, August 11, 1954:

Hush-Hush Over the White House

(By Drew Pearson)

President Eisenhower's much-publicized order allegedly opening all Government information to the public unless it involves national security is not doing so well.

Legitimate news is being hushed up just as much as ever.

* * * * *

AUTHOR OF DIXON-YATES CONTRACT

One of the best-kept secrets in Washingtin is who inside the Budget Bureau prepared the Dixon-Yates plans for a Government-financed private powerplant, with no competitive bidding, in the Tennessee Valley area.

The plan was worked out inside the Budget Bureau, and it is reported that a public utilities "expert" came in from the outside, worked a few weeks with the Budget Bureau, then went to work for Dixon-Yates.

Obviously this information has nothing to do with the security of the Nation and, under White House rules, should be made public. However, when questions were asked at the Budget Bureau, here is a play-by-play account of what happened:

"We don't have a list of the people who worked on the Dixon-Yates plan," stated Virginia De Pury, charming spokesman for the Budget Bureau.

"Could you draw up a list?" she was asked.

"No, that would be too much trouble."

"We'll be happy to do the work for you if you will simply authorize us to make the necessary inquiries," this column countered.

"This is a public building," Miss De Pury snapped. "You can go around and ask any questions you wish."

"But everyone is afraid to talk," she was told. "They send me back to you. Now, if you will let me say it is all right for them to talk, I can get the names without troubling you further."

Miss De Pury refused.

"Are these names a matter of national security?" she was asked further.

"I don't know."

"It may be embarrassing to release the names of those who worked on the Dixon-Yates plan, but it certainly isn't a military secret," the lady was further pressed. "Under the President's directive, nonsecurity information is supposed to be open to the public."

"Jim Hagerty (White House press aid) says we don't have to give out conversations between Government officials," she shot back.

"Did we ask for any conversations?"

"The people who worked on the Dixon-Yates plan had to talk to each other," she bristled.

"We didn't ask for what they said to each other," Miss De Pury was reminded. "We only want to know their identities."

"Why don't you ask President Eisenhower?" she suggested angrily, then withdrew the suggestion.

In the end, this column appealed directly to Budget Boss Rowland Hughes for the names. His reply, phoned back to Miss De Pury, was, "No comment."

GERMAN HIGHHANDEDNESS

If the Reece committee should ever focus attention on the investigation of lobbies instead of charitable foundations—which it won't—it would find that the German lobby was about the most powerful in Washington.

It has hired some of the top ex-Senators and law firms in the Nation's Capital to try to rush a bill through Congress to hand back the former Nazi cartels seized by the United States during the war.

The Germans have been so cocky in their demands that their swaggering manner has almost alienated some of their own lawyers.

"If the fee wasn't so high, I'd pull out," confided one American attorney. "The Germans seem to think they can get anything out of the United States just because we need them to oppose the Russians."

Note: Senator Everett M. Dirksen, of Illinois, main pusher for the return of Nazi industrial property, was so anxious to get his bill through the Senate Judiciary Committee that he phoned Senator Thomas C. Hennings, of Missouri, in St. Louis urging that he O. K. the bill almost before he had time to read it.

The Late James V. Buckley

SPEECH

OF

HON. EUGENE J. McCARTHY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1954

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, James Buckley served with me during his term of Congress as a member of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee. We were both new Members of the Congress. I appreciated and enjoyed his fellowship and friendship. In many ways James Buckley symbolized the great city from which he came. He was big and strong like Chicago. He was positive and forceful. He maintained his position with vigor and with assurance. His direction was forward. In him the great poem of Carl Sandburg "Chicago" was alive. In his voice was the cry of the poet "Come and show me another city with lifted head so singing proud to be alive."

The Administration Is Indebted to a Gimmick

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED MARSHALL

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 11, 1954

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, my attention has been called to an article in the Washington Daily News of August 9 by Mr. Andrew Tully, a Scripps-Howard staff writer, entitled "The Administration Is Indebted to a Gimmick."

Mr. Tully uses figures supplied by the Commissioner of Public Debt to show how a bookkeeping trick keeps the public debt under the ceiling. I have previously discussed other such gimmicks in the House which have been used to evade the debt limit and to give misleading figures to the American people. We have passed legislation which would permit the administration to give the true fiscal facts to the American people and I for one regret that it has not yet become law and that the administration is forced to resort to subterfuge in order to continue its operations.

In this case, the interest owed on Government savings bonds has been eliminated from the public debt even though both previous administrations always included it in reporting the debt figures to the Congress and the people.

You will be surprised to know, as Mr. Tully points out, that if the debt were figured today as it was figured in the Truman administration, we would be well over the ceiling, since present figures fail to include $12 billion in interest due on savings bonds.

The Administration Is Indebted to a Gimmick

(By Andrew Tully)

In all this hassle about increasing the debt limit, don't try to get any consolation out of Government figures which appear to show the public debt as being less than it was under Presidents Roosevelt and Truman.

Actually, figured on the same basis as in previous administrations, the public debt is the highest in the Nation's history.

The reason is a bookkeeping gimmick—perfectly logical and legitimate—adopted by the Eisenhower administration to show the amount owed by the Government to people that have savings bonds.

The Eisenhower boys enter on the books only the current value of these savings bonds, whereas in the past the debt was figured on the basis of the bonds' maturity value. In other words, nowadays if you've just bought a $100 war bond for $75, the Government figures it owes you only $75 instead of $100—since it would have to pay you only $75 if you cashed it today.

In previous administrations, the moment you bought a $75 bond, the Government acknowledged it owed you $100.

Thus the so-called peak-debt year of 1946 wasn't the peak at all. The debt then was $279 billion, which is $5 billion higher than the present debt of $274 billion. But the 1946 figure included approximately $10 billion in interest which the Government figured it owed—or would owe—on savings bonds. Figured on the basis the Eisenhower administration uses, the public debt in 1946 was only $269 billion—or $5 billion less than the current debt.

Or, if you figured the Eisenhower public debt as they figured it in previous administrations, it would amount to $286 billion because the interest to be due on savings bonds has increased to $12 billion.

The public debt, incidentally, has increased $18 billion since Harry Truman left the White House. It was $266 billion then, but again you have to lop off $10 billion in savings bond interest in order to compare it fairly with the current debt. Lowest postwar debt was in 1949, when the debt was $252 billion, or $242 billion if figured according to the Eisenhower system.

All these figures come from Edwin L. Kirby, Commissioner of the Public Debt. Mr. Kirby sighs wistfully when he reminds you that there has only been 1 year in which the United States had no public debt.

That was in 1836 and the reason was a combination of a prosperity wave and a President named Andrew Jackson, who slashed Government expenditures with a meat cleaver. That was the year, incidentally, when the United States paid off the last installment of its $40 million Revolutionary War debt.

Although Americans are accustomed to thinking of themselves as creditors to the rest of the world, part of our public debt is owed to foreigners. The total is $6 billion, mostly held by banks and public institutions in Europe. Germany heads the list of creditors with $675 million in United States I O U's.

Colorado River Upper Basin Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MAILLIARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 11, 1954

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, I have been requested to insert in the RECORD the following telegram which was addressed to all California Members of Congress by the San Francisco Clearing House Association, stating the position of its members on S. 1555, S. 964, H. R. 4449, and H. R. 236:

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., *August 4, 1954.*

Hoover Commission authorized by Congress to make comprehensive study and recommendation concerning our country's reclamation policies and future plans is being bypassed by Colorado River upper basin Senate bills 1555 and 964, and H. R. 4449 and H. R. 236. These bills also would burden American taxpayers with an additional subsidy load of $1 billion of which Californians would be required to pay $93 million. We hope for your cooperation in blocking passage of these unjustified proposals.

Respectfully,

San Francisco Clearing House Association; Bank of California National Association, by Elliott McAllister, President; Crocker First National Bank of San Francisco, by J. F. Sullivan, Jr., President; Wells Fargo Bank & Union Trust Co., by I. W. Hellman, President; Anglo California National Bank of San Francisco, by Paul E. Hoover, President; American Trust Co., by James K. Lochead, President; Bank of America National Trust & Savings Association, by S. C. Beise, President; Pacific National Bank of San Francisco, by E. H. LeMasters, President; the San Francisco Bank, by Henry Verdelin, President.

Housing for Servicemen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1954

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, the 83d Congress has taken two significant steps toward correcting the major morale problem of the services; that of adequate housing for the families of servicemen.

Approval of the military family housing authorization and appropriation bills will mean that some 13,000 military families will be provided with adequate homes at bases and posts where the need is most apparent. This is the first increment in a plan that we hope will eventually provide homes for at least 50 percent of the currently improperly housed peacetime forces of our Nation.

While there are some objections to providing on-base housing as compared to Wherry and other Government encouraged or subsidized private housing units, it seems apparent that tremendous savings will accrue to the taxpayers through providing additional Government quarters at permanent bases.

The present practice of granting quarters allowances in lieu of housing actually costs the Government over $1¼ billion per year. In Government-owned military housing, the serviceman accepts the housing and gets no allowance. The amount which would otherwise be allocated for allowances can thus amortize the cost of such homes in a reasonably short time.

No attempt is being made to provide more than a reasonable minimum of permanent quarters for families of peacetime forces for the years ahead. Great care was taken in the hearings before the House Subcommittee on Housing to see that homes were authorized only for bases or posts that are permanent in nature, where the shortage of available housing was most acute, or where military needs were best served by having men in residence close to action stations.

Even more important and far reaching in its benefits to service families is the new provision in the National Housing Act that extends favorable terms and insured mortgages to men and women on active duty.

Many servicemen in the past have been lured into civilian life by the attractive provisions of the GI bill which provided low downpayments and long-term financing for home purchasers.

The National Housing Act for 1954 extends somewhat similar provisions to enlisted men and officers on active duty. Conferences I have held with FHA officials and military leaders have convinced me that this act will prove to be the biggest boon to the servicemen in many years.

While regulations have not been made public, it seems apparent that under terms of this act a serviceman can purchase a home, living in it while at a given base, post, or station, and upon being transferred can sell the home and repurchase another at his new duty station.

In other words, it will not be a onetime shot, as with the GI program, but instead will, within reason, recognize the impermanence of assignments and not penalize the serviceman through setting a limit on the number of times a serviceman may avail himself of the benefits of home ownership.

Actual provisions of the bill will permit a serviceman to obtain an FHA-insured mortgage not exceeding 95 percent of the appraised value of the property up to $18,000, providing the serviceman either occupies it or certifies his failure to do so is the result of his military assignment. Premiums on the mortgage insurance will be paid by the Defense Department, which will reduce the loan percentage from 4½ to 4¼ percent.

Military regulations are planned to prevent servicemen from abusing the privileges accorded them under this act, but it is expected that the services will be liberal in their interpretation of the act, in order to make the benefits available to all interested career personnel.

This act should prove to be a stabilizing influence on the families of service personnel and, in the opinion of military leaders, should make peacetime career service much more attractive.

Mr. Speaker, it is encouraging to note that the Air Force has reported an upswing in reenlistments for the first time in many years. I believe the constructive efforts of the 83d Congress to improve conditions for servicemen and women have reversed the 10-year trend of reduction of benefits that had put us in a dangerous corner. Morale will improve markedly, and reenlistments are bound to increase if we continue to recognize the importance and dignity of the servicemen in whose hands we have placed the safety and defense of our homes and families.

Report to the People of the 16th Congressional District of Ohio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1954

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, in the many important legislative decisions which I have been called upon to make in this 83d Congress, both as a member of the Appropriations Committee, which controls the spending of all the Federal agencies, and upon the floor of the House, I have at all times attempted to bear in mind the welfare and the wishes of my constituents in the 16th Congressional District of Ohio.

Through many personal trips to the district, comprising the counties of Stark, Tuscarawas, and Wayne, through detailed questionnaires, and by other means, I have sought to keep myself constantly informed on the sentiments of my district regarding legislation pending before Congress.

When I have called upon my constituents for advice and guidance they have responded generously, and their cooperation has materially lessened the burdens of my legislative duties. In turn, I feel that I owe them a report on my more important activities in behalf of them and the Nation during the current Congress, now coming to a close. This is my report.

Congressional Quarterly News Features, a highly respected, independent news service, in a recent survey of voting records, noted that my voting participation on rollcalls in the first session was 100 percent. While this session has not yet been completed, I am confident that my final record of voting participation again will be unusually high.

TAXES AND SPENDING

At the beginning of this Congress I was appointed to the powerful Appropriations Committee, generally accepted as the most important committee in Congress. This appointment brought prestige to my district which it had not enjoyed in many years, since none of my immediate predecessors had acquired sufficient seniority and experience for such an important assignment.

The Appropriations Committee last year conducted studies which resulted in a saving of $14 billion from the budget recommended by former President Truman. Further elimination of wasteful and needless expenditures were made during the present year. Much, of course, remains to be done.

The savings already made have brought a balanced budget in sight, and made possible $8 billion in tax reductions already being enjoyed by our citizens. Reductions in the excise, or sales tax, on theater and other admissions, telephone bills, electric-light bulbs, transportation of persons, and a long list of other items, already are in effect. Income-tax reductions will benefit a vast number of persons through reductions in the withholding and other personal income taxes.

FARM PROBLEM

The farm problem is one of the most perplexing situations confronting the Nation today. I have given this question much time and study.

The farmer has been beset by round after round of inflation brought on by the ruinous spending policies of the Truman administration. Thousands of acres of land have been brought into production through costly irrigation projects financed by the Federal Government. More thousands of acres of marginal grasslands were brought into production during the war, and kept in production by high price supports. Wide usage of cheaper and inferior substitutes for some of our farm products have been encouraged.

Price supports should be maintained at a high level until a more realistic solution can be achieved. But I am confident our farmers prefer to have their products consumed by humans rather than to have them rot in some Government cave or warehouse. The farmers want, are entitled to, and must have a fair share of the national income. I am confident this twin objective can be achieved and will continue to devote my efforts toward that end.

The problem of massive surpluses is a major one. Several additional methods for further reducing surplus stocks have been proposed by me, and are now being considered at high administration levels. Regardless of the disruptive talk of their detractors, the farmers will not be "sold short" by the Eisenhower administration. I am confident we will evolve a more beneficial and satisfactory system than the present one of "production for waste," one which will be satisfactory to the farmers and of benefit to the whole economy.

EMPLOYMENT AND BUSINESS CONDITIONS

The business recession which President Eisenhower inherited has presented difficult problems in the industrial areas of my district. I have been in almost constant contact with the Secretary of Labor, Defense Department officials, and others in an effort to do everything possible in this connection. These officials have been very cooperative and are watching developments carefully. While there appears to have been some improvement, neither I nor they will relax efforts in this connection.

After a series of conferences with the Secretary of Labor and other high Government officials, I succeeded in having the Canton area placed in class IV, which gave industries there preferential treatment on Government contracts. The Department of Agriculture sent carloads of surplus food to areas in the district where it was needed.

The interest and cooperation of President Eisenhower's administration in this problem has been greatly appreciated, and has been of material benefit to the people of my district.

NATIONAL SECURITY

Recent developments have confirmed my stand that we can place little or no dependence in our so-called friends abroad in the time of an emergency. They are looking out for themselves and we must look out for ourselves.

There are enough unexpended balances which already have been appropriated to carry the foreign aid program a full year. Hence I voted against additional appropriations for this purpose. It was my feeling that if this extra appropriation were not made, we could have given the American public a balanced budget. And this we promised to do.

President Eisenhower's proposal for streamlining our Military Establishment, cutting down on our dependence on foot soldiers, and emphasizing more modern weapons was, indeed, a heartening one. We all pray that war will not be thrust upon us, but if it is, we want to be prepared to win it with the least loss of the lives of our people.

SOCIAL SECURITY

More adequate and realistic social security was given much attention by the current Congress. When this measure was under consideration I advocated extending it to those who needed and wanted the coverage. I opposed extending it to such groups as doctors, who did not want to come under the system. Among other things, I was concerned over the teachers' retirement fund in Ohio. I urged we should not jeopardize this group by forcing them under social-security regulation and denying their rights under their own social security system. I felt the same way about police, firemen, and other employees already covered by State and municipal plans.

VETERANS

As a former war correspondent who served with Ohio's 37th Division in the Pacific and saw what the boys went through, the interests of our veterans and their families is very close to my heart. I am convinced that much of the money which in the past has been appropriated for the Veterans' Administration has been used in a very inefficient manner, to say the very least. I have worked and will continue to work to cut out the red tape and inefficiency in the Veterans' Administration, and to see that agency weed out those persons who are not giving courteous and efficient service.

As a member of the Appropriations Committee, I have supported and will continue to support appropriations which give our veterans the medical, hospital, and other rights to which they are entitled. I will continue to do my utmost in this direction as long as I am a Member of Congress.

PROTECT AMERICAN LABOR

The protection of American labor against floods of cheap imports from low-wage areas has been, and will continue to be, one of my main objectives as a Member of Congress. When the appropriation bill for the Department of Interior was under consideration on the floor of the House, I proposed an amendment designed to give American workers a better break on Government contracts. The Buy American Act should be strengthened, not weakened, and the "peril point" provision should be rigidly enforced. American workers must not be put out of their jobs by cheaply made products from abroad.

The recent action of President Eisenhower in raising by up to 50 percent the tariff on imports of cheap watches indicates the attitude of this administration regarding the necessity of protecting American workers. I was among those who recommended this action. My strong support of it was detailed in a recent House speech.

ROADBUILDING PROGRAM

A Federal highway building program that will include rural roads and town and city streets was approved by this Congress. This law authorizes expenditures of $966 million in each of the fiscal years 1956 and 1957 for highway and road construction. It gives the States a greater degree of administrative control over their own roads included in their Federal-aid and secondary systems. The residents of Ohio farms and villages, in common with those in other States, will benefit materially from this legislation. It is of interest that this important highway bill was sponsored by my good friend and neighbor Congressman J. HARRY MCGREGOR, of West Lafayette.

VOTING RECORD

There is attached herewith a record of my stand on important legislation on which recorded votes were taken in the House of Representatives during the 83d Congress. This list shows whether I favored or opposed passage, and the action taken by the House.

1st session

Subject	Bow's position	House action
Un-American Activities Committee, provide funds for.	Yes	Approved.
Military personnel needs, annual review of.	Yes	Do.
Tidelands (oil), confirm title of States.	Yes	Do.
Mexican farm labor, importation of.	No	Do.
Continental Shelf (oil lands, confirm title of States).	Yes	Do.
Reciprocal trade agreement extension.	No	Do.
Mutual Security Act extension.	No	Do.
Government-owned rubber plants, disposal of.	Yes	Do.
Farmers and stockmen, emergency aid for.	Yes	Do.
Communist Chinese, against admission of to UN.	Yes	Do.
Mutual security appropriations.	No	Do.
Farmers, miners, and producers, protection of, under Trade Agreements Act.	Yes	Failed.
Farm surplus, for famine relief abroad.	Yes	Approved.

2d session

Subject	Bow's position	House action
Air Force Academy, establishment of.	Yes	Approved.
Commodity Credit Corp., to discharge indebtedness of.	Yes	Do.
Un-American Activities Committee, provide funds for.	Yes	Do.
Excise-tax reduction	Yes	Do.
Personal exemption increase for income-tax purposes.	No	Failed.
Tax reduction and revision bill.	Yes	Approved.
Housing Act, passage of	Yes	Do.
St. Lawrence seaway development.	Yes	Do.
Flexible price supports (Eisenhower proposal).	Yes	Do.
Alaskan communication system; military construction.	Yes	Do.
Trade agreement extension	No	Do.
Opposing Soviet interference in Western Hemisphere.	Yes	Do.
Health insurance, voluntary prepayment.	No	Failed.
Postal pay increase, establish committee to study.	Yes	Do.
Atomic Energy Act revision	Yes	Approved.
Mutual security appropriation.	No	Do.
Tax revision and reduction, conference report on.	Yes	Do.
Commodity Credit Corporation, increase borrowing power of.	Yes	Do.

NOTE.—Due to the magnificient leadership of Speaker of the House JOSEPH W. MARTIN, of MASSACHUSETTS, and Majority Leader CHARLES A. HALLECK, of Indiana, much important legislation was passed without the necessity of a rollcall vote. Such actions were taken usually by teller or voice votes, for which the votes of individual Members are not recorded.

RIGHT TO VOTE

Mr. Speaker, the right to vote is a very dear heritage of the American people. It is a right which has been denied to increasing millions of formerly free people in the past few years. It can be said without fear of contradiction that those persons who have lost the right of the free ballot wish now they had it back; and if they had it, they would miss no opportunity to use it.

Those of us who do not exercise our right to vote are courting disaster. Being busy, or disgruntled, or bad weather on election day, is no excuse. Even the best excuses for not voting will not alleviate the disaster that will come to us all if, through our failure to vote, our country is destroyed by corruption or decay. It is not only a right but a duty for all patriotic Americans to turn out on election day and vote for the candidate who, in their opinion, can do the most for our country in the perilous days ahead.

So far as I am concerned, I stand on my record in behalf of the people of my congressional district and the Nation and my firm support in most major instances of the Eisenhower administration in Washington.

The Government in Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CECIL M. HARDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 11, 1954

Mrs. HARDEN. Mr. Speaker, for 2 years the Harden subcommittee of House Government Operations Committee has been holding hearings and issuing reports in an effort to unfold the story of the Government in business and to motivate a program of remedy and prevention. No agency, including the Bureau of the Budget, the General Accounting Office, nor the Defense Department, with their numerous comptrollers, accountants, experts, auditors, analysts, economists, political scientists, management engineers, and statisticians, knows the extent of these businesses, their capital assets, the people employed, taxes lost, or unit cost of products and services.

The Chemical Week of May 15, 1954, carried an article listing the facilities in "Uncle Sam's Chemical Empire." It includes 32 plants valued at $311,028,000. To the chemical empire could be added Uncle Sam's banking empire, or his shipping empire, his commissary empire, and so on, until we had a list of perhaps a hundred with assets in the billions.

Why the fuss over Uncle Sam in business? First of all, Uncle Sam is not supposed to be a businessman. He is supposed to be an administrator, regulator, a governor, an adjuster, but not a businessman. He is to do what has been specifically delegated to him. He is to do what the States and the people cannot do for themselves.

On the theme of what the people can and cannot do for themselves, we find a great deal of misunderstanding. Lincoln said:

> In all that the people can individually do as well for themselves, government ought not to interfere.

Many people who want to justify the Government's intrusion into State and private fields consider this statement a justification. They say: "The people cannot do these things, so the Government must in the general welfare." They do not realize that atrophy follows an easy "can't." Strength and general welfare follow "can and will." The philosophy of Lincoln epitomizes the life of one born to low standing but who attained the heights through the opportunity to exercise latent ability, initiative, and energy and to profit himself from his own efforts.

When Lincoln signed the patent bill he stated that it would add fuel to the fire of genius. These few simple words express Lincoln's keen appreciation of the fact that genius must profit from its own work.

One of the most thoughtful presentations of Lincoln's views on Government with respect to free enterprise was revealed in an article by Ralph G. Lindstrom in the Christian Science Monitor on February 9, 1954. The article follows:

LINCOLN'S VIEWS ON GOVERNMENT

(By Ralph G. Lindstrom)

Abraham Lincoln lived and gave his human life to preserve a government which was created to foster free enterprise, individual initiative, and genuine equality.

Today free enterprise and individual initiative are under attack. They have been under attack for a generation—by Hitler's nazilism, Mussolini's fascism, and by Soviet communism. These aggressive systems, and even the means deemed necessary to combat them, tend to obscure and even to endanger all that Lincoln fought to preserve.

Was Lincoln mistaken? Did he and the constitutional fathers merely dream idle dreams? Can such freedoms survive the stress and strain of today's East-West conflict?

Even in his day some charged Lincoln with presidential practices in complete contradiction of his political professions.

Our purpose here is to see what Lincoln actually fought for. His civic concept included:

FREE ENTERPRISE

Lincoln wrote a text for free enterprise. It is in one of those precious and priceless fragments found in his files and written in his own hand. Sometimes they were unspoken reflections—a sort of alone with God testing and tasting of great civic considerations. Others found their way into his speeches.

In one such fragment Lincoln considered why America enjoyed increasing prosperity. He first asked himself: What was the primary cause of our great prosperity? Was it the combination of our Constitution and the Union? This was digging deep. These were basic documents of highest importance in the Lincolnian concept of our Federal Union.

Yet Lincoln dug deeper:

"There is something back of these, entwining itself more closely about the human heart. That something is the principle of liberty to all—the principle that clears the path for all—gives hope to all—and, by consequence, enterprise and industry to all."

CLEARS THE PATH FOR ALL

Enterprise and industry, through paths open to all, are no mere bases for slogans for class-conscious extremes, leftist or rightist. Such a system offers no utopia to the radical of the left. It promises no unearned good. It clears the path for all—gives hope to all. Hope of something for nothing? For unearned good? No, its gift is genuine good. It gives opportunity to achieve, and gives it to all. It does not even promise supply itself; it gives the basis for supply, limited only by the degree of enterprise and work. Its opportunity is for everyone, everywhere—that is, for everyone willing to work and achieve.

Here is no proletariat promise of ease to one class at the expense of another class. It urges no ascendancy of any class over any other class. And the consequence must ever be the blessings of good to any and every man in the degree of his enterprise and industry. This American free enterprise is as soundly and rightly tough minded as the challenge of Sir Winston Churchill's blood, sweat, and tears. Freemen are willing to accept such challenges.

But, neither does Lincoln's text justify any rightist extreme. Four times in that short text he tells himself that good is for all. National and universal prosperity will be attained and retained exactly to the extent that it is kept open to all. Cleared paths, and dynamic hope entwining the human heart, inspire men under free enterprise to their greatest achievements. Lincoln never forgot that prosperity could only be as widespread and as permanent as the universality of its well-based hope and clear paths.

WARNING TO RIGHT AND LEFT

Pondering further, Lincoln rejected anything less than universal opportunity. He recognized that Americans could have declared independence without that principle of universality; but, without it, we could not, I think, have secured our free government, and consequent prosperity. And why? He answered: "No oppressed people will fight, and endure, as our fathers did, without the promise of something better, than a mere change of masters."

This is not only a warning to a class-conscious right; it is also the complete answer to the siren call of enslaving communism, which promises abundance as the reward for surrendered freedom.

Suffice it to summarize here by saying that the Government Lincoln fought for accepts neither bestridden nor bestriding class. He would not surrender freedom of enterprise for promised prosperity by a totalitarian state. Also, he warned those who toil up from poverty to beware of surrendering a political power which, if surrendered, will surely be used to close the doors of advancement against such as they, and to fix new disabilities and burdens upon them, till all liberty shall be lost.

INDIVIDUAL INITIATIVE

Isn't that the same as free enterprise? Not quite. It can be more closely related to what governments should not do, as well as to what they should do. It is one thing to be free and enterprising in competition with other men. It is another thing to keep people free from state competition.

State business takes its capital from the people with whom it competes. It obtains its capital by taxation. So we next follow Lincoln into consideration of how man may be kept free from unnecessary restraints imposed by, and improper competition of, his government; how he should be kept free to reap the proper fruits of his individual initiative.

In Lincoln's first message to Congress we find him asking whether men would struggle as hard to preserve freedom under our Federal Union as they did to establish it.

He went on to observe that under our system people were neither to be debased by other people nor by government. This was no government over people without voice as to what that government should do. It is, observed Lincoln, a "we the people" government. "This is essentially a people's contest."

Was he thinking through something new? No, indeed. He must have been reaching back into his mental inventory for another fragment on government which he probably wrote in 1854. That long before, he asked himself another question: What is the legitimate object of government? He told himself that "government is a combination of the people of a country to effect certain objects by joint effort."

But, then, he was troubled. He saw governments, even those "best framed and best administered" as "expensive" (what would he say today), "onerous * * * and some of them very oppressive." Why, then, "have government"? Why not each individual take "the whole fruit of his labor" without taxes? Why not just take "land * * * without buying it of anyone"? Absurd? Let's see what current history shows.

OBJECT OF GOVERNMENT TOLD

In our generation we have seen Communists seize control of governments by infiltration and force. Then, in the name of the proletariat, they take industry and "land * * * without buying it of anyone." In the name of government, they practice pillage for a class. They seize control and property through the kill-or-be-killed, subject-or-be-subjected practice of mere brute force. They promise abundance to a proletariat and give—to even this supposedly favored class—unequally shared scarcity.

But let us return for more of Lincoln's written soliloquy about the proper spheres of government activity. The test of civic logic is in this sentence:

"The legitimate object of government is to do for a community of people what they need to have done, but cannot do at all, or cannot so well do, for themselves—in their separate and individual capacities."

Then follows his test for confining government to its proper sphere and for ever-broadening individual initiative:

"In all that the people can individually do as well for themselves, government ought not to interfere."

Lincoln gave words their full idea content. Note he did not say: "All that the people do individually do as well for themselves. Whatever they can do for themselves is not a legitimate object of government."

Yet it is no mere play with words to observe that people, over not very long sweeps of experience, decide that they only can do what they do do. Unused functions may be lost in atrophy. Therefore, if people too long fail to do what was once within the can do of their own experience, the area of what they cannot do grows larger—and so does government.

WHAT PEOPLE CANNOT DO

What are some of the things people "need to have done * * * but * * * cannot do * * * or so well do for themselves"? Lincoln answers his question with a general list: Building of roads and bridges, providing for helpless young and afflicted, schools, military defense, policing against crime and violence, the courts, and machinery of government itself.

Would it not be Lincolnian logic to ask ourselves why governments have, since his day, grown so big and exercise so many functions formerly left to individual initiative? No doubt the charge of deliberate creeping socialism would seem a sufficient answer to many. But is it enough, if we are to preserve individual initiative as more than a mere slogan?

World wars, hot and cold, have done much to make national governments in all countries more pervasive. This is one area for man's most earnest study.

But let's look, also, at just one of many other dangers to individual initiative—governmental subsidy. And let us ask whether, when what was once a people cannot do function becomes a function people can do, in their separate capacities, and yet is continued as a government activity, we are not deliberately debilitating individual initiative.

For example, industrial tariffs once were necessary to protect weak and infant industry in America against big and well-established European manufacturers. Now the situation is reversed: many tariffs have become sheer subsidies, or merely protect areas of industrial incompetence. We first pay higher prices because of outmoded tariffs—and then must provide economic relief to other nations who must be subsidized to be kept free from economic collapse and communism. Individual initiative is thereby proportionately stifled in both the giving and receiving nations.

CONTROLS FOLLOW SUBSIDY

But the chain reaction goes further. Agriculture is given subsidy by price control in part for the reason that farmers otherwise sell their products on a much lower basis than they pay for machinery and other tariff-protected products. So with transportation. And thus on and on—with governments growing larger and the people can do area subjected to shrinkage and atrophy. It constitutes a vicious cycle.

But the context of our times has changed. Some industrialists warn against continuance by this Nation, the world's largest creditor, with the largest and most modern industrial plant, of no longer needed tariffs and their consequent endless chain of Government subsidies. They know, too, that controls follow subsidy. They know that, all too often, individual initiative and competence is this not merely unrewarded, but paralyzed.

All of this is only to say that individual initiative will thrive to the extent that people are courageously tough-fibered—people who stand on their own feet—people who do, do whatever they can individually do for themselves—people who never forget that, if they seek Government interference for their business, Government interference, with and against their own business, will follow as effect on cause.

GENUINE EQUALITY

"I certainly wish that all men could be free," wrote President Lincoln to James C. Conkling as a message to 'unconditional Union men' meeting in Illinois.

"As I would not be a slave, so I would not be a master," he also wrote in solemn soliloquy.

"In giving freedom to the slave, we assure freedom to the free," he told Congress on December 1, 1862.

In still another fragment this civic logician wrote:

"Most governments have been based, practically, on the denial of the equal rights of men * * * ours began by affirming those rights."

That great affirmance of the Declaration of Independence—"all men are created free and equal"—has been called a self-evident lie. Yet neither logic nor Lincoln construes that statement to mean that all humans are equal in endowment, in progress, and in individual achievement. Such an assertion would, indeed, be untrue. How, then, are free men to be qual? Lincoln puts it his way:

"We proposed to give all a chance; and we expected the weak to grow stronger, the ignorant, wiser; and all better, and happier together."

LINCOLN EXPLAINS CIVIL WAR

Again and again and again Lincoln said these things. He recorded for history, and told the world, through his first message to Congress, why the Union fought. The Civil War was a struggle for maintaining in the world, that form, and substance of government, whose leading objects is, to elevate the condition of men—to lift artificial weights from all shoulders * * * to afford all, an unfettered start, and a fair chance, in the race of life * * * This is the leading object of the government for whose existence we contest."

Such is the Golden Rule of both ethics and civics.

Communism first promised equality in possessions, in progress, and in achievement. Its end result is found to be fettered start and loss of all free chance—favoritism to members of the party, and still more discrimination in favor of those who happen to be on top at any given time in the struggle for ascendancy in brute force. Lincoln never swung to one extreme to oppose the other extreme. He urged us to stand on middle ground. To hold the ship level and steady.

In his Milwaukee address on agriculture, he warned against those who would "conclude that all laborers are necessarily either hired laborers or slaves * * * that whoever is once a hired laborer, is fatally fixed in that condition for life; and thence, again, that his condition is as bad as, or worse, than, that of a slave. This is the mud-sill theory."

That phrase comes from the description of the position of the lowest sill in a log cabin, permanently embedded in the mud, and forever fixed in that position by the upper levels of the building resting upon it and holding it down.

STROVE FOR GREAT REPUBLIC

To Lincoln, humanity was not, and could not be, comprised of creatures in materially fixed status or strata. Human experience to Lincoln was a race, and government should only assure to all men a fair chance, an unfettered start, in that race.

Well he knew that America had not fully or nearly attained that ideal. But he had an answer for the twittings of those, then and now, who call the "all men are created free and equal" truism a glittering generalization. He called attention to the Saviour's injunction:

"Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect."

How many humans are as perfect as their "Father which is in heaven is perfect"? Yet, do we ridicule high purpose because not yet attained, he asked in effect. No, as individuals strive to attain perfection in their lives, so must peoples, through their governments, honestly strive to assure the equality of opportunity which they state as a purpose of government.

Lincoln fought for a government neither Utopian nor tyrannically fixing individual man in debased or unfavored status. He strove for "the great republic" whose purpose was to enable man to achieve his vast future.

Here was a man of lively sympathy for the cause of equality and freedom, wherever it appeared, and in whatever form. As the late Dr. James G. Randall put it, Lincoln ever fused the cause of nationalism with that of freedom.

Communism: What and Why

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1954

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, as a newspaper publisher, you will undoubtedly be interested in learning of a new neighborhood publication which has been established in the fast-growing Clairemont section of San Diego. It is named "The Voice," and it's masthead carries a very commendable statement of principles, as follows:

> This paper is a community service and is dedicated to the propositions that: men who would have well-organized communities and happy, interesting, and secure lives must live in harmony with the spirit and law of God; every person is worthy of dignity and respect; that community is best for men which gives the greatest possible opportunity for individual freedom of expression and enterprise.

This new publication has already established itself as a voice against communism, and has featured many articles about the menace of communism.

Recently it carried an editorial by Ed Welty that deserves the attention of our colleagues.

Under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I include the editorial in the Appendix of the RECORD Communism: What and Why:

COMMUNISM: WHAT AND WHY

Communism or socialism could be defined as the rough road back to barbarism mistakenly labeled a short cut to destiny.

Many years ago students of government noticed that development of governmental theory and institution developed in cycles that swung first toward the liberal and then toward the reactionary in general feeling. It was also noticed that over a period of time the general movement was toward a liberal direction.

Now, in the early 19th century (150 to 100 years ago) the greater part of Europe and the world was still dominated by the ideas of society inherited from feudal times and even in the infant Republic of the United States practices now accepted as an important part of democracy would have been regarded as unthinkable anarchy.

Everywhere workmen labored 12 to 14 hours a day 7 days a week. Everywhere education was limited and children worked long hours for little more than enough poor food to keep from starving. Nowhere could women vote or even control their own property and most of the nations of the world still condoned slavery.

In England, in France, and in America, politicians, patriots, and philosophers had begun the movement toward human freedom and individual rights, and from these centers the challenge of mankind's dreams and hopes rang out through all the world.

In Germany, where feudal serfdom still existed alongside a growing learning and the beginning of industry, a young man of a wealthy family studied philosophy. He had no personal religion and he was of a bitter and frustrated disposition, unsuccesful at love, and unacceptable as a teacher, he blamed everyone but himself. Gradually he became associated with the most radical elements, and, supported by the wealthy father of a friend, this human failure poured the gall of his frustration and bitterness into a series of distorted writings that have been unparalleled in the havoc they have caused.

This was Karl Marx, the father of communism and socialism. It was his contention that if society were moving toward the left anyway, then the sensible thing to do was to seize power by force and bring about the ultimate changes quickly under a temporary dictatorship.

Like many others, he let his personal defeats and hates influence his thinking. So history as he saw it would wipe out the wealthy and aristocratic classes that had rejected him and the laborers would be the army that would do it. He hungered and thirsted for vengeance and could not wait to see bloody heads roll as they had a few years earlier in France.

So he proposed a dictatorship to hurry the work of a world revolution. Marx was really both a poor student of history and philosophy. He completely failed to realize that a bad means cannot produce a good end.

But he wrote so cleverly and so convincingly that his writings have been the chief tool of professional rabble rousers and demagogs ever since his time.

Now, in our own day, the foolishness of his theories has become apparent, for the whole world is divided into two camps. At the head of the one camp is the Soviet Union (Russia) and at the head of the other is our own country.

The Soviet Union is the product of a Communist revolution and 35 years of Communist dictatorship.

Instead of withering away, instead of providing the self-government, peace, and plenty for a happy people, the Soviet Union has fastened a growing tyranny upon the people of Russia. It has deliberately slaughtered, starved, and imprisoned millions of its own people in order to enforce its rule. It has produced poverty and fear for its people, while it has used its resources to repeatedly invade and enslave the weaker nations on its borders. From day to day it plunges onward in fear and desperation, imperiling the whole world.

In the meantime our own country has led the world in a steady evolution that has produced the highest standard of living the world has ever known.

Here any man with normal intelligence and temperate habits can live a life such as the wealthiest nobles could not have lived a hundred years ago.

Almost every man owns some part of our industrial system through an insurance policy if nothing else. Millions own their own homes, farms, and businesses. Thousands own bonds, have money in the bank, or own at least a few shares of stock in some company. Living conditions and the rights of labor have improved beyond the wildest dreams of even 50 years ago. Every child can get a fine education. The aged, the orphaned the underprivileged can turn to any one of the many agencies for help yet all of this has come quietly, with no civil war, no blood purges, no famine, and no real suffering.

America is far from perfect; a hundred years from now our grandchildren's grandchildren will still find much to do to improve the best that we can bequeath them, yet we should have confidence to work steadily ahead, for the future belongs to the free.

Surely a tree shall be known by its fruit and the good tree that bears good fruit will be tended and treasured, but the poor tree that bears fruit shall be cut down and burned.

Signals Over

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VERA BUCHANAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 11, 1954

Mrs. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to include in the RECORD the following trenchant observation from the Potomac Fever column of Fletcher Knebel in yesterday's Washington Evening Star:

> General Vogel, Ike's new TVA head, says he doesn't think that TVA is creeping socialism. This is Vogel's first week on the Eisenhower team—he hasn't got the signals yet.

Search for Alaska Oil

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. E. L. BARTLETT

DELEGATE FROM ALASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 11, 1954

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, the search for oil in Alaska which is now proceeding so intensively in so many different regions of the Territory is here described in a special dispatch to the New York Times from Fairbanks, Alaska:

Oil companies are sinking millions of dollars in the subsurface of Alaska. Major outside companies as well as Alaska concerns, some of which sell dollar-a-share stocks through newspaper advertisements, are gambling on finding gushers in several parts of the Territory.

The burst of activity involves test drilling as well as some preliminary exploratory work. It takes in natural gas as well as oil, with both Fairbanks and Anchorage, the principal centers of population, interested in bringing in natural gas to cut present high heating and lighting costs.

Plans are being advanced for a $30 million pipeline to carry the gas into Fairbanks from the Gulik field between this city and Point Barrow on the Arctic coast, the farthest north point on the North American mainland.

IN ARCTIC TUNDRA

The upper end of the pipeline would be in the Arctic tundra region, the vast treeless plain north of the Brooks range where the Navy ended a 9-year $56 million oil exploratory program last September. Some 35 test holes were sunk and estimates of oil reserves in one part of the field—the Umiat—range from 30 million to 100 million barrels. The lower figures are not considered to represent commercial quantities.

The Navy's work was begun by the Seabees in 1944 and taken over by Arctic Contractors, a group of companies under contract to the Navy Bureau of Yards and Docks, in 1946. Oil was found not only at Umiat but on the Simpson Peninsula, 45 miles southeast of Point Barrow, and at Fish Creek, 20 miles west of the mouth of the Colville River on the Arctic Coast, 135 miles to the southeast of Barrow.

Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 4, on which part of the exploration was done, consists of 37,000 square miles. Added to it was an adjacent 30,000 square mile tract withdrawn from the public domain by the Secretary of the Interior in the mid 1940's for oil exploration by the Navy.

SEEK TO CANCEL ORDER

Efforts, which appear encouraging to Alaskans, are being made now to win cancellation by Secretary of the Interior Douglas McKay of this withdrawal order.

At this time most of the oil exploration in the Territory is in three general areas along the southern as distinguished from the southeastern or panhandle region of Alaska.

Phil Holdsworth, Territorial commissioner of mines, said at Juneau that about $4 million had been spent during the last 3 years in oil exploration by private enterprises with $2 million to be spent this year. The outside companies include Standard of California, Shell Oil Co., Phillips Petroleum, and the Havenstrite Oil Co.

PROMISING GAS STRIKE

The current bulletin of the Territorial Department of Mines notes that the Alaska Oil & Gas Development Co. "has struck promising gas indications at depths of 1,200 feet and lower at their drilling site near Eureka." This is northeast of Anchorage, the Territorial metropolis.

There is no actual production of oil anywhere in the Territory at present. Oil was discovered in Alaska in 1901 and 23 shallow holes, to a depth of about 800 feet, were sunk in the Katalla field near Cordova between 1921 and 1936, with production never exceeding 50 barrels a day. About 155,000 barrels of highgrade oil was produced.

Katalla was acquired in 1927 by Standard, which has been interested in Alaskan oil prospects at various times since the 1920's.

The Leading Question

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. J. PERCY PRIEST

OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 11, 1954

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to include herewith a transcript of a CBS radio discussion between two distinguished leaders of the House of Representatives, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCormack] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Allen].

The text of the transcript follows:

THE LEADING QUESTION: WHAT ARE THE ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE 83D CONGRESS?

Mr. Bancroft. What are the accomplishments of the 83d Congress?

Well, to debate this week's leading question, we have two outstanding leaders in the House of Representatives—Congressman Leo Allen, Representative, of Illinois, chairman of the powerful House Rules Committee; and the assistant floor leader or Democratic whip, Representative John McCormack, of Massachusetts.

Since this is a Republican Congress, suppose we start with you, Congressman Allen. What are the accomplishments of the 83d Congress?

Mr. Allen. Mr. Bancroft, there have been many that everyone will believe that the accomplishments have been great, and at the outset I wish to emphasize that the Democrats, most of the Democrats, have helped us in what I believe brought about a great program.

I think probably the thing that we all appreciate the most is the end of the Korean war. The guns have been silenced in Korea. Our boys are not being slaughtered any place in Korea. They are home. They got home from Korea, most of them.

I think another thing is the end of controls. You will recall we had the OPA. I think it stifled business—all controls. We have eliminated those during the 83d Congress. Then we reduced the budget. Last year's budget, Mr. Truman's budget, was $68 billion. We reduced that. Our expenditures were $54 billion.

Then we gave the people a much deserved tax reduction, tax relief in the amount of $7 billion. This tax relief has gone out to all the people. In other words, when we gave tax relief by way of reduction in excise taxes on transportation, electric light bulbs, moving pictures, and telephones, and all these things, the people benefited, all the people benefited, and the same with our tax revision bill. That has gone mainly to the people in the lower-income brackets.

Those are what I think are the major accomplishments.

Mr. Bancroft. Those are the highlights. How about you, Congressman, will you go along with that?

Mr. McCormack. It is rather interesting to listen to Congressman Allen. He has only recited a few things.

Mr. Bancroft. We didn't give him much time, in fairness.

Mr. McCormack. I know. If those are the highlights, they are very weak highlights. He talks about the Democrats helping in bringing about a great program. Well, of course, the program that we Democrats supported was the Roosevelt and Truman program that Eisenhower has embraced. In other words, extension of social security that he recommended, who put social security legislation on the statute books? The Democrats.

The extension of unemployment compensation and coverage, who put unemployment coverage on the statute books? The Democrats. He talks about the controls eliminated. Yes; but at the same time they promised lower living costs. The people know they are paying higher costs.

They promised a sound dollar, a sound dollar means you can buy more with the American dollar under the Republicans than you could under the Democrats. Everyone knows that is not so. It costs you at least as much if not more to buy things—food and anything else.

They talk about taxes, but the taxes my friend talks about expired. The Republicans didn't do that. It was congressional action that expired the taxes in December 31, 1953. That was by congressional action, and the expiration of the excise taxes was also by congressional action.

It is true that there has been reductions in the excise taxes, certain excise taxes, and I commend them for that, which benefit the people generally, but, on the other hand, the tax-reduction bill, 90 percent of the benefits go to less than 10 percent of the people.

We Democrats tried to have a wide distribution by a $100 increase in exemption from $600 to $700, which would have benefited everybody, and the Republicans defeated that. So the present tax bill is a big-business tax bill, and a tax bill 90 percent of which only benefits less than 10 percent of the American people. There are a few crumbs in there, among that 10 percent, for some of the people in the lower income brackets, but the great percentage of $1,300 million in reduction in taxes in the first year, which will be about $3 billion the second year, 90 percent of it in each one of those years and the succeeding years in the future, goes to less than 10 percent of the people.

We talk about what the Republican body has done in this Congress. Well, they made certain campaign promises. They made the great crusade. That is out the window.

They promised the liberation of enslaved peoples. That is out the window.

They promised an agonizing reappraisal. That is out the window, although we are going through an agonizing reappraisal. They promised an agonizing reappraisal in relation to the British and the French, but the United States is the one that is undergoing that appraisal.

They promised instant and massive retaliation. That is out the window.

They promised a new military look. That is out the window.

They promised greater prosperity. We haven't got it. The people who are unemployed, the people in the labor-distressed areas of the country, are well aware of the fact that we haven't as much prosperity today as we had under the Democrats.

They promised lower living costs. We know they are not lower.

They promised a sound dollar. We know we haven't got a sounder dollar under the Republicans than we had under the Democrats.

They promised cooperative peace. If my friend from Illinois thinks that there is peace in the world today, then he is a sadly mistaken man, and that is nothing but a deception upon the American people.

This has been a big business administration. The 80th Republican Congress was known in history as the do-nothing Congress. The 83d Republican Congress will be known as the giveaway Congress.

I wonder what they have to say about the killing the bankers made on the higher interest rate on mortgages and loans to business. I wonder what they have to say about the killing the bankers made on the Government bonds when they went down from 189 and then went back to 99 again.

Who moved in and made the money both ways?

I wonder what they have to say about the electrical power developed by the taxpayers' money being turned over to private power interests and the big lobby that has been in Washington all during this administration.

I wonder what they are going to say to the people about the attempt to give away to the big lumber interests and big cattle interests our public domains.

Those are some of the things that they have to meet in the coming campaign, and instead of being an administration for the people, it has been truly an administration for small groups, selected groups, the special interests.

Mr. Bancroft. Congressman Allen, that is quite a long recital. Will you answer that?

Mr. Allen. I believe I will be able to take care of myself pretty well in regard to some of these objections. I am just wondering what the gentleman from Massachusetts can tell me as to one thing, just one thing—not two things—that Adlai Stevenson would have done better had he been elected president.

Mr. McCormack. Adlai Stevenson——

Mr. Allen. Wait until I finish my question.

Mr. McCormack. Sure.

Mr. Allen. Tell me one thing, if Adlai Stevenson had been elected president in the 1952 campaign, tell me one thing he would have done better than Eisenhower did. Tell me one thing, and what has been wrong——

Mr. McCormack. You do not have me before the Rules Committee where you are the boss now. You cannot arbitrarily rule me out, although I do not say you do it. You wouldn't do it. If I was there, I wouldn't let you do it.

In the first place, Adlai Stevenson is not the president. In the second place, he would give an administration that would be for all the people and not for a selected group.

Look at the Cabinet you have. You do not have one man in the Cabinet that fairly represents the cross-currents of American life.

Mr. Allen. We have in the Cabinet—President Eisenhower has brought in some businessmen. Take Mr. Wilson, Mr. Humphrey——

Mr. McCormack. Mr. Wilson says, "What is good for General Motors is good for the country."

Mr. Allen. We have brought businessmen in to run our Government, not bankrupts and business failures who were here for 20 years before, like Henry Wallace and Ickes. We brought outstanding businessmen in and we are getting a business administration. We brought businessmen down to run the biggest government in the world. Is there any objection to that? I think that is commendable?

Mr. McCormack. You make out my case completely when you say you have big-business men running the Government, and they are running it in accordance with the principles of big business.

Mr. Allen. Not bankrupts and business failures, but businessmen, successful businessmen.

Mr. McCormack. You mentioned Harold Ickes. He was one of the greatest public officials we ever had. He represented the people and fought for the people. He didn't give away to the private power interests the great natural resources of our country, such as has taken place under the present administration. Even Secretary McKay has vitiated the mine-inspection law that we passed for the protection of human beings who work in the mines by undercutting it. He is giving away the helium wealth of America. He is going to give away—he only announced this the other day—the helium wealth.

Those are some of the illustrations.

Mr. Allen. I have an article here from the Washington Post of this morning where I believe Mr. Woodner is mentioned in connection with a giveaway. According to the paper here, Mr. Woodner admitted to the committee that he parlayed a net worth of $20,000 in 1944 to $2,915,000. You talk about this giveaway program.

Mr. Bancroft. That is in connection with the so-called housing matter?

Mr. Allen. That is in connection with the housing thing.

I am glad we are only permitting about 35,000 units this year until we can get in there and stop that thing.

Mr. McCormack. This has nothing to do with low-cost housing.

Mr. Allen. Financing those units.

Mr. McCormack. That is public housing. That is different than low-cost housing.

Mr. Allen. That is right.

Mr. McCormack. The law under which they did that was put on the statute books by the 80th Republican Congress. We called your attention to the dangers that would rise. I am not going to blame the Republican Party for that.

Mr. Allen. If the gentleman will answer my question that I put to him a few moments ago.

Mr. McCormack. I answered it. You didn't like the answer.

Mr. Allen. Tell me one thing——

Mr. McCormack. Most of those people who are appearing before the Capehart committee are registered Republicans.

Mr. Allen. He hasn't answered the question.

Mr. McCormack. What question is that?

Mr. Allen. What would the Democratic Party, had it been in control, have done better?

Mr. McCormack. I told you.

Mr. Allen. What would they have done? Would they have prevented the slaughtering in Korea faster, ended controls faster, reduced the budget faster, reduced taxes faster? They haven't done it in 20 years. Would they have reduced 226,000 unnecessary Government workers who didn't perform any functions of government, as the Republicans have? Would they have thrown out 2,400 Federal employees for security reasons?

Just tell me one thing they would have done better.

Mr. McCormack. I told you one thing. We would represent the people.

Mr. Allen. Isn't that representing the people?

Mr. McCormack. Just a minute. Sit there quietly for a moment. You talked about reducing the budget. Your administration spent more money last year than any Democratic administration ever spent. It isn't a question of the appropriations. It is a question of what was spent. Your administration in the last fiscal year spent more money than any Democratic administration spent. You reduced, yes, but you have to make appropriations in future years to make up.

What you did was to deceive the people by reducing the budget, but then you had an appropriation made in prior years that you used to spend and later on you have to make increased appropriations.

Last year you fought for 120 airwing groups, weakening the national defense of our country. We Democrats fought that. This year you are for a 137 airwing group. That meant we Democrats were right last year and the Republicans were wrong.

This fiscal year you are cutting down our Army two divisions and you have another division and a half in the next fiscal year. You have cancelled that. We Democrats warned you against that. So we have had a partial victory.

We Democrats have to guide you Republicans for the best interests of the country.

Mr. Allen. I couldn't accept your figures regarding the authorization——

Mr. McCormack. You wouldn't accept anything I say anyway.

Mr. Allen. That we are bigger spenders than the Democrats.

Mr. McCormack. The facts so show it.

Mr. Allen. Not according to my facts.

Mr. McCormack. The Chicago Tribune is not a Democratic paper, certainly, and they had an editorial to that effect.

Mr. Allen. My good friend John McCormack has mentioned prosperity. Of course, we don't have this war prosperity. I don't think people want to go to war all the time so we can have a war prosperity. I think that, generally speaking, everyone admits that in this reconversion from war to peace there is outstanding prosperity. In other words, I read here in the papers where there are record sales by General Mills, where 10 of the largest companies employing men have had the greatest prosperity. I have items in my hand which show business is increasing.

I am particularly interested in this item where I see there are more people going on vacations than ever in history. Fifty million are going under this good Republican prosperity to a much deserved, and I hope, enjoyable vacation.

Mr. McCormack. There are millions of people listening in.

Mr. Allen. I think there are some people for political reasons—I know some in outstanding life—who are coming out as messengers of gloom. They have been predicting the great depression since last February. Those great economists were telling us that we would be selling apples on the street in June, and so forth.

I think, generally speaking, most people think that under the conditions of reconversion from war to peace we are pretty well satisfied.

Mr. McCormack. I am glad to hear, Mr. Bancroft, Congressman Allen try to sell the American people that we have a wonderful prosperity now. I wonder how the people in Lawrence, Mass., where there are many thousands of people out of work, feel about that statement, particularly when President Eisenhower, in his 1952 campaign, promised to send contracts into the labor distressed areas.

I wonder how they feel in areas like I know in New Bedford, Mass., where there are thousands of people out of work, and people in labor distressed areas throughout the country. I wonder how the millions of people out of work now feel about this statement about this wonderful prosperity. I wonder how the millions who have had their overtime taken away and their take-home pay reduced, I wonder how those working 3 and 4 days a week feel, how they are going to receive this wonderful statement that we have wonderful prosperity at the present time.

I will let Congressman Allen's statement be interpreted by those listening in.

Mr. Allen. About these reductions in overtime, it wasn't so long ago that the labor unions were coming around and wanted a 30-hour week. At one time they said the people are working too much and we should have what they call a 30-hour week. Now they are objecting because in this change from war to peace, where they used to work 60 hours, now they are working 52 hours. That isn't enough for anyone to work.

Mr. McCormack. We have a 40-hour week. My dear friend, you don't know what the law is.

Mr. Allen. A 40-hour week doesn't stop anybody from working 52.

Mr. McCormack. But they get overtime. 1¼ times for every hour over 40. You must not forget that.

Mr. Allen. That is correct.

Mr. McCormack. Who is working 52 hours a week now? Will you tell me?

Mr. Bancroft. Besides Congressmen.

Mr. McCormack. That is right. That is true.

Mr. Allen. Out through my territory, I would say with the exception——

Mr. McCormack. And the farmers. They work.

Mr. Allen. God bless the farmer. I have a lot of them.

Mr. McCormack. But you are cutting down the 90 percent of parity, so you God bless them on the one hand and on the other hand you clip them.

Mr. Allen. I am glad that Mr. McCormack brought up the parity question, for this reason. I think next to the Korean war, the biggest problem that the previous administration handed down to us was the surplus of food. In other words, during the war years when more people were working in the United States at the highest wages at any time in history, the previous administration stored up $7 billion worth of food and surplus which cost us $700,000 a day to store. They didn't solve the problem.

Mr. McCormack. Have you solved it?

Mr. Allen. We are attempting to, and doing a good job toward solving it.

Mr. McCormack. How are you doing it? Giveaway?

Mr. Allen. I believe in flexible supports, and that will help the giveaway.

Mr. McCormack. You have given a billion dollars of food away. I think that is all right, but that doesn't solve the problem.

Mr. Allen. It has to be solved because, I repeat, when you have a nation at war and you have more people at the highest income and greatest purchasing power and perhaps for political purposes, you store $7 billion of grain costing $700,000, I think next to the Korean war, that was the worst problem. We are going to solve it. Flexible price supports are what we need, and we are going to solve it, but it was a tough one.

Mr. McCormack. Mr. Bancroft, the Republican Party promised 100 percent parity at the market place. The Democratic Party promised 90 percent. There was a bill in the House here and in the Senate to extend the 90 percent for 1 year. The Republicans in the House wanted 75 to 90 percent. They were licked, so they brought in an amendment making it 82½ to 90 percent.

Another scheme of this administration is that they claim victories when they have been defeated. The President claims a victory on the Randall report. The Randall report was out the window when it was made to Congress. Then the President said, "I want a 3-year extension of the Reciprocal Trades Act." He didn't get it. He got 1 year.

They say that is a victory. It is a defeat, but we Democrats were the ones who voted it through. He accepted 1 year because his Republican leaders in Congress said, "You won't get any more." Then they come in and fight for 75 to 90 percent of parity and they are forced into 82½ to 90 percent, and that is a defeat, and they claim it is a victory.

Only the other day the President sent up $2 billion supplementary appropriations bill, most of which was in connection with our national defense, and the Republican Party in the House reduced, cut off $900 million in construction of bases abroad and other things in connection with our national defense.

Mr. Allen. Right there, Mr. Bancroft.

Mr. McCormack. They are talking one way and acting another. Ninety percent of the press of the country is Republican. They try to bring the wrong message to the American people.

Mr. Bancroft. Congressman Allen.

Mr. Allen. Where my good friend John McCormack is criticizing—I am going through some papers here, and it is astonishing the support that the Democrats have given on these things. For instance, just about every bill that came before the Senate and House—and I would say this, the Senate had a Democratic majority.

Mr. McCormack. What are the bills?

Mr. Allen. The housing——

Mr. McCormack. That is a Democratic measure. You didn't vote for housing.

Mr. Allen. Here are the two foreign-aid bills, 67 and 19. About every bill they criticized—atomic energy—many of these bills were passed in the Senate which he is criticizing when the Senate had a majority of one Demócrat.

Mr. McCormack. They are Democratic measures. They were Democratic measures in the past years.

Mr. Allen. I do not understand how they vote for these things and still my good friend John is criticizing, when his own party is voting for them.

Mr. McCormack. That is easy to answer. The measures we voted for are Democratic measures for the past 20 years, which Mr. Eisenhower has embraced, and the Republicans promised to repeal, and they haven't put in one bill to repeal any Democratic measure.

Mr. Allen. What measure did you vote against, Mr. McCormack, if you weren't satisfied?

Mr. McCormack. The two you mentioned I was for. Were you for low-cost housing?

Mr. Allen. I voted for 35,000.

Mr. McCormack. I voted for a hundred and forty thousand, that President Eisenhower recommended.

Mr. Allen. I am for economy.

Mr. McCormack. And you were against Eisenhower. You voted against Eisenhower.

Mr. Allen. He asked for a hundred and forty thousand.

Mr. McCormack. You voted for 35,000.

Mr. Allen. But we are probing all this housing thing.

Mr. McCormack. You voted against it.

Mr. Allen. I think it is time to stop this thing and check up on such people as the Woodner situation and other people.

Mr. McCormack. You voted against it.

Mr. Allen. I voted for 35,000.

Mr. McCormack. And against Eisenhower. Eisenhower recommended a measure based on good democratic principles, and we are not going to vote one way under a Democrat and another way under the Republicans.

Mr. Allen. They voted about a thousand percent for it.

Mr. McCormack. The voting record of the Congress shows that the best interests will be served, the best interests of the country will be served next fall by electing a Democratic House and a Democratic Senate. We Democrats will give Eisenhower more support in the interests of the country and in the interests of our people, because we are forward looking, than he will get from his own Republican Party.

Mr. Allen. Here is an article by Joseph and Stewart Alsop, who are talking about the next election. I don't think anybody will say they are Republicans. It says: "Democrats dim election hopes."

This is from Sunday's Washington Post. It then goes on to say that the Democrats didn't have much of a chance——

Mr. McCormack. It didn't say that. I read it. It didn't say that at all.

Mr. Allen. All it says is: "Democrats dim election hopes."

They thought they would win easily, and they are beginning to question it.

Mr. McCormack. But it didn't say they didn't have much chance. That article is entirely different than your construction placed upon it.

Mr. Allen. I don't see how the people can—this prosperity that happens——

Mr. McCormack. You had better not argue prosperity too much because you will be in trouble.

Mr. Allen. Although some said we were going to sell apples in the street——

Mr. McCormack. Nobody said that at all. You cannot point to one person who said that.

Mr. Allen. These messengers of gloom—out in Illinois we have Senator Douglas who started last February talking about a recession. He said he knew what he was talking about because he was an economist. He either didn't know what he was talking about or it was a malicious thought——

Mr. McCormack. He was trying to help the people of our country. He is a great American.

Mr. Allen. You can have a depression easily enough by talking about it. If you have a bank down the street and you say it is going broke, that is the easiest way to have it go broke.

I don't say it was malicious intent. It is probably in a spirit of friendliness and thoughtfulness. That is what I think about the prosperity.

Mr. McCormack. My good friend is handing out the old stuff that the Republicans are always handing out. As I said on the floor the other day, they have broken their promises to the farmers. They promised the farmers one thing when they want the votes, when they are in, they do another thing. They go ahead and say the great majority of farmers will vote Republican because their grandfathers voted Republican. I think the farmers of this day and age and this year are waking up and realizing that there has been a job done on them.

What about the giveaway of the great public resources of our country? I think the people out in the great States of the west coast—10 or 11 of those States, realize what is happening. I think the millions of people who are out of employment realize that they had employment under the Democrats and they do not have it under the Republicans, and the record is clear that the only good thing this administration did is when they sent recommendations up that were consistent with Democratic recommendations and legislation in past years, then, and even in those cases, the great majority of those who voted against them, President Eisenhower's recommendations, came from the Republican Members of Congress. We Democrats voted during this administration as we did during the last 20 years. The whole record is clear of broken promises, and, as the 80th Republican Congress was a do-nothing Congress, this one, this Republican Congress, the 83d, is a giveaway to the big interests Congress.

Mr. Allen. In conclusion, I want to say—and I repeat—I love my good friend John McCormack. The only thing is he should have been a Republican.

Mr. McCormack. Oh, no. I am a disciple of Thomas Jefferson.

Mr. Allen. He is right in there pitching for the Eisenhower program. He is in there voting for it as nearly all the Democrats are. I know him too well He is an honorable man. If he didn't think it was a good program, that things weren't going according to Hoyle, my good friend would be voting against it. He is pitching for this program and he knows we are going places, and we are glad to have him with us on our team. He is on our team and we are glad to have him.

Mr. McCormack. Was social security a Republican program or a Democratic program?

Mr. Allen. It was started under the Democrats.

Mr. McCormack. Was unemployment compensation a Republican or Democratic program?

Mr. Allen. We are going along with it.

Mr. McCormack. You are going along, but who started it?

Mr. Allen. It came under the Democratic administration.

Mr. McCormack. Who started low-cost housing, the Republicans or the Democrats?

Mr. Allen. The Democrats.

Mr. McCormack. The Republicans have killed it.

Mr. Allen. What do you mean "killed it"?

Mr. McCormack. Was 35,000 voted?

Mr. Allen. We are having a million units built through private enterprise. We don't want this giveaway stuff.

Mr. McCormack. I talked about public housing.

Mr. Allen. Yes; I am talking about——

Mr. McCormack. Who started it?

Mr. Allen. The Democrats.

Mr. McCormack. Who put through the reciprocal trade agreement law?

Mr. Allen. You did.

Mr. McCormack. Did you vote for it this year?

Mr. Allen. I did.

Mr. McCormack. Did you vote for it in bygone years, to extend it?

Mr. Allen. When we got into the Korean war, I started to vote for it.

Mr. McCormack. Prior to that did you vote for it?

Mr. Allen. No.

Mr. Bancroft. That is all the time we have. We did get a little away from the subject, the accomplishments of the 83d Congress, but I think we got a preview of the election campaign.

Thank you, Congressman McCormack and Congressman Allen.

Small Business Administration Aids Small Firms Across Country

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1954

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, thousands of small business firms across the country have been able to improve their financial position, get Government contracts, or obtain valuable advice and assistance in solving management and technical problems as a result of the programs of the Small Business Administration.

This agency, the only new governmental agency created by the Eisenhower administration, has just closed its first year of operations and is improving and streamlining its programs so greater numbers of small firms can be helped in the future.

A prime objective of the Small Business Administration has been to make its services available to small firms at the local level, so it will not be necessary for them to spend their time and money in coming to Washington. To meet this objective, 36 field offices have been established in major cities.

In addition to developing, planning, and putting its own small business assistance programs into operation during the first year of existence, the Small Business Administration was also especially interested in obtaining the tax relief embraced in the new Federal tax law.

The Small Business Administration is the first comprehensive, peacetime, independent governmental agency in history created for the sole purpose of advising, counselling, assisting, and protecting small business enterprises.

Legislation creating the Small Business Administration was signed by President Eisenhower July 30, 1953. Its programs of giving assistance to small firms are fast gathering momentum under the direction of the Small Business Administrator Wendell B. Barnes.

The agency's main programs—loans and financial counselling assistance, aid in getting Government contracts, technical and managerial help of many kinds, and disaster loans to help victims of floods and other catastrophies rebuild their homes and shops—are each designed to offer important services to small firms.

In all of these fields the results so far are notable, and they offer even greater promise for future development.

Summing up the year's accomplishments in the four major fields of activity, here is the Small Business Administration's national record—a record of which the administration can be proud:

FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

Authority for the Small Business Administration to make loans did not begin until September 29, 1953. Since then 634 small-business loans, totaling $36,359,962, have been approved. Two-thirds of these loans are bank participation loans, in which local banks put up part of the money, and the Small Business Administration puts up the remainder. Direct loans are made by the Small Business Administration only when they are needed to help small firms that cannot obtain private financing.

Of the total loans approved, 429 loans, totaling $25,926,602, are bank participation loans, and 205 loans, totaling $10,433,360, are direct loans.

In establishing the Small Business Administration's financial assistance program, Administrator Barnes has stressed the fact that the private banks of this country have done and are doing a good job in providing for the credit needs of our businessmen.

The Small Business Administration is not competing with the banks, and plans to offer its loans for sale to them as soon as the loans have been "seasoned" and are of proved worth.

The Small Business Administration is working with the private banks, to help provide term credit to small firms. By putting the emphasis on bank participation loans, the Small Business Administration is helping the proprietors of small firms establish a banking relationship with a private bank in their own community. This is providing a service of lasting value, as it helps to strengthen the customer-bank relationships in the local communities.

DISASTER LOANS

In addition to making business loans, the Small Business Administration has the responsibility of making disaster loans to aid in the rehabilitation of homes and businesses damaged in windstorms, fires, floods, and other catastrophes.

Ninety-eight disaster loans totaling about $400,000 have been made so far, helping people rebuild their homes and shops. The Small Business Administration stands always ready to give help to the homeowners and the businessman whenever catastrophes occur.

PROCUREMENT ASSISTANCE

The law creating the Small Business Administration gives it the responsibility for seeing to it that a fair share of the goods and services purchased by the Government—and remember that the United States Government is the biggest customer in the world—are obtained from small firms.

During the period August 1, 1953, through June 30, 1954, the Small Business Administration assisted 1,080 small firms in obtaining Government contracts totaling $124,837,044.

These figures represent actual contract awards under the Small Business Administration's "joint determination" program, but they tell only a small part of the accomplishments of the Small Business Administration in helping smaller firms get Government contracts.

The Small Business Administration concentrates its contract procurement assistance activity in the area where—except for the vigilance of the Small Business Administration—the contracts would probably go to larger firms. Through its joint determination program it is constantly working to increase the small-business share of Government orders.

Under this joint determination program, the Small Business Administration has representatives stationed in the principal procurement centers of the military departments across the country.

Here, all individual proposed procurements valued at $10,000 or more—except those classified as "confidential" or higher—are screened jointly by the Small Business Administration representatives and military procurement officers.

Those found suitable for performance by small business, if jointly agreed to by the Small Business Administration and the military, are earmarked and reserved exclusively for competitive award to small firms. In some cases, portions of proposed procurements are also earmarked for performance by small firms under this program.

Once a joint determination has been made, the Small Business Administration field offices are notified, and are thus able to call possible procurement opportunities to the attention of small firms in their own areas.

In addition, through cooperative programs, larger private firms constantly are being encouraged to place more of their orders with smaller concerns in their own areas.

The regional offices of the Small Business Administration regularly receive notices of procurement opportunities. They keep a register of many thousands of small firms that are desirous of obtaining a Government contract.

Every day procurement specialists in the regional offices of the Small Business Administration check the list of products the Government wants to buy and refer them to those firms that are capable of producing the specific products.

Last year the regional offices made many thousands of referrals, and although it is impossible to keep a close check on the results of each referral, it is known that they resulted in a good volume of Government contracts going to small firms.

In addition to the activity in behalf of small firms in the regional offices of the Small Business Administration and in the field offices, representatives of the agency in procurement centers of the Armed Services held more than 2,500 interviews with businessmen regarding procurement matters, handled about 40,000 communications regarding procurement matters, and in about 3,000 cases made specific referrals of bid opportunities to individual firms.

In addition to these Government contracts, the Small Business Administration also works with firms holding large prime Government contracts and helps them locate small firms who can take a subcontract. This activity is, of course, a two-way street.

The Small Business Administration not only helps the smaller firms by aiding them in getting more business, but also helps the larger producer develop reliable suppliers. The net result is to stimulate all business activity.

The perseverance of the Small Business Administration in helping small firms get Government contracts is best demonstrated by its certificate of competency program.

Certificates of competency are issued only in cases where a small firm is actually the low bidder on a Government contract and should get the award, except that the military procurement specialist calls into the question the technical or financial ability of the firm to produce the item satisfactorily and on time.

In such cases the Small Business Administration has its production experts investigate. If they find that the firm does have the technical ability and adequate financing to produce the article wanted, a certificate is issued and the contract goes to the small firm.

The Small Business Administration has issued 41 certificates of competency to aid small firms. As a result, these firms won contracts valued at $6,500,000. The taxpayer, incidentally, has a stake in this program, since its objective is to help the low bidder get the contract. So far, the savings total about $284,000.

Sometimes it is found that small firms have the technical ability to handle a particular Government contract, but they lack the financial resources needed to do the job. In such cases the Small Business Administration may be able to approve a loan to help the small firm.

It often happens, too, that the proprietor of a small firm, after consulting with the Small Business Administration financial specialist, is able to work out private credit with his bank, or perhaps by recognizing his production schedule he is enable to get along without a loan.

MANAGEMENT AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

Under this heading the Small Business Administration, through its regional Offices, offers a wide range of service to help small firms.

The Small Business Administration publishes two series of practical and helpful leaflets called Management and Technical Aids for Small Business. These leaflets cover a wide range of management and production problems, and are in great demand. They are designed particularly to aid the proprietor of a small firm who may have an outstanding aptitude in certain lines, but lacks the rounded management experience which big companies hire for their top management team.

The Small Business Administration has experienced management counselors in its field offices. These counselors are always ready to work directly with owners of small businesses on specific questions presented to them. It has recently developed a program of helping small firms with products development problems—finding new uses and new applications for items produced by small firms.

There are hundreds of small firms whose proprietors have ideas for improved or new products and processes, or perhaps they own a product patent, but they may lack the technical know-how or means of putting the article or new idea to practical use. The Small Business Administration is giving help to these firms. Sometimes its experts can direct the proprietor to a competent research institution or laboratory, or refer an inventor to a firm which may utilize his invention or idea.

All of the programs of the Small Business Administration are aimed at this one basic objective: To assist in the growth and survival of small-business firms; to help them meet the continuing challenge of our expanding economy.

There are about 4,200,000 business establishments in the United States. Of these, 96 percent are classed as small. The new tax law enacted by the 83d Congress and signed by President Eisenhower is going to be of great benefit to businesses generally. It will be a boon to small firms.

Congress and the Eisenhower administration recognized that, in recent years, barriers had been erected in our tax structure, handicapping the little fellow. The new tax law will inure greatly to the benefit of the many small businesses of California, as well as to the Nation. I enthusiastically supported the passage of the omnibus tax law, the first major revision of the revenue laws in 75 years.

American taxpayers stand to save $7,400,000,000 in taxes through actions by the Congress which accrue this year or within a year after enactment of a particular measure. Broken down into the tax actions taken by Congress, the savings are as follows, in round numbers:

From Jan. 1 income-tax cut	$3,000,000,000
From reduction excise taxes	1,000,000,000
From repeal excess-profits tax	2,000,000,000
From reductions in new tax law	1,400,000,000
Total	7,400,000,000

Savings to individuals under the new revenue act are estimated to come to $800 million a year. Here are some of the savings which will accrue to individuals:

Through medical-expense deductions, 8,500,000 beneficiaries should save $80 million a year.

Through allowing as dependents children under 19 who are either students or earning more than $600 a year, an estimated 1,300,000 beneficiaries will save about $75 million.

Through splitting income to widows and widowers with children and similar benefits, 160,000 beneficiaries are expected to save $11 million.

Through a tax credit of 20 percent on income up to $1,200 for retired persons, about 1,800,000 beneficiaries will be allowed to keep $141 million.

Approximately 500,000 farmers will save $10 million on liberalized soil-conservation expense allowances.

And working widows, widowers, and working wives to a limited extent, will get a tax reduction up to $600 for child-care expense. This will provide 2,100,000 taxpayers with savings of $130 million.

Savings in taxes by business concerns through the new tax law are estimated to come to approximately $600 million annually.

Now, here are some of the ways in which the new law will aid small concerns:

Liberalized depreciation: This permits faster writeoffs for depreciation on new property acqured in 1954 and later years. Its effect will be to permit tax-free recovery of about two-thirds of the cost in the first half of service life, thus aiding small businesses in the financing of their modernization and expansion.

Treatment of surplus accumulations: This section provides that the burden of proof shall be on the Government to show that earnings accumulations by firms are unreasonable. It also exempts the first $60,000 of earnings accumulations from the penalty tax and takes only the accumulations which are unreasonable in amount.

Research and experimental expenditures: For the first time a small business lacking a regular research and experimental budget has a clear right to deduct its research outlays as current expenses or to amortize them over a 5-year period.

Loss carryover: The new law increases the net loss carryback provision to 2 years, instead of 1 year previously allowed. This helps take care of businesses with irregular or spotty earnings, to permit the offset of losses over a longer period. Any individual who sells his business or business assets will be permitted to use his loss on the sale as a net operating loss carryover.

Relief from double taxation of dividends: Double taxation of corporate earnings has heretofore reduced the incentive to invest, particularly in small new concerns and has restricted the marketability of new equity shares. Under the new law, the taxpayer is allowed a credit against tax of 4 percent of dividends from domestic corporations, plus an exclusion of the first $50 received. This should stimulate the supply of equity capital.

Optional tax treatment for certain partnerships and corporations: Under the previous system there might be marked differences in tax liability of a business depending on whether it operated as a partnership or a corporation. The new law also provides clear, flexible and equitable rules for handling partnership transactions.

Changes in capital structure: The new law permits the issuance of preferred stock dividends to holders of common stock without subjecting such distribution to income tax at the time of distribution. This is calculated to remove tax barriers to needed financial rearrangements, so that new financing may be had without the temptation by the owners of a small concern to sell out to a large concern.

Redemption of stock to pay estate taxes: The new act broadens the present provisions which permit the tax-free redemption of stock in a corporation to pay estate taxes. Its purpose is to avoid the forced sale or liquidation of a business in order to pay Federal estate taxes.

These tax savings for the individual restore freedom to the individual to spend more of his own money as he sees fit and increase disposable personal income and thus purchasing power. For business, the savings will help to achieve healthy growth and thereby strengthen the national economy.

Rev. Gardner A. MacWhorter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SIDNEY R. YATES

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 11, 1954

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, Hobart College was founded in 1822. William Smith College, which is its coordinate college for women, was founded in 1908. At the 129th annual commencement of the colleges held last June, Rev. Gardner A. MacWhorter, of Chicago, Ill., and a resident of the Ninth Congressional District, was singled out and honored for a long and distinguished career of service to his community. The citation which he received was awarded for his inspiring example of service and devotion to his alma mater, to his church and to his fellow man.

Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate Reverend MacWhorter and to join in commending him as truly a man of good will and a devoted servant to the ideal which seeks the brotherhood of man under the fatherhood of God.

Alaska Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. L. BARTLETT

DELEGATE FROM ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 11, 1954

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, in the space of a few years an outstandingly successful home-building program has been accomplished in Alaska under the generous provisions of the Alaska Housing Act, which was approved by the Congress in special recognition of Alaska needs. An article in the New York Times titled "Alaska's Housing Vastly Improved," written by Lawrence E. Davies, who traveled through the Territory recently, tells how modern housing has been built under the beneficial law to meet an acute shortage:

> Six years ago most of the housing in Alaska was substandard. There was a preponderance of tar-paper shacks and lean-to's.
>
> These shacks often rented for more than $200 a month. Huts, 12 by 12 feet, with outdoor "plumbing" and "water within walking distance," were commanding $125 to $175 a month.
>
> Such shacks are still to be found in honky-tonk areas like South Fairbanks, where roads become quagmires; in the outlying parts of Anchorage, the Territorial metropolis; in remote Eskimo villages, like Barrow and Kotzebue; and in towns like Nome, especially in the native districts.
>
> However, the construction of individual houses, apartments, and multiple-family dwellings has proceeded at an amazing pace to take care of military and civilian requirements. Now the need appears to have been met in the larger cities, except perhaps for families in the lowest-income levels.
>
> A $15-million revolving fund for a 40-year period was authorized in the Alaska Housing Act, which was introduced in the National House of Representatives on April 23, 1949, by Delegate E. L. BARTLETT and became Public Law 52.
>
> MORTGAGE LOANS INSURED
>
> The statute authorized the Federal Housing Administrator to insure mortgage loans limited in dollar amounts to one-third more than in the States. It permitted the Federal National Mortgage Association, without regard to limitations, to come into Alaska and act as a secondary market.
>
> The law further authorized the Alaska Housing Authority to serve as mortgagee or mortgagor for FHA-insured home mortgages. It also permitted character loan notes to be issued to Eskimos and others in remote areas, each note not to exceed $500.
>
> The Alaska Housing Authority is a five-member group headed by the Rev. Paul C. O'Connor, a Jesuit priest. It was set up by the Territorial legislature in 1945.
>
> E. Glen Wilder, executive director of the authority, with headquarters in Anchorage, said that nearly $100 million worth of housing had been built under the law.
>
> "When I came here in 1948," Mr. Wilder said, "I saw hundreds and hundreds go through our rental office. Men with tears streaming down their faces appealed to us, 'You're our last hope; the best I can find is a tarpaper shack for $225 a month, and my wife is threatened with pneumonia.' I saw hundreds of families leave for the States who wanted to stay here."
>
> At that time, Mr. Wilder said, a house with 700 square feet of floor space—probably five rooms—rented for up to $350 a month, and one that would have sold in Seattle for $7,500 would rent in Anchorage for $500 a month.
>
> Military housing, he added, had run from $30,000 to more than $70,000 a family unit, including installation of utilities.
>
> Since the beginning of the Alaska Housing Authority program, he declared, the average of all dwelling units sold has been about $15,000, with some offered at $13,500. These have 2 and 3 bedrooms. The top price in Anchorage he put at $26,000.
>
> The Authority concentrates on units for sale, rather than for rent, Mr. Wilder said, adding:
>
> "We loaned over $18 million to private sponsors. We are proud not of what we ourselves built, but of what we have done to help private enterprise do a job."
>
> Money was lent for two 14-story apartment buildings in Anchorage. Similar structures have been built in Ketchikan and Fairbanks. The rentals, for the most part, are high, running around $140 for a 1-bedrom, unfurnished apartment, and $180 for 2 bedrooms.
>
> Many of the apartments, especially in the new buildings in Ketchikan, are still vacant. There, the Ketchikan Pulp Co., which dedicated a $52,500,000 pulp mill this month, has made plans for its own housing development.
>
> Officials has realized in the last year that communities like Anchorage might be overbuilt. For example, in a 252-unit project of individual houses, only 149 had been sold up to a few days ago. Four were rented and 99 were vacant.
>
> In a 400-unit project known as Nunaka Valley at Anchorage, 333 were vacant and 67 rented. All of the houses in these two projects had been built for sale by Johnson & Crooks, of Portland, Oreg.
>
> Mr. Wilder described this firm as "the most capable builders in Alaska," but said that the projects had been completed at a time when the demand had decreased. This, he added, was the result of heavy building on military bases simultaneously with that in civilian centers.
>
> The Alaska Housing Authority is especially gratified by the construction of about 600 dwellings for Eskimos and others in remote areas.
>
> ESKIMO HONESTY LAUDED
>
> "We have delivered the materials to build the homes for $500, and they provide the labor," Mr. Wilder said. "They pay 5 percent interest. The Eskimos are one of the most honest people known. An "X" on a contract is enough if the borrower is unable to write his name. It doesn't enter their minds to be dishonest."
>
> The provision of the simple frame houses, according to Dr. Erwin S. Rabeau, hospital head at Kotzebue on the northwestern coast, means that fewer persons sleep in the weatherbeaten, tumbledown old shanties, some of tar paper, some of driftwood and other materials.
>
> "I have seen a dozen living in one 8-by-10 room," Dr. Rabeau said. "They had to sleep in shifts, and the conditions have invited tuberculosis and other diseases."
>
> Not one of these new frame houses supplanted an ice igloo, for no sourdough could be found who would admit ever having seen an ice igloo in Alaska.
>
> An igloo to an Eskimo means a house. To him the most modern hotel might be an igloo. But an ice igloo, so far as Alaska is concerned, exists only in primary school textbooks and imaginative literature.

Federal Surplus Food Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 11, 1954

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the Record a press release and a series of letters attached to it which I have made public, urging the Commissioner of Social Welfare of the State of New York to apply for participation in the Federal surplus food program.

There being no objection, the press release and letters were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Senator Lehman Urges State Department of Social Welfare To Apply for Surplus Foods Under CCC Program

The office of Senator Herbert H. Lehman today made public a letter he has writen to Mr. Raymond Houston, Commissioner of Social Welfare of New York State, urging prompt application for participation by the New York Welfare Department in the Federal surplus-food program.

Stressing the unemployment situation in New York and the growing need of many individuals and their families, Senator Lehman pointed out that although some surplus food was being distributed in New York as part of the school-lunch program and also to some public charitable institutions, the New York Department of Social Welfare has as yet made no formal application for participation in the food-distribution program, despite the fact that unlimited supplies of such foods are available for distribution to needy persons. Senator Lehman emphasized that he had received many letters from constituents describing their need and urging that food be made available through their local welfare department and through private agencies in New York State. This can only be done, Senator Lehman explained, on application by the department of social welfare.

Copies of the letter to Commissioner Houston and of an exchange of correspondence with a constituent in New York, one of many letters received on this subject, are also attached.

United States Senate,
Washington, D. C., August 9, 1954.
Hon. Raymond Houston,
Commissioner, Department of
Social Welfare, Albany, N. Y.

Dear Commissioner Houston: I have been receiving a considerable number of communications from constituents throughout New York State inquiring about the program of surplus food distribution to the needy which the Commodity Credit Corporation of the United States Department of Agriculture has initiated as a means of utilizing the present large accumulated stocks of surplus foods which the Commodity Credit Corporation has acquired under the price-support program.

The foods now available for distribution include, as you undoubtedly know, large amounts of dairy products—butter, cheese, and dried milk—shortening and vegetable oils, and canned beef and gravy. Most of these foods are available in any amount needed to supply the requirements.

I am aware that the Federal Government is already distributing some of its surplus food in New York State to the school children, by means of the school-lunch program, and to some of the charitable institutions through the division of standards and purchase. However, I am advised that no arrangement has yet been made for the distribution of these surplus foods to the needy people of New York State through the local public and private welfare agencies under the cognizance of your department.

I need not tell you that there has been a great increase of persons in New York State who need such assistance as the Government can give them to maintain a livelihood for themselves and their families. There are areas, as you know, of critical unemployment. The monthly unemployment checks which some of these unemployed receive do not, of course, meet the need. And many unemployed individuals are not, for one reason or another, receiving unemployment checks.

I am sure that the surplus food which the Commodity Credit Corporation is making available in carload lots to State authorities in many parts of the country for the needy would be of great assistance to thousands of people in New York. As far as I have been able to determine from inquiries here, no formal application has been made by the social welfare department for participation in the surplus-food-distribution program.

I would, therefore, strongly urge, on the basis of the letters I have received describing the heartbreaking need of many families, that the New York Department of Social Welfare initiate appropriate application to the Commodity Credit Corporation and proceed to set up a program of surplus food distribution among the unemployed, and to other needy families who would benefit from this program, through the appropriate local agencies in the various localities in New York State in which such a need exists.

I am enclosing for your information a copy of a sample letter which I have received from an individual in Syracuse, N. Y., and a copy of my reply to that letter.

I would be glad to hear any reactions you have to this suggestion.

Very sincerely yours,
Herbert H. Lehman.

Syracuse, N. Y.
Hon. Herbert H. Lehman,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator: I have recently been informed by friends in western Pennsylvania that the Government is distributing surplus food there, not only to relief cases, but to people who are receiving unemployment compensation. Surely the people in our State are entitled to equal privileges—yet no one here seems to know of such an arrangement.

Syracuse has been sorely hit by unemployment. I know of many families who are trying to pay rentals of up to $100 on a $32 (30) a week unemployment check. These are getting more desperate every week. Yet one can see some plan for millions in aid to foreign countries almost every day.

Could you look into this matter? You would earn the gratitude of many.

Sincerely yours,
Mrs. Robert McEwan.

United States Senate,
Washington, D. C., August 9, 1954.
Mrs. Robert McEwan,
Syracuse, N. Y.

Dear Mrs. McEwan: The Department of Agriculture has a program for the distribution of surplus foods which is available to State agencies that desire such foods. In New York State at the moment, the United States Department of Agriculture is supplying surplus food in carload lots to the State board of education, which handles the school-lunch program, the department of property and supplies, which services public charity institutions, and the State 4-H Club organization which cooperates with summer camps in New York State.

But the United States Department of Agriculture does not have any analogous arrangement with the New York Social Welfare Department which administers the State public welfare program. New York State people know that surplus foods are available but no action has been taken by the New York State Social Welfare Department to secure surplus foods for distribution. The Federal Government can only undertake such distribution through the State agencies in charge of welfare activities.

If the New York Social Welfare Department did establish such a program, the food would be distributed through local or county welfare agencies. Again, all communities would not automatically participate in the program. Only those local and county agencies would participate who signified that they wished the program. As to the individuals who would be eligible for the foods once the program was established, this, too, would be a matter of determination by the local or county agency.

I have ascertained that a program for the distribution of surplus foods has, indeed, been established in Pennsylvania, and in many other States. It is equally true that the New York Social Welfare Department could establish such a program, and the welfare agency in Syracuse then could become a part of such a program. However, there are a number of questions which would have to be thought through in setting up such a program—the food is shipped to the States in car-load lots. It has to be stored when it arrives, then broken down into small packages before being issued. Provision for the determination of persons eligible to receive the supplies and records for the same would have to be made.

I would suggest that citizens interested in seeing such a program in Syracuse should approach the mayor. The mayor, in turn, could make application to the governor, or to the department of social welfare.

When I was governor of New York, I helped set up many programs of this type. Now that I am a Senator, I can vote to make surplus goods available, but I cannot set up the machinery for getting the food to the people who need it. This part must be done by the welfare authorities of the State and by the local communities. However, I propose to call this situation to the attention of the appropriate authorities in New York State, in the hope that some action on this front may be initiated.

Yours very sincerely,
Herbert H. Lehman.

Paul Bunyan Would Be Proud of Tree Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDWARD J. THYE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 11, 1954

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, in preserving and replenishing the great forest resources of this country, our Federal Forest Service and our State conservation departments, as well as large private enterprise, must take a necessary leadership, but there is a vital part of this program which belongs to, and can best be developed, by individuals.

We have in Minnesota a large number of "tree farms."

The value of this type of undertaking is well expressed in an address by Mr.

Leonard Carpenter, of Minneapolis, who is president of the American Forest Products Industries, and who recently spoke at the dedication of the North Star Timber Co.'s tree farm at Two Harbors, Minn.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Carpenter's address of July 30 at Two Harbors be printed in the Appendix of the Record, as it outlines not only what has been done in Minnesota but what can be done in many other States as well.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Paul Bunyan Would Be Proud of Tree Farmers

(By Leonard Carpenter)

Mr. Chairman and fellow Minnesotans, it is a pleasure and privilege to visit this north shore area of Minnesota's Arrowhead Country. The fact that the occasion of this visit is a tree farm dedication makes it an even more pleasant assignment.

I know that in making plans for today's program, Neil McKenna considered the possibility that rain might make necessary an alteration of the plan for our activities this afternoon. Perhaps because I am a lumberman, I thought immediately of Paul Bunyan's solution to a similar problem. According to the story a downpour that had started on St. Patrick's Day threatened to continue right on through the 4th of July and spoil the loggers' holiday. Being a man of action, Paul dived into Lake Superior and swam out to where a solid pillar of water was coming down. With powerful strokes, he swam up the pillar. An hour or so later, he came slipping back down. "I turned the damn thing off" he explained as the rain stopped.

I think most Minnesota people like to regard Paul Bunyan as a fellow-citizen. I know that I do, though that may result in part from the fact that both of my grandfathers and my father had a share in the early harvesting of Minnesota's forests. I cannot claim that my own recollection dates back to the use of yoked oxen, but one of my youthful memories is of seeing three teams of horses straining before one of the great sets of logging wheels and later I watched both the Clyde and Lidgerwood skidders—like great prehistoric animals—wrenching the logs from the forest. When I went to work in the early twenties the caterpillar tractor was first being used experimentally. Now it is regarded as an indispensable tool wherever logging is taking place.

Driving up from Minneapolis, it was inevitable that I should recall some of the events in Minnesota's forest history and contrast them with conditions as they are today.

Take the matter of forest fires, for instance. I feel certain there are people in this audience who remember that dry autumn 36 years ago when fire swept over much of St. Louis, Cass, Itasca, Carlton, Pine, and Aitkin Counties at a cost of 438 lives. These fires burned up to the city limits of Duluth and half an inch of ashes covered its streets.

As in all forested States, fire is still a problem in Minnesota. But we have moved a long way since Hinckley, Cloquet, and Moose Lake. Forest fire losses last year were held to 50,000 acres according to a recent news item in the Minnesota papers. Most of the 1,000 fires that caused this loss were small. With the statewide system of forest protection and the modern techniques of fighting woods fires, the average loss last year was held to 50 acres per fire. Our forest protection record will continue to improve because Minnesota's timberland owners and Government agencies are working hard and together to improve both the effectiveness and the efficiency of the forest fire prevention and suppression effort. They have the wholehearted support of Minnesotans who have enlisted in a day-in, day-out campaign to "Keep Minnesota Green." Fire prevention is one very important aspect of this business of growing trees as a crop. It is a part of tree farming and it is, therefore, singularly appropriate that this occasion in which we are all participating today is sponsored and arranged by the "Keep Minnesota Green Association" of which our Governor is the honorary chairman. Dr. Frank Kaufert, director of the school of forestry of the University of Minnesota, and Mr. C. A. Anderson, of the Minnesota vocational agricultural education department, are respectively president and vice president, and Mr. Christian Schacker, of the Blandin Paper Co., and Mr. Floyd Ryan are respectively treasurer and executive secretary.

These tree farms we are dedicating here today are living growing proof of the vitality of Minnesota's forest resources. Every one of their sixty-two-thousand-odd acres symbolizes the ability of nature, with man's help and cooperation, to grow new crops of trees.

Tree planting is an important part of tree farming. Here in Minnesota 12,000 acres of trees a year are planted where repeated fires, agriculture clearing, or misuse have eliminated natural seed sources. I am sure you will not be surprised that 1 of the 11 forest nurseries operating in Minnesota is run by The North Star Timber Co. Thousands of seedling trees from their nursery—enough to reforest 878 acres—have ben planted on this tree farm. Of course, most Minnesota forests reproduce themselves naturally. When it comes to planting new forests, even a Paul Bunyan can't improve on nature. She takes charge and does the best job of all when fire is kept out of the woods and sensible cutting practices are followed.

To operate a forestry program effectively men trained in the business are essential. In Minnesota, the professional skills and technical know-how of graduate foresters are being applied to the business of growing bigger and better-quality timber crops.

Three decades ago you could count the foresters who lived and worked in Minnesota on the fingers of two hands. Most of them were on Government payrolls. Today, in addition to the foresters provided by the Federal Government and the State, Minnesota's wood-using industries and industrial woodland owners employ more than 100 graduate foresters. Forestry and the intelligent use and perpetuation of the forests are to these men not only a source of livelihood but a mission to which they have dedicated themselves. Fortunate it is that the skill and knowledge of America's foresters are available to all tree farmers.

This State's timber harvest got under way back in 1821 when a small sawmill was set up at St. Anthony to cut lumber for the construction of Fort Snelling. Since that time our State has produced 100 billion board-feet of lumber. That's enough to build 10 million two-bedroom homes and provide housing for a third of the families now living in the United States. Actually, a good part of Minnesota's lumber output did go into houses, barns, store buildings, schools, churches, grain elevators, railway depots, railroad crossties, mine props, and into shipbuilding.

Quite obviously, the forests of Minnesota were called on to play their part in providing housing and industrial construction for the western march of civilization which started before and intensified after the War Between the States. Thank God, our forests could respond to this demand and remain in the fruitful and productive condition in which we find them today; for Minnesota's forest resources have played a big part in building this great Nation.

I realize that there are people who look on Minnesota's forest past and shake their heads over the waste and ruthless logging of bygone days. This is perfectly understandable for, measured in terms of modern-day markets and methods, there was waste, and lots of it. To see what took place in the proper perspective, however, one must pause to recollect that this first harvest was in response to the elemental and insistent demand of a civilization on the move which brooked no hesitation or delay. Moreover, at that time there was waste in wheat farming and mining and just about every other field of agriculture and industrial endeavor. Present day economic yardsticks can't be applied to the past. To attempt to do so in retrospect is neither fair nor realistic.

Forty-five years ago, when Minnesota's great pine mills were running at full blast, this State's annual timber harvest amounted to $39 million. Now it is five times that amount.

There is, to be sure, some difference in the value of the dollar. Nevertheless, there is better utilization and a vast array of new wood products. Bany of these are made from jack pine, aspen, and other trees loggers of the Paul Bunyan era considered worthless.

Moreover, today the manufacture of pulp and paper has long since passed lumbering as our State's No. 1 forest industry. Fifty thousand Minnesotans earn their living working for the forest products industries. As employers of men and producers of useful products and raw materials, the forest industries rank next to mining and agriculture in Minnesota's overall economy.

It is probably also unrealistic to apply present-day forestry yardsticks to the future—but for far different reasons. Actually there can be no accurate prediction with respect to the advancement in manufacturing techniques, forestry genetics, and wood chemistry that may be expected to occur in the next half century. Of only one thing we can be sure—5 years from now, 10 years from now, or 50 years from now—the raw materials from America's forests will still be flowing into industry and the products derived therefrom will be playing a vital part in our Nation's economy. More wood will be grown per acre and more and better products will be derived from each tree that is harvested.

Right now there is enough timber standing in Minnesota's forests to supply wood for all the pulp and paper mills in Minnesota, Wisconsin, and Michigan for the next 19 years at their present rate of consumption. Actually, of course, most of these mills derive their raw materials from sources outside of Minnesota, but this gives you an idea of the substantial nature of Minnesota's pulpwood resources. In terms of saw timber, Minnesota's forests contain enough lumber to build a modern home for every man, woman, and child now living in the cities of Duluth and Minneapolis. These calculations are based on official Government inventories.

If you were to see a headline in your morning newspaper stating that the third largest industry in Minnesota expected to triple its capacity, you would probably read the story and presumably make plans to adjust your own business to take advantage of that expansion. Well, that is surely what is going to happen in Minnesota's forest industries. The forests of this State, adequately protected from fire, insects, and disease, and when brought under tree-farm management, can and will produce three times as much timber as they now yield.

This means that instead of jobs for 50,000 people, Minnesota's forest industries will employ 150,000 workers. Moreover, our present annual income of $162,000,000 from forest products will become almost half a billion dollars.

These predictions are not economic fantasy. They are based on a realistic analysis of Minnesota's forest growth potential. To accomplish this objective the owners of the forests must adopt the proper management policies. Woodlands must not only be protected from fire, but the stands must be thinned from time to time and they must be harvested when ripe to achieve the ultimate in growth rate and quality. These management policies must be applied not only to the 8 million acres of commercial forest land held by farmers and industry together, but also to the 11 million acres of Minnesota forest land under Federal, State and county ownership.

Tree farms, such as the ones we are dedicating here today, set a practical pattern for Minnesota forest land owners and operators. These lands have been dedicated by their owners to the production of continuing crops of wood. The North Star Timber Company, like all tree farm owners in the United States, has a well-thought-out plan for utilizing the full tree-growing potential of every acre of land and Mr. Sandburg is going to tell you about it. Mr. Clark is convinced that in handling his land as a tree farm he is following the path of enlightened self-interest.

These things constitute the real promise and meaning behind the tree farm sign. As president of the Forest Industries organization which sponsors tree farms nationally, it is gratifying to be able to say that tree farming principles are becoming the rule rather than the exception where tax-paying woodland owners are concerned. Today we are adding two more names to those of the 328 certified tree farmers already enrolled in Minnesota. Tree farmers now own more than one-third of a million acres of well-managed crop-producing woodland. Forty-eight of Minnesota's 87 counties have certified tree farms.

I salute all 330 of these progressive, forward-looking land owners. They are the prophets and pioneers of forests for the future; they are harvesters of profitable forest crops; they are charting a course and providing an example that will lead Minnesota to full and final realization of its forest potential.

Paul Bunyan would be proud of tree farmers.

The McCarran-Walter Immigration and Nationality Act—Resolution of the Association of Catholic Trade Unionists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 11, 1954

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, the Association of Catholic Trade Unionists, at its ninth annual convention, which was held in Cleveland on July 3 to 5 of this year, unanimously approved a resolution on the McCarran-Walter Immigration and Nationality Act. That resolution also indicated support of S. 2585, the omnibus immigration and citizenship bill which I and 7 other Members of the Senate and 24 Members of the House have introduced and are strongly supporting.

I ask unanimous consent that this resolution by this fine, patriotic, and forward-looking trade-union organization be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION ON THE MCCARRAN IMMIGRATION LAW, PUBLIC LAW 414

Whereas the traditionally dynamic growth of democracy is seriously undermined by the retrogressive philosophy of the McCarran-Walter immigration law;

Whereas this law has proven to be not only badly drafted, confusing, and in many respects unworkable, but also unduly and unnecessarily harassing to aliens now in our land, or seeking admission to it, by putting such aliens and all naturalized citizens in a position where they may exercise their basic freedoms only at the risk of subjecting themselves to loss of citizenship and deportation:

Whereas the Lehman-Celler bill (S. 2585, H. R. 6820–6843) succeeds in putting the true principles of democracy into effect in an enlightened immigration and naturalization policy: Therefore be it

Resolved by the ninth national convention of the Association of Catholic Trade Unionists, That it go on record as being in full support of the Lehman-Celler bill which embodies the immigration policy most closely in harmony with both the needs and the responsibilities of the United States in our present-day world.

Hon. Wesley A. D'Ewart

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEROY JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 11, 1954

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, yesterday while a number of Members were eulogizing our colleague WESLEY A. D'EWART, I was absen on some official business connected with my committee assignment. However, I wish to add my testimony to the worth and ability of Congressman D'EWART. He is a modest, and intelligent Member of the House, who gets a great deal of constructive work done. I do not believe that I could name any one in the House today who is more objective in his attitude toward the problems presented to his committee and to the House than is WES D'EWART.

I came to know this during this session of Congress, because of a bill which I had introduced, namely, House Joint Resolution 330, which provides for the construction of three dams on the Stanislaus River in California. This bill was assigned to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. The chairman, assigned the bill to the Subcommittee on Reclamation and Irrigation. We had a difficult time getting a hearing on the bill, due to the crowded calendar of the subcommittee, and due to some obstructive action which prevented the Subcommittee on Reclamation and Irrigation from getting started on a hearing on this bill.

However, the chairman suggested that we talk to Congressman D'EWART. When I say "we," I mean, myself and some of the directors of the irrigation districts which are proposing to build three dams at a cost of almost $50 million in order to get more water for their districts, and also to generate hydroelectric power. He gave us a very fine hearing and after the story had been told, he promptly stated that he would be glad to give us a hearing on our bill. The hearing was held, and he was frank enough to state that it was one of the most constructive hearings that had ever been conducted by this subcommittee.

I note with much pleasure that Mr. D'EWART is entering the race for United States Senator in the coming election. If the people of Montana want a capable, hardworking, and statesmanlike Senator, I think of no one who would be better fitted and qualified for the job, by background as well as temperament, that Mr. D'EWART. No matter what effort he may be engaged in, his object will be to produce a constructive result. His departure will be a real loss to the House of Representatives, which we hope will be partly compensated for by the United States Senate getting an experienced and statesmanlike legislator.

Uncle Sam Is the Symbol—Do We Serve in the Ranks?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 9, 1954

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, the American political scene has been dominated, substantially, since the founding of this Republic, by the two-party system. Among all the many different types of governmental rule practiced in the countries of the world, this Nation stands by itself in this respect: on the one hand, our constitutional system of checks and balances assures that there can be no swift upheaval or seizure of dictatorial prerogatives; while, on the other, provision is made for the frequent and orderly change of the reins of rule. Intelligent use of the ballot is the means by which public sentiment and personal preference are effectively translated into a declaration of national policy.

This Nation was designed from the first as a Federal Republic, a union of autonomous States, deriving such power as it possessed by the free consent of the governed.

Under the 10th amendment it is provided that "the powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

However, it has not always happened that the individual, the ultimate repository of governmental authority, has chosen to exercise his right of self-rule. Oftentime in our history, there have been shameful instances where the voting public has allowed a portion of its prized edifice of constitutional liberty to be eaten away by its own neglect or indifference on voting day. Many of the abuses and corrupt practices in government, on every level, would never have come about had the "let the other fellow do it" atitude not been present.

How many times in our history has the outcome of an important question or the fate of a worthwhile cause hung upon the delicate hinge of a single ballot?

Government is your job.

Our American system operates under a bipartite political arrangement. Admittedly it has its defects and shortcomings. Nonetheless, it has worked, and in a way which would have astounded even those of our Founding Fathers whose concept it actually was. A one-party system leads to dictatorship. We need only to look to the situation in Russia to realize once again the truth of this statement. Where there is no opposition, there is no freedom.

There are countries of the world where there are many parties working for power, many groups striving for self-expression. Where this situation prevails there can be little semblance of order in government. Each group must bargain with the other; only a coalition can expect to command a majority and this majority, comprised as it is of divergent philosophies and personalities, is subject always to disagreement, dissention, and finally dissolution. When there is no government, anarchy is the order of the day. Any country plagued by such disorder is fair prey to her enemies, both from without and from within.

Our own two-party system has shown itself to be the most workable means by which we may govern ourselves. It is a system of criticism. It provides that a loyal opposition voice its opinion whenever and wherever the necessity or occasion arises. The party out of power is free to alert the citizenry to possible need for change, or to the requirements of the public weal, when the ruling party fails to act with a reasonable degree of promptness. The minority party, the opposition, offers a constructive alternative, which the voting segment of our population may place in power at the next election, if conditions so warrant it. Thus the party in office constantly faces this challenge to its rentention of power and consequently it must be ever alive to problems calling for solution. Otherwise, it faces recall at the polls.

The duty of Mr. Average Citizen is that of trustee over his country's well-being and successful continuance. He does this first by voting for the candidate of his choice, and second, having elected him, he strives to keep constantly in touch with him, so that the voice of the Congressman or Senator or councilman or board member is ever the voice of those whom he represents. Only thus may representation be effective and operative. Only by this means can our precious heritages be perpetuated.

For our system of government to survive, strong and resolute, as it has for over 150 years, it is important that we put our shoulders to the wheel together, to the end that these God-given tenets of American constitutional self-rule be carried out in full conformity with the just consent and expressed wish of those who are to be governed.

Americanism is your business.

Government is your job.

You Asked For It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE M. RHODES
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 11, 1954

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial from the Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employes Journal:

YOU ASKED FOR IT

"The grass will grow in the streets of a hundred cities, a thousand towns; the weeds will overrun the fields on a million farms." This was the prediction of former President Herbert Hoover on October 31, 1932 when hungry men, women, and children were red-eyed from watching for the prosperity that was just around the corner.

With the election of Franklin D. Roosevelt, the Republican Party prophesied the doom of our country. There were charges of boondoggling and the vanquished scoffed at the Federal works project, but the people were no longer haunted by dreams of a chicken in every pot and a car in every garage.

Within the first month of his term in office Roosevelt opened the closed banks and acted to restore Federal credit by abolishing the worst forms of waste. He relieved distress by Federal grants, created the Civilian Conservation Corps, and stopped mortgage foreclosures on farms and homes. In rapid succession came the farm relief law, Tennessee Valley Authority, National Recovery Act, and many more. Our devastated national forests took on new life by the planting of trees. Thousands of acres of land were reclaimed, and the wheels of industry turned again. This was the New Deal.

The Democratic Party under Truman weakened at the seams, and when the time was ripe for a propaganda campaign, the Republicans opened fire. Promises to bring the boys home from Korea, lower taxes, full production, and more jobs was effective ammunition and the New Deal was discarded for a Utopia, just around the corner.

Have the people a right to question the homespun sincerity of the man in the White House in the short period he has been at the helm? If the failure to carry out his campaign pledges is a criterion of his intentions, then the people have such right. Where are the million new homes, the 5 million jobs and the new security promised them? Suppose we look at the record.

With Hoover towns (slums) in every city, 2 million homes are needed yearly to provide a decent dwelling for every American family. Even if we meet this goal, it will take until 1960 to complete the project. The Senate recently approved a public-housing program calling for 35,000 units to be built in each of the next 4 years. This can be appreciated after the attempt to kill the entire housing program. The Douglas motion to construct 300,000 units in the next 4 years and the suggestion of the A. F. of L. executive council for at least 200,000 units a year received little consideration. From all appearances this is the fulfillment of the party's pledge to those who are compelled to live in slums, but why is the President silent on this vital question? Was his pledge to provide better housing just campaign talk?

Why bring up reduction in taxes when it is a dead issue? The big boys have received theirs and now the coupon clippers can laugh up their sleeves. Not satisfied with adding insult to injury by denying the small fry a $20 reduction in his income tax, Congress now is attempting to appease him by a child-care deduction plan for children up to 12 years of age. We maintain that if coupon clippers are to receive special consideration, then the man in the street who earns his bread by the sweat of his brow is entitled to the same. Under the administration's plan if a taxpayer's income was all dividends and came to $5,000 he would pay $200 in taxes, while the $5,000-a-year wage earner would pay $420. Understanding this, it is not difficult to see which way the wind blows. It is estimated that the House bill calling for the baby-sitting provision will cost the Treasury $40 million a year. Don't be alarmed if some Senator or Congressman comes up with something on birth control if the bill becomes law.

We must not mention recession even though unemployment is at the highest peak since the war. With a labor surplus in 31 industrial areas added within the last 30 days, the total now is 123. This may not mean much to the man with a job, but overall personal income has declined $500 million since March. If this continues Hoover's prediction may come sooner than we think; but there is still some hope. What about the appropriations for a Federal works project we heard so much about a short time ago? "Critical" was the word that would decide when the program would get underway. What are we waiting for?

On September 20, 1952, Candidate Eisenhower said to his listeners: "The people who pay the taxes will know where we are going. They will know that we are on our way toward a balanced budget, toward reduction in the national debt, toward lower taxes." The man who said this has repeatedly asked Congress to raise the debt ceiling. In his 1954 budget message the President confessed: "It is not prudent to operate the huge business of the United States Government in such a straitjacket as the present debt limit." How times have changed. He also said when campaigning for President: "We can reduce our budget. We can cut down our taxes. We can live within our means. That is what the brains of America can do if we just give them a chance." When, yes when, are the brains of America going to do all this? That is what the people wish to know. Will it be when the grass grows in the streets of a hundred cities, a thousand towns, as Hoover predicted? Well, you might as well smile and like it—you asked for it.

Connecticut Rural Letter Carriers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTONI N. SADLAK
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 11, 1954

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, the Rural Letter Carriers Association of the State of Connecticut this year is observing the 50th anniversary of its affiliation with the national association. The active membership of the Connecticut branch includes 3 women rural letter carriers. At this year's State convention, Miss Rose J. Ferrante, a rural letter carrier from Middlebury, was elected State president, having previously served in other offices. This is the first time in the Connecticut history that a lady was elected as president. This remarkable attainment seemed to me to be not only an indication of great progress but also the first time nationally that such an honor had been won by our ladies. After inquiry, I found that Miss Ferrante had a predecessor nationwide inasmuch as Mrs. Cassie Toresdahl had served as president of the Montana Rural Letter Carriers Association from 1948 to 1950. Not only do our women rural letter carriers perform their duties well but they also take an active participation in their organization and, when elected to office, prove their capability to provide leadership for their fellow members.

Tax Relief, But for Whom?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 9, 1954

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, there has been a lot of whooping and hollering in the aftermath of passage of the administration's new tax bill, but to those of our citizenry who must squeeze the Saturday's groceries out of an already slimmed-down lower-income pay envelope, the celebration takes on some completely different overtones.

When all is said and done and the oratory is finished, we are faced once again, as always, with the hard, cold facts of the matter. And the picture is not a rosy one.

To those who do not fit into the special, selective category of certain businesses and individuals who are helped by this bill—and this first group includes a preponderence of those who earn a yearly income of under $5,000—the term "tax relief" comes as a hollow expression. For the average wage earner, solace must be taken in the thought that a little tax-relief is better than none.

Under the tax revision bill which has just cleared the Congress, and I voted against it down the line, 73 percent of the relief will go to corporations and another 18 percent to those whose incomes are over $5,000 a year. Only 9 percent of the relief will be given to those whose incomes are under $5,000 a year.

Yet 80 percent of taxpayers earn less than $5,000 a year.

Those who comprise a great majority of our population merit only token reductions.

There is a song, a passage of which aptly describes this type of relief. It goes something like this: "The rich get richer; the poor get poorer." The title of the song is "Ain't We Got Fun." But it "ain't" funny. Tax reductions ought to be more properly spread, and the net result would be to buttress our economy and to balance more nearly our budget, which in fiscal 1954 operated at a net deficit of approximately $3 billion.

There are some sound and beneficial provisions in the bill which are laudable. But there are others which point out clearly the extent to which the proponents of the "trickle-down" taxation theory are willing to go in serving selected interests. Probably the most obvious of these provisions is that setup by the exclusion and credit against tax for dividend income.

Under that proviso, the first $50 in dividends would be excluded from taxation, and a credit against tax equal to 4 percent of the balance is made possible.

This would mean that an individual with $50 or less in dividends from savings will be entirely exempt from tax on that amount, or an individual with $250 in such dividends would exclude the first $50 entirely, and then reduce his total tax by $8, which is 4 percent of the balance of $200.

Such savings cannot be said to be in favor of the average taxpaying citizen.

It seems only ordinary common sense that the way in which to revive a sagging economy is to make available more consumer purchasing capital with which to buy some of the many products presently gathering dust upon merchants' shelves.

Business needs the proper shot in the arm. Witness this truth in the fact that, in the State of Michigan alone, during the first 5 months of 1954, there were over twice as many failures in business as there were during the same period during 1953.

In the month of May 1954 in our own State, business collapses were approximately 2½ times what they were during the same month in the year previous.

Through the first half of 1954, total failures in our country were 5,624. In the same period in 1953, there were 4,284, which brings the national average increase to 34 percent, considerably less than the Michigan percentage.

There are many reasons for this downturn. Certain losses may be ascribed to error in judgment by business owners. Generally speaking, however, it seems that rising unemployment, smaller take-home by those wage-earners who are working, and the resulting lack of purchasing funds in the hands of the greater majority of people has acted to discourage sales. When sales are slow, inventory moves at an equally slow pace. This results in a correspondingly sharp fall-off in production, and this in turn means unemployment, which starts the circle off again, only at a dizzier pace.

If our economy needs a boost, it should be done in an effective and equitable manner, which, in my judgment, is most wisely accomplished by releasing consumer buying power. This can be done best by an increase in individual exemptions, rather than on the basis on which it has generally been done in this bill. Selective assistance to selected groups makes for injustice, inequity, and ultimately an unhealthy national economy.

There have been claims that this bill will result in a reduction in the national tax burden of approximately $7 billion. Actually, the figures are misleading. The figure comes closer to $1.363 billion. Most of the reduction claimed as part of the larger figure came about by expiration of law of a previous Congress, rather than by affirmative action by the present one.

However, even the lower figure, in view of the selective basis on which it was granted, does not do the job it ought.

I would be acting with a callous disregard of the wishes of the best interests of the many whom I represent were I to go on record in favor of a tax program which necessitates the payment of so much of the cost of Government by so many of those least able to pay.

If we cannot adequately provide this year for the type of tax relief which is so desperately needed, then we should address ourselves to the accomplishment of this task just as soon as circumstances and the limitations of human energy and ability permit.

We must and do dedicate our efforts to making available, at an early date, the effective type of tax relief which our average-income citizens—and they are in the great majority—are lacking at the present time.

The Gettysburg Address—It Might Have Been

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. ALEXANDER SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 11, 1954

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, in the midst of our deliberations on serious matters, I think it sometimes helpful to have a touch of humor injected.

I have received a document, which is rather brief, but will be most illuminating to any of us as an amusing bedtime story. It is entitled "Gettysburg Address—It Might Have Been."

At this time I shall read only the first paragraph, as follows:

> Has the reader ever pondered as to what might have happened if President Lincoln had lived in another era, and, in keeping with the times, had seen fit to clear his memorable Gettysburg Address through "channels"? A State Department officer had this frightening thought some months ago and, in the spirit of good, clean fun, "whomped" up the following memorandum to illustrate what might have been. In the same fine spirit, we pass on to you his "Minutes of the Extraordinary Special Subcommittee on Annual and Other Reports, To Consider a Draft Statement: The Gettysburg Address."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the entire article printed in the Appendix of the Record, for the information of our comrades in the Senate.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

THE GETTYSBURG ADDRESS—IT MIGHT HAVE BEEN

Has the reader ever pondered as to what might have happened if President Lincoln had lived in another era, and, in keeping with the times, had seen fit to clear his memorable Gettysburg Address through "channels"? A State Department officer had this frightening thought some months ago and, in the spirit of good clean fun, "whomped" up the following memorandum to illustrate what might have been. In the same fine spirit, we pass on to you his "Minutes of the Extraordinary Special Subcommittee on Annual and Other Reports To Consider a Draft Statement: The Gettysburg Address."

NOVEMBER 25, 1951

The Budget Bureau said that it thought the first draft was a good one, and agreed, in general, with the conclusions which had been reached. It objected, however, to the opening paragraph on the grounds that it was too specific and committed the program of the President when it was not necessary to do so. In place of "four score and seven," the Bureau suggested the words "a number of years ago."

The Bureau felt that "we cannot hallow this ground" might be regarded by some to be in conflict with the Brannan farm plan, and pointed out the similarity of the words "hallow" and "harrow" when used with reference to the ground. In general, the sentence was thought to be a negative one and might easily be eliminated.

It was pointed out by the Bureau that "we here highly resolve" is technically incorrect, in that only Congress can resolve. It recommended in its place the phrase "we here generally coordinate" or "we generally coordinate here."

The Bureau noted several words and phrases, such as "unfinished work," "increasing devotion," "long remember," "great task remaining before us," etc., which it felt were not good choices, in view of the general administrative sensitivity about the size of the national debt, and the prospects for fiscal 1953. It said that it would not make an issue over them, however.

At the conclusion of its comments the Bureau observed that it did not have a vote on the committee, and preferred that it be regarded only as having made suggestions. It also noted that it will have an opportunity later to make whatever changes it sees fit, regardless of what the committee does.

The State Department commented that the word "dedicate" appeared in the text five times. As an editorial change, the Department suggested that some other words be used, such as "apotheosize" for "dedicate." The Secretary said he would attempt to do something about it.

State objected to the phrase "brought forth on this continent" on the ground that, while technically correct, it gave the impression that we felt the entire continent belonged to us, a position in conflict with our present hemispheric policy. It suggested as a substitute "brought forth in that area bounded on the north by 49° north latitude, on the south by 30° north latitude, on the west by the Pacific Ocean, and on the east by the Atlantic."

State also pointed out that reference to "nation" was in error since it is a popular term with no basis in international law. It recommended in its place "member state." There was also objection to the phrase "our poor power" in view of the fact that it gave the impression of unseemly modesty, we really being a major power. State said, however, that it had no alternative language to suggest and recommended that the staff work on it.

State said that it could not agree to the phrase "the world will little note" because only the State Department, as the statutory agency of foreign policy, had authority to comment on what might happen in the rest of the world. It said it would be willing to agree, however, to some innocuous phrase such as "There will probably be only a few people who will note," etc.

State said that there was strong objection in the Department to the use of such phrases as "conceived in liberty," "created equal," "birth of freedom," and "government of the people, by the people, and for the people." These statements, while they might be basically true, might offend a number of member states which did not believe in liberty, freedom, or equality, and it was felt that in the interests of international harmony, it would be better if they were eliminated. The same comment was made with respect to "under God" because there are many countries which do not officially acknowledge the existence of God.

State also objected to such suggestive words as "conceived," "brought forth," "new birth," etc., on the grounds that they might in view of the Bergman-Rosellini incident embarrass friends in Italy.

The Post Office Department said that it had no objection to the speech as it was written, but felt, on hearing the comments of some of the other Departments, that they were extremely well taken.

Defense, in introducing its remarks, said that great credit should be given to the working groups which had prepared the draft. Its own comments would be brief.

The phrase "engaged in a Great Civil War" should be eliminated since mention of war made many people think of the costs of war and this was, unfortunately, often reflected in the military budgets. In its place, Defense suggested "entered upon a period of civil uncertainty involving fairly full mobilization." Defense said that the phrase "all men are created equal" was objectionable to the Air Force but that, in the interest of unification, it would not make an issue of it.

There was also objection by Defense to such phrases as "brave men, living and dead," and "honored dead" on the grounds that this unnecessarily called attention to one of the byproducts of war to which many people still objected. Defense said that it felt that the tone of the entire speech was slightly on the morbid side and it would prefer that it be rewritten in a lighter vein, although it had no specific language to suggest.

The Treasury Department said it, like Post Office, felt that the speech was a pretty good job and had only one suggestion to make. The tone, it felt, emphasized land operations which gave the erroneous impression that the Civil War was entirely a land war. As a matter of record, it pointed out that there were a number of sea engagements. Although it had no specific language to suggest, it urged that mention be made of air-sea rescue.

The Civil Aeronautics Board said that it felt the speech was an excellent first draft for which the working group was to be commended. It said, however, that it had several general suggestions to make. The Board reported that its general counsel had had difficulty with the phrase "fitting and proper" and recommended that "fair and reasonable" be substituted. Note was made of State's earlier objection to "government of the people," etc., and the Board indicated that it would agree with State to its elimination. If it were to be kept, it recommended that it be toned down since there was some question whether a quasi-judicial body, such as the Board, could legally be included in a government of, by, and for the people.

The Commerce Department said it regretted that it had not had sufficient time to coordinate fully all of the interested areas in the Department, and, for that reason, would not be able to take a position. Commerce said, however, that on the basis of some of the comments already received, it had a few editorial changes to suggest and turned over to the Secretary a paper containing 253 of them.

Decision: It was decided to recommit the address to a working group for further study. In addition to the Department of State, Defense, Treasury, Post Office, and Commerce, the Civil Aeronautics Board, and the Budget Bureau, the following agencies will be invited to participate:

Agriculture, because of the possible implication of such phrases as "hallowed ground" and "perish from the earth."

The American Battle Monuments Commission, because of general interest in the field.

The Federal Power Commission, re "our poor power."

Analysis of the New Tax Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1954

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, while there is a general understanding of the overall effects of the new tax-reduction bill recently passed by Congress, there is some confusion among my constituents over provisions having widespread effect on individual taxpayers.

Without attempting a technical analysis of the bill, I believe that a summary of some of the more salient features will be helpful to many individuals in the 16th Ohio Congressional District.

The benefits outlined herein, of course, are in addition to the 10 percent cut in Federal income taxes which went into effect last January 1.

AID TO FARMERS

Deductions up to 25 percent of farm income are allowed for soil and water conservation.

More rapid writeoff of the expense of farm machinery, equipment, and construction, is provided.

Tax on the proceeds of the sale of cattle is removed when the sale is necessitated by disease.

SICKNESS AND ACCIDENT PLANS

Premiums paid by employers to health and accident plans will not be taxable to the employees.

All accident and health benefits paid as reimbursement for actual medical expenses to employees, their wives, or children, are completely exempted from tax.

Payments to employees for loss of wage due to injury or illness are exempted up to $100 per week.

RETIREMENT INCOME CREDIT

All retired persons 65 and over will in effect be exempt on all retirement income up to $1,200. The same exemption will apply to individuals under 65 such as school teachers, policemen, and so forth, if they receive a pension from a public-retirement system.

PENSIONS AND ANNUITIES

In addition to the $1,200 exemption on retirement income, the bill provides a simpler method of taxation of pension and annuities. It ends the annual 3 percent tax paid on annuities, and provides instead a method of computing tax on basis of cost divided by years of life expectancy.

MEDICAL EXPENSES

Medical expenses can be deducted when they exceed 3 percent of income, instead of 5 percent as under present law. For example, a family with $3,000 gross income and medical expenses of $150 will be able to deduct $60. The same family can deduct nothing today.

The bill doubles the present maximum limit on the amount that can be deducted.

CREDIT PURCHASES

Deduction for interest up to 6 percent on installment purchases is provided.

DEPENDENTS

A parent can claim a deduction of $600 for each child regardless of the child's earnings if the child is under 19 and the parent continues to furnish more than half the child's support.

A parent can claim the $600 dependency deduction for a child over 18 regardless of the child's earnings if the child is attending school or college, or receiving on-the-farm training, and the parent continues to furnish more than half the child's support.

An aged parent or other dependent cared for by several members of a family can be claimed as a deduction by one of the members of the family.

A taxpayer can claim $600 dependency deduction for any person, regardless of relationship, if the taxpayer supports that person in his home.

CHILD-CARE EXPENSES

Single working parents, such as a widow, are allowed a deduction up to $600 for the expense of child care for children up to 12 years of age.

The same deduction is allowed for a married woman who must work because her husband is incapacitated.

The same deduction is allowed with respect to any dependent, regardless of age, who is mentally or physically incapable of caring for himself.

HEAD OF FAMILY

A single taxpayer who has a dependent son or daughter will be entitled during the first 2 years after the death of spouse to the same income-splitting privilege as is accorded married couples.

A single individual can receive half the benefits of income splitting if there is a dependent parent for whom the taxpayer maintains a household.

DEATH BENEFITS

The bill exempts all death benefits up to $5,000 paid by an employer to the widow or other beneficiary of an employee.

DIVIDEND CREDIT

The first $50 in dividends is excluded from taxation, and a credit equal to 4 percent of the balance is provided.

LIFE INSURANCE

The estate tax on the proceeds of certain life insurance policies is lessened.

DEPRECIATION

More liberal writeoff of the cost of new equipment is provided. For example, in the first year of life of new equipment, the taxpayer will be able to write off twice the amount now allowed.

FILING TAX RETURNS

Tax returns will be due April 15 instead of March 15, giving the taxpayers an additional month in which to prepare their final tax returns and make payments.

The Need for a Constitutional Amendment Relating to Treaties and Executive Agreements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 9, 1954

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, as this session of Congress is about to close, I want to express my very deep disappointment that the so-called Bricker amendment failed to pass the Senate by the narrow margin of one vote. Notwithstanding this defeat the fight for a constitutional amendment affecting treaties and executive agreements must go forward.

I was encouraged to note, Mr. Speaker, that last week the distinguished senior Senator from Ohio, Mr. BRICKER, has again introduced a proposed constitutional amendment which would, in effect, meet the objections to treaties and secret agreements secretly arrived at.

The so-called Yalta agreement is only one of thousands of executive agreements that are supplementing treaties, closing deals and commiting the United States, throughout the world, in such a way that the American people do not even know what is going on. Certainly Congress has not been consulted as it should have been. The amendment proposed by Senator BRICKER and which he has promised to reintroduce immediately at the start of the new Congress in January will go far to educate our people as to the dangers that lurk in these treaties and secret agreements.

It has been said that treaties to be valid must be approved by the Senate but, Mr. Speaker, it is well known that only a few of these treaties have actually been submitted to that body. At Yalta where President Roosevelt committed this country to approve tremendous concessions for Russia, it was all a simple, informal deal between the heads of state that were meeting in the Crimea. Much of the understandings between these heads were kept secret and only now are reaching the people in piecemeal fashion. This is true also of the unfortunate Potsdam Conference immediately after the war where Mr. Truman was compelled to consummate the understandings at Yalta which by their very terms permitted Russia to loot the industrial potential of Germany. Not long thereafter the American taxpayer was called upon to furnish the money to replace and rehabilitate this very industrial equipment that had been removed by Russia and sent into Iron Curtain countries.

Mr. Speaker, it is now known that when the large United States air bases were being contemplated and constructed in North Africa, Congress had little knowledge of what was going on. When the North Atlantic Treaty Organization came into being, it has been admitted by the Department of State that as the result of that agreement, some 10,000 other agreements have been made committing the United States to all forms of obligations.

It is not difficult to understand the overwhelming attitude of the American people today when they protest the use of secret agreements in furthering foreign policy. Many of the national polls that have been taken, indicate that the people are demanding protection against secret agreements, by appropriate constitutional amendment. They want all doubt removed in this matter so as to avoid future Yaltas.

Mr. Speaker, in support of the argument that I have been making for a Bricker amendment, I call attention to the fact that in 15 years there have been issued about 200 formal treaties which have had the attention of Congress. This goes back to a period beginning in 1939. On the other hand, some 1,400 Executive agreements have come to light but Secretary of State John Foster Dulles has admitted that there have been thousands of unpublished agreements since World War II. This is indeed a situation that demands prompt attention by the Congress and the hearty support of the American people generally.

Mr. Speaker, it seems strange to me that the Department of State would admit that there are many unpublished secret agreements when, as a matter of law, the Secretary of State is required to publish all treaties and executive agreements. As early as 1895, such a law was enacted by the Congress and amended slightly in 1936 and in 1938. The last amendment, however, was Public Law 821 of the 81st Congress, approved on September 23, 1950, which provided for the publication of treaties and other international agreements, separately from the Statutes at Large. Here is the provision of that law:

> The Secretary of State shall cause to be compiled, edited, indexed, and published, beginning as of January 1, 1950, a compilation entitled "United States Treaties and Other International Agreements" which shall contain all treaties to which the United States is a party that have been proclaimed during each calendar year, and all international agreements other than treaties to which the United States is a party that have been signed, proclaimed, or with reference to which any other final formality has been executed, during each calendar year.

Mr. Speaker, upon the convening of the 84th Congress, this matter of secret treaties and secret agreements is a matter of unfinished business. It should have the immediate attention of the new Congress.

Yugoslav, Turkish, and Greek Pact

SPEECH

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1954

(Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, it is with very real pleasure that, as chairman of the Subcommittee on the Near East and Africa of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I call your attention to the pact just signed between Yugoslavia, Greece, and Turkey. This, Mr. Speaker, means more than is apparent to the casual reader. Looking back over the years as I do to the long history of wars in the Balkans and between Greece and Turkey, it is almost incredible that bitterness and suspicion should have given way to the mutual respect and understanding necessary to such an agreement. It speaks well for the statesmanship of the leaders of these three nations that this should have been accomplished in spite of previous antagonisms and wide differences of their social and political backgrounds. It speaks well for the understanding of their people of the need for unity and strength if freedom is to be protected not only in the western world but in the world as a whole. Surely this pact is indeed another link in the ever-growing strength of the defenses of our free world.

Ill Will Toward Minorities Is Not Sectional

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1954

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, repeatedly during the course of debates on civil-rights legislation, I have heard some of our southern friends say that these northerners refuse to understand that we have no Negro problem in the South and that they are constantly stirring up trouble with legislation about things they do not understand. I have always patiently responded that we understand the problem from our experiences with it. I always took time to point out that the matter was not sectional but common to every part of our land where minorities were found in any sizeable numbers.

The Brooklyn Eagle has just completed a series of articles on the Negro in Brooklyn. I placed them in the Congressional Record because I sincerely believed they were significantly important.

I now add to that an editorial on the subject which appeared in the Brooklyn Eagle of August 10, 1954.

I am certain it will be more shocking to many of our southern colleagues than to most northerners to note that in Brooklyn we have some persons so narrow of mind, so lacking in the knowledge of the true principles that make our country great, and so devoid of the divine spirit, that they seek to punish a newspaper, which in the best traditions of the fourth estate, attempts to ameliorate the conditions of some of their neighbors.

More power to the Brooklyn Eagle. For every advertisement it may lose on account of this public service, I am sure it will gain two others, plus a host of new readers.

My hat is off to a champion of our community.

The Eagle's Series on Negroes

The Eagle takes pride in the series of 15 articles devoted to a study of the Negro in our community, his achievements, and his hopes, which just concluded Sunday.

It was brought out by our special writer, Sid Frigand, that records dating back to 1633 reveal that Negroes then held property here as free men. They were pioneers. And today, nearly three and a quarter centuries later, our Negro Brooklynites, still pioneers, are painstakingly toiling to clear away the obstacles that stand between them and their modest goal of equal opportunity and community respect.

The articles have recounted the successes scored by our Negro neighbors and cited many of them who have risen to success and even distinction in their varied professions and callings.

But also it brought out that the Negroes here have known more than their share of social and economic inequities. Evils existing in housing opportunities for Negroes cannot be hush-hushed. They must be brought into the light and examined.

Public reaction to the series has been interesting. By actual count, 27 individual advertisements were withdrawn from the Eagle because of the sentiments expressed. On the other hand we have received words of praise from a great many sources, not only from Negroes but also from whites occupying important positions in the borough. The praise predominated by far. This was typical of Brooklyn.

As far as the Eagle is concerned, publication of the series represented fulfillment of our responsibility to the community.

Reservoir of Language Specialists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 11, 1954

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I send to the desk the text of a statement which I have prepared on the subject of widening the reservoir, so to speak, of American language specialists in the world today, in order that our country may be adequate to all its tremendous challenges on the world scene.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of this statement, together with the text of an appended memo—prepared at my request—by the American Council of Learned Societies, be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Statement by Senator Wiley

On July 31, I reproduced in the Congressional Record the text of a letter which I had just received from Dr. Mortimer Graves, executive director of the American Council of Learned Societies.

That letter may be found on page 12299 of the Congressional Record. In it, Dr. Graves pointed out that an item in the Russian newspaper, Pravda, indicated that the Russians were preparing language dictionaries in some 80 tongues. By contrast, the American Council of Learned Societies is in a position today to prepare dictionaries in only 3 languages.

This is but one of the unfortunate aspects of our present deficiency in foreign languages. Inevitably, therefore, there arises the question, "How can we—under these circumstances—possibly communicate effectively with foreign peoples, particularly those lesser known peoples with whom we have had comparatively little contact in recent years? If we cannot proficiently speak their language and instruct in it, and if they cannot speak ours, how can we possibly get across even our minimal basic concepts and how can they possibly get across theirs? How can we learn about their culture and they about ours? How can they secure technical know-how from us, and how can we understand them and their civilizations so that we, in turn, may profit from their background and experience?"

The barrier of language is encountered by us throughout the world, yet it is a barrier which can be overcome through the application of a reasonable amount of energy and finances. Overcoming the barrier is the indispensable first step in improving contacts with foreign peoples and in strengthening the fraternal bonds of the free world.

The Congress may appropriate hundreds of millions of dollars for a variety of programs—for military assistance, for United States Information programs, for various types of exchange programs and the like. But all these programs will be sadly handicapped if we do not expand the reservoir of United States language specialists. This cannot be done overnight. It should be commenced without further delay.

There follows now a preliminary memo on the problem prepared at my request by the American Council of Learned Societies:

"LANGUAGE PREPAREDNESS FOR NATIONAL SECURITY

"(A preliminary statement prepared by the American Council of Learned Societies, August 11, 1954)

"One of the aspects of a cold war is the constant danger of having one's opponent always prepared to take advantage of a local situation to further his own ends. For example, during the last 5 years Russian training centers have been producing graduates in Arab dialects spoken from Morocco to Indonesia. In this way, the Russians have produced persons capable of representing their government, and—even more important—their ideology, to millions of people. Meanwhile, America is incapable of waging this type of war for men's minds.

"This aspect of national defense has been woefully neglected. The newspapers the last few days have been headlining a crisis in Morocco. Who is competent either to report this situation accurately or to foresee developments vital to American interests? With the exception of the too few trained specialists, unable to work 24 hours a day for more than a few days at a time, there is no one.

"How can we best overtake the Russian lead in this race for the confidence and understanding of other peoples? Only by recognizing our weakness immediately and bracing ourselves to meet it. Fortunately, we are not entirely without resources. The American Council of Learned Societies before and during the Second World War spearheaded a language offensive. At that time the council had the vision to predict the importance of foreign-language training not only as a weapon for war but also as a potential weapon for peace.

"With the impetus of a crisis situation, support was forthcoming from the War Department and 30 textbooks, as well as recordings and dictionaries, were prepared and hundreds of persons received basic language training. This effort was new and was, in large part, experimental. Just as the techniques were beginning to prove themselves—and just as a Korean-English dictionary was ready for publication—the war ended. And so did Government interest in language training; the work was stopped, and that Korean dictionary has never been printed. As a result, the outbreak of the Korean war caught the United States in a little publicized but severely felt state of language unpreparedness; most of the nonnative knowledge of the Korean language was concentrated north rather than south of the Yalu River.

"The year 1954 found America deeply concerned with Vietnam. Who in the United States could read and understand any of the languages of Indochina? With one or two exceptions, only a few emigrees from those countries. How long can this Nation afford this type of ignorance? At the end of 1952 the Department of State had exactly one Thailand expert. In 1953 its man in charge of Thai language training was the victim of reduction in force. Last week, following the Vietnam armistice, we learned that Thailand was next in line. Is this economy?

"Recent elections in Andhra (south India) resulted in substantial gains for the Communist element and put it in opposition to a coalition group which is at least temporarily in power. The United States is greatly handicapped in this connection since no one connected with our Government can read Telegu, the language of the area.

"American inferiority in the language field cannot be remedied overnight through intensive training of a large number of persons in little-known languages. We are further behind than that in that we lack the necessary tools—textbooks, graded readers, and dictionaries which are indispensable to such training. What is even worse, we have an extremely limited reservoir of specialists capable of producing these tools. Mere knowledge of a foreign language does not qualify a person for this. Special training is an essential. For example, the American Council of Learned Societies, with limited private support, is making three dictionaries: Korean-English, Indonesian-English, and Burmese-English. Even with more money, what more could be done at this time? A fourth dictionary could be started, say for Arabic, or Persian, or the language of Afghanistan; and, with great difficulty, perhaps a fifth, but that would be the limit under present conditions. The only way that the situation could be improved, even during the next 10 years, would be the immediate establishment of a long-range program carrying adequate support.

"And where must this support come from? The task is so tremendous that no private source of funds, such as a foundation, no matter how interested and how generously inclined, can make more than a dent on it. The process is so expensive that no commercial organizations could or would attempt it. It is a national responsibility and, as such, must be nationally supported. Unfortunately, the Russians have found this out. They have recognized the production of language tools as being comparable in importance to the production of armaments and have made government funds available for this purpose. Hence, they have reached a point where they can report in Pravda as having 80 dictionaries in process.

"We should not make the mistake, however, of thinking that if sufficient funds could be made available tomorrow that we could begin making 80 dictionaries. With our limited resources of trained specialists, we must begin by the wise use of comparatively modest funds to be expended almost entirely for training. This training should, in the first instance, be directed toward those areas of most obvious strategic importance to American security—southeast Asia and the Arabic world. Recognition by the Congress of the urgency of this aspect of the national defense would go far toward mending the roof before the present showers become a cloudburst."

Weigh the Promises Against the Performance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 11, 1954

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include herewith excerpts from a report by James L. McDevitt, director of Labor's League for Political Education:

WEIGH THE PROMISES AGAINST THE PERFORMANCE

The Eisenhower administration is going to give you a lot of flattering attention between now and election day. They want the workingman's vote. They are going to try to persuade you to vote for a number of Congressmen and Senators who have done everything they could in the past to hurt you.

• • • • •

MINIMUM WAGES

On November 18, 1954, Eisenhower's Secretary of Labor Mitchell told a labor audience in Cleveland:

"I consider our minimum-wage statute can be a great bulwark against substandards of living. It is badly in need of shoring up. We are working hard to find ways and means to bring about an increase in the present 75-cent-an-hour minimum to a more realistic level in keeping with present-day levels."

Two months later in his economic report delivered on January 28, the President flatly opposed any increase in the 75-cent minimum wage. Then he devoted two pages of the report to questioning the very principle of any minimum wage.

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

Unemployment insurance is another case where the administration ran out on a promise. It was a perfect example of how States rights wreck sound legislation. * * *

On January 28 President Eisenhower made the very commendable recommendation that "all the States raise the potential duration of unemployment benefits to 26 weeks * * * raise these dollar maximums so that the payments to the great majority of the beneficiaries may equal at least half their regular earnings."

Secretary Mitchell wrote a letter to each Governor on February 16 "at the suggestion of the President" repeating the President's requests. Of course, nobody bothered to tell the American people that only 14 of the State legislatures would convene this year. Furthermore, under the present States rights law, there was nothing the President could do to force any State to improve its insurance.

So, Senator JOHN KENNEDY (Democrat, Massachusetts) and Representative AIME FORAND (Democrat, Rhode Island) introduced bills in both Houses requiring the States to raise their standards to the exact amount requested by the President.

But Congressman DANIEL REED, GOP chairman of the committee handling the bill, told the House:

"The administration definitely opposes the pending proposal to reach this objective by imposing Federal standards on the States."

Consequently, the bill was defeated in the House on July 8, with 173 Republicans voting against the bill and only 17 for it.

A few days later, on July 13, the Senate turned down Senator KENNEDY's amendment, 56 to 30. On the Republican side 42 Senators voted against the measure and only 3 for it.

After the voting was over, Senate Labor Committee Chairman ALEXANDER SMITH from New Jersey anounced:

"I have checked with the White House, and the President was opposed to the Kennedy amendment."

It's the old story. There is a lot of difference between a politician's promise and his performance.

LIPSERVICE FOR LABOR

In Secretary of Labor Mitchell's prepared script offered each GOP Congressman he says in part: "All you have to do is look at President Eisenhower's program, which is directed toward the improvement of the working conditions, the health, and the earnings of the wage earners of the United States to prove that the Eisenhower administration is more friendly and has more to offer to the working men and women than any administration in recent years."

Unfortunately, those words just don't square with the record. Even though Eisenhower has sometimes given lipservice to labor's needs, he has failed to fight for these programs.

But we know that Eisenhower can fight like a caged tiger for the things he wants. Unfortunately, the record shows he wants to fight that hard only for reactionary programs which benefit the special-interest lobbies which supported him in 1952.

Look at the bitter battle he waged to force through special tax loopholes for wealthy stockholders.

Look at the administration's stubborn Senate fight to force the Atomic Energy Commission, against its own desires, to give away TVA power rights to a private utility combine at an extra cost to the taxpayers of $92 million.

• • • • •

Why didn't he have his congressional lieutenants fight as hard to take what he called union-busting provisions out of Taft-Hartley? Why did he back down on the 19 amendments he promised former Secretary of Labor Martin Durkin last year? Why did he officially recommend this year that Congress permit the States to outlaw the right to strike and picket?

Why didn't he put up the same kind of fight for his housing bill? Last year when Congress retroactively cut back units already contracted for, Eisenhower called it a perfectly acceptable compromise. * * *

Even on social security the President's present sound position is a complete switch from last year. At that time he was cracking the whip for the chamber of commerce plan to wipe out the $17 billion reserve fund and go back to a charity program which the chamber miscalled pay as you go. Even his much publicized health reinsurance scheme was actually considered a meaningless joke by all sides on Capitol Hill.

The President can't blame Congress for the tideland oil giveaway. He can't blame Congress for his appointment of biased, unqualified representatives of industry to the NLRB, to the Federal Power Commission, to the Federal Trade Commission, and many other important administrative agencies. * * *

* * * We have studied Eisenhower's detailed messages to Congress. We have witnessed his administrative appointments. We have observed which programs he fights to enact and which he lets die. We are forced to one conclusion: We think his program is bad for all Americans.

For that reason, Labor's League for Political Education urges every trade-union member to register and vote this year. We all have a stake in electing a Congress which will protect the people from the legislative demands of this administration.

Proposals To Amend the Constitution of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR.

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 6, 1954

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement which I made with relation to certain constitutional amendments which were proposed; and also to have printed thereafter an article from the New Yorker magazine, written by Richard H. Rovere; and also to have printed an article entitled "Congress Has 107 Proposals To Amend the Constitution," written by Tom Yarbrough, staff correspondent of the Post-Dispatch, St. Louis, Mo., written on May 29, 1954.

Mr. HENNINGS subsequently said:

Mr. President, last Friday I asked and received unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the New Yorker magazine with relation to certain proposed amendments to the Constitution. At that time I did not have an estimate from the Public Printer. I am now advised that the cost will be $233.75 for 2¾ pages. This is a worthwhile article which I believe will be of interest to all of my colleagues, and I ask unanimous consent to insert it in the Appendix.

There being no objection, the statement and articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HENNINGS

No Member of this body, I am sure, is unaware of the fact that in this 83d Congress we have been confronted with a spate of proposals for amending the Constitution of the United States. Most of my colleagues are probably aware, too—perhaps because I may have occasionally seemed tedious in the process—that I have repeatedly spoken out against amending the Constitution in what I consider to be an offhand and haphazard fashion. The point I have consistently endeavored to make is that proposed amendments should be subjected to the most critical scrutiny and careful consideration before they are approved by a committee of the Senate and, further, that they should be subjected to the full give-and-take of public opinion and Senate debate before they are submitted to the States for inclusion in the basic law of our land. It is my firm conviction that the Senate of the United States is charged with an important responsibility in this regard which, unfortunately, I think we have not always lived up to.

At the risk of being repetitious, I would like to say that I made this point along with numerous other arguments against the so-called Bricker amendment that would have, in my judgment, seriously jeopardized the power of the Chief Executive to carry out his proper responsibilities in conducting our foreign affairs. I made this point in connection with the amendment to alter the composition and jurisdiction of the Supreme Court—an amendment, incidentally, that was given no more consideration than was afforded in a 1-day hearing in the Judiciary Committee before it was brought up on the Senate floor. I made the same point in connection with the amendment to extend voting rights to citizens at the age of 18.

At that time, I said that I had voted to report the amendment to the Senate for the purpose of full discussion and debate. I noted that the debate apparently was going to consume less than half a day and that I hoped we might have a more thorough discussion after what seemed to me very meager committee hearings on a matter so vital as that of amending the Constitution of the United States. I also raised the question at that time as to whether we might be trying to find an outlet for our psychological frustrations and anxieties over the tremendous world problems which confront us by taking whacks at the Constitution. And I asked further whether the Senate of the United States was to be merely a conduit or a channel through which various attempts to amend the Constitution are to be funneled, or if we do not have the solemn and definite constitutional responsibility to weigh and to determine whether an amendment should be submitted to the States.

In that connection, Richard H. Rovere, in his thoughtful article in the June 19 New Yorker, pointed out what many observers regard as a significant change in the attitude of many Senators toward their responsibility in this field. As Mr. Rovere states:

"The traditional view of Senate responsibility is the one expressed by George Washington, who, being asked by Jefferson why he favored having a Senate, countered by asking Jefferson why he poured some of his coffee into his saucer; when Jefferson replied that he wanted his coffee cooler, Washington said, 'Even so. We pour legislation in the senatorial saucer to cool it.' In what appears to be the new and spreading view here, it is the Senate's job to give the most important kind of legislation no chance at all to cool but to pass it, piping hot, directly to the States."

And he goes on to say: "As far as anyone here knows, there has never been a time in the past when Congressmen supported alterations in the Constitution with lighthearted assertions of indifference to the proposal itself and confidence in its value as a conversation piece."

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to insert in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Mr. Rovere's letter from Washington dealing with this question.

I would also like to call the attention of my colleagues to a recent article in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch by Tom Yarbrough entitled "Congress Has 107 Proposals To Amend the Constitution." Mr. Yarbrough has presented a most informative discussion on the great scope and variety of this administration's astounding number of proposed constitutional amendments. I ask unanimous consent to have his article inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

An interesting sidelight is that the St. Louis Post-Dispatch reproduced, in connection with this article, the fine Herblock cartoon to which Mr. Rovere also referred. It depicts two legislators sitting idly before a huge stack of documents, heavy with cobwebs, labeled legislative program. One legislator, apparently weary of the game of making paper airplanes out of the bills before him, comments to his colleague: "This bores me. Let's amend the Constitution today."

I cannot deny that I was gratified to see the proposed amendment relating to the Supreme Court defeated this week in the House Judiciary Committee. The majority of the committee members voted as they did because they felt that the proposal required more careful study and consideration than could be afforded it this year.

I would like to say in conclusion, that much as I am opposed to the precipitateness with which the Senate seems to be trying to alter the basic covenant of our Nation, it would, in my judgment, be equally foolish to oppose each and every constitutional amendment merely for the sake of opposition. There may very well be some amendments, which, having emerged from the cauldron of the most careful committee hearings and consideration and public discussion and full Senate debate, we may decide are sound and necessary. But let us, I earnestly urge, recognize that we have a responsibility and let us bring to these matters the kind of mature deliberation that is expected of the United States Senate.

[From the New Yorker of June 19, 1954]

LETTER FROM WASHINGTON

(By Richard H. Rovere)

Herbert Block, the Post and Times Herald cartoonist, recently published a sketch of two statesmen, presumably Senators, seated dejectedly before an untidy heap of papers representing that part of the administration's legislative program which is not getting legislated; the pair would have looked the very soul of ennui even if Mr. Block had not caused one of them to be flying a paper airplane, presumably made from a doomed bill, and the other to be saying: "This bores me. Let's amend the Constitution today." As usual, Mr. Block, whose name appears on the latest list of Pulitzer price winners, has spotted a trend. Indeed, on this occasion he has spotted a brace of trends—one toward bored statesman, the other toward Constitution-amending as a diversion, like Scrabble. The present session, which has dragged its feet on the Eisenhower program and has shown a notable lack of interest in getting on with such essential public business as authorization and appropriation, has displayed an enormous zest for framing, debating, and recommending alterations in the basic charter of the Republic. Since the opening of this Congress, there have been brought to the floor of the Senate, which seems to be the kicking-off place for Constitutional amendments nowadays, no fewer than six proposed amendments, all of which have been supported by simple majorities and four of which have been supported by the two-thirds majority that is necessary to refer the proposals to the House of Representatives and, after that, to the State legislatures. The debate on one of these—the Bricker amendment, which evolved gradually and against the will of its author into the George amendment—compared favorably in length and wordage, if not in eloquence, with the original debate, at the State House in Philadelphia in 1787, on the document it would very likely have modified if it had not fallen one vote short of the majority needed.

(It may well be that the last has not been heard of the George amendment, for a motion to reconsider it, sponsored by Senator LENNON, of North Carolina, has much support.)

The other amendment that was brought to the floor and rejected was one to have the Federal Government extend the franchise to citizens between the ages of 18 and 21. Introduced by Senator LANGER, of North Dakota, and endorsed by President Eisenhower, it failed of passage by five votes. Of the 4 amendments that have cleared the Senate, 1 would fix the number of Supreme Court Justices at 9 and make retirement at 75 compulsory for all Federal judges except those appointed for a stipulated number of years; one would prevent Presidential seizure of property except on congressional authority; another, the so-called equal-rights amendment, is intended to end discrimination based on sex; and the fourth, introduced by Senator KNOWLAND, would provide a means whereby the State governors might fill vacancies in the House of Representatives in the event that this city was made the target of an atomic or hydrogen bomb. Senator KNOWLAND's amendment won approval less than a week ago, by a vote of 70 to 1. The solitary naysayer was Senator STENNIS, of Mississippi; he is of the opinion that there is altogether too much amending going on here, and he opposed this amendment not so much to express dissatisfaction with its provisions as to register his disapproval of what he regords as a frivolous approach to the Constitution.

The amendments the Senate has thus far discussed are a selection from perhaps a hundred that have been introduced in this Congress and referred to committee. Some, like the one that passed last week, are merely procedural in nature; some are quaint; some are bizarre; and some are almost revolutionary. There are several proposals for repeal of the income tax; several that embody formulas for limiting nonmilitary expenditures to a fixed percentage of the national income (5, 10, 14, and 20 being among the percentages suggested); 1 to forbid the expenditure of a single dollar of Federal funds for any purpose covered by the term "general welfare"; 1 prohibiting conscripts from serving in any foreign country except in time of war; 1 prohibiting any American troops from serving in any foreign country except on the soil of the country we are fighting against; 1 to deprive new States of representation in the Senate or to limit the representation to 1 Senator (this being proposed despite the fact that the Constitution stipulates that, as the single respect in which it is never to be amended, no State without its consent, shall be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate); 1 to prevent interference with or limitation upon the power of any State to regulate health, morals, education, marriage, and good order in the State; 1 to redefine treason to include the activities not only of persons working for the overthrow of the Government but of those working for the weakening of it, whether or not by force or violence; 1 to give Congress control over trademarks; 1 to provide for the holding in perpetuity of patents and copyrights; and 1 to add to the Constitution the assertion that "this Nation devoutly recognizes the authority and law of Jesus Christ, Saviour and Ruler of nations through whom are bestowed the blessings of Almighty God" and at the same time to provide a new oath or affirmation for citizens whose religious scruples prevent them from giving unqualified allegiance to the Constitution as herein amended.

There is nothing out of the ordinary in either the number or the character of the proposed amendments now in committee; there have been times in the past when the House and Senate Committees on the Judiciary, which get all the resolutions for constitutional changes, have had many more than a hundred amendments on their dockets, a good proportion of them at least as curious as some of those now pending. Over the years, it has become customary for Congressmen to cast the drollest and most dubious schemes submitted to them by friends and supporters in the form of constitutional amendments; they have done this secure in the knowledge that the proposals would be allowed to gather dust until the sitting Congress was succeeded by another. What is decidedly new about the present situation is that as many as four amendments have been reported out of committee and that as many as 2 have carried one House of Congress. In no Congress within living memory has anything of this sort happened; it is a rare Congress that seriously considers even one amendment. A number of observers here who have pondered this speed-up see behind it what they regard as a significant change in the attitude of many Senators toward their responsibilities in this field. The traditional view of Senate responsibility is the one expressed by George Washington, who, being asked by Jefferson why he favored having a Senate, countered by asking Jefferson why he poured some of his coffee into his saucer; when Jefferson replied that he wanted his coffee cooler, Washington said, "Even so. We pour legislation in the senatorial saucer to cool it." In what appears to be the new and spreading view here, it is the Senate's job to give the most important kind of legislation no chance at all to cool but to pass it, piping hot, directly to the States.

This view was given vivid and forceful expression in the course of the recent discussion over Senate Joint Resolution 53—the amendment extending suffrage to 18-year-olds. Senator DIRKSEN, of Illinois, and Senator KNOWLAND, of California, two of the most influential leaders of the 83d Congress, argued that it is less the duty of the Senate to pass upon the wisdom of a proposal for constitutional change than to give the 48 legislatures and, through them, the people of the States an opportunity to express themselves in regard to it. Senator DIRKSEN freely conceded that there were two possible views on the amendment—for and against—and that he had not decided which view he would choose for himself. He felt, however, that there was no need to tax his mind and conscience with the arguments, since it would be up to the legislatures to make the final determination and since a beneficial discussion would be bound to ensue. "I want the country to think about it," Senator DIRKSEN said. The best way to have the country think about it is to pass this proposal, send it to the House, send it to the State legislatures, and let the people of the country discuss it. * * * It will be a moot question [unless] the Congress takes action and exercises its prerogative under the Constitution of the United States by saying to the States of the Union, 'It is your baby now. Call in the people and hear from them, and then determine what in your judgment, should be done.'" He indicated that, for his part, he would be able to view the outcome with benign detachment: "If the legislatures say 'No,' that will be all right with the junior Senator from Illinois; if they say 'Yes,' it will also be all right with me."

Senator KNOWLAND, the majority leader, took substantially the same mellow, tolerant view. Although the amendment would obviously have diminished the authority of the States, since under the Constitution they are charged with determining the qualifications of voters and under this plan they would be forced to accept a uniform standard with respect to age, Senator KNOWLAND defended it not on its particular merits but, rather, as a device for according the States a rare chance to settle a broad and fundamental question of policy. He felt that, quite apart from whether or not it would be a good thing to allow 18-year-olds to vote, passage of the resolution would have "great value," because it would give "the people of the United States * * * an opportunity to express themselves on this very basic issue." Senator HENNINGS, of Missouri, several times asked Senator KNOWLAND to examine the implications of this position. "Is the Senate," he inquired, "to be merely a conduit, so to speak, or a channel through which various attempts to amend the Constitution of the United States are to be funneled so that they may be submitted to the State legislatures, or does the Senate have the solemn and definite constitutional responsibility to weigh and to determine whether an amendment should be submitted to the States?" Senator KNOWLAND made no direct reply to this question, but he asked some of his own that revealed a good deal about his point of view. "What in the world," he said, "are those who are opposing the amendment afraid of in submitting the matter to the 48 States of the Union? Why not let the States express themselves? I am willing to rely on the judgment of the States."

The attitude of the present Congress suggests that the views expressed by Senators DIRKSEN and KNOWLAND are shared by a formidable number of their colleagues. The Senate was well attended when they spoke, but objection was made to the doctrine they set forth by only a handful of states' rights southerners, and by Senator KENNEDY, of Massachusetts, who said that "reluctance to amend the Constitution is one of our most valuable safeguards and bulwarks of stability." There are more than a score of Senators, preponderantly from the administration party but numbering among them perhaps a half-dozen Members of the opposition, who have supported every one of the amendments thus far brought to the floor, and many of them have signified support for several of the proposed amendments still in committee. If a group of this size persists in the belief that the role of Congress should be essentially a permissive one, it would seem to follow that our political institutions are in for quite a round of overhauling. For there is no doubt in the mind of any qualified student of parliamentary institutions that there is less independence of judgment and a lower resistance to mobocracy in the State legislatures than in the Congress, and especially in the Senate. If any proposal that flatters a minority without offending a majority or has the surface aspect of exalting the flag, the home, the church, or strict economy, leaves Washington with the blessing of the Senate and the House, it is pretty certain to have clear sailing in most of the provincial assemblies. Had the Bricker amendment passed both Houses of Congress, either in its original form or in the form of Senator GEORGE's substitute, no amount of pleading by the President and the Secretary of State would have prevented it from becoming the 23d amendment before the end of this year. If the national legislature, which determines the expenditures that are to be met with the revenue from Federal income taxes, were to leave the question of repealing the 16th amendment up to the State legislatures, there could scarcely be any doubt of the outcome. Nor could there be much doubt, in the present atmosphere in this country, of what would happen if the Congress recommended that the States cooperate in broadening the definition of treason just a little, or in establishing a ceiling for Federal expenditures, or in praising Christianity; the State legislatures would collaborate eagerly, for their members would immediately sense the dangers of taking a position that exposed them to charges of coddling traitors, of favoring reckless and unlimited spending, or of being hostile to religion.

It is an odd, ironic circumstance that most of the recent attempts to alter the Constitution by means of amendment have been made by conservative leaders—men like Senators KNOWLAND and DIRKSEN, who have so often detected conspiracies on the part of others to flout, subvert, or evade the principles laid down in 1787. Nothing, it has been pointed out here on many recent occasions, could be more out of keeping with the language and the spirit of the Constitution than Senator DIRKSEN's it's-your-baby-now doctrine. Article V, which describes the amendment procedure, provides that an amendment may originate in the Congress "whenever two-thirds of both Houses shall deem it necessary." (Article V also provides an alternate means for amendment—a convention to be called by Congress upon a request from two-thirds of the States. No such request has ever been made, and those who admire the Constitution pretty much as it stands have uttered fervent prayers that no such request ever will be made. Conventions have a way of gathering a momentum of their own. The convention of 1787 was called to amend the Articles of Confederation, and ended by throwing out the Articles entirely and starting from scratch. It has always been feared that this is what would happen in the event of another convention, and that the laws of chance would run heavily against our getting a new constitution as good as the old.) The requirement that a sense of necessity, or urgency, exist—as it clearly did not in the minds of Senators DIRKSEN and KNOWLAND when they urged the passage of Senate Joint Resolution 53—has frequently been cited in judicial decisions and opinions. In a celebrated test of the 18th amendment, the question was raised as to whether those in Congress who voted for national prohibition were earnestly convinced that there was a need for it, and the Supreme Court held that the mere passage of the enabling resolution "sufficiently shows that the proposal was deemed necessary by all who voted for it. An express declaration that they regarded it as necessary is not essential." As far as anyone here knows, there has never been a time in the past when Congressmen supported alterations in the Constitution with lighthearted assertions of indifference to the proposal itself and confidence in its value as a conversation piece.

As Senator KENNEDY observed, this represents a profound change of temper in the Congress. But there are many people here who have pointed out that the Dirksen-Knowland doctrine is only one aspect of what appears to be a rapidly developing impatience and dissatisfaction not only with the Constitution as a written document but with the institutions that have either grown out of it or grown up alongside it. The plain fact of the matter, these people believe, is that a great many more Americans than even Senator McCARTHY would proscribe have somewhere along the line lost their faith in what the sloganeers call the American way, or our form of government. In such a forum as the Army-McCarthy hearings, for example, the introduction of so basic a constitutional concept as checks and balances or separation of powers produces either exasperation or boredom. The feeling seems to be that if there is something in the Constitution that requires the President of the United States to protect the confidence of his advisers, then whatever it is ought to be changed, provided it cannot simply be overlooked. There is an evident feeling on the part of many that if there is some gimmick of law or custom that makes it improper for Senator McCARTHY to be in possession of a document prepared for executive use, then the gimmick ought to be swept aside; clearly, the prevailing sentiment seems to be that it is more important for McCARTHY to be in on the doings of the executive branch than for the Nation to preserve some archaic notion about the right and privileges of one branch of government vis-a-vis another. Senator MUNDT has announced that he is working up a law to take care of that annoying situation. Similarly, the fifth amendment, which was regarded for over a century and a half as a guarantee of justice equivalent in importance to the right of habeas corpus, has fallen into terrible disrepute; its misuse by Communists has led to a spate of proposals for circumventing it and to some demands for outright repeal of it. No one speaks up in its defense or points out that it was always intended that it should not be misused by some people.

Many other first principles are being strenuously challenged. In the past few weeks, a movement to combine a declaration of religiosity with the pledge of allegiance to the flag has made great headway; if this would not in itself destroy secularism and the separation of church and state, the proposal to amend the Constitution by making Christianity the official state religion would greatly further the job. The Senate sponsor of this last amendment, which has been introduced in identical form in the House, is Senator FLANDERS, of Vermont, a man whose colleagues regard him as a rugged constitutionalist. Civilian control of the military is also looked upon with suspicion. When President Truman relieved Gen. Douglas MacArthur in 1951, his contention was that he was acting in accordance with the role prescribed for him by the Constitution and with the elementary doctrine that a President proposes and a general disposes, whether he likes it or not. While it was conceded that this was the custom, it was widely agreed that it was a most undesirable one and ought to be abolished.

The signs of impatience, of discontent and irritation, multiply on every hand. Sooner or later, such dissatisfaction expresses itself in changes in the structure of law and government. If the Dirksen doctrine prevails, the changes may be numerous and far-reaching.

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of May 30, 1954]

CONGRESS HAS 107 PROPOSALS TO AMEND THE CONSTITUTION

(By Tom Yarbrough)

WASHINGTON, May 29.—The United States Senate has been unusually preoccupied with constitutional amendments this season, but that does not mean that the Constitution is about to be amended. Not by a long shot.

Legislative history indicates that the Senate has been wasting its time, for the odds are extremely long that the Constitution will not be amended in any way this year, next year, or the year after that.

It is a field in which many try but very few succeed.

Since the year 1789, when the first 10 amendments were ratified en bloc as the Bill of Rights, there have been some 4,000 or more resolutions in the Senate and House of Representatives proposing changes in the basic law of the land. Only 15 of them cleared Congress, and 3 of those failed of ratification by the required three-fourths of the States.

That leaves 12 amendments adopted in 165 years, and if prohibition and repeal are considered to cancel each other out in the long view, then the net is 10 amendments—an average of 1 for every 16.5 years.

At this time there are no fewer than 107 proposed amendments on the calendars of the Senate and House Judiciary Committees. Forty are on the dockets for possible action, but few of them stand a chance of action even in subcommittee. Of the total of 107, many are duplicatory, with multiple sponsors among the amending Senators and Representatives.

As the record goes, 107 is not an unduly large number. This sort of thing goes on all the time. Many of the proposals are familiar perennials, such as those demanding equal rights for women and the elimination of the electoral college. What is unusual this year is that three have been advanced to the Senate floor for debate and action. The normal fate is burial in committee.

The Bricker amendment, which would restrict the treatymaking powers of the President, was given long debate and was defeated, although it still may be reconsidered on a technical parliamentary maneuver.

An amendment fixing the number of Supreme Court Justices at the present 9—antipacking, it was called—was given 4 hours of debate and was passed.

An amendment to make 18 years the voting age was defeated quickly.

It is significant that the House of Representatives has been a great deal slower to move. Its Judiciary Committee has 75 proposed amendments on its calendar, but has not reported a single one to the floor and has no hearings scheduled for the 16 now listed on subcommittee dockets.

The Supreme Court amendment sailed through the Senate, but it is not likely to sail through the House. Representative WILLIAM M. McCULLOCH, Republican, of Ohio, chairman of the subcommittee to which the resolution was assigned, told the Post-Dispatch he would consider scheduling hearings on that one, since the Senate had acted, but he observed that there was a notable lack of interest in the subject on the House side.

Also lacking in interest, he said, is the only other Senate-approved amendment so far sent to the House—a device to make it impossible for the Federal Government to attempt seizure of private property as in the case of the steel industry.

The Senate Judiciary Committee, headed by Senator WILLIAM LANGER, Republican, of North Dakota, only this week ordered reported to the floor an amendment providing that vacancies in the House may be filled by appointment instead of waiting for special elections, in the event that 146 or more Members are eliminated by disaster (covering the eventuality of a hydrogen bomb on the Capitol some day while Congress is in session.)

Senator LANGER is inclined to hold hearings and have pending matters threshed out. As chairman of the full committee and also chairman of the subcommittee on amendments, he called for a hearing recently on a proposal by Senator RALPH FLANDERS, Republican, Vermont, to have the Constitution "recognize the authority and laws of Jesus Christ."

Amending the Constitution is a two-way street, as provided in article 5 of the original document. One way is for Congress to propose, by two-thirds vote, and for three-fourths of the States to ratify. The other way is for two-thirds of the States to propose, by petition to Congress, that an amendment be offered for ratification by three-fourths of the States.

Under the second method one proposition is current today. Twenty-seven States have petitioned Congress to limit the Federal tax rate to 25 percent. That started in 1939, and all sorts of legal questions have been raised. Ten States rescinded their action (and were challenged on the ground that once they had said yes they could not say no), and six States later passed the petition all over again—really compounding complexity.

The only technically live proposition now awaiting ratification is the child labor amendment, but its currency is purely technical since Congress fixed no time limit for adoption or rejection. It was submitted in 1924 but there has been no action since 1937, by which time 26 of the 36 States had ratified. The need for it, however, has been vitiated by the Fair Labor Standards Act.

The long list of suggested amendments runs a full spectrum. It ranges from a redefinition of treason (to make it broader and apply for sure in time of peace), to fixing the voting age at 18 and 19 and 21 years (no one yet having declared for 20-year-olds). Others would fix the tenure of the President at one 6-year term, and that of Representatives at 4 years instead of 2.

There is quite a variety. But the Constitution, often shot at, is seldom hit.

Wesley A. D'Ewart: Statesman, Patriot

SPEECH

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1954

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues who have expressed their regrets that WESLEY A. D'EWART is terminating his service in the House. We all wish him success in his effort to extend his service in the Senate of the United States.

It has been my privilege to work with my distinguished colleague since he began his service here. It has been his responsibility to handle bills on the Private Calendar and my responsibility was to clear these private bills for final action in the House.

WESLEY D'EWART has always been a conscientious, able, and diligent public servant. He has rendered outstanding service to his district and the great West in general. He is an expert on reclamation, agriculture and close to his heart are the mining interests in his great State.

We shall miss WESLEY D'EWART. His kindly smile, his modesty and his integrity has endeared him to every Member of this distinguished body. Every good wish goes with him for a successful campaign this fall and for further distinguished service in the United States Senate.

This Is Not the Time To Raise Postal Rates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 23, 1954

Mr. HAGEN of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, when I appear before this House in opposition to H. R. 6052, a bill to increase rates of postage, I am heartened and supported by the fact that I represent the interests of many individuals and business firms, not only in my own district but throughout the Nation. Over the past year my office has been deluged with hundreds of letters and telegrams protesting the hasty and ill-considered action to increase business costs.

I know I speak for the man in the street when I urge that the House not pass the proposed increase in first-class mail. I know his sentiments are pretty well summed up in the following question. Was not this administration elected on a platform of economy so that taxes could be reduced? Since a 33⅓-percent increase in first-class mail is in the nature of a tax, no wonder the average citizen is asking about post-office economies that have been promised, but as yet not realized.

I know I speak for business generally when I oppose an increase in first-class mail because 80 percent of first-class mail is utilized by American business. A small-business man, operating on slim profit margins, does not view lightly this added expense burden in his business, especially when small business is facing a difficult readjustment period following the military armistice in Korea. He has a right to ask—is it really necessary?

When I oppose the additional 30-percent increase in second-class mail I know I speak for the printing and publishing industries at large. The Post Office Department has stated that there are approximately 25,000 publications with second-class entry in this country. Many of these firms are experiencing difficulties despite the fact that they derive certain benefits by having their publications in second-class mail. Of these 25,000 about half are newspapers and half magazines. On April 1, 1954, this group received the last of three 10-percent increases imposed on second-class mail. No one knows yet what the full impact of these rate increases will be.

I know I again speak for small business when I address my remarks to this body in opposition to second-class mail rate increases. According to the 1952 Annual Survey of Manufactures, issued by the Department of Commerce in November 1953, the printing and publishing industry of this country is made up of slightly more than 30,000 establishments. Of this number 28,933 are firms which employ less than 100 persons.

I know I speak for many veterans of this country, because I have been advised by the Veterans' Administration that a total of 71,000 World War II veterans had entered training for objectives in the printing and publishing industry as of November 30, 1952. I am not an expert on costs but, allowing a general average cost indicated from the total expenditures of the Veterans' Administration, it would mean that the Federal Government had spent in excess of $100 million in training these men for this industry.

I know I speak for the press, generally, whose force and influence in this country have never been doubted, whose daily contributions to our democratic way of life are part of our very blood stream.

When I stand in opposition to upward adjustments in third-class rates I know I speak for the thousands of business firms throughout the country who rely heavily upon the mails in the pursuit of their business objectives. Here also the printing industry is involved. Here also business firms have addressed searching letters to me inquiring why increased costs are now being foisted on them by the Post Office Department. They have good reason to raise such inquiries when recent studies have indicated that during January of this year the business of this country primarily dependent on the use of the mails reported the sharpest dips in their business since July 1951.

Gentlemen, I know I speak for your constituency and mine when I say that these general reactions to this measure only serve to reaffirm my position set forth in my minority views on March 18, 1954, namely that this postal bill was developed too hastily and in great measure by patchwork and guesswork.

To illustrate what I mean. The bill before you was presented to the Congress in its original form on July 1, 1953, 6 months after the present administration had taken office. I am sure you are all familiar with the fact that there are many considerations other than costs that go into ratemaking. Some of these are the value of the product, preferential handling, and the ability of the users to pay. Do we have any basis for concluding that such factors were carefully considered in proposing this rate measure to Congress when it was not until December 2, 1953, that the Post Office Department announced the appointment of its Director of Postal Rates and set into motion the organization of a Rate Division, the authority for which had existed for quite some time? In the meantime the Postmaster General would have you enact a rate bill which had no benefits of the research or study to be derived by this group within his own Department.

Last year about this time the House committee brought its consideration of this rate bill to an abrupt halt because objection was made by members of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee in light of the survey of the Post Office Department which was a proceeding pursuant to the authority of Senate Resolution 49 under the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee. This study has been completed, and its findings are very vital to the solution of the postal-rate problem. It has raised many policy questions which should be considered and resolved before undertaking the enactment of a postal rate bill, and yet this bill before the House has not been modified in any way to reflect the findings of the Senate committee.

If this measure must pass the House, I had hoped that once the rate bill reached the Senate there would be ample time for a full consideration of the findings of the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee under Senate Resolution 49 before the Senate committee considered this pending rate measure. However, if this bill is passed by the House and sent to the Senate, there is scarcely time for adequate consideration of the rate bill; let alone the resolution of the many policy questions raised by that Senate committee's objective findings in connection with the operations of the Post Office Department.

The administration and this Congress may well be proud of its work on the tax revision bill which has been sorely needed for many years. This new revised bill will be of tremendous benefit and assistance to American business, labor, farmers, and others, too. Likewise, I insist that before undertaking the passage of any further postal rate measure, there is great need for a new statement of our basic policies and assumptions for the operation of the United States Post Office Department. Both the Senate committee and the Post Office Department have indicated that there is a need for such basic determinations.

At this late date I strongly urge that the House delay enactment of this measure so that next January it can be considered with due consideration for the findings of the Advisory Council to the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee.

Finally, I am strongly persuaded that we should once more raise the question among ourselves affecting the matter of economies promised by the Post Office Department, but not yet effected. In varying terms we have been told that a Post Office deficit of approximately $740 million has been reduced to approximately $350 million. That may be true but I am not convinced that it was all done as a result of economies achieved by the Post Office Department. Rather this great savings has come about principally as a result of an increase in postal rates over which the Postmaster General has control, and the shifting of expenses, such as air mail subsidies and the franked and penalty mail to other agencies of the Federal Government. If great economies can be achieved in the Post Office Department, and I am confident Postmaster General Summerfield and his great team of associates can, these should be made known after 18 months of operation. And I insist that they will have a direct and important bearing on postal rate legislation.

I was very much interested in the speech made on the floor of the Senate on July 16, 1954, in which a Member of that illustrious body pointed out that the Postmaster General had a $100 million savings in his 1954 budget based on the failure to realize the total volume of mail previously estimated. This kind of surplus has a definite bearing on rate measures as do many other real suggestions in the Senate Advisory Council's report showing where great savings can be effected. On transportation alone the forecast of savings by the Senate Advisory Council was verified in a study which said that some $80 million could be saved in this particular field. These and other economies ought to be thoroughly explored by the Congress before asking the American people and their business institutions once more to underwrite waste and inefficiency through increased postal rates.

Much has been stated recently about the need for combining the postal-rate bill and the postal-pay bill. I, for one, believe that they are separate matters and each should be reviewed on its own merits. It should be pointed out that this rate bill does not go into effect until January 1, 1955, and certain portions of it will not become effective until April 1955. Therefore, it would seem to me that very little revenue would be lost if consideration of this legislation is delayed until the next session of Congress.

It is a matter of record that over the past several years the consideration of a rate bill by the Senate Committee has required a minimum of 30 days, and in one instance, a period of 6 weeks. Surely there is no Member of this body who will believe that adequate consideration of this matter can now be given by the Senate committee at this term of Congress. This is a matter which vitally affects all of our people, and in that sense I consider it an item of major legislation which should not be brushed over lightly.

Therefore, I respectfully suggest that this measure be returned to the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee until we are apprised of the economies that the Post Office Department can achieve, until we can study and resolve the policy questions raised by the Senate Advisory Council's report, and until there exists more time in the Senate for adequate hearings to be given to all businesses affected by this measure.

Now or Never, Mr. Independent Banker

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 11, 1954

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to direct attention to an address delivered at the national convention of the Independent Bankers Association of America in Detroit, Mich., by Ed Wimmer, vice president of the National Federation of Independent Business. Although we may not agree with every detail of his address, we must concede the validity of his main theme and the importance of the principle of independence he sets forth:

Distinguished guests and Mr. DuBois, my fellow Americans, it is indeed a pleasure for me to be here before this wonderful group of American free enterprisers, and, like all other speakers who are privileged to address an audience of bankers, I want to say that, to me, it is a genuine privilege and a great opportunity. This I mean from the bottom of my heart, because, in talking to the grocers, hardware men, little dry cleaners, small packers and druggists, and various others in many lines of business throughout the United States, I usually find that these other independents have great respect for their local banker.

If a little grocer has lunch at the Kiwanis Club, or some other civic organization, and sits next to the banker, that afternoon he tells his customers, "I had lunch today with Banker Snodgrass, and he thinks everything is going to be all right." Or whatever the case happens to be.

You bankers are the distinguished citizens of your communities and it is a distinguished opportunity to talk to you, and I want you to know that I have great respect for the patience of men like yourselves who sit and listen to voices, voices, voices—coming from convention platforms, from television, radio, and from all other directions. This patience of those who listen has amazed me for the past many years. It is in this thought that I feel every speaker today owes a tremendous obligation to his audience.

We only progress as we exchange ideas; as we hold to the good and get rid of the bad. Anyone can criticize, and criticism is important, but there is a great need for judgments which emerge out of a profound faith in the goodness of human beings, and if criticism of those things which destroy faith, which eat away at the foundations of freedom and happiness, is made with a clear self-consciousness that all men grow by constructive criticism, then the more of it we have the better off we will be.

In other words, doesn't our hope lie, as one person put it: In searching criticism of the intellectual and moral foundations of our technological society. A radical, they say, is one who tries to get to the root of any problem, and under the conditions I have just enumerated, criticism and radicalism take on a new meaning.

My last appearance before your splendid organization was, I think, in 1943, in Minnesota. Your organization began in the same year I started my own activity in behalf of independent business, and I wish that I had known that year of the meeting of Ben DuBois and a few other bankers, who were getting together to discuss the same objectives I was pursuing in my own small way.

In the year 1931, I was a small-business man. In 1932, I wasn't. I got drafted into the army of unemployed and learned what it was to be absolutely broke; to watch people standing in long lines in front of a bank that had just closed its doors, and, like a lot of other Americans, I began to ask for reasons why.

Before going any further, permit me to say something kind about Ben DuBois, who was asking a lot of questions and who wanted to come up with some answers. To praise him would be merely to repeat what others have said ever since this organization began. Ben is a crusader at heart, and a true and wonderful American. A man who speaks his mind, and I always feel extremely proud whenever he has called me friend. In passing, may I also compliment your magazine, the Independent Banker, which every banker ought to read from cover to cover, and it wouldn't be bad if a lot of people throughout the United States could read many of the editorials and the statements of bankers printed in the columns of this publication.

Gentlemen, the pride of a community is usually a strong bank. There is nothing that gives a person a greater feeling of security than a bank account which in many cases doesn't need to be very big to provide some sort of security.

Personally, I know little if anything about money. One great man in the banking world, Montague Norman of the Bank of England, said a great thing about money. He said, "I don't understand it." Everyone in this country knows, however, that money is like fertilizer—it has got to be spread around—and the economy that is developed to keep it spread, will never be overrun with communism.

Before launching into my subject I would like to say that looking around today gives me a feeling of confusion. I feel like the farmer who was standing in the middle of a pasture with a rope in his hand wondering whether he had found a rope or lost a cow. A year and a half ago, the average man knew whether he wanted to be a Republican or a Democrat, and he didn't mind telling a lot of people just how he felt. It seems that today the average Republican doesn't know whether to stay Republican and go to the poorhouse or become a Democrat and help build them.

We are also living in changing times. An ad appeared in the paper the other day, which read: "Black formal, size 12. Worn once. Will trade for baby bed."

My desire is to comment on those things about which I feel the least confusion, and which are not subject to quick changes. Since you have speakers who are experts on the banking business, my comments will be confined largely to things which I believe are pertinent to your future as independent bankers, and I shall leave the rest to the experts.

We have been moving swiftly, particularly since the first of the year, into what might well be called the era of profitless prosperity—the era of the by-pass. The chisel age. For example, how many people have said to you, if you need a new refrigerator or a new television set or a washing machine, "I can get it for you wholesale." Or, "I can tell you where you can get it wholesale."

Now, doesn't that help your retailers who have accounts at your bank, and the wholesalers and the small manufacturers who sell them—and the salesmen who sell the stores and the clerks in the stores. Here in Detroit practically every member of a labor union and thousands of other people are carrying a card that is alleged to entitle all workers or anyone who has this card to a 15 to 30 percent discount on anything they want, from a carton of cigarettes to a Cadillac. We seem to be getting one idea after another on how we can cut corners, and how we can bring more efficiency into our businesses—in order to save money so more people can be put out of work—so that there are less things bought—so the Government has to take care of more people.

Walter Reuther made a speech in Ohio and he said: "It is time for the workers to do what the farmers are doing with their co-ops, to form their own co-ops; to buy direct."

Anyone who heard him as he painted a beautiful picture of how cheaply they could buy if they could cut out all parasitic middlemen, would really have believed the moon was made of green cheese. Yet his listeners swallowed it, hook, line, and sinker.

I wrote Mr. Reuther and asked him to park his car across the street from a little delicatessen doing $500 a week, and count the Plymouths, Dodges, and Fords, and other kinds of cars that his UAW is making that were stopping in front of this little delicatessen carrying salesmen selling everything from cigarettes and peanuts to clothespins, flour, coffee, candy, cookies; collecting on the cash register or the adding machine, trying to sell new fixtures, a new sign; selling insurance, getting a subscription for a trade journal, or seeking a contribution for their church or civic organization.

All day long a steady stream of automobiles. Then I asked him to park across the street from a big A. & P. or Kroger supermarket, or even a Sears, Roebuck store that may be doing $60,000 or more per week, and see if he could count a single car that stopped in front of those big stores to sell the manager anything, to get a subscription to a trade journal, to sell insurance, or get a contribution.

I then said to Mr. Reuther: "Figure out how many people you are going to eliminate with your ideas, and then see who is going to be making automobiles to sell to whom."

My understanding is, a few weeks later the Consumer Cooperative Headquarters of the CIO became very quiet. So far as I know, Mr. Reuther hasn't said a word since.

Consider the movie that was put out by the Chrysler Motorcar Co. several years ago. This movie showed the wonders of American mass production, and then finally it got into mass distribution, and on the screen there appeared rows upon rows, Main Street after Main Street, of chain after chain, but not a sign of an independent. I wrote the president of the Chrysler Corp. and asked him to do the same thing I had asked Mr. Reuther to do, and received a page and three-quarter letter stating that the officials of Chrysler had never given this matter a single thought. My information was that the films were called in and changed.

Now, if the men who are at the head of such organizations as the CIO and Chrysler haven't thought about the importance of the independent, what can we expect from the average consumer, and especially when the bankers and businessmen themselves haven't said anything about their independence.

One day I spent considerable time with one of the mostly highly paid lawyers in the country. He said to me, after some argument: "I buy everything from A. & P. and I think everybody should buy from A. & P. if they can buy there any cheaper."

My answer was: "I presume you ate in a pretty nice restaurant this noon. The hatcheck girl probably took your coat and hat, and a hostess probably led you to a table."

Then I said: "Couldn't you hang up your own hat? Couldn't you have found your way to a table without the aid of a hostess? In this case you helped to make two girls accountable citizens in their community. You helped them to buy clothes, and in jobs like that they are almost certain to catch a husband and maybe raise a family. Why not the same attention to people and their importance wherever you buy? And why not enjoy the feeling that you are helping other people wherever you buy, so that in the long run they will be helping you?"

After several hours of arguing, he put his arm around my shoulder and we walked down the stairs, and he said: "Maybe you are right."

Gentlemen, there is a man in this Nation today by the name of John McPherrin, and he is the publisher of American magazine, one of the oldest in the United States. A recent statement he made sets the theme of my talk, and I believe it should set the theme for this convention:

"We would like to think of the locally known businessmen as the neighborhood statesmen of America. They are wise enough in most cases to sell the philosophy of free enterprise, and we have always felt that there is no better example of the American ideal than a small-business man holding his own. National leaders who are trying to enlighten the public will find it very worthwhile to work closely with the neighborhood leaders up and down the Main Streets of America. We need never worry about America if local businessmen will carry the truth about free enterprise to their customers."

Gentlemen, are you carrying the truth about free enterprise to your customers? Are you a Main Street statesman who stands up for the things you believe in? I know you are wise enough to sell the philosophy of free enterprise, and I know we won't have to worry too much about America if you do.

Like ourselves and like you, John McPherrin believes in a profit economy of free enterprise based on fair wages, fair prices and fair profits. Too many people in America today do not realize that you can't get fair wages out of anything but fair prices, and that only fair profits can maintain a free enterprise economy. All we are hearing from our economists today, who are advising big businessmen what to do, is more production per man hour, more efficiency, and cheaper prices over the retail counter.

I call your attention to the fact that hamburger was 7 cents a pound in 1932, which was plenty cheap. Corn was 25 cents a bushel. Dresses were selling for 79 cents, but there were 16 million people who couldn't buy the hamburger.

Consider the tariff which you heard so much about yesterday. It, too, is a call for cheap prices made possible by the cheap wages of foreign countries. The advocates of lower tariff walls seem to think they can flood this country with the same price goods that we had in 1932, and that American workers will continue to stay on their jobs and pay taxes.

We maintain that if the tariff walls are reduced any more, that more and more small factories will close down; they won't have any profits to put in your banks. You will forget that they ever existed. That is why I say that 160 million people in this country cannot prosper 2 billion people across the water by merely letting down our tariff walls.

We are already spending billions of dollars in give-away programs; then there are our military expenditures in these foreign countries. We are spending hundreds of millions in travel; we are investing billions in new plants all over the world, ready to hire cheap labor to dump cheap goods on our markets. What more do they want us to do for Europe and Asia?

Liken this country to a lake that is full of water, then think of four other lakes that are at a lower level. Consider what would happen if you ran a drain from the well-filled lake to the other four. You would level them all to the same level.

Not many years ago Japan sold us about 5 percent of the gloves bought on the American market. It is said that today Japan is selling more than 55 percent of the gloves sold in America, and the Swiss are providing 87 percent of all the watch movements sold in the United States.

It is so easy to get the wrong perspective. An Indian went into an automobile dealer in Oklahoma to buy a new car. He said, "Me want big car." His feathers were sticking up on his head and his robe was around his shoulders, but he had plenty of money, and a car was placed on the open road near the dealer and the Indian climbed in behind the wheel.

The dealer said, "Can you drive, Chief?"

He answered, "No, me no can drive. But me drive."

He was shown how to step on the gas, and in Oklahoma there is lots of open space. The old Chief went tearing down the road. About 2 hours later he came tearing back; his feathers were gone and he was quite a mess. His first words were, "Me want new car."

The automobile dealer, thunderstruck, said, "For heaven's sake, what happened to you and where's the other car?"

The old Chief answered, "Me go down road like hell. Telephone poles, fence posts, she come up road like hell. Me see bridge comin'. Turn off to let bridge go by. Me need new car."

Gentlemen, the old Indian had the wrong perspective. We've got to get the right perspective on this tariff question or any other. And here is where we bite down on the meat of this subject.

Our position is just this: America was built on widespread independent ownership of farm, home, and business enterprise, wherever practical and possible, with local control over local affairs. No country, no free society was ever built on any other foundation. The more the independents, the freer the nation.

Many little businesses grew into big businesses, and we need big business. And, gentlemen, we are going to have big labor unions and big government no matter what we do, but today we are faced with a situation whereby consolidation and merger have brought about a monster type of business, monster labor unions and monster government.

Our recommendations are that we unwind the whole show; that we put every bank and every corporation in this country back on its own feet again where Jefferson, Lincoln, and Andrew Jackson would ask that they be put, if they were alive today.

Someone may say that this is being too radical, but I ask you to think of what I said in the beginning, that a radical is a man who intellectually goes to the bottom of all problems. Dante said, 2,000 years ago: "The hottest places in hell are reserved for those who in a period of crisis maintain their neutrality."

Do you dare to be neutral? Don't you want to have a small part in the building of a guard rail along our economic highway, rather than a part in rescuing its thousands of victims?

If I asked you to write down on a piece of paper this morning what three things you want out of life, you would probably state them as: something to love, something to hope for, and something to do. There you have an economic system; the three things that are fundamental to American family life, to the dreams of our youth, the hopes of our veterans, and, in fact, that is all the people of the whole world want, really, is something to do, something to love, and something to hope for.

An expanding business system and a government that provides the people with freedom of opportunity, will come closer to meeting these three needs than any other system so far devised by man. Thomas Jefferson said it in other words, when he wrote:

"It is not to the advantage of a republic that a few should control the many when nature has scattered talent throughout the conditions of men."

Please look back with me, quickly, so that we may get some idea why we are where we are, and what we may be able to do to get where we want to go.

Listen to the statement of the man who was vice president of the Cleveland Trust Co. in 1930. On October 15 of that year he said: "It is encouraging to note that business activity is no longer slowing down."

December 15, 2 months later: "Business is stagnant. We have men, money, materials, and markets, but we are unable to put them together."

On June 14, 1931, another big businessman said: "The European countries all appear confident that an upturn in business is imminent."

Two months later the headlines in Germany: "Berlin closes banks. All banks fail." Headlines in Britain: "Great Britain suspends gold payments today. Closes stock exchange."

We are hearing the same statements today about readjustments, recessions, and re-employment, and we are all asked to be optimistic about the future. No one wants to be a realist who is willing to see that we have been living in a fool's paradise with an H-bomb in the cellar, and, according to the headlines, a Communist in every attic.

Prior to 1929 and prior to the statements I have just read you, we passed through the greatest period of merger and consolidation and chain store growth that ever took place anywhere in the world. A crash was inevitable. The people of the small towns had been deserting their communities to drive to the county seat to buy from Sears Roebuck and Montgomery Ward, who were creating a great drain pipe that was sucking away hundreds of millions of dollars from all the communities in the United States.

They deserted their little independents, these people, and forgot abput their independent banks. And these mergers and consolidation and forgetfulness contributed to the death of 15,000 small banks, and mostly within a year, while the profits of A. & P. were $31 million.

In 1933 we got F. D. R. and his hypodermic needle, and we all were glad to get it. We had our parades. We put our NRA stickers on our windows and windshields, and listened to the chats from the fireside, and we were all for WPA and PWA, and the rest of the alphabet that was used to designate the various forms of relief that breathed life into our business system.

By 1937 there was a great clamor for a cessation of spending and the shovels were kicked from under the WPA workers and they fell flat on their faces. Things began to look pretty bad, but the rumblings of war were being heard around the world. In 1939 we got our defense boom. We began to make ships, uniforms, put guns into the hands of people—we gave them away—we started making more munitions; the steel mills began moving, and everybody said that our free enterprise system was beginning to work.

By 1941, all but 7 million people were employed on private jobs. Then one night we heard the shocking news that Pearl Harbor had been bombed. We were put in clover.

Our free enterprise system really went to work. We bought our women better clothes. We paid off our mortgages. Our farmers bought 500,000 new tractors in a short period of time. Everybody was working and everybody was making money, and everybody was happy except the mothers whose 300,000 sons were buried under the white crosses of Europe, and those mothers whose sons, 130,000 of them, were laid up in the hospitals of the world and who, today, are the forgotten men of the world.

Yes, and because we were successful in helping to destroy two-thirds of the wealth of the world and helping to kill and maim 50 million people in the world, we were successful in our private enterprise system, they said, and capitalism was working.

We made more guns and more gadgets, and we had more bathtubs than all the rest of the world put together. And they say we won the war and never had to give up our butter or strawberries.

After the war was over we began to fill our empty warehouses, and a new wave of prosperity swept over the land. But in 1949 our warehouses began to fill up. We had 4 million unemployed, and there was talk of a depression. And then we got Korea and we were back in business.

You know the aftermath of the Korean war. And you know that the total of our war expenditures, from the beginning of World War II, was more than $700 billion. Enough money to build a home, fill it with furniture, put a car at the front of the door, and several hundred dollars in the bank for every civilized family in the world.

Now we are back where we were in 1949, and the bureaucrats are worried. One of them said he thought we ought to build another bridge across the Mississippi (to keep the people employed)—lengthwise.

My friends, the private and public debt of the United States is more than $600 billion. That will make a carpet of $1 bills 50 feet wide reaching from here to the moon, and that is the carpet we are spreading out in our economic life for our boys and girls to follow. Will they walk this carpet? Will they carry the burdens we have placed upon their shoulders? I think they will, if we give them a chance not to become the slaves of monopoly power, but a chance to become freemen in tomorrow's market place.

Please do not be complacent about today's unemployment. One man out of a job who cannot find a job is a one-man depression. And I am all fed up with this talk about readjustment, because I know that 3 million men out of work is 3 million serious depressions in the minds of those men, and it isn't right that it should be in a country that has so much and needs so much.

It is very hard to wake up some people to what is going on. They remind me of the old Confederate soldier who was recently smoked out. It seems that the Atomic Energy Commission wanted to drop a bomb in the mountains to see what would happen. They chose the place, somewhere near the Tennessee-Carolina border, and sent loud speakers over the area warning everyone to leave in a hurry. Then they dropped the bomb. The rocks and the trees went flying through the air, and the mountains trembled.

After the smoke had settled and the rocks had fallen into place, an old Confederate veteran, carrying a rusty rifle, staggered from the edge of a hole into which Pike's Peak could be comfortably dropped. He dusted himself off and, looking down into the hole, he said: "I don't care what Lee says, I'm giving up."

Gentlemen, can we make the people believe that America needs to take three great steps. The first and greatest need is a spiritual mobilization the like of which has never been witnessed anywhere else in the world. A partnership of every banker and every businessman and every worker in this country with God Almighty.

Two, an economic reorganization and rehabilitation that will make this America of ours the land of the free and the home of the brave, and not the land of the chain and the home of the slave.

Three, the restoration of representative government.

Do you believe, my friends, that any free society has ever been built on any foundation other than one which guarantees a maximum of individual enterprise and a minimum of power in the hands of a few? Do you believe, with Herbert Hoover, that the entrance of Government began strongly three decades ago when our industrial organization began to move powerfully in the direction of consolidation of enterprise?

Look at Transamerica. Thirty-three percent of all bank deposits in California; 44 percent in Oregon; 78 percent in Nevada; 22 percent in Arizona; 5 percent in Washington, and I say this is too much power for any 1 bank to have. Every one of those banks—every single one of them—should be put back on their own feet, and that is how far your bank-holding company act should really go, but we cannot go all of the way now.

We can, however, set up a defense against the Northwest Bancorporation as another example, which has a virtual monopoly in Minneapolis with 73 banks and branches in a 7-State area. Forty-three banks in Minnesota; 5 in Nebraska; 4 in Iowa; 4 in South Dakota, with 18 branches; 9 in North Dakota; 7 in Montana; and 1 in Wisconsin.

What do they want? I will tell you what they want. They want all the banking business of the Northwest, and if you don't wake up they are going to get it, and you bankers are going to let them get it if you don't put on your feathers and fight as you have never fought before.

Please, gentlemen, please; get this in your minds. You are not fighting for independent banking. If that is all you have to stand on; if the salvation of your own bank is the only thing you have in mind, you have no right to raise your voices, no right to protest, no right to appeal to public opinion.

What you must do is to think and to realize and to know that you are fighting for the next generation, the next and the next generation. That you are doing something for the free peoples of the whole world—not just fighting to save independent banking, but to save independent banking because it is basic to all freedoms, political, economic, and social.

Just look at the automobile picture. Imagine, if you can, the statements of so-called experts to the effect that this great industry will no longer provide survival for an independent. Weigh the forces against Nash, Hudson, Studebaker, and Packard. Read the stories that even Chrysler is endangered by monopolistic practices which have beset the industry.

The Department of Justice is now investigating the automobile industry, and this investigation should be supported by every banker in this country with a telegram to his Congressman or to the Department of Justice, and you should send telegrams protesting every banking merger that takes place from now on.

The giants in every industry are mopping up the whole country—wiping out independent grocers by the thousands. National Dairy has over 500 dairies; controls the Kraft Cheese Corp. What more do they want?

I will tell you what they want. They want every dairyman in the country and all those little guys who put their money in your bank, and who have investments and who hire people in their communities.

Look at the three big soap companies and see what they are doing to wipe out the small soap companies with their couponing, and wasteful and extravagant practices. The three big soap companies have nearly 90 percent of all the soap business; five big tire companies have nearly all of the tire business, and our economists, people in high Government office, have looked at this ravaging situation and have actually concluded that companies compete most effectively, just as men fight most effectively, when they are trying to knock each other out.

Who are your allies in your fight against monopoly in banking, in your fight to get passage of your bank-holding company act? I'll tell you who they are. They are the oil jobber, the small coal company operator, the small grocer, the small hardware man, the independent farmer, the worker who wants to be free of monopoly control whether it comes from labor, industry or Government.

They are the furniture men, yes, all the men of Main Street America who are still in business and are independent. And you need them and they need you.

We have even read where Mr. Eisenhower has been advised that it would be a good thing for the small farmers to consolidate into groups and small corporations. What do you country bankers think about what is happening to the little chicken farmer or the small grower of vegetables; the guy who has a couple of hundred chickens laying eggs and bringing them into town, and who, like you independent bankers, are the very bulwark of this Nation's freedom. All this is the name of efficiency; in the name of monopoly.

General Johnson said one time that we can tear down all the fences in Kansas, put a string of tractors across Kansas and grow enough wheat to feed the world. But he also said that "there is such a thing as too damn much efficiency."

One economist asked: "Is there any sense in having 3 banks on 3 corners of 1 business section?" Is there any sense in having 3 filling stations when 1 could do all of the business? Is there any sense in a whole lot of little coal operators trying to keep their mines open when one big mine, highly mechanized, could turn out more coal at lower prices with less help?

Near the end of the Second World War, Lord Beaverbrook of England, publisher of a paper with nearly 3 million daily circulation, said editorially:

"Strolling down the main street of Leatherhead, where I live, I counted 22 chain stores in 3 minutes. One of these companies had no units in Great Britain in 1909, but in 1939 they had 737 stores. I call upon all chambers of commerce, trade associations, bankers, and all tradesmen, to tackle this question of absentee ownership, for if it is not settled, British Tommies are coming home from a war to find the retail field closed to them."

Was it closed? Yes; by the Socialists.

Ben DuBois said it all, early in the thirties, when he declared:

"Our capitalistic system has within it the seeds of its own destruction."

And those seeds of destruction are in the words of Shakespeare who wrote, those many years ago:

"Everything includes itself in power, power into will, will into appetite, and appetite a universal wolf that will at last eat himself up."

Let us follow through with the statement of John K. Galbraith, author of American Capitalism. He says:

"The present generation of Americans, if it survives, will buy its steel, copper, brass, automobiles, tires, soap, shortening, bacon, cigarettes, whisky, cash registers, and caskets from a handful of men."

My friends, just stop and think for a moment, what we are doing to our graduates. Our boys and girls in our colleges. In 1928 a poll was taken of young people on our campuses, and they were asked: "What are your plans after graduation?" Seventy-five percent said they wanted to go into business for themselves. Two years ago another poll was taken, and only 2 percent said they wanted to go into business for themselves. Think, think, think what we have done to young America, when we hear these young men saying, over and over again, that they want to go to work for the biggest corporation, get into the labor movement, or take up a Government career. They ask, "What chance would I have, running a small business?"

Mr. Banker, listen to me. The housewife the farmer, the student, and, yes, many of your own wives, see only Dr. Jekyll in the beautiful front of the chain store. But behind its doors is Mr. Hyde, and the average man today who looks upon the bank-holding companies, their beautiful buildings and up-to-date services, sees only Dr. Jekyll, but Mr. Hyde is behind that door, too.

The American farmer today is little less than a chain-store slave. He gets up in the morning, puts on his chain-store pants and shirt, socks, shoes, and cap. He picks up his chain-store milk bucket and goes out to milk a subsidized cow. He pours the milk into a can that came from Sears Roebuck or Montgomery Ward, loads it into a truck tired by Sears Roebuck and run on Standard Oil gasoline. He sells the milk to National Dairy or Borden, and takes his money to Kroger, or some other chain, and buys his food. His wife cooks it for him on a chain-store stove and serves it with chain-store utensils. After supper, instead of reading the Bible, he looks at the pictures of the pretty girls in the catalog.

Later, he crawls into his chain-store bed, turns off his chain-store radio, sets his chain-store alarm clock, and rests his head on a chain-store pillow. And do you know what Sears and Montgomery Ward have done to show their appreciation? They are printing their catalogs on slick paper.

Does the American farmer know what has happened to him? Does he know what he has done to his town, his sons who might have started a little business in the neighborhood town and raised their families where he could enjoy his grandchildren, and watch them all become responsible, accountable citizens? Of course not. He has no idea what he has done to himself, because the bankers, the grocers, the hardware men, and the rest of the independent business people of America have been sitting on their hands and remaining silent on the most momentous question ever to face a free people.

Not long ago I was talking to the head of a big airline. I asked him if he ever heard of a convention of branch managers, or a convention of chain-store managers, and if there ever was one, what could they talk about and what decisions could they make? I told him that it takes big business to build those big planes he was operating, and it takes a big business to run them, but if they weren't filled up with jobbers, bankers, wholesales, retailers, small manufacturers, and their salesmen, and the great middle class going back and forth across this country, the Government would end up running the airlines and building the planes, and very probably there would be only one big airline, and it would be Government owned.

You know as well as I that our students, workingmen, and our farmers have no idea of the true meaning of the word "capitalist." I think we need to tell them that the little colored boy walking down the street in Alabama, looking up at a man on the street and saying, "shine, sir?" is a capitalist in business for himself, on his own initiative. That he is just as much a capitalist as John D. Rockefeller ever was, in the true meaning of the word, and that men who own lawn mowers, or anything else they can say is their own, that they, too, are capitalists, and this is one of the stories we must tell while there is still time.

During the past few years you bankers have been more outspoken than any other group I know of. Listen to D. Emmert Brumbaugh:

"Monopoly banking not only threatens the tradition of banking systems, but it is a threat to free enterprise and a straight road to socialism."

Guy Sturgeon: "We view with alarm the increasing trend toward the monopoly in our banking system."

James Peters, Bank of Manchester, Ga.: "In numbers there is strength. If there had been 14,000 steel companies, the Government would not have taken them over."

E. E. Placek, Wahoo, Nebr.: "I have been behind the Iron Curtain and I know what caused communism. It was too much wealth and power in the hands of the few as is represented in this country in chain stores and chain banks, and other kinds of chains."

Carroll Byrd, Willows, Calif.: We are getting the story of independent banking not only to our own community but to many communities around us. Let every other banker do the same, and it won't be long before our association and the general public will be working hand in hand."

Harry Harding, Frank Hollister, William Jenings Bryan (your new president)—endorsed the challenge of Orval Adams, that "now is the time to rally your forces."

Now is the time to ask, with W. E. Evans, Halfway, Oreg.: "What is there to be gained by spending multiplied millions in providing a defense of our freedoms from enemies from without, while at the same time we permit enemies from within to tear us down?"

And who among you is not familiar with the advice of the man you know as Spike Evans, who has been saying for a long time that you need to take your cause to the country.

You all know, gentlemen, that you have the National Federation of Independent Business behind you all the way, and you have seen our polls and columns, and our great field force is selling your cause up and down the Main Streets of America, every day. Many other organizations can be enlisted to support bank-holding company legislation such as that now sponsored by Senator CAPEHART and Congressman MULTER, but you will have to solicit this support, and continue to earn it by being vitally concerned with the whole small-business problem.

Mr. Banker, believe me, it is now or never. Again I repeat, it isn't important what happens to you and me. Personally, I am willing to scratch with the chickens, wash dishes in a restaurant, or do anything else in case of a depression, but I want my kids to have an education. I want to help them to become accountable, responsible citizens in this community and Nation. And when my boy walks down the street holding the hand of a girl, I want him to be able to look at a vacant store and say, "Here we will build our future." And I want the banker to be able to help him build.

In that scene you have free enterprise at work. That is your America. That is your Declaration of Independence, and it is a vision you should ever keep in mind.

I understand that Clint Axford, editor of the American Banker, had something to do with the writing of your own Declaration of Independents, which has appeared in your magazine over the names of many, many bankers throughout the United States. Let me repeat it here:

"We are proud of the part which the independent bank has played through the years in building a strong Nation. We believe that the financial requirements of a community are best served by a banking institution owned and managed by home folks who know local conditions best. We urge independent bankers everywhere to unite their efforts for the protection of our free, competitive banking system. We are proud to be independent bankers because we believe independent banking serves the Nation best."

There is a second Declaration of Independence to help make the first one live. And it should be put up in your windows, and there should be a light over it so that people could read it after dark. I am sure it would inspire the grocers, druggists, and hardware men, and, yes, most of your depositors, and the independent farmers who would read it. These other independents need this inspiration. They need the example which you can set for them.

Maybe Mrs. Banker herself might start trading with independent merchants instead of the big chain supermarkets. I feel sure, too, that the wives of other businessmen who are selling their husbands, their businesses, and their home banks down the river of monopoly, would do some thinking.

Surely you must all agree with Woodrow Wilson when he said that the most frightening monopoly in the country would be a control over credit and he challenged the people of his day to serve the long future and the true liberties of men by breaking up that part of it that already existed, and making it impossible for any such monopoly to ever rise up on American soil.

These other trends toward monopoly in food, clothing, appliances, automobiles, and others, are just as frightening for many of them have already reached such stupendous proportions as to stagger the imagination.

Lehman Bros., a bank-holding company of New York, has extended their web of directorates to American Stores, Jewel Tea Co., Kroger, Sears-Roebuck, Associated Dry Goods, Allied Stores, Federated Department Stores, Gimbel Bros., W. T. Grant, Interstate Department Stores, Kaufman, Woolworth—and others too numerous to mention.

Chase National of New York, reached out into Borden, Atlantic & Pacific Tea Co., Allied Stores, McCrory, H. L. Green, and others. Goldman Sachs, of New York, tied in with Jewel Tea, National Dairy, Sears-Roebuck, S. H. Kress, Gimbel Bros., Kaufman, and the May Co., with J. P. Morgan and Guaranty Trust finishing up the picture.

If you will study these trends, weigh this issue, you must know in your hearts that a short way down the road there is a sign that reads, "No U-turn." If we reach that signpost, I think that the American way of life will then rest on a three-sided table at which will sit big business, big labor, and big Government, just as we witnessed it in the steel crisis. The decision will be made as to what to do with capitalism, with private enterprise as you and I know it and have defended it, and you can bet your last dollar that if there are any independent bankers left, they won't have anything to do with the decisions made around that table.

So far as communism is concerned, let it be stated here, that investigations, jet planes, bazookas, H-bombs, germ warfare, or any thing we may develop in these fields will never conquer or eliminate the Communist evil or the Communist idea. The only answer to communism is in a better idea, the American idea that Washington and Jefferson believed it to be.

We have not sold the American idea to the rest of the world. We have only told them about the gadgets we have and the number of telephones, automobiles, and refrigerators. We haven't told them about the Sermon on the Mount, about what is in the Declaration of Independence. We haven't given them any idea of the freedoms guaranteed by the Constitution and the Bill of Rights.

Therefore, we have only the friends we have bought, while the men of the hammer and sickle have marched forward losing not a soldier as they attracted the oppressed masses, and even intellectuals, with their banners of fanaticism.

In the 2 days I have spent at this convention, talking to the members of this dynamic association, my hopes have risen to new heights, and I shall leave here with a feeling that a battalion of battling bankers are going to hold high banners of freedom of opportunity which the whole world is crying for.

We can restore freedom of opportunity and expand it to all parts of the world, if we have the courage to start an unwinding of the giant bank-holding companies. If we have the courage to separate General Motors from Du Pont control, and, in turn, separate General Motors from control of the many companies which operate under its domination; and unwind all of the other giant corporations which have been put together in violation of the spirft of the antitrust laws.

We can then bring bargaining power back to the local level, wherever practical and possible. When we have done this, much of which will have to be accomplished through Congress and various Government agencies, we can then bring control of local affairs in Government back to the local level, too.

In this kind of a program, and in no other, can we reestablish the family farm, the local bank, and the family enterprise as the three pillars of our society. By so doing we ought to be able to open up the longest and greatest period of material progress, human progress and general prosperity the world has ever seen.

In conclusion I would like to offer you copy of a booklet, Prosperity Can Be Permament, written by a banker, and which I believe proves the fallacy of giantism and the fallacy of concentration on efficiency, and the fallacy of the theory that low prices over the retail counter will raise our standard of living. The author is E. G. Shinner, who wrote The Forgotten Man in 1935, and I shall be glad to send the booklet to any person making the request.

Before me is a prayer that was contained in a letter written by George Washington to a friend:

"May we have the wisdom to make the best use of the advantages with which we are now favored, for if we do, we cannot fail to become a great and happy people. May the children who live in this land prosper and continue to merit the goodwill of the other inhabitants of the world, while everyone shall sit under his own fig tree and there shall be none to make him afraid. May the Father of all mercies scatter light and not darkness upon our paths, and may all of us in our separate vocations be useful here and in his own time and way. May He make us everlastingly happy."

You have been a wonderful audience. The attention you have given me will never be forgotten, and may God bless you in your homes, and in your businesses. May God bless the work of this convention, and, above all, ladies and gentleman, may God bless America.

Proposal for a United Nations Writ of Habeas Corpus and an International Court of Human Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN V. BEAMER
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 11, 1954

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following from the Tulane Law Review:

A PROPOSAL FOR A UNITED NATIONS WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS AND AN INTERNATIONAL COURT OF HUMAN RIGHTS

(By Luis Kutner)

Protection of human rights has long been a matter of concern, but of only limited obligation, under international law. Until recently, it was generally thought that, in the absence of treaty, states had almost exclusive authority over their nationals, and only slightly less authority over aliens. Events of recent years, however, have so shaken the underlying premise of these doctrines that unilateral protest with respect to particular violations of human dignity has increasingly given way to a series of international undertakings for the protection of human rights, of which the Charter of the United Nations is one.

INTERNATIONAL COMMITMENTS CONCERNING HUMAN RIGHTS

Under the provisions of this great, constitutional treaty, signatory States are legally obligated to respect and observe human rights and fundamental freedoms "for all." This commitment is derived from its repetition throughout the preamble, purposes, and articles, and particularly from articles 55 and 56, by which "Members pledge themselves to take joint and separate action in cooperation with the organization for the achievement of * * * universal respect for, and observance of, human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion."

The Charter also obligates the organization of the United Nations to "promote universal respect for, and observance of, human rights and fundamental freedoms. * * *" Its provisions are phrased in such a way which may only be interpreted as imposing a duty to promote human rights and fundamental freedoms and a "degree of legal obligations" which "is particularly high." Such a duty and such an obligation must be interpreted, as any treaty, with the assumption that it was "intended * * * to have a certain effect," and to be fufilled in good faith. Article 2 (2) requires the use of such an interpretation, and the history of the drafting of the Charter demonstrates the reasonableness of such use. It follows that the duty of the United Nations cannot be satisfied unless it effectively fulfills its obligations in good faith. This means that the United Nations must exert its full capacity to the extent required to implement the human rights and fundamenal freedoms of the Charter.

The contents of these rights and freedoms are not, however, defined in the Charter. Efforts to spell out these commitments have resulted in a series of agreements developed under the auspices of the United Nations. All agreements require ratification by each state to become effective as a commitment on the part of that state; and, as such, do no replace the obligations under the Charter, and merely constitute a further definition of these obligations for ratifying states.

The Commission on Human Rights, which was established under article 68 of the Charter of the United Nations, was entrusted with the task of drafting a universal Bill of Rights. Its first product was the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, passed by the General Assembly on December 10, 1948. This instrument, while not an enforceable treaty with binding obligations, has been described "as a common standard of achievement for all people and nations," to be implemented by "teaching and education" and by "progressive measures, national and international." Its conception is similar to the United States Declaration of Independence. Accordingly, its scope is most broad and comprehensive, and includes civil, political, economic, social, and cultural rights.

Another agreement, which was approved by the General Assembly the day before the declaration, was the Genocide Convention. The document became effective on January 12, 1951, by the ratification of the 20th state. Its terms make destruction in whole or part of a national, ethnical, racial, or religious group as such an international crime. Other agreements, concerning delimited matters relating to human rights, have also been drafted under the sponsorship of the United Nations.

Regional implementation of international human rights has been discussed and has come conspicuously close to full realization in the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms. This agreement, which became effective in September 1953, provides for regional machinery to implement many of the political and civil rights contained in the universal declaration of human rights and fundamental freedoms.

Hope for effective national implementation of international commitments within the immediate future seems now too optimistic, despite a promising beginning. In the United States and Canada, early judicial recognition of the policy implications of the Charter of the United Nations has been critically received by large segments of professional opinion. While these precedents will, in all probability, seem to future generations to be landmarks of judicial progress, contemporary counterreactions and traditional judicial cautiousness require that the proponents of effective human rights now look elsewhere for their realization.

The two covenants on human rights represent the core of the human rights program of the United Nations Commission on Human Rights. Despite the reluctance of the United States, the drafting of these treaties has been proceeding, and the main outlines are clear.

Both covenants are designed to be legally binding agreements upon the states which ratify them. The obligation proposed in the Covenant on Civil and Political Rights is an unqualified requirement that ratifying states adjust their domestic law to give an immediate remedy for violation of the agreement to any aggrieved person. The obligations proposed for states ratifying the Covenant on Economic, Social, and Cultural Rights are, in contrast, merely "to take steps, individually and through international cooperation, to the maximum of its available resources, with a view to achieving progressively the full realization of the rights recognized in" the Covenant.

These obligations require ratifying states to implement rights of a most comprehensive scope. With respect to political and civil rights, the commitments include most of the traditional rights, such as those prohibiting slavery, denial of due process and equality before the law, and some more recent ones, such as the right of self-determination, the right to marriage and a family and the right to freedom of thought. Economic, and social and cultural rights include commitments which, although extensively recognized in the more highly developed states, sound novel when cast in the form of legal rights. These include the rights to work, rest, leisure, social security, adequate food, clothing and housing, and an adequate standard of living, as well as others.

This growth of international commitments for the protection of various human rights and fundamental freedoms reflects a basic trend in the world community. Throughout the world people are demanding the opportunity to realize values and are requiring that governments play a constructive role in advancing their aspirations. The rise of these demands has required community action, international and national, for the realization and protection of human values.

The undertakings which have been formulated under the auspices of the United Nations constitute a recognition that peace and security cannot be obtained without protection of people from deprivations and threats of external dictation which drive men to violence and war. This assessment of the importance of human rights has been the official attitude of most states, including the Government of the United States, since the inception of the United Nations. Most recently the United States delegate to the Commission on Human Rights, Mrs. Lord, declared that the United States Government recognized that "* * * systematic and deliberate denial of human rights have a direct relationship to the preservation of world peace. Peace and security cannot be assured in a world in which people who are denied their individual rights are pressed to resort to measures of violence against their oppressors. And the governments which violate human rights of those whom they control cannot be expected to respect the rights of other members of the international community."

IMPLEMENTATION PROCEDURES: FULL OF SOUND AND FURY

The sense of urgency evidenced by the alacrity with which governments proclaim human rights and declare their awareness of the dangers inherent in denials of human rights has not resulted in a corresponding effort to devise practical procedures to assure that these rights will be enforced. The procedures which have been so far accepted by the Commission leave individuals little more protected from state coercion than had been the case before the establishment of the United Nations.

The dangerous flaw in the procedures presently contained in the cornerstone of the United Nations program—the two covenants—is simply that the procedures do not provide for effective methods for guaranteeing that obligations will be observed. States may avoid any obligation under the covenants by refusing to ratify them. Most states will be unwilling to assume additional obligations without definite assurance of reciprocity. Even if a state should become a party to either agreement, neither the United Nations nor any state is obligated to take remedial measures for violations of the agreement. Only states ratifying the Covenant on Civil and Political Rights may initiate complaints; and complaints may be made only against a state which is a party to the agreement. There is no obligation to initiate complaints. On the other hand under the Covenant on Economic, Social, and Cultural Rights, neither states nor the United Nations may even bring to the attention of any international body any violation of any rights by another State; only the violating State may report its own breaches. It is no exaggeration to say that under the covenants human rights have a slightly greater chance of effective enforcement than they had before the enactment of the charter which contains specific terms obligating members to provide effective protection. The provision which authorizes complaints and therefore allows states discretion to interfere in the affairs of other states perhaps creates more difficulties than it solves.

The failure of the United Nations to increase the protection extended human rights is inconsistent with the general recognition that the protection of human rights is a task of crucial importance. The root of this dilemma may be found primarily in a world bipolar struggle that has created conditions and perspectives which have strictly limited the willingness of competing governments to share thir control over people. The Soviet Union and its satellites, while revealing a consciousness of the rising demands for human rights by pressing for the inclusion of more rights in the covenants, has taken the position that any international implementation of human rights would be an intervention in matters especially within the jurisdiction of states. It apparently did not object to ratifying the covenants without provisions for international implementation. The United States recently announced that it would not ratify the covenants, although it did not repudiate the principle of international implementation of human rights. Thus, the tensions of international competition have brought about policies which have resulted in the tightening of control over people and in the nullification of the meagre provisions for international implementation contained in the covenants. The result is to encourage the intensification of the very dangers which the charter was designed to prevent.

The inadequacies of the enforcement procedures under the covenants have been implicitly recognized in various proposals which would permit individuals, groups of individuals, and nongovernmental organizations to complain to the United Nations or to a committee established to implement the covenants. The General Assembly has repeatedly instructed the Commission on Human Rights to include provisions for such procedures either in the covenants or in a separate protocol. The latter course of action was followed briefly by the United States when it introduced a draft protocol providing for the right of individuals, groups of individuals, and nongovernmental organizations, within the territory of a State which is a party to the Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, to petition the proposed Human Rights Committee. This right of petition was limited to complaints regarding the failure to give effect to the covenant on the part of the state in which the petitioners resided or were located. However, the sponsor's withdrawal of the proposal during the 1953 session of the Commission, precipitated a movement to include the right of petition in the covenant itself. This was narrowly defeated, and the General Assembly has once again instructed the Commission to include provisions recognizing the right of petition for individuals, groups of individuals, and recognized nongovernmental organizations.

Another proposal which accorded procedural capacity to individuals was the Australian draft statute of an international court of human rights. Its terms would make parties to the covenants ipso facto parties to the statute. It would allow individuals, groups of individuals, and associations recourse to the court to decide disputes arising out of the interpretation and application of the covenants and the abuse of human rights. The decision of the court would be binding and would obligate compliance. Parties would have recourse to the General Assembly as a remedy for the state's refusal to obey the decision. The court would be empowered to refer disputes to the commission on human rights for investigation and report.

Consideration of the proposal was deferred from session to session. It does not appear that Australia will now press for its enactment. A parallel development occurred, however, when the Council of Europe provided in the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms for a European Court of Human Rights. Under these provisions it is possible for individuals to have access to the tribunal for a judicial determination of their rights.

The need to provide procedural competence for individuals was also recognized in the proposal for an Office of a United Nations High Commissioner (Attorney General), advanced by Uruguay. Under this scheme, the Office could receive complaints from individuals, could investigate, mediate, and in serious cases could prosecute the complaint before the proposed Human Rights Committee. The proposal has not yet been extensively discussed in the Committee.

All of these proposals recognize that international law has developed to the point where individuals may be its "subjects." This is clear from the absence of any requirement that states must authorize an individual complaint. Governments have thereby concretely recognized the proposition that individuals, as the ultimate beneficiaries of international law, should be entitled to invoke its protection through appropriate institutions. Such recognition merely accords with the accelerating trend to afford individuals greater access to both international and national forums to vindicate their interests under international law.

The Charter of the United Nations, in fact, can be most reasonably interpreted, in accord with the principle of effectiveness, as allowing individuals to petition the organization for redress of denials of human rights and fundamental freedoms. Authority for allowing such a petition has been partially recognized in the practice of the organization of accepting, acknowledging, and filing petitions; but the Commission has refused to submit an effective proposal in this regard. It has also refused to hear and take action on complaints regarding violations of human-rights provisions of the charter. What the Commission has done in both respects has been to abdicate its responsibility. It was granted the capacity to hear complaints and take appropriate action within the limitations of the charter by the Economic and Social Council, which established it. The Commission's subsequent statement, asserting that it has "no power to take any action" with regard to complaints, was unjustified.

Under the charter, the Commission on Human Rights is not entitled, it may reasonably be maintained, to refuse to consider petitions and take action. It is "under a duty to receive petitions alleging violations of human rights, to examine them, and, on the basis of such examination, to take all requisite action short of intervention." The right to petition is an essential right, which cannot be used effectively unless the Commission has power to act. None of the rights guaranteed by the charter can be made effective unless action may be taken with regard to violations. Nor can the United Nations perform its duty to promote human rights unless it exerts its full capacity to do so. That capacity permits effective action with regard to complaints of individuals. The charter, one distinguished scholar has written, effects "* * * a far-reaching change in the position of the individual in international law. If these provisions of the charter constitute legal rights and obligations, then they signify the recognition, in an international treaty of wide generality, of rights of the individual as such. * * * [The lack of provisions according full procedural capacity to the individual] does not imply a denial of any capacity whatsoever to vindicate his rights before international organs."

The principle that individuals should be allowed to petition the United Nations for effective action with regard to protecting their human rights is thus a deeply rooted consequence of effective interpretation. International congresses and organizations for over 200 years have heard and taken action upon petitions under agreements executed for purposes other than the protection of human rights. Almost all governments provide for the right of petition, and, while the United Nations is not a national government, is has assumed responsibility under a treaty for matters heretofore most directly the concern of such governments, and it must have the capacity to carry out its functions. Difficulties in implementing the principle remain. But these can be solved on the basis of interpreting the charter to give reasonable effect to its obligations.

Nothing in the Charter may be construed as prohibiting individuals from petitioning the United Nations. Article 2 (7) asserts that "nothing contained in the present Charter shall authorize the United Nations to intervene in matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any state or shall require the members to submit such matters to settlement under the present Charter. * * *" But this merely states a vague, prohibitory admonition and does not incorporate "technical and legalistic formulas" which freeze the meaning of the phrase. Since international law is "subject to constant change," the substance of the phrase is open to progressive definition, as John Foster Dulles pointed out at the San Francisco conference.

The proper interpretation of the article turns upon the rule laid down by the Permanent Court of International Justice. "The question whether a certain matter is or is not solely within the jurisdiction of a state," the Court declared, "is essentially a relative question; it depends upon the development of international relations." By the use of the word "essentially," rather than "solely," the draftsmen of the Charter believed that they were giving a broader meaning to domestic jurisdiction; but this broader meaning, it is clear from the proceedings, nevertheless depends upon the development of international relations.

It has become increasingly apparent that denials of human rights in one country have consequences which affect the affairs and interests of other countries. The intensity of this interdependence has been accelerated by changes in technology, in population growth, in the demands and identifications of peoples, and in techniques of organization. Today, with unprecedented instruments of destruction, such as the hydrogen and atomic bombs, it is clear that the world community cannot afford to tolerate the creation and accumulation of hatreds, resentments, anxieties, and insecurities, which are fostered by denials of human rights and which breed destructiveness too easily turned across national boundaries. It follows that international relations have developed to the point where "no people can be secure unless all people are secure." It is therefore only reasonable to assert that the domestic jurisdiction provision does not prohibit the United Nations from taking action with regard to those human rights which are implicitly rights guaranteed under the Charter and which the United Nations, under article 55, is obligated to promote.

INTERNATIONAL PROTECTION FOR FREEDOM: THE WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS

If any denial of human rights justifies action by the United Nations, certainly arbitrary arrests (i. e., a wrongful custody without legal justification) does. If individuals may be arrested or incarcerated without cause, or for causes which clearly violate human rights and fundamental freedoms, they do not have the most elementary fundamental freedom. Is is precisely the use of arbitrary arrest which has been the cornerstone of ancient tyrannies and modern totalitarian regimes.

Such arrests and detentions are clearly violations of the obligations of the charter. Yet, at the present stage of the development of the United Nations, the detained or imprisoned individual lacks any remedy. Provisions of the charter show a clear preference for the use of international machinery and principles of international law and justice for the realization of its purposes. Accordingly, a legal remedy should be developed for correcting this situation.

Probably no single legal remedy has played a greater role in protecting the freedom of individuals from arbitrary arrest than the writ of habeas corpus. This writ developed first in England as a remedy against the tyrannical practices of the Tudor Kings of arresting subjects without legal cause, or for insufficient cause, and imprisoning them indefinitely. It acquired its significance from the insistence of common-law lawyers that the Magna Carta prohibits the King from making arrests without process of law.

The practice of making arrests by the mere order of the King or his officers led to abuses such as occurred in Jenkes' case. In that case the prisoner was arrested for a speech which offended the King and he was detained indefinitely without legal justification of any kind. Jenkes' friends tried to obtain a writ of habeas corpus, but were unable to do so for months. This led to the enactment of the Habeas Corpus Act of 1679 which provided for definite, practical legal procedures for obtaining a writ of habeas corpus and penalties for the refusal of jailers to obey the writ. It did not, however, define any substantive rights. It merely provided a definite procedure whereby common-law courts could obtain jurisdiction over a prisoner to decide whether or not his detention was justified.

The question as to what grounds would justify release under a writ had been raised and considered in the Five Knights case. The prisoners were confined for their refusal to loan the king money. The return of the warden in opposition to the issued writs of habeas corpus stated that the cause of imprisonment was the special command of the king. The petitioners argued that the return stated an insufficient ground for imprisonment. But the court decided that it could not release the prisoners. The significance of the case was that it settled an important question:

"The writ of habeas corpus operates effectively within the limits of unlawful imprisonment. But it is useless against a lawful imprisonment, however unwise or unjust. Much consequently depends upon the location of the line between lawful and unlawful imprisonment. If the area of lawful imprisonment is made large, the value of habeas corpus is correspondingly lessened. The existence of the writ enables a prisoner to find out from the judges where the line lies, but the writ does not fix the line. This is done by other parts of the law."

The urgent need for placing some limit upon protecting individuals from arbitrary arrest and detention requires that the United Nations implement the use of the writ of habeas corpus. Its implementation would not enlarge the area of human rights and fundamental freedoms which the United Nations is obligated to protect. Rather it is demonstrably reasonable to assume that freedom from arbitrary arrest and detention is a freedom already protected by the charter. It is the original "fundamental freedom," without which almost all of human rights and freedoms of the charter are meaningless. The United Nations has the capacity to provide for freedom from arbitrary arrest and detention even by a writ of habeas corpus which requires proceedings effectively exercising that capacity within the territory of a member state and upon the person of a national.

As in England, the question of what constitutes an arbitrary arrest must be answered. Certainly an arrest without color of law is arbitrary. Despite any justification which may exist under municipal law, arrests which violate the human rights provisions of the charter are also arbitrary, because they violate treaty obligations. It must be assumed that these provisions include some deprivations. The minimum standards of human rights recognized by international law are rights whose violation would shock the conscience of mankind. Even before the charter, a substantial body of opinion believed that international law recognized the right of intervention where a state treats its own nationals so as to shock the conscience of mankind. It is preeminently reasonable to insist that the same degree of capacity was granted the United Nations, especially in view of the fact that the procedures contemplated would not constitute intervention.

The extent to which any matter falls within the concept of treatment which shocks the conscience of mankind must be determined, as any issue of international law, in a reasonable manner, utilizing the usual sources of international law. These might include international conventions recognized by contesting or interested states, international custom, general principles of justice as recognized in civilized nations, judicial decisions, and the opinions of publicists, and general principles of law and equity. The flexibility of international law in this respect is analogous to the due process criteria of Anglo-American law. And similarly to the due-process concept, international law leaves the problem of "the location of the line between lawful and unlawful imprisonment" to development by more appropriate authorities than a judicial body.

Nevertheless, the rule of reasonableness must not be used to make the obligation ineffective. While the question of what deprivations amount to arbitrary arrest must be answered in each case according to reasonable standards, the crucial point is that some denials of human rights justify and require corrective action on the part of the United Nations.

The initial requirement of any habeas corpus procedure is that the individual must have the right to be heard. A definite procedure must be devised. English history shows that the guaranties of the Magna Carta were useless until the individual had a right to invoke the authority of the courts. No one denied that Jenkes was illegally imprisoned; but, on the other hand, no one was obligated to hear and take action on his petition. The right to petition an appropriate judicial organ of the United Nations is a prerequisite for an effective habeas corpus procedure.

It is equally important that the state which is the custodian of the petitioner be required to deliver him to the jurisdiction of the United Nations. Such an obligation merely requires the member states to give effect to the provision requiring them to assist the United Nations in carrying out its functions. Article 56 exacts the pledge from states to act in cooperation with the United Nations. An English jailer in 1679 was under no more of a duty with respect to the courts.

The United Nations cannot effectively fulfill its obligations until it enacts its equivalent to the Habeas Corpus Act of 1679. Such a resolution would require that an appropriate judicial organ issue, as a matter of right, an order to show cause why the writ should not issue where it appears that the detention is without cause or for causes which would shock the conscience of mankind. The return of the state could raise such grounds as the plea that the petition is frivolous or malicious or that domestic remedies are still available as proper causes why the writ should not issue. If cause cannot be shown, the state would be required to deliver the petitioner to the custody of the United Nations, either actually or constructively, within or without its territory, depending upon the necessities of the case.

After compliance with the writ by delivery of the prisoner, the question of whether there are grounds which require his release may be tried. It is possible, by a series of multilateral treaties, to stipulate the most stringent restrictions upon the grounds for permissible detention. Certainly the specific content of the human rights and fundamental freedoms of the charter remain open to progressive development; within the limits of judicial discretion, a certain degree of growth is possible. At this point in the development of international law, however, release may be had if the detention is for causes, the enforcement of which would shock the conscience of mankind, or for no legal cause.

Customs and principles of international law provide sufficient precedent for a United Nations habeas corpus procedure. To the extent that the use of such procedures in municipal practice indicates the custom of nations, practices within states are authority for their use. Evidence suggests that the practice is widespread in civilized nations. Although such procedures were not heretofore thought to be capable of use in international law, the individual has only recently been extensively recognized as a subject of rights under international law, and therefore international habeas corpus procedures must be devised. Under various treaties, individuals have been allowed access to international tribunals for a judicial determination of their rights. The charter represents an international commitment for the protection of human rights, and the very object of a treaty may be to stipulate rights for individuals. Rights must be implemented to be effective. Before the charter, aliens were entitled to treatment according to the standards of civilized nations, and States could protect nationals from their own states when they were deprived of their fundamental rights to a degree which shocked the conscience of mankind. Surely, the United Nations, acting under the authority of a treaty requiring it to promote human rights, may establish procedures which merely require that states fulfill in good faith their legal obligations under the charter.

Habeas corpus procedures do not imply the use of forceful compulsion. It is the refusal of a state to deliver a prisoner to the United Nations which raises the entirely separate question of applying sanctions. No greater sanction may be imposed than is authorized by the charter. If the application of a sanction raises the issue of compulsion, arguments must be directed against the reasonableness of its application under the charter. The source of the sanction is to be found in the charter rather than in the procedure under the writ of habeas corpus. Provisions for the reference of any refusal to obey a writ to the General Assembly should be made in the resolution establishing the procedure. The application of the sanction is not a condition precedent for the requested delivery of the prisoner contained in the writ of habeas corpus.

Essentially, the writ of habeas corpus, insofar as it affects the domestic jurisdiction of states, is a procedure which is equivalent to proceedings used under extradition treaties. Under these agreements individuals who commit criminal acts within the jurisdiction of the requesting state may be extradated even if the individual happens to be a national of the surrendering state. Jurisdiction over the crime, and treaty provisions providing that the crime is extraditable, are the requisite grounds for extradition. The requesting state must only state that the person whom it requests committed the crime alleged.

It has not been heretofore supposed that a request for extradition, even if it happened to be for a crime which the surrendering state believed not to be included in the extraditable offenses in the treaty, constituted intervention. Only the threat to enforce the request may be considered intervention. Yet, insofar as the control of a state over people within its jurisdiction is concerned, the same sequence of factual events occurs under both extradition and habeas corpus procedures.

Both procedures begin with a request to surrender an individual. Both allow the surrendering state to exercise its jurisdiction over the person before surrendering him. It is unnecessary for the requesting authorities to state even a prima facie case for its request. Both procedures operate to remove from the jurisdiction of a state persons who are subject to the domestic jurisdiction of the state. While under either agreement (the charter or an extradition treaty) the right of each authority to request the removal of an individual is limited by the provisions of the treaty, each authority is competent to determine whether any particular acts fall within the provisions. Both treaties recognize the right of the individual to be accorded the protection of the higher standard of justice prevailing as between the requesting authority and the surrendering state.

In view of the similarities of these removal procedures, it can hardly be claimed that an interpretation of article 56 as authorizing the United Nations to request the surrender of an individual to its authority is per se unreasonable. A claim that a request to a state to surrender an individual under article 56 constitutes intervention would be as unreasonable as the contention that proceedings under an extradition treaty constitutes intervention. Any quibbling distinction based upon the grounds that the traditional phrasing of the writ has been in terms of an order, not a request, is a "technical and legalistic formula" of the most extreme degree which should not be respected in interpreting article 2 (7). Regardless of whether it is a request or an order, failure to honor a proper removal action of either type is a breach of international obligations. Each procedure is a logical consequence of the authority of bodies politic to exercise jurisdiction over certain acts.

AN INTERNATIONAL COURT OF HUMAN RIGHTS

Once a person has been removed to the United Nations, he is entitled to a hearing for the determination of his rights. At present no organ exists which has clear competence to make a judicial determination of the issues involved without unduly prolonged and wasteful procedures. Under article 7 (2) the General Assembly is authorized to establish "such subsidiary organs as may be found necessary * * * in accordance with the present charter," and article 13 (1) (b) authorizes it to assist "in the realization of human rights and fundamental freedoms for all. * * *" No provision of the charter or the statute of the Permanent Court of International Justice prohibits the establishment of such a judicial body for this purpose. On the contrary, the charter contains several provisions which indicate a clear preference for international judicial machinery.

It is therefore proposed that the General Assembly establish an International Court of Human Rights with authority to issue writs of habeas corpus. Certain general principles should be recognized in the resolution establishing it, such as its compulsory jurisdiction, the binding effect of its decrees, the extent of its jurisdiction, the sources of law it may use, and the methods whereby its judgment may be enforced. Initially, at least, the Court should be allowed to assume jurisdiction over matters involving deprivations of human rights and fundamental freedoms which shock the conscience of mankind. As this matter has become a legal issue, turning upon the determination of the rights and obligations of the charter, international law and rules governing the use of habeas corpus, the Court should be entitled to assume original jurisdiction over the matter; but provision may also be made for referring matters to nonjudicial committees for conciliation and settlement, if the Court deems it appropriate, after compliance with the writ. Individuals should be entitled to appeal to the Court from any nonjudicial settlement.

Such a system would encourage States to cooperate in order to avoid an adverse judicial decree and its consequent effects upon public opinion. But, whatever the final characteristics of any legal machinery which might be establised, it must provide for a judicial determination of issues of arbitrary detention in cases in which the State concerned does not acquiesce in the claim of the petitioner.

This judicial machinery would put the principles of the United Nations to a realistic test. States could no longer proclaim human rights without fulfilling them in good faith, and they could no longer assert their willingness to cooperate without actually cooperating. The crucial test of the effectiveness of an international writ of habeas corpus will be whether or not the writ and the determination of the court are obeyed—a test which is difficult to distort.

So established, the great role which the United Nations writ of habeas corpus could play in the world today would be to give hope to the enslaved and protection to the free. In countries where the craving for human dignity is mute and imaginations of men are still, the Writ, if wisely and courageously applied, could become an inspiring symbol of the determination of the free world to protect the ancient cultural and religious traditions embodied in the ideals of freedom and democracy. It could convert platitudes into realities, generalities into actualities, words into actions. Its enactment could be "the shot heard 'round the world," and the rights which it asserts become as much a rallying point for modern man as the abstract ideals of the Declaration of Independence were for another generation also in time of tyranny.

Once established in the fabric of international relations, it would "erect a worldwide barrier against the knock on the door at 3 a. m." and the paralyzing fear resulting from the existence of that fact. By making it a concern of the world community that no person shall be imprisoned except according to humane law, individuals will be strengthened by the knowledge of the powerful moral and physical support of the United Nations and be given the courage and capacity to resist those who would destroy just government by totalitarianships of the left or the right.

Or Forfeit Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 11, 1954

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, the August issue of the Machinists Monthly Journal, the official organ of the International Association of Machinists, carries a very fine and thoughtful article on the subject of the McCarthy Question, by Albert J. Hayes, the distinguished and eminent president of this great union. I am proud to call Mr. Hayes my friend.

I ask unanimous consent that this fine article by Mr. Hayes, entitled "Or Forfeit Freedom," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OR FORFEIT FREEDOM

(By A. J. Hayes)

Ninety-one years ago this next November 19, a tall gaunt man stood overlooking the harrowed ground of a recent battlefield and contemplating the rows of markers which stood in mute tribute to the men who had died there short months before.

To the crowd which had gathered there to help in dedicating the field of Gettysburg as a national cemetery, Abraham Lincoln opened his remarks with these words:

"Fourscore and seven years ago our fathers brought forth upon this continent a new nation conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal."

In those simple, beautiful words, the man who devoted his presidency to saving the Union summed up the purposes of the men who had created it. And against those stated purposes he appraised the cause and the future of a Nation torn by strife.

Today, as in Lincoln's day, we are faced with the profound problem of saving or sacrificing the fundamentals upon which this Nation is founded. Today, we too, are a people divided.

Our division, thank God, does not concern the solidarity of the States which make up the Union, and we do not seek to resolve our differences by force of arms. But the division is there, and with it a threat of violence so serious that the authorities of our Nation's Capital one time recently deemed it wise to place guards before the residence of a distinguished member of the Government who was a party to the dispute.

Perhaps it behooves us to stand, surveying the carnage of a field of verbal battle, and contemplate that battle and what it means in terms of the Nation we all cherish.

The founders of our Nation, who had expressed their new conception of the reasons for and the functions of government so magnificently in the Declaration of Independence, were not content to let the matter stand on a statement of principles.

They knew, as we must know, that if a people are to remain free, their freedoms must be secured in the very structure of government. And that freedom, in the final analysis, must rest upon the impersonal principles of law, rather than upon the changing whims of man and fate.

They, therefore, devised a government of laws and not of men; and to secure the human rights that they so dearly held, they carefully divided the authority of government among three coequal branches—the executive, the legislative, and the judicial—to assure that each of them might be held in check by the other two.

In the structure of the government which they devised, and at the strong insistence of the people of the newly independent States of America, they spelled out in detail certain rights over which the Congress would have no domain and into which the Government in general could not intrude. These guaranties exist in the first 10 amendments to the Constitution of the United States—the Bill of Rights.

In any matter affecting the rights of free Americans, we must be concerned with three fundamental questions: The basic rights of citizens, as established in the Bill of Rights; the delicate balance between the three branches of Government, as set forth in the Constitution; and the proper functioning of each branch of Government to further and protect the rights of the people and the security of their Nation in the light of the concepts established in the Constitution.

OUR BASIC RIGHTS AT STAKE

Let us first consider the basic rights of free Americans as they are involved in the dispute which blanketed the Nation's airwaves this spring—the Army-McCarthy hearings.

Fifth in point of order among the 10 guaranties established in the Bill of Rights, but second to none in point of importance, is that defining the rights of persons and the limitations of government in matters relating to trial, punishment, and the taking by government of life, liberty, and property.

This famous amendment to the Constitution, now infamous in the minds of some as a hiding place for faithless Americans, reads as follows:

"ART. V. No person shall be held to answer for a capital or otherwise infamous crime unless on a presentment or indictment of a grand jury, except in cases arising in the land or naval forces, or in the militia, when in time of war or public danger; nor shall any person be subject for the same offense to be twice put in jeopardy of life or limb; nor shall be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself, nor to be deprived of life, liberty or property without due process of law; nor shall private property be taken for public use without just compensation."

Every one of the guaranties in the fifth amendment is important. Every one of them protects some right which had been violated by an autocratic state in the experience or the knowledge of the men who drafted the amendment and who came to America to be free.

When you hear someone remark sneeringly about the fifth amendment he is referring of course to that part which states that a person shall not "be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself."

FREEDOM DESPITE DRAWBACKS

That guaranty undoubtedly has caused delay and difficulty in meting out justice in some cases. Yet the reason for the guaranty is of such overwhelming importance that few people would seriously contend we should abandon it and revert to the old practice, still used by Communist and Fascist dictators, of extracting confessions by physical and mental torture. Indeed, the fifth amendment is an expression of one of the basic concepts of freedom which distinguishes our form of government from communism and fascism.

To sacrifice this guaranty in the belief or on the pretext that its elimination is necessary in order to fight communism would be a tragic fallacy and a dangerous precedent. For if this fundamental guaranty of individual rights may be ripped away, why not other rights as well? The end result of such a process would be less and less freedom for the men and women who make up the country, and more and more power concentrated in the hands of government, or select groups of persons in Government. And thus we would endanger the very foundation of the form of government we seek to protect.

It is nonsense to defend an abrogation of the fifth amendment for witnesses appearing before congressional committees on the grounds that such committees do not have the power to try, convict or punish in the sense a court does. They do not have such power, but they do have, through publicity and influence, the power to impair a man's life, restrict his liberty and deprive him of the honor which is more sacred than property.

To make an outcast of a man, to strip him of his chances for a livelihood, to impugn his loyalty—this is fully as serious as depriving him of life, liberty and property. And, in congressional hearings, the whole procedure is accomplished without due process of law.

But the danger and the damage do not stop there. The violations of human rights and dignity, so rampant in some of our recent congressional hearings, tend to pervade our attitudes in other fields.

A tragic example of this fact is to be found in the case of Val Lorwin, a former Government official, who had been indicted and was recently tried for perjury in connection with statements made in his application for Federal employment and before a Government loyalty board.

The trial brought out the fact that the Federal attorney who obtained the indictment had excused his failure to permit the accused to be heard by the grand jury on the grounds that his appearance was unnecessary on the grounds that "he would probably claim the fifth amendment like other Communists." Here we have the terrifying spectacle of a Government prosecutor so imbued by the attitude that human rights are unimportant that he would make such a charge; and a jury so conditioned to this attitude on the part of high public officials that they would accept the excuse as evidence against the accused.

Fortunately our courts of law have not yet suffered the corroding influence of this spreading state of mind, and the case against Lorwin was dismissed because of the prosecutor's actions. But the danger remains, and it will not disappear until we dispel from our minds the unreasoning fears which permit some of us to tolerate, and even to approve, such gross violations of the spirit of freedom and justice which appear with increasing frequency in high public places.

Besides the human rights which are basic to our concepts of freedom, the recent struggle also involves the related subjects of the division of power among the branches of Government and the proper functions of congressional investigating committees.

The maintenance of the division of powers is essential to the preservation of our form of government, because concentration of authority in one or another of the three branches will produce autocratic leadership.

The present situation involves the division of powers between the legislative and executive branches of our Federal Government and the extent to which the Congress may rightfully and safely intrude into the sphere of action of the executive.

Basically, of course, the Congress has control over the broad activities of the executive through control of revenue raising and appropriations measures. In this field the executive proposes and the Congress disposes. And such an arrangement is essential to the democratic control of government.

DIVISION OF FEDERAL POWER IMPORTANT

In the matter which is causing division within the country now, however, the question goes even deeper—how far can the Congress take over the functions of the executive on the alleged grounds that the latter is not performing its functions intelligently or honestly. For that is the only grounds upon which such an invasion of the executive can be defended.

Yet, even admitting for the sake of argument, the validity of the contention, does the remedy lie in an expansion of congressional action at the expense of the executive or is such a solution too dangerous from the viewpoint of our fundamental freedoms?

It seems to me that recent events have proved the solution dangerous. In effect, what we are witnessing is the substitution for executive judgment in matters in which the executive is most fully informed and most competent to act, of a personal, and a highly personal, machine by a member of the legislature.

Since the machine is not dealing directly with legislation over which the courts have review, its actions are not subject to the restraining influence of the judicial arm of government. And by flouting and urging others to flout the authority of the executive, it seeks also to free itself of this restraining force.

Thus in a limited sphere we are witnessing the development of the very concentration of power against which the Constitution seeks to protect us.

This dangerous development is the result of a perversion of congressional investigative power, aided by the misuse of the cloak of immunity which has been cast about the shoulders of Congressmen and Senators in the course of their official duties.

PURPOSE OF CONGRESSIONAL INVESTIGATIONS

The investigative power, so essential to the proper conduct of Government, is intended to be used as a means of revealing the need for legislation to correct situations adversely affecting the public welfare. The publicizing of such hearings, when properly done, may be considered useful in informing the people as to the nature of the situation and the need for remedial action.

In the present case, however, the principal figure at issue has been busy investigating charges of communism in Government and private agencies working for or influencing the Government for more than 4 years, and to date neither he nor the committee which he now heads has made any recommendation for legislation designed to correct the situation. Apparently the investigative power is being used, not to develop or recommend legislative action, but as a tool of publicity to advance the political fortunes of an individual.

Let us keep in mind the fact that the issue involved is not that of ferreting out Communists and denying them access to positions and powers which will enable them to influence the course of Government and to weaken the Nation in its struggle against Red aggression, hot or cold.

There is no doubt about our union's stand concerning communism. The IAM stands second to none in its struggle against that evil force. For 30 years we have denied office and membership to Communists, and have been engaged in ridding ourselves of those who managed to worm their way into our ranks. And, may I say, we were doing those things while some of the self-proclaimed anti-Communists of today were trying to undermine our union, the labor movement, and the Nation for the benefit of world communism.

We are opposed to communism as a philosophy and as a form of government. We are opposed to fascism on both counts also. And we think it is folly to seek to oppose either by embracing the other. They are equally abhorrent to our concepts and our way of life.

If this were purely a matter of fighting communism, I would stand squarely on the side of the fighters. But the matter is not that simple. The question concerns the defense of individual liberties and the proper use of Government rights and privileges.

Let us glance for a moment at the implications of one phase of the current situation. The self-styled protector against communism is known for his ruthless handling of persons who, as far back as 20 years ago, did or said things that might be interpreted as indicating friendship with Communists or sympathy toward communism. Yet, when he is faced with indisputable evidence that he himself, less than 10 years ago, expressed sympathy with a proposal of Communist Russia, he dismisses the facts as ridiculous and false.

In other words, he uses his congressional immunity to place others outside the law, and his power to place himself above it. This is the road to tyranny.

If we have learned anything from history, and especially from recent history, we should have learned to beware the self-anointed leader who proclaims: "For your own sake give me power and authority. I alone can save you." The power and authority he seeks are generally in conflict with law, and when he has them he turns the law against those who have betrayed it for him.

I have faith that the American people will remember, and in that remembering will reject the Roman circus to which they are now being treated and demand an honest investigation into the facts concerning Communist infiltration into our Government and sensitive industrial installation, and the legislation deemed necessary to put an end to it. Then, once more, we can turn back to the orderly processes of government, secure in the knowledge that we will be protected against Communist subversion without sacrificing the individual liberties which our form of government guarantees to us.

I only hope that happens before the abuse of congressional immunity and investigative powers results in a general revulsion which will unnecessarily curtail them. They are useful tools of democracy when they are properly used, and it would be unfortunate if their use were impaired because of their abuse by a few ruthless persons.

THE CONSTANT STRUGGLE FOR FREEDOM

Let us always remember that freedom and democracy are not automatically maintained. The fight to gain them was difficult. It is no less difficult to keep them. And their keeping must be in the hands of the people, who gain most from them. For only in those hands will they be secure alike from the assaults of foreign powers and the insidious plottings of native tyrants.

If we are made of the same stuff as our fathers, who won and developed our freedoms, we shall end the shameful show which debases us and the division which weakens us, and stand once more united in the resolve that "government of the people, by the people and for the people shall not perish from the earth."

Hon. Clifford McIntire, of Maine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALT HORAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 11, 1954

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the Congressional Record, I am pleased to include an excellent article by Larston D. Farrar, which appeared in the current issue of the American Vegetable Grower.

It features our colleague the Honorable Clifford G. McIntire, of Maine. It is an interesting and well deserved tribute to a sincere and hard-working Member of the House.

Representative Clifford Guy McIntire, a Republican from Maine now on Capitol Hill, is a man with whom vegetable growers in all parts of the Nation should become acquainted—for several good reasons.

He has been cited by the University of Maine as an outstanding potato grower in that very famous potato State.

Congressman McIntire has been instrumental in getting potatoes included in the section 32 fund program, thus giving the lowly spud a needed boost at a very critical time.

He (with his twin brother, Smith, who now actually operates the old home place) grows high-quality seed potatoes that are used by other potato growers in all parts of the Nation, and particularly east of the Mississippi River. He has been noted for years for the quality of his seed potatoes, so much so that the McIntire name acquired prominence nationally long before he ever went to Congress.

As a sidelight, his present home is the building in which he attended grade school. He transformed the old school into a home when it became available for private purchase years ago. Few Americans are fortunate enough to spend all their lives in the schoolroom in which they first studied.

These, then, are the highlights of the career of soft-spoken, thick-set blue-eyed, wavy-haired Mr. McIntire, but they do not, by any means, tell the whole story of his career, or why potato growers in every section of the country should listen to him when he speaks.

Clifford Guy McIntire was born May 4, 1908, as was his twin brother, Smith, of course. They, and a sister, Flora, were the children of Frank G. McIntire, who was born in and destined to farm in the township of

Perham, in Aroostook County, Maine, even before the railroad had come through to that section. Frank himself began growing potatoes on the first few acres of land he cleared with his own hands, selling the spuds to starch factories at first, and later shipping table stock when the railroad came in.

As a matter of fact, Aroostook County was no more noted for potato growing in those days than any other county in the Nation. But CLIFFORD McINTIRE's life more or less parallels the development of the county as a potato-growing center, and, during virtually every year of his life, the amount of acreage devoted to potato growing has increased in that area. Today Maine has 156,000 acres planted in potatoes, of which 85 percent is in Aroostook County.

Too, through the years, CLIFFORD McINTIRE has seen the growing techniques change, with planting and harvesting being mechanized more and more with every passing decade. His father planted potatoes by hand and dug them by hand. CLIFFORD cannot remember the time when he had to do either of these things without machinery.

He has seen the per-acre yield increase greatly, too, due both to the favorable soil and climate and to improved seed stock, fertilization, and other growing techniques. He is proud that, on his acres, he has averaged as high as 500 bushels to an acre. It is easy to compute the gross yield on 200 acres with that sort of a yield. Farmers in few other areas equal or surpass his potato growing prowess or that of many other Aroostook growers.

After attending elementary and high school in Aroostook County, both CLIFFORD and his twin brother attended the University of Maine, majoring in agronomy. They lived on the farm for a long while, working with their father, but in 1933 CLIFFORD became associated with the Federal land bank. He worked for that organization until 1947, at which time he became assistant general manager of the Maine Potato Growers, Inc., one of the largest cooperatives in the United States, with headquarters at Presque Isle.

The McIntire family, which includes a daughter and a son, was living right well and enjoying life as potato growers par excellence, without dreams of political service until the death of the Honorable Frank Fellows, who had ably represented Maine's staunchly Republican Third District in Congress for several decades, in the summer of 1951. CLIFFORD still isn't quite sure how he became so involved personally in the race, but it was the consensus among the farmers of Aroostook that some good potato man ought to go to Washington, so he put his hat in the right against seven opponents for the Republican nomination. He won handily, and he took office for the first time on January 8, 1952.

"I've never regretted my deciding to come to Washington," he told the writer recently. "While I have no other political ambitions, I still want to stay in Congress for a few years, because I am sincerely desirous of contributing to agriculture and the potato industry whatever service my background and experience will permit."

AGRICULTURAL COMMITTEE MEMBER

He believes he was extremely fortunate to get a place on the coveted House Committee on Agriculture almost as soon as he came to Washington. Because his life had been spent in farming, he felt that he could render his maximum service to the Nation on that committee. Time has shown that this is indeed the case. The name of McINTIRE has become well and favorably known in the office of the Secretary of Agriculture, as well as around Capitol Hill, where the Congressman attends committee meetings as regularly as he once fertilized his potato crops, and cultivates knowledge as assiduously as he did the spuds in Maine.

"The two big cultivation problems for Maine potato growers always have been the thick, heavy vines and the free stones in the soil," he points out. "We have been picking up rocks for decades, and likely will be for years to come. We have learned how to thin the heavy vines with chemicals, but they still are a problem.

"Our growing season is very short. It begins in June and potatoes must be out of the ground by October 10. Maine grows potatoes of all varieties, shapes, sizes, and taste, but we stick generally to the white potato varieties. Needless to say, most Maine growers are as proud of their products as they can be."

He admits readily that Maine has suffered in the past year or so, due to the drop in the potato market. He does not minimize the financial loses in his own Aroostook County, where farmers "really have taken a severe licking," in his own words.

FREE MARKET FOR POTATOES

But aside from section 32 purchases, and perhaps marketing agreements, he is strongly in favor of a free market in potatoes, and in other farm crops.

"Except in periods of great distress, there is absolutely no reason for Uncle Sam to be interfering with the workings of the free market," he says firmly. "I think that my program has been in that direction, and I am sure it will continue to be."

While minimizing the role of Government, he thinks there is plenty that farmers ought to do, individually and collectively, to improve the potato situation.

"The challenge today is in merchandising," he said. "It lies in the processed fields, in the fresh market, and in better handling of our product from beginning to end. It also lies in better handling of production patterns, so that markets will be satisfied uniformly by potatoes from various areas."

PROCESSED MARKET HOLDS PROMISE

He sees increased hope for potato growers from increased processes which use potatoes—chips, frozen french fries, and the like. As he pointed out, few prophets would dare have predicted, two decades ago, the growth of the potato-chip market to its present size. And few other prophets, only a few short years ago, would have predicted the promise that the future holds for frozen french fries and other potato products.

All in all, a few conversations with Representative McINTIRE offer plenty of optimism to the potato growers of the Nation. They can be certain, too, that in him they have an intelligent, informed, aware spokesman in a strategic spot in the Government. If anybody can get to the heart of a potato problem, he is that man.

There Is Less Darkness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER F. MACK, JR.

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1954

Mr. MACK of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, perhaps the most successful businessman in Springfield operates the John W. Hobbs Corp. He is a typical American who came up the hard way with sheer ingenuity and aggressiveness to own and operate the largest home-owned industry in the capital city of Illinois. John Hobbs is admired by all and has accomplished what few men in comparable positions are able to do. He has gained the admiration and respect of the men who work for him. So familiar is he with the details of his operation that he can stop to do the work of machinists at any level of production. I am indeed proud to have his plant in my district and especially proud to have him as a friend.

Mr. Speaker, a recent article in the Illinois State Register tells part of the interesting story of John W. Hobbs, and, therefore, I would like to include this article as part of my remarks:

ASSORTED SMILES

(By V. Y. Dallman (admiral))

JOHN W. HOBBS SUBJECT OF SMILEFUL ARTICLE IN GOOD BUSINESS BY MARCUS BACH

Thanks to Mrs. Frank Grant of the Grant Stores, 322 South Fourth Street for calling our attention to a delightful article in the magazine Good Business by Dr. Marcus Bach.

Dr. Bach is a distinguished writer, lecturer and teacher who has spoken in Springfield several times. He has many friends here. Among his magnetic books is "They Have Found a Faith," which treats in an illuminating, understanding manner various sorts of minority sects and faiths, including followers of Father Divine et al.

After visiting Springfield's manufacturer, John W. Hobbs, Dr. Bach wrote a very pretty story. Following are excerpts:

"There is less darkness in the world than there used to be, and one man who has helped to bring light into obscure nooks and crannies is John W. Hobbs. Hobbs switches turn on lights all over the world. They work silently and unseen. No doubt you have used them, for the chances are 8 to 1 that when you open the trunk or the glove compartment door in your car and a light goes on, it is Hobbs' invention that does the trick.

"I visited Mr. Hobbs recently in Springfield, Ill., where the John W. Hobbs Corp. is located. Attractive brick buildings, which stand in a landscaped setting, provide 70,000 square feet of flood space. * * * It is a big establishment, and Mr. Hobbs is a big man.

"The story began nearly 30 years ago when Hobbs lay on a sickbed in a Chicago hospital. He didn't know whether he would ever fully recover. He didn't know what the future would hold for him if he did get well. But one thing he knew: A man's mind is the light of life, and when that mind makes conscious contact with God-Mind there is bound to be some special illumination.

"Hobbs was associated at the time with a man who had been trying to perfect an electric automobile clock. Researchers had been working at it, but a solution to the problem eluded them. On his hospital bed Hobbs started making contact, conscious contact, with creative intelligence. * * * While on his hospital bed Hobbs built the mechanism in his mind. * * *

"With faith and work he succeeded. The Hobbs Corp. was founded in 1938. When World War II caused the suspension of automotive accessories manufacturing, Hobbs had already originated and perfected the Hobbs hour meter and pressure switch. These were important instruments in recording the use and maintenance of powered equipment and were installed in aircraft and marine engines, in tractors, tanks, and combat vehicles.

"The Hobbs principles are those of every successful business: Honesty with a purpose, guaranteed service, products that do the best possible job. Management-labor relationships in this establishment are unique. Johoco (John Hobbs Corp.), a worker-inspired, worker-operated organization, settles disputes and generates good will in factory relations. Johoco, which sounds like something out of the Old Testament, is actually something out of the old tradition, which contends that men do not work for an employer, but with him.

"* * * And behind the day and night operations, behind the roaring presses, the singing wheels, and the spinning gears, behind the faultless instruments and the blueprints and the planning is the Hobbs philosophy. * * * For guidance and light, make conscious contact with the mind of God."

Death of Mrs. George C. Thorpe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 11, 1954

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an article entitled "Mrs. Thorpe, Vice Chairman of Citizen's Council, Dies," from the Washington Evening Star of August 10, 1954.

Mrs. Thorpe, whose funeral services will be held today at the Foundry Methodist Church, Washington, D. C., was vice chairman of the Commissioners' Citizen's Advisory Council, and was one of the outstanding civic leaders of the District of Columbia. She was the only woman member of the Citizen's Advisory Council.

For many years she had taken an active interest in civic causes, education, schools, and safety. She was chairman of the AAA women's safety committee, and was one of the constructive citizens of the District of Columbia. I think it would be only fitting that this tribute to her may appear in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Mrs. Thorpe, Vice Chairman of Citizens' Council, Dies—Widow of Lawyer Was Long Active in Civic Affairs

Mrs. George C. Thorpe, 73, a vice chairman of the Commissioners' Citizens Advisory Council, died last night in Doctors' Hospital after a brief illness. She lived at 2139 Wyoming Avenue NW.

Mrs. Thorpe was the widow of Col. George Cyrus Thorpe, United States Marine Corps, retired. Following his departure from the Marine Corps, they settled in Washington 30 years ago, where he practiced law until his death in 1936.

Born in Morris, Minn., Mrs. Thorpe was the former Miss Cora Wells, daughter of H. H. Wells, a Senator. She was educated at the University of Michigan, where she took her bachelor of arts degree cum laude, and did postgraduate work at the Sorbonne, in Paris; at the University of Munich, Germany; and at Columbia University, in New York.

ACTIVE IN CIVIC AFFAIRS

Mrs. Thorpe was active in civic affairs here for many years. She was one of the original members and the only woman member of the Citizens' Advisory Council.

For 16 years she also took a leading interest in the Automobile Association. As chairman of the legislative committee of the AAA's District advisory board, and as chairman of the group's woman's safety committee, she supported legislation enacted in the cause of traffic safety.

Mrs. Thorpe was on the board of directors of the Washington committee for education on alcoholism and was the only woman representative appointed by the Commissioners on their Alcohol Clinic Board.

WROTE FOR MAGAZINES

She wrote numerous articles on art and travel topics for national magazines and fine arts journals. She also served as a columnist on newspapers in Boston and Honolulu, T. H. While in Honolulu, where Colonel Thorpe was commander of marines at Pearl Harbor, she wrote a book based on Hawaiian legends, entitled, "In the Path of the Tradewinds."

Mrs. Thorpe was a member of the Chevy Chase Club, the Foundry Methodist Church, and formerly was active in the League of American Pen Women.

Survivors are a son, George W. Thorpe, of Berkeley, Calif.; two daughters, Mrs. Frederick Winegar, of the Wyoming Avenue address, and Mrs. Charles Brousse, of Perpignan, France, and a granddaughter.

Funeral services have been set tentatively for 2 p. m. tomorrow at the Foundry Methodist Church, 1500 16th Street NW. Burial will be in Arlington Cemetery.

Labor's Role in Our Fight for Survival

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 30, 1954

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I wish to insert an address I delivered yesterday, August 10, before the 69th annual convention of the Ohio State Federation of Labor, at the Hollenden Hotel, Cleveland, Ohio:

Mr. Chairman, members of the Ohio State Federation of Labor, friends, I consider it an honor and a privilege to have this opportunity to address the 69th annual convention of the Ohio State Federation of Labor. All through my public career, I have tried to champion the cause of labor, and labor, in turn, has been very helpful to me in making my work in Congress more beneficial to the people of my district, to the State of Ohio, and our Nation. I shall continue to espouse the cause of free labor and in turn, I look forward to free labor carrying a greater share of the responsibility and initiative necessary to preserve our way of life and the very spirit of freedom throughout the world in these perilous days in which we live.

Only a few weeks ago, I returned to the United States after a period of 5 weeks in Europe as a member of the Select Committee to Investigate Communist Aggression. During that 5 weeks' period, our committee held hearings and took testimony in London, Munich, and Berlin. The committee is chairmaned by the Honorable Charles J. Kersten, of the Fifth District of Wisconsin, who is performing a tremendous service for the Nation. Over 200 witnesses were heard. All of them were competent to speak about communism from firsthand experience, and most of them had suffered the tortures imposed by communism on those who resist its methods. These witnesses came from every walk of life; men, women, and even children.

Upon my return to the United States, I issued a public statement in which I said, among other things, the following:

1. That communism has established a Red Colonial Empire made up of over 28 once free and independent nations with Moscow as the capital city.
2. That the madmen of the Kremlin are working overtime to colonize the rest of the world for communism.
3. That acceptance of the idea that a free society such as ours, and the slavery of communism, can coexist, will lead us either to war or complete surrender to the tyranny of Moscow. These are the only alternatives allowed by coexistence.
4. That the United States should be on guard against a sneak attack by the Communists because they will do just that as soon as they feel they have a 50–50 chance of winning an all-out war.

I made these statements based upon my long study of communism, in theory and in practice, and because the cumulative evidence of the testimony taken by our committee during its European investigation left me no other alternative. The Communists talk about peace when they mean war—they always turn the meaning of words upside down. While they make outlandish claims for peace with the free world, particularly during and since the Geneva Conference, here are some of the things they are doing which show just how untrustworthy their claims are:

1. In East Germany they have organized what is called a people's police, with the strength of approximately 200,000 men. They claim this is a civil police force whose only responsibility is to maintain order. Our committee heard testimony from a recently escaped lieutenant in this people's police force, and other former members of it, which clearly establishes it to be a military unit, trained and equipped for aggressive warfare.

Did you ever hear of a civil police force needing light and medium tanks—mortars, and machineguns and hand grenades?

Did you ever hear of a civil police force engaging in combat maneuvers? The witnesses appearing before our committee told us that was the case with the so-called people's police of East Germany.

There can be no doubt that the masters of the Kremlin plan to use this so-called people's police of East Germany as a striking force against the democratic institutions of West Germany.

Our committee also heard testimony from one of the highest ranking officers in the Communist secret police of the Soviet Union who recently escaped to the free world. He told us everything that the Communist leaders do—all their planning, is predicated on their belief that it is only a matter of time before they will be strong enough to attack and defeat the United States. This statement was corroborated by other witnesses not only from escapees from U. S. S. R., but escapees from all the once independent and free nations of Central and Eastern Europe.

By a coincidence, the distinguished president of the American Federation of Labor, George Meany, was addressing the 91st annual convention of the New York State Federation of Labor the day that I returned from Europe and made my statement to the press. I was very pleased to see that George Meany pulled no punches in his condemnation of those who would lead us on the treacherous path of coexistence. George Meany also raised the question as to whether the policy of massive retaliation was being replaced with a policy of massive appeasement. There are strong indications that the Eisenhower administration, whether it is conscious of the fact or not, is well along the path of appeasement and has just about swallowed the line of peaceful coexistence promoted by the Communist criminals in Moscow. George Meany's question will become extremely pertinent in the immediate months that lie ahead.

The advocates of Marxism—whether we call them Communists or Socialists—have been preaching a doctrine for over a 100 years which promises a utopia and a workers paradise on this earth. They promise that when Marxism comes to power there will be no exploitation of the workers and that instead only those who work will reap the rewards of their efforts, that no one will be subjected to the drudgery of long hours of work or back-breaking labor. This siren call of the Marxists has had an effect on many people in various parts of the world. I want to tell you some of the experiences that our committee heard about concerning life under Marxism and also what happened to those who believed in and prepared the way for communism to take over.

To begin with, every witness that appeared before our committee related that life under communism was beyond the comprehension of those who had never experienced it. They made it clear that there was absolutely no relationship between the theory and promises of Marxism and the practices of communism once it seizes total power in any country. Here is how the workingman fares under Communist rule.

We had before us a young Hungarian man, about 25 years of age, who had escaped from Hungary about 4 months previously. He told us that he was the principal support of his mother and two minor children. He failed to express enthusiasm for communism and as a consequence, lost his job as a trucker in a warehouse in Budapest. He was out of work for several weeks because no other jobs were open to him. He became desperate because his mother and two younger children in the family depended upon him. He went to the Communist authorities and begged them for the opportunity to work. After considerable delay, they finally told him that they had a job for him away from Budapest and his family, in the mines. There was nothing he could do but accept that job. He told us about how he worked 64 hours a week and how everybody at the mines worked the same hours. He also told us that every evening after work he was required to give between 1 and 2 hours of his time to political lectures. Following this routine, he had approximately 6 hours each day that were his own—then he was free to pursue his own pleasure, recreation, rest, and even sleep, before starting work the next day.

I asked this young man about the average hours of work per week and how much the hourly rate was for overtime. His answer was that 64 hours a week was the normal workweek and that no one in Hungary, under the Communists, receives overtime pay no matter how many hours they are required to work.

We also heard the story of a young man from East Germany who was conscripted into the VOPOS, which is the Communist military combat organization in East Germany, which I have referred to earlier. This young man's father was arrested by the secret police and sent by the Communists to one of the former terror camps of Hitler because he organized and led a strike in one of the factories in protest against the long hours of work, poor pay, and the lack of food in East Germany. Consequently, this young man was required to assume the responsibilities of a family and start out to work at the age of 15 years. The only job open to him was in the uranium mines of East Germany. He worked in those mines for over 3 years—at least 10 hours a day, 7 days a week. One day he was approached by one of the secret police who asked him if he would like to become a member of the VOPOS. This same agent explained to him that the VOPOS was the civil police organization of East Germany, and assured him that he would be able to take better care of his mother and two sisters if he were to become a member of the VOPOS. He naturally grabbed this opportunity. He went through all the training and preparatory work required for admission into the VOPOS, and finally was accepted. For over 3 years he was compelled to assist in carrying out the orders of the Communist bosses, including night arrests, breaking up demonstrations, and intimidating workmen who showed the slightest signs of rebellion against the harsh system of life. The reason he escaped was that he could no longer stand the dirty job of suppressing the people—even though it would mean reprisals against his mother.

We heard many other witnesses who corroborated the story of the two I have cited. I raised the question with many witnesses as to whether labor was permitted to organize itself in the nations enslaved by communism. The answer I got was that the masters of the Kremlin do all the organizing, they tell you what labor organization you belong to, they tell you what the program of that labor organization is, and it is not long before you come to realize that this so-called labor organization, sponsored by Moscow, is nothing more than an instrument of oppression of the people.

I asked whether labor had the right to bargain with the employer. The answer I always received was that the employer was the state, and no one was allowed to bargain with the state, because the state knew what was best for the workers.

One witness testified about a strike started in a mine shaft in the area of the Vokurta slave labor camps. The strike was quickly settled. Sixty-four workers were shot and killed and over 200 were wounded. None of the demands of the workers was granted.

I was reminded of my experience while visiting Moscow in 1945. I went through one of the model factories in Moscow, where I saw elderly women engaged in heavy labor, youths 12 to 14 years of age tending machines, and all the other workers busily engaged in metting the norms of work. I asked the plant manager whether there were ever any strikes at the plant. His answer was, "Oh, of course not; everybody is so happy and well satisfied with working conditions here."

I have not the slightest doubt that the elite class of communism, that relative handful of people who control over 800 million people, would all give the same answer to such a question. Such answers would be humorous if they were not so tragic.

We also heard the truth about what happens to the believers and supporters of communism once the Communists come to power in any country. The indigenous Communists are soon liquidated. They are replaced by people who know no other loyalty but the autocracy of Moscow. There are as many purges as necessary to make certain the elite clan in all the Red colonies are completely loyal to Moscow. Then they usually throw in a couple of extra purges for good measure.

In my opinion, the biggest fraud in all history of mankind is that which has been carried out under the banners and slogans of communism. The Communists promise a workers' paradise, and what they have given to the world is an empire of slavery. The Communists promise an economy which would develop a classless society. What they have actually created is a small elite class which controls 98 percent of the people and in which slave and forced labor camps are an essential part of their type of economy. Let me emphasize that the new elite class which has sprung up in the slave world dominated by the Communists live a life of privilege, luxury, and splendor unequaled in the history of the world.

Against this background, let us take a look at the question of trade between the free world and the eimpire of slavery controlled by the Communists. The first question we must ask ourselves is whether we, a Nation which stands firmly by the rights of free labor, indeed, a Nation predicated and dependent upon the great strength that comes from free labor, can engage in a program of trade and commerce with a gang of international criminals who hold in their grip over 800 million people. My answer to that question is divided into two parts.

To begin with, if we allow ourselves to be drawn into a program of trade with the criminals who control the Communist world, just as surely as day follows night, we will pull down and eventually destroy the decent standard of living which we have fought so many years to win for the American worker.

The second is that any trade carried on with the criminals who control the Communist empire contributes to their war plan which they will unleash against the United States just as soon as they feel they have a 50–50 chance of winning. Let me give you several examples of my point. If we were to sell some of our so-called nonstrategic materials, such as our surplus wheat, butter, eggs, and other food products to the Communists, they would pay for these commodities with gold mined by the suffering slave laborers in Magadan and other slave-labor camps. Also, this would permit them to deploy people who would otherwise be employed on the farms, to the industrial centers to work in factories for the production of planes, tanks, guns, ammunition, and other materials of war.

For these reasons, both of which are morally sound and in every sense compelling, I say that we must reject any idea that the fruits of free labor should be put into competition with the products of millions of helpless slaves. I completely reject any such possibility, and am certain that those who are enslaved by the Communist criminals hope and pray that we will not fall victim to the economic trap laid by the Kremlin.

Some months ago, when it was my privilege to be the keynote speaker at the National Conference on Peace and Freedom Through Liberation held in Washington, I said that the defense of the free world was in the hands of religion, free labor, free enterprise, and enlightened nationalism. I then pointed out that these four great forces for freedom had millions and millions of allies and supporters in the many nations enslaved behind the Iron Curtain. After completing the very thorough-going investigation of the European end of the business in which our committee is engaged, I am all the more convinced that we shall win this struggle only when we have used the full strength and resources of religion, free labor, free enterprise, and enlightened nationalism.

In the task that lies ahead, the outcome of which will determine whether freedom in any form shall exist upon this earth, labor has both a major contribution to make and a tremendous responsibility which I believe it is prepared to assume. The labor movement in the United States came into its present position by hard, difficult, and trying struggles against those who refused to recognize those principles of social justice upon which a free society is based. Organized labor has had to prove its metal; it has demonstrated that it can stand up and fight for that which is right against that which is morally wrong. That is why organized labor is the same as free labor in the United States.

Recently, the dangerous notion has been promoted that the scions of the blooded families and the financial aristocracy are best prepared to lead the fight against the slavery of atheistic communism. Consequently, Washington now has an overabundance of Wall Street financiers, Broadway lawyers and dreamy-eyed Ph. D.'s directing the fight against the Communist conspiracy. There are more imported cars parked outside of Government buildings today in Washington—and I mean during working hours—than at any other time since I have been in Washington, and that covers a period of 12 years. This to a large extent accounts for the appeasement offensive now being undertaken by the administration. It also accounts for the bungling stupidity exhibited by our delegations at both the Berlin and Geneva Conferences. Coexistence is their real battle cry. Don't let them fool you with the camouflage of words now being used to explain away our tragic losses in the last year or so.

In my considered judgment, we cannot win the fight against communism unless that fight is led by people who stand for principles and who have experienced the good fight for those things which are right against those things which are wrong. Free labor is in a unique position today to be the standard bearer in our common struggle against the tyranny of communism. Free labor must not be found wanting in this period of world crisis. Free labor must demand the right to be, and to actually become, a full partner in the struggle which our Nation has been called upon to lead against the Moscow Communists who openly state their objective as being world domination.

Labor must demand this right and I assure you that I shall, in every way, support this demand.

The American Indian in Transition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 28, 1954

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent I am extending my remarks to include an article from the June 1954 issue of the American Anthropologist called to my attention by Sol Tax, the distinguished professor of anthropology at the University of Chicago. Mr. Tax enjoys a position of preeminence in his field. His studies include the Indians of Guatemala, Mexico, and North Africa, as well as those of our own country. He is an author of renown, and editor of the American Anthropologist and other professional journals.

I am inserting this statement in the RECORD because I believe it may prove helpful reading to Members of this body in the consideration of proposed legislation concerning our Indian citizens. There are still pending before us bills providing for the termination of Federal supervision over Indian tribes. Mr. Tax and others in the field believe that these bills should not be passed against the will of the Indians, as in their opinion some tribes are still in need of Federal aid. I am happy to have this opportunity of presenting their viewpoints that the Congress in its deliberations may have before it the full picture. The article follows:

THE AMERICAN INDIAN IN TRANSITION

(By John Provinse and Others)

EDITOR'S NOTE.—In June, 1926, Secretary Hubert Work, then Secretary of the Interior under President Coolidge, asked the Institute for Government Research (the Brookings Institution) of Washington, D. C., to undertake a privately financed comprehensive survey of the administration of the affairs of the American Indian. The resulting report of the 10-member survey group, submitted in February 1928 under the title "The Problem of Indian Administration," is known as the Meriam survey, from Lewis Meriam, who headed the survey group. It became the guiding document for the administrative changes initiated during President Hoover's administration by Indian Commissioners Rhodes and Scattergood and, with some important additions in matters of Indian self-government, was the foundation for much of the new deal for Indians so vigorously pursued during the ensuing Democratic administrations by Commissioner John Collier. In the intervening quarter century anthropologists and other scholars in continuing contact with Indian tribes have closely observed their varying and altering reactions and adjustments both to these policies and to the changing world. It is time that anthropologists ask themselves what facts and insights they now have to contribute. Hence, with conference funds provided by the Wenner-Gren Foundation for Anthropological Research, Inc. to the editors of the American Anthropological Association to stimulate conferences and publications on anthropological thought, the editors brought together a small group of anthropologists to examine the basic assumptions underlying our national approach to the Indian problem. The purpose was not to evaluate administrative policies and practices but to examine objectively those assumptions of fact or value, express or implied, which are held by the general American public, by Congress, and by the Executive, and which appear to guide the present handling of Indian affairs. Does general anthropological knowledge of social organization, culture change and cultural resistance, and particular knowledge of the American Indian suggest how valid these assumptions may be? At the request of the editor, John Provinse prepared a list of the assumptions (some of them contradictory) which seemed to him to underlie recent policies and practices involving Indians. This list was sent for comment to David F. Aberle*†, David A. Baerreis*†, Milton Barnett*†, John Bennett*†, Donald Collier†, John Collier*, Edward P. Dozier*†, Frank Eggan*†, Glenn L. Emmons, Jules Henry, M. J. Herskovits†, Francis Hsu†, J. A. Jones*† William J. Kelly, Edward A. Kennard, Clyde Kluckhohn*, Oliver La Farge*, Alexander Lesser†, D'Arcy McNickle*, George Quimby†, Robert Redfield, Robert W. Rietz, Robert Ritzenthaler, Reynold J. Ruppé, Jr.*†, Thomas Segundo†, Julian Steward*, Ruth Hill Useem*†, and John Useem.

Written responses, by those marked with an asterisk, were reproduced and distributed to participants. Agenda for the conference itself were then prepared (by analyzing the responses and reorganizing the assumptions) for the editor by Edward Bruner, Fred Gearing and Robert Merrill.

In addition to names above marked with a dagger, and Provinse, all of the editors and a dozen graduate students attended the conference held at the University of Chicago on February 20, 1954. The assumptions were discussed systematically for 3 hours, after which it was agreed that Provinse would prepare a report of conference agreements to be sent to all other participants for comment and correction. Provinse's resultant summary of conference conclusions was sent for comment to all participants and revised to take into account criticisms and corrections.

An assumption which seems to underlie the basic philosophy of much of the United States approach centers about the idea that assimilation of the American Indian into the normal stream of American life is inevitable, that Indian tribes and communities will disappear.

There was complete agreement on the part of the discussants that this prediction is unwarranted. Most Indian groups in the United States, after more than 100 years of Euro-American contact and in spite of strong external pressures, both direct and fortuitous, have not yet become assimilated in the sense of a loss of community identity and the full acceptance of American habits of thought and conduct. Nor can one expect such group assimilation within any short, predictable time period, say, 1 to 4 generations. The urge to retain tribal identity is strong, and operates powerfully for many Indian groups. It finds support in some of the attitudes and behavior of the general American public, and has been encouraged by Federal policy for the past 20 years. Group feeling and group integrity among the American Indians are as likely to gain strength in the decades ahead as they are to lose it.

On the other hand we may expect continuing adaptation of the Indian groups to the non-Indian society surrounding them. Modification will occur in Indian material culture, in Indian thought and value systems, and in tribal organizational arrangements. But the process of change will be so varied in degree or amount, so selective in type or aspect of cultural feature, and so dependent on social factors of racial prejudice, local attitudes, administrative practices in the larger American society, plus Indian group resistances, that it cannot be taken for granted for any particular group of Indians, much less for all.

Futher, the group was unanimously of the opinion that forced, or coercive, assimilation is self-defeating in practice, tending to antagonize and drive underground in the Indian groups those leaders who might otherwise develop constructive and cooperative attitudes toward greater acceptance of non-Indian society. Also, the extent of coercion that would have to be applied in order to force assimilation—coercion sufficient to disperse the Indian communities—would not be permitted by the American public. Meanwhile, the current practice of telling Indians that their assimilation is inevitable is probably more deterrent than contributory to adjustive changes, since it gives rise to feelings of anxiety and resistance that lead to rejection of new ideas and institutions.

While tribal groups may be expected to survive indefinitely, individuals will continue to leave them, either to join already existing Indian communities in towns and cities, or to enter the larger American society as acculturated, relatively well accepted and adjusted individuals. Despite such individual outmigration the population of the Indian groups will probably maintain itself or increase due to high birth rates and falling death rates.

The general prediction, therefore, is that Indian communities will maintain themselves as cultural islands, more or less well adjusted to or integrated into the American system, at the same time that a growing number of individual Indians will make personal adjustments in the general society. With respect to the communities, therefore, the conference agreed that despite external pressures, and internal changes, most of the present identifiable Indian groups residing on reservations (areas long known to them as homelands) will continue indefinitely as distinct social units, preserving their basic values, personality, and Indian way of life, while making continual adjustments, often superficial in nature, to the economic and political demands of the larger society.

It was noted that cultural islands of many kinds presently exist in America, retaining their cultural identity in thought, value system, and custom, as they make adjustment to the political and economic pressures of the powerful culture surrounding them.

The existence of such cultural islands is generally accepted as proper by the American public, if they do not violate the public sense of basic decency and are not considered an economic burden. There is also a contradictory feeling that differences should disappear in time, and in public and governmental thinking about Indian policy the feeling that differences should disappear seems generally to take precedence over the feelig that groups have a right to self-determination. It is likely that this choice is made, not too consciously, because assimilation is thought to solve a problem—the present economic burden of nonproductive Indian groups—which problem is not seen as solvable in any other way.

In passing the Indian Reorganization Act of 1934, the United States Congress assumed that tribal self-governing organizations, either Indian or Euro-American in form, or combining elements of both, are feasible and culturally compatible means to carrying on tribal affairs without the assistance of Federal or other agencies of government, and that these can be made compatible with other local and State governing agencies. The conference agreed that these assumptions are sound. But it also agreed that such organizational arrangements, if imposed upon a group rather than organized by it, will not function effectively. Experience indicates that the successful operation of those forms of organization which are supported by Indian rather than Western cultural sanctions requires an increased tolerance and understanding by State and local governments, and the willingness of such governmental units to accept and work with the variant forms of organization.

With the recent removal of the last remaining Federal legal restriction on the personal liberty of Indians—the repeal of the Indian liquor laws—our policy seems clearly based on the assumption that Indians are abe to exercise all the rights and duties of normal citizenship without the special status of personal disability implied in the term "wardship." On the other hand, the Federal Government does have special trustee relationships to Indian property and Indian lands, different from those between private citizens and private trust companies in that the latter are set up more voluntarily and bilaterally with legally clearer accountability of the trustee to the beneficiary. Most Indian groups value these special arrangements now existing for the protection of Indian lands. Although these trusteeship provisions may tend to strengthen negative attitudes toward Indians by non-Indians who do not understand the nature and history of the many special provisions that have arisen out of treaties, legislation, and judicial decisions, ending them is not likely to greatly reduce the negative attitudes. This result would more probably be achieved, and with less disturbance to Indian well-being, by retaining the protective arrangements and educating the public as to their nature and history.

Even though some treaties are phrased to suggest that Indians have certain rights in perpetuity, the United States probably did not in its treaties and agreements with Indians over the past 150 years intend to bind itself to provide forever the goods, services, privileges, and tax exemptions it has traditionally furnished to Indians. But it is no less true that many Indian groups feel strongly that they do have a special privilege or right to the tax-free status of their trust lands, guaranteed to them in many instances by treaties or agreements, or confirmed to them in practice by the continued recognition of such exemptions by the Federal Government in its dealings with State and local governments.

The Meriam survey declared that the Indian Service "should be recognized as primarily educational, in the broadest sense of that word * * * devoting its main energies to the social and economic advancement of the Indians, so that they may be absorbed into the prevailing civilization or be fitted to live in the presence of that civilization at least in accordance with a minimum standard of health and decency." The chief effort has been in the education of children, with respect to which one can now compare day schools with boarding schools, and Indian schools with mixed (or public) schools. The conference thought it likely that day schools tend to have greater influence in promoting changes within the Indian community than do boarding schools, in which sense they are superior to boarding schools in educating Indian children to take their places in American life. On the other hand boarding schools seem more strongly to propel individuals off the reservations and into non-Indian society. It is also probable that (other things being equal) public schools are less effective educationally than Indian Service day schools because teachers of classes made up principally of non-Indian children are not in a position to adapt their teaching techniques to the cultural behavior of the Indian pupils and because the latter run into racial and cultural prejudice in the public schools.

On the issue of vocational training, it seems evident that the teaching of skills is profitable only if the vocational opportunities available will clearly match the skills taught. In changing reservation circumstances this is often a difficult prediction. There is also the negative aspect that emphasis on vocational training lessens the opportunity for the appearance of youthful Indian leaders who are prepared for higher educational training.

Since Indian reservations are land based and rural, it is generally taken for granted that all rehabilitation or developmental programs should start with the land. On the contrary, it is clear that for many groups, and for many individuals in all groups, the successful development of a land-based economy is neither sound nor feasible. The land base on many reservations is inadequate and many Indian groups, for cultural reasons, resist entering an agricultural economy. Not all economic possibilities have been explored, and it is probable that their potential resources including imported industry can support larger populations than now exist on most reservations.

It has long been assumed that the most successful planning for development and use of reservation resources is cooperative between Government and the Indian groups. The conferees agreed that all experience supports this view.

It was stressed in discussion that the nature of the Government-Indian relationship, with the Government exercising both authority and guidance, is self-defeating, but that with great administrative skill that contradiction can be somewhat diminished. Failure to consult with the Indian groups and achieve their consent and approval in programs affecting their future welfare and status results in frustration, demoralization, and unnecessary delays in obtaining improved Indian-Government working relationships. Indeed the function of governmental services might be most fruitfully performed if defined as the development of the reservation resources and of the Indians who own them, rather than the management of either of them.

It is suggested by some that there may be purposeful hesitancy on the part of Government to assist in developing reservation resources in order to influence Indians to leave their reservations. If it exists, such a policy is self-defeating, for the insecurity and sense of abandonment likely to be engendered in the Indians probably results in their "digging in" deeper on the reservation. It may be taken for granted, however, that population pressures on some reservations will make it desirable, or even necessary at times, for some Indians to seek their living elsewhere. Furthermore, some individual Indians will want to find opportunities for a life adjustment away from their reservation, even though reservation resources are relatively plentiful. However, with reasonable planning and effort and the expenditure of reasonable amounts of money the present reservations, many of them with undeveloped or underdeveloped resources, including labor and skills, can be brought much beyond their present capacity to support the Indian population.

In enacting the Johnson-O'Malley Act in April 1934, the Congress implied that many community-type services provided Indians by Federal agencies (such as education, medical care, agricultural extension, welfare administration, road construction and maintenance) can and should be provided by the States or other local units of Government under mutually agreed upon contractual arrangements. The conference concluded that in many instances such transfers are advantageous. But since in many cases the State or local governments either cannot carry the financial burden, or are unwilling to assume such burden without full reimbursement by the Federal Government, it would be erroneous to assume that the costs to the Federal Government for such services can be appreciably reduced by such contracts. Nor is it likely that the services rendered by the States will be as good or better than those rendered by the Federal Government, as seems frequently to be assumed. Rather, local competing interests and local prejudicial attitudes may be expected more strongly to affect State administration of services than Federal. Nor is it probable that the mere passage of an act of Congress transferring responsibility to a State, or the completion of a contract for services, will of itself solve the racial, social, and psychological problems of Indians in local communities.

On the basis of substantial evidence, it appears that most Indians believe that State and local units of Government will be less likely to protect or promote their interests than will Federal agencies; their fear of the transfer of services and administration to the former, whether real or fancied, is not easily dispelled. Nor do Indians consider that by such transfers the Federal Government ethically discharges its legal and traditional obligations toward them.

It is sound to assume, on the basis of past performance of several Indian groups, that as adequate skills, techniques and leadership are developed among them, and as the tribe's economic situation improves and permits, Indians can and will assume responsibility for financing and operating many community and other services formerly provided by Government, and in some cases will eventually be able to assume the entire burden. Therefore, the assumption lying behind the decentralization of the Indian service, providing stronger field staffs to help Indian communities develop such skills and leadership, is probably justified. It does not follow, however, that the basic problems of Indian affairs administration are predominantly problems of organization and management, to be solved by constant reorganization of administrative functions. An important factor in success is likely to be personnel at all levels who are not only competent, but understanding of the Indian point of view, nonauthoritarian, and "people-oriented."

The assumptions heretofore dealt with do not exhaust the many assumptions that are made about Indian affairs. Among others, there are the assumptions held by the Indians themselves. Ruth Hill Useem presented to the conference a list of these, which was well received. The discussion it evoked indicated general agreement that these assumptions are made by Indians; but there was not time to consider how universally or deeply these ideas are held. Therefore, they are simply reproduced below.

Besides the assumptions discussed here, there are other factors which are uncontrollable, or unassessable: Social forces over which the Bureau of Indian Affairs, or any other agency of Government, or for that matter any definable social or political entity, have no appreciable control. They projected their confusing reality into the discussions at Chicago many times. If one is even to sense the complex and contrary quality of Indian affairs administration, let alone grapple with it, they must be kept always in mind. It is appropriate that anthropologists should venture their assessments of these supplementary or overriding trends and forces, but a single short conference is inadequate to the purpose. The comments made during the conference on these subjects are not definitive enough to be printed as agreements; considered study and further discussion are desired.

STATEMENT BY RUTH HILL USEEM

The administration of peoples is a two-way process and the way in which any program develops will depend to some extent on the assumptions of the administered as well as the assumptions of the administrators. For example, one of the assumptions of the administration is that no matter what policy is enacted, it can be put into operation. To considerable extent this assumption is true because the Indian makes the assumption that Indians are powerless to affect decisions concerning their fate and must accept such decisions as others make.

Below are some Indian assumptions relevant to American Indian affairs. They are based mainly on knowledge of Sioux and may not be applicable to other groups. It is worthy of note that most Indian assumptions are negative, unenthusiastic and fearful, the outlook of a beaten people. Any policy, and more particularly its implementation, must reckon with these assumptions.

It is assumed:

(1) That the Indian in the foreseeable future will remain a series of separate and identifiable groups despite the fact that some individuals are absorbed into dominant population.

(2) That over the years, the Indian can expect no consistency in policies regarding him. No matter what policy is today, tomorrow it will be different—even opposite.

(3) That the interests of the dominant society will take precedence over the interests of Indians in any policy decision; Indian interests will be considered only when they coincide or at least do not contradict white interests.

(4) That the Indian can do little to affect decisions concerning Indians. Furthermore, those non-Indians who are most sympathetic to Indian interests are individuals who have little power either to make or to influence decisions. Non-Indian friends occasionally have limited power but whatever is done which is favorable to Indians will soon be wiped out by other interests hostile to Indians.

(5) That whatever the policy enacted, the Indians will be told that such policy is "in his best interests" or is "for his own good."

(6) That the turning over of Indian affairs to the States is inevitable. Concerning this inevitability there are several assumptions:

(a) That a State administration is more likely to be hostile to Indians than is the Federal administration. There is more patterned hostility toward Indians locally.

(b) That State administrations will be less able to render health and welfare services (e. g., hospital care, relief, rehabilitation). Local State governments have fewer resources to run these programs than have the Federal agencies.

(c) That State administrations will be run by persons with whom the Indians are in direct competition for land, tax dollars, services, etc., and, therefore, even though they may understand the Indian more, they will be less likely to take Indian interests into account.

(7) That the stated goals of a policy may be and usually are quite different from the consequences of a policy—with the goals usually being more favorable to the Indians than the consequences.

(8) That some type of Government agency should and will be responsible for Indian affairs. Little thought is given to exploring nongovernmental alternatives. (To considerable extent this assumption is shared by governmental agencies.)

Bad Pay Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN R. DAVIS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 11, 1954

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial appearing in the Washington Star of August 10, 1954. This editorial supports the position of the 29 of us who voted against this measure.

BAD PAY BILL

The House yielded to powerful pressure from postal employees' organizations in approving an administration-opposed 7 percent pay raise for postal workers. This was a tug of war between a well-organized employees' lobby and Government forces led directly by Postmaster General Summerfield and indirectly by President Eisenhower. In an election year it is not surprising that the union groups with strong vote-controlling potentialities won out. But the bill passed by an overwhelming majority of the House is bad legislation for several reasons. The President would be justified in vetoing it if the Senate should make the mistake of sending it to the White House.

The House measure is bad because it would perpetuate and aggravate inequities in the postal pay structure which ought to be eradicated, because it would add about $180 million to the Post Office Department's staggering annual deficit without any provision for meeting the extra cost and because it would discriminate against civil service workers generally in the Federal establishment, none of whom would benefit from the House plan. The administration originally had asked for a modest pay increase provided under a postal reclassification bill designed to eliminate inequalities in the present pay schedules. Coupled with the pay bill was a measure to boost mail rates. The unions launched a bitter fight against the administration plan, demanding a substantial straight-out pay raise now, with a reclassification study to follow. Mr. Summerfield later agreed to a compromise 5 percent raise linked with reclassification. If postal employees were to be given this concession, it was generally understood that similar legislation for all classified employees would be passed. Meanwhile, the administration has been urging passage of the companion measure to raise postal rates for a continuing attack on the rising deficit.

The House, by insisting on the 7 percent, no-reclassification postal bill, has imperiled the pay products of Federal workers at large at this session of Congress. The Senate can save the day by refusing to grant the one-sided pay raise voted by the House and by substituting for it the more equitable and less costly administration pay program. This is the only way to assure fair play for all employees on the Government payroll.

Illinois in Need of Federal Assistance in Drought-Stricken Area

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER F. MACK, JR.

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1954

Mr. MACK of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, during the month of July, central and southern Illinois suffered a drought of disaster proportion with a loss of approximately 80 percent of the corn crop and with major losses in livestock due to the intense heat. With a shortage of water and the pastures completely gone, many of these farmers find themselves in need of immediate assistance. I have contacted the governor requesting that he appeal to the President to have this area classified as a major-disaster area but, to date, it has not been so designated.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include the following telegram and copies of two letters sent by State Representative Carl Preihs, to which we are still awaiting replies:

JULY 26, 1954.

Hon. WILLIAM G. STRATTON,
Governor, State of Illinois,
Springfield, Ill.:

As of 4:30 this afternoon no request has been received by the Federal Government from your office requesting that southern Illinois be declared a major-disaster area due to the recent extended drought. In view of this information I urgently request that you immediately appeal to the President to make this declaration as it is readily apparent that all of the 10 counties in my congressional district and at least portions of the 20th, 23d, and 25th Congressional Districts would qualify for and are in dire need of Federal assistance.

If State of Illinois at present time is unable to qualify with participation requirements established by the provisions of Public Law 875, 81st Congress, to become eligible for assistance by the Federal Government, then I urgently request that the State legislature be called into special session. It would indeed seem proper that our State government should make a substantial contribution toward assisting the farmers in alleviating damage resulting from the present drought disaster in addition to qualifying for Federal assistance under the provisions of this act.

FRANK F. MACK, Jr.,
Member of Congress.

JULY 9, 1954.

Hon. WILLIAM G. STRATTON,
Governor of Illinois, Springfield, Ill.

DEAR GOVERNOR STRATTON: I know that you are interested in aiding the people in the drought-stricken areas of the State, a portion of this area being the counties of Christian, Cumberland, Fayette, Montgomery, and Shelby. These counties have had such insufficient rainfall that the pastures are barely alive and some are completely dead. The farmers are suffering terribly.

Because of the drought, much feed will have to be shipped in this fall. At present, freight rate on hay from Northfield, Minn., to Pana, Ill., is $12 per ton. As I understand, there is a Federal regulation which will permit the reduction of freight rates to drought-stricken areas. It so happens that in the area of Northfield, Minn., the rainfall has been abundant and the hay is plentiful.

If you would lend your efforts and would communicate with Washington, I feel that a reduction in such rates could be effected for this area of the State. If we had a Democratic administration in Washington, I would not have to bother you with this matter, but I realize that you are very influential with the Washington Republicans, and can bring about some relief.

May I have your reply.

Sincerely yours,

Carl H. Preihs.

General Assembly,
State of Illinois,
Pana, Ill., August 5, 1954.

Hon. William G. Stratton,
Governor of Illinois, Springfield, Ill.

Dear Governor: On July 9, I wrote to you regarding the terrible plight in which the farmers of the 40th Senatorial District, comprised of Christian, Cumberland, Fayette, and Shelby Counties, find themselves. A copy of my letter is attached hereto.

Regardless of this plea, I have, as of this date received no reply or even acknowledgment of such letter.

Due to the prolonged drought which this area has been experiencing, the farmers are indeed in dire circumstances. Since approximately 70 percent of the farmers, of Christian County alone, are tenant farmers, many will find themselves being driven off of the farm, unless some relief is extended to them.

In behalf of these farmers, I am asking for your assistance in taking such steps as are necessary to declare this a disaster area, so that Federal aid may be obtained.

Sincerely yours,

Carl H. Preihs,
Representative 40th Senatorial District.

Happiness Crusade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 11, 1954

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include herewith an editorial from the New Era, Reading, Pa.:

Happiness Crusade

A big campaign is shaping up to supplant the prophets of gloom with the happiness boys as we enter the 1954 congressional campaign across the Nation.

Handing out of the lollipops in Secretary of Commerce Sinclair Weeks who announced recently that the Government is stepping up spending to generate greater industrial activity.

This, of course, is the same Secretary Weeks who said March or April would bring an upturn in business.

This is the same Secretary Weeks who labeled liberal Democrats and labor leaders as prophets of gloom because they realistically demanded that unemployment be ended by Government policies.

This is the same Secretary Weeks who now says things will be better in the fall.

And why is the Government interested in spending more money now? Because the administration is determined to paint a picture of a rosy economy to help influence the elections in November.

If the people fall for this mallarkey then we underestimate their intelligence. Somehow, we believe the people realize they were hoodwinker by soap-opera specialists who sold the public on a change in 1952. This change arrived in the form of falling business activity and 4 million unemployed, not to mention the millions working only short time.

Now the same strategy is being unveiled for 1954. The propaganda machines are being oiled to disseminate word pictures of tranquility to lull the voters into a feeling of ease and well-being.

Will it succeed again? We don't really know. But judging from the undercurrents and rumblings among unemployed workers and even among those who fear layoffs, all the bologna in the world won't fool the voters a second time.

It cost a lot of money to learn this lesson.

South May Produce a President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 11, 1954

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith an article by Doris Fleeson in the Washington Star:

South May Produce a President—Sparkman and Kefauver Victories Viewed as Proof That Dixie Likes Leaders Who Take National Position on Great Issues

The results in Tennessee added to those of the Alabama primaries show that there is no longer any reason southern statesmen cannot be leaders of the Nation as well.

That the South has begun to take the new dispensation in stride is clearly evidenced in the renomination of Senators John Sparkman and Estes Kefauver. Both these Senators on their own motion had sought national preferment and had accepted the risks involved in being national candidates—Sparkman for Vice President on the Adlai Stevenson ticket in 1952 and Kefauver for President.

In their races this year, all the forces of reaction coalesced behind aggressive young opponents. Against both Senators Sparkman and Kefauver the charge was used that they were liberal Democrats and internationalists. The effort also was strongly made to use the segregation issues against them.

Both Senators defended their records successfully and stood by the Supreme Court. Senator Kefauver calmly told his constituents that anyone who told them they could successfully defy the highest Court in the land was deceiving them.

The noise of the well-financed campaign against Senator Kefauver had frankly frightened him and his friends. His 3-to-1 victory shows that the people of a Midsouth States are not inclined to turn the clock back, but take some pride in the fact that one of theirs took national positions on the great issues of the day.

In supporting Senator Sparkman, the people of Alabama similarly stood by a Senator willing to carry the banner of the National Democratic Party and to serve on the United Nations.

Because of what they are and what they stand for, the Kefauver and Sparkman victories are much more important than their personal good fortunes. It has been a drawback, both to their party and their country, that southerners seemed to feel they could not keep step with the Democratic platform and maintain their power at home.

The northern liberals have dominated Democratic conventions and elected Presidents through their hold on the pivotal States. Yet the political skill and brains of the southerners have swayed the course of Congress and given Presidents Roosevelt and Truman the legislative majorities which made their programs possible.

Their own fears have helped to keep them from the national ticket and in some cases from congressional leadership. Senator Lister Hill, of Alabama, for example, would probably be the Democratic leader today had he not held back years ago lest he be called upon to sponsor or at least defend civil-rights legislation.

Senator Kefauver's availability as a candidate for President has been strengthened by his big victory. At the same time, he and Senator Sparkman have increased the availability of all their southern colleagues.

The South then may look forward again, if the present trend continues, to a southerner in the White House. The last of the planters to possess the Presidency was Zachary Taylor who took office on March 4, 1849. He was a Whig President but a slaveowner from Louisiana. After him, the North, the Midwest, and the West took over. Presidents might claim southern ancestry but they were not thereafter southerners.

Actually the bolt of Southern States to President Eisenhower was a sign that the old taboos no longer held force. Whatever the reasons they publicly assigned to their votes, southerners could have had no notion that they were not voting for the candidate of the progressive Republican faction who was opposed to segregation.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized book dealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by book dealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. The money derived from such sales shall be paid into the Treasury and accounted for in his annual report to Congress, and no sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

HIG

Cha

Rout

Bills
duced
and 3

Bills
S.
the
amen
S. 3
with
S. 3
with
S. 3
4427,
privat
H.
CCC
S.
of soc
(no
S.
port
writte
S.
for th
S.
of he
writte
S.
hearin
tegic
report
H.
hearin
relati
cine,

Bill
appro

Witn
amen

Exce
Ma
Di

IN TI

Mr
unan
the
from
burgh
nual
Veter
The
from
print

I an
of pa
great
I ar
whose
quent
Forwa
Yes
a bac
enemy
It mo
offens
all th
eratio
armie
The
in Wo
The
to the
ond
breaki
throu
crush
sive
for th
The
ers—
and
Lauer
Und
outst
victor
will t
You
devoti
Ameri
My
that
and
today
And
that
way i
did in
Loo
perien
vince
of cit
the a
Ou
stren
under
ity fo
Let
to ou

Appendix

Excerpts From Address by Hon. Edward Martin, of Pennsylvania, to Eightieth Division Veterans' Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 12, 1954

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD excerpts from an address I delivered at Pittsburgh, Pa., on August 7, at the 35th annual reunion of the Eightieth Division Veterans' Association.

There being no objection, the excerpts from the address were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am happy to join tonight in this reunion of patriotic Americans who have served a great military organization.

I am proud to salute the gallant division whose brilliant record is summed up so eloquently in its motto: "The 80th Only Moves Forward."

Yes; the Blue Ridge Division never took a backward step under pressure from the enemy. It never failed to gain its objective. It moved only forward through the Somme offensive, the St. Mihiel campaign, and in all three phases of the Meuse-Argonne operation which broke the back of the Kaiser's armies.

The 80th Division covered itself with glory in World War I.

Then it added another glorious chapter to the story of American valor in the Second World War. It swept across France, breaking down Nazi resistance. It smashed through the Maginot line. It helped to crush Von Rundstedt's massive winter offensive of 1944 and then crossed the Rhine for the final drive into central Germany.

The 80th Division had great commanders—Major General Cronkite in World War I and Major Generals Patch, McBride, and Lauer in World War II.

Under the inspiring leadership of these outstanding soldiers you went forward to victory because you had the spirit and the will to defend American freedom.

You fought with loyalty and the highest devotion to duty because you believed in American ideals.

My comrades, I want to impress upon you that the same spirit of loyalty, patriotism, and sacrifice is America's most vital need today.

And I want to impress upon you further that it is up to the veterans to show the way in these days of troubled peace as they did in time of war.

Looking back over my many years of experience in public life, I am thoroughly convinced that one of the paramount duties of citizenship is to take an active part in the affairs of government.

Our Republic will not attain its full strength until every American has a clear understanding of his individual responsibility for the future of America.

Let us consider just one angle relating to our Government and let us compare the situation as it exists today with 1917 when the 80th Division was organized at Fort Lee, Va.

In 1917 the Federal Government had approximately 500,000 employees on its payroll. Today, even with the cuts made by the Eisenhower administration, there are more than 2,300,000 Federal jobholders.

In 1917, when we were preparing for war, it cost less than $2 billion to operate all the functions and services of the Federal Government. In 1953 we spent $75 billion, which will be reduced in the present fiscal year.

In 1917 the national debt was just under $3 billion. Today it has just about reached the statutory limit of $275 billion and Congress has been asked to raise the limit above that staggering sum.

Our national debt is now bigger than the combined debt of all the nations of the world.

The tax burden of the American people is still the heaviest in all history, even after the reduction voted by the 83d Congress. The combined tax load of 72 other nations, including Soviet Russia, is less than that of the United States.

I mention these facts and figures because they show how much our Government has expanded. They point to the dangers of big government.

In 1878 a distinguished veteran, Senator Benjamin Harvey Hill, of Georgia, rose in the Senate and warned against the dangers of government grown so big that it was beyond the control of the people.

He said and I quote:

"But, sir, I have said I do not dread these corporations as instruments of power to destroy this country, because there are a thousand agencies which can regulate, restrain and control them; but there is a corporation we may all dread. That corporation is the Federal Government.

"From the aggression of this corporation there can be no safety. * * * It is, in my opinion, the danger of dangers to the future of this country. Let us be sure we keep it always within its limits. * * *

"As sentinels of the country's watchtower, Senators, I beseech you, watch and guard with sleepless dread that corporation which can make all property and rights, all States and people, and all liberty and hope, its playthings in an hour and its victims forever."

Unfortunately we have among us so many misguided persons who do not fully appreciate the real meaning of Americanism.

They do not seem to realize that our system of free government places upon each citizen an equal share of responsibility for our growth and progress.

They do not seem to understand the fundamental principle that each American must bear his share of the burden of supporting and defending our country.

The ultimate result of carelessness, apathy and neglect of our civic duties can be the loss of our freedom.

If our form of government is to survive we must all take an active and intelligent part in it. I do not mean national affairs alone, but local, county and State government as well.

It is a vital part of good citizenship to work for the election of men to public office who are imbued with the highest ideals of Americanism. Good government begins at the ballot box.

Another important obligation of patriotic citizenship calls for every American to make his voice heard on the issue of loyalty to the United States.

There is no room under the American Flag for those who would tear down our free institutions or our system of government.

Every Communist who preaches the overthrow of our Government by force is a traitor to America.

They must be driven out of every place where they dare to challenge the American way of life.

Vigorous, courageous, militant patriotism is the most powerful weapon against communism.

We must teach young and old that freedom, under God, is our most precious possession while communism means slavery under the iron rule of godless tyrants.

We must tell over and over again the glorious story of our country's rise to greatness among the nations of the earth.

We must tell and retell the story of our sturdy, courageous pioneers and the heroic exploits of those who extended our frontiers over the mountains and across the western plains.

We must point with pride to the patriots and statesmen who pledged their lives, their fortunes and their sacred honor in support of the resolution that "these United Colonies are and of right ought to be free and independent States."

I make this appeal to you because you are qualified by your service in time of war for leadership in civic responsibility.

You can serve America best by making the principles of good, clean, honest, efficient, economical government your individual and personal concern.

Let us go forward once more, armed and equipped, to fight for our country.

Let us take our places in the front line of the battle to keep America free, strong, prosperous, and at peace.

Letter From Senator Reynolds Regarding Requests for Government Assistance to the Automobile Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAM W. REYNOLDS

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 12, 1954

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Nebraska, like many other Senators, has been literally bombarded in the last few days with communications from automobile dealers, relative to a bill known as the bootleg bill.

My reply to those communications sets forth my views on the proposition of an industry's running to the Government whenever that industry has a problem which it cannot solve within its own ranks.

I ask unanimous consent to have my letter on that subject printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON FINANCE.

This will acknowledge your message relative to S. 3596, having to do with certain practices now prevalent in the automobile industry.

The writer has been engaged in the coal business for 46 years. No great industry has been plagued with cutthroat competition and ruinous trade practices more than has the coal industry.

In 1937, this great industry threw in the towel and came running to Uncle Sam crying for help. In effect, it said to its Government, "We have neither the courage nor the ability to solve our own problems. We abdicate the rights of free American businessmen to run their own affairs, the rights under which our forebears built a great industry. We ask the Government to take over and run the coal business. Let your bureaucrats write the rules and regulations."

The result was the infamous Guffey Coal Act of 1937. Fortunately, that act expired in 5 years under its own terms. Five years was enough. Never again will we coalmen ask the Government to solve problems which should be solved within our own industry, and solved without violation of antitrust laws.

I will oppose any bill which comes to the Senate as a result of some industry running to Uncle Sam for help because it is unable to control bad practices within its own ranks.

Yours very truly,
SAM W. REYNOLDS,
United States Senator, Nebraska.

Excerpt From Speech by Former Senator Ashurst

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRY M. GOLDWATER
OF ARIZONA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, August 12, 1954

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, on the 4th of July, 1954, former Senator Henry Fountain Ashurst, of Arizona, delivered a very eloquent speech before the Association of the Oldest Inhabitants of the District of Columbia. In order that the thousands of persons who read the RECORD each day may have an opportunity to see at first hand the never-dying brilliancy of this great orator, I ask unanimous consent that an excerpt from that speech be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It would be a fascinating drama, in the realm of the imagination, to see pass before us all the men who signed the Declaration of Independence and also all the men who signed the Constitution of the United States, documents that partake of august grandeur in the world's annals. All the characters of men known to history, biography, and fiction would appear. Some men wearing brocaded waistcoat; some wearing silk breeches with silver buckles at the knee and at the instep; the stock, the gaiters, the cork-soled boots, the powdered wig, the lace cuffs, the ivory snuffbox.

The quick, razor-edged tempers, the Lucifer pride, the authentic scholarship, the statesmanship; some of them could have outshone Lord Chesterfield in an exhibit of graceful manners.

Brilliant rhetoricians shaping sentences like daggers of jade; sweetsinging-wasp speakers with golden and silver wings. Many of these men comprehended and treasured the garnered wisdom of the ages; many were familiar with the history of the Republics of the antique world. Not a few were graduated from colleges in the Colonies: Harvard, Yale, William and Mary, Princeton, Kings (now Columbia), and the Pennsylvania College; some were graduated from English, Irish, and Scottish universities, and one need not be acutely imaginative to seem to hear the eager and eloquent oratory, the vibrant words and the gorgeous rhetoric of that romantic long-ago. Some of them ascended the steep acclivity from obscurity to far-shining fame—some few descended the declivity from fame to oblivion. Nearly all were devoted equestrians—good riders who proudly printed their horses hooves into the receiving earth. They were men of courage and fortitude, of self-respect and self-esteem, of energy and action with bold, penetrating eyes, projecting noses, and convex sunburned faces. They were drawn from the various trades, professions and occupations and were shrewd to a remarkable degree.

They each and all were fiercely determined to set up a Government assuring civil liberty, and they launched mankind's first major republic since the days of ancient Rome. Eight of the men who signed the Constitution had 11 years before also signed the Declaration. The principles of the Declaration and the guaranties of the Constitution have withstood the mutations and the vicissitudes of time and have beaten back the wildest storms that ever blew.

During the 178 years since the adoption of the Declaration of Independence the changes that have come to mankind in the habits, dress, manners, ideology, and tempo of life; the advances in transportation, science, technology, mechanical inventions, and chemical discoveries have been sharper and more pronounced than all the changes that came during the exactly 1,900 years between the birth of Julius Caesar and the death of George Washington, but amidst all these startling changes the principles of the Declaration and the safeguards and guaranties of the Constitution today remain vital and unchanged because they embody the inborn, invincible sentiments of all men who know the value of freedom and who respect the dignity and the sacredness of human life.

Our Oil Imports Must Be Reduced

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 11, 1954

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, many Congressmen in this body who come from key oil producing States and who have been watching the increase of imports of foreign oil into this country, until there is being delivered into our ports 1,050,000 barrels of oil a day, realize the absolute necessity of limiting these imports.

I introduced a bill in the first session of the 83d Congress, last year, to limit imports, which was embodied in bill reported by the Ways and Means Committee, and many of the Members of this House will remember that the Congress seemed in a mood to pass the legislation, however, after heated debate the opposition was able, by only a few votes, to recommend the bill to the committee for further study.

This should have been a warning to the big importers but it was not. They have continued to increase their imports to the point of over a million barrels a day at the present time, which is taking 14 percent of the local oil market of this Nation, with the result that we now have a surplus of oil which is causing the independent producers to sustain great losses, and, in the judgment of many of us, may be endangering the defense of our Nation, should we suddenly become involved in an all-out war.

Mr. Speaker, these excess imports have caused the pipeline companies to reduce, in some instances, by 30 percent of their normal purchase of domestic oil in the last few weeks, which has slowed down exploration and production, causing the loss of millions of dollars to those engaged in the independent oil industry, forcing hundreds of dealers to stack their rigs and stop production.

Countless thousands of highly skilled and well-paid employees are being thrown out of work, the Government is losing heavily in taxes it would receive, and the business communities throughout the tri-State area of Illinois, Indiana, and Kentucky are losing a tremendous amount of business and taxes the Government would receive.

The same condition exists in practically every oil State in the Nation. Men are being thrown out of work, and the Federal Government is losing millions in taxes it would otherwise receive.

I hold in my hand a page ad appearing in the Mount Vernon Register News, Mount Vernon, Ill., signed by 35 oil companies and banks, which I hope the Members of the House will read the substance of which I am inserting as a part of my remarks. This will give you an idea of what is happening in Southern Illinois, Indiana, and Kentucky, known as the tri-State oil area. This reflects the condition, generally, in many States throughout the United States.

This points out the absolute necessity that the Congress and the executive department, at the earliest possible date, find some solution for this problem in the interest of the economy of our Nation, and in what many of us believe is in the interest of the defense of our Nation.

The matter follows:

ATTENTION—EVERY LANDOWNER IN SOUTHERN ILLINOIS IS A POTENTIAL OWNER OF OIL LAND

Royalty Owners, Land Owners, Businessmen, Oil Producers, Everyone Interested in the Economy of the State of Illinois:

We believe that a healthy oil industry is important to all the people of Jefferson, Marion, Clinton, and Washington Counties, as well as all of southern Illinois. Taxes paid on oil production are based on the daily average production per lease and are an important source of revenue to help build and maintain schools, roads and other public welfare activities. Vigorous oil activity in this area is a strong support for all business and free enterprise.

Without a fair market for Illinois crude oil production, farmers, royalty owners, field workers and businessmen will all feel the effect of the loss of bonus money, rental and royalty income and unemployment in general.

We are confronted with what should be only a temporary oversupply of crude oil. According to our information, this oversupply of crude oil which has resulted in the proration of oil runs in southern Illinois is due largely to excessive imports of foreign oil.

As of July, 1954, the average imports of foreign oil is approximately 1,100,000 barrels daily. Of this amount approximately 800,000 barrels daily come from our friendly neighbors in the Western Hemisphere, Venezuela, and Mexico. With these two countries we do have substantial reciprocal trade.

The other 300,000 barrels come from the Middle East. With this area we have an infinitesimal volume of reciprocal trade. According to our information, this 300,000 barrels daily of Middle East oil which is delivered to eastern seaport at a very low cost is the most direct cause of proration of oil in southern Illinois. If this excess of 300,000 barrels of foreign oil imports were cut down, it is our belief that proration of oil in the southern Illinois area would be unnecessary.

There are two ways by which this excess of 300,000 barrels of foreign oil imports could be cut back. The executive department, headed by President Eisenhower, could raise the import tariff on this amount of oil high enough that this 300,000 barrels could not be profitably imported. (This is the first remedy.)

The second method by which these excess imports could be cut down would be by act of Congress, cutting the imports of all foreign oil to an amount not to exceed 800,000 barrels daily. (This is the second remedy.)

We both advise and request that you take time and make the effort to write the two United States Senators from Illinois asking them to exert their efforts immediately to get adopted either the first or second remedy as above outlined. Please address your letters to Senator EVERETT DIRKSEN and Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, United States Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C., and your Congressman for the 23d Congressional District, Hon. CHARLES W. VURSELL, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

Respectfully submitted.

Collins Bros. Oil Co.; Fletcher Farrar; Security Bank of Mt. Vernon; Will I. Lewis; Glenn Cole; E. M. Self; F. L. Strickland; Petro Drilling Co., F. L. Strickland; Stewart Oil Co., J. Russell Stewart; Harold G. Watson; Wilbur L. Griffith; Larkin Packer Co., Wiley Ford; Charlie Wood; Curt Ham; Schlumberger, Dan Moon; Walter Duncan Oil Properties; A. B. Carlisle; Homer Rutherford; Leo Horton; Illinois Exploration Co.; Edward T. Robinson; Illinois National Oil & Gas Co., L. L. Benoist, R. E. Benoist; Nash Redwine; C. E. Brehm; T. L. Metcalf; National Associated Petroleum Co.; Waller J. McGlasson; R. Jungbecker; M. J. Mitchell; Hopkins Drilling Co.; H. J. Schlafly; Hartman & Jordan; Glass & Co.; Robert E. Thorpe; Guard Marvin; R. I. McAfee; First National Bank of Mount Vernon; John J. Callahan; Craig & Craig; C. H. Harrison; Holdren Construction Co.; Mount Vernon Chamber of Commerce; Jefferson County Farm Bureau.

L. Quincy Mumford, of Cleveland, Wise Choice for Librarian of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 12, 1954

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, the confirmation of L. Quincy Mumford as Librarian of the Library of Congress on July 29 assures us of a man of great capacity and experience. We in Cleveland, where he has headed our world-renowned public library, are regretting our loss. But we rejoice that in this larger service he will go from strength to strength.

There is no doubt but there is need of a very real housecleaning in the Library of Congress. As in many departments of Government, the Library has fallen into patterns of inefficient and unwise operations. Good organization and economic use of staff will be welcomed by all who use its facilities.

It gives me pleasure to include the following editorial from the Publishers' Weekly of August 7, commenting upon Mr. Mumford as he is considered in the book world:

MUMFORD WILL CARRY ON THE GREAT LIBRARY OF CONGRESS TRADITION

(By F. G. M.)

On July 29, L. Quincy Mumford, librarian of Cleveland, was confirmed by the Senate as Librarian of Congress, 11th in the list of those who have held an office which has come to have great influence, not only among libraries and librarians, but also in every activity connected with books and productive scholarship.

The functions and influence of the Library have been steadily broadened in this century under such creative leadership as that of Herbert S. Putnam, Archibald MacLeish and Luther H. Evans (the latter having resigned a year ago to accept the post of director general of UNESCO). This broadened conception of the functions of the Library which are so firmly imbedded in the Library of Congress practice came under question when Congress recently opposed the requested appropriations for the Library. The review of the facts and functions of the Library which this aroused gave opportunity for vigorous restatements of what the country has come to expect of its National Library.

Quincy Mumford is well versed in the best traditions of the American library and can be relied on to maintain and extend further the broad usefulness of the institution he is to direct. He comes to the post after varied experience including 9 years as assistant director and director of one of the great public library systems of the country. The thousands of librarians who sustain the standards of professional American librarianship have put their stamp of approval on his competence and vision by electing him president of the American Library Association.

American publishing has a continuing and active interest in this office, not only because it depends on the Library of Congress for the recording of copyright, the basic property control of the publishing business, but also because the Library influences and stimulates the whole national conception of the place and use of books and sustains the American book in its place in world scholarship.

There is no aspect of the accumulation of books and other material which the Library of Congress should not touch and invigorate. It has the power to draw to its collections invaluable material of every sort. It can call on the aid and advice of the best minds in every sphere of knowledge. It can be both an archive and a power station. The country has come to have some conception of what such an institution can mean and will be satisfied with nothing less than the steady development of the Library's collections and its usefulness.

Indiana Voters and the 83d Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CECIL M. HARDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 12, 1954

Mrs. HARDEN. Mr. Speaker, during March and April of this year I conducted an extensive survey of voter opinion in my district on portions of President Eisenhower's legislative program. More than 12,500 completed questionnaires were received, many of them representing the views of whole families or of groups.

Now, as Congress prepares to adjourn, I think it of interest to the Members to review the results of that poll as compared with the legislative action which has taken place on the issues involved. A full report is contained in the table below.

The hundreds and hundreds of letters which accompanied poll returns are deserving of more than passing attention. I learned much from them. Many letters covered points and isues not contained in the poll. This indicates a wide interest among the people in legislative affairs. It is a healthy interest, and I am very grateful to those who participated.

The response indicated moreover that people generally are confident that in President Eisenhower they have a leader whom they can trust. They are anxious for him to succeed and they are likewise anxious that their representatives in the Congress help him succeed.

For my part, I am happy that my record in support of President Eisenhower's legislative program is among the best in the Congress. I have supported the President wholeheartedly, for the program he presented to this Congress has as its goal the achievement of prosperity and security at home, peace and good will abroad.

The President of the United States has what is probably the most difficult job in the world. Dwight Eisenhower has met the challenge with dignity, with confidence, and with great ability. He has seen much of his program enacted.

The war in Korea has been ended and today no American lives are being lost in wars anywhere in the world.

We have strengthened our national defense while cutting the cost of its maintenance by billions of dollars.

A firm, consistent foreign policy guides our path toward a just and lasting peace.

Rigid economy and elimination of waste in the Federal Government have resulted in a $14 billion reduction in spending.

Taxes have been reduced by $7.4 billion, most of the reduction going to individuals.

Inflation has been halted, the value of the dollar preserved.

Controls are gone.

The social-security system has been broadened and benefits increased.

A far-reaching highway construction program was approved.

Better care for our older citizens and high health standards for the Nation will result from a 3-year program involving construction of diagnostic centers, hospitals for the chronically ill, and rehabilitation and nursing homes.

Three measures provide the groundwork for research and study in the field of education. Yet there has been no move toward Federal control in this vital field.

Home ownership is encouraged by a new and liberalized Housing Act.

The St. Lawrence seaway will soon be a reality, joining the Midwest to the Atlantic Ocean.

Recognizing weaknesses in the farm program, Congress and the President agreed on an equitable long-range price support law.

Fourteen major reorganization plans to increase efficiency and promote economy in the Federal Government are in operation. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare was elevated to Cabinet status.

Nearly a quarter of a million unnecessary jobs have been abolished from the Federal payroll.

Internal security has been tightened and new weapons forged for use by the Department of Justice in its war on traitors.

Hundreds of suspected or proved subversives have been removed from the Federal payroll. Many have been deported. Court convictions have increased. The drive continues on a 24-hour-a-day basis.

We have moved successfully to take government out of competition with private enterprise. States and local government have been encouraged to assume more direction of their own affairs.

America is economically sound.

We have achieved prosperity without war.

Results of Harden legislative poll

	Yes	No	No opinion	Action by Congress
1. Grant 18-year-olds the right to vote	6,347	4,693	442	Defeated by Senate.
2. Extend social-security coverage to farmers	6,612	3,469	1,401	Passed by House; pending in Senate.
3. Strip citizenship rights from Americans convicted of conspiring to overthrow our form of government.	10,985	294	203	Do.
4. Amend the Taft-Hartley Labor-Management Act, as suggested by President Eisenhower.	7,171	2,450	2,061	Defeated by Senate.
5. Shift agricultural price-support program from fixed levels, as in present law, to flexible support program advocated by Secretary of Agriculture Benson.	8,074	1,724	1,684	Approved.
6. Join with Canada in building the St. Lawrence seaway	8,499	1,387	1,596	Do.
7. Continue United States support of the United Nations	8,013	2,318	1,152	Do.

NOTE.—A special tabulation was made among farm voters on questions 2 and 5, since both are of prime importance to farm families. Farmers voted 1,377 "yes," 1,144 "no", and 216 "no opinion" on the question of extending social security. Flexible price supports won out by a margin of 1,625 "yes," 806 "no," and 306 "no opinion."

Intellectual Freedom of Foundations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1954

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, thanks to the alertness of our colleague the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. WAYNE HAYS, the irresponsibility of the staff of the Special Committee To Investigate Tax Exempt Foundations, and the utter folly of the course the investigation was taking, was exposed. Despite the alertness of Mr. HAYS, some damage was done to the foundations, but it is heartening to see the Nation's press giving full publicity to the written answers which the foundations have filed with the committee.

In this connection, I include the following editorial from the August 10 issue of the East St. Louis Journal:

FOUNDATION REPLIES

The late John D. Rockefeller, Sr., created the Rockefeller Foundation in 1913 for the purpose of promoting the well-being of mankind throughout the world.

In its 41year history the foundation has sought to foster, by financial aid, experimentation, innovation, and original thinking. In short, it has pioneered on the frontiers of human knowledge.

Earlier this summer, however, a special House group known as the Reece committee preferred charges that the tax-free foundations, such as Rockefeller, were a threat to education, were influenced by Communists ideas and were introducing Fabian Socialism to America.

By making public the charges before witnesses on both sides were heard, the committee appeared to have accepted the accusations as true. And when witnesses were called, 11 testified against the foundations while only 1 witness was heard in their defense.

Then the Reece committee suddenly closed up shop, and the foundations themselves were denied an opportunity to answer publicly the malicious charges against them.

However, the foundations have taken the opportunity to submit written briefs in their defense. The Rockefeller Foundation is the latest to give a reply.

The whole report shows clearly that the foundation is in capable and responsible hands and does not intend to sacrifice its principles to please the House committee or its chairman, Representative CARROLL REECE.

It reemphasizes the foundation's position that conformity must not be imposed upon the scholar or scientist, either by the foundation or the Government. The product of a foundation grant should be an intellectual product and should not be anything less.

The Rockefeller report is a splendid explanation of the foundation's position on free and responsible research and scholarship. It is a shame that the Reece Committee ducked into its shell after smearing the foundations and denied them the chance to tell the true story.

Syngman Rhee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 12, 1954

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith the following article by George H. Todt which appeared in the Highland Park News Herald, Los Angeles, on Monday, August 2, 1954:

IN MY OPINION

(By George H. Todt)

"If we had had only a little more courage we could have reached the Yalu," said old Syngman Rhee, speaking of the war in Korea.

"But some people had a bit of cold feet," he continued, "and we were prevented from doing that which we were capable of doing.

"This would have been the best thing for Korea, the United States, the United Nations, and all free nations," concluded the Asiatic statesman and patriot. "At least we would not have to worry about the unification of Korea."

The outspoken words of Syngman Rhee, as he arrived in Washington for a friendly visit with the President earlier last week, are worth pondering awhile.

Unlike so many other orientals, perhaps due to the influence of his Austrian wife, this fine ally does not speak in riddles. His words are honest and forthright. They contain wisdom and commonsense.

When he says that we were prevented from cashing in on victory after our fighters had won it, he was not mistaken. Diplomatic niceties forbade his identifying the forces in the background which denied us our well-earned triumph, but it is already common knowledge in this country who at least part of this shadowy group may be.

On the American end were the State Department planners. On the international plane were the United Nations' people. Also arrayed against our victory were some of our North Atlantic Treaty Organization allies—particularly Her Majesty's Government in Great Britain for reasons which are now glaringly apparent: British trade with the Reds.

There were some other forces, but let us confine ourselves to these three outstanding flies in the ointment for the United States and her comrade in arms, little Korea.

While paying lipservice of sorts, the British to the extent of an entire Commonwealth division, the simple truth of the matter is that none of these three bodies wanted or intended that we should gain a clear cut victory in Korea against the Red Chinese of Mao Tse-tung.

General Douglas MacArthur was fired for insisting that we win against the Reds when we clearly had the capabilities to do so. To date no restitution of any sort has been made in his behalf by the new Republican administration in Washington. The gallant old warrier was cashiered by Harry Truman for merely being right—but the powers that be today prefer to let sleeping dogs lie in this instance. Are they afraid of stirring among the bones which comprise this skeleton in the American closet? If so, why?

It is possible that undue attention might become focused upon the ignominious terms of our giveaway truce in Korea which enabled the Reds to funnel their strength into the newer, more lucrative channels which forthwith compelled the easy surrender of Indochina by the French?

Was it necessary to ease up on the Reds in Korea in order that they could thereafter complete their timetable of conquest in another corner of Asia? Was it not General MacArthur, himself, who predicted long ago that the stalemated truce in Korea would only enable the Reds to turn new fury against Indochina?

And how does all of this fit in with the overall grand strategy of the Communist leaders who guide the Red master plan of world conquset toward its inexorable conclusion?

We are being less than bright if we do not appraise this fantastic series of setbacks and losses with a most suspicious eye. After invariably losing so consistently wherever our diplomats in the State Department take us in this bold new world of ours, it is time we started to ask them some questions of the most embarrassing nature. Can they stand inspection?

We are supposed to hold most of the trump cards in our hand—wealth, power, and the moral forces of freedom under God. Why, then, are we losing everywhere? Why are we hated and despised outside our borders? Why are we poised today on the brink of disaster?

The human factor is the only answer. It is time to look inside the State Department. And it is time for another great debate on our foreign policy.

Postal Pay Increases

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN V. BEAMER

OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 12, 1954

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, I supported H. R. 9245, the Corbett bill, in its original form and signed discharge petition No. 9 in its behalf.

Then, when it seemed possible that the Congress might adjourn before action could be taken on that bill, I voted for the bill combining salary raise and postage increase with the feeling that the postal employees were entitled to some consideration.

Since this particular measure was brought out under suspension of rules, two-thirds vote of the Members was necessary and the bill failed to pass.

However, the Congress was delayed in its adjournment plans and thus on Monday, August 9, the original Corbett bill, H. R. 9245, came to the House for vote. It was approved and again I supported this salary increase.

The bill also provides for a study of reclassification and personnel. Several other provisions of the bill were for the improvement of service and conditions in the Post Office Department. To me these improvements are worthy and a salary increase was due the postal people. I am pleased that the House of Representatives acted before the Congress adjourned.

Pakistan's Eighth Independence Day Celebration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 12, 1954

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following article on Pakistan gives a vivid picture of that country, its future, and its struggle to maintain itself between a hostile India on the one side and Red China on the other.

Pakistan would like to be on our side and to be our ally in any fight against communism in Asia. While we have lavished gifts on India, who rewards us with loathing and insults, we have been comparatively niggardly in our treatment of Pakistan.

Why can we not adopt a policy of helping the people whom we can truly build up on our side, and stop wasting our substance on the weak and the disloyal?

The article follows:

PAKISTAN'S EIGHTH INDEPENDENCE DAY CELEBRATION, AUGUST 14, 1954

(By Prof. Carter Speers)

Pakistan's independence is of ever increasing importance to the free world. The rapid development of the new country is creating a very real pillar of democratic strength in Asia—the strongest between Turkey and the Philippines. Every one of Pakistan's nearly 80 million people has right to be proud of the country's achievements in the seven trouble-strewn years of her history. Every one of America's 160 million people should be proud to welcome this new ally and her friendly people. There is much in common between the two nations.

Seldom before has a new country assumed so important a place in world affairs so quickly. Pakistan's recent Treaty of Friendship and Cooperation with Turkey, and its concomitant arms aid agreement with the United States of America, places Pakistan right up on the firing line of the cold war against the Communists. Pakistan recognizes that in a struggle between Titans, a small nation has little chance. She prefers to choose her friends now, and has done so with her eyes wide open.

Pakistan's achievements in developing her new country cover a wide range—social—economic—military. The world's largest mass migration had to be faced at the very outset. West Pakistan had to absorb 6,500,000 refugees—mostly destitute—fleeing in terror of their lives from India to the promised land of Pakistan. In receiving these refugees, West Pakistan had at that time a net population of 27 million, after 5,125,000 Hindus and Sikhs had left. The way everyone worked together to care for these unfortunates, and feed them and clothe them and help them get settled in their new environs, is an epic in itself. No better example of democracy in action could be found—anywhere. That the task is already so largely accomplished is an outstanding achievement.

Nowhere in the world is the position of women advancing as rapidly as it is in Pakistan. Formerly confined largely to their homes, with little chance for education, or to take part in events outside, they began by taking an active part in the independence movement. The large share they took in the care of the refugees will never be forgotten. Today they are crowding schools and colleges more rapidly than they can be built. Today you will find them taking an active part in politics—in law—in commerce—in industry and most professions. The Fatima Jinnah Medical College in Lahore is graduating 50 young women a year. Hundreds are being trained as fine nurses. For the first time a Muslim woman, Begum Liaquat Ali Khan, has become her country's envoy as Ambassador to the Netherlands. Women's place in the many cultural developments in Pakistan goes without saying. Through it all, they have lost none of their gracious femininity.

The economy of the two regions which became Pakistan on partition from the former British Indian Empire in 1947, had always been agricultural. Most of the habitable land was heavily over-populated. The great mass of the people had been miserably poor for centuries. Improved agricultural methods could do little more than keep pace with the rapidly growing population. Only by industrialization could the general standard of living be raised.

At the time of partition there were practically no factories. There was little known mineral wealth. Foreign exchange, with which to purchase industrial plant, could only be obtained by the export of agricultural raw materials—mostly cotton and jute (burlap) with some hides and skins, wool and tea. But a great deal of exchange thus obtained, together with more than 60 percent of all revenues had to be devoted to the defense services—so great was the threat of Communist invasion from the north and so real the danger of conflict with India developing from some untoward incident arising from one of the serious disputes nagging at the two countries. That left very little for the ordinary expenses of running a government—still less for the urgently needed beneficent services. Little capital remained available for industrialization.

Just as she was well started with development schemes, Pakistan learned the hard way what dependence on an agricultural economy meant. Things had been going increasingly well with world commodity prices running high. Many commitments for defense and plant and consumer goods were outstanding in 1952 when world prices took a nose dive with the prospective end of the Korean war. Pakistan's foreign exchange earnings fell from PRs 2,880 million in 1950–51 to PRs 1,461 million in 1952–53. (One Pakistan rupee equals $0.30225.) Outstanding commitments were reduced as much as possible and imports on consumer goods almost prohibited. The threat of inflation was real.

Worse was to follow. West Pakistan depends almost entirely on irrigation for its existence. Irrigation of some 31 million acres is from the rivers of the Indus basin rising in the Himalayan mountains, and fed by rainfall. At the beginning of the 1951–52 crop season the rains failed, and the country was faced with a shortage of 950,000 tons of wheat. By using up meager reserves—just when the foreign exchange crisis hit—by barter and by borrowing, 800,000 tons were imported, but with dire effect on the country's already strained finances. Even less rain fell at the beginning of the 1952–53 crop season, and with all reserves used up—borrowing extended to the limit, and revenues much reduced—the country faced a shortage of 1,500,000 tons of food grains. Millions of people faced starvation. Then the United States offered a free gift of up to a million tons of wheat—(only 606,000 tons were finally taken)—Canada provided 116,000 tons and Australia 42,954 tons—and the famine was averted. The rains were normal in the beginning of the crop year 1953–54 and with the help of a strenuous "Grow More Food" campaign, over a million tons more food grains were produced than in the previous ill-starred year. Plans are actively progressing for the permanent storage of 500,000 tons of wheat and 100,000 tons of rice to guard against any future lean years.

India has added her mite to the debacle by diverting to her own use a considerable part of the irrigation water Pakistan had used and depended on for decades. Just recently, claiming that Pakistan had not accepted a proposal of the World Bank to divide the available water, India has opened a huge new irrigation system—with dire threat to Pakistan's agriculture. That increasing threat hangs like the sword of Damocles over every effort Pakistan makes. At the same time, the Kashmir question remains unsolved, despite the United Nations' recommendation that a free and impartial plebiscite be held. Besides the political, religious, and moral questions of a settlement in Kashmir, valuable timber, mineral, and water resources are at stake.

It is against such a background that the indomitable people of Pakistan have been pushing steadily ahead with industrialization. Cotton textiles already meet 70 percent of the country's need for coarse and medium cloth and, by next year, may meet the whole requirement, with a possible surplus for export markets. Jute manufacturers already meet internal needs and a good export market is developing. Paper is being made for the first time on a large scale from bamboo in East Pakistan, at the rate of 30,000 tons a year, and again an export market may develop. Sugar—woolen textiles—cigarettes from Pakistan tobacco—bicycle tires and tubes—vegetable oils—paints and varnishes—glass hollow ware—razor blades are now produced. Cement production has been doubled and soon will be trebled with the friendly help of Canada and New Zealand. A DDT plant is being built with the help of the World Health Organization; synthetic ammonia fertilizer plants with American help. And so it goes.

Great progress is certainly being made. With the billions and billions being passed out by the United States of America in various parts of the world, it is interesting to see how much help has been given to this sturdy ally struggling for developement. The wheat gift was fine. We have recently offered similar help behind the Iron Curtain. Arms aid? Although the agreement was signed 6 months ago, the first token shipment has not yet left our shores. Point 4 and technical assistance? Out of the many billions of dollars distributed in the past 3 years—Pakistan has been allotted only $44.25 million—50 cents per capita for her 80 million population.

Compare that with the $3.2 billion given to Italy, a country with only half Pakistan's population. Or with the reputed over $2.8 billion poured into Indochina—again half Pakistan's population. Or compare the $44.25 million made available to Pakistan with the $189 million made available to neutralist India. Possibly the best comparison would be the thoroughly inspired use of more than $1.25 billion with which help Turkey has been able to rebuild her economy and develop her defense forces. Turkey's population is only one-fourth that of Pakistan.

Pakistan's fighting men are every whit as good as Turkey's and there are no finer. The finest fighting men in the world can do little unless they are well equipped—and even then they are limited unless there is a stable industrial economy behind them.

A fraction of the amount we have poured out in other countries would put Pakistan on her feet industrially and defensively, to the manifest advantage of our own security. Americans might well ask if this fine country will be another sufferer from danger of too little, too late.

There are now reports that we are even proposing to sidetrack Pakistan's expressed willingness to join in the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization. It is hard to visualize such an organization without the support and strength of this largest anti-Communist bloc in south Asia. Pakistan does not follow the lead of neutralist India and proved it at the Colombo conference. Why should she be sidetracked in the vague hope of bringing the other Colombo conference countries into SEATO?

It's time for us to look the facts in the face and go all out to help Pakistan develop herself. It will be worth it.

Public Opinion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK C. OSMERS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 12, 1954

Mr. OSMERS. Mr. Speaker, in June I mailed 100,000 questionnaires to voters in the Ninth Congressional District of New Jersey, which I represent. About 15,000 replies have already been received and because of the interest among Members in public opinion, under unanimous consent, I insert the questions and the percentages of the replies thus far received. They follow:

Recapitulation

Do you favor—		Yes	No	Undecided
1. Investigation and exposure of Communists in Government?		96.0	3.5	0.5
2. Senator McCarthy's methods?		42.6	51.0	6.4
3. Outlawing the Communist Party?		68.6	22.9	8.5
4. Lowering the voting age to 18?		27.4	64.0	8.6
5. Universal military training?		80.3	13.0	6.7
6. Statehood for Alaska?		76.1	13.2	10.7
7. Statehood for Hawaii?		77.5	13.3	9.2
8. Pay raises for postal and Federal employees?		58.9	26.6	14.5
9. Raising the postal rates to cover the postal deficit?		74.1	19.5	6.4
10. Ending Government competition with private business?		71.4	19.4	9.2
11. Lower tariffs even if some American industry is hurt?		48.9	38.5	12.6
12. Deferring income tax cuts until budget is balanced?		65.0	27.4	7.6
13. Changing the Taft-Hartley Act?		50.0	37.3	12.7
If answer is "yes":				
Change to favor labor?	39.5			
Change to favor management?	60.5			
14. Regulation of workers pension and welfare funds?		73.4	14.9	11.7
15. Social security for all not now covered?		74.7	15.4	9.9
16. Pay raises for Congressmen?		63.6	22.6	13.8
17. Income tax deduction for depreciation on homes?		75.6	16.0	8.4
18. The record of the Eisenhower administration?		65.9	19.1	15.0

The Protection of Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS E. MARTIN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 11, 1954

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent already granted, it gives me great pleasure to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of the stirring address delivered by former President Herbert Hoover on his 80th birthday yesterday at West Branch, Iowa, a community in the congressional district which I have the honor to represent. It was my great personal privilege to be present on this historic occasion.

As Mr. Hoover showed, our forebears came to Iowa as humble men. They were common men asking nothing from their Government but freedom and the opportunity to develop their talents under God. We are proud that we have produced one of the most uncommon men of this generation. We are also proud that Iowa has been an unfriendly soil for the alien doctrines of communism and socialism.

Mr. Hoover is our greatest living elder statesman, and I commend his words—the distillation of a lifetime of experience and public service—to the Members of this body and to the American people.

Mr. Hoover's address follows:

> The legislature and the Governor of Iowa did me the great honor of inviting me to a reception by my native State on this my 80th birthday.
>
> It is more than difficult adequately to express my appreciation for such evidence of affection.
>
> I am glad to come to West Branch. My grandparents and my parents came here in a covered wagon. In this community they toiled and worshiped God. They lie buried on your hillside. The most formative years of my boyhood were spent here. My roots are in this soil.
>
> This cottage where I was born is physical proof of the unbounded opportunity of American life.
>
> My first paid job was in this community picking potato bugs at one cent a hundred. I was not inspired by altruism to relieve the world of a pest. Such altruism as was attached to that labor was to secure firecrackers with which to commemorate properly the Declaration of Independence. But Iowa is a progressive State. Its mothers, anxious to avoid repairs to small boys, secured a law

abolishing that kind of tribute to the Founding Fathers. Moreover, by insecticides, the slave wage of only a cent a hundred has been overcome.

Iowa has made fabulous progress since I left here. I can prove it by statistics, and all speeches must have statistics because nobody can defy a statistic.

Since that time, the people of Iowa have multiplied the wealth of the State nine times over. That statistic is weakened by the decrease in purchasing power of money. In the meantime with the blessing of the tall corn you have sent to market enough hogs to cover the Chicago stockyards 5,045 feet deep. You can vary that statistic as you like.

Also, you have sent forth a host of men and women who have distinguished themselves in every State in the Union and every foreign country. Their quality is proved by the fact that I have never seen Iowa attributed as the origin of any of our leading bank robbers, gangsters, or Communists.

A VARIED LIFE

Eighty years is a long time for a man to live. Mine has been a life of work in many lands under many kinds of governments, both good and bad. I have been honored by my countrymen in many public offices and with many opportunities to serve outside the Government. I have watched the two great world wars with their holocausts of death, destruction, and famine. I have taken some part in remedy of their terrible aftermaths. I have participated in the search for a healing peace.

I have witnessed the legacy of war in doubting minds, brutality, crime, and debased morals. Moreover, I have witnessed on the ground in 20 nations the workings of the philosophy of that antichrist, Karl Marx.

THE PROBLEMS OF FREEDOM AND PROGRESS

After these long years and from all these experiences, there rises constantly in my mind the forces which make for progress and those which may corrode away the safeguards of freedom in America. I want to say something about these forces but I shall endeavor to do so, not in the tones of Jeremiah but in the spirit of St. Paul.

New forces from science and new ideas, both good and bad, constantly arise in the world. We welcome changes which advance the welfare of our people. Our system always needs repairs.

Also we have to clean up the vast wreckage and disorders of two devastating tornadoes of wars which have swept over mankind during the past 40 years.

And above all, we have need to remedy constant corruption of the safeguards of freemen.

The remedies in America are not revolution. They are except for peace and war mostly jobs of marginal repairs around a sound philosophy and a stout heart.

THE SAFEGUARDS OF FREEMEN

Our Founding Fathers did not invent the priceless boon of individual freedom and respect for the dignity of men. That great gift to mankind sprang from the Creator and not from governments.

The Founding Fathers, with superb genius, welded together the safeguards of these freedoms.

They were mostly concerned with the dangers of political tyranny. With the coming of the industrial age our people welded in new safeguards. We could no more have economic tyranny than political tyranny.

And with these safeguards our people were at one time closer to the goals of human welfare than any other civilization in all history.

POWER OF FEDERAL AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT

The progress of freedom is a neverending struggle to prevent the abuse of power whether by individuals, by groups, or by government or nations.

Our Founding Fathers created unique restraints on power by the Bill of Rights and a structure of built-in checks and balances. Among these new concepts was a division of power between the Federal and State Governments and between the three branches of government. I do not need to tell you that. But what I have to tell you is that these separations of power became seriously confused, corroded, and weakened during the 20 years before this administration.

These confusions have included Executive encroachments on the legislative and judicial branches. There has been judicial encroachment on the States' rights. There has been congressional encroachment on the Executive. The Federal Government has grasped many of the vital functions of State and local government.

Some of the corrosions of our division of power are the aftermaths of our wars. Some of them come from the various infections of socialism. I will tell you more of that later.

Some of the corrosions come from the discovery that it is easy for the Federal Government to light the magic power of Federal credit. But the flame that warms can also consume the safeguards of freemen.

Some of these encroachments come from a long era of beguilement by pressure groups and local government for subsidies from the Federal Government.

One of the end results of all this is the growth of a huge centralized Federal bureaucracy. It has expanded in 20 years from 600,000 to 2,300,000. Some increase is necessary. Most of them are fine men and women. But innate in bureaucracy are three implacable spirits. They are self-perpetuation, expansion of their empires, and demand for more power. Bureaucracy rushes headlong into the visions of the millennium and sends the bills to the Treasury.

Today we have more Federal employees in nearly every State than all the local officials, including constables. They penetrate every part of local government. They produce great waste of the taxpayer's money. They create a vested interest or a vested habit for some pressure group. They interfere in politics and too often are infected with corruption.

Their magics invade personal freedom of every citizen, every moment of every hour.

The remedy is to restore the checks and balances of power, to reinvigorate State and local governments and to deflate the bureaucratic empires.

Many of these confusions of power are today under vigorous investigation in which I have some part.

My countrymen, all these corrosions of the checks and balances of power call for constant battle from you, the people. They must be wiped out if you would stay fully free.

POWER IN OUR FOREIGN RELATIONS

In our foreign relations there are great dangers and also vital safeguards to free men. During the last war we witnessed a special encroachment of the Executive upon the legislative branch. This has been through a new type of commitment of the United States to other nations. I am not going to argue legalisms, for they do not go to the center of the issue. The real issue is whether the President, through declaration or implication or by appeasement or by acquiescence, or by joint statements with foreign officials, can commit the American people to foreign nations without the specific consent of the elected representatives of the people.

There has been a grevious list of such commitments. They include international agreements which shackle our economy by limiting a free market. But more terrible were such executive agreements as our recognition of Soviet Russia which opened the headgates for a torrent of traitors. Our tacit alliance with Soviet Russia spread communism over the earth. Our acquiescence in the annexation by Russia of the Baltic States at Moscow and the partition of Poland at Teheran extinguished the liberties of tens of millions of people. Worse still was the appeasement and surrender at Yalta of 10 nations to slavery. And there was the secret agreement with respect to China which set in train the communization of Mongolia, North Korea, and all of China.

These unrestrained Presidential actions have resulted in a shrinking of human freedom over the whole world. From these actions came the jeopardies of the cold war. As a byproduct these actions have shrunk our freedoms by crushing taxes, huge defense costs, inflation, and compulsory military service.

We must make such misuse of power forever impossible.

And let me say, I have no fears of this evil from President Eisenhower, but he will not always be President.

OUR PRESENT FOREIGN SITUATION

Our dangers from the Communist source of gigantic evil in the world are unending. All of the peace agencies we have created and all of the repeated conferences we have held have failed to find even a whisper of real peace.

Amid these malign forces, our haunting anxiety and our paramount necessity is the defense of our country.

It is not my purpose to define the foreign policies of our Government.

Sooner or later a new line of action will become imperative.

I have disagreed with, and protested against, the most dangerous of our foreign political policies during the whole of the 20 years prior to the last presidential election. I opposed and protested every step in the policies which led us into the Second World War.

Especially in June 1941, when Britain was safe from a German invasion due to Hitler's diversion to attack on Stalin, I urged that the gargantuan jest of all history would be our giving aid to the Soviet Government. I urged we should allow those two dictators to exhaust each other. I stated that the result of our assistance would be to spread communism over the whole world. I urged that if we stood aside the time would come when we could bring lasting peace to the world.

I have no regrets. The consequences have proved that I was right.

THE COMMUNISTS

Today the Socialist virus and poison gas generated by Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels have spread into every nation on the earth. Their dogma is absolute materialism which defies truth and religious faith. Their poisons are of many sorts. The preservation of the safeguards of liberty makes it imperative that we give heed to their every variety.

The bloody virus type, radiating from Communist Russia, is today rotting the souls of two-fifths of all mankind which it has enslaved.

From the day Lenin rose to power in Moscow, the Communists have carried on an underground conspiracy against every other nation. The rank and file of our people are immune from this infection. The recruiting grounds for their agents are from our minority of fuzzy-minded intellectuals and labor leaders. Over a thousand such Communist agents have already been rooted out of responsible positions in our Government and other spots of influence.

Many of these spies and traitors when exposed sought sanctuary for their infamies in the fifth amendment. Such a plea of immunity is an implication of guilt. Surely these people should not have the right to vote or to hold office, for thereby they use these privileges of freemen against the safeguards of freedom.

Despite the clamor over ferreting out these persons, you must not be led into the mistake that Moscow has closed down its recruiting offices for American agents, or that continued action of the FBI and congressional committees is not equally imperative.

I have little fear that these Communist agents can destroy the Republic if we continue to ferret them out. Our greater concern should be the other varieties of Karl Marx virus.

THE SOCIALISTS

Among them are the Socialists. They assert they would proceed only by constitutional means.

The Socialists prowl on many fronts. They promote the centralized Federal Government, with its huge bureaucracy. They drive to absorb the income of the people by unnecessary Government spending and exorbitant taxes. They have pushed our Government deep into enterprises which compete with the rights of free men. These enterprises are endowed with exemption from control of State and local governments. Congressional committees have listed hundreds of these Federal activities. But only a drop of typhoid in a barrel of drinking water sickens a whole village.

Every step of these programs somewhere, somehow, stultifies the freedom, the incentives, the courage, and the creative impulses of our people.

Beyond all this, there is proof in the world that the end result of socialism can be bloody communism. In the Iron Curtain states, it was the Socialist intellectuals who weakened the freedom of men by destroying free enterprise. Thus they furnished the boarding ladders by which the Communists captured the ship of state.

THE WELFARE STATE

One of the postwar cousins of socialism is the so-called welfare state. This poison gas is generated by the same sort of fuzzy-minded intellectuals. Its slogan is "planned economy." The phrase itself was borrowed from totalitarian governments. The end of it would at least be a Government wherein whatever is not forbidden would be compulsory.

One of the annoyances of this cult is its false assumption that our Nation has never been heedful of the welfare of our people. That we are our brother's keeper was rooted in religious faith long before these fuzzy-minded men were born. Since the foundation of the Republic, we have recognized and practiced both private and governmental responsibility for the unfortunate and the aged; for the education of our youth and the health of our people.

Moreover, this cult has a host of gimmicks for giving away the people's money. Among their ideas is that government should guarantee every citizen security from the cradle to the grave.

But it is solely the initiative and the labor of the physically able in the prime of life that can support the aged, the young, the sick—and the bureaucracy. And this active earning group requires the pressures of competition, the rewards of enterprise, and new adventure to keep it on the job. Even if security from the cradle to the grave could eliminate the risks of life, it would be a dead hand on the creative spirit of our people. Also, the judgment of the Lord to Adam about sweat has not been repealed.

When we flirt with the Delilah of security for our productive group, we had better watch out, lest in our blindness we pull down the pillars of the temple of free men.

The British under a Socialist government tried it. Its result was a level of poverty which British Socialists sought to obscure with the term "austerity." Britain is now in retreat from it.

THE COMMON MAN

Among the delusions offered us by fuzzy-minded people is that imaginary creature, the common man. It is dinned into us that this is the century of the common man. The whole idea is another cousin of the Soviet proletariat. The uncommon man is to be whittled down to size. It is the negation of individual dignity and a slogan of mediocrity and uniformity.

The common-man dogma may be of use as a vote-getting apparatus. It supposedly proves the humility of demagogues.

The greatest strides of human progress have come from uncommon men and women. You have perhaps heard of George Washington, Abraham Lincoln, or Thomas Edison. They were humble in origin, but that was not their greatness.

The humor of it is that when we get sick, we want an uncommon doctor. When we go to war, we yearn for an uncommon general or admiral. When we choose the president of a university, we want an uncommon educator.

The imperative need of this Nation at all times is the leadership of the uncommon men or women. We need men and women who cannot be intimidated, who are not concerned with applause meters, nor those who sell tomorrow for cheers today.

Such leaders are not to be made like queen bees. They must rise by their own merits. America recognizes no frozen social stratifications which prevent this free rise of every individual. They rise by merit from our shops and farms. They rise from the 35 million boys and girls in our schools and colleges. That they have the determination to rise is the glorious promise of leadership among freemen.

A nation is strong or weak, it thrives or perishes upon what it believes to be true. If our youth is rightly instructed in the faith of our fathers, in the traditions of our country, in the dignity of each individual man, then our power will be stronger than any weapon of destruction that man can devise.

THIS WHOLE SOCIALIST GAMUT

And now as to this whole gamut of Socialist infections, I say to you, the neighbors of my childhood, the sons and daughters of my native States, God has blessed us with another wonderful word—"heritage." The great documents of that heritage are not from Karl Marx. They are the Bible, the Declarance of Independence, and the Constitution of the United States. Within them alone can the safeguards of freedom survive. Safeguard the true spirit of these guaranties for your children, that they may not become the prisoners of Hydra-headed socialism.

If anyone rises to say that all this is reactionary, you may class him as either fuzzy-minded or an ignorant enemy of freemen.

THE NEW FRONTIERS

Amid this recitation of our problems, I would not have you think that there are not great fields of promise for the future if we can keep out of war.

The last few years have seen advances in science and technology which amount almost to revolution in our life and world relations. If we maintain free minds, free spirits, and direct our steps aright, still other new horizons and new frontiers are open to us. New inventions and new applications of old knowledge will come to us daily.

These new frontiers give us other blessings. Not only do they expand our living but also they open new opportunities and new areas of adventure and enterprise. They open new vistas of beauty. They unfold the wonders of the atom and the heavens. Daily they prove the reality of an all-wise Supreme giver of law.

CONCLUSION

There are voices in our country who daily sound alarms that our civilization is on the way out. Concentrated on the difficulties of our times, they see an early and dour end for us. But civilization does not decline and fall while the people still possess dynamic creative faculties, devotion to religious faith and to liberty. The American people still possess these qualities. We are not at the bedside of a nation in death agony.

Eighty years is a long time for a man to live. As the shadows lengthen over my years, my confidence, my hopes, and dreams for my countrymen are undimmed. This confidence is that with advancing knowledge, toil will grow less exacting; that fear, hatred, pain, and tears may subside; that the regenerating sun of creative ability and religious devotion will refresh each morning the strength and progress of my country.

Foreign Combinations Now Fixing Prices of Raw Materials Imported Into the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS E. MARTIN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 11, 1954

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, on October 21, 1953, I testified before the special Subcommittee on Minerals, Materials, and Fuels Economics of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs in the Senate.

I appeared because of my continued interest in the operation of the laws providing for the United States stockpile of strategic materials which is our first line of defense in any future war. It was my privilege to have participated in the development of our stockpiling laws soon after I first joined the Congress as a member of the Military Affairs Committee. My testimony reviewed the activities of the International Materials Conference and suggested further lines of inquiry to the distinguished junior Senator from Nevada, George W. Malone. The International Materials Conference, an unauthorized international cartel established by the Truman administration curtailed the United States stockpile and allocated materials to the United States for both military and civilian requirements in the midst of the Korean fighting. In my opinion, it was largely responsible for the shortage of tungsten which in turn contributed to the ammunition shortage so vividly described by General Van Fleet when he returned from Korea last year. It also curtailed our access to copper, nickel, and other materials.

In January 1954, responsible officials from the State Department, in their appearance before Senator Malone's committee, corroborated the statements which I had made in 1953. The Eisenhower administration disbanded the International Materials Conference.

Last week at Geneva, in the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations, a vote was taken to establish a permanent commission on international trade stabilization. This new commission would have all of the powers of the IMC and many additional powers as well. The United States' Representative to the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations, Mr. Preston Hotchkis, voted against the establishment of this organization. I am happy that President

Eisenhower appointed such an able man to this vital post.

Former President Hoover, on August 10, 1954, at West Branch, Iowa, made a significant statement in reviewing recent commitments of former Presidents. He said:

> There has been a grievous list of such commitments. They include international agreements which shackle our economy by limiting a free market.

Mr. Hoover was undoubtedly referring to the IMC among other such agreements.

It has recently come to my attention that in 1925, when our distinguished former President, Herbert Hoover, was Secretary of Commerce, he foresaw the dangers in the international raw materials cartel which were then sponsored by foreign countries in many critical raw materials such as rubber and tin.

In accordance with the unanimous consent previously granted, I am happy to be able to insert in the Appendix of the Record an address by Mr. Hoover entitled "Foreign Combinations Now Fixing Prices of Raw Materials Imported Into the United States," delivered before the chamber of commerce at Erie, Pa., October 31, 1925. The Hoover Library on War Revolution and Peace at Stanford University in Palo Alto, Calif., displayed this document prominently in a showcase containing Mr. Hoover's papers. It was one of many significant policy statements by America's greatest elder statesman, an Iowa native son, which I commend to the American people. I believe it will be helpful to those who are now debating the course the United States should take in connection with our further participation or nonparticipation in this new United Nations Commission.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Foreign Combinations Now Fixing Prices of Raw Materials Imported Into the United States

(Address by Herbert Hoover, Secretary of Commerce)

I wish upon this occasion to discuss a matter of considerable gravity in our foreign trade.

Foreign controls of production and price have been created in a number of important raw materials which, because of our inability to produce we must depend upon purchasing abroad. The combinations to which I refer have been set up either directly by legislation of foreign governments or indirectly by government patronage. This sort of control of production and price exists today in coffee, silk, nitrates, potash, rubber, quinine, iodine, tin, sisal, some dyestuffs, quicksilver, certain tanning extracts, and some other things. To demonstrate that this is not an inconsequential matter requires only the recitation of the fact that we expend annually about $800 million for imports now subject to such controls. They amount practically to trade war, and the time has arrived when we require either disarmament or defense.

Three years ago I pointed out this incipient growth and the many dangers which lay in such activities, both to the consumer and producer and above all from the larger view of world interest and progress. At that time my statement was discounted by some for we were assured by their sponsors that the purpose of these controls was merely to temporarily stabilize industry and trade over the disturbed postwar period, and that the consumer would actually benefit as well as the producer.

But these combinations have continued to increase in numbers and some of them have demonstrated all the dangers which I then anticipated and more. The time has arrived when a full, frank, discussion of the whole subject is desirable. For true and effective judgment as to the course of action that should be taken by nations can only be formed by a hammering of the facts upon the anvil of debate.

At the outset I wish to emphasize that in this discussion and I am not criticizing any foreign government or its nationals. I have perhaps had a unique post of observation and I therefore have infinite sympathy for the economic difficulties of all governments during these years. But the world is rapidly gaining stability and measures which may have been necessary to statesmen distraught with the problems of readjustment can now be reconsidered.

Moreover, it could also be said that the buyer of a commodity has an inalienable right to argue at the price even when his friends are the sellers. He has a right to consider all these things from his own point of view without any implication of unfriendliness or criticism for there are two parties in these matetrs—buyers and sellers, not one party. But far above this, if a man sees his friends pursuing courses which can only lead to mutual disaster to themselves or the community in which we all live he is a poor friend who does not say so and say it frankly. And it is equally true among nations.

The economic distortion during the war made controls necessary on a hundred commodities in order to prevent hoarding and profiteering and to stimulate production by guaranteed prices. These controls were intended solely to stimulate production, not to restrict it, and were dissolved at the end of the war, while those now current are, with a few exceptions, the creation of the last few years and for the purpose of increasing price levels through limiting production. They plainly revolve around the monopoly possible over certain raw materials which temporarily or permanently are dominantly produced within the confines of a single nation, and upon which the 50 other nations of the world are dependent for their standards of living and comfort. In no case does any one country possess the total supply of any one of these commodities, but in many cases they possess sufficient that when mobilized they can control the price.

Various legal forms of these price controls have been devised, but in all cases they depend upon governmental action of some kind and their method is either to restrict exports or to establish a unity in selling against the competition of the buyers. I believe in all cases these controls make the same prices to their own citizens as they do to foreigners, but likewise in all these cases their home consumption is but a small percentage of their total production.

These international monopolies have a very wide difference from governmentally created domestic monopolies. In all modern governments where we do create a monopoly we likewise regulate its prices and profits in order to protect the consumer. In these international monopolies the consumer has no voice at all.

We, as a government, have set up no such controls and, through the Sherman Act, we prevent our citizens from doing it. The so-called Webb-Pomerene Act is not for this purpose. We have clung tenaciously to the belief that economic progress must depend upon the driving force of competition. The only thing of the nature that has ever been seriously proposed in our country was certain measures of agricultural relief which in themselves did not partake of this character, for they contained the benevolent aspect of proposing to fix a higher price to our home consumers than to foreigners and to thus bless the foreigner with cheaper food.

The problem that faces the world, and possibly the more serious problem, is not alone the commodities that are now controlled but the spread of these ideas. There are many other raw materials whose sources are so situated that they could also be controlled by action of a single government. The price of wool could be controlled by governmental action within the British Empire. The prices of oil, cotton, and copper could be controlled for many years by similar governmental action in the United States. Tea and jute could be controlled by India; antimony and tungsten by China; nickel and asbestos by Canada.

But an even greater danger lies in the fact that if we conceive a spread of these ideas largely into international commerce, then it is perfectly practicable under government patronage for controls to be established by cooperation of producers in several countries and thus steel, vegetable oils, and a long list of other commodities can be brought quickly into this menacing vision.

Moreover, if these combinations now extant prove successful over even limited periods of years, the tendencies of all producers when in difficulty will be to press their governments to try these devices for even temporary relief. No government can sit still and deny to its own citizens these privileges of profiteering from the foreigner while they suffer from such action of others.

Unless a halt is called, we are likely to see these ideas become established as a regular phenomenon in international commerce.

Any inspection of the list of the present controlled commodities will indicate that few of them actually originate in the great industrial nations—that is, the United States, Great Britain, Germany, France, Italy, Belgium, Czechoslovakia, Austria, Holland, etc. It is true that some of them have been organized in their colonies and some of them participated in by their citizens.

We are, of course, a large producing as well as consuming Nation in raw materials, and we have it within our powers to retaliate, so that we could take care of ourselves if the world is to develop this form of international relation. The industrial countries of Europe, however, have little of such resources and the growth of these methods can only lead to further retardation of their recovery, and if we, the strongest of all nations, enter upon such programs of creating combinations we will have given strength to forces of evil in the commercial world which generations could not remedy.

An easygoing and tolerant world, anxious above all things to keep down international friction might let these controls in international trade. continue—objectionable as they are—if their conduct in every case had been merely to secure a reasonable profit to the producer. But some of them have advanced prices far beyond this point and again demontstrate that inherent quality of all combinations in restraint of trade—that no unregulated monopoly is ever content with the reasonable but always seeks to justify the unreasonable on some grounds or other.

Under a special direction from Congress the Department of Commerce has made an exhaustive investigation of these combinations, and I may cite 2 or 3 as showing this particular tendency. The uniform expression of the managers of the rubber control in the East Indies up to 8 months ago was that the industry sought only from 30 to 35 cents per pound for their product, and our investigation showed they could earn about 25 percent on the capital invested when rubber brings that price. It is today over $1 per pound and production is still being restricted. It is said that previous losses of the growers must be recouped. The same might be said by our wheat, cotton, oil, and copper producers. Likewise the assertion of the coffee industry over years since the war was that stabilization was sought only at roughly 12 cents per pound. It has recently been lifted as high as 82 cents and is today 22 cents, with a great surplus of supplies in its possession.

That this difference between reasonable and high prices is not trivial in its monetary implication to our consumers, is perhaps indicated by the fact that this margin alone over the whole list is today costing us upward of $300 million per annum. And it is not our people who are alone concerned but every other consuming nation in the world.

THE ECONOMIC RESULTS OF SUCH CONTROLS

From an economic point of view, we have two parties to consider in all interchange—the consumer and the producer. High prices stifle consumption and when we stifle consumption we do two things: Reduce the standards of living of the consumer and in the long run tend to reduce the business of the producer. The consumer at once seeks every device to get larger use out of a smaller quantity, and he turns, consciously or unconsciously, to the use of substitutes. The demand for substitutes stimulates every genius to discover and exploit them. I am not talking of adulteration. For instance, the coffee drinker abstracts the last drop from his beans and turns to tea and cocoa. We thus reduced our consumption of coffee by 20 percent during the past year. The rubber user patches his automobile tires and recovers old rubber to use it again. Every chemical laboratory starts on a search for better methods of rubber reclamation. The tin user turns to galvanized iron and glass containers. The farmer demands of his government that it shall produce synthetic nitrates. On the production side the whole world goes searching for other sources of supply outside the controlling country. High profits stimulate production wherever possible in other quarters.

If all these forces be carried to the extreme, the combined result may ultimately bring some of these controls in a crash around the entire industry producers, manufacturing consumers, and distributors alike.

There is here a danger often overlooked, for the distributor and manufacturing consumer of these commodities is compelled to carry large stocks of raw materials in transit, in factory reserve, and in process of manufacture. The manufacturer's commitments to his trade for forward orders compel him to bear a large loss during the rise in prices, and if prices break, he must offer his goods based upon price of raw materials of the day. Thus the ablest managed manufacturing or distributing business is in constant jeopardy from forces they cannot themselves control.

The very erection of these controls is an invitation to the entire consuming world to fight militantly for its existence. The length of time that any particular control can last against these forces no doubt depends upon the degree of need for any particular commodity and the other possible sources, and the possibility of substitutes. These forces can probably break the control of any agricultural product in a few years, for many alternative sources of production exist. Advance in synthetic production of some chemicals will perhaps remedy these combinations. Others might be more difficult to meet. However, these pressures operate very slowly and in the meantime I assume that these facts being well known to the controlling nations they calculate on reaping such a harvest as will compensate them for the ultimate possible demoralization of their producing industry.

INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS INVOLVED

From a political point of view (and I am not speaking of domestic politics but of international relations) these actions and their reactions are alive with danger. As long as our international commerce is based upon the higgling of producers and merchants in a market whose floor is the free flow of supply and demand, their sorrows and exultations do not affect national emotion. It may be that if these controls had never existed prices might temporarily go as high or higher, but in such an event there would be the quick response of increased production with its relief to price, and in any event there would be no national feeling over such natural courses of trade. Instead of this we see today continued restriction and above all the arousal of national feeling of injury.

The moment that a government directly or indirectly fosters or establishes these combinations then that government has taken the responsibility for the prices. Whether these prices be reasonable or high, the populations of the consuming countries direct their attention upon the selling government and the matter becomes one of national emotion among all consumers. These peoples at once appeal to their government for action that it should use it great powers for their protection. Every day for the past year our Government departments have had to deal with exactly this thing. And at once we have higgling of merchants, lifted to the plane of international relations, with all of its spawn of criticism and hate.

Our foreign offices will thus sooner or later become the bargainers in the market and the negotiations of each of them are backed by a fine lot of rooters for the home team. In the long run it will not even have that softening goodwill of sportsmanship for the fixing of prices cannot be based on altruism. The world will never go to war over the price of anything. But these actions can set up great malignant currents of international ill will.

WHAT IS THE REMEDY?

The question naturally arises as to what we, a Nation great both as a consumer and a producer who have so far resolutely refused either to set up such combinations in our products or to allow our citizens to create them, should do in these circumstances. We cannot allow this situation to go unheeded. There are several alternative courses of action.

We could resolutely set ourselves to reduce consumption in every article that is so controlled. We could stimulate the use and manufacture of substitutes. We could induce our citizens to go abroad to other regions and establish rival production. We could prohibit the extension of credit to countries where such controls are maintained. We could request the rest of the consuming world to join with us in these campaigns. It might be that such activities would bring about an everlasting lesson to the whole world. But this is trade war and we want to live in trade peace.

Alternatively we could say to ourselves that we will revise the whole of our traditional national policy of competition as the base of production and that we will legislate and encourage the establishment of these combinations for our own producers with the view of getting back compensating amounts from helpless consumer nations. Our resources are so varied and our people so ingenious that we could probably reap a rich harvest in the final balance in holding up the rest of the world.

Alternatively, again, we might say to ourselves that these combinations are inevitable, and they will be continuing phenomena; that, therefore, we, being a great consumer, will set up defenses by authorizing our merchants and manufacturers to buy these commodities through a single agent, and thus meet the issue of a single seller with a single buyer. For the organized consumer has ever proven stronger than the producer, and we could win out in such a battle. No doubt such a course implies that we must set up distasteful regulation that would provide for protection of our consumer as against this single middleman.

Another alternative which has been suggested is that the consumer nations of the world should secure by international agreements the same rights which they would secure in a domestic monopoly; that prices should be regulated under circumstances that the consumer has an equal voice with the producer.

But I have no liking for any actions of this sort, for they are either destructive of the one hope of the world—progressive production—or they are a recognition of the permanent establishment of these policies in the future international commerce. They contemplate international trade in an atmosphere of contention and dispute instead of peaceful cooperation. The problem should be met on the ground of what in the long run will produce good will and prosperity to the entire world, for no single nation can disassociate its prosperity from the prosperity and good will of all of them.

The world is emerging from the chaos of the war, and these governmental measures are no longer justifiable, since the producers of the world may look forward to more stable times. We are also at the point where the whole consuming world is being driven toward destructive courses to protect itself from exploitation by these controls. Therefore, the time has come when a solution of this problem is both urgent and more feasible.

I am convinced that the sound solution does not lie in any of the alternatives I have outlined; they are all in the nature of last resorts. They recognize trade war. I believe the solution does lie in the willingness of statesmen throughout the world to recognize the consequences of government-controlled production and price and to meet the issue in the only way it should be met, that is, by abandonment of all such governmental action.

The Cost of Using American-Flag Ships

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. ALLEN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 12, 1954

Mr. ALLEN of California. Mr. Speaker, on at least two occasions during the present session members of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee have risen to urge that there should be included in bills reported by other committees a provision that at least 50 percent of the cargoes financed by our Government should move in American-flag ships. The amendments proposed have been resisted on the basis that the cost of transportation in American-flag ships exceeded the cost that would be paid for transportation in foreign-flag ships. I believe that the presentations which were made in opposition to the American-flag ships were made without full information and were based upon a consideration of only one element of the cost which might be involved. Accordingly, I inquired for further information, and some was made available to me. It seemed to me that this information, the facts involved in which I believe to be true and the conclusions drawn from which I believe to be reasonable, should be included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Recently a Member stated on the floor of the House that under our foreign aid programs approximately $700 million of the $1 billion paid for shipping the foreign aid commodities overseas has been paid to American-flag vessels. In his statement he emphasized that it cost our Government $121 million more by shipping the commodities on American-flag ships than it would have if shipped aboard foreign-flag ships. He implied that this increased cost was a direct contribution by the American taxpayer to American-flag shipping.

I do not know what assumptions have been applied to the cost of shipping our foreign aid cargoes to arrive at the so-called increased cost of $121 million. However, even though we assume that the $121 million figure is correct, I believe that dollarwise the American taxpayer realizes a savings by having our foreign aid cargoes shipped in American bottoms.

To begin with, any analysis of comparative costs between American and foreign-flag ships must consider the type of service in which the ships are engaged and the dollar values of the foreign aid cargoes carried. This breakdown is contained in table I:

TABLE I.—*Transportation costs for United States foreign aid,*[1] *April 1948 to June 1953*

[In million dollars]

	Total United States and foreign ships	Carried by United States-flag ships	
		Total out of United States and foreign ports	Total out of United States ports
All services	1,040	763	629
Tramps	429	346	341
Liners	337	274	270
Tankers	267	138	17
Miscellaneous	7	5	1

[1] Includes CF and CIF shipments freight elements of above shipments.

Source: Foreign Operations Administration;

The above table shows that American-flag ships in our liner services received $274 million for the carriage of foreign aid commodities between April 1948 and June 1953. However, it is important to note that the great majority of ships in liner services are members of conferences of which member shipowners of foreign-flag ships charge the same shipping rates as American-flag ships. Therefore, if all of these cargoes were carried in foreign-flag liners the cost to our Government would have been the same. Thus, the shipment of foreign-aid cargoes aboard our liners does not in any way increase the cost to our Government.

Of the $267 million paid for the carriage of liquid foreign-aid cargoes, $138 million was paid to American-flag tankers. However, it is important to note in table I that only $17 million of these cargoes originated from United States ports. The remaining liquid cargoes carried by American-flag ships originated in foreign ports and, therefore, American tankship owners lifted them at the world market rates. The higher cost which resulted from transporting these cargoes aboard American-flag ships is negligible and, therefore, is not to be considered as an important factor in the $121 million figure which is quoted.

After studying table I, it is obvious that the so-called increased cost of $121 million largely applies to the difference of cost between American-flag and foreign-flag tramp ships. This observation should not be taken to mean that our Government is wasting money by having the American tramp ships carry these cargoes. Both the Department of Defense and the Department of Commerce have arrived at the very definite conclusion that an American tramp fleet is essential for our national defense. Also, Congress has time and time again mandated that our ships shall carry at least 50 percent of our foreign-aid cargoes, including the bulk cargoes which are carried by tramp ships.

Also, it is important to note that in the immediate post-World War II period and during the Korean war there was a shortage of ships to carry our foreign economic- and military-aid cargoes. In fact, during the Korean war our Government was compelled to activate over 600 ships from our national-defense reserve fleet in order to meet the shipping needs of the free world. Therefore, it is clear that if our tramp fleet had not been available to carry our aid cargoes, the bidding for such cargoes in the open market, short of ships, would have resulted in rates much higher than those paid to the American tramp-ship operators. This is in accordance with the basic economic law of price being set by supply of and demand for a given commodity or service. This was proved to be true in World War I when our Nation was caught short of ships and general cargo rates soared over 1,000 percent with some rates rising over 2,000 percent. It is a matter of record that many foreign shipowners were able to realize profits from a single voyage equal to the total cost of the ships. Therefore, even though the reservation of foreign-aid cargoes is a form of Government aid to the tramp shipowners, there is absolutely no validity in a statement charging that our taxpayers paid $121 million more by shipping in American merchant ships than they would have if shipped in foreign ships.

No one would lightly dismiss the tariff question by saying that the elimination of all American tariffs would result in a savings to the American consumer and taxpayer. This complex subject must be considered in its entirety as pertaining to the protection afforded to the American farmer, businessman, and worker, and the end result of adjusting American income to the American standard of living. This is also true when the American merchant marine is considered. The American merchant marine is a vital industry which is not only required to develop our foreign trade in times of peace, but to serve as a military auxiliary in time of war. Because the memories of two world wars and the Korean war are still fresh in our minds, we shall not attempt to go into the details for the necessity of achieving and maintaining an adequate American merchant marine.

Aside from the need of the American merchant marine for the development of our foreign markets and for our national defense, it is essential that we study the effect of the industry upon our national economy. In order to limit our analysis we shall present data pertaining to the disbursement of the dollars earned by American shipowners in the carriage of our foreign-aid cargoes, the domestic jobs created, and the taxes collected by our Government. These basic facts in our analysis are contained in the following table:

TABLE II.—*Estimated disbursement and resulting jobs created from ocean transportation of foreign-aid cargoes from April 1948 to June 1953*

	Amount disbursements of subsidized lines in 1950 Col. A[1]	Percent of total disbursements Col. B	Resultant number of direct and indirect employed Col. C[2]	Estimated amount disbursements from foreign-aid programs, 1948-53 Col. D	Estimated resultant number of direct and indirect employed Col. E
Direct employment:					
Domestic salaries and wages paid to:					
Administrative-type personnel	$20,475,000	6.20	7,100	$36,890,000	12,797
Seamen	88,507,000	26.81	33,400	159,519,500	60,200
Longshoremen	11,982,000	3.63	6,400	21,598,500	11,535
Subtotal	120,964,000	36.64	46,900	218,008,000	[2] 84,532
Indirect employment:[3]					
Domestic vessel expenditures, other than above salaries and wages	179,263,000	54.30	38,600	323,085,000	69,573
Other domestic overhead and miscellaneous expenditures	29,889,000	9.06	6,400	53,907,000	11,535
Subtotal	209,152,000	63.36	45,000	376,992,000	81,108
Grand total	330,116,000	100.00	91,900	595,000,000	165,640
Foreign expenditures for necessary port charges, etc.				35,000,000	
Estimated earnings				70,000,000	
Total paid for United States-flag carryings				700,000,000	

[1] Analysis of Construction and Operating Subsidies Under Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as Amended, the Ocean Shipping Panel to the Transportation Council for the Department of Commerce, Oct. 12, 1952, schedule III, excluding capital expenditures, p. 29.

[2] In man-years.

[3] Based on Department of Commerce productivity factors.

Although that portion of table II which refers to the disbursements of the dollars earned by American shipowners by carrying our foreign aid cargoes is listed as "estimated," the area of error is at a minimum and negligible. We shall explain how these figures were arrived at.

The $35 million item for foreign expenditures for port charges and similar items is estimated on the basis of 5 percent of the total $700 million foreign aid cargo revenues received by American shipowners. This figure is not larger due to the fact that most recipient nations were required to provide their own discharging services and, therefore, neither the American steamship companies nor the United States Government incurred any cost in this connection. The figure of $35 million, therefore, would cover only such cargoes which moved under berth term shipment through commercial channels. This is a reasonable estimate of the amounts so expended.

The item of $70 million as the estimated earnings has been fixed at approximately 10 percent of the freight revenue of $700 million. Creditable evidence shows this figure represents the maximum amount believed to have been earned by shipping companies on this carriage during these years.

Columns A and C of table II were carefully calculated by the Ocean Shipping Panel to the Transportation Council for the Department of Commerce. These figures are based upon the disbursements of the subsidized lines during 1950, and the resultant number of man-years of domestic employment created by these disbursements.

Column B contains the percentages of each disbursement item to total disbursements. For example, the first percentage in column B is 6.20 percent. This was arrived at by dividing the grand total of $330,116,000 disbursements into the $20,475,000 paid as salaries and wages to administrative type personnel. The percentages of all of the other individual items were arrived at by the same type of calculation.

Columns D and E are statistical projections based upon columns A, B, and C. Although columns A, B, and C pertain to the subsidized lines only while columns D and E pertain to both subsidized and unsubsidized lines, the projection is accurate because the earnings and operating costs on the revenue dollar have been substantially similar for the subsidized and unsubsidized liners and tramps during these years. This is confirmed by the maritime subsidy policy study, which was published by the Office of the Under Secretary of Commerce for Transportation and the Maritime Administration in April 1954.

The individual items of column D are arrived at by applying the percentages of column B to the total of $595 million which is the amount of disbursements of revenues from the foreign-aid programs, excluding foreign expenditures for port charges, capital expenditures, and estimated earnings for the period April 1948 to June 1953 of the $700 million freight revenues paid to American operators. For example, domestic salaries and wages paid to administrative type personnel by the subsidized lines in 1950 was $20,475,000 or 6.20 percent of their grand total disbursements of $330,116,000. Therefore 6.20 percent of the $595 million which is the amount of disbursements of revenues from the foreign-aid programs, resulted in the figure $36,890,000 as the domestic wages and salaries paid to administrative-type personnel. In this manner the remainder of the percentages of column B were applied to the $595 million figure to arrive at the projected disbursement for each item.

Column E is the projected estimated number of man-year of direct and indirect domestic employment resulting from the disbursement of revenues from the foreign-aid programs. This is based on the ratio of the $595 million disbursements of the revenues from foreign-aid programs to the $330,116,000 disbursements of the subsidized lines in 1950 and the resulting employment. Five hundred and ninety-five million dollars divided by $330,116,000 is 180.24 percent. Therefore, each individual employment item of column C was increased by 180.24 percent to arrive at the man-years of employment shown in column E.

The grand total of man-years of employment resulting from the disbursements of $595 million of revenues from foreign-aid programs is estimated at 165,640 man-years. This is approximately 50 percent [1] of the total number of persons employed in our anthracite coal-mining industry and 25 percent [1] of the number employed in the local railways and bus lines industry during the 5-year period 1948 through 1952. No one would question the fact that this is a significant direct contribution to our national economy. In fact, the full imployment impact of the revenues realized by American shipping companies from foreign-aid cargoes is not contained in the above data. If this revenue had not been forthcoming, many shipping companies would not have realized sufficient profits to continue their commercial nongovernmental cargo operations which result in the employment of more than 6 times the man-years of employment resulting from the foreign-aid shipping revenues.

The estimated minimum taxes paid into the United States Treasury as a result of the carriage of foreign-aid cargoes in American bottoms is contained in table III below:

TABLE III.—*Taxes paid into U. S. Treasury*

A. Taxes on direct wages at minimum rates of 22 percent [1]	$48,000,000
B. Taxes on indirect employment at minimum rates of 22 percent [1]	83,000,000
C. Corporate taxes and taxes paid by stockholders on dividends received at 50 percent	35,000,000
Total minimum increase in U. S. Treasury Revenues	166,000,000

[1] Internal Revenue, Washington, D. C.

Thus, even if one subtracts the supposed saving of $121 million which might have been realized through carriage of our foreign aid tramp cargoes in foreign tramp ships, we still find the United States Treasury has benefited by $45 million. Moreover, there has been created and maintained 165,000 man-years of employment for American citizens. However, we again state that this supposed saving is unrealistic because the shipping rates of the foreign shipowners would have been much higher had not American ships been available during this period.

A very important saving realized by our Government by having subsidized ships carry foreign aid cargoes is in the recapture provision contained in the Merchant Marine Act of 1936. This provision enables the Government to recapture one-half of the profits which are over 10 percent of capital necessarily employed over 10-year periods of the operating subsidy contracts up to the amount of subsidy accrual. The amount of foreign aid shipment revenues received by the subsidized lines would be recaptured by the United States Government in the degree of the recapture position of the companies. The three main categories of recapture are as follows:

First. Companies which, even with the foreign aid revenues, would not have earned over 10 percent of the capital necessarily employed in the business. In this case, the Government would not recapture any of the foreign aid shipment revenues.

Second. Companies which are in a recapture position because of the additional profits realized from foreign aid cargo revenues. In this case, the Government would recapture one-half of the profits resulting from foreign aid cargo carriage which is above the 10 percent of capital necessarily employed.

Third. Companies which are in full recapture position because of their commercial nonforeign aid cargoes and foreign aid cargoes. When companies are in a full recapture position, the Government recaptures one-half of the profits which are over 10 percent of the capital necessarily employed and this amounts to the full subsidy accrual. In this case, the Government may well recapture all of the profits realized by the company from foreign aid shipment revenues.

In the Maritime Subsidy Policy, published by the Under Secretary of Commerce for Transportation and the Maritime Administration, there is contained a statement pertaining to the effect of cargo carriage on subsidy payable. In part, this statement is as follows:

> The amount of cargo available to subsidized American-flag vessels is an important factor in the ultimate amount of subsidy payable by the Government. * * * Consequently, if private industry is to provide a merchant fleet adequate for national requirements, all Government assistance in providing cargo and protection against unfair competition should be provided.

It is estimated that for the 5-year period, 1948 through 1952, the Government will recapture 30 percent[2] of the subsidy accrual for these years. It is obvious that a substantial amount of this recapture results from the foreign-aid shipping revenues received by the subsidized lines. This should be encouraging to the American taxpayers who are interested in developing their national economy and protecting their national security at a minimum cost.

---

[1] Source: U. S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, published in current Labor Review (see appendix, table A).

In addition to the foregoing, there are other factors which cannot and must not be ignored. For example, during the 5 calendar years, 1948 through 1952, the American shipowners paid the United States Government a total of $185,862,278 as charter hire of Government-owned ships.[3] A primary reason for the charter hire of these ships was to carry our foreign aid cargoes over the world shipping lanes short of ships. Therefore, we can safely say that the shipment of foreign-aid cargoes in American bottoms resulted in many millions of dollars of charter hire revenue to the United States Treasury.

Also, our Nation benefits through the maintenance of a self-perpetuating merchant marine which is needed to develop our foreign markets in peacetime and also serve as a military auxiliary in times of war.

All of the above facts barely touch upon the many reasons why American-flag shipping makes real and continuing contributions to our American way of life and why we must preserve unto ourselves a fair share of our foreign commerce, especially that foreign commerce which consists of our economic and military aid cargoes to foreign nations.

Appendix Table A.—*Employees in anthracite coal and local railways*[1] *and buslines industries: 1948–52*

Year	Anthracite coal	Local railways and buslines
1948	80,000	163,000
1949	77,300	158,000
1950	75,100	145,000
1951	69,100	139,000
1952	63,400	134,000
Total	364,900	739,000

[1] Source: U. S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, published in current Labor Review.

Note.—Number employed includes all full-time and part time employees who worked during, or received pay for, any part of the pay period ending nearest 15th of month. The above annual data are averages of the monthly data.

Appendix Table B.—*Total charter hire paid to U. S. Government by United States ship operators,*[1] *1948–52*

Calendar year:	*Charter hire paid*
1948	$84,942,410
1949	39,400,242
1950	14,557,486
1951	28,915,490
1952	18,046,650
Total	185,862,278

[1] Source: U. S. Maritime Administration, Washington, D. C., July 21, 1954.

Achievements of the 83d Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. S. J. CRUMPACKER, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 12, 1954

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Speaker, the Republican 83d Congress has established an outstanding record of legislative achievement. Although handicapped by the fact that the Republicans held only a slim majority in the House and for a time were in a minority in the Senate, a major portion of President Eisenhower's program has been enacted.

The New Deal spending spree has been halted; inflation has been checked; social security benefits have been expanded; home ownership has been made easier; farm prices are being stabilized; the St. Lawrence seaway is on the road to reality; Communists and security risks have been expelled from Government; and the people at long last have seen honesty and integrity restored in Washington. Above all, the Nation is at peace.

The Democrats did succeed in killing some segments of the Eisenhower program: the right of 18-year-olds to vote, statehood for Hawaii, health reinsurance, and revision of the Taft-Hartley Act.

But the foundation of the Eisenhower program has been laid. Our economy has been placed firmly on the pathway of American enterprise after 20 years of straying off into leftwing experiments. A new approach has been made to the Lincoln doctrine of government of, by, and for the people.

The record of accomplishments of the Republican 83d Congress is a long one, but here is a summary of its major achievements:

The fighting has been stopped in Korea and today no American lives are being lost or endangered in wars anywhere in the world.

We have strengthened our defense structure while cutting the cost of its maintenance by billions.

A firm, consistent foreign policy, based on the principle of collective security, guides our path toward a just and lasting peace.

Rigid economy and elimination of waste in the Federal household has cut Government spending by billions.

This has made possible the greatest tax reduction program in history, with savings of $7.4 billion to individuals and business, the lion's share going to the people themselves.

We have halted inflation, preserving the value of the dollar.

Controls are gone.

The social-security system has been broadened and benefits increased.

Home ownership is encouraged by the new Housing Act which corrects abuses in existing law, expands the mortgage credit system, and provides for slum clearance.

Development of the St. Lawrence seaway project, stripped of frills, is assured by action of the 83d Congress.

Contending with weaknesses in the farm program, this Congress has moved to insure agriculture its fair share of the national income. Immediate needs have been accommodated with laws dealing with such problems as surpluses and drought.

Fourteen major reorganization plans to increase efficiency and promote economy in the Federal Government are in operation, and a Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has been elevated to cabinet status.

More than 200,000 unnecessary jobs have been abolished from the Federal payroll.

Internal security has been tightened and new weapons have been forged for use by the Department of Justice in its war against traitors.

We are getting more government back home and we have moved to take government out of competition with private enterprise.

This record adds up to good stewardship—the kind that should merit continued confidence and support of the American people.

The Small, Family-Type Farmer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 12, 1954

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I have a letter from William G. Matousek, of Carter, S. Dak., which I feel I should share with all other Members of Congress. Mr. Matousek, in a very logical, understandable manner, describes some of the problems confronting the small, family-type farmer, of which he is typical.

To him and the many others like him, farming is not just a way to make a living, it is a way of life. We must do everything possible to protect that way of life.

Mr. Matousek's letter is as follows:

Carter, S. Dak., *August 1, 1954.*

Hon. E. Y. Berry,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Sir: As the time of year comes that brings wheat allotments to us, work tapers off just a little and my concern with the present farm program increases in proportion. Probably that is the immediate reason for this letter. Wheat is our cash crop, and when your allotment for that crop has been cut 40 percent it is only natural to become concerned.

Now I know you have nothing to do with that allotment, but you do have a lot to do with the kind of law that produces a program which makes that kind of allotment possible. I am sure that the law was not intended to operate as it does, and if it operated so unjustly to me alone, I would probably just have to find another livelihood, but it is operating just as unfairly to many thousands of others. I think some of us should be heard from directly so that these inequities may come to your attention.

I would like to point out to you some of the unjust ways that this law works when it gets down to the individual. No law I know can be written to apply with equal justice to several million people, but certainly it can be modified so that redress is possible.

---

[2] Maritime subsidy policy, Office of the Under Secretary of Commerce for Transportation and the Maritime Administration, April 1954, appendix, table 17.

[3] Source: Maritime Administration, July 21, 1954 (see appendix, table B).

First, Mr. Berry, it seems to me that in operation no consideration is given to the small family farmer, the man to whom farming is a life as well as a living. His basic needs are the same as those of the large commercial farmer, yet when a cut is going around, proportionately it is larger for the small, diversified family farmer than it is for the big commercial man.

There should be a reasonable allotment to each farmer on which no cut is made. Then there should be a sliding cut taken on each multiple of this basic allotment so that the larger the producer, the proportionately larger cut he takes. This would protect the small man without ruining the larger. This is the principle that is applied in our tax structure. Is it not equitable to apply it to the principal source of income as well?

Second, no provision is made to compensate the man who has farmed conservatively and with proper conservation measures. If he operated a general farm with proper attention to preserving and protecting his land, he does not have a big wheat history. His is a picture of careful soil practice with grass and legume and rotation. When allotments are being passed out, he is fined for his care, and the man who is "mining" for wheat and wheat alone is given a bonus because he has a big, uninterrupted wheat history. The man who has gone along and tried to conform to good farming practices and past farm programs is now penalized for his efforts. Is this a fair manner of treatment?

It appears that the time is fast approaching when we will have allotments for each commodity and cross compliance required. Yet I read that we are only a few years ahead of consumption and that before too many years we will not be able to produce sufficient food and fiber to fill our needs. The CCC is holding some $6 billion worth of excess commodities.

I sat in line at the CCC bin site in Winner a few short weeks ago and pondered the ultimate use of the wheat that was pouring there on top of last year's and how many years more I do not know, while the elevators were deserted, peddling a little feed and seed now and then. A large segment of our economy is disrupted, and also in disrepute generally.

I think, still, that I have the basis of an idea that would be workable and respectable. If, as it appears, allotments are set for all commodities on each farm, why not set them on a bushel basis, consideration to be given to those farmers who have operated conservatively and under good farming practices. Basic, nonreducible allotments would be given to every farmer, then increasingly larger cuts taken in each multiple of this allotment so that the big or commercial producer is made to hold more of his production from the market—something he could well afford to do.

Suppose, for illustration, I would be given an allotment of 2,000 bushels of wheat. This would be my share of the anticipated need for the year. This I would sell in the normal manner through the elevator at a guaranteed price. If I produced more than this, it would be my responsibility to hold it off the market. Next year I might not produce my allotment, so I would draw on my reserve, but it would be to my own self-interest to maintain a reserve, hence an ever-normal granary in case of need. This would serve the double purpose of providing some income each year. Under the present system, I may have 5,000 bushels this year and be able to sell, or rather seal, it all, then next year I may not have any production, and nothing to sell. This is a self-regulatory process. When an individual builds up an unmanageable carryover, he would be forced to cut production and the CCC would not be stuck with his folly as at present.

I ask you to consider my personal position only for the purpose of illustration. My local observation convinces me that the majority of my fellow farmers are not too happy either, and it seems that we are at the beginning, not the end, of restrictions, and each new one hits harder at the small operator because he has less left of that basic necessity.

I am not just passing out platitudes when I say that I have been happy with the change of government operation and political morality that we have undergone. I think that if the party that brought this about is to stay in power, it is essential that consideration be given to that great number of farmers of which I am but one, namely, a family-operating unit, both for a living and a way of living. There is a point below which it will be impossible for us to have our basic livelihood cut and still continue to live in the moderate affluence to which we have become accustomed, and which must be maintained if for no other reason than to make us good customers for the rest of the economy.

As I mentioned above, my wheat base has been cut 38 percent over last year. This cannot but hurt. Fortunately, I have other sources of income and will no doubt make out quite nicely, but it has shaken somewhat my faith in justice and equality.

Sincerely yours,

William G. Matousek.

Strange Bedfellows

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD W. NICHOLSON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 12, 1954

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, I am placing in the Appendix of the Record an item entitled "Strange Bedfellows," written by the editor of the New Bedford Standard. I agree with it. He says:

> The Daily Worker, official organ of the Communist Party in America, is working day and night to destroy McCarthy—and, as a corollary, all investigations of Communist activities.

Mr. Speaker, I think it would be a good thing if this is inserted in the Record so that all the people in the United States could have this for themselves:

> Strange Bedfellows
>
> The Daily Worker, official organ of the Communist Party in America, is working day and night to destroy McCarthy—and, as a corollary, all investigations of Communist activities.
>
> In its efforts, the Worker is vastly assisted by the hate campaign of individuals and publications against McCarthy.
>
> These violent, unfactual, and often untruthful attacks on McCarthy are made to order for the Communist Daily Worker which often republishes them word for word in its columns.
>
> The Worker, in true Communist (and anti-McCarthy) fashion, already has prejudged the coming hearings on new and old charges against McCarthy.
>
> Not only has the Worker found McCarthy guilty but, in true Communist fashion, it is demanding the committee of six Senators sitting in judgment find McCarthy guilty.
>
> Never before have the Communists found such powerful, vindictive, and unreasoning support in their purposes. Never before has communism found such willing cooperation from those who oppose communism.
>
> Not only is the anti-McCarthy drive getting out of hand, but it threatens to be the most serious blow to the democratic process since communism rose to power.
>
> In its attempt to destroy McCarthy, the anti-McCarthy drive threatens democracy itself.
>
> Will the McCarthy haters, people and press, wake up in time to discover their communist bedfellows? No more serious question ever has confronted this country.

Dangerous Compromises in AEC Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1954

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I herewith include the following editorial which appeared in the August 5 issue of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch entitled "Dangerous Compromises on Power":

> Dangerous Compromises on Power
>
> The compromises in the atomic bill which the Senate and House conferees have arrived at thus far do not look too reassuring. On the key point in particular—whether the Government shall produce and sell any atomic power for distribution by public and cooperative systems—the proposed solution seems to fall considerably short of solving.
>
> The power compromise would permit the Atomic Energy Commission to produce atomic power only at experimental, as distinguished from commercial, plants. What assurance is there that these experimental plants would be large enough to afford a genuine yardstick by which to measure what private plants should charge for atomic power?
>
> What assurance is there that the plants would produce enough atomic power to let public and cooperative systems determine a yardstick of distribution costs—and to protect those systems from being destroyed by subsidized competition at the hands of private atomic power suppliers?
>
> Preference in the sale of Government atomic power would be given to public and cooperative systems where practicable. There is no such limitation on the preference in the Federal power laws which have governed the sale of Government-produced electric energy for nearly half a century.
>
> Why would it not always be practicable to apply the preference? Who would decide in any given instance whether it was practicable or not—and by what objective standards? That loophole—where practicable—is big ennough for the historic preference to public and nonprofit systems to vanish through it entirely.
>
> Federal agencies other than AEC would be permitted to apply for license to generate atomic power, provided their own organic laws allowed them to do so. Are there any Government agencies outside AEC whose governing laws would allow them to generate atomic power? If so, which agencies are they?
>
> These compromises, as so far reported, are far inferior to the clear Senate amendments authorizing AEC and some other agencies to produce atomic power commercially and applying the preference to public and co-op systems.
>
> Unless the terms drawn by the conferees preserve public power and public preference, the Senators who stood against the all-private-power bill in the first place should stand equally firm in opposition now, in the joint conference and, if need be, on the Senate floor.

Refugee Relief Program Needs Speeding Up

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 11, 1954

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, before we finish the business of the 83d Congress, I rise to express my profound disappointment in the operation of the refugee immigration program so far. Signed by the President almost a year ago, the act would admit 209,000 refugees by the time it expires in December 1956. Yet, to date, less than 2,000 persons have been admitted. Is this the law which the President described as demonstrating America's traditional concern for the homeless, the persecuted, and the less fortunate of other lands? Can we really expect refugees on the other side of the ocean to believe we are concerned with their tragic plight when we put up all manner of roadblocks to keep them from coming to this country?

It was already apparent in Congress last summer that there was powerful opposition to this program. But yet the majority of us felt it was good and voted for it. As many of my colleagues will remember, I spoke in behalf of this bill during the floor debate on its passage. I believed then that it would be a great psychological weapon in our behalf in the cold war with the Communists, while at the same time offering a haven and a refuge for many of the disinherited and dispossessed of World War II. But the sad fact is that thousands of uprooted Europeans who looked on the passage of this bill as the key to the golden door of freedom and opportunity have been disappointed. They have not only been disappointed in their hopes and dreams of coming to America; they have also been convinced, by our lagging and dilatory tactics, that we are not really interested in them. Worse yet, in their eyes we are in the hypocritical position of having passed legislation for propaganda purposes which we had no intention of implementing.

Why have we given that impression? Mr. Speaker, I believe, and that is the reason I want to go on record before the adjournment of this session, that the fault lies in the administration of this law. I do not seek to impugn the motives of anyone, but in all honesty, it does appear to be a deliberate attempt to ignore the wishes of Congress.

Let us look at the facts. Last August 7 President Eisenhower enthusiastically signed into law the Refugee Relief Act. Congress subsequently appropriated $3 million to get the program started. An experienced administrator, Mr. Scott McLeod, was appointed to head up the program. On the surface this would appear to make for an auspicious beginning of a grand, new program. But this was not the case. From the beginning it was reported that the administrator was unsympathetic to the refugee program itself. As many of you know, it was rumored here on Capitol Hill that everything would be done to impede the progress of the program. Last January, for example, Mr. McLeod told a congressional appropriation committee that he hoped 15,000 persons would be admitted by June 30. And yet—according to a count made in June only 48 refugees had been admitted.

Fortunately, certain Members of Congress did not forget about this program once they voted for it nor did the President give up hope for its success. Last spring—when only 8 refugees had been admitted in so many months of operation—several Members took the floor to register strong protests over what appeared to be a deliberate attempt to sabotage the whole program. One Member, from a State bordering my own, attacked the slowdown as a national scandal. The combined interest of Congressmen and the President had its effect. On April 30, Mr. McLeod sailed for Europe to investigate firsthand the operation of the refugee program. Among other places, he visited Italy where the problem, as Ambassador Luce can verify, is particularly acute and explosive.

In fairness to all concerned, the program has gained momentum in the last month. The last count taken July 22, showed that 1,779 refugees had been admitted to this country, but this is still far short of Mr. McLeod's January estimate of 15,000 by June 30. It amounts to about eight-tenths of 1 percent of the total authorized and the program is almost one-third over.

Every imaginable excuse has been given for the delays. One reason often given is the lack of cooperation from foreign governments in pledging to readmit aliens who obtain visas by fraudulent means. But this reason hardly holds water when we consider that Italy from the beginning has been willing to cooperate in every way and early agreed to take back all refugees who might later be found to have used fraud in obtaining visas. Yet Italians, like refugees from other countries, have been hamstrung in their efforts to come to this country.

Mr. Speaker, the best of laws can accomplish little when there is no will to make it work and when there is lack of cooperation only misfortune for everyone concerned can be the result.

Another reason given for the delay so far is the need for strict security investigations of each refugee. And certainly I think we would all agree that when we voted for the Refugee Relief Act last summer we were voting for an act with adequate security precautions. Special safeguards in regard to security screening were written into the bill. Other precautions, over and above our usual immigration provisions seemed to insure the security of the United States against the possible admittance of subversive agents. I agree that these safeguards are vitally necessary. But I submit, Mr. Speaker, that these precautions should be used only for the purposes for which they were intended.

I believe, further, that we have lost one round in the fight against Communism when we indulge ourselves inordinately in the emotions of panic and fear. Let us look at the situation in Italy. As of July 16, 1954, 4,802 visas had been issued to Italians. How many had been refused on any grounds including security reasons? Only 438. And yet the professional purveyors of a particular brand of security would have us believe that it would be hard to find anyone in Italy or in all of Europe who is not really a subversive.

While the passage of time has enormously diminished the moral and psychological impact which I had hoped this law would have, and while we can never undo the damage of a year of almost complete inaction, we can begin to correct the impression we have created abroad that we don't care about these people. My heart goes out to all those who could and should benefit from this program: to the relatives who cannot join their families in this country because the regular immigration quotas are over-subscribed; to the refugees who have been the victims of the very ideologies we are combatting today. I hope and pray that from here on in the law will be administered in the spirit which we intended when we voted for it last summer.

Hon. Laurie C. Battle

SPEECH
OF

HON. JAMES P. RICHARDS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 5, 1954

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, it is a great loss to the House of Representatives that LAURIE BATTLE is retiring from Congress at the end of this term. As former chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee and now ranking minority member, I have served on that committee with LAURIE BATTLE for a number of years and have firsthand knowledge of his energy, integrity, ability, and devotion to duty. I know of no Member of Congress who has accomplished more during an equal tenure of years. He is the author of the famous Battle Act, which has done much in curbing trade with Russia and Iron Curtain countries. He was last year appointed by President Eisenhower as a member of the Foreign Economic Policy Commission, in which position he did yeoman work. Those are just two of his many achievements since he came here.

I must say, too, that I have a keen sense of personal loss in LAURIE BATTLE'S retirement. I have come to know and love him and his fine family during the years they have been in Washington, and I am sure I speak for the entire membership of our committee and of the Congress itself when I say that it will be hard to fill his place and that we shall truly miss him.

I confidently believe that LAURIE has a great future no matter what activity of life he decides to enter. I hope he will decide to come back here. But in any event, our thoughts and best wishes are with him and his family always.

Beware of the Communists' Smile as Well as Their Growl—Both Are Tactical Maneuvers To Deceive or To Intimidate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 11, 1954

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Minneapolis Tribune of August 8, 1954:

THE SOFT APPROACH

When President Eisenhower offered $15 million worth of food to hungry east Germans last summer the East German Communist regime promptly rejected the offer as an insult and a provocation.

Soviet Foreign Minister Molotov called it a propaganda maneuver—a characterization corroborated by the United States psychological warfare apparatus' subsequent exploitation of the offer.

Both the Communists and the democracies regard food as a potent weapon in the struggle for men's minds.

When President Eisenhower offered on July 29 to send surplus United States food to Danube River flood areas it was assumed the Soviet satellites would turn down the offer in the usual Communist fashion.

The East German Communist regime indeed did reject the food when it was first offered. But last Friday, to everyone's surprise, East German Premier Grotewohl reversed himself and welcomed the food offer as a friendly gesture.

Why this aboutface? Not, it may be safely assumed, because of any humanitarian solicitude for the flood victims. Communist dictatorships don't let such bourgeois notions affect their actions.

Two considerations probably led Grotewohl to adopt this new attitude. He hoped to trap the United States into according some measure of recognition to his government in connection with the food exchange. That was implicit in Grotewohl's expressed hope that details could be arranged by negotiation.

The Chinese Communists are using similar tactics with greater leverage than the food offer affords Grotewohl. The Chinese Communist regime made the United States give it implicit recognition by refusing to discuss through British intermediaries the release of several score Americans held prisoner in Red China. The only way the United States could start moves to liberate Americans languishing in Red prisons was by having State Department personnel talk with Red Chinese officials in Geneva.

Red China is putting similar pressure upon the United States to recognize it as the government of China by refusing to accept notes sent through British intermediaries in connection with the killing of Americans by Red Chinese aircraft. The Chinese Communists are trying to make the United States modify its nonrecognition policy by ignoring demands for satisfaction addressed through a third party.

James B. Conant, United States High Commissioner in Germany, astutely avoided walking into the East German recognition trap by dealing with his Russian opposite number without mentioning Grotewohl. Conant assigned the task of negotiating details of the food delivery to the League of Red Cross Societies.

A second consideration influencing the new East German policy is the current Communist campaign to convince the people of West Germany and other parts of the free world that peaceful coexistence is possible between Communist and non-Communist nations.

Grotewohl apparently hopes to show that his regime is a reasonable one by taking a new tack in Soviet propaganda. The East German press substituted talk about "striving for friendly relations" with the American people for the customary anti-American diatribes.

It must make East Germans rub their eyes to read in the National Zeitung that "to turn down the offered aid would be an offense to the people of the government making the offer."

The Communist regimes haven't hesitated to give such offense in the past. It is unlikely they will hesitate to do so in the future. But just now they are using the soft instead of the harsh approach. Acceptance of the food and talk about friendly ties are part of the soft approach.

Veterans' Benefits Prove National Asset

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CECIL R. KING

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 5, 1954

Mr. KING of California. Mr. Speaker, our forthright stand for veterans' benefits through legislation has proven to be one of our Nation's greatest assets during its 10 years of operation.

The recent report of the Veterans' Administration demonstrates the sound monetary investment and charts the momentous moral and educational uplift to our whole Nation as a result of keeping faith with our armed services.

I enjoy a sense of pride in having strongly supported the veterans' benefits now proven to be self-liquidating.

I commend most highly the millions of veterans who by their individual fortitude and sincerity have converted from defending our Nation in a war emergency to outstanding leadership and stability in our peacetime economy.

It is a personal privilege for me to insert in the permanent RECORD of our United States Congress the Veterans' Administration's factual report. It is a glowing tribute to our veteran:

The GI bill, a law that has left its lasting imprint on the lives of millions of veterans and on America itself, reached its 10th anniversary today.

The law—signed by President Franklin D. Roosevelt on June 22, 1944, contained three major benefits to help veterans in readjustment to civilian life.

One, was a program of guaranteed loans for homes, farms, and businesses. It still is in force. Another, education and training at Government expense, is approaching its end. The third, readjustment allowances for periods of unemployment already has faded into history.

On signing the GI bill in 1944, the President said, "This law gives emphatic notice to the men and women of our Armed Forces that the American people do not intend to let them down."

But veterans have not let down the American people either according to statistics released today by the Veterans' Administration.

Through the GI bill, World War II veterans have become the best educated group of people in the history of the United States.

Because of their training, they have raised their income level to the point where they now are paying an extra billion dollars a year in income taxes to Uncle Sam.

At this rate GI bill-trained veterans alone will pay off the entire $15 billion cost of the GI education and training program within the next 15 years.

Through the GI loan program, veterans have proved themselves to be among the best financial risks in the country.

With the help of GI loans, they have become America's largest single group of homeowners. Therefore, they pay more real-estate taxes to States, cities, and counties than any other group of equal size.

During the past 10 years a total of 3,000,000 veterans—1 out of every 5 men and women who served in World War II—obtained VA-guaranteed and insured loans valued at $23.5 billion.

The United States Government stands behind $12 billion of the amount, in the form of VA guaranties and insurance.

Home loans accounted for the 90 percent of all GI bill loans obtained by veterans, or 3,300,000 for $22.8 billion. Farm loans numbered 66,000 for $256 million; business loans, 213,000 for $575 million.

The average veteran used his GI loan to buy a substantial middle-price home—neither a cracker box nor a mansion.

A recent VA survey disclosed that 60 percent of GI home buyers paid between $10,000 and $15,000 for their homes. Thirty percent paid under $10,000; 8 percent, between $15,000 and $20,000; and 2 percent, over $20,000.

Veterans' record of repayment is unmatched, VA said.

Over the past decade, 650,000 GI loans, amounting to $3 billion, have been repaid in full.

Defaulted loans—on which VA has made good the guaranteed portions to private lenders—numbers only 32,000, or less than 1 percent of all loans received by veterans.

Turning to GI bill education and training, VA revealed that 7,800,000 World War II veterans—half of all who served during the war—trained under the GI bill over the past 10 years.

Of the total, 2,200,000 attended colleges and universities; 3,500,000 went to schools below the college level; 1,400,000 took on-the-job training, and 700,000 enrolled in institutional on-farm training, a combination of classroom work and practical experience on the farm.

Included in the below-college total are 150,000 veterans who were given the chance to learn to read and write in accelerated grade-school classes for adults.

America's veterans have trained for nearly every occupation at which man earns his living. As a result, VA said, the GI bill has helped fill the Nation's reservoirs of trained manpower, dangerously depleted right after the war.

Among the veterans trained were 450,000 engineers, 180,000 doctors and nurses, 113,000 scientists, 243,000 accountants, 107,000 lawyers, 36,000 ministers representing all major religious faiths, 17,000 writers and journalists.

Also 438,000 television and radio repairmen, 711,000 mechanics, 383,000 construction workers, 288,000 metalworkers, 138,000 electricians, 83,000 barbers and beauty culturists, 83,000 policemen and firemen, 45,000 bakers and meat cutters, 61,000 printers and typesetters, 76,000 dressmakers and tailors, and hundreds of thousands of others in many fields.

The VA cited a number of studies indicating that the GI bill has helped raise both the educational and income levels of veterans, as well as those of the Nation.

According to a Census Bureau study, the average male veteran today has completed high school and has gone ahead for some college. On the other hand, the average male nonveteran, in the same age bracket, has been able to finish just a little more than 2 years of high school.

One reason for the difference in educational achievement, the Census Bureau states, has been "the advantage of educational privileges under the GI bill."

Another survey, also conducted by the Census Bureau, showed that in 1947 the median income of male veterans between 25 and 34 years of age was only $2,401. That same year, the median income of nonveterans in the same age group was higher—$2,585.

Six years later, the median income of veterans rose 51 percent, to $3,631. Nonveterans' income, over the same period, showed only a 19 percent increase to $3,065.

The Census Bureau said: "The higher incomes of these veterans may reflect the combined influence of the increase in work experience and the higher level of education which veterans have achieved as compared with nonveterans."

Attributing only part of the increased earnings of veterans to the GI bill, those who have had GI training will be paying approximately $1 billion more each year in Federal income tax. Or, within the next 15 years, they will have paid for the entire program.

VA recalled its experiences in administering the GI bill readjustment allowance program for unemployed veterans.

During the life of the program, VA said, nearly 9 million veterans drew allowances totaling $3.2 billion for unemployed and $600 million for self-employment, during periods when self-employed veterans were netting less than $100 a month.

Only 900,000 veterans, or 10 percent of the total, exhausted their full rights to this benefit.

The average veteran was on the readjustment allowance rolls for only 6 weeks.

VA files are filled with case histories of veterans who successfully make the leap from military to civilian life with the help of GI bill benefits.

In Stephens, Ark., Floyd T. Bryan, ex-Navy veteran, obtained a GI business loan from a bank so that he could buy a bank in a small community where oil had just been struck. Since that time, Bryan's bank has made loans to hundreds of other veterans. "They're the best business on my books," he says.

In Topeka, Kans., Douglas K. Counsellor, former Army Air Force corporal, used two GI bill benefits—on-the-job training and a business loan—to establish a successful auto fabric business. After completing his training, he decided to buy out the firm in which he had trained. He did so with a $4,000 GI business loan.

In New York City, an Army veteran, Floyd T. Gould, is now at work at Brookhaven National Laboratories, performing vital basic research in atomic energy.

Coming out of service in 1946, Gould tried working in a laundry; then selling soap from laundry to laundry; then studying typing so that he could try for a job as a clerk; then studying television repair. None of these was successful.

He came to the VA and applied for vocational counseling, in preparation for enrolling in training under the GI bill. Counseling tests and interviews revealed that Gould was excellent college material; furthermore, that he had a natural bent for science. So he entered college. He won his master's degree and is about to acquire his doctory of philosophy in atomic physics, with brilliant grades. Also, because of his scholastic record, he was able to obtain the important research post at Brookhaven.

VA said the 10-year-old GI bill has been a program for World War II veterans only. Its achievements belong entirely to America's generation of World War II veterans—now averaging the middle thirties, with memories of wartime years growing a little dimmer as each year goes by.

A new GI bill was enacted in 1952 for veterans on active duty after June 27, 1950, the date of the outbreak of hostilities in Korea. This law, too, provides benefits similar to those which were contained in the original GI bill—education and training, GI loans, unemployment pay.

But it's too early to measure the accomplishments of this new GI bill, VA said. More time must elapse before its full impact on veterans, and on the Nation, can be evaluated.

Amend the Railroad Retirement Act

SPEECH

OF

HON. EDMUND P. RADWAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 30, 1954

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 7840) to amend the Railroad Retirement Act, the Railroad Retirement Tax Act, and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. RADWAN].

Mr. RADWAN. Mr. Chairman, I join in paying tribute to the chairman, the gentleman from New Jersey, as well as the ranking Democratic member of the committee, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CROSSER].

Both gentlemen certainly deserve all the praise that has been heaped upon them today.

I am happy to have this opportunity to speak briefly in favor of this bill, H. R. 7840. I introduced a similar measure, H. R. 7979, and for this reason I am especially happy to rise in support of this legislation.

Although I also favored certain provisions, which were supported by many railroad employees in my district, in H. R. 5269, nevertheless, the bill before us is a very good bill and I enthusiastically join with the recommendation made by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce in supporting this worthy measure.

In this connection, it is important that we pay tribute to the people most vitally concerned about this legislation. The railroad network of the United States is the most fabulous network of railroad transportation in the entire world. The records of the railroads in the First World War and the Second World War were simply fabulous. A large part of the success of the railroad-transportation system is due to the skilled and capable workers who are employed by the railroad companies. The management also made a distinct contribution toward the efficiency of the railroads in handling greatly increased tonnages. The legislation before us can briefly be summarized as follows:

First, benefits to widows, dependent widowers, and dependent parents at age 60 instead of age 65.

Second, benefits to widowed mothers with physically or mentally disabled children over the age of 18.

Third, full survivor benefits to widows, dependent widowers, and dependent parents who are also eligible for a railroad-retirement annuity in their own right.

Fourth, increasing the creditable compensation from the present maximum of $300 a month to a maximum of $350 a month in the calculation of a retirement or survivor annuity.

Fifth, disregarding the compensation earned after the age of 65, if the crediting of such compensation would diminish the annuity.

Sixth, changing the disability work clause to a maximum of $100 in earnings for any month without loss of the annuity for that month.

Seventh, excluding the service of certain delegates to national or international conventions of railway labor organizations from coverage under this act.

Eighth, elimination of the requirement in the present law that a child over the age of 16 and under 18 years must attend school regularly in order to be eligible for a survivor's annuity.

Ninth, waiver of retirement benefits for certain individuals who are receiving non-service-connected veterans' pensions.

Again, I want to state that this is very good and sound legislation, and I urge every Member of this House to support it.

Nation's Oil Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM STEED

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 12, 1954

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, the domestic oil crisis in the United States is growing steadily worse. Indications are that the situation will continue to get worse before there is hope for improvement. The best hope for any relief in the foreseeable future lies in administrative action by the Federal Government.

The problem facing our Nation is, basically, too much oil. We are economically drowning in oil.

Foreign imports must share some of the blame for the situation as we find it today. Domestic production has been cut back and curtailed to a breaking point in an effort to offset this flush overproduction, but imports have not shared this curtailment. Instead, imports continue to increase.

With ruin facing our independent oil producers, it seems that even the most uninformed can understand that the burden ought to be shared by all segments of the industry in equal measure.

Oilmen are not the only victims of the crisis now facing us. Their financial ruin, with its resultant bad effects on all our economy, is only a part of the problem. State governments are the first victims of such a condition. All oil-producing States depend on oil runs for a large portion of State revenues. Cutbacks in production is now costing my State of Oklahoma more than a half million dollars monthly over its revenues from oil as compared to just 1 year ago. This cannot continue without wrecking the State government.

A recent editorial in the Daily Oklahoman, of Oklahoma City, brings out a new point on this subject, which I include herewith because it points out why we need action now. The editorial is as follows:

STILL MORE FOREIGN OIL

This country's independent oil producers may take with some reservations the reassuring talk out of Washington concerning the effect of the Iranian settlement on domestic production.

Although Iran's restored output may be directed primarily toward the European market it is difficult to see how the eventual addition of 650,000 barrels a day to the existing world glut could fail to complicate the domestic situation barring a change in import policy.

For regardless of the immediate destination of the Middle East's expanded production the effect would appear to be a further contraction of this country's foreign outlets and aggravation of an already unfavorable export-import balance.

As one of the principal oil producing States Oklahoma has more than an academic interest in this matter. Its bread and butter concern is apparent in the July tax figures showing a decline from the corresponding month in 1953 of more than a half million dollars in gross production collections.

Iran was producing about 650,000 barrels a day when the big refinery at Abadan was shut down in June 1951. That was about 35 percent of the Middle East's production and more than 6 percent of the free world's total output.

Notwithstanding the loss of Iran's output there has been a 113-percent increase in Middle East production during the last 5 years as a result of expanded activity in other oil-producing countries of the area.

Principally because of developments in the Middle East the expansion of foreign capacity has outrun foreign consumption by more than 1,500,000 barrels a day. As a result the Middle East largely has supplanted the United States and Venezuela as the principal source of oil for Europe and other areas in the Eastern Hemisphere.

From its position as a net exporter of oil in the prewar years the United States has become a net importer as a result of restrictions on domestic production without corresponding curtailments of imports.

Figures reported monthly to the Texas railroad commission reflect a gradual widening of the gap between exports and imports, and it might appear that the addition of Iran's production would accelerate this trend in the absence of new restrictions on imports.

Imports currently are supplying about 14 percent of the United States market, and there is some concern over the effect of this trend on the maintenance of enough domestic capacity to meet national requirements in the event of war and loss of foreign sources.

Suggested as a possible solution is a reciprocal trade policy that would relate oil imports from any particular country to the total United States export trade with that country. This may or may not be the ideal solution, but certainly it would seem that foreign producers shouldn't have more than 10 percent of the United States market.

Congress Should Probe Sick and Diseased Poultry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 12, 1954

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, on June 8, 1954, I called to the attention of Members of Congress an article written by Hilton E. Hanna, feature writer for the Butcher Workman, the magazine of the Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen of North America, which reported deplorable conditions in a portion of the poultry industry.

Since that time I introduced House Resolution 647, calling for a congressional investigation of the commercial slaughtering and processing of poultry.

Now Mr. Hanna has prepared a pamphlet on this same subject, which I feel will be of interest to Members of Congress. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I herewith include the article entitled "Congress Should Probe Sick and Diseased Poultry":

CONGRESS SHOULD PROBE SICK AND DISEASED POULTRY

If the American people knew what filth, unwholesomeness, and lack of sanitation exists in certain areas of the poultry industry, they would immediately revolt and demand prompt action by Congress, the State legislatures, and municipal officials to change the situation.

The job of alerting the consumer-citizens of the Nation to the menace of this poultry situation is the No. 1 task staked out for itself by the Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen of North America, A. F. of L., and its nearly 500 affiliated local unions.

The decision to launch this all-important cleanup campaign and compulsory State and Federal poultry regulation and inspection drive was made by the international executive board of the union and unanimously endorsed by some 315 delegates from all parts of the Nation attending a national conference held in Chicago May 24–27. In the words of the executive board, this campaign will be carried out to a successful conclusion, "even if it costs the international union a million dollars."

JUNGLE STORY BRINGS INSPECTION

In 1906 Upton Sinclair published his famous book, The Jungle. That book promptly aroused an indifferent Nation, to the incredible lack of sanitation, sickening economic conditions, and the sea of human misery that surrounded the meatpacking industry of that period.

By March 4, 1907, Federal meat inspection had become a reality. Ever since then that service has continued to be the basic law of the land so far as the slaughtering, inspection, grading, labeling, packing, processing, canning, sale, and transportation of meat and meat products are concerned.

On June 30, 1914, the provisions of the Federal meat regulation and inspection service were extended to cover and include reindeer. But up to now—almost 50 years later—and in spite of its wide popularity and general acceptance as a real American delicacy, poultry tragically remains the "forgotten bird" of the Nation's lawmakers so far as any compulsory regulations are concerned relating to wholesomeness or fitness for human consumption.

POULTRY FORGOTTEN BIRD

Reports now reaching our office indicate that a new "jungle" has sprung up—this time in certain areas of the poultry industry. This "jungle" business in poultry seems to flourish in cases where the rotten products can most easily be passed off without detection. In other words, those who operate this filthy trade make their big haul on the unsuspecting consumer in instances where the chickens are cut up and sold in packages of breasts, wings, drumsticks, or some other particular part of the bird and featured as ready for frying or stewing.

The story of this modern "jungle" is neither the easiest nor the most pleasant for the Amalgamated Meat Cutters to relate. It is difficult to handle, first of all because of the welfare of our members, 30,000 of whom are earning their livelihood in the poultry industry. Equally important, it is a difficult story to handle because of the welfare of those employers in the industry who take pride in the reputation of their business and do everything in their power to make sure that the products they handle are every bit as sanitary and wholesome as those of the great meatpacking industry of today. In spite of these considerations, the general welfare of the consuming public—which means all of us—demands that the story be told.

UNION-EMPLOYERS: QUALITY TEAM

At the present time it is estimated that approximately 300,000 workers are employed in the poultry industry in the United States. In plants where the workers are organized, their contracts provide for sanitary and other decent working conditions. This pride in production and cooperative policing of working conditions has developed to such a point that in a number of areas of the country, processed poultry products carry both the seal of our International Union, the Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen of North America, and the brand name or trade-mark of the company employing our members. This method of declaring labor-management cooperation serves as a double guaranty of highest quality products. It is assurance that both the union and the companies stand 100 percent behind the products they produce.

To these unionized poultry producers must be added those other operators—and there must be many of them—who, while not organized, constantly strive to put good, wholesome, quality products on the market.

On the other hand, recent attempts to organize in certain areas of the poultry industry reveal the existence of some truly putrid, filthy, inhuman, and almost unbelievable conditions. Affidavits in our possession point out that in instance after instance, employees are forced to work day in and day out under sickening conditions, handling and preparing diseased birds which move along in trade and eventually wind up on the tables of unsuspecting customers.

Get the story firsthand from some of the poultry workers themselves.

Listen to this account from a sworn affidavit:

"My job was to pull feathers, and those who were on this job with me and I were the first ones to handle the chickens after they had passed through the scalding process and roughing machine. When the chickens reached me, most of the feathers were off the bodies and I could see the skin of the birds very clearly.

"It is quite often that thousands of chickens would pass on the line with sores on their bodies. Thousands of them would have large swellings as large as a chicken egg on their bodies. These swellings were filled with a yellowish pus, and the odor was very strong. Others would have red spots all over their bodies that looked like smallpox."

Another affidavit reads in part as follows:

"I have seen thousands of chickens that I have worked on that had large sores on their bodies. Some of the sores had hard scabs on them and some of them would be open. I have, when I had time, cut these sores off. These sores would range in size from a dime to the size of a half dollar. I have also seen chickens with red spots all over their bodies. We did not know what caused these red spots but we would remark to each other that they had smallpox or measles."

Here is another worker's sworn statement:

"When I was killing chickens I have cut the throats of many chickens that were already dead and stiff. These dead chickens would at times have part of their heads mashed off. The first time I saw these kind of chickens come along I did not cut their throats, but (my) supervisors came and told me to cut their throats and let them go through with the good ones. I obeyed them from then on until I changed jobs.

"When on the killing job I would also kill chickens that would be sick and have long, thick, and stringy pus coming from their mouths and nostrils.

"When clipping gizzards I would see large growths on the entrails that looked like a mass of jelly. These chicken entrails would smell awfully bad, and at times would make me sick at the stomach. The entrails would have small pimples on them that looked similar to measles. The gizzards would be full of worms and would get all over my hands, and they would also have some kind of hard growths on them. The livers would be almost green at times.

"These diseased livers and gizzards would be taken to the stuffing table and put in a sack and placed back in the chickens."

Still another affidavit gives this picture:

"When packing there would be hundreds of chickens per day come into the packing room that would be bruised, have sores on them, and the chest cavity would be covered with pus. Sometimes the skins of chickens would be so covered with sores (sores that would have openings with a hard gristly ring around them, others that would have scabs over the sores, and others with red pimples that looked like measles and chickenpox) that I would have to take the entire skin off. Some of these sores could be cut off. After taking the skin off or cutting the sores off I would pack them in boxes and see them loaded on trucks to be taken to market. Others that would have different parts that had turned green would have the green parts cut off and the rest of the carcass would be packed and loaded out for market.

COMPULSORY REGULATION AND INSPECTION NEEDED

This threat to the Nation's health and welfare exists primarily because there is no compulsory Federal law regulating the slaughtering, inspection, grading, labeling, packing, processing, canning, sale, and transportation of poultry or poultry products that move in interstate commerce. As a result, in the main only the laws of the jungle prevail in the preparation of poultry products for market.

Compare the case of poultry with that of meat and you get a clearer picture of the whole situation. It is estimated that approximately 80 percent of the Nation's commercial meat supply is prepared under compulsory Federal regulation and inspection and most of the rest is subject to State or local inspection laws. On the other hand, none of the poultry supply of the Nation is processed under compulsory Federal inspection and only few States have any compulsory poultry regulation of their own.

There is, however, a Federal poultry inspection and grading program, but unlike the compulsory program that applies to meat, this poultry program is purely voluntary and covers less than 20 percent of the Nation's commercial poultry supply.

VOLUNTARY PROGRAM LACKS TEETH

This voluntary poultry inspection and grading program is presumably asked for and utilized by those poultry houses and establishments that take pride in being able to advertise and offer their products to the public as inspected for wholesomeness by United States Department of Agriculture or Government graded. No doubt, many of those who apply for this voluntary service do so in good faith and comply with the various regulations and provisions of the program as specified. On the other hand, recent investigations make it perfectly clear that a compulsory poultry regulation and inspection program with teeth in it is long overdue in the interest of the health and welfare of the Nation's consumers. Actually, much of the so-called Federal poultry and poultry products inspection and grading programs is nothing less than a farce which comes close to being a fraud on the American people.

This voluntary Federal poultry grading and inspection program is available under six separate and distinct types of services. Officially they are listed as follows:

(a) Grading of live poultry.

(b) Certification of dressed poultry produced under sanitary requirements in official plants.

(c) Grading of dressed poultry: (1) in an official plant, (2) at terminal markets and other receiving points.

(d) Inspection of dressed poultry in official plants for processing as ready-to-cook poultry.

(e) Grading of ready-to-cook poultry: (1) in an official plant, (2) at terminal markets and other receiving points.

(f) Inspection service in official canning plants.

FRAUD ON THE PUBLIC

To the average citizen this elaborate array and outline of Federal regulations relating to the processing of poultry and poultry products may well be taken as ample proof that any poultry product bearing a United States Government label, stamp, or mark of any kind is okay for wholesomeness and approved for human consumption. In fact, it is probably not at all unreasonable to assume that the average consumer does not even bother to look for Government labels, but just naturally takes it for granted that in the purchase of poultry and poultry products, he or she is protected by the same rigid Federal or State compulsory inspection for sanitation and wholesomeness as apply to beef, pork, veal, lamb, and other meats and meat products.

In light of this traditional faith and confidence of the American people in their Government to protect them from fraud, filth, disease, and unwholesomeness in food products, it is tragic indeed to have to point out that this vigilance falls short of extending to poultry or poultry products.

REGULATIONS THAT MEAN NOTHING

Few people, for example, would suspect that it is possible for them to buy eye-appealing packages of poultry bearing a stamp announcing "Processed under United States Department of Agriculture sanitary standards," but which means absolutely nothing so far as the quality, cleanliness, or edibility of the bird is concerned. That stamp means only that the plant in which the poultry was processed is well constructed and equipped with modern facilities. The United States Department of Agriculture tries to divorce itself from responsibility implied in the "Sanitation" marking by requiring that there be set forth in the same mark, but in smaller print, which the unsuspecting consumer may never read, the following statement: "Not USDA graded for quality or USDA inspected for wholesomeness."

Further reading of the official instruction of the United States Department of Agriculture to plant sanitarians will show why the Government marking referred to above means so little on poultry products. These instructions say plainly: "The service that is rendered under sanitation process marking is limited to sanitation and, as such, we do not have authority to prohibit a company from packing birds that may be emaciated or show external evidence of disease."

SHADY OPERATIONS

In addition to the appalling lack of Federal protection for the consumers of poultry, there is evidence that poultry, from States without regulations, has been entering the market under questionable circumstances and doubtful legality even in States that do have rigid poultry inspections laws. As of the date we go to press, for example, the State of Texas has no poultry inspection law of any kind. Despite this fact, Texas-produced poultry products have been able to reach markets in California, a State with very rigid poultry inspection laws. One of the more significant sections of the California law specifies that out-of-State poultry need not be reinspected if it originates in States whose poultry inspection laws are equally as strict as its own.

Texas-produced poultry was able to sidestep or evade the California law and thus reach markets in the Golden State only through a ruse. The Commissioner of Agriculture of Texas, on his own, and without legal basis, proceeded to appoint and did appoint so-called "inspectors" arming them with authority which did not exist, to certify as to grade and sanitation poultry processed anywhere in the State of Texas, and to do so without the guidance of any published tests or standards. In the most flagrant case reported to us the "inspector" appointed was a company supervisory employee who never once relinquished any of those supervisory duties while serving as an inspector. It was such conditions of false pretense parading under the guise of respectability and legality that enabled this so-called Texas "inspected" and "graded" poultry to reach markets in California and other States like Colorado.

HISTORIC COURT DECISION

As soon as these illegal practices were discovered the Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen immediately instituted proceedings to bring them to a halt. The action was entitled Case No. 98414 Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen of North America, Local 103, A. F. of L., against John C. White, Commissioner of Agriculture, the State of Texas, et al.

On May 17, 1954, Judge Jack Roberts, of the District Court, 126th Judicial District, Travis County, Texas, issued an injunction at the request of the union restraining the Commissioner of Agriculture of the State of Texas and enjoining him from continuing the practices enumerated above. The injunction order was entered by Judge Roberts after the defendant pleaded nolo contendere, or no contest. The importance of this injunction cannot be overestimated. It is a significant step toward the goal of complete elimination of the utterly unwholesome conditions that not only exist but thrive in many areas of the poultry industry.

MAJOR INDUSTRY UNREGULATED

The need for the prompt passage of an effective poultry regulation and inspection program both on the State and Federal level becomes more urgent with every passing day. This is true for several important reasons: (1) Because the poultry industry, one of the major food industries of the Nation, has been permitted and continues to grow unregulated from the standpoint of the quality of its products; (2) because tons of poultry, uninspected for disease and uncertified for edibility, are dumped on the market daily; (3) because between 1940 and 1953 per capita poultry consumption (chickend and turkey combined) jumped from 22 pounds to 35.2 pounds (preliminary figures for 1953); and (4) because health authorities are agreed that a number of poultry diseases are capable of being transferred to human beings.

Additional affidavits underscore the need for prompt action by local, State, and Federal officials to establish an effective compulsory poultry regulation and inspection program.

For example, another worker's sworn statement runs as follows:

"My job was cleaning up, and during the last 4 months my job was cutting off feet. This job required that I handle and cut the feet off every third chicken. During my tenure of employment I have never seen the Federal, county, or State inspector in the * * * plant. I have seen thousands of chickens with large sores, broken wings, discolored spots, and some were green and slimey. These chickens were then sent into the packing room for shipment. I have never seen a chicken that was discarded as unfit for human consumption. All chickens, regardless of their condition, was sent to the packing room."

And another affidavit says this:

"My job was to take the galls off the livers. I also had to handle the hearts. I have handled thousands of livers with big ugly sores, hearts that were enlarged to twice their normal size, and hearts that were covered with pus. Sometimes these sores would break open and an odor was so bad that I could hardly stand it. I would put the livers and hearts into a trough, diseased ones and all. They were then washed by a machine and sent on to the packing room where they were prepared for shipment. I was instructed to put every one, including the diseased part, into the trough, which I did. I have never seen an inspector in the plant."

THREAT TO HEALTH OF ALL

These conditions are direct threats both to the consuming public and to those workers and employers who are cooperating in every way possible to produce quality products. If only from the standpoint of its own economic welfare, therefore, it would seem that the poultry industry itself should be leading the clean-up campaign, both for effective inspection laws adequately enforced and for a well organized, self-policing campaign. In addition, the health of the Nation is, or ought to be, the concern of all. Consequently, the cooperation and support of every consumer-citizen of the Nation is being sought and solicited in this poultry cleanup campaign.

Already a number of citizens, laymen as well as public officials, from across the Nation have expressed interest and pledged their support to the cleanup campaign. Several Members of Congress—both the House and Senate—have volunteered to introduce an effective bill at the earliest opportunity moment. And the initial article on the subject from the May Butcher Workman, official publication of the International Union, has been inserted into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by Congressman MELVIN PRICE, of Illinois.

In further action Congressman PRICE has petitioned Chairman CLIFFORD HOPE and the other members of the House Committee on Agriculture to consider appointment of a special committee to investigate and probe conditions in poultry plants around the Nation. Latest report from Washington on this development is that the whole matter has been placed before the Secretary of Agriculture, EZRA TAFT Benson, for his consideration and action.

The labor press has been solid in its support of the drive. With the passing of time both the daily papers and national columnists are recognizing the campaign and giving it space in their pages and columns.

A LADY ENTERS THE PICTURE

As soon as the Butcher Workman's article exposing the conditions that exist in certain areas of the poultry industry was called to the attention of Congresswoman LEONOR SULLIVAN, of Missouri, she, too, immediately sprang into action. She relayed the information to the Pure Food and Drug Administration, requested a summary report from Commissioner C. W. Crawford on operations of that agency in the area of poultry inspection, and invited their support in the drive for a more effective poultry regulation program.

Inquiry by Congresswoman SULLIVAN revealed a number of facts and figures not at all comforting or reassuring to the consuming public. Actually they ought to be nauseating and very disturbing to every American. The Gentlelady discovered, for example, the following:

1. That under its poultry inspection program in the fiscal year 1953 and the first 11 months of fiscal 1954, the Pure Food and Drug Administration approved a total of 106 seizure actions for the removal of unfit birds from the market. Of these seizures, 64 cases included charges that the item so seized was in whole or in part, the product of a diseased animal.

2. During the same period, the Pure Food and Drug Administration also approved 33 criminal actions for violation of the provisions of the Pure Food and Drug Act. Twenty-two of these actions involved diseased poultry.

It ought to be explained that under the Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act, a food is deemed to be adulterated if it is the product of a diseased animal or of an animal which died other than by slaughter.

3. During the fiscal year 1953, the Pure Food and Drug Administration devoted the equivalent of 10 man-years to the phase of its program dealing with poultry. These operations included work on diseased poultry and work on filthy, decomposed, or otherwise unfit poultry, as well as work on poultry which had been needled or otherwise fraudulently watered to increase its weight.

4. According to Pure Food and Drug Administration estimates, there are approximately 1,300 interstate poultry dressing, freezing, or canning establishments in the United States. But for the past 2 years, the agency has been able to make only about 400 poultry establishment inspections per year, and one quarter of these were reinspection of the same firms. In other words, even assuming that no new poultry houses are established, at the present rate of coverage, it would take at least 4 or 5 years to inspect the poultry establishments now in operation. Despite this fact, the forecast is that the number of hours spent on this work during the 1954 fiscal year will be substantially reduced.

COLD FIGURES TELL TRAGIC TALE

These cold statistics tell a tragic story of the job our Government is not doing to protect the poultry consumers of the Nation from fraud, filth, and disease. From a practical standpoint, this make-believe program of consumer protection, whether under the so-called Voluntary Inspection Service of the Department of Agriculture or under the skeleton staff and inadequate facilities of the Food and Drug Administration, is about as effective as trying to bail a well dry with a sieve. It simply can't be done. Nothing less than an effective compulsory poultry regulation and inspection program, rigidly enforced on the local, State, and national levels, will guarantee the consumers that the birds they buy are fit for human consumption.

In another of its admissions, the Pure Food and Drug Administration verifies the fact previously reported by the Butcher Workman, namely: that it is well established by health authorities that certain poultry diseases are transmissible to man. Among these, for instance, are psittacosis (parrot fever) and Newcastle disease. In addition, there is another group of diseases common to poultry as well as man, and apparently caused by the same disease organism in both. While transmission in such cases has not been definitely established, it is believed that poultry may at least serve as a reservoir of human infections by routes not yet discovered. Certain types of encephalitis and meningitis, pseudo-tuberculosis and pasturella infections are in this group.

STRONG UNION STAND

On May 28, the two top officers of the international union, President Earl W. Jimerson and Secretary-Treasurer Patrick E. Gorman, issued instructions to every poultry local of the international union, or locals having any portion of their membership employed in poultry, to take definite and immediate action, to make sure that no Amalgamated member engages in the slaughtering, processing, or packing of unwholesome poultry. This was an unprecedented move on the part of the international officers of the Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen, but it is an indication of the seriousness with which the union has entered into the fight for an effective poultry regulation and inspection program.

EVERYBODY'S FIGHT

The fight for an effective poultry regulation and inspection program is an all-American fight. Everyone is needed; everyone is welcomed. No one will be slighted and no efforts will be slackened until the victory is won—until chickens, ducks, geese, guineas, pigeons, and the rest of the poultry family are once again birds we can all enjoy because we all played our part in making them safe for human consumption.

Your civil duty calls. Don't be a shirker. Write, wire, "buttonhole" or otherwise contact your Congressman, Senators, State legislators, health officers, mayors, councilmen, and other local officials. Remind them that the health and welfare of the Nation demands the prompt enactment and enforcement of an effective compulsory poultry regulation and inspection program on all levels of government—local, State and National—and demands it now. As citizens, consumers, and taxpayers we owe it to ourselves, our community and the Nation to act on this important matter and act immediately. Health is the concern of all.

On July 16 and 20, respectively, Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS, of Illinois, and Congressman MELVIN PRICE, 24th Illinois District, introduced similar resolutions in the House and Senate calling for congressional investigation of the commercial slaughtering and processing of poultry. Senate resolution is No. 283, referred to Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. House resolution bears No. 647, referred to Committee on Rules.

New Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Mr. Bradshaw Mintener

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 11, 1954

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, the President and Secretary Hobby are to be congratulated on securing Mr. Bradshaw Mintener, of Minneapolis, as Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, with special responsibility for Federal-State relations. This is a very important post because so many of the activities of that Department are joint operations of the Federal and local governments—such as, social security, vocational education and rehabilitation, hospital construction, food and drug administration. Mr. Mintener has had a distinguished career as vice president and general counsel of Pillsbury Mills—and, like so many other officials of this administration, is making a great personal sacrifice to accept this appointment. That is in harmony with the public-spiritedness we in Minnesota have seen Mr. Mintener demonstrate in the many church, interracial, and civic tasks he has accepted in the past and always discharged with distinction. Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an editorial from the Minneapolis Star of August 6, 1954:

The Able Mr. Mintener

Bradshaw Mintener was a key figure in the movement which resulted in a clear call from Minnesota for the nomination of Mintener's old friend, Dwight D. Eisenhower, for the Presidency. Now the President has summoned his good friend to Washington to be Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. But this is no mere paying off of a political or personal debt. The President knows the fine legal and human qualities of the Minneapolis attorney. This city and this State long ago learned that important projects entrusted to Mintener's care were quickly and competently handled. The National Government soon will learn the same.

Congressman Hunter Represents Working People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OAKLEY HUNTER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 12, 1954

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, as the Representative in Congress from the 12th California District, I believe it is important that I report to the people of my district on legislative activities which affect them and my action on such issues. The vast majority of these people are conscientious, thrifty, energetic persons who work hard at their jobs to earn their livelihood. Some of them have passed their productive years and have retired after a lifetime of labor.

Because these people are working, or have worked and are retired, I intend to discuss at this time legislation of special importance to them.

TAX RELIEF

The 83d Congress completely revised our complicated tax structure, closing numerous loopholes which had been giving unfair advantages to the rich, and eliminating or lowering many taxes which had been creating a real hardship on the working people. More than two-thirds of the tax relief goes to wage earners, families, and other individuals. I supported these tax relief measures. This is the biggest tax cut in our history—nearly $7½ billion.

Specifically, the workingman has received tax relief through drastically slashed excise taxes on drugstore items, cosmetics, baby oils, ladies' handbags, telephone bills, and numerous other items. The 20 percent tax on home washing machines has been eliminated entirely. This means that when you go to the store, you have more to spend on yourself and your family, and the tax collector gets less from you. Earlier this year, the tax bill of each individual taxpayer was reduced 10 percent. In addition, the new tax-revision bill gives more generous deductions for medical expenses, freedom from taxation for a retired couple if they have $200 monthly pension income, and children working after school or during summer vacation can now earn more than $600 in a year and still be listed as a dependent. Also, salesmen have fairer means of computing expenses, thus saving money under the new tax law. Working widows will be permitted to deduct the cost of child care.

HOSPITALS AND HEALTH

The 83d Congress has taken important and vigorous steps to promote and protect the Nation's health. One of its first acts was to create a new executive Department of Health, Education, and Welfare with Cabinet rank.

Legislation has been passed to provide Federal aid in the construction of public and nonprofit hospitals, diagnostic and treatment centers, rehabilitation facilities, and nursing homes. Research into health problems is encouraged through the National Heart Institute and the National Institute of Dental Research. Additional funds have been appropriated to expand the State-Federal vocational rehabilitation system, which is designed to help disabled persons to become economically independent.

A new law aids Federal loan officers in seizing and destroying unsafe fabrics used in certain inflammable cowboy suits and explosive sweaters which have burned many children in home accidents. It is now also against the law to ship dangerous fireworks into any State which bans their sale.

At the present time, Congress is considering legislation to encourage the establishment or expansion of voluntary private health insurance plans—permitting a broadening of their coverage in some cases, with increased protection, or lower rates in others. Approximately 92 million Americans are already covered by private plans, but better protection is needed, particularly against long-term illness. This legislation has had my support.

SCHOOLS AND EDUCATION

Congress has authorized an extension of the program of assistance in construction of schools in crowded defense centers and other areas which have grown abnormally because of Federal activities. Congress has also granted similar assistance for school operating expenses. Legislation has been enacted to allow expanded use of surplus foods in the school lunch program.

HOUSING

The Housing Act of 1954 will raise housing standards, help more of our people to acquire homes, assist communities in getting rid of slums, and in improving older neighborhoods, and strengthen our mortgage credit system. In the future, the new law will also stimulate the Nation's entire economy, particularly the construction industry.

The new act makes it possible to buy new homes under FHA-insured loans with much lower down payments. For example, on a $10,000 new home under FHA, a buyer previously had to make a downpayment of $1,250. Now the downpayment is only $700.

HIGHWAYS

The new highway law means that we in the 12th Congressional District can drive our cars with greater convenience and personal safety. Almost all of our gasoline-tax money will be used for highways instead of being diverted for other uses. California gets a big share of funds authorized in this law for freeways, secondary roads, and streets. I cast my vote for more and better roads for my district.

VETERANS

Our Nation's war veterans will have plenty of hospital space for treatment required as a result of service to our country. Congress has provided this year for a record number of beds in veterans' hospitals. Last year I joined with my colleagues in voting for an extension of the GI bill of rights for veterans of the Korean war. This year, as in 1951, I voted for increases in rates of compensation and pensions payable to veterans and their dependents. In view of the present cost of living, these increases were necessary and reasonable.

GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

In 1951 Congress gave postal workers and classified civil-service employees a long-overdue pay raise. Due to inflation, however, the ordinary civilian Federal employee today is economically worse off than in 1939. You cannot recruit or keep competent employees to conduct the business of the United States with that kind of economic prospect confronting them. Aware of this situation, I have supported legislation this year providing for further pay increases. Government employees and others living on fixed incomes can be thankful that the present administration has brought a halt to the deadly spiral of constantly climbing prices.

RAILROAD RETIREMENT

New legislation enacted by the House liberalized the provisions of the railroad retirement system by reducing the eligibility age of widows from 65 to 60, raising maximum earnings from $75 to $100, increasing maximum creditable compensation from $300 to $350, and in many other ways. In the meantime, the unemployment insurance was raised from $7 to $8.50 a day. I supported these provisions.

SENIOR CITIZENS

The House has increased social-security and old-age and survivors insurance benefits by raising benefit amounts, increasing the earning base, eliminating the 5 lowest years of earnings in computing averages, raising minimum primary insurance amounts, increasing maximum family benefits from $168.75 to $200, broadened coverage, and expand benefits in many other ways. I have supported these provisions and have personally supported Dr. Francis

Townsend in his attempt to develop an adequate pay-as-you-go pension plan to assure our senior citizens a dignified standard of living.

Remarkable Man

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 12, 1954

Mr. COOLEY. Mr Speaker, herewith I submit for the Record a brief editorial about a remarkable mand and a very friendly fellow—a man who has cultivated the sweet flowers of friendship throughout his native land and on far-distant shores. Wherever he has traveled, at home or abroad, his constant companion has ben a genial smile. His open heart has been his passport and his warm handclasp has been his visa. Real friendships are priceless and real friends are few, but it does not cost much to smile. Some people are too busy to be friendly, too important to be kind, and too selfish even to smile or to speak a kindly word. Here is a man who has labored in the laboratories of his Lord—never too great to be humble, never too busy to be kind, and never in his life has he been cruel.

Surely he was not born great, nor has greatness been thrust upon him, but he has achieved greatness in the fields of spiritual, civic and social welfare and has endeared himself to the people of his native land. He is great, not because he is a physical giant and big, tall and strong, but merely because he is a gentle man who has planted seeds of friendship along the thoroughfares of life. All who have known him have been impressed with the unaffected elegance and amiable simplicity of his maners.

This remarkable man of whom I speak is James A. Farley, known everywhere as Jim. He has lived a long and useful life, but he shall never grow old because he is animated by the spirit of youth. He has lived well and magnificently and always and ever he has lived above the fog in public duty and in private thinking. From the dawn of manhood's morning to the golden hours of his great life he has been inspired by lofty principles and high ideals and attended by a righteous influence. Surely he has the right to exact from life the real compensations which by his life and love and labor he has so richly earned. He is a man of courage and conviction, and is remarkable merely because of the life he has lived. In politics he has been powerful; in public office he has been a paragon.

Perhaps you wonder why I am having all this to say. Certainly I am not nominating Jim Farley for public office. Neither am I singing a political swan song, and surely this brief tribute is not a requiem. Actually, the little editorial in the Gastonia Gazette prompted me to say these few kind words about Jim Farley, whose friendship most all of us have enjoyed through the years. He has walked with kings, but he has never lost the common touch.

> #### REMARKABLE MAN
>
> Congratulations to Belmont Abbey College on securing James A. Farley as the principal speaker for the approaching commencement exercises.
>
> Jim Farley is one of the most remarkable politicians in American history. And one of the most remarkable personalities of his generation.
>
> Now well in his seventies, and we believe nearing 80, Jim Farley has changed very little in appearance in the last 20 years. Just a few years ago we saw him marching with the Knights of Columbus in the mammoth parade which welcomed Gen. Douglas MacArthur to New York.
>
> He marched the full 5 miles or more without missing a step, walking as erect and with as firm a step as the youngest man in the crowd.
>
> It has been said that Jim Farley knows at least 100,000 people by name, knows where they come from and what their business is.
>
> We can testify to the fact that he has a most remarkable memory, for when we spoke to him at a dinner in New York several years ago, he boomed out, before we could tell him who we were:
>
> "Hello, Atkins. How are things in Gastonia?"
>
> The remarkable thing about it was that we had talked with him only briefly when he was passing through Gastonia some 15 years before, on his way to Newton to dedicate a new post office. That was when he was serving as Postmaster General under President Franklin Roosevelt.
>
> Farley doesn't brag about it, or claim any particular moral preeminence for it, but he has never taken a drink or smoked in his life. Unusual, to say the least, for a national politician.
>
> He is really an outstanding man, and perhaps the most astute politician of his day.
>
> We welcome him to Gaston County to address the graduates at Belmont Abbey.

Mr. Speaker, the fine and friendly editor who wrote the editorial Remarkable Man was in error in estimating the age of the man about whom he was writing. Actually, Jim Farley is well on the south side of 3 score years and 10, and my fondest hope is that he shall reach 100 years and take a new lease on life. May Heaven's blessings attend him and light his pathways through many years to come.

Dr. Jose P. Laurel Honored by Fellow Citizens at Testimonial Dinner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 29, 1954

Mr. HAGEN of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, word has been received in Washington, D. C., that Dr. Jose P. Laurel, one of the greatest leaders and statesmen in the Philippine history, is coming to the United States and Washington, D. C., as a representative of his country and its President Ramon Magsaysay, to discuss many important problems with administration and congressional leaders here.

It is reported that he will be coming to Washington sometime early in September. In view of his visit to this country, I am sure the Members will be interested in reading the remarks of another great Philippine leader, John W. Haussermann, on the occasion of testimonial-despedida dinner in honor of Dr. Jose P. Laurel, July 24, 1954, at the Manila Hotel, Manila, Philippines. However, before inserting the remarks of Judge Haussermann, I want to insert the opening remarks made by Mr. Justice Sabino Padilla. They are as follows:

> The plan is to have only one speaker, Senator Jose P. Laurel, but as I look around I see an interesting personality who has a deep affection for our people and an abiding faith that we will make of our Republic a success. I refer to none other than Judge John W. Haussermann. May I ask him to say a few words?

At this point I desire to insert the remarks of Judge John W. Haussermann:

> Mr. Toastmaster, honored guest, ladies, and gentlemen, it is certainly a pleasure for me to be here tonight and to make a small contribution toward this occasion for the wonderful man as he leaves for the United States as head of the Philippine panel for the revision of the Bell Trade Act.
>
> It is an inspiring sight in these troublesome days of the whole world to see here in Manila a vast audience of this kind made up of all nationalities and meeting together and breaking bread in peace and contentment, and as the honorable Senator goes to the United States, I want to assure him that he is going there with the full faith, confidence, and prayers of the Filipino people that he will be successful in his mission.
>
> I came to these islands 55 years ago and lived with you through all the obstacles and crises through which you passed and it is a great pleasure to me that the good Lord spared my life long enough to see you grow by your own efforts from a status in which you had hardly any participation in your government to the point where you were able to establish a republic built on true democratic principles. As an American I am proud that the sovereignty of the United States over these islands during the transition period was nothing more than a great umbrella over you to protect you while you were getting ready to establish the first and only true democratic nation in the Far East.
>
> Some people wonder why I take such a deep interest in the welfare of the Philippine Islands and why in my late years I should feel obligated to help restore the economy of these islands which was destroyed by the Japanese War. My only answer is that I have faith in the Filipino people and I have faith in America, which faith gives me confidence that if the people of both countries continue in their harmonious relations, respecting the sovereignty of each, this young and vigorous republic will grow in strength and influence and will, in time, become a great beacon light to all the people of the Far East who will in time follow in the footsteps of this republic and cause them to establish a government "of the people, by the people, and for the people."
>
> But, my friends, we have a task to perform. The people of this Nation have recently elected a man who came from the common people, a man who has the interest of the common man at heart, and I hope the entire body of Filipino people will unite and give him support and prove to the people of the Philippine Islands they made no mistake in electing Mr. Magsaysay as President of this republic.
>
> Let us all for a few short years adjourn partisan politics and keep as our goal that

which is for the best interest of this nation. If we all do that, the accomplishment will be for the benefit of each and every inhabitant of the Philippine Islands, and I want to say to you, Senator, as you go to the United States, I can assure you the entire body of the rank and file of the American people has absolute confidence in the Filipino people. I can assure you the American people are sympathetic to the aspirations of the Filipino people and I feel sure they will back you up in getting that which is necessary for the revision of the Bell Trade Act.

In all of my addresses in the United States, I cannot help but bring out the fact that the people of the Philippine Islands are loyal and patriotic and, at the same time, they realize the American people have no other interest save and except to make this great Republic a success. I hope the people of the United States, and especially the panel with which you will deal, will realize that in the early days the United States went through the same sort of crises through which you are now passing and the United States has developed to the point where it is the largest and richest nation in the world and thus is able and should hold the scales and let the balance go down in favor of the things which will benefit the Philippine Islands in this revision.

Then, I hope when the success of this young republic is assured and known throughout the world, the time will come when the skill, determination, and will which are now devoted to the construction of instruments of death to destroy each other, will be turned toward finding formulas which will increase the purchasing power of all low income peoples of the world. Then all issues leading to war will gradually disappear and the people of the world will live in peace, contentment, and security as God, no doubt, intended.

What a wonderful challenge to the people of the Philippines and the people of the United States to work together to hasten the arrival of such an era.

Appreciation of Work Well Done

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1954

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include herein the following very interesting and appreciative letter addressed to my distinguished colleague and friend, Hon. John J. Rooney, of Brooklyn, N. Y. It concerns one of his constituents, Mr. Szyga "Saul" Morgenstern, who was recently granted permanent residence in our great country through the joint legislative action of Congressman Rooney and the junior Senator from New York, Senator Lehman:

July 30, 1954.

Hon. John J. Rooney,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

My Dear Congressman: I am writing this longhand and not on a cold, impersonal typewriter, to tell you in my own hand, and from my own heart, how deeply grateful, and thankful, and humble I feel, as I read your message that President Eisenhower has approved and signed Senate bill 278 on behalf of Saul Morgenstern.

Only a few words, but what a dramatic and dynamic demonstration of America's love of fair play and justice. A plain grassroots citizen, through his Representative puts the complex massive machinery of National Government into operation all the way to the very top—a Presidential signature, and for the sole benefit of one individual, an alien. Only in this blessed land of ours can this happen.

And it was through your kind interest, efforts, and guidance that this was made possible. May the Lord bless you, and keep you as His messenger to carry out His will for many years.

Again, thank you sincerely,
Yours,
Hyman Cleon.

Lowly Burbot Starts $1 Million Firm in Northern Minnesota

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 29, 1954

Mr. HAGEN of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, up in the extreme northern part of my congressional district in Minnesota, which by the way is the northernmost congressional district in the United States, we have one of the most unusual business enterprises found anywhere in the country.

It was founded some years ago because of the fact that a fish known as burbot became more or less of a menace in Lake of the Woods where we have wonderful fishing. This lake has more than 10,000 islands. This fish became a nuisance and the commercial fishermen would throw them in piles on the shore and they would, of course, be wasted there, except when used as fertilizer. Young Ted Rowell, the son of Joe Rowell, one of the pioneers of the Baudette area, became quite interested in trying to find some way of making use of these great quantities of burbot fish. He eventually found a way and started to make and process some medicinal and vitamin pills from burbot livers. It eventually developed into a large business and now is the biggest single enterprise in Lake of the Woods County on the northern border of Minnesota.

The story of the early pioneer days in this business and its progress to its present strong status was written up in the Minneapolis Sunday Tribune of July 25. The complete story is most interesting and I am glad to reproduce it here in the Congressional Record to demonstrate the opportunities that are so presented to people who can see opportunities in their own home localities.

The article is by John A. Wickland, of the Minneapolis Tribune, who is a staff writer here. The article follows:

DRUGS MADE AT BAUDETTE, MINN.—LOWLY FISH STARTS MILLION-DOLLAR FIRM

(By John A. Wickland)

Baudette, Minn.—The burbot is a pretty poor fish, but T. H. Rowell has a real fondness for it.

For it was the burbot, which abounds in nearby Lake of the Woods, that gave Rowell's nationwide pharmaceutical business a start.

Now a million-dollar-a-year enterprise, Rowell Laboratories has branched out into many other phases of drug manufacture. The big mouthed, big-bellied burbot, with its overgrown, vitamin-packed liver, has only a small part these days in the Rowell activities.

The firm is the Nation's largest supplier of quinidine capsules and tablets, which are used for treatment of heart disease. Raw materials for this product are imported by Rowell from the Dutch East Indies.

It also is one of the major producers of sodium para amino salicylate, a drug for treatment of tuberculosis.

In all, Rowell makes some 200 different drug preparations. A large part of the firm's output is in private-label items for other pharmaceutical firms, including some of the Nation's major ones.

Although Baudette, still something of a north woods frontier town, may seem like a strange location for a business such as Rowell's, he wouldn't have it any other place.

Here are some of the greatest hunting and fishing in America, and Rowell loves to do both. Here, too, he and his wife and their daughter, Mary Margaret, and son "Bunny" (T. H., Jr.) can step into their 50-foot cruiser, the *Vio Cal*, named for an early and highly successful Rowell product, and in a few hours be at their cabin on Dawson Island, one of the 14,000 islands that dot Lake of the Woods.

In fact, it was his fishing that interested him in the burbot.

He and his father, the late Joseph C. N. Rowell, a commercial fisherman, observed back in the early thirties that the number of game fish was declining in Lake of the Woods.

Investigation disclosed the burbot was to blame. It was devouring the walleye pike at an alarming rate.

Young Ted Rowell had graduated from the University of Minnesota pharmaceutical college in 1929 and had come home to Baudette to open a drug store. That was when he first conceived the idea of buying burbot livers from commercial fishermen and processing the oil into a pharmaceutical product.

Before that could be done, however, he and his father had to learn about their chosen fish. With few scientific facts available, they had to do their own research on the burbot, the only fresh water member of the cod family.

Rowell long had thought that such an ugly creature must be good for something, and he knew how tasty, though rich, were fried burbot livers.

Research showed, among other things, that the vitamin potency of the burbot's liver is 6 to 8 times that of the cod.

Then one Christmas night, Ted Rowell's drug store burned down. It was the commercial burbot oil business or else for him.

Rowell's first plant was in an old garage. His equipment was primitive. But he produced enough burbot oil for market testing, which left him with the big problem of how to make such tests.

Taking a typically direct approach, Rowell got a job as manager of a chain store in Minneapolis. Then, as a Baudette burbot oil producer, he sold the oil to a wholesale drug firm in the city and bought it back for retail and prescription sale as manager of the drug store.

During his spare time he called on doctors and persuaded them to try the product.

After a year, Rowell was satisfied he had a good product and a growing market. He quit the store job and returned to Baudette to form Burbot Liver Products Co.

In those early days, Ted Rowell allowed himself $60 a month, and he and his wife and son lived in a one-room log cabin near the shore of Lake of the Woods. The burbot oil processing was carried on nearby.

Recently, Mrs. Rowell sadly observed that the area where they then lived has become "terribly crowded" with several fishing camps.

It has been said that Ted Rowell found oil in the dark waters of Lake of the Woods. He did, but like so many oil ventures, it didn't come up to expectations. Burbot oil never quite met his sales hopes.

Just as he was getting discouraged, a doctor friend suggested that he add some other items, such as a calcium product and vitamins. Rowell did. They sold well.

The business began to grow, and the Rowells moved to town. The company name was changed to indicate its widening activities.

Then one of the large drug companies came out with a new product that was so popular the firm could not meet demand. Rowell contracted to make the preparation for the large firm. That opened up the whole new business of producing private label items for other companies.

Now about one-quarter of Rowell Laboratories' production is for the private label trade. Burbot oil has declined to about 5 percent of the company's business.

Aside from Baudette's distance from the large sales markets, Rowell can't think of a single disadvantage to doing business in such a remote place.

On the other hand, he has a sizable list of advantages.

The dry-crisp air, remarkably dust-free, is ideal for the manufacture of drugs, according to Rowell.

There is a plentiful supply of labor and no competition for workers for the laboratories, which employ 40 to 50 people.

Then, too, its remoteness is a decided advantage in case of war. Rowell has a large contract with the Armed Forces that goes into effect with the first shot in any new hostilities.

The firm also is near one of its raw materials, the burbot.

And although Baudette, located where the Rainy River bends north to the big lake, looks on the map like the end of the world, Rowell says he probably gets better acquainted with his customers and the doctors who prescribe his products than most manufacturers.

An amazing number of them from as far away as Texas turn up during the hunting and fishing seasons.

Whenever he can, Rowell takes them up the lake to their vacation destinations on the Vio Cal.

Frequently, he accompanies them on a day's fishing trip to the famous pike grounds outside "the gap," as the local people call the mouth of the Rainy River, or, in the fall, on a duck shoot along Fourmile Bay.

New Post Office Branches in Brooklyn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1954

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to call attention to the following editorial which appeared in the Brooklyn Eagle of August 11, 1954.

Postmaster Quigley is to be congratulated for his splendid idea and although the New York delegation gave wholehearted support to our distinguished colleague, Mr. Keogh, it is he who deserves the credit for having spearheaded this worthy achievement.

It is a most fitting tribute to him that his district should be among the first to benefit by this legislation.

The editorial follows:

Brooklyn Plan Should Bring New Post-Office Branches

Passage of a law permitting the Post Office Department to build branches on Government-owned sites with private financing and pay the cost over a period of years is particularly good news for Brooklyn.

Postmaster Edward J. Quigley conceived the idea about 7 years ago and legislation to put it into effect was introduced in 1948 by Representative Eugene J. Keogh. Because of its authorship by Mr. Quigley it became known as the Brooklyn plan. In the intervening years it has been pressed unsuccessfully until last week when it was finally enacted into law.

Most post-office faculties are now rented at an annual cost of many millions of dollars so that great savings could be effected. In Brooklyn alone Mr. Quigley estimated that the savings would total about $1 million a year in the long run. For only 4 out of the 55 stations in this borough are now owned by the Government.

Under the new law mortgage costs would be met by sums previously paid for rent of the older structure and at the end of the amortization period the amounts paid in rents would become savings. The measure permits the Post Office Department to commit $3 million of rental funds for new projects in fiscal 1955.

It is Mr. Quigley's hope that one of the first postal branches to be built under its terms will be in East New York where a 100 by 200 foot plot at Atlantic and Pennsylvania Avenues is already owned by the Government and there is a pressing need for an adequate new building. Mr. Quigley declared he has been seeking action on this for 8 years and the area has been growing tremendously.

Congratulations are in order to Postmaster Quigley for conceiving a plan which should do a great deal for Brooklyn and also to Representative Keogh and the entire local delegation for their part in getting it through Congress.

McLeod Offers Excuses in His Report Which Manifest His Unfitness—McLeod Must Go—Have Offered Necessary Amendments to Refugee Relief Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 9, 1954

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I have just finished reading Mr. McLeod's second semiannual report submitted to the Congress on the operations undertaken under the Refugee Relief Act of 1953. I find that this document presents all manner of excuses for the complete failure of the program as envisaged by the President and the Congress, which program was entrusted for his tender consideration. One of the main features of the act was "to rescue escapees from behind the Iron Curtain." The President called the bill an act of humanitarianism, as well as a weapon in the cold war that we are waging against Soviet communism.

I am informed from sources other than McLeod's report that only three escapees from behind the Iron Curtain have actually thus far been rescued for entrance into our country.

Now to the McLeod excuses: Not enough money to hire more special agents, although over $3 million was appropriated for special agents; not enough consular clerks to investigate; and not enough cooperation from foreign governments. But, more significant than that, he reveals his ineptitude, his lack of understanding of human problems, and his failure to appreciate the fundamental purpose of the rescue of victims of communism, by the following statement which appears in his report:

> The Administrator has purposely delayed opening the program to the escapees envisaged in section 4 (a) (3). This delay was intended to give all potential participating countries an equal opportunity to decide whether they wish to share in the program by complying with the statutory requirements. In particular, whether they would issue the certificates of readmission required under section 7 (d) (2) of the act.

Presently there are under dole and care in Austrian and German camps, principally furnished by the United States, 23,000 escapees from Communist persecution. Three months ago there were 17,000. These brave people risking their lives are making the trek across the border in daily increasing numbers. Remember, too, the United States has issued proclamations encouraging their coming. A few South American countries have drained off some of them. But delay in the implementation of this program is fatal and is a complete nullification of the intention of the act.

McLeod must go.

The Refugee Act of 1953 was 1 year old on August 7 and on that day Mr. McLeod reported to the Congress that he had issued 7,287 visas out of the 209,000 authorized by the law, to be issued abroad. At this rate it will take the "able" administrator exactly 27 years to bring to the United States the authorized number of refugees. Furthermore, of the 7,287 visas issued, only about 2,100 persons have actually arrived in the United States. This is about 1 percent of the total number of permissible refugees. At such rate it would take a hundred years to carry out the program.

For the breakdown of his operations, among other excuses, he points to the reluctance of the countries affected to issue certificates of readmission in the event that the refugee is found to be excludable. Of course, countries have not cooperated with him not only because they do not wish to commit themselves for the long period required but also because of his arbitrary methods. He insists upon having his men range over Italy and Greece and other lands acting like local cops in examining the propsective applicants as to their habits and associations. The countries resent such invasion of their sovereignty.

He attributes his failure to the "overburdened officers of the Department who recruit and clear investigative personnel." He has spent so much time having investigators investigate investigators that he has nothing to show for 1 year's work. He insists upon more appropriations for more men. Is it that he wishes to build up a huge political machine? His men must be partisans of his party.

Scott McLeod must go.

He has revealed his own unfitness as administrator of the refugee program.

I have this day offered a bill to give the President the power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate to dismiss McLeod and appoint a new administrator for a term ending April 1, 1957. The bill also permits the filing of assurances of jobs and homes by recognized organizations, such as religious groups and special commissions appointed by governors, for the purpose of resettling refugees. Such a commission was already appointed by Governor Dewey and President Eisenhower urged last week that the remaining 47 governors follow suit. The requirement that every refugee admitted under the law would have to be in possession of a certificate entitling him to return to the country from which he is entering the United States, would be eliminated. The present administrator has required that such certificates have unlimited validity and most of the overseas countries are, of course, reluctant to commit themselves to take a refugee back after being in the United States 10 or maybe 15 years.

Presently individual assurances must be given guaranteeing a job and a home in the United States. In all refugee bills passed heretofore, blanketed assurances for jobs and homes were given by welfare and religious organizations. No trouble ensued. McLeod in his administration of the act has required individual assurances guaranteed by welfare organizations. The individual assurances are hardship enough but by demanding that they be supplemented by assurances of welfare organizations as well, McLeod muddied the waters and made confusion worse confounded.

The U. N. and the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 9, 1954

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to direct the attention of our colleagues to the following article written by Roscoe Drummond which appeared in his column Washington in the August 11, 1954, edition of the New York Herald Tribune:

Washington.—The American people are exhibiting a notably strong and stable support of the United Nations.

It is evident that both leadership opinion and public opinion generally are firmly on the side that larger use of the U. N. is desirable and that both the United States and the free world would be far worse off without the U. N.

What is significant is that despite the anxieties over the possible seating of an aggressive Communist China—which may very well not take place—and despite the sensational appeal of Republican Senate majority leader William F. Knowland that the United States withdraw from the U. N. if it is outvoted, dominant American opinion is unswerved in its conviction that the United States needs the U. N. and that the U. N. needs the United States.

The latest Gallup poll, for example, shows that the country stands better than 2 to 1 against Senator Knowland's proposal that we should withdraw if Red China is accredited.

The poll records public opinion of 59 percent against withdrawal, 25 percent in favor, and 16 percent undecided.

Since Americans are overwhelmingly opposed to seating Red China and rightly feel very deeply about it, the testing of opinion on the Red China issue makes the results particularly noteworthy. They suggest a matured judgment that, whatever its weaknesses and shortcomings—most of them imposed by the East-West split—the preservation of the U. N. is incalculably in the interests of the free world and the United States.

American opinion on the U. N. reflects no party differences. In the Gallup survey the Republicans voted 56 percent to 28 percent against withdrawal under any foreseeable circumstances. The Democrats voted 58 percent to 27 percent and independents recorded themselves as 64 percent against to 17 percent for withdrawal.

President Eisenhower has said that the Government expects to be successful in keeping Red China from being seated as long as it remains a participant in any unresolved aggression. But in any event it looks as though he would easily have sufficient public backing to prevent Senator Knowland, and any others who might join him, from unseating the United States.

Recently some 50 leading citizens, widely representative of business, labor, and the professions, participated in a 3-day session of the American Assembly examining America's stake in the U. N. They concluded that it would be a serious setback for the United States if the U. N. were allowed to disintegrate.

"We must stay in the United Nations," they said. "We must work to make it an even more effective instrument for peace with justice and freedom. We must use it and not by-pass it (as U. N. Secretary-General Dag Hammarskjold warned this week). We must make it, in fact as well as in pious theory, the cornerstone of United States foreign policy.

"We do not agree with those who say that the usefulness of the United Nations is at an end because of the obstructionism, cynicism and treachery of the Soviet Union and its associates. We believe, on the contrary, that it is an asset to the United States to have an international forum where this obstructionism, cynicism, and treachery are held up to the scrutiny of the entire world.

"We believe that a universal organization embracing differing ideologies and hence providing a central meeting ground for antagonists is preferable to a United Nations without the Soviets."

The United Nations is often expounded as a world's Town Meeting of the Air, where differences can be exposed and thereby brought nearer to solution, and where frustrated countries and frustrated diplomats can let off steam. This is one valuable function. On the record of hard accomplishment it has already been much more than that.

It was through the United Nations that the Soviet Union was forced to withdraw its troops from Iran in 1947. It was the United Nations Balkan Commission which centered the responsibility upon Moscow and its satellites for violations of the Greek frontier. It was a U. N. commission which, on the spot in Korea, promptly equipped the Security Council with information which permitted the verdict of aggression against the North Korean Communists. The U. N. is still negotiating the disputes between India and Pakistan and between Israel and Jordan.

Obviously the U. N. could be strengthened, but within the present charter there is plenty of opportunity to use it more fully and more effectively. The evidence is that the American people want the United Nations so used and will support the Government in doing it.

Baccalaureate Address of United States Senator Spessard Holland at Emory University, June 5, 1954

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. D. R. (BILLY) MATTHEWS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 12, 1954

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the Record, I should like to include on behalf of myself and my colleague the Honorable Jim Haley, of Florida, a baccalaureate address delivered to the graduates of Emory University on June 5, 1954, by the senior Senator from Florida, the Honorable Spessard L. Holland. Senator Holland is well qualified to speak to the graduates of a great university such as Emory. He is an alumnus not only of that institution but of my own alma mater, the University of Florida, and he has served our university in many distinguished capacities—as student leader, as a State senator, as Governor of Florida, as president of our alumni association, and now as our senior Senator. He has always found time in his busy life to think of the great problems of education, and to do his part in the solution of these problems.

Senator Holland in his address shows a clear understanding of the challenge of education to the youth of our Nation. In reading his splendid talk, I was particularly impressed with his plea for our educated youth to take more interest in the political life of our country. I hope all Members of the House will have a chance to read the complete address of Senator Holland, which follows:

President White, members of the graduating classes of 1954, members of the faculty, ladies and gentlemen, it is a rare privilege to be present at this Emory University commencement. On this joyful occasion I bring my warm congratulations to each of you graduates, to your families and friends, and to the members of the faculty with whom you have worked so closely during your years at Mother Emory. Shall we, perhaps, concede that the feelings of doubt and uncertainty which many of you graduates entertained from time to time, as to your prospects of graduation, may have been equaled or even exceeded by the doubts and fears of the members of the faculty? Nevertheless, with persistence and optimism they continued to labor with you, always hoping for your success. And so I am sure that your happiness is fully shared by them, your teachers, and by your families and friends, and that the dominant spirit of this whole day, for all of us who are here, is unalloyed pleasure.

Graduation from a great college or university is a real achievement. Every person who experiences it is entitled to feel a sense of exaltation and sheer delight which will be equaled rarely in the course of a full and active life. After all, there are very few other deliberate coures of action in any human life in which a fixed goal is attained after so many years of constant effort. You have spent a long, long time in grade school, in high school, in college and university, all in the pursuit of a degree which marks the certified end of your formal period of preparation for useful life. So, I am very sure that each of you is deeply conscious of the fact that this is, for you, a significant day of memorable success and attainment, as well as a day of gratitude and self-dedication. For such success comes not as a matter of accident, nor as a gift, but because you have worked long for it in the effort to live up to a priceless opportunity. To your work has been added the encouragement, assistance, and faith of your parents and your teachers, as well as the inspiration which comes from years of residence at Emory, in the atmosphere of a great Christian institution of higher learning. Please accept my hearty congratuations, along with my hope that the inspiring memories of your graduation experience will always keep you company.

Early military duty faces many of you, so just a brief word about that. As with graduates of former years, I am sure that some of you have a feeling, which I suspect is rather keen, of near resentment that this service looms now, just as you are ready to embark on civilian careers.

I hope that you will erase that feeling from your minds.

Remember that military service never comes at a convenient time for a civilian. Yet, it is a responsibility and privilege as well as a duty that able-bodied American men have accepted for nearly 180 years. I hope you may accept it gracefully.

As I see it there is a good prospect that you will not serve in actual war, but nevertheless you will have made a valuable contribution to the security of our country and to the cause of peace.

Give it your best and a couple of years from now you will have decided that your time in uniform was not wasted but instead actually endowed you with much practical knowledge as to how to get along with your fellow Americans from every walk of life. I predict that your military service will be a source of permanent pride and satisfaction to you. Incidentally, and in a lighter vein, there is many a veteran who has sincere doubt as to whether he could have ever led to the altar the girl of his dreams without the aid of a military uniform.

It is commonplace, but nevertheless wholly true, to say that you go out from this campus into a world which, just now, is confused, divided, and disappointing in many of its aspects. It is not so commonplace, but equally true, to say that you go out into a world which offers you richer reward along with greater challenge than has been found in any earlier age. You are most fortunate in that you enter this outside world of great promise and equally great frustrations with the advantage of an excellent training, which means more now than it has ever meant in the past. For the accumulation of man's knowledge has reached such amazing totals in each of many specialized fields, with each total increasing daily, that there is no adequate substitute for thorough educational preparation.

This advanced training, this storehouse of useful knowledge which each of you now possesses, is a great asset to you personally but I hope that in each case it will prove to be also a useful asset to mankind. The question as to how your training will be used is, of course, a matter of personal responsibility. Without doubt each of you feels today a heavy sense of obligation to render service and leadership to our American people and to humanity. I hope that this sense of responsibility to others will remain with you always as an abiding conviction. Surely it is an inseparable part of the training which you have here received. As ministers of the gospel, doctors and surgeons, dentists, teachers, lawyers, librarians, scientists, authors, engineers, business executives, may you always highly value and eagerly seize upon the opportunity to perform useful service to your fellowmen.

Just here I would like to make two brief comments based upon my own observation of several truly great persons who I feel have most fully lived up to their opportunities. First, I believe that it is a trait of real greatness that the person who possesses it shall have a sense of continuing and genuine humility, both because of his gratitude that he has been so fortunate as to secure his own peculiar training and also because he recognizes that he must continue to be a student, always studying and seeking to add to his own storehouse of knowledge. Along with this humility I think that another quality of true greatness is an avid thirst for knowledge, a continuing desire to eagerly and passionately seek the truth that is not yet known, an acquisitive urge that drives one ever forward in the effort to make knowledge more perfect and science more useful. Those who know you and believe in you confidently expect you to attain true greatness of stature through the qualities which you possess and the service which you shall render.

As to your responsibility to furnish leadership, I feel equally hopeful that we shall hear great things from the members of this class. There is a pressing need among our people for higher and sounder standards. We need to be able to distinguish between the great mass of timetaking diversionary activities which are now available to all of us and the sound, fundamental requirements of wholesome living. Recent statistics give clear warning of the fact that we are neglecting proper physical standards to the degree that many of our young people do not measure up to the high state of physical wellbeing under which they can hope for a maximum of success in modern life. Likewise there is dissatisfaction from many well-informed sources with the inadequate educational and intellectual standards which now prevail in too many places. In the fields of moral and spiritual welfare the rising tide of selfish carelessness, delinquency, and crime poses a challenge to our Nation which I hope may be interpreted by each of you as a personal challenge. Certainly the opportunities and responsibilities for leadership which confront you will supply new channels through which you may pour out streams of useful knowledge, highmindedness, and inspiration which will, through their effect upon others, show you to be worthy sons and daughters of Emory.

Aside from the service and leadership which you will render in the fields for which you have been especially prepared I hope that each of you will make some special contribution toward meeting the very great need for the rendition of devoted service to our country in the many fields of public life. It is a truism that our free way of life, democracy itself, is on trial throughout the earth and that it must successfully meet the test of critical and scoffing observation by others. Not the least important work for us to do, in meeting that test, is to strengthen, purify, and make more efficient our domestic government on every level—local, State, and Federal. I strongly hope that you may accomplish much in this field.

You will, of course, be making real contributions toward sounder and stronger government by performing well in your various fields of spiritual, cultural, professional, and business life but I invite your special attention to the fact that our country badly needs men and women, just like yourselves, to accept greater responsibility for the conduct of public business.

In the first place busy, informed citizens and natural leaders, such as you will be, are too little inclined to serve upon juries, to inform themselves on public issues and actually cast their votes, to use their influence in informing others so that they too will take an interest and vote, to accept responsibility as city or school officials or in the various civic activities which so strongly affect the schools and the whole community life, to insist upon law observance and law enforcement and to uphold the hands of honest public officials—in short to take full part as private citizens and in local positions of trust in making local government function effectively and cleanly. If the good and the informed citizens fail to participate in operating their government you may be sure that the not-so-good and the uninformed will make the decisions and, in that case, government will be poorly conducted and properly subject to criticism and lack of confidence.

But I shall not dwell long on the necessary performance by good Americans of their duties of citizenship, important as that subject is, because I value this opportunity to call to your attention the fact that I keenly hope that more and more of our college graduates who have wide interests and much to do will come to feel that there is a definite need for them to serve in elective and appointive positions of public trust, in such posts as members of the State legislatures, as judges, as governors and in other State executive positions, as Members of Congress, and in high Federal positions in the executive and judicial branches of our Government.

I know that there is a tendency on the part of many good citizens to feel that there is something unwholesome or unclean about political life. Such a feeling is not just a reflection upon our public officials. Much more significant, it is an indication of a lack of confidence in the soundness of our system which, if it justifies its existence, must produce sound leadership through selection by the votes of free people, who indispensably must have the intelligence, courage, and patriotism to make self-government work. I do not believe there is any greater need which our Government feels today than to put an end to this unwillingness on the part of many good citizens, who are highly trained, to seek and accept public office because they regard politics as unclean.

There are some, too, who feel that the financial compensation in public life is inadequate and that point of view would be correct if the mere making of money were the highest objective of life. Fortunately that is not the principle by which most of you will live. Certainly those of you who intend to preach the Gospel, or to devote your lives to the cause of education or of applying the healing arts to suffering mankind, are not dominated by the thought that money is everything. None of you have learned such a false principle here at Emory and I sincerely hope that it will not dominate your lives.

There are others who are unwilling to seek or accept public office because they shrink from the criticism and opposition which they feel they will invite. It is true that one who serves in a public position is open to criticism but I suspect that the same thing is true in every walk of life where people are doing constructive things. I recall a story which my beloved friend the late Senator Clyde Hoey of North Carolina used to tell, which will illustrate the fact that all of the friction and difference of opinion is not in public life. Senator Hoey was walking in the outskirts of one of the cities of his State when he noticed a well-kept little church with a dignified Negro standing in front of it—manifestly a preacher. Said Senator Hoey, "Reverend, is this your church?" to which the Reverend replied, "Yes, sir, it is." Then Senator Hoey complimented him on the neat appearance of the church and asked how many members were in the congregation. The Reverend replied that there were an even 100 members. When Senator Hoey then asked whether the membership was an active, working membership, the Reverend replied, "Yes, sir, they's all working—50 for me and 50 against."

So, critical opposition exists even within our church groups. In public life, it can be said that you must have at least a majority with you or else you are quickly retired to some other field.

While criticism will come to a public official and should come as a means of giving him a fair cross-section of the attitude of his people toward his actions, it is also true that many, many citizens are happy to recognize good service when it is rendered and it is a most satisfying and compensating experience to receive the accolade of one's fellow citizens for the performance of a task which they think has been well done.

There are others who refuse to consider politics as a field for their own activities because they do not believe that our public recognizes and rewards good service and they feel it would be hopeless to expect public approval and promotion to higher public responsibilities on the merits of their performance. It is my judgment that this conclusion is almost entirely wrong. While there are occasional instances in which a demagogue or an inferior public servant is preferred by the electorate over one with a sounder record, I believe that these instances mark the exception rather than the rule. On this point, which is an important one, I would like to refer you to the United States Senate, which I happen to know better than any other group of individuals in public service. Please consider this comment as wholly objective.

Throughout my membership in the Senate the number of former Members of the House of Representatives who are serving in the Senate after service in the House, some of them for long periods of time, has been each year from 35 to 40. Throughout that same period the number of former governors who have been Members of the Senate has varied from 26 to 30. Most of both of these large groups, making up nearly 70 of the total of 96, had served in their State legislatures before their election to Congress. Throughout that same period we have had a considerable number of Members of the Senate who have been elected to membership after long service in the judicial branch of Government, several of them as members of the supreme courts of their States. Another sizable number have been selected from teachers who have served on the faculties of institutions of higher learning and have attained outstanding recognition in important public fields such as international law and economics. A few have been named to the Senate after making a great success in business or in agriculture. It thus appears that the great majority of the Members of the Senate have been chosen by their people after long schooling in the processes of democratic government or after special training of some kind which has impressed their fellow citizens.

I suspect that all of you know, personally or by reputation, the two splendid Senators from Georgia, who well illustrate the point which I have been making. Senator GEORGE was elected to the Senate in 1922 after distinguished service on the Supreme Court of Georgia. Senator RUSSELL was elected to the Senate in 1932 after distinguished service as speaker of the Georgia House of Representatives and as Governor of Georgia. Neither of these great public servants has had serious opposition for many years.

Based upon my own observation of the membership of the Senate, I think that that body rather clearly illustrates my point that the electorate as a rule does recognize trained experience and good service as well as other special qualifications and that there is no merit in the conclusion held by so many that American voters are ungrateful and uninformed and that one who devotes himself to public life should not expect recognition of his service in accordance with its essential merits.

Of course there are exceptions to this rule, even in the Senate, such as your present speaker and perhaps a very few others, but they are actually exceptions and I believe you will find that this same rule applies to the vast majority of every other group of American public officials whom you may survey.

There is one more field of important public activity to which I invite your attention, in which some of you may be peculiarly qualified to render the high service which our Nation so badly needs. I refer to the field of foreign relations in our Department of State.

Throughout the life of our Nation, until recent years, we had paid small attention to this field and we had relatively few persons who were trained to enter it. We were busy in building our own country—in developing our great resources—in creating our vast internal strength, strength enough to make us the final factor for victory in World War I, and an even stronger force in World War II. At the end of the Second World War we emerged with the responsibility of world leadership among the free peoples as the only possible successful champion of democracy, individual freedom, and international decency.

And so, we embarked upon the long and difficult task of building, if possible, the strongest State Department on earth and the most effective system of foreign representation. That is what we needed, almost overnight, and we still need it greatly. Our progress in filling that vital need has been slow. Through all the disappointments we have been making steady headway, though we have by no means reached the goal. I cannot think of any course by which a qualified young university graduate can make himself count for more in the interest of his country and in the cause of peace and world understanding than by entering the State Department—particularly the Foreign Service. I hope that there are some among you who will choose that life. I predict it will bring you great satisfaction.

This has been an inspiring day for me and, I am sure, for all the other alumni of old Emory College who are here. Before noon we were privileged to go down to Oxford where we spent our undergraduate years. Many tender memories came crowding back—there on the old campus and in the little village where, for nearly 120 years, Emory has quietly taught young men how to prepare for fuller living.

And then, back here we came again for your graduation at this marvelous plant of the great new university—much larger than the old, more substantial, more modern, better equipped, wholly beautiful. And yet, we could not help but note with deep satisfaction that the new Emory still carries the unmistakable stamp and the redolent atmosphere of the old. For this new and stately university is a faithful projection and expansion of the old—it is still dedicated to the same high principles of Christian education which have always prevailed at Oxford.

We are proud that we may send our sons here and that now our daughters also are welcomed. Ambitious parents always expect their children to do better than they themselves have done. Certainly that is what we expect of you. Similarly do we expect Emory University to do a better job than Emory College was able to do. The finer facilities, the more varied and higher curricula, the more highly trained faculty, the better preparation which students have before they enroll in the university; these and many other factors should make the influence of Emory a steadily growing force for good, and we confidently anticipate that result.

But the acid test as to whether Emory fulfills her manifest destiny will always rest upon one thing only, which is the standard of performance that is set by Emory men and Emory women as they go out into the world after graduation to put to work the training they have received here.

So, the most inspiring experience by far in this splendid day for returning alumni is to see this great class of graduates—much larger in number than the entire student body in our day—educated far beyond any goal that could have been reached in our time, setting out to test in this challenging world the high degree of knowledge which you have here attained. Of course we are vitally interested in you. Naturally we have every confidence that you will superbly succeed. It is our dearest wish that Emory may always be proud of you. Good luck to you, and may God speed you.

Who Will Inherit This Great Land of Ours?—The Future Is Yours

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 30, 1954

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, at the 68th annual commencement exercises of John Carroll University, University Heights, Ohio, the Very Reverend Frederick E. Welfle, S. J., president of John Carroll University, and Thomas F. Patton, assistant president and first vice president of Republic Steel Corp., delivered addresses on the same general topic of leadership and responsibilities.

These addresses are very timely and present a much needed moral approach to the problems of the present and future. One address complements the other. Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the addresses:

WHO WILL INHERIT THIS GREAT LAND OF OURS?

(By Very Rev. Frederick E. Welfle, S. J., president, John Carroll University)

Reverend fathers, members of the faculty, trustees of John Carroll University, distinguished candidates for honorary degrees, alumni, graduates of 1954, and friends, the last opera of Wagner's famous Ring Cycle deals with the end of the world. In ponderous music, Wagner leads confused mortals and vicious gods through a hell of violence and degradation. The twilight of the gods sees a helpless world go swiftly and inexorably to violent destruction.

Many thinkers in our day, looking out upon current conditions, ask the thoughtful question: Is this the twilight of the gods? Are we approaching the end of the greatest civilization in all history? The struggle between democratic countries and the forces of brutal power, between Chritianity and atheism, between freedom and slavery has been mounting in intensity. Diplomacy would seem to be at a standstill. Feverishly, the engines of destruction are being made more powerful. In many quarters one hears dark forebodings of another world conflict in which men and their institutions, yes, the whole of civilization, will melt away in an inferno of bombs a hundred times hotter than the sun.

These are solemn thoughts for such a happy occasion as a graduation. And yet, they are really very pertinent. Even on this day of joy we might just as well face up to reality. That I hope you will do. But please balance the stark fact of current conditions with a truth equally as real, if not as evident, with one of the really hard facts of history. The world in ages past has gone through many an uncertain period and found its salvation not in fearful weapons of destruction but in the genius of its leaders. That fact I repeat: The world has found salvation not in its weapons of destruction but in the genius of its leaders. The supreme question today is not: Will this beautiful land of ours go down to destruction? Rather, the all-important question is: Who will inherit this great land of ours?

My dear friends, this is a great land. In 178 years, we have grown from 3 million people in 1776 to 160 million in 1954. From every corner of the world people have come to make this a Nation of plenty and power. Thick volumes of diagrams, illustrations, statistics tell the story of fabulous accomplishments in every form of human endeavor.

Nations, like individuals, are judged by the number of forces for good they set into operation. Our shores, our pocketbooks, our classrooms, our every facility have been open to the entire world. We have not been content to overcome our hardships and foster excellent living conditions in these United States; no, we have projected the fruits of American genius and industry into every quarter of the globe. To our eternal credit, as a nation, we have never sought to enslave another nation. We have never spurned a legitimate and sincere offer for international peace and justice. Without threat or promise, we have invited leaders and peoples of all nations to imitate our democratic institutions and our system of free enterprise. The United States has been a huge laboratory in which the basic experiments of democratic action have met the test of time and use. We believe so sincerely in justice; we are so eager to foster international harmony and good will that we have underwritten the peace of the world with our money, our moral convictions, and with the lives of our young men. We can point to 178 years of uninterrupted progress in free and purposeful existence.

Let no human respect or fear of conceit hold fast our tongues. Let us admit for all to hear: this land of ours is great. But, my friends, I return to that all-important question: Who will inherit this great land of ours? Where are the leaders who will master the powers of destruction of this day, who will take the inheritance that is placed in their hands and enrich it with still higher ideals and still grander achievements for other generations yet unborn? My friends, not only am I concerned about the inheritors of this land of ours. In my 8 years of moving about this city and country as president of John Carroll University, I find that question on the tongues of educator, industrialist, statesman, and businessman alike. To be sure, it is not always stated as formally as I have put it. Often enough it is an observation, a Chestertonian hope that another St. Francis will happen along to show men how to love one another. It underlies the frequent utterance that our capacity to destroy has outstripped our capacity to control the means of destruction. It underlay General MacArthur's famous pronouncement on V–J Day that our progress must be of the spirit if we would save the flesh. Who, indeed, will inherit this great land of ours?

My friends, is the answer not clear? Who, indeed, if not the graduates of our colleges and universities? I for one refuse to go along with a certain spirit of anti-intellectualism and fatalism which is abroad in the land today. I want no part of that type of thinking which holds that our young men are a generation of average pupils for whom a core of studies must be watered down to fit their mediocrity. Nor am I attracted by the new fatalism that we must continue to drift helplessly into a final, cataclysmic war with communism. I feel that the university, just as it was in Athens, in Rome, in the Middle Ages, is still the incubator of leadership and that from the halls of our American universities are coming the young men and women who will reverently and humbly receive this priceless heritage and preserve it for their posterity.

Certainly, we at John Carroll University harbor that conviction. We believe that we have here a system of education that is properly designed to turn out leaders for society. We teach a fixed hierarchy of moral values. We drill into the understanding of our students the discipline of will and judgment necessary to shun evil and to live the good life. Slowly, and we hope surely, we implant into them that which the ages have proved to be metaphysically true, morally right, and spiritually valuable. Nor are the finer trimmings of wisdom and virtue overlooked in shaping and outfitting these future leaders.

And now, narrowing my theme still more, let me address myself to you graduates. You, my dear graduates, are the inheritors of this great land of ours. You are among that chosen band to whom the thoughtful in America will turn for leadership. Soon you will walk to this platform to receive your diploma. That is a simple but meaningful ceremony. Your diploma is the university's seal of approval, her evidence to all the world that you are ready to assume your place among the relatively few in this world's teeming millions who are singled out for leadership. Knowing you as I do, I feel that yours are the sentiments of that young man in the Middle Ages who, kneeling before his father, pleaded for knighthood in the following words:

"My arm is strong, overwhelming my ambition;
Father, please give me my sword,
Do not mock my youthful inexperience
I am worthy of my ancestors."

My dear graduates, you are about to do battle in a world impregnated with destructive propaganda and untruths. That is the reason why your symbol of leadership is a diploma and not a sword. The conflict today centers around the control of the minds and hearts of men. To that end you have been specially prepared spiritually, intellectually, and morally. Indeed, we do not mock your youthful inexperience. Instead we have the utmost confidence in you.

Now, in this year dedicated to the Blessed Mother of God, may I ask you to make a specially fervent pledge. Just as the young knight, kneeling before a statue of Our Lady, made an undying promise to serve God and his people, so do you make an imperishable pledge to keep this Nation Christian, free, and honorable. You are God's chosen heirs to this great land of ours. I beg of you, be worthy of your ancestors.

The Future Is Yours

(By T. F. Patton, assistant president and first vice president, Republic Steel Corp.)

At the outset let me say I am happy and proud to be a participant with you today on this joyous occasion. During my own high school days, I had the good fortune to have as teachers the fathers who now direct John Carroll University.

So through the years I have watched its progress with pride. John Carroll is a splendid institution of learning and a credit to the community.

Every student here, every teacher, is a part of the Jesuit tradition of scholarship which for four centuries has proved so successful thoroughout the world. This tradition recognizes that the student has a soul as well as a mind and a body, and the curriculum here is directed to the full and harmonious development of all of a man's faculties. It stresses education in these halls as "education for leadership."

And I myself have been about this world long enough and far enough to realize that education for leadership is a crying need of our day. This is true in politics, in education, in finance, in industry.

In recent years we have heard much about the specialists and their great contributions to our civilization. And their contributions have been great. The specialists have played a brilliant part in most phases of life including industry. The world, and especially the United States, would not be what it is today without them.

But in the acclaim for the specialist, there has been a tendency to ignore the more broadly educated man. That tendency, I am happy to say, is being corrected. Today even our technical colleges are beginning to recognize the need for this broader education. They are including in their curriculum more of the liberal arts and humanities. For there is little value in developing brilliant ideas if they cannot be communicated and put to work for mankind.

And I must confess that industry, too, in its urge and desire to solve its technical problems has shown a tendency to place too small a value on a liberal arts education. That tendency is also being corrected.

For whether trained in a technical college or a liberal arts university, today's graduate must be trained for leadership. It is the trained leader who gives direction and purpose to industry, to government, in fact to all of our activities. He is the man who stands on the wisdom of the ages yet is abreast of the latest idea and the newest technique. He is a better man if his mind has been disciplined on the classics, on history, on literature, and economics as well as on mathematics and the sciences. And above all, he is well-grounded in philosophy and understands why man has inalienable rights to life, to liberty, and to private ownership of property.

In short, it is this kind of man John Carroll University strives to educate, and does.

And might I say that there is a never satisfied demand in industry for the man who can become a leader, the man who can take responsibility, who can size up a situation and come to the right decision, who understands human values and can inspire other men to greater and still greater efforts.

It is the leaders who are the risk-takers, the experimenters. They are the men who are not afraid of the new. Such men as these made this country great. Such men founded our industries and they direct them today. These leaders can see visions and dream dreams and they have the ability to act promptly and to make their dreams become realities. It is men of this caliber who will make America even greater and who will fashion victory for us in this Communist-ridden world.

And industry and commerce must turn to the universities, both liberal arts and technical, for their leaders of tomorrow.

To me one of the most interesting social developments in the United States in recent decades is this growing dependence of the corporations on the universities for trained men and women and in turn of the dependence of the universities on the corporations for funds to carry on their essential work. They are collaborating effectively. They make a natural team in the kind of world in which we live today.

Two world wars have greatly increased the burden of taxes on individuals and consequently they cannot today support the privately endowed colleges as they did in the past. But socially conscious corporations seeing the problem and knowing the importance of the colleges to them and to the future of the country are helping to make up the deficit.

Our modern industrial leaders are acutely aware of the role their corporations must play in the community and in the Nation. They want to be good neighbors. They support community movements for better schools, for more hospitals, for adequate housing so that all of us may enjoy what we know as the American standard of living. Our corporations seek executives who are not only industrial leaders but community leaders as well and it is the responsibility of our colleges to turn out graduates who can become such executives.

You graduates of 1954 have been encouraged to be "men of vision." You have wider sympathies and deeper understanding of human aspirations. You know more of the mistakes of the past and should be better equipped to build a brilliant future for America. You have been taught to think for yourselves and to welcome a new idea. You have been trained to talk and write clearly and forcibly, so you can clearly express your ideas. You will be the leaders of 1974, and you must be able and inspired leaders.

And may I point out to you as you enter the world to start your careers, that you will find great stress laid on power, whether in politics, in foreign affairs, or in industry. But the most powerful of all forces is the power of thought. And that is true whether it is good thought or bad thought. Both lands are competing in the world today. There is a savage and relentless battle going on, on an international scale, and it is basically in the realm of thought. In fact, it is a battle for the very souls of men.

The forces on the one side are directed by the United States, which exalts the dignity of the individual. The forces on the other side are led by Communist Russia, which exalts the state and holds that man's only value lies in his service to the state. On our side we firmly believe that man is made in the image of God. Our enemy, the Communist, is inspired by an irreligious materialism.

And I am sorry to say that this mighty struggle is a specter that will hover over you wherever you go, whatever you do for many years to come.

To me the Communist world is a living tragedy on a colossal scale, probably the most horrible human tragedy since the time of Genghis Khan. There are more than 700 million people in Communist-ruled countries—about 35 percent of the world's population. They are in the grip of this ideology that enslaves them both physically and mentally. Wherever communism prevails it destroys democracy; it destroys freedom; it destroys religion. It perpetuates itself only by the ruthless and merciless slaughter of all opposition.

Contemplating this state of affairs, a free American is bound to ask questions:

How can the Russian people stand for such things?

How can a man with a mind and a soul of his own accept such pagan doctrines and such abject servitude?

The answer, it seems to me, is to be found in the type of education taught in Communist countries.

For more than 30 years Communist dictators have controlled the minds of the Russian people. They have controlled the curriculum in every school and university. They have colored the news in every newspaper and broadcast. They have edited every magazine, every book. They have arranged all amusements, and have made them instruments of propaganda. They have fixed the party line in all matters, political, economic, and intellectual, and have required every man, woman, and child to conform to that line.

The result is that the vast majority of the Russian people have came to accept this Communist propaganda as the truth. They actually believe the distorted picture painted for them of the United States, its ideals, and its people.

We in America must resist this Communist threat and the best way to combat it is to have a definite program for advancing our own democratic freedoms. This program as I see it should have three phases:

The first phase is economic. We must keep our capitalistic society so strong, so dynamic, so prosperous that anyone who wants to work can find a job which will provide a decent living. Then he will not turn to socialistic panaceas in desperation.

The second phase is educational. Our schools and colleges must teach our youth more and more about our American form of Government and the workings of our American economy. No student, it seems to me, should leave an American institution of higher learning without a full understanding of our American heritage. He should know American history and the basis of our freedoms; American institutions and their origins; and the operation of our American free enterprise economy with its free and competitive market.

The third phase is religious. We must identify this knowledge with God and with the eternal spirit of truth so that it becomes a living, a forceful part of our lives. We must emphasize over and over again, and thank God for it, that our American heritage of freedom is essentially spiritual, based on God's natural law and on the teachings of Christ.

Now we Americans have our failings, many of them. Even our finest institutions fall short of perfection. This is only natural because we are human. But let us not see only the imperfections and overlook the good. Let us rather work to remove the imperfections and so make the good even better.

So today we pass along this precious heritage to the graduates of John Carroll and to the boys and girls who are graduating from hundreds of other American institutions. You and they are our hope for the future. You and they must preserve this heritage, enlarge it, and in your turn pass it along to the next generation.

Apart from Christianity itself, I can conceive of no greater gift than this heritage of freedom which is your to cherish and to expand.

And as you go out into the world I ask you to be of good courage. Great things have been done in these United States, but still greater ones remain for you to do.

You are starting your careers in one of the most interesting, the most challenging, periods in human history. You are going to make those careers in the most dynamic, the most successful of all economies. The United States is the most productive, the most powerful Nation the world has ever known. Upon it has fallen the moral and economic leadership of western civilization.

We have exploded the hydrogen bomb and we have convincing proof of the terrific energy God has put into matter. That energy must be applied to peaceful uses. Its potentialities for good stagger the imagination. The changes your generation will bring about can be compared only to the changes that followed the discovery of steam power by Watt and later of electric power by Faraday.

Our population is increasing at a rate that has astounded the experts. This means a larger market—a greater demand—for goods. In recent years industry has been expanding at the rate of $30 billion a year. Almost $3 billion are being spent by industry yearly in its search for new or better products and new or better techniques. All of this means new plants, new tools, more jobs.

And you are the ones who will benefit from the latest advances in science and medicine. You are the ones who will operate pipelines that will stretch across a continent, airplanes whose speed will exceed that of sound. You are the ones who will improve radio and television that carry ideas with the speed of light; who will build better automobiles and better highways; more efficient ships and railroads; who will work with new products like orlon and dacron; who will have new metals—titanium, lithium, magnesium—and a variety of new steels. You are the ones who will explore the wonders of electronics.

Yes, you, too, will make your contributions to this wonderful country of ours. You will bring forth new goods, new techniques, and, even more important, a higher culture. Past generations have laid the foundation of American progress; your generation will build the structure.

And I exhort you to build a beautiful future, for you and your children are going to live in that future.

True you will have your personal problems. You will worry about jobs and marriage and children and perhaps a stretch in the Army. But in your concern over these, do not overlook the larger issues of your community, of your country, and of your church.

Do not make money, important as it may be, your measure of success. Remember you have a soul to save as well as a body. Remember too that a good name and service to your neighbor brings satisfactions which no money can buy.

And to live a truly happy and effective life you must be a participant in life and not a mere spectator. So do not be content with cheering from the sidelines.

Be an active worker in behalf of every worthy community undertaking—be it civic, charitable, political, or religious.

Be a loyal supporter of John Carroll for you can never repay the debt you owe this great institution.

And above all, continue to be a student. Your teachers have done all they can for you, but they have only laid the solid and true foundation on which you yourself must do the building. So continue to increase your intellectual stature. Keep abreast of the parade, or, better still, keep a few paces ahead of it.

Never forget that you have been trained for leadership at John Carroll. Be just that, a leader of Americans.

So members of the graduating class, I wish all of you Godspeed. The future is yours to make of it what you will.

Report to the People of the Fourth Congressional District of Wisconsin—My Record and Votes on Major Issues in the 83d Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 12, 1954

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, the 2d session of the 83d Congress is coming to an end. It is timely, therefore, to pause for a moment, survey the past 2 years, and see what his Congress has achieved, and where it has failed.

We must look at the record, and compare the promises made during the last election campaign with the performance of the 83d Congress. Such stock-taking will help us—and help all the people of the United States—to evaluate the work of our elected Representatives. It will help to elect a good Congress for 1955–56.

This report to the people of the Fourth Congressional District of Wisconsin deals with the work of the 83d Congress. It covers the major issues considered by Congress during the past 2 years, and shows my stand and votes on those questions.

I realize full well that my legislative record may not please each and every one of my constituents. That is to be expected in a democracy, where each and every one of us has the right to his own opinion—a right that we must always respect and safeguard.

Nevertheless, I believe that the voters have the right to know how their Representatives voted on issues of importance to our Nation. For that reason, I have always reported to my constituency on my actions as their Congressman. I want the people of the Fourth Congressional District of Wisconsin to know that I have conscientiously tried to represent them to the best of my ability.

POLITICS AND REALITY

The 1st session of the 83d Congress—described in detail in my 1953 report—acquired the "do nothing" tag. The second session produce a more palatable record, as shown in the table at the end of this report. Nevertheless, one brutal fact remains clear: the legislative program of the present administration thus far has been neither bold, inspiring, dynamic, nor very important. Aside from the St. Lawrence seaway, the meager accomplishments of the 83d Congress boil down to the passage of routine housekeeping bills—such as the annual appropriations—and to the extension, with minor modifications, of long-existing programs developed by past administrations—for instance, social security, Federal aid to highways, airports, hospitals, and other programs.

As I already noted, the passage of the St. Lawrence seaway bill was a noteworthy accomplishment. However, only after Congress will follow through with additional legislation and appropriations necessary to complete the project, will we have a new highway of commerce between the heartland of America and the Atlantic Ocean become a reality. The seaway, for which we in Wisconsin have fought so long, can prove of tremendous benefit to our entire Nation.

LEST WE FORGET

Lest we forget, however, the American people were promised manifold other blessings during the 1952 election campaign by the glib and generous Republican candidates.

The GOP spokesmen pledged, for instance, to cut Federal spending by $15 to $20 billion to balance the budget and to reduce the national debt. Yet during fiscal year 1953 the national debt increased by $7 billion; another $5 billion were added to it during fiscal year 1954, and it appears that the Government will continue to operate in the red through the rest of this year and into 1955.

During the last campaign the Republicans made many extravagant charges about the "mess" in Washington. Upon being elected to office they found themselves in an embarrassing situation: not only were they unable to substantiate most of their accusations, but in addition, they were harassed by exposés of their own "4-percenters," of corruption in the Justice Department, and scandals in the Federal Housing Administration.

It was then that the Nation witnessed a shameful display in which Government officials, led by the Attorney General of the United States, began to pervert and twist facts to save face. The biggest abuses were perpetrated in the name of internal security. Men who died, men who resigned from Government service for personal reasons, men who were fired for plain inefficiency, and many others were branded as subversives and included in the infamous list of "2,000 cleaned-out subversives."

It was only after minority Representatives and the press began to demand names and facts that this fraud was exposed.

THE SANTA CLAUS PARADE

The 83d Congress will be especially remembered for the shameless giveaway of our national resources.

The first big giveaway came with the passage of the so-called tidelands oil bill, which gave to a few States our national oil resources located under the marginal sea, valued at between $70 and $200 billion. The oil interests tried unsuccessfully to secure access to these Federal resources for over 10 years. The Republican majority in the 83d Congress approved this giveaway, and the President signed it.

Then came the betrayal at Hells Canyon, the authorization for the disposal of 28 Government-owned synthetic-rubber plants to private interests for a fraction of their cost, the raid on our public grazing lands, the lumber giveaway, the sellout at Niagara, the natural-gas "steal," the atomic-energy deal—involving a $12 billion investment of the taxpayer's money—and other "fast shuffles."

To be certain, we managed to block some giveaways, to slow down and discourage others. The fact remains, however, that since the Teapot Dome scandal in the early 1920's, there has been nothing in our history to compare with the record of the 83d Congress and our present administration in the bartering away of public resources.

Under the guise of getting the Government out of business, resources and developments in which billions of tax dollars have been invested were offered in "cut rate" deals to big business. To paraphrase a well-known idiom, "never has so much been done for so few, and so little for so many."

HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND SECURITY

Defying old traditions, a number of GOP Representatives joined with the Democrats this year in pressing for new amendments to the Social Security Act. The 1954 amendments grant modest increases in the rates of benefits, extend the coverage of the program, and introduce a number of minor improvements in the law.

While this legislation is neither original nor adequate—especially with regard to the much-needed lowering of retirement age for women workers and the extension of insurance benefits to disabled persons—it represents a step in the right direction. It constitutes one of the few constructive accomplishments of this Congress.

Among other programs continued by the 83d Congress were the extension of Federal aid for construction of medical facilities; aid for the improvement of vocational rehabilitation services to handicapped persons; aid to schools in defense areas; assistance to construction industry and Federal insurance of home mortgages.

Little was done to enact a realistic program of school construction assistance, or to aid families submitted to hardship because of illnesses. Illinois costs our Nation over $10 billion a year. Last year, 8 million American families went into debt for over $1 billion to pay for medical bills. Five hundred thousand families had medical expenses which equaled or exceeded their income.

The administration's attempt to remedy this problem by having the Government underwrite certain health insurance losses of private companies was blocked in the House. The majority of Representatives felt that the administration's health reinsurance bill was inadequate to meet our people's needs, and that it could enrich certain insurance companies with "windfall profits."

THE "TRICKLE-DOWN" POLICY

In reviewing the tax situation, we must keep one thing clear: The automatic 10-percent tax cut which went into effect on January 1, 1954, was approved by the Democratic 82d Congress and signed by President Truman. This is the only tax relief which benefits the average taxpayer to any appreciable extent—in addition, the 82d Congress provided for automatic cuts in excess profits, corporation, excise, and other tax rates, increased temporarily to pay for defense rearmament after the outbreak of the Korean conflict.

The tax bill sponsored by the present administration and approved by the 83d Congress gives very little relief to the average taxpayer. Eighty percent of our people earn less than $5,000 a year. This vast majority will receive a $311 million tax reduction under the administration's bill. This amounts to 9 percent of the total tax relief provided for in the 1954 Republican tax cut.

Corporations and individuals earning over $5,000 a year will receive 91 percent of the tax relief provided for in the $3.3 billion GOP tax bill. This is what is known as the "trickle down" policy, under which tax concessions are made to the well-to-do with the hope that they will seep through to those below.

Together with a number of my Democratic colleagues, I worked for an increase in the individual tax exemption which would benefit all taxpayers, instead of just a few. Our efforts to increase individual tax exemption to a minimum of $700 did not meet with much success.

WHAT ABOUT WORKERS?

The Republican campaign pledge for a revision of the Taft-Hartley Act was just so much talk. No serious effort was made by the majority leadership to enact the needed changes in our labor laws.

The majority party in the House also defeated all attempts to extend the duration of jobless benefits, and to increase their rates. A token gesture was subsequently made to extend the coverage of the unemployment compensation program.

In spite of the high cost of living, and the appreciable level of unemployment, little was done to combat these problems. In fact, the GOP leadership in the Senate overwhelmingly refused money for a committee on consumer interests, which was to investigate middleman profiteering and the reasons for the wide gap between farm income and consumer prices.

Postal and other classified Federal employees received the "runaround" in the needed cost-of-living salary adjustments.

OUR FOREIGN POLICY

The limitations of this report will not permit me to comment on all the issues considered by the 83d Congress. They are listed, however, at the end of this résumé. Before concluding, I want to say a few words about the poor performance of the present administration in the important field of foreign policy.

All of us will long remember the bitter criticisms heaped upon the foreign policy of the past administration by the Republicans. We will also recall the GOP campaign assurances that communism would be stopped in its tracks, that liberation of the Soviet-dominated nations would be at hand, and that our Nation would receive a new, dynamic foreign policy as soon as the Republicans were elected to office.

The miserable and even tragic record of the present administration in the field of foreign affairs makes mockery of those empty promises:

In less than 2 years, Communists have made great gains. Their hold on one-half of Korea was sanctioned—at least for the time being—when the administration accepted the shaky and unsatisfactory truce. The Reds then took over a big portion of Indochina, while our leaders stood by, piously pledging that they would not condone any agreements which would provide for the enslavement of free peoples. In the meantime, 7 million Vietnamese were committed into Communist bondage through the Indochina armistice agreement.

What is even more tragic, is that the unity of the free world has been crumbling under the inept leadership of our Government during the past 21 months. Further, in the face of new Communist advances, our administration has been cutting back our military, mutual security, and anti-Communist propaganda appropriations.

How sadly does this great crusade compare with the record of the past Democratic administration which stopped communism in Greece, Turkey, Iran, and Berlin; which blocked Red progress in Europe with the Marshall plan and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization; which fostered the free world alliance and frustrated Communist plans for the underdeveloped areas through the point 4 program; and which led in stopping Communist aggression in Korea.

Voting record, 83d Cong.

Stand	Issue	Status
	INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS	
Voted for	Mutual security program [1]	Approved.
Voted for	Renewal of the reciprocal trade agreements program [1]	Approved.
Voted against	High-tariff Simpson bill	Defeated.
Voted for	Simplification of United States customs procedures [1]	Approved.
Voted for	Emergency Migration Act (refugee relief bill)	Approved.
Voted for	Making agricultural surpluses available to needy nations	Approved.
Voted for	Resolution opposing admission of Red China to the United Nations	Approved.
Voted for	Resolution condemning Soviet enslavement of free peoples	Approved.
	NATIONAL DEFENSE AND INTERNAL SECURITY	
Voted against	$5 billion Air Force cut, and resultant cutback of our airpower	Approved.
Voted against	Deep cuts for civil defense and atomic energy	Approved.
Voted for	Revision of specialists' draft law [1]	Approved.
Voted for	$450 million naval patrol and submarine vessel construction program	Approved.
Voted for	Establishment of U. S. Air Force Academy	Approved.
Voted for	Restricted use of wiretapped evidence in cases involving treason	Pending.
Voted for	Revocation of United States citizenship of convicted traitors	Pending.
Voted for	Inclusion of words "under God" in Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag	Approved.
	NATIONAL ECONOMY	
Voted for	6-month extension of excess-profits tax [1]	Approved.
Voted for	Reduction in excise taxes and repeal of theater admission tax [1]	Approved.
Voted for	Omnibus revision of the Internal Revenue Code	Approved.
Voted for	Increase in personal tax exemptions to a minimum of $700	Defeated.
Voted for	$966 million highway construction assistance program [1]	Approved.
Voted against	Subterfuge attempt to "abolish" the RFC by changing its name	Approved.
Voted against	Giveaway provisions in authorization of sale of Government rubber plants	Approved.
Voted for	Extension of duration and increase of unemployment compensation rates [1]	Defeated.
Voted against	Increase in first-class postal rates	Defeated.
Opposed	Raising the ceiling on the national debt	Pending.
Favored	Revision of the Taft-Hartley Act	Pending.
	NATURAL RESOURCES	
Voted against	Giveaway of tidelands oil resources, valued between $70 and $200 billion	Approved.
Favored	Oil revenue from outer Continental Shelf for educational purposes	Defeated.
Voted against	Giveaway of Federal regulatory power over certain natural-gas companies	Approved.
Voted against	Giveaway of Government control over power and regulation of atomic energy	Approved.
Opposed	Giveaway of mineral resources under certain public lands	Pending.
Opposed	Giveaway of public grazing lands	Pending.
Voted for	St. Lawrence seaway	Approved.
	GOVERNMENT REORGANIZATION	
Voted for	Renewal of President's authority to reorganize executive departments [1]	Approved.
Voted for	Statehood for Hawaii and Alaska	Pending.
Voted for	Government reorganization plans (Departments of Defense, Health, etc.)	Approved.
	VETERANS AND SERVICEMEN	
Voted for	Family allowances to dependents of servicemen [1]	Approved.
Voted for	Direct housing loans to veterans [1]	Approved.
Voted for	Automatic renewal of Government life insurance [1]	Approved.
Voted for	Income-tax exemptions for servicemen on combat duty [1]	Approved.
Voted for	Increase in veterans' pensions, compensation, and survivors' benefits [1]	Approved.
Voted for	Extension of Korean veterans' GI bill of rights and housing benefits [1]	Approved.
Voted for	Changing of Armistice Day, November 11, to Veterans' Day	Approved.
Opposed	Increased interest rates on veterans' housing loans	Approved.
	AGRICULTURE	
Voted for	Emergency aid to drought and disaster areas	Approved.
Voted for	Federal regulation of trading in coffee	Approved.
Voted for	Sale of $1 billion of surplus agricultural commodities	Approved.
Voted for	Omnibus farm program bill	Pending.
Opposed	Increased interest rates on Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act loans	Approved.
	SOCIAL SECURITY, HEALTH, AND WELFARE	
Voted for	Extension of the National Housing Act [1]	Approved.
Voted for	Increased FHA authority to insure housing loans, with new safeguards [1]	Approved.
Voted for	Federal aid for survey and construction of medical facilities [1]	Approved.
Voted for	Federal aid to schools in defense areas and for vocational rehabilitation [1]	Approved.
Voted for	1954 Amendments to the Social Security Act [1]	Approved.
Voted for	Coordination of Wisconsin State retirement funds with social security	Approved.
Voted for	Allowing full benefits under social security and railroad retirement [1]	Approved.
Voted for	Factory inspection by Food and Drug Administration [1]	Approved.

[1] Denotes extension or modification of a program originated by past administrations.

Rollcall record

	Total rollcalls	Paired	Not voting	Absent on roll and quorum calls [1]
1st sess.	123	8	1	5
2d sess. (through Aug. 11, 1954)	140	3	0	5

[1] Absence on quorum calls does not necessarily mean a legislative day's absence.

Restoration of Seized Property of Enemy Aliens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 12, 1954

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the New York Times, which I now send to the desk.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IN THE NATION

(By Arthur Krock)

A MOST UNUSUAL APPROACH TO MAKING POLICY

WASHINGTON, August 11.—The administration has followed a curious course with respect to Senator DIRKSEN's bill to restore to German and Japanese nationals their properties which the United States seized during the Second World War. And if, as represented to this correspondent by an official in a position to know the facts, the Executive deliberately revealed to Congress the sharp differences in its thinking on this and kindred proposals—culminating in the President's notice to Chancellor Adenauer that none of these has "the approval of my administration"—the procedure almost merits the word "unique."

There have been many instances, increasing as the size of the Federal establishment increased, of lack of Executive coordination in the making and carrying out of policy. No matter how many coordinators were superimposed on the coordinators already busy on their job, administrations have frequently spoken with two or more dissonant voices and their left and right hands have appeared not to belong to the same official corpus. In the Eisenhower regime, from its beginning, this divergence as to what are administration policy and position—especially on international and military matters—has occurred between the White House and an executive department as well as among the departments themselves.

But on each occasion, as during past administrations, the conflict has been traced to garrulity, or faulty coordination, or poor briefing, or the failure of one of those concerned, sometimes because of overwork, to discern the line of policy.

In their testimony on the Dirksen bill, however, authorized spokesmen for the Departments of State and Justice gave directly conflicting counsel to Congress and revealed in so doing that they knew it was conflicting. The Secretary of State told a Senate Judiciary subcommittee there was "no objection from the foreign policy viewpoint" to returning the wartime seized property to its original owners, yet on the previous day an Assistant Attorney General had strongly opposed the legislation on both legal and practical grounds. Moreover, the representative of the Department of Justice had assured Congress he was expressing the policy of the administration in favor of another bill, by which the assets would be liquidated and the proceeds turned over to the War Claims Commission for settlement of claims of United States citizens.

When the President thereafter got a letter from Chancellor Adenauer giving reasons why he hoped for a solution generally favorable to the Dirksen plan, the President did not support the position either of State or of Justice. He markedly failed to echo Secretary Dulles' conditional statement to the subcommittee that "insofar as the problem involved matters of foreign policy, I would have no hesitation in recommending adoption of legislation along the general lines of this [Dirksen] bill." And, in effect, the President disavowed the Assistant Attorney General's assertion that the administration favored the war-claims proposal.

Secretary Dulles' comment on the President's letter was that he understood he was reflecting the administration's views in what he told the Senate subcommittee, but that the situation was confused. Since this understatement, worthy of the British Foreign Office at its best, was not notably clarifying, this correspondent sought enlightenment as follows in a quarter close to the President:

Question. Is it an instance of Executive freewheeling, a misunderstanding, or what?

Answer. You can call it freewheeling, but it was not in any way a misunderstanding. The legislation was fully and often discussed in administration councils, and the apparent divergence of attitude between the two departments was known to all concerned before it was stated to the subcommittee.

Question. Was it known that the divergence would be expressed as it was, and was this course approved?

Answer. Both answers are "Yes." The President does not ask the Secretary of State to oppose legislation which the Secretary believes would be helpful within his area, or to advocate what he believes would not be, when Congress asks for his opinion. Also, the President does not ask the Attorney General to refrain from advising Congress of legal objections he may find to proposed legislation when his testimony is sought. And it is unnecessary to add that the President does not ask him to certify as legal or equitable what he believes to be illegal or inequitable.

Question. Isn't it more usual and desirable for administration policy to be made before Congress asks what it is?

Answer. As a general and almost invariable proposition, yes. But in this matter the administration, as the President said, has not fixed on any measure expressing its policy. And this seemed the best way to explore the complexities of the problem and come eventually to the best solution.

Maybe the procedure will prove out. But, as noted above, it is curious.

Long Range Versus Short Sight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 9, 1954

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, out of the conflicting reports and developments of the congressional sessions has come at least one clear-cut picture of the differences which will be carried by the political parties into the November elections. For the first time in 20 years, a Republican-dominated program was presented to the Congress and substantially adopted. The Democrats, who had gloated for two decades over the failure of the Republicans to develop an outline of legislative opposition, found themselves in the same position and showed little, if any, legislative direction or strength.

As a direct result of this reversal of positions, the Democrats found themselves engaging in forensic rear-guard actions, futile maneuvers, and presented only occasional stopgap suggestions of little serious merit. Often they directed exclusive attention toward election issues as distinguished from vital national considerations. Their sights seemed bounded by November, where Republican efforts were focused on the long-range objectives of national policies, foreign and domestic. The coming months will determine whether or not the long-range view is better than the short sight.

Address by Ralph E. Becker to William L. Ward Republican Club, of the Town of Rye, N. Y.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 9, 1954

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, notwithstanding his death occurred more than 20 years ago, the works and spirit of the Honorable William L. Ward still live on in Westchester County, N. Y., for it was he who, more than any other man, made Westchester, a part of which I have the honor to represent, the greatest county in the world.

Mr. Ward was my friend and my leader. Politically, he was a genius. This was recognized and acknowledged by those who did not share his stalwart Republicanism. He was called the boss of Westchester and a benevolent despot, but not unkindly, for his forthrightness and his fairness were respected even by those with whom he locked horns.

Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to me, I include as a part of these remarks an address by my friend of many years, Ralph E. Becker, Esq., of Port Chester, N. Y., and Washington, D. C., at the dedication of the William L. Ward Club, of the town of Rye, N. Y., on May 18, 1954, at Port Chester:

Mr. Chairman, County President Hopkins, Judge Schmidt, and fellow members, it is good to be here. This is my hometown, and it is never far from my thoughts, because my heart is here. It is difficult to convey the great pleasure that comes from looking out over this audience and seeing the many faces of old, familiar friends.

The purpose of our gathering tonight marks a significant contribution to the Republican Party, and to the people of Westchester—the dedication of a new Republican Club to the memory of a man, great in the history of our county, and in the national history of our party, on the 100th anniversary of that party. This is particularly appropriate when, for the first time in 20 years, we have a Republican administration in Washington, as well as in Albany and in White Plains.

One hundred years ago, in a small American community of 6,000 people, the Republican Party was born. Gathered that night in a 1-room schoolhouse, 53 Americans were gravely concerned about the future of this country. Whigs, Free-soilers, and Jeffersonian Democrats—men of diverse interests united by the common bond of love of country, of fear that the United States was to be split asunder; men, resolute in their common effort to preserve the Union. The need of the hour was a new party, a party that would unite their efforts to further this common cause. Small, but with a cause that was great, they called themselves "the Republican Party."

A primary problem was to combat the forces which would extend human slavery into the new frontiers then being established in this great country. Their decision was far-reaching. It was to enlist the young and vigorous men and women of a young, vigorous country in a party dedicated to the simple, but sacred, premise of preserving human liberties and the inherent dignity of the individual.

The Negro has tried a century-long road in his legislative and judicial battle for freedom and equality. The first milestone was the Emancipation Proclamation of 1863 by the country's first Republican President, Abraham Lincoln. Notable Court decisions document this battle since 1849—the infamous Dred Scott case of 1857 against the Negro—the Thompson Restaurant case in June 1953 for the Negro, and now on May 17, 1954, a unanimous decision by the Supreme Court to strike out the old separate, but equal doctrine established by *Plessy* v. *Ferguson* in 1897.

How appropriate and timely it is for the Supreme Court, speaking through Chief Justive Earl Warren—former Governor of California and a distinguished Young Republican alumnus—to conclude, on this century anniversary of the Republican Party, that separate educational facilities are inherently unequal, and that the Negro, by reason of the segregation complained of, is deprived of the equal protection of the laws guaranteed by the 14th amendment. The Court does not speak of a social system at all, nor of that equality that produces interracial marriages. It speaks simply of a system of human rights which is foreshadowed in the Declaration of Independence, which stated that "all men are created equal."

Within 6 short years of its foundation, the Republican Party became the dominant party in the Nation. It failed in its first presidential election, but the courage and vision of its few founders could not be defeated. Seven years later, in 1861, a year of dire peril to the Union, Abraham Lincoln became President.

Tonight we are here to dedicate a memorial to one whose philosophy of life was devoted to the same human liberty, to the same system of human rights about which Chief Justice Warren spoke so eloquently—to William L. Ward, the greatest Republican leader of our country, whose love and devotion to those liberties and rights placed him in national prominence, and endeared him to the particular affection of all those who knew him.

I must recount a few highlights of the life of Mr. Ward because there are few today who remember him for the great leader that he was. Little or nothing was published about him during his lifetime. He avoided publicity to a remarkable extent for a man of such broad and varied affairs. Even in Westchester County, the newspaper files on his personal activities are surprisingly meager. In this connection, I am indebted for material, as I have been on many other occasions, to my good friends Eddie Hughes, Hugh Robertson, Miss Jane Todd, vice chairman, Republican State Committee, and to our lovable Judge Frederick P. Close, one of Mr. Ward's intimate advisers for 20 years.

William L. Ward was born in Greenwich in 1856, 2 years after the birth of the Republican Party, the son of devout, hard-working, respected Quakers, who moved to Port Chester when he was 7 years old and lived in what we have known for years as Ward's Castle.

His early life was spent in the Quaker atmosphere of piety, serenity, and honesty of purpose. While attending Friends Seminary in New York City, he worked during vacations at the Russell, Burdsall and Ward Nut & Bolt Co., a firm organized by his father and two partners shortly after their arrival in Port Chester.

He worked side by side with his father's employees in the factory, wearing overalls, learning their problems first-hand. The conspicuous absence of labor difficulties at his plants in subsequent years is a direct outgrowth of the understanding he gained in this fashion. This knowledge also proved invaluable to him in the later years, when an understanding of the working peoples' problems was requisite to effective political leadership.

When his business affairs were off to a good start, Mr. Ward began to take active part in politics, an interest that was to grow through the years. He was a staunch Republican from the time he cast his first vote, and for some years thereafter occupied minor roles in politics in the town of Rye.

William L. Ward's real entrance into the political arena was made at the age of 37. He was then a man of maturity and wisdom, a strong individualist, and one of those rare personalities who dominate the world around him, but yet never lose sight of the individual worth of man.

Once he decided to enter politics, he did so with his whole heart, and with a fighting spirit that took him to the top in a few brief years. Westchester was then a Democratic stronghold and the chances of building up the Republican organization were slim indeed. Mr. Ward's services as town chairman had won him some recognition, but he had no strong desire for public office. Nevertheless, when the candidate who had been selected withdrew at the last moment, he found himself running for Congress in apposition to the Democratic incumbent, Benjamin L. Fairchild. The contest was bitter, but when the votes were counted, Mr. Ward had been elected.

In the House of Representatives, his record won the esteem and respect of his associates. He was appointed to several important committees, and was instrumental in the legislation which established the waterway known as Ambrose Channel in New York Harbor. Perhaps the highlight of his career as a legislator, however, was his vote against the declaration of war with Spain.

The sinking of the *Maine* had inflamed the country against the Spaniards. An influential portion of the press clamored for war and the people were aroused, but as a Quaker, Ward felt he could not vote for war. He faced a difficult decision and he discussed the matter with his close friend, President McKinley, before making up his mind. At the end of that talk, the President put his hand on Ward's shoulder and said "Bill, vote as your conscience tells you."

With two other Representatives, he voted against the declaration of war. It was an unpopular vote, and it illustrates his courage in the face of opposition—a characteristic sadly lacking during recent years among some of our public officials.

On his return from Congress, he continued to strengthen the Republican Party in Westchester. He found strong opposition and dissatisfaction on every side. In April of 1900, a decisive primary battle was staged with Mount Vernon and New Rochelle the leading battlegrounds. In this fight, he used so many carriages to bring voters to the polls that it was the subject of newspaper comment in New York City—in fact, he even employed such modern means as bringing voters in by automobile.

From then on, the Republican organization began to function and gain momentum. He fought hard to win control of county offices and obtain a majority on the board of supervisors. Prominent on the Ward team in fighting the good fight for Republicanism were Percy Barrett, the leader of northern Westchester County; his brother, Henry B. Barrett, long-time secretary of the county committee; William Wallin, former mayor of Yonkers; George Werner, of Rye, N. Y., former sheriff and commissioner of public welfare; and Benjamin I. Taylor. All of these men helped William L. Ward make Westchester County a model for other counties throughout the State and the Nation. In this connection we must not forget our distinguished Judge Schmidt, who will soon be retiring from the appellate division. He began his career many, many years ago, in the Ward days, as village clerk of the village of Port Chester. Judge Schmidt helped carry on the leadership which has made the town of Rye famous in county politics for the past half century.

Ward was the leader of the Theodore Roosevelt forces at the Chicago convention in 1912. He made a gallant but unsuccessful fight for his candidate. When the party split that year, Ward refused an invitation to the White House, according to Victor Rosewater, then Republican national chairman. Moreover, he did not follow Roosevelt into the Bull Moose movement. In August 1912, he addressed the Westchester County Republican Committee at White Plains and proclaimed his intention of remaining with the party. He said, "Born in the Republican Party as I have been, I was a Republican at my first vote and I am a stronger Republican today." He urged the support of the regular nominee. In an age of individualists, one of the strongest of them, William Ward, could see the elementary requirements of a strong, united party. Remain he did, and through the years between 1912 and his death in 1933, Westchester County under his leadership grew and prospered. This militant Republicanism has been carried on by other county chairmen, Hon. Charles Griffith, now retiring as surrogate because of age, Livingston Platt, and presently Herbert Gerlach, They have continued to build on the granite foundations laid down by William L. Ward.

I first met William L. Ward in 1928. He told me then of his interest in young people and gave me a letter in which he authorized me to organize the young Republicans of Westchester County. Notwithstanding the greatness of his power as county chairman, there were many town chairmen and city leaders who bitterly opposed this organization of Young Republicans. In 1932, we formed the Association of New York State Young Republicans in Buffalo, N. Y., and Westchester was one of the big three. As a result, I was one of the founders in 1935 of the Young Republican National Federation, at Des Moines, Iowa. Had it not been for William L. Ward's help and his vision, I doubt that we would have gotten our start, and it would not have been possible for me to carry the Westchester torch outside this county.

This was the beginning of the Young Republican movement, which has given us Vice President Nixon; many Governors, including Thomas E. Dewey, Lt. Gov. Walter Mahoney; Senators such as Irving Ives; Congressmen such as Charlie Halleck; Chief Justice of the Supreme Court Earl Warren; Attorney General Brownell; County Supervisor and now our County President James Hopkins; legislators such as our own Frank McCullough, Malcolm Wilson, Hunter Meighan, and hosts of others.

A major achievement of Mr. Ward's career was the creation of the 9th Judicial District which was carried through with the able assistance of Judge Mills of Mount Vernon, N. Y. This occurred almost 50 years ago when Westchester was a part of the Second Judicial District with Kings, Queens, Richmond, and Suffolk Counties. To accomplish this, Mills became a State senator. After the bill was effective, Mills was elected to the bench and became Ward's adviser on matters pertaining to the judiciary. After the death of Mills, Judge J. Addison Young, of New Rochelle, became Ward's adviser, later being succeeded by Judge William Bleakley and Judge Frederick P. Close.

We owe to the inspiration and foresight of William L. Ward and his associates the magnificent recreation program we now have in Westchester. These wonderful parkways, golf courses, swimming pools and tennis courts are the realization of a Ward dream. He firmly believed that these free recreational activities for the whole family were an effective means of fighting communism. Mr. Ward had visited the President of the Columbus Gas & Electric Co. in Ohio, and while there, had been taken on a tour of the city, a very progressive one, and proud of its recreational facilities. When he returned to Westchester, he called Judge Close, told him of the trip and said "I've just talked to Mrs. Eugene Meyer (wife of the publisher of the Washington Post) and she is willing to spend some time on this, but I don't want it paid by the county. I want the county to appropriate $8,500 from the board of supervisors to educate the towns, cities, and villages in order that they develop and pay for their own recreation commissions." It is significant that the present commissioner, Don Strossen, started on the recreation fields of Westchester as a young man. Also one of the first members of the commission was Mrs. Thomas Blaine, of Port Chester.

Few people, including many officials who felt close to him, realized that Mr. Ward's habit of omnivorous reading was greatly responsible for the development of the health service of the county. In the 1920's, Mr. Ward became interested in a book which dealt with medical problems in Holland and methods employed there for the care of people generally, and particularly for the care of the poor. He had translations made of the standard works of Dutch authors, and was so impressed by their system that he made a special trip to Holland to study it. After his return he consulted outstanding authorities here and thus began the legislation leading to the Grasslands Hospital and Clinic.

William L. Ward had a strong conviction that no person in public office should contribute to any campaign fund. He felt a man in office must first be completely honest, then industrious and efficient, and he didn't believe you could get that kind of man by seeking campaign contributions. Public officials must be entirely free and independent in order to perform their duties properly.

A trusted associate, Miss Jane Todd, who was brought to Republican county headquarters by Charlie Millard, of Tarrytown, another member of the Ward team, immediately after women were given the vote back in 1920, and was the first woman member of the county committee, has told me some of the "firsts" of Ward's activities. He was a great believer in social welfare and created the first department of social welfare in the State of New York, with J. Everett Macy as chairman. That work in Westchester County set the pattern for the rest of the State of New York. Mr. Ward established the first children's court in the State of New York, and was instrumental in the first old-age legislation, in a bill presented by Senator Seabury Mastick, of Pleasantville, as well as the first workman's compensation bill presented by Congressman Mayhew Wainwright, of Rye.

Mr. Ward served as national committeeman from New York from 1904 for many years. Although he sought no personal honor, he was always at the top councils of national and State politics.

William L. Ward was the last of a distinguished group of political chieftains and one of the few who died without being stripped of his power, though it was challenged many times. He was recognized as a political genius, a leader whose benevolence and vision is a lasting monument to Westchester history. Politics was a game he played because he loved it. His was a life of achievement distinguished with magnificent victories and tempered with just enough defeats to make the victories seem sweeter. He knew how to say "no" and often did so. Lee Parsons Davis, now retiring as a justice of the supreme court, was one of our great trial lawyers. When he was nominated, then elected, as district attorney as an insurgent, he defeated William L. Ward's candidate. Ward immediately lashed out against Davis, and reduced his salary from $10,000 to $7,500. Davis, nevertheless, later became his friend and also a law partner of Fred Close.

He maintained the utmost degree of political discipline in the ranks, and left many examples of good organization for our party to follow at this time.

He believed strongly that a team is no better than the captain who leads it. In the final analysis, ultimate responsibility for success or failure falls upon some single individual.

Perhaps the Ward "no" which caused the greatest consternation in the party ranks was in his fight with Governor Ben Odell. In 1921, when there was a vacancy in the Appellate Division, Benjamin Odell insisted on the apointment of Judge Arthur Tompkins of Nyack whose qualifications were unquestioned. Tompkins had everything but the approval of Ward and that he could not get because of his alliance with Odell. Ward directed the appointment of J. Addison Young. A few years later while Tompkins was grand master of the Masons of the State of New York, Ward again opposed his nomination as Governor which may have changed the course of political history.

His independence was even stronger on matters affecting Westchester County. In 1897, one of Senator Platt's lieutenants, Comptroller Glenn, attacked Mr. Ward, who commented in one of his few public statements that "Mr. Glenn accuses us of lax management and of involving our financial affairs. These charges are false. We believe in giving the people good government and looking after politics later."

William L. Ward lived in an age of big men—men big in their thinking, big in their planning, and big in their achievements. But the age of big men is not over—you here in Westchester recall this man who lived during your own lives, a man you have chosen to honor by dedicating this memorial to him. His life is over, his record is written—it is you who have issued a challenge to yourselves. You have named this memorial after Ward, and by so doing you have incurred an obligation. That obligation is to dedicate yourselves, as he did, to good government, to the Republican Party, and to the future of this great country. An obligation which is currently being undertaken in such able fashion by County President Jimmy Hopkins.

We in Westchester are particularly fortunate. Over the years, as I have traveled these United States, I have often called Westchester the "garden spot of creation, and the bulwark of Republicanism." That is not an idle slogan—you see about you every day the natural beauties which support that statement. It is the result of the political craftsmanship of William L. Ward, who devoted his energies to bettering his community, improving its government and the living standards of its citizens.

But whether we live in one part of the country or another, we are faced with one national problem—one common national enemy—irresponsible government. We have seen the result of 20 years of political corruption. Our great tragedy is that the Government of the United States has been in the control of shrewd men, skilled in political manipulation, but wholly uninformed in the American system of human rights—men without the faintest conception of the principles of good representative government.

Now a change has been made and we have a great, new, national leader—President Eisenhower. In the comparatively brief time he has been in office we have taken major steps toward reestablishing a responsible, truthful, competent, and soundly progressive government. This is a major achievement, particularly when one stops to recall the domestic political and economic chaos he inherited, to say nothing of our impossible foreign relations.

We Republicans have a gigantic job to do for America and for the world. But it requires more than leadership, more than cooperation—it requires coordination as well.

The great individualists of our history understood this. They, and their teachings must not be forgotten for it is they who contributed to building up the great county of Westchester, the Empire State, and the Nation. In their years, they were concerned with the growth of a world. Yes; they were big men—but today we need even bigger men with bigger ideas. Thus we will be able to keep the Republican Party great, the country great, and this State great.

They represented causes which were at times unpopular, and in so doing they encountered criticism, but they were dedicated to a task, and their achievements stand as an everlasting memorial.

William L. Ward was a great, a colorful American—a man of great political and business vision, a man of great intellect and complete courage, a man of great kindness and honesty and honor. If the William L. Ward Republican Club lives on in his spirit of service, it will do tremendous good for the community, as he did.

The giants of the Republican Party bequeathed us this magnificent heritage—and an obligation to continue the work they began so well.

This is a sacred trust, one that must not be betrayed, if your children and mine are to live and grow in a free world.

AFL Council Won't Back GOP

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 9, 1954

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, it will not come as news that the American Federation of Labor does not like the Republican 83d Congress. The report of its council finds one bright spot in the picture, despite its jaundiced view of the overall record. In the field of social-security extension, the AFL approves the broadening of old-age coverage and increased benefits. In every other area, national defense, the Taft-Hartley Act, taxation, national economy, and foreign policy, the spokesmen of the A. F. of L. had nothing but harsh words for the 83d Congress.

There is no disposition in Washington to take this criticism lightly. No administration, in recent years, has given harder thought to the overriding issues of national defense and foreign policy. The changes in our military preparations ranging from a concentration upon new weapons and techniques to the authorization of a new Air Academy give ample evidence of this truth. Our constant efforts to amend the Taft-Hartley Act were defeated by the Democrats who refused to accept moderate amendments for political purposes, and the revision of our tax laws to encourage continued expansion of the national economy somehow never satisfy official labor spokesmen, despite their purposes.

The voters will have their opportunity to decide on November 2 between Democrats who cringe before such groups as the A. F. of L. council and the Republican majority which has been seeking to do a balanced, long-term job.

Statement of C. R. Gutermuth, Vice President of the Wildlife Management Institute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 9, 1954

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, when the Interior appropriation bill was before the House I submitted an amendment that would provide additional funds for administration of the Fish and Wildlife Service so that administrative costs could be paid by the general appropriations and revenue derived from the sale of duck stamps would be devoted entirely to the purposes for which the fund was established.

In his testimony before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs Subcommittee on Public Lands, Mr. C. R. Gutermuth traced the origins of the campaign to secure revenue for the acquisition of wildlife refuges by means of the sale of duck stamps and told the committee how the money had been used in the past and why a need for additional appropriations was becoming more necessary.

Mr. Gutermuth's testimony will be of interest to all sportsmen and conservationists who participate in this program. His statement follows:

STATEMENT OF C. R. GUTERMUTH, VICE PRESIDENT OF THE WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT INSTITUTE, BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS, JUNE 29, 1954, WASHINGTON, D. C.

Mr. GUTERMUTH. My name is C. R. Gutermuth. I am vice president of the Wildlife Management Institute, of Washington, D. C., one of the oldest, private, national institutions, or national conservation organizations in this country. The institute is dedicated to the better management and wise utilization of renewable natural resources in the public interest, and the continuing efforts of this nonprofit organization date back to 1911.

Mr. Chairman, I hurried back from a business trip to Texas because it was felt that we should submit a brief statement. It would have been much better if the institute president, Dr. Ira N. Gabrielson, was not out of the city and could have appeared since he is familiar with all of the many attempts to get satisfactory migratory-bird legislation enacted prior to the passage of the Duck Stamp Act, and he was the former Chief of the United States Biological Survey and the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, and had charge of the spending of the Duck Stamp Act revenue for several years.

Prior to Dr. Gabrielson's coming with the institute, this private organization played a prominent part in securing the enactment of the duck stamp bill. We also supported the increase of the fee from $1 to $2 in 1949. We had not been quite satisfied with the comparatively small amount that had been used for land acquisition and development, but like all of the others, it was thought that the bulk of the increased revenue would be used to purchase urgently needed refuge and game management lands.

Now then, as far back as in 1951, Carl D. Shoemaker of the National Wildlife Federation started to call attention to the relatively small amount of duck stamp money that was being used for land acquisition and development. The sportsmen across the country did not become aroused, however, until they discovered what was planned for next year, 1955–56, upon the insistence of the Bureau of the Budget.

It should be reiterated that the institute has not been too disturbed by the use that has been made of this special contribution on the part of the wildfowlers. The money obviously has gone for the conducting of important phases of the waterfowl problem.

It was stated, I believe during this hearing, that a substantial portion of this money has been used for other refuges, big game refuges, and so forth. I do not think that the record will bear that out. I do not think that there has been any substantial amount of the duck stamp money actually used for the acquisition, development, or even the maintenance of the big game refuges across the country that are operated by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service.

Up to and including 1953, as shown by the enclosed statement, more than $5,300,000 of the $35,839,551 collected was used for land acquisition and another $5,400,000 was budgeted for use in 1954. Still another $9,400,000 was used for refuge development, and $3,600,000 for enforcement, making a total of $23,700,000 for good and legitimate purposes. No, what we are concerned about is the trend starting with 1954, as shown by the enclosed chart that was prepared for us by United States Fish and Wildlife Service.

You will observe from this chart that the operation and maintenance figure is going to $2,200,000 in 1955–56, and that land acquisition has dropped to practically nothing in next year's budget prospectus. We contend, and Representatives LEE METCALF and LEON H. GAVIN made it abundantly clear in their talks on the floor of the House on April 6, 1954, during the debate on the Interior appropriation bill, that the sportsmen are opposed to this diversion of heir duck-stamp fees, money which they asked to be collected for the extension and development of the national waterfowl refuge system. While the use may be legal as far as the law is concerned, there can be no doubt but that this money is not going to be utilized for the purpose for which it was intended. The sportsmen definitely feel that this is a violation of a trust.

Thank you. That concludes my statement, unless there should be some questions on the tables that we have prepared.

One table deals with the complete use of duck-stamp money since the enactment of the act. It shows clearly the acreage that has been purchased, the acreage listed, the acres that were transferred to the Service, the cost involved in the conducting of the appraisals, titles, and so forth, and the amount of the land transferred, and it covers certain facts as to the use of the money. I hope that this statement can be inserted into the RECORD.

Mr. D'EWART. Without objection, the statement will be made a part of the record at this point.

(The statement referred to is as follows:)

Migratory bird conservation fund (duck stamp)

Total duck-stamp funds collected as of June 30, 1953	$35, 839, 551

Expended previous years and budgeted for fiscal year ending June 30, 1954

Activity	Expended, 1935–53	Budgeted, 1954	Total
Post office (printing and handling)	$421, 557	$155, 706	$577, 263
Purchase of waterfowl refuges [1]	5, 367, 125	1, 125, 250	6, 492, 375
Enforcement and waterfowl surveys	2, 999, 058	610, 850	3, 609, 908
Migratory waterfowl research	2, 274, 777	747, 600	3, 022, 377
Refuge development	8, 471, 068	954, 943	9, 426, 011
Operations and maintenance	10, 008, 668	1, 812, 107	11, 820, 775
Total	29, 542, 253	5, 406, 456	34, 948, 709

[1] Purchase of waterfowl refuges:

Cost of land acquisition, appraisals, surveys, title examinations, fiscal years 1935–53

200,329 acres purchased (average per acre, $13.22)	$2, 766, 635
16,815 acres leased (average per acre, $1.19)	20, 046
2,167,926 acres transferred, etc	----------
2,394,070 acres controlled, cost to service	2, 786, 681
11,835 acres under contract for purchase (cost per acre, $55.20)	654; 122
2,404,905 acres (total), total land cost	3, 440, 803
Cost of appraisals, surveys, titles administration (per acre, 80 cents)	1, 926, 322
Total	5, 367, 125

Mr. GUTERMUTH. Now, about this other statement entitled "Where Your Duck Stamp Money Is Going," it also contains a chart that was prepared by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service. It shows the projected use of money, starting back in the beginning, and you can follow the lines showing the amount of money that has been utilized for land acquisition, and going across, you can see the sudden drop to virtually nothing in acquisition for 1955–56. It shows the amount that was expended for development, and it shows a similar drop to virtually nothing.

At the same time, the heavy black line shows the bulk of this money that was collected from the sportsmen at their request, and the amount increased at their request, which they intended would be used primarily, as I think there has been ample testimony to show, for the acquisition and development of the national waterfowl refuge system. Now, however, we find that in the future this money, practically all of it, is going to operation and maintenance.

Conversely, there has been a corresponding decrease in the amount of funds appropriated annually by the Congress for the carrying on of the routine operational programs of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service.

We are not protesting that the operation and maintenance program has not been adequate. We are not too unhappy about the use that has been made of the money. We feel the money has gone for good purposes. Maybe proportions have not been quite as everyone would like, but the use has not been too bad, as I indicated. Twenty-three million seven hundred thousand dollars, as I pointed out above, out of $35,800,000 has been used about as the sportsmen intended. We have not been too critical about the past. What we are concerned about is the ever-upward trend toward operating expense uses and in the coming year practically all of the money obviously is going for maintenance and operation. So we are concerned primarily about the future use; that is, maybe I should say the recent and future use, because you will see that in about 1953 and 1954 the trend started up and it is going clear to the top now.

The first upward trend shown by this dotted line here, starting in 1950, 1951, and 1952, was brought about largely, I presume, by the fact that the revenue had been increased in 1949 and the first money, I suppose, became available in about 1950, so the trend in some of the uses naturally had to go up slightly, but in 1953 and 1954, you see, the line begins to go almost off the top of the chart.

Mr. Young. Does your chart mean that in the fiscal year 1955 there will be $100,000 spent for land acquisition?

Mr. Gutermuth. Yes; and $300,000 for development, and a total between $2,200,000 and $2,300,000 for maintenance and operation.

Mr. Young. Do you think the Government has kept faith with the duck hunters in utilizing funds for operation and maintenance?

Mr. Gutermuth. Definitely not. I recall many of the statements that were made at the time this act was passed. I recall the record quite clearly and ample testimony was presented during the hearings, bringing out the urgent need then, as now, for additional refuge- and game-management lands in this country.

The sportsmen, you might say, have on their own initiative asked Congress to increase the fee from $1 to $2. Their thoughts definitely were to increase the refuge program and help to compensate for some of the loss in wildlife habitat lands through drainage and other types of uses, human uses of the land for commercial agricultural purposes.

I definitely feel—and this is representative of the feeling generally throughout the country—that this use is inconsistent with the intent and purpose of this legislation as originally enacted.

Mr. Young. What would you recommend, in brief—that a certain portion of the funds be earmarked for acquisition?

Mr. Gutermuth. I have not given much consideration to that, but apparently that would be the only safe solution because it is obvious—and I do not mean to be critical of the Bureau of the Budget in this general statement—there always is a great temptation to try to finance routine operations out of a fund of this kind if the money is available. I think the only safe solution would be to modify the law in such a way so that a specific portion is set aside and allocated for land acquisition and development, as intended by the sportsmen who are paying this fee voluntarily.

Showdown on Atomic Energy for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 9, 1954

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, when the historians come to analyze the trends of the past 20 years, they will cite the recognition of the Soviet Union by the United States as a turning point in the growth of Communist power. Ever since then, the authority of the Soviets has grown at a rapid pace. A strong case undoubtedly could be made out to prove that this was inevitable, with or without American recognition, but our stand certainly did nothing to impede the process.

Now we are faced with a new decisive point affecting world history. Last December, in a magnificent address before the U. N., President Eisenhower asked for world cooperation in developing the atom for peacetime purposes. Soviet Russia to date has adopted the view that the atomic bomb must be banned before anything of a peaceful nature can be projected for atomic energy. The program is too important, however, to permit its loss because of Russian obstinacy. Britain, Canada, and France are prepared to work with our own Government. Here is an opportunity for the demonstration that Uncle Sam has no war plans with respect to any country. By pooling our efforts with our friends we shall make it clear throughout the world that we do not come to destroy, but to fulfill.

Grazing Bill Rider

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 12, 1954

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, on August 10, 1954, the United States Senate attached to the Agriculture Act of 1954, S. 3052, an amendment by Senator Anderson, of New Mexico, which has been identified as 7-20-54-A.

This amendment was adopted by a vote of 45 yeas to 41 nays, and in effect grants property rights and special privileges to 18,000 grazing permittees who use our national forests. This amendment prejudices the rights of the other 160 million people in the United States, and in particular those 35 million people who last year took recreational visits to our national forests.

Over 10 million of that number were hunters and fishermen. For an example of how important it is that this amendment not be favorably considered is indicated in the attached telegram which I have just received from the widow of one of the most outstanding conservationists of our country, Mrs. Cornelia Bryce Pinchot.

The telegram of Mrs. Pinchot is as follows:

Washington, D. C., *August 11, 1954.*

Representative John P. Saylor,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

As chairman of the Forest Conservation Society of America and a longtime conservationist, I was distressed that the so-called stockman's grazing bill to which conservationists are almost unanimously opposed has been tacked on as a rider to the regular farm bill which is now in conference between the House and Senate. Urge you most earnestly to demand that this rider be struck out in conference. If, by what is essentially a legalistic trick, stockman's grazing bill is made into law, the administration of conservation on national forests will be gravely jeopardized. Moreover, I fear the effect will be most damaging for the Republican Party in the coming congressional elections. We dare not go before country as party of anticonservation, thus repeating the unfortunate errors of 1900.

Cornelia Bryce Pinchot
Mrs. Gifford Pinchot.

Time the Government Gets Out of Private Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 3, 1954

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I respectfully request permission to insert in the Record the following editorial which appeared in the Cleveland (Ohio) News on Thursday, July 22, 1954, which also reflects the opinion of the House of Representatives when we passed H. R. 9835.

The two previous Democratic administrations of socialistic philosophy put the Federal Government in direct competition with all sorts of private businesses. Power projects, for one thing, but far from the only thing.

Uncle Sam operates railroads, roasts coffee, makes and repairs furniture, drycleans and presses pants, operates laundries, manufactures rope and gas, makes ice cream and paint, is in the insurance business and banking business, retreads tires, builds, saws, wood, grows flowers ad infinitum.

Nobody in Washington today seems to know the full extent of the Government's area of competition with private business, or the actual count of Government plants, industries, shops, factories, and offices. There are at least 100 various types, however.

The total cost to the United States taxpayers of the Federal Government in business runs into billions of dollars every year.

This is known for a certainty.

President Eisenhower wants the Government to get out of this business wherever it is possible.

At his suggestion, the White House is now drafting a directive authorizing a complete inventory to show just where the Government is in competition against private business in order to come to grips with a major problem in the United States economy.

It is not easy for a new administration to change a course of Government action and policy followed for many years and remove Uncle Sam from private business. The power business, for example.

Every time some one suggests liquidating commercial-type Government operations, protests are loud upon the land and in Congress.

The House Government operations Committee this week is considering a variety of legislative proposals to halt United States competition with private firms where the competition is patently unfair and where private business can do the job better and cheaper.

Chances are remote that the House group will approve a bill creating a special Anti-Government Competition Board for weeding out Federal business activities.

Instead of the superboard which might be cumbersome, alternate proposals would designate the Secretary of Commerce to receive and to act on complaints about Government business activities.

Another would authorize the director of the Budget Bureau to make recommendations to the President whenever any Federal agency seeks to establish a new commercial or industrial activity.

Hundreds of representatives of businessmen's associations, taxpayers' groups and other organizations are testifying before the House committee hearings. All strongly favor such curbing legislation.

Legislation on the problem is mandatory, although noteworthy progress already has been made by the Department of Commerce under the Eisenhower administration.

There is nothing now to prevent a Federal agency from setting up a new competitive activity remote from Washington and actually unknown to the Commerce Department.

The practice of the Government doing things which can be better done at less cost by private industry must be ended—and as quickly as the President, his administration and Congress can do it.

Pan-American Highway Will Help Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 12, 1954

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an editorial entitled "Pan-American Highway Will Help Relations," published in the Jacksonville (Fla.) Times-Union of July 11, 1954.

The editorial relates to the work which has been done by the distinguished senior Senator from Florida [Mr. Holland] in the building of roads, not only in this country, but between the United States and the tip of South America. The Pan-American Highway is a part of this great highway system. The editorial relates also to his interest in linking Florida to this project by the eventual development of the ferry system from Florida to Cuba, and from Cuba to the Yucatan Peninsula.

The senior Senator from Florida was an active leader in the construction of this project, both on the floor of the Senate, as chairman of the Public Roads Subcommittee, and later as ranking minority member of that subcommittee.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PAN-AMERICAN HIGHWAY WILL HELP RELATIONS

Today will mark the beginning of the Pan-American Highway Congress in Caracas, Venezuela, a meeting at which Florida's Senator Spessard L. Holland will receive an award for contributing more than any other North American to linking the Americas with land transportation.

In addition to representing the United States at the Congress held last year in Mexico City, Senator Holland led the fight in the Senate which won an authorization of 7 years during which the highway is expected to be completed. He has been a leader, too, in the development of the Rama Road across Nicaragua and the highways in Cuba and Mexico, which would link Florida with the Pan-American Highway through ferry service across the Florida Straits and the Yucatan Channel.

In his efforts to strengthen our Latin American ties through such projects, Senator Holland reflects the interests of all Floridians. Serving as the gateway for air routes to the Caribbean and South America, Florida has a greater than average interest in the well-being of the neighbor states to the south, and has consistently supported projects designed to strengthen Pan-American unity.

Now about two-thirds complete to South America, the highway promises benefits far surpassing its cost. By permitting motorists to drive between the Americas, it should do much to improve feelings among the various peoples. Such a happening as the Communist assumption of power in Guatemala, for instance, would be much less likely if land traffic were flowing freely between Central America and the north. Our location on adjoining continents offers little advantage if we remain in isolation.

Senator Holland's honor is indeed well deserved. The sooner his efforts achieve their ultimate goal, the better it will be for the entire Western Hemisphere.

Eliminating Wasteful Government Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 12, 1954

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, because of the importance of eliminating wasteful Government expenditures, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the Record a broadcast I made on this subject with my wife, Emily Taft Douglas.

There being no objection, the broadcast was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

CUTTING OUT WASTEFUL GOVERNMENT SPENDING

Senator Douglas. This is your Senator, Paul H. Douglas, making his weekly report from Washington. With me is my wife, Emily Taft Douglas, and I'm going to let her choose the subject for discussion today.

Mrs. Douglas. Let's make it economy. With the high cost of living, I think everyone's interested in cutting out Government expense that's wasteful. You've advanced a lot of proposals in the Senate for economy. About how many would you say?

Senator Douglas. I've been asked that before, so I had the record checked. I proposed a total of about 350 cuts in specific items in appropriation and authorization bills. Had they all been adopted, we would have saved a total of around $8 billion.

Mrs. Douglas. You did have some major successes, didn't you? How much in all would you say that you have saved for the taxpayers?

Senator Douglas. The actual savings which I have been able to put into effect have totaled so far about a billion dollars, and amount to a continuing saving of about $200 million a year. I hope that goes on for a good many years.

Mrs. Douglas. Well, if every Senator succeeded in saving a billion dollars, it would be a tremendous total. Haven't you made some proposals for economy just in the last few weeks?

Senator Douglas. Yes. Recently I have been concentrating on two areas where great economies can be made. The first is the gigantic billion to $5-billion project for the upper Colorado River. The second is the rivers and harbors bill, amounting to another billion dollars. The rivers and harbors bill, commonly called the "porkbarrel bill," has at least a quarter of a billion dollars in wasteful expenditures.

Mrs. Douglas. The upper Colorado project is the one that includes a dam which would flood out the Dinosaur National Monument; isn't it?

Senator Douglas. Yes, it includes the Echo Park Dam in the Dinosaur National Monument.

Mrs. Douglas. That has interested me in another way, because that area has been called a primitive paradise and a unique historic monument. The fossil remains at Dinosaur Monument are very valuable, and the area contains some of the most marvelous natural scenery in the world.

Senator Douglas. It is one of the most beautiful places in the country, and with proper trails it would be a source of inspiration to hundreds of thousands of Americans. It is also unique because imbedded in the rocks are the fossil remains of the dinosaurs that once roamed the earth. It is a priceless natural museum of the history of the earth.

Mrs. Douglas. Priceless and irreparable if it once were flooded. But I suppose if it were a tremendously economical thing to build a dam at that location, there is something to be said for it.

Senator Douglas. It is not an economy move. Quite the contrary, it's an extremely wasteful move. The administration is proposing to spend over a billion dollars to build these gigantic dams and flood out the Dinosaur area and other scenic sites on the Upper Colorado River and its tributaries. The purpose is to irrigate land, but the costs will be phenomenal.

Mrs. Douglas. Isn't that an area of very sparse population? And doesn't the land have an awfully short growing season because of the high altitude?

Senator Douglas. That is true. Moreover, the costs are completely out of line. For instance in regard to the central Utah project, which is part of this upper Colorado program, the actual cost of bringing water onto new land would be almost $1,900 per acre. The richest Illinois farmland is valued at around $500 an acre. On top of this, the beneficiaries of the proposed irrigation loans are not required to pay any interest, and to the extent that even the principal is repaid, the money is drained off into a special account to be spent on more irrigation projects. The taxpayer is just stuck. As a matter of fact, only about $100 an acre will ever be repaid.

Mrs. Douglas. A tremendous waste of the taxpayers' money, for inferior farmland which would compete with Illinois farmland.

Senator Douglas. Yes, it's a completely wasteful project which the administration is undertaking against what was the advice of the Army Corps of Engineers, the Department of Agriculture, the Federal Power Commission, the Geological Survey, the National Park Service, and all the conservation groups and the women's clubs. It means taxing the entire United States and pouring money down a gigantic drain. I have a feeling that carrying out these projects will result in irrigating more money out of the Federal Treasury than water on the land.

Such waste is particularly indefensible when funds for water projects are now needed desperately in the Middle West and Southwest, where continued drought has dried up the water supplies of countless communities. Thousands of farmers have to haul all of their water for livestock and family use. For a fraction of the cost of the upper Colorado project, we could create a chain of lakes and water reservoirs so that there would be abundant water for the thickly settled areas of Illinois and other areas hit by the drought. This certainly should be done before pouring money into the upper Colorado area with its sparse population and short growing season and with the Government being repaid only about one-twentieth of the cost.

Mrs. Douglas. The upper Colorado program is prodigal from every standpoint, especially for an administration that has proclaimed its desire for economy.

Senator Douglas. It is one of the most wasteful things that I have ever seen proposed.

Mrs. Douglas. How about the pork barrel rivers and harbors bill?

Senator Douglas. I would say that the navigation projects represent the real pork in that bill. I am not opposing flood control projects. One of the navigation proposals would provide $91 million to deepen the channel of the Delaware River; $36 million of this will directly benefit only one company, the United States Steel Co., according to the Army Engineers. United States Steel has its new mill at Trenton and this project will enable the company to bring iron ore up from Venezuela to the new mill. Now, I think United States Steel is sufficiently prosperous so that it can pay tolls to meet the costs of deepening the channel. This should not be loaded upon the taxpayers.

Mrs. Douglas. That seems like an awfully big subsidy to a very wealthy firm that has not approved of subsidies for other groups.

Senator Douglas. The leaders of United States Steel have opposed any subsidies to the farmers, but they are apparently seeking the biggest subsidy they can get for themselves.

Mrs. Douglas. Are there other examples of pork barrel projects?

Senator Douglas. There are 57 projects at a total cost of about $250 million in the bill which I think ought to be knocked out of the bill. Some of these represent subsidies to the owners of pleasure boats. Others will enable fishermen to avoid the necessity of sailing with the tide. Still others are not economically justified. The pork barrel is a very fertile and just field for economy. This is your Senator, Paul H. Douglas.

Mrs. Douglas. And Emily Douglas.

Senator Douglas. Saying goodby until next week.

Explanation of Position on Rollcall Votes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDMUND P. RADWAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 29, 1954

Mr. RADWAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I want to declare my position on the following rollcall votes I missed earlier this session:

On rollcall No. 13, I would have voted "aye."

On rollcall No. 19, I would have voted "aye."

On rollcall No. 31, I would have voted "aye."

On rollcall No. 32, I would have voted "aye."

A Slick Scheme

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 9, 1954

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, by the slim margin of four votes the Senate on Tuesday appended the widely denounced grazing bill as a rider to the Agricultural Act of 1954.

This is an important proposal. It affects the public interest in the administration of more than 200 million acres of national forest and Bankhead-Jones lands. Previous attempts to give approximately 18,000 grazing permittees special rights in the use of these lands have been squelched by public opposition.

So controversial is the measure that the House Committee on Agriculture deferred action on the bill that was passed by the Senate several weeks ago.

The grazing bill will weaken the administration of these lands and it gives legal equity to a small group of users who improve the public lands. In granting them these special rights it overlooks completely the many millions of people who benefit from national forest and Bankhead-Jones lands each year.

Grazing and many other beneficial uses of the national forests, it should be emphasized, are of secondary importance to the primary function of watershed protection.

The following editorial from the Denver Post expresses the opinion of thousands of people in the Rocky Mountain region served by that great newspaper:

A SLICK SCHEME

By a narrow vote, the Senate on Tuesday attached the stockmen's self-interest grazing bill to the farm support bill as an amendment.

Senator Anderson, Democrat, of New Mexico, and other members of the stockmen's bloc thought it was a pretty slick maneuver. It was, but it is the kind of maneuver which should be prohibited by the rules in the interest of integrity and good legislation.

The Senate passed the stockmen's pet measure some time ago as a separate bill. In the House of Representatives, the stockmen's bill failed to get out of committee.

Now, by combining the stockmen's measure with the farm bill, the Senate has thrown the grazing proposal into a House-Senate conference committee, although the House itself has never considered the grazing issue.

These bills are so important that they should be considered separately—each on its own merits, if any. The result of combining the bills will be to prevent any careful consideration of the grazing measure in the House, if the conference committee accepts the Senate amendment.

As an amendment to the farm bill—which is considered must legislation—the grazing measure will not be subject to the kind of scrutiny it would have if presented by itself.

The evil of enacting major legislation by means of riders or amendments on other bills has long been recognized by our most conscientious Congressmen and Senators. It is a process which is inimical to the process of giving due consideration to each separate enactment.

The stockmen's bill would weaken the administration of the national forests in the interest of all the people. It is a matter of deep concern to Colorado, which has so many national forests, a State whose future will depend to a large measure on the best use of forest resources—recreational and timber resources as well as grass resources.

The question here is whether the interests of a relatively few stockmen are to be placed above the interests of the millions of people who use and benefit from the western national forests each year.

It is to be hoped that the House conferees on the farm bill—who include Congressman Hill, Republican, of Colorado—will not agree to accept the stockmen's grazing measure as an amendment to other legislation. If the conference should agree, it is to be hoped that the House, on behalf of the whole people, will reject the amendment and demand a new conference.

Congressman Young Will Hold Conferences in Nevada

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFTON (CLIFF) YOUNG

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 12, 1954

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, since I have been in Congress I have attempted to keep in close communication with the people whom I represent.

Immediately following my return to Nevada, I will make an official business tour of the 17 counties in my State. A temporary office will be established in various communities, and local citizens will have an opportunity to confer informally with their Representative in Congress. A member of my Washington staff will accompany and assist me.

The schedule for the first part of my tour is as follows:

Monday and Tuesday, August 30 and 31, 1954: 9 a. m. to 12 m.; 1 p. m. to 5 p. m., Federal courtroom, Las Vegas.

Thursday, September 2, 1954: 9 a. m. to 12 m.; 1 p. m. to 5 p. m., Townsite Elementary School, room 12, Henderson.

Friday, September 3, 1954: 9 a. m. to 12 m.; 1 p. m. to 5 p. m., municipal council chambers, Boulder City.

Tuesday, September 7, 1954: 1 p. m. to 5 p. m.; 7 p. m. to 10 p. m., mayor's office, city hall, Sparks.

Wednesday, September 8, 1954: 9 a. m. to 12 m., courthouse, Yerington.

Wednesday, September 8, 1954: 2 p. m. to 5 p. m., courthouse, commissioner's room, Hawthorne.

Thursday, September 9, 1954: 9 a. m. to 12 m., courthouse, Fallon.

Thursday, September 9, 1954; 2 p. m. to 5 p. m., courthouse, Carson City.

Friday and Saturday, September 10 and 11, 1954: 9 a. m. to 12 m.; 1 p. m. to 5 p. m., courthouse, commissioners' room, Reno.

No appointments are necessary for these conferences. Any or all of my constituents are urged to meet with me on the date most convenient to them to discuss problems where my office may be of assistance. I am looking forward with enthusiasm to this tour.

Colorado River Storage Project: Farmers Cannot Pay a Dime for It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 12, 1954

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, the supporters of the multi-billion-dollar upper Colorado River storage project, H. R. 4449, have told Congress that it is a sound and feasible project and will more than repay its cost. The Bureau of Reclamation and the Department of Interior have voiced the same contention before committees of Congress.

Do these people tell one story to Congress and another behind the scenes? I respectfully ask my colleagues to answer that question themselves, after they have read the following statements.

> The farmer can't pay a dime on the Colorado River storage project, not one dime. He can't even pay for his participating projects.

Those, Mr. Speaker, are the words of C. B. Jacobson, an engineer of the Bureau of Reclamation. They were spoken before the Upper Colorado River Commission at a meeting in Santa Fe, N. Mex., on September 15, 1952. The transcript of the meeting containing those words, and the quotations which follow, were published by the Commission.

At this same meeting, Engineer Jacobson also told the commissioners, with regard to this project—and I quote from the printed transcript:

> The only source of revenue on the Colorado River storage project is from power.
>
> All the costs have been allocated to power and to irrigation; but all your irrigation costs for maintenance and replacement and operation are to be paid for by power. There is no other source of revenue.
>
> * * * as your power investment is paid off, your interest payments are smaller each year and are not large enough to meet the annual irrigation payments.
>
> The only source of revenue you have is power. First the power investment is paid off. Repayments of irrigation costs in the storage project are deferred until after the entire power investment has been paid off.
>
> Under the Colorado River storage project plan, however, you are going to authorize 12, 13, 14 participating projects, and then over a period of possibly 75 years you are going in periodically with requests for additional participating projects.
>
> Probably the 13 original projects could get by under the Collbran plan; however, we in Reclamation have our serious doubts as to whether we can look ahead 50 years and assure authorization of the later participating projects under such a plan of repayment as shown under the Collbran legislation.
>
> The United States [the taxpayers] would have been out all the interest on all its investments during that period [70 years]. It amounts to $693 million. But if you run the project another 33 years and put all that money into the Treasury, this $693 million would have been returned.
>
> It [the interest money] goes into the reclamation fund, but the problem is to get it back.
>
> The remaining part of the interest over and above that needed to repay irrigation or make these annual payments will be put in the Colorado River development account. * * * The principle of the account is new; this is the one thing that will probably require new legislation.
>
> The account is a procedure whereby all the revenue is credited to the account and all the disbursements are debited to the account. In this manner, some of the objections to the interest component are hoped to be overcome.

The bracketed matter is mine, but the statements are those of the Reclamation Bureau's spokesmen. I believe my colleagues will find them somewhat in conflict with the statements made before Congress.

Gunpowder Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLIFTON (CLIFF) YOUNG

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 12, 1954

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, the RECORD has been unduly burdened of late days with propaganda on behalf of what has been appropriately called gunpowder politics. Among others, apparently certain manufacturers of shotgun and rifle shells are assisting in a nationwide campaign of villification of livestock producers of the West under the guise of pseudoconservation organizations. They have succeeded to the extent of misleading even some of our foremost sportsmen's groups. They are even financing legitimate organizations in the distribution of propaganda based on glittering generalities rather than facts. Regrettably it has had some effect on the public because of the names of these respected sportsmen's groups.

The gentleman from Montana's First Congressional District was recently honored by a number of groups, apparently to some extent, for his part in an unceasing campaign against the livestock industry of the range regions of the West. He has been most considerate of those promoting these gunpowder political attacks on the administration-supported Forest Lands Grazing Act. He has assisted by placing in the RECORD copies of editorials which unfairly and unjustly criticize this measure.

One of the latest of these is entitled "The Neatest Trick of 1954." The charges included therein point out no specifics in opposition to the bill, but must be answered to clear up certain misstatements and protect the integrity of the Forest Service, the Department of Agriculture, one of our greatest basic private enterprises of the agriculture industry, namely, livestock producing, and those representatives of the western range areas who have worked so diligently to bring about uniformity and the most efficient use of the natural resources of the West.

Mr. Speaker, one of the responsibilities of this Congress is the drafting of legislation to most wisely utilize for the good of the Nation the vast land areas of the 11 Western States which are held in public trust in the name of the United States Government. Fifty percent of the land areas of the 11 Western States is owned by the Federal Government. As can be readily seen, this does not include land upon which cities have grown, but is comprised principally of the rugged mountains, deserts, and forests where settling under the Homestead Act with an acreage limitation was found to be impracticable to establish a sound economy. The grass which grows on these public land areas is one of the greatest natural resources this country has. When we mine the mountains the product is gone forever; when we drill for oil we exhaust that much of our natural resources; but when we harvest the grass which comes up each year, we not only utilize one of the greatest natural resources of this area but we know that, with proper management and care, that natural resources will be ready for harvest again the next season, and both the quantity and quality of that natural resource can be improved under proper safeguards.

There are those who would have you believe that it should be established as the national policy that the livestock men of the areas who have built a major portion of the economy of the West upon the proper utilization of these resources should be driven from the public lands so it could be turned over to the exclusive use of men pleasure-bent—with rifle and shotgun under arm—who would wander through the unharvested grass and shoot at deer and duck. Were this to be done, a valuable, recurring resource—this annual forage crop—would be irretrievably lost.

What heinous crime have these livestock men committed which causes the gentleman from Montana to raise this anguished cry against them in the RECORD? Mr. Speaker, these men have produced from this natural resource, grass, the meat, the leather, and the wool which have fed and clothed the Nation. Remember the leather shoes you are wearing, the wool of your suit, the meat at your table is the direct harvested result of utilization of the natural grass resources.

Upon the production of these articles depends the income of vast land areas of the Western States. Not only have these users of the public lands paid their fee for the use of the grass crops which have been harvested, but from the profits they have paid some part of the taxes which built schools and financed State governments. In many of these areas it is the only economy upon which is based the commerce and business of the area.

The gentleman from Montana has placed in the RECORD an editorial stating the attempt to pass the forest grazing bill is for a small group of stockmen. Mr. Speaker, there are thousands of permittees who graze livestock on the forest lands and other public lands of the West. Consider how many more thousands are furnished employment in the industry and in the service organizations which supply them with their needs and handle their products. Mr. Speaker, without confusing the

RECORD with the many thousands of stockmen who have permits—for which they pay—to graze under strict control, on other public lands, but just directing our attention to the forest grazing bill, there are more than 26,000 such stockmen who graze on forest lands. The Nation benefits from their production, and from the tax revenues on all their profits and on the wages of the employees and on the wages and profits of the allied industries. In 1953, 3 million head of sheep and 1,150,000 head of cattle harvested the grass natural resources of the public forest lands. Figured on an animal-month-unit basis of grazing, there were 8,500,000 sheep months and 6 million cattle months of grazing on the forest lands. Please realize, Mr. Speaker, this is only supplemental grazing—summer grazing, if you please—to make more productive the livestock operations on the private lands of the western feeding areas. Yet the opponents of this forest grazing act, by the deft use of glittering-generalities propaganda, would try to make you and the public believe the forest grazing bill is for only a few.

Over in the other body, an amendment has been accepted to the omnibus farm bill which would establish a more secure working relationship between the livestock producers of the West, as tenants who lease land, and the Government of the United States, which is the landlord for the livestock industry.

Mr. Speaker, this amendment is identical with the forest grazing bill which passed the Senate unanimously early this year. Hearings were held in the House Agriculture Committee and there was every indication that after 2 years of study this measure would be approved quite overwhelmingly by the House of Representatives, because of the reasonableness of the measure which would establish a sound landlord-tenant relationship between the Forest Service and the livestock industry. I take pride in the fact that this Republican administration has been quick to recognize the benefits of establishing and recognizing the multiple uses of the forest lands and giving some sense of security to an industry which harvested the grass resources of our forest lands for the benefit of the Government and the profit of our citizens.

Material placed in the RECORD by the gentleman from Montana mentions that the forest grazing bill is not germane to the agriculture bill. It is germane. It was this body of the Congress which made of the agriculture bill, receiving consideration in the House, an omnibus bill, carrying several items which had been passed separately by the Senate. Practically all matters affecting the Department of Agriculture, from agriculture attaches to support prices on basics, were included in the agriculture bill made into an omnibus bill by the Agriculture Committee of the House of Representatives. Then why, Mr. Speaker, is it not germane to include legislation directing the activities of the Secretary of Agriculture and the Forest Service in the production of meat, leather, and fiber on the public lands?

Mr. Speaker, the gunpowder politicians and their propaganda do not point out specific places in which they oppose the forest grazing bill, they only make wild, arm-swinging charges that there is a great strain on many for the benefit of a few. The facts refute this. They would have you believe that all people who believe in conservation oppose this bill. That is not true. For 2 years conservation groups, the administration, and the livestock industry have been presenting their position on this matter to Congress. Let me quote a small portion of a considerable amount of material delivered to the Senate by Senator ANDERSON on August 3 of this year, in which the National Wildlife Federation supports the forest grazing bill. Hugh B. Woodward, regional director of the National Wildlife Federation, states that they have attempted.a sane and dispassionate evaluation of the measure as passed by the Senate on March 8 of this year, and says "such an approach must be divorced from unreasoning prejudice." Their declaration that widespread opposition persists is due to lack of knowledge and understanding, and I again quote Mr. Woodward:

> After a complete review of all congressional legislation affecting national forests; after many months of careful and conscientious study of S. 2548 from the time of its introduction through the committee hearings, careful analysis of the Aiken committee report to the Senate, and the debate and colloquy at the time the bill was passed by the Senate, as printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, we have an abiding conviction that the merits of the amended bill justify and should command the support of every thoughful citizen of the United States interested in the protection of the public values of our national forests.

Mr. Speaker, now that the other body has adopted the Anderson forest grazing amendment, it will give this body an opportunity to agree in the establishment of a broad declaration of congressional policy for the administration of all national forest lands. I hope that the Members of the House will not be deluded by the misinformation circulated on this amendment and will join with the other body in giving the American people a constructive program for improving the multiple use of our national forest areas.

Question of the Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 9, 1954

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, who will call the Dem tune, Adlai or Harry, for this year?

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Printing and binding for Congress, when recommended to be done by the Committee on Printing of either House, shall be so recommended in a report containing an approximate estimate of the cost thereof, together with a statement from the Public Printer of estimated approximate cost of work previously ordered by Congress within the fiscal year (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 145, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on Printing, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

DISTRIBUTION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

To the Vice President and each Senator 100 copies; to the Secretary and Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, each, 25 copies; to the Secretary, for official use, not to exceed 35 copies; to the Sergeant at Arms, for use on the floor of the Senate, not to exceed 50 copies; to each Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress, 68 copies; to the Clerk, Sergeant at Arms, and Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives, each, 25 copies; to the Clerk, for official use, not to exceed 50 copies; and to the Doorkeeper, for use on the floor of the House of Representatives, not to exceed 75 copies; to the Vice President and each Senator, Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress there shall also be furnished (and shall not be transferable), 3 copies of the daily RECORD, of which 1 shall be delivered at his residence, 1 at his office, and 1 at the Capitol.

PRINTING DOCUMENTS AND REPORTS

Documents and reports of committees with the evidence and papers submitted therewith, or any part thereof ordered printed by Congress, may be reprinted by the Public Printer on order of any Member of Congress or Delegate, on prepayment of the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 162, p. 1940).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

on
on
on
va
To
Le
an
of
by
Th
M
of
re
an
sp
th
re
pl
ri

cr
pa
pa
be
ic
ou
fo
ge
re
ve
pr

be
dr
th
or
Na
ou

C
ho
104
of
Au
Eis
sol
loy
pre
rity
de
de
cri
to
me
of
the

A
of

Appendix

Iowa Approves Attorney General Leo A. Hoegh's Endorsement of President Eisenhower's Loyalty Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS E. MARTIN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 9, 1954

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, on July 26 some remarks were inserted on page 11390 of the Congressional Record by Mr. George Rhodes, of Pennsylvania, under the caption "The Big Lie Technique" which were an attack upon Leo A. Hoegh, attorney general of Iowa and Republican candidate for Governor of Iowa, charging that statements made by Attorney General Hoegh were false. The statements in question referred to by Mr. Rhodes had reference to the record of the Eisenhower administration in ferreting out certain Government workers and Mr. Rhodes undertook to place a spotlight on the word "disloyal" rather than upon the fact of the dismissal, resignation, or general riddance of employees who are generally labeled "security risks."

Mr. Rhodes' inserted statement created little notice in Congress and only passing comment in a few Iowa newspapers but that is not at all surprising because the people of Iowa, both Republicans and Democrats, know and thoroughy understand and trust Leo Hoegh for his outstanding record as attorney general of Iowa and for his general reputation for honesty, truth, and veracity, and for his devotion to highest principles.

The entire controversy over the number of Federal employees removed or dropped or resigned has grown out of the development of law and Executive orders enacted and issued to protect our Nation against offenses that jeopardize our national security.

On April 27, 1953, President Eisenhower approved Executive Order No. 10450 as authorized by Public Law 733 of the 81st Congress which was enacted August 26, 1950. The effect of President Eisenhower's executive order was to consolidate the so-called Federal employees' loyalty program, which existed under the previous administration, with the security risk removals process authorized under Public Law 733. In his security order President Eisenhower established the criteria upon which a determination is to be made as to whether the employment or retention in the Federal service of any person is clearly consistent with the national security.

As testified by Philip Young, chairman of the United States Civil Service Commission, on the employee security program, before the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee, March 2, 1954:

> There has been in recent years a mounting public distrust of Government employees based on disclosures that unsatisfactory persons at various times have held Government positions of a highly sensitive nature. The old loyalty program which had been in effect for almost 6 years by January 1953, had done little to allay this distrust. Clearly, increased public respect for the Government service depended on greater assurance that no person would be hired or retained in a Government job unless his employment was entirely consistent with national security.
>
> * * * * *
>
> Under the previous administration an attempt was made to grapple with this problem through the operations of the Federal employees loyalty program, which was established by Executive Order No. 9835 in 1947. However, the system of adjudication under this program was intricate, time-consuming, and sometimes, in the final analysis, inconclusive.
>
> * * * * *
>
> As time went on, it had become apparent that the original standard under the loyalty program was not adequate for dealing with cases of suspected disloyalty. The original standards used for refusal of employment, or removal from employment, on grounds relating to loyalty was "reasonable grounds for belief that the person involved is disloyal." On April 28, 1951, by Executive Order No. 10241, President Truman changed the standard to "a reasonable doubt as to the loyalty of the person involved."

Public Law 733 was then enacted by the 81st Congress and President Eisenhower's Executive Order No. 10450 was issued April 27, 1953, establishing the present security program.

Quoting Philip Young's testimony further:

> President Eisenhower, in his state of the Union message of February 2, 1953, to the 83d Congress, said: "The safety of America and the trust of the people alike demand that the personnel of Federal Government be loyal in their motives and reliable in the discharge of their duties. Only a combination of both loyalty and reliability promises genuine security."
>
> He further stated: "The heads of all executive departments and agencies have been instructed to initiate at once effective programs of security with respect to their personnel," and added that the Attorney General would advise and guide departments and agencies in the shaping of these programs.
>
> In applying these principles set forth by President Eisenhower, it was decided to broaden the application of the statutory authority which the 81st Congress had given the President in Public Law 733 of 1950. Therefore, the President, by Executive Order 10450 of April 27, 1953, established a Government-wide employee-security program, based on the authority and the approach set forth by the Congress in Public Law 733, and abolished the old loyalty program.
>
> The basic objective of the employee-security program is to make sure that there is no employee on the Federal payroll nor any applicant appointed who can, because of his position, endanger the national security. The American people must be assured that the Federal employees are persons of integrity, high moral character, and unswerving loyalty to the United States.

The various offenders guilty of subversive action, sex perversion, felonies or misdemeanors, or various other causes, come squarely within the program established by Congress and by President Eisenhower, and the important thing is the determination and proven effectiveness of the Eisenhower administration to carry out that loyalty program. That program meets with the unqualified approval of the people throughout the entire country. From my extensive personal contacts, I know that the people of Iowa approve most enthusiastically the program that is now being carried out so effectively by President Eisenhower and I know that the people of Iowa also approve enthusiastically the endorsement of President Eisenhower's program by Attorney General Hoegh. The people of Iowa will not be swayed by any effort to distract by quibbling of definitions.

Tribute to Former President Hoover

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 13, 1954

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, we have all been congratulating former President Hoover on the anniversary of his birthday. A very fine and timely editorial was published in a recent edition of a Pittsburgh newspaper, and I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

HOOVER

> More men and women reach the great age of 80 in this era of medical science than used to be true. But few possess the physical stamina and mental vigor to undertake new jobs of the greatest magnitude at that great age.
>
> Today, Herbert Hoover celebrates his 80th birthday in West Branch, Iowa, where he was born. Orphaned early in life, he was sent to Oregon to live with relatives. He came of an austere Quaker family who believed in hard work and practiced what they believed.
>
> Born before it became illegal for children to earn their way, Herbert Hoover can hardly remember when he did not work at something. He made his way through Stanford University by holding all sorts of jobs, including a newspaper route, a laundry service, manager of athletics, and working for the United States Geological Survey. He was a successful and well-to-do engineer in his early twenties.

The habits formed in early life have served Herbert Hoover well in his long career as a mining engineer, a businessman, the manager of the world's most intricate and widespread charity, the Belgian Relief and afterwards the American Relief Administration; then as Secretary of Commerce and as President of the United States. Few men have known such varieties of activities and such success in all of them; yet he has had his tribulations, particularly since he entered public life.

When Herbert Hoover retired from business to head the Belgian relief, he decided never again to work for private profit. He has never used for himself any salaries he received from Government service.

During and immediately after World War I, he was among the most popular of public officials; his Presidency was marked by the great depression and by an unpopularity rarely encountered in our history. He took success and failure with Quaker evenness of temper—and he went on working. He never permitted the shafts of antagonism to embitter his spirit.

At no time idle, he has spent the past 15 years flying around the globe to feed the hungry. Under President Truman, he coordinated the food supply of 38 countries. He has written about 10 books and is constantly working on more of them, some of which he says will not be published until he is dead. He orginated and engaged in the great debate on the American foreign policy which so profoundly affected the course of events. He has served under Presidents Truman and Eisenhower as Chairman of the Commission To Organize the Executive Branch of Government and is engaged in this magnificent task at this moment.

It must be tremendously gratifying to him, as it is to his friends, that during the past decade, from his 70th to his 80th birthdays, Herbert Hoover has become America's most beloved citizen. No other man, in our country, has earned the friendship and esteem of his fellow citizens as has this former President to whom Republicans and Democrats alike turn when they seek knowledge and wisdom which can only come from vast experience and broad generosity of spirit.

It must in particular be gratifying to him that the State of Iowa is remembering him on this day as one of her sons who left the cornfields to become one of the great men of American history and one of the good men, in a deeply religious sense, of our troubled times.

May God grant that we shall be celebrating his 90th birthday in New York, where he has lived and worked for so many years.

Subsidies on Favorable Newspaper Postal Rates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GUY M. GILLETTE

OF IOWA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 13, 1954

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, during the debate in the Senate on the farm bill I referred to subsidies which were paid, other than those to farmers, and in so doing I mentioned certain subsidies which were available, because of favorable postal rates, to a number of publications, including the Chicago Tribune. I have received a letter from the Chicago Tribune stating, in part, that while they had received some of these benefits, they had always opposed the present rates and were urging their increase.

In fairness to the Chicago Tribune, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter addressed to me by Mr. Walter Trohan, of the Chicago Tribune, manager of that newspaper's Washington Bureau, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHICAGO TRIBUNE,
WASHINGTON BUREAU,
Washington, D. C., August 11, 1954.
The Honorable GUY M. GILLETTE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I noticed in a recent RECORD that you complained that the Tribune is getting large subsidy from the Federal Government on favorable newspaper postal rates. I do not propose to debate the size of this thing, but I merely want to advise you that for 25 years, to my knowledge, the Tribune has campaigned for upward revision of this rate. I can show you a file of editorials calling for upward revision of the rates.

Some years ago Senator DOUGLAS, of Illinois, attacked the Tribune on the ground that it was a beneficiary of these rates. I showed him the file of our editorials, which, as I said before, I would be happy to show you, and he apologized on the Senate floor. I am not asking for any apology. I am merely informing you, because I am sure you are interested in fair play, that we do not favor the existing rates, even though we may benefit somewhat. I am sure your estimate is high, but we need not go into that.

Sincerely yours,

WALTER TROHAN.

Farm Bloc Solons Justified in Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. THYE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 13, 1954

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Mankato Free Press. It is an excellent editorial, and certainly is very thought provoking. I hope my colleagues will read it.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FARM BLOC SOLONS JUSTIFIED IN VOTE

The Senate has approved and sent to a conference committee a proposed new agricultural marketing bill which is hailed as a victory for President Eisenhower and Secretary of Agriculture Benson.

It provides for flexible supports for the so-called basics of farm commodities on a sliding scale from 82½ to 90 percent of parity, with the flexible scale remaining on dairy products at from 75 to 90 percent of parity. This sets the general parity level 7½ percent above the level which the administration wished on basics; keeps dairy supports where they have been under Benson's order.

Both Senators THYE and HUMPHREY, together with a considerable number of farm State Senators, helped to make up the 44 votes cast against this proposed compromise. It carried by a margin of 49 to 44 votes.

The Minnesota Senators remained firm in their contention that until other segments of the Nation's economy have come into line with a lowered price program, it is unjust to arbitrarily vote such a reduction in the income of the farmer. That is the position which this newspaper has maintained and which we feel is entirely sound—for the welfare of the Nation as a whole.

Flexible farm price supports are desirable. They must be adopted in due time. So also is a balanced budget desirable; an end to the danger of inflation; a stable price and wage level; a sound dollar.

But until the Government itself moves more decisively and successfully than it has to balance the budget, to stabilize the dollar, to insure a steady level of prices and of wages, it is both unsound and unfair to lower the supports which have heretofore insured the Nation's agricultural industry to operate profitably in an economy where semi-inflationary and semiwar conditions continue to prevail.

As Senator THYE pointed out, in voicing opposition to the new parity levels in the Senate debate, the price of steel recently advanced $3 a ton; the level of wages for steelworkers was upped substantially; other elements in the Nation's economy continue moving higher. This means that there has been no reduction, nor any promise of reduction, in the price of the things which the farmer must buy. Where then is the justification for voting parity price levels which will reduce his income substantially?

More than this, even if other elements in the economy appeared to have been stabilized, there would still be danger in reducing the parity levels for farm crops until some positive and constructive steps have been taken to dispose of the vast surpluses of these crops which overhang the market and threaten to depress farm commodity prices.

A first step is a constructive program to dispose of these surpluses—a proposal which Val Bjornson, Republican candidate for the Senate, has placed at the top of the list in his discussion of the farm problem. A second step is to bring other elements of the economy into a more stable position—Government spending; the national debt; the level of industrial and retail prices, and the labor market.

In insisting on what it terms stabilizing the farm program, by lowering parity levels at this time, the administration is doing more than unsettling the agricultural industry; it is taking a step which may, and very possibly will, injure the Nation's economy as a whole.

It is to be hoped that when this question is finally ironed out in the conference committee and a completed measure is presented to both Houses of Congress, that current parity levels will be retained until other essential adjustments of the Nation's economy have been achieved.

Herbert Hoover: Public Citizen No. 1

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY O. TALLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 30, 1954

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial which appeared in the Sunday edition of the Cedar Rapids Gazette, Cedar Rapids, Iowa, under date of August 8, 1954:

Herbert Hoover: Public Citizen No. 1

On Tuesday Iowa's most distinguished and illustrious citizen, Herbert Hoover, is coming back again to the tiny cottage in quiet and peaceful West Branch where he was born 80 years ago, the second son of the village blacksmith.

His birth was unheralded and unsung by all save his devoted and delighted Quaker parents, who lie buried side by side a few rods from the little home, and those among the 300 or so population who always made a fuss over a new arrival in their midst. After all, there was nothing to distinguish him from other newborn babes.

But his arrival this time will be different. This time his appearance will be heralded by thousands of fellow citizens who will be there to welcome him in person. It will be heralded by millions more throughout the world who will be there in spirit.

The sincere good wishes will come from their great, collective heart. It will be as if they are trying, in the only way they know, to make it right with him, while there is still time, for all the hurt that was visited on him by this same American public only 2 decades ago when it didn't know him as well as it does today.

What has happened in the 80 years this much-maligned, much-beloved man has spent on earth that he should be jostled about in the public fancy from favorite to fall guy to favorite again? What has come about that he should once again occupy a place, this time a quite special place, of love and affection in the grand, but oft-times fickle heart, of the American people who so bitterly rejected him and all they thought he stood for when he occupied the White House? What is there about Herbert Hoover, the man, that has brought on this great change in sentiment?

Who is there among us who can say? Probably no person can put his finger on any one factor, or combination of factors, and say "this is it." But each has his own idea as to what causes the tides of human sentiment to shift, sometimes so swiftly, sometimes so slowly, that not even the changing tempo itself can be explained.

Many ideas have been offered as to what changed the public attitude toward our oldest former President as his popularity has increased in recent years.

We have our idea, too, on what happened as the shifting tides affected Herbert Hoover. It is no better, and possibly no worse, than the next fellow's. It is in that sense that we submit it, simple though it may be.

We believe that in the years since he left the White House, a bewildered and disillusioned man, but withal, one whose abiding faith in the ultimate fair-mindedness of his fellow man never faltered, Herbert Hoover and the American people got to know one another better. They got to understand one another better. They plain got "over the back fense" better acquainted.

We believe it was as simple as that. For once people get to know each other, once they make a genuine effort to understand each other, they usually get to like each other.

Herbert Hoover and the American people were not well acquainted when he was President. Not as well acquainted as they had believed they were a few years before when he was establishing a record as Secretary of Commerce that no predecessor had attained and that each successor has been shooting at futilely ever since. Nor as well acquainted as they though they were when he headed European relief missions, exhibiting an organizational genius, as an understanding humanitarian, that won him the undying love and affection of millions who are alive today because of it.

But soon after he became President things began to change between Herbert Hoover and the people. No longer was he the great humanitarian, the man who was born of poor Quaker parents, who was orphaned as a child, who knew poverty and hard work in his teens, who worked his way through college and hired out as a common laborer underground in a mine. No longer was he a man who had made the most of his opportunity to learn his work so well that he became the world's leading mining engineer in his thirties, the great humanitarian in his forties, the favored presidential candidate in his fifties.

That was all past for now, as President, the people chose to believe that he, and he alone, was responsible for the great economic depression. Suddenly he loomed up in their minds as the front man for the moneyed interests, the unsmiling, stiff-collared fellow in the White House who cared not at all for the people and who was doing nothing to help them.

And he, in turn, must have thought that the people were an unappreciative lot, who either couldn't or wouldn't understand his efforts in their behalf. And so the breach grew until the people snapped his political neck.

It continued to grow as the years passed until, gradually, the people came to the realization that while they might not always agree with his policies, here was an American of rare moral qualities, of high principle, whose great devotion to his precious role as an American citizen dwarfed those around him.

And, so the people took a new look at the man, Herbert Hoover, at his record as an engineer, an administrator, a humanitarian. There they found that when he left the White House he hadn't laid aside his responsibilities as a private citizen; that he stepped back into that role to accept assignments by both a Democratic and a Republican President to head a nonpartisan commission to study reorganization of the executive branch of Government, burdensome assignments that only one of his caliber could handle but that few men of his age would tackle.

They liked what they saw,—liked it so much that, openly and unshamedly in the face of earlier actions, they took him straight into their hearts and accorded him a permanent place there as Public Citizen No. 1.

It is in that sense that his fellow men, who have come to know him better, on Tuesday will wish a happy birthday and many returns to this man whose steadfast devotion to duty, humility, and greatness will stand through the years as a shining example of citizenship to all Americans.

Hon. William Henry Harrison

SPEECH

OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 12, 1954

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in speaking a kind word about William Henry Harrison. You know, the name "Harrison" is emblazoned in history, and many footprints in the political sands are marked by that name. William Henry Harrison is a graduate of the University of Nebraska. He married a Nebraska girl. My district, incidentally, borders Wyoming, and he represents the empire State of Wyoming. As chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, I have had the pleasure of having Mr. Harrison as a subcommittee chairman of the Indian Affairs Committee and lately on the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation. His knowledge of western problems has been of tremendous value to the committee. William Henry Harrison has worked hard. He has been faithful in attendance and has made contributions at all times not only to the subcommittee but to the full committee. I am sorry, in a way, that Mr. Harrison is going to leave the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of which he was such a valuable member. I hope as he goes over to the other body—as I know he will—he will carry with him much information and knowledge which will be of benefit to him there.

Statement of C. R. Gutermuth, Vice President of the Wildlife Management Institute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 9, 1954

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I called attention of my colleagues to the testimony of Mr. C. R. Gutermuth before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs Subcommittee on Public Lands.

The vice president of the Wildlife Management Institute appeared June 29 at a hearing on the subject of duck stamps. He asked, and was granted, permission to supplement his remarks with a written statement, which follows:

Chairman D'Ewart, I appreciate your courtesy in permitting me to extend the brief remarks that were made before your committee on June 29 concerning the use of the duck-stamp money. In my previous testimony I stated that we are not too concerned about what has happened in the past, but rather that there is considerable anxiety about the recent trend toward large-scale diversion of the duck-stamp revenue. Actually, Mr. Chairman, in our efforts to call attention to the repeated reductions in annual appropriations of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service and the use of more and more of the stamp fees for maintenance and routine operations, I am afraid that some of the well-meaning conservationists either have been a little overenthusiastic in criticizing an eminently successful program, or their comments have been misinterpreted.

As you know, both Dr. Gabrielson and I have been rather close to this program. We think that it is most unfortunate that rumors have gotten around that there has been illegal use of the duck-stamp funds. We feel, and the record shows quite clearly, that remarkable progress has been made in the establishment of a splendid waterfowl refuge system. Strange as it may seem, the magnitude of this program and its outstanding success seems to be better known in foreign countries than here at home. No less than a dozen foreign governments have sent specialists to the United States to study the waterfowl refuge program, these men staying from a few months to a year, with the thought of returning to their homelands and applying as much of the program and management philosophy as could be financed or assimilated by their people.

In order to make recommendations for the future, it is essential to review briefly what has happened in the past. The place to start is with the dark prospects for waterfowl in 1934 when, after 5 years of continuous drought, much of the nesting ground was dry, and only a limited breeding population went north. Through the recommendations of the now-historic Beck committee to the President, and the devoted and inspired activities of the famous conservationist, Jay N. "Ding" Darling, the United States Biological Survey (now United States Fish and Wildlife Service), in the spring of 1934 was able to get $6 million for acquisition of waterfowl nesting grounds and $2,500,000 for development purposes. After that $8,500,000 of emergency money was exhausted, "Ding" Darling and the revered Senator Norbeck succeeded in getting Congress to earmark an additional $6 million for an acquisition program. . So $14,500,000 really was made available during the 1930's for refuge purposes without the use of duck-stamp moneys.

The first duck stamp law was passed in 1934, but a full year had to elapse before the receipts were available. Only 635,001 stamps were sold in the first year. In 1935, the total dropped to 448,204. There were 603,623 stamps sold in 1936, and it was not until 1938 that the income reached $1 million a year.

For comparative purposes, in those days when the Federal Government was restoring large-scale areas to give immediate relief to the hard-pressed waterfowl, it cost from $1,500,000 to $2,000,000 to buy and develop a 30,000 to 50,000-acre waterfowl refuge. Therefore, if the Service would have had to rely upon duck stamp income alone, it would have taken the first 3 years of sales to initiate a single refuge.

Fortunately for the waterfowl, other sources of lands were available. Some 124,485 acres, largely undeveloped, had been acquired previously under the Migratory Bird Conservation Act of 1929. This, along with easement areas and lands suitable for waterfowl amounting to 782,657 acres which were withdrawn from the public domain, became available immediately. With the emergency funds mentioned above, 808,796 additional acres were obtained, and when those monies were exhausted, another $6 million was made available (1936) for continuing the program under the Duck Stamp Act. All of which means that they had a lot of waterfowl land that needed to be restored.

Furthermore, by that time the survey had a couple of dozen CCC camps and hundreds of WPA men working on those lands. The rub was, it had no money with which to buy cement, reinforcing steel, construction equipment, or other materials, such as fencing, posting signs, fire suppression equipment, and all of the many things needed to develop and begin administering a newly hatched refuge system.

Because of the urgency of restoring those lands, and since the waterfowl could not wait for a theoretical accumulation of duck stamp moneys to do the entire program, a practical policy consequently was adopted of using duck stamp funds to purchase materials; other more temporary emergency funds were devoted to land purchase. By so doing, it is believed that the national waterfowl refuge program was advanced 18 years or more over what would have been possible by the use of duck stamp funds alone.

In the latter part of that period some additional 389,774 acres were obtained from the Corps of Engineers and TVA reservoirs. State-controlled lands of 229,774 acres also were made available. By the use of duck-stamp revenue, 209,330 acres were purchased in more recent years, after the emergency purchase funds had been exhausted. All in all, those acquisitions resulted in a well-rounded program of 3,269,549 acres of developed waterfowl lands in some 205 projects scattered over the Nation. This has been an unprecedented achievement—a fact that, for the most part, has been overlooked in the testimony given to date.

In my previous testimony I objected to a statement that had been made that "duck-stamp dollars were expended rather lavishly in former years" in the development of big-game areas. That complainant also said that recreational areas on refuges were overdeveloped and were too elaborate. I checked into both objections, and only $500 of duck-stamp funds in the entire program has been spent on big-game areas. That was on the Charles Sheldon antelope refuge in Nevada, which is a good waterfowl-producing area. There, through the use of a CCC camp, they developed a series of ponds for waterfowl nesting purposes. The project was beneficial; but during the war period, when no other funds were available, a heavy storm damaged the dikes severely and washed out most of the control structures. In order to restore the area to waterfowl production, they fixed the controls and repaired the dikes by using $500 of duck-stamp money. Let me repeat that expenditure was for waterfowl, not for big game.

The record shows that two small additions to big-game refuges were acquired with duck-stamp fees, 40 acres at the Sheldon refuge and 731 acres at the Hart Mountain refuge in Oregon, but both of those purchases were for waterfowl developments, and they were approved by the Migratory Bird Conservation Committee.

Criticism was directed toward the use of concrete picnic tables and benches in refuge picnic areas. In my opinion, the use of those concrete tables has been real economy. The Refuge Branch had used wooden tables and benches previously, only to have vandals utilize them for firewood. Tables and benches made of gas pipe and iron straps were tried next, but the people hauled them home for personal use. It was not until a clever CCC foreman designed cheap, easily constructed concrete tables and benches that there was any permanence in that type of equipment. Once constructed, it has lasted for years. Before the concrete units were made, such equipment had to be replaced annually. Moreover, at the time that the tables were constructed, the most expensive cost item—that of labor—was abundant.

There has been some criticism about not doing more waterfowl work in California, and a few other States. We must be fair about that because, when the Service had considerable money to spend in certain localities, it frequently could not get the concurrence or cooperation of local authorities. There always have been, and always will be unavoidable obstacles in a program of this magnitude. Some people have wanted all refuge areas potentially opened to shooting, but until the Duck Stamp fee was revised in 1949, the original areas acquired with those funds were held inviolate. A few folks have tried to secure special considerations for their localities, such as baiting, live decoys, and increased bag limits, and it is not surprising that varying kinds of complaints were voiced when the opportunity arose.

No, the failure to acquire more Federal refuge lands cannot be charged to any one factor. California, for example, passed a law in 1948 that required the approval of local taxing units in the establishment of Federal waterfowl areas in that State, and also that the Federal lands purchased for such purposes would be subject to State and local taxation. Immediately the Attorney General of the United States ruled that State and local provinces could not tax the Federal Government, thus effectively closing the door on further land acquisition and development by the Federal Government in that State.

Nevertheless, we now have 50 Federal refuges open to public shooting of big game, upland game, and waterfowl. Of these, 32 are open to waterfowl shooting, and 3 or 4 constitute the largest-scaled waterfowl hunting opportunities in the world; so we think that there is every reason to be proud of the program so far as it has gone. Naturally, we would be much happier if more of the duck stamp money could have gone for land acquisitions; but, Mr. Chairman, when Congress was asked earlier in the year to give the United States Fish and Wildlife Service an adequate appropriation with which to perform its required duties and responsibilities, so that it would not have to dig deeper into the duck stamp fund for routine operating expenses, we had no idea that this would lead to blasts at a commendable refuge program, and to unwarranted charges of illegal use of earmarked funds.

What, then, is the real problem, and how can the situation be remedied? Today, 1 man in 70 is a waterfowl hunter. More than 2 million duck stamps have been sold annually for the past 3 years. About 25 percent more duck hunters have appeared during the past 5 years than during the period from 1934 to 1948. The present population of the United States is 160 million, and we may expect this to reach 190 million in 1975. At the present rate of annual increase in duck hunters, we conceivably could have 4 million wildfowlers in 1975. Twenty years ago, it was estimated that not less than 12,500,000 acres of managed habitat in all classes of ownership were needed to provide minimum requirements, if the waterfowl resource was to be maintained at somewhat near the existing level. Over the past two decades no more than 4 million acres of waterfowl habitat have been acquired by the Fish and Wildlife Service and the State game departments. At the present rate, the combined efforts of those agencies are not keeping abreast of current needs in problem areas, and they will not be able to do better without embarking upon a greatly expanded acquisition program.

Twenty years ago it was estimated that the Federal Government should restore and maintain at least 7,500,000 acres of managed waterfowl habitat. That requirement still holds good, and since only about 3,500,000 acres of waterfowl lands have been restored, there remains a future program of approximately 4 million acres to be developed with duck stamp and supplemental funds from Congress. It has been estimated that the States can well restore 5 million acres before the burden of maintenance proves too heavy. Everything considered, it seems quite clear that if the waterfowl resource is to be preserved in the future, it will have to be done on public lands, State and Federal, devoted primarily to that purpose. Due to the rapid invasion of the few remaining acres of waterfowl habitat by economic and industrial forces, and because of the increasing pressures and tax rates, comparatively little waterfowl habitat will be in the hands of private owners by 1975. This great resource, which provides an economic turnover of $1,250,000,000 annually, must in the future be preserved on public lands and largely by the combined and cooperative activities of the Fish and Wildlife Service and the 48 State conservation departments.

I know that for the past 3 years the Fish and Wildlife Service has planned to devote more of the duck-stamp money to land purchase, striving for 1,500,000 annually. That goal was achieved in 1949 by the increase in the duck-stamp fee to $2. But no sooner had the service accumulated a reasonable land-purchase budget when both the Bureau of the Budget and the Congress said, "Here, quit buying land and go back and use that purchase money for maintaining the existing refuges; your appropriation base has been reduced proportionally." That sort of thing has been happening each year. For example, in the 1954 appropriation, $1,652,000 was provided under the heading "Management of Resources; (3) Maintenance of Mammal and Bird Reservations." When the service's 1955 budget request was being considered, the Bureau of the Budget made a reduction of $652,000 in the above item. Consequently, the 1955 budget presented to Congress last January requested only $1 million for maintenance of mammal and bird reservations. Congress cut another $164,000 from this item, thus allowing a mere $836,000 for this activity in 1955, approximately half the amount available during previous fiscal year.

As an additional "kick in the pants," Congress in passing this deplorable 1955 budget warned the service to "expend the duck stamp legally," and then turned around and earmarked the bulk of the maintenance and development allotment for fish hatcheries. Congress cannot escape a large share of the blame for this pathetic situation—for the fact that over the last decade the service has had to devote more and more duck-stamp money annually to maintenance of existing refuges, when this money should have been used as the sportsmen intended, for the purchase of new units to fill the gaps in the continental chain of refuges along the four great waterfowl flyways of this country.

You are reminded that, originally, through the Migratory Bird Treaty Acts with Great Britain and Canada on the one hand, and Mexico on the other, Congress assumed certain obligations to implement those treaties. One of the requirements was a system of waterfowl refuges to provide always enough waterfowl habitat to carry the birds and to send back a reasonable number of breeders to repopulate the breeding grounds each season. That phase of the program should be financed by congressional appropriations. The sportsmen asked, however, that more than the minimum be done, for which they were willing to pay extra. They wanted the program expedited and enlarged so that more waterfowl habitat would be restored in the shortest time possible, so that there would be more public shooting opportunities. With that thought in mind, the sportsmen allowed themselves to be required to purchase special stamps, the proceeds of which were to go for the acquisition and development of additional lands. Unfortunately, through limitations placed on the Service by both Congress and the Bureau of the Budget, as Mr. Shoemaker so ably explained, the Federal Government has not been able to fulfill its treaty commitments, nor its obligation to those abiding sportsmen. Thus, a double-barrel approach must be made on this program in the future.

Congress definitely should reinstate and increase the maintenance and development moneys that were withheld from regular appropriations, and were then diverted from the duck-stamp fund. More than that, additional money should be provided over and above the present duck-stamp income, which can be accomplished in several ways. First, and probably the least desirable, would be to increase the cost of the duck stamp. But, if the proposed increase were appreciable, say, more than a dollar, it ultimately would result, I fear, in less income becoming available, since that would tend to drive away from the sport the average wildfowler, who is perhaps the backbone of the duck-stamp income. To increase the duck stamp to $5, as has been proposed in some circles, would place waterfowl hunting in the realm of a monopoly—above the reach of the beginner and "one-gallus" hunter. Any such increase, however, definitely should be earmarked specifically for land acquisition.

Congress now matches money with the States for such benefits to the general public as highway construction, the restoration of State game lands (Pittman-Robertson program), and the restoration of State fishing resources (Dingell-Johnson program). Most people get some enjoyment and pleasure from wildlife, and in view of the extra financial contribution to the perpetuation of this resource that is being made by the sportsmen in the purchase of the $2 stamps, is it not fair that Congress match each year the total duck-stamp purchases of the sportsmen with an equivalent sum in order to expedite the program and help finance the acquisition, development, and maintenance of the indispensable waterfowl refuge program? For instance, the sportsmen are buying $4,250,000 worth of stamps each year. If Congress would appropriate an equal amount, the Fish and Wildlife Service would have approximately $8,500,000 each year, which is about what will be required over a period of 20 years for the 4 million acre, $240 million program that is needed for the completion of the minimum waterfowl management program held necessary to preserve the invaluable waterfowl resource. While this is a rather staggering figure, it is infinitesimal as compared to some of those foreign investments in future public welfare.

Right Step

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 9, 1954

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, under general leave to extend my remarks, I wish to call the attention of my colleagues to the following editorial from the Seattle Post-Intelligencer of August 2, 1954. The editorial comes in the wake of the Navy's recent announcement allocating its 1955 construction and conversion program to various private and public shipyards throughout the country:

RIGHT STEP

The process of rehabilitation set in motion for Pacific coast shipbuilding yards by the Navy's current reconversion program is a right step in a very sound direction.

Naturally, and properly, the communities involved think of the matter in terms of revived employment and markets for materials and improved business and economic conditions generally.

These things are tremendously important, but it is much more important that the same program bringing such benefits to the several Pacific coast communities has a vital bearing on how America as a whole will fare in the event of a national emergency.

If we get into a major war, to put it bluntly, with our west coast shipyards in a condition to make them inadequate for immediate and efficient wartime use, we are going to have a longer and costlier war than necessary on our hands—and we just possibly might lose such a war.

At the very least, with obsolete shipbuilding facilities at the beginning of a future war, we would have to build the needed yards in a hurry—and hope for enough time to get it done.

In consequence of the Navy's sound program, which will give jobs to thousands of workers and improve business for many communities, America will be closer to being ready for a big war if such a thing ever comes.

"Want To Trade?" London Asks Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. SMITH

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 3, 1954

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include the following article from the Christian Science Monitor:

THE WASHINGTON SCENE

(By William H. Stringer)

"WANT TO TRADE?" LONDON ASKS WASHINGTON

WASHINGTON.—The British are going to be asking Washington this autumn about American intentions concerning "trade, not aid." It will be interesting to see what the Eisenhower administration, which came to power on a moderately liberal foreign-trade platform, will be able to reply.

London is sending the Chancellor of the Exchequer, Richard Austin Butler, over here in late September. One purpose is to attend sessions of the International Bank and Monetary Fund. Equally vital will be his talks with Secretary of the Treasury George M. Humphrey and other American officials—concerning trade and currency convertibility. Because the British have some doubts about American policy: the Eisenhower administration has professed much but, so far, has produced little.

So the British will ask: Is a new fight really to be made, next year, for maximum extension of the reciprocal trade program? Will the administration really go to bat to push the Randall Commission's trade and investment recommendations through Congress? Is Washington prepared to lend a stabilizing hand to the prospective European drive for currency convertibility?

Mr. Butler and his cohorts will be asking trenchant questions because, on one hand, Britain is a nation which largely "lives by trade" and because, on the other hand, the policies of a gigantic production machine and creditor nation such as the United States are likely to have far-reaching impact on world trade.

World commerce has been zooming ahead in the past 2 years. There has been a marked improvement in the dollar reserves of most western European countries. Industrial production is well above prewar levels. Britain and other European nations are approaching that exciting, long-awaited moment when—if all goes well and no disastrous world cataclysms intervene—they can begin the final hazardous drive toward actual de jure currency convertibility.

Of course once currencies are freely and officially convertible (blocked accounts excepted) and once dollars can be had for pounds and lire can be changed into reichsmarks, then world trade can boom ahead without hindrance from the inability of one nation to earn the brand of currency it needs for purchase of the goods it wants to buy. Convertibility would help free up world trade.

But what makes Chancellor Butler's questions to Washington this September especially important is this: The target date for full convertibility of the British pound—bellwether of European currencies—can be set at between 12 and 18 months from this September, perhaps around January 1956. This assumes, however, a continued progress in multilateral world trade.

And in this picture the United States foreign economic policy—whether it lowers its tariffs, whether its businessmen invest abroad, whether it indulges a mild East-

West commerce, whether it favors establishment of a reserve cushion of American or World Bank funds against a run-on convertibility—indeed, whether the United States practices what Washington has been preaching—this can greatly assist or seriously slow the drive for convertibility, in the British view.

What reply will Secretary Humphrey make to the British soundings? There is one opinion in Washington, embraced by Congressmen who dissented from the Randall report, which holds that the free world's trade is on such a sure footing now that it can stop worrying about what the United States does. The dollar gap has been solved, it is argued, and foreign gold and dollar reserves total more than $23 billion. The United States can be as protectionist as all get-out, and Europe will no longer appreciably suffer, according to this viewpoint.

The opposite view, subscribed to by the Randall Commission majority and the Eisenhower administration and the Democrats, is that American policy still decisively influences world progress toward freer trade and economic stability. And that there is still a dollar gap of between $2 and $3 billion, though temporarily concealed by American foreign-aid spending. And that if the United States does not cooperate with all measures to develop maximum trade within the free-world periphery, it cannot complain if vigorous exporters like Britain, Germany, and Japan seek deals behind the Iron Curtain.

Eisenhower spokesmen say the administration plans a determined drive to push the Randall recommendations through Congress in 1955. A national campaign is assured, to convince Americans, including Congressmen, of the wisdom of a liberal foreign-trade policy. But, noting that the Eisenhower administration has just upped the tariff on Swiss watches, the British will want to be sure.

For one thing, all trading nations will be watching the November election outcome. If more Old Guard protectionist Republicans are sent to Congress, prospects for a liberal trade program will go glimmering. If the Democrats gain control of Congress, prospects will brighten. If the congressional complexion remains relatively unaltered, then much will depend on the vigor and persuasiveness of Presidential leadership.

Remember the Night?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 11, 1954

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith an editorial from the New York Post:

REMEMBER THE NIGHT?

The longer he thinks about it, the more convinced is Herbert Hoover that the country has been going to perdition ever since he left the White House. In his rewritten history book, the Republic was doing fine when he was abruptly retired to private life; he has nothing but bitter words, however, for everything that happened in the 20 years that followed.

It is difficult to quarrel with the nostalgic reminiscences of a man who is no longer young; we had wistfully hoped that Mr. Hoover would permit his 80th birthday to pass without another strident, self-righteous sermon. But we hoped in vain. Reading the address he delivered in Iowa yesterday, we were struck by the fact that a man could reach so venerable an age with so little humility and mellowness.

As Hoover sees it, he was right all along, and never more right than when, as an ex-President, he urged this country to stand aside while the Nazi armies marched triumphantly through Europe. It must be great to be so sure that everything would have turned out all right if we had denied aid to nations assaulted by Hitler. But such dogmatism seems especially graceless in a man whose record for prophecy has proved so dreary in so many areas.

What is most painful in the Hoover text is his renewed onslaught on those policies of the welfare state which restored the dignity of millions of Americans in the years after the Hoover collapse. It may not be nice to bring up the subject on the day after a birthday party, but the tone Mr. Hoover set for the occasion was hardly congenial. So we must confess that we wondered as he spoke whether he has succeeded in banishing all memory of the gaunt faces, the broken homes, and the weeping children that were the unforgettable images of his own Presidency.

Of all men, Herbert Hoover should be the last to impose ruthless judgment on others or to claim infallibility for himself. Our Republic has suffered reversals and tragedies in the last two decades. But it was surely never closer to breakdown and anarchy than it was as a result of the doctrine that became known to the world as Hooverism.

Hooray for Mississippi

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. SMITH

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 3, 1954

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, the attached editorial from the Vicksburg Evening Post speaks for itself. Mississippi is very proud to have furnished the presidents of both Boy's Nation and Girl's Nation. The Mississippi Department of the American Legion and its auxiliary are to be commended upon the manner in which they have successfully handled this fine program at the State level. I am informed by State Comdr. Woodley Carr that both Girl's Nation President Jerolyn Ross and Boy's Nation President Ed Perry will be brought back to Washington for the American Legion convention later this month.

HOORAY FOR MISSISSIPPI

A Mississippian for President of the United States? Why, it just isn't possible. They can talk about equal rights, etc., but it just isn't in the cards for anyone in this State to become the Chief Executive of these United States, particularly as we have a one-party system in the South.

And yet, when all things were equal, and the forces of power politics were not involved, Mississippi did furnish two Presidents to the Nation. And the year was 1954. Surprised? Well, do not be surprised. It was not, of course, the real thing, but the wearers of the honor accorded them, regarded it as proudly as the present occupant of the White House or any of his predecessors.

Several weeks ago, the annual Boys' Nation convened in the Capital City of the United States. In this extremely well-planned activity, boys had gathered in the capital cities of each State, and there had set up a mythical Boys' State, electing officials, and carrying on all of the activities of the State. Delegates from each State were elected to represent their State at Boys' Nation where the functions of the Federal Government were reenacted by the boys. Elected president of Boys' Nation, was Edward Perry, of Bay St. Louis, Miss.

And now, the culmination of a similar program for girls, has resulted in the election as president of Girls' Nation, of Miss Jerolyn Everette Ross, of Meridian, Miss.

To these two young people we extend our warmest congratulations. It is a wonderful honor to be elected to the highest office in their respective groups, and it is particularly pleasing to comment that the teenagers who elected them were more imbued by patriotic impulses than by political considerations, and they just elected those they felt best fitted for the jobs.

It is too bad their elders do not operate in this manner. We are quite sure there are many citizens in the deep South who are qualified and able, but whose geography has ruled them out of consideration as candidates for the highest office in the land.

Philippine-American Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 12, 1954

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow will be observed in Manila and on the islands of the Philippines as Philippine-American Day, marking the 55th anniversary of the inauguration of relations between the Philippines and the United States of America.

As the last veteran of the Spanish-American War in this body, I have an especial interest in this anniversary. When the *Maine* was sunk in Habana Harbor on February 15, 1898, the Philippines were under the cruel yoke of Spanish rule. Then came our war with Spain and shortly after the declaration of hostilities Dewey and the American Fleet on that memorable 1st of May of 1898 started the islands on the road to a long-dreamed-of but insufferably long-denied freedom. It is to the eternal credit of the United States that our pledge of Filipino independence was kept with fidelity. It is to the eternal credit of the people of the Philippines that in the hour of our need their friendship to us was proved to the utmost. Whatever the future has in store for this world of ours we may be certain that throughout the years and centuries the people of the Philippines and the people of the United States will stand together as brothers on the firm foundation of a friendship tried and proved.

We wish for President Ramon Magsaysay an administration of brilliant accomplishment and for the men, women, and children of the Republic of the Philippines all the blessing of a benevolent God and a free country.

I think it is not inappropriate at this point to mention the visit to Washington of the Honorable Jose D. Leon Guerrero, director of the commerce department of the government of Guam, and his beautiful and charming wife. We are honored and pleased by the visit of this distinguished representative of the government of our far-flung possession in the Pacific which, as did the Philippines, came within the fold of our affections and concern as a result of the Spanish-American War.

By unanimous consent, I am extending my remarks to include the proclamation of President Magsaysay:

PROCLAMATION No. 52 BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE PHILIPPINES DECLARING AUGUST 13, 1954, PHILIPPINE-AMERICAN DAY

Whereas August 13, 1899, marked the official beginning of relations between the Philippines and the United States and the commencement of a happy and mutually profitable association between Filipinos and Americans;

Whereas on the occasion of the 55th anniversary of that event, it is appropriate that the two peoples renew and further strengthen the bonds that bind them in view, particularly, of the prevailing critical world conditions that threaten their security and the democratic institutions that they have jointly developed and stanchly defended at the cost of their resources and blood;

Whereas it is meet and proper that this historic event in the lives of the two nations, loyal partners in the active defense of freedom, be properly commemorated so that it may ever remain a source of inspiration in the noble effort to insure the success and permanence of the free and democratic enterprises in which they are engaged and which constitute their contribution to the peace of the world and the happiness of mankind; and

Whereas it is desirable that the two peoples be afforded every opportunity to get together on a intimate basis and encouraged to find a common medium for the friendly, intelligent, and unselfish appraisal of the problems as well as the advantages that arise from their present relationship, always in a spirit of cooperation and with due regard for each other's rights, interests, and aspirations;

Now, therefore, I, Ramon Magsaysay, President of the Philippines, do hereby declare August 13, 1954, as Philippine-American Day. I call upon all our people and all Americans residing within Philippine territory to observe this date with appropriate ceremonies designed to promote mutual understanding and helpfulness and to enhance the practical significance of the intimate association existing between Filipinos and Americans and between the Government of the Republic of the Philippines and the Government of the Republic of the United States of America. I especially call on all civic, business, religious, and service organizations and schools, both public and private, to devote this date to exercises calculated to advance knowledge and wider appreciation of the value of Philippine-American relationship and of the benefits derived from it.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the Republic of the Philippines to be affixed.

Done in the city of Manila, this 29th day of July, in the year of our Lord, 1954, and of the independence of the Philippines, the ninth.

RAMON MAGSAYSAY,
President of the Philippines.
By the President:
FRED RUIZ CASTRO,
Executive Secretary.

H. R. 1227, Known as the Bryson Bill, Should Be Supported

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDWARD H. REES

OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 9, 1954

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me by the House, I am including a statement I submitted to the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on H. R. 1227, being known as the Bryson bill, which would prohibit the advertising of liquor on billboards, in magazines, over the radio, and on television.

It is my view this legislation is of sufficient importance that it should have had consideration in the House.

The statement follows:

Mr. Chairman, I want to express my appreciation for the opportunity of submitting my views with respect to this proposed legislation. I, also, want it known that I support it.

The purpose of advertising is to increase sales. Among other things, the question before us is whether it is in the public interest to increase sales of liquor. We are not dealing with an ordinary object of legitimate trade in this case. The Congress and State legislatures have again and again recognized restrictive laws on the ground that alcohol is a dangerous commodity. Nearly all States recognize that it must be sold under severe restrictions. Every State in the Union, so far as I know, has laws and regulations that are far more strict with the sale of alcoholic beverages than with any other commodity.

We have even recognised the necessity of controlling the sale of alcoholic beverages with respect to advertising. I am sure you know that such advertising is presently subject to some regulation by the Alcohol Tax Unit of the Treasury Department, also, by the Federal Trade Commission. I mention this only to indicate there has been some recognition with respect to such control.

I don't know of anyone who really supports what is known as alcoholism. Nobddy, so far as I am advised, believes that alcoholism is good for our people. On the other hand, almost everyone will admit two things—that it is a dangerous commodity and that its sale is on the increase. In this modern age the use of it has become more dangerous. Drunken drivers of automobiles have become a dangerous menace, not only to themselves but to others. Thousands of people lose their lives because of the excess use of alcohol. That situation is growing worse every year. Last year 34 percent of drivers involved in fatal accidents had been drinking. A 10-year study of traffic problems in Cleveland, Ohio, reported alcohol was evident in more than half of the cases studied. Railroad, bus lines, air lines, and other means of transportation recognise alcohol as a killer. They just don't knowingly employ anyone who uses alcohol, even moderately.

About 2 years ago, Dr. Jellinek, an economist of Yale University, who had given years of study to this problem, estimated there were 7 million people in the United States who were either alcoholics or whose lives had been seriously affected by the use of alcohol and who were in danger of becoming alcoholics. Dr. Andrew C. Ivy, a member of the faculty of the University of Illinois, who had likewise given this problem serious study, put the figure at 7,500,000.

A subcommittee of the Senate has been investigating the problem of juvenile delinquency. A report has recently been submitted stating that since 1948 the number of delinquents has been steadily increasing. They call attention to the offenses committed by boys and girls under 19 years of age. The report indicates that since 1948 the number of juveniles committing these serious crimes has increased as much as 100,000. One of the witnesses who testified before that committee is Irving M. Kriegsfeld who is an outstanding authority on this subject. He said, and I quote: "Early identification with adult behavior results in considerable increased drinking and gambling." Part of this behavior is presented in a glamorous light through Men of Distinction series of advertisements. More of this glamor is presented through advertisements entitled "Homelife in America," being a series of advertisements where every incident of homelife is suggested as a proper occasion for drinking beer.

Dr. Edward Carlton, president of the American Association of Physicians and Surgeons, says the factories of the Nation lose 1 billion man-hours of labor a year because of hangovers. This is just one item of the cost of drink. The expense to American industry is a cost to all of us.

J. Edgar Hoover, in a recent statement, said "the startling increase in juvenile delinquency is largely due to parental failure." He calls it "one of the greatest tragedies of American life." A great share of the parental failure is due to drinking in cocktail lounges by the fathers and mothers of children who roam the streets.

It has always been my understanding that Congress has the police power, not only to attempt to prevent crime, but to guard the health and morals of this Nation. Here is one place where we should discharge our responsibility to help safeguard the American people. If you had 7 million people exposed to typhoid through lack of laws to exterminate mosquitoes and destroy the germ, you would act quickly enough. Here you have more than 7 million people who are a public liability, or in danger of becoming so, and who are a drain on their relatives and upset their families through drinking. You have 400,000 children whose lives are being ruined either directly or indirectly because of the use of alcohol.

It seems to me it is time for this Congress to discharge its responsibility. If people want to drink, that is one thing, but to encourage and insist through advertising in the newspapers, on billboards and over the radio and TV, that it's for their best interest to do so and that they really ought to do it, then I think we are carrying a situation too far.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to call your attention to an article that recently appeared in the local papers. It states that one of the toughest housing problems in the District jail last year was to take care of more than 14,000 drunks. The statement says that the number of admissions for intoxication has more than doubled in 5 years. "Police," the statement says, "could do something else with their time spent last year in arresting 37,000 persons for drunkenness." Officials state that municipal court criminal division would be deprived of 20,000 cases a year, if they could get rid of the drunks. You may be interested to know that in the Gallinger Hospital alone 2,156 persons were treated during 1 year for diseases caused by immoderate drinking. The situation has become so serious in the District of Columbia that it has become necessary to establish courts just to deal with drunk people alone. Incidentally, the number that were treated for alcoholism in one of the hospitals in this city almost doubled in the last 5 years.

It seems strange that we use public funds to try to cure alcoholics, but hesitate to approve legislation to restrict the advertising of a commodity that brings misery, poverty, and even death. A dangerous thing they say, but to restrict the advertising of it is not in the public interest.

There has been what I regard as a weak argument by those opposing this legislation to the effect that many people would be thrown out of employment if this legislation were approved. There are, at least, two answers, one of them is that it must be a poor excuse to say that people need to be employed to produce a commodity that is dangerous and certainly not for the best interests of this country. Furthermore, the millions of dollars that are spent for alcoholic beverages could be used to employ people in doing things worthwhile, building schoolhouses and churches and other buildings and improvements. The annual expenditure of $9 billion for liquor is pure waste. It is more than we spent for our churches last year. It could have been better spent for food, clothing, and other needs of the families that went without these things because the money was spent for alcoholic liquors.

This is a constructive piece of legislation. It ought to be approved. I hope you will report it favorably.

Hoover Myth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 11, 1954

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include herewith an editorial from the Reading (Pa.) New Era:

Hoover Myth

A calculated campaign has been underway for the last few years to surround ex-President Hoover with a halo, synthetic as it may be, presumably as the first step toward a form of Republican sainthood.

Unfortunately for the boys directing the strategy, their efforts to rewrite history are futile since all the propaganda in the world cannot remove the stigma from Hoover's do-nothing record in the great collapse and the great depression of the early thirties.

What's more, Hoover, by his very utterance alienates millions of Americans who have not changed their attitude about his ineptness and poor leadership at a time when economic disaster in America put millions of Americans on bread lines and gave Communist agents their best opportunity to spread a doctrine that breeds on misery and hardship.

On his 80th birthday this week, the depression President attacked what he called Presidential misuse of power during the 20 years of the New Deal and Fair Deal. He then joined in McCarthy's most obnoxious smear to charge that Roosevelt and Truman's regimes were responsible for the growth of Communist tyranny.

These statements, of course, merely prove that Hoover is as blind today as he was in the dark ages of the 1930's when he consistently forecast a chicken in every pot, 2 cars in every garage, and prosperity just around the corner.

In those days workers were grateful for the appearance of Franklin D. Roosevelt on the scene to restore order in the Nation's banking system, to put people to work; to launch such great social reforms as social security, public housing, minimum wage legislation, bank deposit insurance—to mention only a few. Perhaps this was the abuse of Presidential power Mr. Hoover now deplores, but we doubt whether anyone with depression memories would agree with him.

We also doubt whether the American people will "buy" his argument that Democrats were responsible for Soviet growth. A look at recent history reveals that it was President Truman who launched the aid program for Greece and Turkey to halt Communist expansion; forged the North Atlantic Alliance to retain allies in Europe against the Reds; launched the foreign aid policies that kept our friends from falling prey to Russia long ago; and called the Commie bluff in Korea.

Another look at recent history reveals that it was the present Republican administration that sat silently on the sidelines while France sold out 12 million people to the Commies in Indochina. And it was Eisenhower who removed the Seventh Fleet from Formosa so Chiang Kai-shek could attack the Red Chinese mainland, even though everyone in his right mind knew Chiang couldn't fight his way out of the proverbial paper bag. In fact, news reports indicate we may shortly have to defend Formosa against Communist attack.

The big money boys allied with the reactionary press are determined to remold former President Hoover into the role of an all-wise elder statesman whose words are weighted with wisdom and authority. They know he will plead the cause of special privilege and will get big headlines for his every utterance.

Reverence and respect for old age are laudable, but we doubt very much whether the American working people owe Hoover more than that.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Printing and binding for Congress, when recommended to be done by the Committee on Printing of either House, shall be so recommended in a report containing an approximate estimate of the cost thereof, together with a statement from the Public Printer of estimated approximate cost of work previously ordered by Congress within the fiscal year (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 145, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on Printing, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the Congressional Record is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Frank Brodie is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the Record at $1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

DISTRIBUTION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

To the Vice President and each Senator 100 copies; to the Secretary and Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, each, 25 copies; to the Secretary, for official use, not to exceed 35 copies; to the Sergeant at Arms, for use on the floor of the Senate, not to exceed 50 copies; to each Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress, 68 copies; to the Clerk, Sergeant at Arms, and Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives, each, 25 copies; to the Clerk, for official use, not to exceed 50 copies; and to the Doorkeeper, for use on the floor of the House of Representatives, not to exceed 75 copies; to the Vice President and each Senator, Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress there shall also be furnished (and shall not be transferable), 3 copies of the daily Record, of which 1 shall be delivered at his residence, 1 at his office, and 1 at the Capitol.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized book dealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by book dealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. The money derived from such sales shall be paid into the Treasury and accounted for in his annual report to Congress, and no sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRICE OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

The Public Printer is authorized to furnish to subscribers the daily Record at $1.50 per month, payable in advance.

Remit by money order payable to Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C.

PRINTING DOCUMENTS AND REPORTS

Documents and reports of committees with the evidence and papers submitted therewith, or any part thereof ordered printed by Congress, may be reprinted by the Public Printer on order of any Member of Congress or Delegate, on prepayment of the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 162, p. 1940).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the Congressional Record, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

HIG

Cha

Rout

Bills
duced
S. Co

Bills
H.
U. S.
(S. R
H.
of the
2486)

Bills
appro

Bill
years
issue
Mich

Milit
ment
leave
cepted
ment

Atom
confe
Energ
bill, r
appoi
land,

Debt
6672,
comm

5

5

Appendix

Junior Press Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. DUFF

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, August 14, 1954

Mr. DUFF. Mr. President, I send to the desk and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record a copy of a release issued by the United States Information Agency to 85 foreign countries, concerning the Junior Press Conference, a television program originating from station WFIL in Philadelphia and carried weekly on the American Broadcasting Co.'s national hookup.

The Junior Press Conference brings the youth of our Nation in contact with the leaders of public life in America in the discussion of important public questions of the day. Thereby it not only creates a forum where public leaders may understand the thinking of the youth of America, but also develops discussions with which all the American people are interested and about which they ought to be informed.

Another conspicuously valuable service rendered by this forum is in making known to foreign countries the degree of freedom of expression which is found in the United States at a time when equal freedom of expression is denied in continuously enlarging sectors of today's world.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

JUNIOR PRESS CONFERENCE LETS STUDENTS QUESTION WORLD LEADERS

Is man the weaker sex? Are college fraternities a good thing? Are we headed toward world war III or can peace be continued indefinitely? Questions like these and the answers to them, given by prominent people, are the substance of which Junior Press Conference is made.

Junior Press Conference is a weekly television program of the American Broadcasting Co. in which student editors of college newspapers ask questions of qualified experts. To make the questions and the guest speaker's answers as spontaneous as possible, the program is not rehearsed. Research on the subject is permitted, but questioners and guests do not discuss the matter until the program is underway and do not meet socially until the program is over.

Junior Press Conference is the product of the imagination and energies of Mrs. Ruth Geri Hagy, who acts as mistress of ceremonies in addition to planning each week's presentation. The program, which originates at television station WFIL in Philadelphia, is carried on the ABC nationwide hookup.

Persuading important and busy people to submit themselves to her student editors' questioning isn't a major problem with Mrs. Hagy. Because she is well-known to students and the public in her capacity as senior adviser to the United States National Student Association (the American counterpart of European student unions), few refuse her invitation. During the year that her program has been televised, she has had as her guests General of the Army Omar Bradley; Dr. Ahmed Hussein, Egyptian Ambassador to the United States; V. K. Krishna Menon, Indian Ambassador to the United Nations; Harold E. Stassen, Administrator of the United States Foreign Operations Administration; Sir Percy Spender, Australian Ambassador to the United States; Paul G. Hoffman, head of the Ford Foundation; James Carey, secretary-treasurer of the Congress of Industrial Organizations (CIO); and such prominent United States legislators as Senators Estes Kefauver, Wayne Morse, and Frank Carlson.

The young editors who question the guests are selected through two United States college students' organizations—the National Student Association and the Associated Collegiate Press—on the basis of their interest in a particular subject and their articulateness. Last year, representatives from more than 100 different colleges in 32 States were on the program.

Topics are chosen because of news interest and student suggestions and then authorities on those subjects are invited to participate.

"In this way we try to delve into problems from the many points of view that will give students and our audience the most balanced understanding of the conflicts involved and thus help them evaluate solutions," Mrs. Hagy explains.

Once the subject has been determined, the students selected, and the specialist invited, Mrs. Hagy leaves the preparation of material up to the individuals.

On Monday, the day of the television program, the students meet in her Philadelphia apartment and spend the afternoon tearing the place apart for books, magazines, newspaper clippings, and work space. She provides soft drinks and then everybody gets strewn around the floor, hot under the collar, and furious arguments rage—frequently getting off on tangents that have nothing to do with the show. For pure human interest, Mrs. Hagy says this is the program that should be televised instead of the one that is. From the afternoon discussion come the main points to be brought out in the half-hour show that begins at 9 p. m.

After dinner, Mrs. Hagy and the students go to the American Broadcasting studios, have television make-up applied, and go through a camera rehearsal. The guest to be interviewed arrives about half past 8, but does not meet the students until the show begins. Mrs. Hagy says:

"Everything seems to happen differently than in the rehearsal. Sometimes the most argumentative students never open their mouths—they seem to get camera shy. Whatever they say, however, is natural and provoked only by their reactions to what the guest says."

Although the subjects vary from civil liberties to national defense and politics, the issues of greatest interest to the college reporters are love and peace.

Two of the most popular programs, Mrs. Hagy says, were Are We Educating for Modern Marriage? discussed by Dr. Marynia Farnham and Prof. Leo Gurko and Is Man the Weaker Sex? with guest speaker Prof. Ashley Montagu, author of The Natural Superiority of Women.

The subject of world peace is close to their hearts the television program director says, because so many of the students are war veterans. She says that student leaders, afforded the opportunity of knowing students from other lands, find that they too have the same strong interest in love and peace.

Mrs. Hagy is helped in the selection of programs by the Associated Collegiate Press which takes student polls on various themes, but the best thermometer of student opinion, she says, is the junior press office located in the national headquarters of the United States National Student Association in Philadelphia.

"There student leaders from all over the world come and go. Almost any day, one can find an exchange student from Nigeria, Israel, Egypt, Tanganyika, Burma, or Brazil," she says.

Described as a college news forum where "the citizens of tomorrow meet the leaders of today," Junior Press Conference is proving mutually beneficial to both the students who ask searching questions and the leaders who answer them.

The Tennessee Valley Authority

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, August 14, 1954

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record the fine statement made by Mayor George Dempster, of Knoxville, Tenn. Mayor Dempster, one of the Nation's most capable and progressive mayors, made this presentation as president of Citizens for TVA, before the Hoover Commission Task Force at Chattanooga, Tenn., on June 1, 1954.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

STATEMENT BY MAYOR GEORGE R. DEMPSTER, KNOXVILLE, TENN., PRESIDENT, CITIZENS FOR TVA, INC., BEFORE THE TASK FORCE ON WATER RESOURCES AND POWER, COMMISSION ON ORGANIZATION OF THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH OF THE GOVERNMENT, CHATTANOOGA, TENN., JUNE 1, 1954

My name is George R. Dempster. I am mayor of Knoxville, Tenn., and president of Citizens for TVA, Inc., a peoples organization supporting the continiued operation of the Tennessee Valley Authority at maximum efficiency. I am here to give this task force information about the TVA development which I hope will assist you in reaching the conclusion that TVA is a project of vast benefit and importance to the whole United States and should be preserved.

It has been my privilege to have watched and worked with the TVA development in three different capacities: First, as a businessman with manufacturing operations located in Knoxville, one of the key cities of the Tennessee Valley area; second, as mayor of the city of Knoxville; and finally, since last September as president of Citizens for TVA, Inc., a nonprofit, nonpartisan grassroots organization with voluntary membership composed of citizens throughout the seven-State area served by TVA, and in other parts of the country as well.

As a lifelong resident of the Tennessee Valley, I also know something about the history and background of the TVA development.

There are those who think of the Tennessee Valley Authority as the brain child and creature of the New Deal, conceived by what they like to think of as impractical idealists imbued with messianic zeal. But what are the historic facts?

The history of major conservation efforts on a national scale dates back to the administration of President Theodore Roosevelt, who was one of the country's first outspoken apostles of conservation. An important associate of his was his chief forester, Gifford Pinchot, who also headed the National Conservation Commission. This representative body made a report in 1908 after exhaustive study of natural resources.

This study gave recognition to the interdependence of natural resources which, as seen by Chief Forester Pinchot, calls for conservation efforts to promote the wise use of water, land, and forests for the good of man.

President Theodore Roosevelt, in commending this report, proposed to the Congress that broad waterway improvement should "be achieved by coordinating agencies in the Federal departments through the medium of an administrative commission or board, acting in cooperation with the States and other organizations and individual citizens."

Senator George Norris, often called the father of TVA, had much of his broadly conceived conservation background in mind when he evolved the basis for the TVA Act, which created an arm of the Federal Government as an entirely new departure in regional development "clothed with the power of government," to quote President Franklin D. Roosevelt's words, "but possessed of the flexibility and initiative of private enterprise."

The TVA Act, recommended by a Democratic President and sponsored by a Nebraska Republican Senator, followed earlier, unsuccessful efforts by Republican Congresses to provide for public development of Muscle Shoals. (Federal interest in the development of the Tennessee River dates back, incidentally, 130 years—to 1824 when John C. Calhoun, Secretary of War under President Monroe, ordered a survey directed at improving navigation.)

Truly the creation of TVA as a Federal agency empowered to assist in the development of resources of an entire river basin was of bipartisan origin, and was perhaps a prophetic precedent for TVA's nonpartisan administration since the beginning.

What is TVA's record since 1933?

As a businessman, I can testify that business in the Tennessee Valley has been materially stimulated by the programs and activities of TVA, and its general condition greatly improved. This has not been "spoon-fed" prosperity; TVA simply provided the opportunity for economic development, and the people of the valley took advantage of it and devoted their own efforts toward pulling themselves up by their bootstraps.

As mayor of Knoxville it has been my privilege to observe closely the progress made by my city and the surrounding trade area. Knoxville has become one of the thriving trade centers of the Nation. Since TVA maintains its headquarters in Knoxville., I have been sufficiently close to the operation of the agency to know whether in its dealings with the people it has shown any desire to shove people around or to force certain measures down our throats. There has been a total absence of such tactics or techniques. Instead, TVA's whole approach has been one of cooperation, consultation and negotiation—working on the grassroots level, enlisting the cooperation of State, county, and municipal agencies and the people in improvement of all the valley's resources.

As president of Citizens for TVA I have become increasingly aware of the feelings of the people of the Tennessee Valley with respect to TVA, and it is my unqualified observation that the vast majority of them believe in TVA and are outspokenly in favor of its continued operation as the vital, democratic institution they have known for over 20 years.

As the Citizens for TVA headquarters in Nashville we have received hundreds of unsolicited letters from valley residents and others, testifying to their faith in TVA. I wish to quote from just a few of them:

From a citizen of Jenkins, Ky., familiar with the valley prior to TVA and afterwards, came this message:

"I remember how it looked then and I have been over the same area in the last 90 days, and the change has been nothing short of remarkable. No combination of private capital could have developed the area to the extent it has been done by the TVA."

A housewife of Memphis, Tenn., writes:

"Everyone here feels we would lose a great deal if TVA is curtailed by political factions. TVA is one of the greatest things this section of the country ever had and is a source of strength to the rest of the Nation. Let's keep it politically clean."

A TVA enthusiast from Orange, N. J., writes:

"The best thing for those people to do who look with envious eyes on the wonders that have been created within the valley would be not to destroy, but to build bigger and better authorities if possible, in other river valleys, cursed with similar soil erosion, floods, lack of river traffic and electric power. Judged in terms of health and wealth to the inhabitants, the Federal Government since 1789 has nothing finer to its credit than the creation of the TVA."

Here's a message from an official of a Chicago company who in joining the Citizens for TVA told of being at the foot of Norris Dam when it was under construction and who "from the very start has been a great admirer of Senator Norris and enthusiastic about the great development. It is saddening to see some of the great gains made in the past 20 years swept away by super-selfish men."

"I think the TVA is a monumental achievement. I feel, as an English visitor said: 'It is as beautiful as a poem'," writes a TVA enthusiast in the publishing business, outside the valley, but whose forebears came from Tennessee.

From the chairman, division of social sciences, of a small college in Mississippi: "I wish to commend Citizens for TVA for leadership in the struggle to conserve the gains which this excellent project has brought to the people of this area."

From a Tennessee Valley housewife:

"The budget of the Federal power agencies does not contain an allotment for propaganda so we must depend upon the loyalty of our friends."

From the manager of an electric cooperative in Vermont:

"Representative DONDERO referred in one of his speeches to the purchasers of TVA as "captives." You can tell him for me that we would very much like to be one of its captives. * * * Our average rate for the past 5 years has been over 13 mills per kilowatt-hour, which readily explains why we would like to have a yardstick in this area.

"I definitely cannot understand the logic of Congress in opposing self-liquidating loans for generating plants as an economy measure when they allow tax abatement subsidies to the private utilities which make the total loan requests for TVA insignificant by comparison."

From a rural dweller in Trezevant, Tenn.:

"Sure, if the private companies could eliminate TVA it would put millions of dollars in their pockets at our expense. Our rates would likely triple instead of merely being double. It would work a hardship on all the people that have bought electrical appliances * * * in fact it would create panic."

A Bridgeport, Ala., housewife expresses the feelings of one who knew the hardships before electricity became available in the homes of her area:

"I know what electricity does on the farm, and in the home. There has never been an invention that has done more for the people than electricity. Six years ago life was hard and no time for rest, but now we have more rest, and work is no more a burden but a pleasure. I truly hope that everybody without electricity will soon have it and enjoy life while they live."

A Pontotoc, Miss., resident makes known his feeling in no uncertain terms.

"TVA is one of the best things ever to come to the farming class of people."

"Being a widow, I certainly would not like an increase in rates, and am glad to help to keep this project under control," writes a homemaker of Princeton, Ky.

"We do not want a power company to take over TVA. This is what we want and let's hold it," writes a Tennessee farmer.

A citizen of Ramer, Tenn., puts it this way:

"TVA is ours and we want to keep it."

A Dyersburg, Tenn., R. F. D. dweller:

"We must not let them take TVA. TVA certainly has been a lifesaver for us poor farmers. Just hope it can be continued as is."

Another farm family in Friendship, Tenn.:

'What on earth would we do without TVA? I just want to cry when I think about anyone wanting to do away with anything as worthwhile. I was married the year TVA went into production and when I think about how happy the farm people were—oh."

From a businessman of Andersonville, Tenn.:

"I consider the TVA the sole instrument in bringing a more abundant life to the people of the valley."

"I am a 100-percent TVA booster, for I would hate to see it get in the hands of the power trust, for I know what it would mean," write a citizen of Pittsburg Landing, Tenn.

"We need TVA as it is," is the plea of a married couple in Hopkinsville, Ky.

"It seems to me that the private power companies had time and opportunity to have done something about bringing electricity to the country people if they had wished to do so. I certainly don't think they should be interfering now after it has already been done. Hope they can be stopped," writes an Adamsville, Tenn., housewife.

"Am also grateful to know there is a way by which the people can be heard in the fight to save the TVA," is the expression of a Trenton, Ky., businessman.

A mother in Sparta, Tenn., is proud of present service from TVA:

"Twenty years ago when our oldest son helped build Norris Dam our electricity of today was only a dream to come true, now we are very proud of our service and wouldn't want it changed."

Since, as the Bible tells us, "by their fruits ye shall know them," permit me to refer to some of the fruits of TVA's 21 years of operation in developing the resources of an entire region.

In keeping with the objectives prescribed by law, TVA has brought about major improvement in preventing floods—in fact, since TVA's major dams were completed, we have not experienced really serious flood damage in the valley, although for 3 straight years heavy flood conditions were experienced. This same flood-control program has benefited areas of the Ohio Valley and the Mississippi Valley as well.

The TVA through improvement of the navigation channel, has made possible constantly increasing barge-line traffic on the river, which in 1953 amounted to another all-time high record of 7 million tons, carried 1 billion ton-miles at savings to shippers of $12 million.

The TVA's agricultural efforts have worked a virtual revolution in valley farming. Soil-depleting row crops have been largely superseded by soil-conserving cover crops supporting animal husbandry agriculture made possible by the production of TVA high-analysis phosphate and nitrate fertilizers. These, incidentally, are now produced in large quantities by the commercial fertilizer plants of the Nation.

The TVA program of malaria control has virtually wiped out that disabling disease which, prior to TVA, incapacitated some 30 percent of the valley population annually, and which, of course, took them out of the ranks of breadwinners for long periods of time.

The TVA forestry program is bringing about a remarkable improvement in this valuable crop, so that to date some 250 million seedlings from TVA nurseries have been used in reforestation projects and the majority of counties in the Tennessee Valley have now adopted some organized fire-prevention program. Private owners are adopting scientific-management forest projects handled upon a sustained yield basis.

The TVA low cost, high use electricity policy, which has introduced mass-production methods in the field of power distribution, has resulted in the lowering of rates all over the Nation but without causing the private power companies to suffer a reduction in earnings. Actually, just the opposite has been true.

Please realize that bigness was thrust upon the TVA, first by the power demands of World War II in which TVA power played a key role; and, in recent years by the ever-growing demands of the defense program, and particularly the Atomic Energy Commission. By 1957, it is conservatively estimated that the defense needs alone will take more power than TVA generated this past year; that the civil and nondefense needs of the valley will by 1957 be taking only one-third of total power production.

We of the Tennessee Valley have entered into solemn covenants with our own Federal Government whereby our Government agrees to furnish wholesale, the electric power needed by our people. There was never any stipulation written into those agreements that we cannot grow, cannot enlarge, cannot ask for more power as it is needed. Just as we agreed to have TVA become our sole supplier of energy, so we were led to have faith that as our power needs increased, the TVA would expand to take care of those needs. Gentlemen, we have faith in the contractual promises of our Government and we do not believe that any measures should be introduced that would force the TVA to go back upon its solemn contractual word.

In conclusion, I want to state for the record that we are under no illusions about the objectives of Mr. Hoover, the Chairman of the Commission of which this task force is a subdivision. In suggesting over a year ago the formation of this very Commission to which he was later appointed as Chairman, Mr. Hoover made the grand design of this proceeding quite clear. I quote from a speech delivered by Mr. Hoover on April 11, 1953, at the diamond jubilee of the Case Institute of Technology, Cleveland, Ohio:

"The objective of the whole proceeding should be to get the Federal Government out of the business of generating and distributing power as soon as possible."

In this same speech Mr. Hoover used the bankrupt phrase, "creeping socialism," in referring to Federal public power projects, thereby echoing the propaganda line of the private power companies.

Now when we look at the background of Admiral Moreell, chairman of this task force, can we have any feeling that he is an unbiased judge? Admiral Moreell, in a speech delivered on November 10, 1952, before the American Petroleum Institute, said the Tennessee Valley Authority, among other public projects, was in line with "this century-old strategy of Marx—what today we call creeping socialism."

Seven members of the task force were also members of the panel and Committees on National Water Policy of the Engineers Joint Council, which 3 years ago came out against the preference clause in contracts for the sale of public power and against Federal construction of transmission lines to serve the preferred groups—i. e., municipalities and cooperatives.

Anti-TVA or antipublic power statements are directly attributable to several members of this task force. In fact, it is impossible to discover a known friend of public power among the task force membership. Apparently no effort has been made to assemble a neutral group or even to achieve a balance between private and public power proponents.

Despite this evidence of bias, and despite the publicly stated aim of Mr. Hoover to "get the Federal Government out of the business of generating and distributing power as soon as possible," I am bold enough to urge you nevertheless to consider the TVA openmindedly.

Objective appraisal of this world-renowned development surely must lead any reasonable man to conclude that it is one of America's finest examples of democracy in action.

Flanders Has Some Solid Backing in McCarthy Fight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, August 14, 1954

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an article entitled "Flanders Has Some Solid Backing in McCarthy Fight," written by Peter Edson, NEA Washington correspondent, and published on July 27, 1954.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Flanders Has Some Solid Backing in McCarthy Fight

Washington, July 27, 1954.—A little known but growing political group quickly jumped on the coattails of Senator Ralph E. Flanders, Republican, of Vermont, when the salty Vermonter took out after his colleague, Senator Joseph McCarthy.

It is called the National Committee for an Effective Congress. Members call themselves bipartisan. But with their frankly liberal goals, they find that since 1948 only 5 of the 22 Senators and Representatives whom they have supported successfully have been Republicans.

Their box score isn't bad. They've lost only nine of the men they've supported.

The McCarthy camp charges that Senator Flanders has been masterminded by some powerful organization operating in the background. The committee has been accused of playing this role.

It's true that the group has been working hand and glove with Senator Flanders in his anti-McCarthy efforts. But it's not exactly true that they've masterminded him. In fact, it's the other way around to some extent. They've learned a few tricks from the cagy Vermont solon.

For instance, his release of his speech calling for a censure of Senator McCarthy several days before he planned to deliver it in the Senate caught the committee's professional public-relations man by surprise.

Flanders' motive in doing this was to make sure that every Senator had read the speech by the time he formally delivered it. It was a neat parliamentary move to force a faster showdown on the censure motion.

It was also to keep any Senators from stalling on the vote on the claim that they wanted more time to study the motion.

For months the committee had been seeking some means for getting the Senate to face up to the McCarthy question. But it took Senator Flanders to show them the best way to do it.

There's some substance to the charge that the committee is powerful. The central idea binding the group has caught on significantly since they first put it in practice in 1948.

Committee spokesmen now claim to have 5,000 contributors widely scattered around the United States who are willing to spend various sums for the campaigns of approved candidates.

A total of about $300,000 has been given to date to favored candidates and the committee hopes to have some sizable campaign contributions available for the upcoming November elections.

The committee's small permanent staff in New York has a $30,000-per-year budget. It is headed by former film writer George E. Agree.

The ghost-writer for former President Franklin Roosevelt, Playwright Robert Sherwood, is one of the guiding lights of the group. Other key members of its board of advisers include the former prosecutor at the Nuremburg trials, Telford Taylor; Robert R. Nathan, economist; Mark Ethridge, publisher; and composer Oscar Hammerstein II.

The donations which the group makes to favored candidates range from $500 to $5,000. the only strings attached to this money, it is claimed, is the promise from a candidate that he will try to maintain those qualities and goals which caused him to be approved in the first place.

One of the most desired qualities in a legislator, the committee believes, is that he strive for a "creative international foreign policy."

The committee wants him to be a good team player on the liberal side of all issues. And the group also urges their candidates to make extensive use of the committee for help any time.

The committee is also very practical. It has a policy of not supporting a candidate who has no chance of winning.

Senator Thomas C. Hennings, Jr., Democrat, of Missouri, is very grateful for the help the committee gave him in his campaign in 1950. He says of the group:

"In the past, liberal forces have been working on a piecemeal, disunited basis. There was a definite need for a well-informed body of citizens who focus their interest and energy on the Congress, its operations, and its personalities.

"The desire of the NCEC to accept this challenge is heartening news. Members must be people who can provide sound leadership in their home communities, and at the same time contribute to a long-range liberal political philosophy."

The Honorable William Henry Harrison

SPEECH

OF

HON. JACKSON E. BETTS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 12, 1954

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Illinois, concerning Bill Harrison. I learned to know him well ever since we first came to the 82d Congress, because his room was next to mine in the Old House Office Building. We associated together informally as well as on the floor of the House. I had the honor to succeed the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Springer] and Bill Harrison as head of the 82d group, and I am proud that I followed in their footsteps. I am happy to know that Bill Harrison will still be with us. Through our friendship I have found that he has always been not only a perfect gentleman through and through, a true inheritor of all his rich ancestry, which goes back to William Henry Harrison, a President of the United States, but he is also an able legislator. I certainly hope that he will be able to continue with us and grace the other body.

The Honorable Wesley A. D'Ewart

SPEECH

OF

HON. HAMER H. BUDGE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1954

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Speaker, before leaving Idaho to come to Washington to be sworn in as a freshman Congressman, I had heard so much about Wesley D'Ewart that I almost felt as though I knew him. My predecessor representing the Second Congressional District of the State of Idaho, the Honorable John Sanborn, had told me that no Member of the House was more capable or better informed on matters affecting the Western States than the gentleman from Montana [Mr. D'Ewart]. In the 4 years during which it has been my pleasure to serve with him and under his chairmanship, the words of John Sanborn have been proven true many, many times. Wesley D'Ewart has been not only one of the foremost spokesmen for the States of the West, but he has also put in probably as much time at his work as any Member of Congress, and his industry and devotion to his work have been manifest in many fields, but particularly those affecting the Western States.

His background, his legislative ability, his knowledge of the problems of the West, and his courage and honesty will be sorely missed. It is with the greatest regret on the part of all of us from all sections of the Nation to see Wes D'Ewart leaving the House of Representatives where he has done such meritorious service for his people of Montana, for the West and for the Nation.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Printing and binding for Congress, when recommended to be done by the Committee on Printing of either House, shall be so recommended in a report containing an approximate estimate of the cost thereof, together with a statement from the Public Printer of estimated approximate cost of work previously ordered by Congress within the fiscal year (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 145, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on Printing, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided,* That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized book dealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by book dealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

DISTRIBUTION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

To the Vice President and each Senator 100 copies; to the Secretary and Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, each, 25 copies; to the Secretary, for official use, not to exceed 35 copies; to the Sergeant at Arms, for use on the floor of the Senate, not to exceed 50 copies; to each Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress, 68 copies; to the Clerk, Sergeant at Arms, and Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives, each, 25 copies; to the Clerk, for official use, not to exceed 50 copies; and to the Doorkeeper, for use on the floor of the House of Representatives, not to exceed 75 copies; to the Vice President and each Senator, Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress there shall also be furnished (and shall not be transferable), 3 copies of the daily Record, of which 1 shall be delivered at his residence, 1 at his office, and 1 at the Capitol.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the Congressional Record, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

PRINTING DOCUMENTS AND REPORTS

Documents and reports of committees with the evidence and papers submitted therewith, or any part thereof ordered printed by Congress, may be reprinted by the Public Printer on order of any Member of Congress or Delegate, on prepayment of the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 162, p. 1940).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the Congressional Record is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Frank Brodie is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the Record at $1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. The money derived from such sales shall be paid into the Treasury and accounted for in his annual report to Congress, and no sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRICE OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

The Public Printer is authorized to furnish to subscribers the daily Record at $1.50 per month, payable in advance.

Remit by money order payable to Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the Record.

Nec

IN

N
una
the
and
luti
fro
T
me
pri
Nen

A
ato
in
pro
to
buc
def
T
of
ma
its
nev
edi
ing
Byi
um
offi
F
Eac
spo
fur
pre
pay
wh
sen
wel
tha
mo
tin
nat
it:
san
I
for
res
ear
Wh
Vir
eve
in
you
pu
tin
me
I
mo
Se
sev
sev
en
of
pr
th

Appendix

Need for Termination of Deficit Financing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, August 14, 1954

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the Record a statement and various editorials relative to a resolution introduced by the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. Byrd] and myself.

There being no objection, the statement and editorials were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

NEED FOR TERMINATION OF DEFICIT FINANCING

(Statement by Senator Bridges)

A month ago the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. Byrd] joined with me in introducing Senate Joint Resolution 174, proposing that the Constitution be amended to assure the American people of balanced budgets in the future by putting an end to deficit Government financing.

The response to this proposal by the voters of our country has been overwhelming. The man on the street has been quick to see its wisdom and its necessity. Over 100 newspapers, large and small, have carried editorials praising its purpose and advocating its enactment. Furthermore, Senator Byrd and I have received mail in such volume as to tax the limit of our already busy office staffs.

Pay-as-you-go government is long overdue. Each day that we fail to recognize and respond to growing inflation, the danger of further damaging our national stability and prestige increases. The people who must pay our Nation's tax bill, the same people who have sent us here to the Senate to represent them are aware of this danger. And well they might be for it is simple arithmetic that we cannot continue to spend more money than we take in and, at the same time, remain domestically sound and internationally strong. As one Illinois editor put it: "The main objective * * * is sound as sanity."

I am more convinced than ever of the need for quick action by the Congress on this resolution so that the way will be paved for early ratifying action by the 48 States. When you read, as the senior Senator from Virginia and I have, so many letters from every corner of this Nation, written by people in all walks of life, supporting our proposal, you will quickly see that now is the time to put our financial house in order; now is the time to restore common sense to Government.

In order to point up my contentions even more strongly, I append hereto a copy of Senate Joint Resolution 174, together with several editorials which have appeared in several newspapers throughout the Nation endorsing its purpose. They are a sample of the editorial comment in support of the proposed amendment and echo accurately the sentiments of the American taxpayer.

Senate Joint Resolution 174

Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide for the imposition of Federal taxes to provide revenues at least equal to appropriations, except in time of war declared by the Congress or when the United States is engaged in open hostility against an external enemy

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, and shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. On or before the 15th day after the beginning of each regular session of the Congress, the President shall transmit to the Congress a budget which shall set forth his estimates of the receipts of the Government during the ensuing fiscal year under the laws existing on such date and his recommendations with respect to appropriations to be made for such fiscal year. Except in time of war declared by the Congress or when the United States is engaged in open hostility against an external enemy, the total appropriations recommended by the President for any fiscal year shall not exceed the total of his estimates of the receipts of the Government during such fiscal year.

"SEC. 2. In the event the Congress, except in time of war declared by the Congress or when the United States is engaged in open hostilities against an external enemy, makes appropriations for the ensuing fiscal year in excess of the total of the President's estimates of the receipts of the Government during such fiscal year reduced by any amount by which the apropriations made for all previous fiscal years beginning subsequent to the effective date of this article of amendment (except fiscal years during which the United States has been engaged in a war declared by the Congress or open hostility against an external enemy) have exceeded the actual receipts of the Government during all such fiscal years, it shall enact measures to raise during such ensuing fiscal year an amount of additional revenue at least equal to the amount of such excess.

"SEC. 3. As used in sections 1 and 2 of this article, the term 'appropriations' includes grants of authority to make actual expenditures of funds but does not include appropriations to reimburse the Government agency making such actual expenditures.

"SEC. 4. No motion in either House of Congress to adjourn for more than 3 days shall be in order during any period of time when the Congress has failed to perform its duty under section 2 of this article.

"SEC. 5. This article shall be effective on and after the first day of the calendar year which begins after the date this article is ratified.

"SEC. 6. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years from the date of its submission to the States by the Congress."

[From the Exeter (N. H.) Newsletter of June 15, 1954]

Senators Styles Bridges and Harry Byrd have proposed an amendment to the Constitution that would require the Federal Government to maintain a balanced budget except in the event of war.

Senator Byrd has long been a powerful influence in opposition to efforts to increase the public debt now set at $275 billion. He was successful last year in balking administration proposals to raise the limit to which the Federal Government may borrow, and it would appear that his opposition now will prevent an increase to the $290 billion limit that the administration requests. Senator Bridges, as chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee, must be considered as a strong voice in the opposition. He cites that a continuance of present United States fiscal policy for the next 40 years, or the estimated period that the Nation faces in maintaining a costly defense program would reduce the American dollar in 1994 to a value of about 12½ cents.

The amendment as proposed by Bridges and Byrd would mean that Congress at the close of each session, except in time of war, must balance appropriations with income. If appropriations exceeded Government receipts they would have to be met by the levying of new taxes.

The voices of economy are not entirely lost in the midst of the heavy spending of the past two decades. They grow louder now to slow down if possible the policy of inflation to which the Government has long committed itself.

[From the Manchester (N. H.) Union Leader of July 16, 1954]

Senators Styles Bridges and Harry Byrd are following sound business judgment in their proposal of a constitutional amendment to put the Government on a pay-as-you-go basis, except in time of war.

Bridges sizes the situation up correctly when he says that the Nation will continue for many years to carry a costly defense load. This, therefore, ceases to be an emergency and has become the normal permanent status. It must be recognized as such, which means that appropriations must be made to cover such spending, instead of permitting the national debt to grow indefinitely.

The national debt is now almost $275 billion—a gigantic sum. To keep adding to that debt as is being done today is suicidal. It is a grave injustice to coming generations, who must carry that load as well as the problem of their own day.

Of late the National Government has been an agency for spending without any real regard for solvency. The taxpayer's money is poured out recklessly, and then if political demands exceed receipts, more funds are borrowed. It surely is time there was a jacking up. The only form that can take is to demand a balanced budget.

No one can deny, as Senator Bridges asserts, that emergencies of great magnitude that strike the Nation unexpectedly must be dealt with by heroic means, whatever the financial cost may be. But we should not go on indefinitely pasting an emergency label on the whole course of time. We must not forget also that Government borrowing and the piling up of a costly debt have helped to cut the value of the dollar. Today it has about half of the value of 20 years ago. This process must not be allowed to go on indefinitely, and to accelerate its shrinkage as the national debt climbs.

BRIDGES was right when he declared that "to insure monetary stability we must put an end to the practice of financing Federal operations through an interest-bearing charge account that is never paid and upon which our Government has come to depend." President Eisenhower promised in the election campaign to do something about it, but his administration has not got very far. Now let's have a showdown and settle the matter by ruling that the Government must pay its way in peacetime and no fooling about it.

[From the South Bend (Ind.) Tribune of July 18, 1954]

FOR REAL REFORM

The enforced Federal budget balancing proposed by United States Senators STYLES BRIDGES, New Hampshire Republican, and HARRY F. BYRD, Virginia Democrat, deserves serious congressional attention. They have introduced a resolution for amendment of the Constitution for that purpose. Senator BRIDGES is chairman of the Appropriations Committee and Senator BYRD heads the Joint Congressional Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Expenditures. Those official positions enhance the appearance of authoritative judgment of the Federal fiscal situation. The fact that the resolution has bipartisan sponsorship makes it even more practically impressive.

If the Constitution were amended on the pattern proposed by those two Senators, Federal revenues would be estimated in advance by the executive department as at present. If Congress voted for appropriations in excess of the estimated revenues, congressional adjournment would be forbidden until taxes to keep the budget balanced also were voted. Only when the United States was involved in war, with or without a formal declaration by Congress, would the constitutional compulsion for budget balancing be suspended. In wartime, of course, the taxes to match expenditures could be literally crushing. This has been taken into account by Senators BYRD and BRIDGES.

The unbalanced Federal budget has become a dangerous way of life in the United States in the last two decades. Senator BYRD remarks that the Federal or national debt is equal to all of the accessible physical assets of the Nation. This year Congress was asked, he added, to appropriate $56 billion, although unexpended balances of previous appropriations total $85,900,000,000. In other words, the Government might spend $143,200,000,000 if Congress acceded to the current appropriations request.

Remarking that the value of the dollar and the Nation's security are threatened by this condition, Senator BRIDGES states that crisis borrowing and emergency borrowing, except in wartime, must be stopped. "The bottomless purse in the hands of a Socialist-minded bureaucracy," he says, "is the ideal weapon with which to break down the virtues of thrift and industry and destroy the self-sufficiency and personal initiative of the people." This "fantastic charge account" which has been a major factor in Federal Government spending and the debt increase in the last 20 years is "a form of invisible taxation—a secret capital levy—upon all of the people."

It is reasonably plain that voluntary abstention by the Government cannot be anticipated. Enforced budget balancing, involving either economy on taxes that would make all citizens more sensitive to the full meaning of Government spending projects, is the only remedy. As a promoter of economy, the Bridges-Byrd resolution is exceptionally promising. Full-scale debate on it in Congress should have great educational effect. Passage of the resolution to the States and reasonably prompt action on it by the legislatures would decisively resolve this vitally important issue.

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Daily Calumet of July 26, 1954]

A GOOD IDEA DOOMED FOR AX

Another noble idea is headed for the ashcan or the ax, as you like it. Reference is had to a proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States forbidding the Federal Government to operate by deficit spending in peacetime. The first noble experiment was the proposed celebrated Bricker amendment, making it illegal to sign treaties with other nations if the provisions of such documents violate existing law.

Take your own case. Say you earn $375 per month. How long can you go on spending $376 a month and get by? Yet the Government is doing just that. What a strange state of affairs it is, we must pass laws making us stay within all bounds of sanity regarding money matters.

Thanks to HARRY FLOOD BYRD, of Virginia, and W. STYLES BRIDGES, of New Hampshire, two United States Senators, who propose a commonsense limitations on spending. Every taxpayer in America ought to send BYRD and BRIDGES a bouquet. What these two ordinary, hard-headed lawmakers want is a constitutional amendment prohibiting the President's budget proposing the spending of more than the estimated receipts for the next fiscal year.

The idea has plenty of merit, but the spenders will knock it in the head. The deficit for the fiscal year just ended June 30, was $3 billion. It is said it will be much greater when we look at the books on June 30, 1955. We'll bet a dollar to a nickel it will.

The national debt now is crowding the legal limit of $275 billion. There are strong notions underway in Washington to boost that figure still more. They ought to run such goofs out of office. All that's needed to inflate the $275 billion mark is a bill approved by Congress. It will encounter vigorous opposition, but observers of the Washington scene predict its passage.

Already opponents have taken one healthy swing with the ax on the Byrd-Bridges idea. It is said that in peacetime it frequently becomes necessary to spend for defense and the possibility of war. Under such circumstances the administration—Republican or Democrat—might be pinched considerably on spending for security. That's a lot of balderdash. The amendment can be so put together as to preclude the element of danger in a time of crisis.

The main objective sought by Senators BYRD and BRIDGES is as sound as sanity. Not only is it wise to put the clamps on a soaring debt, but it is absolutely necessary unless we are willing to see the Federal debt puncture the sky and so precipitate financial disaster upon the Nation.

The present debt of $275 billion is appalling. It will take this generation and a good many more to put the Federal Government back on the black side of the ledger. It will take God only knows how many years to balance our books, if indeed this Nation ever does without resorting to repudiation of governmental obligations. That would be ruin, also.

Lend Senators BYRD and BRIDGES your very best punch. Hope, fervently, they may put their proposal through the Congress. It will be a tough fight. There still are a number of New Deal Demos around, augmented by Republican big spenders, whose main interest seems to be in spreading the power of the Federal Government over ever-widening areas. Enough of that.—H. F. W.

[From the Durham (N. C.) Sun of July 19, 1954]

POWERFUL ARGUMENT

The proposal of Senator BRIDGES, of New Hampshire, chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee, that the Constitution be amended to provide for a balanced budget may not be a pleasant thought for some Members of Congress or for some executive leaders but it has much to recommend it. It is an application of the pay-as-you-go principle.

Senator BRIDGES' amendment would require that revenues must be provided by any Congress to match any appropriations it may make. It would eliminate deficit spending; would provide that the Government spend only so much money as it may expect to have to spend.

Latitude in times of national crisis, however, is provided. The restriction would not apply in any time of war or in any period of open hostilities against an external enemy. What would happen in the event of the need of any sudden buildup toward war? There would have to be, presumably, a sudden buildup in revenues to pay for the expenditures.

There will be some strenuous opposition among the Members of Senate and House; no doubt of that. There are Representatives and Senators who are impatient of any check on their pet spending schemes and many are apostles of the system of spending today and letting tomorrow take care of the bills. They may not be here tomorrow and, in any event, "tomorrow is another day."

Senator BRIDGES' resolution grows out of the failure of even a conservative Republican Congress to move toward a balanced budget and the pressure being exerted for another lifting of the national debt limit. The deficit for the year ending June 30 was about $3 billion. This year, Senator HARRY BYRD, of Virginia, says, the deficit will be greater instead of smaller because taxes have been reduced faster than expenditures. Moreover, although Senator BYRD said nothing of that, taxes have been reduced for those more able to pay rather than for the great body of Americans.

Senator BYRD, in an address in the Senate last week, stoutly supported the Bridges amendment and advanced at least one powerful argument in its favor. The ban on deficit spending, said Senator BYRD, "would be an affective deterrent on nonessential spending."

It would, indeed. He has a strong point there. Congress is persuaded into excessive spending by pressure groups; and succumbs because it is aware that the beneficiaries will be pleased and because the rest of the country will not complain too much. It will not complain too much because, under deficit spending the day of reckoning is postponed and because it will not think the thing through. Besides other pressure groups conclude that they may want some "gravy" of their own some day.

If, however, the Congress is required to find the money for the additional expenditures and forced to levy additional taxes for the spending which goes beyond available revenues, it will be impelled to pause; for the citizen does not utter louder cries of anguish than when another tax is being added.

[From the Bridgeton (N. J.) News of July 17, 1954]

WOULD CURB SPENDING

Senator STYLES BRIDGES, Republican, of New Hampshire, and Senator HARRY BYRD, Democrat, of Virginia, are collaborating on an amendment to the Constitution, the purpose of which is to put an effective curb on Government spending.

This amendment, which if passed by Congress and ratified by the required number of States, would put an end to all headaches over balancing the budget for under the amendment it would balance itself.

The purpose of this amendment is to forbid any administration to spend more in any one year than the estimated receipts for that year. The budget and receipts would have to balance. In short, the Federal Government would have to be conducted on a pay-as-you-go basis. This is good common sense and there is no reason why the Government should not be conducted on that basis.

These two men are not dreamers, but men who have been close students of our financial situation and have been earnest advocates of bringing our financial situation into balance. Senator Byrd, who is a successful businessman, has long since won the reputation of being an expert in Government financial affairs and of having such facts and figures at his fingertips.

In discussing the proposed amendment, Senator Bridges said something must be done to set our financial house in order or else our national stability will be endangered and our national prestige shaken.

This statement by Senator Bridges is not overdrawn by any means and coincides with the views of these wise financiers of the Nation, and is the reason both of these men oppose any increase in the debt limit.

We were promised that the Republicans would balance the budget if placed in power. At the end of the first year of the Eisenhower administration the budget remained unbalanced, the excuse being that it was impossible owing to commitments of the Truman reign. The second year of the Eisenhower administration finds the budget $3 billion out of balance, and it is predicted the next year will find the situation even worse. So it is apparent that some such drastic step as the proposed amendment must be taken to insure the country financially.

No action on this proposed amendment will be taken until the next session of Congress and it may find the going hard, as the spenders will oppose any effort to put a curb on them, but once the amendment comes before Congress the people should rally so overwhelmingly in its support that Congress will not dare to fail to approve it. Once through Congress there is no question of its approval by the necessary number of States, for the people are tired of their Government being continually billions of dollars in the red and of the mountain of debt under which they are laboring.—W. E. M.

[From the Omaha (Nebr.) Evening World-Herald of July 20, 1954]

IN TIME OF PEACE, PAY CASH—THAT'S BYRD-BRIDGES PLAN

Democratic Senator Byrd, of Virginia, and Republican Chairman Styles Bridges, of the Senate Finance Committee, are joint sponsors of a proposed constitutional amendment which, in the interests of America, should be submitted and adopted in jig time.

In brief, this amendment would prohibit deficit spending. It would require Congress to levy taxes to cover the entire amount of its appropriations every year.

As Senator Byrd explains it, the amendment would not be applicable "during periods when the United States is engaged in war declared by Congress or in open hostilities against an external enemy."

But in times of peace—no deficits.

Is there anything wrong with that? Is there any reason why this wondrously rich country should keep running farther and farther into debt, even in years of great prosperity? We think most Americans would agree that there is none. We think the Byrd-Bridges amendment, if submitted, would be adopted virtually by acclamation.

The proposed amendment is only part of Senator Byrd's personal program of things that must be done "if we are to preserve our solvency." He recommends these four moves:

1. Balance the budget by reducing spending.
2. Hold the existing debt ceiling at $275 billion. "This is more than enough for us to owe."
3. Reduce taxes after reducing expenditures; "it does not make sense to borrow money to reduce taxes."
4. Short of a national emergency, there can and should be a moratorium in all new spending programs until the Federal Government is showing a budget surplus.

Here again we think there would be very little difference of opinion among those Americans who honor simple arithmetic above socialistic theories. The wonder is that so few men, once they are elected to Congress and move to Washington, actually vote the way any rational and patriotic American ought to vote.

[From the Nashville (Tenn.) Banner of July 20, 1954]

BYRD-BRIDGES FORMULA: IF DEFICITS WERE ILLEGAL, BUDGET WOULD BALANCE

It isn't as easy—and not always as spectacular—to get out of debt as to get in. The New Deal and its offspring the Fair Deal made a big splash with their red ink, operating on the theory that prosperity came that way and that the Federal debt didn't matter because "after all, we owe it to ourselves."

With only four exceptions, Senator Harry Byrd points out, the Government of the United States has operated in the red for 25 years, and a balanced budget is not yet in sight. The deficit for the fiscal year ended June 30 was approximately $3 billion; and he warns that this year's deficit will be higher because taxes have been reduced faster than expenditures.

The Eisenhower administration made a substantial dent in the deficit of last year. By the budget recommended by Harry S. Truman (his last one) the amount of red ink for fiscal 1954 would have been $9 billion. But the Government still is spending in excess of income because Congress has deleted some revenues without a corresponding deletion on the spending end of the ledger. So the debt mounts.

Specifically the bipartisan economy—or budget balancing—plank introduced by Senators Byrd, of Virginia, and Bridges, of New Hampshire (chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee), provides:

Under section 1 the President, at the opening of each session of Congress, would submit a budget setting forth both appropriation recommendations and revenue estimates, but the recommended appropriations shall not exceed estimated revenue under tax laws existing at the time.

If, in any session, Congress enacts appropriations which, in combination with any deficit carried over from the previous year, exceed the revenue estimates, section 2 requires legislation raising additional revenue to cover the deficit.

Under section 4 neither the House nor the Senate may adjourn until estimated revenue and enacted appropriations, plus any previous year deficit, are in balance.

The amendment, of course, is careful to provide that it is not applicable during periods when the United States is engaged in war declared by Congress, or in open hostilities against an external enemy.

In simple language, this amendment would prohibit deficit spending; if appropriations exceed revenue, taxes must be raised to cover the deficit. This would be an effective deterrent to nonessential spending, which actually comprises a big part of every deficit.

Practically everything else has been tried to curb excessive spending, of the type born with the New Deal policy of tax, spend, and elect. Maybe a law government wide, prohibiting expenditures beyond income, can do it.

The Russians Lose a Cold War Battle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 16, 1954

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include herewith an editorial entitled "The Russians Lose a Cold War Battle," which appeared in the August 14, 1954, issue of the Courier-Journal, of Louisville, Ky.

The editorial is as follows:

THE RUSSIANS LOSE A COLD WAR BATTLE

A sharp cold war defeat for Russia, a defeat long years in the making, is the basic meaning of the antiaggression pact just signed by Greece, Turkey, and Yugoslavia. It is a 20-year collective-action hands-off sign to Moscow, in a strategic area which Moscow has repeatedly attempted to dominate since 1946. And it is backed not only by 1.3 million of the world's toughest soldiers, but by the collective strength of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, to which Greece and Turkey already belong and to which Communist but non-Soviet Yugoslavia now indirectly adheres and soon may directly adhere.

The pact represents a tremendous strengthening of the free world front against Communist expansion. On Russia's southwestern border it posts the allied strength of Turkey's standing army of nearly 600,000, Yugoslavia"s 600,000, and Greece's 150,000—all of them tough and well-trained and newly fortified with Western military equipment, and many of them battle-tested veterans. The exploits of the Turks in Korea are happily familiar. The Greeks, in one terrible decade ending in 1949, fought Italians, Germans, Bulgarians, Yugoslavs, and a civil war. The Yugoslavs, in World War II, tied down 16 German divisions in their mountains and forests, contributing materially to Allied victory in Italy and the West.

This is a heartening triumph for the West now, enhanced by the prospect of a Trieste agreement that could end Italo-Yugoslav friction and add Italy to the new pact. It is all the more cheering in the perspective of the few brief years that saw Russia's historic drive to the Mediterranean all but succeed.

In 1946 the newly born cold war got warm with Moscow's demand for joint control of the Straits of the Dardanelles. Turkey, then isolated but as courageous as ever, stoutly refused. The same year Communists in Greece came close to seizing power there. For two years Yugoslavia aided this Communist effort, until Russian arrogance and overreaching led Tito to break with Moscow in June of 1948 and to begin his slow rapprochment with the West. From 1947 the Truman Doctrine and American aid gave new hope to the Greeks and the Turks, and ultimately, with British and French collaboration, to the Yugoslavs. Only last year Moscow repeated its demands for a foot in the Dardanelles, softly this time suggesting talks with Turkey alone instead of dragging in the Soviet satellites. But Turkey's reply, as defiant as ever, this time came from a nation infinitely stronger and no longer alone.

For the Greeks and the Serbs the new entrance is a renewal of old ties. Both fought for their freedom from the old Ottoman Turks. Both fought the Germans in the two world wars, and both are ethnically close. They split briefly only when Belgrade was obeying Moscow's orders. Now we can thank Moscow's cupidity and stupidity, no less than Western statesmanship, for bringing them together again, and in alliance at last with their ancient enemies the Turks. For us, with our own Army of only 17 divisions, it means at least 70 tough Allied divisions directly confronting the Russian Bear—divisions, our own military experts are convinced, are as tough and dependable as any we have on our side. It is enough to make Moscow think a long time indeed before initiating fresh aggression anywhere in Europe or the Middle East.

The Church in the News

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 16, 1954

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the Record, I wish to insert the following article from the Lutheran of July 28, 1954, concerning certain Hungarian and Czechoslovak clergymen who are currently delegates to the World Council of Churches assembly at Evanston, Ill.:

The Church in the News

(By Elson Ruff)

UNITED STATES CLEARS EAST EUROPEAN DELEGATES

President Eisenhower and Secretary of State Dulles said it would be all right for men from Iron Curtain countries to enter the United States for the World Council of Churches assembly next month. Even Senator Pat McCarran, who sponsored the tough immigration law which shields the United States behind its own iron curtain, said East European delegates could come "as long as they mind their own business, leave when they are supposed to, and don't participate in sabotage or propaganda against this country."

But there were high hurdles to clear. According to the law, the United States consul in each European country has the final word on applications for entry visas which are filed at his office. The Department of State recommended to consuls that they cooperate in clearing the way for delegates from Red countries.

This month Attorney General Brownell approved 11 Czechoslovak and Hungarian delegates for the trip to Evanston. This approval should be sufficient to guaranty visas for them. Still pending were applications from 16 in East Germany, 2 in Poland, and 1 in Yugoslavia.

STATE DEPARTMENT EXPLAINS

Lengthy explanation of why the United States is permitting Iron Curtain country churchmen to come to Evanston was given last week by the State Department. "In each of these countries," the State Department said, "there have been some churchmen of all faiths who have found it possible to reconcile their faith with public support of communism. Such may be the case with some or all of the clergymen from Czechoslovakia and Hungary who have now applied for admission to the United States to attend these church gatherings. * * *

"The spiritual foundation on which this Nation rests is too strong to be adversely affected by any pro-Communist activities in which this small group of delegates from Communist-dominated areas might attempt to engage. The other participants in these gatherings, as well as the American people in general, will be in a position to judge by the conduct of these delegates whether they come here as churchmen or as propagandists of an aggressive and materialistic philosophy * * * hostile to religious faith."

Pro-Communist delegates might benefit, too, from their contacts in America, the State Department thought.

THE CZECHOSLOVAK SIX

It was reported from Prague that there are three Lutherans among the six Czechoslovak delegates being sent to the World Council assembly. Bishop Jan Chabada and Superintendent Andrej Ziak of the Church of Slovakia, plus the dean of the Bratislava theological school, Jan Michalko, are the Lutherans.

The Church of the Czech Brethren (Lutherans and Reformed merged to form this church in the Czechlands in 1918) is sending its synodical senior, Dr. Viktor Harek, and the dean of the Comenius theological school, Dr. Joseph Hromadka. The Reformed Church in Slovakia is sending Bishop Imre Varga.

Last month Czechoslovak churches launched an effort to win friends in English-speaking countries by mailing the first issue of a monthly English-language newsletter. "New forms of political, social, and cultural life are coming to life before our eyes," wrote Dr. Hromadka. "We see our people in their intensive work of the building of a new order. We love our people and feel a sense of solidarity with them in their plans and desires, in their mistakes and weaknesses."

IN CONCLUSION

Don't forget, when reports of the World Council of Churches assembly appear in your newspaper, that a newswriter's job is to report dramatic and unusual events. If a pro-Communist bishop makes a 5-minute speech attacking American democracy, it will get more newspaper space than a dozen speeches explaining why Christians don't approve of sin.

It now seems certain that a few pro-Communist churchmen will be permitted to come to the Evanston assembly. There won't be many, and they probably won't talk much. But what they say will be played up beyond it true value.

It is desirable that delegates from churches of the Red nations should come to the assembly, for the churches must struggle to keep from being separated by the Iron Curtain. In Communist countries the only men who are permitted to hold positions of leadership in churches are those willing to give active support to the Communist program.

We have no reason to doubt the sincere Christian faith of these men. But we consider them deluded in the reasons they give for supporting their Red governments. Communism will eventually conquer the world, they say. They are pioneers working out the way for churches to survive under communism.

Bishop Lajos Veto said at the Hannover assembly in 1952 that the Hungarian churches are "already now successfully tackling those problems which sooner or later will face all churches on this earth, particularly when the old obsolete form of social organization will be superseded by the society of the future."

Perhaps if you have Communist doctrine preached at you year after year, you can come to believe such a statement. We in the free world don't believe that all churches on this earth will be compelled to come to terms with Moscow. Communism contains within itself the poisons which will detroy it if non-Communist nations can keep their patience, strength and hope. If communism does conquer the world, there will be no churches left.

We disagree completely with these men from eastern Europe about their friendly attitude toward their Red rulers. But we can easily understand why they lull themselves with comforting explanations.

One Communist collaborator expected at Evanston, Prof. Joseph Hromadka, is more difficult to understand than the others. He freely chose to put himself in the peculiar situation where he is now. As a strong anti-Nazi, he and his family had to leave Czechoslovakia when Hitler's troops arrived in 1939. He lived in the United States until 1947, was a popular lecturer at Princeton Seminary, and could have stayed here the rest of his life.

But he went home and became the chief Protestant leader in waving the Red flag in Eastern Europe. He sees clearly all the faults in the western democracies, but never speaks of the inhuman crimes of the police states. "The path of my faith and the path of the communistic activity intersect one another, but they are not identical," he says.

He will probably have opportunity to explain his ideas here next month, but I suspect he will not be successful in convincing anybody. Maybe, in a land of freedom of speech and respect for civil rights, he won't even be able to convince himself.

Some Farm Price Comments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER JOHNSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 16, 1954

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, one of my constituents has clipped from the Minneapolis Star Journal of August 10, 1954, some very good comments on an editorial run shortly before by the paper. I believe they are very instructive and should be brought to the attention of the Members. I herewith submit it for your consideration:

Some Farm Price Comments

To the Editor:

On an editorial July 14 I see the caption "Farmers Aren't Busted." Apparently that is quite a feather in the cap of the present administration. Perhaps this item will provide food for thought: "The number of business failures in the United States during June ran about 210 a week, according to a recent report by Dun & Bradstreet. This total was about 28 percent higher than the number of business failures a year earlier, and has been following this trend for 63 consecutives weeks."

Or this: Edwin Christianson, president of Minnesota Farmer's Union, declares: "The June 15 agricultural price report shows that almost every important farm commodity had declined from May to June although prices are usually seasonally strong that far ahead of harvest. In Minnesota, the parity ratio on the 16 leading commodities has dropped to 78 percent of parity. Worse than that, it is certain that there will be no recovery of prices when the new crops come to market. Minnesota has a 78 percent of parity average while the national average is 83 percent. You need only to remember that the parity average for the 6 worst years of the great depression (1930 to 1935) was 72 percent of parity to see how close we are to bankruptcy conditions today."

And now a quote from the Louisville Courier-Journal: "On February 15, 1953, the United States Department of Agriculture reported the index of prices was down to 256; rose to 258 by May 15, but by June 15, had dropped to 248, the sharpest fall in 5 years. Minutes after the United States Department of Agriculture report was issued, Secretary

Benson issued his own statement that this price drop "doesn't indicate a general weakening in the farm price structure."

I shall not draw any conclusions; I shall merely leave the conclusions for you good readers to draw.

Mrs. Otto A. Wolner.

Butterfield, Minn.

V. I. Minahan, 1881–1954

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. BYRNES

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 16, 1954

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, one of Wisconsin's foremost editors died suddenly last week. He was Victor I. Minahan, editor of the Green Bay Press-Gazette and the Appleton Post-Crescent, two of the leading dailies in my congressional district.

Mr. Minahan was universally respected. His great gifts were enhanced by splendid personal characteristics—kindness, fairness, generosity, and integrity. He had two brilliant careers, first as a lawyer of outstanding ability and success and for the last 24 years as a distinguished editor. His widely quoted editorials reflected the incisive mind of the counselor, but they were always tempered with deep and human understanding. As a leader in his community, Mr. Minahan's advice was always eagerly sought and freely given. In my own case, I have benefited deeply from his counsel as have countless others who always found his door open.

Wisconsin has lost one of its finest citizens.

Under leave to extend my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I include three tributes to Victor I. Minahan which have appeared in newspapers in my congressional district:

[From the Green Bay Press-Gazette]

V. I. Minahan Passes

The death of V. I. Minahan, editor of the Press-Gazette, brought to a close a useful life. Although he had been in failing health for some time, it is characteristic of the man that he had dictated some editorials and had gone wading to relax in the cool waters of the bay when death came.

Mr. Minahan lived only a few years past the three score and ten which are supposed to be the right of all, but he had in that time completed two careers, both with outstanding success. He was a lawyer and had engaged in the practice of law in Green Bay for many years before he became editor of the Press-Gazette. He built up a successful law business and distinguished himself as a member of the Brown County Bar. But early in this career he became interested in the newspaper business and in 1914 when he thought the newspaper service to the people of this area was inadequate he organized a company to publish the Free Press.

It quickly became apparent that the city was not any better off with two papers which it could not support and this led to the consolidation of the Press and Gazette with the late John K. Kline, editor, and Andrew B. Turnbull, business manager. Mr. Minahan was one of the principal stockholders in the new company but he continued the practice of law until 1930 when, upon the death of Mr. Kline, he became editor.

His service as editor of the Press-Gazette during the past 24 years requires no elaboration here. He had definite views on the place of the newspaper in the community it serves and he spared no effort to put his ideas into effect. No day passed that he did not prepare his editorials if he was physically able. During his career he traveled a great deal but distance was not permitted to keep him from his work.

Whether he was in Florida, California, or Egg Harbor his work was as regular as his meals, but it may be a mistake to call it work. He enjoyed his occupation. Although editorial writing is an exacting and tiring task for most people, it never seemed to be so to him. He often declined help that was available to him and more often than not appeared not to have space to print all he wished to say.

In the Press-Gazette office he had the respect and affection of all. He was kind and generous. He had a sharp eye out for those who were trying hard as well as for those of special abilities. It was his greatest pleasure to give a hand here and there to those whom he felt needed help and deserved it. Often his editorial comment was turned to some person who had won neither wealth nor power but who had put forth the effort or shown the perserverance and skill required for success.

His contributions to the community were many, and without publicity. One great contribution which cannot be concealed is written in the columns of the Press-Gazette during the past quarter of a century. As we read it this community has lost a fine man and an able and understanding editor.

[From the Manitowoc Herald-Tribune]

Victor I. Minahan

In spite of failing health, V. I. Minahan, editor of the Press-Gazette of Green Bay, dictated some editorials on the day of his death last week. He was subject to a heart seizure while wading in the waters of Green Bay near his summer home at Egg Harbor.

This devotion to his work, even though he had help which he declined to avail himself of, is indicative of the type of man who for 24 years served his community through the editorial columns of the Press-Gazette. Prior to engaging in the newspaper profession he had distinguished himself as a brilliant lawyer.

As such, he earned a widespread reputation for his ability, honesty and the zeal with which he handled his cases. It was perhaps this close attention to details and desire to further serve Green Bay which brought about a decision to publish another paper. When the Free Press later merged with the Gazette, he was a principal stockholder and later became its editor.

This writing also brought additional distinction to the man who had previously been outstanding as an attorney. The power he attained was exercised judiciously, and no one, high or low, found him other than meticulously fair. Mr. Minahan shunned personal glory and thus many of his philanthropies were without publicity, but he had earned the gratitude of many people and organizations for his fine deeds.

The Press-Gazette has lost an able editor and the city of Green Bay one of its most consistent supporters.

[From the Marinette Eagle-Star]

Victor I. Minahan

Victor I. Minahan had the training and experience that ably fitted him for the post of editor of the Green Bay Press-Gazette which he did not assume until he was nearly 50 years of age. He had a keen, balanced mind that enabled him to present an editorial subject in a manner most worthy of the profession.

Background and experience in various walks of life make an editor all the more capable of presenting a subject and judging the news. Mr. Minahan had these in abundance. He taught in a rural school and established a law practice after completing his law course at the University of Wisconsin. His prominence in the field of law resulted in his being called upon to serve as special prosecutor in graft cases. He was a captain in the field artillery during World War I and it was natural for him to exert his leadership in the American Legion, born of the war.

These and other experiences and affiliations were invaluable to Mr. Minahan and he used them to great advantage as editor of one of the leading newspapers of the State.

The Truce in Indochina

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 16, 1954

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the Boston Traveler, of Boston, Mass., recently asked Members of Congress from Massachusetts to express their opinion on the truce in Indochina.

I include in my extension of remarks a statement I made which appeared in the August 11, 1954, issue of the Boston Traveler:

(By Congressman John W. McCormack)

(This is another expression of opinion by a Massachusetts Member of Congress regarding the "truce" in Indochina in response to inquiry by the Traveler.)

It is evident that the "truce" in Indochina was unfortunately a military defeat for France, and a bad blow for the free world.

It is also quite evident that it is only a matter of time when the Reds will move again and probably take over the rest of Indochina, as well as Laos, and seriously threaten Cambodia.

OTHERS IN PERIL

The other nations of Southeast Asia are also in danger.

The strange attitude of France has been known for a long time. When we were told as recently as last March by high officials of the present administration that the Navarre plan would succeed, and Indochina was safe from the Communists, it was known, or should have been known, by our officials that the Navarre plan was a failure and that defeat would result.

The strangest thing about the whole southeast Asia problem is the way Great Britain is acting with its important interests there.

It looks to me as if Britain and France are playing up to the Communists; that some kind of a deal exists that is not for our best interests.

There is no question in my mind but that a determined effort was made some weeks ago to get us unilaterally into Indochina.

If certain things that were proposed had received the approval of the leaders of both parties in Congress, I have no hesitancy in expressing the opinion we would have been involved in Indochina.

It certainly would have been unwise for us to go in there, if at all, alone.

The military defeat of France and Indochina leaves all of southeast Asia in peril and quick action is necessary if the Communists in that area are going to be stopped. If we are going to make a pact with southeast Asia nations, it must be done very quickly.

I might also say that it looks as if some of the nations there will not join any defense pact and the question of developing an effective defense pact is uncertain.

The world situation from our angle has worsened considerably in the past year. As I see it, the most effective way for President Eisenhower, in the first instance to give us needed leadership, is to create bipartisanship in fact, as well as in name.

This can be done by drafting and appointing outstanding Democrats to prominent positions in the State Department, in the Defense Department, and even in his Cabinet.

The probability is that he will not do this—but he should. And I do not mean Eisenhower Democrats because Democrats do not consider them to be Democrats.

Before, during and after World War II, President Roosevelt and President Truman had a large number of able Americans who were Republicans in prominent position and at one time, at least two Republicans were members of the Cabinet.

At the present time there are no real Democrats that I know of occupying prominent positions in any agency of the Government.

VITAL MESSAGE

The best evidence of bipartisanship is the drafting of able members of the opposite party to serve our country in a crisis. President Eisenhower is the only one who can do this.

In my opinion, bipartisanship of this kind will be a message that other countries can understand and evaluate in its proper light.

I might also say I consider the reduction of our Army and Navy to be very unwise, just as I thought the reduction of our Air Force last year, which has been corrected, was unwise.

For the only thing the Communists respect is what they fear and that is military strength and power greater than they possess.

Every effort should be made to try and develop a real southeast Asia pact and in such a pact England and France should assume their full responsibility.

On June 9, 1954, I made a speech in the House of Representatives in which I recalled the action of President Roosevelt in a critical hour during the Second World War, in order to galvanize the Western peoples into action and weld them together to fight Nazism and Facism, made the dramatic move of drafting the Atlantic Charter guaranteeing the four freedoms for all those fighting Nazism and Facism.

At that time I said, "We need some such dramatic gesture now to win the Asian's faith and confidence." I think that suggestion of mine is just as sound today as when I made it only a few months ago.

Apparently steps are under way to try and lay the foundation for such a meeting and I hope it is not too late.

In any event, we have got to face the world situation and view it objectively. Crying and moaning over what has happened or what would not have happened if some things had taken place, is not going to have us meet the situation as it confronts us today.

If President Eisenhower creates a real bipartisan government bringing unity to our people, and if he increases our Armed Forces as he should, and if he gives the leadership that will bring about a real effective southeast Asia pact, we will be able to do those things necessary to stop the Red hordes in their attempt to dominate the world.

In order to accomplish this, we must have decisive leadership. Above all, our leadership should not be confused and uncertain.

Annual Flag Day Exercises, Lodge 109, BPOE, Wilkes-Barre, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. BONIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 16, 1954

Mr. BONIN. Mr. Speaker, on June 13, 1954, I had the privilege to be the principal speaker at the annual Flag Day exercises of Lodge 109, BPOE, in Wilkes-Barre, Pa., and I wish to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following speech I delivered on that occasion:

SPEECH BY HON. EDWARD J. BONIN, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, ON FLAG DAY, JUNE 13, 1954

We have assembled this afternoon to commemorate a remarkable day in the history of our American Republic.

On June 14, 1777, 177 years ago, the Thirteen Colonies along our eastern seaboard celebrated their first year of independence.

The Founding Fathers of our constitutional form of government were in the midst of the great American Revolution against tyranny. General Washington's army, ill-clothed, inadequately armed, and poorly disciplined, was retreating before the trained regulars of the British Empire. Only the courage and the conviction of General Washington saved the patriot forces from total defeat.

The memorable event we celebrate today was not consummated on the battlefield—but in the sober atmosphere of the Old State House in the city of Philadelphia.

Meeting at a time of stress and discouragement, the loosely bound Continental Congress adopted a resolution dedicating the Stars and Stripes as the standard of the infant Republic.

Thus was established a new emblem of liberty, freedom and justice—the symbol of human rights that are the gift of God—the oldest, the proudest, and the best loved flag in the world.

In assemblies such as this, it is fitting and proper to discuss the meaning and significance of our flag and to consider thoughtfully the pledge of allegiance to the flag and to the Republic for which it stands.

To every loyal American, regardless of ancestoral origin, that pledge signifies a solemn rededication to the pain and suffering of those who transmitted our inheritance to us. It means that we believe, with all our hearts and minds, in the sacred principles that guided our illustrious patriots in their struggle for freedom and independence.

It means that we pledge, as they did, "our lives, our fortunes and our sacred honor" in the cause of American liberty.

It means that we will work, sacrifice and fight to preserve and defend our American system of free government—not only when it is threatened from abroad—but also from enemies who would destroy it from within.

We can be proud that, in all its glorious history, the Stars and Stripes has never been carried in a war of aggression. It has never been the symbol of conquest or territorial acquisition. It has never brought tyranny or oppression to any people on earth.

Instead it has always been glorified and acclaimed as the flag of liberation, peace, and opportunty. Irrespective of the place where Old Glory has been unfurled to the breeze, its noble and inspiring message has always been: "Here men shall be free."

Have we been faithful to that solemn declaration?

Within the lifetime of most of us, we have gone forth to fight for human liberty at a stupendous cost in blood and money.

Twice within a generation, the people of many nations—liberated from tyranny and oppression by the heroic sacrifice of our young men and women—looked to the Star Spangled Banner as their last remaining hope for peace and freedom.

After World War I, we believed we had made the world safe for democracy. However, a jumbled peace and a confused foreign policy prepared the way for the rise of new men determined to conquer the world through dictatorial power. They brought us into a greater conflict on a global scale.

Once again, the Stars and Stripes were carried to victory on the battlefields of Europe, Asia, Africa, and in the Islands of the Pacific.

The precious lives of young Americans were sacrificed in the cause of liberty and civilization.

We have strayed a long way from the principles of the men who planned our Republic, our Constitution, and our flag. Yes, we have refused the warning of George Washington to avoid entangling alliances.

Our forefathers told us to love our neighbors—but keep our fences high; they notified us that inherting a Republic was like inheriting any other kind of riches; it is hard to hang onto it.

Each day as I sit in the hallowed halls of Congress, I hear the pleas of the selfish who demand we guarantee their personal welfare, regardless of what happens to our national welfare—I see those who want everything for nothing—those who shrug off public debt and applaud bigger and bigger government—these people, my friends, are guilty of a crime beyond the dignity of human beings. They are deserting their children and their children's children.

I say future generations are entitled to share in the liberty and opportunity that we found here.

They are entitled to inherit this Republic as we did—intact—unmodified—unmortgaged. We who stand by without protest and permit this betrayal of our children—are cowards for our silence.

Cowards, permitting the wasters to exploit the farm bloc, the labor bloc, the foreign blocs, the minority blocs, and so—pacifying each other—tear our Nation asunder.

We must rededicate ourselves to individual liberty and opportunity. We must rally behind the battle cry of "Back to the Constitution," back to the meaning of our flag.

The Constitution and our flag is a sacred bond, binding the dead, the living, and the yet unborn—signed in the snow of Valley Forge and sealed in the sacrifices of Bunker Hill.

On this day, dedicated to the glory of the Stars and Stripes, let us honor those who died under it to keep it free. Let us declare unrelenting war against every force that would undermine or weaken the American system of individual liberty and opportunity.

Baptized by our fathers' blood and consecrated by our mothers' tears and dedicated to immortality by the prayers and sacrifice of a free people, may the American flag forever wave over the land of the free and the home of the brave.

Food Washed Down the Rivers as Conservation Neglected

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER ROGERS
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 16, 1954

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I call to the attention of the House a most pertinent editorial written by Mr. Clyde Warwick, publisher of the Canyon News, Canyon, Tex.:

FOOD WASHED DOWN THE RIVERS AS CONSERVATION NEGLECTED

Beefsteak and potatoes, roast duck, ham and eggs, and bread and butter with jam on it, are being washed down our rivers each year in the form of good rich farm topsoil.

Of course we don't see these items floating down the streams which are overflowed, but nevertheless they are going down, down the rivers, together with valuable water which we need in the future.

While all America is thinking about feeding the starving peoples of the world, it might be a good thing to stop and ponder what will happen when we cease to produce a surplus of feed.

Right now there is plenty of food, with a vast store in the warehouses of the Nation. When our shortsighted policy prevails of refusing to conserve the soil of the Nation, we may reach this very point when food would be at a premium rather than a surplus on the market.

It makes us furious to consider all of the commentaries and the sage words of advice as to what we should be doing with our surplus food, when you consider the amount that goes into storage and the food in surplus amounts to so small a portion of the subsidies which are paid by the Government for this, that, and the other.

Down Among the Sheltering Pines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 16, 1954

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial entitled "Down Among the Sheltering Pines," which appeared in the August 13, 1954, issue of the Gleaner and Journal, of Henderson, Ky.

The editorial is as follows:

DOWN AMONG THE SHELTERING PINES

The South has taken on a new look very like a pine tree.

Last week our friendly neighbor, Owensboro, had occasion to meet up with that new look, when the Messenger ran off its first newspaper printed on paper made from southern pine.

The occasion was observed by Geoffrey Hutchings, a salesman for the Bowater Paper Co., which several years ago started building a mill at Calhoun, Tenn. Owensboro's is not the first newspaper to use product of this newly producing pulp mill, but it is near the first. The Macon Telegraph and News (Mark Ethridge started his newspaper life there), is another southern paper with that new look. Before that one other paper had been printed on Bowater pine pulp.

Bowater is only one of many mills which have been built in the past several years to manufacture paper out of pine pulp. There are also paper mills operating on trees which grow on batture land along the Mississippi, lands which are left by the river, which are not sand, but hardened clay.

The southern pulp and paper industry is bringing new life and new dollars into the South. The industry was responsible for the planting of 180,250,000 trees during this past planting season. This information about the planting was gathered from the 46 pulp mills and 30 pulpwood dealers of the South, and the area covered includes 11 southern States extending from Virginia to Texas.

Last year the pulp industry of the South was responsible for planting 128 million trees. This year's planting represents a gain of more than 52 million. The planting has resulted in putting approximately 180,250 acres of idle land to work growing trees.

Report to the People of the Ninth Wisconsin Congressional District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER JOHNSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 16, 1954

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the final curtain is being drawn on the 83d Congress. It has been my privilege to serve in the second session of this Congress. I was elected last October to fill out the unexpired term of the late Congressman MERLIN HULL, who represented the Ninth District so ably from 1934 until his death in May of 1953.

When I was a candidate last year in the special election, I pledged the citizens of the Ninth District I would follow—as closely as my own convictions and philosophy permitted—in the footsteps of my illustrious predecessor on all legislative matters affecting the average or common man. I have endeavored—since I was sworn in on January 7, 1954, to keep that pledge. In all sincerity, I say that I believe I have kept faith with the people of the Ninth District. My voting record sustains this belief.

At this time I should like to place in the RECORD a brief summary of my votes and position on some of the major issues that came up during the 2nd session of the 83d Congress.

One of the major questions considered by Congress in this last session was the tax revision bill. Taxes are always of concern to the people who must pay them. For this reason, I wish to make it clear why I could not support the administration's position on the need for certain giveaway provisions in the tax revision bill. In particular, I was very much opposed to the provision granting extremely favorable tax exemption to income derived from corporation stock dividends.

Frankly speaking, I cannot subscribe to the administration's "trickle-down" philosophy on the need for special dividend income tax exemption. Only a few people in the United States will reap the benefits from this exemption. At various times the administration has played up to the public on its desire to achieve a balanced budget. I also believe in a balanced budget. Apparently the administration conveniently forgot about balancing the budget when it espoused the cause of the coupon clippers.

It was—and still is—my contention that if tax relief is in order, then the people in the lower income brackets should receive an increase of at least $100 a year in exempted income. I know that farmers, workers, small-business men, and others in my district could use an additional $100 a year of exemption on income.

There is definitely a need for some spending at the bottom of the Nation's economic ladder. I supported the proposal to increase personal income tax exemption. The proposal was opposed by the administration. The opposition of the administration, I presume, was based on the need for a balanced budget.

The administration is certainly aware of the fact that the automatic 10 percent tax cut which went into effect on January 1, 1954, was approved by the Democratic 82d Congress. The bill approved by the 83d Congress gives very little relief to the average taxpayer.

What did the 1954 Republican tax cut do? Well, 80 percent of the people in the United States earn less than $5,000 a year. The great majority of people will receive a $311 million tax reduction. This figures out to about 9 percent of the total relief provided for in the 1954 GOP bill. Ninety-one percent of the tax relief in the $3.3 billion GOP tax bill will go to individuals and corporations earnings over $5,000 a year.

For the purpose of the record, I wish to say I did not oppose every administration program. I supported the President and administration when I thought they were right. For example, I supported the President on all of his requests for appropriations pertaining to domestic, foreign, and military programs needed to strengthen our Nation against the encroachments of imperialistic communism. As a matter of fact, I suspect I and most of my Democratic colleagues supported the President on some of his programs much better than some members of his own party.

There are people in the United States who are very vocal in their opposition to communism. Some of the vocal battlers are not so consistent when it comes to supporting the struggle against communism with cash to inaugurate sound economic programs for winning the allegiance of people in other lands.

Perhaps it is possible to defeat communism with hard words and sensational newspaper headlines. I doubt it, and that is why I voted for the aid and military programs.

Turning back to domestic problems, I wish to say I supported every sound proposal to increase social-security benefits and extend coverage under the program. I hope the final bill will be the one we first passed in the House.

As a member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, I took a keen interest in legislation affecting veterans and their dependents. I attended every meeting of the committee. On the House floor I supported committee-sponsored bills to the best of my ability. The record will show that I consistently voted in the interest of veterans.

Along with other people in this country, I believe a strong educational system is one of the foundation stones of our republican form of government. A well-informed citizenry is essential to preserve and extend our democratic way of life in this critical period of world history. I agree with the philosophy that education is the first line of defense in a democracy. In keeping with this conviction, I voted for all bills to aid our educational system.

During this session of Congress I was very much interested in conservation legislation. There were good and bad bills on conservation up for consideration by the House. I opposed the bills which I thought were bad and supported those which were good for conservation. I was strongly opposed to one bill that would have given away piecemeal our national parks and forest lands to private interests.

The great majority of people in the ninth district are dairy farmers. Thousands of people living in smaller communities of the district are dependent to a large degree on the financial stability of dairy farmers. For this reason I was as much concerned about agricultural legislation as I was about taxes. Farmers and people who depend on farmers must have incomes to pay taxes.

Therefore I opposed very vigorously cut in dairy prices ordered early in the year by Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Benson. I received hundreds of letters from farmers in the district on Benson's action. I can say without fear of refutation almost 100 percent of the farmers did not favor Benson's cut.

Later in the session, when the general farm bill was up for consideration, I attempted to amend the bill to increase dairy price supports above the 80 percent provision contained in the bill. I also supported other amendments for the same purpose.

Percentagewise the ninth district probably has more farmers in REA co-ops than any district in the country. At one time, when I was farming, I belonged to the Jackson Electric Cooperative. I supported all legislation to increase REA loan authorizations because I know from firsthand observation what this program has done since 1935 to make rural America a better place in which to live.

When the Atomic Energy Act was considered by the House, I opposed all of the provisions to give away the people's equity in this program. The people of the United States have over $12 billion invested in the atomic-energy program. I voted to protect this investment, and I shall continue to do so.

In closing, I wish to say that at all times I tried to vote in the interests of people—regardless of whether those people are farmers, workers, veterans, Federal employees, old people, professional people, or small-business men.

Hon. Harold H. Velde

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 16, 1954

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I am inserting in the Record a resolution unanimously adopted by the American Legion, Department of Illinois, at its 36th annual convention in Chicago, commending my able colleague, Harold H. Velde, as chairman of the Committee on Un-American Activities and the committee as a whole in its important work.

The resolution follows:

Be it resolved by the 2,600 delegates representing the 226,000 members of the Department of Illinois, the American Legion, in regular convention assembled at Chicago, Ill., August 5, 6, 7, and 8, 1954, That we again wholeheartedly commend the Honorable Harold H. Velde, of Illinois, as chairman of the Committee on Un-American Activities of the House of Representatives and all of the members of that committee for their untiring efforts in furtherance of the objectives of such committee, and in like manner endorse their activities and the constitutional manner in which they were executed, particularly—

(a) the rules of procedure which the committee adopted which safeguarded the rights of witnesses and ensured courteous and constitutional treatment for all such persons;

(b) the thoroughness of the committee's report, in three parts, of its investigation of Communist activities in the Chicago area;

(c) the report of the committee on organized communism in the United States, which was thereafter committed to the committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union where it is now under consideration;

(d) the annual report of such committee likewise now before the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union; and (e) its exhaustive Guide to Subversive Organizations and Publications which has been so widely acclaimed by all persons and organizations interested in the preservation of the Nation as it was established in 1787 and as it existed and functioned up to the time of our entry into World War I.

Submitted by Charles V. Falkenberg, representing Logan Square Post, No. 405.

Federal Survey of School Facilities and Local Resources Challenged in Nebraska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT D. HARRISON

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 16, 1954

Mr. HARRISON of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following excerpt from the July 1954 issue of Today's Taxes, the publication of the Nebraska Citizens Council:

FEDERAL SURVEY OF SCHOOL FACILITIES AND LOCAL RESOURCES CHALLENGED

The 81st Congress appropriated $3 million to carry on a survey of public school plant facilities. The survey is being conducted by the United States Office of Education with the assistance of State departments of education. The first phase of the nationwide survey has been completed and a report was recently published.

According to the report, the States vary widely in their capacities to provide adequate facilities for school purposes. Alabama was estimated to be least able to finance needed facilities with only 2.36 percent of the necessary resources. Connecticut was most able to provide adequate school plans, the report stated, with an estimated 90.78 percent of the resources available to finance adequate school plants.

The survey report does not define what is meant by needs or what is meant by available resources. Some observers believe that the report is purposely vague in its use of terms in order to justify Federal aid to schools. Federal aid has been resisted by some educators because they feel that Federal funds will have strings tied to them. They feel that school finance and control of local school districts should be as close to home as is possible. It seems obvious that local control should be maintained where adequate resourses are available since each school district has problems peculiar to itself which cannot be solved by general directives handed down from the Federal or State Governments.

NEBRASKA DOES NOT NEED FEDERAL AID

The school facilities survey reported that Nebraska is one of the most self-sufficient States, with 79.45 percent of the resources needed to put its school plants in order. Our school plants needs were placed at $137 million. The survey implies, however, $28 million in Federal aid would be required in Nebraska to finance the $137 million building program which is needed.

We have made a preliminary study of the relationship of school district indebtedness to the assessed valuation of school districts. Our study indicates that Nebraska has more than adequate resources to take care of its school building needs. The amount of bonded indebtedness in rural elementary school districts is $1.5 million, or just forty-five one-hundredths of 1 percent of their total assessed valuation. In high-school districts the bonded indebtedness averages only 2.50 percent of assessed valuation. Since 10 percent of the assessed valuation is the rule-of-the-thumb limit on bonded debt suggested by many school financial experts, the Nebraska school system has more than adequate resources at its disposal to provide additional school facilities as the needs arise.

We recognize that there is a variation among school districts in the amount of their resources from assessed valuations, and also in their needs for school facilities. Because there is not space here to show the needs and resources of each district—there are about 6,000 districts—we have separated them into rural elementary districts and high-school districts. The latter includes the elementary schools in those districts. We have broken down the total outstanding bonded indebtedness and the assessed valuation for the schools for fiscal year of 1952–53 by counties as shown in the annual report of the department of public instruction for 1953.

RURAL DISTRICTS

For the rural elementary districts, 75 counties had no outstanding school bonds. In the remaining 18 counties with an aggregate assessed valuation of $329.5 million, the outstanding bonds were $1.5 million, for an average of forty-five one-hundredths of 1 percent of valuation. The lowest were 2 counties with one one-hundredth of 1 percent, and the highest county was 1.82 percent of assessed valuation. Only 3 counties had rural school bonds outstanding for more than 1 percent.

HIGH-SCHOOL DISTRICTS

Among the high-school districts, in 75 counties with an aggregate assessed valuation of $1.5 billion, the amount of outstanding bonds at the end of the year 1952–53 was $37.4 million, for an average of 2.5 percent. The districts in the remaining 18 counties had no outstanding bonded indebtedness. Thirty of the 75 counties had high-school districts with a bonded debt of less than 1 percent. Thirty-two counties had between 1 and 5 percent. Of the remaining 13 counties, their high-school districts ranged from 5.48 to 13.1 percent, which was the hightest of all. The lowest was four one-hundredths of 1 percent.

It is rather significant that during the school year 1952–53 high-school districts issued bonds for building purposes in 21 counties, for a total of about $7 million. These are included in the total mentioned above as outstanding at the end of the year. Many of the districts in the largest cities and towns have either completed new school buildings or are now in the process of building or letting contracts. A few examples are Beatrice, Hastings, Grand Island, Fremont, York, Alliance, Scottsbluff, Sidney, Lincoln, and Omaha.

SOME DISTRICTS BUILD ON A PAY-AS-YOU-GO BASIS

The Omaha School District is carrying on a long-range building program on the pay-as-you-go basis, using the 4-mill levy to retire their remaining bonds and to build one or more new buildings each year. Most of the rural districts prefer to handle their building needs by an annual mill levy. They are permitted by law to make a special levy of not to exceed 5 mills for a term of years if approved by 55 percent of the voters. The total amount of one authorization is limited to 5 percent of the actual valuation. This would permit the rural districts to raise an aggregate of over $86 million—far more than any amount necessary to house all rural schools. The legal limit for bonded debt for class I and II districts (rural elementary and towns under 1,000 population) is 40 percent of assessed valuation. After deducting present outstanding bonds, this would provide potential resources in the aggregate for the entire State of over $600 million—far beyond any need.

There is no statutory limit for bonded indebtedness of class III and IV districts. Class V (Omaha) has no limit except the amount of taxes which a maximum 4-mill levy will produce for the payment of debt service. This can also be used for acquiring sites and the construction of, or additions to, buildings. If 10 percent of assessed valuation is assumed as a reasonable amount for bond debt, then the aggregate total of potential resources for school plants in high-school districts is more than $126 million after deducting the present outstanding bonds.

It should also be noted that most of the districts having a bond debt of 5 to 13 percent have more recently constructed new facilities and therefore have no immediate need.

The facts that we have found pretty much knock the Federal school survey into a cocked hat. We are not the only State which has challenged the survey figures. Independent research agencies in other States have reported that the Federal school survey report gives a misleading and erroneous picture of the ability of State and local government to finance their school building needs.

Almond Growers Deserve Protection

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OAKLEY HUNTER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 16, 1954

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, since 1950, the domestic almond industry has operated under a Federal marketing-agreement program, whereby a certain percentage of the crop is salable in normal trade channels, and a certain percentage is declared surplus and must be disposed of in noncompetitive outlets. Under such an arrangement, the domestic industry is endeavoring to work out its own salvation without Government subsidy or price support. Coincidental to such a program, hearings are held before the Tariff Commission under section 22 of the Agriculture Adjustment Act looking to restrictions whereby imports of foreign-produced almonds are not permitted to adversely affect the marketing program and dissipate the industry's efforts.

On September 1, 1953, the Tariff Commission, as a result of formal hearings, recommended establishment of a quota fee of 5 cents per pound on the first 7 million pounds of shelled almonds imported into the United States, with 10 cents per pound added for importations in excess of said 7 million pounds. This recommendation was for the crop year October 1, 1953, to September 30, 1954, and to continue until changed by recommendation of the Tariff Commission. As of September 29, 1953, the recommendation was approved by Presidential proclamation with the proviso that the same was to continue for the crop year only.

Notwithstanding this action, imports were relatively heavy and packers' carryover at the end of the 1953–54 season will be substantial, and somewhat more than at the beginning of the season. A record large production is forecast for the 1954 crop.

Presently, a hearing has been set by the Tariff Commission for August 24, 1954, to consider appropriate action for the coming crop year.

In view of the situation, as outlined, the American almost industry is hoping for a more favorable quota than was established last year and that the quota will be on a continuing basis.

This matter was made the subject of a meeting of the California delegation committee on agriculture on July 14. It was unanimously agreed at that meeting that the case presented by the American almond industry was a meritorious one and that its request for continuing and more adequate protection should be acted upon favorably by the Tariff Commission and the President. Accordingly, as chairman of the committee, I was authorized to inform the President of the committee's views.

Mr. Speaker, following are some pertinent facts concerning the domestic almond industry which I believe will be of interest and value to Members of Congress:

United States almond production and California production are synonymous—there are no commercial plantings of almonds in the United States other than in California.

One hundred and five thousand acres are devoted to the production of almonds in California. (California Crop Reporting Service.)

California almond production for 1954 is estimated at 52,500,000 pounds, shelled basis; 1953 production was 40 million pounds, shelled basis.

Farm value of the 1953 crop was approximately $19 million.

Processing and packing by California shippers increased the farm value by approximately $5 million.

Persons in California wholly or partially dependent upon the California almond industry for a livelihood total approximately 50,000.

United States tariff on almonds established under the Hawley-Smoot Tariff Act of 1930: Unshelled, 5½ cents per pound; shelled, 16½ cents per pound; blanched and otherwise prepared, 18½ cents per pound.

Almonds were listed or considered in early trade agreements with Spain, France, Italy, and Iran, but were not listed in the more recent negotiations at Annecy, Torquay, and Geneva.

United States production of almonds has increased approximately 300 percent in the last 20 years and is now capable of supplying the entire United States demand.

Crop year:	*California production meat basis*
1930–39	16,230,000
1940–49	30,290,000
1950–53	39,050,000

United States almond consumption 1950–53 crop years averaged approximately 42,700,000 pounds, shelled basis.

For 8 of the last 16 years imports averaged 2,340,000 pounds, shelled basis. However, in certain years during this period imports of 22 million, 18 million, 13 million, and 12 million shelled pounds were experienced.

The production of almonds in countries other than the United States is approximately 168 million pounds, shelled basis. Italy and Spain account for approximately two-thirds of these supplies.

Imports of almonds into the United States have represented but a fraction of the world's supplies. There is not a world surplus of almonds and the principal producing countries outside the United States are not dependent upon this market for disposal of their supplies.

Almond plantings in both Spain and Italy are currently subsidized by the Spanish and Italian Governments.

Almond imports in all principal producing countries outside the United States, including Spain and Italy, are embargoed.

Approximately 35 to 40 percent of the cost of producing almonds in California is hand labor, for which the domestic producer pays from $1 to $1.25 an hour. By comparison, in Spain and Italy, the 2 principal sources of competition, labor rates for identical work are but a fraction of those paid in the United States (approximately $1.25 for an 8-hour day).

In addition to increased labor rates, domestic producers are experiencing greatly increased costs in the form of expenses for fertilizers, spray materials, machinery, taxes, etc. These increased costs have made the need for additional tariff protection all the more acute.

Signing of the Tax Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 16, 1954

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, this is a historic day. This morning President Eisenhower signed the monumental tax-revision bill enacted by this Congress. It was my great honor to be among those present at the signing and to be the recipient of one of the pens he used.

Under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I am inserting in the RECORD the statement issued by the President at the time he signed this historic tax bill to benefit all our citizens:

Statement by the President

This bill which today becomes law is the excellent result of cooperative efforts by the Congress and the Department of the Treasury to give our tax code its first complete revision in 75 years. It is a good law. It will benefit all Americans.

This law brings tax relief to large numbers of our citizens. It is, in fact, part of a comprehensive tax program which, since January 1 of this year, will have provided for tax cuts totaling $7,400,000,000—the largest dollar tax cut in any year in the Nation's history.

It is a law which will help millions of Americans by giving them fairer tax treatment than they now receive. For example:

The parents of dependent children who work can continue to claim their children as dependents, no matter how much the children earn.

Retired people and widows living on retirement income other than social security will receive a tax credit which will in effect be equal to the tax credit now given to people living on social-security income.

Taxpayers will now be able to claim as dependents, people who are not related to them, so long as they provide more than one-half of such dependents' support.

Farmers active in soil and water conservation will be able to deduct from their income the cost of such conservation work, up to 25 percent of their gross income.

People with large medical expenses will now be able to deduct from their income all such expenses which exceed 3 percent (rather than 5 percent) of their incomes, and the maximum amounts deductible will be twice as large as they were in the past.

Working widows and many other mothers with child-care expenses will be able to deduct from their income up to $600 a year for the costs of taking care of their children.

People receiving sick benefits paid by employers will not have to pay any tax on such income up to $100 a week.

In addition to removing inequities in our tax system, this law will help our economy expand and thus add materially to the strength of our Nation. It will help our people produce better goods at cheaper prices—and it will help to create more jobs.

This economic growth will be fostered by such provisions as more flexible depreciation and better tax treatment of research and develpment costs, thus encouraging all business—large and small—to modernize and expand. And, partial reduction of the double taxation of income from dividends will stimulate the investment of savings by our privite citizens and so make available the thousands of dollars that provide the plant tools and power needed for each new job in America.

Numerous other provisions will also help to expand the economy. These include the easing of the so-called penalty tax on accumulated earnings when necessary for legitimate business purposes; the extension of the carryback of net operating losses, and the greater flexibility of the tax treatment of recapitalizations and reorganizations.

Almost balancing the revenue lost through these tax reductions is additional revenue of $1.2 billion gained by an extension of the 52-percent tax on corporation profits. The new law also closes more than 50 loopholes through which, in the past, some taxpayers may have attempted to avoid their fair share of the tax burden.

And, at long last, the American people will have—because of this law—much needed clarification of many tax provisions which previously have been subject to controversy.

I congratulate the Congress and its leaders for having enacted this monumental tax revision. Its passage is a tribute to a Congress which in this session has made so many major contributions to the prosperity and security of the people of our country.

Medical Care Plan in Tennessee May Become United States Pattern

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. PERCY PRIEST

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 16, 1954

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks I desire to include here an article by Sarah Booth Conroy, published in the Knoxville News-Sentinal.

Having for many years been intensely interested in the question of medical care, particularly for those who because of various circumstances, might be denied adequate care, I am greatly encouraged by the development of the program of the Tennessee Medical Association as described in this article.

The Tennessee Medical Association has accepted the philosophy that organized medicine can and should assume an active role in the medical affairs of local communities.

I commend Tennessee doctors for the program now underway in Clear Fork Valley, and recommend a careful reading of the following article:

(By Sarah Booth Conroy)

The Tennessee Medical Association has Clear Fork Valley on its conscience.

And the voice of that conscience will not be stilled until everyone in the valley has adequate opportunity for medical care.

The TMA has set up the Tennessee Medical Foundation to work for Clear Fork Valley, and eventually for other areas of medical poverty, a program of self-supporting medical care.

For Clear Fork Valley this means fewer babies will be stillborn. Older people will live out a normal life expectancy. Younger people will work more days with less time out for illness.

And life, with fewer toothaches, less fatigue, more easing of pain, will be brighter.

DOCTOR TAKES POST

By the middle of August the first, basic steps will have been taken to offer the 3,870 people of Clear Fork Valley this adequate medical care. A young man who has just graduated with honors from the U-T Medical School, will open a general practice of medicine at Valley Creek in the heart of Clear Fork Valley.

Dr. David C. Meek will have at his disposal a 40-by-80-foot building with several thousand dollars' worth of diagnostic and treatment equipment. Dr. Meek will be paid by TMF.

Once a week, Dr. Charles Cross of Oak Ridge, a dentist who was born in the valley, holds a dental clinic.

The building was a former commissary, abandoned for about a year, but renovated with $300 given, a dollar here and a dollar there, $500 from the Claiborne County Court, and a great deal of hard work by the men of the community. The building itself was provided by the Pruden Coal Co. for $1 a year.

Patients will pay fees comparable with those charged by doctors in surrounding areas. These fees will go to pay for TMF's investment.

AMA MATCHES, TOO

But the nationwide implications of the project are so vast that groups from the American Medical Association, the national office of the United Mine Workers welfare and retirement fund, and several foundations interested in medical socioeconomic research are anxiously watching.

This is the importance of the project:

"The Tennessee Medical Association has accepted the fundamental philosophy that organized medicine can, and should, assume an active role in the medical affairs of local communities and shall stand in a position to materially assist and insure the provision of good medical care to the people of the State of Tennessee."

This statement by Dr. B. M. Overholt, head of Knoxville's Acuff Clinic and chairman of the TMF's committee on medical care, may well be the farthest that any medical association has gone toward committing itself to such a program. The work that is being done in Clear Fork Valley may set a pattern for the State, and perhaps the Nation.

THREE THOUSAND EIGHT HUNDRED AND SEVENTY LACK CARE

The founding fathers of the Tennessee Medical Foundation are Dr. Ralph H. Monger, Knoxville, president; Dr. Ernest G. Kelly, Memphis; Dr. A. M. Patterson, Chattanooga; Dr. F. L. Roberts, Memphis; Dr. John B. Youmans and Dr. Daugh W. Smith, Nashville.

Dr. John R. Thompson, Jr., president of the TMA, says the Tennessee Medical Foundation is a nonprofit corporation established in 1952 for the purpose of carrying out the following broad functions:

1. To assist communities in analyzing health and medical care needs and in developing plans and programs for securing better medical facilities and services for such communities.

2. To provide consultative and specialist services to physicians, dentists, and nurses working in rural and isolated areas.

3. To help to relate the objectives of organized medicine to the work of public and private health agencies in the community, in the solution of its health and medical care problems.

The way to Clear Fork Valley from Tazewell, Claiborne County seat, is over 2 mountain ranges, 2 States, and miles of rough and rocky road.

In the 16 mining communities and neighborhoods in this area of Claiborne and a small area of Campbell Counties live 3,870 people.

INSPECTION MADE

Until recently there were three men practicing medicine in the area.

A committee of TMA found that 1 had had a year of medical school, 1 had studied for a time at a liberal arts college, and the 3d had finished his education at grammar-school level.

Now only the last practitioner is still in business, the TMA says. Of the other 2, 1 died and the other went into a concessions business.

"I just couldn't believe that such medical poverty could exist 70 miles from Knoxville," Dr. Overholt explained.

"Before I went to Clear Fork Valley with an investigation team of the American and the Tennessee Medical Associations, I thought Tennesseans had the best medical care in the world.

"I turned red in the face with embarrassment when we walked into one of the alleged doctors' office and found unbelievable filth. I'll say this for him, he did his best to keep us from going in."

This investigation, made at the instigation of the United Mine Workers' Welfare and Retirement Fund's medical division, shocked the doctors profoundly.

As Dr. John Winebrenner, regional medical director of the UMW fund put it, "A committee of the United States Public Health Service made a report on this area, and other coal communities in 1947. The report was so bad that many people considered it fantastic.

"As soon as the UMWWF's medical division got under way in 1949, we brought substandard practices in coal mining areas to the attention of the American Medical Association."

Dr. Overholt says the committee found that these pseudo-doctors were actually working with some licensed doctors in urging unnecessary operations.

There was one 15-year-old girl who was made sterile by such a needless operation, Dr. Overholt said, in illustration.

FEW VOLUNTEER

About the only licensed doctors willing to come into the region were those who came with the idea of making a quick killing—not quite literally—and then taking the profits to set up practice in a city, explained Dr. Winebrenner.

"One of these would come in under a "company doctor" arrangement whereby he would receive office space and lodging from the company as payment for treating mine injuries.

"He would then set up 'pencillin assembly lines.' So much for a shot, and the nurse made the injection. Double shot twice as effective and twice the cost."

As for dental care, it was nonexistant. Some people told of a teen-age girl who pulled teeth for 50 cents a tooth.

SANITATION LACKING

Sanitation is almost unknown in the valley. Seven hundred families live in houses with no baths. Fifty-four families have no toilet facilities; 624 have outdoor toilets of which 66 percent are completely unsanitary.

Garbage dsposal is as bad: 656 families feed their garbage to animals, throw it out or dump it in a creek.

The result in terms of health?

In a 1-year period, 89 cases of arthritis, 27 of tuberculosis, 18 of pneumonia and flu, 9 typhoid cases, 10 of diphtheria were definitely reported. How many undiagnosed illnesses there were, no one knows.

There was an average of 6 stillbirths a year during the last 5 years. That's 1 per 645 against the State average of 1 per 2,200.

Dr. Winebrenner adds that the life expectancy is of course much lower than the State average.

COMMUNITY ISOLATED

Why this medical poverty?

The community is not attractive to a young doctor and his wife, fresh from medical school's stimulation. The financial rewards are meager for the honest man.

Clear Fork Valley is a long way away from a town like Knoxville, with its medical academy offering the latest information, so vital for the conscientious physician.

Clear Fork Valley is miles from the specialists of the profession, so needed in the increasing complexity of modern medicine.

The valley is not used to thinking of itself as a unit. Communities are small and isolated. Only 35 percent of the houses are on all weather roads. 370 families have no private mode of transportation.

Employment in the valley is principally offered by the mines, now in a serious recession.

Forty percent of the heads of households are employed by the mines, 19.6 percent are unemployed; 7.5 are retired and another 7 percent are housewives.

HOMES INSPECTED

This dismal picture of the valley is what researchers from the Tennessee Medical Foundation discovered when they made an actual house-to-house canvass ending in June of this year. The survey was compiled by Clifford Seeber, field secretary of the foundation.

"When we first looked at this situation," Dr. Overholt said, "I called Dr. Daugh Smith in Nashville. He's treasurer of the foundation. I said, 'Do you think we can do anything here?'

" 'We'll have to,' he said. By this time we were receiving requests for aid from other sections.

"Some of the proposals we considered back in 1952 would make us die laughing now, they seem so unworkable. But none of us then had any experience of training in socioeconomic medicine.

"So we looked for people who did. Mr. Seeber, our secretary, has a long background of this sort of work. Dr. Winebrenner of the UMW was a tremendous help.

"In the spring of last year, the Commonwealth Fund of New York donated $19,500 for research on the area.

"The Tennessee Public Health Department supplied advice on the questionnaire, a team of nutritionists and a sanitarian to survey those problems, a dentist to see what the school children needed in the way of dental work.

"The public health department also will supply a public health nurse," Dr. Overholt added.

MANY INTERESTED

The United Mine Workers fund has agreed to send its beneficiaries to the clinic, and thus help support it by buying its services. Now treatment and hospitalization of the UMW people must be taken care of outside the area.

When facilities are complete, the fund will use the clinic's maternity ward.

The State Dental Association helped in getting the dentists for the clinic.

Mr. Seeber emphasizes the help given by the people of the valley. A committee composed of W. F. Mullins, chairman, the Reverend Fred Hill, Roscoe Bostic, Joe Lawson, and Jesse Hamm headed the rebuilding of the clinic building, aided by about 25 others.

SPECIALISTS TO HELP

When the clinic gets under way in the middle of next month, Dr. Meek will have every possible help from the premier men of his profession.

Specialists of all descriptions—pathologists, X-ray, internal medicine, pediatrics, and so on, will come into the valley alternately every month. Dr. Meek will keep extensive records on all patients.

All the money from fees during the year's trial period will go to support the clinic. The Tennessee Medical Foundation's money for the project comes primarily, of course, from individual Tennessee doctors.

From the clinic's influence, the entire sanitary, nutritional, and cultural level of the community should be raised.

In a few years, the foundation hopes, Clear Fork Valley itself will take over responsibility for supervising and financing the clinic, always with, however, the interested advice of the foundation.

CLINIC AT WARTBURG

Clear Fork Valley while presenting the worst problems, is not the only area of substandard medical care which has appealed for help and received it from the foundation.

Wartburg is proudly showing off its brand-new clinic, which it hopes to have staffed soon by a dentist and two doctors, whom the foundation will help find for them.

The foundation has had doctors meet with a committee named by the Morgan County Court, which has built the $25,000 clinic with finances from the court. George Buxton, Sr., gave land for the building. And the court will spend $10,000 to equip the building under the advice of the foundation which also helped draw up plans for the clinic.

"This matter of equipment," explained Dr. Overholt, "is one of the factors making it hard for a doctor to start out in a rural community. Twenty-five years ago a doctor could be well set up with $1,000. Now he needs at least 10 times that much."

AIDED BY KIWANIS

The committee which has built the hospital is composed of John Dillon, high-school principal at Wartburg and a member of county court; W. Dudley Human, Wartburg, school superintendent; Ross Williams, Jr., Lancing, county judge; W. H. Bullard, Oakdale; and L. N. England, Sunbright.

Until this clinic opens, the 16,000 people in Morgan County must drive to Oak Ridge, Harriman, or Rockwood for complete medical service.

The Wartburg plan is to give the equipped clinic, rent free, for a year for the use of the doctors and dentists. After that, the rent will amortize the cost of the clinic.

"It's about the same principle," explained Judge Williams, "as in these towns which build plants for industries to induce them to come to town. We've built a medical plant for doctors and dentists to get them to come to us."

The Wartburg clinic idea first started with the Kiwanis Club and spread thereafter.

Wartburg is a most progressive town, with many other projects under way—a $200,000 communitywide water system, sidewalks, a $45,000 addition to the school, and city lighting. Ninety percent of the people in Wartburg own their own homes.

TOO SMALL FOR HOSPITAL

Neither Wartburg nor Clear Fork Valley needed a hospital. As Dr. Overholt explained it, Hill-Burton Act funds were available from the Federal Government to build a hospital in each place. However, such money would have to be matched by the community, and the specifications for such hospitals are expensive and elaborate.

"A town needs to be a good size, with a large drawing area, to support a hospital," Dr. Overholt explained. "We've found that hospitals much under 40 beds are not economical to operate.

"Furthermore, with adequate clinic facilities, most hospitalization can be taken care of at more metropolitan centers."

Which brings up La Follette, where local, State, and Federal money has been combined to construct a municipally owned 43-bed hospital. Construction was due to start this month.

FINANCING IS PROBLEM

The foundation's committee has helped the La Follette people in developing plans for the hospital. Later the foundation will offer aid in getting personnel and developing plans for operating the facility.

This help will include the setting up of a "tissue committee," which will examine all tissue removed during operations at the hospital. This commitee, a progressive project now in use by many hospitals throughout the country, serves to prevent unnecessary operations.

Other areas will be helped, as the foundation is able. And plans include more aid for the existing projects.

Plans are being worked out now for a prepaid surgical-medical plan for Clear Fork Valley. This plan wil include the payment of a nominal fee, much like that paid by miners through payroll deductions for support of their medical services.

Dr. Overholt explained the plans to the Second Annual Conference on Medical and Hospital Problems in the Bituminous Coal Mining Area, meeting in Charleston, W. Va., last September.

He said, that such prepayment plans must be developed as a part of the Tennessee plan, an existing insurance plan for surgical bills, with the cooperation of both labor and management.

Also projected is an arrangement by which young doctors who go into these marginal area clinics for reasonable periods will be aided in getting especially desirable postgraduate training later.

DOCTORS RESPONSIBLE

Dr. Overholt summarized the problem in a statement which has been widely distributed to doctors throughout the area:

"We feel that a program should be worked out for the best advantage of each local community.

"Solutions applicable in rural Tennessee are not necessarily fitted to the metropolis of Chicago. We feel that high quality of comprehensive medical care must be provided to all the people at a reasonable cost.

"This can only be achieved by evolving more efficient systems of providing medical care and more efficient means for paying for that care.

"We feel that the physician should have access to all the resources necessary for the care of the patient, and that it is necessary to develop teamwork, not only of medical components but of lay and community elements in order to achieve this purpose.

"We feel that our State medical association has assumed only that responsibility which it should rightfully bear to the people it must serve.

"It is easy to agree that we are all against sin, but the procedures and the techniques to develop solutions require cooperative planning and plain hard work."

The Meditation Room

SPEECH

OF

HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 5, 1954

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, approval by both Houses of the establishment and furnishing of a room for meditation and prayer in the Capitol, causes a great many Members of the Congress much satisfaction.

Apparently many Members have felt this need for some time. In times of extra pressure and stress, mankind has always turned to the Almighty for help, strength, and guidance. The opportunity for quiet seclusion and meditation, convenient to the Houses of Congress, with suitable religious atmosphere and furnishings, but entirely nonsectarian, should be provided by this room.

The Capitol Architect has sufficient funds for refinishing, rearranging, and equipping the room, except, of course, for a stained glass window, seemingly an essential of such a room.

I am happy that the Judson Studios of Los Angeles, whose principals live in my district, saw fit on the very day that the resolution was offered, February 12, 1953, to call me on the long-distance phone, offering to donate such a window. This is more than a company offer. The highly skilled workmen, several of them immigrants from Europe, have insisted that they donate their time as a contribution not only to their adopted country, but to the high purpose of this project.

Several designs for the stained glass window have been suggested. The committee had the suggestion that the window depicit various scenes enacting the Sermon on the Mount. In order to make it strictly nonsectarian, the studio has in mind various instances in American history in which the help of the Almighty was invoked by prayer—Washington at Valley Forge, and so forth. Final design, of course, must be approved by the committee under the direction of the Capitol Architect. Work, however, is to proceed immediately in the hope that the room may be dedicated upon the convening of the 84th Congress.

I wish to congratulate the sponsor of the resolution, the Honorable BROOKS HAYS, of Arkansas, and the then chairman of the House Prayer Group, the Honorable KATHARINE ST. GEORGE, of New York, for their assistance to the Honorable KARL M. LECOMPTE, of Iowa, chairman of the House Administration Committee, and his committee, as well as Senator WILLIAM E. JENNER, of Indiana, chairman of the Senate Rules Committee, in making effective the resolution.

Dr. Malcolm T. MacEachern Honored by Hospital Administrators

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 11, 1954

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, August 16 has been designated as a day of honor to world famed Dr. Malcolm T. MacEachern, of Northwestern University. His work in the field of hospital administration has received worldwide acclaim. The following editorial appears in the July issue of Hospital Management:

SEND YOUR GREETINGS TO DR. MACEACHERN ON DR. MALCOLM T. MACEACHERN DAY, AUGUST 16, 1954

There is one person and only one who is universally honored as a world figure in the hospital field. His contributions to better hospitals around the world are beyond counting. The warmth and charm of his personality have been experienced everywhere. He is among us, full of vigor, continuing to make large contributions to the field. His name is Dr. Malcolm T. MacEachern, who has occupied so many important posts, who has been elected to so many positions of leadership, who has received so many honors throughout the world, that a complete listing would be difficult to achieve.

Because of all these things Hospital Management is asking all hospital people everywhere, around the globe, to signify their love and appreciation by sending greetings on Monday, August 16, 1954, to Dr. Malcolm T. MacEachern, Northwestern University, Hospital Administration, 339 East Chicago Avenue, Chicago 11, Ill.

August 16, 1954, is not a birthday. Dr. MacEachern doesn't have birthdays. He's probably somewhere between 18 and 42 years old. It's been three decades since he was president of the American Hospital Association. He is planning three more decades of service.

So let all hospital people in all departments, both professional and lay, prepare their notes of appreciation and their signatures, either as individuals or in groups, to reach Dr. MacEachern on Monday, August 16, 1954.

Let's take a look at some of the presidencies, chairmanships, and directorships which Dr. MacEachern has held:

President, American Hospital Association, 1924–25; president, International Hospital Association, 1938–41; honorary president, Inter-American Hospital Association, since 1941; president, Chicago Medical Society, 1946–47; chairman, Tri-State Hospital Assembly, since 1941; honorary president, Western Hospital Association, since 1928; associate director, and director of hospital activities, American College of Surgeons, 1923–50; chairman, Administrative Board, American College of Surgeons, 1923–50; director, Hospital Administration, Northwestern University, since 1943; and many others.

Hospital Management hopes August 16, Malcolm T. MacEachern Day, will be a personal day of tribute to him for many years to come.

Restoration of Freedom and Independence to Communist-Dominated Countries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS M. MACHROWICZ

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 16, 1954

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I wish to include a letter I received from Prof. Lev. E. Dobriansky, of Georgetown University, president of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, Inc., expressing full endorsement and support of House Resolution 663, introduced by me on July 22, 1954, setting forth as the permanent goal of American foreign policy the restoration of freedom and independence of Poland and other nations now under Russian Communist domination:

AUGUST 5, 1954.

Hon. THADDEUS M. MACHROWICZ,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: It is with much personal delight that I take this opportunity to inform you that the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, which as a central, national organization represents approximately 1½ million Americans of Ukrainian ancestry, expresses its full endorsement and support of House Resolution 663, setting forth as the permanent goal of American foreign policy the restoration of freedom and independence of Poland and other nations now under Russian Communist domination.

We are in complete sympathy with all of the specific contents of your thoroughly principled resolution, and are particularly happy to note its superlative tone of interdependence as concerns the common fate of all the enslaved nations in Eastern Europe. In the light of contemporary European history, punctuated by naked, imperialist drives from both East and West, it is unthinkable, in our judgment, that a permanent restoration of the freedom and independence of Poland can possibly be secured without the full restoration of the same for Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, Ukraine, White Ruthenia, and other formerly independent nations both within and outside the nominal structure of the Soviet Union.

It is our dedicated organizational will to promote and strive for the independence of all of these nations in the primary interest of our own great Nation. It is also our innermost conviction that only on this moral basis can we hope for a real, just, and peaceful community among the peoples of these nations, both as an institutional guaranty against future imperialist aggressions and as a lasting condition of happiness and prosperity for the peoples concerned. These basic considerations motivate our action in endorsing fully and wholeheartedly your well-founded resolution.

With kindest regards and best wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

LEV E. DOBRIANSKY.

The Importance of the Coal Industry and the Need To Strengthen It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 11, 1954

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I am greatly impressed by a factual bulletin relating to the bituminous coal industry that recently came to my attention. It set forth the basic importance of this industry to the Nation and presented facts, figures, and viewpoints to sustain the suggestion that something should be done to protect and encourage it.

The bulletin to which I refer was published by the Appalachian Coals, Inc., July 29, 1954. I include it as part of my remarks because of the worthwhile information it contains. It deserves the serious consideration of the Members of Congress. It reads as follows:

TAKING THE PROBLEM APART

Leaders of industry, State and Federal administrators, and legislators subconsciously realize the basic importance of the bituminous coal industry to the Nation.

It is time now for these men, who are the architects of America's industrial might, and its place in the free world, to apply their conscious thinking to the well-being of this indispensable but not indestructible industry.

They know of the economic chaos caused in England by the disintegration of its coal industry and the failure of nationalization to revive it.

They know of the rapidly expanding cold war between the Communist and free nations which threatens to become hot at any moment. But do they know that Soviet coal production, which was nearly 8 times the 1928 figure in 1952, exceeded British production on that year by 30 percent, and that Soviet rulers plan to push production in 1955 to 416 million, which figure will probably be higher than United States production in 1954?

While coal production has been growing rapidly in the Soviet Union and its satellites, United States production has fallen off sharply from 630 million tons in 1947 to around 400 million tons, or more than one-third in 1954.

The Iron Curtain countries are not only gearing up for military but also for economic warfare in strengthening their ability to produce coal for their own requirements and for export.

WHAT HAS HAPPENED?

The United States coal industry, which has spent hundreds of millions of dollars since World War II in a gigantic modernization program, now finds itself in an unprofitable position due to loss of markets and rising costs. It has suffered too many serious blows within too short a time such as—

1. Loss of much export business to foreign competition.
2. Loss to imports of foreign residual oil sold at dump rates to United States steam plants.
3. Unecomonic exploitation of limited natural gas reserves.
4. Decrease in normal use of coal by 75 percent by railroads through dieselization in last decade.
5. Increases in freight rates with coal carrying the losses of passenger and dining car traffic and other commodities.
6. Increases in wage rates and fringe benefits which greatly exceed those paid by the oil, natural gas, and other industries.

WHAT DOES IT ADD UP TO?

Should the hot war come, these things would occur:

1. Submarine menace would halt importation of foreign oil.
2. Demand for oil products for military use would skyrocket.
3. The oil industry could not possibly supply the demand for both military and normal requirements.
4. Demand for natural gas for special industrial processes and normal requirements would exceed the capacity of the pipeline systems.
5. Coal, in addition to its own step-up in demand, would be called upon to quickly make up the deficit in total national energy requirements, which would be much greater than in World War II.
6. Coal demand, it is estimated, would be one-third higher than in World War II, or 800 million tons against 620 million tons.

COULD THE COAL INDUSTRY MEET THE SITUATION?

This depends upon (1) from what to what tonnage; (2) whether the industry is economically healthy; (3) whether it attempts to expand from a position of strength rather than weakness; (4) whether leaders of industry and Government recognize certain responsibilities and take realistic action.

Coal's ability to expand from a retracted position depends on from what-to-what volume. If the industry's volume has shrunk to and held at an unprofitable level for some time it will not be in a position to greatly expand its productive capacity. It will be short of working capital, equipment, supplies, and trained personnel and the opening up of closed mines is a great gamble, often unsuccessful, because of deterioration of underground workings.

Authorities agree that the bituminous coal industry—in order to put itself in a safe position to serve the country—must maintain present developed mines at or near their present capacity and to do this the coal industry needs to produce approximately 550 million tons of coal per year. This can be done logically by—

1. Congress restricting the importation of foreign residual oil which will displace about 50 million tons of coal per year at present rates.
2. The administration arranging for Marshall aid countries to buy American coal. (Why should Western Europe buy millions of tons of coal from Iron Curtain countries when American coal is competitive?)
3. Amending the Natural Gas Act to permit and encourage natural gas to sell at its true economic value in the markets. (It is selling today at the well for one-fifth the price of crude oil and two-fifths the price of coal at the mine.)
4. The railroads, in cooperation with the Government, reduce their freight rates on coal so that they will return not more than the cost of hauling plus a reasonable profit. (Today they are set up to carry the losses of passenger and dining car traffic and on other commodities.)
5. Adjusting wage rates and fringe benefits to be competitive with other industries, particularly the oil and natual gas industries.
6. Providing additional sound leadership in the industry itself.
7. Combining more productive capacity under single well-managed units.
8. Better selling through larger units, including regional marketing agencies.
9. Realization by utility and industrial executives that it is in the national and their own companies' interest to pay the cost of production plus a reasonable profit for the coal they buy.

These nine logical steps, if effectuated, will strengthen the coal industry while doing no harm to any other industry and will enable it to meet the high energy demand which may be placed upon it without warning.

Now there is just one thing more important than the support of coal and that is coal's support of the Nation. Although not often so stated, the survival of a Nation in today's world finally depends on its ability to deliver the greatest amount of energy to the point when and where it is needed.

Coal is this Nation's No. 1 energy source. A strong, prosperous, privately owned coal industry is the best defense policy this country can have.

COAL-FIRED CROP DRYERS INCREASE FARM PROFITS

A boon to farmers everywhere is the newly developed coal-fired crop dryer, by Bituminous Coal Research, Inc. Through the use of this trailer mounted farm implement, there is substantial opportunity for lowering of farm operating costs and for increasing farm income.

BCR says: "The use of heat dryers can increase the feed value of hay by 55 percent. It has been found that a cow that will eat 30 pounds of good hay per day will only eat 19 pounds of poor hay. This means the farmer must add 6 pounds of grain daily to the cow's ration to prevent a decrease in milk production. With 30 head of milking cows and poor quality hay, the farmer must add 18 tons of supplemental food to the ration per 200-day feeding year. At $85 per ton this adds $1,530 to the farmer's feeding costs—which otherwise would go toward paying off a dryer in one or two seasons. The best food value is in the leaves, many of which shatter and fall to the ground during raking and handling when the hay is left in the field until it is dry enough for safe storage. The leaves are retained when hay at 35 to 40 percent moisture is handled and stored for heat drying.

"The BCR crop dryer has demonstrated its suitability for low-cost drying of baled hay, chopped hay, ear corn, seed corn, shelled corn, and other small grains.

"Complete drying satisfaction can be achieved only by the use of heated air, which provides the most rapid means of drying and is most independent of bad weather conditions.

"Heated-air drying prepares crops for safe storage, free from mold, spoilage, fire hazard, and loss of feed value. It allows the farmer to harvest earlier, at higher moisture content, and with less dependence on weather conditions. The carotene, color, and aroma of hay are retained. High test-weight value of wheat is maintained. Field losses of corn are substantially reduced. Contamination of soybean fields is eliminated. Crop rotation is speeded.

"Agricultural extension services and the United States Department of Agriculture recommend heated-air drying, and have published bulletins on their tests."

Crop drying is regarded by BCR as a potential market for several million tons of bituminous stoker coal, the safest and lowest cost fuel for the purpose. A crop dryer is profitable to all farms, large or small, even in seasons of drought. It is pointed out that bituminous coal is readily available in those areas where 80 percent of the Nation's hay, corn, and grains are produced.

Farmers throughout the Nation are discovering that artificial crop drying materially increases farm income and that the crop dryer is becoming an indispensable implement.

Bituminous coal production

	Tons		Tons	Percent change
Week ended July 24, 1954	[1] 7,025,000	Week ended July 25, 1953	9,172,000	−23.4
Year to date	[1] 203,271,000	Year to date	249,711,000	−18.6

DISTRICT 8 COAL CARLOADINGS

	Week ended July 24, 1954	Average week 3d quarter, 1953	Percent change	Week ended July 25, 1953	Percent change
Cars	[1] 31,868	37,940		38,354	
Tons	[1] 2,065,000	2,357,000	−12.4	2,386,000	
	Year to date			Year to date	
Do	[1] 51,193,000			61,561,000	−16.8

[1] Preliminary.

COAL CARLOADINGS OF PRINCIPAL RAILROADS SERVING DISTRICT 8 AND ADJACENT DISTRICTS

[50-ton units]

	Southern	NYC	B. & O.	L. & N.	C. & O.	N. & W.
Jan. 1, 1954 to July 17, 1954	39,716	189,200	324,361	243,452	432,017	369,063
Jan. 1, 1953 to July 18, 1953	50,574	225,400	387,368	293,189	533,345	422,940
Percent (+) or (−) 1954 versus 1953	−21.5	−16.1	−16.3	−17.0	−19.0	−12.7
Week ended July 17, 1954	1,322	6,290	12,534	9,255	17,993	15,868
Week ended July 18, 1953	1,343	7,823	15,792	12,025	22,345	17,544
Percent (+) or (−) 1954 week versus 1953 week	−1.6	−19.6	−20.6	−23.0	−19.5	−9.6

Steel operations

	Scheduled week ending July 31, 1954	Previous week	Month ago	Year ago
Percent of current capacity	64.5	66.3	65.8	92.6
Tons of ingots and castings	1,538,000	1,557,000	1,568,000	2,087,000

Trend of business activity

	Week ended July 17, 1954	Preceding week	Month ago	Year ago	1946 average
Business Week index (1946–49=100)	[1] 124.2	124.4	126.8	125.7	91.6

[1] Preliminary.

Korean Rehabilitation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 16, 1954

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I request unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record, a letter written to me by the Honorable James H. R. Cromwell, formerly our envoy to Canada and, during World War II, American adviser to President Syngman Rhee, and a memorandum proposing a new approach to the rehabilitation of Korea. The letter describes a proposed new departure in American foreign policy which I consider to be of sufficient interest and importance to bring to the attention of the American people and their representatives here on Capitol Hill.

There being no objection, the letter and memorandum were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

CROMWELL & CO.,
Washington, D. C., August 10, 1954.

Hon. KARL MUNDT,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MUNDT: I am writing you this letter because I know that you are one of the Senators who believes that our foreign-aid program requires reappraisal and rejuvenation. I am convinced the great majority of thoughtful Americans coincide with that opinion, and it therefore may be appropriate, with respect to the necessity for rejuvenation to submit to you, in the form of this letter the private-enterprise plan as a possible new departure in American foreign policy.

This plan is an expansion and extension of the private-enterprise plan for Korea, which was entered into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by the Honorable PAUL SHAFER, of Michigan, on March 5, 1954. The plan, as applied to Korea, was approved in principle by President Syngman Rhee, and since he was recently in Washington for conferences concerned chiefly with the economic rehabilitation of the ROK, a presentation to the public of the new ideas contained in the private-enterprise plan appear to be timely and in order.

To promote discussion and consideration of the new ideas embodied in the plan, Congressman SHAFER, filed on July 20, 1954, an amended House Concurrent Resolution 219. It is because this resolution has received the endorsement of the National Association of Manufacturers and of a number of our highest and most respected executives, both in industry and labor, that I am emboldened to bring these proposals to your attention and that of Senators who believe as we do.

Respectfully yours,
JAMES H. R. CROMWELL.

THE PRIVATE ENTERPRISE PLAN AS A NEW DEPARTURE IN AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY

1. AN OVERSEAS RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION PLUS PRIVATE INDUSTRIAL SPONSORSHIP

A great French philosopher has said that a republic lives on its perils. I believe, however, that Montaigne should have added that a republic learns its lessons by its experiences.

Measured in terms of our unsatisfactory experiences with international gifts and giveaway programs, we should, by now, have learned to avoid them in the future. And if we eliminate gifts and giveaways as a major factor of our foreign policy, as the world's wealthiest nation, we will need a substitute which will demonstrate our desire to aid less fortunate peoples but will not perpetuate the weaknesses and defects of these past policies. Fortunately, there is available another method—a new idea to which we may now turn.

I refer to the idea, first, of creating an overseas Reconstruction Finance Corporation, similar in purpose and general design to our own organization of the same name. This overseas RFC would be adequately financed by congressional appropriations, and set up under the laws of those of our allies who would welcome such a lending organization and who would be entitled to it by reason of their proven loyalty and devotion to the cause of world freedom. There would be, of course, high level American planning and supervision.

The second idea and concomitant idea endowed with interesting potentialities is that of inducing some of our outstanding and most efficient American coporations to sponsor the construction and operation of counterpart factories in those countries qualified for the establishment of branch RFC's. Under this plan each American parent corporation would receive as compensation for its know-how and management, a 25-percent permanent share of the equity stock in its new allied corporation. All the funds required by such new allied corporations would be borrowed from the branch RFC so that the American sponsors would not have to risk a penny of their stockholders' money.

Provision would be made to guarantee that a substantial portion of the balance of 75 percent of such equity stock would ultimately be sold to the native men and management of the new allied corporations, and that the remainder of the stock would be widely distributed in small holdings among the people themselves.

2. CONCENTRATION OF UNITED STATES EXPENDITURES AND STRENGTH TO BUILD UP THE POWER OF STANCH AND STRATEGIC ALLIES

I understand that since World War II we have granted to our friends and allies all over the world, about $60 billion in various forms of relief, arms, aid, reconstruction, and so forth. The worthy purpose of these vast expenditures of our precious natural resources and wealth, was to build up a formidable and united association of free nations which would combat the growing menace of communism.

I will not disgress at this point to state my convictions as to how successful this venture has been. Each citizen can judge for himself in this respect. But there is a growing conviction in our country that the time has come to take a new look—another look, if you please—to determine whether we can afford to continue such vast outlays.

There is an urgent need to weigh the benefits we have received in exchange for our $60 billion. So, it is at this important juncture in our own and in world affairs, that I submit this new and comparatively modest departure in American foreign policy. I mean, of course, the ideas I have just outlined for the creation of an "American Allies Reconstruction Finance Corporation" with adequately financed branches located in the capitals of our staunchest Allies.

Let me name several of those nations that I personally consider to be our most loyal Allies. In these countries the inauguration of this so-called private enterprise plan or Reconstruction Finance Corporation Plan, would, in my opinion, be welcome, and would prove particularly effective. First, of course, is our outstanding, fighting Ally the Republic of Korea. Then there are Formosa, the Philippine Republic, Greece, Turkey, Pakistan, and several of our South American neighbors. I am sure we will all agree that the courage, loyalty and fighting spirit of each and every one of these Allies is beyond question of doubt.

To put it bluntly, the countries I have named are good risks, because they will stick with us through thick and thin. Now in seeking, as we must, to conserve our resources of manpower and of minerals and metals, would it not be wise to build up the industrial power of these several nations, as rapidly as we can? And should we not concentrate the expenditure of our precious dollars upon those whom we can surely trust, rather than upon those who will probably be among the missing when the chips are down?

3. WHY PUBLIC RATHER THAN PRIVATE FUNDS MUST BE USED

In all of these nations I have named are rich and valuable natural resources waiting to be developed. But, of far greater importance, there are brave, hardy, and intelligent people, eager to be taught the world-famous American know-how. Those freedom-loving people are eager to grasp the golden opportunity of raising their standards of living to the hitherto undreamed-of heights which the application of that famous American know-how will positively guarantee.

This being the case, you may ask, why not encourage private capital to undertake the vital task of building up the industrial power of these strategic bastions of freedom? Why do we have to appropriate Government funds for this purpose? My answer is threefold:

First, because the primary consideration involved here is strategic rather than commercial.

Second, because for this same reason the risk for private capital is too great to induce the investment of its savings.

Third, because time is the essence of our world problem today. The expanding menace of communism does not allow the passage of time necessary for the normal development and growth of industry under a system of private investment.

I want to point out that it has been the rapid industrialization of Russia under communism that has led, and is leading, a number of underdeveloped nations to accept socialism with its risk of government ownership and regimentation. They accept this risk because they see no other means to accomplish rapid industrialization.

Now, let me pose these questions: Is not this private enterprise plan, as I have described it, the means and method through which the United States can offer our stanch allies the rapid realization of industrialization that they need and so ardently desire? And can we not, at the same time, offer them far more than has ever been accomplished in Russia? And can we not, at the same time, avoid the Red terror and the appalling sacrifices suffered by the unfortunate Russian people?

4. CREATING INDUSTRIAL AND STRATEGIC GIBRALTARS THE POSITIVE WAY TO DEFEAT COMMUNISM

I say we can. Furthermore, we can simultaneously develop industrial and strategic Gibraltars within all these nations where the principles of the private enterprise plan may be applied. What do I mean by Gibraltars? I mean that the application of American know-how and American capital in underdeveloped regions can immeasurably and quickly raise the standards of living of all the people within them. I mean that this can be accomplished under a system of freedom and private enterprise and with great gain to us, both spiritually and materially; and, finally, I mean that we can establish in these nations a social order and political philosophy which would assure the perpetuation of those inseparable twins, capitalism and democracy.

What is it that the false prophets of Moscow promise to their people and to the people of their satellites? They promise them that communism will enable them, within a generation, to match the industrial power and wealth of America. That, indeed, has become the great world dream. All peoples everywhere have heard fabulous tales of the power and wealth of America and of the freedom from oppression and from want that exists in these United States, and because they dream dreams of achieving these benefits for themselves, they are discontented with their hard lot in life, and are thus fertile fields for the impossible promises of communism.

Obviously we Americans cannot raise the living standards of all the people of the world, but we can raise the standards of living in those nations I have named, and of a number of other nations in South America which are eligible for application of the private-enterprise plan. And, let me emphasize this fact: We can accomplish all this for a fraction of the $60 billion we have sown throughout the world, and for which we seem to have reaped little but a harvest of contempt and ill will.

5. HOW THE PRIVATE-ENTERPRISE PLAN WOULD CREATE BOTH GOOD WILL AND GOOD INVESTMENT

What I propose is no giveaway program. In the case of Korea, we are morally obligated to reconstruct, in that tragic land, the devastation wrought by our own calamitous policies. Now, that job is going to be an expensive one and we cannot, in all probability, expect any repayment from the Korean people other than in the form of their loyalty and good will.

But, I submit, Korea is the exception to the rule, for I have not the slightest doubt that in a country of rich resources such as Turkey, a billion dollar Turkish branch RFO would, within 2 or 3 decades, return to this Government not only its original investment, but a handsome profit besides. And that, I am positive, is the way the Turkish people, or any other self-respecting, independent people would want it to be.

Now what about our American corporations that woudl design, build, and operate counterpart enterprises in foreign lands, and would teach the local folks American methods of manufacture? Have they not everything to gain and nothing to lose? Would the parent corporations fear the competition of their progeny? Well, I do not know whether you can compete with yourself, but I do know that competition is the lifeblood of capitalism. I also know that an expanded production of goods means an expanded volume of trade between nations.

So, while our American corporations would be disseminating their knowledge and the good will that goes with it, they would at the same time, be earning a profit commensurate with the services rendered. And again I say, that is the way it should be.

6. SYNOPSIS OF THE GAINS TO AMERICA OF ABIDING BY THE TENETS OF CAPITALISM

The time has come for the United States to cease practicing the preachings of communism. Stripped down to its bare fundamentals, Marxism is just the ageless old phony of "something for nothing," and that is exactly what America—supposedly the citadel of capitalism—has been practicing. We have given away $60 billion and, I repeat, we seem to have reaped little but a harvest of contempt and ill will. Now, if that is not "something for nothing" then what is?

So, before concluding my remarks with an enumeration of the advantages to the United States inherent in the application of this private-enterprise plan to our stanchest allies, I say this: Let it be, henceforth, the sense of Congress and of the American people that we will neither build nor rebuild nor sustain bankrupt Socialist economies with our hard-earned tax dollars, nor go bankrupt ourselves by giving away billions for nothing. Let us, rather, regain our own self-respect and the respect of the world by recalling and practicing this great Christian doctrine from St. Luke, chapter 10, seventh verse: "For the laborer is worthy of his hire."

And now, here is my enumeration of the advantages to the United States that are inherent in the private-enterprise plan:

1. In this program, the money we spend will be the money we lend, and the sums so spent will eventually return in kind, both spiritually and financially.

2. We will create positive bastions of potential military might in strategic areas where there is now military weakness.

3. We will substitute the sound strategic principles of economic and military concentration for our present unsound and anticapitalistic policy of waste and dispersion.

4. We will open the doors of economic opportunity and higher standards of living to our faithful allies, and simultaneously deal a mortal blow to world communism.

5. We will forge, on the anvil of sound commercial cooperation, those enduring friendships that can only be founded upon mutual trust, profitable trade, and proven performance.

6. We will liquidate the further failures of a foreign policy based upon the operation of an international poorhouse supported by American tax-dollar gifts.

7. We will demonstrate the superior principles, values, and soundness of the American system of private property, private enterprise, and personal freedoms, as compared to Communist regimentation, slavery, and terror.

The Hardships Experienced by Point 4 Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, August 16, 1954

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, from its very inception I have been pleased to give my continued support to the point 4 program of technical assistance to underdeveloped countries, a program which will now be reviewed by a special committee set up for this purpose.

Without prejudging that committee's important work, I may say the following: Point 4, although it has occasionally departed somewhat from the main track, and although it has had its flaws, nevertheless, is, in my judgment, sound in most of its fundamental concepts. It has proven of tremendous value to our own country in terms of good-will appreciation, and to foreign peoples in terms of tangible and intangible benefits.

It is most unfortunate to read the occasional sweeping unfair criticisms which have been made of point 4. Many of the criticisms have been leveled without the slightest conception on the part of the critics of all the good that point 4 has accomplished.

What is not generally realized, moreover, is that the folks who are carrying out the point 4 program have often experienced the greatest hardships throughout the world, suffering from the elements, from insect ravages, and from primitive conditions.

I send to the desk a very interesting Associated Press dispatch which vividly describes how point 4 workers in 59 countries are combating hunger and poverty and inevitably experiencing casualties in the process.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of this dispatch be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the dispatch was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Milwaukee Journal of August 15, 1954]

POINT 4 ARMY CASUALTIES HIGH

(By William C. Owen)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—As free-world diplomats maneuver to block the spread of communism, a group of men and women works quietly but effectively battling communism's two great allies—hunger and poverty. Here is a report on the worldwide point 4 project of the Foreign Operations Administration.)

WASHINGTON, D. C.—In Liberia a sudden squall overturns a boat and two men drown.

In Afghanistan a man breaks his back during a jouncing ride over rough roads.

In Jordan a man tortured by dysentery works on alone and unattended in the desert to complete his job.

Such men might be missionaries, driven by devotion to carry their religion to the four corners of the world.

Instead, they are United States Government employees, hard at work in what President Eisenhower has called a "new kind of war * * * upon the brute forces of poverty and need."

Some 2,500 men and women of the Foreign Operations Administration (FOA) are fighting this battle in 59 countries of the free world. Their casualty list is long.

FOA is the major channel through which the United States sends its dollars, food, equipment, and skilled Americans to the needy peoples and nations of the world.

Life for these men in some countries means exciting scenery, splendid living, and, at times, too much work to enjoy such advantages.

But for most, living conditions are unpleasant, morale killing or downright dangerous. It is a far cry from the "gravy train" life which some critics have depicted.

Depending on experience and knowledge, the pay ranges from $7,000 a year up for technically qualified workers. In addition, they get special allowances which in some countries include a housing allotment, a cost of living adjustment, and a hardship differential amounting to a maximum of 25 percent of base salary.

The pay is lower for secretarial, clerking, and other less specialized jobs.

The number of cushion posts is small—they are mostly in the Europeon countries and some in Latin America, says an FOA official. Even these assignments have their drawbacks—poor housing, high prices, bad health conditions.

But this is nothing compared to duty in the malevolent deserts and jungles of Africa.

Albert A. Gallo, chief of the regional projects office for the Middle East, south Asia, and African areas, says jungle life and Americans often cannot mix. Tropical diseases and jungle dangers fell a large number of FOA pioneers and failure to adjust to local conditions causes psychic breakdowns among workers and their families.

To do their job in such areas, men and women face "isolation * * * the community of interests is small," lack of modern conveniences, difficulty in providing proper education for children, "bites from insects we're still learning about," rainy seasons, with 2 inches a day, and dry spells that shrivel men, women, and children.

Americans must undergo the hardships of such places in carrying through the technical cooperation program of FOA—the sharing of American knowledge and skills.

Miss Anne Whatley, deputy of the Pakistan-Afghanistan division, recently made a 4 month inspection tour of her territory. She tells of American technicians going 200 miles into the desert to teach villagers how to be healthier, eat better, develop small industries they could carry on in their cottages. The technicians lived in local housing with no bath or flush toilets, ate C rations, broiled in 116 to 117° heat, and underwent whiplash sandstorms.

Alan Laflin, a civil engineer by profession and director of the Latin American mission, said Americans at the new FOA mission in Surinam (formerly Dutch Guiana) meet with untamed jungles, isolation, and scarcity of food.

And with a grin he indicated that a stout heart is needed, because—

"Occasionally an alligator will fall into your swimming pool.

"Poisonous snakes or boas frequently are found on doorsteps * * * or making off with dogs.

"Sometimes jaguars get into the outlying district of the city."

The casualty list of these FOA pioneers gives a graphic insight into the human cost of this new kind of war.

"There were hundreds of injuries sustained in line of duty last year," said Mrs. Daisy B. Fields, employee relations officer. "The majority of men and their dependents who work overseas develop illnesses and suffer injuries.

"Many people die from heart attacks caused by overwork, high altitudes, poor living conditions, and hot, humid climate." Mrs. Fields said she believes heart attacks are "the major fatality." Recently 3 fatal heart attacks were reported in 1 week.

Mrs. Fields said many people have to return to the United States for treatment after suffering nervous breakdowns.

"There is a relationship between the hardship posts, like Africa, and breakdowns," she said. There is about one collapse a month.

All FOA employees are briefed fully before they go overseas or into a foreign land about the rigors and dangers they will face. But still they go.

Commenting on these peace crusade pioneers, FOA Director Harold Stassen says:

"Armed with a textbook, simple tools, or a spray gun to banish malaria, these dedicated men and women are helping greatly in making the true American spirit known to the world."

The Coal Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, August 16, 1954

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "The Coal Industry," written by George H. Love, president of the Pittsburgh Consolidation Coal Co. The Consolidation Coal Co. is one of the largest coal companies in the world, and Mr. Love is an authority on coal and its production.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE COAL INDUSTRY

I have been asked to talk to you for a few minutes about the coal industry generally and more particularly how it affects Pennsylvania. A coal miner would normally fell a little out of place at a bankers' convention because if he owed the banks he would be avoiding them and goodness knows banks have not generally sought coal loans. Nevertheless, the coal industry has played a great part in the industrial development of this State and in doing so has received much help from the banks in Pennsylvania. I think the records show that the industry generally has been a good payer of debts, although it has not been overly kind to its stockholders.

When we speak of coal in Pennsylvania we must differentiate between anthracite and bituminous. Anthracite, having been confined to our own State, has through the years performed a great service in Pennsylvania in giving employment and creating business, but it has been shrinking each year recently and is currently struggling for its life. Anthracite production reached its peak in Pennsylvania in 1917 when some 100 million tons were produced, but the tonnage in 1953 amounted to only 30 million tons and obviously the shrinkage will continue. This is primarily because anthracite is used in home heating and the public has been changing over to other fuels which are more convenient and more cheaply transported, first to the locality of the consumer and finally to his basement. Some of the better anthracite properties have real value and will furnish employment for a long time, but as an industry its future is problematical.

THE NO. 1 PRODUCER

When we think of coal we give chief consideration to bituminous, which is used today in quantities some 14 times more than anthracite. While it is mined in 25 States of the Union, some 90 percent of it is produced east of the Mississippi. Pennsylvania was the No. 1 producer of bituminous coal for many years, although its production has drastically declined, but it still maintains second place among the States. In 1953 we produced 94 million tons in Pennsylvania compared to a high of 179 million tons in 1918. In spite of the fact that nationally coal production has declined more than 30 percent in the last 6 or 7 years during a period when practically all other industry was booming and also in spite of the fact that we are now back to a point where we will probably mine no more coal in 1954 than in a year like 1939, we still mine and use bituminous coal in enormous quantities. In fact, we produce a greater quantity of bituminous coal in this country than we produce of any other product and we may go on to say that no other country in the world produces as much of any single product. We have produced as much as 630 million tons and last year our production was 450 million tons. For comparison, we may produce 80 million tons of steel this year, some 700,000 tons of copper, 1⅓ million tons of aluminum and about ½ millions tons of lead and the same of zinc. You may be interested to know that we use far less than 25 million tons of all meat products in this country in a year's time. In other words, when we talk about bituminous coal we are talking of something that is produced here in tremendous volume and is thus a great contributor to the whole economic life of America.

THIS HUGE INDUSTRY

However, the decline from the levels reached immediately after the war is at far too great a pace and may again throw this huge industry into economic chaos. It happens that the industry is receiving too many blows more or less simultaneously. These are the dieselization of railroads which will take some 100 million tons away from the industry, the tremendous spread of natural gas pipelines in what we normally consider coal's territory and, third, the flood of residual oil which is flowing into this country primarily along the eastern seaboard. We could hardly find fault with the railroad dieselization program, as that stemmed from progress. We could perhaps think that, inasmuch as coal is such an important customer of the railroads, the program could have been carried on a little slower to prevent the possible chaos I mentioned above and, since the diesel is supposed to be so much more economical and such a great saver of dollars, the railroads might have eased the blow to coal by reducing the transportation cost of coal and giving the coal industry some of the benefits rather than having gone in exactly the opposite direction and increased coal freight rates some 50 percent which limited our ability to compete in our remaining markets.

The increase in the use of natural gas was and is to be expected because the public wants the convenience of this fuel and our only plea is that it be conserved for higher uses such as the domestic heating load rather than dumped under boilers where coal is normally used with such great efficiency merely to give a pipeline a better load factor. I am convinced that the importation of residual oil must be limited by Government action. There are only two major producers who are bringing this bottom-of-the-barrel product into this country in volume and they are both very large and rich. I am sure they both realize that the bituminous coal industry is essential in this country and they also know that they are not extending our oil reserves by bringing in this residual but merely replacing coal under boilers at whatever dumped price is necessary to get the business. We must import crude but this bottom-of-the-barrel product has only 5 cents a barrel import duty as opposed to 50 cents a barrel on gasoline. If we need to import oil products rather than crude why not bring in gasoline to compete with gasoline in this country and thus conserve our limited oil reserves rather than bring in residual with one-tenth the duty to compete with the coal industry?

USE OF ENERGY

I have just given you the dark side of the coal industry but there is a brighter one and that is the enormous increase in the use of energy and in this eastern part of the United States where 90 percent of the coal is mined the producers of energy look primarily to coal for their raw material. This public utility production of energy has more than tripled since the end of the thirties compared to coal which has been just holding its own in that period and many forecasters are estimating that the demand for energy will double in the next 10 years and if it happens this will call for the use of 200 million tons of coal. There is no better barometer of our standard of living than the use of energy and I am sure we are going to continue to call on machines to do things for us and add to the use of energy in our homes. Therefore, the bituminous coal industry is really a producer of energy and may be considered in the energy business rather than in the coal business.

As the emphasis has changed to energy rather than particular uses of coal, Pennsylvania's coals, which have extraordinary qualities, are now no longer essential in the more modern plants which have been equipped to burn any kind of coal, so that a trend has been established toward the use of the coal that can be produced cheapest and in this regard Pennsylvania's coal has some disadvantages. We have also tried to impress on the railroads that they are no longer hauling coal to compete with coal carried by another railroad but rather they are transporting energy and are thus primarily competing with pipelines, the high tension transmission lines and tankers bringing in residual oil into New York Harbor.

I attended the annual stockholders meeting of the General Electric Co. last month at Schenectady where they had errected an electric house, small but containing all sorts of electrical gadgets, including refrigerators set in the walls and a heat pump to furnish heat and air conditioning. This small house it was estimated would use some 23,000 kilowatt-hours annually as opposed to the average use per household of 2,300 kilowatt-hours. So here we see modern development at its best, as instead of coal coming into this house by wheelbarrow and thus failing to compete with natural gas, we find it coming in over a wire in a form the consumer wants it, and this particular home would use some 10 or 11 tons of coal as opposed to one-half that amount in the old-fashioned job of just home heating.

THIS BRIGHTER SIDE

In addition to this brighter side of the marketing possibilities for coal we also see that coal is doing a tremendous job of increasing its efficiency and thus reducing its cost to the public. We are selling coal today at the mine for 10 percent less than we did 6 years ago, although our labor rates and costs of supplies have gone up more than 30 percent in the same period. That is because our efficiency in mining coal as an industry has increased more rapidly in the last 10 years than has the efficiency in any other major industry. We could also add that the possible future markets for chemical products from coal are enormous, but these possibilities are still embryonic as is the actual conversion of coal to oil, gasoline, or gas. All of these can be done but it is not economic to think of them as long as they are in abundant supply in natural liquid or gaseous form.

Let me touch very briefly on the possibilities of atomic energy taking the place of energy created by more conventional fuels. Up to date the development of fissionable material has been a great consumer of energy. As a matter of fact, the whole atomic program will soon be using 10 percent of our total energy in this country. Therefore, the program has added to coal's markets and will continue to for the next decade or two as we see by the example of the Atomic Energy Commission's approval of the purchase of coal as a source of energy for powerplants which are being built in conjunction with the newest atomic project. These contracts are for 15 years but they could have been made for a longer period if the producers of the coal had been willing. While we will doubtless be creating large amounts of energy by atomic means 20 or 30 years from today, it is our best guess that the total demand for energy will increase by a greater amount than that supplied by atomic means and, therefore, coal will also be creating far more energy than it is today.

STOCKPILING

Today the Government is engaged in an intensive and expensive program of stockpiling many products, such as nickel, lead, and copper, but if the emergency comes when these products will be needed we must also have the energy available to convert them into the materials of war. This energy can only be created from coal and therefore I point out that we must stockpile the ability to mine coal rather than the coal itself, as it would be impractical to store it in such enormous quantities. It takes 5 to 10 years to develop a new coal mine today and if we let the mines continue to close and the miners to drift away into other industry we may not have the ability to produce energy which is the most necessary war material of all.

To maintain a strong core of a coal industry able to meet any situation that may arise we must keep a few remaining markets for coal intact and to do so the importation of residual oil must be curbed and the use of natural gas restricted to the higher uses such as home heating. The day after a war is declared the tankers carrying residual oil will disappear from the Atlantic and the pipelines will not be able to carry the additional load. Therefore, we must help coal through these serious competitive times so that it will be available to do the job again as it was in the last two world conflicts.

The great industrial development in Pennsylvania has been based on coal. If we will handle the patient during this period when he is so sorely pressed with sufficient care and reason I am willing to predict that Pennsylvania will enjoy an industrial rebirth in the not too distant future based on its own coal and that of neighboring States.

Hon. William Henry Harrison

SPEECH

OF

HON. SAM COON

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 12, 1954

Mr. COON. Mr. Speaker, we regret to see WILLIAM HENRY HARRISON leaving the House of Representatives. I have come in contact on many occasions with Mr. Harrison on matters relating to our Second Congressional District in Oregon.

As chairman of the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, Mr. Harrison has been very instrumental in helping us with legislation relating to our reclamation projects. He has been a strong supporter of all legislation for the West and particularly for the State of Wyoming, which he so ably represents. All of us who have served with him recognize his ability, and we wish him well in his new venture.

Labrador Ore: A New Economic Horizon for North America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 16, 1954

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the opening up of the Labrador ore fields represents one of the great milestones in the economic progress of America. It is a landmark, as well, in the military defense of the North American Continent.

The first shipment of iron ore from that field underlines the significance of the passage of Public Law 358, of the 83d Congress—the Wiley St. Lawrence seaway development law.

I send to the desk the text of an editorial which appeared on the Labrador ore shipment in last Saturday's August 15 Milwaukee Journal. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Labrador's Ore Comes Out

Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey rushed up to Seven Islands on the St. Lawrence River the other day to join a welcoming committee for a trainload of reddish earth known as iron ore.

It was ordinary high-grade iron ore—but extraordinary as a symbol of achievement and a guarantee that America's steel mills will have plenty of raw material for years to come.

This ore shipment is the first to head for the mills from a bonanza of at least two billion tons in the frozen wastes near Ruth Lake astride the Labrador-Quebec border. The existence of the ore has been known for a long time. But to get it out, a railroad had to be laid down for 360 miles through wilderness. To start operations, 170 million pounds of machinery and supplies had to be air lifted to what became the northern terminus of the railroad. In the mining area itself 250 miles of roads have been hacked out to connect known deposits.

All of this was done by private enterprise—to the tune of a $250 million investment. The company doing the job is the Iron Ore Co. of Canada. It was organized by the M. A. Hanna Co., of Cleveland, which Secretary Humphrey formerly headed, and the Hollinger Consolidated Gold Mines, Ltd., of Canada. Stockholders include Republic, Wheeling, Armco, Youngstown Sheet & Tube, and National Steel companies.

What the investment does is guarantee this country a new and invaluable source of iron ore to meet demands of the steel mills and augment the waning supplies of high grade ores in Minnesota's Mesabi range. It gives us a supply that is well inland, which will not require the ocean shipping so dangerous in wartime. As of now the ore will go out the St. Lawrence from Seven Islands to mills in Baltimore and Philadelphia. Some will go by barge to Great Lakes mills.

As soon as the St. Lawrence seaway is built, regular ore boats will be able to carry it down the lakes to the mills. One of the big justifications of the seaway was the need to provide transportation for this new ore source. It took courage, imagination, and faith to go ahead with the project before the seaway was finally approved. The men who went ahead did so in the belief that the seaway was inevitable—that it had to come.

Ore production will be a 6-month-a-year job. This is not because ice will close the seaway for a few months a year, but because it gets too cold in the Labrador area to mine and ship. In subzero temperatures iron ore clings to the sides of steel railroad cars and heavy snows make travel difficult.

But in a 6-month season the region will soon be shipping 10 million tons a year to our mills. Steel has helped build a great America. Labrador-Quebec resources guarantee us ore for steel for years to come.

Senator McCarthy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 13, 1954

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include herewith an editorial from the Huntington Beach News, Huntington Beach, Calif., by Jim Farquhar, with regard to Senator McCarthy:

McCarthy still continues to rate more space in the public prints than any other American. Feeling runs so high both pro and con, it is sometimes difficult to peg the facts.

But a few things are clear. Eisenhower, who ducked the issue for many long months, finally took his stand with Adlai Stevenson, the Democratic Party, the Communist Party, the one-worlders, the international bankers, the Deweyites, and the leftwing New Dealers. His denunciation was vigorous and bitter. The position of the Republican administration is indeed peculiar. In this district, for instance, as is generally the case throughout the Nation, the Democratic candidate for Congress is campaigning on an anti-McCarthy platform.

Republican incumbent Jimmy Utt, on the other hand, at variance with his Republican Party President, is a strong McCarthy adherent. His position is either correct or he is a dead duck in November. And if he is right, the President is very wrong.

How many people are keeping in mind the fact that the appropriation for McCarthy's committee was voted by the Senate without a dissenting vote?

How many of the "Hate McCarthy" group, who decry the absurdity of the present circus spectacle, are keeping in mind that the investigation was instigated not by McCarthy but by his foes?

Are those who are so frantic to have the present hearing ended motivated by a belief that it serves no purpose or is it because McCarthy is winning most of the skirmishes? Compared to the billions spent elsewhere, why isn't it healthy for the great American middle class to look in on some of the things which go on in Washington?

One intelligent local political student told the writer he has never missed a one of the near-midnight telecasts on the McCarthy-Army hearings. Also he was anti-McCarthy when they started and he is pro-McCarthy now.

The trouble with most of us is we don't pay enough attention to politics to know what we are talking about.

In Wisconsin, for example, a third of a million people were actually so ignorant they signed a "Hate McCarthy" recall petition not knowing that no Member of Congress can be recalled by the people.

It hardly seems possible that the administration leadership in Washington could have been so dumb as to have enlisted the Army in a fight they couldn't possibly win, and which served only to demonstrate to the American people glaring weaknesses in the Army politics, policy, and discipline.

A Democratic campaign to discredit a Republican Senator's investigation of Communists in Government, receiving the support of a Republican President, is indeed amazing.

Equally revealing is the spectacle of the Democratic members of McCarthy's committee, all aligning themselves with Eisenhower against McCarthy.

But perhaps the most remarkable situation of all was the fact that Army Secretary Stevens' chief adviser has been Harry Truman's former top legal counsel, Clark Clifford.

Some students of politics will not soon forget that Eisenhower has clamped the lid on what was said and who was present at the now famous "Get McCarthy" huddle of top dogs in the administration on January 21.

But as is inevitable what was said and who was there is gradually leaking out. And the facts are far from pretty.

It is also strange that while the purpose of the Army attack is to ruin McCarthy and that McCarthy is designated as the target to be destroyed, whenever McCarthy fights back and draws blood, his wounded attackers either scream in rage or go out in the cloak room and burst into tears.

But the funniest thing about the whole procedure is the policy line laid down by such fence-riding newspapers as the Los Angeles Times which is forced to give the story a big play, but apologizes for the poor showing of the "Hate McCarthy" crowd on the ground that they are well meaning but inept politically.

They attempt to write McCarthy and his associates off by damning them with faint praise and the sobriquet of "slick."

One of their Washington columnists attempted to be clever in analysis, leaping from one side of the proposition to the other, paragraph by paragraph, but finally winding up with the grandiose conclusion that neither side proved anything.

That is where by cool and calm design they aim to completely befog their readers.

For all who care to read and study and think, and stay up long enough to bring into their living rooms, a chapter in American government, with all its petty personal jealousies, as well as its virtues, is being unfolded, that all may see.

And seeing they may learn. Let us have more of it, not less. Let the people directly know what their servants in Washington are saying and doing and thinking.

Let us have less of this prejudice against race or religion. When all the truth gets a complete hearing and the well springs of information are not dammed up but allowed to flow freely, there need be no fear what the verdict of a majority of the American people will be.

New Bipartisan Anti-Communist Committee Active

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 30, 1954

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, on July 1, 1954, an editorial appeared in the Wyoming County Times, published at Warsaw, N. Y., concerning the House Committee on Communist Aggression. This editorial paid well-deserved tribute to the Honorable CHARLES J. KERSTEN, the veteran Congressman from Wisconsin who is chairman of the committee. It also pointed out that the House committee was doing a serious job of documenting the evidence of Communist aggression and terror. I have the honor of being a member of that committee and can attest to the accuracy of the statements made in this editorial. I, therefore, under unanimous consent, insert this editorial in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

NEW BIPARTISAN ANTI-COMMUNIST COMMITTEE ACTIVE

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—This congressional committee's work is of particular interest as the American people are uneasy about our leader's lack of foresight and future safety of the United States.)

The Kersten bipartisan committee on exposing Communist agression has just departed for Europe, where it will hold hearings for about a month.

This congressional committee and its work, represents one of the few bright spots in the national political scene today. In the first place it is completely bipartisan. The committee members work together with real mutual respect and in perfect harmony. What is most encouraging is that the committee members are among the best informed in the House of Representatives and are completely dedicated to the cause of human freedom. This is largely due to the able leadership of its chairman, CHARLES KERSTEN, of Wisconsin. On the committee's return from Europe it will continue to hold its hearings in the United States. Its work consists of serious, documented evidence as to Communist aggression and the methods and means used to take over free independent countries which were even more anti-Communist than we are ourselves. This is of great concern to the American people and a good and salutary lesson for the President himself and those in the administration, as well as others who fail to recognize the very real danger of the international Communist conspiracy.

This committee's work is of particular interest to this country in that the American people are uneasy over the lack of foresight and political judgment of the present administration and worried over the future safety of the United States. The country has been kept in the dark as to the present Communist infiltration into Government, they dig up dead ones such as Harry Dexter White, but say nothing about those who are influencing if not spearheading the Eisenhower policy. The country is being kept in ignorance of the sellout which is taking place in Geneva, where we do nothing but answer the accusations of the Russians and their Red Chinese stooges and try to negotiate some compromise whereby the Communists can keep what they have gained by military aggression and at the same time save our face by not kicking us too hard in the pants. Not a word said about the forcible seizure of the free nations of central and eastern Europe and the enslavement of another 100 million people. It is a gold-edge dividend to the Kremlin that we do not, for there lies her Achilles heel, her weakest point. By openly bringing up that question and accusing her of aggression and the enslavement of free peoples, we would enormously embarrass her and do much to undermine her hold on her slave empire, as well as on the misguided intellectuals in the free world.

We believe this congressional committee can do a great deal to produce an awareness and understanding of the vital importance of that part of the world to our own security. This column will look forward with interest to the work of this bipartisan committee in the immediate months ahead.

Those Who Invoke the Fifth Amendment Should Not Be Permitted To Serve the Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 1, 1954

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill which would make a plea of the fifth amendment, by any Federal employee or former employee, ground for dismissing him and barring him from any further Federal service if the employment is current, and for terminating any pensions or other benefits, if he is no longer so employed. Enactment of such a bill has been requested by the national executive committee of the American Legion. This measure is modeled after the New York law on this subject.

I understand that, as a matter of practice, anyone who hides behind the fifth amendment while he is in the Government service loses his job. But this should be written into law. This proposal is an important part of the whole pattern of laws which we have been developing to deal better with Communists, subversives, and other undesirables in the Federal Government. I realize it is too late to expect action at this session but hope the proposal may receive early attention in the next Congress.

Any Government official or employee who is hired to serve the American public and who then refuses to answer questions before a court or congressional committee about the conduct of his office, the performance of his duties, or his own qualifications for his post, ought to be discharged forthwith and should certainly be disqualified from holding any other office thereafter. And anyone who is receiving pensions and benefits for prior service in the Government ought to have them taken away if he refuses, on the same grounds, to discuss his conduct or responsibilities while he was so employed.

We have had a law which provides substantially this in my own State of New York for many years. Enactment of a similar Federal law would loosen the tongues of some reluctant witnesses and would smoke out of their hiding places others who ought not to be in Government jobs.

The purpose of the bill is not in any sense to compel public officials to incriminate themselves by their own testimony, but only to drive dishonest and unfaithful persons out of the public service. Anyone can still plead his fifth amendment privilege, if he wishes. But nobody can make that plea about his fitness to hold office and then go right on in the office he was being queried about. He cannot say to the public, whom he is supposed to be serving, "If I told you the truth about myself and the way I am doing this job on the public payroll, I would disclose a crime—but that is no reason for turning me out of my job." Under these circumstances, the plea always amounts to an admission that he has something to hide about the way he has done his job, and that is certainly enough to warrant applying the forfeitures this bill provides.

The bill is carefully drawn, with respect to the forfeiture of benefits, so that it would not entail loss of any funds which an employee has actually paid in under the Civil Service Retirement Act. These funds actually belong to the employee and should not be forfeited by him, any more than by any other person who has such credits and leaves the Government service without claiming or being entitled to an annuity.

I believe this measure will be very effective in separating sheep from goats in the important work of weeding out disloyal, unfit, and defaulting employees on the Government payroll. Honest persons will have an additional incentive to speak up and clear themselves, while those who have things to conceal will be more quickly exposed and more surely dealt with.

I congratulate the American Legion on its sponsorship of this bill and am happy to join with this fine patriotic organization in this effort.

A copy of the measure is as follows:

A bill to prescribe penalties applicable to present and former officers and employees of the United States who refuse to testify concerning matters relating to their public office or employment

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) any officer or employee of the United States or any department or agency thereof who refuses to testify upon matters relating to his office or employment, or his qualifications therefor, in any proceeding wherein he is a defendant or is called as a witness, upon the ground that his answer may tend to incriminate him or compel him to be a witness against himself, or who refuses so to testify on such ground when called by a grand jury or a congressional committee, shall forfeit his office or employment and any emolument, perquisite, or benefit arising therefrom, and be disqualified from holding any office of honor, profit, or trust under the United States.

(b) Any former officer or employee of the United States or any department or agency thereof, who refuses to testify upon matters relating to his former office or employment, or his qualification therefor, in any proceeding wherein he is a defendant or is called as a witness, upon the ground that his answer may tend to incriminate him or compel him to be a witness against himself, or who refuses so to testify on such ground when called by a grand jury or a congressional committee, shall forfeit any emolument, perquisite, or benefit arising from such former office or employment, and be disqualified from holding any office of honor, profit, or trust under the United States.

(c) In the event of forfeiture of any annuity or retirement pay, the amount paid into an annuity or retirement fund, less any funds previously refunded or paid as annuity benefits, shall be returned to the payor or his legal representatives with interest at 4 percent per annum to December 31, 1947, and 3 percent per annum thereafter, compounded on December 31 of each year.

Genevieve de Galard-Terraube, French Airborne Nurse, Visits the United States at the Request of Congress, July 26 Through August 17, 1954

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 12, 1954

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, on June 4 both the House and Senate passed House Concurrent Resolution 236, which read as follows:

Whereas this year marks the 100th anniversary of Florence Nightingale's historic nursing of the wounded in the Crimean War; and

Whereas Nurse Genevieve de Galard-Terraube, officer of the Army of the Republic of France, in her ministering to the sick and wounded at Dien Bien Phu and her subsequent service to her comrades as prisoners of the Viet Minh has provided an example of the courage of a woman in battle and of the devotion of a nurse to her sworn duty which has been unsurpassed in this century; and

Whereas this inspiring woman is representative of the devotion to duty of soldiers of the Republic of France, which has been an ally of the United States for 178 years, and whose people today are considered the warm friends of the people of the United States; and

Whereas Nurse Genevieve de Galard-Terraube's example of fortitude in the face of supreme danger has changed the fall of Dien Bien Phu from a military reversal to a great psychological victory of the undefeatable principles of free mankind fighting the forces of darkness; and

Whereas this nurse, known affectionately as "the Angel of Dien Bien Phu," embodies the finest attributes of free women accepting with men the full burden of living in our modern world: Therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress hereby extends to Nurse Genevieve de Galard-Terraube its warm congratulations for her gallant service and invites her, at the earliest time convenient to her and her country, to visit the United States as an honored guest.

The President is respectfully requested to transmit copies of this resolution to the Government of France, and to Nurse Genevieve de Galard-Terraube.

This was transmitted to Mlle. de Galard-Terraube with the following cover letter from President Eisenhower:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, D. C., June 14, 1954.

DEAR MLLE. DE GALARD-TERRAUBE: It gives me great pleasure to transmit to you a resolution by the Congress of the United States inviting you, at the earliest time convenient to you and your country, to visit the United States as an honored guest.

The people of the United States have followed with sympathy and deep admiration the courageous and resolute resistance of French Union forces against Communist aggression. I wish to include myself among the many to whom the example set by your fortitude, your devotion to duty, and your concern for the sick and wounded has been inspiring and in accordance with the best traditions of humanity.

With best wishes,
Sincerely,
DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

On July 24 the Speaker laid before the House the following communication:

VISIT OF MLLE. GENEVIEVE DE GALARD-TERRAUBE—COMMUNICATION FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the President of the United States, together with a letter from Mlle. Genevieve de Galard-Terraube, which were read:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, July 23, 1954.

Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr.,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I am pleased to transmit herewith a letter addressed to me by Mlle. Genevieve de Galard-Terraube accepting the invitation of the Congress to visit the United States and asking that her thanks be submitted to the Congress.

Sincerely,
DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

[Translation of letter to the President from Mlle. de Galard]

JUNE 28, 1954.

MR. PRESIDENT: I am profoundly touched by the great honor which it has pleased the American Congress to do me by inviting me to go to the United States. This honor belongs to all those whose lot I proudly shared for nearly 2 months and to all the nurses who, in a more obscure situation, sought to relieve the suffering of the wounded. It is on these terms that I accept with gratitude the invitation of the Congress.

In accepting this invitation I am mindful of all the families in mourning, of all those who are still out there, of those who battle and those who are in the prison camps and who, more than I, merit the honor which is paid me; their thought will stay with me and without doubt my taking to the people of the United States an echo of their heroic courage will be of a continuing aid to them.

The American Nation will understand my feelings all the better in that at this very moment it is making a generous contribution to the repatriation of the wounded of Indochina. I shall be happy, upon the occasion of my visit, to express the gratitude of the French families for this gesture which translates so well the traditional friendship of our two countries.

I beg Your Excellency to please transmit my most humble thanks to the Congress of the United States and to accept the assurances of my profoundly respectful sentiments.

GENEVIEVE DE GALARD.

On Monday, July 26, with the unanimous consent of this House to be absent on official business, I went to New York to welcome to the United States on the part of the President and the Congress this young guest whose valiant service to the wounded at Dien Bien Phu—Indochina—has so stirred the imagination and gripped the heart of America.

Today, I have asked for this time in order to report upon the results of our invitation and its acceptance by Mlle. Genevieve de Galard-Terraube, airborne nurse of France.

NEW YORK

I need hardly tell you that on July 26 the press, radio, television, and newsreels were at Idlewild Airport in full force, all of them immediately captivated by Mademoiselle.

The reception party consisted of myself, representatives of the State and Defense Departments, Army, Navy, and Air Force nurses, as well as members of the French Embassy and their New York consulate. With the mayor of New York's representative Ambassador Richard Patterson, rolling out the red carpet in the usual form, the parade cars and the police escort throughout the day could not have been surpassed.

A delightfully intimate note was added by the presence at the airport of several members of Mlle. de Galard's family. This group was escorted to the airport by Mrs. John Lodge, wife of the distinguished Governor of Connecticut. In the party were Mr. and Mrs. Joseph F. Kelly, of Ridgefield, Conn.; Mrs. Kelly being an aunt; their son, Count Gaston de Galard de Bearn, Mademoiselle's cousin; and Mrs. Chantel Munier Prouty, of Windsor, Conn. Mrs. Prouty had attended the Louise de Bettignies School in Paris with Mademoiselle.

We made a brief stop at the Plaza Hotel, whose management very generously made a beautiful suite available, and then on to the Battery for the parade to the city hall.

I should not be giving you the full story did I not try to tell you something of the drama of her reception by the people of that great gateway city of New York.

From the Battery to the City Hall the sidewalks were literally packed with eager folk applauding, cheering, waving, calling "Bravo, Bravo," "Vive la France." Men and women wiped their eyes quite unashamed. Photographers kept calling "Look this way, honey"—"Smile, Jenny"—"Wave to us, Genevieve." And she? Sitting alongside her in the lead parade car, where she was perched high on the back of the seat, I saw tears of deep emotion in her eyes, too.

The ceremony at the city hall was colorful and gracious. The invited audience of city officials, nurses, representatives of various welfare organizations, and representatives of the various services, presenting the colors of the two countries, received our guest with a warmth that was good to see. The Marseillaise and The Star-Spangled Banner preceded the short welcoming speeches and the presentation by the mayor of the scroll of the city.

Mademoiselle's gracious word of appreciation endeared her for all time to those who heard her.

The official program follows:

Official Reception in Honor of Lt. Genevieve de Galard-Terraube, "Angel of Dien Bien Phu, Monday, July 26, 1954

Commission for Public Events,
New York, N. Y.

National Anthem, France; National Anthem. United States of America; United States First Army Band.

Presiding: Richard C. Patterson, Jr., Commissioner, Department of Commerce and Public Events.

Address: The Honorable Frances P. Botton.

Address: The Honorable Count Jean de Lagarde, Minister Plenipotentiary, Consul General of France.

Address: The Honorable Roger Seydoux, Minister Plenipotentiary at the French Embassy, Washington, representing his Excellency, Ambassador Henri Bonnet.

Address of welcome: The Honorable Robert F. Wagner.

Presentation of scroll: Mayor of the city of New York.

Response: Lt. Geneleve de Galard-Terraube "Angel of Dien Bien Phu."

Municipal Broadcasting System, WNYC, Department of Correction Band, Capt. William Warfield.

Honor escort to Lt. Genevieve de Galard-Terraube: Col. J. R. Bowers, First Army and staff; mounted police escort; United States Army Band and contingent; United States Marine Corps contingent; United States Navy contingent; United States Air Force Band; Fire Department Band and contingent; New York Post Office Band; 40 and 8 contingent; massed colors, fire department.

After these ceremonies we proceeded to the Plaza, again between enthusiastic crowds.

Luncheon was in a tiny French restaurant with the French officials. There I listened with all my absorptive capacity to her replies to their many questions. Again I saw how sincere is her humility, how unassuming her courage. Truly, she is a valiant daughter of a long, long line of splendid soldiers of France.

That afternoon I held a reception in the Plaza for the members of our national welcoming committee and representatives of the nursing profession, as well as of hospitals, nursing schools, welfare organizations, Red Cross and others. They were a fitting background for the following citations given her by: Columbia University, the American Nurses' Association, and the National League for Nursing:

Citation for Distinguished Service in the Profession of Nursing to Lt. Genevieve de Galard-Terraube

For her heroic devotion to the sick and wounded soldiers at Dien Bien Phu which has stirred the respect of all citizens:

For her courage in remaining with her patients during the last terrible weeks of siege at the battered bastion in Indochina and later by her presence greatly influencing the morale of her patients and fellow prisoners of the Viet Minh:

For her faithful adherence to duty as a volunteer for service and as a nurse through which she has symbolized and dramatized for all the free world the high precepts of the nursing profession and the contributions of modern military nursing:

This citation is inscribed and awarded to her on the 27th day of July 1954 by the American Nurses' Association.

Agnes Ohlson,
President.

July 26, 1954.

The National League for Nursing salutes Genevieve de Galard-Terraube, airborne nurse of the French Air Force.

The dark brings out her light; her valor perpetuates the inner spirit of her countrymen; her heroism quickens the pulse of humanity; here radiance reflects a loftiness of service in the career of nursing.

Mademoiselle de Galard was awarded a Columbia University bicentennial medallion in silver, with an acompanying citation which read:

The bicentennial committee of Columbia University in cooperation with the division of nursing education, teachers college, and the department of nursing of the faculty of medicine awards to Mlle. Genevieve de Galard-Terraube a Columbia University bicentennial medallion in recognition of her heroic devotion to duty in nursing the soldiers of Dienbienphu. In putting the needs and comforts of her patients beyond personal freedom and safety, in ministering to the sick and wounded, whether friend or foe, she followed with honor the example set by Florence Nightingale 100 years ago.

In honoring Mademoiselle Galard-Terraube Columbia University pays tribute to the nurses of all nations whose valor, though outstanding, remains unsung.

By here courageous stand in face of danger, Mademoiselle Galard-Terraube has exemplified a dedication to duty that has become a tradition of nurses. She has symbolized anew throughout the world the high calling of the modern professional nurse.

That evening the French Consul General entertained with an informal dinner in her honor, at which I had the opportunity to express something of our appreciation for her coming, what her visit can mean to nurses and nursing here and in France as well, and the hope that her visit would bring about a better understanding between our two peoples.

WASHINGTON

The welcomings in Washington were very different, but just as moving. The Defense Department plane which was to carry her across the country touched down at MATS' terminal, where a detachment of nurses from the three military services stood at attention to receive her before an honor guard and band from Bolling Field. There also were Ambassador and Madam Bonnet, of the French Embassy; Congressmen Edna Kelly and James Fulton, of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House; representatives of Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia; Mr. John F. Simmons, chief of protocol, and Mr. Jamison Parker, public-affairs officer, both of the State Department; and the special representatives of Defense, Army, Navy, and Air Force nurses.

Later she was received by members of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs and was honored guest at a congressional luncheon I gave. The Senators I had invited found it difficult to attend because of the pressure of legislative business on the floor. I deeply appreciated that several came in for a few moments. We House Members kept tabs on what was happening on the House floor through the Speaker and whip, who were also present.

On Wednesday, Madamoiselle Genevieve and I appeared together on two television network programs. Later she laid a wreath at the National Nurses Memorial in Arlington Cemetery in a moving ceremony which will not be forgotten by those who attended. Her visit to Walter Reed Hospital was deeply appreciated. Mrs. John Foster Dulles very graciously included her in the luncheon she was giving for the wives of diplmats of the 16 nations who joined us in Korea. Later I had the pleasure of introducing her to the Secretary of State. She was accompanied, of course, by the French Ambassador, Henri Bonnet, and Assistant Secretary McCardle and Mr. Parker, of the State Department, joined us. At 6 o'clock she was guest of honor at a beautiful reception at the French Embassy.

If there was to be any highlight in this spectacular tour, it most certainly came on Thursday when Madamoiselle de Galard was received by President and Mrs. Eisenhower. The President expressed the appreciation of a professional soldier for this young woman's outstanding display of heroism and then awarded her the Medal of Freedom with Bronze Palm. The medal takes its place beside the Legion of Honor, which was conferred upon her during the siege of Dien Bien Phu.

THE WHITE HOUSE

The President of the United States of America, authorized by Executive order, July 6, 1945, has awarded the Medal of Freedom with bronze palm, to Mlle. Genevieve de Galard-Terraube, French airborne nurse, for meritorious service.

MEDAL OF FREEDOM (WITH BRONZE PALM)

Mlle. Genevieve de Galard-Terraube, French airborne nurse, by her ministrations to the sick and wounded at Dien Bien Phu, inspired and heartened the entire free world. Her service to her comrades, marked by the courage of a woman in battle and by the devotion of a nurse to her sworn duty, has been unsurpassed in this century. Her supreme fortitude in hours of peril, her unfaltering dedication to her mission reflected the greatness of spirit manifested on many fields, in many centuries, by the soldiers of France.

The republic she serves so nobly has been an ally of the United States for 178 years. The continuing friendship between the peoples of the two Republics is symbolized today in their joined salute to Mme. de Galard-Terraube. Her service at Dien Bien Phu reflects great credit upon herself and her country and the cause of freedom around the world.

July 29, 1954.

From the White House, Mme. de Galard went to the National Institutes of Health in Bethesda. There Surgeon General Dr. Leonard A. Scheele awarded her a citation and honorary membership in the Association of Military Surgeons.

Genevieve de Galard-Terraube, French airborne nurse, with nobility of purpose, with selfless devotion to duty despite danger, you denied yourself comfort and safety that you might serve God, your country, and your people in the heroic defense of Dien Bien Phu. You are a symbol of the highest traditions of professional nursing and have brought honor to all who care for the sick or wounded, in peace as in war.

The Association of Military Surgeons of the United States commends you.

LEONARD A. SCHEELE, M. D.,
The Surgeon General, United States Public Health Service; President, Association of Military Surgeons.
JULY 29, 1954.

Later that day she was guest of honor at a tea given by the American Red Cross Nursing Services where she planted two little holly trees. The Red Cross has also recommended her for the Florence Nightingale Medal, highest honor of the nursing profession.

RESOLUTION OF TRIBUTE TO LT. GENEVIEVE DE GALARD-TERRAUBE

During the siege and fall of Dien Bien Phu, Lt. Genevieve de Galard-Terraube, a French nurse, acted in the finest tradition of nursing, established in the Crimean and other bitter wars, by providing an heartening example of unselfish service and inspiration to the garrison during the siege, by administering aid and comfort to the wounded, courage and cheer to the disheartened, and, after the fortress fell, by refusing an offer of freedom so she could stay until the wounded were cared for and repatriated; be it

"*Resolved, therefore,* That the American National Red Cross in convention assembled pay tribute to Lt. Genevieve de Galard-Terraube for her outstanding contribution to the nursing profession and for the renewal of faith and hope for humanity which her uplifting example of selfless fortitude has provided people throughout the world; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That this tribute to Lieutenant de Galard-Terraube be presented to her through the offices of the French Red Cross; and that the American National Red Cross join with the League of Red Cross Societies in recommending to the International Red Cross Committee that she be awarded the Florence Nightingale medal.

(Adopted unanimously at the American Red Cross National Convention, Los Angeles, Calif., June 16, 1954.)

Friday, July 30, saw us at Bolling Field taking off for Cleveland, where I left Mlle. de Galard and returned to Washington. We were received by the Governor, the mayor, and other officials, and the regional French consul, M. Beliard, down from Detroit.

Mlle. de Galard was the weekend houseguest of Mr. and Mrs. Kenyon C. Bolton. First came a reception at their home, under the auspices of the Council on World Affairs, on Friday. Monday, a second reception gave opportunity to literally thousands of nurses and student nurses, to meet Mlle. de Galard. There were visits to the Red Cross headquarters of the Cleveland area, and observation of a mobile blood-donor operation in action. Interspersed with all this were an informal luncheon at the home of Mr. Laurence Norton in Mentor, a dinner given by the French Consular Agent, refreshing swims, a delightful evening at the "Musicarnival" where at the end of the play our Jenny was called on stage and presented with flowers.

August 3 to 6 our guest was in Chicago where she was received by Mayor Kennelly and other high city officials, as well as representatives of the American Medical Association, the American Hospital Association, the Illinois League for Nursing, the Institute of International Education, and representatives of the Fifth Army. The American Medical Association and the American Hospital Association graciously arranged receptions for Mlle. de Galard and afforded her the opportunity of meeting many prominent members of the medical and nursing professions in the Chicago area. She also visited the Veterans' Administration Research Hospital and attended a reception for student nurses at the Michael Reese Hospital, arranged by Miss Lorentz, of the Illinois League for Nursing. The French Consul General also entertained Mlle. de Galard at a dinner on the evening of August 4 and on August 5 she was given a luncheon by the Chicago office of CARE, which is now launching a special program for relief of refugees in Indochina.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I should like to tell you a touching little story which tells in a few words what pages might not convey as to the meaning of Mlle. de Galard's visit in this country. It happened in Chicago at the veterans' hospital. My correspondent told it this way:

I thought it might interest you to know what happened in our hospital the day of Mlle. de Galard's visit. There was a little celebration for her which was attended by all nurses and patients who could leave their wards. After the celebration, when our honored guest had left the building, the nurses returned to work. On one of the floors all the patients were waiting for their arrival at the elevators. They had little presents and gardenia corsages for every one of them. They said they admired what Mlle. de Galard had done in Indochina, but that their nurses take good care of them, too, and deserve gratefulness and attention as well. We all thought it was very nice of the patients, and I knew you would be pleased to hear about it. I am sorry I had no chance to tell the story to Mlle. de Galard, because I am sure it would make her very happy, too.

On behalf of the men and women who devote their lives to caring for the sick and injured, the American Hospital Association and the American Medical Association present this citation to Mlle. Genevieve de Galard-Terraube, "the Angel of Dien Bien Phu," whose devotion to the same noble cause has made her a 20th century symbol of the traditions established by Florence Nightingale.

EDWIN L. CROSBY, M. D.,
Director, American Hospital Association.

GEORGE F. LULL, M. D.,
Secretary and General Manager, The American Medical Association.
(For the officers and trustees of our organizations.)
CHICAGO, *August 3, 1954.*

To Genevieve de Galard-Terraube in admiration and tribute for heroic devotion to the care of the sick and wounded soldiers at Dien Bien Phu, we, the hospitalized veterans of the Veterans' Administration Research Hospital, Chicago, Ill., gratefully affix our names.

Edward B. Cushing, Max R. Chomblee, Harvey Nerod, James D. Washington, Jessi A. Shuke, Charles B. Gerndt, Joseph Cusack, Fred H. Zeiss, Orville Canney, Walter Covington, Henry McFarland, Walter R. Moody, Joseph M. Henley, Chester Wysocki, Howard A. Matthews, Roland Bianchetto, Ray V. Johnson, Harry M. Semmers, Aaron H. Cole, O. L. Norton, Rev. Walter J. Braselton, Charles H. Strey, Louis Mosier, John Buhr, Benna H. Siy, Perry W. Collinson, Robert E. Shannon, Roy G. Weidleman, Estelle H. Wajerski, Laurence La Carza, Glenn L. Woolworth, Jr., Harold Moore, John Gengler, George Ready, Roy L. Davis, John C. Kelleher, William J. Gerleve, Charles L. Neigh, William Markley, Lee R. McCullony, Eugene K. Blair, Emery E. Nale, Ernest Stellwag, Henry L. Falconio, John E. Murray, John Dailey, Joseph Hartridge, Mike Smith, Wm. M. Denear, Ole M. Heltner, Robert R. Nangle, etc.

GRANT HOSPITAL OF CHICAGO,
SCHOOL OF NURSING,
Chicago, Ill.

Mlle. Genevieve de Galard-Terraube in recognition of the honor and glory your heroism has brought to the profession of nursing throughout the world the Grant Hospital of Chicago, School of Nursing, hereby establishes a 3-year scholarship in your honor to be known as the Mlle. Genevieve de Galard-Terraube scholarship.

This scholarship will be awarded to that candidate whose qualities of mind and heart and spirit make her most likely to carry on noblest traditions of the nursing profession which you exemplify.

Given at Chicago, in the State of Illinois, August 4, 1954.

COYL C. MASON, M. D.,
President, Medical Staff.
JOSEPH F. DITEN,
President, Board of Directors.
MONA JACKSON, R. N.,
Director, School of Nursing.
WILLIAM A. HUTCHINSON, M. D.,
Executive Director.

Veterans' Administration, Department of Medicine and Surgery, Nursing Service, pays tribute to Mlle. Genevieve de Galard-Terraube in recognition of her outstanding courage and performance of duty at Dien Pien Phu exemplifying the ideals and traditions of the nursing profession.

Given at Chicago, Ill., this 5th day of August 1954.

DOROTHY V. WHEELER,
Director of Nursing Service.

After a restful weekend at Lake Tahoe with her cousin, M. de Guiringaud, French consul general in San Francisco, Mlle. de Galard proceeded to San Francisco, arriving there on August 10. Met by representatives of the Armed Forces and officials of the local medical, civic, and service organizations, and of the French consular corps, she was then welcomed to the city by Mayor Elmer Robinson. That evening a reception at the local Red Cross chapter headquarters was held for representatives of the Red Cross, chapter officials, service chairmen, and professional nursing organization representatives and members, after which the French consul general gave a dinner in her honor. During the next 2 days she visited Fort Miley Veterans' Administration Hospital, the Presidio, the Irwin Memorial Blood Bank, Treasure Island, and Travis Air Force Base. This last is the base through which the wounded French soldiers from Indochina were sent on their way home. A cosponsored reception was held for her by the World Affairs Council of Northern California, the American Women's Voluntary Services, and France-Amerique; and another reception was held under the auspices of the French colony in San Francisco.

Leaving San Francisco August 12 the party spent a night in New Orleans en route to Gunter Field at Montgomery, Ala. This gave her apportunity to visit the School of Aviation Medicine, and observe the air flight training courses given for Air Force nurses.

August 14 saw her back in New York where she remained over the weekend again the guest of the Plaza Hotel, taking off for Paris via Air France, August 17.

This in brief, Mr. Speaker, is an account of the visit of the French airborne nurse, Genevieve de Galard-Terraube. May I take this opportunity to thank some of the many hundreds of people and organizations who have played a direct part in her tour of the United States. The very heaviest roles have been played by the Departments of State and Defense, the French Embassy, and by the member organizations in the National Welcome Committee. These last-named are: American Association of Social Workers; American Cancer Society; American Heart Association; American Hospital Association; American Medical Association; American National Red Cross; American Nurses' Association; American Public Health Association; Defense Advisory Committee on Women in the Services; National League for Nursing; United States Public Health Service; United States Defense Department; United States Air Force Nurse Corps; United States Army Nurse Corps; United States Navy Nurse Corps; the Veterans' Administration; Women's Medical Specialist Corps—United States Army and United States Air Force—and the World Medical Association.

A particularly happy choice by Assistant Secretary of State McCardle of Mr. Jameson Parker gave this project an experienced Foreign Service officer to travel with the official party. For the past month he has worked tirelessly around the clock to coordinate every effort in this endeavor. I want to mention also Mr. James Donovan of the Department of State, who is responsible for Mlle. de Galard's itinerary and receptions in the various cities and Maj. Howard McGrath, special events officer of the Department of Defense who has coordinated the Defense effort. Mr. Joseph Tambone, protocol officer at the United States Mission to the United Nations, offered splendid assistance on the New York plans.

Ambassador and Madame Bonnet, of the French Embassy, were the gracious hosts of Mlle. de Galard during her entire stay in Washington. M. Roger Seydoux, Minister, and M. Jacques Dupuy, Second Secretary, could not have been more helpful and cooperative.

Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that this brief report on the results of the unique invitation we extended this French airborne Nurse Genevieve de Galard-Terraube will give to each and every member of the 83d Congress a sense of the dual purpose behind our action: to honor a gallant nurse whose service in the fortress of Dien Bien Phu, way off in Indochina, so deeply touched the hearts of the free world, and to further cement the friendship between our two great nations.

Wherever Mlle. de Galard went she won the hearts of all who saw her with her gentle dignity, her humility, and the rare spirit which radiated from her. We can be sure that as she goes among her own people she will take with her a better understanding of the people of our United States. And after all, Mr. Speaker, understanding is the cornerstone of peace.

Under leave previously granted, I am appending hereto several documents pertaining to Mlle. de Galard's visit:

The Angel of Dien Bien Phu

(By Ruth Boyer Scott, registered nurse)

Courage is often an unsung quality of nurses—possibly because it is usually a deeply instinctive rather than a premeditated reaction to a sudden situation. But a 29-year-old brown-haired French nurse made world headlines recently when she deliberately sought a dangerous situation and met it with unforgettable courage.

French Air Force Lieutenant Genevieve de Galard-Terraube, having lived through the terrible siege and fall of the Dien Bien Phu fortress in Indochina, refused the first offer of freedom when it was made by the Communists. As the only woman among 11,000 soldiers, she waited and worked until more than 400 wounded had been flown out.

Creative appreciation is also a much needed quality. Congresswoman Frances P. Bolton for years has been an admirer of nurses and an active worker on their behalf. With inspiration, she introduced a resolution inviting Mlle. de Galard to visit the United States as an honored guest of Congress.

A layman who knows the history of nursing, Mrs. Bolton pointed out in the resolution that this year marks the one-hundredth anniversary of Florence Nightingale's historic contribution to the Crimean War.

"Everyone was thrilled in the House and Senate by the hope of recognizing this unsurpassed nurse who served under fire, with no other woman about to offer either physical or moral support, and transformed a military reversal into a great psychologic victory," the Congresswoman related. "The resolution was passed by both Houses of Congress without one dissenting voice."

President Eisenhower himself sent the congressional invitation to the Government of France. He also wrote directly to the nurse herself with warmest praise of "your fortitude and devotion to duty."

Mrs. Bolton says, "Lafayette was given the use of a United States vessel so that he could come here to be honored in post-Revolutionary times. No other person before Nurse de Galard-Terraube has ever been invited formally by Congress to become an 'honored guest'." Nearly 2 centuries have intervened since Lafayette's visit but only this difference is apparent—today the contemplated honors will go to a Frenchwoman of unique gallantry rather than to a gallant Frenchman.

As plans began to take shape for Mlle. de Galard's visit, Mrs. Bolton became the focus of day and night activity. "And I mean night," Mrs. Bolton laughed. "I had a phone call at 1: 30 a. m."

As chairman of the National Committee to Welcome Genevieve de Galard-Terraube, Mrs. Bolton surveyed the attitudes in 15 national organizations outstanding in health and allied fields. Members of the American Nurses' Association, the National League for Nursing, the United States Public Health Service, and the Army, Navy, and Air Force Nurse Corps were happy to assist with the arrangements.

"We must remember," Mrs. Bolton told planners, "that our guest is a little tired, a little shy, and doesn't speak much English. "The spectacular public welcome in New York City and Washington must be tempered with quiet hours and a full opportunity to see what any nurse is eager to observe."

Like Florence Nightingale, Nurse de Galard volunteered for war service. She asked for duty in Indochina in the fall of 1953. She flew in and out of the enemy-surrounded fortress of Dien Bien Phu in helicopters with the wounded. Artillery fire damaged her plane on March 27 so that it couldn't take off. The next day, while she was still grounded, according to an article in the Paris magazine, Match (May 1-8), the airlift was interrupted, and in the ensuing blockade she remained as the only woman member of the garrison.

And so she went about her nursing, helping the doctors care for the wounded. Despite the overwhelming burden of her duties, she didn't miss the chance to visit with a wounded soldier who also was a native of her beloved Paris. Her fluent chatter distracted his mind from pain during surgery, he proudly related when he was flown out before she was.

While Lieutenant de Galard was still under shellfire in the tottering fort, the grateful French Republic made her a Knight of the Legion of Honor, and awarded her the French Military Medal for heroic duty. Her 41 days under siege were followed by 17 days as a prisoner. To her, those record-making days "opened new horizons and the camaraderie was wonderful." She left her prison with mingled "joy and sadness."

When she reached the relative safety of Hanoi, she said, "I had no idea I was famous." And so, as in Florence Nightingale's life, we find another instance where the relationship between patient and nurse was such that tragedy and overwork could be translated into a "wonderful experience." Unlike Florence Nightingale, however, who sailed from England accompanied by a staff of 38 nurses, Genevieve de Galard-Terraube was quite alone as a woman. It is this triumph of dedicated service and buoyant spirits over "the lone woman" which has so deeply moved not only the French and American people, but everyone in the free world.

Florence Nightingale was never a prisoner. But the Angel of Dien Bien Phu, an appelation Mlle. de Galard will have to bear for eternity, could not be sure when she refused the first offer of freedom that she would ever have another chance.

Unlike Florence Nightingale, who returned to London, still weakened from fever, by slow passage on a British man-of-war, the French heroine came home to Paris, worn but well, by the modern miracle of plane flight, to find her likeness in color on the cover of Match (June 12).

Just as Florence Nightingale came from a family of refinement and social standing, so does Mlle. de Galard. Her family bears one of the old and proud names in French military annals.

Her mother, Vicountess Oger de Galard-Terraube, wept when she heard the news from Geneva that her famous daughter had been flown out safely from Dien Bien Phu to Hanoi, Indochina. When the heroic nurse reached Paris the aging vicountess, her black garb relieved only by a mauve blouse, hugged her daughter briefly. Then she released her to the wildly joyful crowd at the Orly Airport. Genevieve, in the trim navy blue uniform and beret of the French Air Force, had a smile for everyone, and her blue eyes were full of joy.

But observers say that her smile was just as heart warming when she was flown out from the fallen fort, weary and dusty, in the coverall which is the paratrooper's campaign uniform. That she wore shoes without stockings was the most insignificant personal sacrifice of a gently reared girl. That she wore lipstick was the gallant gesture of today's nurse who works under fire in field pants, and still is a delightful woman.

To the American planners of Congresswoman Bolton's welcoming committee, who were trying to combine consideration with enthusiastic appreciation, a French Embassy secretary brought word from a San Francisco-stationed cousin of Mlle. de Galard that he had talked with her in Paris. Her cousin reported that she was "extremely tired but extremely grateful" to the American people.

Other bits of information about her relatives have come out. While she was yet a prisoner of the Communists, another cousin was in Geneva at the peace conference as a correspondent for a French newspaper. The Communists told him, "The army high command has decided to liberate your cousin." But, as the world soon learned, the plucky nurse refused the proffered freedom at this point.

As planners were coping with the impossibility of including all the major American cities—and all the officials, nurses, doctors and American Red Cross workers who wanted to meet her—into the proposed itinerary, this was the word: "San Francisco is a must, because she has relatives there."

Magazines must go to press months ahead. When this issue reaches you, many nurses already may have seen Genevieve de Galard-Terraube. Many more will not have had this privilege, but will have looked to radio and television and newspapers for details of her tour.

In June Mrs. Bolton was "hoping" and trying in her humanitarian way to make a success of the "Welcome of Two Centuries." She was hoping that Mlle. de Galard would spent a night or two in Mrs. Bolton's home, across the street from the French Embassy where a tea was planned. She was hoping, as a member of the Board of Regents of Mount Vernon, to take Genevieve to this beautiful colonial shrine and home of our First President—whom France helped to victory.

She was hoping that hazel-eyed, blond-haired Miss Mary Vance Trent of the State Department would be the American angel for this famous nurse. The tour was officially under the guidance of the State Department's exchange program, by which many foreigners visit our country every year. Miss Trent, who speaks French fluently, was scheduled as official interpreter and travelling guide for the nurse. But of equal importance, Miss Trent is a capable, warm-hearted person, who would try to be more friend than guide as she accompanied a famous nurse and protected her from the overexuberance of the admiring public.

Whatever may come of these plans, while this magazine rolls through the presses, American nurses salute 1954's Nurse of the World. And they voice appreciation for Congresswoman Bolton, who is not only a friend to nurses here, but also, through her memberships internationally, is unusually well informed on nursing in France and in other parts of the world.

Address by Joseph A. Mikus, Director of the Slovak League Press Bureau

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 30, 1954

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, at the recent annual meeting of the Slovak national conference held in Washington, a significant address was delivered by Dr. Joseph Mikus, director of the press bureau of the Slovak League of America. The Slovak League of America is a cultural and civic federation of Americans of Slovak descent and has been active on the American scene for over 70 years. The Slovaks in America have always been known for their firm devotion to God and country. Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include this address:

Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen; I am very glad to see you here today in such great numbers. It looks like a veritable pilgrimage of the Americans of Slovak descent to Washington.

With what purpose have you come to the American Capital. It is not difficult to guess. I am able to read the answer in your eyes, in your hearts. You have come here for the high purpose of asking recognition, in principle and before the representatives of American political thought and action, of the human and national rights of the Slovak people, who are now suffering under a foreign regime behind the Iron Curtain. The terrible situation in which our people are living there at the present time confers upon us a moral obligation to draw the attention of the free world to this dreadful reality.

The life of the Slovak nation has not been easy during the last century. First, the Magyars tried to engulf them in their supernationalistic concept of the Hungarian state; then our Slavic brothers, the Czechs, endeavored to make us disappear—as a simple minority—in the ethnographic fusion, or rather confusion, of a so-called Czechoslovak national unity. Now the Communist regime in Prague, aware of the futility of Benes policy, would like to dissolve Slovakia in the Socialist unity of the Czech and Slovak working class.

All this constitutes a serious attempt against our national life and our traditional values which characterize us as a distinct political unit in central Europe. The end goal of such a program is the complete disintegration of our national spirit and of our national consciousness. All this is nothing more than a front for a policy of subtle genocide, which according to the great engineers of communism, should lead to the world proletarian state. In depriving any nation of its local color and of its particular cultural individuality, such a Communist world power would convert Europe into a dreadful Siberian desert.

For that reason, nationality is a factor of great importance in the anti-Communist strategy. It is a value which clearly stands against the Communist effort to establish a quicksand of constant proletarian revolution the world over. In fact, Soviet domination could only succeed on a worldwide basis over the corpses of individual nations. Hence, if Europe is to survive, the individual nationalities must be preserved.

Another important task of anti-Communist strategy consists in establishing an equitable order among different nations. In Europe, for example, it is not the variety of nations which is the cause of political sickness of that continent, but rather the lack of any sound order among them. The stronger nations have always tried to dominate the weaker ones. In some cases, the present situation is but a prolongation of the old feudal system on an international level. The subservience of small peoples to stronger ones is still permitted, in the middle of this 20th century, by the international code of power politics.

Slovakia, however, like other countries under a foreign rule, yearns for freedom and independence. This trend is very easy to understand. After many disillusioning experiences with foreign governments, the Slovaks are now firmly convinced that they will be able to preserve their traditional values only under a national government.

In this respect, the attitude of Msgr. Karol Kmetko, former archbishop of Nitra, is worthy of remembering, since it expresses perfectly the general opinion in Slovakia. Interrogated as a witness during the Tiso trial, on February 6, 1947, this undoubtedly most representative figure of the genuine public and spiritual life of Slovakia after 1945, expressed his people's public opinion, before the Communist so-called national court in Bratislava, in the following way:

"If it were practically possible for Slovakia to become free, we would all be for independence. It is hardly possible to imagine a man so poor," went on Msgr. Kmetko, "that he would not like to have his own house and that he would prefer to be dependent on others. In the same way, it is impossible to imagine a nation which would not desire to be independent."

In America it has been frequently stressed that the goal of all social policy is to provide a house for each family. This is, in fact, an excellent policy. Such a minimum level of social equality is the best means of preventing communism on a national level. Nobody having an interest in defending democracy could, therefore, uphold in our enlightened times, a policy of preserving large estates with all consequent divisions into rich landlords on the one side and poor agricultural workers on the other.

The same principle is valid even in the field of international social justice. A positive policy, inspired by the principle of social equality on a world level, will go beyond the concept of international charity to a world program of self-determination and self-government for all small and weak peoples, within a stable and legal world order.

Now, probably more clearly than at any other time, we can see all the weaknesses in the world policy of a colonial system which was not abolished at a timely moment. The concept of collective security does not work among the colonial and semicolonial peoples. The policy of status quo, of old servitudes, of vested rights in other territories as practiced by some great powers, is not in accordance with the fundamental aspirations for freedom of those peoples. In order to struggle more effectively against communism, all peoples—I say peoples not States—in the Far East as well as in Europe, should be recognized as free. Their indecision would change immediately. Instead of being observers or victims in a struggle between two blocks of power, as they usually feel themselves to be, they would have to directly defend their own freedom, their own independence. Nobody is going to be willing to defend a value over which he will have no control.

But it is not only in the Far East that the Western World needs to adopt a direct approach to the different nationalities. The same need seems urgent even in Europe. The Urkainians and the Slovaks, for example, can hardly understand why the Western World continues to recognize without protest the control of Moscow over Ukraine or of Prague over Slovakia and why America speaks to the enslaved Slovaks over broadcasting stations which are subject to discreetly exercised supervision by the Czechs. We positively know that the Slovaks would not only be pleased, but strongly encouraged, if America would try to approach them in their own language, in their own spirit, according to their own aspirations. The Slovak as well as the Ukrainian or Byelorussian resistance would be considerably strengthened, if those peoples could hear, over the American Radio, something about the principle of self-determination of peoples, about the American effort to enlarge the realm of democracy in the world in opening even to the smaller peoples the prospect of freedom and independence.

President Eisenhower redefined the task of the American information service, in the following way:

"The purpose of the United States Information Agency shall be to submit evidence to peoples of other nations by means of communication techniques that the objectives and policies of the United States are in harmony with and will advance their legitimate aspirations for freedom, progress and peace." (H. Doc. 311, Washington, D. C., 1954, p. 4.)

This conference should give expression, in an appropriate way, to the general conviction of all free Slovaks that our people should not constitute an exception to this well-defined program, that it should not be deprived of its hope for independence.

The Slovaks, whose traditional anti-Communist attitude has been attested since the time of Louis Stúr—in other words, since the very publication of the Communist Manifesto by Karl Marx, in 1848—would like to participate in the anti-Communist crusade of the Free World. But they desire to do so under their own name, just as they desire, should events so transpire, to die under their own name. Symbolically speaking, they would like to take part in this crusade of Western civilization against the incursion of the Orient into Europe, under their own national banner and spiritual and political command.

If there is a psychological problem involved in the cold war at all, it consists in the principle: Every nation behind the Iron Curtain should be respected in terms of its traditional national individuality, and therefore approached in its own language, in its own spirit, by the people who know this language and this spirit. This would create a world-wide solidarity among peoples which would be strong enough to effectively combat the danger of communism.

Food and Farm Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 12, 1954

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit below an editorial appearing in the Shreveport Journal, Shreveport, La., of August 12, 1954, as follows:

FOOD AND FARM PRICES

A committee staff study of the House Agricultural Committee finds that while farm prices have fallen 20 percent in the last 3 years, food prices paid by consumers have not reflected this drop. The cost of marketing and processing food has absorbed the difference and unless these costs are curbed, the committee sees no relief for the consumer.

However, the study found that industrial workers can now buy more food than in any earlier period in history, because of the increase in their hourly earnings. Thus, average industrial families do not feel the cost of food because of their high wages. By the same token, their wages have been increased in part to meet the high cost of living.

These enlightening bits of information were turned up by the committee in its investigation:

"A shirt—a $3.95 cotton shirt—contains about 30 cents worth of cotton. That is what the farmer gets. Cutting back the price of cotton would mean very little in the price of a shirt.

"In the case of tobacco, the producers in 1953 received about $800 million for that part of their crop consumed in the United States. Federal, State, and local taxes on the 1953 crop, by the time it reached the consumers, amounted to approximately $2,100,000,000.

"A 5-cent peanut candy bar contains about one-half cent's worth of peanuts, and if the confectioners got their peanuts free this would not change the price on a 5-cent candy bar—although a few more peanuts might be added. * * *

"Out of each dollar spent for food in the United States 5 cents goes for imported foods, fish, and other products not produced on American farms. Out of each dollar spent by the American housewife for domestically produced food, 56 cents now goes for processing, marketing and transportation charges. The farmer receives 44 cents. Of this 44 cents, approximately 30 cents goes to purchase tractors, trucks, plows, gasoline, fertilizer and other supplies required by modern farming.

"Thus, the farmer and his family have about 14 cents out of each consumer dollar spent for domestically produced food for their work and their investment."

The Use of Former Communists as Witnesses in Federal Trials

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES J. KERSTEN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 3, 1954

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, many ex-Communists have recently been subject to unjustified abuse by various commentators and others. They have been railed against as "paid informers" when in reality, these ex-Communists have often suffered economic losses because of their willingness to testify against the Communists.

The Department of Justice has likewise been subject to attack because of the use of these former Communists in the various Smith Act trials. Despite the cries of the anti-anti-Communists that these ex-Communists are not reliable, no less an authority than J. Edgar Hoover, the head of the FBI has asserted that these ex-Communists have been not only reliable but invaluable in the fight against Communist subversive activity.

Mr. Warren Olney III, Assistant Attorney General of the United States, in a recent speech before the Michigan Association of Prosecuting Attorneys at Mackinac Island, Mich., ably presented the position of the Department of Justice with respect to the use of former Communists in Federal trials. As Mr. Olney points out, these ex-Communists have faced the scrutiny of hundreds of different jurors in different parts of the country, and these jurors, by their verdicts, have attested their belief in the reliability of the testimony of the ex-Communists by returning guilty verdicts in almost all Smith Act cases which have been tried to date. The testimony of these ex-Communists was indispensable in these trials.

As Americans we owe a debt of gratitude to these former Communists who have suffered great personal abuse by testifying against their former compatriots in crime. Their actions in testifying help protect and safeguard all citizens. I include herewith most of the speech of Mr. Olney on July 23, 1954, before the Michigan Association of Prosecuting Attorneys:

When I was so graciously invited to address you here I was faced with the customary problem of deciding what to talk about. We who are engaged in law enforcement have so many problems in common that the list of possible subjects was almost infinite. Recently, however, the Department of Justice has been the target for an unprecedented barrage of abuse, emanating mostly from certain newspaper columnists, because the Government is frequently utilizing the testimony of former members of the Communist Party in criminal prosecutions of various kinds where membership in the Communist Party is alleged or is otherwise an issue. What is being challenged is not the accuracy or credibility of any particular witness but the propriety of the whole practice in present use of using former members of the Communist Party to testify as expert witnesses concerning the aims, doctrines, revolutionary tenets of communism and of using the testimony of confidential informants who have wormed their way into party councils for the purpose of obtaining information for the Government. Although questions of communism and Communists and the use of former members of the party as witnesses do not often arise in State prosecutions, the use as witnesses of coconspirators, informers, and confidential informants is even more general in State prosecutions than it is in Federal. I decided upon my subject because the attacks being made upon the Department of Justice and its witnesses make it timely, and because I know that in your membership I have an audience which is thoroughly experienced and familiar with the essential problem involved.

Generally speaking, in Communist cases, the Government has called to the witness stand two types of former Communists: Those who were at one time convinced Communists but who have renounced their Communist ideologies and allegiance; and those who, while they are posing as members of the Communist Party, sometimes for many years, have furnished information to their Government on Communist activities, usually in the capacity of confidential informants to the FBI.

The use of both of these kinds of witnesses has recently been denounced. It has been described as a "novel practice" and as a "sharp departure from American tradition of law." The worst kind, and I must say the most unjustified kind, of personal abuse has been heaped upon the witnesses themselves. They have been called in the public press "stool pigeons," "Government spies," "professional witnesses," and "hired informers." The Department of Justice has been denounced for calling them to the witness stand at all. Now, what is this all about?

All of you know that the practice of utilizing the testimony of coconspirators and informers in criminal cases is by no means novel and is not unique to cases involving the Communist conspiracy.

* * * * *

SUPREME COURT UPHOLDS USE OF EX-COMMUNISTS' TESTIMONY

All of us recall the celebrated Dennis case which was tried before Judge Medina in New York City during 9 months of 1949. In that case 11 top leaders of the Communist Party were convicted for conspiring to teach and advocate the violent overthrow of the Government. On appeal to the Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, the appellants challenged the propriety of the Government's reliance on the testimony of former Communists and confidential informants to prove its case. The convictions were, of course, upheld both by the court of appeals and by the United States Supreme Court, and in the opinion handed down by the court of appeals, Judge Learned Hand pointed out that the "courts have countenanced the use of informers from time immemorial; in cases of conspiracy, or in other cases when the crime consists of preparing for another crime, it is usually necessary to rely upon informers or accomplices because the criminals will almost certainly proceed covertly."

Thus, it is plain that the use of informants and former Communists by the Government in trials involving covert crimes, such as conspiracy, is neither new nor unusual. The use of informants and former Communists in Smith Act prosecutions, as well as in other proceedings against Communist Party officials, is indispensable and while dictated by sheer necessity and expediency is nevertheless in the public interest.

In succinct comment on the fact that "FBI methods include the use of paid informers," Director J. Edgar Hoover has retored: "This is correct. How else is it possible to secure certain types of information. The most important espionage case in American history was solved through the services of a paid informant of the FBI." Mr. Hoover was referring to the famous case of the "House on 92d Street" which involved a Nazi espionage ring working within the United States during World War II. A young member of the Nazi spy ring defected and contacted the FBI. Thereafter he worked closely with FBI agents, who were thus placed in a position to secure the necessary evidence for a successful prosecution as well as to render nugatory the efforts of the spy apparatus. Had it not been for the services of this informant and the vigilance of the FBI, the damage which such an espionage apparatus could have caused to the Nation's war effort would be incalcuable. But the ring was broken and 33 German agents were sentenced in Federal court to over 300 years in prison.

Not only did the Nazis attempt to operate espionage rings in this country, but the Communists have done likewise, as evidenced by the Soviet espionage cell which was revealed by Elizabeth Bentley. This type of Communist activity in the United States is, of course, closely integrated with the Communist conspiracy existing in this country for many years.

GOVERNMENT RELIED ON EX-COMMUNISTS IN SMITH ACT PROSECUTIONS

In Smith Act prosecutions, in which 72 leaders of the Communist conspiracy have been convicted to date, the Government has, of necessity, relied on the testimony of former Communist and confidential informants. Many of the former Communists at one time held high positions in the Communist Party of the United States, some of them were sent by the party in the early 1930's to the Lenin Institute at Moscow, where the classes were taught by teachers from the United States and Russia, including instructors from the Red army for the "practical subjects" which were taught in the course entitled the "Science of Civil Warfare." The students at the Lenin School were taught that the dictatorship of the proletariat would be established by the violent overthrow of the capitalist state, and upon returning to the United States, such party initiates were assigned to teach the venomous doctrine of Marxism-Leninism to party members at schools in this country.

Many of these former Communists, who recognized the error of their ways and renounced communism, have testified in various cases as expert witnesses.

The courts have held that the aims, purposes, and teachings of the Communist Party are the proper subject of expert testimony. Because of this, the Government has utilized, wherever appropriate, the expert testimony of those persons who, from long years of study of the Communist Party doctrine and from long years of practical experience under the iron discipline of the party, are best in a position to testify as experts on the subject. Such expert testimony is, of course, in large measure based upon and supported by documentary evidence, such as literature which is published by the party and which is used in party teaching. But the literature is of no use without a qualified witness to introduce it in evidence and explain its true significance.

J. EDGAR HOOVER EMPHASIZES VALUE OF EX-COMMUNISTS IN FIGHT AGAINST COMMUNISM

The importance and necessity of securing information from former Communists was dealt with at length by the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation in an article entitled "Breaking the Communist Spell," which appeared in This Week magazine of November 1, 1953. The Director said in part:

"The ex-Communist holds in his hands weapons which can strike a mighty blow against the terrible evil * * * when the ex-Communist withdraws and at the same time makes a full disclosure to the proper authorities, he does irreparable damage to the cause. He places his change of philosophy, conscience, and action on the records. He is restoring himself to the ranks of good citizenship and is making amends for his wrongs against America resulting from his party activities. He is protecting now and in the future his family and our way of life."

Although it has ben established conclusively in Smith Act prosecutions and in other proceedings that the Communist Party is dedicated to the violent overthrow of our Government and its objective in this respect has become a matter of widespread, if not in fact, common knowledge, the law nevertheless requires the Government in each new prosecution or proceeding undertaken, in which the issue of the aims and doctrines of the Communist Party is present, to prove these facts by competent testimony. Not only is it logical and reasonable, but there is no escape from continuing to use for this purpose those witnesses who have demonstrated their qualifications as well as their reliability as experts in this sphere of specialized knowledge. Such witnesses have already given vital testimony on the revolutionary tenets of Marxism-Leninism; they have been subjected to protracted and rigorous cross-examination by defense counsel skilled in courtroom techniques and tactics, in some instances such cross-examinations lasting literally for weeks; their testimony has been scrutinized and weighed in the balance by juries representative of the American people and found to be credible. Their reliability and credibility is demonstrated by the 72 convictions already secured against members of the Communist conspiracy in this country. In fact, of 75 individuals tried for so-called Smith Act violations, that is conspiracy to teach and advocate the overthrow of the United States Government by force and violence, 1 and only 1 defendant has been acquitted by a jury. I submit that there is no better judge as to the credibility and value of these witnesses than the hundreds of American citizens who, as jurors, observed their demeanors under direct and cross-examination and evaluated their testimony as truthful and reliable and gave them a resounding vote of confidence through verdicts of guilty that have been returned in cases throughout the land.

With each succeeding blow rendered by an American jury at the heart of the Communist conspiracy the party leadership has become more and more security conscious. In 1948 detailed plans were made for the establishment of an underground apparatus in the Communist Party. That underground setup is presently in effect in every Communist Party district in the United States. In 1949 the party stopped issuing membership cards and at about the same time instituted clandestine procedures for the keeping of dues and the maintenance of membership rolls.

Although the party, in some degree at least, still operates openly in many sections of the country, the real hard-core leadership of the party has been underground for several years. Such men, in the words of Lenin, are truly professional revolutionaries who will combine legal work with illegal work. The following advice from Lenin is being fully implemented by the Communist Party of today: "A Communist must be prepared to make every sacrifice and, if necessary, even resort to all sorts of schemes and stratagems, employ illegitimate methods to conceal the truth in order to get into the trade unions, stay there, and conduct the revolutionary work within." (Collected Works, vol. XVII, pp. 142–5.)

In coping with such an organization, the FBI has relied to a great extent on the services of confidential informants, many of whom have now testified as Government witnesses in various judicial proceedings.

CONFIDENTIAL INFORMANTS ESSENTIAL TO FBI

Confidential informants are individuals who, during the course of their party membership, regularly report in full detail all Communist Party activities which are observed by them as ostensible members of the party.

The extreme value of the services performed by such individuals has, in recent years, been fully demonstrated during the course of public trials. The value of such informants from an intelligence standpoint should not be underestimated. Many informants of the FBI have devoted long, bitter years to the task of participating in Communist activities for the purpose of reporting such activities to Government authorities.

Most of such confidential informants who have been called as witnesses in criminal prosecutions have identified one or more of the defendants as a member of the Communist Party describing also the activities of the party within the district and the party activities of the defendants. They have testified to such occurrences as their attendance at district leadership training schools, district conventions, Communist Party club meetings, as well Communist Party educational activity of a local level.

Generally, the Communist Party activities of such informants have been restricted to one district. Therefore, the contacts within the Communist Party made by such informants usually are limited to the particular leaders within that district. It is usual, because of these facts that such informants have been used in only 1 or possibly 2 prosecutions.

Aside from showing the aims and objectives of the Communist Party, in these trials the Government is also called upon to prove that each particular defendant besides being a member of the Party, had personal knowledge of its illegal aims and purposes, and that each defendant had the specific intent to bring about the violent overthrow of the Government. For this purpose confidential informants are often necessary as witnesses. All of these considerations have required the Government to utilize an average of four condfidential informants in each Smith Act prosecution and an average of 1 or 2 confidential informants in other kinds of cases.

* * * * *

In September 1952 the FBI, in a series of swift and coordinated raids in 10 different cities extending from Detroit to the West Coast, simultaneously arrested 18 Communist Party leaders who were subsequently charged, in 3 indictments, with conspiring to teach and advocate the violent overthrow of the Government. Of the 18 so arrested, 16 were convicted. One was acquitted and one died during trial. Now, is it reasonable to assume that an operation of such magnitude could have been planned and successfully carried out without benefit of information furnished by confidential informants over long periods of time? Is it reasonable to assume that without the aid of such information, the agents of the FBI could have reached deep into the recesses of the Communist Party underground apparatus, which they literally did, in order to effect the majority of these arrests?

* * * * *

The fact is that ever since the time of Nathan Hale, who was hanged for being a patriotic American spy, the American people have felt only gratitude and admiration toward those citizens, both men and women, who have sacrificed their comfort, their welfare, and even their lives to obtain that information and intelligence which from time to time has been essential to frustrate our enemies and to protect our country.

One of the criticisms most frequently levelled at both the Government and its witnesses is that the Government often pays the former Communist who is a witness on a basis in excess of the ordinary statutory witness fees. This is true. But what are the facts and what is the problem?

In all other kinds of litigation, both civil and criminal, the Government is frequently obliged to utilize the services of expert witnesses. This testimony cannot be secured and cannot fairly be expected without compensating the witness for his time and service. Twenty-five dollars a day is a common rate for the Government to pay for experts and is far less than the amounts that private litigants are constantly charged for their expert witnesses. Since in each of the Communist prosecutions the Government must establish Communist history, doctrine, practice, and its revolutionary tenets, it should be obvious that the testimony of experts on this subject is absolutely essential. Where, I should like to ask, could the Government possibly obtain witnesses with better qualifications to testify as experts on this subject than from the ranks of those who have personally held high official positions in the top echelon of the Communist Party who have in the past acquired a working mastry of Marxism-Leninism in all its revolutionary aspects, who have personally attended the Communist training schools, both as students and instructors, who have personally engaged in the conspiratorial activity with revolutionary goals. It is because of the extraordinary qualifications of these witnesses that their testimony is so devastating to the Communists and, I dare venture to state, it is because of their very effectiveness that they have become a target of abuse by certain elements in the press.

CASE HISTORY OF AN EX-COMMUNIST'S VALUABLE AID

Let me give you an example of how a former official of the Communist Party is actually utilized in the courts. This witness left the Communist Party in January 1950 after having served more than 20 years as a Party functionary carrying out its program. The enormous volume of recollection and of valuable detailed data which accumulates in the mind of any person who for 20 years has devoted himself to a well-organized, highly disciplined conspiracy should be obvious. Following a period of disillusionment with the Party this witness resolved to do everything within his power to destroy the evil which he had come to recognize. He offered his cooperation to the FBI in the fall of 1950. For many, many months thereafter he was interviewed and reinterviewed over and over again concerning the whole of his life in the Communist Party which, as I say, extended over 20 years. Of course all of his statements were carefully checked and every means was utilized to verify by independent evidence the authenticity and reliability of what he had to say.

In 1952, 1953, and 1954 this man was called to the witness stand qualifying as an expert on the aims and doctrines of the Communist Party. He testified in no less than nine Smith Act prosecutions, qualifying in each case in accordance with the settled principles of American jurisprudence. These trials took place in Los Angeles, Baltimore, Pittsburgh, Seattle, New York, St. Louis, Philadelphia, Detroit, and Honolulu. Their duration in point of time was from 4 to 9 months apiece. They resulted in the conviction of 61 important Communist Party officials. These convictions have been a devastating blow indeed to the leadership of the Communist Party. They have undermined the party structure in this country; they have badly hampered its recruiting activity; they have exhausted its finances; and they have forced the remaining diehard conspirators to take refuge underground with a consequent demolition of their activity.

The witness to whom I refer was on the witness stand in each of these cases for from 4 to 6 weeks. In one case alone his cross-examination lasted more than 4 weeks. In addition to his appearance in court there were, of course, also long weeks and months of pretrial conferences in the course of preparation.

In addition to this activity this man has also been an important and valuable witness in the extensive proceedings against the Communist Party itself before the Subversive Activities Control Board and also in the proceedings before the same Board in connection with a number of additional Communist front organizations. That is not all, but it is a principal part of the activities of this man in the interest of and on behalf of the Government during the past 3 years. For all that I have described and for more besides, he has been paid by the Department of Justice at the rate of $25 a day on those days only when his services were being utilized. And for this he is being called a professional witness as though it were a term of reproach, and the Department is denounced for utilizing a paid informer.

Nothing, I submit, could be more unfair. Reason and commonsense dictate that witnesses of this character cannot possibly be expected to devote their efforts to the service of the Government to this extent without being properly compensated. A man has to eat and so does his family and he certainly can do little more than that at the rate the Government has been paying him.

JURORS CONVINCED OF CREDIBILITY OF EX-COMMUNISTS

The Department of Justice makes no apology for the former Communists that it has produced as witnesses for the Government in Smith Act and other Communist prosecutions. In advance in every case their testimony has been carefully checked and evaluated. In all instances they have been open to complete, severe, and extensive cross-examination by able counsel. We have been satisfied in the past and are satisfied now that with respect to the matters on which they were examined in court they have in all instances testified truthfully and accurately. This judgment in the case of the witness who I have just discussed, who testified in 9 trials, has been confirmed by the verdicts of 108 separate jurors, each of whom in the face of cross-examination has been convinced to a moral certainty and beyond a reasonable doubt of this man's truthfulness and credibility. We consider the Department of Justice would be failing in its duty if it refused to present these witnesses and we consider that they have well earned the tribute which was eloquently expressed by the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, as follows:

"The individual contributions of former members of the Communist Party to the security of our way of life are shining examples of people who have recognized their mistakes and are doing all within their power to rectify them.

"These people deserve the Nation's respect, and their neighbors' fair-minded forgiveness for their past devotion to communism. Their means of livelihood must be protected, and loyal Americans must accept their sincere repentance as a return to the full scope of citizenship."

Echo Park Dam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 16, 1954

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, the conservationists and the conservation forces in the United States have been concerned with the threatened invasion of a national park by the erection of Echo Park Dam within the Dinosaur National Monument.

The statement made by the Speaker of the House that this project cannot be passed at this session has been hailed by conservation leaders all over the country.

The following news item issued by the Wilderness Society is an example of the reception of this good news:

CONSERVATION LEADERS ACCLAIM SPEAKER MARTIN'S STATEMENT ON ECHO PARK DAM

Conservationists today (Monday, August 16) acclaimed Speaker MARTIN's statement that the upper Colorado River storage project cannot be passed in the House of Representatives during this session of Congress because of widespread opposition to Echo Park Dam in Dinosaur National Monument.

The national wire services quoted Speaker MARTIN as saying last Thursday (August 12) that so many protests against invading Dinosaur National Monument had been received by Members of the House that the measure (H. R. 4449) would not be brought up. He was reported as saying there would be little chance that it could be passed in any event.

National conservation leaders called special attention to the fact that the House Speaker recognized the national park threat as the chief reason for the project's failure, despite the strong opposition to it from others on economic or engineering grounds. They felt that the principle of permanent protection of national parks and monuments had thus been considerably strengthened.

Charles Callison, conservation director of the National Wildlife Federation, and Howard Zahniser, executive secretary of the Wilderness Society, made a statement typical of conservationists' opinion. They said:

"We believe the Speaker's statement strengthens still further the policy for preservation of the national park system. Conservationists have not objected to the Upper Colorado project as such, but have insisted that it must not invade the Dinosaur National Monument and thus violate the National Park System. Speaker MARTIN's statement adds new respect for the public's determination to protect their great park system.

"Conservationists and independent engineers have long contended that the Upper Colorado River storage project can be accomplished without invading the monument. There are various acceptable alternatives to the Echo Park site.

"If the project is proposed in another Congress," they suggested "it should include these alternatives and thus avoid further conflict with an established national park policy."

The conservationists said it is not yet known whether the Senate will act on its version (S. 155) of the upper Colorado project, but they expressed the opinion that the Speaker's comments should discourage Senate proponents from attempting further action. The Senate version of the bill calls for initial expenditure of about a billion and a half dollars, compared with a billion in the House bill.

A Report to the People on the 83d Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RUSSELL V. MACK

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 3, 1954

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, for the past 8 years, I have had the honor of representing the people of the nine counties of southwest Washington in the Congress of the United States. I am grateful to those who, by their votes, have enabled me to have the interesting experience of being Congressman.

This is my report to these people, whose employee I am, on what Congress did and did not do in the 2 years since my last election.

Some politicians for selfish reasons are apt to call the present Republican Congress "a do-nothing Congress." For the same selfish reasons other politicians are likely to describe the present Congress "the best Congress ever." Put down both statements as being biased and prejudiced. The Congress has been neither totally bad nor 100 percent perfect. It has left undone some things it should have done. On the other hand, this Congress has enacted many progressive, forwardlooking, constructive and wise laws that will be of benefit to the citizens of the Nation.

The people of my district are my employers. I, the Congressman, am their employee. What these people, my employers, want from me, their employee, I think, is a factual account of what the Congress did or did not do during the past 2 years. In short, they want the facts. Once the people have the facts, they will make up their own minds as to the Congress and also as to whether I, their Congressman, have done a good job or a poor one.

Here are some of the important things this Congress did and what it left undone:

Congress enacted the St. Lawrence seaway bill, which every President from Coolidge to Eisenhower has recommended but which, heretofore, always has failed of passage. Congress did not, however, vote to grant statehood to Alaska or Hawaii, although recent Presidents of both parties have recommended statehood for both. I, always, since coming to Congress, have supported the St. Lawrence project and statehood for both Alaska and Hawaii.

Because of my active support of the St. Lawrence seaway bill, I was one of about 20 Senators and Representatives invited by President Eisenhower to be present at the White House when he signed the St. Lawrence bill into law.

THE GREATEST ACHIEVEMENTS

The greatest achievements of the first 18 months of the Eisenhower administration, of course, was the ending of the Korean war and the keeping of our Nation's young men out of bloody involvement in the Indochina mess. This resulted from actions by President Eisenhower. He, and he alone, is entitled to all the credit for stopping the Korean war and preventing our involvement in Indochina.

When General Eisenhower went to Korea to make a personal inspection of the situation there, his opposition called his Korean trip "politics." They charged his motive was to make votes, not to make peace. They, loudly, predicted the Eisenhower Korean trip would accomplish nothing and would end in failure.

The opposition turned out to be false prophets. Despite their predictions that he would bo nothing, President Eisenhower promptly ended the Korean war. The weekly casualty lists bearing the names of 500 to 1,000 American boys who had been killed or wounded in action stopped. American mothers, fathers, wives, and sweethearts breathed prayers of praise and gratitude to President Ike.

Some of the opposition breathed no such prayers. They said the Korean peace meant nothing, that it would not last. The answer to that is that it has lasted now for more than a year.

Lately, some of Eisenhower's opposition has been claiming that the President and Congress would get involved in war in Indochina. They have not and they are not going to get involved.

Perhaps, someone else in the White House might have done just as well as President Eisenhower in getting our Nation out of one war and keeping it from involvement in another. On the other hand, someone else in the White House might have done worse. Certain it is, however, that no President could have done better than Ike in keeping the Nation at peace, for we are at peace

EISENHOWER DEPRESSION BUG-A-BOO

When Eisehower ended the Korean war, while his opponents still were shouting it could not be done, this opposition had to take up a new line of attack on the President and upon Congress.

There had been a slight decline in business and employment after the ending of the Korean war. The Eisenhower opposition hailed this decline as a sure sign that the Nation was going into a great Eisenhower depression. Had the American people been less well educated than they are, they might have been scared into panic by the dire predictions of these apostles of gloom and doom. The American people knew, however, that every modern war has been followed by a slowdown as industry switched over from wartime to peacetime production. Some layoffs during the postwar period of adjustment were inevitable.

The people with calmness and courage took the changeover period from war to peace production after Korea in stride. Soon business and employment were on the upgrade again. The so-called Eisenhower recession just did not materialize as Ike's opponents said it would. Today, the Nation looks forward on brighter and better prospects for a long period of prosperity—a prosperity based upon peace not upon war and killing.

Ike's opposition gloom peddlers who 6 months ago were shouting "depression," "depression," from the housetops, over every radio set and from the halls of Congress are silent on this subject now. They want the people to forget they ever made such false prophet predictions.

WASTEFUL SPENDING SLASHED

President Eisenhower and the Congress from the very start of the new administration began eliminating wasteful and extravagant Federal Government spending wherever it was found. President Eisenhower, himself, set the example for eliminating extravagance by ordering the presidential yacht *Williamsburg*, laid up.

The *Williamsburg*, for many years, has been kept in instant readiness for any weekend cruise on the Potomac that a President might want to take. Cost to the taxpayers of operating this only occasionally used palatial presidential yacht was $600,000 a year. Ike said, "lay it up." Then he advised his Cabinet members to go and likewise wipe out extravagance wherever found.

Car pools were instituted to lessen the overly large and careless use of the 260,000 automobiles bought and owned by the Government for the use of Federal employees. Under the old wasteful system, every tenth Government worker had a car assigned to him for his own special use. Under the car-pool system much of the waste will be eliminated. The Government will save, it is estimated, $180 million that formerly went for the purchase, depreciation, operation, and maintenance of this needlessly and excessively large number of cars.

Better methods were put into effect throughout the Government. Red tape and duplication were lessened and in many instances eliminated. Where two persons held political jobs to do the work one should do, the payrolls were trimmed.

Enormous sums were saved for the taxpayers. The total savings accomplished by President Eisenhower and the Congress are enormous.

In a brief period of 17 months President Eisenhower and Congress cut $14 billion from the Truman rate of spending.

Whereas President Truman, just before leaving office, had predicted a $10 billion deficit for the coming year, President Eisenhower cut this deficit to $3,029,000,000, or by about $7 billion under what President Truman had predicted that deficit would be.

This, however, was not all. Eisenhower and Congress at the same time also reduced taxes by more than $7 billion, including the removal of $1 billion in excise taxes on theater tickets; bicycles; sporting goods; toilet articles; bus, train, and airplane tickets; jewelry; films; light bulbs, and many other things all consumers buy.

Other tax benefits granted included greater deductions from income taxes for money paid on doctors, medical, and dental bills. Also, allowed by this Congress was an extra $1,200 exemption from taxation of money received in pensions. This exemption of pension receipts benefits retired teachers, policemen, city firemen, and all who draw pensions of any kind from either public or private sources.

MANY SERVICES EXPANDED

When the Congress began cutting spendinng by the elimination of waste and extravagance, the opposition said necessary Government services to the people would be eliminated or reduced.

Has the cutting of Federal wasteful spending reduced worthwhile Federal services? No. On the contrary, Congress during the past year enacted many laws increasing beneficial services to the people.

For example, Congress this year authorized the spending of $300 million a year more on highway construction than was ever spent in any year during any previous administration. As a result of this expanded highway building program, $10 to 20 million more dollars will be spent during the next 2 years on Washington State highways than was expended on them during the past 2 years. This means better and safer highways for the motorist. It means, also, more jobs for construction workers and thereby a stimulation of general business and employment.

The wages and salaries of Federal workers, including postal employees, have not been lowered by increased efficiency and elimination of waste. On the contrary, Congress increased the wages and salaries of Federal workers by 5 percent.

The benefits to millions drawing social security will be increased this fall due to laws passed by this Congress. Even the opposition admits the new social-security law is the best pension law the Nation ever has had.

Retired railroad workers and the widows and orphan children of railroad workers had their pensions increased and liberalized.

The pensions and compensation paid disabled veterans and the widows and orphans of war veterans also were increased by 5 percent.

Federal Government loans available to war veterans for buying or building homes were increased to $150 million. Heretofore, such loans have been limited to $100 million a year. This loan liberalization not only will aid veterans to acquire homes, it will, also, stimulate increased home building while in turn will aid the forest product industries and their workers.

Appropriations granted by this Congress are sufficient to operate 103,000 beds in veterans hospitals, the greatest number ever operated.

Funds for the rehabilitation of disabled persons whether veterans or civilians were increased by 50 percent.

These increases in wages, salaries, and in pension payments to those drawing social security, railroad retirement, or veterans benefits will cost more than a billion dollars a year. This billion dollars spent for increased benefits to the people plus the $7 billion tax reduction could not have been given if greater efficiency and economy through the elimination of waste and extravgance had not been attained.

Could anyone have imagined 18 months ago that the first 18 months of the Eisenhower administration would bring this billion dollars increase in services, a tax reduction of seven billions and the budget, at the same time, $7 billion closer to being in balance? Certainly, these were colossal achievements.

MORE HOME BUILDING

This Congress enacted a law that made credit for home buying easier. This law lowers down payments for those wishing to buy or build a home. It gives buyers longer time to repay loans. It makes the monthly purchase payments smaller. All of these benefits, granted by the present Congress, have made home building and home ownership easier.

These easier loans benefit the family that wants a home. Also, the easier payments will stimulate more building of homes. That, in turn, means more buying of lumber, plywood, shingles and other building materials and should insure high production and full employment in the industries producing those materials for several years to come.

During the first year of the Eisenhower administration there were more homes built in the United States than in any year in the Nation's history. Records already made in the present year indicate that the present year will see as many or even more home building starts as in the first year of Eisenhower's administration which was the Nation's best year ever for new housing starts.

With loans now liberalized by the present Congress, several good years of home building lie ahead. A good home building year, normally, is a good year for all forest product industries and their employees.

MORE DAM BUILDING

The Flood Control Committee of which I am chairman approved an authorization of $180 million for power dam building on the Columbia River during the coming 2 years. This huge sum insures, the United States Army engineers testified before my committee, that the Columbia River dams now building can be kept on schedule.

The $180 million includes $3.6 million for surveys and $3 million for a start on a new Columbia power dam. The engineers would not say what new dam will be started but they indicated that the new dam start would be either Libby or John Day. These dams, both, are huge undertakings and the building of either would add tremendously to Columbia River power production.

We need a new dam start to insure electric energy expansion after 1960 and the $3.6 million for surveys and $3 million which I, as flood control chairman, got into this bill for new constructions, will help get that new start.

The Congress has passed this bill which came out of my committee. As chairman of the subcommittee which handles many of the items in the bill, I played an important part in getting it adopted by the House.

This same bill includes an item for deepening the entrance channel to the Columbia River to 45 feet, a project which will cost $8.5 million and be of great help to the seaports of Longview and Vancouver as well as providing much work for residents of the towns of Chinook, Ilwaco, Ocean Park, Long Beach, Seaview, Nahcotta, and Oysterville near where the $8 million construction job will be undertaken.

The bill further includes some river and harbor improvement work on Grays Harbor and Willapa Harbor.

MONEY FOR TIMBER ROADS

I was fortunate in being able to obtain from Congress increased funds that will be available for processing timber sales and building access roads into timbered areas where Federal timber is being damaged by disease or bugs.

These added appropriations should prove most helpful in Eastern Lewis, Cowlitz, Clark, and Skamania Counties where bugs are doing enormous damage to timber in the Gifford Pinchot National Forest. The problem is to get this timber out quickly before it is all lost through rot.

While there are troublesome times, mainly due to the attitude of Russian leaders, the present outlook for the United States is the best it has been in many years.

Our Nation is not at war. We have a strong leader in the White House whose abilities the Russian dictators know and respect. The Russians, knowing President Eisenhower's capacities, are loathe to mix with America while such an able and experienced leader is President. This has improved our prospects for peace.

Also, the policies adopted by this Congress are, in the main, sound and reassuring, as is indicated by the fact that the switch over from a war to a peace economy after Korea was accomplished with a minimum of slowdown dislocation of the economy. Also, that dislocation was the shortest lived in history.

I expect to spend about 100 days in the district, staying there until about Christmas. During my stay at home, I hope to meet just as many of my constituents as possible and to be as helpful as I can to each in helping him solve any government problem he may have.

My office in Washington, D. C., will remain open, in competent hands, for the use of those having problems in the Capital. Also, I shall have an office in the Aberdeen First Federal Saving & Loan Building where I can be reached by those wishing to see me on any matter.

My Hometown Is Debt Free

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ALBERT P. MORANO

OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 11, 1954

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am proud to include a news story which appeared in the August 6 issue of Greenwich Time announcing the great news that my hometown of Greenwich is now debt free. I also include an editorial from the same newspaper on the fiscal emancipation, and, in the way of comment, would like to add that I, like all Americans, look forward to the day when our National Government will enjoy freedom from indebtedness.

The above-mentioned follows:

GREENWICH IS FREE FROM DEBT

(By Bill Fink)

The town of Greenwich is debt free today.

For the first time in more than 100 years, there is no bonded indebtedness. The last installment—$2,000—was paid off today on a 1909 refunding issue of $500,000, which included the retirement of a debt incurred during the Civil War.

Few municipalities in the country, and none of any size in Connecticut, can boast of being debt free. And to mark the occasion, the board of estimate is sponsoring a bond-burning ceremony at the September session of the representative town meeting.

The reader must cushion himself for a slight blow at this point, despite the good fiscal news from town hall about the town being emancipated from bonded debt. While it is technically true we are free of our bonded debt, actually are not free of debt.

The reason for this is under the modified pay-as-you-go policy mortgage debt of $2,887,000 in the next 4 years. The town went on the strict pay-as-you-go policy in 1934 and then deserted it for the modified plan more than 10 years ago.

The modified pay-as-you-go policy allows capital improvements to be paid for in a single tax year, or to be spread over a period not to exceed 5 years.

To illustrate—in the 1954 budget the sum of over $2 million was appropriated by the town for the construction of the Eastern Junior High School. This year the taxpayers planked down $250,000 as the first installment on the 5-year mortgage. Further mortgage payments that must be picked up in the next 4 years are as follows: $250,000 in 1955; $350,000 in 1956; $425,000 in 1957, and $880,000 in 1958.

Rector K. Fox, now vice chairman of the board of estimate and taxation, a member of its budget committee last year, in addressing town meeting on November 5, 1953, said that while the town will be free of its bonded debt in 1954, it will not be debt-free because under the town's modified pay-as-you-go plan, it must continue to borrow from the future." He added, "As long as this 5 year spread exists, we are not strictly speaking free of debt. We have committed tax receipts 5 years aread. We have borrowed from the future. We are in reality still in debt."

Greenwich in 1934 was at the financial crossroads with a high debt structure of over $6,400,000 brought on by floating bonds for years for capital improvements and for refunding previous issues. The town today is one of top triple A financial rated communities in the Nation. But it was not always so.

In 1909 the board of estimate was created by special legislation following a municipal scandal that rocked the community. It was not until 1934, however, that the pay-as-you-go plan was inaugurated and bonding for improvements ceased as a municipal practice.

Pay-as-you-go is the basic financial policy of Greenwich and under this our capital improvement programs are financed.

Next year's budget now in preparation calls for the raising of $678,000 on prior year capital improvement appropriations.

By going forward with the pay-as-you-go policy the town has saved millions of dollars in interest alone. Figured this way the town in 20 years has spent over $13 million for improvements financed by pay-as-you-go out of current taxes. The interest on this figured at 2½ percent comes to over $3 million.

It could be said that Greenwich Point, dredging of three harbors, building of two firehouses, construction of the Julian Curtiss School, and the addition to the North Mianus School were built with the money saved on interest payments.

The town may bond again next year—but this will be financing of the $3 million sewer projects. However, in sewer bonds the taxpayer benefiting from construction of sewers reimburses the town.

FISCAL EMANCIPATION

Greenwich has cause to rejoice. It now enjoys the enviable position among the communities of the country of being debt free, something of which few municipalities can boast.

The credit for the healthy fiscal condition of the town belongs to the members of the board of estimate and taxation over the years and the wise policies which they established and conscientiously followed.

The finance board has every justification to feel proud of the achievement. Insofar as bonded indebtedness is concerned, there just isn't any.

But the taxpayer, while exacting his full measure of satisfaction and pride, must not lose sight of the fact that we are not debt free as a community in the true sense of the word. Any more than is the individual who has all his current and past bills paid in full, but has a $10,000 mortgage hanging over his head.

Under what is called the modified pay-as-you-go policy, we are mortgaged for the future. When a vast expenditure is spread over 5 years and the annual installments are specifically set forth in the budget, it means there is a debt that must be paid off.

This is not said to detract from the outstanding job and the proud position in which we find ourselves. It is merely a reminder that while we are technically debt-free as far as bonded indebtedness is concerned, we are not and perhaps never will be absolutely free of debt.

In a growing community, the demands for new and improved services, schools, sewer facilities, highways, sidewalks and higher salaries, make it impossible for spending to remain at one level.

The taxpayers make the demands and the taxpayers foot the bill. When large sums are involved, the cost is spread over a 5-year period, making the payment painless, making it unnecessary to float bond issues, but hovering as a Damocles sword mortgage responsibility nevertheless.

Regardless of the technicalities, the people of Greenwich should enjoy this particular moment in our history. For the first time in 100 years we are unburdened by bonded indebtedness and that is something to boast about.

The Free World's Course After Geneva

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, August 16, 1954

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I send to the desk the text of an article which I recently prepared at the request of the French newspaper L'Aurore. Following the Geneva Conference, I had been asked for comment on the policies which I felt would maintain and strengthen the free world alliance.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the statement I prepared be reprinted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FREE WORLD'S COURSE AFTER GENEVA

The Geneva conference, in spite of all its flaws, need not prevent a basis for redoubled unity among the western allied powers, nor should it prove to be a source of worse frictions as regards future European and Asiatic policy than have already, unfortunately, occurred between the western powers.

It is my earnest hope that, although there are obviously considerable differences between the western allies with respect to the results at Geneva, we can and will go forward together with common policy.

Certain steps should now be taken by France, by my country, by the United Kingdom, and the other free powers. If these steps are not taken, then the postlude to the Geneva conference will dash France's high hopes and will regrettably fulfill the worst apprehensions of many people in the United States.

The next month is absolutely crucial. The Soviet Union is trying desperately to drive further wedges into the western alliance. Crafty Red Russia will dangle all sorts of bait in order to try to secure French postponement on EDC. The Communists, internally and externally, will try to widen wedges between France and the United States, between France and West Germany, West Germany and England, and in every other way. The Communists will continue to play upon traditional fears and upon historical divisions. So, France is called upon to fulfill a great role in resisting Communist efforts to divide and conquer.

I have faith in the judgment and wisdom and fidelity of France. I have faith that France will not forget how the Communists showed their traitorous disrespect of France's own gallant fallen sons at Dien Bien Phu. France will not forget how the Soviet tyrants and their MVD have proven that they are brothers "under the skin" of the Hitler S. S. and Gestapo, which tortured and murdered French men, women, and children, just as the aggressive Russian Red army invaded peaceful lands in the same manner as did the Hitler Wehrmacht.

As a friend of France, I shall speak now frankly to her, just as I would that she speak frankly to my country. We shall speak thusly—always, of course, in complete mutual respect, always with complete devotion to this principle—that each of the Allied powers will work out its own destiny in accordance with what it basically feels to be its own national interests, but in a manner consistent with maintaining the strength of the free world's alliance.

The people of the United States fervently wish well of the Republic of France. We wish well of your distinguished and able Premier, Monsieur Mendes-France. We wish well of France's worthy intended efforts, as for example, toward greater productivity and other national goals.

For France, for my country, I suggest now, with humility but with deep conviction, certain steps:

1. Now is the most important time in the history of the world for the peoples of each land to give heed to their most responsible voices.

Each people should give heed and support to those of its leaders who strive for allied unity, for friendship, for understanding. France, fortunately, has such leaders, and they deserve your support.

My own country too has such leaders, and they deserve and will receive support by my people. Our two greatest such leaders are the President of my country and the Secretary of State. I have urged my countrymen to support these men.

I have urged my fellow Americans to turn their backs upon those who unfairly criticize France or our other allies—to turn their backs on those misleaders who would have us forget how France's sons and our sons have together shed their blood in defense of France's devastated fields twice within a generation. I have urged my countrymen not to heed—as they definitely will not heed—those who would have us forget mankind's indebtedness to France, who would have us forget the peaks of cultural, scientific, political, and intellectual attainment which France has represented down through the centuries.

So, too, I hope that our friends in France will not heed any among them who attempt to widen a chasm between your country and mine.

There are those in France—notably the Communists—who would have you falsely believe that the United States is allegedly "eager for war," whereas, actually, no country in the world more desires peace than does America. These spreaders of falsehood would have you believe that the United States is in the grip of so-called fascism, whereas, actually, in no country of the world is liberty more vital or dynamic. Do not, my friends, believe the slanders against my country, and I pledge to you that your friends in the United States will not permit any slanders to misrepresent or defile France.

2. Upon the historic forthcoming decision of your National Assembly with regard to the European Defense Community may well depend the entire fate of collective security in the world.

If, as I trust it will, your National Assembly promptly ratifies the EDC, may it do so in a manner which will definitely not require renegotiation among the signatory powers. Such renegotiation would probably be doomed to failure. Thus, "passage" of EDC with substantive reservations on the part of France, could prove an international political catastrophe leading to endless chaos.

I can deeply appreciate the concern which France, three times invaded, feels over the prospect of German rearmament. I point out to my French friends, however, that there has never been a reasonable, practical alternative to EDC, insofar as the future of West Germany is concerned. Surely France would not want an independent West German national army with an independent German general staff.

Today, at least for the time being, there are, fortunately, responsible voices leading Germany who counsel for a wise and just settlement on the Saar, who counsel that the German people never again take up arms through an independent national army. But if France makes the situation impossible for responsible German leadership, who can tell who might replace such leadership and what the overall consequences of EDC's failure might be?

3. Just as I respectfully urge France to ratify EDC, I shall urge my own Senate and House of Representatives to approve the Mutual Security legislation now pending before us.

I shall combat any efforts to emasculate this legislation or to misuse it. I feel sure that the United States Congress will maintain the high and noble spirit of mutual respect and aid which has been implicit in all of the mutual defense legislation which we have enacted.

4. I urge France, whose leaders have already contributed so much to the foundations of the European High Coal and Steel authority, to accelerate its contributions for further economic unification of Western Europe, to be accompanied simultaneously by moves for political unity.

We, of the United States, deeply appreciate the many problems which will have to be resolved—the problem of any possible domination of such unity by any one power.

We know, however, that only through genuine unity in Western Europe—political, economic, military—can the prosperity and defense of the entire area be lastingly achieved.

As you move toward such unity, you can be sure that the United States will continue to lend its good offices for the mutual prosperity and defense of Western Europe. We will not return to so-called isolation.

5. We regard southeast Asia as representing the most dangerous power vacuum of 1954 and probably of years to come. This vacuum must be filled by effective collaboration among the free nations. It should come, I believe, in two steps:

(a) An interim and immediate multilateral declaration of intention against external aggression or internal penetration. This declaration should be agreed to by all the powers represented in southeast Asia, including the neutralist bloc.

(b) A strong military alliance in which a defensible line is actually drawn and well-prepared allied troops assured for the defense of that line against further Communist aggression.

With regard to the initial multilateral declation, surely, even neutralist countries like India should prove agreeable toward stating openly as a matter of principle that the throttling of the independence of any people by external aggression or by internal subversion is contrary to the principles of humanity.

Surely, these neutralist powers should not allow their historical opposition to imperialism on the part of any of the Western Powers to blind them to the fact that they should give no further comfort to the only aggressive imperialism in the world today which wants to expand and tighten its hold, namely, Soviet imperialism. It is the worst, vilest imperialism in history.

By contrast, those Western Nations which were formerly empires are obviously moving in the direction of granting increasing freedom to the colonial areas.

A multilateral declaration in words, however noble, will not, however, stop armed Red divisions.

At present the defensive forces available in southeast Asia against Communist aggression are woefully weak in relation to the huge Communist Chinese forces massed at the borders. What is necessary, therefore, is to build in countries like Thailand a far stronger and infinitely more modern and better equipped security force. In addition, there should be available mobile troop units in other free Asiatic countries, ready to spring to the defense of any other given area which is subject to aggression.

In Western Europe, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization has proven its great worth in preventing aggression. NATO has required great sacrifices on the part of the participating powers like France. Yet these sacrifices are not the slightest fraction of what these countries would experience in the event they were to be smashed under the Communist steamroller.

We are well aware that the free southeast Asia countries would like to devote their limited resources almost exclusively to peaceful pursuits—to education, to agricultural improvement, to health purposes. But unless they are willing to devote a substantial portion of their budgets for their own defense, and unless they are willing to cooperate for the military defense of other free nations, they may find that they may—one by one—suffer the same fate as Tibet in Asia, or as Poland in Europe.

Setting up a southeast Asia alliance will obviously take time, but that is no excuse for anyone's stalling.

We must all remember that the tempo of Communist aggression is speeding up. The momentum of Viet Minh success, along with Red Chinese success, is carrying communism forward.

For free nations now to engage in endless talk, endless haggling over the details of the defensive military alliance would simply be to postpone action until a time when action might prove too late.

6. If there is to be any real vitality to southeast Asia defense, it can only be established on a satisfactory resolution of the extremely difficult and complex colonial question.

No area can be successfully defended unless its own people believe in the West's good faith. And they will not believe in that good faith unless the area is given irrevocable and demonstrable assurances of the West's support of the movement toward sovereignty, as promptly as the colonial areas are ready for it.

We, of America, know that world Communism would like to see all of the underdeveloped areas which now do not enjoy full sovereignty thrown prematurely into full independence. The Communists know that chaos would then result, for many of these peoples are unready for political, judical, and military self-government.

At the same time, we of the United States feel that if the Western powers fail to recognize the inevitable and rightful movement of peoples toward self-government; if any of the Western powers display an obstinate, self-centered, and repressive attitude, then calamity will result, and there will be more Indochina-like guerrilla wars, civil wars, and possibly international wars ensuing.

7. Finally, I trust that France will recognize that the people of the United States are 99 percent opposed to recognition of Communist China. In taking this stand, we are neither impractical nor emotional. We are simply remaining faithful to principles of liberty, equality, and fraternity which Red China abhors but to which you and we remain devoted.

And so, as the seventh step—in postlude to Geneva—I urge that we turn down recognition of Red China, a nation which we and you and the other peaceful members of the United Nations, have rightly branded as an aggressor and which has never purged itself of that aggression.

The shocking events within the past few days involving the barbaric action of the Peking Government in shooting down a defense less British commercial airplane and then in attacking rescue planes—constitute the latest indication of the Red Dragon's true nature.

If irrespective of that nature, Communist China were to be voted—as a matter of expediency into the United Nations General Assembly, and/or into the Security Council, the United Nations might be dealt, in effect, a death blow. The people of the United States would regard such entry of Red China as an indefensible violation of the very principle for which the United Nations was established. A wave of bitterness would sweep the United States. Yet, without the support of the people of the United States, it is obvious that the U. N. can neither succeed nor exist in any vitality.

Even aside from the United States attitude, I point out that for France's and the world's own good, Red China should remain excluded. If she were admitted to the United Nations, that would not be a first step leading toward a resolution of East-West problems. It would be a step resulting in the intensification of East-West tensions.

Why? Because the Moscow-Peking empire would have received such a tremendous psychological lift, would have won such a tremendous victory, as to become even bolder, more ferocious. It would become even more overconfident, more eager to deal what it might feel to be a diplomatic-military coup de grace to the alliance of the retreating Western Powers, whom it would then regard even more contemptuously as alleged "weak" and "crawling."

Ordinarily the people of the United States are among the first who are eager to sit down at a conference table and talk to anyone. But we are not eager to shake hands with a criminal power, when those very hands are stained with the blood of our sons. Those same Red hands are stained with the blood of France's sons.

The Foundations' Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 16, 1954

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to commend to the attention of our colleagues the following very fine article written by Mr. M. Jay Racusin. It appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of August 16, 1954:

THE FOUNDATIONS' CASE—NONPROFIT FUNDS, WITH $7,500,000,000 RESOURCES, HELP ADVANCE EDUCATION, HEALTH, SOCIAL WELFARE

(By M. Jay Racusin)

An Oxford University scientist and a colleague of his making a systematic study some years ago of antibacterial substances, found themselves stalled at a critical point.

In their search for something that might be useful to mankind, they had run out of money. They needed additional equipment and materials for one of their vital projects.

The scientist, a professor of pathology, unable to raise the funds in England, applied to the Rockefeller Foundation. He explained that he had recently engaged a German refugee biochemist to collaborate with him and needed $1,250 for the purchase of laboratory materials to enable him to go ahead. The foundation gave him the grant. The year was 1936.

The outcome of their work was the purification and development of penicillin as one of the most beneficent and powerful germ killers of modern times.

The scientist and his colleague were Dr. Howard Walter Florey and Dr. Ernest Boris Chain. They shared the Nobel Prize with Sir Alexander Fleming, who discovered the mold from which penicillin is extracted.

PRACTICAL ACHIEVEMENT

This points up the contributions and practical achievements of the Nation's great foundations even with such comparatively trivial outlays as the $1,250 involved in the penicillin project.

The interest of State and Federal legislative committees in the operations of the country's philanthropic foundations has focused public attention on these organizations and prompts a closer look at their origins, purposes, practices, resources, and accomplishments.

What is a foundation? It is a nonprofit organization set up by an individual or group of individuals, usually endowed with substantial sums of money or valuable securities or properties, whose capital or income or both are to be used solely for charitable purposes.

Foundations are generally licensed by States as corporations and are occasionally chartered by the Federal Government, and may be called by various names such as trusts, institutes, endowments, funds, or charities. If they conform to their announced philanthropic purposes, they are exempt from local, State, and Federal taxes. Since 1950, all such organizations desiring tax exemption must file applications with the Internal Revenue Service.

Authorities differ on the number and resources of these groups. Dr. Ernest V. Hollis, of the United States Office of Education, told a congressional committee in 1952 that there were from 32,000 to 35,000 such organizations with total resources of $7 billion. A recent Reece committee report placed the number at about 7,000 and resources around $7,500,000,000. The Internal Revenue Service list of organizations granted tax-exemption status totals more than 56,000. This list, which admittedly is not policed thoroughly, includes many religious as well as charitable organizations.

THREE HUNDRED MILLION DOLLARS ANNUAL GIFTS

The disbursement of these foundations were estimated by a Reece committee researcher at around $300 million a year. Dr. H. Rowan Gaither, Jr., president of the Ford Foundation, said, however, that only $168 million is given each year by foundations. This is only 3 percent of the total of $5,600,000,000 distributed annually by private philanthropies in America.

During the whole of the 19th century only seven persons of wealth established foundations in the United States. In the first decade of the 20th century, 12 new foundations were established, and at least 22 in the second. Thereafter, during the era of great foundations, they increased by leaps and bounds.

Before the advent of the big foundations, endowments were generally confined to some limited purpose such as support of a school or a church, care of orphans, crippled children, or the indigent aged.

The immense resources of the newer organizations, however, required broader fields of activity and their purposes were extended to improvement of social and living conditions, promoting the advancement and diffusion of knowledge, and promoting the well-being of mankind and understanding between nations throughout the world.

RESEARCH VENTURE CAPITAL

They are usually supervised by boards of trustees, generally unpaid and free from political controls of legislative and pressure groups, and carefully chosen for breadth and diversity of interests. While a few have research organizations of their own, most of them try to achieve their objectives through grants to universities, research centers, hospitals, fellowships, scientists, scholars and organizations active and experienced in chosen fields.

Education and research in the physical and social sciences are the most favored fields of the foundations today. The greatest amount of foundation money in recent years has been spent in education, with medicine and public health running a close second, and social welfare third.

They are concerned with preventing human ills rather than immediate palliation of them. They provide the venture capital for research and discovery, and the scientists, scholars and other workers provide the intelligence.

On the basis of the latest figures available, the 10 largest foundations in the Nation have combined total resources of $1,590,125,901. About 70 have resources of $10 million or more.

Although established at different times in the last half-century, they have given away in varied forms of philanthropy during these 5 decades a total of about $1,400,000,000.

The leader of these giant charities, in point of assets, is the Ford Foundation, with current resources in excess of $518 million.

The largest total of benefactions was made by the Rockefeller group with their much older history. These include the Rockefeller Foundation, General Education Board and the China Medical Board. Their combined disbursements over 50 years amounted to $828,830,379. These do not include the personal benefactions of John D. Rockefeller, Sr., John D. Rockefeller, Jr., or the Rockefeller Brothers Fund.

The House Rules Should Be Amended To Provide a Fair-Play Code for Congressional Investigations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 1, 1954

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, it is regrettable in the extreme that the House Rules Committee has not reported and the House has not passed a fair-play code to govern all investigating committees. Extensive hearings were held at the conclusion of which, I understand, a subcommittee unanimously voted out a resolution.

Since the prospects for House action at this session now appear dim, it is my intention to move on the opening day of the 84th Congress to amend the House Rules to incorporate those basic principles almost universally accepted as desirable for both the investigating committees and witnesses who appear before them. Nearly all such committees in both House and Senate have now adopted a set of guideposts. But there should be a uniform code written into the rules.

The investigating power of Congress must not be impaired. It has been suggested rigid rules might hamper and impede congressional investigations. The effect, in my judgment, would be just the opposite. Not only would the committee work be facilitated, but at least equally important, the vital investigative function of Congress would be dignified, the prestige of Congress enhanced, and public confidence in the legislative process strengthened.

The 83d Congress, despite its outstanding achievements, has missed the opportunity of constructive accomplishment in not pushing through this much-needed reform. I believe a great majority of the Members of both parties feel as I do on this issue. They should be given an opportunity to express themselves. Prior to the opening day of the 84th Congress, I shall circulate to the Members specific proposals for amending the House rules. I hope and believe they will receive an enthusiastic response.

How To Fight Subversives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 16, 1954

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I direct the attention of our colleagues to the following editorial which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of August 14, 1954:

How to Fight Subversives

The administration has presented a detailed program to supplement the Internal Security Act and other laws designed to attack subversion. The Democrats, by the sudden insertion of an amendment outlawing the Communist Party, into a Senate debate on one phase of this program, managed to throw everything into confusion—at least for the time being. The House, which has been the legislative balance wheel throughout the session, can still correct the Senate's error, and there is good reason to believe that the Representatives will do so.

The basic practical arguments against outlawing the Communist Party, which have been expressed by Attorney General Brownell and J. Edgar Hoover, the head of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, are sound. If the party were driven underground altogether, the FBI would have a substantially harder task in keeping tabs on membership and policies. Enforcement of the ban would be difficult, and confidential informants would be exposed in the process. Moreover, the constitutional issue would be complex, and might tie the hands of the Government for years, while the courts were assessing the question.

Other anti-Communist measures have made good progress in the courts. The Government has gone far ahead with confidence in prosecuting Communist leaders under the Smith Act. Under the Internal Security Act, the Subversive Activities Control Board has declared the Communist Party "substantially directed, dominated, and controlled" by Moscow, so that the party must disclose its membership or the individual members must register, and accept strict controls over their political and propagandist activities. If they refuse to do so—as they have thus far refused—they will be subject to prosecution. In Mr. Brownell's words, they will "by their own acts, outlaw the Communist Party." The testing of these provisions in the courts is close to completion, after which an effective basis for the legal surveillance of the Communist Party will have been established.

Much of this hard work will be undone if the outlawry of the Communists becomes law. With the first Communist arrested under the bill passed by the Senate, the whole machinery of trial and appeal would have to be set in motion again. The Government's legal advisers are doubtful of the constitutionality of banning a whole party as such, so that after a great deal of wasted time and effort, it would probably be necessary to return to the older, sounder methods. This delay would only be to the advantage of the Communists themselves. It is up to the House to set the Senate and the Nation back on the right course.

Dorgan's War on Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 4, 1954

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following truthful and interesting article by the Honorable Thomas Dorgan, clerk, superior court for civil business, County of Suffolk, which appeared in the Boston Traveler, Boston, Mass., Wednesday, July 28, 1954:

The article follows:

Fights Red Educators—His Teacher's Oath Law Stirred Academic Furor, Roused Parents to Peril

(By Thomas Dorgan, clerk, Suffolk superior civil court)

I have been asked to comment on the progress we have made on checking communism in the Commonwealth.

From time to time, persons ask, "Is it worth it, Tom?" and they mean all the battling in the halls of the legislature, this speaking and writing and traveling from place to place, seeking to arouse the people to take effective action against the menace of communism.

First, let me say that like many other persons engaged in combating the evil of communism, I realize that the main answer is not in locking up the Communists, but rather in knocking out the social and moral conditions that breed the stuff.

EVIL IS HERE

But achieving social justice is a long range program. The Commonwealth of Massachusetts can be proud of its progressive social legislation. There is still much to be done.

But while we labor to fashion a society worthy of the dignity of man, I have no sympathy with those who shout themselves hoarse that the evil of communism is secondary and therefore unimportant.

A doctor who designs a long-range program of fresh air, sunshine, and rest for a tubercular patient cannot be indifferent to a lunatic in the ward who has a lethal weapon and a phial of poison and is determined to use it on his patient.

Apart from constantly speaking and writing against the evil of communism, my own efforts have been largely identified with the menace of communism in our schools.

The recent decision of the Massachusetts Supreme Court in the Faxon case has spotlighted once again the evil of harboring within our schools, teachers who are unwilling to teach loyalty to our country.

ELECTED IN 1932

That decision set my thoughts rambling down memory lane to the year 1935. I had been elected a member of the legislature in 1932 from ward 17, in Dorchester. I shall never forget the kindness and cooperation of the citizens of ward 17. They made it possible for me to be of service to them.

In 1933, the United States Government granted the Communist gangsters in Russia diplomatic recognition. It proved a gateway for the Communist conspiracy to infiltrate America.

NEED FOR ACTION

It was shortly after my election that a couple of graduates from Harvard and MIT came to me with requests for help. They were worried about the existence of a Communist cell composed largely of professors. I checked their information and became convinced there was need for action.

I knew enough about communism at that time and have become increasingly convinced ever since to know that it is not a mere academic subject. I knew that it was far more than a strange heresy to be tolerated. It was and it still is a worldwide conspiracy—ruthless, intensely serious, and a sinister conspiracy—bent on dominating the world.

What I knew of this international menace led me to file a bill in the legislature which would require teachers and professors in our educational institutions to take a loyalty oath to defend and protect the Constitution of the United States and the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

You would think that was simple enough and reasonable enough in time of public danger. I wasn't prepared for the roar of protest that went up on all sides. I thought the oath would help increase a sense of social responsibilty, intensify patriotism, and form a solid wall of public opinion against the subtle encroachments of communism.

I knew the vast majority of teachers were loyal Americans. I knew the Communists were relatively few. But a fireman doesn't ignore smoke coming out of a window just because it's a little column of smoke.

CELL IS IMPORTANT

The Communist cell in a school or college is important because back of it stands the full power of a whole international conspiracy. Those who have studied the pattern of Communist conquest know well how the tiny minorities, tiny but intensively active, have taken over nation after nation until at present they arrogantly challenge the existence of the entire free world.

As I said, I was not prepared for the roars of protest that came from prominent citizens, from graduates of Harvard, MIT, Boston University, and many other colleges. I was threatened with being forced out of office. The Speaker of the House, a Harvard alumnus and member of the governing board at that distinguished institution, asked me to withdraw the bill. I refused.

The original bill I filed carried a penalty attached to it. The penalty was a $5,000 fine and 5 to 10 years in prison. The education committee knocked off the penalty. The day the bill was heard, the auditorium of the State house was packed. No hearing up to the present time has commanded so much attention.

All the presidents of the colleges and universities and prominent members of educational institutions vigorously protested the bill. But apparently the argumentation had convinced the legislators of the bill's timeliness and usefulness. It was enacted into law in 1935.

After that, the teacher's oath law coasted along through the years rather uneventfully. While the Communists worked silently and effectively from 1935 to 1950, they were protected in the name of academic freedom, aided by public indifference and official irresponsibility. Even good men apparently took the attitude, "Well, Tom, now you've had your law passed—let's forget it now and get along with important matters." But in 1950 a series of events began to arouse public opinion and elicit more urgent action in the legislature. The congressional committees began to take testimony.

WAS ALARMED

In all this testimony, Massachusetts came in for considerable share of attention. Operations of the Communist apparatus at

Harvard and MIT, especially, came into prominence. Industrial and professional organizations apparently had escaped the vigilance of our local authorities.

As a reaction to this new development, in 1948, the legislature sought to put teeth into the teacher's oath law by attaching a $1,000 fine to its violation. I tried to put on a $5,000 fine and a 5-year sentence in State prison, but the legislature would not consider it.

Particularly alarmed at the testimony of Herbert Philbrick concerning "70 members in the professional section of this area, divided into 13 cells," I sponsored a bill in 1951 with Representative Paul A. McCarthy to outlaw the Communist Party in the Commonwealth. The bill was passed, making membership in the party illegal, subject to fine and imprisonment and empowering the attorney general to conduct any necessary investigations in keeping with the purpose of the act.

In 1953, aroused by the failure of certain colleges and universities to clean their own houses, another bill was presented to the legislature, calling on the presidents of schools and colleges to expel Communists. The bill was given the new treatment by referring it to the committee on rules. This is a brazen piece of business that circumvents the Constitution.

Apparently goaded by rising public opinion, the governing board of Harvard took up the cases of three faculty members who allegedly belonged to the Communist Party. They were found guilty of more or less serious misconduct and rather gently reprimanded. There the matter stands today.

IGNORED VIOLATION

In drawing up its brief of the case, appraising the conduct of these faculty members, the governing board utterly ignored the apparent violation of the teacher's oath law. We can only conclude that the governing board contemptuously dismisses that law as unimportant.

We wonder what it thinks of the rest of the legislation of the Massachusetts Legislature which, by charter, has legally granted Harvard a right to exist in the community and has given the university tax-exempt privileges. I know these privileges were not given to harbor admitted Communists, commie fronters and invokers of the fifth amendment.

There can be no compromise with such a force as communism. It is ridiculous to expect that the Communists can be amenable to compromise, or appeasement, or conciliation, or any other decent overtures. As Munich failed as a compromise with nazism, so too, Poland, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, China, and other nations stand as real evidence that there can be no compromise with communism.

We cannot mix decency and indecency and expect the total product to be decency. We cannot mix positives and negatives and expect the total product to be positives.

We cannot mix Americanism and communism and expect the product to be Americanism.

The Russian cold war has been more successful than the hot war. In the cold war we allow all fundamental rights to be taken advantage of by Communist conspirators, commie fronters and invokers of the fifth amendment. In a hot war we can punish enemies for treason. Why not in a cold war? That question should be answered.

I believe the Constitution protects two groups, namely, loyal Americans and friendly aliens residing in this country, but I am sure it doesn't protect agents for a foreign conspiracy.

If we had only half the zeal of the Communists we would not have to worry about our freedom and liberty which protects our security. The day has arrived to ask the question, Which side you are on—the Communist or the American?

Public Laws 511 to 530, Inclusive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 30, 1954

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, for the convenience of those of my colleagues and others who may wish for ready reference to a compendium of the legislation we in the 83d Congress have enacted, I have extended my remarks on numerous occasions to include the reports on the new laws which I have been sending to my constituents in the Second District of Illinois. By unanimous consent, I am extending my remarks to continue with these reports, as follows:

PUBLIC LAW 511

H. R. 8973, taxi drivers in the District of Columbia: This will save the District of Columbia the expense of issuing badges to hackers. Hereafter the license posted in cabs (as in Chicago) will suffice. Hackers themselves will be unbadged.

PUBLIC LAW 512

H. R. 8692, District of Columbia: Another instance in which the Congress of the United States serves in the joint capacity of State legislature and City Council for the District of Columbia. Public Law 512 places building and loana associations in the District on the same basis as the banks in the matter of payment of trust accounts to the beneficiary on death of trustee.

PUBLIC LAW 513

H. R. 8974, International Bank: This permits insurance companies organized in the District of Columbia to invest in obligations of the International Bank.

In the 81st Congress we authorized the investment in International Bank debentures of trust funds of national banks. This seemed to me to be leading by indirection to a contribution of American capital to the loaning funds of the World Bank much in excess of our share under the proportionment arrangement.

As a member of the Banking and Currency Committee I recently made an inquiry on this phase and was happy to learn that one or two bond issues had been floated successfully in foreign countries. American capital, however, continues to furnish the bulk of the money of the International Bank, the activities of which are largely similar to those of our own Export-Import Bank. So far the two banks have worked in harmony in doing an outstanding job.

PUBLIC LAW 514

H. R. 9143, Federal Reserve greenbacks: In circulation at the present time is about $30 billion of greenbacks, seven-eights of which are greenbacks issued by Federal Reserve Banks. You will be interested in learning that behind $26.5 billion of Federal Reserve notes now outstanding is $28.1 billion collateral, consisting of $11 billion in gold certificates, $17 billon in United States Government securities and $100 million in eligible paper. Please note that much over half of the collateral behind your greenbacks is the Government's I O U.

Under section 16 of the Federal Reserve Act banks could not pay out notes of other Federal Reserve Banks. This necessitated the sorting out of millions of greenbacks and much crisscross shipping in making exchanges. It cost $750,000 a year and served no useful purpose. All that Public Law 514 does is to repeal this expensive section 16.

If you are interested further in the Federal Reserve setup, I suggest you obtain a copy of House Report 1702, 83d Congress, 2d session.

PUBLIC LAW 515

S. 1303, elections during Japanese occupancy: During the American occupation of Japan (1945–52) there were a number of elections and plebiscites in which some 2,000 visiting Americans expatriated themselves by participating. Reason for their participation was a general belief (stemming from newspaper articles) that General MacArthur approved voting by Japanese-Americans as the issue was one between communism and the new order of Japanese life and government established by the United States.

Public Law 515 restores the right to naturalization to American citizenship as was done in the case of Americans participating in the elections in Italy and in other similar instances. Benefited by the act is a constituent in the the second district, a fine and loyal American for whose relief I had introduced a private bill in 1953, consideration of which was withheld pending the expected enactment of this general legislation. On the signing by the President of Public Law 515 I wired him the glad news and received the following reply:

"You have brought me the best news of this year. I am aware of your great support for the passage of this bill and I am indebted to you for your effort to solve my personal problem and many other Japanese Americans who voted in Japan during the occupation."

PUBLIC LAW 516

S. 3605. Under Secretary of Treasury for Monetary Affairs: Offices of Assistant Treasurer of the United States and Assistant Registrar of the Treasury are unoccupied because unnecessary. Public Law 516 abolishes the offices and substitutes therefor an Assistant Treasurer of the United States for monetary affairs (debt management and protection of public credit) and another Secretary in addition to the present two Secretaries.

PUBLIC LAW 517

S. 3378, revision of Organic Act of Virgin Islands: Some 50 islands comprise the Virgin Islands which we purchased from Denmark for $25 million ($40 an acre) during World War I. Only St. Thomas, St. John, and St. Croix are inhabited. Total population: 25,000. In 1953 we appropriated $745,000 in grants to the Virgin Island municipalities to cover deficits. Our total appropriation for the Virgin Island in 1953 was over $6 million, at the rate of $240 for each inhabitant.

Public Law 517 rewrites and modernizes the organic act of 1936 (patterned on the old colonial system of Denmark) in the interest of efficiency and economy. I was glad to join with Congressman DAWSON and others in effecting amendments that removed discriminatory features and inequities to native Virgin Islanders. There still is room for improvement, which I hope will be made in the 84th Congress.

The Virgin Islands were discovered (1493) and named (in honor of St. Ursula and her companions) by Columbus on his second voyage. Sea-roving bands of Carib Indians inhabited them, later the pirates took over and then Denmark. In 1867 we started negotiations, in 1905 Denmark offered to sell for $5 million but 12 years later when our fear of the use by Germany of the islands for a submarine base made it a seller's market the price went up fivefold.

PUBLIC LAW 518

H. R. 7125, removing the poison from food: Here is legislation of direct concern to you since it relates to the health safety of your family in eating fruits and vegetables.

When the use of pesticides and coloring substances (as with oranges) was unregulated there were occasional deaths, many illnesses, from excess of residue.

In 1938 Congress first made specific provision for the regulation of pesticide residue. At that time there were few pesticide chemicals on the market. In postwar years industry research has made a valuable contribution in the development of many new chemicals. Public Law 518 provides for prompt and efficient testing (1) in the safeguarding of the public health and (2) in protecting producers from costly and complicated procedures in processing.

Representing a consumer constituency, my support was won by the provision for an advisory committee of scientific experts selected by the National Academy of Science to pass judgment. I know you will agree with me that we should be satisfied with nothing less than the judgment of disinterested scientists whether the residue of poison is harmless or enough to kill us.

PUBLIC LAW 519

H. R. 6342, Purchase Contract Act of 1954: Public Law 519 supplies a third method for occupying buildings for Federal purposes. Heretofore it was possible only (1) by direct construction, or (2) by lease. This act (title I) broadens the authority by permitting the Administrator of General Services and the Postmaster General to acquire land and construct public buildings through purchase contract agreements. Funds available for 1955 (present fiscal year) are $5 million.

Title II covers the so-called lease-purchase setup. It authorizes the Postmaster General to make lease agreements for the erection of postal buildings on real estate acquired by the Postmaster General and conveyed to the lessor for the construction thereon of a post office to be rented to the Government. If interested, Assistant Postmaster General Ormonde A. Kieb is the man to contact. Address: Bureau of Facilities, Office of Postmaster General, Washington, D. C.

PUBLIC LAW 520

S. 3480, loans to small business: This merely corrects an omission from the Small Business Act of 1953, permitting national banks to participate in real-estate loans to small business. However, in debate in the House some illuminating facts were brought out: (1) The Small Business Administration, which since its creation in the summer of 1953 has received 2,146 applications from small business, has made only 39 loans, and (2) the Small Business Administration has spent $2 million in administrative expense to process $2 million worth of loans affecting only 39 concerns and leaving over 2,000 deserving applicants still waiting at the church.

Chairman Wolcott of the Banking and Currency Committee replied that most of the money had gone to furnishing technical advice to small business such as big business obtains from its own research organizations.

The Small Business Administration, however, was set up to fill the gap when RFC was prematurely junked. Instead of filling the gap by supplying an available lending source to small businesses that qualify, the trend has been toward research.

PUBLIC LAW 521

S. 1276, interest on farm loans: Most of the loans under the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act (for buying and improving family-sized farms) have gone to veterans reestablishing themselves in agriculture. The interest rate has been 3 percent. Public Law 521 raises it to 4 percent. Reason: when the administration in 1953 adopted its hard money policy and boosted the Government interest rate the money of the banks went into Government securities. The available market for 3 percent loans to GI farmers and others dried up.

I was among those who deplored the hard money policy proclaimed by the Secretary of the Treasury a year or so ago. Finally the bankers themselves found it was bringing on a critical financial situation with its repercussions upon interest rates everywhere. Then there was some moderation. But the GI farmers with others will continue to pay through the nose because of someone's folly.

PUBLIC LAW 522

H. R. 7468, foreign truckers on our highways: Canadian motor carriers use our highways in increasing numbers. To less extent the conditions exists on the Mexican border. Public Law 522 requires them to comply with the rules of the Interstate Commerce Commission applicable to American carriers as regards (1) qualifications and hours of employment of drivers, and (2) safety of operation and equipment. Furthermore, foreign truckers must carry insurance and have a resident agent in each State for legal service.

PUBLIC LAW 523

H. R. 8247, preservation of historic battleships: In 1953 when the U. S. S. *Olympia* (Dewey's flagship in the historic battle of May 1, 1898, in Manila Bay, and which later carried back the body of the Unknown Soldier of World War I) was about to be junked your Representative introduced a bill for her preservation. This bill was incorporated (with others for the preservation of the *Constitution*, *Hartford*, and *Oregon*) in what is now Public Law 523.

The measure was approved by the President and became effective on July 23, 1954. Within 6 months thereafter the *Olympia* must be claimed by some State, municipality, or nonprofit organization, otherwise this flagship enthroned in the affection of the veterans of two wars, will be consigned to Davy Jones. In the House your Representative succeeded in extending the time to 1 year, Senate was obstinate and conferees agreed on 6 months.

I am happy, however, that the provision was left in for the removal before scrapping of any parts or pieces of historic interest. The larger parts will go to interested historical or educational institutions, smaller pieces to individuals wishing them as memontoes. Distribution will be made through the Secretary of the Navy.

The *Constitution* will be repaired, towed to Baltimore and presented to Maryland for restoration as a public monument.

The *Hartford* repaired and towed to Mobile, will remain as a public memorial in the harbor of that city.

The *Oregon* will share the same fate as the *Olympia*, 6 months more of life after July 23, 1954, unless sooner claimed.

PUBLIC LAW 524

S. 2987, reseeding public rangeland: Commodity Credit Corporation owns 77 million pounds of hay and pasture seeds [value, $2.7 million] acquired under support programs ending with the 1952 crops. Public Law 524 makes good use of some of this seed (about 1 percent) by turning it over to the Forest Service, the Fish and Wildlife Service and the Bureau of Land Management for the seeding of grazing lands. As a result an additional 110,000 acres of the public rangeland will be available for grazing.

PUBLIC LAW 525

H. R. 6263, Alaska: This reconveys back to the Rotary Club of Ketchikan, Alaska, a 4-acre recreation area which the club gave to the Federal Government in 1942 but was found difficult to supervise.

PUBLIC LAW 526

H. R. 6975, site for a high school: In 1905, when Tule Lake was being lowered in connection with a Federal reclamation project, California gave the United States title to the land uncovered. Public Law 526 gives back some 28 acres as the site for a new high school which will benefit the settlers on the Klamath irrigation project.

PUBLIC LAW 527

H. R. 8713, helium gas: Under the Helium Act of 1925 the Secretary of the Interior was authorized to dispose of byproducts of helium production not needed for Government use. Public Law 527 restores this authority which had been deleted from the 1951 act.

PUBLIC LAW 528

H. R. 9005, wartime production extended: On the finding by the Committee on Armed Services (House Report 1765) that "the present emergency may become acute at any time," Public Law 528 was enacted further to extend (July 1955) the wartime authority of the Secretaries of Army, Navy, and Air Force to expand and maintain industrial productive capacity in both Government and private plants to meet military needs.

PUBLIC LAW 529

H. R. 9006, paintings to Australia: As trophies of war the United States got 28 paintings of Australian troops which were made during World War II by German artists when the Australians were in North Africa and Crete. Public Law 529 permits their donation to the Australian War Memorial in Camberra, Australia, where they appropriately belong, and will be treasured. This gracious gesture, however, required another public law since without it no one had authority to make the gift to a foreign government or museum.

PUBLIC LAW 530

H. R. 7601, White House Conference on Education: Some time prior to November 30, 1955 prominent educators and interested laymen from all parts of the country will meet with the President at a White House Conference on Education. From this conference will come recommendations how best the municipalities, the States and the Federal Government can cooperate in meeting what is described in the act as "significant and pressing problems in the field of education."

Public Law 530 authorizes an appropriation of $1 million to be alloted to the various States, according to population, to meet the expense of State conferences preliminary to the White House conference.

The House passed the measure by roll call, 269 to 69. I voted yes. Most of the votes in opposition came from the southern bloc, heated up by the recent antisegregation decision of the Supreme Court.

Republican Submersive Activities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 16, 1954

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the CIO News of August 16, 1954, is quite interesting:

Oh, To Be a Trout

The House of Representatives spent 2 full days debating and passing a bill to require that restaurant menus clearly state whether the trout being served are 100-percent American or 100-percent alien.

It's possible there's merit in this proposal—though it's a little hard to guess what that merit may be.

But it's significant, perhaps, that the GOP Congress which has shown so little interest in the needs of plain people has devoted so much time to the alleged needs of plain fish.

We're led to the wish that the 83d Congress, having started worrying about the needs of fish, may eventually get around to further consideration of the needs of the people.

Public Laws 481 to 510, Inclusive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 28, 1954

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent, I am extending my remarks to include my report on Public Laws 481–510, inclusive, 83d Congress, made to my constituents in the Second District of Illinois, as follows:

PUBLIC LAW 481

House Joint Resolution 256, International Instrument Exposition: Whenever there is a world's fair or exhibition in this country Congress permits exhibitions from foreign countries to come in duty free. Public Law 481 grants this right to foreign exhibitors at the First International Instrument Exhibition at Philadelphia, September 13–25, 1954.

PUBLIC LAW 482

H. R. 8149, Medical Facilities Survey and Construction Act of 1954: In effect, this is an extension of the Hill-Burton Act (providing Federal grants to States) under which over 1,000 nonprofit hospitals have been built in the last 7 years. It authorizes appropriations of $20 million for diagnostic or treatment centers, $20 million for hospitals for the chronically ill and impaired, $10 million for rehabilitation facilities, $10 million for nursing homes, and $2 million for surveys by the States of their needs in this field. Actually only part of these amounts was included in the supplementary appropriations bill for 1955, remainder was promised after completion of the surveys.

Public hearings on this measure covered exhaustively the state of the Nation's health; 95 distinguished physicians, scientists, and laymen participating. Some highlights of their testimony:

Adequate treatment is not available for heart disease, cancer, arthritis, and rheumatic disorders, cerebral palsy, muscular dystrophy, and other long-term illnesses.

To date only 12 percent of the national need for beds in chronic-disease hospitals has been met. Reason of quickened demand for facilities for chronically ill: Increased old-age group, those 65 years and over now numbering 12 million, as against 3 million in 1900.

PUBLIC LAW 483

S. 2488, Sioux Indians: Public Law 483 gives assurance to the Indians in the Cheyenne River Sioux Reservation and the Standing Rock Reservation (they were considerably exercised) that the Indians who surrender trust patents and receive land exchange assignments will get back titles as good as the one they relinquish.

PUBLIC LAW 484

S. 3336, Columbia River compact: This amends an act of 1952 by adding Nevada and Utah to the States of Idaho, Montana, Oregon, Washington, and Wyoming authorized to negotiate a compact for the equitable apportionment of the waters of the Columbia River system.

PUBLIC LAW 485

House Joint Resolution 537, International Trade Fair at Seattle: From March 11 to 25, 1955, the fourth International Trade Fair will be held at Seattle, Wash., specializing in exhibits from the Far East. Public Law 485 exempts exhibits from customs duty. See Public Laws 481 and 486.

PUBLIC LAW 486

House Joint Resolution 545, International Trade Fair at Dallas: Similar to Public Laws 481 and 485. Permits foreign exhibits to International Trade-Sample Fair at Dallas, Tex., to come in duty free. If sold in this country, and not returned to land of origin, articles then become subject to customs charges.

PUBLIC LAW 487

H. R. 7371, Postal Savings Certificate: Some 250 million postal savings certificates are piled up with the Post Office Department. Public Law 487 will help by permitting the postmaster to destroy paid certificates and other evidences of deposit after 6 years.

PUBLIC LAW 488

H. R. 3191, California Gets Another Break: California has a claim against the United States for alleged damages resulting from an emergency closing of the outlet gates of Shasta Dam in the Sacramento Valley. Oscar L. Chapman, then Secretary of the Interior, stated the claim was without any legal or equitable basis. Nevertheless, Public Law 488 permits the Federal court in California to hear the case and pass judgment despite the fact that the statute of limitations in tort already has run. Add this one to the tidelands oil gift to California which included beside priceless oil rights several millions dollars in cash money held by the Supreme Court of the United States to belong to all the people of our country. As your representative I do not like these repeated evidences of California influence. For the facts read Mr. Chapman's letter in House Report 660, 83d Congress, 1st session.

PUBLIC LAW 489

H. R. 6893, Shoshone Irrigation District in Wyoming: In 1904 the Shoshone irrigation project in Wyoming was authorized. The United States put in a large investment to restore arid land to production. In 1922 the Shoshone hydroelectric generating plant was added. In 1928 the plant started to make money. Before the profits were sufficient to liquidate the cost of the construction the Shoshone Irrigation District put in its claim for a percentage. The then Secretary of the Interior said the claim was ridiculous. Litigation resulted.

Public Law 489 seeks to effect a compromise by giving $426,000 to the district for past acruments and providing for the payment of future percentages. The district, however, is obligated to use the money in making amortized construction payments to the United States and in maintenance costs.

PUBLIC LAW 490

H. R. 5620, surveyor's error: Because someone in 1919 made an error in a plat of survey, Public Law 490 was necessary to clear title to certain lands in Colorado. It confirms boundary lines as established in 1868 and 1875.

PUBLIC LAW 491

H. R. 7913, land for State park: This authorizes the sale to Texas (for use as a public park) of 200 unused acres in the Texarkana Dam project. Properly the United States retains oil and mineral rights.

PUBLIC LAW 492

H. R. 9232, surplus Federal property: This extends to June 30, 1955, the temporary authority to dispose of surplus Government property by negotiation rather than by advertising. The Administrator of General Services requested the extension pending the expected enactment by the 84th Congress of permanent legislation governing such sale in normal times.

PUBLIC LAW 493

H. R. 9340, Camp Blanding, Fla.: Under Public Law 493 the United States will convey to Florida some 40,000 acres within the Camp Blanding Military Reservation with the condition that it be used with the 31,000 adjoining acres owned by the Armory Board of Florida exclusively for military purposes and resurrendered to the United States in case of an emergency.

Federal interest in timber resources (estimated value, $1,250,000; annual gross yield, $75,000) and returns from mining operations (ilmenite and titanium ore) are to be protected by agreement with the Florida Armory Board which will manage the properties.

Camp Blanding was an infantry replacement training center in World War II. Land and buildings cost the Government over $43 million. Since then additional millions have gone into railhead spurs and other troop supporting facilities. Public Law 492 is intended to keep the plant ready for fresh use in event of war necessity with the cost of maintenance shifted on the Armory Board of Florida.

PUBLIC LAW 494

H. R. 6412, dental outpatient care: In the 81st Congress I appealed to the House to pass over a Presidential veto a bill granting outpatient care to aging veterans of the Spanish-American War. I was deeply moved by the almost unanimous vote of my colleagues.

In June of 1953 when the independent offices appropriation bill was before the House I raised the question that a rider to that bill would completely wipe out the 1950 act as far as dental care was concerned. I also pointed out that it would deny needed dental care to certain Korean veterans. Assurance was given that such was not the intention. Nevertheless, after the enactment of the 1953 act with the rider to which I objected the Veterans' Administration did bar these Spanish War and Korean veterans from dental care.

Public Law 494 puts VA back on the track. It specifically states these veterans are not subject to the "outpatient care" limitations of the 1953 rider.

PUBLIC LAW 495

S. 1999, deceased members of uniformed services: This is a codification and broadening of the laws governing the disposition of the remains of deceased members of the armed services. A new feature is provision for transportation of remains of dependents and of civilian employees dying overseas.

PUBLIC LAW 496

S. 2370, sale of ships to Brazil: Under Public Law 496 the United States will sell 12 small vessels (5,000 tons) to Brazil or citizens of Brazil exclusively for coastwise trade in Brazilian waters. Purposes: (1) to contribute to the economic development of a friendly nation, (2) to serve the foreign policy of the United States, (3) to advance hemispheric solidarity, and (4) to realize some $700,000 (half of construction cost) from the sale of vessels for which we have no use and for which there is no available market.

PUBLIC LAW 497

S. 2726, collection of overpayments: It happens that sometimes overpayments are made both to civilian Federal employees and personnel in the armed services. Public Law 497 is intended to expedite collection of such erroneous payments by authorizing withholdings from current pay in amounts not exceeding two-thirds of the paycheck. Dissatisfied employees may appeal to GAO or the Court of Claims.

Here is a question asked in debate:

"If a man in military service is divorced and payments are erroneously continued to his former wife while he has made his mother the beneficiary must he make double payment?"

The answer was:

"No; under existing opinions of the Judge Advocate General recoupment cannot be made when the individual received no payment."

PUBLIC LAW 498

H. R. 2683, public works in Alaska: Of $70 million authorized in the Alaska Public Works Act (expiring in 1955) only $41 million has been appropriated. Public Law 498 extends the act into 1959 in order meanwhile to clear the way for appropriations of the remaining $29 million when and if Congress decides. Ultimately it is expected the Alaskan program for water, sewers, streets, schools, and health centers will be resumed. For the present economy has it down for the 10 count.

PUBLIC LAW 499

H. R. 222, duty on bauxite: Bauxite is converted into aluminum. Prior to World War II domestic production was 370,000 tons a year, imports 494,000 tons. Now we annually produce in the United States 1.5 million tons, import 5 million tons. Reasons for the greatly increased demand: Use of aluminum in airplane and other manufacturing industries, requirement in our national-defense program. Public Law 499 suspends for 2 years duty on crude and calcined bauxite to (1) help our own industries, and (2) help along "trade not aid" in a field where our own production needs foreign contribution.

Section 2 of Public Law 499 excludes from duty 24 bells imported for addition to the carillon at the Citadel, famed college at Charleston, S. C.

PUBLIC LAW 500

H. R. 8538, drug addicts at sea: You will find this of interest. Narcotic addicts and traffickers have had fairly easy sailing on ships at sea because they could not be proceeded against for narcotic offenses ashore. The danger has increased alarmingly with the growth of the drug habit.

Public Law 500 authorizes the Coast Guard to deny seamans documents and to revoke existing documents in the case of persons convicted of violation of the narcotic drug laws or known to be addicts. It is probable the Coast Guard will call upon the Public Health Service to make the necessary medical examinations with respect to the seaman's use of or addiction to narcotic drugs.

PUBLIC LAW 501

H. R. 9008, soldier's saving program: Enlisted personnel (numbering 460,213) of the armed services have $73 million on deposit under the soldier's saving program. Public Law 501 further encourages thrift by providing (1) 4 percent interest on deposits, (2) exemption from debts including those to the Government and those resulting from court-martial, and (3) the right to withdraw deposits at any time of personal emergency instead only at time of final discharge.

PUBLIC LAW 502

H. R. 956, correction of typographical errors: Because there were two small typographical errors in Public Law 368, discovered after its signature by the President, Congress had to enact another public law to make "officers" read "office" and "forces" read "force."

PUBLIC LAW 503

Senate Joint Resolution 165, Missouri River Basin: This merely authorizes the inclusion of the Glendo, Wyo., project as part of the planning for development of the water resources of the Missouri River Basin under the Flood Control Act of 1944. The Glendo project, which includes a reservoir and power plant, will cost over $50 million when and if undertaken. It was stressed in debate that Public Law 503 is neither an authorization nor an appropriation.

PUBLIC LAW 504

House Joint Resolution 459, Lake Texarkana: Sole purpose of this act is to give a name to the body of water behind the Texarkana Dam and Reservoir, now under construction 9 miles distant from Texarkana, Tex. Public Law 504 decrees it shall be known as Lake Texarkana. Fair enough since the local folks want it. The proud name of Texarkana now will be shared by a city, a dam, and a lake.

PUBLIC LAW 505

H. R. 4496, site for a Maryland school: Schools in Prince Georges County, Md., adjoining Washington, are running double shift because of burden of caring for 12,000 children of Federal employees. Public Law 505 helps out by making available land for a new school site. The board of education is to pay full market value for the property.

PUBLIC LAW 506

S. 3539, reenlistment bonuses: Rapid falling off of reenlistments in the armed services is causing concern. Hence Public Law 506 which boosts reenlistment bonuses to a maximum of $2,000. Instead of the old flat scale the bonus will be computed according to pay grade and number of years for which reenlistee signs up.

PUBLIC LAW 507

S. 1796, Board for Fundamental Education: In recognition of its achievements in the half century since its founding as a mission house for Negroes in Indianapolis, Public Law 507 grants a Federal charter to the Board for Fundamental Education, a nonprofit organization of national scope, nonsectarian, nonracial, and supported by private funds. Flanner House in Indianapolis is the board's headquarters and center of its urban program, Jarvis Christian College in Hawkins, Tex., the center of its rural program.

PUBLIC LAW 508

S. 2468, generals of the Army: Effect of Public Law 508 is to promote to the grade of 4-star general (general of the army) 9 retired 3-star generals (lieutenant generals) who in World War II commanded an army, a field army with supporting units or comparable forces in the Pacific theater. Three of the promotions are posthumous: McNair, killed in action July 27, 1944; Buckner, killed in action June 18, 1945; Patch, deceased. Others are: Lear, Simpson, Truscott, Eichelberger, Gerow, and Richardson.

Promotions will not affect retirement pay as no retired officer receives pay greater than that of a major general.

PUBLIC LAW 509

H. R. 6422, Camp Drum in New York: In wartime confusion surveys of land acquired for the Pine Camp Military Reservation (now Camp Drum) were not too accurate. Public Law 509 authorizes necessary correction of land conveyances.

PUBLIC LAW 510

H. R. 7132, Veterans of Foreign Wars: Veterans of Foreign Wars owns a small bit of land in the District of Columbia on which it has been paying a tax of some $700. Public Law 510 exempts the land from tax payment. American Legion, Disabled American Veterans, American Veterans of World War II benefit from similar legislation.

Communist Ties of Guatemala's Former President Arbenz

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES J. KERSTEN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 16, 1954

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, August 15, I spoke in Milwaukee at the annual convention of the Wisconsin Retail Food Dealers Association. I would like to call the attention of the House to some of the facts which I disclosed on that occasion:

A few weeks ago I was in a Communist book store in the Soviet section of Berlin, Germany. The literature there described the glories of life under communism.

Some college professors and misguided liberals in our own country look forward to the day when the Communists will take over, when there will be a new Utopia.

The golden promises of communism have deceived many in every country of the world.

But the thing that I want to talk to you about today is the violent contrast between the golden promises of Communist life with the reality of what it really means to live under the Reds. First I want to talk to you for a few minutes about life under the Reds behind the Iron Curtain in Europe, then I want to say something about the recent example of life under the Reds in Central America—in Guatemala.

Our Committee on Communist Aggression has taken the first-hand testimony of over 160 witnesses who escaped through the barbed wires of the Iron Curtain in Europe. In addition, we have received hundreds of sworn statements and pieces of documentary evidence that tell the true facts of what it means to live under Red domination there. We heard stories from Poles, Hungarians, Rumanians, Estonians, Latvians, Lithuanians, Ukrainians, Byelorussians, Germans, Czechs, Slovaks, and Russians. Sworn statements were received from Armenians, Georgians, Azerbaijans, North Caucasians, Cossacks, Idel-Uralians, and Turkestanians.

The cross-section of witnesses included members of former ruling royal houses as well as ordinary workers and peasants; internationally known generals, political leaders, and soldiers; members of the formerly free parliaments and governments, clergymen of all denominations, heads of great institutions of learning, teachers and students, businessmen, labor leaders, seamen, and housewives; intellectuals and even children.

They were people who escaped from their Communist-controlled homelands just a few months ago, as well as those who escaped during and after World War II.

Barbed wires, mined fields, machineguns, savage dogs, and ruthless frontier guards have not been able to shut the door of freedom to those who chose escape to the West.

All who testified had one thing in common; they were eyewitnesses. They saw. They experienced. They were there. Most of them suffered the tortures of communism. They came separately from the different nations enslaved by communism but with fundamentally the same story: the antihuman nature of real life under communism.

The basic conclusions from their cumulative testimony under oath cannot be questioned. It was a tragic parade of witnesses—people from another world. A dreadful world of mass murder, slave labor camps, the ever-present secret police, and hatred, hatred beyond the comprehension of us Americans.

But somehow the stories of mass murders, tortures, and concentration camps, when they are on another continent, do not make too much of an impression on us Americans. We think that the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans protect us from these terrors. We do not worry too much about them.

What we fail to realize is that these oceans do not protect us today as they protected us a few years ago.

Ruthless tyrants of years ago could extend their tyranny over only a small area.

But today the same tyrants that can send innocent people to mass graves might, in a short time, be able to send a hydrogen bomb on a guided missile across the ocean.

It may be providential for us in the United States therefore that an examle of Communist occupation has recently been exposed in Central America. This is closer to us. This we can understand.

I want to talk therefore, about a phase of Communist aggression which has been pretty much overlooked by the United States press and public, and which for a long while, was even ignored by our Government. It is a subject on which I intend to have quite a bit to say, in the near future, for I believe it may have as much of a vital effect on our national interests, in the long run, as events in Europe and Asia, five or ten thousand miles away.

This Communist aggression is right next door to us, in the Western Hemisphere.

Insofar as our national security is immediately concerned, the most ominous gain made by the Red conspiracy since the end of World War II, was their political conquest of the small Central American Republic of Guatemala, just a few hours flight from our major southern cities, and only minutes by plane from the Panama Canal.

Also, from the standpoint of our national security, the most serious setback the Communists have yet suffered, was when the forces of Col. Carlos Castillo Armas liberated Guatemala from the control of the Kremlin, in the revolution last June.

We in the United States have only the vaguest concept of the true importance of the revolution led by Colonel Castillo. It marked the first time in the history of the Communist conspiracy, with the exception of the Spanish revolution 15 years ago, that a nation has broken free from the shackles of communism after it had been firmly secured.

And, ladies and gentlemen, I assure you that on June 19, when Castillo launched his historic uprising, every branch of the Guatemalan government, including the presidency, was firmly in the grip of the shackles of the Kremlin.

A few weeks before the revolution, I authorized a member of our committee to look into reports that Communists had infiltrated the Government of Guatemala, and were conspiring against the established governments of neighboring Central American Republics. At my request, Representative Patrick J. Hillings visited several countries of Central America, including Guatemala, and conferred with our Ambassadors and other informed sources. He was accompanied by a staff assistant and a committee consultant, a Washington newspaperman who has made an intensive study of political conditions in Central America.

The following were some of the findings of the staff members who made the study:

"The government of President Jacobo Arbenz, of Guatemala, was not merely Communist influenced, as it was often described. For all practical purposes it was Moscow directed and Moscow controlled.

"The control of Guatemala by the Communists under the regime of President Arbenz was the direct result of flagrant and continuing intervention in the affairs of that republic, by a nonhemispheric power, the Soviet Union. He became the tool of the Kremlin.

"The government of President Arbenz, acting in accord with the Soviet Union, has been actively and continuously intervening in the affairs of neighboring Central American and Caribbean Republics.

There is evidence that the attempt to assassinate President Somoza of neighboring Nicaragua and a government-crippling strike in Honduras last April and May were linked in a Communist plot, engineered in Guatemala, to seize control of all Central America. To me the significance of this preliminary study is the fact that, wherever it gains a foothold, whether Europe, Asia, or Latin America, communism tends to spread like the political cancer that it is, and imperil the freedom of neighboring countries.

In our intensive study of Communist aggression in other areas, our committee has unearthed an amazing array of curious facts. To me the most curious fact of all is the ability of the Communists to continually delude so many well-meaning people, by the simple guise of sailing under false colors. In recent weeks there has been an alarming tendency on the part of certain self-styled liberals, to dismiss the overthrow of the Communist regime in Guatemala, as simply another "banana" revolution, engineered doubtlessly by the United Fruit Co. There is an even more alarming tendency by a few writers, to paint the Arbenz government as a basically liberal movement, that had somehow strayed just a little bit left of center.

Nothing could be further from the truth. Today, I am able to release for the first time, to the American press, excerpts from a few of the documents which were found in the files of former President Arbenz; documents which he apparently did not have time to dstroy in his hasty flight of a few weeks ago to asylum in the Mexican Embassy.

These documents left among the personal effects of Arbenz includes:

1. A report by the secretary general of the Communist Party of Guatemala, to the Central Committee of the party. The report is inscribed "to the young and exemplary president of Guatemala, Jacobo Arbenz, with deep-felt affection of his friend—Jose Manuel Fortuny." Remember, Fortuny was the known secretary general of the Communist Party in Guatemala.

2. An edition of Mao Tse-tung's writings, presented to Arbenz by a prominent woman Communist. The book is specially bound, with Arbenz' name stamped in gold on the cover.

3. A note to Arbenz from a prominent Communist, transmitting an unidentified "memento of the Soviet Union."

4. A biography of Stalin that had been presented to Senora Arbenz, by a prominent woman Communist, with the inscription "the lofty example of the great should inspire us with enthusiasm." (I might interpolate here, that the Guatemalan Congress observed a moment of silence, as a tribute to Stalin, when the news of his death was announced.)

5. The original of a secret Communist Party document addressed to Fortuny, the Guatemalan secretary general of the party, by a functionary, found in the office of Mrs. Arbenz in the palace.

6. A series of questions submitted by a group of army officers to Arbenz, regarding the Communist Party's links with the Government, and the answers of Arbenz.

This last document gives a good insight into the political philosophy of Arbenz, himself. Let me just quote a couple of the questions and Arbenz' answers.

The officers asked the President whether it would not be advisable to dismiss Communists from various posts in the Government and teaching profession. Arbenz insisted there were only a few officials in his Government who were Communists and that they were perfectly O. K., and then went on to add, and I quote:

"In the teaching professions there can be as many (Communists) as they like, because neither the regulations thereof nor academic freedom permit discrimination on that basis."

I want to digress for a moment and tell you what the evidence we procured showed was the general teaching of schoolchildren under the Arbenz regime:

The PRG (Communist Party) paid special attention to the field of education and completely dominated the Ministry of Public Education to the extent of firing, hiring, and admonishing teachers as it pleased. The Escuela Normal (teachers' college) is a Marxist training center which sends teachers into the various educational institutions of the Republic: Their mission is to initiate subverse activities and organize Communist cells even among children of tender age, whom they teach popular songs of pro-Russian content, such as the Third Internationale. The children are taught that respect of and obedience to their parents is a thing of the past, and that today, under the "New Order" established in the people's democracies, the children are more fortunate because there are neither moral nor religious prejudices to prevent them from developing freely; that they owe no thanks to their parents for having them brought into the world, as they were conceived in a moment of selfish pleasure, that God and divine providence are terms employed by the religious for the purpose of putting the world in chains, for depriving the people of the real pleasures of life. That one's motherland (patriotism) is not the place where we were born and live among those who love us, because (national) frontiers were created by the capitalists and exploiters of the poor, that we are citizens of the proletarian world and that consequently there is no such thing as a motherland (patriotism); and that we owe obedience only to the liberator from world misery: The great Soviet Russia.

The army asked (in the questions found in Arbenz' effects):

"Could not the Government * * * prohibit groups and individuals from intervening in the affairs of other countries?"

Arbenz, in his revealing reply (and this was after the attempted coup on Honduras and Nicaragua), stated, and I quote:

"It is impossible and improper to violate constitutional guaranties in this sense."

The army also questioned Arbenz as to whether he would condemn the statement of a Communist member of congress, Montenegro Paniagua, who had publicly stated that if a revolution were launched by Castillo, the Government would, and I quote: "order the heads blown off of all anti-Communists."

Arbenz, in his reply, said:

"The second thing is to consider whether, if we are invaded, we should leave the internal enemies dedicated to their sabotage activities."

In this reply, Arbenz, as he had on several previous occasions, identified all anti-Communists as internal enemies.

To me these three answers, defending the right of Guatemalan Communists to intervene in the affairs of other countries; surrendering to them the country's teaching profession; and denouncing anti-Communists as internal enemies, cannot be interpreted as the words of a misguided liberal or leftist. They are the words of a servant of Moscow. And when read in the light of other documents and books found in Arbenz' personal effects, it is obvious that they are the words of a willing and knowing servant of Moscow.

Our committee also has evidence that when the army officers were discussing these questions about Communist domination of Guatemala with Arbenz last June, the three top Communists in the country—Arbenz' friends—Fortuny, Pellecer, and Flores, were in the next rooms.

Another interesting document we have found among Arbenz' effects is a letter from the head of his secret police containing the suggestion that the visas of all anti-Communists who attended the recent convention in Mexico City on May 31, this year, be canceled to keep them from coming home.

The staff of our committee is now in the process of obtaining evidence of the tortures and terrorism as brutal and savage as any employed in the Iron Curtain countries, or the Soviet Union itself. One of the major tasks of the Committee on Communist Aggression, in the coming months, will be to inform Congress and the public on the true nature of the Communist conspiracy in the Western Hemisphere, of the alarming inroads it has made, and of the threat it contains to the security, not only of the United States, but every nation in Latin America as well.

We have much more documentary evidence showing President Arbenz was the agent of the Kremlin in Guatemala.

In addition we have a great deal of evidence showing the numerous trips of Guatemalan officials from Central America to countries behind the Iron Curtain where they received their instructions.

Until early this year only one airline operated between Europe and Guatemala. But about 8 months ago the traffic became so heavy that another airline providing service between Guatemala and Europe was put in operation. Many of the Communist Party members, students, labor leaders, traveled back and forth from Guatemala to points behind the Iron Curtain to attend various rallies and conferences. Payments for most of this travel was made by drafts out of Communist Czechoslovakia. In the last 6 years 75 Czechs have gone to Guatemala. It is estimated that in one 12-month period, approximately 150 government leaders, Communist Party members traveled to Iron Curtain countries from Guatemala.

Only the sheerest of good luck avoided a disaster of the gravest sort in Central America last April. Only the courage of Castillo Armas and his small group of followers wrested from the Kremlin the foothold they had secured in Central America. But we can no longer afford to sit by, complacently, and rely on good luck and the courage of others. We have neglected our relations with our friends in Latin America far too long for our own safety, as well as for theirs. The Communist threat is global and not only are events overseas of concern to us. We must also take a good look at what is happening here in our own hemisphere—in our own front yard.

This country does not intend in any way—and certainly our committee does not intend—to intervene in the affairs of other American nations. But we should also see to it that nobody else intervenes in their affairs, particularly the Soviet Union.

But, why, you may ask is it so vital that we prevent the Soviet Union from getting a strangle hold on Central America. Is it just that we don't want a Communist economy so close to us? It is more than that. It is because whenever the Iron Curtain clamps down on any country the Reds show their true nature.

They are devils unmasked when they are behind the Curtain. Then it is that they single out the possible leaders of any opposition and torture them sadistically before they murder their victims and throw them into mass graves. I have here some photos taken of a few of the 500 bodies already found, with evidence of torture too horrible to relate or show to the public. The same satanic activity that is occurring in Poland, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Soviet Russia, China, and everywhere the Reds come to power.

The facts of life behind the Iron Curtain are in violent contrast to the Communist propaganda about a desire for peaceful coexistence.

The peaceful coexistence line is only to give them time to kill off millions of opposition in their own countries and make ready for further aggression.

The most recent example of the Red idea of peaceful coexistence is the Red murders in Vietnam after all their sweet talk of peace at Geneva and only yesterday the raging hate against the United States snarled out by the criminal Chou En-lai, when he said: "We vow to take Formosa and then intend to live in peaceful coexistence with the rest of the world."

I want to read for you the unanimous recommendations of the House Committee on Communist Aggression, after listening to the facts about what they are doing to all people except the evil and malicious.

Here are our recommendations made 6 days ago to Congress:

"RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE HOUSE SELECT COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE COMMUNIST AGGRESSION

"1. That the President of the United States take the initiative in convening an international conference of all free non-Communist nations for the following purposes:

"(a) To express formal recognition of the fact that the Communist governments, which now control over 800 million human beings, are not representative of the will of the people.

"(b) To seek agreement whereby the free non-Communist nations acting in concert will withdraw diplomatic recognition from all Moscow-controlled Communist governments.

"(c) To reaffirm the friendship and solidarity of the people of the free world with the people and nations enslaved by communism.

"(d) To develop a program for the rapid and complete termination of all commercial treaties and trade with Communist governments and the initiation of a program of trade among all non-Communist nations which will strengthen the security of the free world.

"(e) To develop an overall, dynamic program for the defeat of the international Communist conspiracy.

"2. That the President immediately establish the national military units authorized under section 101 (a) (1) of the Mutual Security Act of 1951, as amended. Such national military units will demonstrate by deed to the millions of people held captive within the Communist empire that we are firmly allied with them in their hopes and struggles to attain freedom and national independence. This includes large numbers of men conscripted into the Red army and other military establishments under Communist control.

"3. That Congress enact H. R. 8000, known as the Political Asylum Act of 1954, to provide for the effective reestablishment of selected escapees in the free world.

"4. That peaceful coexistence be clearly identified as a Communist myth. It should be rejected on the grounds that it is impossible for a civilization based on a belief in Almighty God, to coexist with an aggressive criminal conspiracy dedicated to the destruction of civilization and the enslavement of all mankind.

"5. That an International Juridical Commission be established within the framework of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization so that Communist crimes perpetrated against humanity be fully recorded, and officially noted for prosecution.

"6. That this report and the record of testimony be transmitted to the United States Ambassador to the United Nations with the request that they be made available to the delegates of the other member nations so that the world may see the incriminating evidence against the international conspirators who seek to destroy nations and individuals, religion and education, free labor, free enterprise, free speech, free press, and freedom itself."

These are the answers to Red lies. Life under the Reds as it was in Guatemala City only last June and as it is today in Moscow.

To Restrain the Unrestrained

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 16, 1954

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, former President Hoover last week, in his speech at West Branch, Iowa, included several significant observations with respect to the great latitude of secret executive agreements, which has prompted an excellent editorial in the August 12 issue of the Wall Street Journal.

This editorial is entitled "To Restrain the Unrestrained." I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

To Restrain the Unrestrained

In the course of his 80th birthday speech at West Branch, Iowa, Mr. Herbert Hoover spoke of the "grievous list" of secret executive agreements in foreign affairs. He concluded: "We must make such misuse of power forever impossible."

Executive agreements, Mr. Hoover said, had spread communism over the earth, turned over the Baltic States to Soviet Russia, partitioned Poland at the Teheran Conference, surrendered 10 nations to slavery at Yalta and set in motion the communization of Mongolia, North Korea, and all China. One result of these "unrestrained Presidential actions" is a worldwide shrinking of human freedoms. Another has been a steady encroachment on powers of the legislative branch by the executive.

"The real issue is whether the President, through declaration or implication or by appeasement or by acquiescence, or by joint statements with foreign officials can commit the American people to foreign nations without the specific consent of the elected representatives of the people."

Indeed, the President can so commit the Nation. The Supreme Court decided, in *United States* v. *Pink*, that an executive agreement had the status of a treaty. The case arose from an exchange of letters between President Roosevelt and Mr. Litvinov, and the High Court held that the correspondence overrode a law of New York State. Many students of constitutional law agree that the ruling transgressed also the property guaranties contained in the fifth amendment.

The question, therefore, is not whether the President can commit the American people in the ways Mr. Hoover described, but whether any President ought to have the power to do so.

In the early months of this year, there was a great debate in the Senate about unrestrained powers of treaties and executive agreements. The Bricker amendment to the Constitution went before the Senate with more than 60 signatures. Those who favored no restraint on treaties and executive agreements aimed their guns at the language in Mr. Bricker's draft and went so far as to say that it would result in "48 State Departments, one for every State in the Union," and that it would completely tie the President's hands in the conduct of foreign affairs. Finally the Senate substituted Senator George's amendment, and in the end 60 Senators voted for it. They lost by one vote.

The issue was not settled then, and indeed the necessity for spelling out the areas in which executive agreements and treaties should be operative received impetus in April of this year when Prime Minister Churchill disclosed for the first time to the House of Commons—and incidentally to the American Congress—that a secret agreement had been entered into with President Roosevelt concerning atomic weapons; we agreed not to use them without Britain's consent. And even though the passage of the McMahon Atomic Energy Act was said by the White House to have canceled the agreement, former President Truman said he believed it was still in effect.

Mr. Truman also said some other things which bear out what Mr. Hoover had to say the other day. "There was no secret about it to the people who were entitled to know about it," Mr. Truman said.

Yet this secret agreement gave to another government—however friendly and stanch an ally—a veto power over the use of weapons at the heart of our military and foreign policies. Were not the people entitled to know of this, and should not such a decision have been made only after the consent of the Congress? We think so.

A few days before Mr. Hoover's speech another amendment to the Constitution to restrain the powers of treaty and executive agreements was introduced by Mr. Bricker. It may be that his version is not the exact one the Congress will want. But it includes the sensible restraints contained in the earlier Bricker and George proposals: That no treaty or international agreement which conflicts with the Constitution shall be effective.

Such a constitutional amendment might not make forever impossible the misuse of power Mr. Hoover talked about, but it will close some dangerous loopholes and do much to restrain the unrestrained.

The Late Vito Marcantonio

SPEECH

OF

CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1954

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Our late colleague Vito Marcantonio, came to the House about the same time that it was my privilege to begin my service here. On his passing, those whose policies and beliefs were as his lost an able, vigorous and effective advocate.

He not only knew the parliamentary procedure which governed the House, but he never lacked the courage to use that knowledge to further the legislative program to which he adhered.

He was so far to the left that I could not go along with his views. Perhaps I was too far to the right. However that may be, no Member of the House, so far as I know, ever doubted his sincerity, ever failed to recognize his ability or his effectiveness.

In this country of ours, under our form of government, every citizen, as well as every Member of Congress, has a right to his own opinion as long as he stays within the letter and the spirit of the law. It has always been my firm conviction that we should be tolerant in our judgment of others, that no man should be condemned because of what he believes as long as he is sincere, entertains honest convictions. Equally true is it that no man is required to accept or to follow the views of another. Our colleague served the people of his district vigorously, consistently, and sincerely.

Ironmaster of North America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 16, 1954

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, the August 1, 1954, issue of the Washington Post and Times Herald contained a very interesting article written by Tris Coffin, distinguished author and radio commentator, about Cyrus Eaton, the ironmaster of North America. As Mr. Coffin so ably describes him, Mr. Eaton is an "evangelist for a venturesome free-enterprise system of economy." I commend this article to my colleagues and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

IRONMASTER OF NORTH AMERICA ONCE WAS POOR DIVINITY STUDENT

(By Tris Coffin)

A multimillionaire philosopher, who argues the Greek classics with John L. Lewis, is the hero of a new epic of America. Thanks in good part to his daring, the West has the iron to build a great new peaceful world, or to defend itself from any attack.

He is courtly Cyrus Eaton, at 70 an evangelist for a venturesome free-enterprise system of economy.

Eaton is 1 of the 20 wealthiest men of America, chairman of the board of a great railroad serving Washington, the Chesapeake & Ohio, a bold financier who trounced Wall Street in a series of major wars, and recently was hailed as "the iron master of North America" by the London Daily Mail.

Eaton, whose main base is Cleveland, controls the largest reserves of high-quality iron ore on this continent, an estimated 2 billion tons in southern Canada.

The epic in which Cyrus Eaton plays such a leading role is a dramatic search for ores in the wilderness of Canada. Without these ores, America could fade in power and glory like ancient Babylon, within this century.

Eaton led the way with typical boldness in 1942. Under the drain of war orders, the supply of iron ore of the famous Mesabi Range in Minnesota began running low. Eaton raised $40 million to examine a highly speculative find across the border in Ontario.

To conservative business interests, this was a sheer gamble. The area was an isolated hunter's paradise. The nearest town was an Indian village of Atikokan, population 300. The temperature sank to a frigid 50 degrees below zero, with winds howling down from the North Pole. To make matters worse, the ore lay at the bottom of a 50-foot deep lake. The lake, Steep Rock, was 15 miles long and four miles wide and surrounded by moose pasture.

Many engineers declared the ore could not be removed economically. Eaton answered he would drain the lake. He spent millions on a tunnel bored upward through solid rock for 2,000 feet to the center of the lake. Still the pessimists argued that the tunnel, instead of draining water, would become clogged with rocks.

When the borers were within 20 feet of the lake bed, they planted dynamite time fuses and ran. Eaton later confessed this was one of the most trying moments of his crowded life. First there was a deep rumble, then a cloud of smoke shot up with a wild whoosh. Boulders catapaulted high in the air, and the water in a raging, bubbling roar began coursing through the tunnel.

Today Steep Rock has more than fulfilled his hopes.

Eaton also controls another great iron field on the tip of the rugged Ungava Peninsula in far northern Quebec Province. He speaks of it in his gentle, precise voice with the enthusiasm of a young prospector:

"You can walk for 110 miles on surface iron ore there. There is plenty of hydroelectric power from rivers flowing into the channel to Hudson Bay. And the deep-sea harbors are open half the year."

With these two immense iron ore properties, Eaton sees the United States as a customer for Steep Rock, with Europe buying Ungava ore. He expresses his faith in the future:

"Iron ore is the basic material of iron and steel, and hence the foundation of modern industry. The steel-making furnaces of the United States alone consume about 130 million net tons of iron ore a year, and the demand is likely to go higher.

"England urgently needs iron ore, as do Holland, Belgium, and France. There will be a world market, provided the costs of production and transportation can compete with new ore sources in South America, Africa, and Asia."

Eaton's view of those who fail to share his high hopes is the scorn of the bold fighter for the timid soldier. He told the Empire Club in Toronto:

"Canada is held back by the excessive caution of her banks, railroads, and utilities and by her Federal and Provincial Governments, especially in their approach to electric power development and highway construction. Now is the time for her big institutions to abandon the penurious and unprogressive policies of a contracting economy, and embark on a bold and courageous course of expansion to bring the economic status of every Canadian to the highest in the world."

Cyrus Eaton is a colorful, manysided personality. A British reporter who met him last winter described him as "the tycoon who looks like a cardinal." His clear blue eyes regard the world with a disarming tolerance. He has snowy white hair and the trim figure of an athlete.

He skis with his grandchildren, rides horseback regularly. He enjoys camping out at his mining sites, even in the bitter cold, and he regards the practice of lolling on Florida sands in the winter as effete. He neither smokes nor drinks.

Eaton dresses quietly in conservative dark colors, and speaks softly. His manners have the charm of an Old World aristocrat. He works with a planned intensity 12 to 14 hours a day and travels thousands of miles a year from Cleveland to New York and Washington, into Canada, and across the Atlantic to buy prize Shorthorn cattle in Scotland.

One side of the Eaton personality is the scholar. Some time ago, one of his sons-in-law, Lyman Butterfield, director of the Museum of Early History at Williamsburg, met Eaton at the railroad station. The younger man had not known the financier-industrialist long and half expected a dry old gentleman clutching a New York Journal of Commerce.

Instead, he found a witty individual who had read on the train a volume of psychologcal tragedies in the Greek style by the 17th-century French poet, Jean Baptiste Racine. Eaton and his good friend, John L. Lewis, also a classical scholar, have a great time trying to catch one another on the fine points of minor Roman orators.

The happiest moments he can recall were during the summer of 1949 when he was host to delegates of the Association of Universities of the British Commonwealth at his summer home in Nova Scotia.

Eaton is a trustee of the University of Chicago, Denison University, and Case Institute of Technology, a founder of the Cleveland Museum of Natural History, and an elector of the Hall of Fame. He has written vigorous articles on philosophy and progressive finance. He was a director of the Cleveland Metropolitan Park Board for a decade.

Another side of Eaton is as the astute master of finance, who plans his attacks with all the logic and skill of a Napoleon. At 27, he had risen from the status of a poor ministerial student to that of a utility baron with a $3,500,000 fortune.

He has been one of the great powers in utilities, steel, and rubber, and in 1930 he broke Wall Street's grip on railroad financing. He has been for some time the largest individual stockholder of the Chesapeake & Ohio Railway Co., and early this year he became Chesapeake & Ohio's board chairman.

In addition, Eaton is chairman and president of the Portsmouth Steel Corp., chairman of Steep Rock Iron Mines, Ltd., chairman of West Kentucky Coal Co., one of the country's largest independent coal operators, and director of the Sherwin-Williams Co. and the Cleveland Cliffs Iron Co.

A third side is Cyrus Eaton, the enthusiastic farmer and raiser of registered Scotch shorthorn cattle at 3,000-acre Deep Cove Farms in Nova Scotia and 870-acre Acadia Farms at Northfield, Ohio. This fits into his master plan for transforming his native Nova Scotia into a great beef cattle ranch, and thus raising its income level.

The idea of improving Nova Scotia arises from his childhood. Eaton was the son of a small farmer and general-store keeper in the quiet village of Pugwash. He left there to study for the ministry in the footsteps of his distinguished uncle, the late United States Representative Charles Eaton, one-time chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee. Representative Eaton was almost as an older brother to Cyrus.

At 17, the younger Eaton visited his uncle, then pastor of the fashionable Euclid Avenue Baptist Church in Cleveland. The two were summoned to a command performance dinner by the parish's most famous member, John D. Rockefeller, Sr., There, from the older man, the boy learned a new philosophy—that human progress and happiness could be rapidly advanced by dynamic free enterprise.

He believes that just as insistently today. He has remarked: "Functioning properly, capitalism can produce more of the good things of this world than any other system. And the life of the mind and the spirit will flourish if there is material progress in nations which combine capitalist economics with political democracy."

There is no room in the Eaton philosophy for labor-baiters or stuffed-shirt capitalists. He believes in employee ownership and backed his belief with a $7,600,000 loan to the 850 employees of the Cincinnati Enquirer, so they could purchase that newspaper.

His first statement as board chairman of the C. & O. was to tell the workers: "I should like to see all of the 40,000 become stockholders, so they would achieve the same enthusiastic participation that is carrying the employee-owned Cincinnati Enquirer to new peaks of success."

The stuffed-shirt capitalist, to Eaton, is the bane of modern American society. He firmly believes the caution and lack of imagination of reactionary businessmen have forced the Government to take an increasing role in the economic life of America.

Today, at the median point of another great career, as the iron master of North America, Cyrus Eaton sits serenely in his skyscraper office overlooking Lake Erie. There, he watches the big ore ships moving in with Steep Rock ore for his Cleveland-Cliffs Iron Co., and dreams of an ever expanding economy with a better life for all.

Occasionally, when asked for the root of the philosophy that has taken him so far, Eaton will gently quote Spinoza, "No regrets, no fears."

Reds Hope To Rule Sports, Too

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 16, 1954

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, as a further illustration of the machinations of the Red conspiracy, I would direct my colleagues' attention to an article entitled "Reds Hope To Rule Sports, Too," appearing in this week's issue of U. S. News & World Report. I therefore ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to the printed in the Record, as follows:

Reds Hope To Rule Sports Too—12 Million Athletes in Training To Beat the West

Soviet Russia is pushing a worldwide sports offensive with a calculated goal: Victory over everybody—but most of all over the United States—in the 1956 Olympic games at Melbourne.

Month by month since the start of the year, Russian athletes have been bursting out of the Iron Curtain, trained to the ears. Time after time they've been beating the other fellow at his own games, on his own grounds.

They've licked the British at crew racing, the Canadians at ice hockey, the Scandinavians at skiing.

The grand design is clear: A prolonged display of power and propaganda, building up to a climax in Australia 2 years hence.

First big payoffs already are in. The Russian victories are spectacular and genuine.

In Japan, last January, the Soviets swept the world skating championships. Their top star, Boris Shilkov, won the speed-skating title in a blinding snowstorm.

In February, Russian skiers invaded a big international meet in Sweden. Both Soviet men and women took important firsts from the Scandinavians, who are considered the world's foremost skiers.

In March, again in Sweden, a Russian ice-hockey team licked the Canadians, supposedly the best anywhere at the game.

Down in Italy, in May, a Soviet basketball team ran away with the European cup. And, in July, Russian gymnasts took 10 out of 14 medals in world championships in Rome.

In France, the Soviets appeared with a team of 5 parachutists (3 men and 2 women) and easily captured the world's parachute-jumping contest. The French were staggering to hear that 800,000 Soviet youths belong to 1,300 parachute clubs.

Biggest upset to tradition, however, came at the Henley Regatta, famed British rowing classic.

A 33-man Red team turned up 3 weeks early for intensive training. They took home 3 out of 5 prizes, including the big one. The Times, of London, confessed: "We have suffered reverses in the past, but never quite so complete."

How do they do it? In Russia, sports is a big, grim, production-line business, run from grade school to Olympic track by that supercoach, the state.

At the apex of an immensely complicated training setup is the All-Union Committee on Physical Culture and Sports. It has the status of a Cabinet ministry. It controls the activities of 12 million competing athletes in the Soviet Union.

The athletes themselves are organized into clubs, and affiliated with factories, collective farms, schools, army and navy units, even the secret police. The clubs are supervised by All-Union Committee federations for each sport.

Invitations to competitions outside Russia are accepted or rejected by the All-Union federations; in other words, by the boys upstairs.

Actually, training and selection of individual athletes begin in grade school. At the age of 12, the sturdiest specimens are handpicked for 400 chilren's sports schools.

At the age of 17, the best graduates of the children's sports schools go to youth sports schools, which are really athletic colleges. The colleges turn out star athletes and coaches.

Jobs for athletes are easy. Stars in any sport get well-paid positions in factories, stores, etc., but they spend all their time working at their sports specialties.

In the winter they often are shipped off to resorts in Southern Russia so their training will not be interrupted.

Early last spring, a Frenchman who visited the Russian Black Sea resort of Sochi was surprised to find many Soviet athletes on the beach. He learned they were on vacation from their jobs in Moscow, training already for the August European track meet at Berne.

This practice of phony, full-pay jobs for full-time athletes raises the question of the amateur status of Soviet competitors in Olympic contests. However, other countries cahnot challenge the certification of the Soviet Olympic Committee.

Nevertheless, there are numerous known cases where Russian soccer players have received pay as railway engineers, where a crack Olympic rifle shot has worked in a Russian circus, where coaches have doubled in brass as Olympic track stars.

Big impetus for the current Russian sports offensive goes back to the Olympic games in Helsinki in 1952. There, the Russians finished second to the United States, on the accepted basis of point scoring.

However the Russians never admitted they lost. And, a few months after the games, Moscow decreed a fighting program to raise Soviet standards in the events where the West had shown superiority at Helsinki.

During those games, Russian gymnasts and hefty Soviet women weight-throwers had been almost unbeatable. But United States athletes had run away with first places and records in the main track and field events.

Americans had humbled such Soviet hopes as Lituev, the hurdler, and Kazantsev, the steeplechase star.

The Russians took these defeats to heart. Soviet athletes were told to get better than the West—or else. The fighting program not only applied to track and field sports. It covered a whole slate of Western-type competitions, from basketball to skiing.

By 1954, the Soviets were ready to branch out. Russian teams were entered in 150 international competitions this year.

They picked their spots with great care. Unless they felt almost certain of winning, they didn't bother to send anyone.

Only the best men and women in each sport got outside the Iron Curtain. The teams were trained full time, right up to the moment of competition.

Outside Russia, touring Red teams have been kept under close wraps. Coaches, trainers, physicians, political supervisors, and plain guards, with obvious pistol bulges under their coats, watch their every movement.

There is no case on record of defection by a Russian athlete, although a few satellite sportsmen have gone West when they had a chance.

Contacts with foreigners are held to a barely correct minimum for the Soviet stars. The Russian teams are always housed together, sometimes in crowded quarters, preferably remote from other competitors.

"They may shake hands when they have to meet you," said one American team captain. "But they won't look you in the eye—they look down at your feet."

On the whole, their conduct on the field in international events this year appears to have been exemplary. Foreign crowds, from England to Japan, have applauded their sportsmanship. By contrast, at Helsinki in 1952, the Russians sometimes skated close to the thin edge of the rule book.

Away from the field, Russian athletes are told it is dangerous to go out alone in Western countries lest they be trapped in some anti-Communist propaganda stunt. At Sochi, one Red athlete explained to a French woman:

"Suppose I should walk along a street in Paris after you. A passerby pushes me and I bump into you involuntarily. At this moment a photographer takes a picture of us. The photo the next day would appear in the newspaper with a caption saying: 'Russians are vulgar and barbarians. Look how they conduct themselves with women'."

In Sweden last winter Western skiers were entranced by the pretty Russian girl competitors. Some hoped for an evening chat, perhaps even a date. Nothing doing. The Russian girls spent their evenings waxing their skis for the next day's events.

Russians can't relax anywhere. Even in their continuous round of "friendly" competition within the satellite states, they have to win.

In most cases, the satellite sports officials understand this thoroughly. But the satellite audiences have been known to walk out when some Russian boxer got a long count, or when a referee made an outrageous decision in favor of a Soviet team.

A Hungarian basketball official is quoted as saying: "It is very difficult to appoint referees when Soviet teams are playing, as they must not be defeated." And, in one basketball junket to Red China, the Russian team took along its own referee, its own rules, and its own basketball. The Chinese said later that the ball felt as heavy as a bowling ball.

No effort, no expense is spared by the Soviets in the process of winning.

Sports equipment in the Soviet Union is quite ordinary, but the Russians appear at international contests with the finest apparatus money can buy.

At Paris, they used a new type of square parachute never seen in the West. It had safety gadgets that automatically opened the 'chute if the jumper delayed as much as 3 seconds in pulling the rip cord.

For the Olympic yacht racing at Helsinki, the Russians bought expensive boats in Britain, Sweden, and Norway. Prior to the Olympic rifle contests, Russian emissaries were dispatched to Switzerland to buy all the American .22 caliber ammunition on hand. This was repacked in red-starred Russian boxes for the competition.

It's all part of the Russian obsession with winning, at any cost. As a Russian political boss told the English at Henley: "This is sport to you. But we are over here to win."

Red propaganda expects to collect big dividends from the sports offensive. The idea is simple: An able Russian athlete is tops as an international advertisement for "peaceful coexistence." At once, he symbolizes strength, clean living, fun, fair play. He's a propaganda natural.

The Russians are working it two ways. The Iron Curtain now is wide open for Western athletes and sports leaders. The Soviets beckon Europeans, Asians, even Americans to athletic extravaganzas, games, and free tours of Communist sports centers.

Most visitors emerge slightly dazed, but impressed with the size of it all.

The American head of the International Olympic Committee, Avery Brundage, of Chicago, recently completed such a trip. He told reporters in Moscow that United States athletes will have to work hard to keep up with the Russians. Maybe, he said, American boys could do with fewer TV sets and automobiles, more athletic training.

Men like Mr. Brundage, of course, are not easily impressed by the "peace" propaganda angle of the sports offensive. But it's a different story with the ordinary sports fan in Western Europe.

The French magazine Realités, in an article on French workers, recently interviewed a miner, little interested in politics, who votes Socialist but belongs to the Communist-controlled union, CGT.

In reply to questions, the miner said he considered the Soviet Union a peaceful nation and the American Government bellicose and influenced by capitalists. Asked to explain, he said he admired the Soviet Union very much because it is able to accomplish great things.

"One has only to see," he said, "what they have succeeded in doing in the field of athletics."

Act To Control Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 16, 1954

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, we need additional legal restraints on Communist activities beyond that which already exist.

The proposed legislation now under consideration seeks to provide stronger and more useful ways of combating this menace within our borders. Communism works from within in an insidious and secretive manner. This makes it hard to ferret out. As to the best means to deal with it we are learning by experience. This requires changes in our approach. The present bill differs from that passed by the Senate a few days ago. It may or may not be the best means. However, it can be said to have the endorsement of the Attorney General, who is the legal adviser to the President, and a member of his Cabinet. He is presumed to know best as to what is necessary to bring communism and its agents to justice. Therefore, I will give my support to the present bill in order that at least we do something worthwhile to curb the menace of communism. It is not claimed that this is the last word, or the only remedy. The passage of this bill may cause the necessity of a conference between the Senate and House to resolve the differences between the bills passed by the respective bodies. But in any event it will mean progress toward providing more adequate means of dealing with communism in our country.

I regret that this bill comes before the House under a procedure that precludes as full debate, and opportunity of amendment, that a bill of this importance should have. I believe it could have been made even better if such had not been the procedure adopted. A matter of this kind is so vital to our welfare that it should be given every opportunity to be strengthened that is possible. However, I have no doubt that it can and will be an improvement upon present law.

The bill sets forth in sections 2 and 3 of the proposed amendment as fine a statement as to the purposes, and aims of communism, together with the way in which it works and imposes itself upon the body politic, and, the most effective means of controlling it, as has come to my attention at any time. It reads as follows:

FINDINGS OF FACT

SEC. 2. The Congress hereby finds and declares that the Communist Party of the United States, although purportedly a political party, is in fact an instrumentality of a conspiracy to overthrow the Government of the United States. It constitutes an authoritarian dictatorship within a republic, demanding for itself the rights and privileges accorded to other political parties, but denying to all others the liberties guaranteed by the Constiution. Unlike other political parties, which evolve their policies and programs through public means, by the reconciliation of a wide variety of individual views, and submit those policies and programs to the electorate at large for approval or disapproval, the policies and programs of the Communist Party are secretly prescribed for it by the foreign leaders of the world Communist movement. Its members have no part in determining its goals, and are not permitted to voice dissent to party objectives. Unlike members of other parties, members of the Communist Party are recruited for indoctrination with respect to its objectives and methods, and are organized, instructed, and disciplined to carry into action slavishly the assignments given them by their hierarchial chieftains. Unlike other political parties, the Communist Party acknowledges no constitutional or statutory limitations upon its conduct or upon that of is members. The Communist Party is relatively small numerically, and gives scant indication of capacity ever to attain its ends by lawful political means. The peril inherent in its operation arises not from its numbers, but from its failure to acknowledge any limitation as to the nature of its activities, and its dedication to the proposition that the present constitutional Government of the United States ultimately must be brought to ruin by any available means, including resort to force and violence. Holding that doctrine, its role as the agency of a hostile foreign power renders its existence a clear present and continuing danger to the security of the United States. It is the means whereby individuals are seduced into the service of the world Communist movement, trained to do its bidding, and directed and controlled in the conspiratorial performance of their revolutionary services.

PROSCRIBED ORGANIZATIONS

SEC. 3. The Communist Party of the United States, or any successors of such party regardless of the assumed name, whose object or purpose is to overthrow the Government of the United States, or the government of any State, Territory, district, or possession thereof, or the government of any political subdivision therein by force and violence, are not entitled to any of the rights, privileges, and immunities attendant upon legal bodies created under the jurisdiction of the laws of the United States or any political subdivision thereof; and whatever rights, privileges, and immunities which have heretofore been granted to said party or any subsidiary organization by reason of the laws of the United States or any political subdivision thereof, are hereby terminated.

Mr. Speaker, in dealing with communism we must not overlook the necessity of attacking it from all sides and from every angle, communism directs its attack against Americans of both parties. The sooner we understand this fact the better it will be for all of us. No group of Americans is the special target of communism and none should claim a monopoly of anticommunism. Although, we Americans may disagree among ourselves on other issues, we should never lose sight of the fact that communism is a common enemy and that we must stand united in our fight against it.

I include as part of my remarks an editorial appearing in the Courier-Post, published at Camden, N. J., issue of August 14, 1954, reading as follows:

SENATE PASSAGE OF BILL TO BAN COMMUNIST PARTY

Has the Senate acted wisely, or with due deliberation, in passing the bill outlawing the Communist party?

The fact that it voted 85 to 0 to do so is a fair measure of the Communists' general popularity both in the Senate and in the Nation at large. From that standpoint its action is not open to challenge.

But the action, initiated by 19 Democrats, is nevertheless unexpected and surprising.

The Administration has been asking, among a dozen or so other bills aimed at communism, one which would bar any Communist from holding office with or being employed by a labor union. This was the bill under debate Thursday when, accepting the Democrats' proposal, the Senate voted to combine the two and declare the Communist party to be "in fact an instrumentality of a conspiracy to overthrow the Government of the United States" and to make the party illegal. The legislation would provide penalties of 5 years in jail and a $10,000 fine for persons remaining in or willfully joining the party or committing any act designed to carry out Communist purposes.

The vote was taken amide a welter of parliamentary maneuvers, with a number of Senators, perhaps, not knowing exactly what was going on. Although legislation to outlaw the Communist Party has been under discussion for years, this vote to do so was taken almost as an afterthought and without reflection. It was taken in a confused parliamentary situation, with the titular Republican leader, Senator KNOWLAND, of California, once more deserting the administratio position on important legislation and using his influence against the administration.

For the fact is that this administration, which certainly no one accuses of coddling communism, does not want the Communist Party outlawed, or at least has not up to now.

President Eisenhower and Attorney General Brownell have asked for and backed the House-passed bill to decitizenize Reds, and the Attorney General's other anti-Communist bills, which are in various stages of the legislative process.

But Brownell has repeatedly objected to outlawing the party on the ground that it would undermine present internal-security laws.

J. Edgar Hoover has repeatedly objected to outlawing the party lest it would serve to drive the Reds farther underground and make the task of the Federal Bureau of Investigation in ferreting them out far more difficult.

It is a little hard to escape the belief that the Senate's action Thursday night was, as Senator LEHMAN, Democrat, of New York, put it, "blunderbuss, scattershot" business or motivated by little more than a desire, for vote-getting purposes, "to do something—anything—about Communist influences in the United States," as he said previously in connection with other anti-Red legislation.

The bill now goes to the House, where it seems unlikely to receive concurrence. Members of the House appear to be as startled as some Members of the Senate itself at the Senate's action.

Should the administration reverse itself and now give the green light to the bill, the chances are the House will pass it. Otherwise not.

But unless new reasons for such a change of mind now exist, it is safe to assume that J. Edgar Hoover, for instance, will not change his opinion about the bill.

And on a subject of this nature, so far as the Courier-Post is concerned, and most other Americans as well, J. Edgar Hoover's opinion is good enough for us.

Investigation of Irregularities in the Treasury Department

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ALLEN FREAR, JR.

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 16, 1954

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "What Goes On?" published in the Washington Daily News of Monday, August 16, 1954.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT GOES ON?

All Senator WILLIAMS, Republican, of Delaware, was trying to do was to give the taxpayers a little more protection from the kind of inside the Government skulduggery so notoriously illustrated by the scandals in the Internal Revenue Service at the tail end of the Truman administration.

Senator WILLIAMS and 20 other Senators proposed a bill to permit the FBI to investigate, on request, any irregularities in the Treasury Department, of which the tax-collecting agency is a part. The bill also required the Treasury Secretary to refer to the FBI any evidence of wrong doing.

There was an ironclad reason for this bill.

Years back the Treasury and Internal Revenue officials decided, by administrative fiat, that they were immune from a general law permitting the FBI to investigate the departments of the Government. Then, when the tax scandals were breaking into the open, they nailed down this polilcy by sneaking a joker into a fat bill having to do with the Secret Service.

The effect was that the Treasury was the sole investigator of itself. The ensuing scandals proved what often happens in a situation like that.

The Williams bill to correct this unique law for covering up shenanigans passed the Senate without dissent in April. In July, the Senate without dissent wrote similar provisions into the new tax bill.

But when the tax bill went to a House-Senate conference committee for adjustment of differences, this provision was eliminated in circumstances never satisfactorily explained. Senator WILLIAMS let out a roar of protest on the Senate floor and after that the House Judiciary Committee reported out his original bill of last April, with some muddling amendments proposed by the Defense and Post Office Departments.

When the bill got to the House floor, it was on the so-called Consent Calendar, where objection from a single Congressman could block it. Representative ABRAHAM J. MULTER, a Brooklyn Democrat, provided that fatal objection. He didn't explain.

This bill had the active sponsorship of at least 21 Senators. It twice was approved by the Senate. It was backed by the Justice Department. The Treasury Department favored it.

It is a bill to help prevent a recurrence of the tax scandals.

But it is being killed surreptitiously.

What in tarnation goes on?

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized book dealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by book dealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

DISTRIBUTION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

To the Vice President and each Senator 100 copies; to the Secretary and Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, each, 25 copies; to the Secretary, for official use, not to exceed 35 copies; to the Sergeant at Arms, for use on the floor of the Senate, not to exceed 50 copies; to each Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress, 68 copies; to the Clerk, Sergeant at Arms, and Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives, each, 25 copies; to the Clerk, for official use, not to exceed 50 copies; and to the Doorkeeper, for use on the floor of the House of Representatives, not to exceed 75 copies; to the Vice President and each Senator, Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress there shall also be furnished (and shall not be transferable), 3 copies of the daily RECORD, of which 1 shall be delivered at his residence, 1 at his office, and 1 at the Capitol.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

Congressman Hunter Reports on Farm Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OAKLEY HUNTER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 17, 1954

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, with the ending of the second and last session of the 83d Congress, I am happy for this opportunity to present to the Members of the House and the people of my district, a summary of the accomplishments of this Congress and the administration in the field of agriculture and related matters, with special emphasis on such accomplishments as are of particular interest to the State of California.

Representing, as I do, one of the most productive and diversified agricultural areas in the United States, I am vitally interested in the welfare of American farm families and in our Nation's farm program. It is fortunate, indeed, that having such an interest, I have had the pleasure and honor of serving as chairman of the California delegation agricultural committee and serving also, as a member of the House Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations.

APPROPRIATIONS

The Department of Agriculture appropriations bill for the fiscal year commencing July 1, 1954, and ending June 30, 1955, includes direct annual appropriations for regular activities of $723,683,150—$5,287,752 more than last year and nearly $25 million more than requested by the Department of Agriculture.

An additional $10 million was appropriated for agricultural research programs and State experiment stations. Funds for the Agricultural Extension Service were also increased by more than $8 million. I am proud to have spearheaded the move in the House to appropriate more adequate funds for research and education.

Congress also authorized an agricultural conservation program at a level of $250 million for the coming year. This is $55 million more than the preceding year. The additional $55 million is to be used for conservation payments on acreage diverted from production of basic commodities because of acreage allotments.

MOVES TO HALT PRICE DROPS

When the 83d Congress convened in January 1953, and the Eisenhower administration took office, farm prices had been declining for 2 years. Prices received by farmers had dropped 15 percent between February 1951, and January 1953. This sharp rate of decline has been stopped, and prices have leveled off and become relatively stable.

Among moves to protect farmers' incomes were, first, the elimination of price controls imposed by the previous administration, and, second, the inauguration of Federal programs to help farmers hold their products off the market while prices recovered from temporary slumps because of oversupply. Included in this second category are such things as drought assistance, farm credit, storage facilities, disposal abroad of accumulated surpluses, price supports, and other programs.

On January 23, 1953, just 3 days after President Eisenhower took the oath as President, a House Agriculture Subcommittee began an investigation of livestock problems. The subcommittee reported that price controls on beef were injuring farmers by interfering with the orderly process of marketing.

Between the time price controls on cattle were imposed in April 1951, until beef prices were decontrolled in February 1953, cattle prices had dropped from $30.20 a hundred pounds to $19.70, a loss to farmers of $10.50 a hundred pounds.

Acting on the subcommittee's recommendation, President Eisenhower issued an order on February 6, 1953, removing price controls from all meat products.

INCREASED GOVERNMENT BEEF BUYING

The new watershed, soil- and water-conservation law passed by the 83d Congress established a permanent long-term program to protect farmers' investment in land and to prevent future price drops due to disorderly marketing practices in the wake of drought and flood.

But let me get back to the emergency program to stabilize prices. As part of this program, President Eisenhower ordered military procurement of beef to be stepped up until it reached 120 days' supply, the maximum allowed by law. The military buying program for beef began on February 17, 1953. Also, the Department of Agriculture initiated a program to buy 250 million pounds of beef for the school-lunch program and for foreign aid.

GRAIN STORAGE

One of the most important and effective steps yet taken to protect farmers on prices is the grain-storage program enacted by the 83d Congress.

A serious shortage of grain-storage facilities which was allowed to develop during the previous administration was threatening the whole farm price-support program when the Government changed hands in January 1953. Storage bins with a capacity of 250 million bushels had been declared surplus and disposed of by the Commodity Credit Corporation between July 1943 and July 1948. Since there could be no effective price-support program without adequate storage facilities, Congress and the new administration moved swiftly to put measures into effect to secure an enormous expansion of grain storage. These moves included:

First. A program announced June 17, 1953, for loans on wheat stored on the ground in States where regular storage facilities were not available and where it was feasible to store wheat on the ground or in temporary structures during the summer months.

Second. Purchase of grain-storage structures with a total capacity of 196 million bushels through the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Third. Putting into effect on April 24, 1953, a reseal program under which existing CCC loans on corn, wheat, and oats stored on farms would be extended for another year.

Fourth. Securing the use of 305 ships of the reserve fleet as emergency storage space for surplus grain. Each ship will hold 225,000 bushels of wheat.

Fifth. Granting 1-year extension of programs providing loans to farmers for purchase of new storage facilities and drying equipment.

In addition to these emergency measures taken by the Department of Agriculture to meet the immediate needs of farmers for storage facilities, the Congress and the new administration established the first real program to provide storage space sufficient to meet the long-range needs of agriculture. This program provides:

First. Federal income-tax concessions granted by Congress to persons who erect grain-storage facilities. The law enacted in 1953 permits tax deductions based on 5-year amortization of construction costs.

Second. Agreements by the Commodity Credit Corporation guaranteeing a minimum space rental in newly constructed storage facilities.

PRICE PROTECTION FOR FARMERS

I think we all agree that Federal price supports, important as they are, cannot of themselves stabilize farm prices. A well-thought-out program covering the controlling economic factors which regulate farm prices is necessary. Republicans in Congress, the President, Secretary of Agriculture Benson, and indeed most Democratic Congressmen from farm areas agreed on the major points of the new program. For example, virtually all Republicans favored the surplus removal program—one of the major items of the administration's farm program.

The constant threat that surplus stores of farm products acquired by the Government would be thrown on the open market had a strongly depressing effect on farm prices. Disposing of these surplus stocks was an important part of the overall farm price stabilization program undertaken by the Congress and the new administration. To do this, a new and vigorous drive has been initiated to rebuild export markets for farm products, and Government-owned stocks have been ordered insulated from the market by a so-called commodity set-aside.

INCREASE EXPORTS OF FARM PRODUCTS

The serious loss of foreign markets for American farm products was an important factor in the dangerous farm price slump in 1951 and 1952. It is plain that if we are to have good prices for farm products over the long pull, we have to recover the foreign markets that were lost, and we must develop new ones. One of the important points in President Eisenhower's recommendations was a vigorous drive to rebuild export markets and to develop new ones. This part of the program was included in the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954.

This new law establishes a 3-year program for the sale and exportation of surplus farm commodities in such a way as to expand market demand abroad for United States farm products and to implement United States foreign policy. The Congress authorized the President to spend $1,300,000,000 of Commodity Credit Corporation stocks to carry out the program.

The foreign currencies obtained through sale of surplus farm products abroad are to be used for: First, development of new markets for United States agricultural commodities; second, purchase of strategic and critical materials; third, procurement of military equipment and defense materials, facilities and services; fourth, financing the purchase of goods and services for other friendly nations; fifth, promotion of international economic development and trade; sixth, payment of United States obligations abroad; seventh, loans to promote multilateral trade and economic development; and eighth, financing international educational exchange activities.

REBUILDING EXPORT MARKETS

Our program to dispose of surpluses and to rebuild export markets for farm products also included:

First. Action by the Foreign Operations Administration in disposing of surplus farm products in friendly foreign countries under section 550 of the Mutual Security Act enacted by the 83d Congress.

Second. Three special trade missions organized by the Department of Agriculture and sent abroad to explore possibilities of expanding United States agricultural trade.

Third. Creation of a Foreign Agricultural Service in the Department of Agriculture to give greater emphasis to foreign market development.

Fourth. Negotiation of a new International Wheat Agreement for 3 years with an average increase of 25 cents a bushel in minimum price. This higher price is important to American farmers because it requires wheat-importing countries to buy our wheat at a price ranging up to 50 cents a bushel above the prevailing world price in June 1954.

Fifth. Expansion of a program to barter United States farm surpluses for needed raw materials.

Sixth. Invitation of a program to sell agricultural surpluses for foreign currency and use proceeds to pay United States obligations abroad.

In another move to rebuild export markets for our farm products, the 83d Congress gave the Secretary of Agriculture responsibility for agricultural attachés in American embassies in foreign countries. For a long time, there was no direct contact between these attachés and the Department of Agriculture. All reports on foreign developments affecting our farmers had been made to the State Department. I am proud to have been a coauthor of the legislation transferring the agricultural attachés from the State Department to the Department of Agriculture.

In still another surplus removal operation which at the same time helped a country which has always stood beside the United States in United Nations General Assembly debates, the Republican Congress enacted a law on June 25, 1953, transferring 1 million long tons of Government-owned wheat to Pakistan. In a second law enacted August 1, 1953, Congress authorized the CCC to make $100 million worth of surplus stocks of farm products available to the President to be used in meeting famine or other relief requirements of peoples friendly to the United States.

COMMODITY SET ASIDE

An important part of the new Administration's program of price protection for farmers is the commodity set-aside. The huge accumulations of Government-owned surplus farm products held in storage were depressing farm prices.

One of the important points in the farm program President Eisenhower submitted to Congress was a proposal to authorize CCC to set aside reserves of surplus commodities to a value up to $2,500,000,000. These stocks will be insulated from the commercial supplies and used in constructive ways, such as in school-lunch programs, disaster relief, aid to people of other countries, and stockpiled at home for use in a national emergency.

The Republican 83d Congress included this proposal, without change, in the law it enacted.

INCREASED BORROWING AUTHORITY

In order to permit continuation of price-support operations on basic commodities at 90 percent of parity through 1954, President Eisenhower asked that the borrowing authority of the CCC should be increased by $1,750,000,000—from $6,750,000,000 to $8,500,000,000. This important part of the program to protect farm prices was enacted promptly by the Republican Congress.

A second bill, H. R. 9756, increasing CCC borrowing authority to $10 billion was passed by the House July 29, 1954.

PRICE SUPPORTS

The President also recommended that Congress continue, without important change, the price-support program on such commodities as oats, barley, grain sorghums, soybeans, flax, meats, poultry and eggs, fresh fruits and vegetables. The Secretary of Agriculture has discretion to support prices on these commodities up to 90 percent of parity. This recommendation was included in the new farm bill enacted by the Republican Congress.

PRICE SUPPORTS FOR WOOL

President Eisenhower also asked Congress to enact a completely new price-support program for wool. The program which had been in effect on wool for a number of years had proved ineffective because foreign countries were shipping wool to United States markets at prices just below the price-support level of domestically produced wool.

Imports of cheaper foreign wool had caused our output to shrink to a level where this country was producing only one-third of its own wool requirements. This level is dangerously low from a national defense standpoint. To remedy this situation, Congress enacted a new program under which the Secretary of Agriculture can support wool prices through loans, purchases, direct payments to farmers, and other operations.

Direct payments to wool growers are expected to be the principal method used. This part of President Eisenhower's farm-price-protection program was also included in the law enacted by the 83d Congress.

FLEXIBLE VERSUS FIXED SUPPORTS

All farm leaders sought a method of protecting farmers on the price of basic commodities—corn, cotton, wheat, peanuts, tobacco, and rice. One group thought that the best method of doing this would be to continue mandatory price support at 90 percent of parity on these commodities. Another group, equally sincere about the farmers' welfare, believed that a system of flexible price supports would produce a better balance between supply and demand, thereby increasing the price that farmers could secure for their products in the market place.

The 83d Congress combined the better features of both of these suggestions by providing price supports on the basic commodities, ranging from 82½ percent to 90 percent of parity.

If this Congress had not enacted this new law, price supports on the basic commodities could have dropped as low as 75 percent of parity. The price-support law finally adopted guarantees farmers substantial protection on prices. At the same time, it gives the Secretary of Agriculture some discretion in fixing the level of price supports to secure adjustments in production.

Assuming normal yields and legal acreages, anticipated exports and domestic consumption, and a set-aside of 4 million bales, the 1955 support price for cotton will be 90 percent of parity.

DROUGHT PROGRAMS

In 1953 a drought which parched grasslands and pasture in the southwestern part of the United States was forcing owners to ship hungry livestock to an already glutted market. The Congress and the President took quick action to help these ranchers and stockmen to keep their herds intact. On June 30, 1953, $8 million was made available from the President's emergency relief fund to send livestock feed rations at reduced prices to drought-stricken areas.

Other emergency drought programs in 1953 and 1954 included: First, designation of approximately 800 counties in 18 States and Hawaii as disaster areas where farmers could participate in emergency feed programs; second, sale of 2,117,500 tons of feed at below market price to eligible farmers; third, distribution of 37,300 disaster loans totaling $53,398,000 to farmers in areas affected by drought; fourth, furnishing nearly $40 million in special livestock loans to farmers to help maintain their basic herds; and fifth, initiation of a $15 million wind erosion control program applicable in Colorado, Kansas, Nebraska, Texas, New Mexico, and Oklahoma.

WATER CONSERVATION

In addition to these emergency drought relief measures, the 83d Congress passed two new permanent programs to protect farmers not only from temporary price slumps resulting from disorderly marketing during droughts and floods, but also to guard them from loss of their capital investments in the land because of water scarcity, erosion, and floods.

Under one of these bills, farmers in all States can obtain direct 20-year loans from the Government to build and maintain water facilities. Formerly, such loans were available only in 17 Western States. These loans from the Farmers' Home Administration are to be secured by increased production resulting from supplemental irrigation derived from the newly constructed facilities.

In addition to direct loans, the new law provides for Federal insurance on loans through private credit channels to farmers for construction and maintenance of water storage and utilization facilities. The bill authorizes the Farmers' Home Administration to insure loans to individual farmers up to $25,000 and to corporations up to $250,000. The Secretary of Agriculture is also authorized to make direct loans and to insure loans to finance improvements of farm land by soil or water conservation or drainage facilities, improvement of soil fertility, establishment of improvement of permanent pasture, sustained-yield afforestation or reforestation, or other erosion preventatives and other related conservation measures.

WATERSHED PROGRAMS

A second major program aimed at protecting farmers from future losses such as they have experienced from drought and flood in the past 4 years was established by Public Law 566 of the 83d Congress. This legislation provides authority and direction for cooperative Federal-local action in attacking the problems of upstream soil and water conservation and flood prevention. It establishes a framework of policies and standards under which action in this field can be taken jointly by the Federal Government, States, counties, and other local government entities, soil conservation or watershed districts, and local citizens' groups.

Based on the sound principle of payment for value received, the law provides that the cost of the programs and improvement shall be shared equitably between the participants in proportion to the benefit which each will receive.

The program authorized by the new law will supplement existing programs for agricultural soil and water conservation and programs for development and flood protection of major river valleys. It will bridge the gap that existed between these two types of programs and greatly enhances the ultimate benefits of both. It also provides an additional means of aiding in the conservation of scarce water supplies.

Under the policies established by this legislation, plans and projects will not be handed down from the top as part of some overall development plan, but can be initiated only by the people of the localities most intimately involved and can be carried into operation only with the fullest cooperation and initiative on the part of local groups and agencies.

A $5 million appropriation in 1953 and another $5,500,000 appropriation in 1954 as part of a $28 million program to construct 62 pilot watershed projects were also enacted by the 83d Congress as part of the watershed program which had been characterized by the New York Times as one which will "go down in history as one of the lasting and most beneficial legislative actions of the past decade."

TAX CREDIT FOR CONSERVATION

The 1954 tax revision bill gave special benefits to farmers who make investments in conservation. Farmers may now deduct each year from Federal income-tax money spent for conservation up to 25 percent of their gross income. Until now, this expense had to be capitalized and tax money could be recovered by the farmer only by depreciation or selling his farm.

FARM CREDIT

In addition to enacting these important new laws on Federal price supports and conservation, the 83d Congress has also passed new laws and has improved some old ones to help farmers in other ways. For example, new laws have been enacted improving and expanding farm credit.

In order to help farmers who face emergency situations arising out of the drought, this Congress enacted a new disaster loan law. This law authorized the Secretary of Agriculture: First, to furnish feed for livestock and seeds for planting to farmers, ranchers, and stockmen in disaster areas; and second, to make direct loans to established livestockmen who have a good record of operations but who are temporarily unable to get necessary immediate credit.

The new administration has also fulfilled its campaign pledge to decentralize administration of the farm-credit system, shifting more control over credit policies away from Washington, where control had become concentrated, and vesting it largely in farmers themselves. On August 1, 1953, Congress passed a bill which—

First. Spells out the details of greater farmer ownership and control of credit agencies and lays the groundwork for systematically retiring Government capital.

Second. Decentralizes power by directing that the Farm Credit Administration delegate to various Federal land banks and other district credit agencies more duties and authority. The purpose is to move more authority from Washington to places nearer the farmers.

Third. Establishes a 13-member Federal Farm Credit Board with full responsibility for policies of the Farm Credit Administration.

The Department of Agriculture also announced new procedures to enable the Farmers' Home Administration to provide farmers quicker loan service and to save taxpayers an estimated $1,500,000 annually through reduced administrative costs. About 70 forms, reports, files, procedures, and work routines established under the Truman administration are being eliminated to provide quicker action on farmers' loan applications.

RESEARCH AND EDUCATION

Research and education are basic functions of the Department of Agriculture. They are indispensable if our farmers are to improve their productivity and enlarge their markets. The additional funds appropriated by this Congress will make possible an expanded and improved research and education program. This means, among other things, 28 new farm advisers for California.

Research enables farmers to become more efficient, to get higher yields from an acre of land, and more meat or other livestock products from an animal-breeding unit, and do it with less labor. Research makes possible improved tractors and machines, better crop varieties, improved fertilizers and practices, new ways of controlling insects and diseases, better methods of feeding livestock, improved cultural practices, and savings in handling and transportation of foods. This means a greater net income to farmers and at the same time a better life for all of us.

STREAMLINING THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

In another move to give farmers better service and to cut down overhead so that a greater portion of Agriculture Department appropriations will go to direct farm benefits, the new administration reorganized the Department of Agriculture. Congress enacted legislation which follows recommendations of the Hoover Commission and which was endorsed by the Grange, the Farm Bureau, and the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives. It created 2 more Assistant Secretariats for the Department and gave the Secretary authority to reorganize 6 agencies in the Department which previously had certain autonomous status independent of the Secretary.

Twenty-two agencies in the Department were consolidated into six by earlier action of Secretary Benson soon after he took office.

On October 13, 1953, Secretary Benson announced another streamlining operation designed to provide better service to farmers through placing operations on a businesslike, efficient, and decentralized basis. The reorganization was made under authority of Reorganization Plan No.

2, enacted in the first session of the 83d Congress. It puts all service agencies of the Department under four main groups: First, Federal-State relations; second, marketing and foreign agriculture; third, agricultural stabilization; and fourth, agricultural credit.

BIPARTISAN NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMISSION

In order to keep politics from interfering with the administration of farm programs, as has happened in the past, the new administration created a bipartisan agricultural Commission to review the policies and administration of farm programs. The new 18-member Commission, created by Executive order on July 20, 1953, is made up of 9 Republicans and 9 Democrats. A minimum of 12 members must be farmers.

COTTON ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS

A very large part of my time this year and last was spent in helping to bring about a change in the law with regard to cotton marketing quotas and acreage allotments.

Because of the surplus of cotton, the Secretary of Agriculture, as required by the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, last year proclaimed a national acreage allotment for 1954. Under this law, the cotton acreage allotments for each State are based on plantings in that State during a base period. During the base period, however, cotton plantings in California were considerably less than they were during the 3 most recent years, 1951–53. The law was discriminatory in its application to States like California and Arizona, where cotton has been on the increase in recent years. It favored the South, where plantings have either remained relatively static or have actually declined. For example, had there been no change made in the law, cotton acreage in California would have been cut back 51.5 percent from 1,400,000 acres in 1952 and 1953 to 695,000 acres in 1954. Southern States would have been cut considerably less. During the first session of the 83d Congress, Senators and Congressmen representing cotton-producing areas in the West, sought to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act so as to alleviate the economic distress and discrimination which would result from the imposition of acreage allotments for the 1954 cotton crop under the law as it then existed. As chairman of the California congressional delegation committee on agricultural problems and as the Representative of a major cotton-producing district, I naturally was very active in the move to change this law.

At long last, in January of this year a bill was passed amending the law so as to provide that no State would be cut more than 34 percent. Under this new formula, California received an additional 238,000 acres, or a total of 936,000. This gave California cotton farmers at least 65 percent of their average plantings during the period 1951–53 or 40 percent of the highest acreage planted in any one of such years.

During this session of Congress, I have been concerned lest provisions harmful to western cotton growers be written into the omnibus agricultural bill. There were several southern-sponsored changes which could have had adverse effects. Three such changes were particularly objectionable. They were:

First. Three-year referendum on the question of marketing quotas and acreage allotments. This would have meant controls could be voted in for a period of 3 years rather than from year to year as provided under existing law. California having an expanding cotton economy, controls are undesirable except for such period as is absolutely necessary.

Second. National reserve for small farms made up of a percentage of each State's allotment. This reserve, it is felt, would be used in a number of ways more beneficial to other areas with the result that California would contribute more to the reserve than would be returned.

Third. Reduction of the carryover allowance from 30 to 20 percent in determining the normal supply of cotton. This would increase the probability of permanent controls. Furthermore, on a permanent basis, 20 percent is not adequate to take care of our foreign and domestic marketing requirements.

I am happy to report that the Agricultural Act of 1954, as finally passed, does not contain any of these objectionable provisions.

In addition to the changes previously discussed, there were two other changes made in the law this year which I am confident will be of benefit to California cottongrowers. First, county committees are given the option of allotting acreage on the basis of the old county factor method or on the basis of individual farm history. Second, the 50-percent cropland limitation is optional with the county committees.

With these changes, we can have a more flexible and more equitable distribution of the county allotment to the farm than we have had previously.

SPOT COTTON MARKET

The Department of Agriculture's announcement this summer that the Fresno cotton exchange has been added to the list of designated markets, crowned with success the efforts of over 2 years. The Fresno market was first formed in May 1951, and in March 1952 it was recognized as a bona fide cotton spot market. Under that designation, however, quotations on the Fresno exchange were not used in the calculation of futures contracts. Coupled with this victory for western cotton, was the announcement by Herman S. Kohlmeyer of the New Orleans cotton exchange that penalties heretofore applied on irrigated cotton will cease to exist and specifically that low middlings in cotton will be tenderable in the New Orleans exchange. This is deserved recognition for the far western grower who has had his cotton discriminated against but who through scientific development and better seed has now been able to produce cotton equal to rain-grown cotton. There are indications that the New York exchange will take the same step soon.

DAIRY PRODUCTS

The basic problem in the present milk-surplus situation is overproduction and/or underconsumption. Nineteen hundred and fifty-four will be the biggest year ever in milk production. Per capita consumption, on the other hand, has fallen off. If the American people were drinking as much milk per capita as they were only a few years ago, there would be no dairy surpluses. Surpluses, of course, depress prices. Dairy industry leaders agree that an overall promotion program is needed to step up the consumption of milk. The various beverage makers spend millions of dollars each year plugging their products through every advertising device imaginable, and after they have created a demand they make certain that the product is where and when the public wants it.

While waiting for an overall promotion program to step up consumption of milk, the Department of Agriculture has been making an effort to meet some of the immediate problems and in recent weeks has: First, launched a nationwide education campaign to promote the culling of low-producing cows from dairy herds; second, offered to sell for export at world prices Government-owned stocks of butter, cheese, and dried milk; third, developed a special program to facilitate the use of butter and nonfat dried milk solids; for recombination and sale as fluid milk in friendly countries; fourth, sold more than 400 million pounds of dried milk at greatly reduced prices for use in mixed animal and poultry feeds; and fifth, sought increased consumption of dairy products through school-lunch programs, donations for domestic and foreign relief and other outlets.

On the legislative side a number of changes and additions to the law were contained in the Agricultural Act of 1954, which will benefit dairymen.

The Agricultural Act of 1949 required the Secretary of Agriculture to support dairy prices at between 75 and 90 percent of parity to assure an adequate supply of milk and other dairy products. During the current marketing year, the Secretary, acting in accordance with the law, reduced the support price to 75 percent of parity. He could not do otherwise in view of the surplus situation.

The House this year approved a floor of 80 percent, but this was rejected by the Senate. As a result, the law remains the same as it has since 1949.

The dairy section of the Agricultural Act of 1954, is indeed, a real improvement over the present law. It contains the following provisions:

First. Authorizes the use up to $50 million annually of Commodity Credit Corporation funds for the next 2 years to increase the consumption of fluid milk by schoolchildren. This is in addition to the provisions of the Agricultural Appropriations Act of 1955 which provides for the use of section 32 funds for butter and cheese in the school-lunch program.

Second. Provides that until March 31, 1956, the Secretary may use any method he determines to be necessary to dispose of surplus stocks of dairy products owned by the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Third. Authorizes the use of surplus dairy products, including milk, by the armed services and in veterans' hospitals.

Fourth. Authority for an accelerated brucellosis program during the next 2 years.

FRUITS AND VEGETABLES

Mr. Speaker, I wish now to call attention to certain selected activities relating to California in the fruit and vegetable crops during the past fiscal year.

Raisins: Section 32 export payment programs were operated for both the 1952 and 1953 crops. The rates of export payment under the 1952–53 program which was substantially completed prior to the beginning of the 1954 fiscal year were 2.5 cents per pound on natural Thompson seedless, Sultanas, muscats—except soda-dipped or Valencia and layer muscats—and Zante currants, and 3 cents per pound on golden bleached Thompson seedless. The export payment program for the 1953 crop was made effective on September 1, 1953, with a flat export payment rate of 2 cents per pound. During the fiscal year export payments were made on nearly 50,000 tons at an estimated expenditure of approximately $2 million.

Amendments are being considered to the marketing agreement and order to include new provisions to give packers and exporters greater flexibility in export markets. Exports of free tonnage raisins for the season through June 30, 1954, were 61 percent below those of the preceding season to the same date.

Tree fruits: The California tree fruit marketing agreement and order programs cover Bartlett pears, plums, and Elberta peaches. The agreement and order were issued in May 1939 and have operated continuously since that date although regulatory activities were suspended during the war years.

Activities under this program during the current year included the appointment of members of the control committee, consisting of 13 growers and 12 handlers, for the overall local administration of the program, and the appointment of the three commodity committees, which have as their principal function the recommendation, to the Secretary of Agriculture, of regulations governing the interstate shipment of the particular fruit for which the committee is concerned. Each of the commodity committees recommended regulations during the current season. Such regulations were issued and limited interstate shipments to the grades and sizes specified in the regulatory order.

This marketing agreement program provides that a referendum shall be held biennially during the months of December or January, to ascertain whether growers favor the termination of the program. As the last referendum was held in January 1953, growers will be given an opportunity after the close of the current marketing season to vote on whether they want the program continued.

Almonds: With the 1953 crop slightly above average and a heavy carryover for 1952-crop almonds in the hands of packers and shellers, supplies for the 1953–54 season were such that a surplus of 15 percent was applied to the 1953 production. Such surplus was disposed of in outlets outside of domestic commercial scale as almonds, principally in export with a lesser quantity being sold for the manufacture of almond butter. On September 29, 1953, an additional import fee of 5 cents per pound on the first 7 million pounds imported and 10 cents per pound thereafter, was invoked by Presidential proclamation for the period October 1, 1953, to September 30, 1954. However, imports were relatively heavy, amounting to about 7 million pounds, kernel weight, and packers' carryout at the end of the 1953–54 season will be substantial, and somewhat more than that at the beginning of the season. A record large production is forecast for the 1954 crop and the industry may request assistance from the Department in disposing of surplus supplies.

Walnuts: On the basis of early estimates of the 1953 walnut crop, the surplus percentage under the marketing agreement and order was originally set at 20 percent. When it became evident that the crop was shorter than previously estimated, the surplus was reduced to 15 percent. Under the agreement order as it existed prior to and during the 1953 season, the surplus percentage applied only to shipments of walnuts for in-shell sale. In recognition, however, of the increasing importance of the sale of shelled walnuts in overall grower returns, and of the continuing upward trend in production, the agreement and order was amended in July 1954. As now effective, the agreement and order will continue to regulate the shipment of in-shell walnuts as heretofore and, in addition, provides for regulation of the shipment of shelled walnuts in years when the total production of walnuts exceeds the available outlets—both in-shell and shelled—at reasonable prices. In-shell shipments were below average during the 1953 season due to an apparent shift in walnut consumption to the shelled product and the competitive effect of in-shell pecans.

Figs: Establishment of a proposed Federal marketing agreement and order for California dried figs was considered at a public hearing held by the Department June 15–18, 1954, at Fresno, Calif. The hearing was held at the request of the California Fig Institute and the Dried Fig Advisory Board of the California marketing order for dried figs.

A California State marketing order on dried figs is operated under the authority of the California Marketing Act of 1937, as amended. The proposed Federal program would authorize both quality and volume regulation of the handling of dried figs and if put into effect the Federal and State regulation of the handling of dried figs would be complementary.

The evidence presented at the hearing is now being reviewed by the Department and it is expected that a decision with respect to the industry's proposal will be issued within a relatively short period of time.

Apricots: The 1953 California apricot crop proved to be substantially greater than was estimated during the early months of the season. Also, a strike of cannery workers occurred during the latter stage of apricot harvest, temporarily shutting off the most important utilization outlet for the crop. As a result, the dried pack greatly increased: 15,530 tons as compared with an average of 9,975 tons during the three preceding seasons. Shipments from packers increased, but not enough to prevent a substantial carryover into the following marketing season. An export payment program was made effective on April 28, 1954, to encourage additional exportation. Approximately 1,818 tons, mostly of medium and smaller sizes, were exported under the program. The program was terminated on June 11, 1954, when it became apparent that the 1954 crop would be small and that remaining 1953 crop dried apricots could be marketed without program assistance during the 1954–55 season. The cost of the program approximated $272,765.

The Department purchased 4 million pounds of dried apricots for distribution under the school-lunch program at an an estimated commodity cost of $1,400,000.

Canned fruits and vegetables: The Department purchased approximately 800,000 cases of canned peaches from the 1953 crop at an estimated commodity cost of $3,800,000. These canned peaches were purchased for distribution under the school-lunch program. On July 22, 1954, the Department announced that it contemplated purchase of canned peaches of the 1954 pack for the national school lunch program.

The Kadota Growers, Inc., of Merced, Calif., have requested a purchase program on canned figs. Their request is based primarily on the fact that the Quartermaster announced recently that they do not plan to buy any canned figs this year. This contrasts to requirements of 77,000 cases for the Armed Forces announced last January. Between 1940 and 1953, the Quartermaster purchases have averaged 25 percent of all Kadota figs canned and in some years have been as high as 38 percent of a pack. This request is now under consideration by the Department.

A total of 451,000 cases of canned tomatoes and 100,000 cases of canned tomato paste at a commodity cost in excess of $2 million were purchased from the 1953 packs of these product. These supplies were distributed through the national school lunch program.

Citrus: A marketing agreement and order program was made effective in September 1953 providing for the regulation of the weekly volume of shipments and for limitation of the size of Naval oranges shipped. A similar order covering Valencia oranges grown in California and Arizona was issued in March 1954. With the issuance of these two programs the California-Arizona orange industry has again adopted regulatory programs similar to that provided in Order No. 66 under which it operated for about 10 years. Order No. 66 was terminated in 1952 after a referendum in which only a slight majority of the growers indicated they favored continuance of the program. The marketing agreement and order program on California-Arizona lemons was made effective in April 1941 and has operated continuously since that time. Regulation limiting the volume of lemon shipments was made effective during each week of the 1953–54 fiscal year and an amendment to the program has been proposed by the four major lemon marketing organizations to add an additional member on the Lemon Administrative Committee, the agency established for the local administration of the program, and to provide handlers additional flexibility of operation under the weekly allotments issued to them.

Regulations covering the shipment of California-Arizona grapefruit were issued under that program which has been in effect since 1941.

During the fiscal year export payment programs were in effect for oranges and grapefruit. The orange export subsidy program which was effective for the 1953–54 crop was the sixth consecutive one that was operated. Considerable progress has been made in restoring orange exports to the pre-World War II level and exports have been subsidized at the rates which have been progressively reduced. The continuation of the export subsidy program for oranges not only has been instrumental in restoring export markets but has also resulted in the expenditure of much smaller amounts by the Department than would have been required to purchase outright sufficient quantities to relieve grower distress in the absence of subsidy programs. The estimated expenditure for this program totaled more than $5,800,000 covering the export of 6,260,000 boxes fresh equivalent of oranges and grapefruit.

A total of 500,000 gallons of orange juice at an estimated cost of $900,000 were purchased with section 6 funds for distribution to the national school lunch program.

Tokay grapes: Prior to the 1953 shipping season, volume regulations under this program were carried out through limiting the number of carloads of Tokay grapes released each day from railroad concentration points. Increasing movement by trucks had lessened the effectiveness of this type of regulation. Hence, the industry proposed the revision of the program to allocate among the handlers the quantity of Tokay grapes which may be shipped during 3-day regulation periods. The public hearing on the proposed revisions was held in April 1935, and the amendments were made effective the following August. After the close of the marketing season, a referendum was conducted to ascertain whether the Tokay grape growers desired the program continued. Of the growers voting in the referendum, 68 percent favored continuation of the program.

Winter pears: The operation of the winter pear marketing agreement and order covering the States of California, Oregon, and Washington was continued during the fiscal year. In view of the large crop of winter pears an export payment program was made effective. Estimated expenditures under this program were nearly $300,000 with an export payment rate of $1 per box. In addition, 126,000 boxes of fresh pears were purchased at an estimated cost of $424,000. These purchases were distributed to school lunch, welfare agencies, and eligible institutions.

Ed Hart: A Grand Guy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 11, 1954

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I wish to include herein a news item captioned "Ed Hart: A Grand Guy." The article, which appeared in a column by the able Art Sylvester, writer for the Newark Evening News, is a skillful sketch and characterization of Mr. Hart. Those of us who have been privileged to serve in the Congress with Ed Hart know there is no grander guy.

I have taken the liberty of deleting certain portions of the article since they have no relationship to the author's high estimate of Mr. Hart.

The article follows:

Ed Hart: A Grand Guy—Hudson's Retiring Representative Holds Affection of Congress as Man With Mind and Heart

(By Arthur Sylvester)

Washington.—If you look in the Congressional Directory for biographical data on the Representative from New Jersey's 14th District here's what you find: "Edward J. Hart, Democrat, lawyer, Jersey City."

That's all.

* * * * *

One of the finest speakers, Mr. Hart has been sparing in the exhibit of his talent. That reticence is in keeping with his modest biographical note.

UNPOPULAR DECISION

Representative Hart won't be around next year, Mr. Hart's retirement after 20 years' continuous service is his own choice. It is one of the most unpopular decisions imaginable from the viewpoint of Ed Hart's colleagues. The gentleman from New Jersey is immensely popular on both sides of the aisle.

The Hart popularity is not due entirely to an engaging personality. Mr. Hart is a man with a mind as well as a heart. He is witty in speech and while penetrating in his estimate of his colleagues he is never mean, petty, or jealous in his comments. The same can't be said for many Members of Congress.

But Republicans as well as Democrats, while enjoying Ed Hart's capacity for friendship, respect his intellectual ability. Among politicians of course the ability to speak well wins admiration. If a man speaks well extemporaneously, as Ed Hart does, and can mix it with sense, as he can, he is sure of congressional respect.

Typical of what makes Mr. Hart so well liked is an anecdote told by Harry L. Towe, former Republican Representative from the ninth district. Many years before Mr. Towe came to Congress he was in a position to do a small favor for Mr. Hart. "At least Ed considered it a favor," Mr. Towe recalls, "although I didn't consider it very much.

DIDN'T FORGET

"Soon after I arrived on Capitol Hill, Ed Hart spoke to me. I don't think I had seen him since the day we met years ago. He recalled the incident to me, thanked me again for what I had done and said if there was any help I needed he would be glad to be of assistance. Lots of men would let it go at that. But when I did need some help and appealed to him he produced at once."

Fellow members of the New Jersey delegation gave a goodby party for Mr. Hart recently. It was informal and everyone had a good time. Ed made one of his behind-closed-doors speeches for which he is famous. In the course of it he kidded both Representative Charles Howell (Fourth District), the Democratic nominee for Senator, and Clifford P. Case, his Republican opponent. Everyone enjoyed it, including his targets, even though he did say he couldn't see much to choose between them.

After 20 years of service Mr. Hart, being a highly intelligent man, is tired of Capitol Hill politics. There is a sort of cloying sameness to it. He is tired, too, of two homes, of traveling back and forth between here and Hudson County, and of the physical and mental wear and tear that is part of a life that has many real satisfactions. There is talk, too, that he may wind up as a member of the New Jersey Public Utilities Commission.

While he was born in New Jersey 61 years ago and took his bachelor of arts and master of arts at St. Peter's College he got his first political job here. That was in 1913, during the Wilson administration, when he was secretary to what was then known as the District of Columbia Excise Commission.

BACK TO NEW JERSEY

Then he went back to New Jersey where he was chief field deputy of the Internal Revevnue Bureau in the Newark office from 1918 to 1921. It was there, romance says, that he met Miss Loretta A. O'Connell, who on April 14, 1936, became Mrs. Hart. Ed Hart is the sort of husband you run into outside a Fifth Avenue shop smoking tranquilly while his lady spends his money inside.

Congressman Hart got his law degree here at Georgetown University in 1924. He set up practice in Jersey City 3 years later. He was assistant corporation counsel of Jersey City from 1930 to 1934, which meant he was a Hague man. This was a loyalty from which Mr. Hart never wavered. But in later years, while he never talked about it, one knew Mr. Hart considered that the boss had lost his touch.

During his congressional service, which began January 1935, Mr. Hart was unanimously elected first chairman of the House Un-American Activities Committee in 1945. As such he deplored the attitude of those who denounced a view as un-American simply because it differed from theirs. He served as chairman of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee and vice chairman of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report.

Those who watched him in operation know why he is called an able legislator. And those who followed the stormy course of the Democratic Party while he was its State chairman know why he is also called an able politician. And all who have had contact with him simply as a man call him a grand guy.

Conference on Radioactivity Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 17, 1954

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following editorial that appeared in the Christian Science Monitor on August 16, 1954.

The article, Wake Up, Americans, follows:

Wake Up, Americans

It is good news that a conference of Japanese and American experts will be held this fall to discuss radioactivity problems. Another encouraging item is the report that the United States is paying very heavy damages ($800,000) to the Japanese fishermen injured in the Bikini tests a few months ago.

Here is some evidence that official notice has been taken of the situation produced by careless handling of the H-bomb, plus careless handling of Japanese feelings. The damage done to American interests in Asia is more difficult to estimate in dollars, but could prove much greater and harder to compensate.

In another column we are publishing three letters which may help Americans to see the situation as it looks to Japanese. One of the letters is extreme. And plainly some of the hysteria was irrational if not incited by Communists to arouse anti-American feeling. It is notable that comment from Japanese and other countries has taken so little account of the fact that the Soviet also conducts bomb tests. But Americans are not immune to hysteria themselves, and when it occurs—however produced—it presents a situation which must be faced.

Some official steps were taken to help the Japanese fishermen, and in some degree local pride and a reviving nationalism in Japan hampered American efforts. But there have also been sane and courageous responses from many Japanese. For instance, Asahi recently ran a cartoon showing an angry Japanese reading a headline about a recent earthquake and saying: "That must be due to the Bikini hydrogen bomb tests." He was labeled "The man who isn't satisfied unless the blame for anything and everything is put on the H-bomb test."

For Americans the need is to sense more clearly the depth and extent of the feeling aroused among other peoples. We welcome the evidence of efforts to repair the damage. But an even greater awareness may be required to impel the necessary efforts not only to set up more adequate safeguards for future tests but to develop more effective approaches to the thoughts and emotions of peoples whose friendship is a vital factor in defense.

Czechoslovak Delegates to World Council of Churches Assembly, Evanston, Ill.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 16, 1954

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the Record, I wish to insert the following letter sent by the Honorable Stefan Osusky on August 2, 1954, to the executive committee of the World Presbyterian Alliance and concerning the Czechoslovak delegates to the current World Council of Churches Assembly at Evanston, Ill.:

August 2, 1954.

Executive Committee,
World Presbyterian Alliance,
Princeton Theological Seminary,
Princeton, N. J.

Gentlemen: Prof. Josef L. Hromadka, official delegate of the Evangelical Church of Czech Brethren in Communist-dominated Czechoslovakia, and a vice president of the World Presbyterian Alliance, affirms that Christianity and communism can coexist and work out a satisfactory rapprochement. Perhaps the Reverend Hromadka, who is assuredly a learned man, has in mind some historical precedent when he formulates this seductive slogan. It could be that he is thinking of the instance of His Most Catholic Majesty King Francis I of France: the French Crown concluded an alliance with the Porte, and the Catholic French coexisted with the Infidel Turks. Why then should not the Christians and the Communists coexist in peace?

The analogy, if drawn, is somewhat more than inept. Coexistence as it prevailed between the French and the Turks in the 16th century was a matter of modus vivendi between two states, separated by thousands of miles, for a given political purpose. It was never intended to accommodate people living together as neighbors in one and the same state. Professor Hromadka speaks of Christians and Communists living in one state, Czechoslovakia, governed by the Communists. Can these coexist and work together?

The philosophical conception of Christianity is dualistic, that of communism monistic. When the spies of the chief priests asked him whether it was lawful to give tribute unto Caesar or no, Jesus answered them, saying: "Render unto Caesar the things which be Caesar's, and unto God the things which be God's." Caesar's things, which is to say the things of the government, are to keep order and maintain law. If the rulers fail to maintain the rule of law, however, or forbid Christians to practice charity, or to denounce evil, or if men are prevented from teaching in the name of Jesus then, according to St. Paul, "we ought to obey God rather than man."

The dualistic conception of Christianity, looking upon man as an end in himself in the state, recognizes the right of the citizen to be represented in the legislative and executive bodies of the state, recognizes his innate right to freedom of conscience, freedom of assembly, freedom of speech, and respect for his human dignity.

The Communist conception is monistic. In Russia, while Stalin lived, he was both Caesar and God. So was Klement Gottwald in Czechoslovakia. Since his death, a small group of Communists has personified both God and the state. To the Communist overlords, man is merely the tool of the state. The spiritual and material tyranny of the Communist rulers allows the citizen no other attitude but blind obedience to the Communist Party line. The only authorized freedom is that of self-criticism—provided it conforms to the party line, and concerns only the modality of its application. The totalitarian Communist constitution of May 9, 1948, while it claims to guarantee the basic human rights of all Czechoslovak citizens, also stipulates that its individual provisions shall be interpreted in the spirit of the principles of the people's democratic order. Its aim, defined in the Criminal Code of 1950, is to crush the workmen's class, in order to construct socialism, and later communism.

Under the provisions of law No. 217 of October 14, 1949, churches in Czechoslovakia were nationalized and placed under the control of a state administrator holding cabinet rank in the Government of Czechoslovakia. The function of this state administration is to see to it that the churches act in harmony with the totalitarian Communist constitution and "the principles of the democratic order."

Forced-labor camps were organized as a means of political coercion to enforce these principles of the democratic order. It is stated specifically that this measure is directed against "class enemies," against those who have a hostile attitude toward the government or its ideology, and even against persons who manifest an intent, or intend to manifest their opposition to the Communist regime.

Before the Communist putsch of February 25, 1948, ministers of the Evangelical Church were elected by congregations. According to the provisions of law No. 218 of October 14, 1949, the election of a minister or church official by the congregation requires the approval of the Communist government. Since state approval, even when granted, may at any time be withdrawn, and since the state has been providing the salaries of priests, ministers, and church dignitaries, following the nationalization of church estates, this means that priests, ministers, and church dignitaries are under the direct control of the Communist regime. Those who have accepted coexistence and collaboration with communism have thus become its servants.

As it is provided by law in Czechoslovakia that a hostile attitude toward the government or its ideology, either in deed or suspected intent, is an offense punishable by forced labor or by genocide in the form of a refusal of social security benefits, I respectfully submit the question: How can Christianity coexist and work together with communism, which nationalizes human consciences, without treading the path to perdition and self-destruction?

Sincerely yours,

Stefan Osusky,
Czechoslovak Minister to France (1921–40); Delegate to the League of Nations (1920–37); Lecturer on the Philosophy of International Law at Charles University, Prague (1936–39); Professor of European Culture and Civilization at Colgate University, Hamilton, N. Y. (1946–50).

Rising Marketing Costs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARGUERITE STITT CHURCH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 17, 1954

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am submitting the agricultural letter of August 6 sent out by the Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago, following other insertions by me relative to rising marketing costs and the share of the farmers and middlemen therein. This letter gives an additonal constructive analysis of that engrossing and compelling problem:

Marketing costs are attracting public attention again. The House Agriculture Committee has recently taken another look at the situation for farm commodities. Interest is prompted by the continued decline in farm prices while average retail food prices have shown little or no change.

During periods of recession, it is typical for farm prices to decline relatively more than retail prices of food products. Conversely, during business upswings, prices of farm products increase relatively more than retail food prices. The same thing happens for most other raw materials as these commodities usually are far removed from final consumers in terms of both place and form.

From 1949 to 1951 retail food prices increased 13 percent while farm prices increased about 22 percent. Since the 1951 peak in farm prices, the shoe has been on the other foot. Farm prices have declined 19 percent while food prices are about the same as in

1951, although down almost 2 percent from their peak reached in 1952.

Farmers receive a rising share of the retail dollar on business upswings and a declining share during periods of shrinking demand. Between 1949 and 1951, the farmers' share increased 2 percent. Since 1951 it has been reduced by 4 percent.

Consumer interest in marketing costs is largely a reflection of his concern about high food prices. The farmer interest, on the other hand, reflects his concern about low farm prices. Both of these points of view are always present but increase in tempo whenever prices rise or fall. They simply reflect the opposing interests of sellers and buyers. The actual level of marketing costs at any given time probably is quite incidental to these opposing points of view.

Nevertheless, marketing costs—usually characterized as middlemen's margins—frequently have served as a scapegoat on which both producers and consumers could expend their dissatisfactions during times of adverse income-cost relationships. The real issue, of course, is not whether the percent of consumer income spent for food is high or low or whether the proportion of these expenditures which find their way into farmers' pockets is above or below 50 percent, but whether the processing and marketing functions demanded by producers and consumers can be performed more economically.

Many additional services have been incorporated into the marketing processes for food in recent years and important production improvements have been made on farms. Thus, past relationships do not necessarily indicate that present margins are high or low.

Additional marketing services provided consumers include more convenient packaging, a greater variety of ready-to-serve foods and higher quality merchandise. On the producer side additional services include such things as improved transportation and storage facilities, market news information, and assuming of financial risk.

In addition to the pressure to exand services, the marketing system has encountered rising wage and transportation rates. Under these circumstances only increased efficiency can keep the cost of processing and distributing from rising. Research by both public and private interests and substantial capital investment in new facilities have contributed to improved efficiency and will likely continue to play an important role.

The price-cost squeeze on farmers may be due in part to a rise in marketing costs. On the other hand, farmers' total sales may have been boosted by the increase in marketing services. In attempting to diagnose the cause of the price-cost squeeze in agriculture—and to prescribe a cure—it is important that difficulties resulting from changing levels of economic activity be distinguished from alleged inefficiencies in the marketing system.

The outlook for the remainder of the year indicates little change from present trends. Prices of farm products are likely to continue to slip, in view of the large supplies now in prospect. On the other hand, only a slight easing of food prices at the retail level is foreseen. Any reduction in retail food prices will probably be limited largely to meat and poultry where the farmers' share of the retail dollar is higher than for most other farm products. Since 1951, prices of meat at retail have declined 10 percent while prices of all foods have not changed materially.

With a continued rise in the standard of living, the long-term outlook would suggest a still smaller share of the retail food dollar going to farmers as the demand for services by consumers will likely continue to grow. But this does not necessarily indicate that farmers will be worse off.

Accomplishments of 83d Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. ROSS ADAIR

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1954

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, realizing the importance of the accomplishments of the 83d Congress, I should like to set forth some of them and of the results of the first year and a half of the Eisenhower administration.

END TO KOREAN WAR

Foremost in any such recapitulation is the fact that the United States is not now at war and American boys are not being killed in active warfare any place in the world. Before his election, Mr. Eisenhower said he would strive to bring an end to the Korean war, and this has been done. If for no other thing, the present administration deserves the continued trust and confidence of the electorate.

In the field of national defense, we have embarked upon a program that is sometimes referred to as "the new look." Simply put, this means we are attempting to get a greater degree of national security for less dollars spent. While no one of the armed services is neglected, there is special emphasis put on air power in all its aspects. The Defense Department is also making renewed efforts to assure that the taxpayer's dollar will buy the maximum amount of defense materiel. This is being accomplished through better administration and economy of operation.

DEFENSE AGAINST COMMUNISM

Today we seek a just and permanent peace in the world through a consistent and firm foreign policy. This policy is based upon the desire for freedom for all peoples and their willingness to form alliances for their common defense against communism.

The value of the dollar has been stabilized and inflation has been halted.

Tax reductions of an estimated $7.3 billion have gone into effect with most of this great saving going to individual citizens. This is the greatest tax savings ever put into effect by a single Congress.

In its first full year in office, this administration and the Congress reduced expenditures by an estimated $12 billion. This was accomplished by strict economy and the elimination of waste.

The social-security system has been broadened and improved.

Controls which previously plagued us have been removed.

GOVERNMENT PAYROLL REDUCED

In keeping with campaign promises, Government payrolls have been reduced by almost a quarter of a million people.

Having in mind the fundamental importance of agriculture, this Congress has given unusually long and detailed study to the farm problem. As a result of this study, legislation has been enacted which has as its two-fold goal both the protection of the producer and the consumer. It is recognized that the farmer must get a fair return for the produce he sells, and yet this must be achieved without constantly adding to surplus stocks already in existence. The program enacted into law is a long-range one which is designed to benefit all segments of our population.

PROGRAM OF HIGHWAY CONSTRUCTION

An extensive program of highway construction was approved.

Preservation of our internal security and the fight on communism have been vigorously pushed forward. People of doubtful loyalty have been removed from our Federal Government, and the Department of Justice has been given increased legislative authority in its fight against the menace of communism. We are determined that our Nation shall never be taken over by this godless philosophy.

Integrity in Government has been restored.

Increased benefits have been given to deserving groups of veterans and their dependents.

Attention has been given by the Congress to many other matters of prime importance. Among them are: Reorganization of several agencies of the Federal Government, legislation providing for study, but not Federal control over problems in the field of education, and the liberalization of the Housing Act to aid those who aspire to own their own homes.

AMERICA THAT IS PROSPEROUS

Finally, we have achieved an America that is prosperous and economically sound without war. Certain people had said that the transition from a war to a peacetime economy could not be made without a severe depression, but they have been proved wrong.

The people of America, through their elected Representatives, have again demonstrated the strength and resourcefulness of free men. A great responsibility was laid upon this Congress, and it has discharged it well.

Tax Revision Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR A. KNOX

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 17, 1954

Mr. KNOX. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I wish to include some of the highlights of the new tax law, the changes in general which are effective last January 1.

This is the first comprehensive revision of the internal revenue laws since before the turn of the century and the enactment of the income tax.

Approximately a half a million man-hours of work have gone into this gigantic achievement.

Over 3,000 changes in the revenue laws are contained in the tax revision measure. In general, the purpose of these changes has been to remove inequities, to end harassment of the taxpayer, and to reduce tax barriers to future expansion of production and employment.

The new law closes over 50 loopholes through which taxpayers today can avoid paying their fair share of taxes.

The new law contains $827 million relief for individuals and $536 million relief for business. In addition, the new law will extend the present 52 percent corporate income for 1 year which means an additional $1.2 billion tax on business. This increased tax on business practically pays for all of the tax relief granted so that the net cost to the revenue will be only $163 million.

Without attempting to give a technical interpretation, the following represents some of the highlights of the new tax law. These changes in general are effective last January 1 so that the taxpayers will receive the benefit from them this year.

DEPENDENTS

First. A parent can claim a deduction of $600 for each child regardless of the child's earnings if the child is under 19 and the parent continues to furnish more than half the child's support.

Second. A parent can also claim the $600 dependency deduction for a child over 18 regardless of the child's earnings if the child is attending school or college, or receiving on-the-farm training, and the parent continues to furnish more than half the child's support.

Third. An aged parent or other dependent cared for by several members of a family can be claimed as a deduction by one of the members of the family.

Fourth. A taxpayer can claim at $600 dependency deduction for a foster child.

Fifth. A taxpayer can claim a $600 dependency deduction for a child awaiting adoption.

Sixth. A taxpayer can claim a $600 dependency deduction for any other person, regardless of relationship, if the taxpayer supports that person in his home.

Seventh. A taxpayer can claim a $600 dependency deduction for a cousin who is institutionalized because of physical or mental disability.

Savings to taxpayers, $85 million.

CHILD-CARE EXPENSES

First. Single working parents, such as a widow, are allowed a deduction up to $600 for the expense of child-care for children up to 12 years of age.

Second. The same deduction is allowed for a married woman who must work because her husband is incapacitated.

Third. The same deduction is allowed with respect to any dependent regardless of age, who is mentally or physically incapable of caring for himself.

Fourth. A similar deduction is allowed a married woman if the combined income of her husband and herself does not exceed $5,100.

Savings to taxpayers, $130 million.

MEDICAL EXPENSES

First. Medical expenses can be deducted when they exceed 3 percent of income, instead of 5 percent as under present law.

Second. Example: A family with $3,000 gross income and medical expenses of $150 will be able to deduct $60. The same family can deduct nothing today.

Third. The bill doubles the present maximum limit on the amount that can be deducted.

Savings to taxpayers, $80 million.

HEAD OF FAMILY

First. A single taxpayer who has a dependent son or daughter will be entitled during the first 2 years after the death of his spouse to the same income-splitting privilege as is accorded married couples.

Second. A single individual can receive half the benefits of income splitting if he has a dependent parent and if the taxpayer maintains a household for the father or mother.

Savings to taxpayers, $11 million.

RETIREMENT INCOME CREDIT

First. All retired people 65 and over including schoolteachers, firemen, policemen, and civil servants, will in effect be exempt on all retirement income up to $1,200. This will mean a tax reduction for these retired people of up to $240 a year.

Second. Example: A retired single individual over 65 who has a total retirement income of $3,000 today pays about $300 in income tax. Under the bill, his tax is reduced to $60—a saving of $240.

Third. The same exemption will extend to individuals under 65 if they receive a pension from a public retirement system, such as do teachers.

Savings to taxpayers, $141 million.

CREDIT PURCHASES

The bill allows a deduction for interest up to 6 percent on installment purchases.

Total saving to taxpayers, $10 million.

CHARITABLE CONTRIBUTIONS

The bill increases from 20 to 30 percent the allowable deduction for charitable contributions to churches, hospitals, and educational institutions.

Total savings to taxpayers, $25 million.

AID TO FARMERS

First. Deductions up to 25 percent of farm income are allowed for soil and water conservation.

Second. The bill permits more rapid write-off of the expense of farm machinery, equipment, and construction.

Third. Removes tax on the proceeds of the sale of cattle when the sale is necessitated by disease.

Savings to taxpayers, $10 million.

SICKNESS AND ACCIDENT PLANS

First. Premiums paid by employers to health and accident plans will not be taxable to their employees.

Second. All accident and health benefits paid as reimbursement for actual medical expenses to employees, their wives, or children, are completely exempted from tax.

Third. Payments to employees for loss of wages due to injury or illness are exempted up to $100 a week.

Savings to taxpayers: No estimate possible.

DEATH BENEFITS

The bill exempts all death benefits up to $5,000 paid by an employer to the widow or other beneficiary of an employee.

Savings to taxpayers: No estimate possible.

PENSIONS AND ANNUITIES

In addition to the $1,200 exemption extended to retirement income, the bill also provides a simpler method for taxation of pensions and annuities, ends annual 3-percent tax paid on annuities and provides instead a method of computing tax on basis of cost divided by years of life expectancy.

Savings to taxpayers, $10 million.

DIVIDEND CREDIT

First. Excludes first $50 in dividends from taxation and provides a credit against tax equal to 4 percent of the balance.

Second. Example: An individual with $50 or less in dividends from his savings will be entirely exempt from tax on that amount.

Third. Example: An individual with $250 in dividends from his savings will exclude the first $50 entirely, and then reduce his total tax by $8—4 percent of the balance of $200.

Savings to taxpayers, $204 million.

DEPRECIATION

The bill will permit the more liberal writeoff of the cost of new equipment. For example, in the first year of life of new equipment, the taxpayer will be able to write off twice the amount now allowed.

Savings to taxpayers, $375 million, of which $75 million represents savings to individuals such as farmers, shopkeepers, and salesmen.

DECLARATIONS OF ESTIMATED TAX

The requirements are eased for filing declarations of estimated tax. Upward of a million taxpayers will be relieved of the present requirement for filing.

FILING TAX RETURNS

Tax returns will be due April 15 instead of March 15, giving taxpayers 1 additional month in which to prepare their final tax returns and make their final tax payments.

RESEARCH AND EXPERIMENTATION

The bill grants taxpayers an option to either deduct as an expense or to amortize research and experimental expenditures.

No revenue estimate possible. The provision is designed to encourage business research with the objective of creating new products, new processes, and new jobs.

METHODS OF ACCOUNTING

The bill brings tax-accounting rules into harmony with business accounting, thereby eliminating to a great extent the necessity for taxpayers to maintain two sets of books. It provides realistic computation of net income for tax purposes in conformity with sound business practices.

Savings to taxpayers, $47 million.

DEPLETION

The bill increases the rate of percentage depletion on a variety of critical and strategic minerals in order to encourage the development of domestic sources of supply.

Savings to taxpayers, $34 million.

PARTNERSHIPS

First. The bill adopts comprehensive provisions concerning the tax treatment of partners and partnerships in order to remove confusion of existing law. Principal objectives are simplicity, flexibility, and equity between partners.

Second. Certain proprietorships and partnerships are given the option to be taxed as corporations.

Savings to taxpayers, $20 million.

INVENTIONS

The bill extends capital-gains treatment to proceeds realized by an inventor on the sale or exchange of a patent.

No revenue estimate possible. The new provision is designed to encourage invention and thereby promote a healthy economy and an improving standard of living.

NET OPERATING LOSS

The bill extends the net operating loss carryback to 2 years and makes certain other adjustments.

Savings to taxpayers, $120 million.

LIFE INSURANCE

The bill lessens the estate tax on the proceeds of certain life-insurance policies.

Savings to individual taxpayers, $25 million.

CONSOLIDATED RETURNS

The bill removes the 2 percent penalty tax with respect to consolidated returns filed by regulated public utilities.

Savings to taxpayers, $35 million.

IMPROPER ACCUMULATIONS

The bill eases the penalty tax on certain accumulated earnings in order that business, especially small businesses, may have greater freedom in retaining their funds for legitimate business purposes.

Savings to taxpayers, $10 million.

CORPORATION INCOME TAX

The bill extends for 1 year the present 52 percent corporation income tax.

Total increase in revenue, $1.2 billion.

REPUBLICAN ACTION FOR TAXPAYERS

The 10 percent reduction in Federal income taxes which went into effect last January 1 saves individual taxpayers a total of $3 billion annually. This tax cut would not have been possible if the Congress and the administration had not cut the Truman budget for fiscal 1954 by $12 billion.

Nor would the $2 billion tax savings by elimination of the excess-profits tax have been possible without this budget cutting.

The Republican excise-tax reduction law saves taxpayers an additional $1 billion.

The tax revision act will save taxpayers $1,400,000,000.

A total of $827 million of this tax saving is for individuals. The remainder, $536 million, is tax relief for business.

The overall tax-cut program will save $7,400,000,000. Of this amount, individuals receive an overall total tax saving of $4,700,000,000. The tax savings so far surpass any previous total in the history of Congress.

Odd Love Feast in Moscow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY R. SHEPPARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 17, 1954

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Constantine Brown, from the Washington Evening Star of August 16, 1954:

ODD LOVE FEAST IN MOSCOW—WORLD PUZZLES AT SPECTACLE OF HIGH BRITISH POLITICIANS PARTYING WITH RED LEADERS DURING COLD WAR

While the imposing delegation of leaders of the British Labor Party sat swapping sentimental toasts with Malenkov, Kruschchev and company in Moscow, the people of the free world wonder to what end all this camaraderie will lead.

Former Prime Minister Clement Attlee and his party of Laborites, including the stormy leftist leader Aneurin Bevan, stopped off in the Soviet capital en route to keep a date with Mao Tse-tung, Chou En-lai and the other top men of Red China. The Kremlin rolled out the red—or should we say white—carpet for the visiting Britishers.

From the warm and most cordial character of the Soviet welcome for the party, it was obvious that every effort was being made to add to the prestige of the British delegation by the most painstaking attention to detail. Moscow even reported that the great Malenkov himself personally picked a bouquet for Edith Summerskill, the only woman member of the party. This is a strange Malenkov. Indeed, this is an unlooked-for Communist, indulging in such gross bourgeois flattery.

The dinners and parties were all arranged in a manner of intimacy. Little conversational groups gathered around the chief Russian bigwigs to have, we suppose, heart-to-heart talks about the state of the world and the Soviet desire for peace with coexistence.

Out of these cozy tete-a-tetes came reports of earnest agreement on the peaceful intentions of the Kremlin. Wilfrid Burke, chairman of the Labor Party, found Malenkov very friendly, he said, and very anxious to establish peaceful relations with the West.

The Muscovites broke precedent, even, to attend a dinner at the British Embassy. The Embassy must also have broken precedent; borscht was served, and no one dressed for dinner. No one said whether or not the ghosts of Kipling, Clive, Rhodes, or Victoria sent a delegation in protest, or picketed the place. But Peter the Great and Boris Godounov were certainly present in spirit. All hands drank a toast to Queen Elizabeth.

As if to underline the significance of the Moscow visit, the British Foreign Office, not at present under the wing of the Labor Party, announced that the Soviet Government has invited a delegation of British members of Parliament to visit Moscow this fall. The invitation, from the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet—the Red version of a parliament—was addressed to Lord Simonds, head of the House of Lords, and to Speaker Morrison of the House of Commons. The invitation has been accepted.

Thus the Communist leaders, by inviting officially the visit of an all-party delegation from Britain's Parliament, rather adeptly spike the guns of those scoffers who have charged off the significance of the Attlee delegation's visit with the "Oh, they're just a bunch of Socialists anyway" type of comment.

And the Kremlin propaganda strategists pat themselves on the back and award themselves a few medals for a master coup. For the world looks at the spectacle of the staid and dignified British visitors in their friendly visit to the lair of the Red chieftains, and somehow the picture of Communist aggression becomes blurred and unreal. That, of course, is the Red design, and it is a clever one.

Although technically there is nothing amiss at all in these friendly visits between nations having formal diplomatic ties, as is the case in both the Russian and Chinese journeys of the Attlee party, much could be said on the question of the British taste in choosing this particular time for the visit.

British troops, under the banner of the United Nations, have hardly stopped fighting and dying in Korea against the Chinese Red hordes. And there is no peace in Korea, even yet, beyond the mockery of the truce agreement entered into last year. The guns have not yet had time to cool in Indochina, where the West abjectly settled a war on Communist terms and called it a peace.

The British are past masters at the art of diplomacy, and are very much aware that the Russian intentions in all this show of cordiality are primarily to place the United States, the acknowledged leader of the free world forces, in an embarrassing position.

Coexistence, in the British view, would appear to be a considerably different procedure from any the term implies in the United States.

While it could never be said of Americans that they spurn the hand of friendship with any nation, it has always been something of an American characteristic to expect that the hand will be sincerely proferred.

It has been the consistent stand of our policymakers that, in the case of the Soviet, actions speak louder than words—or toasts.

The Sioux Nation Has Been Honored Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. USHER L. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 17, 1954

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, the Sioux Nation has been honored by the selection of Mary Louise Defender, who was named Miss Indian American. A full report on this incident appears here as printed in Sheridan, Wyo., under date of August 9, 1954:

Mary Louise Defender, a Sioux maiden from Fort Yates, N. Dak., Sunday night was named Miss Indian America.

Runners-up were Mary A. Turley, Cherokee Tribe, Tulsa, Okla.; Kay Price, Navaho, Gallup, N. Mex.; and Annie Grace Strange Owl, Northern Cheyenne, Birney, Mont.

Selection of Miss Defender from 76 candidates was announced at the concluding program of All American Indian Days, which saw more than 40 tribes gathered here for 2 days of sports contests, dance exhibitions, and pageantry.

Miss Defender, 23, will be a guest at the Miss America beauty contest in Atlantic City, N. J., next month. She is 5 feet 9 inches tall, and weighs 133 pounds. She attended Haskell Institute, Lawrence, Kans., and is employed at the land law office at the Standing Rock Sioux Agency.

Her entry was sponsored by the Mandan Shrine unit at Bismarck, N. Dak., of El Zagal Temple at Fargo, N. Dak.

Arlene Wesley, a Yakima Indian of Toppenish, Wash., won the first Miss Indian America contest last year.

Galloway Calhoun, of Tyler, Tex., national chairman of the Shrine hospitals for crippled children, was made an honorary member of the Blackfeet Tribe. Participating in the ceremony was John Sharp, of Browning, Mont., a Blackfoot, who was the first child admitted to the Minneapolis, Minn., Shrine Hospital for Crippled Children 3 years ago.

All-American Indian days were sponsored by Kalif Shrine Temple of Sheridan, with proceeds going to Shrine hospitals for children.

Mr. Speaker, this is the second time within my memory in which a Sioux Indian girl has been selected from all the tribes as the finest example of Indian maidenhood on the American continent. At the World's Fair in Chicago in the nineties, the daughter of Harry Chin was selected as the finest looking Indian girl in America. The peculiar thing about these things is that both belonged to the Sioux Tribe at Fort Yates, N. Dak.

I knew the first selection as Mrs. Ironroad, who lived many years on the reservation and was always, even in her advanced years, a striking personality.

I know the people of North Dakota will take great satisfaction in knowing that Miss Defender has received this signal honor.

Philippine-American Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday; August 17, 1954

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, another potent piece of evidence of the closeness and the friendship of the people of the Philippines is a recent proclamation by President Magsaysay declaring August 13, 1954 as Philippine-American Day.

In include in my extension of remarks the proclamation issued by President Magsaysay together with an editorial appearing in the Philippines Herald of August 3, 1954.

The selection of Baguio in the Philippines as the meeting place in early September of the nations that will participate in a possible southeast Asian pact is ideal.

The far-seeing and courageous leadership of President Magsaysay and his associates in the Philippines in recognizing the purposes of Communist aggression and their willingness to take steps designed to meet this challenge, justifies the Philippine Republic being host to such a conference.

The men and women of the Philippine Republic under this leadership have clearly shown their desire, their will, and their determination to be a free people under God and under law.

The proclamation and editorial follow:

PRESIDENT MAGSAYSAY'S PROCLAMATION DECLARING AUGUST 13, 1954, AS PHILIPPINE-AMERICAN DAY

Whereas August 13, 1899, marked the official beginning of relations between the Philippines and the United States and the commencement of a happy and mutually profitable association between Filipinos and Americans; and

Whereas on the occasion of the 55th anniversary of that event it is appropriate that the two peoples renew and further strengthen the bonds that bind them in view, particularly, of the prevailing critical world conditions that threaten their security and the democratic institutions that they have jointly developed and stanchly defended at the cost of their resources and blood; and

Whereas it is meet and proper that this historical event in the lives of the two nations, loyal partners in the active defense of freedom, be properly commemorated so that it may ever remain a source of inspiration in the noble effort to insure the success and permanence of the free and democratic enterprises in which they are engaged and which constitute their contribution to the peace of the world and the happiness of mankind; and

Whereas it is desirable that the two peoples be afforded every opportunity to get together on an intimate basis and encouraged to find a common medium for the friendly, intelligent, and unselfish appraisal of the problems as well as the advantages that arise from their present relationship, always in a spirit of cooperation and with due regard for each other's rights, interests, and aspirations.

Now, therefore, I, Ramon Magsaysay, President of the Philippines, do hereby declare August 13, 1954, as Philippine-American Day. I call upon all our people and all Americans residing within Philippine territory to observe this date with appropriate ceremonies designed to promote mutual understandng and helpfulness and to enhance the practical significance of the intimate association existing between Filipinos and Americans and between the Government of the Republic of the Philippines and the Government of the Republic of the United States of America.

I especially call all civic, business, religious, and service organizations and schools, both public and private, to devote this date to exercises calculated to advance knowledge and wider appreciation of the value of Philippine-American relationship and of the benefits derived from it.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the Republic of the Philippines to be affixed.

Done in the city of Manila, the 29th day of July, in the year of our Lord 1954, and of the independence of the Philippines the ninth.

RAMON MAGSAYSAY,
President of the Philippines.

By the President:

FRED RUIZ CASTRO,
Executive Secretary.

[From the Philippines Herald of August 3, 1954]

The proclamation of August 13 by President Magsaysay as Philippine-American Day should serve to instill more effectively in the minds of our people a deeper appreciation of the significance of the historic association between the Philippines and the United States which commenced that day more than half a century ago. The new official designation will at the same time serve to erase the somewhat unpleasant connotation that the original name "Occupation Day" implies:

It is but appropriate that a special occasion should be set in which Americans and Filipinos may jointly celebrate a day dedicated to the promotion and advancement of their common interests precisely because they are faced today with grave situations constantly being created by many disruptive influences. The enemies of democratic unity and the subversive activities of individuals and groups bound by common loyalty to a dangerous alien ideology, which today threaten the peace and security of the world can best be overcome by a further strengthening of the bonds that bind peoples and countries upholding the cause of freedom. The unity and mutual helpfulness that underlie Philippine-American relationship constitute a pattern of defense for the entire democratic world.

On the eve of negotiations for a reappraisal of the bases of future Philippine-American relations, it is well that both peoples should be reminded of the mutually beneficial character of their association since the advent of American influence in this country. The magnificent achievements of Philippine-American collaboration for more than 50 years now have been brought about by a spirit of respect for each other's rights and legitimate interests of Filipinos and Americans and by their common concern for the welfare and security of our Nation. The observance of Philippine-American Day should drive home the urgent necessity of further reinforcing the foundations upon which Philippine-American understanding and friendship rests and President Magsaysay should be commended for his initiative in proclaiming the day and giving it new meaning.

Let's Complete Action on Railroad Retirement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM T. GRANAHAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 17, 1954

Mr. GRANAHAN. Mr. Speaker, it has been noted here before that there seems to be some official reluctance about speeding action on the Railroad Retirement bill containing higher and broader benefits and which also increases the top unemployment compensation benefits available to railroaders. We all saw how the chairman of our committee, Mr. WOLVERTON, of New Jersey, practically had to issue an ultimatum to get it up for House action.

This bill is now somewhat stalled over in the Senate and I urge that the administration get behind it and help us get it through Congress before adjournment.

As I said, there might appear to be some official reluctance about speeding action on this bill. Perhaps we are wrong in believing that. We now have the word of a high-ranking administration official that the bill is, in fact, an important part of the President's program.

We were not so sure about that before today. The Budget Bureau report to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce when we were considering the bill initially was, to say the least, very lukewarm and full of all sorts of worries about how it might set precedents for liberalizing social security.

Now, however, the Solicitor of the Labor Department, in a speech today before the Wisconsin State Federation of Labor in which he extols the Eisenhower concern for the worker, definitely lists "increased benefits under the railroad retirement and railroad unemployment compensation programs" as among parts of the President's program which the Labor Department Solicitor, Stuart Rothman, says: "have been enacted into law or soon will be."

It is good news to know that the President supports this bill. Can we now count on some help in getting it through the Senate and into law?

United States Government Showed Unfortunate Timing in Filing Monopoly Suit Against United Fruit Co.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 17, 1954

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include an article entitled "United States Government Showed Unfortunate Timing in Filing Monopoly Suit Against United Fruit Co.," written by Frank R. Kent and appearing in the Boston Sunday Herald, Boston, Mass., of August 15, 1954.

There are countless persons, including myself, who agree with Mr. Kent's views as expressed in his article that "it does seem that the filing of this suit a few weeks ago in New Orleans—which is not the United Fruit Co.'s headquarters—was one of the worst cases of timing in recent years."

The article follows:

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT SHOWED UNFORTUNATE TIMING IN FILING MONOPOLY SUIT AGAINST UNITED FRUIT CO.

(By Frank R. Kent)

Whatever the merits of the Government's suit against the United Fruit Co. alleging that it is a monopoly in restraint of trade under the Sherman Antitrust Act, it does seem that the filing of this suit a few weeks ago in New Orleans (which is not the United Fruit Co.'s headquarters) was one of the worst cases of timing in recent years.

The reasons for this view are clear. One, it is well recognized that one of the chief aims of the Communist propaganda is to make trouble for us in Central and South America.

In Guatemala, it is beyond dispute that the former government was communistically supported, that its leaders were anti-American; that they were also anti-United Fruit Co., which has large holdings and employs many thousands of people there.

TARGET OF REDS

A second reason is that the United Fruit Co. is a constant target of the Communists. The weight of the United States, as exerted through its able Ambassador, John Peurifoy, and in other ways, was in favor of the revolutionists in Guatemala; so was that of the company.

The success of the revolution was in considerable measure due to our Government. Its failure would have been a Communist victory—and so heralded around the world.

A third reason is that, having lost in Guatemala, the Communists have now shifted to other tactics—and in another country—Honduras. In the reports of Patrick Skene Catling, of the Baltimore Sun, the recent disastrous strike against the United Fruit Co., which its Honduran manager, Joseph F. Aycock, attributes to the Communists, have cost the company an estimated $8 million to $10 million in spoiled fruit, flooded plantations, unchecked plant disease, and other deterioration caused by temporary neglect of crops and equipment.

TOO EASYGOING

This strike was inspired and directed by Reds. The strike, which is the company's first, will cost it an additional $5 million in wages and was managed by labor leaders, instructed and financed by Guatemala's Arbenz regime. According to Catling, Aycock says "we have not been able to deal with the union yet because nobody in it appears to know who is supposed to do what." Further, Aycock says "putting only about six of them in jail would have a very salutary effect.

"Unfortunately, the Honduran Government, though very fine in many ways, is loose and slipshod in the matter of eliminating Communists."

Adding this Honduran situation to what happened in Guatemala, where the United Fruit Co. is a favorite Communist target, it does appear that the sudden filing of a suit against the company as a monopoly plays directly into the Communists' hands and supports their propaganda. In its complaint the Government, with supporting evidence, makes a strong case against the company.

In its reply the company puts up a strong defense. What seems true, even from the Government's complaint, is that this suit could have been filed 2 or 3 years ago or 2 or 3 years from now, without any damage to the national interest. But to file it at this time, when the Communists are promoting strikes and using the company as an example of American imperialism and oppression, does not appear to reflect much credit upon the judgment of the Department of Justice.

Address by Hon. William S. Hill, of Colorado, to the Annual Convention of the Independent Grocers Alliance, Chicago, Ill., August 9, 1954

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. HILL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 11, 1954

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, on August 9, 1954, I addressed the 28th annual convention of the Independent Grocers Alliance at Chicago, Ill.

I should like to include my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD:

My friends of the Independent Grocers Alliance, I am highly honored, indeed, to have the opportunity of speaking to you at your annual convention.

It is no minor task to prepare interesting information for such an organization as the IGA. To build this type of an association is difficult, indeed. Cooperation of independent merchants who have been born, reared, and steeped in individualism is not achieved by a simple twist of the wrist or by any hocus-pocus. I know this through personal experience in operating an independent hardware store.

You are one of the largest food-retailing organizations in the world. That of itself carries with it grave responsibilities as well as untold and unheralded opportunities for service in every community in which you operate food outlets.

Progress by cooperation has been and must continue to be the basic fundamental in the development of business units in America.

It is estimated that the steadily increasing population of the United States will require at least 5,000 new supermarket food stores within the next decade.

The investment in buildings and equipment alone will run over one-half billion dollars.

Food distribution is a great business in America. This gigantic industry is an absolute necessity. If there is such a thing as "critical material," as classified in our defense, certainly food distribution is a critical industry if our people are to be supplied with a proper type and kind of food. Only with a proper system of food distribution will our people be able to follow the general pursuits of their activities to earn a livelihood and continue to develop a standard of living and a way of life that can only exist under a free Government.

Keep in mind that our population is increasing at a rate of 2,500,000 people per year. Actually, this means that every year we are adding to our population a city the size of Los Angeles, Calif., plus a Lousville, Ky. Five years from now we will need an additional farm production equivalent to the entire annual crop output of Illinois and Iowa combined. And I am only including the actual food necessities.

True, today we have huge commodity surpluses. But, our rate of population will soon catch up with our total agricultural production, and if I read the signs of the times correctly, we could in a short period of years be deficient in supplying proper types and kinds of food for our domestic market.

Undoubtedly the increasing efficiency of our food marketing systems has delayed the full impact of our population growth on the increasing use of farm products.

The spread between the price the farmer receives for his commodities and the cost to the consumer will be narrowed and reduced as properly developed markets become more efficient.

Marketing efficiency is of paramount importance and should increase the consumption of agricultural products in considerable quantities. The per capita consumption of meats, fruits, vegetables, milk, and eggs must be increased from year to year, and the records show that as yet one-third of our city families are not consuming enough of these items according to the best nutritional standards. By improving the present daily diet of this one-third of our urban population, we would create a new market for roughly 5 million people. This is your opportunity and responsibility in the immediate days ahead.

The battle against waste of fruit and vegetables must be carried on with unrelenting vigor. Food stores have accomplished wonders in this direction the last decade, but today is the day of opportunity.

Records indicate that 30 percent—almost one-third of all fresh fruits and vegetables—are lost between the farmer's production point and the consumer's kitchen. This is a terrific loss that could and should be greatly reduced. A recent study in South Carolina disclosed that only 57 percent of the tomatoes harvested in that State ever reached the consumer in any form.

You are familiar with the recently developed lettuce crate which curtails at least 20 percent of the transportation losses of lettuce. Other vegetables can be marketed with approximately the same improvement in care and handling.

Many additional dairy products could be channeled into human nutrition if they were properly marketed with new and up-to-the-minute cartons and modern methods of preserving the freshness.

Your Federal Government is spending more than $100 million a year in marketing research on this very important item.

There are problems your organization must face and assist in solving if we are to keep abreast of the increasing population.

We owe a great deal to our food industry for its most historical achievement—a land of plenty, where the food shelves are always bulging with a varied and tempting supply of nutritious food. The entire food industry is justly and rightly proud of this achievement.

The days of the old marketing methods are over. The frontier trading posts that handled everything from a toothpick to furniture and farm equipment have long since disappeared. The IGA stores have replaced these posts. We have—certainly in my lifetime—seen a revolution in food distribution—and the end is not in sight.

The old cracker barrel days—the poorly kept, unlighted, filthy grocery store—have departed, and a good riddance indeed.

With the departure of the old frontier trading post, a revolution in transportation and food distribution developed side by side. With the development of national brands of goods and brand advertising, the local retailer threw off his old character and began the slow and uphill drive to become a modern merchant.

Millions of farm families who used to be self-sufficient, as far as their food supplies were concerned, now purchase food at the supermarkets.

If my figures are correct, the number of grocery stores has almost doubled every 10 years since 1850. In 1870 there were 7,000 wholesalers in the United States, but by 1900 there were 93,000.

With the improvement in transportation and storage of fresh fruits and vegetables came also the frozen food industry, a specialty in itself, and one that is fast becoming a principal department of the grocery store.

Yes, distribution methods are in a fluid state—shifting, changing, expanding. These are ever-changing conditions that up-and-coming business firms of any type and kind must appreciate, and they must be able to adapt their operation to new demands as our country shifts directly from a rural population to cities and their fast-growing suburbs.

As a member of the Committee on Agriculture in the House of Representatives, and as chairman of the Select Committee on Small Business, I should like to discuss with you for a brief moment how your great organization of merchants is closely associated with, and certainly interested in the action of the legislative branch of your Government as it concerns the detailed operation of the wholesale and retail food industry.

The farmers must produce food in abundance. The distributors must prepare the food for sale in a sanitary and appealing manner. The producer suffers when proper sales methods are not developed and the consumer lacks a balanced diet and finds the cost of food out of reach. So, the farmers have a keen interest in our system of food handling and distribution. At times it may appear that this relationship is remote—but we find this is not true upon closer examination.

The farmer and his family are heavy consumers and buy in abundance the food offered by the distributors. So, if the farmer receives a fair share of the national income and if he attains equality with other economic groups, such as the laboring man, a greater stability and a higher standard of living are results of this complete and total cooperation of the producer, the distributor, and the consumer. In no sense can they be considered separate economic entities.

We continually hear about the high price of food, but the truth of the matter is, we are buying cheaper food in relation to the average family income than at any time in our history. And the food, remember, is better, cleaner, and more appetizing, and affords a better diet than ever before in the history of the human race.

There must be on hand at all times sufficient food and fiber for our growing population. In case of drought, floods, pests, or in the event of war, food production must be held at a high level and an abundance of food in the market place is essential.

In 1953 the consumer could buy for 18 percent of his annual income the same food that in 1933–39 cost him 23.8 percent of his income.

Our Committee on Agriculture, in its report to the House on the new farm bill, presented figures prepared by Government economists to show that consumers get more and better food at a less percent of their wages at the grocery today than ever before.

In 1914 the average factory employee could buy 3½ pounds of bread with an hour's earnings; in 1929 he could buy 6.4 pounds; and in 1953 he could buy 10.7 pounds of bread with an hour's earnings.

Time permits no further discussion of this phase of food production, distribution, and consumption.

In closing, just a few brief remarks on recent legislation in which you are keenly interested. Time prohibits detailed analysis.

I. The tax revision bill, the first complete overhaul of our tax legislation in 75 years. These should interest you:

(a) Credit deductions on installment purchases up to 6 percent;

(b) Taxation of pensions and annuities reduced;

(c) Dividend credit of $50 excluded from taxation and a credit against a tax equal to 4 percent of the balance;

(d) Depreciation, the write off cost of new equipment. The taxpayer would be able to write off twice the amount now allowed;

(e) Tax accounting rules brought into harmony with business accounting;

(f) Extension of net operating loss carry-back to 2 years;

(g) Lessening of the penalty tax on certain accumulated earnings in order that business, especially small businesses, may have greater freedom in retaining their funds for legitimate business purposes.

In summation: The 10 percent reduction in Federal income taxes which took effect last January 1 saves individual taxpayers a total of $3 billion annually.

Two billion tax dollars are saved by elimination of the excess-profits tax.

The excise tax reduction law saves taxpayers an additional $1 billion.

The tax revision act will save taxpayers $1,400,000,000.

A total of $827,000,000 of this tax relief is for individuals. The remainder, $536 million is tax relief for business.

The overall tax-cut program will save $7,400,000,000. Of this amount, individuals receive an overall total tax saving of $4,700,000,000. These tax savings surpass any previous total in the history of Congress.

OTHER LEGISLATION

II. Overhauling and modernizing of our Nation's highway system—a $50 billion program.

III. The 1954 Agricultural Act.

IV. Revision of social-security legislation.

V. Balancing of the budget now within 75 percent of accomplishment.

Many, many more legislative acts could be discussed, but just a word in closing on the Small Business Administration. The SBA, as it is usually called, was created to give financial, managerial, and technical assistance to business—men like yourselves. It is the first peacetime legislation designed specifically for small business. It is becoming increasingly apparent to Americans everywhere that when the oportunity for business to begin small and grow big is eliminated, the American economy and the system of free, competitive enterprise will have been effectively destroyed. The opportunity must continue for small business to grow strong and prosper.

The IGA is typical of what can happen in the American economy when business organizations decide to coperate in a progressive and thoroughly American manner.

Thank you, it has been a pleasure to address you.

Bipartisanship and Our Policy in Asia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 17, 1954

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD the following address I made recently in Union County, N. J., on Bipartisanship and Our Policy in Asia:

It is always a great pleasure for me to come back to Union County and discuss with my fellow citizens some of our national problems. I'm grateful for your invitation to appear before you this evening, and I ask you to accept with me the responsibilities of citizens of our great Republic to think through some very serious problems we face in the world today.

I know that public servants such as myself are sometimes inclined to take themselves too seriously, and to talk too much about too many complicated questions. But it is a hard fact that our Nation is facing many grave problems, and that these problems can only be solved by intelligence and hard work on the part of the men and women whom you elect to office. It is our job to think about these problems and tell you what we think and why. This is the only way that you can decide how well we are doing our job and whether we reserve your continued support.

Now I am not going to employ any fancy slogans or catch words if I can help it because the subject under consideration demands sober judgment, not emotional harangues. Much of what I say may not agree with the thinking of some of you and I realize before I begin that some may feel that I am being partisan in my approach. Let me assure you that I do not in any way take delight in the serious problems the administration faces, and that I am firmly in support of soundly conceived bipartisan efforts to meet our responsibilities as leader of the free world whether the administration is Democratic or Republican. It is because I believe the question of national, not partisan, survival is so important that I offer my comments tonight.

I'm going to talk generally about our policy in Asia; a policy to defend the free world against further enrcoachment of the Soviet Union—A policy for the survival of freedom, if you will. First, I think it would be well to set the framework for this type of discussion by discussing foreign policy in general, looking at a bit of history in terms of development of our foreign policy since World War II and to talk about this much discussed subject of bipartisanship in foreign policy.

Let me make it clear that I do not pretend to be an expert in foreign policy. Sometimes, when I hear things that are said in the Congress, and see things that are done in our dealings with other nations, I am inclined to suspect that there aren't any experts in foreign policy. But there need to be. During the critical years ahead, all of us must learn to understand the basic issues of foreign policy much better than we do now. Every American citizen needs to realize that his very life, and the lives of his family and friends, will depend in large part on the kind of foreign policies we have and how they are carried out. Foreign policy is no longer just a subject for polite conversation, or a matter which we can leave to the boys in striped trousers. In an age of atomic bombs and long-range aircraft, it is a matter of vital and immediate concern to every man, woman, and child in America.

It was not long after World War II that the reinauguration of Russian aggression designs became all to apparent. Russian imperialist ambition go back to czarist days and, with various ups and downs, have been rather consistent. After the Russian revolution in 1917, there was a period between the wars when Russian internal problems were such that their aggressive designs were temporarily deferred. During and immediately following World War II, it was hoped by practically everyone that some modus vivendi, some living-together arrangement could be worked out with the Soviet Union whereby we could live in peace despite the fact that we recognized that the Communist form of tyranny is an anathema to us. As I stated, this wish for a modus vivendi on the part of peaceful men of all political alliances was quickly squelched with the emergence of renewed Russian imperialist designs and the bad faith of Russia in keeping agreements.

Now the important thing to keep in mind is the danger to our own country which has resulted from this Russian imperialism. There was once a time, 40 or 50 years ago, when this country seemed relatively safe, no matter what happened in other parts of the world. We had great oceans to protect us, and there were other powerful nations which could be counted on to hold back aggressive dictators. But along came airplanes, submarines, atomic bombs, germ warfare, and other hideous inventions of modern military science, and we came to realize that the oceans no longer protect America any more than the Maginot line protected France in World War II. At the same time, friendly nations in Europe and Asia have been so gravely weakened by two world wars that they are unable, alone, to hold imperialism in check. All this adds up to the fact that we are directly menaced by the spread of communism and that communism can be checked only if the United States throws the full force of its wealth, influence, and power into the balance scales against it.

We have no choice but to give the free world active and effective leadership in the gigantic struggle against Communist expansion. If we do not do so, there is a very real probability that we will either be living in a Communist-dominated nation 20 years from now, or else that we will all be dead, buried under an avalanche of Soviet bombs.

As the pattern of Communist imperialism developed, I think we can point with pride to the record of previous Democratic administrations in taking the United States from a position which had been isolationist in the middle thirties to one of the most amazing records of achievement of world leadership in the history of the world. Imagine it. In the short period from 1947 through 1952, the following great steps forward were taken under Democratic leadership with the able assistance, in many instances, of a minority of Republicans under Senator Vandenberg. We gave independence to the Philippines in 1946, showing clearly that we were not a colonial nation; we supported the independence of Indonesia as against our longtime friends, the Dutch, thereby helping to prevent a repetition of Indochina in those fertile islands to the south of the Indochinese Peninsula; we helped pressure the Russians to evacuate Iran; we stopped the Communists in Greece and Turkey under the Truman doctrine; we checked the rise of communism elsewhere through the Marshall plan and mutual security program; we broke the Berlin blockade; we built a system of defensive alliances, including NATO and the Pacific defense pacts; we gave reality to the concept of collective security by stopping the Communists in Korea; we laid the groundwork for the Schumann plan and EDC; we took steps to bring Italy, Germany, Austria, and Japan back into the family of nations; we showed our humanitarian interest in the advancement of our underprivileged neighbors under the point 4 program; we developed thermonuclear weapons; we sent military and to Indochina; we created the United Nations and its effectiveness against aggression, including the little assembly which permitted united action in Korea; and we made progress in hundreds and hundreds of little ways other than those I've mentioned.

Now, I don't claim the record of the Democratic administration is perfect. Certainly, the major blot on it is the conquest of China. From my cursory study of the problems in China, I'm not at all certain there was any politically feasible way we could have helped the Chinese Nationalists save China from the Communists. Certainly those who scream the most today about the loss of China to the Communists were totally unwilling to take the necessary steps required at that time—including the use of American troops to save the situation in that vast area of the world. The major responsibility for the loss of China of course lies with the Chinese Government itself. However, considering the tremendous stake we have in that area of the world and considering the strategic nature of the vast area of China to the cause of freedom in the world, we must admit that our efforts toward saving the situation in China lacked the vigor and the single-mindedness of purpose that have permitted the tremendous achievements I have outlined in other areas of the world. We did not do all possible to block the Communists' advance in that area of the world. However, let me repeat that those who now scream the loudest about it were the least willing to do what was required at the time.

When I say that we did not do everything possible to stop communism in China, I am not referring solely to what we did or failed to do in the late 1940's. There can be no doubt that grave mistakes were made during this period. But these mistakes followed earlier mistakes. Mistakes in foreign policy do not always come to light immediately; sometimes they take 20 years to be seen. The groundwork for the loss of China was laid when our Government, despite the pleas of Secretary Stimson, stood idly by and let the Japanese take Manchuria in 1931. In all the years that followed, the free Chinese Government never recovered real control of this wealthy area; it passed from the Japanese to the Communists. When the history of this century is writen, I am sure that the one tremendous mistake that will be recorded in our foreign policy—the one mistake which overshadows all others, was the rejection of the League of Nations and all other plans for international cooperation after the First World War, and the decision to go it alone. During the 1920's and early 1930's, while the United States remained in isolation, nazism, fascism, and communism developed their power, and came to dominate most of the earth. After a bloody and exhausting war, the power of fascism and nazism were broken, but the Communists were there to pick up the pieces, and Communist power emerged stronger than ever. Today, it seems incredible to remember that the richest and most powerful nation in the free world, the United States of America, was deluded by the mirage of isolationism—that we crawled into a shell and permitted the growth of evil forces which today threatened our very existence. And it is even more strange that some of our best-known politicians still lean toward this mirage. Even today, there are politicians who stand ready at a moment's notice to give the Communists a tongue lashing, but who quietly support policies which would inevitably cut the United States off from the rest of the world, surrender American leadership, and thereby hand the whole universe to the Communists on a silver platter.

Again referring to the development and execution of our foreign policy, under the Roosevelt and Truman administrations we had in a very true sense a bipartisan foreign policy. I think that with certain exceptions it is safe to say that it made very little difference whether Senator Vandenberg or Senator Connolly was head of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee as far as the development and execution of foreign policy was concerned; both cooperated with each other and were equally involved in policy formulation. In addition, I would like to call to your attention the fact that under both President Roosevelt and President Truman many prominently identified Republicans were called upon to play a vital role both in shaping our foreign policy and in carrying it out. I would like to mention just a few of those distinguished Republicans who were appointed by Democratic Presidents: Henry L. Stimson; Frank Knox, a Republican choice for Vice President; Robert T. Patterson; Robert A. Lovett; Gen. William H. Draper, Jr.; Gen. Lucius Clay; Nelson A. Rockefeller; Senator John Sherman Cooper; Senator Warren Austin; and, last but not least, John Foster Dulles and Dwight D. Eisenhower.

In the execution of our foreign policy let me point to a significant example of bipartisanship. When the entire Marshall plan concept was developed and put into practice, a prominently identified Republican and a strong supporter of President Eisenhower, Mr. Paul Hoffman, was appointed as its head and was given practically a free hand in developing the administration of this great effort to build Europe against the threat of Soviet internal and external aggression. Many of his appointments—as a matter of fact, most of his top appointments abroad—were Republicans. The entire program of aiding the Europeans, particularly the technical-assistance aspects, were entirely free of political consideration. Technical experts were appointed completely aside from their political affiliations. This, in my view, is the correct approach to executing an American foreign policy. I am very sorry to say that with the appointment of Mr. Harold Stassen this entire approach was drastically shifted, and now the agency that administers the same program that Mr. Hoffman administered has become, to a large degree, a political agency where patronage considerations are often the determining factor. The result is that not only at the policymaking level but at the actual execution level Democrats, even nominal ones, are largely shut out from consideration.

Now, I bring these matters up not in a spirit of partisanship but because I believe it is a very important indication that the present administration is making little or no attempt to construct or administer a bipartisan foreign policy. I hear a great many words about how many times the Secretary of State has talked to the Democrats, but I see at the policymaking level absolutely no indication that Democrats are being brought in to the development of the policy, nor at the execution level do I see the appointment of Democrats to help administer the program. This is in direct contradiction to the experience we had between 1938 to 1952.

It is far more important for President Eisenhower, with the policy he advocates, to have a bipartisan foreign policy in formulation as well as in execution than it was for the Democrats in previous years. The reason is very simple. The Democratic Members of the Congress, in very large majorities, supported the Truman and Roosevelt foreign policy and only a small minority of Republicans ever gave it consistent support. Therefore, the need for Republican support was not great. Today, however, only a small minority of the Republicans give President Eisenhower consistent support on crucial aspects of his foreign policy whereas the 83d Congress shows that a large majority of Democrats are prepared to support the President if he would stick by his guns and fight for the international programs he asked for early in his term of office.

Now, what I'm telling you is not campaign oratory; it's solid fact. As Al Smith used to say, "Let's look at the record." The record—all down in black and white—will show you how many Republicans in the House of Representatives have supported the President's foreign policies more often than I have. And let me tell you—you can count them on your fingers. You don't need to use your toes.

Or take the Senate. On August 3, only a few days ago, the Senate voted on the President's mutual security program, which is designed to give allied nations help in resisting communism. Most of the money is used to buy weapons for soldiers who will stand right beside our own troops in case of war. And what happened? Fifteen Republicans opposed the program, as against only four Democrats. And you should also take a look at the list of Republicans. You will see such well-known names as WELKER, McCARTHY, BRICKER, DIRKSEN, and other Members in good standing of the dinosauer wing of the Republican Party. Not one of these esteemed gentlemen ever passes up a chance to talk about communism. Some of them can't make a speech without using the word "Communist" in every second sentence. But when the chips are down, when it's a matter of doing something to stop the rolling tide of Communists from the rice fields of Indochina to the slums of Italy and the banana plantations of Guatemala, you find them voting against the President's program to stop communism. All they have to offer is hot air. And, somehow, I don't think hot air is ever going to stop Communist imperialism.

Let me cite another significant example of how this failure to view foreign policy in a bipartisan sense has seriously injured a crucial part of the President's announced program. At the October 1952 conference of the Soviet Union, Joe Stalin clearly indicated that he felt the time had come for the Soviets to make a tactical shift in their effords to split the free world. One tactical weapon Stalin mentioned was the weapon of trade. I think we should pay attention to what Stalin said in this regard since we should design policies to meet the tactical maneuvers that the Soviet Union undertakes. You may recall that in the 1930's Mr. Chamberlain, Prime Minister of Great Britain, went to Munich and he came back and said "Peace in our time," and he said he was convinced that Adolph Hitler didn't want any further territorial gain after he achieved the Sudentenland. If Mr. Chamberlain would merely have taken the trouble to read what Adolf Hitler had written in Mein Kampf, which outlined his world conquest ambitions, we might have avoided the catastrophe which developed later in Europe.

Therefore, let's look at what Joe Stalin said in 1952. He said that the trade relations between the free nations of the world were deteriorating and that each capitalist country was attempting to capture a larger share of the market; that this need for markets presented an opportunity for the political use of trade by the Soviets. In other words, by making attractive trade offers to the various free nations of the world, the Soviets could make them dependent upon the Soviet Union, and the arming of Japan, the coalition of EDC, etc., could thereby be blocked.

This is precisely what Russia has been attempting to do since 1952. If you don't believe Stalin's words, just look at the trade offers the Soviets have been making to England, Germany, France, and other nations. This is a serious threat. Our allies need markets. The two largest markets in the world are the United States and the U. S. S. R. To survive, our allies must sell their products, to a large extent, in one place or the other. If the Soviets can achieve a large amount of trade with free nations, our allies will be much less inclined to continue to support the the strong moves necessary to offset Soviet expansionist tactics.

Now, what has the President said about this question? Consistently during the 1952 campaign, in public statements since then, and in his specific recommendations to the Congress, he has said that we, the United States, must take the lead in a constructive trade policy. He has consistently said that such a trade policy is a crucial part of our international policy. For a year after his inauguration, the Randall Commission studied this problem and came up with a very modest series of recommendations, including a recommendation for a 3-year extension of the Reciprocal Trade Act. However, under pressure from old-guard Republicans, the President surrendered.

My contention is that had he taken the trouble to consult with his Democratic friends in Congress, had he taken the trouble to defend his own position, there is a good chance he could have achieved his goal. But because his party will not let him conduct his foreign policy in a truly bipartisan way, and since the Republicans have consistently opposed the reciprocal-trade program, the President gave up without a fight. Now this obviously has a serious detrimental impact on the total program of the United States to provide leadership for the free world in its efforts to minimize Soviet influence.

We all understand the reasons why the Soviets are moving into the Far East and southeast Asia—Japan, Indochina, Thailand, Burma, and Malaya. That is where the riches of Asia are and where we have failed to build strength. Southeast Asia is rich in rubber, tin, oil, rice, and other vital products. Japan is a highly desirable area from the Soviet point of view because of her industrial capacity. Japan is a particularly vulnerable area because of her dependency upon world markets, because she must sell her manufactured goods and buy raw materials in order to survive. This is vividly shown by the $40 million barter deal recently worked out between Japan and Russia. Under its terms, Japan will sell ships, steel rope and wire, and diesel engines in exchange for Russian raw materials. Unless we expand our trade with Japan, she will be forced into ever-increasing dependence upon the Soviet Union.

Another danger is that Japan will expand her trade relationship with China now under Communist domination. This is precisely what the Communists in the world want. If they can get Japan into a very dependent position upon China, under Communist control, then the first long step toward forcing the Japanese away from the free world has occurred and the difficulty of ever developing a strong Pacific alliance against further Communist expansion has increased tenfold. The Communist design in this regard is quite clear. China will not help Japan out of her difficulties, and this has been clearly stated by Chou En Lai, unless Japan is willing to break her relationship with the United States. The problem we face in southeast Asia today is relatively minor compared to the tremendous blow to the free world which would occur if Japan is wooed into a dependency relationship on the Communist world with its great industrial might.

Now I point out this dire situation with respect to Japan as one example of the reason why our trade policy is so important in meeting the Communist threat in the world today, and why the President's lack of dependence upon a bipartisan foreign and trade policy is having such a disastrous effect upon our defense against the Communists' tactical maneuvers. The President gave up on his request for this trade program. He did so despite the fact that he has said a number of times that trade is a vital and crucial part of our efforts as the free-world leader. This is a devastating blow to our foreign policy and a devastating blow to our role as leader in protecting free institutions in the world. The old-guard Republicans were responsible for this defeat.

I have frequently commended the present Secretary of State for his outstanding efforts. Certainly, no one can say that John Foster Dulles has not worked hard and traveled many thousands of miles in pursuit of his duty. There has been no Secretary of State that I know of who has carried so heavy a burden of a divided support in his own party to the delicate and difficult job of international negotiation. I don't need to recall to you the series of ultimatums that ensued from prominent Republican Senators that pursued the Secretary of State to Geneva, binding his hands to any freedom of action. In addition, no man could have done more or tried harder to weld a southeast Asia defense structure in the past 3 months. However, unifying the non-Communist world, including the European countries interested in the Asian area, into a defense alliance in the matter of a few short weeks is a task terribly complicated and probably impossible to achieve in such a short period of time.

Only in the last 3 months did we realize the full necessity for a defense structure in southeast Asia. Yet we should have been fashioning such a structure at least 18 months ago. It is now very apparent that our estimates of the situation in Indochina have been woefully and terribly inaccurate. We have depended upon the notion that the Navarre plan could succeed in Asia and that the Communists in Indochina could not mount an organized drive and had to depend upon guerrilla action. The Navarre plan assumed that if the French could lure the Communists into an open fight, they could be easily defeated in Indochina. This plan was tragically proven to be false with the fall of Dien Bien Phu. Even as late as 5 months ago, several administration spokesmen, including Secretary of State Dulles and Secretary of Defense Wilson, predicted a probable military victory in Indochina for the forces of the French Union. In February of this year, Secretary Wilson said that a French victory was "both possible and probable." "I see no reason to think Indochina will be another Korea," said Secretary Wilson. As late as March, Secretary Dulles said, "We have no reason to abandon the Navarre plan," which called for a decisive military victory by the French in 1 year.

During the same period, our Indochina policy fluctuated on all points between assurances of early withdrawal of the few American technicians to warnings of heavy commitments of American manpower. A statement by Vice President NIXON concerning the intervention of American manpower was wholly at odds with prior statements of the President and with his own earlier assertions that massive retaliation was preferable to being nibbled to death in localized conflicts.

Mr. Dulles suggested his support for both positions, however, irreconcilable they may seem to you and me. We have heard a great deal of talk about seizing the initiative. The only question of initiative doesn't seem to be one of whether we have it or the Communists have it, but whether the President has it or the Old Guard Republicans have it. And I'm afraid we all know the tragic answer to this question. While Secretary Dulles has been laboring to unite the world in opposition to Communist imperialism, his party leaders in Congress have been suggesting that we crawl into a hole and pull it in after us. Some have even suggested that we pull out of the United Nations if the other countries don't vote our way on the China question.

Let me make one thing clear. I am completely opopsed to having Red China in the United Nations. And I will continue to be opposed to it under any circumstances that I can now foresee. But let me ask you a simple question. What earthly good would it do for the United States to pull out of the United Nations? Would it help to stop Communist advances anywhere in the world? Would it strengthen our friends? Would it contribute to the safety of our cities, or help to increase the total military power which we now maintain in conjunction with our allies? I think we all know the answer. The admittal of Red China to the U. N. would be a grave mistake, but the withdrawal of the United States would be a catastrophe. We can never defeat communism by running away—by picking up our dolls and going home.

Now, it may appear that I am being overly partisan, but I don't intend to be. I am only saying that I went to the Congress committed to a bipartisan foreign policy conceived to block the encroachment of the insidious tyranny of Soviet communism on the world. To do this, I have tried to discern the policy I'm being asked to support. But the conflicting, vacillating statements on both Indochina and world trade make it practically impossible for anyone to know what the policy of the administration is. Let me conclude this particular aspect of my talk by saying that before the President insists on the support of our allies in building a defense structure in southeast Asia, may I respectfully suggest that he seize the initiative back from the various Republican spokesmen so that we will know what policies we're being asked to support.

I don't presume to be an expert on southeast Asia, but I would like to suggest tentatively some of the alternative courses open to us. Even for the experts it is difficult to say precisely what our policy should be in Indochina or what course future events will take. These will depend in great part on the reaction of Asians and Europeans to the terrible defeat freedom has suffered in the loss of 12 million free souls to the black night of tyranny. Ideally, it is hoped that the French, with additional assistance, material, and technical aid from the United States, will intensify the training of native troops, and grant full and genuine independence to the people of the remaining area of Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos. Now, the French people have been carrying the burden of human losses in Indochina for 8 long years and, after Dien Bien Phu, settled for a major defeat rather than continue the struggle. I think we can understand this point of view, particularly if we remember how dissatisfied some Americans became with the Korean war.

Given this setback, let us hope it spurs us on to strive for a defensive structure in southeast Asia between those nations willing to cooperate with us and with each other. Through this method we might hope to restrict the Communists at their present line of expansion. Of course, it is clear that through their movements in Cambodia and Laos and the remaining free portion of Vietnam the Communists do not intend to stop their expansionist designs with Vietnam. They're going to try the same pattern of infiltration and subversion in the rest of Indochina that they have so successfully perpetuated in Vietnam. Now is the time to lay plans to meet this threat. Let's take the economic and political measures now which will avoid the painful alternates of military intervention or capitulation.

Certainly, the wisest political move is to grant independence to all nations in the area able to assume self-government. The failure of France to do this much earlier in the case of Indochina is a major cause of our problem there today since it permitted the Communists to seize control of the Nationalists' movement in Vietnam. We cannot afford to give that kind of advantage to the Communists in any other part of the world. Coupled with this political attack are the vital weapons of economic and technical assistance and propaganda programs as part of the arsenal of freedom in that strategic area of the world.

In conclusion, let me just briefly outline what appear to me to be the necessary considerations for a successful program to maintain the structure of the free world, particularly in southeast Asia and Asia in general. First of all, I think we have to look at the economic problem. We cannot establish a policy in Asia that does not work for the economic stability of the area. Economic survival depends on a satisfactory trade relationship. The trade relationships of Asia have been drastically disrupted by the war and by the emergence of a Communist China always ready to utilize trade as a purely political weapon. Therefore, we must develop a sound, progressive and responsible trade program. Since the United States has the largest market of the world, it must assume the leadership in developing trade policy not only for Asia but for the entire free world. I have already suggested that the abandonment by President Eisenhower of his modest but crucial trade program without a fight is a serious blow to this responsibility of the United States. The failure of the President to recognize that in not only trade legislation but also many other international programs, he is dependent upon the bulk of Democrats for successfully accomplishing his goals—the apparent failure of the President to realize this fact—has had a seriously detrimental effect upon the leadership of America in the free world.

A second general aim for Asia particularly is the continuance of the so-called point 4 concept as an American expression of interest in the welfare of human beings. This program does more to put the lie to the Communist propaganda that America is a purely materialistic nation than any other effort we have made. It is a very inexpensive program with the participating nations abroad providing by far the largest amount of the resources put into it. The benefits derived are and can be tremendous.

A third goal is a grant of complete independence to all countries that are able to assume self-government. We should do all possible to encourage those nations which still have colonial holdings to abandon them at the earliest possible time since the continuance of colonial domination plays into the Soviets' hands more than almost anything else. As to the immediate problem in Indochina, it seems to me that we should encourage the French to grant complete and immediate independence.

We should rapidly build a southeast Asian security structure. A defensive alliance among the nations of southeast Asia will warn the Communists in language they can understand that any further aggressive moves in that area of the world will be met by the united strength of the area backed with material and technical aid from the west. This type of action, as has been shown in Europe, is the best way to deter Communist aggression and avoid the need for ever involving manpower in actual warfare.

Last but not least, let me suggest that on all these points, as I mentioned with respect to trade, a vital necessity is an American, a nonpartisan approach to these problems of meeting Communist aggression in the world today. I don't think it is necessary to point out that there are many extremists in the Republican Party and some in the Democratic Party who do not support the sound programs to meet the Communist threat. These head-in-the-sand men without vision will never be reconciled to the needs of the 20th century—as the President sees these needs and as most of us Democrats see them. Attempts to compromise with these extremist elements have not only resulted in half-hearted, too-little-and-too-late policies in some instances, but have even resulted in giving up watered-down programs without a fight, as the recent experience with trade legislation clearly indicates. The President has a working majority in Congress for a soundly conceived foreign and trade policy. To obtain it, he must, it seems to me, recognize that a large bulk of Democrats must participate if it is to succeed. The sooner we get back to a real bipartisan effort, the sooner will we move forward with our great responsibility as leader of the free world. Leadership of this high quality is not an option, it is an absolute and inescapable imperative for the survival of the free world.

Portrait of a Proper Washingtonian

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. HENDRICKSON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 17, 1954

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article appearing in the Sunday edition of the New York Times of August 5 be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

This fine writing by Mr. William S. White concerns our distinguished senior Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS].

I commend this article to my colleagues as well as to the people of America.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PORTRAIT OF A PROPER WASHINGTONIAN

(By William S. White)

WASHINGTON.—Never before in his life has ARTHUR VIVIAN WATKINS been involved in an affair so untidily dramatic as now besets him, the most prim and most sternly upright Member of the United States Senate.

Mr. WATKINS, a slight, profoundly earnest and profoundly kind man of 67, looks squarely, if a bit shyly, upon the world from glittering rimless glasses below carefully combed white hair. The adjective" thin" is so descriptive of him—face, build, manner, even voice—as to be improperly apt.

Quite suddenly it has fallen to his lot to be the reluctant but unterrified chairman of the most embarrassing—and the most important—special committee that has been set up by the Senate in at least 20 and possibly in 50 years.

He is in charge of the bipartisan six-man panel that will investigate whether the conduct of Senator Joseph R. McCarthy, Republican, of Wisconsin, is properly censurable by the Senate itself. Few public men have ever undertaken more disagreeable tasks; few public men have undertaken such a task in as aseptically objective a manner as Senator Watkins, the senior Republican Senator from Utah, is displaying.

He has, for example, announced: "The rules of evidence in courts of the United States, State and Federal, are the rules that will apply * * *." This is so vast a change from the generality of congressional investigations, in which the rules are loose indeed, as to be almost historic.

Mr. Watkins, whose respectability is matchless in a body of many respectable men, has an air of rectitude that is all but terrifying and, a man absolutely without cant or "side," probably is utterly unaware of the effect he unwittingly gives.

This effect is that of a glacially cold and distinterested judge. In his past when he actually was a district judge in Utah, he was so scrupulous that he quit eating with his old law colleagues at a common luncheon table he long had frequented.

In the memory of old observers, no other man in the Senate, with the single exception of one of Mr. Watkins' closest friends, former Senator Forrest C. Donnell, of Missouri, has ever been so deeply correct in word and action. It was seriously written of Senator Donnell that he would not close a letter to a friend with the phrase "my wife joins me in sending regards" without telephoning Mrs. Donnell to inquire whether these were indeed her true sentiments, and whether it was all right thus to convey them.

While one knows of no anecdote quite so striking that is applicable to Senator Watkins, there can be no question that his sense of puntilio is without example in today's Senate. In the old days, Senator Tom Connally, the casually able Texan, was Mr. Watkins' special goad.

Senator Watkins endured with a sort of shaky-voiced but resolute poise the most piercing of the more or less poisoned oratorical darts that Mr. Connally, as leader of an internationalist foreign policy, delighted to hurl at him as a representative of the semi-isolationist school.

The Connolly versus Watkins engagements—they could not be called feuds, for Mr. Watkins was and is wholly without the savage joy in combat for its own sake that happily animates the Texan—arose precisely out of Senator Watkins' unparalleled precision. When a matter like the North Atlantic Treaty came forward, Mr. Watkins tirelessly and formidably pressed for the meaning, and all possible alternative meanings, of every clause and section and, indeed, almost every word.

He did so in face of the unexampled power of public scorn from a man, Mr. Connally, whose skill in blowing down opponents on the Senate floor is not in the least way approached by any present Member—including Senator McCarthy himself.

The Watkins precision, the Watkins doggedness in the face of every rebuff and oral assault, have never faltered in the past. Almost certainly these qualities will now be put to the supreme test, for Senator McCarthy has never yet failed to dominate any Senate committee proceeding that has in any way involved him.

It is hardly conceivable that any two men could be more unlike than the muscular Mr. McCarthy from Wisconsin and the frail Mr. Watkins from Utah.

Senator McCarthy has, in a magnified way, many of the traits supposed to be held by extroverts. He is gregarious, convivial, careless, and uninhibited. Senator Watkins, in a magnified way, has many of the traits commonly assigned to introverts. He is rather lonely, wholly abstemious, spare, dry, slightly nervous in manner, and a man who could not be imagined in the act of slapping another's back.

Nevertheless, and for all this, there is steel under the almost parsonical mien that Arthur Vivian Watkins turns toward the world. Although basically an orthodox Republican, he is to the last limit permitted to him by his convictions a loyal Eisenhower follower. It is said of him by colleagues that he has on occasion fought it out in the Senate Judiciary Committee with such powerful and combative Republican rightwingers as Senator Everett McKinley Dirksen, of Illinois, and even with the greatly feared Democrat, Senator Pat McCarran, of Nevada.

It is even said that Arthur Vivian Watkins, rimless glasses and all, on one occasion when he was leading for the President toward a more liberal immigration policy, indicated that he would be quite prepared to step out of the closed committeeroom with an antagonist and, as they say, "take off our coats."

For Mr. Watkins to reach that state he had to be moved volcanically—but he can be so moved. For one example, he reached that point last winter over the issue of President Eisenhower's nomination of Gov. Earl Warren, of California, to be Chief Justice of the United States.

Mr. Warren, as an internationalist Republican, was never the friend or the ideal of the rightwing Republican group to which Mr. Watkins most of the time belongs. Nevertheless, Senator Watkins' veneration for tradition, for objectivity and for the due process provisions of Anglo-Saxon justice could not be higher.

Thus, when the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, Senator William Langer, Republican, of North Dakota, allowed to be published some very odd and unverified charges in opposing Mr. Warren's confirmation by the Senate, Mr. Watkins found himself unable to contain himself, notwithstanding that he is president of the Sharon Stake Latter Day Saints Church.

He turned upon the startled Senator Langer—who, by the way, requires no help whatever in taking care of himself—and from little Mr. Watkins there issued a geyser of hot words about "the biggest lot of tommyrot" he had ever heard.

Mr. Watkins' moral code, political and otherwise, is as rigid as a pole and few men in the Senate, if any, would be slower to forgive delinquency, just as few would be slower to change it without overwhelming and proper evidence.

What the Senate, therefore, has in Select Committee Chairman Watkins is a highly traditional, inflexible, deeply cautious man who will, in the opinion of some colleagues who may not in fact particularly like him, unswervingly deliver true judgment, whichever way he sees it, when the time comes.

He has many times shown the white-faced courage of the essentially gentle, essentially timid man. Although he has been many things—small-town editor, fruit grower, and now Senator—he is perhaps most of all a judge.

New York Wants Out From the Doghouse

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 17, 1954

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, Mr. James Morgan is not only an outstanding student of history but he is a keen and discerning interpretator of current events.

I include in my remarks an interesting article written by Mr. Morgan appearing in the Boston Globe of August 15, 1954.

His observation about the powerful financial interests in the environs of Wall Street, in connection with the 1952 Republican National Convention, and the part played by Winthrop Aldrich, then chairman of the Chase National Bank, and his brother-in-law, John D. Rockefeller, and Gov. Thomas Dewey, of New York, in connection with stopping the late Senator Robert Taft, and nominating General Eisenhower, is most interesting.

The article follows:

NEW YORK WANTS OUT FROM THE DOGHOUSE—ITS CITY SLICKERS HAVING PUT OVER EISENHOWER, ITS DEMOCRATS ARE HOPING TO RESUME THEIR OLD IMPERIAL SWAY OVER THE HICKS FROM THE STICKS

(By James Morgan)

New York will hold the center of the political stage in this coming month of September, when party leaders will "leave it to the convention," as Boss Murphy used to say, to nominate the Democratic and Republican candidates for Governor. The Republicans have been beseeching Governor Dewey to change his mind and to run for a fourth term. Their best remaining hope to hold the State is pinned on Senator Ives.

The Democrats, on the contrary, are embarrassed with riches. Congressman Franklin D. Roosevelt is an active candidate for that nomination. Those who are impervious to the magic of the name of this 40-year-old son of a President and grandnephew of another are pressuring the newly elected mayor, Robert F. Wagner, himself also a junior to a distinguished father, to exchange city hall for the State capitol. That party still has in reserve a dark horse, William Averell Harriman, a favorite son in the Chicago convention 2 years ago.

CITY SLICKERS PUT OVER IKE

From the time William H. Seward, of New York, entered the Republican convention of 1860 a 2-to-1 favorite only to be outshouted by the packed galleries of the Wigwam on the Chicago lake front and outmaneuvered by the Lincoln men, the New Yorkers lost every contest until the nomination of Eisenhower.

Powerful financial interests in the environs of Wall Street, wearied of being on the outside for 20 years, decided long in advance of the presidential election of 1952 to take fortune by the forelock and get on the inside.

They had no reason to find fault with Senator Taft, who was leading for the nomination, except that they didn't believe that the long run of Democratic luck could be broken by Mr. Republican or any other straight-out party man. As they viewed the problem, the only chance of winning was with a candidate imported from outside of politics.

To consolidate the East behind General Eisenhower, they had to start with the control of the New York delegation. As Governor Dewey had announced that he would retire in 1950, and thereby lose his mastery of the machine, he was summoned into a conference at the Chase National Bank with the chairman of the bank, Winthrop Aldrich, and his brother-in-law, John D. Rockefeller. He emerged from that meeting with the announcement that he would run again.

The aged Lieutenant Governor, who had been gathering support as the successor to the retiring Governor, felt under obligation to tell his supporters why he was leaving them out on a limb. He make the mistake of writing instead of telephoning his explanation, which included a reference to some financial assistance he would receive in paying his debts. One recipient of the letter, being anti-Dewey, leaked its contents.

CITADEL AND DOGHOUSE

With Governor Dewey in a position to deliver the New York delegation to Eisenhower, the other delegations from the East easily were lined up on the same side. The planners next were able, with the aid of eastern financial influence in General Motors, to take away from Taft the automotive State of Michigan and thus break into the solid Midwest.

Still they had not succeeded in overcoming Taft's lead when the convention met. It was their exposure of the usual dirty work at the crossroad in rounding up for the Senator the delegations from the Republican rotten boroughs of the South that gave them the windfall of a moral issue. That turned the trick in a most forehanded and efficient campaign for the capture of the convention.

While the Republicans have been the party of the Middle West, New York has been the keystone in the Democratic arch from the days of Jefferson. Although the city of New York, with its huge Democratic majorities, has been the citadel of that party, its leaders have been in the doghouse at most national conventions in the 70 years since Grover Cleveland was thrust upon them, after General Bragg, of Wisconsin, had declared, "We love him for the enemies he has made"—in Tammany Hall.

When Cleveland came up for the customary renomination of a President opposition was hopeless, and a spokesman for Tammany assured us of the press on the arrival of the delegation in St. Louis, "Aw, we're unanimous for the old so and so." But at the next convention, in 1892, the entire New York delegation, under the lead of Croker, sat in sullen silence while the wigwam rocked with the chorus of—

"Grover, Grover, 4 years more of Grover,
Out they go, in we go, then we'll be in
clover."

NOT THE SAME OLD TIGER

Woodrow Wilson and Franklin D. Roosevelt also were nominated in defiance of Tammany. But a change has been in process since the consolidation of the 5 Boroughs of Manhattan, Brooklyn, the Bronx, Queens, and Richmond into 1 city half a century ago. Brooklyn has outgrown what is now in literal truth little old New York in Manhattan. The parent island is being pressed also by the growth of the Bronx, and the late Edward J. Flynn, of that borough, became the boss of all the bosses.

The damming of the flood of immigrants has deprived the Tammany tiger of the green fodder on which he waxed fat. Slum clearances also have taken away from him some of his once happy hunting grounds. Higher wages, social security, settlement houses, playgrounds and parks, and the movies are competing with the Tammany clubhouses and reducing a dependence on the monopoly of social services that Tammany once had.

Racial changes, too, are reflected in the very name of the present able and ambitious successor to Kelly, Croker, and Murphy—Carmine DiSapio. That Italo-American has so far persuaded the county leaders upstate that his organization is not the old rule or ruin machine, that they elected him to the Democratic National Committee, whose door never before was entered by a Tammanyite. DiSapio has left the mayor he nominated with such a measure of independence that Robert F. Wagner is being acclaimed another LaGuardia.

CAN NEW YORK REGAIN PRIMACY?

The Republicans are at one serious disadvantage in drafting a candidate for Governor next month. They are not able to convince Governor Dewey that another term at Albany would assure him a third try for the Presidency. Nor can they give Senator Ives a guaranty that his election for Governor would bring him any nearer the White House than he now is in the Senate.

For the Republicans in the country at large are allergic to New Yorkers. Of the five to whom they have entrusted the standard of their party, Willkie, Dewey, and Eisenhower were transplanted from the Middle West. A fourth, Hughes, was defeated. Among the 12 Presidents the Republicans have elected, Theodore Roosevelt alone was born and bred in the imperial State. Even he slipped in by the side door from the Vice Presidency, with a broad brim hat disguising him as a ranchman from the wild West.

The Governorship of New York, mark the contrast, has been the steppingstone to the Democratic nomination for President five times since the Civil War. Of the four Democrats in the White House in that era, half of them, Cleveland and F. D. R., were promoted from Albany to Washington. A third, Governor Tilden, missed by only one disputed electoral vote. Wilson moved to 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue from Princeton, N. J., a suburb of Manhattan. Only Truman was a "hick from the sticks," in the vernacular of Broadway.

This first Democratic ex-President in 30 years was also the first candidate of either party since Woodrow Wilson to lose New York and yet win an election. That brought to a period a long story of the primacy of the Empire State in American politics. Shall it ever again exercise that imperial sway in a Union whose course is westward, with California casting the deciding vote in two national elections in the recent past?

An Investment Pays Off

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. GLENN BEALL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 17, 1954

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, the Baltimore Sun, an independent Democratic newspaper, recently commented editorially on the progress of the Eisenhower administration.

This editorial entitled "An Investment Pays Off," commends the President very highly, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN INVESTMENT PAYS OFF

As the Eisenhower program continues its triumphant march through the Congress, interested observers will have noted several features of the situation which are almost unprecedented in recent years.

Mr. Eisenhower took office along with a Congress which was almost evenly divided between Republicans and Democrats. In addition, his own party, though in nominal control, was badly split almost down the middle. There was every indication that either the Democrats would take over and block the whole program or else that the extreme right wing of the Republican side would accomplish the same end.

Actually it was the rightwing Republicans who first ventured to challenge their titular leader. Their instrument was the proposed Bricker amendment to the Constitution. The purpose of this amendment was to tie the hands of the President in the conduct of foreign affairs. Without once raising his voice, Mr. Eisenhower was successful in pushing aside this dangerous reversal of the constitutional practice for the time being. After that rebuff, the rebellious Republicans somehow lost the initiative.

The next real test, one might say, came with the tax bill, especially with that feature of it which reduced, if it did not eliminate, the element of injustice involved in the double taxation of corporation dividends. Here the demagogs, in the Congress and outside it, sought to arouse class feeling by the usual kind of rabble rousing. Their efforts broke down before the logic of the proposal.

For more than a generation, President and Congressmen have quailed before the threats of the so-called farm bloc. The cowardice—political prudence is a politer description—of many saddled us with an outdated system of rigid farm subsidies which has cost us billions and, in addition, produced mounting surpluses of basic commodities which hang like an impending avalanche over the agricultural markets.

Mr. Eisenhower's program, designed to bring more resiliency into the whole structure of farm supports, was argued before the true farmers of the country as if he and Secretary Benson had never heard of the political farmers. They based their case on the facts of the situation. The political spokesmen of the supposedly embattled farmers gave ground slowly, but they yielded. The indications are that Mr. Eisenhower, instead of arousing the hatred of the true farmers, actually won their admiration by the reasonableness of his position and his pluck in standing up for it.

In his quiet but effective way, Mr. Eisenhower has challenged those who insist that the Federal organism shall swallow more and more of the potential hydroelectric power sources of the country—who envisage, in brief, a nationwide Tennessee Valley Authority and shriek that private development of such resources is robbery of the people. Here again the battle continues, but the zest has gone out of it. Mr. Eisenhower is certain to see his concepts prevail.

The big showdown with the labor politicians is yet to come. They make no secret of their distaste for Mr. Eisenhower and his ideas, and so far they and their friends have been able to delay consideration of the relatively mild changes in the Taft-Hartley Act which he would like to make. Clearly they have no stomach for a head-on battle with the man who has demonstrated so great a capacity to get what he wants over all the other pressure groups.

And of what does this capacity consist? Mr. Eisenhower does not resort to invective. He has not publicly denounced a single individual since he took office, not even those who have openly attacked him and sought to block his program. He has ignored the pressure of groups as such. In this he is in marked contrast with his recent predecessors. He has preached no dogma save that of public decency and public welfare. He has acted on the principle that the people of the United States and their representatives in the Congress can be trusted to act for the public good when the circumstances are made known to them. He has invested his honesty and candor in this faith. And what dividends they have already paid.

Hail to the Chief of North Castle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 9, 1954

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, the House has granted me permission to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a tribute to the chief of police of North Castle, N. Y., John Hergenhan, upon his election as president of the New York State Association of Chiefs of Police. No small honor.

The editorial was published in the Daily Times, of Mamaroneck, N. Y., July 31, 1954.

Those of us who have knowledge of the performance record of Chief Hergenhan know that his selection for this important post was well deserved and a fortunate one for the Empire State.

The above-mentioned follows:

HAIL TO THE CHIEF OF NORTH CASTLE

For the head of such a small police force as that of North Castle to be elected president of the New York State Association of Chiefs of Police is an obvious tribute to the individual rather than to his force or community.

Chief John Hergenhan, of North Castle, is a colorful personality. His town is comparatively small in population and his regular force includes only nine men. But he does a lot with what he has and he does not hide the light of North Castle beneath a bushel basket. He will not only fight at the drop of a hat anyone who decries the grandeur and greatness of his hometown; he will even furnish the hat to drop.

So, to the chief of North Castle, our heartiest congratulations on being elected to lead the association of more than 600 top law-enforcement officers from the 200 cities and towns and villages of this State.

The association and the State will know that Chief Hergenhan is on the job.

Benson Strategy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. THYE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 17, 1954

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Alfred D. Stedman which was published in the St. Paul Pioneer Press of Sunday, August 15, 1954.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BENSON STRATEGY

How did he do it? What strategy gave Ezra Benson the victory against heavy odds in his long fight for flexible farm price supports?

Of course, flexibility has been favored by every President from Hoover to Eisenhower, including, at times, Truman. It has been put in use by every Secretary of Agriculture from Henry A. Wallace to Benson, also including, at times, Brannan. A quarter century of administrative experience thus backed Benson's side.

But, beyond the merits, what of strategy? That always affects the outcome of such congressional struggles.

William M. Blair told in the New York Times of July 2 how the strategy worked in the House. Now the same kind has succeeded in the Senate. He reported many GOP Members influenced by a feeling of need for Presidential help in campaigns this fall.

Beyond that, Blair's story traced the strategy back to conflicts between regional farm groups, such as those between wheat and feed grains; between wool and cotton, and cottonseed, and its vegetable-oil competitor, soybeans.

He traced it also to consumer-producer conflicts over dairy and other prices—conflicts which made the big-city Democrat Members wary of supporting the farm bloc.

"The Eisenhower administration played upon these conflicts with the touch of a master," Blair reported. He told of the administration bid for western wool votes with a direct-subsidy plan. He told of the alternative put up to them of going with the administration on flexible price supports or of getting no wool program. He told of lowering price supports on manufactured dairy products—which, he might have added, didn't extend to high-priced eastern fluid milk and so didn't antagonize those dairy groups that want cheap feed and high-priced milk.

Also Blair described the angling for consumer backing by Benson and aids. "They never made the outright claim that a reduction of wheat or corn or cotton supports would mean lower consumer prices for staple foods and cotton shirts," he wrote. "But, knowingly or unknowingly, they created the impression."

So the administration's Republican losses to the farm bloc were more than offset. "In the showdown vote," Blair wrote, "the wool and dairy Members and a bloc of the northern big-city Democrats kicked over the traces and stood with the President."

The result is being widely hailed as a personal triumph for Secretary Benson.

Such victories convey their rewards, assess their costs, and create their opportunities.

The rewards of this one are conspicuous. The congressional session began with political foes in full cry for Benson's official scalp. It ends with them beaten, with his Cabinet position strengthened, the President backing him more firmly than ever, and with even Congress on his side.

The costs include those personally borne by the Secretary. His long and hard speaking campaign began in St. Paul back in February of last year. A weaker man could have been floored by the strain.

And there are hidden costs of a strategy that turns farm group against farm group, section against section, and consumer against farmer. The strategy worked. But will the conflicts thus stirred up flare back to plague an administration that is seeking national unity?

An opportunity of the Secretary's victory is to see that they do not. It is to heal those wounds, remove grounds for sectional feelings of discrimination, and win confidence of farmers and consumers for his more flexible farm program. The victory strengthens him to seize that opportunity.

Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee Reports on Bryson Bill, H. R. 1227

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 17, 1954

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, the Bryson bill—H. R. 1227—was the subject of long and extended hearings by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House of Representatives. Because of the widespread interest in the bill I am herewith including, as part of my remarks, a copy of the report issued by the committee today, setting forth the views of the committee with reference to the bill at this time.

The report reads as follows:

REPORT ON H. R. 1227, BRYSON BILL

The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to whom was referred the Bryson bill (H. R. 1227) to prohibit the transportation in interstate commerce of advertisements of alcoholic beverages by mail, newspaper, periodical, newsreel, photographic film, or record for mechanical reproduction, and the broadcasting of such advertisements by radio and television, having considered same, submits the following report:

Extensive hearings were held on the bill by the entire committee on May 19, 20, 21, and 24, 1954. The record of the hearings covers almost 500 printed pages. Over 50 witnesses appeared in person and were heard. An even greater number submitted statements for the record. Included among the representatives were various civic and religious groups, publishers, representatives of labor unions, distillers, trade associations, the press, radio, and television broadcasters, and Members of Congress. In addition, numerous letters, telegrams, and petitions were received from all parts of the United States.

The bill before the committee and the hearings held thereon raise many difficult issues, particularly those of a constitutional character resulting from the adoption of the 21st amendment. These issues require further consideration and more detailed information. The questions in the main are as follows:

1. To what extent, if any, from a constitutional standpoint is the 21st amendment applicable?

(a) Does it preclude Congress from adopting legislation designed either to prevent, regulate, or control advertising of alcoholic beverages?

(b) Does Congress have the power to adopt legislation that would apply to the advertising of intoxicating liquors in States, Territories or possessions where the delivery or use of intoxicating liquors is prohibited by law?

2. Is there any constitutional prohibition against such proposed legislation because of curtailments of free speech—

(a) as to radio and television?

(b) as to newsparers, periodicals, etc.?

(c) as to use of the mails?

3. Does the second section of the 21st amendment give a State the right to pass legislation on this subject with reference to—

(a) radio and television operating within the State, or, broadcasts from stations operating without the State?

(b) newspapers and periodicals published and circulated within the State, or, circulated in the State although published outside of the State?

4. If the second section of the 21st amendment gives protective rights to a State, how would such rights be made effective with respect to broadcasts originating in another State?

5. Would Congress have the power to prohibit the movement in interstate commerce, by mail or otherwise, of advertisements of alcoholic beverages that originate outside the boundaries of the United States?

6. Does the Federal Communications Commission have jurisdiction under present law that would enable it to carry out provisions contained in the proposed legislation without additional congressional action?

7. Does existing law enable the Federal Trade Commission to proceed against advertisements of alcoholic beverages when such advertisements are deemed misleading or deceptive with respect to the effect of alcoholic beverages on health and morals?

In view of the many complaints received by this committee with regard to improper or excessive advertising of some alcoholic beverages on radio and television, the committee is seeking information from the Federal Communications Commission, the beer, wine, and broadcasting industries and their respective trade associations with regard to (a) extent of this advertising in dollar volume in relation to other advertising, (b) the number, character, and length of programs sponsored by wine and beer manufacturers, and (c) the broadcast time consumed in the course of such programs and by spot announcements of beer and wine products.

In this connection, the committee takes cognizance of the fact that the distilling industry has adopted a policy of refraining from advertising its products over radio and television. This fact creates the thought that consideration could profitably be given by the beer and wine industries to the possibility of eliminating or curtailing their advertising over radio and television.

The committee furthermore takes cognizance of the fact that the television code specifically prohibits the advertising of hard liquors on television while the code does permit the advertising of beer and wine without any restrictions. The committee, therefore, raises the question whether radio and television broadcasters should not also adopt specific policies with regard to the advertising of beer and wine products with a view to eliminating or curtailing such advertising. The advertising of alcoholic beverages on television is not in good taste if such advertisement includes a scene of a family or any person drinking, serving, or preparing drinks, or contains any representation primarily appealing to children.

The committee feels that the efforts of the broadcasting industry and particularly the television industry at self-regulation in this highly sensitive field of advertising and programing, have not been as successful as the committee might justifiably have expected. The committee feels that it is incumbent upon the radio and television industries, in their own enlightened interest, to give serious consideration to the widespread complaints with reference to the advertising of alcoholic beverages over their mediums and to take immediate steps to meet these complaints.

The committee, therefore, feels justified in requesting that the radio and television industries submit to this committee by January 1, 1955, a report as to the steps already taken, and proposed to be taken, to cope with this problem. We expect the wholehearted cooperation of all concerned in arriving at a satisfactory solution to these vital issues.

Where Is That Slump?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 9, 1954

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, to offset to a small degree the cries of our political adversaries that the financial condition of the United States after a year and a half of a Republican administration, might be improved, I wish to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial published in the Daily Times, of Mamaroneck, N. Y., titled "Where Is That Slump?"

The editorial follows:

For the first half of 1953 personal income in the Nation was at the annual rate of $284,700 million For the first half of 1954 it has been at the annual rate of $285,500 million.

For 1953 as a whole, personal income was $286,100 million. Since the comparisons of the first half of each year show we are running this year some $800 million ahead of the rate for last year, we may, at least presumably, anticipate for 1954 as a whole personal income around $286,900 million.

These are not guesses. They are official figures from the Department of Commerce. And if last year was the biggest year in business history of the United States, 1954 may be even bigger. This is a gratifying contrast to earlier forecasts which had included opinions we would have a "leveling-off period." Instead, the trend is still upward.

The figures are hereby respectfully referred to Senators Paul Douglas, of Illinois, and Wayne Morse, of Oregon, and to Walter Reuther, head man of the CIO. For these have been the bellwethers among the gloom-and-doom boys who predicted earlier this year we were headed for Hades in a wheelbarrow.

What's that again, boys?

More Liberal Retirement Program Needed for Retired Railroad Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 29, 1954

Mr. HAGEN of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, it is with pleasure that I rise to lend my support to H. R. 7840, recently approved by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Because of the keen interest this type of legislation holds for hundreds of members in my district, I have followed closely the detailed hearings on this bill.

May I state that I am aware H. R. 7840 is not a panacea for all existing ills in the Railroad Retirement Act, and does not provide the key to the many complex problems which beset those who fall under its provisions, and who must depend for their existence solely on the meager benefits afforded by the act. But on the other hand, this bill corrects in one simple measure several minor inequities which have been permitted already too long to exist.

For that reason I urge the House to lend its approval to H. R. 7840 for the small, but much-needed assistance it will provide at this time. I wish to make it clear that I feel the inequities, which will remain, even after this legislation is enacted, should be corrected after sufficient study, as soon as Congress reconvenes at the beginning of next year.

If I am fortunate enough to be a Member of Congress next year, I intend to introduce a bill to provide for adequate increases in all classes of pensions. There is an urgent need for such legislation. I trust I will have the cooperation of all elements in the railroad industry in an attempt to formulate amendments to the act, which will not only be actuarially practicable, but which will be liberal enough to afford all annuitants a sizeable increase in the amount of their subsistence.

But of necessity that will have to remain for next session. Right now we have the chance to effect some minor changes in the act, which will then put us in a better position to know what further general improvements can be made next year.

The legislation before us can briefly be summarized as follows:

First, benefits to widows, dependent widowers, and dependent parents at age 60 instead of age 65.

Second, benefits to widowed mothers with physically or mentally disabled children over the age of 18.

Third, full survivor benefits to widows, dependent widowers, and dependent parents who are also eligible for a railroad retirement annuity in their own right.

Fourth, increasing the creditable compensation from the present maximum of $300 a month to a maximum of $350 a month in the calculation of a retirement or survivor annuity.

Fifth, disregarding the compensation earned after the age of 65, if the crediting of such compensation would diminish the annuity.

Sixth, changing the disability work clause to a maximum of $100 in earnings for any month without loss of the annuity for that month.

Seventh, excluding the service of certain delegates to national or international conventions of railway labor organizations from coverage under this act.

Eighth, elimination of the requirement in the present law that a child over the age of 16 and under 18 years must attend school regularly in order to be eligible for a survivor's annuity.

Ninth, waiver of retirement benefits for certain individuals who are receiving non-service-connected veterans' pensions.

Many members of the railroad industry residing in my district have taken occasion to write me concerning this legislation. Many of them are in one of the categories mentioned above, and from their sincere letters, I can assure you that this legislation is needed and needed badly. For what little improvement it will make in their bleak lives, I think we should not hesitate to approve H. R. 7840 without further delay, for the benefit of the retired railroad workers.

The Indochina Truce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 17, 1954

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include a splendid analysis, one of the finest and most interpretative I have seen, prepared by one of the ablest Members of the Congress, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. O'NEILL] on the Indochina truce, appearing in the Boston Traveler of August 12, 1954:

Was There a Deal With the Reds?—Geneva Sellout, O'Neill Asserts

(By Hon. Thomas P. O'Neill, Jr.)

(Editor's Note.—This is another expression of opinion by a Massachusetts Member of Congress regarding the truce in Indochina in response to inquiry by the Traveler.)

The recent Geneva conference has been widely credited with having contributed to world peace. It is time to recognize reality. We have witnessed at Geneva the culmination of a perfumed sellout to Communist aggression.

The partioning of Vietnam proclaims to the entire Communist world and to all neutral peoples of South Asia that the combined military might of the free world has been incapable of halting aggression.

FENCE SITTER WARNED

Of greater significance, the Geneva document proclaims to fence sitters the world over that those guarding the fences of freedom had neither the determination nor the will to forestall this latest act in the Communist march of world conquest.

The responsibility of the present administration in this tragic loss is not absolved by its refusal, for a while, to participate actively in the conference, nor can it escape the onus by having signed a separate declaration at the end of the conference.

The people of the United States can take no pride in the rationalization of the Secretary of State that the loss of the present may lead to a gain for the future. The ceremonies and rituals cannot obscure the fact that the independent world capitulated at Geneva and that the United States was a leader of the free world at the time of that capitulation.

The responsibility of France in the sellout at Geneva cannot be camouflaged by the record of her sacrifices in 7 years of warfare or by the gallant efforts of French Union forces.

In the more important battle, the battle to win the loyalty of the Indochinese people, France cannot escape accountability for her record in Indochina during 83 years prior to World War II.

France is accountable for the begrudging and pathetic measures of so-called independence granted since the end of World War II.

France is faced with the indictment of having sponsored a local regime which was sympathetic to French colonial interests and in no sense broadly representative of the people of Vietnam.

VIETNAM SHACKLED

During the post-war years, while Indonesia, the Philippines, Burma, India, Pakistan, and Ceylon have made great strides in independent self-government, the peoples of Vietnam have remained shackled and spoonfed.

France made Geneva inevitable by a policy of frustrating the free development of self-government even though proclaiming ever greater degrees of so-called independence that is, independence within the French Union.

The credit which may be due France for fighting communism is seriously qualified by the failure of France to create conditions in Indochina under which the Indochinese would be deeply inspired to fight the Communists because they felt they had a real stake in the outcome.

The United Kingdom cannot escape responsibility simply on the ground of an 11th-hour decision of the British chiefs of staff that military resistance could not halt the Vietminh forces. Nor is there solace in the view that the free world might agree to prevent the further conquest of southeast Asia, but only after an important portion of Vietnam had been offered as a sacrificial gift to the Communists.

We have long since learned, or should have learned, that the value in preventing aggression extends far beyond the country or territory actually save in a given instance. Since World War II free peoples the world over have found hope in seeing aggressive actions successfully resisted in a number of instances.

A blockade did not drive us from Berlin. That Greece is free today bears witness to the determination of free men to thwart Communist subversion and expansion.

KOREA FINE EXAMPLE

In Korea, the United States, with some assistance from the United Nations, gave evidence that the will of free men to defend themselves could not be intimidated by Communist force. Had we compromised in Greece or Korea with a Geneva document it is doubtful whether Japan or the Middle East would be free today.

By permitting the fall of northern Vietnam has provided a springboard from which the Communists can launch attacks for the subjugation of Laos, Cambodia, and Thailand. Having penetrated and conquered these states, Indonesia and Burma would lie exposed as the next victims.

In the struggle between a united Communist world and the divided, irresolute, free world represented at Geneva, the loyalty of the people of south Asia may be given to those who have proven they can win success. With each new Communist victory the burden of resistance will become progressively compounded.

If the United States Government is to retain its position of leadership it cannot condone the perpetuation of condtiions which predispose any area to an ultimate sellout as that at Geneva.

No surrender should be passively viewed from the sidelines. We look upon the loss of northern Vietnam from the vantage point of hindsight.

Having learned our lesson, it is now incumbent upon us that we look to Indonesia, Burma, Thailand, Tunisia, Morocco, indeed the entire free world, with acute foresight, in order to prevent any further Geneva sellouts.

The Farmers' Neglected Plight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MORGAN M. MOULDER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 12, 1954

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Speaker, on the 5th day of this month there appeared in a Washington newspaper the following report concerning President Eisenhower's attitude on the many appeals and proposals we have made for Federal assistance to the drought disaster areas:

> President Eisenhower yesterday was reported a little vexed and somewhat irritated over what he considers unjustified appeals for Federal drought relief from sections of the country that he feels do not need it. The areas criticized were not identified. The President's attitude was described by Representative Dewey Short, Republican, of Missouri, speaking for himself and three other Republican Congressmen who went to the Chief Executive's Office to discuss drought conditions.

What disturbs me is the failure of the President and his advisers to understand the farm problems and the fact that disaster on the farms is not even good for General Motors much less the rest of the country. If anyone should be vexed and irritated it should be the farmers who now find themselves at the little end of the horn with a Republican administration in power.

Yesterday I read an article published by the Summers Elevator Co. in the Daily Democrat-Leader, Fayette, Mo., as follows:

> About the drought program—we don't think this program as it is being set up is worth a tinker's dam.
>
> As we see it, the sum total of the program is this: If you are sitting out here completely starving, with some foundation cows, ewes, and goats, and if after going through a lot of redtape the committee is sure you are going to starve, and they are sure that you are not going to feed any hogs or cattle to improve your situation, then if and when the Government ever gets its machinery set up, you may get some help.
>
> Please understand, we are not blaming any local committees, or offices. This is the way it has been set up by the Government, and these local boys cannot do anything about it.
>
> As much as has been said and written about the drought assistance for Missouri, and then to come up with a program such as this, it looks like the rest of the United States is being led to believe we are getting a lot of assistance, and the people of Missouri are getting the goaround.
>
> Why isn't is just as necessary for the men feeding hogs and cattle, who have lost their entire corn and grass crop, to have some form of assistance, as the man who is raising calves and lambs?
>
> Why, if farmers have all worked equally hard to get a crop and all are burnt up in the same manner, are not all equally entitled to any assistance that might be forthcoming?
>
> Now if we are misinformed as to how this program works, which we don't think we are, or if this program is changed, before you read this, then we are ready to take back all we have said. But if this program is what we tell you it is, we say it is a rotten deal and not worth the price of the airplane tickets Washington spent to send men out here to decide which class of farmer they would try to help, and which they would let suffer.

Antarctic Expedition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. STERLING COLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 17, 1954

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following letter to the editor of the Washington Post and Times Herald published July 13, 1954, titled "Antarctic Expedition":

ANTARCTIC EXPEDITION

> It is to be hoped that before the session ends the Antarctic expedition will be authorized to sail in December under provisions set forth in S. 3361 and its companion H. R. 8954 by Senator Francis Case and Representative Thor Tollefson.
>
> In 1947–48 Commander (now Capt. Finn Ronne, of Washington, D. C.) led an expedition wintering in Antarctica. Since then the United States has had no expedition, either public or private. This means that instead of building up a history of occupation and administration in the rich Antarctic Continent to help clinch any possible claims to land and minerals, the United

States has shown an indifference and apathy that is appalling. The same Captain Ronne would head the expedition proposed in the bill.

It is the belief of this taxpayer that most United States citizens, including most Members of the Congress, would favor any expedition furthering United States interests in Antarctica, inasmuch as other nations are showing consistent attention to the fascinating south polar regions. Evidently the potential economic importance of the Antarctic is vivid in the minds of foreign explorers and statesmen.

How the United States can maintain lethargy and expect to benefit through weather information, mining, various scientific activities, etc., is not clear. Many of your present readers will recall Admiral Byrd's fine article, "Are We Losing a Continent?" carried in a Sunday supplement to the Times Herald in January. As a matter of fact, no valid reason has ever been expressed for hesitancy in setting up permanent bases and beginning some Antarctic development under the Stars and Stripes.

Probably John and Jane Public merely need to wake up a bit to the fascination and values of the great southern continent. There is room for any interested and creative nation because Antarctica is only a little smaller than South America and wide open for ideas and initiative.

Taxpayer.

Chevy Chase.

It Looks Pretty Good

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 9, 1954

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, on August 2, the Daily Times, Mamaroneck, N. Y., published an editorial in which President Eisenhower is quoted as saying he believes his administration has "a pretty good record." My own feeling is that that is an understatement. The record is far more than "pretty good," in my opinion.

It has been my privilege to support the Eisenhower program by my votes in the House and I have pride in the accomplishments of the 83d Congress.

Permission has been given me to insert an editorial in the Congressional Record entitled "It Looks Pretty Good":

It Looks Pretty Good

Said President Eisenhower on July 7: "I think we have got a pretty good record, and there is so much of the record being enacted, of the program being enacted into law, that I think by the end of the month or by the time, whatever it is, that Congress goes out, we are going to look pretty good."

It is now the end of the month. And a review of administration accomplishments, capped by the cornerstone $1,363,000,000 tax relief bill, approved Thursday, gives solid substance to the President's earlier claim.

There was his victory, earlier in the week, on the Atomic Energy Act. His foreign aid appropriations bill was cut but there remains sufficient with which to do a good job. Earlier, 10 regular appropriation bills had been approved.

Outstanding, we think, is the President's success as the first Chief Executive in 30 years of trying to push through the St. Lawrence seaway project. Also, significant was his achievement, against heavy odds within his own party, in defeating the Bricker amendment to weaken the Executive's authority.

The extension of reciprocal trade legislation, although for only 1 year, was an administration victory, as were also the excise tax reductions and the mutual defense treaty ratified with Korea. Also approved was the administration's $1 billion highway program, a door opener to his later proposed $50 billion long-range highway proposal. Broadened unemployment insurance coverage and expanded social security are other feathers in the administration's cap.

Too, we must include the "new look" military budget, a housing bill which while not as much as the President asked is still substantial, the progress made toward flexible farm-price supports, the dividend tax relief, as included in Thursday's omnibus tax reform bill, partially offsetting the double taxation of corporation earnings, and chances for stronger antisubversive measures.

Altogether, indeed, the administration's legislative accomplishments look pretty good. And we predict before final adjournment of this 2d session of the 83d Congress they will look even better.

The President doesn't make much noise about it—but he gets things done.

See America, Too

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. DODD

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 17, 1954

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the Record, I wish to insert the following editorial from the Christian Science Monitor of August 14, 1954.

The idea of inviting Mr. Atlee and Mr. Bevan to visit the United States on their way home from China is an excellent one.

It will be good for both Mr. Atlee and Mr. Bevan to have a chance to make a real comparison between life in the United States and life under a Communist regime in China.

The editorial follows:

See America, Too

In all seriousness the Christian Science Monitor would propose that either President Eisenhower or the leaders of the opposition party or both should invite the leaders of the British Labor Party who are now in China to return to Britain by way of the United States.

Mr. Attlee of course has been in the United States before. But we believe Mr. Aneurin Bevan, left-wing leader and sharp critic of the United States, has never visited the United States.

In Government circles, among opposition leaders, and particularly among the leaders of American trade unionism, these British delegates would find information, a welcome, and a concept of freedom and integrity exceedingly pertinent to the crucial evaluations the British travelers seek to make.

Just possibly political etiquette might prevent the Eisenhower administration from officially inviting members of the party opposing the British Government in Parliament. But surely nothing need prevent American leaders such as Mr. Adlai Stevenson and Senator Lyndon Johnson from encouraging the British laborites to see America too.

And surely both the inviters and the invited would find in their getting together for a cross-country spin opportunities to serve (1) their own, (2) their countries', and (3) the entire free world's political needs.

For example, an American visit would be useful to Mr. Bevan as America's sternest and perhaps most frequent critic in Britain—even if all it did was to clothe his animadversions with the authority of firsthand observation.

Mr. Attlee, who is planning in any case to return home via Canada, a detour southward would help to lift his oriental studies above the criticism they have aroused among many of his own countrymen.

Mr. Stevenson it would mean a boost in an already high international reputation as well as being a coup against a Communist device to split the Western Allies.

And for Senator Johnson it would mean a sizable credit for having helped turn the flank of a Communist propaganda drive by arranging an American epilogue to Chou En-lai's Chinese play.

But questions of protocol aside, might it not be possible for the White House to extend an informal courtesy to a former Prime Minister of Britain or to engineer a bipartisan invitation?

Beyond these considerations of politics and international strategy, a visit by these leading Britons among the people of their most important ally could have profoundly desirable effects. It would, we can hope, provide the evidence they need in order to convince some of their own countrymen that the American people are a war-hating, peace-loving folk who understand liberty.

We can hope that the general well-being of the American people—some of which is due to great natural resources and enterprise as well as to a sense of social justice—would help to show the delegates why extreme left-wing theories, and particularly communism, are anathema to so many Americans.

And we should expect that this group of incisive and purposeful Britons would return from their visit to Peking and Moscow, and America, with a new perspective—a viewpoint too broad to permit the superficial comparisons which have in the past bedeviled the Anglo-American and the whole Western Alliance.

House Should Study Bill To Outlaw Red Party

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 16, 1954

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to direct the attention of our colleagues to the following editorial which appeared in the Brooklyn Eagle, of August 15, 1954:

House Should Study Bill To Outlaw Red Party

United States Senate action in passing unanimously a bill to outlaw the Communist Party reflects faithfully an emotional hatred of communism which exists generally among the American people. Whether such a law represents the best practical means of controlling the evil and danger of communism is a question inspiring sharp differences of opinion.

This question must now be given thoughtful consideration by President Eisenhower and by the House before the drastic measure sponsored by Senator HUMPHREY, Minnesota Democrat, is translated into law. Public sentiment for such legislation is undoubtedly strong.

Texas has put through a law making membership in the Communist Party a criminal offense, and similar measures are pending in other States. There are 11 measures in the House and 4 in the Senate following almost identical lines. It is the conviction of the public that the law should deal ruthlessly with those committed to the principles of communism, with their implications of subversion and treason.

The objection has been raised by some Americans sincerely concerned for the safeguarding of democratic ideals that the outlawing of membership in a political party would violate basic beliefs and traditions. This objection would have validity if the so-called Communist Party were actually a political organization in the accepted sense of the term. It is not. It is an alien conspiracy. Its people owe no loyalty to this Nation's Constitution nor its institutions of Government. Their political faith is that of Russia. They draw their inspiration from Moscow and they strive for the Kremlin's objective, which is the destruction of democratic government everywhere.

Notwithstanding these known facts, Attorney General Brownell and FBI Director Hoover do not approve of action to outlaw the Communist Party. They put their faith principally in the Smith Act, which has been employed so effectively in dealing with the Red hierarchy, and some subsidiary legislation.

While the constitutionality of the Smith Act, which makes it a crime to advocate or teach the desirability of the overthrow of the American Government by violence or to organize or help to organize any group for that purpose, was unpheld by the Supreme Court in 1951, the constitutionality of an act such as that passed by the Senate would have to be established.

Both Attorney General Brownell, who is nationally in charge of the anti-Red drive, and Director Hoover, who has the task of running the Reds to earth and knows best how it can be done, are convinced that Communists can best be fought in the open. To a large degree, of course, their activities even now are underground, but a bill to outlaw the party might easily have the effect of making more difficult their detection and prosecution.

The Senate supporters of the Humphrey bill may be credited with commendable zeal. They acted hurriedly in response to Democratic initiative. The House Members should make a more serious effort to determine the wisdom of the legislation, also the wishes of President Eisenhower.

The National Park System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, August 5, 1954

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I have been closely in touch with the work being performed by Mr. Conrad L. Wirth, Director of the National Park Service.

In my opinion, he is doing a wonderfully fine job. He is able, conscientious, and thoroughly imbued with the spirit of the conservation of the great natural resources under his control.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an article which appeared in the Saturday Evening Post entitled "Twenty-Four Million Acres of Trouble."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TWENTY-FOUR MILLION ACRES OF TROUBLE

(By Robert M. Yoder)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Taking care of the White House is just one of Conrad Wirth's countless chores. As boss of America's national parks, Wirth is host to 46 million tourists a year; runs $4 billion worth of scenery. Here are some of his frustrating problems.)

As Conrad L. Wirth hikes down a corridor of the Department of the Interior in Washington, or sits at lunch in the Cosmos Club, a passing friend sometimes sings out, "Hi-ya, Connie. How are things?" Wirth is manager of a 24-million-acre domain which can grow problems the way Indiana can grow corn, and there must be days when he is tempted to answer this question. Even a partial account could be a little striking.

"Why, about normal," Wirth might say. "We're having a little trouble with crocodiles, mountain climbers, wild burros, moonshiners, poachers, and smugglers, of course. There's some question what to do with maybe five or six thousand surplus elk, and it's going to be a fight to preserve the land-loving goose. The high cost of caves is something of a headache, and I wish we could figure out how to keep the sea cows from hanging around the business district—that's in Miami. There are 7 kinds of beetles attacking 7 kinds of timber, the prehistoric ruins need some work done, and we had a complaint from a man who says that in the forest primeval there is no place to plug in his electric razor. * * * How are things with you?"

A husky 200-pounder in his early fifties, Wirth looks well built to withstand work and worry, and providence keeps him beautifully supplied with both.

They are perquisites of his job—clearly one of the most remarkable in the world. Wirth is director of the National Park Service; boss of our 180 national parks, monuments, historic sites, and recreational areas.

This means administering $4 billion worth of the grandest and most peculiar real estate under our flag, including glaciers, volcanoes, geysers, deserts, giant sequoias 3,500 years old, great caves, and petrified forests.

So a multitude of plain and exotic troubles is to be expected. This is a condition so natural, in fact, that without them, Wirth propably would suffer some form of the bends, like a diver brought up too suddenly from the deep.

Wirth's paramount problem is money; he is in a financial hole of real grandeur. The parks are running down and getting harder use, by more millions, every year. "The people," one park man says, "are wearing out the scenery." To get what Wirth needs will require a small miracle of salesmanship.

Whatever your problem, Wirth's got one to match. Does your dog nip the garbage man? Wirth's got bears which nip tourists, sometimes bringing on lawsuits—one, which the Government won, for $75,000. Got aphids on the roses? It will be consoling to consider Wirth's pest problems: On a day no worse than usual they will include beetles, tent caterpillars, webworms, loopers, sawflies, and wood ticks. His oddest gardening worry is preserving a Hawaiian plant so excessively rare that there are only two known specimens. It's an item called Hibiscadelphus giffardianus.

Does your house keep you poor? Wirth has this problem in a curious form. The real estate in his charge includes 62 sets of prehistoric ruins which must be kept in a kind of suspended ruination. That comes high: It costs $8,000 a year to maintain the ruins in Mesa Verde, Colo., and Wirth figures those at Chaco Canyon, in New Mexico, need $65,000 worth of work to put them back in their old, terrible shape.

Wirth can expect trouble from every quarter; even so, there are surprises. Along with being the boss of 3,600 employees, with whom he gets along splendidly, Wirth is the boss of 300 statutes, mostly in battlefields. One of the statutes has given him a good deal of trouble. Lightning knocked both arms and the head off a 13-foot figure of Liberty, atop an 87-foot shaft at Yorktown, where Cornwallis surrendered. A well-known sculptor is executing a new figure, on commission, but now refuses to put it on the shaft, which he contends is an eyesore.

And while name writers are a nuisance, year in and out, it was a surprise when one of them chose Half Dome, in Yosemite. That great peak, looking like half a loaf of bread, presents a face of rock 2,000 feet high. High as it is, one visitor swung down on 20 feet of rope to paint his name. He chose too big a canvas; he ran out of paint after finishing only one initial.

If repining over human vandalism gets him nowhere, Wirth can worry about vandalism by buffalo. The Yellowstone buffaloes long have been a joy but a care. Once they dwindled to 23. A small breeding stock was put inside fences and treated royally. The buffalo ranch worked fine; the buffaloes multiplied until there were hundreds.

But they got as tame as cattle, and just about as exciting to see. With free hay in winter, and no worries, they lost vigor, spirit, and tourist appeal. The duty of the Park Service is to preserve wildlife in the wild state. So it was necessary to wean the buffaloes from the easy life and turn them wild again. That was accomplished. But the buffaloes have a keen eye for luxury. About 1,000 head of the Yellowstone buffaloes come into the Firehole River region to spend their winters in steam-heated comfort beside the hot springs and geysers. It's a good move; here they can get at the dried grass without rooting in snow.

But 1,000 buffaloes produce serious wear and tear. They have chipped away rock formations which took centuries to build. So a deal will have to be made whereby, in return for free hay, they stay away from the hot springs. The Park Service never attacked a preservation problem with such unmitigated success as in the case of the buffaloes. Where once the lordly buffalo was vanishing, there now are buffaloes all over the joint.

Preserving wildlife is tricky business. "Remove one thing," said a great naturalist, "and you find it is hitched to everything else in the universe." If the park rangers thin out the coyotes to protect the deer, the deer get so numerous they eat themselves and others out of browse. Then they go to town, where that is possible, and ransack garbage cans. Once they have tasted garbage, raw forage isn't good enough.

The park director's problem always include two or three creatures on the very brink of going extinct. Right now, the crisis cases are the blacked-footed ferret, the crocodile, and the nene. Only about 60 of the ferrets have been sighted in the last 7 years, and a third of those were dead. An investigation is underway to find out what the ferrets need and how they can be coaxed to continue.

The nene is a long-legged, brown-necked little Hawaiian goose which may very well be the rarest creature on earth.

The nene was common enough at the start of the century, but now it is thought there may be no more than 50 left. Its worst visible enemy is the domestic pig, gone wild and tough. The pigs destroy the nests and young or keep the nenes too nervous to nest. Wild goats, meanwhile, devour the nenes' favorite berries. There is hope of saving the poor slighted birds by giving them all possible protection in Hawaii National Park, but it will be a near thing.

The American crocodile never has been plentiful, even if you regard a very few crocodiles as plenty. Only one small section suits this salt-water nightmare, a strip about 100 miles long on the southeastern coast of Florida. Crocodile numbers have dwindled because anyone sighting a crocodile is likely to shoot it for its valuable hide, worth $4.50 a foot, and other crocodiles come to grief in fishermen's drag seines.

Though the ugly creatures are classed as vanishing, naturalists think the crocodile can be saved. That's because the Everglades National Park takes in Florida Bay, a favorite crocodile haunt, and park rangers war constantly on crocodile poachers.

Along with being a sanctuary for crocodiles, and perhaps the only place in the world which is underwater half the time and subject to terrific grass fires the rest, the Everglades park is also a home for put-upon manatees, so Wirth is the manatee's foster mother as well as the comforter of the crocodile.

Short in the nene, ferret, crocodile, and manatee departments, Wirth is woefully long on elk, having far more than the parks can pasture. Last winter, in four huge corral-like traps costing $10,000 each, Yellowstone rangers live-trapped 219. The elk lift got rid of 125. The elk lift consists of hauling the elk out of the park, into open hunting country, by truck. The rest were given to various parks for stocking purposes. Still others wandered out on their own. But there were still far too many elk, so aerial elk shooting was tried. A plane and a helicopter were able to chase several herds over park boundaries. All told, the winter's efforts may have reduced the elk population by 1,000. Good? Yes, but only a starter. It still leaves a remarkable excess—about 4,600 elk too many.

Wirth's collection of peculiar problems includes international smugglers, dealing, of all things, in a harmless form of wax. These are rifle-toting bands, bad all out of proportion to their contraband, and given to shooting. The wax is made by cooking the candelilla plant, and is used in shoe polish, floor wax, phonograph records, and medicine. The wax runners smuggle it in from Mexico via the Big Bend National Park, in Texas, defying Mexican law, which says all such wax must be marketed through the Government.

But things never are so bad as they might be for Wirth. He has one stanch ally—the grand old law of compensation. The improbable happens, but the probable desists. The wild parks are full of danger—great glaciers, cliffs, geysers throwing fountains of scalding water, steam jetting from hillsides, lakes at altitudes where the strongest swimmers tire quickly. Thousands of the park visitors never before saw country wilder than a vacant lot. Yet the fatality rate is spectacularly low.

Each year, recently, has brought mountain climbers in record numbers. Many get in trouble, but are rescued.

Excellent planning accounts in part for the fine safety record. Though Kilauea Volcano in Hawaii had been quiet 18 years, they were ready when it erupted one midnight in 1952. In 5 months 450,000 visitors flocked to look down on the great lake of fire. Nobody got hurt except a man who chose this opportunity to commit suicide. The final report said "30,000 cars parked, 1 fender scratched."

Wirth's job makes him a big-time resort proprietor, the boss of 23 hotels and lodges, 4,086 cabins, 1,511 tents. Unfortunately, what that comes to is not nearly enough. He has 15,000 miles of roads to maintain, he has general supervision of 200 concessions doing $30 million worth of business a year. Indirectly, this puts Wirth in a variety of business enterprises ranging from renting pack horses to running mineral baths. He is also the boss of 114 museums, the chief of a small force of traffic cops on the Baltimore-Washington Parkway, and the custodian of 527 buildings of historical significance, most of which need something.

He is a man of consequence in 39 States and 4 possessions, and he is also chief yardbird for the White House. In a sense he is the President's landlord, the White House being Reservation No. 1 in the Capital's Park System, which is another of Wirth's responsibilities.

Wirth tackles his assorted duties with unfailing calm and a good deal of zest, though this isn't the way he expected to spend his life. A landscape architect, he planned to devote himself to private practice, dealing in subdivisions and country clubs rather than geysers and battlefields. Parks were a little overly familiar: Wirth was born in one city park, raised in another, worked in parks every summer as a boy. That was enough for his older brother, Theodore, Jr. He went to sea and became a rear admiral. Except for the admiral, however, it's a park family. Conrad's younger brother, Walter, is park superintendent at Salem, Oreg.; Conrad's older son, Ted, is in the NPS office in Omaha.

Wirth is the son of a highly successful park man, the late Theodore Wirth, Sr. Theodore Wirth came here from Switzerland, after studying horticulture in France and England. For 6 years he was a gardener in Central Park, New York, and on private estates in Long Island, and then became park superintendent in Hartford, Conn. Conrad was born there, in the superintendent's residence in Elizabeth Park.

When Conrad was 9, the family moved to Minneapolis, where his father developed a park system which won worldwide attention. A bold and imaginative builder, the elder Wirth also put forward an idea now generally accepted, but then brandnew. Parks, he held, are for recreation as well as beauty; this calls for tennis courts and baseball diamonds as well as rose gardens.

Conrad Wirth couldn't have had a better teacher. But when he got out of Massachusetts University he went into private practice, first in San Francisco, then in New Orleans. For 4 years he had nothing to do with parks. The gulf country was booming, and Wirth and his partner, Harold Neale, worked on projects of considerable splendor. The biggest was the Pass Christian Island development, a 5,000-acre venture involving the creation of islands and canals and intended to rival Florida at its flossiest.

But the Florida boom collapsed, and all around the gulf big plans went glimmering. Property was selling for 10 cents on the dollar. Nobody needed landscape architects to plan multimillion-dollar dream cities. "I'd have been glad to plan a miniature golf course," says Wirth.

Just when he needed it most he was offered a post on the Planning Commission for Washington, D. C. There he got to know Park Service men, liked their devotion to the parks, their unusual esprit de corps. When they had an opening in 1931, he took it gladly, and was back in the family business, parks. His brother, the admiral, held out stanchly, but the land got him in the end. After World War II he was appointed Superintendent of Buildings and Grounds at Annapolis, and later went into the real-estate business in California.

Wirth's work for 20 years was long-range planning. Some of it is only now bearing fruit; one result is the new Cape Hatteras Seashore Recreational Area, a brand-new type of national playground. Nowhere in the system was there a great stretch of Atlantic seacoast still undeveloped. Wirth studied every mile of the coast and found nothing to compare with the picturesque islands making up North Carolina's outer banks. To get what he wanted took 20 years, but in his work you have to have patience.

Adding to this park or that, Wirth handled massive land deals, in one case swapping 180,000 acres of grazing land for 10,000 acres of valuable timber owned by Montana, but inside Glacier National Park. He made himself an authority on "inholdings" and hopes before he retires to see many of these disappear. Inholdings are land privately owned, but inside the parks. Inside Mammoth Cave National Park, for instance, there are two privately owned caves. The Park Service hopes to buy them in time, but good caves run high these days; this pair will cost around $500,000. For a long time the Government didn't own the actual site where Cornwallis surrendered, in Yorktown battlefield, but Wirth bought that in 1948.

Wirth has had a hand in developing 561 city and State parks as well as the national ones. That came about in the days of the depression, when, as Interior's representative, he had charge of CCC camps which built or improved parks all over the land. He sighs, these shorthanded days, for the crew he had then—95,000 young men, 17 to 23, who could do anything from stringing power lines to digging artificial lakes. For years to come, vacationists will have a better time because we had that siege of unemployment in the grim thirties. Virginia had 1 State park in 1933, for example; by 1942 it had 6, drawing just under 500,000 visitors a year.

Wirth became director in December of 1951. He is one of the few top officials to survive the change of administration; Secretary of the Interior Douglas McKay decided that Wirth was uniquely qualified for a highly difficult job and ought not to be disturbed. "It is men like this," says Secretary McKay, "that give to Government service the prestige it deserves." To repay his work and worry, he can reflect on solid accomplishments. The Cape Hatteras seashore—the finest beach preservation in the world—is his special pride. Land buying will be finished this summer. Both millionaires and bums contributed to this newest of the parks. The wealthy patrons were Paul Mellon and Mrs. Ailsa Mellon Bruce, children of the late Andrew; they put up $618,000. This is a form of philanthropy Wirth is cultivating hard. A special booklet titled, "The Fifth Essence," is put before ladies and gentlemen of wealth, inviting contributions to the national park trust fund. The frugal Wirth got a donation to publish this appeal, and the book carries no publication date, so it can't get dated.

The down-and-outers who helped with Hatteras were on the Outer Banks in "transient camps" in the thirties; some had been bonus marchers in 1932. The sea was making inroads, and the campers tied down the shifting dunes with brush fences and tough grass. One of the campers came back to show his wife where he had worked as a jobless and penniless youth, and what the pleasant consequences have been. The ex-bum couldn't tarry. A big wheel now, he was on his way to Florida for a winter vacation, driving his expensive new car.

This year also should see the creation of Cumberland Gap National Monument, a 21,000-acre park in Virginia, Tennessee, and Kentucky, and Harpers Ferry National Monument, in West Virginia and Maryland. Another major project is under way at Independence Hall, which will stand in a setting of dignity and charm at the end of a 3-block mall. And the Statue of Liberty, a shabby disgrace 5 years ago, has been refurbished.

There is also a new deal for concession operations, expected to produce better service for tourists. The parks now take a percentage of the gross instead of the net, and Wirth tries to extract a promise of bigger and better facilities in return. Major improvement is under way in Grand Teton, including a whole new tourist village; it is the first large-scale development in any national park in 30 years.

But these are bright spots in a dark picture. Every year brings more visitors, coming earlier, staying later. This is precisely what the parks are for. The trouble is, the parks are in no shape to accommodate so much business.

"Some of the camping grounds are so crowded," Wirth says, "that they amount to outdoor slums. Before the war, the biggest attendance was 21 million. Last year it hit 46 million. In 1941 we had $84 million to run the park system; last year we had $34 million. What we're trying to do just can't be done; it's like trying to put 2 gallons of water into a 1-gallon bucket."

Badly as he needs money for development, he needs maintenance money worse. Little could be done during the war. Budgets since then have been too small to allow any catching up. The backlog of needed work—roads, buildings, additional campsites—is now a towering $600 million. Wirth says he could usefully and sensibly spend $60 million a year for the next 10 years, and that this might save the parks. "Save," he insists, is not too strong.

"Take Yellowstone," he says. "Yellowstone will be destroyed if things keep on as they're going; literally destroyed. Crowds are walking all over the formations, vandalism is more and more prevalent. We ought at least to keep what we've got, and we're not doing it. All we can do is put patch on patch, and that's bad business, whether it's a national park or a private home."

Cabins are a major dilemma. The parks need them, and concession operators would build them—but not until there are suitable sites. That means light, sewer, and water systems. Wirth hasn't got the money. His chances of getting as much money as he needs don't seem bright, but Wirth tackles the job cheerfully. His best bet, he sees clearly, is to persuade Congress and the Nation that it would be money well and profitably spent.

"Twenty-three States," he says, "say travel is one of their three biggest industries. The business can't be measured accurately, but it's estimated to run somewhere between twelve and thirty billion a year. It is believed the parks generate more than $2 billion of this. If so, they are responsible for $580 million which gets back to the States and the Federal Government in taxes. It works out to $150 million in local taxes and $430 million in Federal.

"As I say, this travel business is a byproduct, not our principal purpose—which is to help people enjoy and understand the God-given wonders of our country. But it's a byproduct too valuable to lose. Some say we can't afford to put the parks in shape and keep them that way. I say we can't afford not to. They're making the Federal Government $430 million a year in taxes, and the Government is spending only $33 million on them. It's bad business to let a plant be destroyed when it produces that kind of a return."

Half the time in Washington, half in the field, Wirth commonly works 7 days a week, and 7 nights. It's a job which would give many a man ulcers in 3 months, and often seems thankless.

But Wirth is lively and resilient, and there is much about the job he likes a great deal. It is work with big consequences; a lot rides on Wirth's judgment. He likes the fact that it's "not just for today." Americans will enjoy that new seashore at Hatteras, for instance, for hundreds of years.

Moreover he knows the Park Service has many well-wishers. In Glacier, a cigar-smoking taxpayer took Wirth aside for a pep talk. "Don't let people run cattle in the parks," he said. "Don't let anybody cut those trees. The parks are for the wildlife and the people. Anything I can do, let me know." This red-hot conservationist was Groucho Marx.

As Adjournment Nears

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 17, 1954

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial which appeared in the New York Times of August 17, 1954, is worthy of our attention:

As Adjournment Nears

In what will probably be its last week of legislative activity, the 83d Congress still has before it three major bills that are now being whipped into final shape. No matter with what promise of efficiency and high hopes of precision the Congress begins its labors in January, it almost invariably winds up in a mad mid-summer scramble to get home, whether it is under Democratic or Republican management. Human nature is the same in Congress as anywhere else; and things inevitably pile up at the end with the result that in those last few days or weeks of pressure for adjournment important matters tend either to be shoved aside or given inadequate consideration.

One that surely has had inadequate consideration is the bill to outlaw the Communist Party that was tacked on to another anti-Communist measure on the Senate floor last week. Control of the Communist conspiracy concerns the safety of our country and is therefore a serious matter that ought to be handled seriously by both parties, and not in the end-of-term, election-year, holiday spirit with which it has been treated in the last few days. The administration was strongly opposed to the bill as it passed the Senate. It has agreed to the more moderate House version, but it cannot be said that this legislation has received anything like the mature thought in Congress that it deserves. In the Senate, particularly, both Democrats and Republicans have indulged in an obviously political attempt to get credit for something that looks like anti-Communist legislation irrespective of the possibility that it might make actual control of the Communist conspiracy by the FBI more difficult than ever.

The atomic-energy bill and the farm bill are the other two important measures that are still pending. They each passed House and Senate with significant points of difference. Yesterday conference committees agreed on both bills and they should shortly be at the White House. These two bills when completed ought to add substantially to the legislative record of the 83d Congress. The monumental tax revision bill was signed into law yesterday; the bill to increase benefits and extend coverage under social security is now safely through both Houses; a $3 billion foreign-aid program has been authorized, although the exact size of the appropriation is still in dispute. The St. Lawrence seaway is certainly on the credit side; and so are the Housing Act and the Reciprocal Trade Act, though in certain respects these latter two fall so far short of what is desirable that the credit they add is very slight indeed.

These are only some of the highlights, and they omit mention of many failures of the present Congress. We will review the record in more detail when adjournment is an accomplished fact. Meanwhile, in addition to the few larger issues that are still pending, there are some smaller ones which could easily be taken care of during these final few days. As a positive example the Senate ought to pass the implementing legislation (already approved by the House) that would make effective the International Copyright Convention ratified some weeks ago. As a negative example both Houses should take care to see that there does not slip through, via a rider or otherwise, the proposed authorization of a dam in Dinosaur National Monument, which would constitute an invasion of the national park system. The 83d Congress is nearing its end. It still has it in its power materially to add to or detract from the record it has already built.

Exploration During the Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER HOLTZMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 17, 1954

Mr. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including herewith an article written by the well-known explorer, Wendell Phillips Dodge, on exploration during the year 1953, appearing in the New International Year Book, 1954, Events of 1953, copyrighted by Funk & Wagnalls Co., New York.

Commander Dodge is looked upon as an outstanding authority on this subject, and, during 9 years as editor of the Explorers Journal of the Explorers Club, New York, his reports about scientific exploration, particularly, have had worldwide circulation.

With House bill H. R. 8954 in the offing, along with Senate bill 3381, it is believed this article may prove enlightening to all who read it in the RECORD.

The article follows:

EXPLORATION

During the year 1953 exploration achieved a new high and a new low in the final conquest of Mount Everest and in penetrating to the greatest depth of the sea. These two events stand out above all others, although there were many other notable attainments.

MOUNT EVEREST

In exploration today, the explorer leader who plans and executes expeditions rarely is just a scientist; it is he who must correlate the several sciences that may be involved in an exploration expedition, making each as effective as possible in the final accomplishment. Such was Col. John Hunt, expedition leader of the successful British Mount Everest expedition, who planned the assault on the earth's highest peak, the 29,002-foot Gariskhanta, on the frontier between Nepal and Tibet, in 27°50′ N., 87°5′ E.—the Goddess of the World, to Tibetans, who call it Cholmolungma.

Everest was conquered on Friday, May 29, 1953, 3 days before the coronation of Queen Elizabeth II of the British Commonwealth, by the New Zealand beekeeper and mountaineer, Edmund P. Hillary, and the famous Sherpa guide, Tensing Norkay. Soon afterward the two British men—Col. Sir John Hunt and Sir Edmund P. Hillary—were knighted by Queen Elizabeth, and Tensing Norkay was given the highest honor for a national of another country.

EXPLORATION UNDER THE SEA

On September 30, 1953, Prof. Auguste Piccard, of Switzerland, and his 31-year-old son, Jacques, penetrated to the greatest depth under the surface of the sea, reaching about 10,330 feet, easily beating the record of some 6,900 feet set by 2 French naval officers during the previous month.

Professor Piccard reported that 2 miles beneath the surface of the sea there was a gravelike calm, and Stygian blackness broken only by ghostly flickers of phosphorescence, hinting at unknown forms of life. "There was nothing else to see—even our powerful searchlight grayed away in the silent, sunless darkness of the abyss," he said.

Dr. Edward C. Ballard, director of Great Britain's National Physical Laboratory at Teddington-on-Thames, set out to investigate why the temperature of the earth's crust fluctuates like a fever chart of a sick man, by means of a series of temperature readings on the floor of the Atlantic Ocean. He dropped electric thermometers 15 feet into the ooze of the Atlantic 2,000 fathoms below the research ship *Discovery II*, on an oceanographic mission west of the Irish coast.

The experiment was to be primarily a piece of research into the heat flow dynamics of the inaccessible interior of this planet, to help geophysicists to understand what causes volcanic eruptions and why the great ocean deeps are where they are, and also to acquire a better understanding of the temperature gradients of the so-called mantle of the earth.

Beginning in the spring of 1953, imaginative achievements in exploration by a French naval officer-explorer, Capt. Jacques-Yves Cousteau, began aboard the *Calypso*, a 350-ton, 142-foot former American minesweeper completely converted to oceanographic purposes. Captain Cousteau is a coinventor of the device that for the first time enables men safely, comfortably, and independently of all surface connections to enter depths once permitted only to men encumbered with the old-fashioned bulky diving gear.

Called an aqualung, the Costeau device is a breathing apparatus through which the diver breathes compressed air carried in tanks on his back. An ingenious valve auto matically releases the proper amount of air as depth pressures vary, and the body always maintains an interior pressure equal to that outside. Lead weights hold the underwater swimmer at any level he chooses, while flippers on his feet give him extra power.

Captain Cousteau's underwater photographs reveal for the first time that the regions beneath seas are a blaze of brilliant colors. As a result of his undersea explorations already made during the year 1953, Captain Cousteau learned that strange fishes, the civil engineers of the undersea world, build Red Sea beaches by grinding coral in their powerful jaws.

Another invention of Captain Cousteau, the aquascope, meaning "water looker," is just that, an unique 2,700-pound tank built of armorplate steel with wide plastic windows. It carries two men with color cameras, high-voltage power equipment and high-speed lights 50 feet to 100 feet down to become an inconspicuous part of the natural marine habitat on the sea floor.

Lying prone on an air mattress inside the aquascope, the photographers were able to catch underseas life on natural color film at midnight as well as midday. They were able to stay down indefinitely, watching fishes and other creatures of the reefs and shoals in all their normal activities. Split-second flashes of the powerful lights do not seem to disturb marine life sitting for portraits.

In the *Calypso* a diving well amidships permits the ship's human fish to come in and out of water comfortably regardless of the air temperature outside. On her deck she carried a helicopter, and below were scientific laboratories of several kinds. Twenty men were in the crew.

The main interest of the expedition is physical oceanography—depths, physical, and chemical properties of ocean water, and the like. As aqualung divers are limited to 300 feet and can stay down about an hour at a time, much of this work will be done with instruments.

Working with a new technique he has devised, Victor C. Anderson, physicist, collected evidence that indicated a scattering layer that derives its name from the fact that concentrations of marine organisms reflect sounds that strike them. The presence of this scattering layer is an important factor in the operation of sonar or echo-sounding equipment.

A large number of echoes on a series of records taken in deep water some 12 miles west of San Diego indicated the presence of fish 12 to 18 inches long at a depth of 1,200 yards.

IRAQ

For more than a hundred years many famous antiquities have been uncovered in Iraq, which yielded its first Paleolithic, or Old Stone Age skeletal remains to a cooperative archaeological expedition of the Directorate General of Antiquities of the Iraq Government and the Smithsonian Institution in Washington, D. C. These were of a small child unearthed in situ 26 feet deep in the Paleolithic deposits in excavations at Shanidar Cave, some 250 airline miles north of Baghdad, in northern Iraq. Ralph S. Solecki, archaeologist and director of the expedition, and a Fulbright research scholar in Iraq, made the announcement in the summer of 1953.

The site of the discovery lies within the Zagros Mountains in the valley of the Greater Zab River north of the rolling steppeland which forms part of a fertile farmland area extending from Egypt to Iran. The cave within which the deposits were explored is a large amphitheaterlike shelter which has been leached out of solid limestone rock.

The skeletal remains of the child, represented by the teeth, skull fragments, and whole and fragmentary remains of the arm and leg bones, were found well within the deposit characterized by stone implements of the Mousterian Age. This period is of Paleolithic origin, dated geologically in Europe to a cold phase of the Ice Ages.

DANISH SCIENTIFIC MISSION TO AFGHANISTAN

Prince Peter of Greece and Denmark, leader of an important continuing exploration expedition to Central Asia, reported in the summer of 1953 that he and three fellow workers from the National Museum of Copenhagen, Denmark, had gone into the unknown and uncharted central mountains of Arghanistan and studied the various nomadic tribes there: Hazaras, Aimaks, and Pakhtoons. Prince Peter, also carrying on with his Tibetan research, achieved a goal of anthropometrically measuring 2,000 Tibetans.

On the road to Lhasa, the so-called Staircase which takes one up over 12,000 feet at Lingtu, Prince Peter learned more than is generally known about the "Abominable Snowman." After a halt at Ngatang (Gnatong), being caught by the early monsoon rain, he and a small party, including the Princess, went on to Kopup at the foot of the 14,000-foot Jelep-la Pass. This place is reputed for its Abominable Snowmen, all sorts of legends about them being current there. With tales of this mysterious beast continuing to persist, the London Daily Mail was to sponsor an international expedition in 1954 to track down the legendary dweller of the Himalayan heights.

Gerald Russell, 43-year-old naturalist of the United States, who was the first to capture a giant baby panda as a member of the Harkness Expedition on the Chinese-Tibetan border in 1936, is to be the leader of the expedition. Among others are Tom Stobart, 39, who filmed the conquest of Mount Everest in May 1953, and Ralph Izzard, 43, Daily Mail correspondent, who followed Sir John Hunt's footsteps part of the way through the wilds of Mount Everest.

WENDELL PHILLIPS DODGE.

Problems of World Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 17, 1954

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am pleased to include an address by Mr. O. R. Strackbein, chairman of the Nationwide Committee of Industry, Agriculture, and Labor on Import Policy, before the annual Rutgers AFL Labor Institute, August 4, 1954.

The speech follows:

PROBLEMS OF WORLD TRADE

(Address by O. R. Strackbein, chairman, the Nationwide Committee of Industry, Agriculture, and Labor on Import-Export Policy, before the annual Rutgers AFL Labor Institute, August 4, 1954)

The interest of labor in the conditions under which imports enter this country is no less vital and direct than that of the employers who operate in industry, agriculture, and mining. Both are concerned over the loss of production, or earnings. To the worker this means loss of employment or a curtailment of hours of work. Or it may mean a reduction in wages, loss of fringe benefits, or a deterioration in working conditions. To the employer or owner it means lower sales, lower profits, or actual financial loss.

The real question involved in assessing the effects of imports is the character of the competition and the condition of our home market as it confronts import competition. These two factors determine to what extent imports may be injurious, a matter of indifference or even helpful. Broad or general statements against imports are meaningless as are statements that indiscriminately praise imports and trade in general.

Trade is not and never was an end in itself. To be worth the effort it must be profitable to someone. However, it can happen that what is profitable to one person or to one group may be injurious or detrimental to another person or group. It is this latter condition, inherent in many trade transactions, that gives rise to the problems of trade. Obviously if imports injured no one there would be no opposition to them.

The principal question is whether import trade can be conducted profitably without injury to someone else or whether, if this cannot be done, the benefits may so outweigh the injury that imports may still be justified; or again, whether the conditions of importation can be adjusted to limit the damage without greatly restricting the import volume.

Undoubtedly a great part of our imports are not only helpful and profitable but also have the great advantage of injuring none of our own producers or undermining our labor standards. Into this category fall most of our imports on the free list, which comprises nearly 60 percent of our total imports. Coffee is such a product. It is our number one import item. In 1953 we imported $1,465,000,000 worth of the tropical berry. No one complained except against the price; and the import trade must have been profitable. Here then we have the almost ideal conditions of trade. No one produces coffee in this country and we are delighted to obtain the product free of duty from the tropical countries that are especially adapted to coffee growing.

The same condition applies to most of the other items on the free list. Some of them, such as tin, represent materials that we lack completely or such as newsprint which we produce only in inadequate quantity.

Should all our imports fall into these classes we would hear very little of the foreign trade problem. That is not the case, however, and consequently we do have trade problems. We do import products that compete with those produced in this country; and most of such imports are on our dutiable list. The problem is twofold. Export interests wish to sell ever greater quantities in foreign markets. Such interests may overproduce with respect to the domestic demand and thus face the alternative of unprofitable prices at home, with possible outright losses, or disposing of the surplus in other countries.

We have several important farm crops that are in a chronic state of overproduction in relation to the domestic market and as a result have become wholly dependent upon exports for their well-being. Such crops are cotton, wheat, and tobacco. We also have come to export a good part of our recently expanded crops of soybeans and rice. These are the sources of much of the pressure for further tariff reductions.

Our imports from other countries determine in great part how much they can buy from us. If we import little we cannot export much. Those who wish to export farm products and thus get rid of their surpluses insist that we should import in sufficient volume to make this possible. Also, those who look to the foreign markets as outlets for industrial products such as machinery, automobiles, office equipment, and steel, not so much for the disposal of surplus production but to spread the overhead and thus increase profits, are strong in their support of a high volume of imports.

Neither of these groups seeks imports for the sake of imports; nor do they care what the imports consist of. They are interested primarily in an operation that will put dollars into foreign hands which in turn may be spent on American cotton, wheat, tobacco, soybeans, automobiles, office equipment, etc.

What is wrong with this?

Nothing at all, but for one thing. Not all our imports, as already stated, are non-competitive with our own production, such as are coffee, tea, tin, etc. Many of our imports compete directly in our own market with the output of our own factories and farms. That is why the trade problem is twofold. Export interests, seeking to expand export markets or to hold on to the war and postwar artificially high levels of exports, demand that we expand our imports sufficiently to make this possible. On the other hand, our producers, our manufacturers and farm operators and their workers who are hit by the competition from imported products challenge this concept.

They wish to know why they should be exposed to injurious or even disastrous competition, leading to demoralized market conditions, production cutbacks, unemployment and the discomfiture of labor generally, so that someone else may be favored with more profitable trade.

The export interests respond that more imports will not really hurt at all; that in fact they are good for everybody in general. Naturally the domestic producers who actually experience the competition are outraged and galled over the presumption of the beneficiaries of exports, themselves free of import competition or thoroughly insulated against it, in lecturing their brethren about the benefits of imports and adding insult to injury by saying that the import competition does not hurt.

The export interests add that if their exports decline, as they will if foreign aid is reduced and tariffs are not, unemployment will as certainly result as it will if imports displace domestic products in our market. And this is true.

Thus we do have a conflict of interests and the question is how it can best be resolved. Is it simply a quantitative question, i. e., a simple question of whether more people would be unemployed by a shrinkage in our exports than the number that would be displaced by imports if freer trade policies were adopted? Or is something else at stake?

Export interests and the supporters of freer trade introduce another element at this point, a political factor as distinguished from the economic. This is the need for friends in the cold war. Against what they call the minor injury that might result from further tariff reductions, must be set the weight of free-world harmony. We cannot make or keep friends if we increase tariff rates or refuse to lower them on goods that friendly nations would like to ship to us in greater volume. Moreover, say the freer-trade proponents, both we and our debtors are getting tired of economic assistance from this country. Other countries would vastly prefer to pay their own way. It is humiliating to them to receive financial grants from us; and our taxpayers are getting equally tired of footing the bill.

Thus the export interests have very strong and appealing considerations on their side. Undoubtedly policies designed to implement these considerations would and should prevail if they are not counterbalanced by other considerations.

However, there do exist compelling considerations on the other side.

1. A continuing high level of production and employment in this country is to the interest not only of this country but to nations that side with us. We are stronger militarily if we are strong economically rather than weak. Other countries sell more here when we are prosperous than if our economic activity subsides.

Imports hitting a surplus or buyer's market, if allowed to come in at prices below those prevailing here, produce deflationary effects. In order to defend themselves against heavy inventory losses domestic producers under such circumstances will curtail production, and this means layoffs, shorter workweeks, etc. If these retrenching measures are widespread because import competition is widespread the deflationary forces will be difficult to halt, and our economy may be greatly weakened. This would be unfortunate not only for us but for our friends in the cold war.

The threat from this source can be greatly minimized if tariff rates substantially bridge the competitive gap and thus prevent gross underselling. It can also be contained within tolerable limits by the imposition of flexible import quotas that would set aside a reasonable share of the market to imports.

2. It is imperative that we maintain production, employment, prices, and wages at high levels. Also we must maintain conditions that are conducive to the flow of investments into plant renewals, plant expansions, and the building of new plants. Otherwise the balance between production and consumption will break down.

Maintenance of these elements at a high level is necessary because of our high national obligations, mostly contracted at a time of high prices. To meet our defense budget, our interest payment on the public debt, etc., we must have a high national income. Our price level therefore cannot be allowed to drop substantially. Our annual national budget today is of nearly the magnitude as our total national income in 1939. Therefore we cannot think of going back to the prewar price levels.

Imports that undercut our market when it is in a surplus state will threaten the whole economic structure. They will go counter to all the special provisions made to cushion our economy against deflation, such as unemployment insurance, social security, minimum wages, obligatory collective bargaining, farm-price supports, bank-deposit insurance, etc. These are all well-imbedded interferences with a free market; but the reduction of tariffs is in the opposite direction and will tend to undo the effects of these measures.

Unfair foreign competition makes more difficult the planning of production; it puts a damper on investment and on plans to expand production facilities. Therefore it undermines the conditions necessary for continuing prosperity.

With the obligations of collective bargaining, high wages, and high material costs resting upon the domestic producers, they are in no position to compete with imports the foreign producers of which are not similarly burdened. If we support the governmental policies that create these burdens we must see to it that competition from abroad does not take advantage of the disability imposed upon our producers and manufacturers. The boss, in hoping to meet low import prices, can no longer tell his employees overnight, "I am sorry, I find it necessary in order to compete with imports, to reduce wages 20 percent." No. His costs are quite rigid and he enjoys a comparatively narrow margin of competitive flexibility.

Therefore when the export interests urge greater imports through further tariff reductions they prescribe for their fellow producers what they would abhor for themselves, namely, being pitted against formidable competition with one competitive arm tied behind their backs.

Take note of that, for example, that wheat and cotton, the export interests of which are in the forefront of the freer-trade parade, are themselves rigidly protected by highly restrictive import quotas. In addition both are the beneficiaries of price supports and subsidies.

They excuse their protection on the grounds of their price supports. But what of the fixed burdens on industrial producers? What is the difference? Each is the result of the operation of public policy as expressed in laws on the statute books.

These various considerations, if properly presented to foreign countries, would be understood by them. But who offers them such explanations? No one. Rather our policy seems to be to ignore the plain facts of our domestic economy and its vulnerability to import competition and thus to lead our overseas friends to believe that we agree with them when they insist on a wider opening of our doors to imports. This is faulty policy, to say the least, and will lead to our immeasurable embarrassment and to bitter reaction abroad when the weight of the counterconsiderations to freer trade can no longer be ignored. That time is fast approaching and all the heavy and clumsy efforts to ignore these facts of life will lead to the same unpleasant results as the flouting of inescapable facts usually begets.

3. The United States has already greatly reduced its tariff. This fact is only beginning to become known. We have cut our tariffs by over half, and rising prices have lowered them yet more. Today our average tariff level on dutiable items is 75 percent below the level of the 1931–35 period. No other country can exhibit a record surpassing this. Moreover, we make little use of the many nontariff restrictions that are widely used by other countries, such as exchange controls, import licenses, bilateral trading arrangements, and import quotas. Oddly enough, such import quotas as we do have are principally for the benefit of cotton, wheat, and wheat flour producers who are noted for their strenuous opposition to protection.

The United States in the past 20 years has joined the ranks of the low-tariff countries, with only 6 or 7 countries having lower average tariff protection than we. The fact is that our tariff reductions have been made during a period when their effects could not be fully tested, i. e., under the umbrella of a seller's market when demand for goods was strong in relation to supply. The result is that today as we move out of the seller's market into a buyer's or surplus market, many industries find themselves competitively overexposed as other countries regain their prewar export capacity.

Therefore the need today is for a more satisfactory remedy than the existing ones against the errors committed by those who so eagerly and recklessly wielded the axe on our tariff over a 20-year period.

Today when out of some 40 applications to the Tariff Commission under the escape clause 1 or 2 tariff rates are increased, loud protests go up abroad and also at home. Yet the escape clause is a part of our trade agreements and it has been most niggardly enforced.

Just recently in response to the restoration of the duty on watches in pursuance of an escape clause action through the Tariff Commission, Switzerland, which is the predominant source of watch imports, screamed to the high heavens and threatened retaliation.

That is the reward we reap when we liberalize our trade barriers excessively. Switzerland had taken 83 percent of our market for watches under the reduced tariff rate. The domestic industry was clearly at a competitive disadvantage because of the much higher wages prevailing here. Had it not been for the generally very prosperous conditions prevailing throughout the country there cannot be the least doubt that our watch industry would have been wholly destroyed.

When, however, we undertake to preserve what is left of this industry, Switzerland, a very fine country, inhabited by very fine people, grows angry and denounces and threatens us as if we were traitors, faithless, and heartless. This, I say, is the fruit of our craven long-term policy of economic appeasement. It is obvious that if Switzerland had captured 100 percent of our market for watches she would not have been satisified and would have protested vehemently had we then undertaken to reestablish the watch industry in this country.

So long as other countries need only to file a sharp protest and threaten to go communistic to bring us to book, so long will they use such tactics. It costs them nothing. We ourselves forged the weapon for them and placed it in their hands. It would be surprising indeed if they did not use it. We should withdraw any and all policies that assume that international friendship is for sale. Such policies only expose us to a species of bluff and blackmail.

The conclusion follows that the conflict of interest in our trade should be resolved on a quantitative economic rather than an international political basis. The cry of communism and cold war has been overworked by those who see in it a weapon to be used to their own profit.

4. The remaining question, then, is one of balance of benefits or injury. The helping of one group of producers, namely, the export interests, by a method that jeopardizes or actually injures other producers is neither fair nor can any net economic gain be attributed to it. As matters stand it appears that in the aggregate much more harm, actual and potential, can come from excessive tariff reductions or inadequate protection than can be counterbalanced by any resulting benefits to exports.

In the first place, many more workers are employed in industries and agricultural pursuits that are exposed to injury from imports in varying degrees than are employed directly or indirectly in production and servicing of goods for exports. The ratio, conservatively stated, is 5 to 1. The segment of our economy that is vulnerable to import competition covers the whole country, east, west, north, and south, and every State in the Union. It cannot be injured on a broad front or actively threatened with injury or forced to operate under the blight of impending adversity without undermining the economic health of all industry and agriculture, including the exporters.

Some three or four million workers, by liberal estimates, are employed directly or indirectly in production for export. Actually, however, only about 40 percent of these should be counted because nearly 60 percent of our commercial exports are attributable to our free-list imports. In other words, when we talk about the tariff question we are concerned with only about 40 percent of our imports, i. e., the dutiable list. If we should embargo all these dutiable imports we would still have the 60 percent that are on the free list; and they would sustain exports of a somewhat equal volume.

Thus the figure on export employment attributable to dutiable imports, or that part of our trade affected by the tariff, shrinks to a figure ranging from 1,200,000 to 1,600,000. This may be compared to some 15 million, or 10 times as many workers employed, directly and indirectly, in import-vulnerable industries and branches of agriculture.

This shows a very one-sided equation and may be mitigated by several considerations. Some of our industries and farm products are for the time being at least, adequately protected by existing rates. Also, not all parts of a vulnerable industry are equally subject to injury. Some of the large units may be better able to withstand foreign competition than the smaller enterprises. Their productivity per man-hour may be sufficiently high to offset our high wage rates. In general this is true of our mass production industries and they have not been counted among those that are vulnerable to import competition.

However, further tariff reductions would bring more products and more industries and farm commodities into the zone of vulnerability.

We cannot avoid the conclusion that on balance the interest of domestic producers in reasonable protection greatly outweighs the claim of export interests to foreign markets that can be gained only at the expense of increased imports that will injure our domestic economy.

The conflict can, however, be resolved if we adopt a policy of having no trade barrier higher or no quota restriction tighter than that necessary to prevent substantial import injury. Such a policy would contemplate a product-by-product approach to tariff adjustments as contrasted with general upward or downward revisions of the tariff. It would include the use of import quotas as a means of assuring to imports a fair share of our market without throwing our own industries and their workers to the wolves of unfair import competition.

Such a policy would help to maintain our industrial and agricultural production at the necessary high levels and this in turn would assure other countries a larger market here than they would have if we allowed them to upset our economy.

The Nationwide Committee of Industry, Agriculture, and Labor on Import-Export Policy does not seek high tariffs. We seek the highest level of trade that our economy can absorb without destroying the underlying bases of a lively trade, namely, the American labor standard and a healthy competitive medium for our industry and agriculture. This calls for a judicious and careful adjustment of our tariffs and quotas, up or down, as the case may be.

We should begin by greatly liberalizing import quotas on wheat, wheat flour, and raw cotton.

One Hundred Years on the Great Lakes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 9, 1954

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave previously granted me, I should like to insert in the RECORD the following article commemorating the 100th anniversary of the Oglebay, Norton & Co., one of Cleveland's pioneer firms. This is one of America's highly respected industrial enterprises. Its founders, past and present officers typify the best of American business and industrial leadership and tradition.

The article follows:

ONE HUNDRED YEARS ON THE GREAT LAKES

This year Oglebay, Norton & Co. celebrates its 100th anniversary. Concerning itself originally with the mining and selling of iron ore in the Lake Superior district, it has since grown in size until today it is active in iron ore mines, coal mines, dock facilities, and acts as sales agent for ore, coal, and other raw materials used in the steel, ceramic, and chemical industries.

The formation of the Great Lakes Basin by retreating glaciers of the ice age millions of years ago resulted in one of America's greatest natural assets. In addition to this largest of all inland seas there was laid down at the same time in Michigan, Wisconsin, and Minnesota great iron-ore deposits and to the south coal was formed in Pennsylvania, West Virginia, Kentucky, and Ohio. Thus there were formed millions of years ago the waterways and raw materials which were to play an important part in the industrial development by man of the Great Lakes Basin.

DISCOVERY OF IRON ORE

Discovered as early as 1600 by French explorers it wasn't until 1780 that man first recorded formation of iron ore in the Lake Superior district. In addition, copper, fish, fur, and timber were found in plentiful supply. However, the full impact of the recording or iron ore in the Lake Superior district failed to stir the imagination of these early explorers. It wasn't until a good 60 years later, with the rediscovery of iron ore in the Lake Superior area, that man's imagination was fired. These early pioneers correctly reasoned that if iron could be brought down to lower lake ports and coal brought up from the south, a great iron producing center could be established along the shores of Lake Erie. Earliest of these practical men who had visions of mining the ore and bringing it to Lake Erie ports were Isaac Hewitt & H. B. Tuttle, Cleveland commission merchants. The company, known as Hewitt and Tuttle, was principally engaged in the selling of food. However, as time went on, they became more and more interested in the selling of Lake Superior iron ores. The first shipment of ore from the Lake Superior region to the lower lakes was made in 1852 comprising 6 barrels. It was dug by hand and hauled by mule team to water, hauled by mule again around the Soo, wheel-barreled onto a sailing ship and, legend has it, consigned to the commission firm of Hewitt & Tuttle.

The firm of Hewitt & Tuttle, forerunner of Oglebay, Norton & Co., from this small beginning started the flood of iron ore which was to reach an alltime high of approximately 95 million tons in 1953.

SOO LOCKS CONSTRUCTED

Insignificant as this beginning may seem, the tremendous tonnages moved today would be impossible without the construction of the locks at the Soo. These early businessmen realized that without a practical method of navigating the rapids at the Soo larger tonnages could not have been economically brought down. A petition to construct such a lock was turned down by the United States Government. Henry Clay, the leading statesman of that time and a strong opponent of the Soo locks, called the Soo "the land beyond the moon."

Progress was not to be stopped, however, and in 1855 private capital constructed the first lock at St. Mary's Falls. The two-master brig *Columbia*, for which it is believed the Columbia Transportation Co. is named, was the first vessel to lock through with a full 132 tons of iron ore. The year that followed the opening of this lock 14,500 tons of freight passed on the St. Mary's River. Compare 14,500 tons with 125 million tons of freight passing on the St. Mary's River in the peak season of 1953. This is more tonnage than moved through the Panama Canal and the Suez Canal combined in a whole year.

OGLEBAY JOINS TUTTLE

In 1884 Earl W. Oglebay joined Horace Tuttle, son of the founder, in a partnership under the name of Tuttle, Oglebay & Co. The firm sold the iron ore production of many mines and in addition operated the Montreal Mine. The Montreal Mine, one of the deepest underground mines in the world has been in continuous operation since 1886.

David Z. Norton, a well-known Cleveland banker, joined Mr. Oglebay in 1890, bringing with him a contract for the sale of ore produced at the many mines of the Lake Superior Consolidated Mines Co. owned by his friend—John D. Rockefeller. The firm name was changed from Tuttle, Oglebay & Co. to Oglebay, Norton & Co.

COLUMBIA FORMED

Because of Oglebay, Norton & Co.'s interests in the mining, transporting and selling of iron ore in the Lake Superior district they were required to charter vessel capacity through various vessel owners. In the early years of this century there were few, if any, major steamship companies having more than one vessel. One of these vessel operators was Captain Richardson, managing owner of 15 large lake vessels who, through his friendship with E. W. Oglebay and D. Z. Norton, transported Oglebay, Norton & Co.'s iron ore in his fleet. After his death on October 2, 1919, his fleet of 11 vessels was formed into the Columbia Steamship Co. which later was to be changed to the Columbia Transportation Co.

COMPANY EXPANDS

In May 1924, Oglebay, Norton & Co. was incorporated under the same title with Crispin Oglebay, nephew of Earl W. Oglebay, as President and Robert C. Norton, son of David Z. Norton, as treasurer. In 1928 Lawrence H. Norton, also a son of David Z. Norton, became a director.

In the years that followed, the company became active in the sale of raw materials, other than iron ore, for the steel, ceramic, and chemical industries. Expanding yet in another direction Oglebay, Norton & Co. became managers of coal mines in southern Ohio and West Virginia. In addition, the company is associated with the Toledo Lakefront Dock Co. and the Toledo, Lorain, and Fairport Dock Co. which operates dock facilities at lower lake ports.

Crispin Oglebay, who was appointed president in 1924 and later became chairman of the board, passed away in 1949. He was nationally known as a business leader, philanthropist, and sportsman. Upon his death, Robert C. Norton became chairman of the board. Mr. Norton and his brother, Lawrence H. Norton, sons of David Z. Norton, have made important contributions to our present industrial and social climate.

Another official of the company is Courtney Burton, grandson of E. W. Oglebay. He is a vice president of Oglebay, Norton & Co., president and director of several companies, and active in many cultural, civic, and other organizations.

Another grandson of a founder who carries on the tradition is Fred R. White, Jr., who is a vice president of Oglebay, Norton & Co. Fred White, well known to Columbia personnel, is also a vice president of the Columbia Transportation Co.

TAYLOR BECOMES PRESIDENT

Mr. Harrie Taylor, a native of Chautauqua, N. Y., was appointed as president of Oglebay, Norton & Co. in 1949. In addition to this major responsibility, he holds many executive positions and directorships with organizations identified with mining and Great Lakes commerce.

A prominent Clevelander, E. W. Sloan, Jr., was appointed at the same time to vice president and treasurer of the firm.

This is a brief record of the history and growth of Oglebay, Norton & Co.'s first 100 years in business and, in effect, it reflects the growth of the iron and steel industry in the Great Lakes region. Columbia takes this opportunity to salute Oglebay, Norton & Co.

Wetback Drive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 16, 1954

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, the National Catholic Weekly Review America of August 14, 1954, contains the following interesting comment with regard to a subject in which I have been interested for some time. As a member—and chairman for 4 years—of the appropriations subcommittee which supplies funds for the activities of the Immigration and Naturalization Service of the Department of Justice, I have visited the Mexican border along southeastern Texas and can easily visualize what has been happening there as described in this article. I feel that we should commend the new Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization, Gen. Joseph M. Swing, on his drive to clean up this blight on our American reputation. As far as I am concerned, I shall continue to see that he is properly provided with sufficient funds for carrying out his drive.

The article to which I refer reads as follows:

> WETBACK DRIVE HURTS POCKETBOOKS
>
> The Government's drive to gain control over the traffic of wetbacks across the United States-Mexican border has turned out to be more effective than seemed likely 2 months ago. It has proved so effective, in fact, that a small minority of farmers in the Lower Rio Grande Valley has been conducting a most unusual campaign of vilification and protest against officers of the United States Border Patrol. In a special dispatch to the New York Times from Alice, Tex., dated August 1, Gladwin Hill tells an amazing and shameful story of the lengths to which greed will sometimes drive presumably decent people. Immigration officers are finding it difficult to find rooms in hotels, restaurants that will serve them meals and even service stations that will sell them gas for their cars. They are the objects of attack in the local press, which refers satirically in banner headlines to the occupation army. An organized whispering campaign stresses atrocities allegedly committed by the Border Patrol in rounding up the wetbacks and returning them across the Rio Grande. Regardless of the laws of God and man—both of which they appear to be violating—these Rio Grande Valley farmers insist on their sacred right to hire wetbacks for as little as 20 cents an hour. They might read with profit (to their souls, that is) the fifth chapter of the Epistle of St. James.

Eighty-third Congress, Second Session—Final Report

SPEECH

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 16, 1954

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, here is the record as finally completed of this Congress. There will be much controversy as to the sufficiency of the accomplishments of this Congress. I believe that on the whole it has done many worthwhile things which needed doing, but there is much that is undone or only partly done. Progress toward peace, security, and higher standards of living is heavily dominated by world events and more strongly influenced by sections in the United States than by party alinement.

PEACE

The two dominant recent considerations have been accentuated understanding by the free world, of the mortal peril inherent in A-bomb and H-bomb war, and free discussion of the idea of coexistence with the Communist bloc. The accentuation of the danger from the A-bomb and H-bomb is likely to prove a benefit to the free world which normally moves more slowly than it should in reaction to peril and the peril is the possible elimination of all civilization in such a war. The hope of coexistence may be a pleasing illusion to the British or any other people, who we understand are so much closer to the dread nightmare of a sudden Communist attack with A-bombs and H-bombs of which dictators like those in the Kremlin are always capable, but it is certainly not the stuff of which policies for world peace can be made. The fundamental dynamics of the Communist system, which are the same for any totalitarian system, for Hitler as well as Malenkov and company is such that it must constantly expand for it is unsuccessful in getting the cooperation of its own people and in doing an effective internal job. Its only hope for survival, therefore, is to continually scare its own people with the fact that they are being threatened by external enemies, to continually expand by infiltration, aggression, or any other means no matter how immoral and, if possible, to overwhelm all opposition and to rule the whole world as one totalitarian system. Coexistence is an acceptance of conquests already made and presumes that we will not protest the Communist Chinese ill-gotten gains in North Korea and northern Vietnam, or the Soviet Union's ill-gotten gains in East Germany, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, and Albania. It would be the height of folly in terms of policy and immoral as well to concede the legality of permanence of the fruits of these aggressions. But it is entirely practicable to take this attitude without going to the other extreme of inviting a preventive war. I am convinced that the Congress and the American people will not tolerate any such eventuality.

The program which appears best for us in the quest for world peace is to place even greater reliance on the collective action that can be attained in the United Nations, even though the Russian veto and other delaying tactics may prove very nettling and disrupting at times. Second, that we should have a formula to deal with colonialism and the tens of millions of people who need to be brought to independence and self-government, and who have heretofore been non-self-governing. Regional organization is the best way to inspire confidence in former colonial areas and to give them the greatest amount of internal strength during the formative period of self-government.

If we are to avoid world war III, the competition between the free and the Communist world will be ultimately resolved by determining who can do the best job in terms of human satisfactions. With our genius for production and our magnificent traditions to advance the dignity of the individual we should at once undertake with vigor the offensive in the economic, social, education, and information fields. I believe also that in this way we can be successful in attracting from behind the Iron Curtain many of the peoples and states now enslaved there.

ASIA AND THE PACIFIC

There is no question that the free world suffered a serious reverse when the Red River Delta of Indochina fell into Communist hands. The Communists have gotten a foothold in south and southeast Asia from which they can now threaten Thailand, Malaya, south Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia, Indonesia and Burma, India, Pakistan, and Ceylon and have also a new window on the Pacific. Anyone who had the idea that the Communist aggression in Indochina was some kind of an effort by Indochinese nationalists to drive out the French will soon see that the Communists will do nothing but enslave the population of northern Vietnam. Under these circumstances, the action of our Government in not recognizing the armistice agreement between France and the Communist forces in Indochina insofar as it partitioned the country but stating that force would not be used to undo the armistice agreement seems exactly appropriate.

We have suffered in Indochina from the failure to organize the region of southeast Asia for its own security and to sponsor self-government and independence for non-self-governing peoples there, and see now that such regional organization cannot be improvised when aggression comes despite the fact that we have mutual security arrangements with Japan, the Philippines, New Zealand, and Australia.

I joined in assisting in the adoption of resolutions first refusing to recognize any conquests by Communist aggression in this area of the world. This was the proposal of British Foreign Secretary Anthony Eden for a Locarno pact for this area. Also, the Congress reaffirmed its strong opposition to the admission of Communist China as the representative of China in the United Nations, emphasizing its conviction that brigandage and aggression should not be a way to get into the United Nations. The policy of our Government must now be to strive to establish the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization (SEATO), thereby paralleling the situation in Europe where we have a North Atlantic Treaty Organization, NATO, of 14 nations organized for their own security and cooperation. In southeast Asia there should be heavy emphasis also upon regional economic cooperation through such an organization and in addition remaining problems of independence and self-government in that area can be dealt with most effectively through the intermediation of such a regional organization.

MUTUAL SECURITY ACT

The Congress has passed the mutual security program for 1954. This embodies the foreign policy of the United States. The bill provides for overall foreign aid of about $3 billion of which 85 percent is directly and indirectly for military assistance to our allies and to regional security organizations of which we are members and 15 percent is for technical and economic assistance. Other interesting features of the bill required that 50 percent of United States aid material be transported in American-flag vessels. About $700 million is provided for assistance against Communist aggression in the area of Indochina in order to deal with the situation which now faces us as a result of the cession, in effect, of North Vietnam to the Communists. Another important provision is one to stimulate overseas travel by United States citizens and by foreigners in the United States following generally the lines of a bill which I introduced and which received widespread support in the Congress and the country. About $70 million is likely to be provided for special economic aid to India in its 4-year development plan, $115 million is provided for special economic aid in Israel and the Near East, and $9 million for special economic aid in South America. About $110 million is provided for the technical-assistance programs in countries of the free world and a United States contribution to the U. N. multilateral Technical Assistance Program of about $9 million adequate to December 31, 1954, is also provided. About $28½ million is provided for other humanitarian programs like the United Nations Children's Fund, the Intergovernmental Committee on European Migrants, transportation overseas of relief packages, and others. Two hundred million dollars is provided for relief and reconstruction in the Republic of Korea and $30 million is authorized for the support and resettlement of the Palestine-Arab refugees.

The mutual security program marks the continuance, in 1954–55, of the policy of erecting a shield of military security of regional organizations, alliances, and bases throughout the free world; behind this shield we pursue programs of economic and technical assistance and cooperation with these same allies and carry on the interchange of students, professors, trade unionists, businessmen, and civic leaders among the countries of the free world and explain the position of our country through the media of the United States Information Agency. The policy is sound but needs to be pursued with greater resources, vigor, and initiative than we have yet shown to meet the magnitude of the Communist challenge and competition with which we are faced in the free world.

FOREIGN ECONOMIC POLICY

An enlightened economic policy is essential to our country's free world leadership for peace. The report of the Presidential Commission on Foreign Economic Policy early this year urgently recommended extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act for 3 years with certain liberalizing features. This I supported, but the Congress has refused it and extended the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act only for 1 year with the present restrictive clauses still contained in it. There are also grave signs of a return to protectionism in the country. This is against our interests in terms of foreign policy and also against the interest of consumers in our country. So for example, a great effort is being made to put a tariff on lead and zinc in order to favor uneconomic production of some lead and zinc mines in this country which could better be put on a standby basis with some Government help. Also the President materially increased the tariff on Swiss watch movements; and a drive is being made in the Congress to double the tariff on hardboard with a resultant material increase in cost to the consumer of this important building and packaging material though domestic competition is flourishing and only one company produces 70 percent of the domestic output.

There has been a considerable amount of discussion about East-West trade, in, I emphasize, nonstrategic goods—strategic goods directly useful for war are under pretty complete and successful control—with constant appeals to the emotions that it should be completely embargoed. This trade today amounts to less than 2 percent of the whole external trade of the free world which gets more out of it than it gives to the Communist world, because it enables the nations of Western Europe to get foodstuffs and raw materials which they urgently require. Should we embargo this trade the United States would have to make up the difference of some $2¾ billion a year in some kind of aid. There may be very sound military reasons for such an embargo even on nonstrategic goods, but we cannot ask for an embargo on the ground that this is a good way to additionally implement the cold war unless we are ready to pay the cost, and from all indications in the Congress, we are not.

In late November, there will be an economic conference of the American States at Rio. Our country has a great opportunity there to present an enlightened, cooperative, and forward looking economic policy for raising standards of living, improving the flow of capital investment funds, both public and private, and expanding technical assistance and the interchange of peoples, skills and ideas with the Latin American countries. It is essential that we make the greatest use of this opportunity especially in view of the serious Communist threat which we have just faced in Guatemala.

GUATEMALA

What the dire threat of Communist infiltration means right on our doorstep was shown by the suspension of constitutional guaranties by the Communist infiltrated government of Guatemala. This was almost immediately followed by a revolution against the Communist dominated government which ended quickly with its decisive defeat as it obviously did not have the support of the people of Guatemala. Our problems there now are to insure recognition for the broad social and economic development of Guatemala and for the firm establishment of constitutional guaranties and free institutions there. In attaining these absolutely vital objectives, the collective action of the American states is essential and it is a great challenge to us as the leader in this hemisphere to be sure the Organization of American States fully measures up to its responsibilities.

GERMANY AND FRANCE

With France's disengagement from the 7-year-old conflict in Indochina, and the continued lag in its National Assembly ratifying the treaty for the European Defense Community, the question of Germany comes strongly to the fore again. The EDC is the best means which has been devised for utilizing the defense potential of Western Germany without incurring the danger of a renewal of German militarism. This project has been approved by West Germany, Belgium, Holland, and Luxembourg and looks in a fair way to be approved by Italy. The principal sticking point is France which is fearful of German dominance in the EDC, and has now set many conditions reducing the effectiveness of EDC as a means to integrate free Europe, as the condition to even considering EDC. Pressure upon our Government to turn the German Federal Republic loose in terms of rearmament must be sternly resisted. The danger of some new German-Soviet approachment must be constantly borne in mind especially while the Soviet has the absolute power to hold out the bait of re-unification upon Communist terms of West and East Germany. The government of the German Federal Republic and the German people have so far shown themselves on the side of the free world. It would be most unwise to expose them to Soviet blandishments by a surrender to the pressures for complete sovereignty and rearmament for West Germany at this time. The policy indicated by our Government may necessitate a grant of further sovereignty to the German Federal Republyic but with the continued maintenance of United States, British, and French troops there for the defense of Western Germany and without allowing West Germany to rearm a national force. This is an unhappy compromise but one forced upon us by the situation. It may be necessary to do without the utilization of the West German military potential for a time (until we can work out EDC) rather than to incure the grave dangers of a renewed German national military establishment.

NEAR EAST AND ISRAEL

The situation there still remains tense. It is constantly aggravated by serious border incursions, ambushes, and clashes engendered by continued Arab hostility against Israel. The fundamental policy of our Government must continue to be strict adherence to and implementation of the Three Power Pact between the United States, United Kingdom, and France guaranteeing against aggression in that area while at the same time we make a regional effort at economic cooperation and development and resettlement of the Palestine-Arab refugees. It is for this reason that it is so important that Israel continue to participate in the mutual security program in generally the same magnitude in which she has participated in it for the last 3 years. Provision in the just enacted mutual security program is for $115 million for economic development for Israel and the Arab States.

In no case, however, is it consistent with the policy of our Government to give arms aid to the Arab States. I joined with others in the Congress to protest against supplying arms to the Arab States at a time when such supply was first contemplated to Iraq as it is now said to be contemplated to Egypt. I urged an amendment in the Mutual Security Act which provides that no arms may be furnished in any case which could be utilized for major external military operations to any country unless required by it as a member of a regional security organization. It is believed that this provision will very considerably moderate the situation with respect to Iraq. If arms are to buttress the regional security of the Near East, Israel with very tough and effective fighting forces and a highly defendable strategic position must be considered on high priority.

The recent settlement of the Suez questions between Egypt and the United Kingdom providing for the evacuation of British forces from the Suez under certain conditions will contribute to the pacification of this area but I have joined with others in the Congress to insist that the United States see that Egypt as a result of this arrangement no longer continues to violate the resolution of the United Nations Security Council of September 1, 1951 to refrain from an interference with shipping to Israel through the Suez Canal. Such a blockade by Egypt has been causing grave economic difficulties to Israel which it and the free world cannot afford in view of its own efforts to settle immigrants and refugees.

Considerable progress has been reported on the possibility of working out the Jordan River Valley development scheme for which President Eisenhower sent Ambassador Eric Johnston into the Near East. It is certainly to be desired that an economic bridge be found which could lead toward some peaceful relationships toward Israel and the Arab States as the diplomatic bridge seems impossible at this time.

OTHER FOREIGN POLICY DEVELOPMENTS

Efforts are being made in the Congress to bring about a return of German and Japanese property of private individuals and corporations seized during World War II in the United States by the Alien Property Custodian and which by law had been earmarked to be devoted to the claims of Americans who were prisoners of war and for injuries done to them. It is opposed by the President and the Department of Justice. It is argued by others that this would be a good public relations move. I opposed the return of German property very strongly upon the ground that the German Government had already undertaken by treaty—Bonn Agreement—to pay damages for the property of its nationals which was seized during the war in the United States, that much of the property or its proceeds had already been utilized for war claims, that United States taxpayers should not be called upon to reimburse for property in view of what Nazi Germany was guilty of in outrages against the world in World War II and that there are some thousands of claims pending by persecutees of Nazi Germany now residents and citizens of the United States, against these very assets which in all morality and decency were entitled to first and highest priority and should not be relegated to the German forum. The legislation is unlikely to pass in this Congress though it is likely that the drive for it will be renewed in the next Congress.

An amendment to the War Claims Act was passed this session which extended the period for filing claims for compensation by World War II prisoners of war to August 1, 1954.

I introduced a resolution protesting the kidnaping by the Communists in East Germany of people and officials from West Berlin. This is barbarism—not civilized conduct—and deserves the condemnation of the world.

I introduced a resolution hailing the new governments of the Gold Coast and East Nigeria in West Africa, formally colonial areas of the British and now gradually emerging into self-government and independence. This resolution was enacted by the House of Representatives and the Senate, and will be signed by the President of the United States. I consider it vital that we strongly support local independence movements which are attained through the utilization of free institutions and where the capability is shown for protecting a safeguarding such independence against some new Communist imperialism. Through such a policy we can show a leadership and statesmanship in Africa which is moving rapidly toward self-determination and avoid the mistakes for which the free world paid so heavily in China and Indochina.

ATOMIC ENERGY

This was the first time that legislation upon this momentous subject came before the Congress since the original Atomic Energy Act passed in 1946 which gave the Government full control over all atomic materials and developed both for weapons and civilian uses. The purpose of the legislation was to permit our country to share atomic information more widely with its allies, to permit greater private-enterprise participation in the development of atomic energy for electric power and to make provisions for patent in respect to atomic energy for civilian uses. There was no dispute about the sharing of limited atomic information with our allies—on the use and characteristics of weapons and civilian uses—but there was very great dispute about the electric power and patent phases of the law. The law as finally enacted will undoubtedly permit the Government, if necessary on a yardstick basis, to go into the atomic power generating field, but will give the priority in the development of atomic energy for power to private enterprise, provided it meets the conditions established by the Atomic Energy Commission. This is certainly a conservative compromise. When the bill was in the House, I voted against keeping the Atomic Energy Commission entirely out of the generating of electric power from atomic energy. Also, I voted to require the compulsory licensing of patents with proper compensation to inventors, as this atomic field is altogether too new to give an opportunity to some few peoples or companies to get a monopoly on new patents. A momentous step will have been taken in the enactment of a new Atomic Energy Act heralding a new revolution in the world of production when the atom is available for generating electric power. This, too, is a great competition between the free and slave Communist worlds in which it is essential that our country lead.

ECONOMIC SITUATION

Since my last report, the employment situation has stabilized with a reduction of about 400,000, bringing the figure of unemployed to 3,347,000 at June 30, 1954; and with over 62 million Americans gainfully employed. Other reassuring factors in the economic situation are the relative stability of consumer prices which has continued quite consistently now since the summer of 1953 and the material reduction of inventories in the hands of manufacturers since the summer of 1953. The latter is a helpful sign for the future as it shows that the consumption is keeping up and that one of the major indicators which gave the greatest fear of recession early this year is gradually coming into better adjustment. The purchasing power of the dollar has varied by only ½ percent in the last year and a half—gross national product.

The aggregate productive power of our economy is running at the rate of about $356 billion a year which, though not as high as it was in 1953, when it reached an all-time high, or up to our potential at full employment, is still well above the figure for any year other than 1953. New housing construction which represents such an important part of our economic base is continuing at a relatively high rate with about a million two hundred thousand units indicated for 1954, but this is still a half million starts per year less than we ought to have considering our housing needs and our economic capabilities.

The national health program failed of enactment and Federal aid to hospital construction, nursing homes, and so forth, aggregating $96 million was on the modest basis, and only meager progress was made toward urgently needed Federal aid to education and school construction. There was enacted a $96 million Federal-aid-to-road-construction program which is being implemented.

By enacting an improved social security law, effecting some improvement in the unemployment insurance system and keeping consumers' prices stable, the Federal Government has sought to put some concrete base under the economy. On the whole, the picture though not what it ought to be shows elements of great strength and there is a real feeling that we have gotten over the worst of our recession anxieties. International uncertainties being what they are, of course, these must always be borne in mind in appraising the economic situation. So, too, must the need for dynamic planning and initiative especially in foreign trade opportunities, use of leisure time and attaining of full employment be constrantly before us.

COST OF LIVING

Farm price policy has loomed very large in this administration's program in view of its determination to give some attention to the consumer by insisting upon a system of flexible farm price supports rather than the high fixed farm price supports which have been in effect now since the war. Under high fixed farm supports, the consumer is made to pay in two ways. One in higher food prices and second in taxes to sustain the Government price support program. The United States now has over $7 billion tied up in agricultural surpluses and commitments undertaken with respect to them, is paying for commodities on hand alone about $500,000 a day in storage charges and has very recently had to increase borrowing power for absorbing farm price surpluses to $10 billion. All of this despite the fact that the farmer's income has fallen by 13 percent in the last 2 years and that his export markets though at the moment showing some recovery, have fallen by almost twice that during the same period of time. I have fought hard here for flexible price supports and also have opposed increases in borrowing power to maintain the high farm price parity program. The effect of such a program was seen when on April 1, the Secretary of Agriculture cut the support price on butter to 75 percent of parity and brought about a price reduction in butter available to consumers by about 10 cents a pound. Meanwhile, the Agriculture Trade Development and Assistance Act providing $700 million for the sale of agricultural surpluses to cooperating nations for local currency plus authorization to utilize $450 million of such surplus under the Mutual Security Act of 1954, represents an effort to dispose of some of the enormous surpluses created by the Federal Government's high fixed farm price support operations.

Investigations are continuing into the rapid rise in the price of coffee. The latest is a report from the Federal Trade Commission on monopoly controls. This should be pursued as we must assure that American consumers are treated fairly in this the greatest single import item—other than international travel—of our country.

CIVIL RIGHTS AND CIVIL LIBERTIES

The historic unanimous decision of the Supreme Court holding segregation on grounds of race, creed, or color, in public education and in public housing to be contrary to the Constitution is a historic event in our national history. It is the greatest single action in decades to demonstrate the determination of our people that all shall be citizens of the same class. This decision now needs to be effectively implemented and extended into other fields where there is still serious discrimination and segregation. It should result in a renewal of the drive to eliminate segregation in railroads, buses, and other means of interstate transportation. I testified in favor of the Heselton bill which was reported favorably by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce but was caught in the closing logjam and in a renewed drive for a Federal Fair Employment Practices Act with enforcement powers.

I took up the fight to insure fair treatment in the investigation by the Special Committee To Investigate Tax Exempt Foundations. The activities of this special committee in cutting off public hearings before the foundations could be heard threatened serious injustice to many foundations which have done much for our people and our country. My resolution sought a review of the work of this special committee by the House Rules Committee as it is my conviction with respect to all congressional investigations that there must be some way of maintaining control over them on the part of the authorizing House so that they deal justly both with individuals and the matters which they are investigating.

I testified before the Senate Rules Committee in favor of my bill to establish a Joint Committee on Congressional Investigations of Communism and Subversion to replace existing committees in this field—the House Un-American Activities Committee, the Senate Subcommittee on Investigations—McCarthy and the Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security—and also to establish rules of fair procedure and means for enforcing those rules. I believe that the hearings before the Senate Rules Committee made it very clear that such a plan as this would enable such congressional investigations to be effective in pursuing the effort to expose communism in key places without engaging in excesses doing violence to our national security, higher learning, religion, or the morale of Government employees and Armed Forces or to affect adversely our foreign policy. Excesses in these congressional investigations harmful to our national interests have shown that reforms are essential. I shall continue to fight for these reforms.

I called for an investigation and for furnishing of information on the antireligious, anti-Catholic, anti-Protestant, and anti-Jewish hate propaganda which is going through the mails exploiting the anti-Communist feelings of our people in a fraudulent effort to seek the cover of the internal anti-Communist campaign. I named specifically 10 such hate publications purportedly of general circulation which were violations of the spirit of our laws and Constitution. The Postmaster General in response advised that much as the distribution of hate propaganda through the mails is deprecated the law as it is at present cannot reach them. I am convinced that new law is needed for this purpose and shall do everything that I can to see that the Federal Government is enabled to meet this grave aspersion on our free institutions.

BUDGET AND TAXATION

It was originally anticipated that in the fiscal year ending July 31, 1954, the Government would run a budget deficit of over $9 billion. Instead the deficit was slightly over $3 billion. This was brought about through a $7 billion reduction in expenditures. Budget receipts remained fairly constant at about $64,600,000,000. Tax cuts of $7½ billion were achieved in this fiscal year including a reduction estimated at about $4 billion per year in taxes payable by individuals through the maintenance of the 10 percent personal income tax cut which took effect on January 1, 1954, a cut of about a billion dollars in various excise taxes which generally were paid by consumers and favorable provisions for medical expenses, working mothers, those who draw retirement compensation, parents with children at college, and others estimated at $827 million.

The most important development in the field of taxation was in the enactment of the tax revision bill, the first full codification of Federal tax laws for 75 years. In addition to rewriting and simplifying the tax law the purposes of the bill were to continue the corporate income tax at 52 percent and to deal with tax inequities which concerned individuals. Primary among the individual benefits are allowed deducton of medical expenses above 3 percent of taxable income instead of 5 percent as at present, exemption of the first $1,200 of retirement income annually from taxable income after attaining the age of 65 or for retired government employees before that age, reductions of taxable income up to $600 annually for expenditure for child care by single working mothers or those with an incapacited husband or wife if the family's income is less than $5,100 a year, and deducton for a child as a dependent even if the child is earning more than $600 a year provided the taxpayer is responsible for more than half of the child's support or the child is attending college. Other improvements include nontaxability of income from health or accident plans or death benefits, right to report as the head of the household for and to receive the benefit of income splitting 2 years after the death of a spouse and to half the benefit if single and maintaining a home for a dependent parent, increase in allowable deductions of charitable contributions and similar benefits. The new tax law provides that the first $50, plus 4 percent of dividend income, may be deducted from taxable income but not in excess of 4 percent of such income. As noted in my previous district report, I opposed at one and the same time additional exemptions for individuals over and above the tax reductions already made on the ground that they were entirely political in nature and not warranted by our financial situation and also credits for dividend income on the ground that this was unfair to wage and salary earners who would not receive at this time any increase in exemptions. I voted accordingly in the various stages of the tax revision bill.

HOUSING, HEALTH, WELFARE, AND EDUCATION

Forecasts are that new housing construction is running at the annual rate of 1,206,000 units per year, a high since 1950, but the problem is that a balanced national housing program is made even more difficult by the failure to include adequate public housing in the housing bill which was recently enacted and by the continuing failure to find a solution for the problem of middle income housing. The whole situation has been further troubled by the Senate investigation of "windfalls" defined as the excess of FHA guaranteed mortgages over the cost to build middle income rental property and the fact that the mortgage principal rather than the cost of construction is reflected in the established rents.

I fought hard for the President's minimal program of 140,000 federally aided low rent housing units to be constructed in 4 years but this failed of enactment. The only result of the struggle was an authorization of 35,000 new public housing units for 1 year but with such restrictions as to its being utilized only for urban redevelopment as to make it unlikely that many more than 10,000 to 15,000 of the public housing units will actually be started. New York City will probably do better than most places in respect of the authorization of 35,000 getting an estimated 15 percent of all units so authorized, but the country's housing needs cannot be justly met on this minimal and truncated program. The housing bill also liberalized mortgage credit for single family homes making it possible now even for nonveterans to acquire a $10,000 home with an FHA mortgage for a downpayment before closing expenses of $750. Also FHA mortgages are made available for the first time on existing housing.

A strong effort was made to begin to establish some responsibility in the Federal Government for the people's health through an administration bill for a $25 million fund for the reinsurance of voluntary health plans like Blue Cross and Blue Shield in order to enable them to establish broader coverage and increase their benefits. The bill failed because some thought it did too little and others were not willing to do anything. I supported at least the effort on the ground that it was a beginning in accepting the national responsibility for the people's health. I continue as the sponsor of the comprehensive national health program for substantial Federal-State aid to voluntary health programs and this is now being hailed as the most logical solution by important trade union and other civic union organizations. It is unfortunate that a reverse has been suffered in the first instance but a national health program is vital to our country and the Federal Government must come to it.

A bill was enacted into law which I supported authorizing Federal spending of $16 million a year for 3 years to aid State and local communities and expanding hospital and clinical facilities for the chronically ill, aged and physically disabled. This aids further the remarkably successful Federal hospital construction—Hill-Burton—program.

A bill was passed which I strongly supported extending greater Federal aid to State rehabilitation programs for the crippled and handicapped. A great many people—estimated at approximately 2 million—require vocational rehabilitation in this country each year. We have heretofore been able to help by rehabilitation only 60,000 annually. By the terms of the new 5-year comprehensive vocational rehabilitation program, the Federal Government will ultimately aid the States in the rehabilitation of over 200,000 of the handicapped per year. It is estimated that for each dollar spent in Federal aid under this program, approximately $10 will be returned in taxes from the productive work of the handicapped person rehabilitated under this program.

Three resolutions were adopted regarding the participation of the Federal Government in education. First, to establish a National Advisory Committee on Education, second, to assist cooperative research in educational problems, and third, and most important, to authorize a White House conference on education to analyze the problems of Federal aid to education and school construction and see what the Federal Government can do to help meet it. These are but mild steps toward affirmative Federal aid to meet the very serious classroom shortage, shortage in funds for teaching, and similar school expenses and other educational problems in the country. I supported these moves, however, as at least some effort in the right direction. The measure which has the best chance in the Congress is Federal aid to school construction. I am supporting a bill to provide $500 million for this purpose over a 2-year period. A bill has also been authoritatively introduced to provide Federal participation of $5 billion, which is estimated to be about one-half of the aggregate requirement of $10 billion for school construction for the Nation. I shall give most earnest support to these efforts which I believe to be vital to the future of our country.

SOCIAL SECURITY, UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE, LABOR

The most signal achievement of this administration is in the expansion and improvement of the social security law. An estimated additional 10 million are expected to be covered by the Social Security System, including farm workers, various groups of professional men—with the notable exception of doctors—including lawyers, dentists, and ministers; employees of State and local governments on an optional basis; employees of the Federal Government not covered by retirement systems; United States citizens employed outside the United States and certain persons employed in fishing and other activities.

One of the very important provisions is to raise the ceiling of allowable earnings for social security beneficiaries to $1,000 a year with one monthly benefit check withheld for each additional $80 or fraction of $80 earned from any type of employment. This is the principle for which I have contended for a long time. Efforts must continue to afford even greater relief as older people should be encouraged to work and to supplement what they receive under the Social Security System rather than be discouraged from doing so. The wage base for the payment of the 4-percent social-security tax divided equally between the employee and the employer is raised from $3,600 to $4,200 a year. Benefits were increased on an average of about $6 a month per beneficiary.

The minimum benefit is increased to $32.50 from $27.50 and the maximum benefit is increase from $85 to $108.50 a month for single persons and from $127.50 to $162.50 for married persons.

Approval was given to extending unemployment compensation coverage to employers of 4 or more workers, the previous standard having been 8 workers under the Federal law and also bringing Federal employees in States under unemployment compensation into the system. I supported a more liberal unemployment compensation bill seeking to provide coverage for all employers of 1 or more employees, to establish minimum benefits payments of 26 weeks and to make the maximum weekly benefit not less than two-thirds of average weekly earnings. This was defeated, though I introduced legislation for it and with others, fought for it.

Social security, unemployment compensation and a national health program are the fundamental concrete base for all American working people and self-employed, dependent upon their earnings and every effort must be made to build them up, strengthen them and make them comprehensive.

Efforts to enact amendments to the Taft-Hartley law, even those which were generally agreed upon as vital, failed in both houses when the Senate turned down its own amendments' bill. I have joined with others of my colleagues here in sponsoring legislation in consultation with the great national labor federations of amendments urgently required to maintain the integrity of labor-management collective bargaining and I have also opposed efforts to have government by injunction, or to otherwise, coerce this typically American process of adjusting relations between management and labor. Also it proved impossible to get consideration of an increase in the minimum wage, now 75 cents per hour, under the Federal Fair Labor Standards Act, which should be realistically $1.25 per hour.

Some concrete gains were made, however, in this important area of national life, notably the passage of improvements to the Railroad Retirement Act. This measure was strongly backed by all the railroad unions, and provided for an increase in retirement annuities, a reduction of the eligibility age for various benefits, increases in unemployment benefits and other changes urgently required to bring the railroad retirement system more nearly in line with present conditions and costs of living. Of equal significance was the passage of an act implementing the Railroad Retirement Act by permitting individuals to receive benefits under both the Railroad Retirement Act and the Social Security Act. I supported and worked for both these measures.

I opposed, however, the so-called wetback bill to admit Mexican workers for seasonal work on farms in the Southwest on the ground that there is no adequate supervision or enforcement contained in this legislation for those from Mexico entering the United States for temporary farm work and because it tended to embarrass our relations with Mexico.

VETERANS AND ARMED FORCES

It has been necessary to be eternally vigilant in respect of veterans' benefits, veterans' compensation, veterans' hospitalization and veterans' rights generally. Korean veterans were given an additional 1 year to take advantage of the GI education benefits. The principal measure passed with respect to veterans was an increase by 5 percent in the monthly benefits payable to veterans with service-connected disabilities, their widows, survivors, and beneficiaries. A similar increase was granted to veterans entitled to benefits under the program for those over 65 or permanently and totally disabled but not service connected. In addition, an act was passed extending the direct loan program of the Veterans' Administration with an appropriation of $100 million to aid veterans in the financing of home mortgages; a law was enacted providing for the quick naturalization of aliens who had served in the United States Armed Forces from June 24, 1950, to July 1, 1955; while social-security wage credits for military service were extended for 18 months.

Other veterans' measures remain urgent but that is all that it was possible to accomplish despite an outstandingly brilliant effort by the chairman and members of the Veterans' Affairs Committee in this Congress.

POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

There has been a classic struggle going on here regarding pay increases for post office and classified civil-service employees. There is no question about the fact that a raise is urgently required by existing costs of living. The difficulty has been in the economy drive and the Post Office's effort to reduce its deficit by further increases in rates. After fighting for the Withrow bill, I supported the Corbett bill to give the post office workers a 7 percent across the board increase with a minimum of $240 and a maximum of $480. The opportunity was given to vote for a 5 percent pay raise with a minimum of $180 and without a maximum, tied to a bill to increase mail rates. I supported this measure also, upon the ground that it was essential to make provision for a postal pay increase through willingness to be realistic in the matter of postal rates.

A pay raise, which is essential to Federal classified employees, will stem directly from a pay raise for the postal workers, and therefore a fight for one is a fight for the other.

Desirable legislation is also being enacted for "fringe benefits," such as group insurance to Federal employees, a repeal of the Whitten rider which I opposed from the very beginning, which has blocked promotions and an adequate personnel system, revisions in annual leave and sick leave practices and similar matters. In every way it is essential that personnel relations be considered by the Government on the highest priority. Ours is a government of laws not men, but it is the men who administer the laws and the Federal Government must show its sense of justice to those who work for it.

MISCELLANEOUS ISSUES

We have had submitted a number of bills labeled anti-Communist. It has been necessary not to be taken in by the labels but to carefully analyze each bill to be sure that it constitutes a material factor in the anti-Communist struggle and that we were not paying too high a price for it in terms of American freedoms. I supported bills depriving of citizenship those convicted under the Smith Act of seeking to overthrow our Government by force; establishing condign punishment for peacetime espionage; ruling out the Communist as a political party and various contempt citations putting up to the courts the issues of witnesses' refusals to answer legitimate questions of congressional investigating committees. I also supported a bill to allow congressional committees to take such cases into court at once so as to get the maximum number of answers to their questions and to make punishment for contempt assured for failure to answer, and I supported the move to amend the wiretapping bill by requiring a court order first. On the other hand, I opposed a bill giving congressional committees the power to grant immunity, and thereupon to require testimony of a witness pleading self-incrimination on the ground that this would not advance the anti-Communist struggle but would, on the contrary, represent an invasion of one of the fundamental historic freedoms of all the American people and one of a very special significance to minorities of religion or race, while putting into the political arena a power to let rogues go free and to punish innocent men.

There have been a great many bills before us to establish dams to produce power and aid navigation as well as reclamation and irrigation projects involving substantial extensions of credit by the United States. I have proceeded generally upon the basis that we must help in the development of our country according to established patterns, preserving and improving our natural resources for the public interest, being careful that our national parks and our national monuments are not compromised or invaded, and guarding against "windfalls" to a few.

There has been a greatly renewed interest in the problems of youth and juvenile delinquency in our dangerous world. I have been working hard for the National Youth Assistance Act to develop a $50 million national youth program. I also endeavored to bring about an appropriation of $165,000 for the Children's Bureau of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for the purpose of coordinating the activities of State and local youth commissions throughout the country.

I have made every effort to get consideration of the essential revision of our immigration laws to make them accord with wise United States leadership of the free world. I have joined with others of my colleagues in seeking hearings on a bill which I sponsored entitled "The Immigration and Nationality Act Amendments of 1954" to liberalize the immigration laws. I have also continued my work to see that there is effective implementation of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953 and am glad to say that better progress is being made with 7,287 visas granted under this act as of July 30, 1954, and with the enactment of legislation which will pool the aggregate 209,000 quota numbers available for refugees and escapees from behind the Iron Curtain and those for preference immigrants from Italy, Greece, Holland and West Germany. The authorization to continue United States participation in the intergovernmental committee for European migration is expected to resettle several hundred thousand of the excess working population of free Europe in this fiscal year. I believe, however, that we must declare the rewriting of the basic immigration law, the McCarran Act, to be a primary objective of our foreign policy.

A constitutional amendment giving 18-year-olds the right to vote failed in the Senate. I hope that it will be brought up again as I favor it. It may be trite, but it is true that those old enough to defend our country with their lives, should have something to say about how it is run.

Interest continues in my resolution for the unification of Ireland.

I testified in support of a bill with others of my colleagues for a United States Arts Foundation to assist college, cooperative, and voluntary nonprofit efforts in the fields of theater, music, and art. This is an area in which we are far behind practically all the other countries of the free world. Such activities are essential to us as our time for recreational and cultural enjoyment increases and as our world leadership becomes essential in these fields, too.

Grants of statehood to Hawaii and Alaska got lost in the legislative logjam with contrary bills coming out of the House and Senate. This is a must for our country and I have and will constantly and actively support statehood for both.

I have also sponsored and worked for a United States Travel Commission to develop for all our people including those in the moderate income level—$3,500 to $5,000 a year—the opportunity for overseas travel which I believe is entirely feasible.

I have introduced legislation and worked to enable members of the Armed Forces to vote for candidates for Congress in national elections without regard to State laws relating to registration and without payment of any poll tax and to recommend to the States a better and more effective absentee voting procedure for civilians who are necessarily serving abroad. The broadest possible franchise for all our people is vital in our national interest.

CONCLUSION

This completes the record of the 83d Congress. As is always true, much has been done, not always adequately and a good deal of what is essential has been left undone. On the whole it is not an untypical American congressional record of achievements and shortcomings. The people will judge as to whether a dynamic and progressive program, to use the words of President Eisenhower has been enacted. It is vital to us in public office to be sure that they have all the facts upon which to judge. This I consider to be my highest duty and this I have sought to accomplish to the best of my ability.

Tomorrow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 16, 1954

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, no doubt you will find the following item from the current issue of U. S. News & World Report highly interesting:

TOMORROW

Eisenhower, all at once, is fixed in the course he will follow.

"Peaceful coexistence" is to be given passive acceptance. War is out. Truce in Korea will be accepted as permanent. So will Indochina loss.

Break in relations with Russia will be avoided. Trade, in fact, will be expanded with Russia, and probably, with Communist China.

United States will avoid throwing its weight around in the world.

Britain and France will get a freer hand in Europe. Dollars will be supplied in abundance, at the same time, to make their lot easier.

Outlawing the Communist Party

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 17, 1954

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Outlawing the Communist Party," published in the Wall Street Journal of August 17, 1954.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUTLAWING THE COMMUNIST PARTY

The recent unanimous vote in the Senate to outlaw the Communist Party may have been understandable from the political view. But it was hardly a considered act, and it set off a chain of circumstances the end of which cannot be foreseen.

Because of the political implications in the Senate action, even the administration now has decided to do something to outlaw the party. Senator FERGUSON and House Speaker MARTIN, after a White House conference, announced that the Congress will be asked to pass a statute to outlaw the party but not to injure individual members—a good trick if they can do it.

Thus the political pressures brought on by the Senate action have forced the administration to shift its position; formerly it opposed the outlawing with the view that to do so would only drive the Communists underground and make them harder to bring to book under the present antisubversive laws. The purpose was to skirt the issue of actual outlawry but make it troublesome by other statutes for the Communists to carry out their plotting. Some of the proposals have run into difficulties in the Congress, for some chipped away at constitutional safeguards. It was to a bill to strip collective bargaining rights from unions which followed the Communist line that the amendment to outlaw the party was tacked on in a late Senate session.

Everybody present voted for it, and many reasons have been advanced for the accord. One Democrat said it was time to put the Republican administration on the record. "We called them and raised them and they fell into line like stampeding cattle."

The November elections provided the pressure for the Senate unanimity, and under administration backing of an outlaw measure the pressure for its adoption by both Houses will be very great indeed. Members who are up for election will not want to have it said that they voted for the Communists by voting against the outlawing; and even those not facing the electorate this year will want no such mark on their record.

But stampeding like cattle is scarcely an act of wisdom on the part of the administration in asking legislation on such a grave issue. There is a question whether an outlawing of the Communist Party—though everyone knows it is not a party but a treasonable conspiracy—is constitutional even under the clear and present danger yardstick the Supreme Court follows. There is no question that it ought not be done in a hurry, as did the Senate—which held no hearings on the bill and heard no witnesses—

and as the administration apparently now proposes to do.

It may be that those are correct who believe that the Communist Party ought to be outlawed as a menace endangering our security and survival. But to do it in haste is unwise; to do it for political purposes is unbecoming. And if the FBI's Mr. Hoover is right in saying that it would only make the Communists more difficult to catch and if the law itself transgresses our constitutional processes, to do it at all may be the way of danger.

Address by the Vice President of the United States at Whittier College Commencement, June 12, 1954

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PATRICK J. HILLINGS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 16, 1954

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, Vice President Richard Nixon received an honorary degree from his alma mater, Whittier College, in my district, on June 12, 1954. The Vice President delivered an address on that occasion which is a most challenging and stimulating discussion of America's responsibilities in the world today.

Under unanimous consent, I insert the text of his address in the Record.

The address follows:

Address by the Vice President of the United States at Whittier College Commencement, Whittier, Calif., June 12, 1954

Dr. Smith, members of the class of 1954, and friends of Whittier College, certain occasions in a person's life leave an indelible impression on his memory. One such occasion for me was the day 20 years ago on an afternoon like this when I received a bachelor of arts degree from Whittier College.

The other is this day because of the opportunity it provides to see old friends and to live again the priceless memories of 4 years spent on this campus, the privilege of speaking to the graduating class and to so many friends of Whittier College, and the honor not dreamed of 20 years ago of being the recipient of an honorary degree.

In accepting this degree, I should like to do so not for myself alone, but in behalf of the entire class of 1934. To ask a college to choose which of its graduates to honor is like asking a mother to select a favorite among her children.

This afternoon I spent an hour with my fellow members of the class of 1934. Teachers, businessmen, farmers, wives, and mothers—all segments of our society were represented.

Only history will record which contribution was the most significant, which job the most difficult, which the most representative of the Whittier tradition. People often tell me, for example, how difficult it would be for them to speak to 50 million people on television and radio. All I know is that that task is very easy for me compared to facing 50 seventh graders 5 days a week year after year, as one of my college classmates has for the past 20 years.

I believe that Whittier College can be proud of all of the graduates of that class, and for them all I accept this degree.

But enough of the past. This day belongs to the class of 1954, not that of 1934.

At this point, I would like to make an admission. Choosing a subject for this occasion has not been easy. What could I say which would add to the knowledge of those who have just finished studying for 4 years under some of the best teachers in America? I can testify how good they are because some of them were here when I was. Finally, on Wednesday of this week, I discussed the problem with a former university president who now heads the organization for which I work. He said, "Those young folks are smart. I suggest that you talk from your own experience—talk about something you know." I have taken that advice.

I should like to begin with two personal notes.

Every year since graduation I have had a deeper appreciation of the privilege, shared by only 10 percent of my contemporaries, of being able to go to college at all. With that appreciation has developed a growing awareness of the sacrifices my parents made to send me to college. Today I know this class will join me in a special word of gratitude to those who helped them reach this day of achievement.

I was proud of Whittier College in 1934. But every year since then that pride has increased. Let me give you some of the reasons:

Because Whittier College is a small college in the best American tradition.

Because it has a fine dedicated group of men and women on its faculty.

Because it has struggled through difficult times and always held its head high, keeping its troubles from its students, wherever possible.

It wasn't until I read Herbert Harris' fine history of the college, the Quaker and the West, that I realized that 1932, my sophomore year, was a year of crisis, a year in which an already underpaid faculty shared further cuts in their salaries to keep the institution going. What a magnificent group they were. Men like Smith, Ostrum, Skarstedt, Upton, Coffin, Watson, Harris, Newman, Landreth, and Cooper. Women like Lohman, Andrews, Anderson, and Meade. To paraphrase what President Eisenhower said at Abilene 2 years ago, "We were poor, but the glory of it was that we didn't know it." And to the faculty, the board, and the Whittier spirit belongs the credit.

Finally, I am glad that I went to Whittier College because, at Whittier, education means more than just learning how to make a good living. The Whittier student is also taught the importance of worthwhile living. Education which is not based soundly on philosophy and religion is nothing more than technological cleverness. I think you will agree with me that no student can attend Whittier College without acquiring a sense of social and community responsibility.

I know that in the years ahead you will reach the conclusion I have reached—that the small Christian college like Whittier is one of the great bulwarks of our American educational system and of our democracy.

Now let us turn to the future.

The class of 1934 went through 6 years of depression and 2 wars in the last 20 years. What does the future hold in store for the class of 1954? It is a common practice for commencement speakers to look with pessimism on the future, to tell the graduates everything that is wrong with the United States and the world, and urge them to go out and do something about it.

My message to you is not one of pessimism, but one of faith and hope, or courage and confidence. I do not minimize the problems we face. The next 20 years could see civilization destroyed. But, if free world leadership is equal to the task, the class of 1954 may see civilization make its greatest progress in recorded history in that 20-year period.

Let us look for a moment at our own country. First a glance into the past: Ours is a young Nation as nations go—only 170 years old. Yet, in 170 years, we have seen 13 States expand to 48—3 million people grow to 160 million—a debtor nation with a weak agricultural economy become the most powerful nation in the world, producing over one-half of the world's goods.

Let us look at the events of the present. The President's legislative program is the most eloquent proof you can have that we live in an age of progress—that the American economy is not declining and static, as many said it was in 1934, but that it is dynamic and expanding. For example:

The tax program is aimed at encouraging new investment and new enterprise which will mean more goods and more jobs for all Americans.

Great power, irrigation, and highway-development projects will add billions to the Nation's wealth.

An expanded social program will provide added protection against the adversities of old age, unemployment, and illness for millions more of our people.

The fact that one of our most difficult problems is the development of a farm program can in itself be counted as a blessing. Because the problem is created not by scarcity, but by surplus. What a far cry from the gloomy forecast of Malthus just a few hundred years ago that the world's increasing population could not be supported by the world's resources.

There are those who say our freedoms are being whittled away. But in no nation of the world is the freedom to speak, to write, to learn, to travel, to work as we choose, greater than in America. And by the landmark decision of the Supreme Court in the school-segregation case we have taken another long step forward in guaranteeing freedom of opportunity to all our citizens, regardless of race, creed, or color.

The future holds even greater promise than the past.

We stand on the threshold of the atomic age with the unlimited energy of the atom being released for peaceful purposes. Even the power and the energy of the sun may be harnessed and put to practical use in our lifetime.

Men and women, not only in America, but throughout the world, can have food, clothing, and shelter—all the good things in life—in greater abundance than in any time in history. For the first time in the world's history, man has a chance to wage a winning world war against poverty, misery, and disease.

All this can come to pass if—and it's a big if—we can have peace. It is particularly appropriate that we consider this question. The young men of this class will bear the major brunt of war if it comes. No student can attend Whittier College without acquiring a dedicated concern for the cause of peace.

If we are to have peace, we must determine what threatens the peace of the world. The answer to that question would seem obvious to us, but, unfortunately, it is not obvious to millions of people in the world.

I recall when Mrs. Nixon and I visited the Province of Mysore in India last November. At a dinner in our honor the Chief Minister of Mysore, in introducing me, said, "There are two equal threats to the peace of the world—the United States and the Soviet Union. If we are to have peace, the two must get together. I suggest a wedding, and India will be the high priest at the ceremony." Fantastic, you say. But millions believe this in the non-Communist, neutralist world.

What is the truth, however?

The record clearly shows that there is only one threat to world peace, the one that is presented by the internationalist Communist conspiracy with its power center in the Soviet Union.

Except for the Communists, every great power in the world rejects war as an instrument of national policy and adheres to the spirit and letter of the United Nations Charter.

What is the nature of this threat? How serious is it?

Twenty years ago, geographically speaking, the Communists controlled only the Soviet Union and its 150 million people. But the Communist organization and the Communist idea were on the march in every corner of the globe. That idea commits the members of the conspiracy to one great objective—to conquer the world by war if necessary, by other means if possible.

The extent of their success is measured by the fact that today they control 800 million people and one-third of the world's area, as against 600 million on the side of the free nations and 600 million neutral. And they still move relentlessly on. War in Korea, war in Indochina, insurrection in Burma, Indonesia, Malaya, and the Philippines, political control in Guatemala, subversion everywhere. These actions give the lie to the Communist claim of peaceful intentions.

What is their ultimate objective? To acquire a balance of power in the world which will enable them either to begin a world war they can win, or to force the free world to surrender to their domination without a war.

This is the Communist objective. What is America's?

Stated simply, it is as Secretary Dulles said last night, "Peach without surrender." How can we reach this objective in dealing with the Communists? Experience has taught us that in dealing with an aggressive dictatorship, a policy of weakness, diplomatically or militarily, leads to war. That is why we have adopted a policy of strength, based on these principles:

First, we recognize that we can't do the job alone; we need allies all over the world. That is why we cooperated with other free nations in the United Nations in resisting Communist aggression in Korea. That is why we have called for united action to resist Communist aggression in southeast Asia. That is why we have built alliances with our friends in Europe, South America, the Pacific and in Asia.

Second, we maintain our military strength, and that of our allies, at adequate levels to resist aggression, not because we want war, but because we believe that this is the only way to avoid war in dealing with an avowed aggressor.

Third, we have announced to the world that in the event of future overt aggression, we may in our discretion, use our mobile retaliatory power against the source of aggression, not because we want an atomic war but because we want to avert the conditions which might bring one about.

Because of these policies of united action, military power, and a threat of direct retaliation, the chance that the Communists will engage in overt aggression in Korea, in Indochina, or anywhere else in the world has been reduced to a minimum.

What then do we have to worry about? Unfortunately, we are dealing with an aggressor who does not limit himself to traditional tactics of conquest. In Indochina today, we see a new type of aggression—more effective, more dangerous, more difficult to deal with than the traditional type of overt aggression we stopped in Korea.

In this type of action we see the greatest threat to the free world today. No soldiers marched across the border, none were landed on the shore, yet Indochina is in grave peril, and the consequences to the free world, if it falls, could be desperately serious.

How did they do it? Through mounting a foreign controlled, inspired, and direct Communist revolution against the existing government. Those who do the fighting are natives of the country whose leaders have been won over to the Communist cause.

What can we do about it? We can try to develop united action to aid the existing government. But this is not the real answer; this is not the long-range answer. It is at best a short-range expedient.

The fundamental question is: Why do revolutions occur? Because people in a country are willing to fight against their existing government for a cause they believe in. Revolutions cannot be successful unless the people are for them.

The answer to Communist aggression of this type then is to find the causes for which people turn to Communist leaders and deal with them directly. If we do not, we will be confronted with one Indochina situation after another, all over the world.

What is the Communist appeal? Let us look at Asia. Here lies the balance of power in the world with 600 million people uncommitted in the struggle between the free nations and the Communist nations.

What does communism offer that the Asians want? Not its godlessness, because the Asians are basically religious. Not its cruelty, because the Asians are kind and friendly. Communism has appeal in Asia because the Communists have associated themselves with certain great causes which the Asians believe in.

What are those causes?

There is the desire for economic progress. This is understandable when we consider the terrible poverty which exists in most of these areas. In India, for example, the per capita income is one-twentieth of what it is in the State having the lowest per capita income in the United States.

But those who believe that economic progress is the complete answer to communism are indulging in a dangerous fallacy. There are those who say, for example, "Give every Asian another bowl of rice, and you will have no communism." Nothing could be more wrong. The bowl of rice is important, but to say you can buy the Asian's loyalty with material aid alone is an insult to a proud and sensitive people and a false and superficial analysis of a complicated problem.

An example proves the point. Hong Kong is one of the most beautiful cities in Asia. It is well run; it has a fine police force and a good water supply; it is generally prosperous. Ninety percent of the people are Chinese. They are better off economically there than probably any city in Asia. Yet a British civil servant admitted they would vote overwhelmingly for independence from their colonial government if given a chance. I asked a Chinese businessman why this was true in view of the material well-being of the people. He replied by telling me the parable of the two dogs.

There is first the dog which is well-groomed, well-fed, has a warm kennel in which to sleep, but is on a chain. There is another dog which is uncared for, which goes hungry most of the time, and has no kennel in which to sleep, but is not on a chain. Which dog is the happier? The dog which is free.

In this simple illustration, we see another of the great causes to which the Asians are dedicated in addition to economic progress. The Asian wants freedom, not necessarily in the sense we think of it but freedom meaning independence—independence from any foreign domination.

In addition, he wants equality. Recognition of his equal dignity as a human being and recognition on an equal basis of his culture and his religion.

He also wants peace. He needs a period of peace in which to consolidate his newly won independence, and to enable him to devote his meager resources to economic progress. I remember Prime Minister Nehru telling me, "We need in Indian at least 20 years of uninterrupted peace to raise our people to a bare subsistence level economically."

Finally, the Asian wants to be on the winning side. This is particularly true of the Japanese who lost World War II, and of other countries occupied during World War II. That is one of the reasons the outcome in Indochina is so important. Because if Indochina is lost to the Communists either by negotiation at the conference table or by defeat at the battlefield, the Communists may use that fact in a subtle and devastating way to convince those on the fence in Asia that the Communist side is the winning side.

These then are the causes which the Asians believe in and which have a similar appeal in other critical areas of the world.

What do the Communists offer as far as these causes are concerned? They have cleverly associated themselves with each of them. But their deeds have not matched their words.

Instead of independence, they have brought Communist colonialism.

Insead of economic progress, they have brought economic exploitation.

Instead of peace, they have brought war.

Instead of equal recognition of native cultures and religions, they bring forced conformity to the Communist doctrine of atheistic dialectical materialism.

They succeed because they at least offer a dynamic alternative; they do not stand for the status quo.

What then is the answer? We must expose the falsity of the Communist idea, and of Communist tactics, and we must make the contrast with the American position absolutely clear.

We Americans have a good cause to sell in Asia and everywhere in the world.

We are a world power, but we are unique among history's great world powers in that the United States wants nothing from any other country, no land, no concessions, just friendship and peaceful relations.

As a country which came from colonial status to independence, and which gave the Philippines their independence, and is helping to guarantee that independence now, we are in an excellent position to prove to people who wish to gain their independence or retain it that we are on their side.

Our economic aid programs which totaled $30 billon in the last 7 years without any strings attached are eloquent proof that the United States is willing to cooperate with other nations in raising their economic standards.

The President in his great speech of April 16 and in his December speech before the United Nations made it clear to the world that the United States is willing and ready to use its vast resources to wage war on poverty, misery, and disease if the Communists will quit blockading the road to peace and agree to international disarmament and atomic inspection.

The President, the Congress, and the great majority of our people believe in equality for all people. We individually can help on this score by our deeds. Every act of prejudice in the United States hurts us irreparably abroad. Those of you who have grown up in the Whittier tradition of tolerance and friendship can help to make your community and your country an eloquent example of America's fundamental belief in equality and opportunity for all.

What we in the United States and other free nations must do is to associate ourselves unequivocally and directly with these great causes other people believe in and that we believe in—peace, equality, independence, and economic progress.

We will win the battle for men's minds if we do, because we do not have to talk and live a lie as do the Communists. Once those on the fence are convinced that their best chance to get equality, peace, independence, and economic progress is to side with the United States and other free nations, the danger of Communist subversion will be brought under control, and the chance for peace will be increased immeasurably.

May I add a note of faith? I have no doubt as to the outcome of this struggle. We can have peace without surrender. The Communist attack on the free world can be defeated without a war. Why? Because most important, we are on the right side, the side of freedom, justice, and peace—against the forces of slavery, intolerance and war. We must never forget that ours is the revolutionary, dynamic idea. The Communist idea is static, tyrannical, and despotic.

All we need to be sure that we win is inspired leadership and an informed public opinion to back that leadership.

May I therefore urge each member of this class to do your part in providing that leadership and in creating that opinion. You have had the priceless advantage of 4 years together at this fine college. You are keenly aware of the problems confronting the free world, and you have developed a sense of responsibility toward solving those problems. To each of you may I urge that you dedicate a part of your life to public service. Some of you may run for office. Others may decide to take nonelective government positions. All of you can participate in your local political organizations. I can assure you that both of our great major parties can always use new blood and new leadership.

May we be at least as dedicated to the ideals of freedom as the Communists are to the ideals of slavery.

As you go forth, don't go with a long face but go with courage and confidence that the great principles in which we believe will eventually prevail.

To each of you congratulations, good luck, and may God be with you all the days of your life.

The Drought Program—An Explanation of the Government's Program, in Cooperation With the States and Individual Farmers, To Combat the Effects of Drought

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. HILL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 17, 1954

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following explanation of the drought program:

STATEMENT OF ASSISTANCE AVAILABLE THROUGH THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE IN DROUGHT DESIGNATED AREAS

In addition to the regular services available to farmers and ranchers through the Department of Agriculture, the following special programs are available upon a proper showing of need: (1) hay and feed grain program in areas designated under Public Law 875, and (2) emergency loans through the Farmers' Home Administration.

HAY AND FEED GRAIN PROGRAM

The hay and feed grain programs are only available in States that have been declared disaster areas by the President of the United States. A State USDA drought committee is established in each State where drought conditions appear to constitute an emergency. The USDA drought committee is composed of the chairman of the State agricultural stabilization committee as its chairman, and with the following as additional members: State director of the Agriculture Extension Service, State director of the Farmers' Home Administration, State director of civil defence, a prominent rancher or farmer, and a prominent banker.

The State USDA drought committee is responsible for obtaining and furnishing information to the Secretary of Agriculture with respect to drought conditions in the State. Where the severity of drought conditions justify the Secretary of Agriculture will use the information submitted by the State USDA drought committee, together with other information available to him, as a basis for recommendation to the President for designation of a drought disaster area under Public Law 875. In addition to the recommendations from the Secretary of Agriculture provisions of Public Law 875 require the governor of the State to make a formal request to the President setting forth the facts and conditions which constitute the emergency and how the State government is rendering asistance to meet the emergency. The request from the governor of the State and the recommendations from the Secretary of Agriculture constitute the basis upon which the President decides whether a state of emergency exists in any State pursuant to Public Law 875.

In States that have been designated by the President as drought disaster areas under Public Law 875, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to designate the counties within the State in which the hay and feed grain programs will operate. The information submitted by the State USDA drought committee and other information available to the Secretary is used as a basis for determining the counties in which these programs will be made available.

The hay program in these designated drought areas is conditioned upon the governor of the State signing a contract with the Department of Agriculture whereby the Department makes available to the governor such sum or sums of Federal funds as may be agreed upon in the contract for use by the governor in defraying the cost of the transportation of hay but not to exceed one-half of the actual cost of the transportation of hay or $10 whichever is the lesser. The State government is responsible under the contract for carrying out all phases of the distribution of hay to farmers and ranchers under the program and generally do that through trade channels. The responsibility to the Federal Government under the hay program is to make available the Federal funds as outlined above to assist in defraying the cost of the transportation of hay in the drought-stricken areas and to determine the eligibility of farmers and ranchers for such assistance.

The Department's feed grain program which involves the distribution of Commodity Credit Corporation surplus gains is only available in disaster areas designated under Public Law 875. Under the policies that have been announced by the Department, farmers and ranchers who are in need of assistance to maintain their foundation herds of cattle, sheep, and goats may obtain applications for these surplus feed grains at either the local county office of the Farmers' Home Administration or the local office of the Agricultural Stabilization Service. The completed applications may be filed at either of these local offices. The county committee of the Farmers' Home Administration has been designated to review all applications for hay or feed grains to determine eligibility therefor under these programs. Farmers who receive approved applications for surplus feed grains will obtain such grains at a reduced cost of 60 cents per 100 pounds. Farmers or ranchers will purchase the grain through local trade channels. The local dealers who sell the grain to the farmers or ranchers will obtain from the local commodity credit office negotiable certificates for the 60 cents per 100 pounds of grain sold to eligible farmers and ranchers. Commodity Credit Corporation will pay off these certificates with grain from its surplus inventories.

EMERGENCY LOAN PROGRAM

The Department has available through the Farmers' Home Administration emergency loans to assist farmers and ranchers in drought areas who are unable to obtain the credit they need from local private sources.

Special livestock loans are available to farmers and ranchers who need credit to continue their cattle, sheep, or goat operations. These loans are available in any State without regard to drought disaster designations.

Production emergency loans under Public Law 38 may be made available in States upon a designation by the Secretary of Agriculture. The designations under this statute by the Secretary of Agriculture are separate from the designations under Public Law 875. Where drought conditions are such that private lenders are unable to meet the credit needs of farmers and ranchers, the county supervisors of the Farmers' Home Administration in consultation with private credit sources or other agricultural leaders will submit reports to the State director of the Farmers' Home Administration requesting that the area be designated as a disaster area under Public Law 38. A report of the counties affected is submitted by the State director of the Farmers' Home Administration to the Administrator of the Farmers Home Administration in Washington. Where the facts justify, a report and recommendation is submitted to the Secretary of Agriculture for the designation of certain county or counties in a State as a disaster area for emergency production loans under Public Law 38. The action of the Secretary of Agriculture on these recommendations is final. In addition to these production emergency loans as described above, the Secretary of Agriculture may also authorize the making of economic emergency loans, where he finds there is a need for emergency credit, in areas that have been designated as disaster areas under Public Law 875. Information concerning the conditions and terms of these emergency loans from the Farmers' Home Administration can be obtained from the local county office of the agency serving the area in which the applicant resides.

SUMMARY

1. How States may obtain designations under public Law 875 for hay and feed grain programs

Step No. 1: The governor of the State must request the President to declare the State as a disaster area under Public Law 875.

Step No. 2: The State USDA drought committee must submit a report to the Secretary of Agriculture showing that a drought condition of major proportions exists in the State and setting forth information of the conditions in each county in the area to be designated.

Step No. 3: The Secretary of Agriculture will submit recommendations to the President concerning the designation of the area requested by the governor.

Step No. 4: If a State is designated as a drought disaster area by the President in accordance with the governor's request, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to designate the counties or areas within the State in which the hay and feed grain program will be operated. Counties or parts of counties will be added and deleted by the Secretary from the area as change in drought conditions warrant such action.

2. How does a farmer or rancher make application for and receive assistance under the hay program?

Step No. 1: In drought-designated areas where the governor and the Department of Agriculture have entered into a contract for the hay program, farmers and ranchers may obtain application forms for hay at reduced transportation costs at the local office of the Farmers' Home Administration or the county office of the Agricultural Stabilization Service.

Step No. 2: All applications for hay at reduced transportation costs must be approved by the county committee of the Farmers' Home Administration for the county in which the farmer and rancher reside. Completed applications must be filed by the farmer or rancher at the county office of the Farmers' Home Administration or at the county office of the Agricultural Stabilization Service.

Step No. 3: After approval by the county FHA committee, the approved application for hay may be picked up by the farmer or rancher at the county agricultural stabilization office.

Step No. 4: The farmer or rancher who has been certified for assistance under the hay program will deliver the approved application to the local dealer or person from whom he will purchase hay. The approved application will permit the farmer or rancher to purchase the hay from local sources at the reduced transportation costs.

3. *How does a farmer or rancher obtain assistance under the Department's feed grain program?*

Step No. 1: In areas that have been designated as drought-disaster areas under Public Law 875, farmers or ranchers may obtain application forms for feed grain at reduced costs at either the county office of the Farmers' Home Administration or the Agricultural Stabilization Service.

Step No. 2: County committees of the Farmers' Home Administration are responsible for determining eligibility of applicants for feed grain. Completed applications for feed grain must be filed at either the county office of the Farmers' Home Administration or the Agricultural Stabilization Service.

Step No. 3: Farmers or ranchers whose applications have been approved will obtain purchase orders from the county office of the Agricultural Stabilization Service. The purchase orders will be used by farmer or rancher to purchase the feed grain through local trade channels at a reduced cost of 60 cents per hundred pounds.

Step No. 4: The local feed dealers will obtain from the county office of the Agricultural Stabilization Service a negotiable certificate in exchange for the purchase orders obtained from farmers or ranchers who have purchased grain from them. The negotiable certificates will be used by the local dealers to obtain surplus feed grains from the Commodity Credit Corporation.

4. *How do farmers and ranchers obtain emergency loans through the Farmers Home Administration?*

Step No. 1: Farmers and ranchers who are producers and feeders of cattle, sheep, and goats and who are unable to obtain credit from private credit sources to continue their operations may apply at local offices of the Farmers Home Administration for special livestock loans in all States without regard to any drought designations.

Step No. 2: Where other types of emergency loans through the Farmers Home Administration are needed local interested citizens should request the county supervisor of the Farmers Home Administration to request the designation of the area under Public Law 38.

Step No. 3: The State director of the Farmers Home Administration will submit a report to the Administrator of the Farmers Home Administration in Washington, D. C., supporting the need for emergency credit in the county or counties in the State(s) under his jurisdiction.

Step No. 4: The Administrator of the Farmers Home Administration will make appropriate recommendations in justifiable instances to the Secretary of Agriculture requesting designation of areas for emergency loans.

Step No. 5: The Secretary of Agriculture makes the final determination for designations of areas for emergency loans.

Step No. 6: In areas that have been designated for emergency loans by the Secretary of Agriculture farmers and ranchers desiring such loans may obtain application forms and make such applications at the local county office of the Farmers Home Administration serving the area in which the farmer or rancher resides.

Lower Price Props

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. THYE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 17, 1954

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial appearing in the Washington Post and Times Herald of August 11, 1954.

Mr. President, thereafter I wrote a letter in answer to the editorial, which appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald of August 16, 1954.

Mr. President, I ask that both the editorial and this letter of mine be printed in the RECORD together, so that the reader may determine which position is correct.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of August 11, 1954]

LOWER PRICE PROPS

Farmers as well as consumers have reason to be pleased by the vote of the Senate for flexible price supports. Despite all the table-thumping on the part of so-called friends of the farmer in the debate, the men who grow crops know that they cannot prosper in the long run if they have to rely upon enormous Government subsidies that result in piling up unwanted surpluses. In a considerable measure the votes of both the Senate and the House reflect the viewpoint of farmers who have come to see that blind price-fixing is not the answer to their problems.

It is true, of course, that many farmers are willing to close their eyes to the potential disaster inherent in rigid price supports in times of overproduction. So long as subsidies continue to flow into their pockets, they are nothing about what happens to the mountainous surpluses taken over by the Government at the taxpayers' expense. We surmise, however, that the number of these reckless producers has notably diminished, thanks in very large measure to the courageous educational campaign carried on by Secretary Benson and his colleagues in the Department of Agriculture.

The furious assault against the moderate Aiken-Schoeppel amendment to the farm bill is especially difficult to explain in any other terms than political haymaking. The amendment, approved by the Senate, will permit the Department of Agriculture to adjust price supports on basic crops from 82½ to 90 percent of parity. If it had failed and Congress had voted to continue the present rigid 90-percent supports, the bill would in all probability have been vetoed by the President. Since the administration has ample strength to sustain such a veto, this would have given effect to the long-suspended 1949 Farm Act allowing price supports to fall as low as 75 percent of parity.

It may well be that this outlook induced a number of Senators to vote for the more moderate form of the flexible price support principle embodied in the Aiken-Schoeppel amendment. In any event, the Senate and House have shown good judgment in breaking away from a rigid formula that was annually building up new troubles for the farmer. Likewise the Senate beat down a spirited but foolish drive to upset the 75-percent-of-parity price support fixed by Secretary Benson for butter, cheese, and dried milk. It is a notable victory for the administration, and in the long run we are confident that it will work to the advantage of the farmer as well as that of the taxpayer and the consumer. What a pity that this good work was clouded yesterday by attachment of the unsound grazing bill to the farm bill.

[From the Washington Post and Times-Herald of August 16, 1954]

THE SENATE AND THE FARM BILL

There appeared in the Washington Post and Times-Herald of August 11 an editorial entitled "Lower Price Props" which surprised me, not because it contained conclusions relative to agricultural price supports which are contrary to mine, but because the tone and character of the comment seemed to me completely at variance with the oft-emphasized professional standards in your crusades for higher level of ethics on the part of public officials.

You clearly and unmistakably impugn the motives of those Members of the Senate who opposed changing the level of farm price supports at this time, while in contrast you attribute to those with whom the editor agrees motives of courage, sincerity, and devotion to the good of the country. I wonder why you would do this, or why you would assume that on this issue 44 Members of the Senate were motived by less worthy motives than 49 others.

Your editorial speaks of "table thumping on the part of so-called friends of the farmer," and you do not even make this a general accusation but state that this was specifically the case in the debate. You talk about blind price fixing. You libel the farmers of this country, who in war and peace have produced the food and fiber to feed and clothe this Nation and help others less fortunate, by asserting that so long as subsidies continue to flow into their pockets, "they care nothing about what happens to mountainous supplies taken over by the Government at the taxpayers' expense," and you call them "reckless producers" whose number has perhaps diminished by the courageous educational campaign of the Secretary of Agriculture and his associates.

Then you turn this vitriolic stream on some Members of the Senate and assert that the "furious attack" against provisions of the administration bill "is especially difficult to explain in any other terms than political haymaking." Finally you describe as "spirited but foolish" the effort to provide what seemed to me a reasonable balance in equity for the dairy farmers.

I would be the last person in the world to deny you the freedom to conclude that the majority in the Senate and House had shown good judgment in breaking away from the rigid formula of price supports, and to herald their triumph to the world. I would even be willing to say you may be right on the issue. For the sake of our national economy, I hope and pray that you are right and that the cutback in the level of farm price supports and subsequent policies of the Department of Agriculture will not have the effect of pushing our American farmers, and the country, into a recession at a time when the net income from agriculture is already at a lower point in relation to the national income than it was in 1932.

You are completely wrong, however, when you impugn the motives of those with whom you differ, and when you belittle those who happen to be, at the moment, in the minority in the Senate.

If we believe in our representative Government we must believe that the "collective judgment" on complex issues will be soundest and best when there is spirited debate by strong advocates of differing points of view. We gain nothing whatever when we say that our opponents' conclusions are the result of pressures or self-interest and ours alone stem from sound reasoning and unselfish motives.

Would it not be well if we focused part of our attention in connection with efforts to raise the standards of our Government—and the level of debate in the Senate—on the columns of the Post and Times Herald? Is it not just as proper and timely for me, as a public official whom you would feel quite free to criticize on how I discharge my public responsibilities, to consider how well you discharge your obligation to give a true and accurate picture of what you are reporting or interpreting? How objective have you been in telling your readers about the debate on the agricultural question? How fair? Have you considered the question only from the point of view of your consumer-readers, since no producers read your metropolitan editions, or have you sought to interpret it in the light of its implications to the Nation as a whole, since you are a national, and not a sectional, newspaper?

I ask these questions not to be offensive but because I believe that a great newspaper like yours, situated here in the National Capital, is in a very real sense an arm of the Government. It could well be the conscience of Government—certaininy the voice of that conscience.

The rules of the Senate provide that when a Member in debate shall, directly or indirectly, in any form of words, impute to another Senator or to other Senators any conduct or motive unworthy or unbecoming a Senator he may be called to order, required to take his seat, and not be permitted to proceed without leave of the Senate. This is a time-honored parliamentary rule intended to raise the level of debate which can so easily degenerate into personalities when arguments fail.

Schooled in that tradition, I feel constrained to raise a point of order against the Post and Times Herald in the arena of public discussion for your editorial, but I shall not burden you with a recital of why I feel you are not merely impolite, but also quite mistaken in your conclusions on the merits of the question.

EDWARD J. THYE,
United States Senator from Minnesota.
WASHINGTON.

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—We are astonished that Senator THYE should consider our reference to "political haymaking" as an impugning of motives. It is also astonishing that the Senator should accuse us of impugning his motives just after accusing us of libeling the farmers of the country by saying they are only interested in subsidies. The first point made by the editorial was that "the men who grow crops know that they cannot prosper in the long run if they have to rely upon enormous Government subsidies that result in piling up unwanted surpluses." Instead of libeling the farmer we gave him credit for seeing the advantages of flexible support prices, while acknowledging that there are some farmers who are more interested in subsidies than in curtailing surpluses.)

Interregional Competition for Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 17, 1954

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by A. H. Raskin which appeared in the New York Times on July 26 on the interregional competition for industry.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CIVIL WAR FOR INDUSTRY IS FOUGHT AS SOUTH AND WEST BID FOR JOBS

(This is the first of two articles on the growing interregional competition for industry and its impact on the job pattern)

(By A. H. Raskin)

The civil war is being fought with new intensity on the industrial front these days.

States are competing for new businesses in a no-holds-barred rivalry that has grown more acute as conditions make manufacturers increasingly cost-conscious.

The Middle Atlantic States of New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania, long the banner-carriers in total industrial employment, have been pushed out of first place in manufacturing, construction, and mining. With the development of the St. Lawrence Seaway, they are likely to lose their overall job supremacy to the Great Lakes States of Illinois, Ohio, Michigan, Indiana, and Wisconsin.

The South, a late starter in the industrial tug-of-war, is bidding aggressively for increased recognition—so much so that some northern Congressmen, under the leadership of Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY, Democrat, of Massachusetts, believe that the Federal Government should classify some of the lures the South holds out as "unfair competition."

The most spectacular advances in the war and postwar periods have been made by Texas and California, which have twice as many persons working in nonfarm jobs as they did in 1939, when the national defense boom started in this country. One-eighth of the country's industrial workers now live in these two States.

New England, grandfather of the national economy, is having the roughest going. The precipitous decline of the textile industry has struck it especially hard; other industries are held back by antiquated plants and often by antiquated management methods. But New England remains confident that its payrolls will go up as new industries move in to replace those that fold or move out.

The battle for business is not confined to regions. Little towns seek to pull plants away from big cities in their own State or section.

Municipally built factories, tax exemptions, lower labor costs and immunity from unionization are among the bait held out to attract industry from one area to another. Many States and communities have "drummers" constantly on the road to sell the advantages of their home towns to industrialists in the market for new facilities.

There is nothing inherently bad about the fact that the economic map is changing. On the contrary, it is in the national interest to have a broad diffusion of industry for both economic and military reasons.

The American business structure is so interrelated that keeping one region in economic peonage would tear down the prosperity of the other regions; conversely, a rise in industrial activity and living standards in any area creates values that benefit the rest of the country. Building plants close to raw materials and to markets also means lower production costs, lower prices, and a wider distribution of wage income.

KEY PLANTS DISPERSED

To these normal economic considerations has been added the need for dispersing key industrial plants to make them less vulnerable to atomic attack.

The Atomic Energy Commission has set up facilities that provide employment for 150,000 workers in areas remote from general concentrations of industry or population, and the Government has used tax concessions as an incentive to private companies to follow the same policy in locating new factories.

The kind of industrial migration that arouses concern, though, is the kind that stems from this: the construction of plants by the community, coupled with a pledge of tax-free operation and cheap labor, to induce a manufacturer to abandon his operations in the North and start over in the South.

Criticism of such bargain basement tactics has not been confined to northern public officials or union leaders worried about the weakening of their own strongholds. Many southerners have said that the South is inviting more trouble than gain by catering to what they call "the hoboes of American industry."

This viewpoint was expressed in a recent editorial in the Charlotte (N. C.) Observer. It praised the growth of Southern industry, but it asked whether the welcome mat for new business did not entail such lavish concessions that the South was selling its strength and vitality at less than cost prices."

"There are plums for the picking," the editorial declared, "but they must be chosen with great care. For some thrive hardily in the southern soil while robbing it of its fertility.

"Industrialization offers the hope of deliverance from economic duress. But industry that accepts favors to exploit poverty only prolongs it."

CASE OF A CARPET PLANT

The decision of Alexander Smith, Inc., to shut down its 80-year-old carpet mill in Yonkers and concentrate the bulk of its future production in a town-built factory at Greenville, Miss., has given New Yorkers a closeup of the competitive pressures operating on the industrial front.

The Greenville plant, in production 1 year, is described as the most modern in the carpet industry. It was built through a municipal bond issue of $4,750,000, and the company put in $10 million more of its own money for looms, dry vats, humidity controls and other equipment.

For the 20-year life of the municipal bonds, the company will pay a rental of about $300,000 a year—a sum adequate to meet the interest and amortization on the bonds. At the end of the period, the town still will own the plant but Alexander Smith will have an option to lease it for 79 years more at what the company calls a "nominal" rent.

Keeping the plant under town ownership means that the factory building will be permanently exempt from local taxation. In addition, the company has a guaranty that it will not be required to pay any municipal taxes on its equipment for at least 5 years, with a probability that the exemption period will be extended to 10 years. In Yonkers the Smith tax bill for this year is $170,000.

How much the company will save in labor costs by operating in Mississippi is a subject on which it is difficult to obtain precise information. The workers in the Yonkers plant belong to the Textile Workers Union, CIO, and their wages average $1.74 an hour. The Greenville plant has no union, and its wage scales are 30 to 50 cents an hour below those prevailing in the Westchester factory, according to union estimates.

HIGHER WORK QUOTAS SET

But the comparison of labor costs does not end with relative wage rates. The absence of union restraints in Mississippi makes it possible for the company to establish higher work quotas for its Greenville workers.

As a result of this increase in managerial freedom and the greater efficiency of the productive machinery, the yield per wage dollar in Greenville is "very substantially greater" than in Yonkers, company spokesmen say.

William E. Barksdale, executive director of the Mississippi Agricultural and Industrial Board, is pained by charges that the State has been guilty of unethical practices in its efforts to attract industry. He stresses that there was no suggestion that Alexander Smith was going to close its Yonkers plant when the citizens of Greenville voted to build a branch factory for the company 4 years ago.

At that time the company had indicated its intention of staying in Yonkers by making heavy postwar investments in new rugmaking machinery there. It was not until a drastic slump in the carpet business caused its Yonkers losses to mount to $1,800,000 a year that the Smith directors decided it was "economically impossible" to continue using the Westchester plant.

Mr. Barksdale says very few of the 92 companies for which Mississippi communities have put up tax-free plants have abandoned operations in other sections. The 92 plants involved municipal bond issues totaling $29,206,000; additional investments by the companies in machinery and equipment brought the total value of the factories to $108,800,000.

Only 2 of the 92 plants have unions, and in both instances the manufacturer welcomed unionization because he wanted a union label on his products to stimulate sales in union strongholds in the North and West.

RIGHT-TO-WORK LAWS

Only 20,000 of the State's 314,000 nonagricultural workers hold union cards, and virtually all of them are in the railroad and construction trades. Like most of the southern States, Mississippi has a right-to-work law, prohibiting any form of compulsory union membership.

Many companies planning new factories spurn special help from the communities into which they move. Even in Mississippi, in the 14 years since the State began its balance agriculture with industry program of bonds and tax exemption, plants built with private funds have outnumbered those put up under community auspices by a margin of more than 2½ to 1. Included among the 247 privately financed factories are some of the biggest in the State.

Giant corporations in the electrical and automobile industries insist on paying their own way when they go into new areas. Lemuel R. Boulware, vice president in charge of industrial relations for the General Electric Co., sums up its attitude this way:

"We are not looking for bargains in land, buildings, taxes, or anything else. We want no subsidy of any kind."

Other companies of comparable size operate on the same principle.

The General Electric expansion program stirred a battle last week between the company and James B. Carey's International Union of Electrical Workers, CIO. The union accused GE of planning to break up seven big plants into scores of smaller ones to be located in small towns with wage levels 80 cents to $1 below those in the present job centers.

This brought from the company the reply that it had no plans that do not call for the continued full effective utilization of our enormous investment in our existing facilities.

General Electric observed that it had cost hundreds of millions of dollars to build the seven big plants and that it would cost twice as much to duplicate their productive facilities in other localities.

ONE HUNDRED PERCENT EXPANSION SOUGHT

However, the company made no secret of its intentions to do part of its future expanding in new centers in the South and West. Its goal is a 100-percent increase in business in the next 10 years and it intends to split its expansion between the existing GE plants and new factories in the areas where the company makes its sales.

Nearly half of the company's 225,000 workers are now employed in plants in New York and Massachusetts, and the company feels some decentralization is in order if only to prevent its competitors from making capital of the fact that GE sells its products all over the country but plows most of its payroll dollars into two States.

Before the war the company had only a handful of employees in the South. However, during the war it bought the Ken-Rad radio tube plant in Owensboro, Ky., with 4,800 workers, and since then it has built half a dozen southern plants, including a giant appliance factory with 5,000 workers at Louisville.

Ninety percent of the 13,500 workers in the GE's southern plants belong to unions, and the company denies that a desire to escape unionization plays any part in its plans to expand in the South. The Carey union says wage differentials between the North and South are extremely high in the electrical industry, amounting in many instances to more than $1 an hour.

General Electric gears its wages to community levels, but Mr. Boulware maintains that its southern operations are not founded on a wish to beat wages down. He says the insurance and welfare benefits enjoyed by General Electric workers automatically add 16 or 17 cents an hour to the local wage level and that pay differences tend to dry up in a relatively short time.

AUTO PAY EQUALIZED

In the automobile and steel industries, the wage gap between North and South has largely disappeared. The assembly plants built by the Ford Co. and the General Motors Corp. in Atlanta pay the same wages as similar plants in Detroit. A Birmingham steelworker gets the same pay as a worker in Pittsburgh.

Before the war, 3.8 percent of the country's steel capacity was located in the South; now the figure has risen to 5.6 percent. Four new plants in Georgia, Kentucky, and Texas represent the bulk of the automobile industry's southward expansion.

All the major auto and steel plants are unionized. However, some small auto parts and steel fabricating plants have moved to areas in which they could successfully resist union organization and pay at rates far below those prevailing in the North.

Surveys by the Federal Bureau of Labor Statistics have indicated relatively little spread between the North and the South in wages for skilled workers. In fact, the scarcity of skills in some southern communities often permits expert mechanics to command a higher wage than they could get in the North. Among unskilled and semi-skilled workers, the differentials range from 15 to 40 percent.

To what extent wages have been a critical factor in the decline of the northern textile industry is a matter of dispute. Total textile employment in New England dropped from 303,000 in 1947 to a present level of 165,000. But national employment in textile mills also shrank during the period. In the last 3½ years, the overall total went down from 1,252,100 to 969,900.

The northern textile manufacturers blame union wage demands and union restrictions on productivity for many of their difficulties but Solomon Barkin, research director for the Textile Workers Union CIO feels that a larger share of the responsibility rests with unenterprising management.

He asserts that too many manufacturers were interested only in making quick profits out of the industry in the war and postwar years. Relatively little was done to modernize plants, develop new products or revise sales methods to keep abreast of southern competition he contends.

EXPANSION IS UNEVEN

Apart from textiles, coal mining, and a handful of other "sick" industries, the national economy has been growing so fast in the last 15 years that no geographic area has stood still. A study by Seymour L. Wolfbein of the Bureau of Labor Statistics makes it plain, however, that there have been sharp sectional differences in the rate of growth.

The national total of nonfarm workers went up from 30,319,000 in 1939 to 49,510,000 last year, a rise of 63.3 percent. In the same period New England's gain was only 37.4 percent and the Middle Atlantic States' 44 percent.

New York's job total grew 42.7 percent, as against 115 percent for California and 109.4 percent for Texas. Michigan was up 82.1 percent, Ohio 73.6 percent, Pennsylvania 44.4 percent, Illinois 50.2 percent, Tennessee 79.1 percent, Alabama 70.3, Missouri 56.4 percent, and Florida 117.4 percent. Interestingly enough, Mississippi, for all its special inducements, was just a little ahead of the national average, with a job expansion of 65.9 percent.

Percentage comparisons are not always a sound guide in this type of tabulation. Highly industrialized States like Massachusetts, New York, Pennsylvania, and Illinois start with such high employment totals that a substantial growth in jobs may show only a relatively small shift in percentage. On the other hand, the gain of a few jobs in a State that is predominantly agricultural can make it look very good in a percentage table.

For example, New York showed a growth from 4,178,000 jobs in 1939 to 5,960,000 last year, a gain of 1,782,000. New Mexico went up from 78,700 jobs to 176,000, a rise of 97,400. Translated into percentages, New York's increase was only 42.7, as against New Mexico's whopping 123.8.

California gained 180 percent in factory jobs while Massachusetts was moving ahead only 30 percent, but one-third of all the country's manufacturing employment is still centered in the 9 States of the New England and Middle Atlantic regions.

After evaluating thousands of figures bearing on the shift of industry from one area to another, Mr. Wolfbein cautions against any acceptance of the notion that any part of the country is dead.

"The concentration of industry and commerce, the concentration of job opportunities, the concentration of manpower requirements and labor supply remain to a significant extent in the regions and States where they had been more than a decade ago," he observes.

Industry is on the move, but not all the movement is in a single direction. As long as the economy keeps expanding, the experts feel, every State will have a job to do.

White House Picketing Risky

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 17, 1954

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an editorial from the Winston-Salem Journal of July 15, 1954, entitled "White House Picketing Risky."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

White House Picketing Risky

Senator Wayne Morse has the American ideal on his side in his opposition to a bill that would ban picketing the White House. There are also some practical considerations to be taken into account in the controversy.

As the Oregon Independent pointed out, the President is a servant of the people, not their master, and they have the right to petition him. Peaceful picketing is a legitimate means of petition and protest.

Furthermore, the picketing serves the practical purpose of permitting people to blow off steam and of demonstrating that freedom of speech is jealously guarded in this country. The man who can petition the President of the United States is bound to feel better about his situation, whether he gets the remedy he wants or not.

The pickets should understand that they establish themselves at their own risk. The President has been known to practice his golfing on the White House lawn. If one of them gets conked by a golf ball, nobody can be blamed. The Constitution guarantees freedom of speech but it does not protect anybody from a slice or a hook.

Our American Political System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 17, 1954

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, from time to time and from many different sources additional light is thrown on what I am pleased to call the American political system—a political system that is unique in the annals of mankind.

This present ray of light is from the editorial page of the Wall Street Journal of Friday, August 13, in the form of a letter to the editor from J. Harvie Williams, which was inspired by an earlier editorial Rows Within Parties. The editorial dealt with some of the causes of intraparty rows and the problems of party discipline. It suggested that the United States was too big for the tight party-discipline of our British cousins and added that attempts to impose such discipline on parties in the United States would lead to a multiplicity of parties, or a multiparty system such as prevails in Ireland, Israel, and in the countries of continental Europe.

To the contrary, Mr. Williams points out that the difference in organizational structure between British and American political parties follows their different fundamental ideas of the locus of sovereignty; and that while party discipline in Great Britain is imposed from the top down by the party managers, it is imposed in the United States from the bottom up by the voters themselves. Then, Mr. Williams adds that the multiparty systems of Europe spring from the multimember representation of districts in the legislative body, and cannot exist under the principle of a single-member district, such as prevails in the election of Congress. But most important, and to this I would draw the attention of Senators, Mr. Williams concludes with the fact that, contrary to every American principle of representation, members of our electoral college are chosen in multimember districts. He suggests that this greatly unbalances and distorts the similar principles of representation that underlie the two elected branches of the Government of the United States. These observations provide persuasive arguments in support of the constitutional amendment on reform of our electoral college which has been introduced by Representative Coudert in the House and by me in the Senate.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial and Mr. Williams' letter be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial and letter were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal of August 9, 1954]

Rows Within Parties

President Eisenhower clearly recognizes that he has a double role. He is President of the United States and as such he must stand above partisanship. Yet he is also the leader of the party which nominated and elected him and only through party action can he hope to achieve his administrative and legislative purposes.

The President referred to his role as party leader in a press conference the other day. He said that the individual occupying the Presidency could not escape responsibility for party actions, even those which he might not approve. He then added that anything which tended to divide the party was something which he must try to avoid or to correct.

All of this came up in answer to questions concerning the present row in the Senate over Senator McCarthy, of Wisconsin.

The fact is, we suggest, that it is a rare exception when American political parties are not divided and plagued by quarreling factions. Even in campaign years differences are ill-concealed.

There is no record that these differences have always resulted in defeat of the party. There is some record that an attempt to compromise the differences or to punish the rebellious party factions is likely to do more damage than the quarrels.

In the presidential election of 1924 the Republican Party was badly split. The elder Robert M. La Follette ran for President on an independent ticket. Many Republicans who did not openly support Mr. La Follette gave no more than token support to Calvin Coolidge. Yet Mr. Coolidge won hands down.

It is quite true that at that time the Democrats were also badly divided but had they been unified, it is doubtful that they would have won for the simple reason that Mr. Coolidge exactly fitted the mood of the country at the time.

In 1928 the Republicans nominated Herbert Hoover and he apparently hoped to placate some of the party disgruntled. He agreed with Senator Borah of Idaho that he would propose tariff revision. Mr. Hoover did just that and that tariff bill was the beginning of the troubles which beset his administration.

Mr. Roosevelt tried another way to achieve party unity. He proposed to purge a group of Congressmen and Senators who had disagreed with him. All but one of those who were thus proscribed won renomination and reelection. It was one of Mr. Roosevelt's great setbacks.

It would seem, then, that the cost of trying to achieve party unity can come high. And there is certainly no record that party disunity by itself isures a party's defeat.

There could not be in the United States, as there is in Great Britain, two parties which rigidly enforced party discipline. The United States is too big for that; its people and the interests of its geographical sections vary too widely. An attempt to enforce strict party regularity would only result in a multiplicity of parties, probably with the chaos we see in countries which have such a political arrangement.

The fact is that the people of the United States encourage the party maverick. For years the people of Nebraska elected the late George Norris to the Senate because they admired his independence. People who voted enthusiastically for Mr. Roosevelt nevertheless returned the men that Mr. Roosevelt tried to purge.

It is the politicians and political writers who take party disagreements seriously. The voters themselves seem rather to enjoy them.

[From the Wall Street Journal of August 13, 1954]

Election Reform

Editor, the Wall Street Journal:

Your excellent editorial, Rows Within Parties, includes 1 paragraph of 3 sentences with the latter 2 of which I cannot wholly agree: It reads:

(1) "There could not be in the United States, as there is in Great Gritain, two parties which rigidly enforced party discipline. (2) The United States is too big for that; its people and the interests of its geographical sections vary too widely. (3) An attempt to enforce strict party regularity would only result in a multiplicity of parties, probably with the chaos we see in countries which have such a political arrangement."

Your first sentence is correct for the reason that with us sovereignty—the power to declare the law—is posited in the people of the United States and the structure of government erected on that foundation is a Federal union of States. In England, a unitary government, sovereignty is formally posited in the wearer of the crown.

With us, because the organization of our parties follows the structure of government, the impulse in political affairs begins in the local communities. The power to make party nominations for elective offices rests (in various forms) in the party people in each of the districts represented by the office: congressional district, State representative district (assembly district in New York), etc. In England the power to select all of the party nominees for the House of Commons rests in the central governing committee of the party. With us only the voters can discipline the party candidates by defeating them for nomination or election. In England the governing committees impose party discipline by denying the party label to candidates, forcing them to run as independents, if at all. With us the party power to discipline United States Senators is diffused over 48 States; and the power to discipline Representatives in Congress is diffused over nearly 435 separate congessional districts.

With regard to your second sentence, the United States is not "tco big for that" were we a unitary state, as so many would have us be. If the national committees of our parties were legal entities (operating under national law) rather than extra-legal bodies representing 48 legal State parties (operating under the laws of 48 States), we would move quickly toward unitary parties which could impose party discipline by denying nominations to various candidates.

Finally, only proportional representations of parties in multimember constitutencies (districts) can produce the multiparty systems that plague continental Europe's legislative bodies. England's two-party system rests on single-member districts for representation in Commons, as does ours for representation in the House of Representatives (once by law but now by custom). The staggered election of United States Senators (one-third each 2 years) makes single member districts of the several States for their elections. On top of this, our two-party system is compelled to exist by the requirement of a majority of the vote in the electoral college for the immediate election of the President.

Upon reflection, I think, you will agree that most of the division within the parties arises from the fact of the narrow constituency of the executive branch of the Government. The electoral college has indivisible representation from multimember districts. Thus, party control of that body could be determined by as few as 12 statewide pluralities of just 1 vote each, while party control of the House of Representatives depends on 218 separate pluralities. Yet there is an elector corresponding to each Member of the House of Representatives.

Obviously, then, the present statewide—en bloc method of choosing members of the electoral college—a body corresponding exactly with a joint session of Congress—grossly unbalances and distorts the otherwise similar principles of representation that underlie the executive and legislative powers of the United States. Herein lies the major source of the difficulty.

J. HARVIE WILLIAMS.

Importance of American Merchant Marine to National Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 17, 1954

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, while there seems to be an inclination in some quarters to question the need for an American merchant marine adequate to serve the Nation in peace and war, there is no such question in the minds of those who have to work with and rely upon that merchant marine in time of emergency.

The United States Navy knows how vital the American merchant marine is to national security. The Honorable Charles S. Thomas, Secretary of the Navy, pulls no punches in stating his view on the necessity for a strong merchant marine. In an address to the graduates of the Massachusetts Maritime Academy he made plain some facts that Members of Congress and citizens generally should keep in mind. I ask unanimous consent that pertinent portions of the Secretary's address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A STRONG AND ADEQUATE MERCHANT MARINE

(Remarks by Secretary of the Navy Charles S. Thomas, before the Massachusetts Maritime Academy, Faneuil Hall, Boston, Mass., Sunday, August 15, 1954)

It is an honor to address you gentlemen upon your graduation from the Massachusetts Maritime Academy, some of whom will be serving in the United States Navy, and all of whom will be officers in our American Merchant Marine.

One of the vital elements of seapower is a strong and adequate merchant marine, and this is what I want to speak briefly about this afternoon.

In this age of supersonic speed and atomic power, there are many Americans who wonder why the United States needs a strong and adequate merchant marine. As Secretary of the Navy I would like to make it emphatic and clear that we of the Navy regard the merchant marine as an indispensable element of our defense, fully as important and vital as the Army, Navy, or Air Force.

In the first place, our merchant marine does not serve just the coastal areas or the Great Lakes. The entire nation benefits from a strong merchant marine. With all our wealth and our abundance of natural resources, it is hard to convince the average American that we must import and export to live, to assist our friends and neighbors, to maintain our standard of living, and to survive in the event of war.

Let us consider one example—our modern combat airplanes flying today. With only American and overland resources they could not be built in the numbers adequate for a total defense.

Essential to their manufacture are such raw materials as aluminum, chromium, titanium, antimony, tin, cobalt, mica, and tungsten. The largest percentages of these materials must be brought in merchant ships from overseas sources. I need not mention rubber for their tires, fuel for their tanks, and uranium for their atomic weapons. Even prosaic but necessary items such as coffee, sugar, and vegetable oils must be carried to our ports by merchant vessels.

The first answer, then, as to why we need a strong and adequate merchant marine in these modern times is that it is important to our peacetime economy and prosperity.

The second reason why we need a strong and adequate merchant marine is that it is essential to our success and security in time of war. Military production, like our peacetime industrial production, is dependent upon the importation of strategic materials, and the exportation of the finished products of war for ourselves and for our friends. The protection of our friends against aggression, as well as the defeat of the enemy will demand that we be able to project our strength across the seas. To do this, we must have an adequate merchant marine in peace—one which is rapidly expansible in time of war.

I need not tell you gentlemen that historically the United States Navy and the American merchant marine have been closely, even inseparably, related. All of you know that John Paul Jones was a merchant mariner for 16 years before he became famous in the Continental Navy, that Stephen Decatur commenced his naval career as a privateer. You also know that the American Navy was created entirely from the American merchant marine. One of our early Congress' first acts was to establish and encourage a merchant marine, for to our forefathers, it was fundamental that if our country was to grow and prosper, it must have the world's best merchant marine. This our rugged and talented merchant mariners proceeded to give us, with the succession of the fast packets, the New Bedford whalers, the famous clipper ships.

In every war, the merchant marine has played a vital though sometimes unpublicized role. The war in Korea is the most recent example. Every fighting man sent to Korea was accompanied by 5 tons of supplies and it took 64 pounds of supplies and equipment every day to keep him there. Five million passengers, 22 millions tons of petroleum products, and 52 million tons of dry cargo were transported to, from, and within the Korean theater to support that war. Of these totals, more than 80 percent of the dry cargo was carried by merchant shipping.

I think figures such as these are eloquent proof of why we need a strong merchant marine. Neither I, nor any responsible officer who advises me in Washington, have ever given credit to the idea that in a future war, atomic weapons, and modern submarines will sever the United States' life lines. We recognize that to prevent this is one of the Navy's primary problems at the outbreak of war—to keep open our sea communications to our forces overseas, to our allies, and to our sources of raw materials. Our enemy will undoubtedly try to isolate us as he tried in two past wars, but we are going to do our best and I am sure he will not succeed.

These fundamental facts are well known to you gentlemen, and to this audience. I regret to say, however, that despite the vital and obvious need of a strong and adequate merchant marine both for peace and for war, I view with mounting concern the condition of our merchant marine today, and more especially, for the immediate future. Eight-tenths of our merchant fleet will be obsolete in 8 to 10 years; nine-tenths of it is now too slow for wartime use and we presently are seriously short of tankers. What is more alarming, there is virtually no merchant shipping being constructed on our ways and our development of new ship types is virtually at a standstill. In short, there is grave prospect that, unless promptly rectified, our country is to slowly slip downward and backward as a maritime power allowing our foreign trade to be brought in and taken away in foreign bottoms. You may be surprised to learn that since 1939, 13 nations which did not even have merchant fleets have since entered the maritime scene. Even landlocked Switzerland now has a 30-ship merchant marine.

As Secretary of the Navy, it is my earnest opinion that we cannot allow our merchant marine to approach disuse and decay on the grounds that we can trust to luck and improvise to meet our next emergency as we did in World War I and World War II. There will not be time, if general war breaks out again, to resurrect a merchant marine. Our survival will be vitally dependent upon the merchant shipping which is available during that critical initial period.

To fully support our peacetime economy, and to provide a reasonable base for wartime, a joint survey by the Navy Department and the Maritime Administration has revealed that we should have an active merchant marine of approximately 1750 ships—about 1300 cargo, about 425 tankers, and about 25 troopships. It also specified that these ships should be fast—in the neighborhood of 18 knots for cargo, 18½ knots for tankers, 22 knots for troopships—not only for protection against the modern submarine, but to expedite delivery of their cargoes. These ships should be capable of rapid loading and unloading, and thereby reduce to a minimum the turn-around time. These ships should be designed for use in the great majority of the world's ports. They should have the latest propulsion systems which emphasize fuel economy.

I might also add that our ship designers should be mindful of the possible future need for merchant ships capable of rapid loading and unloading under conditions where major ports are unusable. And designers should also be alert that the economical use of nuclear energy for ship propulsion may not be far away.

Such a merchant marine is a tall order, I will admit, but it is certainly not beyond the capacity or genius of our people.

Specifically, what should we do today to obtain such a merchant marine?

First, we should commence at the earliest possible date a construction program of new merchant ships which will revive our lagging shipbuilding industry, retain its skilled craftsmen and designers, and which will replace with modern vessels the large group of Victory and Liberty ships which become obsolete in mass between 1962 and 1965.

Secondly, we need to develop, build, and test certain prototype vessels so that mass production of them could proceed in wartime.

Thirdly, we must reaffirm the spirit of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936. I would like to read you just a few lines from the preamble of this act: "It is necessary for the national defense and development of its foreign and domestic commerce that the United States shall have a merchant marine."

1. Sufficient to carry its domestic commerce and a substantial portion of the waterborne export and import foreign commerce of the United States and to provide shipping service on all routes essential for maintaining the flow of such domestic and foreign waterborne commerce at all times.

2. Capable of serving as a naval and military auxiliary in time of war or national emergency.

3. Owned and operated under the United States flag by citizens of the United States insofar as may be practicable, and,

4. Composed of the best equipped, safest, and most suitable type of vessels constructed in the United States and manned with a trained and efficient citizen's personnel.

It is the declared policy of the United States to foster the development and encourage the maintenance of such a merchant marine.

If we would fulfill the spirit of that passage, we will have cause for worry about our merchant marine.

As Secretary of the Navy, I assure you that the Navy shall do all in its power, as it has in the past, to work for and support a strong and adequate merchant marine.

I do not want my words of warning about the present state of our American merchant marine to be misinterpreted by you young gentlemen. In my opinion, the situation is grave, and immediate steps should be taken to rectify a dangerous trend. However, this does not imply discouragement or a lack of hope on my part. The American people, I have observed, when given the facts, always act promptly, resolutely, and intelligently. I do not believe for an instant that, once informed, they will allow their merchant marine to fall into decay and disuse and thereby endanger our peacetime prosperity or our security in the event of an emergency.

You gentlemen are stepping into important and demanding duties in a vital field. I believe your job is one with a fine future, and I know that it is one which is indispensable to our country's prosperity and security. Your education and training here at the Massachusetts Maritime Academy have given you the basic qualifications for this important task and have prepared you to meet not only your responsibilities in mercantile shipping, but have also prepared you to meet your basic responsibilities in contributing to national defense.

The Interregional Competition for Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 17, 1954

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD the second in a series of two articles by A. H. Raskin which appeared in the New York Times on July 27 on the interregional competition for industry.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNION BUILDS A PLANT IN "CIVIL WAR" ON JOBS

(This is the second of two articles on the growing interregional competition for industry and its impact on the job pattern.)

(By A. H. Raskin)

New York's biggest union is giving a reverse twist to one of the key devices used by southern communities to induce northern manufacturers to abandon unionized plants here and operate under nonunion conditions in the South.

While other unions complain about the undercutting of northern standards by community-financed, tax-free plants in the South, the International Ladies Garment Workers Union, A. F. L., is using its own funds to build an apparel factory in Appomattox, Va.

The factory, which will cost the union $40,000, is part of a double-barreled attack on a New York manufacturer of children's dresses, who decided to discontinue his 40-year-old factory here at the end of last year and to do all his manufacturing in 3 plants in Virginia and North Carolina.

The garment union's venture into plant construction is symptomatic of programs being developed by many elements in northern industry. They are doing this to combat what they consider "unfair competition" by some southern cities in enticing new enterprises through "bargain basement" tactics on the tax and labor fronts.

COUNTING ON HUGE PROJECTS

Mayor Wagner's new commerce commissioner, Richard C. Patterson, Jr., is trying to draft a program to make New York a more attractice place to do business. The State is counting on the Thruway, the St. Lawrence seaway and other public works to help increase its job roster by at least a third. New England, worst hit by the flight of industry to other areas, has formed scores of local development corporations to stem the outward tide.

President Eisenhower's Council of Economic Advisers has set up a "task force" to study all the problems involved in the changing geography of American industry and to decide whether there is anything the Federal Government should do about it.

However, for both economic and political reasons, it is unlikely that Uncle Sam will do much to put the brakes on the shift of industry or to outlaw any of the lures that are being used in the interstate competition for plants.

The Government is committed to apolicy of preferential treatment for "distressed areas," especially those in which the collapse or migration of pivotal industries has left a chronic unemployment problem. They get special consideration in the allocation of Federal contracts, provided they can match the prices offered by manufacturers in healthier economic areas.

But the military program is at such low ebb these days and the volume of work reserved for depressed zones so small that the policy is of scant importance in putting body into ghost towns.

The national dispersion policy, intended to protect vital industrial plants against atomic attack, is founded on the principle that no region is to be built up at the expense of any other. However, it does allow bigger tax writeoffs when facilities are put up in distressed areas.

New England, though, found few manufacturers eager to seek certificates of necessity for the construction of new factories, utilities, or transportation facilities there. It got only 2.9 percent of the certificates approved by Federal authorities. Pensylvania alone got 12.4 percent and Texas 11.3 percent. New York's $1,027,454,000 in approvals represented 5.9 percent of the national total over a 3½-year period.

LOAN ALSO MADE

The most challenging of the self-help projects conceived by unions to check losses in the South is the garment union's decision to put up a union-owned plant in Virginia and turn it over to a New York manufacturer to operate under a union contract. As a companion project, the union has made a $20,000 loan to another manufacturer to expand a union shop he has been running for many years in the South.

Here is how David Dubinsky, the union's president, describes the origins of the plan:

The children's dress concern of G., H. & E. Freydberg had operated in New York since 1910. It employed 150 workers in a Manhattan factory and its operations were covered by a standard union contract. Some years ago it opened branch factories, with a combined total of 400 workers, in Appomattox and Lynchburg.

When its union agreement expired last December 31, the company informed the union that it had decided "for economic reasons" to transfer the work formerly done in New York to a new plant in Greensboro, N. C. Efforts to negotiate new contracts for the two Virginia plants, which had been operating on a union basis, proved unavailing.

The company challenged the union's right to represent the Virginia workers. The union accused it of committing a series of unfair labor practices to drive workers out of the union, and a strike was called.

According to Mr. Dubinsky, 220 of the 300 Appomattox workers walked out and 30 of the 100 at Lynchburg. The union was able to find jobs for most of the 150 displaced workers in New York, and it established strike benefits of $20 a week for the 250 away from their jobs in Virginia.

The Greensboro plant, newly built with community funds, was included in the strike call, but Mr. Dubinsky said it had only a handful of workers. The strike at the three southern plants has continued for almost 7 months without forcing a full shutdown in any of the 3.

CONTRACT ALREADY SIGNED

With the double purpose of putting its striking members back to work and making it harder for the Freydberg concern to keep its work force, the union encouraged the Virginia Novelty Co., a unionized contracting shop in Appomattox, to expand its facilities sufficiently to hire 100 more workers.

As a spur to expansion, the garment union, one of the country's richest labor organizations, loaned the company $20,000. The enlarged facilities will start operating early in August, Mr. Dubinsky said.

At the same time the union began work on a $40,000 factory, with a floor space of 14,000 square feet. Arrangements were made to lease the plant at a nominal rental to Youth Time Toggs, Inc., a New York company, which will operate in Appomattox under the name of the Lin-Bar Dress Corp.

The company will offer jobs to all the strikers at wages 12 cents above those prevailing in the Freydberg plants. The employer has signed a contract to observe union conditions, and the union has pledged full cooperation in fostering high productivity among the workers.

Mr. Dubinsky made no secret of his hope that those still at work in the Freydberg plants would quit to get the higher wages at the union-built factory. The union head said the plant could take up to 300 workers. He added that he was studying the possibility of undertaking a similar project in Greensboro to war on the Freydbergs there.

"Some firms go south because they need more output, want to be close to expanding sales markets, or have other bona fide reasons," he said. "The union has no quarrel with those who go with no purpose to break down established labor standards, but we do oppose those bargain hunters whose sole aim is to undermine and destroy.

"By building this plant, we will not only relieve the union of the necessity for paying strike benefits of $6,000 a week, but we will provide decent employment for southern workers and make a permanent contribution to the welfare of the Appomattox community."

TRAINING COSTS CUT

The employer who will operate the union-financed factory was equally enthusiastic about the project. Ira Ravner, president of Youth Time Togs, praised Mr. Dubinsky and the union's industrial-engineering department, headed by Dr. William Gomberg, for laying out what he declared would be one of the finest productive units in the country.

The availability of workers with training acquired in the Freydberg plants is not the least of the attractions that the deal holds out for Mr. Ravner. He estimates that he will save $600 in the training of each worker. For the initial work force of 150, this means a profit to the company of $90,000, according to his calculations.

Under the contract, the company will have the right to buy the plant at its original cost after 5 years. The union will charge no interest on its investment, and Mr. Dubinsky indicated that the rent would be credited to the purchase price at the end of the 5-year period.

What the Freydberg company thinks of the arrangement could not be learned yesterday. Irwin Freydberg, president of the company, was away from the executive offices at 1359 Broadway, and other officers reserved comment until his return.

INDUSTRIAL SLUMS SHUNNED

Keeping business in New York is the assignment given by the mayor to the $1-a-year head of his commerce department. Commissioner Patterson is in the process of recruiting a policy committee to help him carry out his task. It will include representatives of labor, management, finance, transportation, foreign trade, the entertainment industries, and other elements in the city's tax-burdened, traffic-choked economy.

The dimensions of Mr. Patterson's problem are indicated by the announcement of the American Safety Razor Co. that it plans to quit Brooklyn next May and transfer its operations to Staunton, Va. Fourteen hundred workers will lose their jobs in the shift.

The United Electrical Workers, independent, which is seeking the city's help in blocking the move, says the company will have a tax exemption and a wage rate of 20 to 50 percent lower than it has now when it gets established in its new quarters.

The United Furniture Workers, CIO, wants Mr. Patterson to sponsor an idustrial redevelopment program for New York that would parallel the program that is being carried out for eradicating the city's slums.

Many furniture shops are leaving the city for Long Island and New Jersey because they find it too costly to do business in the city's industrial slums, Morris Pizer, president of the union, declares. The virtual impossibility of getting trucks to and from plants without endless delays is cited by the union as a major handicap.

Louis Hollander, president of the State Congress of Industrial Organizations, has called on Governor Dewey to take the lead in setting up a regional organization of governors and Members of Congress from the New England and Middle Atlantic States to defend industry against unfair competition.

The principal objective of such an interstate alliance would be to raise pressure for an increase in the Federal minimum wage from 75 cents an hour to $1.25. The CIO also urged Federal standards for unemployment insurance and workmen's compensation on the ground that lower State taxes in the South for such programs helped pull business out of the North.

Most of the union fire is reserved for the Southern practice of putting up community-financed plants and guaranteeing a long period of tax exemption to the potential users—a practice that unions call "Dixie socialism."

The House of Representatives struck at this practice in its version of the administration tax bill. It decreed that no tax deduction was to be allowed for rents paid by companies that used tax-exempt factories financed by municipal bonds. The Senate Finance Committee killed this provision, and Southern opposition is expected to keep it from being restored in the conferences between the two Chambers.

Southern communities are firm in denying that they are pirating industry from the North. On the contrary, they contend that what is happening is a belated recognition of the importance of the Southern market and its potentialities for makers of all types of goods. The South is still far from having the share of industry it considers rightfully its own.

Massachusetts Fisheries: Shape of Things To Come

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. BATES

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 17, 1954

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, problems of the fishing industry of this Nation have been of vital concern to this Congress, and I am certain that my colleagues in the House of Representatives will find a special interest in the following article published by the Gloucester (Mass.) Times recently under the heading of "Commonwealth's Oldest Industry Sized Up by Experts."

The Times devoted an eight-page section to the report prepared for the Department of Commerce of Massachusetts by Daniel P. Norman and W. W. A. Johnson with the cooperation of Gov. Christian A. Herter, former distinguished Member of the House, and Commissioner Richard W. Preston; and I agree with its editor that this report, "properly used, can become a vital tool in the reawakening of the State's oldest industry." The Times article follows:

In the concluding chapter of the report on the Massachusetts Fishing Industry Today, entitled "The Shape of Thing To Come," the authors say: "It is easy to view with alarm or with rosy optimism the future of any old New England industry, and it is equally easy to select facts to justify either viewpoint. The fishing industry is no exception. There are ample grounds for both fears and hopes. Let us look closely at certain explicit factors:

"There is little reason to expect much improvement in the supply of groundfish or of soft-shell clams. The Fish and Wildlife Service and the Woods Hole Oceanographic Institute have both reported new finds of ocean perch, particularly at great depths, and new lobster supplies have been located at depths below 100 fathoms.

"New gear may be needed to catch these fish effectively. Soft-shell clams will apparently continue in short supply until local weather conditions once again control predators.

"There is no proof that scallops are decreasing in abundance, and the Canadian Fisheries Research Board has reported finds of extensive new scallop beds.

"VIRTUALLY UNTAPPED

"Fish populations exist in our offshore waters which have been virtually untapped.

"The most important of these is shrimp, and it is only a matter of time until they are pursued. A serious attempt has just been begun by the Cape Cod Shellfish Corp. to harvest our big supply of sea clams on a commercial scale.

"Other little exploited shellfish such as mussels and sea snails are likely to be developed into profitable specialties. Such developments have been repeatedly expected to materialize in the past, but they are likely to receive fresh stimulus from the fact that European countries are now opening new markets here.

"Pioneering will have to be done by others (we note that a Danish firm has just sent over an exploratory of precooked sea snails, in a most attractive package). Private experiments with improved traps are now quietly being carried out along our coast and suggest that our lobster catch will increase.

"Our menhaden catch is still a fraction of what it could be. Many other fish from hake through starfish can be utilized profitably in the future.

"FREEZING FISH AT SEA

"We have explained at various points, the importance of top-quality fish and of uniformity of fish supplies to our fish processors. Both of these objects are difficult to attain under present fishing conditions, but the splendid work of the Fish and Wildlife Service presents a solution that is tailor-made for our Massachusetts' trawler fleet.

"This process is summarized here. We have seen earlier that our fishing boats rarely utilize their full hold capacity.

"Part of this unused hold space can be filled with refrigeration machinery, and whole (ungutted) fish can be frozen successfully at sea as soon as they are caught.

"BEEN DEMONSTRATED

"This is no academic possibility, but has been demonstrated in practice with a large trawler which has operated at sea and brought adequate supplies of fish to port for proper evaluation. The whole-frozen fish can be stored until wanted, then thawed and processed by conventional methods.

"Details of the freezing and thawing conditions are well established and preliminary cost estimates by Bromield. New data soon to be published by the Fish and Wildlife Service show that the process is economical and can be profitable. This prospect is particularly appealing to fish processors who own trawlers, because the whole-frozen fish are maintained in fresh condition and will keep their high quality for a very long time, so that they can be uniformly metered to the year.

"Anything that will improve the efficiency of the processing plants above their present low level will improve their financial status and enable their operators to take advantage of new processes which are efficient only when operated on a continuous basis.

"PRECOOKED FISH

"Recent publicity and the prior discussions above foreshadow clearly the amazing changes taking place in our fishing industry because of the introduction of precooked fish. It is less than a year since fish sticks were introduced on a commercial scale and we have seen how fish processors are rushing into this field.

"Technical data are not available about the problems involved in the large-scale cooking of fish, but anyone who has ever been served a mess of greasy, oil-soaked clams is aware that such problems exist.

"The large fish processors naturally have not contributed to the public knowledge about their experiences, which have been painful, because they see no reason to save their competitors from making the same errors.

"STICK TROUBLES

"One simple example of the type of difficulty encountered will suffice to illustrate the point. It was natural for processors to attempt to cook fish sticks in the same class of cooker used for years in the fried clam stands. A frozen fish stick is far more difficult to heat than a clam, and in turn, cools the heating oils more rapidly.

"The heat capacity of the oil in the standard fryers proved much too small to cope with the fish sticks, and much larger fryers had to be used. These, in turn, were only a makeshift solution, and today special devices are engineered for the trade.

"Ordinary bread crumbs, used for breading the fish sticks, are highly absorptive and pick up too much oil, so special crumbs are made for this purpose; cooking temperatures and times are very critical and must be constantly watched or automatically controlled. The type of oil used governs the cooking time and temperature, as well as the quality and the cost of the finished product.

"TECHNICAL PROBLEM

"In short, the commercial cooking of fish sticks is really a technical process which must be as carefully controlled as any purely chemical process. Too many small processors fail to realize this fact and attempt to rush into the business on the same basis that they would attempt to cook a Sunday night supper.

"You might think that it is a simple matter to dip a fish stick first into batter and then into breading, and so it is when you are handling only 1 or 2. The problem becomes suddenly difficult when you try to handle many thousand fish sticks an hour by the same hand process. Considerable research is still continuing to be done to develop good mechanical breading machines.

"RAPID PROGRESS

"The industry is making rapid progress in overcoming most of the technical problems of handling fish sticks and other precooked fish. As experience is gained in this field, it becomes obviously economic to precook and market other fish products.

"The larger firms are already considering the marketing of complete precooked dinners, and it is likely that the smaller firms will be able to enter the specialty fields with precooked clams, mussels, sea snails, and other delicacies which appeal to a restricted but profitable market.

"In conclusion, it is fair to say that the future of our fishing industry, like that of all our industries, depends on the vision, courage, and capability of its members."

Address by Hon. Lister Hill, of Alabama, At Banquet Celebrating the 10th Anniversary of the Blue Cross of Florida

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 17, 1954

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by me at Jacksonville, Fla., on last July 2, at a banquet celebrating the tenth anniversary of the Blue Cross of Florida.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VOLUNTARY HEALTH INSURANCE: ITS ACHIEVEMENTS AND CHALLENGES

(Address of Hon. LISTER HILL, United States Senator from Alabama)

Permit me to express my appreciation of the honor that you do me in bidding me to be with you on this occasion. May I say that I have a very special, and inherent interest in medical care, for I am the son of a doctor. My father began the practice of medicine long before the benefits of the discoveries of the 19th century reached the rural areas of our country. The first laparotomy he ever saw he performed himself in a room over a corner grocery store.

Fifty years ago, lacking the facilities of a hospital, he sutured the wounded heart of a boy. The operation was performed in a Negro cabin in Alabama, the only light was the flickering flame of a kerosene lamp. He is generally credited with being the first American surgeon to successfully suture the human heart.

While my father was long denied many of the advantages of the progress of medicine, his gratitude to the pioneers was expressed in his selection of a name for me. He named me for Joseph Lister, the great surgeon who first brought the discoveries of Pasteur into the operating room.

When knowledge of the cause and cure of disease was meager, when the scope of the ministrations of the physician and the surgeon was small, the home was adequate for the care of the sick and the injured.

The role of the hospital in the community began to change in the last years of the 19th century, when the discoveries of Pasteur, Koch, and other pioneer bacteriologists began to be applied by Lister. It soon became evident that effective application of these epochal discoveries required equipment and an environment which could not be provided in the home.

Then came Roentgen with the X-ray and the revolutionary advances in diagnosis and treatment that it brought. But the wonderful machine was expensive and immobile. It could not be brought to the patient—the patient had to be brought to it.

The revolution in medical practice and the emergence of the hospital as a necessity to the lives and health of all of us have produced in the minds of the American people a new concept of medical care. We have lifted our sights both as to the quality of the medical care we expect and as to its availability.

These great expectations have created many problems—practically all of them financial ones. Although the revolution in medical practice has brought man untold benefits in the way of longer life, in his ability to manage disease and stop pain, it has also at each step of the way increased the investment in health facilities and consequently the cost of medical care for more and more people.

Laymen, and some in the medical profession, do not realize that it takes some $15,000, at present prices, just to make a bed available for a sick patient in a modern hospital.

This difference in the rapid rate of medicine's progress and the rate of progress toward the solution of some of the problems of medical economics is well known to those of you who serve in hospitals and with Blue Cross and Blue Shield. It is not generally recognized, however, that this difference is the factor that gave rise to the pressure to socialize medicine.

I have been in the Senate for some years. I have observed the various pressure groups at work. I am happy to tell you that through the building of hospitals and health facilities and the simultaneous extension of voluntary health insurance, we have dealt a real setback to the pressure groups that are bent on bringing about compulsory Federal health insurance. But, while the pressures for a compulsory system have been temporarily checked, it would be fatal to imagine that the pressure groups have been defeated once and for all. They have not been and they will not be defeated until two problems—the availability of hospital facilities, and the higher cost of medical care—have been solved.

In 1946, when Senator Burton and I sponsored the Hospital Survey and Construction Act, we not only recognized the urgent need for more hospitals and better medical care, we were convinced that the only way to defeat a compulsory health insurance system was with an effectively functioning voluntary system. It seemed clear to us that the first step toward the goal of bringing the benefits of modern medicine within the reach of all our people was to make certain that hospital beds were available when needed. Hospitals and voluntary health insurance—it seemed to us—had to advance together. One could not proceed very far or very satisfactorily without the other. Hospitals not only have to be paid for. They have to be maintained. Health insurance provides hospitals the means for a steady income. On the other hand, the extension of health insurance beyond the capacity of hospitals to supply beds when needed would only serve to aggravate the shortage of beds and increase the pressure for a socialized system.

How well the theory has worked is no better demonstrated than right here in Florida. With the financial aid and stimulation of the Hill-Burton hospital-construction program, you good people here in Florida have achieved an outstanding record in the building of hospitals and health facilities. A statewide survey of your health resources at the beginning of the program showed that, like the Nation as a whole, you had only about one-half the general hospital beds needed by your people. The situation with respect to facilities for the care of mental, tuberculosis, and chronic disease patients was as bad or worse.

With respect to public health centers—for preventive medicine—the shortage of facilities was even more critical.

Your State and local officials and devoted citizen groups moved promptly and enthusiastically to take advantage of the financial assistance offered by the Hospital Act for the building of hospitals and health facilities. Beautiful new hospitals—modern in every detail—began to open their doors in community after community which had no hospital of any kind before and making it possible for your doctors to bring you the best in medical care.

Your people—like the people of my own State of Alabama and all over the Nation—grew more than ever health conscious. The building of hospitals and health facilities in Florida under the program has been limited only by the amount of funds appropriated pursuant to the act. The new urge to build hospitals refused to recognize these limitations and you have gone beyond the program and built hospitals outside the program.

In less than 7 years since construction started under the program, 53 hospitals and other health facilities have been approved for construction at a total cost of some $29 million, of which almost one-half has been provided through Federal aid under our Hill-Burton Act. Thirty of the fifty-three projects are already built and serving your people. Eleven are now under construction, and a dozen more are soon to be built. The program has added close to 2,000 general hospital beds, increasing your total supply by some 42 percent. Your beds for the mentally ill have increased by more than one-third. You now have over twice as many beds for patients with chronic diseases. The number of your public health centers has almost doubled. You have built a wonderful, new 4-year School of Medicine at the University of Miami, to train your own sons and daughters in medicine and meet the shortage of doctors. Even now you are building a second fine School of Medicine at the University of Florida at Gainesville. These are but a few of your splendid achievements in providing facilities for better medical care.

The construction of your splendid facilities would not have been possible but for the fact that your Blue Cross and Blue Shield were moving simultaneously to bring hospital and medical care within the financial reach of more and more of your people and to assure to your new hospitals a steady source of income. Your Blue Cross plan, though one of the youngest in the Nation, has done a splendid job within the 10 years of its life. Today almost a half million of your people have hospital insurance protection under the plan. Your Blue Cross is now paying hospitals in Florida at the rate of some $5½ million a year.

Your Blue Cross has consistently expanded its benefits, quite often with no increase in subscription rates. Such expansion of benefits is made possible because the operating expense of your Blue Cross has been consistently held down. Today it is approximately 8.7 percent.

What Blue Cross has been able to do for hospital bills, Blue Shield has begun to do for doctor bills. Enrollment in your Blue Shield—established only 8 years ago—now totals almost 400,000 subscribers. And last year it paid doctors in Florida some $2½ million. Its cost of operation, because it is so closely integrated with the work of Blue Cross, is very low, less than 11 percent.

Both plans provide for reciprocity of enrollment with free transfer from the plan in one State to the plan in another. Blue Cross provides for reciprocity of service benefits so that a New York subscriber in this beautiful vacation land and can get the care that he needs here just as a Floridian can in New York.

Some 90 million Americans today have some type of hospital prepayment protection. Blue Cross alone in the United States has presently enrolled over 46 million persons and new members are being enrolled at the rate of almost 3,000 a day. More than 29 million persons are protected by Blue Shield and its membership is growing by over 2,000 a day. Still more millions are enrolled in other types of surgical and medical insurance.

These facts demonstrate that the American people stand ready to meet reasonable costs of illness. They demonstrate that—in voluntary prepayment plans—we have found the proper instrumentality through which the normally healthy individual may provide himself protection against the cost of possible illness—the instrumentality for easing the burden on his family by distributing the financial hazards of illness.

This is, indeed, a day of rejoicing for, in truth, you are on the way to realizing the dream of bringing the benefits of modern hospital and medical care to all your people, and you are seeing the dream come true within the framework and the pattern of our free system of American medicine.

To each of you who has devoted himself so untiringly, so unselfishly, and so generously to the task—to Mr. H. A. Schroder, the splendid executive director, and the other splendid officers and directors of your Blue Cross and Blue Shield, representing hospitals, the medical profession, labor, management, and the general public—I extend heartiest congratulations. I rejoice with you and with all the people of Florida over the work that has been done.

Appreciating your fine accomplishments in Blue Cross and Blue Shield and without minimizing or detracting in any way from them, let me suggest that the real test is in the future. It is not enough to have fine hospitals and wonder drugs and good doctors just for some of the people.

We must now look ahead to the challenges presented to all of us who are interested in meeting the health needs of the people.

There is the need to protect a larger segment of the population, and there is need to provide more and broader benefits to those persons who already have protection. The actions by your Blue Shield last year—increasing coverage and raising the income limits for full service—are further proof of the conscientious, devoted manner in which you are tackling these problems, and again I congratulate you.

Most persons now protected have been reached through group enrollment. We must find ways and means of enrolling many others—farmers and people in rural areas, the self-employed, people employed in small groups where there may be less than five persons working for the same employer. Farmers today have access to health insurance policies on an individual basis only. The result is increased cost and limited benefits.

We must consider those groups among the population who are least able to purchase health insurance and those we know definitely are unable to do so. Here we are talking about the aged, retired, temporarily unemployed, and the various classifications generally included under the nonwage and low-income categories running down through the indigent group. The aged present not only an important problem but one which is increasing.

The urgency for developing adequate means for hospital and medical care for our indigent population was given new emphasis at the National Convention of the American Medical Association in San Francisco last week.

I agree with Dr. Walter Martin, the incoming president of the association, who told the delegates that enough progress has not yet been made in providing "an orderly and generally acceptable way of meeting the needs of those who are not able to care for themselves by direct payments or under an insurance program."

The attention which our doctors are devoting to this problem is shown by the action of the Medical Society of New Jersey at its 188th annual meeting in Trenton the week before the AMA's national convention in San Francisco. The Medical Society of New Jersey declared:

"The most urgent problem in the distribution of medical care is that relating to the provision of medical and hospital care for elderly and aged, disabled, physically and mentally handicapped, indigent, medically indigent, unemployable, and employed persons for whom adequate medical and hospital care cannot be provided by established prepaid sickness-insurance plans operated upon sound insurance principles."

I suggest that the solution lies in a voluntary partnership arrangement between the Federal Government, State and local governments, hospitals, doctors, and local citizen groups with prepayment health plans. It is this kind of partnership that has proven so sound and so successful in the building of hospitals and other health facilities under the Hill-Burton Act. I have proposed in the voluntary health insurance bill, which I am sponsoring in Congress, that this same partnership arrangement be extended to voluntary health insurance.

Many people we include in the sweeping generalization of more than 90 million people protected by health insurance have inadequate protection. This inadequacy may be measured by the extent of debts incurred, funds borrowed, and the financial hardships which result to families because their hospital and medical expenses exceed the protection covered by their insurance.

The potential catastrophe for millions of families is being met by your plans today. Certainly we realize this is true when we hear that every 80 minutes of every working day—1 major Blue Cross plan in the Nation pays a bill of $1,000 or more. It is evident that the first catastrophe for the millions of Americans who are not protected is their lack of insurance when illness strikes.

I wonder, however, whether we know how many of the families who have availed themselves of your protection continue to suffer financial catastrophe in illness. It is incumbent upon each and every Blue Cross and Blue Shield plan to seek out the answer to this question, that the solution may be found.

We hear much of "comprehensive care" as the term applies to medical services. A study by Health Information Foundation reveals that the so-called normal items of medical care accumulate for a fairly large number of families to the point of becoming a major expense. These are the families that want and need a comprehensive health-insurance program.

As we move forward to meet the different problems, we know that insurance principles are important and must be considered carefully. We should recall, however, that much of what is already being done is being done in spite of insurance principles, and we should regard insurance principles as guides and not as limitations upon our thinking and our planning.

As we strive to hold down premiums, there should be no resort to cutting and reducing benefits or coverage, for to do so would defeat the very ends we seek.

Dr. Edward McCormick, retiring president of the American Medical Association, at its convention in San Francisco last week called upon the doctors to set up average fee schedules on an area basis. "Such area-wide fee scheduling would," Dr. McCormick declared, "markedly accelerate the expansion of hospital and medical-insurance programs."

Let me express the hope that there will be no turning away from the principle of service benefits. Rather let us hope that Blue Shield plans will generally move further in the direction of guaranteeing service benefits to the people.

Hospitals likewise face a need for readjustment and are making them. The Blue Cross offers its subscribers a service contract as it should, but this places certain responsibilities upon hospitals to deal fairly with the plan, recognizing the benefits it brings to them.

The employer faces a new responsibility to help his employees provide for themselves the means for adequate medical care.

There is a continuing challenge to labor unions, which constitute natural groupings, to make use of the union itself as an instrumentality for the extension of coverage to its members.

Finally, the individual employee has his responsibility to his employer, his family, and to his community. He must do his full part.

As we celebrate the 10th anniversary of your Blue Cross of Florida we look to new horizons, and the possibilities challenge the imagination. My message to you tonight is that you approach them with the vision of that great Frenchman, L'Enfant, whose genius turned a swamp into the most beautiful of all American cities—Washington, the Nation's Capital. We remember that he said, "Make no little plans; they have no magic to stir men's blood."

Let us remember that as we build hospitals and health facilities, as we bring the benefits of hospital and medical care to our people, we are building the health and strength of our people. We are building the strength of America. We are making America strong that we may keep America free.

Select Committee To Investigate the Conduct of the Junior Senator from Wisconsin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON
OF COLORADO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 17, 1954

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article published in the Grand Junction (Colo.) Sentinel of August 10, 1954, entitled "JOHNSON Accepts Task To Pay 'Debt'." The article was written by George S. Holmes and portrays a true picture of the way each of the six members of the new McCarthy hearing really feel.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JOHNSON ACCEPTS TASK TO PAY "DEBT"

(By George S. Holmes)

WASHINGTON.—For three full terms, EDWIN C. JOHNSON, of Colorado, has been a Member of the United States Senate. To him, that membership has been both an honor and a privilege. His personal veneration of its history and traditions and its commanding place in world affairs, as well as his respect and affection for his colleagues of these past 17 years, amount to an obsession.

Now he is bowing out voluntarily, but not without a final gesture that may well be the culminating act of his congressional career—service on the McCarthy investigating committee.

When the Senator asserts that he is answering the call of duty in accepting this tedious and unpleasant assignment, his statement, in the opinion of this reporter, may be taken at face value.

JOHNSON believes he owes it to the Senate to undertake this last, but most vital job. It will give him an opportunity of repaying, in a way, the debt of gratitude he feels toward his colleagues and the powerful forum in which he has spent the happiest years of his long public service.

So far as Senator JOHNSON is concerned, it is the Senate, not an individual, on trial. Its honor, prestige, and dignity are at stake. According to the Coloradan's creed, they must be preserved. The charges are that they have been degraded by the conduct of one Member. The task of determining the truth of these accusations may be a nasty one but it must be done.

That is why the senior Senator from Colorado, who has a heavy campaign of his own confronting him at home, in the race for governor, has consented to serve on the investigating committee.

"I voted for the appointment of such a committee," said JOHNSON, "and I could not run out on it when asked to serve. I am going to do the best I can and do not know when I shall be able to go home. I am prepared, however, to see this thing through to the end. Speed is not the first consideration.

"This is a very serious matter. The dignity of the Senate is involved. The Senate, not an individual, is on trial. If the prestige and standing of the Senate have been impaired, they must be restored. This is a dry-cleaning process but somebody must do it. I did not seek the assignment, but neither would I refuse it when pressed upon me.

"It may take a little while but it will be worth it. There is one thing I cannot stand—any reflection whatsoever upon the honor and integrity of the United States Senate."

Declaring his impartiality in the case, JOHNSON declared:

"I came into this matter with a clear conscience and I will come out with a clear conscience."

Youngtimers in Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 17, 1954

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Democratic Digest entitled "Youngtimers in Politics." The article follows:

HOW TO WIN FRIENDS AND ELECTIONS—A STORY OF YOUNGTIMERS IN POLITICS

How does youth go about the task of making itself politically effective?

Ask the Young Democrats of Mahoning County, Ohio, who have turned a moribund organization into an alert club that puts a worthwhile sum into the party's war chest, enlivens election campaigns, and develops political leaders.

Lesson No. 1 of this success story is the Art of Getting Started, which in the Mahoning instance involves such unrelated but universally delightful diversions as baseball, baton-twirling, and eating Baked Alaska. It's a phase of political action which combines work and play in agreeable proportions, as you will learn if you talk to any one of a group of earnest young Americans who are veterans of the Mahoning movement—Tommy Pachell, Joe Garea, Maggie Farragher, Michael Pope, Martha Horvat, Frank Battisti, Carmine Fortunato, and a good many others.

Mahoning County nestles in a valley near the northeastern tip of Ohio. Its largest city is Youngstown, a bustling cosmopolitan area, shaded by the Allegheny foothills and the smoke from its giant steel mills. It is in Youngstown where most of the story takes place.

Four years ago, the Young Democrats Club of Mahoning County was, in the words of its then president, Tommy Pachell, "in a coffee-and-doughnuts era." The treasury was flat, the membership was small. This year they staged a banquet that promises to become a legend hereabouts. In addition to being what the society editor called a success—"a good time was had by all"—it produced a campaign fund big enough to carry the club's own responsibilities and cover a generous contribution to the national party to help elect Democrats to Congress from other States.

In the last 4 years, these young men and women (median age 27) have built up an organization totaling 420 paid members and helped to elect qualified young candidates to the city administration.

The Young Democrats Club, founded in 1930, did not attempt its first Jefferson-Jackson fund-raising dinner until 4 years ago. The idea came from a small group of young men and girls, over coffee and doughnuts in the Purple Cow Coffee Shop in Youngstown's comfortable Pick-Ohio Hotel.

"Some people said we were crazy to attempt it," recalls Tommy Pachell. "They had told us nobody would come."

First on the agenda, they decided, was to get a speaker who would help to draw a crowd. They turned to their Congressman, MICHAEL J. KIRWAN, for help. That first dinner cleared $285 for the club's treasury from a sale of 345 tickets at $3 each. The Young Democrats of Mahoning County have been turning to MIKE KIRWAN ever since then.

"He's been like a godfather to us," says Joe Garea. "We wouldn't know where to turn without him." In addition to his role of helpful adviser, the Young Democrats find that Congressman KIRWAN's voting record in Congress and his statewide popularity have been good talking points for them in getting support for their various activities.

With the start provided by their first banquet, the Young Democrats jumped into the mayorality campaign that same year. Not rolling in funds, they concentrated on finding inexpensive ways to help make their candidate known.

For instance, Carmine Fortunato's brother was national baton-twirling champion, and that suggested the idea of a line of Democratic majorettes trained by him. The end result was a baton-twirling contest, which drew attention to the club and to the Democratic candidate, who was photographed with the contest winner.

Then there was the West Side Merchants' Halloween parade. The Young Democrats entered a float "dedicated to youth," with the pretty majorettes riding through Youngstown's main streets. No one could explain how the Republican incumbent mayor wound up behind the livestock in the parade. As the livestock lumbered slowly through the central section of Youngstown, the Republican mayor stymied behind them, the Young Democrats circulated among the crowd passing out handbills of their candidate. The float won first prize, a $25 war bond, but was later disqualified by the judges because it was entered by a political organization. The Democratic candidate for mayor lost out that year, but that campaign activity encouraged the Young Democrats to go on.

"Incidentally, that cost us money," recalled Michael Pope, now serving his second term as president of the organization. "And we were operating out of our own pockets."

At the next regular monthly meeting, the fund-raising problem was attacked more purposefully. The group decided on an excursion that would appeal to young people. A chartered train to Cleveland was quickly arranged to catch the double header between the Indians and Boston Red Sox. It was a good ball game, and a lot of fun, but the club lost $100 on the project by not allowing enough time for ticket sales.

That lark was a profitable experience, however. What the club lost in money was offset by a new membership and growing interest in the organization. The next venture was a fashion show, aimed at bringing more girls into the club. It was staged by Maggie Farragher, cost accountant at McKelvey's Department Store in Youngstown. Again, the membership went up, and the treasury just about held its own. After that came the May Dance, with Martha Horvat as May Queen. That netted a small financial gain but by this time the organizers realized the importance of planning, of a coordinated effort, and of using the talents of just as many members as possible. All of which added up to the memorable Jefferson-Jackson dinner on May 1, 1954.

As everyone who has ever tackled the problem knows, successful planning for a big party dinner corresponds to a planning for a battle. Preparations must start early, as it did in this case—5 months before the affair. Club President Michael Pope named

Carmine Fortunato as chairman, and Maggie Farragher and Frank Battisti, as co-chairmen. There was also a corresponding secretary, a recording secretary, banquet treasurer, publicity chairman, reception committee, entertainment committee and a committee on arrangements. The key to success in this operation was that a large element of the membership was brought in to share responsibility for the affair. There was some confusion, but no end of pressure to get going.

Congressman KIRWAN's advice was requested and, at his suggestion, Congressman SAM RAYBURN from Texas was scheduled to be the banquet speaker.

By mid-March, when the members began their ticket-selling campaign, things began to look a little glum in Youngstown. The steel mills were operating at only 70 percent of their capacity. Unemployment had struck the area. People were worried about their jobs and the future. Would they spend $10 for a dinner?

The answer was provided by resourceful party workers like Mike Pope. With Mahoning County well covered by other ticket sellers, he spent his weekends across the State border in Pennsylvania, overcoming sales resistance.

A question that Joe Garea often encountered when he went to his friends among the mill workers, was: "Why ten bucks for dinner?"

Soft-spoken Joe, a building estimator with a college degree under the GI Bill, replied: "This is our only way of raising money to help elect Democrats. We don't get any big contributions from your steel company, nor from any of the other big steel industries. It's got to come from the little fellows like you."

Martha Horvat, youthful Deputy Sheriff, made the rounds of her fellow workers in the court house, and checked off a sizable ticket sale before starting out at neighborhood door-bell ringing.

The city's young trial attorney, Frank Battisti, talked to businessmen about "MIKE" KIRWAN's voting record and his ability, and the importance of electing a Democratic Congress next November. A lot of effective campaigning was done in the work of selling the dinner as an important step in party building. Yeoman's work in this cause was done by the two vice presidents of the Young Democrats, Marion Alexander and Eugene Fox, corresponding secretary Elbert Smith; Stephen Crea, general chairman of all operating committees; Peter La Polla, and many others.

Some of the ticket orders came by mail from the various nationality groups in Youngstown, as a result of a letter to them in their native language. Friends of the members, and in some cases the fathers and mothers of members, translated letters into Hungarian, Croatian, Czech, Italian, and Greek. Rose Farina and six helpers copied the translations on the club's stationery in a personal appeal for their support.

By the evening of May 1, the largest dining room in the Hotel Pick-Ohio had been oversold and there was still a clamor for tickets.

Eighteen pretty young hostesses had been appointed for the banquet, under the direction of Rosann Kubilis. They were swamped by the crowd when the hotel doors swung open. Guests too late for tickets stood around waiting for the program to follow the dinner.

The weeks and months of planning had paid off. As the head table guests filed in, the band struck up "The Eyes of Texas Are Upon You," in honor of Speaker RAYBURN. The program went off with the precision of a TV show, thanks to a rehearsal the night before. Along with Mr. RAYBURN as principal speaker, there was an address by Congressman KIRWAN, an introduction by visiting dignitaries, a welcoming address, a brief history of the club by Mike Kirwan, Jr., and community singing. State candidates from as far away as Cincinnati (270 miles) were in the audience and some 28 newspaper and radio correspondents were seated with the diners.

The Young Democrats Club of Mahoning Couhty today is a well-organized and influential group, which has gained the respect of the community and the admiration of such old-timers as County Chairman Jack Sulligan, who says: "They're doing a good job and I'm happy to cooperate. After all, we are all working toward the same goal."

"We are always looking for political news, and this group of young Democrats makes news," says reporter Clingan Jackson of the Youngstown Vindicator.

An alumnus of this club is the present Democratic mayor of Youngstown, Frank Kryzan, former president of the group, who has just turned 41.

"They won't let me vote any more," said the mayor, "because I'm beyond their age limit of 40." But he proudly displays his life membership card, entitling him to attend Young Democratic meetings.

Jack Nybell, 31-year-old finance director of the city, is a member of the executive committee of the Young Democrats of Mahoning County.

Frank Battisti, another Young Democrat, is trial attorney for the city at the age of 31.

The Young Democrats have, as Attorney Battisti puts it, "thoroughly destroyed the myth that you've got to be an old-timer to take part in politics."

Internal Revenue Code of 1954

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 17, 1954

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission to extend my remarks, it is a pleasure to present an explanation of H. R. 8300, now the tax revision law.

The new tax revision bill, which President Eisenhower signed into a law today, is the most monumental legislative undertaking in the history of the Congress. It is the first comprehensive revision of the internal revenue laws since before the turn of the century and the enactment of the income tax.

Approximately a half a million man-hours of work have gone into this gigantic achievement. Over 3,000 changes in the revenue laws are contained in the revision measure. In general, the purpose of these changes has been to remove inequities, to end harrassment of the taxpayer, and to reduce tax barriers to future expansion of production and employment.

The new law closes over 50 loopholes through which taxpayers today can avoid paying their fair share of taxes. It contains $827 million relief for individuals and $536 million relief for business. In addition, the new law will extend the present 52-percent corporate income for 1 year which means an additional $1.2 billion tax on business. This increased tax on business practically pays for all the tax relief granted so that the net cost to the revenue will be only $163 million.

Without attempting to give a technical interpretation, the following represents some of the highlights of the new tax law. These changes in general are effective last January 1 so that the taxpayers will receive the benefit from them this year.

DEPENDENTS

A parent can claim a deduction of $600 if the parent furnishes more than half of the child's support, if he is under 19, or if over 19, if attending school or college or receiving on-the-farm training. The same deduction can be claimed for a foster child or one awaiting adoption. A taxpayer can claim $600 deduction for any person supported in his home or a relative institutionalized because of physical or mental disability. An aged parent or other dependent cared for by several members of the family can be claimed by one member of the family. Saving to taxpayers: $85 million.

CHILD-CARE EXPENSES

A widow or a single working parent is allowed a deduction of $600 for expenses of child care for children up to 12 years of age. A married woman is allowed the same deduction if her husband is incapacitated or if the combined income of her husband and herself does not exceed $5,100. The same deduction is allowed with respect to any dependent regardless of age who is mentally or physically incapable to care for himself. Saving to taxpayers: $130 million.

MEDICAL EXPENSES

Medical expenses can be deducted when they exceed 3 percent of income instead of 5 percent as under present law. For instance, a family with $3,000 gross income and medical expenses of $150 will be able to deduct $60. They can deduct nothing today. The bill doubles the present maximum limit on the amount that can be deducted. Saving to taxpayers: $80 million.

HEAD OF FAMILY

A single taxpayer who has a dependent son or daughter will be entitled during the first 2 years after the death of his spouse to the same income-splitting privilege as is accorded married couples. A single individual can receive half the benefits of income splitting if he has a dependent parent and if the taxpayer maintains a household for the father or mother. Saving to taxpayers: $11 million.

RETIREMENT-INCOME CREDIT

All retired people 65 and over including schoolteachers, firemen, policemen, and civil servants, will in effect be exempt on all retirement income up to $1,200. This means a tax reduction up to $240 per year. For example, a retired single individual over 65 who has a total retirement income of $3,000 today pays about $300 in income tax. Under the new law his tax is reduced to $60. The same exemption will extend to individuals under 65 if they receive a pension from a public retirement system, such as to teachers. Saving to taxpayers: $141 million.

CREDIT PURCHASES

The law allows a deduction for interest up to 6 percent on installment purchases. Savings to taxpayers: $10 million.

CHARITABLE CONTRIBUTIONS

The law increases from 20 to 30 percent the allowable deductions to churches, hospitals, and educational institutions. Saving to taxpayers: $25 million.

AID TO FARMERS

Deductions up to 25 percent of farm income are allowed for soil and water conservation, and it permits more rapid write-off of the expense of farm machinery, equipment, and construction. It removes tax on proceeds of sale of cattle when sale is necessitated by disease. Saving to taxpayers: $10 million.

SICKNESS AND ACCIDENT PLANS

Premiums paid by employers to health and accident plans will not be taxable to their employees. All accident and health benefits paid as reimbursement for actual medical expenses to employees, their wives and children, are completely exempt from tax. Payments to employees for loss of wages due to injury or illness are exempt up to $100 a week. Saving to taxpayers: No estimate possible.

DEATH BENEFITS

The law exempts all death benefits up to $5,000 paid by an employer to the widow or other beneficiary of an employee. Saving to taxpayers: No estimate possible.

PENSIONS AND ANNUITIES

In addition to the $1,200 exemption extended to retirement income, the law also provides a simpler method for taxation of pensions and annuities, ends annual 3 percent tax paid on annuities and provides instead a method of computing tax on basis of cost divided by years of life expectancy. Saving to taxpayers: $10 million.

DIVIDEND CREDIT

Excludes first $50 in dividends from taxation and provides a credit against tax equal to 4 percent of the balance. For instance, an individual with $250 in dividends from his savings will exclude the first $50 entirely, and then reduce his total tax by $8—4 percent of the balance of $200. Saving to taxpayers: $204 million.

DEPRECIATION

The law permits the more liberal write-off of the cost of new equipment. For example, in the first year of life of new equipment, the taxpayer will be able to write off twice the amount now allowed. Saving to taxpayers: $375 million.

DECLARATION OF ESTIMATED TAX

The requirements are eased for filing declarations of estimated tax. Upward of a million taxpayers will be relieved of the present requirement for filing. Tax returns will be due April 15 instead of March 15.

METHODS OF ACCOUNTING

The law brings tax-accounting rules into harmony with business accounting, thereby eliminating to a great extent the necessity for taxpayers to maintain two sets of books. It provides realistic computation of net income for tax purposes in conformity with sound business practices. Saving to taxpayers: $47 million.

NET OPERATING LOSS

The law extends the net operating loss carryback to 2 years and makes certain other adjustments. Saving to taxpayers: $120 million.

IMPROPER ACCUMULATIONS

The law eases the penalty tax on certain accumulated earnings in order that business, especially small businesses, may have greater freedom in retaining their funds for legitimate business purposes. Saving to taxpayers: $10 million.

CORPORATION INCOME TAX

The law extends for 1 year the present 52-percent corporation income tax. Total increase in revenue: $1.2 billion.

The 10-percent reduction in Federal income taxes which went into effect last January 1 saves individual taxpayers a total of $3 billion annually. This tax cut would not have been possible if the Congress and the administration had not cut the Truman budget for fiscal 1954 by $12 billion. Nor would the $2 billion tax saving by elimination of the excess-profits tax have been possible without this budget cutting. The excise-tax reduction law saves taxpayers an additional $1 billion. The tax-revision act will save taxpayers $1,400,000,000.

The overall tax-cut program will save $7,400,000,000. Of this amount, individuals receive an overall total tax saving of $4,700,000,000. The tax saving so far surpasses any previous total in the history of Congress.

Railroad Retirement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD H. POFF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 17, 1954

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, on July 30, 1954, this House passed the bill H. R. 7840, which makes some few meritorious changes in the Railroad Retirement Act, but which at the same time increases the monthly tax base, at the expense of both the employee and the company, from $300 to $350. By reason of a previous appointment with the chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, I was not on the floor when this vote was cast, and I was very much surprised to learn from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the next day that it was a unanimous vote of both Democrats and Republicans of 360 to 0.

I have just returned from a brief visit to the Sixth District of Virginia, which I have the honor to represent, and while there I had an opportunity to talk at some length with several of my good friends among the railroad workers. Mr. Speaker, I can personally testify that they are bitterly disappointed at the action of Congress in sidetracking H. R. 5269 for H. R. 7840. The chief complaints are:

First. No provision was made to lower the retirement age from 65 to 60 after 30 years' service or to any age after 35 years' service.

Second. No provision was made to install the "5 best years" rule.

Third. H. R. 7840 provided only indirect and incidental benefits—not to the worker himself but principally to his survivors.

Fourth. H. R. 7840 does not provide any benefits for nearly 290,000 retired employees or 260,000 other beneficaries already on the retirement rolls.

Fifth. H. R. 7840 does not increase the benefits of the 36 to 40 percent of railroad workers who are earning less than $300 per month.

Sixth. The increase in the taxable wage will cost the employee who earns as much as $350 an additional $37.50 a year, while his anuity will be increased by only 69 cents for the first year's service.

This great disappointment and dissatisfaction of the individual railroad workers demonstrates once more the validity of the old adage, "Haste makes waste." A review of the legislative record will disclose that this measure was hurriedly scheduled, debated, and passed by the House on July 30. It was referred to the Senate Labor Committee on July 31. It was received by that committee on August 1. Without ever having been referred for consideration to the Subcommittee on Railroad Retirement, it was preemptorily and without deliberate debate ordered reported in the closing minutes of the executive closed-door session of the full Senate Labor Committee on August 2.

Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to infer that there has been a purposeful attempt to mislead the Congress or to stampede it into faulty legislation. We are in the closing hours of a long and busy session, and I choose to think that this haste has been the product of adjournment confusion. But whatever the cause of the haste, I am persuaded that given more time for careful research and analytical debate, Congress could have written a bill which would have been more responsive to the will of the people who own the fund we administer as trustees.

DISTRIBUTION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

To the Vice President and each Senator 100 copies; to the Secretary and Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, each, 25 copies; to the Secretary, for official use, not to exceed 35 copies; to the Sergeant at Arms, for use on the floor of the Senate, not to exceed 50 copies; to each Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress, 66 copies; to the Clerk, Sergeant at Arms, and Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives, each, 25 copies; to the Clerk, for official use, not to exceed 50 copies; and to the Doorkeeper, for use on the floor of the House of Representatives, not to exceed 75 copies; to the Vice President and each Senator, Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress there shall also be furnished (and shall not be transferable), 3 copies of the daily RECORD, of which 1 shall be delivered at his residence, 1 at his office, and 1 at the Capitol.

Appendix

Our Small Business Administration Is Assisting Our National Economy To Grow Stronger and To Stabilize Our Home-Owned-and-Operated Business Firms

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM S. HILL

OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 18, 1954

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Select Committee on Small Business, I would like to take this occasion to summarize some of the more important activities of the committee in aiding small business, the economic backbone of the Nation.

As you know, our committee was established to investigate the problems of small business to determine whether the potentialities of small business are being adequately developed, or whether any factors are hindering its development, and also whether Government agencies are adequately and equitably serving the needs of small business.

One of the most important and beneficial investigations we conducted during the 83rd Congress was on Federal taxation. Realizing that taxes were proving a heavy burden for small-business men we made specific recommendations for tax relief, many of which have now been effected, either by legislation or by permitting tax laws to expire.

Our committee recommended that the automatic decrease in income tax on January 1, 1954, be permitted to go into effect. We also recommended that the excess-profits tax be permitted to expire.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud that the 83d Congress permitted the expiration of the excess-profits tax and the reduction in personal income tax. These reductions have been of great benefit to many hard-pressed businessmen, and they were possible only because of the economies and careful spending of the Eisenhower administration.

Our committee made other tax recommendations with an eye toward giving tax relief and providing encouragement and incentives for small-business men. Some of these recommendations, now in large part enacted into law in the tax revision act of 1954, are:

First. Increased depreciation through the declining balance method.

Second. Relief for small corporations from the plan to make tax payments current.

Third. Option for deductions of research and development expenditures.

Fourth. Relief from surplus accumulations now considered under section 102 of the Internal Revenue Code.

Fifth. Additional year added to carry back provisions considered in computing net operating loss deductions.

Sixth. Relief, through exemptions and partial credits, from double taxation of dividends.

Many people in the mining areas of my State of Colorado and of the West in general have felt the disruptive, depressing effect of lead and zinc dumping in this country by foreign countries. As a result of this dumping which in large part took the domestic market away from domestic producers, our committee held hearings in four western cities to study the problem.

Industry members testified before the committee that foreign lead and zinc can be produced more cheaply than domestic metal and, as a result, marketed in this country at a price which would be unprofitable and uneconomic for the domestic industry. They also testified that higher average grade ore, lower labor costs and devaluation of foreign currencies have all acted to permit profitable exports to the United States even when market prices were low.

The lead and zinc industry in this country has unquestionably been hurt by these practices, but I am happy to say today that the Office of Defense Mobilization, due at least in part to our efforts and investigations, is now buying only domestic lead and zinc for the strategic stockpile.

Another activity of the Committee on Small Business is a continuing investigation of Government competition with private business. One of the most alarming trends in government over the past 20 years has been the steady encroachment of Government commercial and industrial activities in fields which properly belong to private industry.

For instance, the Armed Forces now have 28 scrap metal baling facilities, 5 coffee-roasting plants, 2 paint factories, 5 motion-picture studios, 74 bakeries, and 97 laundries. That is only a partial list, but the point is that small-business men could perform those activities probably with better service and in most cases at a lower cost. Private businessmen pay taxes while Government industries do not.

The Eisenhower administration is trying to reverse this trend, and is trying to take the Government out of as many business activities as possible whenever they are in competition with private, taxpaying industries. This is a policy in which our committee is happy to participate.

I would like to discuss a piece of legislation the Select Committee on Small Business initiated.

One of the more important pieces of legislation enacted during the 83d Congress was the Small Business Act of 1953. This law created the Small Business Administration whose purpose it is to give small business a permanent and independent voice in the Federal Government.

The new agency, as conceived by the Congress, not only assumed the function of the Small Defense Plants Administration and the loan functions of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, as they pertain to small business, but broadened the scope of Government assistance to small business. The agency is now concerned with all members of the small business community instead of imposing the limitation on those involved in defense production.

The SBA received its legislative beginning on March 18, 1953 when I introduced a bill to establish the agency and "preserve small business institutions and free competitive enterprise."

SBA offers three major types of assistance to small firms. The first and probably the most important is in making business loans to any small business that meets certain basic credit requirements. The agency is primarily interested in making loans where credit would not otherwise be available to a deserving businessman.

Secondly, SBA offers assistance to small businesses in procuring Government contracts. It carries on a program of joint determination with the Department of Defense to earmark procurements, where possible, for exclusive performance by small business. This program has been of tangible assistance to hundreds of small firms.

The third SBA function, management and technical assistance, is being put into effect by setting up extension courses on such subjects as analyzing current sales and distribution, cost estimating, production problems, and effective managerial organizations.

In closing, I would like to deal briefly with a statement made by Edward F. Howrey, chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, before the Select Committee on Small Business, July 14, 1954.

Mr. Howrey stated that "small business has an essential, economic, and human role in American life. All inequitable handicaps should be eliminated so that small firms may grow in a healthy way and compete more effectively with their bigger competitors."

Mr. Howrey has established a Small Business Division in the FTC in recognition of the important role of small business in this economy. Small-business men may go to this divison for advice and information regarding legal matters under the jurisdiction of the Commission.

Mr. Howrey assured the committee that "while the Federal Trade Commission supervises the competitive practices of both small and big business, we are fully aware of our duty to make a special effort to protect small business from predatory practices."

Where Man Conquers the Handicap: Not Handicap, the Man

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDGAR A. JONAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 18, 1954

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, much has been said about encouraging the gainful employment of the physically handicapped and in acknowledgment of the importance of such an effort the Congress has authorized and appropriated for Federal efforts in that direction. However, nothing so eloquently speaks for the wisdom of such a program as an actual demonstration of how a person, seemingly handicapped, can rise to a prominent position in his business and in the community in which he resides.

Appended hereto, from the August 8, 1954, issue of Parade, is an article by Jonas H. Mayer, a leading resident of Chicago, whose own story of how he conquered the handicap of deafness to rise to success should be an inspiration to his fellow Americans similarly afflicted and a lesson to us all of the great accomplishments possible by the so-termed physically handicapped:

How I Conquered My Deafness

(By Jonas H. Mayer, vice president in charge of sales, American Linen Supply Co.)

CHICAGO.—I love to go to the opera. Maybe that sounds odd, coming from a man who has been stone deaf for 37 years. But I know all the arias, I can read the lips of the singers and I can follow the action, since I still have my eyes. And I have an advantage over other operagoers. If the tenor is sour, they still have to listen, but I always hear Caruso.

I think my deafness has been as much a blessing to me as a handicap. When I lost my hearing after my plane was shot down in World War I, I could have retreated from the world and brooded. Certainly it was a rude jolt. But it didn't take me long to find out that a motor can miss on one cylinder and still do a good job. So I thought: Why not a human being?

The news that I was to live out my life in a soundless world completely changed my pattern of thinking. I had a deeper appreciation of the senses that remained; I was more than ever determined that I wouldn't be held down. After 37 years of what the rest of the world would call "being handicapped," I can say that there is no such thing as a handicap—unless it's a lack of courage.

Courage every deaf person needs, because he must tackle a formidable enemy: himself. Many deaf persons are sensitive almost to the point of a persecution complex. A dinner guest turns his head to talk to the woman at his elbow; immediately the thought flashes through the deaf person's mind, "They're talking about me." If the woman laughs, there is a chill around the heart and the feeling, "They're laughing at me because I'm deaf."

Like every deaf person, I felt these twinges and stabs of pain at first. Then I took stock of myself. In conversation, my head swiveled quite a bit, but it wasn't because I was deliberately turning my back on someone to exchange gossip about them. It was a perfectly natural movement. The feeling of being the butt of jokes ebbed away.

Once I had a good grip on myself, the next step was to learn to hear again. By that I mean lipreading. Those who think lipreading a kind of black magic are badly misled. It's long, it's tedious, but it's rewarding in the end. I can compare it best to learning to type—the lessons don't take too long, but the practice goes on forever. Today I can lipread in five languages.

In business, being without my hearing has never thrown me for a loss. An attorney once worked with me for 2 days before I missed something he said. Then I told him I was deaf. He was astounded.

"I'm going back and tell my partners," he said, "that I worked with a fellow who was deaf as a post—but a heck of a long way from being dumb."

DON'T PLAY FOR SYMPATHY

When you get that kind of respect, you feel that the whole battle has been worthwhile. Of course, I don't mean using deafness as a crutch, or a play for sympathy. No person in his right mind wants sympathy. I've never asked more than to be treated like everyone else, without pity and without bumbling helpfulness. I think I can take care of myself, in business or anywhere else.

To those of you who are blessed with normal hearing: If you want to help a deaf person, talk as quietly, slowly, and intelligibly as you can. But don't make him conscious of your help. That applies to all the "handicapped." Tell the blind man, "There are three steps here," but don't lead him.

There are millions more like me in this country. There are many, many more who are losing their hearing, but won't admit it. My advice to them is: Face up to it. Then adapt your life to fit the situation—it's not half so difficult as you think.

I have a happy family, a devoted wife, and a successful business life. I swim, hunt, fish, dance, drive a car, fly a plane. What do I miss? I can answer—and mean it sincerely: Not a thing.

Exploding an Athletic Myth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT P. MORANO
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 18, 1954

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, for as far back as my memory takes me, I have been subjected to tales of the fantastic athletic prowess of the modern race of supermen which the western part of our country reportedly was producing.

I do not wish, at this time, either to confirm or refute this claim, but I do think that a story appearing in this morning's sports pages speaks for itself.

A delegation of boys from a city in my district, Stamford, Conn.—just a normal, healthy group of youngsters deprived of the wonders of western environment—met with a team from Visalia, Calif., the pride of my colleague from the great sunshine State, HARLAN HAGEN, in the opening of the third annual Babe Ruth world series at Griffith Stadium.

The Stamford boys trounced the Californians by the decisive score of 8 to 1. Our pitcher, Andy Wasil, tossed rings around the Visalians, striking out 13 of them and pitching a near shutout.

Now I am sure I will be hearing more boasting from my colleagues from the great far west. However, the performance of my little league ballplayers last night will always bear testimony to the undeniable fact that the East is still the major league in sports, and, let us face it, the West is still the cradle of the minors.

Following is an account of the game which appeared in the Washington Post:

Wasil Fans 13—Stamford Wins in Ruth Series

The third annual Babe Ruth "world series" was launched yesterday at Griffith Stadium as the two-time defending champs from Samford, Conn., pounded out an 8 to 1 decision over Visalia, Calif., in the nightcap of a twin bill.

Stamford struck quickly for 2 runs in the second, added 3 more in the third, and never was headed.

The champions' much-sought-after pitching phenom, Andy Wasil, effectively scattered four hits to record the victory. Wasil, a husky speedballer, fanned 13 and walked in the only Visalia run in the fourth to ruin his bid for a shutout.

STAMFORD	AB	H	O	A
Fancl, 3b	3	0	1	1
Lione, ss	4	2	0	1
Robotti, cf	3	2	1	0
Wasil, p	2	1	0	1
Pustari, 1b-rf	3	1	1	0
Ferrara, c	4	2	13	0
Maz'ak, 1b	3	1	3	0
Pagano, rf	1	0	0	0
Yeager, 2b	4	0	2	1
Dim'ro, lf	2	0	0	0
Totals	29	9	21	4

VISALIA	AB	H	O	A
Moore, cf	3	0	1	0
Ba'kley, lf	1	0	2	0
aBet'ton	0	0	0	0
Black, rf	2	0	2	0
bWebb	1	0	0	0
Fischer, c	3	2	4	1
Reyn'a, ss	3	0	0	4
Tre'ler, 3b	3	0	0	1
cTodd	1	0	0	0
Smith, 2b	2	0	3	4
Cutler, 1b	3	1	8	0
Th'pson, p	3	1	1	1
Yates, p	0	0	0	0
Totals	25	4	21	11

aWalked for Barkley in 7th.
bStruck out for Black in 7th.
cStruck out for Tressler in 7th.

Stamford	023	000	3—8
Visalia	000	100	0—1

R—Smith, Fancl, Lione 2, Robotti 2, Wasil, Postari, Ferrara. E—Lione, Fancl, Ferrara, Tressler, Smith. RBI—Mazurak, Pustari, Barkley, Robotti, Ferrara. 2B—Thompson, Lione. S—Robotti, Black, Reynosa. SF—Wasil. DP—Reynosa, Smith and Cutler. L—Stamford 6, Visalia 11, BB—Thompson 3, Wasil 6. SO—Thompson 2, Wasil 13. Yates 1. HO—Thompson 9 in 6⅓, Yates 0 in ⅔. R-ER—Wasil 1-0, Thompson 8-7, Yates 0-0. HBP—Thompson (Pustari). WP—Thompson. B—Thompson, Wasil. U—Stevens, Edmondson, Beller. T—2:13.

Penalties for Membership in the Communist Party

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 16, 1954

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, the 208 Members of the House of Representatives who voted on yesterday to provide penalties for membership in the Communist Party recognized that the time has come to really face the issue of this foreign conspiracy in our country.

Every intelligent American has recognized for many years that a Communist is an agent for a foreign power. The

Communist Party is not now and never has been a political organization.

During the years that I have been a member of this body I have consistently voted against the Communists. I believe that the vote on yesterday is tremendously significant and indicates that the American people have decided to strike out once and for all against these agents of the Kremlin.

The idea that our vote will be ineffectual and drive the party underground is, of course, ridiculous. It is simply saying that you cannot do anything about a conspiracy in your midst. I know that we can. This bill will be effective.

I believe that the 14 criteria included in the Senate amendment are adequate and will cover any type of subterfuge that the Communist Party might resort to.

I hope that this bill is enacted into law and that it is signed by the President of the United States.

It is very significant indeed that the Senate of the United States voted 85–0 on this measure and the House of Representatives voted 208–100, which well reflects the sentiment of all of the people of the United States.

Veterans' Pensions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 18, 1954

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from Mr. Wayne E. Richards, past commander in chief, Veterans of Foreign Wars:

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D. C., August 17, 1954.

Hon. EDITH N. ROGERS,
Chairman, House Committee on
Veterans' Affairs,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MRS ROGERS: May I take this opportunity and method to personally thank you, as chairman of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and, through you, all members of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, for your splendid cooperation and sympathetic consideration with respect to legislation affecting the welfare of veterans and the dependents of deceased veterans during my term as commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States which ended August 6, 1954.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars is deeply appreciative of the determined fight made by you and your committee to win a much-needed increase in compensation and pension rates for our deserving veterans and the widows and orphans of deceased veterans in the face of what seemed like insurmountable odds at times. I am sure that it was the determined spirit of you and your fine committee, which refused to surrender when the odds were against you and continued the fight, that brought about an increase for the deserving pensioners as well as for the service-disabled.

In spite of the pressing demands for economy and the determination of the national administration to reduce Federal spending, the Veterans of Foreign Wars is pleased with the spirit and cooperation of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs in initiating and getting through the Congress several measures that strengthened and improved the veteran benefit program.

With best wishes and kind personal regards to you and all members of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, I remain

Sincerely yours,

WAYNE E. RICHARDS,
Past Commander in Chief.

Progress in Civil Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDMUND P. RADWAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 14, 1954

Mr. RADWAN. Mr. Speaker, the recent decision to establish the Continental Air Defense Command represents a major step in the long struggle to achieve an adequate defense against any possible attack on the United States. The establishment of this command is, I am sure, most gratifying to the many loyal Americans who have been working to improve our national civil-defense program. It indicates that our military leaders—perhaps for the first time—view with some degree of optimism the problem of defending this Nation against a possible superweapon attack. More than anything else, I believe that it is evidence of the worthwhile nature of civil-defense work itself.

The apathy with which civil defense has been regarded by the public in recent years is notorious. Despite this general indifference, however, many of our civic-minded citizens have worked relentlessly to prepare our communities to withstand the devastating effects of modern superweapons; and the job that they have accomplished is remarkable. To be sure, the task is yet unfinished, but we have come a long way.

Since the passage of the Federal Civil Defense Act in January 1951, two parallel movements to strengthen our home defenses have been underway; and as a result considerable progress has been achieved.

In August 1951 the first of these movements was inaugurated with the establishment of the Lincoln Laboratory at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. This program, officially designated "Project Lincoln," has the mission of conducting research and development work on air defense problems, and is sponsored jointly by the Army, Navy, and Air Force. Its contract is administered by the Air Force.

Also in 1951, the Federal Civil Defense Administration, the National Security Resources Board, and the Department of Defense jointly organized "Project East River" for the purpose of studying civil defense needs. This project was carried out by a group of more than 100 scientists, educators, and businessmen under the sponsorship of Associated Universities, Inc. Its 10-volume report was completed during the summer of 1952. In December 1952, the Secretary of Defense appointed the seven-man group known as the Kelly committee to advise the Department of Defense on continental air-defense problems.

Partly as a result of these two movements—one dealing with military measures, and the other with nonmilitary measures for continental defense—the civil defense program of the United States has been given added significance in our military strategic planning. Civil defense is now recognized as a vital link in our defensive armor.

The progressive military thinking reflected in the newly formulated Continental Air Defense Command has been virtually matched on the civilian side. In the Congress, several bills designed to strengthen civil defense have been introduced during this session, and the creation of a joint congressional committee on civil defense has been proposed. The Federal Civil Defense Administration is currently shifting its headquarters from Washington, D. C., to an area less likely to be a primary target for the enemy, and many industrial organizations are reported to be taking similar precautions. Several large companies, for example, have formulated disaster plans including provisions for alternate headquarters, lines of succession, and emergency supplies and equipment.

These recent developments, it seems to me, should be most encouraging to our State and local civil defense groups throughout the country. It is they who have thus far borne the greatest burden in the struggle for adequate civil defense. And it is principally because of their remarkable effort that the objectives of civil defense now seem possible of attainment. These workers richly deserve the praise and support of us all.

The battle is not yet won. The danger has not abated. But one important phase of the battle has been won, and that phase is what might be termed the struggle to get started. I am confident, Mr. Speaker, that the wheels now rolling will not be slowed by the apathy of the past; no longer will there be a feeling of hopelessness. I feel sure that we can look forward to steadily increasing support for civil defense, and that the gains already won will be more than matched by an aroused American citizenry.

Rebuild the Highways Without Taxation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE S. LONG

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 18, 1954

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article from the Winn Parish Enterprise, a newspaper published in my district by the Honorable B. W. Bailey, which is self-explanatory. Much has been said regarding the building of highways in our Nation in the past few months, and I trust this will be helpful.

The article follows:

Rebuild the Highways Without Taxation

(By B. W. Bailey)

The Federal Bureau of Public Roads is authority for the statement that the highway system in this country embraces more than 3 million miles, and that they are in such a state of depletion that an annual expenditure of $1,600,000,000, not to rebuild, but to repair and keep them open to accommodate the ever-increasing traffic of an expanding commerce, will be required.

All authoritative sources agree that the highways must be rebuilt in such a stable manner as to be able to meet, not only present needs, but also to accommodate the needs of the foreseeable future.

Every yard of the highway system as it stands today was constructed with funds provided by taxation. The roads are worn out, but a very large amount of the obligations issued to secure the funds remains to be liquidated.

Meetings of the highway organizations in a number of States have been recently held for the purpose of determining how the funds for rebuilding the highways may be raised. All of them wind up in the same blind alley, "Where is the money coming from?"

Nothing is more obvious than that it cannot be raised by the orthodox conventional way of taxation. The tax burden is so excessively heavy as matters stand now that tax collections have begun to show diminishing returns. To undertake to add to the already heavy burden the amount necessary to do the job is to invite disaster.

There are just three ways that offer themselves for the rebuilding of the roads.

One is the conventional tax plan that is presently in use. It has proved to be inordinately expensive, and it also carries its limitations. The additional load of taxation that such a plan would impose upon the taxpayer should justly rule it out of consideration. The danger signal is at half-mast.

The toll road idea does not meet the requirements. Aside from its high administrative cost, it is expensive to the motorist, and the toll gates every few miles a nuisance to the traveling public. At the very best it is a patchwork proposition. There are great stretches of country so sparsely settled that the tolls would not pay interest of the bonds. Patchwork never has or never can solve a fundamental problem. The toll-road idea on account of its inadequacy as a continuous unit rules itself out also.

That brings us down to the other plan, and to make it clear it is necessary to look over the background. The estimates run all the way from fifty to one hundred billion dollars necessary for the complete rebuilding of the highways. The Bureau of Public Roads estimates that at present price levels for labor and materials that somewhere between eighty and one hundred billions of dollars would be required to do the job as it should be done, and that under present methods of procedure, 15 years would be required for construction.

There are 180 months in 15 years. Taking an intermediate figure of ninety billions and breaking it down into monthly payments, gives an expenditure of $5 million.

A special issue of Treasury notes, a legal tender for all debts, public and private, of $15 billion would meet the payrolls on the basis above outlined for almost 3 years. This issue to be set aside in a pool to be employed by the Treasury for no purpose other than to pay the vouchers for road construction. The enabling act to provide that as the notes so issued are redeemed they shall be automatically reissued and placed back in the pool to pay incoming vouchers. The redemption after a period of about 3 years would be sufficient to absorb the monthly payrolls.

At the end of the construction period, or at the lapse of 15 years, the entire issue to be permanently reissued or retired at the pleasure of Congress.

Under such a plan as above outlined, or some modification of it, a highway system could be constructed that would meet all requirements of a rapidly growing population and an expanding commerce for years, all without the cost to the taxpayer of a single penny beyond the labor and material cost of the printing which would be less than one-tenth of a penny for each bill printed.

The benefits to society would not stop here. Already there is an army of unemployed of 4 million, and it is being augmented, at least in places. Society is losing the production of these people, amounting to $20 million a day and the unemployed is deprived of the take-home check. The road-building program as outlined would furnish a ready market for the discharged workers. Moline, Ill., and South Bend, Ind., are 2 examples where layoffs amounted to 50 percent of the working force.

In opposition to the adoption of such a plan for the rebuilding of the highways, the cry of inflation would be raised and a lurid picture painted of the damage to be done to the widows and orphans as well as the coupon clippers. The basis upon which the inflation structure rests is 15 percent and 85 percent credit as shown by Government statistics.

All are agreed that the highways must be rebuilt, and that includes the peddlers of doom also. All agree there is no substitute for highways which now handle about 50 percent of the freight and passenger service. They also agree that the economy of the country could not function without the highways.

They also overlook the very important fact that a credit dollar is just as inflationary as a monetary dollar with this difference. The credit dollar bears interest, and not only the interest must be paid but the principal, too, according to the stipulations of the contract, while the monetary dollar bears no interest and the dollar does not have to be paid because no debt was created in the beginning. It was paid out by the Federal Government for services rendered like road construction, flood control, and other items of internal improvement.

And to prove his contention, or so he thinks, he comes up with what he calls a 47 cent dollar when the record shows there is no such a dollar. A dollar is always worth 100 cents, anywhere, any time, any place. It will always pay a hundred cents on any debt, or taxes. It will always buy a hundred cents worth of anything in the market place that is for sale including Government bonds.

The tides ebb and flow, rise and fall, but the shoreline remains constant, so does the price of the dollar, always worth a hundred cents. The price of commodities rise and fall like the tides, but not the price of the dollar. It remains constant like the shoreline, always worth a hundred cents.

There is a little machine buried deep in the hole of the great ocean liner known as gyroscope that keeps giant vessels on an even keel regardless of weather conditions. The legal tender clause in the enabling act that authorized the printing of money is the gyroscope that keep its value on an even keel like the big ocean liner, always at one hundred cents.

Then this prognosticator of the evils of legal tender paper money comes up with what he regards as a knock out, declaring it to be "printing press money", without knowing that that there is no other kind of legal money except printing press money. A solid gold bar is not money in a legal sense, and cannot be until it has been assayed, 10 percent copper added, and passed through the minting machine which is a printing press. The coin must weigh exactly so many pennyweights, and it must contain 90 percent gold and 10 percent copper to qualify as legal money.

And this is not the whole story. There are in circulation this good day no less than $346 million that were issued by Lincoln's first Congress that has met all the requirements, enabled Lincoln to win the War Between the States, served in every capacity that money can legitimately serve, has always been worth a hundred cents, and supported only by the faith and credit of the United States. This is another answer to the "printing press" critic, and the end is not yet, of his opposition.

It is necessary to evaluate the effect a building program of this character, financed as proposed, would have upon the economy of business structure as a whole.

The feeding of $5 million monthly into the channel of trade over a period of 3 years would have little inflationary effect upon the business structure as a whole. The expansion of the business due to the full employment the program would produce would easily absorb the expansion of the added volume of money paid into circulation. Instead of being a deterrent, it would add volume to production and distribution which is the life of a healthy economy.

A further look at the composition of the business structure is necessary for a correct evaluation of the fundamental soundness and stability as a going institution on a colossal scale. It is of profound interest to every citizen, and should be essayed with a cold analytical eye. Should weak points develop, an opportunity to strengthen them once they become obvious should become a necessity not to be delayed.

The statistics quoted below are furnished by governmental agencies and therefore are supposed to reflect the facts that are not questionable.

Here they are:

"At the close of business on December 31, 1933, the combined deposits of the banks in continental United States (round figures), $201 billion; circulation, $30 billion; currency outside the banks, $27 billion." That would leave in vaults of the banks only $3 billion, with outstanding deposits of $201 billion. If all the $30 billion were in the vaults of the banks the ratio of deposits to cash would stand at 201 to 30. But that is not the case. Only $3 billion are in the bank vaults to take care of a debt of $201 billion. To break the figures down still further, using round numbers (implying the $30 billion were all in the vaults, which, of course, they are not), the ratio would stand 15 cents in cash and 85 cents in credit. On the whole, there are just 15 cents on the dollar that could be realized should all loans be called at the same time.

These statistics are not quoted to create a feeling of panic in the mind of anyone. Do not reach for the checkbook and rush down to the bank and withdraw your deposit. It's just as safe today as it was yesterday, and will be as safe tomorrow as it was today, in the absence of the development of such a cataclysm as the stock-market crash in 1929.

The business structure of this country could well be likened to an inverted pyramid standing on its apex represented by 30 while the top represented by 201.

A building sought to be constructed by such dimensions would not stand up till the last nail was driven or the last brick was in place. It is no wonder the business structure as it stands today begins to totter when an ill wind begins to blow.. The base cries for widening and strengthening with the top restricted. To put it in different language: More monetary dollars and a drastic reduction in credit.

The adoption of the plan above outlined, or some derivation of it, would give the business structure the added strength it so sorely needs to ride out a financial storm such as almost completely wrecked it in the blizzard of 1929. It would do more than that. It would give this country the finest road system in the world without costing the taxpayer a penny, and it would be a guaranty against any profit or unemployment for 15 years.

The plan is as sound as it is meritorious and it is as meritorious as it is sound.

The Problem of Japan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 18, 1954

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, last June 22 President Eisenhower, in an address to the National Editorial Association, made some timely comments on the real importance of Japan to our own security. As the President expressed it, it is "absolutely mandatory to our safety" that the United States do everything possible to keep Japan free. He declared that the Japanese people cannot make a living unless they receive aid from us, unless we import goods from them, and unless they can carry on trade with other countries of Asia. For these reasons, he pointed out, we must be realistic in our attitude toward Japan. We must not be unduly restricted by half-truths to the effect that we cannot afford further "giveaway" programs, that our allies should not engage in any trade with Communist-controlled countries, that we should not import goods from countries with lower wages and living standards than our own, and that America should not get involved in southeast Asia.

This problem of Japan will be a crucial one in the months ahead. For that reason I should like to call to the attention of my colleagues the following editorial from the New York Times of August 17:

THE PROBLEM OF JAPAN

At a time when the United States is trying to build up a defense system for Southeast Asia one of our present allies in the Far East is running into serious trouble which, unless cured, could blow up into a real crisis next year. This ally is Japan, and the trouble is a rapidly deteriorating economic situation which might impair Japan's position as an anti-Communist bastion.

The danger was pointed up by President Eisenhower when he declared that Japan is the key to the defense of the Pacific, and that Communist domination of Japan with its large, industrial resources would convert the Pacific into a Communist lake. The President likewise alluded to the fundamental problem of Japanese existence when he pointed out that 85 million people are crowded together in a mountainous land no larger than California. To this might be added that Japan is still suffering from the ravages of the war, that she has lost an empire which helped to support that population in the past, that her industrial plant is obsolescent and therefore a high-cost producer despite low wages, and that her trade and fishery still suffer from the war's aftereffects.

This situation was disguised by large-scale American aid after the war, by the Korean war boom and by large American military expenditures. But American aid has ceased, the Korean war boom is over, and American military expenditures are shrinking as American troops begin to withdraw from the islands. The result is a steadily increasing trade deficit, dwindling financial reserves, growing unemployment and political unrest. On top of that Japan is now supposed to rearm for her own defense to permit the withdrawal of all American forces.

The Japanese Government is trying to cope with the situation by an austerity program designed to cut all but essential imports, and by reducing the scale of her rearmament to the detriment of free world security. But the real cure can only lie in increased production and trade, for which she needs outside help. The Japanese talk of a Marshall plan for them, but, as President Eisenhower said, the United States is no Atlas able to carry the world on its shoulders. He agrees, however, that something must be done, and proposals are already being made for some direct aid and larger loans, encouragement of Japanese trade with the free world, and allocation of military supplies. But President Eisenhower has already hinted that some accommodation might also have to be found for Japanese trade with China, presumably when Peiping's conduct makes this possible. Since the west is now slashing trade barriers against Soviet Russia and her European satellites, this problem cannot be ignored.

The Farm Bill Approved

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. USHER L. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 18, 1954

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, this bill with 82.5 percent to 90 percent of parity for wheat, corn, peanuts, cotton, rice, tobacco, and 75 percent of parity for the dairyman, came out of conference on the 17th, and the Senate conferees could not be moved on the question of dairy products. The wheat men, the cotton men and all other groups put up a fight for the dairy interests, but Senator AIKEN and Eisenhower were too much to contend with. In the House two Members from Minnesota, the Honorable AUGUST H. ANDRESEN, the Honorable H. CARL ANDERSEN, and the Honorable HAROLD COOLEY, from North Carolina, the Honorable JAMIE L. WHITTEN, from Mississippi, and, in fact, the entire Agriculture Committee of the House, did great service in the interest of keeping buying power in the Farm Belt, as a guaranty against another disastrous depression. They were, however, unable to turn the tide against the well-organized Benson Senate.

When the matter came to the House for approval, here is the spot the Members from the Farm Belt were in, and that included myself. My disposition was to vote against this conference report, because I realized that the dairy interests of the country would suffer a severe blow. Oleo butter has taken its toll; now added to that is a 25-percent handicap compared to parity, and the inevitable result will be that many dairymen will go out of business.

The reason why I did not vote against the conference report was that the House conferees had made a gallant fight but lost. The great mistake was made in 1949, when as a compromise the Aiken sliding-scale provision was incorporated in the bill at that time. I called attention to the danger of this provision. In the bill, therefore, at that time were the seeds of the present defeat. If no bill had been passed at this session, then the Aiken sliding scale—75 percent to 90 percent of parity—would automatically go into effect. The "chicken feed" statesmen, headed by Senator AIKEN, had gotten the ear of the President, and regardless of his pledge in the campaign to retain 90 percent of parity, he lined up with the chicken feed statesmen.

Rather than dump all supports on a 75 percent to 90 percent of parity, I thought it better to take what we could get in lieu of taking something worse. In order to save the embarrassment of Members to vote on a rollcall vote, no rollcall was had, so when these Members go home no one will know how they voted. But I am willing to go on record on every vote I cast, and if there had been a rollcall, I would have voted to take the only bill we could get.

The bill with the 82½-percent parity, which Benson will no doubt set in motion as soon as this bill is signed, will not immediately put farmers out of business, because they are on that level now, but eventually no business can stand up long with a 17½-percent discount below parity.

The acreage cut which Benson has made will put many small farms out of business. No change was made in this authority given the Secretary of Agriculture, and I personally know of many small farms whose owners cannot make a living for their families on such a slash in acreage. As I see it, therefore, the Farm Belt is in a precarious situation today.

Polish Soldier's Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. BYRNE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 18, 1954

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a resolution adopted by Philadelphians of Polish descent gathered at a mass meeting held at Eddington Park, Pa., on Sunday, August 15, 1954. The occasion was the celebration of Polish Soldier's Day, and it was my privilege to act as a member of the honorary committee and to participate in this meeting.

The resolution follows:

We, Philadelphians of Polish descent gathered at the mass meeting at Eddington Park, Pa., at the Polish Soldier's Day celebration held on the anniversary of the great Polish victory of August 15, 1920, over the overwhelming might of Soviet Russia, victory which gave to the free world 20 years of peace and security from the evils of communism and the 10th anniversary of the heroic but tragic Warsaw uprising against the Nazis, the uprising betrayed by the Soviet Union, solemnly appeal to all the responsible leaders of these United States for better understanding of the key geopolitical and moral position of Poland.

Today, the Polish nation is forced to live once again in slavery and oppression. That nation was our heroic ally and comrade in arms during the last World War when no other people sacrificed as much. Ironically, however, no other country was so cruelly defeated in victory. Poland's losses were six million killed on European battlefields, in gas chambers and concentration camps of ruthless Nazi Germany, in Katyn Forest, and in hundreds of macabre labor camps of Soviet Union during the 6 years of long underground struggle and the 63 days of unprecedented uprising in Warsaw. The tragedy of it is that to the infamy of the free world, Poland, after all her efforts, was handed over by her shortsighted Allies in Teheran and Yalta to the most cruel, inhuman slavery of Moscow, and today again as it was under Nazi occupation, the Polish nation is subjected to physical and moral extermination.

This spiritual terror is particularly evident in the field of religion. All religious denominations are constantly persecuted behind the Iron Curtain. However, the Communist hatred is especially strong against the Catholic Church—the religion of 95 percent of the Poles. Thirteen bishops and 5,000 priests have been imprisoned. The heroic primate of Poland, Stefan Cardinal Wyszynski, has been tortured for a year on special orders from the Kremlin. At the same time, all efforts are being exercised to crush the splendid resistance of the martyred church and to make her a new tool of the Communist evil. But the spirit of Poland remains unconquered as proven by everyday risky defections to the free world.

Just recently, Moscow started world-wide propaganda for a new parley with the Western powers to bring about a settlement of the German problem. However, all of Europe fears the revived German military might and the neo-Nazi revisionism. To achieve a real and lasting peace in Europe, it is necessary that, first of all, the Soviet Union immediately withdraw all her Armed Forces and police, both uniformed and secret, beyond its prewar 1939 borders—so that the free and unfettered elections under international control may be arranged in those countries as soon as possible. Such reestablished democracy of Poland and other east-central European countries should be fully guaranteed by all the Eastern and Western governments concerned. All other solutions of Europe's problems would be inadequate, temporary, and unjust.

With all due respect we sincerely request the President and Congress to implement as soon as possible the liberation policy of General Eisenhower as proclaimed in his greatest speech on foreign policy of April 16, 1953. The unpaid faithful friends behind the Iron Curtain deserve much better treatment than those costly allies who cowardly dream about the so-called coexistence with evil, and selfishly veer our great democracy toward the immoral compromise with the totalitarian regimes. Those countries on the other side of the Atlantic, while protecting their own colonial interests want us to act against the basic principles of Jefferson and Lincoln and they do force us into more and more Munich-like diplomatic and strategic defeats.

Similarly to our Jewish brethren who have justly been warning the free world since 1932 as to the mortal danger of German nazism so have Poles since 1939 been warning all the free world that further appeasement of world domination seeking communism could lead us only to a global disaster. Poland was the first victim of Soviet aggression. America is scheduled as its final aim. The free State of Israel was the Jew's reward for their sufferings under Hitler, free and independent Poland in a democratic world should be declared the ultimate goal in our ideological struggle with godless brutal communism.

Leon J. Kolankiewicz,
Chairman, Polish Soldiers Day Celebration.
Julian Zbytniewski,
National Senior Vice Commander.
Teodor Przybyla,
District 10 Commander.
Walter Szmygell,
Commander, Post No. 12.

Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE S. LONG

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 18, 1954

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, before the curtain falls upon this significant and historic session of the greatest parliament on earth, I believe it is not only fitting and proper, but indeed it is mandatory, that at least one Member of this House rise up and speak out to put certain matters that are of vital importance to our national welfare—indeed, matters which may determine our national survival or national destruction—in proper focus.

At the beginning of this session of Congress, and indeed throughout most of the long months of its sitting, we have been greatly concerned with the affairs of Europe, of Asia, and of Africa. Now I do not minimize the importance of those areas, nor do I overlook the fact that the people who inhabit those vast areas are members of the human family, and that all members of the human family are mutually responsible for the welfare of one another over the long range. But, Mr. Speaker, of immediate concern is the welfare and safety of our own country—indeed, our most immediate problem is that of national survival.

When this session began, we had high hopes that we had achieved world safety through alliances with our traditional friends, England and France, and to that end we had over the past few year spilled out in abundance our wealth and our technical knowledge, naviely believing that our dollars and our technology could purchase or retain their friendship. Mr. Speaker, we have had a sad awakening. The once great Empire of France has ended in defeat and confusion abroad; and, at home, the people of France, whom we have always held in such high esteem, are in such a state of confusion that they are unable to even maintain a stable government. With the surrender in Indochina, our pivot of defense on our eastern frontier has collapsed; and with it all of our hopes of gain from the billions which American taxpayers have poured into France since 1946 in an attempt to bolster our faltering friends of that once great nation. Only our late enemy, the Bonn government of Western Germany, deters our mortal enemy, Communist Russia, from moving into and making of Paris only a satellite capital of an atheistic empire.

Our other and even more traditional friend, the government of Her Britannic Majesty has fared but little better and, despite the financial aid which we have given to that once great empire, offers us now no aid and comfort in assurance of our own safety. Not only is her Commonwealth of India, with its vast hordes of people and vast riches as well extending aid and comfort to our enemy, but as I speak these words, the leader of Her Majesty's loyal opposition, and longtime first Minister, Mr. Clement Attlee, is, together with his closest advisers, making a quasi-official tour of those bleak lands inhibited by the poor slaves who are doomed to dwell behind that forbidding frontier which Britain's great but now aging first Minister himself designated as the Iron Curtain.

In Korea, Mr. Speaker, our great Nation suffered its first defeat on the field of battle in all its long history. Let us face that fact, Mr. Speaker. It is now a part of history. In losing on the field of battle, we lost face throughout the Far East, and hence we contributed to the surrender of Indochina, and the Japanese Empire, so firm in its friendship for us in its time of defeat, is now looking more and more toward its neighbor and our enemy, Communist China.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we must face some unpleasant facts. We have demonstrated that we are capable of being the world's mightiest warriors; we have demonstrated in Japan and Germany that we can be magnanimous in victory; and we have demonstrated in Yalta, in Potsdam, in Berlin, in Geneva, and in Caracas that we can be and usually are naive fools at the conference table.

And now, Mr. Speaker, let me return again to the main theme of this address: That our national survival demands that we cease our global fencing with windmills and take measures that will insure our own safety, and give credit where credit is due. This year of 1954 will go down in history as the year in which American foreign policy met disaster in all of those places where it should have been successful, and in which it made a beginning of success in the place where it was to have been least expected.

Mr. Speaker, in my own State of Louisiana is located the great city of New Orleans, which is the second port of our Nation. When this session began, there was an atheistic Communist government in existence that was no more than an hour away from New Orleans by modern jet fighter plane. That evil Communist government was firmly in control of the territory and people of our friend and neighbor in our own hemisphere, the Republic of Guatemala. Those functionaries of our Government charged with the conduct of our foreign relations should be held to stern account for permitting a condition to come about whereby our friends and neighbors in Guatemala could be seduced by our enemy; and it is a sad commentary on all of us that we failed for so long to recognize the obvious fact that, while we planned furiously to stop godless communism from spreading in southeast Asia, 7,000 miles from our shores, we did nothing to aid our friends in Latin America to prevent its tentacles from closing down upon a sovereign American Republic, from which a hydrogen bomb could have been delivered within an hour to cast destruction upon our own land.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as this momentous session of the Congress of the United States draws to a close, we may all thank God and the patriotic people of the Republic of Guatemala and a few citizens of our own country for bringing to an end the direct threat to our survival that has ever faced our American homeland. This handful of patriotic men and women, against the greatest of odds, and with little assurance from our own Government, have brought to an end in ignominious defeat the first attempt of atheistic communism to establish itself officially in the Western Hemisphere.

Obviously, it would be impossible to name individually each person who had a part in destroying the Communist government in our own backyard while we spent our time and our money in a futile attempt to stem the tide of communism 7,000 miles from our own shores. We know, of course, such names as Col. Castilla Armas, now the head of the ruling junta in Guatemala, and of Col. Elfego Monzon, who is also a member of the junta, and is the man who controls the professional military forces of that nation. We also know about the efforts of our own Ambassador, John A. Peurifoy, who gave his assistance in the ultimate showdown, when the Communist government was actually overthrown. However, we do not know about such patriotic Guatemalans as Col. Roberto Barrios Peña—Pain-ya—former Chief of Staff of the Guatemalan Army and former superintendent of its military academy, who has spent a fortune and more than 5 years in exile from his native land fighting, sometimes forlornly and alone, to prevent the engulfing of his native land by atheistic communism.

Now I mention Col. Barrios Peña—Pain-ya—because we in Louisiana have been honored to act as host to him during much of his period of exile, and he is a man of such background, vision and patriotism as to be an asset to all upon whom he bestows his talents and understanding. He it was who became the first Spanish American anti-Communist; he it was who became the first prominent Latin American to become an exile and be deprived of his property and his income because he would not compromise with his principles. And during all of that exile, this great man has loved his country with a deep and abiding love, and while giving to us the benefit of his knowledge as a student, as a military man and a statesman, he has never sought power for himself, and he has never failed to point out to us that our survival depends upon the strong friendship of the nations of this hemisphere, banded together in a concordant of mutual friendship and respect. We want no satellites in the Western Hemisphere; no nation should be subservient to any other nation. Of more importance, we should stop depending upon talk alone to sustain our vaunted "good neighbor" policy in Latin America. Again let us face the facts: While we have insisted that we are the good neighbor of the nations to the south of us, we have spent many times as much upon Germany and Japan, our enemies in the great war that ended in 1946, than we have upon those friendly nations of our own hemisphere whom we delight to call our good neighbors.

Mr. Speaker, we have much to learn from the experience in our neighboring Republic of Guatemala about the evil design and careful intrigue of our enemy. The overthrow of the Communist government in that Republic was brought about by the people themselves, with only the aid of a few patriots in our own country; and yet it was made to appear to the world that we had intervened in the affairs of Guatemala. Soviet Russia, great world power and force for evil which she is, made no attempt whatever to maintain her first American satellite in power. Those of us who understand the nature of Communist intrigue and conspiracy knew full well there was some reason for the failure of Russia to support her satellite government in Guatemala, and the reason was very soon made apparent. Not unexpectedly, the explanation was given by Mr. Clement Attlee on the floor of the British Commons, when in a debate with Her Majesty's First Minister about Indochina, he justified the intervention of Communist China in Indochina by comparing it with the intervention of the United States in the Republic of Guatemala. And so, by a clever maneuver, we stand accused before a hostile world, always too ready to believe the worst of us, of being ourselves an aggressor nation.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the people of the United States are getting a little weary of supporting unwilling allies who become faltering friends in the face of danger. One-worldism, the brotherhood of man, the United Nations, all are comfortable dreams, dreams that we hope may in time become reality, but the reality of the moment is that we stand before the world in mortal peril, and our only source of strength is the firm and willing friendship of the nations of this hemisphere. We vary from our neighbors to the south in language and in customs, but we conform with them in more ways than we vary. We spring from a common heritage as colonies of European nations, and we share the same sweetness of liberty gained by the valor of our arms and the courage of our people. We have a common ancestry of aggressive and daring Europeans who dared to leave the comfort and safety of known surroundings to plunge across the dark Atlantic and into the unknown jungles of the New World to search for liberty, freedom, and riches.

Why then should we give of our sustenance to those unwilling and tired old civilizations of Europe that our valorous ancestors quit so many years ago? Why should we fear the worst that the Old World may threaten? We of the Americas are giants of strength, sharing a common heritage, devoted to our God and our respective nations, desiring to live only in peace with the Nations of other hemispheres but ready to defend our liberties if need be, convinced beyond any doubt that the outcome can never be other than in our favor in any contest of might between the tired old nations that lie behind the Iron Curtain, whose people live in slavery and degradation, while we of the Americas are joined forever in a pact of mutual respect and dedication to God and our individual freedom, not as master and servant, not as planet and satellites, but as sovereign equals determined to maintain our common heritage.

One last word, Mr. Speaker, before we ring down the curtain on this memorable Congress. Our people too often fear an economic depression, and some timid economists among us say that we have never really gotten out of the great depression of the 1930's, but that we have received respite only by reason of our numerous wars. What men of little vision. Depression is the result of the false philosophies and economies of the tired and outworn governments of the Old World. We of the Americas have been blessed beyond all measure by divine providence.

South of us there is untold natural wealth awaiting the miner, the prospector, and the forester. Southward also are 180 million people, all potential customers for highways, mills, factories, railroads, airlines, automobiles, televisions, air conditioners, all of the vast wealth which we of the United States have so well been able to produce and make available to the man in every walk of life. Depression. Ridiculous. We face, together with our independent friends to the south of us, as well as our English-speaking friends above our northern border, unlimited prosperity for the next 500 years, bringing the highest standard of living on earth to all the peoples of America.

Let us, then, Mr. Speaker, say goodby forever to faintness of heart and those of little faith. Let us concentrate our efforts, our riches, and our cooperation among those friends who understand us and appreciate us, because we are all Americans. If we will concentrate our efforts for a decade on those friendly nations of our own hemisphere, we may forget aggression from without. The only aggression we need fear is the knocking at our gates of those less fortunate peoples of the Old World, seeking our permission to peacefully and as friends, join the peoples of the Americas in the enjoyment of liberty and the free worship of God in the highest and most satisfying society that man has ever devised. Let us never lose sight of the sacrifices made by Christ, our Saviour, and remember that we, as mortals, can do little; but through His guidance, all things are possible.

Accomplishments of the 83d Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. BEAMER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 18, 1954

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, accomplishments of the 83d Congress are so numerous that only a bare outline can be given. Previously, certain important measures and events have been outlined, and others can be given on future occasions. However, I would like to set forth some of the highlights:

Fighting in Korea stopped and no American lives are being lost.

More defense with less money. Defense structure has been strengthened and cost of its maintenance has been cut by billions of dollars.

Firm, consistent foreign policy, based on principle of collective security, leads toward a just and lasting peace. No appeasement with communism.

Rigid economy and elimination of waste in Federal Government has cut billions of dollars from Government spending. More than 213,000 Federal employees have been eliminated.

Greatest tax reduction in history. Savings of $7.4 billion to individuals and business, with the lion's share going to the people themselves.

Inflation halted and sound fiscal policy inaugurated.

Controls are gone in industry.

Social-security system has been broadened and benefits increased, and entire system is being placed on a more nearly sound actuarial basis.

Health and education programs for encouragement and assistance to the States have been provided.

Judicial system relieved with the addition of 23 new judgeships—2 in Indiana.

Hoover Commission Government reorganization plans—14 of these—were passed. These will result in efficiency and economy and savings of billions of dollars to the taxpayers in the years ahead.

Housing Act also takes Federal Government out of competition with home builders, will save further waste, provides for 35,000 units for 1954 and, for the first time, is slum clearance.

Farm program is being met in an honest realistic manner to insure agriculture fair treatment in future as well as at present time. Immediate needs were met in cases of drought and surpluses.

St. Lawrence seaway, stripped of frills, was made possible by United States participation.

Socialism being stopped. Submerged lands returned to States in traditional and constitutional boundaries; Federal barge lines sold; synthetic-rubber plants authorized for resale; power projects now being made available to private as well as to public interests; Atomic Energy Act amended for development of peacetime applications by private individuals or corporations; highway construction totaling $3.5 billion authorized for a 2-year program which places more authority in the hands of the States.

New moral climate with almost no public scandals and a return to recognition of a faith in God as exemplified by President Eisenhower and many others in high position.

Our Defeat in Indochina

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 18, 1954

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following statement I have furnished Mr. W. G. Gavin, managing editor, the Boston Traveler, in response to his poll for an opinion from the Massachusetts congressional delegation on the truce in Indochina:

OUR DEFEAT IN INDOCHINA

The fighting has stopped in Indochina.

The truce is supposed to be a gain of some kind.

A similar truce in Korea solved nothing for our side. It helped the Chinese Reds by giving them the opportunity to shift their aggression, this time to Indochina.

That is the northern half of that country for the moment.

Part and parcel of that familiar pattern, "conquest on the installment plan."

First, the Reds "sic" one of their satellites onto a chunk of the free world.

Then, when we get scared and start making threats that even confuse ourselves, the Reds step forward with the olive branch marked "peace by appeasement."

We fall for it, thinking that the word "peace" means actual peace.

Everyone is happy that the fighting has stopped, but few in the Western World seem to realize that every time the fighting stops we have retreated a few more steps. If this should become a habit, we shall eventually wind up with our backs to the wall.

Unless we regain the initiative in the cold war.

I can never understand why we must wait for the Communists to make the first move and then try to counter it with half measures.

What the Reds have gained by military force against Allied weakness and indecision in northern Indochina will be followed by successful infiltration and subversion of southern Indochina, unless we come up with a better plan ahead of their schedule.

A solid defense alliance for southeast Asia is imperative.

Diplomatic, military, and economic experts must work hand in hand to discourage further Communist aggression in this area.

But the supreme test of leadership will hinge on our ability to win the allegiance of the oppressed millions who, hating the European imperialism that they are pushing out of Asia, are beng seduced by the siren call of Communist imperialism whose ruthless tyranny they fail to understand.

Surely the United States, born of a revolution and dedicated to equality of opportunity for all men, is best fitted to create a dynamic policy under dynamic leadership to help these submerged millions and to win their genuine friendship for mutual progress in a world at peace.

We in the United States are impatiently waiting for such policies and such leadership to develop.

In the meantime the Communists are outwitting us.

The truce in Indochina will be but another station stop on the road to disaster until we pioneer a better way that the world will be happy to follow.

We are still waiting for constructive initiative from the White House.

How We Have Outlawed Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. USHER L. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 18, 1954

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, if the Congress of the United States was ever irrational and bewildered, it was over this bill. The present laws we have enforced under the direction of the Attorney General and supported by J. Edgar Hoover are making prompt headway against weeding Communists out of the direction of this Government, and in prosecutions of overt acts of communism. The long list of convictions is an evidence of the success we are having. This Congress at this session gave the Attorney General additional powers as requested.

In this state of affairs, along comes a Senator, and not only supports the Butler anti-Communist bill but amends it to make communism, per se, unlawful. It was a sudden move and caught the Senate napping. It passed the amendment 85 to 0. The bill then came to the House, and the House made enough amendments as were thought would avoid repealing all the machinery Hoover and Brownell had been using in prosecution of Communists. The amendments were not accepted by the Senate, and here again the Senator proposed another amendment, which made it a felony for any person to think as a Communist, and left in the bill provisions which evidently will repeal all tools we have to prosecute overt acts of communism. The House leaders then asked that we vote down the Senate amendment and hold a conference.

But that was not to be. A Member from Texas moved that the conferees be instructed to approve the Senate amendment outlawing the thinking of communism and there the matter rests. The conferees are not bound to follow this instruction.

Anyone who thinks this is not a political move certainly ought to be examined by the most available sanity board. This whole fuss was stirred up by the master-minded Democrats.

If the bill is passed as it came from the Senate, making it a felony to think communism and, at the same time, destroy the machinery to handle Communists, the President will undoubtedly veto the bill and that will end it. But the proponents have gained what they were after, to get out on the stump and say, "We killed communism dead as a doornail," but the Republicans came to the rescue of the Communists. That may elect a few Democrat Senators to another term in the Senate, but it will be a costly price the people of the United States will pay.

The Democrats were sailing along with much promise of success before this move was made, but when the people see through this camouflaged move to actually protect Communists, the Democratic rise in temperature will undoubtedly lower a few degrees.

If the President does not veto this bill, then all the machinery we have built to cope with communism in the United States will go down, and the Communists will have clear sailing again. Anyone knows, even an abnormal mind, that it is clearly unconstitutional to prevent a man from thinking anything he wants to think. The proponents know this as well as anyone, but they are confident that no one will detect what they are trying to do. I have not always supported the administration, as is well known, but on this sugar-coated and unconstitutional amendment, I will support the administration and be proud to do it.

What Can We Do With Food Surplus?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALT HORAN
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 18, 1954

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I am pleased to include an editorial by Paul H. Hallett which appeared in the Inland Register, the official newspaper for the diocese of Spokane, Wash.

I am indebted to the Reverend Terence J. Tully, editor and business manager of the Inland Register, for this fine contribution:

WHAT CAN WE DO WITH FOOD SURPLUS?
(By Paul H. Hallett)

One of the greatest paradoxes of this time is the distress caused by huge surpluses of food in the United States, which it is deemed impolitic to sell or give away. So great has this surplus become that Secretary of Agriculture Benson has announced a 12-percent cut in wheat acreage.

At the same time, Dr. Charles Malik, who is Lebanese Ambassador to the United States and one of the ablest members of the United Nations—certainly its most Christian-minded spokesman—told a Georgetown University audience that he believed we must count on parting with at least half our possessions, and expect plenty of suffering and hardship beside, before we can really master the present crisis with communism.

Far from beginning to part with half our possessions, we have not gone even a fair way toward disposing of our superfluities. It is argued that to sell or give them away would depress the market.

Such reasoning does not meet the facts. Figures show that the market for our products, at least in the undernourished countries, which include half the people in the world, remains constant, no matter what the price. It remains constant because the poorer countries have little to sell in exchange for food, and therefore can buy only a certain amount.

What we need to combat effectively the hunger in the world—so helpful an ally of communism—is the formation of a world food reserve under the joint auspices of the Food and Agricultural Organization, the International Bank, and the U. N. Secretariat. In all countries supplies that are surplus to current demand should be taken off the market and diverted to areas where they are needed, even though no payment is now possible.

The better-endowed nations, according to a well-informed economist writing in the London Tablet, will have to accustom themselves to giving food to the hungry nations. We do not greatly mind giving away arms, whose cost is many times the value of our present food surplus. We should not logically object to a policy of giving away food, so that the weaker countries may resist Communist political infiltration through the exploitation of hardship and discontent.

God has given the earth for the use of all its inhabitants, and those who actually inhabit a certain country are only the stewards of its wealth. Differences among the living standards of nations there will always rightly be, according to differences in energy, resourcefulness, and ambition. But where, as is the case with us and the British Commonwealth, abundance of land and comparative fewness of consumers are also responsible for our superfluities, distributive justice demands that we share this abundance.

Hon. Bernard W. (Pat) Kearney, of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 18, 1954

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the Members of Congress to a signal honor paid to the ranking member of our Committee on Veterans' Affairs, Gen. B. W. (PAT) KEARNEY, by the National Encampment of the Veterans of Foreign Wars held recently in Philadelphia, Pa.

At last year's encampment, held in Milwaukee, Wis., it was voted to present a citation to General KEARNEY in recognition of his outstanding service as a member of our committee. Following is the wording of the citation:

The Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States presents this certificate of appreciation to the Honorable BERNARD W. (PAT) KEARNEY, Member, House of Representatives, State of New York, in recognition of the many outstanding services he has rendered war veterans as a member of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs and chairman of the Subcommittee on Hospitals. In witness thereof we have hereunto set our hands and the official seal of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States. Approved by the 54th National Encampment, VFW, in Milwaukee, Wis., 1953.

General KEARNEY, who is a past national commander of the VFW, has always been vitally interested in veterans' problems. Besides being the ranking Republican member of our committee, he is the chairman of the important Subcommittee on Hospitals, which considers all legislation pertaining to the many hospital and domiciliary facilities of the Veterans' Administration.

Personally, I am delighted at this recognition of his fine committee work. He deserves every bit of praise that can be given him.

The Present Situation of Agriculture and a Brief Report on the Agricultural Act of 1954

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. HILL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 18, 1954

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I should like to discuss with this House the present situation of agriculture and give a brief report on the Agricultural Act of 1954.

Mr. Speaker, it has been said that American agriculture has reached the end of an era. Farm legislation during World War II, the postwar period and the Korean war has consisted of high production goals, 90 percent of parity on the basics and price supports stimulating high production of many other farm commodities.

The heavy surpluses now in the Commodity Credit Corporation have accumulated in the past couple of years as an aftermath of the wartime era. The failure of the previous administration to invoke necessary controls to keep production in line in 1952, and the rather quick shift from a wartime to a peacetime economy following the Korean armistice contributed to the accumulation of surpluses in the CCC.

Your Committee on Agriculture, a committee on which I have been proud to serve for the past 12 years, realized early in the 83d Congress that great changes were taking place in the farm segment of our economy. Our committee decided to go to the grassroots to sound out farmers' thinking on these changes. Hearings were held by the committee in numerous farm communities, large and small, from Maine to California, and anyone who wished to testify could tell the committee what type or kind of legislation they wanted for a long-range farm program. This was excellent testimony, given by the farmer or his wife, and our committee benefited greatly from it.

One misconception which should be dismissed when discussing farm legislation is that price-support programs are the direct and only cause for high food prices. This is not the case, and the fact of the matter is that the farmer gets surprisingly little of the consumer's food dollar.

Let me give you the facts on the farmers' share of the consumers' dollar on one commodity: Wheat. Following the removal of price controls in the fall of 1945, prices received by farmers for wheat moved upward to a peak in 1947. Retail prices of cereals and bakery products increased even more rapidly between 1946 and 1948.

Farm prices for wheat declined sharply as a result of good harvests and a drop in exports in 1948 and 1949 and then recovered somewhat in 1951 and 1952, as a result of increased demand associated with the Korean war. Since 1952 the farm price of wheat has dropped 10 percent and would have dropped further except for existing price supports.

In contrast to the ups and downs of the farm price of wheat, the retail price of cereals and bakery products has moved only in one direction since World War II—up.

Out of each dollar spent by the American housewife for domestically produced food, 56 cents now goes for processing, marketing, and transportation charges. The farmer receives only 44 cents.

We should never forget how closely tied up the welfare of our agriculture is with the entire economy. The crops the farmers grow not only go on to the dinner table and into making clothing, but they also have found countless industrial uses. For instance, corn is used for the production of starch and starch derivatives, the production of alcohols—ethyl and butyl—and the production of organic acids. Significant economies and improvements in industrial methods have been realized because of the proper exploitation of agricultural residues, such as corncobs, rice hulls, shells of nuts and fruit pits.

And, we should not forget the effect the farmer's income has on the economy. Farmers received approximately $10.3 billion in marketing income during the first 5-months of 1954. This money goes back into the mainstream of the American economy through the farmers' purchase of goods and services. So we can see that farmers are not only one of the most important producing groups in the country, but one of the most important groups of consumers as well.

It is not difficult to see what happens percentagewise to our economy when you curtail the purchasing power of 20 million people. It becomes clearer as to how much the prosperity of this country depends on the farmer when you realize that nearly every American city of 10,000 or less depends largely upon agriculture as the basis of its economic life.

In the past 50 years the emphasis in agricultural research and experimental work has been on development of better seeds, improved farming operations, and all that goes to increase output of farm commodities. The result has been a 40-percent increase in farm production.

MARKETING RESEARCH MUST BE EMPHASIZED

Now it is time to begin another phase of agricultural research, namely, the marketing of farmers' produce and controlling the amount the farmer gets from the consumer's dollar.

Mr. Speaker, the 83d Congress has been a productive Congress by way of introducing and developing and passing farm legislation of outstanding and far-reaching effect on future farm programs of the United States.

A brief discussion and analysis of several of the significant agriculture bills passed by this Congress will indicate the creditable record of this Congress in both temporary and long-term farm legislation.

DROUGHT-RELIEF BILL

One piece of legislation to help farmers on a temporary basis, and we all hope for the immediate future only, was a bill I had the privilege of introducing to provide Federal assistance to farmers hard hit by drought. In July of 1953, as chairman of the Livestock Subcommittee which investigated drought conditions in the western areas, I got a vivid picture of what impossible conditions farmers were facing. Most of the fields were as bare as if it were midwinter. And today this drought condition has spread to most sections of the Midwest.

The measure which I introduced provides payments of up to $1 per acre for farmers who carry out emergency wind erosion measures under the 1954 agricultural-conservation program. This act has helped and, I hope, continues to help farmers preserve their topsoil in the face of discouraging wind and drought conditions which have plagued so many sections.

SURPLUS DISPOSAL BILL

Another measure passed by this Congress and of great importance for the immediate future is one to dispose of surplus farm commodities, a measure which I also had the honor of introducing.

This bill permits the sale of $700 million worth of surplus commodities held by the CCC. It also authorizes the granting of commodities to needy people at home and abroad, and to publicly owned hospitals and other institutions in this country. This act will result in farm surpluses being an asset to the country, both financially and in terms of good will.

INCENTIVES TO WOOL PRODUCERS

One measure which western Members of Congress were happy to see passed during this session of Congress is the wool-support program. Wool has long been a declining industry in this country. Today it is one of only two major agricultural commodities that is produced in deficit supply in the United States. The major reason for the decline in production has been the low-tariff protection given to wool, and the consequent dumping of foreign wool on the American market.

The measure which this Congress passed authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to support wool at 90 percent of parity or above in order to encourage an annual production of 300 million pounds of shorn wool per year. The Secretary can use several methods to support the price of wool, including loans and direct production payments. It is not expected that the total of 300 million pounds will be reached soon, as only 227 million pounds were produced last year.

WATERSHED-DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

I have discussed several important short-term acts passed by this Congress which will be valuable to American farmers during the immediate future. Now, I want to talk about some of the measures which are for the long haul, or the long-range agricultural program.

One very valuable measure for long-term planning is the Watershed and Conservation Act.

The purpose of this act is to provide the legislative authority and direction for cooperative Federal-local action in attacking the problems of upstream soil and water conservation and flood prevention. The bill provides the policies, the framework, and the standards under which action can be taken jointly by the Federal Government, States, counties, soil conservation or watershed districts, or local citizens' groups.

Based on the sound principle of payment for value received, this act provides that the cost of programs and improvements shall be shared equitably between the participants according to the benefit received.

One of the best features of this act, Mr. Speaker, is that the plans and programs for conservation and watershed work will not be handed down from the top, but can be developed and initiated at the local level. In other words, the people who see firsthand the need for such work will be the responsible initiators of watershed conservation programs.

The average net worth increased from $4,474 to $8,349. This progress was made during the average 4.1 years they operated with Farmers Home Administration credit.

Loans totaling $35,606,600 were advanced from appropriated funds to help small farmers buy, enlarge, or improve their farms and farm buildings during the year. Another $9,530,800 in real-estate credit was advanced for similar purposes by private lenders and insured through the insured-mortgage program.

Farm-water facilities and irrigation system loans, limited until the end of the 1954 fiscal year to the 17 Western States but soon to be available throughout the country, totaled $6,500,000. In the future, this program will include loans for both water and conservation purposes.

The $93,460,700 advanced to meet emergency needs and to permit farmers to continue normal operations included $35,165,000 in special livestock loans, a program that was established in July 1953.

Despite the materially increased lending operations, the Farmers Home Administration cut its annual administrative costs by about $4 million. Combining 4 area-finance offices and the national finance division into 1 national finance office located in St. Louis accounted for a large part of the savings. Reorganization of the National and States offices also contributed, as did other streamlining activities including elimination of duplicate forms and files. Administration of the agency's program is being placed closer to the farmers by giving county supervisors the power of final approval on a larger number of loans.

AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1954

In closing I should like to make a few remarks concerning this act. There are various amendments, new sections, as well as directives to the Secretary of Agriculture in this legislation.

Surplus agricultural commodities will be planned "in a commodity set-aside": wheat, cotton, cottonseed oil, butter, nonfat dry milk solids, and cheese.

Dairy products are supported at 75 to 90 percent of parity and additional authority given to the Secretary of Agriculture to dispose of dairy surpluses.

Commercial corn and wheat areas are adjusted.

Agricultural attachés of the State Department are placed directly under the Secretary of Agriculture.

In administering programs of diverted acres, the Secretary of Agriculture may make his regulations applicable on an appropriate geographical basis; semiarid areas where good husbandry requires maintenance of a prudent feed reserve, regulations relating to diverted acres shall be administered in such a manner as to permit the production of forage crops for storage and feeding operations; disaster areas are to be administered so as to restore the normal pattern of agriculture as quickly as possible.

Price supports on the basic commodities, with the exception of tobacco, are to be on a flexible scale with a floor of 82½ percent for the 1955 crop. The support level for tobacco remains at 90 percent of parity. Mandatory price supports are continued on tung nuts and honey at from 60 to 90 percent of parity and Irish potatoes are made eligible for support along with all other nonmandatory commodities at zero to 90 percent of parity.

Many Congressmen expressed concern regarding some of the regulations and some of the entire sections of this act. However, the Congress will be in session again in less than 5 months and if amendments are necessary they can be considered and changed early in 1955.

Friendship Between Nations Promotes Understanding of Mutual Benefit as Expressed by Hon. Antonio J. Bermudez, of Mexico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 18, 1954

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, in this day of uncertainty in world affairs the need for real friends is apparent. The free nations of the world are continually seeking ways and means to maintain the principles of democracy. America has spent billions of dollars around the world, particularly in Europe, to strengthen democratic nations. As time moves on it becomes apparent that money alone cannot buy time and lasting friendships.

It is in this connection that I wish to bring to the attention of our people the words spoken by a great Mexican, Hon. Antonio J. Bermudez. Today he is the director general of Petroleos Mexicanos. At the time he spoke the words to which I refer he was the mayor of Juarez, Mexico. The occasion was the 10th annual conference of mayors of the United States, in 1942, held in the city of Washington, D. C. The Honorable F. H. LaGuardia, mayor of New York City, was president of the United States Conference of Mayors at the time and the presiding officer at the convention. The list of speakers at the conference included many outstanding officials of our national government and representatives from other governments outside of the United States.

Among those attending the conference from countries other than the United States was the Honorable Antonio J. Bermudez, mayor of Juarez, Mexico, appointed by President Avila Camacho of Mexico to participate in the conference as the representative of mayors of Mexican cities.

In addressing the convention, Senor Bermudez expressed thoughts that might well be the present day-to-day, year-to-year policy as well as in 1942 when uttered, not only between his native land, Mexico, and the United States, but also as the basic policy of all nations in their relationships with one another. To know Senor Bermudez is to recognize the spirit of sincerity that dominates his every act and thought. The words he speaks and the acts he performs always come from the heart and the result of deep conviction. The thoughts he expressed in the address to which I have referred take on additional significance when it is realized that he was appointed as the representative of mayors of Mexican cities by Avila Camacho, President at that time of Mexico. President Camacho was then and always has been a true friend of the United States. Thus, the words of friendship expressed by Senor Bermudez may be considered as also expressing the views of President Camacho.

I cannot emphasize too strongly the mutual advantages to be gained not only by Mexico and the United States by an adherence to the principles of friendship as outlined in the address, but also as between all the friends of democracy on this American continent and throughout the world. The ideas expressed by Senor Bermudez should be accepted as a pattern to be followed at all times, in times of peace as well as in times of war. After all the sacrifices and suffering incident to war a structure of better understanding and a friendlier life both continental and worldwide could and should be built upon a foundation of friendship.

What finer or more idealistic statement of the objectives of true friendship could be expressed than in the words of this distinguished Mexican, when he said, "We believe that everything that is good, everything that is right, should be accomplished in the name of friendship." And, what greater assurance of true friendship between the two great Republics of Mexico and the United States could have been stated, or, with greater sincerity, than when he said in his memorable address:

> We feel that the future of the United States is the future of Mexico, and the destiny of the United States is the destiny of Mexico, that the friends of the United States are the friends of Mexico, and the enemies of this United States are the enemies of Mexico.

I conclude my remarks by including the entire address of Senator Bermudez. Brief though it is in words, yet strong and appealing, as it makes friendship between nations the real basis for promoting and strengthening a better understanding among nations. The address reads as follows:

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE ANTONIO J. BERMUDEZ, MAYOR OF JUAREZ, MEXICO

I never make speeches in my own land, and I know very well that I cannot make a speech in a foreign language, but I am delighted to attend and say a few words.

On behalf of our country, my colleagues from Mexico and I wish to say that we are gratefully honored in attending this conference of Canadian and United States mayors. We know that this conference will be fruitful and successful.

I bring you greetings from His Excellency, Avila Camacho, the President of our country, and from all the mayors of Mexico, and as Mayor LaGuardia said, "We are all in the same boat." We do not come here only and merely as mayors. We come as allies in the same worthy cause. We come here as good neighbors, and we come here as good friends.

We Mexican people are strong believers in friendship. We believe that friendship is a beautiful word, with a beautiful, far-reaching meaning. We believe that everything that is good, everything that is right, should be accomplished in the name of friendship. Reciprocal acts of friendship are mutually beneficial and very necessary at this hour, and because we feel that way, I will say that the good-neighbor policy of the United States has been and continues to be the perfect masterpiece of international friendship.

We know that there will be some very valuable knowledge derived from this conference, that there will be some very enlightening discussions, and my colleagues and I will listen very attentively and try to acquire some of that knowledge to take back home with us, in order that when we go back to our country we may be better able to serve our community, better able to serve the world, and above all things, better able to cooperate with you. We want to render you our fullest unlimited cooperation. Mexico wants to fulfill and to execute her duties loyally and faithfully. It is only logical and natural we feel that way because at this hour, at this moment, we feel that the future of the United States is the future of Mexico, that the destiny of the United States is the destiny of Mexico, that the friends of the United States are the friends of Mexico, and the enemies of the United States are the enemies of Mexico.

Hon. Alvin F. Weichel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 18, 1954

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I want to pay my respects to my colleague from Ohio, the Honorable ALVIN F. WEICHEL, who is now retiring from public service.

AL, as he is affectionately known to all of us, has served the public for many years, having served as a prosecuting attorney from his county, as well as having served on the bar committee of the State, and has served in this legislative body since 1942.

AL will be remembered for his sincere efforts and endeavors to represent the people of his district, and he rose to the chairmanship of the important Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

I am sure that I am joined with his many colleagues in wishing him every joy and success in his retirement. He has been a faithful servant.

New Housing Bill Called Boon to Moderate Income Buyers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 9, 1954

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency which drew the housing bill recently enacted by the Congress and as a member of the conference committee which perfected the versions of the bill passed by the Senate and the House, I ask to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD three newspaper articles concerning the new law: One under a byline of White Plains in the 26th Congressional District of New York titled "Housing Bill Called County Building Boon"; another forecasting that the effects of the new law will be widespread; and a third calling attention to the boon which its provisions will be to moderate income buyers.

The articles follow:

HOUSING BILL CALLED COUNTY BUILDING BOON

WHITE PLAINS.—New housing legislation will stimulate Westchester's home building industry and enable more moderate-income families to own their own homes, in the view of Louis A. Scofield, of Yonkers, president of the Westchester County Association, and Edward A. Lashins of Harrison, president of the Home Builders Association of Westchester.

In a joint statement today they predicted that the measure passed by Congress and awaiting action by President Eisenhower will result in an unprecedented demand for houses in the county, because of lower down payment requirements and longer mortgage periods.

Saying that more than 6 percent of the homes scheduled for completion in Westchester this fall are in the over $20,000 class, Mr. Lashins said that under the new bill a purchaser could get a $25,000 house with a down payment of $5,000 and pay off the balance over 30 years. Now a $9,000 payment is necessary for such a house with a 20-year mortgage.

GAIN FOR COUNTY

He saw the new bills as benefiting Westchester even more than nearby areas. Mr. Lashins explained that on Long Island the building industry has been operating on about 60 percent Veterans' Administration and 40 percent Federal Housing Administration mortgages.

In contrast, he said, Westchester has had only about 10 percent VA and FHA insured loans. The balance have been conventional mortgages, with a one-third downpayment normally required, and at a higher interest rate. Mr. Lashins believes that under the new legislation lending institutions active in the county will use more FHA mortgages, resulting in easier terms for the buyer.

"If 'zoning-thinking' of Westchester municipalities softens to the extent that they make provision for the building of moderate-priced homes, the county will assure itself of continued growth and a balanced economy," Mr. Scofield said.

BALANCED DEVELOPMENT

He added that sound development is a balanced one recognizing the needs of all income groups. Such development, Mr. Scofield continued, brings increased tax revenues and benefits local business.

Acknowledging the existence of problems, such as school congestion, which have resulted in upzoning in some areas, Mr. Scofield held that such problems will arise despite such action and said that provision must be made for schools, adequate transportation, and other facilities.

"In spite of ourselves," Mr. Scofield said, "Westchester will continue to grow because of the many advantages it offers large industries as a suitable place for the establishment of their executive offices.

"The new housing legislation offers opportunity to provide private dwellings for our moderate-income families and the thousands who have recently come to Westchester with the decentralization trend."

HOUSING BILL EFFECTS SEEN WIDESPREAD

The national housing bill will provide a tremendous stimulus to the home-building industry, according to Edward A. Lashins, president of the Home Builders Association of Westchester.

"Due to the lower down-payment requirements and longer mortgage period as provided in the bill," Mr. Lashins said, "an unprecedented demand for Westchester homes is expected. Characterized as a county of higher-priced homes, Westchester builders report that 66.2 percent of new homes scheduled for completion this fall are in the over $20,000 class. Under the new law a home buyer needs only $5,000 down on a $25,000 house, the remainder to be paid over a 30-year period. Formerly, $9,000 was required as downpayment on a new house with a 20-year mortgage. The new bill puts the more expensive Westchester home within reach of thousands of additional families.

"As a matter of fact, the national housing law is seen to benefit Westchester even more than surrounding counties. The Long Island home-building industry, for example, has been operating on approximately 60 percent VA and 40 percent FHA mortgages all along. Westchester, on the other hand, has had only 10 percent VA and FHA Government-insured loans. Ninety percent of the loans have been conventional mortgages, non-insured, non-guaranteed, normally one-third down and at a higher interest rate. Lending institutions will, no doubt, use fewer conventional mortgages, the benefits derived to be passed on to the home buyer."

NEW HOUSING BILL CALLED BOON TO MODERATE INCOME BUYER

"The national housing bill, passed by both the House and Senate and awaiting President Eisenhower's signature, will be a great stimulus to the Westchester home-building industry as well as providing the opportunity of homeownership to many more moderate-income families," it was said in a joint statement by Louis A. Schofield, of Bronxville, president of the Westchester County Association, and Edward A. Lashins, of Harrison, president of the Home Builders Association of Westchester.

The new legislation, providing lower downpayment requirements and extension of mortgage maturity, puts the benefits of homeownership within reach of thousands of additional Westchester families, according to the two leaders.

TERMS EASED

"Due to the lower down-payment requirements and longer mortgage period as provided in the bill, an unprecedented demand for Westchester homes is expected," Mr. Lashins stated. "Characterizing Westchester as a county of higher priced homes, builders report that 66.2 percent of new homes scheduled for completion this fall are in the over $20,000 class.

"Under the new legislation a home buyer need pay only $5,000 down on a $25,000 house, the remainder to be paid over a 30-year period. Formerly, $9,000 was required as down payment on a new $25,000 house with a 20-year mortgage. The new bill thus makes down payments and monthly payments more realistic in terms of moderate income families."

"As a matter of fact," continued Mr. Lashins, "the national housing law is seen to benefit Westchester even more than surrounding counties. The Long Island homebuilding industry, for example, has been operating on approximately 60-percent VA and 40-percent FHA mortgages all along.

"Westchester, on the other hand, has had only 10-percent VA and FHA Government-insured loans. Ninety percent of the loans have been conventional mortgages—noninsured, nonguaranteed, normally one-third down and at a higher interest rate. Lending institutions active in Westchester will, no doubt, use fewer conventional mortgages and divert a great deal of funds to FHA mortgages, resulting in easier terms for the homebuyer."

William A. Jump Memorial Foundation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE CANNON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 18, 1954

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include an official announcement made by the United States Department of Agriculture, as of August 16, 1954, just released to the press.

The name of William A. Jump is one of the most illustrious in the history of the Department. He was long noted as one of the ablest and efficient officials who have served in the liason between the Congress and the executive departments. The foundation is an appropriate memorial and reflects credit on both the Government and Mr. Jump and will serve purposes of which he strongly approved and which he faithfully serviced in his lifetime.

The announcement by the Department is as follows:

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D. C., August 16, 1954.

Secretary Benson names four new trustees for William A. Jump Memorial Foundation. They are: George Y. Harvey, clerk of the House Committee on Appropriations; William W. Parsons, administrative Assistant Secretary of the Treasury; James C. Worthy, Assistant Secretary of Commerce; and Eugene J. Lyons, Assistant Postmaster General. The memorial was established in

1949 to honor the late William A. Jump for his 40 years of outstanding services to American agriculture as an administrator of the budgetary and financial aspects of programs of the United States Department of Agriculture.

Upon What Basis Does Navy Department Award Contracts for Ship Construction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 18, 1954

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, it is important that the shipyards of the country, private and Government, should be awarded ship construction contracts in order to maintain a complete and efficient organization of the numerous and varied types of technicians and skilled tradesmen required in the construction of ships.

To accomplish this purpose one of the most important considerations is to recognize the need in the several shipyards and allot contracts in full recognition of such facts. In serving the best interests of the Government it is also necessary to recognize the principle of competitive bidding. There may be times when both of these principles cannot be given full play at the same time; times when other important elements must be taken into consideration and awards made accordingly. But in any event a fair division of the work must always be given the fullest recognition.

It is because of what seems to have been a failure in recent months to make a fair division of the work that I directed the following letter to the Secretary of the Navy:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., August 3, 1954.

Hon. CHARLES S. THOMAS,
Secretary of the Navy,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Representing the First Congressional District of New Jersey, I am naturally interested in the allotment of ship construction work to the New York Shipbuilding Corp. located at Camden, N. J., within the district which I represent and also to the Philadelphia Navy Yard, located immediately across the Delaware River from my congressional district and in which many hundreds of workers living within my district are employed.

The question I wish to direct to you is—Why have these two shipyards been so totally ignored in recent months in the granting of contracts for ship construction? During the same period of time, awards have been made to other yards, mostly those operated by the Bethlehem Steel Co., although not entirely.

We do not dispute the fact that the Bethlehem yards may have been in need of work, but the same is also true of the New York Shipyard and the Philadelphia Navy Yard. In some instances the awards were made on a noncompetitive basis. In such instances the two shipyards in which I am interested were not even given the opportunity of bidding. Why?

During the same period of time we have seen ships taken from a low bidder and given to a higher bidder. I have in mind the case of Bath Iron Works who was the low bidder for the construction of 3 destroyers at a price of $47 million. Notwithstanding its low bid, the ships were awarded to Bethlehem Steel Co. at a price of $53 million—or $6 million more than the Bath Iron Works bid. Why?

Having a direct bearing upon the above transaction we now learn of the intention to award the construction of 3 destroyers to the Bath Co. from the 1955 program. Was this done to compensate the Bath Co. for the loss of the 3 destroyers mentioned in the previous paragraph? No mention of the price has been made. What is the price? Why is not the construction of these ships on a competitive basis? Was there a reason other than what I have above stated that did not permit the New York Shipyard or the Philadelphia Navy Yard to bid for the construction of these 3 destroyers?

As further evidence of what seems to be a determination to favor the Bethlehem Steel Co. as against other shipyards, I call attention to the awarding of a contract for design of ammunition ships to the Bethlehem Co. This award was made without any other shipyard or designer being asked to quote a price. Why?

Another award to Bethlehem Steel Co. that seems open to criticism, unless there is some reason not readily discernible, is the contract that was handled through the Bureau of Ships for the Fort Eustis Beach Lighter Design (Army Transport Corporation). In this case I understand an award was made to Bethlehem Steel Co. on an estimate cost of $163,950. The New York Shipyard bid on a fixed price basis of $138,060. Why was the low bidder ignored?

The design and development of a gas turbine propulsion plant for A. F. class vessels was awarded to George Sharp without competition. Why was neither New York Shipyard nor Philadelphia Navy Yard permitted to bid?

The contract for specifications and plans for icebreaker vessel was awarded to H. Newton Whittlesey without competition. Why?

Why was the recent award for the construction of a Forrestal-type air carrier awarded to the Brooklyn Navy Yard? It already has another similar carrier under construction.

Furthermore, the awarding of a contract to a navy yard differs from an award to a private company in many ways that inure to the benefit of the navy yard in making its bid. In the first place, a navy yard bid is not a firm bid. If the navy yard bid proves to have been too low it will get an additional appropriation to finish the ship, no matter how great is the additional cost. In addition to the above, the navy yard does not pay Federal, State, or municipal taxes. It has no cost of overhead. Machinery, equipment, and facilities are supplied by the Government, and there is no cost of financing, and it has many other advantages. The private yard must calculate all of these items in its bid. It is surprising how near the fixed price bid of the private yard in many cases comes to the estimated bid of a navy yard. I realize there are important considerations that determine the necessity to have navy yards and to maintain their personnel organization by awarding them contracts. The reason is the same that makes it necessary to award work to the private yards. But even if such be true and even though the law also requires equal division between navy yard construction and private yard construction, then why in this most recent instance was not an opportunity given to the Philadelphia Navy Yard? Nor should the fact that the New York Shipyard bid, which was so low, been overlooked as being in the best interests of the Government.

In presenting these inquiries in behalf of the workers at the New York Shipyard and the Philadelphia Navy Yard, I do so with the strong conviction that they have been unjustifiedly overlooked and ignored in the awarding of the contracts to which I have made reference. Of course, I am not so unreasonable as to expect that all the work should be given to the two shipyards in which I am particularly interested, but I do think it is reasonable and right to expect that there be a fair division of the work. I respectfully submit that in my opinion such has not been the case with reference to the awarding of the contracts to which I have referred. I will greatly appreciate your giving to me the information that will enable me to have an answer to the inquiries I have made.

With kindest personal regards, I am
Sincerely yours,
CHARLES A. WOLVERTON.

Self-Incrimination and Fifth Amendment Abuse

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 18, 1954

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a most thoughtful and ably written editorial from a recent edition of the distinguished Boston Herald and the distinguished Worcester Telegram, both prominent, outstanding, Massachusetts newspapers, entitled "Self-Incrimination" and "Fifth Amendment Abuse."

As the Members of this House will observe, these editorials very ably deal with some of the problems posed by recent legislative efforts to change the law relating to witnesses and their testimony before congressional committees.

As I have previously observed on the floor, these are vital questions which go to the very root of our constitutional system. Will we continue to have a Government under our great Constitution scrupulously following the rule of law which by that immortal document protects the rights of individuals, or will we move in the direction of eliminating the basic constitutional safeguards and protections which this Nation has historically observed since its inception and adopt the totalitarian pattern of suppressing these rights?

Personally, I do not believe that, except in rare instances when martial law may be temporarily justified, whether it be in war, disaster, catastrophy or in the struggle against communism and subversion, the Congress would ever be justified in abating these great constitutional principles which have served us so well and which have so materially helped to bring greatness, strength, and glory to this Government.

There will be abuses of every law. There will be abuses of the constitutional protections. There will be certain shady, criminal, unscrupulous, and subversive individuals who may profit by these abuses. No doubt some of the abuses referred to could be eliminated by more intelligent application of the Constitution and existing laws by administrative officials and congressional committees. But essentially the abuses permitted by constitutional safeguards would be in my opinion mild and negligible indeed as compared to those that would develop out of the scrapping of the Constitution and the nullification of our time-honored constitutional provisions contained in the body of that document and the Bill of Rights which guarantee the very fundamental rights of Americans and all those living under the American flag.

If to some extent these provisions are a refuge for the guilty and the subversive, how much less desirable it would be to have a legal situation wherein the guilty and innocent alike, either through well-meaning error, or the caprice and whim of officialdom, are stripped of all their defenses against oppression and tyranny, subjected to the terrors of ruthless inquisition and finally condemned to punishment against every sacred and ancient principle of Anglo-Saxon law solely as the result of their own admissions and statements wrung out by coercion and compulsion under the color of law.

Such procedures are not only contrary to every basic principle of American constitutional law, but they are also inimical to the spirit and traditions of this great Government. It is unthinkable that this Nation should be forced to abandon its tested and invaluable constitutional principles in order to check the activities of Communists and subversives. And of course it is constitutionally indefensible as well and unnecessary to set up one rule of law for subversives and another for all others.

No one has been more articulate than I have been since my membership in Congress in pointing out the great peril to American liberty that is presented by the existence and increasing activities of the world Communist conspiracy. I have believed and hold sternly to the view that we cannot move too speedily or too vigorously to uproot this great evil which is threatening free institutions. But we must take this action in the American way, not in the totalitarian way. We must take it with full respect for and adherence to our sacred Constitution, our laws and our traditional principles, or we will be playing into the hands of the Communists by using the very methods and tactics which we condemn in their tyrannical systems.

The techniques proposed by the so-called anti-immunity bill are fantastic and confused beyond measure. They baffle understanding. Their only possible effect would be to intermingle and mix legislative, executive, and judicial powers into a bewildering pattern serving only to thwart and befuddle real law enforcement and what is worse cancel out certain individual constitutional rights.

If there is one thing absolutely essential for us to do as Americans in the great crisis confronting us, it is to stick tenaciously to the great principles and truths of our immortal and unequaled Constitution. It provides proper, lawful ways and means to effect those changes which modern progress may dictate. It affords ample powers of law enforcement consistent with basic legal principles of morality and justice. But to tamper and traffic with its most sacred provisions is bound to work great damage and injury to the moral integrity and spiritual validity of American institutions.

The editorials follow:

[From the Boston Herald of August 7, 1954]

SELF-INCRIMINATION

The immunity bill which the House of Representatives has just approved by the huge margin of 293 to 65 goes very far to satisfy the requirements of due process. It is so cautiously written, in fact, that the lawmakers may have trouble reconciling it with the tougher Senate version in the few days that remain to this session.

But many honorable people will continue to question its propriety.

The immunity bills are, of course, all aimed at getting around the self-incrimination clause of the fifth amendment. Recently many witnesses before congressional committees (and to a lesser extent grand juries) have abused the constitutional privilege in order to escape testifying on matters of genuine public concern. And both Congress and the administration have moved determinedly to close the loophole.

The remedy advanced has been to grant the witness immunity from prosecution in connection with anything he may say, so that he will cease to be, in the constitutional language, a witness "against himself." The consensus of legal authority has been that, where the immunity grant is as broad as the guarantee, the witness may be compelled to talk under penalty of contempt.

Making the immunity complete is not as easy as it seems. There is a question, for example, whether the Federal Government can grant immunity from prosecution in a State court. There is also a question how far immunity goes in cutting off a chain of evidence which may lead to a related crime. Probably these technicalities can be worked out. But questions will still remain.

Is the fifth-amendment protection, as it has developed, in fact applicable only to cases which might lead to criminal prosecution? Is not a Communist or former Communist, still being made a witness "against himself" in a very real sense, if he publicly confesses his crime even with immunity from prosecution? The ordeal of the hearing, public opprobrium, possible loss of employment, are all punishments, whether legally recognized or not.

And Dean Griswold has reminded us of another question, raised by Justice Stephen Field a half century ago. "The essential and inherent cruelty," the judge said, "of compelling a man to expose his own guilt is obvious to everyone and needs no illustration." The cruelty, he implied, was in the self-exposure, not the punishment that followed.

But, it may be asked, why worry about being cruel to Communists? Are they not the cruelest of all? And do they not richly deserve exposure? Obviously we owe nothing to them. And obviously we have an obligation, not merely a right, to expose them wherever we can.

That is all true. But we must move slowly in remaking the Bill of Rights for our own sake, not for the Reds. It is our form of Government which is at stake. Justice Holmes once said: "We have to choose, and for my part I think it a less evil that some criminals should escape than that the Government should play an ignoble part."

It may be possible to write an immunity bill which serves the good purposes sought by the Government without in any way taking away from the dignity and integrity of our constitutional processes. But we must be sure before we act.

We should remember that compulsory confession of crime is one of the features of the Soviet system which Westerners have always found most "ignoble" in the very sense Justice Holmes meant.

[From the Worcester Telegram of August 10, 1954]

FIFTH AMENDMENT ABUSE

The troubled postwar years, filled with the growing menace of Communist intrigue and subversion, have seen the rise of a vexing constitutional and legal problem in this country. It concerns the use of the Fifth Amendment by persons anxious to avoid testimony before courts, grand juries and congressional investigating committees.

Before 1946, this practice was not in the public eye. But, in the past four or five years, the American public has stared in amazement at the parade of witnesses refusing to answer questions regarding their associates, their business practices, and even their loyalty to this country, on the ground that they might be incriminated if they did.

This poses a very serious problem. The processes of law, justice and Government have been hampered. Vital information has obviously been withheld. Yet, neither the courts nor Congress has had any recourse to the witness who simply refuses to answer questions, taking the fifth amendment as his shield. In 1950, for instance Congress cited 63 persons for contempt, in an effort to establish some penalty precedents. But only two of the 63 were convicted.

The House and Senate have now passed separate, but similar bills aimed at correcting the situation. These bills, if they become law, will compel defiant witnesses to testify in cases involving national security. If the witness invokes the fifth amendment, he will be granted immunity from prosecution in any court for what he divulges. If he persists in his refusal to talk, he will be immediately cited for contempt of court or Congress. The difference between the House and Senate bills lies in the final authorization for the immunity grant. The House bill gives this power to Federal district court judges. The Senate bill would give the immunity grant to the Attorney General, but with the proviso that his opposition could be overridden by Congress.

One need not be a Communist, nor a friend of the fifth amendment pleaders, to have some doubts about these bills. For they are an attempt to change the Constitution by the passing of a law, which cannot be done. In justice, it must be recognized that the Fifth Amendment has been badly perverted by many of the shabby characters who have utilized it during the past few years. Instead of a protection for the innocent, it has become largely a refuge for the guilty. But it was written with the innocent in mind and the innocent stand to suffer if it is weakened or bypassed.

The granting of immunity may seem a way out of the dilemma. Actually, it may raise up thornier problems than it solves. For to grant a criminal immunity in all courts for testimony he gives, may be to award him a new protection for his crimes. If brought to book later, he might be able to argue successfully that his indictment was the indirect result of his immune testimony. Court procedure could thus be enormously complicated. Criminals and subversives might actually scheme to testify under immunity so as to provide themselves with future legal weapons. On the other hand, unscrupulous law-enforcement officials might be able to take unwarranted advantage of a witness' confessions, even though his testimony was immune. Once a man is known to be guilty, it is relatively easy to find other leads to his guilt.

It may be, of course, that these objections can be taken care of. We do not know. The subject has enormous ramifications. But it is clear that in our efforts to get at the malefactors among us, we must not unduly weaken our constitutional bulwarks.

Atomic Energy Act of 1954

SPEECH

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 17, 1954

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, as one of the House conferees, I signed this report. We went into conference to resolve the differences between the other body and the House and in the second conference, I think, the managers on the part of the House and the managers on the part of the Senate satisfactorily resolved the issues and the points in dispute to the point where we have an opportunity this afternoon to consider a better bill than the one which went into conference. I would not impugn the motive of any Member of either body for whatever position they took on this bill, whether they opposed it or favored it. I think it is a subject which requires considerable thought and study. Unfortunately, few Members of either body had the personal opportunity to give this the close study and thought required to fully understand its many provisions. I think the House should know that by accepting the position of the other body on the patent provision, we are merely going back to the original patent provision which was in the bill which came to the floor of the House for our consideration just a little over a week ago. We are asked, today, to accept almost the identical language which came to the House from the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. True, it was amended in the House and it was amended on a rollcall vote, but this compulsory licensing provision was originally approved by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, by almost unanimous vote. It became the position of the other body, and I might say, it is also the position that was recommended in a message to the Congress from the President. I think anyone can support the position of the conferees in full justification. I can see no way in which this amendment could hold back the program. The President, himself, foresaw a period in which the participation would be so limited that a few companies might be in a position to set up a patent monopoly. He recommended safeguards, and I, personally, have the feeling that the conferees, in this last action, have provided those safeguards which the President recommended. It is for that reason that I, as one of the managers on the part of the House, signed the conference report.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I heard, with great interest, the gentleman from New York on the question of so-called compulsory licensing. But, is it not a fact that the courts, themselves, have, when they saw a monopoly, enforced compulsory licensing, and if memory serves me, that is true in the field of radio tubes. Therefore, it is not such a horrible proposition, but it is used where they run into a situation which is conducive to monopoly such as this one.

Mr. PRICE. I might say in reply, that the Atomic Energy Act on the books today contains a compulsory licensing provision, and certainly the constitutionality of it has not been questions, at least not in court.

Have Subsidies Become Our Lifeblood?—Is There a Remedy?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. GWINN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 12, 1954

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, some time ago the Government took by force private property by taxation and gave big gobs of it to the beef cattlemen. In effect, beef became the public property of the Government. More and more people went into raising beef for Government subsidies. Surpluses of cattle increased. Prices to the consumers were fixed high by the Government, in spite of increasing surpluses. Suddenly the people quit eating beef. They struck. Just as suddenly the sturdy big-hatted ranchers woke up to the fact that they were raising socialized beef for the Government which is a most unreliable political customer. They had lost their real dependable customers, the American people. So the cattlemen took a vote and threw Government price supports and control of their business out. They chose the hard road of winning their customers back in a free beef market. That meant lower prices, but increased beef consumption from 62 to 76 pounds per capita—an alltime record. Congress was not smart enough to stop subsidies, but the cattlemen were.

The potato growers were corrupted for years by Government checks totaling $478 million. They, too, delivered their potatoes to the Government instead of the consumers. Suddenly the taxpayers were shocked to see the Government paying farmers for potatoes with taxpayers' money, then burning the potatoes to make them scarce to keep the prices high. To make it worse, after destroying the potatoes on one side of the road, the Government bought potatoes from Canada to feed the people on the other side. Congress went right on, year after year, and could not stop. The people did stop it. Potatoes won their freedom from Government. And tough as freedom is, potatoes would not go back into socialism, viz, big management, ownership, and control by the Government.

In the same way the Government has been insisting on taking by force private property and building publicly owned Government houses. It rents them at half rent, exempt from taxation. And, of course, Government expects tenants to vote right in return for favors. A very narrow majority in Congress has been insisting lately on forcing public houses on to the people in spite of the fact that the people do not want them. Generally wherever the people vote they throw Government housing out, keep their own money at home, and manage their own affairs.

Now come the people of Tennessee telling the true story of TVA, the first and most highly touted of American socialistic experiments. It is turning out very badly for Tennessee. For the Tennessee Valley has become totally dependent upon Government power and annual appropriations from Congress, and is falling behind the other Southeastern States. That is because the other States are not dependent on what Congress may or may not do. The other States make and pay for their own electric power, depending upon themselves. Tennessee has found by bitter experience that business firms will not move into a State where the amount of electric power they produce depends on Congress taking the money to build their powerplants by force from somebody else in far-distant States. Congress is finding it more and more impossible to buy the votes in Tennessee by taking the money from Massachusetts, New York, Illinois, and other States. Even the little schoolboys now define TVA as "a river that flows through 7 States and drains 41." Even so, they are being drained again for the 22d year.

This year be it noted, a Republican Congress is appropriating less than any year before, but it is still $120 million to build steam plants. That will help heat their houses with electricity, though Tennesseans have plenty of coal in their backyards which they could use. They could also use oil like other people. But it is cheaper to use electricity so long as taxpayers in other States can be socked to provide it partly at their expense for Tennessee. But Tennessee knows that no scheme to buy votes as crazy and incredible as TVA can last. So Mr. Robert M. Metcalf, Jr., vice president of Guaranty Mortgage & Trust Co., of Memphis, Tenn., comes up with this remedy. He proposed a new and greater TVA in Spotlight for the Nation. He says:

A New and Greater TVA

We are nearing a fork in the road.

With the inexorable march of events, it may not be far ahead.

Probably during this administration, our Government will be faced with a choice of what to do with TVA—for the long pull. The administration itself is pledged to a withdrawal of Government from the fields of industrial enterprise. The new Hoover Commission is already girding itself for that job; a task force of the Commission under Ben Moreell is working in the specific realm of water resources and power. In the battle that has already raged for years in the press and through the halls of Congress, the recommendations that come in from the task force may well bring on the climax.

With the taxpayer who lives elsewhere in the Nation naturally reluctant to continue being forced to invest in power facilities for Tennesseeans, the fight over TVA appropriations has become increasingly bitter.

The resident in the TVA region, on the other hand, sees TVA as a fait accompli and will declare war at the flick of a power switch when he feels that his city's growth has a ceiling being placed on it by threat of a power shortage. He realizes that is is unsound and risk-filled to be dependent upon Congressmen from all sections of the country to vote funds for his power expansion needs. Nonetheless that is the way it has been and still remains.

What would be the happiest solution of the problems posed by TVA—the best answer for the country as a whole and for the residents in the TVA region?

It is this: Sell the power-generating facilities to the people in the area it serves.

By this one stroke we would accomplish these great objectives:

1. Reverse one of the biggest socialistic steps the United States has ever taken.

2. Lift TVA off the backs of the Nation's taxpayers (as it has been with respect to (a) its demands for capital funds and (b) its nontaxpaying status, though a producing enterprise.)

3. Get the ownership of TVA truly in the hands of the people (and they would be the people most concerned) with control of the vast project at home.

4. Give to TVA the dynamism and flexibility of private enterprise, with an ownership truly alert and responsive to power needs.

5. Eliminate the tyranny, abuse, and graft of politics to which an institution like TVA is so subject.

6. Stop the threat of a power shortage that constantly hangs over the TVA region because of dependence upon Congress for growth funds.

The legislative processes to bring into being this new TVA need not be labryinthine. They might well lead to the following steps:

1. Empowering TVA to issue bonds, debentures, preferred and common stock for private sale (in the order noted below), specifying that the United States Treasury shall be the ultimate recipient of all securities sales proceeds.

2. Sale of the senior securities first, in proportions that are normal for a public utility of that type.

3. Sale of the common stock, to be offered first to individuals residing in the TVA region. The equity would probably not be too large, after step 2 is taken, for the TVA region residents to take all of the stock. They would be allowed to purchase for cash, exchange for United States bonds or pay by installments.

4. Election of board members by the new owners and complete divorce of TVA from the United States Government. The cognizant State regulatory bodies would take over regulation, and from them must be obtained prior agreements to allow rates to go to proper economic levels.

Then Mr. Metcalf concludes by asking, "Could any American dedicated to basic principles ask for a better TVA?"

And so, Mr. Speaker, as this session of Congress comes to a close, I propose to the people that they help, as Mr. Metcalf has helped with a new idea, to solve our problems. No President, no Congress, no government can solve them without such help. For twenty years Congress indulged itself in a kind of vote-getting game, sometimes under the lash of a President, to redistribute the wealth. They indulged in doing good with other people's money without too much disturbance to conscience in taking private property and making it public ownership and operation. If conscience were disturbed, alleged national defense relieved it. But by now each group getting the benefits of the redistribution are running head on into each other or running out of benefits. Indeed the mess, which this Congress came into power 2 years ago to clean up, has smeared the faces of those who have quite diligently wrestled with it.

If there are critics of the failure of Congress to reverse the New Deal trend and save the taxpayers much more, let them answer these questions. Which particular group feeding in the public trough would they knock out first? Which subsidy law would they repeal to start with? They must be repealed one at a time. That is, which group's vote would they risk losing first? That's been tried.

Three weeks ago the Illinois delegation in Congress representing corn attacked peanuts. Corn having been for nearly 20 years in the public trough and feeling quite secure said in effect: "Now what basic rights have peanuts to put their feet in this trough?" "Why the country would never miss them if we never raised another peanut. They are indigestible anyway." And corn called for a vote of all the others to throw peanuts out. Whereupon peanuts furiously counter-attacked with most devastating effect. They said, "Why of all those feeding in this trough that have grown sleek and fat and should be thrown out, it's corn. Above all others it should fall on its knees and ask forgiveness for its sins in the well of this House." So little peanuts, who really had no case at all shamed corn and scared the others so that the vote was 228 to 170 to keep peanuts in. After the fight peanuts got nearly as much subsidy as corn got for keeping itself padlocked in cribs so as to make itself look scarce and high priced.

After that vote in the House in which peanuts did so well, apples were heard tumbling all over themselves out in the halls. They said, "Why sure enough we are just as basic as any of the rest. Besides we can be kept by freezing. What's more basic than an apple a day keeping the doctor away?" In the distance you could hear groups without number organizing the votes so that every seat in the House will be endangered unless the Member votes to give each new group theirs for no good reason except that all the others are getting theirs. When I asked a friend on the floor if this would ever stop, he answered "No; it will go on for ever."

When government controls the economic laws of potatoes, it controls the moral laws surrounding their use. If government owns your house, and rents it to you, it will tell how to live in it. You may commit one sin or have one illegitimate child in government housing but not two. This is the rule in the book of morals in Houston, Tex. You are free to vote, of course, but if you vote against the party that provided your house you may expect to move. And so cattlemen, potatomen, many government tenants, dependents on government for power or loans or health, must do the will of government and not of God. Government becomes a substitute for God.

I dare say a majority of Congressmen are leaving Washington this August 1954 with a greater political, economic, and moral sense of frustration, than at any time in 22 years. It is not primarily because of entanglements with other nations, but because we have tried and failed to resolve questions of right and wrong on a constitutional basis in our domestic affairs. The contentions of groupism and the outright disorder and lawlessness of some of the more powerful ones have wearied the souls of Congressmen. What is worse, they have no defense from these groups, no limitations on their power to satisfy them, no ground on which to stand and fight.

So the people themselves must come to the defense of the President and the Congress to get the Government out of all its unlawful, unconstitutional business. They must remove such questions from elections. And then amend and clarify the Constitution by action in the State legislatures so as to keep the Republic from going Socialist ever again.

Let me know your reaction to the Metcalf proposal and subsidies.

Anti-Communist Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 18, 1954

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an editorial from the Washington Evening Star of today with reference to the Communist Control Act acted upon yesterday in the Senate.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Perilous Politics

Congress has allowed election-year politics to dominate its better judgment in considering anti-Communist legislation. It is perilous politics for a majority to vote in favor of a bill which Attorney General Brownell and FBI Director Hoover have warned would hinder rather than help in the war against the Red conspiracy. The bill approved yesterday, first by the Senate and then by the House, contains a provision which, according to these officials, would hamper the FBI and which is subject to challenge on constitutional grounds.

The unwise provision, sponsored by Democratic Senator Humphrey, would make it a criminal offense to be a Communist. If the proposal is designed to counteract charges of Democratic softness toward Communists in the Government, it may boomerang. Such a law, says Mr. Hoover, would drive all Communists underground and greatly complicate the FBI task of infiltrating their ranks. The FBI has been doing a splendid job of keeping the Reds under control, using the Smith Act to jail top-ranking leaders of the party and the Internal Security Act to force registration of the party before the Subversive Activities Control Board. Both of these effective approaches would have to be scrapped under legislation to outlaw membership in the party, as well as to outlaw the party itself. The Subversive Activities Control Board already has found the Communist Party to be a Moscow-controlled agency subject to registration. Arguments on the party's appeal to the United States Court of Appeals have been completed and the court's decision is awaited. The Government's hope of a favorable decision will be blasted if the Internal Security Act is scrapped in favor of a questionable law, condemned by the FBI.

It would be better to have no bill than the one which has been rushed through both Houses. President Eisenhower ought to veto it—whatever the political risks involved.

Political Offensive Against Reds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 30, 1954

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Select Committee of the House To Investigate Communist Aggression which recently completed an important series of European hearings, I was asked by the Cleveland News to give them my impression on the evidence presented by the various witnesses appearing before our committee.

I prepared a summary of my views, based upon what a long line of witnesses appearing before our committee had to say on the stark realities of life under communism. My impressions appeared in a specially prepared article in the Cleveland News, July 19, 1954.

After our committee had concluded its hearings in Berlin, I was invited to give a talk over radio Luxembourg to the enslaved people behind the Iron Curtain, as well as to all the many other listeners of radio Luxembourg in all of Western Europe. I was informed that radio Luxembourg is the most powerful single radio station in all Europe, which, incidentally, does not receive 1 penny of government subsidy. It was my privilege to accept this invitation and to deliver over radio Luxembourg in the form of an address, the material which I had prepared for the Cleveland News. Under unanimous consent, I insert this article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

POLITICAL OFFENSIVE AGAINST REDS IS URGED BY FEIGHAN

(By Hon. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—This article was especially written for the News by Congressman MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN, of the 20th Ohio Congressional District.)

NEW YORK.—For the past 3 weeks the Committee on Communist Aggression of the House of Representatives has been conducting hearings and sessions in London, Munich, and Berlin. As a member of that committee I have had the unique opportunity to hear evidence presented by the most competent authorities in the world on communism—those who have had to live under it and have suffered from it. The committee sessions ran consecutively from early morning to late in the evening. (FEIGHAN returned to New York today.)

A long procession of witnesses from almost every one of the many nations enslaved by Russian communism told us of the brutal treatment they suffered at the hands of the Communists and of mass killings or other unbelievable crimes committed by the Communists which they witnessed with their own eyes. The witnesses came from every walk of life, clergymen, physicians, farmers, bankers, workers, statesmen, housewives, and even children.

The sum total of all the evidence presented before our committee leads me to the following conclusions:

That communism as a system of government is the most brutal, inhuman, and tyrannical ever known in the long history of all mankind.

That the honeyed promises of Communist theory and propaganda are to mankind what the tune of the Pied Piper was to the rats of Hamelin—they can lead only to the total destruction of civilization.

That the entire evil system of communism is controlled by a relative handful of Russian tyrants in Moscow who are supported by less than 3 percent of the people enslaved within their vastly extended empire.

That the final objective of the international Communist conspiracy is world domination—the enslavement of all nations and people—a goal they confidently expect to win by default.

That it is impossible to reach any diplomatic agreements with the Russian Communists which award them anything less than complete surrender—the conference table is a stalling device used by them to gain time which they desperately need to consolidate their empire.

That the millions of people enslaved by the Russian tyrants are today our strongest allies but we shall commit a fatal error if we permit ourselves to believe we can forever hold this advantage over the enemy—time does not play on our side as some theorists would have us believe.

That our own survival as a nation and our free way of life demands that we immediately undertake a full-scale political offensive—an offensive predicated on the great moral and political principles which form the foundation for a free society.

A Lie Nailed Down

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MORGAN M. MOULDER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 3, 1954

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Speaker, the St. Louis Post-Dispatch is the best one of the few great daily newspapers. It is a defender of the truth and honesty for the best interests of the people in all walks of life. It is truly nonpartisan and renders great service to the public. The following is a reprint of an editorial published in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch last February:

A LIE AND THEY KNOW IT

The Truman and Roosevelt administrations were administrations of unadulterated betrayal to communism and deep-dyed treason that lasted 20 long years. Such is the impression that the Lincoln birthday orators of the party in power are attempting to put over this week.

This is an insult to the intelligence of the American people. Apparently, these partisan blabbermouths cannot remember something that the American people know very well. This is the fact that Dwight D. Eisenhower and John Foster Dulles enjoyed both trust and preferment in the Roosevelt and Truman administrations.

The blunt truth is that if it had not been for the opportunity for service accorded Mr. Eisenhower and Mr. Dulles by Presidents Roosevelt and Truman, Dwight Eisenhower and John Foster Dulles would not today be the No. 1 and No. 2 men in Washington. Had it not been for their part in the administration of "Communist treason," the chances are the world would never have heard their names.

Just how crazy can politicians get?

Outlawing Communist Party

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 18, 1954

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed separately in the Appendix of the RECORD an interesting and useful article, insofar as the information it conveys is concerned, written by James Montagnes, published in the Washington Daily News of August 18.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CANADA FOUND OUTLAWING THE COMMUNIST PARTY DIDN'T WORK—A RED BY ANY OTHER NAME

(By James Montagnes)

TORONTO, August 18.—Canadians are watching with interest the United States plan to outlaw the Communist Party. Canada tried the same thing—and found the party came up with another name and kept right on working while it was underground.

Today Canadian Communists operate as the Labor Progressive Party, and manage to have elected representatives in city councils and provincial legislatures.

The LPP plugs its name with public meetings and ads in daily newspapers on various national and local problems. In the past year, for example, they have fought the influx of United States capital into major Canadian industries and the repeal of wartime rental controls in urban certers like Toronto.

BANNED IN THIRTIES

During the depression thirties, the Communist Party was first outlawed under the Conservative government of R. J. Bennett. The party went underground, but its publications and leaflets were found everywhere. Its leaders became political martyrs.

Early in World War II, the party was again outlawed, and its leaders hunted and interned when found. Most of the top men in the party, including Tim Buck, who later became secretary general of the LPP, went into hiding.

They all came out, some from outside Canada, after the war. Canada's famous Royal Canadian Mounted Police have a special section which has for many years kept a close eye on the leading party members.

CHANGED NAME

When the commies changed their name to the Labor Progressive Party they also started printing a daily newspaper, the Canadian Tribune, in Toronto. Its financing became worse by the week, and within a year the paper had to suspend as a daily. Now it is published as a weekly. Its circulation is small.

Similarly the influence of the LPP has been slipping in recent years. Its stronghold is the Toronto industrial area, and some of the mining towns in northern Ontario.

Party members have tried to control a number of international unions in transportation, communications, and mining fields. Some of these unions have been cleaned up internally; others still operate as left-wing organizations, especially in the mining and electrical industries.

UNIONS FALL

Some of the unions have ceased to exist, as the Canadian Seamen's Union, which only a few years ago controlled all Great Lakes and coastal shipping in Canada.

In political contests the LPP has also lost ground. In the Toronto civic council, it used to have 4 or 5 members and as many in the board of education. In the past year practically all have been defeated at the polls.

In the Ontario provincial legislature only one LPP member now sits for a Toronto post. In the Canadian Federal Government there has been no LPP member since Montreal's Fred Rose was convicted in the postwar Russian spy ring case and lost his seat.

KEEPING IT OPEN

Attempts have been made by the Conservative Party to have the LPP outlawed the same way as its predecessor, the Communist Party. But so far the Government has felt it is better to keep the party in the open than to drive it underground, where it is more difficult to keep track of its members.

Public meetings held by LPP in the past few years at Toronto have dwindled in attendance.

In Toronto with over 1,250,000 population, the LPP now does well with a meeting of 2,000.

The Administration's Farm Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMIE L. WHITTEN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 18, 1954

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, the farm bill of this administration is now recorded history. It is being hailed by Secretary Benson and the administration as a great start toward improving conditions and relieving present problems in agriculture.

As you know, I serve on the committee which reviews the actual operations of the whole Department of Agriculture, including price supports, CCC operations, and the rest; I have spent months doing that work each year now for about 10 years, during 4 of which I served as chairman. Certainly I have had an opportunity, which comes to few, to know the real workings of the various farm programs. Based on that experience, I am sure the Secretary and the administration are clearly wrong. The bill which has been passed is not a farm bill, it is a middleman's bill. It merely adds to the middleman's profits when the spread between what the farmer gets and the consumer pays has already increased 85 percent since 1945.

In this Nation of ours, where wages are protected by minimum wage laws and the bargaining power of labor unions, where industry is protected by tariffs, in this great country of ours where only during the past 20 years agriculture has—for the first time in our history—received some equality in law and in our economy, this Republican bill is a step backward; and I would like to point out why.

THE SITUATION

First, we do have on hand huge quantities of farm commodities in which the Government has a large investment. Those commodities are on hand largely because our Government requested the farmers to expand their production. For the period 1942 to 1952, at the request of the Government, farmers increased their production tremendously, but without any agreement by the Government to buy the output of their farms—though we did contract to buy the extra output we demanded of the factories, which paid cash to their labor. During that same period, as a part of our foreign-aid program, our Government held American farm commodities off world markets at truly competitive prices. That policy is still in existence today and those are the two major reasons why we have these surplus farm commodities on hand now.

REPUBLICAN CLAIMS

This new farm bill is hailed by the administration as a great farm bill. It is represented to the country that to change the support level on basic commodities from 90 to 82½ percent will work wonders toward reducing our surpluses, which are surplus only to our domestic needs. Further, it is represented such change will reduce the cost of living to the consumers.

Actually, because of the set-aside provisions of this bill, the support level on basic commodities like cotton for 1 year will come close to 90 percent. Mr. Benson, however, says this is only a start. He will be back next year for another 7½-percent reduction, which he tried to get this year. What has really happened is that there has been a big buildup of public sentiment against any farm program. The Secretary of Agriculture, unwittingly perhaps, has misled the American people.

Let us check the record. On all the basic commodities on which they have changed the compulsory support level, we have lost only $21 million over a period of 21 years under firm price supports. What this bill does, Mr. Speaker, is put the six basic commodities—on which we have lost only $21 million in 21 years—under the flexible provisions along with other commodities which have already been under it, and on which, in the same 21-year period, we have lost $1,450,000,000.

TRADE POLICY

There are some good features of this bill, such as placing agricultural attachés in foreign countries under the Agriculture Department. This is something I have advocated repeatedly at every opportunity for a number of years. This means that for the first time our salesmen of agricultural commodities report to and take orders from the Department they are supposed to represent, instead of the State Department.

But the bill falls far short of what we need because we follow the sales policy announced by the Department of Agriculture, and I quote:

> These commodities are offered at prevailing world market prices in the following manner: Corn is offered at the world market price on date of sale at point of delivery. Wheat is offered on the basis of the domestic price at the time of sale less an export allowance announced daily, equal to the difference between the world price and the domestic price. Oils and peanuts are offered on a bid basis and bids are accepted if the price is not below the world price. (P. 49, pt. 1, Agricultural Appropriation Hearings.)

Surely they must know CCC stocks must move in world trade channels at competitive prices in order for any farm program to work. It is tragic to make our farmers cutback their production and absorb this buildup of commodities which Government policy on sales requires, particularly since the Government asked for the expanded production and now does not place the surplus on the counters of world trade on a competitive basis.

Until we can break down this foreign trade policy, or rather lack of a trade policy, we will have lots of salesmen on the road with little to sell because our prices are not competitive even though the law authorizes sale in world trade at truly competitive prices.

IT IS NO FARMERS' BILL

This great Benson farm bill is not a farm bill; it is a middleman's bill. It simply lowers the bidding price to the farmer, without any requirement that such amount be reflected in the retail price of the finished product. Instead of the farmer getting a higher support level at his time of need, he gets a low one. Instead of getting a low support level when he needs less help, he gets a higher support. In other words, if the Government feels that the consumer groups need more of a given commodity the Government will raise the support level to get the farmer to produce. But, if supplies are plentiful and the farmers have surpluses and need help, then the support level is reduced. That is certainly not for the benefit of the farmer. It is admitted by the Department of Agriculture that the cost of what the farmer buys has gone up fully 12 percent in the last few years; but the price received for his production has gone down 13 percent in the last 2 years.

MODERN PARITY

What do they do under this bill to meet that problem? They change the parity formula and the farmer is placed under modern parity. That sounds nice, but it really means that the farmer's support level is based on the average prices he has received for his commodities for the last 10 years; and it ignores completely his rising costs. Where the old parity, which Mr. Benson has gotten rid of because it is old, provides a support level tied to the cost the farmer pays, this change to modern parity will help make the farmer's plight more severe.

DAIRY SUPPORTS

In this bill we find that the support level on dairy products is reduced from the House bill level of 80 percent of parity to 75 percent of parity. I am one of those who realize that we cannot have high level supports on commodities without some control of the quantity. However, Mr. Speaker, the situation becomes different when the dairy farmers were urged to increase their production by the Government; and their production was held off world markets at truly competitive prices. As long as that governmental policy exists, whatever the justification may be, we have an obligation to protect the producer.

OTHER BUSINESS—AGRICULTURE

I have before me copy of the Kansas City Star of August 12, 1954, in which great headlines proclaim "United States Economy to a Peak—Overall Conditions Since Republicans Took Over Are Better Than During Any Previous Period, President Declares in Midyear Report."

The next article in the same paper carries the headline "Farm Incomes Dip—Only 44 Cents of Each Consumer Dollar Reaches Producer, New Figures Reveal—As Marketing Costs Soar—While Farmer's Share Falls to Postwar Low, Food Buyers Get Little Break—Decline During April–June Period to Men of the Land Is 3 Percent."

It is under these conditions that we find this farm bill passed. For the first time in 20 years we are basing our support of farm commodities on the prices the farmer has been getting, without any relation to the cost he pays.

CONSUMERS WON'T BENEFIT

There will be no real benefit to the consumer. The amount the farmer receives from the wheat that goes into a loaf of bread has dropped from 2.9 cents to 2.5 cents; but the retail price of the loaf of bread increased from 12 cents to 16.5 cents in the same period.

There is about 31 cents worth of cotton in a $3.75 shirt. If the farmer contributed the cotton there would be no reduction in the retail price of such shirt, as long as the consumer would pay the $3.75, and so it goes.

BAD EFFECT IS SEEN—MORSE, BENSON

Farm prices received have dropped 13 percent in the last 2 years. There have been 11 freight rate increases since World War II. The farmer's costs have gone up. Farm purchasing power will probably be at the lowest level next year since the depression years of the 1930's. Farm machinery people will know it. Appliance firms, automobile dealers, and all the rest will know it.

Let me quote the Under Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. True D. Morse, who said the stringent farm controls will mean less profits for the farmers and will slow down the whole economy:

> There will be less for labor to do—less crop work, harvesting, processing, transportation, storage and sales. To the extent that farm production is cut back and restricted, it tends to weaken consumer demand and national prosperity on which farm markets depend.

Secretary Benson says he does not believe it will start a farm led and farm fed depression. I hope he is right. I can only point out that every depression we have had was led off by a break in farm income.

DEPARTMENT'S ARGUMENT

Mr. Speaker, there are many things that the farmer should recognize. All the arguments I have heard Secretary Benson and Under Secretary Morse make for flexible price supports were in reality arguments against any price supports. The general tenor of Mr. Benson's testimony before our committee has been that a little hardship visited on the farmers might be good for all of us. I do not believe that theory, but apparently we are about to find out about it.

The Secretary says we should have a prosperous United States notwithstanding the decline in farm income. A check of the records of the economy of this Nation throughout its history will disclose that over any 5 year period the national income has averaged about seven times the farm income. While it is true that other segments of our economy are enjoying prosperity while farm prices are going down, just observe the next 4 years and you will see that unless we can change this farm bill the drop in farm prices will pull the other down with it. Our history clearly proves that fact. The similarity between today and the late 1920's is alarming.

WHAT IS THE PURPOSE?

Mr. Speaker, the tragedy of this bill is that the American people have been led to believe that a change in the support level for basic commodities will correct everything. They have been led to believe that present conditions require the so-called diverted acreage program, whereby the farmer will have the Government make his price support contingent on his farm being planted almost acre by acre in line with departmental demand. In effect, it is a drive to limit our farmers almost entirely to the domestic market.

There are many who believe, in view of the Department's obvious opposition to any farm price-support program, that this control of diverted acreage is just a means of making the program so unpopular with farmers as to get rid of price supports entirely. Certainly it will make it hard on the farmer.

REAL CAUSE OF OUR PROBLEM

Actually the administration misses the boat. Our problems come not because we support the price received by our farmer for domestic commodities, which is done in an effort to give him somewhat equal purchasing power and equal treatment. They come because our farm commodities have not been and are not now offered on world markets at competitive prices. It is as simple as that. According to the Department's own tesimony we have been a residual supplier. Those commodities that we have offered have been offered at prevailing world prices, and if our competitors reduce their prices they have gotten the business. Then if their supplies were insufficient to meet world demand they have come to us to take up the slack. That is where the cure must come, in a change of national policy so that Commodity Credit Corporation stocks will be made available to the world on a competitive price basis.

Such action is authorized by law now, but it is not being used. Such action is contemplated by all the legislation we have. Until the administration realizes that fact, the farmers are in for a tough time. With the farmer in for a tough time we will have further destruction of our fertile soil, 40 percent of which has already been depleted We will have a return to the time when farmers did not live like other people because their income did not make it possible.

A VICTOR BUT MANY LOSERS

The Nation's newspapers, in large headlines, have hailed the new farm bill with its flexible supports as being a great victory for the President and Mr. Benson. The President says it is a start in the right direction. Perhaps it is a victory for them, for they had their way. However, for every winner, there is a loser; and the loser here is the American farmer. He alone is to get less. He alone is separated from consideration of his cost of production. He alone is supposed to do better with less. May I add that while he is the immediate loser, the people of the whole Nation will be the loser in the long run.

George Kennan, the Author of Containment, Coexistence, and National Surrender

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 30, 1954

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, on June 29, while in Munich as a member of the Select Committee of the House To Investigate Communist Aggression, I made a statement to the press which I believe will be of interest to the Members of Congress. After hearing a long line of witnesses, most of whom had suffered under the terrible tyranny of communism, tell our committee the hard cold facts of what the Communists intend to do to the United States and all other free nations, I felt compelled to make this public statement:

> Even since the day I became a member of the House Committee To Investigate Communist Aggression I have heard remarkable testimony on the methods and techniques of Communist aggression which add up to the greatest criminal conspiracy in the history of all mankind. This testimony has come from the people who have lived under and suffered the tortures of Communist aggression.
>
> None of this testimony came from armchair or ivory-tower theorists.
>
> On the basis of this firsthand testimony I am all the more convinced that the policy of containment as advocated by the former diplomat, George Kennon, is not only amoral but represents a sure formula for the defeat of human freedom everywhere in the world and the establishment of world domination by the Russian Communists.
>
> The policy of the United States toward the enslaved nations of people must be a positive one based on established American moral and political principles. That is the only formula which can preserve western civilization.
>
> The Stars and Stripes and a great many European newspapers, particularly those published in Germany, were kind enough to give my statement complete coverage.

Americans United in Opposition to Seating of Red China in the U. N.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES J. KERSTEN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 9, 1954

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, because of the loud talk of a few leftwingers and Communists it might be generally realized throughout the world that virtually all Americans are unanimous in their opinion that Red China should not be seated in the U. N.

Recently, more than a million persons signed petitions against the admission of Red China into the U. N.

On July 15, 1954, the House of Representatives adopted H. R. 627 by a vote of 281 to 0. House Resolution 627 reads as follows:

> *Resolved,* That the House of Representatives reiterates its opposition to the seating of the Communist regime in China as the representative of China in the United Nations or any of its specialized agencies and supports the President in his expressed determination to use all means to prevent such representation.

And on July 29, 1954, the Senate of the United States, by a vote of 91 to 0 again expressed its opposition to the admission of Red China into the U. N. The measure which the Senate acted upon reads in part, "The Congress hereby reiterates its opposition to the seating of the Communist regime in China as the representative of China."

President Eisenhower, at a press conference on July 7, stated:

> I am completely and unalterably opposed under the present situation, to the admission of Red China into the United Nations. I personally think that 95 percent of the population of the United States will take the same stand.

The President went on to explain his position further:

> Red China is today at war with the United Nations. They were declared an aggressor by the United Nations, in the Assembly. That situation has never been changed.
>
> They are occupying North Korea; they have supported this great effort at further enslavement of the people of Indochina; they have held certain of our prisoners unjustifiably, and they have been guilty of the employment of the worst possible diplomatic deportment in the international affairs of the world.
>
> Now, how can the United States, as a self-respecting Nation, doing its best in conformity with the moral standards as we understand them, how can we possibly say this Government should be admitted to the United Nations?

The American people have lost 33,417 of their youth killed in the Korean war and have had an additional 108,650 wounded. These 142,000 casualties will forever be a vivid reminder to the American people of the true nature of the Chinese Communist regime.

But American opposition to Red China is not solely an emotional response to this great loss—it is based on the U. N. Charter itself. Article 4, section 1, states:

> Membership in the United Nations is open to all other peace-loving states which accept the obligations contained in the present Charter and, in the judgment of the organization, are able and willing to carry out these obligations.

This section clearly indicates that membership in the United Nations is not to be open to all nations but rather only to peace-loving states. The very word united in the United Nations implies that the nations are united as to its objectives and are not merely an assembly of all states.

Secretary of State John Foster Dulles aptly expressed this position when he stated:

> The United Nations was not set up to be a reformatory. It was assumed that you would be good before you got in and not that being in would make you good.

Secretary Dulles explained this point in his press conference on July 8, 1954, as follows:

> The record of the Chinese Communist regime is such that it is, in my opinion, clearly not qualified to be seated in the United Nations.
>
> Let me, if I may, elaborate that a bit. I recall from the days at San Francisco in 1945, when the charter was drawn, that there was at that time a very considerable argument on whether the United Nations should be a universal body which would represent all the governments of the world, good, bad, or indifferent, or whether membership should be on a selective basis. That was strongly argued at San Francisco and the proponents of selectivity won. That is reflected by the provision in the charter that members should be peace-loving and able and willing to discharge their obligations under the charter. That is strengthened furthermore by the provision that any nation against which enforcement action was taken should be liable to suspension from membership in the United Nations. In other words, the United Nations was not set up to be a reformatory. It was assumed that you would be good before you got in and not that being in would make you good.
>
> The United States, basing itself on the principles of the charter, which are clear, takes the position that the Communist regime is disqualified by its consistent record of opposition to the principles of the United Nations. In Korea it carried on war against the United Nations. At the Geneva Conference it continuously donounced the United Nations. It has been the subject of enforcement action recommended by the United Nations. In southeast Asia it promoted aggression. All of these facts combine to make a case such that we do not believe that the requisite vote can be found to admit the Communist regime to represent China in the United Nations.

This strong opposition of the American people to the admission of Red China to the U. N. is not based on any dislike or distrust of the U. N.; rather it is based on a strong desire to make the U. N. really effective. The American people realize that if Red China were admitted to the United Nations it would be as Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee stated in the United States Senate, "a death blow to that organization."

Senator WILLIAM KNOWLAND, of California, the majority leader of the Senate, feels so strongly on this subject, that on July 1, 1954, he stated in the Senate:

> On the day when Communist China is voted into membership into the United Nations, I shall resign my majority leadership in the Senate, so that without embarrassment to any of my colleagues or to the administration, I can devote my full efforts in the Senate and throughout the country to terminating United States membership in that organization and our financial support to it. My conscience would not permit me to remain silent or inactive if this last grand appeasement takes place.

Similarly, Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON, of Texas, the minority leader in the Senate, stated on July 2, 1954:

> The American people want no appeasement of the Communists.
>
> Second, the American people will refuse to support United Nations if Communist China becomes a member.

A perusal of the United Nations Charter, would demonstrate to anyone that this organization would commit suicide if it admitted Red China to its body. Article 2, section 2, of the U. N. Charter states:

> All members, in order to insure to all of them the rights and benefits resulting from membership, shall fulfill in good faith the obligations assumed by them in accordance with the present charter.

Would anyone seriously contend that Red China would fulfill its obligations under the charter in good faith?

Article 2, section 3 of the charter states:

> All members shall settle their international disputes by peaceful means in such a manner that international peace and security, and justice, are not endangered.

Article 2, section 4 of the U. N. Charter states:

> All members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state, or in any other manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations.

Who would seriously suggest that Red China will refrain from the threat or the use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any other state?

Article 2, section 5 of the U. N. Charter reads:

> All members shall give the United Nations every assistance in any action it takes in accordance with the present Charter and shall refrain from giving assistance to any state against which the United Nations is taking preventive or enforcement action.

Not only is Red China not assisting the United Nations in its actions but it is the very subject against which the United Nations has taken action and branded as an aggressor in Korea. It has not only not refrained from giving assistance in the battle against war in South Korea, but has been the instigating force of that war.

These are the principles of the U. N. Charter: For what purpose shall the U. N. continue is existence if it ignores these principles? The admission of Red China to the U. N. would be a complete perversion of these principles and of the U. N. itself. Could the U. N. possibly retain the respect of any rational person if it admits to its membership this wanton aggressor and destroyer of its own people?

There is no indication to this date that the Red Chinese regime is representative in any way of the Chinese people. It has no claim to legitimacy. This regime is neither a government nor is it legitimate. It consists solely of a band of gangsters who have seized the trappings of government and are using it as a club to make its own people obey its dictates, having slain millions of its own people in the attempt.

Mr. Walter P. McConaughy, Director of the Office of Chinese Affairs in the United States Department of State, expressed the United States attitude toward the Red Chinese regime when he explained in the Department of State Bulletin of January 11, 1954, the reasons for American refusal to recognize the Chinese Communist regime. Mr. McConaughy there stated:

> To start with, let us take a look at the four generally accepted criteria which a new regime ordinarily must meet before its recognition as a legitimate government and its acceptance into the sisterhood of nations. These four criteria are (1) effective control over the territory of the country; (2) sovereign independence; (3) truly representative character—something in the nature of a mandate from the people governed, or at least their consent without coercion; and (4) acceptance of its inherited and generally recognized treaty and other international obligations and adherence to a pretty well established minimum standard of decency in its treatment of foreign nationals and interests within its borders.
>
> Of these four criteria it would seem that the Peiping regime meets only the first and that is perhaps the least essential of the four.
>
> Repeatedly we have recognized governments in exile which could not meet the first criterion. But it would be a serious matter to overlook the other three tests.
>
> The Chinese Communists do not measure up under any of them. They are subservient to Moscow and international communism; they impose an alien minority rule by force and falsification on an intimidated, isolated and misinformed populace; and they openly flout every Chinese treaty obligation, every principle of the U. N. Charter, and every clause in any reasonable formulation of human and property rights for aliens.

Mr. McConaughy also offered strong practical reasons against recognition of Red China. These arguments apply with equal force with respect to admitting Red China to the U. N. Mr. McConaughy stated:

> On grounds of international law, the case against recognition is very strong. On practical grounds, the argument is equally strong.
>
> Recognition has assumed a political and psychological significance which is new. It has become a symbol. Recognition in this case would mean in the eyes of millions, especially in Asia, not necessarily approval but acceptance, accommodation, and reconcilement.
>
> Nonrecognition means refusal to accept the Communist triumph as definitive. It means to many that the will to resist Communist expansion is alive; that communism is not the inevitable "wave of the future" for Asia; that communism is not assured of acceptance and legitimation in every country where it may gain a beachhead; that our Asian friends who have the courage to stand up against communism will not have the ground cut from under their feet if communism should attempt to subvert or take over their native land.
>
> Some may be unable to see why the recognition issue should signify all this; but the fact is that it does to many Asians; including numbers who are on the fence. Many an Asian has told me that American nonrecognition of the Communist regime in Peiping has had much to do with checking the impetus of the Communist advance in Asia.
>
> Even Chinese who are not particularly in sympathy with the Chinese Nationalist Government tell us that recognition of the Communist dictators in Peiping would be the greatest single nonmilitary triumph for the Communist cause and the hardest psychological blow against the will to resist the further spread of communism that could be devised.
>
> It would be an unthinkable betrayal of the Chinese Government and its people on Formosa and likewise a grave disservice to the mass of Chinese people on the mainland suffering under Communist dictatorship. Our friendship for them shall not waver, and it demands that we shall not strengthen the hand of their oppressor.
>
> The Communist side is becoming increasingly aware of the immense political and psychological advantages, as well as the parliamentary advantages in the United Nations, which could be obtained from general worldwide recognition of the Peiping regime. Hence we are beginning to see a series of maneuvers out of Moscow and Peiping designed to force the general international acceptance of Mao Tse-tung regime as the legitimate government of China, entitled to occupy China's seat in the United Nations. This endeavor must be resisted.

The argument has been made by some that if we object to the admission of Red China into the U. N. why do we not object to the presence of the Soviet Union in the U. N. I, for one, of course, have continuously advocated that we should take measures to expel the Soviet Union from the U. N., precisely because it has violated the U. N. Charter, particularly article 2, section 5, which I have quoted above. However, even though one does not advocate the expulsion of the Soviet Union from the U. U., it does not necessarily follow that it is therefore desirable to admit Red China. We are well aware of what type of regime the Red Chinese are. Any act leading toward its admission to the U. N. would be done in the face of our actual knowledge of its treacherous character.

But when the United Nations was formed it was believed by many people that the Soviet Union was a peace-loving state; that it was able and willing to carry out the obligations of the charter; that it would attempt to settle its international disputes by peaceful means; that it would refrain from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any other state; that it would assist the United Nations in its actions and that it would refrain from giving assistance to any state against which the United Nations is taking preventive or enforcement action. It was seriously believed by many that the Soviet Union would be become a true partner in the U. N. and live up to its provisions. It was on that very assumption that they were brought in as one of the founders of the United Nations. We now well know, that the Soviet Union got into the U. N. by reason of its guile and the free world's gullibility. Now that it is in, it is difficult to expel it.

But however that may be, because we have made a serious mistake once is no reason to make the same serious mistake again. The U. N. cannot admit Red China, knowing its true character, without thereby denying the very purpose of the U. N.'s existence.

The American people feel a strong bond of friendship with the Chinese people. The Chinese people and the Nationalist Government were strong and faithful allies of the United States in its war against Japan. The American people know that the Chinese Nationalist Government is more representative of the Chinese people than the Chinese regime could ever be. We know that this dark hour in Chinese history will pass and that China will again be free and a sovereign nation.

These American hopes for China were expressed on February 26, 1954, by Mr. Walter S. Robertson, Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs, in an address he made on the occasion of the transfer of two United States destroyers to the Republic of China, at Charleston, S. C. Mr. Robertson on that occasion stated:

> It is for all these reasons that no wish is closer to the heart of the American people than that China shall be herself again. It is in witness of that hope that two American destroyers today are being transferred to the Chinese flag. These vessels are symbols of our abiding faith in China and of our conviction that China will again, as always in the past, prove stronger than the alien intruder. We believe these ships will contribute to bringing nearer the day when China will belong unreservedly to the Chinese. In passing to the command of the Republic of China, they go to strengthen a government that is at once a symbol and a fruit of the inextinguishable Chinese spirit.
>
> Recently, 14,000 Chinese prisoners of war in Korea, by choosing to forsake the ties of family and community in order to live under a truly Chinese flag, exposed the fraudulence of the claims of the authorities in Peiping to speak with the voice of China. The passionate determination of so many soldiers from their command not to return to Communist rule clearly came as a great shock to those authorities. It did not surprise us in the least. There has never been any question in our minds as to how the Chinese people would choose if given the choice between a government rooted in Chinese traditions and one that has made of China a handmaiden of an alien imperialism. It is because of what we know of the Chinese people's ability to endure the most malignant fortune without being crushed by it or surrendering to it that we have no doubt of the outcome of China's present travail.

The Late Honorable Sidney A. Camp

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 16, 1954

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, it was with sorrow and grief that I received the news of the passing of our beloved colleague, Sidney Camp. Duties in my district prevented my being here to eulogize him at the time of his passing, and now as I rise to pay tribute to my late departed friend, there is little that I can add to the splendid eulogies spoken by other Members. It has been my privilege to serve with him on the Committee on Ways and Means. He was a valuable member of the committee and had an unfailing sense of devotion to duty. All who knew him loved him and he will be sorely missed both in the committee and in the House. Sid Camp has left a host of warm friends and the Nation has suffered a great loss. My deepest sympathey goes to the members of his family.

Congressmen Need Raise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 18, 1954

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following words of Drew Pearson should give us "food for thought." They are part of his column which appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald of August 18, 1954.

CONGRESSMEN NEED RAISE

It may sound strange coming from one who has done his share of criticizing Congress, but in my opinion it would be a tragedy if Congress did not come back this fall to vote a pay raise both for judges and Congressmen themselves.

President Eisenhower urged such a pay boost last year. A commission was appointed, a recommendation made, but now all has been forgotten.

Congressmen and Federal judges are still struggling along on salaries that few similarly qualified professional men would work for, though some are getting tired and resigning.

In the old days, the Senate was a rich man's corporation, where a Member could afford to work for nothing. And the resultant legislation, as could be expected, benefited the rich. The House of Representatives has featured those who got kickbacks from their staff, private expense accounts a la NIXON, or skimped their families.

Few men in any job these days have to maintain two houses, unless they are corporation executives and get paid for it. But a Congressman must keep a home in his district and a home in Washington, esspecially if he has children. The expense is terrific.

On top of this, few people are called upon to work longer hours than a United States Senator.

The ordinary citizen working such hours would have gone on strike long ago, whether union or nonunion.

Yet most Members of Congress are conscientious, honest men. This writer happens to have exposed irregularities, helped send four Congressmen to jail in recent years. However, I am certain these do not represent the congressional average.

What's bound to happed is that if congressional salaries are not increased, the caliber of our legislators will go down and down.

Since Congressmen hesitate to vote themselves an increase before elections, I suggest that the House return after November, when the Senate will have to return to vote on MCCARTHY anyway, and then both take up the long overdue question of congressional and judicial salaries.

Our Liberty Is Not Expendable

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 17, 1954

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith excerpts from an address by Eric Peterson, general secretary-treasurer of the International Association of Machinists, made at the IAM summer institute at Madison, Wis.

OUR LIBERTY IS NOT EXPENDABLE

The changing times have brought to American labor a greater interest and a grave responsibility in the world scene. If we would remain free, we cannot ignore the threat to the freedoms of all of us which are contained in the plottings and activities of imperialistic communism.

We must be alert to recognize the cynical lies behind the ever changing false faces put on by the Communists to trick us. These masks are worn to disguise the cruel and heartless exploitation of all workers in Communist countries.

If the free people of the world are to be victorious in this struggle, if we are to remain leaders of the free world, we of the American labor movement must do our part in exposing and identifying Communist trickery.

We must recognize, for example, that Communists use the slogans of peace as instruments of war, that they use the slogans of prosperity, justice, and self-rule to enslave nations.

STOCKHOLM PETITION

All of us still remember the Stockholm peace petition circulated by the Communists 4 years ago. That so-called peace petition was launched in Stockholm, Sweden, on March 19, 1950—almost 3 months to the day before their invasion of South Korea.

The Stockholm peace petition was part of the military plan for the Communist invasion of South Korea. Its objective was to arouse world sentiment against the development of atomic weapons by the United States to such a pitch that South Korea could be invaded without fear that atomic weapons would be used against the Communist forces there.

Let us never fail to point out that the Communist Government of Russia also has a well-developed atomic weapons program. Let us point out again and again that it is Russia that refuses to agree to any program for international control of atomic armaments that would include international inspection of atomic energy plants. The United States and Canada are not only willing but have committed themselves to such a program.

Anyone who knows the truth, knows the enormity of the Communist lies. They call themselves the party of peace. Yet, they continue to prepare for war.

ANOTHER CAMPAIGN

Behind the Iron Curtain, Communist propaganda praises the preparations for aggressions. In other countries, anyone who would prepare to resist their aggression is labeled a warmonger.

The whole purpose of the Communist peace offensive is to trick us into slackening our preparations to resist their next aggression.

I point this out to you today because I am reliably informed that the Communists are about to launch another "peace campaign." As a prelude to the invasion of what country? Formosa? Southern Indochina? Iran? Yugoslavia? We don't know who is next on their time table.

It's our job to help make our neighbors understand that when a Communist uses the word peace, he is doing it to help the military plans of the international Communist movement.

A NEW FALSE FACE

During the past few weeks, the Communist Party in this country—what's left of that miserable band—has changed its line once again. And, once again they are putting on a new false face. In this one, they are trying to convince us that they are sincere advocates of democracy and Americanism. For the next few weeks or months, they are going to try to persuade Americans—including trade union members—to work for a national policy of "peaceful coexistence" with communism.

They are going to masquerade—as they have before—as champions of the workingman. The Communists, of course, have a great contempt for workingmen. They think that a change of line and a few slogans will make us forget all about their purpose and their real program—as printed up long ago in the basic literature of the Communist Party and as practiced in every Communist country.

Do they think we cannot read their labor laws? Laws that deny workers the elementary rights of freedom of speech, freedom of assembly, freedom of association? Laws that in Russia, for example, send a machinist to jail if a locomotive breaks down after he has repaired it? Laws that make a worker financially liable for spoilage? Laws that carry jail sentences for lateness for work?

PEACEFUL COEXISTENCE

As honest union members, we cannot live a peaceful coexistence with any group that has as its basic purposes the suppression of our individual and group liberties.

Nothing in the Communist drive for world domination provides us with any evidence that they have any intention of living peacefully with the free world. The evidence is all to the contrary. For that reason, we cannot support any policy of coexistence with communism whether proposed by Communists or anyone else.

Nor can we live in peaceful coexistence with any other group that seeks to suppress our American liberties—even though they pretend to do it in the name of fighting communism.

VALUE OF FREEDOM

We in the International Association of Machinists believe in the free American way of life. We believe that a man is innocent until he is proven guilty. We believe every man is entitled to a fair trial—no matter what wrongdoing he is charged with. We believe that every man has the right to dissent and that he should be encouraged to, if that is his honest belief. We believe in the American 2-party political system and we oppose anyone who would seek to change the opposition with treason because he hasn't always agreed with it. We are against the introduction of totalitarian methods in America. That is why we are dead against McCarthyism.

We in the International Association of Machinists stand for peace. At the same time, we believe that there are things worth fighting for. Freedom is one of them.

We—the organized workers of America—are living, incontrovertible proof of the value of freedom. Only in a free society can a labor movement such as ours exist. Only through a free labor movement can wage earners achieve the dignity, justice and opportunity which are their birthright.

So, we must educate ourselves in these troubled times to a realization of national and world problems and to an ability to do our part in solving them.

The Atomic Energy Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 22, 1954

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, it is said hereabouts that the atomic energy bill will soon be considered in the House and that only 2 days will be allowed for debate and discussion.

The bill is compiled of some 107 pages of technical provision and complex phraseology. It affects a $12 billion investment of the American taxpayers and whatever final law we enact will reach into the destiny of many generations to come.

It is, therefore, my earnest hope and plea that the leadership will insure that no restriction of time be placed upon discussion of perhaps the most vital subject yet to be presented to this Congress or indeed any other Congress.

As the bill now reads it is objectionable to me, and I think a great many others, primarily because it negatives the nonpartisan public-power policy of this country that has been developed since 1902. That occurs because of the current absence in the measure of any reliable safeguard against exploitation of atomic power by private utilities. It practically forbids the Atomic Energy Commission to operate in the commercial power field which simply means that the taxpayers will have to pay for further experimentation, from which the private utilities will ultimately benefit.

There are many deficiencies in the bill as it now stands but, in the public interest and recognition of the tremendous amount of money that has come out of the average taxpayer's pocket, two major improvements must be inserted in the act before, in my judgment, it should be approved.

The present patent provision must be corrected to insure that no atomic development monopoly can be established by those few firms privileged to carry out the original atomic energy research under Government contract and subsidy.

The provision restricting the Atomic Energy Commission from producing atomic power for Government-operated plant uses and also making it available for public consumption through rural electric cooperatives and municipal agencies must also be removed in deference to the power-consuming public and protection against unjust profiteering.

I sincerely remind the Members of this House that a heavy moral obligation rests upon us with respect to this particular legislation. Let us give this vitally important subject the long and careful and serious consideration it warrants. We can do no less to merit the continuing trust and confidence of the people who sent us here to legislate for the general welfare.

The Foundations' Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 17, 1954

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to direct the attention of our colleagues to the following article, written by Mr. M. Jay Racusin. This is the second of two articles describing some of the accomplishments and objectives over the years of the leading philanthropic foundations of this country. The first article has already been made a part of the RECORD.

It appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of August 17, 1954, and is as follows:

SUPPORT FOR FOOD RESEARCH, MEDICINE, ASTRONOMY, AND FOREIGN GOOD WILL AMONG THE CONTRIBUTIONS

(By M. Jay Racusin)

For more than twenty years a group of scientists on the southwestern tip of Cape Cod have been quietly working on a little known project under the name of the Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution. This work, like many others, represents another important tangible instance of the efforts made by the Rockefeller and Carnegie Foundations.

The scientists have been searching for new mass resources of protein food. The late Dr. Karl T. Compton, atomic scientist and former head of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, had warned the world that unless new, limitless sources of such food were found, the increase in population over the next 50 years would bring tremendous social upheavals.

These scientists recently reported they had found untold wealth of the necessary nutrition in the ocean and that it could easily be made available to man. They are devising methods by which the hungry peoples of the world, without any knowledge of the sea, may feed themselves unstintingly from its bounty, and avoid the social upheavals predicted by Dr. Compton.

The thousands of scientists, scholars, and educators who have been financially nursed through their studies by these and many foundations, the scores of colleges, universities, hospitals, research centers and professional organizations that have received millions from them for scientific and educational advancement represent values to the community and the Nation which, though intangible, are incalculable.

SMALL AID, BIG RESULT

Sometimes a small grant to a faltering scientist at a crucial moment has produced spectacular results. In this category is the case of Dr. Leonard Colebrook, former director of the laboratory of Queen Charlotte's Hospital in England. He was looking for a remedy to reduce the number of deaths and infections of women in childbirth. He received a grant for the purpose from the Rockefeller Foundation.

In 1936 he reported that he had been developing and experimenting with a drug produced by the Pasteur Institute, a changed version of the German chemical, prontosil, and that it had amazing powers in protecting women in childbirth from infections. He called his drug sulfanilimide. It had its derivatives have been useful in the cure of forms of meningitis, pneumonia and other diseases.

Another Rockefeller Foundation fellow, Dr. Edwin J. Cohn, developed a plasma fraction and transfusion technique at the Harvard Medical School during World War II which has become part of the blood-bank service of the American Red Cross.

The Rockefeller Foundation provided financial assistance to Dr. Ernest A. Lawrence, inventor of the cyclotron, to perfect his early models, and provided money for the 184-inch model that was the key tool for the research work that produced the atom bomb. The same foundation financed the successful search for human sex hormones. And it provided fellowships for specialized training for 23 of the leading scientists who later worked on the first atom bomb.

A DOUBLE UNIVERSE

In 1928 the California Institute of Technology began work on a project to double the size of the universe for human eyes. It was the 200-inch telescope at Mount Palomar, the largest telescope in the world. The Rockefeller Foundation financed the entire venture and had put up a total of $6,500,000 when the telescope began functioning in January 1949.

The same foundation, in 1910, initated a project to suppress hookworm and yellow fever in the South. Within 5 years and with the expenditure of millions on experts, equipment and medicaments, the two diseases were brought under control.

The foundation's work on these and other diseases, including malaria and the yaws, was extended throughout the world. In India, particularly, where 60 to 80 percent of the population were found to be infected with one or another of these ailments, the job of eradication brought economic improvement and health to millions of the people.

In the 1940's, the Rockefeller Foundation, apprised of a serious food problem in Mexico, developed corn and wheat-growing projects there with such success that the food yield was increased by around 30 percent. This project was copied in other areas throughout the world where food shortages existed.

In 1946, the Rockefeller Foundation financed the establishment at Columbia University of the Russian Institute, providing instruction and information on Russian affairs. Army, Navy, Air Force, and State Department representatives have been receiving training there on how to deal with Russian and Communist problems. The institute has received high praise from President Eisenhower for its services as a "cornerstone of our defense against communism."

The Berkshire Music Center, a training school for musicians, is also a philanthropy of the Rockefeller charities.

WORK IN FOREIGN FIELD

Outstanding in the foreign field as a means of promoting good will is the venture of the Ford Foundation in a village-improvement program. It is going forward in 43,000 villages in India, and is expected to be operating in all of the country's 500,000 villages by 1963.

The Ford Foundation has also made a special effort in the field of television which it is seeking to develop as a powerful medium of public education. Its omnibus program, a phase of its TV-Radio Workship, over 82 stations, is said to reach a maximum of 18 million persons weekly throughout the country. Another program, Excursion, for young people, is said to have a weekly audience of 9 million.

The John Simon Guggenheim Memorial Foundation, has aided some 1,500 writers, artists and all types of professional students with fellowships to enable them to develop latent talents. Among these fellows have been Stephen Vincent Benet, author of John Brown's Body, and Thomas Wolfe, who wrote Look Homeward, Angel. Many other foundations have contributed in this field.

In the list of foundation contributions there is also the Sloan-Kettering Institute for Cancer Research, financed by the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation, and the National Gallery of Art at Washington, erected and largely stocked by the A. W. Mellon Educational and Charitable Trust.

The above list is but a sampling of some of the tangible good things the foundations of the Nation have accomplished.

STRONG SOCIAL FORCES

Dr. Ernest V. Hollis, of the United States Office of Education, ranked foundations only immediately below school, church and government as among the most influential social forces of our time.

Their tremendous achievements have been conceded in the recent report of the Reece House Committee Investigating Tax-Exempt Foundations. "Innumerable public benefits," said the report, "are traceable to the philanthropies in which foundations have been engaged. Both in volume and kind their benefits must appear to any student of this subject to have been without parallel. And in the vast majority of instances they must be regarded as beyond question, either from the standpoint of their conformity to the intentions of their donors, or from the standpoint of the truly American quality of their consequences."

Which Page Do You Read?—Big GOP Dailies Jubilant in Editorials—Job Layoff Stories Are Another Matter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 17, 1954

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it is unlikely that the slick propaganda of reactionary columnists will succeed in having many people believe that black is white and that good is bad. This brain-washing technique now being used to deceive the public indicates what little respect these writers have for the intelligence of the American people. This desperate effort to popularize the record of the Eisenhower administration is being made by the Republican press all over the Nation. A good example of what is being done is given in an article by Don Smith, publicity director of the Ohio CIO.

Mr. Speaker, I include herewith Mr. Smith's article which was published recently in the CIO News:

Which Page Do You Read?—Big GOP Dailies Jubilant in Editorials—Job Layoff Stories Are Another Matter

Ever since unemployment started to increase under the present administration, most Ohio papers have been beside themselves trying to cover the whole thing up.

You could hardly blame them in a way. After all, 20 years is a long time to wait for a Republican President.

The editorial page is an interesting page to read these days because it is here that the papers really ignore the facts. The papers' columnists also join in the campaign.

We noticed recently that the Cleveland Plain Dealer was doing a dandy job of ignoring the facts.

One of its columnists, Philip Porter, wrote a column in which he poked fun at what he called the "prophets of doom" for their warnings about the anemic state of our economy. Porter poked fun because he said such dire predictions were only echoes now. They were echoes now because things were fine and looking better, Porter wrote.

One editorial entitled "The Recession Recedes" assured its readers, "Calm optimism over business prospects is sweeping the country."

But in the news columns which are based primarily on fact, the Plain Dealer reported—on the same day Porter's "everything is rosy" column appeared—that "Akron began to feel the pinch of poor relief today when city council's finance committee approved transfering $50,000 into the relief account * * *. This marked the first time since before World War II that the general fund was tapped for poor relief."

And this one from Mansfield, Ohio: "With county relief rolls growing here, Richland County Commissioners today announced a plan to put able-bodied but jobless men to work on county work crews. The relief-roll workers will earn up to $5 a day, which will be credited on their grocery and rent bills."

In short, the editorial writers fly in the face of the facts printed in their own newspapers. While they are attempting to put rose-colored glasses on their readers, their news columns are printing the true facts of the case.

Now that the one-party press has a Republican President, it just can't admit that business and people aren't as well off as under the Democrats.

If people started to believe such things, they might elect some Democrats to office. So, the papers must do their best to protect the "new team." And they do it by constantly reassuring their readers that times have improved since January 1953.

The only trouble is that many of their readers may be looking at such editorials and columns as they stand in line to collect their unemployment checks.

GOP Farm Program Is Divide and Conquer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 18, 1954

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an article appearing in the September 1954 issue of the Democratic Digest, entitled "GOP Farm Program Is Divide and Conquer."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

GOP Farm Program Is Divide and Conquer

On the eve of the House vote on the Eisenhower farm program, Vice President Nixon and Agriculture Secretary Ezra Taft Benson took to the airwaves and tried to explain to the country why the administration had abandoned General Eisenhower's campaign promises and was advocating lower farm price supports.

But the next day the authoritative Wall Street Journal revealed the real underlying reason for the repudiation of 1952's golden promises: the Republican high command, reported the Journal, is convinced that "the GOP stands to gain more votes by advocating flexible price supports than it can hope to win by accepting another year or more of the present 90-percent price guaranties. The GOP's sharp-pencil boys are convinced that control of Congress in this fall's elections will be decided not on the farms but in the cities."

The Journal had finally voiced what many others had begun to suspect—that the months ahead are to see a concerted campaign on the part of the Secretary of Agriculture to drive a wedge between the farmer and the city dweller, to set one economic group against another.

This theme showed itself early in Benson's tenure as the Government's top farm official. In April 1953, barely 3 months after he had taken office, Benson told the American Society of Newspaper Editors that unless costs of the price-support program were cut down, "the customers in the cities will turn against the program and may result in throwing it all out."

The potential farm-city split can always be exploited by anyone who seeks to peddle the argument that lower farm supports will mean lower food prices to consumers. But the facts show that although farm prices have fallen 7 percent since the Republicans took over, food prices to the housewives have remained at peak highs.

The farm-city split can also be exploited by anyone who chooses to ignore the fact that farm-price supports are not mere handouts to farmers, but prosperity insurance for the entire Nation—white-collar workers, laborers, businessmen, large and small. Since Ezra Benson took office, cash receipts from farm marketings have fallen about $2 billion. This represents a $2 billion drop in the market for automobiles, clothes, appliances, farm equipment, and other products, which are manufactured in the cities. Farm implement dealers and workers don't need to be told about how farmers and city folk must depend on each other; acute unemployment in that industry tells the story graphically.

Any Secretary of Agriculture has it within his power to point out this interdependence and heal over a potential farm-city split, or to fan the flames of the city revolt against the farmer. Ezra Benson has chosen the latter course. In January of this year he presented to the Senate Agriculture Committee some figures purporting to show that the cost of the farm program since 1932 has been more than $16 billion, and wondered "At what point will the 140 million Americans who do not live on farms rise up * * * and demand not revision but outright elimination of all direct aid to agriculture?"

Outraged Senators protested the $16 billion figure. Some days later, Benson quietly submitted to the committee a new set of figures, which showed the total cost of the farm price-support program to be one-sixteenth of his original cost figure.

It would be a mistake, however, to attribute this Benson campaign entirely to the political calculations of the Republican sharp pencil boys. Benson actually believes in a philosophy that is a sharp departure from the thinking that underlies the Democratic farm program.

Two Benson statements give the key to this new philosophy. One, made during his first press conference as Secretary of Agriculture, has to do with farm price supports which, for the past two decades have been looked on as prosperity insurance for the entire Nation. Now they are regarded as mere disaster insurance, designed to protect the farmer against a curious phenomenon which Mr. Benson calls "undue disaster." Many farmers are disturbed at the thought that there exists, in Benson's mind, such a thing as a due disaster—something which is coming to the farmers regardless.

The other Benson statement is reminiscent of the philosophy of the late Andrew Mellon, who believed that "a little unemployment is a good thing." Ezra Benson seems to feel that "a little insecurity" ("the spur of insecurity," as Benson puts it) is also a good thing for the soul, especially the farmer's soul.

The championing of this philosophy has been given the flavor of a righteous moral crusade both by Eisenhower and by Benson.

Benson is fond of telling reporters who come to interview him that the farmers will come around to his point of view for the simple reason that his beliefs are right. Beginning with his very first press conference, Benson's statements and speeches have been studded with phrases such as, "the guiding principle [of my administration] will be to strengthen the individual integrity, freedom, and the very moral fiber of each citizen."

Throughout, there is an implication that the farmers are a selfish, greedy, immoral lot to expect their Government to help them in their lonely fight against not only the hazards of nature but the more important hazard of a totally free and unpredictable market. But as a leading farm spokesman commented, "It's all very well for Ike and Benson to moralize about the virtues of austerity and the importance of farmers standing on their own feet, but I'd be more impressed if the President applied some of this philosophy to his business pals. Apparently it's wrong and immoral to back up the farmers, but perfectly all right to fix up the big business boys with tariff protection, tax writeoffs, giveaways of our natural resources, and all sorts of other subsidies running into the billions."

During Benson's first year in Washington, he was most often portrayed by reporters as a sincere, naive, and totally candid man, who assumed his high office untutored in the ways of Washington life, armed only with his high moral convictions. "Benson: Prayer, Persuasion and Parity" was the headline on an early newspaper profile of Benson.

To veteran Washington correspondents, this was not quite a faithful portrait of the Ezra Benson they had known as a Washington lobbyist during 4 years of World War II, who had sought to emasculate wartime price controls, pushed antilabor legislation, and blocked efforts to improve the lot of Mexican farmworkers. These reporters were well aware that Benson is no Washington novice, and that he knows his way around the corridors on Capitol Hill.

Benson's highly touted principles began to pale even to Washington newcomers when one of his first major actions was to continue dairy price supports at their existing high level. This obviously went against his own personal convictions, since a year later Benson lowered dairy supports a full 15 percent.

The Secretary's tendency toward sanctimoniousness also made it more difficult for many to swallow his spending of Government funds to furnish a Government-owned cottage on Government land for his own weekend use.

But if, as seems to be the case, Benson believes in "a little insecurity" for the farmer, he has stood behind that belief, for his policies have surely been well designed to achieve that aim. Chief among these is his decision that price supports on 5 of the 6 basic commodities (wheat, cotton, corn, peanuts, and rice) should be placed on a sliding scale ranging from 75 to 90 percent of parity (the measure of fair prices to farmers in relation to prices they pay for things they buy), replacing the present minimum 90 percent supports.

Neither Ezra Benson nor Dwight Eisenhower seemed concerned by the direct violation of General Eisenhower's categorical pledge at Brookings, S. Dak., during the 1952 campaign: "The Republican Party is pledged to the sustaining of the 90 percent parity price support, and it is pledged even more than that to helping the farmer obtain his full parity, 100 percent parity, with the guaranty in the price supports of 90."

The Benson-Eisenhower formula of lower price supports opens up the possibility that at the very time the economy is declining, farm price supports will be lowered, thus cutting farm income and purchasing power and hastening the decline.

One Washington observer has wisecracked, "I guess Ezra Benson has never read General Eisenhower's campaign speeches. He certainly leads the Cabinet in the broken-promise department." The record bears out the reporter's observation.

General Eisenhower pledged himself, for example, to foster rural electrification. But Ezra Benson impounded REA loan funds already provided by Congress, made drastic cuts in other REA loan funds, and abolished many of the technical services which the Government used to provide REA cooperatives.

General Eisenhower complained, during the 1952 campaign, that soil-conservation work was proceeding too slowly. His Secretary of Agriculture cut soil soil conservation and flood-control floods by roughly half, and reorganized the renowned Soil Conservation Service in such a way, experts say, as to destroy its technical competence.

The general spoke disparagingly, 2 years ago, of the moral bankruptcy of the Brannan plan. Yet this year he and his Agricultural Secretary have recommended a system for supporting wool prices described by the Omaha World-Herald as "the Brannan plan, lock, stock, and barrel." This wool plan was suggested as early as 1946 by former Agriculture Secretary CLINTON ANDERSON.

Another 1952 pledge was to end what General Eisenhower had called regimentation of the farmers. Yet Ezra Benson has instituted what are generally agreed to be the tightest production controls in the history of the farm program.

But the broken pledge that contains the most disturbing symptom of Benson's philosophy is the often-repeated Eisenhower promise to "increase farmer participation" and to have the farm program "farmer-run." Not only has Ezra Benson ordered new Federal employees (whom Eisenhower had called agricrats in 1952) to perform functions formerly carried on by farmer-elected committeemen; more important, he has placed bankers, businessmen, and middlemen, rather than farmers, in key spots in the Agriculture Department. As Business Week magazine reported, "there's no doubt that top staffers are probably more properly classified as businessmen than as farmers."

This business influence is reflected in the operation of Benson's department. Many Democratic Senators and Representatives from the Southwest observed last summer that the administration's program to aid the drought-stricken cattlemen, when it was finally put into operation, had the effect of helping the packers and processors far more than the cattle growers.

Bankers have benefited from the administration's application of its "tight money" policy to the farmers. The cost of obtaining a Government-price-support loan has been raised by one-half percent, the benefit going to the bankers who handle these loans.

The entire Government loan program has been administered in an almost miserly way. When last year's southwestern drought pushed many small cattlemen to the brink of bankruptcy, Ezra Benson refused to give them the temporary loans that would see them through the crisis; he had to be forced by Congress to institute an emergency loan program.

And as Benson continued to push his lower price-support program, Agriculture Department figures revealed that farmers' parity ratio had slipped to the lowest point since March 1941.

Ireland: The Finances of Partition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ROONEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 18, 1954

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following review from the Derry Journal:

IRELAND: THE FINANCES OF PARTITION

(Review by "Commentator")

The ramifications of the Belfast Government's financial relations with Britain have all along been a mystery to most people. They are completely beyond the man-in-the-street. The Government's own supporters have never been able to make hear nor tail of them; even its party members have repeatedly confessed themselves to be in the dark on the subject. "I have for 3 years," said Mr. A. F. Wilson, Member of Parliament, "been trying to get a grip on the precise situation. In site of the Minister's (Major Sinclair's) able manner even now I have not fully got the grasp of the whole situation."

Small blame to a backbencher like Mr. Wilson for being unable to figure it out when it appears at times to be beyond even the Minister himself, as when his statement that "the six counties only received from reserved revenue whatever is sufficient to meet their own requirements" was belied by the fact that on quite a number of occasions the amounts paid over by the Imperial Exchequer considerably exceeded in fact the amounts necessary to bridge the gap between Stormont's revenue and expenditure. Even the official statements of accounts in Britain and in Belfast do not always agree.

British parliamentarians in general are completely ignorant with regard to the position and most of them in any event could not care less, which just suits the British Government's policy to a tee. British ministerial answers to occasional queries on the subject are so reticent and evasive as to suggest a conspiracy of silence such as they maintain on the question of partition in general. They have even been known to lend themselves to a complete misconception as when one of them described as correct a statement by the egregious Professor Savory to the effect that "the net amount paid by 'Northern' Ireland since the 'Northern' Ireland Government came into existence in 1922 is no less than £194 million sterling. That is the net contribution by 'Northern' Ireland as a contribution to the British Treasury"—a statement which the British Treasury officials must have known to be sheer nonsense.

UNVEILED

Two years ago the subject came under an embarrassing limelight for Stormont in a series of articles by Mr. G. C. Duggan, C. B., O. B. E., LL. D., retired principal assistant secretary to the Six County ministry of finance and comptroller and auditor-general for the area. From his intimate knowledge of the working of the system he revealed the trend in Stormont's financial relations with Britain which had steadily reduced the former to a mere underling of the imperial exchequer, while retaining the trappings of a semi-independent legislature.

Now comes a book which puts the whole system under the microscope of research by a highly qualified and competent mind in such matters and which, with copious reference to all the available figures and other data, lays bare for the first time the full story of the working of Britain's financial transactions with the Belfast Government from the start, insofar as they cannot be cloaked by the devious devices of either government. The book is entitled "Ireland—Finances of Partition" (Published by Clonmore & Reynolds, Dublin, 18/–) and the author is Labhras O Nuallain, honors graduate in economics and political science of University College, and also of Trinity College, Dublin. Thoroughly versed in the sphere of applied economics, he has made a particularly intensive study of the economic and social structure of the six-county area and his book, a masterly survey of a subject rendered particularly abstruse and cloudy by the modus operandi of the partitionists, has by dint of the keenest scrutiny and research at last dispelled the fog that has surrounded the financial aspect of the question.

It might be thought that a book which is based largely and of necessity on a mass of statistical and other detail proper to the subject of high finance and departmental operations would make dry reading for the tyro in such matters, but this is not so in the case of Mac Ui Nuallain's work. For running through his minute examination of the whole mase of intergovernmental maneuvers and transactions with which the book primarily deals is the documented and deeply informative account of the inside working of the policy by which partition is maintained by a system of imperial intrigue and manipulation on the financial as on the political side and in the former will be found a key to much in the latter. If, therefore, Irish readers, whatever about English ones, would inform themselves of the deeper and more subtle forces at work in the mutilation of this country they will find this revealing book anything but the dry-as-dust thing that the subject of economics and political science might seem to the non-academic mind to be.

THE BRIBE

From the background of the earlier Anglo-Irish financial relations it proceeds to examine the financial side to the imperial overtures leading up to the Partition Act of 1920. Therein we find the British Government playing the same double game as subsequently in the case of the Boundary Commission; pretending, for the deception of Nationalist Ireland, to be threatening Sir James Craig with financial pressure, as later with the pretense of territorial pressure, to go in with the rest of Ireland, while in reality providing Craig and Co. with every intimate assurance of imperial backing, financial, territorial, and otherwise, in pursuance of the bridgehead policy. Mac Ui Nuallain's account of the sequel to that 1920 transaction in the continual badgering of the British Governments by their Belfast confederates for the full price of maintaining partition, resulting in a series of financial accommodations down to this day, makes absorbing reading.

It is a story of downright self-interest on both sides, and of each seeking to make the most for its own ends of what was a self-seeking and sordid bargain from its inception. It reveals the old British flair for exploitation, at the cheapest price to itself, conflicting with the six-county unionist determination not to be outplayed at a game in which each side had the measure of, and as bad a political conscience, as the other. Whenever the British ever showed any signs of kicking at the Belfast claims for subvention which grew ever more repetitive and importunate as time went on, the latter always held a trump card which generally, or at least superficially, decided the issue in their favor—the fact, namely, that the six-county bridgehead piece of imperial strategy stood or fell by the subservience of the Belfast Government to that policy.

POLITICAL BLACKMAIL

It was in essence a policy of blackmail and it worked up to a point, and at a price, but as Mac Ui Nuallain's book brings out, it was a deal in which Stormont was outdone in the longer run by the world's most practised experts in diplomatic cunning. When it was found, particularly in the industrial sphere, that the Six County statelet was, as Mr. Andrews later confessed, "a bad insurance risk," and indeed a completely uneconomic unit for the critical purposes of an unemployment insurance scheme, save on the horrible assumption of an endless series of great wars, the Belfast Government had to look to Britain to avoid bankruptcy, which Britain, for her own political ends, had to avert. The result, after a deal of intergovernmental haggling, throughout which Stormont Ministers were seldom off the Imperial doorstep, was the series of reinsurance agreements whereby Britain had to undertake to foot the deficit in the unemployment fund in an area doomed to periodic depression.

But—and this was the catch—the increasing and unavoidable dependence of the Belfast Government on Imperial subventions of various kinds (the reinsurance scheme more particularly) entailed, by the conditions of the deal, an ever-tightening grip by the Imperial paymasters on the whole subordinate system of Government in Belfast—until at last it was reduced to a mere sub-office of Whitehall.

ANNEXATION

The most recent Stormont "Budget" has confirmed the trend described by Mac Ui Nuallain—the almost total annexation by the British Treasury of control over the finances of this area, whether of the directly reserved or the nominally transferred kind. According to the Partition Act of 1920 the financial relationship between the Belfast-run area and Britain was to be much the same as that which the 1914 Home Rule Act (save the mark) laid down for all Ireland. That is to say, the Imperial Government would levy and collect most of the taxation here and out of it refund to the subordinate government such amount as its limited sphere of self-government required, while holding on to the rest for Imperial purposes.

The amount thus to be retained in the case of the Partition Act was to be a fixed figure (first put at almost £8 million and reduced in 1922 to £6 million) and was to be known, euphemistically, as the Imperial contribution. Whatever balance, if any, remained, was styled the residuary share of reserved taxation and was to be made over to the Belfast Government. As for the contribution, the Latin dictum holds, memo dat quod non habet, for the truth is that the Imperial Government itself collects, and withholds, that surplus of Imperial revenue from this area over and above what it chooses to refund for such of Stormont's requirements as it approves. So that the contribution which the Imperial Exchequer retains is never in Stormont's possession or control at all and therefore not in its power to give.

The only moneys over which the Belfast regime had actual control at the outset were such comparatively trifling proportion of the total taxation of this area as was derived from the local or transferred taxes (confined to death duties, stamp duties, motor vehicles tax, entertainment tax, certain license duties and mineral rights duty—in an area that had no minerals). The proceeds of that very limited sphere of taxation that was transferred to the Belfast government were but 10 percent of the total revenue collected from the area. What it did with that local revenue was to be its own affair.

THE SHORT-LIVED AUTONOMY

And so it remained until the Reinsurance Agreements whereby, under (blackmailing) pressure from the partition government, its imperial bosses were obliged to become guarantors of the Six County unemployment fund, which would otherwise have gone bankrupt; and later of the social services in this area, which would otherwise have been unsupportable. Not once, as Mac Ui Nuallain's book brings out, was the Six County unemployment fund in balance from 1922 until 1939, when the war situation brought its false boom to the rescue of the chronic depression in this area, with its totally unbalanced economy.

The earlier reinsurance agreements to subsidize the local services, especially labor—for the increasing difficulties of the statelet made further begging missions and fresh agreements imperative—were accompanied by Stormont assurances that it would keep step with British developments and services, but in 1946 a significant clause was introduced in the agreement of that year. Thereafter Stormont became bound, not simply by its ministerial promises to follow British legislation relative to the subsidized services in this area, but was specifically required by British statute to do so.

That was the beginning of the end of any real powers of autonomy on its part, an abdication that has since extended even to the case of its own transferred revenue, which is now subject like the rest of its income to British Treasury approval, as even Major Sinclair has admitted. Hence his annual pilgrimage to Whitehall on the eve of his budget to get the approval of his imperial overlords and wait upon their orders relative to the terms of that precious document.

UNDER THE IMPERIAL THUMB

This is how the Six County Comptroller-General in his report (1947–48) disclosed the complete financial subjection of this area, by a radical change in the relationship laid down in the 1920 act, and one never submitted to either Parliament:

"The 'Northern' Ireland budget will be agreed each year between the (Imperial) Treasury and the Ministry of Finance for submission to the Joint Exchequer Board" (a mythical body which is only another name for a form of appeal by Stormont to Caesar against Caesar). "All 'Northern' Ireland supplementary estimates arising in the course of a year will be furnished to the (British) Treasury for their information and agreement, as above."

Furthermore: "The (Belfast) Ministry will consult with the Treasury in advance, in respect of any items of 'Northern' Ireland expenditure other than expenditure on services in parity with Britain estimated to exceed £50,000."

In other words, any expenditure supposedly at the discretion of the Belfast Parliament is now subject like the rest to British Treasury approval.

Could Stormont's financial and budgetary subjection be more explicitly stated? The British Treasury has now assumed both in theory and in practice the controlling and deciding voice in all matters of Six County expenditures, of whatever kind, so that the distinction laid down in the Partition Act between reserved and transferred spheres of control has now gone by the board. In fact, the Comptroller-General, in reply to a specific question on the point by the late Mr. MacManaway, confirmed that Stormont expenditure on "transferred" services had since 1947–48 to be approved both in bulk, and to some extent even in detail, by the British Treasury. And yet, Unionist M. P.'s and their dull-witted electorate still fondly delude themselves that the Stormont Parliament is anything more than a mere agency and hack of the Imperial Government Treasury.

MR. WARNOCK'S TWO VOICES

A particularly blatant case in point of Stormont's subservience to the Imperial will was the imposition on this area of the British revaluation measure in 1932 for purposes of extracting increased revenue, "A measure which," said Mr. Warnock (speaking in 1940 when he was a troublesome back-bencher on the way to promotion) "dealt a death blow to the financial structure of this country. This country is a poor country. It has no coal and no mineral resources worth talking about so far as we know. It has no primary production except agriculture and it is utter nonsense that this country can maintain itself and make a contribution of 6 millions per annum" (the figure is now up to 20 millions) "to any other country."

How different his story then from that of the Mr. Warnock who since his promotion has been busy depicting this same poor country in such flattering terms by contrast with his previous outcry. The late Major Sinclair in reply to the Mr. Warnock of those days could only point out that the six counties had really no voice in the matter complained of, just as at the time of the revaluation itself Mr. Pollock (then Stormont Minister of Finance) silenced all Unionist opposition to the measure with the blunt intimation, "We must pass this measure in this Parliament or have it forced on us at Westminster. That is definite."

STORMONT'S WAY OUT

The limit in the absurdity in Stormont's abject financial subjection to the British Government was reached in 1946 when Major Sinclair in his "budget" statement blurted out, in sympathy with the class to which he belongs, that he flatly disagreed with his boss, the British Socialist chancellor's increase of death duties in the imperial budget of that year. Nevertheless, he could see no way, he said, under the parity commitment of avoiding the adoption of the British duties without modification—though death duties were within the category supposedly transferred by the 1920 act to the Belfast Government's control. Major Sinclair subsequently discovered an alternative method (with the British Treasury's gracious permission) of sparing wealthy estates in this area under the levy in question, to the extent realized by raiding the charitable funds of the Catholic Mater Hospital instead.

"THE IMPERIAL CONTRIBUTION"

While Stormont propagandists like to boast, in British hearing, of the amounts this area has paid over in the form of the imperial contribution, they are a lot more reticent on the subject in their speeches for home consumption. For the fact is that from the outset, and more particularly in recent years, that imperial levy has been a sore point with the Ulster Scot, who would love to have his loyalty on the cheap, whereas he has had to pay for it, through the nose. Nor, even at that, has Britain come well out of the reckoning, either. Her imperial adventures in later times have produced few profitable propositions from the standpoint of the British Treasury.

Mac Ui Nuallain in the Finances of Partition has laid bare for the first time the whole truth, so far as it can be ascertained, about the imperial contribution concerning which Stormont propaganda has gone in for a half-truth and has been two-faced even about that. For while it makes a loyalist virtue in the one breath of what it has paid to Britain, it does its utmost to get away with paying as little as it can, or alternatively, to get back as much as possible, while stifling all the heartburning in its own camp on the subject of that levy by pleading that there is no escape from it.

Moreover, Mac Ui Nuallain points out, all the official figures for that imperial contribution, whether given out in Stormont or Westminster, are gross figures. The net figures when the imperial offsetting grants and subventions, including the gift of the land annuities, are taken into account are never stated by either government; still less is the true contribution, that is to say, when the total, including the military, costs of the imperial occupation of this pale come into the reckoning.

THE WANGLE

The account given by Mac Ui Nuallain of the visissitudes of the "contribution" itself throughout the years and of all the Belfast Government's maneuvers with regard to it makes piquant reading indeed. From the start, persistent efforts were made by the Craigavon Government to wangle out of its financial commitments under Partition. As Mac Ui Nuallain shrewdly sums its policy up: "Its determination was to exact the utmost, financially, economically, and politically, from the connection with Britain while at the same time endeavoring to whittle down the Belfast Government's obligations under the financial clauses of the 1920 act."

In that it has been aided by successive British Governments, whether Socialist or Tory, for reasons of imperialist expediency. As often as not the terms of the 1920 act in that as in other respects have been quietly circumvented by intergovernmental arrangement or ministerial commitment without reference to the Westminster Parliament which, according to the statute, is the supreme authority in all matters relating to this area. In consequence of the many maneuvers behind that Parliament's back, the whole financial structure of the 1920 act has been altered out of all recognition, generally to the financial advantage of the Belfast Government, but also, as we have seen, to the detriment and indeed near extinction of such autonomy as the 1920 act purported to confer upon it.

THE STRANGLEHOLD

Ostensibly, the annual financial adjustments between the two Governments was to be determined an intangible body known as "the Joint Exchequer Board," whose membership was unknown to Six County Unionists themselves, whose "deliberations" were private, and whose reports, if any, were unpublished. Eventually such powers as were to be vested in that Board, which for aught anyone knows, never met at all, became simply a matter of its chairman's signature to the necessary documents, and eventually passed to the British Treasury, whose officials have since ruled the Stormont financial roost without the remotest reference to any say in the matter by the Belfast Parliament itself. Stormont's so-called budget is therefore unique in that it could not be rejected "constitutionally" by Stormont at all, as any such action would be completely ultra vires on the part of that parody and simulacrum of a democratic Parliament.

As a result of the decision of the Colwyn Committee in 1922 the Belfast Government was forbidden to whittle down "the Imperial contribution" by embarking on any expenditure on its own "in excess of the strict necessities of the case"; so that it was rendered unable in the inter-war years to make any impression on the leeway that existed in these Six Counties in such things as housing, water, sewage, and public medical services. Everyone in this area knows, on the subject of the housing more especially, the shocking result of that Imperial stranglehold, plus the Six County's Ascendancy's indifference in the matter. Throughout those years of inter-governmental maneuvering in the financial, as in the political sphere, the attitude of the Craigavan Government, observes Mac Ui Nuallain, was a "strange mixture of wheedling and subservience."

At any rate the Colwyn Committee arrived at this radical alteration of the terms of the 1920 act; that whereas in that act the "Imperial contribution" was to be a first charge on the Six County revenue, it was now to be merely a contingent residue arrived at by a bureaucratic and most complicated formula, by British Treasury officials in a manner beyond the will, or even the wits, of either Parliament or people.

NEVER OFF THE DOORSTEP

Meanwhile an ever-dwindling "Imperial contribution" became more and more offset by Imperial grants in aid, particularly with regard to the unemployment deadweight which this area meant for the Imperial paymasters.

The Belfast Troy government was significantly averse to footing any of the unemployment bill out of its own limited sphere of transferred taxation, since that was of a kind that affected the propertied and commercial class in this area. So it fobbed off its unemployment problem on Britain. The joke was that if at any time the British unemployment fund became in need of the Belfast government's benevolence the latter was to do the needful in its turn. One consequence of the British assumption of liability for the dole in this area was that the Six County Ministry of Labor, from being a transferred service, became a mere agency of the British Ministry.

The Imperial contribution had meanwhile dwindled to the negligible sum of £24,000 in 1935 and for 9 years before the war amounted to no net contribution at all, the mounting Imperial grants more than offsetting the contribution, which had become merely a technical fiction. And all the time the Belfast government's begging missions to London went on apace. "Sir James Craig has hardly been off the doormat of the treasury for 24 hours during the last 4 years, begging for money from the British Treasury," said Snowden—surely an ignominious spectacle.

LOYALTY AT A PRICE

Then came the war, from the outset of which Britain undertook, on the Belfast government's immediate representations, to foot the bill for all the wartime services in this area, including, laughably enough, the expansion of the B specials, who never fired a shot in the war, except by way of misdemeanor. At the same time came a further shoal of Imperial subsidies, particularly in the agricultural sphere.

But the imperial rate of taxation also soared and with it so, automatically, did the imperial contribution, until it reached over 36 million in 1945. Again the unionist heartburning on that score became manifest, and again the Stormont Minister of Finance could only plead in reply that he had, alas, no option in the matter.

Neither, ironically enough, could the Tory government in Belfast do other than follow almost verbatim the postwar Socialist legislation in Britain, of which necessity Stormont propaganda proceeded to make a unionist virtue. Needless to say, those postwar social services in this area had also to be covered—to an unspecified amount and by special arrangements not open to scrutiny by either parliament—by a financial guaranty by the British treasury.

BOILED DOWN

An exhaustive investigation by Mac Ui Nuallain into all the available figures, from 1921 to 1950, that is to say, so far as they can be gleaned at all through so much official reticence and hush-hush on the subject, leads to this estimate of the whole crazy criss-cross of accounts and contra-accounts, of imperial levies, recoupments and subventions by which the partition system is maintained.

Gross imperial contribution for the above period, £282,237,344; net amount after deduction of all the grants-in-aid to Stormont, £226,186,333; true contribution (when all the ascertainable costs of the imperial establishment in this area are also taken into account), £81,615,924. Or an average of less than 3 million per annum.

In fact, if the full costs of the occupation could be assessed, Mac Ui Nuallain is strongly of the opinion that the British treasury has over the years been definitely the loser in the whole transaction.

SHORT OF CONSCRIPTION

During the war the Belfast Parliament was stripped by sundry orders in council and defense regulations of even the semblance of an independent legislature and was reduced to a mere voting machine and mechanical recorder of decisions arrived at in Westminster. To all intents and purposes Britain took over complete control and did what she liked with the Six Counties—short of imposing conscription. The Irish national determination on that score, so firmly stated by Mr. de Valera, put the kibosh on any such idea.

We have already seen that the operation of the reinsurance system and the conditions attaching to it meant that labor in this area was no longer a transferred service and the Belfast Ministry of Labor became in effect a mere agency of the British Ministry. One clause of the 1920 act after another likewise went by the board, without formal reference to either Parliament. For the most part, these things were quietly arranged in ministerial or departmental conferences or even per ministerial correspondence. When the British Ministry of Supply took over the domestic administration of Britain's war and post-war economy, and this area was sucked into the process, whatever substance there had been in the powers of the Stormont Ministry of Industry and Commerce, and it was little enough, became a mere shadow, hence its utter inability to make any impression on the present dole-ful situation in the diseased and disbalanced state of the Six County economy—to which the war had come as a horrible kind of palliative when the Six County unemployment figure had topped the 100,000 mark.

INTO THE IMPERIAL POT

The Stormont Ministry of Agriculture was next for the imperial pot, its powers being transferred by a defense regulation—which is still in force—to the British Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries, to which the Belfast Ministry now merely acts as agent, with the Minister merely as a local agricultural figurehead. Even that is only a part-time capacity, as the Stormont Minister in question exchanges his desk for his pulpit once a week.

If Britain pumped wartime largesse in the cost of services and subsidies into the six counties out of the swollen proceeds of the latter's wartime taxation imposed on the British scale, Stormont paid for those imperial disbursements by the further shedding of powers transferred to it under the 1920 act. The remainder are of a kind that concern those things to which it clings most avidly—the powers of patronage, and bigotry, and coercion, in whatever priority is most pleasing to the nature of the Ulster Scot.

THE OCCUPATION STATUTE

Another example of this area's absorption in the British administration as a result of the war remains to be considered—in fact, the Germans will have got out of the occupation statute before Stormont has. The British Government adopted the wartime device of delegating the operation of certain imperial services to Belfast government departments, which have thus been gradually trnasformed into mere branch departments of the British Government. These include such controls as food, feeding stuffs, seeds, timber, coal, wool, petrol, divisional food offices, price regulations, etc.

To add to the administrative complication entailed by this agency system, all staff expenses on the services concerned are paid by Britain through Stormont, by offsetting appropriations-in-aid to use the Treasury jargon in the case. In one Stormont ministry the percentage of its total administrative expenses which came under the head of Imperial agency services was at one point as high as 62 percent. Of the number of nonindustrial civil servants under Stormont in 1948 no less than a fourth were engaged on agency services for imperial government departments. One of the many glaring anomalies, and indeed ridiculous features, of the whole Stormont set-up is, therefore, that a high proportion of the civil servants nominally in its service are, apart from their appointment at Stormont's gift, completely beyond its control and are not at all answerable to the government which appointed them.

THE SHADOW

Mac Ui Nuallain's book sets out in a thorough and penetrating survey all the facts and figures which I have summarized in these articles, relative to the peculiar and extremely complicated version of Crown colony administration that exists in these parts, behind a shadow-play of democratic and autonomous forms; which become more and more shadowy as time goes on. Being a technical investigation of the inner working of a system so complex and obscure in many respects that it seemingly conspires to defeat investigation. Mac Ui Nuallain's work has consisted in laying bare the facts, save those which are buried too deep in the interdepartmental archives for discovery. His book is not primarily concerned with pointing the moral, though it certainly prompts a question.

That question the reader is left to answer for himself: namely, why, in view of such a cumbrous and costly duplication of powers, the administrative and financial complexity of the operation, and the glaring redundancy that is involved in the over-government of this small area to the backbreaking point, Six County Unionists will stand for the patent absurdity of it all.

Or to put the question another way: how does it come about that, if they persist in their insensate opposition to a national and natural unification of government in this country, they do not call for an end to a rubber stamp Parliament and for an outright return to Westminster, which rules the Stormont roost in any case?

Indeed some months ago the chief whip of their party mooted just such a suggestion, whether by way of flying a kite or what, I know not. At any rate, his quite remarkable admission, coming from such a source, that the Belfast Parliament had become a needless institution and that they might well consider dropping it and reverting completely to Westminster, evoked surprisingly little comment in Six County Unionist quarters, though there were a few gasps of disillusionment in the correspondence columns of the Unionist Press at the time.

THE DREGS

To the mind of this writer there is only one explanation of the Unionist retention of the extravagant folly of the dual administration in this area to the last limit of absurdity. For all its shedding of powers conferred upon it by the 1920 act—which has thus proved anything but sacrosanct—the Belfast Government has retained a few, to which it clutches greedily. One is what Mr. Jack Beattie well named the "vine tree system" of patronage, which extends from the juiciest emoluments in the higher branches down through all the offshoots of the system to the maintenance of paid party henchmen yclept the special constabulary.

Another power to which Stormont clings for its bigot life is that over the system of electoral misrepresentation and in particular of local misgovernment in the undisguised interests of ascendancy, including all the powers of gerrymander and of discrimination ad lib in the sphere of appointments under the public service, even in housing, and in what not else that goes to the propping of Protestant privilege in this pale.

Still another power which Stormont has not relinquished to any imperial department or control is that of the police—and for reasons that are all too familiar to the Nationalist majority in places like Derry and Enniskillen.

In short, the British Government could not be trusted to do on its own the things it is quite prepared to connive at the Protestant government's doing, and that in such notorious fashion, in this pale.

Farm Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALLACE F. BENNETT

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 18, 1954

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an editorial from the Boston Herald entitled "The Farm Bill Mouse," much of which is made up of quotations from the statement made on the floor of the Senate by my senior colleague the Senator from Utah [Mr. Watkins].

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Farm Bill Mouse

But Senator Watkins, in a statement he modestly declined to read but had inserted in the Record, seemed to go deepest toward the core of the whole farm program.

The chief beneficiaries of the $7,500,000,000 received by farmers under support programs, have been the upper one-third of our farmers, he pointed out. These are some 9 million farmers living on 2 million of the most efficient and well-operated farms, farms producing nearly 80 percent of the annual marketable crop value.

It is among these farms that the Government makes crop loans of over $100,000 apiece (average of 5 largest wheat loans in Kansas). Or $480,000 (average of 5 largest cotton loans in Mississippi).

The farm problem is not there. The real problem is among the other two-thirds of the farmers, who make a precarious living or hardly a living at all, who get trifling help or none from price supports. Their troubles are ignored by the politicians, who cry for 90 percent or 100 percent of parity.

The trouble with these farmers is simply that there are too many of them.

"The harsh truth," Mr. Watkins said, "is that the solution to many a small farmer's economic problem is not to be found in agriculture at all, even with the most generous price-support program that could be devised by a heedless Government headed for national bankruptcy."

The economic and social answer to agricultural poverty is not price support, not a small dole, but mobility—a gradual movement of farm people into other areas where they can make a living and find opportunity. No Member of Congress can make 2½ acres of sharecropped tobacco, or 15 acres of hillside, bottomland, or alkali soil produce a reasonable living.

If Congress as a whole has not recognized the real problem, the administration has, and Secretary Benson, in his overall program, has held it in mind.

High fixed supports are not only economically absurd; they do not meet the real farm problem, the problem reflected in the fact that in 1953 the per capita income of our farm population was $882, compared to $1,898 average for the nonfarm population.

Congress, under the courageous and relentless hammering of the administration, has now taken a step—a little step, but still a step—toward treating the farm ills where they exist—not where the loudest screams come from.

My Record in the 83d Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 16, 1954

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, throughout my public life, of over 20 years of municipal and Federal Government, I have consistently respected and complied with the Biblical mandate to "render an account of thy stewardship."

Since becoming a Member of Congress, I have, at the end of each term of office, compiled, published, and distributed to the people of my district a concise report of my congressional activities.

This current report is, then, simply a continuation of my established custom in recognition of the moral obligation resting upon every individual privileged to hold a responsible public office.

THE TRUTH IS IN THE RECORD

Mr. Speaker, the desire for truth is ever present in the human mind and heart. In the inevitable confusion and bewilderment overshadowing our great country's destiny today there is, naturally, a heightened longing in each American citizen to find the truth. There has, perhaps, never been a time in our national history when it was more seriously important for the American voters and citizens to know the truth about the actions and philosophy of those of us to whom they have entrusted the guidance of their Government for leadership in a troubled world. The foundation source of fact on the deeds and words of men serving in this United States House of Representatives is the official journal, called the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, required by law to publish the proceedings of each legislative day in the Congress.

The main body of this personal report with some accompanying comments, will reveal the exact words I spoke and actions initiated during particular legislative discussions and debates. It is, of course, obviously impossible to include herein my every word and action, in detail, during the brief time allowed. However, I desire to clearly outline my personal convictions upon certain major issues that achieved a particular measure of public prominence and interest. I shall do that by presenting pertinent extracts from the speeches and remarks I made during this Congress and which are wholly contained in the pages of the official CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

THE WORCESTER TORNADO A DISTRICT TRAGEDY

Mr. Speaker, late in the afternoon of Tuesday, June 9, 1953, the city of Worcester and surrounding communities of central Massachusetts were suddenly struck by the most vicious tornado in our history, leaving widespread death and property damage in its wake.

Word of the disaster reached me by telephone to my office here at 7 p. m. I immediately made arrangements to return to Worcester, my home city, and the next day made a complete inspection of the destruction, which was, indeed, awe-inspiring in its ferocity.

On Thursday morning, June 11, I flew back to Washington, and as soon as the House assembled at 12 noon, I introduced House Resolution 276 and asked unanimous consent for its immediate consideration. The substance of the resolution was that it should be the sense of the House of Representatives that the devastated tornado-stricken sections of Worcester and central Massachusetts should be declared a major disaster area and at the earliest opportunity all possible Federal aid should be given such area.

The resolution was promptly approved by my sympathetic colleagues and on the same day the President officially declared that unfortunate part of our great Commonwealth a major disaster area within the provisions of Public Law 875 of the 81st Congress.

Following the resolution's approval, I immediately brought this House action to the attention of officials of the Civilian Defense Administration, the then Reconstruction Finance Corporation, the Housing and Home Finance Agency, and the Farmers' Home Administration. These are the agencies empowered under existing legislation to render prescribed assistance, through State and local governments, to disaster areas when they have been so designated by the President. These agencies, together with the American Red Cross, promptly went into action to assist our people in every possible way.

A great many of the tornado victims lost their complete household furnishings in the disaster and, unfortunately, too few of them had any insurance coverage in order to help them in trying to set up temporary housekeeping and keep family units together. I asked the Federal agencies to permit them to use, out of Government surplus property, such articles as chairs, tables, mattresses, and so forth, which I found were stored uselessly in warehouses. It was a shock to me to learn that Government officials interpreted existing laws as preventing them from aiding our own American citizens in that manner.

To correct this legal deficiency and remove all doubt from official minds, I introduced in the House of June 18, 1953, H. R. 5826, a bill to authorize the President to donate surplus Federal property to individuals in a major disaster area. Thereafter, I requested our two Massachusetts Senators to introduce similar bills in the Senate and by working together my original proposal was placed on the statute books with the Presidential signature on July 17, 1953 and is now known as Public Law 134, 83d Congress. It proved to be of immeasurable assistance to the disaster victims.

When Worcester city officials informed me they felt greater Federal financial assistance was needed, I drew up a petition to the President, signed by every member of the Massachusetts delegation, and forwarded it to the White House, under date of June 29, 1953, urging his approval of additional funds.

I remained in continuing contact with local city officials and the heads of the Federal agencies here until the emergency care and housing were over and recovery operations were proceeding in normal fashion.

I have in my files official letters from the mayor of Worcester expressing thanks and praise for my cooperative efforts.

I have had to summarize this account, Mr. Speaker, because of space limitation. However, the chronological history of my cooperative actions on behalf of my people are officially listed on pages 6431, 6432, 6433, and 6434 of the June 11, 1953, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, on pages 6928 and 6929 of the RECORD of June 19, 1953, and on pages A3787 and A3788 of the June 24, 1953, RECORD.

I am pleased to be able to relate that through the wonderfully coordinated activities of local, State, and Federal governmental units, civic organizations, church and community leaders, the physical properties of the disaster area are either well on the way or fully restored. No words can portray the persevering courage, fortitude, industry, sacrifice, and initiative of the tornado victims who lost family members as well as their entire homes and furnishings. The example our brave people demonstrated in this time of tragedy will stand forever as their inspiring monument in the annals of American history.

FORESTALLING COMMUNISM

Mr. Speaker, it has, for some time now, been apparent to every loyal United States citizen that the gravest threat to survival this country and the free world has ever faced is the scourge of atheistic communism. It is obvious, therefore, that the time has come for this Nation to take every reasonable precaution to protect ourselves against their devilish aggression, both from within and without.

I supported aid to Greece and Turkey, the so-called Marshall plan, a sound foreign aid program, and alliances with friendly allies, all designed to stop the advance of Communist tyranny and persecution abroad; of course, I have consistently voted for strong American military preparedness.

However, it has long seemed to me, and a great many other Members of Congress, that in the general concern with foreign and domestic military plans, the real dangers of Communist infiltration and subversion from within our own beloved country had been somewhat overlooked. We deeply felt the day had come, and legislative duty required us to erect safeguards to prevent us from unconsciously falling victim to the same insidious type of Kremlin-directed machinations that overthrew other Christian democratic nations before they really knew what happened.

With that conviction, and in that patriotic spirit, measures were presented in this Congress permitting a Federal judge to grant immunity to any congressional witness giving testimony of Communist conspiracy, forfeiting citizenship of any person convicted of conspiring the overthrow of the United States by force and violence, making peacetime espionage a capital offense with the death penalty, and outlawing the Communist Party. I supported all of these bills.

My thoughts on the grave danger of domestic Communist activity are expressed below.

House speech, July 21, 1954:

> Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I am, of course, mindful of the basic constitutional guaranties of free speech and peaceful assembly. We, and all other officers and agencies of government, are and should be vitally concerned in the preparation of these great democratic liberties for our individual citizens. Our entire judicial system and procedure is set up precisely to protect the innocent and prevent any prejudgment of the accused until proved guilty beyond reasonable doubt after trial by jury. These are among the traditional blessings of this great and free country, and God forbid us from ever abandoning them.
>
> However the grant of a personal right does not carry with it the unlimited privilege of abuse, and perversion leading to the contradiction and repudiation of the original purpose of the right. That is the morality, as well as the patriotism, involved in this legislation.
>
> We have documentary evidence that the Communist doctrine is pledged to the accomplishment of the subjugation of all free peoples and it is openly stated they will conspire to overthrow any government by force or violence if that becomes necessary to their objective.
>
> The proof of this fanatical and immoral Communist determination to gradually enslave the free world through infiltration, false propaganda, fear, persecution, all types of devilish deception, and finally, by force, is terribly clear on the face of the world today. Slowly and fiercely deliberate, they have stamped their tyrannical heel upon nation after nation all over the globe, suffocating the free spirit of ever-increasing millions of peoples.
>
> America is the last and grandest prize in their plans. It has been too long obvious their intention and hope is to achieve our enslavement by the perverted use of the very freedoms and liberties we so proudly acclaim. How foolish we would be to continue to lend our assistance to their aims in that fashion.
>
> The time has come to publicly and legally recognize the Communist scourge for what it really is, a menacing threat and persistent thrust at the heart of American freedom. The hour has come to impress upon the dreamers, the hesitators, the doubters, and the intentional enemies within, that we recognize the serious nature of this contest for survival.
>
> Let us, in this critical time, be extremely vigilant in safeguarding our security rather than permit, through misguided leniency, traitors to take destructive advantage of our democratic blessings. In that patriotic spirit let us enact this preserving legislation without further delay.

THE POWER TO TAX IS THE POWER TO DESTROY

Mr. Speaker, I cannot be counted among those who accepted and applauded the perhaps hasty and unthinking statements made by the present head of probably the most important executive department before a congressional committee when he said: "What is good for General Motors is good for the country."

I must confess that I prefer instead, the earnest exhortation of the President himself when he proclaimed that the yardstick of measurement of his own personal actions would be, "Is this good for all Americans?" I accept the President's implied request to me and all other Members of Congress and conscientiously applied it to my own legislative actions. Accordingly, I deeply believe the traditional principles of equality of sacrifice and ability to pay must remain as the cornerstone of American tax policy, if this Nation is to long endure.

It is in conformity with those principles and the Christian philosophy behind them that I have consistently cast my votes on tax legislation since becoming a Member of Congress. That is why, during the discussion of the 1954 revenue bill, I first voted with a great many of my colleagues for recommittal so that a greater measure of tax relief through higher personal exemption could be afforded the people in our middle- and lower-income brackets who, I was convinced, needed it the most. Our efforts in this manner to equally distribute taxation hardships were repulsed by a very narrow margin.

When the Revenue Act of 1951 was being debated, I spoke as follows:

> I would feel derelict in my obligation if I did not briefly speak once again on the deficiencies of our overall antiquated tax system. Since becoming a Member of Congress I have continually urged that a nonpartisan committee be appointed to thoroughly study and recommend elimination of the existing injustices and overlapping of our spread-eagling, topsy-turvy tax structure which is fast demoralizing the American people. Noted tax experts and authorities have supported my stand in this respect.

Because the current tax measure was the first real recodification of our laws in almost a century, because it contained some few measures of relief to struggling American families, because the Government, of course, must have revenue to operate and because there was no alternative, we supported the measure on final action with the hope of helping to enact a more equitable law in the next Congress.

My convictions as expressed during the debate on the Internal Revenue Code revision of 1954 are contained below.

House speech, March 18, 1954:

> Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, as my colleagues here well know, I have, for the past 7 years, repeatedly urged the vital necessity of complete revision and recodification of our entire Internal Revenue Code. In three successive Congresses, I have introduced bills whose purpose was to accomplish that objective. We all fully realize that our present internal revenue laws are jumbled, complicated, often contradictory, little understood by the average person, and filled with obsolete regulations, imposing multitudinous inequities, irritations, and too often great hardships upon the American taxpayer.
>
> The tax measure before us today is the first attempt in nearly half a century to revise and simplify the Internal Revenue Code.
>
> It serves to forcefully remind us that the time is long overdue for a complete and thorough revision of our tax system in the public interest. I earnestly wish this present bill was a more generally equitable one.
>
> When we scrutinize this bill carefully, it becomes forcefully apparent that in its entirety, and in its particular provisions to extend special tax relief on dividend income and through changes in depreciation calculation, it would, should it become law, give investors and business 12 times as much relief as individuals.
>
> The average individual would get $6 in tax relief, $250 million divided by 39 million tax returns showing taxable income, while the average dividend recipient would ultimately get $200, $1.2 billion divided by 6 million stockholders, or 33 times as much. The discrimination is still understated, since the less than 4 percent of the taxpayers receiving dividends, those with income over $10,000, get more than three-fourths of all taxable dividends. If we consider families rather than tax returns, we find that less than 1 percent of the American families own 80 percent of all publicly held stocks. An examination of those authoritative figures and percentages certainly indicates that the major tax relief offered in this measure is being granted to those who need it least and is a contradiction of our traditional principle that taxes should be apportioned on the fair basis of ability to pay.
>
> While the inequitable disproportion of tax relief presented in this measure would be open to conscientious questioning at any time, it is the more striking now because of the definite and increasing unemployment situation throughout the country which the President himself has publicly recognized.
>
> No reasonable person doubts that we are in a recession, and no true American desires the economic decline to go any further. The United States Census Bureau has estimated there are more than 3 million unemployed people in this country today and, unfortunately, that figure is slowly but steadily advancing. I believe that all of us are aware of the grave problem inherent in this increasing unemployment, and I know we are all patriotically united in our determination to take all possible steps to prevent the present recession from growing into a dangerous depression.
>
> It, therefore, seems but simple logic to conclude that the best and most immediately effective way to strengthen business incentive and our declining economic trend is to place additional spendable income in the hands of American consumers. The same sound logic, not to mention the moral responsibility of legislating in justice to all, moves us to the conviction that any additional income, granted from tax reduction, should be at least proportionately distributed to families in the lower half of the income scale. Statistical evidence of long standing demonstrates that these families are required to spend practically all of what they have and get, while the same statistics show that most of the saving is confined to the upper brackets of the income scale.
>
> In my opinion, these facts are strong arguments on firm economic grounds, demonstrating the necessity as well as the justice in granting increases of personal exemption for the low-income taxpayer when we are proposing to grant substantial relief to prosperous business and high-income groups. The lessons of history show that it is far easier to stop a mild decline than to halt a galloping depression. The country as a whole, business, consumers, and the Treasury Department all have much more to lose by a further reduction in national income than by the loss of revenue through raising such exemptions, for action of that kind

would promptly add billions to the slowing stream of general purchasing power.

Reluctant as I am to disagree with the President's program, I nevertheless very deeply feel he has accepted questionable advice from his economic counselors. While the bill contains many desirable changes in our outmoded tax system, there is obviously grave doubt existing in the minds of a great many Members here of its substantial merit.

EMERGENCY EXCISE TAXES

House speech, March 10, 1954:

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, I am supporting this measure because it is at least partially keeping faith with the people on the promise of the Congress to remove these so-called temporary and emergency excise and luxury taxes when vital need of them no longer exists. My reluctance in favoring the measure is because of my belief it does not go far enough, and it discriminates against many other items that should not be still considered luxuries and equitably ought to be afforded proportionate reductions.

One of the most compelling and forceful reasons for supporting this measure, inadequate as it is, arises out of the alarming current unemployment trend throughout the country. We all, I know, earnestly and sincerely hope this trend is short lived and will be eliminated when the administration readjustment policies and programs are completed. Nevertheless, and without any partisanship, we would indeed be lax in our duty if we pretended that dangerous unemployment did not now exist. It is, therefore, imperative and timely that some effort must be made to increase consumer purchasing power, thereby stimulating production and helping to reverse the rising unemployment rate. It is fundamental in the American system that our tax policy should, to the fullest possible extent, encourage a constant expanding economy. I greatly hope the Members of this body will remember that fundamental tax principle when we are called upon to consider higher tax exemptions on individual incomes next week.

Let us plan now, barring any national or world emergency, to expand this program of excise-tax reduction and elimination so that the entire American purchasing public and all affected industries will be treated alike with fairness and justice.

We have abundantly fulfilled all our pledges to our foreign allies and friends; let us keep faith with our own people who have suffered too long from too much taxation.

SOCIAL SECURITY COMBATS COMMUNIST PROPAGANDA

Mr. Speaker, I have long maintained that if we cannot afford to give a concrete demonstration of the ability of this blessed country to reasonably provide for security of our older citizens' enjoyment of abundant American life, then we have no right to tell Communist followers that our democratic process is more inherently Christian than their pagan godless state of servility.

Ever since becoming a Member of Congress in 1947, I have consistently voted in favor of wisely expanding and reasonably liberalizing the provisions and benefits of our social-security law because social security was originally founded and continues to operate upon humane, progressive principles calculated to strengthen our democratic free-enterprise system and demonstrate to the world our Christian concern for human life.

Again in this Congress I was privileged to support such legislation as revealed below in the remarks taken from my speech in the House when current amendments were being debated.

House speech, June 1, 1954:

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, I am very glad to speak once again in support of the expansion of our present social-security legislation.

In my firm judgment, adequate social-security legislation is a sound barrier against the advancing scourge of communistic propaganda and philosophy which is challenging us this very hour and is forcing us to fight for our very survival.

There are still a great many technical inequities in this measure that I hope will be adjusted in future consideration but since it is this bill or no bill I urge my colleagues to approve it without further delay. In substance it is a real step forward for those of us who have persistently advocated increased coverage and more liberal benefits.

In the overall analysis this bill strives to correct numerous inequalities that have been demonstrated from the testing ground of experience. It is a healthy indication that as time goes on this Congress will more and more recognize the obligation we have to our older citizens to remove, in a Christian spirit, the haunting and despairing darkness of fear of want that comes in the sunset of life to so many Americans through no fault of their own, other than generosity to their own families.

How much stronger, how much more resistant to Communist entreatment and intrigue this Nation will be when its citizens are assured that our great business system and our Government, working harmoniously together, have established a dignified, humane financial operation making them eligible to receive what every worthy working American deserves, namely, reasonable security in time of adversity and dire need.

Let us, therefore, enact this measure now and diligently work to improve it in the future.

LABOR, HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE DEPARTMENTS

Outside of morale and spiritual strength, no attributes are more vital to national progress and security than the promotion of good health, the advancement of sound education, and the encouragement of peaceful labor-management relations in this Nation.

It is my firm opinion, founded on substantial evidence, that the Federal Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare have proved to be national assets. The Department of Labor is charged generally with administering and enforcing Federal statutes designed to advance the public interest by promoting the welfare of the wage earners of the United States, improving their working conditions, and advancing their opportunities for profitable employment.

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare was established for the purpose of improving the administration of those agencies of the Government whose major responsibilities are to advance the general welfare in the fields of health, education, and economic security.

Periodic attempts have been made, by advocates of drastic appropriation reductions, to negate the legally established purposes of these departments and make it impossible for them to carry out the responsibilities imposed upon them by Congress through the original laws creating them.

While the record will show my consistent support of all reasonable economy proposals, these misguided efforts to save a sovereign at the expense of almost life itself appear to me a contradiction to American tradition and national intention, as well as being against the President's exhortation to legislate "for the good of all America." I am pleased to state the Congress eventually granted sufficient funds to permit these departments to reasonably fulfill their public duties.

House speech, May 25, 1953:

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, whatever other differences may exist among us, no one will deny that the functions and services of the Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare Departments directly affect the fundamental resources of the people of this country.

When we speak of "forcing" economies in connection with such obviously important subjects and services, it is eminently wise to approach the task with the understanding mind and sympathetic heart of the skilled surgeon who knows he has life and destiny in his hands. Let me remind you that in acting upon the appropriations for these essential departments of Government, we are dealing with the lives of our people and the destiny of this country in a most delicate sense.

You Members here know I have been and am now a consistent advocate of Federal expenditure reductions, and voted accordingly, whenever the absolute need of requested appropriations could not be demonstrated by the various department officials. Careful and prudent elimination of Federal waste, extravagance and nonessential spending is the objective of us all. God knows, and, without any irreverence, may I say we know our overburdened taxpayers and harassed businesses can stand that. However, let me exhort you not to let the mere cry of economy become a catchword instead of a patriotic watchword.

HOSPITAL CONSTRUCTION

Is it good for all America to practically eliminate further construction authorized under the Hill-Burton hospital program? These funds are used to help States and communities defray part of the costs to erect hospitals and public-health centers; they are granted on the basis of population and economic need. These projects are adding 96,500 hospital beds and over 330 public-health centers to the Nation's health resources. Under this program, 430 communities now have hospitals for the first time. One hundred and fifty-one other communities now have hospitals where their previous facilities were substandard and unacceptable under the minimum laws of fire and life safety. If there is any Federal program that has proved its worth to the American people, it surely is the hospital-construction program.

Other impractical reductions set forth in this bill would disastrously impair such essential public-health services as pure food and drug enforcement, control of communicable diseases, and cancer and polio research, to mention only a few. Is that good for all Americans?

EDUCATION

In the areas of education, the proposed cuts would seriously disrupt Federal assistance to the State activities and agencies carrying out vocational guidance in teaching distributive occupations, giving aid to schools in crowded defense localities, and extending vocational rehabilitation to disabled veterans and the physically handicapped. The admittedly competent Federal Commissioner of Education resigned rather than attempt to fulfill the obligations of his office, which would be virtually impossible with the ridiculous budget offered him. He questioned the wisdom of saving "such small sums while we continue as a Nation to spend billions for other purposes."

LABOR

In the Labor Department and the independent labor agencies, the reductions advocated in this measure would paralyse the proper functioning of such important Government divisions as the National Labor Relations Board, the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service and the Railroad Retirement Board; divisions which have splendid records of achievement in public service and promoting harmonious management-labor relations. Other agencies whose vital work in the public interest and welfare would be practically destroyed if these cuts stand approved are the Women's Bureau to protect women from exploitation, the Bureau of Veterans Reemployment Rights, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Bureau of Employment Security, Workmen's Compensation Bureau, and the Wage and Hour Division of Labor.

INTELLIGENT ECONOMY

Mr. Chairman, at a time when we are generously granting billions of dollars to aid our foreign allies, is it wise to neglect our own citizens? At a time when we are boasting to the world of our better way of life, as opposed to the Communist state, is it intelligent to dangerously retract so many public services whose contributions to national progress have been acknowledged? At a time when we are engaged in a bitter struggle for national survival, is it practical to disrupt the morale of our own people? I submit it is not.

In the spirit and admonition of the President, let us continue to legislate and appropriate for the good of all America.

THE VETERAN AND OUR MORAL OBLIGATION

Mr. Speaker, it will be a dark and tragic day in our history if this Nation ever neglects the moral obligation we owe to the veteran and his dependents.

It was my privilege to serve on the House Veterans' Affairs Committee in both the 80th and 81st Congresses. My activities on behalf of our veterans, their families and dependents are well known and have been publicly recognized. I have been accorded personal commendations by the Disabled American Veterans, the Military Order of the Purple Heart, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and the American Legion, as well as several other veterans' organizations.

My cooperative committee efforts in helping to formulate sound veterans' legislation have been publicly commended by the beloved and distinguished current head of the present House Veterans' Affairs Committee, my colleague from Massachusetts, the Honorable EDITH NOURSE ROGERS.

Under her inspiring and experienced direction, the committee considered and reported a great many measures designed to preserve and promote veterans' interests, but unfortunately, a major portion of them was rejected, against her wishes, by the leadership.

Nevertheless, she did succeed, against certain powerful opposition, but with the help of myself and many other Members of both sides, in obtaining congressional approval of a few bills of importance to our veterans.

Among them were measures to preserve the eligibility of certain veterans to dental outpatient care and dental appliances; to authorize veterans' benefits for individuals disabled in connection with reporting for service induction; to provide for the automatic renewal of expiring 5-year-level-premium-term policies of United States Government and national service life insurance; to extend for World War II veterans a further presumption of service-connection for tuberculosis, other than pulmonary; to prohibit reduction of any rating of total disability for compensation, pension, or insurance purposes which has been in effect for 20 or more years; to extend the time for direct home loans under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act, with provision for additional funds; to extend for another year Korean GI educational and training eligibility. I supported all of these measures.

Of course, the most prominent bills enacted were H. R. 9020 and H. R. 9962 providing increased compensation and pension rates for all disabled veterans and their dependents. My statements on these measures are outlined below.

House speech, July 21, 1954:

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply disappointed that this bill, as amended, is being presented now to this body for a vote rather than H. R. 9020 as it was first reported by the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

We are prevented from acting on the original bill by the Rules Committee under the leadership instruction, which refused to report it for action by the House. I was one of those who gladly signed a discharge petition to bring this bill to the floor for a vote.

I felt then, and I feel now, that the Veterans' Affairs Committee recommendation providing a reasonable cost-of-living rate increas to all our disabled veterans, both service and nonservice connected, for their widows, and children, and dependent parents was merely the recognition of justice.

Unfortunately these increased rates, recommended by committee members of their own party, were not acceptable to the leadership here and they have forced out this compromise amendment which sharply and inequitably reduces the compensation increases on the plea of necessary economy. They did this despite the implied pledge of President Eisenhower as a candidate in 1952 when he said, and I quote:

"No program of economy should overlook the legitimate rights and needs of disabled veterans."

By the standards on which this Congress generously appropriates money for assistance to questionable allies and subsidization of big business, the amount of money that this increased pittance would have meant is infinitesimal.

Nevertheless, this compromise measure, although leaving out so many needy veterans, and widows and dependents, grants some small relief, and since we shall have no other choice, I shall vote for it.

However, I shall not relax my efforts, and I urge you all to rally to the veterans' deserving cause to bring to the floor, before adjournment, another bill which will accomplish all the just and rightful objectives of H. R. 9020, as originally reported.

FOREIGN AID AND NATIONAL SECURITY

Mr. Speaker, I have consistently been in favor of the basic principle involved in mutual security defense aid and that is to prevent the necessity for American fathers and sons to fight all over the world under treaty commitments that have been made.

House speech, June 30, 1954:

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, I think we can all agree that the primary objective of this legislation is to promote the peace and security of the United States. Inherent in that objective must be recognition of the gravest problem of United States foreign policy, which is the protection of the United States from the Soviet threat.

It is obviously sensible to reasonably assist our friendly allies both militarily and economically, thereby encouraging them to reject communistic overtures and appeals. By such assistance, we are certainly promoting our own security and protecting ourselves from the Kremlin menace.

However, before we go headlong ahead, motivated by the accepted objective, with enthusiastic and unbridled appropriation, I feel that patriotic wisdom compels us to stop for a few moments to reexamine, restudy, reappraise, in summary, this whole foreign-aid program.

Now when we put all the figures together we discover that in principal and interest on these foreign-aid programs, continuing since 1940, they have cost the people of the United States the fabulous sum of over $131 billions.

I have listed these facts and circumstances to reemphasize what I regard to be our absolute obligation to the American people to take the greatest care of their money and exercise the highest vigilance over the manner in which it is spent. We can promote the fullest rehabilitation of friendly foreign nations, and it will avail us nothing if we thereby foolishly destroy the morale of our own people here at home.

In that connection, let us remind some of the impractical geniuses in our State Department, as well as our Defense Department experts, that we are not appropriating money here for the purpose of destroying American industries and eliminating employment opportunities for our own people. The placing of American Government contracts abroad at a time when unemployment in this country presents a currently serious economic problem is, to say the least, of very questionable wisdom. It is indeed the more foolhardly when we realize that some defense items and essential parts of industrial machinery are being manufactured abroad in places where the danger of Communist infiltration and sabotage is a high and recognized threat. Such promiscuous spending, in the guise of promoting friendly foreign relations, will not be tolerated by the American taxpayers, and this Congress should be and must be extremely restrictive of their authorization and approval. We can, perhaps, give some of the American people's money away discriminately with their sanction, but we can never expect them to stand loyally by while we give their jobs away.

As I indicated at the start, I am not opposed to the fundamental objectives of this measure. I believe it is practically wise to continue to reasonably furnish aid to those allied countries demonstrating their willingness to fight in the common cause against Communist oppression. I believe that we can enact a prudent foreign-aid program of substantial continuing value to ourselves and the free world.

In conclusion, let me exhort you not to rush this legislation. It is deserving of our prolonged study and debate. It is a program in keeping with our Christian democratic philosophy and is basically good for ourselves and the free world.

However, let us also be mindful that our watchword on all appropriation measures should be "the American taxpayer and our own economic stability come first."

HOUSING FOR THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

The basic unit of this Nation is the American family, and the first necessity for Christian family life is a decent place to live.

Having entered the Congress in 1948 with the heartfelt conviction, based on prolonged study and experience, that the critical shortage of adequate housing facilities for the American people was a dominant domestic problem, I have continuously supported Federal legislation for reasonable housing construction. Since that time, there has been steady improvement in the situation but, by the evidence of unquestioned authority, there still remain some sections of the country where housing and slum clearance are desperately required. This was recognized by the President himself, who favored the appropriation of money for the building of 35,000 units of public housing this year, together with a 4-year development program. Unfortunately, the President's appeal on this occasion was eventually denied, although many of us vigorously fought the losing battle with him.

Below is an exact excerpt from the speech I made in the House at the time this proposal was being discussed.

House speech, April 22, 1953:

Mr. Donohue. Mr. Chairman, I very deeply regret that this bill as presented to us by the committee ignores the recommendations of President Eisenhower and his Housing and Home Finance Administrator, who favor the inclusion of sufficient funds to build 35,000 units of public housing. Unfortunately, the bill, as it stands before us, would terminate the public-housing program and, in effect, slum-clearance and redevelopment, immediately. Therefore, I am opposed to the bill in its present form and urge the approval of amendments to authorize continuation of a reasonable public-housing construction and slum-clearance program so vitally needed in so many communities in the country.

In that respect, I am very happy to approve and join the sentiments of the President as expressed in a statement he made last October as a candidate:

"We must have better housing for those Americans who are now forced to live in slums and substandard dwellings."

The federally assisted low-rent housing program is a Christian solution to the housing needs of a great many desperate families as well as being a major factor in vitally urgent community slum clearance and redevelopment. It is imperative that the bare minimum of 35,000 dwelling units be restored in this bill, the same number agreed upon and approved last year. I earnestly hope and urge this House to take such reasonable and wise action to continue this minimum housing program until the whole housing situation can be surveyed and definite national needs determined.

PERMANENT SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

It has always been an unquestioned American tradition that this Government shall aid, counsel, assist, and protect the interests of small business in order to preserve our democratic system of free competitive enterprise.

With the dissolution and absorption of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and the Small Defense Plants Administration, a great number of Congressmen, including myself, favored legislation to create a new permanent independent Small Business Administration, with the paramount duty of encouraging and assisting small enterprises in peacetime as well as in any emergency period.

Recognizing the importance of our small businesses in defense-production efforts and the national economy, I have consistently urged reasonable Federal assistance and guidance to them throughout my congressional service. My convictions on this subject are presented in the following extract from my remarks in the Chamber when this legislation was under consideration.

House speech, June 5, 1953:

Mr. Donohue. Mr. Chairman, I consider it a conscientious duty to speak here this afternoon in support of the small-business people of my own district and the Nation. The only voice they have in the enactment of Federal legislation is yours and mine, and we would be neglecting our obligation if we failed to truly represent this solid segment of our national and area economy.

I am heartily in favor of the principle of this legislation to establish a permanent, independent Small Business Administration. In modern times, Government assistance has become more vitally important to insure that a fair proportion of the total purchases and contracts for military supplies and services shall be placed with small business enterprises and to maintain and strengthen the overall national economy.

With the scheduled end on June 30 of the Small Defense Plants Administration it is imperative to the survival of small business to have a Government agency to direct and assist them in obtaining appropriate Government contracts and also advise them on applying for necessary financial loans.

Our small-business firms have a substantial employment figure. By granting reasonable help to keep these firms going we are taking safety steps in the prevention of threatening unemployment which is unquestionably uneconomic in these dangerous days when every personal and every resource of the Nation should be brought into this fighting struggle against Communist aggression.

EMERGENCY IMMIGRATION FOR QUALIFIED REFUGEES

One of the proudest of our American traditions arises from the historical fact that this country originally gave harbor to the victims of religious and political persecution. We cannot forget that this Nation itself was founded almost altogether by displaced persons.

In advancing our position of world leadership in these perilous days, we can speak more convincingly for freedom everywhere when we have done our Christian utmost to give real freedom to those now faced with Communist extinction. Security screened and qualified refugees are the kind of people in whose behalf the original American tradition of asylum was established and whose immigration to these shores has enriched our country from its earliest days right up to this hour.

I have, therefore, been continually sympathetic with reasonable legislation to grant permanent residence to immigrants who can meet the very high standards and qualifications that must be set up to protect our own security. It has seemed to me we should implement as fully as we can the clear intention of the Almighty that brothers and sisters, mothers and fathers of one family should be together in 1 land under 1 roof.

The substance of my remarks on this legislation are set forth below.

House speech, July 28, 1953:

Mr. Donohue. Mr. Speaker, I am supporting and voting for this emergency refugee immigration measure, and I hope the majority of my colleagues will also, because it is in the true spirit of our Christian democracy and a concrete gesture of the moral leadership we must demonstrate if the United States is to successfully guide a bewildered world away from atomic destruction.

I have spent the most of my life as the friend and neighbor of immigrant fathers and their families. The contributions of these people to community, State, and National betterment present a glorious record. God knows the sons, and, yes, the daughters, of these families have fully participated in our national defense efforts and are doing so right now on the tragic fields of Korea.

In the administrative operation of this bill the established security regulations will not be relaxed. The provisions for screening and checking against the possibility of subversives slipping through will be completely carried out.

Mr. Speaker, a good many of us very deeply feel and have advocated the necessity for making substantial changes in the present immigration law. The outmoded quota system in that law together with several other discriminatory provisions should be and I hope will be eliminated in the near future. Meanwhile we have a chance here by passage of this emergency measure to correct some of the prevailing injustices.

In these circumstances I am in full agreement with the President that we must assume our just share of the responsibility of providing asylum for these desperate men, women, and children who face certain anihilation if they again fall into the hands of the enemy barbarians.

As a nation of immigrants and the sons of immigrants passage of this measure is in accord with the best traditions and ideals of this blessed United States.

AID TO THE PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED

To continue to ignore the problems of medical attention; vocational training, education and employment placement of the physically handicapped would be a grave mistake that no Christian progressive government can afford to make, especially in these times of Communist challenge.

As a result of the persistent pleas of myself, and many other Members of Congress, a measure, now Public Law 565, of the 83d Congress, was adopted. The purposes of this law are to assist in the extension and improvement of vocational rehabilitation services, provide for a more effective use of available Federal funds and facilitate the application of legal provisions already established. While this law does not, in the opinion of many of us, completely encompass the whole problem, it is a promising step in the forward direction. My thoughts on this important subject are revealed below.

House speech, July 31, 1953:

Mr. Donohue. Mr. Speaker, as my colleagues know, I have, since becoming a Member of Congress, been urging the enactment of legislation to establish a Federal agency to aid and assist the physically handicapped to take their right and proper place in American life.

For that purpose, I introduced in the last Congress, H. R. 8549, and in March of this Congress introduced H. R. 4262, to establish a Federal Commission for the Physically Handicapped. The objectives of this bill are to increase defense manpower, provide for the general welfare, promote rehabilitation and employment of handicapped individuals, and help preserve our Nation by setting up a Federal agency for handicapped. Authoritative figures show that there are approximately 30 million Americans who suffer physical handicaps, and it should be obvious that the Federal Government can no longer afford to delay in trying to solve a problem involving nearly one-fifth of all our citizens.

The very nature of the problem, the great number directly affected, and the scope of any solution demands the continuing participation and assistance of an appropriate agency of the Federal Government, acting under comprehensive legislation.

ATOMIC-ENERGY BILL

House speech, July 22, 1954:

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, it is said hereabouts that the atomic energy bill will soon be considered in the House and that only 2 days will be allowed for debate and discussion.

The bill is compiled of some 107 pages of technical provisions and complex phraseology. It affects a $12-billion investment of the American taxpayers, and whatever final law we enact will reach into the destiny of many generations to come.

It is, therefore, my earnest hope and plea that the leadership will insure that no restriction of time be placed upon discussion of perhaps the most vital subject yet to be presented to this Congress or indeed any other Congress.

As the bill now reads, it is objectionable to me, and I think a great many others, primarily because it negatives the nonpartisan public power policy of this country that has been developed since 1902. That occurs because of the current absence in the measure of any reliable safeguard against exploitation of atomic power by private utilities. It practically forbids the Atomic Energy Commission to operate in the commercial power field which simply means that the taxpayers will have to pay for further experimentation, from which the private utilities will ultimately benefit.

There are many deficiencies in the bill as it now stands but, in the public interest and recognition of the tremendous amount of money that has come out of the average taxpayer's pocket, two major improvements must be inserted in the act before, in my judgment, it should be approved.

The present patent provision must be corrected to insure that no atomic development monopoly can be established by those few firms privileged to carry out the original atomic energy research under Government contract and subsidy.

The provision restricting the Atomic Energy Commission from producing atomic power for Government-operated plant uses and also making it available for public consumption through rural electric cooperatives and municipal agencies must also be removed in deference to the power-consuming public and protection against unjust profiteering.

I sincerely remind the Members of this House that a heavy moral obligation rests upon us with respect to this particular legislation. Let us give this vitally important subject the long and careful and serious consideration it warrants. We can do no less to merit the continuing trust and confidence of the people who sent us here to legislate for the general welfare.

CONTINUING GOVERNMENT REORGANIZATION

It is an axiom of Christian progress in civilized society that the least government is the best government. Among the highest duties of any legislative body is eternal vigilance to insure the governmental system does not collapse upon itself from overweight and smother the personal liberties it is intended to promote.

In this historical period of tendency and temptation to solve all problems by passing a law, many of us have, for years, been deeply disturbed by the octopus growth of National Government. We recognized the danger and necessity of taking proper measures to meet it. It was, therefore, a pleasant duty for me, as a Member of the 80th Congress in 1947, to support and vote for the bill which became Public Law 162 of that Congress. It provided for a Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government which afterwards became known as the Hoover Commission. No one needs to be reminded of the enormous good that Commission accomplished.

In order that that good work might be continued another such Commission was established in this present Congress through the enactment of Public Law 108 and has the same purposes and duties of the previous Hoover Commission.

Mr. Speaker, many of us, with continuing legislative responsibilities, also realized the unhealthy trend toward government duplication and friction at National, State, city, and town levels, which has steadily advanced during these turbulent years of global unrest.

In dozens of competing fields, there are competing activities between and among all these various governmental units throughout what is supposed to be the United States. To finance this profusion of governmental activities and agencies, there is a correspondingly confusing and stifling array of taxes.

Obviously, too much such Government means reckless extravagance, waste and duplication from top to bottom. It places unbearable and oppressive tax burdens upon private business and the ordinary working man and his family. Such evil conditions develop the discouraged and disheartened citizenry characteristic of a deteriorating nation. A dispirited people and a disordered Government are just what the Kremlin leaders are trying to promote here in America. God forbid that their devilish designs be unwittingly and unconsciously forwarded by our own lassitude or negligence.

In an attempt to prevent such a calamity, I introduced H. R. 8714, in the 81st Congress, H. R. 8560 in the 82d Congress and H. R. 3603 in this Congress. All of these bills had for their purpose to provide for the establishment of a Commission to investigate and make recommendations with respect to the distribution of governmental functions and sources of revenue within the framework of our Federal, State, and local systems of government.

I am happy to state this objective was finally accomplished in this Congress by the adoption of Public Law 109.

The following is an extract from my remarks in the House on the subject.

House speech, August 1, 1953:

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, having introduced bills to provide for such a commission in three successive Congresses, I am proud of the part I had in promoting final action on the establishment of this Commission to study relationships among Federal, State, and local governments.

The primary purpose of this Commission is to investigate and make recommendations for the correction of the fantastic duplication and overlapping that currently exist in our complex network of separate government units at all levels.

The staggering cost to the taxpayer in supporting all these units, not to mention the morale-straining irritation imposed by them on individual citizens, comes close to being a national disaster.

I am sure that all Members of Congress and all our citizens will join in supporting the efforts of the Commission to bring refreshing relief to the smothering American taxpayers and good order in place of the vast confusion that threatens the collapse of our traditional government operations.

FEDERAL AND POSTAL EMPLOYEES' PAY

House speech, August 9, 1954:

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, I am happy to rise in support of and to urge prompt approval of this measure to increase the rates of basic compensation of all postal employees and thus attempt to somewhat bring them into line with positions of comparable responsibilities and service in private industry.

It has been my privilege to repeatedly appear before the House and Senate committees, during these past few years, to testify on the various bills to eliminate the salary injustices prevailing among the Postal Department's employees, as well as all Federal employees, whose wage scales have so seriously lagged behind the advances granted in the comparable fields of industry.

I was among the first signers of the discharge petition because I deeply believed the request of the postal employees for an equitable salary readjustment should have the particular sympathy of all of us. They form a large group of our most reliable public servants. The service they render is fundamental and essential to the Nation. The security they enjoy is paid for by themselves. There are no more loyal people in our Government than those working in the Postal Department.

May I also remind you that the best insurance against any misguided reception of false Communist propaganda by our Government employees is to wisely and practically extend them adequate salary compensation.

It is only ordinary commonsense and recognition of the facts of life that if our Government employees are sufficiently compensated to enable them to meet their personal and family obligations with confidence and a high morale, then there will be no doubt of their loyalty as good Americans and their repudiation of Communist ideas.

I urge you, therefore, in simple justice, to promptly and favorably approve this measure.

ADJOURNMENT VERSUS LEGISLATIVE DUTY

House speech, July 27, 1954:

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, there appears to be a well-founded rumor around here that the leadership is planning to offer a resolution to adjourn sine die at the end of this month. If the rumor is true and the proposal is presented to the House, I intend to vote against it.

Every one of us knows there are many grave domestic problems, upon most of which the President himself has requested our action, that have not yet been accorded any consideration. Also, no one can predict what emergency may suddenly erupt on an international front. The new atomic-energy bill, the foreign-aid measure, the postal and Federal employees' pay revision, and the question of raising the public debt limit are matters of such serious national consequence that they should not be given hasty and peremptory treatment just to meet a politically expedient closing date.

These, and other major issues ought to be accorded the long, careful, thorough debate, and discussion necessary for the full understanding essential to patriotic and intelligent action. Any other course practically amounts to a denial of our responsibilities.

The people who sent us here have a right to expect us to place legislative duty and the national interest above any personal convenience or political expediency. I, for one—and I deeply feel there are a great many others who agree with me—am willing to stay on the job until our full duty is conscientiously discharged.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Mr. Speaker, this summary would be highly inadequate if I did not list, in part, some of the bills I introduced in the 83d Congress. They follow:

H. R. 3369, to carry out the recommendations of United States Tariff Commission with respect to duty concessions on Swiss watch movements.

H. R. 3603, to provide for the establishment of a commission to investigate and make recommendations with respect to the distribution of governmental functions and sources of revenue within the framework of our Federal, State, and local systems of Government.

H. R. 4261, to idemnify drivers of motor vehicles of the postal service against liability for damages arising out of the operation of such vehicles in the performance of official duties.

H. R. 4262, to establish a Federal Commission for the Physically Handicapped.

H. R. 5139, to incorporate Wounded Combat Veterans, now known as The Military Order of the Purple Heart.

H. R. 5826, to authorize the President to donate surplus Federal property to individuals in a major disaster area.

H. R. 8484, to amend tariff Act to insure that crude silicon carbide imported into the United States will continue to be exempt from duty.

H. R. 8574, to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 so as to reduce from 4½ percent to 4 percent the maximum interest rate on home loans made, guaranteed, or insured under that act.

H. R. 9840, to provide for programs of public facilities construction which will stimulate employment in areas having a substantial surplus of labor, and for other purposes.

H. R. 9965, to provide for loans to enable needy and scholastically qualified students to continue post-high-school education.

H. R. 10003, granting the consent of Congress to certain New England States to enter into a compact relating to higher education in the New England States and establishing the New England Board of Higher Education.

H. R. 10004, to provide for emergency Federal assistance to the States and Territories in the construction of public elementary and secondary school facilities urgently needed because of overcrowding, and to encourage full and efficient use of State and local resources in meeting school construction needs, and for other purposes.

H. R. 10064, to provide for the establishment of a VA center for domiciliary and chronic care at the Cushing VA Hospital at Framingham.

H. R. 10095, to provide assistance to communities, industries, business enterprises, and individuals to facilitate adjustments made necessary by the trade policy of the United States.

H. R. 10096, to provide for the establishment of a United States Foreign Service Academy.

Cosponsor of H. R. 9430, to provide for unemployment reinsurance grants to the States, to revise, extend, and improve the unemployment insurance program, and for other purposes.

H. R. 10239, to amend section 201 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, so as to provide that all quota numbers not used in any year shall be made available to immigrants in oversubscribed areas in the following year, and for other purposes.

A NECESSARY PERSONAL NOTE

Mr. Speaker, 8 years ago, following my release from active military service, I presented my qualifications to the voters of the Fourth Congressional District in Massachusetts for the honor and privilege of representing them in the United States Congress. They accepted me in November of 1946 and reelected me in 1948, 1950 and 1952.

No man could help but be deeply inspired and gratified by the confidence the people of my district demonstrated in electing me as their national representative to the 80th, 81st, 82d and 83d Congresses.

Since the day of assuming the responsibilities of Congressman, I have conscientiously worked to justify that confidence and trust. The full facilities of my office have been energetically and courteously extended, at all times, for personal service to my constituents. I have cooperated, on every occasion, with the community agencies, social, fraternal, and racial organizations of my district in the promotion of their various objectives.

The expressed wishes of the majority of the people I represent, and a thorough study of the issues involved, have been the foundation for my judgment and action on legislation to advance the best interests of my district and the Nation.

I am happy to present this summary of my voting record on domestic and foreign legislative measures to my people.

CONCLUSION—TIMELY COUNSEL FROM A GREAT AMERICAN

Mr. Speaker, the words of wise authority remain forever as comforting beacons of guidance in troubled, distressing hours. A counseling message to all Americans is contained in the following extract from a speech given at Harvard University graduation exercises on June 30, 1910, by the late great Chief Justice Charles Evans Hughes:

> The most important agencies of democracy are, after all, not the organs of government, but the influences that shape public opinion. * * * Democracy must prize its public life. It has stripped it almost altogether of ceremonial and of meaningless and absurd forms. It has placed the public officer in a position of power, to be used for service. * * * Having surrounded him with none of the pomp which makes appeal to the thoughtless and ignorant, it must invest him with the higher honor which should be the reward of fidelity. Those who cultivate the true democratic spirit will be as earnest in their support of faithful officers as they are unsparing in their condemnation of the faithless.

Eisenhower Administration Leads Way Toward Cooperation Between Farmers and Government, To Conserve the Nation's Soil and Water

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 16, 1954

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday the President signed the amendment to the Water Facilities Act which makes the benefits of that act available throughout the entire Nation and provides for both direct and insured loans for water facilities. In addition the act is greatly broadened by setting up a program for direct and insured loans for soil conservation activities. This act, taken in connection with the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act and the provision in the tax bill which permits the deduction of expenditures for soil conservation practices for income-tax purposes, constitutes a real legislative achievement in the field of soil and water conservation. It is a recognition by this Congress and the Eisenhower administration of the tremendous importance of conserving our soil and water resources. I know of no one who has taken a greater interest in this subject than President Eisenhower. This interest is indicated by the fact that at the time he signed the Water Facilities Act, the President issued a statement in which he discussed the importance of all three of the legislative proposals to which I have referred. I am sure every Member of Congress and every citizen who is interested in conservation, and that certainly includes most of us, will be cheered and encouraged by this splendid statement. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the statement herewith:

> I am happy today to sign into law the amendment to the Water Facilities Act.
>
> This is one of three legislative actions taken by the 83d Congress which give important new strength to our national efforts to conserve the vital water and soil resources of the United States. This legislation is of high significance in the movement which came to life 50 years ago when Theodore Roosevelt gave new meaning to the word "conservation."
>
> This legislation is significant because it gives new stimulus to local initiative and establishes for the first time a nationwide program of conservation practices based on the concept that farms, streams, forests, and towns are all interrelated parts of a watershed. It recognizes in practical terms that the upstream part of the watershed, as well as the downstream part, must be taken into our plans if we are to have the water we vitally need and if we are to solve with maximum effectiveness three of our most challenging problems—soil erosion, floods, and drought.
>
> The first of these bills is the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act. This act recognizes by law for the first time the great importance of upstream watershed protection in our overall water resource policy.

For the first time also, this act provides a broad program of Federal technical and financial assistance to such local watershed groups as are willing to assume responsibility for initiating, carrying out, and sharing the costs of watershed protection which will help conserve water for agricultural uses and supplement any needed downstream flood-control measures.

The second bill amends the Water Facilities Act. Formerly limited to the 17 Western States, the program established by this act makes available, throughout the entire Nation, loans for developing agricultural water improvements on farms and ranches. In addition, this law establishes a program of direct or insured loans for drainage facilities, reforestation, and other water and soil conservation measures. Farmers and ranchers frequently need credit to take care of the initial investments required in establishing conservation systems, or to tide them over an adjustment period while they shift to a better and, in the long run, more profitable type of land use. These new credit provisions, specially geared to conservation needs, provide a significant means of encouraging and advancing soil and water conservation. The third legislative action is part of the congressional revision of the internal revenue laws. It allows farmers and ranchers to treat expenditures for a number of soil conservation measures as current annual expenses which may be deducted from farm income in computing income taxes. This act therefore gives farmers new tax advantages on these land improvement measures. Not only will these advantages benefit the farmer financially; they will also add incentive to the application of soil and water conservation measures.

These three bills rest on several sound principles.

First, we recognize that it is absolutely urgent to conserve and improve our water resources. For water is essential to every part of our life, and in quantities that are usually unsuspected. It takes 18 barrels of water, for example, to refine a barrel of oil. It takes 85,000 gallons to produce a ton of rubber. It takes something like 800,000 gallons of water to mature an acre of cotton. It takes some 1,300 gallons of water each day to supply the direct and indirect needs of each one of our citizens. As our population increases, so will these demands.

Even these statistics do not drive home the urgency of adequate water supplies nearly so well as the personal experiences many Americans have had this very summer—of insufficient water for crops and livestock, of failing wells, of restrictions on use of water in towns. Some of our cities have had to seek means of supplementing their failing or depleted reservoirs. Some have had to haul water from nearby streams. In rural areas, there has been a growing call for water for irrigation. These facts add up to a hard warning: we cannot afford to waste water.

Any attempt to conserve this water should take into account a key fact: that this all-important water—the water we use on our farms, in our homes, in our businesses, or in our factories—has been collected from all the lands of the watershed, beginning at its uppermost limits. Our streams, our deep wells, our storage reservoirs are merely accumulations of water that have fallen on the land in the form of rain or snow. Some of it runs off in creeks and rivers. Some of it evaporates. Some soaks in to nourish crops and trees. Some finds its way into springs or into the sands we tap with our wells. How much water runs off, and how fast, and how much soaks in to feed our crops and springs—these quantities depend in large measure on what kind of land it falls on, what this land is used for, and what kind of cover—trees, grass—the land has.

For this reason our water management programs must not go to work only in large streams or rivers, though the flood-control and other measures there are of enormous importance. Our programs to conserve water must begin where the raindrop falls. And because of the extensive erosion and sedimentation damage which result from floods in headwater streams and small tributaries, and also because these parts of the watershed have up to now been relatively neglected in conservation planning, these programs must put new emphasis on their management.

Under the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, sound soil conservation plans will be developed to establish the right use for each kind of soil on all the farms of a watershed. Soil conservation will be supplemented where necessary with small detention dams, channel improvements, or other measures to protect the fertile bottomland along these small streams.

These measures will be of pronounced benefit to agriculture. More and more American farmers are coming to realize that good land use and land treatment can help them to conserve water as well as soil. They are seeing the advantages of inducing as much water as possible to soak into the ground where it falls—water which will help grow crops and help recharge underground water supplies that are tapped by farms and by cities and industries. Thus an accelerated soil conservation and watershed program will also benefit urban centers by helping to keep sediment from cutting down the storage capacity of our large city reservoirs. It will reduce the amount of silt that has to be filtered from water before it can be used by city water systems or by industry. And it will help lessen the damage caused by drought and thus help stabilize areas where this hazard has been unusually severe.

Another significant contribution of the watershed legislation is that it gives new force and emphasis to local leadership. Its programs are not Federal work projects; no new agencies will have to be created to carry them out. These programs will be planned only at the instance of local people. They will be planned with the cooperation and participation of local and State governments. They will be initiated only when local people have demonstrated their willingness and ability to share equitably in the cost and to assume responsibility for direction and maintenance of the work.

The watershed and water development programs will also encourage a new and improved means of local-State-Federal teamwork. Locally, rural and urban interests must join forces in sponsoring and contributing to the programs—contributing the funds, labor, material, lands, easements, and other needs that can best be supplied by local organizations. State and county governments are also involved. Floodwater retarding dams, sediment control structures, channel stabilization measures, and the like, on the tributary streams, represent measures which individuals cannot be expected to install by themselves, and which may properly require State or even Federal aid because their benefits extend beyond the local community. The Federal Government also has a major roll in providing technical, research, financial, and educational assistance.

To do this work, all levels of government and private endeavor must cooperate. And there will be a call for increased effort in the future. Because our population is growing rapidly, the demands upon the Nation's soil and water resources are bound to become heavier in the years ahead. But we do have the resources to match this growth if we manage them wisely. In the long run, it is absolutely vital to the welfare of farm and urban people, and to the strength of the entire Nation, that we work soundly and vigorously to protect and develop our Nation's vital water supplies and the related resources of farmland, range, and timber. In such a matter of national interest, we must act with effectiveness. These three measures show that we have so acted.

Culture and Greek Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 18, 1954

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, great Greek thinkers throughout the centuries have given a philosophy to the world which is one of the very basic foundations of modern civilization as well as a noteworthy source of free government. Plato, Aristotle, Epictetus, and many other great Greek thinkers nourished and developed democratic ideals, high ethical concepts and the culture of freedom. Greek philosophy is concerned with personal values and flatly rejects materialistic concepts of life.

Among the greatest orators in history were the Greeks. The Philippics of Demosthenes rank among the great orations of history.

The inspiring family life of the Greeks has enabled them throughout history to retain strong racial solidarity. Their zeal to sacrifice for their nation, loyalty to spiritual values, love of religion and belief in God which they have practiced for centuries, typify a truly great people. The Greeks have felt, as civilized Americans have felt throughout history, that worthwhile human progress and belief in God Almighty are inseparable. The doctrine that without faith in the Divine Master no nation can long survive is a basic feature of Greek civilization—a doctrine which must be recognized more fully by all peoples, if communism is to be successfully fought.

The achievements of Pericles, the leader of the Golden Age, are indelibly inscribed upon world history. There are few periods in all time where the fine arts, cultural life, and individual development in political and artistic values flowered in such a favorable climate as under his regime. Pericles and his contemporaries have long since gone, but the ideals they stood for, and the lessons they taught, the culture and civilizing influences they nurtured, will remain forever as an inspiration for mankind.

The famed Acropolis is a great monument which symbolizes a culture that has profoundly influenced human beings throughout the ages. It was the place of refuge and the inspirational center of glorious olden Greece. It was the place where Christianity took new and vigorous root. It still inspires the Greek people and the free world.

Aphrodite, the goddess of beauty, typifies the magnificent art of the Greeks, not only beauty in the physical sense, but beauty of the soul, of ideals, of thought and culture.

Prophecy in the world did not die with the Delphic oracle because the heroic fight of present-day Greece against communism which has electrified and inspired the world is a prophecy that in the future all democratic-minded peoples will militantly defend and preserve institutions of democracy and justice.

Sculptors, artists, writers, musicians, the drama, the stage, the harp and lyre sounded in the past a song of hope, strength, and courage which united the Greeks of ancient time. And now they sound again to defy the enemies of freedom and to rally true lovers of liberty to do battle against its enemies.

The logic, the rhetoric, the aesthetics of Aristotle are as realistic and vital today as when first written. The ideals of Plato still beckon those pledged to scholarship and freedom of thought. If you should subtract Greek culture from civilization, there would be no civilization as we know it today because it is a primary cornerstone of our modern poltical, social, and ethical life.

It is pertinent to note that the Greeks of old were not materialists. They were profoundly spiritual in their approach. They did not embrace mechanistic philosophies. They were idealists. For that reason despite their many contributions to the material world, their greatest triumphs will be found, not in the world of matter, but in the world of thought and the world of the spirit.

Realizing these things, it is easy to understand why, with unquenchable purpose, the modern Greeks, against powerful revolutionary subversion, have gallantly protected their free way of life. And we of America, greatest free nation in history, may well be proud that our culture is enriched, enobled, and perfected by the presence and loyalty of so many devoted, industrious, inspired American citizens of Greek heritage.

Appropriation Acts of the 83d Congress, 2d Session—Part I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 30, 1954

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent I am extending my remarks to include Part I of the report prepared for my constituents on the Appropriation Acts of the 83d Congress, 2d session. The purpose is to give to the men and women of the United States whom we represent an exact accounting of the disposal we in the Congress make of the money in the Treasury of the United States, a large part of which comes from their pockets in the payment of Federal taxes. The first of these reports, which in their entirety will cover all of the appropriations of this session of the 83d Congress, follows:

PUBLIC LAW 304—H. R. 7996, SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT

A. Appropriates $27,517,616 to supply supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954. Continues antistrike provisions.

B. Items:

Appropriations

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH	
Senate: Inquiries and investigations	$600,000
Total, ch. I	600,000
TREASURY DEPARTMENT	
Bureau of Accounts: Salaries and expenses, division of disbursement	$4,800,000
Coast Guard: Acquisition, construction, and improvements	(8,120,500)
Total, ch. II	4,800,000
DEPARTMENT OF LABOR	
Bureau of Employment Security: Unemployment compensation for veterans	15,000,000
Total, Department of Labor	15,000,000
NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD	
Arbitration and emergency boards	125,000
Total, National Mediation Board	125,000
Total, ch. III	15,125,000
EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT	
President's Advisory Committee on Government Organization	$60,000
INDEPENDENT OFFICES	
Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government	1,431,909
Total, chapter IV	1,491,909
CLAIMS, AUDITED CLAIMS, AND JUDGMENTS	
Claims and judgments	5,500,707
Grand total	27,517,616

PUBLIC LAW 374—H. R. 7893, TREASURY DEPARTMENT AND POST OFFICE APPROPRIATIONS ACT

A. Appropriates $3,332,732,700 for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, Export-Import Bank of Washington, and Reconstruction Finance Corporation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955. Continues anti-strike provisions.

B. Item:

Appropriations

TITLE I. TREASURY DEPARTMENT	
Office of the Secretary: Salaries and expenses	$2,600,000
Bureau of Accounts:	
Salaries and expenses	2,548,700
Division of disbursements	14,500,000
Total, Bureau of Accounts	17,048,700
Bureau of the Public Debt	44,997,300
Office of the Treasurer:	
Salaries and expenses	15,499,000
Contingent expenses, public moneys	--------
Total, Office of the Treasurer	15,499,000
Bureau of Customs: Salaries and expenses	39,996,300
Internal Revenue Service	265,912,000
Bureau of Narcotics: Salaries and expenses	2,770,000
United States Secret Service:	
Salaries and expenses	$2,438,000
White House Police	712,000
Guard Force	268,000
Total, U. S. Secret Service	3,418,000
Bureau of the Mint	4,450,000
Coast Guard:	
Operating expenses	155,889,300
Acquisition, construction, and improvements	3,000,000
Retired pay	19,775,000
Reserve training	2,500,000
Total, Coast Guard	181,164,300
Total, title I, Treasury Department	577,855,600
TITLE II. POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT	
Administration	$19,491,100
Operations	1,899,776,000
Transportation	702,219,000
Finance	8,501,000
Facilities	124,890,000
Total	2,754,877,100
Grand total, titles I and II	3,332,732,700
ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES OF GOVERNMENT CORPORATIONS	
(Limit on amount of corporate funds to be expended)	
Export-Import Bank of Washington	$1,070,000
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	3,500,000
Total	4,570,000

Appropriation Acts of the 83d Congress, 2d Session—Part II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 30, 1954

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent, I am extending my remarks to include my second report to my constituents on the appropriations of the 83d Congress, 2d session, as follows:

PUBLIC LAW 471—H. R. 8067, DEPARTMENTS OF STATE, JUSTICE, AND COMMERCE, AND THE UNITED STATES INFORMATION AGENCY APPROPRIATIONS ACT

A. Appropriates $1,201,710,500 for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, and the United States Information Agency for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955. Prohibits the use of funds for the promotion of the principle of world government or one-world citizenship. Declares it the sense of the Congress that the Communist Chinese Government should not be admitted to membership in the United Nations as the representative of China. Continues anti-strike provisions.

B. Item: *Appropriations*

TITLE I. DEPARTMENT OF STATE	
Salaries and expenses	$62,500,000
Representation allowances	475,000

Appropriations—Continued

Acquisition of buildings abroad	$2,500,000
Emergencies in the Diplomatic and Consular Service	1,000,000
Contributions to international organizations	28,250,000
Missions to international organizations	1,050,000
International contingencies	1,000,000
International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico:	
Salaries and expenses	$450,000
Construction	300,000
Operation and maintenance	1,000,000
Rio Grande emergency flood protection	----------------
American sections, international commissions	245,000
International Fisheries Commissions	310,000
International educational exchange activities	14,700,000
International Claims Commission	130,000
Total, Department of State	113,910,000
TITLE II. DEPARTMENT OF STATE	
Legal activities and general administration:	
General administration, salaries and expenses	2,472,500
General legal activities, salaries and expenses	9,450,000
Antitrust Division, salaries and expenses	3,100,000
United States attorneys and marshals, salaries and expenses	14,500,000
Fees and expenses of witnesses	1,000,000
Claims of persons of Japanese ancestry, salaries and expenses	200,000
Total, legal activities and general administration	30,722,500
Federal Bureau of Investigation: Salaries and expenses	78,282,000
Immigration and Naturalization Service: Salaries and expenses	39,000,000
Federal Prison System:	
Bureau of Prisons, salaries and expenses	26,385,000
Building and facilities	----------------
Support of United States prisoners	2,475,000
Total, Federal Prison System	28,860,000
Office of Alien Property: Salaries and expenses	($3,000,000)
Total, Department of Justice	176,864,000
TITLE III. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE	
Office of the Secretary:	
Salaries and expenses	2,050,000
Technical and scientific services	----------------
Salaries and expenses, defense production activities	----------------
Total, Office of the Secretary	2,050,000
Census Bureau:	
Salaries and expenses	$6,200,000
Census of business and manufactures and agriture	----------------
Special surveys of manufactures and other businesses	----------------
Sample census of agriculture	----------------
Full census of agriculture	16,000,000
Total, Census Bureau	22,200,000
Civil Aeronautics Administration:	
Salaries and expenses	97,650,000
Air navigation facilities, establishment of	5,000,000
Technical development and evaluation	700,000
Washington National Airport:	
Maintenance and operation	----------------
Construction	----------------
Federal-aid airport program	----------------
Federal-aid airport program (liquidation of contract authorization)	----------------
Alaska airports, maintenance and operation	600,000
Air navigation development	1,050,000
Total, Civil Aeronautics Administration	105,250,000
Civil Aeronautics Board:	
Salaries and expenses	3,777,000
Payments to air carriers	40,000,000
Total, Civil Aeronautics Board	43,777,000
Coast and Geodetic Survey:	
Salaries and expenses	10,200,000
Construction of geomagnetic station	
Total, Coast and Geodetic Survey	10,200,000
Business and Defense Services Administration: Salaries and expenses	6,320,000
Bureau of Foreign Commerce:	
Salaries and expenses	2,000,000
Export control	3,600,000
Total, Bureau of Foreign Commerce	6,100,000
Office of Business Economics: Salaries and expenses	900,000
Bureau of Foreign and domestic Commerce:	
Departmental salaries and expenses	----------------
Field office service	----------------
Total, Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce	----------------
Maritime activities:	
Operating-differential subsidies	65,000,000
Salaries and expenses	13,500,000
Maritime training	2,200,000
State marine schools	660,000
Total, maritime activities	81,360,000
Patent Office: Salaries and expenses	$11,500,000
Bureau of Public Roads:	
Federal-aid highway	500,000,000
Forest highways	15,000,000
Inter-American Highway	1,000,000
Access roads (act of Sept. 7, 1950)	----------------
Public lands highways (liquidation of contract authorization)	----------------
Elimination of grade crossings (liquidation of contract authorization)	----------------
Rama Road, Nicaragua	1,000,000
Total, Bureau of Public Roads	517,000,000
National Bureau of Standards:	
Operation and administration	1,000,000
Research and testing	3,150,000
Radio propagation and standards	2,100,000
Construction of laboratories	----------------
Construction of laboratories (liquidation of contract authorization)	115,000
Total, National Bureau of Standards	6,365,000
Weather Bureau: Salaries and expenses	24,750,000
Total, Department of Commerce	829,822,000
TITLE IV. UNITED STATES INFORMATION AGENCY	
U. S. Information Agency: Salaries and expenses	$73,914,000
Grand total appropriations, titles I, II, III, and IV, Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce and U. S. Information Agency	1,201,710,500

Appropriation Acts of the 83d Congress, 2d Session—Part III

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 18, 1954

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent, I am extending my remarks to include a continuance of my report to my constituents in the Second District of Illinois on the appropriation laws of the 2d session of the 83d Congress, as follows:

PUBLIC LAW 453—H. R. 8367, CIVIL FUNCTIONS APPROPRIATION ACT

A. Appropriates $57,071,300 for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955. Continues antistrike provisions and provides for the employment of experts at not to exceed $15,000 per year, the rates for individuals not to exceed $100 per diem. Prohibits the use of funds after September 1, 1954, for the maintenance and operation of hospitals in the Canal Zone.

B. Items:

Appropriations

QUARTERMASTER CORPS

Cemeterial expenses	$5, 489, 200

CORPS OF ENGINEERS

General investigation	2, 907, 500
Construction	300, 367, 600
Operation and maintenance	76, 110, 000
General expenses	9, 544, 000
Mississippi River and tributaries	45, 450, 000
Niagara remedial work	2, 000, 000
Plant account	--------------
Total, Corps of Engineers	436, 379, 100
U. S. Soldiers' Home: Maintenance and operation	(5, 134, 000)

THE PANAMA CANAL

Canal Zone Government	$13, 788, 000
Capital outlay	1, 415, 000
Total, Panama Canal	15, 203, 000
Total, regular annual appropriations, Department of the Army civil funtions	457, 071, 300

PUBLIC LAW 357—H. R. 8481, THIRD SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION ACT

A. Appropriates $505,218,741 to supply supplemental appropriations for fiscal year ending June 30, 1954. Continues antistrike provisions.

B. Item:

Appropriations

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Compensation and retirement fund expenses: District government retirement and relief funds	$120, 000
Public schools:	
General administration, supervision, and instruction	1, 537, 500
Vocational education, George-Barden program	24, 000
Metropolitan Police: salaries and expenses	1, 800, 000
Fire Department: salaries and expenses	700, 000
Courts: United States courts	37, 536
Public welfare:	
Agency services	--------------
National Capital parks	69, 000
Pay increases, wage-scale employees	1, 200, 000
Settlement of claims and suits	29, 625
Judgments	222, 218
Audited claims	333, 370
Total, chapter I	(6, 073, 249)

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

Senate: Beneficiaries of deceased Senators	$12, 500
Salaries, officers and employees: Office of Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper	--------------
Contingent expenses: Motor vehicles	--------------
House of Representatives:	
Salaries, officers and employees: Office of the Doorkeeper	13, 615
Contingent expenses of the House:	
Stationery (revolving fund)	$3, 200
Folding documents	15, 000
Capitol Police: Capital Police Board	2, 855
Education of House and Senate pages: Expenses	2, 785
Government Printing Office: Working capital and congressional printing and binding	--------------
Total, legislative branch	49, 955

JUDICIARY BRANCH

Courts of appeals, district courts, and other judicial services:	
Fees of jurors and commissioners	$115, 000
Travel and miscellaneous expenses	36, 000
Salaries of referees	(7, 000)
Expenses of referees	(71, 600)
Total, Judiciary Branch	151, 000
Total, chapter II	200, 955

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Salaries and expenses	--------------
International contingencies	--------------

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Legal activities and general administration:	
Salaries and expenses, claims of persons of Japanese ancestry	1, 560, 000
General provision	--------------
Total, Department of Justice	1, 560, 000

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Office of the Secretary: Aviation war risk insurance revolving fund	--------------
Civil Aeronautics Administration: Land acquisition, additional Washington Airport	34, 541
Maritime activities: Operating-differential subsidies	29, 500, 000
Bureau of Public Roads: Federal-aid highways	55, 000, 000
Total, Department of Commerce	84, 534, 541

ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON WEATHER CONTROL

Salaries and expenses	--------------
Total, ch. III	$86, 094, 541

TREASURY DEPARTMENT

Bureau of Narcotics: Salaries and expenses	67, 500
Internal Revenue Service: Salaries and expenses	3, 600, 000
U. S. Secret Service: Salaries and expenses	--------------
Total, ch. IV	3, 667, 500

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Bureau of Employment Security:	
Grants to States for unemployment compensation and employment service administration	$12, 100, 000
Unemployment compensation for veterans	24, 400, 000
Total, Department of Labor	36, 500, 000

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Office of Education:	
Payments to school districts	$5, 850, 000
Assistance for school construction	55, 000, 000
Social Security Administration:	
Salaries and expenses, old-age and survivors insurance	(996, 000)
Grants to States for public assistance	58, 000, 000
Total, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare	118, 850, 000
Total, ch. V	155, 350, 000

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Agricultural Conservation Program	$15, 000, 000
Disaster loan revolving fund	--------------
Forest Service: Fighting forest fires	4, 500, 000
Commodity Credit Corporation: Administrative expenses	(3, 000, 000)
Independent offices: Farm Credit Administration	(120, 000)
Total, chapter VI	19, 500, 000

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Office of the Secretary: Operation and maintenance, Southeastern Power Administration	$138, 000
Office of Territories: Construction, Alaska Railroad	4, 594, 000
Total, chapter VII	4, 732, 000

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

Funds appropriated to the President Refugee Relief	$250, 000

INDEPENDENT OFFICES

Federal Power Commission: Salaries and expenses	($25, 000)
Housing and Home Finance Agency:	
Public Housing Administration: Annual contributions	10, 800, 000
Tax Court of the United States	25, 000
Veterans' Administration:	
Compensation and pensions	215, 000, 000
Servicemen's indemnities	7, 000, 000
Total, chapter VIII	233, 075, 000

Appropriations—Continued

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY	
Rivers and harbors and flood control:	
Construction, general	$800,000
United States section, St. Lawrence River Joint Board of Engineers	245,000
Total, chapter IX	1,045,000
DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE	
Office of the Secretary of Defense:	
Claims	(2,500,000)
Retired pay	(12,000,000)
Department of the Navy:	
Audited claims	(25,895.59)
Total, chapter X	(14,525,895.59)
JUDGMENTS AND UNAUTHORIZED CLAIMS	
Judgments and unauthorized claims	1,553,745
Grand total	505,218,741

Congressman Young Represents Working People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFTON (CLIFF) YOUNG

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 12, 1954

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, as the sole Representative in Congress of the State of Nevada, I feel it important at this time to report to the people of my congressional district on legislative activities of the 83d Congress which affect them.

The past 10 years have seen a truly amazing economic growth in my State—and the future holds promise of even more rapid development. There are many factors in Nevada favorable to industrial expansion. One such factor is a large group of conscientious, energetic, working people. They labor hard at their jobs, earning a livelihood while building a stronger and sounder State economy. Others have passed their productive days and have retired after a lifetime of labor. Knowing of their interest in matters before Congress from the many letters received by me during the past year, I intend at this time to discuss legislation of special importance to them.

HOSPITALS AND HEALTH

The 83d Congress has taken vigorous steps to protect and promote the Nation's health. A new national emphasis was given to this field by the establishment of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

These specific provisions were included in a forward-looking health program: First, Federal aid in the construction of public and nonprofit hospitals and nursing homes; second, research in the perplexing health problems. I regret that time does not permit me to tell of the great advances which have been made in the battle against cancer, heart disease, polio, and many other diseases as a result of the Federal research program; third, an expanded vocational rehabilitation program was approved which will greatly increase future aid to disabled persons and build a more productive America by assisting these people to become economically independent.

HIGHWAYS

The 1954 Federal Highway Act provides the greatest sums for highway improvements in the history of our Nation. The State of Nevada will receive $8,719,541 during each of the next 2 years. This exceeds by nearly $3 million annually funds available in the past.

Improved highways will mean more convenience, greater personal safety, stimulation of our important tourist trade, and the strengthening of national security and civil defense.

I supported this legislation and also measures to secure four-lane highways from the west coast inland to southern and northern Nevada.

SENIOR CITIZENS

Improvements were made in our social security an dold-age and survivors insurance programs by increasing the earning base; raising the benefit amounts; eliminating the 5 lowest years of earnings in computing averages; increasing the amount a beneficiary can earn without losing benefits; and by extending protection under the act. I will be glad to furnish details to those who request them.

TAX RELIEF

The 83d Congress completely revised our cumbersome, crazy-quilt tax code, and passed tax relief measures representing the biggest tax cut in the history of our Nation—nearly $7.5 billion.

I am pleased to report that more than two-thirds of the tax relief will benefit wage earners' families and other individuals. Henceforth, when the people of Nevada go shopping they will have more to spend for themselves and their families, and the tax collector will claim less.

On January 1, 1954 the tax bill of each individual taxpayer was reduced 10 percent. The new law provides these tax benefits: more liberal deductions for medical expenses; exemption on retirement income up to $1,200 per year for all retired persons 65 and over; dependency deduction by a parent who furnishes more than half the support of a child, even though the child earns more than $600 per year; full exemption of accident and health benefits paid as reimbursement for actual medical expenses to employees; exemption up to $100 per week on payments to employees for loss of wages due to injury or illness; deductions for child-care expenses by working widows and widowers in certain instances.

The workingman in Nevada will also be interested in drastic slashes in excise taxes on many items such as light bulbs, cigarette lighters, sporting goods, baby oils, cosmetics, telephone bills, ladies' handbags, and numerous other things.

RAILROAD RETIREMENT

I supported legislation enacted to permit persons entitled to benefits under the Railroad Retirement Act and the Social Security Act to receive full amounts under both acts. Since October 1951, railroad retirement benefits have been reduced by the amount of old-age insurance benefits.

I also supported another measure to improve the railroad retirement system by, first, reducing the eligibility age of widows from 65 to 60; second, increasing earned income limitation of annuitant from $75 to $100 per month; third, permitting a totally and permanently disabled child and his widowed mother to receive benefits after child reaches age 18; and, fourth, increasing from $300 to $350 maximum compensation taxable and creditable for both railroad retirement and unemployment insurance.

MINING

In a State such as Nevada, where mining is an important part of our economy, it has been distressing to witness the trend during the past several decades which has favored foreign operators to the detriment of American producers. Our Government has in the past spent millions of dollars in other countries to develop mines operated by low-cost foreign labor.

I am pleased to report a change in this philosophy, which resulted in boom towns in foreign countries and ghost towns in the West. Although trade with foreign countries is important in a sound foreign policy, it is impossible to defend the past policy which made us dependent on foreign sources for minerals necessary to our national security.

At long last, Congress this year quite properly halted the appropriation of American funds to develop foreign mines. I am hopeful that the future will see even more vigorous steps taken to protect our own mining industry, particularly in the field of strategic minerals; thereby not only strengthening our security program but stabilizing our economy as well.

VETERANS

I joined with my colleagues in voting for a number of bills on matters of real concern to veterans and their dependents. This year legislation was passed, first, giving Korean veterans homestead rights similar to those given to veterans of other wars; second, extending the period in which disabled veterans of World War II and the Korean war can secure vocational education; third, extending the direct home-loan program to June 30, 1955, and authorizing an additional $150 million of loans by that date; fourth, increasing rates of compensation and pensions payable to veterans and their dependents; fifth, providing for a record number of beds for veterans' medical treatment; and, sixth, providing for automatic renewal of Government and national service life insurance.

FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

As a result of inflation, the average civilian Federal employee is today economically worse off than prior to World War II. Thus it is impossible to recruit or retain competent employees to conduct the business of the United States Government.

While the burden of increasing prices has been eased, Government employees are entitled to wage increases in order to give them parity with their pre-World War II economic position.

I therefore supported legislation this year providing pay increases to postal workers and classified civil-service employees.

HOUSING

As a result of the Housing Act of 1954, our Nation will be able to raise housing standards, assist communities in getting rid of slums, help more of our people to acquire homes, strengthen our mortgage credit system, and eliminate past abuses in the housing program.

The new law will stimulate the Nation's entire economy, particularly the construction industry, which is important to many of my constituents.

Under the new act it will be possible to buy homes under FHA-insured loans with much lower downpayments. For example, on a $10,000 new home a buyer previously had to make a downpayment of $1,250. This has been reduced to only $700.

EDUCATION AND SCHOOLS

The 83d Congress continued the program of Federal assistance for school construction in defense areas, and in other communities which have grown abnormally because of Federal activities. Similar aid was granted for school operating expenses in federally impacted areas. Legislation was enacted to permit expanded use of surplus foods in the school-lunch program.

In addition to providing for these immediate needs, the Congress authorized a comprehensive study and analysis of our Nation's education problems to determine what must be done to provide for a stronger educational system capable of meeting the challenges posed by the atomic age. There will probably be a strong effort in the next Congress to improve educational standards.

Mr. Speaker, time does not permit full discussion of each and every bill considered by the 2d session of the 83d Congress. However, I feel certain that the people in Nevada will be interested in this part of the record.

A Very Timely Tax Reduction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. THYE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 18, 1954

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "A Very Timely Tax Reduction," written by Arthur Upgren, and published in the Minneapolis Star of Monday, August 16, 1954.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A VERY TIMELY TAX REDUCTION—BOTH CORPORATE AND PERSONAL INCOMES HAVE BENEFITED

(By Arthur Upgren)

HANOVER, N. H.—The earnings figures for 447 large American companies published last week in the National City Bank of New York monthly letter show how perfectly the Eisenhower administration has timed its tax policies to offset the economic recession which started a year ago.

Taxes were lowered for industry by the cancellation of the excess-profits tax starting January 1 of this year. As the mild recession proceeded sales of American industrial companies declined.

Usually this decline would be followed by a reduction of the outlays of these companies for new factories, tools, machinery, and equipment. This could easily enlarge the recession beyond its light 4-percent decline in total national production.

But tax reduction came at the right time. Earnings have been sustained as the following figures from the National City Letter show:

	1953	1954	Decline	
			Amount	Percent
	Billions of dollars	*Billions of dollars*		
Sales	44.2	41.2	−3.0	−7
Expenses	37.3	35.6	−1.7	−5
Profits before taxes	6.9	5.6	−1.3	−5
Federal income taxes	4.2	2.7	−1.5	−35
Profits after taxes	2.7	2.9	+0.2	+7

Sales of these companies declined by 7 percent and expenses of every kind except Federal income taxes did not decline fast enough to prevent a big drop in profits before taxes.

In these expenses it is known that wages and total wage payments have held up very well, whereas raw material costs have declined. Profits before taxes dropped $1.3 billion. Against this, total taxes went down even more. The decline in taxes was $1.5 billion. As a result the final net profits after taxes rose a little.

Thus the reduced tax policy of the Government converted a decline in both sales and profits—before taxes—into a small gain in profits.

The Eisenhower tax policies have included similar cuts in taxes upon personal incomes. As in the case of corporation sales there has been a decline in personal incomes. Yet that decline—before taxes—has been likewise converted into a very slight increase in personal income after taxes.

As a result families have been able to spend as much as before the slight recession, and have been able to save as much, too.

These are the most remarkable tax policies in all our history. In past recessions we raised taxes and made the recession deeper. This time we have lowered taxes and made this about the smallest recession we have ever had.

The cut in taxes upon personal incomes—more than half of all 1954 tax cuts—has kept up consumer buying and brought it to a new high level. The cut in corporate taxes has helped bring expenditures for new factories and tools also to a new high level.

What responsibility does this beneficial tax cutting place upon all those businesses? Business, of course, must do its part. That part is to hold expenditures for plant and equipment at such high levels that there will be no cause whatever of further recession from this factor.

This does not mean business must spend for equipment foolishly. Business should spend only for purposes which enlarge its profits.

But today there are so many new machines, new tools, better trucks and moving equipment, better-designed factories, better research facilities which are profitable to business and which business can buy that business must search out every one available to it.

Will a Multiple-Price System of Price Support for Wheat Increase Surplus Feed?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 16, 1954

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, one of the arguments which has been made against a two-price program for wheat has been that it would increase surplus feed and offer unfair competition to other feed producers. This argument has been most effectively answered by Dr. J. T. Sanders, formerly the legislative representative of the National Grange and well known to many Members of Congress. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by Dr. Sanders:

WILL A MULTIPLE-PRICE SYSTEM OF PRICE SUPPORT FOR WHEAT INCREASE SURPLUS FEED?

(By J. T. Sanders)

Corn belt farm leaders have registered opposition to a two-price system for wheat on the erroneous claim that increased surplus wheat would increase the total feed available and thus increase effective corn surpluses. Actually, nearly all the weight of evidence is that a two-price or multiple-price support would tend to reduce feed surpluses rather than increase them as claimed.

At first thought this statement seems almost ridiculous. The more wheat produced under a multiple-price system, without any control of acreages, the more surplus wheat would be produced and thus the more wheat would be available for feed for livestock. Especially would this seem to be true if the "free market," or surplus, price of wheat under a two-price support was competitive with corn prices for feeding. This seemingly logical conclusion, however, will not stand up at all, under a critical examination.

If wheat production did not compete for land use with corn, grain, sorghums, barley, and oats, obviously the more surplus wheat we would have, the more total feed surplus we would have. But almost everywhere wheat is grown in the United States it competes for land use with feed crops.

Every planted acre of wheatland producing feed in Illinois produced an average, from 1940 to 1949, of 23 bushels of wheat or 26 bushels of corn equivalent for feeding.

During these same years the average acre of corn in Illinois produced an average of slightly over 50 bushels of corn per acre, or almost 2 times as much feed per acre as Illinois wheat produced.

The amount of wheatland in Illinois and Corn Belt States to the east is not to be "sneezed at." In Illinois, from 1940 to 1949, wheat occupied 1,414,000 acres compared with corn on 8,470,000 acres; that is, wheat occupied one-sixth as much land as corn. In Indiana wheat occupied one-third as much land as corn; in Ohio more than one-half as much.

Let's look at the feed crop and wheat acreages for the different geographic regions of the Nation. The feed grain crop acreage in the North Atlantic States was more than 3½ times wheat acreage and feed production was 5 times the feed value of all wheat produced, reduced to corn feed units; for the North Central States the figures were for feed crops 4 times land and 7 times feed values of that for wheat; for the South Atlantic Region the feed crops occupied 7 times as much land and produced 8 times as much feed equivalent as all wheat; for the South Central States over 2½ times as much land and 3⅓ times as much feed was produced as wheat; finally in the Western States the figures are three-fourths for feed land and about an equal feed production for wheat. Thus in every section of the country, the substitution of an acre of wheatland for a feed crop acre will reduce the total available feed even if every bushel of the added wheatland were turned into feed channels.

One of the most effective ways to reduce feed surpluses would be to plant more wheat in these States on land that now grows corn or other feed crops. A multiple-price system for wheat would, if it increased wheat acres and reduced corn and other feed crop acreage, thus actually reduce the Nation's surplus of feed.

But, you say, this won't hold true in the Wheat Belt proper. Let's look at Kansas and North Dakota. Kansas grows grain sorghums, barley, and corn in competition with wheat for the land's use. In North Dakota an acre of wheat for feed substituted for barley will reduce feed production 25 percent; wheat substituted for oats would reduce feed per acre slightly even if all the wheat is fed.

In Kansas the substitution of wheat for feed will reduce feed on barley land slightly, and on cornland by around 25 percent. In Oklahoma wheat for feed will just about break even with corn and grain sorghum.

Even in the Wheat Belt, therefore, if a multiple-price support for wheat increased wheat acreage at the expense of barley, oats, and sorghums, the shift would not increase the surplus of feed but would on the whole decrease it. Wheat clearly competes with these feed crops for land use in these areas.

You say all this sounds good in theory, but have these minor feed crops (barley, oats, and sorghums) increased when planted wheat has been reduced and vice versa? Let's look at the record.

From 1929 to 1953 total United States wheat acreages were decreased from the acreages of the previous year during 8 years—from 1930 to 1931; from 1931 to 1932; from 1937 to 1938; from 1938 to 1939; from 1939 to 1940; from 1941 to 1942; from 1947 to 1948; and from 1949 to 1950. An extraordinary decrease in 1934, due to severe drought is omitted since it was accompanied by a 34-million-acre reduction of all crops and in addition an abandonment of 53 million acres of crops after they were planted—a combined loss of use of 87 million acres out of around 370 million, or nearly one-fourth of all cropland.

During these 8 years of wheat-acreage decreases the aggregate reduction of planted wheat acres amount to 32.6 million acres. In these same years increases in the acreage planted to the 3 minor competing feed crops amount to 38.5 million acres. If all the reduced wheat production had been taken from feed, total feed lost by reduced wheat fed, using average yields of wheat for those 8 years, would have been equal to 32.3 billion pounds of corn.

On the other hand, the increase feed as a result of increased acreage in barley, sorghum, and oats (which was largely on diverted wheatland) amount to an increase of 39.7 billion pounds of corn equivalent, or a 23 percent increase in available feed as a result of shift from wheat. In the case of the minor feed crops these results are based on actual yields during these 8 years and the corn equivalent value of these feeds.

During these 8 years the index of price of all feed rose 3 years by a total of 59 points and dropped a total of 132 points for 5 years or a net decline in feed prices of 73 points. Thus the withdrawal of wheat from the feed market actually had a net depressing effect on feed prices.

A similar analysis of acreage changes in oats, barley, and grain sorghums for the 14 years from 1929 to 1953 when wheat acreages were increasing (except in the year of 1935 which was a year of heavy increase of all crops as a rebound from the disastrous drop of the severe drought year of 1934) shows that wheat acres increased an aggregate of 52.8 million and that the acreage of the 3 feed grains decreased a net of 31.3 million acres. Based on an average feed producing capacity per acre for the three feed grains of 104 percent of that of wheat, the displaced feed grain acreage would thus account for more than three-fifths of the total additional feed value of increase of wheat. Actually, during these 14 years the increases of wheat fed were almost exactly balanced by decreases of wheat feeding, since there were 360 million bushels increased feedings 8 years and 350 million decreases on 5 years, with no change in the year from 1952 to 1953.

The net results, therefore, of these 14 years when wheat acreages increased, are that no additional feeding of wheat occurred and there was added to the total feed supply from the increased feed crop acres some 15 to 17 million tons of corn-equivalent feed grains. Certainly there is no basis of Corn Belt alarm in these figures for years of wheat acreage increases during the past 25 years.

Those corn farmers who fear that a program of price supports for wheat which does not at the same time restrict the total acres of wheat should remember that surplus wheat under a multiple-price system must be sold at surplus prices, not at supported prices. This surplus low price should keep wheat acreage in reasonable balance with feed crop acreage.

Also, Corn Belt farmers should realize that if a multiple-price-support system were applied not only to wheat but to cotton, feed production in the South would likely decrease. Under cotton-control programs in the South prior to World War II corn acreage was increased until as much corn was planted in the 11 Southern States as cotton. Lest some think that for the good of the South more corn and less cotton should be grown in the South, I call attention to the fact that in 1935 a study of the United States Department of Agriculture showed that cotton production yielded southern farmers almost 3 times as much wage per hour of labor used in its production as did corn-production labor. Cotton is always likely to pay southern farmers far more for their labor than corn; and there is no possibility of the average hill cotton farm ever competing with Corn Belt farmers in corn production. To set up any cotton program that encourages such competition in corn production in the South is bad both for southern farmers and Corn Belt farmers. A multiple-price system would not do this and should receive the enthusiastic support of Corn Belt farmers.

We have had about the same total acres, 360 million to 370 million, total crops, except in extreme drought years, for the past 25 years. Also, despite the fact that a shift from animal to mechanical field power has taken place, we have had about a marked increase in the units of field power from 1920 to 1953, 21 million to 41 million units, to till this 360 million to 370 million acres of cropland. Again farmers have supplied, together with their families, around four-fifths of all labor needed to do this field work. This labor of farmers goes to waste if it isn't used. The percentage of labor supplied by the farmer is gradually increasing as a result of mechanization. The farm labor is a fixed cost, since it wastes if not used. Also, the farmer has a very high fixed cost in land machinery and power. These must be used and cannot with impunity be allowed to stay idle. All farm costs are today probably from 75 to 80 percent fixed, and cannot be reduced by reducing farm output. As a result, it is next to impossible for the Government, or farmers voluntarily, to reduce total farm output. Farm programs that undertake to do this could not undertake a more futile task. Reduction by law of a single crop causes violent shifts to other crops, disrupting economic forces, and causes unsound use of farm resources.

Neither flexible price supports which must use control to prevent great surplus accumulation in the Governments hands, nor high fixed supports will permit balanced full output. On the other hand, they greatly damage balanced farming. Since, regardless of Government control, farmers will continue to plant around 360 million acres, year in and year out, and will turn out surpluses regardless of effort to control them, we should not disturb a sound balance of output.

Since almost exactly 250 million acres are normally planted to the 6 basic crops and 3 minor feed crops (9 crops), to undertake to reduce this acreage will have about 2½ times as much surplus-producing influence on the 50 other crops to which farmers will turn the diverted acres. This is because 2½ times as much land is in the 9 crops normally as in the 50 other crops.

A system of price supports based on multiple prices, with surpluses from all crops selling at surplus prices and thus governing the balance of production for the 59 significant crops, will avoid the difficulties of control and violent shifts into unsound use of cropland. It will also avoid regimentation of farmers. Such multiple-price system can be self-financing and will not rely on year-to-year appropriation and political vicissitudes to operate it.

A multiple-price plan, operated without control or market quotas to farmers, for wheat, would give farmers around 35 percent larger income than flexible supports under the 1949 law, and an income around 22 percent above that of present high fixed supports. This is based on parity at $2.50 per bushel for domestic-consumption wheat; on export wheat under the wheat agreement at $1.55 per bushel; and surplus wheat at the unjustified low price of $1.25 per bushel, either for feed or non-wheat-agreement export.

Finally, since, as I have shown, such a plan probably would reduce the total feed units in the Nation, due to reduced feed-crop acres if increased acres are devoted to wheat, such a price support would not affect corn producers adversely, regardless of their claims to the contrary. Indeed, it would tend to reduce surplus feeds rather than to increase them, as has been shown.

DISTRIBUTION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

To the Vice President and each Senator 100 copies; to the Secretary and Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, each, 25 copies; to the Secretary, for official use, not to exceed 35 copies; to the Sergeant at Arms, for use on the floor of the Senate, not to exceed 50 copies; to each Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress, 68 copies; to the Clerk, Sergeant at Arms, and Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives, each, 25 copies; to the Clerk, for official use, not to exceed 50 copies; and to the Doorkeeper, for use on the floor of the House of Representatives, not to exceed 75 copies; to the Vice President and each Senator, Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress there shall also be furnished (and shall not be transferable), 3 copies of the daily RECORD, of which 1 shall be delivered at his residence, 1 at his office, and 1 at the Capitol.

Appendix

Tariff

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. BEAMER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 19, 1954

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, on previous occasions, I have expressed myself in behalf of certain industries and their thousands of employees who live and work in the Fifth Indiana District. My remarks in each such instance could apply to many other industries in Indiana or in any community in the United States.

In behalf of the bicycle industry, I have appeared before the United States Tariff Commission. More recently, I submitted H. R. 9682 in behalf of the glass industry. These two industries are used merely as illustrations of principles that underlie the future well-being of many industries in many localities.

Illustrations of the adverse effects of competition of foreign imports could be given in statistical order. The difficult and nearly impossible task of meeting the competition of foreign products, made with cheap labor, and perhaps even with "slave" labor, is best known to the United States manufacturers and to American workers. However, in the hope that a general outline of the tariff situation will afford an understanding of many of the present-day problems, some observations are offered.

I want the record to be clear: I firmly believe in the principle of the protective tariff, and I shall continue to work for the protection of American industries and the American laboring man. My later remarks will explain why this is necessary.

All of you probably have heard the expression that "the tariff is a local issue." This thought was first advanced by the Democrats in the last century. They recognized that the Republican protective tariff policy was popular wth the people and sought to minimize the significance of our policy. It is true that a single tariff cut can have serious effects on dozens or hundreds of businesses in many localities throughout the country. In this sense, the tariff may be thought of as "local." But, even in this sense, it is not a local issue; it is thousands of local issues.

What the Democrats overlooked when they called the tariff a local issue is that the Constitution vests complete control over the subject in the Federal Government. The States are forbidden to impose duties on imports or otherwise to interfere in the regulation of foreign commerce. The Founding Fathers who wrote the Constitution wisely vested these matters exclusively in the Federal Government to insure that they would be administered in the national interest.

Many of these same Founding Fathers were Members of the first Congress that convened under the Constitution in 1789. The second law they passed was a tariff act, which provided in section 1:

> Whereas it is necessary for the support of the Government, for the discharge of the debts of the United States, and for the encouragement and protection of manufactures, that duties be laid, etc. (1 Stat. 24).

This act was signed by George Washington on July 4, 1789, and was a fitting celebration of the 13th anniversary of our independence.

The only law which was given precedence over the tariff was the oaths of office act—approved June 1, 1789; 1 Stat., p. 23—which was necessary to get the Government organized. The second law was to provide the wherewithal to run the Government and to protect our industries. Truly, the Founding Fathers put first things first.

For the better part of a century, the tariff provided the bulk of our Government's revenue, but later excises and income taxes have been the principal sources of revenue. For many years now the tariff has yielded about one-half billion dollars annually, as compared to annual Federal budgets upward of fifty billion dollars. In other words, the tariff now supplies only 1 percent, or less, of Federal revenues.

I do not see how the tariff could ever again be our chief source of revenue. Indeed, I doubt it will ever again be even a large source of revenue, unless we should put duties on such things as coffee, iron ore, crude rubber, tea, cocoa, and newsprint paper—things which we must import in large quantities. It is far from clear that it would be in our national interest to tax these imports. Accordingly, I am convinced that the principal field in which the tariff is important today and for the future is the movement of trade. That is to say, with revenue no longer a major factor in tariff thinking, the main question is the degree to which we should use the tariff to protect our domestic manufacturers, thereby affecting the volume of our imports and, indirectly, also our exports.

Apart from the question of denying strategic goods to hostile nations, all will agree that exports are good business. Exports mean jobs and profits for the companies that can export. And, unless we are to continue the giveaway programs of the last generation on a large scale and for the indefinite future, our exports will have to be paid for by imports. It is hoped that we can taper off these give-away programs in the near future and, thus, relieve the taxpayers of this burden and restore trade to a strictly business basis.

Accordingly, we should survey the tariff problem from the long-range point of view. If we decide to protect our domestic producers by raising the tariff on cheap competing imports, we should do it with our eyes open to the realization that curtailment of imports is bound to curtail exports. Action that saves jobs for one domestic industry might mean loss of jobs in other industries that produce for export.

Of course, we do not always take action in this field on the basis of what is best for business. Frequently the largest strategic considerations are the determining factor. I should like to tell you the facts leading up to the rupture of trade relations with Czechoslovakia 3 years ago, an incident with which I was closely connected.

In 1947 our Government negotiated a trade agreement with Czechoslovakia promising them "most-favored-nation" treatment and slashing the tariffs on the goods they export to us. Before this agreement took effect, the Communists took over the Czech Government. Shortly after the coup, President Truman put the trade agreement into effect, although many of us thought it was both foolish and foolhardy to do so.

The Communists promptly started juggling the Czech trade to build up Russia's military might. The heavy industry was turned eastward to strengthen the Red army. The consumer-goods industries were directed to the West, especially to the United States. The dollars derived from the sale of Czech glassware, carpets, textiles, shoes, et cetera, et cetera, in the United States were used for military supplies for Russia and the world-wide Red spy system. All this time, Russia was growing more and more hostile to us, instituting the Berlin blockade, helping defeat Nationalist China, and starting countless other aggressions that hurt us, either directly or indirectly.

And through the trade in Czech goods, aided by tariff cuts under the trade agreement, the American people were actually, though unknowingly, helping to finance the Red aggression. Many of us in Congress were appalled at the situation and put an amendment in the Trade Agreement Extension Act of 1951 to withdraw the trade-agreement concessions from all Communist countries, including Czechoslovakia "as soon as practicable."

The Truman administration announced a few weeks later that it was carrying out the mandate of Congress for a long list of Communist countries. However, examination of the list showed that Czechoslovakia was not included, presumably because the administration had previously entered into the trade agreement referred to above. Bear in mind, please, that in the meantime, the

Czechs had jailed and convicted our former neighbor, William Oatis, on trumped-up spy charges. Time and again I tried without success to get a statement from Mr. Acheson's State Department as to their intentions. The vagueness of the replies convinced me that they planned to stall along indefinitely on the ground that it wasn't practicable to take action.

This outrageous stalling was roundly denounced in Congress. I pressed for a resolution demanding rupture of all relations with Czechoslovakia and got excellent support from many other Republicans—and also from some Democrats. Finally, we drove the State Department out of its shell and into action. Since November 1951, the trade agreement between the United States and Czechoslovakia has not been enforced. And, finally, Oatis was released from prison.

Of course, the sanctions thus imposed on trade with Czechoslovakia helped many American businesses to keep going, but the point is that the larger strategic factors, rather than the business factors, were the main force that guided our policy.

Twenty years ago a New Deal Congress delegated to the President the power to regulate trade by means of trade agreements with other countries. This was a "temporary"—3-year—measure intended to help overcome the depression. The depression ended with World War II, but the trade-agreement program is still with us, having been extended from time to time by Congress. The Congress has not yet made up its mind whether to grant the President additional tariff-cutting power or to make the program more or less permanent. President Eisenhower has asked for new and more permanent power and Congress will decide the question next year.

It is apparent we must be very cautious in granting further power to the Executive to reduce our tariffs. I feel that the President's advisers have not fully informed him of all of the relevant facts concerning the problem.

For example, for many years the State Department has been the sparkplug of the tariff-cutting program. The Department has chairmaned and dominated the Trade Agreements Committee, which actually makes the decisions, subject only to a Presidential veto. That Department also controls the negotiations with other countries, and what is the principal theme of the State Department on the issue? It is that the Congress should continue to delegate more and more power to the Executive because this is the only practical way of reducing our excessively high tariff. This was the theme in 1934 when the program started, and this is the theme in 1954.

What are the facts? In 1933, the year before Congress passed the Trade Agreements Act, our average tariff on dutiable imports was 53.6 percent; the average rate on all imports—both free and dutiable—was 19.8 percent. I have no wish to quarrel with the State Department's arguments that these rates were rather high.

What is the situation now after 20 years of tariff slashing? In 1953 our average tariff on dutiable imports was 12.8 percent and the average on all imports—both free and dutiable—was 5.3 percent. In other words, our tariff has been reduced by 75 percent, so that it is now only one-fourth as high as when the program began. Consider also that these figures are based on the values of the goods in the country of origin, so that they ignore transportation and other costs of getting the goods to our markets. If the figures were computed on values comparable to those prevailing in the United States, they would show our tariff to be even lower, and still the spokesmen of the State Department would have you believe that our tariff is excessively high and that Congress should approve still more big slashes in it.

As a matter of fact, our tariff is lower than that of most foreign countries; and of the few countries whose rates average less than ours, most of them employ other devices to restrict imports, such as exchange controls, quotas, and licenses—devices which have been used only in a few instances by the United States. The net result is that the United States is now just about the freest trade nation in the world. It is hoped that the Secretary of State and other high-level officers of our country will recognize these basic factors in the near future in order that when we legislate next year we can do so on a sane basis and without the diverting and deceptive ballyhoo of former years.

Coming now to the meat of the coconut, we should favor continuance of tariff protection because this policy will help to continue our diversified economy, and will permit continued operation of the many small businesses scattered across the land. Also, we must recognize the claims of the mass-production industries, which enjoy large export markets, that the policy of high-tariff protection hampers their logical development. These companies are large employers of labor and pay good wage. We do not want to hurt them and all reasonable steps should be taken to foster their exports. On the other hand, we dare not endorse a policy of free trade which will hurt our smaller industries that employ even greater numbers of people.

Since the Government in the past has fostered high-wage policies for our domestic industries, the Government should not let them be driven out of business by the low-wage imports from abroad. The maintenance of a large diversification of small industries will be a good hedge against depressions. We cannot afford to put all our eggs in the mass-production basket.

Let it be clear that an isolationist tariff is not favored. We dare not exclude all competitive imports. In many cases imports of competitive goods have enriched our standards of living, not only by bringing us products we might otherwise have lacked, but also by forcing domestic producers to adopt more efficient and economical methods which ultimately have inured to the general good. It is hoped we can continue to import a large variety of competitive goods.

However, there comes a point at which our domestic producers cannot offset the price advantage of imports by further economies. In the face of rigid wage structures, the producer whose costs are higher than the price of imports has no option but to shut down. Some communities may be able to absorb individual shut-downs if these are few and far between. However, if the closings disemploy a large part of the labor force it is time for Government intervention. When the facts are plain that imports are certain to force the closing of an industry, then it is time for action.

It does not seem that our established procedures provide reasonable relief to industries that are threatened by imports. Congress has authorized the Executive to raise duties, and even to put quotas on imports, when a domestic industry is threatened. Congress also has directed the Tariff Commission to make investigations and publish reports in order to bring the true facts into the open.

Since the principal influence on tariff policy in the executive branch has been the free-trade philosophy of the State Department, these procedures have not worked well. There still is opportunity for the President and the Congress to bring about some improvements, and to be more sympathetic to the plight of American producers than it has been for 20 years.

Finally, it should be observed that, largely by means of obfuscation, the Democrats have deceived the American people about the need for more and more tariff slashes. They have used the tariff-juggling power for partisan political advantage. They pursued the inconsistent policies of tariff reductions and rigid, high agricultural price supports. While deploring Government interference in trade by the protective tariff, they have used the power of Government to interfere in trade by subsidizing exports of wheat and cotton.

Another illustration of partisan chicanery is concerned with the escape clause under which we reserve the right to raise the tariff to prevent injury to American industries.

The escape clause first was written into the Mexican trade agreement which took effect in 1943. Many American industries applied for relief but got only a brushoff. They even were unable to learn why their cases had been dismissed. In 1950 relief was granted to the hat industry. This was the first time we actually used the escape clause. How did this case differ from the others that were dismissed without reason? The principal difference is that the hat case came up when two New Deal Senators were campaigning for election in Connecticut, the center of the hat industry, and the Democratic administration thought that a tariff increase would help them.

Consider the timetable and remember that the election was scheduled for November. The Tariff Commission held its hearing on May 9, 1950, at which time the Democratic Senators asked for a tariff increase to help the industry.

The Commission reported to the President on September 25, recommending the increase. Although the trade agreement called for prior consultation with the foreign governments concerned before an increase in the tariff, the State Department did not even give advance notice to these governments. Instead, it sat on the case for more than 3 weeks and then, on October 19, 1950, at the height of the Connecticut campaign, it announced that the tariff would be increased. They even violated the obligation of consultation to obtain partisan political advantage. And the strategy worked; the two New Deal Senators were elected.

Naturally, we do not begrudge tariff protection to the hat industry. However, protection should not arbitrarily be denied to other industries and the tariff power should not be misused for partisan advantage.

Recently, we have observed a group of Democratic Senators demanding increased tariff-slashing power at the same time they are demanding continuance of rigid price supports at 90 percent of parity. These policies are diametrically opposed; the function of tariff cuts is to reduce prices, the function of such price supports is to raise them. And when this conflict was noted in the Senate debate, what was the Democrats' answer? It was, in effect: "If we did not have such a high tariff on imports, we would not need such high supports for agriculture." Indeed, a tariff averaging little over 5 percent being used as an excuse for price supports at 90 percent.

Can there be any more challenging evidence of the Democrats' unfitness to govern?

The Detroit Milk Order Amendments Are a Barrier to Higher Milk Consumption

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES G. OAKMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 19, 1954

Mr. OAKMAN. Mr. Speaker, almost three years have now elapsed since milk prices in Detroit have become subject to Federal regulation. It was on September 1, 1951, that an order fixing minimum prices to dairy farmers was issued by the United States Department of Agriculture. The anniversary of that event this year will, I believe, pass without much celebration. As events have shown, the order has served the interests of neither farmers nor consumers. What is more, those who originally petitioned for this form of regulation, would make matters worse now by asking for new and additional restrictions on the supply of milk for Detroit consumers. While we have labored in this session of Congress to enact new measures for the increased consumption of milk, they have labored to erect new barriers which would impede the free flow of this valuable food.

Mr. Speaker, at the time the Detroit milk order went into effect, I raised my voice in protest against it. It seemed to me then to be an unjust and unnecessary type of regulation for the Detroit area. But most important of all, I raised my voice in protest against the higher prices to consumers which this order was bringing in its wake. My protest found a response throughout the Detroit community, and the public became deeply concerned.

I had the honor and privilege at that time of being a member of the Common Council of the city of Detroit, and I introduced a resolution in the council which called for an investigation of this matter. The investigation showed that the order was raising prices to consumers, that it was bound to injure small milk dealers, and that it was bound to concentrate the milk business in the hands of a few large operators. As a result of these findings, the government of the city of Detroit, pursuant to a resolution of the common council, made a formal request on the Department of Agriculture to suspend the order. Without much reason or logic, the Department of Agriculture refused to honor our request. Defending the order, the then Secretary of Agriculture told us that a fundamental element of his policy in issuing milk orders was "that the price levels be such as to insure a sufficient supply of pure and wholesome milk." In the light of subsequent developments, this statement was sheer sophistry.

The demand for a milk order for Detroit did not conclusively represent the wishes of the rank and file of dairy farmers in the Detroit milkshed. It was primarily desired by a group of would-be monopolists purporting to represent these dairy farmers. Time and again when these men were challenged in the course of the investigation by the city of Detroit to poll their own members on their wishes for a Federal milk order, they declined to do so. They feared that they did not have their support, let alone the support of other dairy farmers in the milkshed.

Mr. Speaker, those who asked for the order wanted to increase their economic control of the Detroit milk market. The order contained specific provisions designed to eliminate competing sources of milk supply. These provisions required a qualified supply plant to ship at least 10 percent of its milk to Detroit in certain months of the year, regardless of whether there was a demand for the milk or not. If it failed to do that, it was disqualified. As much as this may have hurt the supply plant, it hurt Detroit consumers even more. It hurt them in two ways: First, they lost an approved source of milk supply. Second, with the total available supply thus reduced, the price was automatically increased through the operation of an escalator clause contained in the order. The escalator clause took recourse in a common economic principle: A reduced supply calls for a higher price.

The 10-percent provision did not work fast enough, however, for the would-be monopolists. Accordingly, early in 1952, not long after the order became effective, they proposed that the 10 percent be raised. But they were turned down on this. A year later they proposed it again, and again they were turned down. Being persistent fellows, however, they proposed it a third time, and this time it appears that they have gotten the Deputy Administrator of the Agricultural Marketing Service to go along with them. He has recommended to the Secretary of Agriculture that the percentage be raised to 30 percent. All they need now is the approval of the Secretary of Agriculture.

The proposed amendments, which the Secretary of Agriculture has on his desk now, would disqualify supply plants which do not ship 30 percent of their supply to a city plant in certain months of the year, irrespective of whether there is a need for the milk or not. Only large operators would be able to escape the restrictive effects of this requirement. They would be permitted to treat all of their plants as a unit. The small cooperative, or small milk dealer, operating 1 or 2 supply plants, would feel the full effects of these new restrictions.

What is especially onerous about the proposed provision is that it would not only require supply plants to ship 30 percent of their milk to the city, regardless of demand conditions, but the milk would have to be bottled by the city plant, and would have to be sold as bottled milk. Furthermore, before the city plant could bottle this milk, it would first have to bottle 85 percent of all the milk it received directly from farmers.

These are impossible requirements. No independent dealer could meet them and survive.

It is obvious that the proposed provision has only one purpose; namely, to reduce the supply of milk from qualified plants so as to permit the escalator clause to do its work in raising the price of milk to Detroit consumers.

Mr. Speaker, I have always supported sound legislation for the farmer. I have voted for the farm bill which we have just enacted, containing as it does an authorization for the expenditure of $50 million annually to increase milk consumption in schools. I will continue to vote for every sound farm measure. Consumers in our cities are interested in maintaining prosperity on the farm, because they know that their own prosperity is tied up with it. But they are opposed to measures which would use the sovereign powers of the Federal Government to restrict the supply of milk, and to raise arbitrarily the price of milk. Such a policy could lead only to the further piling up of surpluses of dairy products. It is not in the interest of the Nation or of the farmer.

In the city of Detroit we have just witnessed an unprecedented development in the field of labor-management relations, which should serve as a model for farmer-consumer relations. Just last week labor and management in Detroit have entered into a new type of understanding, which is designed to increase the consumption of milk. Some of our milk drivers' unions have agreed to forego previous demands for higher wages. The milk companies, on their part, have agreed to make substantial price reductions on purchases by consumers of more than one quart of milk per day. This is a forward-looking step which was hailed by the whole community. It is the type of action which an enlightened farm leadership should follow, for in that direction lies true progress for us all.

[From the Detroit News of August 13, 1954]

MILKMEN AND REBATES

Coming as it does in a time of economic adjustment, the gamble of 650 route drivers that lowered prices for milk consumed in quantity will stimulate their sales and income should, at least, warm the public heart.

Drivers of the six dairies involved draw $16 base pay weekly, relying on sales commissions for the remainder of their livelihood. They agreed with dairy executives not to press for a $12 raise, if the companies would adjust prices.

Accordingly, about 60,000 families will be offered a drop from 21 to 18 cents on each quart of milk over 30 consumed monthly. Families buying more than 90 quarts will be rebated 3 cents a quart on all.

The benefits of the plan will fall with full effect on the home filled with children. The dairy farmer, long complaining against handler's profits and cut rates for his surpluses, should be pleased. The agreement dovetails with the economic theory that prosperity best can be achieved through increased production and sales at lowered prices.

The union involved displayed a sensible alertness to the fact that the milkman has become a luxury among consumers now turning to milk depots. It remains to be seen how the competition meets 650 bustling salesmen armed with a new and popular talking point.

Amendments to H. R. 9985

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. USHER L. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 19, 1954

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, while I am in favor of H. R. 9985, introduced by Mrs. ST. GEORGE, July 21, 1954, I think the following amendments, in principle, should be added to the bill. While it is late in the session for any action on new bills or amendments, I submit these amendments for the RECORD. Members will thus have an opportunity to study these amendments fully before any action is taken on the original bill.

The amendments follow:

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO H. R. 9985, A BILL TO AMEND THE TRADING WITH THE ENEMY ACT

SEC. 48 (a) All claims for loss or dispossession or destruction of or damage to property owned by citizens or nationals of the United States, or their legal predecessors in title, which was located or situated within the geographical boundaries of Germany as they existed as of December 7, 1941, or which was within an area under the control of Germany as of December 7, 1941, shall be fully paid and compensated for by Germany on a replacement cost basis as of the date of the award or judgment, provided such property damage claims arose as a consequence of confiscation, dispossession, larceny, or duress (with or without violence) by the forces or authorities of Germany or its allies or by their individual members or by individual nationals of Germany or its allies (whether or not pursuant to orders).

(b) The term "citizens or nationals of the United States" shall include any natural and legal person or organization, firm, trust, association, or corporation.

(c) Any doubt as to the right of a United States citizen or national to compensation for property so lost, confiscated, dispossessed, destroyed or damaged shall be resolved in favor of the claimant if such claimant can establish possession or legal or equitable title thereto at any date on or after the 1st day of January of the year 1933.

SEC. 49. The Foreign Claims Settlement Commission, as established by Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1954, which was prepared and transmitted by the President to the Congress on April 29, 1954, and which plan becomes effective according to its terms on July 1, 1954, shall have jurisdiction to receive, examine, adjudicate, and render awards and decisions with respect to all of the foregoing claims mentioned in section 48 of this act. In passing upon the validity of such claims as are defined in section 48 of this act, the Commission shall exercise all the functions conferred upon it by virtue of said Renegotiation Plan No. 1 of 1954.

SEC. 50. Persons desiring to claim pursuant to section 48 shall file notice of claim with the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission within 1 year from the enactment of this section in such form and manner as may be determined by regulations to be promulgated and published by such Commission: *Provided, however,* That if, prior to the enactment of this section, a claimant has filed with the International Claims Commission or with the War Claims Commission or with the Department of State of the United States a claim for loss or destruction of or damage to property, as specified in section 48 of this act, no additional claim need be filed unless a claimant should desire to supplement or amend such claim as previously filed.

SEC. 51. Preference in the processing of claims shall be given by the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission to natural persons as claimants (1) who are over 60 years of age or (2) who have not been able to take full advantage of section 127 of the Internal Revenue Code in deducting war losses from their Federal income taxes.

SEC. 52. All claimants whose claims are not processed, adjudicated, and paid within 1 year after the claim shall have been filed as specified in section 50 of this act, or within 1 year after the passage of this act, whichever is the later, or any claimant who is aggrieved with any decision of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission in the adjudication of his claim or in the denial of his claim, may institute a suit in equity in the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia (to which suit the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission shall be made a party defendant) to establish the loss or damage sustained by the claimant through loss or destruction of or damage to his property, as specified in section 48 of this act, and if so established the court shall order the payment of such damages to the claimant in the judgment to be entered by it in such action.

SEC. 53. All moneys required for the payment and processing of said claims shall be provided from the following sources:

(1) Moneys received or to be received by the United States of America from the Federal Republic of Germany under the so-called London agreements of February 27, 1953, providing for payment by Germany of:

(a) the sum of $1 billion in fixed installments for postwar economic assistance from the United States and (b) the sum of $203 million payable in 50 semiannual installments beginning July 1, 1958, such payments being for surplus property furnished by the United States.

(2) Out of prior appropriations made to the Foreign Operations Administration or its predecessors not actually expended or obligated by such Administration at the date of passage of this act, such allocation, however, not to exceed the sum of $1 billion.

In the event that the sums hereinabove mentioned to be provided for payment of such claims are insufficient for such purpose, then in such event any additional amounts of money necessary to pay the awards or judgments granted claimants are hereby appropriated for such purpose.

A Problem of Outstanding Importance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 19, 1954

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an editorial from Labor.

This is a very interesting and enlightening editorial that warrants the serious consideration of every Member of Congress.

The editorial follows:

WAVE OF BIG MERGERS ENDANGERS DEMOCRACY

If economic and political democracy is to be preserved in this country the American people and Congress had better do some serious thinking about a subject which an article in the conservative U. S. News & World Report magazine calls "a problem of outstanding importance."

Entitled "Business Mergers: Why So Many Now," the article says "the merger crop is extra big this year. Huge deals have taken place; bigger ones are in the works. You can scarcely pick up a daily business newspaper without reading of a couple of consolidations.

"A year ago, this merger fever was quite warm. Today it is hot. It sweeps through large segments of important industries—such as autos, drugs, chemicals, construction machinery, and textiles. The whole process seems to be in keeping with other signs of the times."

Why this sweeping wave of corporate mergers? The article gives these reasons:

1. "The big concerns are well heeled. The new tax law and the end of the excess-profits tax leave more cash in their hands—available for buying other businesses.

2. "Government is friendly to business. Industrial leaders show no fear that their path to bigness will be blocked by antitrust action."

That remark is extremely significant. Back in the Woodrow Wilson reform era, Congress passed a law forbidding corporations to combine in mergers which would substantially reduce competition and tend toward monopoly. That law contained a loophole which practically nullified it. After years of struggle, Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, Democrat, of Tennessee, succeeded in plugging that loophole—just before the Eisenhower administration came in.

Under the present administration, as the article in the conservative magazine shows, the antimerger law, despite the plugging of the loophole, is a dead letter.

3. Reducing competition is a main purpose of the mergers, the article makes clear. "The men who put the mergers across point to the struggle for greater strength and profit."

After citing some of the huge mergers already carried out in various industries, the article says "the biggest one in process of negotiation would join Bethlehem Steel Corp. and Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co. in a new $2.3 billion firm, with plants spread halfway across the Nation."

The article points out a series of textile company combines among other examples of the fact that a new shape is being given to whole industries by mergers.

Since that article was written, newspapers have reported further giant mergers. One disclosed by the Associated Press involves several companies controlled by Clint W. Murchison, one of the richest Texas oil men. "Estimates of his wealth," the AP says, range up to half a billion dollars."

What does all this mean to the American people? It means this:

First, with corporations constantly growing fewer and bigger, and less and less real competition, profits, prices, and the cost of living will rise.

Second, there will be less chance to become an independent businessman, because little fellows can't compete with the massed economic and financial power of the giant combines. Farmers also will be at their mercy.

Third, and most important, how can democracy survive when a few big businessmen and their Wall Street banker allies have the economic control which carries with it so much political power?

Under the present administration and Congress, as the magazine article said, "industrial leaders show no fear that their path to bigness will be blocked by antitrust action." The voters can change that situation in this year's elections.

All for the Corporations and Big Shots—None for the Laboring Man and His Family

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE S. LONG

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 19, 1954

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, confident that Congress would cut income taxes for their stockholders even before the measure was passed, corporation heads planned and acted to make the most of it for their coupon-clippers.

The corporations that ordinarily paid dividends in July deliberately delayed dividend distributions this year until August.

When the corporation heads sat down this May and June to calculate how much profits they will sock away in their treasuries and how much will be declared as dividends and mailed out, they correctly predicted the then pending tax bill would make the dividend income credit device effective after August 1.

That is the device permitting a taxpayer to exclude $50 of dividends received each year from his income, to figure the taxes, and then to deduct 4 percent of the rest of his dividend income from his taxes.

The business interests fought hard for passage of this device; they did not just expect and plan on how to get the most mileage out of it.

There was no similar deduction in the bill for wage income or any other type of income—the corporation stockholders now will pay less income taxes than will anyone else with the same income, same number of dependents, and same living costs.

The device will save dividend recipients $204 million in the year ending June 30, 1955, and about $350 million each year thereafter—provided it is not increased by later Congresses.

Now, my friends, this is our Republican Congress at work. More than half of our people, and that is the half in the lower brackets, will receive very little tax reduction. This has been, in my opinion, the big man's Congress and all the tax reductions have gone into the upper brackets. That is, of course, why we hope and pray that our next Congress will be Democratic, and maybe we will be able to help the fellows in the lower income brackets. The old Republican trickle-down theory to help the big boys first is shown in its worst form.

Now that the Republicans have passed their tax bill and bragged about how much they have helped the people, let me say to you that they have helped some of the coupon clippers and big shots in the upper brackets, but 50 million people in the lower brackets receive but a token reduction. This should convince every right-thinking man and woman, especially laboring people, that the Republican Party is the party of the big shots and has no sympathy for the laboring man.

The Coal Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 19, 1954

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include two letters written by Martin L. Burtless with reference to the economic ills which presently beset the coal industry. Mr. Burtless, a former West Virginian who now resides in Washington, D. C., is very much interested in the problems affecting the mining industry.

The letters follow:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *July 31, 1954.*

Mr. NEIL H. JACOBY,
Member, Council of Economic Advisers,
Executive Office of the President,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. JACOBY: It is now common knowledge in governmental and industrial circles that the coal industry flounders helplessly in a sea of whirling confusion and that it feebly gasps for life under the American system of unrestricted competition.

Economic conditions differ little in the coal-mining areas throughout the Nation, so my remarks will be confined to the fast-sliding economy of West Virginia, and to its major provider, which is the coal industry.

Since I had previously alluded to these subjects, I request of you that you refer to your file which contains a copy of your letter of March 23, 1954, to me; my letter of March 7, 1954, to you; and a copy of my letter of November 18, 1953, to Governor Marland of West Virginia.

The 23 weeks which have elapsed since March 7, 1954, are now buried in eternal oblivion. But the sparse economy of the State of that date and the livelihoods of thousands of families, which, at that time had shrunk to a substandard level, have progressively worsened.

During this empty period of 23 weeks, additional thousands of families have joined the ranks of the tens of thousands who had previously been reduced to a substandard scale of living. And hundreds of families have descended from the ranks of tens of thousands of families on a substandard scale and have joined the ranks of the thousands of families who had previously been reduced to poverty.

The evolution continues and it will envelop most of the citizens in the stricken areas unless it is quickly checked either by the coal industry or by governmental action.

Small businesses and professional men are being drawn into the maelstrom and the coal industry itself now hangs by a slender thread between insolvency and complete failure.

As is generally the case, the masses or families in lowest income brackets are harshly penalized for the indiscretions of a moribund industry. These poor families are totally without representation and they are not schooled in the ways of cooperative action in the economic disaster which has descended upon them.

It has been clearly demonstrated through the years that many of the major problems of the coal industry have been fabricated by them. And it has been just as clearly demonstrated that they do not possess the key to the problems of their fabrication.

Whoever possesses the key to some or all of the problems of the coal industry should be invited either by the coal industry or by a governmental committee to disclose them. Nothing should stand in the way of extend-extending help to the tens of thousands of families who needlessly suffer.

Here in brevity is an outline of a formula which will resolve all the problems of the coal industry.

An exact diagnosis of the organizational structure of the coal industry would reveal that it is grievously afflicted with two major diseases of contagious character.

Each is fed by a group of minute organisms with varying degrees of poison. Many of these minute organisms act independently of the others.

Of the two diseases, one is curable and the other is incurable.

All of the organisms which feed the curable disease can be efficaciously treated. Some of the organisms which feed the incurable disease are susceptible of alleviation. The incurable organisms have been spawned by progress.

To the current time the coal industry has been unable to distinguish between the curable and incurable organisms which accounts for the infeebled condition in which it now finds itself.

Let's separate the wheat from the chaff and resolve the grave economic problems for the industry, and relieve the suffering and distress of the thousands of families who live in the stricken areas.

In recognition of the serious plight of these thousands of hungry families, the President has appointed a panel under the direction of Dr. Arthur S. Flemming with the title of Interdepartmental Committee on the Soft Coal Industry.

Since so much is at stake, and since some of the ills of the coal industry can be efficaciously treated, no time should be wasted in the administration of the medicine.

I now unequivocally state that with the cooperation of the able membership of the Interdepartmental Committee on the Soft Coal Industry, we can formulate a plan of procedure, which will quickly resolve the curable ills, and which will alleviate many of the incurable pains of the industry.

This plan of procedure can be prepared within a few days. Few, if any, statistics will be needed. It can be put into operation within 30 days and the coal industry should be functioning normally within its fixed niche within 6 months.

I offer my services in this humanitarian task and I will be available for it on a few hours notice. You or any member of the committee will be able to reach me by dialing Lincoln 7–4913.

Since I have been keenly interested in stabilization of the coal industry for a number of years, I enclose a copy of a letter with date of March 5, 1947, which I forwarded to a number of topflight coal executives.

Sincerely yours,

Martin L. Burtless.

Charlotte, N. C., *March 5, 1947.*

To Coal Executives in West Virginia and Pennsylvania.

Gentlemen: Producing coal at reasonable cost has never been the industry's major problem. Selling it at a gross profit which assures the payment of normal dividends to investors and standard wages to mine labor is its unsolved problem.

A routine examination of the records of its performance will disclose that from its inception to the current time the selling branch of the coal industry has progressed little, if any, in potency. It came into existence as an impotent agency, and it has never risen above that category during its entire period of activity.

In its currently enfeebled condition, the selling branch of the industry is unable to cope with contemporary competition.

Coal, as is generally known, is a basic commodity, and the industry is of major proportion. As vital as it is to the national economy and security, the industry has never experienced a semblance of stableness. Traditionally, it is either a prince or a pauper.

With 400,000 underpaid wage earners it contributed substantially to the collapse of the economic structure of the Nation in October 1929, and it extended the length of the depression beyond its normal span.

Its many thousands of investors and approximately 400,000 wage earners depend upon it for dividends and livelihoods.

Each group thrives only during periods of disaster, such as wars and the transitional periods following wars.

As a general thing, the coal industry experiences periods of 8 years of prosperity and 17 years of unparalleled adversity during each cycle of one-quarter century.

During the long period of adversity the investor is a forgotten man insofar as dividends are concerned, and mine labor lives in poverty and squalor on his substandard wages; but the supine personnel of the selling branch, who could not equalize realizations with costs, lives through both periods of the cycle in average affluence.

Irrespective of the range in mining costs, during the long period from January 1, 1924, to October 1, 1940, which is approximately 17 years, all producing companies lost money in mining coal. If any producing company realized a net profit, and some did, it was derived from the sale of merchandise and not from coal. In such cases, the profits from the subsidiary business exceeded the losses from the principal business.

It was the only major industry which paid substandard wages and still operated at a loss during the prosperous 1920's.

The huge deficit of the long period of 17 years could only be paid by two groups in the coal industry. Mine ownership contributed its share by depletion of assets; and mine labor contributed its share from the difference between standard and substandard wages. The opulent industrial consumer was the principal beneficiary of the huge contribution.

Mine management was fully aware that the selling branch was the weak link in the chain of the industry.

The deterioration of its plant facilities and the gradual disappearance of its assets, as a result of the chronic condition of costs in excess of realizations, deeply concerned mine management. It thoroughly understood that equalization of the two factors was a fundamental procedure, but it could not reconcile them, as the supine personnel of the selling branch could not match the wits of the sagacious industrial purchasing agent.

Mine management employed every conceivable means, except one, for rectification of the corrosive condition. It curtailed costs by mechanization of mines; it effectuated substantial reductions in mine costs of other categories; it neglected necessary repairs to plant facilities; and it decreased wages and increased prices of its merchandise through its commissaries to its employees, which was equivalent to an additional reduction in wages.

The introduction of all of these cost-saving devices did not change the relation between costs and realizations. Such savings were merely passed on to the industrial purchasing agent and retailer dealer in lower prices by the inept selling branch.

The only remedy for the deteriorating condition was revitalization of the moribund selling branch, whose heritage was impotency; but as yet mine management has not undertaken the highly important task.

As a result of the war, or of demand in excess of supply, the industry has earned substantial profits without selling effort. The war granted it a respite of 5 years of inactivity which it could have profitably utilized for renovation of the selling branch, but mine management did not grasp the opportunity. It merely vegetated during that long period of a seller's market.

The time of supply in excess of demand inevitably approaches. Curtailment of production cannot be avoided. At this time supply actually exceeds consumption, but demand equals production because general industry is storing huge tonnages of coal in expectation of a work stoppage either on April 1, 1947, or on July 1, 1947.

The coal industry soon enters an era of incomparably merciless competition with a selling personnel in its customarily debilitated condition. As it is now constituted, it would be well that mine management become reconciled to a repetition of its poverty-stricken condition of the prosperous decade of the 1920's during the equally prosperous period of the late 1940's and early 1950's.

Unless executive management revamps the selling branch of the industry before the day when supply exceeds demand, average realizations will drop below average costs within a period of sixty days after the shift.

A thorough overhauling of the selling branch before supply surpasses demand is highly essential, but the simple expediency of an industrywide shift in form of compensation from salary and expenses to a commission would prolong by many months the inevitable plunge into the red of the overall industry, and it might well solve the malignant problem for all time.

Such a system would unerringly reveal the incompetents and it would automatically dispose of them. The incentive feature of it would disclose and release repressed and latent talent, and it would attract outside talent. It would tend to stableness, and it would contribute substantially to equalization of realizations and costs when supply surpasses demand, which would be helpful in the payment of dividends to investors and standard wages to mine labor.

When the coal industry operates at a loss, it becomes conscienceless and heartless. It quickly resorts to self-preservation. It stops the payment of dividends to investors and since labor costs approximate 65 percent of total costs, it reduces wages. The two groups are penalized by the impotency of the selling branch.

The keystone of a prosperous coal industry is a proficient selling organization.

Sincerely yours,

Martin L. Burtless.

Stop Unwarranted Curtailment of Railway Post-Office Service in New England

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 19, 1954

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following communications I received in my office today in further protest against curtailment of railway post-office service in New England:

Boston Branch,
National Postal Transport Association,
August 17, 1954.

Hon. Thomas J. Lane,
House of Representatives,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Congressman Lane: At our regular meeting, August 3, 1954, the Boston branch felt compelled to pass the attached resolution due to treatment afforded the first division board of directors, who are presidents of the various National Postal Transport Association branches in New England, at a recent meeting with Post Office Department officials regarding curtailment of railway post-office service in New England.

Sincerely yours,

Henry T. Anglim, Jr.,
President.

Whereas the executive committee of the first division, National Postal Transport Association, at a recent conference held in Washington, D. C., July 22, 1954, with the Post Office Department officials in an effort to protect vital mail service for New England patrons of the postal service and to protest curtailment of such service, were labeled as false rumormongers by Post Office Department officials; and

Whereas subsequent developments produced proof that proposed curtailments were then in process of being promulgated; and

Whereas Postmaster General Summerfield has stated in Postal Bulletin No. 17953—"It is not only the legal right but the duty of the Postmaster General to provide employees with full information about post-office management proposals affecting them": Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Boston branch, first division, NPTA, strongly resents such attempts to discredit our duly elected representatives and deplores the use of such sharp practice; and be it further

Resolved, That the Boston branch feels compelled to point out that such unwarranted and shabby treatment has materially reduced the high level of labor-management relations and mutual respect that has taken many years to attain; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to Division President Legge, National President Thomas, Members of the New England congressional delegation, Assistant Postmaster General in charge of transportation, the Postal Transport Journal for publication, and a copy spread on the minutes of this meeting.

A Report to My Constituents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 19, 1954

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, following my usual practice of submitting a report to my constituents of my activities during each Congress, I want to take this opportunity to review briefly some of the highlights of the 83d Congress.

This Congress, although nominally controlled by the Republican Party, was in fact one of the most closely divided Congresses in the history of the Nation. In the House of Representatives the margin of control fluctuated through death or resignation with the result that at no time during the 2-year period did the Republican Party enjoy a majority of more than five seats. In the United States Senate the hair-line majority has never exceeded one seat. In some instances due to death the Democratic Party actually had a majority even though the control of the Senate remained in the hands of the Republican Party. Because of the narrow margin of votes between the Republicans and Democrats in Congress every legislative proposal was given thorough discussion and political steamrolling became a lost art. The result was that almost the entire Eisenhower program was approved on a nonpartisan basis.

DO-SOMETHING CONGRESS

The 83d Congress, which has been appropriately termed the do-something Congress, has established an outstanding record in legislative achievement. Nineteen hundred and fifty-two campaign pledges have been redeemed to the extent that it is possible to say the spending spree has been halted; inflation has been checked, wartime controls have been abolished; long-suffering taxpayers have been given relief; the national defense has been streamlined and strengthened; social security, railroad retirement and veterans benefits have been liberalized; home ownership has been made easier; the program for planning public works has been revived; farm prices are being stabilized; the public health programs have been broadened; a record-breaking highway construction program has been approved; foreign aid has been reasonably reduced; a carefully drawn budget has been adopted which comes ever nearer to eventual balance; the Government is gradually being taken out of business; the Atomic Energy Act has been brought up to date; Communist and security risks have been expelled from Government; honesty in Government has been restored; and above all, a consistent and firm foreign policy based on collective security is a reality with the result that the shooting has been ended in Korea and as a Nation we are at peace.

It is noteworthy that 95 percent of the administration's legislative requests has been approved by the 83d Congress as against the 6 years of the Truman administration which managed to get less than 43 percent of its program approved by a Democratic Congress.

BUSY AND HECTIC SESSIONS

The 83d Congress which convened in January 1953 was busy and hectic primarily because it heralded the return to power of the Republican Party which inherited the aftermath of 20 years of Democratic rule. Almost all the major legislation considered by the 83d Congress was controversial and hence was the subject of spirited debate.

COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENT

During the 83d Congress I retained my membership of many years on two important congressional committees—the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy and the House Armed Services Committee. Because of my length of service in Congress, my seniority on both of these important committees has classified me as a senior member of each. Both of my committee assignments and especially my membership on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy consumed a major portion of my time and to such an extent that literally for days I found myself behind closed doors involved in discussing matters pertaining to atomic energy, military defenses, and domestic and international affairs.

ATTENDANCE RECORD

During the 83d Congress despite the heavy demands on my time because of committee assignments, and visiting various Government agencies on congressional business, I achieved another 100-percent attendance record by answering all quorum and roll calls. My overall attendance record is near perfect during my congressional career and is one of the best in the history of the Congress of the United States according to the records of the Clerk of the House of Representatives.

LARGE VOLUME OF MAIL

Throughout the 83d Congress my daily volume of mail continued to increase to such an extent that the postmaster of the House of Representatives in issuing a report stated that of the 435 Members of the House I received the third highest volume of mail.

Following my usual practice, I personally read every piece of mail received at my Washington and Altoona offices. In the majority of cases, I develop the information to answer inquiries. My files are full of letters of appreciation for services rendered to my constituents. These thank you expressions of my effort to truly represent at all times the people of this congressional district are deeply appreciated.

TAX RELIEF

Because of the administration's elimination of wasteful and extravagant spending which cut $14 billion from the Truman administration rate of spending, taxes are being reduced by nearly $7½ billion this year—the largest savings to taxpayers in any year of our history. More than two-thirds of the tax relief goes to individuals, 85 percent of whom are working men and women. Additional tax relief has been granted by drastically reducing wartime excise taxes on telephone bills, drugstore items, luggage, baby oils, cosmetics, and numerous other items. Savings in the field of personal income taxes are possible through generous deductions for medical expenses, and to retired persons by exempting from taxation the first $1,200 of retirement income. Children working after school or during summer vacations may now earn more than $600 yearly and still be listed by their parents as dependents. Working widows with children under 12 years of age are permitted an income-tax deduction for the cost of child care.

In voting for tax relief, I was one of the few who stood up and was counted in favor of the proposed amendment to increase the individual income-tax exemption from $600 to $700.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

As a member of the House Armed Services Committee I joined civilian and military leaders within the Department of Defense in placing our Armed Forces on a sounder and firmer basis to which constant improvements can be made in a more orderly manner. These improvements have been referred to as the New Look and are designed to give military strength to our country without wasting the taxpayers' dollars. This new concept of our defense needs is based on improved weapons and a greater reliance on expanded airpower. This year's military appropriations were based on the New Look concept which included long-range planning, and made available for defense spending after July 1 the total sum of nearly $77 billion.

SOCIAL SECURITY

As usual, I was active in the field of social legislation, and joined other Members of Congress in making possible the greatly expanded and improved social-security program which will increase benefits and grant social-security coverage to millions of Americans not previously covered by the Social Security Act. The provisions of several bills I introduced to amend the Social Security Act were incorporated in the social-security bill approved by Congress. I am pleased to have played a part in broadening the coverage and liberalizing the provisions of the Social Security Act.

OLD-AGE PENSIONS

While social security has been improved considerably, there are a lot of us in Congress who are of the firm belief that a universal pension, with everyone contributing and participating is the answer to the old-age pension problem. I continued my activities in the field of old-age pensions by working with business, labor, and pension groups who are seeking a solution to what has become America's No. 1 problem—the adequate care and welfare of the Nation's senior citizens.

THE RAILROAD RETIREMENT ACT

I am greatly disappointed that the 83d Congress did not approve all my proposals to liberalize the provisions of the Railroad Retirement Act and especially to increase benefits. There is no type of legislation in which I am more interested than amendments to the Railroad Retirement Act. As a matter of fact, I pleaded, prodded and begged in my efforts to comply with the wishes of my constituents regarding their ideas as to how the Railroad Retirement Act should be amended. While I was treated courteously by the congressional committees who listened to my pleas, the age-old argument, that the retirement fund could not stand the cost of the proposed amendments without increasing payroll taxes, prevailed. The result was that these committees wrote a bill which contained their own version of amendments to the Railroad Retirement Act. This committee bill was the only measure presented to Congress for consideration and it was simply a case of voting for it or against it. While I stated publicly that I was not satisfied with the committee bill, it did contain a provision of a bill which I introduced reducing eligibility age of widows from 65 to 60 years. The committee bill also contained other provisions which had my approval.

My efforts to eliminate the restrictions against the payment of dual benefits to persons entiled to social security and railroad retirement benefits met with success when Congress approved a compromise provision of my bill H. R. 356. Originally it was intended to include the spouse and widow but because of the cost factor and its effect on the railroad retirement fund the legislation could not secure approval as originally introduced. In reporting on my activities in this field, I yield to no one in the effort I put forth to amend the Railroad Retirement Act during the 83d Congress.

VETERANS AND THEIR DEPENDENTS

During the 83d Congress I continued my efforts in behalf of the veterans of all wars and their dependents, an activity that I began after my discharge from World War I in 1919. Not only have I personally assisted hundreds of veterans and their dependents in obtaining benefits to which they were entitled but I played an active role in securing congressional approval of bills now laws, which provide and increase benefits to the veterans of all wars and their dependents. In addition to my legislative activities in behalf of veterans and their dependents, I continued my activities in the field of organized veterandom by working in close harmony with officials of the major veterans groups who frequently consult with me as we strive constantly to protect the best interests of the veterans of the Nation.

A SOUND NATIONAL FARM POLICY

During the 83d Congress I joined with agricultural leaders in Congress in advocating a sound national farm policy for the country, the taxpayer and the farmer. The common objective was to relieve the nation from the costly and wasteful burden of high rigid farm price supports and at the same time continue reasonable aid for American farmers. These rigid farm price supports were enacted in 1942 as a war measure and at the time when the country was faced with a tremendous job of food production and the high prices were guaranteed to encourage the farmers to go all out. It is generally agreed that if the Administration's flexible price support program is given a reasonable trial the shameful waste and inequity of Government-rigged high prices will become a thing of the past thus saving the American taxpayer billions of dollars now invested in the mountain of surplus commodities stored all over the country.

PROTECTING AMERICAN LABOR

I continued my efforts to restrict the importation of cheaply manufactured foreign products which are destroying the jobs of American wage-earners, by voting against the extension of reciprocal trade agreements until assurance is given that American workmen will be protected. My principal effort in this field was in the introduction and support of legislation designed to curb the importation of foreign residual oil from the Caribbean area which has captured our eastern seaboard coal markets. While not successful in having the legislation approved, the administration is conscious of the plight of the ailing coal industry and Presidential committees are now studying the situation. In my opinion reciprocal trade agreements are responsible for much of the unemployment we have in central Pennsylvania in the leather, gas meter, textile, coal, pottery, light bulb and railroad industries. The protection of American wage earners against the flood of cheaply manufactured foreign imports will continue to be one of my main objectives.

EFFORTS TO AID SMALL BUSINESS

Ever mindful of the fact that small business is the backbone of our economic life, I devoted much effort to aiding and assisting the businessmen of my congressional district. Almost daily I aided various industries in the central Pennsylvania area who had problems with the Federal Government concerning contracts, shortage of materials, small business loans, tax amortization certificates, and so forth. This effort on my part to aid business firms resulted in thousands of dollars in Government contracts, while tax amortization certificates were issued amounting to nearly $13 million. This meant continued employment for the employees of the firms I was able to assist.

At my request the Small Business Administration made a survey of my congressional district to determine the defense production capabilities of our industries so that Government procurement agencies could be gided by such information in channeling contracts aimed at relieving the unemployment situation.

In addition, for the past 2 years I enjoyed an arrangement made with officials of the Small Business Administration whereby any manufacturer or businessman in my congressional district who needed expert advice in the field of Government contracts could secure the services of a business specialist from the Small Business Administration who made a personal visit to the plant and evaluated its potentialities. This arrangement has paid dividends for it has resulted in several Government contracts for my congressional district totaling several million dollars. In a few words, I have left no stone unturned in my efforts to assist small business firms in the central Pennsylvania area.

THE COAL AND RAILROAD INDUSTRIES

Time and time again during the 83d Congress I called the attention of Congress and the Federal Government to the fact that existing Government policies are a menace to the coal and railroad industries in my congressional district. In my appearance before congressional committees, Government agencies and the White House, I pointed out that the Government policy of subsidizing fuel substitutes such as hydropower projects as well as the importation of residual oil has virtually wrecked the economy of central Pennsylvania. I stressed the fact that since 1948 nearly 50,000 soft-coal miners have lost their jobs in Pennsylvania and that hundreds of coal mines have been abandoned or closed chiefly because of the inroads made by the importation of foreign residual oil which has captured the eastern seaboard coal markets from the soft-coal industry. In addition to my efforts to convince Congress and the Government in general that something has to be done to assist the ailing coal and railroad industries, I joined management and labor in a program designed to focus the attention of the American people on the plight of the coal and railroad industries. Partial success of our efforts is revealed by the fact that after our July conference with President Eisenhower at the White House he has named two separate and top-level committees to study the ailing soft-coal industry and other fuels and to report to him this fall. This effort on the part of those of us who represent coal-producing areas is directed toward bolstering a sagging economy by rehabilitating the coal industry, which means increased carloadings for the railroads of the Nation.

UNEMPLOYMENT

In the early part of the 83d Congress when unemployment developed in the central Pennsylvania area due to the closing of coal mines and the effect on related industries, at my request the United States Department of Labor made a survey and immediately declared the great portion of my congressional district as a critical area because of surplus labor. As unemployment continued to develop because of the loss of coal business by the railroads and the fact that the end of the shooting war in Korea brought about a nationwide economic readjustment, I moved promptly in an effort to alleviate the situation.

As the result of numerous conferences with experts in and out of Government service and with top officials of management and labor, I soon realized that the coal industry was the victim of severe competition from substitute fuels, the chief offenders being natural gas, hydropower, and foreign residual oil. Recognizing that the salvation of the coal industry depends upon finding new uses for coal and being told by informed sources that it would be from 8 to 10 years before a practical program of new uses for coal could be perfected, it was apparent that during the interim years new industries was the only answer to our problem of unemployment.

With the assistance of agencies of Government I played a part in encouraging community groups to develop programs for attracting new industries. Information kits were distributed by me which contained specific directions on how to proceed in contacting business firms seeking new sites. In addition, from time to time, leads were furnished by me in the form of lists of manufacturing firms eager to build or acquire new plants. I am pleased to report that practically every community in my congressional district has an active industrial committee and thousands of dollars have and are being raised to finance a realistic approach in solving the need for new industries in order to eradicate unemployment.

Meanwhile I have lost no opportunity in my effort to assist business firms in securing Government contracts; to encourage communities in this congressional district to plan public-works projects with Federal aid as provided by recent amendments to the Housing Act; furnishing information on Government-owned patents available to industry; arranging for a survey by the United States Department of Agriculture of the forests in this congressional district to determine the economic value of our timber and the part our forests can play in providing employment opportunities; joining in the program of developing uses for strategic materials found in the central Pennsylvania area; arranged for a Government inventory of the defense production capabilities of our industries; continually furnishing information on employment opportunities with the Federal Government to unemployed persons and assisted hundreds of them to overcome difficulties in collecting unemployment insurance benefits. In addition, I arranged for the county commissioners in the Blair-Centre-Clearfield area to distribute Government-owned surplus commodities to the unemployed and their families.

The unemployment situation in my congressional district has greatly disturbed me and almost daily I have been asking officials of government, business, and labor, "What additional steps can I take to alleviate unemployment in my congressional district?" The answer is that I am doing everything within my power to find a solution to the problem.

HOUSING

The recently enacted Housing Act of 1954 will raise housing standards; aid communities in improving older neighborhoods; and assist more of our people in getting homes by decreasing the downpayment and strengthening our mortgage credit system. The overall program is designed to stimulate the building of more than 1 million new homes a year and to provide for the rehabilitation of existing but still sound homes.

PUBLIC HEALTH

Congress approved a bill that I supported which provided for a broad expansion of a Federal public-health program which includes vocational rehabilitation of physically handicapped persons whereby the number to be rehabilitated each year is increased from 60,000 to 250,000. Other legislation approved provided Federal aid in the construction of public and nonprofit hospitals, diagnostic and treatment centers, rehabilitation facilities, and nursing homes. Research into health problems is also being encouraged through the National Heart Institute and the National Institute of Dental Research.

INTERNAL SECURITY

Since my discharge in 1919 from the Armed Forces following World War I, I have consistently opposed the philosophies of communism, socialism, or any other ism which attempts to overthrow or undermine the American system of government. In this connection the approval by Congress of the administration's subversive control program gives to the Department of Justice new weapons to be employed in its war against spies, saboteurs, traitors, and their kind. In addition, during the 83d Congress I voted for the bill to outlaw the Communist Party in the United States. This program to control subversives has my enthusiastic support because I am convinced there is no compromise possible with communism.

MISCELLANEOUS

At all times during the 83d Congress I was keenly interested in legislation affecting the American people and especially the residents of my congressional district. It took many hours of night work to prepare myself for not only debate on various legislative measures but to vote intelligently and in the best interests of those whom I represent.

PERSONAL SERVICES TO CONSTITUENTS

I wish to mention the efforts I made to keep in touch with you, my employers, and to keep you informed of happenings in Washington. As you know, I reported to you weekly by radio and TV and I also wrote a column for daily and weekly newspapers. Reprints from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of statements I made in Congress were mailed to many of you throughout the congressional district. My duties as a member of the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy kept me close to Washington during the 83d Congress as we were engaged in rewriting the Atomic Energy Act of 1946 which consumed over 14 months of continuous intense study of this important subject. Many weeks found me working 12 hours daily and 7 days a week. On the weekends that I found it possible to leave Washington, I visited as many communities as possible in my congressional district and interviewed constituents in a further effort to help them with their problems concerning the Federal Government.

CONCLUSION

As a member of the House Committee on Armed Services and the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy, together with my legislative and other duties, the 83d Congress proved a very busy one for me. I devoted all my time and effort to the job of representing you in Congress. I considered all issues solely from the standpoint of their effect on our Nation and on the American people as a whole. I have tried to meet every issue fairly and squarely and at no time did I permit narrow, partisan views to influence or hinder me in doing what I considered my duty. To many of you who have written letters of gratitude and encouragement, I am profoundly grateful. I assure you that I treasure your best wishes and shall always strive to justify your confidence and respect.

Buffalo Harbor, River, and Ship Canal

SPEECH

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. MILLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 17, 1954

Mr. MILLER of New York. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission to extend my remarks, I am taking the liberty of expressing the feelings of the vast majority of people of the city of Buffalo, N. Y., and the Niagara frontier regarding appropriations for Buffalo Harbor, river, and ship canal.

We were all very grateful to President Eisenhower when he and his administration saw fit to recommend $1,100,000 for fiscal 1955 to continue the deepening of Buffalo Harbor. When the Senate Committee on Appropriations favorably recommended the badly needed additional funds and the Senate of the United States approved the President's and Senate committee's recommendations the news was received with renewed enthusiasm by all of us. It was indeed gratifying to learn that this administration and the upper body could foresee that it would be false economy not to continue the deepening of this important port.

Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of my colleagues who are not familiar with this project I would briefly like to point out that it is not a new one. It is of vital importance to the defense and commerce of the Niagara frontier and the Congress through previous authorizations and appropriations has given due recognition to the economic importance of this major harbor.

It is, indeed, a sad commentary when I am forced to point out that, tonnagewise, the port of Buffalo has dropped from second to sixth port in the Great Lakes in a relatively short span of years. At the present time it is ranked 15th in tonnage in the entire Nation, and the previous year it was ranked 12th, yet its waterborne commerce still averages in excess of 20 million tons annually. It is the biggest inland port in the United States in dollar value of commerce handled. Our waterborne commerce has made Buffalo the largest flour-milling and feed-mixing center in the world, the third largest steel plant in the United States which relies upon lake transportation for most of its raw materials is located there. Coal goes by lake and river to the second largest steam generating electric plant in the United States located on the Niagara River in the port of Buffalo. The contribution to the national economy and defense of these and other industries at this port is hard to parallel at any other port.

The United States Army Corps of Engineers years ago recognized the necessity of improving this port. Congress authorized the recommended improvements in 1935 and 1945 but has since been negligent in providing the necessary funds to do this work.

Mr. Speaker, I would further like to take this opportunity to express the gratitude of the people I represent to the President, Senator Irving M. Ives, and the entire Senate of the United States for endorsing this worthy project and hope you may join with them and our colleagues on the House Committee on Appropriations in support of the continued development of this major port.

Public Opinion of the United States and the Public Opinion of Great Britain Are Poles Apart on Certain Basic Issues

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 23, 1954

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an article by Mr. David Lawrence entitled "Churchill's Visit." Mr. Lawrence in this article points out some basic differences in American and British foreign policy. I commend this article to the Members of the House.

Churchill's Visit

(By David Lawrence)

Sir Winston Churchill came and he spoke—and he made a profound impression. It would be wrong to say that he "conquered" the criticism or opposition here, because there is still a wide gap which requires further explanation and perhaps extended debate.

Basically, the British Prime Minister revealed more of his point of view in his answers to questions in his talk to the Washington correspondents/than he did in the carefully worded document issued from the White House as a joint statement with President Eisenhower.

The Churchill philosophy, in brief, is this: Why not try reasoning some more with the Soviet Government? Why not try to open more contacts with the Russians and hope that this will mean a realization by the Russian people of the benefits that are enjoyed by the people on this side of the Iron Curtain?

It is a tempting formula, and there is a plausible logic behind such an approach. The trouble, however, is that it has been tried and found wanting. Again and again since 1945, the western powers have endeavored to reason with the Communists or have made concessions in the hope of gaining something reciprocal. But the end result has been disappointing, and the Communists today are marching to victory after victory as they add more and more millions of people to their sphere of domination.

What the British Prime Minister says, in effect, is that, despite previous setbacks, it is the duty of the free world to go on trying for peace through reason. But he adds a word: "Vigilance." This means he wouldn't let his guard down. It explains what he meant when he said: "We will press forward with plans for collective defense."

The difficulty with the Churchillian phrase "peace with strength" is that America is expected to furnish all the strength while the Communists refuse to furnish any of the peace. The British and French see no risk in temporising with communism and trying to postpone a world showdown. But the dangers of such a strategy are greater for the United States than for any other nation, because the stakes are bigger for America.

The Prime Minister on his visit here has won the respect and admiration of the newspapermen, as he has won the affection and regard of the President and the Secretary of State. But the situation has passed beyond personalities. Neither Ike or Winnie can by themselves settle anything any more.

The public opinion of the United States and the public opinion of Great Britain are as far apart as the poles on certain basic issues. The American people feel hurt by the manner in which great ideals have been trampled upon. To tell the fathers and mothers of 40,000 American boys who were killed in Korea—even before a peace settlement has been arranged—that it is timely to take the Red Chinese into our bosoms is to make a nation of skeptics the next time someone preaches idealism when American troops are besought to enter a foreign war.

The British officials have completely misconstrued the American temper. The policies they advocate can only force isolationism on America in the end. For if peaceful coexistence is so near and so practical, why should several American divisions of troops stay in Europe? Why shouldn't they be brought home so that some of the fun for the Russian people, to which the Prime Minister referred in his talk here, might be forthcoming also to the American taxpayers, who are footing the bills?

It could be that Sir Winston is right and the Russian people would welcome the benefits of a higher standard of living, but is this something either Great Britain or the United States can confer upon the people of the Soviet Union? Isn't that something which the rulers in the Kremlin will decide as they continue their restrictions on the national economy even while they build up armament? How much influence can the allies have on internal policies in Russia if they repudiate the liberation philosophy expressed so ably by Secretary Dulles?

Among the topics discussed by the President and the Prime Minister was the possible veto by Britain of the use of the atom bomb or hydrogen bomb by the United States in time of war. The British want America to consult before dropping a bomb. But there is no evidence as yet that the Communists will consult anybody before they drop one, and there may not be time to have a parliamentary debate or a huddle in London if certain American cities have been destroyed. The logical answer is: "Consult, yes, if there is time, but the United States must retain a free hand to retaliate as she can if an attack is made directly on the territory of this country."

Because of the many grave problems that have been tackled forthrightly in the Churchill-Eisenhower conference here, it is a good thing that the exchange of views has occurred, but the fundamental viewpoints have not been altered very much—and future events alone can test whether a further at reasoning with the Communists will yield any result. Certainly there can be no objection to more talk—provided the Communists don't gobble up a few more Latin American countries and more territory in southeast Asia while the Western Allies are pleading with Satan to be reasonable.

The Record Imports Verity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDGAR A. JONAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 19, 1954

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the press of America plays an important part in making available to the public facts and information relating to what one may term as many diversified topics and problems that attract the interest of the people throughout the Nation.

The interest and fascination developed following the investigation of the McCarthy senatorial committee is a good example of how involved the real and basic issues can get. Such a situation occasionally results in bantering about accusations and charges that frequently are based on wishful thinking and personal feelings and dislikes.

According to well-established and recognized rules of American jurisprudence, the "record imports verity." Therefore, I consider it of sufficient importance to call attention to an editorial carried in the Chicago Daily Tribune as of August 18, 1954.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the Record, I include the editorial taken from the Chicago Daily Tribune and entitled "What Senator McCarthy Has Accomplished." The editorial follows:

What Senator McCarthy Has Accomplished

"Name one Communist whom McCarthy has sent to jail" has become a standard challenge by the anti-anti-Communists. Since the legislative department of the Government, in which the Senator serves, is wholly lacking in power to send anyone to jail for any offense, apologists for the Reds can pop this one and sit back smugly.

Walter Trohan, chief of the Tribune's Washington bureau, has analyzed the record and summarized Senator McCarthy's real accomplishments since 1950, when he charged that the Truman State Department was full of Communists, and then picked up the gage of battle that the New Dealers and Truman Republicans threw down before him as a result of those charges.

When his original charge was challenged, Senator McCarthy made a speech in the Senate on February 20, 1950, in which he listed 81 persons who were then or had been employed in the State Department, and described them as serious security risks. These persons were originally listed by number, in fairness to those who might be able to clear their names, but they were named later.

Mr. Trohan reports that of those who were still in the State Department in 1950, almost every one has been separated from it since by dismissal or resignation. Leading characters on this McCarthy list included Owen Lattimore, who is now under indictment for perjury, Philip C. Jessup, whose appointment as a delegate to U. N. the Senate later refused to confirm; John Stewart Service, dismissed on grounds of reasonable doubt of his loyalty; John Carter Vincent and Oliver Edmund Clubb, career men in the Department who were permitted to retire under fire; and Edward G. Posniak, another career man who was permitted to resign.

Senator McCarthy, it must be remembered, had no investigative facilities at his disposal in 1950. His charges against the State Department were investigated by a committee headed by Senator Millard Tydings, the Maryland Democrat, which whitewashed the Department. This cost Tydings his Senate seat.

In 1953, Senator McCarthy became chairman of the Senate's permanent subcommittee on investigations—the McCarthy committee. In the course of its investigations, the subcommittee has turned up 83 persons who refused on constitutional grounds publicly to answer questions about Communist activities, espionage, or sabotage, Senator McCarthy has called these people fifth amendment Communists.

Included in the list is Maj. Irving Peress, who was promoted and given an honorable discharge from the Army after he refused to say uder oath whether he was a Communist. Also listed are a number of former Government employees in secret laboratories, and present employees of companies doing secret defense work for the Government.

A considerable number of those who took refuge behind the fifth amendment were authors of books stocked in the libraries maintained abroad by the State Department information service. Senator McCarthy's investigation of these libraries raised shrill cries of "book burning" from Communists and their liberal sympathizers. Actually, no books were burned. What the Senator showed in this instance was that the State Department had permitted Communists and their sympathizers to write many of the books sent to Europe to win Europeans away from communism.

Among the duties of Mr. McCarthy's committee is to determine whether present laws are being properly administered by the executive department, and to inquire into the need for new laws. Executive officers have been prompted to enforce more strictly the statutes designed to protect the Government against Communist infiltration. Legislation has been drafted to make it possible for defense contractors to get Communists or fellow travelers out of their secret laboratories.

The question arises why these activities should offend anyone except the Communists and their friends, a tiny minority in the Nation. The answer can be found in the Communists' objective in penetrating the State Department. It was to mold American foreign policy to serve Russia. As the records from Teheran, Yalta, and Potsdam on down testify, they were eminently successful.

Senator McCarthy's great sin, in the eyes of the internationalists, has been that he showed how we got our foreign policy. His disclosures forced the people who have been representing that policy as being all that is good and holy to climb into bed with the Reds.

Amendment to the Refugee Relief Act of 1953

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAURENCE CURTIS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 19, 1954

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, there is a great deal of interest in the district which I represent in the Refugee Relief Act of 1953 and in the liberalizing amendment to that act passed in the House on August 17.

I congratulate Hon. Louis E. Graham, of Pennsylvania, the author of that amendment and the chairman of the Subcommittee on Immigration of the Judiciary Committee. It is my good fortune to serve with him on the Judiciary Committee, although not on his subcommittee.

This amendment is a fair extension of some of the provisions of the original Refugee Relief Act which was passed in 1953. That act authorized the admission to this country on special nonquota visas of over 200,000 persons who had fled or escaped from behind the Iron Curtain, or had been expelled from their homelands.

Included in this figure were 60,000 of Italian origin and 17,000 of Greek origin.

This amendment makes it easier for these persons of Italian and Greek origin to come in under the act. As orginally passed, a certain quota of each of these groups was reserved to those having close relatives in this country. The applicants in those categories greatly exceeded the quotas provided in the original act, and the effect of this amendment is to permit the total number of each of those groups to be admitted either under such special quotas or under the more general provisions.

This liberalization of the law will mean a lot to those of our citizens who have relatives seeking to enter this country under the provisions of the 1953 act. It will mean happy family reunions and a further strengthening of this country through the building up of these families, some of whose members are already citizens.

The Anti-Communist Bill Could Deeply Injure the Cause of Genuine Anticommunism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. USHER L. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 19, 1954

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, the newspaper whose slogan is "All the news that's fit to print" has some appropriate comments to make on the anti-Communist bill. Here's what the New York Times had to say in its issue of this morning:

> THE ANTI-COMMUNIST BILL
>
> Amidst all the confusion among House, Senate, administration, and public over the anti-Communist bill that has been whipsawing back and forth the last few days, two facts are outstandingly clear. One is that Congress has been giving just about the most vivid exhibition of how not to legislate that it has presented in years; and the other is that the forces of demagogy on both sides of the aisle—and in the most unexpected quarters—have risen with frightening speed and strength to overwhelm the judgment and courage that the American people have a right to expect from their legislators.
>
> That communism is a subversive doctrine and that the Communist Party is an organism dominated and directed by a foreign power is one matter on which virtually all Americans are in agreement. That we must protect ourselves against any danger of subversion from communism goes without saying. That we have already taken important, effective steps to do just that is a matter of history. That the pending legislation threatens to wreck the control measures already well under way, that it may drive the Communist Party further underground, and that it probably does violence to the Constitution and the civil liberties of all Americans—these are points that the majority of our legislators of both parties seem to have forgotten in the desire to score a political point in an election year.
>
> The legislation as it passed the Senate and was accepted in principle by the House has been written largely on the floor. Politics has been the dominant motif, for the Democrats have been so cowed by Republican attacks on their loyalty that they now think it necessary to prove, even if by similar demagogic means, that they are just as anti-Communist as the Republicans. The administration, some of whose important members and advisers have engaged in these attacks on the Democrats, is now in the position of struggling to forestall anti-Communist legislation that could deeply injure the cause of genuine anticommunism. Everyone is in a state of confusion. This is a sorry spectacle for our great and powerful democracy to present to a watching world.

Food Service at the Veterans' Administration Hospital, Perry Point, Md.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 19, 1954

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following letter:

> VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION,
> *Washington, D. C., August 12, 1954.*
>
> Hon. Edith Nourse Rogers,
> *Chairman, Committee on Veterans' Affairs,*
> *House of Representatives,*
> *Washington, D. C.*
>
> DEAR MRS. ROGERS: I am writing you about the food complaint that was registered against the Veterans' Administration Hospital, Perry Point, Md., which was brought to your attention by the telegram that Mrs. Sarah McClendon, news correspondent, Arlington, Va., sent you on July 31, 1954.
>
> The serious nature of the complaint demanded a special study of the dietetic situation that prevailed at the Perry Point hospital to supplement a study of this hospitals operations, including its dietetic service, that was already under way. The facts in this special study were developed by representatives of central office and the area medical director's office who visited the station for the sole purpose of investigating the complaint which you received. Their reports have been submitted.
>
> It was immediately determined that the primary source of the food complaint had to do with the condition of the potatoes that had been served. This hospital purchases processed peeled potatoes. Recently the hospital received a batch of overprocessed potatoes which, even though they were thoroughly cooked, retained a hard, rindlike surface. It gave the impression that they were

undercooked. The hospital thereupon discontinued the purchase of potatoes from the particular supplier from whom those potatoes were received. This corrective action was taken by the hospital on its own initiative prior to this investigation.

During the course of this investigation practically all of the 99 general medical and surgical patients were interviewed about the food situation. They had remarkably few complaints to offer, and those that they did register were not of serious import. Nevertheless, the investigators reviewed all aspects of the food service at the hospital and did find some areas where there was room for improvement. Immediate corrective action was taken, which will lead to better coordination and service. Action has also been taken to lead to the strengthening of the dietetic staff by the addition of one dietitian, since it is believed that a staff of four dietitians, which the hospital now has, is inadequate to cover properly the very active 150 general medical and surgical beds occupied by many patients requiring diet therapy, in addition to meeting the needs of the 1,680-bed neuropsychiatric hospital.

I wish to thank you for having brought this matter to our attention and for your continued interest in our medical program.

Sincerely yours,

H. V. Higley,
Administrator.

Sooner or Later a New Line of Action in Foreign Policy Will Become Imperative

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1954

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the former President, Herbert Hoover, has correctly said that the time has come for a new line of action in our foreign policy. The history of the past 20 years or more is a record of appeasing communism. One has only to refer to the recognition of Russia and the agreements at Yalta and Potsdam to know that our own Nation must share a major part of the responsibility for the establishment in Central Europe of the Communist message.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an editorial entitled "Crossing the Swamp" from the Wall Street Journal:

Crossing the Swamp

In former President Hoover's speech at West Branch, Iowa, there was a sentence as brief as it was significant. It was this:

"Sooner or later a new line of action will become imperative."

Mr. Hoover was speaking of American foreign policy and the sentence, not otherwise amplified, came in the midst of an indictment of that policy over the last 20 years.

One count in that indictment was that this Nation has assisted the spread of communism over the earth. It did so by its recognition of Russia, its later alliance with Russia, by acquiescence in the annexation of the Baltic States to Russia, by the agreement at Yalta which gave Russia its hold in Eastern Europe, and the agreement with Russia concerning China.

Another count was that "all of the peace agencies we have created and all of the repeated conferences we have held have failed to find even a whisper of real peace."

And still another count was that our policy has helped to shrink human freedom not only abroad but also in this country because it has resulted in huge taxes, inflation, and compulsory military service.

Among many in this country, particularly on the eastern seaboard, it is not fashionable to take Mr. Hoover seriously when he talks on foreign policy. He is an unreconstructed isolationist. Or he is a gentleman of 80 looking backward. But such patronizing observations fail to conceal the validity of Mr. Hoover's indictment.

A hundred million people in Europe, and many times that number in Asia, have been brought under Communist rule. And whether or not they realized what they were doing, American officials consented to arrangements which helped bring about this unhappy situation.

In many places in this world freedom has been killed and misery has been spread; see those current pictures of Vietnamese squatting among a few pitiable belongings while they wait transportation to a strange place where they have no idea of how they will live.

And have all the conferences and all the agencies brought anything resembling peace? Is it not true that as never before Americans are conscious of the central government at their elbow?

A change is imperative, says Mr. Hoover. What will be its direction and who will be its directors he chooses not to discuss. Had he gone into those details, it is probable that this newspaper, among others, would have found cause to disagree.

But it is hard to disagree with the basis for Mr. Hoover's conclusion that a change is imperative. His basis is that underlying our foreign policy is a set of assumptions which have proved to be errors. Those errors have not been fully acknowledged, much less corrected. Instead they are defended. And a policy which has no better foundation must topple.

It is like a man trying to find a hidden path through a swamp. It is not to be expected that he will never step from the path. But when he does misstep, he must not continue on that course. If he does continue each further step will draw him deeper and deeper into the mire until he is finally exhausted. What the man must do is to step back to the firm ground that he has left and try a new direction.

Well, why stray into swamps? The answer is that the United States—or any other nation—has no choice but to cross the swamp that is this 20th century.

Mr. Hoover says we have wandered from the path and are wallowing in the mire; that we must get back to solid footing.

It seems to us that it is hard to differ with him.

Abusing the Privilege of Free Speech

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDGAR A. JONAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 19, 1954

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I call attention to an editorial published in the Evening Star, Washington, D. C., under date of August 18, 1954, in which that great newspaper takes to task the Democratic national chairman for his untimely and unsupported charges directed against the President of the United States.

The paper terms Mr. Mitchell's utterances as a "smear."

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the Record, I include therein the editorial from the Evening Star, entitled "Mr. Mitchell's Smear," and which is as follows:

Mr. Mitchell's Smear

It is a little surprising, even in a campaign year, that Democratic Chairman Stephen A. Mitchell would undertake in such transparent fashion to smear the President and Bobby Jones.

The technique adopted by Mr. Mitchell is a familiar one. He began by saying that the President had ordered the award of a powerplant contract to the Dixon-Yates concern. He said that this was a scandal. Then he said this: "It so happens that a director of 1 of the 2 companies in the favored syndicate is one of the President's closest friends—with a cottage next to President Eisenhower's at the Augusta golf course."

Thus was born, by implication and innuendo, the smear of President Eisenhower and Bobby Jones.

Mr. Mitchell knew that he did not have the facts to justify the insinuation that the President was trying to favor his friend. For he tried to hedge by such comments as "maybe" the President and Mr. Jones never talked about the contract, and "maybe" it's just a coincidence that they happen to be friends with cottages next door to each other. But this makes it all the worse. For it reveals that Mr. Mitchell didn't know the facts and hadn't tried to get the facts. He was merely throwing mud in the general direction of the President and Bobby Jones, hoping that some of it would stick.

Most Americans will not need the disavowals from the President and Mr. Jones to reconize this for what it is. It is something which might be called Mitchellism. When Senator McCarthy trades in this kind of "guilt by association," Mr. Mitchell is among the first to throw up his hands in horror. And it is fitting that at least two Democrats—Senators George and Kefauver—have spoken out to rebuke Mr. Mitchell for what he, in his own turn, has done.

Their Belated Flurry Menaces the Real Anti-Communist Drive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DeWITT S. HYDE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 19, 1954

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, under permission heretofore granted, I insert in the Appendix of the Congressional Record an editorial from the Baltimore Sun of August 18, 1954, with respect to the efforts of certain elements of the Democratic leadership to amend the bill outlawing the Communist Party:

Their Belated Flurry Menaces the Real Anti-Communist Drive

The one hope for straightening out the tangle into which the Senate liberals have thrown the anti-Communist legislation is for the sound and stable men in the Congress to keep in mind what the Senate liberals are doing. These men, remember, represent the New Deal forces which for many years coddled the Communists and resisted every effort to restrain the Communist conspiracy in the United States.

Now these men are doing what amounts to the same thing all over again. They are disrupting the effective administration program which has sent almost a hundred key Communist leaders to prison. They menace the drive which is well on the way to forcing the Communist Party to register and spread its official secrets on the public record—or suffer an outlawry not open to the very serious constitutional doubts raised by the liberals' outlawry proposal.

These constitutional doubts, indeed, illustrate most vividly the glee with which the Communist movement must view the liberals' outlawry bill. Interruption of the present program and litigation raised by the new bill might well delay effective steps against communism in America for years. In these times of cold war, a delay of years in America's effective control of domestic communism might be just what the Kremlin people hope for.

Not of course that the Humphreys, Morses, and Lehmans are to be put down as pro-Communist because they disrupt the anti-Communist program. No more could you argue that all the New Dealers who were soft on communism in the thirties were pro-Communist.

The liberals' motive now is what the New Deal motive was then—to manipulate the communism issue for political advantage. In the thirties the New Dealers wanted left-wing votes, and no matter how far left. Today the liberals hope to flush out of public memory the New Deal's softness toward communism in the thirties by a show of tough anti-communism in the fifties.

All these things are clear in the public record. If Members of Congress who voted for the liberal bill against their better judgment seems to have passed these considerations over, it was not always because they were afraid to stand up and be counted against an anti-Communist bill, even a bad one. Some Members voted for the bill because it does contain some necessary provisions for purging unions of communism. But the liberals' bill is still a bad one on balance. What is needed is legislation which will supplement and fortify, not disrupt and immobilize the tight, calm, surefooted and formidable program Mr. Eisenhower has set in motion and pushed so far.

The House Committee on Un-American Activities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KIT CLARDY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 19, 1954

Mr. CLARDY. Mr. Speaker, the House Committee on Un-American Activities has been continuously and severely attacked and smeared by leftists of all degrees. I am indeed thankful that there are some organizations, however, who see and understand the truth. A short while ago the American Legion, Department of Michigan, adopted a resolution demonstrating its understanding of the subversive problem confronting the Nation. That resolution commends my committee and the others engaged in the troublesome business of digging out Red spies and subversives of all kind. I am more than pleased to have this placed in the RECORD. The resolution reads:

Whereas the American public has recently been alerted to the Red danger throughout our land; and

Whereas many patriotic employees of congressional committees have been attacked by subversive elements and misguided officials who have fallen victims to the communistic line of attack: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the American Legion, Department of Michigan, in convention assembled in Grand Rapids, Mich., this 25th day of July 1954, move a vote of thanks to those members of the Federal Bureau of Investigation and other employees of the three congressional investigating committees for the services rendered their country in the ferreting out of Red spies and saboteurs in our industries and Government units that have affected the security of the national defense of our country; and be it further

Resolved, That we commend patriotic American officials who have fought to rid the country of those seeking its change or overthrow; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to chairmen of the Committees on Un-American Activities and request that it be spread upon the Journals of both the Senate and House of Representatives at Washington, D. C.; and be it further

Resolved, That we urge our Federal officials to carry out the objectives of this resolution; and be it further

Resolved, That we move a vote of thanks to the active working members of the three congressional investigating committees, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and other employees of the three congressional investigating committees for the services rendered their country in the ferreting out of Red spies and subversives from our industries and governmental units, all in the interest of our national security, and that their work of the three committees be continued.

(Adopted by the American Legion, Department of Michigan, Grand Rapids, Mich., July 25, 1954.)

Oppressive Wheat Regulations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURR P. HARRISON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 19, 1954

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, from firsthand reports given me by numerous farmers in my congressional district, I have formed the conclusion that the current wheat acreage allotment and marketing regulations promulgated by Secretary of Agriculture Benson are oppressive and do not honor the spirit of the statute enacted by the Congress.

I have joined today with certain colleagues from Virginia in directing to Mr. Benson a protest against the regulation, coupled with an appeal for their revision in justice to the small farmer.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix, I enclose a timely editorial on the subject by Mr. G. Kenneth Levi, able editor of the Clarke Courier, a weekly newspaper published at Berryville, Va., The editorial, which appears in today's edition of that newspaper follows:

An interesting and unusual case was heard last week before a committee of three out-of-county farmers with the Federal Government seeking to penalize James and Edward Weir, operators of a farm under the name of Weir Bros. in Clarke County. The Government seeks $100.80 as a penalty against the Weirs for raising wheat in excess of their Government allotment.

A decision from this committee will be forthcoming at some future date.

The Weirs had planted wheat last fall in the amount of 6 acres over their allotment. The local committee allotted the Weir brothers 17 acres for wheat planting. Twenty-three acres were planted. Furthermore, the Weirs claimed that they had never received notification from the local agriculture stabilization and conservation office of their allotment. They contend, too, that they had received compliance notice that they were within their prescribed acreage. And another contention brought out at the hearing was that the wheat grown on their farm was used solely for feeding livestock and poultry. Ironically, the regulations say that wheat fed is wheat sold, the idea behind this being, we suppose, that eventually livestock find their way to the markets fed on unmarketable grain. At the hearing James Weir testified that for the past 14 years none of the wheat raised on his farm had been marketed.

To review the Government program as to marketing quotas on wheat, farmers all over the country voted for marketing quotas last year for the 1954 crop. They voted this year, too, although the vote in Clarke County was 57 to 12 against them. However, the Government received the two-thirds majority necessary to put the plan in operation. The majority was voted largely by the vast wheat farmers in the West and Midwest, where the acreage is large and the program will do them more good.

To review further, the Clarke County allotment set by the Government for 1954 was 4,399 acres. This means that this number of acres must be prorated among all farmers who raise this grain. And the farmer who planted the most wheat in 1952 and 1953, regardless of the size of his farm, would receive the greatest benefits.

Wheat allotments are necessary, the Government contends, because there is in this country today a 2-year surplus, sufficient for our domestic and export requirements over two 12-month periods. The support price of $1.12 per bushel has kept the price of wheat up, and this has proved of greater value to the Midwest farmer whose acreage runs into the thousands than the local man. Once a farmer has complied with the acreage allotment he is given a marketing card which he must produce, whether he sells to a mill, to another farmer, or to anyone else.

After all the evidence at the hearing was in, the case boiled down to the fact that the Weirs contend that they had received notice of their compliance with the wheat allotment, but that they had not received notice that their acreage was over their allotment until after they had harvested their grain. Subsequently, they would be penalized $100.80, arrived at by the 6 acres in excess of their allotment, times the normal yield for the Weir's farm of 15 bushels to the acre, times the $1.12 support price of wheat. The Government for some unknown reason uses the word "penalize." Actually it amounts to a fine.

The Government, on the other hand contended that the Weirs had received notice of their excess acres and they had been advised to plant a grain mixture of barley on the excess. This, they say, the Weirs did but it was not of sufficient percentage to avoid the penalty.

The law is the law and ignorance of it is no excuse. We do not here censure the Weir brothers or the Government in their respective cases. We do, however, believe that this measure of allotments and quotas is a highhanded one that strips the farmer of his rights and liberties under the law. It takes from him land without the due process of law, depriving him of the right to sow his fields as he wishes and in whatever he wishes. The case of the Weirs might be different, but there are farmers who need every acre of their land to plant in wheat or some other grain for feed for their livestock.

By this regulation, the Government has also stripped farmers of their rights to sell wheat to mills or to others by denying them marketing cards. Nor can they buy wheat from others who may not have such a card. Too, the Government prevents a farmer from feeding this cheap feed he raises in order to save the cost of purchasing outside feed.

In the case of the Weir brothers who have never in 14 years sold any wheat but have used it all for feed, it is a bitter pill. There should be some other manner of handling such cases without penalizing the man who is trying to get along and make a living on his farm in these complex times.

Communism in America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS

OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 19, 1954

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted to me, I am pleased to include in my remarks a letter which I have received from one of my constituents, Mr. Elijah Y. Lipetz, of Clarksburg, N. J. Mr. Lipetz is a poultry farmer in Monmouth County, N. J., and has given much thought to the problem of communism in America and its threat to our free institutions. He is opposed to outlawing the Communist Party, although he believes that all possible measures must be taken to prevent Communists from dominating any labor union. His letter and the supplement contained therein makes a great deal of good sense and I hope that it will be of interest to the Members of Congress. Mr. Lipetz has given me his permission to include his letter with my remarks:

Hon. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: As a plain citizen I take the liberty to offer the following suggestion about the Communist problem:

Instead of outlawing the Communist Party and spending big sums in prosecuting those who persist in remaining Communists—let us organize a campaign to persuade as many party members as possible to leave the fold.

Such a campaign may be conducted through the press, radio, television, open meetings, etc. It has a good chance to meet with success now that the Communist Party members realize their precarious position. Under present circumstances, many Communist Party members are apt to step out of the narrow confines of party propaganda and begin to consider facts as they really are.

An organized drive to draw away a large part of the Communist Party membership should weaken the party and make its influence negligible. A constant parade of the facts of Communist behavior since the infamous "win-at-any-cost Lenin" till today—is apt to register on a number of the honestly misled rank-and-file members. A frank statement that the capitalist system has its faults and ways and means are being found to overcome them—may yet convince a number of the Communist Party membership that capitalism is not yet doomed to self-destruction. A comparison of living standards under a free economy versus those of a totalitarian state should also present a picture highly unfavorable to communism.

I sincerely hope that you will seriously consider the idea here expressed.

Respectfully yours,
ELIJAH Y. LIPETZ.

P. S.—To clarify the source of the above suggestion I attach a supplement with information about myself.

SUPPLEMENT

The writer: I am one of your humbler constituents—a small poultry farmer in Monmouth County. I am not now and never was a Communist. My view is that communism is a beautiful but fundamentally wrong dream. This dream is being used by a group of clever rascals to further their own ends. Their aim is to get the whole world under the domination of their group, and consequently of themselves or successors. The Communist leaders have no morals whatsoever. They are fully convinced that the end justifies the means.

They dangle a description of their pretty dream before all peoples of the world, especially those who find the burdens of life too heavy. These unfortunates may see an escape in the idea that the Communist state will solve all their problems, not only economic but also political, social, intellectual, moral, etc.

Once the poor victims are entangled they become constantly surrounded by a web of party propaganda. This closes their minds to commonsense, and they begin to see each thing as their Kremlin masters would have them see it. The Communist methods of persuasion run from the most subtle suggestions to brutal force, terror, and torture, if they find it necessary to use these.

Behind the Iron Curtain the Kremlin has all the advantages. But a small group of Communists living in a great democracy should feel the influence of truth and facts. Reasoning, persuasion, and public opinion still are great forces. We should not and need not use terror and fear as the Communists do.

My name is signed on the letter. I abhor publicity, and would ask you not to use it unless you deem it absolutely necessary.

ELIJAH Y. LIPETZ.

Save Durum Industry and the Durum Wheat Farmer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN

OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 23, 1954

Mr. HAGEN of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, because of the rapid decline in production of durum wheat in Minnesota and North Dakota and other durum wheat areas, I believe the editorial published in the St. Paul Pioneer Press for August 16, 1954, entitled "Save Durum Industry" will be of interest to the Members of the Congress.

It also might be stated that the durum farmers are restricting their acreage because of the uncertainty of the crop. Ways and means must be found to combat the diseases and the elements which are becoming so disastrous to the durum crops.

The editorial follows:

SAVE DURUM INDUSTRY

Out in the North Dakota open spaces and eastward within the walls of durum mills and macaroni factories, alert people speak in whispers about what now is happening to the industry of growing durum wheat.

Their awe is natural. In fact, it could well extend to consumers, especially those with big families to feed on modest incomes. For there are no more delicious ways for a frugal housewife to get the most out of an inexpensive meat ration than in the macaroni and spaghetti dishes. For those at their best, real amber durum wheat is the foundation. And the Dakotas and Minnesota raise the whole United States supply.

Thus, the grain rust disaster reported by the Pioneer Press deeply concerns the durum milling and food industries. It is national in its interest and effects. If ever an agricultural predicament called on industry, government, and science to pool resources and ingenuity for defensive action, this one does.

Few, if any, parallels are to be found in the whole history of American agriculture for the swift decline in durum production since 1950 under the attack of the black stem rust disease of wheat. It stands revealed as a disaster even in the Government's official figures, and reports to the Pioneer Press from unimpeachable sources describe the real damage as even worse than officially admitted thus far.

In Minnesota that grew a million bushels in 1950, durum production has just about disappeared. In South Dakota that grew nearly 6 million, it is also a vanishing crop. In North Dakota, whose famous Durum Triangle now produces nearly all that's grown in this country, the crop has shrunk 60 percent even according to official figures. The entire national supply of durum on July 1 was down to 4.9 million bushels, some of which wasn't of milling quality.

When has a crop suffered such blows from a disease? Worse, no doubt, were the potato blight that spread famine in Ireland, and the chestnut blight that wiped out the American chestnut stand. But this country doesn't want any famine even of just spaghetti and meatballs; and it doesn't want wiped out the industry of growing the beautiful amber durum, or of milling and manufacturing it into macaroni and spaghetti and puffed wheat and noodles.

So leaders in this field have good reason to pool defenses. It will be some years before science can make available seed of new rust-resistant varieties of durum in quantites to support a general shift to them. And as yet unsolved is the problem of finding a fungicide as effective as dusting with sulfur at much less cost. Though the disease might not strike so hard again in 1955, farmers are now so alarmed that only systematic preparations for the worst can avert a large exodus from durum production.

Lines of defense are known to specialists. But the defenses capable of use next year seem mostly beyond the means of individual farmers. Organized assistance therefore will be essential. For instance, even at a season cost of $10 to $15 an acre, big-scale dusting with sulfur would have more than paid for itself this year. But without some industry contract or Government price guaranty high enough to cover such costs, most farmers wouldn't risk so great an investment.

So it is good news that a nationwide meeting of representatives of the macaroni industry is being held in Chicago early this week and that the Federal Government will be represented there in discussion of emergency steps. A similar conference of even broader representation could well be held in the Twin Cities later to draw together all available defense forces of industry, government, and science. The durum industry is far too valuable and durum is much too significant in the Nation's food supply to be left in any avoidable jeopardy. The time to act is now while there still is time to save this important industry.

Labor Must Awaken at the Voting Booth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 19, 1954

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following editorial from Labor's Daily, Thursday, August 19, 1954:

NO DETOURS FOR LABOR

Never before has organized labor been as acutely aware of its responsibility of spearheading a drive to protect our American way of life as it is today.

Never before has a national administration so conclusively demonstrated it is an implacable foe of labor and the people as the Eisenhower regime.

Never before has there been such a brazen and wanton disregard of the inherent rights of public ownership and individual rights as that of the Republican administration.

National resources have been plundered, raped, and pillaged; greedy, wealthy interests have been fattened at the expense of the people, and suffocating fear like poison-laden fog is spreading across the land.

Millions of workers are unemployed, and yet the administration has, through misleading statements, doctored statistics, and fake economic reports, tried to label it a normal, mild readjustment necessary to change over from a war to a peace economy.

For many weeks now, Eisenhower Cabinet members, their assistants and GOP hucksters have been going about trying to sell the voters on the administration's dynamic program.

The Republican Party is employing every weapon it can muster in an attempt to gain control of the 84th Congress.

It must have control if it is to survive as a strong national party. The GOP still vividly remembers its errors of the recent past. The crookedness and ineptness of the Harding administration, the cautious, do-nothing Coolidge administration, and the calamitous great depression engendered by the Hoover regime cost it 20 years of rule.

In its brief return to power, the Republicans have recommitted all their old sins and have thrown in a few dozen extras for good measure.

So it is inevitable that the people again will revolt and cast them out of office. Smarting from their hurts and disappointments, just as they were when avalanches of votes swept Franklin Delano Roosevelt into office again and again and elected Harry Truman when all the political experts derided his chances, the voters once more will rise and demand an administration concerned primarily with human values.

Labor in 1952 recognized the danger of returning the GOP to power. Its leadership warned rank and file members of the necessity of voting for their bests interest and against the Republican reactionaries (and some Democrats, too).

Individual union members responded, but weakly. Hundreds of thousands of them neglected to qualify to vote. Many stayed away from the polls. And far to many workers failed to educate their wives and other members of their families to the urgent necessity of voting for labor's friend rather than a general who promised a miracle in Korea.

That labor is fully aware now that its 1954 and 1956 political action programs must be full strength, aggressive, and unrelenting has been attested this year by convention after convention of the various international and national unions.

Political action has been placed high on the agenda of most of them and much time taken up with fruitful discussions and planning for the important elections.

The leaders of the American Federation of Labor, the Congress of Industrial Organizations and most of the major independent unions all through the year have thrown a pitiless spotlight on the GOP regime and fully acquainted their members with its union-hating policy and complete ignoring of the best interests of the masses of American people.

Now it is up to Joe and Sue Worker and the voting members of their family.

In the ballot boxes lies the secret weapon that will blast the Taft-Hartley Act off the statute books and halt the giveaways of the people's natural wealth. The only road to equitable taxation, social justice, protection of civil rights, and restoration of human dignity to the individual runs through the voting booth.

There are no detours.

Before the Gavel Falls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 19, 1954

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to include an editorial from the August 1, 1954, issue of the New York Times entitled "Before the Gavel Falls":

BEFORE THE GAVEL FALLS

When the 20th amendment was proposed it was thought that this reform, giving Congress 2 additional months in which to work, would prevent the undignified last-minute confusion of the traditional session. It did not.

When the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 was passed it was hoped that this provision, calling for adjournment on July 31, would cause the two Houses to systematize their work. The theory was, again, perfectly dandy. The only difficulty is it hasn't worked—as we are once more being reminded this week-end. A hot and bothered Congress wants to go home, but can't until its absolutely essential work is done. The result is that this absolutely essential work is done with a minimum of reflection and a mere pretense of discussion.

It is often said that Congress doesn't do its work on the floor of either Chamber but in committee rooms. This statement has truth in it. The committees thresh and grind the grist that is offered, in each Chamber, to the whole membership. Nevertheless, these are supposed to be deliberate bodies. It makes a citizen nervous when they don't leave themselves time to deliberate—as, all too often, at the end of sessions, they do not.

The present session, the second of the 83d Congress, started off under the usual good auspices and with the customary flow of good nature and optimism. Speaker MARTIN declared that the President could expect to "have a better record of legislative accomplishments than any President in the last 20 years." As late as the middle of April, House Republican Leader HALLECK called the record a great one. As recently as July 7, the President himself believed that "by the end of the month or by the time, whenever it is, that Congress goes out, we are going to look pretty good."

The truth is, the record could look worse—and it will probably be lengthened and strengthened as the next few days go by. What is unfortunate in the situation is the waste of time at the beginning of such sessions and the haste at the end of them. The waste is perfectly apparent during the first few weeks, when there seems an endless amount of time in the bank. This year the fight over the Bricker amendment and, more recently, the filibuster over the amendments to the atomic energy bill, wasted time in a conspicuous fashion. Whether the same can be said for the McCarthy hearings is another matter; the fact is that during the dreary weeks when the junior Senator was on or near the television screen the work of the Senate lagged.

There is nothing new, not even anything peculiar to Congress, in this slow-down and speed-up. The same thing happens in our State legislatures. It is our national habit, when we legislate, to talk, dawdle, procrastinate, investigate far beyond reasonable certainties, raise points of order, indulge in personalities and mend political fences. Then, at the last moment, we go off like a fire company to a five-alarm fire.

As the week was ending this newspaper's report of major bills still waiting action in one house or the other, or slated for conference, ran to 19 or 20. The absolutely necessary ones among those bills will become law; indeed, quite a little was accomplished on Friday and Saturday. Others will be postponed, just because there isn't time for them.

One hardly knows what to suggest, except that a people so ingenious in saving time and energy in virtually every other field of activity ought to be able to improve on the legislative process. Improvement, it need hardly be added, would not mean suppressing debate or otherwise impairing the democratic process. We want more democracy, not less. What democracy is there when members of a legislative body vote sight unseen, on the instructions of party whips, in the last hours of a session, on measures they have never even read, much less heard debated?

A joint standing committee on how to get more work done better, sooner and more intelligently might be a good thing to have on Capitol Hill.

Depressed Poultry and Egg Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER JOHNSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 19, 1954

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the poultry farmers of Wisconsin, and the rest of the Nation for that matter, are in a crisis. Poultry prices are at depression levels. Live poultry has sold in some areas for as low at 9 cents a pound. Through all this disaster, poultry farmers have been asked to "tighten their belts." They have been the victims, it seems to me, of the present philosophy of the Department of Agriculture that low farm prices will have a stabilizing influence. The only influence that depression level poultry prices are having is to force families from the land and to cause retrenchment away from their meager but adequate living standards of last year.

Local business is dependent in many areas throughout the Nation on the welfare of poultrymen. When farmers can pay bills, buy new equipment and other farm supplies, business flourishes. But when farmers are getting 20 cents a dozen for eggs and 9 cents a pound for live poultry they go bankrupt.

Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson has authority to remove surplus eggs with section 32 funds. Believing that it is imperative that immediate action be taken to boost egg prices, I have written Secretary Benson urging him to make purchases of eggs for use in the federally assisted school-lunch program.

The Kiplinger agricultural letter, a portion of which is quoted in the letter to Secretary Benson, clearly points out that an increase in egg production hardly explains a 25-percent drop in egg prices. While I am in complete agreement with this line of thinking, I am strongly in favor of a purchase of a substantial quantity of eggs as the first step toward correcting the depression level to which the price of eggs has dropped. I am suggesting to Secretary Benson, however, that a detailed study be made of the factors influencing egg prices if the purchase of eggs under section 32 does not have the desired effect of raising egg prices.

Mr. Speaker, I include in my remarks my letter to Secretary of Agriculture Benson.

The letter follows:

AUGUST 19, 1954.

Hon. EZRA TAFT BENSON,
Secretary of Agriculture, United States Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SECRETARY BENSON: I am taking this means of calling your attention to the critical situation of poultry producers in Wisconsin as well as in other poultry-producing areas.

I am informed that poultry farmers in some areas are receiving 20 and 25 cents a dozen for eggs. Such egg prices balanced against the cost of production means bankruptcy for many worthy farm families unless immediate action is taken by the Department of Agriculture to boost egg prices.

There is no good reason why poultry farmers should have to sell their produce at giveaway prices while eggs at retail reflect little, if any, of the farm price drop.

The Kiplinger Agricultural Letter of August 14 gives a very accurate report of the dire circumstances of poultry farmers. I quote from this letter as follows:

"Price trends in poultry and eggs puzzle Government price experts. With production up this year, they expected some dropoff in prices. But the increase in production they say, has not been big enough to explain the very low prices prevailing over much of this year.

"Take eggs for an example: Production of eggs is running 3 percent up from a year ago. But prices of eggs are down 25 percent, or even more at times. They have slumped from boom prices last year to almost depression prices for this year * * * a drop that a 3-percent increase in supply hardly explains.

"And turkeys: A bigger crop this year than last, more turkeys than the industry thought wise. But the increase doesn't seem big enough to account for a drop of about 20 percent in prices farmers receive for birds.

"Farm chickens: Prices of these are down a fourth from 1953. Reports of chickens bringing 9 cents a pound on Midwest farms are common."

Many poultrymen have had to mortgage their farms to meet current farm operating and family living expenses, the most important of which is feed. This has been necessary because many feed dealers have refused to deliver feed except on a c. o. d. basis. With sources of credit exhausted, the outlook of family poultry producers is dim, indeed. Unless some action is taken immediately to investigate and correct the cause of the full-scale depression among poultry producers, many families will be forced from their farms. To prevent this from happening and to give courage to the many hard-hit families, I strongly urge you to make section 32 funds available at once for the purchase of eggs to be used in the federally assisted school-lunch program.

The Kiplinger Agricultural Letter clearly points out that something other than the increased production of eggs may be involved in the drop in egg prices to depression levels. But it is my belief that the first step toward stabilizing of egg prices should be the purchase of a substantial quantity of eggs. If this does not have the desired effect, I strongly recommend that a detailed study be made of the various factors which contributed to the price drop.

Sincerely yours,

LESTER JOHNSON.

Facing the Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. MORGAN M. MOULDER

OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 12, 1954

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Speaker, H. J. Waters, Jr., edits and publishes one of the most outstanding and influential newspapers in the State of Missouri, the Columbia Daily Tribune at Columbia, Mo., where three great educational institutions are located, the University of Missouri, Stephens College for Women, and Christian College for Women.

On the 12th day of last June, Ernest Breech delivered the commencement address at the University of Missouri. Ernest Breech was born and reared in the town of Lebanon, Mo., in my district and where I graduated from high school. He is recognized as one of the great business executives in this country.

Mr. Speaker, the following is an editorial printed and published in the Columbia Daily Tribune concerning the commencement address delivered by Mr. Breech:

STILL A LAND OF OPPORTUNITY

Ernest Breech, a captain of industry by virtue of his rank as vice president of the Ford Motor Co. and a doctor of laws by virtue of the recognition of his service to his fellow men by the university of his native State—Missouri—had inspiring advice for the more than 1,200 members of the University of Missouri's graduating class today as he delivered their commencement address before he received the university's high honor of a doctorate. He told the graduates not to trade courage for fear or progress for security, and held out to them America's freedom of opportunity and its goal of creating more and more wealth and a higher and higher standard of living in contrast to the welfare state idea of redistributing the wealth that exists. Mr. Breech's speech ought to be a challenge to a graduate setting out to take his place in the world, but perhaps it left some of Missouri's 1,251 a little cold. Most of them were born and reared in the days which followed the big bust, in the days when we were getting started with social security, unemployment insurance, and other social measures—good in their place, but no substitutes for the American way. Some of them, perhaps, are sons and daughters of men who got their start in the CCC camps of depression days. And now, caught in a vortex of inflation and high taxes, they may be pardoned if they're a little more concerned about pension funds than opportunity. To many of them the hill to individual achievement—and personal prosperity—may look awfully high and awfully steep. Is there opportunity in America still for the oldtime Horatio Alger boy in these days of big business, big taxes, and big shots?

For an answer we turn to another commencement speech this week. It was delivered Tuesday morning by Clifford F. Wood, president of the United States Steel Corp., to the graduating class of his alma mater, Monmouth College. Mr. Wood told the graduates the opportunities are still here, and are still growing. The opportunities, he said, have, in fact more than doubled within a generation. He put it this way:

"Business has more than 4 million enterprises requiring every skill and trade, as against 2 million enterprises when fathers of today's graduates were starting their careers"

Present steel capacity is more than twice the 56 million tons that existed when he entered the industry, Mr. Hood pointed out.

"In law, there are almost 200,000 legal advisers in private practice, business, political affairs, and other areas. Opportunities here have doubled in the last generation.

"In religion, church membership exceeds 92 million as contrasted with 48 million a generation ago.

"In medicine and surgery, there are more than 218,000 doctors today as compared with 144,000 a generation ago.

"In agriculture, the farmer now can produce food for himself and 14 other persons as against about eight people 30 years ago. This rise was attributed to wonder chemicals for soil enrichment as well as great advances in machinery and farming techniques.

"In the automotive industry, there are 54 million automobiles, buses, and trucks traveling a network of about 2 million miles of surfaced highways. This compares with only 12 million vehicles riding along 400,000 miles of surfaced roadways a generation ago."

So the university graduate, who presumably is equipped with more than average talent and ability, has an ample and growing field in which to accept, if he will, Mr. Breech's challenge. Opportunity is still abroad in the land in America—opportunity which has much more to offer in satisfaction in living, much more in service to fellow men, and greater rewards, financial and otherwise, in the end—for those graduates who have what it takes to accept the challenge.

Congressional Investigations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LAURENCE CURTIS

OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 19, 1954

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, every Member of Congress is aware of the wide interest in the subject of procedures used in congressional investigations. Bills and resolutions have been filed, and hearings have been held, but little definite action has yet been taken.

It so happens that during the last days of the session, the house of delegates of the American Bar Association made some recommendations on this subject. Believing that it would be in the public interest to have the point of view of this representative group of lawyers before the committees which will consider this subject at the next session at which time the bill can again be filed, and be available meanwhile, I have filed a bill which incorporates some of these recommendations.

It should be pointed out that the recommendations of the house of delegates of the American Bar Association have not yet been finally acted upon by that association.

This bill adopts a somewhat different approach from that in other resolutions on the subject in that it proposes the enactment of a statute on the subject which will control action in both branches. This is a procedure somewhat similar to that used in the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946.

It is to be hoped that the filing of this bill will help to speed action on this vital subject.

The Communist Control Act of 1954

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 18, 1954

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include my statement favoring S. 3706, the Communist Control Act of 1954:

COMMUNIST PARTY KICKED OUT OF THE UNITED STATES

The Communist Party in the United States—directed from Moscow, and dedicated to the proposition that freedom must be murdered—has been banished from our shores.

Stripped of those rights that it would use to weaken, betray, and destroy us.

It has tried to use freedom as an instrument for confusing, dividing, and paralyzing freemen and their free institutions.

It has applied itself to turning man against himself.

In an age where material progress and its resulting problems has placed a great strain upon our mental and spiritual ability to cope with the challenge—frustration has resulted in the neurosis of communism.

Suspicious, venomous, and fanatical.

Cunning in the use of enduring values, cloaking itself in respectability, emphasizing the letter of the law while cynically rejecting its spirit—all for the purpose of destroying our security and plunging us into slavery.

It took us a long time to wake up to this insidious danger.

When Communist Russia was first recognized by our Government it solemnly pledged never to interfere in our internal affairs.

That promise was being abused at the very moment it was given.

Now we know that there can never be coexistence with such a stealthy and merciless foe.

Pledges; treaties, trade, or any means by which nations try to get along wiht one another mean nothing to the Communists. They are only beguiling interludes to fool and soften their intended victims. Just one more technique in their campaign of waging total war against humanity.

You and I have been puzzled and worried by the evidence that some Americans, who have enjoyed every opportunity and advantage that this Nation offers have defected to the enemy.

However few they may be it is a symptom of the covert activities of the Communist Party in the United States.

The fact that the Communists are able to brainwash the weak and the gullible, may not seem to be a matter of great concern to the overwhelming majority of loyal Americans. But when these few are able to get into sensitive positions within Government, and elsewhere, then our security as a nation is endangered.

Of late, they have become more brazen. The way they have flouted the fifth amendment to the Constitution, using it not for its original purpose of protecting the innocent, but in order to make a mockery of the law itself, so that they may continue in their subversion prompts us to take effective action.

The laws of this Nation weer never meant to protect those who seek to destroy our Government.

Communists have been able to carry on in their conspiracy because of loopholes in the laws.

An entirely new situation confronts us, whereby they take advantage of lapses in our security.

To correct this situation we have voted to outlaw the Communist Party, which is the agent of a foreign power.

Henceforward, membership in it shall be regarded as evidence of conspiracy against the representative form of Government established and maintained by the American people.

The line is clearly drawn.

The Communist Party, advocate of treason, is hereby declared to be the enemy within our gates.

It must be hunted down and exterminated.

J. George Stewart

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 19, 1954

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Evening Star of August 17, 1954:

NEW ARCHITECT OF CAPITOL IS WELL-KNOWN FIGURE ON HILL—J. GEORGE STEWART SERVED IN HOUSE FROM DELAWARE

J. George Stewart, appointed by President Eisenhower to succeed David Lynn as Architect of the Capitol, will assume his post in the building where he has had long personal experience.

A civil engineer by profession, former Republican member of the House from Delaware, and later on the staff of the Senate District Committee, Mr. Stewart is well known on both sides of the Capitol. He was said to have been widely endorsed by congressional leaders.

Mr. Stewart's appointment was announced late yesterday by the White House. It is not subject to confirmation by the Senate. The new official will take over his duties from Mr. Lynn, who is retiring September 30 after many years of service.

Asked for comment on his appointment, Mr. Stewart modestly replied: "I hope that I can do as good a job as my predecessors in the architect's office have done."

RECALLS FIRST VISIT

Recalling his first visit to Washington, where later he spent many years, Mr. Stewart remembered coming here with his father, Hamilton Stewart, for the inauguration of President Taft during a big snowstorm.

A native of Wilmington, Del., Mr. Stewart received his education in the schools of that city and at the University of Delaware. He joined his father's construction firm of Stewart & Donohue, which was the largest heavy construction company south of Philadelphia. Later Mr. Stewart headed the firm for several years.

Most of the firm's big work was on the estates of Delaware. He built the gardens, masonry and new buildings of Nemours, a du Pont estate near Wilmington, and Winterthur Farms, now a museum of American architecture. He supervised construction of Wilmington Park, the city's baseball stadium.

IN 74TH CONGRESS

Mr. Stewart was a member of the Delaware Athletic Commission from 1931 to 1934 and a commissioner on the Delaware Emergency Relief Commission in 1934.

He was elected to the 74th Congress, serving from January 1935 to January 1937.

He came back to the capital in 1947 as clerk of the Senate District Committe, and continued in the succeeding Congress as a staff member to the minority.

As an engineer consultant, Mr. Stewart has served with the Lands Division of the Justice Department and with the Army Corps of Engineers, Washington district.

He lives here at 3701 Connectitcut Avenue NW, and has a home in Hollywood, Fla.

The Airlines Strike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. PERCY PRIEST

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 19, 1954

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, during my years of service on the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, one of my great interests has been the development of a commercial aviation program in this country second to none.

I have participated in the passage of legislation to promote safety in air transportation and feel that it is a matter that needs constant attention.

Personally I am not in a position to make a decision as to the merits or demerits of the current strike of pilots who have, until the strike began, been flying planes of American Airlines.

But among the many editorials which have been published on this subject, I have selected four which to me seem to be reasonable and pertinent in this controversy which I hope may be settled soon. Under leave granted to extend my remarks, I include these editorials:

[From the Chicago Daily News]

Air-Mattressing?

The airplane has brought transcontinental travel into a new dimension. It gets people across the country in hours instead of days. But the failure even of the DC-7 to get them westbound against prevailing winds regularly within 8 hours has involved American Airlines in a pilots' strike. The pilots have authorized a strike against United, but they are still working for that line.

American has gone into court with a damage suit against the pilots' union, charging breach of contract.

Under the old rules of the Civil Aeronautics Authority, a pilot on continental service could be regularly scheduled only for 8 hours in the air at one time. It was recognized that unusual weather conditions might keep a man in the air longer than that; he gets paid extra if that happens. The limitation was on the regular schedule.

When American and United got their new DC-7's, it was hoped they would make it each way across the continent in less than 8 hours. Going westward, it regularly takes a little more, though the lines are getting closer, with experience, to the goal.

The CAA decided that no safety hazard was involved in the extra time. It required the airlines to publish more realistic schedules, but at the same time it authorized them to schedule flights up to 10 hours in continental service. In overseas service, a single crew may be scheduled up to 12 hours of continuous flight.

The overseas crews are generally larger, but they do not always have any more pilots than the two who operate long flights over land. The extra man may be only a navigator. There is a flight engineer on both types of service.

The argument concerns very small margins. "Flight time" is ordinarily measured from "block to block." It includes time waiting on the runway to get started. Some flights that technically represent more than 8 hours "flight time" do not actually take more than 8 hours in the air, if you eliminate the warmup and waiting time on the runway.

The chances are that continuing technical improvement will put the regular transcontinental flight time, even westbound, within the 8-hour limit most of the time.

If the transcontinental flights were interrupted somewhere to pick up a fresh crew, the lines would have a rather complicated scheduling problem on their hands. It is hard to see how it could be solved completely without hiring some extra people, though the pilots argue it could be done so that there would be few extras or none.

It would slow down the flights at least 20 minutes; more than that if the planes had to wait (as often happens) for clearance to land and start up again at a crowded airport.

Since the airlines have every incentive to push the speed of the planes up to the 8-hour limit, we think the pilots would be well advised to call off their strike and work with their employers for an improved performance. The chance of getting the nonstop time improved will not be promoted if there are no nonstop flights to experiment with.

American's management says the pilots are only expected to make 10 transcontinental flights a month—5 each way. This doesn't look like hardship. We can believe, as the management says, that this duty is eagerly sought by veterans of the service for the extra time it gives a man at home.

The railroads have suffered a good deal from their inability to translate all their mechanical improvements into better service. We should be sorry to see the airline pilots take even a first step toward establishing the air mattress on the same basis as the railroad featherbed.

[From the Boston Herald]

The 35-Minute Strike

The fastest plane available for commercial transport takes a scheduled 8 hours and 35 minutes to cross the continent from east to west. The pilots refused to fly more than a scheduled 8 hours.

What, then, is to be done? Are nonstop flights to be abandoned even though facilities for them are available? Or can the public reasonably expect the pilots to make the small concession necessary to permit this kind of progress—progress, incidentally, far in advance of anything the railroads have been able to contrive in 85 years of transcontinental transportation?

It seems to us that the pilots ought to make this compromise. It seems to us that the Air Line Pilots Association is being stiffnecked in insisting on its 8-hour rule and its right to negotiate this change in working conditions. Certainly it seems that the issue could be deferred without a strike until the Civil Aeronautics Board considers the matter of a permanent waiver of the 8-hour rule later this month.

The pilots contend that 8 scheduled hours in the air is all that can be safely expected of them. They say that the east-west flights run more than 8 hours and 35 minutes more than half the time, and sometimes run to 10 and even 12 hours. They say that American Airlines went to the CAB and got a temporary waiver of the 8-hour rule for these flights and failed to dicker with the union. They point out that 2 of the 5 CAB members felt that the waiver was granted without adequate hearing. They regard the 20 minutes lost by 1 stop as insignificant against the danger of long flights.

But the real issue ought to be safety and safety alone. And the pilots have not made out a good case. It is hard to believe that 8 scheduled hours is safe and 8 hours and 35 minutes is not—or even that 9 hours actual flying time is safe and 9 hours and 35 minutes not.

Actually the pilots who fly the route like the assignment. It piles up flying time fast and gives them 20 days off in every month, which is not bad for $19,000 a year. The pilot is assisted by a copilot and a flight engineer, and after the plane reaches cruising altitude, an automatic pilot can take over. He is not, therefore, on constant alert, although he is supposed to remain pretty constantly in his seat, which is no fun even for 8 hours.

The controls, dials and indicators and radios are imposing. But it is still difficult to believe that this flying is as strenuous as piloting the old Ford trimotors and biplanes with few navigational aids 20 years ago when the 8-hour rule was instituted.

The CAB decided that even 10 hours scheduled nonstop flight was not unsafe. The overseas limit is even more—12 hours.

This is the time for American and the other airlines to stand firm—tactful, maybe, but firm. The pilots have struck over something that resembles some of those notorious railroad featherbedding rules, and unless the airlines meet the issue here and now, they, too, will be cramped by makework restrictions.

[From the San Francisco Chronicle]

A Strike Against Nonstop Flights

The airline pilots who have struck American Airlines would find it extremely difficult to justify their position in the eyes of the American traveling public.

The public cannot help but feel, insofar as the facts have been made known, that this is a strike designed for no other purpose than to prevent the flying of a nonstop transcontinental route, from east to west.

The nominal issue is an 8-hour day. Nonstop flights from West to East, sped along by favoring winds, can be made within the 8-hour limit. Headwinds slow down the westbound flights, which customarily require from 30 minutes to 2 hours beyond the 8-hour limit; the average, according to the striking union's own figures, is 9 hours and 8 minutes. This, the strikers firmly assert, puts such a flight outside of safety regulations.

Against such a stand there is the fact of long experience and the studied opinion of the Civil Aeronautics Board, which is legally authorized to set up safety rules. On overseas flights a 12-hour limit for single crews has long been in effect—though such crews do carry a third member capable of flying the airplane. The CAB, in its expert judgment, has held that on transcontinental flights 10 hours would be well within the safety limit. The pilots' association attempted and failed to overturn this judgment in the courts—and it has declined to arbitrate the right of American Airlines to be guided by it.

The pilots concede that they have no economic dispute with the company; wages are not at issue. Thus, the strike appears as one called exclusively to maintain rigidly and inflexibly the principle of the 8-hour day—which other pilots have long since modified, properly and wisely, in the interests of transocean flying.

A lesser modification is indisputably called for in the interests of the nonstop transcontinental flight—a flight which the CAB has called safer than a transcontinental flight with intermediate stops. Pilots would be well advised to call off their strike forthwith and agree to arbitration.

[From Aviation Week]

ALPA's Mistake

No other aviation publication has reported so fully the views and activities of the Air Line Pilots Association. No other aviation magazine has expressed so much hope in the present administration of ALPA under Clancy Sayen. No other air magazine devotes space to a regular column written by an ALPA member. But Aviation Week can find little sympathy for ALPA's strike against American Airlines, either in aviation or among the public. We disagree with ALPA.

Any union must combat what it considers a chipping away of its benefits. But the 8-hour rule became effective about 1931, and it seems to us that the vast improvements in working conditions and salaries of air-line pilots since then merit some special consideration by ALPA for unusual circumstances such as those involving westbound nonstop transcontinental flights. There must have been ways to protect ALPA, as well as American Airlines. There must have been other alternatives short of a strike. Editorially, our view is that the American strike was unnecessary at this time, and a major mistake.

ROBERT H. WOOD.

International Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. ALEXANDER SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 19, 1954

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President on the 12th day of August the executive council of the American Federation of Labor issued, under the heading "International Crisis," a statement dealing with the far eastern situation, and I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTERNATIONAL CRISIS

(Statement by executive council, A. F. of L. August 12, 1954)

The free world is beset by new and dangerous perils. The security is gravely endangered by illusions about the role of Soviet communism since the death of Stalin. Anxious for peace and eager to live and let live, the democracies have, in varying degree, ignored the basic, permanent, threat of the Moscow-Peiping military axis and its worldwide Communist conspiracy. This has led to a serious weakening of their sense of urgency and vigilance. Their will to cooperate and unite for a common cause has been shaken. Their drive to become strong enough to deter and defeat direct and indirect Soviet aggression has been dangerously slackened. Some in the free world (Bevan, Nehru) even go so far as to oppose every effort by the democracies to promote their collective security and self-preservation on the ground that such efforts are harmful to peace.

Costly concessions have been made to the Communist imperialists on the pretext that they must not be displeased or provoked. These concessions (Indochina) have not alleviated but aggravated world tension and have encouraged the Communists in their conspiracy to subvert all free societies and to foist upon them totalitarian dictatorships. In this situation, the Kremlin and its junior partner-in-plunder (Mao Tse-tung) have succeeded in misleading many people to trust the stepped-up Soviet propaganda for so-called coexistence. Given the habit of the democracies to relax their vigilance and reduce their strength the moment they feel that the threat to their freedom and peace has abated, reliance on this Soviet strategy is fatal to the security of the free world.

If Moscow were sincere in its revival of this maneuver, devised by Lenin in 1920 in order to gain time for preparing the final assault on the democracies, it would first of all liquidate its activities aimed against the existence of those with whom it claims to seek coexistence. These fifth column activities, directed by the Kremlin, have but one aim—to subvert, overthrow, and replace the governments with which the U. S. S. R. is supposed to be at peace or even has special treaties of alliance and friendship. These Communist activities are a form of indirect, but none the less infernal, Soviet aggression—fatal to the freedom and national independence of big as well as small nations (China 1945, Czechoslovakia 1948). Before there could ever be coexistence, conducive to the peace and well-being of all mankind, the Soviet dictatorship would have to fulfill certain conditions. Let the U. S. S. R. go back to its borders of 1939 (pre-Stalin-Hitler pact). Let the Kremlin accept U. N. supervised democratic elections in all areas of tension (Germany, Korea). Let Moscow agree to the actual banning of atomic and hydrogen weapons through effective international inspection and control.

The executive council of the American Federation of Labor rejects the notion that the free world must choose between coexistence—the policy of successive or massive appeasement of the Soviet aggressors—and a policy of waging a preventive war against the Moscow-Peiping axis. We sincerely want peace with freedom. We, therefore, reject both of these policies. The policy of coexistence can lead only to another world war—under conditions in which the democracies would morally, materially, and militarily be far less able to resist, let alone defeat, the Communist enemy.

Instead of helping the Communist dictatorship to overcome the serious economic and political difficulties now besetting the Soviet orbit, instead of providing these totalitarian aggressor with the commodities and credit they need for strengthening and streamlining their already powerful and dangerous war machines, let the democracies pursue a positive program to aid freedom and peace through building up their own unity and ever greater strength. The executive council of the A. F. of L. proposes that this program should have among its guiding lines the following measures:

1. Complete rearmament—military, economic, political, and social—adequate enough to discourage and defeat Communist subversion and aggression against the free nations on all continents.
2. Setting of definite time limits for granting independence to the colonial and semicolonial peoples, as the United States did in the Philippine Islands.
3. Expansion of purchasing power, productivity and trade, and stabilization of the prices of basic raw materials (rubber, tin, etc.) within the free world.
4. U. N. supervised democratic elections in all areas of conflict (Germany, Korea, China, Indochina), in order to reduce international tension and to enable the people of these countries to achieve genuine national reunification in freedom and to select governments which shall enjoy full sovereignty in their foreign as well as domestic affairs.
5. Rigid and permanent opposition to admitting into United Nations membership the Mao Tse-tung regime or any other government which (a) has been imposed on a nation by a foreign power; (b) which exercises effective control of the country by denying its people the human rights specified in the U. N. Charter; and (c) which is engaged in, or has been found guilty of, aggression against the United Nations.
6. Bilateral nonaggression and mutual-aid pacts between free nations (United States and Republic of Korea, Philippines, Nationalist China) until such time as agreements can be reached for organizing a more inclusive collective-security system.
7. Negotiations for the settlement of international disputes to be conducted through regular diplomatic channels or through the channels of the United Nations with a view of strengthening the U. N. as an instrument of world peace.
8. Continuous and increased emphasis on advancing the cause of peace through promoting a genuine disarmament program—a practical program carried out in stages, effectively controlled and inspected internationally on both sides of the Iron Curtain.

The Miracle of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 19, 1954

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, what is the miracle of America? What is it that has brought us from a struggling backwoods country of less than 6 million people, a mere century and a half ago, and made us the greatest power on earth?

The secret of this great miracle, in my mind, may be found in the Constitution of the United States. This basic law contains that concept of government which provides, for the citizen, freedom of choice and freedom of action, unlimited except when his choice or his action would interfere with the rights of others.

Men succeed best when they do the things they like best. Freedom and opportunity are essential to each other. Each is necessary to progress and success. This secret is incorporated in our cherished American Constitution. It should be better understood by Americans and the world.

To this end, therefore, I propose that a film be made on the creation and development of the Constitution of the United States. The film would recreate the setting in which the Founding Fathers worked. It would trace the evolution of each important clause in the Constitution from its origin to its final form, sweeping history, if need be, for its source material.

This film, shown in every school in the land, would help coming generations to understand this, The Miracle of America, and enable others, in their own language, also to understand.

Nineteen hundred and fifty-six, 2 years hence, will be 180 years of American independence. This might well be an appropriate time to have the film story on The Miracle of America introduced or made available to our schools and to the public as well.

Air and Atomic Supremacy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER E. MERROW

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 19, 1954

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, in my remarks I am going to discuss the so-called New Look in reference to our policies of defense in what is now the thermonuclear era. Since the development of the hydrogen bomb we possess a weapon of untold magnitude and have power that staggers the imagination. We talk now of explosions expressed in megatons. A megaton is a million tons of TNT. The hydrogen bomb is capable of completely annihilating the area in which it explodes. With this power the responsibility of the United States as the leader of the free world has greatly increased, and upon our decisions in matters of defense and foreign policy hinge the well-being, the future happiness, and the peace of all mankind.

The September 1953 issue of the Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, the subject of which is Congress and Foreign Relations, is a volume which I helped edit and I wrote the first article entitled "United States Leadership in a Divided World." In the first paragraph of my statement, I employed these words:

> This is a crucial and decisive decade in the history of the United States, also in the history of freedom-loving nations. Our Republic occupies a destiny-given position in a

> sharply divided world. The United States, by far the strongest and the most powerful nation which has to date existed upon this earth, possesses an opportunity without parallel in the annals of mankind to exercise leadership. The free world is being attacked on many fronts and is being undermined from within wherever the Communists are able to make their sinister influence felt. In this universal struggle the forces of freedom must prevail, if ultimately there is to be fashioned an international society in which human beings can live free from molestation and free from the threat of tyranny and enslavement.

The United States is a youthful nation. It was only 462 years ago this coming fall that Columbus discovered the New World. In 1788, 166 years ago, the Federal Constitution was ratified. I might say in passing that New Hampshire was the ninth State to approve this epoch-making document. Four hundred and sixty-two years is a short period of time in the history of the world—166 years is a much briefer period—but during this brief period a mighty nation has arisen on the North American Continent.

When in Rome with a study mission last October for the purpose of studying the Food and Agriculture Organization, as well as the general political and economic conditions of Italy, it seemed to me that we were on ancient ground. Two thousand years ago Rome was resplendent in her glory, but even 2,000 years does not take us far into ancient history.

We are all familiar with the recent press accounts concerning the greatest archeological discovery of our time in ancient Egypt. Cheops' funeral vessel has been found and more discoveries will undoubtedly follow. This Egyptian Pharaoh reigned about 2750 B. C., nearly 5,000 years ago. But to go even farther eastward we find even more ancient civilizations. On various missions for the Foreign Affairs Committee, I have been in the Indus Valley and in Mesopotamia, the land between the Tigris and the Euphrates Rivers. As we think of the Sumarian civilization antedating Cheops' reign by 2,000 years, and as we think of the ancient civilizations of the East, we realize that against a background of 6,000 years of history 166 years is but a short period of time. However, during these 166 years, and more particularly since the turn of the century, 54 years ago, the Republic of the United States has become the most powerful nation in the annals of mankind.

The Spanish-American War marks the beginning of the role of the United States as a world power. In a little over a half century from that time to the present turbulent decade of the 1950's our rapid ascendancy to world leadership stands without parallel. We have risen to the dizzy position of world leadership and with this position has come staggering responsibilities.

I have often stated the issue of our time in language similar to that Mr. Lincoln used in his famous Gettysburg Address. He referred to our Nation as one "conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal." You recall that the Civil War President then said:

> Now we are engaged in a great Civil War, testing whether that Nation, or any nation so conceived and so dedicated, can long endure.

I believe we can appropriately state that now we are engaged in a globe-encircling struggle, testing whether free civilization, or any civilization go conceived and so dedicated, can long endure.

In this divided world the forces of Communist tyranny are seeking to destroy our heritage and the heritage of all free men. The evidence of the sinister plans of the Soviet Union accumulate day by day. The Communists talk peace while their philosophy of conquest and war remains the same. Let us keep constantly in mind that there can be no compromise with this monstrous evil and let us also keep in mind that we are engaged in a life and death struggle for survival.

The Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles, in an address entitled "The Evolution of Foreign Policy," delivered before the Council on Foreign Relations in New York on January 12, said:

> But before military planning could be changed, the President and his advisers, as represented by the National Security Council, had to make some basic policy decisions. This has been done. The basic decision was to depend primarily upon a great capacity to retaliate instantly, by means and at places of our choosing. Now the Department of Defense and the Joint Chiefs of Staff can shape our military establishment to fit what is our policy, instead of having to try to be ready to meet the enemy's many choices. That permits of a selection of military means instead of a multiplication of means. As a result, it is now possible to get, and share, more basic security at less cost.

We note that the Secretary stated "the basic decision was to depend primarily upon a great capacity to retaliate instantly, by means and at places of our choosing." I am particularly pleased that the basic decision has been made by this administration. In a speech entitled "United States Air Supremacy—Only Road to the Peace," which I delivered on the floor of the House on December 15, 1947,, nearly 7 years ago, I said:

> We must achieve an air force equal to any air force or combination of air forces on earth. United States air power is the key to the future well-being and happiness of the world.

Furthermore, in the same speech I stated:

> Air power—overwhelming—is the only possible defense against the atomic bomb. Any nation contemplating an attack on the United States will hesitate only if she knows that within a period of hours from the time the attack is made there will be delivered in reprisal a knock-out, devastating, retaliatory blow from the air. The United States can be immunized against attack from the air by building a completely unassailable and invincible air force. With air supremacy and supremacy any aggressor would not entertain the idea of an attack upon us because it would be perfectly clear that the cities of the country making the attack, the industrial centers, the lines of communication, and great segments of the population would be wiped from the face of the earth by a practically instantaneous single paralyzing blow from the air. Only by being fully prepared to deliver such a blow within a matter of hours after the first indication of an impending assault upon us will we be able to consider ourselves to possess any measure of security. We have the ability, the resources, the strength and the will which we must begin to exercise to create an air force fully capable of accomplishing the objectives I have set forth.

This statement was made in 1947, and I believe it is even more significant today than it was at that time. In view of the rapidly developing international events in 1954, I would like to add two additional sentences which I used in my speech in 1947. I said we are "definitely on our own. By our strength and by our strength alone will we be able to survive."

Furthermore, I would like to point out that on April 1, 1948, 6 years ago, I said in a speech on foreign policy made in the House of Representatives, that—

> Most important of all planks in a realistic bipartisan program on foreign policy is the achievement and the maintenance of adequate preparedness on the sea, on the land, and more especially in the air. Atomic supremacy and air supremacy by the United States must be realized at all costs.

Mr. Speaker, in this particularly crucial period in the history of the world, the United States has a tremendous opportunity and a staggering responsibility. We have the opportunity of leading the free world in the struggle to maintain and continue freedom. We have the responsibility of doing everything within our power to achieve a just and lasting peace. We must negotiate from strength in the conferences of the world and we must be so prepared and so ready for any eventuality that we can maintain our security. I am convinced that the illimitable thermonuclear power which we possess is the major factor for ensuring the peace of the world.

By maintaining air supremacy and atomic supremacy, I feel certain that no aggressor will dare to unleash a thermonuclear war which would result in widespread destruction of the most horrible nature. We must and we will maintain this supremacy and eventually we will construct an international society in which men will be able to live free from fear and free from tyranny.

Alcide de Gasperi

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 19, 1954

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, it is my sad task to announce to the Members of the House that Alcide de Gasperi, eight times Premier of Italy, passed away at 3 a. m. this morning, August 19, 1954, at the age of 73 years. Death came to Mr. de Gasperi in his north Italy mountain home at Sella Val Sugana.

The name of de Gasperi will always be a symbol of honor, courage, and achievement throughout the free world. Italy has lost a great statesman, and the United States has lost a stanch friend.

Mr. de Gasperi was born in Pieve Tesino, near Trent, in the southern Tyrol, when that region was part of the Austro-Hungarian Empire, of Italian parentage. From an early age, he showed a keen interest in Italy's welfare and future. In November 1904, when just 23 years old, he was arrested at Innsbruck for taking part in a political demonstration with other Italian students. One month later he was released, with the help of the Italian Government. After graduating from the University of Vienna, he became editor of a daily newspaper, the Catholic Voice, at Trent. He was elected to his first legislative post in 1911, when he was named Councilor of the Empire, and went to the Austrian Parliament in Vienna. While there, he was an active voice for the Italian minorities.

When Tyrol was given to Italy after World War I, Mr. de Gasperi joined the Popular Italian Party, forerunner of the Christian Democrats. He was elected a member of its national council in 1919, and 2 years later entered the Italian Chamber of Deputies.

Under de Gasperi's leadership, the Popular Party broke with Mussolini and when that dictator suppressed political opposition, de Gasperi was forced to retire to Tyrol. Suspected of taking part in clandestine activities of that party, he was imprisoned for 16 months and released. After he was freed, de Gasperi worked in the Vatican library, and earned his living by writing articles.

Italy's entry into World War II brought Mr. de Gasperi back to political activity. He became active again in the opposition and in the re-formed Popular Party.

After Italy's surrender and the Nazi seizure of Rome in 1943, he was sought by the police and took refuge in the Vatican, with other great men who were to become leaders in postwar Italy.

In 1944 when the Christian Democrat Party was formed from the old Popular Party, Mr. de Gasperi emerged as its leader and party secretary. In 1944 and 1945 he was selected for several important posts, finally becoming Foreign Minister and from that post moving into the premiership at the end of 1945.

The state of chaos in Italy at the time de Gasperi took over the premiership is almost beyond belief. Wages were very low; prices very high; the Communists were in the Government; riots and bloodshed occurred almost daily, and the prostrate people of Italy lived under constant threat of a Communist uprising. Mr. de Gasperi went to work against these odds and in the 1948 Italian elections, he inflicted a smashing defeat to the Reds.

For 5 years after that he fought the Reds constantly and successfully, ever championing close alliance with the United States and the anti-Communist West, and working hard for European unity.

It was Mr. de Gasperi who brought Italy into the North Atlantic Alliance. He worked strenuously for the Schuman coal-steel plan, the Council of Europe, and the six-nation European army, and made Italy a participant in all of them. To the hour of his death, he fought for the European army.

His contribution toward a stable Italy, his struggle against communism, and his lifelong work for democracy will not be forgotten. The death of this gallant statesman who led Italy out of postwar chaos and into the path of democracy is a serious blow and a very great loss for Europe.

Employment at Boston Naval Shipyard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 18, 1954

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a letter I have received today from Rear Adm. B. E. Manseau advising me that no appreciable change in current employment of approximately 10,600 is expected at the Boston Naval Shipyard during the remainder of this quarter.

While I was naturally pleased to receive this information indicating that there would be no further cuts at the Boston Naval Shipyard, I have been greatly concerned about previous cuts and the steady reduction of employment at that establishment over a period of time. There have been continuous, repeated and substantial reductions-in-force at this establishment.

On many occasions, I have been in touch with the Navy Department in an effort vigorously to impress upon its high-ranking officials the imperative urgency of maintaining employment at the Boston Naval Shipyard at a high level in order to maintain the organization of skilled personnel so vital to the national defense as well as to insure employment security to large numbers of highly trained workmen, who are most essential to our economy and the national interest.

Naturally, it is always reassuring to receive word that the Navy Department has allocated new work to this yard but, in my opinion, not enough work is being allocated to maintain the yard at proper level of employment and efficiency. We should have in mind our precarious international situation and make sure that our great shipbuilding and ship-repairing industry is kept intact and at a high peak of efficiency at all times.

For these reasons, I hope that the Department will listen to the pleas which I have made, and other colleagues have made, to allocate additional work to the Boston Naval Shipyard and to our other great shipbuilding facilities in Massachusetts.

Now the letter:

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,
BUREAU OF SHIPS,
Washington, D. C., August 18, 1954.

The Honorable PHILIP J. PHILBIN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PHILBIN: I am writing to apprise you of employment prospects at the Boston Naval Shipyard for the second quarter of fiscal 1955.

You will be pleased to know that no appreciable change in current employment of approximately 10,600 is expected at Boston during the remainder of this quarter. Based on our most recent appraisal of work requirements, employment at this shipyard is expected to total between 10,300 and 10,700 at the end of December 1954. While no layoffs are anticipated during the second quarter of fiscal 1955, there will be, of course, the usual adjustments among trade groups.

It is emphasized that the foregoing estimates of employment at the Boston Naval Shipyard are subject to change at any time, because of possible revisions in operational requirements and other factors. In the event that any significant changes should take place, you will be promptly advised.

With kindest regards,

Sincerely yours,

B. E. MANSEAU,
Rear Admiral, U. S. N.,
Acting Chief of Bureau.

An Excellent Nomination

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 19, 1954

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, there has been general approval expressed at the recent nomination of Herbert Hoover, Jr., as Under Secretary of State. I feel now that we all wish him success in his new position, which is an especially vital one in these days of crisis. I should like to include as part of my remarks the following editorial from the New York Times of August 19, entitled "An Excellent Nomination":

AN EXCELLENT NOMINATION

The Under Secretaryship of State in our country is always a position of importance but it is especially so at the present moment. In Britain, France, and most other European countries the Permanent Secretary or Secretary General or whatever his title may be is a civil servant from the diplomatic corps. This gives him a permanency of tenure regardless of governmental changes and it keeps him strictly out of party politics.

In the United States, the Under Secretary is a political appointee who must have the confirmation of the Senate. This links the post to the administration in power, which is consistent with a system in which the Secretary of State is a Cabinet officer directly responsible to the President. It permits the Under Secretary to become Acting Secretary and to represent the State Department in conferences, as the retiring Under Secretary, Gen. Bedell Smith, did recently at Geneva.

That Herbert Hoover, Jr., is now to take over this important post is cause for satisfaction. He has shown in his recent handling of the Iranian oil negotiations that he has diplomatic, as well as technical abilities, of a high order. He is young for the post—51 years—and vigorous, and he will need to be.

Gen. Bedell Smith, who has filled the position with such authority and solidity in the past year and a half, is, unfortunately, not well. He undertook the job at great personal risk and has kept going through a sense of discipline and loyalty, but he has driven himself almost beyond endurance. His promise to be available for occasional service to the Government is reassuring.

Mr. Hoover will have an unusually heavy burden. The difficulties of the next few years in the field of foreign policies are bound to be great. In addition, Secretary Dulles, unlike his predecessor, Dean Acheson, likes to be relieved of as much administrative work as possible in order to concentrate on policy matters. This will mean a heavy operational burden for the new Under Secretary along with his work in policy fields. There is every reason to suppose that Mr. Hoover can take it, and do a first-rate job.

Report on Irrigation and Reclamation Legislation of the 83d Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 19, 1954

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, several of my colleagues have asked about the various bills which have been introduced relative to irrigation and reclamation projects. I have had the staff of my committee, Interior and Insular Affairs, prepare a rundown of the bills which have been reported in the House.

I am quite proud of what has been accomplished. Under this Congress and the Republican administration, much has been done to promote irrigation and reclamation. We have worked closely with the Appropriations Committee in getting funds to start actual construction of seven new projects. In addition, my committee has authorized many new projects.

There have been charges that this administration is turning its back on irrigation and reclamation; that if we continue to follow this policy irrigation and reclamation are doomed.

As Al Smith used to say, "Let's take a look at the record." About $60 million in new projects has been authorized by this Congress. Two other projects, Michaud Flats and Santa Maria, totaling $27 million have been approved by the House and are now pending before the Senate where they have committee approval.

My committee also reported H. R. 4449 which would authorize the development of the upper Colorado River Basin—the last of the major river basins remaining undeveloped in the United States.

As you will note by the chart that follows, 11 new projects were favorably reported by my committee. Many hours of hearings were held on each of these projects. Both proponents and opponents were given ample time to present their arguments.

Besides the 11 authorizations, 5 other projects were given the green light to start or continue actual construction. Several other bills were approved relative to incidental problems concerning operating projects. Also, 10 bills dealing with irrigation districts were approved.

The Fryingpan-Arkansas project was reported favorably by my committee, but the rule for consideration was voted down by the House. No rule has been granted on the upper Colorado River Basin bill.

The report:

Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, irrigation and reclamation legislation, 83d Cong.

	Reported	Passed House	Passed Senate	Enacted
PROJECT AUTHORIZATIONS				
Central Valley project, works for development of water supply for waterfowl management (H. R. 4213) ($500,000).	July 28, 1953	Aug. 1, 1953	Aug. 11, 1954	
Chief Joseph Dam project, Foster Creek division (H. R. 4854) ($6,000,000)	do	June 23, 1954	July 6, 1954	July 27, 1954, Public Law 540.
Colorado River storage project (H. R. 4449) ($1,000,000,000)	June 9, 1954			
Fryingpan-Arkansas project (H. R. 236) ($173,000,000)	June 28, 1954	(1)		
Michaud Flats project (H. R. 5499) ($10,000,000)	July 23, 1954	Aug. 3, 1954	(2)	
Niobrara River Basin project (Ainsworth, Lavaca Flats, Mirage Flats, and O'Neill units) (H. R. 8520) (no authorization of funds).	June 15, 1954	June 22, 1954	Aug. 11, 1954	
Palo Verde project (H. R. 8498) ($7,000,000)	June 29, 1954	June 30, 1954	Aug. 16, 1954	
Rogue River Basin project, Talent division (H. R. 8384) ($23,000,000)	July 14, 1954	July 30, 1954	Aug. 11, 1954	
Santa Margarita project (H. R. 5731) ($22.6 million)	July 27, 1953	July 31, 1953	May 28, 1954	July 28, 1954, Public Law 547.
Santa Maria project (H. R. 2235) ($17,000,000)	Jan. 7, 1954	Feb. 2, 1954	(2)	
Washita River Basin project (S. 118) ($38,000,000)	Aug. 4, 1954			
PROJECTS APPROVED FOR CONSTRUCTION				
Eklutna project (S. 2097)	July 15, 1953	July 30, 1953	June 18, 1953	Aug. 13, 1953, Public Law 260.
Missouri River Basin project (Glendo unit) (S. J. Res. 165)	June 28, 1954	July 6, 1954	June 22, 1954	July 16, 1954, Public Law 503.
Missouri River Basin project (Sargent unit)				
Missouri River Basin project (Yellowtail unit) (committee resolution)	(3)	May 4, 1954		
Solano project (committee resolution)	(3)	Apr. 1, 1953		
OTHER PROJECT LEGISLATION				
Davis-Parker project (consolidation of the 2 projects) (H. R. 3598)	July 15, 1953	July 27, 1953	May 17, 1954	May 28, 1954, Public Law 373.
Eden project (exchange of lands) (H. R. 7057)	Mar. 4, 1954	Mar. 15, 1954	do	May 28, 1954, Public Law 377.
Falcon Dam project (transmission and disposition of electric energy) (S. 3090)	May 25, 1954	June 7, 1954	May 19, 1954	June 18, 1954, Public Law 406.
Milk River project (adjustment of charges) (H. R. 7813)	July 15, 1954	Aug. 3, 1954	Aug. 16, 1954	
Owl Creek project (exemption from excess lands limitation) (H. R. 4721)	Feb. 25, 1954	Mar. 15, 1954	Aug. 11, 1954	
Palisades project (payments for improvements) (H. R. 6786)	Apr. 2, 1954	Apr. 26, 1954	July 17, 1954	July 27, 1954, Private Law 561.
Riverton reclamation project (compensation to Indians) (H. R. 4483)	Apr. 14, 1953	Apr. 20, 1953	July 30, 1953	Aug. 15, 1953, Public Law 284.
Shoshone project (conveyance of land to University of Wyoming) (H. R. 6068)	Mar. 29, 1954	Apr. 5, 1954	May 4, 1954	May 17, 1954, Public Law 362.
Vermejo project (amend authorizing act) (H. R. 6882)	June 21, 1954	July 6, 1954	July 17, 1954	July 27, 1954, Public Law 542.
IRRIGATION DISTRICTS				
American Falls Reservoir District (amendatory repayment contract) (H. R. 9889)	July 30, 1954	Aug. 4, 1954	Aug. 11, 1954	
Belle Fourche Irrigation District (certain costs made nonreimbursable) (S. 727)	July 27, 1953	Jan. 18, 1954	July 18, 1953	Jan. 30, 1954, Public Law 289.
Black Canyon Irrigation District (amendatory repayment contract) (H. R. 9630)	July 21, 1954	Aug. 3, 1954	Aug. 11, 1954	
Deaver Irrigation District (certain costs made nonreimbursable) (S. 727)	July 27, 1953	Jan. 18, 1954	July 18, 1953	Do.
Hermiston and West Extension Irrigation Districts (amendatory repayment contract) (S. 2761).	May 24, 1954	June 7, 1954	May 17, 1954	June 18, 1954, Public Law 404.
North Unit Irrigation District (amendatory repayment contract) (S. 2864)	July 14, 1954	Aug. 3, 1954	July 6, 1954	Aug. 10, 1954, Public Law 573.
Pine River Irrigation District (amendatory repayment contract) (H. R. 7466)	June 21, 1954	July 6, 1954	July 17, 1954	July 27, 1954, Public Law 533.
Rosa Irrigation District (amendatory repayment contract) (H. R. 6487)	May 24, 1954	June 7, 1954	June 22, 1954	June 30, 1954, Public Law 462.
Shoshone Irrigation District (restore to district portion of power revenues) (H. R. 6893)	May 20, 1954	June 7, 1954	July 6, 1954	July 15, 1954, Public Law 489.
Willwood Irrigation District (certain costs made nonreimbursable) (S. 727)	July 27, 1953	Jan. 18, 1954	July 18, 1953	Jan. 30, 1954, Public Law 289.
LEGISLATION AMENDING FEDERAL RECLAMATION LAWS				
Authorize loans to local public agencies for construction of distribution systems on Federal reclamation projects (H. R. 9961).	July 23, 1954	Aug. 3, 1954	(2)	
Exchange of farm units on Federal irrigation projects (S. 887)	July 27, 1953	July 30, 1953	July 18, 1953	Aug. 12, 1953, Public Law 268.
Extension of time during which Secretary may enter into amendatory repayment contracts (H. R. 8027).	June 15, 1954	June 22, 1954	Aug. 12, 1954	
Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (amend with respect to secretarial authorization) (H. R. 4551).	July 24, 1953	Feb. 3, 1954		
Small projects legislation, supplemental Federal reclamation laws by providing for Federal cooperation in non-Federal projects and for participation by non-Federal agencies in Federal projects (H. R. 8301).	July 22, 1954	Aug. 3, 1954	(2)	
Title transfer on movable property to irrigation districts (H. R. 8026)	June 7, 1954	June 22, 1954	July 17, 1954	July 28, 1954, Public Law 551.

[1] Defeated.

[2] Reported by Senate committee.

[3] Adopted.

Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, irrigation and reclamation legislation, 83d Cong.—Continued

	Reported	Passed House	Passed Senate	Enacted
MISCELLANEOUS				
Department's power policy				
Missouri River Basin compact (H. R. 7439)				
Sabine River compact (S. 3699)	July 20, 1954	Aug. 3, 1954	July 10, 1954	Aug. 10, 1954, Public Law 578.
Sale of electric transmission facilities to States of Arizona and California (H. R. 9751)	do			
Tri-Dam project (interest-free loan for private development) (H. J. Res. 330)	July 23, 1954			
Water resources of Alaska (H. R. 2843)	July 14, 1954	Aug. 3, 1954	Aug. 11, 1954	

The President's Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 18, 1954

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, as this Congress draws rapidly to an end, many people have been wondering how well the President's program has been received. In my opinion nowhere could it be better reflected than in the attached Gallup poll which was taken recently when much of the program had already been completed. The President's percentage of general approval is within 1 percent of his popularity at the time he came into office. This in spite of many strong battles that have taken place in a very marginal Congress. This is a tribute to a great President. The poll is herewith attached as published in Sunday's Washington Post:

THE GALLUP POLL: PRESIDENT'S RATING RISES TO 70 PERCENT

(By George Gallup, director, American Institute of Public Opinion)

President Eisenhower's personal popularity, which had been trending slowly downward since March, has bounced back with remarkable vigor.

Registering a 9-point upward spurt over the last 2 months, his popularity is now at 70 percent in the latest poll by the institute.

That is the percentage of voters questioned who say they approve of the way Mr. Eisenhower is handling his job as President. A total of 21 percent say they disapprove, while 9 percent express no opinion.

With the start of his second year in office, Mr. Eisenhower received a vote of confidence from 71 percent of the Nation's voters last February. One month later, the figure had dropped to 68 percent and then continued downward until it reached 61 percent in June—the low point so far this year.

Representative voters in all parts of the country were interviewed on this trend question:

"Do you approve or disapprove of the way Eisenhower is handling his job as President?"

Here is the trend since February:

[Percent]

	Approve	Disapprove	No opinion
February 1954	71	19	10
March	68	19	13
May	64	22	14
June	61	23	16
Today	70	21	9

Interviewing in the latest survey was concluded after the truce settlement in Indochina and after many of the controversial bills in the Eisenhower program, including the tax revision bill, had been passed in Congress.

The groups in the population which give Mr. Eisenhower the strongest approval vote today are the college-trained group, women voters, older people, white-collar workers and voters living in the Middlewest.

However, the chief gains in approval since 2 months ago come from rank-and-file Democrats, grade-school-trained people, manual workers, and middle-aged people.

Here is the vote today by party affiliation and by various population groups:

[Percent]

	Approve	Disapprove	No opinion
Republicans	89	7	4
Democrats	56	32	12
Independents	72	17	11
Men	68	23	9
Women	71	19	10
21–29 years	68	21	11
30–49 years	70	22	8
50 and over	72	18	10
College	74	19	7
High school	70	20	10
Grade school	66	23	11
Professional and business	74	19	7
White collar	75	17	8
Farmers	65	24	11
Manual workers	67	22	11
East	69	24	7
Midwest	71	18	11
South	66	22	12
Far West	72	20	8

Today's result does not necessarily mean that 70 percent would vote for Mr. Eisenhower if an election were held.

Many Democrats interviewed in the survey said that they approve of the way Mr. Eisenhower is carrying on his job. But many of these would not cast election ballots for him in preference to a Democrat.

One facet of the President's high popularity lies in the impression which voters have that he has not treated any groups in the population unfairly.

My Position on Rollcall Votes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDMUND P. RADWAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 19, 1954

Mr. RADWAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I want to declare my position on the following rollcall votes I missed earlier this session:

On rollcall No. 41, I would have voted "aye."

On rollcall No. 58, I would have voted "aye."

On rollcall No. 80, I would have voted "aye."

On rollcall No. 81, I would have voted "aye."

On rollcall No. 142, I would have voted "aye."

On rollcall No. 144, I would have voted "aye."

Attack on President Assailed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 19, 1954

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by David Lawrence:

ATTACK ON PRESIDENT ASSAILED—CRITICISM OF POWER DEAL INVOLVING GOLFER BOBBY JONES IS CALLED MITCHELLISM AND CHARACTER ASSASSINATION

Maybe a new world has come into the political dictionary—"Mitchellism"—and perhaps it ought to be spelled with a small "m," for, as Mr. Truman says about such words, they represent a technique rather than anything personal.

"Mitchellism" means making a speech which charges the President of the United States with dishonesty in the conduct of his office and accuses him of guilt by association with individuals who play golf with him—if they happen to have business affiliations.

Adlai Stevenson denies that Stephen Mitchell did "attack the honesty of the President." Since Mr. Mitchell is chairman of the Democratic National Committee, it would appear to be up to Mr. Stevenson, as titular leader of the Democratic Party, to draw up any resolution of censure, so to speak, in order to achieve that form of party discipline which the so-called liberals have at times urged Mr. Eisenhower to exert upon the national chairman of his party.

Mr. Mitchell's words are to be found in a prepared speech issued in advance of delivery before the annual meeting of the American Bar Association, where the Nation's best lawyers congregate. They usually understand the explicit meaning of words and innuendoes. Here is Mr. Mitchell's exact statement:

"In my view, giving away the people's property is corruption even if it's done brazenly in broad daylight. Money doesn't have to change hands in little black bags, as in Teapot Dome days.

"Let's look, for example, at the Dixon-Yates scandal. Here was a deal to grant a subsidy of $140 million to a favored power syndicate, on the President's personal order, over the protest of the Atomic Energy Commission, and the TVA without competitive bidding. A director of 1 of the 2 companies in the favored syndicate is one of the President's closest friends, with a cottage next door to President Eisenhower's at the Augusta golf course. Maybe they never even talked about it, I don't know."

Why, it will be asked, was the personal relationship of the President and Bobby Jones, the former national golf champion, dragged into the papers in this way? For nobody can doubt what the effect of the Mitchell innuendo was, when published from coast to coast. It was a smear upon the integrity of the President. What a sorry reward for a man who has served his country so well through his life that now he is to be accused of dishonesty in public office by the man who runs the Democratic Party's official machinery.

Denials will be of little avail. For Chairman Mitchell has so worded his inference of guilt that the explanations will never catch up with accusations. It will be interesting to see how many clergymen now will preach from pulpits about this form of character assassination and how many of the so-called liberal groups will now cry out about the wave of hate which nowadays has crept into the forums of public affairs.

As for the facts on the power contract made by the Atomic Energy Commission, there are two sides to the controversy. Senator FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas, Democrat, who is one of the most ardent of the followers of Stevenson, says the contract was awarded properly and not a bit of scandal was connected with it. He ought to know, as the power plant is to be built in his State and naturally he is thoroughly familiar with all its details.

As for a "subsidy," the question really was whether the American people would get less out of it by allowing the TVA—a Government corporation which pays no Federal taxes—to build the plant or by letting it be done by a private power company which pays taxes. In the end, more money, it is estimated, will come to the Government through encouragement of private industry.

As for the Atomic Energy Commission's action, Mr. Mitchell doesn't reveal to his listeners and readers that some of the Truman appointees constituted a 3-to-2 majority and raised some doubts as to what legal steps were necessary as there were no precedents to go by. The matter was referred to the President, who, upon receiving legal advice, instructed the Commission that it had authority to make the proposed contract.

Whether or not this was a correct action—and there is no persuasive evidence against it—the fact remains that the exercise of official judgment should not be assailed as dishonest, nor should there be accusatory inferences about "corruption in broad daylight" and "little bags of money" where the acts of Dwight Eisenhower are concerned.

This, however, is "Mitchellism," which is strangely askin to "Trumanism," for it will be recalled that in the campaign of 1948 the then President made an analogous attack on the intergrity of Mr. Eisenhower. Strange how indifferent some of the Democrats can be about character assassination when they themselves are wielding the smear brushes.

We Mourn the Passing of Premier de Gasperi

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 19, 1954

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, it is with extreme regret that I rise to join with our colleagues in expressing our sorrow at the passing of Alcide de Gasperi, former Premier of Italy.

He was indeed a great man, a hard hitting, implacable foe of the Communists. He was a real friend of the American people and did much to rebuild and strengthen the friendship between his people and the free peoples of the world.

Italy will miss him; the United States will miss him; and the free people of the world will miss him.

Our heartfelt sympathy goes out to his family and to his countrymen.

European Defense Treaty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 19, 1954

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following editorial from the Christian Science Monitor, Wednesday, August 18, 1954:

CRUCIAL DAYS FOR EDC

The modifications of the European Defense Treaty proposed by Premier Mendès-France and his cabinet in Paris are so far-reaching that now the question arises whether the EDC conception can survive them. Would it still be an EDC if this draft were adopted? Or will the French Parliament by any possibility ratify EDC if the changes are rejected?

The Netherlands and the United States have expressed their stiff opposition to the changes. The Hague decries an effort "to hollow out the supranational elements of the treaty," and Washington emphasizes the importance of maintaining these elements and the "nondiscriminatory nature of the treaty" as it would affect Germany.

M. Mendès-France faced a situation in which the defense treaty probably could not have been pushed to ratification as it stood. He has tried to find a substitute which would be accepted by the French National Assembly. In the process he has made concessions to fears and chauvinism without yet mollifying the opposition of the Gaullists.

Yet the Premier well put the situation of France in a recent broadcast when he said that his country has only the choice of permitting West Germany to rearm under the surveillance of the six-nation treaty or of standing by while Germans are armed "without any control" from France.

As the issue now moves to the conference of the six foreign ministers in Brussels the prospects of compromise do not seem great. Yet some compromise there apparently must be if EDC is to become an actuality. For French opinion is reported as strongly backing its Premier.

The sacrifice of supranational features means that for 8 years each of the 6 States would exercise a veto power on policies, that the military integration intended within 3 years could be indefinitely put off, and that there would be no move toward eventual federation with a directly elected governing assembly.

Theoretically the renouncing of federation as a goal might make it easier for Britain to participate, but this seems rather a distant hope to offset the bitter disappointment of the Netherlands and probably Belgium on this score. The point of Belgian Foreign Minister Paul-Henri Spaak is well taken that the only course the Low Countries and West Germany can accept its ratification of EDC as it stands and discussion of amendments afterward.

In that pattern the countries which have ratified or sponsored EDC could reasonably promise to support amendments to bring the 50-year term of the EDC treaty down to a closer relationship with the 20 years of the North Atlantic Treaty, in which the same nations are included.

But the United States cannot well give its blessing to changes which would destroy the workability of the organization as an agency for controlling integrated troops. Nor can it ask the German Republic to accept an inferior position—lacking control over its own soldiers while other members retain control of theirs.

The ministers at Brussels may well tell M. Mendès-France that unless Paris is prepared to be much more cooperative, Europe will consider other patterns of defense less to France's advantage.

Those who wrote the defense charter were following an international or at least European recipe. They might concede that if the product comes out looking more like a French loaf than they intended, still it would be better than no bread. But if the loaf is so crumbly that it will not hold together, then it is no bread.

Premier Alcide de Gasperi

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ALBERT W. CRETELLA

OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 19, 1954

Mr. CRETELLA. Mr. Speaker, it is with the greatest shock and sorrow that I heard of the death today of the great former Premier of Italy, Alcide de Gasperi.

It was De Gasperi, an 8-time Premier, who took over the leadership of war-torn Italy in 1945 as the head of the popular Christian Democrat Party.

An active opponent of early fascism, De Gasperi was jailed on more than one instance by Dictator Mussolini. The feeling and spirit of democracy have caused De Gasperi much hardship and privation since his early days as a student in Italy when he began to rise in opposition to the then strong-arm Government.

Here was a man whose life and dedication it was to see the emergence of a free and democratic Italy. In the difficult postwar years the task of realizing this end was no small one in this politically splintered nation.

No less a man and no more bitter an opponent of godless communism than Alcide de Gasperi could have kept the Italian Government in coalition with the aims of the United States and the free Western World. No less a man than he could have led and succeeded in the drive for European unification. Through his diligent efforts he, in 1949, brought Italy as a charter member into the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, an alliance of nations which had been at war with Italian fascism but a few years before.

De Gasperi earned the profound respect of entire free Europe. He has been called the most intelligent, most skillful, most honest, and most courageous statesman of these days.

It was only because of his broken health that De Gasperi recently was compelled to relinquish his position as titular head of the Christian Democrat Party.

America and the free world mourns the death of Alcide de Gasperi. He will forever be remembered as the lean old statesman who led his great, spirited country out of chaos and into the beaming light of democracy.

Conservation: Down and on the Way Out

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE L. HAYS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 19, 1954

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the following article deals with a most timely subject. I include it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that each Member of the House of Representatives can read it with careful consideration of the important points it makes:

[From Harper's of August 1954]

CONSERVATION: DOWN AND ON THE WAY OUT

(By Bernard DeVoto)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Through many little measures— most of them scantily reported in the press—the Eisenhower administration is reversing the Nation's 70-year-old policy for protecting our natural resources. Here, for the first time, is a complete picture of the devious campaign against America's forests, water power, parks, public lands, and soil-conservation program.)

An aphorism of the Chinese philosopher Mencius declares that the problem of government presents no difficulties: it is only necessary to avoid offending the influential families. In January 1953 the Business Administration in Washington took off from a related premise; that it was only necessary to get along with the trade associations.

This article deals with public power and the public lands, other natural resources, and the national conservation policies which have been developing for three-quarters of a century. In dealing with them the administration had to convert into concrete measures the generalizations of the Republican platform and campaign promises. It had no program when it took office. It was promptly handed one specific program, which the electric power companies had worked out in anticipation of a Republican victory in 1948. It has improvised several others, playing by ear. On several problems, it apparently is not concerned with programs; it has simply drifted downward.

Perhaps I can formulate the campaign generalities as working principles. In fields where private enterprise could operate at a profit, the administration would try to reduce Government operations. In fields where private enterprise could not make profits, it would maintain Government operation up to the minimum political necessity. In both areas it would try to provide a greater measure of local participation and control, greater cooperation between Federal and local governments, and a friendly partnership with private business. It would try to decentralize Federal administration, and it would, in an even more opaque phrase, "operate at the grassroots."

There was an inherent weakness in these working principles. They would throw the gates wide open to the boys in the back room unless the administration could get in first with programs of its own. It did not and the boys—the trade associations, the lobbies, the special-interest groups—rushed in with a loud whoop. During the campaign Mr. Eisenhower once remarked that he would not interpret his election as a mandate to preside over the liquidation of the publicly owned natural resources of the United States. Others have so interpreted it, however; a considerable liquidation has been affected already and much more is in the works. Eighteen months have made clear that the executive departments and the independent agencies will go much farther than Congress in alienating public property—but not (except perhaps in the Department of the Interior) as far as the boys have in mind.

They pin their hopes to the new Hoover Commission. The first one worked out intelligent plans for reorganizing the executive departments in the interests of efficiency and economy; but the second one is clearly intended to slay Mr. Hoover's white whale at last. It is to erase 20 years of infamy, root out all remnants of the New Deal, and turn the clock back to 1928. There are those who regard 1928 as practically a pinko compromise: the clock should be turned back somewhere beyond Theodore Roosevelt.

FIAT BY WASHINGTON

In the Departments of Agriculture and the Interior the business men whom the administration summoned to government promptly displayed the political ineptness visible in other departments. One reason may have been the sources of information which it was natural for them to rely on. A Congressman who wants a quick check on what the folks back home are thinking is apt to telephone to a local editor or political figure, or the head of some local labor or farm organization. From the top offices of Agriculture and Interior, however, the phone calls went instead to a chamber of commerce or to the Washington office of a trade association. The information available there being of a radically different kind, there followed such miscues as Secretary McKay's nomination to be Director of the Bureau of Mines of an open and recorded enemy of the services he would have to direct.

Top officials were also unable to recognize public opinion as a political force. Congressmen saw a/clear portent in the widesperad opposition to the tidelands bill—and in the public outrage when the Assistant Secretary of Commerce tried to discharge the Director of the Bureau of Standards for affirming that the addition of a laxative to a storage battery would not improve it. But to the businessmen in office these were unrelated and meaningless phenomena, just one of those things. The Department of Agriculture revealed this state of mind in its handling of the reorganization of the Soil Conservation Service. There could be no more local an organization than a soil-conservation district; more than 2,500 of them cover the country and they are literally of the grass roots. But they were not consulted about the reorganization of SCS and indeed could not find out what was going on till it was completed. In administration semantics, "local participation and control" had become fiat by Washington. The districts were enraged; they still are.

This reorganization, an aggrandizement of the land-grant colleges and the Extension Service at the sacrifice of conservation values, was typical of the new order in several ways. SCS had originally been organized on the basis of State units but had evolved a much more effective organization in a series of regions, each with its own headquarters, specialists, and technicians. The reorganization plan proposed to dissolve the regions and substitute State units for them. The heart of SCS assistance to farmers was its 6 technical services; 4 of these were to be abandoned and the specialists of the other 2 were to be distributed among the land-grant colleges (so far as the colleges had jobs for them) and the Washington headquarters. For the immensely successful program of SCS, 48 fractional and necessarily unharmonized programs were to be substituted; and these were to be administered from Washington. Decentralizaion had worked out in the semantics as greater centralization. Incentive to local conservation practices was to be provided by decreasing appropriations. And with technical service reduced, much research was to be abandoned.

But opposition to tidelands and the firing of Dr. Astin had not been just one of those things, and nationwide opposition to the new scheme forced the Department to reverse itself in midair. A new system of regional offices, under a different name and with headquarters in different cities, was extemporized. (In the semantics, A ceases to be A when you rename it B.) The technical services were retained, though in a more cumbersome and more expensive form.

As I write, SCS is half flux and half chaos. The technical teams have been broken up. Their invaluable pool of common experience at working together has been dissipated. This drastic impairment of professional skills is typical of the administration of public resources in the new order. So are the increased expense, delay, red tape, and inefficiency. So is the destruction of morale in a career service. Promising young men have left SCS in droves; promising young men who might have sought a career there are notably failing to join it. An administration fetish whose name is management-practice improvement has had its paper tribute, but a straitjacket of mediocrity has been forced on public administration. And a damaging blow has been struck at the conservation of American cropland and rangeland.

The Department of Agriculture, however, appears to have taken instruction from the public reaction. Evidently it has abandoned some reactionary changes which it had in mind a year ago and has narrowed the scope of some others. Not so the Department of the Interior. The boys have practically taken it over; the predicted giveaways are in progress. There is a cynicism in Interior which reminds observers of the aromatic days of the general land office. Yet some things that look like cynicism may be mere ineptness: thus Secretary McKay at a moment when all the conservation organizations in the country—national, nonpartisan, and representing hundreds of thousands of votes—were denouncing his recommendation of Echo Park Dam. Seeking for le mot juste to characterize conservationists, he came up with "punks."

RETURN TO SPOILS SYSTEM

The top officials of SCS have been put on schedule C; so have those of all other Conservation Bureaus in Agriculture except (as yet, perhaps) the Forest Service, and all those in Interior except the Geological Survey. Schedule C is a classification withdrawn from civil-service protection which permits discharge at the will of the Secretary, without regard to merit. It has a twofold purpose: (1) to provide jobs; (2) to substitute a pliable sycophancy for professional judgment in the making of policy. Promotion according to merit is abandoned for the spoils system, and career services become political footballs. The effect on the conservation agencies has been disastrous; it had not hitherto been supposed, and it cannot be supposed now, that the publicly owned resources could be administered on any basis except a purely professional one. These bureaus first introduced into the American Government the concept of a professionally expert civil service. Staff them with spoilsmen, and the public resources must begin leaking away.

The Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration is appointed to serve 10 years. It was therefore a tipoff when the White House requested the resignation of Mr. Claude Wickard 2½ years before the end of his statutory term. Rural electrification and Federal power can be treated together here, and several facts which are tirelessly misrepresented must be noted. The electric power generated at public installations runs between 13 and 16 percent of the national total, never more. In spite of nationwide propaganda by the utilities (paid for out of tax money and rate increases), unalterable natural circumstances make it certain that the percentage will decrease as time goes on. Furthermore, the consumer cooperatives which REA serves are strictly private enterprise, locally owned by their members and locally managed. They pay interest on the loans which REA makes them; they pay off the loans; they pay local taxes. They are "socialistic" only in the new semantics: in that they are not owned by the utility companies and they sell power to consumers so cheaply that their rates serve as a yardstick by which the rates of the utilities—a natural monopoly—can be regulated. Finally, most of the power they sell is bought from the utilities.

They constitute an area of private enterprise which the utilities had refused to pioneer or develop. In 1935 when REA was established, about 11 percent of the farms in the United States had central-station power; in 1952 about 90 percent had it. This constitutes an agricultural revolution even greater than that effected by SCS; it has transformed agricultural production, farm labor, and rural living. REA and the co-ops have greatly increased the business done by the utilities and very greatly increased that done by manufacturers of electrical equipment and appliances.

A multiple squeeze has been put on co-ops and REA. The administration's first budget request drastically cut REA funds. Its power-generation program, and therefore its bargaining power with the utilities, would have been destroyed. Its ability to accommodate new co-ops and the ability of the co-ops to serve new customers would have been drastically reduced. Congress refused to go so far and saved much of the program by increasing the appropriation far above the request. But Congress did not vote an increase over the budget's allotment for technical service. Thus the theme of SCS is repeated, for the abandonment or even any serious reduction of REA's technical service to the co-ops would be a serious blow, to some of them a fatal blow. Small co-ops, unable to afford such a technical staff as a utility company maintains, have been able to get their problems solved cheaply by REA. Moreover, the power-use section of REA was cut down, and the auditing services were abolished, thus increasing the financial hazards of the co-ops. A related but unsuccessful move was the attempt by Congressman KIT CLARDY, of Michigan—an old and dear friend of utility companies—to double the rate of interest which REA charges on loans to the co-ops.

Meanwhile what amounts to a rewriting of the Federal Power Act, supplementary acts, and even the Reclamation Act has been achieved by administrative action. The utilities would be glad to have the Government build the large and expensive control dams—because they make private downstream dams efficient—provided they could buy the power generated at them on their own terms and could control its distribution. But they have always rebelled against the preference clause. This clause—which in essence goes back to the earliest conception of public power in Theodore Roosevelt's first administration—is a provision that public bodies and cooperatives shall have first call on the power generated at Federal dams. ("Public bodies" means primarily municipally owned systems and such organizations as the power districts of Oregon and Washington.) The ordinary growth of such systems was provided for by selling the rest of the power to utilities on short-term contracts only. By abandoning this practice, the administration is in effect discarding the preference clause.

In the Northwest, utility contracts, previously short-term, now run 20 years. This limits the growth of co-ops, denies them new customers, and rations the power used by their present customers. A similar change in the Missouri Valley has been held up till after the November election. The co-ops have been faced with an impossible choice. Either they must forfeit their preference privilege, thus arresting their own growth, or they must contract for power far in advance of their needs and so pay a ruinous bonus for power which they could not use and which would have to be resold to the utilities at dump prices.

The utilities have fought the construction of steam-generating plants by REA to firm the power produced at Government hydroelectric plants, a frequently necessary measure because of seasonal fluctuations in stream flow. And the low rates charged by the co-ops have always harrowed them, for the differential is all too visible. There would be no reason for co-ops if they could not pass on to their members the savings they effect, and Assistant Secretary of the Interior Aandahl announced the answer. Federal power rates, he said, would be raised to the point where there would be no incentive to continue REA or establish cooperatives. Here is one form of private business with which the administration will not enter into a friendly partnership—and, as Senator Murray remarked, here is a negative yardstick for the power industry.

As for the generation of power, the Director of the Budget announced that there would be no "new starts"—no additional Federal power projects—till arrangements had been made with local (which here means large-scale and absentee) interests to install the generating facilities.

He thus proclaimed publicly a policy which some members of the administration were simultaneously denying. It is significant that of the 23 new starts so far made by the Corps of Engineers, none are multiple-purpose and none include power. And it seems likely that the Engineers will be favored over the Bureau of Reclamation in such new projects as are authorized. They are far friendlier to the utilities, they can legally assess against the taxpayers a larger percentage of the costs, and they are able to circumvent painful provisions of the Reclamation and Power Acts.

The program drawn up by the utilities in 1948 has not been carried out in full. But the process of strangulation that has been applied to REA should kill it in another 2 years. The co-ops will be withdrawn from competing with the utilities and furnishing data for the regulation of their rates. It would take considerably more than 2 years to get a wall round Federal generation of power.

Secretary McKay's abandonment to the Idaho Power Co. of the Hell's Canyon site—the greatest remaining one in the country—was geared to this policy. In the current semantics a consumer cooperative, owned and operated by farmers unable to get electricity except by their own efforts, would not be local enterprise; but Idaho Power is.

Idaho Power is a Maine corporation. About 7 percent of its stockholders live in the mountain West; of its thirty largest stockholders all, except Harvard University and the Commonwealth Fund, are insurance companies or investment trusts; all but two are east of the Mississippi and those two are insurance companies. The corporation could satisfy its future needs more cheaply by building steamplants, but the idea is to keep Federal power out of central and southern Idaho. The cost of the three small dams it currently proposes to build in Hell's Canyon will be taken care of by a rate increase—there being no public systems to provide a yardstick—and by the use for permanently profitable construction of the tax-amortization privilege which was intended to protect defense industries from losing money on temporary plant expansion. The Secretary also withdrew Government opposition to the Pacific Gas & Electric Co.'s proposed developments on the North Fork of King's River—developments made possible by existing facilities built at public expense.

But much as eastern-owned western utilities respect the spirit of private initiative, the West needs dams and wants payrolls. The relinquishment of Federal-reserved sites and no-new-starts policy caused uneasiness, and there was November to think of. So the upper Colorado storage project was taken out of mothballs and nearly a billion dollars' worth of construction was recommended. (It will cost about twice that; for obvious reason, Bureau of Reclamation estimates are poetic conventions.) Its political feasibility is obvious but its economic and social justification is open to the most serious doubt. Worse still, the plans for it are part fantasy and have been changed so often and so capriciously that no one knows to what extent its engineering is sound. But it satisfies the requirements. No corporation would ever want to build dams on this stretch of the Colorado, so there is no competition; but the promise of the Budget Director would attract corporate investment in the generating facilities, since the public would be paying all other costs.

The recommendation of this project breaches the basic national parks policy: one of the dams it includes, Echo Park, is to be built in Dinosaur National Monument. The dam will destroy the beauty of spectacular canyons of the Yampa and Green Rivers. There was a peak of cynicism in Mr. McKay's promise to spend $21 million of Bureau of Reclamation funds to build the roads now denied the monument and to construct recreational facilities at the fluctuating, unsightly reservoir which the dam will create. This sum is equal to four-fifths of the drastically cut 1955 appropriation for the entire National Park Service.

The progressive impairment of the parks by budgetary bloodletting is a national disgrace—but it is a smaller evil than Mr. McKay's approval of Echo Park Dam. Opening the parks to exploitation by the Bureau of Reclamation—which in the semantics is cooperation between Federal and State governments—makes only a matter of time their exploitation by any corporations which may want their water, water power, timber, minerals, or grass, and which have sufficient capital to awe a businessman in office.

Many trial balloons about TVA have been sent up. The refusal to reappoint Mr. Gordon Clapp as its Director made clear that career-service administration is not desired. His successor will need only a single qualification: a distaste for socialistically increasing private business in the Tennessee Valley by providing cheap power. Several other trial balloons from Interior are significant, such as suggestions that the tremendous Central Valley project might be sold to the State of California. At the right price it would make a happy deal; the big corporate farms would get the water denied them by the 160-acre limitation they have been fighting since 1902 and P. G. & E. would get the power facilities. This clue is underscored by a recent announcement that the utility companies of the Northwest are forming a syndicate capable of taking over all the Federal dams and powerplants on the Columbia River, the projects that brought industry and boom times to the Northwest.

If the Central Valley and the Columbia Basin projects should be handed over to utility corporations, how will flood control, erosion control, and the other conservation functions of Federal projects be carried on? The utilities could not possibly assume them. Indeed a corporation has no proper concern with them, and no State has ever done an even passable job at any of them. Nevertheless, the clues suggest that the ground work is being laid for the property evaluators, rate specialists, and constitutional lawyers of the new Hoover Commission to propose that all Federal reclamation and power projects be sold.

THE COWBOYS RIDE AGAIN

Both the platform and the campaign had promised to take care of the small but influential group of western stockmen who ever since 1946 have been trying to gut the Forest Service and get hold of the grazing ranges in the national forests. A bill embodying as much of the malodorous stockmen's proposal for an act as it seemed cagey to put in one package was sponsored (behind the scenes) by Senator Barrett, of Wyoming—who as a Congressman had spearheaded the attempted landgrab of 1946–47. He has great parliamentary and backstage skill: but his sole victory with this bill was his success in keeping the Secretary of Agriculture's adverse report on it from reaching the House Subcommittee on Public Lands.

At the public hearing Western spokesmen—water users, sportsmen, wildlife specialists, hydrologists, city engineers, individual stockmen, small stock associations—ripped the bill to shreds. The Denver Post attacked it repeatedly; so did such other prominent papers as the Salt Lake Tribune, the Portland Oregonian, and the San Francisco Chronicle. More striking was the opposition of many small newspapers, even in Wyoming, which had always before supported the plans of the stockmen's lobby. Whereas the attempted landgrab of 6 years before had to be stopped by the East, this time the West itself prevented a shameful raid on the public resources. Senator Barrett—seeing that the bill would be defeated if it came to a vote—maneuvered to keep it in committee and to prevent publication of the testimony at the hearings.

But something had to be done for the stockmen and so the Hope-Thye-Aiken bill was made an administration measure. Bad to begin with, it was rendered truly vicious by amendment; it has been passed by the Senate but as I write has not been taken up by the House. That such sound conservationists as Senator Aiken and Congressman Hope have been lined up behind so reprehensible a measure shows the formidable pressure that the United States Chamber of Commerce and other allies of the stockmen's lobby have succeeded in bringing to bear. Long since, Senator Aiken should have been attacking his own bill.

The bill would achieve three major objectives of the landgrabbers. It would give present holders of grazing permits in the national forests two different kinds of property rights in those forests, thus impairing the public title and in part alienating public property. It would enable the present permit-holders to sell the permits at will and without reference to the Forest Service, closing the ranges to newcomers and making monopolization of them certain. It would permit them to construct permanent improvements on the public ranges, further alienating public property and enabling the permit-holders to tie up the public lands indefinitely with lawsuits. Finally, it would cripple the regulatory power of the Forest Service by permitting appeal to the courts on various kinds of purely administrative decisions. It is a raid on the public land system and its passage would seriously undermine our conservation policy.

The House of Representatives stopped something even worse, a bill by Ellsworth of Oregon long a congressional spokesman for big lumber interests. It provided that when the Government acquired privately owned timberland, as for the reservoir of a dam, which a timber operator had under sustained yield (that is, cutting only in step with replacement by natural growth), the operator would have the option of being paid in cash or by the transfer to him of publicly owned timberland of equivalent value. This meant the national forests or the far smaller forests administered by the Bureau of Land Management—and in committee it was extended to include the forests in the national parks. Proof of operation under sustained yield was not stipulated and there was no guarantee that it would be used on the land to be acquired. The Government bureau which must provide the timberland was given no control over its selection, and no power to require any kind of protection or conservation.

Barefaced as these provisions were, however, they were unimportant compared to the central fact: ostensibly a measure of relief for suffering corporations, the bill provided for the direct transfer of portions of the permanently reserved public lands to private ownership. Enemies of the public lands system have been trying to achieve precisely that fundamental step ever since the first reserves were made in Benjamin Harrison's time. The Hope-Thye-Aiken bill would open fissures in the foundation of our national conservation policy—but the Ellsworth bill would have shattered it.

The Secretary of Agriculture drew up an adverse report and this time it reached the committee. Normally this is enough to stop a bill. He was, however, prevailed on to withdraw it. No notice of the public hearing was given except the routine listing in the Gazette; conservation organizations and interested Congressmen did not know that it was to be held. It was attended only by representatives of the Department of Interior, who had been instructed to think highly of the bill (one who wasn't thinking highly enough on the witness stand was called away by telephone), and of the Department of Agriculture, who had obviously been instructed not to think ill of it but to try to get it softened nevertheless. The committee reported it out and by a tricky lateral pass in the Rules Committee Mr. Ellsworth cleared the way for an attempt to slip it over on the House in the closing days of the session. Chance discovery at the last moment, however, scared him into holding it over till the next session.

By then the bill was in the open and it was murdered. The quarterbacking on the floor of the House was by Congressman Metcalf, of Montana, who was making a distinguished record in his first term. His Democratic teammates were Madden of Indiana, Price of Illinois, and Brooks of Texas, with McCarthy of Minnesota, Magnuson of Washington, and Hays of Ohio assisting at critical junctures. A striking development, however, was the cooperation of four Pennsylvania Republicans who were well acquainted with the issues at stake—Messrs. Gavin, Saylor, Fulton, and Mumma. Mr. Gavin's role in the debate was especially informed and expert. This extemporized coalition drew the bill's teeth with amendments and then, when the strength of the opposition became manifest, Mr. Metcalf moved to recommit it. His motion carried on a rollcall vote of 226 yeas and 161 nays—a brilliant victory for the freshman Congressman, who is not even a member of the relevant committee.

Perhaps a few other Republican Congressmen, who were active in opposition to the grazing bill, can be added to what looks like a conservation bloc. If the Republican Party retains control of the House in November, this bloc will be important. For it is clear that if any of our historic conservation policy is to be saved, it must be saved in the House. Senator Langer fitfully opposed some anticonservation measures but no other Republican Senator did. Senator Aiken, who devised the strategy for many earlier victories over anticonservation forces, has now put his great prestige at the service of the attack on the Forest Service. The Independent Party, Senator Morse, has been magnificent, making an all-out fight against every anticonservation move.

REORGANIZATION WITH BURGLAR'S TOOLS

The Forest Service may also serve to illustrate dangers latent in other administration fetishes—reorganization, consolidation, and a cant phrase from schools of business administration, management-practice improvement. If consolidation and reorganization are the first recourse of a management engineer, they can serve more devious ends and become the last one of a lobby or a landgrabber.

The Forest Service has always been decentralized. It began with a regional organization, to prevent the delays and rigidities that half-paralyzed the General Land Office. There are now 10 regions, each with headquarters and specialist staffs. Differences in terrain, climate, forestation, methods of lumber operations, and other complex variables make this the only kind of organization that could conceivably be efficient. To consolidate the regions, reducing them to 4 or even 2, as has been proposed, would greatly increase expense and greatly reduce efficiency. It would increase travel, paper work, and red tape. It would slow up administration and all field operations. It would make the specialist and scientific activities of the Service more cumbersome and expensive. In all these ways it would add to the costs of the private businesses that use the forests. But the notion is attractive to the managerial mind. You consolidate the Omaha and Denver offices of Continental Gadgets: why not, then, consolidate Nebraska and Colorado?

There is a more sinister aspect. Weakening professional and administrative efficiency by such a consolidation of the regions would favor both the special-interest groups which want to expoit the national forests and those which want all Federal regulation everywhere undermined. Also it would greatly reduce such ability as the Service now has to resist the attacks of its enemies. That is one of the ends in view.

All these hazards would be increased by the unbelievably idiotic plan, which has also been proposed, of abolishing the regional setup and achieving local control by grouping the national forests—which disregard State lines—in State units. Neither a forest stand nor the watershed of a river will stop short at a State boundary on executive order. But the 38 miniature forest services thus created—in 10 States there are no national forests—would be easy prey for the local special-interest groups. The administration fetish which dreams of reorganizing Federal conservation activities on a Statewide rather than a regional basis is a victory for the propaganda which represents issues as a conflict between local interests and Washington—when in fact they are conflicts between one local interest and all the others; that is, between a special interest and the public interest. In every aspect of conservation this kind of local control must inevitably mean local vulnerability, local manipulation, and local intimidation.

All research in the Department of Agriculture except that of the Forest Service has been grouped under one bureau. In some respects the results have been of no particular importance, in some others they have reduced expense and increased efficiency. But also in some instances they have reduced efficiency and increased expense. It seems likely that the eye of the management-improver is on Forest Service research, and that his table of organization calls for transferring it to the central bureau. To do so would be a truly stupendous blunder. Forest Service research created scientific forestry in the United States and is now the foremost in the world. It is so organically related to the field activities and daily jobs of the Forest Service that it could be dissected out only at the cost of permanent damage. The damage done would increase geometrically in the future.

And one wonders. The Forest Service, always the cornerstone of our national conservation policy, is the most vigorous of the conservation bureaus. That is precisely what is wrong with it in the eyes of the landgrabbers, the cowboys, the United States Chamber of Commerce, and its other organized enemies. It is threefold: it consists of the national forests, its agencies which assist and supervise and cooperate with State forestry and private forestry, and its research programs and experiment stations. The effort by the Bureau of the Budget to abolish two of its cooperative programs suggests an intention eventually to amputate one full third of the Service. Removing its research to another bureau would also lop off a third. Reduced by two-thirds, it would be weak, ineffective, easily preyed upon, immensely less valuable to the American future. Is that the end in view? At any rate, in their most arrogant moments the landgrabbers never dreamed up so promising a way to make it impotent.

ARRIVAL OF THE BUZZARDS

In a year and a half the businessmen in office have reversed the conservation policy by which the United States has been working for more than 70 years to substitute wise use of its natural resources in place of reckless destruction for the profit of special corporate interests. They have reversed most of the policy, weakened all of it, opened the way to complete destruction. Every move in regard to conservation that the administration has made has been against the public interest—which is to say against the future—and in favor of some special private interest. Most notably, too, every one has been in favor of some big special interest and against the local small ones. The friendly partnership with business has turned out to mean only some kinds of businesses, the bigger the better.

More important still is the appointment of officials friendly to the enemies of the public interest, for this is preparation for the future. Judicious selection of a Director could doom TVA, for instance, and no doubt will. The utilities plan to "get the Government out of the power business altogether," with all that that implies in destruction of resources and exploitation of consumers. Many other corporate plans look to getting hold of publicly owned resources and converting them to dividends. Under Secretary of the Interior Tudor has announced that his legal staff is rewriting contracts for the water from Federal dams in such a way that the 160-acre limitation can be "bypassed"—which means that the Government will connive at breaking the fundamental reclamation laws. Assistant Secretary Lewis has said that he looks forward to the time when there need be no Federal forestry. Their chief, Secretary McKay, has repeatedly said that he favors the disposal to private hands of various classes of public lands.

We called it corruption in Harding's time. It is not corruption when it is administration policy. But it does show an intent, or perhaps only a willingness, to turn the clock back beyond Hoover, beyond the first Roosevelt, to the old Stone Age of Republican domination by those to whom the infinite wisdom of providence had entrusted the property interests of the country. Meanwhile the future of the United States is caught between the inexorable millstones. Population pressure steadily increases. The rivers fill with silt, the water table drops, the rains run off as floods. In the West, booms end because there is neither enough water nor enough electricity. The West, too, has had 4 years of drought, parts of it 5 years. Two Dust Bowls have formed: "The best place to get a Colorado farm is eastern Kansas." And the best place to get anything else you may want is the Department of the Interior.

Indirect damage, such as the sacrifice of professionalism in the public service is manifest. But consider something else. If, for instance, the Central Valley project should be sold to California, doubtless Mr. Hoover's evaluators could work out a price. (California utilities and the Department of the Interior cooperating.) What would be entirely beyond computation is the loss to the public in past investment, future waste, and future expense. Similarly with every other aspect of conservation—erosion control, flood control, watershed management, forestry, range improvement. Whatever is lost or weakened now will mean pyramiding loss in the future.

For it is the nature of the problems of land and water that damage done to either is cumulative. And it is also their nature, as the entire American experience has shown, that they can be grappled with effectively only by Federal action.

Soil-conservation districts, REA cooperatives, conservation organizations, browned-out areas of power consumers, towns, and counties apprehensive about dust and drought—here are a lot of voters. One obvious giveaway is the presentation to the Democratic Party of a shining issue for 1954 and 1956. And if schedule C proved to be a fine means for a quick cleanup in top admintrative offices, it will remain one after the elections.

In the early fall of 1953 Washington birdwatchers reported a phenomenon which their amiable hobby could not explain. The number of turkey buzzards resident in and near the city had increased remarkably. The buzzard population continued to grow through the winter and the following spring. By now it has created a sizable problem at feeding time at the zoo.

Premier Alcide de Gasperi

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. BARRETT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 19, 1954

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I have heard with profound sorrow and deep regret the announcement of the death of ex-Premier Alcide de Gasperi of Italy. His country and the world have been bereft of a great man. The passing of Alcide de Gasperi is a great loss to Italy, Europe and all freedom-loving, democratic peoples of the world.

It is a serious blow we have to suffer, particularly on the eve of the conference on a European Defense Community, for which Mr. de Gasperi fought almost to the hour of his death. It is indeed unfortunate that Western Europe has been robbed of one of the stanchest supporters of the cause of European unity.

The free world has lost one of its most outstanding and able statesmen. Mr. de Gasperi led Italy from fascism through a Communist-inspired crisis to becoming one of the most politically stable countries in Western Europe. He is primarily responsible for bringing Italy in 1949 into the North Atlantic Alliance against Communist aggression, and was a two-fisted foe against the growing menace of communism. Even in early life he showed a keen interest in Italy's welfare and future, and his entire adult life was devoted to the idea of a democratic Italy.

A great leader has gone from the midst of the democratic Western World. Alcide de Gasperi has well filled a place in the record of the future of the world. His foresight and wisdom are further indicated by his choice and support of Mario Scelba to succeed him as leader of his beloved country. May Premier Scelba be blessed with a similar long and distinguished career of service to his country and the entire free world.

Pakistan, Iran, Turkey: New Frontiers for Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 12, 1954

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I enclose a most informative article regarding one of the 3 or 4 most crucial frontiers in the world. The United States welcomes the clear-headed and courageous action of the Pakistan Government in allying itself openly with the free world and offering to contribute its full strength to the common defense against the common enemy—Communist imperialism. The United States Government must be equally clear-headed and courageous in implementing the new agreement promptly and effectively.

The article is by the veteran observer and student of world affairs, Edgar Ansel Mowrer and appears in Colliers of June 25, 1954:

NEW FRONTIER FOR FREEDOM

(By Edgar Ansel Mowrer)

Secretary of State John Foster Dulles rose from his desk in the State Department, Washington, and walked over to an illuminated globe in a corner of the office. "What would you think," he asked me, "if the free world's Middle East defense were organized right up on the Soviet border?" He drew his finger from Turkey across Iran and Afghanistan to Pakistan.

"Would the countries involved like it?" I asked.

"That remains to be seen," the Secretary said.

My interview with Dulles took place last September. Four months later Turkey had—withour blessing—offered Pakistan a treaty of friendship and cooperation in the political, economic, cultural and defense fields, and the United States had agreed to add Pakistan to the long list of countries to which we are supplying arms for defense against aggression.

In April, we also concluded a military-aid agreement with Iraq. We have had a similar agreement with Iran since 1949, and there is reason to believe that Afghanistan would like to get American weapons, too. Thus the first steps have been taken toward forging what Dulles envisioned that September afternoon—a defense line on the Soviet Union's southern approaches.

The whole Middle East is excited over the Dulles line—as I discovered on a tour of the colorful area. But before taking up what I saw and heard, let's consider for a moment how much the new pacts will mean to our own future.

The most important step of all was the bringing of Pakistan into the Western camp. While the United States agreed only to arm Pakistan, the Turkish-Pakistan mutual-defense pact makes her a partner of our stanch ally, Turkey. Should the Soviet Union attack the United States or any other member of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, the rest of the signatories—including Turkey—are pledged to full support. Under the Turkish-Pakistan Pact, Pakistan would then be expected to go to Turkey's—and therefore our—assistance.

The Pakistan agreements could prove the free world's most important move since it went to war in Korea. They also mean a great extension of the former American policy of containment of communism. Indeed, the free world seems to have seized the initiative in the cold war and certainly has established another front from which to fight in case the cold war gets hot.

Other Middle East countries may line up behind Turkey and Pakistan in a defensive alliance. If and when they do, the free world will be able to seal the invasion routes around the Persian Gulf, protect or interdict the great oil fields of the area, defend the Suez Canal, deny the Indian Ocean to Soviet submarines, add perhaps 20 or more divisions to the forces of freedom, and give those forces airbases close to the Soviet's interior.

These goals are highly desirable regardless of what happens in Indochina and Korea. The Middle East is a major gap in the almost worldwide defense wall we have been gradually erecting against Communist aggression. Indochina and Korea lie far from this potential area of operations and cannot affect it; they are advance outposts of our Pacific chain of Far East bases. Given a few years, good fortune, and resolute leadership, the free world may close the Middle East gap and thus complete a global Monroe Doctrine warning the Communists: So far but no farther.

Dulles is providing the needed leadership in this first stage of building the Middle East wall. It was he who approved Pakistan as the key ally in the new setup, he who pushed through the arm-Pakistan program against powerful opposition, he who encouraged Turkey in her offer to Pakistan of a full military alliance.

Behind our decision to arm Pakistan raged one of the hottest, though virtually unpublicized, controversies in Washington in recent years. While the subject was still under consideration India protested against any arming of her subcontinental rival. Paul Hoffman, original head of the Economic Cooperation Administration (ECA), called on President Eisenhower to voice his disapproval; he said he agreed with Chester Bowles, former Ambassador to India, that such action would only heighten tension between India and Pakistan and might cause us to lose India altogether. There was even opposition within the State Department, where some officials feared that arming Pakistan might drive India into communism.

On the other hand, Republican leader Senator WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND, of California, who had recently toured the Middle East, thought the new plan might well become "Secretary Dulles' master stroke in geopolitics."

On December 28, 1953, President Eisenhower gave final approval to the arms-for-Pakistan program. Three weeks later I left on assignment from Collier's for Pakistan, India, Afghanistan, Iran, Iraq, and Turkey. I wanted to find the answers, if possible, to such questions as:

What kind of ally will Pakistan make? What new risks have we assumed? What is the outlook for bringing Iran firmly into the defensive alliance to close the gap of nearly 1,200 miles between Turkey and Pakistan? What is the attitude of Iraq, of Afghanistan?

On my arrival at Karachi, capital of Pakistan, I found a remarkable change had occurred since my last visit 3 years before. The people had transformed the former sleepy garrison town of less than 300,000 inhabitants into a going capital of 1,500,000 population. The overhead roar of international airliners and the horns of motorcars and buses mingled with the shouts of farmers to their overloaded donkeys, the squawking of bicycle rickshas and cyclists, and the tinkling of bells attached to the knees of camels.

MANY FEARED FOR PAKISTAN'S SURVIVAL

When Pakistan became an independent dominion within the British Commonwealth of Nations in 1947, even some of its friends predicted it would not survive. They asked how 75 million people, divided into 2 widely separated mountainous areas with unfriendly Indian territory between, lacking many natural resources and with almost no well-developed industry, could hope to establish and maintain economic and political stability in a total area about one-eighth the size of the United States. West Pakistan borders on Iran, Afghanistan and India, missing contact with Russia by only a few miles. East Pakistan is bordered by India, the Bay of Bengal and Burma.

Despite these heavy handicaps, I found, the people of Pakistan are determined to remain united and to remain free. By will and by work they are creating a Moslem state to preserve the Moslem way of life.

Pakistan's desire for an alliance with the United States stems from the firmest of foundations—calculated and legitimate self-interest. Its prime minister, Mohammed Ali, was formerly ambassador to Washington and saw for himself what Western life is like. But the alliance will be no one-way road. Pakistan is prepared to carry its share of the burden, both economically and militarily.

"Don't underestimate our stability," Mumtaz Hasan, Secretary for the Ministry of Finance, told me. "We haven't much money, but we grow enough to feed our people—barring another bad drought like last year when you pulled us out with a gift of wheat. So long as the world needs jute and cotton, Pakistan can be self-supporting."

Pakistan's sense of unity with the Western nations in foreign affairs is strengthened by the possibility that Red China someday might move against East Pakistan. If so, the Karachi Government would defend its eastern provinces with all its strength. A strong Pakistan thus will be a deterrent to any move by Red China into the subcontinent.

The Pakistan people have an indomitable spirit, a fine military tradition, and a remarkable interest in world affairs, derived in part from long association with the British. I first noticed these qualities while talking at Karachi with Iskander Mirza, a former officer, now permanent Defense Secretary. Mirza, a man of action (he loves to hunt), welcomed me in English accents.

When I asked him what he thinks of foreign protests against American arms for Pakistan, he snorted: "Let them scream their heads off. As Pakistan becomes stronger, they will become friendly enough." Then he told me, "Go where you like, see what you like, and talk to whom you like."

Armed with this carte blanche, I saw a good deal of the Pakistan Army. I visited Chief of Staff General Nasir Ali in his house at army headquarters in Rawalpindi. I stayed at Peshawar with Divisional Commander Haq Nawaz, a devout man who discusses religious philosophy and military strategy with equal ease. I went to the races at Lahore with Maj. Gen. Azam Khan. I spent hours in discussions with younger officers. And I visited the school for recruits at Rawalpindi.

Nearly all the high command, I found, were trained in English military schools and had led troops in World War II against the Germans or Japanese. To the Pakistanis, the military is the finest of all professions. Voluntary service is often for as long as 30 years—and hereditary. In three separate companies where I lunched, the fathers of three-fourths of the rookies had served with the colors. In many villages the prettiest girls scorn suitors out of uniform.

Pakistan's Army, Navy, and Air Force consist entirely of volunteers. All three services can get as many recruits as they can pay. These are the people of the famous Khyber Rifles, the Pathan Regiment, the Baluchi Regiment, the Punjabis. Kipling's Gunga Din was from what is now Pakistan.

Pakistan leaders told me they hope to raise their army from its present strength of 8 divisions and assorted special battalions to 20 peacetime and 30 wartime divisions of 15,000 men each. In terms of manpower, 225,000 men are now in the armed forces and there is a pool of a million men with military training. The eventual size of the Pakistan Army will depend largely on the amount of equipment supplied by the United States. The extent and kind of military aid we will provide is now being studied by a survey commission.

FOREIGN MINISTER OPPOSES NEUTRALITY

India's Prime Minister, Jawaharlal Nehru, talks earnestly of the good that might flow from maintaining a policy of neutrality in the world struggle between communism and freedom, but the martial Pakistanis take a different view. Bearded and pious Foreign Minister Zafrullah Khan told me, "Neutrality offers no safety for us. Our sympathies are with the West and we prefer to carry our share from the beginning."

Prime Minister Mohammed Ali, a heavily built, smiling Bengali, went further. "We consider the dangers involved in becoming your ally," he explained, "smaller than those of remaining aloof and seeing the free nations go under one by one."

General Ayub Khan, Pakistan commander in chief, clinched the argument. "We are prepared to be your friends," he said. "But we will fight communism whether you are our friends or not."

At Karachi, Maj. Gen. Mohammed Musa, deputy chief of staff, gave me the picture as the Pakistanis see it:

"Communism's four military objectives in this part of the world are the Suez Canal Zone, the great Persian Gulf oil area, Pakistan's airfields, notably at Dalbandin, Pishin, and Quetta, and Pakistan's port of Karachi. As things stand, we could not prevent Soviet occupation of the first two, though we could make it costly. With sufficient arms, Pakistan alone can preserve its airfields for the wartime use of American planes and prevent Karachi from becoming a Soviet submarine base."

Wartime airfields closer to the new Soviet industrial centers beyond the Urals are considered immensely valuable by high allied officers whom I consulted—General Gruenther, NATO commander; Gen. Paul Ely, French chief of staff; and Greece's premier, Field Marshal Alexander Papagos.

The map tells why. To Omsk in Siberia from our Morroccan fields is about 4,000 miles; from Okinawa, more than 3,200 miles; from Libya, 3,000 miles; from Foggia in Italy, about 2,700 miles; from Ankara in Turkey, something over 2,100 miles. But from Quetta (or Pishin) in Pakistan, Omsk is only 1,700 miles. What a spot for a refueling station or a fighter base to support our bombers on their way to or returning from Siberian targets should war be forced upon us.

Yet—even with Turkey's assistance—Pakistan could not (as General Musa admitted) prevent Communist land forces from advancing south and occupying the great Irani or Iraqi oil fields or the Suez Canal Zone. The oil fields and the Canal Zone can be defended by weaker forces against land attack from the north on only one line: the Zagros Mountains, which range northwest to southeast through Iran to Pakistan, with peaks as high as our Rockies. Just three major passes lead through the Zagros into Irag and the same number to the head of the Persian Gulf.

Farther east, access to the warm salt water of the Arabian Sea lies across a 900-mile-wide stretch of desert. Properly defended by a coalition of Turks, Iraqis, Iranians, and Pakistanis, with Anglo-American air support, this mountain-and-desert line might be held against a multitude. And holding it would be even easier if Afghanistan would permit Pakistan forces to advance north to the Hindu Kush mountain range, just south of the Afghanistan-Soviet border.

What chance have the United States, Pakistan, and Turkey of forming such a Middle East coalition and bridging the gap? What prospects are there that Afghanistan will permit Pakistan forces to move across the border?

OVER MOUNTAINS AND DESERT TO KABUL

The answers lay to the west of Pakistan. I headed first toward Afghanistan. The country lies between Pakistan and the Soviet Union and at present forms a neutral buffer between the Communist and anti-Communist camps. Because no pilot cared to land a plane on the ice-covered dirt field at Kabul, the Afghan capital, I hired a chauffeur-driven car and set out from Peshawar. The unheated, 1949 model American car first threaded the 28-mile-long Khyber Pass until the pavement ended at the Afghan frontier. Then we crossed a desert, ascended a steep, narrow gorge, climbed painfully over a 7,000-foot snow-blown mountain range and came down soon after dark into frozen Kabul (pronounced cobble). We had traveled 180 miles in 12 hours.

On both sides of the frontier we continually met camels. These giant beasts are still an important means of transportation even in progressive Pakistan. Each winter tens of thousands of persons migrate from Afghanistan across the Khyber Pass into Pakistan and India in search of livelihood and return in the spring. We met many camels, and at each meeting it was the car, not the camel, that turned aside.

Afghanistan's 12 million inhabitants are almost untouched by communism—or democracy. Their Government is unusual. Until recently, the King and most high state officials were members of a single branch of a single family—the Duranis. Afghans call their country a "democratic constitutional monarchy."

Keeping such a kingdom independent is no small diplomatic feat. Of the 120,000 conscripted soldiers, 70,000 are used for police duty. The remainder lack even simple equipment. Appeasing the mighty Soviet Union seems—at present—a necessity. But Indian loans are welcome, and the Afghans, with a minimum of publicity, are appealing to the United States for as much aid as possible. The United States Export-Import Bank already has advanced the country $39,500,000 for economic projects, and the Afghans also would like to get some modern weapons.

I came away convinced that the Afghan rulers, although anti-Communist, are conscious of their country's weakness and exposed position and will not open their borders to Pakistan troops or join the West until they feel that the United States is willing and able to defend them under all circumstances—a difficult task. There is no official confirmation of recent reports that the Afghans have suggested or are considering federation with Pakistan. On the contrary, the story has been officially denied.

Iraq was the next country I visited. Officials in Washington and Karachi had said Iraq's adherence to the Turkish-Pakistan pact was eminently desirable—partly because Iraq lies just west of the Zagros Mountains, partly because the Iraqis are Arabs and their adherence might eventually bring other Arab states into the alliance.

In the legendary city of Bagdad, I interviewed the then Prime Minister of Iraq, Dr. Mohammed Fadhil al-Jamali, in his European-type house. Dr. Jamali and his cabinet later resigned over a domestic political issue, but his successor, Arshad al-Umari, continued the existing foreign policies.

Talks initiated by the Jamali government resulted in an agreement in April whereby the United States will furnish military aid to Iraq in return for that country's promise to defend itself against aggression.

"But joining a military alliance with Turkey and Pakistan is something different," Dr. Jamali told me. "It might cause misunderstanding among our friends of the Arab League. Also we should have to consult our ally, Great Britain, before answering any such invitation."

My visits and interviews in Afghanistan and in Iraq gave me no firm conviction that either country would come quickly into the Dulles line for Middle East defense, though of the two we seem to have a better chance to win over Iraq. However—and this is somehow encouraging—while both are highly desirable as allies, neither is absolutely necessary at the moment. The one essential country—in addition to Turkey and Pakistan—is Iran. If Iran is missing as a strong member of the alliance, a door comprising some 900 miles of common frontier with Soviet Russia will be left open.

Failure to close this door will not blot out all we gain by having Pakistan as an ally, but it surely would leave the non-Communist Middle East and the free world dangerously and unnecessarily vulnerable. The door can be closed by building Iran as a strong link in the defense line. Iranians with whom I talked stated openly that the United States must put up the money needed.

Iran is not only exposed externally, but is fearfully weak internally. Few Americans realize how close Iran came to communism in August 1953. Our Ambassador, Loy W. Henderson, believes that had the Iranian people waited 48 hours longer to throw out weeping Prime Minister Mohammed Mossadegh and recall the exiled Shah, the Tudeh (Communist) Party would have seized control of the nation and made it another Soviet satellite.

Many observers told me that Iran still could lurch downward through nationalism into communism—or could rise to become a stable nation capable of considerable self-defense against its northern neighbor. They believe that the course Iran follows depends largely on the amount of American aid it receives—and how well that aid is utilized.

Iran has been getting some military aid from the United States for several years. Brig. Gen. Robert A. McClure, head of the United States military mission training the Iranian Army, considers the soldiers first-rate material and the officers, many of them French-trained, quick to learn. In a couple of years, the Iranian Army could—if it gets enough United States help—fill its part of the gap between the Turks and Pakistanis. But first the nation must get back on its feet economically.

AN INTERVIEW WITH THE SHAH OF IRAN

The Shah, Mohammed Riza Pahlevi, frankly discussed Iran's dire economic plight and need for American aid when he received me at a mountain-top hotel outside Teheran. He entered the room without ceremony, dressed for skiing. A handsome man of 34 who speaks excellent English, he waved me to a seat beside him on a sofa and began to talk.

"Iran is a ruin," he said. "First military occupation, then rule by Mossadegh have left us with a shattered economy. We urgently need more money to pay our civil servants, our police, and our army. We need funds to increase our productivity by more irrigation, to repair our railroads, and main roads, to transform our army from an internal police to a national defense force.

"Until we have repaired the damage of recent years, our people would never understand any discussion of common defense with Turks or Pakistanis. Our present job—I repeat—is rehabilitating our country.

"In 1949," the Shah continued, "I visited Washington and asked for American economic help. Had I got it, Iran would never, I feel sure, have come so close to utter ruin and communism. Now you are helping us.

"It is up to you to decide whether you wish to tide us over until our oil revenues fill the gap. You have given Turkey a billion and a half dollars. Iran could be equally important."

The new Prime Minister, Gen. Fazollah Zahedi, the man who arrested Mossadegh and put down the combined Communist and fanatical nationalist conspiracy just in time, also talked eloquently of economic aid from the United States, but did not answer my questions about common defense.

This situation seems to leave the problem of total Middle East defense very largely in the lap of the Shah. Foreigners insist that only he can give the popular backing to make the vital decisions, some of them unpopular, necessary to stabilize and strengthen his country. Moreover, he still must prove that he can rule Iran. The Shah is liked as an affable, well-meaning young man, but in the past he has been indecisive.

From these countries of more or less uncertainty, I moved next to Turkey, where there is no doubt of national sympathies and capabilities.

The most striking characteristic of new Turkey is determination. Modern Turks have decided that their country (a tenth the size of the United States and with only 22 million people) is to be a great nation—and they are well on their way to making it so.

Greatness requires that the Turks maintain an army larger than they can afford—at present, 19 divisions, 13,000 men to a division. They acquired the means to support such forces by becoming an ally of the United States and entering NATO. Since 1947, United States taxpayers have invested about a billion and a half dollars in Turkey.

IN THE SHADOW OF THE SOVIET MENACE

To deserve this money, the Turkish Republic for almost 3 years stood at the end of the NATO line, exposed to the threatening might of the Soviet Union to the north and northeast and with only the political soft spots of Iran and the Arab countries to the east and south. But the Turks are not a timid people. Some two-thirds of the Turkish soldiers invalided home from Korea or released after a term of service volunteered to go back.

Former President Ismet Inonu, old, deaf, and wonderfully brash, confided to me at his Ankara home: "Our next task must be raising the morale of our European allies to the level of America and Turkey."

The Turks are modeling their army on American lines. They are committed to partnership. President Celal Bayar, returning home from his visit to the United States, told his countrymen, "The Americans like us and have confidence in us just as we like them and rely upon them." Prime Minister Adnan Memderes and opposition leader Kasim Gulek both made the same remarks: "Never forget that no matter how sharp our internal political struggles, they will not change Turkey's will to be a close friend of the United States."

All this helps explain why Turkey, once it was sure of American approval, took the initiative in starting the mountain-and-desert wall across southern Asia. Its first choice of an ally in the area was Pakistan. An army captain who showed me around Ankara remarked: "If we can get a few more such friends, we may avoid world war III."

Today Turkey—no longer end man, but key man—has become a sort of universal joint linking three defense groups: the 14-nation NATO, the Ankara Alliance (Turkey, Greece, and Yugoslavia), and the Turkish-Pakistani partnership, whose further development is Turkey's chief diplomatic task in the days ahead.

Pakistan's rejection of neutrality has dispelled a nightmare of certain United States ambassadors (names withheld on request)—that India might succeed in creating a vast neutral belt from Indonesia to Egypt. Any neutral belt, they think, inevitably helps the Communists.

But India's Nehru has not abandoned his impracticable dream, as I learned when I called on him in New Delhi. "By arming Pakistan," he told me, "you are involving a whole area that needs peace and economic improvement in a political dispute and perhaps in a new war. I do not see what you expect to get out of it."

"Another deterrent to a possible Soviet attack."

"Local forces are no deterrent. The only real deterrent is Russia's fear of war with America," he declared.

"That fear failed to prevent the Communist attack in Korea," I countered.

"That was another matter. Now you will drive awakening young Asians into the Communist camp by seeming to seek Asian man power to fight your battles. If you really want peace, you should cease talking of alliances, armament, and war. You should think peace, talk peace, and act peace."

"Mr. Prime Minister," I broke in, "are you trying to stop armed aggression by incantation?"

TALK OF WAR AND A-BOMBS CRITICIZED

Nehru's handsome face grew darker. "No and no. It is your Mr. Dulles who is using incantations—always talking of war and A-bombs."

"I think Mr. Dulles wants peace as much as you do."

"Then he is on the wrong track," Nehru retorted. At the door the Prime Minister said good-by and added: "Always remember, we must have peace at almost any price." And he was gone.

Some Americans and others argue that in arming Pakistan we are losing India. The truth is we never had India to lose, and United States officials in Asia expect no very serious reaction to the Pakistan agreements. Some even say that if the United States continues to offer arms to India for the same anti-Communist purpose as to Pakistan, India someday may decide to accept them and join the armed freedom front.

Informed Americans in the Middle East will give you a guess that the cost of building the Dulles line of defense will be a billion dollars over the next few years, but they agree that it is worth building. Back home I found no money estimates available from officials, but Vice President Nixon told me he considers the move "a necessary step in resisting Communist penetration."

Admiral Arthur W. Radford, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, goes still further. In his office at the Pentagon, he said: "Our decision to bolster the Middle East was essential. If we had done nothing, the Soviets were almost sure to move into the area. They have had their eyes on it for a long time."

Every successful move we have made over the last 7 years—whether helping Greece or Turkey, breaking the Berlin blockade, operating the Marshall plan, promoting NATO, or intervening to save the Republic of Korea—has entailed the danger of major war.

This danger is perhaps what Secretary Dulles had in mind when he said:

"Sometimes it is necessary to take risks to win peace just as it is necessary in war to take risks to win victory."

Your Congressman Reports to You

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SIDNEY R. YATES

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 19, 1954

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I was elected to the United States House of Representatives in 1948. During the 6 years I have served in Congress I have attempted to maintain close communication with the people of my district by reporting each week on my activities and on the actions taken by the Congress. I have done this for two reasons: first, because I believe that those who have honored me by selecting me as their representative are entitled to know the manner in which I have acted on their behalf; second, because I believe that in this American democracy of ours, politics is the business of all citizens and it is important that they know what is happening in the Congress.

The 83d Congress is drawing to a close. I think it is well to review some of its most important activities, and accordingly, I am presenting copies of the letters which I wrote on important subjects during the session:

PROMOTION OF CAPT. HYMAN G. RICKOVER

(Newsletter No. 124)

FEBRUARY 14, 1953.

Since I wrote to you a few weeks ago respecting the case of Capt. Hyman George Rickover, I went into the matter much more thoroughly and was even more appalled by the action of the admirals in having passed over him for promotion. Not only is he the acknowledged authority in the Navy on the application of atomic power to the propulsion of naval vessels, but during World War II, he helped perfect so many electrical devices that it is said a four-star admiral put the following note in Rickover's service file. "This man has done more for the Navy from an engineering point of view than any other officer."

On Thursday I made a speech branding the action of the admirals as a shocking example of military waste and profligacy. By any reasonable standards that the admirals wanted to use, Rickover should have been promoted, but because of the secrecy surrounding the proceedings of naval selection boards, nobody knows what happened. "For all we know," I said, "for all even the Commander in Chief of the Navy, the President of the United States knows, the standards for promotion employed by the selection board may be those recommended by Adm. Joseph Porter in Gilbert and Sullivan's Pinafore when he sings:

"I polished up that handle so carefulee
That now I am the ruler of the Queen's
Navee."

And—

"I thought so little they rewarded me
By making me the ruler of the Queen's
Navee."

Maybe it was an admiral's stepped-on toe with a long memory that deprived the Navy of Rickover's services; or perhaps it was "convoy mentality." This was a phrase I used to show the admirals' refusal to permit any nonconformity. Under the rules of the wartime convoy system, no matter how fast a ship was capable of traveling, as long as it was part of the convoy it was compelled to reduce speed to equal that of the convoy's slowest member. "Apparently," I said, "the admirals have transferred that rule of the convoy to the field of officer selection."

In my opinion, the Rickover case is important because we are in a new age, an atomic age, an age of new weapons and it is necessary that we recognize by promotion to top echelons officers who are scientists, as well as fighting men. President Eisenhower recognized this in his book, Crusade in Europe, when he wrote:

"Indeed one of the most important characteristics of the successful officer today is his ability to continue changing his methods, almost even his mental processes, in order to keep abreast of the constant change that modern science, working under the compelling urge of national self-preservation, brings to the battlefield."

I suggested to the House that (1) naval selection boards which pass upon the promotions of engineering officers to admiral be made up of three civilians selected by the President from among the outstanding scientists and engineers in the country in addition to the admirals; (2) to eliminate complete secrecy by requiring that a stenographic record be made of the entire proceedings of the board, with copies forwarded to the President of the United States, the Secretaries of Navy and Defense, and to the chairman of the Armed Services Committee of the Senate. In the event of disagreement in the selection of the officers, such disagreement could be noted and attached to the stenographic report by minority members; (3) the President to have the power to substitute those approved by the minority in place of those approved by the majority if he so desires, rather than being restricted as he is now to vetoing the proceedings of the board and reconvening it.

(Newsletter No. 127)

MARCH 14, 1953.

Congressman DEMPSEY of New Mexico appeared to be completely serious at lunch last week as he proposed petitioning the Atomic Energy Commission to postpone the explosion of the atomic bomb scheduled for March 17. "For the last couple of centuries," he said, "the Irish have had St. Patrick's day for their very own. It is the one day of the year when we make all the noise. Now the Atomic Energy Commission comes along and outdoes us with their bomb. It's an outrage."

In my last newsletter to you I wrote "next week should write the ending—happy or unhappy—to the Rickover story." This week the ending was written—a favorable ending which came quite suddenly and unexpectedly. On March 5, I testified before the Senate Armed Services Committee. Four days later Senator Saltonstall, chairman of the committee, made public a letter dated March 6, which he had received from Secretary of the Navy Anderson, in which the Secretary stated that he was going to convene two selection boards. One board would meet for the purpose of recommending for retention for another year, engineering duty captains who were due to retire this June, including one who would be experienced and qualified in the field of atomic propulsive machinery. This is Rickover's special field. The second selection board to which the Secretary referred would be convened in July for the purpose of selecting captains for promotion to rear admiral, one of whom would be required to be an engineering duty captain experienced and qualified in the field of atomic propulsive machinery. There is no doubt that the Secretary's language is directed specifically toward rectifying the injustice done to Rickover and practically assures his promotion.

The action proposed by the Secretary is unprecedented in the long history of the Navy. Never before has the Navy taken the unheard-of step of reviewing the case of a captain twice passed over for promotion to rear admiral. It marks the end of an intensive engagement which started on January 22 when I took the floor to bring the Rickover case to the attention of the Congress. At that time, few conceded any hope for a favorable conclusion, and I myself stated that the odds were 99 to 1 against Rickover. Yet, I believed the Navy was so wrong that the fight must be made. On January 26 I sent copies of my speech to President Eisenhower and Senator Saltonstall in order that they might be made aware of the situation. On February 12 I again made a speech to the House, this time for an hour, in which I requested the Senate Armed Services Committee to withhold confirmation of the officers recommended for appointment by the selection board until the committee had an opportunity to assure itself that the Navy's atomic vessels program project would not be jeopardized by Rickover's retirement. I sent copies of the speech to President Eisenhower, to Senator Saltonstall and to all members of the Senate Armed Services Committee. On February 18, when the new story broke that Time magazine and Michael Amrine, of the North American Newspaper Alliance, declared that their stories on the atomic submarine had been held up by the Navy, one for 67 days and the other for 15 days, I again took the floor to protest against the Navy's censorship of Rickover's part in the development of the atomic sub. On March 2 I addressed the House again, this time for an hour and a half, on the necessity for the prompt and successful completion of the atomic vessels project to national security and urging Rickover's retention as head of the program in order that it continue to move forward unimpeded. On that day, too, I gained an ally in the fight when Senator Jackson, of Washington, who had been a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, agreed to join with me in testifying before the Senate Armed Services Committee which had decided to defer confirmation of all promotions to admiral until it could check the Rickover case. On March 5, I testified before the committee for more than an hour. The Secretary's letter was revealed on March 9.

This is the log of the engagement. From Senator John C. Stennis, of Mississippi, whom I had never met before testifying before the Armed Services Committee, I received the following letter this week:

"Dear Representative Yates: Again I want to congratulate you most heartily on your splendid presentation of the Rickover matter to our committee. Also I want to congratulate you on the results obtained, which seem to me to be a splendid solution for the time being, and this is about as far as Secretary Anderson could have gone."

Let's call the Senator's more-than-generous commendation a ribbon for the Rickover campaign.

Sincerely yours,

Sidney R. Yates,
Member of Congress.

Tidelands Giveaway

(Newsletter No. 130)

April 4, 1953.

The tidelands bill is like a hardy biennial plant. It raises its oily head every 2 years with each new Congress. In previous years when it was approved by the House and the Senate, President Truman cut it down with his veto, and its supporters could never rally enough strength to revive it and override the President. But this year, with the indication by President Eisenhower that he will approve the legislation, the bill promises to attain full flower and to bear fruit for the coastal States.

Since the first decision in 1947 of the United States Supreme Court, holding that the Federal Government has a paramount right to the submerged lands immediately seaward of the low-water shoreline, and to their oil deposits, representatives of Texas, Louisiana, and California have led a drive for a bill to change the law by conveying the Federal Government's interest to the States. It is understandable that these representatives should press for legislation so beneficial to their States. It is not so understandable, however, that the President of the United States, representing the people of all 48 States, should favor legislation which conveys the property belonging to the people of all 48 States, to the people of only 3. It is equally difficult to understand why every Republican Member of the House from Illinois, excepting only Congressman McVey, should vote for the bill when it passed the House last week. The effect of their vote was to approve the relinquishment of the proprietary rights of their Illinois constituents in the submerged oil resources—some $50 billion worth at least—to the people of three coastal States. States' rights? What of the rights of the people of the State of Illinois?

Senator Hill has proposed that the oil resources be developed for the benefit of all the schoolchildren of the Nations. Others have urged that the oil deposits be conserved in the interests of national defense. Others have recommended that the oil wealth be exploited to substantially reduce our national debt. If the bill passes, as it undoubtedly will, these become only suggestions of what might have been.

During the debate on Monday and Tuesday, I made four speeches against the bill pointing out the many deceptions used by those who favor the bill to obtain its passage. The first was in calling the bill itself the "Tidelands bill" because the tidelands—the land lying between the high and low water marks on the shores of the ocean—were not even involved in the legislation. Everybody admits that the States own title to this strip of land and to inland waters such as rivers, lakes, and bays. Confusion began when proponents of the bill began to designate the submerged lands lying seaward 3 miles from the low-water mark as tidelands in order to identify such lands as State owned because of the name. "This is no tidelands bill," I said. "This bill could with much more justice be called the tri-States misappropriation bill. It seeks to misappropriate the Nation's wealth for the benefit of Texas, Louisiana, and California. Talk about pouring oil on troubled waters—this bill will pour the oil wealth of 48 States into the tanks of only 3."

I pointed out two instances of the scare warfare used by the attorney general of Texas in an effort to win Illinois to Texas' side of the controversy. The first was a letter to the bankers financing Chicago's new filtration plant by raising questions as to the title to the land under Lake Michigan. Former Corporation Counsel Joseph F. Grossman described the effort for what it was: "* * * propaganda designed to free the States bordering upon the oceans and the Gulf of Mexico from interference by the United States in the exploitation of all resources under those waters." The second was a letter written by the same Attorney General of Texas to Senator Paul Douglas, stating that Douglas' position in opposition to the bill would destroy the title of Illinois to the land underlying Lake Michigan. A copy of the letter was read to Douglas in the Senate by a Senator from Florida. Douglas answered: "I thank the Senator for calling my attention to a letter which I have not yet received. The Senator seems to have more information about my correspondence than I possess."

Congressman Bender made a two-sentence speech during the debate: "Mr. Speaker, I think we decided this issue with the last election. Now let's vote." I believe Bender was wrong. Tidelands will still be an issue in the next election.

Sincerely yours,

Sidney R. Yates,
Member of Congress.

A Report to My District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STUYVESANT WAINWRIGHT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 16, 1954

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I feel that the people of my district should have a full report of my accomplishments for them in the Congress during the 2d session of the 83d Congress. Therefore, I submit the following:

A Congressman is an employee of the people. As your employee this is the second annual report. Government, which has grown enormously in recent years, should, I believe, be brought closer to the people. In order to help my neighbors, friends, and constituents have a greater understanding of the happenings in Washington, I have written a weekly column for the newspapers, engaged in weekly broadcasts, mailed out special legislative reports, and spoken at as many gatherings, of every description, as physically possible.

This session of the 83d Congress is over. I am proud to say that I had at least a small part in its accomplishments. But what are its accomplishments? It would be far too long a report, were one to list the hundreds of votes cast so I intend to touch on only eight of the many issues. All were part of the President's program and all were vigorously supported by me. In addition to this I shall report to you the supplemental work, done exclusively for your benefit locally.

On the national scene:

First. The Truman budget, fiscal 1954, was reduced 61 percent. Seven billion one hundred million dollars less than former President Truman predicted for this year, fiscal 1955.

Second. A tax bill was passed granting cut in income and excise taxes, amounting to $7.5 billion.

Third. The States were given title to and control of the submerged oil lands as opposed to Federal ownership and control.

Fourth. A flexible farm bill was passed.

Fifth. Economic controls were voted out the window; no depression has come as predicted by the prophets of doom and gloom, but, rather, the reverse is true—we have genuine prosperity.

Sixth. The St. Lawrence seaway program was enacted after 30 years of failure in prior Congresses.

Seventh. A new social-security bill was passed, giving coverage to 10 million additional people, as well as raising the amount of the individual benefits.

Eighth. The Congress enacted new stringent anti-Communist internal security laws, and the party itself was outlawed.

In addition to these specific measures, President Eisenhower fulfilled the special campaign pledge to take us out of war. For the very first time in 15 years our Nation is operating on a full peacetime economy—capacity employment exists, and jobs are safe—business is excellent.

As the President said several days ago:

> We have halted inflation. The purchasing power of the dollar has varied only one-half of 1 percent in the past 8 months.

Because of this one who is usually an arch opponent of the Republican Party, Columnist Doris Fleeson, had this to say several weeks ago:

> Democrats who a few months ago were supremely confident that they would romp home in the House and win narrow control in the Senate are today full of misgivings. They are banking on the economic recession and slipping farm prices. Now the administration's attitude of confidence in both areas has infected them. Eisenhower's spokesmen are not merely talking confidence; they are betting it.

These important national policies have had their direct effect on the people of Long Island, who are now more numerous and more prosperous than ever before. For example, I predict in the building field alone we will have greater expansion, hard as it may be to believe, than any prior time.

But what of the local and personal issues presented, supported and undertaken by your Congressman? The following 22 points outline the work accomplished for you on the local front:

First. Promised funds for the maintenance of Fire Island Inlet. The Department of the Army has scheduled an engineer dredge for the inlet by mid-September.

Second. Promised a fight to the end for the establishment on a permanent basis of the Kings Point Merchant Marine Academy in Nassau County. The bill passed the Merchant Marine Committee, of which I am a member, cleared the all-powerful Rules Committee, and then passed the House on July 30. The bill has been bottled up in the Senate.

Third. Obtained approval for the establishment of new post offices in the First Congressional District, as well as the installation of city delivery and the establishment of new R. F. D. routes in many towns and villages. This represents the first such effective changes in 10 years.

Fourth. Sponsored what became known as the Wainright bill (H. R. 8647). It passed the House on June 7, 1954, and the Senate on August 16, 1954. This measure stopped seizure of small craft by Customs when boat owners add safety features to their vessels at Coast Guard's request. This bill is part of a complete revision of all Coast Guard regulations to provide greater safety at sea.

Fifth. Obtained first class status for the Suffolk County Air Base at Westhampton, including a permanent housing program which passed the House on July 29, 1954.

Sixth. Reduced danger and firing hazard at Montauk Point from the United States Army AA battery stationed there. Public hearings on this subject were held at Montauk in the winter of 1954.

Seventh. Reviewed the Government's choice of Calverton as an airfield site. This investigation perpetuated a change in site checking methods by the Department of Defense.

Eighth. Halted runway extension construction at MacArthur Air Field in the Lake Ronkonkoma area based on the petition of local residents. Hearings indicated there would be no substantial benefit to national defense by this expensive construction program.

Ninth. Succeeded in having four private immigration bills passed by both Houses of Congress and signed by the President in behalf of Mrs. Nathalie Illine, of Halesite; Miss Dorothy Sonya Goldschmidt, of East Northport; Theodora Sammartino, adopted daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Vincent Sammartino, of Islip; Alexander Ptsche, the husband of Mrs. Frieda Petsche of Northport. The passage of these four bills makes it possible for these fine families, heretofore separated because of a technicality in the immigration laws to be reunited in these United States.

Tenth. Obtained special funds for golden nematode research. Interceded continually with Secretary of Agriculture so that potato farmers would be taken out of competition with subsidized farmers of the South and West using diverted acreage. Stopped Cuban embargo on Long Island potatoes.

Eleventh. Have been successful in obtaining visas for admission to the United States and in expediting issuance of passports for over 380 people.

Twelfth. Obtained 10 appointments to United States Military Academy, and the United States Naval Academy, and the United States Air Force Academy. This is the greatest number in the history of the First Congressional District.

Thirteenth. Made weekly reports to the people by radio and through the press. Many leaders in Government have been guests on my radio program. Members of the Cabinet and executive branch will write a number of my weekly articles in the months ahead.

Fourteenth. Obtained, by intercession with the Secretary of Interior and in conjunction with the New York State Conservation Commissioner, a separate wildfowl shooting season for Long Island. Local hunters have been striving for a Long Island season ever since the event of hunting laws.

Fifteenth. Insisted on special safety precautions for the Plum Island Animal Research Laboratory; conducted a safety inspection with the former Surgeon General of the United States Army and other qualified officials.

Sixteenth. Presented, with Congressman MARTIN DIES, of Texas, and Congressman CHARLES KERSTEN, of Wisconsin, an anti-Communist information series.

Seventeenth. Made 2 overseas missions for our Government; 1 to the Orient in 1953, and another as a congressional representative at the inauguration of the Governor of the Virgin Islands.

Eighteenth. Presented to the Suffolk County Board of Supervisors a historical American flag that flew from the dome of the Capitol on the day of the inauguration of Dwight D. Eisenhower as President of the United States.

Nineteenth. Sponsored a district-wide Americanism essay contest, offering as a prize a parchment copy of the new oath of allegiance, personally signed by President Eisenhower.

Twentieth. Met with the President of the United States and the Prime Minister of Great Britain, Sir Winston Churchill, at the White House on Friday, June 25, 1954.

Twenty-first. Polled, at my own expense, the voters of the First District in order to obtain their views on the great issues of the day. Only by report such as this, of administration and individual action, may the people exercise intelligently their previous vote.

Twenty-second. Worked in conjunction with the Suffolk and Nassau officials on the rehabilitation program for the Long Island Railroad.

My office in Washington, D. C., will remain open, in competent hands, for the use of those having problems in the Capital. Also, I shall have an office in Huntington and Wainscott, Long Island, where I can be reached by those wishing to see me on any matter. It has been a pleasure to serve you, and it is certain that you as my employer are entitled to pass judgment on these activities.

Alcide de Gasperi: Soldier, Statesman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 19, 1954

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, the unexpected and untimely death of the former premier of Italy, Mr. Alcide de Gasperi is a great loss to the free world. Particularly will he be missed at this time when EDC appears to be in dire need of leaders of his stature. He was one of Europe's stanchest supporters of European unity and a key exponent of EDC.

Mr. de Gasperi led Italy from fascism through the Communist crisis and out of postwar chaos to a democratic pattern of government. His coalition government has nurtured the cooperation developed between Italy and the free world. He was a bitter foe of the Communists and has worked unceasingly in the battle against the Communist and neo-Fascist factions in his land. His untiring efforts have laid a foundation upon which the future of Italy is most promising.

In the passing of Mr. Alcide de Gasperi the United States has lost a proven friend, the free world a leading spokesman, and his beloved country an outstanding statesman.

May the good Lord grant him eternal rest.

Your Congressman Reports to You

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SIDNEY R. YATES

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 19, 1954

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I present copies of several newsletters I have sent to my constituents during the 83d Congress:

HOUSING

(Newsletter No. 141)

JULY 29, 1953.

It is becoming increasingly apparent that only a disagreement on the conference report on an important bill will prevent an adjournment by August 1. As quitting time nears, the Members are not disposed to recommit any of the conference reports, because they know that a stubborn group of conferees can keep Congress in session indefinitely. However, when the independent offices appropriations conference report came back to the floor last week, I made the fight to send it back to conference because the conferees had undertaken the destruction of the public-housing program. Although the report provided for the construction of 20,000 public-housing units during the next fiscal year, there was also included a clause which prohibited the Public Housing Administration from entering into any new contracts with local housing authorities without the further approval of the Congress.

I told the House that I had voted against the conference report and refused to sign it because I considered it to be one of the rankest pieces of discriminatory legislation I had seen. "It hits hardest against the little fellow," I said, "the low-income family which cannot afford to pay for homes or apartments under present conditions." In this report the low-income family gets practically no help from its Government. On the other hand, those who can afford to buy houses get all the subsidies and all the assistance provided for by the Public Housing Act of 1949. * * * This bill should not be limited only to a rehabilitation of property; it must contain the opportunity for rehabilitation of people, too.

I pointed out further that the action of the conferees meant delaying if not killing many slum-clearance projects, because such projects cannot be approved unless housing is available for those being evicted. I read to the House the telegram of Fred Kramer, a leading Chicago realtor, which expressed the hope that funds would be made available for the continuance of the public-housing program. Mr. Kramer's telegram stated: "As we sponsor and are vitally interested in private enterprise's participation in the slum clearance and redevelopment program in Chicago, it is particularly vital that we have some public housing for relocation purposes Relocation is really the key for slum clearance these days."

During the debate, Majority Leader HALLECK, of Indiana, rose to read a letter from President Eisenhower, which indicated that the President had reversed his previous recommendation to continue the public housing program at an annual level of 35,000 units and had approved the action of the conferees. I challenged HALLECK: "Does not the gentleman think the President of the United States ought to stop retreating? * * * Certainly General Eisenhower ought to stabilize his lines and not retreat any more." HALLECK replied: "If the gentleman wants to take issue with the President of the United States and the position he has taken, he may go ahead and do so. I am not going to." Certainly, under the circumstances I believe that issue should be taken with the President. If he makes a definite recommendation to the Congress on an important matter for the purpose of influencing congressional opinion and intending that action be taken in accordance with his views, in the absence of some compelling reason, why should he not stand his ground? Why should he change his mind? The conference report was approved by the House by a vote of 239 to 161.

Another conference report which came up involved appropriations for the civil functions of the Army. This is the bill that provides funds for river and harbor improvements. Congressman JENSEN, of Iowa, looked quite dejected as he asked the Members to help him by voting for a $2,800,000 appropriation. The story he told was a very sad one. It seems that the Missouri River had left its channel in his district and wandered away. The residents of his district had invested $2.5 million to construct a toll bridge across the old channel because the Army engineers had informed them that the river could be captured and returned to its previous bounds. The people now wanted the Army engineers to move the river back to its original channel at a total cost to the Government of about $9 million. Congressman HAND, of New Jersey, a member of the subcommittee kept a straight face as he described the situation: "We are faced with a rather unique problem here. Instead of building a bridge over the river, we are supposed to build a river under the bridge." The Members felt sorry for JENSEN, but they nevertheless voted down his amendment. It is said by those who are familiar with this region that as the Missouri rolls past the point closest to the bridge, there is a sound like gurgling laughter as it looks toward the beautiful and lonesome structure now spanning a dusty gravel bed.

Many of you have written to me inquiring about the conclusion of the case of Capt. Hyman George Rickover. I know you will be delighted to learn that this week it was recommended that he be promoted to rear admiral.

Sincerely yours,

SIDNEY R. YATES,
Member of Congress.

SHOOTING IN THE HOUSE

(Newsletter No. 145)

MARCH 3, 1954.

Members of the House are frequently called upon to escort friends or members of their families to seats in the visitors' galleries that overlook the floor of the House of Representatives. Usually they will sit there for a few moments of conversation to identify the Congressman speaking on the floor, or to point out the parliamentary maneuvering, or to explain the bill being discussed. Sitting there makes them all feel good, the Congressmen as well as the visitors, for it makes them feel as though they are really watching American democracy in action.

There seemed to be nothing unusual about the galleries last Monday. Suddenly a series of sharp cracks like a bunch of firecrackers being exploded startled the House. All proceedings were halted while everyone turned immediately toward the far corner of the galleries, and there in horror they saw three men and a woman standing with guns in their hands shooting into the mass of Congressmen below. The woman held a long automatic revolver with both hands and sprayed the House with bullets until her ammunition ran out. Then she waved a Puerto Rican flag aloft and tossed it over the railing, crying, "Viva Puerto Rico."

It was all over in less than a minute but in that brief period more than 20 shots spattered into the walls, into the ceiling, into the seats—and into 5 Congressmen. Congressman MORANO, of Connecticut, was sitting on the aisle near the Speaker's Lobby, which is the main corridor. When the gunfire exploded almost over his head, he raced for the exit and hurled himself through the doors. As he swung them open, a deep voice immediately behind him gasped, "They got me." and Congressman BEN JENSEN of Iowa stumbled and fell with a bullet in his back. A few seconds earlier, JENSEN had been standing next to MORANO. Congressman KEATING, of New York, thought they were firing blank cartridges and continued to watch the shooting until Congressman BENTLEY, of Michigan, who was standing next to him, gasped and collapsed into the center aisle with a bullet through his lung. Congressman PATTON, of Arizona, was called off the floor by a page to answer a telephone call. As he walked through the door a bullet pierced the seat he had just occupied and severed an artery in the leg of Congressman ROBERTS of Alabama, who was sitting in the next row behind. PERCY PRIEST, of Tennessee, pulled ROBERTS to the floor, then removed his own tie and applied it as a tourniquet to ROBERTS' leg. Majority Whip LES ARENDS was unaware that any thing was happening until a shot whistled by his ear and imbedded itself in the table where he was sitting, sprinkling him with splinters. Congressman CANFIELD, of New Jersey, was showered with plaster when a bullet hit the ceiling above him. Four or five bullets spattered into the paneled wall a few feet above the heads of the pages.

Tom Iorio is the Democratic pair clerk. He was talking to Congressman FALLON, of Maryland, near the pages' bench in the rear of the House when it appeared that a rollcall vote would be demanded. Iorio left FALLON and went to his desk near the Speaker's rostrum to set up voting pairs for Members who were absent. When the shooting started, he leaned across his desk to see who had set off the fireworks. Lew Deschler, the Parliamentarian, pulled him back crying, "Get back, you fool—those are real shots." In the rear of the Chamber, Congressman FALLON fell to the floor with a bullet in his hip.

When the gunmen were overcome and disarmed, the Members got up from the floor and straggled in from the corridors. Dr. Calver, the congressional physician and his two assistants, rushed in to help the wounded. An icy numbness gripped everybody as they looked down at those lying on the floor. BENTLEY, ashen faced, quiet, very seriously hurt; JENSEN, white, too, also badly hurt; DAVIS, of Tennessee, with his leg propped up and with friends holding handkerchiefs to both sides of his calf where the bullet had gone through; ROBERTS bleeding freely in spite of the tourniquet; and FALLON looking around and waiting for the stretcher bearers. Many of the Congressman drew deep and nervous breaths as they looked at their injured colleagues. One of them voiced the sentiment of all when he said softly, "There but for the grace of God go I."

There was not so much a feeling of anger as of amazement. It was incredible, unbelievable that this thing should take place in the United States House of Representatives—and yet there it was. The first inclination was for more rigid security measures; more severe checking of visitors; more armed guards scattered throughout the galleries—perhaps a bulletproof plate glass between the gallery railing and the ceiling. But there was a feeling of sadness, too. For the first time in the long history of the House, there had been a violent disruption of the open and friendly relationship between the people watching their Government at work and their elected representatives.

Sincerely yours,

SIDNEY R. YATES,
Member of Congress.

CONGRESSIONAL INVESTIGATING COMMITTEES
(Newsletter No. 146)

MARCH 12, 1954.

There are many congressional committees that you never hear about because they perform their work in a quiet, efficient, and objective manner. There are others whose activities are constantly emblazoned across the front pages of your daily newspapers. It may have been such a committee which prompted the late Senator Henry Cabot Lodge to reply as he did when he was asked to comment on the work of congressional investigating committees. "Perhaps the best way to answer your question," he said, "is to tell you about my friend Si Hoskins. As I was out walking one lovely spring morning, I saw Si sitting contentedly on the grassy bank of a stream. 'Si,' I asked, 'what are you doing?' 'Well, sir,' he replied, 'I'm paid to shoot the muskrats. They are ruining the dam.' There was a muskrat swimming in the water near him and I cried: "Hey, Si, there's one now—why don't you shoot?' Si looked at the swimming animal, looked back at me and puffed a tranquil cloud of smoke into the air from his pipe. 'Sir,' he said, 'do you really think I should shoot that muskrat and lose my job?' "

Certainly the Senator's opinion could not have been intended to apply to all investigations, for he must have been aware of the splendid work performed by the committee headed by his colleague, Senator Walsh, which exposed the Teapot Dome scandal. Similarly, in recent years, there have been restrained, well-regulated hearings, as, for example, those conducted by Senator RUSSELL and a Senate Armed Services subcommittee into the dismissal of General MacArthur from his command in Korea; by Senator FULBRIGHT and a Senate Banking and Currency subcommittee into the work of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation; by Representatives CHELF and KEATING, one a Democrat and one a Republican, into certain activities of the Department of Justice. There is no question but that the power to investigate and report back to the Congress for action is a most potent and necessary tool of democratic Government.

Yet, it must be equally apparent that the power to investigate, like the power to tax, is the power to destroy. Those who wield the tremendous powers of government must have a constant and complete appreciation of the great responsibility which is theirs and must avoid abusing their authority. Investigative activities which are sensational, politically inspired, or keyed to the personal ambitions of the committee chairman, where reckless accusations are made without reasonable foundation in fact, will be terribly destructive not only of personal reputation and economic livelihood, but destructive as well, of the confidence of the people in their Government and in their basic institutions. It is a sad commentary when newspapers carry headlines such as the one which appeared recently: "Velde Committee Clears Clergy." One would believe that the contrary would be true, that if there were to be a judgment, that it would be the ministers who should sit in judgment upon the congressional committee.

Despite the fact that Members of Congress are becoming more and more aware of public disapproval of the shortcomings of congressional committees, it is rare that they will do more than criticize them. A few weeks ago, the question of providing funds for two such committees came before the House. Although the Committee on Un-American Activities was criticized for publicity seeking; for the failure of its chairman to observe the committee's own rules when he authorized, without consulting the committee, the subpenaing of former President Truman; for taking no responsibility for the testimony it received and published in its hearings, it was granted funds to carry on its work. There is a general feeling that the committee is working in a much more objective way than it has in the past. Amazingly enough, however, a subcommittee of the House Government Operations Committee which wanted funds to investigate racketeering in labor unions, was rebuffed. Perhaps it was the fact that its project invaded the jurisdiction of the House Committee on Education and Labor, which is now studying the same subject; perhaps it was the fact that Chairman CLARE HOFFMAN, of Michigan, who is chairman of the full committee, objected to the granting of such funds to the subcommittee; perhaps the House wanted to cut down on the growing number of investigations and for the moment agreed with Senator Lodge. At any rate, the committee's project came to a sudden end when its request for funds was voted down.

Maybe progress is being made. In an earlier Congress, according to the book History and Procedure of the House of Representatives by Alexander, the following incident took place: "When Reuben Whitney was before a committee of investigation in 1837, Bailie Peyton, of Tennessee, taking offense at one of his answers, threatened him fiercely and when he rose to claim the committee's protection, Mr. Peyton, with due and appropriate profanity, shouted: 'You shan't say one word while you are in this room. If you do, I will put you to death.' The chairman, Henry A. Wise, added: 'Yes; this insolence is insufferable.' As both of these gentlemen were armed with deadly weapons, the witness could hardly be blamed for not wanting to testify before the committee again."

Your friend,

SIDNEY R. YATES,
Member of Congress.

Famed Louisiana Foods and the Military

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDWIN E. WILLIS

OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 19, 1954

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, as we all know, Louisiana is famed for good eating, and south Louisiana, in which the Third Congressional District is situated, is the most famous of all. We have in particular the best seafoods and our Louisiana shrimp, which my district is a leader, are most delicious. As a great number of our people are of French descent, they inherit a love for good food and know best how to prepare dishes that not only delight the palate but are most unusual as well.

Even in the military field my constituents continue to carry out the best traditions of cooking, as will be noted from an article appearing in the New Orleans Times-Picayune relative to the National Guard Company, of Breaux Bridge, La., in attendance at the annual summer encampment of the 39th Infantry Division, Louisiana-Arkansas National Guard, at Camp Polk, La. This article clearly shows why the Breaux Bridge Guardsmen and their chief, Sgt. Leon Castille, are the envy of other companies and their chefs. Sergeant Castille sees to it that his men continue to enjoy real French cooking while away from home, with such tempting items as rice and gravy, French pastry, French drip coffee, and other specialties.

I believe that the more and more familiar our Armed Forces become with Louisiana shrimp and rice and our other famous delicacies, there will be a great demand for these items in the service menus, and in fact I am advised that they are steadily increasing in popularity among the military ranks. I offer the following item, which I have previously mentioned, as a source of guidance and inspiration to all our military organizations:

FOOD TO DELIGHT THE FRENCH PALATE SPECIALTY OF BREAUX BRIDGE CHEF

(By Pvt. Gerald Bodet, PIO, 39th Infantry Division)

CAMP POLK, LA., August 15.—The French have always upheld the special label of unique when it comes to matters of food.

That still holds true for Americans of French descent.

And it especially holds true for Americans of French descent attending the 2-week summer encampment here of the 39th Infantry Division, Louisiana-Arkansas National Guard.

A good case in point is Sfc. Leon Castille, mess sergeant for Breaux Bridge's Co. F, of the 156th Infantry Regiment.

The 156th is one of the 3 infantry regiments that compose the 39th Infantry Division.

Sergeant Castille, who still makes free with his expressions in French despite his native American birth, is a master chef in the south Louisiana tradition.

His mess hall is unique among Army eating halls, from his rice and gravy special to his fresh-dripped coffee—available at any minute of the working day—and into the night.

To prepare mess is almost a family job for Sergeant Castille and his 165 French-speaking guardsmen from Breaux Bridge and the surrounding area.

Each year a collection of $1 per man is made to buy supplements to the Army food.

With this money the sergeant can purchase 500 pounds of rice, plus quantities of sugar, onions, hot sauce, and artificial drink flavoring.

For the discriminating coffee drinker, Sergeant Castille has constructed a 3-gallon coffee pot, and drips fresh coffee daily. The pot's strainer was made from a piece of stovepipe and screen.

Sergeant Castille's coffeepot is merely an example of how much like home the cooking is.

In preparing the rice and gravy, the men's favorite dish, Sergeant Castille lets the well-seasoned gravy simmer 4 hours, to be sure no flour taste remains.

If the seasoning isn't just right, hot sauce is near at hand.

His homemade pie with crisp, brown crust is an especially prepared dessert well worth waiting for.

Sergeant Castille himself is married and has three children. He likes Army life because, as he says, "A boy grows into a man faster in the Army than anyplace else."

During World War II he served 20 months at Fort Sam Houston, Tex., to get his first taste of life in khaki.

It was there also that soldiers first tasted the sergeant's food, for in the last 8 months of service he was cook.

His hometown of Breaux Bridge is a friendly little French settlement of 1,700, and is situated near Lafayette.

He is often called on by the townspeople to cook for barbecues or benefit dinners, and on Sundays prepares the family supper.

Many people are curious to know why he doesn't swap his filling station for a restaurant, but Sergeant Castille is quite happy with his present occupation and doesn't think it's time for a change.

His aim is to remain in the National Guard as cook for some 11 more years and become eligible for his pension.

Until then, soldiers of Company F, 156th Regiment, will go on saying "C'est si bon" when chow is served.

Major Provisions of the Agricultural Act of 1954

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 19, 1954

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, in response to the numerous requests coming to me and to other Members of the House from throughout the country for information on the Agricultural Act of 1954, the staff of the House Committee on Agriculture, at the direction of the chairman, has prepared a summary of the major provisions of this general farm legislation recently enacted by the Congress. In order that the information on this important legislation might have the widest possible dissemination, I am placing this summary in the Record:

THE AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1954

1. BASIC CROPS

This legislation establishes a flexible price support program at 82½ to 90 percent of parity for the 1955 crops of wheat, corn, cotton, peanuts, and rice. In 1956 and thereafter the support level of these crops will be at 75 to 90 percent of parity, unless Congress takes action to change these flexible levels. The support level of the sixth basic crop, tobacco, remains at 90 percent. All the basic crops, by previous congressional enactment, are supported through the current year, as in several years past, at 90 percent of parity. These new provisions are made with respect to specified basic crops:

Corn

Repeal of existing marketing quota provisions, while retaining acreage allotment authority. Change the base period for determining normal yield for corn for counties and for farms from 10 years to 5 years. Increase the allowance for carryover in the normal supply from 10 percent of domestic consumption plus exports to 15 percent.

Wheat

(a) Commercial area: A definition of the noncommercial wheat-producing area, the purpose being that producers in the commercial wheat area would be subject to acreage allotments and marketing quotas when required by law, while producers in the noncommercial area would not be subject to these limitations and would receive only 75 percent of the level of support accorded producers in the commercial area. The noncommercial area will consist of States that plant 25,000 or less acres of wheat annually. According to the best information available at this time, this will place in the noncommercial area the 12 States, Alabama, Arizona Connecticut, Florida, Louisiana, Maine, Massachusetts, Mississippi, Nevada, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, and Vermont.

(b) Proclamation date: The latest date on which the Secretary may proclaim wheat-marketing quotas and acreage allotments is changed from July 15 to May 15.

(c) Wheat producers in recognized summer fallow areas who practice summer fallowing are given special consideration in setting wheat allotments to assure equitable treatment as compared with those wheatgrowers in summer fallow areas who do not practice summer fallowing.

(d) The allowance for carryover in the normal supply is increased from 15 to 20 percent of domestic consumption plus exports.

(e) Surrender of acreage: Any part of a 1955 farm acreage allotment can be voluntarily surrendered and reapportioned to other farms in the county or, if not needed in the county, transferred to the State committee for reapportionment. Such surrendered acreage for the purposes of farm history shall be regarded as having been planted on the farm from which it was transferred rather than on the farms to which the allotment was transferred.

Cotton

Wider discretion was given to county committees in allotting cotton on a basis of the history of plantings on individual farms. In addition the county committee may limit any farm acreage allotment to not more than 50 percent of the cropland on the farm. The new legislation makes permanent a temporary provision in present law that a cotton farmer may voluntarily surrender any of his cotton allotment he does not intend to plant, for reallocation in his county or State, with such surrendered acreage being counted in the history of his own farm for the purposes of computing future acreage allotments.

Peanuts

The legislation as finally approved makes no change as to acreage allotments or penalties.

Rice

The Secretary of Agriculture is directed to make a study of multiple-price systems as applied to rice and report to Congress thereon by March 1, 1955.

2. DAIRY PRODUCTS

No change was made in the support level—75 to 90 percent of parity at the discretion of the Secretary. The Secretary has set the dairy support level at 75 percent for the current marketing year. The Secretary is given authority to use any method he determines necessary to dispose of surplus stocks of dairy products now owned by the Commodity Credit Corporation. Up to $50 million annually for a 2-year period may be used by the Commodity Credit Corporation to increase the consumption of fluid milk by school children. Surplus dairy products may be distributed free to the armed services and veterans hospitals after they have purchased their usual quantities in the commercial markets. An accelerated brucellosis eradication program is authorized for the next 2 years. The Secretary is also directed to make a study of alternate dairy price support methods and report back to Congress on or before January 3, 1955.

3. WOOL

Use of incentive payments to producers for 4 years, beginning April 1, 1955, to support the price of wool at a level, up to 110 percent of parity, that will bring about a larger production of this fiber of which the United States now produces about one-third of its needs, and support of mohair within 15 percent of the support price of wool. Wool now is supported at 90 percent of parity, under a loan and purchase program. Trading in wool is made subject to the jurisdiction of the Commodity Exchange Authority.

Honey and tung nuts

No change is made in these commodities which now have mandatory supports at 60 to 90 percent of parity. Under this authority the support price for honey is 70 percent for the current marketing year and for tung nuts 65 percent of parity.

All other crops

No change is made in the discretionary power of the Secretary of Agriculture to support prices of other crops at 0 to 90 percent of parity, except that Irish potatoes are made eligible for support along with all other nonmandatory commodities at 0 to 90 percent. Under this authority these supports are in force for 1954: Barley, oats, rye, and sorghums for grain, 85 percent of parity; flaxseed, 70; soybeans, 80; dry edible beans, 80; cottonseed, 75; and crude pine gum, 90.

4. SET-ASIDE

Authority is provided for the Commodity Credit Corporation to set aside reserves up to a value of $2,500,000,000 from the present CCC stocks. These stocks will be insulated from the commercial supplies and used in constructive ways, such as in school lunch programs, disaster relief, aid to the people of other countries, and stockpiled reserves at home for use in a national emergency. Amounts of commodities in the set-aside will be accounted for in computing acreage allotments and quotas of various crops but their presence will not be recognized in computing support prices.

The CCC shall, as rapidly as the Secretary of Agriculture shall determine to be practicable, set aside within its inventories not more than the following maximum quantities and not less than the following minimum quantities of agricultural commodities or products thereof heretofore or hereafter acquired by it from 1954 and prior years' crops and production in connection with its price-support operations:

Commodity	Maximum quantity	Minimum quantity
Wheat.............bushels..	500,000,000	400,000,000
Upland cotton..........bales..	4,000,000	3,000,000
Cottonseed oil.......pounds..	500,000,000	0
Butter...................do....	200,000,000	0
Nonfat dry-milk solids do....	300,000,000	0
Cheese..................do....	150,000,000	0

5. MODERNIZED PARITY

Under existing law modernized parity will go into effect on wheat, corn, cotton, and peanuts for the crop year beginning January 1, 1956. On the basis of present price relationships, this would amount to a reduction in 1956 of 39 cents per bushel for wheat; 22 cents per bushel for corn; 1.8 cents per pound for cotton; and 2.8 cents per pound for peanuts. In order to prevent this abrupt drop, the present bill contains a transitional parity provision providing that the parity price shall be decreased only 5 percent per year until the gap between old parity and new parity is closed.

6. SUPPORT THROUGH PROCESSORS

Whenever price supports or surplus removal operations are carried out through purchases from loans to, or payments to, processors the Secretary is required to obtain assurances that the producers of the agricultural commodities involved will receive the maximum benefits from the price support or surplus removal operations.

7. DIVERTED ACRES

The bill gives the Secretary no new or expanded authority to deal with diverted acres. However in any programs for diverted acres, (1) the Secretary may make his regulations applicable on an appropriate geographical basis; (2) in semiarid or other areas where good husbandry requires maintenance of a prudent feed reserve, his regulations relating to diverted acres shall be administered in such manner as to permit the production of forage crops for storage and subsequent use in farm feeding operations; and, (3) in areas declared to be disaster areas, the regulations shall be administered in such a manner as will most quickly restore the normal pattern of the agriculture of such areas.

8. ACP PAYMENTS

The agricultural conservation payment program is extended for 2 years. The legislation permits the Secretary to fix fair prices on conservation materials and services, although this is not mandatory as in existing legislation. Compliance with acreage allotments on basic crops is made a condition to eligibility for ACP payments, with the stipulation that this provision shall apply only to farmers who knowingly harvest crops in excess of their allotments, after a determination by the Secretary that a farmer's plantings are in excess of his allotment. The Secretary is required to give farmers a reasonable opportunity to get into compliance on plantings of basic crops if they are found to be in excess of allotments. Although application of this general provision on eligibility will not be possible in the current year, the provision relating to the opportunity of farmers to adjust their basic crops so as to comply with the acreage allotments will be effective for the 1954 crops which have not yet been harvested.

9. MARKETING AGREEMENTS

Producers of fruits and vegetables, in the new legislation, are permitted under marketing agreements to fix the type of package used. The legislation authorizes marketing orders to continue in operation during periods when the price of the regulated commodity is at or above parity. Grapefruit for canning or freezing is included in those commodities for which marketing orders may be issued. Funds collected under marketing agreements may be used for market research and development. Imported fruits and vegetables may be required to comply with the standards of maturity, size, and quality required in the marketing agreements adopted by domestic producers.

10. AGRICULTURAL ATTACHÉS

The new act provides for the establishment of a new and more effective representation of American agriculture and agricultural interests in our Embassies and missions abroad, by transferring the agricultural attachés from the jurisdiction of the Department of State to the Department of Agriculture.

The act provides that appointed employees and officers of the Department of Agriculture shall be regularly and officially attached to the diplomatic missions of the United States in foreign countries upon the request of the Secretary of Agriculture and the concurrence of the Secretary of State. Overseas agricultural representatives henceforward will be directly under the Secretary of Agriculture with respect to agricultural matters and their agricultural duties, and will make their reports directly to him. This should greatly improve the efficiency and value of our foreign agricultural representation.

11. TERMS OF COMMITTEEMEN

The Secretary of Agriculture is prohibited from imposing any limitation upon the number of terms for which members of the agricultural stabilization county committees may be reelected.

12. SALE OF CCC FEED GRAINS

The new act authorizes the Commodity Credit Corporation, for the period ending March 1, 1955, to sell feed grains it owns at the support price plus 10 percent at the point of storage. This temporarily relaxes a provision of the 1949 act prohibiting CCC from selling storable commodities into the commercial market at less than the current support price plus 5 percent plus a reasonable carrying charge. This is intended to make the feed grains available at a lower price to feeders who are unable to purchase the grains on the market except at prices above parity. A situation has developed in some parts of the Corn Belt in which farmers, fearful of the effects of the drought on this year's corn crop, are holding in storage their farm-stored stocks of corn.

Your Congressman Reports to You

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SIDNEY R. YATES

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 19, 1954

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I present copies of several newsletters I have sent to my constituents during the 83d Congress:

SOCIAL SECURITY

(Newsletter No. 154)

JUNE 8, 1954.

The social-security bill went through the House last week by a vote of 355 to 8. Only 2 Republicans, 5 Democrats from Texas and 1 from Virginia voted against it. Congressman EBERHARTER, of Pennsylvania, expressed amazement at the lack of traditional opposition by the Republican Party. "All in all," he said, "I am indeed gratified that the present majority party has now seen the light and is following the lead and program advocated for so many years by the Democrats in Congress and by Presidents Harry S. Truman and Franklin D. Roosevelt. I heartily welcome their joinder with us and I am happy over it for, as has been often said, 'There is much joy in bringing the wayward into the fold'."

The amendments to the act were sweeping ones. Ten million additional persons were added to the program, the largest group being self-employed farmers whose earnings exceed $400 per year. The bill also proposes to include all professional people except physicians. Physicians were excluded because the American Medical Association had requested their exclusion. Yet, in spite of the fact that other professional organizations had sought similar exclusion for members of their professions, lawyers, dentists, architects, engineers, accountants, ministers, veterinarians, chiropractors, and optometrists will come under the provisions of the bill as approved by the House.

One of the first questions asked was why were physicians omitted when all other professions were included. Congressman COOPER, of Tennessee, the ranking Democrat on the committee, furnished the explanation that the testimony given to the committee showed most physicians do not retire at age 65. In view of the fact that they continue to work beyond that age, the committee did not think it fair for them to be required to pay the tax when they did not expect to retire and receive benefits. On the other hand, he said evidence was presented that dentists, required to stand on their feet while working at their chairs, were required to retire at an earlier age than physicians. What about lawyers, though, he was asked. Lawyers sit as much as physicians, and yet they were selected for inclusion in the bill. COOPER could give no satisfactory reply; but most Congressmen knew the answer lay in the very powerful voice the American Medical Association had created in Washington in the last few years.

Of particular interest to me was the fact that more flexibility was given to the so-called work clause of the law, under the terms of which those receiving social-security payments may now earn only $75 per month without losing their benefits. The new provision places such earnings on an annual basis. The earnings limitation is now $1,000 per year. If a beneficiary's earnings exceed $1,000, he would lose 1 month's social-security benefits for each $80 earned in excess of the $1,000. While I approve of the change which permits earnings to be computed on an annual rather than a monthly basis, I am still of the opinion that such a limitation is most unfair and should be stricken or drastically amended. A person of 65 who has contributed to the social-security system during most of his working years should be entitled to draw his benefits without being penalized for earning an amount which is reasonably necessary to provide a decent standard of living in his old age. Although the new bill raised minimum monthly benefits from $25 to $30 and maximum benefits from $85 to $98.50, it is obvious that these are still inadequate, and I believe that if a person wants to continue to work to supplement his income, he should be permitted to do so. But even apart from the financial aspects of the problem there are many reasons why a person reaching age 65 should not be compelled to retire against his will. Medical evidence is overwhelming that those compelled to retire suddenly lose their interest in life and deteriorate rapidly. They get a feeling that they are not wanted and that they are no longer an essential part of their community. Our older people want to work and can work, and the fact remains that their ability to work is the best guaranty of their continued status in the community and their independence. We must get away from the idea which the work clause promotes, that a person's birth certificate is the only test of his ability.

It seems to me that until the social-security program furnishes the basis for permitting our older citizens to live in reasonable comfort, it cannot be said to provide security for old age. The fact that it is designated as a security program does not mean that this desirable goal has already been achieved. When he was President, Abraham Lincoln was approached by a delegation of abolitionists who urged him to issue the Emancipation Proclamation before he was ready. Lincoln protested, saying that he could not possibly carry out the intent of the proclamation even if he issued it because he lacked the means to enforce it. To support his argument he asked the group: "How many legs will a sheep have if you call the tail a leg?" "Five," was the immediate answer. "You are mistaken," said Lincoln, "for calling a tail a leg does not make it so."

The social-security law is good legislation but there are still changes which we must make in order that it may deserve its name.

Your friend,

SIDNEY R. YATES,
Member of Congress.

FARM LEGISLATION

(Newsletter No. 156)

JULY 2, 1954.

Prof. Albert Einstein was asked for a simple explanation of his theory of relativity at a gathering he once attended. "Let me explain it in this way," said the great mathematician. "A few weeks ago while taking a walk on a hot day with a blind friend, I remarked that I would like a drink of milk. My friend stopped me. 'I know what a drink is,' he said, 'but what is milk?'

"I replied: 'Milk is a white liquid.'

"'Liquid I know,' he said, 'but what is white?'

"'The color of a swan's feathers.'

"'Feathers I know, but what is a swan?'

"'A swan is a bird with a crooked neck.'

"'Neck I know; but what is crooked?'"

Einstein took the blind man's arm and held it out. "This is straight," he said, and then bending it, "this is crooked."

"Ah," exclaimed the blind man, "now I know what milk is."

"And that in a nutshell," said Einstein to the gathering, "is my theory of relativity."

Professor Einstein's task would have been much easier had he been able to bring his friend to the House of Representatives last week where for 3 days debate raged on the new farm bill. Not only would his friend have learned about the beauties of the cow and its delectable product, but the professor himself might have enjoyed witnessing the evolution of another theory of relativity—the congressional theory, dealing with the relative position of the farmers on one hand and consumers and taxpayers on the other. Two major concepts were under consideration: the present system of fixed high price supports at 90 percent of parity for basic commodities, and a flexible system of support prices ranging between 75 and 90 percent of parity, depending on supply and the Nation's agricultural needs.

It seemed to me that the arguments favoring the present program were as circuitous as Einstein's explanation of his theory. Assuming that the program made sense when it was conceived during the war as an incentive to increase production, it doesn't make sense now when Government warehouses are bulging with surpluses of 425 million pounds of butter and about $6 billion worth of other agricultural commodities, for which the Government is paying approximately $700,000 a day for storage charges alone. Yet the bill reported by the House Committee on Agriculture proposed to continue the present high fixed price support system for another year. It gave recognition to the ever growing surpluses by providing for reductions in the crop acreage to be planted. Dairy products, which up to a few months ago had been supported at a price of 90 percent of parity, were pegged in the bill at 80 percent, but in order to compensate for the lower price support, milk producers were given complete freedom of production. The dairy-State Congressmen refused to accept this proposal. They wanted "equality" with other producers, and it was because of this disparity in the support price that they broke the farm bloc's usually united front. When farm representatives fall out, the consumer gets a break, and that is what happened last week.

The committee confidently anticipated its recommendations to be sustained, but early in the debate its expectations were exploded when the House approved the amendment offered by Representative Harrison, Republican of Nebraska, to change fixed high price supports for flexible price supports ranging between 82½ percent and 90 percent of parity. The 82½ percent figure came as a distinct surprise, because the President has been so insistent on a lower price limit of 75 percent. Speaker Joe Martin confessed in private conversation that this was the best deal he could put over with Republicans representing farm areas. Had the President's proposal been insisted upon, Martin said, it could not have carried. I voted for the amendment.

Congress Andresen, Republican, of Minnesota, led the dairy drive for "equality" by moving to raise the support price from 80 to 82½ percent. As representatives from dairy States described the difficult plight of their constituents, one gained the impression that if the amendment failed, dairy farmers would have to find other things for their cows to do in order to break even. But Congressman Abernethy, of Mississippi, told them they were fooling nobody, saying: "You are attempting to put yourself in position to get not only the same price support, but you also want the right to market without marketing quotas, every pound of milk that Old Bess will give. With that right and a good high support price you are going to milk her to death." The cotton bloc stood firm; the Andresen amendment was voted down.

Later in the debate I caught what appeared to be a sleeper in the bill, a paragraph which gave Secretary Benson the right to establish any support price he wanted to for the producers of wool. I was opposed to granting such a blank check to the Secretary and offered an amendment fixing a maximum price the Government can pay for wool. It was the only amendment offered by a city representative which the farm representatives accepted. Maybe it is because of the sheep in my district. There are some, you know—in the Lincoln Park Zoo.

Your friend,

Sidney R. Yates,
Member of Congress.

An Inadequate Health Insurance Bill

(Newsletter No. 157)

July 15, 1954.

When Abraham Lincoln was once confined in the White House with a bad cold he was visited by a Congressman who called to express his sympathy. The President stopped him and laughingly said: "Let's not talk about my colds. I am bound to catch them." When the Congressman looked surprised, Lincoln pointed to his large feet and said: "There's the reason—there is so much of me on the ground, you know."

The common cold which sent President Lincoln to bed still continues to plague all of us, for little progress has been made since that time to determine its causes and cure. But the war against it goes on—not only against the common cold, but also against heart disease, cancer, tuberculosis, mental illnesses, arthritis, rheumatism, polio, blindness, diabetes, cerebral palsy, epilepsy, multiple sclerosis, muscular dystrophy, and other crippling and killing diseases. For this year alone the amount approved by the Congress for research and experimentation to fight such diseases approximates $90 million.

Yet, paradoxically enough, the very fact that we were able to learn how to treat some of the diseases has resulted in the creation of many new problems of an economic nature. The tremendous number of new medical tests and discoveries has caused the expense of hospitalization and medical attention to increase to the point of where contracting a long-term disease represents a real financial catastrophe to the average American family. The cost for hospitalization of a chronic heart patient for 1 year approximates $4,000. The monthly cost for full treatment at a cerebral palsy center averages as much as $750 per child. Treatment for polio and the use of an iron lung for a year may cost as much as $10,000. The impact of such a hard-hitting disease upon a family—its standard of living, tuition for the children, the savings of years, is readily apparent. Obviously, the seriousness of the problem warrants national attention.

One of the answers offered is the voluntary health insurance program. However, only 12 percent of our people have hospital insurance; only 24 percent have hospital and surgical insurance; 20 percent have hospital, surgical, and medical insurance. The cost of such insurance is still high. About 41 percent of the American people have no insurance protection of any kind, and even those who are insured do not receive complete coverage. It was to meet these needs, presumably, that the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee brought to the floor last week the President's bill to create a reinsurance fund of $25 million as a basis for covering losses by health insurance companies willing to undertake new programs to give additional medical protection to the American people.

The Members of the House were interested in the bill. They are very much aware of the expense of good medical care and the need for finding some means to deal with it. They were sympathetic, therefore, to the purposes of the bill, but as they listened to the debate, their interest sagged and at the end, they voted 238 to 134 to recommit the bill. Why? Because even the bill's most vocal supporters, there were no enthusiastic ones, praised it only as "an experiment which might work, giving greater insurance coverage to more people." Congressman Eugene McCarthy, Democrat of Minnesota, commented that the best argument made was "that the bill will do no harm." "I suppose," he continued, "that in itself this is grounds for supporting the bill, because on many occasions during the course of this session, we have not been given that happy choice." Congressman Williams of Mississippi, likened the bill to cotton candy he had purchased for his daughter. "It looked pretty," he said, "it tasted sweet and smelled sweet, but when she tried to bite into it, she found nothing there." He called the bill all air and no substance.

Republicans are blaming the Democrats for the defeat of the bill. The fact remains that 75 Republicans, including the chairman of 8 committees, who normally would be expected to support the President, voted to kill it, as well. There was a general feeling that it was a mouse brought forth to attack a mountain.

The President is quoted as being disappointed, stating that he had made a campaign pledge to bring good medical care within the reach of the modest family budget. If this was the purpose of the bill, it escaped everybody in the House, even the President's most ardent supporters. When the question was asked, will this bill reduce the cost of health insurance premiums, the answer was no. To the question, will this bill reduce the costs of medical care?, the answer was no. To the question, will this bill make insurance available for any persons who cannot now afford it?, the answer was no.

Looks like the President needs a new bill to meet America's medical bill.

Sincerely yours,

Sidney R. Yates,
Member of Congress.

Your Congressman Reports to You

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SIDNEY R. YATES
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 19, 1954

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I present copies of several newsletters I have sent to my constituents during the 83d Congress:

New Tax Bill

(Newsletter No. 147)

March 22, 1954.

Julius Caesar was warned to beware the Ides of March. Many an American taxpayer experiences the same feeling of trepidation, for the Ides of March—March 15, is income tax day. Congressmen, too, look with a jaundiced eye at the Ides of March, for they pay taxes like other Americans, and undergo the same purple emotions in filling out their tax returns. That is one reason why they had a special interest in the new tax bill which the House Committee on Ways and Means brought to the floor last week. It was a huge document consisting of 875 pages. The report which accompanied the bill was 444 pages long. Friends of mine on the committee told me that even they did not have a full grasp of all the changes that had been made in the law.

There was general approval among the members for certain provisions such as the ones granting tax relief to working mothers, granting exemption of the first $1,200 of retirement income, granting additional credits for medical expenses, and revising the provision to permit dependent children of taxpayers to contribute more to their own support. Major objection was that these beneficial provisions did not go far enough in granting relief.

Two proposals provoked a knock-down, drag-out fight. One, advanced by Republican Members, was to grant a tax credit for corporation dividends on the theory that taxation of corporate income and of dividend income constitutes double taxation. The second proposal was advanced by the Democratic Members and sought to increase personal income tax exemption from $600 to $700 on the theory that the $2,400,000,000 loss in revenue to the Treasury could be used to better advantage at this time in increasing consumer purchasing power.

In opposing the dividend proposal, the Democrats pointed out that 80 percent of all taxpapers have incomes of less than $5,000 per year. Moreover, only 8 percent of all American families own any corporate stock—92 percent own none; amazingly enough only six-tenths of 1 percent own 80 percent of all publicly held stock. The Democrats argued, therefore, that the dividend proposal gave relief to only a privileged few.

Congressman MILLS, Democrat, of Arkansas, led the charge against the dividend proposal. He stated that Republicans in the past have opposed additional taxes on corporations with the argument that such taxes were inevitably passed on to consumers through increased prices. If this be true, said MILLS, where is the double taxation? If corporations are taxed, is not the amount of the tax recovered through passing it on to the public?

But, he went on, even assuming the Republican argument was sound, the form of the dividend proposal was unconscionable. The formula proposed did not exempt dividened income—it exempted $50 of dividend income the first year and $100 per year thereafter from inclusion in total income. But more than that, it permitted, as well, the deduction of 5 percent of dividend income the first year and 10 percent of dividend income for each year thereafter, not from gross income, but from the total tax bill itself, a feature that is generally overlooked. The real effect of this provision is shown when dividend income is compared to earned income. A man working for a salary of $4,000 per year, with a wife and two children, would pay a tax of $240. The tax on a similar family with $4,000 of dividend income would be $110 per year. If the man's salary were $8,000 per year, the tax would be $976—if the dividend income were $8,000, the tax would be only $484.

The Democrats proposed, therefore, a double-barreled motion—to recommit the bill to the committee with instructions to strike out the dividend proposal and to increase personal income-tax exemptions from $600 to $700. In a tense, dramatic vote, the motion was defeated 210 to 204, with 6 Members voting present. The bill now goes to the Senate where there is much sentiment for increasing exemptions, not from $600 to $700, but from $600 to $800, and where the dividend proposal may be eliminated.

Democrats were looking to the Senate for another reason and chuckling at the fight between Senator McCARTHY and Secretary of the Army Stevens. "Isn't that something," said a Democratic Congressman from the South: "Republicans in the Senate and Republicans in the executive branch, putting each other under oath to find out which of them is lying."

Your friend,

SIDNEY R. YATES,
Member of Congress.

WIRETAPPING BILL

(Newsletter No. 149)

APRIL 9, 1954.

A minister from Boston was among President Lincoln's visitors one day early in the Civil War. "Let us have faith, Mr. President," said the minister with great solemnity, "that the Lord is on our side in this great struggle." Lincoln sat in reverie for a moment and then replied: "Reverend, the question of whether the Lord is on our side doesn't concern me greatly, because I know the Lord is always on the side of the right. But it is my constant anxiety and my fervent prayer that I and this Nation may be on the Lord's side."

This story has real meaning to Members of Congress. We seek the Lord's side on each of the votes we are called upon to make. Most of the time we have no doubt that we have found the correct answer. On other occasions, however, the search for the truth is a most difficult one. Such an occasion was presented this week when the bill to legalize evidence obtained by wiretapping in cases affecting the national security came to the floor. Wiretapping, the tool of secrecy, snooping, and surprise, is a most obnoxious invader of the constitutional right of every American citizen to privacy. Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes called it "a dirty business," and although the FBI and other police use the device in their work, the law forbids the admissibility in court cases of evidence gathered in this way. The question we faced was whether the national security required waiving our deep-rooted aversion to this furtive instrument.

Many will argue as did a number of Congressmen that we must fight fire with fire. The Communists use wiretaps; why should not we? It is true the Communists do use this device. They also use clubs and rubber hoses and approve of concentration camps. Should we? If Communists use detestable police methods, should this not be the very reason for us to avoid them?

We must keep constantly in mind the distinction between democratic and Communist values. America's strength lies in spiritual and moral forces which communism opposes. Our real hope lies in the fact that we are a people who will cherish and fight for the sanctity of individual freedom, for equal justice under law for every American. While it is true that we must protect ourselves from the spy or saboteur, at the same time we must know that every time we chip away any part of our individual freedom in the name of security, we may be crushing by our own action the very thing the spy or traitor wants to destroy.

There wasn't the slightest doubt in my mind that the bill proposed by the Republican administration, the Keating bill, went much too far. It proposed to give complete power to one man—the Attorney General of the United States—to authorize wiretapping by the FBI and by military and naval intelligence units without any check or supervision by the courts. The bill validated wiretap evidence for use in national security cases such as espionage, sabotage, or treason. With true totalitarian technique, the Republican leadership deliberately labeled the measure the "antitraitor bill" intending thereby to whip the Members into line, daring them to vote against a bill so captioned. I fought the bill and in a speech to the House I condemned it for giving dictatorial power to the Attorney General—a prosecutor at that, without court supervision to protect against the obvious possibility of unconscionable abuse. "This bill is similar to the one requested and recommended by President Franklin D. Roosevelt in 1941," I said. "I would have voted against that one too, because this is not a matter of party loyalty. This involves a person's deepest convictions, the dictates of his conscience, his appreciation of the meaning of individual liberty as he understands the intent of the Bill of Rights of our Constitution. There is not here involved a question of being soft toward Communists or coddling traitors because every Member of this House despises communism and wants to protect our Nation from spies and saboteurs. What is involved is one of the basic distinctions between the democratic form of government which we love and cherish, a government which recognizes the sanctity of the individual on one hand, and on the other hand, the smothering totalitarianism of the Communist form which subordinates the individual completely in the name of security for the State. * * * When national security becomes the sole test, individual freedom is blotted out. When individual freedom is blotted out, it becomes very difficult to distinguish between democratic and totalitarian forms of government."

The Republican proposal was beaten when a substitute amendment was offered by Congressman WILLIS, Democrat, of Louisiana, to permit the use of wiretapping evidence in cases involving the national security only upon receiving the prior approval of the Federal court. I have great faith in the integrity of the Federal judges and I feel confident they will not tolerate misuse by the FBI of the prying ear of the wiretap. Only with this assurance and in the belief that in this instance the national security warranted granting the authority, did I vote for the Willis amendment. Only time will tell whether, in so doing, I will be found on the Lord's side.

Your friend,

SIDNEY R. YATES,
Member of Congress.

THE NEW LOOK: INADEQUATE FOR DEFENSE

(Newsletter No. 151)

MAY 1, 1954.

During World War I Marshal Ferdinand Foch was Supreme Commander of the Allied armies. As a result, his chauffeur was extremely popular with newspaper reporters, who tried in this way to obtain newsworthy items. "Tell us, Pierre," they would plead, "what does the Marshal say? When is the war going to end?" Pierre kept putting off his questioners, until one day he emerged from headquarters and summoned the reporters. "The Marshal spoke today," he declared. "Yes, yes, what did he say?" asked the reporters. The chauffeur replied: "He said to me: 'Pierre, what do you think—when is the war going to end?'"

Congressmen returning to Washington last week from their traditional Easter recess pondered the same question when the appropriations bill for our Armed Forces was brought to the floor. The threat of Communist aggression has made huge military appropriations a part of our way of life, and although nobody in Washington inquires seriously "When is the war going to end," there now seems to be a growing feeling within the administration that there will be no drastic change in the world situation in the foreseeable future. This is the administration's so-called New Look policy.

The New Look makes the Air Force the keystone of our defense, reversing the position taken by the administration last year when it cut $5 billion from the Air Force budget. It is akin to the foreign policy suggested by the late Senator Robert A. Taft, who declared in June 1952: "There is only one foreign and military policy which will maintain our security and our peace and our solvency, and that is the building of an Air Force sufficiently large to control the air over this country, over the oceans which surround this continent and able to deliver atom bombs on Russian cities and manufacturing plants. Such an Air Force would certainly be able to prevent the spread of communism across the sea to island countries." The New Look is a policy geared to large wars, to all-out atomic wars, and it proposes to avoid small ones like Korea. Vice President Nixon defined it a few weeks ago by saying: "Rather than let the Communists nibble us to death all over the world in little wars, we would rely in the future primarily on our massive, mobile retaliatory power which we could use in our discretion against the major source of aggression at times and at places of our own choosing."

Last week's appropriation bill translated the New Look into dollars and cents. The bill provided for $28.6 billion for fiscal year 1955, as compared with $34.3 billion for fiscal year 1954 and $44.7 billion for fiscal year 1953. Major cut comes out of the Army, which will suffer a reduction of three full divisions of troops from 20 to 17 during the next year. Gen. Matthew Ridgway, Chief of Staff of the Army, who must have approved the budget only after heavy pressure, had this to say to the Appropriations Committee: "There is no reason to expect abandonment of the ultimate intentions of the Soviet bloc to bring about our downfall, nor any reason for expecting any Soviet concessions on the major problems contributing to present international tensions. On the contrary, from our point of view, the strength of all major components of Soviet bloc military power continues to increase. Industrial capabilities continue to expand, and the bloc's overall objectives of overthrowing the Western World and securing world domination appear as unchangeable as ever * * *. We are steadily reducing Army forces—a reduction through which our capabilities will be lessened while our responsibilities for meeting the continuing enemy threat remain unchanged. The military power ratio between western defense capability and the Soviet bloc's offensive capability is not changing to our advantage."

Secretary of the Army Stevens told the committee that the reduced appropriation for the Army was justified only on the basis of four assumptions: (1) No further use of American troops in Korea; (2) a South Korean Army of 20 divisions by June 1954; (3) a strengthened Japanese Army; (4) no additional commitments to be made upon the United States Army. Presumably, the Army's loss of strength will be made up by stronger National Guard units.

President Teddy Roosevelt's foreign policy was based upon "speaking softly, but carrying a big stick." The Indochina situation showed Secretary Dulles in a reverse position. Echoing hollowly through the halls of Congress were the boasts of Republican Members earlier this year that the new administration has seized the initiative from the Kremlin. Mr. Molotov, not Mr. Dulles, is top dog at the Geneva Conference.

In my newsletter No. 80, dated April 28, 1951, I wrote: "In many respects, this period of partial mobilization and partial warfare is infinitely more productive of tension than would be a state of complete mobilization and total warfare, and we must have great individual strength of character and be able to think logically and clearly if we are to win our struggle against the Communists. This is no time for impulsiveness and emotionalism." What I said 3 years ago still goes. I think we ought to take a new look at the New Look.

Sincerely yours,

SIDNEY R. YATES,
Member of Congress.

Philippine-American Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 19, 1954

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to call the attention of the United States Congress and the American people to the fine gesture of friendship of the President of the Philippines, our good friend Ramon Magsaysay, in declaring August 13, 1954, as Philippine-American Day. We United States veterans who were in the Philippine area in World War II know the fine cooperation and friendliness of the Philippine people, and hope to stand together for liberty and peace in the bright future ahead for the peoples of our free nations:

PROCLAMATION NO. 52, DECLARING AUGUST 13, 1954, PHILIPPINE-AMERICAN DAY

"Whereas August 13, 1899, marked the official beginning of relations between the Philippines and the United States and the commencement of a happy and mutually profitable association between Filipinos and Americans;

"Whereas, on the occasion of the 55th anniversary of that event, it is appropriate that the two peoples renew and further strengthen the bonds that bind them in view, particularly, of the prevailing critical world conditions that threaten their security and the democratic institutions that they have jointly developed and stanchly defended at the cost of their resources and blood;

"Whereas it is meet and proper that this historic event in the lives of the two nations, loyal partners in the active defense of freedom, be properly commemorated so that it may ever remain a source of inspiration in the noble effort to insure the success and permanence of the free and democratic enterprises in which they are engaged and which constitute their contribution to the peace of the world and the happiness of mankind; and

"Whereas it is desirable that the two peoples be afforded every opportunity to get together on an intimate basis and encouraged to find a common medium for the friendly, intelligent, and unselfish appraisal of the problems as well as the advantages that arise from their present relationship, always in a spirit of cooperation and with due regard for each other's rights, interests and aspirations: Now, therefore

"I, Ramon Magsaysay, President of the Philippines, do hereby declare August 13, 1954, as Philippine-American Day. I call upon all our people and all Americans residing within Philippine territory to observe this date with appropriate ceremonies designed to promote mutual understanding and helpfulness and to enhance the practical significance of the intimate association existing between Filipinos and Americans and between the Government of the Republic of the Philippines and the Government of the Republic of the United States of America. I especially call on all civic, business, religious, and service organizations and schools, both public and private, to devote this date to exercises calculated to advance knowledge and wider appreciation of the value of Philippine-American relationship and of the benefits derived from it."

In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the Republic of the Philippines to be affixed.

Done in the city of Manila, this 29th day of July, in the year of our Lord, 1954, and of the Independence of the Philippines, the ninth.

RAMON MAGSAYSAY,
President of the Philippines.
FRED RUIZ CASTRO,
Executive Secretary.

The Drys' Iron Curtain With Holes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 9, 1954

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, what did a congressional committee do when it was faced with a patently absurd bill which carried favor with a self-appointed guardian group of public habits? What did it do to appease the prodding and pressure of the self-righteousness who in the name of temperance exhibited all the tantrums of the intemperate? It ducked and dived around the issue, it bared its teeth but did not bite, it cloaked its lack of conclusions by shifting the burden to other groups and ended up by declaring, "We didn't say 'Yes' and we didn't say 'No'."

This is exactly what happened when the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce was confronted with the Bryson bill, H. R. 1227, a bill to prohibit the transportation in interstate commerce of advertisements of alcoholic beverages by mail, newspaper, periodical, newsreel, photographic film, or record for mechanical reproduction, and the broadcasting of such advertisements by radio and television. By some inadvertence, no doubt, skywriting and match covers were not included. After 500 pages of testimony, the committee concluded that the issues "require further consideration and more detailed information." This is what I call the "hot coal" formula. You lift, drop, and blow. The other formula adopted in the report is the well-known dodge of "chestnuts-in-the-fire." Let the other fellow do it for you. The whole problem: foam, froth, and hop, is poured into the funnel of the radio and television industries. The sound of running is heard all through the Nation as the committee, playing straight man to the fall guy, reports:

> The committee feels that it is incumbent upon the radio and television industries, in their own enlightened interest, to give serious consideration to the widespread complaints with reference to the alcoholic beverages over their media and to take immediate steps to meet these complaints.

The next step in the "you-do-it-not-me game" is the stern admonition, the straight father-to-son talk. "The committee, therefore" ends the report, "feels justified in requesting that the radio and television industries submit to this committee by January 1, 1955, a report as to the steps already taken, and proposed to be taken, to cope with this problem. We expect the wholehearted cooperation of all concerned in arriving at a satisfactory solution to these vital issues." Do I detect the glimmer of a threat?

Now, if I were a member of the radio and television industry, I would find myself questioning why was such request thrown at our industry and not at newspapers and magazines? Discrimination, I would cry. Is a puzzlement. Is an advertisement of wine or beer less corrupting when viewed with the morning coffee than when Willie Mays hits a triple? Or is not the radio and television industry expected to hit back as would the newspapers? Or is it because the radio and television industry is much younger and more easily frightened? Or is it because the human voice entices more effectively than printed prose?

There is another soulful bit in the report to which I call your attention:

> The committee takes cognizance of the fact that the distilling industry has adopted a policy of refraining from advertising its products over radio and television. This fact creates the thought that consideration could profitably be given by the beer and wine industries to the possibility of eliminating or curtailing their advertising over radio and television.

Oh, the virtues of circumlocution and timidity. Not the gingerly approach: "This fact creates the thought that consideration could profitably be given." The committee could not say directly and forthrightly, "Let the wine and beer industry do likewise." The intelligence not fogged by the fanaticism of the prohibitionist knows how absurd is the policy adopted by the distilling industry.

Is man but an empty vacuum bottle into which an advertisement can be poured and he immediately drops his restraints, his balance, and his sense of proportion? Does a jingle like "XYZ is a hearty beer, mellow, frothy, clean, and clear" change the prudent habits of a lifetime? Since when is a picture of a family supper with wine or beer at a table a picture of dissoluteness, invitation to crime or excess? He beholds evil who thinks evil.

There are those unfortunate and piteous souls who would drink to excess if there were not a newspaper, radio, and television advertisement to be spied anywhere in the world.

Let the prohibitionists turn their energies toward the problems of the causes of alcoholism, insecurity, poverty, social maladjustments, problems that need to be attacked with all the energies at our command. I am sure the alcoholic beverage industries would gladly join hands with them in an effort to find cause and cure, medically and psychiatrically. This is a recommendation to which the committee could have lent its signature and support. Instead, here we have an attempt to intimidate the wine and beer industry, threaten the radio and television industry, and belittle the intelligence of temperate men and women by suggesting that the viewing of radio and television advertising of beer and wines is the first major step toward Skid Row.

Senseless Strike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PATRICK J. HILLINGS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 16, 1954

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to place in the RECORD several editorials discussing the strike now in progress against American Airlines.

The editorials follow:

[From the following Hearst newspapers: New York Journal-American, Albany Times-Union, Boston American, Baltimore News-Post, Pittsburgh Sun-Telegraph, Chicago American, Milwaukee Sentinel, Detroit Times, San Francisco Examiner, Los Angeles Examiner, San Antonio Light, Seattle Post-Intelligencer]

SENSELESS STRIKE

The strike of the AFL Air Line Pilots Association against American Airlines, the world's biggest air carrier, seems to us to be rash, illogical and completely devoid of justifiable cause.

It will find no favor with the public and we suspect that, in their hearts, most pilots don't like it either. If it succeeds it will wreck nonstop transcontinental flights and jam the brakes on the progress of commercial aviation in this country.

The strike was called because the western nonstop flight of American, against prevailing winds, takes approximately 35 minutes more than 8 hours.

Now let's look at the facts.

The Civil Aeronautics Board, which established an 8-hour flight limit for pilots in 1931, recently revised the limit up to 10 hours for nonstop transcontinental flights. The CAB would not have done so had it not been certain it was safe.

In fact, the CAB has characterized the nonstop coast-to-coast flight as "safer than one of comparable length involving intermediate stops."

The Pilots Union appealed to the Federal court in New York. The court turned the appeal down. Next the National Mediation Board intervened and failed. The union turned down an offer of arbitration, which the company accepted, and struck.

Here are some more facts:

Pilots of the nonstop planes fly 10 days a month, or five round trips. They average 22 hours rest between flights. For this they receive salaries of $18,000 to $19,000 a year.

Anyway you look at it, the strike doesn't add up. It is senseless. It is against the judgment of the CAB and the interests of the public.

[From the Hollywood Citizen-News of August 6, 1954]

THE POWERFUL FEW

The thousands of employees who have been forced onto the unemployed payrolls by the strike of American Airline pilots, the thousands of air travelers who have been inconvenienced, the thousands of investors who see their investments threatened, and the general public are finding it difficult to understand what justifies the severe damage that many are suffering.

The striking pilots say that the justice of their position should be clear to all.

American Airlines had a few nonstop flights to New York. The pilots assigned to these flights on their own request were assigned five round trips each month. They had 20 days each month for rest. Going east the flying time was 7 hours and 35 minutes. Coming west the flying time was 8 hours and 35 minutes, the prevailing winds accounting for the difference in time in the different directions.

Before the inauguration of the nonstop flights the pilots could not be required to accept a flight scheduled for more than 8 hours.

It is the extra 35 minutes scheduled for 5 flights a month to which they object.

Whatever damage results from their strike to whatever thousands of people, they say, is justified, because they have been asked to exceed the old limit of 8 hours.

On the other side it is pointed out that the Civil Aeronautics Board, which originally established an 8-hour flight limit for pilots, revised that limit this year to 10 hours only insofar as it pertained to nonstop transcontinental flights.

The decision of the Board was based on a report of the Civil Aeronautics Administrator to the effect that the transcontinental flights "would not have an adverse effect on safety."

"The Board's decision declared that 'nonstop operation is safer than one of comparable length involving intermediate stops' and that 'a waiver of the 8-hour rule will permit pilots to enjoy more total time off, since their monthly maximum flight time (85 hours) may be logged in 10 days under the waiver provision, whereas 15 days otherwise would be required. Five additional days off for rest and relaxation definitely contributes to overall safety.' "

The pilots took their case to the United States circuit court of appeals which denied their petition with the comment that overseas airlines have enjoyed "favorable experience on transatlantic flights where for the last 9 years the maximum permissible day aloft has been 12 hours."

In none of the three presentations of their contentions to agencies of the Government have the pilots been able to prove that their position is sound.

Pilots are vital to air transportation. In consideration of their importance they earn as high as $19,000 a year. Hundreds of capable pilots would be happy to have the jobs at much less compensation.

Pilots of the nonstop flights have 20 days a month on which they do not fly any trips. This would seem ample time in which to refresh from the ordeal of flying five times a month a schedule that is 35 minutes over 8 hours.

From the standpoint of the country's entire economy the strike is not serious.

While thousands of employees on comparatively small salaries are out of work and their families suffer, the railroads and other lines have picked up extra business. Many travelers may be inconvenienced and required to spend more money than they had planned on spending, but they are getting where they want to go.

The strike isn't a major public issue, though, to the public, it is a regrettable and irritating issue.

[From the San Diego Union of August 18, 1954]

MATTER OF MINUTES

Airline pilots are finding little public sympathy for their strike against American Airlines.

In effect, what the pilots want is a featherbedding provision (adding an unneeded third pilot), or a halt to aviation progress. Neither request is reasonable.

The protest of the pilots does not involve working conditions or pay. The airmen are striking because transcontinental flights from east to west will take slightly more than the 8 hours of their usual shift. American estimates the extra time at 35 minutes. The pilots claim the flight takes 9 hours, sometimes 10.

The fliers' contention that piloting beyond the 8-hour mark automatically impedes safety is disputed by the Civil Aeronautics Board, which has issued a temporary order extending flying time to 10 hours for a crew. The CAB is charged with enforcing strict safety rules.

With two pilots and an engineer the flight crew is not confined during the usual trip. And the 8-hour day is not involved in a 40-hour-week question, or anything like it. The pilots fly only 10 days a month. The schedule does not appear exhausting to a point of creating danger.

On overseas airlines, pilots often fly as long as 12 hours, although they usually have 3 men.

Within a short time we will have planes with speed to make this dispute academic. Meanwhile, it seems foolish to halt welcome nonstop cross-country flights because of 35 minutes' difference for a pilot who flies 10 days out of 30.

[From the Washington Sunday Star of August 15, 1954]

GROUNDED AIRLINE

At midnight tonight most of 16,000 employees of American Airlines will be dropped from the company payroll or will receive the required notice for such severance. The reason for this drastic action by the Nation's biggest air carrier is that its entire fleet of planes has been grounded since midnight of July 30 by a strike of its 1,200 pilots.

The real issue, directly affecting only about 50 of these 1,200 pilots, is whether American may operate a nonstop transcontinental schedule involving more than 8 hours of continuous flying by a single crew. For more than 20 years there has been an 8-hour limitation, by Government regulation, on overland commercial flying. When American set up its nonstop cross-country schedule it hoped to make the trip in less than 8 hours each way. Experience proved that the westbound flight, against prevailing winds, took more time. The company accordingly asked and received from the Civil Aeronautics Board express permission to schedule transcontinental nonstop service within a 10-hour limit. Both the Civil Aeronautics Administration and the CAB expressed the opinion that the longer flying time—for a nonstop operation—would not "have an adverse effect on safety." The company then scheduled its eastbound flights in 7 hours 35 minutes and its westbound in 8 hours 35 minutes.

The Air Line Pilots' Association objected to the breaking of the 8-hour rule and issued a strike notice. National Mediation Board efforts to produce an agreement failed and the board's proposal for arbitration was rejected by the union although accepted by the company.

The cross-country airliners are operated by a pilot, co-pilot, and flight engineer. They average 5 round trips monthly, meaning 10 working days per month. Flying time is limited to 85 hours per month. Salaries run close to $20,000 yearly. Flying a modern airliner by a three-man crew without intermediate landings and takeoffs permits relaxation for the pilots en route—unless weather conditions are unusually severe. It is difficult to believe, particularly in view of the CAB's consideration of the point, that there is any danger involved in the extra flying time required for five westbound flight flying time required for five westbound flights per month.

It has been proved that there is a public demand for the nonstop service. The Pilots' Association will be doing itself, the airline industry, and the public a real injury if its action forces abandonment of this service.

[From the Richmond News Leader of August 14, 1954]

STAND PAT, AMERICAN

American Airlines has an opportunity just now—a terribly painful opportunity to be sure—to render a service of incalculable value to the entire air transport industry. If American can stand fast in the face of an unwarranted strike of its 1,200 pilots, the industry may be saved in the future the catastrophic effects of the labor practcies that have so harassed the railroad industry.

Let us put it bluntly: This is a featherbed strike the pilots are staging. The aim is to force American Airlines, as a price for maintaining transcontinental nonstop service, to employ additional pilots that are not needed to perform "work" that does not have to be done. This is the sort of make-work agreement devised by the railroad unions and extended to outrageous limits by the musicians' union. It cannot be justified in economics, in law, or in the long-term welfare of the union members themselves.

The American labor movement has been marred by some strange and unwarranted strikes, but none has been stranger or more unwarranted than this one. Only 50 pilots actually are involved in a dispute that on Monday will throw more than 16,000 employees off American's payroll. These 50 pilots are the aristocrats of the air—the senior pilots and copilots, earning from $10,000 to $20,000 a year, who fly the transcontinental runs. In a normal month, they work only 10 days and are off 20. And on 5 days a month, American would require them to fly an extra 35 minutes to an hour beyond the pilot's customary 8-hour flight limitation. This flying time is necessary to maintain westbound nonstop service from New York to Los Angeles; on eastbound flights, from Los Angeles to New York, prevailing tailwinds permit nonstop service within the 8-hour limit.

The Civil Aeronautics Board has approved American's westbound schedule as a safe one. The Civil Aeronautics Administration, which enforces the CAB's orders, also has found no hazard in the extra 35 minutes. A Federal court has refused to set aside the CAB's ruling.

Plainly, the pilots would not be subjecting their own company to heavy loss of revenue, imposing upon their fellow employees, and damaging their own high reputations, if they did not feel that a "labor gain" of great importance is at stake. They must know the absurdity of their contention that the extra 35 minutes of flying time is "not safe." They do know that within a few years, new jet liners will permit westbound transcontinental runs in much less than 8 hours and thus make the question academic. But if they can win this strike, establishing a featherbed practice and usurping the clear prerogatives of management, the pilots will have established a "make-work" precedent for all air lines.

The railroads went through this, and surrendered, and came bitterly to regret it. If this time American refuses to surrender to the pilots' economic rough stuff, the entire industry will be in American's debt for years to come.

Professor Advises All To Look at Red Issue With Cold Reality, by Frank Munk, Ph. D.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD H. VELDE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 19, 1954

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Oregonian of Sunday, August 8, 1954:

PROFESSOR ADVISES ALL TO LOOK AT RED ISSUE WITH COLD REALITY

(Recent hearings of the Velde committee have raised difficult questions pertaining to higher education. The board of trustees of Reed College has been considering the cases of three faculty members cited by the congressional committee for alleged Communist membership. All three men refused to testify before the committee for constitutional reasons. On June 20 the Oregonian ran a statement by 1 of the 3, Dr. Stanley Moore, who gave his reasons for refusing to testify before the committee and cited the principle that political beliefs and activities (of a teacher) are not properly a matter for the college's official concern. The following article does not refer to the cases of the three Reed teachers specifically but discusses the underlying problems from a point of view that differs from that of Dr. Moore. Dr. Frank Munk has been professor of political science at Reed since 1946. He has written several books on the various forms of totalitarianism. A Czechoslovakian by birth, he has lived under nazism and communism.)

(By Frank Munk, Ph. D., professor, Reed College)

Many of the criticisms directed at congressional investigating committees are no doubt well deserved. As early as 1884 Woodrow Wilson pointed out that congressional government is committee government. In recent years we saw many indications of government by investigating committees, a trend which many deplore and more view with alarm. One of the consequences has been a state of undeclared war between a vast segment of the intellectuals and the political representatives of the people—a cold war which may lead to a dangerous alienation of the intelligentsia and irreparable damage to the community.

Is it not true though that many intellectuals are only playing into the hands of congressional investigators by their deliberate blindness to the existence of conspiratorial Communist groups on the campuses of some of our best colleges and universities? Are we closing our eyes to something we ought to have a good look at? Would the investigators have had their field day had the academic profession been more sensitive to infiltration and more cognizant of the threat from the extreme left? Does liberalism always have to be one-eyed—seeing the enemy on the right but not the one on the left?

The batle cry, of course, is academic freedom. And rightly so, since it is the magna carta of academic education—the only level at which it fully exists, at which it can be defended and at which it is indispensable to the health and growth of a society. However, academic freedom itself is in constant flux, it never twice means the same thing. It can be used both to defend freedom and to impair it.

TEACHERS WATCH

Originally, it stemmed from a medieval society, and had little, if anything, to do with the freedom to teach and to learn. The university was in the nature of a guild, a rule-making and rule-imposing community. The contents of teaching was strictly supervised by the church. All the older colleges and universities in the United States came to be established by churches and their freedom was strictly circumscribed by the exigencies and sometimes the vagaries of church life.

The modern conception of academic freedom is an importation from Germany, more especially of the growth of German graduate schools after 1870. Paradoxically, German universities of this period were anything but politically free.

Teachers of the social sciences were looked at with a jaundiced eye and screened for political orthodoxy and acceptability by the Government. Until 1918 it was practically impossible for a Marxist to obtain a teaching position in either Germany or Austria-Hungary, all appointments being subject to Government approval.

In most parts of Europe, in the latter part of the 19th century it (academic freedom) still meant autonomy, rather than Lehr und Lernfreiheit. In this country the growth of academic freedom was neither uninterrupted nor was it ever complete and absolute. During periods of war or tension there have always been regrettable departures from and violations of academic freedom, perhaps most markedly during the First World War. This is not to say that it should not be as pervasive as possible. On the contrary, I favor freedom to teach, to learn, to dispute, to disagree. But I also vividly recall how freedom was abused to make German universities hotbeds of nazism.

This raises the real question: What degree is possible? Should the teacher have complete license both in and out of the classroom; should he be immune from the taboos, directives, myths, and folkways of a society? Should he be "beyond the good and evil," above what his community considers as moral, proper, and decent—the old issue of customary against reflective morality?

FREEDOM ARGUED

Should the academician rightfully claim the absoluteness of academic freedom, while so frequently stressing the relatively culture-boundedness and social-relatedness of all other claims and values? Why should it be absolute, when he is telling us that everything else is relative? Or should academic fredom, alternatively, mean just freedom of teaching in the classroom? With no limitation, or with some limitation? Must it by any chance be balanced by responsibility, and if so, responsibility to whom? Students, fellow teachers, administrators, the large community?

And if there are to be any limitations, implicit or explicit, what kind of limitations and who is going to prescribe and apply them? Here the real dangers lie and it is only proper to ask whether abuse of academic freedom is not less objectionable than its deliberate limitation? The answer is that only the academic profession itself can decide and that outside intervention can only do more harm than good, except under the most exceptional circumstances and when there is "clear and present danger."

HARVARD TAKES STAND

We now put our finger on the tooth that is hurting: Does academic freedom protect teachers who espouse and propagate communism, fascism, or any other totalitarian ideology—of which this century probably will see a few more?

First, let us look at what the professional organization of college teachers, the American Association of University Professors, has to say. "The tests of the fitness of a college teacher should be his integrity and his professional competence, as demonstrated in instruction and research." It brands propaganda in or out of the classroom, advocacy of legally defined subversive action, in his extramural relationships as causes for dismissal, provided his guilt is established in a proceeding in which he is given a full measure of due process. It has never gone on record whether membership in the Communist Party is or is not cause for severance.

The Association of American Universities, representing the administrators, upholds critical freedom, hospitability to an infinite variety of viewpoints, the study and examination of unpopular ideas, but states unequivocally that membership in the Communist Party extinguishes the right to a university position, since it deprives the scholar of integrity and independence.

One of the clearest statements of policy regarding Communist professors comes from Harvard University: "We would regard with the gravest concern the presence on our teaching staff today of a person who is now under the domination of the Communist Party. We think membership in the Communist Party by a faculty member today, with its usual concomitant of secret domination by the party, goes beyond the realm of his political beliefs and associations. It cuts to the core of his ability to perform his duties with independence of thought and judgment. By the same token, it is beyond the scope of academic freedom. In the absence of extraordinary circumstances, we would regard present membership in the Communist Party by a member of our faculty as grave misconduct, justifying removal."

PARTY ACTION CONNED

This leaves unanswered the question of former party membership and that of faculty members who invoke the fifth amendment. Both are regarded as misconduct, but not necessarily grave misconduct, and therefore may not result in removal by the corporation of Harvard University, each case to be decided on its merits after full and deliberate consideration of the facts and issues involved.

The Harvard position, and that of the majority of other institutions, is based on the conviction that Communist Party activities differ fundamentally from other political activities in that they are secret, deceptive, and conspiratorial. This is borne out by what has come to light in the various investigations. The crux of the matter is not the defense of unpopular or controversial opinions—it would be suicide for any university to prohibit or to limit such discussion—but the organization of clandestine totalitarian groups on our campuses. Clandestine and secret Fascist (including native Fascist) groups would be just as objectionable and incompatible with academic freedom.

In the words of the Association of American Universities, "a scholar must have integrity and independence." This cannot be reconciled with the use of falsehood and deceit as normal means of persuasion; or with thought control—the dictation of doctrines which must be accepted and taught by all party members.

Harvard goes even farther, stating that "the use of the fifth amendment is entirely inconsistent with the candor to be expected of one devoted to the pursuit of truth." This last statement will not be acceptable to some who sincerely deplore and condemn communism. There are those who honestly believe that congressional committees are overstepping their constitutional bounds, and who refuse to testify in protest, and another group who are willing to put on record their own past, but refuse to furnish information on others.

Assuredly, there may be honest differences of opinion about the validity and defendability of their position. A minimum requirement, though, would seem to be their willingness to give free and full testimony on anything reflecting on their integrity before a properly constituted body of their own college or university. As the AAU put it, "the university is competent to establish a tribunal to determine the degree of any trespass upon academic integrity, as well as to determine the penalty such trespass merits."

SECRECY VERSUS INTEGRITY

Why do we assert that the Communist Party differs fundamentally from all other political movements, at least from those now extant in the United States? First, because it and its members act as agents of a foreign power, a major military power, unfriendly to this country and what it stands for. Secondly, because it serves as fountainhead of and provides the apparatus for an underground, conspiratorial movement which would replace our system of representative government by a system which they themselves call the "dictatorship of the proletariat," i. e., dictatorship of the oligarchy ruling the Communist Party. Thirdly, because "truth or consistency in public statements as ends in themselves are inconceivable to a Bolshevik," thereby denying the very foundation of academic freedom. Why should we be disturbed by the existence of Communist Party groups on campuses? Presumably, they just contribute to controversy which admittedly is the lifeblood of free inquiry. Partly, because all positions should be stated openly, without disguise or camouflage, without a motive other than that of education. More importantly, because Communist Party cells represent a training ground for illegality. This was abundantly demonstrated in the report of the Royal Commission of Canada, investigating the famous espionage ring in 1946—a classic statement which ought to be required reading for those who still regard it as "the kind of knowledge about which it is prudent to make no inquiries."

CELLS GET NOTICE

One of the objects of cells or Marxist study groups on campuses is "to accustom the young Canadian adherent gradually to an atmosphere and an ethic of conspiracy. The general effect on the young man or woman over a period of time of secret meetings, secret acquaintances, and secret objectives, plans, and policies can easily be imagined. The technique seems calculated to develop the psychology of a double life and double standards."

Reasonable care must certainly be taken by every college that the normal educative processes not be distorted and perverted to such ends. True, most students—and even teachers—are apt finally to discover that their eagerness and idealism have been exploited for ultimate purposes of doubtful nature, and they tend to get out and away from it all.

Ernst Morris' book on the American Communist shows conclusively that the American Communist Party is in the overwhelming majority of cases a corridor through which membership moves at a rapid rate. The turnover is terrific. Few except the hard-rock nucleus stay much more than a couple of years, and of late it has shrunk to a point where it is more of a problem in clinical psychology than a genuine political movement. Yet, the damage is usually done: Promises of a lifetime lay wilted in the path of young men and women who were taken in and then got out.

Even that may be taken as part of the price we have to pay for a perfectly free and untrammeled education. "Freedom of thought exists only where there is freedom to err." But freedom to err does not include freedom to conspire; education is somewhat distinct from training for treason. Nor can clandestine groups be permitted to extend and magnify their influence far beyond their small numbers by a conscious systematic and successful policy of infiltration of other on- and off-campus organizations and organs of self-government. This has of course long been recognized by most labor unions, but it has not always been seen by the academic community.

CANADIAN CASE CITED

Disregarding more recent testimony, we again turn to the Canadian Royal Commission, which sat and deliberated in a dignified, thoughtful, and intelligent manner without benefit of television and press agentry. "One objective," the commission concluded, "is that this technique facilitates the achievement of a basic policy of the Communist Party, viz, to get control, through the election of secret members to the directing committees, of as many types of functionary organizations as possible, including trade unions, professional associations, and broad nonparty organizations such as youth movements. Similarly, secret members or adherents of the Communist Party may be used to take the lead in organizing new, broad, and ostensibly nonpolitical organizations, after which they obtain for themselves and other secret adherents key positions on controlling committees. By these means the technique of secret membership is calculated to facilitate essentially dishonest, but not ineffective methods of propaganda in the interests of a foreign state."

The American college and university is perhaps more vulnerable to infiltration than those of other countries, where there usually exist vigorous political movements and organizations apart from the Communists. In this country, faculties and students are largely nonpolitical, intent on their little specialties and pursuits, and individualistic in their proclivities. A well-knit, purposeful, and trained cell can go a long way in exercising influence and pressure. The danger of uniformity and conformity is by no means confined to machinations of the extreme right—not by a long shot. The very minimum would seem to be awareness that such influences have existed, and alertness to the possibility of their reappearing at various times and in various disguises.

LIBERTY GUARDED

At the same time, we must be vigilant lest we harm the sensitive plant of academic liberty while controlling the weeds. Ultra rightists no less than ultra leftists would like us to blur and efface all the shade and color combinations of liberal, Socialist, and Communist. Actually, a liberal ought to be the very antithesis to a Communist, and in most parts of the world—more especially in Europe—he is just that.

We should also be able to distinguish between the many varieties of Marxism. Every Communist is a Marxist, but every Marxist is not a Communist. Again, in countries where socialism is a real political movement of the masses, rather than a fad of a few "curdled indignants," it is the Socialist parties in places like England, France, the Scandinavian countries that have proven to be the best dike against the totalitarian variety of socialism, namely, communism.

It should not be beyond us, furthermore, to distinguish between pure political and economic theory, and what has been called "the operational code of the Politburo." I am frequently amazed at intellectuals who have never gone, and refuse to go, beyond the so-called classics of socialism—Marx, Engels, and perhaps Lenin. They know next to nothing about the new imperialism, nationalism, bonapartism of the Soviet Union, the new class structure in the Communist orbit, the new and assertive bureaucracy, and least of all the elimination of any vestige of free inquiry and academic freedom under communism. There is indeed something dated and anachronistic about the typical leftist's enthusiasm for something that has ceased to have relevance and reality quite some time ago.

Finally, there is the problem of responsiveness to public opinion and that is admittedly a tough one. Too much responsiveness would lead to submissiveness, lack of integrity, and ultimately loss of our raison d'etre. Too little responsiveness, or none, leads to a kind of academic isolationism, ivory-towerishness, and ultimately loss of vigor. Just as we build multipurpose dams we must have multipurpose education. "The education of the individual is to my mind a finer thing than the education of the citizen," wrote Bertrand Russell, "but considered politically, in relation to the needs of the time, the education of the citizen must, I fear, take the first place." Institutions, too, have to show "a decent respect to the opinions of mankind"; they do not have to be subservient, but at least they must not show too much of that "arrogance that the possession of knowledge (not necessarily wisdom) so often induces," to quote Francis Wilson.

BALANCE REQUIRED

Essentially, this raises the issue, and a very big issue, of the position of education in a democracy. There is poignancy to the fact that intellectuals have frequently advocated social control, political and economic planning, Government intervention in everything from womb to tomb, but recoil at the thought of social control of education. Not that many of these measures are not justifiable. It is only that everybody is willing to control the next fellow, but views with indignation social control of his own vocation. Freedom for the sheep and freedom for the wolves. * * * It is all a matter of balance and of a degree.

Ultimately academic freedom will only survive if it will be equilibrated by academic resonsibility to the profession itself and to the larger community. There are no game refuges or reservations where we could be protected from the pressures and perhaps even the persecutions of the mass. "The loose-jointed integration of liberal society is being replaced," in the words of C. Wright Mills in "White Collar," "by the more managed integration of a corporate-like society." Or as the layman would put it, we cannot have our cake and eat it too.

We must face all the unpleasantness and pressures and tribulations of the society we live in; there is truly no place to hide. The sooner we will decide to face reality, to live in the present instead of the 19th century, even to face the reality of communism, the better it will be for academic freedom and the future of this country. "Vision," said Lord Radcliffe, "is not the right to dream or the gift of prophecy, but, more humbly, the best light that we have."

Thanks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 19, 1954

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the closing days of the exciting 83d Congress are upon us.

For their friendly support and helpful suggestions during all the days of this legislative session, I should like to thank the many, many good and kind-hearted citizens of Jersey City and Bayonne, N. J.

It has been a joy, Mr. Speaker, to represent those wonderful, wonderful people of the 13th Congressional District of New Jersey here in the Nation's Capital, in the beautiful city of Washington, D. C.

On the eve of my return home to resume the challenge of winning the consent of my distinguished constituency, God willing, to another term in the Congress, my third, a familiar expression comes to mind:

> For your success, credit others. For any failure, debit yourself.

I do and shall, if need be, Mr. Speaker.

Alcide de Gasperi

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. DODD

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 19, 1954

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, today the free world has lost one of its great spokesmen and one of the outstanding apostles of a united Europe.

The death of Alcide de Gasperi is a great loss.

Seven times Premier of Italy and lifelong foe of communism and fascism, his voice will be missed in the councils of Europe.

This great man was, in my judgment, one of the greatest statesmen of his generation.

In his lifetime, he did not receive the credit that he deserved, but long after his death he will be remembered for the contribution which he made to his own country, Italy, and to the world at large.

The fact that Italy has not been overwhelmed by the Communists is due most of all to the leadership of de Gasperi. For Italy he was certainly the man of the hour. While he lived, communism in Italy was faced by its greatest living Italian opponent. As we mourn his death, and in his memory, we must resolve to do all that we can to make certain that Italy does not fall under the control of the Communist conspiracy.

Several weeks ago, I was in Italy and while there visited with Premier Mario Scelba and with former Premier Pella. Both of these men are worthy disciples of de Gasperi. Both of them are believers in democracy and freedom. I am confident that Prime Minister Scelba will carry on in the tradition of his mentor, Alcide de Gasperi. His task will not be an easy one and we of the United States should assist him in every possible way.

Mr. Speaker, we of the United States bear a great responsibility to Italy.

Should Italy fall into the Communists' hands it is not an exaggeration to say that an enormous catastrophe will have occurred.

From the standpoint of politics and geography, a Communist Italy will put

Western Europe, and indeed the Western Hemisphere, in grave jeopardy.

If this center of culture and religion is placed under the yoke of communism, we can expect to lose many others who are now on our side and who will give up further resistance to Communist domination.

Psychologically the loss of Italy could in itself be fatal to our cause.

These are great reasons for firm resolution on our part to assist the Italian Government and the Italian people, but in addition we carry a greater moral responsibility with respect to Italy than we do anywhere else in the world.

For we forced communism on the Italian people.

It was the Government of the United States, acting with its allies, that permitted the Communist leader, Togliatti, to return from Moscow at the close of the war and to be given a voice in the public affairs of that nation.

Up to that time communism in Italy had never been a major political problem.

We led the people of Italy to believe that communism was just like other political organizations in the world, and with our blessing and at our urging this evil conspiracy was planted in the midst of the Italian people with our benediction.

Not only did we insist upon the Communists having a voice in the affairs of postwar Italy, but we went further and gave the Communists in Italy advantages that we denied to others. The UNRRA operation in Italy played directly into the hands of the Communists and gave them a tremendous economic advantage.

We of the United States made it possible for the Communists to get started in east-west trade operations in Italy, which today brings to the Communist Party in Italy an income of many millions of dollars a year. Having built up communism in Italy and created the Communist problem for that country, we are now becoming impatient with the Italian Government because of its inability to effectively and immediately overcome the Communist forces.

It is not uncommon these days to hear some prominent Americans say that the situation in Italy is hopeless and to suggest that we might as well write her off as sure to fall into the Communist orbit.

This is a defeatist attitude, not only with respect to Italy but as well with respect to ourselves, and those who make these pronouncements are either without knowledge concerning the real situation in Italy or without faith in the world cause of freedom and democracy.

Italy cannot fall into the hands of the Communists, as a matter of our own survival.

Associated with these expressions of gloom and despair concerning Italy are a considerable number of false factual reports concerning that country.

For example, it is frequently said in the United States that a very high Italian birth rate is a principal cause of Italy's difficulty. The fact of the matter is that at the present time Italy has the lowest birth rate in Western Europe. The birth rate of France is higher. So is that of Holland and so is that of England.

A second false claim with respect to the situation in Italy is that communism has flourished in Italy only because of bad social and economic conditions. But the available statistics and information does not support this assumption.

I was amazed to discover that the moving-picture industry in Italy has been heavily infiltrated by the Communists and surely this cannot be explained away on the grounds of poor social and economic conditions.

A third mistake with respect to the Italian problem lies in the assumption that economic conditions are deteriorating in that country and not improving. But the fact is that the economy of Italy is remarkably sound considering her situation and is growing stronger every day.

Considering all of the factors involved, Italy has done an outstanding job.

Let us remember that Italy at the close of the war was badly demoralized and impoverished. If she did not have the Communist problem her task would have been enormous but when we forced communism on Italy we compounded the post-war difficulties of the Italian people. That is why in fairness we must acknowledge that the Italians have done remarkably well under all circumstances.

The Italian people at heart can never be Communists. It is not in their nature to accept the materialistic doctrine of that evil philosophy.

If Italy goes Communist it will be because the people have been deceived and misled and because, as a matter of despair, they have no other choice left. There are millions of vigorous anti-Communists in Italy who are constructively working every day to win the masses of Italy to the side of freedom.

While I was in Italy I became aware for the first time of an organization called the Christian Union of Employers and Managers, which is an association devoted to the development in Italy of a constructive program based on sound, social and economic principles.

It is a union of employers and managers in industry, convinced of the necessity for reestablishing a moral and social order based on the principles of Christianity.

It is an association of employers and executives in industry and business who are conscious of their social responsibility and determined to respect the primacy of human values in business and professional life.

It is an organization offering employers and managers in industry an opportunity to train themselves as leaders of men and, as such, to evaluate and solve the many problems in the noneconomic order connected with employment in modern industry and business.

It is a movement to help erect a social structure based on personal worth and responsibility, through the initiative of employers and managers in industry concious of their mission to serve the common good.

This great force for good believes that Christian social doctrine contains principles and basic orientation capable of overcoming social conflicts and differences and of establishing an economic order based on justice and collaboration between the various elements of society.

It believes that no one is exempt from responsibility toward the individual and the social order, and that such responsibility is in accordance with the individual's position and function in social and economic life.

It believes that there is a community of activity and interest between employers and workers in industry and in the general economic order.

It believes that it is possible to improve management-labor relations within an individual company as well as on the industrywide basis.

It believes that there is no satisfactory substitute for private employment and that private enterprise is justified morally, socially, and economically.

This organization holds great promise for the future in Italy and it is an indication of the kind of leadership that is emerging in that country and which can succeed, provided that we of the United States keep faith with our Italian friends of democracy.

In addition to continuing our active support and help for the democratic forces in Italy, we must demonstrate to the people of Italy, as we do to the people of the entire world, that we do not intend to take communism lying down.

We must make clear that we mean what we say. There must be no doubt about the fact that we will no longer appease the forces of communism anywhere in the world.

And finally, but most importantly, we must build up our strength and our might so that those who are in peril abroad have no doubt at all about our ability to win this struggle with the forces of communism in the world.

I can think of no better way to respect the memory of Alcide de Gasperi on the occasion of his death than to firmly resolve that we shall see Italy through and that we shall not permit her to fall a victim to the Communist conspiracy for world domination by the Communist tyrants.

Behind the Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 18, 1954

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith an editorial from the Wausau Daily Record-Herald, Wausau, Wis., one of the leading daily newspapers in my district, under date of August 12, 1954. The editorial is as follows:

BEHIND THE VOTE

Representative MELVIN R. LAIRD, of Marshfield, was 1 of but 29 Congressmen who voted against a 7-percent hike for half a million post-office workers, 351 lawmakers having voted for it.

But Representative Laird, in voting against the measure, was making more of an effort to help the postal workers—and the country—than those who voted for it, in our view.

It is not that he opposes a raise for postal workers, because he favors one—but not in the form voted by the House. The legislation as voted by the House, he said, had no chance of White House approval, and everyone concerned was aware of it. Word off the floor was to "go ahead and vote for this bill as it doesn't have a chance of becoming law," because it either would be amended by the Senate or vetoed by the President.

In other words, its passage was a purely political vote as a result of what Representative Laird termed "perhaps the greatest display of political demagogery which we have witnessed this year."

What Representative Laird favors is a pay increase of 5 percent, plus allowances, tied in with an increase in postal rates and administrative authority to reorganize the entire pay and job structure of the Post Office Department. Such a bill is sought by the administration.

The Congressman noted that if the bill passed by the House is not amended to bring it in line with the provisions sought by the executive department, the postal workers won't receive any raise at all at this session, because the administration feels they are "absolutely necessary in order to obtain some semblance of fiscal responsibillity in the operations of our Federal Government * * *."

The Wisconsin Seventh District Representative made the point that the Federal Government now owes nearly $275 billion and is at the limit of the debt ceiling. Since the end of World War II the postal deficit has amounted to more than $4 billion and the taxpayers are paying $100 million a year just as interest on that postal debt.

He raised this question:

"How can we face the voters back home and tell them we voted for this legislation which will cost the taxpayers an additional $200 million a year but we are unwilling to vote for a single red cent of revenue to meet the additional costs? By passing this legislation * * * we will merely be deciding to pass the bill on to our children and grandchildren in the form of a still larger national debt to be paid for by them some time in the future."

Representative Laird displayed statesmanship and courage in taking the stand he did. He deserves the full support of his constituents, including the postal workers, in putting their interests above politics.

They Tried To Get Me, Too

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 19, 1954

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an interview between the Honorable Martin Dies, of Texas, and the editors of the U. S. News & World Report, August 20, 1954:

They Tried To Get Me, Too

(Interview with Martin Dies, chairman, House Un-American Activities Committee, 1938–45)

Question. How long were you chairman of the House Un-American Activities Committee?

Answer. From 1938 to 1945, a period of 7 years.

Question. When did you leave Congress?

Answer. In 1945—January 3, 1945.

Question. Were you defeated in the race?

Answer. No. I withdrew because of my health. They told me that I had a cancer of the larynx, and, believing it, I announced that I wouldn't be a candidate. It later developed that I didn't have it, but I was in pretty bad shape for several years.

Question. Did you have pretty intense opposition?

Answer. I had the usual opposition. The CIO had raised $35,000 to $40,000, and the conservatives didn't come to my rescue. They just took everything for granted. It was a combination of circumstances. I had no money to fight back with, and I knew that President Roosevelt and his lieutenants and the labor unions were concentrating on me.

Question. Why were they concentrating on you? Were you particularly active against unions?

Answer. No. But you see, I investigated the CIO and exposed the fact that a number of CIO unions were Communist-dominated, and they were bitterly assailing me in the press. John L. Lewis was very bitter about it. He called the White House in 1938, and Roosevelt called me to the White House and told me that Mr. Lewis had just called him.

Question. This is while Lewis was still head of the CIO——

Answer. Yes.

Question. What did Roosevelt say?

Answer. Let me give you the story briefly in the order in which it happened. In 1937, Representative John McCormack was chairman of this committee, for a period of 12 months. Representative Dickstein ran the subcommittee and concentrated on so-called nazism. Much of it was antiracial. The results were that there was disorder and semiriots when he would hold the hearings, and it became a matter of some concern to the Democratic leadership. So, they came to me and asked me to take the committee.

There was placed in the Congressional Record, which is still there, the endorsement of about 75 or 100 organizations demanding that the committee be continued. Those endorsements came from left-wing groups largely. Of the 75, probably 60 percent were organizations which we found to be Communist-controlled. Their idea of upholding this committee was, of course, to use it solely to go after the Nazi-Fascist groups.

Now, when I introduced a resolution at the request of the Democratic leadership, I announced that it was my intention to devote sufficient time to communism. When I announced that, they switched their support immediately and began to fight the committee almost from the beginning. I then received a letter from the Speaker of the House——

Question. What year is this?

Answer. 1938—Mr. Bankhead, by special messenger, marked "Confidential"—the original I still have—sent me a letter in which he transmitted to me instructions as to the kind of investigation which was expected—a letter of suggestions. They said that to investigate any organization simply because it had Communists in it, like the CIO, would be a very grave mistake.

Question. Where did these instructions come from?

Answer. From the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and it originated in the White House.

Question. Did Speaker Bankhead say they originated in the White House?

Answer: No; but I later found out that they did. But, at any rate, I then told them frankly that I intended to investigate Communists, regardless. Well, the first thing I did was to go see John L. Lewis. I called on him and Lee Pressman [CIO counsel] was present. I told him that the evidence which we had collected showed very plainly that the CIO was infiltrated with Communists, and that some of the unions were under complete domination. I asked Mr. Lewis to cooperate with us to the end that we could get them out and clean up the organization. Mr. Lewis became very angry and told me that the Communists had the same right to be in a union as anyone else. He said, "We make no distinctions. We have Republicans, we have Democrats, we have Catholics, we have Protestants."

So, one word led to another and he said, "The CIO don't need you or any other Congressman to tell us how to run our organization." He was in quite a huff, and I left.

Well, I opened hearings on the CIO in August, the 8th or 10th, and I got a telephone call from the White House to come. I went to the White House and Senator Sheppard was there. He had been talking to the President before I went in.

Question. This was the late Senator Sheppard, of Texas?

Answer. Yes. The President turned to Senator Sheppard and said, "Senator, what are we going to do about Martin?" The Senator said, "What do you mean?" "Well," the President said, "you know, all this business about investigating Communists is a serious mistake. Mr. Lewis is very much disturbed. I just got a telephone call from Mr. Lewis and he is very, very much disturbed. If Martin insists on investigating the Communists in the CIO, it will antagonize the CIO which will in turn hurt the Democratic Party because we must rely on the CIO in some of the doubtful areas."

Then one thing led to another. I reported that conversation in 1939 in a series of articles in Liberty magazine, called More Snakes Than I Can Kill. Roosevelt was confronted with my interpretation of the interview and did not deny it.

So, it was told during his lifetime. He stated, in effect, to me that he didn't want communism investigated. He wanted me to confine my efforts to Naziism. That's what everybody else wanted when I got the committee. They wouldn't believe that un-American activities encompassed communism. They didn't see communism was any threat to the United States.

Question. Didn't you subsequently bring out a report which stated that a majority of these unions were Communist-dominated?

Answer. Yes. I brought out 8 or 9 reports.

Question. Wasn't there something, too, about the executive board of the CIO?

Answer. That nearly one-half of the executive board had Communist records, and that 12 of the international unions were completely Communist controlled and that 9 others had Communists in their membership.

Question. Was it generally suspected at that time that Lee Pressman, chief counsel of the CIO, was a member of the Communist Party?

Answer. No; I didn't know it. He denied, you know, vigorously that he was a member of the Communist Party. At the time of my interview with Lewis, I didn't know that Pressman was a member of the party.

Question. He didn't admit it until 1950; did he?

Answer. That's right, it was many years after my experience with him that he admitted under oath before a congressional committee that he was. But, at any rate, Roosevelt land the gage of battle down then. He told me very frankly what the situation was.

Well, I went on back and exposed the Communists in the hearing on the CIO, and from then on we just battled almost every day. The President issued a public statement which appeared on the front pages of the newspapers. I answered him. I got the Mutual Broadcasting to give me 30 minutes, and the White House demanded that Mutual give the late Paul Anderson, a newspaperman on the other side of the controversy, the same time to answer me. They demanded that I surrender my manuscript, and I refused.

The evening I went to the broadcasting station, it wasn't certain whether we would go on the air or not, but I refused to surrender my manuscript.

It's a long story, but, in other words, we fought all the way through. Now, in 1941 I submitted to the Executive a list of about 2,000 Communists on the Federal payroll, including Alger Hiss, Harry Dexter White, Harold Glasser, and others, and asked that they be discharged. They refused to expel them. Then I got the House to appropriate $100,000 for the purpose of financing an investigation by the Department of Justice.

I said to the House and to the administration, "Since you won't take my evidence, I'm going to make the Department of Justice investigate this list and this evidence." I got $100,000 for the work, not with the approval of the administration, for they were not in favor of it, and we overruled them. The Department of Justice then took the information that I had and the evidence and yet flatly refused to do anything about it.

Question. Is this recorded in some letter?

Answer. This is all in the reports, yes, filed in the House of Representatives.

Question. Who was the Attorney General then?

Answer. Francis Biddle was the Attorney General from September 1941 on.

Here's the basis on which they reported back to the House. They said to the House that the Department of Justice had submitted the list to the heads of the departments with the request that the departments indicate which ones they wanted investigated. There were only several departments that asked for any investigation at all, and therefore no investigation was made in the majority of cases.

That list of 2,000, then, stayed there for a little more than a decade before they finally were discharged. In 1941, I wired Roosevelt, just before the outbreak of the war in December, and urged him to reconsider. I told him that this thing was far more serious than he thought it was, that they were in the Government and they were there to steal our diplomatic and military secrets, that if it would please him I'd step down, quit the chairmanship if it had become a personal matter between him and me, but that the big thing was to do something about it, to understand that the Russians were out for world conquest, that that was their primary objective.

Roosevelt called me up, in Orange, Tex., and said, "I just got your telegram and appreciate it. I want to review this with you," he said. "Can you come to Washington?"

"Yes, I can come," I said.

"Can you leave tonight?"

So, my wife and kids left that night and we got to Washington Wednesday morning. The interview was set for 12 o'clock. I went to the White House at 12 o'clock and sat there 1 hour. He let me cool my heels. Finally the door opened and a man walked out who was notoriously in the Communist movement and had admitted that he was the man who put up the money for a fellow named Mayne, who had forged letters purporting to link me with William Dudley Pelley.

It was a very crude forgery, but we found the photographer here in Washington where they had gotten some of William Dudley Pelley's letters, pasted them together, forged something in which I was purported to say to Pelley, "I'll see that you get protection."

USE OF FORGED LETTER

Question. Pelley was regarded as a leading Fascist sympathizer at that time?

Answer. Yes. So, the outcome of the whole thing was that the forgery was exposed.

Question. How was the forged letter about Pelley used?

Answer. Then they got the New Dealers together, some 25 of the top-ranking New Dealers, and said, "Here's what we've got on Martin Dies—here's the letter." Of course, that tickled them to death and they agreed to use the letter.

So, in my absence, they put it in the Congressional Record, released it to the press, and the press carried it all over the United States—"Dies Linked With Pelley."

We traced it down with our investigators, and within 2 or 3 days we got Mayne, the man here in town that they had hired, and he confessed before the Rules Committee.

I asked the Rules Committee to conduct an impartial investigation, which they did. They brought Mayne before them and they brought William Dudley Pelley, and he denied ever having received any such letter from me. Mayne confessed. He said he got the money from a man who was then an official in one of the departments, I think Agriculture. Afterwards Roosevelt promoted him.

Question. What happened when you did see Roosevelt?

Answer. When I went into Roosevelt's office, he had a reporter there to take down the whole conversation. I said, "Isn't this rather unusual?" He said, "Well, I think it's best for everyone." I said, "That's fine—if I can get a copy of it." "You can get a copy of it," the President said.

We spent then over an hour and I told him exactly what was going on inside his Government. I told him the Communists were using those 2,000 persons inside this Government and that they were stealing everything in the world that they wanted and had access to.

We talked the whole thing over, and he told me, I remember distinctly, "You must see a Red under your bed every night."

Well, I told him: "I don't see a Red under my bed every night, but this is something that ought to be cleaned up."

At any rate, it was a rather long interview, and the reporter took it all down. I warned him again that the thing we had to come to understand was that the real objective of Russia is world conquest, and they'll use Fascists, Nazis, anything or anyone in their objective of world conquest.

A SECRET INTERVIEW?

Question. Did you get a copy of that interview?

Answer. Well, I left the White House, and as I walked out I said to Marvin McIntyre, one of his secretaries: "Marvin, the President promised me a copy of this. I want to keep it for my files. It may never be of any value, but I would like to have it." "Sure," he said, "I'll see that you get it."

I waited a week, and I didn't get it. So, I called Marvin and told him I hadn't gotten a copy of the interview that the President promised me. He said he'd see about it, and I waited another week. I called him again, and he said, "I don't know what's held it up, but I'll look into it."

Well, I waited another week or so and it did not come, so I sat down and wrote a letter to the President and reminded him of his solemn promise to furnish me with a copy. I got a letter back from the secretary saying that they had reconsidered the matter and it was against public policy to release the interview. I never got it.

Question. Did you find in those days that the prevailing view was that the Communists were just another political organization—not connected with the Soviet Government?

Answer. Well, that was partly true. But the evidence was very, very clear. In 1938, in our first report we unanimously—and that was five Democrats and two Republicans—found that the real purpose of the Kremlin was world conquest, and that all of this camouflage, all of these tactics, were all solely for the purpose in the end of conquering the world.

So that certainly there was no excuse after 1938—which was when the first report we filed and which was supported by ample evidence—for anyone in the Government to believe that the Communist Party was just another political party.

Here was what happened, and the people have not yet understood it. The Communists had quite a number of "front" organizations, like the American League for Peace and Democracy, which claimed 7 or 8 million members. The Communists had that for an apparatus. It was a fine vehicle because it published magazines and newspapers.

At one time we had 600 publications displayed in the caucus room to show members of Congress how much propaganda these Communist organizations were putting out. The Communists had their "fronts." They had the CIO to the extent that they could influence it—not completely dominate it but they had a tremendous voice in the decisions of the CIO. They controlled the American Labor Party at that time.

Now, the Democrats, as Roosevelt told me, were in this situation—he felt that at that period they had to have the support of the so-called, what they called them then, "liberal groups," and it was that influence which they exercised that caused the New Deal bunch to be soft. It was purely politics. In other words, if the American Labor Party switched from Democratic to Republican, it meant New York would go Republican—it was that narrow a margin. And in many districts, it was either get the CIO support or you didn't elect a Democrat.

Roosevelt told me all that quite frankly. He never made any bones about it. So, you had that political influence which they wielded, together with the fact that the President was really fascinated with Russia. Everybody who knew the inside story knew perfectly well that whenever you mentioned the name "Russia," Roosevelt would come to life and wanted to talk about it. He told me, "Now, I'm not a Communist and don't believe in communism, but," he said, "the present government in Russia is infinitely better than the old Czarist government."

I remember his words almost as if they were yesterday in his defense of the Communists. And another thing that he told me: "Several of the best friends I've got are Communists. You're all wrong about this thing," he said. "I'm not defending the Communists as such, but I'm telling you it represents a tremendous advance over what existed in Russia." That was his thinking.

THE CASE OF JOE LASH

Of course, Mrs. Roosevelt was more so than the President. In the case of Joe Lash, who was her protégé, when we investigated the American Youth Congress she had Joe Lash and the rest of the officers of the Youth Congress stay at the White House as her guests during the entire investigation, and she drove them to the committee hearings in the White House car. They'd show up in the morning. Mrs. Roosevelt would come sit right by them, knitting. Then when noontime came, they all got in the White House car and went back to the White House.

Finally, the evidence was so conclusive that Mrs. Roosevelt became very disturbed and sent for me to come to the White House, which I did, to have lunch with her. I walked in. She hadn't arrived, and I found myself in the presence of the queerest looking people you've ever seen. It would be hard for me to describe them. I sat there, I didn't introduce myself and they didn't introduce themselves.

Finally, she walked in and we went into the dining room. Well, I knew that Joe Lash was the subject of the thing, although she hadn't told me, and so I had brought the file, a partial file.

She said, "Well, I guess you know why I've asked you to lunch here."

"Well," I said, "I presume it's about Joe Lash. I guess, of course, that you know Joe Lash perjured himself before our committee."

"Yes, I know," she said, "He told me that he misrepresented things and he is very sorry."

"Well, did he tell you he was a Communist," I asked, "when he told us under oath that he wasn't?"

"Yes," she said, "he's confessed to me that in his youth he had joined the Communist Party."

"He's 32 years of age, Mrs. Roosevelt," I said, "He couldn't be so very youthful." Finally I said, "Now, what is it you want me to do?"

"We've got a chance," she said, "to get him in Naval Intelligence, if can get a clear bill from your committee."

I am telling you actually what happened. It's almost unbelievable, nowadays, but it happened. "Well," I said, "I'll call the committee this afternoon, Mrs. Roosevelt. Do you mind, Mr. Lash, coming before the committee again?"

Of course, I was baiting her. I wanted to put it in the record, because I knew perfectly well that they would deny what went on with me as the only witness. She fell for it and said, "Yes, that would be fine. May I send counsel with him?" I said, "Sure."

So, then Joe Lash came before the committee and I got him to confess that he had perjured himself, that he had been a Communist, and that he was an applicant for the Naval Intelligence and would get in the Naval Intelligence.

Then I asked him why he was not drafted, and he couldn't give an explanation. I then called the draft board in New York to find out, in the presence of the committee, and the draft board said that because of White House interference they did not draft Joe Lash. So, that was the sort of thing that Roosevelt was surrounded with. Until you understand that, you simply don't understand what went on during that critical period.

LINES TO THE KREMLIN

Question. Were you able at that time to connect up the activities of Communists with the Soviet Government in any way?

Answer. Completely! It was just overwhelming. Not just one volume of it but volumes of evidence. First, you had the confessions of the former Communists—we had some former Communists then just as they do now—who told of the connections. Then we had documentary proof that we had seized.

Question. How did you get it?

Answer. You see, the first thing we did was to issue subpenas duces tecum and seize the records of the "front" organizations in the country. We made a fairly clean sweep of this thing. At that time they were operating quite openly. Many of the documents which we obtained contained irrefutable proof of Soviet domination of the party here, the connection between them, the orders issued by the Kremlin and directed to agents in the United States. So, there was no doubt whatsoever about the thing.

Question. But, in addition to evidence of the Soviet Government's connection with the Communist Party here, was there anything that indicated that these people who were becoming members of the Communist Party were aware of the Soviet Government's interest in this country?

Answer. Oh, absolutely. There may have been some exceptions. There always are exceptions. But it was made so plain to them through the party line. In other words, here were the party and the leaders zigzagging every time the Communist International did.

Here was their role just as plain as could be. For instance, before Hitler invaded Russia, during the years of the pact, the line of the Communist Party then was to denounce British imperialism and American interference. When the invasion took place, the party, after a silence of about 24 hours waiting for the line to be communicated to it, then began to flip-flop completely over and demand that we immediately intervene.

Now, all of these people in the Communist movement could not have overlooked throughout this period the slavish adherence of the party and of all its subsidiary and auxiliary organizations to the Communist International line.

Then, more than that, it was taught to them in clear language that one of the primary duties of the Communists was loyally to follow the line, in language about which there couldn't have been any doubt in anybody's mind. This is within the party. Now, when you got out on the fringe, there was a different situation.

You had a great many gullible, unthinking people who joined, probably a total membership of 8 or 10 million at the height. Many of those people were your professional joiners—uplifters, do-gooders, people who had a mission on earth, and so on—and they were just easy prey for the Communists. But many of them joined all of the organizations.

It was a cumulative sort of thing. If John Doe belonged to one organization, you could understand that; but when John Doe belonged to the entire apparatus, and everywhere that they showed their footsteps you could find John Doe, then it was a conclusion that you couldn't escape that John Doe knew exactly what he was doing. He might have been deceived by one organization, but he couldn't have been deceived as to all organizations.

SUPPORT FOR RED FRONTS

Question. Were there many of those 8 or 10 million who were members of all the organizations?

Answer. Oh, yes. Do you know that nearly every Cabinet member during the Roosevelt administration, at one time or another, spoke under the auspices of Communist organizations, gave letters of endorsement and other expressions of encouragement to the Communist movement? That doesn't mean that they were Communists. I'm just showing you the support they gave these organizations after we had exposed them. The officers of these Communist organizations were received time and time again at the White House. I've got the instances of it. I've got the photographs of the receptions.

Question. How do you account for that—the failure of your committee to be convincing to the public?

Answer. No, no. The public always stayed with the committee. We never fell below 80 percent in the Gallup poll in 7 years. That was quite a high average. They took a poll, perhaps, every 6 months, and we never dropped below 80 percent. We had the support of the people—we had the support of the Congress. We won every fight despite the administration.

The people knew that the thing wasn't right. They knew enough to support the committee. But here was an administration that was tremendously popular—a President who was very popular. He had the confidence of the people. Despite their premonition that this thing was wrong, and the fact that they continued to stay with the committee, they nevertheless followed Roosevelt in spite of hell and high water.

If you remember the period, it was a period in which the people would say, "Well, I don't agree with the President on this or on that," but they still stayed with the President on election day.

Question. Were there lots of CIO members in your district?

Answer. They dominated every refinery in my district. I had the biggest CIO district in Texas. In Port Arthur and Beaumont, every refinery, which was the chief industry, was completely controlled by CIO. But I had been in Congress 14 years and been elected every time.

COMMUNISTS VERSUS DIES

Question. Did the Communists try to defeat you in your district?

Answer. Yes.

Question. Do you think they would have beaten you if you had stayed in the race?

Answer. No. You see, I had stood this thing for 7 years. What was really the matter with me was nervous exhaustion. They gave me the works—everything they could do, little personal things.

Question. Anything like what McCarthy has had?

Answer. Oh, he doesn't know what it is. They tried to get me, too. Listen, they examined my income taxes for 6 months—sat there in my town with 2 revenue men sent from Baltimore and spent 6 months making me dig up everything I had ever made for 10 years.

Question. Did they find anything wrong?

Answer. No, nothing whatever. If they had, they would have put me in the penitentiary. I had been very honest about my finances. I never accepted any money and was not unscrupulous about any of my dealings. I knew what I was up against.

Question. What else did they try?

Answer. They would do this. If you want a good idea of some of the things they did, read the diary of the late Harold Ickes, Secretary of the Interior in Roosevelt's Cabinet. One thing was to pass the word around among the business people and chambers of commerce, "Do you want some PWA (Public Works Administration funds)? You know you're not getting it, and you're not going to get it as long as Martin Dies is in Congress."

Another thing was ridicule. They just called me a "zany," one of Ickes' favorite expressions. Then something happened which I told the Senate Rules Committee about the other day.

In 1938, we had J. B. Matthews before us as a witness—he wasn't then working for the committee—and in illustrating how the Communists use prominent people for propaganda purposes, how they exploit names, he told of the occasion when Ce Soir, the Communist newspaper in Paris, had its anniversary, and they got people to sign telegrams. They had one telegram, which J. B. had possession of, which contained the names of prominent movie stars and among them was Shirley Temple.

"Now," Matthews said very carefully, "I don't want to be intimating that Shirley Temple or any of these people are Communists—this is not being introduced for that purpose—but rather to show how they exploit prominent names to give respectability to Communist publications."

Immediately the press carried the story: "Dies Accuses Shirley Temple of Being a Communist."

I then took the radio and read the entire transcript to the Nation, and I know I had a tremendous audience that night. I think it is one of the biggest audiences that anyone had had at that time because of the publicity and interest and it was in all the newspapers and I could tell from the mail that we got.

I said over the radio, "Now, here are the newspapers carrying this sort of story, and here is exactly what took place," and I read the exact transcript.

You would have thought that that would have flabbergasted them, but within a week's time Mrs. Perkins (Secretary of Labor) and Ickes and Biddle (Attorney General) made public speeches in which they said the Dies Committee accused Shirley Temple of being a Communist, and they continued to use that and use it to this day. The New York Times published a letter of Earl Browder's a few weeks ago in which Earl Browder makes again the same statement. So that in public speeches and in interviews that they gave out, Cabinet officers sought to ridicule the committee.

Question. And this broke you down?

Answer. It was a cumulative thing. Sure it broke me down—after 7 years.

Question. How long can a fellow stand that sort of thing?

Answer. I think a man would have to be young and strong to stand all that. I stood it all I could 7 years. I was ready for the hospital, and I was only 37 when I started this.

THREATS OF DEATH

Question. Did they threaten you physically at any time?

Answer. Let me follow this up and just show you. I went to the hospital here in Washington in 1940 to have my appendix removed. After my wife left the hospital and went home, all night long the telephone rang with people calling just about every minute: "Well, is your husband dead yet?" "I'm doing a lot of praying, but not what you think. I'm praying that he dies."

Now, they had that whole thing concocted to keep calling her that night. We finally had to take the telephone out and put in a private line because the telephone just rang all the time. It's a little thing, but it's cumulative.

Question. Like a drop of water——

Answer. Just like a drop of water that keeps falling on you. Then there were threatening notes all the time. There was hardly a mail that I opened that there wasn't a note threatening me with death or the children with kidnaping. They made one attempt on Bobby, my boy, here in Washington. We cautioned him to be careful. We had told Bobby that if anybody tried to get him in a car, just start running and hollering. This was before they assigned agents to us.

So, one day he was walking down Columbia Road—we lived off 16th Street, on Hobart—and a car stopped. There were two men in the car, and one of them said, "Come here, son," and when he said that, Bobby started to run and holler for about a half a block. He immediately knew that's what it was. This fellow followed him but couldn't catch him.

Well, there was a constant harassment like that for 7 years. Then, of course, there's the whispering that you're an agent for the Fascists and Nazis. The Federal Communications Commission gave out a statement that they had monitored the Nazi program and that I was more often mentioned favorably than any man in the United States, all of which was a lie. When we went into the thing and demanded the proof, all was to the contrary. But they put that out, all over the country, a deliberate lie.

But that caused people, even people who were for you, to begin to wonder: How strong is he for the Nazis? I had an uncle who had a ranch near Austin, Tex., and they started whispering around that we were all Nazis, and that my uncle had a swastika at his ranch that we all saluted. My uncle had a furious quarrel over that. But there were such things as that that went on and on. There's no end to what they can do to you.

Question. Do you think they are doing it now?

Answer. Well, of course, they are not doing it to me. I'm no longer in the picture.

Question. Do you think it's probably the same?

Answer. I would say so, unless they've changed. I don't know actually what they are doing to other people now, because it is just pure hearsay for me now.

Question. Have the chairmen who succeeded you on this committee been subjected to the same sort of thing?

Answer. Everyone who tried to do something. It hasn't been as furious, of course, as it was during my time, because then they had the open support of the administration, and public opinion to some extent favored Russia. Russia was popular then. I understand that after I left, Parnell Thomas, Representative from New Jersey, got it. They went after him. No doubt Parnell Thomas did a very stupid thing. Why he did it, I don't know. At any rate, if he accepted the kickback on the salary of one of his employees, he probably did what many others in Congress had done in the history of our country, unfortunately.

But, at any rate, they went after him with hammer and tongs. They went after anyone who fearlessly exposed and investigated Communists. You say, "If a fellow's strong, why can't he take it?" But he can't because his family is dear to him, his reputation is dear to him.

Question. Was this concentrated on the chairman, or did other members of the Committee feel it?

Answer. Well, they beat Joe Starnes [of Alabama]. They fought him in his district and beat him. Costello [of California] was defeated. They centered their fire on everybody in the committee who was opposed to them and really did his duty.

NO CREDIT, EVEN LATER

Question. When the CIO later dropped these Communists, did they ever give you any credit?

Answer. None whatsoever. In 1950, they expelled 11 or 12 of the organizations which we had exposed and which they had accused us of being pro-Fascist for exposing. They carried on a regular campaign in which they said we were labor baiters, how horrible it was to accuse these organizations of being Communist, what a terrible thing it was, and then in 1950 they got rid of these very ones. But they made no apology to the Dies committee. They didn't say they were wrong in harassing us.

There wasn't a publication that they put out during that 7-year period—there might have been a few, but none I ever saw—that didn't contain an attack upon us. They went into my district, they went into the refineries, and everyone would get their CIO paper with all these outrageous lies. There got to be so many lies that you couldn't contradict them all. You'd spend all your time trying to deny it.

Question. Did you have the support of the AFL [American Federation of Labor]?

Answer. Yes, we had their support, their loyal support, too. Mr. John Frey was a very patriotic gentleman and a strong anti-Communist, and he knew everything that was going on and did everything he could. He was the vice president and we had the support of the AFL.

Question. They supported your appropriations in Congress, too, didn't they?

Answer. That's right.

RED-TINGED UNIONS

Question. Of these CIO unions, didn't you name others that they didn't get rid of, like the Auto Workers?

Answer. Yes. We named 21. But we didn't classify the Automobile Workers as a Communist-dominated union. We just simply showed that there were some very active Communists inside the organization.

The same way, for instance, in Chicago. I seized the records of one of the biggest unions there, about 5,000 members. At any rate, when we got the records, we found two lecturers on the payroll of the union whose purpose it was to lecture on Marxism. We got the official charts that they used in which they depicted the universe—first prehistoric man, the earliest stage, then democracy, and finally the utopia of communism. The union was paying these two lecturers out of the funds of the workers to lecture on that, and there was a check there for $12,000, without any authorization from the union, that they were using to buy Daily Workers in subscriptions of thousands of copies which they would send throughout the country.

Now, that doesn't mean that the union was a Communist organization. It did mean that the leadership of the union was Communist. In other words, the rank and file didn't know. And, oh yes, in order to try to discover why, out of 5,000, they would let a thing like that go on, I demanded the minutes of the various meetings and I discovered that never did they have over 300 present.

Out of 5,000 they would have 300 attend the meetings. And the Communists would get together in advance and have their agenda. For instance, they'd agree that they would nominate so-and-so tonight—"I'll nominate him, you sit over here and second the nomination, and you sit over here and you sit over there, and we will make it appear unanimous."

That was the technique. We exposed 21 international unions in which Communists were very active in their control. The CIO claimed that some of them cleaned themselves up.

Question. What do you think about it?

Answer. I just don't know. I'm under this handicap now—it's been since 1945 that I've had any close contact in this subject, and this is something you dare not hazard an opinion. It's something you have to work with every day. I just don't know what the situation in the unions is today.

Question. Did you find any Communists in the Armed Forces as a result of your investigation?

Answer. Yes.

Question. Both in uniform and civilian?

Answer. That's right.

Question. Were there many of them?

Answer. Well, you see, they had 165,000 members in 1938—that's card-carrying members in the Communist Party.

Question. How did you find this out?

Answer. I got a membership card, I managed to secure a card—every Communist at that time was issued a card, and each card had a number—and this card was No. 165,000. There was every reason for us to believe that that was the maximum strength at that time. Now, you understand that around a million persons have passed through the party. It's a fluid sort of thing; they come and they go.

Question. How many of these were in the CIO?

Answer. Of that 165,000 members, 50,000 were in the CIO. This is the story on that which William Green, president of the AFL, told me.

When Roosevelt called Green to the White House to organize the industry, Green refused to do it on a mass basis because, he said, "We would have unionism in name but not in principle, and we don't believe in that." He then sent for Lewis and Lewis agreed to do it in support of the Government. So, he went out there to organize all the workers. Well, they had a scarcity of trained organizers. The Commies were all trained, the finest organizers on earth. So, Lewis utilized the Commies as organizers during that period when they were in desperate need of organizers.

Question. He did this unknowingly——

Answer. No, I believe he did it knowingly. He knew it perfectly well—although he has always fought the Communists and his organization issued one of the finest anti-Communist papers, I guess, that has ever been on the subject. Lewis has never been pro-Communist, but I believe he did this as a matter of expediency. He did this because he felt he could use them and, when he no longer needed them, he could get rid of them. Now, he denied that later on and accused his successor, Phil Murray, of being the captive of the Communists. But the whole truth of it—and I'm just as certain of this as anything in the world from my interview with him in 1938—is that he knew perfectly well what he was doing, that he was using these boys because they were wonderful organizers and could get the job done. But he never could shake them after that.

AN INFILTRATED ARMY?

Question. What about the number in the Armed Forces?

Answer. They always claimed that they had a total membership in the Armed Forces of around 50,000.

Question. This is before the universal draft?

Answer. Yes. They tried to infiltrate the Army and did infiltrate the Army, and we found considerable evidence of it.

Question. Was this voluntary enlistment?

Answer. Well, before you had the draft it was voluntary enlistment. But the total participation in World War II, according to the claims of all the Communists who appeared before us, was approximately 50,000. They claimed they had 50,000 members during the war in the Armed Forces. But they infiltrated everything. It wasn't just the Armed Forces. They went into schools. We issued a special report on that in 1941. They got into Hollywood.

I went to Hollywood and seized the records of a number of prominent movie stars and found from their own records that they had contributed hundreds of thousands of dollars to the Communist movement. I met with Schenck, the Warner brothers, and the principal executives, and we sat down around a table, just as we are meeting here, and I told them of the tremendous support their industry was giving to the Communists and I asked them to do something about it. They were very cold and very antagonistic, and finally Harry Warner said to me, "Well, we're not worried about the Communists. The thing we're worried about it is the Nazis. There's the bunch we want to see you get after."

"Well," I said, "if you're going to be consistent, you are going to have to go after every form of totalitarianism. I don't see how you can oppose nazism, on the one hand, in principle—if you are opposing them as a matter of principle—and then condone communism. Here are your actors contributing regularly thousands upon thousands of dollars. Here are your scenario writers who are members of the party and who are shaping their writing to very adroitly carry out the Communist propaganda."

Question. Did they later come around to your point of view?

Answer. They didn't during my 7-year period as chairman. Later on, of course, public sentiment changed and I know only from what I read in the papers that they did finally come out against the Communists.

COMMITTEE METHODS

Question. What do you think about the discussion and controversy over methods of congressional committees?

Answer. Just what I told the Jenner committee when I appeared recently. From the very beginning of the investigation of communism there has been a controversy about methods. Ham Fish, of course, had an investigation way back in 1924, but it didn't last long. They fixed him up quick. He was told there was a barn out here in Maryland where the Communists stored a lot of stuff. So, Fish went out there with his investigators, and the newspapermen and photographers accompanied them. There was quite a show over the barn, and there wasn't anything there but some rotten tomatoes. Well, that just killed Fish's chances. That was the end of his investigation, although Fish did some fine work. He never could live that down. The papers carried pictures of the tomatoes and all that.

So, that investigation never did get off the ground. Then McCormack's investigation never probed communism very thoroughly.

The argument of the critics is this: They're for the objectives of the committee, but they're against the methods of the committee.

I testified before Senator Jenner at the Rules Committee a few weeks ago just what that mean. I said to him, "What methods? What are they talking about? Get them to specify. Ask them to come here and give a bill of particulars."

Now, let's see. What are the methods? Let's say I'm the chairman of the committee and I have subpenaed John Doe, who is suspected of being a Communist, to appear before me at 10 o'clock in the morning. John Doe comes in. I start asking him questions, and he arises and shakes his fist at me and begins to denounce the committee as Fascist agents. I then throw him out of the committee room and immediately he begins to squawk, and the "liberal" press squawks, that I violated his civil liberties, that I have done violence to his rights as an American.

Now, they did this when I threw this fellow out who was head of the Transport Workers. The "liberal" newspapers said it was the most outrageous thing that had ever happened, and he had stood before the committee and before he even answered a question shook his fist and insulted the committee.

So, let's see a bill of particulars.

First, does a witness owe any respect to the committee? There's been a lot said about how committees conduct themselves to a witness, but how about when Mrs. Roosevelt—and I told Senator Jenner this—let all the Communist officers of the American Youth Congress stay at the White House and accompanied them to our committee hearings and knitted, and when the first witness was sworn in and pulled out of his pocket a very insulting poem about the committee, even though we were rapping on the desk telling him not to read it, did anybody in the country then say: "It is not right to treat an agency of the people this way. It's not right to insult them. It's not right for the First Lady of the land to lend countenance to this sort of thing"?

No, they didn't say it. Only a few editorials appeared in the United States in condemnation of that, as I recall. Never once did they condemn this sort of behavior of the witnesses, but let the committee make one little mistake—that they would interpret as a mistake—then this was emblazoned in the newspapers and we were denounced for it.

Question. What was the poem he read?

Answer. Well, it's in the record. It was an insulting poem designed to create the appearance that we were the tools of big business, that we were Wall Street henchmen, stooges. And Mrs. Roosevelt smiled and applauded. She was the First Lady of the land, the wife of the President, and we were an agency of the people of this country. She sat there and applauded that sort of conduct. And yet she and her friends today are among those hollering the loudest about "procedures."

So, I just named certain instances like that to the Jenner committee the other day and I said, "Find one word in the press in which that sort of thing was condemned—just one word."

NO BACKING IN PRESS

Question. The press was condemning you at that time?

Answer. Well, the conservative press was not, but they were apologizing for me. The funny thing about this was that so great was the propaganda, so clever this thing, that even among your friends they would finally get them to where they'd say, "Well, I'm for Dies. I believe he's trying to do a good job. Of course, I don't approve of all of his methods—" I've had them tell me that.

And I'd say to them, "Name the methods. What are the methods you are talking about? Subpoenaing witnesses? Is anything wrong with that method? He comes before the committee. Anything wrong with that? I swear him in. Anything wrong with that? I ask him a question. Anything wrong with that? He gets up and calls me a Fascist blankety-blank—and I kick him out. Anythink wrong with that?

Question. Do you think it is any different today?

Answer. I just don't know because I have not attended a single meeting of any of the hearings. I am satisfied that it is the same old stuff. I have never head of one of them changing their spots.

Question. The opposition, you mean?

Answer. Yes, the Communists. I am sure that the Communists have the same tactics and techniques that they have always had. This is univereal. Now, the proof of it is that the very think they deplored in us has occurred in the U. N., in the international conferences. They can no more do business, they are having the same trouble trying to talk to Communists and reason with them that we had in our committee. It is just a repetition on a bigger basis. But nobody criticizes the diplomats. The diplomat just get us and walks out in disgust. Nobody says anything about procedure there. But the procedure of our day was under fire.

THE URGE FOR CHANGE

The truth of the matter was, as I told the Jenner committee, there were 10 million "liberals" running around like a chicken with its head chopped off and wanting to change everything. They didn't know exactly what they wanted to change, but they were for changes. Along came the Commies, and they were the only group in that bunch that had a program. They knew where they were going and what they were doing.

So, they took over this 10 million and used them, and then suddenly came the exposure that here were these organizations that the "liberals" had sponsored and worked under and contributed money to under the control of Moscow.

Question. What was the reaction?

Answer. Here was the reaction. There were 565 Federal employees here in this town who belonged to the Washington League of Peace and Democracy. We exposed the organization as a Communist front, and it was. The evidence was overwhelming. Later the Attorney General had to agree with us. Now no one disputes it. All right. What did the 565 do? We didn't name them at first—we simply issued a report and said this organization was part of the orbit of organizations of the Soviet conspiracy. Did they come forth and say, "If that's true, we want to get out of it"? No. They began to issue derogatory statements. They said that the Dies committee was a Fascist organization.

Question. What happened?

Answer. They were proud of themselves. They thought they were going to change the world. They were a bunch of suckers and they couldn't take it. So, instead of being a gentleman and saying "Well, I made a mistake," they turned on the committee and began to denounce it.

Almost universally that was the reaction among this group. They got caught and they were afraid their names would come out and only about one-tenth of 1 percent ever came out. But every one of them was living in fear that some day all these names were coming out.

So, in order to forestall that and to prevent that from happening, they united for the purpose of stopping any investigation. Personally, I never intended to give their names out because I never saw any good purpose to come from that——

Question. The 10 million, you mean?

Answer. Yes. I did give the 565 out—afterwards. And they said that was rotten procedure. The President issued a statement on it, saying it was so sordid that he had to do something about it. But the reason I gave them out was because they had been warned and I tried to persuade them to get out of the organization and to drop it, but they began to defy me and the committee and so I said, "All right. If you believe this is a fine organization, then you certainly don't object to having your names made public. If this is what you say it is and you want to stand on it, then you can't object to having your name connected with it.

Therefore, I turned it over to the newspapers and they published the whole thing. Well, all the fat was in the fire then. Here were the names. Then, of course, the Civil Liberties Union and all the liberal groups began to use that as a horrible example of an irresponsible committee that would publish names. On the one hand, they spent 3 months defending the organization, refusing to quit it, and then when their names were given out they said they were smeared.

How can a man's name be smeared simply by making public his affiliation in a supposedly bona fide organization?

Question. What evidence is there about this 10 million?

Answer. The way I would put it is that there were 10 million members claimed by the organizations. All the officers of the Communist-front organizations stated what their total membership was.

Question. Might there not have been a lot of duplication?

Answer. There may have been. Probably there were some overstatements. Or there may not have been. So darned much that they conceded during that period has turned out since then to be true. You see, they were not trying to cover up anything favorable to them. After all, they were respected then, hobnobbing with the elite of the land.

Look what Browder said in his letter published recently in which he told about the "happy period from 1933 to 1945, when the Communists were accepted in the best society." So, their attitude was not one of covering up anything favorable—they boasted when they came before the committee of their influence and power.

CARE IN CHECKING NAMES

Question. Of those 2,000 you found in the Government, how many of those were in the State Department?

Answer. It was quite a large number. I think a large group of them was in the State Department. But now we just didn't take the names of people who were in an organization and say he belongs and therefore he is a Communist. It wasn't done that way at all.

It was a cumulative sort of thing. We took all the circumstances together on John Doe. John Doe belonged to four organizations. John Doe signed a manifesto. John Doe did this and that, following the party line. Just like a jury would try a case on circumstantial evidence—and a majority of the cases are tried on circumstantial evidence. So we took the circumstantial evidence—and understand there were 2 Republicans and 5 Democrats, 2 of whom were New Dealers, on our committee. Two members were strong with labor. There was Healey, who was coauthor of the Walsh-Healey Act, and there was Joseph Casey—all from labor districts.

Now, many of these findings, mind you, were unanimous findings. I never had trouble with my committeemen except two. They tried to pack it on me. They put several New Dealers on the committee, but after they got on it, pretty soon, when they began to see the facts, they knew they were wrong.

Question. Did you have FBI files?

Answer. We had access to all files. But we had enough evidence on Hiss to raise a serious doubt about Hiss.

Question. What year was this?

Answer. That was in 1941, when we submitted his name.

Question. Did the FBI let you go through their files?

Answer. No, not generally. You see, in 1938 they had practically no files on the Communists. They had investigated the German-American Bund. They submitted to us their report on the German-American Bund. I kept after them to get the Communist files, but they were rather evasive about it. Finally, when we seized all of these records, they then came to us and said, "Now, listen. We want the privilege of copying your records."

So, we set them up—145 filing cabinets. By 1941 we had 145 filing cabinets and we had a girl there for the purpose of aiding the FBI. And so they came almost every day, as many as 12, 15—agents of the FBI, and intelligence people—copying the most elementary things about this. So it convinced me that, if they spent hours and days and weeks copying, they didn't have it. I couldn't conceive of anyone copying all that that they already had. Therefore, I judged that the Department of Justice had not let them do anything very much at that time.

Question. Mr. J. Edgar Hoover was the head of the FBI?

Answer. Yes; and a very fine man. But from conversations which I had with him, while he didn't say so, I always had the feeling that he wanted to do a lot but couldn't on account of the Department of Justice. I think that's exactly the way the situation was.

LIMITS ON THE FBI

Question. You don't believe, then, that the FBI can do it all?

Answer. No; the FBI can't do it all. You see, they could do a lot if they had a free hand. Here's the limitations of the FBI. They can't subpena a witness. They can't put a man under oath. The greatest advantage in this committee business is to be able to subpena a witness and put him under oath and make him testify.

Question. The FBI can't evaluate testimony, either, can they?

Answer. No; they can't.

Question. And they can't make it public——

Answer. No; they can't make it public. But more important than all that is this: The FBI is under the Department of Justice, and if the Attorney General is against a certain thing, no matter how zealous the FBI may be, they are compelled to take orders from the Attorney General.

So, with Biddle as Attorney General, of course they weren't going to investigate. They couldn't do it on their own. They're under the Attorney General. A congressional committee, on the other hand, has absolute independence. It's not under anybody's control.

Question. Aren't there wraps on the FBI now?

Answer. No, I don't think so.

Question. Has the FBI enough men to carry out a large-scale investigation of this type?

Answer. I don't know. They always kept quite a number of men in our offices for years and years. They were there copying everything in the world we got.

Once I got a big haul in Philadelphia. I knew there was a Federal judge there who was going to give us trouble, so I had it timed and grabbed the stuff about 4 o'clock and rushed it over to a secret place. I had a photostat machine set up and we spent all night making copies of this stiff.

The next morning the Federal judge issued an injunction. He ordered all records to be returned, arrested two of my investigators, and so I hid out in a blind office until we completed the photostating. Then I came out and announced we were going to honor and obey the injunction.

Question. Were you doing this as a one-man committee, or did your committee support you?

Answer. My committee supported me throughout. However, I did much of the work by myself. It wasn't that I wanted to. It was just that the boys had so much work to do that very seldom could I get a quorum present. If I had had to have a quorum present, I just couldn't have done business. We had seven members. Each fellow has his own committee. He's not the chairman. He's got his own business to tend to and they just don't have time. You've got to sacrifice everything to carry out an investigation.

You can't tend to your congressional duties half way if you carry on one of these things. But I've always had their support because I took pains always to call them up and be diplomatic and consult them about things.

But I conducted a large percent of the hearings by myself.

"ONE-MAN" HEARINGS: WHY?

Question. Do you think if they abolish the one-man idea it would ruin the committees?

Answer. It would be the end of all of them. They know it. Say you've got a witness scheduled and you telephone and no quorum shows up—you've got to release the witness. You can't bring him all the way back to Washington. You can't function in the House of Representatives or in the Senate if a quorum has to be present for a hearing.

Question. What about two members?

Answer. Well, that wouldn't be quite as hard to get except that you put in the hands of the other member the right completely to nullify the hearings if he sees fit. The opportunity to sabotage is greater where they can strike at you through someone who doesn't have the same interest in making a success as you do. You're the chairman—the responsibility is up to you. If somebody makes a mistake they don't say, "John Doe's mistake"—they say, "The Dies committee" or "McCarthy committee" has done so-and-so.

So the chairman soon finds himself in the position where he has to take all the blame and he is the commitee, regardless of whether everyone is present or not, he becomes the committee so far as the public is concerned. Therefore, if you require one man to be there, it presents the opportunity to get that one man on their side. So first thing you know the Congressman who is with you may begin to drift off, and first thing you know he's on the other side.

There is the danger of the proposition of making your chairman dependent on someone else. I told Senator Jenner's committee that—I said, "This is an attempt to destroy congressional investigation."

Question. Going back to this 10 million members of front organizations—you started to develop that—was there any substantiation of this 10 million?

Answer. Yes; I think they had them all right—I was convinced from the evidence before us, the testimony of the officers and what we found from the books, and a lot of instances. Take the International Workers' Order. They had 195,000—1,900 chapters—that was bona fide. I know that that was their membership. Well, the Workers' Alliance was a loose organization—it had over a million. I don't think there is any question but it had it, because in every section of the country where it operated it had large membership.

Question. But the CIO never had more than 4 or 5 million, did they?

Answer. No.

Question. That included the total membership of the CIO in that, didn't it?

Answer. No; I'm not including the CIO—I'm talking about your front organizations.

Question. In the case of these labor groups, wouldn't the same members belong to one or more organizations? In other words, there was duplication, wasn't there?

Answer. That is right. There would be duplication as to individuals—but I'm allowing for that, because in the American League for Peace and Democracy they reached a total membership of 8 million.

Question. What was that organization?

Answer. That was an organization that the French Communist, Henri Barbussi, was ordered to establish throughout the world. It started in Amsterdam, Holland. A meeting was called there for the purpose of launching the League. They formed a league in France—"The French League Against War and Fascism"—the British—and all over the world they had similar organizations.

It was first the League Against War and Fascism. Then it became the League for Peace and Democracy. Later it merged into the Peace Mobilizaiton. You see, as you expose one, they would then take another name, and then another name.

Question. Was that membership of 8 million in this country?

Answer. Yes, in this country they had 8 million members. In every little town—why there were members of Congress that belonged to it, and they came to me and said, "I didn't know anything about it."

DANGER IN FRONT GROUPS

Question. They were not card-carrying members though?

Answer. No, they were not card-carrying members, but—remember this—say you belong to an organization. That organization has a publicatoin. You get the publication. You're contributing money to them. You're helping finance them. That gives them the opportunity to reach you through the publication. That gives them the prestige—after all, politicians will listen to 8 million Americans. They come to Washington and say, "We represent the American League for Peace and Democracy—we have a membership of 8 million." Their influence was considerable at that time.

Now you say, "How many were Communists?" Probably only a small percent of them were Communists, but the Communists were using them and Earl Browder—head of the American Communist Party—claimed that there were 2 million—he testified under oath that there were 2 million people in the country that would go with the party the full length. So he narrowed it down, and I always felt that there were somewhere around that number probably that would go with the party.

In other words, you're not a card-holding member. That doesn't mean you're not cooperating, because there have been a million that belonged to the Communist Party since 1919—total number of people who passed through the party who at one time or another belonged to the party. Now how many of them have repented? We don't know.

Question. In your experience of interviewing Communists and ex-Commuists do you feel that you can ever believe a Communist?

Answer. Sure you can believe a Communist under some circumstances. Yes, I've found when things were to their interest to tell the truth, they will tell it. If it's against their interests, they won't tell the truth. But I found things that they said during 1938 and 1939 that have absolutely been verified, proving to me that where they think it's to the party's interest, they do tell you the truth. They felt then that it was very much to the party's interest to exaggerate their strength and their power, and I'm sure they did exaggerate their strength and their power, but even giving credit for all that, you had a sizable organization in this country.

Question. How about the ex-Communists, do you feel that they can be trusted?

Answer. They can be trusted, but I've always followed the practice of never accepting their testimony except where it was corroborated. I didn't accept it unless they corroborated their statements to me with other and independent evidence which gave me reason to believe that they were telling the truth.

OUTLAW COMMUNIST PARTY?

Question. Do you feel that the party should be outlawed by legislation?

Answer. Yes. I think so because, though there is a dispute on it, I've felt so since 1941. We recommended it unanimously in 1941. Here's the reason I think it ought to be outlawed:

First, from 1919 to 1924 they were outlawed. That's something that is not generally known by the public. But under wartime legislation the party was outlawed and during the period——

Question. What was the period—1919 to 1924?

Answer. I'd say about the beginning of 1920, shortly after they were organized—the Communist Party had its origin in the United States in 1919 shortly after the [Russian] Revolution.

Question. Did we pass a law outlawing them?

Answer. Under wartime legislation——

Question. Did Mitchell Palmer [Attorney General] raid them?

Answer. Yes, Palmer raided them, and they had wartime authority under a statute, I forget the wording of it, but it was ample to give them authority to completely squelch them, which they did.

Now they stayed underground from 1920 to 1924. During that period they made no progress. They were still just a weak, small, ineffectual number. And all the evidence proves that. The investigation of that period proves that—they were stymied.

Then when they were allowed to come out and to form these organizations, this legal apparatus, they began to grow because they were able to deceive so many gullible people. The very fact that they could organize, that they could get a charter, that they could operate in a building like other people, use the telephone and telegraph and all those things—it gave them a respectability that enabled them to use gullible and unthinking people.

So I've always felt that we should deprive them of the legal appartus because we've had 25 years' investigation and everybody who has investigated them, whether court or congressional committee, has found that it is a treasonable conspiracy, that it is not just another political party, but that it is a border patrol of the Soviet Union on our shores.

Now in view of the findings of the court—the Supreme Court of the United States has found it, too—the Communist Party is a criminal conspiracy. It's been my opinion that we ought to outlaw them and declare them an illegal organization and prohibit their operation in this country.

Now I don't say that that will do away with communism—I'm not suggesting that. For they've always had an aboveground apparatus and an underground apparatus. The two work simultaneously. They never depart from that system, you see. So you'll always have the underground apparatus. But it will be reduced to a negative force, compared with their ability to organize and deceive people and extend their influence the way they did.

Question. Do you think the security program of the Government is operating successfully now?

Answer. I just don't know. That's a hard thing to answer to someone who is on the outside. I just don't come in contact with it.

Question. I should think you would be a member of the House Un-American Activities Committee.

Answer. They wouldn't put me on that committee.

Question. Why?

Answer. Of course, there is no vacancy—there hasn't been a vacancy since I've been here, and that's a good enough excuse. But even if there is a vacancy, it is not likely that they would put me on there.

Question. If the Democrats were in control, would you be on it?

Answer. It would depend on the leadership, and I say it is doubtful that the leadership would put me on there.

Question. Who would be chairman if the Democrats were in?

Answer. Mr. Walter, of Pennsylvania.

ADVICE TO M'CARTHY?

Question. Do you have any advice to give Joe McCarthy on how he ought to run his committee?

Answer. I have felt that he was making some mistakes. I don't like to talk about mistakes, because I made some myself. Looking back on it, I could have done a good many things probably better than I did, too. I never did think I was by any means perfect, but I felt that McCarthy has rushed headlong into trouble that he could avoid. Now perhaps he couldn't. It's awfully easy to sit on the sidelines and tell the other fellow how to run a committee. Nobody understands the problems except the man who is in charge of it. So it is hard to say with any finality that this or that is true.

Question. Do you think the members of an investigating committee should pass on the staff?

Answer. No, I don't think so. I think the chairman should be allowed to select his staff and that the committee should approve it. But only after the chairman has selected it do I think that the committee ought to have the right of veto on good ground.

Now you've got to give a big leeway to a chairman in this kind of work for him to do any good. If you don't trust him, if you try to circumscribe him, if you hamstring him, then he's through. No matter how sincere he is, he couldn't do his work. My rule in my committee was: I named the whole staff, all employees and everybody else. I did tell the committee about it, I gave them the reasons I named them, and usually they authorized me to do it. I never had any trouble with my committee.

Question. Do you think they should have a veto power, though?

Answer. Yes, I think they should. I think it is a matter of diplomacy rather than rules. I think a smart chairman wouldn't want to impose somebody on the committee they did not want. I think if you go about it right you can get the approval of the committee.

But I think you ought to submit to the committee your reasons for appointing John Doe, Bill Smith, and so on. And then the committee ought to have the right on cause—that's quite different from an arbitrary right—to object. I mean by that that if you are a member of the committee and you say, "I object to that appointment," and the chairman would say, "Why do you object?" And you say, "I object to the appointment because this man, back in Boston or in New York, was regarded as unreliable." See what I mean? I think you ought to have the right of veto, on cause.

TELEVISION: A HANDICAP

Question. Do you wish you had had television when you were chairman of the committee?

Answer. No. I'd rather not have it. I tell you offhand I think television is a great handicap. It's a diversion—it keeps a man from thinking. A man who runs a committee like this must be in full possession of his faculties. Now with television he is conscious of it and he is thinking of the effect rather than of doing a good job. He is thinking, "What effect will it have upon the people?"

Question. Was there radio at the time of your committee?

Answer. Yes, but we seldom allowed it. I seldom allowed any broadcasting of the proceedings. Because if you do that, in the first place, every member feels he has to say something to get it back to his district. If John Doe doesn't speak, his district says, "Why weren't you active?"

So you have a bunch of fellows, including yourself, acting the monkey for public entertainment rather than doing the job. I didn't have radios set up in the committee. But newspaper reporters are different—you have got to have newspaper reporters.

Question. How was the coverage of your committee by the press; was it fair?

Answer. It was by some reporters—at that time the New York branch of the Newspaper Guild (CIO) was Communist-controlled. Nobody now denies that. There was a fight within the guild itself in New York, not the whole guild all over the country. But the New York Guild particularly was pretty heavily Communist.

Some way or another they always jockeyed this thing around to have the leftwingers report the committee. It was an amazing thing how that worked. Very few of the right-wing group ever showed up for the reporting. And I would protest. I'd say, "Why don't you send somebody else down here?"

Question. Did you talk to the editors about it?

Answer. Yes; I tried my best to correct it. I took that Shirley Temple thing up with all the editors. I said, "Now here's an example. You don't want this. Look at the headlines. Look at the story and then look at the transcript."

But at that time there wasn't much that they could do, evidently. At least they didn't correct it. So we had a preponderance of left-wing reporters at that time reporting the hearings.

We did have some very fine men there who did a good job, but unfortunately the other crowd could always get out a story which just had a twist, a certain twist, a certain way of writing the thing, that left a bad impression. Not something that you could put your fingers on—the way you write a sentence, you leave a question mark in somebody's mind. And we had that to contend with, of course, for 7 years.

Question. You didn't have left-wing columnists in those days, did you?

Answer. Before I was to appear on "Meet the Press" it had been planned to have one writer on it——

Question. Was this recently?

Answer. Yes. So I dug into my files and came across his writings in which he denounced me very, very bitterly and compared me and my committee with La Follette—you remember the civil liberties thing. He said, "There was a model committee." Another thing, he said that my treatment of Murphy was one of the most disgraceful things in the history of our country. Roosevelt issued a statement condemning the Dies committee for the hearings in Detroit on the sitdown strike. He called it a sordid procedure. Later he and others in his administration said we had defeated Murphy and 80 New Dealers for Congress and the Senate.

Question. Which Murphy was meant?

Answer. Frank Murphy when he was Governor of Michigan. Later Roosevelt appointed him to the Supreme Court of the United States. You see, I went into Michigan when the sit-down strike had everything stymied in the automobile world. I moved into Michigan and investigated the sit-down strike and proved it was a Communist proposition.

Question. The sit-down strike was a Communist proposition?

Answer. Yes. There was a time there when it was so bitter I couldn't leave the hotel.

Question. What year was that?

Answer. That was in 1938.

Now, I have been talking about my files on the writer in question. I found La Follette's statement in Collier's magazine in 1947—almost 10 years later. In his article he confessed that his committee staff was infiltrated with Communists. Here is an article in which he tells the country that he discovered that his committee staff was infiltrated with Communists. And here was a writer who was holding him up as a model. That's an illustration.

So you see that was what we were up against. Here were the columnists, here were the reporters, some of the commentators, constantly driving home the idea to the average person. "Here is a bunch on the House Committee on Un-American Activities that is irresponsible; they don't care what they say; they're smearing innocent people, and so on."

Now, in spite of all that, we never went below 80 percent in the Gallup poll. And we won every vote eight times in a show-down fight with the administration against us.

HOLDDOWN ON FUNDS

Question. On getting funds, you mean?

Answer. Yes. And we had to renew the committee every year—it was a special committee.

Question. Did they cut your funds?

Answer. Yes, the first appropriation was $25,000, which was deliberately for the purpose of sabotaging the committee. One House Member told me in the cloakroom the other day some stories of the pressure which was exerted by the administration in those days to hold the appropriation down to a minimum in the hope that we couldn't operate with it.

Question. What about Dr. [W. A.] Wirt—did he testify before you?

Answer. They pilloried him. He told the absolute truth and that is the most disgraceful thing that ever happened in the history of our country—it killed him, literally.

Question. What did he do and say?

Answer. He had come to Washington like a lot of these New Dealers and he got to running around with them where they were holding these meetings and they began to talk about a revolution and going to overthrow the Government and what they were going to do.

So he became alarmed. They would have teas, cocktail parties, and meetings and a number of prominent New Dealers would say, "This is just the beginning. What we've got to do is take over. We've got to do this and that."

So the poor fellow, being patriotic and conscientious, goes and talks and tells what he learned.

Question. To a congressional committee?

Answer. Yes. But after he made the public statement they formed a committee and they put Bulwinkle as chairman of it, and they brought that poor fellow, Wirt, before them, and talk about giving a man the works—he had no counsel, and Bulwinkle got on the floor and made the statement that Wirt had been a slacker or something terrible—and later Bulwinkle had to retract. But they just ruined that old man, Wirt. He told the truth—every word was the truth.

CLERGYMEN FOUGHT US

Question. Did you have any problem with the clergy?

Answer. In 1939 a telegram was sent to the Speaker and I think to every Member of Congress signed by 98 prominent clergymen—they were the leaders throughout the country—under the auspices of the American League for Peace and Democracy. They were an organization that we had exposed in a unanimous finding as a Communist-controlled organization, and they sent the telegram under the auspices of the American League for Peace and Democracy, demanding that the committee be closed, the investigation folded up, and so on.

Those 98 were the leaders and they fought us very, very strenuously. They weren't Communists. We didn't accuse them of being Communists. But it shows you the deception that had been practiced upon them, how badly deceived they were at that period.

Question. Do you think J. B. Matthews got a bad deal?

Answer. I think they should have heard Matthews. There is another illustration. If anybody else had been denied a hearing instead of Matthews, it would have been the subject of an editorial all over the United States and Members of Congress would have taken the floor and screamed their heads off.

Here was a man who was dismissed summarily and denied the right to appear before the committee in his own defense. So it just depends on whose ox is gored.

As I said on the floor of the House the other day that if you had a committee tomorrow like La Follette's committee, whose job it was to smear American business, who fabricated evidence against businessmen, who tried to convince the country—using Communists on his staff—that American business couldn't be trusted—and there hasn't been anything in the history of our country like the tactics used by the La Follette committee—no liberal would object. That would be fine—that would be the proper method.

But the minute we came along and turned the tables on them and said, "All right, you've spent years talking about business, about how corrupt business is, about how selfish private enterprise is, how much harm it has done to this country, and now we'll just turn the spotlight on you for a while. Let's see what you've been doing." They couldn't take it.

They could bring men to Washington who were not skilled in politics and who had spent their lives in a factory or in a business and who knew nothing in the world about public relations or politics—they could bring them here, set them down before La Follette and this group and let a radical examine them and smear them and insinuate that all they cared about was the dollar. They could do all that, but the very minute we turned this thing on them it was a different story. They then began to scream to high heaven.

Tomorrow you could start an investigation designed solely for the purpose of investigating American business and the liberal press of this country would find no objection to it. La Follette was a hero. I was called a rascal by the so-called liberals. And if they had ever been able to prove that I had Fascists on my payroll, my secretary and my lawyer, if they could have proved that on me I would have been put in the penitentiary, but La Follette confessed in 1947 that he himself discovered that he had Communists on his committee staff for the purpose of smearing American business. Now where is a better illustration than that?

Question. Did they try to stack your committee?

Answer. Our committee found—you will find it in the 1939 report—that when the resolution which created the committee authorized and directed the departments to furnish us with help, I called on the Department of Justice and everybody to furnish us investigators and lawyers. They refused to do it. Someone called me up from the Civil Liberties Committee and said, "I can get you help." I said "That's fine."

I made it appear that I was falling for him. I said, "Send them around." He sent around two people that our committee suspected were Communists. That's in the report of 1939. In other words, there they were trying to load my committee from the executive department with Communists.

Now if that doesn't show you the inconsistency. If tomorrow this whole fight was directed at private enterprise, which is the foundation of our economic system, there wouldn't be a single liberal in this country who would object to the very tactics that have been charged against those of us who have been investigating Communists.

SECRECY IN GOVERNMENT

Question. How do you feel about employees of the executive branches furnishing information to the committees? Do you think they should or shouldn't?

Answer. Well, I tell you it depends on circumstances. I wouldn't lay down any blanket proposition that employees have a right to come to the chairman of a committee and say anything they want to. I don't think so.

Suppose you are an employee in charge of confidential files involving the safety of the country. I certainly don't think you ought to have a right to come to me as chairman and violate your oath of office and I wouldn't ask you to. But suppose you are working in a department, like one of the men in the State Department—and this is talking about things in the past, not something that involves present dangers to the country—and you're uneasy, sure you've got a right to come.

I had an employee of the State Department come to my home and tell me there was an Executive order issued to destroy all the old records which the Hoover administration had on Communists. He wasn't violating anything that involved national defense. Now if an employee feels that something is about to be done which is inimical to our Nation and that he can have no recourse to his superiors, and that he is not violating any oath, I think he is perfectly justified to come.

But I don't think you have a right to encourage employees to violate the law—I wouldn't do that. For instance, if you are in charge of secret files and you've been instructed not to reveal that, I don't think you have a right to come to me and give me any part of it. Because if you set that precedent, then pretty soon it would be an evil thing—no one would ever have confidence in anybody else.

Again, you've just go to use your judgment.

HOW TRUMAN REACTED

Question. What was your relation with Truman?

Answer. I didn't have anything to do with him except one time when he was appointed head of his committee and he called on me to find out how to issue subpenas and how to handle his committee and that's the only time I ever saw him face to face. I've seen him on television.

Question. Did you tell him the method you were using then?

Answer. Yes. I showed him the whole thing and he congratulated the committee and said it did a wonderful job and when my son graduated at Kemper Military Academy—Truman was the orator and when he was shaking hands with the boys in the presence of all of them he complimented my committee as one of the greatest committees of Congress. I had very little contact with Truman. But I had plenty with Roosevelt to make up for whatever I lacked having with Truman.

Question. How did the editorials of the country go? Didn't you say earlier that they were attacking you and the committee?

Answer. Of course—it was this way—the conservative press never was strong—now the Hearst press was pretty strong for us. But generally speaking the conservative papers would apologize—they never took a strong, aggressive stand and said, "Sure they are doing a good job, they're right about this thing." They were ashamed—you see this propaganda was going all the time, and so everyone would pick up the line and the line was, "Well, we're for what Dies is trying to do, but we can't agree on method."

But they couldn't tell you what method—I would say, "Name me an instance," and I would defy them on the radio and everywhere else. I would say, "Name me one instance—here is the recorded hearing, go read it, tell me one question that is not proper." I usually followed the rules of evidence. I'm a lawyer, been a lawyer for years.

Question. When you came back to Congress this time after a lapse of 8 years, were you elected from the same district you represented before?

Answer. I was elected as Congressman-at-large, carrying my old district 3 to 1. There were eight opponents in the race. I lacked 7,200 votes getting a clear majority against all of them. But the man who was second was about 450,000 votes behind me, and he withdrew, and there was no runoff.

How Hughes Lost California in 1916

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEROY JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 19, 1954

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an article by Edward A. Dickson concerning one of the most notable and costly political feuds in American history. It occurred in the presidential election of 1916. Justice Charles Evans Hughes was the Republican Party's nominee. He lost the Presidency by losing the electoral vote in California.

Since that time a controversy has continued over the question, "Why did Hughes lose California?"

Some blame Gov. Hiram W. Johnson, who was overwhelmingly elected Senator on the same ticket with Hughes.

The whole story revolves about the simultaneous visits of the two men at the Hotel Virginia in Long Beach, Calif.

Stories leaked out that an unhappy incident of some sort had created friction between Hughes and Johnson.

Distorted versions of the episode have persisted down to the present time.

The true story of what actually happened is here told, at my solicitation, by Edward A. Dickson, formerly publisher of the Los Angeles Evening Express, the only living person who participated in the incident.

The article follows:

HOW HUGHES LOST CALIFORNIA IN 1916

(By Edward A. Dickson)

News of the nomination in 1916 of Justice Charles Evans Hughes as the Republican candidate for President was received in California, if not with wild enthusiasm at least with restrained satisfaction. The party's standard bearer was highly respected for his solid intellectual qualities, his honorable political record and his amiable though somewhat austere personality.

Among California's Republicans there was at first a feeling of disappointment that the nomination had not gone to Theodore Roosevelt. But that feeling gradually subsided, as the fine character of Justice Hughes became better known. Prior to the visit to California of the presidential nominee, it was generally assumed that he would easily sweep the State in the November election. A reasonable degree of harmony seemed to have been restored among the formerly discordant elements of the party.

But personal resentments and long-standing feuds are not easily forgotten. The bitter political quarrels during the stormy presidential campaign back in 1912 between Taft and Roosevelt for the Republican nomination had left wounds among the leaders that were slow to heal.

Highly important results not infrequently are caused by trivial events. So it was that from a purely local political feud in California during the presidential campaign of 1916, history was seriously affected by an incident of relatively minor significance.

It is generally known that there was a political misunderstanding of some sort in California which caused the defeat of Charles Evans Hughes for the Presidency of the United States in the eventful year which preceded our country's entrance into World War I. Speculation has been unending as to what might have happened in world history if Hughes rather than Woodrow Wilson had been chosen to head the Nation in that memorable election. Would Hughes have kept this country out of war? Or, backed up by the prestige and world influence of Theodore Roosevelt, might he not have prevented the passions of the time from ripening into a senseless and unnecessary world conflict?

Hughes was "almost" elected. In fact, the entire Nation went to bed on the night of November 7, 1916, confident that the Republican nominee had been chosen and that the Democratic administration had been retired. It awoke the following morning to learn the astounding news that Hughes had been defeated; that California, credited the night before as safely in the Republican column, had actually gone for Wilson by a few thousand votes.

Commenting on the extraordinary result, the historian Cleland, in his California in Our Time, writes as follows:

"That narrow margin profoundly affected the future of two great political parties, the fate of the United States, and the destiny of the world."

California's electoral vote turned a Hughes' victory into a Hughes' defeat.

The eyes of the Nation immediately focused upon California. What was the cause of the upset? Governor Johnson had been elected United States Senator by the startling majority of 296,815 votes; yet Hughes, his team-mate on the Republican ticket, lost by 3,773 votes. Had Hughes been betrayed by the Johnson Republicans; and if so, why? Or had Hughes blundered?

The contention of the so-called Old Guard Republicans, as the anti-Johnson element proudly proclaimed themselves, was that Hughes had been betrayed; that the progressive wing of the party had inaugurated an anti-Hughes whisper campaign because of some fancied but unfounded affront to Johnson by Hughes early in the campaign. Partisan newspapers presented their views as to how it happened, with the result that a large segment of the Nation came to believe that political treachery was the real cause of the election disaster.

For a proper understanding of the political situation in California in 1916, it is necessary to recall conditions during the preceding several years.

In 1912, Governor Johnson had been chosen by the Progressive National Convention, following the split in the Republican Convention at Chicago, to run for Vice President on a ticket headed by Theodore Roosevelt.

In California, Johnson's followers organized the Progressive Party, and abandoned to the Taft supporters the remnants of the Republican Party. The presidential contest was very bitter, the Taft Republicans making a poor showing. The Roosevelt-Johnson ticket carried the State. The vote stood:

Roosevelt (Progressive)	283, 610
Wilson (Democrat)	283, 436
Taft ("Old Guard" Republicans)	3, 914

When Johnson came up for reelection as Governor in 1914 a desperate effort was made by his political adversaries to defeat him, first at the primary and then at the general election. He was, however, reelected—and by a heavy majority. Then, 2 years later, he became a candidate for United States Senate.

The old feud flamed anew. Willis H. Booth, a Los Angeles banker and a man of the highest character, had been persuaded to become an opposition candidate for the Republican nomination for Senator. Openly supporting Booth was National Committeeman William H. Crocker.

By the time Hughes entered the State on his nationwide political pilgrimage a hotly contested struggle was in the making for the senatorship, and the presidential candidate found himself plunged into the midst of a seething political maelstrom. Both factions, however, were giving loyal, even if secondary, support to Hughes.

Apparently Hughes had not been carefully briefed as to the delicate situation existing in California, and the necessity of his maintaining a neutral attitude with regard to the senatorship.

Political protocol called for a welcoming committee of the top party officials to meet Justice Hughes at the Oregon line. William H. Crocker and Chester H. Rowell, the one representing the Old Guard and the other the Progressive Republicans were sharing honors as members of the Republican National Committee. Crocker was a prominent San Francisco banker and Rowell a distinguished newspaper editor and publisher. Both were on hand to greet Hughes.

Also present to extend greetings was the Republican State Chairman Francis V. Keesling, generally recognized as affiliated with the anti-Johnson faction of the party.

Rowell was given an opportunity to meet the presidential candidate, but most of Justice Hughes' time on the trip down to San Francisco was absorbed by Crocker and Keesling. Rowell did get an opportunity to propose a big mass meeting in San Francisco for Hughes, with Governor Johnson presiding. That, he suggested, was the politically proper, as well as the politically wise, thing to do, since the Governor was the titular head of the party in California.

But Crocker argued against this, insisting that it would give Johnson an unfair advantage over Booth in the senatorial primary. Hughes allowed himself to be guided by the latter advice. Rowell so reported to Johnson, then on a speaking tour in the Southland.

The San Francisco meeting was largely attended, and the vociferous applause that erupted when old-guard leaders appeared on the platform early turned the affair into what had the earmarks of being an anti-Johnson demonstration. Hundreds of Johnson sympathizers left the hall in disgust, after Hughes had joined in paying rather fulsome praise to national committeeman Crocker.

Thus, the very first appearance of Justice Hughes in California was a forecast of political dissension. Hughes had failed to grasp the tremendous political opportunity the occasion had afforded.

The cavalier treatment accorded Rowell, together with the unwise manipulation of the San Francisco meeting, would not in themselves have deflected enough Johnson supporters to have defeated Hughes. It remained for an incident at the Hotel Virginia in Long Beach to sow the fatal seeds of partisan resentment that finally robbed the Republican nominee of the electoral vote of California—and the Presidency.

As Hughes headed south for his big meeting in Los Angeles, Johnson was campaigning in the interior of the State. Johnson left Bakersfield early Sunday morning for Los Angeles, where Hughes had preceded him by a few hours.

In response to a telegram from Governor Johnson, I joined him at Los Angeles and accompanied him to Long Beach. As we approached the Hotel Virginia, where rooms had been engaged for him, it was apparent from the waiting crowd that Justice Hughes was due for a visit, although his published schedule had fixed that day for Pasadena.

We found the lobby of the hotel crowded with well-known Republicans, eagerly awaiting the arrival of Justice Hughes. The chairman of the welcoming group was a local publisher, with a long-standing grudge against Governor Johnson.

As Governor Johnson was registering, the chairman, in a voice moderated to reach the ears of the governor, muttered, "Isn't it contemptible for the governor to force himself into a Hughes reception?"

The Governor, of course, ignored the offensive remark, and immediately retired to his room. He was gravely concerned over the situation, however, and expressed regret over the unfortunate lobby episode.

In a short time, cheering and applause signalized the arrival of the distinguished jurist. From the window we saw Hughes, escorted by the truculent editor, walk out on the strand for a brief ceremony of welcome. That over, the crowd vanished and all was quiet.

Inasmuch as the local chairman knew of the presence in the hotel of the Governor of California, we thought that he would convey that bit of news to Justice Hughes. Had he done so, there is not the slightest doubt but that Hughes would have sought an opportunity to pay his requests to the State's chief executive.

As it was, Hughes arrived and departed from the hotel without meeting Johnson—without knowing that the two were at that moment under a common roof.

Later Governor Johnson and I sat on the veranda to discuss phases of his campaign. As was characteristic of Johnson, he took an exceedingly gloomy view of his chances for victory at the approaching August primary. He had been advised that Booth had been selected to preside at the Los Angeles meeting. While Johnson expressed a high regard for Booth personally, he felt that his competitor was being given an unfair advantage by having his own candidacy for the Senatorship so closely linked with the candidacy of the party's nominee for President, while at San Francisco, he himself, although Governor, had been denied a similar recognition.

During the course of the afternoon, a telephone call was received from a Mr. Farnham, in charge of the Hughes party. He stated that the Justice had just learned that Governor Johnson was at the hotel at the time of his visit, that he was sorry that he had not known it when there—and would the Governor join him at dinner in Pasadena that evening?

I thought at the time that it would have been much better had Justice Hughes taken the time personally to telephone to Governor Johnson, rather than entrusting that responsibility to Farnham. The amenities really called for it, especially in view of the already strained political relationship that had been permitted to develop in the north. A personal call from Hughes to Johnson would surely have softened the tension. I detected a tinge of bitterness in Johnson's instruction to his secretary that he was engaged for the evening and would be unable to accept Justice Hughes' invitation to dinner.

Later, Farnham again telephoned to ask if he himself might call later in the evening to present the compliments of Mr. Hughes, who was tied up with an engagement in Pasadena and could not personally come to Long Beach. The governor stated that he would be pleased to receive Mr. Farnham. The situation seemed for the moment to have cleared.

Governor Johnson asked me to remain for dinner, so that I might be present at his conference with Farnham. I accepted his dinner invitation, but took my departure shortly before the hour set for the conference. I told the governor that the talk between Farnham and himself should be an intimate one, and that the presence of a third party might seriously interfere with a frank discussion of the Hughes-Johnson campaign in California.

The following morning I received a telephone call from Governor Johnson, asking me to come to Long Beach to discuss the events of the preceding evening.

He told me the details of what had proved to be a most unpleasant meeting. He now seemed convinced that Hughes was knowingly allowing himself to be used by the old guard to embarrass Johnson in his contest with Booth.

Relating the events of the preceding evening, the Governor said that when Farnham had appeared in the hotel lobby he was accompanied by none other than State Chairman Keesling. Johnson admitted that he had made no effort to conceal his irritation. It all seemed part of a deliberate plot being engineered by his opponents to prevent Justice Hughes' representative and Johnson from meeting on what ought to have been friendly grounds. Apparently, the Governor had been as courteous as the belligerent atmosphere would permit, but the presence of Keesling as a peace envoy—and as a third party to the conference—doomed the meeting to a painful failure. No date for a formal meeting of Hughes and Johnson had been found; Johnson's own schedule of speaking engagements, the Governor had rather curtly announced, could not be altered to make possible a meeting with the presidential candidate. So ended the conference.

Governor Johnson recognized the gravity of the situation. I endeavored to work out an acceptable speaking itinerary that would enable him to at least have an afternoon's conference with Hughes before the latter left California. The Governor, however, remained adament. His own meetings had been widely publicized, he said, and he could not disrupt the schedule.

Governor Johnson did agree, however, that no good could come from a public display of resentment on his part, and that the joint campaign must go forward in good faith so far as the Progressive wing of the party was concerned. I was pleased to see that after the irritation caused by Keesling's visit had had time to cool off, he dismissed the subject and seemingly accepted my explanation that Keesling, as State chairman, had probably been asked by Hughes to accompany Farnham to Long Beach; that Keesling, in his official capacity, had no good reason for not complying, because to have refused would have been a plain indication that there was a feud in the making.

So, the Hotel Virginia incident terminated, and Justice Hughes departed from California without having had an opportunity to meet the chief executive of the State.

Rumors were not slow in reaching the public. And as was natural with stories propagated in the heat of a political campaign, there was a complete distortion of what actually had occurred at the Hotel Virginia.

One interpretation that was widely publicized at the time, purported to tell the inside facts of the failure of Hughes to meet Johnson. This story had it that both Johnson and Hughes were weekend guests at the hotel, but that strangely enough Hughes was unaware, during his entire stay, that the Governor also was lodged under the same roof. Referring to the Hotel Virginia, this story ran as follows:

"In the old hotel, Hughes inadvertently administered to Senator Hiram Johnson the most famous slap in American political history—a slap that cost Hughes the Presidency of the United States.

"Hughes and his committee stopped at the Hotel Virginia for a weekend rest—so did Johnson who chanced to be in the city.

"All one day the Governor waited in his room, expecting that Hughes would send for him. Probably Hughes did not know Johnson was there. At any rate Johnson—the Progressive element declared—naturally expected a 'howdy-do' and a nod of the head from the party chieftain. * * *

"Hughes departed, however, without having seen Johnson. * * *

"And California, traditionally Republican but smarting under the 'slap' to Johnson—went Democratic in the Presidential election. The California votes elected Wilson."

Another account also extensively publicized—a story that persisted even down to Justice Hughes' death—was to the effect that Governor Johnson and Hughes had actually passed each other in the lobby of the hotel; that Hughes had returned Johnson's salutation with merely a stiff bow, and then had openly refused to shake the Governor's extended hand. The origin of that version was the Democratic southern headquarters.

There can be no denial that thousands of Johnson's admirers resented what they felt was an affront to their Governor, but Governor Johnson and his close political advisers made every effort to silence the unfortunate incident and to urge wholeheartedly the election of the entire Republican ticket, from Hughes and Johnson down. That Johnson could not influence all of his supporters, many of whom had resented the manner in which the Hughes itinerary was handled in California, is but natural.

Wise counsel had prevailed in planning for the Hughes meeting at Los Angeles. Keesling himself vetoed any suggestions of slighting the Progressive Republicans, and urged the selection of Judge Russ Avery, a warm personal friend of Governor Johnson, to preside.

It proved to be an overflow meeting, one of the largest political gatherings ever held in California. Judge Avery paid an eloquent tribute to the party's nominee for President. It was marked by harmony throughout, and everything possible was done to quiet any feeling of discord or disunity.

Governor Johnson defeated Booth for the Republican nomination at the August primary election and at the general election in November faced the Democratic candidate for Senator, George S. Patton, of Pasadena, father of General Patton, one of the heroes of World War II.

But distorted stories of the Virginia Hotel affair continued to be spread—both by the Democrats and by bitter partisan foes of Johnson. It was unavoidable, under the circumstances, that there would be a resulting prejudice against Hughes. No one anticipated, however, that the loss of votes would reach the astounding total that the election figures showed.

The final count was:

For President:	
Wilson (Democrat)	466,289
Hughes (Republican)	462,516
Wilson's majority	3,773
For Senator:	
Johnson (Republican)	574,667
Patton (Democrat)	277,852
Johnson's majority	296,815

The unhappy incident at the Hotel Virginia had taken its toll.

The Not-So-Vanishing American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 19, 1954

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record a statement prepared by me with reference to the unveiling of a statue of the famous Indian leader, Sitting Bull.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

THE NOT SO VANISHING AMERICAN

Today in the Black Hills of South Dakota a great statue of the famous Indian leader Sitting Bull is being unveiled. But this statue does more than pay homage to a single Indian warrior. It is a long delayed tribute to the entire American Indian people of which Sitting Bull's great Sioux Nation was a mighty part.

In Minnesota, one of the States where the Indian people lived and fought, we have a deep appreciation for the contributions made by the American Indian to this Nation's history and culture. Indeed, the very name of my State, Minnesota, is an Indian word which has been translated beautifully as meaning "cloud tinted water." In my office hang the words of an Indian prayer whose wisdom can truly be taken as a message for our times. It reads, "Let me not judge my brother until I have walked 3 miles in his moccasins." This is the kind of poetry which bespeaks our whole Indian tradition of art and lore.

But it would be a mistake to imagine that the mighty contributions of this country's first inhabitants are things of the past. In the days of the frontier when the iron horse shot through the western plains driving the buffalo from the range, the American Indian fought back to preserve his home. Such a man as Sitting Bull was a leader in this fight. Now in a later day we find the descendents of these mighty warriors fighting fearlessly alongside other Americans to defend this country against foreign aggression.

In years past it became a rather hackneyed cliche to refer to the American Indian as the vanishing American. But the latest figures show that the Indian population has grown to a point far beyond any that has been reached in recent years. No, the American Indian refused to die, disappear, or vanish from the land where he first watched our immigrant ancestors step ashore at Plymouth Rock. The American Indian will remain to preserve the irreplaceable tradition and culture which have become such an integral part of our American way of life. He will continue to take his place alongside the millions of other Americans of different races, religions, and national backgrounds in industry, agriculture and the thousands of other occupations which make America tick. The American Indians have always been known as our first citizens in point of time. Now there can be no denying that he deserves his place among our first citizens in point of contribution and performance as well.

Nothing Like an Isolated Internationalist

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 19, 1954

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an editorial entitled "Nothing Like an Isolated Internationalist," published in the California Farmer of July 24, 1954.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

NOTHING LIKE AN ISOLATED INTERNATIONALIST

Just a few years back we ran into a frenzied campaign against isolationism in this country. Dutifully this country rode to the other extreme and took off in 87 directions with buckets of money to help everybody who looked like they had the slightest economic ill.

Today we are practically isolated in spite of our big effort to do good. We have lost all cards in Asia. China is dictating policy. France and England have let us down. We stand almost alone and with opposition in our fight to contain communism.

We are a "Sad Sack" and we might add, an almost empty sack. Congress has just completed sending the last of the money-spending bills to the President. The foreign-aid bill just sent to the Hill was for $3.4 billion. This will be added to the $9,749,500,000 which they still have on hand and which they have not made up their minds how to spend.

Take a look at the way some of this money is being spent, then think back over the happenings of the past month and the way our so-called allies have been treating us.

To quote Representative JOHN PHILLIPS: "* * * of the money requested, we are digging 2,600 deep wells for India, so they may grow more cotton, while they vote with and support our enemy.

"We are building factories in Italy to produce synthetic fibers. We took out of the bill $75 million for Great Britain to build aircraft. England has been spending her own money to experiment with, and build advanced commercial aircraft, while we build fighting planes and bombers, part of whose use will be to defend England.

"It is not generally known that when England and France abstained from voting in the United Nations, on the Guatemala issue, it was only under the most firm pressure from the White House and our State Department. Their intention has been to vote against us."

We have become internationalists. The harder we work at it the more isolated we become. If we progress at this same rate we will end up fighting the Russians all by our lonesome, broke and with no friends among the major world powers.

Appendix

Restoration of Seized German Assets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, August 19, 1954

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an editorial entitled "Restoration of Seized German Assets," published in the Chicago Tribune of August 12, 1954, and two news articles by John O'Donnell, on the same subject, appearing under his column, Capitol Stuff.

There being no objection, the editorial and articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Restoration of Seized German Assets

Mr. Eisenhower has informed the West German Government that no pending legislation to return German private assets of $500 million seized in this country during and after the war has the approval of his administration. The President's position apparently insures the defeat of legislation introduced by Senator Dirksen for restoration of the German property. The measure has been favorably reported by the Senate Judiciary Committee.

Mr. Eisenhower sent his letter to Chancellor Adenauer after the Dutch Government had strenuously protested the Dirksen bill. Its argument appears to be that if the United States were to act honorably in this matter, 18 other nations which were alined with it in an agreement on reparations reached at Paris in 1946 will be under pressure to follow our lead in disgorging.

Although the State Department supports restoration, the Department of Justice opposes it, contending that to give back the seized property would take millions of dollars out of the pockets of American and give a windfall of similar proportions to Germans. How the millions got into American pockets does not bother the Justice Department, nor is it explained why it is a windfall for the victim of a robbery to get back what was taken from him.

It seems to us that simple justice and morality should govern in this matter, even if there were not ample international law and treaty commitments to make it clear that restoration is the legal obligation of the United States Government.

When a similar situation arose after the First World War, the late John Bassett Moore, an authority on international law, commented sarcastically, "In the original statute the function of the alien property custodian was defined as that of a trustee. Subsequently, however, there came a special revelation, marvelously brilliant but perhaps not divinely inspired, of the staggering discovery that the foreign traders and manufacturers whose property had been taken over had made their investments in the United States not from ordinary motives of profit but in pursuance of a hostile design, so stealthily pursued that it had never before been suspected, but so deadly in its effects that the American traders and manufacturers were eventually to be engulfed in their own homes and the alien plotters left in grinning possession of the ground.

"Under the spell engendered by this agitating apparition, and its patriotic call to a retributive but profitable war on the malefactors' property, substantial departures were made from the principle of trusteeship."

If we are bent on stealing something that belongs to others, the least we can do is not to pretend that there is virtue in the act.

Capitol Stuff
(By John O'Donnell)

Washington, August 15.—The muddle into which the Eisenhower administration has managed to flounder over the problem of returning to private citizens in Germany the assets which we impounded and seized at the outbreak of World War II is almost inexcusable. These assets amount to half a billion dollars. They represent the life insurances, the annuities, the vested income of thousands of German investors who put their savings into corporations operating within the United States long before Hitler was ever heard about.

The present situation proves the sturdy endurance of those ancient axioms: (1) history repeats itself; (2) governments and peoples never learn anything from history.

In the current confusion over the disposal of alien property seized in wartime, we have a playback of what happened during World War I.

In World War I, the Democratic administration of Woodrow Wilson, acting under the advice of foreign foes of Germany, seized all German assets—physical properties, patents, trade-marks, etc., within the borders. The seizure and holding during the war was correct by international law, morality, and tradition. But the same law, morals, and ancient custom always observed by this Republic and all other civilized nations required that the property be returned to the individual citizens of the one-time enemy at the end of hostilities. Wars are waged by governments against governments, not against private citizens.

Back in World War I, we hedged and after Versailles shamefully stalled on carrying out a moral obligation. A Republican administration under Harding came into power. Scandals in the Office of the Custodian of Alien Property gave the first evidence of flagrant dishonesty in the new GOP regime. The overall situation was inherited from the Democrats, but the Republicans were corrupted by the easy money shaken from the private investors in a defeated nation.

Now we're getting a rerun of the ancient economic movie. Under the wartime Democratic regime of Roosevelt and Truman we first seized and then decided to hold the private assets of the German investors. Under Government operation they provided scores of lush spots to pay off political debts with cushy $40,000, $60,000 and almost $100,000 a year directorships, to say nothing about enormous legal fees to pet law firms and fat jobs in management.

There's a bill backed by Republican Senator Dirksen, of Illinois, which would turn the property back to the private citizens who own it—in accordance with ancient law and morality—and which furthermore would remove it from the zone of temptation.

OPPOSED BY BROWNELL, BACKED BY DULLES

Secretary of State Dulles has already told the Senate committee that he was for the Dirksen bill—cosponsored by Senators Jenner, Republican, of Indiana, and Butler, Republican, of Maryland.

Attorney General Herbert Brownell's Justice Department, however, has raised legal objections to the bill. This is reasonable, because the present legal machinery governing former enemy property is the brain child of the late Commie-traitor, Harry Dexter White, No. 1 man in the Treasury under New Deal Henry Morgenthau, Jr., and the real author of the Morgenthau plan to turn Germany into a goat pasture and so make it easy pickings for the Kremlin.

With this split between State and Justice, the White House got into the act with President Eisenhower's letter to West Germany's politically hard-pressed Chancellor Adenauer. Ike wrote that he favored a "fair, equitable, and satisfactory solution" but withheld endorsement and refused to request speedy action on the pending bill.

MUCH ABOUT A $150 MILLION WINDFALL

Meanwhile, there is much more than meets the eye in the controversy. In the last 10 days, opponents of the Dirksen bill—many in high places—have leaked (gushed is the better word) so-called news beats to pet reporters and captive columnists all designed to delay action on the bill and so keep the dough of foreign investors here, and, of course, also keep their fat jobs and fees.

With a cynical grin we noted that none of these exclusive dispatches mentioned the highhanded effrontery with which the Truman administration used the Alien Property Office for lush political payoffs (facts which did come out in formal testimony before the Senate). But they all bore down heavily on a so-called windfall benefit of $150 million to foreign stockholders, a claim which so far as this reporter can discover never came out in the Senate's exhaustive survey.

Testimony before the committee on the Dirksen bill disclosed that Jack Frye, chairman of the board and president of General Aniline & Film and General Dye Corp., since 1947 was paid total salaries by both seized chemical concerns of $97,000 a year.

Frye was the man-about-Washington for Howard Hughes' Trans World Airline until his ouster in a company shakeup. It was while Frye was boss of TWA that the airline picked up the checks for the wedding of Elliott Roosevelt and Faye Emerson, including the tab for the champagne. Many more important Democrats knew the Frye largesse.

LOUIS JOHNSON'S FIRM COLLECTED

Former Defense Secretary Louis Johnson, the fund-raiser for former President Truman's 1948 campaign, fared even better than Frye. His law firm, Steptoe & Johnson, also have been on the General Aniline & Film payrolls since 1947 at a retainer of $54,000 a year. In addition, Steptoe & Johnson the testimony indicated, were given fees for special litigation totaling $564,240 for the years 1947 through 1952.

Capitol Stuff
(By John O'Donnell)

Washington, August 16.—The phone rang this afternoon and the Long Island, N. Y., operator crisply announced that there was a phone call from one Bernard Baruch who wanted to talk person-to-person with one reporter John O'Donnell.

The Baruch call came through promptly. The brisk and lively voice of the youngest elder statesman in the history of the Republic—after all, this adviser to Presidents will be 84 come Thursday—wasted no time about saying that he had read this reporter's piece about favoring the return to private citizens of Germany and Japan of the investments which we seized at the outbreak of World War II and gave a lot more reasons why it should be done, and promptly.

It was sound, calm, reasoned argument, leading up to the conclusion that we are going against long-established international law, basic morality, the traditions of our own country (and in particular those of Baruch's great hero, Gen. Robert E. Lee) if we punish the private citizen of a one-time enemy nation by grabbing his personal investments in our Republic on the grounds that his country was defeated in war.

As a result we suggest that the Eisenhower administration, in these days of befuddlement over the legal and moral issues involved, dust off that famous bench in Lafayette Park across from the White House and invite Elder Baruch to sit down. Baruch could tell the young boys now running the country what he learned when he was called in to advise on this same problem back in World War I. The Alien Property Custodian problem then gave birth to scandals under the Democrats which, in turn, ruined the incoming Republicans under Harding.

History, as oft noted, has a habit of repeating itself. Republicans under Eisenhower, operating the present alien property setup with all its lush pickings of fat-cat jobs which they inherited from the Roosevelt-Truman regime, are now skating on the same thin ice of disgrace and scandal over which the Harding Ohio gang of the twenties cavorted before jail sentences, suicides, and firing of Cabinet members ended the big and easy shakedowns.

AT VERSAILLES, HE SAID "NO"

Said elder statesman Baruch today after he had pondered the highly controversial problem which has split Capitol Hill, the Cabinet, and the White House:

"Back in the days of the Versailles Treaty when Britain and France urged that the private property sequestered of aliens should be seized, I took a definite exception and said 'No.' I took the stand in Paris that under all law, all morality and tradition, all private property of former enemies, and that included ships seized at sea, was inviolate. I would not permit it."

At this point, elder statesman Baruch pointed out that while the pressure was being put on Wilson by our associates in World War I ("remember Wilson never called them Allies—they were associated governments," said Baruch), we held out against the British pressure to seize German private overseas investments, patents, copyrights, etc.

"And at that time, Woodrow Wilson told me," continued the elder statesman, "'Barry, you are right. I'll follow your advice.'"

PROPERTY GRABBED BY OHIO GANG

Later, and this is not from Baruch's conversation, the Woodrow Wilson-Baruch approach was brushed aside and the private property of enemies, technically described as "sequestered," was in fact held in ransom by the former members of the Ohio gang, Attorney General Harry Daugherty in particular, until the foreign owners would pay off the kidnap release money to Cabinet members and appointees of the President of the United States at—as was disclosed in criminal trials—a 10 percent and up basis.

But the alert memory of Baruch reaches up to the present situation, sprouting from our seizure of alien property in this Nation after Pearl Harbor.

When we properly seized for the duration of World War II the bank accounts and investments of all enemy aliens, the biggest plums were the multimillion American subsidiaries of I. G. Farben, General Aniline and Film Corp., and General Dye Corp.

Now, Baruch recalls, the whole job was dumped by the late President Roosevelt into the hands of Leo T. Crowley, then head of the New Deal Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, and chairman of the board of Standard Gas & Electric Co., described by Baruch as "an utterly honest man."

ASKED BARUCH TO TAKE OVER

But, reports Baruch, F. D. R. was worried about the aniline dye situation and the whole I. G. Farben setup. In those days F. D. R. bluntly asked Baruch: "I wish you would take it over—you will run it honestly and competently."

Baruch, who did an extensive job for F. D. R. on the rubber shortage, turned down that added chore. But on this present occasion, he has written a letter to Secretary of State Dulles endorsing his stand before the Senate committee in support of the Dirksen-Jenner-Butler bill which will turn back to private citizens in one-time enemy nations the personal funds which in peace they had once invested in the United States.

These assets are now held by us—assets which to those citizens mean their life insurance and their old-age retirement incomes, money used to buy shares in corporations, the wealth of which was represented by equipment, trademarks, patents, copyrights (on poems, novels, stage and movie plays, etc.) securities, cash, etc.

Until World War I and the Treaty of Versailles, the property of a private citizen was inviolate in war—win, lose, or draw.

Billions Down the Drain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 19, 1954

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Billions Down the Drain," which was published in the Paul Bunyan News of San Francisco, Calif., on August 2, 1954.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BILLIONS DOWN THE DRAIN

It seems about time that our slaphappy, giveaway administration comes to its collective senses and realizes that the billions that we have poured into foreign countries have not slowed down the advance of communism in these countries. In fact, in some cases it has been the cause of accelerated Communist sympathies. The moneyed and privileged class has seen fit to squander this largesse and in many cases use it for increased trade with Communist countries.

According to the California Farmer, "We are digging 2,600 deep wells for India, so they can grow more cotton, while they vote with, and support the enemy." "It is not generally known that when England and France abstained from voting in the United Nations, on the Guatemala issue, it was under the most firm pressure from the White House and State Department. Their intention had been to vote against us. We have become internationalists. The harder we work at it, the more isolated we become. If we progress at this same rate, we will end up fighting the Russians all by our lonesome, broke, and with no friends among the major world powers."

No wonder the American taxpayer hates to pay the large tax that he is forced to pay, when he realizes that our Government is giving a large portion of it to unappreciative countries that would cut our throat at the first opportunity.

How does it happen that this magnanimous beneficence can continue with out a popular vote by the people of the United States? If the matter of extending aid to foreign countries was voted on by the public tomorrow it would go down to ignominious defeat.

We have deluded ourselves for years in believing that if we made these countries strong militarily and economically, it would be a bulwark against communism. What it really amounts to is a richer price for the Communists to capture.

Let us stop playing Santa Claus and pay some attention to our own impoverished Navaho Indians and spend some of these billions on roads and other much needed improvements in this country. And at the same time take some of the huge tax burden of the backs of the long-suffering public.

Sitting Bull: A Great Leader of the Old Sioux Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 19, 1954

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement prepared by me entitled "Sitting Bull: A Great Leader of the Old Sioux Nation."

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SITTING BULL: A GREAT LEADER OF THE OLD SIOUX NATION

The sovereign State of South Dakota is indeed proud to be the last stronghold of the old Sioux Nation—and the native land of Sitting Bull, the medicine man who led the Sioux in their last great moment of triumph climaxed in Custer's Massacre at the Battle of the Little Big Horn.

Even today, visitors enjoying the spectacular scenery of the mountainous Black Hills of South Dakota, and the nearby awe-inspiring Badlands, can hear the throbbing of Indian drums and watch descendants of the mighty Sioux tribesmen perform their age-old sun dance.

Originally the powerful Sioux Nation controlled the entire Northern Plains—from Wisconsin westward through Minnesota and Iowa to Nebraska, the Dakotas, Montana, and Wyoming.

In those early days a highly developed nation existed in peace and plenty—until the advent of the white man who discovered gold in the mountains and the wealth of golden grain on the prairies.

From that time onward, the desperate Sioux waged brilliant and decisive battles to retain their national boundaries—but little by little they were forced back. Today, their proud empire has been reduced to the Pine Ridge, Cheyenne, Lower Brule, Crow Creek, Rosebud, and Standing Rock Reservations in western South Dakota.

Through those days of swirling battles, sharp skirmishes, midnight raids, and horrible massacres, the Sioux fought bravely under the leadership of Sitting Bull—a prominent and respected medicine man.

Born in what is now South Dakota, he quickly attained respect of the warring tribes and his became a voice often heeded around the chieftain's council fires. Aided by Crazy Horse, Sitting Bull's prowess became a historical fact in 1876 when Gen. George Armstrong Custer blundered into the Battle of the Little Big Horn.

From the high point of this battle—located in southwestern Montana, not far from the Black Hills of South Dakota—the prestige of the Sioux Nation rapidly disintegrated under the constantly increasing pressure of the westward movement of civilization.

All of these historical and dramatic facts in the life of Sitting Bull, and in the life of his people, are portrayed in a new motion picture entitled "Sitting Bull," which is a W. R. Frank production in color and Cinemascope and is distributed by the United Artists Corp. The world premiere of this film is being held tonight (Aug. 19) in Rapid City in the beautiful Black Hills of South Dakota.

This film, which is having its world premiere tonight in Rapid City, S. Dak., pays tribute to the man himself, and portrays in vivid fashion the life and times of the great Sioux Nation in the days when this most powerful of all Indian tribes ruled America's northern plains.

To bring the life of Sitting Bull to a close, he was murdered by Indian police while resisting capture on the Grand River in northwestern South Dakota. His remains were spirited away, to lay in a neglected grave for years in nearby North Dakota.

This negligence was dramtically reversed last year, when public-spirited citizens of Mobridge, S. Dak., secretly removed those remains to a new grave on the bluffs of the Missouri River, overlooking Mobridge and the sweeping valley of the Missouri—the homeland of Sitting Bull.

And now, travelers driving westward over United States Highway No. 12 can stop near Mobridge and pay tribute to Sitting Bull at his grave, which is surmounted by a majestic statue carved by Korczak Ziolkowski, of Custer, S. Dak.

This film, Sitting Bull, joins with the South Dakota citizens who gave the Indian leader an honored resting place, to bring the talent, exploits, and ability of Sitting Bull to the lasting attention of all Americans.

Truly, the descendants of Sitting Bull and his fighting comrades—those Sioux Indians now living in and near the Black Hills and the Badlands of South Dakota—can be proud that this great Indian leader is now achieving his rightful place in American history.

The Voice of Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 19, 1954

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, just a few days ago I received a copy of a newspaper, Liberty and Justice, published in Madrid, Spain. The feature article of this newspaper has to do with the Honorable CHARLES J. KERSTEN, Member of Congress from Wisconsin, who is chairman of the Select Committee on Communist Aggression of which I have the honor of being a member. Congressman KERSTEN has long been known for his untiring efforts in the cause of liberty and justice and it is therefore fitting that this newspaper should devote its lead article in its issue of July 31 to the cause of which he has been champion for a good many years.

Congressman KERSTEN is not one who is inclined to seek personal publicity for the cause he so well espouses. In my work with him I have observed that he is quick to avoid any publicity which tends to give him personal credit for the magnificent job he is doing. He believes that public attention should be directed to the issues and to the exposure of all the evils which communism has visited upon mankind. Those of us who have worked with Congressman KERSTEN have come to know him as the quiet man from Wisconsin. I know that he will continue to refrain from seeking personal publicity, but I believe that the feature article which appears in the publication, Liberty and Justice, under the title "Mr. KERSTEN, Champion of the Nations Under Soviet Dominaiton," is so accurate and descriptive of his endeavors that fair play demands this article be brought to the attention of the Members of the House and the American people.

Under unanimous consent, I include this article in my remarks:

MR. KERSTEN, CHAMPION OF THE NATIONS UNDER SOVIET DOMINATION

(By Pamfil Seicaru)

In the tragic controversy between two worlds, one which is respectful of human liberty and personality, and the other, the world of communism, which denies any freedom, a conciliatory attitude has become impossible. A policy of appeasement has been proposed and practiced by all formulas for seducing the Soviet regime and thus trying to win it over to peaceful coexistence. Diplomats, specialists in the policy of compromise, have tacitly consented to consider the nations sacrificed at Teheran and Yalta as having forfeited their rights, proclaimed by the American Declaration of Independence in 1776, this being the price for a precarious peace.

Ten years after this sacrifice of 110 million Europeans, exiles may wonder whether this repudiation of the principles for the sake of which war was waged against Hitler and nazism is worthwhile. It has been impossible to conclude even a patched-up peace. Those truths have been proclaimed with authority by Robert A. Taft in his book, A Foreign Policy for Americans. Already in June 1941, Senator Taft pointed out the very dangerous consequences of an alliance with Soviet Russia. Immediately after the beginning of the war between national-socialist Germany and Soviet Russia, in June 25, 1941, Robert A. Taft asked the following questions: "To spread the four liberties all over the world, we are going to send planes, tanks and guns to Communist Russia. If Stalin, thanks to our help, maintains himself in power, do you believe that he will spread the four liberties in Finland, Estonia, Latvia or Lithuania? Do you think that even in Russia proper anyone will ever talk of the four liberties after the end of the war?"

Soviet Russia has signed the Atlantic Charter, the United Nations Charter, in the same way she signed in 1933 the ill-fated agreement on the definition of the aggressor, keeping none of her pledges.

A crook will sign without hesitation the most solemn engagement with the firm resolution not to keep it. Likewise Soviet Russia will sign any agreement, after having obtained the highest price for it, happy to find that simpletons still exist who grant some credit to her signature. "Undoubtedly, if the Second World War has been waged for spreading liberty all over the world it has been a failure," wrote Robert A. Taft in his book. It was natural, American good faith having been deceived by the Moscow brigands, that a violent commotion should agitate American public opinion. This tragic disillusion has produced anticommunism which is a spontaneous reaction of American public opinion against the Communist danger and not a byproduct of pressure exerted by propaganda of the United States Government.

Mr. KERSTEN, an authentic representative of this current of public opinion, delivered last year in Congress an implacable indictment against the policy practiced by Soviet Russia in Rumania and in the other countries subjected to Communist terror. His statements prove his perfect knowledge of the situation created by the Russian occupation army, which supports the Communist regime imposed by Moscow and which is the real sponsor of the regime. This knowledge of the atrocious conditions which follow the accelerated setting up of communism, results from a careful study of all the available documentary evidence concerning the enslaved countries, information just as accurate as it is ample.

One might say that Mr. KERSTEN suffers in his conscience the terrible ordeal endured by the nations condemned to serve as guinea pigs for the experiment of setting up communism. To be able to revolt against a certain state of affairs one must participate in the sufferings caused by an unjust political and social order. Compassion implies also the Christian feeling of human solidarity just as a refined sensibility. When Mr. KERSTEN proclaimed in 1953 this truth that God is creator of all human beings, and the source of their rights, he was asserting the Christian concept of social order.

Mr. KERSTEN's conception of the state is absolutely contrary to the Marxist thought; he maintains that the mission of a state is to be at the service of man and not to become his master; that the state is not justified to divert the executive power from its task—administration and police—and compel it to crush human rights by the application of terror. Mr. KERSTEN condemns implictly all conceptions tending, directly or indirectly, to create the Communist totalitarian state.

Soviet Russia is a past master in the technique of setting up totalitarian regimes. From October 1917 to the present day she is putting into practice a sanguinary conception of the state; arising from the materialist conception of history the Communist regime has annihilated the spiritual value of man. An atheist conception of life could only lead to mass murder. For an American, convinced that right originates from divine, natural and moral law, the conception of the state as executioner is a lasting provocation.

Those who cannot see as well as those who through hypocritical calculations refuse to see the apocalytical threat represented by the Communist idea—under its Marxist form of the materialist conception of history—believe that a policy of coexistence with Soviet Russia is possible. A transaction of merchants establishing a basis compromise and then "wait and see": that is the mentality which formulates British diplomacy, cherishing the hope that time generally takes the edge of revolutionary dynamism. A policy of expediencies, feeling no shame to forget the famous principles of the Atlantic Charter, under the condition that such an abjuration should be a paying one, this is the policy which has contributed to Soviet Russia's expansion, facilitating the triumph of communism.

The option in the present phase of history is between freedom and totalitarianism, between man and robot and it cannot be solved by diplomatically commercial expediences. Cowardice or the fear to poise the forces that affront each other at a crucial moment of history, have been practiced, just as the illusion that an average solution exists the results of this policy, or rather lack of policy are obvious. The victory of the Communists in China is the result of General Marshall's illusions; he believed that appeasement was a possible solution.

While the Free World continues to live on illusion, Mr. Kersten's campaign can be considered as an apostolate in favor of the reconquest of freedom for the nations now enslaved by Soviet Russia, and of restoring their sovereignity to all the nations that have been condemned to pay the price of the errors committed at Teheran and Yalta.

Faith, assisted by an untiring energy, has determined his political objective, namely to expose the sophisms of the policy to create a so-called peaceful coexistence with Soviet Russia.

After a serious inquest among the refugees from behind the Iron Curtain, carried out together with other Congressmen, Mr. Kersten has delivered the following statement to the Spanish paper Ya:

"The number of victims behind the Iron Curtain will never be exactly known because the number of persons who have been murdered is unknown and is probably superior to that obtained from calculations and estimates. Let us not talk of numbers because they are astonishing, amounting to many dozens of millions; but I must record that the massacre of Katyn, for example, was a trifle in comparison with the mass-murder of more than 100,000 prisoners and deportees in 1939, in the concentration camps of the Ukraine.

We know that millions of people die in the Russian and satellite concentration camps for political prisoners, either murdered or as a consequence of the merciless treatment to which they are subjected. Among these camps is the famous camp of Chechen-Ingush where more than half a million deportees suffer till they die.

Mr. Kersten answers thus indirectly the supporters of the policy of peaceful coexistence. He does not feel satisfied with documentary evidence alone for the enlightenment of American public opinion; he also proposes under these circumstances the creation of an international court with the duty to judge the Red leaders as international murderers.

"If we succeed in creating an international criminal court and the free world adopts a realistic policy defining the Red rulers as they are in reality, there will ensue many favorable opportunities for the military forces behind the Iron Curtain, supported by the martyrized enslaved nations, to make the Red rulers appear before this criminal court and answer for their crimes."

Judging this action from our point of view as refugees and knowing the mentality of our nations, we believe this attitude to be the right one which will possibly bring favorable results. However, if the whole world has good reasons to fear war, this does not mean that the price of peace must be the maintainment in bondage of 110 million Europeans.

War can finally be avoided if the resistance of the people behind the Iron Curtain is encouraged and if revolution within the whole European space dominated by Soviet Russia is helped to explode.

Some insurrectional movements took place in Czechoslovakia in June 1953 and a revolt of greater proportions exploded in Eastern Germany and Berlin. A mere start of the slaves was sufficient to cause complete confusion in Moscow where a general rising was feared.

When 110 million slaves will burst asunder their fetters, when the choice between liberty and death will become the sole possibility, no military force will be capable of stifling a revolution of such magnitude. Propaganda favoring the policy of coexistence facilitates Russia's task in the 11 occupied countries. If people in these countries were convinced that they would be supported morally and materially by the great democracies, then general insurrection would be inevitable.

Mr. Kersten's great merit is to have understood this truth. The courage he showed by proposing the creation of criminal court called upon to judge the Red murderers designates him as a statesman with a clear view of the right road.

Political refugees must begin a permanent campaign of agitation against the maintainment of the status quo in Europe.

The liberation of our countries cannot be expected from a generous gesture made by Malenkov or Molotov, suddenly seduced by Sir Winston Churchill's dialectics or Mr. Attlee's passion for liberty.

By proposing the setting up of an International Criminal Court Mr. Kersten prevents a repetition of Pontius Pilate's gesture. This could be the starting point for a mobilization of world public opinion against the self-deception of a possible peaceful coexistence with the hangmen in Moscow.

All the refugees conscious of their duties toward there own countries must group themselves around Mr. Kersten.

American Federation of Labor Rejects Coexistence and Asserts Principles of Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES J. KERSTEN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 19, 1954

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, on August 12 at New York City the executive council of the American Federation of Labor issued a statement of principles ringing with Americanism in its truest sense.

The American Federation of Labor rejects coexistence with communism.

The American Federation of Labor rejects the notion that the free world must choose between a policy of coexistence or a policy of waging a preventive war.

I congratulate the executive council of the American Federation of Labor on its penetrating analysis of the main issue of the cold war. I also congratulate the American Federation of Labor for its exposure of slave labor in the U. S. S. R. and its fight for free labor.

Herewith follows the statement of the executive council of the A. F. of L.:

The free world is beset by new and dangerous perils. Its security is gravely endangered by illusions about the role of Soviet communism since the death of Stalin. Anxious for peace and eager to live and let live, the democracies have, in varying degrees, ignored the basic, permanent, threat of the Moscow-Peiping military axis and its worldwide Communist conspiracy. This has led to a serious weakening of their sense of urgency and vigilance. Their will to cooperate and unite for a common cause has been shaken. Their drive to become strong enough to deter and defeat direct and indirect Soviet aggression has been dangerously slackened. Some in the free world (Bevan, Nehru) even go so far as to oppose every effort by the democracies to promote their collective security and self-preservation on the ground that such efforts are harmful to peace.

Costly concessions have been made to the Communist imperialists on the pretext that they must not be displeased or provoked. These concessions (Indochina) have not alleviated but aggravated world tension and have encouraged the Communists in their conspiracy to subvert all free societies and to foist upon them totalitarian dictatorships. In this situation, the Kremlin and its junior partner in plunder (Mao Tse-tung) have succeeded in misleading many people to trust the stepped-up Soviet propaganda for so-called coexistence. Given the habit of the democracies to relax their vigilance and reduce their strength the moment they feel that the threat to their freedom and peace has abated, reliance on this Soviet strategy is fatal to the security of the free world.

If Moscow were sincere in its revival of this maneuver, devised by Lenin in 1920 in order to gain time for preparing the final assault on the democracies, it would first of all liquidate its activities aimed against the existence of those with whom it claims to seek coexistence. These fifth column activities, directed by the Kremlin, have but one aim—to subvert, overthrow, and replace the governments with which the U. S. S. R. is supposed to be at peace or even has special treaties of alliance and friendship. These Communist activities are a form of indirect, but nonetheless informal, Soviet aggression—fatal to the freedom and national independence of big as well as small nations (China 1945, Czechoslovakia, 1948). Before there could ever be coexistence, conducive to the peace and well-being of all mankind, the Soviet dictatorship would have to fulfill certain conditions. Let the U. S. S. R. go back to the borders of 1939 (pre-Stalin-Hitler pact). Let the Kremlin accept U. N.-supervised democratic elections in all areas of tension (Germany, Korea). Let Moscow agree to the actual banning of atomic and hydrogen weapons through effective international inspection and control.

The executive council of the AFL rejects the notion that the free world must choose between coexistence—the policy of successive, of massive appeasement of the Soviet aggressors—and a policy of waging a preventive war against the Moscow-Peiping Axis. We sincerely want peace with freedom. We, therefore, reject both of these policies. The policy of "coexistence" can lead only to another world war—under conditions in which the democracies would, morally, materially, and militarily be far less able to resist, let alone defeat, the Communist enemy.

Instead of helping the Communist dictatorship to overcome the serious economic and political difficulties now besetting the Soviet orbit, instead of providing these totalitarian aggressors with commodities and credit they need for strengthening and streamlining their already powerful and dangerous war machines, let the democracies pursue a positive program to aid freedom and peace through building up their own unity and ever greater strength. The executive council of the AFL proposes that this program should have among its guiding lines the following measures:

1. Complete rearmament—military, economic, political, and social—adequate enough to discourage and defeat Communist subversion and aggression against the free nations on all continents.

2. Setting of definite time limits for granting independence to the colonial and semicolonial peoples, as the United States did in the Philippine Islands.

3. Expansion of purchasing power, productivity and trade, and stabilization of the prices of basic raw materials (rubber, tin, etc.) within the free world.

4. U. N.-supervised democratic elections in all areas of conflict (Germany, Korea, China, Indochina) in order to reduce international tension and to enable the peoples of these countries to achieve genuine national reunification in freedom and to select governments which shall enjoy full sovereignty in their foreign as well as domestic affairs.

5. Rigid and permanent opposition to admitting into U. N. membership the Mao Tse-tung regime or any other government which (a) has been imposed on a nation by a foreign power; (b) which exercises effective control of the country by denying its people the human rights specified in the U. N. Charter; and (c) which is engaged in, or has been found guilty of, aggression against the U. N.

6. Bilateral nonaggression and mutual aid pacts between free nations (U. S. and Republic of Korea, Philippines, Nationalist China) until such time as agreements can be reached for organizing a more inclusive collective security system.

7. Negotiations for the settlement of international disputes to be conducted through regular diplomatic channels or through the channels of the U. N. with a view of strengthening the U. N. as an instrument of world peace.

8. Continuous and increased emphasis on advancing the cause of peace through promoting a genuine disarmament program—a practical program carried out in stages, effectively controlled and inspected internationally on both sides of the Iron Curtain.

S. 3447 and H. R. 9163

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL T. DURHAM

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 19, 1954

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, Senate bill 3447, which was passed by the House today, is a bill that is designed to permit a physician to prescribe certain non-habit-forming drugs preparations verbally rather than in writing. In fact, it does little more than legalize a practice which is very widespread already, with the most unfortunate result that the druggist who accepts a prescription over the telephone is left holding the bag unless he is careful enough and persistent enough to require the physician to sign a prescription the next time he is in the pharmacy.

It should also be noted that there are many exempt codeine preparations under existing laws, such as Cheracol cough syrup. This bill would merely extend the coverage to include some other similar compounds and preparations.

Under this bill, not only will the druggist be protected in the future in a practice which is already widespread, but services to the sick would be expedited.

The law which prohibits a physician from using the telephone to prescribe common everyday prescriptions for the alleviation of pain was enacted 40 years ago—December 1914. It is quite appropriate that we revise laws of this kind, subject to all appropriate safeguards, to conform to the very important developments in medical and pharmaceutical sciences.

I wish to make it very clear that this bill would not authorize a verbal prescription for any drug until the Federal Commissioner of Narcotics has issued a regulation describing precisely what drugs may become subject to the verbal prescription procedure.

Before he issues such a regulation, the Commissioner is required to consider the views of the Surgeon General, the United States Food and Drug Administrator, the respective heads of State narcotic law enforcement agencies, and the respective secretaries of national associations representing narcotic-drug manufacturers, physicians, and pharmacists.

It will not be possible to predict in advance what drugs will be considered entirely safe by the Federal Commissioner of Narcotics and his advisers.

Under the terms of the bill, the druggist is still required to maintain the same kind of records of issue which are required of him at the present time, but he is authorized to prepare the written record on the basis of a spoken rather than a written order.

Also a verbal prescription will only permit repetitive sales if specifically authorized by the physician in the same manner as for a written prescription.

Action on this bill is desirable because it is necessary to amend the laws of some States in order to put the new practice into effect. This bill we have passed today, S. 3447, by being made effective now, will permit the State legislatures to amend their laws next year. Otherwise many of them would not have had an opportunity to do so until 1957.

This bill I am sure will be welcomed by every druggist in every State of the Union. I have spent many years as a druggist and this was while the present law was in operation. This measure, in my opinion, will be a valuable addition to the present law.

One-Hundred-Year Saga of Blue Nuns One of Dauntless Courage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 19, 1954

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, this year marks the centenary of the Sisters of the Holy Humility of Mary, who have, during the past 100 years, devoted themselves untiringly to the noble service of God and country. By their arduous sacrifices and zealous efforts they have made a priceless contribution to this country. They have enriched the lives, spiritually and culturally, of countless thousands; they have comforted those in grief and distress and ministered to the sick. The July 23, 1954, issue of the Catholic Universe Bulletin carried an article briefly outlining the history of the Sisters of the Holy Humility of Mary since they arrived in this country in 1864. Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include this article:

ONE-HUNDRED-YEAR SAGA OF BLUE NUNS ONE OF DAUNTLESS COURAGE

Nestled in a secluded valley near the Ohio-Pennsylvania border in New Bedford, Pa., 10 miles from Youngstown, Villa Maria Convent today is a far cry from the 300 acres of rough, untamed land which greeted a handful of French Sisters when they arrived in 1864.

Its transformation is a fulfillment of a prediction that in America the nuns would find "the same unfailing providence" they found in France.

The order had been founded in 1854 in Donmartin, France, by Father John J. Begel in the diocese of Nancy, under the title of "Sisters of the Humility of the Blessed Virgin Mary." It was the year that Pope Pius IX proclaimed the dogma of the Immaculate Conception.

In 1863, Father Begel met Father Louis Hoffer, of Louisville, Ohio, who had been sent to France by Bishop Amadeus Rappe, first bishop of Cleveland, to bring a teaching order to the new diocese.

Father Boegel accepted and with the entire sisterhood of some 12 members, began packing.

First blow came on the eve of departure when Mother Magdalen, cofounder and superior, died. Daughter of a wealthy family, she had financed the young community for the 10 years of its life. She also provided traveling expenses to America and was to purchase the property which Bishop Rappe had selected.

With her death, plans for America were abandoned. Bishop Rappe, however, wrote: "You will find in America the same unfailing providence as you found in France."

Encouraged anew, the group began packing again and arrived in New York June 14, 1854. With Father Begel were 9 professed Sisters, 2 novices, and 2 orphans, who later joined the community and became known as Sister Magdalen and Sister Sacred Heart. Sister Sacred Heart's little sister had left France with them but died on the way and was buried at sea. Sister Magdalene was a sister to one of the professed nuns, Sister Anastasia.

They came to Pennsylvania July 25, 1864, faced with the task of succeeding where two other orders—Franciscan Brothers and Sisters of Charity—had failed.

The "farm" had been deeded by its owner, William Murrin, to the Pittsburgh diocese with the stipulation that it be used for religious purposes. Bishop O'Connor built a 2-story brick building which he intended for a diocesan seminary.

Owing to the inaccessibility of the place that plan was abandoned. Next, a colony of Franciscan Brothers took charge. They, too, found the land unproductive and the location poor. After 4 years, they returned to Pittsburgh and left the place on the hands of the Pittsburgh bishop who then sold it to Bishop Rappe for $3,000.

The Cleveland bishop asked the Sisters of Charity of St. Augustine to open an orphanage there. They tried from 1859 to 1864.

Such was the situation when the French nuns took up the challenge by starting an orphanage and a boarding school for girls.

They had little money, a sizable debt, and a farm which wouldn't yield anything for a year at least.

In this near wilderness they remembered the well-kept farms and the rich fields of their native France. The journal they kept tells how close they came to giving up.

But they didn't. They began to work the land. A sawmill was installed and the work supervised by the nuns, some of them doing the work themselves. To build an addition to the home, which had been erected by the Franciscans, a kiln was set up.

The nuns cultivated the soil, sheared sheep, dyed the wool, wove the material for their garments and that of their orphans and made their own shoes.

The language was a stumbling block, but English verbs were conquered, too.

The difficulties with which they had to struggle impeded for a time the educational progress of the community, but friends among the clergy, other sisterhoods, and layfolk who learned of their poverty helped them. The material condition of the community improved and membership increased.

The land continuously yielded better crops, thus enabling the nuns to support themselves and their orphans. To provide accommodations for the growing community the original brick building was doubled in size in 1869 and again in 1878.

The Sisters found Bishop Rappe's prediction coming true that an "unfailing providence would provide."

In 1871, during an epidemic, they went into homes to nurse the sick dying of black smallpox. They buried the dead at night.

Irish laborers on a nearby railroad gave the Sisters their first opportunity in hospital work. The men came over the hills to be nursed, and later repaid the nuns by contributing toward a small building which served as a hospital from 1879 until Bishop John P. Farrelly asked the Sisters to take over the present St. Elizabeth Hospital in Youngstown, which opened in 1911. Besides St. Joseph's, Lorain, the nuns also operate St. Joseph Hospital, Warren.

For the first 60 years at the Villa the nuns conducted an orphanage for girls; from 1907 to 1937 they mothered the boys at St. Anthony Home; for 50 years, from 1874 to 1924, they had charge of the domestic work at St. Mary Seminary, and since 1922 they have conducted Rose-Mary Home.

This year the order expects to start construction of a new girls' high school to be called Magnificant, on 25 acres of a 65-acre tract in Rocky River. It will accommodate 1,200 students.

Success has marked their labors in the fields of education, hospital administration, and welfare work.

In a small white chapel on the convent grounds there remains a link with France and the beginnings of the order.

It is a statute of the Immaculate Conception minus the right arm. An ordinary statue would have been replaced long ago. But not the Madonna of Villa Maria.

It first stood in a flower garden in Donmartin. To this grotto came the nuns each evening for prayer and recreation.

Mother Magdalen once said that as she prayed, the statue of the Blessed Mother seemed to bow to her. When the community came to America, the statue came, too, but it arrived in pieces.

A nun gathered up the pieces and put the statue together as well as she could. All but one arm. Every effort to repair it failed. The statue still stands in the chapel which the children of the neighborhood call the Wish House.

When the sisters try to correct this name, the children say:

"What else can we call it? What we ask for here is nearly always granted."

In the tiny chapel, the Blue Nuns, from postulants to Mother Lorita, H. H. M., the 10th superior since the foundation of the community, visitors and children recite this indulgenced prayer:

"Most Holy Virgin, I believe and confess Your Holy and Immaculate Conception pure and without stain. O, most pure Virgin, by thy virginal purity, thy glorious quality of Mother of God, obtain for me of thy Divine Son, charity, humility, purity of heart, body, and mind, the gift of prayer, a holy life, and a happy death. Amen."

Former Senator Joseph E. Ransdell

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RUSSELL B. LONG

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 19, 1954

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, on July 27 of this year there passed away former Senator Joseph E. Ransdell, who at the time of his death was the oldest living former Member of the Senate. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD three editorials and an article which appeared in various Louisiana newspapers.

There being no objection, the editorials and articles were order to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New Orleans Times-Picayune of July 28, 1954]

Joseph E. Ransdell

A good man, a good citizen, and a good public servant over a span of years that most people can only half remember, Joseph E. Ransdell is dead at 95. It has been a long time—23 years—since Senator Ransdell was retired from public life, but with many of those who remember some of his years in official harness his career was the finest expression of the doctrine that public life is a public trust. Through nearly a half a century he carried through faithfully the trusteeship which he assumed in one office or another. And time after time, in his final years, appreciative citizens found ways to express their gratitude for the service he performed and the example he set.

What State history will record about Senator Ransdell is that he was elected to a number of public offices, served 14 years in the House and 18 years in the Senate, and was the originator of the first comprehensive flood-control legislation for the lower Mississippi Valley and the State. Naturally his flood-control bill was the masterpiece of his career. But in the hearts of people who knew him well the memory of his personal qualities and his exemplary life will be most treasured.

The passing of this fine citizen and public man is an occasion for sincere mourning.

[From the Baton Rouge (La.) Morning Advocate of July 29, 1954]

Senator Ransdell

As a United States Senator, Joseph E. Ransdell was not the headline maker that some were before him and others have been since. But his career in the public service was as productive as it was long and it is no exaggeration to say that future generations will enjoy the benefits of his work.

The unified flood-control plan for the lower Mississippi Valley is, of course, his legislative monument. Under this bill, passed in 1928, the Federal Government took charge of flood control in the valley and since that time work has been done that it is believed will prevent any repetition of the flood disasters that have occurred in the past.

Another of his more important bills was that creating the National Health Institute in Washington. Senator Ransdell, who then was ending his career in Congress, served for a time as head of the Institute. This project was a natural sequel to his 1917 bill which led to establishment of the United States Public Health Service Hospital at Carville for treatment of Hansen's disease.

Former Senator Ransdell died Tuesday at the age of 95. It was 23 years ago that he lost his Senate seat to the late Senator Huey P. Long. Some of the major projects that he inaugurated now have been underway so long that they may be thought of by the present generation as having always been in existence. But they are still important, living projects.

The great unified flood-control program of which he was the author is now the subject of intense interest throughout the lower Mississippi Valley. Work to prevent capture of the Mississippi by the Atchafalaya will bring the program near completion.

The hospital at Carville is now the leading institution of its kind in the world. Work done there has brought new hope to many patients and has gone far to remove the fear and superstition that for centuries have surrounded Hansen's disease.

Among those who knew him, the former Senator is remembered as a man of dignity and level judgment. The campaign in which he lost his Senate seat was a bitter one, but he lost neither his equanimity or his sense of proportion, and was not himself embittered. For nearly two decades thereafter he remained active in his personal life and in public affairs. He was the owner of a large pecan orchard and even after passing the age of 90 was a well-known figure in the southern pecan industry, a leader of the Louisiana Pecan Growers Association.

His was a long and vigorous public career and a long and vigorous life. As the present Senator LONG—RUSSELL LONG, son of the man who defeated Senator Ransdell—said, Louisiana has lost an outstanding citizen who gave many years of his life to public service.

[From the Shreveport Times of July 29, 1954]

Joseph E. Ransdell

Joseph E. Ransdell, who died Tuesday at his home in Lake Providence at the age of 95, was one of Louisiana's fine gentlemen. In his younger years he was one of its most capable statesmen. As United States Senator he was the first man in Congress to call for Federal flood control and nationwide development of waterways through Federal activities. He took the first steps to create what is now the tremendous Mississippi Valley waterway system.

Senator Ransdell first held public office nearly 70 years ago when he became district attorney of East Carroll Parish. Only 4 years later he was sent to the House of Representatives in Washington and then to the United States Senate where he served under every President from McKinley to Hoover.

A courtly gentlemen of the old school southern frock-coat type, Senator Ransdell also was a man of remarkable logic of mind and maintained an unusual clarity of intellect even through his final years when he was approaching the century mark in age. In recent years—when in his ninties—he wrote several letters to editors of the Times on both State and National political affairs which were astonishing for keen understanding of the most elusive details and ability to pin down a controversial subject to a very simple issue.

To his sole survivor, a niece, Mrs. Isabel Keene, the Times joins the many thousands who respected and admired Senator Ransdell in extending heartfelt sympathy. A splendid man has been taken from this life.

[From the Alexandria Daily Town Talk, Alexandria-Pineville, La., of July 28, 1954]

Great Loss to Louisiana

(By Adras LaBorde)

The new generation cannot appreciate what Louisiana has lost in the death of Senator Joseph E. Ransdell.

As his biographer it was my privilege to learn every facet of the bearded old gentleman who was a national figure for 32 years, a real statesman whose service to the Nation spread over the most historic half-century of its existence.

Joseph Ransdell's life story is an integral part of the story of Louisiana, from his birth at Elmwood plantation in Rapides parish to his death at Lake Providence Tuesday at the age of 95.

It is the story of a man whose love of people and of the Nation enabled him to overcome odds that appeared insurmountable.

His labors on behalf of flood control, of rivers and harbors improvements, of farm prosperity, of better health are part of the glorious history of the century.

A NOTEWORTHY PROPHET

But more than that, Senator Ransdell was a keen student of international affairs—a prophet whose vision was broader than that of any of the Presidents under whom he served.

He was a leading exponent of American intervention in World War I and the first to see the fallacy of isolationism. After the war he disagreed with President Wilson on his peace policies, and when he learned that Wilson was going to Europe to confer with Lloyd-George of Britain, Clemenceau of France and Orlando of Italy on world peace, the Senator wrote him a strong letter urging that a leading Republican—former President Theodore Roosevelt—be taken along as an adviser and conferee.

President Wilson answered he needed help but he couldn't take "that man."

Senator Ransdell realined himself with Wilson in the fight for ratification of the Versailles Treaty and United States participation in the League of Nations. It was during that fight, in one of the most brilliant speeches of his 32 years in Washington, that he made the now-famous prediction:

"Fifty years hence it will be a matter of common wonder that there should have been any opposition to the League of Nations."

World War II and subsequently the United Nations proved the sagacity of Joseph E. Ransdell.

FOR BETTER HEALTH

Living monuments to this great Louisianian include the United States Leprosarium at Carville, La.; the National Institutes of Health at Bethesda, Md.; a large number of flood-control projects throughout the Mississippi Valley.

Although it has long been forgotten by all but a handful of his intimates Senator Ransdell's most treasured victory came with the approval of his bill to establish the National Institutes of Health after a 6-year fight.

The significance of this success was epitomized by the chief of the Kentucky Public Health Service who wrote 7 years later to Senator Ransdell: "* * * * there are probably a million people living in this country today who would not be living if it had not been for your advocacy of that public-health measure."

He championed the fight to rid the country of tick fever, thereby achieving a master stroke toward a great livestock industry. He was the father of Federal aid to control floods, the champion of protective tariffs that saved Louisiana's sugar industry, one of the first exponents of reforestation.

The Senator was past 90 when I began the task of writing his biography, so that future generations could have a record of his achievements. But he was still full of memories of the bitter battles he had waged on the floor of both Houses of Congress—not only in quest of legislation to improve the lot of his fellow Americans but also to stamp out injustice and bigotry.

HE GAVE A GOOD ACCOUNT

Few men will ever be given the chance to serve in Congress for 32 years, and just as small a number will be granted a lifetime of 95 years. Perhaps those who are accorded either or both must be men who, like Senator Ransdell, can give a good account to their Creator that they have made positive use of every day.

Men can't live forever, no matter how indelible the footprints they may leave behind. Louisiana was bound to lose Joseph E. Ransdell. But in the legacy that it has received because he has lived within its borders the State must never forget him.

The picture of the stately gentleman with the characteristic white goatee as he defended what he considered to be right against all odds must remain a symbol of the statesman who is willing to subordinate regional prejudices to national aggrandizement.

Senator Joseph E. Ransdell was truly a great warrior—and there has been none like him in Louisiana since his departure from the Washington scene 21 years ago.

The Foundation To Defeat Communism: An American Enterprise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 19, 1954

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, on July 30 I had the honor to attend a dinner here in Washington sponsored by the Foundation to Defeat Communism in company with five of my distinguished colleagues who are members of the Kersten Committee To Investigate Communist Aggression. On that occasion some highly pertinent remarks were made by members of the committee which bear a vital relationship to the security of the United States. Moreover, since these remarks bear upon the question of whether the free American way of life can long coexist with aggressive Russian communism, I feel they will be of keen interest to the Members of Congress. Under unanimous consent, I include in the Record the following news release issued by the Foundation To Defeat Communism which highlights these issues:

Foundation To Defeat Communism—The Traitorous Character of Coexistence: Respite for the Communist Conspiracy To Prepare a Sneak Attack on the United States—The Monstrous Crimes of the Soviets—Urgent Necessity of Breaking Political and Trade Relations With the Communist Bloc—The Kersten Committee on Communist Aggression Exposes the Kremlin's Schemes at the Foundation's Dinner

The system of government under which the masters of the Soviet operate is one which "puts good people in jail and criminals in office," declared Congressman Charles J. Kersten of Wisconsin, chairman of the House Committee on Communist Aggression.

Speaking at the dinner offered by the Foundation To Defeat Communism, on July 30, in honor of the members of the House Committee on Communist Aggression, Charles Kersten stressed the fact that there is a life-and-death struggle between the free world and communism and that no compromise is possible between the two.

Recalling the mass graves of Russia, where over the bodies of innumerable victims the NKVD have made playgrounds for children, Charles Kersten emphasized that there has never been in history such a perversion of human nature. Civilization is upside down behind the Iron Curtain, he added, and there is no possibility, unless we abandon all our traditions, principles, and way of life, to compromise with such a criminal negation of everything we stand for. All attempts at whatsoever modus vivendi or coexistence are extremely dangerous delusions, which can but lead to our own downfall.

The Kersten committee returned from an investigating tour in Europe and conveyed to a large meeting at the Congressional Hotel their findings and conclusions. In an impressive demonstration of unity of purpose and solidarity with their Chairman Kersten, both Republican and Democratic members of the committee denounced the policy of coexistence, trade with the Communist bloc, and the continuation of diplomatic relations with the Soviets and their satellite governments.

"The idea of peaceful coexistence is indeed the opiate of nations because it seeks to put free people to sleep while Communist criminals are carrying out their work of subversion and sabotage of free institutions" stated Congressman Michael Feighan, Democrat, of Ohio, and added "that the advocates of peaceful coexistence between the free world and the masters of the Communist slave empire should be awarded the Lenin Medal for extraordinary service in the cause of that criminal conspiracy."

The coexistence policy was sharply criticized on this occasion. Congressman Fred Busbey, Republican, of Illinois, exposed coexistence as a product of a disastrous vacuum in the political thinking of the Roosevelt, Truman, and Eisenhower administrations. "We do not have an American foreign policy. Roosevelt did not have an American foreign policy, Truman did not have an American foreign policy, and now Eisenhower does not have an American foreign policy. We have instead a policy of drift which is pushing us, more and more, to a terrible dead end."

Congressman Ray Madden, Democrat, of Indiana, and Thomas Dodd, Republican, of Connecticut, stressed the necessity of organized action in order to bring the truth about the Communist criminal conspiracy to the people, by penetrating the thick screen of leftist propaganda still going on in this country.

"I worry about the fellow travelers and not about party members, because they are performing the best service for the Communists," said Mr. Dodd. Recalling that the leftist deception of the American people goes far back, he urged a common effort for reeducation toward intellectual honesty, especially in schools and universities.

"This Communist directed deception of the American people," declared Congressman Madden, "made many believe that communism is a social utopia and that what is going on behind the Iron Curtain is an experiment in social reform. There are in this country even today some fuzzy nitwits who believe there may be some good in communism. The investigation of our committee reveals the atrocious, barbaric, inhuman Communist despotism, which aims at the absolute tyrannical control of the human being. The testimony presented to the Kersten committee should be read in all the schools of America. The American people should know that the Muscovite beast has killed more people than all the tyrants of the world put together from Nero to Genghis Khan."

Congressman Alvin Bentley, Republican, of Michigan, urged that every step be taken to stop the suicidal coexistence policy. He mentioned his resolution in the House against the Admission of Red China in the United Nations. He impressed on his audience that the breaking of relations with the Communist bloc is a prerequisite for preventing the further deterioration of our international position and the commencement of a saner foreign policy.

James McTigue, counselor of the committee, said that in view of the facts uncovered by the investigation, "Peaceful coexistence with Communists appears like living with rattlesnakes; you never know when they are going to strike."

More arguments against the policy of coexistence were brought by Chairman CHARLES KERSTEN and Congressman MICHAEL FEIGHAN. Both described coexistence as helping in the consolidation of the political and military might of our mortal enemy. It puts our seal on his criminal activities in destroying our Christian civilization by the disintegration of the family, the exterminating persecution of religion, and the annihilation of the national spirit of the enslaved. The fact was emphasized that an American policy of coexistence would entail the loss behind the Iron Curtain, of the immense reservoir of potential, active forces on our side, still nourished by their faith in the United States.

Introducing the members of the committee at the foundation's meeting, Edward O'Connor, administrative assistant to the committee, put in evidence the remarkable cooperation reigning between the Republicans and Democrats within the committee, "which is a symbol of the true fight of America. Each member of the committee is a man dedicated to the work he is engaged in."

This American solidarity in the fight against communism was affirmed in the recommendations made by the committee before the House (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, August 9).

Briefly these recommendations include:

1. Convening of an international conference to break diplomatic relations with the Communist bloc, recognize the rights of the enslaved and terminate all commercial treaties and trade with Communist governments.

2. Establishment of national military units of refugees from behind the Iron Curtain.

3. To provide for the effective reestablishment of selective escapees in the free world.

4. That peaceful coexistence be clearly identified as a Communist myth and rejected.

5. That a commission under NATO records and notes for later prosecution Communist crimes.

6. That all members of the U. N. be informed of the findings of the committee's investigation.

"The Foundation To Defeat Communism has as one of its main objectives to help in the spreading of the constructive work which Congress is accomplishing in combating the Communist scourge," declared Mrs. Willard Edwards.

Speaking on behalf of the foundation, Mrs. Edwards pointed out the importance of furnishing such material to the smalltown newspapers, "which are not controlled by the leftist lords of the American press."

Will Panama Be Next?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS E. MARTIN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, negotiations relative to the formulation of a hew treaty between the United States and Panama are yet in process. New and far-reaching demands are being made by Panama as regards the annuity paid that country by our own because of the operation of the Panama Canal. It is believed that these demands have caused the delay in reaching an agreement on the indicated points. Apropos of the situation presented, under leave accorded, I am extending in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as a part of these remarks the semimonthly Economic Council Letter 341 of August 15, 1954, dealing with the subject. The letter constitutes an interesting—and illuminating—contribution in the premises; and it is now set forth because of the important information involved.

The letter follows:

WILL PANAMA BE NEXT?

Diplomatic conversations over Panama's demands for further treaty revision have continued in Washington and Panama since September 1953. Progress, if any, has been top secret at both ends.

Panama's desires haven't lessened. Alger Hiss set a pattern when he was a power in our State Department. Over the protests of Spruille Braden, then Assistant Secretary of State, Hiss reported to the United Nations that Panama was an "occupied territory." This gave color to Russia's charges of American "aggression" and inflamed Panama to reassert its claim of "sovereignty" over our Canal Zone.

Most pressing, however, is Panama's desire to increase our annuity payment of $430,000 (originally $250,000) to a minimum of $5,000,000 or to 20 percent of gross canal tolls, now around $37,500,000 a year.

Surrender of American sovereignty rights in the Canal Zone is unthinkable. It would set a pattern for eventual surrender to international control.

Reasonable increase in the annuity may be conceded. Proven inequities will be adjusted. But conflicts of interest as old as the canal itself may yet be needled to a showdown by Communist and "hate-America" agitators.

Meanwhile other problems at Panama call for total reevaluation—and action.

1. The long-neglected rock fissure on Contractors Hill which threatens a slide into the canal, and pressures impinging from opposite Gold Hill could force an upheaval in the canal bed that would block the channel temporarily despite preventive steps now underway. This is the judgment of some eminent geologist-engineers.

Added to this danger is the vaster engineering problem of modernizing a waterway fast approaching obsolescence. Plans to deepen to canal to sea level are opposed as a monstrously expensive, impractical and unnecessary boondoggle by many civilian engineers who helped build the canal. They have memorialized Congress to authorize immediate creation of an independent commission to reevaluate the whole problem.

The sea-level plan would require a new treaty with Panama to alter some of the Canal Zone boundaries. This would bring demands for indemnities and still higher annuities; consequently higher tolls to burden all commerce.

2. The Comptroller General of the United States, in a still unpublicized audit report, discloses situations so serious that he recommends complete reorganization of the Canal Company and Canal Zone Government into one responsible civilian agency.

IT'S ONLY THE UN-IVERSAL URGE

Now don't blame Panama's statesmen. Theirs is only the UN-iversal urge: "Get all you can from Uncle Sam."

So, in order to hold their political jobs, they tell the populace that their little country is entitled to a fair share in what they represent to be an enormously profitable canal enterprise. Gross tolls are the talking point, not the small net.

America's net investment of $489,162,524 and what the United States has done for Panama get slight mention when a Red-inspired mob shouts "down with the Yanquis." Our canal hasn't paid a dividend since 1950. The first comprehensive audit of the whole Panama Canal enterprise wasn't completed till the end of fiscal year 1952.

But it's easy for the politicos to remember that in 1936 they wangled "Good Neighbor" F. D. R. into abrogating America's treaty rights to build and use defense bases outside the Canal Zone; that it cost United States taxpayers more than a million in rental for 134 bases during World War II, and multimillions for construction.

Then Uncle Sam was kicked off all the bases in 1948 by the Panama National Assembly bowing to Communist-inspired riots.

Now the atmosphere seems to have changed. Blessed for the first time in many years with what appears to be a stable government, Panama's treaty negotiators are doing their best to prove that a profitable, cooperative partnership is now possible.

They point to many acts of genuine friendship since President José Antonio Remón was elected in 1952. His Congress has outlawed communism. He has fired notorious Red teachers. Apparently good use is being made of big loans and of more than a million dollars a year of United States technical cooperation funds applied, with many American technicians, to Panamanian agriculture, education, housing, public health and social welfare. Needed, they report, 100 more social workers.

Treaty-revision pressures began building up a year ago. President Remón and his lovely Senora with an entourage of 10 came to Washington in September, but preliminaries were started in Panama on August 12, when two retired United States Army public relations experts, Generals Julius Klein and Kenneth Buchanan of Chicago, were engaged by the Gvoernment in Panama.

The nature and purpose of their employment, recorded in the Foreign Agents Registration Section of the Department of Justice in Washington, was to serve the Government of Panama as public relations counsel with regard to its [Panama's] efforts and aims to bring about a satisfactory adjustment of its relations with the United States of America by way of treaty amendment and other forms of aid.

Total recorded fees and expenses up to the termination of their employment December 31, 1953, amounted to $20,245.22.

Panama's treaty negotiators, assisting Ambassador Roberto M. Heurtematte, are Dr. Octavio Fabrega, former Minister of Foreign Relations, and Don Carlos Sucre, former Minister of Government. They are allowed $50 a day for expenses. They may be on their way to report before this is off the press, for Panamanian patience is reported to be wearing thin.

Typical of the intermittent meddling from partisans of Panama is a recent letter in Newsweek, signed by a Panamanian, warning the United States.

"Pressure is building up in Panama among the masses. * * * Many are asking themselves how long will President Remón be able to continue without explaining to the public why negotiations should be delayed so long. * * * Imagine the repercussions should Panama decide after, say, 1 year of ineffectual negotiation to recall their mission."

The 1936 treaty, which sacrificed American rights to defend the canal from bases outside the zone, was held up until 1939 by the United States Senate.

President Remón has been quoted as saying he will not retreat one step from his demands for justice from the United States.

If a formula for justice is shaken down into a draft treaty by next January, its ratification will have to share attention with other problems from the isthmus.

SEA-LEVEL CANAL—A BOTTOMLESS PIT

American taxpayer, your Panama Canal cost you half a billion dollars. It is near to bursting its seams, and you cannot afford to be indifferent about it. For makeshift solutions can endanger your country's safety, and affect your tax bills, too.

A makeshift third set of locks, authorized in 1939, was to permit transit of the new aircraft carriers and other ships too big for existing canal locks. Estimated cost, $277 million. Excavation started in 1940, suspended in 1942, cost $75 million.

Then in 1947 the Army bosses of your canal enterprise revived a proposal to construct a practically new Panama Canal at sea-level. Estimated cost, at 1947 prices, $2,500,000,000. Experienced civilian engineers say the sea-level plan would cost now 4 to 5 times as much. They speak from personal experience in the original canal's construction, 1904–14.

They don't put it baldly in their memorial to Congress, but between the lines anyone familiar with the problems at Panama can read their questioning of Army men's qualifications to pass wisely on operational requirements of either a lock or a sea-level canal. The only Navy man ever in a position to influence decisions of the Panama Canal management was appointed only last December. He is retired Rear Adm. Richard E. Byrd, famous explorer.

These civilians have risen since their canal digging days to eminent positions as consultants and administrators at home and abroad. They ask your Congress to weigh points which this space can only summarize:

1. A sea-level canal is as vulnerable to A- or H-bombs as a lock canal.

2. Tidal locks would be required to control Pacific tides, and vulnerable reservoirs and huge dikes to divert the Chagres and other rivers.

3. Makeshift repairs and alterations, recently authorized, estimated at $26,500,000, would only delay solution of basic problems.

4. Canal improvements should look to transit capacity, now cramped, and to navigational efficiency, always deficient. Ships could not make the speed in a narrow sea-level channel that they do through Gatun Lake.

5. The third-lock expenditure of $75 million can be largely salvaged by using its excavations, now useless, in constructing a new set of larger locks at the Atlantic end and a new, three-stage set consolidating the Pedro Miguel and Miraflores locks at the Pacific end of Gatun Lake. This would extend Gatun Lake and provide needed anchorage space at the approach to the Pacific locks. The worst bottleneck of the canal, long since recognized as an error, is the placement of the Pedro Miguel locks so close to the exit of the Gaillard Cut.

6. All this proposed reconstruction, expansion of transit capacity and increase in navigational efficiency, say these civilian engineers, can be accomplished for $600 million to $750 million—against the unknown billions a sea-level canal would cost.

7. This can be done without changing Canal Zone boundaries, for which a new and no doubt costly treaty with Panama would be required.

8. H. R. 1048, introduced of Representative THOMAS E. MARTIN, Republican, of Iowa, and supported strongly by Representative CLARK W. THOMPSON, Democrat, of Texas, would authorize a commission of independent men of widest engineering, operational, governmental, and business experience to investigate and recommend a solution at Panama. This Congress did not act on the Martin resolution, but the canal problem will haunt the next Congress.

Isn't it obvious that the facts should be found and conclusions reached by other than governmental personnel who are all too often concerned with justifying their own mistakes?

Furthermore, early launching of a thorough, independent investigation may be the only way to head off precipitate action on treaty readjustments for which Panamanian agitators will be clamoring.

A TANGLE OF CONFLICTING AUTHORITY

The American people have at their "strategic outpost of hemispheric defense" a tangle of conflicting authority, bureaucratic immobility, and a system adaptable to covering up past engineering, administrative, and diplomatic blunders.

If you doubt it, study the current audit report of the Comptroller General of the United States covering your Panama Canal enterprise (printed copy not yet available).

Congress ordered a complete new setup, effective July 1, 1951. Canal management was turned over to the Panama Canal Company, a new Government-owned corporation. Other Canal Zone functions were left to the Canal Zone government, headed by a governor who traditionally is an Army Engineer. The governor is also president of the Canal Company.

Traditional also is the succession: another Army officer understudying the big boss and stepping into his shoes. So the Comptroller General has met resistance when he has recommended investigations by authorities outside the self-perpetuating bureaucracy.

"It is apparent," says the audit report, "that the armed services are reluctant to relinquish control over their activities."

Duplication of services and facilities, extravagance and waste still persist, forcing the Comptroller General to these conclusions:

"We recommend that the Panama Canal Company and the Canal Zone Government be combined into a single independent government agency * * * that the organization be administered by a single civilian administrator or by a small civilian board or commission composed of not more than three members * * *

"The administrator or members of the board should serve full time, reside in the Canal Zone, and be selected on the basis of successful backgrounds in governmental, utility, and commercial fields * * *

(The board) "has not yet adopted any major changes * * * essential to improve efficiency and economy. The number of improvements during the past year has been limited because most of the board members have outside interests in the United States requiring practically all of their time and attenion."

Examples of bungling and waste cited in the audit report would lead stockholders in a business corporation to fire the management. Absenteeism of directors and domination of the canal enterprise by Army Brass are pinpointed as root causes of deeply embedded trouble.

Canal personnel has been reduced from 18,239 to 16,393 in 1 year. Dissatisfaction continues among those who remain. American employees have laid their grievances before Congress through their "United States citizens association."

No big business in the United States has tougher public and labor relations problems than Uncle Sam's corporation in Panama.

There is much more of the argument for drastic reorganization at Panama to command your attention. It is your canal—your outpost of national defense. It needs your vigilance.

EARL HARDING,
Vice President, National Economic Council, Inc.

Outlawing Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. USHER L. BURDICK
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, Congress in a state of hysteria about communism, fanned by the action of Russia against the United States and the constant propaganda put out here in Washington by the Russian Embassy against the United States, and the convictions obtained by the Government, made a bold stroke, as it thought, to complete the destruction of Communist thinking in the United States. Under this law, and the laws we have—the Smith Act—a card-carrying Communist must register or be guilty of a crime. Under this new law, as it left the house, if his registration shows him to be a Communist, he is ipso facto a felon. Anyone who has spent a week in a law school knows such action is unconstitutional. This process repeals the fifth amendment of the Constitution completely.

Congress has declared, in this bill, that communism is a felonous conspiracy against the United States. Tomorrow or next year the Congress can, in like manner, declare any organization, in their opinion engaged in a conspiracy against the United States and make advocates of that movement felons. Many good people in the United States are working daily and assiduously to build a world government that will be superior to our own Government, and destroy the Constitution of the United States. That movement is going on while this anti-Communist bill was being debated.

It makes no difference the way in which people contrive to destroy our Government, whether by force or violence, or through any other means, designed and intended to destroy our Constitution. When the Constitution is destroyed, our Government is destroyed. Has anyone made any move to "outlaw" these builders of a world government?

In the interest of this great Republic, does it make any difference what ism is set up to destroy it? Is not nazism just as bad as communism? Is not facism just as bad? While we seek to destroy one ism why should we be so hysterical as to allow the other two to progress

We have destroyed communism in the United States, the proponents of this bill say, by legislative fiat exactly in line with the means employed by Hitler and his gestapo. By this action we have ceased to operate as a democracy.

While we have put communism out of business here—as believed—we foster it in the United Nations. That organization is full of Communists, and many of them are citizens of the United States. We continue our appropriations to keep Communists there, as was evidenced by the mutual security appropriation bill, which passed the House—$5,788,000—just ahead of the anti-Communist bill. We oust Communists from the payroll of the United Nations and the United Nations puts them back and pays them damages. We do nothing about that but continue our appropriations to that organization.

Both the Bible and the statutes of the world outlaw murder, arson, and all other major crimes, but has that stopped murder and all the rest? We have stopped Communists, but will that stop communism? Not at all. Communism is a condition of mind, and no matter what the penalty some people will keep on thinking what they want to think. Congress cannot stop thinking for if it does, more violence has been done to our Constitution and the Government than the thinking of these misguided people.

Up to the time people do some overt act, the thinking of communism is a right any individual has under the Constitution. If, however, he takes part in any undertaking to destroy the Government, either in planning it or acts committed in execution of the design, the thinker of communism has committed no punishable act against the Government.

This bill really is designed to keep men from thinking whatever they want to think, and that is clearly unconstitutional.

Alcide de Gasperi

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include herein the following editorial which appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald August 20, 1954, in the passing of Italy's former Premier Alcide de Gasperi:

ALCIDE DE GASPERI

"This is indeed a grievous blow." Dr. Konrad Adenauer, the West German Chancellor, is reported to have exclaimed when he received news of the sudden death of Signor de Gasperi yesterday. He spoke truly; and for the friends of the European Defense Community the blow was all the harder to bear in coming while they were still suffering from the shock occasioned by the treachery and defection of Dr. Otto John. For Signor de Gasperi, like Dr. Adenauer himself, had been one of the stanchest advocates of unified opposition to further Communist aggression and resistance to the increasingly clamorous champions of neutralism and peaceable coexistence. Although he had been obliged more than a year ago, by the defection of his own social-democratic allies, to resign as head of the Italian Government, and more recently, because of poor health, to relinquish the leadership of his Christian Democratic Party, his powerful personal influence, which was felt not only in Italy but also throughout Western Europe, remained. It was this influence, supported by the prestige and sagacity of the venerable Don Luigi Sturzo, which had prevented the party from being torn apart by the tensions of its radical and conservative extremes and had saved it from wandering into the morass of compromise and vacillation in which its French counterpart, the Mouvement Republicain Populaire, now appears to have lost itself.

Now that its great leader is gone, the future of the Italian Christian Democracy, shaken by its internecine disagreements, by the impact of the Montesi-Montagna scandals, and by the ever-growing violence of attacks of its adversaries of the Left and Right, confronted at almost every turn by the urgent and baffling internal problems of overpopulation, unemployment and agrarian reform, seems grim and uncertain. It is the glory and the tragedy of the European Christian Democracy that in Signor de Gasperi and Chancellor Adenauer it has given the Western World its two ablest and most clear-visioned statesmen of the postwar epoch, yet has apparently been unable to produce younger men capable of succeeding them.

The place that Alcide de Gasperi will eventually occupy in the history of our times will of course be determined to some extent by events. If Western Europe is ever relieved from the shadow of communism; if a comity of European peoples is ever realized in some form of supranational confederation, his place will be a high one indeed. Whatever may happen, he will be recognized as one who perceived what courses are necessary if historic Europe is to overcome the economic chaos and spiritual decadence that were its legacy from the 19th century nationalisms and the 20th century wars.

Republican Social Security Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, enactment of my bill H. R. 9366, to extend and improve the social-security system, represents one of the most outstanding achievements of this Republican Congress. It extends vital retirement and survivorship protection to over 10 million Americans for the first time. Moreover, the bill provides substantial increases in benefits both for those who are already drawing benefits and for those who will become entitled to benefits in the future. The following are the highlights of this new social security legislation:

I. EXTENSION OF COVERAGE

First. Farmers: The bill extends social security coverage for the first time to self-employed farm owners and operators. This means that old-age and surviors insurance protection will be extended to about 3.6 million farmers, their wives, and their children.

Second. Farm workers: The bill also extends coverage to about 2 million farm workers who are not covered today. In general, farm workers who are employed regularly by one farmer are covered at the present time. The bill extends this same protection to those farm workers who earn $100 or more in the course of a year from one employer.

Third. Professional groups: The bill extends social security coverage to accountants, architects, engineers, and morticians. As a result, the only professional groups which will not be covered by social security in the future are lawyers, doctors, dentists, and other medically related professions.

Fourth. Ministers: The bill covers ministers and members of religious orders, whether self-employed or employees, if they elect individually for coverage on the same basis as self-employed individuals. It is estimated that this amendment will extend coverage to about 260,000 persons.

Fifth. State and local employees: The bill extends coverage to the employees of State and local governments who are covered by State and local retirement systems—other than policemen and firemen—under voluntary agreements between the States and Federal Government, if a majority of the members of the system vote in a referendum in favor of coverage. There are about 3.5 million persons in this group.

Sixth. Domestic workers: The bill extends coverage to domestic workers in private homes—and others who perform work not in the course of the employer's place of business—who are paid $50 in cash wages by an employer in a calendar quarter, regardless of the 24-day test required in the present law. This provision will extend coverage to about 250,000 persons.

Seventh. Miscellaneous: The bill also extends social security coverage to the following groups for the first time:

(a) American citizens employed outside the United States by foreign subsidiaries of American companies, under voluntary agreements between the Federal Government and the parent American company—about 100,000.

(b) Home workers who are now excluded from coverage as employees—whether or not they are now covered as self-employed persons—because their services are not subject to State licensing laws—about 100,000.

(c) Employees engaged in fishing and related activities, on vessels of 10 net tons or less or on shore—about 50,000.

(d) American citizens employed by American employers on vessels and aircraft of foreign registry.

(e) Cotton-gin workers: The following is a breakdown of the additional coverage: 3,600,000 farmer operators, 2,100,000 farm workers, 200,000 domestic workers, 3,500,000 State and local employees, 250,000 ministers, 100,000 home workers, 50,000 fishermen, 100,000 employees of foreign subsidiaries, 50,000 in employment not in course of trade or business, 100,000 professional self-employed, and 150,000 Federal employees; totaling 10,200,000.

II. INCREASE IN BENEFITS

First. More than 6.5 million persons now on the benefit rolls will have their benefits increased as of September 1, 1954. The average increase for retired workers will be about $6 a month, with proportionate increases for dependents and survivors. The range in primary insurance amounts for those now on the rolls would be $30 to $98.50, as compared to $25 to $85 under present law.

Second. Persons who retire or die in the future would, in general, have their benefits computed by the following new formula: 55 percent of the first $110 of average monthly wage—rather than $100 as in present law—plus 20 percent of the next $240—rather than 15 percent of the next $200. Thus, an individual's retirement benefit will be as high as $108.50 a month, and he and his wife together could receive as much as $162.75 in retirement benefits.

Third. The minimum monthly benefit amount for a retired worker would be $30, and the minimum amount payable where only one survivor is entitled to benefits on the deceased insured person's earnings, would be $30.

Fourth. The maximum monthly family benefit of $168.75 would be increased to $200; the provision of existing law that total family benefits cannot exceed 80 percent of the worker's average monthly wage would not reduce total family benefits below 1½ times the insured worker's primary insurance amount, or $50, whichever is the greater.

III. EARNINGS BASE

The total annual earnings on which benefits will be computed and contributions paid is raised from $3,600 to $4,200.

IV. COMPUTATION OF BENEFITS

The individual will be entitled to drop out from the computation of his average monthly wage for benefit purposes up to 5 years of his lowest earnings.

V. RETIREMENT TEST

The earnings limitation would be removed entirely at age 72—instead of at 75, as under present law. For beneficiaries under age 72, the earnings limitation would be made the same for wage earners and self-employed persons. A beneficiary could earn as much as $1,200 in a year from covered work without loss of benefits. He would lose a month's benefit for each unit of $80—or fraction thereof—of covered earnings in excess of $1,200, but in no case would he lose benefits for months in which he neither earned more than $80 in wages nor rendered substantial services in self-employment. Beneficiaries engaged in noncovered work outside the United States would have their benefits withheld for any month in which they worked on 7 or more days.

VI. ELIGIBILITY FOR BENEFITS

(a) As an alternative to the present requirements for fully insured status, an individual would be fully insured if all the quarters elapsing after 1954 and up to the quarter of his death or attainment of age 65 were quarters of coverage, provided he had at least 6 quarters of coverage after 1954.

(b) Benefits would be paid to the surviving aged widow, widowed mother, and children, or parents of any individual who died after 1939 and prior to September 1, 1950, and had at least 6 quarters of coverage.

VII. PRESERVATION OF BENEFIT RIGHTS FOR DISABLED

The period during which an individual was under an extended total disability would be excluded in determining his insured status and the amount of benefits payable to him upon retirement or to his survivors in the event of his death. Only disabilities lasting more than 6 months would be taken into account. Determinations of disabilities generally would be made by State vocational rehabilitation agencies or other appropriate State agencies pursuant to agreements with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

VIII. RECOMPUTATION OF BENEFITS FOR WORK AFTER ENTITLEMENT

An individual may have his benefit recomputed to take into account additional earnings after entitlement if he has covered earnings of more than $1,200 in a calendar year after 1953 and after the year in which his benefit was last computed.

IX. CONTRIBUTION RATES

Employers and employees will continue to share equally, with the rates on each being as follows:

Calendar year:	*Rate (percent)*
1954–59	2
1960–64	2½
1965–69	3
1970–74	3½
1975 and after	4

The self-employed would pay 1½ times the above rates.

PUBLIC ASSISTANCE

First. The provisions of the 1952 amendments, presently scheduled to expire on September 30, 1954, with respect to temporary increases in Federal payments to State for old-age assistance, aid to dependent children, aid to the blind, and aid to the permanently and totally disabled are extended through September 30, 1956.

Second. The provisions of the 1950 amendments for approval of certain State plans for aid to the blind which did not meet the requirements of clause (8) of section 1002 (a) of the Social Security Act are extended from June 30, 1955, to June 30, 1957.

Robert Dinwiddie: "Grandfather of the United States"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PORTER HARDY, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 19, 1954

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, Virginia has a rich history extending back into the colonial era. During that period it produced many leaders who contributed greatly toward the formation of the United States. But few stand higher than Robert Dinwiddie, Governor of Virginia, 1751 to 1758.

In that position he had the arduous task of leading the colony during the French and Indian War—a war that ended French power in North America. His greatest contribution, however, was the discovery of George Washington and launching that young Virginian on his military career—acts of the highest importance that culminated many years later in Washington's becoming the Fathers of his Country.

Thus, it is indeed gratifying to read in the 1954 issue of the Phoenix, a magazine published by the students of Archbishop Stepinac High School, of White Plains, N. Y., an admirable summary by Philip Bergan of Robert Dinwiddie's career as Governor of Virginia. The young author credits Dinwiddie with being the "grandfather of the United States."

This unique historical relation between Dinwiddie and Washington is perpetuated in the city of Portsmouth, Va., where two of its principal streets, adjacent and parallel, are named for these two celebrated men: Dinwiddie and Washington Streets.

Since 1954 marks the second centennial of important military operations on Virginia's colonial frontier by Washington during Dinwiddie's governorship, it is eminently fitting to include Philip Bergan's excellent summary in the RECORD and thus make Robert Dinwiddie better known to the Nation at large.

The summary follows:

ROBERT DINWIDDIE: "GRANDFATHER OF THE UNITED STATES"

(By Philip Bergan)

Although few have heard of Robert Dinwiddie, he has acquired the title of "Grandfather of the United States," and was a prominent percursor of our Union. As Lieutenant Governor of Virginia from 1751 to 1758, he did much to promote the idea of a Union between the Thirteen Colonies. At the time he did not succeed in his farseeing objective but later it was his preparation that facilitated the Colonies joining and winning the revolution.

Dinwiddie, son of a Glasgow merchant, was born in 1693 and as he advanced in years entered the government service. He was appointed collector of customs for Bermuda in 1721, and after 17 years became surveyor general of customs for the southern district of America. Thirteen years later he became lieutenant governor of Virginia, the highest ranking resident official, and held this post for 7 years.

When he was sent to Virginia, he realized that the colonies faced a great danger from the French who were slowly winning control of the Ohio River area. He determined that they would never infringe upon the King's right. It was then that he also recognized the need for all the colonies to act together on this issue. The French were united in Canada; the English possessed 13 little colonies each fighting its own fight. In January 1754 he sent letters to the governors of the most important of the British colonies in America. In these letters he urged them to come to his aid in repulsing the enemy and in advancing the common cause. He described the threat and urged speed in coping with this foe. However, Dinwiddie's fellow governors were so slow in acting that they allowed the French to gain the initial advantage. While the Fernch were fortifying the Ohio, Dinwiddie was trying to prepare a united force. He received little aid from his neighboring governors in this work. As the war in the backwoods met reverses, he wrote to the governors again urging them to unite their resources and face the common foe. Again he was confronted with shortsighted men and had to help his little army out of his own pocket. When General Braddock arrived from England he gave the general the fullest extent of cooperation. Indeed, Braddock praised the governor by saying that he succeeded beyond all hopes in his fight against the French. Finally, there was a governors' conference at Alexandria in 1755. Even after that the colonies still did not cooperate with each other. They would agree to one thing and in reality do another. After 7 years of trying to hold the new continent together, Dinwiddie returned to England in ill health. At first glance one sees a man who was unsuccessful in his great aim, but upon deeper investigation we see that this man profoundly altered the course of early American history.

It was the memory of his urging that finally aided the colonies to unite and this resulted in the casting off of the rule of England. Even after the colonies had become free, they needed his memory. They remembered his pleading for unity and they heeded his warning. Yes, this man wielded great influence over the makers of this great country. When the authors of the Constitution met, under the greatest of Dinwiddie's proteges, George Washington, they allowed nothing to stand in the way of unity. But, after the signing of the Constitution, his memory was lost to history; his character changed under the influence of historians. Now, however, we see him as he was, a lone man speaking out for the cause of unity in an age of dissension.

Prayer for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEO W. O'BRIEN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, many Members of the House of Representatives on this, the final day of the second session of the 83d Congress, are revising and extending remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Some are devoting their remarks to the accomplishments or lack thereof of this particular Congress. That is their right, and their duty, because the people are entitled to those views in determining their choices for Federal offices in November.

I should like to address myself, Mr. Speaker, to something alien to politics—something which may be the true and final key to the closed door of world peace.

It is my privilege to conduct, over station WRGB in Schenectady, N. Y., a weekly television commentary which is nonpartisan and nonpolitical. Two and one-half years ago, during one of those programs, I remarked:

> Wouldn't it be a wonderful thing if all the people of the world who believe in the power of a Supreme Being were to join simultaneously, say at noon, London time, on a specified day, in a mighty prayer for peace?

Mr. Speaker, I expressed conviction that such an assault upon the gates of Heaven, joined in by the bus driver at an American street corner and the camel driver in some faroff desert; by the policeman in New York City and the store clerk in Paris; by the housewife in Des Moines and the lawmaker in Bombay, would surely produce what every decent human heart is aching for—a world untroubled by war and threat of war.

Mr. Speaker, the usual mail response to my program is not great because I avoid controversy as religiously as possible.

But during the week following the suggestion of a moment of simultaneous prayer I received more than 400 letters, some of them signed by entire families. They came from 40 communities and 4 States. They came from wives and mothers, fathers, children, clergymen, and college students.

Those letters overwhelmed me with their deep sincerity and their humble belief that prayer would bring peace.

I felt that I had been handed a great responsibility to further what I had suggested and what those people so strongly endorsed. I wrote to the Governor of New York State and the President of the United States, asking them to use their greater power and influence to bring about that moment of universal and simultaneous prayer. Their responses were cordial but, until today, I have felt that the pleas of those people had gone unanswered and that, somehow, I had failed them.

Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States delivered a speech on Thursday of this week at Evanston, Ill. Among other things, he said this:

> The goal should be nothing short of inviting every single person in every single country of the world who believes in the power of a Supreme Being to join in a mighty, simultaneous, intense act of faith. The act of faith might take the form of a personal prayer by the hundreds of millions—delivered simultaneously and fervently for the devotion, wisdom, and stamina to work unceasingly for a just and lasting peace.

Mr. Speaker, on tomorrow, with the cares and concerns of the session 24 hours and 350 miles away from me, I shall report back to those wonderful people who wrote me 2½ years ago.

I shall tell them that their voices did not cry out in the wilderness and that what they fervently desire has now been endorsed in the strongest possible terms by the powerful leader of the most powerful nation on earth.

I shall suggest to them, also, that they write to President Eisenhower, telling him what they told me so long ago, and urging him to set in motion at once the international machinery for carrying into effect this mighty and simultaneous plea to Almighty God.

The Illinois State Employment Service Is a Prophet of Gloom and Doom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, for fear of being labeled as a prophet of gloom and doom at the White House level, under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD without personal comment the report on Labor Market Trends in the East St. Louis, Ill., area issued for August 1954 by the Illinois State Employment Service.

I do, however, respectfully call this summary, an official report of an agency of the Government of the State of Illinois, to the attention of the White House.

The report follows:

EAST ST. LOUIS AREA LABOR MARKET TRENDS, AUGUST 1954

SUMMARY

Seasonal factors contributed materially to the continued downward employment movement in the East St. Louis area [1] during the 60 day period ending July 15. The seasonal layoff of 600 workers at commercial fertilizer plants plus the entrance of 700 to 800 students into the labor market dominated both the employment and the unemployment trends. Unemployment rose by 200 to 6,400 (including 1,475 women) while employment dropped 725. Primary metals edged downward during the past 2 months and forecasts a similar drop in the next 60 days. Industrial chemicals, with a slight dip during the past 60 days, anticipates the situation will reverse itself somewhat in the next 60 days, when a substantial number of students will return to school and commercial fertilizers will be moving into its busy fall production season. Meatpacking likewise at the threshold of its peak season, will start to increase its work force as will retail trade. While the prospects of some unemployment drop can be foreseen, only very moderate employment gains are anticipated.

MANUFACTURING CONTINUES TO SLIDE

During the 60 day period just passed the employment decline in manufacturing totaled 850. Commercial fertilizers which ended their spring season dominated this downward movement with a seasonal layoff of 600. Primary metals exhibiting continued weakness dropped another 100 from their payrolls. A lag in consumer demand whittled an additional 75 from industrial chemical plants, while plant repairs, vacation schedule readjustments, and slow sales caused small losses of 50 each in lumber-wood, stone-clay-glass, and rubber. Slightly offsetting these cutbacks were gains aggregating 75 in food processing and coal-petroleum.

NONMANUFACTURING SHOWS MODEST UPTURN

Contrasting movements attributed to seasonal factors played a major role in nonmanufacturing which edged up by 125 during the 2-month span from May 15 to July 15. Current construction activity, where the greatest gains occurred, covers a wide range of small projects including subdivision developments, sewer systems, and road and bridge jobs. Retail trade followed its normal summer pattern with a decrease of 100. Transportation (except railroads) and utilities boosted their employment approximately 100 with seasonal repair and rebuilding programs.

UNEMPLOYMENT EDGES UPWARD

Unemployment as of July 15 was estimated at 6,400 (including 1,475 women) as compared with a total of 6,200 (including 1,300 women) for mid-May. Seaosnal layoffs at local plants, laid-off persons coming back home from other areas, and the entrance into the labor market of 700-800 students at the end of the school year pushed the jobless total upward while a considerable number of local construction workers who found work outside this area tended to reduce the net rise in unemployment. For the first time in several years temporary workers (students) are finding it extremely difficult to secure employment.

LABOR SUPPLY

The current labor supply is ample for any known or foreseeable needs that may occur during the next several months. According to an analysis of the registrants on file with the East St. Louis ISES office during July,

---

[1] This area includes the city of East St. Louis and consists of the following townships in St. Clair County: Canteen, Centerville, Stites, East St. Louis and Sugar Loaf.

74 percent of these job seekers are under 45 years of age, and represent all occupational categories from entry occupations (5 percent) to the unskilled (38 percent). Although transportation sometimes poses problems for the people living in this area and securing work in adjacent areas, the lack of job opportunities is the principal restrictive factor to their securing employment at this time. Some movement of farmworkers from "burned out" areas into this locality has been noted.

EMPLOYMENT OUTLOOK

Based upon reports from the area's leading firms, local employment will display mixed but slightly rising trends during the next 60 days. Accelerated seasonal activity in commercial fertilizers and meatpacking will provide the necessary employment bulge to more than offset the slackening tempo of nonmanufacturing industries and the pessimistic forecasts of industrial chemicals and primary metals groups. However, due to the large pool of currently laid off workers with callback rights, new hires will be at a minimum for the next few months. Construction activity should remain at a high level through the fall months. Also, the approach of the fall school term should help to boost retail trade in the coming period. Bolstered with the prediction of a slight employment rise and the knowledge that hundreds of students will withdraw from the labor market during the next 30 days, the outlook brightens somewhat from the period just passed.

Employer Associations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks I include one of the finest addresses on a high moral plane, I have ever read, delivered by John Quincy Adams, president, the Manhattan Refrigerating Co., New York; Bronx Terminal Annex, Bronx, N. Y.; Union Terminal Cold Storage Co., Inc., Jersey City, on July 8, 1954, at the Serra International Convention, Grand Rapids, Mich., entitled "Employer Associations":

With your kind permission, I should like to take this opportunity to express a few thoughts on the Serran and management. These remarks are based on my own experiences as a Catholic businessman, as chairman of the coordinating committee of the food industries of New York, a group of 50 food trade associations, and as a first-hand observer at the scene of some of the most flagrant transgressions of its sacred trust by management. I refer in this letter to the New York waterfront. Here I might add parenthetically that the views expressed on this and other matters in the New York area earned for me in 1948, the Quadragesimo Anno Medal, awarded annually by the Association of Catholic Trade Unionists to the individual most effectively advancing the social ideals of the papal encyclicals.

The task before us is the reform of man and institutions. This cannot take place unless we have individuals and organizations dedicated to reform. Individuals cannot effect this reform no matter how powerful their personalities. Organization extends and perpetuates the influences of individuals, and compensates for their weaknesses. There is no substitute for organization.

All classes and groups—labor, management, white and black, Jew Protestant, and Catholic have a vital role to play in this reform. All bound together by charity and a zeal for social justice. Just as the worker must go to the workers organizations, so we in management must go to management organizations.

It was for this reason perhaps that Pope Pius XI, in his encyclical, Quadragesimo Anno, urged organization of employers when he said, "But if this cannot be said of organizations which our same predecessor intensely desired established among employers and managers of industry—and we certainly regret that they are so few—the condition is not wholly due to the will of men but to far graver difficulties that hinder associations of this kind which we know well and estimate at their full value. There is, however, strong hope that these obstacles also will be removed soon, and even now we greet with the deepest joy of our soul, certain by no means insignificant atempts in this direction, the rich fruits of which promise a still richer harvest in the future."

The purpose of such organizations should be to push forward and give practical application to the grand ideals of Christian social doctrines. These employer organizations should not have a narrow and sectarian base. They should be open to all regardless of faith, color or creed. For there can be no reform of our economic structure unless workers, management, and the public generally believe that such reform is desirable. We must have a similar framework of underlying beliefs and talk the same language. Unless we believe in the sacred dignity of man we cannot build an economy that works for man and the common good of all.

We must believe with the Holy Father that "to receive one's wage is a prerogative of the personal dignity of anyone who makes his productive contribution in one form or another as employer or laborer, toward the output of the nation's economy."

As did Leon Harmel, that farsighted and sainted French employer, we must learn to consider those who are in our plants not merely as employees or wageearners. They are men and women who like ourselves were made by God to know Him and love Him. That they are employed by us is just another condition of their lives. From us, their employer, they must receive no evil and as much good as possible.

The plant and its atmosphere are shaping the lives of workers. Our is a world of plants and industry. It is in this world that we have to be Christian. Our vocation as Employers is surely to practice in a special sense the virtues of prudence, justice, and charity. Employers bear serious responsibilities, spiritual and economic.

Thus in its search for profits, management must be ever mindful of the requirements, both material and spiritual, of labor. God's chief interest on earth is man. Man should be management's chief interest, too. Not profits or wealth, though we do have to make profits to remain in business.

The profit motive is not harmful. It is to subordinate man to profits that is harmful, to place profits above the common good of society. The sources of trouble in our economy is not the profit motive or private property. It is sin; and no class has a monopoly of this commodity. Parenthetically, we might remark that the most dangerous enemy of private enterprise is not communism, but secularism and greed. Without these diseases communism would never have captured the citadels of men's minds and hearts. These are the unseen and ubiquitous fifth column in our world.

Yet management owes more than decent wages to labor. Labor has psychological needs that must be met. The need for status and security; the need for understanding and to be treated as human beings. Unless we meet these needs, the claims of social justice cannot be said to have been satisfied. Management that does not meet them cannot long survive. We are all partners and members one of another. Our relations with labor must be based on self respect. We must respect their judgment as they must respect ours. Labor and management are inextricably bound. The prosperity of one determines the prosperity of the other; the misery of labor undermines the position of management. To deprive labor of its just right is a sure way of eliminating management's rights.

As the Holy Father said in his encyclical to Catholic employers: "We have just made reference to the preoccupations of those who are engaged in industrial production. Mistaken and disastrous in its consequences is the prejudice, alas, too widely held, which sees in these problems an irreducible clash of rival interests. The opposition is only apparent. In the economic domain management and labor are linked in a community of action and interest. To disregard this mutual bond, to strive to break it, can only betray a pretension to blind and preposterous despotism. Employers and workers are not implacable adversaries. They are cooperators in a common task. They eat, so to speak, at the same table, seeing that they must live in the last analysis, from the gross or net profits of the national economy. Each receives his income, and in this regard their mutual relations do not in any way imply that one is at the service of the other."

We must accept labor unions as a necessary part of our economy. Were it not for labor unions, many of our industries would not be in such excellent shape. Where would the garment industry be without its unions? Thanks to its unions, the industry enjoys stability and prosperity. In our plants, our warehouse and clerical employees are organized. The warehouse and clerical unions promote the welfare of our employees. But they help us too. They have on many occasions assisted us in getting our viewpoint better understood by State and Federal authorities. These A. F. of L. unions have encouraged workers to increase productivity and improve the competitive condition of our plants. Interestingly enough, the greatest pressure for a more complete mechanization of our plants has come from labor and not from management. As one of our shop stewards said, "the greater the productivity, the greater the productivity, the greater the profits, the greater the profits the more secure our jobs and the greater the wages."

In his address the Holy Father refers to the "occupational organization" of industry, so ardently desired by Pope Pius XI. According to the Holy Father "Nothing indeed appeared to him more suited to bring economic liberalism under control," than the enactment of a statute which would set up such an occupational organization.

If we are to have such Industry Councils in the United States then the best way to get them, is by taking the initiative now, and not wait for Congress to pass laws. An employer organization can do a great deal to popularize and develop the idea of the Industry Council.

One of the things we have in our plants is industry or plant councils. These councils were organized with the consent of our unions. They do not consider wage questions or hours. They give our employees a more direct participation and a better understanding of management. Shop stewards meet with management representatives to discuss mutual and company problems. We find out how workers feel and what their thoughts are; they obtain a better appreciation of management policies.

If we want to maintain industrial peace, we must keep open the lines of communication between labor and management. Our employees must hear us and we must listen to them. Communications, like cooperation, is a two-way street.

As Leon Harmel wrote, "It is necessary to summon the workers to take their rightful share of initiative, responsibility and activity. * * * That is what we tried to do in 1885 by the establishment of the factory council. By gathering together a number of men delegated by their fellows we were able to open our hearts to them, to let them understand our thoughts, to introduce them to the business and management of the factory and to interest them in it, in a word to make them real cooperators. They on their side, could take back to their mates the good spirit which animated them and the confidence we have been able to inspire in them."

The basic unit to the occupational organization plan is the plant council. We believe that, in the economic sphere, the plant council is to the National Industry Council what a congressional district is to the House of Representatives in the political field.

Management should retain control. It should not abdicate its rights or responsibilities. Our stockholders and employees look to us to carry the burden of direction. But management and labor must become one team at the service of our community, and plant councils today are an aid in bringing about this goal.

We believe that employer organizations should encourage management to raise the level of security and the ceiling of opportunity as much as possible. Pope Pius XII in his address to employers, stated: "As we must not forget, on the other hand, that it is supremely advantageous to a healthy social economy when this accumulation of capital derives from the greatest possible number of courses, it is very desirable, in consequences, that the workman also should be enabled, by the fruit of their savings, to share in the creation of the capital resources of their country."

The greater the opportunities which we in top management offer our associates and workers, the healthier our economy and the happier our workers. Responsible leaders of the CIO and A. F. of L. have done a good job selling private enterprise to the rank and file. We can do our part by making labor's association with us a happy one.

Another thing that employer associations are doing is to encourage management to participate in community projects. We are happy to say that most firms do a great deal. There are few community projects that are not headed by management personnel. Unions are cooperating more and more, and thus we see Management and Labor, working together shoulder to shoulder, for the community.

Our companies played a part in the building of the Holland Vehicular Tunnel and the Gansevoort Meat Market. Presently we are landing our personnel and the influence of our companies to the forward-looking efforts of the United Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Association of New York in the matter of a new and modern wholesale market for fresh fruit and vegetables in the Metropolitan area. In this we are not alone. Many companies are doing similar things in New York, Chicago and other cities.

This is not simple altruism. We have found it good business. When a community flourishes, we thrive. Our position in the community is good because the community is in good shape. Were it to decline, our companies would suffer. We must serve our community or we are lost. The Christian doctrine of ownership as stewardship is sound business.

It is along these lines that I would suggest we, in employer organizations move. I am sure that many employers are beginning to think this way. But more than organizations, we need more employers with vision. We need less talk and more action, less blueprints and more sacrifice, less meetings and more prayers. If the laity supplies the leaven, the bread of peace and prosperity will rise in our world of industry.

Russia's Master German Spy, Otto John, Fools the Central Intelligence Agency's Director and Others—How Foolish Can We Be?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 10, 1954

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Otto John, the Russian spy who has had access to top-level secrets in Germany and apparently in the United States, is now revealed as a consummate Russian stooge. However, before revealing his true identity, he came to the United States last June and was welcomed with open arms at the Pentagon by the CIA. While he was in this country he had ready access, apparently, to top secrets and to many defense plants. From this it would appear that the free nations of the world are now at the mercy of the Russian masters in the Kremlin who know just what our military strategy is.

Mr. Speaker, in this connection I am including, as part of my remarks, a news article that appeared in the Washington Evening Star written by Daniel De Luce, Associated Press foreign correspondent from Berlin:

DR. JOHN IDENTIFIED BY RUEFUL ALLIES AS RUSSIAN MASTER SPY

(By Daniel De Luce)

BERLIN, August 17.—Dr. Otto John is identified now by rueful allied powers as Russia's master German spy.

The man who dined cozily in Washington 2 months ago with Allen Dulles, Central Intelligence Agency Director, and curried favor with the British secret service for 10 years sits openly in the Communist camp today.

Until he motored into Berlin's Soviet sector the night of July 20—as casually as driving around the block—Dr. John was security chief of the West German Government.

His Office for Protection of the Constitution spent $2 million a year from the Federal treasury on espionage. His mission: To ferret out and expose Communist and Nazi plotters inside the Bonn republic.

This work was directly connected not only with the security of the West German State but of 400,000 allied troops.

LEARNED MUCH ABOUT ALLIES

From his headquarters in Cologne, Dr. John maintained contact with allied intelligence agencies.

Inevitably he learned a great deal about what the allies did to fight Communist espionage.

Fear of eventual exposure is considered the primary motive for his switch. The British say now that they became uncertain about John about 10 months before his overt defection. They never told the Americans, French, and West Germans of such doubts, however. The French were always lukewarm on John because of his known background as a British agent. Americans courted him.

This personable, talented Western deserter, born 45 years ago in Marburg, has mixed with princes and revolutionaries, Gestapo brutes, and Red stool pigeons, austere idealists, and sex-mad libertines.

NAZI AGENT AT 27

A boy wonder with a legal degree, Dr. John was appointed business trustee of Lufthansa, the Nazi government's international airline, in 1936, when he was barely 27.

If the Gestapo wanted special information from John to be gathered on his official trips abroad, it takes no great stretch of the imagination to suppose he complied.

But it is also known that he established contact with a German baron who deserted the Nazi diplomatic service for British asylum in 1939, then deserted the British for Communist East Germany after the war.

He also became intimate with a Dutch double-agent who two-timed the British in favor of the Soviet Union in wartime, flitted in and out of John's security office last year, and was found dead, an apparent suicide, in a Swiss hotel last November.

Allied intelligence can only speculate now on the possible links that John forged with the Soviet spy rings that sprang up within Hitler's occupied Europe after 1941.

When the bomb plot against the Fuehrer was hatched in 1944 John was in on it. His primary assignment was liaison with Prince Louis Ferdinand, anti-Hitler grandson of the last Kaiser.

When the assassination failed, John's brother, Hans, was among those executed. John escaped on a Lufthansa plane to Madrid, and the story is that he turned over top secrets of the V–weapon rocket base at Peenemuende to British agents, who spirited him on to London. He was soon welcomed into British counterintelligence.

OPPOSED BY ADENAUER

At last resettling in the Bonn Republic, John was the British-favored choice in 1950 to head the new federal security office. Chancellor Konrad Adenauer did not care for him, but John got the job.

He cultivated two old friends, Dr. Wolfgang Wohlgemuth, much-married West Berlin playboy and parlor pink, and United States counterintelligence Capt. Wolfgang Hoefer, a German who had emigrated in 1938 and acquired American citizenship.

Promoting for himself a coast-to-coast tour of the United States, John returned from it in mid-June after being cordially welcomed to the CIA headquarters and Pentagon in Washington and to United States defense plants.

At 9 p. m. on July 20—the 10th anniversary of the bomb plot—John was driving Wohlgemuth and himself in the latter's sedan when a West Berlin customs officer halted them at the Sandkrug bridge over the Spree Canal.

WIFE LEFT BEHIND

Behind in a British sector hotel, Mrs. John, a woman 7 years older than her husband, and Prince Louis Ferdinand were waiting for John to come back from an unexplained errand and join them at dinner. They had all attended unnerving memorial services that day for anti-Nazis slaughtered by the Gestapo.

"I must warn you that you are entering the Soviet sector," the customs officer told John.

"That's where we want to go," he answered lightly, and drove on.

It was 3 days later, on July 23 that Captain Hoefer, while being questioned on the John case by two higher intelligence officers, went distraught into the next room of his Berlin apartment, took out his service pistol, and killed himself with a bullet through the head.

The Airlines Pilots' Strike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN JARMAN

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, the first airline in this country to offer nonstop transatlantic service has had to cancel its service to the public because of a crippling pilot strike. The gravity of this interruption in service and vital background information dealing with the issues involved are discussed in the following newspaper editorials, not only from my home State of Oklahoma but from other parts of the Nation:

[From the Daily Oklahoman of August 7, 1954]

Who Has It as Good?

This airlines pilots' strike which is putting transcontinental air travelers to some inconvenience had its origin last November when American Airlines began two-way nonstop services between New York and Los Angeles.

The prevailing winds over the country move from west to east, and the DC-7's in transcontinental service have no trouble making the eastbound trip in less than 8 hours. But the tailwinds on the eastbound flight are headwinds westbound, keeping the pilots in the air longer than 8 hours.

This additional flight time averaging about 35 minutes was the grievance that culminated finally in the present strike. The Airline Pilots Association contends a safety hazard is presented by nonstop flights of more than 8 hours although crews in overseas service are in the air much longer of necessity.

In granting a waiver to the 8-hour domestic flight rule the Civil Aeronautics Board authorized transcontinental nonstops "of more than 8 but not more than 10 hours of continuous duty aloft without an intervening rest period provided that the flight is conducted in pressurized airplanes with a flight crew of at least two pilots and a flight engineer."

What is the lot in general of these pilots whose union contends they shouldn't be made to sit in air-conditioned comfort with their passengers a few minutes longer than 8 hours?

American Airlines says its DC-7 pilots fly 10 days of each month and are off duty the remaining 20 days. On 5 days of the month they exceed 8 hours of flying by 35 minutes, but they are in the air only 7 hours and 35 minutes on the other 5 days.

For working 10 days a month the first pilots for American Airlines are paid around $20 an hour or $1,600 a month or $19,000 a year. The pay for copilots will run from $600 to $950 a month depending on seniority.

Earthlings grubbing along in more prosaic pursuits probably would feel they never could expect to have it so good. They might wonder why anyone would strike in these circumstances and create a situation that eventually could throw a lot of people out of work who haven't any grievance at all against the company.

What the union wants is still another crew to sit out the westbound flights except for perhaps 35 minutes at the end of the shift. The term "featherbedding" is used most often to describe similar practices on the railroads. But it appears that the railroaders who started this business have a lot to learn about it from the birds in another featherbed.

[From the Tulsa Daily World of August 3, 1954]

Grounding the Airlines

The strike of 1,200 pilots of the American Airlines is not the result of caprice.

Is it then a well-concerted and well-timed strategem in view of the support it is receiving from fellow members of the A. F. of L. Air Line Pilots Association, who may also shut off flights of the United Airlines and Trans-World?

The American's nonstop transcontinental flights is the point in issue. The unionized pilots are protesting schedules that force them to stay in the air more than 8 hours on such flights. Union spokesmen say it is a fight for preservation of safety regulations and the public interest.

Since the three lines carry about 40,000 passengers daily, in addition to their mail poundage, the public certainly has an interest in this strike.

The American started its nonstop coast-to-coast flights several months ago. The west-east trips were scheduled for 7 hours, 35 minutes, while the east-west trips (because of prevailing winds) were timed for 8 hours, 35 minutes. The schedules were based on the combined dictates of reason and experience, subject to the vicissitudes of weather. They were approved by the Civil Aeronautics Board over union objections.

The United States court of appeals, totally detached from all factions, denied the union's motion to ban these schedules. Since then, the pilots contend the trips, in numerous instances, have required more than 8 hours.

The pilots are in an exacting and exciting profession. But they also have obligations of duty and service. They organized into a union in 1930 and have helped force their pay up to the present $15,000 a year top. Collectively, do they wield an unequaled authority?

C. R. Smith, president of the American Airlines, states the company's position simply and sensibly: (1) The flight crews of two pilots and an engineer, are on duty 10 days of the month; off duty 20 days of the month; (2) pilot members of the same union have for the past 9 years been flying and are today flying similar nonstop in overseas service with limits up to 12 hours.

"Does it make sense," Smith asks, "that flight crews can be scheduled to fly as much as 12 hours in crossing the ocean, where landing places and navigational aids are scarce, but cannot be scheduled to fly 8 hours and 35 minutes, 5 times a month, across the United States, where airports and navigational aids are abundant?"

The flying public expects and is entitled to the speediest and safest service. The CAB, the agency of the Federal Government responsible for the regulation of United States civil aviation, says the American Airlines coast-to-coast flight fills the bill. This strike is patently inimical to the public.

[From the Norfolk (Va.) Ledger-Dispatch of August 5, 1954]

Striking Airline Pilots Lose Some of Their Glamour

When 1,200 pilots of the American Airlines went on strike during the past weekend it was natural to assume that in suspending one of the world's largest air transportation service they were moved by some great issue. Surely these men would not take such a drastic step for any whimsical reason or without full regard to their responsibilities to the public as well as to the company for which they were working.

The facts, however, do not sustain such an assumption. The airline pilots, whose salaries are in the five-figure bracket, went on strike because the men who fly transcontiental planes are required, on the westward flights, to be on duty a few minutes over the normal 8-hour day. These knights of the air, for all the glamor that surrounds them, have acted just as unglamorously as any other worker who jumps when his union boss blows the whistle.

For many years it has been established practice that crews of transcontinental commercial planes shall not be on duty more than 8 hours at a time. A nonstop service by the American Airlines makes the flight from Los Angeles to New York in 7 hours and 35 minutes. But because of headwinds, the westward flight takes 8 hours and 35 minutes, and sometimes a little more. In June the Civil Aeronautics Board approved a 10-hour shift for transcontinental crews, and the Civil Aeronautics Administration confirmed it. Both agencies said the increased time allowance on the nonstop flight would not affect safety adversely.

The Airline Pilots Association, which is the pilots' union, insists that to require the plane crew to work 35 minutes extra on its westward flight—which they fly only 5 days a month—would put an undue physical strain upon them and thus would militate against safe operation. Which most people, we assume, will regard as perfect nonsense. To suggest that an airline pilot could be on duty for 8 hours at a stretch without prejudice to the safety of his ship but that an extra 35 minutes of service would put such strain upon his resources as place his plane and the lives of his passengers in jeopardy is ridiculous.

The truth of the matter is that the purpose of this walkout is to force the airline to employ an extra crew for this nonstop flight, which would be featherbedding of the most ludicrous sort. Inevitably it would increase the cost of air transportation without any justification whatsoever. These people—and that means most people—who have looked upon these pilots as a breed somewhat above the common level, are bound to feel a little hurt by this behavior on the part of these men.

[From the El Paso Times of August 7, 1954]

Out of Step

Those American Airlines pilots who are on strike out to be made to realize that the sympathies of the public are not with them.

They have tied up the largest airline in the United States. And for what?

Air travel has grown into one of the largest industries in our country. Many Americans depend upon it. Transcontinental nonstop travel is a part of that scheme.

In the opinion of the Times, the striking American Airlines pilots should bring themselves up to date. Are they a part of the new way of travel or are they not?

New Hope for TVA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT E. JONES, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following editorial from the Daytona Beach Morning Journal of August 16, 1954. This article was brought to my attention by Mr. John Broadway, a member of the city board of commissioners of Huntsville, Ala.

It follows:

NEW HOPE FOR TVA

Supporters of the Tennessee Valley Authority naturally wanted to assure themselves of the attitude of the new nominee toward the project before confirming him as a Director and the new Chairman of the Board. The Senators had in mind the statement of President Eisenhower that the TVA is an example of "creeping socialism."

They examined Brig. Gen. Herbert D. Vogel before the Public Works Committee for 2½ hours after his nomination to replace Gordon Clapp was submitted by the President. Vogel said he wouldn't describe the big project as Eisenhower did and promised to defend the TVA against encroachments by private utilities.

He said the TVA should build any new plants it needs rather than have the work done by private utilities. His replies to the searching questions of Senators satisfied them of his attitude and they joined with the others later in voting approval of his appointment.

The country will have an opportunity to judge Vogel after he takes over as Chairman of the TVA Directors. Private utilities have never forgotten their hope of eliminating this Government-sponsored project which has done so much to revive and expand the economy of the States in the TVA area.

Plenty of cheap electricity for homes, factories, farms, towns, and cities constitute only one of the benefits of the TVA. It has in addition prevented floods on the Tennessee River and aided navigation.

The TVA has served as a yardstick for the rates which private utilities charge their customers and this has been one of their sore points.

Industry has been attracted to the TVA region and hundreds of jobs opened to people who formerly were struggling for mere economic existence. The sentiment of the majority of Republicans in and out of Congress is against the TVA. They say it is Government competing with private enterprise. But the private utilities had an opportunity to serve the people of that region adequately before the inception of TVA and failed to do so. It was right for the Government to step into the breach and provide the people cheap electric power to ease their burdens and improve their chances of raising their standard of living.

More projects similar to TVA are needed in other great river basins but they will come only when the Democrats control the Federal Government. The prospects now are that a beginning in that direction will be made when the voters elect a new Congress in November.

Amending the Social Security Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, there has been considerable conjecture as to whether or not agriculture should be included in the Social Security Act. At this point I would like to include in the RECORD the resolution of the South Dakota Stock Growers Association at their annual meeting on June 9, 1954. The resolution reads as follows:

Whereas the administration has presented a plan to Congress which, if enacted into law, will make ranchers and farmers subject to the Social Security Act; and

Whereas we believe such legislation to be unnecessary, unsound, and just another cog in the wheel of creeping socialism: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, the members of the South Dakota Stock Growers Association, in convention assembled, are opposed to any such amendment; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to each of our Senators and Representatives in Congress and that they consider it a request to do everything in their power to defeat such proposal or any similar plan.

Danger of Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN R. DAVIS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I have received some interesting letters from a new resident of my congressional district, a native of Hungary who has a doctor of law and political science degree, and who has been in this country only a short time. In Hungary, he worked with the State police for years, serving as liaison officer to the Army intelligence branch and living close to the Soviet border, so became well acquainted with Communist methods.

Part of one of his letters follows:

Most Americans are thinking about us newcomers as lunatics because we emphasize the deadly danger of communism, certainly this is because Americans do not know yet the real face of communism.

I met prisoners of war coming out of Russia. All were surprised by the fact that we did not know about the armament of Russia. One of them was a countryman and former colleague of mine. He came from Siberia, traveling about 10,000 miles across Russia. "You are all crazy here," he told me angrily. "The whole Soviet is an arsenal, busy making weapons against you. I was sure America was doing the same thing, but your people think more of drink and girls. You can say to your American friends that there will come a day when they will work in Siberia like I had to do."

I met Ukranians also, some of them members of the underground, who were angry because America had not given any help to them. They warned me not to come to the United States of America, saying the Communists are very busy making a-bombs for the Yankees for a Christmas when they will sweep us down.

All this happened in Europe some years ago. But right here in Wisconsin last month a thunderstorm left a small city without gas and electricity for half a day and the entire life of the city was crippled. Yet nobody gave a thought to what could happen to Wisconsin or the United States of America in case of war with the Communists. All our life is based on electricity, and our production capacity would stop if our electric power centers were knocked out. And it does not need A-bombs; it only needs a couple of dozen of well-trained saboteurs. I am shocked to see that some Communist agents, taking advantage of the fifth amendment, seem to get more sympathy than some Senators or Representatives who try to expose them.

I do not believe that massive retaliation or united action would be the proper weapons against communism, because you cannot be sure of the result in a shooting war. Until you can realize and make public every day the danger of communism, you do not have the chance of victory. And if you recognize its real danger, you also will recognize that there is only one deadly weapon against them: To use their own means.

For example, you did not yet realize that East Europe is the weakest point of Communists. This was the reason for making a real Iron Curtain there, and seeking battle in Korea or Indochina. You must lift this Iron Curtain and you can beat the Communints under the belt there. You must not risk the lives of our boys for that, but must spend dollars to undermine the Communist regimes, especially in the satellite states and in Ukraine. A shooting war would be a great risk for us; a well-organized underground movement must be a success.

Eighty-third Congress, Second Session, Second Report to the People of the Fifth Congressional District of Maryland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK SMALL, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Speaker, with the adjournment of the 83d Congress at hand, it is only natural that attention will be focused on our accomplishments during the two sessions of this Congress. I therefore submit the following report to my constituents:

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE

As a member of the Committee on Public Works, I have continued to devote much time to legislation dealing with this subject. Certain public works projects, such as those involving roads, navigable streams and tidewater, where local governments cannot act without Federal participation—as in the case of Peace Cross—and those projects which are interstate in nature, must necessarily have Federal participation and coordination. The consideration of legislation covering such matters involves endless hours of hearings, including the presentation of highly technical data.

Another subject coming under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Public Works is the study of our water supply and water pollution. One of our basic resources is water. We are running short on this resource in the United States, and are faced with the necessity of finding some economical way to take the salt out of the ocean water, so that it will be usable in supplementing our fresh water supply. The shortage of water directly affects the growth of industry. For instance, the production of every ton of steel involves the use of 8,000 gallons of water. Herein enters the problem of pollution. The water taken out of our streams for industrial purposes is dumped back, contaminated with chemicals, and this polluted water kills marine life. We have here, then, a twofold problem, not yet solved; accordingly, much research and work remain to be done before we can arrive at the answers.

PEACE CROSS

"Why doesn't somebody do something about the floods at Peace Cross?" For

20 years or more this question has been pressed by residents, businessmen, and motorists who have been plagued by the ever-increasing floods at the intersection of United States Routes 1 and 50, in Bladensburg. Therefore, upon coming to Congress in January 1953, as Representative of the Fifth Congressional District of Maryland, one of the first things I did was to inquire into the legislative steps necessary to get flood relief at Peace Cross. It was a pleasure for me to spearhead the drive in Congress for the Anacostia River flood-control project.

One of the problems not generally known to the public was the fact that the Anacostia River is considered a navigable river and therefore comes under the jurisdiction of the United States Army engineers. Even though the Maryland State Legislature, on April 11, 1953, made available $4,250,000 for the Peace Cross flood-control project, this money could not be used until a Federal appropriation, also, was available, which would enable the Army engineers to go in and supervise the work. It was necessary, therefore, that the Army engineers make a comprehensive survey of the project and submit their report and recommendations.

Early in the 1st session of the 83d Congress I started my campaign for "project Peace Cross." On March 6, 1953, I called in person on Director Joseph M. Dodge, of the Bureau of the Budget. At that time I urged Director Dodge to include funds for Peace Cross in the budget that he was then preparing for submission to the Congress. Repeatedly thereafter I made strong representations to Director Dodge; the Honorable JOHN TABER, chairman of the House Appropriations Committee; and the Honorable GLENN R. DAVIS, chairman of the Subcommittee on Army Civil Functions and Military Construction. I presented in evidence photographs, cartoons, editorials, articles, and letters received from individuals and citizens' groups, all of which pointed up the seriousness of the situation. Not once were these gentlemen permitted to forget the urgent need for an appropriation to clean up the mess at Peace Cross. On March 18, 1953, I asked Chairman TABER for an opportunity to present testimony and witnesses before the House Appropriations Subcommittee then about to consider the Army civil functions appropriation bill. During April and May I contacted the leaders of the House, outlining to them the deplorable conditions that existed in the Bladensburg area and urging their support of the project. On May 13 I testified before the Army Civil Functions Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee.

Back in April 1953, while contacting the Army engineers, I was reminded that the overall policy announced by the President for the entire country was "No new starts on construction in 1953." This meant that any project on which work had not already been started was a hopeless cause for that year. Nevertheless, I continued to present the Peace Cross project at every opportunity, and on May 22, 1953, I testified before the Senate Committee on Appropriations. When the Army civil-functions appropriation bill left the House, it did not include funds for the Anacostia River Basin flood-control project, but through the efforts of Senator JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER and Senator J. GLENN BEALL, an item of $500,000 was inserted on the Senate side and received Senate approval. To our great disappointment the item was knocked out by the conferees, and the bill that went to the President for signature contained no funds for Peace Cross.

Another attempt was made on July 30, 1953, to obtain construction funds for Peace Cross when the supplemental appropriations bill was amended by the Senate to provide $200,000 for this purpose, but again the item was struck out when the bill went to conference. On August 1, 1953, I went on the floor of the House with the purpose in mind of offering a motion to have the House put this item back in the supplemental appropriations bill. However, after discussing the matter with the conferees I realized that they were working under extreme pressure and that there were a number of other items that would have to be considered if the debate were opened for consideration of the Peace Cross item. To force the issue at that time was not practicable. In spite of all our efforts, another appropriation bill had been passed without any provision for flood relief at Peace Cross.

So, we had to start all over again in the 2d session of the 83d Congress. More representations were made to the Bureau of the Budget, to the congressional leadership, and to the committees. Finally I appealed directly to the President, and this time I got results. My first information that Peace Cross was included in the proposed budget came from the White House. This was clear evidence that the President had acted in our behalf.

Inclusion of the item in the budget was the first and most important step. The next step was to again appear before the House and Senate committees. This I did, presenting additional arguments and material. I displayed a map showing that civil-defense highways led, of all places, directly to Peace Cross. I showed the committee blowups of photographs depicting actual flood conditions, with buses and ambulances bogged down in the middle of the Peace Cross puddle. I quoted reports telling of the man-hours lost by Federal and District of Columbia Government employees when Peace Cross was flooded, because they were daily commuters between Prince George's County and the Nation's Capital and must go through Bladensburg.

Now we were getting somewhere. The House approved an item of $1 million for Peace Cross; the Senate lowered the amount to $900,000 but approved the item; and the conferees approved this latter amount. At long last an appropriation bill containing funds for Peace Cross was on its way to the White House. The President signed the bill on June 30, 1954.

So, in the end, somebody has done something about Peace Cross.

AID TO EDUCATION

Although, as a businessman, I am generally opposed to Federal grants and subsidies and the intervention of the Federal Government which usually goes with such aid, there is an instance in which I make exception—that is, Federal aid to our schools in Government-impacted areas. In this situation, where the Federal Government causes an impacted condition in certain areas by the installation of its agencies, resulting in an additional financial burden on local governments, I feel it is only fair that the Federal Government contribute toward that financial responsibility.

The Fifth Congressional District has several areas that are highly impacted as a result of the expansion of Federal projects and installations. We are vitally affected because of the heavy expense incurred, not only in the construction of schools but also in the construction and maintenance of roads; maintenance of police and fire protection, sanitary facilities, and various other facilities which are normal and necessary adjuncts to our schools. The Federal Government has taken thousands of acres of our ground, causing a heavy loss in tax revenue. At the same time we are confronted with a continuing heavy influx of population coincidental with the expansion of Federal projects and installations. This increase in population adds to the overburdening of our already crowded school systems.

While I am basically committed to and support reduction in Government expenditures and balancing the budget, I think it would be wrong to start with our schools and our schoolchildren. I, therefore, voted to restore the item providing aid to schools in the second supplemental appropriations bill and supported the school construction in federally affected areas bill and legislation for emergency school construction.

Other legislative action, not involving appropriations, is sometimes necessary to aid our schools. For instance, early in 1953, the Prince George's County Board of Education sought my assistance in obtaining a much-needed site for a proposed new school in the Oxon Hill-Forest Heights area. The site in question was part of the St. Elizabeths Hospital tract. I ascertained that Congressional action would be necessary to effect a transfer of this land from the Federal Government to the Prince George's County Board of Education. Accordingly, I promptly introduced appropriate legislation. By diligently pursuing, step by step, the legislative procedure essential to passage of a bill in Congress, I succeeded in obtaining approval of this transfer of land. The bill has now been signed by the President and has become law.

Another notable instance of legislative action involving school property is found in Charles County where the Board of Education is seeking title to the ground on which Lackey High School and the Indian Head Elementary School are located. This ground is owned by the Federal Government and is under the jurisdiction of the Navy Department until transfer is effected. The Navy Department recommended approval of the request for a transfer, and subsequently the Department of Defense gave approval as disposal project No. 24, subject to approval of the Armed Services Committees of the House and Senate. Approval was given, also, by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Complying with my urgent requests, repeatedly emphasized, that action be taken prior to adjournment of the 83d Congress, the Senate and House committees have now given their approval of the transfer.

THE HATCH ACT

From the time this legislation was enacted I have felt that the sections prohibiting Federal, State, or local government employees from taking an active part in political management or in political campaigns are unfair. I am sure that I have as many civil-service employees in my district as any Member of Congress, and I feel that they should have the right to go out and get on a stump and express themselves freely as to why they think I should or should not be reelected to Congress. They pay taxes and they have the same obligtions as other citizens. They should not be penalized because they happen to earn their bread and butter by working for a Government agency.

The bill that I introduced to amend the Hatch Act is a simple one. It would merely eliminate the two sections of the act that prohibit Government employees from participating in political campaigns. The other portions of the act that now protect them from pressure, coercion, and compulsion to contribute to political campaigns are still retained. With the adoption of my amendment, the employees would still have the protection of the original act, plus the restoration of their right to express themselves like other citizens.

Two days of hearings were held on my bill in February of this year before the Subcommittee on Elections of the House Administration Committee. The Civil Service Commission expressed itself during the hearings as opposed to my amendment. The Commission argued that the provision of the Hatch Act that states, "No officer or employee in the executive branch of the Federal Government, or any agency or department thereof, shall take any active part in political management or in political campaigns," while set up in restricting language, is actually a "protection" for Federal employees, since it applies to supervisors as well as subordinates and "protects" the individual employee from political coercion. I cannot agree with this theory. You can set up all sorts of "protection" around people. You can put them in jail in order that they will not be hit by an automobile, and keep them there the rest of thier lives—if you consider such action "protection." But I do not think this kind of protection is justifiable. As I have stated, the main portion of the Hatch Act which is purported to be for the protection of Government employees, is retained. I fail to see where my proposed amendment removes this protection from any Government employee; it simply restores the right to individual citizens of the United States of America to express themselves.

The hearings were adjourned, subject to call of the chairman, and no further action has been taken on my bill. But some good did result from the hearings. During the consideration of this legislation, it was pointed out that unduly severe penalties could be imposed upon a State or local employee for minor infractions of the Hatch Act, such as wearing an oversized political button. The penalty for such violation would be the same as if the employee had hired a sound truck and actively campaigned. Attention having been called to this situation, the question was raised: "What advisability is there of giving more discretion to the Commission on the supension or removal of State and local employees?" This question was referred to the Civil Service Commission for study, and the Chairman requested that the Commission report back to the subcommittee. After receiving the Commission's report, the full Committee on House Administration reported favorably on a bill granting the Commission more discretion in imposing penalties on State and local employees.

This liberalization is indicative of the growing sentiment with respect to the prohibitive and punitive features of the Hatch Act, and I shall continue to press for further liberalization for all Government employees.

ANDREWS AIR FORCE BASE AND FRIENDSHIP INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT

I have conferred with the Secretary of Commerce and other high officials of the Government to emphasize our continued opposition to proposed partial commercialization of Andrews Air Force Base. At a conference with the Secretary of Commerce and representatives of the commercial airlines as recently as June 22, 1954, Senator JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER and I advocated the use of Friendship International Airport to handle the overflow of transoceanic and transcontinental air traffic which cannot be readily accommodated at Washington National Airport.

JONES POINT BRIDGE

Legislative action was completed in the House on August 17, authorizing construction of the Jones Point Bridge across the Potomac from Prince George's County to Alexandria. This bill will now go to the White House for final approval. This new bridge will be an important link in the development of the metropolitan area, and I have supported this legislation actively in committee and on the floor of the House. A central area bridge to serve the downtown area of Washington was included in the authorization.

DELAWARE AND CHESAPEAKE CANAL

I supported in committe and on the floor legislation for widening and deepening the Delaware and Chesapeake Canal. This project, when completed, should be a great benefit to the port of Baltimore and to the whole State of Maryland.

GOOD MANAGEMENT

The 83d Congress set a modern speed record June 30 when it completed action on every regular appropriation bill a day before the new fiscal year began, and saved money in the process. Disregarding all other achievements, this is a noteworthy accomplishment indicative of good management. The second session of the 80th Congress was the only other in the past 25 years to operate so efficiently. The total amount approved in the appropriation bills this year was $47,642,131,205—almost $7 billion less than in 1953. We have achieved a tax cut of over $7 billion.

The immense volume of legislation confrontingfronting Members of Congress is better understood when you know that 10,695 measures were introduced in the Senate and House in 1953, and by June 30, 1954, the number had climbed to 15,133. The President has signed into law in this Congress more than 500 bills.

The United States Department of Commerce reports that the gross national production for 1953 reached $365 billion, the greatest in all our history, exceeding 1952 by $19 billion. It is believed that 1954 will top any previous year. Personal services and personal income are proportionately higher than any previous years. Employment for the month of July this year showed an increase of 50,000 over the previous month. Virtually all business indicators show an optimistic picture.

Construction also is hitting all-time highs, and is expected this year to exceed any previous year by $3 million. All of this, plus an estimated increase of 19 million in our population in the next 6 years, heralds an era of continued production and prosperity. It is largely up to everyone to take advantage of his opportunities under such an expanding peacetime economy. It is my purpose to serve the best interests of the people of the Fifth Congressional District of Maryland and the best interests of the United States. I have an efficient staff dedicated to the ideal of service and always ready to assist in every way we can in any worthy matter before the Government. You will find us on the job daily at 1608 New House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

Congressional Actions Boost Service Careers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, the 83d Congress has reversed the 10-year trend of cutbacks of military benefits. We have taken many constructive steps to improve the attractiveness of military service.

These results are outlined admirably in a recent article by Congressman DEWEY SHORT, chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, which was printed in the Army-Navy-Air Force Journal of August 21, 1954. Under unanimous consent, I insert this statement in the Appendix of the Record:

Congressional Actions Boost Service Careers

(By Hon. Dewey Short, chairman, House Armed Services Committee)

Recent magazine articles have outlined numerous difficulties which the armed services face in retaining career personnel. Little has been written, however, to advise the public of the actions which have been taken during this Congress to overcome these deficiencies. In order to keep the record straight, I want to discuss what I deem to be the principal points of interest.

It is true that the last pay raise voted by the Congress for military personnel was less than the 10 percent requested. It is also true that subsequent to that pay increase there had been a series of actions, both in the Congress and in the executive branch, which curtailed or otherwise adversely affected a number of the so-called fringe benefits. During the first session of this Congress, this committee took this whole problem under serious consideration and it was decided that the first priority of business should be to restore, to the maximum possible extent, fringe benefits to their original status. This decision was largely predicated on the fact that the overwhelming number of service personnel, both officers and enlisted persons, who wrote to the committee about their problems were far more interested in the restoration of fringe benefits than they were in an immediate pay raise.

CONGRESS IS CONCERNED

The following discussion of committee actions, which began in the first session, presents the best available evidence that the Congress is not only deeply concerned about the welfare of service personnel but is taking constructive action in support of those beliefs.

Some 4 or 5 years ago when the Congress began looking for ways to economize, the Appropriations Committees of both the House and the Senate, which were under the control of a Democratic administration, instituted a series of legislative riders and limitations which would have an adverse effect upon the fringe benefits of service personnel. These actions continued through succeeding sessions of Congress and through the first session of this Congress under a Republican administration. However, the President has stated his opposition to these actions and it is a definite fact to say that the trend has certainly made a turn for the better. It is also accurate to state that the Armed Services Committees have continued to oppose these infringements upon service benefits and have instituted a series of actions, legislative and otherwise, which have already overcome a number of the previous adverse effects.

RESTRICTIONS IMPOSED

Among the first restrictions placed on service personnel, particularly officers, was the limitation on promotions. This was soon followed by a restriction on retirement, an attempt to close a number of commissaries, a restriction on the transportation of household effects, and other similar adverse actions.

Without belaboring the details, the House Armed Services Committee began a detailed study of the ill effects of the promotion and retirement restrictions, which study consumed more than 6 months of effort. The net result was the approval of a bill by the committee which established a reasonable system of temporary promotions, repealed the promotion limitation, and the retirement limitation. The bill has now been passed by the House and the Senate and signed by the President.

With reference to commissaries, it should be pointed out that at the time of the commissary limitation in the appropriation bill there were approximately 206 commissaries in operation throughout the United States. It was thought for a while that the limitation would result in the closing of a large number of these commissaries. However, the Department of Defense, with much encouragement from individual Members of Congress, placed a liberal interpretation on the restrictive language in the appropriations bill and, as a result, only six commissaries were closed. Four of that six were located on installations which were then scheduled to be deactivated and have in fact now been deactivated. Therefore, the net loss of commissaries has been 2 out of more than 200.

In this regard it is pertinent to point out that the House Armed Services Committee will consider legislation as soon as possible with the view of determining whether or not present cost limitations on commissaries should be relaxed.

INCREASE HOUSEHOLD LIMIT

A study was also instituted last year to determine the net effect of the limitation on the transportation of household effects. In accomplishing this study a comparison was made between the same type of authority granted members of the Foreign Service of the State Department for the transportation of their household effects. The result clearly showed a discrimination against military personnel. During the course of this study it was also determined that an increase in the present maximum limit of 9,000 pounds to approximately 11,000 pounds would relieve practically every person in military service of the possibility of defraying any portion of the cost of transporting his household effects. The House Armed Services Committee strongly recommended the increase to 11,000 pounds, and that has been accomplished.

The inadequacy or total lack of family housing for married personnel in the service, as well as the inadequacy of barracks for enlisted personnel, has been another source of disappointment and an additional reason for the lowering of service morale. In this regard the President recommended a new housing program for military and naval installations throughout the country, and it is pertinent to note that, even though this request was made late in the second session of this Congress, the Congress today took final action which authorizes the construction of approximately 12,000 new family units on bases throughout the country, with a limited number at stated overseas installations. The supplemental appropriation bill contains an initial increment of $75 million toward this authorization of $175 million. In addition, the same bill includes another authorization in the amount of $25 million for the construction of family units at overseas bases through the use of foreign currencies generated through the sale of agricultural products in those countries by the Commodity Credit Corporation. This is a completely new venture in the various attempts to provide more and better family housing both at home and abroad; and if it proves successful, an additional authorization for overseas construction will undoubtedly be granted by the Congress.

MEDICAL CARE IS PROBLEM

The question of dependent medical care has become increasingly serious. This has resulted from a series of related actions. In the first place, all of the services except the Air Force are decreasing in size. When the forces in any given areas have been drastically decreased, there can no longer be a justification for maintaining the particular service hospital in the area, if, through reorganization, the normal complement of service personnel in that area are assigned to another area. This has definitely occurred in some cases, resulting in the closing of certain service hospitals which dependents have relied upon for medical care.

In addition, the services must all rely upon doctors whose services are obtained through the Doctor Draft Act. It is only natural for any doctor to complain if he is drafted from his civilian pursuits into one of the services and then required to devote a major portion of his time to the treatment of service dependents. I think all reasonable people will appreciate that there is some validity to that type of complaint. It is this very situation which is causing much of the present hardship in those service hospitals which are continuing to operate. Of course this provides no comfort for the service dependents.

However, it should be noted that the President has recommended legislation which would provide dependent care on a scale never heretofore attained. It would authorize service dependents to obtain such care in their own civilian communities, from their own family physicians under circumstances wherein the Federal Government would defray almost the entire cost. That legislation will be before the House Armed Services Committee in the 84th Congress.

A final item of great interest among enlisted personnel concerns a possible increase in the reenlistment bonus. The Committees on Armed Services have taken speedy action on this legislation and it has already been approved by the Congress and signed by the President. As a result, those reenlisting will receive a substantial increase in their reenlistment bonus.

MAKE SERVICES ATTRACTIVE

In times like the present it is always true that it is possible for the more able service personnel to earn more money in a civilian occupation than in the pursuit of a service career. However, history has proven this to be a temporary situation and it is factually correct to say that there have been many occasions in the past when life in the service was far more attractive than life in the civilian community. In the final analysis, persons in the service must view their situation on a long term basis and then reach that decision which they feel would most nearly meet their own desires and needs.

The foregoing discussion of service benefits does not exhaust the list of matters under consideration. However, it should serve to insure all reasonable persons in military service that persons in authority in the Government, including the President, various able representatives in all of the services, responsible committees of the Congress, and a large number of individual Congressmen are all working in concert for a common goal: To make service life more attractive and give the maximum amount of stability to a service career.

Representative Rogers Rips Reds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. D. R. (BILLY) MATTHEWS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the Record an editorial which appeared in the Palm Beach Post, a great Florida newspaper, in its issue of August 5, 1954. This editorial commends my friend and able colleague from Florida, Congressman Rogers, for his successful fight to prevent reinstatement and payment of damages to 11 "fifth amendment Americans" employed by the United Nations. I supported Congressman Rogers' position and I am proud of the great victory which he won. The editorial from the Palm Beach Post follows:

Representative Rogers Rips Reds

There is no more vigilant foe of communism and subversion in Congress than Florida's own Representative Dwight Rogers. Most recent example is his concurrent resolution designed to prevent reinstatement and payment of damages to 11 "fifth amendment Americans" employed by the United Nations.

Representative Rogers asked the Congress to throw its moral support behind the United States delegation to the U. N. to "resist and prevent" salary awards from being paid by the General Assembly to what he termed "disloyal" employees. He said they "refused to testify before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee when asked about their membership in the Communist apparatus and other subversive activities. All of them took refuge under the fifth amendment and refused to answer questions. * * * Whereupon Secretary General Trygve Lie dismissed them from the United Nations employment."

The disloyal Americans appealed to the Administrative Tribunal at Geneva, which decided they must be reinstated and awarded damages of $179,420. This verdict was later upheld by the International Court of Justice. The court's opinions are not binding on the U. N., so the next step will be a decision by the General Assembly on whether to pay the awards.

Representative Rogers points out that since the the American taxpayers foot most of the bills for U. N. expenses, payment of the awards would be contrary to national policy. "We should not use American taxpayers' money * * * to pay American employees engaged in subversive activities and who refuse to testify on account of self-incrimination and take refuge under the fifth amendment," he told the House of Representatives.

Rogers' proposal drew immediate support of many of his House colleagues and will gain further widespread backing among his constituents, including us. Any covenant which binds this Nation to pay compensation for the privilege of being betrayed is indefensible. Any agreement which permits any body except the United States Congress to appropriate or allocate American tax moneys is stupid.

If, in spite of the efforts of Representative Rogers and other true Americans, the United Nations insists on paying those subversives, there will be chalked up another reason why the United States should get out of that international fiasco. It may take the admission of Red China as a member to do it, but there is already on the record good and sufficient cause.

Perhaps Representative Rogers may some day see fit to lead the fight to extricate us from that foreign entanglement. We still think George Washington was right.

Alcide de Gasperi

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the Record, I include therein a recent statement appearing in the Washington Post and Times Herald concerning the most unfortunate passing of Alcide de Gasperi, distinguished Italian statesman.

Like everyone in the free world, I was greatly shocked to learn of the passing of this great man. He was a fearless champion of freedom, a courageous fighter against communism and his death is a great blow to the cause of freedom.

Signor de Gasperi, though confronted with powerful, ruthless opposition and defection among some of his own followers and suffering from poor health, never gave up the fight to keep Italy free. Head of the Italian Christian Democrats, it was through his influence that radical and conservative extremes in his own party were deterred from that unhappy compromise and vacillation characterizing recent developments in France.

Facing not only difficult problems of foreign affairs but an avalanche of violent attacks by adversaries of the left and right, Signor de Gasperi was beseiged by baffling internal problems of agrarian reform, unemployment and over-population. No opposition, however strong and ruthless, was able to suppress the zeal and high spirit of Signor de Gasperi's determination to fight off and conquer dangerous Communist movements threatening to engulf his nation.

He was a statesman of first caliber, and we can only hope that time and events will develop new leadership of his quality, persistency, and ability to maintain an unyielding front against communism.

The place of Alcide de Gasperi in the history of our era is already assured. It will be a high and noble one. His death is an irreparable loss to the free world; but the memory of his deeds, his personal valor, his never-say-die spirit, will continue to inspire the great Italian people.

The memory of his triumphs will give them courage, I am sure, to fight with the same fortitude and determination against the unprecedented threat to their liberties. The way may be hard, the problems great, the alternatives of economic chaos and spiritual decadence distressing. But the recollection of what Signor de Gasperi did to preserve human freedom in his day may well be the spark that will again fire the noble Italian people with the fervor and indominable will to protect their free way of life against the great Communist conspiracy seeking to destroy it.

Alcide de Gasperi has left a noble legacy. It is for a revitalized Italy to preserve it.

The article referred to follows:

De Gasperi, Foe of Italian Communists Dead at 73 After a Heart Seizure

Sella Val Sugana, Italy, August 19.—Villagers mourned side by side with national leaders today at the bier of former Premier Alcide de Gasperi, the anti-Communist battler who led Italy out of postwar chaos.

The body of the 73-year-old Christian Democrat leader lay in a simple wooden bed in the pine-surrounded chalet in his native Tyrolean hills, where a heart attack felled him early today.

De Gasperi fought for the European Defense Community (EDC) almost to the last, and hazards now besetting European unity at a six-nation Brussels meeting apparently contributed to his passing.

Only last night he made an impassioned telephone call to Premier Mario Scelba, almost sobbing as he warned his protege that "if the defense community is not established, God knows what will happen."

"Gesu! Gesu! (Jesus! Jesus!)" were De Gasperi's last words just before he died, his family reported.

POPE SENDS CONDOLENCE

One of the first to send condolences was Pope Pius XII, whose Roman Catholic faithful provide a bulwark of support for the Christian Democrats.

President Eisenhower praised De Gasperi's "devotion to democracy and his dedication to the cause of European integration."

Prime Minister Churchill said De Gasperi served both Italy and all Europe "loyally and well."

From the Brussels EDC meeting, West German Chancellor Konrad Adenauer sent a message declaring that the "loss of De Gasperi is a blow for everybody who cares for the future of Europe."

Even De Gasperi's longtime political foe, Italian Communist Chief Palmiro Togliatti, joined in the condolences.

It had been generally expected that De Gasperi would have been elected president of Italy next year at the end of the term of incumbent Luigi Einaudi.

NO HINT OF ILLNESS

De Gasperi ended his 7½ years as head of the Italian Government a year ago, in July 1953. He resigned after losing a confidence vote in Parliament, but his party kept its political grip and successive Premiers have been Christian Democrats.

A little more than a month ago, De Gasperi relinquished his titular leadership of the Christian Democrat Party machine to a younger man, Amintore Fanfani, former Agriculture Minister in one of his cabinets.

Although there had been reports of poor health, De Gasperi's death came without any prior public hint that he was seriously ill. Only after his death was it revealed that he suffered a heart attack a week ago.

His heart pains became intense Tuesday. He suffered a seizure at 2 a. m. today, an hour before the attack that took his life. His physician, his devoted wife, Francesca, and 2 of his 3 daughters were at his bedside. A third daughter is in a convent.

"I say goodbye to all people who loved me," he told his family and Msgr. Rodolfo Grandi, who gave his extreme unction, minutes before.

De Gasperi's body will be brought to Rome Sunday. The final services—a solemn state funeral—will be held Monday.

BROKE WITH MUSSOLINI

Born near Trent, De Gasperi stemmed from Italian parentage in the southern Tyrol region. At the time of his birth, that area was part of the Austro-Hungarian Empire.

Dedicated to the ideal of a democratic Italy as a youth, he was arrested at the age of 23 for taking part in a political demonstration.

He was elected to this first legislative post in 1911 when Trent electors sent him to the Austrian Parliament in Vienna. There he became a powerful voice for the Italian minorities.

When his native Tyrol went to Italy after World War I, De Gasperi joined the Popular Italian Party—forerunner of the Christian Democrats. He was elected a member of its national council in 1919 and 2 years later entered the Italian Chamber of Deputies.

Under De Gasperi's leadership, the Popular Party broke with Mussolini after the rise of Fascist power and De Gasperi retired to Tyrol in the face of Il Duce's suppression of opposition elements.

ENEMY OF COMMUNISM

Although he kept a hand in politics and was imprisoned in 1927 for 16 months on charges of clandestine activities, De Gasperi's fullscale return to political life came only with World War II. He joined the opposition and the reconstructed Popular Party.

Once, after Italy's surrender and the Nazi seizure of Rome in September 1943, he took refuge from police in the Basilica of St. John the Lateran.

In July 1944, when the Christian Democrat Party was formed, De Gasperi became its leader and party secretary. He became foreign minister in April 1945, and premier in December.

In 1948 he inflicted a smashing election defeat on Italy's Communists, and for 5 years after that fought the Reds at every turn. In 1949 he brought Italy into the North Atlantic Alliance against Communist aggression as a charter member of NATO. He was one of the leading spirits in the Schuman coal-steel plan, the Council of Europe and the European army.

Take the World in Stride

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. VAUGHAN GARY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I should like to call to the attention of the Members of the House a recent address by Vera Micheles Dean, editor of the Foreign Policy Association, recently visiting professor of government at Smith College, and now visiting professor of government at the University of Rochester, delivered on June 5 at the annual alumni-alumnae dinner at the University of Richmond, Va. The address proved most stimulating, and I believe that every American interested in the world crisis and America's responsibility to meet this crisis in the atomic age will profit by reading excerpts from it.

The address follows:

TAKE THE WORLD IN STRIDE

(By Vera Micheles Dean)

Earlier generations, in other periods of crisis, had to grapple with problems which, for them, were no easier than those of our own times. Yet they summoned the courage to live, and to us now living they transmitted a rich heritage or ideas and aspirations which we, in turn, must pass on to those who come after us. They took the world in stride. And so must we.

It is the fashion among us today to deplore the mistakes the United States is said to have made in world affairs. With this deprecatory and often cynical attitude I emphatically disagree. I see no reason why we should go around, either at home or abroad, in sackcloth and ashes, saying that this country is always wrong, or that the Republicans or Democrats, as the case may be, are guilty of treason because we did not always achieve the goals we set for ourselves.

Of course we have made mistakes in the past; and we shall make other mistakes in the future. But what nation hasn't? Search the records as much as you want to; you will find no such nation. What we must remember is that we are new to foreign policy. It is only since 1945 that our country has emerged as a great power on the world stage. Before that time we were like spectators who from comfortable seats could watch the drama of world events unrolling before our eyes. It's true that once in a while we would become sufficiently excited about what we saw to hiss the villain or applaud the hero. And twice in the lifetime of your parents we became so deeply aroused that we leaped upon the stage and took part in two world wars.

But even as we did so, we had the reassuring feeling in the back of our minds that, once the curtain was rung down, once the war was over, we could get off the stage and again lean back in our comfortable seats. It was only in 1945 that we realized we could no longer do this; that from then on, whether we liked it or not, we had to take part permanently in the world's drama. We were unprepared for this sudden change in our role.

We have improvised policies in areas of the world where we had had little or no experience before. And, given our amateur status, we have turned in what is on the whole a creditable performance; a performance that includes the Marshall plan; the defense of Greece and Turkey; the establishment of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization; the Berlin airlift; point 4 aid to the underdeveloped areas of the world; the struggle for the independence of South Korea; and cooperation in many spheres with the United Nations.

For a Nation which on the eve of World War II was still dreaming of isolation from the crises of Europe and Asia and hoped to maintain its neutrality, the United States has moved far on the road toward responsibility in the building of the world community. And we have done this together, Republicans and Democrats, as we have tried to develop and maintain a bipartisan foreign policy.

But a nation, like an individual, can never stand still. It can't rest on its laurels. And as we move forward from national adolescence to maturity, there are two things we must bear in mind if we are to fulfill our new role in world affairs to the best of our ability. We must not expect everyone to love us; and we must learn to face the facts of international life without flinching.

I find it embarrassing to hear some of our fellow citizens ask "Why don't the Indians (or British, or Chinese, or Russians) love us?" Or, more constructively, "What could we do to make them love us?" It is time we discovered that there is no such thing as love affairs among nations. True, some nations have begun to be aware of our desire for public expression of appreciation. Take Pakistan, for example. In 1953, when we gave wheat to that drought-stricken country, the Pakistanis drove 400 camels to the dock in Karachi, their capital and principal port, each carrying a placard which read, "Thank you, America." Now that kind of gratitude is, of course, very pleasant, when it comes spontaneously, from the heart of those to whom we have found it possible to give aid. But we must not expect all the nations whom we help—knowing that by helping others we also strengthen ourselves—to go about like the Pakistani camels, saying, "Thank you, America," every hour, on the hour.

As we grow in maturity, we shall realize that it is impossible to please all nations all of the time. If we support France in Morocco, we shall lose the support of many Moroccans, and many more Asians and Africans. If we help the Moroccan nationalists, we are bound to hurt the feelings of the French. But this is the kind of decision that each of us make day in day out in our homes, on the college campus, in our local community. We have to learn to make choices on the basis of the best information we can get, and stop worrying whether we please everybody. For if you try to please everybody and have no critics or enemies, you will turn out to be a Milquetoast, without convictions, without principles, and without a policy.

Thus we see that to have an effective foreign policy we must make the next step: we must learn the fact of international life. Here there are three main points which, like Ariadne's thread, may help us to find our way through the seemingly exitless labyrinth of world affairs.

First, let's remember that ideologies come and go, but geography remains. Some people dispute this point, contending that atomic weapons and the H-bomb have obliterated geography. But take a look at the map. You will find that the main trouble spots which have plagued mankind throughout history are still important in the strategic plans of the great powers at mid-20th century: Suez and Panama; the Baltic and the Dardanelles; Poland and Korea; Persia and Tibet; and so on down the list. Even if we atomize Moscow and Peiping tomorrow—or they atomize us—we would still have to cope with the problems of geography: That is, of course, assuming that the whole universe does not blow up in the meantime.

Second, the world struggle in the midst of which we live is not only a clash of 2 sets of ideas; of 2 moral, political, and economic systems. It is also a struggle to strike a new balance of power, to replace the balance shattered in World Wars I and II.

When I was in college the balance of power was regarded as a sordid device used by the British to keep hold of their world empire. It is only since the United States itself has become a world power and, in many areas of the globe has taken over some of the responsibilities once carried by the British, that we have come to realize there has to be a balance of power, or, if that sounds better, a balance of interests, in all human relations: In New York, and Washington, and San Francisco; between Republicans and Democrats; between the various elements in our society—labor, capital, farmers, consumers; on every college campus and in every organization. But now something new has been added. For we are now working to create a community of nations. What we are trying to do is to bring the balance of power within the confines and under the supervision of the United Nations, where not only the great powers, but also the small countries, are represented; just as in the United States we try to fit the often conflicting interests of the many diverse groups into the framework of the Nation so that they can work together for national, and not only for their own special interests.

This brings us to the third point that may help to guide us in world affairs: The value of diversity. Some of us, as we read or hear the clashes of views between nations different in their traditions, historical development, political, economic, and social conditions, may be tempted to say: "But this is dangerous; we can't cooperate with peoples who don't see eye to eye with us; let's get out of the United Nations and work only with nations whose ideas and practices are exactly like ours."

This is the road to isolation. For there is no nation in the world which is exactly like any other, and if we have to wait for nations that agree with us on everything, we shall be postponing international cooperation till doomsday. And do we really want to have complete uniformity? Americans believe in individualism. Democracy by definition, welcomes diversity—diversity of race, religion, and ideas. What we welcome at home we can hardly reject in our relations with other peoples. Nor need we fear, as some of us do, that by mingling with peoples who challenge our beliefs and way of life, we shall succumb to theirs. Those are indeed men and women of little faith who think that our convictions are so frail they will be blighted by the first contact with the outside world.

What, then, are the facts of international life our Nation must face? Nothing would be more dangerous for the future of our Nation than if we, through fear of criticism, twist the facts to make them more palatable, sugar the pill, give false comfort, and pretend we have ideas we don't really have, just to be "in the groove," just to conform with official policy at any given time. What would you think of a physician who told you that there's nothing much the matter with you because he does not want to hurt your feelings, or frighten you or your family, or lose you as a patient—and thereby perhaps endanger your life by a false diagnosis?

But many of us are afraid to hear a frank diagnosis of the world situation, and afraid also of the medicine that may have to be prescribed. Let us ask ourselves, first of all, what it is we are afraid of. Today we are legitimately afraid of aggression not only by Russia but also by Communist China. I say this is legitimate because both Russia and China have taken over control of the territories of some nations and threaten others. At the same time we learn from history that both Russia and China, in the past, have themselves been threatened and have actually been invaded by neighboring countries—Germany and Japan, our own recent enemies whom we now regard as friends. No matter how strongly we feel about the need for our own survival, we must realize that other nations, abhorrent as they are to us, may have comparable anxieties which they, too, regard as legitimate. The more we study, the more we see that the world is complex, that things are not all black or white: there are many shades of gray in between.

Our struggle is not only one of power between the West and the imperialism of Russia and China. It is also a struggle of ideas between communism on the one hand and democracy on the other. That is true. We cannot and must not dismiss the fact that there are people on the other side of the Iron Curtain who are just as convinced about their way of life as we are about ours. We cannot and must not dismiss the fact that communism has won over many people, some of them men and women of outstanding talents and achievement. When we study the cases of men like Klaus Fuchs or Alan Nunn May who committed treason, as it seems to us, not for money, not for power or prestige, but for some kind of ideas, we have to ask ourselves: What is the attraction of Communist ideology, and how can we meet their challenge?

If we look at the map we see that the greatest success won by communism has been in those areas of the world which have had little or no experience with the traditions of western democracy, and where conditions in our time are or were comparable to those of the early industrial revolution in Britain at the end of the 18th century, or even at the end of the Middle Ages in Europe: Russia and Eastern Europe (here only Czechoslovakia is an exception); China and Vietnam. These are also areas where—note this well—there was only a weak, small middle class, and the choice seemed to be between two forms of authoritarianism, conservative or revolutionary.

Communism has also had a great appeal for peoples in western nations—notably in France and Italy—where capitalism has not succeeded, as it has here, in providing a rising standard of living for more and more people. It also has an appeal in Asia, the Middle East, and Latin America where either the desire for political independence or resentment against unsatisfactory economic conditions have created unrest, and a feeling of disillusionment with existing institutions. For example, in India, which has so far been remarkably successful in resisting the tempting promises of communism, the principal area of Communist victories has been the state of Travancore-Cochin, with a high degree of literacy, where overpopulation and resulting poverty have produced a strong desire for change.

What is the appeal of communism? In France and Italy, where the Communists poll 25 percent or more of the vote in free elections, it is generally said by the Catholic Church that the success of communism is directly due to dissatisfaction with the governments' failure to improve low living standards. We can help Western Europe, not only by military aid, but by providing a larger market here for their exports.

In Asia, too, where we often think that the Communists might have a free sweep if it were not for military intervention by the West, there are very few people except convinced Communists who are attracted by the ruthless methods of the Communists in Russia or China, or who want to accept the sacrifices the Russians have had to bear in order to carry out their program of industrialization. What interests the Asians about Russia and even more about China, is something else. What they see are two recently backward countries which are engaged in transforming their economies within a relatively short period of time. The Asians recognize that this is being done at a terrible cost in material and spiritual terms; and neither India nor Pakistan, nor Indonesia and the Philippines, wants to pay that cost. The great problem for them is how to discover a way of modernizing their economies without resorting to political dictatorship, purges, and thought repression which are the hallmark of totalitarianism.

The underdeveloped countries of the world, then, are not ready to embrace communism. They are determined to achieve two things: national independence from intervention of any kind by foreign powers, Communist as well as anti-Communist, and they want to develop their economies in such a way as to satisfy the modest, sometimes pathetically modest, dreams and aspirations of their peoples. Otherwise, they feel, the appeal of communism, which holds out promises of prompt relief from poverty, will prove too strong for their as yet unstable societies.

The Communists are well aware of the problems of Asia. They capitalize on the desire of colonial peoples for independence. They encourage nationalist movements, as they have in Indochina, in hope of driving the colonial rulers out, and then succeeding to their former power. To combat the Communists on this battleground, the West must encourage the nationalist desires of the Asian peoples, and press for independence as rapidly as possible. It is significant that the Asian nations which have been least vulnerable to communism are the ones that achieved independence after 1945, with our sympathy and support—India and Pakistan, Burma and Ceylon, Indonesia and Philippines; while Indochina, where the French were reluctant to withdraw, has proved a victim of Communist infiltration.

The political struggle of nationalism and the economic struggle for improved living standards are linked with still another trend—the struggle for the conscience of mankind, which has been going on since World War I—some would say since the French and American revolutions. The struggle for the conscience of mankind was reflected in nazism and fascism. It is now reflected in communism. Some of our people have felt that this struggle could be won by what is known as psychological warfare—that you could either subdue or persuade other people with psychological appeals and inducements. The main difficulty, as our psychological warriors have discovered, is that it isn't enough merely to discuss ideas or to make promises unless we are ready to translate our ideas into reality and to fulfill our promises. Otherwise, all our talk about democracy and our denunciation of communism will be dismissed abroad as mere propaganda.

Confronted by the many complex problems of our times—one of the great seedtimes of civilization—you may feel faint of heart. How, you may ask, can I grapple with the dangers of an age which the poet W. H. Auden has called the age of anxiety?

To this I would reply that your parents and I have seen, in our lifetime, revolutions, wars, civil strife, horrors uncounted in Europe and Asia. Yet for some reason—it may be just animal optimism, but I think it is a rational faith—I still believe that international affairs are not a tornado, they are not a force of nature whch is beyond human control. I still believe that human beings have and must exercise control over events which are, after all, of their own making.

What we need to do is to achieve the mature state of mind where we shall recognize that in world affairs it is no more possible to have utopia than in our personal affairs. We do not expect, at home and at college, to have an all A record, or achieve our objectives 100 percent. We get used to disappointments and frustrations. We do the best we can with what we have. We don't reject our friends or commit suicide every time things don't come out just right. That is exactly what we have to learn to do in world affairs. As President Eisenhower put it so well at the height of the Indochina crisis: We must find a modus vivendi, a practical method of getting along, between the two extremes of the unattainable and the unacceptable. We must face the realities of international life. But that does not mean that we should jettison our ideals—for ideals, too, are the stuff and substance of reality.

But if we are to build an effective and fearless foreign policy, it is not enough to know the world we live in. It is not enough to recall and apply the traditions and ideals of this country. It is also essential for us to make sure that the best of America, as the President has well said, is reflected in our attitude toward other nations.

And when we say the best of America, I mean the kind of democracy that has been developed here, the feeling of freedom and fellowship that has characterized this Nation and, to other nations, has meant the essence of the American way of life. The most terrible thing that could happen to us would be if, in the effort to combat Russian and Chinese imperialism and the ideology of communism, we should transform this Nation into the image of what we hate. The most important thing, therefore, is that each one of us as citizens should work without ceasing to make our common heritage live up to the highest ideals of other countries. similar plan.

Eisenhower-McKay Power Policy Loses $21 Million Payroll for Pacific Northwest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record a statement I have prepared relative to the loss of $21 million in payrolls in the Pacific Northwest, due to the Eisenhower-McKay power policy.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MAGNUSON

A $21 million annual payroll has been lost to the Pacific Northwest by the Eisenhower-McKay power policy.

That policy has decreed no new starts on the Columbia River or its tributaries.

That power policy has assured that there will not be a single new kilowatt on the line—put there by this administration.

That policy has substituted the word "partnership" for performance. It has substituted "confusion" for comprehensive development.

It has driven a $270 million investment and a $21 million yearly payroll from the Pacific Northwest into the arms of British Columbia.

I now document these statements.

On August 5 the lead story in the American Metal Market bore this headline, "Reynolds Metals To Participate in Big Frobisher Project—American Aluminum Firm To Have Role in Vast Development."

Now what is the Frobisher project and what is the role of Reynolds Aluminum Co. in that project?

The Frobisher project is a projected $700 million power and metallurgical development on the headwaers of the Yukon River in British Columbia. The project itself is to be undertaken by Northwest Power Industries, Lt., a subsidiary of Quebec Metallurgical Industries and Frobisher, Ltd.; which in turn are subsidiaries of Ventures, Ltd. These are Canadian firms but their main financial substance is United States capital. As I have already stated, the entire project is estimated to cost $700 million; $270 million of this, according to the American Metal Market, will be spent by 1962, "by which time it is hoped that 880,000 horsepower will have been developed."

Still quoting the American Metal Market, "Site of the huge project is the Atlin Lake region along the British Columbia-Yukon border, 800 miles north of Vancouver."

What is the role of Reynolds Aluminum Co.? Again I quote from the American Metal Market.

"Reynolds Metals * * * is taking a 30 percent interest in the joint enterprise," and again, "Reynolds Aluminum Co. have signed for 30 percent of the hydroelectric power."

Now, what does this mean for the Pacific Northwest? It means that Reynolds has had to sign up for a share in the Canadian project in order to get the cheap kilowatts it needs for aluminum production. American capital which should be available for development in the Pacific Northwest is moving to Canada. The aluminum industry now must consider the possibility of moving elsewhere—and out of the United States—just as the textile industry has moved out of New England.

One-third of the electric output at the Frobisher project will provide power for about 200,000 tons of new aluminum capacity. It is reasonable to assume that the American company, Reynolds, would have brought these potlines to the Northwest had the cheap kilowatts been available. If the announcement in the American Metal Market is true, the Pacific Northwest has already lost this investment and this payroll.

Now, let's translate this into an economic loss—spelled out in terms of jobs and payrolls.

The potential economic loss to Washington and Oregon can be reckoned best in terms of potential payrolls which have now been diverted elsewhere. A 1954 study, The Impact of the Aluminum Industry on the Economy of the Pacific Northwest, prepared by the Stanford Research Institute for the Aluminum Company of America, identified 7,600 employees actually in the Northwest aluminum industry in 1952, of which about 4,800 were employed in the production of 350,000 tons of primary aluminum, and the balance in fabrication of basic aluminum commodities such as sheet, cable, wire and rod.

Allowing for a potential of 200,000 tons of aluminum in the Canadian project, that project represents a potential permanent payroll of 2,500 workers diverted from Washington and Oregon by the administration's short-sighted policy of blocking further development of low-cost power in that area.

Add a proportionate amount of basic fabrication and this becomes a permanent payroll of 4,000 workers, enough to support a city the size of Wenatchee, Wash.

With the addition of the community services and related employment, which such a payroll would create, the total becomes 7,000 employed persons; which, with families, is a city the size of Everett, Wash.

Furthermore the initial 8-year construction program ($270 million of an ultimate $700 million) for the Canadian project calls for steady work for 4,000 to 5,000 construction and related service workers throughout that period—with practically permanent employment for that many assured throughout the duration of the overall-20-year construction program.

Now, let's translate into dollars the loss of 200,000 tons of new aluminum capacity. I have already demonstrated that a plant of that size would create employment for about 7,000 people. Assuming an average yearly earning of $3,000 per worker, which is conservative, this means that the Republican administration through its policy of blocking Northwest power development has cost Washington and Oregon a potential payroll of more than $21 million per year.

This is a single example of what the Eisenhower-McKay power policy has done to our region. Seven thousand jobs at a single crack is a price too high to pay for a slogan. I refer, of course, to the word "partnership"—coined in the last campaign and parroted ever since.

Low-cost power is the greatest economic resource of our Pacific Northwest. By blocking further rapid development of that resource the administration has placed us in a position of economic colonialism, and has made feasible the Canadian competition which I have just recounted. The impact on our economy of no new starts will have disastrous and long-range implications.

Someone has sold the Pacific Northwest down the river. Along with that they have sold Alaska down the river—because Alaska, too, was scheduled for hydroelectric and aluminum development.

The Pacific Northwest has been and could continue to be, the aluminum capital of the world—provided the cheap kilowatts are on the line for aluminum production. But the Eisenhower-McKay power policy has decreed that the kilowatts will not be on the line and that when and if they do come on, they will not be cheap but high-cost kilowatts.

Who has sold the Pacific Northwest down the river? Eisenhower and McKay—and the fact that a great American aluminum company has decided to move to Canada with 7,000 jobs and a $21 million payroll clinches the point.

New England's Great Textile Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I have noted Senator GREEN's very able statement appearing in yesterday's RECORD regarding the textile industry in New England and wish to commend him for his clearly stated views on this subject of such great importance to Massachusetts and New England.

It is incredible that anyone should discount the importance of the textile industry. It is even more incredible that a banker and economist should, if he is correctly quoted, state or intimate that the New England economy should be predicated on products for export. The direct contrary is true and has been true for many years, namely, that the New England economy, to achieve maximum prosperity, must strengthen its greatest markets, the markets of America.

If there are those who wish to sacrifice the great textile industry because it has suffered temporary reverses and is undergoing a period of readjustment, they must never forget that this industry at the present time, as Senator GREEN so aptly pointed out, employs over 200,000 men and women, who with their families are directly dependent upon this great industry. Every intelligent economic report, as well as sound economic theory, tends to support the thesis that it is imperative to retain a vital, dynamic textile industry in New England. As the report of Prof. Seymour E. Harris, of Harvard University stated:

> This is a matter of outstanding importance whose significance we cannot overemphasize.

An industry with a payroll of $750 million a year is certainly favorable and vital to any area and obviously, since it is the second largest source of industrial wages in our region, it is of utmost essentiality to preserve it as a healthy economic unit. There is a great deal of misrepresentation concerning the New England textile industry and this is deplorable. Not only are its total wages high but it has spent huge sums modernizing its plant and equipment, purchasing products of other New England industries and paying substantial taxes in many communities.

Senator GREEN's analysis of the importance of the textile industry to New England is not only admirable but convincing. How any banker could be unaware of its importance is a deep mystery to me, as it will be to other persons interested in our New England economy. Of course, there are some who favor opening the doors wide to the influx of cheaply produced foreign goods. If this is done to a greater extent than it has been done, there can be but one definite result and that will be to destroy a great many of our New England and American industries, which depend largely upon our own markets and pay wages and insure working conditions that cannot be compared with those of any other nation. In fact, our standards are infinitely higher than those of any other nation and must be preserved at all costs.

I must be frank and say that when I read of a responsibly placed leader of finance making such indiscriminate attacks upon a great industry like the textile industry it does much to break my confidence in that kind of leadership and makes me feel that fuzzyminded thinking has more influence in our financial and economic policies than is generally supposed by the American people.

I hope there will be no repetition of such unwarranted criticism of a great industry upon which so many citizens of New England depend to such a large extent for their livelihood.

The Drought in Missouri

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL C. JONES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I regret to report that despite some rains in Missouri 2 to 3 weeks ago, the drought continues to grow worse. The unprecedented heat, with temperatures of from 100 to 107 degrees being recorded on many successive days and accompanied by dry scorching winds, is causing almost unbelievable damage in many areas, even including some of the counties in the southeastern part of the State in the 10th District where we had very good crop prospects up until just a few days ago. Telephone reports from some of these counties within the past 24 hours inform me that whereas 2 weeks ago we had prospects of average yields for soy beans that unless the heat abated and rains came to relieve the situation there was a possibility that many fields would not have enough beans to justify a harvest.

In addition to the telephone calls and telegrams which I have received, Mr. Speaker, I am also in receipt of a copy of a letter which our Governor, the Honorable Phil M. Donnelly, has mailed to President Eisenhower, asking that 19 other counties be included in the list of counties that are now eligible for drought relief. This situation has been certified to the President by Mr. Murray C. Colbert, chairman of the ASC committee, who is also chairman of the State drought committee in Missouri, and I include also copies of two of Mr. Colbert's letters to Governor Donnelly.

Actually, Mr. Speaker, while some sections of some of the counties are not in dire need and probably would make no requests for assistance of any kind, there is every reason why the entire State of Missouri should be included in the disaster area in order that farmers in any county who have suffered from the drought could be eligible for the same kind of consideration and the small measure of relief that is available to others through the program which has been safeguarded through regulations that virtually strip the program of any effective aid.

Following are the letters referred to above:

JEFFERSON CITY, MO., *August 19, 1954.*

HON. DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER,
President of the United States,
The White House, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am in receipt of a letter dated August 13, 1954, and a supplemental letter dated August 16, 1954, original copies attached, from Murray C. Colbert, chairman of the Federal USDA Drought Committee for the State of Missouri, in which his committee recommends the following 19 counties be immediately designated as drought relief areas of Missouri: Worth, Gentry, Grundy, Harrison, Mercer, Putnam, Sullivan, Adair, Iron, Reynolds, Madison, Bollinger, Wayne, Butler, Ripley, Carter, Shannon, Oregon, Howell. These counties are in addition to the 76 counties designated by you on August 2, 1954, as drought disaster counties in Missouri.

I am glad, of course, to concur in the recommendation of Chairman Colbert and his committee that these 19 Missouri counties be immediately designated by you as drought disaster areas in the State of Missouri. If so designated, this would make a total of 95 counties of the 114 counties of Missouri that have been designated as drought disaster counties by you.

However, I am still of the opinion, and the members of the Missouri Drought Emergency Committee, which I appointed, are still of the opinion, that the entire State of Missouri should be designated by you as a drought disaster area. This would mean that, in addition to the 76 counties previously designated and the 19 counties herewith recommended for designation as drought disaster areas, the city of St. Louis and the remaining 19 of the State's 114 counties should also be designated as drought disaster areas. These remaining counties are: Atchison, Holt, Nodaway, Schuyler, Scotland, Clark, Knox, Lewis, Washington, St. Francois, Ste. Genevieve, Perry, Cape Girardeau, Scott, Stoddard, Mississippi, New Madrid, Pemiscot, Dunklin.

On July 20, 1954, I recommended to you that the 114 counties and the city of St. Louis of Missouri be declared drought disaster areas. Then on July 27, 1954, at the request of K. L. Scott, Director, Agricultural Credit Services, United States Department of Agriculture, I submitted substantiating evidence to support my request. On July 28 and 29, Ross Risly, Assistant to the Secretary of Agriculture, and Harvey Dahl, Special Assistant to the Secretary of Agriculture, made a personal inspection of drought conditions in certain areas of Missouri. Immediately after their return to Washington your designation of the 76 counties was forthcoming on August 2, 1954.

Facts and figures presented in our previous recommendation would indicate there are a number of counties in which pasture, corn, and hay conditions are as bad or worse than in some of the 76 counties previously designated. In fact, in a survey made of these counties on August 9, 1954, Chairman Colbert's letter states, "that the pasture, corn, and hay conditions of these counties are in as bad or worse condition than those counties already included in the drought areas."

Chairman Colbert has also submitted to me three tables indicating the percentage of normal of the August 1, 1954 condition of corn, hay, and pasture in the 19 counties recommended for designation by his committee, and a supplemental table showing conditions of pasture, corn, and livestock water, as compared with conditions at this time last year in all Missouri counties not designated at this time as drought areas.

While certain sections of Missouri have experienced some rainfall in recent weeks, this moisture has still been far from adequate, and the drought situation remains and continues critical. Our corn crop has been reduced in the best areas to 35 to 40 percent of normal as of August 1, 1954. However, with the hot winds during the past several days this percentage continues to decrease, and in the greater portion of our State corn production will be a total loss. Pasture and grass seedings in the entire State have been lost. For these reasons, I again strongly urge that the entire State of Missouri be designated by you as a drought disaster area.

Sincerely,

PHIL M. DONNELLY,
Governor.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
AGRICULTURAL STABILIZATION,
AND CONSERVATION OFFICE,
Columbia, Mo., August 13, 1954.

GOV. PHIL M. DONNELLY,
State Capitol, Jefferson City, Mo.

SIR: The State drought committee recommends that the following counties be included in the drought relief area of Missouri: Worth, Gentry, Harrison, Mercer, Putnam, Sullivan, Adair, Iron, Reynolds, Madison, Bollinger, Wayne, Butler, Ripley, Carter, Shannon, Oregon, Howel.

A survey made of these counties on August 9, 1954, shows that the pasture, corn, and hay conditions of these counties are in as bad or worse condition than those counties already included in the drought area.

The enclosed table shows the percentage of normal that the pasture, corn, and hay is in counties that we are recommending be included in the drought area.

Respectfully submitted.

STATE DROUGHT COMMITTEE,
MURRAY C. COLBERT, *Chairman.*

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
AGRICULTURAL STABILIZATION,
AND CONSERVATION OFFICE,
Columbia, Mo., August 16, 1954.

GOV. PHIL M. DONNELLY,
State Capitol, Jefferson City, Mo.

DEAR GOVERNOR DONNELLY: Supplementing our letter to you on August 13, 1954, I regret to advise that Grundy County was inadvertently left off the list of counties recommended by the State USDA Drought Committee for inclusion in the Missouri Drought Disaster Area. Please include same.

I am enclosing a map indicating percentagewise present conditions of pasture, corn, and livestock water as compared with conditions this time last year in the counties not now included in the drought disaster area.

The State USDA Drought Committee urgently requests that you recommend to the President of the United States, Dwight D. Eisenhower, that the following 19 counties be promptly considered for inclusion in the drought disaster area in Missouri: Grundy, Sullivan, Adair, Putnam, Mercer, Harrison, Worth, Gentry, Iron, Reynolds, Madison, Bollinger, Wayne, Shannon, Carter, Howell, Oregon, Ripley, Butler.

Your promptness in this matter will be appreciated.

Very truly yours,

MURRAY C. COLBERT,
Chairman, Missouri State USDA Drought Committee.

Farm Conditions in Eastern Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter I have received under date of August 10, 1954, from Rosa Lee Reece and her son, of Prescott, Wash., relating to farm conditions in eastern Washington.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRESCOTT, WASH., *August 10, 1954.*

Hon. WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

My son and I, as tenant farmers, cultivate approximately 7,500 acres yearly in eastern Washington producing wheat.

We look to you and your colleagues from this State to portect us against the evident intention of the administration, and the Secretary of Agriculture in particular, to put us farmers back where Hoover had us and left us.

Today we are in a sea of uncertainty—uncertain what or how much we can plant, uncertain how much of our land must lie idle, uncertain what we can expect to get for the crop we are now putting in—uncertainty about everything except the certainty that we are being driven back to insolvency and ultimately clear out of business.

I urge you to do something to save us. If you can't do anything else, at least lift up your voice in our behalf.

We farmers are listening—and waiting.

Yours in distress,
ROSA LEE REECE and SON.

Relation of Illiteracy to Civilian, Military Needs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Relation of Illiteracy to Civilian and Military Needs," which appeared in the August 19, 1954, issue of Labor's Daily. Illiteracy is a national problem, and I have endeavored to point up in this article the urgent need for corrective action to wipe out this blot on our society.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RELATION OF ILLITERACY TO CIVILIAN, MILITARY NEEDS

(By Hon. HARLEY M. KILGORE, Democratic Senator from West Virginia)

The subject of illiteracy has been close to my heart for many years. I first became interested soon after graduating from the University of West Virginia when I was a public-school teacher in my native State. As Judge of the criminal court of Raleigh County, I was brought face to face with the unfortunate conditions resulting from illiteracy.

During the past 6 years on several occasions I called the attention of the United States Senate to the problem. I have introduced bills designed to assist States in attacking the problem. And I have inserted articles and statements in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with a view to throwing light on the subject, and of alerting my fellow Senators, and the Congressmen to its magnitude and urgency.

This is not a local problem, nor a Southern problem. It is national in scope and nonracial in its reach. According to the 1950 census, nearly 10 million of the adult population of the Nation were functionally illiterate. That is, they had not completed the fifth grade. This level of schooling is considered essential for effective functioning in the rudimentary day-to-day activities involved in being a citizen or a soldier.

PROBLEM IS GRAVE

The gravity of the problem is astounding when it is remembered that nearly three-quarters of a million men were rejected during World War II on account of mental deficiency. This was a great loss of manpower, because studies have shown that a majority of those men with proper training could have contributed significantly to our manpower needs. Authorities in the field have pointed out that about the same proportion of these men were educable as would be found in the general population.

They also suggest that the high rejection rates for mental deficiency were, in general, the results of deficiencies in the quantity and quality of education available in the 1920's and 1930's, Drs. Ginzberg and Bray, in their book, The Educated, concluded that "most of those who fail have simply been deprived of reasonable educational and cultural opportunities."

AVOID REPEATING ERROR

"We may not know all we should know about the difficult problem of mental deficiency," the report continues, "but we surely know enough to avoid repeating the error of confusing the mentally deficient with the educationally deprived."

According to Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, director of selective service, we are still suffering severe handicaps because of illiteracy. He said in testimony before a congressional committee in 1952, that during the first year of the Korean conflict, preinduction examinations were given to a million and a half selective-service registrants. Of these over 500,000, or 35 percent, failed to qualify for military service.

The single most significant disqualifying cause was educational deficiency. For nearly 300,000 men, or 20 percent of those examined during the first year, functional illiteracy was the principal cause of rejection.

ECONOMIC EFFICIENCY

Economic efficiency is another angle from which we need to consider this question. Illiterates retard our technological progress, because they are unable to meet the exacting demands of high-speed and complicated modern machines. Experience has shown that there are major barriers in the way of absorbing even a small number of illiterates into an industrial organization that has adjusted itself to a literate work force.

In an article I wrote for School Life in 1952 I called attention to the relation of illiteracy to our economic progress as follows:

"Our economic strength is an important link in our defense program. The industrial and agricultural activities which are at the foundation of our economic strength are becoming highly mechanized, requiring an ever-increasing amount of literacy. Lack of ability to read makes the illiterate a menace to himself and his fellows in industry and prevents the agricultural worker from benefiting fully from the services of Government bulletins, county agents, and other sources of helpfulness. The products of industry and farm are second only to manpower in our defense efforts. Anything, therefore, which impedes their flow, as does illiteracy, is an enemy within our ranks. It retards economic growth and development and should be stopped without delay."

ILLITERACY DETERRENT

"Normally, when our economic establishment should be geared to the scientific and technological progress of our times, illiteracy is as much of a deterrent as in times of emergency. It is well known that industrial wages and farm income of individuals, communities and States rise in proportion to the rise in literacy. Retail sales also are closely related to literacy. The flow of interstate commerce, the interdependence of individuals and groups, and elimination of geographical boundaries by modern transportation and communication facilities are more and more becoming matters of national concern. And anything which affects them, as does illiteracy, becomes a national responsibility."

I am convinced, as most anyone would be who knows the facts, that neither from the standpoint of our civilian nor military defense can we afford the luxury of the inefficiency and loss of manpower resulting from illiteracy. Sooner or later we must face up to the necessity of eliminating this blot from our national life. It is the responsibility of every agency of Government—Federal, State, and local—and of every citizen to do whatever is necessary to bring this about.

A New Ike Age for Alaska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, an Alaska newspaper, the Juneau Independent, published an editorial in its July 22 issue entitled, "A New Ike Age for Alaska." The writer states in part:

> Alaska is accustomed to the deep freeze treatment. But the cold wave that blew frost in our direction from President Eisenhower's press conference last week was enough to chill the spirit of even the toughest old sourdough among us.

The writer refers, of course, to the President's attitude on statehood and concludes his editorial by saying:

> It looks like bleak and bitter weather ahead from here to 1956. The new Ike age for Alaska has begun.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the entire editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A NEW IKE AGE FOR ALASKA

Alaska is accustomed to the deep freeze treatment. But the cold wave that blew frost in our direction from President Eisenhower's press conference last week was enough to chill the spirit of even the toughest old sourdough among us.

We wish it were permitted to quote an American President's press conference remarks so we could tell you exactly what Ike said about statehood. We have a transcript, and we think most Alaskans—indeed most Americans—would find what our Chief Executive said pretty disconcerting.

When a reporter from the Portland Oregonian tried to pin down the administration's position on statehood, saying that the Interior Department mentioned defense considerations as objections whereas nothing of that kind was expressed at the Pentagon, Ike said he was indeed concerned about Alaska from a security standpoint.

He said that the fate of the outlying areas west of Anchorage and north of the Yukon troubled him.

Fair enough. We defer, of course, to President Eisenhower's knowledge and judgment in defense matters.

But the President went on from there to lay the basis for what we all must now fear will be a new Ike age for Alaska. He did it when John W. Vandercook, of the American Broadcasting Co., confessed he didn't quite understand the theory that a Territory is necessarily easier to defend than a State.

Ike replied that he wouldn't say it was easier to defend. What he would say was that it was easier to use. It was easier to use, he explained, because in one case, it would be under the absolute control of the central Government, while in the other it wouldn't.

This strikes us as being about what George III would have said about his colonies in America. They just weren't nearly so handy to use when their inhabitants began talking about life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. The absolute control of the central Government was George's paramount aim then as we're afraid it is Ike's—as respects Alaska—now.

What our President said at his press conference was the most shocking—and we're afraid revealing—thing we've heard in the line of attitudes toward Alaska in a long, long time.

It looks like bleak and bitter weather ahead from here to 1956. The new Ike age for Alaska has begun.

Eighty-third Congress Appropriations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFF CLEVENGER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 12, 1954

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, the one big promise the Republican Party made to the people 2 years ago was to cut unnecessary spending, deficit financing, and arrest the rapid deflation of our dollar and cut our taxes.

The first must come from saving through less spending; the next, stopping inflation through checking the great borrowing in excess of national ability to pay more taxes.

What is the record of the 83d Republican Congress?

83d Cong.	Budget estimate	House Appropriations Committee recommendation	Approved	Decrease below budget estimated
1st sess	$68,621,899,638	$53,980,760,150	$54,539,342,491	−$14,082,557,147
2d sess	50,238,590,985	46,780,200,703	47,642,131,205	−2,596,459,780

It will be noted from the above that the reductions in the Truman budget estimates in the 1st session of the 83d Congress totaled $14,082,557,147. The reduction for the 2d session totaled $2,596,459,780. The total appropriations for the last session of the 82d Congress exceeded $75 billion.

The following table shows the reductions recommended by my subcommittee for the State Department, Justice Department, Commerce Department, and the United States Information Administration:

Bill	Budget estimate	House subcommittee recommendation	Decrease below estimate
State, Justice and Commerce fiscal year, 1954	$1,469,494,515	$1,143,146,712	−$326,347,803
The supplemental, 1954	147,854,042	72,018,242	−75,835,800
State, Justice, Commerce and USIA, fiscal year, 1955	1,313,920,960	1,146,988,000	−166,932,960
The supplemental, 1955	129,305,746	23,291,297	−106,014,449
Total	3,060,575,263	2,385,444,251	−675,131,012

From the above table it will be seen that the State, Justice, and Commerce Departments subcommittee, of which it is my privilege to be chairman, made one of the deepest percentage cuts of any committee.

The men on my committee, Mr. COUDERT, Mr. Bow, and Mr. COON—and for the most part sustained by the three from the minority party, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. PRESTON, and Mr. SIKES—and the members of the full Committee on Appropriations all deserve the thanks of the American taxpayers everywhere. This subcommittee recommended reductions of more than $675 million below the budget estimates, which represent a reduction of over 22 percent.

Every time an appropriations request is reduced those responsible therefor are severely criticized. It is a thankless task, but one which must be done if this great Nation is to remain solvent.

The Big Slide of 1954

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. R. POAGE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Farmer, can you feel the price supports on which you have so long relied sliding out from under you just when you need them most? American farmers asked Mr. Benson for a fish but were given a serpent; they asked for a loaf but were handed a stone by the present Republican administration. The farmers of America have asked for 90 percent of parity suports, and in the campaign of 1952 were promised those supports by the party now in power. In a speech made by General Eisenhower at Brookings, S. Dak., during that campaign, we find the following statement:

> The Republican Party is pledged to the sustaining of a 90-percent parity price support, and it is pledged even more than that, to helping the farmer obtain his full parity—100 percent of parity—with the guaranty and the price supports of 90 percent.

This was not an extemporaneous speech but a well thought out appeal for farm votes. The above quotation appeared in the news release handed out before the speech by the Republican Campaign Committee, as well as in the speech itself.

On July 1 of this year the House of Representatives was called upon to redeem that pledge. I doubt that during the past 18 years I have been a Member of this House that I have ever witnessed a more cruel exhibition than that day's repudiation of the party pledge and of all party members who tried to honor it. On that day we saw a coalition of those who were determined to pull the foundations out from under all price supports, repudiate not only their party's pledge, but also repuidate the only real farm leaders their party has produced, including Chairman HOPE, of the Agriculture Committee. Everyone agreed that farm prices were low—too low—yet the overwhelming majority of the Republicans voted for a "flexible" plan, a "sliding scale." Now I ask you, have you ever seen anything slide uphill? In spite of any explanations or excuses they may offer, the Republican leaders demanded and received unwaivering support of lower farm prices, and this program does mean lower suports every time supports are needed. Let no one deceive you. When the country suffers a widespread disaster like drought, production will naturally decrease the prices will go up without any supports. Farmers do not need price supports when production is short—but that is the only time this sliding program would give 90-percent supports. Farmers need supports when the market is low. That is exactly when the Republican plan will slide right out from under them. Any time farm prices start sliding down, Mr. Benson's supports will slide right down with them. Reminds me of buying a lead life preserver.

Much of our fuzzy thinking on price supports stems from the fact that most people do not know or do not remember that the great bulk of our losses have occurred on commodities which were being supported by the very flexible plan which the Republicans are now extending to all crops. Our greatest losses, on potatoes, occurred while the support on potatoes was flexible. Supports on dairy products were and still are flexible. On the other hand, supports on the basic commodities have not been flexible and up until the day the present administration came into power had not cost the taxpayers one thin dime. In fact as of January 1, 1953 the basics showed a net profit to the Government of $13,011,290. True, Mr. Benson has lost more than $100 million on basics during the past 18 months. But about fourteen-fifteenths of all price support costs have involved nonbasics—and most of his losses have been under flexible programs. How stupid can we get? Here we abandon the cheapest and most effective support program we have yet devised and substitute a program which has proven to be both costly and ineffective. Does anyone think flexibles kept us from growing excessive surpluses of potatoes?

Another widespread fallacy which has received general acceptance in recent months is the belief that lower farm prices would, of themselves, eliminate our surplus problem. A lot of people seem to believe if you will but lower the price of farm products you will materially reduce farm production without any governmental controls. Mr. Benson points to the evils of large surpluses and then, without one scintilla of proof, assumes that if we would lower the price of our basic commodities we would automatically reduce our surpluses. There never was a more fallacious conclusion presented to the American people. If you do not control the production of agricultural commodities, lowering the price will simply result in the production of more and more of the things you do not need, until everyone goes broke together.

Let me illustrate this with the example of cotton. In 1937 we produced our largest cotton crop. At that time we had supports of 53 percent of parity. The farmers knew their product would bring a smaller amount of money per unit of production. They reacted as farmers always have and always will react; they tried to make up in increased units of production what they stood to lose in price. With 53 percent supports they grew our largest cotton crop. How can anyone seriously believe 75 percent supports would control production?

Do not tell the American people you will restore the farmer's freedom if you destroy his livelihood. You do not restore anybody's freedom by making him an economic slave. The latest statistics show that even now all farmers, including the most prosperous, in our rich Texas blacklands just barely make 75 cents per hour for their labor. The Republican Party wants these farmers to work for less than the legal minimum wage for industry, and for less than one-half of the actual average industrial wage.

The farmer will work in the face of seemingly insurmountable difficulties to provide for his family. If he has to grow twice as much to receive the money necessary to pay his obligations, then he will attempt to grow such an amount, and our surplus problem is only aggravated. Of course, the present administration's program will bring about a reduction of surpluses in time—after it has bankrupted enough farmers. What American wants that kind of production control?

The Republicans speak of a flexible program as opposed to what they call the rigid system which is now in effect. Let me point out that we have no rigid system, and that just as parity in itself is flexible so is 90 percent of parity. Parity is that price for farm products which will return to the farmer today a buying power comparable to that which his production had during the base period—generally July 1, 1909, through June 31, 1914. In other words, parity relates the present value of the farmer's products to the cost of things he has to buy. It goes up when farm costs go up; it comes down when the general level of prices comes down. It is not a fixed amount in dollars and cents, but is intended to retain a maximum degree of stability in farmers' buying power. That's all the "flex" I want to see.

I am of the opinion that agriculture is still the basis of our entire economy. History has proven that any time we let the price of the basic agricultural commodities drop to as low as 75 percent of parity, our country has suffered a devastating depression. From past experience we know that jackrabbit stew and other such dishes do not compare very favorably with the meals of prosperity we have enjoyed during the past 20 years of Democratic administration. In fact, when the farmer cannot buy and a depression comes, it is likely to be more difficult to catch a jackrabbit in Pittsburgh than in Punkin Center. Many of our great labor organizations have realized this fact, and I have been heartened to see them take a firm stand for national prosperity against the Eisenhower-Benson policy of creep-unemployment.

We have heard a lot of talk about principle in connection with the farm price support program. I have listened to some very tear-jerking speeches about "I stand above petty politics" and "I base my stand on principle," and "I am for 75 or 82½ percent of parity supports because it would be wrong in principle to get 90 percent."

Now let us be sensible. What is the difference in principle between 90 and 75 percent? It is merely a question of arithmetic. True, it is a matter of tremendously important economics, but there is no principle involved in the choice of figures. It is pure hogwash to tell the American people that the level of support is a matter of principle.

I think it is a sound principle to give price supports to the American farmer when he cooperates by accepting controls to bring his production in balance with consumptive demands. I think such supports should be high enough to keep the farmers' children in shoes, and maybe to invite Santa Claus to visit the farm home at Christmas. I am for that principle. The Democratic Party, and 19 idependent acting Republican Congressmen are for that principle.

Why should we accept 82½ percent of parity next year? Why should we accept 75 percent of parity the following year? The proponents of the administration have not told us. They have talked in generalities about the evils of the present program. They have talked about the immorality of 90-percent supports. The freedom about which Mr. Benson talks will not be restored by this cut in farm income, because even Mr. Benson admits we will have to maintain exactly the same controls which we have today. We will still have acreage allotments. We will still have marketing quotas. We will still have surpluses. We will still spend tax money to move these surpluses; but we will have less tax money because there will be less income. We will retain every evil, but we will lose most of the benefits of the present program.

We will not get lower prices for the consumer. The producer of basic commodities always gets a very small part of the consumer's dollar: about 2½ cents out of a 17-cent loaf of bread, about two bits out of a $3.99 shirt, possibly half a cent out of a 21-cent box of cornflakes. Actually, the price of wheat has dropped 10 to 15 percent since this administration came into office, but the price of bread has gone up by a like percentage. If Mr. Benson is able to cut the farmer's price of corn by 25 cents per bushel, how much do you believe that will reduce the price of grits? The only reduction in the price of food will be the result of lessened consumer buying power, as unemployment increases.

In the final analysis, you get neither a reduction of surpluses nor an increase in freedom for the farmer. You get neither lower prices to consumers nor any saving to the taxpayer. The only thing you do get is less income for the farmer, less buying power in farm areas, and a lesser degree of prosperity throughout the entire country. This Republican plan for flexible supports is nothing more than the revival and expansion of a system which has already failed. It proposes that you burn the house down because you cannot afford a new living room carpet, and that you move the family out and live under the trees. I think we had better remember that those trees will shed their leaves, come winter.

Priest Rapids Mess Good for a Chuckle Says Wenatchee World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record two editorials. The first is from the Wenatchee Daily World of July 28, 1954, and the second from the Grand Coulee Star of July 29, 1954.

Both editorials comment on the controversy which has developed over construction of Priest Rapids Dam. As of the date the editorials were written, the State power commission was in competition with Grant County public utility district to become the licensee. Both editorials deplore the fact that the State commission has seen fit to take action which may cause a delay in getting this project under construction.

Under legislation recently passed by Congress, the so-called "local interests" have only 2 years in which to apply for a license. If the public power agencies in the State of Washington start fighting among themselves, the 2-year period may well elapse with no action being taken.

There is an additional comment in the Wenatchee editorial which I call to the Senate's attention, as follows:

> If you take water and run it through a pipe for drinking purposes, it's real Americanism. If you run the same water through a pipe and raise crops with it, that's fine, too. But if you run the same water through a pipe to turn a wheel by which you can make electricity, it's "socialism."
>
> Silly, isn't it?
>
> We hope the power commission can laugh at its own predicament.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wenatchee Daily World of July 28, 1954]

PRIEST RAPIDS MESS GOOD FOR A CHUCKLE

With two hearings scheduled for the next month, the question as to whether Grant County Public Utility District or similar public organizations should build the Priest Rapids Dam on the Columbia River or whether the new Washington State Power Commission should construct it ought to be well aired.

A lot of questions will undoubtedly be asked at the July 30 meeting of the commission in Seattle and at the August 20 meeting of the public utility district in Ephrata. But there's one inquiry, which, if we were taking the stand for the power commission, we'd hate to have asked.

We'd be awfully embarrassed.

It's this:

Why are the forces who have been shouting creeping socialism each time the Federal Government attempts a new power project or each time a public group seeks to expand its service through democratic process, now suddenly, hurriedly and enthusiastically embracing socialism by putting the State in the power business?

We get a real chuckle out of the commission rushing pellmell into the socialistic public power field, calling a secret meeting and doing other hurry-up behind-the-scenes maneuvering, to keep Grant County Public Utility District from going socialistic and building Priest Rapids Dam before the commission can.

Of course, we don't look upon development of waterpower resources by the people as anything but the healthiest kind of democracy, just as is the formation of irrigation districts and cooperative groups.

This hollering of socialism also provides us with a laugh in another instance.

Hells Canyon Dam, a project as fine as Grand Coulee Dam, has been called everything in the book, but the most frequently heard charge is that it's socialistic.

Now we find the people who've been saying this, including the Governor of Idaho, advocating another dam in the same stretch of the river, known as Mountain Sheep. (It just so happens that it doesn't interfere with Idaho Power Company's three-small-dam plan of partial river development.)

Thus, you see socialism is a geographic thing, too. At Hells Canyon, a Federal dam is socialism. A similar dam 60 miles downstream at Mountain Sheep site is nothing to worry about.

Perhaps it can be best summed up like this:

If you take water and run it through a pipe for drinking purposes, it's real Americanism. If you run the same water through a pipe and raise crops with it, that's fine, too. But if you run the same water through a pipe to turn a wheel by which you can make electricity, it's socialism.

Silly, isn't it?

We hope the power commission can laugh at its own predicament.

[From the Grand Coulee Star of July 29, 1954]

POWER COMMISSION OUT OF BOUNDS IN INTERFERENCE WITH PRIEST RAPIDS DAM

It is deplorable that the State of Washington which is so heavily dependent upon public power has a State administration which consistently endeavors with marked success to foul up the development of new projects which could greatly benefit industrial growth.

The latest blunder has been pulled by the State power commission which is sticking its unwanted nose into the Grant County Public Utility District planned development of the Priest Rapids site on the Columbia River. The State body's action in filing for a temporary permit to construct the dam is clear out of line.

The public utility district has done all of the preliminary planning to date, even to the point of getting the necessary legislation through Congress. Now the State body steps in and through its action may delay the project indefinitely. This looks like a "sour grapes" action more than anything else and much bitter feeling is going to result.

The State power commission, which was originally slated to be something of an advisory group and not a dam-building agency, could very well pick out some other site and promote a project of its own inception. Instead, this group sits back and lets another agency lay all of the groundwork and then enters the scene to stir up unnecessary delay and dissention.

This is an excellent example of the type of leadership this State enjoys in the field of public power. If as much effort and State finances had been used by the State administeration to discover and promote an original power project as was squandered in opposing Hells Canyon, for instance, there could conceivably be another development of this type underway. The Ice Harbor project would be a dandy for the State to build if it is sincerely interested in promoting power dams. On the basis of the record to date, we are frankly dubious of the commission's value toward development of the State's resources.

Hate Mail

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAURENCE CURTIS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, during the closing days of the session a report on the subject of hate mail from the Postmaster General was received by the chairman of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. This report resulted from the initiative of our colleague, Representative JACOB K. JAVITS, of New York, who has filed a resolution requesting it.

There is general aversion in this country to certain willful purveyors of falsehood concerning racial and religious groups whose one object seems to be to divide class against class and group against group, and hold up to contempt the ideals of liberty, equality before the law, and brotherly human consideration which have been foundation stones of our American civilization since the days of our Founding Fathers.

This type of propaganda is bad enough during ordinary times; but it is unbearable during a period of cold war when cunning adversaries are seeking every means to infiltrate, subvert, and divide the American people.

The time has come to find a way of curbing this evil. That must be done without encroaching upon time-honored American freedoms granted by the Bill of Rights, and particularly freedom of the press. Here is another example where purveyors of division use the cloak of American constitutional freedom in order to undermine those very freedoms. Constitutional protections were never intended to serve as a cloak for such activities. A way must be found within the framework of the Constitution to put some limit on this type of activity, and I believe it can be.

Existing law is inadequate to restrain this menace. That fact was spelled out in detail in the above-mentioned report from the Postmaster General. He said:

> The Congress has, over the years, prescribed what may or may not be transmitted through the mails. * * * Section 1717 of title 18, United States Code, provides that circulars, postcards, prints, newspapers, etc., which contain matter advocating or urging treason, insurrection, or forceful resistance to any law of the United States are nonmailable. This same section also provides that matter in violation of a number of other sections of title 18 is likewise nonmailable. * * * It should be noted, however, that these sections do not expressly provide for the exclusion from the United States mails of matter attacking a particular religion, religious group, or race. * * * It is, of course, regretted that the postal facilities are employed for the dissemination of material of this type. However, in the absence of authority to exclude it, the Postmaster General has no alternative but to accept the material and deliver it to destination.

This report from the Postemaster General came too late in the session to make possible the drafting and mature consideration and enactment of legislation at the present session. However, this deficiency in our laws must be remedied, and I have therefore filed a bill which, during the adjournment of Congress, will be available to Members and to the many persons and organizations interested in this subject.

It is clear that there are principles of law which can be relied upon to provide some measure of remedy to the intolerable abuse above referred to. The Supreme Court of the United States has many times held that even freedom of speech is not unlimited.

The most frequently cited limitation was that voiced by Mr. Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes when he pointed out that freedom of speech could not be construed so as to permit a prankster to shout "fire" while sitting in a crowded theater. Even more to the point is the decision of the Supreme Court in *Beauharnais* v. *Illinois* (343 U. S., p. 250), in which it upheld the provisions of an Illinois statute making it a crime to exhibit in any public place any publication which "portrays depravity, criminality, unchastity, or lack of virtue of a class of citizens, of any race, color, creed, or religion" which "exposes the citizens of any race, color, creed, or religion to contempt, derision or obloquy."

In the chapter of the Criminal Code dealing with postal crimes and nonmailable matter, there is a catchall provision making letters and writings nonmailable which are used in the commission of other crimes which are there listed. The dissemination of hate mail during these days of the cold war might properly be attacked as an attempt at sabotage or subversion; and a provision might be inserted in the chapter dealing with that subject, and then included in the abovementioned list. However, in view of the difficult constitutional questions involved, it seemed better, at least for the time being, to limit the remedial provisions to one making the dissemination of such material nonmailable.

The bill which I am filing was drafted along the above lines and reads as follows:

A bill to amend section 1717 of title 18 of the United States Code, so as to make nonmailable certain defamatory and other matter

That section 1717 of title 18 of the United States Code is hereby amended by relettering subsections (b) and (c) thereof as (c) and (d), respectively, and by inserting after subsection (a) of such section a new subsection as follows:

"(b) Any written or printed matter or thing upon which is written, printed, or otherwise impressed any epithet, term, or language of libelous, scurrilous, defamatory, or threatening character as regards an individual or religious or racial group, or calculated by the manner or style of display and obviously intended to reflect indecently and injuriously upon the character or conduct of another or which portrays depravity, criminality, unchastity, or lack of virtue of a class of citizens of any race, color, creed, or religion, or which exposes the citizens of any race, color, creed, or religion to contempt, derision, or obloquy is nonmailable matter, and shall not be conveyed in the mails, nor delivered from any post office, nor by any letter carrier, and shall be withdrawn from the mails under such regulations as the Postmaster General shall prescribe."

Labor Department Employee Wins Robert B. Irwin Memorial Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to insert the following article contained in the publication Performance: The Story of the Handicapped, concerning Miss Louise McGuire, veteran handicapped-worker specialist in the United States Department of Labor's Wage and Hour and Public Contracts. Miss McGuire is a resident of my congressional district and has rendered outstanding service to our Federal Government.

Labor Department Employee Wins Robert B. Irwin Memorial Award

In recognition of outstanding accomplishments through many years service in behalf of blind workers, the National Industries for the Blind has presented the Robert B. Irwin Memorial Award to Miss Louise McGuire, veteran handicapped-worker specialist in the United States Department of Labor's Wage and Hour and Public Contracts Divisions. She also represents the Wage and Hour Administrator in connection with President's committee activities.

The objective of the National Industries for the Blind is to provide work for the blind and to standardize and market blind-made products on a nonprofit basis. Its vice president, Peter J. Salmon, and Miss Roberta Townsend, chairman of the Workshop on Industrial Homework, made the presentation on behalf of President William Ziegler, Jr., at a banquet May 20 at the Burlington Hotel in Washington.

The award citation of Miss McGuire recites in part, "In affectionate appreciation and grateful recognition and in tribute to a long and distinguished career of service to mankind, both here and abroad * * *." It describes Miss McGuire as one, "Who, with patience, fairness, and enthusiasm, has worked toward better understanding and application of the Federal labor laws as they affect the workshops for the blind * * *." It was the first time the award has been made to an individual.

AWARD IN MEMORY OF PIONEER WORKER FOR THE BLIND

The memorial award of the National Industries for the Blind was established in memory of the late Robert B. Irwin who, with Helen Keller, pioneered in developing useful activities for the blind and in educating employers and the public generally to their needs and capabilities for gainful employment.

Last March 4, Miss McGuire received the Labor Department's distinguished service award from Secretary James P. Mitchell, for her notable and devoted leadership over many years in raising the labor standards and working conditions of the handicapped workers throughout the country.

Not so long ago, her friends in the Department noticed Miss McGuire's arm bandaged up in a sturdy cast. She had been in an auto accident while on Government business. Louise was philosophical about her injury. "With all my years of working on problems of the handicapped, I really knew for the first time how it feels to do a job when you have a physical disability. Fortunately, mine was temporary. Some people have lived for years under disabilities. We want to make sure these folks have what they need and want—opportunities for employment."

Joining the Wage and Hour Division at its inception in 1938, Miss McGuire has been primarily responsible for developing regulations dealing with wage rates and other benefits for handicapped workers under the Fair Labor Standards Act.

As secretary of the Wage-Hour Administrator's Advisory Committee on Sheltered Workshops, Miss McGuire has been highly successful in obtaining voluntary compliance with Fair Labor Standards Act provisions on the part of sheltered workshops. National leaders in this field have attested to the valuable effect of the act on the wage status of both clients and employees of charitable nonprofit agencies, and have recognized how Miss McGuire has aided in securing understanding of the law.

Always interested in ways of advancing the welfare of the handicapped, Miss McGuire has prepared statements about wage and hour and other workshop standards for the use of many charitable and religious organizations. The ILO, at a meeting of United Nations agencies, acclaimed as an outstandingly useful document, a Handbook on Sheltered Workshops, which she edited.

Her advice and consultation services have become more and more in demand. Frequently called on to address local and national organizations, her participation is also sought in conferences on various social problems.

What Should We Do With Our Agricultural Surplus?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an article entitled "What Should We Do With Our Agricultural Surplus?" written by my colleague, the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. Thye] and published in the summer 1954 issue of the Heartland.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

What Should We Do With Our Agricultural Surplus?

(By Hon. Edward J. Thye, of Minnesota)[1]

What to do about our surpluses of agricultural commodities is one of our most important domestic problems.

In a real sense the surplus problem is the farm problem, for no program we set up for agriculture will serve satisfactorily during peace years unless it includes a sound approach to managing and handling surpluses when they occur.

These surpluses are, of course, the amounts of food and fiber produced on the farms of America which are in excess of markets available in any given year, at prices accepted as reasonable and just in this country. It could well be argued whether we have any surpluses at all when considered in the light of the needs of our own growing populations or the fact that over one-half of the people of the world are living on the edge of starvation and suffering from malnutrition diseases.

And yet we cannot escape the fact that we will soon have $6 billion worth of surplus foods and fibers in Government storage which are feeding and clothing no one.

---

[1] United States Senator Edward J. Thye, of Minnesota, was Governor of his State from 1943 to 1947, when he began his service in the Senate. He was reelected for a second 6-year term in 1952 by the largest total vote ever given a candidate for the Senate in Minnesota. Ed Thye, as he is best known to his constituents, has operated his own farm near Northfield, Minn., since 1922, and he still runs this farm of nearly 600 acres with hired help while devoting full time to his senatorial duties. Before being elected lieutenant governor of Minnesota in 1942, he had served for 4 years as deputy State commissioner of agriculture. In the Senate he has been a leading member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. He is also a member of the Committee on Appropriations and chairman of the Committee on Small Business. He was one of the early advocates and a consistent supporter of the St. Lawrence seaway project.

It must be perfectly evident to anyone looking at the tremendous inventories of Government-owned farm products that we have not found the solution. With all our know-how in industry, in commerce, and in distribution, must we stand helpless in the presence of this problem? I do not think so.

Much depends on how we approach this problem. Surely in our great inland States, which constitute the heartland of America, there can never be an acceptance of the idea of scarcity for we know that an abundant production is not only the natural course of a sound agricultural economy, but one of the greatest sources of the Nation's strength.

We must always have sufficient plantings of food and fiber to meet our needs. It is inevitable that in some years, when all factors are favorable, including such an uncertain one as the weather, there will be surpluses. We must not allow the proportionately small surpluses of our Nation's farm economy to bring about a recession for our farmers. That is a major reason why I have advocated the need of dealing effectively with our surplus problem before we undertake to make drastic changes in the level of farm-price supports. It is such a well-established fact as to scarcely need any restatement that if agriculture does not share fairly in the national income, or if the farmers suffer a depression, every other segment of the economy will sooner or later experience the same adversity.

Some of our best farm economists have said that the nature of the farm business, our superb soil resources, and our present stage of development in the world make farm surpluses for many years to come not only inevitable, but highly desirable. In fact, these surpluses can well be one of our greatest blessings.

If we look to the future we realise that there will be a need not for less but for greater production of food and fiber on our farms. Our prospective growth of population for the next quarter of a century is for an average of around 1.6 million a year, so that by 1975 we probably will have a national population of possibly 190 million, or 40 million more people than we now have.

We have used about 360 million acres of cropland each year since 1920, when we had approximately 4 acres of crops per capita. We have now 2.7 acres due to the growth of population. Yet during this period we have actually increased our total farm output by more than our population's grown—a feat unparallelled in the agricultural history of the world.

By 1975 we shall probably have to feed our people around 2.2 acres of cropland per capita. This would mean that yields per acre would need to be increased about one-fourth, and we would require a greater relative increase in output from livestock and pastures. This will seriously strain our capacity to expand production to equal the population's expansion—to say nothing of dietary improvement.

It is of no comfort today, when surpluses tend to overflow all reasonable storage capacity and we have yet to implement the solutions, to observe that 20 years from now we may have a critical underproduction, but no long-range farm program can fail to take note of these future needs. This is one reason why I personally have advocated a program for the use of diverted acres taken out of production that would encourage the planting of legumes and other soil-building crops against the day when there will be greater demands on our productive capacity.

As we consider our immediate surplus problem, we must not forget that our American farmers brought production to a high level during the war period to meet the needs of this country and its allies for food and fiber that were essential to winning the war. We must not forget that it was at the Government's urging and encouragement that a high level of production was maintained during the more recent defense build-up. Farming is by nature an industry, quite unlike manufacturing, where it is not possible to control or balance the units of production except over a considerable period of time.

It was only last fall, during the planting season of winter wheat, that the Government took steps to provide for acreage allotments for wheat, a program in which farmers by direct vote agreed to cooperate in order to reduce the surplus in this basic crop. It was only this past spring that similar programs for corn and cotton, two other basic crops, were inaugurated.

I do not regard acreage allotments as the final solution of the problem. They are at best a temporary expedient, but I believe they must be undertaken at this time in our effort to bring our surpluses into manageable proportions. And, as I have said, these arrangements must be coupled with a sound program for use of diverted acres that will provide for soil-building practices and that will avoid production of crops tending to create new surpluses in other commodities.

We have been regrettably slow in working out an effective program along these lines, for obviously here is a place where the Government must take the lead although the willing support and cooperation of the farmers themselves are essential to make the program work.

Other steps which represent parts of the solution involve a program of larger use of these commodities to improve the nutritional standards of the American people, to provide for increased distribution in welfare programs considering the needs of certain low-income groups, and to enlarge the benefits of the school-lunch program.

Up to this time we have certainly not made sufficient distribution of such surplus food on hand as dairy products, considering the need in certain lower-income groups or the objectives of the school-lunch program.

In a single year the Commodity Stabilization Service inventories have grown to a total of 270.6 million pounds of butter, 262 million pounds of cheese, and 469.6 million pounds of nonfat milk solids.

Yet for the fiscal year ending July 1, 1953, only 22.3 million pounds of butter went into the food-distribution program, 8 million pounds to institutions, and only 0.8 million pounds for welfare purposes, including distribution to needy Indian people.

The Department of Agriculture has stepped up the butter-distribution program for the present fiscal year to a total of 61 million pounds. It can be accelerated, not only for the good of agriculture but for the good of our people. If the distribution program is too cumbersome and restricted, other sound methods should be employed that will make these food products available to people who cannot afford to buy them on the market.

There is, moreover, a place for industry-financed sales promotions. Per capita consumption of dairy products, for example, has dropped, although the dairy producer has one of the greatest foods that could be offered on the market. Fluid milk contains natural milk sugars and calcium that are essential in one's diet. The surpluses in dairy products would vanish if we undertook a real selling program in this country of this highly nutritive food.

In addition there are three foreign channels for use of surpluses in farm production in this country; namely, (1) normal commercial export markets, (2) sale of surpluses outside of these channels with acceptance of local currency for reinvestment in the purchasing countries, and (3) distribution of surpluses largely through church relief organizations, refugee organizations, and other nonprofit agencies.

Congress has recently had under consideration provisions of an act to increase the consumption of our agricultural commodities in foreign countries. This legislation declares it to be the policy of the Congress that this greater dissemination of abundance shall be managed to expand international trade, to promote the economic stability of American agriculture and the national welfare, and to further the foreign policy of the United States. It authorizes the use of $1 billion over the next 3 years to broaden the program for sale of food and fiber for the local currencies of other nations, and a program of barter for strategic materials needed by the United States.

It permits the President, to the extent of $300 million in 3 years ahead, to furnish emergency assistance on behalf of the people of the United States to friendly peoples of other nations, to meet famine and other urgent relief requirements. It makes commodities available for relief distribution abroad by private nonprofit welfare organizations. It expands the availability of food for needy persons in the United States, for the school lunch program, and for other nonprofit uses.

This 3-year program is essentially a good one. In permitting exchange of commodities now in Government storage for foreign currency, goods, or services, the act provides a means by which we can acquire additional strategic materials, defray part of the cost of our military base construction program abroad or meet other overseas commitments.

I believe there is a most constructive opportunity also for use of some of our surpluses for distribution among the needy people of our friends and allies, including such distribution by voluntary agencies which are well equipped to do the job on a basis that will give a maximum of benefit to persons who really need this help.

There have been occasions when gifts of food under crisis conditions have been proved a most effective stroke of diplomacy. Distribution of food packages in West Berlin and and the shipment of wheat to Pakistan are examples of generosity fully rewarded by payment in good will.

All of these steps which I have enumerated are essential in dealing with our surplus problem. It is apparent that the high fixed cost nature of the farm business and the uncertainties and hazards of farming make the effort for full production not only logical but necessary. Also, the rapid improvement of our knowledge, methods, and machinery insures a continued rapid increase in our productivity per man, per acre, and per head of livestock.

Vexing and troublesome though the result may seem to be, this is the American way. And so, until our population catches up, there will be surpluses. If we are wise and if we are forthright in our planning we will be able to manage them.

In the final analysis, this abundant production could well be the most powerful weapon of peace ever given to a nation. Let us use the surpluses to help feed hungry people, to help them gain strength so they can themselves become more productive. Let us use them as a far more potent destroyer of communism than is the hydrogen bomb, for communism has no greater ally than hunger, and democracy and freedom have no greater ally than a well-nourished people.

If these surpluses are allowed to waste, or are dumped onto the world markets to break normal markets, great discredit and ill will to us will be the result. On the other hand, if these surpluses are used to relieve hunger, to increase productivity and trade, and to establish new future demands without interfering with normal private trade, we can reap rich harvests of good will, of reduced costs of checking aggression, and of increased profitable future trade with friendly nations.

Let us never forget that the great continued abundance of our food and fiber—the even full flow from our farms of the means of high standards of living—is one of the greatest factors in our Nation's greatness and of its leadership in the world.

Report to the People of the Eighth Congressional District of Wisconsin—VIII

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. BYRNES
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a report to the people of the Eighth Congressional District of Wisconsin on my voting and attendance record for the 2d session of the 83d Congress.

No attempt has been made to include votes on all of the numerous bills, motions, and amendments, but the report does include all rollcall votes, all quorum calls, and my votes on some other measures on which there was no record taken, but which I believe are of importance and concern to the people of my district. The purpose of this report is to collect in one place and in concise form information which is scattered through some 14,000 pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It also contains information which is not available from any public record but which I feel should be made available to the people.

The descriptions of the bills and the amendments or motions as contained in the report are for the purposes of identification only; no attempt is made to describe the legislation completely or to elaborate upon the issues involved. I believe this word of caution is advisable, in view of the fact that the descriptions used are, for the most part, taken from the official titles of the bills which unfortunately do not always reflect the nature or true purpose of the legislation. Upon request, I will be pleased to furnish more complete information concerning any particular bill, as well as a summary of the issues involved and the reasons for my vote.

The furnishing of this report continues a service I began in the 1st session of the 80th Congress. This is the eighth report of my voting and attendance record. These eight reports show how I voted on 1,252 questions in the House of Representatives. Based on quorum calls and the record votes, they also show an attendance record of 95 percent.

Voting and attendance record, Representative John W. Byrnes, 8th District, Wisconsin (83d Cong., 2d sess.)

Roll call No.	Date	Measure, question, and result	Vote
	1954		
1	Jan. 6	Call of the House	Present.
2	Jan. 20	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 5337, providing for the establishment of a United States Air Force Academy:	
3	Jan. 21	On passage. (Passed, 329 to 36)	Nay.
		H. J. Res. 358, to discharge indebtedness of Commodity Credit Corporation:	
4	Jan. 27	On passage. (Passed, 323 to 27)	Yea.
		H. R. 7209, continuing the effectiveness of the Missing Persons Act until July 1, 1955, allowing the continued pay and allowances of servicemen missing in Korea:	
	do	On passage. (Passed, voice vote)	Yea.
5	Feb. 2	Quorum call	Present.
6	Feb. 3	do	Present.
7	Feb. 3	do	Present.
8	Feb. 4	do	Present.
9	Feb. 4	do	Present.
		H. R. 3300, authorizing the State of Illinois and the Sanitary District of Chicago, under direction of the Secretary of the Army, to divert water from Lake Michigan into Illinois Waterway:	
10	do	On amendment designed to prevent additional diversion of water until survey of lake levels had been completed by Corps of Engineers and submitted to Congress. (Rejected, 177 to 202.)	Yea.
11	do	On motion to recommit. (Rejected, 150 to 234)	Yea.
	do	On passage. (Passed, voice vote)	Nay.
12	Feb. 16	Quorum call	Present.
13	do	do	Present.
14	Feb. 17	do	Present.
		H. R. 4646, providing for the exchange of certain public and private lands in order to prevent Federal lands acquisition from interfering with sustained-yield timber operations:	
15	do	On motion to recommit. (Adopted, 226 to 161)	Nay.
16	Feb. 18	Quorum call	Present.
		H. Res. 400, to provide funds for the operation of the Committee on Un-American Activities:	
17	Feb. 25	On passage. (Passed, 363 to 1)	Yea.
18	Mar. 1	Quorum call	Present.
19	do	do	Present.
20	Mar. 2	do	Present.
		H. J. Res. 355, relating to supplying of agricultural workers from Mexico:	
21	do	On motion to recommit. (Rejected, 156 to 250)	Nay.
	do	On passage. (Passed, voice vote)	Yea.
22	do	Quorum call	Present.
23	do	do	Present.
24	Mar. 4	do	Present.
		H. R. 8067, making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, and the United States Information Agency, for fiscal 1955:	
25	Mar. 5	On an amendment to increase funds for subsidies to air carriers from $23,000,000 to $40,000,000. Adopted, 265 to 105)	Nay.
	do	On passage. (Passed, voice vote)	Yea.
26	Mar. 8	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 8127, amending and supplementing the Federal-Aid Road Act to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways:	
	do	On passage. (Passed, voice vote)	Yea.
		H. R. 8149, authorizing further Federal assistance to the States for surveying the need for diagnostic or treatment centers, for hospitals for the chronically ill and impaired, for rehabilitation facilities, and for nursing homes, and to provide assistance in construction of such facilities through grants to public and nonprofit agencies:	
	Mar. 9	On passage. (Passed, voice vote)	Nay.
27	Mar. 10	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 8224, reducing and extending certain excise taxes:	
28	do	On motion to recommit, with instructions to remove taxes on admissions of 50 cents or less. (Rejected, 200 to 213.)	Nay.
29	do	On passage. (Passed, 411 to 3.)	Yea.
30	Mar. 11	Quorum call	Present.
31	Mar. 15	do	Present.
32	do	do	Present.
33	Mar. 17	do	Present.
		H. R. 8300, revising the internal revenue laws:	
34	Mar. 18	On motion to recommit with instructions to increase personal exemptions and eliminate section dealing with double taxation of dividends. (Rejected, 204 to 210.)	Nay.
35	do	On passage. (Passed, 390 to 80.)	Yea.
36	Mar. 22	Quorum call	Present.
37	do	do	Present.
38	Mar. 23	do	Present.
39	Mar. 24	do	Present.
		H. R. 8152, extending for one year, until June 30, 1955, the Veterans Administration's direct loan program for VA homes and farmhouses:	
	do	On passage. (Passed, voice vote.)	Yea.
40	Mar. 29	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 8224, reducing and extending certain excise taxes:	
41	Mar. 30	On adoption of conference report. (Adopted, 395–1.)	Yea.
42	Mar. 31	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 8583, appropriating funds for various independent offices for fiscal 1955:	
43	do	On motion to recommit with instructions to adopt language preventing FNMA from liquidating mortgages. (Rejected, 180 to 214.)	Nay.
	Mar. 31	On passage. (Passed, voice vote.)	Yea.
44	Apr. 1	Quorum call	Present.
45	Apr. 2	do	Present.

Voting and attendance record, Representative ***John W. Byrnes, 8th District, Wisconsin*** *(83d Cong., 2d sess.)*—Continued

Roll call No.	Date	Measure, question, and result	Vote
	1954 Apr. 2	H. R. 7839, aiding in the provision and improvement of housing, the elimination and prevention of slums, and the conservation and development of urban communities:	
46	...do...	On motion to recommit with instructions to provide 35,000 public housing units each year for 4 years. (Rejected, 176 to 211.)	Nay.
47	...do...	On passage. (Passed, 352 to 46.)	Yea.
48	Apr. 5	Quorum call	Present.
49	Apr. 7	...do	Present.
50	Apr. 8	...do	Present.
		H. R. 8649, authorizing the admission into evidence in certain criminal proceedings of wiretap information secured in national security investigations:	
51	Apr. 8	On amendment requiring a court order in order to make wiretap evidence admissible. (Passed, 221 to 166.)	Nay.
52	...do...	On passage. (Passed, 379 to 10.)	Yea.
53	Apr. 12	Quorum call	Present.
54	Apr. 14	...do	Present.
		H. R. 303, transferring the administration of health services for Indians and the operation of Indian hospitals to the United States Public Health Service, now under the Department of Interior and Bureau of Indian Affairs:	
	Apr. 26	On passage. (Passed, voice vote)	Yea.
55	Apr. 27	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 7397, amending the Public Health Grant-in-Aid Act by consolidating and simplifying the several public health grant-in-aid programs for assisting States and local communities in providing necessary public health services:	
	...do...	On passage. (Passed, voice vote)	Yea.
56	Apr. 28	Quorum call	Present.
57	Apr. 29	...do	Present.
		H. R. 8873, appropriating funds for the Defense Department for fiscal 1955:	
58	...do...	On passage. (Passed, 377 to 0)	Yea.
59	May 5	Quorum call	Present.
60	...do...	...do	Present.
61	May 6	Quorum call	Present.
		S. 2150, providing for creation of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation to construct part of the St. Lawrence seaway in the United States territory:	
62	...do...	On motion to recommit. (Rejected, 157 to 242.)	Nay.
63	...do...	On passage. (Passed, 241 to 158.)	Yea.
64	May 10	Quorum call	Present.
65	...do...	...do	Present.
		H. R. 2556, amending United States Code relative to extradition of certain fugitives from United States to countries occupied by United States jointly with 1 or more powers:	
66	...do...	On motion that enacting clause be stricken out (that the bill be killed). (Adopted, 228 to 68.)	Nay.
67	May 11	Quorum call	Absent.
		H. Res. 533, citing Bernhard Deutch for contempt of House of Representatives by refusal to answer questions before the Committee on Un-American Activities:	
68	...do...	On adoption. (Adopted, 346 to 0)	Absent.[1]
		H. R. 9040, authorizing cooperative research in education:	
69	May 12	On passage. (Passed, 296 to 55)	Yea.
		H. Res. 532, providing for consideration of H. R. 7434, establishing a National Advisory Committee on Education:	
70	...do...	On resolution. (Adopted, 194 to 140)	Yea.
71	May 13	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 7434, establishing a National Advisory Committee on Education:	
72	...do...	On passage. (Passed, 179 to 157.)	Yea.
73	May 19	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 7601, providing for a White House Conference on Education:	
74	...do...	On passage. (Passed, 269 to 69.)	Yea.
75	May 26	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 9242, authorizing certain construction at military and naval installations and for the Alaska communications system:	
76	...do...	On passage. (Passed, 346 to 0.)	Yea.
		H. Res. 568, providing for the consideration of H. R. 9366, amending the Social Security Act and Internal Revenue Code:	
77	June 1	On adoption. (Adopted, 270 to 76)	Yea.
		H. R. 9366, amending the Social Security Act and the Internal Revenue Code so as to extend coverage under the old-age and survivors insurance program, increasing the benefits payable thereunder, preserving the insurance rights of disabled individuals, and increasing the amount of earnings permitted without loss of benefits:	
78	...do...	On passage. (Passed, 355 to 8)	Yea.
		H. J. Res. 243, amending the pledge of allegiance to the flag of the United States of America by adding the words "under God" after the words "one nation":	
	June 7	On passage. (Passed, voice vote)	Yea.
		H. R 2828, providing for per capita payments to members of the Menominee Tribe of Indians from the trust funds credited to the tribe and for freeing the tribe from Federal supervision over a period of years:	
	June 8	On adoption of conference report. (Adopted, voice vote.)	Yea.
79	June 9	Quorum call	Present
		H. Res. 580, providing for the consideration of H. R. 7494, extending the Trade Agreements Act for 1 year:	
80	June 11	On adoption.. (Adopted, 273 to 63.)	Absent.[1]
		H. R. 7494, extending the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements under sec. 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, for 1 year:	
81	...do...	On passage. (Passed, 281 to 53.)	Absent.[1]
82	June 14	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 9517, appropriating funds for the government of the District of Columbia for fiscal 1955:	
83	June 15	On amendment fixing the Federal payment to the District of Columbia at $20 million instead of $16 million. (Passed, 186 to 168.)	Nay.
84	June 16	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 8729, extending for 2 years the present authority of the Federal Reserve banks to purchase securities directly from the Treasury in amounts not to exceed $5 billion outstanding at any one time.	
85	...do...	On motion to recommit with instructions to limit bond purchasing authority to periods when no cash is available. (Rejected, 80 to 250.)	Nay.
86	June 17	Quorum call	Present.
		H. Res. 583, providing for disagreement to a Senate amendment to the Housing bill providing for public housing and agreeing to conference requested by Senate:	
87	...do...	On passage. (Passed, 360 to 19.)	Yea.
88	June 28	Quorum call	Present.
		S. Con. Res. 91, expressing the sense of Congress that the United States support the Organization of American States in taking appropriate action to prevent interference in Western Hemisphere affairs by the international Communist movement:	
89	June 29	On passage. (Passed, 372 to 0.)	Yea.
90	June 30	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 9678, promoting the security and foreign policy of the United States by furnishing assistance to friendly nations (mutual security bill):	
91	...do...	On amendment stating it to be the sense of Congress that no funds should be used for governments which are committed by treaty to maintain Communist rule over any defined territory of Asia. (Passed, 389 to 0.)	Yea.
92	...do...	On passage. (Passed, 260 to 126.)	
93	...do...	Quorum call	Present.
94	July 1	...do	Present.
95	July 2	...do	Present.
		H. R. 9680, providing for continued price support for agricultural products, augmenting the marketing and disposal of such products, and providing for greater stability in the products of agriculture:	
96	...do...	On amendment to provide flexibility in price supports from 82½ to 90 percent of parity for the 1955 crops of basic commodities. (Passed, 288 to 170).	Yea.
	...do...	On passage. (Passed, voice vote)	Yea.
		H. R. 6342, amending the Public Buildings Act of 1949 relative to acquisition of real property and the construction of public buildings for housing Federal agencies, including post offices, by executing purchase contracts:	
	July 7	On adoption of conference report. (Adopted, voice vote)	Yea.
		H. R. 9640, amending the Vocational Rehabilitation Act so as to promote and assist in the extension and improvement of vocational rehabilitation services, provide for a more effective use of available Federal funds and otherwise improve the provisions of that act:	
97	July 8	On passage. (Passed, 347 to 0.)	Yea.

[1] If present, would have voted "yea."

Voting and attendance record, Representative John W. Byrnes, 8th District, Wisconsin (83d Cong., 2d sess.)—Continued

Roll call No.	Date	Measure, question, and result	Vote
	1954 July 8	H. R. 9709, a bill to extend and improve the unemployment compensation program:	
98	do	On motion to recommit with instructions to impose Federal standards upon State programs. (Rejected, 110 to 241.)	Nay.
99	do	On passage. (Passed, 309 to 36.)	Yea.
		H. R. 9580, revising and extending the laws relating to espionage and sabotage:	
100	do	On passage. (Passed, 324 to 0.)	Yea.
101	July 12	Quorum call	Absent.
		H. Res. 623, providing for the consideration of H. R. 8356, the health service prepayment plan reinsurance bill:	
102	July 13	On passage. (Passed, 274 to 88.)	Yea.
		H. R. 8356, the health service prepayment plan reinsurance bill:	
103	do	On motion to recommit. (Adopted, 238 to 134.)	Nay.
104	July 15	Quorum call	Present.
		H. Res. 627, reiterating the opposition of the House of Representatives to the seating of the Communist regime in China in the United Nations:	
105	do	On passage. (Passed, 381 to 0)	Yea.
106	July 20	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 7839, the Housing Act of 1954:	
107	do	On recommittal motion designed to provide 140,000 new units of public housing over a 4-year period in lieu of the 35,000 new units for fiscal year 1955. (Rejected, 156 to 234.)	Nay.
108	do	On adoption of conference report. (Adopted 358 to 30)	Yea.
		H. R. 9888, extending the time for initiating training under the Korean GI bill of rights to 3 years instead of the present 2 years after date of induction:	
109	July 21	On passage. (Passed, 399 to 0)	Yea.
		H. R. 9020, granting increases in compensation and pension to veterans of all wars and their dependents:	
110	do	On passage. (Passed, 399 to 0.)	Yea.
		H. R. 9245, providing postal rate increases and postal pay increases:	
111	do	On motion to suspend rules and pass with an amendment. (Rejected, 228 to 171. A ⅔ majority is necessary for passage under suspension of the rules.)	Yea.
		H. R. 7130, providing for loss of nationality by native-born or naturalized citizens upon conviction of advocating or conspiring to advocate the overthrow of the United States by use of force or violence:	
	do	On passage. (Passed, voice vote.)	Yea.
		H. R. 8180, increasing Federal contributions to State homes for disabled American veterans:	
	do	On passage. (Passed, voice vote.)	Yea.
112	July 22	Quorum call	Present.
		H. Res. 664, citing Bolza Baxter for contempt of the House of Representatives by refusal to answer questions before the Committee on Un-American Activities:	
113	July 23	On passage. (Passed, 376 to 0.)	Yea.
114	do	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 9757, amending the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, as amended:	
115	July 24	On amendment relating to atomic patents. (Passed, 203 to 159.)	Yea.
116	July 26	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 9757, amending the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, as amended:	
117	do	On motion to recommit. (Rejected, 165 to 222)	Nay.
118	do	On passage. (Passed, 231 to 154)	Yea.
119	July 27	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 10051, the mutual security appropriation bill for fiscal 1955:	
120	July 28	On passage. (Passed, 266 to 128)	Nay.
		H. R. 8300, a bill to revise the internal revenue laws of the United States:	
121	do	On motion to recommit with instructions for House conferees to agree to Senate amendment which deleted section providing credit against the income tax of an individual of a percentage of the dividends received from certain domestic corporations. (Rejected, 169 to 227.)	Nay.
122	do	On adoption of conference report. (Adopted, 316 to 77.)	Yea.
123	do	Quorum call	Present
		H. Res. 626, providing for the consideration H. R. 236, authorizing the construction, operation, and maintenance by the Secretary of the Interior of the Fryingpan-Arkansas project, Colorado:	
124	do	On passage. (Rejected, 188 to 195.)	Yea.
		H. R. 9756, increasing the borrowing power of the Commodity Credit Corporation:	
125	July 29	On passage. (Passed, 317 to 57.)	Yea.
		H. Con. Res. 265, providing for sine die adjournment of the 2d sess. of the 83d Cong. on July 31:	
126	do	On passage. (Rejected, 183 to 193.)	Yea.
127	do	Quorum call	Present.
128	July 30	do	Present.
		H. R. 7840, amending the Railroad Retirement Act, the Railroad Retirement Tax Act, and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act:	
129	do	On passage. (Passed, 360 to 0.)	Yea.
		H. R. 9666, amending sec. 1001, par. 412, of the Tariff Act of 1930 with respect to hardboard:	
130	do	On passage. (Passed, 235 to 109.)	Yea.
		H. Con. Res. 266, providing for sine die adjournment of the 2d sess. of the 83d Cong. on July 31:	
131	do	On passage. (Adopted, 179 to 167.)	Yea.
		H. R. 8384, authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Talent division of the Rogue River Basin reclamation project, Oregon:	
132	do	On passage. (Passed, 163 to 144.)	Yea.
133	do	Quorum call	Absent.
		H. R. 9821, providing for orderly termination of Federal supervision over the property and members of the Menominee Indian Tribe of Wisconsin:	
	Aug. 3	On passage. (Passed, voice vote.)	Yea.
		H. R. 7785, making permanent the increases in regular annuities under the Civil Service Retirement Act:	
	do	On passage. (Passed, voice vote.)	Yea.
		H. R. 9909, prohibiting payment of annuities to Federal officers and employees convicted of certain crimes:	
	do	On passage. (Passed, voice vote.)	Yea.
		H. R. 8006, safeguarding the rights of riparian landowners in Wisconsin whose title to property has been brought into question by reason of errors in original survey and grant:	
	do	On passage. (Passed, voice vote.)	Yea.
		S. 3681, authorizing Civil Service Commission to make available group life insurance for civilian officers and employees in Federal service:	
	do	On passage. (Passed, voice vote.)	Yea.
134	Aug. 4	Quorum call	Present.
		S. 16, amending the immunity provision relating to testimony given by witnesses before either House of Congress or its committees:	
135	do	On passage. (Passed, 293 to 55.)	Yea.
136	Aug. 9	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 9245, establishing a joint committee of Congress to study postal field service reclassification and providing a 7-percent pay increase for postal employees:	
137	do	On motion to discharge the Committee on Rules from further consideration of H. Res. 590, the rule providing for consideration of H. R. 9245. (Passed, 348 to 29.)	Nay.
138	do	On passage. (Passed, 352 to 29.)	Nay.
		H. Res. 687, providing for consideration of S. 2033, relating to the labeling of foreign-produced trout sold in the United States:	
139	do	On passage. (Passed, 209 to 159.)	Yea.
		H. R. 9678, promoting the security and foreign policy of the United States by furnishing assistance to friendly nations:	
140	do	On motion to recommit. (Rejected, 97 to 266.)	Nay.
		On passage. (Passed, 202 to 55.)	Aye.
141	Aug. 16	Quorum call	Present.
		S. 3706, outlawing the Communist Party, prohibiting members of Communist organizations from serving in certain representative capacities, and for other purposes:	
142	do	On passage. (Passed, 305 to 2)	Yea.
		S. 2308, authorizing and directing the investigation by the Attorney General of certain offenses by Government officers and employees with other Governmental agencies:	
	do	On passage. (Passed, voice vote)	Yea.

Voting and attendance record, Representative John W. Byrnes, 8th District, Wisconsin (83d Cong., 2d sess.)—Continued

Roll call No.	Date	Measure, question, and result	Vote
	1954 Aug. 16	H. Res 705, providing for House agreement to Senate amendment to H. R. 6672, providing for a temporary increase in statutory debt limits until June 30, 1955:	
	do	On passage. (Passed, 193 to 31.)	Yea.
		H. R. 9680, providing for continued price support for agricultural products, augmenting the marketing and disposal of such products, and providing for greater stability in the products of agriculture:	
	Aug. 17	On recommittal of conference report. (Rejected, voice vote.)	Yea.
	do	On adoption of conference report. (Adopted, 208 to 47.)	Nay.
		H. R. 10203, providing rewards for information concerning illegal manufacture or acquisition of special nuclear material and atomic weapons:	
	do	On passage. (Passed, voice vote.)	Yea.
143	do	Quorum call	Present.
		S. 3706, outlawing the Communist Party, prohibiting members of Communist organizations from serving in certain representative capacities, and for other purposes:	
144	do	On motion to instruct conferees to accept Senate amendments. (Adopted, 208 to 100)	Nay.
		H. R. 10051, making appropriations for Mutual Security for fiscal year 1955:	
145	Aug. 19	On adoption of conference report. (Adopted, 188 to 77)	Nay.
146	do	On motion ordering previous question on amendment providing $55 million and providing 80 percent of the foreign currency generated shall be used to strengthen and improve the civilian economy of Spain. (Adopted, 186 to 76.)	Nay.
		S. 3706, outlawing the Communist Party, prohibiting membership of Communist organizations from serving in certain representative capacities, and for other purposes:	
147	do	On adoption of conference report. (Adopted, 265 to 2.)	Yea.
		H. R. 2236, providing for regulation of certain public transportation in the Washington metropolitan area:	
148	Aug. 20	On recommittal of conference report with instructions to eliminate establishment of Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Regulatory Commission. (Rejected, 95 to 164.).	Nay.

AN EXPLANATION OF TERMS

Of necessity the report contains parliamentary and legislative terms with which the reader may not be familiar. An explanation of some of these terms may, therefore, be helpful:

A. A quorum call consists of a calling of the roll of Members to determine whether or not a quorum—a majority of Members—is present. No business may be conducted when it is found that a quorum is not present.

B. Recommittal: Generally, on all important bills, a motion to recommit the bill to a committee, with or without instructions, is voted upon by the House before it votes upon passage of the bill. If such a motion is adopted, it means that the bill will be changed, delayed, or even killed. However, when a motion to recommit is accompanied by instructions, the vote generally indicates whether the Member is in favor of or opposed to the change in the legislation proposed by the instructions and does not necessarily indicate his position on the bill as a whole. A motion to recommit with instructions, if adopted, does not kill the bill.

C. The type of bill can be determined by the letters which precede its number. All bills that originate in the House are designated by an H; those that originate in the Senate by an S. There are four main types:

First. H. R. (S) designates a bill which when passed by both Houses in identical form and signed by the President, becomes law.

Second. H. J. Res. (S. J. Res.) designates a joint resolution which must pass both Houses and be signed by the President before becoming law. It is generally used for continuing the life of an existing law, or in submitting to the States a constitutional amendment, in which case it does not require the signature of the President but must be passed by a two-thirds majority of both Houses.

Third. H. Con. Res. (S. Con. Res.) designates a concurrent resolution. To become effective it must be passed by both the House and Senate but does not require the President's signature. It is used to take joint action which is purely within the jurisdiction of Congress. Many emergency laws carry the provision that they may be terminated by concurrent resolution, thus eliminating the possibility of a Presidential veto.

Fourth. H. Res. (S. Res.) designates a simple resolution of either body. It does not require approval by the other body nor the signature of the President. It is used to deal with matters that concern one House only, such as changing rules, creating special committees, and so forth.

D. Rule: Important bills, after approval of the committee concerned, go to the House Committee on Rules where a rule, in the form of a House resolution (H. Res.), is granted covering the time allowed for debate, consideration of amendments, and other parliamentary questions.

E. Conference: Representatives from both Houses of Congress meet in conference to work out differences existing in the legislation as passed by the two bodies. Upon conclusion of their conference, a report is submitted to each House setting forth the agreements reached. Each House then must act by way of adopting or rejecting the report in whole or in part.

F. Ordering the previous question: A motion to order the previous question, if adopted, shuts off further debate on the question before the House and prevents further amendments to such proposition.

G. A bill may pass, or be defeated, by one of the following kind of votes:

First. Voice vote: The Speaker first asks all in favor to say "aye" then those opposed to say "nay." If there is no question as to the result, this is sufficient.

Second. Division: If the result of the voice vote is in doubt, the Speaker asks those in favor to stand, then those opposed to stand. He counts in each instance and announces the result. If he is in doubt, or if demand is made by one-fifth of a quorum, then—

Third. Tellers are ordered. A Member on each side of the question is appointed as teller, and they take their places at each side of the center aisle. Those in favor walk through and are counted. Those opposed do likewise. The result settles most questions, but any Member, supported by one-fifth of a quorum, can ask for a rollcall. This privilege is guaranteed by the Constitution.

Fourth. Rollcalls place each Member on record on the particular measure involved. Each Member's name is called and his vote recorded. Rollcalls constitute the official voting record of the House.

The outcome of various votes are indicated in parentheses in the record above. In the case of rollcall votes, the actual vote is shown—the yeas first and the nays last.

What My Home Means to Me

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. DAVIS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a copy of a letter by Mrs. Sylvia B. Zsuffa, of 886 Cherry Street NW., Atlanta, Ga., which was chosen for the first award in a contest on What My Home Means to Me, sponsored by Home Modernizing magazine and its publisher, W. Wadsworth Wood, of Chicago, Ill.:

ATLANTA, GA.

Mr. W. WADSWORTH WOOD,
Small Homes Guide, Inc.,
Chicago, Ill.

DEAR MR. WOOD: We have just bought a dream. To the passer-by, it is just another old house set high on a hill. Nothing smart about it. But to us, it is our dream come true.

The past few years have not been easy. It is not easy when you're 40, with a growing family to go into the Army for a second time, when your country calls; to pull up roots; to face long separation, then the difficult adjustment to an alien environment.

Now we have a home. Home? What does it mean to us: First of all, it means "togetherness"—my husband near; the children busy at homework in the evening.

Second, it means permanence. A strange word in these impermanent times. But we can't name anything that would give us a greater sense of permanence than our owning a few feet of land in this, our country, for which my husband fought.

And last, our home means adventure. The cooperative excitement of building a new kitchen; of learning how to use a sander; wield a paintbrush. In short, of making our home a livable dream, which, like all dreams, is measured by the amount of personal struggle put into them.

Sincerely,

Sylvia B. Zsuffa
Mrs. Sylvia B. Zsuffa.

The Republican Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND

OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record, The Republican Record of the 83d Congress. It is understood, pursuant to the prior order, that additions and corrections may be made at a later publication date; but I desire to have the material printed in the Appendix of today's Record.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, is this confined to the Republican record of the 83d Congress, or is it the record of the 83d Congress?

Mr. KNOWLAND. It is the record of the 83d Congress; but I believe it is customary for both the majority leader and the minority leader to have it printed.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

THE REPUBLICAN RECORD

The Eisenhower administration and the 83d Congress worked together and our joint efforts resulted in the following notable achievements:

We ended the fighting and sacrifices of American lives in Korea; kept the United States out of the war in Indochina; liquidated the Communist foothold in Guatemala; strengthened the free nations; and confronted Russian imperialism and Communist aggression with the firm determination to safeguard freedom and attain genuine peace.

We reorganized and strengthened the national defense by policies and programs capable of providing security over the long pull at substantial savings and without undue strain on the national economy.

We acted decisively to safeguard the Nation from enemies within its borders and to rid government, labor, education, and all other phases of American life from Communist infiltration and subversion.

We successfully bridge the difficult transition from war to peace and maintained prosperity at the highest level in the Nation's history. Price, wage, and rent controls were ended, freeing American enterprise from undue Government interference. The national economy was stabilized and the value of the dollar strengthened, ending the cheating of our people by inflation and avoiding the distress of deflation, while employment, production, wages, and earnings remained high.

We cut taxes by nearly $7½ billion, reducing individual income-tax payments, excise taxes on goods consumers buy, and providing substantial benefits in other deductions and allowances for individuals and enterprise.

We acted to end the shameful waste of farm surpluses, and to provide farmers with a long-range program for an independent, self-reliant agriculture, with Government providing a shield against destructive forces beyond farmer control.

We continued, strengthened, and enlarged programs to meet human needs, to strengthen civil rights, to aid our veterans to become established in civilian life, and to provide adequate care for the disabled, to expand social security, and to assist the aged, the blind, and dependent widows and children.

We arrested the trend toward destructive socialistic tendencies in Government by the encouragement of private competitive enterprise, thrift, and the self-reliance of our people.

We encouraged the States to meet their proper responsibilities; urged labor and private enterprise to solve their own problems without Government interference; and worked to make all our people more self-reliant. We restored to the States the rights of the States to develop submerged lands, and other resources within their boundaries.

In these and all other respects a Republican administration and Congress fostered the forward progress of a free nation under a government without favoritism, without corruption, without waste or extravagance, but efficient, economical, trustworthy, and fair to all.

OUTSTANDING PROGRAM ENACTED DESPITE SLENDER MARGIN

In two busy, exacting sessions, the 83d Congress carried through to enactment an outstanding program of constructive legislation. It did this even though Republican control rested on slender voting margins. The Senate began and ended with a bare Republican majority of one. For almost a year after the death of Senator Taft, Republicans were actually in the minority. In the House the Republican margin in the first session started at 7 but fell to 4 at the close of the second session through deaths and resignations.

The achievements of the Congress were made possible by close coordination between House and Senate and harmonious relations with the President and the executive departments and agencies. Congress' heaviest workload—the regular annual appropriation bills—was efficiently handled and fully completed in the 1954 session before the start of the new fiscal year July 1. This removed confusion and uncertainty from Government administrative in the executive branch—an achievement which Democratic-controlled Congresses utterly failed to accomplish in recent years.

Party support of the Republican leadership and of the President ran exceptionally high. Congress was neither a rubber-stamp nor an unruly critic of the President's program. Beginning with White House conferences with Republican leaders in both Houses including standing committee chairmen, and continuing with weekly conferences throughout the session, Congress and the President cooperated for the good of the Nation. Detailed and continuous bipartisan consultations, not only on foreign policy but on domestic legislation as well, were carried on by the President and the Republican leadership with Democratic Party leaders in both Houses of Congress.

The major accomplishments in detail are:

REPUBLICANS END KOREAN WAR AND PRESS FOR PEACE WITH HONOR

By placing American interests foremost and with firm, realistic policies, the Republican administration accomplished the following in its conduct of foreign relations:

It ended the fighting in Korea, secured the exchange of prisoners, and began the peaceful reconstruction of that war-torn country. By strengthening Korean troops, the administration was able to bring home several American divisions.

It kept America out of a hot war in Indochina while giving France aid and support until a negotiated truce was signed.

It played an effective part in ending the Communist regime which had seized power in Guatamala.

It took the initiative against communism in all parts of the world—

By exposing Communist hypocrisy, designs, and tactics at Berlin and Geneva conferences.

By a congressional resolution supporting a united Germany.

By a Senate resolution condemning the Soviet mistreatment of minorities and its callous disregard of human rights.

By reaffirming official policy denying Red China's admission to the United Nations.

By leading American states at Caracas in the adoption of a resolution declaring communism to be a threat to freedom and peace in the Americas and pledging full consultation in the event of any aggression.

By negotiating arms pacts to strengthen central American countries against Communist subversion.

By taking appropriate steps to oust Americans in the United Nations who serve the Communist cause and by instituting an FBI check on the fitness of Americans for loyal service.

By undertaking to share information on atomic weapons with allies in the common defense against Communist aggression.

And by proposing an international pool of atomic energy for peace.

At the same time the administration acted resolutely to reinforce the defenses of the free world. It pressed France and Italy for action on the European Defense Community by indicating that American aid may not be forthcoming unless EDC or a satisfactory alternative is carried through. It continued to train and build up the NATO forces and to equip them with planes, guided missiles atomic weapons, and other materiel. New air bases were acquired in Spain and the bases elsewhere improved. European recovery and security are now so well advanced that American aid may be steadily and safely reduced. Military aid was given to Pakistan and aid to Nationalist China continued.

Security pacts

In addition to our network of security pacts with 39 nations, a treaty was concluded with Korea, a mutual assistance agreement was signed with Japan, and negotiations were begun on a security pact for southeast Asia. The Senate ratified three treaties providing for the legal status of United States forces in Europe, and four treaties to settle claims and improve relations with Germany. The Senate approved authority for the President to take appropriate steps consistent with constitutional processes to restore German sovereignty.

Working strongly for world economic progress, the Congress and administration simplified customs procedures, made new studies of the trade agreements program and extended the act for another year, and continued the International Wheat Agreement. It concluded treaties of commerce and friendship with several nations, agreements on sugar production and marketing, and treaties concerning German debt settlements, Mexican migratory labor and duty-free trade with the Philippines. It climaxed years of hope and effort by arranging for American participation in the St. Lawrence seaway, opening the heart of the Nation to ocean shipping.

Humanitarian deeds

Continuing its great humanitarian tradition the United States sent food to East Germany, wheat to Pakistan, and entered upon a comprehensive program for distributing farm-surplus commodities for famine and distress relief, and in exchange for strategic raw materials. A program was enacted offering refuge for 214,000 Iron Curtain refugees, including many orphaned children.

By many changes and improvements, the administration has achieved better management in handling foreign affairs. The State Department was reorganized. The Foreign Operations Administration and United States Information Service were set up as independent agencies. The Voice of America was greatly improved. Regulations on security risks have been tightened and at the same time the rights of individuals have been protected. By a complete overhaul, national-defense policies and programs were brought into more realistic relationship with foreign policies and commitments. And in this field of heavy executive responsibility for the conduct of foreign affairs, the President worked in close cooperation with Congress and with bipartisan representaitves in both Houses.

REPUBLICANS INCREASE NATION'S DEFENSE AT LESS COST

By departmental reorganization, better management, and a thorough overhaul of the entire national-defense program, the Republican administration has built a highly flexible, mobile Army, Navy, and Air Force capable of handling anything short of a major international war requiring all-out mobilization. Should an all-out war occur, this program would and could be rapidly enlarged.

Most significant are the actions (1) to maintain a large, well-rounded, highly trained and equipped military force for the indefinite future; (2) to incorporate atomic and other new weapons into the regular military arsenal for strategic and tactical use; (3) to establish an Air Force Academy comparable to West Point (Army) and Annapolis (Navy); and (4) to gear our military program to our foreign policies and commitments.

These are history-making decisions. They result from a fresh appraisal of our defense program by a new team of military and civilian officials following the end of fighting in Korea. Their main object is to bring our defense program abreast of latest developments in policy, technology, strategy, and tactics. Recognizing the long-term threat and varied tactics of Communist aggression, the new program replaces crisis planning for peak danger years with continuous combat readiness for any contingency. Research, production, procurement, and expenditures are better coordinated to fit the large military program into the framework of a sound civilian economy which the Nation can afford to sustain indefinitely if necessary.

Many billions available for defense

Defense Department appropriations for 1955 alone total $28.8 billion of which $7.6 billion is for the Army, $9.7 billion for the Navy, $10.9 billion for the Air Force, with the remainder for other departmental expenses. Supplemented by $55 billion in carry-over funds, the total available for expenditure will be $83.8 billion. In addition, $1.3 billion has been authorized for military public works and large sums for atomic energy, merchant marine, and other programs related to the regular defense establishment. For 1955 it is planned to have an Air Force of 120 wings with 970,000 men and women as part of a planned buildup to 137 wings by 1957; an Army of 17 divisions with 1,173,000 men and women; and a Navy and Marine Corps of 689,000 personnel operating 1,080 ships and 13,200 aircraft. Plans for improving the Reserve force are in the making.

Compared with previous years, the Administration has achieved greater actual defense power at lower costs and with substantial savings to taxpayers.

The new program includes greater attention to continental defense by extension of the radar system to the Far North in cooperation with Canada, by a new continental aid defense command with improved fighter-interceptor forces and antiaircraft weapons, by coordinating communications systems throughout the country, by increasing the role of the National Guard in home defense, and by building cooperation in civil defense between local, State, and Federal units.

NATO forces improved

Our striking and defensive force in global operations has been strengthened by the acquisition of bases in Spain and by improvements in other foreign installations provided for in military public works appropriations. NATO forces in Europe have been improved in organization, by provisions for the exchange of information on atomic technology, by new equipment for conventional weapons, guided missiles, and atomic cannon, and by enlarged training programs for handling these newer weapons.

By extended research and development, advances in technology and new production arrangements, all the armed services are improving the effectiveness of equipment and material. Congress provided $5 million for special air research and facilities at selected airbase laboratories. The President approved an expanded stockpiling program for the purchase of some 35 to 40 strategic metals and minerals from domestic producers wherever possible. The Army concentrated its medium-tank production for greater efficiency at less cost.

Many changes have been instituted to improve service morale. Legislation was passed to provide control of promotions and better proportion between grades of officers. The program for handling security risks has been firmed up. Commissions will be denied to doctors and dentists if they turn out to be security risks. Segregation in the services has been ended.

NATION PROSPERS UNDER REPUBLICANS

President Eisenhower and the Republican Congress have given the Nation its greatest period of prosperity in history—and have done so despite the adjustments required in changing from a war to a peacetime economy.

The depression predicted by calamity howlers and partisan critics did not materialize.

Prosperity was not accident, however. The Republican Congress and Administration took positive steps to instill public confidence, to smooth out the bumps that appeared here and there, and to spur peacetime activity to supplant declining war demands. Yet the Government did not resort to any of the deadly socialistic drugs prescribed by left-wing economic medicine men.

Cost of living stabilized

The cost of living was stabilized. In contrast to the 6 percent average annual increase in living costs under the Truman administration, the cost of living has been held down to only slightly more than 1 percent since Republicans took charge. Likewise the rapid decline in purchasing power of the dollar occurring under the Democrats has been stayed. The value of the dollar has varied only one-half cent in the past 18 months.

Republicans moved quickly to wipe out restrictive controls. Less than a month after inauguration the President voluntarily ended wage controls. Price controls were removed by March 17, 1953. Federal consumer and real estate credit controls were abolished. Many other emergency powers over various aspects of the Nation's economy were repealed by law, although Congress continued to June 30, 1955, the President's authority to allocate scarce and strategic materials in emergency and under the V-loan program, whereby the Government guarantees qualifying types of defense contract loans.

In line with Republican campaign pledges to remove the Government from competition with private business, the Congress acted to dispose of some 28 federally owned synthetic rubber plants and restored to States their rights to develop oil, minerals, and other natural resources.

Construction activities encouraged—small business aided

Congress enacted a great number of laws to help maintain a healthy, growing economy. In the construction field alone, this Congress compiled a notable record. It voted funds and encouraged the building of such things as houses, ships, hospitals, health clinics, highways, airports, and rivers, harbors, and flood-control projects.

Small business already is benefiting from the Small Business Administration, created by the Republican 83d Congress to make loans, sublet prime contracts, and otherwise strengthen the backbone of America.

All business will be stimulated and more jobs created as a result of the tax laws enacted by the 83d Congress.

Congress increased Federal research funds so that new ideas and technological processes can be made available for commercial uses, in turn meaning more jobs and better products.

In a variety of ways the Republican Congress and administration moved to aid those relatively few areas of chronic and temporary unemployment. At least a dozen projects worth more than $20 million are being built in distressed communities through the tax-benefit program of the Office of Defense Mobilization. Congress extended unemployment compensation coverage to some 4 million workers. It also strengthened the unemployment compensation system by setting up a reserve of $200 million from which States may borrow when necessary, and in addition it provided for the refund of excess tax collections to States, enabling them to increase benefits to unemployed workers, as 25 States have already done.

In addition, the Government has a whole arsenal of economic weapons which Republicans have pledged to use, if it should become necessary, to maintain a high standard of living for our people.

Under Republican leadership, the Nation's economic barometers read "fair weather ahead."

REPUBLICANS MAKE RECORD-BREAKING TAX REDUCTIONS

Republicans kept their pledge to reduce taxes—by a whopping $7.4 billion in 1954, the largest tax cut the American people ever enjoyed in a single year.

Individual income taxes were reduced by about 11 percent beginning January 1, 1954, the first tax cut since the Republican 80th Congress. Only because the Republican Congress and administration slashed Government spending by billions of dollars was the $3 billion income-tax reduction possible.

By contrast, under Democrats taxes reached an all-time high in 1952. In fact, Democratic Congresses voted 14 out of 15 income-tax increases since the first income tax law was passed in 1913 by Democrats.

Excise tax cuts voted by the 83d Congress means savings for everybody—in all, some $999 million—and will stimulate business activity and employment. Excise taxes were reduced on such things as stoves, refrigerators, clothes driers, handbags, cosmetics, admission tickets, sporting goods, telephone calls, and telegrams. To offset this loss to the United States Treasury, existing excise rates were continued on such items as liquor, beer, cigarettes, gasoline, automobiles, and cabaret admissions.

The excess-profits tax on business was continued for 6 months, to December 31, 1953, to coincide with the date of tax cuts for individuals and to bring in some $800 million of needed revenue to the United States Treasury.

Millions benefit from tax revision law

Millions of persons and thousands of businesses will enjoy additional tax cuts under the far-reaching tax revision law the Republican 83d Congress enacted this year.

Over 60 percent—$827 million—of the $1.4 billion of tax relief provided in the law goes to individuals.

The first complete revision of the internal revenue laws in more than 75 years, the tax reform law represents the combined efforts of congressional committees and administration officials to simplify Federal tax laws, remove inequities, close loopholes, and stimulate the country's economic growth without at the same time endangering the Government's financial condition.

New tax features of particular benefit to individuals include:

Larger deductions for medical expenses, affecting some 8,500,000 persons;

Tax deductions up to $600 for costs of care of dependents (child under 12 or other dependent mentally or physically unable to care for himself), affecting some 2,100,000 working people;

Fairer treatment of persons receiving retirement income, affecting some 1,800,000 people; more generous treatment of annuities, affecting some 800,000 people;

More liberalized deductions for dependents, affecting some 1,400,000 taxpayers;

More flexible provisions for depreciation, affecting some 9,600,000 persons;

Partial relief from double taxation of dividends, affecting some 7,100,000 of the 47 million taxpayers in this country;

More liberal deduction for interest under installment purchase contracts, affecting some 1,600,000 people; and

More liberal allowance for soil and water conservation expenses, affecting some 500,000 farmers.

Some $536 million in tax relief will flow to business under the new tax code. At the same time, Congress continued for 1 year the 52 percent tax on corporate earnings over $25,000 which, it is estimated, will bring in $1.2 billion in revenue.

Features of the new tax code designed to stimulate business growth and create jobs include:

More flexible provisions for depreciation, affecting some 600,000 corporations;

A longer period for applying net operating losses against profits and allowance for divident-received credit and percentage depletion in computing losses, affecting some 50,000 businesses;

An option to taxpayers to deduct research and experimentation costs from current expenses or to amortize the costs, affecting countless businesses;

Less stringent tax treatment of "surplus" earnings accumulated by businesses to allow business, especially small enterprises, greater freedom in retaining funds for growth and expansion;

Increased rates of percentage depletion on a variety of critical and strategic minerals in order to encourage the development of domestic sources of supply;

More equitable treatment of partnerships; and tax accounting in closer accord with business accounting.

Congress closed over 50 loopholes through which taxpayments had been avoided in the past and improved the law by many more technical provisions.

Honesty and fairness replace corruption in tax collecting

Besides providing generous tax cuts for the American people, Republicans cleaned up the mess found in the Nation's tax collection agency, the Internal Revenue Service. Shown to be riddled with corruption under the Democratic administration, the agency is now well on its way toward becoming a model of honesty and fairness under the Eisenhower administration. The crooks and grafters have been weeded out. Tax cases are being vigorously prosecuted.

The up-to-date business methods installed by Republicans are giving taxpayers quicker rulings, faster audits, and earlier refunds.

NEW OPPORTUNITIES FOR AMERICAN FAMILIES TO HAVE GOOD HOMES OF THEIR OWN

The Republican 83d Congress has made it possible to help fulfill the fundamental desire of American families to have good homes of their own.

Enactment of the Housing Act of 1954 and related laws constitute a program designed to meet the problems of housing, for both civilians and servicemen, while providing sound community development and maintaining a growing economy.

President Eisenhower asserted in his housing message to Congress last January 25 that the major objective of the Republican administration's national housing policy was "the development of conditions under which every American can obtain good housing." When he signed the new law August 2, he hailed the congressional action as "a major advance toward meeting America's housing needs."

Lower downpayments, longer periods to repay

The Republican-sponsored housing law permits lower downpayments, lower monthly payments, longer repayment terms of up to 30 years, and increased mortgage limits of up to $20,000. More money is made available for home loans by the merger of all FHA mortgage insurance activities into one authorization which was increased by $1.5 billion.

Under the new FHA-insured mortgage program, it is possible, for example, to buy a $9,000 new home for $450 down and monthly payments of $46.83.

This example of the new lower downpayment—in this case less than half the former downpayment rate—indicates how housing opportunities can open up in areas and for income groups never before reached. Mortgage amounts under the new law are now 95 percent of the first $9,000 of the value of a new home plus 75 percent of the value in excess of $9,000. A $12,000 home can be purchased for $1,200 down, instead of $2,400, with monthly payments of less than $60. Home buyers also are protected by guaranties required from builders or sellers using FHA-insured mortgages.

Housing actions result from intensive study

Within a few weeks after taking office in 1953, the Republican Admininsration ordered a complete review of all Government housing activities and policies. A 23-member Presidential Advisory Committee on Housing was appointed. The Senate and House Banking and Currency Committees held extended hearings in the 1st session of the 83d Congress. These resulted in the Omnibus Housing Amendments of 1953, which encouraged construction of lower priced sale and rental housing and authorized construction of 33,000 public housing units. More than 1,100,000 new homes were constructed during the first year of the new administration. Then, with the study of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, the recommendations of the Presidential Advisory Commission, and testimony received by congressional committees, a broad-scale housing program has become law. This Housing Act of 1954 presents a coordinated pattern, instead of a patchwork of assorted housing laws.

Protections for home owners provided

Also during the second session of this Congress, congressional committees unearthed a major scandal wherein many alleged irregularities and the taking of windfall profits were found to have occurred in the administration of housing laws under the Truman administration. Republicans were determined to stop profiteering and other abuses and tightened up provisions of the 1954 law with this end in view. The law also provides protection to home owners from shoddy repair work by making lenders take part of the risk in each FHA-insured loan for home improvements or repairs. FHA cracked down on luxury repairs by issuing an order in June 1954 prohibiting loans for such purposes.

The new housing law includes a new element. This is the urban renewal program to save our cities by clearing slums and redeveloping blighted housing areas. Where salvage of blighted areas is impossible, slum clearance is promoted and families are provided with public housing. The law allows commitments for upwards of 35,000 such public housing units during the coming year for low-income families.

Early in 1954 the volume of private housing construction began to move ahead of 1953. In midsummer the Bureau of Labor Statistics reported that for the first 6 months of this year 564,100 units had been completed, indicating that the 1954 rate may come close to the all-time record. Housing is geared into almost every industry in the country. These feeder industries cover the whole range of consumer durable goods. Taken as a whole, they add up to employment for some 5 million persons and a sound prosperous economy.

The long-standing concern for servicemen and their families received action by the Republican Congress in a new law authorizing up to $175 million for 13,613 units of family housing for personnel in the military services. The Secretary of Defense would certify the necessity for such housing to be provided by the military departments near military bases. Military statisticians estimated that the cost of the units would be amortized over a period of 14 years because no housing allowance would have to be paid for each family occupying the housing units that could be constructed under this law.

The Congress also authorized home and farmhouse loans to veterans and granted Korean war veterans the same preference as World War II veterans in admission to Government housing.

BUILDING THE NATION—DEVELOPING RESOURCES

Under Republicans, the Nation moved forward with a great program of public works and with outstanding measures to develop our natural resources.

The Republican Congress authorized over $1' billion for 183 navigation, flood control, and beach erosion projects throughout the Nation.

It approved the St. Lawrence seaway project.

The administration, through the Federal Power Commission, approved construction of the St. Lawrence River power project by the State of New York and the Province of Ontario. When completed, the project will generate the second largest amount of power of any similar project in the country.

The 83d Congress approved the largest Federal coast-to-coast roadbuilding and improvement program in history.

It authorized an $837 million military and naval public works construction program.

It modernized the Atomic Energy Act to speed up the development of nuclear energy for peacetime use.

It revised Federal land acts for a more economical development of mineral lands and other natural resources.

It authorized irrigation and reclamation projects.

It made surplus seed available for reseeding of rangelands.

It revised the Water Facilities Act to aid conservation of land throughout the United States, its Territories, and possessions.

The Republican Congress returned to the States their rights to submerged lands, but retained for the Federal Government almost nine-tenths of the offshore lands and 83 percent of the estimated mineral deposits.

It provided for upstream watershed protection and flood prevention under local control, thereby helping reverse the 20-year trend toward a policy of having the Federal Government hand down decisions on what projects are needed and where.

It permitted the Federal Power Commission to license local public-utility districts and private power companies to pay for and construct their own power projects at no cost to the Federal Government. Such projects would be operated on a partnership basis with the Government, with the Army engineers handling navigation and flood-control features of such projects.

It authorized what potentially will be the third largest public power dam in the Nation—Priest Rapids Dam on the Columbia River. Construction of other dams also was authorized.

It authorized construction of new tankers for defense purposes.

It approved a modernization program for merchant ships and created a Federal Ship Mortgage Insurance Fund to facilitate private financing of new ship construction.

It approved a lease-purchase program whereby rent money may be used for eventual purchase of Government buildings, saving taxpayers millions of dollars in outlays for new post offices and other Federal structures.

It approved legislation for various services to improve public lands.

The President proposed a vast $50 billion national road-building program, most of which would be self-financing.

Platform pledge on resource development fulfilled

The record of this Congress in the fields of public works, natural resources, and water policy fulfilled in detail the promises in the Republican platform adopted in 1952. For example, the platform stated: "We favor restoration to the States of their rights to all lands and resources beneath navigable inland and offshore waters within their historic boundaries." This was done.

In the first session, two long-standing and important questions relating to use of submerged lands and the historic rights of States were resolved. The Submerged Lands Act of 1953 confirmed the ownership, title rights, development rights, and leasing rights of States to the lands and resources under navigable waters out to their historic boundaries. The Federal Government's authority is preserved in the case of navigation, commerce, national defense, and related matters.

Another new law, the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act, extended the jurisdiction and control of the Federal Government to the subsoil and seabed of the entire Continental Shelf adjacent to the shore of the United States.

The Federal Aid to Highways Act authorizes a 2-year program of $1.9 billion in Federal aid for building, improving, and modernizing roads in every State. It will make possible the improvement of about 40,000 miles of highways; stimulate the Nation's economy through additional employment and increase business for manufacturers of road building materials and equipment; strengthen national defense; it means less traffic congestion and safer travel. In July 1954, the President proposed a $50 billion contruction and modernization program for the Nation's highways. The plan is based on a system of properly articulated highways that is intended to help solve the problems of speedy, safe transcontinental travel and intercity communication, plus a financing proposal based on self-liquidation of each project where that is possible.

Dream of seaway to Atlantic Ocean realized

The dream of an all-water route from the Atlantic through the Great Lakes to the Midwest for most oceangoing ships was realized in the St. Lawrence seaway legislation. Increased expansion in commerce and trade will in all probability run into the billions. The seaway will bolster the line of communication in our national defense system. Cost of the project is to be financed by bonds which will be paid off by tolls.

The omnibus rivers and harbors and flood control bill authorized more than $1 billion for 105 navigation projects at an estimated cost of $319.2 million, 56 flood-control projects at $413.3 million, 22 beach-erosion-control projects at a cost of $14 million, and modifications for a variety of existing projects. Almost every area of the Nation is benefitted by the law.

The Republicans gave more impetus than ever before to the development of atomic energy for peacetime use by our people. The Congress passed legislation bringing the Atomic Energy Act of 1946 up to date for the common defense of free nations, for the promotion of peacetime uses, and to meet other realistic and fast-moving developments in the fields of nuclear energy. The act permits limited exchange with United States allies of information about atomic developments and authorizes and encourages atomic development by private industry. The Atomic Energy Commission is permitted to dispose of electric energy it produces in the course of its own operations, but not to produce electricity for commercial purposes unless authorized by Congress. Private industry will be permitted to use atomic reactors and related facilities under a licensing system. The Congress expressed its belief that atomic power at competitive and consequently lower cost could be reached more quickly if private enterprise were encouraged to participate. The AEC entered into an agreement with the Westinghouse Co. to develop and build an atomic powerplant near Pittsburgh. The Duquesne Light Co., a privately owned public utility serving the Pittsburgh area, was licensed to operate the atomic generating station, paying the Government for the atomic heat generated at the Westinghouse plant. The heat would be used to make electricity. The AEC also announced it was negotiating with a private utility in the South to furnish AEC with power. The AEC in turn would feed the power to TVA which is running short of electricity because of atomic demands. The AEC also entered into a contract with North American Aviation for an atomic power test plant near Los Angeles.

REPUBLICAN ACHIEVEMENTS BENEFIT WORKERS

Without fanfare and without the aid of a lot of new laws, the Republican administration set a record of substantial achievements benefiting workers throughout the Nation.

Foremost among these was the successful transition from a war to peace economy without serious effects on the workers. The picture for the first half of 1954 shows that after a slight dip in economic activity, prices were stabilized, industrial production raised above 125 percent of the 1947–49 base of 100, employment pushed to 62 million, and personal income headed for an annual total of $285.5 billion, over three-quarters of a billion better than the same period in 1953 which was the most prosperous year in American history. Extremes of inflation and deflation, most harmful to wage earners, were avoided by Government policies and activities.

Where employment difficulties arose, as in scattered pockets of labor surplus areas, the administration moved swiftly to meet them with a corrective program. The Labor Department gathered and analyzed data from 150 labor market areas, pinpointing those in need of aid. The Commerce Department set up a development division to aid depressed areas in locating new industries and launching new products. The Small Business Administration set up by the 83d Congress increased its loans to small business, helped small producers to bid on defense work, and pressed prime contractors to subcontract work to small firms. The Office of Defense Mobilization modified its manpower policies to help absorb unemployment and eased tax amortization procedures to aid firms in depressed areas. Special "set asides" in defense procurement were held open for firms having idle capacity and surplus labor.

Unemployment compensation reserve established

Congress strengthened the Federal-State system of unemployment compensation by providing for a $200 million reserve out of unemployment tax revenues and earmarking this reserve for loans to States. In addition, the excess tax revenues will be returned to the States to stimulate them to provide larger benefits. Since Republicans took office in January 1953, 25 States (19 with Republican administrations, 6 with Democratic) have increased their unemployment insurance benefits. These actions, supplemented by substantial tax cuts, price stability, and general stimulation of the economy, prevented these pockets of labor surplus from resulting in severe hardships to workers and communities or endangering a sound economy during the changeover from war to peace.

Making good on the Republican pledge to encourage an era of industrial peace, the President announced a policy of keeping the Government out of labor disputes and the administration moved to restore collective bargaining to full force and effect. It ended wage controls, releasing the backlog of negotiated wage increases blocked by Government regulations under the previous administration. The National Labor Relations Board speeded up its procedures for handling elections, settling labor disputes, and disposing of cases of unfair labor practices; while the Labor Department increased its disposition of wage violation cases under the Davis-Bacon Act.

Taft-Hartley Act changes stymied by Democratic votes

The Republican administration proposed and Congress carefully considered over a score of improvements in the Taft-Hartley Act which experience had indicated were fair and necessary, but Democrats in the Senate killed the legislation. By voting solidly to send the bill back to committee, Senate Democrats clearly labeled their action as political in order to discredit the law and to save the issue for another Democratic Party bid for the favor of labor leaders in future campaigns. Yet the law had been passed originally over President Truman's veto with Democratic support in both Houses, had not been repealed afterward by two Democratic-controlled Congresses, and has for more than 6 years successfully safeguarded the rights of union members against labor bosses and management alike.

Under the act strike losses to workers have been greatly reduced, collective bargaining strengthened, and the growth of labor unions stimulated. As late as last fall at its St. Louis convention, it was announced that the A. F. of L. had a million and a half more members than it had in 1952; while President Walter Reuther announced to the CIO convention in November that "The CIO * * * is at the strongest point in its history, both in respect to the size of our membership and our financial structure."

The administration aided labor in many other respects. A new clause was put into effect in all Government and defense contracts eliminating discriminations on account of race, religion, color, or national origin in the recruitment, employment, pay, training, and promotion of employees. The cost of living has been kept down and tax reductions amounting to more than $7.4 billion in 1954 practically amount to a raise in pay for all workers, with a large number of additional benefits going to workers in tax-revision legislation. Average hourly and weekly wages are again rising. Social security has been broadened and benefits increased. Congress enacted an expanded program of vocational rehabilitation which in 5 years will raise the number of disabled persons restored to self-supporting lives from the present 60,000 to 200,000 per year.

REPUBLICANS BOLSTER THE NATION'S FARM ECONOMY

In policy and action the 83d Congress and the Eisenhower administration fully recognized the importance of farmers and farming to the national welfare.

The agricultural progress record is impressive. Chief among the accomplishments was the slowing of the decline in farm prices—a decline that registered its greatest drop during the last 2 years of the Truman administration.

From February 1951 to January 1953, just before Republicans took control of the Government, the farm price average dropped 17 percent. Since then, there has been a further trend downward from the war and postwar price peaks, but the decline has been held to less than 8 percent.

The Congress and administration together have acted to strengthen the farm economy in the following ways:

1. Developed, with the cooperation of farmers, farm organization leaders, land-grant colleges, and others, a new farm price-support program keyed to peacetime conditions and directed toward assuring agriculture its rightful share of the national income while preserving the American farmer's traditional independence and initiative.

2. Reduced taxes and changed certain tax law provisions to make them more equitable to farmers.

3. Expanded both off-farm and on-farm grain storage, essential to the proper functioning of price-support operations.

4. Launched a large-scale farm-surplus disposal program in an effort to move some of the surplus into stomachs, instead of storage.

5. Provided far more than did the preceding Democratic Congress and administration for REA loan funds for extension of rural electrification and telephones.

6. Stepped up soil-, water-, and forest-conservation work.

7. Gave generous assistance to drought-stricken farmers and stockmen in the Southwestern States in the form of credit, low-cost feed, hay, and reduced rail rates.

8. Stabilized cattle prices by the purchase of 250 million pounds of beef in 1953 and programs to stimulate beef consumption.

9. Sent special trade missions abroad to explore possibilities of expanding United States agricultural trade.

10. Supported continued United States participation in a revised International Wheat Agreement with an average increase in price of 25 cents a bushel for wheat.

11. Intensified agricultural research and education activities.

12. Increased the 1954 national cotton-acreage allotment to 21.4 million acres, to alleviate hardship on many cotton farms that would have resulted from the 18-million-acre allotment,required under previous legislation.

13. Reorganized the Agriculture Department to effect better supervision, coordination, and review of farm problems and also established the National Agricultural Advisory Commission to advise the Secretary of Agriculture.

President Eisenhower and his Secretary of Agriculture carried out fully the President's assurances at the outset of his administration to support existing agricultural laws, including continuance through 1954 of price supports on basic commodities at 90 percent of parity. However, in transmitting to Congress on January 11, 1954, his recommendations for a new farm program, President Eisenhower observed:

"Present laws discourage increased consumption of wheat, corn, cotton, and vegetable oils, and encourage their excessive production. The huge and growing surpluses held by the Government act as a constant threat to normal markets for these products. Thus, present law produces results which in turn are hurtful to those whom the laws are intended to help. Partly because of these excessive stocks, farm income has fallen steadily over the past 3 years."

The President recommended flexible—in place of rigid—price supports for the basic commodities, with adjustment to the flexible program to be accomplished gradually in the interest of both the farmers and the Nation's economy as a whole. Congress responded with legislation adhering in principle to the flexible-support provisions of the bipartisan Agricultural Acts of 1948 and 1949, but which the Democratic 81st and 82d Congresses did not permit to take effect.

Under the new legislation, the Agricultural Act of 1954, mandatory price support for the 1955 crop of five basic commodities—wheat, corn, cotton, rice, and peanuts—will be within a range of 82½ to 90 percent of parity, depending upon the supply outlook for each commodity. Tobacco price support will be maintained at 90 percent of parity as long as marketing quotas are in effect.

Senator AIKEN, chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, said the minimum level of support for the basic commodities next year, in view of the supply situation, would be: tobacco, 90 percent; cotton, 90 percent; rice, 89 percent; corn, 90 percent; peanuts, 86 percent; and wheat, 82½ percent.

Nonbasic commodities for which price support is required are milk and butterfat and their products, at levels between 75 and 90 percent of parity necessary to assure adequate supplies; honey and tung nuts, at 60 to 90 percent of parity, and wool including mohair.

Price support for wool and mohair is designed to increase production. For wool, support is to be established at a level necessary to encourage production of 300 million pounds of shorn wool annually. For mohair, it is to be at the parity percentage necessary to obtain a desired level of yearly production.

The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized, but not required, to support other nonbasic commodities at variable levels.

The law also provides for a gradual transition after January 1, 1956, from the "old parity" to the "modernized parity" formula in computing parity prices for the basic commodities to which the "modernized parity" formula does not now apply.

Among other provisions in the Agricultural Act of 1954 are incentives for good and proper land use practices and the transfer of agricultural attachés in foreign countries from the State Department to the Deparment of Agriculture.

On the Rural Electrification Administration programs, the Republican record was considerably better than that of the Democrats in the preceding Congress. For the 2 fiscal years 1954 and 1955 the Republican 83d Congress approved total loan authorizations for the electric program, including contingency authorizations, of $350 million. The 82d Congress, under Democratic control, voted total loan authorizations for this program, including contingency authorizations, of only $275 million.

REA electric loans, in the first full fiscal year under the Republican administration ending June 30, 1954, totaled $167,104,100 compared with $164,972,662 for fiscal 1953.

The fiscal 1955 regular loan authorization for the REA telephone program of $75 million voted by the 83d Congress is the highest for any single year since the start of this program in 1950. The amount authorized for fiscal year 1954 for telephone loans, $67.5 million, was the second highest for any 1 year. Fiscal year 1954 telephone loans totaled $74,712,000, compared with $41,727,000 made by the Truman administration in fiscal 1953.

These figures make a mockery of the claim of critics that Republicans are unsympathetic to REA.

Two important agricultural conservation measures enacted by the 83d Congress were extension of the Water Facilities Act, heretofore applicable only to 17 Western States, to all of the United States, its Territories and Possessions, and the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act.

Both enable and encourage expansion of conservation and improved use of America's two greatest natural resources—soil and water.

Aids to farmers in tax laws

Tax laws enacted by the 83d Congress are of benefit to farmers and farm families in a number of ways. Under the tax revision law, farmers can claim a $600 dependency deduction for a child regardless of the child's earnings if such dependent is receiving on-the-farm training and the farmer continues to furnish more than half of his support.

The revision law also allows for farmers:

Deductions up to 25 percent of farm income for soil and water conservation expenses;

More rapid writeoff of the cost of new depreciable assets—farm machinery, equipment, etc. Under the declining balance method of depreciation now permitted, the farmer can write off in the first year twice the amount allowed under the straight-line method;

Removal of the tax on proceeds from sale of cattle when the sale is necessitated by disease, provided the proceeds are reinvested in cattle within 1 year after the close of the taxable year.

Previously where a farmer did not file a declaration of estimated tax by January 15, he had to file his final income-tax return by January 31. This deadline is now extended to February 15. Also, where a farmer files a declaration by January 15, his final return is now not due until April 15.

Farmers' accounting requirements are eased to permit the use of the farmer-preferred hybrid bookkeeping system.

Another Republican-passed tax law provides for rapid amortization of farm grain-storage facilities. Whereas before such facilities could be amortized only over their "useful life," this now can be done over a 5-year period. This provision was included in the Technical Changes Act of 1953 (P. L. 287, approved Aug. 15, 1953), which was reenacted by the tax-revision law.

REPUBLICANS SET NEW LANDMARKS IN CIVIL AND POLITICAL RIGHTS

The Republican Party has been traditionally the party of civil and political rights. In 1953–54 the frontier of progress in these basic rights moved forward.

The historic United States Supreme Court decision of May 17, 1954, outlawing segregation in the Nation's public elementary and high schools set another great landmark.

Under the Republican pledge to press for equality of rights of all citizens of every race, color, and creed, the Justice Department filed a brief and a Justice Department official appeared before the United States Supreme Court on December 8, 1953, to urge, in behalf of the Republican administration, that the Court find public school segregation to be in violation of the 14th amendment to the Constitution. The decision of the Court was unanimous.

Among the forthright actions taken by the administration since it took office in January 1953 was that of eliminating segregation in the Armed Forces. That action was coupled with the abolition of segregation in military post schools and among civilian employees in military and naval installations and in Federal civilian employment.

A Government Contract Committee has been established to promote equal job opportunities on all Government work done by private industries. This is a direct effort to prevent discrimination among employees of those industries engaged in Government work.

The Veterans' Administration was ordered to eliminate segregation in all veterans' hospitals as rapidly as possible without sacrificing medical considerations. That program is well on its way to fulfillment.

Various steps have been taken to eliminate segregation in the Nation's Capital. The Department of Justice argued successfully in the case of a restaurant before the Supreme Court with the result that all restaurants and public places in the District of Columbia are now open to all persons. Since the Supreme Court's May 17 decision, plans have been initiated by District of Columbia officials to bring segregation to an end in their schools, city playgrounds, institutions, and agencies.

Negroes receive important posts

Negroes have been given high political appointments in the Republic administration, including delegate to United Nations; legal counsel, Post Office Department; minority groups consultant, Labor Department; member, Caribbean Commission; Ambassador to Liberia; adviser and consultant, War Claims Commission; member, Federal Parole Board; Register, Treasury Department; adviser on business affairs, Commerce Department; Special Assistant to Commissioner of Public Housing on Racial Affairs; Advisory Committee on Government Housing Policies and Programs; member, International Development Advisory Board; assistant counsel, Foreign Operations Administration; Governor of Virgin Islands; Assistant Secretary, Labor Department; head of United States Educational Mission to Afghanistan; National Board of Field Advisers to Small Business Administration; member of Board of Foreign Scholarships; and in many other departments and agencies.

The 83d Congress passed legislation to remove certain restrictions against Indians and to give them more rights of American citizenship. Public Law 281 gives the Indians personal-property rights whereby they may sell or buy without permission of the Bureau of Indian Affairs. Public Law 280 provides that Indians can obtain the same rights as others in civil and criminal cases. Indians are also permitted to negotiate their own land leases.

The Federal Voting Assistance Act of 1954 makes it possible for members of the Armed Forces and civilians serving overseas to vote in national and State elections provided they are qualified voters in their respective States.

Solid Democratic Party opposition defeated the passage of a bill to give the vote to 18-year-old citizens.

Statehood for Hawaii was voted but blocked by Democratic Party tactics in the Senate tying statehood for Alaska in the same bill, despite the fact that Alaska and Hawaii present entirely different problems of statehood.

BETTER HEALTH, EDUCATION, WELFARE, AND SOCIAL SECURITY

To expedite and improve human welfare and social progress many agencies operating in these fields were drawn into a new Health, Education, and Welfare Department with Cabinet status. For the first time, all such problems are receiving systematic and comprehensive study instead of piecemeal consideration.

Education

Recognizing Federal responsibility in districts which are overcrowded because of Federal activities, the 83d Congress provided financial aid for school construction. Congress also continued to July 1, 1956, Federal aid in the maintenance and operation of schools in these areas. These funds will cover the expenses of about 1 million school children.

The Office of Education was authorized to contract and cooperate with universities, colleges, and State educational agencies for research, surveys, and demonstrations, and to establish a nine-member National Advisory Committee to aid in supervising educational problems. A $1 million fund was approved for allotment to States for conferences on educational problems preliminary to a White House conference scheduled for November 30, 1955.

Health

To safeguard the Nation's health the Hill-Burton Act was extended to 1957 and expanded for hosptal facilities for the aged, chronically ill, and phsyically disabled.

A broader program of vocational rehabilitation has been established to increase State financing and activities, and to encourage closer Federal-State-local cooperation. It includes the training of doctors, physical therapists, occupational therapists, rehabilitation counselors, psychologists, and social workers. Increased emphasis is placed on improvedment of rehabilitation techniques and special facilities such as community workshops, speech and hearing clinics, and initial staffing of such facilities.

Increased grants were made for research on cancer, heart, mental health, and arthritis. A new clinical center of the National Institutes of Health in Bethesda, Md., was opened with 500 beds to seek cures for such diseases.

As a health protective measure, Congress passed a law specifically giving the Food and Drug Administration power to inspect factories where pharmaceutical and food products are manufactured.

The Robert A. Taft Sanitary Engineering Center was opened for the purpose of research in the public sanitation field.

Social security

A social security act was passed bringing some 7 million more persons into the Federal retirement system and increasing the benefits of the 5 million already retired.

Under this act, social security beneficiaries now have the advantage of a much more liberalized program. They may now earn as much as $1,200 a year from covered work without loss of benefits. In addition, the new formula makes it possible for beneficiaries to earn more than $100 in any one month without losing all 12 months' benefits.

The age of beneficiaries for earning unlimited amounts without losing their benefits has been lowered from 75 to 72 years.

Those under the railroad retirement system have benefited by a change in the law which increases the benefits of some 36,000 an average of $24 a month, retroactive to October 30, 1951.

Welfare

As the new and expanded programs of vocational rehabilitation, hospitals for the chronically ill, and increased social security benefits go into effect, the need for other temporary forms of public assistance should decrease. Persons receiving such relief either are being returned to a productive life or are being cared for under the new programs which give them greater freedom as individuals.

AID TO VETERANS

This administration insisted that the human approach rather than the cold casework approach be made toward veterans and their problems. This resulted in a reorganization of the Veterans' Administration along functional lines, giving veterans and their dependents faster, better service at less overhead cost.

Among the more important specific benefits given to our veterans was the increase in compensation payments to those with service-connected disabilities as well as an increase in the monthly payments to widows and dependent parents of veterans. Non-service-connected disability pensions were also increased.

The 83d Congress extended to July 1, 1955, the act providing for Federal contributions of dependency allotments for more than 1 million enlisted personnel. Over 11,000 Korean war prisoners and soldiers missing in action were benefited for a period well beyond the truce by extension of the Missing Persons Act to July 1, 1955, providing for a continuance of pay checks and family allotments. Privileges of soldiers overseas to send home gifts duty-free and bring back their personal possessions free of duty were extended for another 2 years.

The Congress increased by $100 million the revolving fund to finance direct Veterans' Administration loans to war veterans unable to finance home and farmhouse loans through private lending sources.

Under the old-age and survivors insurance system, military personnel under certain circumstances are provided wage credits for active duty without payment to the OASI fund.

Congress simplified the handling of veterans' life insurance policies, giving better protection for the insured veteran as well as realizing savings of about $600,000 a year through less paperwork.

A law was passed which provides that all types of tuberculosis among veterans causing 10 percent disability within 3 years of discharge is presumed to be service-connected.

Korean War veterans were granted the same preferences as World War II veterans in war housing, in civil-service appointments, and in free postage service. Time has been extended for Korean veterans to initiate training under the GI bill of rights.

Funds for hospital beds largest ever voted

To take care of the ever-increasing load of hospitalized veterans and to provide them with adequate facilities, the Congress enacted the largest appropriation ever provided for a total of 114,415 beds, the highest number the VA feels it can use and staff properly.

Federal payments for each veteran cared for in a State soldiers' home have been increased.

Under appropriations passed all veterans' hospitals will continue to operate. Since January 1953, new veterans' hospitals have been opened at Birmingham, Ala; Syracuse, N. Y.; and Durham, N. C. Further, a portion of the new hospital at West Haven, Conn., providing 396 beds for tuberculosis cases, has been opened and the hospital at Indianapolis, Ind., has been converted to a tuberculosis hospital.

Construction was completed on hospitals at Chicago and Oklahoma City as well as at Minneapolis. New hospitals are being built and completed at Ann Arbor, Mich.; Brockton, Mass.; Chicago; Cincinnati; New York City; two at Pittsburgh; at St. Louis, Mo.; Salisbury, N. C.; and Los Angeles. Additions are being made to existing hospitals in Dallas and Houston, Tex., and conversion projects started on the hospitals at West Roxbury, Mass.; Dearborn, Mich.; and Jefferson Barracks, Mo. Additional hospitals are being planned for early construction at Cleveland; San Francisco; and Topeka, Kans.

REPUBLICAN ACTION ON THE COMMUNIST ISSUE

The Republican 83d Congress, acting in concert with the Eisenhower administration, was able to put the full weight of the Federal Government behind the effort to deal with communism as a domestic issue in the United States. Action has been vigorous and results tangible.

With the threat of Communist domination hanging over the entire world, Americans sometimes forget that for 20 years the Republicans—with the aid of those Democrats who had not surrendered to the New Deal—fought this battle. Never in control of the executive branch, and always a minority in the National Legislature—except during the 80th Congress—it was a ceaseless Republican effort that brought about the great exposures and forced through the first installments of remedial legislation. The breaking of the Alger Hiss case was a Republican achievement. So was the William Remington case. The revelation of the destruction of subversive records in the armed services was brough about by Republicans. When a journalist's beat revealed that there was a secret military directive permitting the commissioning of Communists in the Army, it was the Republica attack that forced the Truman administration to cancel the order. In the field of legislation it was the Republicans who passed the Taft-Hartley Act—with its non-Communist oath—over Truman's veto. What eventually became the Internal Security Act of 1950 was initiated by Republicans during the 80th Congress, and it was Republican determination that provided the pressure to pass the final act over the Truman veto.

With the installation of the Eisenhower administration, action on the Communist issue began at once. The Truman Loyalty Order (Executive Order 9835 of March 21, 1947) was revoked and on April 29, 1953, the President issued a new order completely reorganizing security procedures. The executive branch moved forward using existing law. The Congress pushed on with investigations of infiltration and simultaneously began the consideration of new laws.

A series of measures, passed by both Houses and sent to the President, strengthens the hand of the executive in combating the Communist conspiracy in this country.

These measures include:

1. S. 3706, which outlaws the Communist Party and provides for the determination of the identity of certain Communist-infiltrated organizations was passed with almost unanimous support of both parties in the House and Senate.

2. S. 16, which makes possible the granting of immunity to witnesses testifying before congressional committees. Under this measures subversives will no longer find an easy refuge in the fifth amendment. Furthermore, witnesses who otherwise might be perfectly willing to testify but who dread penalties, are now encouraged to give evidence that will throw additional light on the conspiracy.

3. H. R. 7486, which imposes heavier penalties for concealing persons from arrest. Only light penalties could be imposed upon the four Communists who concealed Robert Thompson in the Sierra Mountains for months before the FBI ran him to ground. Thompson was one of the 11 Communist leaders convicted in 1949 in the first Smith Act trial. Under the new measure much stiffer penalties can be imposed for harboring fugitives.

4. H. R. 8658, which imposes heavier penalties on bail jumpers. The genesis of this measure was the Gerhardt Eisler case. Eisler, a top Communist agent, escaped from New York on the Polish ship *Batory* after he had been indicted for passport violation.

5. H. R. 9909, known as the Alger Hiss bill. The measure denies a Government pension or retirement benefits to any Government employee convicted of a felony.

Still another measure, approved by the President July 29, 1954, amended the Internal Security Act by requiring that all printing presses owned or controlled by Communists must be registered with the Attorney General.

Meantime investigations were continued by congressional committees. The most sensational single revelation was the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee's disclosure of the circumstances surrounding Truman's promotion of Harry Dexter White from the Treasury to the International Monetary Fund. This promotion had been made in the face of repeated warnings from the FBI concerning White's subversive activities and associations. Among the more notable congressional documents was the same subcommittee's report, Interlocking Subversion in Government Departments, published July 30, 1953.

Proof that the exploration of the past is still a hot issue was shown by the fact that during the year 1953, no fewer than 305 witnesses before congressional committees invoked the 5th amendment. A substantial number would not answer questions about their past affiliations. During the 2d session of this 83d Congress, 27 recalcitrant witnesses before the House Un-American Activities Committee were cited for contempt of Congress; 5 such witnesses before the Senate Committee on Government Operations were cited.

While these efforts were being pursued in Congress, the executive branch was pressing action under already existing law. A new Division of Internal Security has been set up in the Justice Department, in charge of an Assistant Attorney General. This Division will have the handling of all court proceedings in matters affecting internal security.

Since January 1953, 50 high-ranking Communists have been convicted under the Smith Act, which provides drastic penalties for those advocating the overthrow of government by force and violence. During the same period—since January, 1953—three Communist leaders have been convicted of filing false affidavits under the non-Communist oath section of the Taft-Hartley Act. Four more are under indictment and are about to go to trial.

The Subversive Activities Control Board, operating under the provisions of the Internal Security Act, held lengthy hearings and finally issued an order requiring the Communist Party to register the names of its officers and members with the Attorney General. The Communists appealed the order and the decision of the United States Court of Appeals has yet to be announced. Meantime, after other hearings, the Board ordered the Labor Youth League to register as a Communist-front organization.

In addition to the various types of action enumerated above some 2,400 security risks were weeded out from Federal employment between January 1953 and June 30, 1954. As of August 16, 1954, 105 alien subversives had been deported since January 1953 and, in addition, 355 new deportation proceedings and warrants for arrest had been issued against alien subversives.

CLEANING UP THE MESS

The Republican Party, when it came into office in January 1953, inherited a mess. Members of the Truman administration had been convicted of fraud. The involvement of no less than 14 Government officials in instances of favoritism and influence had been exposed. Members of Truman's official family had accepted valuable gifts; mink-coat and deep-freeze scandals had disgusted the Nation. Hundreds of Federal employees had been caught trying to improve their private fortunes through their positions on the public payroll. Ten Federal agencies were entangled in shadowy manipulations.

There were 78 headlined scandals in the Agriculture Department, 48 in the Internal Revenue Bureau, 19 in the Defense Department, 10 in the RFC, 9 in the Justice Department, 5 in the Post Office Department.

Machinations of influence peddlers had spread through the land. Mixed up in the awarding of many Government loans and contracts were corrupt political bosses and underworld characters.

Pledge to oust crooks kept

In their 1952 platform, the Republicans pledged to put an end to corruption, to oust the crooks and grafters, and to restore honest government to the people.

That pledge is being kept. Under leadership intent upon exposing rather than covering up corruption, the Congress and the Executive are cooperating in providing the kind of government in which decent citizens can take pride.

The Internal Revenue Bureau is one Government agency which has felt the impact of this teamwork. Following the exposé of malpractice, unheeded by the Truman administration, a total of 388 revenue officials were separated and 60 convicted in the year 1953 alone. Even a former Commissioner, topman of the Bureau, Joseph D. Nunan, Jr., has been found guilty of cheating the Government of $91,000 on his own income taxes and sentenced to 5 years in prison.

By the end of 1953, Attorney General Brownell had referred 614 tax-evasion cases for prosecution, cases which had been hidden in desk drawers during the previous administration. Many of the tax cases involved tax exemption of racketeers who had made campaign contributions to Democrats. One such case resulted in a 5-year prison term for Frank Costello, infamous New York racketeer of the Truman era. Another was the case of the notorious underworld character, Frank Cammarata, whose income-tax delinquency was whitewashed by New Deal-Fair Deal officials for 8 years.

The Senate Banking Committee has uncovered enormous windfall profits under the Federal Housing Administration's construction program. Top Truman officials in the FHA, including Assistant Commissioner Clyde L. Powell and General Counsel Burton C. Bovard, have been fired.

Use of restricted information uncovered

The use of restricted information by Truman officials for financial gain has been uncovered. A high Agricultural Department official, Jack Cowart, accepted shares of stock in a company having dealings with the Department; Cowart has been found guilty of perjury in connection with this irregularity. Steps have been taken to strengthen the conflict-of-interests law, which is intended to prevent Federal officials from serving the interests of themselves and friends when their official responsibility is to serve the interests of the Government.

A searching inquiry by the Senate Agriculture Committee uncovered many irregularities in the Commodity Credit Corporation during the Truman administration. As of January 1, 1954, shortages involved some $11,310,000. The Republican administration, in its first few weeks in office, discovered in the CCC books some 70 shortages which occurred during New Deal-Fair Deal days.

E. Merl Young, of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, peddled influence; Young has been convicted of perjury. An investigation by a Senate committee disclosed that the RFC Board of Directors poured about $4 million into an obviously bankrupt firm; this is still under investigation. The RFC has been abolished.

Nine indicted in surplus ship deal

Nine individuals have been indicted in a crooked surplus ship deal.

The Senate Judiciary Committee found in the Office of Alien Property a number of employees who were on the subversive list. It also found irregularities. One alien businessman was found to have been drawing a salary of $97,000 a year from a defunct company.

The Republican administration exposed a cash-for-leave scheme which was operated in the previous administration. It was discovered that more than 50 employees of the Rent Stabilization Office had been fired for bookkeeping purposes as of a certain day, given cash for up to 90 days' accumulated leave, rehired the next day on a temporary basis, and 30 days later restored to the permanent payroll. Officials responsible in this case have been fired, and a change in the law now prevents such abuses.

Other abuses are being corrected. For example, Truman pardoned many criminals secretly, some of them members of the old Pendergast machine of Kansas City. Now, the Department of Justice makes public all pardons. As a matter of fact, all Federal pardons were made public until Franklin D. Roosevelt took office. Then the curtain of secrecy fell, not to be lifted until the Republicans came back into office.

Congressional investigations continue to turn up shocking cases of corruption and crookedness during preceding administrations. Thousands of pages of testimony have been placed in the official record. And the complete story has not yet been told.

REPUBLICANS REVERSE THE TREND TOWARD BIG GOVERNMENT—PRACTICE EFFICIENCY AND ECONOMY

Through reorganization of executive departments and agencies, reduction of Federal personnel, and large-scale paring of appropriations and expenditures, the 83d Congress and the Eisenhower administration made the Government more efficient and economical, cut down its size, and checked the New Deal-Fair Deal trend toward an all-powerful central Government.

These were the accomplishments:

In 1953 and 1954, the Congress, with the administration's cooperation, cut appropriations by many billions of dollars.

The new obligational authority voted for fiscal year 1954 was close to $20 billion below the amount ($80.2 billion) provided for fiscal year 1953. This was by far the largest peacetime decline in the level of appropriations in a single year in the history of the Government.

For fiscal year 1955 the Eisenhower administration's budget request was the lowest in years. Therefore, the appropriation reduction by Congress was considerably less than for the previous year. Budget requests submitted for the 10 regular annual appropriations for fiscal year 1955 were $44.2 billion and the actual amount appropriated was a little under $42.7 billion—a cut of about $1.5 billion. Substantial reductions also were made in two other large money bills, the fiscal 1955 foreign aid and the supplemental measures.

Also in concluding action on the regular annual appropriation bills for the new 1955 fiscal year which began this July 1, the Congress set a record for expeditious handling of these bills. This was only the second time since World War II that Congress finished work on the regular appropriations before the start of the new fiscal year. The first time occurred in the second session of the Republican 80th Congress in 1948.

Truman budget cut by more than $10 billion

The spending budget for the fiscal year 1954, proposed by Truman before he left office in January 1953, was reduced by more than $10 billion. Also, the Republican administration actually cut fiscal 1954 spending by more than $6½ billion under the amount spent in fiscal 1953.

As President Eisenhower remarked on July 22 this year in reporting on the administration's fiscal progress, "We have come over two-thirds of the way toward balancing the budget. As we have done this while putting into effect a tax program which will return nearly $7½ billion to the people." Truman's budget deficit for fiscal 1953 was $9.4 billion and he had forecast a deficit for fiscal year 1954 of $9.9 billion. The actual fiscal 1954 deficit was approximately $3 billion.

Over 200,000 taken off Government payroll

Well over 200,000 persons were removed from the Federal civilian payroll.

Congress approved all 12 of President Eisenhower's Government reorganization plans. These plans included creation of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and authorized departments and agencies to operate on a sounder, more businesslike basis.

Congress also established two commissions, the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government (called the Hoover Commission) and the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations.

The Hoover Commission has a mandate to survey all Federal functions and recommend changes to promote economy and efficiency, including abolition of any functions found no longer to be of value to the American people. The Intergovernmental Relations group is studying such problems as overlapping jurisdictions between Federal and State Governments, Federal grants-in-aid to States, and conflicts between Federal and State Governments over tax resources.

A Report of Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to insert the following address of the Honorable Edward F. Howrey, Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, which was made before the section of antitrust law of the American Bar Association on August 19, 1954:

A REPORT OF PROGRESS

(Address of Hon. Edward F. Howrey, Chairman, Federal Trade Commission, prepared for delivery before the section of antitrust law of the American Bar Association, Chicago, Ill., August 19, 1954)

During the 12 months since the last association meeting in Boston, I have completed my first year as Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission. I feel that the year has been one of progress. We have not accomplished all of our objectives, but we have taken measurable strides in what I consider to be the right direction.

Shortly after taking office I suggested a revaluation or reassessment of the Commission's responsibilities. Among other things I proposed a return to first principles, a program for increased compliance and enforcement, a full-fledged attack on delay—probably the worst enemy of administrative law, and a study of agency overlap and duplication of activity.

Let us review a few of the developments that have taken place with reference to these problems:

RETURN TO FIRST PRINCIPLES

In creating the Federal Trade Commission, the Congress had two principal ideas in mind: First, to create a body of experts competent to deal with complex competitive practices by reason of information, experience, and careful study of business and economic conditions; and, second, to authorize this body of experts to deal with unfair competitive methods in their incipient stages. The action was to be prophylactic; the purpose was prevention of diseased business conditions.

While the Sherman Act of 1890 constituted a substantial first step toward the alleviation of the deficiencies of private remedies in the antitrust field, there remained a general climate of doubt, particularly in Congress, that the Sherman Act and the judicial process provided the complete solution in an America emerging from an agricultural economy. It was believed that the administrative process—in the form of a trade commission—would be well suited to deal with the difficult problems of industries and markets, problems which Congress was unable to solve and which it considered too burdensome for the courts to solve without assistance.

In my first public statement as Chairman, made at Ann Arbor in June 1953, I called attention to the fact that critics of the Commission had maintained that it was not the body of experts Congress intended; that it had become instead a prosecuting agency employing laborious procedures and rigid interpretations without regard to the relationship of law, business economics, and public policy. I said that if this were true, that if an administrative tribunal of experts does nothing but promulgate per se doctrines, the rationale for its creation disappears. I urged that the Commission gear itself to the responsibilities originally contemplated by Congress.

Assuming that some of the criticism was justified, what have we done about it at the Commission?

1. First and foremost, the decisional work of the Commission is ample evidence, I believe, of a return to first principles. The Maico, Pillsbury, and Harley-Davidson decisions make clear that the Commission will examine relevant industry and market facts; that henceforth it will attempt to perform its intended function as a body of experts. The General Foods decision demonstrates that conclusive presumptions of injury do not constitute acceptable substitutes for fair evidentiary standards. The Lever Bros. decision provides reassurance that the Commission is looking to the impact and practical consequences of its enforcement measures. The Wildroot decision indicates that good faith consultation and cooperation can, in some cases at least, take the place of compulsory procedures. And the Doubleday and Eastman decisions show, I believe, that the Commission will take a good hard look at so-called peripheral test cases.

The Commission has, at the same time, been hard-hitting and effective where the circumstances required it, particularly the hard-core type of case. Since I have been Chairman, the Commission has issued 129 cease and desist orders—29 in the antimonopoly field and 100 in the deceptive practice field.

The magnitude of some of these orders is indicated by one cease and desist order that terminated a restraint of trade combination among 350 distributors of electronic equipment. Another involved the entire salmon industry of Alaska and brought to an end a long standing price-fixing combination among canners and fishermen unions. A number of orders to cease and desist were issued under section 3 of the Clayton Act; these required the discontinuation of exclusive dealing arrangements in the hearing aid, hog serum, and motorcycle industries. Numerous other orders prohibited false labeling of wool and fur products, false and misleading advertising of food plans, and misrepresentations with reference to sewing machines and other consumer appliances.

During the same period of time the Commission issued 141 complaints, 34 in antimonopoly cases and 107 in deceptive practice cases.

Illustrative of the antimonopoly complaints were those against members of the iron and steel scrap industry alleging restraint of trade in both domestic and foreign commerce; against price-fixing agreements among building material manufacturers and among paint and wallpaper dealers; and against unlawful price discrimination in the sale of petroleum gas used by farmers and rural residents for cooking and heating.

Complaints in the deceptive practice field ran the entire gamut of consumer goods, from food and drugs to clothing and home appliances.

Based on a comparison of fiscal years, I am told that the record of complaints issued during the past fiscal year has not been surpassed—at least in recent years. While I have no intention of running a statistical race against earlier commissions, and did not intend to compile this record until asked to do so a few weeks ago in order to prepare a statement for the House Small Business Committee, I cite it here to show that an administrative tribunal can have a sensible trade regulation program and still remain a strong law enforcement agency.

2. The economic and marketing work of the Commission is of primary concern if the administrative process is to furnish the broad factual base in the complex field of antitrust law that Congress originally intended. Almost every antitrust case presents economic and marketing problems. Legal procedures are employed, it is true, but primarily for the purpose of resolving relevant economic questions. For this reason, the Commission's Bureau of Economics has been and is being revitalized. Our economists are working closely with our investigators and trial lawyers. Primary emphasis is being placed upon those practices that have significance in the market place; that have or are likely to have some economic consequence.

Recently the Commission issued two economic reports, one on changes in concentration in manufacturing, and the other on coffee prices. Both are fair, honest, and objective studies. The coffee report is in my judgment one of the best economic studies ever published by a governmental agency.

3. On several occasions, I have taken the position that the Commission should not further extend the per se doctrine; that, except where the courts and Congress have directed otherwise, the Commission should determine competitive effects by examination, analysis and evaluation of relevant market facts.

If this view is to prevail, satisfactory answers to three very practical questions must be found:

(a) What are the relevant economic and marketing factors in the particular case?

(b) How can they be developed?

(c) How can they be presented in evidence without unduly burdening the record?

If a rule of reason approach is ever to receive general application, solutions to these questions must be forthcoming. In a recent talk before the American Marketing Association I attempted to furnish partial answers. My main purpose, however, was to stimulate the thinking of antitrust scholars and perhaps thereby stimulate legal and economic research on the overall problem.

4. Another key in our effort to effectuate a return to first principles lies in the improvements that have taken place in the factfinding and decisional work of the Commission and its hearing examiners.

On May 11, the Commission adopted the following program:

(a) The hearing examiner should issue findings and conclusions and his reasons therefor in every case, whether they be favorable or adverse to the allegations of the complaint. He should abandon formal and legalistic findings and adopt instead narrative and descriptive reports.

(b) The form and content of the order to cease and desist, which is part of the initial decision, should be improved.

The prohibitions of the order should deal with the specific issues and should be so clear that respondents will have no doubt as to what is expected of them. The exact practice found to be illegal should be expressly prohibited, as well as such other practices as may be necessary to assure adequate relief.

(c) Except in rare cases, the Commission, on review or appeal, should not issue new or separate findings.

Where the Commission disagrees with some of the findings in the initial decision, it is the purpose of an opinion to point that out, to explain why the Commission differs, and to order the findings modified accordingly. Since the Commission, under the statute, has the ultimate factfinding responsibility, the opinion should, of course, expressly adopt the findings and conclusions of the hearing examiner as modified.

(d) The Commission should write an opinion in every case.

It is my hope that as a result of this action future published decisions will not only constitute the authentic public record of what was done in a particular case but will also afford a collection of precedents by which its handling of future cases can be forecast. All of us know that fact-finding is the heart of the Commission's work. Narrative and descriptive reports will provide a long-needed degree of certainty in this complex field of the law.

5. The Commission has, I think, adopted the view that it should proceed against "hard-core," predatory violations of the antitrust laws and should forego cases of doubtful validity and questionable economic consequence. We feel we should not deplete our limited resources on fringe issues having no practical benefit. In this connection, we feel that the Sherman Act, the Federal Trade Commission Act and the Clayton Act, with its Robinson-Patman amendment, can be successfully administered as interrelated expressions of national antitrust policy—not as separate and conflicting statutes.

6. To assure a proper functioning of the Commission as a quasi-judicial agency, a number of steps have been taken to increase the authority of the hearing examiners who, as the triers of fact, are of key importance in the administrative process. In the Eastman Kodak case, for instance, the Commission ruled that examiners were qualified to entertain a preliminary motion to dismiss on the ground that the complaint failed the state a cause of action.

Presently the Commission is engaged in a comprehensive study of its rules of practice. On the basis of this study, it is fair to expect that the Commission will be able to revise its rules and thus to improve its administrative procedures. Such revisions will, I hope, include recommendations of the President's Conference on Administrative Procedure to increase the authority of hearing examiners. This will lend greater substance to the spirit and purpose of the Administrative Procedure Act.

I attempted to deal with some of these important considerations in my dissenting opinion in the Florida Citrus case. There the Commission held that the hearing examiner did not have the authority to entertain a motion to dismiss predicated on the contention that, inasmuch as the practices had been abandoned, there was no further public interest in the proceeding. My dissent stated that the jurisdictional issue of public interest should not be removed from the adjudicatory processes of the Commission and made a matter of administrative discretion. If the basic statutory issue of public interest can be removed from the hearing table and determined by the Commissioners, as plaintiffs instead of judges, upon the basis of information contained in secret files, so can any other issue.

As Chairman, I have attempted in every possible way to strengthen administrative law and procedure.

INCREASED COMPLIANCE AND ENFORCEMENT

Several steps have been taken to accelerate and make more effective the Commission's compliance and enforcement work. These include:

7. In November of 1953, we announced the appointment of members of the Commission's Advisory Committee on Cost Justification. The purpose of this committee, which consists of outstanding specialists in the field of distribution cost accounting, is to ascertain the feasibility of developing standards of proof and procedures for costing for adoption by the Commission as guides to businessmen desiring to comply with the Robinson-Patman Act. The work of this committee should result in a strengthening of the administration of the act and result in wider compliance with its provisions.

8. The investigative work of the Commission has been improved and expanded. All of the Commission's work, its successes and failures, depends primarily upon the facts which are developed by investigators in the field. The attorneys engaged in this work had received neither the recognition nor the support necessary for effective results. A number of steps have been taken to assure improvement, including the establishment of a separate Bureau of Investigation.

In addition to its usual case work, this bureau will, on occasion, make industry-wide investigations. Typical of these is the present nationwide investigation of the advertising claims of concerns selling health, accident and hospitalization insurance. This is the first investigation of its kind that has ever been conducted by a law enforcement agency. The public interest in this project, like the coffee study, is almost staggering.

9. In September of last year, a special staff committee was appointed to study the agency's procedures for obtaining compliance. On the basis of this committee's work, the Commission adopted in June a broad-scale compliance program. This will include, as a first step, a systematic and selective review of over 4,000 cease and desist orders, 8,000 stipulations and 2,000 trade practice rules. Other steps include:

(a) Closer coordination between the general investigative staff and the staffs primarily responsible for compliance with orders, stipulations and trade practice rules.

(b) More frequent use of procedures for requiring the filing of special follow-up reports "showing the manner and form of compliance with cease and desist orders."

(c) Use of a more informative letter of notification to respondents under orders and parties to stipulations concerning the action taken in receiving and filing their reports of compliance.

(d) A more effective program for enlisting the cooperation of industry members to effect industry-wide observance of trade practice rules.

On August 3, we appointed a task force to screen current national and regional advertising so as to determine whether advertisers are in compliance with outstanding orders, stipulations and trade practice rules. The task force is comprised of personnel with legal training. Previous advertising surveys were conducted by nonlegal personnel.

These measures will serve to stimulate compliance with existing orders. It is useless, it seems to me, for the Commission to enter orders unless it sees to it that they are obeyed either voluntarily or through appropriate enforcement proceedings against those who deliberately or willfully ignore them.

Failure to obtain compliance constitutes a waste of public money, has a demoralizing effect on competitors and members of the public who have been injured and tends to encourage a disregard of antitrust and trade regulation laws, oftentimes to the direct detriment of small businessmen trying to enter or remain in a highly competitive market.

10. On May 13 of this year, I indicated in a public statement that the Commission's trade practice conference rules would, in appropriate instances, be backed up by investigations and formal action. On that date I announced the Commission's plan to effectuate a cooperative program designed to bring about prompt compliance with the rules in the cosmetics industry. In the future, one of the purposes of the trade practice rules will be to ferret out and pinpoint the willful violator.

11. To expedite compliance in formal cases, the Commission adopted in May a new rule of practice permitting a more extensive use of consent orders. This new rule was recommended for the primary purpose of reducing expense and delay. The new rule—

(a) Eliminates the previous requirement that consent settlements contain findings of fact.

(b) Permits disposition of a case by consent at any stage of the proceeding.

(c) Allows settlement of a case as to some or all of the issues or as to some or all of the respondents.

(d) Authorizes hearing examiners to accept or reject stipulations containing proposed consent orders, with acceptance subject to Commission review and with rejection subject to appeal to the Commission.

Under the new rule, the only admission required of respondents is that of jurisdiction. Respondents must agree, however, that the complaint may be used in construing the terms of the order; that the order shall have the same force and effect as if entered after a full hearing, and that the order may be modified or set aside in the same manner as other orders. The rule further provides for the respondents to waive the entry of findings of fact and conclusions of law, as well as further procedural steps before the hearing examiner or the Commission, and also their right to contest in the courts the validity of the order.

12. On December 11, 1953, the Commission adopted a policy to provide fuller protection of the public against unfair and deceptive practices through increased cooperation with officials of State governments. Under this policy, the Commission will regularly refer to State authorities matters it closes for lack of the jurisdictional prerequisite of interstate commerce.

13. The consultative function of the Commission has not in recent years received sufficient emphasis. Before the enactment of the Federal Trade Commission Act, both political parties, the Congress and the President, envisaged a trade commission which would, as part of the administrative process, provide solutions to many complex competitive problems through consultation. It is my hope that the new Bureau of Consultation, which was established on July 1, will revitalize this intended program. The new Bureau includes, in addition to the Divisions of Trade Practice Conferences and Stipulations, a Division of Small Business. The establishment of the latter Division was considered important in order to make the facilities of the Commission readily accessible to small-business concerns. Among other things, the Division will advise small-business men with respect to laws administered by the Commission, explain to them the method by which complaints are initiated, inform them of the status of investigations in which they are interested, and otherwise expedite small-business matters through the Commission.

DELAY

14. One of the most significant events during my term as chairman was the recent reorganization of the Commission. Its significance depends in no small measure upon the frequent criticism, valid in my view, that the Commission's operations and procedures over the years have been marked by endless delays.

Shortly after I took office, I stated that every effort would be made to eliminate such delays. The reorganization, based as it is upon an objective survey by an outside firm of management consultants, is designed to achieve this end. Measures have now been placed in effect to eliminate more than 50 percent of the procedural steps formerly taken within the Commission in the internal processing of its work.

The new organization of the Commission represents a major change in both concept and structure. By contrast, it is much simpler than the old organization and should promote more economical use of manpower. With well selected personnel in key positions, the organization should develop a high level of administrative efficiency, enabling the Commission to fulfill its responsibilities with greater dispatch and less cost.

All investigative activities will be centered in a newly formed Bureau of Investigation, all trial work in a new Bureau of Litigation, and voluntary compliance procedures in a Bureau of Consultation. Thus the Commission will no longer enjoy the luxury of two separate trial and investigative staffs. The integrated staffs should prove more economical and, I am confident, will provide the basis for a more effective administration of our antimonopoly and trade regulation statutes.

Probably one of the greatest causes of delay in the past was the fact that responsibility for a case was not centered in any particular individual. Responsibility was reassigned to conform to various stages of the development of a case, with no one attorney remaining continuously responsible. To correct this shortcoming, and also to furnish a smooth coordination of trial and investigative activities in keeping with the principles outlined by the first Hoover Commission, provision has been made for the appointment of project attorneys in the Bureau of Investigation. These attorneys will supervise a case through its entire course and will be responsible for any unnecessary delay.

We envisaged the project attorney as being analogous to the solicitor in the British practice. The solicitor is responsible to his client through all phases of a case, although he may, from time to time bring into the case additional assistance in the form of economists, accountants, barristers and the like. Like the solicitor, the work of the project attorney will not cease with the conclusion of the investigation; he will accompany the case into the litigation stage and assist the trial attorney with respect to the facts. It is my feeling that, if delay is to be eliminated, this feature of the reorganization will be more helpful than any other.

15. One of the most important accomplishments in our effort to eliminate delay has been the reduction in the backlog of cases pending before the Commission for decision. It has been the custom, at the first of each month, for the Secretary to report at the conference table the cases which have rested on individual Commissioners' desks for 30 days or more.

In the period since early 1953, with Commissioner Mead acting as whip and with the cooperation of all the Commissioners, we have reduced by almost five times the number of cases pending more than 30 days. I am especially proud of this fact.

The Commission has also become more expeditious in disposing of informal matters brought before it by the staff. The backlog of recommendations for complaints, for example, has been reduced by more than 10 times—until at the present time this work is virtually current.

OVERLAPPING ACTIVITIES

16. Some mention should be made of the steps taken to improve the relationships existing between the Commission and other agencies of the Government. I have long deplored instances of overlapping and conflicting activities. It is inconceivable to me that there is justification for noncumulative remedies being sought by more than one agency against the same person, at the same time, for the same thing.

I am especially grateful for the fine arrangement that we have with Stanley N. Barnes, of the Department of Justice. We discuss matters of mutual concern at frequent intervals, and I am strongly convinced that the great volume of our work is in no way inconsistent.

In the field of food, drug, and cosmetics we have been able to work with Secretary Hobby a very promising interagency agreement designed to correlate the work of the Commission and the Food and Drug Administration in such a way as to eliminate overlapping activities and duplication of effort. This agreement has been in effect since July 1.

Similar liaison arrangements, although less formal, have been made with other agencies, including the Bureau of Standards, the Post Office Department, and the Patent Office.

These are some of the events that have taken place in recent months at the Commission. I hope you will agree that they have been constructive and in the public interest.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Printing and binding for Congress, when recommended to be done by the Committee on Printing of either House, shall be so recommended in a report containing an approximate estimate of the cost thereof, together with a statement from the Public Printer of estimated approximate cost of work previously ordered by Congress within the fiscal year (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 145, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on Printing, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the Record.

ctor's
fice

PRR

Congressional Record

United States of America

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 83^{d} CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 100 WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, AUGUST 24, 1954 No. 164

Appendix

NOTICE

The last issue of the daily Congressional Record for the second session of the Eighty-third Congress will be published not later than Friday, September 10, 1954. Pursuant to the 10-day limitation provided by the House and Senate in their resolutions, copy and proofs of speeches withheld for revision, or extensions of remarks as authorized by either House, shall be placed in the hands of the Public Printer not later than Wednesday, September 1, 1954. An issue of the daily Record of that date will be published.

By order of the Joint Committee on Printing.

WILLIAM E. JENNER, Chairman.

The Magnificent Achievements of the Eisenhower Administration and the Republican 83d Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. HALLECK

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I offer the text of a speech delivered by me before the Delaware Republican State convention at Dover, Del., on August 18, 1954, entitled "The Magnificent Achievements of the Eisenhower Administration and the Republican 83d Congress":

Less than 2 years ago, free Americans called upon the Republican Party to take over the reins of our Federal Government.

These free Americans gave us a task of awesome magnitude to perform, but it was an assignment we accepted willingly, in a spirit of devotion to the Nation's welfare.

We began our labors at a critical time in history, with the peoples of all liberty-loving nations beseeching us for leadership on the international scene.

WHAT OUR CITIZENS WANTED

On the domestic front, our own citizenry, discontented, disillusioned and dismayed by the trend of national affairs, looked to the Republican Party to restore sound, consistent, forward-looking policies at the Federal level of government.

Here in your own great State, the story is reflected in the solid gain made by the Republican Party in 1952.

The folks of Delaware were just as fed up as were folks elsewhere, from coast to coast and border to border.

They wanted an end to the frustrating, stalemated war in Korea.

They wanted thrift and efficiency in the operation of the Federal household.

They wanted relief from the mounting burden of taxation.

They wanted the assurance of loyalty to American ideals among those holding positions of public trust.

They wanted freedom from bureaucratic restriction and regimentation.

They wanted protection for the dollar they earned.

They wanted government by law—with fair, decent administration of the law.

I submit that, while these desires presented a challenge worthy of any political leadership, they were really not too much to ask.

At any rate, this is essentially the assignment we undertook and I want to talk to you today about how well we have performed in that mission.

The job has not been easy. No one expected it would be.

When I first came to the Congress in 1935, the country was facing serious problems.

I said then, and I meant it, that if those who had the responsibility of leadership could come up with the right answers to our difficulties, I would support the administration then in power even though it might mean the extinction of the party I represented.

Finding the right answers to the difficult problems that beset us today is still far more important than mere party considerations.

Certainly, every loyal American should want this present administration to succeed in its efforts to bring us through the dangerous and trying times which lie ahead.

Certainly every citizen who voted for President Eisenhower in 1952 has an obligation to help him carry out his great program for the security and well-being of the Nation.

REPUBLICAN MAJORITIES VITAL

While much has already been accomplished in the first 2 years of President Eisenhower's leadership, election of solid Republican majorities in the House and Senate is vital to a continuation of policies which have brought sound government back to the Federal scene.

You know, the Democrats want the country to believe they'd do a better job of supporting the President's program if we'd just let them take over the Congress.

Right now, they're trying desperately to ride two horses going in opposite directions.

Because our program is a good one they are trying to create the impression they're all for it.

But, too often of late, when the chips were down—when the time came to stand up and be counted—our friends on the other side of the aisle failed to deliver, may I say, with suspiciously partisan unanimity.

The strategy has been just a bit obvious: block key features of the administration's program and create false issues for the coming campaign.

Well, my friends, that piece of strategy hasn't worked and it isn't going to.

We have come to the end of the Republican 83d Congress, and an accounting of our stewardship is now in order.

It is time now to measure the stature of Republican leadership with the yardstick of accomplishment.

THE REPUBLICAN RECORD OF ACHIEVEMENT

It is time now to evaluate the record of achievement made by a Republican Congress and a Republican administration since January 1953.

As a member of the Congress of the United States privileged to serve the great House of Representatives as majority leader, I am proud to set down what we have done.

The record we have made stands as a monument to Republican principles of Government.

It is a record that has inspired the American people with new hope and confidence in the future of this Nation.

It is a record that justifies the public faith which led to the election of Dwight D. Eisenhower as President and to the election of a Republican Congress in November 1952.

Our people have come to associate the Republican Party with peace.

Weary with war and the threat of war, Americans turned to Dwight Eisenhower in their search of an end to the grinding conflict in Korea.

KOREAN TRUCE

Today the guns of death are silent, thanks to the initiative, resourcefulness, and courage of a Republican leadership which gave top priority to the task of forging a Korean truce.

No leadership could have acted with greater dispatch and resolute purpose to extricate this Nation from an intolerable situation.

With a foreign policy that is firm, consistent and realistic, we are moving with confidence through the troubled waters of international dissension and distrust toward the safe harbor of a just and lasting peace for all mankind.

STRENGTHENING OUR DEFENSE

To guard against whatever storms or difficulties may arise along our course, your Republican leadership has worked diligently and with unprecedented success to strengthen the military and economic security of our Nation.

Careful planning and sound management, together with a new concept of strategy in the Department of Defense, have given this country greater armed might at far less cost.

We have brought much nedeed balance into the picture—balance between the needs of our Armed Forces and the needs of our domestic economy; balance between the branches of the military services themselves; and balance between the needs of our defensive structure at home and our obligations within the framework of the mutual-security organization we have helped to build.

We have revised and strengthened the program of mutual security assistance, placing heavy emphasis on military aid to friendly nations. As a result, approximately 80 percent of funds appropriated will be earmarked for that purpose.

We have bolstered the Nation's airpower by providing for the maintenance of 143 combat wings, and have assured continuing leadership of high quality for this branch of the armed services by establishing an Air Force Academy.

BUILDING A PROSPEROUS ECONOMY

Mindful that the military arm of any nation can be no stronger than the economic body which supports it, Republican leadership has taken steps to insure the continuing growth and vigor of America's dynamic productivity.

Working together, a Republican administration and a Republican Congress have restored fiscal responsibility to the Federal operation.

The magnitude of the budgetary job faced by Republican leadership in January of 1953 was staggering.

The national debt had grown to a size beyond the comprehension of the human imagination.

A philosophy that spending was the panacea for the Nation's ills had resulted in ever-increasing budgets, mounting taxation, and devastaing inflation.

In addition to a public debt that was pushing the ceiling set by law, Republican leadership found, after assuming office, that it had inherited $81 billion in charge accounts, for which no provisions had been made to pay.

It is no exaggeration to say that persons then in charge of Federal operations had all but lost control of the spending process.

We have regained that control under the Republican leadership.

We have checked the momentum of an inherited spending backlog, and we have brought long overdue relief to the American taxpayer.

SUBSTANTIAL BUDGET CUTS

Spending proposals found on the books at the beginning of the Republican 83d Congress were reduced during the first year of operation by some $10 billion.

At the end of two sessions of the Congress, we have achieved cutbacks of approximately $12 billion.

Because of this determined and continuing effort to economize, the Republican 83d Congress has been able to enact the largest tax-saving program in the history of the Republic.

Let me emphasize this fact: No Congress in history has ever voted a tax-saving program of the size and justice voted by the Republican 83d Congress.

For two decades—with the single exception of 2 years during the Republican 80th Congress—taxes against the earnings of our people spiraled upwards. Waste and excessive spending went hand in hand with oppressive taxation. This is always the case.

TAX CUTS: $7.4 BILLION

Today, however, the annual tax bill for the American people is $7,400,000,000 less than it was less than 18 short months ago.

This is monumental achievement.

It may be rightly said that, in many respects, this has been a taxpayers' Congress.

Personal income tax rates are 10 percent lower; excise tax rates are 50 percent less in most cases; the excess profits tax is dead; our retired school teachers, firemen and police, working mothers, the disabled and the handicapped, investors in production and jobs for wage earners are all reaping the benefits of this wise legislation.

We have accomplished extensive revision of the Internal Revenue Code, correcting literally hundreds of unfair provisions which had developed through the years.

This was a project long overdue. It took a Republican Congress to bring millions of citizens deserving relief from hardship resulting because of inequities in the law.

Percentage-wise, a lion's share of the tax savings involved will go to individuals. Much of the burden of making up Federal revenues lost by enactment of the tax revision bill will henceforth be carried by our larger business enterprises, the 52 percent corporation tax having been extended.

CONTROLS ENDED

Not only have we eased the burden of taxation on individuals and on business, but we have broken the chains of needless bureaucratic regimentation and restriction which for too many years hampered Americans in all walks of life.

Stifling controls are a thing of the past.

No longer are Federal price czars picking the pockets of the American producer and consumer; no bureaucratic bosses are counting out the weekly pay checks of the American wage earner.

INFLATION HALTED

Moreover, thanks to sound Government management principles and practices, inflation has been stopped in its tracks and faith in the value of the American dollar has been restored.

To millions of senior citizens living on fixed incomes from pensions, annuities, or life savings, this accomplishment of Republican stewardship puts an end to the nightmare of a rising cost of decent living standards.

HIGHWAY CONSTRUCTION EXPANDED

The problem of deteriorating highways had been too long neglected.

The Republican 83d Congress has taken a major step toward the solution of that problem with enactment of one of the finest highway programs ever to emerge from the national legislature.

For the next 2 years, nearly a billion dollars will be provided annually, and for the first time in history, virtually 100 percent of the tax money collected on gasoline and oil sales will be returned to the States for road-building purposes.

We have put an end to the unjustified diversion of such funds for other purposes—diversion which in the past has amounted to as much as 40 percent of such revenue.

Equally important, the Highway Act returns to States, counties, and municipalities much of the control over the types of roads they can build—control which had been wrested from local governments by a power-hungry Federal bureaucracy.

Now, for the first time, funds available for a type of road construction in certain areas may be used to build highways in keeping with the needs of the regions served.

HOMEOWNERSHIP STIMULATED

Good housing in decent surroundings is the hallmark of a solid citizenry.

The Republican 83d Congress has responded to the almost universal desire of American families to own their own homes by enactng legislation designed to help our people see such dreams come true.

And just let me emphasize: This measure has been designed to function within the traditional concepts of our competitve enterprise system.

At the same time, provision is made to tackle the ever-present problem of slum clearance, encouraging replacement of these menaces in health and morality with dwellings worthy of human dignity.

AN IMPROVED ATOMIC ENERGY PROGRAM

Before the end of his first year in office, President Eisenhower inspired the free world with his courageous and far-sighted plan for a global atomic energy agency to promote the use of fissonable material in peaceful pursuits for all mankind.

Failure of the Soviet Union to accept this proposal in good faith has exposed the Kremlin's so-called "peace" offensive for what it is—a patent phoney.

Meanwhile, the Congress is taking historic action in the field of atomic energy legislation with the first major revision of the basic Atomic Energy Act of 1946.

Again reflecting the Republican Party's belief in the dynamic potential of our traditional American system of competitive enterprise, provision has been made for development of atomic power harnessed to constructive purposes through the cooperation of Government and private initiative.

Looking to a future of vitually unlimited possibilities in the atomic age, the Republican 83d Congress has devised adequate safeguards against the growth of monopoly, either Federal or private, in this field of undreamed wonders for the service of humanity.

ST. LAWRENCE WATERWAY

The needs of an expanding American economy led the Republican 83d Congress to enact significant legislation which will bring to reality a project of long years standing—the St. Lawrence seaway.

Changing circumstances, as well as the elimination of frills and oether objectionable features from original development plans, were important factors leading to adoption of this proposal as a joint effort with our great neighbor to the north—Canada.

FOREIGN TRADE

Extension of the Reciprocal Trade Act and a $1.3 billion farm surplus disposal program abroad reflect Republican determination to promote a healthy flow of international trade, while making available to deserving nations in need of food a part of America's abundance.

At the same time, we have eliminated many complexities of foreign commerce with a comprehensive Customs Simplification Act to facilitate and encourage foreign trade.

Meanwhile, a realistic appraisal of changing situations on the foreign economic front is going forward, taking into consideration the self-interest of this Nation and the necessity for solving the complex problems of world trade.

FARM PROGRAM IMPROVED

Not the least important of our constructive actions has been the revision of our farm program to fit the needs of a dynamic and expanding agriculture.

Advent of a Republican administration was marked by a concerted study to find out what kind of agriculture program the farmers themselves want and to give them a greater voice in the administration of the farm credit system.

Better living for thousands of American farm families is assured by a stepped-up Republican program of loan authorizations for rural electrification and rural telephone systems with the latter nearly doubled in size beyond that of the last year under the Truman administration.

We have faced the issue of mounting surpluses with courage but with proper concern for the economic welfare of our farm population.

Contending with obvious weaknesses which had developed in the former program, the Republican administration and the Republican 83d Congress have moved to insure agriculture its fair share of the national income during the difficult period of transition from the abnormal demands of a wartime economy to the requirements for food and fibre on the part of a nation at peace with the world.

Implementing this farsighted program of graduality, the Congress has responded immediately to needs for extensive storage, for additional borrowing power by the Commodity Credit Corporation, and for adequate relief funds for rural areas visited by disasters of nature over which man has no control.

Because of many actions taken by the Republican 83d Congress, America will be a better land in which to live.

SOCIAL SECURITY BROADENED

We have covered a broad area of forward-looking social legislation reflecting sound Republican principles through the preservation of a great system of free enterprise which has already brought this Nation to the highest living standards among the peoples of the world.

We have broadened the program of old-age and survivors insurance, bringing some 6 million more earners under the plan. Expanded benefits and liberalized provisions will make it possible for millions upon millions of citizens in retirement to enjoy a greater sense of security than ever before. With the enactment of this Republican legislation, the retired, the widowed mother, and the dependent child will henceforth receive more generous allowances, in keeping with the needs of the times.

RAILROAD RETIREMENT ACT AMENDED

This session has seen enactment of amendments to the Railroad Retirement Act which liberalize retirement and unemployment benefits to railroad workers and their dependent survivors.

Henceforth widows, dependent widowers and dependent parents of covered workers can qualify for benefits at age 60 instead of 65; dependent children, permanently and totally disabled before the age of 18, and their mothers, will continue to receive survivor benefits beyond the present cut-off age; maximum daily unemployment benefits are increased from $7.50 to $8.50 and disabled workers drawing retirement benefits are now allowed to earn $100 monthly from outside sources without losing their annuities.

HEALTH SAFEGUARDED

As the session progressed, the Congress considered and approved important measures in the fields of health and education.

Facing up to the facts of our Ameriacn society—that our population is aging and that science has succeeded in conquering many of the infectious diseases with new drugs, your Republican Congress authorized substantial expenditures so that our older citizens will receive adequate medical care and attention.

A 3-year health and hospital program providing $182 million for the construction of diagnostic centers, hospitals for the chronically ill, as well as rehabilitation and nursing homes, has been enacted into law.

A $2 million fund has been provided for surveys by State health authorities to determine the needs in the field of health. New research weapons will be made available to continue the assault against the Nation's major killers—cancer, heart ailments and other disorders of the brain and nervous system. For this, the Republican 83d Congress voted the greatest amount of money our researchers in these fields have ever had available.

EDUCATION RESEARCH FOSTERED

The basis for a three-pronged attack on the problem of how we can best provide better educational advantages for our children has been established through legislative action.

Bills reflecting the President's general pattern of procedure on this front would provide for close cooperation between Federal and State Governments, as well as drawing upon the experience and resources of higher institutions of learning.

Properly utilized, this program will coordinate our research to determine regional needs, thus avoiding duplication of effort and diffusion of our resources in approaching the job of meeting the requirements of an increasing population of youngsters.

DISPLACED PERSONS AIDED

Mindful of the hardships imposed upon unfortunate peoples abroad displaced in the aftermath of wars, this Nation, under Republican leadership, has implemented its foreign policy with legislation to admit 214,000 above-quota persons under strictest security regulations.

DESERVING VETERANS BENEFITED

Rights of the men and women who served this country during the Korean conflict have been safeguarded with an extension of benefits.

At the same time we have recognized the needs of disabled veterans with a program of increased benefits to them, to childless widows and to dependent parents in the best tradition of a nation's sense of responsibility to those who deserve our gratitude and who need our assistance.

When the American people called upon Republican leadership to take over the management of this vast Federal operation, they expected that thrift and efficiency would replace careless waste and needless duplication.

Their confidence was not misplaced.

The housekeeping job has been magnificent.

FEDERAL OPERATIONS STREAMLINED

Fourteen reorganization plans have been instituted in the Departments of the Executive branch designed to eliminate unnecessary jobs, streamline and improve service, and avoid overlapping of functions.

These reorganization plans include establishment of a new Department of Health, Education and Welfare with Cabinet status.

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION CREATED

This Republican administration's solicitude for the small business people of the Nation and their problems is reflected in the creation of the Small Business Administration as an independent agency of the Federal Government.

Records made by the Post Office Department, the Department of Defense and the General Services Administration are typical of the good that has been accomplished in doing a better job at less cost to the taxpayer.

Simple economies and sound management procedures have resulted in savings of approximately $150 million during the last 12 months in the General Services Administration alone.

In the far-flung activities of the Department of Defense, savings amounting to billions have been achieved in a year and a half through more efficient utilization of manpower, standardization of procurement and other intelligent business practices at the administration level.

GOVERNMENT PAYROLLS CUT

Nearly a quarter of a million jobs have been abolished or consolidated by executive departments, thereby adding millions more in dollars to the amounts saved through better Federal management.

At the same time, loyal civil servants have received welcome assurance that they will be treated fairly and decently in the pursuit of their Government careers.

Dignity, equity, and standards based on merit have been restored to the civil-service system, replacing the phony and cynical program of employment and advancement based on political favoritism which blossomed under the Truman regime.

INTERNAL SECURITY TIGHTENED

The administration and the Congress, under Republican leadership, have cooperated in a diligent and rewarding effort to root out the disloyal and the incompetent from Federal payrolls.

As a result of persistent investigation, some 2,400 persons found to be security risks have left Government employment, thereby restoring the confidence of the American people that secrets vital to the security of our country will not fall into enemy hands through the treachery of spies and traitors or their potential tools.

Adding the Department of Justice in a tightened program of security, the Congress has moved to provide new and devastating legal weapons against those who would betray America.

By these actions, we have swept away a Communist web over Washington, and have made certain that agents of a foreign philosophy, or their sympathizers, will never be able to weave another.

There is no doubt about where this administration stands on the issue of communism.

Vigorous prosecution by the Department of Justice has resulted in the conviction of 50 Communist Party leaders on charges of conspiring against the United States Government. Twenty-two more are scheduled for trial or are now on trial.

Almost 100 additional organizations have been declared subversive in character.

Orders to deport 268 aliens with records of Red activity have been issued by a Republican Attorney General.

A housecleaning among United States employees in the United Nations is nearing completion. That housecleaning, instituted under Republican leadership, has received the praise of a Federal grand jury which compared the situation today to that which we found when Republicans took office.

Congressional hearings, in the face of continued complaints and criticism from questionable sources, have been pressed resolutely. Under a Republican administration, the country is assured such investigations will continue as long as evidence of need exists.

COMMISSIONS ESTABLISHED

The ground work for a continuing program of increased efficiency and economy in the Federal Government has been laid by the establishment of commissions to study intergovernmental relations and to study complex Government activities as they relate to private business.

We have made positive moves toward getting the Federal Government out of competition with business, selling the Mississippi Barge lines, providing for disposal of 13 synthetic rubber plants and curtailing or liquidating numerous other Government activities properly the province of private enterprise.

STATUS OF SUBMERGED LANDS CLARIFIED

Passage of the submerged lands legislation has ended long confusion over legal issues involved in the development of resources and has reaffirmed the constitutional rights of States to lands within their traditional boundaries while safeguarding the interests of the Federal Government in tideland areas.

Such activity on the part of the administration and the Congress stems from a deep-seated conviction that much of what the Federal Government has been taking unto itself in recent years can be done better and cheaper by State and local governments or by private enterprise.

We are determined to get big Government off the backs of the people as much as possible.

By our record, we have demonstrated a willingness to meet those obligations which are properly Federal in character, while turning back to local and State levels those duties and responsibilities which can best be handled in that manner.

I know of no other way to stem the tide of a growing Federal power which endangered the very freedoms we seek to protect.

I know of no surer way to strengthen the sinews of the system of self-government and competitive enterprise to which the Republican Party is dedicated.

These major accomplishments are on the record books.

The significance of what we have achieved in two short years goes far beyond the immediate benefits already evident.

PUBLIC'S FAITH RESTORED

We know that the conduct of Republicans in high office has restored faith in their leadership.

We know that the sound and far-sighted policies under which the Federal household is now being managed have stimulated confidence on the part of business.

We see evidence that solid and substantial progress has been made toward the establishment of a true prosperity based not on the forced-draft demands of feverish preparation for war, but on the peacetime needs of a dynamic and expanding nation which seeks only to work out its own great destiny in harmony with the world.

The Republican 83d Congress is adjourning.

We have forged a splendid program of administrative and legislative progress since January of 1953.

Working as a highly effective team, a Republican administration and a Republican Congress have strengthened our defenses against potential enemies, both from within and from without. We have improved the economy, providing safeguards against dangerous inflation, and stimulation for the healthy expansion of business and industry, thereby promoting higher standards of living for the American people.

In short, we have restored good government to the national scene, bringing to life a program dedicated to a secure and prosperous future for our country.

THE JOB AHEAD

But more work lies ahead for the Republican Party.

Continuation of this magnificent program, which every loyal American should want to see fulfilled, depends upon the election of another Republican Congress in November.

The heavy spenders, the high-tax advocates, the wild-eyed radicals with their socialistic schemes, the Communist coddlers, and the power-hungry paternalists are waiting in the wings, eager to regain control.

This must not happen.

President Dwight D. Eisenhower needs and deserves the help of another Republican Congress to work with him during the last half of his first term of office.

Election of a Congress unsympathetic to the policies and principles of a Republican administration could well wreck the magnificent gains we have made.

We must make absolutely certain that the American people know and appreciate the great record that already has been written.

It is up to the Republican Party to spell out that record.

Realizing our accomplishments and achievements of the first 2 years of Republican leadership, I am confident that the American people will, in overwhelming numbers, give to the Republican Party their renewed vote of confidence in the congressional elections of 1954.

Insurance of American Exports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Need for the Insurance of American Exports," by the Honorable Claude Pepper, former Senator from Florida. This article appeared in the May 1953 edition of Tradescope, published by the Foreign Trade Society of the School of Business and Civic Administration of the City College of New York.

Senator Pepper, while he was a Member of this body, was one of the chief sponsors of legislation which would have provided for a system of export insurance to facilitate the granting of sound credit terms to foreign customers of the United States. This legislation, the counterpart of which, S. 849, is now pending in the Senate, would help small American manufacturers with little or no foreign-trade experience or contacts, would enable American exporters to compete with European firms which are backed by foreign-export-credit insurance and provide additional sources of financing to the small exporter. This export insurance program would not be a special privilege to small business, but is intended to enable small-independent exporters to compete on a fair basis with larger firms.

It is my judgment that Senator Pepper's views on this important subject should receive serious attention by the Congress.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEED FOR THE INSURANCE OF AMERICAN EXPORTS

(By the Honorable Claude Pepper, former Senator from Florida)

In the 79th Congress I was appointed chairman of the Subcommittee on Foreign Trade of the Senate Committee on Small Business. While I was chairman of that subcommittee I had an opportunity to study very carefully the desirability and practicality of Government insurance of private American exports. As a result of these studies I introduced in the Senate a bill, S. 2180, which was widely circulated and discussed by a great number of exporters and bankers and their trade associations. That bill was reintroduced in the 80th Congress as S. 414. A subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency of the United States Senate held a hearing on this in March 1947, but the Congress failed to take action on it. Identical bills were introduced in the 81st Congress and 82d Congress, and, more recently, Senator JAMES E. MURRAY, Democrat, of Montana, introduced S. 849 on February 10, 1953.

This proposed Export Insurance Act would facilitate through a system of insurance, the granting of sound credit terms to foreign customers of the United States. There is no subsidy involved. The Export-Import Bank, through a Foreign Trade Insurance Division of the Bank, created under the bill, would have authority to insure an exporter, particularly small and medium sized firms, against the risk of nonpayment by a foreign customer because of foreign government prohibitions against payment in dollars. In such cases insurance could be issued up to 100 percent of the amount then due. In other instances, such as risk of insolvency or default on the part of the buyer, exporters could be insured up to 90 percent of the amount due. Only loans on sales for the usual sound terms would be made.

Under the bill, the bank would issue capital stock on $100 million subscribed to by the United States. Funds from such sales would finance the operations of the Foreign Trade Insurance Division of the bank.

It is intended that the Federal Government only put up the original capital. The Government will not have to put up anything else—administrative expenses and any losses would be paid out of the premiums derived from the insurance.

The Export-Import Bank today does write a form of insurance for exports through its so-called take-out agreements, a form of financing without recourse to the American exporter. Generally speaking, this type of arrangement is now available only to large exporters of capital goods.

There is nothing in the bill which discriminates against big business. The benefits of this type of insurance would be made to the entire American community. For the bill is designed to stimulate the maintenance of American exports at a high level in which both large and small businessmen will be able to participate, but in particular it will help to insure that small business will participate.

The bill is patterned mainly on the Government insurance systems now in successful operation in Great Britain and Canada. Sixteen countries have had some form of government export insurance before World War II, with the British system going back as far as 1926.

As I stated before, the bill covers the risk of insolvency or default on the part of a foreign buyer, with coverage limited to 90 percent of the contract price. The insured exporter under the bill would retain substantial interest in the completion of the transaction by the buyer. It may be expected, therefore, that in many lines of export where the customary profit margin is high, the coverage would be limited to 75 percent or perhaps 80 percent of the selling price, roughly the out-of-pocket costs of exports, but not his profit margin.

The second risk covered is the imposition by the foreign government of an exchange bloc or restriction which prevents the foreign buyer from transferring funds for the payment of his purchase. This does not mean that an exporter knowing of an exchange bloc in the country of his purchaser could sell him in the face of that knowledge, because the bank would not insure the transaction in the face of such a known situation. This latter type of situation should be minimized by the successful operation of the International Stabilization Fund.

One hundred million dollars worth of capital would permit the issuance of insurance up to perhaps $500 million of exports. This figure is based upon the ratio shown by the experience of the Canadian system, in which the ratio of actual exports insured to the money made available by the Canadian Government export activities was about 5 to 1.

Under the bill, in all probability the premium rate of such insurance would be about 1 percent; the rate of course, would vary according to the various types of sales, with a range from about three-eighths of 1 percent to about 1½ percent.

The proposed bill would permit the issuance of several types of policies in accordance with the special needs of different kinds of business. In a business with a normal turnover of the commodity in 30 to 60 days, the Division could write a blanket policy covering the exporter's annual business to a number of countries on credit terms of 30 to 60 days and he would not have to apply with respect to sales made in accordance with the exporter's established past practice. On the other hand, transactions which require individual specialized negotiations would require separate policies. However, a prime objective of the bill is to reduce the writing of policies to be as automatic and actuarial as possible.

Under the bill the bank would be required to maintain representatives in the major export business centers to advise and assist exporters on the policies and practices of the bank. The bill further provides for the establishment of a trade advisory committee. The purpose of both of these provisions is to assure that the bank understands and reflects the full needs of exporters and carries out its policy accordingly. It is expected that these advisers would be stationed in the regional offices of the Commerce Department and no new offices of the bank would be required.

In my judgment, at least four important classes of exporters would benefit from the Government insurance proposal for exports. First, a large number of small manufacturers now have greatly expanded their plant capacity. Only a few of these, in capital goods generally, have export experience and contacts. This is particularly true in the field of machinery and metal fabrication. Second, the insurance program could be made available to cover general commodities exports sold on 90 to 120 day terms and thus enable American exporters to compete on a better basis with the credit terms of European firms who are backed by government export credit insurance. Third, the small exporter who has a potential market which he cannot realize because of inadequate financial resources will be one of the chief beneficiaries of export insurance. Possession of an insurance policy should make available to him additional financing by banks on his export paper, and thus permit him to expand his business without necessitating an increase in his own capital. Fourth, many American exporters must establish contacts and channels for business. This can be done under a liberal insurance program.

It is interesting to note that according to a study made by the Federal Reserve Board, approximately one-half of export financing, and probably over one-half of the financing of small traders supplied by member banks of the Reserve System during the pre-war period, was in the form of purchase or discount of, or advances against, drafts drawn on foreign buyers or banks. Many of these member banks believe that export insurance would increase their interest in this business. These banks financed over $800 million of exports in 1938 and also collection drafts on foreign buyers or banks on shipments worth over $300 million in 1938. While this same proportion may hold, the return of foreign competition may affect us greatly. Yet in competing in a foreign field we all realize that we cannot fall back to the level of our exports during the 1930's.

In normal times, there are two principal methods to finance exports—discounts or advances against drafts drawn by American exporters on foreign buyers and banks—under which the American exporters bear the credit risk. Under the second method, the exporter draws a draft on the American bank, which that bank accepts, and the foreign buyer arranges for a letter of credit through his own bank—insurance would not cover the American bank risk—on nonreimbursement by the foreign bank at maturity. About one-half of our financing in 1938 was via the first method. Thus insurance in 1938 would have greatly affected American bank export credit policies.

Export insurance should have a tremendout effect on an exporter's potential business volume. One of his chief liquid assets is foreign accounts receivable. But American banks, which exist on financing with recourse to the exporter, in effect, ignore the collateral value of this asset and look only to the exporters own capital and credit standing. With government insurance backing, the value of these accounts receivable as loan collateral would no longer be ignored.

The small exporter whose capital will not permit him under sound business to carry more than $10,000 worth of foreign accounts receivable at any one time may get a policy which, for example, covers 80 percent of $10,000, enabling him to carry a risk of only $2,000. Thus such an exporter can afford to increase his exports five times and his insurance of foreign accounts receivable to $50,000, still carrying a risk of only 20 percent of that amount, or $10,000, which is no more than what he was risking when he was selling only one-fifth as much. Furthermore, the cost of such financing is very moderate—usually about 1 percent.

Let me point out the following considerations. The system is an entirely voluntary one. No one need apply for or obtain Government insurance of his exports unless he believes that he will benefit by doing so. The system will operate without subsidy to the policy holder and without charge to the taxpayer. The premium charge will be based on the risk involved and estimated on actuarial and other valid criteria and net operating expenses. Premium income of the system should be the amount required for payment of claims and net administrative expenses.

The types of policies issued would reflect the requirements and special characteristics of various classes of export business, from the general commodities or consumer goods field with credit terms not usually extended beyond 3 to 6 months to capital goods with credit terms which may run from 6 months to 3 years or more, and each sale of which is usually a nonrecurrent specialized negotiation.

Premium rates on a given policy are generally confidential between the exporter and the Government agency, and vary with each policy, depending upon the exporter's past loss experience, type of goods sold, credit terms, countries covered, and other relevant circumstances.

There is another factor which must be considered in relation to this export insurance program. The very crux of the American free-enterprise system has been the tremendous growth of concentrated economic power in the United States which has led to a situation where in every major industry a few firms dominate the business.

Independent businesses exist only if corporation giants permit them to do so.

Experience should teach us a lesson. From 1940 to 1942, 16 percent of our small business concerns were forced out of business. There is no question that something has to be done about that trend. This is particularly true in the field of our foreign exports. Experience in past years shows that an overwhelming preponderance of our foreign exports go to American big business. An export insurance program is not special privilege for small business. It would balance the scales to enable independent exporters to compete fairly with larger firms.

Manpower Utilization in Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. DODD

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 19, 1954

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the Appendix of the RECORD the digest of a remarkable survey on the manpower problems of a whole nation. I have reference to the recent report by Dr. Eli Ginzberg, professor of economics at Columbia University's Graduate School of Business on Manpower Utilization in Israel, sponsored by the United States Technical Cooperation Administration in concert with the Israel Government.

This document is remarkable because it is the first of its kind. As one who has recently returned from Europe, where I have observed European reactions to some of the assistance we have rendered as a nation, I welcome this example as a forerunner of the kind of practical assistance which a democracy like ours can and should be providing for democracies like Israel in applying new areas of knowledge to universal problems.

The Ginzberg report is a pioneer's report, marking the first time a foreign government has utilized the scientific tools and practical techniques developed by the National Manpower Council at Columbia for looking at an entire economy from a comprehensive manpower point of view. And I should like to point out that the National Manpower Council, of which Dr. Ginzberg is also research director, was in turn made possible by a grant from the Ford Foundation which had the imagination to open new vistas of scientific inquiry into human resources an area no less important than material resources. Indeed, General Eisenhower, as president of Columbia, foresaw such international application as this when he initiated a major manpower research project there 4 years ago even before the later creation of the National Manpower Council helped make Columbia a

national center of the basic manpower research.

The report which follows is a condensation of Dr. Ginzberg's findings based on his work in Israel as a special TCA consultant:

MANPOWER UTILIZATION IN ISRAEL

INTRODUCTION

There is no country in the world that cannot raise the level of its economic accomplishment through an improved utilization of its manpower resources. Important as are other resources, such as valuable land, large deposits of minerals and stands of timber, the economic strength of a nation depends in the first instance on the quality of its human resources.

* * * * *

Because of the central importance of the human resources factor in determining the rate of economic progress, and because of the limitations of other economic factors in Israel, the continued neglect of manpower policy would prove costly, if not disastrous. The shaping of manpower policy in Israel will be beset by obstacles unique to the country. For some years past and probably for some years to come, Israel will be a deficit economy; it will continue to consume more than it will be able to produce although it is hoped that the amount of the deficit can be progressively decreased until it is finally eliminated through increased production and exports. If Israel is to become economically viable in the foreseeable future, every effort must be made to close the gap between production and consumption. Effective manpower policy must therefore be set within the realities of the governmental budget and of the Nation's total economic capabilities.

* * * * *

In the recommendations that follow, emphasis has been placed on the specifics of manpower policy in the different sectors of the economy; this will be followed by an effort to extract the major principles that have relevance for the whole.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Agriculture

There is general agreement that insufficient manpower is a significant limiting factor in the output of agricultural produce, particularly in the older and well established kibbutzim. For the most part, these organizations have the other resources required to expand their production (with the possible limitation of housing)—available land, water, equipment and technical skill. The apparently available manpower represented by the new immigrants is not actually available. There are barriers to the absorption of new immigrants within the established kibbutzim and resistence to accepting this kind of life among the immigrants themselves.

* * * * *

It is therefore recommended that the Israel Government act to inform the public of the relevant facts and the urgent necessity for remedial action in this sphere and, after the assurance of public support, challenge the kibbutzim to develop suitable solutions to the difficulties that now stand in the way of increased employment and increased output. In pressing for satisfactory solutions, the Israel Government should indicate to the kibbutzim that in the national interest it will make use of the various instruments of control available to it—the granting of import licenses for new machinery, the granting of various forms of credit, the leasing of land in the Negev—to insure the desired results.

* * * * *

The following actions should be initiated to reduce the turnover losses and to increase the incentives to farm settlement particularly in the establishment of Moshavin.

(a) The timing of settlement should be more closely adjusted to the availability of water and the other essentials upon which a successful agriculture depends.

* * * * *

(b) Since many of the new settlers come from urban backgrounds and have ingrained urban ways, their negative reactions to farm life can be reduced by selective programs which bring something of the city to the farm communities. Consideration should be given to the rather large gains that could be accomplished at small cost through the institution of movie programs, traveling musicians, a library on wheels, and related social and recreational services. This would help to reduce the feelings of extreme isolation which are paramount during the formative period of settlement.

* * * * *

Industry

Manpower policy for industry has the same general objective as manpower policy for agriculture—to provide greater opportunity for the productive employment of larger numbers of the population. However, there are significant differences between the way in which industry can accomplish its objectives and the methods which agriculture must use. The future economic viability of Israel will depend to a very considerable degree on the success which its industry has in exporting a substantial part of its production. Since there are very few natural advantages for Israel industry, it is faced with serious difficulties in trying to enter and maintain a position in the markets of the world. During the recent past, one unfortunate consequence of the stringencies in hard currency has been the inability of Israeli manufacturers to secure a continuing and reliable supply of essential raw materials.

* * * * *

It is therefore recommended that the Isreal Government take steps to insure that those sectors of industry which give fair promise of developing a successful export trade be afforded the opportunity to secure adequate amounts of raw materials to provide for a sufficiently high level of operations which alone can insure reasonable labor costs and reasonable selling prices.

* * * * *

It is recommended that certain funds in the development budget be redirected from long-range projects in favor of overcoming specific obstacles that stand in the way of specified industry competing successfully in the export market.

For a considerable period of time many concerns or industries may remain close to but not actually in an internationally competitive position. Since there is a dearth of opportunities for the productive employment of the working population, it would be sound economic policy to provide some type of small subsidies to expanding industries especially on an interim basis, rather than to risk the collapse of the entire effort.

* * * * *

Management

With the exception of the public utility sector and a relative few other sectors, Israel industry is very young. One consequence of this is that there are few experienced persons in business management. Closely related to this is a shortage of staff personnel on which top management customarily relies—production engineers, comptrollers, market analysts, and the array of other modern business specialists. The stimulation of inflation and the protective environment surrounding Israel industry resulted in its developing a strong profit position during the past several years. This fact helped to obscure the essential weakness of its management structure.

There are no easy or quick ways of strengthening the existing management structure. * * * However, the Israel Government can contribute through the following actions.

(a) It is recommended that the Israel Government set an example in those sectors of the economy in which it has direct responsibility by selecting key personnel as carefully as possible and by providing the other essential conditions for effective management.

* * * * *

(b) In allocating funds for starting or expanding important enterprises, the Israel Government should make more liberal allowances than hitherto for the managerial and technical personnel who come from abroad and who can contribute to the efficiency of the initial operations of a plant. This will represent a further drain on limited hard curencies but a realistic accounting would indicate that the contributions of competent specialists will many times exceed the costs of their hire. * * *

(c) Together with appropriate business organizations, the Israel Government should explore the possibility of developing in the key industrial centers of the country, particularly in Haifa and Tel Aviv, one or more groups of industrial and business consulting staffs whose services in such fields as production engineering, cost accounting and industrial psychology, would be available to interested concerns on a part-time and partially subsidized basis.

* * * * *

It is recommended that the Israel Government stimulate and encourage efforts to bring into Israel under contracts of at least 2 years' duration competent foremen, particularly from countries where the scale of enterprise and the type of problems bear some resemblance to those of Israel. Although again this will represent a drain on hard currency, the numbers involved need not be large and the investment can therefore be kept within narrow limits.

* * * * *

Government

Every approach to the problem of governmental personnel in Israel must start from two simple facts. First, because the state has been in existence for only a few years it has great need for a considerable amount of the nation's best talent. Secondly, because of political, military, and economic problems of pressing urgency, the Israel Government is constantly involved in decision making of paramount importance for the present and the future. Hence, competence in government is a desideratum without parallel.

It is noteworthy that many competent persons have left the Government during the past few years. Although some turnover was inevitable, especially during the first years of the Government's existence, the resignations appear disproportionate, particularly because many of those who left would have been willing to remain in government service if the conditions had been more conducive to constructive work and satisfactory living.

With respect to working conditions for those in government service it is recommended that the Israel Government move as rapidly as possible to a clarification of the responsibilities of the ministers and their political assistants, and of the duties, rights, and privileges of the permanent administrative corps of civil servants.

* * * * *

It is recommended that the Israel Government provide for a senior civil-servant adistrator within each of the ministries who will not be subject to reassignment with every change in Government.

* * * * *

Consultants

Because the conditions of work in Government service are unattractive to many of the ablest people in the country, and since it is unlikely that the Government will be able to remedy all of these difficulties very rapidly, careful consideration should be given the following proposals.

It is recommended that the Government intensify the efforts which it has already started to invite key persons outside of the Government to participate on part-time assignments as members of important committees or commissions, as consultants to Ministries and other governmental agencies. Furthermore, it should expand its efforts to utilize on a temporary basis persons outside of the Government who have special competence and particularly those who have had prior governmental experience for the performance of special missions.

* * * * *

Military

The State of Israel was secured by victory on the battlefield and its survival depends in the first instance upon an efficient system of security. There is much to admire in the past accomplishments and present efficiency of the Israel Army and from many points of view it is not surprising that the army has been the darling of the public.

It is important to remember that the army predates the state and, further, that it has many young men in its top administrative group unhampered by tradition or institutional practices which have played so large a part in determining the contours of the civil government. Moreover, all armies, including the Israel Army, have a certain affinity for formal organization and administration. For these several reasons, the army has been called upon to undertake a large number of functions that were not directly connected with its military responsibilities.

Again, like all armies, the Israel Army desired to develop an organization that was as nearly self-sufficient as possible. Self-sufficiency is an expensive aim for any army in a period of partial mobilization, and it is particularly expensive in a small country with a weak economy. * * *

It is recommended therefore that the Government of Israel explore all the situations where it might be possible to integrate military and civilian services and operations without endangering the efficiency of the security forces with the aim of securing economies in the use of manpower and equipment.

* * * * *

Career Officers

In periods of peace and partial mobilization most armies are confronted with the serious problem of the resignation of many able officers and noncommissioned officers. Since the officers in top echelon of the Israel Army are very young, the problem is even more pressing in Israel. It is very expensive for the Army to train to a high order of competence some of its most promising officers only to have them leave the Army when their training would begin to pay off. Since the civilian government has a shortage of trained administrators, it would be well to explore whether any possibility exists of retaining these men on governmental service.

* * * * *

POLICY GUIDELINES

The full report included additional recommendations on the following subjects: the importance of establishing administrative farms using day labor; more careful control over visiting experts as well as over Israelis studying abroad; the importance of raising government salaries; adjustments in current military manpower policy relative to the reserves; the utilization of women; and the use of army units for agricultural work; an improved strategy for professional and scientific manpower training including greater coordination among the Hebrew University, Haifa Technion and the Weizman Institute; and adjustments in vocational training and in the utilization of immigrant's skills.

The above recommendations for the improvement of the utilization of manpower in Israel are more than individual and discrete comments about a large number of unrelated sectors of the economy. Underlying these many recommendations are a series of policy implications which together establish a framework for a manpower policy. These are the major policy guidelines:

1. Although the government is taking many actions to improve the utilization of manpower the assistance of various groups and public support in general is required to implement them. In a democracy, manpower policy is not only the concern of government and of the interest groups, but must involve the understanding and participation of the public. In a democracy the success of manpower policy depends to a very large extent on the individual citizen. Even where compulsion is used, as in the military sector, success depends on the understanding and determination of each citizen-soldier to serve his country rather than on his fear of punishment for malperformance. * * *

2. Because public participation is the sine qua non of an effective manpower policy in a democracy, it is of paramount importance for the leaders of opinion, governmental and nongovernmental, to present the relevant facts to the people so that they can understand the challenges which face the Nation and their responsibilities for successful solutions * * *.

3. Of course the public cannot always be completely informed about all matters, for certain disclosures would weaken the Nation's security. Israel's tenuous security position gives added weight to this consideration. However, the leadership should not withhold a host of relevant information from the public under the guise of security considerations because it fears the consequences of public scrutiny and criticism * * *.

4. The present is always limited by the past. However, future progress depends in large measure on the extent to which the present generation can emancipate itself from the past and determine upon new and better ways to solve new and challenging problems. A democratic government cannot simply eradicate the major institutions of the past, even though some of them are a drag on current productivity and future progress. However, a virile Government must be willing and able to challenge those institutions which are retarding progress. The fact that the Government of Israel is young and that many institutions in the country are very much older and in certain respects stronger adds emphasis to the need for a constant critical review of the inheritance of the past.

5. During the past 5 years, the people of Israel have had truly overwhelming problems. By dint of their own exertions and with external help they have succeeded in meeting and overcoming major challenges to their security and welfare. This experience, superimposed on the accomplishments of an earlier period, has encouraged the leadership to formulate large-scale plans. Much of Israel's strength resides in this approach. But it also implies weakness, particularly in the realm of manpower. To make a large number of relatively small improvements in training and performance, year in and year out, can lead to a significant increase in total productivity. This increase would be larger than could be accomplished by grandiose projects of uncertain development. In Israel there is so far relatively little understanding of the importance of cumulative small improvements. Yet these present a major opportunity for Israel to improve its chances of becoming economically viable in the near future.

6. Stress on quality has been conspicuously absent during the past decade of Israel's experience. This is true of almost every level of economic activity. However, Israel's industry and agriculture, if they are to be internationally competitive, must strive for even higher standards. * * *

7. During the past years, Israel has improved the knowledge and competence of its managerial group in the most expensive of all possible ways—by permitting them to learn through experience. If time and money were of no concern this could conceivably continue. But since both are of great importance, Israel must use every possible device to reduce the expenses and to shorten the time required for its managerial group to achieve the competence necessary to provide the leadership for an efficient economy. * * *

8. Although it is impossible to exaggerate the importance of managerial competence in the effective utilization of manpower in Israel, consideration must also be given to the system of incentives and penalties imbedded in the economy and society which has such a pronounced influence on the willingness of people to work and to work efficiently. Many practices of an earlier day which represented social gains when they were introduced today constitue a danger. Although they will not be easy to change or eliminate the attempt must be made, for many of yesterday's gains can be tomorrow's liabilities.

9. For a host of reasons, Israel has been preoccupied with the accomplishment of material improvements in agriculture, industry, and the services, and has devoted only a small amount of attention to improving the quality of its human potential. The fact that Israel has so few natural advantages may help to explain why it has concentrated on material accomplishments. But this has been a serious error in policy: Israel's major potential is its people. This is the one resource that it can improve significantly through its own efforts. Moreover, it is only through an improvement in its effective human resources that it can ever hope to solve its pressing economic problems and provide a sound base for a stable society.

CONCLUSIONS

In order to implement the foregoing recommendations it will be necessary to establish within the Government of Israel an agency charged with the determination of manpower policy. It is therefore recommended that there be established in the Office of the Prime Minister a manpower policy council composed of the following elements:

(a) The Ministers of Defense, Treasury, Labor, and Education.

(b) An Advisory Council composed of distinguished individuals in various sectors of Israel life who will be able to contribute to the formulation of effective policy. These individuals are to speak for themselves and not for organized groups.

(c) A small permanent Secretariat that will be able to call upon all governmental agencies and nongovernmental agencies for assistance in preparing background information and other data for the deliberations of the Council.

An effective manpower policy requires an organ whose major responsibility includes the following:

(a) To elicit the urgent manpower problems of the country and evaluate them.

(b) To recommend action to the appropriate bodies after careful consideration of the known facts and evaluation of alternative solutions.

In its deliberations, a body charged with manpower policy should always bear in mind the following facts:

(a) That discrete manpower policies, to be effective, must be subjected to the test of basic democratic values.

(b) That manpower policy must be closely integrated with general economic policy and with the overall goals of the society.

Israel's economic planning must be focused on the achievement of viability, which implies the reduction and eventual elimination of her large deficit of foreign exchange. The intelligent and constructive use of her manpower resources is a necessary condition for the accomplishment of this major economic objective. But it is more. For Israel's future depends on her people.

ELI GINZBERG,
Consultant.

The Upper Colorado River Storage and Development Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL

OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 16, 1954

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, as the 2d session of the 83d Congress draws to a close, I must confess that at times during the session I have been somewhat irritated and angered by the activities of some of my colleagues, especially those from the southern part of the great State of California. It has been impossible to thumb through the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD during these last months without finding some article, either in the body of the RECORD or inserted in its Appendix, which is unjustly critical of the upper Colorado River storage and development project, especially as to the Echo Park Dam unit which, after all, is but one related single entity of the overall development program. A great number of these insertions have been without foundation or fact.

For over a quarter of a century I not only have had knowledge of, but I have also been called upon to take part in the controversy between the upper basin and the lower basin over the waters of the Colorado River. At this time I would question the motives of the vociferous Members of the vanguard operating for the well oiled and carefully prepared propaganda barrage of the lower basin. I hate to see the presently proposed necessary and vital program of the upper basin of the Colorado River kicked hither and yon for political personal gain by ambitious politicians. Also, I hate to see this well developed and rational program undercut and destroyed by the union of forces from areas which must profit because of its failure.

I have gone from day to day, week to week, and month to month during this session without attempting to make answer to this floodtide of commentary by lower-basin representatives. I have had neither the time nor the resources to furnish to my colleagues factual information which is available to answer these screaming tirades of the low landers. I have no trained lobbyists, no well-heeled specialized groups grinding out propaganda for my use. I must rely upon the advice of able men of my own State, most of whom are all too busy with necessary personal activities other than the controversy between the lower and upper basins of the Colorado River. I must depend to a great extent upon the practical suggestions of my country cousins, who have acquired a wealth of information about the Colorado River by living on and with it for many years, but who also are limited in the time which they can give to the solution of its problems. I must also put credence in the findings of the Bureau of Reclamation, which has spent years of study on the problems and questions arising out of the controversy along this great river. If and when the the Bureau representatives and those working with them make mistakes—and for that matter all men and groups of men do sometimes make mistakes—then I must learn of such mistakes the hard way, for I have no battery of trained engineers and specialists at my disposal. Nevertheless, I have a determination, not only to find out the facts which are involved in all matters pertaining to the upper Colorado River storage and development program, but also to see to it, as far as possible, that my colleagues in Congress have access to such facts in order that they, themselves, may base their final decisions upon the facts and not upon prejudices and emotional appeals.

Water, it is wisely said, in the West as well as elsewhere, is the life blood of our very existence. It is especially true that it may not be wasted in the West. The volume of usable water determines the limits of all facets of civilization. What happens to the last waterhole determines the life and death of the area involved. This is a most serious game of life. It is well that all who are interested know all of the rules and all of the facts surrounding the game.

We of the upper Colorado Basin are painfully aware that we are now and always have been in the great minority. We have no great metropolitan areas. Neither do we have great centers of industrialization. Inequitable and unfair conflicts; that is, the overly strong antagonist against the less strong, are not popular in this country of ours. The deserving underdog usually can depend upon obtaining public sympathy by the very need of his case. I hope that this truism will hold for the interests of the upper basin area of the Colorado River. If it does not, then we shall have seen the mighty crush the weak—a situation contrary to American tradition. We shall have seen superior political power used to squeeze legitimate benefits from people of a deserving area so that the greedy can hog the public trough.

It is time for honesty and clarity to be used in the consideration of this whole matter. We have had quite enough of bombast and braying. The whole subject has been most thoroughly and quite fairly studied in the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs of both Houses. The hearings are printed and available. The reports of the committees, with a minority report from the committee of the House, which approved this program are available. Truly we have no need for the daily harangues and self-serving statements which are being placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, not to educate but to demonstrate—to the folks back home in southern California—how this or that office seeker is slaying the dragon. Let such office seekers run on some record of factual interest to their own district rather than of emotional interest engendered because of its past relationship to an area a thousand miles away. There is no disposition on the part of any individual or group of individuals in the upper Colorado River Basin to despoil or lessen the rights which the people of the lower basin have in the Colorado River. It is not fair that these self-seeking political ambitious representatives should endeavor to advance politically over the imagined dragons of the upper Colorado River Basin for, in fact, there are no dragons, only a people in hopeless minority—a people, however, who are very much aware of their opposition and who are determined, if it is at all possible, not to become victims of a program of, or of a group of people having uncontrolled selfishness as a basic claim for attention.

I feel certain that the real issues which are present in the upper Colorado River storage and development program are not clear to many Members of the House. May I state further that it is my opinion that this lack of clarity—this confusion—is a part of the program of those seeking to delay or destroy the ultimate potential development of our area. What is not understood, it is reasoned, is more easily maligned and more easily defeated. One rational insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and there have been a few among the barrage of emotional appeals, is that which was placed in the July 15 RECORD at page A5128, by the Honorable A. L. MILLER, of Nebraska, the present chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. Such insertion is aptly entitled "Echo Park Dam: Too Much Heat and Not Enough Light." If, after studying such insertions as that by Dr. MILLER, additional informative material is desired I shall be glad to try and supply it. On the other hand, if one-sided propaganda is wished, it can be found by easy reference to the insertions made by the opponents from the lower river.

Almost a third of a century ago it was decided by solemn and binding compact among the States of the Colorado River Basin, with the Federal Government in agreement therewith, that an equitable part of the waters of the Colorado River are to be used in the upper basin of the river—in that part of the basin where the waters arise. The waters come from the snow-capped mountains and forested slopes of the upper basin. Ours is the area of origin, a principal which seems to mean so much to the people of the great State of California when considering the use of waters which rise and flow entirely within the confines of its own borders. However, their application or friendliness to such a principal stops at their own State lines. They know full well that the law of gravity applies to flowing water more readily and more effectively than to any other element or combination of elements. They know that no matter what means are applied in keeping the water from use in the upper basin—if it remains unused, it must naturally flow down to the lower basin without any further effort on their part to capture it or possess it.

How do you boil down so great and involved a controversy into "20 quick lines"—making it clear so that those who wish can understand it? Perhaps such cannot be done, but here at least is a try.

The headwaters of the main stems of the Colorado River are mostly in the States of Wyoming and Colorado, with far the greater portion being in Colorado. The Continental Divide splits Colorado almost in half, the Western part being the area where the Colorado River and most of its tributaries lie. All in all this one-half of the State contributes slightly over 70 percent of the entire flow of the Colorado River. The balance of the flow: that is, not quite 30 percent comes from the other upper basin States, Wyoming, Utah, New Mexico, and Arizona. Lower down; that is, below Lee Ferry, the water evaporates far faster than any water runs in. California and Nevada contribute nothing in the form of water to this river. I make only slight reference about the origin of the hot air which causes the evaporation. The upper basin of the Colorado River is all of the natural drainage above Lee Ferry which is located near the Arizona-Utah border. It includes the States I have mentioned. The lower basin includes California, Nevada, most of Arizona, and a small part of Utah. Recent history records the fact that it is the States of California, Nevada and Arizona which find it impossible to agree on who gets what from the river. This is true even though the powerful State of California, in its ordinary legislative procedure, passed, signed and proclaimed a "self limitation statute" on how she is to use her share and permit others to use their share as decided among themselves. If at this time you are of the opinion that this legal status should be binding enough to end the matter—and most assuredly it should be—please just continue to give to me your attention. There is more. Once again, I call to your mind the fact that back in the 1920's the duly authorized representatives of all of the States involved got together in Santa Fe, N. Mex., and in their sovereign capacities divided the waters of the Colorado River. Without going into the carefully worded language, the division agreed upon at that time simply means that on the basis of what was thought then to be the average flow of water in the Colorado River, one-half of such flow was to go to the upper basin from which virtually every drop comes and the other one-half to the lower basin, meaning mostly, of course, the State of California which contributes only a matchless thirst. These divisions were to be made subject to an expected treaty entitlement to the United States of Mexico the total amount of which was to be determined later. This treaty priority on the river has since been found by treaty agreement to be 1½ million acre-feet per year. It now appears that a most important mistake was made at Santa Fe. It had to do with the amount of water for division—the crux, of course, of the whole problem. The delegates had good reason to think that the erratic and muddy old lady averaged about 16 million acre-feet in a year. This thinking was responsible for the figures which were used; again roughly speaking 7½ million acre-feet to each basin per annum. However, since that memorable year of 1922, the muddy and erratic old river has reneged. The river has been averaging, as nearly as can be determined, slightly over 12 million acre feet in the average year since the date of the compact.

Primary arithmetic indicates that this complicates the situation—a division of waters which are not in existence. Yet, never once has anyone in the upper basin ever suggested directly or impliedly that under the conditions of scarcity the people of the lower basin were not entitled to their annual priority claim on the river. Present interbasin consumptive uses in the upper basin amount to somewhere around 2 million acre-feet. Present transbasin consumptive uses amount to 440,000 acre-feet. No matter how one figures or how long he sticks with the problem, there just has not been sufficient water in the river in the average year since the date of the Santa Fe compact to supply the upper basin entitlement under such compact agreement if the upper-basin States were in position to put their share to beneficial use.

The sovereign State of California has received more benefits from Federal expenditures for reclamation than any other State in the reclamation West. Many of her projects were depression built and present replacement cost would be phenomenal. Southern California, including her great shining cities, lives in her greatness because she is largely watered by the Colorado River. The great breadbasket in the Imperial Valley is almost entirely watered by the Colorado River. Farther north, her great Central Valley is watered and blessed by the huge Central Valley project. Only the State of Washington with its monolithic Grand Coulee project can compare with California for Federal assistance received while growing great and mighty.

Now this self-same State, awash in the ever-expanding benefits of basic water development, has the temerity and the gall to rise up in opposition to the legitimate development of the upper basin. Thus far, she has her sister State of Arizona tied up in the Federal courts and has petitioned the court to blanket all of the other Colorado Basin States into her linen-washing expedition. She continues her "half-century-old" death-dealing tactics to put the heat on Colorado and Wyoming and Utah and New Mexico—up the river where the water rises. I am not sure but that perhaps it is this California-generated heat which has brought to us in 1954 the driest year that we have had since 1934—perhaps even dryer than heretofore. The old munificent division of 15 million acre-feet, plus Mexico, rings just ever so slightly hollow this year because the mighty Colorado will trickle down to Lee Ferry the stupendous total of just under 5 million acre-feet. That is just about the whole of the mythical "self-limitation" amount of 4.4 million agreed to by California and which she has been said to be using for years.

We of the upper basin, in full understanding of our commitments to the lower basin, and in complete sympathy with the needs of one another, have entered into a mutual compact and have divided among ourselves our share of the waters of the Colorado River—that part that is left for our use after lower-basin entitlements have been delivered at Lee Ferry. Relying upon the promises expressed and implied at Santa Fe and in the years since the signing of that memorable compact agreement, we now propose, in harmony with all of such agreements, to have constructed the large holdover storage dams in our basin for the dual purpose of permitting us to make our contract deliveries to the lower basin and to permit the uses of our water in the upper reaches of the Colorado River tributaries. The program contemplates the storage of water when it is in plentiful supply to save it up against the hour of need for lower-basin deliveries during the years of scarcity. Competent engineers have advised us that some 48 million acre-feet of live storage is necessary for us to discharge our responsibilities. As stated hereinbefore, this storage program will not only make it possible to make deliveries to the lower basin but it will also permit use by us, especially in years of scarcity, of our own legal share of the Colorado River waters. We cannot do this now. As a matter of fact, we are able presently to put to beneficial use only about 58 percent of our legal allocation—mind you I said allocation, not water—for the water is not there and has not been there during the average year since 1922. In fact, up to the present we have been able to put to beneficial use in the upper basin only about one-third of the compact allocation.

Let me repeat just once more for the sake of clarity that we of the upper-basin area—that is, Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming, and a small part of Arizona—are presently trying to piece together a well-planned and coordinated system of holdover storage systems so that we can meet commitments to areas in the lower reaches of the river and at the same time develop our own resources in the interests of the local and national economy and security. That being the case, one would naturally assume that the lower-basin areas would be working hand in hand with us in order to further such a development program. Such is emphatically not the case. Quite the contrary is true and it is true with a vengeance. There is a reason. The lower basin apparently is not yet ready, in spite of legal agreement and sacred promises to the contrary, to help limit their own potential possibilities just as long as water must flow downhill.

Western river law or "water law" provides that he who—and that includes a State—first puts water to use and continues it to beneficial use, has perpetual priority to that amount of water necessary to such use. Perhaps the real issue is clearer now to all. Self-limitation statutes be made and disregarded as selfish interests dictate. The hungry horde in the lower basin wants every possible drop and they want to get this clamp of first beneficial use on it. That explains this proclivity to take one's near neighbors to court, to oppose by all available means one's neighbors' development—and at the same time fatten one's own political nest irrespective of party so that one can move on to a smaller and possibly more select body—and the proclivity to hide as much of this as possible behind the cleanest possible skirts that can be prostituted for this end. We in the upper basin are reaching the limit of our endurance of such machinations.

Address of Ralph E. Becker Before Don Bosco Community Center, Port Chester, N. Y.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 16, 1954

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include an address delivered on the occasion of the 25th anniversary of the Don Bosco Community Center last November, by my friend Ralph E. Becker, Esq., of Port Chester, N. Y., and Washington, D. C.

The Don Bosco Center is the focal point for Italian civic, cultural, educational, and athletic activities in the community in which I live. The contribution the center has made to the building of the community and the great work it has done for the youth of Westchester County has been noteworthy.

I especially join in the words of commendation by Major General Dean, of which Mr. Becker speaks in detail.

The speech is as follows:

Mr. Toastmaster, Dr. Gioffre, Father Celoria, Joseph Carlucci, Joseph Nencetti, honored guests, and friends, familiar persons and places—old friends—that is what Port Chester means to me. My roots are deep; my parents lived here. I have every reason to be grateful, to be thankful, to the many good people who are the life's blood of this community. This is my hometown. Port Chester gave me my early education. It held my hand in my early practice of the law. Its interests are my interests. It is never far from my mind, because my heart is still here. For these reasons, I am particularly honored to speak to you.

After World War II ended, a war in which I served voluntarily, I returned home, but it was only a few months before I was elected chairman of the Young Republican National Federation. In serving the Republican Party at the national level, I attempted, at the same time, to further serve my country and this community. In traveling nearly 200,000 miles, it was impossible to keep up my personal contacts at home. For a long time I tried commuting, but as you can well realize, it is difficult to commute, and still maintain a normal homelife, and I have a lovely wife and four children.

I can't say that Port Chester was exactly a wilderness when I started my travels around the country, but I am reminded of another speaker who, in a desire to impress his audience, wrote a fine speech and memorized it, word for word. His speech began, "100 years ago, the place where I now stand was a howling wilderness." The evening of the meeting came, the speaker was introduced, he rose bravely and began, "100 years ago, the place where I now stand"—then to his dismay, he realized that he had completely forgotten what came next. He began, "100 years ago"—but still the rest of the speech eluded him. In desperation, he began a third time "100 years ago, the place where I now stand was a howling wilderness—I wish to God it still was, and that I was in the middle of it."

It is always an exacting task to speak before old friends and neighbors, who are more discerning in their judgment than are strangers. But I know your judgment will be kind—unlike our friend, I do not desire to be in a wilderness. It is consoling that I am with old friends.

It is extremely important, both to ourselves and our country, that we give some part of our time, even though at infrequent intervals, to an organization such as this, which is devoted to the improvement and development of the youth of the Nation. Those of us, who are involved in the problems of daily living, and I think all of us are, become overwhelmed with its trivialities, in the search for our daily bread. We either forget or perhaps are just simply unaware, that the development of our national assets, is a job for all of us, and not one that is centered either in Washington or in the hands of a limited few.

In our own lifetimes, we have witnessed the rapid development of a technological age, the birth of a nuclear physics age—the automobile, radio, television, radar, jet plane—and now, we enter upon a new and even more frightening age of atomic energy. This industrial and technical progress has called for, and will continue to call for scientific improvements virtually unknown a few years ago. Great scientific discoveries have accumulated a vast store of technical information and creature comforts for all mankind.

Every day there are new improvements made in these material fields—but I ask you whether mankind has kept stride in the matter of the spirit, the mind, individual morality. In fact, the only indication I have noted—and with great alarm—is that public and individual morality has, during the past two decades, continually weakened, not strengthened.

The problem that faces us, as individuals, and in our social groups such as this Don Bosco Center and kindred organizations, is not to seek new fields of morality, but to strengthen those virtues which help us choose the good and not the evil—old virtues which have been tried and tested, and upon which no one has been able to make any improvements whatever.

Despite the well-advertised advances which this 20th century has brought us, Duz, which does everything—the "treat" instead of the treatment—Tums for the tummy, and chlorophyll toothpaste which guarantees everything—except your bank balance—there are certain fundamentals of every day living which never change.

These fundamentals, instilled in us by institutions like this, account for the growth of men and the growth of leadership so essential to our American way of life.

Those of us who, shall we say, have passed the first blush of youth, know that certain qualities of character which are most essential in the development of the good individual can only be implanted and nourished at a tender age. We are constantly on the search for young people, who show strength of character and possess those homely virtues that are sometimes spoken of much too lightly. Once, these qualities have been developed and the youth of the Nation has a strong foundation, then we can be certain that no matter what the future holds, youth will be able to handle itself and choose the good rather than the evil. We shall never be able to completely protect our young people, and perhaps this is no more than right. What we should do and what this Don Bosco Center has as its major purpose, is to give youth the strength and encouragement to make its own future. Here, in this Community Center, emulation of the principles exemplified by the life of Don Bosco serves as a ready source of strength and encouragement to our youth.

The future is what counts, and it depends upon what we have given and continue to give. There is a story current in Washington of a passenger in a taxi. It passed the National Archives Building and the passenger read aloud the inscription on the base of one of the huge statutes flanking the main entrance, "What is past is prolog." Turning to the cabdriver, he asked, "What on earth does that mean?" The cabbie gave him a withering look as he replied: "Mister, that means, you ain't seen nothin' yet." The 25 years of service given by this Don Bosco Community Center is merely prologue—I can say too, "You ain't seen nothin' yet."

The fullness of character which the Don Bosco Center is developing can be broken down into a number of essentials, each important in itself: (1) Faith in God and one's self; (2) good sportsmanship; (3) a love of truth and honesty; (4) good character and good citizenship; (5) being good neighbors.

Life is full of countless illustrations of the meaning and importance of each one of these qualities.

Recently, we have witnessed a fine example of all these virtues. All of you, I am sure, have heard of the heroism, the valor, the sufferings of Maj. Gen. William F. Dean, the highest ranking prisoner held by the Chinese Communists, who recently returned from 3 years' imprisonment in Korea.

General Dean told of his experiences at a luncheon at the National Press Club in Washington, which I attended. No one walked out until Dean's story was completely told. I saw this whitehaired, blue-eyed, hard-hitting, straight-talking general who was betrayed by irresponsible persons into the hands of the Communists. I cannot recall when I have been more impressed by the integrity and qualities of character of an individual. He epitomized The American at his best.

Here is a man, who was subjected to unbelievable punishment, mental torture, and physical pain such as you and I would find difficult to imagine. More important, however, is that here is a man with such strength of character, such faith in God, such belief in himself, and the country he represented, that alone he was able to withstand all the pressures a depraved Communist society could bring to bear upon him.

The day was August 25, 1950. After fighting side by side with the GI's he had become separated from them and had been alternately hiding and traveling, trying to return to his own lines. Several times he had almost been caught by the enemy. Physically, he was wounded and exhausted; earlier he had suffered a deep gash on his head and a broken shoulder. Then, when he was almost within reach of friendly territory, the betrayal took place. Perhaps if the general had had some money, rather than occupation scrip, he might have been able to buy his way across the lines.

Here was a man who had eaten little or no food for many days—who had lost almost 60 pounds of his weight, and who somehow found the humor to describe his first bowel movement in 33 days as the "great passage." This is an indication of how much the human body can take, if one has the will.

As a prisoner, he never knew what was going to happen to him next. His captors always promised the worst. They made mockery of him, and paraded him through the streets. They asked, "Are you cold?" When he said "Yes," they stripped him of his clothes. This was in the dead of the bitter Korean winter. His interrogators were wrapped in fur-lined overcoats. At this point they took the general's cot away. He was forced to sit on his hands and sleep on the floor. At one stage of the interrogations he was confined to a cell box so small that he was unable to stand, and was required to crouch painfully 24 hours a day.

What they wanted from him was the defense plans for Japan. "And what worried me," he said, "was that I knew them. One night they told me they were going to torture me the next day, and I didn't know whether I could take it. I decided the best thing for me was suicide. My guard dozed. I got his submachine gun. I knew exactly what I was going to do. I was going to shoot a blast out the window, wake the Chinese colonel, let him have it, and then stick the barrel in my mouth. This was the great disappointment of my life. I couldn't make those double triggers work.".

And so he was overpowered again, and subjected to sieges of questioning lasting up to 72 hours at a stretch, with 3 or 4 interrogation teams working on him in relays. His only relief from the questioning was, ironically, dysentery. He had to leave the room as much as 36 times in 1 day.

I recall that he was asked recently whether he found the mental or the physical torture more unbearable. His answer was that the mental torture was by far the worse. Someone asked, "How can you prepare GI's for this kind of torture?" The general replied: "You can't. To make a man, to build a person who will stand long, hard pressure must be done long before he comes to the Army."

These qualities, as I have pointed out, do not just grow in a general, or in any other person. They are planted in the individual—nourished and guided by places such as this Don Bosco Center. They are cultivated here, and grow to produce the strong, firm men, of whom the general is such an outstanding example.

When the general was introduced, he was referred to as a "hero." He modestly averred that he was no hero, that he was just a fellow who managed to get himself captured by the enemy. Perhaps so, but he certainly is a hero to me.

All of us who heard the general left the hall with the feeling that here indeed is a man. I can think of no greater reward for you who participate in the work here at Don Bosco than that someday the world will point at a Don Bosco product and say, "There goes a man"—each and every one of you can then realize with justifiable pride that you played some part in this wonderful final result.

Anti-Red Compromise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to direct the attention of our colleagues to the following editorial which appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald of August 20, 1954:

ANTI-RED COMPROMISE

Sponsors of the drastic bill to fine and jail Communist Party members and fellow travelers have shown good judgment in their retreat from it. The strongest argument that has been advanced in favor of the bill was that Congress ought to strike directly at the Communist conspirators who are mortal enemies of the United States. But that is precisely what the Government is doing under present law. More than 80 Communist leaders have been convicted under the Smith Act, and the Communist Party stands condemned as an agency of Moscow policy, with only two court decisions required to make it final. The Humphrey amendment was in no way necessary to effective control of the Communist conspiracy.

The nub of the controversy, as we see it, was not whether the real Communist conspirators should be brought to book but whether our prisons should be filled with Communist dupes and misguided fellow travelers who have in some way been associated with the Communist program. For several years the country has been in a furor because investigating committees have been exposing and censuring people on the fringe of the Communist movement, some of whom have had only the remotest connections with communism or in some cases no connection at all. How much greater would have been the furor if Congress had instructed the Department of Justice to throw these people into prison.

A drive against members of the Communist Party wins emotional enthusiasm, but, as Senator FERGUSON pointed out, there is no longer any such thing as membership in the Communist Party. Communists no longer carry cards. Now that they are required by law to register, virtually all of them deny membership. This will not prevent the Department of Justice from continuing to prosecute the leaders of the conspiracy, but it does emphasize the futility of trying to penalize Communist membership. That approach, with the sweeping Humphrey-Dies definition of Communist membership, could only result in rounding up thousands of ignorant and deluded people remotely associated with communism at an appalling cost to our national dignity and our claim to freedom, aside from the cost of keeping them in prison.

The new approach overwhelmingly approved by both Houses of Congress yesterday is to subject Communists to the penalties of the Internal Security Act as members of a Communist-action organization. Of course, Communists are subject to those penalties under the present law, and the party has already been found to be a Communist-action, Soviet-dominated organization. This means that Communists may be barred from Federal employment, defense-plant jobs, and from obtaining passports, either under the present law or the compromise bill. In this section of the bill Congress has merely reenacted the Internal Security Act.

The effect of the language in the bill stripping the Communist Party of its legal rights as an organization is still not clear. Obviously it is not intended to relieve the party of its obligation to register under the Internal Security Act. But if it loses all the rights of an organization, can it still be held to its legal obligations as an organization? Certainly the new measure will complicate the litigation before the courts. We cannot help thinking that it would have been much better for Congress to have passed the section of the bill curbing the rights of Communist-dominated labor unions and to have left any change in the status of the Communist Party up to the next Congress. By that time the constitutionality of the Internal Security Act will probably have been finally tested. But the compromise is a very notable improvement over the Humphrey amendment that had twice swept through the Senate and won agreement in principle from the House.

The World Has Passed Him By

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 17, 1954

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith the following editorial from the Milwaukee Journal:

THE WORLD HAS PASSED HIM BY—HERBERT HOOVER WOULD HAVE US TURN BACKS ON WORLD TODAY AS HE DID TO DEPRESSION WHEN PRESIDENT

In his Presidency, Herbert Hoover stood—with banks failing all about him—predicting the end of poverty and an upsurge of employment "in 60 days." He proved then that he was no prophet.

Now a quarter of a century later, Hoover proves that he also lacks the ability to look back and understand what he has seen. In his home State of Iowa, he attempted to explain the years since 1932. It was the speech of a man who ignores the forces that erupted after the suffering and destruction of World War I, blazed up again in World War II, and are simmering today even in the jungles of Asia and Africa.

The basic trouble in Herbert Hoover's world is that he still thinks as he did in the twenties, that the United States can live in happy isolation. As he sees it, all that has happened is the work of evil men, particularly Democrats, who turned him out of office.

This is no new attitude of Hoover. In 1931, in Indianapolis, on one of those rare days when he was admitting that perhaps the economy wasn't exactly healthy, Hoover said that the trouble was the result of World War I which "had come on during a Democratic administration."

BLAME FOR EVERYTHING WRONG

But now it is not mere depression for which he blames Democrats—a label he equates with Socialists. He now says that Democratic Presidents through "unrestrained Presidential actions" are to blame for everything that is wrong with the world. He says that those Presidents have been turning the world over to communism. Most "terrible" was the recognition of Russia back in 1933. It "opened the headgate for a torrent of traitors." Hoover seems to feel that, unrecognized, Russia would have evaporated.

But these Democratic Presidents did not stop there, says Hoover. At Yalta, Teheran, Potsdam, he says, the Democratic Presidents actually signed treaties with Russia involving appeasement and surrender which doomed millions behind the Iron Curtain and set in train the communization of Mongolia, North Korea, and all of China.

The most charitable thing one can say about this statement is that perhaps Mr. Hoover has not read the treaties he criticizes. It was Russian violation of those treaties, not the treaty provisions, that has caused most of the trouble.

WITH SOCIALISM RAMPANT?

It is as though Russia does not exist in Hoover's world. He blames the cold war, inflation, high taxes, defense costs, military programs on unrestrained presidential actions during Democratic administrations. Even World War II he blames on our Government.

After years in which the economy and well-being of Americans were never better, Hoover deplores the economic consequences of the welfare state. People's incomes are absorbed by taxes. Socialism runs rampant. Planned economy is destroying our Nation and pulling down the pillars of the temple of freemen.

If there was ever danger of communism in this Nation it was when Mr. Hoover was President. While he was praising the rugged individualist this was a nation of too many ragged individualists. Rugged bankers and business men were running to Washington for help. Remember those days? In Iowa where Hoover spoke, corn was down to 30 cents a bushel when Hoover was pooh-poohing depression. Wheat was under 50 cents. Thousands of farms were being foreclosed. Farmers who never even heard of Karl Marx were defying sheriffs, taking law into their own hands, threatening to hang judges. Here was a seedbed for communism that required the unrestrained presidential action Hoover deplores.

There were shantytowns filled with despairing people—Hoovervilles they called them. The lack of presidential action led people to call old newespapers Hoover blankets and jackrabbits Hoover hogs.

GENERAL MOTORS AT 7⅝

If more than a handful of people lined up, passers-by asked whether it was a bank failure or a breadline. Here was the soup kitchen, flat-wallet era. The apple, sold on street corners by jobless men, was its symbol.

A 1931 Chicago survey showed that working girls were earning under 25 cents an hour, one-fourth of them under 10 cents. Servants worked for board and room and $10 a month. And these were the lucky ones with jobs.

Factory chimneys stood smokeless. Stock prices fell. General Motors dropped from 72¾ to 7⅝, Radio Corp. from 101 to 2½, United States Steel from 261¾ to 21¼ while Hoover was in the White House. Bankruptcies were everywhere. Wages were down 60 percent, production below 50 percent.

Hoover didn't cause all that. But he thought for a long time that if he ignored it, as he would have us turn our backs on the world today, all our troubles would go away. He was talking then in the 1932 campaign, about the same greatest issue—not food and jobs but "individualism versus regimentation." Just as in Iowa he said the Nation's strength is not the common man but the uncommon man."

Clever cliches. But Hoover still doesn't realize—as he didn't realize in 1932—that the common man will no longer lie down and roll over when the uncommon man snaps his fingers. This is a world of ferment born of common men—yellow, black, and white—who demand their places in it, who want a better share.

DAY OF THE UNCOMMON MAN

Democratic Presidents didn't create this present restless world any more than Hoover created the depression. But these men have recognized this world, as they have had to, and—with the help of forward, not backward, looking Republicans—have been trying to live in it, to help solve its problems, to adjust this country to things as they are.

They know that stalwart individualism, the uncommon man, trust in our heritage are fine—but not enough. Hoover says they are enough. And he adds that "if anyone rises to say that all this is reactionary, you may class him as either fuzzy-minded or an ignorant enemy of freemen."

Here is intolerance, indeed, political bigotry personified, belief in hiding your head in the sands. Here is what branded Herbert Hoover as one of the most unsuccessful of our Presidents. Here is what caused millions of Americans completely to reject his continued leadership, as they must today reject his myopic advice and his opinions of a bygone era.

The world has passed him by.

Voters Judged Callous to Politicians' Faults

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record a news article by Frank R. Kent, published in the Washington Sunday Star of July 4, 1954.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Voters Judged Callous to Politicians' Faults—Writer Says James Roosevelt, Yorty, and Condon May Win

(By Frank R. Kent)

A short while ago a reputation for integrity, good moral conduct, and patriotism was considered a basic requisite for any candidate for even the smallest elective office. There, of course, have been immoral and unworthy men elected to high public position, but rarely, indeed, have their immorality and unworthiness been publicly proclaimed and undenied during their campaign.

In these days, the standards have been so lowered as hardly to exist at all. Formerly, unworthy men could be elected to Congress and stay there so long as their unworthiness was not discovered. Now, discovery seems to make little difference. Look, for example, at the great State of California. There is a Congressman out there who has had himself nominated in the Democratic primaries for the United States Senate. His name is Samuel William Yorty and he has twice been elected to Congress from the 26th district, which now has nominated the notorious Mr. James Roosevelt, eldest son of the late President. Mr. Yorty is out campaigning against Senator Thomas H. Kuchel, who was appointed by the then Governor Warren to fill out the unexpired term of Senator Richard Nixon, now Vice President.

Well, the thing that happened to Congressman Yorty was an "exposure" of the fact that for campaign purposes he had franked out at Government expense approximately 4.2 million copies of a speech he made in the House. This was so vastly in excess of all previous abuse of the franking privilege that it attracted national attention and has since been certified as a record. Mr. Yorty is the champion franker of all time. It has been said that his was not even a very good speech, though the franking cost to the taxpayers is estimated at $195,000. To those, like Senator Byrd, who believe that waste in Government is wicked, its title "Let's Build a Better America," is highly ironical.

The interesting thing is that while Mr. Yorty makes no denial and slight defense of this unprecedentedly costly franking job, the best political observers of the California situation are not at all sure that this exposure will lose him many votes. The general feeling is that he will not defeat Senator Kuchel but not because of this extraordinary episode in his political career. The idea is that the voters have become so used to wild extravagance in the Government in the past 22 years that economy, debt, and taxes are matters that no longer rouse them to indignation or resentment.

It should arouse the voters. It should stir Congress to move toward making such absurd throwing away of the taxpayers' money impossible. But it just fails to do so. There is a disposition—and a very dangerous disposition—on the part of voters to say, "Oh, well, what the heck?" instead of jumping up on their hind legs and demanding that this kind of business stop wholly and immediately. This is the disposition that makes is impossible to balance the budget and restore national solvency. Probably, if Mr. Yorty had been renominated for the House instead of running for the Senate, he would have been elected without trouble, because his district is so overwhelmingly Democratic. As a statewide candidate, this shocking abuse may trip him up.

Concerning James Roosevelt, there is no intention here to go into the revolting details of his private life except to say that they are so unsavory as to make it almost incredible that such a man could be elected to any public office. Yet so heavily Democratic is his district and so insensitive the voters that the odds are he will be. This is not quite all of the California story. In the Sixth District Robert L. Condon has been renominated by the Democrats for the House. Mr. Condon seems to have had a creditable war record and to have served without discredit in the House since 1952. But the Atomic Energy Commission did refuse him access to certain restricted areas when he appeared, with others, as a member of a House committee on a trip of inspection. The reason given was that he was not a good security risk. Mr. Condon has denied that there is anything in his record to make him a bad security risk, but the Atomic Energy Commission, which has no tinge of McCarthyism, would hardly make a charge like that without some basis.

Be that as it may, it does seem that these three nominations—Yorty, Roosevelt, and Condon—are sufficiently odoriferous to smell the whole California Democratic ticket up pretty badly this fall. The fact that National Democratic Chairman Mitchell refused to indorse Messrs. Roosevelt and Condon is highly significant. For, concededly, any Democratic candidate whom Mr. Mitchell can't take would be pretty hard for any one else to take. It's his business to take them.

Mitchell's Charge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 17, 1954

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith the following editorial from the Reading (Pa.) New Era:

Mitchell's Charge

The charge of "influence peddling" leveled against President Eisenhower by Democratic National Chairman Steve Mitchell in connection with the construction of a private powerplant in which golfer Bobby Jones has an interest is one that should get a through airing for the benefit of the prncipals involved as well as for the public which ultimately must pass final judgment.

Although Mitchell's assertion promptly drew heated rebuttals from the Republican heirarchy in Washington, the entire episode recalled day-in and day-out assaults upon the character and leadership of Democratic Presidents Truman and Roosevelt. Some of the verbal assailants in those days resorted to vile and cheap words for their assaults, and the big press hungrily gobbled it up as "news." This continuing campaign even carried over into Eisenhower's own presidential bid when he read the dirt ghost writers turned out on their typewriters.

Now, of course, the shoe is on the other foot. Eisenhower is president and the Republicans are making big decisions—such as the atomic giveaway and the maneuver to shackle the Tennessee Valley Authority in its growth. Therefore, they must take the consequences of irregularities or even a hint of irregularities in the administration. And just as Harry proved to be the target then, Ike must be it now. For it was his personal order to the Atomic Energy Commission to buy power from a new private power outfit rather than from TVA that lay the groundwork for Mitchell's accusation.

Isn't it amusing how the Republicans can cry with moral indignation when their little game is exposed? And have you ever wondered whether their memories are so short they can't remember the relentless attack leveled against Ike's predecessors on many matters quite trivial when compared with the Nation's power policy involving billions?

The public is entitled to know who is right. For this reason we hope Congress, with adequate minority representation, will investigate Mitchell's charge and report to the public.

Statement by Hon. Styles Bridges, of New Hampshire, About the Record of Nearly Two Decades of His Service in the Senate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement prepared by me regarding happenings during the nearly two decades of my service in the Senate.

There being no objections, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF SENATOR STYLES BRIDGES, OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

Within a few hours the Vice President of the United States will bring down the gavel and the 83d session of the Congress will come to an end. Soon thereafter each of us will return to the tasks and duties which await us at home.

In my case, I intend to present my record to the people of New Hampshire and ask that they return me to the United States Senate. I am not unmindful that the voters of my Sate have seen fit to repose great trust and confidence it me for many years. I know that my energies have been dedicated to the meeting of that challenge, and I take personal satisfaction in feeling that I have done so successfully.

The people of my State have extended to me the highest honors possible for them to extend to any citizen, for which I am deeply grateful. They elected me as their chief executive in 1934 and I had the privilege of serving as Governor during 1935 and 1936. I was elected to the United States Senate in 1936 and I am now completing my eighteenth consecutive year of service in that body.

My colleagues in the United States Senate have honored me with electing me President pro tempore of that body. In addition, I am now serving as chairman of the Appropriations Committee, ranking member of the Armed Services Committee, chairman of the Senate Armed Services Preparedness Subcommittee, member of the Republican Policy Committee, member of the Senate Personnel Committee, and member of the Nonessential Expenditures Committee. Prior to my election as President pro tempore of the Senate, I served during the 82d Congress as the Republican leader of the Senate.

This session of Congress has been constructive and fruitful. In all fairness it must be stated that its accomplishments have been under Republican leadership with the cooperative effort of thoughtful members of both political parties who have examined each legislative proposal on its merits and have supported this well-balanced American program without allowing blind partisanship to destroy their perspective.

We have all worked together and we have accomplished much:

(1) For the first time in two decades we have overhauled our tax structure. The new tax bill removes many of the inequities and injustices and makes a sound start toward producing the required revenue for the Government. The new law provides the necessary incentives to business and to labor so that we may continue to expend our economy and to enjoy the fruits of our labor.

(2) We have made a realistic start toward reduction of taxes which, together with our program of economy in Government, has narrowed the gap between income and expenditures so that our budget is very nearly in balance.

(3) Our Defense Establishment is realistically organized to meet the demands of modern warfare. The Army, Navy, and Air Force appropriations are consistent with present needs and provide the essential flexibility that will enable us to adjust ourselves as the military situation requires.

(4) We have revised the Atomic Energy Act of 1946 to provide a sound program for the development of atomic energy for private industry and peaceful use. At the same time, the Nation's atomic weapon stockpile has grown rapidly in total numbers, increased variety and versatility of weapons. In the last 2 years the development of thermonuclear weapons has been vigorously prosecuted. This Nation has available now for its own defense, and the defense of the free world, weapons whose blast effect is measured in millions of tons of dynamite. The present state of our military preparedness should give would-be aggressors cause for reflection.

(5) A few other of the administration programs which have been adopted are: (a) The Korean defense pact, (b) the highway program, (c) the housing program, (d) the reciprocal-trade program, (e) various appropriation bills for the defense and other executive departments.

(6) Additionally I should like to point out that legislation has been enacted to: (a) provide a Federal program of flexible supports for farm prices, (b) put teeth into our war against subversion, (c) provide for a multi-million-dollar Federal-State program for specialized medical facilities, (d) provide increased aid to veterans with service-connected disabilities, (e) extend Federal unemployment compensation benefits to an estimated 4 million persons, (f) provide wider coverage under the social-security program, including for example, plans whereby 9 million additional workers will receive the benefits of the old-age and survivors' insurance system.

These are but a few of the legislative accomplishments that this Congress has achieved under Republican leadership. Time does not permit me to discuss the many desirable measures which have been enacted. It is sufficient to say that the record is available for public examination.

There have been sharp differences of opinion on some of these issues, and the decisions which we have reached followed full discussion and debate. The fact that we reached decisions has again demonstrated the strength of our free institutions.

The ending of this session of Congress will have a deep personal significance for me. It will mark the completion of my 18th year as a Member of the United States Senate. Eighteen years is a large part of a man's life. During those two decades there have been many changes in this world in which we live. This country emerged from a worldwide depression; in Europe a Fascist-totalitarianism threat appeared, and was finally defeated by freemen; another, more sinister form of oppression now stalks the world; there have been political upheavals in Europe and Asia and the Near East; armed aggression was met and partially repelled in Korea; and the world is now sharply divided into two armed camps which glare at each other over fortified boundary lines.

No man among us can predict when the tinder will light in this dry forest of hate and engulf the world in another conflagration. At home there have been marvelous changes in our society—television, electronics, refrigeration, air-conditioning, and the marvel of the atom which promises so many benign uses for the health and prosperity of man. Our people are better fed, better clothed, better educated and more healthy than people have ever been since the beginning of time.

There have been many changes, some good, some bad, some will have a profound effect upon the heritage which we transmit to our children.

Since I have played a part in the deliberations leading toward the decisions in many of the events of the last two decades, I ask the forbearance of my colleagues to recall some of these events and to make some reflections upon them.

SOME THINGS DO NOT CHANGE

I suggest that in the ever-changing society of the world community of nations in which we live, there are some things that do not change. There are certain eternal values which stand the test of time and provide guideposts for those who would live in dignity and in freedom. Perhaps it is old-fashioned, and, if so, I confess that sin, to emphasize that truth, morality, justice, courage, honesty, fidelity, and devotion are qualities which cannot be eroded by time. America was a great land when Christopher Columbus discovered it. It had its fruitful fields; it had its mountains, its forests, its streams. But a race of hearty forbears, dedicated to the fundamental beliefs which I have listed, made this country a great Nation.

ALL CHANGE IS NOT PROGRESS

The only lamp by which our feet can be guided is the lamp of experience. I therefore suggest to you that all change is not progress. I have observed in my 18 years in this most honored of legislative assemblies that whenever we have equivocated or compromised on the fundamental philosophy of decent living, which I have briefly discussed, we have ultimately paid the price.

As a young boy, born on the farm, I early learned the realities of life. I learned the meaning of labor, of management, of frugality, and the conforting emotions that one derives from earnng his way in the world. I also learned that you can't get something for nothing. And when I came to the Senate of the United States in the year 1936 I was one of a lonely group of 16 Republicans lost in a Sargasso Sea of Democrats. We tried to stem the tide of the New Deal. We did manage to crystallize opposition to the plan to "pack" the Supreme Court of the United States and to destroy its equal sovereignty with the other branches of our Government. We did hold the line on some other basic issues but by and large it was a period of excesses and creeping socialism; a system of Government controls in the guise of security, supplanted individual freedom of enterprise through which America had grown great.

THE ESSENCE OF GOVERNMENT IS THE ABILITY TO FORESEE

The essence of government is the ability to foresee. It is, therefore, apparent that governments will not long endure unless their representatives realistically appraise the facts and chart the probable future developments. It was apparent to some people in the years before World War II that the Nazis were bent on world conquest; that the Black Shirt Fascists of Mussolini were a threat to world peace; and that the development of the militaristic Government of Japan would eventually explode in the Far East.

Why was it not apparent to more people? These totalitarian philosophies degraded the dignity of man. They made him the slave of the state, they crushed minority groups, oppressed free thinkers, and regimented men's minds. We knew these things in America. We could not claim ignorance of the facts. And yet we appeased, we compromised, we equivocated. In the year 1937 when I introduced a resolution in this Senate to stop the shipment of war materials—including scrap iron and steel to Japan—that resolution was defeated. We met that steel and scrap iron just 5 years later on that tragic Sunday when the Japanese bombs rained on Pearl Harbor.

I was one of the few Senators who voted against the Neutrality Act in which we professed that the struggle between nazism and the free world was none of our business. That act was passed, and we tried to sit smugly aside while other men died. But again the attempted compromise with basic principles failed. Shortly thereafter, I was this time one of the many who voted to repeal the Neutrality Act and assume our rightful responsibilities in world affairs. Who knows how the course of history could have been changed if we had recognized the Nazi-Fascist threat and taken prompt action before it developed into the military machine which almost dominated Europe. We do know that the price of appeasement was hundreds of thousands of lives and untold suffering on farflung battlefields of the world. We do know that by failure to foresee we dissipated the greatest asset of this Nation—the lives of its young men.

I know there are many people in the United States who would like to forget that there was a war in Korea. But unfortunately there were 33,417 young American men who gave their lives in that fruitless struggle. There are 106,650 American boys who were wounded—some of them maimed for life—who will never be the same as a result of that ill-fated conflict. You will recall that when General of the Army Douglas MacArthur was summarily dismissed from his position as Commander in Chief of the Far East, that he told us the truth and the truth was bitter. He said in war "there is no substitute for victory." He said we cannot buy time with American lives. He told us that if as a nation we felt resort to arms was necessary, we should bring all of our power to bear to bring the conflict to a victorious conclusion. But again we equivocated. We fought a stalemate war. Though every schoolchild in America knows that we were fighting Red China, officially our diplomats refuse to accept that fact and to the end claimed that our enemies were guerrillas.

We never declared war on Red China. We never took action against our opponent where such action would damage him. We never even stopped our allies from continuing their trade with the Reds. On several occasions when we had victory within our grasp, we denied our military leaders the right to push forward to that victory.

It is a tragedy that I have to discuss the Korean war. I know it must be unpleasant. There are many who got their iceboxes—they got their television sets, their autos, and mink coats—but there were many families who got death notices from the War Department. These dead and wounded American young men cannot be forgotten or ignored. They gave their lives for a principle and we as a nation did not stand behind them. At the time of the MacArthur hearings I joined with seven of my colleagues in a report which stated any settlement of the Korean war based upon the status quo will be a Munich-like respite which will make the ultimate reckoning infinitely more costly. I don't like to, but I must, suggest that the first part of that reckoning was paid a few weeks ago at Geneva when world communism engulfed more millions of human souls.

NECESSITY FOR A STRONG ECONOMY

During these trying years I more than once recalled the statement of Abraham Lincoln that "if this country is to be destroyed it will be destroyed from within." For 18 years, therefore, I have worked as a Member of the Senate Appropriations Committee in an effort to balance the budget and promote sound fiscal policies. I know that government cannot continue to spend more than it takes in anymore than a private family can spend more than it earns without eventual bankruptcy. This is truth. All of those who do not recognize it are compromising with the fundamental principles which are eternal. Therefore, while I have consistently voted to increase American military, naval and air power, I have insisted that America must be strong economically as well as militarily.

In the 80th Congress, in cooperation with my Senate colleagues, we balanced the budget. For the first time in 22 years we reduced the national debt and checked wartime inflation and saved more than $9 billion. I think we proved that the job can be done if there is a will to do it.

I am an advocate of the free enterprise system—a capitalist as the left-wingers put it. I believe government should stay out of business as much as possible in order to avoid competition with taxpayers. Government competition will ultimately drive those taxpayers into bankruptcy and dry up the source of Government revenue. I have not been able to understand why Uncle Sam must make rope, ice cream, chewing gum, and false teeth; operate schools and movies, and, believe it or not, even run undertakers' parlors.

Some small measure of success has attached itself to my efforts in this direction, but there is much to be done and I earnestly enlist the support of all who are willing to admit that they too are free enterprisers.

ATOMIC ENERGY

It was my privilege in the year 1942 to be one of four Members of the United States Senate to be told of the Government's plans to probe the mysteries of nuclear fission in an effort to construct the first atomic bomb. As a member of the Appropriations Committee during these war years, I was charged, with my colleagues, with the responsibility for secretly providing the funds required for this project.

It would be amusing, if it were not so tragic, that although we kept this secret from the Members of this Senate and from the American people, we were apparently stolen deaf, dumb, and blind by the Russians. Perhaps by this time we have learned.

I suggest that there is more to the atom than military weapons. We have, during this session of Congress, listened to extensive discussions which, had they been on other subjects would have been roundly denounced as filibuster. But there has come from these discussions a residual value. Those of us who have followed the progress of atomic energy know the hopeful side of the atom. We realize that the industrial, medical, agricultural and research applications of this force will play a vital role in our future development. The American people have invested almost $6 billion in capital, plants, and equipment in our atomic energy program. It is comforting to be able to assure you that this investment is a wise one. Our atomic strength has undoubtedly restrained the barbarians, and its benign applications give promise limited only by man's ingenuity and resourcefulness.

COMMUNISM

My views on communism are the same as they were toward fascism, since, though the enemy has changed his color to red, the danger to free institutions is indentical.

As early as 1943 I began to publicly question the administration's appeasement of Soviet Russia. It was apparent that a philosophy based upon force, denying God, and ruthlessly exterminating all opposition, would eventually slake its thirst with the blood of free people. Again the facts were apparent. Again we disavowed truth, honesty, and courage, and even denied our God. There were many voices raised, including mine, against the sell-out deals in Asia and Southeast Europe, but we ignored the warnings of conscience and again set in motion events which ultimately engulfed us.

During this period I have been an advocate of collective security. It may be a surprise to some of my critics, but I voted for aid to Turkey, Greece, the ECA, the North Atlantic Pact, the Military Aid Pact, and other programs of a like nature which seemed to me to provide strength to the free world. I advocated the United Nations Charter, but I refuse to distort the lessons of history and therefore warned when the charter was formulated that the veto provision in the hands of the Russians was likely to render the peace organization ineffective. I have opposed the scoop-shovel approach to foreign aid, and those who would dissipate the assets of the United States in gigantic Santa Claus giveaway operations. Mutual assistance and aid for those who will help themselves is the philosophy which I have consistently backed. The shores of history are strewn with the wrecks of nations which have tried to buy freedom. Freedom is not for sale. If people want it they have to fight for it—Uncle Sam cannot export it.

STOMACH COMMUNISM

There is a basic fallacy in the approach of some people to the problem of communism. They believe that if by magic the United States can feed and clothe and provide the people of the world with all of the material goods from televisions to bathtubs, that communism will disappear from the face of the earth. This is the doctrine of stomach communism, the thesis that communism thrives in undeveloped regions of the earth, that it spreads among undernourished people, that a correlation exists between man's material possessions and his political philosophy. In the two decades which I have watched this insidous force develop, I have concluded that this thesis is false. Communism is a state of mind, not a question of calories. Political philosophy is that of the soul, not of the stomach.

Call the roll of the traitors of freedom. Mention Fuchs, Alger Hiss, the Rosenbergs, Greenglass, Gold, May, and others. Were any of these underprivileged people? were they poor? Were they undernourished? Or did they accept the benefits and privileges of free society without accepting the responsibilities that adhere to freemen?

And I say to you, and I beg of you to listen, that the only force in the world capable of combating the political philosophy of communism is the political philosophy of independence. The State of New Hampshire is far from the most wealthy State in our great Nation. The income of our people does not rank high in comparison with the people who live in some other localities, but we have few Communists, and relatively few fellow travelers, because we are God-fearing, truthful, honest, industrious, frugal people who have adhered to the faith of our fathers. You may not find many televisions or bathtubs in the mountains of Tennessee, but it is a sure bet that if you're looking for a Communist you had better take one with you.

Germany, under Hitler, was the best fed, best equipped, most industrial society in Europe. If there was anything to the theory that totalitarianism depends on lack of calories, the Germans would have never fallen for it.

Fancy names for policies of appeasement do not impress me. I did not believe 15 years ago that you could do business with Hitler, and I solemnly warn you today that you cannot do business with the Kremlin. Any spiritual compromise which we make, any dishonesty with which we delude ourselves, has a price tag attached, and that price will be measured in the lives of American boys.

As you would expect, the Communists do not take kindly to my philosophy. Frankly, I receive some satisfaction from the fact that they have on numerous occasions attacked me. I had the special honor to be singled out by TASS, the Soviet News Agency, as "one of the principal enemies of communism in the world." Radio Moscow, I am pleased to say, described me as "An American cannibal who has been the foremost enemy of communism in the American Congress since 1936." Now I don't want to profess to steal the laurels from some of my colleagues, but that is a title which I have been aspiring to attain for the last 18 years. Pravda stated that "far from being a pawn of the Wall Street imperialist, Fascist clique, Bridges is one of its leaders * * * who was largely instrumental in blocking the peaceful intentions of the Soviet Government."

Thoughtful people will reflect on these statement when occasionally my opponents fabricate mysterious tales of the China lobby. The explanation for the attention which I have gotten from Moscow is simple enough. The masters of the Kremlin know that I will never compromise my convictions in the face of their pressure. The Kremlin knows that I do not share the hopeless illusion that Communists are men of good will.

LIBERALS VERSUS CONSERVATIVES

One of the most interesting and, in some ways, most amusing changes that I have witnessed in the last 18 years is the confusion that certain pressure groups have created in the public mind as to the definition of the words Liberal and Conservative.

In the year 1776 by the Declaration of Independence "a new order was given to the world." This new order was a Liberal order based upon the fundamental belief that man had certain inalienable rights and that governments among men derived their just powers from the consent of the governed.

This new liberal order was a doctrine of individuality, of self-reliance, and it stressed the importance of each person over and above the importance of the State. It recognized the innate divinity of man as one of God's creatures and the capacity of man of chartering his own way. Now the liberals of this age, and of any age, are the people who support that doctrine. They do not believe that government should encroach on the private life of the individual unless such encroachment is imperative in the national welfare.

In 1934 I was elected Governor of the State of New Hampshire at the relatively young age of 36. I was labeled a liberal at that time. I would say that the program of my administration was liberal. We adopted a pay-as-you-go finance in State government. We balanced our budget without curtailing essential services or cutting back necessary relief programs during that depression period. New Hampshire was a pioneer in the interstate pacts and social legislation. It was the first State to qualify under the Federal Social Security Act and the second to enact legislation to provide unemployment insurance for workers. Under my administration we developed and provided funds for a State cancer commission for clinics and detection of this dreaded killer. We extended State aid to widowed mothers, and I achieved some personal satisfaction from being the first Governor of New Hampshire to appoint a woman judge and other women to executive positions within the State government.

I was then, and am still, dedicated to the political philosophy as in the Declaration of Independence. I believe this is a liberal philosophy, and I believe that by any proper definition of the term, I am a liberal.

Now, regimentation, totalitarianism, and autocracy are as old as pages of history. People have been regimented by military oppressors since the days of Genghis Khan. It is no trick to organize a society when you force the people to obey your will beneath the roughshod boots of storm troopers. The new order of our country was a new order because it reposed its power in the people. So I say to you with great solemnity that any person, no matter under what excuse, no matter what guise, no matter what temporary expedient is used, who attempts to take power, responsibility, and authority from the people and place it in the hands of a centralized government, that man is an antiliberal. He opposes the new order. He turns back the pages of history.

How strange that in this very Chamber we hear over and over again the voices of those who would increase Government power, extend controls over our people, describe themselves as liberals while we who would keep our people free are termed conservatives or reactionaries, depending upon who is describing them. Again, this is an example of intellectual dishonesty for which we will ultimately pay the price. The time has come when we must stop turning horse chestnuts into chestnut horses and to recognize that the philosophy which made this Nation great was a philosophy not of bureaucracy and hypocrisy, but one of truth and reason.

CONCLUSION

I am not unmindful of the strains and stresses of the closing days of a Congress or of the demands which are made upon the time of individual Senators. However, I have believed it proper that I should make the principles for which I stand a matter of public record.

The Responsibility of Management in Our Atomic Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 18, 1954

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, in order that the people of the country may know about the situation, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record a most remarkable and timely address on the subject the Responsibility of Management in Our Atomic Future, by John Jay Hopkins, a distinguished American industrialist. He is chairman of the board and president of General Dynamics Corp., builders of airplanes and submarines. That corporation also designed and constructed the *Nautilus*, the world's first atomic-powered submarine. Mr. Hopkins is well qualified therefore to discuss the subject of the utilization of atomic energy in industry.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado subsequently said: Mr. President, yesterday I obtained unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an address delivered by John Jay Hopkins, whose firm built the *Nautilus*, the first atomic-powered submarine in the world.

Mr. Hopkins recently delivered an address on the subject the Responsibility of Management in Our Atomic Future. His speech was longer than is permitted to be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

I now ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding the objection with respect to the length of the speech, it may be printed in the Appendix of the Record, because of its great value to the American people, who are interested in the development of atomic energy.

I am informed by the Public Printer that the address will require approximately 2½ pages of the Record, at a cost of $212.50.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Responsibility of Management in Our Atomic Future

(By John Jay Hopkins)

Just a year ago, on June 23, 1953, the "Submarine in the Desert," the landlocked prototype of the atomic-powered submarine made an historic, though then secret "dry run" at full power on a simulated course across the Atlantic Ocean. While the diesel motors of conventionally powered submarines may be run at top speed for only a few hours and—only on the surface—this remarkable test proved that the atomic engines of the *Nautilus* can be driven submerged at top speed hour after hour and day after day.

Now, in addition to a number of nuclear-powered submarines, which are being built and projected for the immediate future, the Atomic Energy Commission is planning several land-based reactors of different types, the most notable of which is the 60,000 kilowatt reactor that the Westinghouse Electric Corp. is designing for Duquesne Light & Power. Further, the Commission and the United States Air Force—together with a number of companies, including our own Convair division—are pursuing vigorously the development work which will lead to the application of atomic power to aircraft. Such aircraft, when technical difficulties have been overcome, should offer advantages of speed and range and a reliability unapproached by present combustion engines, jets, or rockets.

Basically, it is not much of a step from atomic-powered submarines to atomic-powered combat and passenger ships and to nuclear-propelled airplanes and trains. These present different problems, but in the light of gains already made atomic transportation is not too far off, but rather well within our compass. Indeed, one can picture a world of the near future in which atomic energy heats and powers our factories, lights our cities, cooks our food, conquers our ills, and propels our ships, planes, and trains.

It is likely also that the use of atomic energy in one of its protean forms will yet solve two of civilization's most difficult problems—the economical distillation of sea water for industrial and agricultural use and the instantaneous disposal of human and industrial wastes.

THE ATOMIC REVOLUTION

Such applications of atomic power to industrial uses as well as to military functions mean, of course, that we have—without question—entered not only a new industrial era but a new and marvelous revolutionary age. For, while the impact of nuclear physics on our world economy can be compared with the discovery of fire, steam, and electricity—and atomic power with the earlier sources of wood, coal, oil, and falling water—we are not engaged merely in a change of sources and forms of power.

Completely upsetting our status quo, the atomic revolution will entail an infinitely varied transformation, affecting profoundly every phase of our lives—power, travel, transport, communication—and compelling us to make over our economics and social customs, our medical practice and agriculture, our biology, and even our political, business, and financial systems.

Lest this seem merely personal enthusiasm, however, let us examine the facts objectively. In reality, how big a thing is nuclear energy? Where might it actually lead us? What is the conservative probability that it will alter drastically habits of living, customs, and values? Will there really be a nuclear tidal wave—or simply an atomic ripple?

RISING COST OF CONVENTIONAL FUEL POWER

Economically, certain important facts must be considered, the first of which is population growth. To the consternation of the neo-Malthusians, the world's population has been increasing in geometric proportion since the industrial revolution and shows indications of continuing at an accelerated pace. The United States has grown by 84 million people since 1900, while India, for example, is faced with an increment of some 6 million a year. At the same time, the world's standards of living have advanced, particularly in Europe and in the United States. Such developments, plus two colossally wasteful wars in the past two decades, have imposed a fearful drain on prime power sources. This is not to say that we face any immediately dangerous situation with respect to power; but as prime sources are exhausted and secondary deposits are exploited, it is axiomatic that costs for mining, processing, and distribution will increase, resulting in higher power costs to the consumer. It is this ultimately disastrous process which can be reversed by the utilization of our atomic resources. As economic need drives us along the road of nuclear energy and we turn from conventional power with all its ramifications of production, distribution, and consumption, the implications may well prove revolutionary for our industry and our economy.

INCREASED DEMAND FOR POWER

Of course, a wholesale dismantlement or conversion of power facilities does not seem likely. Not only is such a course unnecessary, it would be neither practical nor feasible, and it would violate every precept of good sense. Yet power consumption in the United States is expanding at a rate of 5 percent a year, and new plants cannot be built rapidly enough to cope with demand. A large proportion of this increased consumption, since it is occurring in urban or suburban areas which have always been well supplied with power, is indicative only of an expanding normal market. But there are areas of the United States—New England is an example—which have never had adequate supplies of power despite the best efforts of rural electrification, hydroelectric development, and farsighted transportation interests. Such areas are not served by adequate transportation and are not richly endowed with those natural advantages which would make cheap power economical to manufacture. The atom should provide a millennium for these power-hungry portions of our geography and our population, for the simple reason that with the atom there are no large-scale transportation problems to consider. Coal and oil are bulky, relatively low-cost-per-unit products requiring complex transport to be marketable for power. In contrast, it is conceivable that one ordinary trailer truck in one trip could transport enough uranium to power a city with a population of 100,000 for a year.

FALLING COST OF ATOMIC POWER

Today, experts are hesitant to say that nuclear-powered plants will soon produce power below the cost of our most efficient, conventionally fueled plants. It is significant to note, however, that their enthusiasm and optimism seem to be growing markedly month by month. There are now but few who would argue that a nuclear-powered plant cannot be built to produce power at a cost somewhere in the upper third of present United States power costs.

Indeed, at public hearings recently held by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy on amendment of the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, the Atomic Energy Commission, in a statement favoring the revised bill, painted a complete picture of the prospective nuclear power industry. In a comprehensive analysis, the AEC pointed out that while the median cost of steam generated central station power in the United States is 7.4 mills, only 14.4 percent of new capacity built since the war is produced at more than 7 mills per kilowatt-hour. However, 70 percent is produced between 4 and 7 mills. "* * * when reactors no longer require abnormal development costs and when costs of manufacturing nuclear plant equipment have been reduced, several reactor systems have a good chance of producing power at from 4 to 7 mills per kilowatt in large 300,000 kilowatt plants." Nuclear power at a cost as high as 7 mills would be competitive for part of the market in the Northeast, Southwest and North Central regions of the United States. In two illustrative cases cited by AEC, one moderately optimistic and one pessimistic, the total nuclear share of United States electrical output in 1975 would be 10 percent and 2 percent respectively. It is noteworthy that small stationary units, steam and internal combustion, producing at costs from 8 mills up, would total 6 percent of total new capacity, or an estimated 12 million kilowatts, over the next 20 years.

A staff expert of the AEC has recently estimated that by the year 2000, 50 percent of the electrical industry's power plants will be nuclear. These estimates, it should be remembered, are being made before the first full-scall power plant has even been built. How, then, can anyone doubt that American ingenuity will soon bring nuclear energy into sharp competition with existing sources?

ATOMIC POWER IS ABSOLUTE POWER

On a second score, too, the atom must achieve a revolution in our energy sources, simply because the potential reserves of energy from fissionable materials are now estimated to be more than 20 times that available from existing mineral fuels—coal, oil, and gas. I should like to emphasize again that the rate of energy used is growing even more rapidly than our population rate. We are therefore forced to anticipate those demands which cannot be met by our capital resources in existing fuels. Furthermore, the varied uses of coal, oil, and gas not yet to be met by fissionable materials caution us to conserve these conventional so-called fossil fuels. We cannot ignore the increasing demands for liquid fuel for automotive power. Third, it is increasingly evident that the atom—not merely as a source of physical power—will become the essential ingredient of all future progress.

To a physicist, atomic energy is a prime tool for studying the structure of the physical world, and the interrelation of force and matter. To the researcher in biophysics, chemistry, medicine, or metallurgy, atomic energy provides priceless precision tools to identify and trace chemical reactions within the constitutents of living and inorganic matter. To the military man, atomic energy has given instruments of unimaginable power. To the industrialist it offers not only a new type of fuel—but new, faster, lower cost, more reliable ways of investigating the wear in pistons; measuring the thickness of films of rubber, paper, and metals; computing the radiography of castings, and detecting impurities in dyes, paints, crystals, and chemicals. Agricultural research is making studies of great importance on plant growth and soil processes through the use of radioactive stimulants and tracers.

Hence, it follows that in the five forms of nuclear fission—atomic weapons, atomic propulsion, atomic portable or package reactors, large central station powerplants, and the radiant energy of atomic waste products—we are now possessed of power unlimited. And this absolute power is to be monitored by electronic brains that "think," administer, measure, control, and coordinate with faultless precision in millionths of a second and millionths of an inch and—not too many years from now—in millions of miles.

CHILDHOOD'S END

Therefore, are we not now, as managers—and I equate the term "manager" with the designation "leader"—confronted with more than the vast problems of technology? Have not the almighty multipliers—atomics and electronics—presented us with what is fundamentally a problem of ethics? How ominous and fateful seem now, in the atomic age, the words of Lord Acton: "Power tends to corrupt; absolute power corrupts absolutely."

All who now comprehend the significance of the electronic multiplication of atomic power must also have some understanding of the grave responsibilities that are brought to bear on the managers of our dynamic industrial economy. We have had thrust into our hands the instruments of the legendary gods—infinite creation or utter destruction is ours. And the weight of our new and sudden social responsibilities, when understood, must either mature or ruin us. As Korzybski observed prophetically in an earlier time and as Alfred Clarke has recently implied, all humanity has, in a political, social, economic, and moral sense, come to the end of its childhood—and we industrially of ours.

If this does not merely appear to be so, we need to cultivate not narrow, local ambitions but ambitions for the world. We need to take not only the national view—for that must always be important—but also the universal view, or by that view we shall survive. In the words of the world-famous economist Gunnar Myrdal, "America has now joined the world and is tremendously dependent upon the support and goodwill of other countries. Its rise to leadership brings this to a climax. None is watched so suspiciously as the one who is rising. None has so little license, none needs all his virtue so much as the leader. And America, for its own security, cannot retreat from leadership."

NEED FOR ETHICAL IDEALS

We must, then, as we begin to bear the responsibilities of our power and our manhood, return to the ideals on which this country was founded and which alone will win us any eminence we may possibly attain to in world history. These are the ideals of the rights of man, of the essential dignity of man, of the brotherhood of man, regardless of race, creed, color, or social condition. It must be our task, not to conquer the world, but to help the world win a new and better way of life. And, in that winning, our arch rival will not be the nation which exercises the most crushing power, but that nation which can best help an impoverished world secure for itself the greatest material well-being and the utmost political freedom and personal opportunity. This idea was, perhaps, stated best, and most concisely, 2,500 years ago, in these words: "Wealth does not bring goodness, but goodness brings wealth and every other blessing, both to the individual and to the state." Those words of Socrates fell on unlistening ears in the Golden Age; we should pray that they will not go unheeded in the atomic age.

If we are, indeed, in the very midst of an atomic revolution, and if we, as managers, must lead it, we must remember that industry, primarily one of the most basic human activities, is a social institution; therefore, it is social perception, sensitivity, and intuition that are required. Our managerial prototypes 125 years ago replaced animay power with water or steam power and utilized this additional power potential directly to produce goods. They built factories, standardized operations, and in an incredibly brief period transformed the Western World into an industrial state. Some of them may have understood that they were creating an industrial revolution, but what many failed to take into account was that they had also caused a social revolution in their own lifetime. The factory age depopulated farms, built up slums, contributed to poverty and insecurity, and promoted much needless unrest and hardship. One has only to reread the pages of Dickens' great novels to see pictured in vivid imagery the social waste products of that earlier revolution—the Fagins, Quilps, and Sykeses that peopled then and people still the dead ends and back alleys of the world.

As managers, as leaders, as men matured by a new historical perspective and responsibilities new in history, we cannot permit the Atomic Revolution to foster such follies.

MASSIVE ATOMIC CREATION

So eminent an authority on modern warfare as Sir John Slessor has declared that the massive threat of atomic air power has "abolished total war and given the free world a security against that sort of attack that has nearly ruined it twice in the last 40 years." Little wars, fought with conventional arms and armies, he foresees, but the fear of "massive retaliation" rules out the Pearl Harbor or blitzkreig attack of hemisphere proportion. Thinking in nonmilitary terms we may—if we substitute for massive atomic retaliation the massive peaceful use of industrial atomic energy—extend this military hypothesis to other areas of human activity. A multiplication of world power resources on the level which seems likely to occur would be a powerful deterrent to the worldwide total depression of the 1929 variety. Again, the rapid development and export of peaceful atomic resources, if only in the form of science and technology, to the so-called backward or have-not nations would remove much of the international friction which has bedeviled our world since the dawn of the 19th century.

The concept of massive atomic creation, peaceful in purpose but revolutionary in effect, could shatter the heart of the Communist ideological appeal in Asia and in Africa, in Indonesia, Indochina, China, India, and Arabia, by bridging for all practical purposes the abyss between those who have and those who have not. By unlocking and sharing the secret of the atom, we might in due time reduce the difference between the haves and the have-nots to something like the difference betwen 99 and 100 instead of the difference betwen 1 and 200. The difference between East and West cannot be solved by military means, by Marxian dialectic, or by the conference technique. A reconciliation of man to man can be effected only by eliminating the basic causes of difference—fear and want, greed and hate. Thus, by wiping out the problems which Marxism claims that it alone can solve, we may strike to the death that aggression which hides behind the plausible mask of the Communist philosophy.

Most modern historians are agreed that a lack of natural resources, particularly of power, have contributed in large measure to the historical development of imperialism and colonialism. This lack—this important cause of war and international unrest—may well be removed by portable atomic power. In addition, adequate power usually means the development of industry, and industry raises living standards. The export of atomic technology to the backward nations, by increasing their abilities to produce and consume, could improve world market conditions and act as a massive deterrent to that kind of poverty and ignorance upon which communism flourishes. This in essence is our public responsibility as managers. We are in the vanguard of the Atomic Revolution and for the benefit of mankind we are asked to lead it, lest—under the leadership of others—it engulf us.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROBLEMS

The overall and overriding principles and objectives of management in the atomic future have been outlined. But what of the practices of management? Responding to the demands of modern industrial society, with its minute divisions of labor, its mass markets, its web of transport and communication, and its infinite variety of products, business management has grown steadily more complex. Within our own lifetime many of us have seen the birth and rise to professional status of such tools of modern management as industrial relations, public relations, personnel administration, and the increasingly complex and fascinating function of communication. Since this proliferation of the management function has evolved merely from the stimulus of normally expanding industry, it might be a fair assumption to predict even more complex administrative functions in the revolutionary atmosphere of the atomic future. We are told by some philosophers of modern business management that we face greater and more serious problems in management than ever before. But we must not meet these problems by increasing the complexity of our organization or by placing greater reliance on systems, measurements, tabulations, and other empirical aspects of scientific management.

SIMPLIFYING MANAGEMENT STRUCTURE

It is obviously true that civilization has become more complex and that the studies made in atomic energy and electronics, by requiring a deeper understanding of basic human values, are likely to demand a reappraisal of time-honored habits, customs, and techniques. Yet the atomic revolution now altering our way of life, and about to raise the world's living standards, does not necessarily call for further complication of our already complex business organization. Indeed, the modern trend in administration is the more efficient use of scientific management rather than a mushroomlike expansion to meet needs which have not yet presented themselves, and may never exist.

This trend will probably be continued, and in fact abetted, by the radical changes which are being made in communication through the extensive employment of servo-mechanisms and other control devices. For scientific management to work efficiently, all parts of a business organization must be coordinated. There must be a specialization of function, but this must never degenerate to a mere function of specialization

Such criteria are more trenchant now than ever; for the ingenious machines of the atomic age will require an exact and controlled environment for operation. Their use, therefore, precludes cumbersome, bulky, administrative organization by which policy and action may be achieved fitfully after long delay. The manager of the future must be in a position to make instant decisions eliciting instant response. He must, therefore, have constantly available accurate, timely information on which to base such decisions. Paradoxically, where the invention and application of atomic or electronic devices require an increasingly elaborate technologoy, the business of producing or using such instruments will require a simpler, less ornate management structure.

The irresolute executive may also expect short shrift. For the new age will insist upon a rapid evaluation of information and experience and a quick decision which cannot brook temporizing and equivocation. In some of our larger business organizations, there has developed an overspecialization of executives, a tendency to produce synthetic executives in a hothouse environment—or, to use a more modern term, to produce them hydroponically with gravel and chemicals but without earth. Since this sort of management specialization ill equips men to meet the unexpected, it will become even more difficult to justify when exposed to the rigorous conditions of automation and intensified competition. Allaround, rough-and-tumble experience can better prepare a manager to meet the needs of our atomic future, and seniors who spare the rod may spoil the executive. There is probably nothing of greater disservice to the junior executive in this atomic age than an overtolerant or easygoing superior.

COMMUNITY RELATIONS

One last specific implication of the atomic revolution for management is the importance that must be attached to community relations. The health and safety programs being developed by those industries which are engaged in nuclear work look beyond the plant gates and vitally concern themselves with the public attitude. Because of the novelty of atomic energy, and because of the extensive, even sensational literature which has grown up about it, the public has often become alarmed. Ignorance, misrepresentation, and rumor have been abroad in high places as well as low. To recognize this, we have only to remember our recent unpleasant experience with the latest H-bomb explosion and some of the statements in the press of friendly nations.

A healthy public opinion, educated to accept atomic energy as not different from other energy sources and as perfectly controllable, is an obvious public relations objective.

SOME SPECIFIC RESPONSIBILITIES

In addition to practicing the broad principles already discussed, what specifically should we as managers do in this atomic age?

1. Educate: We should seek in every way possible—with money, time, and encouragement—to increase the number and quality of trained engineers, scientists, and technical personnel coming from our top universities. Leaders of professional institutions are in the process of assembling pools of engineers and scientists for future utilization by industry. It is worthwhile noting that these new-type engineers, technicians, and scientists are thinking not only in new terms but in new ways. Their chief characteristics are imagination, enthusiasm, energy, and the ability, through an ordered, logical approach, to detect basic principles in seeming complexity. Therefore, it should be perfectly obvious to perceptive business leaders that the more trained craftsmen, technicians, designers, and engineers of this sort that we can bring into military and industrial atomic applications now, the farther ahead we shall be when we can direct all our energies to the industrial atomic projects of the future.

In the development of men whose constant contact with experiment will give them the confidence and competence to attack any problem, the engineering schools need our help. They are short of cash, and they are seldom accorded even encouragement. There is perhaps no sounder course of action for managers to recommend to chief executives and directors than the investment of the company's time and money in the development and growth of engineers, upon whom depend not only the safety and future well-being of America but the freedom of the world.

2. Cooperate: Managers must cooperate with the Defense Department and the Atomic Energy Commission, as well as with one another. Industry must seize this opportunity with its own resources to develop America's atomic industrial might. It is not likely that we shall engage in a struggle with our Government agencies or with the Government for a monopoly of atomic power. With the greatest vision, our Government has indicated an obvious desire to give industry its rightful responsibility for atomic development. If we should at any ultimate date fall into socialism, with state ownership of the materials and the means of production, this will result not from an aggressive act on the part of our Federal Government but from our own apathy and indolence.

3. Participate: We should take part in the various organizations which are devoted particularly to the defense of the Nation and the development of our atomic industrial power—primarily, the National Security Industrial Association, founded by the late James Forrestal, which seeks to bring together on mutual problems the leaders of industry and the leaders of the armed services, and the new Atomic Industrial Forum, an organization of some 400 members of industry now doing pioneer work in furthering our atomic industrial progress.

4. Communicate: Insofar as it is consistent with Federal policy, we should communicate the good news of the atomic revolution to and through our own employees, our communities, our suppliers, our share owners, and our customers, both here and overseas. The vital importance to our atomic age of a general public understanding of the atom cannot be emphasized too strongly. Our 60 million workers—and voters—should be able to comprehend and openly endorse the aims and objectives of our military, industrial, political, and scientific leadership. My company is presently undertaking a program of public, employee, and shareowner information and education in these respects. We look forward to joining with other members of industry in a broad education program which, in simple terms, will provide the public with the information on which it may be based the calm opinions and sound actions essential not only to our military but our industrial success.

CONCLUSION

Unfortunately we cannot delineate here the specific problems and the thoroughgoing changes in plant management, operating function, working conditions, physical layout, health, and safety, organization, and personnel which are already confronting management in the atomic present—to say nothing of the atomic future. It must be evident, however, that just as we are already requiring a new kind and quality of scientist and technician, we shall increasingly require the development and growth of a new breed of management men—men of ethics and vision, of spiritual faith in the atomic future and material power in the atomic present, men who stand no longer in awe of the world, or of the universe.

To paraphrase the remarks of a former chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, if we as managers are not interested enough in doing those things which the atomic age requires, we shall not earn the right to enjoy the benefits which the atomic age provides. Should we ignore our obligations, or leave them unfulfilled through ignorance or apathy the world will drift to the first atomic war, and the last.

Long ago, Alexis de Toequeville, a young French aristocrat, visited our shores and examined American institutions with an objective, cosmopolitan eye. His observations form one of the finest treatises on American civilization and are particularly apt to our atomic age. "Epochs sometimes occur in the life of a nation," said De Tocqueville, "when the old customs of a people are changed, public morality is destroyed, religious beliefs shaken. In this predicament to retreat is impossible, for a people cannot recover the sentiments of their youth any more than a man can return to the innocent tastes of childhood: such things may be regretted, but they cannot be renewed. They must go forward and accelerate the union of private with public interests."

Let's Be Fair to Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 19, 1954

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to call attention to the following article relative to congressional and judicial salaries:

LET'S BE FAIR TO CONGRESS

(By Virginia E. Miller, publisher, the Congress Times)

It is probably not a subject that those Members who face tough battles for reelection would care to discuss at this time, but, in the interest of congressional efficiency, it is vitally important that action be taken soon to adjust salaries of Members of the House and Senate and the Federal judiciary in keeping with the costs of living and of serving in Congress and on the bench, and in conformity with the responsibilities involved.

I had much to do with the basic research involved in the brief presented to the Commission on Congressional and Judicial Salaries which simply on the basis of the cost of holding congressional office or a judicial post demonstrated that an increase in compensation is long overdue.

The Commission, headed by Mr. Bernard Segel, of Philadelphia, explored the subject objectively, obtained all pro and con views, and after careful deliberation by the industrial, labor, professional, and civic leaders serving on the Commission, recommended an increase. President Eisenhower was later quoted as favoring adequate compensation for members.

As Congress nears adjournment, the subject has been discussed by several writers, including two widely-read writers, Drew Pearson, the Bell Syndicate columnist, and by Fred Othman, of the Scripps-Howard United Features syndicate.

As a former publisher of the Pictorial Directory of Congress and currently as editor and publisher of a tabloid newspaper serving employees of the Congress, I have had ample opportunity to study this pay issue carefully. My view is, let's be fair to Congress and take steps to have Members' salaries, as well as the pay of Federal judges, increased to assure the highest caliber of people in these vital posts.

It was regrettable that no recommendations were made for a fair readjustment of the salaries of administrative assistants of Senators and Representatives and staff directors of committees. They are the real workhorses of Capitol Hill, who next to the Members themselves, carry the heaviest burden of running a congressional office or a congressional committee. However, this is a matter that could be taken care of when congressional and judicial salaries are rescaled.

In order to give this subject full discussion, I would welcome letters, statistical data, and other material on the subject mailed to our publication address, the Congress Times, 1130 South 16th Street, Arlington, Va.

Handouts to the Greedy, Brushoffs to the Needy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ISIDORE DOLLINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Speaker, I chose as the title of my report to my constituents this year "Handouts to the Greedy, Brushoffs to the Needy." We have had 2 years of Republican administration; nothing has been accomplished; the campaign promises which garnered Republican votes were conveniently forgotten; effective leadership and a constructive forward-looking program have been found completely lacking; the critical needs of the people of our country have been ignored; the responsibilities of our Government in these crucial days have not been met at home or abroad.

The Republican Party will point with pride to certain beneficial measures passed during this session, such as the social-security amendments. Bear in mind that in each instance, they were only carrying out a continuation of the Democratic program. Also remember that they succeeded in scuttling more beneficial laws than they enacted—public housing among them. The Republicans would have you believe that we are enjoying prosperity. Who is enjoying the prosperity and what kind is it? The stock market in June was breaking 1929 peak prices—yet United States industry was operating far below capacity. If you own property your income has increased, but if you are a worker, job prospects are not too good, and unemployment in July passed the 3 million mark. Facts do not bear out the claim of prosperity asserted by the administration.

One clear and irrefutable fact has emerged: the Republican philosophy of government has not changed. All major legislation pushed by the Republicans has been based on their theory that if you make the well to do more prosperous, some benefits will trickle down to those less fortunate. The Democrats have always legislated on the principle that the masses must have direct help; that when the vast majority enjoy even reasonable financial security, those at the top of the economic ladder benefit accordingly. Let us not forget that this same Republican philosophy and type of leadership which backed big business and huge profits to the utmost in the 1920's also disregarded the little people, the wage earners, farmers, and small business. Our Nation, as a result, suffered the worst depression in our history; millions lost their homes, and 14 million men were unemployed.

We must avoid a repetition of such a tragic period. A depression, with its attendant factors of disunity, discontent, and panic, invites an upsurge of communism. It was during 1931 and 1932 that the Communists made their first real progress and gained a strong foothold here—those were depression years. When we legislate for the benefit of all the people, when we make it possible for all to enjoy security, we provide effective weapons against communism. To forget the human element in our Government is to foster communism. The Republicans, as proven by their legislative record, have not profited by the lessons their past mistakes should have taught them; their aims remain unchanged—help those who have, and ignore all others.

GREAT GIVEAWAYS

The Republican administration has already given away to private ownership, industry, and monopolies, billions of dollars of natural resources of our country, which rightfully belong to all the people. More such giveaways are contemplated. The first major legislation steered through the Republican Congress turned over to oil monopolies upwards of $70 billion in tidelands oil. President Truman twice vetoed this oil giveaway and protected public ownership of these vast reserves. President Eisenhower, during his campaign, promised to maintain TVA; already the utility and power interests have been successful in undermining TVA which provides millions with electricity and power at reasonable rates. Public lands, grazing rights, timber rights, as well as water and power development rights are all threatened; it will take constant vigilance and determination to prevent these from falling into the hands of private ownership. The administration has also proposed to dispose of the Government's multi-million-dollar helium, titanium, and zirconium production facilities, another windfall for big business and loss to the taxpayers.

The latest giveaway was provided by the atomic energy bill. The American taxpayers have invested, so far, $12 billion to advance research and experiment. Now the way is clear for a few favored utilities to reap huge profits, with no safeguards provided to protect the people against this subsidized private monopoly. We already have proof of windfalls to big business under the new atomic bill; the President ordered awarding of a contract to a syndicate which was $90 million higher than that offered by a rival syndicate and $140 million more than TVA would require to supply the power.

TAXES

During the 1952 campaign, the Republicans promised to ease the tax load of the American people. Their failure to do so amounts to a betrayal.

The tax bill as passed, provided for a reduction of taxes by $1.4 billion. About one-fourth of these reductions will go to individuals, and the remaining ones will go to corporations. Of the one-fourth which will benefit individual taxpayers, more than one-third of the benefit will go to those who have income from stock dividends.

Instead of increasing the individual tax exemption which is wholly inadequate under present high living costs, the Republican administration has liberalized tax deductions only for those taxpayers who suffer some misfortune, such as those required to pay tremendous medical expenses, but the majority who would have benefited by an increase of individual tax reduction of even $100 per year were completely ignored.

The tax bill is neither equitable nor economically sound. Unemployment continues at a high rate, purchasing power is shrinking. The need for an intelligent and constructive tax policy which would increase mass purchasing power and stimulate industrial production is urgent.

HOUSING

A critical housing shortage still exists; millions of Americans are without homes or living quarters of their own; millions exist in substandard dwellings; the need for new housing in our country has not been met for decades, and although it is a disgrace to us, we have refused to provide adequate shelter for our people.

The President, in a special message, asked for authority to make 140,000 public housing starts over a 4-year period. The housing bill as passed, authorizes only 35,000. However, these are only to replace buildings torn down for slum clearance. It stands to reason that since there will be no new building, there will be no tearing down of slum dwellings as there would be no housing units to replace them.

The law is a far cry from the great need which exists and is a sham and a delusion. The public-housing program started under the Democratic leadership provided for 135,000 housing starts each year for a 6-year period. The Republicans have now scuttled this program. Under the law, bankers and builders profit, but the very needy who must rely on assistance from the Government, through the public-housing program, are forgotten. This measure is another repudiation of the Republican campaign promise to help the little fellow.

I have fought for public housing and the protection of tenants. I did all in my power to have the public-housing program extended. The housing bill which came before us was inadequate and unfair. This is one more instance where the Republican administration failed to meet its responsibility to the people.

LABOR

The Republicans wooed the labor vote by definite promises to revise objectionable features of the Taft-Hartley law and to make it fair and acceptable to union labor and millions of other working millions in our country. The Republican administration did nothing whatever to correct the law; the hardships and inequities go on. In view of the definite promises made, this is a rank betrayal of labor, and it will not be forgotten by all those who relied upon the Republicans to keep their word.

Living costs have continued to rise and wage increases have not been adequate to meet the increased cost of living. I introduced a measure to increase the minimum wage now set by law to $1.25 per hour, but no action was taken on such legislation by the Republican leadership.

IMMIGRATION

Another high-sounding, fine promise by the Republicans that they would revise the Naturalization Act of 1952, known as the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act, has been ignored. Nothing has been done to wipe out the inequities, injustices, and unfairness of this law. As the law stands, it causes untold hardships; it has earned us criticism and disrespect; it is contrary to the very principles of democracy and brotherhood of man upon which our Nation was founded.

I voted against the McCarran Act when it came before us; I voted to sustain former President Truman's veto of the measure. Thereafter, I introduced a bill to repeal the McCarran Act. I also joined with a number of members of Congress in an effort to have the McCarran Act changed, and introduced an omnibus immigration and naturalization bill to revise and replace it. These efforts have all been in vain, and suspicion, racial discrimination, and fear, continue to flourish under our present law. No longer can we be looked upon as a place of refuge for the oppressed, no longer can visitors and immigrants feel welcome in our great land. The failure of the Republican Congress to meet its obligation in this regard has lowered our standing among the great nations of the world.

SOCIAL SECURITY

The social-security amendments passed provide benefits that will be a great boon to the millions dependent upon social security, and some of those who have suffered hardships because of lack of coverage under the law or insufficient payments in these days of high living costs. The amendments are a step in the right direction, but there is still much need for improvement.

The Republicans are taking pride in this accomplishment, but we must remember that formerly they opposed the program, cut down on the coverage of the law and fought against liberalizing the benefits. Do not forget that the leadership under the Democratic Party began this great program which is so helpful to workers, that they saw the need for safeguards against unemployment, destitution and dependency.

The major new amendments provide coverage for additional millions of persons, a raise in the ceiling of allowable earnings for social security beneficiaries, and an increase in benefits for each beneficiary.

POSTAL AND FEDERAL SALARIES

After much delay, wrangling, and bitter debate, the Republican leadership finally permitted passage of a bill providing for the long overdue pay raises for postal and Federal employees. The bill was inadequate, and does not grant sufficient increases to assure the employees of a decent living. Our faithful postal and Federal employees merited better and more generous treatment, but once again false economy prevailed, and they are victims of the Republican drive to save at the expense of the little fellow.

I shall continue my efforts to obtain an adequate wage for all Federal and postal employees.

GENERAL TOPICS

I have always vigorously opposed any reductions in appropriations for the Veterans' Administration. Any economy measure which brings hardship to our veterans, their widows, and dependents, is unjustified. Our veterans should have adequate medical, hospital, and domiciliary services, and I shall not spare my efforts in their behalf.

Although an effort was made to give some assistance to veterans, yet very little was done during this session as compared to the needs. The 5-percent pension raises voted for most dependents is inadequate in these days of high prices, but the administration insisted on paring the figure from the 10 percent requested to the 5 percent finally allowed. The watered-down veterans' bills finally passed leave much to be desired—once again the Republican administration saved a few dollars at the expense of the needy veterans.

Another big problem was ignored by the administration and another promise broken when consumers were left with no protection against runaway prices and profiteers. The Republicans eliminated price controls and at the same time assured the public that prices would remain stable. Living costs continued to soar and have reached a new high. I reintroduced my bills providing for a Consumers' Advisory Bureau and a Joint Committee on Consumers, to try to help, but was unable to get Congress to take action on them.

I have lost no opportunities to fight for civil rights, and reintroduced my bills to prohibit discrimination. It is only by continued vigilance and striving that we can hope to end the evils of discrimination which exist in our country.

Space does not permit my giving complete details regarding all major questions and all my efforts in behalf of the people I represent. Unfortunately, some must be omitted from my report. I have advocated an investigation as to the resurgence of fascism and anti-Semitism in Germany; I have worked for all possible assistance under our foreign-aid bills; Federal aid to education and construction of schools.

BRONX CONGRESSIONAL OFFICE

I wish to remind my constituents that I maintain a congressional office at 938 Simpson Street, Bronx, which is open daily. They are welcome to call there and to take up their problems. I also invite them to write me so that I may have the benefit of their views and suggestions regarding legislation.

It is my aim to render faithful and conscientious service to the people who have chosen me to represent them in Congress and I have tried, to the best of my ability, to fulfill my duties to the satisfaction of my constituents in the 23d District of New York.

Fort Stanton Grazing Land

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANTONIO M. FERNANDEZ

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, at about this time last year, just before the adjournment of Congress, I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a warning that the General Services Administration and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare did not seem disposed to comply with the law requiring grazing lands carved out of the public domain to be returned to the public domain when the use for which they were withdrawn had been terminated. I called attention to a tract of land comprising 27,000 acres at Fort Stanton, N. Mex. This land had been used for the raising of beef in connection with the Fort Stanton hospital. The utilization of that hospital by the Public Health Service had been terminated as of June 30, 1953. The hospital facilities with 259 acres of land had been transferred to the State welfare department of New Mexico for its use.

The balance of the 27,000 acres under the law should have been returned to the public domain from which it was carved. Subsequent events proved that my concern about the matter was justified.

Instead of returning this land to the public domain, the Public Health Service proposed, and the General Services Administration agreed, that 12,760 acres of this land should be transferred to the New Mexico Department of Public Welfare purportedly for the protection of the water rights and water supply of the hospital.

Since the Mescalero Indians claimed a right to the property, I introduced one bill transferring all the grazing land to the Indians in order that the Indians might have the opportunity of presenting their claim thereto. At the same time I introduced a bill directing that it be returned to the public domain, as the law requires.

The Indians presented their claim to the Committee of Interior and Insular Affairs. At the same hearings I submitted to the committee on behalf of the State department of public welfare a memorandum which had been prepared to show the need of these lands by the hospital to protect its water rights and water supply. However the memorandum actually showed exactly the contrary. The memorandum and the evidence showed first, that all the water rights and water supply going to the hospital originated at a point several miles up the stream above the land involved; and second, that all of the watershed from which it draws its water supply lay several miles above the land involved from whence the water is piped to the hospital. True, the evidence showed also that there were water rights appurtenant to a small 40-acre tract within the reservation; but it was admitted that the water owned under this water right was also being piped in at the point of diversion above, and had so been piped in for approximately 20 years. The memorandum above referred to also stated that application had been made for the formal transfer to the water pipe intake.

The Department, thereupon, asserted that the land was needed also for the purpose of raising beef for the hospital.

I believe I represented the consensus of opinion in the State when I urged that a hospital has no more business running a ranch for the production of beef, than a ranch has in running a hospital.

As proof of that I call attention to the manner in which they propose to break up this big ranch. Although it is nicely subdivided and fenced into a bull pasture, a dairy pasture, and several rotating pastures, the Health, Education, and Welfare Department is undertaking to cut across all those fences without rhyme or reason, leaving a long narrow strip of several miles high and dry on one side which would render it useless for any purpose. Every fence except a portion of the south boundary fence will have to be removed and relocated. I have been unable to find out who will bear this expense. Nor have I found out what is the sense of this foolish and extravagant decision. Certainly no man with any knowledge of land or ranching would ever undertake the division of any such tract of land in the absurd manner proposed. This tract of grazing land should be returned immediately to the public domain for administration by the Bureau of Land Management. Of course, if the Mescalero Indians are entitled to it, they may assert those rights at any time so long as the land is held by the Federal Government and so long as the Government does not divest itself of the fee title to the land.

If the hospital is to be supplied a ranch for the raising of beef, then the entire tract already fenced and subdivided into pastures should be turned over to the hospital. Wherever it goes it should go as an entity. It is folly to break it up in the manner proposed by the Department and as shown by the map on file with the committee and with the General Services Administration.

So far as I am concerned, I shall continue to protest the breaking up of this land in this fashion, and I shall continue to protest its being left idle and useless as it has been for over a year. The duty of the Department to return this land for utilization is plain. The livestock industry, as well as the Mescalero Indians, have been hard hit for pasture. This land should be utilized immediately. As every good rancher knows, fences have to be kept up and in order. As it stands now, it is no man's land, and no one has the responsibility to protect it.

The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, after hearing the testimony of the Mescalero Indians, did not approve that bill. It did not report out any bill, undoubtedly because as urged by the Department, the General Services Administration Act contains sufficient authority for the General Services Administration and the Department to act if they will only act. The committee's decision not to report any bill out, checks the matter back to the General Services Administration.

The people of New Mexico are watching and wondering at the fumbling manner in which this little matter is being handled. And they wonder why.

A Realistic "Set-Aside" Program by the Department of Defense Will Help Relieve Unemployment in Surplus Labor Areas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 19, 1954

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, as a continuing effort on my part to relieve unemployment in my congressional district, I wrote the following letter to Hon. Charles E. Wilson, Secretary of Defense, urging that surplus labor areas so designated by the Secretary of Labor be given greater recognition in awarding of defense contracts.

As mentioned in the letter, the residents of my congressional district are doing everything possible to bolster the economy of the bituminous coal fields in central Pennsylvania and many firms in that area would benefit greatly with a realistic "set-aside" program in awarding defense contracts.

The letter, together with an inventory of the defense capabilities of firms in my congressional district, follows:

House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C., August 17, 1954.

Hon. Charles E. Wilson,
Secretary of Defense,
Washington, D. C.

My Dear Mr. Wilson: For the past several years my congressional district has been classified by the United States Department of Labor as a critical area and placed in category IV because of surplus labor. This classification is based on the fact that over 12 percent of the employables are walking the streets principally because of the ailing soft-coal industry and its effect on the railroads and related industries. In the city of Altoona, Pa., alone, the Pennsylvania Railroad shops, the largest in the world, are practically closed with some 7,500 employees furloughed and trying to exist on railroad unemployment insurance benefits supplemented by public-assistance benefits from the State of Pennsylvania and the distribution of surplus commodities to needy families.

In a desperate effort to relieve this distressing situation by bolstering the economy of my congressional district, I have been trying for months to aid our industries by furnishing them detailed information as to how they can qualify for defense contracts. On several occasions some firms have been able to obtain contracts under the set-aside plan but in the majority of cases we find that the defense agency concerned has a lukewarm attitude toward a realistic set-aside program. The result is that a great number of contracts are awarded without adherence to set-aside provisions.

In an effort to stress the desperate plight of industries in my congressional district, at my request the Small Business Administration assigned a task force to the three-county area and as a result of public meetings in each county they have been able to furnish me with an inventory of the defense-production capabilities of our industries.

I am enclosing a photostatic copy of this Small Business Administration inventory which shows definitely the part my industries can play in defense production if they are given the opportunity to participate in the set-aside program.

The purpose of this letter is to request respectfully that you assist my congressional district and others that are classified in category IV as critical ae rbsausacee of surplus labor, by reviewing the set-aside program and directing that it be enforced by requiring that all defense contracts contain a set-aside designed to definitely assist in relieving unemployment in the so-called critical areas such as mine in Pennsylvania.

In requesting the enforcement of a realistic set-aside program, I also request that the Department of Defense implement such action by taking the following steps:

1. Notify each procuring activity which purchases the items suitable for manufacture in my district that full consideration must be given to a set-aside whenever the item comes up for procurement.

2. Notify me when such procurement opportunities arise and furnish a report on the amount of the set-aside or the reasons for rejecting a set-aside. A copy for follow-up purposes of such report should also be sent to Mr. T. G. Waale, Director, Office of Procurement and Technical Assistance, Small Business Administration, Washington, D. C.

3. In case a set-aside is made, make certain that the qualified manufacturers listed in the report are furnished with a bid set, so that they may enter bids on the non-set-aside portion of the procurement, thereby making them eligible to participate in the set-aside.

4. Furnish me a report of the results of awards made under each procurement where set-aside provisions are in effect.

In making this determined effort to asist the sagging economy of my congressional district, I am appealing to you in behalf of the some 300,000 residents whom I represent, thousands of whom are walking the streets seeking employment. These solid American citizens are doing everything possible to aid themselves but they are powerless to do the task alone.

For your information every community in the three-county area has active industrial committees employing every conceivable idea in an effort to attract new industries. At this moment the citizens of Altoona with over 10,000 unemployed in the coal, railroad and related industries are engaged in a campaign to raise a million dollars to finance the acquisition of new industries.

With the residents of my congressional district doing everything possible to assist themselves and since it is the policy of our Government to rush to the aid of backward and distressed areas abroad, the information that I furnish in this letter and its enclosures should prove conclusively that here is a case where charity should begin at home.

Mr. Secretary, if the Department of Defense will recognize the plight of distressed areas in category IV and realize that the skilled labor they contain can be utilized to the benefit of this Nation by employing their talents in a realistic set-aside program, you will have accomplished a real service to this Nation and the areas concerned by helping to abolish the gaunt specter of unemployment and misery now in our midst.

Awaiting to hear from you, and with best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

James E. Van Zandt.

Attendance List, Small Business Administration and DuBois Board of Trade, Sponsored Meeting of July 29, 1954

Mr. E. A. Noon, president, DuBois Board of Trade, DuBois, Pa.

Mr. H. M. Smith and Mr. Marshall Jatty, Brockway Pressed Metals, Inc., Brockway, Pa.

Mr. C. H. Brennan, Brockway Clay Co., Brockway, Pa.

Mr. Frank Bentley, Brockway Glass Co., Brockway, Pa.

Mr. Jack Sheffler, Commercial Job Printing Co., DuBois, Pa.

Mr. Don H. Erickson, DuBois Tool & Electric Supply Co., DuBois, Pa.

Mr. Robert Day, DuBois Electric Storage Battery Co., DuBois, Pa.

Mr. C. J. Phillips, the B. F. Goodrich Co., DuBois, Pa.

Mr. Ben Mercer, Jeffers Electronics, Inc., DuBois, Pa.

Mr. J. R. Osborn, Mr. Huntz, Mr. Albert, and Mr. Curry, Osborn Machine Co., DuBois, Pa.

Mr. John Bauser, and Mr. Earl Hudson, Rockwell Manufacturing Co., DuBois, Pa.

Mr. Frank Shakespeare, H. Shakespeare & Sons, DuBois, Pa.

Mr. James Mitchell, and Mr. Hohn Reitz, Symmco, Inc., Sykesville, Pa.

Mr. Ralph Smith, L. B. Smith Co., Sykesville, Pa.

Mr. J. C. Dunlap, Triangle Auto Spring Corp., DuBois, Pa.

Mr. Fred J. Brown, and Mr. M. H. Hartzfeld, Union Banking & Trust Co., DuBois, Pa.

Mr. George W. Yohe, and Mr. John Q. Groves, DuBois Deposit National Bank, DuBois, Pa.

Mr. Dock R. Farthing, Jr., Small Business Administration, Washington, D. C.

Mr. Charles H. Swisher, Small Business Administration, Washington, D. C.

Mr. Fernand Thomassy, Small Business Administration, Pittsburgh, Pa.

Attendance List, Small Business Administration and Chambers of Commerce, Clearfield and Philipsburg, Pa., Sponsored Meeting of July 28, 1954

Hon. A. H. Letzler, State senator, Houtzdale, Pa.

Mr. H. M. McGarvey, County National Bank, Clearfield, Pa.

Mr. Peter Bosco, Philipsburg Chamber of Commerce; also Chevrolet Harpster Co., Philipsburg, Pa.

Mr. Ward Smith, Smith Camera Shop, Clearfield, Pa.

Mr. Robert E. Krebs, Krebs Bros. Transfer Co., Clearfield, Pa.

Mr. Kenneth Nicholson, Undertaker, Clearfield, Pa.

Mr. E. P. Spencer, Houtzdale Bank, Houtzdale, Pa.

Mr. Hilmer J. Anderson, Andersons Department Store, Houtzdale, Pa.

Mr. Thomas V. Gould, Houtzdale Bank, Houtzdale, Pa.

Mr. Luther Wilks, Radio Specialty Shop, Houtzdale, Pa.

Mr. Frank Hoffman, Sanitary Milk Co., Curwensville, Pa.

Mr. J. Hamer Tate, Clearfield Cheese Co., Curwensville, Pa.

Mr. George M. Dimeling, Dimeling & Schrot Insurance Co., Clearfield, Pa.

Mr. William K. Ulerick, the Clearfield Progress (daily newspaper), Clearfield, Pa.

Mr. William W. Strange, the Wm. W. Strange Funeral Home, Morrisdale, Pa.

Mr. George Scott, the Clearfield Progress (editor), Clearfield, Pa.

Mr. Herbert Janke, Janke Meats, Winburne, Pa.

Mr. Thomas H. O'Brien, Pennsylvania State Employment Service (manager), Clearfield, Pa.

Mr. Joe Lucas, Morningstar Bakery, Philipsburg, Pa.

Mr. Dean F. Wagner, Postmaster, Coalport, Pa.

Mr. Joseph Gallaher, Coalport, Pa.

Mr. William T. Davis, Attorney, Clearfield, Pa.

Mr. Ed Walker, Harbison Walker Refractories Co., Clearfield, Pa.

Mr. James H. Johnston, Johnston Contracting & Paving Co., Clearfield, Pa.

Mr. Carl Anderson, insurance, Clearfield, Pa.

Mr. O. A. Curtis, General Hardware & Supply Co., Philipsburg, Pa.

Mr. John Tush, Putman & Greene, Philipsburg, Pa.

Mr. Lewis Stein, Elliot Coal Mining Co., Philipsburg, Pa., also Philipsburg Association of Commerce.

Mr. Ralph E. Johnston, Pennsylvania Electric Co., Philipsburg, Pa.

Mr. Lincoln Stevenson, Dumont Airplane & Marine Instruments, Inc., Clearfield, Pa.

Mr. William Diehl, Dumont A. & M. Instrument Co., Clearfield, Pa.

Mr. S. K. Williams, Clearfield Furs, Inc., Clearfield, Pa.

Mr. W. Elbridge Brown, Clearfield Trust Co., Clearfield, Pa.

Mr. L. E. Soult, Soult Wholesale Co., Clearfield, Pa.

Mr. Charles T. Kurtz, Kurtz Bros., Clearfield, Pa.

Mr. Joseph Logan, H. R. Woolridge Co., Clearfield, Pa.

Mr. George McG. Fryberger, president, First National Bank, Philipsburg, Pa.

Mr. Lloyd Shankle, vice president, First National Bank, Philipsburg, Pa.

Mr. Edsel Hurwitz, Hurwitz Furniture Co., Philipsburg, Pa.

Mr. George Sheldon, Sheldon's, Philipsburg, Pa.

Mr. Gaston LeBlanc, district director, CIO.

Mr. George W. Gaylor, Chamber of Commerce, Clearfield, Pa.

Mr. Dock R. Farthing, Jr., Small Business Administration, Washington, D. C.

Mr. Fernand Thomassy, Small Business Administration, Pittsburgh, Pa.

Mr. Charles H. Swisher, Small Business Administration, Washington, D. C.

Mr. Paul Ruch, D. J. Industries, Inc., Clearfield, Pa.

Mr. Paul Ruch, Clearfield Plastics, Inc., Clearfield, Pa.

Represented, Haley Lumber Co., Curwensville, Pa.

Represented, Williamsgrove Clay Products Co., Bigler, Pa.

Rev. Robert Croyle, pastor, Trinity Methodist Church, Clearfield, Pa.

Attendance List, Small Business Administration and Chambers of Commerce, Altoona and Tyrone, Pa., Sponsored Meeting of July 27, 1954

Mr. Dean R. Gwins, Tyrone Equipment Co., Tyrone, Pa.

Mr. William F. Cox, Titan Metal Manufacturing Co., Bellefonte, Pa.

Mr. C. E. Barr, West Virginia Pulp & Paper Co., Tyrone, Pa.

Mr. R. B. Garman, Tyrone Lime & Stone Co., Tyrone, Pa.

Mr. B. C. Jones, First Blair County National Bank, Tyrone, Pa.

Mr. W. J. Hoyne, Chicago Rivet & Machine Co., Tyrone, Pa.

Mr. John C. Horn and Mr. C. L. Miller, John R. Wald Co., Tyrone, Pa.

Mr. James W. Gardner, Seabrook Water Blanching Co., Tyrone, Pa.

Mr. Ward McLanahan and Mr. Robert H. Brown, McLanahan & Stone Corp., Hollidaysburg, Pa.

Mr. J. H. Butcher, Butcher & Hart Manufacturing Co., Altoona, Pa.

Mr. Howard P. Semler and Mr. L. W. Hargest, Pittsburgh Ordnance District, Pittsburgh, Pa.

Mr. Fernand A. Thomassy, SBA branch office, Pittsburgh, Pa.

Mr. Joseph Mazzei and Mr. Don Rorabaugh, American Steel Fabricators, Altoona, Pa.

Mr. G. S. Ruth, Altoona Chamber of Commerce, Altoona, Pa.

Mr. Arthur L. Bobbe, Vincent Horwitz Co., Inc., Altoona, Pa.

Mr. William C. Parrish, Juniata Valley Lions Club, Alexandria, Pa.

Mr. James R. Crum, hotel and motel proprietor, Alexandria, Pa.

Mr. Dock R. Farthing, Jr., Small Business Administration, Washington, D. C.

Mr. Charles H. Swisher, Small Business Administration, Washington, D. C.

Defense Items Suitable for Manufacture by Firms in the Altoona-Clearfield-DuBois Area, Pa.

SHAFTING, PROPULSION, SHIP

Titan Metal Manufacturing Co., Bellefonte, Pa.

Purchasing office

Navy Bureau of Ships, Washington, D. C.

BARS AND RODS, NONFERROUS BASE METAL

Titan Metal Manufacuring Co., Bellefonte, Pa.

Purchasing offices

Chicago Procurement Office, Corps of Engineers, Chicago, Ill.

Rocky Mountain Arsenal Procurement Office, Chicago, Ill.

New York Chemical Procurment District, New York, N. Y.

Ordnance Tank Automotive Center, Army Ordnance Corps, Detroit, Mich.

Picatinny Arsenal, Army Ordnance Corps, Dover, N. J.

Springfield Armory, Army Ordnance Corps, Springfield, Mass.

Watervliet Arsenal, Army Ordnance Corps, Watervliet, N. Y.

Navy Purchasing Office, Washington, D. C.

General Stores Supply Office, Philadelphia, Pa.

Marine Corps Headquarters, Washington, D. C.

Warner Robins Air Material Area, Robins Air Force Base, Macon, Ga.

Chemical Corps Research Procurement Agency, Army Chemical Center, Md.

Pine Bluff Arsenal Procurement Office, Dallas, Tex.

Detroit Arsenal, Army Ordnance Corps, Center Line, Mich.

Frankford Arsenal, Army Ordnance Corps, Philadelphia, Pa.

Rock Island Arsenal, Army Ordnance Corps, Rock Island, Ill.

Watertown Arsenal, Army Ordnance Corps, Watertown, Mass.

Redstone Arsenal, Army Ordance Corps, Huntsville, Ala.

Aviation Supply Office, Philadelphia, Pa.

Naval Gun Factory Supply Office, Washington, D. C.

Topeka Air Force Depot, Topeka, Kans., Attention Directorate of Procurement and Production.

Pittsburgh Ordnance District, Pittsburgh, Pa.

ALUMINUM FORGINGS FOR AIRCRAFT, COMMUNICATION, SUCH AS PANELS, DIALS, KEYBOARDS, TOWING BARS, AIRFRAME COMPONENTS

Titan Metal Manufacturing Co., Bellefonte, Pa.

Purchasing offices

Signal Corps Procurement Agency, Philadelphia, Pa.

Navy Bureau of Aeronautics, Washington, D. C.

Air Material Command, Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio.

Navy Bureau of Ships, Washington, D. C.

Aviation Supply Office, Philadephia, Pa.

Rome Air Force Depot, Griffis Air Force Base, Rome, N. Y.

COMPONENTS OF AMMUNITION, SUCH AS FUZES, EMPTY CARTRIDGE CASES, PLUGS, ETC.

Titan Metal Manufacturing Co., Bellefonte, Pa.

Purchasing offices

Pine Bluff Arsenal Procurement Office, Dallas, Tex.

Army Ordnance Ammunition Center, Joliet, Ill.

Navy Bureau of Ordnance, Washington, D. C.

New York Chemical Procurement District, New York, N. Y.

Picatinny Arsenal, Army Ordnance Corps, Dover, N. J.

ALUMINUM CASTINGS (MACHINED) SUCH AS FIN ASSEMBLIES—GUIDED MISSILES, AND COMPONENTS FOR BOMB RACK AND ROCKET LAUNCHER COMBINATION

Titan Metal Manufacturing Co., Bellefonte, Pa.

Purchasing offices

Redstone Arsenal, Army Ordnance Corps, Huntsville, Ala.

Navy Bureau of Aeronautics, Washington, D. C.

Rock Island Arsenal, Army Ordnance Corps, Rock Island, Ill.

Army Ordnance Ammunition Center, Joliet, Ill.

Navy Bureau of Ordnance, Washington, D. C.

Air Materiel Command, Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio.

ZINC DIE CASTINGS, COMPONENTS FOR ENGINE-FUEL, ELECTRICAL, AND COOLING SYSTEMS

Titan Metal Manufacturing Co., Bellefonte, Pa.

Purchasing offices

Navy Bureau of Aeronautics, Washington, D. C.

Ships Parts Control Center, Naval Supply Depot, Mechanicsburg, Pa.

Yards and Dock Supply Office, Naval Construction BN Center, Port Hueneme, Calif.

Marine Corps Depot of Supplies, San Francisco, Calif.

Air Materiel Command, Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio.

Aviation Supply Office, Philadelphia, Pa.

Marine Corps Headquarters, Washington, D. C.

Marine Corps Depot of Supplies, Philadelphia, Pa.

Army Ordnance Tank Automotive Center, Detroit, Mich.

Central Procurement Office Transportation Corps Supply Field Service Agency, Marietta, Pa.

CANVAS GOODS, SUCH AS COVERS, SLEEPING BAGS, TARPAULINS, DUFFEL BAGS, AMMUNITION BELTS, KNAPSACKS, ETC.

Vincent Horowitz Co., Inc., Altoona, Pa.

Purchasing offices

Philadelphia Quartermaster Depot, Philadelphia, Pa.

Marine Corps Depot of Supplies, Philadelphia, Pa.

Central Procurement Office Transport Corps Supply Field Service Agency, Marietta, Pa.

Pittsburgh Ordnance District, Pittsburgh, Pa.

Detroit Arsenal, Army Ordnance Corps, Center Line, Mich.

Frankford Arsenal, Army Ordnance Corps, Philadelphia, Pa.

Navy Purchasing Office, New York, N. Y.

Chicago Procurement Office, Corps of Engineers, Chicago, Ill.

Wilkins Air Force Depot, Shelby, Ohio.

Aviation Supply Office, Philadelphia, Pa.

Army Ordnance Tank Automotive Center, Detroit, Mich.

Picatinny Arsenal, Army Ordnance Corps, Dover, N. J.

Raritan Arsenal, Army Ordnance Corps, Metuchen, N. J.

Springfield Armory, Army Ordnance Corps, Springfield, Mass.

Watertown Arsenal, Army Ordnance Corps, Watertown, Mass.

Rossford Ordnance Depot, Army Ordnance Corps, Toledo, Ohio.

Rock Island Arsenal, Army Ordnance Corps, Rock Island, Ill.

Ordnance Ammunition Center, Army Ordnance Corps, Joliet, Ill.

Watervliet Arsenal, Army Ordnance Corps, Watervliet, N. Y.

Redstone Arsenal, Army Ordnance Corps, Huntsville, Ala.

SLIPPERS, CANVAS, HOSPITAL

Vincent Horwitz Co., Inc., Altoona, Pa.

Purchasing office

Philadelphia Quartermaster Depot, Philadelphia, Pa.

LAUNDRY BASKETS, CANVAS

Vincent Horwitz Co., Inc., Altoona, Pa.

Purchasing offices

Chicago Quartermaster Depot, Chicago, Ill.

Navy Bureau of Ships, Washington, D. C.

Yards and Docks Supply Office, Naval Construction BN Center, Port Hueneme, Calif.

New York Chemical Procurement District, New York, N. Y.

Navy Purchasing Office, Washington, D. C.

Marine Corps Headquarters, Washington, D. C.

MISCELLANEOUS TYPES OF FLATWORK, SUCH AS WORK CLOTHING AND PUP TENTS

Vincent Horwitz Co., Inc., Altoona, Pa.

Purchasing Offices

Philadelphia Quartermaster Depot, Philadelphia, Pa.

Marine Corps Depot of Supplies, Philadelphia, Pa.

Navy Purchasing Office, New York, N. Y.

HELMET LINERS—PLASTIC

Clearfield Plastics, Inc., Clearfield, Pa.

Purchasing Office

Chicago Quartermaster Depot, Chicago, Ill.

MISCELLANEOUS LAMINATED PLASTIC MATERIALS

Clearfield Plastics, Inc., Clearfield, Pa.

Purchasing Offices

Philadelphia Quartermaster Depot, Philadelphia, Pa.

Signal Corps Procurement Agency, Philadelphia, Pa.

Aviation Supply Office, Philadelphia, Pa.

Marine Corps Headquarters, Washington, D. C.

Topeka Air Force Depot, Topeka, Kans.

Armed Services Medical Procurement Agency, Brooklyn, N. Y.

Chemical Corps Research Procurement Agency, Army Chemical Center, Md.

Navy Purchasing Office, New York, N. Y.

General Stores Supply Office, Philadelphia, Pa.

Marine Corps Depot of Supplies, Philadelphia, Pa.

Wilkins Air Force Depot, Shelby, Ohio.

AUTOMOTIVE ACCESSORIES AND SPARE PARTS—PLASTIC

Clearfield Plastics, Inc., Clearfield, Pa.

Purchasing offices

Ordnance Tank Automotive Center, Army Ordnance Corps, Detroit, Mich.

Yards and Docks Supply Office, Naval Construction BN Center, Port Hueneme, Calif.

AIRCRAFT HARDWARE—PLASTIC

Clearfield Plastics, Inc., Clearfield, Pa.

Purchasing offices

General Stores Supply Office, Philadelphia, Pa.

Topeka Air Force Depot, Topeka, Kans.

Air Materiel Command, Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio.

TOOL CHESTS—PLASTIC

Clearfield Plastics, Inc., Clearfield, Pa.

Purchasing offices

Chicago Quartermaster Depot, Chicago, Ill.

Navy Purchasing Office, Washington, D. C.

CASE LINERS—PLASTICS

Clearfield Plastics, Inc., Clearfield, Pa.

Purchasing offices

Signal Corps Procurement Agency, Philadelphia, Pa.

Chemical Corps Research Procurement Agency, Army Chemical Center, Md.

Armed Services Medical Procurement Agency, Brooklyn, N. Y.

Navy Bureau of Ordnance, Washington, D. C.

Navy Bureau of Ships, Washington, D. C.

Ordnance Ammunition Center, Army Ordnance Corps, Joliet, Ill.

Marine Corps Headquarters, Washington, D. C.

AIRCRAFT AUXILIARY FUEL TANKS—PLASTIC

Clearfield Plastics, Inc., Clearfield, Pa.

Purchasing offices

Aviation Supply Office, Philadelphia, Pa.

Air Material Command, Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio.

PAPER STOCK FOR BOOKS AND MAGAZINES

West Virginia Pulp & Paper Co., Tyrone, Pa.

Purchasing offices

Philadelphia Quartermaster Depot, Philadelphia, Pa.

Marine Corps Headquarters, Washington, D. C.

Marine Corps Depot of Supplies, San Francisco, Calif.

Navy Purchasing Office, New York, N. Y.

Marine Corps Depot of Supplies, Philadelphia, Pa.

MINERAL CONSTRUCTION MATERIALS

Tyrone Lime & Stone Co., Tyrone, Pa.

Purchasing offices

Chicago Procurement Office, Corps of Engineers, Chicago, Ill.

Marine Corps Headquarters, Washington, D. C.

General Stores Supply Office, Philadelphia, Pa.

District public works officer, Fourth Naval District, Philadelphia, Pa.

Corps of Engineers, United States Army, Pittsburgh, Pa.

RIVETS AND MISCELLANEOUS FASTENING DEVICES

Chicago Rivet & Machine Co., Tyrone, Pa.

Purchasing offices

Chicago Procurement Office, Corps of Engineers, Chicago, Ill.

Topeka Air Force Depot, Topeko, Kans.

Ordnance Ammunition Center, Joliet, Ill.

Raritan Arsenal, Metuchen, N. J.

Transportation Corps Supply Agency, Marietta, Pa.

General Stores Supply Office, Philadelphia, Pa.

Ordnance Tank Automotive Center, Detroit, Mich.

Frankford Arsenal, Philadelphia, Pa.

Rock Island Arsenal, Rock Island, Ill.

Navy Purchasing Office, Washington, D. C.

AIRCRAFT AND AUTOMOTIVE MAINTENANCE AND REPAIR SHOP EQUIPMENT

Chicago Rivet & Machine Co., Tyrone, Pa.

John R. Wald Co., Tyrone, Pa.

American Steel Fabricators, Altoona, Pa.

Purchasing offices

Ordnance Tank Automotive Center, Detroit, Mich.

Aviation Supply Office, Philadelphia, Pa.

Bureau of Aeronautics, Washington, D. C.

Warner Robins Air Material Area, Macon, Ga.

Air Materiel Command, Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio.

Wilkins Air Force Depot, Shelby, Ohio.

ELECTRICAL HARDWARE AND COMPONENTS OF POWDERED METALS SUCH AS BUSHINGS, CONNECTORS, SLEEVES, CLIPS, CONTACTORS, POINTS, BRUSHES, CLAMPS, COLLARS, TERMINALS, ETC.

Brockway Pressed Metals, Inc., Brockway, Pa.

Symmco, Inc., Sykesville, Pa.

Purchasing offices

Chicago Procurement Office, Chicago, Ill. (Corps of Engineers).

Bureau of Aeronautics, Washington, D. C.

Rome Air Force Depot, Rome, N. Y.

Signal Corps Procurement Agency, Philadelphia, Pa.

Marine Corps Headquarters, Washington, D. C.

Gentile Air Force Depot, Dayton, Ohio.

BEARINGS, UNMOUNTED, OILLESS

Brockway Pressed Metals, Inc., Brockway, Pa.

Symmco, Inc., Sykesville, Pa.

Purchasing offices

Chicago Procurement Office, Chicago, Ill. (Corps of Engineers).

Detroit Arsenal, Army Ordnance Corps, Center Line, Mich.

Watervliet Arsenal, Watervliet, N. Y.

Bureau of Ships, Washington, D. C.

Aviation Supply Office, Philadelphia, Pa.

Marine Corps Headquarters, Washington, D. C.

Topeka Air Force Depot, Topeka, Kans.

Signal Corps Procurement Agency, Philadelphia, Pa.

Naval Gun Factory, Washington, D. C.

General Stores Supply Office, Philadelphia, Pa.

Mallory Air Force Depot, Memphis, Tenn.

GEARS, CONES, PULLEYS, FILTERS (OF POWDERED METAL)

Brockway Pressed Metals, Inc., Brockway, Pa.

Symmco, Inc., Sykesville, Pa.

Purchasing offices

Topeka Air Force Depot, Topeka, Kans.

Bureau of Ships, Washington, D. C.

Navy Purchasing Office, Washington, D. C.

Air Materiel Command, Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio.

Chicago Procurement Office, Corps of Engineers, Chicago, Ill.

Marine Corps Headquarters, Washington, D. C.

Aviation Supply Office, Philadelphia, Pa.

GUN ATTACHMENTS AND COMPONENTS (POWDERED METAL) SUCH AS TRIGGERS, GUARDS, CLIPS, ETC.

Brockway Pressed Metals, Inc., Brockway, Pa.

Symmco, Inc., Sykesville, Pa.

Purchasing offices

Rock Island Arsenal, Rock Island, Ill.

Springfield Armory, Springfield, Mass.

MISCELLANEOUS ENGINE ELECTRICAL SYSTEM COMPONENTS (POWDERED METAL)

Brockway Pressed Metals, Inc., Brockway, Pa.

Symmco, Inc., Sykesville, Pa.

Purchasing offices

Bureau of Aeronautics, Washington, D. C.

Ordnance Tank Automotive Center, Detroit, Mich.

Marine Corps Depot of Supplies, Philadelphia, Pa.

Air Materiel Command, Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio.

Marine Corps Headquarters, Washington, D. C.

MISCELLANEOUS COMMERCIAL HARDWARE (POWDERED METAL)

Brockway Pressed Metals, Inc., Brockway, Pa.

Symmco, Inc., Sykesville, Pa.

Purchasing offices

Chicago Procurement Office, Corps of Engineers, Chicago, Ill.

General Stores Supply Office, Philadelphia, Pa.

Chicago Quartermaster Depot, Chicago, Ill.

Topeka Air Force Depot, Topeka, Kans.

Ordnance Tank Automotive Center, Detroit, Mich.

Raritan Arsenal, Metuchen, N. J.

Springfield Armory, Springfield, Mass.

Watertown Arsenal, Watertown, Mass.

Signal Corps Procurement Agency, Philadelphia, Pa.

Marine Corps Depot of Supplies, Philadelphia, Pa.

Frankford Arsenal, Philadelphia, Pa.

Rock Island Arsenal, Rock Island, Ill.

Ordnance Ammunition Center, Joliet, Ill.

Watervliet Arsenal, Watervliet, N. Y.

Marine Corps Headquarters, Washington, D. C.

MISCELLANEOUS LABORATORY EQUIPMENT FABRICATED OF STAINLESS STEEL

D. J. Industries, Inc., Clearfield, Pa.

Purchasing offices

Transportation Corps Agency, Marietta, Pa.

Chicago Quartermaster Depot, Chicago, Ill.

New York Chemical Procurement District, New York, N. Y.

Bureau of Aeronautics, Washington, D. C.

Navy Purchasing Office, Washington, D. C.

Philadelphia Quartermaster Depot, Philadelphia, Pa.

Chemical Corps Research Processing Agency, Army Chemical Center, Md.

Frankford Arsenal, Philadelphia, Pa.

Bureau of Ships, Washington, D. C.

Navy Purchasing Office, New York, N. Y.

Aviation Supply Office, Philadelphia, Pa.

Electronic Supply Office, Great Lakes, Ill.

Pittsburgh Ordnance District, Pittsburgh, Pa.

Ships Parts Control Center, Mechanicsburg, Pa.

Air Materiel Command, Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio.

Armed Services Medical Procurement Agency, Brooklyn, N. Y.

COMPONENT PARTS FOR AMPHIBIOUS VEHICLES AND TANKS SUCH AS MANIFOLDS, EXHAUST PIPES, AND MUFFLERS OF STAINLESS STEEL

D. J. Industries, Inc., Clearfield, Pa.

Purchasing offices

Detroit Arsenal, Center Line, Mich.

Navy Bureau of Ships, Washington, D. C.

Ordnance Tank Automotive Center, Detroit, Mich.

PIPE AND CONDUIT—CLAY

The Brockway Clay Co., Brockway, Pa.

Williamsgrove Clay Products Co., Bigler, Pa.

Purchasing offices

Chicago Procurement Office, Corps of Engineers, Chicago, Ill.

General Stores Supply Office, Philadelphia, Pa.

Marine Corps Headquarters, Washington, D. C.

Army Corps of Engineers, Pittsburgh, Pa.

BUILDING BRICK AND TILE

The Brockway Clay Co., Brockway, Pa.

Williamsgrove Clay Products Co., Bigler, Pa.

Purchasing offices

Chicago Procurement Office, Corps of Engineers, Chicago, Ill.

Corps of Engineers, United States Army, Pittsburgh, Pa.

General Stores Supply Office, Philadelphia, Pa.

REFRACTORIES AND FIRE SURFACING MATERIALS

The Brockway Clay Co., Brockway, Pa.

Williamsgrove Clay Products Co., Bigler, Pa.

Purchasing offices

General Stores Supply Office, Philadelphia, Pa.

Transportation Corps Agency, Marietta, Pa.

Chicago Procurement Office, Corps of Engineers, Chicago, Ill.

Philadelphia Quartermaster Depot, Philadelphia, Pa.

MISCELLANEOUS COMMERCIAL HARDWARE SUCH AS LOCKWASHERS, SNAP RINGS, RETAINING RINGS, KEYS, PINS, SEMS MACHINE SCREW AND LOCKWASHER ASSEMBLIES

Butcher & Hart Manufacturing Co., Altoona, Pa.

Purchasing offices

Chicago Procurement Office, Corps of Engineers, Chicago, Ill.

Chicago Quartermaster Depot, Chicago, Ill.

New York Chemical Procurement District, New York, N. Y.

Transportation Corps Agency, Marietta, Pa.

Chemical Corps Research Procurement Agency, Army Chemical Center, Md.

Ordnance Tank Automotive Center, Detroit, Mich.

Frankford Arsenal, Philadelphia, Pa.

Rock Island Arsenal, Rock Island, Ill.

Watertown Arsenal, Watertown, Mass.

Signal Corps Procurement Agency, Philadelphia, Pa.

General Stores Supply Office, Philadelphia, Pa.

Middletown Air Materiel Area, Middletown, Pa.

Wilkins Air Force Depot, Shelby, Ohio.

Raritan Arsenal, Metuchen, N. J.

Springfield Armory, Springfield, Mass.

Watervliet Arsenal, Watervliet, N. Y.

Aviation Supply Office, Philadelphia, Pa.

Marine Corps Depot of Supplies, Philadelphia, Pa.

Topeka Air Force Depot, Topeka, Kans.

MISCELLANEOUS SMALL METAL COMPONENTS FOR ORDNANCE, SUCH AS PLUGS, BUSHINGS, SAFETY PINS FOR FIRING MECHANISMS, PLATES, CLIPS, ETC.

Butcher & Hart Manufacturing Co., Altoona, Pa.

Purchasing offices

Rock Island Arsenal, Rock Island, Ill.

Ordnance Ammunition Center, Joliet, Ill.

Springfield Armory, Springfield, Mass.

Pittsburgh Ordnance District, Pittsburgh, Pa.

INDUSTRIAL FASTENING DEVICES (INCLUDING AIRCRAFT, COWLING FASTENERS)

Butcher & Hart Manufacturing Co., Altoona, Pa.

Purchasing offices

Chicago Procurement Office, Corps of Engineers, Chicago, Ill.

Frankford Arsenal, Philadelphia, Pa.

Raritan Arsenal, Metuchen, N. J.

Transportation Corps Agency, Marietta, Pa.

General Stores Supply Office, Philadelphia, Pa.

Aviation Supply Office, Philadelphia, Pa.

Ordnance Tank Automotive Center, Detroit, Mich.

Ordnance Ammunition Center, Joliet, Ill.

Rock Island Arsenal, Rock Island, Ill.

Navy Purchasing Office, Washington, D. C.

Topeka Air Force Depot, Topeka, Kans.

MISCELLANEOUS MARINE HARDWARE (SMALL ITEMS)

Butcher & Hart Manufacturing Co., Altoona, Pa.

Purchasing office

Topeka Air Force Depot, Topeka, Kans.

MISCELLANEOUS MARINE HARDWARE (SMALL ITEM)

Butcher & Hart Manufacturing Co., Altoona, Pa.

Purchasing office

General Stores Supply Office, Philadelphia, Pa.

MISCELLANEOUS RAILWAY HARDWARE (SMALL ITEM)

Butcher & Hart Manufacturing Co., Altoona, Pa.

Purchasing office

Transportation Corps Agency, Marietta, Pa.

WOODEN AMMUNITION BOXES, BOX SHOOK, CRATES, CRATE SHOOK, MISCELLANEOUS PACKING BOXES

Haley Lumber Co., Curwensville, Pa.

Du Bois Tool & Electric Supply Co., Du Bois, Pa.

Purchasing offices

Corps of Engineers, St. Louis, Mo.

Chicago Quartermaster Depot, Chicago, Ill.

Rocky Mountain Arsenal Procurement Office, Chicago, Ill.

Ordnance Tank Automotive Center, Detroit, Mich.

Picatinny Arsenal, Dover, N. J.

Rock Island Arsenal, Rock Island, Ill.

Ordnance Ammunition Center, Joliet, Ill.

Watervliet Arsenal, Watervliet, N. Y.

Redstone Arsenal, Huntsville, Ala.

Bureau of Ordnance, Washington, D. C.

General Stores Supply Office, Philadelphia, Pa.

Marine Corps Depot of Supplies, Philadelphia, Pa.

Gentile Air Force Depot, Dayton, Ohio.

Pittsburgh Ordnance District, Pittsburgh, Pa.

Corps of Engineers, Atlanta, Ga.

Chemical Corps Research Procurement Agency, Army Chemical Center, Md.

Pine Bluff Arsenal Procurement Office, Dallas, Tex.

Frankford Arsenal, Philadelphia, Pa.

Raritan Arsenal, Metuchen, N. J.

Springfield Armory, Springfield, Mass.

Watertown Arsenal, Watertown, Mass.

Rossford Ordnance Depot, Toledo, Ohio.

Signal Corps Procurement Agency, Philadelphia, Pa.

Navy Purchasing Office, Washington, D. C.

Marine Corps Headquarters, Washington, D. C.

Gadsden Air Force Depot, Gadsden, Ala.

Armed Services Medical Procurement Agency, Brooklyn, N. Y.

PALLETS, WOOD

Haley Lumber Co., Curwensville, Pa.

Du Bois Tool & Electric Supply Co., Du Bois, Pa.

Purchasing offices

Navy Purchasing Office, Washington, D. C.

Marine Corps Headquarters, Washington, D. C.

POLES AND PINS FOR TENTAGE

Haley Lumber Co., Curwensville, Pa.

Du Bois Tool & Electric Supply Co., Du Bois, Pa.

Purchasing offices

Chicago Quartermaster Depot, Chicago, Ill.

Wilkins Air Force Depot, Shelby, Ohio.

Marine Corps Depot of Supplies, Philadelphia, Pa.

POLES, WOOD, INCLUDING FLAGPOLES

Haley Lumber Co., Curwensville, Pa.

Purchasing offices

Philadelphia Quartermaster Depot, Philadelphia, Pa.

Marine Corps Depot of Supplies, Philadelphia, Pa.

Corps of Engineers, Atlanta, Ga.

Navy Purchasing Office, New York, N. Y.

Corps of Engineers, St. Louis, Mo.

BARRELS AND HOOPS, WOOD

Haley Lumber Co., Curwensville, Pa.

Purchasing offices

Chicago Procurement Office, Corps of Engineers, Chicago, Ill.

Chicago Quartermaster Depot, Chicago, Ill.

Rocky Mountain Arsenal Procurement Office, Chicago, Ill.

New York Chemical Procurement District, New York, N. Y.

Gadsden Air Force Depot, Gadsden, Ala.

Corps of Engineers, Atlanta, Ga.

Chemical Corps Research Procurement Agency, Army Chemical Center, Md.

Pine Bluff Arsenal Procurement Office, Dallas, Tex.

General Stores Supply Office, Philadelphia, Pa.

SPLINTS, WOOD

Haley Lumber Co., Curwensville, Pa.

Purchasing offices

Middletown Air Matériel Area, Middletown, Pa.

Armed Services Medical Procurement Agency, Brooklyn, N. Y.

CRUTCHES, WOOD

Haley Lumber Co., Curwensville, Pa.

Du Bois Tool & Electric Supply Co., Du Bois, Pa.

Purchasing office

Armed Services Medical Procurement Agency, Brooklyn, N. Y.

TOOL CHESTS AND LOCKERS, WOOD

Haley Lumber Co., Curwensville, Pa.

Du Bois Tool & Electric Supply Co., Du Bois, Pa.

Purchasing offices

Corps of Engineers, Chicago, Ill.

Navy Purchasing Office, Washington, D. C.

General Stores Supply Office, Philadelphia, Pa.

Mallory Air Force Depot, Memphis, Tenn.

Chicago Quartermaster Depot, Chicago, Ill.

Bureau of Ships, Washington, D. C.

Marine Corps headquarters, Washington, D. C.

Signal Corps Procurement Agency, Philadelphia, Pa.

KITCHEN CABINETS AND WORK TABLES

Haley Lumber Co., Curwensville, Pa.

Du Bois Tool & Electric Supply Co., Du Bois, Pa.

Purchasing office

Chicago Quartermaster Depot, Chicago, Ill.

AMMUNITION BOXES, METAL (SMALL ARMS)

Du Bois Tool & Electric Supply Co., Du Bois, Pa.

Purchasing offices

Detroit Arsenal, Army Ordnance Corps, Center Line, Mich.

Picatinny Arsenal, Dover, N. J.

Springfield Armory, Springfield, Mass.

Frankford Arsenal, Philadelphia, Pa.

Rock Island Arsenal, Rock Island, Ill.

Watertown Arsenal, Watertown, Mass.

Watervliet Arsenal, Watervliet, N. Y.

Bureau of Ordnance, Washington, D. C.

General Stores Supply Office, Philadelphia, Pa.

Redstone Arsenal, Huntsville, Ala.

Navy Purchasing Office, Washington, D. C.

Pittsburgh Ordnance District, Pittsburgh, Pa.

MATERIALS-HANDLING EQUIPMENT—SUCH AS PALLET RACKS, PUSHCARTS, HANDCARTS, STACKERS, WINCHES, HOISTS, CRANES

American Steel Fabricators, Altoona, Pa.

Purchasing offices

Chicago Procurement Office, Corps of Engineers, Chicago, Ill.

Bureau of Ships, Washington, D. C.

Marine Corps Headquarters, Washington, D. C.

Navy Purchasing Office, Washington, D. C.

Yards and Docks Supply Office, Port Hueneme, Calif.

General Stores Supply Office, Philadelphia, Pa.

AIRCRAFT GROUND HANDLING EQUIPMENT

American Steel Fabricators, Altoona, Pa.

Purchasing offices

Wilkins Air Force Depot, Shelby, Ohio.

Bureau of Aeronautics, Washington, D. C.

Aviation Supply Office, Philadelphia, Pa.

FABRICATED SPARE PARTS FOR TANKS, TRUCKS, AND TRAILERS

American Steel Fabricators, Altoona, Pa.

Purchasing offices

Chicago Procurement Office, Corps of Engineers, Chicago, Ill.

Ordnance Tank Automotive Center, Detroit, Mich.

Detroit Arsenal, Army Ordnance Corps, Center Line, Mich.

SMALL CALIBER GUN MOUNTS, SUPPORTS, AND COMPONENTS

American Steel Fabricators, Altoona, Pa.

Purchasing offices

Navy Bureau of Ordnance, Washington, D. C.

Springfield Armory, Springfield, Mass.

Rock Island Arsenal, Rock Island, Ill.

Pittsburgh Ordnance District, Pittsburgh, Pa.

COMPONENTS OF ARTILLERY, NAVAL GUN, AND MORTAR AMMUNITION SUCH AS PRIMERS, FUSES, BOOSTERS, ADAPTERS, ROTORS

John R. Wald Co., Tyrone, Pa.

Purchasing offices

Rocky Mountain Arsenal Procurement Office, Chicago, Ill.

New York Chemical Procurement District, New York, N. Y.

Ordnance Ammunition Center, Joliet, Ill.

Navy Bureau of Ordnance, Washington, D. C.

Pine Bluff Arsenal Procurement Office, Dallas, Tex.

Picatinny Arsenal, Dover, N. J.

Redstone Arsenal, Huntsville, Ala.

Pittsburgh Ordnance District, Pittsburgh, Pa.

TRAPS AND SPACERS FOR 3.5 INCH ROCKETS

John R. Wald Co., Tyrone, Pa.

Purchasing offices

Redstone Arsenal, Huntsville, Ala.

Pittsburgh Ordnance District, Pittsburgh, Pa.

Navy Bureau of Ardnance, Washington, D. C.

ROCKET AND MISSILE LAUNCHERS

John R. Wald Co., Tyrone, Pa.

Osborn Machine Co., Du Bois, Pa.

Purchasing offices

Rock Island Arsenal, Rock Island, Ill.

Navy Bureau of Ordnance, Washington, D. C.

Supply Office, Naval Gun Factory, Washington, D. C.

Navy Bureau of Aeronautics, Washington, D. C.

Pittsburgh Ordnance District, Pittsburgh, Pa.

AIR COMPRESSORS, TRAILOR-MOUNTED

John R. Wald Co., Tyrone, Pa.

Purchasing offices

Chicago Procurement Office, Corps of Engineers, Chicago, Ill.

Detroit Arsenal, Center Line, Mich.

Navy Bureau of Aeronautics, Washington, D. C.

Navy Bureau of Ships, Washington, D. C.

Marine Corps Headquarters, Washington, D. C.

Chicago Quartermaster Depot, Chicago, Ill.

Ordnance Tank Automotive Center, Detroit, Mich.

Navy Bureau of Ordnance, Washington, D. C.

Yards and Docks Supply Office, Port Hueneme, Calif.

Gadsden Air Force Depot, Gadsden, Ala.

PAINT SPRAYING EQUIPMENT

John R. Wald Co., Tyrone, Pa.

Purchasing offices

Raritan Arsenal, Metuchen, N. J.

General Stores Supply Office, Philadelphia, Pa.

Pittsburgh Ordnance District, Pittsburgh, Pa.

Aviation Supply Office, Philadelphia, Pa.

Topeka Air Force Depot, Topeka, Kans.

MISCELLANEOUS MACHINERY RELATED TO ROAD CONSTRUCTION AND MAINTENANCE EQUIPMENT

John R. Wald Co., Tyrone, Pa.

Purchasing offices

Chicago Procurement Office, Corps of Engineers, Chicago, Ill.

Yards and Docks Supply Office, Port Hueneme, Calif.

Engineer Supply Office, Columbus, Ohio.

HEAVY ARTILLERY AND NAVAL ORDNANCE MOUNTS AND COMPONENTS

Osborn Machine Co., Du Bois, Pa.

McLanahan & Stone Corp., Hollidaysburg, Pa.

Purchasing offices

Rock Island Arsenal, Rock Island, Ill.

Watertown Aresenal, Watertown, Mass.

Pittsburgh Ordnance District, Pittsburgh, Pa.

Navy Bureau of Ordnance, Washington, D. C.

Watervliet Arsenal, Watervliet, N. Y.

Ordnance Supply Office, Naval Supply Depot, Mechanicsburg, Pa.

WINCHES

Osborn Machine Co., Du Bois, Pa.

Purchasing offices

Navy Bureau of Ships, Washington, D. C.

Yards and Docks Supply Office, Port Hueneme, Calif.

Chicago Procurement Office, Corps of Engineers, Chicago, Ill.

Oklahoma City Air Materiel Area, Oklahoma City, Okla.

CABLE CUTTERS FOR MINESWEEPING EQUIPMENT

Osborn Machine Co., Du Bois, Pa.

Purchasing office

Navy Bureau of Ships, Washington, D. C.

MISCELLANEOUS HEAVY ORDNANCE ITEMS INCLUDING SPECIALTY FOUNDRY MACHINERY

Osborn Machine Co., Du Bois, Pa.

Purchasing offices

Ordnance Tank Automotive Center, Detroit, Mich.

Picatinny Arsenal, Dover, N. J.

Ordnance Ammunition Center, Joliet, Ill.

Watervliet Arsenal, Watervliet, N. Y.

Redstone Arsenal, Hunstville, Ala.

Chicago Procurement Office, Corps of Engineers, Chicago, Ill.

Supply Office, Naval Gun Factory, Washington, D. C.

Frankford Arsenal, Philadelphia, Pa.

Rock Island Arsenal, Rock Island, Ill.

Watertown Arsenal, Watertown, Mass.

Rossford Ordnance Dept, Toledo, Ohio.

Pittsburgh Ordnance District, Pittsburgh, Pa.

General Stores Supply Office, Philadelphia, Pa.

Naval Ordnance Plant, York, Pa.

Ordnance Supply Office, Naval Supply Depot, Mechanicsburg, Pa.

Naval Ordnance Plant, Macon, Ga.

Naval Ordnance Plant, Indianapolis, Ind.

Naval Ordnance Plant, Forest Park, Ill.

CASTINGS, IRON AND SEMISTEEL (ROUGH AND MACHINED)

Osborn Machine Co., Du Bois, Pa.

McLanahan & Stone Corp., Hollidaysburg, Pa.

Purchasing offices

Chicago Procurement Office, Corps of Engineers, Chicago, Ill.

Rocky Mountain Arsenal Procurement Office, Chicago, Ill.

Ordnance Tank Automotive Center, Detroit, Mich.

Picatinny Arsenal, Dover, N. J.

Raritan Arsenal, Metuchen, N. J.

Ordnance Ammunition Center, Joliet, Ill.

Watervliet Arsenal, Watervliet, N. Y.

Rossford Ordnance Depot, Toledo, Ohio.

Marine Corps Headquarters, Washington, D. C.

Pittsburgh Ordnance District, Pittsburgh, Pa.

Chemical Corps Research Procurement Agency, Army Chemical Center, Md.

Pine Bluff Arsenal Procurement Office, Dallas, Tex.

Frankford Arsenal, Philadelphia, Pa.

Rock Island Arsenal, Rock Island, Ill.

Springfield Armory, Springfield, Mass.

Watertown Arsenal, Watertown, Mass.

Redstone Arsenal, Huntsville, Ala.

Navy Bureau of Ships, Washington, D. C.

Topeka Air Force Depot, Topeka, Kans.

AIRCRAFT, ENGINE STANDS

Osborn Machine Co., Du Bois, Pa.

Purchasing offices

Navy Bureau of Aeronautics, Washington, D. C.

Wilkins Air Force Depot, Shelby, Ohio.

Aviation Supply Office, Philadelphia, Pa.

MISCELLANEOUS AUTOMOTIVE AND TANK HARDWARE (LARGE ITEMS)

McLanahan & Stone Corp., Hollidaysburg, Pa.

Purchasing offices

Detroit Arsenal, Center Line, Mich.

Ordnance Tank Automotive Center, Detroit, Mich.

MISCELLANEOUS RAILWAY HARDWARE (LARGE ITEMS)

McLanahan & Stone Corp., Hollidaysburg, Pa.

Purchasing office

Transportation Corps Agency, Marietta, Pa.

MISCELLANEOUS MARINE HARDWARE (LARGE ITEMS)

McLanahan & Stone Corp., Hollidaysburg, Pa.

Purchasing offices

General Stores Supply Office, Philadelphia, Pa.

Ships Parts Control Center, Naval Supply Depot, Mechanicsburg, Pa.

STONE QUARRYING AND MINING EQUIPMENT

McLanahan & Stone Corp., Hollidaysburg, Pa.

Purchasing offices

Chicago Procurement Office, Corps of Engineers, Chicago, Ill.

FUEL SYSTEM ACCESSORIES OF RUBBER, INCLUDING FUEL CELL FITTINGS

B. F. Goodrich Co., Du Bois, Pa.

Purchasing offices

Navy Bureau of Aeronautics, Washington, D. C.

Ordnance Tank Automotive Center, Detroit, Mich.

Topeka Air Force Depot, Topeka, Kans.

Transportation Corps Agency, Marietta, Pa.

Navy Purchasing Office, Washington, D. C.

General Stores Supply Office, Philadelphia, Pa.

Chicago Procurement Office, Corps of Engineers, Chicago, Ill.

MISCELLANEOUS RUBBER FABRICATED MATERIALS

B. F. Goodrich Co., Du Bois, Pa.

Purchasing offices

Chemical Corps Research Procurement Agency, Army Chemical Center, Md.

Marine Corps Headquarters, Washington, D. C.

General Stores Supply Office, Philadelphia, Pa.

New York Chemical Procurement District, New York, N. Y.

Navy Purchasing Office, Washington, D. C.

Marine Corps Depot of Supplies, Philadelphia, Pa.

FOUNDRY MACHINERY

Clearfield Machine Co., Clearfield, Pa.

Purchasing offices

Chicago Procurement Office, Corps of Engineers, Chicago, Ill.

Ordnance Tank Automotive Center, Army Ordnance Corps, Detroit, Mich.

Frankford Arsenal, Army Ordnance Corps, Philadelphia, Pa.

Picatinny Arsenal, Army Ordnance Corps, Dover, N. J.

Rock Island Arsenal, Army Ordnance Corps, Rock Island, Ill.

Ordnance Ammunition Center, Army Ordnance Corps, Joliet, Ill.

Watertown Arsenal, Army Ordnance Corps, Watertown, Mass.

General Stores Supply Office, Philadelphia, Pa.

Detroit Arsenal, Army Ordnance Corps, Center Line, Mich.

Raritan Arsenal, Army Ordnance Corps, Metuchen, N. J.

Springfield Armory, Army Ordnance Corps, Springfield, Mass.

Watervliet Arsenal, Army Ordnance Corps, Watervliet, N. Y.

Rossford Ordnance Depot, Army Ordnance Corps, Toledo, Ohio.

Redstone Arsenal, Army Ordnance Corps, Huntsville, Ala.

Pittsburgh Ordnance District, Pittsburgh Pa.

CONSTRUCTION, MINING AND EXCAVATING EQUIPMENT SUCH AS CRUSHING, PULVERIZING, SCREENING AND MIXING MACHINERY

Clearfield Machine Co., Clearfield, Pa.

Purchasing offices

Chicago Procurement Office, Corps of Engineers, Chicago, Ill.

Yards and Docks Supply Office, Naval Construction BN Center, Port Hueneme, Calif.

Engineer Supply Office, Columbus General Depot, United States Army, Columbus, Ohio.

SPECIALTY MIXING MACHINES FOR CHEMICAL AND ORDNANCE PLANTS AND LABORATORIES

Clearfield Machine Co., Clearfield, Pa.

Purchasing offices

Chemical Corps Research Procurement Agency, Army Chemical Center, Md.

Rocky Mountain Arsenal Procurement Office, Chicago, Ill.

New York Chemical Procurement District, New York, N. Y.

Director, Naval Research Laboratory, Washington, D. C.

Naval Ordnance Laboratory, White Oak, Md.

Supply Office, Naval Gun Factory, Washington, D. C.

Ordnance Supply Office, Naval Supply Depot, Mechanicsburg, Pa.

MISCELLANEOUS GLASS CONTAINERS AND LABORATORY GLASSWARE

(Such as specimen jars, prescription and medicine battles, ointment jars, identification bottles, covers, slides, jugs, bottles and vials for detection kits, etc.)

Brockway Glass Co., Inc., Brockway, Pa.

Purchasing offices

Chicago Quartermaster Depot, Chicago, Ill.

Signal Corps Procurement Agency, Philadelphia, Pa.

Armed Services Medical Procurement Agency, Brooklyn, N. Y.

Chemical Corps Research Procurement Agency, Army Chemical Center, Md.

New York Chemical Procurement District, New York, N. Y.

Rome Air Force Depot, Griffis Air Force Base, Rome, N. Y.

General Stores Supply Office, Philadelphia, Pa.

Headquarters United States Marine Corps, Office of the Quartermaster General, Washington, D. C.

Topeka Air Force Depot, Topeka, Kans.

Marine Corps Depot of Supplies, Philadelphia, Pa.

Navy Purchasing Office, New York, N. Y.

Director, Naval Research Laboratory, Washington, D. C.

Naval Ordnance Laboratory, White Oak, Md.

Armed Force Institute of Pathology, Washington, D. C.

Walter Reed Medical Center, Washington, D. C.

SMALL ELECTRONIC COMPONENTS

(Such as relays, contactors, solenoids, capacitators, filter chokes, and coils)

Jeffers Electronics, Inc., Du Bois, Pa.

Purchasing offices

Chicago Procurement Office, Corps of Engineers, Chicago, Ill.

Signal Corps Procurement Agency, Philadelphia, Pa.

Gentile Air Force Depot, Dayton, Ohio.

Engineer Supply Office, Columbus General Depot, United States Army, Columbus, Ohio.

Detroit Arsenal, Army Ordnance Corps, Center Line, Mich.

Ordnance Tank Automotive Center, Army Ordnance Corps, Detroit, Mich.

Raritan Arsenal, Army Ordnance Corps, Metuchen, N. J.

Frankford Arsenal, Army Ordnance Corps, Philadelphia, Pa.

Picatinny Arsenal, Army Ordnance Corps, Dover, N. J.

Rock Island Arsenal, Army Ordnance Corps, Rock Island, Ill.

Springfield Armory, Army Ordnance Corps, Springfield, Mass.

Watertown Arsenal, Army Ordnance Corps, Watertown, Mass.

Watervliet Arsenal, Army Ordnance Corps, Watervliet, N. Y.

Redstone Arsenal, Army Ordnance Corps, Huntsville, Ala.

Bureau of Aeronautics, Department of the Navy, Washington, D. C.

Bureau of Ships, Department of the Navy, Washington, D. C.

Aviation Supply Office, Philadelphia, Pa.

Ships Parts Control Center, Naval Supply Depot, Mechanicsburg, Pa.

Electronics Supply Office, Great Lakes, Ill.

Headquarters, United States Marine Corps, Office of the Quartermaster General, Washington, D. C.

Air Materiel Command, Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio.

Rome Air Force Depot, Griffis Air Force Base, Rome, N. Y.

BATTERIES, STORAGE FOR AUTOS, TRUCKS, TRACTORS, DIESEL MOTORS, ETC.

Du Bois Electric Storage Battery Co., Du Bois, Pa.

Purchasing offices

Central Procurement Office, Transportation Corps Supply Field Service Agency, Marietta, Pa.

Ordnance Tank Automotive Center, Army Ordnance Corps, Detroit, Mich.

Signal Corps Procurement Agency, Philadelphia, Pa.

Bureau of Ordnance, Department of the Navy, Washington, D. C.

Bureau of Ships, Department of the Navy, Washington, D. C.

Navy Purchasing Office, Department of the Navy, Washington, D. C.

Aviation Supply Office, Philadelphia, Pa.

General Stores Supply Office, Philadelphia, Pa.

Headquarters, United States Marine Corps, Office of the Quartermaster General, Washington, D. C.

Air Materiel Command, Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio.

Warner Robins Air Materiel Area, Robins Air Force Base, Macon, Ga.

Pittsburgh Ordnance District, Pittsburgh, Pa.

PRECISION ELECTRONIC ASSEMBLIES—RADIO COMMUNICATION EQUIPMENT

Dumont Airplane & Marine Instrument, Inc., Clearfield, Pa.

Purchasing offices

Signal Corps Procurement Agency, Philadelphia, Pa.
Bureau of Aeronautics, Department of the Navy, Washington, D. C.
Bureau of Ships, Department of the Navy, Washington, D. C.
Aviation Supply Office, Philadelphia, Pa.
Air Materiel Command, Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio.
Rome Air Force Depot, Griffis Air Force Base, Rome, N. Y.
Electronic Supply Office, Great Lakes, Ill.

PRECISION ELECTRONIC ASSEMBLIES—RADIO NAVIGATION EQUIPMENT

Dumont Airplane & Marine Instrument, Inc., Clearfield, Pa.

Purchasing offices

Signal Corps Procurement Agency, Philadelphia, Pa.
Bureau of Aeronautics, Department of the Navy, Washington, D. C.
Rome Air Force Depot, Griffis Air Force Base, Rome, N. Y.
Bureau of Ships, Department of the Navy, Washington, D. C.
Gentile Air Force Depot, Dayton, Ohio.
Electronic Supply Office, Great Lakes, Ill.

PRECISION ELECTRONIC ASSEMBLIES—RADAR EQUIPMENT

Dumont Airplane & Marine Instrument, Inc., Clearfield, Pa.

Purchasing offices

Signal Corps Procurement Agency, Philadelphia, Pa.
Bureau of Aeronautics, Department of the Navy, Washington, D. C.
Bureau of Ships, Department of the Navy, Washington, D. C.
Aviation Supply Office, Philadelphia, Pa.
Electronics Supply Office, Great Lakes, Ill.
Air Materiel Command, Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio.
Rome Air Force Depot, Griffis Air Force Base, Rome, N. Y.

UNDERWATER SOUND EQUIPMENT

Dumont Airplane & Marine Instrument Inc., Clearfield, Pa.

Purchasing offices

Bureau of Aeronautics, Department of the Navy, Washington, D. C.
Bureau of Ships, Department of the Navy, Washington, D. C.

TELEPHONE AND TELEGRAPH EQUIPMENT

Dumont Airplane & Marine Instrument, Inc., Clearfield, Pa.

Purchasing offices

Signal Corps Procurement Agency, Philadelphia, Pa.
Bureau of Ships, Department of the Navy, Washington, D. C.
Air Materiel Command, Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio.
Rome Air Force Depot, Griffis Air Force Base, Rome, N. Y.

Tribute to Hon. Carl T. Curtis, of Nebraska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 4, 1954

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I do not want the 83d Congress to recess without paying tribute to the gentleman from Nebraska, Representative CARL T. CURTIS. CARL is leaving the House of Representatives. Having won the Republican primary for Senator from Nebraska, he will replace the late Dwight Griswold as the representative from the great State in the Senate.

CARL CURTIS has been a member of the Committee on Ways and Means since 1945. His service on the committee has been distinguished in every sense of the term. His keen, analytical mind, his thorough technical competence in the field of taxation, his broad understanding and knowledge of social security legislation—these qualities combined with his splendid judicial temperament, enabled him to play an important role in the work of the committee and to make legislative contributions far beyond those of the average member of Congress.

In view of this distinguished record, it is not surprising that the people of Nebraska have not permitted him to retire to private life. In indicating that he is their choice for Senator they have paid fitting tribute to the exceptional quality of his public service.

CARL's departure from the House will leave a void which only those who knew him well can fully appreciate. In particular, his loss will be most sorely felt by the Committee on Ways and Means.

I know that I speak for all the members of the committee when I say that our sorrow at his departure is tempered only by the knowledge that, in the Senate, he will have an opportunity to continue his magnificent career of service to his country.

Where Is England Going?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, under the English governmental system, the "loyal opposition" is almost a part of the ruling organization. Where there has been a relatively close division of authority between the majority and the minority, the activities and efforts of the party out of power are often closely identified with the Government itself. In the present situation, the British Labor Party, headed by former Prime Minister Clement Attlee, is almost a second voice of the Government itself, and its official actions take on great importance.

Because of this unique parliamentary background, the visit of Attlee and seven other leaders of the British Labor Party to Moscow and Peiping has been properly noted as an item of major concern to our own country. In conjunction with the apparent easing of trade relations between Britain and Russia, the cordiality demonstrated on this trip behind the Iron Curtain and the seeming determination of Great Britain to play the role of world arbitrator on some program of "peaceful coexistence" must give Americans much food for somewhat indigestible thought. If the British Empire is to receive substantial assistance from the United States and is then to utilize this opportunity to deal with Communist-led nations as if they were good friends, perhaps it is time for Uncle Sam to take still another good look at our foreign policy. Our entire purpose has been the development of stanch friends and warm allies. If we are to find them something less than stanch and considerably north of warm, we may be constrained to look elsewhere.

Hunter's Defense Exposes Public Power Hostility

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I do not question the right of any Member of the House to voice his opinion on the issues of the day. I recognize also that criticism of Members of Congress by the press is not always justified.

There has been a difference of opinion recently between one of my colleagues and the press concerning atomic-energy legislation. As a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, I am familiar with this legislation. In this case, I believe the gentleman from California is mistaken.

An editorial on the subject from the Fresno Bee follows:

HUNTER'S DEFENSE EXPOSES PUBLIC POWER HOSTILITY

Congressman OAKLEY HUNTER, Republican representing Fresno, Madera, and Merced Counties, has seen fit to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an attack upon the McClatchy newspapers for what he calls disregard for the truth and false editorial statements.

The occasion was an editorial in which his vote for the House version of the new atomic-energy bill was denounced as imperiling public power and as a vote against the welfare of his region and of those who sent him to Congress.

Every one of his denials is a confirmation of the original charge.

HUNTER spoke of the bill passing the House, as it did, and the Senate, as it did, by solid majorities. He sought thus to convey the impression there was overwhelming support for his own position. But he omitted to say the Senate amended the bill and corrected the very defects which this newspaper protested and for which HUNTER voted.

He said it was not a power bill. That is false on the face of it. The bill would put the private utilities in the power business with nuclear know-how developed by the expenditure of billions in public funds. It would authorize the AEC to license these businesses. Instead of a power bill, it really should be called the private power bill and HUNTER helped make it the private power bill.

HUNTER voted to forbid the AEC on any effective basis to produce and distribute atomic power commercially. This he does not deny. He piously says the House bill did not forbid other Government agencies to go into the nuclear power business. What kind of mumbo jumbo is this? What agency other than AEC has any control over atomic materials? Who is falsifying, who is misleading?

To bolster his charge that the Bee falsified, Hunter says he supported an amendment which actually gives preference to public bodies. What kind of forensic fancy Dan footwork is this? Under the terms of the original House bill which Hunter supported the AEC was banned from producing atomic power commercially except the byproduct energy developed for its own research facilities.

What sort of preference would go to public bodies? Public power bodies were to be given crumbs. Private power was to have the feast, and with Hunter's aid and approval.

Hunter confirms in every detail this newspaper's charge he voted to imperil public power and thereby the public interest.

To demonstrate he was done an injustice all Hunter need do is state he is for Government production and distribution of commercial atomic power and that he will fight for it, just as many Senators and many of his House colleagues have done.

Hunter's record is clear. He voted to forbid the only Federal agency qualified to produce commercial atomic power to do so on an effective basis. It does no good to talk about the exception which would permit the the AEC to distribute some of the byproduct power from its research undertakings. Such is merely more misleading double talk.

Unless the Government can enter the commercial atomic production and distribution field with its own plants comparable in size to Federal hydroelectric undertakings, the principal of the power yardstick is dead and America will enter this vast new field with all the odds rigged for restoration of private power trusts on an unprecedented scale.

Amending the McCarran-Walter Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAURENCE CURTIS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the need for amendment of the McCarran-Walter Act was pointed up in the debate yesterday regarding the bill to admit outside the quotas provided by that law a large number of Spanish sheepherders needed on the western ranges. The Spanish quota is only 250, yet upward of 600 sheepherders were admitted in this manner.

The same need is also pointed up by the number of private bills acted on by the House Committee on the Judiciary, on which I serve. These bills are passed to relieve injustices caused by the present law. We should either enforce the McCarran-Walter Act with its restrictions, or amend it, rather than circumvent it in this piecemeal fashion. This procedure is not fair because those who have some measure of influence or who happen to know a Congressman secure an advantage.

Four thousand such private bills were introduced at this session. The numbers favorably acted upon by the past four Congresses were: 79th Congress, 14 bills; 80th Congress, 80 bills; 81st Congress, 81 bills; 82d Congress, 729 bills.

The President of the United States in his state of the Union message stated that there were injustices in the present law, and urged that they be corrected. When the present law was passed, a Presidential commission was appointed to study the law and recommend amendments. This Commission issued its report on January 1, 1953, and bills have been offered based on that report and otherwise by both Republicans and Democrats. I filed one of several similar bills filed in the House. Yet no action has been had.

Many Members will leave this session regretting this result. This is a subject of great interest in the district which I represent. It should be given priority at the next session.

The Challenge to the Survival of Our Civilization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, on November 1, 1953, the Americans of Rumanian descent in Cleveland gathered together to honor Father John Trutza on his 25th anniversary as pastor of St. Mary's Rumanian Orthodox Parish. On that occasion it was my pleasure to have delivered an address appropriate to this occasion and which has been reprinted in the 1954 edition of Calendarul Solia. Under unanimous consent, I insert in the Record my address as it appeared in this edition:

The Challenge to the Survival of Our Civilization

(Address of Hon. Michael A. Feighan, of Ohio)

It is a privilege for me to be with you this afternoon and to share in your deliberations in these very troubled times and to help you commemorate Father Trutza's 25th anniversary. All of us know of the great devotion Father Trutza has for our beloved United States, and as well as his deep concern and hopes for the Rumanian nation, which today is suffering under the most terrible tyranny in all its glorious history. I thought it would be a most fitting tribute to Father Trutza if I were to say a few words about the challenge to the survival of our civilization. I felt this would be appropriate because Father Trutza, in his lifelong work, stands as a symbol of that civilization.

As you know, I am deeply attached to the ideals and aspirations which bring you together and from which you draw your unconquerable hopes for the future. For a great many years, my father was interested in and did all he could to assist the cause of the Rumanian people here in the United States. On many occasions I recall the kind and warm words he had for the Rumanians and the esteem in which he held them. If he were alive today, I know he would be here with us, and would be expressing the same sentiments that I am conveying to you.

Christianity and human freedom are ultimate moral forces to which we must turn in the hour of peril, with faith and total dedication, if free humanity is to survive. I know that you as a group of Americans, whose kinfolks in your country of origin are being subjected today to the most cruel tyranny and oppression of spiritual life, are particularly sensitive to these truths.

Looking at the tragic situation in Rumania we see as in a mirror the evils which beset our world and we see, at the same time, the specter of our own errors. But beneath the terror of enslavement one is aware of the undying spiritual force which is awaiting—perhaps the greatest force in the service of our cause—the great day of decision. This force was molded during the centuries of Rumanian history by a profound urge for independence and an unwavering Christian faith. In utterly adverse conditions, the Rumanian people fought through the ages as a vanguard of Christianity. One of the most famous leaders in the struggle of these small and brave Rumanian states—Stephen the Great—was given in the 15th century by no less an authority than the Pope himself, the title of Atleta Christi (the Athlete of Christ).

This profound Christian faith has been the great sustaining force in the trials of the Rumanian nation. Rumanian culture and national consciousness have developed around the monasteries, which were the core and expression of spiritual resistance in face of the recurring waves of pagan onslaughts. As elsewhere this religious force has become an essential element in the worldwide struggle against the Communist tyrannical paganism of our days. Of course the Soviets have tried to thwart this powerful faith and to make out of the church a subservient instrument of the Communist state; but behind a facade of conformity, imposed by oppression, there lives the same ancient and inextinguishable sources of spiritual allegiance to God and human dignity and freedom. The impressive number of servants of the church who are being martyrized in the Communist concentration camps of Rumania bear witness to this fact.

At the moment of the greatest persecution of the nations in eastern Europe, people are turning more and more to the lifegiving power of the faith. The brutal materialism which the Marxist doctrine and the Soviet knout is enforcing upon the enslaved finds no response. As you are undoubtedly aware, this Soviet materialism which is preaching as the highest value of life material comforts, is characterized in fact by reducing the general standard of living to the very lowest level. The exploitation of the subjugated nations for the benefit of the Soviet war machine has brought them to a state of extreme want and misery. The whole industrial effort is directed to heavy industry which is integrated in the Soviet war plans and the only resource seen by the puppet governments for the implementation of the false promises of Malenkov for increasing consumer goods is in a greater and more inhuman exploitation of labor.

The Rumanian Communists have recently indicated that they will impose new servitudes on the workers through a thorough stakhanovist system enforced by so-called labor-control brigades. The complete regimentation of labor and of every human activity is pushed to the extreme in accordance with Russian Communist aims. The Communist propaganda which is endeavoring to convince the oppressed people that the happiness of the collectivity will ensue from this utter deprivation of individual rights, now stirs nothing but hatred.

It is most unfortunate that for all too long the American people were not fully informed about the real state of affairs resulting from the political errors of the free world at the end of the war. The sleeping conscience of the West and acts of expediency have veiled the truth and entertained illusions about communism and the possibility of coexistence with it. Today we are discovering, through our own ordeal, what had been so lightly passed over when it did not appear to affect us directly.

Like all my fellow countrymen I have been shocked by the revelations brought to the surface by the Korean war. The inhuman treatment inflicted on our young men taken prisoners shows in its stark reality the true aims and methods of Russian communism. The report of Dr. Charles Mayo to the United Nations brought, in a dramatic way, the realities of this problem into the limelight. The cruelty and demonic disregard for the human soul, shown by the Communists, confirms for us the crimes which have earmarked Russian Communist history and which we took all too lightly. The sufferings of the people behind the Iron Curtain are thus becoming more generally understood through the sufferings of our own fellow countrymen. Through this tragic experience our country must more than ever before reconsider its moral and political foundations and realize that freedom and peace are indivisible and that our national security is not possible without them. The terrifying crimes against the body and soul of humanity going on in the vast Communist empire and which were in part revealed to our prisoners in Korea, would eventually—if they are to continue unabated—strike a mortal blow to our very existence.

It is a fallacy to believe that pacts and treaties could bridge the world of freedom and the empire of slavery, between good and evil, between honesty and perfidy. The so-called political realism which proclaims that we can obtain security by a compromise with the Devil, with each passing day is being completely demonstrated as a dangerous delusion. Indeed every effort to come to any arrangement with the Communists ends in failure, because for them all such settlements with the free world are merely steps in their overall plans for world enslavement.

What is then the road to follow for the building a world at peace in which human freedom and individual dignity is permanent?

We have tried up to now to answer this question by cooperating with the dictators and their stooges. Why don't we try to look toward their victimized peoples, toward the subjugated nations with their ardent longing for liberty. Why don't we do our best to encourage and help these peoples in the strivings of their creative nationalism, of their religious faith and traditions, of their legitimate will to independence?

Of course the practical methods of implementation are not easy to determine, but the first essential point in a problem of such magnitude is to fix one's objectives. If we are convinced that freedom and security for the world and for America have their basis in the freedom of nations and all peoples then we will also find the path leading to the realization of these goals. For my part I believe that one of the greatest contributions to the clarification of this vital problem comes from groups such as yours, in which the Christian faith and belief in the mission of constructive nationalism are so deeply ingrained.

Mankind has overcome other ordeals in the past. It will do so again if we stand united and do not compromise on the principles which created these United States. If we do this there is no doubt in my mind that the day will not be far off when the subjugated peoples will regain their freedom, when your beloved Rumania will have broken the chains of Russian Communist slavery.

House Restaurant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, with reference to the remarks I made here on the floor of the House yesterday concerning the splendid management of the House restaurant facilities, I include the following figures which show the appropriations made for over 7 years for the House and Senate restaurants:

House restaurants [1]

	Appropriations		
	Operations	Capital	Total
1948	$27,500		$27,500
1949	27,500		27,500
1950	47,500		47,500
1951	47,500		47,500
1952	47,500		47,500
1953	47,500	$23,000	70,500
1954	47,500		47,500
	292,500	23,000	315,500
1955 (present year)	12,500		12,500
Total	305,000	23,000	328,000

[1] Include House dining rooms and coffee shop in Capitol; cafeteria in New House Office Building; and carryout service in both office buildings.

Senate restaurants [1]

	Appropriation		
	Operations	Capital	Total
1948	$45,000	$84,000	$129,000
1949	42,500	15,000	57,500
1950	42,500	13,000	55,500
1951	42,500	34,000	76,500
1952	42,500	18,500	61,000
1953	65,000	1,600	66,600
1954	65,000	4,250	69,250
	345,000	170,350	515,350
1955 (present year)	67,500		67,500
Total	412,500		582,850

[1] Include Senate dining rooms and coffee shop in Capitol; cafeteria, carryout service and coffee shop, Senate Office Building.

Formosa: Eisenhower Stand Versus Truman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, everyone who has studied the Kremlin's basic policies insists that the one element which matters in the thinking of the Communist clan is the knowledge that deterrent force is available to cut them down to size. Nothing in the history of the recent past suggests reason to believe that the Moscow powers will respect the integrity of small nations in any degree, unless the prospect of superior force provided by large nations is on the horizon.

Red China is making loud noises on the subject of Formosa. Her intentions are clear, no matter how much we may seek to delude ourselves on the question. China means to seize Formosa at the earliest possible moment, and she is waiting only for the opportunity. Here is a case where the difference between American foreign policy under President Eisenhower and our policy under former President Harry Truman becomes evident. We did not clarify our intentions in 1950, and the Chinese construed our silence as an open invitation to aggression in Korea. This time, we have spoken, and no one will be able to say that Uncle Sam remained silent when he had a duty to speak.

Our Seventh Fleet is protecting Formosa. This is the order. Red China knows it. Moscow knows it. If any attack is made on the island, we shall resist it because we must. The Free World's future is at stake. No new Communist aggression will go unchallenged, and the knowledge of this truth is the greatest deterrent we can present to the Reds in our time.

Social-Security Amendments Improve Social-Security Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, it is gratifying to realize that after months of hearings and consideration the bill providing improvements in benefits and coverage under social security has at last come to Congress for final action.

While I would have liked to see additional improvements made, yet, I realize that the amendments as adopted do provide a considerable increase in benefits to those now under social security and those who will come under its provisions in the future. It is likewise commendable in the increased number of individuals who have been brought within social-security provisions and who previously did not have its benefits.

In all the bill will add more than 10 million persons to the social-security system. When this additional number is added to the individuals already under the bill it will mean that a very large percentage of all our workers will have been provided for under our social-security program.

Included in this number of new additions there will be approximately 2,100,000 agricultural workers; 150,000 Federal civilian employees not presently participating in the system; 250,000 of certain individuals classed as ministers and members of religious orders, with certain restrictions and limitations; 3,600,000 of farm operators and professional self-employed individuals. In my opinion it is unfortunate that physicians, lawyers, dentists, and other medical practitioners are not included in the bill as self-employed persons. The bill does include self-employed professional architects, accountants, and engineers. This will extend coverage to approximately 100,000 persons not heretofore covered. I see no valid reason why any professionally employed person, regardless of the type of his or her employment, should have been excluded. I am of the opinion that this exclusion will be remedied in the next session of Congress. I certainly hope so.

Under the terms of this bill State and local employees would be entitled to come under the social-security system if a majority of the employees of the particular organization so applying should vote in favor of coverage. Under this provision there can be several million more new additions. It depends upon the result of referendums that may be held.

There are many other changes contained in this new law, all of which are designed to broaden and improve the provisions of the present act. For instance, the age at which the retirement test no longer applies with respect to limitation of earnings of those under social security has been reduced from age 75 to age 72 and the limitation of earnings to those under 72 has been raised to $1,200 per year. Thus, the reduction of the age to 72 and the increase of allowable earnings to $1,200 is a decided improvement with respect to our aged persons.

In conclusion, it is particularly gratifying that in addition to the improvements already mentioned there have been substantial increases to be paid present beneficiaries under the social-security system. The increases under the present bill range from the present $25 to $85, to $30 to $98.50. But individuals who retire in the future will get higher benefits, up to a maximum of $108.50 instead of $98.50 for those already retired. Since a wife who is 65 gets half of the husband's benefit, a couple both over 65 could draw $162.50 a month.

There may be many changes that experience under the new law will show to be necessary, yet it is a great victory to have attained what has been accomplished under the bill now before us. It has my support, with the hope that any further improvements found necessary can be given further consideration at the next session.

Tribute to Hon. Thomas E. Martin, of Iowa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, now that this 83d Congress is drawing to a close, I wish to take the opportunity of paying a tribute to our distinguished colleague, the Honorable Thomas E. Martin of Iowa.

Tom Martin has been one of the most distinguished and valuable members of the Committee on Ways and Means. His service on that committee, of which I have the honor to be chairman, has been marked by sound judgment, great integrity, hard work, and a conscientious sense of duty both to the people of Iowa and to the American people as a whole. He has made a splendid record of achievement on our committee.

Tom became a member of the Committee on Ways and Means in 1947. Since that time, he has actively fostered the welfare of the farmer, businessman and laborer. During this past session alone, his contributions toward overhauling our tax system and improving our social-security program have proven invaluable. He has worked to see that our domestic producers and workers are adequately protected from excessive imports of foreign goods. He has continued to conscientiously represent the interest of his Iowa constituents and has also served equally well the people of the United States.

I must note with regret that Tom Martin is now leaving this House where he has served so notably. However, as United States Senator from the great State of Iowa he will continue to serve his State and his country with distinction. I wish him every success.

Intelligent Solution of Labor Problems by Labor Groups

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, the best way to settle labor-management disputes is within the family itself. Both management and labor understand better than any outsiders exactly what the issues really involve, how far they can go in reaching an understanding, and where the basic troubles lie. Government intervention is always, at best, a last resort technique, to be used where all else has failed.

In the recent Studebaker Co. difficulty, the workers of the company accepted a voluntary pay cut designed to keep the organization in operation in the face of a serious competitive situation. Other instances in which labor organizations have cooperated to keep their employer in business have occurred in the immediate past. These are evidence of intelligent labor statesmanship, and the examples merit public notice and commendation.

The arbitration decision recently handed down in the railway trainmen controversy proposed an acceptance of the original offer of a 5 cents per hour increase which was made by management originally, to the disappointment of the brotherhood membership. But the use of the machinery provided by the Railway Labor Act was employed in accordance with its procedural structure, and represents again a victory for the orderly processes of government. There is growing evidence that the day of violence in labor disputes has come to an end. Sober reason, good judgment, and the establishment of legal techniques designed to facilitate the consideration of facts are a better answer every time.

Ukrainian Insurgent Army in Fight for Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, a short time ago I was invited to write the introduction to a book which was about to be published dealing with the underground resistance to Russian Communist imperialism. This book has just been published and is now available to the general public. In order that Members of Congress may have a short review of the important contents of that book, I, under unanimous consent, insert in the Record the introduction which I wrote for Ukrainian Insurgent Army in Fight for Freedom:

UKRAINIAN INSURGENT ARMY IN FIGHT FOR FREEDOM

In the perilous days in which we live, days in which the very survival of our way of life hangs in a delicate balance, we have been compelled to look carefully at the world arena to better know our friends and to clearly understand and identify the enemy. In the course of such an appraisal it would be foolhardy to overlook any reservoir of friendship we have in any quarter of the globe. Any special friends we might have such as those who have demonstrated their dedication to the cause of human freedom, national sovereignty and individual dignity, must be clearly recognized and singled out for all the extra support we can afford to give them. If we do anything less than this we will be playing lightly and dangerously with the ultimate survival of the United States.

Such an appraisal of necessity requires us to examine and fully understand the resistence efforts of the enslaved nations and people of the Russian-Communist empire. All too frequently we are subjected to stories and fables which seek to discredit the efforts of these captive nations and people to throw off the historic chains of Muscovite tyranny. More recently we have been subjected to the Russian-Communist line which holds that there has been created a "Homo Sovieticus," and even a Soviet civilization, the subtle purpose of which is to cause us to believe that resistance within the Communist empire to the imperialist Muscovites has ended. Were we to be taken in by this line we would fail to identify our most dependable friends and would thus fail to stand by them.

Ukrainian Insurgent Army In Fight for Freedom is one of the most important contributions to American understanding of the meaning and significance of resistance movements in the form of national liberation struggles now taking place within the empire of Muscovy. It deserves a careful reading by every patriotic American who is dedicated to the same moral and political principles of justice and freedom, and the right of national sovereignty which are empressed in the American Declaration of Independence. The essays and addresses set forth in this work portray a stubborn and dedicated struggle for those same moral and political principles which cannot be obscured by moonshine internationalism, whether it is distilled in Moscow or in the dens of the Russia first circles in the United States. They relate one story, common and basic to both the United States and the Ukrainian nation—the epic of patriotism, enlightened nationalism, impassioned love of God and native country.

Many Members of Congress who are accustomed to dealing with facts and reality understand with feeling and conviction the historic aspirations of the Ukrainian nation for genuine sovereignty which can come only with national independence and self government. The number of understanding officials in the Government of the United States is growing day by day and it is hoped that this book will increase their understanding as well as their numbers. This story of the heroic struggles of the Ukrainian nation is truly representative of the aspirations of every other non-Russian nation held captive in the Soviet Union—Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, White Ruthenia, Georgia, Armenia, Adzerbaidzahn, Caucasia, Moslem Turkestan, and including the Siberyaks (Russian Separatists in Moscow Dominated Asia).

Since the end of World War II circumstances bearing a direct relationship to our survival have caused the American people to become better acquainted with the despotic captivity of Poland, Slovakia, Hungary, Rumania, East Germany, Czechia, Bulgaria, and Albania. These are the once free and sovereign nations which have been added to the Moscovite empire during and since the end of World War II. It is a little known fact that the fate of these nations is precisely the same as that which Moscow visited upon the 15 non-Russian nations of the Soviet Union following World War I. American people must come to understand that the only difference between the fate of these Moscovite enslaved nations is a difference of slightly more than 25 years. Unfortunately, some of the self-proclaimed experts of our day have coined the word "satellites," a term which they apply on to the nations enslaved by Moscow since World War II. This completely, if not purposely, neglects the cause of the other non-Russian nations enslaved by Moscow following World War I.

The message contained in this book is more than anything else the pleading of a once free and sovereign nation for recognition by advocates of freedom everywhere in the world. Indeed, it sets forth an eloquent plea on behalf of all the once free and sovereign non-Russian nations who are now bound by the historic Muscovite chains of slavery. It is a refreshing and stimulating account of the deep and abiding faith of enlightened nationalism which is the mortal enemy of Russian communism. For those who have been misled by reading the devious works of the Maxist view or traditional Russian imperialism, it may come as a shocking revelation. It may be said with certainty that it will cause a new fury within the multicolored camp of Marxists, Russia Firsters, and the advocates of the morally bankrupt policy of containment.

The validity of the story told in Ukrainian Insurgent Army in Fight for Freedom, can be accurately measured by the attacks made upon it by this multicolored camp of despotic reactionaries and the reception given to it by the controlled elements of the literary sections of the free press.

Question of the Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, after Attlee et al. return to England, what will Churchill have to say?

Hate Propaganda Through the Mails

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, appended hereto is an editorial from the American German weekly newspaper Aufbau, which brings us also the viewpoint and ripe experience of escapees from Nazi persecution who are now United States citizens and who are contributing so much to our country. They have so much of value to teach us here because their own dred experience with totalitarianism.

The above-mentioned follows:

HATRED BY MAIL

On July 14, Congressman JACOB K. JAVITS, who watches as probably no other Representative of the people to see that our civil liberties are safeguarded and protected, and that nobody tries to hide behind them in order to advance his own interests, introduced a resolution in the House of Representatives, in which he submitted to the Postmaster General a list of 10 publications, cited by name, which are regularly shipped through the United States mails and which disseminate nothing but hate propaganda—publications appearing at home and abroad. It concerns primarily antireligious hate propaganda directed equally against Protestants, Catholics, and Jews. Representative JAVITS demanded that Postmaster General Summerfield submit comprehensive figures and other data concerning this hate propaganda and demanded, above all, an explicit explanation as to whether or not the postal authorities had taken legal action against the further dissemination of those publications, especially prohibiting their shipment by mail.

The Postmaster's answer is sad enough. In barren terms Mr. Summerfield stated that the present American laws, especially sections 1461, 1717, and 2388 of the United States Code make no provision for excluding from shipment by mail printed matter or other materials attacking a particular religion or race, which could be done only in case of incitement to arson, murder, treason, or revolt. In addition, it is customary that, in order to exclude material from shipment by mail, unequivocal proof of the presence of danger is required. This intepretation of the laws, the Postmaster stated, makes it almost impossible to exclude such hate propaganda from shipment by mail.

In our opinion the Postmaster General's answer is just as unsatisfactory as Congressman JAVITS, who make it available to us, thought it to be. There is an obvious deficiency in the law upon which the Congress should focus its immediate attention. We cannot tolerate all sorts of agitators to use the privilege of the mails under the pretext of fighting communism in order to plant the seed of hatred all over the country with the aid of the mails. It is high time that legislation be passed for clearing out this madness—the shipment of hatred through the mails. It seems not only logical and necessary but it is also within the interest of the Federal Government itself, which must see to it that its institutions should not be misused and exploited for purposes which are contrary to all free institutions and totally opposed to the fundamental beliefs of the overwhelming majority of the American people. The decision of the United States Supreme Court of April 28, 1952, in the case of Beauharnais against Illinois made a special point of stating that legislation which outlaws slander of a religious or racial group is constitutional.

The text of the Postmaster General's statement follows:

OFFICE OF THE POSTMASTER GENERAL,
Washington, D. C., July 26, 1954.

Hon. EDWARD H. REES,
Chairman, Committee on Post
Office and Civil Service,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Reference is made to your request for a report, by July 26, 1954, on House Resolution 632.

House Resolution 632 requests that the Postmaster General furnish to the House of Representatives certain information with respect to 10 single-print and periodical publications. The information requested is:

(a) Whether the United States mails were or are being used for the distribution of these publications;

(b) The time or times of such transmission, the volume of mail in each case, and the class of mail used;

(c) Whether the United States mails are being used for the transmission, from outside the United States to destinations within the United States, of any of these publications; and

(d) Whether any action has been taken under the laws of the United States regarding the transmission of these publications through the mails.

The records of the Department at the headquarters office at Washington, D. C., do not contain all of the information sought by this resolution. For example, if any of these publications are mailed at the third-class rate of postage, under permit or otherwise, the only complete record of such mailing would be at the office of mailing. The volume of individual issues of second-class publications can be obtained only from the post office where the publication is entered. Accordingly, in these two respects at least, I will have to call upon the postmasters at the points of mailing, for the information requested. This is being done and as soon as information is received it will be forwarded to your committee.

The information presently at hand is set forth in the attachment to this letter.

Of prime importance among the items requested by this resolution is a report on the action taken with respect to these publications.

The Congress has, over the years, prescribed what may or may not be transmitted through the mails. It has, for example, said that obscene materials are nonmailable (18 U. S. C., sec. 1461). This same section of the Criminal Code provides that matter of the character tending to incite arson, murder or assassination is also nonmailable.

Section 1717 of title 18, United States Code provides that circulars, postcards, prints, newspapers, etc., which contain matter advocating or urging treason, insurrection or forceful resistance to any law of the United States are nonmailable. This same section also provides that matter in violation of a number of other sections of title 18 is likewise, nonmailable. Among the sections listed is 2388, which section provides in effect that whoever, when the United States is at war, makes or conveys false reports or false statements with intent to interfere with the operation or success of the military forces of the United States, or to promote the success of its enemies or willfully causes or attempts to cause insubordination, disloyalty, mutiny or refusal of duty in the military forces, or obstruct the recruiting or enlistment services to the injury of the United States, shall be fined not more than $10,000. Mail matter doing any of these things is nonmailable.

The sections of the law which might be said to cover the publications listed in the resolution are 1461, 1717, and 2388 of title

18. It should be noted, however, that these sections do not expressly provide for the exclusion from the United States mails of matter attacking a particular religion, religious group or race. In order that publications may be treated as nonmailable, therefore, it must first be determined that they incite to arson, assassination, or murder (sec. 1461, title 18), advocate or urge treason, insurrection, or forceful resistance to law (sec. 1717, title 18) or certain false reports and false statements or other material reasonably calculated to cause insubordination, disloyalty or mutiny in the armed forces (sec. 2388, title 18.)

With respect to these sections of the code, the courts have, on a number of occasions, held that before a violation of the sections could be spelled out and therefore before the material could be called nonmailable, it was necessary that there be a clear and present danger that the things proscribed by the statute would come about. Because of these interpretations the Post Office Department has rarely been able to find that publications of an anti-Semetic, anti-Catholic, anti-Negro or anti any other race, creed, or color, were nonmailable. In reviewing publications of this character the Department has, on occasion, sought the advice and counsel of the Department of Justice. That Department has consistently advised that before publications may be declared nonmailable under these sections of the law the requisite, intent, and willfulness, must be spelled out.

It is, of course, regretted that the postal facilities are employed for the dissemination of material of this type. However, in the absence of authority to exclude it, the Postmaster General has no alternative but to accept the material and deliver it to destination.

I regret that I am not able at this time to fully comply with the information requested in this resolution. It is a physically impossibility to produce all of this information within the time prescribed, because, as has been above noted, much of the information requested must be procured from points far distant from the headquarters of Washington, D. C.

Due to the urgency of this request, this report has not been cleared through the Bureau of the Budget.

Sincerely yours,
ARTHUR E. SUMMERFIELD,
Postmaster General.

Pay Increase for Postal and Other Government Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to know that we will get a chance, even at this last hour, to vote an increase of pay to our faithful postal and other Government employees. They are entitled to it.

The bill now before us provides a straight 5 percent increase for all classified employees with a minimum increase for such workers of $170 and a maximum of $440.

The minimum rate of each grade is to be increased by 5 percent and this amount will be carried over to all other within-steps of the grade, subject to the minimum and maximum standards.

The salaries of postal workers, will be increased by a flat 5 percent; with a $200 minimum and $440 maximum.

It is pleasing to realize that the increases are granted to the postal workers without an increase of the rate for first-class mail. This is a separate and distinct subject. It should come before the Congress in a bill that relates to that subject and no other. It can then be decided on its own individual merit. It was unfair and unjust to demand that the postal workers should have no increase unless and until Congress passed legislation that would provide an increase of rates for first-class mail. Such an increase would have been unfair to the users of first-class mail. At the present time this type of mail is providing revenue that amounts to over a $150 million more per year than the expense of servicing such mail. Thus, it would be unjust to put an additional burden upon the only class of mail that is paying its own way and showing a substantial profit. It was wise and just to separate the question of an increased mail rate from the question of an increase for postal workers.

It is, indeed, most pleasing that our efforts in behalf of our postal employees and other governmental workers have proved successful. Now, it is my hope that the President will give his approval to the legislation.

Eisenhower-Dulles and the Principles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate the Wyoming County Times, published at Warsaw, N. Y., by Mr. H. Floyd Burd, for his editorial in the July 29 issue of the paper. Mr. Burd's keen analysis deserves study by every American who is interested in preserving our free way of life:

EISENHOWER-DULLES AND THE PRINCIPLES

The last manifestations of the coexistent team, Eisenhower-Dulles, have confirmed publicly what was already known; namely that the lofty honeyed words of our foreign policymakers have no connection with reality. Mr. Dulles has accepted the defeat in Indochina and the abandonment to Communist tyranny of additional millions of human beings, together with important strategic areas. Accordingly the administration has sent again to Geneva Gen. Bedell Smith, well known for his sympathetic understanding of leftist causes, in order to seal the sell-out. But all this, Mr. Dulles superiorly declares, "carries no danger that the United States will abandon its principles."

We are sure that Messrs. Dulles and Eisenhower will not abandon for a minute the principle of hypocrisy, but that has nothing to do with the "principles of the United States," which they abandon in fact at every turn, while spouting about morals, ethics, and ideals. This sad course is advanced, no doubt, by the inclination and temperament of the two coexistents. It is their natural weakness that makes them descend every day a step further on the slope of appeasement and withdrawal, thus becoming unwittingly tools in the Communist expansionist schemes. The Communist advance, according to the Kremlin's strategy, is generally insured through our fatigue and exasperation deftly exploited, and especially through our progressive, apparently minor, concessions which in the long run and globally prove to be important and sometimes decisive. Because of the lack of foresight and stamina of our present leaders we are slowly and smoothly brought to swallow what we abhor, to accept and accommodate ourselves to what initially we strongly opposed and fought. Our blessing of the partition of Indochina is a clear example of these successful tactics of the enemy, based on our capacity to be maneuvered into yielding on everything. Both President Eisenhower and Mr. Dulles categorically rejected at the beginning of this cycle any idea of partition or appeasement. But as time passed, progressive little concessions made every other day, nibbled away at this stand and now the exact opposite is adopted under various pretexts. This is the manner in which the Eisenhower administration has not only eluded the promises made during the 1952 electoral campaign but has gone even further.

Now another little idea which is beginning by the same means to make headway is the admittance of Red China to the United Nations. Already the Berlin and Geneva Conferences have served enormously Red China's interests, and in fact, after the Chou En-lai tour in Asia, made in the limelight of the Geneva Conference and benefiting from its prestige, Communist China has established itself as a partner in the new international order, sponsored by the big powers. Of course the United States is adverse to the admission of Red China, but so were we to the partition of Indochina and our administration has managed to get around it. President Eisenhower has taken good care to stress that his opposition to collaboration in the U. N. with Communist China is only temporary. What we need apparently is just a little time more to familiarize ourselves with the idea and some fake promises from Peiping. This stand of the President together with the accord of Mr. Dulles on Indochina's partition are considered as a sign of political realism by the circles of appeasement at any price in Europe. Those articles—the correspondents inform us—believe that by such a flexibility the United States foreign policy would liberate itself from a rigid doctrine attitude which was an obstacle for positive policies. "For example"—writes one of these correspondents—"President Eisenhower said his opposition to admittance of Communist China into the United Nations was based upon moral grounds. Europeans see no great moral distinction between Communist China which the United States declines to recognize, and Communist Russia, which the United States recognizes."

We will hear such arguments in the months to come at an increasing rate and we will see to what a dangerous impasse this policy of the Eisenhower administration—with God in theory but with the devil in practice—will bring our country. There is fortunately still a means to prevent this course: the people should speak strongly this November.

New England Needs a Veterans' Home

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following address I shall deliver on station WMEX, Boston, Mass., 7:30 to 7:45 p. m., Saturday, August 21, 1954:

I think it shames all of us to see in every city and town the few veterans now old and chronically ill, hanging around the village square or wandering along Main Street—alone, forgotten, and with no one to take of them.

Remembering their once vigorous manhood and the sacrifices they made for our country we feel that we have neglected them.

A decent respect for their heroic services to the Nation in its time of need prompts us to ask: "How can we take care of these 'old soldiers' now that they need help?"

Most returning veterans look fine and fit.

Unscarred—they seem to be in perfect health.

But any man who has gone through the grind of combat leaves something of himself on the battlefield.

The wear and tear of such an experience is not always visible to those who were never called upon to serve in the Armed Forces of the Nation.

Sometimes the veteran—after what he has gone through—is unable to readjust himself to the ways of civilian life. Civilians cannot understand his problem. They soon forget what he has sacrificed for them. In the callous and mechanical rush of life they abandon him to his fate.

Only his fellow veterans, and his service organizations, carry on the fight to give him some protection.

The United States has over 20 million veterans.

Most of them are able to take care of themselves. Others cannot.

While we spend a per capita average of $87 a year to help other nations, we only allot $2 on the same basis, to support the program for our own veterans.

It is hard to comprehend why some taxpayers still complain about this $2 "tribute" to help the men who risked their lives to defend our freedoms and our opportunities.

"A veteran's home?" they ask blankly, not knowing what it is to be homeless.

Sheltered themselves from the pain and weariness and shock of battle.

Begrudging an appreciation that might cost a little money.

Domiciliary care is the provision of a "home," with such incidental medical care as is needed, for eligible veterans suffering from a permanent disability who are incapacitated from earning a living and have no adequate means of support.

On July 14, 1954, the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the United States House of Representatives held hearings on proposals to adopt the now surplus Cushing VA Hospital at Framingham, Mass., into a domicile for deserving New England veterans.

At the present time there is no Federal "home" for veterans in the six New England States. They are obliged to go to centers at Bath, N. Y.; Dayton, Ohio; Martinsburg, W. Va.; and Kecoughtan, Va.—far from friends and familiar places.

This is strange, considering that our veteran population is on the increase.

And remembering that we had a home when the need was less.

Up to 1944 we had an adequate number of domiciliary beds because there was then in existence a 1,100-bed domiciliary at Togus, Maine. This was discontinued and converted into a hospital for the treatment of mental illness. Since 1944 New England has been without a VA domiciliary home.

There are several "soldiers' homes" maintained by the New England States, with long waiting lists. They simply cannot cope with the need.

The Federal "homes" in New York, Ohio, Virginia, and West Virginia, are an unreasonable distance away for New England veterans who are sick, and broke, and with no one to look after them.

It was pointed out at the hearings that the potential national requirements for domiciliary beds are calculated on the basis of 0.009 percent of the total veterans population. That would establish a requirement of 1,217 beds for domiciliary care in New England.

Application from needy veterans for such a sanctuary are putting a great strain upon the excellent soldiers' homes maintained by the Commonwealth of Massachusetts at Chelsea and at Holyoke. The State is faced with the tragic prbolem of taking beds away from surgical cases to make room for domiciliary veterans who want to stay at the "home." Only a Federal home would relieve this pressure and retain the splendid surgeons currently serving on those staffs.

New England has 1,350,000 veterans, representing 6.6 percent of the veteran population in the Nation. If the present 17 VA domiciliaries were properly apportioned, New England would have 2 of them instead of none.

The Chief Medical Director for the Veterans' Administration recently stated, and I quote: "We know that as of December 31, 1953, there were resident in the New England State Soldiers' Homes 1,518 veterans eligible for domiciliary care by the Veterans' Administration. * * * I feel that there is an additional indeterminate number of eligible beneficiaries who would apply for admission if facilities were immediately available and within commuting distance of their homes."

To which I might add, that applications for care at distant points are being placed on file—due to lack of accommodations—in addition to those who do not seek care because they know that there is no room for them hereabouts—under present conditions.

The General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, on January 21, 1954, passed a resolution "memorializing the Congress of the United States to take the necessary steps for the purpose of establishing a soldiers' home under Federal jurisdiction at Framingham"; in other words, to convert the Cushing Veterans' Administration hospital at Framingham, Mass., to a domiciliary with a 2,000-bed capacity.

The Cushing Hospital was erected in 1943 for the Army as a wartime emergency project. The acquisition of the hospital by the Veterans' Administration for temporary use as a hospital was approved by the President in 1946. The hospital has since been closed by the VA and the patients transferred to new VA hospitals recently completed.

The Federal Government's investment in Cushing Hospital totals over $7 million.

It is a well-built hospital, constructed of brick. All of its buildings are one-story structures, well adapted for those who are infirm or who are suffering from chronic illnesses.

Cushing was declared to be surplus.

It may be boarded up or sold.

Even though, as of May 31, the Jamaica Plain VA Hospital, at Boston, which absorbed the greater part of the patient load at Cushing when it was closed, had a waiting list of 179 veterans who needed hospitalization. Other VA hospitals, serving psychiatric cases, also had waiting lists.

It is here that we must make the distinction between medical or surgical cases, on an in-and-out basis, and those who will never be well again.

How many times have VA hospitals replied in answer to applications for admission that "we have no available beds for this type of patient because his illness is of a chronic nature"?

This emphasizes the need for special facilities for "old soldiers" separate from medical or surgical cases of a temporary character.

We cannot expect the States to assume a burden which is the primary responsibility of the Federal Government.

These permanently disabled men and women served the Nation, and now it is the Nation's turn to protect them when they can no longer battle with life.

The Massachusetts delegation in Congress, together with representatives of the veterans' organizations, have fought hard to prevent Cushing from going to waste.

They have put up a strong case for the conversion of this facility-in-being to a veterans' home.

We in New England are at last waking up to our rights, and are determined that they shall be recognized.

We insist upon our fair share of Federal assistance.

Years ago, these veterans gave the best of their manhood to save us.

Now, some of them are disabled beyond recovery.

If we are to complete our promise to them, we must begin to provide a rest haven for those who will never be able to lead useful lives again.

Cushing is available and it can be converted into a facility for their permanent care, for the remainder of their few years at a fraction of the cost that would be required to build a new facility for this purpose.

Our World War I veteran population is aging.

Many are alone.

Some are homeless.

We don't want them to die, abandoned, in some back alley or in the charity ward of a municipal hospital. They have earned from our Nation far better than most because they gave so much—the right to live out their remaining days without worry or hardship and in the congenial company of their fellow veterans—not discarded, not forgotten.

A veterans' home at Cushing is the least we can and must provide for the aged, ill, and homeless veterans of New England.

Needed: A New Birth of Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial by William H. Hudnut, Jr., minister of the Third Presbyterian Church, of Rochester, N. Y., reprinted from Presbyterian Life in the Postal Alliance, publication of June 1951, is appended:

NEEDED: A NEW BIRTH OF FREEDOM

The vocation of every church member is to make his business, home, habits, and politics as Christian as possible. It is well for church people, therefore, to be concerned over the fact that something unwholesome has been happening to our political climate during the past few years, that our faith in freedom has been overcast. Trial by public opinion, the spawning of informers, the fear of being quoted, the danger of losing one's job, have all made their ugly appearance, and are alien to the best in American democracy.

If there is one thing more than another that our democratic tradition has stood for, it is the nonconformist spirit, the right and duty of the individual to make his own opinion heard. This freedom of expression and of association has been our chief glory as a nation. Sometimes this freedom has been abused, and witnesses have obstructed proper inquiry by hiding behind the fifth amendment.

But while we hear much these days of the fifth amendment, we hear little of the sixth, which is also a hard-won bulwark of our free society. "* * * the accused shall enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial, by an impartial jury * * * to be informed of the nature and cause of the accusation; to be confronted with the witnesses against him; to have compulsory process for obtaining witnesses in his favor, and to have the assistance of counsel for his defense." I believe Communist infiltration should be rooted out by all legal means, but I also believe that Communist methods must be opposed—the doctrine that the end justifies the means, the studied use of falsehood, the irresponsible furtherance of suspicion, the public reckless accusation of individuals and institutions by investigators and informers whom the law cannot touch.

Such methods endanger liberty, promote looseness of thought. Bishop Oxnam opposes the McCarran immigration law; so do the Communists; therefore the bishop must be Communist. General Marshall tried to effect a modus vivendi between Chiang Kai-shek and the Chinese Communists, and so he was called "a member of a conspiracy to aid Russia." These are totally unwarranted conclusions, of course, but they are the inferences that the uninformed draw. Was it not Justice Holmes who said that we must be careful to preserve freedom even for the thought we hate? The labeling of suspects by committees which take no responsibility for the accuracy of the material they release, the pillorying of security risks before their guilt is proved—all this savors of the techniques of dictatorship. Accusation is not conviction; yet many today seem to think it is. Congressional investigations are an important part of our way of life, and it is imperative that the way in which they are conducted does not hamper the high causes they are appointed to serve.

Surely it is un-American to label anyone as un-American before his disloyalty has been proved. We have every right to protect our society, but the methods used to achieve this end are just as important as the end itself. When the authorities that control the Indiana War Memorial Building in Indianapolis closed it last November to a meeting of the American Civil Liberties Union because the American Legion and the Indianapolis Minute Women protested, they were using un-American methods. To yield to such pressure seems a betrayal of the very freedom that the soldiers for whom the memorial was erected died to preserve. Why should we fear controversial opinions? They stimulate thought. Our present anxiety neurosis does little credit to the tradition of courage that is our national heritage.

Such a spirit spread abroad in our land has the most harmful ramifications, especially in education. Harvard University is called a "smelly mess," and the president of that historic institution is advised to clean up his faculty. A kind of vague distrust of our whole educational enterprise is thereby promoted. Would we want any univerisity to insist that all opinion expressed on the campus adhere to one point of view; to cease to be a university, in short, and to become instead a factory for the production of timid minds?

This prevailing spirit of suspicion and fear made a professor of physics at the University of Georgia resign recently, even though he denied being a Communist. Governor Talmadge had so stigmatized him to the board of regents, and the president of the institution had then advised him to resign. Perhaps the professor was lying, perhaps he was or is a Communist, I do not know. The point is, the methods used to unseat him were precisely those used by Hitler to get rid of professors in Germany; all you have to do it to substitute the name "Jew" for "Communist." These measures are used in Russia to get rid of someone the regime dislikes; just substitute "capitalist reactionary." Such methods are completely at variance with our American sense of fair play.

One more instance is the almost unbelievable case of the Air Force Lt. Milo J. Radulovich. The loyalty of Lieutenant Radulovich was not questioned, but nevertheless he was about to be ousted from the reserves as a security risk because his 65-year-old father was accused of having received copies of the Daily Worker; and his sister, Mrs. Margaret Fishman was said to have engaged in picket-line acitvity which the Communists were alleged to have organized. It seems incredible that such a thing could have happened in the land we love. Fortunately, Secretary of the Air Force Harold Talbott reversed the recommendation, and Radulovich was not discharged.

Another cornerstone of democracy, the principle of individual responsibility, was about to be violated here. In our conception of justice, a man is not held accountable for the actions of family or friends unless there is proved compliicty. In Anglo-American law guilt is personal and not collective. To discharge an American officer because of the activities of his relatives is reminiscent of dismissing a German professor because one of his grandparents was a Jew.

We need to listen to one of our greatest living men, Judge Learned Hand: "* * * the spirit of liberty is the spirit which seeks to understand the minds of other men and women; the spirit of liberty is the spirit which weighs their interests alongside its own without bias; the spirit of liberty is the spirit of Him who, nearly 2,000 years ago, taught mankind that lesson it has never learned, but has never quite forgotten, that there may by a kingdom where the least shall be heard and considered side by side with the greatest." That is authentic Americanism, that is the high tradition, that is the truth that sets men free.

Power on the Spot

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT GORE

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Power on the Spot," appearing in the Washington Post of July 17, 1954, commending the speech of the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] made in the Senate against the Dixon-Yates contract in the TVA system.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POWER ON THE SPOT

Senator COOPER's significant differences with the administration position on electric power in the Tennessee Valley ought to give some pause to promoters of the private contract. Mr. COOPER has made what is probably the clearest and simplest explanation of the issues. He has pegged his opposition to the administration plan on the most fundamental discrepancy—an abuse of the authority of the Atomic Energy Commission. Actually, under the administration plan the AEC would be used to contract for private power, not directly for its own needs, but for Tennessee Valley Authority customers in the Memphis area. Furthermore, there has been no competitive bidding on the contract which the President has directed the AEC to enter into with the private Dixon-Yates group.

Both Senators COOPER and PASTORE noted that this contract would have the effect of rewriting by Executive action the basic functions of TVA as determined by Congress. Mr. COOPER's proposal for an alternative means of financing TVA's needs for additional powerplants through the sale of bonds seems to us to have much merit. But any change in the scope of TVA operations ought to be made openly by Congress. There is special reason to hold up any precipitate action, as Senator COOPER suggested, in order to give the new TVA Administrator, when he is appointed, a chance to survey the situation.

An amendment by Senator ANDERSON would block the Dixon-Yates contract unless it were rewritten to eliminate reimbursement for Federal income taxes and to provide that power be furnished directly to the Atomic Energy Commission. The administration will be very foolish indeed if it permits this amendment to come to a vote. For either the administration will lose, or it will hand the Democrats a potent campaign issue, not only in the Tennessee Valley, but elsewhere in the country where public power is in question. From the standpoint of the administration's prestige it would be far better for the President to compromise by accepting Senator COOPER's suggestion that the whole matter be shelved pending study by the new head of TVA.

Address by the President to the World Council of Churches

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN S. COOPER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield to me, to permit me to make a unanimous-consent request for an insertion in the RECORD?

Mr. MALONE. I yield, if I may have consent to do so without losing the floor.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of the President's address at the assembly of the World Council of Churches, at Evanston, Ill., on August 19, 1954.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Your Grace, the archbishop, President Miller, members of the clergy, my fellow citizens, and friends, there are many good reasons why I am so delighted to meet with this Assembly of the World Council of Churches on this beautiful campus in this charming city.

I think it is very fitting that one of the great universities of our country should be the host to this wonderful body of world representatives.

Now, I should like to enumerate a few of the reasons why I believe that I speak for the American people in saying that we are proud that this assembly has chosen to meet here.

First of all, the citizens of the United States feel highly honored that you have chosen this country in which to hold this second assembly of the world churches, because you are a world body of spiritual leaders here in this land, where we sometimes are thought to adhere to and to place our trust in material values.

Now it is true that in today's world of risks and alarms we must, and we will remain strong, and seek to make our good friends strong in all those scientific, material, and military means that insure or enhance our safety, and discourage aggression against us or against our friends.

But we know that there is no true and lasting cure for world tensions in guns and bombs. We know that only the spirit and mind of man, dedicated to justice and right, can in the long term enable us to live in the confident tranquility that should be every man's heritage.

We are likewise delighted that your conference, representing 48 nations, and 163 groups, spiritually brings the world to the center of the North American Continent.

However worried citizens of this Nation may be about our own country—and we are—all of us realize that the problems and hopes before us today are world problems and world hopes.

More and more we understand the phrophetic wisdom of John Wesley's statement: "The world is my parish."

QUOTES PRESIDENT WILSON

Again, you call yourselves a council. The term suggests that you accept the injunction, "Come, let us reason together." Deliberations such as yours, involving long-term as well as immediate objectives, can lend depth and distance to our own thinking.

International-political conferences deal habitually with crises and their results often are little more than a series of improvizations.

Indeed, responsible officials have no opportunity to deal with a matter until it becomes a crisis. Woodrow Wilson complained, "By the time anything gets to me, it is a problem." [Laughter.]

We in the Government today often feel the same. In many respects we envy the chance of the members of this great convocation to meet and plan on a positive basis for the world in the years to come.

Still another reason for our gratification in your presence among us is that you are a council of churches. You represent a vast body of believers, of men and women who know the power of believing. You are custodians of a definite faith and confidence in an age of uncertainty and bewilderment.

Many of you have what the Quakers call a concern. Your energies are pledged.

You are committed to a program that involves personal responsibilities for the general good. It therefore heartens us to have an assembly of this sort in the United States of America, and on our part we think it fitting that you meet here. Almost anywhere you turn in this country, you will find a confluence of religious forces producing a person or an institution with service to others as an objective. Moreover, we are a Nation of many people, out of many lands. Practically every national group is represented in all branches of our Government.

With our diversity, if you could look at us from afar, we would be theortically impossible. But we do exist, and in reasonable harmony.

RECALLS NATION'S ORIGIN

Thus, we meet the variety of this great assembly with a variety of hopes and aspirations. So even as you have announced your aims, we as a people have put our ideals on record. We have chosen to state these ideals for all the world to see.

At our national beginnings, now a century and three-quarters gone, we announced what we intended to make out of this country. We proclaimed then the principles on which it was founded and toward which we continued to strive. We have fallen short, yes, but the ideals we have set forth—that we have blazoned on the record—stand always there to challenge us. Thus, we shall view with the greatest of sympathy your own efforts here to set forth a steadily higher ideal toward which man, in his growth, must always move.

We will watch with great interest what you do here for another reason. We are essentially a religious people. We are not merely religious by tradition. We are inclined more today than ever to see the value of religion as a practical force in our affairs. Contrary to what many people think, the percentage of our population belonging to churches steadily increases. In a hundred years, that percentage has multiplied more than three times.

Recently a great Bible society announced that it had doubled the distribution of the Scriptures in the United States since 1948. Bible distribution in this country last year rose to almost 10,000,000 volumes published in 81 languages. Now, these two facts are not in themselves proof, either of piety or of an approaching millennium, in religion as serious and genuine, not merely theoretical.

A score of religious faiths, large and small, are represented in the membership of our present Congress, and it will interest you to know that a good many Members of our Congress periodically meet together outside of legislative hours to consider how religious principles can be applied to the practical affairs of our Government. [Applause.]

SPEAKS OF "LOGISTICS OF FAITH"

I think that you ought to feel at home here and to know that you are among people who feel in harmony with your purposes. Believing, as we do, in the importance of religion, we shall expect much of this convocation, we hope that you will touch our imagination, remind us again and again of the vision without which the people perish. Give us criticism in the light of religious ideals. Kindle anew in us a desire to strive for moral greatness and to show us where we fall short. We shall listen if you speak to us as the prophet spoke in the days of old. We look to you for another thing, and that is for a practical demonstration of the Christian ethics. We hope you may show us additional and better ways in which is can be applied to all sorts of problems. This is what you might call the logistics of faith.

We as a people have sought, however imperfectly, to carry out in this spirit programs that have been regional and even global in scope.

The war was scarcely over, may I remind you, until American hearts were digging cash out of American pockets, to help restore devastated regions, to relieve suffering.

There was finally established the great system of CARE. CARE packages going everywhere in the world, to feed the hungry, to bring a moment of cheer and of good feeling to millions who were in despair.

The Marshall plan, and its effort to restore to other nations something of the ability they had to earn their own living before the cataclysms of war struck them. The technical assistance that spread around the world, from Peru to Pakistan, from everywhere that people want to get technical help to help themselves. And aside from all these, we have a great record of Red Cross and churches and other groups, doing their mightiest all of the time to help their brethren who are less fortunate.

Now, admittedly, my friends, these programs always reflect our own enligtened self-interest as well as humanitarian purposes. We know that no nation may live by itself alone. To preserve the individual freedoms we prize so highly, we must not only protect ourselves as a nation, but we must make certain that other with like devotion to liberty may also survive and prosper. We have wanted a world in which we might live in peace and confidence, and in striving toward that goal we have understood that to help others was often the best way of ourselves to advance.

But underlying all of these practical considerations has been belief in the dignity of man and in the rights conferred upon him by his Creator, so well stated in our Declaration of Independence, which I hope, by the way, your grace, the archbishop of Canterbury, you have read.

Now, my friends of the convocation, there is another thing we can hope to learn from your being with us. I illustrate it by quoting the statement of a former college president, and I can understand the reason for his speaking as he did. I am sure President Miller can.

This president said: "I have two kinds of problems—the urgent and the important. The urgent are not important and the important are never urgent."

THE MIGHTIEST FORCE

Now, this, I think, represents a dilemma of modern man. Your being here can help place the important before us, and perhaps even give the important a touch of urgency. And you can strengthen our faith that men of good will, working together, can solve the problems confronting us.

Because these men, these people, these devoted people meeting here, believe, first of all, always in faith; faith is the mightiest force that man has at his command. It impels human beings to greatness in thought and word and deed.

I am going to call to your mind just two instances. First, the First Crusade, 1906, five columns of individuals starting in Europe, out of a great burst of faith in the ability to rescue, as they felt, the Holy Land from the infidels.

Five columns started out without taking the slightest thought of military organization, of the terrors and troubles and tribulations on the way. They had no commissaries and lines of supply. They just started toward the Holy Land.

Only two reached Constantinople—bedraggled, torn, suffering; but the point is the other 3, lost on the road, their numbers down; there was not a thought of turning back. They had faith. And they moved on into the Holy Land to carry out the mission for which they started.

Faith unlocked the energies of that whole Continent and carried men forward through the sufferings and hardships that were almost inconceivable.

And then, let's come down in years to something nearer our own shores, but of course in size much smaller. In 1620 a little group of Pilgrims started out from the eastern seaboard of the Atlantic; and they landed at Plymouth Rock, after a passage across a stormy ocean that today no one in his senses would think of attempting to use.

They came across without the slightest diminution in their faith that here in this untried, unchartered land they could build for themselves a place in which they would prosper and they could stand up right before their God.

WHAT MEN CAN OVERCOME

And they made among themselves a compact, and it began, "In the name of God, amen."

I cite these two just to show what men can overcome, and I assure the ladies, when I use the term "men," I mean humanity as a whole.

But what people can overcome when they believe in others. Those of you who have seen the incredible deeds of devoted and dedicated men on the battlefield, know that you do not have to go back even to the Pilgrims to be certain of this same truth.

The achievements of believing men and women then in every generation remains a challenge to us in ours. Faith has indeed moved mountains.

Now ours is a time when great things must again be dared in faith.

Around the world men and women anxiously search the future for the dawning of a just and lasting peace. Its winning cannot be left to the diplomat and the soldier. History is filled with the stories of their failures, no matter how skillful or devoted their efforts.

Yet those failures have not destroyed hope. There is no other longing of men so universal and so indestructible as the yearning for a lasting, just and noble peace.

I believe that even if this goal seems for the moment far beyond our reach, there is, nevertheless, much that each of us, you and I, everybody in this audience, can do to help attain it.

Let me speak then for a moment, not as this Nation's Chief Executive whose days are largely devoted to the efforts of Government to secure peace, but as a private citizen, a single member of one of the constituent bodies of this council of churches.

But I must speak also, inescapably, as one who has seen at first hand the almost miraculous battlefield achievements of men bound together by mighty devotion to a worthy cause.

A thousand experiences have convinced me beyond room for doubt that common and fervent dedication to a noble purpose multiplies the strength of the individuals and the body, and brings within the scope of their capabilities almost any conceivable objective.

Today, now the campaign for a just and lasting peace desperately needs the lifting and transforming power that comes from men and women, the world over, responding to their highest allegiances and to their best motives.

Now, how can we help strike this spark of dedication in receptive hearts around the earth?

I believe that you, members of this convocation, spiritual leaders of a great world organization, together with your brethren of other faiths, can lead the way. The goal should be nothing short of inviting every single person in every single country in the world who believes in the power of a Supreme Being to join in a mighty, simultaneous, intense act of faith.

That act of faith might take the form of a personal prayer by the hundreds upon hundreds of millions—delivered simultaneously and feverently for the devotion, wisdom and stamina to work unceasingly for a just and lasting peace.

If this mass dedication, launched an unending campaign for peace, supported consequently by prayer, I am certain wondrous results would ensue.

First, and at the very least, there would be a reminder to each of us that the cause of peace needs God. We would come to know also that responsibility for peace or conflict rests in some degree with each of us.

Each would be heartened and strengthened by the certainty of close comradeships in faith and purpose. Thus, there would be set in motion a great and growing force that could unify men in peace as a common peril unifies them in war.

There would be initiated unceasing and universal study of the principal factors in the global problems that seem to impede progress toward peace. There would be generated a support for honest and devoted world leaders that would inspire them to plumb new depths of knowledge and understanding, and seek new paths toward conciliation.

There would spring forth and be carried out new projects for defeating the despair and suffering and hopelessness in which millions now live. And the destruction of the conditions that shrivel the soul and starve the body would add new millions to the soldiers of the faith, the faith that the children of God can live if they so will, in the climate and the relationships that mean justice and decency and peace for all.

Now, my friends of this great convocation, I hope you do not deem me presumptuous in expressing to you my personal belief in your opportunities and capabilities as spiritual leaders of men; but if I have, I plead in extenuation, the universal realization that the time has come when for mankind there is no substitute for a just and lasting peace.

We may have ignorance and selfishness and greed and atheism and war and destruction; or we may have courage and stamina and understanding and faith and peace.

None of us is denied the high honor of working in this cause. May each of us have the vision to recognize his own opportunity to contribute, effectively. May each of us in his own faith find the strength to do his full part.

Thank you, my friends.

Administration Position on Farm Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS H. KUCHEL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Administration Position on Farm Prices." The article was published in the summer of 1954 issue of Grain Quarterly, and was written by Don Paarlberg, Assistant Secretary of Agriculture in the Cabinet of President Eisenhower.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADMINISTRATION POSITION ON FARM PRICES

(By Don Paarlberg, Assistant to the Secretary of Agriculture)

The administration's major proposals regarding changes in agricultural price policy are these:

That a part of our burdensome stocks be set aside and eliminated from price-support computations in order to ease the transition to the new program.

That Federal assistance be given to increase the exports of American farm products both within and outside the normal channels of trade.

That for the basic commodities, except tobacco, a change be made from price support at rigid 90 percent of parity to price support at 75 to 90 percent of parity, depending on supply.

That beginning January 1, 1956, parity for all farm products be figured on a modernized basis which takes account of present production methods and changes in supply and demand that have occurred during the more than 40 years since 1910–14.

That when land must be diverted from production agricultural conservation program funds be used to help farmers make these adjustments in a manner that will advance soil conservation and long-term efficiency.

The President's message sets a new direction for agriculture, and recommends that we proceed thereon gradually rather than with haste. This program involves building for better, steadier farm income by strengthening those institutions which have long been the pride and hope of American agriculture—freedom and responsibility.

A number of questions have been asked regarding these proposals. Here are some of the questions most frequently asked and the answers.

How great are the changes which are proposed?

Only 20 percent of United States farm income is obtained from the five commodities (wheat, corn, cotton, rice and peanuts) for which it is proposed that we change from rigid to flexible supports. For these five basic commodities, changes in the level of price support would be moderate. There are only seven States in which these commodities bring in 40 percent or more of the farm income.

Under these proposals, could the support price move up as well as down?

Yes, the support price could move in either direction.

Under the proposed legislation, as under present law, the dollar level of price support depends on the index of prices paid by farmers for goods and services—the so-called parity index. If this index rises, the the dollar level of price support rises, other things being equal.

While the proposed legislation calls for a schedule of price floors between 75 and 90 percent of parity, based on supply, it provides discretionary authority to support the price at higher levels than called for by the price support schedule if conditions justify.

Furthermore, it authorizes raising the level of price support above 90 percent of parity if emergency conditions should prevail.

Beyond that, the free market price can rise above the support level or above 90 percent of parity if the commodity concerned is in short supply or is urgently needed.

What will happen to farm income under these proposals?

First of all, the level of farm income depends far more on general economic conditions than it does on the level of price supports. The chart on page 37 reveals that prices of supported and nonsupported farm commodities have behaved in similar fashion during the past 22 years.

Since the program would not become operative until 1955, this year's farm income would be in no way altered.

Next year, or any year, the farm income from nonbasic crops would not be affected directly, since legislation for these crops would generally remain as before. These nonbasic crops bring in about three-fourths of our farm income.

The set-aside will cushion next year's change over to the flexible provisions of the Agricultural Act of 1949.

Modernized parity would not begin until January 1, 1956, and transitional parity would ease that shift.

For 1955, if the program recommended by the President is enacted into law, farm incomes would be slightly higher than would be the case if no legislative action were taken and the Agricultural Act of 1949 became effective. The provision for the set-aside would mean higher support prices than would otherwise be the case, and would make these prices easier to obtain.

For subsequent years, after the program got fully underway, there is no better statement than that made by the President: "Year in and year out, it (the program) will provide the best prospects for the stability and growth of farm income."

There is interest in a comparison of farm income as between the administration's proposal and a continuation of 90 percent of parity. Setting aside for the moment such considerations as cost and storage problems, it appears that in the short run, incomes from wheat and cotton would be slightly higher with 90 percent of parity; in the long run, because of loss of markets, acreage cuts, and the price depressing effect of surpluses, incomes from these commodities would be lower if support at 90 percent of parity is attempted than if the President's recommendations were adopted.

The level of farm income resulting from a proposed farm program is an important, but not a sole, criterion of the appropriateness of that program.

If prices are lowered, won't farmers increase their production so as to maintain their incomes?

This problem has been studied by an impressive number of scientists; there is no competent piece of research known to us which supports the contention that a lowered price brings increased production.

The question of how farmers respond to price changes is a searching one; a correct answer must be given if wise decisions are to be made.

If farmers increase production when prices fall relatively, then they act contrary to their own interests and contrary to the needs of consumers. Such a situation would be intolerable and would call for a full fledged system of Government controls.

If farmers decrease production when prices fall relatively, then they make adjustments which are in the interests of all concerned, and can safely be entrusted with a large degree of freedom in planning their production.

Careful studies indicate that the latter is the case.

Why are hogs now selling at about 120 percent of parity? Because farmers decreased their production in response to the lower prices of 1952.

Why do we now have record numbers of cattle on farms and ranches? Because our livestock farmers responded to the favorable prices of several years ago.

Many people who profess to believe that a low price causes increased production do not, by their actions, support this belief. When greater production is desired they ask for higher, not lower price support.

The Congress has acted wisely in the past with reference to this issue. When greater production was needed, as for flaxseed during the war, the support price was raised. When supplies of potatoes became burdensome, price supports were withdrawn.

One may well question the argument that the price supports which were used to encourage increased production during the war should now be used to prevent such production increases.

Those crops which have not been under production control during the past 20 years in general exhibit a fairly good balance of supply and demand. Supplies in general are not burdensome and prices have averaged as high as for the controlled crops. This seems to demonstrate that farmers respond in a rational manner to changes in price.

The effect of price on production is obscured by a number of factors. For example, farmers respond not to the price of a commodity as such but to the price of one commodity relative to another. The degree of response depends on the availability of alternative opportunities. For some commodities there are attractive alternatives; for others there is little choice. The length of time required to bring about a production change varies with the nature of the product. Broiler production can be increased or decreased in response to price changes within about 4 months' time. For most crops, a year is required. For cattle 3 or 4 years are needed. For many fruits, price changes do not have their full effect until a decade or more has passed.

It has been found that in the absence of controls, if the price of cotton changes 10 percent, the acreage of cotton the following year changes about 2 percent, in the same direction. Wheat acreage responds in a similar manner. Corn acreage is less responsive to price changes; the acreage of flaxseed increases and decreases sharply from year to year as prices change.

It is not proposed in the administration's recommendations that price changes should bear full responsibility for shifts in the production of basic crops. Authority for acreage control must be retained and must be used. But price and production controls would be operating togeher to bring about needed production changes, rather than working against one another, as at present.

An argument for flexible supports is that they will permit shifts from commodities which are in abundant supply to those in greater need. To what products could farmers shift?

Some of our present acreages should be shifted out of crops and into sod and woodlots. This would be in the interest of wise land use, and would restore the more desirable pattern which existed prior to the offering of high incentives for expanded production.

We are consuming, today, about the same amount of meat per capita as did our grandfathers 50 years ago. There is an opportunity to increase our production and consumption of meat, milk, and eggs above present levels. We are far from having reached the limit in providing our people with these nutritious and palatable foods. As the richest nation in the world, we could afford to eat more livestock products; several nations exceed us in per capita consumption of the protective livestock foods. This is true of Argentina, Australia, and New Zealand. Livestock production requires a large acreage to provide a given supply of food. It takes about 7 acres devoted to the production of livestock products to produce as much food energy as 1 acre of grain. When acreage is abundant, livestock production is a logical use of land and labor. But this can occur only when price relationships permit the shift from grain to livestock.

Sharp changes in the volume of livestock production are not desirable, and are not recommended. But moderate shifts in this direction, made voluntarily by farmers in response to price changes, would go a long way toward finding profitable uses for our agricultural resources which are in line with sound land use practices, nutritional requirements, and consumer needs.

An illustration of what might be accomplished in this field is given by the poultry industry which during the past several decades has improved quality, lowered costs, and greatly expanded per capita consumption of poultry products. During the past 30 years, per capita consumption of eggs and chicken meat increased 25 and 54 percent, respectively.

Currently, we could be using more pork.

During the past half century we have improved our level of living as measured by housing, education, transportation, and clothing. We have not improved our level of living as measured by per capita consumption of red meat. There is an opportunity to do so.

Is not national income related to farm income at a ration of 7 to 1, and should we not therefore endeavor to maintain farm income at a high level so as to assure a high national income?

We should endeavor to maintain farm income at high levels in the interests of both farmers and nonfarmers. This should be done through methods that encourage efficient production and move farm products into use rather than into government storage.

There is a relationship between farm income and national income, but it is not always 7 to 1, there is nothing automatic about it, and causation does not necessarily lie with farm income.

Years ago, when a large percentage of our people were farmers, the ratio was 2 to 1. During the late 1940's the ration was about 7 to 1. Currently it is 10 to 1. A decade or two from now, if the trend toward urbanization continues, the ratio may become 15 to 1. During several postwar years the ratio has not held; farm incomes declined and national income increased.

Even if the ratio were consistently 7 to 1 this would not demonstrate that causation lay with agriculture. If farm income and national income are found to be associated, it still remains to be determined whether the one causes the other, or the other causes the the one, or whether they are both the result of a third force. The cock crows at the break of day, but it does not logically follow that he causes the sun to rise.

It is doubtful that a dollar, once it got into the pocket of a farmer, would enjoy the unique distinction of multiplying itself seven times.

There are other ratios that bear a fairly constant relationship to national income. The value of new construction is maintained fairly well at a ratio of about 9 to 1; for sales of Sears, Roebuck & Co. the ratio is reasonably stable at about 1,200 to 1. If blind faith is to be placed in ratios, then one can make a case for maintaining national income through subsidies to our mail order houses rather than to our farmers. It would be far cheaper.

There is a relationship of agriculture to the rest of the economy, and it is probably similar to the relationship of the various members of the human body to one another. Each is important, but there is no one organ on which the health of the body exclusively depends.

Is not price support at 90 percent of parity necessary to protect the small farmer?

Such benefits as are given by price supports tend to be distributed on a bushelage or poundage basis. It is obvious, therefore, that large operators are helped more than small ones.

A recent study of the potato program, done at the University of Minnesota, reached the conclusion that potato price support speeded the shift from the small operation to the highly specialized commercial unit.

The problem of the small farmer is primarily that of increasing the size of his operation and improving his efficiency. Research, education, and credit are often more appropriate to his needs than price support, which on his few bushels or bales, nets him little extra income. The extra dollars which might come to the small farmer through price support are important. But for every dollar that comes to him, many more dollars come to the big operator and the competitive advantage of the large operator is thereby increased.

In North Dakota, for the 1953 crop, the average wheat loan was $2,890 and the average of the 5 largest loans in the State was $71,253. In Iowa, the average corn loan was $2,154, while the average of the 5 largest loans was $98,535. In Mississippi, the average cotton loan was $372 and the average of the five largest loans was $479,535.

Is it not true that the flexible supports give assistance to farmers when the supply is short and they least need it, and lower the supports when the supply is large and most needed?

It is true that the level of support varies inversely with the supply, but it is not true that farmers are helped in a manner inconsistent with their needs. Under the act of 1949 a normal supply is supported at 90 percent of parity and a large supply, 130 percent of normal, is supported at 75 percent of parity. With these supports, the larger supply brings in 8 percent more gross income than does the normal supply.

Under the flexible price supports, supply and price fluctuate inversely, tending to stabilize gross farm income. Under rigid price supports, gross farm income is unstabilized, since price is not permitted to compensate for changes in volume.

The misunderstanding comes from focusing on price as a sole objective, overlooking the important fact that income is more important than price, and income is the product of quantity times price.

Since the program recommended by the President would indicate supports at or near 90 percent of parity over the years, what objection can there be to making these supports mandatory at 90 percent?

The Agricultural Act of 1949 and other relevant legislation were written with a view toward maintaining supplies of basic commodities at levels which would call for price supports at or near 90 percent of parity. No important changes have been proposed in this, beyond suggesting increases in the normal carryover of wheat and cotton. If the administration's proposals are adopted, and if supplies are kept in line as the basic law contemplates, prices would be supported at or near 90 percent of parity under the loan program.

There are several unpredictable factors, however, which might create supplies in excess of the quantities contemplated.

The minimum acreage provisions for certain crops might be raised.

Acreage allotments and marketing quotas might not be invoked.

Yields might be exceptionally high.

Export markets might suddenly be diminished.

Domestic outlets might be curtailed.

If supplies piled up as a consequence of such circumstances, it is important that there be an opportunity for lowering the support price, to encourage consumption, to reduce the incentive for high production, and to encourage desirable shifts in the pattern of production. This is the reason why flexibility is desirable, even though it is contemplated that the support price would normally hold within the upper limits of the 75 to 90 percent range.

Flexible supports serve to call constantly to farmers' attention the fact that supplies must be held in line with demand in order for price supports to remain at or near 90 percent of parity.

How much have farm programs cost during the past 22 years?

One hears various answers; the cost has been quoted by some at "a little over a billion dollars" and by others at "about $16 billion." Which is correct?

Strangely enough, each is correct if one properly specifies what is being included in the cost.

Suppose we were to ask a group of farmers how much it costs to operate a tractor. One would report on the cost of gas and oil only. Another would add the cost of repairs, depreciation, interest, and taxes. Still another, if he wanted to make the figure impressive, would add the wages of the man driving the tractor.

It is the same way in reporting the cost of price supports. Those who wish to keep the figure low report only the direct costs to the Commodity Credit Corporation of price-support programs—a little over a billion dollars. This omits other programs which have essentially the same purpose but are handled by other agencies or are differently accounted for.

Those who wish to report a high figure quote $16 billion which includes costs of programs for conserving the soil, extending credit and other activities not directly related to the support of prices or incomes.

The Department of Agriculture made a study in which the cost was totaled for those programs and only those programs aimed primarily at supporting prices and incomes. This included the International Wheat Agreement, surplus disposal, and related programs. Administrative costs, interest charges, and all overhead items were included. The figure that came out was $7.5 billion. This would be an average of about $60 per farmer per year if all farmers shared equally, which, of course, they do not. Some receive many times this amount; others receive little or nothing.

I anticipate an associated question—how much Government help has been extended to nonfarm people through subsidies of various kinds?

I can only say that this is a statistical no-man's land with figures embracing a wide range and being less well documented than the estimates for agriculture.

Perhaps, as for the boy eating apples, the question is not whether we are getting as much as the next fellow but whether what we are getting is really best for us. I commend the issue to you on that basis.

Why should we try something new at this time, when there is some uncertainty regarding the economic outlook?

The program recommended is not new; in its essential elements it has had strong bipartisan support in both Houses of Congress. The record abounds with statements given in favor of flexible supports by individuals and groups who now oppose them.

Some people seem to agree that the recommended farm program is sound but feel that it should not be enacted at this time.

The recommended program will have no effect in the immediate future, as it would not alter the situation in any way until the 1955 crop is harvested, a year or more hence. Even then the changes would be slight. Modernized parity will not begin for the basic commodities until January 1, 1956.

The responsibilities of leadership call for the implementation for the 1955 crop of sound legislation which has now been postponed 6 years.

What happens if no price-support legislation is passed?

In the event of no new legislation we would go to the permanent features of the Agricultural Act of 1949. This act is largely the basis of the administration's proposals, so that if there is no new legislation, the major part of the administration program would become law automatically.

Resolution of Veterans of Foreign Wars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EARLE C. CLEMENTS
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record a resolution passed by the Veterans of Foreign Wars at Philadelphia, August 6, 1954.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States approved and vigorously supported the principle of using impounded funds and assets of enemy nationals to pay damage claims to American servicemen who suffered brutal and inhuman treatment as prisoners of war of the Japanese and German enemy forces. This is only fitting and proper that those who suffered so deeply at the hands of our enemies should be compensated in some measure from the impounded funds and assets of former enemy nationals.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars is informed that efforts are being made through proposed legislation in the Congress of the United States to return these impounded funds and assets in the amount of approximately $500 million to the former Japanese and German owners, including millions of dollars to the I. G. Farben industries which helped to enable Hitler to wage war against the free world.

The 55th annual and national encampment of the Veterans of Foreign Wars called upon the Congress of the United States to delay action upon such proposed legislation until a study has been made to determine the amount of money needed adequately to compensate American servicemen who suffered inhuman treatment at the hands of their Japanese and German captors. The American taxpayers should not be called upon to provide these payments out of tax funds while Japanese and German nationals receive this windfall of approximately $1 billion.

International Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, recently we have witnessed the almost comical spectacle of all sorts of persons falling over each other in an effort to clamber aboard the anti-Communist bandwagon. Apparently they imagine that a single belated vote to outlaw the Communist Party will cause our people to forget their years of softness toward the Communist conspiracy at home and abroad.

One organization that has no need either to apologize or to try to cover up its past on this most important issue of our time is the American Federation of Labor. For two decades it has been valiantly fighting to expose and destroy this threat to every freedom and value we cherish. Furthermore, it consistently proposes concrete steps to take and policies to follow. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include a splendid statement analyzing the twin perils we face as a result of Communist gains in Asia and the further weakening and division of the free world resulting from its confusion under the impact of the deceptive peaceful-coexistence and expand-trade maneuver by the Communists, and suggesting the course we should follow.

The statement follows:

International Crisis—Statement by Executive Council, A. F. of L., August 12, 1954

The free world is beset by new and dangerous perils. The security is gravely endangered by illusions about the role of Soviet communism since the death of Stalin. Anxious for peace and eager to live and let live, the democracies have, in varying degrees, ignored the basic, permanent threat of the Moscow-Peiping military axis and its worldwide Communist conspiracy. This has led to a serious weakening of their sense of urgency and vigilance. Their will to cooperate and unite for a common cause has been shaken. Their drive to become strong enough to deter and defeat direct and indirect Soviet aggression has been dangerously slackened. Some in the free world (Bevan, Nehru) even go so far as to oppose every effort by the democracies to promote their collective security and self-preservation on the ground that such efforts are harmful to peace.

Costly concessions have been made to the Communist imperialists on the pretext that they must not be displeased or provoked. These concessions (Indochina) have not alleviated but aggravated world tension and have encouraged the Communists in their conspiracy to subvert all free societies and to foist upon them totalitarian dictatorships. In this situation, the Kremlin and its junior partner in plunder (Mao Tse-tung) have succeeded in misleading many people to trust the stepped-up Soviet propaganda for so-called coexistence. Given the habit of the democracies to relax their vigilance and reduce their strength the moment they feel that the threat to their freedom and peace has abated, reliance on this Soviet strategy is fatal to the security of the free world.

If Moscow were sincere in its revival of this maneuver, devised by Lenin in 1920 in order to gain time for preparing the final assault on the democracies, it would first of all liquidate its activities aimed against the existence of those with whom it claims to seek coexistence. These fifth-column activities, directed by the Kremlin, have but one aim—to subvert, overthrow, and replace the governments with which the U. S. S. R. is supposed to be at peace or even has special treaties of alliance and friendship. These Communist activities are a form of indirect, but nonetheless infernal, Soviet aggression—fatal to the freedom and national independence of big as well as small nations (China, 1945; Czechoslovakia, 1948). Before there could ever be coexistence, conducive to the peace and well-being of all mankind, the Soviet dictatorship would have to fulfill certain conditions. Let the U. S. S. R. go back to its borders of 1939 (pre-Stalin-Hitler pact). Let the Kremlin accept U. N.-supervised democratic elections in all areas of tension (Germany, Korea). Let Moscow agree to the actual banning of atomic and hydrogen weapons through effective international inspection and control.

The executive council of the American Federation of Labor rejects the notion that the free world must choose between coexistence—the policy of successive or massive appeasement of the Soviet aggressors—and a policy of waging a preventive war against the Moscow-Peiping Axis. We sincerely want peace with freedom. We, therefore, reject both of these policies. The policy of coexistence can lead only to another world war—under conditions in which the democracies would, morally, materially, and militarily be far less able to resist, let alone defeat, the Communist enemy.

Instead of helping the Communist dictatorship to overcome the serious economic and political difficulties now besetting the Soviet orbit, instead of providing these totalitarian aggressors with the commodities and credit they need for strengthening and streamlining their already powerful and dangerous war machines, let the democracies pursue a positive program to aid freedom and peace through building up their own unity and ever greater strength. The executive council of the A. F. of L. proposes that this program should have among its guiding lines the following measures:

1. Complete rearmament—military, economic, political, and social—adequate enough to discourage and defeat Communist subversion and aggression against the free nations on all continents.

2. Setting of definite time limits for granting independence to the colonial and semicolonial peoples, as the United States did in the Philippine Islands.

3. Expansion of purchasing power, productivity, and trade and stabilization of the prices of basic raw materials (rubber, tin, etc.) within the free world.

4. U. N. supervised democratic elections in all areas of conflict (Germany, Korea, China, Indochina) in order to reduce international tension and to enable the people of these countries to achieve genuine national reunification in freedom and to select governments which shall enjoy full sovereignty in their foreign as well as domestic affairs.

5. Rigid and permanent opposition to admitting into United Nations membership the Mao Tse-tung regime or any other government which (a) has been imposed on a nation by a foreign power; (b) which exercises effective control of the country by denying its people the human rights specified in the U. N. Charter; and (c) which is engaged in, or has been found guilty of, aggression against the United Nations.

6. Bilateral nonaggression and mutual-aid pacts between free nations (United States and Republic of Korea, Philippines, Nationalist China) until such time as agreements can be reached for organizing a more inclusive collective security system.

7. Negotiations for the settlement of international disputes to be conducted through regular diplomatic channels or through the channels of the United Nations with a view of strengthening the U. N. as an instrument of world peace.

8. Continuous and increased emphasis on advancing the cause of peace through promoting a genuine disarmament program—a practical program carried out in stages, effectively controlled and inspected internationally on both sides of the Iron Curtain.

Hard-Money, High-Interest Policy of 1953

SPEECH

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 17, 1954

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Patman] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to discuss the hard-money, high-interest policy of 1953.

This chart was prepared by the President's Council of Economic Advisers. It correctly reflects the trend of interest rates in 1953 and 1954. It will be noticed from this chart that United States Government bonds long-term, corporate triple-A bonds—Moody's—and Treasury bills go right along together with the monetary policy of the United States Government.

The Government, through its agent or servant, the Open Market Committee of the Federal Reserve System, has the power to make money easy or to make money hard, to make interest rates low or to make interest rates high. The Government exercised that power in the early part of 1953, and by reason of that, it will be noticed that interest rates commenced going up in the first month of 1953, and they went up until about the middle of May, and for a reason now known commenced going down about May 11 and have been going down ever since. That is the easy-money policy.

MONEY MANAGERS TOOK AN ABOUT FACE MAY 11, 1953

What I want to discuss with you is what happened on May 11, 1953. One week before May 11, 1953, or May 4, notice was given that on the next Monday, May 11, 1953, a resolution would be introduced by Members of the House and Members of the Senate calling on the Federal Reserve Open Market Committee to support Government bonds at par. The reason interest rates went up was because there was no support under Government bonds. That support had been taken out. Therefore, this resolution was prepared and was introduced by me, but for the Democratic leaders in the House of Representatives, including the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Rayburn], the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCormack], and a majority of the Democratic members of the Committee on Banking and Currency. In the Senate, a similar resolution was introduced. So on that day, May 11, 1953, the Government's money masters took an about face and changed their policy entirely and commenced going the other way. This has been admitted. In the extension of my remarks, I expect to show that by the highest authority in the United States, Mr. Martin, who is Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve system, these bonds were allowed to go down.

OPEN MARKET COMMITTEE CALLED UPON TO SUPPORT GOVERNMENT SECURITIES AT PAR

I am inserting herewith a copy of a statement I made in the House of Representatives, May 11, 1953; also a copy of a resolution that was introduced in the House and Senate, asking the Open Market Committee to support the prices of Government securities at par, and a joint statement that was given out by the sponsors of the resolution in the House and Senate. It is as follows:

FEDERAL RESERVE CALLED UPON TO SUPPORT GOVERNMENT BONDS AT PAR

Mr. Patman. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today for the joint sponsors a resolution calling on the Federal Reserve Board and the Open Market Committee of the Federal Reserve System to support United States Government securities at par. In the resolution the phrase "should support," and so forth, is used; the reason the word "direct" is not used is because the Federal Reserve System is an agency of Congress, and its officials will certainly carry out any expressed will of Congress.

In the House, although a bill or resolution can only bear the name of one Member, I have introduced the resolution, but the other cosponsors of it are Representatives Rayburn, McCormack, Spence, Multer, Rains, Deane, O'Hara of Illinois, Addonizio, Dingell, Eberharter, Bailey, Price, Perkins, and Rogers of Colorado.

Mr. Speaker, it was the traditional policy of this Government through the Open Market Committee of the Federal Reserve Board System for more than 15 years to support United States Government securities at par. That policy commenced prior to World War II, it was in effect all during World War II, and it was not until March 1951 that the Federal Reserve Board refused through the Open Market Committee to further support Government securities. As a result of that, long-term Government bonds have gone down to 97, 96, 95, 92, and finally to 91.

The new policy is breaking faith with the people of this country who have a reason to believe and who had a reason to rely upon the traditional policy of the Federal Reserve System in the support of those bonds. It has broken that good faith.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution is offered for the purpose of restoring that traditional policy. I hope that there will be an early hearing and a favorable report and that the resolution will be adopted. It is not in the form of a bill, because a bill is unnecessary. The Federal Reserve System is an agency of the Congress. Anything that the Congress says that the Federal Reserve System should do, that System must do. It is supposed to represent the will of this body and the Senate. The resolution expresses that will for the purpose of getting those bonds supported again as they were traditionally before March 1951.

In the Senate the resolution is cosponsored, in addition to Senator MURRAY, by Senators LONG, GREEN, KILGORE, MAGNUSON, MANSFIELD, and HUMPHREY.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

"Concurrent resolution to provide for support of the credit of the United States of America by the Federal Reserve System

"Whereas millions of loyal and patriotic American citizens supported their Government during World War II by buying Government bonds and have continued to do so since the end of World War II;

"Whereas the Federal Reserve System has been pursuing a policy of refusing to do its part in supporting the credit of the United States of America by buying its proper share of Government bonds and other Government securities;

"Whereas the credit of the United States of America has been impaired thereby;

"Whereas as a consequence, Government securities have fallen below par and the capital position of those with investments in previously issued Government securities has been seriously impaired;

"Whereas this policy of the Federal Reserve System has made it easier for banks, insurance companies, corporations, and private investors to obtain higher interest rates, and thus higher profits, on money loaned to the Government;

"Whereas the increased interest rates on Government securities will result in vast additional expenditures by the Federal Government and a substantial and unnecessary increase in the national debt;

"Whereas this policy of the Federal Reserve System has increased interest rates not only on funds borrowed by the Federal Government, but has also helped to bring about a dangerous rise in interest rates on funds borrowed by (1) farmers, (2) foreign purchasers of American agricultural products, (3) home builders, (4) veterans who are buying homes and all other home buyers, (5) businessmen (particularly small-business men), and (6) local governments for the construction of schools, roads, water supply and sewage systems, and other essential public facilities;

"Whereas this policy of the Federal Reserve System may tend, in combination with other factors, to bring on a decline in business activity throughout the economy and to accentuate the deflationary trend in American agriculture;

"Whereas this policy of the Federal Reserve System is an ineffective and inappropriate substitute for soundly conceived measures to control the supply and use of credit and to maintain the value of the American dollar;

"Whereas whatever flexibility is needed in the prices of Government bonds should take place above par under the alternative policy of Federal Reserve System support of Government bonds at par;

"Whereas this policy of the Federal Reserve System undermines the ability of the United States of America to meet the financial problems that would inevitably result from a new international emergency;

"Whereas this policy of the Federal Reserve System violates the purposes of the Congress in the creation of the Federal Reserve System;

"Whereas this policy of the Federal Reserve System is inconsistent with the maintenance of maximum employment, production, and purchasing power as called for in the Employment Act of 1946;

"Whereas a policy of supporting United States Government securities at par will not only cost the taxpayers nothing, but will also result in a saving to the taxpayers and a profit to the Treasury: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring)*, That the Federal Reserve Board and the Open Market Committee of the Federal Reserve System should support the price of United States Government securities at par, but not exceeding par, as was done before the so-called Treasury-Federal Reserve accord which was announced March 4, 1951."

The joint statement that was prepared by the sponsors and released today was as follows:

"A group of Senators and Representatives announced their intention to introduce in both Houses today a resolution to help stop the rapid and reckless interest rate increases resulting from the policies of the Federal Reserve System and the Treasury Department.

"The resolution would require the Federal Reserve System to support United States Government securities at par, thereby enabling the Government to borrow at lower interest rates. This in turn would permit low rates for farmers, businessmen, home buyers, local governments, and other borrowers.

"Speaking on behalf of the group, Representatives WRIGHT PATMAN, Democrat, Texas, and Senator JAMES E. MURRAY, Democrat, Montana, charged that in the brief 3-month period from December 1952, to March of this year, while the Government had to borrow large sums of money, the Federal Reserve System dumped about $900 million worth of Government securities. The Federal Reserve System also refrained from buying any new Government securities. As a result, the price of long-term Government bonds has hit a new historic low.

" 'The refusal of the Federal Reserve System to support the credit of the United States,' stated Representative PATMAN and Senator MURRAY, 'would be bad enough if it resulted only in additional billions of dollars in Government expenditures and the national debt.

" 'But it has also led to a dangerous spiral of interest-rate increases for private borrowers.

" 'First, there was an increase in the interest on support loans to farmers and on Export-Import Bank loans for the purchase abroad of American cotton. Then came an increase in the commercial-bank rate on prime-business loans. This was followed by a rise in rates on consumer-installment loans. Over the last weekend the interest rate on VA- and FHA-insured home mortgages was boosted. All of this is happening at a time when there is a serious decline in agricultural prices and a growing danger that the agricultural price decline may spread to the rest of the economy.

" 'The adoption of our resolution will help protect American farmers, veterans, home buyers, and small-business men against the harmful effects of further interest-rate boosts and of undue tightening in the supply of credit. The adoption of our resolution will also provide invaluable insurance against the threat of future depressions, foreclosures, bankruptcies, and unemployment.'

"In past years Representative PATMAN and Senator MURRAY have coauthored many important legislative measures, including the Employment Act of 1946, the legislation which established the Smaller War Plants Corporation, and other statutes protecting American small-business enterprise."

DEMOCRATS FORCED REVERSAL OF HARD-MONEY POLICY

President Eisenhower recently claimed credit for the fact that the decline in business activity had leveled off. Apart from the fact that this year's recession need not have happened at all, if the decline has not been too large, the credit for that is rightfully ours rather than the Republicans.

Few would dispute that the administration's policy of hard money and increased interest rates choked off the boom of 1953 and brought on the 1954 recession. This policy took the form of refusing to support the Government bond market, issuing new bonds at higher interest rates and thereby depressing the price of outstanding Government securities below par. This policy was carried out despite the vigorous protests of Democratic Members of Congress. Under this policy, the Federal Reserve sold Government securities instead of buying them to support their price. Under this policy, as the President acknowledged in his January 1954 Economic Report, lenders became confused and did not know what to expect. Mortgage money to finance new homes virtually disappeared from view.

The hard-money policy was, of course, drastically reversed. The easing of credit sparked home building, which in turn has helped to keep the 1954 business recession in check. The facts about the reversal are not too widely known. Briefly, the reversal actually took place some time before the effects became visible. The record will show that prior to May 11, 1953, the date of the resolution sponsored by Democratic leaders calling upon the Federal Reserve to resume purchases of Government securities and support the price of Government bonds at par, the Federal Reserve had been reducing its Government holdings. Immediately upon the introduction of the resolution of May 11, 1953, the Federal Reserve Open Market Committee resumed open market purchases. By the end of May 1953, Federal Reserve weekly purchases exceeded $100 million. The decline in the price of Government securities was halted in early June 1953. As a result of Democratic pressure, the market price of the Treasury 2½s has risen from a low of 89 to a premium over par. These bonds were selling at 89.20 June 1, 1953. The 3¼'s, which have gone to 111 in a year, provide clear evidence that the interest-rate policy pursued in early 1953 was much too high. These bonds were selling for 98.20 June 1, 1953, and 110.8 on June 1, 1954. A discreet investment by one who could read the signs could, and many probably did, make 15¼ percent in 1 year's time on a riskless investment in these 3¼-percent bonds.

As a result of Democratic opposition to the hard-money policy and pressure on the Federal Reserve to reverse its policy of abandoning support of the Government bond market, money and credit have become abundant and interest rates have declined. To the extent that this reversal has caused the economic decline to be checked and made the outlook seem promising to the President, the credit for this quite properly belongs to the Democrats who opposed the hard-money policy of the President and his administration and forced its abandonment.

Recovery of the economy after the administration reversed its hard-money, high-interest policy has been greatly retarded by the lack of assurance from the administration that this ill-fated policy will not be repeated.

May 26, 1954, Mr. William McC. Martin, Jr., Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System testified before the Banking and Currency Committee of the House as follows:

Mr. PATMAN. In 1952, before the end of the year, what were your instructions to the one in charge of open-market operations in the New York bank? What was he supposed to do during the month of December 1952?

Mr. MARTIN. I have no idea offhand. We have a meeting of the executive committee every 2 weeks. There have been very few exceptions to that, and we change our instructions every 2 weeks.

Mr. PATMAN. You change your instructions every 2 weeks. But generally, you were not buying bonds in 1952, in December, were you? You were not buying bonds?

Mr. MARTIN. At the tail end of 1952?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. MARTIN. I don't think we were.

Mr. PATMAN. What were your instructions in 1953, in the early part of the year? Were your instructions to tighten up, or to loosen up, on money?

Mr. MARTIN. In the early part of 1953, as you well know, our policy was one of general restraint.

It will be noticed that Mr. Martin advocates putting on the brakes and pursuing a policy of general restraint in early 1953. This was the commencement of the hard money, high-interest policy.

Mr. PATMAN. Why did you do that? Why were you putting on the brakes so?

Mr. MARTIN. At that particular time?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes.

Mr. MARTIN. Because we feared, as I have testified repeatedly, a bubble on top of a boom, and we felt that the money supply should be permitted——

Mr. PATMAN. Well, in December 1952, you said the danger of inflation was over.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. PATMAN, you are not quoting me correctly.

Mr. PATMAN. Well, the papers misquoted you, then.

Mr. MARTIN. Well, the papers frequently misquote people. Not that I am attacking the papers, but——

Mr. PATMAN. Well, that was verified by your action in February reducing the margin requirement on stock-market transactions. If that is not in the direction of fighting deflation, I would like to know what it would be.

Mr. MARTIN. The speech to which you refer, Mr. PATMAN, in 1952, was an address which I gave to the Investment Bankers Association.

Mr. PATMAN. That is right.

Mr. MARTIN. Without benefit of manuscript.

Mr. PATMAN. Well, I am just quoting what the papers said, and I haven't seen it denied.

Mr. MARTIN. Well, I am not denying all of the implications of this, but I believe that the danger of drastic inflation was coming to a halt at the end of 1952, but it would have been—could have been—a very serious matter for us if the bubble that developed, the resurgence of business enthusiasm, if I may term it such, following President Eisenhower's election, in 1952, had been permitted to run itself into a speculative fever, and therefore, we permitted interest rates to reflect the force of supply and demand.

Mr. PATMAN. For how long did you do that, how many months?

Mr. MARTIN. We did that roughly until the early part of May.

Mr. PATMAN. May 11?

Mr. MARTIN. Well, May 6 the Open Market Committee had its meeting and decided that we would reverse ourselves.

The about face on the hard-money policy was not put into effect until May 11 when the Open Market Committee went into the market and bought the first Government securities they had bought in months in order to start on the easy-money policy.

VETERANS HARD HIT BY HIGH-INTEREST MOVE

I am inserting herewith most of an article that appeared in the Washington Sunday Star, May 3, 1953:

INTEREST RATES RAISED ON UNITED STATES HOMES LOANS, ENDING LONG DISPUTE

(By Robert J. Lewis)

The Government yesterday raised interest rates on home loans in another move in its unmistakable tighter-money policy.

The administration acted to raise interest rates on Government-aided housing by from one-quarter of 1 percent to one-half of 1 percent.

Climaxing a series of Treasury-sponsored moves supporting higher interest rates, the action was reported to have been decided on by the White House itself to settle a long-drawn-out controversy over whether or not home loan rates should be raised.

GI MORTGAGE RATES

Veterans' Administration rates on GI mortgages were raised one-half of 1 percent across the board to bring them up from 4 percent to 4½ percent.

Federal Housing Administration rates were raised one-quarter of 1 percent. Since FHA in the past has had a number of different rates, the one-quarter of 1 percent increase means that in the future some FHA loans will be at a rate of 4¼ percent, come at 4½ percent, and others will remain at 4 percent.

In general, however, both FHA and GI rates for single-family homes, will now be equal at 4½ percent. Previously on such loans, the GI rate was 4 percent and the FHA rate was 4½. Rates for apartment construction in the future will be 4½ percent. Rates for military, defense, and cooperative housing will remain at 4 percent.

The increase will cost a veteran borrowing $10,000 on a GI mortgage an additional $840 over a 25-year loan period. The loss would be greater if interest on this amount were to be figured in.

ACTION IS RELUCTANT

Two leading housing officials said the increases were authorized reluctantly.

Veterans' Administrator Carl R. Gray, Jr., said the action was taken "only as a last resort and after extended consultation with other Government agencies concerned with housing and fiscal policies."

Several questions occur to me in reading this article. First, why was the Treasury pressuring for higher interest rates on housing loans, including veterans' loans, just a week before the Treasury evidently knew the hard-money policy was going to be changed completely? In other words, within 1 week from that time, the monetary policy would be eased and the very argument that was used to support a higher interest rate, May 3, would not be persuasive at all after the policy was changed. Furthermore, the interest rates that were put into effect, 1 week before the hard-money policy was reversed have remained in effect, which gives a windfall to those receiving the increased interest rates. The rates that were announced on May 3, 1953, should have been canceled the next week when the monetary policy was changed. These rates have remained in effect and have not been reduced, which is very unfair to veterans and others who are required to pay these rates, which were based upon the continuance of the hard-money policy. It will be noticed that the article states that the increase will cost each veteran borrowing $10,000 on his GI mortgage an additional $840 over a 25-year loan period.

It would be interesting to know how many veterans the past year have been required to sign up to pay $840 additions on their $10,000 mortgages because of the unnecessay increase in interest rates.

Commencing in March 1951, when the Board of Governors declared their independence from the Executive over the objection of the President at that time, who was Mr. Truman, the Board defied Mr. Truman. They went ahead, although they had promised Mr. Truman, as President of the United States, that they would continue to support Government bonds, as they had in the past, and Government bonds had not up until that time for over 10 years been allowed to go below par. The Board in conference with the President promised to continue that policy, but after they got out of the meeting and they met with the representatives of the private banks, they decided they would not go along with the President and they would take the support out from under the Government bonds. That was March 4, 1951.

DEMOCRATIC ADMINISTRATION UNDER PRESIDENT TRUMAN OPPOSED CHANGING WORLD WAR II PATTERN OF INTEREST RATES ON THE NATIONAL DEBT

First. Mr. Eccles, as Chairman of the Board of Governors, caused the first break in wartime rates in July 1947, by permitting the three-eighths percent return on Treasury bills and the seven-eighths percent rate on certificates to be discontinued. This permitted these rates to go up and up, agricultural prices commencing to go down immediately.

Second. President Truman evidently did not like this, and when the time came, in February 1948, Mr. Eccles was not reappointed Chairman of the Board, although Mr. Eccles claimed that the reappointment had been promised him by President Truman. Mr. Eccles was notified 2 months before the time for the appointment by Dr. Steelman that he would not be reappointed. Mr. Eccles' friends wanted him to be vice chairman, but President Truman refused to appoint a vice chairman. Notwithstanding this, he remained on the Board.

Third. President Truman had the entire Board in his office, January 30, 1951, and received a promise from the Board in the public interest that they would continue to support long-term Government bonds at par. This, the Open Market Committee, which has on it five representatives of the private banks, refused to go along with the promise, and permitted bonds to go down below par. President Truman tried everything within his power to prevent it from being done, but the Board went back on him, defied him, and did it anyway.

From that time on, in defiance of the President, the price of Government bonds commenced to slip, and until the present administration came in, they had gone down to 95.20 which, as bad as it was, was not destructive. But then the present administration came in and they kept on going down, and they went down to 89. I am referring to long-term Government bonds.

I am inserting herewith the following tables showing the prices of the long-term 2½'s and the newly issued 3¼'s:

Treasury bond price movement

2½ PERCENTS ISSUED OCT. 20, 1941—1947–54

[Price decimals are 32ds of $1]

	1947		1948		1949		1950		1951		1952		1953		1954	
	Mean	Change	Mean	Change	Mean	Change	Mean	Change	Mean	Change	Mean	Change	Bid	Change	Bid	Change
January	105.31	−0.09	101.01	0	102.18	+0.20	105.04	−0.28	103.30	+0.12	97.02	+0.03	95.17	−0.03	98.00	+1.20
February	106.00	+.01	101.10	+.09	102.28	+.10	105.05	+.01	102.31	−.31	97.00	−.02	94.16	−1.01	99.14	+1.14
March	106.00	0	101.14	+.04	103.14	+.18	105.02	−.03	101.04	−1.27	97.28	+.28	93.16	−1.00	99.31	+.17
April	105.13	−.19	101.22	+.08	103.12	−.02	105.05	+.03	100.08	−.28	99.10	+1.14	92.04	−1.12	100.18	+.19
May	105.18	+.05	102.30	+1.08	103.11	−.01	105.09	+.04	99.12	−.28	98.26	−.16	90.20	−1.16	99.02	−1.16
June	105.15	−.03	101.27	−1.03	104.27½	+1.16½	104.26	−.15	98.17	−.27	98.20	−.06	92.12	+1.24	99.29	+.27
July	105.29	+.14	101.13	−.14	105.01	+.05½	105.06	+.12	99.23	+1.06	98.07	−.13	92.18	+.06	100.16	+.19
August	106.19	+.22	101.07	−.06	105.31	+.30	105.04	−.02	100.16	+.25	97.10	−.29	92.08	−.10	100.11	[1] −.05
September	105.29	−.22	101.05	−.02	105.21	−.10	104.05	−.31	99.17	−.31	95.27	−1.15	94.28	+2.20		
October	105.09	−.20	101.01	−.04	105.21	0	103.15	−.22	99.12	−.05	97.01	+1.06	95.12	+.16		
November	103.08	−2.01	101.19	+.18	105.21	0	103.18	+.03	97.25	−1.19	96.22	−.11	94.18	−.26		
December	101.01	−2.07	101.30	+.11	106.00	+.11	103.18	0	96.31	−.26	95.20	−1.02	96.12	+1.26		

[1] As of Aug. 16, 1954.

NOTE.—Price range since first trade: High 109.18 on Apr. 6, 1946; low 89.30 on June 1, 1953.

Prices shown are the mean of closing bid and ask quotations until April 1953. Beginning April 1953, prices are closing bid quotations in the over-the-counter market for the last day of the month.

3¼ PERCENTS DATED MAY 1, 1953

[Price decimals are 32ds of $1]

	1953		1954	
	Bid	Change	Bid	Change
January			106.16	+0.26
February			108.24	+2.08
March			109.03	+.11
April			110.00	+.29
May	99.06	−0.23	108.24	−1.08
June	99.22	+.16	110.08	+1.16
July	100.05	+.15	111.16	+1.08
August	100.12	+.07	111.22	[1] +.06
September	102.10	+1.30		
October	103.30	+1.20		
November	103.29	−.01		
December	105.22	+1.25		

[1] As of Aug. 16, 1954.

NOTE.—Price range since first traded: High 111.28 on Aug. 3, 1954; low 98.20 on June 1, 1953.

Prices are closing bid quotations in the over-the-counter market for the last day of the month.

Source: Treasury Bulletin.

CRAP GAME

It will be observed that during election years, 1948, 1950, and 1952, the market was more stable than during the off years, 1947, 1949, 1951, and 1953. I repeat my charge that the Government bond market is being used as a crap game. Investors who can read the signs or should happen to be in the "know" can clear big profits quickly through such manipulations.

Recently the rate paid by the banks—most of them sold to New York City banks—for United States bills has been increasing each week. Why is that, when the money supply is so plentiful? The law of supply and demand is certainly not working. I hope it is not a forerunner to another hard-money high-interest policy.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. The gentleman will recall at that time I introduced a resolution providing that all Government bonds should be acceptable at par in payment of income taxes.

Mr. PATMAN. Yes, sir; that is a fine thing. They should be acceptable at par and accrued interest. That is a good bill and I hope the gentleman pursues it. It is a good way to force the Open Market Committee to support the market and confine all the crap-shooting in the Government bond market to be above par.

May 4, 1953, I made the following statement on high interest:

WHAT HIGH INTEREST IS DOING TO THE PEOPLE

It is causing the Federal Government, States, counties, cities, to pay more interest for increases in budgets which also increases taxes. It causes all public utilities—including electricity, gas, water, telephone, transportation—to pay more interest, which causes an increase of rates. In the end, the landlord having to pay all these increases, must have an increase in rents. The wage earner is put in a squeeze, having to spend so much of his income for rent increases caused by interest increases. The same thing applies to the farmer. The result is purchasing power of both farmer and wage earner is reduced, which retards the economy and will eventually lead to a depression. The result of interest increases is low wages and lower farm prices which are the makings of a real depression.

Remember these are Government bonds that went down. Any bank can buy these bonds and if they want to borrow money on them they get 100 cents on the dollar, new money, on these 89-cent bonds. They are worth 100 cents on the dollar. Yet the Government's money masters—the Open Market Committee of the Federal Reserve System—allowed these bonds to go down to 89 cents on the dollar. But when they found out they had made this terrible mistake—we Democrats showed it in this resolution that was introduced—they took an about-face and bonds began to go up. As the price of bonds goes up the interest rates go down. They are now over 100. If the hard-money policy had continued, we would have been in a serious depression in a short time. We were in a recession on May 11, 1953.

MUST WATCH GOVERNMENT BONDS

I took this time to ask the Members to keep in mind the fact that these bonds must at all times remain above par. We must be on the alert to do what is necessary to bring to the attention of the authorities the fact that they must not permit these bonds to go below 100 cents on the dollar again. It is a terrible thing. It is ruinous to the country. It is ruinous to the economy. Ordinarily it would not be necessary to call it to their attention, because we have seen the destruction it would cause. But we are told that this retreat—and it is a retreat—is a temporary retreat, and they are going back. I am inserting in my remarks statements from Secretary Snyder and Chairman Spence of the Committee on Banking and Currency and the assistant chairman of that committee, Mr. Brown, about why Government bonds should be supported at par.

I am also inserting excerpts from the testimony before a Senate committee, when Mr. McCabe, former Chairman of the Board of Governors, was being interrogated on the question of his confirmation for the post, in which he said that bonds should continue to be supported at par.

I am going to insert in the RECORD statements from other people like Marriner S. Eccles, who was Governor of the Federal Reserve Board longer than any other person, living or dead. He said they should always be supported at par.

In addition to that, I am inserting a statement from other prominent people, showing the importance of supporting these bonds at par. Notwithstanding this overwhelming testimony, convincing testimony that bonds should be supported at par, the Board of Governors, through the Open Market Committee, permitted them to go below par. I hope it is never done again.

SUPPORT GOVERNMENT BOND PRICES: SECRETARY SNYDER AND CONGRESSMEN SPENCE AND BROWN

Inflation control hearing before the House Committee on Banking and Currency, Senate Joint Resolution 157, July and August 1948, page 252:

Mr. Spence. Mr. Snyder, when we had 2½-percent bonds the debt of the Nation was $21 billion to $23 billion. When these bonds went to 80 percent, where do you think these 2½-percent bonds, which are taxable as against the others which were nontaxable, if not supported by the Federal Reserve, would go to now when the national debt is $250 billion?

Secretary Snyder. I would be greatly concerned as to what would happen if we just turned loose the support of the bond market.

Mr. Spence. Does the support of the bond market not have a psychological effect upon the holders of the bond very similar to the effect of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation on depositors in banks? It gives them a confidence which makes them retain their bonds. Otherwise they would probably put them on the market, and nobody can tell how low they would go; is that not true?

Secretary Snyder. I think that is true; yes, sir. There would be constant doubt as to just what the level would be.

Mr. Spence. How essential is it to maintaining the credit of the Government?

Secretary Snyder. From my point of view it is the most essential thing to do right now, to maintain confidence in the Government's monetary operations.

Mr. Spence. If that confidence were destroyed the inflationary conditions would certainly be very much worse and one can hardly foresee what would happen. I think that is the very basis of the whole thing. Whether the support of the bond market is inflationary or not, it must be continued.

Mr. Brown. I think by all means we should hold these bonds at par. Any suggestion you have to make to this committee in order to help you do that I think this committee would like to have, because I think that is the most important thing. We should hold these bonds at least at par. I think you are doing a good job on this line.

CHAIRMAN M'CABE FOR SUPPORTING GOVERNMENT BOND PRICES

Excerpts from confirmation of Thomas B. McCabe hearings before the Committee on Banking and Currency, United States Senate, 80th Congress, 2d session, March 3, 1948—pages 156–157:

Mr. McCabe. I would like to say that I am thoroughly in accord with the current program of the Federal Reserve in supporting the Government bond program.

The Chairman (Senator Tobey). I take it that events indicate what is in my own mind; that you feel the bonds should be maintained at par for an indefinite period.

Mr. McCabe. Well, the support program, as you know, follows a pattern on the Government bonds, and my own feeling is that that pattern, certainly as far as I can ascertain today, is a right one.

The Chairman. You approve of the procedure the Federal Reserve followed in December, when it dropped the price down to make it more uniform?

Mr. McCabe. I thought that was a very constructive move.

* * * * *

The Chairman. Then it comes down to this question: I think we are in accord with the theory that we should maintain a uniform pattern, and that we should maintain these at par for an indefinite period; the alternative being, if we reduced the price of the bonds, the evil that would ensue at once in the ruining of so many of our savings institutions that are loaded to the muzzle with Government bonds. How do you feel about that situation?

ETHICAL DUTY TO BOND PURCHASERS

Mr. McCabe. Well, in the general support program, I feel this: There are three paramount considerations.

First, there is the refunding, or refinancing, problem of the Treasury.

The second is that I feel we have an ethical responsibility to the people who have purchased Government bonds. Our present Federal debt is a very large one. In fact, it is one and one-half times all the rest of the debt of the United States put together; the total, that is, of private and corporate debt of all kinds.

And the third consideration, I think, is that it is very helpful to commerce and industry and agriculture to know that there is a reasonable range in interest rates, and they can reasonably count on that in refinancing of businesses, business enterprises generally.

The Chairman. You would share my apprehension, would you, to be perfectly frank, as to the danger of price decline below par, and the consequent effect upon savings institutions in the country?

Mr. McCabe. Well, when you talk about the absolute support price, I think, sir, that that has to be reviewed from time to time to ascertain what that level should be.

My own feeling is that I am in full support of the action that has been taken to date in supporting the program.

The Chairman. And as you look ahead, you have nothing in the back of your mind that would lend you at this time to a mental commitment, or reservation, that would happen in the future, as far as you can see: that reduction below par?

Mr. McCabe. In the "foreseeable future"—I think those are the words.

Page 172:

Senator Fulbright. The fact is that the necessity for supporting Government bond prices, which everyone seems to agree on, has almost nullified the principal owner to control credit.

Mr. McCabe. It has been a very strong factor.

Senator Fulbright. That was the main tool, and it is practically nullified by these conditions.

Mr. McCabe. To my mind that must be done.

FEDERAL RESERVE MADE PUBLIC COMMITMENT TO SUPPORT PRICE OF GOVERNMENT BONDS

McCabe, testifying before the Banking and Currency Committee on supporting Government bonds at par, stated on August 2, 1948—page 89, hearings, on Senate Joint Resolution 157:

It is my view that the System is obligated to maintain a market for Government securities and to insure orderly conditions in that market * * * because of the widespread repercussions that would issue throughout the economy if the vast holdings of the public debt were felt to be of unstable value.

Page 88:

In order to keep the prices of Government securities from declining, the Federal Reserve System has continued to carry out its wartime responsibility of supporting the market by buying at relatively stable prices securities offered for sale and not purchased by others.

Mr. McCabe testified as follows—page 95:

As you know, the System has made a public commitment to support the 2½-percent yield level on long-term Government bonds for the foreseeable future. I gave my reasons for subscribing to that commitment when my confirmation was under consideration by the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency. Although that commitment substantially limits our freedom of action, I believe there is a better way to operate against credit expansion than now to abandon that commitment.

It will be noticed that Mr. McCabe says there is a better way to prevent inflation than to abandon support of Government bonds at par.

Page 101, McCabe stated:

I have a very strong conviction that it is vitally necessary to support the 2½ percent bonds.

This was in answer to a question of Chairman Wolcott, in which he asked:

Do you think that we have to continue to support Government bond prices at par?

Mr. McCabe further stated—page 101:

The thing that we have to consider is the colossal magnitude of this debt—$250 billion. It is 1½ times all the rest of the debt in the United States put together.

Further—page 101—he says:

If we directly stabilize a portion of this debt so that it cannot be monetized, that is the answer.

In other words, Mr. McCabe says it is not necessary to take the peg from under the support prices—that a portion of the debt can be sterilized and that will be the answer.

FEDERAL RESERVE CHAIRMAN SAYS BONDS SHOULD BE SUPPORTED UNTIL CONGRESS SAYS OTHERWISE

Page 108 of the same hearings, the chairman asked, and Mr. McCabe answered as follows:

The Chairman. Well, there have been orthodox ways of controlling it heretofore. Ever since 1914 we have controlled the volume of credit by the manipulation of reserve requirements and rediscount rates. I do not know why we have to supplement those with consumer credit controls at the present time, any more than we did before.

Mr. McCabe. I say to you, sir, if it is the wisdom of this Congress that the Federal Reserve Board should not support the Government bond market, then I think Congress should so direct the Federal Reserve.

Page 135, I stated:

Mr. Patman. I thoroughly agree with you. That is the reason I voted against the tax-reduction bill. I wanted to keep that money in the Treasury and pay it on the national debt.

Page 171, Marriner S. Eccles, Governor of the Federal Reserve Board, stated on August 3, 1948, in referring to the Board of Governors:

The chairman is the liaison and of necessity the administration must have a liaison with such an organization as the Federal Reserve System.

Of course, the President appoints all the members of the Board, and he designates who shall be Chairman and who shall be Vice Chairman.

Page 180, Mr. Eccles admitted that the Federal Reserve Banks raised the reserve requirements 100 percent in 1 year. The raises commenced just before the payment to the soldiers on June 15, 1936. It was the first time in 20 years reserve requirements had been raised.

Mr. Eccles stated—page 182—as follows:

> I feel—and I know the Federal Reserve people as a whole feel—that we must, so far as we can see it at the present time, and I can give you reasons, if you want them, continue to support the 2½ percent rate.

Page 182:

> Mr. PATMAN. The only reason is that it would break every bank in the country if the bonds went much below par, is it not?
>
> Mr. ECCLES. Well, I do not think it would do that.
>
> Mr. PATMAN. It would be possible, however?
>
> Mr. ECCLES. If they had to sell the bonds while they were down, it would certainly impair some of them. But I will mention it in just a minute, if I can, Mr. Congressman, but to try to peg the short-term rate, and hold that down below the point at which it would normally go in a free market in relationship to the 2½-percent rate does not to my way of thinking make very much sense in the present situation. I would certainly feel that if Congress should give to the Board the authority to increase the reserve requirements, as has been proposed by Chairman McCabe when he appeared before this committee yesterday, that they would also favor, as the Federal Reserve does, and I would also hope that the Treasury would favor, permitting the adjustment in the short-term rate to a market rate. Then we would let the discount rate go up.
>
> Now, there may be some people who think that that would create such uncertainty that that will tend to slow up borrowing. I do not think any such thing. I think that the raising of the short-term rate is minor insofar as its monetary effect is concerned, but it is an important part of the overall credit-control mechanism, and I feel that it would not be logical or sensible to increase the reserve requirements of all banks and keep the discount rate down to 1¼, which would have to be done, and force the short-term rate and continue to hold the short-term rate down to 1⅛.
>
> Now, aside from its monetary and credit effect, there is a serious question of bank earnings. Especially is that true of the banks in the central Reserve cities and in the Reserve cities. I do not say that that is major, but it is certainly a factor, because all of the commercial paper and business rates are related to that short-term rate.
>
> Their costs have gone up, just like other costs, due to the inflation, very rapidly, and their earnings have dropped very, very fast during the past year. To increase the reserve requirements by 10 percent, which would force them to dispose of 10 percent of their earning assets—their bonds, would affect their earnings quite seriously, and that really is where some of your formidable objections to this bill come in. I feel that as a part of this control, if it is going to be made effective, the short-term rate should be permitted to rise. Failing to permit it to rise, and increasing the reserve requirements and diminishing their reserve assets would put the banks under pressure to go out and seek loans at as high rates as they were able to find, maybe longer-term loans, even though it did impair some of their liquidity. We feel that if you should increase this reserve requirement, take away from them that much of their earning assets, that that should be partly overcome by permitting the short-term rate to rise. We would not force it up. It will automatically rise. It cannot go very high if you support the 2½-percent rate. It is not going to create very much uncertainty, so long as you hold the 2½-percent rate, because the range with which the short-term rate can rise would be within its present 1⅛ and I would say possibly 1½ percent. That in itself is not a very great rise.
>
> So I do not agree with those who say that is all that is necessary, because it creates so much uncertainty. It cannot create uncertainty so long as you hold the 2½-percent rate. But if that rate rises, our discount rate rises, in the trend of a credit tightening, and that, in turn, will reflect itself on all other loans and investments. If your dollar is diminishing in price, then, certainly the cost of interest should go up some. The owner of money, the savers, the insurance people, and the investors generally certainly should not be the only ones to suffer to the extent that they have suffered, by holding down the interest rate beyond what seems to be necessary.
>
> Now, getting to the 2½-percent rate, people say, "Well, why do you not let the 2½-percent rate go up, so that it will reflect the demand for savings and for investment, so that more people will save and not spend so much? If you let the rate go up, it would be a very important anti-inflationary factor."
>
> Well, to let the 2½-percent rate go up raises some very, very serious problems, and these are some of the problems that it raises:
>
> In the first place, it would unstabilize the entire Government bond market, and when the public debt represents 60 percent of the entire debt, you are not playing with any small and minor item. You are playing with $250 billion of a total debt structure of around $400 billion. That is not the tail of the dog. That is the dog. If you are going to have stabilization in the Government market, you cannot have the public in a position of complete uncertainty as to how far the price of securities—Government bonds, and, of course other bonds and mortgages—would reflect the price—municipals; they would all reflect the price of a drop—the uncertainty as to what the market value of their assets as well as what the cost of interest was going to be. That is especially true for the reason that the Government has falling due in the next 12 months $49 billion of debt—$49 billion in 12 months. Another $46 billion within the next 5 years. There is close to a hundred billion dollars in 5 years, with $49 billion in 1 year.
>
> The job of refunding that much debt is no simple and easy task in a market that is unsupported and unsecured and unstable. How do you price the issues each week and each month that you have to offer to the public? Who is going to buy the issues, and at what price, when they do not know what the price may be after they have bought them? How can you finance long-term or short-term municipals, and corporate and other securities that are falling due every day and every week, and when new money is being raised, when there is no basis upon which to price them?

ALL FAVOR HOLDING LONG-TERM RATE

Mr. Eccles stated further—page 185:

> Now, it is true, I suppose, that legally the Open Market Committee could say to the Treasury, "You must price your securities at such and such a price. We will not support the market at the prices that have been outstanding." But, as I brought forth before this committee, the Open Market Committee and the Federal Reserve Board are in favor, with the Treasury—and I think with the great majority of bankers and the public generally—of holding the long-term rate.

Page 196, Mr. Eccles replied, in answer to the question of Mr. SPENCE, "What was the bonded indebtedness of the United States at the time the bonds went to 82?"

> Something around 24 to 25 billion dollars.

I might ask this question: If Government bonds, totally tax exempt, yielding a rate of 4½ percent, without any support by the Federal Reserve System, could go to 82 or 83, then when our national debt was $25 billion only, the query is, where would a 2½ percent fully taxed bond, taxable bond go, if the Federal Reserve withdrew from its support, when there was a debt of $250 billion?

In a colloquy between Mr. MULTER and Mr. Eccles, the following—pages 215-216:

> Mr. MULTER. I think you might have made some comment about what would happen to the E, F, and G bonds if Government support of the bond market were withdrawn.
>
> Mr. ECCLES. Well, I am glad you mentioned that, because we do have a demand liability in the form of E, F, and G bonds of something like $53 billion. Certainly any sale of E, F, and G bonds would stop while the long-term interest rate was unsettled and uncertain, and there might be a large cashing in of those securities, because if the interest rate on market securities should go up, which it would if the prices go down, there would be no reason why holders of E, F, and G bonds would not want to either shift to the market bonds—which, of course, in itself, might stabilize the price, except that the Government would have to borrow money to pay off the E, F, and G bonds, in some form—but the holders of E, F, and G bonds might very well cash in their securities and hold idle cash waiting to see what to do with that money, or they might cash in the bonds and try to spend the money for an automobile or for stocks or any number of things. It would be most unfortunate if the holders of those large savings bonds should start cashing them in on a large scale, which could very well eventuate if you withdrew support from the long-term market bonds.
>
> I am glad you reminded me of that, because that is just another argument supporting the arguments that I have already made for maintaining the present rate of 2½ percent on long-term Government bonds.

SECRETARY SNYDER SUGGESTS CONGRESS SHOULD DIRECT IF SUPPORTS ON GOVERNMENT BONDS TO BE REMOVED

On page 233, Secretary Snyder answered a question, "If it is necessary to support the long-term rate, we have adopted a policy of that sort, yes." Page 248, Secretary Snyder stated:

> If the Congress wants to direct us to remove our support prices from the bonds, it is within their scope to do it.

On page 249, Secretary Snyder and Mr. Smith:

> Mr. SMITH. Mr. Snyder, the question was asked you of Mr. Monroney, if you would let bond prices drop, whether that would not be inflationary. You answered the question by saying it would be disastrous. Would you answer the question directly, whether that would be inflationary or deflationary?
>
> Secretary SNYDER. Well, there is no question but what it could be inflationary.
>
> Mr. SMITH. Would be which?
>
> Secretary SNYDER. The immediate step might be inflationary but the end result would be a disastrous deflation.
>
> Mr. SMITH. Why do you say the immediate effect would be inflation?
>
> Secretary SNYDER. It would build up prices in other fields.
>
> Mr. SMITH. Well, explain that.
>
> Secretary SNYDER. Well, the people would liberate their money from Government bonds. If they take their money out of Government bonds and put it in other things, they would be building up prices of other things.
>
> Mr. SMITH. But generally there would be a drop; is that not true?

Secretary Snyder. Over the long range there would be a disastrous drop; yes, sir. We are just as interested, Congressman, in avoiding a disastrous deflation as we are in not creating inflation. We have the double problem always before us. It is not a clear-cut problem. Right now the inflationary pressures are greater so we are having to address ourselves to that angle. At the same time we have to bear in mind the effect that deflation would have, or what deflation could do to us.

PROMISE TO PURCHASERS OF GOVERNMENT BONDS

Page 258, while Secretary Snyder was a witness, I stated:

Mr. Patman. I am sorry; I was not here. The reason I am asking you the question is that I know there is a lot of sentiment in this Congress to do away with support prices on Government bonds and to let them seek their level. I think it would be one of the most disastrous things which could possibly face our country—for the same reason that we had such a condition after the other war, when bonds went down to 75 cents, as you well recall.

This time it was contemplated that we would not permit bonds to go down. I know when the Ways and Means Committee was considering war financing, before the war, I appeared before the committee in support of a program that would prevent that very thing, and I was assured by the members of the committee that that committee—the Ways and Means Committee—would do everything within their power to prevent that disaster occurring again.

It was going to be the policy of the Government always to keep those bonds above par, and to assure the people that they would be above par—and so far they have done that.

Now, if we go back on that—what we might call an implied promise and a recognized promise by congressional leaders of that time—after people bought bonds on the strength of that fact, and if the word were to get out that support prices are likely to be done away with, I do not know what might happen in this country, because the people would begin to run to the banks, run to the Treasury, and they would begin to cash their bonds.

I can see in that one of the most disastrous things, or possibly the most disastrous thing, that is proposed in this whole program.

CRIMES OF 1920'S TO BE PREVENTED

Hearing on the debt limit of the United States, H. R. 1470, January and February 1943, commencing at page 10, I stated as a witness before the Committee on Ways and Means:

The Chairman. Suppose the Federal Reserve banks balk?

Mr. Patman. They can't balk. They are an agency of the Congress. They have to do what Congress says.

The Chairman. These bonds can't all be held by the Federal Reserve banks; they have to be scattered throughout the country.

Mr. Patman. I am afraid we are talkng about different things. I am afraid you are talkng about the usual industrial or commercial transaction, and I am talking about the Government finances.

The Chairman. I beg your pardon. I am sorry; I ddn't follow you.

Mr. Disney. As I understand it, these banks are heavily loaded with Government bonds, so heavily loaded that a sharp decrease in the value of Government bonds would wipe out their capital stock.

Mr. Patman. Two or three points decrease would wipe out their capital stock, but there is no danger of that.

Mr. Disney. Suppose there was a sharp decrease in the value of Government bonds, that would have a tendency to wipe out a part of the capital stock of the banks, or some of them, and if any sizable number of them should get in that position, they would be liable to be in trouble and go broke and take the rest of the banks with them. How could we prevent that?

Mr. Patman. That is already provided for, Mr. Disney. The open market committee, which, by the way, has been moved from Washington to New York, has already arranged that any bank in dstress can get a hundred cents on the dollar on its bonds any time. There is where the Government's credit comes into play again. They just issue more Federal Reserve notes to buy those bonds, and they are not going to let the banks suffer. They have already told them they will not let them suffer. There is no danger of that at all.

Mr. Disney. No danger of Government bonds——

Mr. Patman. Declining; absolutely not. It is, in effect, guaranteed by the United States, and there is no danger in the world. In fact, I think it is a good thing, although it is the Government's credit being used again, free. It is perfectly all right.

Mr. Knutson. Right at that point, why did Government bonds drop to 82, along in the fall of 1921?

Mr. Patman. Because of a situation you gentlemen had vision enough to guard against when this war started. In 1914, when the war started in Europe, and in 1917, when we became engaged in the war, we did not make any provision to protect the people who bought United States Government bonds. They had to sell them in the open market. Consequently, when the war was over, and everyone wanted to sell their bonds, naturally the market went down and down, and some of them sold as low as 75 cents on the dollar. It was the crime of the age to permit that to be done. Men in the armed services had paid for their bonds a few dollars a month over a period of time. And when they came out of the service they saw these bond manipulators force the price down to 75. It was absolutely a crime. But you gentlemen provided—and if you will remember, I appeared before this committee in connection with that and invited your attention to it, and asked you, for God's sake, to prevent any such thing happening in the future. Not necessarily because of my testimony did you do it, but you provided, anyway, that now they can get their money 100 cents on the dollar, and the people of this Nation should appreciate what this committee did to initiate that type of legislation which will protect them against that awful crime that happened after the other war.

Page 15:

FEDERAL RESERVE CREATES MONEY

Mr. Patman. Let me read a little more of the testimony of Mr. Eccles, in answer to questions asked him by Mr. Dewey. I have had an awful time getting these things, Mr. Chairman. The witnesses have shown irritation, sometimes, in being compelled to answer questions, but over a period of years I have gotten the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Morgenthau, the Under Secretary, Mr. Bell, and Mr. Eccles and other high officials of the Government to prove every statement that I make concerning this. I mean not my own opinions or conclusions, but statements of fact. I have other testimony to prove it. Let me read Mr. Eccles' testimony when he was interrogated by Mr. Dewey on June 17, 1942 [reading]:

"Mr. Eccles. No; the Federal Reserve would buy in the open market. If the Federal Reserve then bought a billion dollars of securities in the open market that would be new Treasury issues. The banks would still hold them, and the Federal Reserve would put into the banks another billion of excess reserves. If they used that billion they could buy 5 billion more of Governments, and you could keep the price up. For every billion of the Federal Reserve banks put in the open market operations, the private banks could buy 5 million.

"Mr. Dewey. That comes pretty close to some other ideas I have heard.

"Mr. Eccles. I mean they could buy 10 billion. I mean the Federal Reserve when it carries out an open market operation, that is, if it purchases Government securities in the open market, it puts new money into the banks which creates idle deposits.

"Mr. Dewey. There are no excess reserves to use for this purpose.

"Mr. Eccles. Whenever the Federal Reserve System buys Government securities in the open market or buys them direct from the Treasury, either one, that is what it does——

"Mr. Dewey. What are you going to use to buy them with?

"Mr. Eccles. What is who going to use?

"Mr. Dewey. The Federal Reserve to make these purchases?

"Mr. Eccles. What do they always use?

"Mr. Dewey. You are going to create credit?

"Mr. Eccles. That is all we have ever done. That is the way the Federal Reserve System operates. The Federal Reserve System creates money. It is a bank of issue."

Page 18:

FEDERAL RESERVE BANKS PROVIDE MONEY FOR COMMERCIAL BANKS

Mr. Eccles testified before the Banking and Currency Committee June 17, 1942, on a bill to amend the Federal Reserve Act. His testimony which appears at page 15 of the hearings discloses that commercial banks can buy all the bonds they desire to buy and if they are called on for money to pay their depositors the nearest Federal Reserve bank can always furnish them the money they need. His testimony is as follows:

"Mr. Patman. Is it not a fact that you did send out letters to the banks which made the statement that the Federal open market committee was ready to buy all the bonds at par?

"Mr. Eccles. No, sir; not buy, but we adopted a policy, each bank did, that would loan par on them.

"Mr. Patman. That would loan par on Government securities?

"Mr. Eccles. Yes.

"Mr. Patman. Do you charge the interest rate that is effective in that particular Federal Reserve district?

"Mr. Eccles. One percent.

"Mr. Patman. One percent?

"Mr. Eccles. Yes.

"Mr. Patman. Have you ever told all the banks that you stand ready to make loans at par at a 1-percent interest rate?

"Mr. Eccles. Each Federal Reserve bank has done that."

Page 20:

FEDERAL RESERVE USES GOVERNMENT OBLIGATIONS (CURRENCY) TO BUY GOVERNMENT OBLIGATIONS INTEREST BEARING—KEEP BONDS AND DRAW THE INTEREST

On the same day Mr. Eccles testified, at page 25 of the hearings:

"Mr. Patman. Mr. Eccles, the day before yesterday, I had gotten down to the point where, if we needed more money, one way to give the banks extra reserves to purchase Government bonds would be for the Open Market Committee to buy Government bonds in the open market, and I suggested if you bought for the Federal Reserve bank one billion dollars' worth of bonds, that would automatically create a billion dollars of reserves in the banks, and, after the reserves had been reduced to 50 percent, the maximum that would enable the banks to purchase $50,000,000,000 worth of bonds. Now, let us assume that has happened——

"Mr. Eccles. $10,000,000,000 worth by the purchase of a billion dollars' worth of bonds in the market?

"Mr. Patman. I got the two mixed up. The purchase of a billion dollars' worth of bonds in the market, after the excess reserves had been reduced, will enable the banks to buy ten billion?

"Mr. Eccles. That is right.

"Mr. Patman. Where the fifty billion came in was if you would automatically reduce the reserves now, which you have a right to do, that would give them $5,000,000,000 of excess reserves, which they could use to purchase $50,000,000,000 worth of bonds.

"Mr. Eccles. That is right.

"Mr. Patman. Now let us assume that we not increase the reserves in the banks, and you go into the market and buy a billion dollars worth of bonds; you buy them with Federal Reserve money, do you not?

"Mr. Eccles. Well, we buy them with Federal Reserve credit.

"Mr. Patman. I know; but suppose the banks call for the money, you issue Federal Reserve notes, do you not?

"Mr. Eccles. What we do, if we purchase Government securities in the market, is, we credit the account of the bank that turns them in. They usually come through the banks.

"Mr. Patman. That is right.

"Mr. Eccles. Even though they may be individuals who are selling the securities; and we debit the bond purchase account, showing that the Federal Reserve has a liability to the banks to the extent of $1,000,000,000, which represents their reserves on the one hand, and that they own $1,000,000,000 of bonds in what we call the portfolio, on the other hand.

"Mr. Patman. I know in practice that is exactly the way it is done, Mr. Eccles, but suppose the banks want the billion dollars in currency, you would pay it in Federal Reserve notes, would you not?

"Mr. Eccles. That is right.

"Mr. Patman. Those Federal Reserve notes, as we have often discussed, are obligations of the United States Government?

"Mr. Eccles. That is right.

"Mr. Patman. Then you use those Government obligations to buy interest-bearing Government obligations and you place them with the Federal Reserve banks—12 of them?

"Mr. Eccles. That is right.

"Mr. Patman. And they would continue to receive interest on those Government obligations as long as they were outstanding?

"Mr. Eccles. That is right."

Page 21:

On June 17, before the same committee, at page 21 of the hearings on the bill to amend the Federal Reserve Act, Mr. Eccles testified:

"Mr. Eccles. No; the Federal Reserve would buy in the open market. If the Federal Reserve then bought a billion dollars of securities in the open market that would be new Treasury issues. The banks would still hold them, and the Federal Reserve wculd put into the banks another billion of excess reserves. If they used that billion they could buy five billion more of Governments, and you could keep the price up. For every billion of the Federal Reserve banks put in the open market operations, the private banks could buy five billion."

Page 22:

AMOUNT OF MONEY FEDERAL RESERVE BANK COULD ISSUE

When Dr. E. A. Goldenweiser, Director of Research and Statistics for the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, testified before the Banking and Currency Committee of the House on October 1, on the price-control bill, the following questions were asked and the following answers given, page 1536, volume 2, of the hearings.

"Dr. Goldenweiser. The total reserves of the Federal Reserve are about 20½ billion, not 23 billion.

"Mr. Patman. I am talking about the total gold supply that is either owned by the United States Government or claimed by the Federal Reserve banks through the——

"Mr. Goldenweiser. The amount of the stabilization fund is not available to the Federal Reserve.

"Mr. Patman. No; but I am presuming that it will be available. That will be 23 billions?

"Dr. Goldenweiser. All right.

"Mr. Patman. That leaves 16 billions unattached?

"Dr. Goldenweiser. Yes.

"Mr. Patman. How much bonds could the Federal Reserve Open Market Committee buy in the United States, Government bonds, based upon that?

"Dr. Goldenweiser. It depends on how much of it will be in deposits and how much in notes. But, roughly speaking, about three to three and a half times.

"Mr. Patman. Three and a half times?

"Dr. Goldenweiser. No; not three and a half times. From two and a half to three times.

"Mr. Patman. That would be about $40 billion?

"Dr. Goldenweiser. That is right.

"Mr. Patman. When that money is paid out, suppose they pay it to the commercial banks, they could expand about five to seven times to one on that, couldn't they?

"Dr. Goldenweiser. If they paid that much assessment?

"Mr. Patman. Yes; they would have the power to under the existing law?

"Dr. Goldenweiser. That is right.

"Mr. Patman. That means that, say, an average of six times—that is about right now, isn't it—about six?

"Dr. Goldenweiser. Approximately.

"Mr. Patman. That means that they could inflate about $240 billion more?

"Dr. Goldenweiser. That is right."

It will be noted that the Federal Reserve banks and the commercial banks could expand their deposits sufficiently to purchase $240 billion worth of Government bonds at the time Dr. Goldenweiser testified. When the reserves are reduced to the limit that they can be reduced, these banks may purchase as much as $480 billion of Government bonds without having any more capital stock or assets than they now have except, of course, as Mr. Eccles always adds, that they will have the Government bonds.

Page 3, how money is created by privately owned banking system:

During the first week in December, Gov. Marriner S. Eccles, Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, stated in a letter to all banks:

"Continuing the policy which was announced following the outbreak of war in Europe, Federal Reserve banks stand ready to advance funds on United States Government securities at par to all banks."

Page 10–11:

LEON HENDERSON'S TESTIMONY ON NO DEBTS, NO MONEY

In the hearings before the House Banking and Currency Committee on the price-control bill, the following questions were asked by me and the following answers given by Mr. Leon Henderson (pp. 981–982):

"Mr. Patman. * * * You stated yesterday that everybody should take advantage of this period of rising prices to pay their debts. You really don't believe everybody should pay their debts, do you? If you mean that, what we do for money, since our money is based on debt?

"Mr. Henderson. I have been through that, the same as you have, and I don't believe our economy would come to a halt if people paid their debts.

"Mr. Patman. If everybody paid their debts?

"Mr. Henderson. If you are going to say that I have discounted the trade acceptances which the Federal Reserve has created by a couple of bookkeepers, that is not the connotation debt has for me.

"Mr. Patman. You had in mind individual debts, personal debts?

"Mr. Henderson. Yes.

"Mr. Patman. And if the policy is good for individuals, why isn't it good for corporations?

"Mr. Henderson. I think it is.

"Mr. Patman. All right. If everybody paid their debts, where would you get money to carry on business?

"Mr. Henderson. You would get into debt and come out again. I assume the healthy process of credit is that you do liquidate debt as you do the trade acceptances."

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Henderson's very clever reply was, in effect, that it is all right to pay the debts, but you should get right back into debt again in order for the country to have this circulating medium.

NO DEBTS, NO MONEY (ECCLES)—CHAIRMAN MARRINER S. ECCLES' TESTIMONY ON NO DEBTS, NO MONEY, IN HIS TESTIMONY ON THE PRICE-CONTROL BILL BEFORE THE BANKING AND CURRENCY COMMITTEE

Chairman Eccles, of the Federal Reserve Board, testified as follows, page 1338 of the hearings, September 30, 1941:

"Mr. Patman. * * * You made the statement that people should get out of debt instead of spending their money. You recall that statement, I presume?

"Mr. Eccles. That was in connection with installment credit.

"Mr. Patman. Do you believe that people should pay their debts generally when they can?

"Mr. Eccles. I think that depends a good deal upon the individual; but, of course, if there were no debt in our money system——

"Mr. Patman. That is the point I wanted to ask you about.

"Mr. Eccles. There wouldn't be any money.

"Mr. Patman. Suppose everybody paid their debts, would we have any money to do business on?

"Mr. Eccles. That is correct.

"Mr. Patman. In other words, our system is based entirely on debt."

Mr. Speaker, there can be no dispute about the statement that our system is based entirely upon debt, and if a person and corporation paid their debts, we would not have sufficient money to do business on.

Page 12:

CREATE MONEY, BUY BONDS, AND COLLECT INTEREST

When the Honorable Marriner S. Eccles, Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, was before the Banking and Currency Committee of the House, of which I am a member, on Tuesday, September 30, 1941, I interrogated him about how he obtained for the 12 Federal Reserve banks the $2,000,000,000 in Government bonds, which the system is now holding and charging the Government interest thereon. The questions and answers appear in the printed testimony, volume 2, page 1342, and is as follows:

"Mr. Patman. * * * How did you get the money to buy those $2,000,000,000 of Government securities?

"Mr. Eccles. We created it.

"Mr. Patman. Out of what?

"Mr. Eccles. Out of the right to issue credit, money.

"Mr. Patman. And there is nothing behind it, is there, except the Government's credit?

"Mr. Eccles. We have the Government bonds.

"Mr. Patman. That's right; the Government's credit."

BANKERS SHOULD NOT BE ON BOARD OF GOVERNORS

The truth is the Board of Governors should not be composed of bankers. There is a difference between the science of money and the use of money. Bankers use money, and they are clever. They are professionals. They are qualified to use it, and they serve a very useful and constructive purpose in our country. We could not get along without the commercial banking system. We must have it. We want it to remain privately owned; we want it to make a profit, because we want a good system. If it were within my power, I would encourage every person who has enough money to check on to have an account in a bank, even if the banks had to be helped with public funds to pay the cost of the banks carrying unprofitable accounts. It would be in the public interest. It would be so helpful in many ways. But the banking system as such should be separated from the science of money and the use of money and credit to maintain an expanding economy to provide adequate production and maximum employment. As it is now, the Government manufactures money, but it is done through the Federal Reserve System, created through the Federal Reserve System. The Federal Reserve System will take a million dollars' worth of new money that is made over at the Bureau of Engraving and Printing and trade that million dollars in the open market for Government bonds of a similar amount, that are drawing interest. Then they keep the bonds, they use this Government obligation, which cost them nothing, because they are a Government agency, and they trade that new money for Government bonds. They hold the bonds and draw the interest.

WARTIME INTEREST RATE PATTERN FOR LONG-TERM GOVERNMENT SECURITIES BROKEN MAY 1, 1953

The Treasury broke the pattern for interest rates on our World War II war debt on May 1, 1953, when a bond issue was sold which provided a 3¼-percent interest rate. This was three-fourths of a percent higher than any other marketable long-term Government bond that has been issued in 20 years.

There was a good reason for fixing the interest rates on Government bonds low. Most of the money that was used for war financing was not genuine money in the sense that actual money was borrowed by the Government on Government bonds, but it was synthetic money that was created on the books of the commercial banks or the books of the 12 Federal Reserve banks. However, the money created was just as good as the other money. In fact, it all comes off the same printing press or created with the same ink on the same paper and carries the same United States Government guaranty.

But there is a difference in the money insofar as the lender is concerned. In one case, the lender is a bona fide citizen who has actually worked and earned the money. It is his money, and if he parts with it by letting the Government use it to finance the war, he is entitled to a fair rate of interest on the money.

In the other case, where the money is created by the banks, and that is where most of our money comes from—created money—the taxpayers are really paying through the nose in having to pay enormous annual interest charges every year for this synthetic money. The real bad thing about it is that a Government bond never seems to be paid off. It is always refunded. So as bad as it is for a taxpayer to pay interest on synthetic money for 1 year, the bad effect is multiplied by the payment each year for 25 years, 50 years, or 100 years. This type money should be paid as quickly as possible and the interest burden removed.

It is all right to pay interest on all money borrowed by the Government regardless of the kind of money—real or created—so it all has the same purchasing power but bank-purchased bonds with created money should be paid off first.

I do not oppose banks creating money under our fractional reserve system. I am only opposed to the abuse of the privilege. I oppose banks putting themselves into a position of security with adequate earnings in this way to the extent that they will fail to take care of local needs.

TRADING PRINTED MONEY FOR GOVERNMENT BONDS

When the Federal Reserve banks obtain from the Bureau of Engraving and Printing here in Washington printed currency, they can trade this money for United States Government bonds, which carry an interest charge. The former is currency and the latter is a Government bond. They both represent the Government's credit. They are really one and the same thing. Behind each is the Government's promise to pay.

The Federal Reserve banks, after trading non-interest-bearing currency for interest-bearing securities, retain the interest-bearing securities and collect the interest when due from the United States Treasury. This is the way the banks get their income. After their expenses are paid and 10 percent is set aside for surplus in each of the 12 banks, the remainder—90 percent—goes back into the United States Treasury.

The Federal Reserve banks have $25 billion of these bonds today acquired in that way, and they are collecting five or six hundred million dollars in interest annually from the taxpayers. Normally, your agent, acting for you, if he were negotiating with someone that you owed a promissory note, and that agent gave a check for a thousand dollars on you to pay that note, you would expect to get that note back, canceled. Naturally you would. But in this case, contrary to that businesslike way and supported by logic and reasoning, this agency of our Government takes this Government obligation which draws no interest, Federal Reserve notes, which you use as currency every day, and they trade that currency for interest-bearing obligations and the interest-bearing obligations are not canceled, although it is a Government agency using it. They are retained in their vaults and in their portfolios, and the interest is collected, which is comparable to you permitting your agent to keep that $1,000 promissory note and requiring you to pay him interest every year as the interest is due. That would be a comparable situation. That is exactly what is going on today through the Federal Reserve System.

The banks have permitted themselves to do a lot of things that normally they would not do if they had any opposition, but they have not had any opposition in this country for 40 years and they have been allowed to do anything they wanted to do, and the Board of Governors has been composed largely of bankers, people who naturally have the bankers' viewpoint. They are permitting the banks to do a lot of things that are not in the interest of the banks themselves over the long run or in the interest of the country. So I think the Federal Reserve Board should be changed; the bankers should be taken off the Board of Governors and the Open Market Committee entirely, divorced wholly from the banking system, and let this Board and Committee operate in the interest of the people and in the interest of the Government. It is just as ridiculous as it would be if we permitted the railroad owners to be appointed on the ICC to fix freight and passenger rates.

Since the Federal Reserve Board was organized we have in this country what is known as the Maximum Employment Act of 1946 that sets up a duty and obligation of the Government agencies to perform in keeping this country on an even keel, to keep it prosperous and under maximum employment. This Board should do certain things, and they should look at it from the standpoint of the country and not from the standpoint of the banks. This is a new duty the money masters have that they did not have before 1946.

I am inserting in connection with my remarks statements from the different Chairmen of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System and of the different Secretaries of State about the Employment Act of 1946, and its importance.

IMPORTANCE OF THE MAXIMUM EMPLOYMENT ACT OF 1946

Comments on the applicability of the Employment Act of 1946 before the Subcommittee on General Credit Control and Debt Management 1952, of the Joint Committee on Economic Report:

Reply by John W. Snyder, Secretary of the Treasury, compendium, page 2:

> The Employment Act of 1946 now represents the basic policy directive bearing upon economic objectives for the Treasury, as well as for other Government departments and agencies.

Reply by William McC. Martin, Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, compendium, page 209:

> Employment Act of 1946: Applicable to the Board of Governors as well as to other Government agencies is the following declaration of policy contained in the Employment Act of 1946.

Reply by Chairman Martin, compendium, page 212:

> This statement of purpose in layman's language applies to the credit and monetary sphere the principles set forth in the con-

gressional declaration of policy in the Employment Act of 1946.

Joint answer of the Federal Reserve banks, compendium, page 651:

> While the Employment Act of 1946 contains no explicit directive to the Federal Reserve banks, the stated objectives of that act guide the consideration of Federal Reserve policy.

Statement of Secretary Snyder, hearings, page 9:

> It is a primary goal of both Treasury and Federal Reserve policy, and an important part of public economic policy in general, as expressed in the Employment Act of 1946.

Statement of Chairman Martin, hearings, page 78:

> The Federal Reserve Board is subject to the Employment Act of 1946.

Statement of Chairman Martin, hearings, page 81:

> And I am accepting the Employment Act of 1946 as national policy and being applicable to the Federal Reserve System.

Testimony of W. L. Hemingway, American Bankers Associations, hearings, page 336:

> Representative Patman. Of course, they would always have over them this threat that if there should develop a poor economic situation in our country with lots of unemployed and lots of distress, and there was need to do something to bring the country back, and the Employment Act of 1946 was not carried out as the President and the Congress thought it should be carried out, in cooperation with the Federal Reserve Board, the Congress by a majority vote could change that. If we happened to have an obstinate, contrary board, that just would not do what was necessary to help the country come back, why then something could be done about the Board.
>
> Mr. Hemingway. That is right.

Testimony of Malcolm Bryan, president, Federal Reserve Bank of Atlanta, hearings, page 430:

> There may be an implication of built-in inflationary bias, as we have interpreted the act or tended to interpret the act up to now, but I want to make very clear that I approve of it as a statement of policy of our Government of all branches.

Testimony of Allan Sproul, president, Federal Reserve Bank of New York, hearings, page 537:

> Mr. Sproul. In the answer of the presidents of the Federal Reserve banks, I think we expressed that opinion, and certainly it is my opinion that principles and policies set forth in the Employment Act of 1946 are a guide to us in our actions with respect to credit policy.
>
> Representative Patman. And you recognize it as a congressional policy?
>
> Mr. Sproul. Yes.
>
> Representative Patman. And I believe you stated that you recognize, too, that the Federal Reserve System is an agency of the Government?
>
> Mr. Sproul. Yes.

Testimony of E. A. Goldenweiser, member, Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton, University, hearings, page 765:

> I think the general mandate in the Employment Act and in phrases in the Federal Reserve Act, together with the public understanding and the legislative and congressional history of the Federal Reserve, has now made its mandate reasonably clear.

Testimony of Jacob Viner, professor of economics, Princeton University, hearings, page 794:

> The text of the mandate they have now has just been handed to me [Employment Act of 1946], and I want to read what that mandate is, for the special benefit of those who think that the Federal Reserve has a sufficient mandate now.
>
> In the declaration of policy in the Employment Act, the last words are "to promote maximum employment, production, and purchasing power."

Statement of the United States Chamber of Commerce, hearings, page 804:

> As an instrumentality of Congress, the Federal Reserve is presumably bound by this declaration of policy. Moreover, since monetary policy is an important means of achieving and maintaining a maximum level of business activity and employment, the Federal Reserve cannot evade or ignore this congressional declaration of policy.

Statement of Murray D. Lincoln, president, Farm Bureau Insurance Companies, Columbus, Ohio, hearings, page 816:

> The Federal Reserve System is one of the principal means of achieving the purposes of the Employment Act; in fact, it would be practically impossible to attain them without extensive use of monetary policy.

Statement of Donald E. Montgomery, director of Washington office, International Union, UAW–CIO, hearings, page 819:

> The only policy directive cited to you by the Board as giving it responsibility with respect to stabilizing the economy is the Employment Act of 1946. But that act contemplates no independent action by any part of the Government. On the contrary, it calls for coordination of all the relevant powers of Government under the direction and responsibility of the President. How can the Federal Reserve Board pretend to draw authority from that act while proclaiming its independence of the Executive?

NO DEBTS, NO MONEY

A lot has been said here about the payment of the national debt. I believe in paying debts, and I believe in individuals and other people paying their debts; but in connection with our national debt, the Board of Governors must keep in mind under the Employment Act of 1946 that they must have sufficient money and credit to buy the goods and services that are available. Keeping that in mind there must be debts. There is one thing I want in particular to invite your attention to. Do not be afraid anybody will dispute it, they will not, it cannot be disputed; these people who talk about paying the national debt entirely and other debts entirely, pay off all debts, do not, I am afraid, take everything into consideration.

Under our capitalistic system if they have thought this thing through—we have a capitalistic system; that is the finest and best system in the world; it is the private-enterprise system. I would not change it at all, I would not change our banking system; I would leave it all just like it is. There are certain changes I would make, such as the Board of Governors and certain changes in the Federal Reserve banks, but that does not go to the changing of the commercial banking system. I would leave it just as it is under our capitalistic system. If any changes should seem expedient they should be made gradually and in a helpful way without endangering our privately owned, profitably operated commercial banking system consisting of about 15,000 establishments.

Keep this in mind that where there are no debts there is no money. You know you cannot have money without debts. If it were possible for us to levy income taxes and pay off our national debt in 10 years or 20 years it would cause the most devastating and destructive panic we have ever had on earth; you could not stand it; it would be canceling too much money.

So in our country with 161 million people, every year in order to have prosperity we must have the economy going up about 4 percent, that is our gross national product, for the purpose of taking care of the new workers that come in every year, and to take care of those who have been displaced during the year by labor-saving devices and machinery. There are about a million new workers every year. There are almost a million people who are replaced by new labor-saving machinery every year. So there are 2 million people that have to be taken care of every year in our economy. If we keep on an even keel that is not enough. We would soon have a backlog of unemployment. In order to take care of these new workers and these displaced workers, we must have our economy increasing at the rate of about 4 percent a year. That means in our gross national production. In order for the gross national production to increase we have to increase our money supply. The only way we can increase our money supply is through debts. That is the only way in the world in our present capitalistic, private enterprise money system. Today we have debts, public and private, of about $640 billion. That includes our national debt of $275 billion, our States, counties and cities, installment debts and all other debts—about $640 billion in all.

REASON FOR PROSPERITY

Of course, people talk about having to pay these debts off. If you paid them all off you would not have any money. We would be reduced to barter. For a time in one section of the United States the people were absolutely dependent upon barter, using axe handles, hickory nuts, skunk hides, and things like that for legal tender. The reason our people are prosperous is because we have money and credit available to purchase the goods and services that are available for sale. We must continue to have it available.

DR. BURGESS' VIEWS

I am going to insert in the Record statements from people who will corroborate, at least they have said what I am saying here, and I refer to witness No. 1, Dr. Randolph Burgess, who is the architect of the present administration's monetary policy, of National City Bank fame, one of the greatest experts in our country. I do not agree with him all the time, but I recognize him as a great man and as a great expert in his line.

He appeared before our Committee on Banking and Currency recently. They talk about paying off the national debt rapidly. Naturally, I favor paying off the national debt when we can without disrupting our economy. But do you not agree it is something that should not be done quickly and suddenly over a period of 10 or 20 years? I am going to put his testimony in the Record. At that time I asked him a question along this line.

Dr. Burgess, if we were to pay all of our debts, is it not a fact we would have no money to do business with?

He finally said that that is the fact. He hedged on it at first. He said: "We would find a way." Then he had to admit that it would be a different way from what we have now. Under our capitalistic system as it exists today, there is no way to have adequate money and credit without debt. If all debts were paid there would be no money.

Statement of W. Randolph Burgess, Deputy to the Secretary of the Treasury, before Committee on Banking and Currency of the House of Representatives, May 27, 1954:

Mr. Patman. Alexander Hamilton is credited with saying that a national debt is a national blessing, and Andrew Jackson is credited with saying that a national debt is a curse to the Republic.

Do you agree with either one of those statements and, if so, which one?

Mr. Burgess. Well, I think it is rather academic. We will have a national debt for a long time to come. I wouldn't worry about our situation, if we didn't have any; I think we would get along pretty well.

Mr. Patman. Suppose we were to issue a capital levy and pay off the national debt over a period of 10 years. What would be the effect on our economy?

Mr. Burgess. I think that would be very destructive of people's initiative and incentive, to feel that we felt it was right to take away people's capital. That is going pretty far.

Mr. Patman. Of course, I was just using that—that is a rather brutal way of doing it—but suppose we raised income taxes and paid it off over a period of 10 years, or 15 years. Don't you think it would be in the direction of a severe deflation?

Mr. Burgess. I agree with you, yes.

Notice what Dr. Burgess says about paying off national debt too rapidly.

Mr. Patman. And isn't it a fact, Dr. Burgess, that our capitalistic system being as it is, that we might as well be realistic and recognize that without debt we cannot have prosperity?

Mr. Burgess. Well, I wouldn't make as broad a statement as that, but I think I would say, from where we are now, we cannot undertake to pay off this debt in 10 years or any such period, because it would be too much of a shock.

Mr. Patman. In fact, if we didn't have debts we wouldn't have any money.

Mr. Burgess. No, I wouldn't—you mean if there weren't any debts, public or private?

Mr. Patman. That is right.

Mr. Burgess. Well, we would find some other way to do it.

Mr. Patman. We would be reduced to barter?

Mr. Burgess. I think we could still have a money system.

Mr. Patman. We would have to change our system. What I am talking about is our present capitalistic system, which we are all in favor of—I am in favor of it, you are in favor of it—yet under that system, without debts, we could not expand our economy.

Mr. Burgess. Well, without getting into great flights of imagination, I quite agree, that under our system as it works if we are going to have progress and move along, people have to borrow to go ahead and do things.

Mr. Patman. And then if the people don't borrow money, and the banks do not lend money, and the local governments do not borrow money, it might be that the Federal Government would have to have deficit financing for the purpose of creating debts to expand our economy; is that right?

Mr. Burgess. That is possible.

Mr. Patman. In other words, somebody has got to create debts, either public or private.

Dr. Burgess knows we cannot have sufficient money and credit without debt and therefore has admitted the time might come when the Federal Government may be compelled to create debts in order to provide our economy with money.

In addition to that I am going to insert statements from the Chairman of the Board of Governors along the same line.

Before the Banking and Currency Committee of the House of Representatives, May 26, 1954, the following testimony was recorded:

Mr. Patman. About the reserves: If you reduce the reserve requirements—the banks have no excess reserves now—and you reduce the reserve requirements, say, one point, how much excess reserve would that make available?

Mr. Martin. I would have to check one point. I would say it is about 7 or 8 hundred million dollars. Perhaps about a billion dollars.

Mr. Patman. About a billion dollars?

Mr. Martin. Yes.

Mr. Patman. What is the difference in you saying that all the banks of the country, without putting up an extra dime of capital, without putting up anything in the way of security at all, you can just create a billion dollars more money, and on that you can create about $6 billion—what is the difference between that and printing press money?

Mr. Martin. The forces of the market are at play.

Mr. Patman. I know, but it is the creation of money, is it not?

Mr. Martin. We have the power to create money. That is the strength of the Federal Reserve System.

Mr. Patman. Well, the private banks have it, too, don't they?

Mr. Martin. Not in that sense.

Mr. Patman. On their reserves don't they create it on an average of 6 to 1 now?

Mr. Martin. If they lend the money, or create the loans or investments, they can do that.

Mr. Patman. That is right. But under your capitalistic system, which I believe in, and which we all believe in, we think it is the finest and best system on earth, you cannot do business in this country unless people go into debt, can you?

Mr. Martin. I think it is possible to do business without going into debt.

Mr. Patman. Under our system?

Mr. Martin. Yes, sir; I think it is possible.

Mr. Patman. How would you do it? Suppose everybody paid their debts, what would you do for money?

Mr. Martin. Well, now, debt is an important part, I don't want to debate that. Debt is an important part of our business.

Mr. Patman. Of our economy. Could we do business without debt?

Mr. Martin. Well, theoretically, I think you could. You would have to change the system.

Mr. Martin thereby admits that we cannot have sufficient money under our present capitalistic system without debts and the only way we can provide ourselves with money without debt would be by changing the present system.

Mr. Patman. Well, you would have to pay out money into circulation, instead of borrowing it into circulation?

Mr. Martin. You would have to change your system.

Mr. Patman. You would have to change from your capitalistic system entirely. But under a system as we have now, if everybody paid their debts, all the money you would have left would be the $346 million Lincoln greenbacks, and the silver certificates, and the silver, and the copper coins; is that right?

Mr. Martin. Well, I don't know your figures, but——

Mr. Patman. Well, I am just giving them from memory. But your memory on that is better than mine.

Mr. Martin. You would have gold.

Mr. Patman. But it is not in circulation. If everybody paid their debts, we would not have money to do business on, and we would be reduced to barter, wouldn't we?

Mr. Martin. Well, we could certainly go back to the stone age and engage in barter.

BANKS LARGE HOLDING OF GOVERNMENTS

I am inserting herewith a report of the condition of a bank in a western State, as of June 30, 1954. The statement discloses loans and discounts of less than $15 million and holdings of United States Government securities of more than $58 million.

I hope the banks will pursue a policy of making all local loans possible and invest less and less in United States Government securities. I am apprehensive that if the trend continues as is indicated by many bank statements, the banks will rely more and more upon riskless Government securities and become less anxious to take the time and trouble of dealing with applications for local small loans.

LOANS OFF BILLION PAST YEAR

A recent statement of the condition of all the banks discloses that loans and discounts are off over a billion dollars the past year, but the investment in United States Government securities is up considerably. After all, accommodations and services to local people come first. I am sure that bankers generally recognize this as bankers are among our finest citizens and are always anxious to be helpful to the communities and cities they serve.

What I am afraid of is that our governmental policies are making it too attractive for banks to invest in riskless securities. Bankers are expected to look at the situation from a standpoint of the bank's interest, and I believe it is possible under present circumstances for many banks to be persuaded that it is in their interest to get away from local loans in order to enjoy absolute security and reasonable earnings from investments in riskless securities.

The statement that I am inserting is not typical of all banks; I think it is an exceptional case, but since it is a statement of a bank that is principally owned and operated by a former President of the American Bankers Association, I thought it would be of interest to show the trend in this particular bank. It is as follows:

REPORT OF CONDITION OF ——— NATIONAL BANK OF ——— WESTERN STATE AS OF JUNE 30, 1954

RESOURCES	
Cash and due from banks	$28,714,729.97
United States securities (par value or less)	58,738,194.05
Municipal obligations	5,989,466.79
Total liquid assets	93,442,390.81
Loans and discounts	14,873,093.26
Stocks	80,100.00
Banking house	1.00
Furniture and fixtures	1.00
Other assets	13,412.87
Total	108,408,998.94
LIABILITIES	
Demand deposits	$96,836,640.81
Time deposits	7,242,608.75
Total deposits	104,129,249.56
Capital stock, common	750,000.00
Surplus	1,500,000.00
Undivided profits and reserves	2,029,749.38
Total capital investment	4,279,749,38
Total	108,408,998.94

Suppose all banks adopted the policy of having such a large percentage of their investments in Government securities and such a small percentage in loans. Who would create the debts necessary to sustain an expanding economy? Would the banks be in the position where they would not only object to Government securities being paid off but also in the position of demanding that more Government securities be made available for them to purchase? It will not be long until the trust funds that support the different old-age and retirement systems will probably be able to buy all the Government securities available. I hope the banks never get into the position where it is in their interest to oppose the continuance and establishment of such funds.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I want to be sure that I understand the gentleman correctly, and I think I did. According to the gentleman's theory, if we are to have prosperity we should go further and further into debt?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes. You have got to do that. There is no way else to do it under our capitalistic system. Does the gentleman know of any other way to do it? I do not. Dr. Burgess does not, Chairman Martin, of the Board of Governors, Federal Reserve System, does not, Mr. Eccles does not. I asked Leon Henderson a question along that line years ago. Leon Henderson said all debts ought to be paid. I asked what we would do for money then? He said that we would have to go right back into debt again. That is the fact. With no debts we have no money. As foolish as that sounds right off it is the truth under our capitalistic system. Certainly we should not expect any debt to be permanent but the aggregate amount of debt must increase in order to expand our economy.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Did the gentleman oppose increasing the limit of our national debt?

Mr. PATMAN. I did. A year ago I voted against it because they had plenty of money in the banks to take care of the Government's needs for the next year. They had $9 billion in the banks on the day I spoke, which is a large amount. Normally they have from four to six billion dollars in the banks all the time, which gives opportunity for great favoritism, in addition to destroying the use of it for the Government's purposes.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. How does the gentleman explain the fact that it takes debt to create prosperity although it would not be a good thing to increase the national debt?

Mr. PATMAN. Well, I want the private-enterprise system to work by local people going into debt through the local banks and other financial institutions. The Government should stay out of debt as much as possible. Like local and State governments, they should stay out of it, and only to be used at a time of emergency. But, Dr. Burgess admitted, in questioning him, that the time could come—and I am putting his testimony in the RECORD—that we would have to increase our national debt in order to have enough money and credit to do business on.

Now, if it got to that point, I would increase it just for that purpose, but I am not going to increase it if it is not needed for that purpose. I would rather use this idle and unused money in the banks that the Government is not receiving any interest on at all; nothing; idle; four to five billion dollars. It is serving no useful purpose for the Government. It is just helpful to the banks. I do not object to helping the banks, but I do not want to help them that way. Why should the Government borrow money and pay interest when it has billions of dollars in private banks idle and unused? The banks have a side to the question. I am impressed with the arguments they made. I want them treated right. It can be adjusted and the banks treated fairly without the Government giving up the use of these deposits.

INCREASING NATIONAL DEBT

The only reason I voted against increasing the national debt a year ago was because they had $9 billion idle and unused in the banks which, if they used, they would not have to increase the debt limit. And, the debt limit was not increased during this past year and it did not exceed the limit because they had to dip in and use some of these idle and unused funds. On yesterday I did not vote to increase it because they still have between four and one-half to five billion dollars in the banks, and I want the Government to use that idle money before we increase the debt limit. But, whenever it is necessary to increase it, I am for increasing it. I think it is intellectually dishonest for a Member of Congress to vote for appropriations which, when paid, will exceed the debt limit and then fail to vote to raise the debt limit to take care of them. I think it is just as wrong and dishonest as a Member of Congress voting for all appropriation bills and against all tax bills. It is the same thing. So, the time might come in this country when we will have to increase the national debt just for the purpose of creating sufficient money and credit. I hope that time never comes, but it is possible.

So, again, in conclusion, I invite your attention to the fact that we should all remain on the alert, to persuade the authorities against permitting the Government bonds to go below par. It should never be permitted again. If such a policy is started again, Congress should do something about it without delay.

Report to the People of the Second Congressional District of Wisconsin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN R. DAVIS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I include herewith my sixth annual report to the people of the Second Congressional District of Wisconsin. In the 5 immediately preceding years I prepared reports on my voting and attendance records for the sessions of Congress. This is a similar compilation for the 2d session of the 83d Congress complete to the date of sine die adjournment on August 20.

By means of newsletters and conferences throughout the district during congressional recesses, I have attempted to inform my constitutents and report to them on my stewardship as their Representative in Washington. This voting report is in keeping with my purpose of keeping the people of my district as fully informed as possible on congressional issues.

It is a complete record. It is not a hand-picked list of a few so-called key votes compiled by some lobbyist, pressure group, or political campaign committee. The whole record is here in concise form for the people to examine and evaluate for themselves.

If more complete information on any measure considered, or an explanation of any particular vote is desired, I shall be glad to respond to such requests, as I always have in the past.

The report follows:

Voting record—1954

Roll call No.	Date	Identification and result of vote	My vote
1	Jan. 6	Quorum call	Present.
2	Jan. 20	do	Present.
3	Jan. 21	H. R. 5337, authorizing appropriation of $26 million to initiate construction of a U. S. Air Force Academy. (Passed, 329 to 36)	No.
4	Jan. 27	H. J. Res. 358, to discharge indebtedness of the Commodity Credit Corporation, thus increasing available lending funds by $850,000,000. (Passed, 323 to 27.)	Aye.
5	Feb. 2	Quorum call	Present.
6	Feb. 3	do	Present.
7	do	do	Present.
8	Feb. 4	do	Present.
9	do	do	Present.
10	do	Amendment to H. R. 3300 to authorize the State of Illinois and the Chicago Sanitary District to divert additional water from Lake Michigan to the Illinois Waterway, which amendment would prevent any additional diversion until pending survey of lake levels by Corps of Engineers had been completed and submitted to Congress. (Rejected, 177 to 202.)	Aye.
11	do	Motion to recommit (kill) H. R. 3300, to authorize the State of Illinois and the Chicago Sanitary District to divert additional water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway. (Rejected, 150 to 234.)	Aye.
12	Feb. 16	Quorum call	Present.
13	do	do	Present.
14	Feb. 17	do	Present.
15	do	Motion to recommit (kill) H. R. 4646, to provide for exchange of certain public and private lands, to prevent Federal lands acquisition from interfering with sustained-yield timber operations. (Agreed to, 226-161).	No.
16	Feb. 18	Quorum call	Present.
17	Feb. 25	H. Res. 400, providing $275,000 for the operation of the Committee on Un-American Activities. (Adopted, 363 to 1.)	Aye.
18	Mar. 1	Quorum call	Present.
19	do	do	Present.
20	Mar. 2	do	Present.
21	do	Motion to recommit (kill) H. J. Res. 355, relating to the supplying of agricultural workers from Mexico. (Rejected, 56 to 197.)	No.
22	Mar. 3	Quorum call	Present.
23	do	do	Present.
24	Mar. 4	do	Present.
25	Mar. 5	Amendment to H. R. 8067, making appropriations for Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, to increase from $23,000,000 to $40,000,000 the amount allowed for subsidy payments for air carriers. (Adopted, 265 to 105.)	No.
26	Mar. 8	Quorum call	Present.
27	Mar. 10	do	Present.
28	do	Motion to recommit H. R. 8224, to reduce excise taxes which exceed 10 percent to that figure, and extend certain expiring excise taxes for 1 year, with instructions to insert provision repealing all taxes on admissions of 50 cents or less. (Rejected, 200 to 213.)	No.
29	do	H. R. 8224 to reduce excise taxes which exceed 10 percent to that figure, and extend certain expiring excise taxes for 1 year. Passed, 411 to 3.)	Aye;
30	Mar. 11	Quorum call	Present.
31	Mar. 15	do	Present.
32	do	do	Present.
33	Mar. 17	do	Present.
34	Mar. 18	Motion to recommit H. R. 8300, general tax revision bill, correcting inequities and loopholes in Federal tax laws, and extending 52 percent corporate tax for 1 year, with instructions to increase personal income tax exemptions from $600 to $700. (Rejected, 204 to 210.)	No.
35	do	H. R. 8300, general tax revision bill, correcting inequities and loopholes in Federal tax laws, and extending 52 percent corporate tax for 1 year. (Passed, 339 to 80.)	Aye.
36	Mar. 22	Quorum call	Present.
37	do	do	Present.
38	Mar. 23	do	Present.
39	Mar. 24	do	Present.
40	Mar. 29	do	Present.
41	Mar. 30	Conference report on H. R. 8224, to reduce excise taxes. (Adopted, 395 to 1)	Aye.
42	Mar. 31	Quorum call	Present.
43	do	Motion to recommit H. R. 8583, independent offices appropriation bill, with instructions to insert provision to prevent the Federal National Mortgage Association from selling mortgages below par value. (Rejected, 180 to 214).	No.
44	Apr. 1	Quorum call	Present.
45	Apr. 2	do	Present.
46	do	Motion to recommit H. R. 7839, to aid in provision and improvement of housing, and elimination and prevention of slums, with instructions to add provision for 35,000 low rent public housing units for each of next 4 years. (Rejected, 176 to 211.)	No.
47	do	H. R. 7839, aid in provision and improvement of housing and elimination and prevention of slums by encouraging private enterprise in building. (Passed, 352 to 36.)	Aye.
48	Apr. 5	Quorum call	Present.
49	Apr. 7	do	Present.
50	Apr. 8	do	Present.
51	do	Willis substitute amendment to H. R. 8649, to authorize admission into evidence of wiretap information in cases involving traitors, saboteurs, and spies, requiring prior court order for wiretapping. (Adopted, 221 to 166.)	No.
52	do	H. R. 8649, to authorize, upon order of Federal courts, admission into evidence of wiretap information in cases involving prosecution for traitors, saboteurs, and spies. (Passed, 377 to 10.)	Aye.
53	Apr. 12	Quorum call	Present.
54	Apr. 14	do	Present.
55	Apr. 27	do	Present.
56	Apr. 28	do	Present.
57	Apr. 29	do	Present.
58	do	H. R. 8873, Department of Defense appropriation bill for 1955 fiscal year, containing $28,700,000,000. (Passed, 377 to 0.)	Aye.
59	May 5	Quorum call	Present.
60	do	do	Present.
61	May 6	Motion to recommit (kill) S. 2150, providing for creation of the St. Lawrence Seaway Corporation. (Rejected, 157 to 242)	No.
63	do	S. 2150, providing for creation of the St. Lawrence Seaway Corporation. (Passed, 241 to 158)	Aye.
64	May 10	Quorum call	Present.
65	do	do	Present.
66	do	Motion to strike enacting clause of H. R. 2556, to permit extradition of certain fugitives from United States to countries occupied by United States jointly with 1 or more other powers. (This action killed the bill.) (Carried, 228 to 68.)	No.
67	May 11	Quorum call	Present.
68	do	H. Res. 533, citing Bernhard Deutch for contempt of the House of Representatives for failure to answer questions before the Committee on Un-American Activities. (Agreed to, 346 to 0.)	Aye.
69	May 12	H. R. 9040, to authorize cooperative research in education. (Passed, 296 to 55)	Aye.
70	do	H. Res. 532, the rule providing for consideration of H. R. 7434, to establish a National Advisory Committee on Education. (Adopted, 194 to 140.)	Aye.
71	May 13	Quorum call	Present.
72	do	H. R. 7434, to establish a National Advisory Committee on Education. (Passed, 179 to 157)	Aye.
73	May 19	Quorum call	Present.
74	do	H. R. 7601, to provide for a White House Conference on Education to be held prior to November 30, 1955. (Passed, 269 to 60)	Aye.
75	May 26	Quorum call	Present.
76	do	H. R. 9242, to authorize construction at military and naval installations in amount of $877,000,000. (Passed, 345 to 0)	Aye.
77	June 1	H. Res. 568, closed rule providing for 3 hours of debate on and waiving points of order against H. R. 9366, to amend the Social Security Act. (Adopted, 270 to 76).	Aye.
78	do	H R. 9366, amending the Social Security Act, to extend coverage under old-age and survivors insurance program, increase benefits preserve insurance rights of disabled individuals and increase earnings permitted without loss of benefits. (Passed, 355 to 8).	Aye.
79	June 9	Quorum call	Present.
80	June 11	H. Res. 580, providing for the consideration of H. R. 9474, to extend the authority of the President to enter into reciprocal trade agreements for 1 year. (Adopted, 273 to 63).	Paired For.
81	do	H. R. 9474, to extend the authority of the President to enter into reciprocal trade agreements for 1 year. (Passed, 281 to 53)	Paired For.
82	June 14	Quorum call	Present.
83	June 15	O'Hara amendment to H. R. 9517, making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia, which amendment was to fix the Federal payment to the District at $20 million, instead of $16 million. (Adopted, 186 to 168).	No.
84	June 16	Quorum call	Present.

Voting record—1954—Continued

Roll call No.	Date	Identification and result of vote	My vote
85	June 16	Motion to recommit H. R. 8729, to extend for 2 years the authority of the Federal Reserve banks to purchase securities directly from the Treasury in amounts not to exceed $5,000,000,000 outstanding at any one time, which motion would require the Government to use cash that is now in banks before borrowing. (Rejected, 80 to 250.)	No.
86	June 17	Quorum call	Present.
87	do	H. Res. 583, providing for disagreement to Senate amendments to and sending to conference of H. R. 7839, proposed Housing Act of 1954. (Adopted, 360 to 19.)	Aye.
88	June 28	Quorum call	Present.
89	June 29	S. Con. Res. 91, to express the sense of Congress on interference in Western Hemisphere affairs by Soviet Communists. (Adopted, 372 to 0.).	Aye.
90	June 30	Quorum call	Present.
91	do	Vorys amendment to H. R. 9678, Foreign Assistance Extension Act of 1954, stating it to be the sense of Congress that no funds should be used for governments which are committed by treaty to maintain Communist rule over any defined territory of Asia. (Adopted, 389 to 0.)	Aye.
92	do	H. R. 9678, Foreign Assistance Extension Act of 1954, authorizing $3,400,000,000 in assistance to friendly nations. (Passed, 260 to 126.)	No.
93	do	Quorum call	Present.
94	July 1	do	Present.
95	July 2	do	Present.
96	do	Harrison amendment to H. R. 9680, to continue price supports for agricultural products, augment marketing and disposal of such products, and provide greater stability for agriculture; which amendment provided flexibility in price supports from 82½ percent to 90 percent of parity for basic commodities. (Adopted, 228 to 170.)	Aye.
97	July 8	H. R. 9640, to amend the Vocational Rehabilitation Act to extend and improve the vocational rehabilitation services, provide for more effective flexible use of Federal funds, and increase the authorization for the President's Committee for Employing the Physically Handicapped. (Passed, 347 to 0.)	Aye.
98	do	Motion to recommit H. R. 9607, to extend and improve the unemployment compensation program, with instructions to increase the benefits and provide 26 weeks of coverage by Federal mandate. (Rejected, 109 to 241.)	No.
99	do	H. R. 9607, to extend and improve the unemployment compensation program by including 4 million workers not now covered, employers of 4 or more employees in each of 20 weeks per year, and Federal civilian employees. (Passed, 309 to 36.)	Aye.
100	do	H. R. 9580, to strengthen the internal security of United States by amending statutes relating to espionage, sabotage, and registration of foreign agents. (Passed, 323 to 0.)	Aye.
101	July 12	Quorum call	Present.
102	July 13	H. Res. 623, providing for the consideration of H. R. 8356, health service prepayment plan reinsurance bill, waiving points of order. (Adopted, 274 to 88.)	Aye.
103	do	Motion to recommit H. R. 8356, health service prepayment plan reinsurance bill. (Agreed to, 238 to 134.)	No.
104	July 15	Quorum call	Present.
105	do	H. Res. 627, reiterating the opposition of the House of Representatives to the seating of the Communist regime in China in the United Nations.(Adopted, 381 to 0.)	Aye.
106	July 20	Quorum call	Present.
107	do	Motion to recommit the conference report on H. R. 7839, the Housing Act of 1954, with instructions to include a provision for 140,000 new units of public housing over a 4-year period in lieu of 35,000 new units for fiscal year 1955. (Rejected, 156 to 234.)	No.
108	do	Conference report on H. R. 7839, the Housing Act of 1954. (Adopted, 358 to 30.)	Aye.
109	July 21	H. R. 9888, extending the time for initiating training under the Korean GI bill of rights from 2 years to 3 years from induction date. (Passed, 399 to 0.)	Aye.
110	do	H. R. 9020, granting a 5 percent increase in compensation and pension to veterans of all wars and to their dependents. (Passed, 399 to 0.)	Aye.
111	do	H. R. 9245, providing for postal pay increases, amended to provide for postal rate increases and reclassification of employees. (Failed, 228 to 171, a two-thirds majority being necessary for passage under suspension of rules.)	Aye.
112	July 22	Quorum call	Present.
113	July 23	H. Res. 664, citing Bolza Baxter for contempt of the House of Representatives by refusal to answer questions before the Committee on Un-American Activities. (Adopted, 376 to 0.)	Aye.
114	do	Quorum call	Present.
115	July 24	Cole amendment to H. R. 9757, Atomic Energy Act of 1954, substituting a requirement that showing be made that patentable idea was not developed while employed by AEC, for compulsory licensing of patents. (Agreed to, 203 to 159.)	Aye.
116	July 26	Quorum call	Present.
117	do	Motion to recommit H. R. 9757, the Atomic Energy Act of 1954. (Rejected, 165 to 222.)	No.
118	do	H. R. 9759, the Atomic Energy Act of 1954. (Passed, 231 to 154.)	Aye.
119	July 27	Quorum call	Present.
120	July 28	H. R. 10051, the Mutual Security appropriation bill for 1955, totaling $2,895,944,000. (Passed, 266 to 128.)	No.
121	do	Motion to recommit the conference report on H. R. 8300, Tax Revision Act of 1954, with instructions to delete sec. 34, providing credit against the income tax of an individual of a percentage of the dividends received from certain domestic corporations. (Rejected, 169 to 227.)	No.
122	do	Conference report on H. R. 8300, Tax Revision Act of 1954. (Adopted, 316 to 77.)	Aye.
123	do	Quorum call	Present.
124	do	H. Res. 626, providing for the consideration of H. R. 236, to authorize the construction of the Fryingpan-Arkansas project, Colorado. (Rejected, 188 to 196).	Aye.
125	July 29	H. R. 9756, increasing the borrowing power of the Commodity Credit Corporation from $8,500,000,000 to $10,000,000,000. (Passed, 317 to 57).	Aye.
126	do	H. Con. Res. 265, fixing Saturday, July 31, for sine die adjournment. (Rejected, 183 to 193)	Aye.
127	do	Quorum call	Present.
128	July 30	do	Present.
129	do	H. R. 7840, to increase railroad retirement benefits and taxes, and amend the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act. (Passed, 360 to 0)	Aye.
130	do	H. R. 9666, to include hardboard in the tariff schedules relating to wood and manufacturers of wood. (Passed, 235 to 109)	Aye.
131	do	H. Con. Res. 266, fixing Saturday, July 31, for sine die adjournment. (Agreed to, 179 to 167)	Aye.
132	do	H. R. 8384, to authorize the construction of the Talent division of the Rogue River Basin reclamation project, Oregon. (Passed, 163 to 144).	Aye.
133	Aug. 3	Quorum call	Present.
134	Aug. 4	do	Present.
135	do	S. 16, authorizing Federal courts to grant immunity from prosecution to witnesses who testify before either House of Congress on its committees. (Passed, 293 to 55).	Aye.
136	Aug. 9	Quorum call	Present.
137	do	Motion to discharge the Committee on Rules from further consideration of H. R. 9245, postal workers pay raise bill. (Agreed to, 348 to 29)	No.
138	do	H. R. 9245, postal workers pay raise bill. (Passed, 352 to 29)	No.
139	do	H. Res. 687, providing for consideration of S. 2033, relating to the labeling of packages containing foreign-produced trout sold in United States, and requiring certain information to be posted in public eating places serving such trout. (Agreed to, 209 to 159.)	Aye.
140	do	Motion to reconsider the conference report on H. R. 9678, Foreign Assistance Act of 1954. (Rejected, 97 to 266.)	Aye.
141	Aug. 16	Quorum call	Present.
142	do	S. 3706, to amend the Subversive Activities Control Act to provide for determination of identity of certain Communist-infiltrated organizations, and to outlaw the Communist Party. (Passed, 305 to 2.)	Aye.
143	Aug. 17	Quorum call	Present.
144	do	Motion to instruct House conferees on S. 3706, to amend the Subversive Activities Control Act, to provide for determination of identity of certain Communist-infiltrated organizations, to agree to Senate amendments to House amendments to the bill. (Adopted, 208 to 100.)	No.
145	Aug. 19	Conference report on H. R. 10051, foreign assistance appropriation bill for 1955. (Adopted, 188 to 77.)	No.
146	do	Motion for the previous question on Taber motion to recede and concur with an amendment on Senate amendment No. 31 to H. R. 10051, foreign assistance appropriation bill. (This amendment included proviso requiring 80 percent of foreign currencies generated by our aid to Spain to be for development of civilian economy, instead of 60 percent being available for military construction, as provided by our treaty. Adoption of motion for previous question prevented my motion to strike proviso.) (Adopted, 186 to 76.)	No.
147	do	Conference report on S. 3706, to amend the Subversive Activities Control Act, to outlaw the Communist Party, and provide for the determination of the identity of certain Communist-infiltrated organizations. (Adopted, 265 to 2.)	Aye.
148	Aug. 20	Motion to recommit conference report on H. R. 2236, for the establishment of a Commission on Area Problems of the Greater Washington Metropolitan Area, to study transportation problems. (Rejected, 95 to 164.)	Nay.

Statement by Hon. Stuart Symington, of Missouri

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STUART SYMINGTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, Because of the drought in Missouri, farmers in my State need action now under S. 3137, the extension of the Water Facilites Act of August 28, 1937. This bill has now been signed by the President and is Public Law 597.

Provisions of this law should be made immediately available to drought-stricken farmers.

Since this legislation is now public law, the benefits of this legislation should be made immediately available. Further delay seems inexcusable.

Despite the immediate need, however, Mr. R. B. McLeaish, Administrator of the Farmers' Home Administration, has just written me that it will be approximately 30 days from date of signature by the President before the rules and regulations will be issued.

This means it will be the latter part of September before the county FHA supervisors will be in a position to receive and process applications for loans.

The basic provisions of S. 3137 are not new. Loans for development of facilities for water storage and utilization have been made in the arid and semiarid States of the United States since August 28, 1937.

As the farmers in Missouri and other Midwestern States suffered the ravages of drought, they repeatedly requested that the provisions of this act be made available for them.

On March 10, 1954, True D. Morse, Under Secretary of Agriculture, wrote to the President of the Senate, submitting a proposed bill to make this assistance available throughout the Nation. On March 16 Senator AIKEN introduced the bill S. 3137.

The bill was reported by the Senate Agriculture Committee on May 17, and was passed by the Senate on May 24, and by the House with amendments on July 27. The Senate agreed to the House amendments July 28.

On August 5 the bill was sent to the President.

In view of the history of this legislation and the fact that the basic provisions had the approval of the Department of Agriculture more than 5 months ago, and the last amendments were adopted nearly a month ago, it is difficult to understand why the necessary instructions and regulations are not ready now.

Mr. President, at this point in my remarks I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD a letter which I wrote to Mr. McLeaish on August 19; a copy of his letter dated August 17; a copy of my letter to Mr. McLeaish dated August 9; and a copy of a letter from Mr. McLeaish dated July 28, 1954, received by the Honorable PAUL C. JONES, Congressman from Missouri's Tenth District.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT
OF AGRICULTURE,
FARMERS' HOME ADMINISTRATION,
July 28, 1954.

Hon. PAUL C. JONES,
House of Representatives.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN JONES: This is in response to your letter of July 21 regarding the extension of the Water Facilities Act now being considered by the Congress.

The amendment to the act being considered by the Congress provides for loans for soil- and water-conservation measures for the installation of water facilities. These loans may be made as direct Government loans or insured by the Government in the same maner as loans are now insured under the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act. As the result of these new features, present policies and procedures for making water-facilities loans will have to be revised extensively to provide for the making and servicing of both direct Government loans and insured loans. At the present time the new features are being studied carefully, and the new policies and procedures are being developed. It is expected that within approximately 30 days after the bill is signed by the President the Farmers' Home Administration will be in a position to announce the new program to the public and to its field officials.

The program will be administered by the Farmers' Home Administration through its State and county offices. Each agricultural county of the country is served by a county office of the Farmers' Home Administration, with a county supervisor in charge. Farmers who are interested in receiving assistance under the program will file their applications with the county supervisor.

You will observe, from the enclosed pamphlet entitled "Loans for Water in the West," which briefly explains the water facilities program as it is presently administered by the Farmers Home Administration, that farmers are expected to pay as much of the cost of the facilities from their own funds as they are able. However, these loans have been made for 100 percent of the cost of facilities when it appears that applicants are carrying on sound farming programs and have some equity in their property after providing reasonable security for the loans.

The enclosed pamphlet states that the interest rates on water facilities loans is 3 percent. Under the present act and the proposed amendment, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to fix the rate of interest on insured loans. It provides, however, for a loan insurance charge of not less than 1 percent on outstanding principal balances. In view of this provision, the interest rate on both direct loans and insured loans likely will be between 4 percent and 5 percent.

If we can furnish you additional information, we shall be pleased to do so upon your request.

Sincerely yours,
R. B. MCLEAISH,
Administrator.

AUGUST, 9, 1954.

Mr. R. B. MCLEAISH,
Administrator, Farmers Home Administration,
Department of Agriculture,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MCLEAISH: As I am sure you are aware, thousands of farmers in Missouri, suffering as they are from the third straight year of drought, are intensely interested in the Water Facilities Act as amended by the Congress.

It is our understanding from conversations with your office that it will take approximately 30 days after the bill is signed by the President before the Farmers Home Administration will be in a position to make available the provisions of the new program to the public.

As shown by a recently completed survey of the State by Dr. Edward L. Clark, State geologist, 56 counties in Missouri are in critical to bad condition and 22 are in only fair condition, insofar as water supplies are concerned.

More than 200 well drillers in Missouri now have a big backlog of orders for wells as soon as information is ready on these loans. Thousands of other farmers will order wells drilled just as soon as they are sure they can obtain the financial backing for this purpose.

In many sections of Missouri the hauling of water became a commercial business in recent weeks. Much of this would not have been necessary had it been possible for the drought-stricken farmers to drill wells or install other water facilities.

For the above reasons I urge that everything possible be done to expedite provisions for the new water-facilities program in Missouri and will appreciate your keeping my office informed as steps are taken to this end.

With kind regards, I am,
Sincerely yours,
STUART SYMINGTON.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT
OF AGRICULTURE,
FARMERS' HOME ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., August 17, 1954.

Hon. STUART SYMINGTON,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR SYMINGTON: This is in reply to your letter of August 9 regarding the critical condition of the water supply and the interest of farmers in Missouri in the proposed amendment of the Water Facilities Act, which is now on the President's desk.

When it became apparent the bill would likely become law, present policies and procedures for making water facilities loans were examined to determine revisions that would be required to provide for making and servicing of both direct Government loans and insured loans. New policies and procedures are being developed as rapidly as possible. It is expected that within approximately 30 days after the bill is signed by the President, rules and regulations will be issued and county supervisors will be in a position to receive and process applications for loans.

We will be glad to keep you informed of the progress made in expediting provisions for the water facilities program in Missouri.

Sincerely yours,
R. B. MCLEAISH,
Administrator.

AUGUST 19, 1954.

Hon. R. B. MCLEAISH,
Administrator, Farmers' Home Administration, Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MCLEAISH: This is to acknowledge receipt of your letter of August 17, replying to mine of August 9.

On March 15, Senator AIKEN introduced a bill to extend the Water Facilities Act. It was passed by the Senate on May 24 and by the House on July 27. The House changes were adopted by the Senate on the next day and it went to the President for signature on August 5.

The water-supply emergency in Missouri has been fact for months and such fact has been fully known to the Department of Agriculture. As you know, I have been urging action for some time.

On July 28, in a letter to Congressman PAUL C. JONES, you stated that your program would be ready within approximately 30 days after the bill is signed by the President. That meant you would be prepared to act on or about the 28th of this month.

Since the purpose and major provisions of the bill have been known to you for months, it was difficult to understand why the necessary instructions and procedures could not have been ready in anticipation of the President's action.

However, you advise that it will take still another 30 days after presidential signature—which has not yet taken place.

This delay appears to me to be inexcusable, in face of the dire distress of thousands of American farmers. I would be interested in knowing the cause of the delay. I would be even more interested in learning that you have changed your plans and will act immediately upon learning of presidential action on this bill.

Sincerely,

STUART SYMINGTON.

The Record of the "Do Something" 83d Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. BROWNSON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. BROWNSON. Mr. Speaker, the constructive record of the 83d Congress is proof that the Congress and the President can work together. This successful cooperation between the executive and the legislative is in marked contrast to the bitter struggles which have been so evident in previous administrations with almost disastrous results to our national welfare.

With mutual respect and a shared goal great enough to command a common loyalty, President Eisenhower and the Republican 83d Congress have succeeded in reversing long standing trends toward higher and higher spending, have overhauled income tax laws and reduced income taxes, and have accomplished the happy transition from war to peace with minimum disturbance of the economy, now virtually free of shackling controls.

The theme of this cooperative effort on the part of Congress and the White House is best expressed in the simple philosophy of President Eisenhower as I heard him state it at the Lincoln's Birthday rally in Washington, this year. He said:

> In all those things which deal with people, be liberal, be human. In all those things which deal with the people's money or their economy, or their form of government, be conservative—and don't be afraid to use the word.

During the first 18 months of each term I have been given the privilege of presenting a weekly report to the citizens of the 11th Indiana District over radio stations WIBC, WIRE, and WISH. As the date of a campaign approaches this privilege is quite properly suspended. Because I believe that the folks back home are entitled to know in detail the accomplishments of the 83d Congress and exactly what part I played and how I voted on the major issues as their representative, I am making this report to them on this, the closing day of the second session of the House of Representatives.

This has been a Congress of constructive achievement. The people did get the change for the better they voted for in 1952. This has been a "can do" and a "will do" Congress. Its program has been neither New Deal nor ultrareactionary. On the whole, this Congress has wisely applied traditional American principles in working out thoughtful solutions to today's serious problems.

ECONOMIC AFFAIRS—SPENDING

The Republican 83d Congress appropriated, overall, $26 billion less to run the Government for 2 fiscal years than the last Democratic Congress appropriated in 1951 and 1952. In his first year in office President Eisenhower and the Congress cut over $12 billion from the budget President Truman submitted and emphatically said could not be cut.

Even though the Eisenhower budget requests for the last 2 years were about $23½ billion below those of the preceding Truman administration, Congress cut an additional $4.6 billion from his budget requests during the first session and trimmed an additional $2½ billion from the administration's estimates during the second session, which has just adjourned. Congress took $657 million from the President's requests for foreign aid, alone, in this year's economy drive.

These economies were effected by exercising rigid controls over spending, by reducing the Federal payroll by over 200,000 employees, by taking a new and realistic look at defense requirements, and through 14 reorganization plans submitted to the Congress by the President and considered in the House of Representatives by the Committee on Government Operations, of which I am a member and a subcommittee chairman.

As a "watch dog" committee charged with examining into the economy and efficiency of nonmilitary activities overseas, the International Operations Subcommittee was gratified to be singled out by Herbert Hoover for mention in his nationwide broadcast from the Government economy rally of the farm-city conference, May 25, 1954. In commenting on the Brownson subcommittee investigation of the construction of staff quarters in Germany during a previous administration, former President Hoover said:

> While the authorities can carefully watch efficiency and waste in Washington, their influence seems to decrease inversely with distance.

Working closely with the Appropriations Committee in cooperation with the Bureau of the Budget and the General Accounting Office, investigating committees of the Congress are credited by responsible students of the Government scene with major achievements in cutting Federal spending.

TAXES

In order to understand fully the significance of the 83d Congress actions in cutting excise, excess profits, and income taxes it is necessary to review briefly 20 years of recent history.

In the 20 years of Democratic Presidents there were many new taxes imposed, many tax rates raised and many tax exemptions cut. Direct tax collections from individual citizens went up from $427 million in 1933 to more than $30 billion—70 times as much. The individual was also paying the Federal Government more than 3 times as much tax on his automobile, twice as much tax on his gasoline, twice as much tax on his radio, 25 percent more tax on cigarettes, 50 percent more tax on his beer, and 10 times as much tax on liquor.

Between 1932 and 1952, personal income tax exemptions fell from $1,500 to $500. The "little man," for whom the Democrats profess so much sympathy, in 1952 paid seven times the income taxes he paid in 1933. World War II, the Korean police action, and the efforts of the New Deal to spend its way out of a depression were important factors in explaining some of these tax increases.

In these 20 years of tax increases, there were only 2 tax reductions. The first was when the excess-profits tax was allowed to lapse temporarily after World War II. The second was when the Republican 80th Congress balanced the budget and cut income taxes in 1948 over the veto of President Truman.

In contrast, the overall tax-cut program of the Eisenhower administration and the Republican 83d Congress, the greatest in all history, will save the citizens of the United States $7.4 billion every year. Of the total amount, individuals will receive an overall tax saving of nearly $4¾ billion. Most of the remainder will be translated into investments that will create more employment for more people.

The 10 percent reduction in Federal income taxes which went into effect last January 1 saves individual taxpayers a total of $3 billion annually. This tax cut would not have been possible if Congress and the administration had not cut the Truman budget for fiscal year 1954 by $12 billion. Nor would the $2 billion tax saving by elimination of the excess-profits tax have been possible without this budget cutting. It is significant that the 52 percent income tax on corporations had to be retained.

The Republican excise tax reduction law will save taxpayers nearly a billion dollars more a year by reducing the Federal tax on such every-day purchases as bus, train, and airplane tickets, household appliances, cosmetics, movie admissions, telephone calls, and telegrams.

The omnibus tax revision act will not only save taxpayers $1.4 billion, of which $827 million is for individuals, but will help millions of Americans by giving them fairer tax treatment than they now receive. This is the first complete revision of the Federal tax code in 75 years. It will help parents of dependent children who work, retired persons, and widows living on retirement income, farmers active in soil and water conservation and working widows and mothers with child-care expenses, persons receiving sick benefits, and those burdened with large medical expenses.

In signing the nearly 1,000-page measure, President Eisenhower said:

> I congratulate the Congress and its leaders for having enacted this monumental tax revision. * * * In addition to removing inequities in our tax system, this law will help our economy expand and thus add materially to the strength of our Nation. It will help our people produce better goods at cheaper prices—and it will help to create more jobs.

FARM POLICY

President Eisenhower sought to replace the wartime system of high, rigid price supports for farm products with a flexible, or sliding-scale, rule. The aim was to provide leeway for the Government to encourage production of needed crops by high-support prices and to discourage surpluses of others by dropping the support level. Specifically, the proposal was for authority to support prices of five basic commodities; wheat, corn, rice, cotton, and peanuts; between 75 and 90 percent of parity. Support at 90 percent was mandatory.

The House approved the flexible system but limited the range to 82.5 and 90 percent of parity for the first year. The Senate followed, five weeks later, with the same action.

It is interesting to note that throughout the entire United States only 20 percent of cash receipts to the farmer come from the 5 basic commodities affected by this legislation. In Indiana only 14 percent of the farmers cash receipts are derived from wheat, corn, rice, cotton and peanuts, but, 68 percent of agricultural cash receipts come from meat animals and dairy and poultry products for which price supported feeds are an element of cost.

A majority of Indiana farmers insist that the flexible system is the sensible solution to the growing problem of overproduction and costly Federal aquisition of surpluses.

TAFT-HARTLEY

The President, though accepting in spirit the Taft-Hartley Labor Act, nevertheless had promised to revise that act to meet some union objections. The bill that eventually issued from the Senate Labor Committee was not in fact an administration bill. It was a compromise that apparently did not totally please any faction.

On August 21 the New York Times described the result of the Senate action in the following words:

> The net of it was that the Democrats rose in great strength, all members of the party present standing together, and the measure was killed by vote of 50 to 42.
>
> Three Republicans, and the Independent, Mr. MORSE, joined the 46 Democrats against the bill as a motion of Senator LISTER HILL, Democrat, of Alabama, to send it back to committee. Forty-two Republicans were quickly overcome.

REMOVING GOVERNMENT COMPETITION

As a result of 20 years of big government, bureaucrats in Washington managed to poke their noses into over 100 different private business enterprises in competition with taxpaying small-business men. This was an almost inevitable result of the previous administration's theory of centralized power and the matching philosophy of tax and tax, spend and spend, elect and elect.

But President Eisenhower, his Republican administration and his Republican Congress brought a different policy to Washington—less government in business. The executive and the legislative branches are cooperating in a large-scale reduction of Federal commercial-type services and manufacturing operations, with accompanying cuts in the Federal payroll and budget. Up to now, it is estimated that the sale of the Government's commercial-type enterprises to private taxpaying owners would return as much as $40 billion to the Treasury.

Specific programs where marked progress has already been made include:

Sale of the Inland Waterways Corporation for $9 million.

Liquidation of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

Sale of Bluebeard's Castle Hotel in the Virgin Islands for $410,000. This is a 48-room luxury establishment built in 1934 as a New Deal public works project.

Disposal of tin and rubber facilities.

Closing of a uniform factory in the Brooklyn Navy Yard.

Reducing paint manufacturing.

Eliminating some sawmill operations.

Reducing coffee-roasting operations in the Armed Forces.

Returning certain airport control towers to city governments.

Eliminating certain mapmaking activities in the highway field.

Much of the exhaustive study on the problem of effectively eliminating Government competition with private enterprise has been undertaken by the House Committee on Government Operations, of which I am a member. Special credit should go to my colleague and fellow subcommittee chairman, Hon. CECIL M. HARDEN, of Indiana, whose work in this field has continued the efforts of the Bonner subcommittee, on which I served, and has attracted national attention.

The President, his Cabinet, and the Republican 83d Congress have accepted the challenge of Abraham Lincoln's definition of the proper function of government, first laid down on July 1, 1854, when he was an unsuccessful candidate for the United States Senate. The legitimate object of government is "to do for the people what needs to be done, but which they cannot, by individual effort, do at all, or do so well, for themselves."

HEALTH AND WELFARE

HOUSING

The heart of the President's housing program was the liberalization of FHA home mortgage loan terms and the construction of 35,000 new low-rental public-housing units every year for 4 years. Slum-clearance measures were also recommended.

The 83d Congress did liberalize the program for insurance of loans for home building and home improvement. Included in the law was the Brownson amendment, the only amendment passed by the House, which ultimately provided for reducing downpayments required on new housing from $2,000 on a $10,000 house to $700, with authorization for the President to reduce these requirements further to $500 at his discretion. This should provide an expanded market for new-home construction and make it possible for many veterans who have used up their GI loan privileges to trade in the equity they now have in a small house as downpayment on a larger home to meet the space requirements of expanding families.

Public housing was limited to 35,000 units for a single year. While this is at the rate of construction requested by the President, some critics have stated that restricted language in the bill makes attainment of the full number of starts doubtful. Administration supporters generally believe that the omnibus housing bill will result in additional employment in the building industry, increase the numbers of low-cost housing units built by private enterprise, and tighten up the loopholes which made possible the FHA scandals of the previous administration that have come to light during the past year.

HEALTH

Congress approved two major items in President Eisenhower's health program. These were bills granting Federal money to the States to help build diagnostic and treatment centers, rehabilitation facilities and nursing homes and expanding the vocational rehabilitation plan.

One major proposal for health legislation was killed in the House. It was a plan to set up a $25 million Federal fund to reinsure private, voluntary health insurance policies involving exceptional risks not ordinarily covered now. This plan received support from many medium and smaller sized insurance companies and Blue Cross groups. It was opposed by the American Medical Association at the last minute.

The defeat of this plan was a blow to the President from the Democrats who opposed it with an almost solid bloc of 162 votes, many from the same Congressmen who were most enthusiastic in support of the Ewing socialized medicine proposals. The bill fell under a strange crossfire. On the one side, ultraconservatives in both parties claimed it approached socialism. On the other side, New and Fair Deal Democrats spurned the Eisenhower approach as altogether too tame for them.

SOCIAL SECURITY

In this field, the 83d Republican Congress gave the President a victory that was in strictly human terms the most significant of his administration. Feeling that it was time the Republicans put some gold in the gold painted brick called social security. Congress allowed the rate to rise, raised the base from $3,600 to $4,200 and extended the protection of old-age pensions and survivors insurance to 10 million additional Americans. Beginning in October the 6.3 million now receiving old-age and survivors benefits will get from $5 to $13.50 more in their monthly checks.

This was not a contentious issue. In the House both parties overwhelmingly approved the administration's proposal, in fact the vote was 355 to 8. Nowhere during the long discussion of this issue was there a significant and informative record vote. The 83d Congress also broadened the unemployment compensation system to cover Federal employees and workers in thousands of small business establishments and reaffirmed the principle of State control of these funds. After December 31, 1955, the law will apply to employers of four or more workers, extending protection to nearly a million more employees.

VETERANS

Besides providing generously for the operations of the Veterans' Administration and its hospitals, the 83d Congress approved a 5 percent increase in service-connected disability compensation to 2 million eligible veterans and increased pensions and compensation of widows and dependent parents.

A 1-year extension during which Korean veterans are eligible to start and complete GI-bill training under Public Law 550, 82d Congress was approved.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

FOREIGN AID

The foreign-aid program was extended for another year, but the President's request for nearly $3.5 billion was cut by the Congress to just over $2.7 billion, as compared with the $4.5 billion appropriated last year. Included in the authorization law was the strong request that the President explain the situation to Congress if Red China is admitted to the United Nations.

FOREIGN TRADE

Here the Congress gave the President considerably less than he had requested. On the basis of a study made for him by a special commission headed by Clarence B. Randall, an industrialist, he had strongly appealed for a 3-year extension of a reciprocal-trade, tariff-cutting program and had asked for authority to make further tariff reductions up to 15 percent. Congress voted a 1-year extension with no additional tariff-cutting power.

Part of the Atomic Energy Act permits limited exchange of atomic material and information with allies and thus becomes a foregin policy measure.

A treaty of mutual defense with South Korea cleared the Senate easily.

PUBLIC WORKS

HIGHWAYS

From the Roads Subcommittee of the House Committee on Public Works, of which I am a member, came a 2-year Federal-aid highway program authorizing $975 million annually for 1956 and 1957 to be spent in cooperation with the States. This is an increase of approximately $500 million in Federal moneys available annually to the States for road work and represents the return of virtually all of the Federal gasoline tax money to the States.

New emphasis is being placed on the interstate highway system establishing a new formula of 60 percent Federal funds and 40 percent State funds. Helpful to Indiana will be the new provision that half of the funds for interstate highways will be apportioned among the States in the ratio of each State's population to the national population.

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

Herbert Hoover and every President since has favored United States participation with Canada in building on the St. Lawrence River a seaway linking the Atlantic Ocean to the Great Lakes. This year a bill authorizing the seaway, the cost of which to the United States is indicated in this legislation to be about $105 million, was passed by the House, 241 to 158. In the Senate the vote was 51 to 33.

Although I originally supported the Dondero bill which provided for sale to private investors of seaway bonds, I opposed the Wiley bill in committee and on the floor of the House because I felt that the estimated $105 million represented only a fraction of the ultimate cost of the seaway to the taxpayers and because it seemed obvious that if the project had merit private investors would buy the bonds and eliminate this drain on the Treasury.

ATOMIC ENERGY

The President's request for legislation encouraging private enterprise to participate in the development of peacetime atomic power was bitterly contested by Democrats in a 13-day Senate filibuster. They predicted private monopoly of atomic power and high rates to users. But the measure, which also authorizes fuller international cooperation in atomic-energy matters, was passed by both Houses.

ANTISUBVERSION

Passage of legislation to outlaw the Communist Party, to grant witness immunity, to make peacetime espionage and sabotage punishable by death, and to provide for citizenship forfeiture, was enacted in the closing days of the 83d Congress. The President's request that evidence secured through wiretapping be made admissible passed the House and died in the Senate.

The bill outlawing the Communist Party declares as "findings of fact" that the Communist Party is an "instrumentality of a conspiracy to overthrow" the Government and is "the agency of a hostile foreign power." This bill also deprives the party of "the rights, privileges, and immunities attendant upon legal bodies created under the jurisdiction of the laws of the United States or any political subdivision thereof." Under this provision the Communist Party would be prohibited from holding bank accounts, obtaining enforcements of contracts in the court, or filing candidates for public office.

The anti-Communist bill also makes anyone "knowingly or willfully" a party member "subject to all the provisions and penalties of the Internal Security Act of 1950 as a member of a 'Communist-action' organization." In other words the new bill would require that party members must now register individually, regardless of whether the party itself ultimately registers. This legislation also provides that in determining whether a person is a Communist Party member, juries shall consider evidence under 14 headings including whether he is on a membership list, has contributed money to the party, has written, spoken, or otherwise carried out its orders, or indicated willingness to carry out its purposes.

EISENHOWER SCORES 0.830

Today the White House issued a list of 64 bills requested by the President, only 11 failed to pass. Figured as we are used to in computing batting averages, this would give him a percentage of 0.830. Last year President Eisenhower scored 0.727. This compares with President Truman's averages for the years 1947 through 1952 of 0.477, 0.457, 0.441, 0.442, 0.404, and 0.349.

Of the 64 measures listed by the White House as major legislation on the administration program for the second session, 7 were considered by the Senate only and did not reach the House for a vote.

The implementation of the remaining 57 programs required action in 84 instances by the House. Out of these 84 chances to support the administration's program, I voted with the President 72 times; against his program 8 times, and was absent 4 times. This gives me a batting average of 0.857 for the year. I voted against the administration program only 9.5 percent of the time and missed balloting on 4.8 percent of the issues on that official list.

So noncontroversial was much of the Eisenhower program that on 29 of the 84 votes which implemented the 64-item list no rollcalls were demanded. Considering only the 55 cases in which there were record votes, I supported the President 80 percent of the time and opposed his program only 14 percent of the time.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud of the record of the Eisenhower administration and of the 83d Congress. This has been a "Do-Something" Congress. Its program has been constructive and its accomplishments have been evolutionary rather than revolutionary. As the President said:

> The economic program being enacted by the present Congress marks a milestone in constructive legislation. It will help to reduce unemployment and to stimulate enterprise and development in all directions.

Do you remember 1952? That was the year when they told us, "You never had it so good." President Eisenhower comparing the first half of 1954 with the same period in 1952, President Truman's last year in office, said he found industrial production up 3.3 percent, the gross national production up 4.4 percent; nonagricultural employment up 1.1 percent; personal incomes up 7.2 percent; disposable personal income up 8.8 percent, per capita disposable income up 5.3 percent, and bank debits outside New York City up 10.2 percent.

The daring young men who came to Washington with President Roosevelt are old and tired and disillusioned now. All they can predict for the future of their great country is doom, disaster, and depression. They insist on campaigning again and again on the basis of a depression they were unable to lick until

World War II came along and bailed them out. Why, the Democrats in the Senate even killed the President's proposal to grant voting privileges to 18-years-old because they were afraid to trust anyone with the ballot who was so young he could not remember the last depression.

The record of the 83d Congress and the Eisenhower administration will speak for itself to people who are looking ahead toward the future. Under consent I include in the RECORD the following tabulation of the official list of major legislation on the administration program together with my voting record on each issue so that my constituents will know exactly where their Representative stood:

Voting record of Charles B. Brownson on major legislation of administration program

Item	Bill	Description	My vote	Date	Score
1	H. R. 7434	**Advisory Council on Education:**			
		Rule	Absent	May 12, 1954	Absent.
		Passage	Nay	do	Wrong.
2	S. 2475	**Agricultural surplus disposal:**			
		Passage	Yea (not record)	June 16, 1954	(Right.)
		Conference	Yea (not record)	June 30, 1954	(Right.)
3	H. R. 5337	**Air Force Academy, passage**	Absent	Jan. 21, 1954	Absent.
4	H. R. 9757	**Atomic Energy Act amendments:**			
		Patents	Yea	July 24, 1954	Right.
		Recommit	Nay	July 26, 1954	Right.
		Passage	Yea	do	Right.
5	H. R. 8658	**Bail jumping, passage**	Yea (not record)	July 21, 1954	(Right).
6	S. 2714	**CCC borrowing power, $6,750,000,000 to $8,500,000,000**	Yea (not record)	Mar. 5, 1954	(Right).
	H. R. 9756	**CCC borrowing power, $8,500,000,000 to $10,000,000,000**	Yea	July 29, 1954	Right.
7	H. R. 7130	**Citizenship forfeiture, passage**	Yea (not record)	July 21, 1954	(Right).
8	S. 3706	**Communist infiltration and outlawing Communist Party:**			
		Passage	Yea	Aug. 16, 1954	Right.
		Accept Senate amendment	Yea	Aug. 17, 1954	Wrong.
		Adopt conference report	Yea	Aug. 19, 1954	Right.
9	S. 16	**Compulsory Testimony or Witness Immunity Act, passage**	Yea	Aug. 4, 1954	Right.
10	H. R. 9040	**Cooperative research on education, passage**	Yea	May 12, 1954	Right.
11	H. R. 6665	**Cotton acreage adjustment marketing quotas, passage**	Yea (not record)	July 31, 1953	(Right.)
[1]12	H. R. 6584	**Customs valuation, passage.** (Died in Senate committee.)	Yea (not record)	July 30, 1953	(Right.)
13	H. R. 8097	**District of Columbia public works, passage**	Yea (not record)	Mar. 22, 1954	(Right.)
	H. R. 9517	**District of Columbia appropriations amendment to implement authorization passage**	Yea	June 15, 1954	Right.
14	H. R. 6672	**Debt limit increase:**			
		Recommit with instructions	Nay	July 31, 1953	Right.
		Passage	Yea	do	Right.
[1]15	S. 23	**Defense facilities protection.** (Died in Senate.)			
[1]16	S. J. Res. 53	**18-year-old voting:** Rejected in Senate (34 yeas, 24 nays; lacked required ⅔ majority. For: 27 Republicans, 7 Democrats; against: 0 Republicans, 24 Democrats) May 21, 1954.			
17	S. 3245	**Emergency farm loans, passage**	Yea (not record)	Aug. 4, 1954	(Right).
18	H. R. 9580	**Espionage and sabotage, passage**	Yea	July 8, 1954	Right.
19	H. R. 8224	**Excise taxes reduction:**			
		Recommit with instructions	Nay	Mar. 10, 1954	Right.
		Passage	Yea	do	Right.
20	S. 2308	**FBI investigation authority, passage**	Yea (not record)	Aug. 16, 1954	(Right.)
21	H. R. 9680	**Farm program, flexible parity amendment**	Yea	July 2, 1954	Right.
22	S. 3681	**Federal employees group life insurance, passage**	Yea (not record)	Aug. 3, 1954	(Right.)
23	H. R. 2263	**Federal employees fringe benefits, passage**	Yea (not record)	May 3, 1954	(Right.)
[1]24	H. R. 8860	**Foreign economic policy:**			
		Kean bill introduced			
		No action in House committee			
25	H. R. 7486	**Fugitive harboring, convicted felons, passage**	Yea (not record)	July 7, 1954	(Right.)
[1]26	H. R. 3575	**Hawaiian statehood:**			
		Recommit	Nay	Mar. 10, 1953	Right.
		Passage	Yea	do	Right.
		Senate included Alaska, House Rules Committee refused to send bill to conference.			
[1]27	H. R. 8356	**Health reinsurance, recommit**	Nay	July 13, 1954	Right.
28	H. R. 8127	**Highway Act extension, passage.** (I supported in subcommittee and in committee.)	Yea (not record)	Mar. 8, 1954	(Right.)
29	S. 967	**Hospital Survey and Construction Act amendment, passage**	Yea (not record)	Mar. 9, 1954	(Right.)
30	H. R. 7839	**Housing:**			
		Recommit with instructions	Yea	Apr. 21, 1954	Right.
		Passage	Yea	do	Right.
		Recommit conference report with instructions	Nay	July 20, 1954	Wrong.
		Adoption of conference report	Yea	do	Right.
31	Executive B	**International Sugar Agreement:** Executive treaty ratified by the Senate, House action not required.		Apr. 28, 1954	
32	Executive A	**Korean Security Treaty:** Executive Korea Mutual Defense Treaty ratified by the Senate, House action not required.		Jan. 26, 1954	
33	H. R. 6342	**Lease purchase, passage.** (I supported in subcommittee and in committee.)	Yea (not record)	July 24, 1953	(Right.)
[1]34	S. 3363	**Medical care military dependents.** (No committee action.)			
35	H. J. Res. 355	**Migratory labor, Mexican farm labor:**			
		Recommit	Nay	Mar. 2, 1954	Right.
		Passage	Yea (not record)	do	(Right.)
36	H. R. 9924	**Military Family Housing: Passage**	Yea (not record)	July 29, 1954	(Right.)
37	H. R. 9242	**Military Public Works: Passage**	Yea	May 26, 1954	Right.
38	H. R. 9678	**Mutual security program:**			
		Anti-Communist amendment	Yea	June 30, 1954	Right.
		Passage	Yea	do	Right.
		Recommit conference report	Nay	Aug. 9, 1954	Right.
	H. R. 10051	**Mutual security appropriations:**			
		Passage	Yea	July 28, 1954	Right.
		Adoption of conference report	Yea	Aug. 19, 1954	Right.
		Spanish amendment	Yea	do	Right.
39	H. R. 9245	**Postal rates, reclassification, pay adjustments:**			
		(Failed under suspension)	Yea	July 21, 1954	Right.
		Discharge Rules Committee	Yea	Aug. 9, 1954	Wrong.
		Passage	Yea	do	Wrong.
	H. R. 7774	Senate amendment	Yea (not record)	Aug. 20, 1954	(Wrong.)
40	H. R. 9474	**Reciprocal trade, passage**	Yea	June 11, 1954	Right.
41	S. 3539	**Reenlistment bonus, passage**	Yea (not record)	July 14, 1954	(Right.)
42	H. R. 6287	**Renegotiation Act, passage**	Yea (not record)	July 22, 1953	(Right.)
43	H. R. 9859	**Rivers, harbors, flood control, passage.** (I supported this bill in committee.)	Yea (not record)	July 26, 1954	(Right.)
44	S. 2150	**St. Lawrence seaway:**			
		Recommit	Yea	May 6, 1954	Wrong.
		Passage	Nay	do	Wrong.
		I offered an amendment in committee and in the House to amend this bill to provide for private financing to be repaid from tolls to save the taxpayers over $100,000,000. When this amendment was rejected I was forced to oppose the bill as fiscally unsound.			
45	H. R. 6276	**Ship Mortgage Act amendments**	Yea (not record)	June 7, 1954	(Right.)
46	S. 3546	**Ship repair, for merchant marine**	Yea (not record)	July 29, 1954	(Right.)
47	H. R. 9366	**Social-security program, amendments:**			
		Adoption of rule	General pair announced for.	June 1, 1954	Absent.
		Passage	General pair announced for.	do	Absent.

Footnotes at end of table.

Voting record of Charles B. Brownson on major legislation of administration program—Continued

Item	Bill	Description	My vote	Date	Score
48	H. R. 5173	State unemployment funds, recommit	Nay	July 8, 1953	Right.
[1] 49	S. 2650	Taft-Hartley Act amendments. Recommitted by Senate, 50 to 42, May 7, 1954. For recommital; 46 Democrats, 3 Republicans, 1 Independent; against recommital, 42 Republicans.			
50	S. 3458	Tanker construction, Navy charter	Yea (not record)	July 14, 1954	(Right.)
51	S. 2408	Tanker construction, trade in	Yea (not record)	July 6, 1954	(Right.)
52	H. R. 10009	Tariff schedule and customs simplification	Yea (not record)	July 26, 1954	(Right.)
53	H. R. 8300	Tax revision:			
		Recommit with instructions	Nay	Mar. 18, 1954	Right.
		Passage	Yea	do	Right.
		Recommit conference report with instructions	Nay	July 28, 1954	Right.
		Adoption conference report	Yea	do	Right.
[1] 54	H. R. 4440	Upper Colorado project			
		Never brought to vote in either House or Senate.			
55	H. R. 6788	Upstream flood control	Yea (not record)	Mar. 11, 1954	(Right.)
56	H. R. 9709	Unemployment insurance coverage:			
		Recommit with instructions	Nay	July 8, 1954	Right.
		Passage	Yea	do	Right.
57	H. R. 9020	Veterans compensation, passage	Yea	July 21, 1954	Right.
58	H. R. 9888	Veterans' education and training (Korean veterans), passage	Yea	do	Right.
59	H. R. 8152	Veterans home loan, passage	Yea (not record)	Mar. 24, 1954	(Right.)
60	H. R. 9640	Vocational rehabilitation, passage	Yea	July 8, 1954	Right.
61	S. 3103	War powers extension, passage	Yea (not record)	June 22, 1954	(Right.)
62	S. 3137	Water Facilities Act amendments, passage	Yea (not record)	July 27, 1954	(Right.)
63	H. R. 7601	White House Conference on Education, passage	Yea	May 19, 1954	Right.
[1] 64	H. R. 8649	Wiretapping, amendment requiring authorization by court order	Nay	Apr. 8, 1954	Right.
		Passage	Yea	do	Right.

[1] Defeat of administration program.

( ) Not a record vote.

Congressional Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SIDNEY R. YATES

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I am including in my report to my constituents letters on Captain Rickover to point out an important congressional activity. A Congressman does not concern himself only with legislation. He is the advocate and champion of individuals who are caught in the frightening and frustrating maze of the impersonal bureaucracy and endless redtape of big government. He may be called upon to help work out immigration difficulties, veterans needs, social-security adjustments, or he may suddenly be thrust into an almost hopeless case, as I was in the case of a Navy captain named Hyman G. Rickover.

A graduate of the Naval Academy, a Chicagoan, Rickover was the man who envisioned and planned the atomic submarine. His work was described by the Secretary of the Navy as "the most important in the history of the Navy." Yet for reasons unknown and undisclosed, the Navy twice refused to promote him to admiral, an action which Time magazine called "brazen prejudice." As a result he was faced with compulsory retirement at age 53.

I was asked to help Rickover and I agreed to do so. When he received his promotion to admiral, I felt I had made a real contribution.

I am also including in this report the following excerpts from a newsletter to my constituents on the atomic energy bill:

JULY 26, 1954.

ATOMIC ENERGY BILL

(Newsletter No. 156)

The atomic energy bill had just been called up for consideration in the House. Speaker JOE MARTIN and Majority Leader CHARLIE HALLECK were determined to bolster the flagging hopes of Republican Senators by driving the bill through the House in 1 day, and this they did. It was a sleepy 3:15 in the morning before we adjourned. Those of us who opposed the bill saw our efforts to correct its worst features defeated by the Republican majority voting solidly.

Perhaps the principal reason underlying opposition to the bill was the feeling that the $12 billion investment of the people of the United States in the development of atomic energy was being given away to a few companies whose vast wealth and resources permitted them to qualify to receive licenses. Even with respect to these giant corporations, the probability existed that they would have to be given additional subsidies for some time.

It seemed to me that the Government should not overlook the feasibility of requiring the payment of compensation for the valuable rights it granted, and I offered an amendment which would require the Atomic Energy Commission to take into consideration the payment of a franchise fee as a possible condition in the licenses it granted for the development of atomic energy for commercial purposes. I pointed out to the House that under the terms of the act, licenses could be granted for 40 years. "Certainly within that period of time," I said, "such fantastic progress will be made in the use and application of nuclear energy as will dwarf the pioneering efforts made thus far. * * * Should not the people of the United States who have already contributed so much to the development of atomic energy, and who are now asked to license their exclusive ownership to prospective developers, be paid compensation in the nature of royalties just as are the patentees for whose benefit the House has already adopted an amendment?" The amendment was rejected when Congressman COLE, Republican, of New York, who opposed my amendment, argued that the licensees would pay compensation through increased taxes. This caused Congressman ALBERT, Democrat, of Oklahoma, to murmur: "Well, give me a railroad and I'll pay taxes, too."

It's anybody's guess when Congress will adjourn. I hope our adjournment does not depend upon an occurrence similar to that of the city council meeting in California, which was disrupted by an earthquake. The councilmen hastily tumbled out of the building to safety, leaving only the clerk to conclude the meeting. He hesitated just long enough to write across his minutes: "On motion of the city hall, the council adjourned."

Your friend,

SIDNEY R. YATES,
Member of Congress.

Chicago Tribune Pays Tribute to President Eisenhower

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the Chicago Tribune has paid a great tribute to President Eisenhower which the American people will applaud. It comes at a time when the Congress is about to adjourn and the President can take pride in the achievements of his 83d Congress.

Included in these remarks is the editorial from the Chicago Tribune:

EISENHOWER'S VISIT

The crowds which greeted President Eisenhower on his visit to Illinois and the warmth of their welcome can leave no doubt that he is a popular President.

Mr. Eisenhower achieved this enviable place in public esteem without recourse to demagogic tricks. He generally talks sensibly. He has little or no gift for the rhetorical flourish and, tho he is fluent, he is not likely to be called eloquent by anyone who knows the meaning of words.

Mr. Eisenhower is not what is sometimes described as an inspired orator and that may be one important reason for his success in his public appearances. The people trust him because he doesn't seem to be acting a role but, on the contrary, conducts himself with the innate dignity and good sense of a competent executive.

The two audiences were about as different as two audiences can be. The one in Springfield was composed largely of partisan politicians and, for the rest, of citizens who had come expecting a partisan political speech. The other in Evanston was composed largely of distinguished churchmen from many corners of the world, eager for a word of encouragement in their search for church unity.

Though the two addresses were very different in form and content, it was the same man delivering them, a man of good will who faces the world and his tasks with courage and hope. He could tell the political audience with pride, but without boasting, of the achievements of his administration and of the Congress, then in its closing hours. He could make his attack on Senator PAUL DOUGLAS' gloomy prophecies the more effective for its humor and lack of rancor.

Then in Evanston he could perform the immensely useful service of reminding the leaders of many sects from many countries that the Government and the people he represents are the best of all evidences that close cooperation among men of varying backgrounds is not a day dream but an actual achievement of the American Nation. There is no divergence among the delegates at Evanston that cannot be matched by a divergence of race or creed in America, but American unity is a reality.

Mr. Eisenhower's popularity springs from the belief that he is a good man, a competent one, and "perfectly safe." He will not set the world ablaze with his eloquence, but the people will trust him, and that may be a good deal more useful to his country and his party.

What Is Aggression in Atomic Age?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. STERLING COLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following remarks made by me before the eighth annual national convention and Air Force reunion of the Air Force Association, held at the Hotel Fontenelle, Omaha, Nebr., August 20, 1954:

To come together with the members of this association would in any case be a real pleasure, and to address them here in the headquarters city of our magnificent Strategic Air Command is a high honor.

My remarks will be brief—they concern the implications of nuclear weapons for our national survival.

More than any other single factor of military strength, it is American air-atomic supremacy which has so far kept the Kremlin from launching an all-out bid for world domination. For this, our country must give heartfelt thanks to the men and women of our atomic energy program, and to all those who serve under Gen. Curtis LeMay. I salute him and all his associates in the Strategic Air Command.

Today, however, intercontinental atomic war can proceed in two directions. Soviet progress, both in the output of nuclear weapons and in the development of high performance delivery vehicles, has been unexpectedly, and appallingly, rapid.

It can nonetheless be contended that the threat of our atomic reprisal will suffice to stay the hand of the Kremlin. All of us fervently hope this will be so. Let us remember, however, that Tojo and Hitler suffered ultimate defeat—but not until they tested our resolve in the crucible of battle. It can be argued that, even if intercontinental atomic war should befall us, the destruction of New York would be answered by the destruction of Moscow and Leningrad. But a gutted building in a Russian city cannot compensate us for a gutted building in an American city.

Do not mistake the import of my words. The ability to answer a nuclear Pearl Harbor with a devastating counterblow must of course remain the military cornerstone of a national program for survival in this atomic age. No sensible person could recommend strengthening our passive defenses at the price of weakening our capacity to strike back against an aggressor. But atomic vengeance, standing by itself, is not enough. Our capacity to retaliate must now be coupled with a continental defense program of such scope and efficiency that our foes will know—in advance—that a nuclear attack can never bring this Nation to its knees.

I say this in a spirit of humility, and with a keen awareness of the heavy burdens and solemn responsibilities imposed upon those officials charged with providing for the common defense and security. It is one thing to say to these men: "Our existing continental defenses are inadequate." It is quite another thing to sit in their places and build defenses which are adequate.

The task of creating an effective continental defense may well represent the greatest and most difficult national-security problem ever faced by our country. Soviet air-atomic power is increasing at an accelerating rate. To answer its challenge, we need no less than a quantum jump in the effectiveness of our defenses against nuclear attack.

Some maintain that a continental defense system which could inflict large losses on enemy bomber formations is beyond our grasp. They hold that nuclear armaments have irrevocably tipped the unending contest between weapon and counterweapon in favor of the offensive. We cannot dismiss such arguments out of hand. Yet who could foretell, a short 15 years ago, the incredible story of atomic and hydrogen bombs? The art of developing new tools of defense—new electronic detection devices, new interceptors, and new antiaircraft missiles—is now in ferment. May it not therefore be that the continental defense problem—if attacked with all the vigor and boldness at our command—will yield unexpected solutions?

Thanks to the efforts of such distinguished Americans as my fellow guests, Mr. Donald Quarles and Dr. Mervin Kelly, the best scientific minds in our Nation are now being brought to bear on the problem of continental defense. The selection of Gen. Benjamin Chidlaw to head our newly established Continental Defense Command makes it certain that the military direction of this program will be in good hands.

To my way of thinking, the overriding problem we now face in continental defense is that of combining the human and material resources now devoted to this effort into an organizational and administrative structure of maximum efficiency. All three branches of our armed services have indispensable tasks in our program for detecting, intercepting, and destroying enemy bombing formations. In my mind, the logic of this fact has long called for creating, within our Armed Forces, a theater commander for continental defense. I was therefore deeply gratified when such a command was established earlier this month. My only regret is that we waited so long to take this step.

If it is logical to centralize the continental defense operations of the three services under a single commander, it impresses me as equally logical—and equally necessary—to have a single, high-ranking civilian official within the Department of Defense made responsible for the overall supervision of our continental defense effort. At present, no official has the exclusive responsibility of making sure that our continental defense preparations are moving forward with maximum dispatch. In an attempt to help correct what I deem a dangerous diffusion of responsibility in this field, it was recently my privilege to introduce a bill aimed at establishing a new position within the Department of Defense—an Assistant Secretary for Continental Defense, who—subject only to the direction of the Secretary of Defense—would be charged with the task of furnishing leadership and direction to our program for repelling nuclear attack.

Yet the case for a unified continental defense effort does not end here. We need only look at a polar-projection map to realize that, without the cooperation of our Canadian friends, we simply cannot engage in realistic defense preparations. In this era of near-sonic jet bombers, we must have it in our power to detect enemy aerial formations long before they reach the urban centers of North America. In the event of attack, it would be no less urgent to join battle with enemy bombers over the Arctic wastes and far out over the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans, than to confront our foes with successive barriers of defensive weapons. Yet neither detection-in-depth or interception-in-depth would be possible without the aid of our northern neighbors.

Today, Canadian-American continental defense cooperation proceeds through the mechanism of numerous advisory committees. But consultation is not the same as real coordination—it cannot substitute for a genuine unification of the continental defense efforts of our two nations.

I therefore again urge that, under the autority of the United Nations Charter, we now seek to enter into a mutual continental defense pact with Canada. Such a treaty would represent the continental defense equivalent of NATO. Under it, we could establish a North American continental defense organization, to which military units from our two nations could be assigned in a manner akin to the forces now reporting to SHAPE headquarters in Paris.

I concede that such a pact would represent a bold departure in defense planning. Yet we must acknowledge the new dimensions to sovereignty brought about by the threat of nuclear warfare.

Permit me to cite but one example of this. I am impressed by the arguments for building a distant early warning line in the far north of Canada, together with seaward extensions of such a line. Now assume for the moment that such an early warning system were actually in existence. Suppose the Sovients thereupon proceeded to test our nerves by repeated aerial feints against such a system. What if massive Soviet bomber formations, capable of carrying hydrogen weapons, were sent over the Atlantic and Pacific in so-called training flights. In the event of actual attack, every minute would be precious—the slightest delay in alerting our civilian population and military forces might make effective defense hopeless. Would we, therefore, evacuate our cities the moment Soviet planes entered our distant early warning net? Would the President immediately order the planes of our Strategic Air Command aloft? Or would we wait until the enemy formations neared our coastlines and our cities before issuing a general alert? I hardly need to spell out the extraordinary dilemma in which we might find ourselves. If we immediately responded to such repeated, large-scale feints by evacuating our cities, the Soviets might have it in their power to paralyze our economy and demoralize our population. If we did not instantly respond to approaching formations, however, we might be overwhelmed by an actual attack.

May it not therefore be that the time has arrived when we must consider the possibility of defining anew the concept of armed aggression? May it not be that the day is nearing when international law will be forced to take account of the realities of air-atomic power and the ever-present danger of nuclear sneak attack? May it not be that the time is approaching when the mere appearance of significant numbers of unannounced and unauthorized enemy planes within an early warning network would in itself constitute an act of aggression?

It is the nature of the crisis in which the world finds itself as a result of nuclear weapons that now compels me to explore such thoughts, which to me are distasteful but realistic. I need hardly to say that no such redefinitions of international law, even should they some day prove necessary, would bring us any real degree of military security. This is the last audience which needs to be told that military might, even atomic might, cannot by itself bring just and lasting peace to this troubled planet. All recorded history proves again and again that prolonged armament races end in war. Military deterring power can do no more than buy us time, time which must be used to build the only foundations upon which real and enduring peace can rest—a world community of human brotherhood and the respect of man for his fellow man.

Communists Greatest Threat to America Came During Hoover Depression

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 11, 1954

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I recently read with interest a letter to the editor in the open forum of the Ledger-Dispatch, of Norfolk, Va. The writer, a Mr. B. A. Banks, expressed a view I had frequently expressed in public addresses to the effect that communism posed its greatest threat to America during the administration of Herbert Hoover, when, as Mr. Banks puts it, the banks of the Nation began to topple like tenpins in a bowling alley, and when millions were walking the highways and byways looking for work, which was nowhere visible.

Mr. Banks sees things very clearly. I am certain if the young voters of the country had gone through the Hoover depression they would be a little fearful of the doubletalk and the high-pressure salesmanship the present administration is putting out to the public. I recall the statements of optimism on the part of Herbert Hoover in those days, and some of the things that are happening in high official places today bring back sad recollections of the Hoover depression.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I herewith include Mr. Banks' letter:

THE ENTERING WEDGE

EDITOR, LEDGER-DISPATCH:

According to press reports, former President Herbert Hoover declared in his Iowa address that "the entering wedge in America for the Communists" was due to "Democratic misuse of power" during the 20 years between his administration and the election of Dwight D. Eisenhower.

From Mr. Hoover's words it would appear that he is still scanning the political horizon for the dies irae, or the day of wrath so fervently predicted by him in 1932, when he assured the American people that with the election of Mr. Roosevelt grass would grow on the main streets of all our cities. While this prediction did not come true, today the American people know that Mr. Hoover's grass would have grown rank and lush had he been reelected.

Of course Mr. Hoover's charge that communism took hold in America under Democratic administrations is exacuated of all force when one reflects that the nearest the country ever came to seriously considering the possibilities of communism was under his regime, when the banks of the Nation began to topply like tenpins in a bowling alley, and when millions were walking the highways and byways looking for work which was nowhere visible.

When it is considered that communism is born of political inequality and tyranny and exists and germinates only where injustice is found; that it flourishes in the midst of misery and discontent, in the poverty of the masses, in the unemployment of the workers, in breadlines and soup kitchens, there is little doubt that the greatest impetus that Communist movement achieved in this countrytry was imparted to it by the Hoover administration, and the greatest blow it ever received in America was the defeat of Herbert Hoover for a second term by the late Franklin D. Roosevelt.

If this Nation was ever near chaos and communism and anarchy, it was when Mr. Roosevelt stepped into the White House. Rooseveltian democracy, and that alone, saved the Nation from communism and the hell of Hooverism.

By Mr. Roosevelt's recognition of the principle that "government is a contrivance of human wisdom to provide for human wants," he cured many of the causes of communism, and while it may not be dead in America, it can never attain strength or political potency so long as pure democracy remains in the ascendency in our country.

B. A. BANKS.

Hon. Edward J. Hart

SPEECH

OF

HON. BRENT SPENCE

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with his other colleagues in paying a tribute of affectionate regard and admiration to ED HART.

When he first came to Congress 20 years ago a mutual friend who had served here a long time said to me, "A new Member has come from New Jersey. You will hear from him. He speaks with fluency and eloquence and is a man of great capacity and sincerity." This prediction has been fulfilled for ED HART has grown in the admiration, respect and confidence of his colleagues through the years.

He has served his constituents with fidelity and with intense zeal. He became an outstanding chairman of a great committee. His splendid service to his district, State and Nation entitle him to their eternal gratitude; and with all he is a kindly, modest man who makes friends because he gives friendship. His fine disposition and good will have gained him an enviable place in the Congress of the United States. He is retiring of his own volition, and we all know that he could stay here as long as he desired.

We hope in his retirement that he may have all things which he desires, that he may have a long life, health, and happiness and may be showered with God's greatest blessings all his days.

Need for Bricker Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, a distinguished British Cabinet member has recently pointed out that in Britain all important treaties require approval by Parliament.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I shall include an editorial from the Chicago Tribune on this subject. Certainly there can be no good reason for not passing a proper constitutional amendment to safeguard the Nation against secret treaties and executive agreements in the next session of Congress.

The editorial follows:

TREATIES IN BRITAIN AND HERE

The American Bar Association has got it straight from the feedbox that Mr. Eisenhower, in opposing the Bricker amendment, wants a far more extensible power to make internal law for the United States through the treaty power than Britons are willing to allow their government. The particular irony of this business is that Britain, though it functions without a written or formal constitution, insists on constitutionality in the treaty process, whereas our Executive, though operating under a Constitution, seeks to use treaties to circumvent it.

British treaty procedure was outlined to the bar by David Maxwell Fyfe, Home Secretary in the British Cabinet. He is a qualified authority on British law who has held numerous official legal posts.

Fyfe said, first, that as Britain lacks a written constitution, there is no prescribed procedure for consummating a treaty. The treatymaking power is vested in the Crown—i. e., the Ministers who wield executive power. Yet, though no formal approval or ratification by Parliament is required, the British Government has become so aware of the desirability of a legislative check that the invariable practice now is to submit all important treaties to Parliament for approval, which takes the form of a statute permitting the treaty to become effective.

So far this does not vary materially from American constitutional procedure. The difference is that a British treaty, when ratified, does not of itself have the force of law. It overrides no existing British domestic law, not even a municipal law. The treaty is binding on the government; it is not binding on the British courts or people.

In the United States, to the contrary, a treaty is, under the Constitution, the "supreme law of the land," carrying a form superior to the constitutions and laws of the States. But, by decision of the Supreme Court, a treaty is of much greater force than the Constitution allows it. For the Court has held that a treaty need not be made "in pursuance of the Constitution," but only under "the authority of the United States"—that is, by the President and two-thirds of the Senators present and voting.

> Since the American treaty need not be in pursuance of the Constitution, it may therefore be used to fasten upon Americans provisions with force as "the supreme law of the land" which would otherwise not only be unconstitutional but which Congress is specifically enjoined under the Constitution from legislating. Thus the treaty power offers a means by which the powers of the National Government can be enlarged beyond what the Constitution grants.
>
> The Bricker amendment, in its present form, would protect against this abuse by specifying that a treaty or other international agreement would become effective as internal law only through legislation valid in the absence of a treaty. That is, no unconstitutional extension of domestic law would be possible merely by running it in under sanction of a treaty.
>
> It is this provision which has drawn particular fire from the Eisenhower internationalists. But Mr. Fyfe informs the American bar that this safeguard is of long standing in Britain. There, he says, if a treaty is in conflict with domestic law, the British Government must persuade Parliament to pass legislation modifying existing law or adopting new law so that the treaty may take effect. Otherwise, no British court will give effect to a treaty if its terms conflict with the law of the land.
>
> We suggest that these facts demonstrate the entire unreasonableness of opponents of the Bricker amendment. They insist on the right of the Executive to use treaties to undermine the Constitution. The British, with no written constitution, are far more scrupulous in demanding that no treaty be used to encroach upon the rights of Britons under domestic law. We should delay no longer in placing executive resort to the treaty power under firm constitutional restraint by adopting the Bricker amendment.

The Spirit of Liberty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SIDNEY R. YATES

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, the foundation for good democratic government is a well-informed people. "Know the truth and the truth shall make you free" is an American tenet as fundamental as love of liberty. The great American judge, Justice Learned Hand, described the American spirit in a moving and eloquent speech he made in 1944. He said:

> We have gathered here to affirm a faith, a faith in a common purpose, a common conviction, a common devotion. Some of us have chosen America as the land of our adoption; the rest have come from those who did the same. For this reason we have some right to consider ourselves a picked group, a group of those who had the courage to break from the past and brave the dangers and the loneliness of a strange land. What was the object that nerved us, or those who went before us, to this choice? We sought liberty; freedom from oppression, freedom from want, freedom to be ourselves. This we then sought; this we now believe that we are by way of winning. What do we mean when we say that first of all we seek liberty?
>
> I cannot define it; I can only tell you my own faith. The spirit of liberty is the spirit which is not too sure that it is right; the spirit of liberty is the spirit which seeks to understand the minds of other men and women; the spirit of liberty is the spirit which weighs their interests alongside its own without bias; the spirit of liberty remembers that not even a sparrow falls to earth unheeded; the spirit of liberty is the spirit of Him who nearly 2,000 years ago taught mankind that lesson it has never learned, but has never quite forgotten: That there may be a kingdom where the least shall be heard and considered side by side with the greatest.

Armed with the truth, exalted by the spirit of liberty, America must inevitably achieve fulfillment of its great democratic ideals.

Federal Government's Stake in Tobacco Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL T. DURHAM

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herein the following editorial which appeared in the Durham Morning Herald, Durham, N. C., August 20, 1954, entitled "Federal Government's Stake in Tobacco Industry":

> FEDERAL GOVERNMENT'S STAKE IN TOBACCO INDUSTRY
>
> Who is the chief beneficiary of the tobacco industry? Statistics recently released by F. M. Parkinson, executive director of the National Tobacco Tax Research Council, show that the Federal Government enjoys a greater income from tobacco than all the farmers who produce the crop or the manufacturers who process it.
>
> For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, Federal taxes on cigarettes yielded a return to the Federal Treasury of $1,513,740,000. Farmers who produced the tobacco used in cigarettes—flue-cured, burley, Maryland, and aromatic—received $550 million for their crop during the same period. The States which impose cigarette taxes received $494,587,000 from that source, almost as much as the farmers did. And municipal governments which levy cigarette taxes took in an additional $30 million from this tax. For over 30 years the Federal Government has received more income from the tax on cigarettes than the manufacturing companies have received for cigarettes.
>
> Mr. Parkinson's figures on tobacco taxes during the 9 years since the close of World War II are astronomical. The production of cigarettes reached the astounding total of 3,216,491,000,000, and on this more than 3 trillion cigarettes, taxes amounting to $15,184,000,000 were paid to Federal, State, and municipal governments. Approximately 9½ billion pounds of tobacco were required to make these cigarettes, and the farmers received for this tobacco approximately $4,800,000,000. Thus the taxes paid on cigarettes amount to more than three times as much as the farmer receives.
>
> The statistics on tobacco taxes show that the Federal Government makes more money on tobacco than anyone who works in it from its cultivation through its manufacture to its distribution. They suggest that tobacco bears a disproportionate tax burden and support Mr. Parkinson's claim that the decline in cigarette consumption (which was reversed in May) may be attributed in part to consumer protest against high cigarette taxes.

History of H. R. 7304, To Prevent Discrimination by Segregation in Interstate Commerce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. HESELTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, I deeply regret the events which made it impossible to secure a vote in the House on H. R. 7304. From conversations I have had with many of my colleagues I am convinced that it would have passed the House with a substantial majority. It is a most unfortunate instance of how a majority of the House can be deprived of their clear right to cast their votes on meritorious proposals which they favor.

Because of this and because of the many inquiries I have received as to the possibility of voting on the bill, I feel compelled to make a brief statement as to the facts.

I introduced H. R. 7304 on January 18, 1954. It was referred to the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, of which I am a member.

Public hearings were held on May 12, 13, and 14.

The bill, in a slightly amended form, was favorably reported to the House by a vote of 19 to 7 on July 21, 1954. On that date, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON], chairman of the committee, wrote the following letter:

> HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
> COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND
> FOREIGN COMMERCE,
> *Washington, D. C., July 21, 1954.*
>
> Hon. LEO E. ALLEN,
> *Chairman, Rules Committee,*
> *House of Representatives,*
> *Washington, D. C.*
>
> DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am attaching hereto a copy of the bill H. R. 7304—providing relief against certain forms of discrimination in interstate transportation—together with a copy of House Report No. 2480.
>
> The committee is very anxious to have this bill brought up promptly on the floor of the House, and I would appreciate it if you could arrange to set a date for the granting of such rule as promptly as possible.
>
> Sincerely yours,
> CHARLES A. WOLVERTON,
> *Chairman.*

No hearing was scheduled before the Rules Committee and no rule was granted as requested.

After it was announced on July 30 that suspensions would be in order on August 3, I conferred with Speaker MARTIN and told him I would like to be recognized to call up H. R. 7304. He said he would be very glad to recognize me.

However, under the procedures prevailing in the House in connection with suspensions, it is also necessary to receive the approval of the leadership on both sides. For this portion of the record I now quote certain questions asked of me and the replies I made in the House on August 4:

> Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I am very much interested in a bill which has been reported out of the Committee on Interstate and For-

eign Commerce, H. R. 7304. I know many of the members are anxious for that bill to come to a vote. It deals with the prohibition of segregation in interstate travel. I wonder if anyone could tell me what the situation is and what the prospects are of that bill coming to a vote.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I happen to be the author of that bill. It was reported out of my committee by a vote of 19 to 7. I am extremely anxious to have it come up for a vote, because I am convinced that an overwhelming majority of the Members of the House would like to vote on that bill. I am doing everything I can to bring that about, but I cannot give the gentleman any assurance at this time that it will be possible to do so.

Mr. HOWELL. Is there any chance of getting a rule on that bill?

Mr. HESELTON. I cannot answer that, either. We were told that the Committee on Rules has suspended meetings. I do not know whether that will be changed or not.

* * * * *

Mr. MCCARTHY. I understood it was to have been called up under suspension of the rules. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts know whether that plan has been changed or what will be necessary in order to bring it up?

Mr. HESELTON. I understand, in order to do that, it has to receive the approval of the leadership on both sides.

Since that time, with many others interested in this legislation, I consistently sought reconsideration so that either a rule could be granted or arrangements could be made for my recognition for a suspension. But all this was without success. However, again I want to pay a deserved tribute to Speaker MARTIN who did everything possible to assist me in my efforts.

Nevertheless, I believe much has been accomplished toward early enactment of this legislation. I shall refile the bill on January 5 next, when the 84th Congress convenes. Both the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON], and the ranking minority member, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST], have assured me that prompt hearing on the bill will be scheduled. In view of the understanding the committee has of the pertinent evidence and of the bill, an early favorable report can be expected. In connection with floor consideration, I recommend strongly that all who are interested in having this bill become law make their wishes known to the members of the Rules Committee and to the House leadership.

The report of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce is House Report No. 2480.

The text of H. R. 7304 as reported by the committee is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That all persons traveling within the jurisdiction of the United States shall be entitled to the full and equal enjoyment of the accommodations, advantages, and privileges of any public conveyance operated by a common carrier engaged in interstate or foreign commerce, and all the facilities furnished or connected therewith, subject only to conditions and limitations applicable alike to all persons, without discrimination or segregation based on race, color, religion, or national origin.

SEC. 2. It shall be unlawful for any common carrier engaged in interstate or foreign commerce, or any officer, agent, or employee thereof, to segregate, or attempt to segregate, or for any other person to aid or assist any such officer, agent, or employee in segregating or attempting to segregate, passengers using any public conveyance or facility of such carrier engaged in interstate or foreign commerce, on account of race, color, religion, or national origin of such passengers. Any such carrier or officer, agent, or employee thereof who unlawfully and willfully segregates or attempts to segregate such passengers on account of race, color, religion, or national origin, or any such other person who aids or assists any such officer, agent, or employee in segregating or attempting to segregate such passengers on such account, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and shall, upon conviction, be subject to a fine of not to exceed $1,000 for each offense, and shall also be subject to suit by the injured person in an action of law, suit in equity, or other proper proceeding for damages or preventive or declaratory or other relief.

H. R. 7304, the Necessity of Congressional Action in Order To Prevent Discrimination by Segregation in Interstate Commerce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN W. HESELTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, I know that there is a widely held impression that discrimination by segregation in interstate commerce has been eliminated. However, testimony before the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce in favor of H. R. 7304 contradicts any such impression. In connection with those hearings, I want to call attention to a most unfortunate incident of such discrimination as reported in Jet in its issue of August 12. It is stated that the pregnant wife of an Air Force serviceman was beaten unconscious with a night stick by a policeman in a southern State. Apparently, she refused to move from a sidewalk in front of a white bus loading section. The lady charged that the policeman first punched her in the side when she failed to carry out his orders, whereupon she struck him with her pocketbook. She states that the officer began flailing her over the head. As a result of this she was taken to the Air Force base hospital for treatment. It is more than regrettable—it is disgraceful that any such incident should occur anywhere in the United States. It points up the imperative necessity that Congress should recognize its clear responsibility in the enactment of legislation such as H. R. 7304 to prevent discrimination by segregation in interstate commerce.

In this connection, I want to make available an excellent article which appeared in the March–April issue, 1953, of New South. The title of the article is "Law Versus Practice in Interstate Travel."

While I agree that there is a clear responsibility on the part of both the railroads and the Interstate Commerce Commission to eliminate racial discrimination on interstate trains. I am convinced that the Congress itself has an equal responsibility to legislate in the field over which it has exclusive jurisdiction when the Supreme Court has so clearly held that such discrimination is unlawful and unconstitutional.

The article follows:

LAW VERSUS PRACTICE IN INTERSTATE TRAVEL

To the casual observer, no change in the segregation pattern seems more spectacular than that in interstate railway travel. Not long ago absolute segregation was the rule on all trains traveling through the Southern States. Today, on these same routes it is almost a rarity not to see at least a few Negroes scattered through the once all-white coaches, pullmans, and diners. It is even more of a rarity to encounter evidence of racial friction among the passengers. The new policies have been accepted by the public as matter-of-factly as the old ones.

But the uninitiated observer may miss a great deal. Seeing Negro and white passengers in the same cars, he may conclude that railway segregation is virtually a thing of the past. It would not likely occur to him to make his way forward to car 1. If he did, he might be astonished to find Negro passengers crowded into a "Jim Crow" coach, in the old tradition. And if he pursued his investigation further, he would discover that a host of discriminatory practices—some open, some subtle and indirect—still plague the Negro traveler.

A carefully documented report of these inequities has recently been issued by Dr. Herman H. Long of the race relations department, American Missionary Association, Congregational Christian Churches, at Fisk University. Entitled "Segregation in Interstate Railway Coach Travel," the report is based on the first-hand experiences and observations of field personnel, white and Negro, who kept careful records of approximately 28,000 miles of rail travel in 1949 and 1950. The result is something different from and more valuable than the usual indictment of segregation. Instead of broad arguments against segregation in general, we are given a detailed dissection of segregation practices in a specific field and their effects in human terms.

PERCENTAGES AND PEOPLE

This approach is especially useful because its puts the main emphasis on what happens to individuals rather than the group as a whole. In rail travel, as in other areas of public life, the practitioners of segregation have pitched their defense on the group basis. They have sought to show that, percentagewise, the Negro group has been allotted a fair share of space and facilities. But increasingly the critics of segregation have succeeded in demonstrating to courts and administrative bodies that the issue is not races and percentages, but discriminations suffered by individuals.

A good example is the Arthur W. Mitchell case, decided in 1941. Congressman Mitchell, a Negro, sued the railroad for denying him Pullman accommodations, although he held a first-class ticket. The company argued that all of the first-class accommodations set aside for Negroes were occupied and that the normal Negro demand was too limited to warrant setting aside more. The Supreme Court held that this defense was not valid, since the right to equal accommodations is a personal one and cannot be made contingent on the number of Negroes seeking it. "The comparative volume of traffic," said the court, "cannot justify the denial of a fundamental right of treatment, a right specifically safeguarded by the provisions of the Interstate Commerce Act."

FALLEN BARRIERS

This significant decision spelled the beginning of the end for discrimination in

Pullman travel. Today, there are few remaining barriers to first-class reservations by Negroes and those are mainly occasioned by the private prejudices of ticket agents or other railroad personnel. The same may be said of dining car facilities. Several court actions, culminating in the Henderson decision of 1950, established the principle that a passenger, of whatever race, must be served in due turn if there is an empty seat in the diner. It is not enough, said the court, to set aside separate facilities sufficient to accommodate the average number of Negro diners; for "it is no answer to the particular passenger who is denied service at an unoccupied place in a dining car that, on the average, persons like him are served."

COACHES UNTOUCHED

Dr. Long points out, however: "For the most part, the train facility that involves the largest segment of the passenger travel, coach accommodations, has been left untouched by these desegregation developments. Interstate railway carriers serving Southern areas still maintain, for the most part, completely disparate policies and practices toward Negro interstate passengers, even on the same train, depending upon whether they are first class or coach accommodations. The existence of state laws of segregation is no longer the absolute factor; they are made to apply in the operation of one set of practices and not to apply in another."

There is scarcely any legal basis for this distinction between first-class and coach accommodations. The Interstate Commerce Act, which governed in the Mitchell and Henderson cases, is clearly applicable to coach travel. It forbids public carriers in interstate commerce "to subject any particular person * * * to any undue or unreasonable prejudice or disadvantage whatsoever." In the Irene Morgan case, 1946, the United States Supreme Court held this to mean that the State of Virginia had no power to require segregated seating on motorbuses which operate across State lines.

"As there is no Federal act dealing with the separation of races in interstate transportation," declared the court, "we must decide the validity of this Virginia statute on the challenge that it interferes with commerce, as a matter of balance between the exercise of the local police power and the need for national uniformity in the regulations for interstate travel. It seems clear to us that seating arrangements for the different races in interstate motor travel require a single, uniform rule to promote and protect national travel."

LAST LEGAL DEFENSE

What applied to motor carriers could be assumed to apply equally to rail transportation. But the Morgan case left one question still unanswered: Is it lawful for interstate bus and rail lines to do what the States cannot do—that is, enforce regulations of their own requiring segregation? Only last November, the Supreme Court upheld a lower court decision outlawing such a regulation, in the case of *Chance* v. *Lambeth*. The suit was brought in 1948 by William Chance, a Negro school principal of Parmalee, N. C. While traveling as a coach passenger between Philadelphia and Rocky Mount, he was requested at Richmond to move to identical accommodations in an all-Negro car. The request was based on company regulations requiring segregation. Chance refused to move and was put off the train.

The case was first heard by a Federal district judge in Virginia, who ruled in favor of the railroad. However, the Circuit Court of Appeals in Richmond reversed the decision, holding that the company regulation requiring segregation was an unlawful burden on interstate commerce: "When white and colored passengers are permitted to ride together for part of their journey through the State of Virginia, and then are compelled to separate and change cars, and when passengers in coaches are segregated on account of race while passengers in Pullman and dining cars are permitted to ride together irrespective of race, the burden upon interstate commerce is as clearly manifest as that imposed by the statute of Virginia which was invalidated in the Morgan case."

Legally, then, there is no longer any defense of segregation on interstate railroads. But in practice the situation is by no means settled. Before the court decision can become fully effective, a great deal of inertia and resistance will have to be overcome. The railroads not only must revise their policies to conform to the new standards, but must also wage a vigorous educational campaign among their employees. Only the most determined company action can insure that nondiscriminatory procedures will be followed by railroad personnel, from ticket agent to conductor.

So far, there is scant evidence of such determination. Railroad practices have as yet shown little improvement over the confusing and contradictory conditions discussed in Dr. Long's report. Following is a brief summary of some of the chief forms of discrimination described in "Segregation in Interstate Railway Coach Travel."

ALLOTMENT OF SPACE

Coach passengers on southern trips my be segregated in one of several ways, depending on the particular railroad and train involved. If the point of origin is outside the South, Negroes may either be seated in a "Jim Crow" car from the start, or be required to change to one at Washington, D. C., St. Louis, or some other transition point. In other cases, Negro passengers boarding the train outside the South are not segregated at any time, while those boarding below the Mason-Dixon line are uniformly seated in the all-Negro car I. Contrariwise, those boarding northbound trains at southern points may be segregated for the first part of the trip only.

Almost without exception, the space designated for Negroes is in the first car. A certain amount of flexibility is sometimes provided by means of a divided second car, the front half of which may be used for overflow of Negro passengers. Such adjustments are by no means automatic, however, since they are entirely at the discretion of the conductor, who may or may not care to make them. Thus the space in car 1 may be considered the only reliable quota of seating for Negro passengers.

OVERCROWDING

In the sample study by Dr. Long and his staff, the cars occupied by Negroes represented 18.4 percent of the total. On the face of it, this may seem a fairly liberal quota, since the average proportion of Negro passengers to the total was 16 percent. But these are average figures which do not reflect the actual distribution of passengers on specific trips. In 13 out of 42 trips, the proportion of Negro passengers exceeded the 18.4-percent quota, and in several instances was 2 to 4 times as great. On a few trips, the reverse was true: the number of white passengers exceeded the quota of seats allotted to them, while seats in the all-Negro car went unoccupied. As might easily be predicted, the fixed quota system proved grossly inadequate as a means of preventing discrimination and hardship to individual passengers.

The arrangement was even less equitable on the reserved-seat trains, taken separately. Though this class of facilities represented 54 percent of the total space in the sample, Negroes were allotted only 7.2 percent. This is particularly significant in view of the fact that the reserved-seat trains are the fastest and most modern of coach facilities and are growing in use on all rail lines. The relatively small quota of seats allotted to Negroes, therefore, puts an absolute ceiling on the number who may secure these more desirable accommodations.

QUALITY OF ACCOMMODATIONS

In no field is the impracticability of "separate but equal" more obvious than in train travel. Since segregation narrowly limits the Negro passenger to the facilities designated for his race, he has no choice as to the seating comfort, ventilation, lighting, lounging, and toilet space available in other sections of the train. If the so-called Jim Crow facilities are inferior in these respects to any found elsewhere on the train, then obviously equality does not exist. Short of integration, the only sure way to avoid discrimination in quality would be to set aside the very best facilities on the train for Negroes. Not only have the railroads failed to do this, but they have customarily chosen the oldest, least modern, and least comfortable cars for Negro use.

For purposes of comparison, Dr. Long's observers rated the coaches in four cotegories: de luxe, modern, ordinary, and antiquated. Thirty-six percent of the white coaches were of the de luxe type, as compared with 23 percent of the Negro coaches. The two groups had the same percentage of cars classified as modern. Thirty-two percent of the Negro coaches were rated as ordinary and antiquated, as compared with 18 percent of the white coaches. (Negroes had a monopoly on the facilities classified as antiquated.) With some exceptions, the reserved-seat trains show up much better than average; facilities throughout these trains are usually of quality—including the Negro car. But it must be remembered that Negroes encounter greater difficulty in securing reservations on most of these trains, since facilities for them are sharply limited.

PASSENGER TREATMENT

The double standard applied to Negro coach passengers is described as follows by Dr. Long:

"The entire pattern of administering train services to the Negro public within the South and on Northern trains whose terminus is the South, is geared to segregation. This ranges all the way from the purchase of a ticket, to use of station facilities, passing through admission gates to the train, boarding the train, and to the train trip itself. The administration of segregation is done by a number of funtionaries, including ticket sellers and reservation clerks, gate attendants, conductors, brakemen, porters, and even redcaps.

"All of these persons operate under orders and customary expectations and procedures, with more or less absolute authority for their areas of responsibility but within an hierarchical authority system which has the conductors, ticket and passenger agents at the top. * * * Many of the practices which ensue from this authority system, hinged not only to the necessity of segregation but also the impulse of white superiority, are punitive in their impact upon the Negro public. This covers such things as brusqueness of manner, referring to passengers as 'boy' or similar titles, failure to give adequate information or giving necessary information grudgingly.

"Probably the best example of the extreme to which these practices are taken is afforded by occasions when Negro passengers must purchase tickets at southern terminals. All station facilities of the South have separate accommodations for white and Negro passengers, and in many instances this includes not only separate waiting and rest rooms but also separate ticket windows and stairways for entering and leaving the train platforms. The arrangement is such that the Negro passenger has no occasion to go into the general or white waiting room, and to enter upon such territory by accident, necessity, or ignorance may result in trouble.

"Since the Negro passenger must therefore buy his ticket from the window facing the Negro waiting room, he must, perforce, suffer the uncertainties of being noticed by the ticket agent and having the agent decide to serve him. The uncertainties turn into occasions of undue hardship and discrimination, for it is commonly reported that agents will often ignore the waiting Negro client, deciding to render service at his own leisure and after all white clients have been sold tickets."

RESERVED-SEAT TRAINS

The manipulation, deception, and subterfuge involved in enforcing the segregation policy on reserved-seat trains are truly formidable. Here are some of the common techniques as described by Dr. Long:

"One fairly general method used by ticket offices in complying with requests for seat reservations via the telephone, particularly in southern areas, is to assure the potential passenger that space is available, telling him to pick up his reservation at a certain time before train departure. Thus, it is not until the individual appears at the ticket office that specific seat assignments are finally made. The juggling of seat assignments according to the racial identity of the passenger may and does occur at this point. This avoids raising the racial issue between the agent and passenger over the phone and in the transaction, although Negro passengers have raised objections out of northern points, when they see that they are being put into a segregated car. It has the distinct disadvantage, however, of the agent having to refuse issuance of a reservation or to give seat space in a white car, when the passenger appearing before him happens to be a Negro and the limited space of the Negro car is filled."

OTHER TECHNIQUES

"Partly because of this kind of complication, as well as for other reasons, agents follow other kinds of practice designed to obtain the racial identity of the person requesting seat space over the telephone. In the southern cities, and occasionally in Northern and border points, the passenger may be asked, 'Are you colored or white?' or 'Do you want space in the Negro car or white car?' or just 'In what car do you want space?' All of these, of course, are direct efforts to allot seat reservations on the basis of race. The Negro passenger, not wishing to enter into argument with the agent or to say anything which would prevent his getting space and proceeding with the trip is inclined to comply.

"At northern points, and most notably out of the Chicago area, more subtle measures are used for getting the racial identity of the persons requesting seat space via the telephone. At the initial phase of the conversation, just after space has been asked for a given reservation-seat train going to the South, the agent may ask from what hotel, address, or phone the passenger is calling. This is always done before the agent indicates whether or not space is available on the train. Since the inference is that it may be necessary to call the passenger back, in the event that there is not space or that some may be released, the passenger will give the requested information.

"Yet this is not a service given by railroad reservation offices, as is the case with airlines. The passenger has to take the initiative in checking and re-checking reservation openings. Since about 8 of every 10 Negroes in Chicago live in the densely settled southside area, and since the telephone exchanges and the number prefixes rather clearly define these areas, it is relatively easy to ascertain whether it is a Negro or white passenger seeking a reserved seat. Other possible clues may escape in the conversation which will enable the agent to reduce the possibility of making an erroneous identification."

SPACE CHANGES

"There is bound to be a small proportion of errors in this procedure, but it is always possible to make a correction when the passenger appears at the ticket window to pick up his space and ticket. Investigators reported from their experience that this may be done in one of two usual ways: (1) by making a direct shift in the reservation, or (2) pretending a conflict exists on the original assignment.

"In the former case, the agent will check with the reservations clerk, appearing to be merely making a routine check on the space but actually arranging for a transfer of the space to the segregated car. No questions are raised with the passenger, and when he is handed his ticket and reservation enclosed in an envelope, presumably everything is in regular and good order. Later, in casually looking through the envelope or presenting his space ticket for checking by the conductor or passenger agent, he will discover that his seat is in a different car—Car 1 or its equivalent for Negro passengers going into the South. It is too late for protest or modification, and the urgency of being on the train and completing the trip is immediate.

"In the second case, the agent will ask the passenger what space had been reserved for him. If the passenger is not quite sure or haltingly indicates the space, the agent may say, after conversation with the reservations clerk, that the passenger is probably in error and that the space reserved for him is in Car 1 or its equivalent. On the other hand, if the passenger knows clearly what car and seat space he has and appears confident of this knowledge, the agent will effect a transfer by simply saying that the clerk must have made an error, because a previous commitment had been made for the space. He will add reassuringly, however, that there does happen to be space available in Car 1 or its counterpart and that fortunately the passenger can have it.

"Even if the segregation sieve still fails to catch 1 or 2 Negro passengers, there is a final measure of a direct nature which can be effected while the train is en route. This is simply for the conductor to change the Negro passenger to the segregated car at the point on the trip where the Mason-Dixon Line is reached. Although this is a usual procedure on the nonreservation trains, it is a somewhat hazardous undertaking for these trains, since the reserved space is for the entire trip from point of departure to destination. Suits of complaint and damage against the railroads by disaffected Negro passengers have grown out of this kind of situation. Conductors now make the changes hesitatingly, if at all, and they do so after assessing the Negro passenger and the situation quite carefully."

IMPONDERABLES

"The administrative details involved not only have the character of the picayune and arbitrary, but they also show the extremes of subterfuge and misrepresentation to which segregation policy unavoidably leads in transactions with the Negro public. And there are the imponderables of the effects of these practices upon the individuals toward whom they are directed—the uncertainty of getting on a reservation train and of following a given travel plan, the irritations from the delays in getting reservations, the embarrassment of changes in committed seat space in ticket offices and on trains. Though these effects are not measurable quantities, they constitute a basic and important part of the segregation-discrimination equation insofar as these special railway services are concerned."

This summary by no means exhausts the list of discomforts, inconveniences, and humiliations documented by Dr. Long and his associates. For example, there are the difficulties that arise when facilities for one race or the other are suddenly overcrowded by an influx of passengers. There is also the problem of through coach service—a service seldom available to Negroes under the Jim Crow system. While other passengers remain comfortably in their seats as their coach is transferred to another train, Negroes must struggle with baggage, inclement weather, and often long waits in the station in order to change trains.

CONFLICT AND VIOLENCE

Worst of all, there is the ever-present threat of conflict and violence in the segregated situation. Even the best-intentioned conductors are likely to grow touchy and inconsiderate under the strain of preserving rigid separation of the races, under all sorts of harassing conditions. And Negro passengers grow rightfully resentful when they are deprived of dignity and comfort by an arbitrary system, often crudely administered.

Under such conditions, heated disagreements are only to be expected. All too often, local police are called in at this point to enforce the racial codes. Protesting Negro passengers have been arrested, beaten, and even killed in the ensuing controversies. It hardly matters if the Negro involved is within his constitutional rights as an interstate passenger. To a policeman in a small Southern community, he is likely to appear in defiance of State law and local custom and, as such, deserving of no more consideration than a common criminal.

It is to be wondered at that the railroads themselves have been willing to pay so high a price for coach segregation. Certainly uniform treatment of all passengers will greatly simplify their administrative and operating procedures. But, whether they hold this view or not, the recent actions of the Supreme Court has given it the force of law. As the Mitchell case outlawed Pullman segregation and the Henderson case outlawed dining-car segregation, so now the decision in the Chance case has clearly made it unlawful for an interstate railroad to practice segregation on coaches. In one respect, the Chance case went even further. It established that such segregation is unlawful even if the separate facilities are equal in every respect.

Plainly, the railroads and the Interstate Commerce Commission, as the responsible Government agency, now have a public duty to eliminate all racial distinctions on interstate trains. A careful reading of Segregation in Interstate Railroad Coach Travel, would be an excellent way for them to start.

The First Law of Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL T. DURHAM

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend by remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Daily Times News, Burlington, N. C., of August 20, 1954:

THE FIRST LAW OF NATIONS

Ask the average man on the street, in the barber shop, anywhere, the difference between socialism and communism in government and his answer most likely will be vague. He is an intelligent man, too. He simply hasn't studied these government influences thoroughly, although either may be a dominant factor in his life.

Under socialism, like in Britain, government differs from communism only in the ballot. The people may vote a change. Under communism if the people ballot it is fixed, as if no ballot at all.

Thurman Sensing makes this comment:

No one should be surprised that the British Socialists got along so well with the Russian Communists in their visit to Moscow. They should get along just as well with the Chinese Communists in Peking.

Socialism is nothing more nor less than a halfway step to communism, and with the same ideological parents the Socialists and the Communists should get along nicely. Socialism, by its very nature, means complete control of production and distribution, of prices and wages. Complete socialism, therefore, only differs from communism in that under the former the people assumedly retain the right to change their form of government while under the latter the people have no such right.

In either case, so long as people live under Socialist or Communist governments their lives are planned for them and they have no say-so in the matter. The individual is simply a cog in the machine of state. He is part of a mass. He is of no importance as an individual.

What is rather surprising, however, is that a group of members of the English Parliament, both Socialists and Conservatives, have received and accepted an invitation to visit Moscow and discuss peaceful coexistence. This can only mean existence on Communist terms.

In fact, it would not be understandable at all if one did not recognize that the British, by their training for a thousand years, are nothing if not realistic. And being realistic in this case means that the British, seeing an opportunity to perhaps peacefully expand their trade with the Russians and Chinese and other Communist nations, are seizing the opportunity to do so.

To the British, realism in this case means survival. And survival is not only the first law of nature, it is the first law of nations. Take the case of our own Nation. Regardless of the altruism and idealism connected with our efforts of recent years, underlying all of them was the fundamental purpose of survival.

But it has been true of the British Isles for a long time that they cannot survive without trade; there is no other way for the 50 million people living there to support themselves. So long as they were leaders in the industrial revolution and so long as their empire was expanding and remained intact, they had no particular problem in this respect. Now that recent Prime Ministers have presided over the dissolution of this empire, the problem is staring them directly in the face.

It must not be overlooked, either, that our rebuilding of Germany and Japan since the end of the Second World War as our own bulwarks against communism is having much to do with causing Britain to seek trade with the Communists. These former enemies are also industrial nations, and they have rebuilt their economies almost entirely at our expense. At the same time, they furnish Britain with its stiffest competition, and now that this competition is reaching its peak, Britain must look for other markets.

It is a rather sad commentary on our foreign policy that we should enter global wars, defeat our enemies, then rebuild them to such an extent that they can destroy our friends economically or at least force them into trading with nations whose governments are ideologically repugnant to us.

All this does not excuse the Socialists of Great Britain; it perhaps does explain the attitude of the British. If we should put ourselves in their place and ask what we would do under similar circumstances, what would our answer be?

There is a lesson here for all of us—for all nations. What we must realize is that industrial nations must trade in order to survive—and that survival will be placed above all other considerations. This does not apply to just Great Britain. It also applies to Germany and Japan; if they cannot trade with the free world, they, too, will trade with the Communist nations.

Southern Exposure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 12, 1954

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith the following editorial which appeared in Justice, the publication issued to its membership by the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union:

SOUTHERN EXPOSURE

Almost a month has passed since President Dubinsky issued his challenge to southern nonunion garment manufacturers. Speaking in Savannah on July 7, he offered a 3-year moratorium to any such firm that would raise its minimum wage to 90 cents an hour and pledge to keep it 15 cents ahead of any new minimum enacted by Congress. The ILGWU, he said, would abstain from any effort to organize such a firm for a period of 3 years.

This was a fair offer to the self-proclaimed industrial saviors of the South. Indeed, even some friends of organized labor construed the offer as an end of ILGWU organizing in that section. But no one should have expected all of these low-wage-paying benefactors to line up the next morning in front of ILGWU regional offices to get application blanks for the moratorium offer. We didn't even expect a small crowd.

However, in view of the cries of anguish and the loud wailing set up by these honorable profiteers every time an ILGWU organizer appears on the Southern scene, there seemed to be the possibility that a handful of them would take the union at its word and step forward to take advantage of the unique offer.

Not one single savior has turned up.

They have confused and frightened numerous communities with their warnings that all the ILGWU wants is to collect more dues and to take the work back from the South. (They never stop to explain how both these purposes can be accomplished simultaneously.) By backing their professed concern for the South and its garment workers with the 90-cent minimum they could now have insured keeping their employees out of the ILGWU, free from the prospect of paying dues, desperately dependent on the low-standard jobs they provide.

Instead these avid bargain hunters consider even 90 cents an hour to be outrageously high. They are "protecting" the southern garment worker against the $36 weekly pay envelope. They are safeguarding southern communities against annual earnings of $1,872 (assuming 52 weeks of full work).

This is not a wage on which the South can prosper even if it is too high for the crap shooters, the gamblers and the chiselers. The future of the South is not with them.

It lies rather with the growing groups of southern community leaders who share the realization that their people are being victimized by peanut industrialists who pit section against section, town against town, worker against worker.

It lies with the garment workers, such as those in Miami, who in recent months have doubled ILGWU membership in their area.

It lies with South Carolina workers who struck in Hartsville to back up their demand for the 35-hour work week.

It lies with employees of the Freydberg plants in Appomattox and Lynchburg, Va., and in Greensboro, N. C., who, with rising determination to settle for nothing less than victory, have picketed over 6 months.

It lies with thousands of garment workers whose spokesmen at the 16th southeastern regional conference of the ILGWU last month pictured their area as one in which workers are waking to the intent of State right-to-work laws, are challenging employer intimidation, are looking more and more toward the ILGWU as the sole instrument through which they can sustain and share in southern prosperity.

The ILGWU's $40,000 garment plant in Appomattox, representing little more than 6½ weeks of strike benefit, is nearing completion. It will be leased to a unionized firm that will employ Freydberg strikers. It represents a new organizing tactic rather than a business venture. It is also tangible evidence of this union's aims in the South.

Far from blocking industrial expansion we stand for legitimate rather than bargain basement growth; now, as for more than a half century, our chief function remains to use every legitimate means to organize workers so that they, their families, and their communities may share equitably in the fruits of their labor.

One Nation—Under God

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 17, 1954

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, it is always thrilling to hear the pledge of allegiance recited by an audience, particularly when it is composed of young Americans. The sincerity and devotion that is depicted upon the face of even the youngest is inspiring. And now that the words "under God" have been made a part of the oath of allegiance to our country it has created a new and additional sacredness that makes our pledge more meaningful than ever before.

The history of mankind through all the ages has demonstrated that the finest things and the greatest blessings in life come "under God." This is particularly true in this country of ours, where from the earliest beginnings on these shores there has been a recognition of God. Thus it is most befitting to have added these significant words "under God" to our oath of allegiance. As these words are repeated, "one Nation, under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all," we are reminded not only of our dependence upon God but likewise the assurance of security that can be ours through reliance upon God.

These words, "under God," taken in conjunction with the words "in God we trust," that we have stamped for many years upon our coins, can be taken as evidence of our faith in that divine source of strength that has meant and always will mean so much to us as a nation.

The full significance of this acknowledgment of God, and what it means to us as a nation was well and appropriately expressed by President Eisenhower after he had signed the bill which Congress had passed adding the words "under God" to our oath of allegiance. Making it the law of our land, he said:

> From this day forward the millions of our schoolchildren will daily proclaim in every city and town, every village and rural schoolhouse the dedication of our Nation and our people to the Almighty.
>
> To anyone who truly loves America nothing could be more inspiring than to contemplate this rededication of our youth on each school morning to our country's true meaning.
>
> Especially is this meaningful as we regard today's world.
>
> Over the globe mankind has been cruelly torn by violence and brutality and, by the millions, deadened in mind and soul by the prospect of an atomic war. In this somber setting this law and its effects today have profound meaning.
>
> In this way we are reaffirming the transcendence of religious faith in America's heritage and future.
>
> In this way we shall constantly strengthen those spiritual weapons which forever will be our country's most powerful resource in peace or in war.

These words of President Eisenhower might well be the answer of America in these tragic days to communism as it seeks to destroy all freedom loving, God-fearing nations. Let us never forget that recognition of God by this and the other nations of the free world will mean victory and security against the forces of evil that deny God. May we, as a nation under God, ever recognize Him as the source of our refuge and strength.

Death of De Gasperi Tragic Loss to World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ROONEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, the death of Alcide de Gasperi, former Premier of Italy, is indeed a tragic loss not only to Italy but to lovers of democracy over the whole world. He was our faithful friend and valiantly stood by us over the years. Mr. de Gasperi was a brilliant and dependable statesman with whom I had the great honor of conferring on a number of occasions in the course of my many visits to Italy over the years and when he came to the United States about 3 years ago. To his dear wife and children, I extend my deepest sympathy in their bereavement.

Mr. Speaker, as part of these remarks I include the following editorial from today's Brooklyn Eagle:

> It was the great misfortune of modern Italy that it failed so long to produce a leader capable of rising to the demands of critical times. The combination of a weak, futile monarch and a ruthless, brutal dictator, bent upon self-glorification through the restoration of ancient power and glory, led Italy through successive stages into war, disastrous defeat, and finally social and economic chaos.
>
> The greatest blessing to befall Italy in the postwar years of misery and despair was the emergence of Alcide de Gasperi, a man rarely endowed with those qualities that make for true greatness. He was, above all else, a man of admirable personal character. His private life was reflected luminously in the bright light of day. He was sincerely concerned with the welfare of the masses of the Italian people, so long the victims of exploitation and neglect. He was a statesman of the first order who commanded respect and exercised influence in world councils.
>
> Many notable accomplishments may be recorded to the credit of Alcide de Gasperi during his 7½ years as Premier of Italy. He initiated long-deferred social reforms whose need was at the root of the appalling growth of communism in Italy. Through an extraordinary talent for conciliation and compromise he welded divergent political elements into an effective coalition and succeeded in averting the danger that Italy might fall under the power of Moscow. He was one of communism's most fearless and relentless foes.
>
> He was also a consistent and sincere friend of the United States, whose help he sought and received in his efforts toward the economic rehabilitation of his country. His gratitude found practical expression in his stanch support of the union of Western Powers and his efforts to give his countrymen the benefits of free democracy.
>
> Even though he had retired from public life, Alcide de Gasperi, who symbolized all that was best in national leadership, will be greatly missed. His death deprives Europe of one of its few great statesmen, but Italy is fortunate in the respect that the regime he established, and which is one of enlightenment and progress, continues in power.

Second Interim Report of the Committee on Communist Aggression

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. BONIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. BONIN. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, August 9, 1954, the Committee on Communist Aggression filed its second interim report of its hearings recently concluded in the United States and Europe. As a member of that committee, I wish to report some of my personal observations about Communist aggression and the methods by which it is perpetuated.

I noticed that from the moment the Communists become the bosses their activity is marked by brutality and terror. Murder and robbery are common. Anyone opposed to their violence and threats are assassinated by party men or front-organization leaders.

We discovered that certain class groups are especially earmarked for the death penalty without any form of legal or judicial justification. This is particularly true of priests and stanch supporters of Christianity. The same fate is accorded to public officials, right-wing political leaders, and those sympathetic to law and order. Judges, lawyers, and heads of veterans' organizations are speedily liquidated without the slightest effort to give them a fair and impartial trial.

In thousands upon thousands of families, the male members are murdered or sent to concentration camps deep in the heart of Siberia. The same fate is applied to many of the women, but it is common practice to violate the persons of these women before their fate is sealed.

These crimes against the life and freedom of the people of the captive nations proceeds hand in hand with every outrage against mankind's most cherished possessions, public as well as private; moral as well as material; religion, culture, art, and even the national treasure, suffer the destructive blows of terror and violence. Under Marxism, all property, whether real or personal, is confiscated. Industrial plans, family dwellings, small shops and stores become the property of the state for the enrichment of the bosses in the Kremlin.

Another common practice after the Communists take over is the invasion of all churches and property under its control. The Marxist plan to wipe out religion is the same in every country. The assassination of the clergy ranges from the highest ecclesiastical authorities down to the humblest clergyman.

When the hard core of the Communist Party moves in, they dismantle the interior of practically every church with speed and alacrity. Altars, tables, and statues disappear and are replaced by portraits of Lenin and Stalin. In some instances, they permit a few churches to remain untouched for the purpose of using them as a showplace to outsiders that freedom of religion is permitted.

The local party leaders also confiscate, for their own use, churches and convents and then use them for prisons, shops, warehouses and even theaters.

Innocent men and women taken prisoners are beaten with clubs and butts of guns until they faint. When they succumb to this violence, they are doused with cold water to revive them. In this way, thousands upon thousands lose their lives.

Prisoners are locked in dark, damp and unsanitary cells. At 12 o'clock midnight, they are removed from their cells and escorted to the interrogation room where they are cross-examined amid curses, insults and beatings. At six in the morning, they are returned to their cells but not allowed to sleep. One witness testified that he was confined in such a small cell that he was forced to stand in a stooping position for many weeks. Water is kept on the floor of the cell so he could not sit down. Those who are confined in such cells usually die from spinal disturbances or go insane.

The Communists use the most refined tortures to obtain confessions. Large numbers of prisoners die as a result of their sufferings and ill treatment.

The committee heard about the so-called amnesty offered by the Kremlin. This amnesty is granted—not a general pardon, a means which had until recent date been applied in free nations and in the civilized world, exclusively to political offenses—to murders, thieves, robbers, and other criminals. The use of the term "amnesty" has been distorted to include the foulest types of criminal that humanity abhors. It is almost unbelievable that a government could stoop to such distortions of accepted practices in a civilized nation.

After the "amnesty" to common criminals, the rabble led by these criminals are equipped with arms furnished by the Kremlin. Thereafter, they begin their crimes of violence, robbery, burglary, and murder to terrorize the unsuspecting public. The terrorized public remains passive because of fear; fear of what might happen to them today, tomorrow, or next week. Fear for the safety of father, mother, husband, wife, or children. Fear of starvation, fear of imprisonment, fear of arrest and torture. Fear is everywhere in captive nations and no segment of life has any feeling of security.

Every means is used by the Communists to instill fear. The man on the street, the farmer in the country are made to realize that their very existence is dependent upon the good will of the Communists in power.

The people behind the Iron Curtain are suffering cruel and barbarous treatment but no matter how dark the present may be for these people they refuse to submit to atheistic communism or to accept the abject slavery under Russia. Once again they will be free.

The Late Honorable Paul W. Shafer

SPEECH

OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 18, 1954

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I was greatly shocked yesterday afternoon when I received the news of the death of our beloved friend and colleague, Paul Shafer. It was 18 years ago when I came to the House of Representatives at which time I joined my friend and colleague, Paul Shafer. At that time we both became members of the House Military Affairs Committee which was later merged into the House Committee on the Armed Services.

During all this period of time it has been my privilege to serve with Paul on that great committee. Our colleague was never one to treasure petty thoughts. He was always broad gaged, patriotic, forthright, honest and constructive in his attitude.

I noticed the approach he took to all legislation that came before the committee. I always felt that his interest was that of the United States as he approached the consideration of legislation which would make our country safe and keep it independent of foreign influences.

Congressman Shafer gave unstintingly of his time and of his energies to the cause of national defense. He fought with great zeal and enthusiasm for those measures which would make our land safe from Communist aggression and would give us the power to preserve our institutions and protect our homes. He helped nurture the program to produce synthetic rubber when synthetic rubber was used by this country to win World War II. As this industry grew into full bloom the time came when it was found advisable to return it to private enterprise. As chairman of a Synthetic Rubber Subcommittee of the House of Representatives, Paul plunged into a program of writing measures which would place this industry back in private ownership and yet yield to the United States the full value of the plants which had been built and owned by our Government. The legislation, although difficult in preparation, passed the House of Representatives and became the law of the land.

Naturally, Mr. Speaker, I was deeply shocked, grieved and distressed when I received the news of his passing yesterday. He was a most affable gentleman, an able Congressman and a truly great American.

I take this opportunity to extend my very heartfelt sympathy to members of his family in this dark, sad hour of their bereavement.

Let's Keep the Record Straight—A Report to the People of the Sixth District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. POLK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 18, 1954

Mr. POLK. Mr. Speaker, in the heat of political campaigns false statements are sometimes made; either through ignorance of the facts or with a premeditated intent to mislead the public. Sometimes statements involving half-truths or statements which involve issues or questions which taken out of context may make it appear to those who do not have all the facts, that a person's attitude or stand on some particular question or issue was quite different from that person's true attitude or stand on the particular question or issue involved.

Also, by making false statements concerning a person's stand on a particular issue, there may be implanted in the mind of the reader or listener the idea, that the person about whom the first false statement was made, holds certain views on some subsidiary or collateral issue, or subject. For example, a speaker by stating that a person is opposed to loyalty oaths for Federal employees may convey the idea that the person about whom this statement was made is also sympathetic to communism, because the two ideas, lack of loyalty and communism, are usually closely associated in the public mind.

I mention this because of a speech made before the Fayette County Young Republican Club on February 4, 1954, by Mr. Kline Roberts, of Columbus, Ohio, as reported in the Washington Courthouse Record Herald of February 5, 1954, page 10. Mr. Roberts is majority floor leader of the Ohio House of Representatives in Columbus. I do not recall ever having met Mr. Roberts and from his speech I assume he knows little or nothing about my record in Congress and I assume further, that someone advised him what to say about my voting record.

Mr. Roberts holds a responsible position in the Ohio General Assembly. He is one of the leaders of the Republican Party in Ohio, and is, no doubt, an honest and an honorable man. However, on this occasion, his statements concerning my voting record in Congress, as reported in the press, do not conform to the Record. His statements raise some interesting questions. Who advised Mr. Roberts concerning his speech on this occasion? Was it someone with a selfish interest in endeavoring to discredit my service to the people of the sixth district? Was it someone who would benefit from the spreading of false insinuations and innuendoes about me personally?

As reported in the Record Herald, Mr. Roberts is quoted as saying:

> Polk was one of the two people in the whole Congress voting against defense appropriations; was opposed to barring salary of public employees who refuse to sign loyalty oaths; had opposed a watchdog committee to check expenditures of appropriations; had voted against President Eisenhower's Government reorganization plan; and in a great majority of cases he had opposed Republican-favored bills in Congress.

Four of the above statements are absolutely false. The fifth, "Had voted against President Eisenhower's reorganization plan," is one-tenth correct. The President submitted 10 reorganization plans to Congress for approval. I voted against 1 of the 10 reorganization plans. I voted against the President's Reorganization Plan No. 6 for the Defense Department, rollcall vote No. 69, June 27, 1953. I supported all of the nine other reorganization plans submitted by the President to Congress. Mr. Kline Roberts in his speech at the American Legion hall in Washington Courthouse neglected to tell his audience the whole story. He so worded his statement as to make it appear that I have opposed all the President's efforts to reorganize the Government departments, while in fact I only opposed 1 out of 10 reorganization plans the President asked Congress to approve.

The statement that "Polk in a great majority of cases has opposed Republican-favored bills in Congress" is false. The words used—"in a great majority of cases has opposed"—indicate to the casual listener or the casual reader that Polk is opposed to almost all of the President's program. This is not true, and fortunately there is a Record to prove how I have voted.

The Congressional Quarterly News Features, of Washington, D. C., a reputable and unbiased reporter of congressional votes, in their May 28 issue, volume XII, No. 22, page 665, published a table entitled "Support for Eisenhower." On this table are registered five significant items:

First. Number of times Representative voted pro-Eisenhower on the 11

House rollcalls through May 18 which tested support for the President's program and leadership. Polk is credited with 6 votes out of 11 as pro-Eisenhower.

Second. Active support: Percentage of 11 Eisenhower issue rollcalls on which Representative voted pro-Eisenhower. Polk is credited with 55 percent of active support pro-Eisenhower.

Third. Active-support percentage for all of 1953: Polk is credited with 50 percent active support for Eisenhower in 1953.

Fourth. Number of times Representative voted anti-Eisenhower on the 11 Eisenhower issue rollcalls of 1954: Polk is credited with 4 anti-Eisenhower votes.

Fifth. Active opposition: Percentage of the 11 Eisenhower rollcalls on which Representative voted anti-Eisenhower. Polk is credited with 36 percent of his votes being in opposition to Eisenhower.

The above is from the report published by Congressional Quarterly News Features entitled "Eisenhower Support—GOP Backing Higher but Democrats Often Provide Margin of Victory," May 28, 1954.

As your Representative to Congress, I have supported the Republican administration when I thought it was right and I have not hesitated to oppose those measures I consider to be bad legislation for the Sixth District.

It is my firm conviction that a Representative should represent, so far as possible, the views of his constituents. With that view always in mind I have circulated questionnaires throughout the Sixth District for the purpose of securing samplings of public opinion on various questions and issues. The answers my constituents have given to these questionnaires have been very helpful to me, and I am deeply grateful to those who have taken the time to give me their counsel and advice.

May I make it perfectly clear that my conception of my responsibility as Representative is that I should endeavor to represent the people of the Sixth District. To do otherwise would be in violation of one of the cardinal principles of representative government as laid down by the Founding Fathers, the authors of the Constitution of the United States. I do not consider it my responsibility to represent either the President or the Republican or Democratic Parties, but all the people of the Sixth District.

The statement "Polk was 1 of 2 people in the whole Congress voting against defense appropriations" is utterly false.

The last defense appropriation bill I opposed was on February 23, 1939, under the Roosevelt administration, when I was 1 of the 205 Members who voted against an appropriation to fortify the island of Guam. Later events proved that my vote on that question was probably wrong, and I have since then supported and voted for larger defense appropriations instead of smaller defense appropriations. For example, on July 22, 1953, I was 1 of the 161 Members who voted for sufficient appropriations to provide for 143 air wings for national defense. We were defeated in this effort but later the administration revised its policy on the Air Force and asked for more money, which was granted by Congress, thus proving that those of us who were advocating a stronger Air Force were correct in our original stand on this question.

Likewise, the statement that I "was opposed to barring salary of public employees who refuse to sign loyalty oath" is completely false. For many years, every appropriation bill providing for Federal salaries has contained the following provision:

> No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used to pay the salary or wages of any person who advocates, or is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence.

Of course, anyone voting against a single one of the many appropriation bills passed in recent years can be charged falsely for voting against the bill because of the loyalty oath.

I am well aware that Mr. Kline Roberts' false statement on this issue contains the insinuation that I am in some way sympathetic with communism. To anyone who really knws me and knows my views and my voting record during nearly 16 years' service in Congress, such an insinuation is so ridiculous as to be unbelievable. but in the new parts of the Sixth District, in Fayette, Pickaway ,and Ross Counties, such a statement might well raise a question concerning my fitness to hold a public office.

To those who are not familiar with my views on the subject of communism and on all phases of disloyalty to our great country, may I say that on the subject of communism I fully concur in the resolution adopted by the 54th National Encampment of the VFW at Milwaukee in 1953, which recommends "outlawing the Communist Party in the United States and to make it a felony to belong to the Communist Party, or any other group by any other name, which engages in subversive activities with the intent to overthrow the Constitution of the United States and the American Republic."

The following record votes during the 83d Congress show my official actions on this issue:

First. On August 17, 1954, on rollcall vote No. 144, I was one of the 208 Members of the House of Representative who voted for the Dies motion to completely outlaw the Communist Party. This was an amendment to the Communist control Bill, S. 3706. This motion carried by a vote of 208 yeas to 100 nays.

The administration opposed this amendment and consequently it was rewritten by the committee of conference between the House and Senate to conform to administration recommendations.

Second. On August 19, 1954, on rollcall vote No. 147, I voted for the conference committee version of the bill S. 3706 which was approved by the House.

Third. On August 16, 1954, on rollcall vote No. 142, I voted for the Communist Control Act as originally submitted to the House for consideration. This bill did not actually outlaw the Communist Party and did not go as far as I would go in providing protection against Communist activity.

Fourth. On July 23, 1954, on rollcall vote No. 113, and

Fifth. On May 11, 1954, on rollcall vote No. 68, I voted for contempt citations against various individuals as requested by the House Un-American Activities Committee.

Sixth. On February 24, 1954, on rollcall vote No. 17, I voted for an appropriation of $275,000 for the House Un-American Activities Committee.

Seventh. On July 21, 1953, on rollcall vote No. 95, I voted yea on the proposition that Communist China should not be admitted to the United Nations.

I mention these seven record votes during the 83d Congress, in support of important propositions relating to communism and its eradication and control, because I realize that many of my constituents do not have an opportunity to read the Congressional Record and consequently may not be informed concerning my stand on this issue.

May I suggest to Mr. Roberts and to all others who may make accusations without foundation, the reading of some remarks on this subject by Abraham Lincoln.

Lincoln said:

> I believe it is an established maxim in morals that he who makes an assertion without knowing whether it is true or false, is guilty of falsehood, and the accidental truth of the assertion does not justify or excuse him. This maxim ought to be particularly held in view when we contemplate an attack upon the reputation of our neighbors. (Letter to Illinois Gazette, August 1846.)
>
> Persisting in a charge which one does not know to be true is simple malicious slander. (Cooper Institute, New York, 1860.)
>
> A man cannot prove the negative, but he has a right to claim that when one makes an affirmaive charge he must offer some proof to show the truth of what he says. (Ottawa, Ill., 1858.)
>
> It used to be a fashion amongst men that when a charge was made, some sort of proof was brought forward to establish it, and if no proof was found to exist, the charge was dropped. (Jonesboro, Ill., September 15, 1858.)

Management Problems of Government Dwarf Those of Our Biggest Corporations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STUART SYMINGTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include a statement in the Record on the management problems of Government.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

> Mr. President, even if we consider only those activities which every one of us would agree must be done by Government, the management problems dwarf those of our biggest corporations.
>
> The direction in these times of such diverse areas as foreign policy, national de-

fense, fiscal affairs, agricultural policy, and many more comparable management problems demands great numbers of able and experienced top executives, backed up by a large group of capable career people.

The problem of how to recruit and retain this body of management skill is one of the most difficult challenges to the success of democratic government.

The problem becomes diminished in time of actual shooting war, because it is relatively easy to persuade men from outside Government to serve as a patriotic act.

Since World War II, I have heard innumerable people say: "I'd be glad to serve—if we got into a war."

But the irony is, that under the ruthless logic of modern war, our ability to win would depend upon what had been done in the years before war started.

The greatest patriotic service can be done by those who serve when the need for their help is great—as it is now—and there is not the obvious compulsion of wartime.

I have long been interested in this problem of getting men to run our Government. In 1945 I left business to come to Washington; and have had some first-hand knowledge of the difficulties faced by the previous administration in persuading businessmen to take on the top policy jobs in an administration with which the majority of businessmen were not in sympathy.

As example, after Korea started, and while thousands of American boys were being wounded and killed on the field of battle, for months it was impossible to obtain anyone to accept the vitally important post of Economic Stabilizer.

The first man who finally took that job, months after we had gone to war, was the 34th asked.

When the administration changed, we had hoped—every public spirited American would have hoped—that this was one problem of government which would diminish considerably.

After all, the new administration had the support of a majority of executives in industry.

It seemed logical, therefore, to expect that industry would do everything in its power to assure that the new administration would be able to obtain adequate assistance from the ranks of business, and retain that executive talent necessary to perform its exacting tasks.

There has recently been published two significant analyses of the record of this administration in manning direction of its responsibilities through calling upon business executives to accept management jobs in government.

The first of these is a report by Fortune magazine.

The second is an editorial which recently appeared in one of the world's great newspapers, the St. Louis Post-Dispatch.

The conclusions of those carefully written analyses are pessimistic.

The Fortune report concluded that "the administration from now on will find it harder to locate businessmen who are willing to serve."

Not only are businessmen hard to get for Government posts, but the Fortune report, and the Post-Dispatch editorial, conclude that even if businessmen are successful in making the change from industry to government, they are in general inclined to consider their government service as an interlude, to be made as brief as decently possible.

Apparently, the problem of getting, and keeping, good men is to remain acute.

Apparently it is becoming steadily more difficult for this administration to get good men into government.

When they do come in, it is equally difficult to persuade them to stay long enough to learn what it is all about, so that they may contribute not only on the basis of their inherent ability, but also from a background of real knowledge of government environment.

Experience is fully as important in government as it is in business.

Let us imagine the consternation in General Motors if a new president was to be appointed from outside the company; one who knew very little about the company's problems; and one who, it was understood, planned to remain only a little over a year.

This would not be businesslike in business, but it is apparently accepted as standard procedure in the management of our Government.

The Post-Dispatch editorial said: "Secretary of the Interior McKay, himself a businessman * * * is quoted by Fortune as believing that for top jobs in the Government, the Government will have to depend in the long run mainly on men willing to stay in political life."

That is the only way we can obtain the experience so vital for good government.

Despite this need, no real effort has been made to retain such public services. In fact, since January 1953, we have lost the services of many devoted and able men for whom the government service was a career.

Their loss was far worse than the highly touted industry men who came down for a "12 month or so fling."

My colleagues who serve on the Civil Service Committee know much better than I what has happened to the group of people just beneath the top policy levels.

Concerning them, the Post-Dispatch said: "Or as Cabell Phillips, a Washington correspondent of the Sunday New York Times, wrote in Harper's magazine: 'When the businessmen came to Washington some of them had a pretty definite conviction that the $10,000 and $12,000 career people they found in their departments couldn't be much good; otherwise they would have left long ago to make more money elsewhere.' "

The Post-Dispatch concludes that the Government has "lost some unusually experienced people whose counterparts it will be virtually impossible to recruit from the business world, replacing them in large measure with lawyers and business executives on loan, who have no intention of making government a career."

But the loss of top-level civil-service career men and women has not been the full measure of the loss of the experience so vitally needed to manage the executive agencies.

The policy of replacing experienced people already in Government now affects even Presidential appointees who rose from the career ranks and had little or no partisan political background.

What happened to the widely endorsed Hoover Commission idea of career Assistant Secretaries who were to furnish the continuity so necessary to the orderly operation of large Government departments?

Let us look at what happened recently in the Atomic Energy Commission.

This agency, charged with so much of the responsibility for the future of each one of us, was treated in the last administration so nonpolitically that the first Commission was composed of 4 Republicans and 1 Democrat.

On June 30 the term of Atomic Energy Commissioner Eugene M. Zuckert expired.

In my judgment, Mr. Zuckert was one of the most competent, most respected, and most patriotically constructive men who ever devoted his energies to the public service.

And his is a remarkable record.

After obtaining a public-school education in New York, Mr. Zuckert enrolled at Yale University, from where he received a B. A. degree in 1933.

Four years later he received a bachelor of law degree from Yale, and certification for completing a combined law and business course at Harvard and Yale.

With that unusual training, Mr. Zuckert then became a member of the bar in both Connecticut and New York; and practiced law in both States.

Most of his professional career, however, has been devoted to the public service.

From 1937 to 1940, Mr. Zuckert had his first experience in Government when he became an attorney for the Securities and Exchange Commission.

Later, at the age of 29, he became a member of the faculty of the Harvard Graduate School of Business Administration.

Mr. Zuckert advanced in rank in this profession, becoming assistant dean of the school and serving as administrative head of the first advanced management course ever given at the Harvard Graduate School.

During this same period, Mr. Zuckert served as a special consultant to the commanding general of the Air Force, assisted in the training of thousands of Air Force officers, and carried out a number of special assignments for the Air Force's commanding general.

In 1944 and 1945, Mr. Zuckert served in the office of the Chief of Naval Operations. He was released from the Navy in September 1945, to become my executive assistant when I was Administrator of the Surplus Property Administration.

When I moved from Surplus Property to become Assistant Secretary of War for Air, Mr. Zuckert went with me as special assistant.

In September 1947 the Air Force became coequal with the Army and Navy in the National Defense Establishment. As Secretary of the Air Force, I was fortunate to have Mr. Zuckert as Assistant Secretary. His contributions to efficient management of this new Department were invaluable.

In January 1952, Mr. Zuckert was nominated for appointment as a member of the United States Atomic Energy Commission. This appointment was confirmed by the Senate on February 4, and he served in this responsible position until June 30, 1954.

The above recital of some of the major responsibilities of Gene Zuckert in no way gives adequate measure of the great worth of this able man. His industry, his integrity, his sense of perspective, his analytical ability, and his practical efficiency combine to make him a most valuable public servant.

It is incredible to me that this great American patriot was not only thrown out of the Government by the administration apparently for no other reason than the fact he was a Democrat, but was not even thanked by his chief when he left after such an outstanding job.

The Trip-Lease Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD a statement prepared by me on the trip-lease bill.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President, one of the great disappointments of this 83d Congress has been our failure to act and secure final passage of H. R. 3203. This bill, which deals primarily with transportation of agricultural commodities from farm to market, was passed by the House on June 24, 1953.

It was exhaustively studied by two committees of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce—but due to some unknown obstruction in the committee it was never sent to the floor for consideration. I feel certain that many members, if not most members of the Senate committee, favored its passage.

Lengthy hearings were held both in the House and Senate on this trip-leasing bill. A total of 702 printed pages of testimony was taken by the subcommittee under the late Senator DWIGHT GRISWOLD, of Nebraska, and later by the full Interstate Commerce Committee. Hearings requiring 520 pages of testimony were also held by the House Committee on Foreign and Interstate Commerce before its overwhelming passage of the bill through that body more than a year ago.

Rarely has any measure had the unanimous support from all farm organizations that this bill enjoyed. Recent testimony from farm groups included the American Farm Bureau Federation, the Farmers Union, the National Grange, the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, the United Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Association, and many others. They all expressed to both the House and Senate committees the urgent need of agricultural interests for its passage.

On May 6, 1954, Secretary of Agriculture Ezra T. Benson testified before the Senate committee. The following excerpt from his testimony is particularly convincing and in point:

"A great deal of confusion over a long period of time has resulted in growing uncertainties and conflicting opinions with respect to the matter of trip leasing. In order that all parties may be properly guided by the intent of Congress, it is our hope that H. R. 3203 will be enacted into law, thus removing the multiple uncertainties concerning the activities of vehicles embraced within the provisions of section 203 (b) (4a), (5), and (6) of the Interstate Commerce Act.

"We believe, however, that the Commission's amended order does not restore the flexibility which Congress intended should accompany the exemptions set forth in section 203 (b) (4a), (5), and (6) of the Interstate Commerce Act. We wish, therefore, to express our continuing interest in, and support of, the legislation proposed by H. R. 3203.

"The flexible, efficient, and economic movement of exempt and processed agricultural commodities may not be adequately accomplished under the rules presently prescribed by the Commission."

I had been extremely hopeful that favorable action could be taken on the measure by the Senate committee and by the Senate before adjournment; however, the press of other business has been such that we have been precluded from further considering the matter in committee with the result that it has been impossible to present the bill for final action on the floor.

This bill is designed to provide a flexible pool of motor carriers which can be used in the marketing of agricultural commodities, particularly at harvest time, and utilized to serve producers and consumers alike in the better distribution of commercial goods all at lower cost and quicker service than would otherwise be possible.

In addition the bill gives the Interstate Commerce Commission certain authority not heretofore specifically provided by statute to regulate leasing practices of authorized motor carriers, and promote safety on the highways.

The bill goes further than this, however, in that it preserves the right of the farmer and the small truck owner to lease their trucks without restrictive and unjustified regulation which would have the effect of increasing costs to the farmer and the consumer, load the highways with empty returning trucks, and throw many truck owners, small-business men out of business. It should be remembered also that during World War II the Defense Transportation Administration specifically ordered the utilization of our trucking facilities on an oil-out trip-leasing basis as the most economical and efficient operation of our national truck fleet—a principle which still holds good today.

The practice of leasing trucks, particularly those of farmers on a single-trip basis or for short periods, has been the custom in the trucking business since time immemorial. Under such a practice the most economical and efficient use is made of the farmer's truck and the small-business man's truck, subject to all the safety regulations prescribed by the Commission and at approved rates under the full supervision of duly authorized carriers. If the practice is discontinued by administration regulation, as is threatened, untold damage will be done to our system of marketing farm products. The passage of this bill will prevent such a disaster.

It has been sincerely felt by some that the changes proposed by the Interstate Commerce Commission would rectify the damage about to be done and protect the farmer. This is not the case as can be clearly seen from a reading of the testimony of every leading farm group in this country. The record before the committees of both Houses shows that without exception the farm groups that testified support the bill in its entirety.

I am convinced by careful study that the proposed changes do not protect the farmer, and by the same token the consumer, and the small-business man truck owners.

Accomplishments and Failures of the 83d Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAM RAYBURN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, most of the people of the United States and many peoples in free and enslaved lands over the world held high hopes for the success of the Republican administration when it assumed the solemn responsibility of guiding this great and powerful Nation on January 20, 1953.

President Eisenhower and the Republican Party were looked to for vigorous and creative leadership. What a disappointment we all have suffered.

As we look around us at the end of the 83d Congress, we see that the grand hopes of our people and of friendly peoples in foreign lands have been crushed on the bitter walls of disillusionment. We witness confusion instead of confidence. We see dismay and uncertainty, instead of pride and courage.

In the 20 months since the Eisenhower administration and the Republican Party took over, we have seen our country undergo an amazing transition; we have seen our Government lose prestige and power throughout the world; we have seen our influence as a leading Nation diminish, and here at home we have seen great segments of our economy struck down.

If there is one word in the English language that would properly describe this Republican administration, it is the word "inept." For, my colleagues, this administration has bungled our foreign relations through an ineptness that astounds those of us who, even though in the minority in Congress, want to protect this great Government; want it to occupy the same eminence it should occupy in world affairs, and want it to survive, above all else.

But the sad fact before us is this: Since the Eisenhower administration took over, this Government has not won a battle on a foreign diplomatic front.

On domestic issues, the Eisenhower administration has exhibited an ineptness in considering what is best for all the people, an ineptness magnified by its desire and programs to benefit selected groups; groups of tremendous wealth and privilege; groups that ignore the increased power of the masses of working men and women and the millions of farmers, who provide the food and fiber which create the basic wealth of this Nation.

If I were addicted to making predictions, I would say that if the Eisenhower administration and the Republican Party continue on the course they have adopted, the reaction of the people of this country will be dangerous.

This so-called Eisenhower business administration and Republican Congress have proved by their programs and actions that they are strictly for big business.

The measures they have espoused and enacted which could be classified as of benefit to the people are merely extensions, or modifications and expansions, of policies and laws which originated in previous Democratic administrations. I refer to housing, reciprocal trade, social security, mutual aid—all of which were initiated by Democrats and all of which were once denounced and fought by Republicans.

The voters of this country cannot be fooled forever. They know the Republicans realized that they would have to have something to use in their political campaigns, that they would have to have some bait to try to attract voters, so they can stay in power.

The people also know by now, however, that the Eisenhower administration and the Republican Congress have done a big job—a big job on the farmer, the consumer, the laborer, and the family with a small income.

The administration and the Republican Congress have driven down prices for farm products and have driven up prices for the consumer. They gave big-moneyed people handsome tax advantages over the people who earn their income by toil. And all this, my friends, is what our Republican colleagues hail as stabilized economy.

We Democrats do not want a stabilized economy for this country. We Democrats want a thriving and growing economy for this country.

A stabilized economy is easily recognized as the old Republican squeeze play—squeeze the little fellow and make the big fellow bigger. It is a vise—a vise to get the last dollar from the consumer and to pay the least dollar to the farmer and worker.

If the Republican Congress and the Eisenhower administration had paid as much attention to the problems confronting the Nation's future security as they have paid to their program to reduce the American farmer to the state of Hoover-advocated peasantry and to their program to reduce labor to the impotent state of Hoover poverty, we would feel safer in our position in world affairs.

Yes, my friends, it is a sad fact that many good people voted for a change in 1952, and it is a sadder fact that many of them have gotten a change with a vengeance.

When the Republican candidate for President and Republican orators went all over the country in the fall of 1952 they denounced the Truman-Acheson foreign policy. They ate up the agreements of Yalta, Potsdam, and Teheran blood raw every morning for breakfast.

Since coming into power, I presume somebody in the State Department read the provisions of these agreements and understood them. I have heard nothing about them since—not even a suggestion of a change in them. Neither do I hear the Republicans repeating their campaign calls for a change in the Truman-Acheson policy. The fact is that since this Republican administration came into power no attempt has been made to change the Truman-Acheson policy. But they did make one change. They administer it in a sorry fashion. I am sad to say the Republicans have administered it in such a blundering way that we now have fewer friends in the world than we ever had in the history of the United States.

Yes, we have witnessed a new aggressive power rise in Communist countries due to Republican faltering steps in our foreign relations. We are now witnessing failure upon failure in Asia and Europe through ineptness. We can see a drift away from American leadership abroad, a drift of once friendly nations to the powers on the plains of Asia.

Neither the people of America nor the peoples of friendly or unfriendly nations know, from the welter of conflicting statements by Republicans in the executive branch and Republicans in the legislative branch, who is speaking for this Nation on international affairs. But the unfriendly nations do see clearly that in this confusion the Republican leaders do not know what they are doing or where they are going. And, my friends, the Reds are taking full advantage of it.

This 83d Republican Congress ended its deliberations with a smidgen of positive legislation and with a mass of problems unsolved through ineptness and the lack of constructive ideas on what to do.

Unfortunately for the people of this great country in a perilous period yet unequaled in our history, this 83d Congress will blot our record with the reputation of having worked harder and produced less original legislation than any of its predecessors.

The Republicans hailed their legislative program as "dynamic" and "forward-looking."

It was as "dynamic" as the dodo, as "forward-looking" as yesterday.

It was not conceived for the benefit of the best interests of all the people, but for big business and the privileged people.

Of all the major legislation enacted, only five bills would fall into the category of positive law. In the first session, the tidelands oil and emergency refugee bills became law. In the second session, the St. Lawrence Waterway, the revision of the tax structure, and the Democratic anti-Communist bills were enacted. It was in the maze of so-called minor legislation that the Republican Party and the Republican administration did most of the work for the privileged people and big business, excepting, of course, the vast advantages granted them in the Revenue Revision Act.

What about the remainder of the President's program that became law? Again I say, it was either extension, revision, or modification of basic laws enacted in previous Democratic administrations. Without the help of the Democrats who voted in the interest of the people, much of this part of President Eisenhower's program would have gone the way the rest of his program did—the bills he proposed which were either defeated, sidetracked, or ignored by the Republican leaders in the position of responsibility.

The record shows that the Republican-controlled Congress repudiated certain proposals of the party's elected leader, scorned many of their and President Eisenhower's bright campaign promises, abandoned pronounced principles, and handed their chief bitter morsels of compromises. Yet the Republican administration and the Republican press have the audacity to hail these compromises as "victories."

As an American, as leader of the Democratic minority in the House, I cannot take partisan comfort from this record, dismal as it is, distorted as it is, by Republican publicists and apologists, who brazenly hail defeats as victories and embarrassing compromises as achievements.

It is, to me, a solemn and tragic spectacle that portends ill for our country and for our people.

Mr. Speaker, I have now served longer in the Congress of the United States than any Member presently sitting in the House of Representatives. I do not contend that this endows me with any special wisdom. It is an accident of fate which leaves me in this position of seniority after so many other of our colleagues have left this scene.

Out of that long experience of more than 40 years, however, has grown the deep conviction that the continued existence of our free political institutions rests upon two bulwarks:

First, the two-party system. Second, party responsibility.

It is with grave sense of sorrow that I say we have seen those foundations shaken and weakened, and the future of our Nation threatened.

The Republican Party, entrusted with the reins of Government at both ends of Pennsylvania Avenue for the first time in 20 years, has demonstrated in 20 months its complete inability to govern.

It has revealed an ineptitude that is shocking to those of us who have devoted our lives to the service of our people.

Excepting in its determination to advance big business over the interest of the mass of individuals, the Republican administration has disclosed a complete lack of unity, an utter division of aims and goals.

It has unveiled an unparalleled vacuum of leadership.

It has uncovered a rash of conflicting elements and contentious views.

It has brought before the American people the spectacle of a Republican President pleading—and often pleading in vain—with a Republican Congress to support his proposals.

It could be that since the Republicans labored so long and so faithfully in the fields of the minority—hurling stones at constructive Democratic measures—their power to function as a responsible majority has atrophied.

It is evident, whatever the cause, that the Republican Party has spawned a generation of habitual obstructionists as varied as the fish in the sea—obstructionists who are incapable of acting cohesively and constructively.

The GOP today is not a unified political entity. It is a conglomeration of splinter groups, each of which considers that it and it alone should rule—rule not only the party, but the Nation. For this great democracy, the situation in the Republican Party is pitiful.

The American people tell us that they are confused by the erratic gyrations of this Republican Congress and this Republican administration. Well, they should be.

Deliberations of this Congress have been hampered and impeded, and actually stalled, by constant conflicts which have raged between Republican conservatives and Republican progressives—with the middle-of-the-roaders fighting both. The Republican nationalists and the Republican internationalists have engaged in constant cat-and-dog fights, while the Republican interventionists and Republican isolationists cut each other up.

Then we see the Republican chief executive using hammer and tongs on his own forces in the GOP Congress to try to get what he wants.

The picture of the Republican Party strife was not painted by the Democratic minority. The Republicans did it themselves. An artist, at least an amateur artist himself, President Eisenhower recognized the painting. In a desperate and almost frantic appeal to end the free-for-all Republican fracas, President Eisenhower publicly called for more political fusion and less political fission.

Bitter seeds of collapse have been sown by Republican dissension and the fruit will be a sour crop of disintegration. To me, it is a dire warning that our American way of political life is endangered by a breakup of what purports to be the conservative political party.

Under a system of two strong and unified political parties, this Nation has grown and prospered. We Democrats are alarmed over the growth of splinter parties under the Republican banner, over the desertion of principles of the founders of the party, and the failure to follow their elected chief. For we know the wisdom of the doctrine of two unified parties. It has been proved in the history of other countries where splinter parties have strangled parliamentary action, and their nations have been reduced to impotency as a result.

This is the most crucial of all times for the United States. Yet, we find ourselves with an elected leader who does not lead, because the men and women in his party's rank and file refuse to follow. Even though these people wear the Republican insignia, they ignore the discipline of party responsibility, wander off on tangents and desert their party standard.

How can the Republican leadership have the audacity to ask the voters of America to elect more irresponsibles to Congress in November? How can they ask the voters to compound an existing evil?

President Eisenhower voluntarily set the standard by which the American electorate is to decide on how to vote in November. On the recent date of August 4, the President announced at his press conference that the issue of the 1954 election was the enactment of a program based on the Republican platform.

The record shows that in contrast to the Republican pledges to the people in the 1952 National Convention, their platform is now in shambles.

In foreign policy the platform promised for America a "dynamic initiative"; a course of action "animated by courage, self-respect, steadfastness, vision, purpose, competence and spiritual faith."

What have we had for the past 20 months?

We have had indecision, instead of initiative; we have had timidity instead of courage; we have had absement instead of self-respect; retreat instead of steadfastness; blindness instead of vision; bungling instead of purpose; and incompetence instead of competence.

We have witnessed a startling exhibition of evasiveness, of alternate threats and withdrawals, of contradictory statements from immature voices high in Republican circles; voices that have not quit sounding off despite repudiation by their Chief Executive.

The Vice President of the United States announced one day that American ground troops were going to be sent to Indochina. Another day, the White House denied it. "Massive retaliation" was threatened against Red aggressors by the Secretary of State. Yet the Reds march on and prove his words empty.

The President asserts we can find a means of peaceful coordination with the Reds, even as they gain ground and our position in the world grows graver. Yet almost at the same time the Republican leader of the Senate calls for war against Red China. To cap the climax of indecision and lack of determination or ideas of how to meet the situation, the Secretary of Defense takes a "new look" at the latest defense New Look and pronounces that it is all "political" and not a "military" matter.

In the midst of this whirligig came the fall of Dien Bien Phu; the surrender at Geneva, the abandonment of 12 million people—once free people—in Indochina to Communist slavery; and an uneasy truce dictated by the Reds, a truce as shaky and as unsure as the truce the Chinese wrung from us in Korea. After all this, the brave and almost forgotten words of the 1952 Republican platform come to haunt us as an echo of a once great party. That platform promised:

> Our Nation will become again the dynamic moral and spiritual force which was the despair of the despots and the hope of the oppressed.

I say again, if there is any one word that can fully describe this administration, it is the word "inept."

By the most recent ineptness of this administration, we have not only lost face in Asia, but we probably have lost all Asia. We have lost prestige in Europe, where our allies are confused and confounded by the ever-shifting actions and statements of the Republican administration. Threats by the Secretary of State to retaliate against friendly nations have alienated the once warm friendship they held for us. These nations have given evidence of wanting to go their way on independent paths, and that has given aid and comfort to our enemies, potential and actual.

And, my friends, what has happened to that Republican platform pledge of "liberation"? Imagine the disillusionment of enslaved peoples in Communist-controlled countries, when they recognize that the Republicans also have failed on that one.

To be honest we must stamp the word "failure" on that flowing Republican platform promise:

> We will come to enjoy the reality of peace.

To speak on Republican promises and Republican performances is like shooting fish in a barrel.

Take the field of foreign economic policy, in which the Republican administration promised "trade, not aid."

President Eisenhower surely knows by now that we must encourage the free flow of international commerce; that we must buy from other countries if they are to get the dollars needed to pay for goods bought from us. He must know also, by this time, that international friendships are built upon trade and good will and not upon threats of reprisals.

President Eisenhower did embrace the reciprocal trade policy instituted a score of years ago by a Democratic administration. But his Republican Party, wedded to high protective tariffs, fought him down. In the first session, the Reciprocal Trade Act was extended for only 1 year with the aid of Democrats who furnished more votes for it than the Republican majority. The President was placed in the negative position of promising his Republican leaders that he would negotiate any new trade pacts and that he would destroy the bipartisanship of the Federal Tariff Commission by surrendering to demands to put an additional Republican "protectionist" on the majority side.

Only with the help of the Democrats did the President succeed in getting another bare 1-year extension of this act in the second session. Again we Democrats provided more votes than did the Republicans. Amid much ballyhooing the Randall Commission was created, a group of businessmen and legislators, to bring forth recommendations for promoting trade abroad. He endorsed its recommendations for a 3-year extension of the trade act, with additional power for the President to reduce tariffs, and for a reduction in taxes on American corporations doing business abroad.

On this, the Republican Congress handed the President one of his most severe rebuffs. It tossed the tax and tariff proposals out of the window.

On national defense the Republicans slogan makers promised a New Look and more "boom for a buck." Ignoring the tense international problems in the Eastern Hemisphere, the President and his economy-minded coworkers looked at national defense from a dollar angle and not from the broad view of national safety.

Since then, the Republicans have vacillated on national security as much as they have on foreign policy. The Secretary of Defense announced the Nation was going to have fewer war planes and better defense. He said he was going to economize by cutting the fighting forces, and that this would produce more safety for the Nation. How can you reconcile these statements?

The President went along on this program,—which purported to prepare for any type of war with emphasis on retaliatory atomic attacks. Economy was the key, but safety was sidetracked. By last May, events in the Far East disclosed the weakness of the plan. The administration took a new look at the New Look, and since then they have been looking over old problems and new problems.

Manpower goals destined to go down, now are to go up.

Defense spending was to decline. Now it is to rise.

The Air Force was to have fewer fighting wings. Now it is to have more fighting wings, nearly as many as the Truman administration said were needed.

Universal military training is out one day, in another day, and denied by the White House, until at least after the November elections.

The Republican platform had pledged:

> We will strip it—

Our preparedness program—

> clear of—lack of coordination.

On national economy, the Republican platform said:

> Our goal is a balanced budget, a reduced national debt.

The budget has not been balanced.

The national debt limit has been increased by $6 billion, to $281 billion.

Large annual deficits continue.

We saw the unusual situation of the Republicans promising to balance the budget, cut taxes, stop deficit spending and reduce the national debt—and then claim credit for a percent reduction in individual income taxes the Democrats had provided to take effect on January 1 this year.

At no time after World War II did the then President Truman ever recommend deficit financing. The fact is that the Truman administration, despite the cost of the Korean conflict, operated the Government on a cash basis. For the 8 years, 1946 to 1953, inclusive, cash operating income of the Government exceeded operating outgo by $6,862,000,000. Excepting 1949, 1952, and 1953, a surplus in revenue was recorded.

At the outset, this administration instituted a "hard-money" policy. It boosted the interest rate on new Government securities and withdrew support from outstanding obligations. Certain Government bonds dropped 10 percent in market value. The smart operators and bankers grabbed these low-priced securities, thereby boosting their interest return.

The Secretary of the Treasury and his other hard-money advocates soon were forced to abandon this policy and began to support the bonds through purchases. President Eisenhower, using his influence on the Federal Reserve Board, supposedly an independent agency created by Congress, and on the Treasury, shifted to a soft-money policy, to counteract the effect the hard-money policy had on business, employment, and the economy as a whole.

The Republicans wanted to avoid an economic recession. Since then the Federal Reserve System has pumped money into the economy, booming certain securities on the stock market, many far beyond their true earning value. If such an operation had been undertaken under a Democratic administration, the Republicans would have condemned it as inflation.

In the first session, the Republican Congress dealt a defeat to the President when it rejected his plea to increase the national debt limit from $275 billion to $290 billion. This session granted the administration a temporary 1-year increase of $6 billion after refusing to fulfill a request for a $15 billion permanent increase.

The Republican platform advocated an economy of "full production."

In December 1952, the last month of the Democratic administration, the Federal Reserve Board's seasonally adjusted index of industrial production stood at 133 percent of the 1947–49 average, the accepted base of 100 percent. For June of this year, it was 124 percent, a drop of 9 percent.

Another promise was eclipsed by performance.

Fewer people were working in July of this year than in the same month in the last year of the Truman administration. In July 1952, the number of jobless was at 1,942,000. In July 1954, the jobless numbered 3,346,000, an increase of 40 percent, and the working force is increasing a million a year.

Republicans dismiss the increased unemployment as conditions resulting from soft spots in the economy. Individuals without jobs or income may be soft spots for the Republicans, but idle workers are in a depression of their own.

This administration pays more attention to the manufacturers and their profits than to the condition of the workers. It points with pride to "profits after taxes of manufacturing corporations in 1953," described by a joint report of the Federal Trade Commission and the Securities and Exchange Commission as "6 percent higher than in 1952."

To counteract the decline in earnings of workers and income of farmers, we Democrats sought to get the Republican Congress to increase the personal exemption on individual income taxes from $600 to $700. This would have saved the taxpayers around $2½ billion—money which could have been used to buy food and goods, thereby stimulating business activity and more employment. But the Republicans defeated this effort. They succeeded in winning, however, on a proposal to exempt from taxation a portion of income from dividends on stocks, thereby giving relief to individuals on unearned income—more relief than granted to persons who work for a living.

The Republicans dropped the excess-profits taxes on corporations. This benefited the most profitable of corporations because of the 450,000 operating in this country, only about 50,000 were paying excess-profits taxes.

While the Republicans did reduce excise taxes by $990 million, they continued for a year the Korean increases in excise taxes amounting to $1,077,000,000, making the so-called excise-tax reduction actually an increase of $87 million. The Republicans sought to make those excise levies permanent, but we Democrats mustered enough strength to defeat that move, which would have saddled the people and business with these levies forever. The Republicans also continued for another year the corporate tax rate of 52 percent, to bring in $2 billion. The peacetime rate previously was 42 percent.

Now the Republicans continue to claim credit for the 11 percent tax reduction on individual income, which we Democrats provided for in the 81st Congress. What the Republicans did on this was purely negative.

The individual income-tax payers will save $3 billions through positive action taken by the Democrats, yet the Republicans claim they did it.

The Republicans also allowed the social-security taxes to increase from 3 to 4 percent on payrolls, half to be paid by the workers and half by the employers.

On agriculture, the Republicans made big promises in the 1952 campaign. At the national plowing contest in Kasson, when he was a candidate, Mr. Eisenhower stated that he not only favored 90 percent of parity on farm commodity prices but he favored 100 percent in the market place for 1954. But at Brookings, S. Dak., later, he placed no time limit on his pledge.

After the election, President Eisenhower changed his mind. He went all out for Secretary of Agriculture Benson's proposal for flexible price supports from 75 to 90 percent. Whenever a minimum is set on price supports, it automatically becomes the maximum.

The Eisenhower administration put full pressure on Congress to adopt the flexible provision. Republicans were told that if they reenacted the Democratic 90 percent rigid price support for the basic commodities of cotton, corn, wheat, rice, tobacco, and peanuts, President Eisenhower would veto the bill, thereby placing into effect the old Aiken Act, passed by the Republican-controlled 80th Congress. This would have made the maximum price support 75 percent.

The Republican compromise of 82½ percent was adopted in view of this threat. Despite the fact that it was a compromise, President Eisenhower hailed it as a victory over the farm bloc in Congress.

This victory over the farmers and the farm bloc in Congress comes at a time when farmers are getting 20 percent less for their prdoucts than they were getting 2 years ago. This means another cut of 7½ percent to producers of the basic crops.

The victory was a repudiation of the President's own campaign promises for the Republican platform said:

> We favor a farm program aimed at full parity prices for all farm products in the market place. * * * The Republican Party will create conditions providing for farm prosperity and stability.

In 20 months, Secretary Benson accomplished an unprecedented thing. They turned the town people against the farmer. I think this effort to turn the townfolks against the farmer was one of the cruelest things I have ever heard of.

Why they did it is pretty obvious. They did it for political reasons, and they used the false argument that Government-held farm surpluses increase the cost of living. This discreditable and demagogic tactic will rise to haunt the Republican Party, even though they did it because they are trying to lure into the GOP fold the huge vote in the vast cities across the land.

The Republican-controlled House Committee on Agriculture repudiated the false argument that stored farm surpluses increased the cost of living. In a special study of the problem the committee found that while the prices the farmer receives have dropped, the retail prices paid by consumers have risen.

Out of each dollar spent by the housewife for food produced in this country, the report said the farmer receives 44 cents gross, or 14 cents net, after paying the cost of production, including gasoline, fertilizer, seed, labor, trucks, tractors, and other supplies. Thus with a heavy investment and for the labor of himself and his family, the farmer gets but 14 cents of each consumer's dollar, a small margin.

The 56 cents of the consumer's dollar goes to the processor, the middleman, and the retailer.

A typical example cited by the committee was wheat. It reached a peak price of $2.81 a bushel in January 1948. The average price of a loaf of bread was then 13.9 cents. Wheat is now $1.91 a bushel, and the average price of a one-pound loaf of bread has increased to 17 cents.

Who are the profiteers under the Republicans—big business? The great mass of consumers and the struggling farmers do not profit.

The Republicans pledged a stabilized economy in their campaign pledges. The cost of living has been constantly increasing. The costs have been increased not only on food, but on utility rates as well. The vast power companies and the telephone companies have increased their rates; the price of gasoline has raised the cost of transportation; and hikes have occurred in almost all lines of services. This accounts for increased earnings by certain elements of industry.

President Eisenhower embraced the principle of the housing program initiated in previous Democratic administrations—a program which has made it possible for millions of young couples to acquire homes, for millions of city dwellers to move out of slums into modern, healthy apartments.

The Republican Party has made promises for improved housing and slum clearance. President Eisenhower asked Congress to authorize the construction of 140,000 units of low-cost housing. But the Republicans rebuffed him, 75 percent of the GOP Members of the House voting against his recommendation.

The Republicans cut his request down to 35,000 low-cost housing units, just one-fourth of his request. On the straight rollcall for the 140,000 units, only 51 House Republicans voted for the President's program, and 150 voted against him. On the same vote, 124 Democrats voted for the 140,000 units while 61 voted against. In other words, 66⅔ percent of the Democrats voted for his proposal and 75 percent of the Republicans voted against it.

Yet the compromise on 35,000 units was hailed by administration ballyhooers as a victory for President Eisenhower.

It seems that the Republican publicists around the White House are trying to brainwash the American people to a point where one must ask: "When is a victory a defeat, and when is a defeat a victory?"

The answer could be: "In Republican administration propaganda."

Certainly the Republicans cannot claim a victory for the President on his proposals they rejected:

First. Revision of the Taft-Hartley Labor Act.

Second. Statehood for Hawaii and Alaska.

Third. The trade, not aid, program.

Fourth. The health insurance program.

Fifth. Give 18-year-olds a vote.

Sixth. The internal security proposals.

The Republicans did revise and extend the social-security program, instituted by the Roosevelt administration in 1934, and passed by Democrats despite the GOP cries of "socialism" and "radicalism."

When the social-security proposal was brought before the House 20 years ago, every Republican Member who voted, voted to kill the measure on a motion to return it to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Even the revision was a compromise as compared with the request of President Eisenhower, who proposed to cover 10,500,000 in the old-age and survivors insurance system. The Republican Congress slashed the coverage, dealing the President another blow. It did raise the monthly benefit payments in the belief that this would be politically adroit.

It was a strange scene in the House for us Democrats to see this program espoused by reactionary Republicans, who had denounced the social-security system as "socialistic" and "radical" in the days of Roosevelt and Truman.

The mutual security program, also initiated by the Democrats to aid European, Asiatic and other countries to combat communism in the early post World War II years, was continued after the Republicans cut the President's proposal to $2.7 billion. The President needed Democratic assistance in both sessions to defeat the Republican isolationists. In the session just closed, 141 Democrats and only 118 Republicans in the House supported Mr. Eisenhower.

Both the President and the Republican Congress displayed their opposition to public power, as embodied in the Tennessee Valley Authority and great Federal projects that have brought cheap power into western regions which have since prospered.

The determined efforts of this administration to give away to big business electrical power, developed by taxpayers' money, and the Federal Government's great timber and oil reserves and grazing lands are revealed in policy and legislation. Much of this has been accomplished through so-called minor bills, rushed through in more or less disguised form to benefit selected groups and special interests which contribute substantially to Republican campaign funds.

During his presidential campaign, Mr. Eisenhower pledged in Tennessee to support the Tennessee Valley Authority. He later reversed himself and cited TVA as "creeping socialism." His recent order to the TVA to let its facilities be used by a new power corporation set up after he entered the White House was a shocking act. Not in my memory has a Chief Executive taken such a drastic step, particularly when an established government function was involved.

This development has caused alarm among many people, especially since the administration has committed itself to a giveaway policy—a policy by which private interests in many lines are acquiring projects developed at taxpayers' expense for the benefit of the entire country.

The administration giveaway policy would have gone so far as to let business take over Government patents on atomic energy, which truly belong to the taxpayers—the taxpayers who contributed $10 billion to the development of this source of limitless energy. Only the determined efforts of the Democrats in Congress prevented this policy being written into law as a part of the revised atomic energy bill.

The Republican Party is determined to take care of its own. Thus, legislation to bolster the shipyards by authorizing modernization of old ships and the building of new merchant marine vessels unneeded while thousands of wartime and postwartime vessels rot at their hawsers has been speeded through Congress in the final days of the session.

Now, let us go back for a brief review of the "dynamic" and forward-looking" Republican program:

The major bills enacted were, as I said before, originally instituted by Democratic administrations; namely:

First. Reciprocal trade.

Second. Mutual security.

Third. Housing.

Fourth. Social security.

Fifth. Farm price supports.

As for the five positive pieces of legislation enacted by this Congress, the tidelands and St. Lawrence Waterway bills had been before Congress for a long time, and before World War II we Democrats initiated a study looking to the revision of the revenue bill, but were interrupted by the emergency of the all-out war in the early forties. The emergency refugee bill was supplemental to previous refugee legislation enacted by the Democrats after World War II.

This administration said it wanted an anti-Communist law. But then it became apparent that the kind of law wanted by the administration was a weak-as-water measure which would have slapped the Communists on their wrists and told them not to be naughty boys. The strong anti-Communist bill finally enacted into law was initiated by the Democrats and passed over administration opposition. It answers effectively the Republican charge that Democrats are traitors to their country, a falsehood of the lowest type.

Throughout this Congress, the Republicans have shown hostility toward veterans of our wars and legislation benefiting them. They have clipped appropriations where possible and blocked measures proposed to improve the condition of the veterans.

Throughout this Congress, the lack of resourcefulness of the Republicans has become more and more obvious, the absence of vision has become more pronounced, and the negative approach to critical problems confronting the Nation is glaringly apparent.

The situation is such between the President, who has embraced much of the Democratic legislative program, and the Republicans in Congress, who have resisted it, that the country will be better off if it returns a Democratic Senate and House in the November elections.

But there is one significant thing that must be cited. While the Republicans denounced the Roosevelt and Truman legislative programs, during two entire sessions of this Congress, they have not sought to repeal one piece of welfare legislation.

In 1952 the people of the United States concluded that they wanted a change. Let me repeat, many of them got it with a vengeance. After these months of change, I want to ask you, Mr. Farmer, Mr. Laboring Man, Mr. Small-Business Man, "What is your financial condition in 1954 compared to what it was in 1951 and 1952?" and ask you wherever you live, in any section of the United States, "Have you been benefited by and are you proud of the change?"

The Grange Stands for Good Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RUSSELL V. MACK

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

August 20, 1954

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, the Grange is the greatest farm organization in the world. One of the things in which every granger is deeply interested is good government—government that is progressive, forward looking, efficient, economical, and humane.

The Grange through its national offices has spoken out for many programs it favors in its goal of obtaining better Government.

I am happy to report to my Grange brothers and sisters that the present Congress enacted many, of course not all, ideas, either in whole or in part, for which we grangers stand.

SOCIAL SECURITY

Grangers will recall that about a year ago I took an opinion poll among all of the 99 granges of my district as to how Grange members felt about farmers being covered by social security. Replies from grangers showed that more than 90 percent of all those answering my poll wanted farmers to get the benefits of social security.

I am happy to report that the social-security bill passed by this Congress provides social-security coverage for the Nation's 3½ million farm owners. I was happy to work and vote for social-security protection for the farmers. The grangers wanted this. They got their wish.

WHAT FARMERS MUST PAY

The new law treats farmers as self-employed people, not employees. When an employee is covered by social security, his withholding tax is 4 percent of his income. Half of this tax is paid by the employee and half by the employer.

In the case of farmers and all self-employed persons the tax rate is 3 percent instead of 4 percent and the full 3 percent is paid by the self-employed person.

Thus, if your annual income as a farmer is $2,000, your 3-percent withholding tax for that year will be $60; if your income is $3,000, your tax will be $90; and if your income is $4,200, your social-security tax will be $124 a year.

A farmer's social-security tax does not become due until he pays his income tax. In short, his first withholding tax for social security will not be due and payable until April 1, 1956. This tax will be on the farmer's income for the year 1955.

HOW TO QUALIFY FOR BENEFITS

A person to start drawing a social-security pension must be 65 years of age.

A person must be in a sense a retired person. He is allowed to earn from his profession or trade up to $1,200 a year without this income affecting his right to a pension. However, if he earns in salary or wages from his business or farm more than $1,200 a year net, the pensioner forfeits 1 month's pensions for each $80 he earns above $1,200.

The pensioner must have paid into the social-security fund withholding taxes for one-half the years between his start under the system, January 1, 1955, and his 65th birthday. Thus, if you are 62 years old on January 1, 1955, you must pay into the fund for 18 months before you can get a pension. If you are 59 years old, you must pay into the fund for 3 years. If 55 years old now, you must pay into the fund for 5 years.

Young farmers, who are under 45, will be permanently insured when they have paid into the fund for 10 years.

Farmers over 65 may qualify by paying into the fund for 18 months. Eighteen months is the minimum one must be covered to get benefits.

HERE IS WHAT YOU GET

Upon retirement at age 65 you are entitled to a pension equal to 55 percent of the first $110 of your average monthly earnings plus 20 percent of that part of your average monthly earnings that are above $110 a month.

Example: If your average monthly earnings were $200 you get $60.50—which is 55 percent of the first $110—plus $18—which is 20 percent of the remaining $90. Thus, on $200 a month earnings you receive $78.50 a month.

If your average earnings were $300 you receive $60.50 on the first $110, plus $38—which is 20 percent of the remaining $190—or a total pension of $98.50.

If, and when, your wife becomes 65, she is entitled to half of what you get. If you receive a pension of $78.50 a month, she will be paid an additional $39.25. If you receive $98.50, she will receive $49.25, the 2 of you receiving a total monthly pension of $147.75.

When an insured farmer dies, his widow is entitled to receive, starting at age 65, three-quarters of the pension the farmer received. If he received $100 a month, she will get for the rest of her life or until she remarries, a pension of $75.

The system also provides a small amount of death benefits to cover funeral expenses.

I will be glad to discuss with you or groups of your farmers, the new social-security law as it affects farmers and all other groups. Most people are interested in this new law.

GRANGE HIGHWAY IDEA ACCEPTED

The National Grange always has held that all gasoline tax money should go into highway building and not be diverted to other purposes.

The present Congress enacted a bill which, in effect, approves this Grange policy by compelling the use of all funds derived from the 2-cent-a-gallon Federal gasoline tax on highway building.

Heretofore, for many years past, our Government has been collecting about $875 million a year from its 2-cent Federal gas tax.

Of this $875 million collected from the Federal gas tax, Congress spent only $575 million in past years on highways and diverted $300 million or more to other purposes, some of it to foreign aid. Some of the gasoline tax money was actually diverted to build highways in foreign countries at a time when we desperately needed better roads in our own country.

This Congress authorized the expenditure of $875 million annually on building highways, or $300 million more than ever has been authorized heretofore. Thus, all, or practically all, of the gasoline tax revenues will go into highway building. As a result of this expanded highway program Washington State will receive more than $5 million a year of additional Federal funds for building highways.

This is what the Grange wanted. I was happy to support this legislation. I not only supported it, but since I am a member of the Public Works Committee, which prepared this legislation, I was in a position to help write it.

THE PUBLIC POWER QUESTION

I am, as you know, an advocate of public power development of the Columbia River and its tributaries. I know there is a great deal of talk about President Eisenhower planning to scuttle all public-power development on the Columbia. I put such talk down to politics.

There is talk that there will be no new starts on the Columbia River in the future. There is no foundation for such talk.

It was Truman, himself, when the Korean war began who issued the order against new starts on river and harbor flood-control work. That Truman order remained in effect until after the Korean war ended, which was well into Eisenhower's first year. Truman, not Eisenhower, was the author of the no-new-starts policy.

The Flood Control Committee, of which I am chairman, in its bill this year authorized the expenditure of $180 million for power-dam building during the next 2 years on the Columbia River. That was the largest amount authorized for any river development in any one area of the entire Nation.

This $180 million for Columbia power development was approved by the United States Army Engineers and by the Budget Bureau, which organizations are the President's spokesmen on river-development matters.

This bill authorizing this huge $180 million sum passed both Houses of Congress and will be signed by the President. This does not look like the President is going to scuttle Columbia River power development, does it? Perhaps all this talk about Ike scuttling Columbia River power development is mainly directed at making election votes rather than hydroelectric kilowatts.

Of course, I know, President Eisenhower says we ought to develop power by partnership arrangements.

Development of power exclusively and solely by the Federal Government never has, and is not now, getting the Northwest additional power as fast as the Northwest needs it. Building of Federal power dams on the Columbia started 21 years ago. In those 21 years the Federal Government has completed little more than 3 million kilovolts of installed capacity—an average of only about 150,000 kilovolts of installed hydroelectric power completed a year. We must have 500,000 kilovolts of additional power annually to keep up with the growing demand of our region. We have been increasing our power supply less than one-third of the amount we require for growth.

Ike wants the local interests, the States, the countywide PUD's and the municipal public-power utilities to get into the picture and help develop power.

By State, county and municipal bodies working together with the Federal Government, we can get more power sooner and that is what the Northwest needs and I think what the Northwest wants. The Priest Rapids Dam proposal is one example of what can and should be done.

CUTTING FEDERAL SPENDING

For several years, the National Grange as pursued with great vigor a campaign for the elimination of waste and extravagance from the Federal Government and the achievement of more efficient and effective Government.

Great progress has been made in this direction by the present Congress. In the first 19 months of the Eisenhower administration $14 billion of wasteful and extravagant spending were eliminated.

President Truman as he left office submitted a budget which he said provided for spending $10 billion more than would be taken in from revenues. In other words, he predicted a $10 billion deficit for the first 12 months of Eisenhower's administration.

Eisenhower gave a tax reduction not contemplated by Truman. Eisenhower raised veterans' pensions. Eisenhower increased social-security and railroad-retirement pensions. Eisenhower provided more money to ease credits in order to encourage more home building. Despite all these and other expanded services which President Eisenhower put into effect, Ike cut the deficit which President Truman predicted would be $10 billion to approximately $3 billion—made a budget deficit reduction of $7 billion. He did this by eliminating or lessening, as Grangers suggested, waste and extravagance from Government.

AIDS TO FARMERS IN TAX LAWS

Tax laws enacted by the 83d Congress are of benefit to farmers and farm families in a number of ways. Under the tax-revision law, farmers can claim a $600 dependency deduction for a child regardless of the child's earnings if such dependent is receiving on-the-farm training and the farmer continues to furnish more than half of his support.

The revision law also allows for farmers:

Deductions up to 25 percent of farm income for soil and water conservation expenses.

More rapid writeoff of the cost of new depreciable assets—farm machinery, equipment, and so forth. Under the declining balance method of depreciation now permitted, the farmer can write off in the first year twice the amount allowed under the straight-line method.

Removal of the tax on proceeds from sale of cattle when the sale is necessitated by disease, provided the proceeds are reinvested in cattle within 1 year after the close of the taxable year.

Previously, where a farmer did not file a declaration of estimated tax by January 15, he had to file his final income-tax return by January 31. The deadline is now extended to February 15. Also, where a farmer files a declaration by January 15, his final return is now not due until April 15.

Farmers' accounting requirements are eased to permit the use of the farmer-preferred hybrid bookkeeping system.

Another Republican-passed tax law provides for rapid amortization of farm grain-storage facilities. Whereas before such facilities could be amortized only over their useful life, this now can be done over a 5-year period. This provision was included in the Technical Changes Act of 1953—Public Law 287, approved August 15, 1953—which was reenacted by the tax-revision law.

Public Laws 531 to 547, Inclusive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 18, 1954

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent I am extending my remarks to include my reports on Public Laws 531 to 547, inclusive, to my constituents in the Second District of Illinois, as follows:

PUBLIC LAW 531

H. R. 9040, cooperative research in education

Public Law 531 is a new approach in the field of educational research. It authorizes contracts and jointly financed cooperative arrangements with universities, colleges, and State educational agencies for the conduct of research, surveys, and demonstrations. Heretofore the work has been confined to the office of the Commission on Education in Washington. By distributing it among local schools and agencies throughout the Nation, a wider range of experience will be tapped. Moreover, much more can be accomplished and at less expense to Federal taxpayers since part of the money will come from local sources.

Eventually will come from the research and surveys recommendations covering every phase of school construction and administration. These will be made available as optional help-aids (take or leave) to anyone desiring them. Conceivably they can be of great value to local school boards and others in formulating programs adapted to their own respective problems.

The House passed the measure by a rollcall vote of 296 to 55. I was happy to cast your vote on the affirmative side. Not so, however, in the case of Public Law 532, which was brought up seemingly as a companion bill to Public Law 531 in the apparent hope that deceptive doubling-up would catch the champions of popular education offguard and asleep.

PUBLIC LAW 532

H. R. 7434, National Advisory Committee on Education

This bad law (sought to be covered up by the good law preceding) opens the door for another attack on popular education in its present cultural functioning similar to that in the early thirties when in the name of economy a determined drive was made to reduce the curriculum in the public schools to little more than the three R's. I have vivid recollections of those days, and the happy opportunity my nightly radio broadcasting over WCFL gave me to participate in a historic and successful battle to save our schools.

Public Law 532 creates a National Advisory Committee on Education to initiate and conduct studies of problems of national concern in the field of education and to blueprint for Congress its legislative program in the educational field. A pretty big order, I would think, and one that would require the best efforts of the outstanding educators of the Nation.

I think you will be shocked, as I was, when the measure came up in the House, to learn that Public Law 532, presumably for the advancement of education, actually bans from control of the committee the men and women of greatest knowledge, experience, and devoted interest in the field of education. Originally the measure completely disqualified educators from committee membership. Later the ban was mildly sugarcoated to concede them the possibility of a minority representation by specifying that a majority of the committee should not be professional educators. It did not make it mandatory to include a single educator, but strictly forbid the educators, if any, exercising majority control.

The intent is as crystal clear as the ringing of a bell. With school population increasing and costs mounting, this marks the beginning of another drive for educational curtailment. It is on the same pattern as recent attacks upon our colleges, universities, and educational foundations.

I regard Public Law 532 as one of the most potentially evil enactments of the 83d Congress. It passed the House 179 to 157, a narrow majority of 22, possible only because of the 99 absentees. I voted "No."

Fortunately, the day was saved in part by stripping the measure of authorization of immediate funds. Hence until another Congress provides the money the National Advisory Committee on Education will exist only on paper. If the friends of our schools had been less alert the sneak attack on popular education might have resulted in a greater degree of immediate peril.

PUBLIC LAW 533

H. R. 7466, Pine River Irrigation District, Colorado

Just another reclamation project that did not pay out according to the calculations. Public Law 533 gives the district until 1994 to pay back in easy installments Uncle Sam's $3,300,000 investment.

PUBLIC LAW 534

H. R. 9242, Military and Naval construction authorization

Construction of public works, housing and facilities for the Army, Navy, Air Forces and Alaskan Communication System totalling

$837,369,600 are authorized by Public Law 534. It takes 29 printed pages to list all the projects in continental United States and overseas. This will give you an idea of overseas authorizations. Five and five-tenths million dollars for family housing and other facilities at Keflavik, Iceland; $6 million for housing and medical and other facilities at Okinawa; $13 million for Guam.

The act limits expenditure for permanent barracks within continental United States to a unit cost of $1,700 per man, $5,000 a man for bachelor officers quarters.

PUBLIC LAW 535

S. 2583, indemnities for swine

In 1952 vesicular exanthema, a contagious disease, threatened swine in Oregon and other States. The Secretary of Agriculture declared an emergency in August of that year and Federal funds were made available to cooperate with various States in indemnifying owners for swine destroyed to prevent spread of the plague. Public Lad 535 provides for the payment of indemnities for swine destroyed in July 1952, prior to the declaring of the emergency. The amount involved is about $3,300.

PUBLIC LAW 536

S. 2786, fire protection compact

About 21 percent of the standing timber in the United States is in 10 Southeastern States, which produce half the Nation's pulpwood, a third of its timber. Recent severe drought has intensified the forest-fire hazard beyond the protective capacity of the States acting individually. Public Law 536 gives the necessary congressional consent to a compact entered into by the 10 States to pool resources in preventing and fighting the fire destruction of our timber.

PUBLIC LAW 537

S. 3197, donations to defense effort

During World War II, American citizens, motivated by a patriotic desire to contribute more than their required share, made voluntary gifts to the Government totaling more than $7 million. Such gifts to the extent of $365,000 continued to come in during 1953. Public Law 537 authorizes the acceptance of conditional as well as unconditional gifts. Conditional gifts are those earmarked for specific purposes, as recreation, medical supplies, etc.

PUBLIC LAW 538

H. R. 1067, Tax Court of the United States

This authorizes the Supreme Court of the United States to prescribe uniform rules of practice and procedure (in the 11 courts of appeals) for review of decisions of the United States Tax Court.

PUBLIC LAW 539

H. R. 2846, Hawaii

To aid Hawaii to complete pier 2 in Honolulu Harbor Public Law 539 gives back to the Territory 3 acres of land for which the Federal Government has no need.

PUBLIC LAW 540

H. R. 4854, Irrigation

Public Law 540 aims at the reclamation (largely for fruit growing) of some 6,000 acres of arid land in a mountainous region along the Columbia and Okanagan Rivers in the central part of the State of Washington. It is expected that the irrigation of this land will make it possible for the fruit growers and other farmers benefited to pay back within 50 years $2.5 million of the estimated $4.5 million cost. The $2 million balance of the Federal Government's investment would come from water power revenues. That is on the general pattern of irrigation projects. Uncle Sam eventually to get back his money, part from the sale of water power, part from agricultural profits made possible by the conversion of arid waste into cultivable acres.

What Public Law 540 does is to authorize the construction of the Foster Creek division as part of the Chief Joseph Dam project, which if and when carried to completion will entail a total expenditure of at least $35 million with expected reimbursement of $20 million from sale of water power, $15 million from land owners.

PUBLIC LAW 541

H. R. 4928; Uncle Sam helps out a city

Fifty years ago the United States brought 48 acres of farmland in New Jersey and set up a quarantine station. Now it is the center of Clifton, a thriving city of 75,000 which has come with the passing of a half century. Mushrooming Clifton is territorially congested, needs a site for outgrown municipal buildings. The only available site is 14 of Uncle Sam's acres which are presently used as burial ground for dead animals from the quarantine station. Public Law 541 reflects the proper cooperative spirit of Federal Government in relation with municipal government by authorizing the sale of the 14 acres to Clifton for a new city hall. Then Uncle Sam can buy an incinerator for the disposal of his dead animals.

PUBLIC LAW 542

H. R. 6882, Vermejo reclamation project

Because of a debt owing to the liquidating RFC in connecting with the Vermejo reclamation project in New Mexico, Public Law 542 provides a financing and repayment plan to enable the proposed conservancy district to work things out on a time-payment basis.

PUBLIC LAW 543

H. R. 8549, Breaks Interstate Park

In 1953 Congress gave consent to Kentucky and Virginia to enter into a compact for a bi-State park on a fork of the Big Sandy River. Public Law 543 approves the compact which the two States since have ratified. This is in an area of great scenic beauty. Virginia has appropriated $50,000 and Kentucky $25,000 for the start of development. Autoists may wish to jot it down.

PUBLIC LAW 544

H. R. 7664, Columbia River Basin

The Priest Rapids Dam and Reservoirs was approved by the Flood Control Act of 1950 as a unit in the comprehensive plan for flood control and water power in the Columbia River Basin. Estimated cost: $364 million.

Despite the rapidly expanding demand for hydroelectric power in the area, the Federal Government has not gone ahead with the project. Local interests desiring to take over, Public Law 544 gives the necessary authorization to Public Utility District No. 2, Grant County, Wash. (a nonprofit public body under State law), to enable it to get a license from the Federal Power Commission.

Similar arrangement has been made in other areas where local interests have wished to hasten developments on the Federal program for which appropriations were lagging. It amounts to local governments relieving the United States from the responsibility of financing. That I think is sound. Nevertheless, each proposal of this nature should challenge careful study to make certain that (1) the Federal interest in relation to the flood-control program in its entirety is completely protected, and (2) the public is assured fair and nondiscriminatory rates with first call in the purchase of power and energy going to public bodies and cooperatives.

PUBLIC LAW 545

S. 2367, contract research

This is an amendment to the Bankhead-Jones Act permitting the Department of Agriculture to carry on all its research projects by contracts with public and private research organizations and individuals. Heretofore only research in the marketing field could be let out by contract. The rest had to be done by the Department personnel.

You will find interest in the fact that well over $1 million a year in market research contracts have been let. Secretary Benson told the Congress the contract plan was more efficient and economical than leaving the work to the Department's researchers.

PUBLIC LAW 546

H. R. 8983, historical site in Oklahoma

Oklahoma plans to restore and preserve as a historical museum the old Indian agency building (of Territorial days) at Muskogee. Public Law 546 conveys the property, including parking space for touring autoists and others. This being in Oklahoma, the Congress, of course, was alert in seeing that oil and mineral rights were reserved.

Public Law 546 indexes, as have others covered in these reports, the definite trend throughout the country in the restoration and preservation of historic places. Here, I think, is the true reflection of the love of and loyalty to country that have been instilled in Americans by the teachings in our schools and colleges.

PUBLIC LAW 547

H. R. 5731, dam at San Diego, Calif.

During World War II the United States acquired 135,000 acres of land in San Diego County, Calif., now occupied by the United States naval hospital, the naval ammunition Depot and Camp Joseph H. Pendleton, a major Marine Corps training center. Included is 21 acres, through which runs the last stretch of the Santa Margarita River before reaching the Pacific Ocean.

Public Law 547 authorizes the construction of the De Lux Dam (cost: $22.6 million) in that area to serve the joint purposes of Navy and the water users in the Fallbrook Public Utility District. The district will have 56 years in which to pay its $7 million contribution.

Meeting the Chinese Red Menace With an Economic Program for the Chinese People To Help Them End the Communist Regime and Reestablish Nationalist China—Part I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, every day the Chinese Communists tell the world, especially the American people, that they will take over Formosa by force of arms and warn us against helping Nationalist China's valiant leader, President Chiang Kai-shek, in driving back the invaders.

A major war in east Asia may be in the offing. We should be prepared for any eventuality. We are committed to help Nationalist China. Our cooperation should be in every field where the objective could be most effectively achieved.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to insert in the RECORD a statement by Mr. Vicente Villamin, a man who has made profound and practical examination of the different phases of the Asian questions. He is here presenting an economic program to meet the Chinese Communist menace.

I urge very strongly that all Members of Congress and administration leaders interested in Asian questions, especially those relating to China, study carefully Mr. Villamin's statement. He has an economic plan that commends itself for its commonsense, practicality, and timeliness.

Mr. Villamin's statement follows:

How To Win Over the Chinese People

(By Vicente Villamin)

A general war in Asia would be an immediate possibility if Red China should carry out its threat of taking Formosa by force. Red China's Foreign Minister Chou En-lai says Formosa must be "liberated," meaning conquered. He also say that the United States must not help Formosa.

As an overt act, the Chinese Red army and air force are reported to be taking battle positions along the China coast facing Formosa. The Red official radio at Peiping is continually blaring out invasion threats and dire predictions.

Under President Chiang Kai-shek, the Chinese National Government on Formosa is ready to give a rough reception to the Red invaders. The United States is committed to render aid to that Government. Secretary of State John Foster Dulles so declared recently. In that he has the unanimous backing of the United States Congress. And the American people are for it.

ARE THE REDS BLUFFING?

Are the Red Chinese bluffing? They might be. They are flushed by their victory in Indochina. They feel they won at the recent Geneva Conference by preventing it from producing a Korean unification plan. They discovered at Geneva the loose unity existing among the Western Powers. And they believe that these things have given them enough prestige to make it unpopular for the United States to go to the aid of Nationalist China on Formosa in resistance to their act of "liberation."

The United States understands perfectly her position in the situation. She is not to be bluffed out by the Chinese Reds by war threats and verbal attacks. She knows that any sign of fear or hesitancy would give the Chinese Reds the courage that they lack to proceed with their invasion of Formosa, thence to extend their act of "liberation" to the free countries of east Asia.

A GENERAL WAR IS POSSIBLE

If Red China invades Formosa, it is possible that she will resume the war in Korea and Indochina. She would think that that would be the best time for her to conquer all Korea and all Indochina.

The United States would be engaged in the defense of Formosa. And so in Korea, but this time probably without the cooperation, immediate cooperation at least, of the 15 other United Nations countries whose armed forces have already returned home from Korea. It is highly probable that no United States troops will go to Indochina. Under a renewed attack by the Reds, the French would more likely than not complete their total surrender of Indochina.

THE CHINESE PEOPLE WILL DECIDE

The attitude of the Chinese people in the war will be decisive as to the war itself and as to the destiny of Asia. If they side with Nationalist China actively, the Chinese Red regime will be overthrown and communism in China would be at an end. That massive fact would ensure the reign of freedom and democracy in Asia, dismiss Russia from Asia, weakening and chastening her in Europe and everywhere else, and make America a still greater power for good in the world.

It is, therefore, essential that the Chinese people be won over to Nationalist China. This task is tremendous, but it is achievable. During the last 4 years of Red regime the Chinese people have known what communism is, and they detest and dislike it thoroughly. In the meantime, they have witnessed the building of the model of a new, democratic, honest, and enlightened government on Formosa for the China that is going to be redeemed from communism and Russianism." It is reasonable to expect that the Chinese people would rally to their old colors when the forces of President Chiang Kai-shek unfold them on the mainland. Together they will march to demolish the Red regime and put the Red leaders who have not escaped to Russia in their places.

AN ECONOMIC PLAN FOR CHINA

To make doubly sure that the Chinese people will join Nationalist China to overthrow the Chinese Red regime, there should be a program for the economic development of China to be put into operation as Nationalist China establishes its authority on the mainland. This program will take the place of the Red economic program now under way and should be much better for the people. In other words, Nationalist China will have a better government and a better program for the people's welfare and progress.

The United States alone could finance the economic program. Such financing would be the very best investment she could make for world peace, progress, and freedom as well as for her own security from Communist molestation. It would be the cheapest and at the same time most effective way of defeating the Communists in Asia and thus depriving Russia of her most formidable ally.

An economic program calling for an expenditure of $2 billion a year for a period of 5 years would be an immense improvement on the Red economic program now in operation. In carrying out this program, the cooperation of the overseas Chinese could be and should be enlisted. There are among them many successful businessmen, bankers, industrialists, engineers, scholars, agriculturalists, and other leaders in the different fields of endeavor.

CHINESE-AMERICAN COOPERATION

The United States will exercise supervision and direction of the planning, operation, spending, and securing good results. There will be cooperation between America and the reborn China. Instead of being an enemy of the United States, China will become her friend and ally. A strong China allied with the United States would be the greatest setback that Russia could suffer. It would make Russia realize her lack of power and reason to dominate the world, and that would be the beginning of the end of international communism.

The amount of $2 billion is roughly one-half of 1 percent of the national product or income of the United States for one year. The United States Government is spending yearly some $50 billion over normal defense expenditures for defense largely as the result of the Russian menace. When China becomes strong, industrially and militarily, say, 10 years from now under the hostile Red regime, the United States will be confronted with a new menace that might be more serious than the Russian menace, and that would boost her defense budget to enormous proportions.

Thus the $10 billion for the 5-year economic program for China would be the best, the most effective and the most timely investment the American people could make for world peace, prosperity, and security and for the disintegration and discrediting of communism in the world.

AN ANNOUNCEMENT IS NEEDED

Chinese Red Foreign Minister Chou En-lai, the same man who specialized in insulting, assailing, and misrepresenting the United States at the recent Geneva Conference, has been hurling threats against the United States from Peiping and announcing the invasion of Formosa. It would be logical for the United States to say when she declares her determination to aid Formosa that she would help the Chinese people on the mainland to better their economic condition under a Chinese-American cooperative program that would eclipse the Red program. The Chinese people would understand the meaning of that assurance and they would do their mighty best to regain their Old China, to be governed and developed along modern lines by real Chinese that love freedom and hate communism, Russianism, and dictatorship.

Hon. Edward J. Hart

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, one of the greatest pleasures of my years of service in the National House of Representatives is the fact that it enabled me to meet and know our distinguished and brilliant colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Hart]. During our 20 years of service together there has developed between us a close and lasting friendship. Ed Hart's friendship will always remain as one of my treasured memories.

For the past 20 years Congressman Ed Hart has been one of the outstanding Members of the Congress.

During that period he has been the most eloquent Member of the House, which body numbers among its membership many Members of outstanding ability in the field of oratory. Ed Hart is not only eloquent but sound in thoughts he expressed when he addressed the House. His devotion to duty has been evidenced by his close attendance to his committee work and to the House during its sessions.

Among those who served with each other there is no Member who has more favorably impressed himself upon his colleagues than has Ed Hart.

Congressman Hart is not seeking reelection and is retiring from the House.

I shall miss Ed Hart. I shall miss him personally because of our close friendship. I shall miss him as one of the Democratic leaders because we could always depend upon the support of Ed Hart. His sense of loyalty—strong and lasting loyalty—is a trait Ed Hart possesses and evidenced.

In retirement from the House, I wish Ed Hart every happiness and success he so richly deserves.

My wish is that he will in the future frequently visit Washington and the Chamber he loves, the National House of Representatives. Ed Hart will always be welcomed by his friends and those who served with him.

The Advantages and Disadvantages for the United States of Economic Self-Sufficiency

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a paper on the advantages and disadvantages for the United States of economic self-sufficiency which I have had my staff prepare in cooperation with various experts in this field and drawing upon governmental and private studies. This is a subject which I feel is of great importance in the shaping of national policy. It cannot be covered in all its aspects in a brief paper, but I believe that this is a very valuable discussion of some of the problems and I should like to invite this paper to the attention of of the congressional committees which are concerned with this subject.

There being no objection, the paper was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ADVANTAGES AND DISADVANTAGES FOR THE UNITED STATES OF ECONOMIC SELF-SUFFICIENCY

There is little doubt that no other developed nation in the world outside of the Soviet empire could attain economic self-sufficiency so readily as could the United States, if self-sufficiency is used to mean the situation in which there are no economic dealings with other nations while the existing standard of living does not fall drastically. This paper will seek to examine some of the advantages and disadvantages of a policy deliberately designed to make the United States economically self-sufficient. Such a policy would involve economic changes so numerous and complex that there is no pretense in this brief paper to have done more than touch on a few of the more obvious. The effect of ending international capital movement is, for example, ignored completely.

Clearly a policy pointed toward economic self-sufficiency would involve substantial economic dislocation within this country at least during a transition period. At present over 4 million people earn their living from international trade. These people would have to find other jobs. Many industries are dependent on foreign sources of supply for raw and partially fabricated materials. These industries would have to develop domestic sources of supply or where this is impossible they would have to develop substitutes. If this, too, is impossible they would have to change their production or go out of business. Undoubtedly there would be a difficult period during which many industries would have to operate at less than full capacity. It is assumed herein that the transition period to complete, or virtual, independence in the economic sphere from all other nations would be tolerable although no study has been made which confirms or denies this assumption.

After examining the case of complete self-sufficiency, the paper will go on to examine two other possibilities which are something less than complete economic self-sufficiency. First of these other possibilities would involve making the Western Hemisphere into an economic unit in which the United States would inevitably be the dominant member. The second would involve ending our economic dependence on other nations for everything except those commodities which we could not produce at all within the United States or only at very high cost. There are, of course, many other variations between complete self-sufficiency and substantial economic relations with other friendly nations which are not discussed.

THE ADVANTAGES OF COMPLETE ECONOMIC SELF-SUFFICIENCY

In a world full of threats of war probably the greatest single advantage arising from economic self-sufficiency would be the complete freedom from any dependence on foreign sources of supply and the elimination thereby of certain vulnerable points in our national strength.

Overseas supply lines, as we have learned in two World Wars, are vulnerable to enemy attacks. There is also the danger that many of our overseas sources of supply, particularly those sources located in southeast Asia and the Middle East, might either be destroyed or seized by hostile forces. The threat of having all or a significant part of our overseas supplies of materials cut off in this manner and our industrial production thereby disrupted would be eliminated by economic self-sufficiency. However, even though our own production would be unaffected by the loss of foreign supply sources, their loss would have an adverse effect on the industrial output of our allies, and the burden on our production would be increased as we tried to compensate for this decline in our allies' output. Presumably we would do this so long as our military strategy continues to be based on a system of alliances as it is today.

Development of atomic weapons has reached the point where our major ports are, or soon will be, vulnerable either to airborne or submarine attack which might render these ports useless for periods of time. The significance of this threat to our security would be greatly diminished by economic self-sufficiency even though we would probably still have need of our ports for the movement of troops and supplies overseas.

The Navy, the Air Force, and to a lesser extent, the Army, in the event of war would have to devote some of their forces to the protection of ocean supply lines and foreign sources of materials.

Economic self-sufficiency would, therefore, relieve the Armed Forces of certain responsibilities. Likewise certain of our industrial resources would be freed since the need for a merchant marine would be reduced. The only threat to our sources of supply remaining should we attain self-sufficiency would be direct attacks on this country.

A second benefit to be expected is that cutting off international trade would give an extremely powerful impetus to the discovery of new domestic resources or the development of substitutes for imports. The situation on petroleum reserves is a classic example of how the apparently alarming depletion of a domestic resource caused the Government tog ive a special stimulus to new discoveries which have caused proven reserves to expand over the years. Complete self-sufficiency would cause this experience to be repeated in many other areas. The development of substitutes and technological improvements which conserve materials or permit us to use lower-grade raw materials have frequently prevented us from suffering the consequences from losses of foreign sources of supply. Artificial rubber, synthetic textiles, and atabrin are famous examples of substitutes developed to replace natural imports. The increased use of taconite is helping to replace the depleted rich domestic iron ores, although at a higher cost. It should be kept in mind, however, that ending all international trade might easily cause us to exhaust certain of our natural resources much more quickly than we would if we continued to meet part of the domestic demand from imports. Furthermore, it is likely that no satisfactory replacement is possible for all our essential imports.

The third benefit to be gained from economic self-sufficiency would be the possibility that it would insure a more continuously high level of employment. Although there is no way of proving this point—indeed some recent evidence points to the opposite conclusion, it seems possible that by eliminating foreign sources of supply we would generate a demand for the domestic production of many of the things which we now secure from abroad. Any gain in employment resulting from such a demand would have to be offset against the loss of employment resulting from shrinking export markets in order to arrive at the net effect of self-sufficiency on domestic employment. (It might be considered consistent with a policy of self-sufficiency to continue grant aid to foreign countries for the sake of our political and security requirements even though we had ceased to import from abroad. To the extent that grant aid replaced normal dollar earnings of other nations arising from their exports to the United States, the reduction in employment resulting from declining exports would be reduced.) Since the United States probably would be an inefficient producer of a number of the things we now import, the real cost of these goods would be high, which would probably mean that a large amount of labor would be required for their production. If the demand for these goods did not drop off too severely as a result of higher prices, considerable employment might be generated, although the low productivity of such labor would imply that the wages paid this labor would be low.

A related benefit to the one mentioned above would be the elimination of a possible element of instability in the domestic economy. Economic fluctuations in other nations can be transmitted to this Nation through declines or increases in the demand for our exports, through variations in prices of our imports and in other ways. (The great size of the United States economy relative to all other free nations, even taken together, however, indicates that we are likely to be the single most important element in determining the level of economic activity in the free world.) It is possible, on the other hand, that international trade is on balance a stabilizing influence on our domestic economy. In any event, the effect of imports and exports on the general level of economic activity in this country is slight when compared with more powerful factors, such as consumer spending, private investment, and the Federal budget.

There is no question but that certain particular interests in the United States would be greatly benefited from the termination of all foreign trade. Industries such as lead and zinc mining, woolgrowing, watch manufacturing, pottery, and hand-blown glass manufacturing, which now produce less than the total domestic demand, would enjoy a great expansion in the demand for their output, although they could not expect to take over the entire share of the markets now supplied by imports.

DISADVANTAGES OF COMPLETE SELF-SUFFICIENCY

There are also disadvantages to such a policy. Were there not, it would be hard to understand why we had not long since adopted it.

The first important drawback to a policy of self-sufficiency is that it would be accompanied by a general lowering of our standard of living. The task of evaluating the cost of this country of a complete cessation of international trade would be a massive one which goes back far beyond the scope of this paper.

The pattern of production within the country would be shifted, in some fields quite markedly, consumer preferences would alter as imported products ceased to be available, wage structures would have to adjust to reductions in output in certain fields and to increase in others. It can be said with certainty, however, that our standard of living would decline with such a stoppage of international trade. Some, possibly many, prices, would go up and the quality of goods would deteriorate; wage levels would decline to some extent; and the range of goods available to consumers would be restricted. The basic cause for such a decline in living standards goes to the heart of the theory of international trade.

We engage in international trade for the same reason that we have domestic trade; that is because as individuals and as a Nation we have discovered that we can secure the things we want with the least effort by producing those things at which we are most efficient and trading our products for the specialties of others. This principle of obtaining the biggest return for one's efforts by concentrating on the things wherein one is most efficient and exchanging the surplus of that product for the products of others, applies to nations as strongly as it does to individuals.

A few indications can be given to show what the effect might be of stopping international trade. These indications, which must be heavily qualified, are only hints, and there is no pretense that the full ramifications of such a change in our economic life have been considered. In 1950 the United States was deficient in the domestic production of raw materials to the extent of about 9 percent, the balance being supplied by imports. If it is assumed that the total output of the raw material consuming industries would have been reduced by approximately the same percentage in the absence of imports, the gross national product would have been less by roughly $10 billion in that year. Since both imports and exports would have been eliminated, this $10 billion drop would have been offset by the amount of the export surplus (in that year it was $1.4 billion) leaving a reduction in goods and services available in the United States of $8.5 billion. Obviously, the actual situation might not have been this bad since under these circumstances there would have been many compensating changes, such as an increase in the domestic output of raw materials, a switch in the pattern of consumption of raw materials to those items which are more plentiful in this country, and the development of synthetic substitutes. These changes might largely offset the physical reduction in supply of raw materials, but only at higher costs. The effect of the increased raw materials prices alone may be illustrated by the fact that a 2-cent increase per pound in the price of basic metals would add roughly $2.5 billion to our annual bill for these metals. Whereas the Nation was only slightly in deficit in the production of its raw materials in 1950, there is every indication that our dependence on foreign sources of supply will increase rather sharply so that the real cost of shutting off international trade will probably go up markedly over the years.

The detrimental effect of ending our international trade would be considerably more important than just the shortage of raw materials which such action would create. We would be forced to cut back significantly on the production of many items where we are highly efficient, for example, many types of machinery and major farm products such as cotton, wheat, and tobacco. These types of production yield high returns because they are efficient. We would in turn expand production in the relatively inefficient industries which yield lower returns. It is apparent under these conditions that our factories and farms would be producing less to some extent than they now do. Declining total output can only mean a falling standard of living.

Some indication of the possible cost to the consumer in finished goods from stopping all trade can be gained from comparing imported and domestic prices for comparable goods. Using data prepared by the Tariff Commission with the necessary adjustments to make the foreign values shown roughly comparable to domestic prices, it appears likely that consumers would have had to pay $40 million more in 1950 than they actually expended to buy the same amount of china tableware if they had bought entirely at domestic prices. This is not a prediction that they would have done so, but is rather a hint as to the possible magnitude of the added cost. Similarly in the field of motorcycles consumers in 1950 would have had to pay some $1 million more than they actually did if they had bought the same quantity of motorcycles entirely at domestic prices. The total additional cost to consumers of ending international trade could only be guessed at after a more detailed analysis of hundreds of items.

Attainment of economic self-sufficiency very possibly might have an adverse effect on the vigor and productivity of the American capitalist system which in turn would weaken our industrial base for war production. Numerous examples are available both at home and abroad to show how lack of foreign competition has led to stagnation in an industry. Watches and opticals are two important industries in this country which claim an important defense role. Foreign competition in both cases has been a significant element in keeping American technology up to date with foreign technology. On a bigger scale one can point to France as an example of what happens to an entire economy which systematically isolates itself from foreign competition. Economic stagnation in France is one of the major sources of weakness in the whole free world today. By contrast other European nations which suffered as heavily as France in the last two wars have today much more vigorous economies in part as a result of permitting more free international competition.

The whole system of military alliances on which this Nation has built its postwar security could be seriously weakened by a United States policy of seeking self-sufficiency. In the first place it is recognized both here and abroad that the relationship of giver and aid recipient, which has characterized United States relations with many other nations since the end of World War II is highly undesirable and damaging to good relations between nations. We have been willing to assume the burden of foreign aid because we felt it desirable to have friends with strong economies and military establishments. Other free nations are dependent upon the United States for many raw and manufactured materials which they now finance largely by their exports to us. If we became economically self-sufficient, we would be faced with the choice of seeing the military establishments of our allies begin to deteriorate rather rapidly (most foreign economies are now in sufficiently good condition to be able to survive, although with lower standards of living, without United States exports if they cut back their military efforts sharply; Japan is probably the major exception) or increasing our aid substantially.

On psychological grounds our alliances would suffer from a policy of economic self-sufficiency. Other nations have long been fearful that the United States would return to isolationism. It would be hard to convince them that our cultural and political interests in the rest of the world were as great as ever after we had closed one of the main channels of contact between nations.

Although this paper does not deal with the reasons which might cause this country to desire economic self-sufficiency, it is probable that the major reason usually given for advocating this course is the desire to strengthen the Nation in the event of war. There should be a brief discussion, therefore, of the desirability of terminating international economic relations prior to the time when such relations might be broken off as a result of war. Since we only engage in international trade to the extent that it is profitable to the Nation, we can increase our wealth to a greater extent by permitting international trade to go on as long as possible than we can by stopping it. If properly used, this greater wealth can increase our ability to wage war rather than decrease it. Furthermore, we can add to our military strength by increasing our supplies prior to hostilities through imports of those materials which are useful to our war potential and which are inefficiently produced in this country. Included within this group of commodities are many raw materials and certain manufactured items.

If the Nation were actually preparing for the most efficient conversion to a wartime economy, we should deliberately seek to discourage domestic production in peacetime of those things which we will not produce in war, either because they are luxuries or because they depend for their production on imports which would not be available in wartime. Conversely we should seek to expand production beyond normal peacetime needs the industries whose production is in greater demand in war—e. g., steel, aluminum, certain chemicals, etc. International trade would be an invaluable counterpart to such a program. In peacetime we could satisfy through imports the consumer demand for those goods which we would not manufacture while providing a market in peacetime through exports for the industries we wish to expand in anticipation of abnormally large wartime demands. Such a pattern of international trade might have the incidental advantage to us of causing production of goods not essential in war to expand in potentially hostile countries while causing production of war essentials to be retarded in those countries. These considerations would indicate that if the United States were now preparing to make itself as self-sufficient as possible in war, it should probably seek to expand international trade prior to the war.

TWO MODIFICATIONS ON COMPLETE ECONOMIC EFFICIENCY

The first variation involving something less than complete self-sufficiency would be to make an economic entity out of the Western Hemisphere or a major portion thereof.

The Western Hemisphere as a self-contained unit would be free of many of the drawbacks which face economic self-sufficiency for the United States alone. The Western Hemisphere is much more nearly self-sufficient in raw materials than the United States. Being a larger area than the United States, it would be less injured by the reduction in economic competition, and there would be more opportunity within the areas for specializing on producing the things at which each nation is most efficient. The military advantages and disadvantages of this possibility would have to be considered.

There is one fatal difficulty in this proposal which probably would prevent its ever becoming a reality; the other nations in the hemisphere, or at least very important ones, would not willingly agree to such an arrangement. There would be for one thing serious economic drawbacks in such an arrangement for several nations, particularly in Latin America, Brazil, Chile, and Argentina, for example, all have big markets outside the Western Hemisphere. Many of their products are also exported by the United States. They would therefore suffer hardships by the loss of non-Western Hemispheric markets. The United States might compensate them for this loss but the heavy cost would raise doubts as to the worth of the policy.

There are political forces which would also work against making the Western Hemisphere a self-sufficient bloc. The ties of the commonwealth are still strong, so there is little reason to believe that Canada would agree to a system which would cut her off economically from the other commonwealth countries. To the south we find both friendliness and willingness to cooperate with us and also considerable resentment of what is considered Yankee imperialism. Argentina is deliberately trying to organize an anti-United States bloc in South America. Some of the other big Latin American nations have been cultivating their relations with Western European nations recently as a counterweight to American influence. In such a situation an attempt by the United States to form a self-sufficient economic grouping of nations in the Western Hemisphere would seem almost certain to provoke a strong anti-United States reaction. This modification of complete economic self-sufficiency, therefore, appears not to be feasible.

The other possibility would involve attaining as complete a degree of economic self-sufficiency as possible while still importing those materials which it would be impossible or very costly to produce in this country. This modification would avoid the difficulties which would arise under complete self-sufficiency from not being able to replace certain imported items from domestic sources, but it would also reduce the military advantages of self-sufficiency since the dependence on foreign sources of materials would not have been ended. Indeed such a policy might have the serious disadvantage of pinpointing for a potential enemy exactly those imported items which it would be most difficult for us to replace.

There is real question as to whether such a policy could be successful because of the likelihood that the nations which are the materials suppliers would not agree to supply us only with raw materials. Most of the nations which are the main suppliers of raw materials resent a relationship in which they are only suppliers of raw materials, and they are seeking to industrialize their economies. Furthermore, many of the areas which are major suppliers of materials are associated with Western European nations which are anxious to sell their manufactured goods to the United States. These European nations might not agree to have the territories and countries associated with them supply materials to the United States when the parent countries have little or no economic relations with the United States. It is entirely possible that the other free nations would set out purposefully to make themselves economically independent of us if we sought to make ourselves largely independent of them.

It is certainly possible, on the other hand, that other nations when faced with a gradual decline in United States imports would strive even more vigorously to maintain their dollar-earning capacity which would cause them to maintain or expand their exports of raw materials to the United States. All the same, a policy which restricted United States imports to raw materials would undoubtedly re-create a dollar shortage problem which would tend to cause all nondollar nations to expand their trade with each other in order to secure the materials which they otherwise might buy from us. This development could go on to the extent that our access to foreign raw materials might be significantly reduced.

Like the first modification of complete economic self-sufficiency, therefore, the second possibility appears to face important, practical obstacles. If the above analysis is correct, one would probably have to assume that there would be a great chance, should we ever set out to attain a large degree of economic self-sufficiency, that the process would be difficult to arrest and might go on to a state of complete self-sufficiency.

Eighty-third Congress, 2d Session: Accomplishments Worthy To Be Remembered

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFTON (CLIFF) YOUNG

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, it has been aptly said that there are two dangers to the American form of government. The first is a Communist conspiracy which threatens our way of life; the second is the growing complexity of our Government which makes it difficult for citizens to know what is being done on their behalf.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I believe it my responsibility as Nevada's Representative in Congress to make this report to the people of my State on overall accomplishments during the 2d session of the 83d Congress.

Representative government can work only if the people are well informed. If we are to keep this experiment in freedom from perishing at the hands of our enemies, it is imperative that the people know what is being accomplished at the national level and the direction in which we are moving. With this thought in mind, I am going to summarize achievements which I believe will be of particular interest to the people of Nevada.

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

First, I should like to speak on developments in the international field. For the first time in 17 years there are no wars being fought in the world. Our foreign policy is based on resolution, firmness, patience, and, above all, upon strength. Our Government has been working diligently toward the formation of the European Defense Community; a settlement is near on the Iranian oil problem and the British dispute in the Suez Canal area; the Communist threat in Guatemala has been stopped. Although the situation remains tense in Korea and Indochina, a regional pact of the anti-Communist nations of this area appears to offer the best hope for peace, and its formation is being steadfastly pursued by our Government.

MUTUAL SECURITY

The 83d Congress continued the mutual security program, but on a greatly reduced basis. The total amount voted was $2.7 billion. Of this sum, 85 percent was allocated directly or indirectly for military assistance.

While I voted to continue authority for this program, I opposed appropriations when it appeared that the Foreign Operations Administration, as a result of loose bookkeeping procedures, could not present to Congress an accurate and businesslike record of its financial transactions. Furthermore, it was shown that even if additional funds were not appropriated this year, the program could be continued for another 18 to 24 months by using the unexpended and unobligated funds on hand.

I concluded, therefore, that the question of additional appropriations should be deferred until next year, when Congress receives a clearer picture of financial requirements. With so much belt tightening here at home, it seemd unfair to ask American taxpayers to give additional money to an agency which already has more than it will use during the next 18 months.

NATIONAL SECURITY

Our national security program is a subject of paramount interest to all Americans. While economies have been effected in the armed services, they have not been made by sacrificing our strength. Only the fat and waste have been removed; the sinew and muscle of our military strength have been improved with the changes.

Our air strength is today superior to that of any other nation, and a powerful air force will continue to be the cornerstone of our security program.

For the first time in many years we are making plans for a strong, well-equipped Reserve force—read for instant action. Although our primary purpose is to deter military aggression, our military experts recognize the possibility of either small brush-fire wars or all-out conflicts. They have planned accordingly.

ECONOMIC HEALTH

Mr. Speaker, with civilization under the greatest siege in history, it is apparent our country faces a period of prolonged peril. The so-called New Look in our preparedness plans means merely that it is a security program for the long pull.

Because military strength and economic health are indivisible, I should like also to discuss the condition of our national economy.

There are those who predicted that the transition from wartime to peacetime economy could not be made without a severe depression. Events of the past year have proved they were wrong. Today the Nation's economic health is good and getting better.

The elimination of unnecessary spending and the enactment of sound legislation in the fields of taxation, housing, atomic energy, highway development, public works, and agriculture have strengthened our economy. We have again demonstrated the ability and resourcefulness of democratic government to meet and dispose of problems that face us.

TAX REDUCTIONS

In the field of taxation, the 83d Congress was responsible for the biggest tax cuts in the history of our country—nearly $7½ billion.

For the first time in 78 years there was a complete revision of our tax laws.

Benefits to taxpayers include increased allowance for medical expenses, exemption of retirement income for persons over 65 years of age, and deductions for widowed mothers who work and must pay for child care, to mention only a few of the 3,000 changes.

Congress also removed and reduced the annoying taxes on items such as washing machines, telephone calls, ladies' handbags, baby oils, cosmetics, jewelry, cigarette lighters, and many other things that we purchase daily. I will be pleased to send a more detailed explanation on tax changes to those who write to my office.

These tax cuts were made possible only by reductions in Government expenditures and elimination of unnecessary jobs. It is interesting to note that more Federal jobs were abolished than there are people in the entire State of Nevada.

ATOMIC ENERGY

Shackles were removed from development of atomic energy by amending the Atomic Energy Act of 1946. This legislation should hasten the day when the atom will become the tireless servant of mankind, instead of a threat to its existence.

The new law eliminates Government monopoly in the field of atomic energy, and permits international cooperation for both peacetime and military purposes.

HOUSING

With the passage of the Housing Act of 1954, it should be easier for Nevada citizens to buy their own homes. The law provides for lower down payments, extended mortgage periods, and other advantages. Also, loopholes which permitted past abuses were closed.

This legislation should result in an unprecedented period of home construction. Certainly nothing could do more to prevent the spread of socialism or communism than making it possible for every American citizen to own a home.

AGRICULTURE

An important achievement of the 83d Congress was the adoption of a flexible price-support program for agriculture, with supports from 82.5 percent to 90 percent of parity.

The high, rigid support program of recent years resulted in huge surpluses. These surpluses not only drained our soil resources, but now cost the Government—and the American taxpayers—$700,000 a day for storage costs alone.

Of interest to the Nevada wool industry is the provision made for incentive payments to wool producers, for the purpose of guaranteeing a minimum domestic production for national defense purposes.

COMMUNISM

Several legislative blows were struck at communism by the enactment of bills that outlaw the Communist Party; grant immunity to fifth-amendment witnesses to compel testimony; deprive persons of rights as American citizens, upon conviction of subversive activities; increase penalty for subversive activities; and extend the time before the statute of limitations applies.

With regard to this latter provision, you will recall that Alger Hiss could not be tried for espionage because the statute of limitations prevented trial on this charge. He was finally convicted of perjury before a congressional committee.

A series of minor bills increased the penalty for harboring fugitives, require registration of printing equipment used for publishing subversive or Communist material, and provided for special action similar to the Government's present loyalty and security program to keep subversives out of defense plants.

In addition, more than 2,400 security risks have been removed from Federal jobs; and the Department of Justice has sought out and convicted 41 top leaders of the Communist Party, and has deported 105 subversives—all within the brief period of the past 18 months.

VETERANS

Veterans' compensation and pension benefits have been increased and improved; the time extended within which disabled veterans may secure vocational education; and a record number of beds provided for hospitalization of our veterans.

SOCIAL SECURITY AND RAILROAD RETIREMENT

The social security program was expanded and benefits increased. If details of these changes are desired, I will be glad to furnish them upon request to my office.

Similar action was taken with respect to the Railroad Retirement Act.

HOSPITAL CARE AND VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION

The hospital construction program was continued and more funds appropriated for medical research. I regret that time does not permit me to tell of the outstanding gains being made in the battle against cancer, heart disease, and other diseases by your Government.

The vocational rehabilitation program was strengthened as Congress provided for a greatly expanded program in the years ahead to aid disabled persons in becoming economically independent.

RECLAMATION AND FLOOD CONTROL

Mr. Speaker, I should like now to discuss matters which are in some ways of more direct concern to the people of Nevada.

I was pleased to support in the 83d Congress the following reclamation and flood control measures of benefit to my State: $118,000 appropriated for reclamation work on the Humboldt River in the vicinity of Battle Mountain; $40,000 appropriated for flood control planning at Matthews Canyon in Lincoln County; authorized flood control work on the Truckee River in the so-called Washoe project; continued work on the Las Vegas pumping project, a study to find ways of using water from Lake Mead. The final report on this study is scheduled for January 1956.

Also, legislation was approved granting rights-of-way to the Las Vegas Valley Water District, to bring water from Lake Mead to the Las Vegas area.

A reclamation measure was passed by the House to encourage joint Federal-State and local cooperation in small reclamation projects up to $5 million in size. This law would have resulted in both economy and decentralization, but unfortunately failed to obtain Senate approval in the closing days of this session.

PUBLIC LANDS

With nearly 85 percent of Nevada's total area under Federal control, we are vitally concerned with the administration of this great natural resource. A jungle of outdated laws and insufficient personnel in the Bureau of Land Management are hampering proper administration of the public domain. Reorganization of the Bureau of Land Management and assignment of more personnel to Nevada have helped considerably in this situation. But more employees are needed to clear the backlog of pending claims and a number of changes in existing laws are necessary.

I sponsored a bill to establish a commission to make a complete study of some 5,000 public-land laws and bring them up to date. Countless conflicts in southern Nevada between small tract applicants and mining claimants point up the need for prompt action in this field.

A serious problem in northern and central Nevada is the presence of halogeton, a poisonous weed which is dangerous to the livestock industry.

I assisted in a successful move to restore funds for the halogeton control program. A large part of the total appropriation will be spent in Nevada.

A grazing bill which would have provided greater stability to livestock operations of Nevada's sheep and cattle growers was defeated in the closing days of Congress.

MINING

The 83d Congress enacted a multiple mineral development bill—Public Law No. 585—which will open additional lands for mining claims in Nevada and eliminate doubts heretofore arising over the validity of claims based on a discovery of uranium.

Because of the complex nature of this bill, which changes basic mining law, I prepared a summary of it for Nevada miners. Copies have been sent to each county recorder in our State for distribution when mining claimants file their affidavits of performance of annual assessment work. Additional copies are available from my office.

Encouragement has been given western miners by the President's announcement of a new stockpiling program based on long-range security requirements. Although this will be of some assistance, new laws will be required in the future to protect our mining industry from the unfair competition of foreign imports.

Specifically, legislation is necessary to give our lead and zinc industry stability, and to prevent the violent ups and downs that have plagued the lead and zinc producers in the past. In foreign-aid legislation, Congress ended a policy followed for many years of using United States money to build up mines in foreign countries which later compete with American producers.

ANTIGAMBLING BILLS

A number of antigambling bills were introduced in both Houses, several of which, if enacted, would have had a disastrous effect upon the legalized gambling industry in Nevada. I appeared at several committee hearings, testifying on a bill introduced by Representative KEATING, of New York, which presented the most direct threat to Nevada's gambling industry. I am glad to report that we were able to work out an amendment which would have protected Nevada's industry from the effects of this measure. While the adjournment of Congress prevented passage this session, it can be expected that similar legislation will be introduced in a future Congress.

HIGHWAYS AND AIR TRANSPORTATION

The Federal Highway Act passed by the 83d Congress provides for an expenditure of $966 million during each of the next 2 years for highway construction. This is the greatest sum of money ever authorized for this purpose. It will mean that the State of Nevada will receive approximately $8,719,541 for each of the next 2 years.

Air transportation also received assistance this year when Congress voted to continue the Federal aid-to-airport program. This should be of assistance to communities like Reno and Elko, where municipal airport development is planned.

I was successful in obtaining passage of my amendment in the House for the appropriation of $69,449 to cover damages caused by Federal Government plants to the Elko Municipal Airport in 1952.

INDIANS

I am proud to report that the 83d Congress made a better record toward improving conditions of our Indian citizens than any Congress since the establishment of the Bureau of Indian Affairs over 100 years ago. Legislation was enacted to provide for termination of Federal control over some 10,000 Indians during the next few years.

The bill which I introduced and which affected certain Nevada colonies and reservations, was not perfected prior to adjournment. However, valuable groundwork was done. Still to be worked out are provisions for Federal contributions for welfare services to Indians during the transition period, and improvements to be made prior to termination of Federal control. The typhoid case at the Elko colony and the lack of authority of local health officials to institute proper health measures, indicates need for prompt action in this field.

ONE HUNDRED PERCENT VOTING RECORD

Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that time does not permit greater detail on many of these measures; and there are other items of importance which I have not been able to discuss. However, I am planning a tour of my State following adjournment, when I will be able to present personally further information to my constituents.

It is my belief and hope that most Nevadans will approve in general the measures I have supported. There perhaps will be some bills or parts of legislation enacted by the Congress which will not receive the unqualified approval of all of my constituents. Mr. Speaker, this is to be expected in a legislative body made up of 435 Representatives from 48 States and all walks of life. The compromise of conflicting and differing viewpoints is an indispensable part of democratic process. However, I should like the citizens of my State to know that in my efforts to represent them faithfully I have been present for every roll call vote during my term in office.

I trust that the record of accomplishment outlined in this report will be of interest to them; I sincerely hope it will assist in understanding the sometimes confusing picture of their National Legislature.

Engraved on the wall over the Speaker's rostrum is a quotation from Daniel Webster, which reads:

> Let us develop the resources of our land, call forth its powers, build up its institutions, promote all its great interests, and see whether we also in our day and generation may not perform something worthy to be remembered.

Mr. Speaker, I think that the 83d Congress has performed well in its efforts to follow the advice of this great American.

Drought Conditions in Oklahoma

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT S. KERR

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, in the closing hours of the session of the 83d Congress, I pointed out to the Senate the need for additional assistance to the drought disaster areas of Oklahoma.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the following resolution from the Board of County Commissioners of Le Flore County, Board of County Commissioners of Cherokee County, Board of County Commissioners of Adair County, and the Board of County Commissioners of Sequoyah County, Okla., which further emphasizes the need to which I referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Board of County Commissioners of Sequoyah County, Le Flore County, Adair County, and Cherokee County, in the State of Oklahoma, meeting in a special emergency meeting in the district courtroom of the county courthouse in Sallisaw, Sequoyah County, Okla., on this the 18th day of August 1954, for the purpose of organizing said counties and eastern Oklahoma for the purpose of combating an economic depression to provide the physical needs of the people of the said counties and of eastern Oklahoma brought on as a result of the drought and general unemployment, do hereby adopt the following resolution:

Whereas there now exists in Sequoyah, Adair, Cherokee, and Le Flore Counties, and in eastern Oklahoma, a condition of unemployment and lack of finances of the people of said area to provide the necessities of life. Said condition having been brought on by lack of available working opportunities and the extreme drought which has existed in said area for several months; and

Whereas because of the drought there is a shortage of water both in the settled communities, in the towns, and in many instances at the rural schoolhouse; and

Whereas it is necessary that the State and Federal Government take steps to alleviate said situation; and

Whereas be it therefore resolved that the said boards of county commissioners of said counties do hereby petition the Honorable ROBERT S. KERR and MIKE MONRONEY, United States Senators from Oklahoma, and ED EDMONDSON and CARL ALBERT, Congressmen from the eastern section of Oklahoma, and all other members of the Oklahoma congressional delegation that they use their efforts to bring about a made-work program in at least the eastern section of the State of Oklahoma for the purpose of caring for the problem of unemployment and at the same time provide adequate supplies of water to the schools of said sections, to the towns in said section and the farms for the purpose of providing funds for the labor for the construction of water lines, water dams, irrigation canals and for the construction of school buildings and for culverts and bridges on county roads in all cases where the materials are furnished by the local agents.

Done in open called session this 18th day of August 1954.

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS OF
LE FLORE COUNTY, OKLA.,
J. PAUL MATHER, *Chairman.*
AMOS CARTER, *Member.*
OWEN LOCKHART, *Member.*
BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS OF
CHEROKEE COUNTY, OKLA.,
BUCK THORNE, *Chairman.*
JACK BALLEW, *Member.*
J. B. LITTLEFIELD, *Member.*
BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS OF
ADAIR COUNTY, OKLA.,
OWEN BUFFINGTON, *Chairman.*
BUSTER BIGBY, *Member.*
TOM KEETES, *Member.*
BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS OF
SEQUOYAH COUNTY, OKLA.,
M. G. FINK, *Chairman.*
R. C. WILLIAMS, *Member.*
W. H. MORGAN, *Member.*

Does Rainmaking Pay?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the South Dakota Stockgrower of July 15, 1954.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DOES RAINMAKING PAY?—NATIONAL BODY SET UP TO CHECK ON CLOUD MODIFICATION

(By FRANCIS CASE, United States Senator from South Dakota)

On July 1, 1954, there swung into action a National Advisory Committee on Weather Control. The primary duty of the committee is to see what is being done in the field of cloud modification and to report back to Congress within 2 years.

Under the law, all agencies, private and public, who engage in cloud-seeding operations, are to register with the committee and then later to report the methods they use, the conditions of the atmosphere, and the results that follow.

In short, the intent is to find out who is doing what, under what conditions, and with what results.

DOES RAINMAKING PAY?

If favorable results are demonstrated, that, of course, will be tremendously important to ranching, farming, industry, and to national defense.

If unfavorable, or if certain methods are proven to be less useful than others, that, too, will be important to those who put up the cash for the projects that seek to increase rain or to those who seek to prevent it. Cherry growers, for instance, want sunshine, not rain, at certain times.

For it's a fact that in some areas cloud seeding is attempted as a means of breaking up clouds or fluffing them so they will float away.

(I have seen a series of pictures where naval aviators have literally carved holes in a solid undercast of clouds so that a clear view of a landing field could be created for landing planes.)

I have said that this committee "swung into action" July 1 because that is the date on which funds first became available for their operations. Actually the committee organized last fall after the members received an "interim" appointment from President Eisenhower. He had signed the bill after Congress adjourned. The appointments were confirmed by the Senate in January.

Up to the start of the new fiscal year, however, the members have been paying their own expenses to attend meetings and Charles Gardner, Jr., of my office, has been serving as their secretary and directing an office staff of borrowed personnel.

FIVE FROM SCIENCE AND INDUSTRY

The President named an outstanding committee:

Capt. Howard T. Orville, of the Bendix Corp., Baltimore, chairman. Captain Orville was in charge of a Navy cloud-modification project a few years ago and is an outstanding meteorologist.

Dean A. M. Eberle, of South Dakota State College, vice chairman. Dean Eberle combined representation for educational institutions and agriculture on the committee. As we know in South Dakota, Dean Eberle has been greatly interested in the volunteer projects in this field and has kept records in an attempt to determine whether cloud-seeding resulted in increasing rainfall in target areas above that which fell without seeding in nearby areas.

Lewis T. Douglas, of Arizona. Douglas is a rancher in Arizona today but is also the director of some large corporations with offices in New York City. At one time he was Director of the Bureau of the Budget and at another time United States Ambassador to Great Britain. He became interested in cloud-seeding some years ago and has been responsible for the starting of an Institute of Cloud Physics at the University of Arizona.

Douglas broke with the Roosevelt administration on budget questions and is a great admirer of President Eisenhower. Last fall he called me at Custer by long-distance telephone from New York to ask if I thought he should accept the President's request that he take a post on the committee. Said he had been asked to take other positions in the new administration but this was the only one that interested him. Naturally, I told him I hoped he would accept because he is known to be a man who combines exceptional ability with vision.

Kenneth Spengler, of Boston, secretary of the American Meteorological Society. Spengler is one of the best informed men on the subject and is scientifically trained in the field of wind, weather, and water.

Gen. Joseph J. George, of Atlanta, Ga., meteorologist for Eastern Airlines. Eastern, the line headed by Eddie Rickenbacker, has a remarkable record in stability of operations and many people credit it to General George's understanding of atmospheric problems. He directed cloud research projects for the Air Force during the war.

SIX FROM UNITED STATES DEPARTMENTS

To serve with this group of 5 men from the fields of science, agriculture and industry, the law provides for 6 men from Government. These are:

Robert B. Murray, Jr., Under Secretary for the Department of Commerce, which embraces the Weather Bureau.

Ralph Tudor, Under Secretary for Interior, which embraces the Bureau of Reclamation, highly interested in mountain snows as well as prairie rains.

Dr. Donald A. Quarles, an Assistant Secretary of the Department of Defense in charge of scientific research. Weather controls many military movements.

Surg. Gen. Leonard A. Scheele, of the Public Health Service, interested in municipal water supplies and its relation to public sanitation.

Dr. Alan T. Waterman, Director of the National Science Foundation which seeks to coordinate public and private scientific research.

J. Earle Coke, Assistant Secretary of Agriculture.

The best guarantee of value in the committee's work is the high caliber of these men who were selected by the President and who have consented to contribute their experience and knowledge to guide the committee and to evaluate project results.

EXPERIMENTS ARE WORLDWIDE

Cloud modification today, or rainmaking if you choose, is being attempted all over the world.

Spain's drought, last year, led Franco's government to contract for cloudseeding projects. France, belatedly, tried cloudseeding when the Reds in Indochina pressed down just ahead of the monsoons.

Australia has voted the largest part of her entire research funds to the field of cloud physics. The head of their bureau recently came to Washington for a conference. He told Gardner and me that they hope to convert at least one-third of the great Australian desert into liveable range country. What that might mean to the future of sheep raising, you can conjecture as well as I, but the significant thing is that they even think of cloud modification in such terms.

If they can convert a desert into a range country, we may well wonder what we can do in "the short grass" country.

I realize that there is the risk of misunderstanding in this field. I get letters from some people who think it is "wrong to interfere with nature."

In reply, I point out that clouds carry a great reservoir of water. Only a fraction of it falls as rain at best. We tap the underground stores of water with wells. We store the surface waters in dams—and thereby interfere with the march of waters to the seas where the clouds gather their moisture. We do many things to change the course of nature, as we learn the ways of nature.

When Mr. Douglas was in Washington recently to confer with Captain Orville and President Eisenhower on the committee's program, he told me that some of his rancher neighbors at first questioned him on this point. At one of the stock growers meetings, an old neighbor asked him if he really thought it right to "interfere with nature." Douglas replied, "Well, Jim, I'd like to know if you castrate any of your calves."

WE HAVE MUCH TO LEARN

Rainmaking is really not "rainmaking"—it merely is an attempt to increase the condensation of the moisture in the atmosphere and make it thick enough or heavy enough to fall as drops of rain or flakes of snow. The moisture has to be in the atmosphere—you cannot make it.

We can simply try to learn the ways of nature and to use them for the benefit of mankind.

Clouds are high fogs, let us say for simplicity's sake. When and where do you find ground fogs? In cool pockets. Ever drive through them and find a mist on your windshield? Ever start your windshield wiper and see the mist pushed together until drops trickle down the glass?

Or, ever watch the mist form on the outside of a glass of ice water on a hot sticky day? And finally drip? Did the glass leak? No, the air moisture condensed.

Putting dry ice into clouds creates cold spots. Putting a silver iodide into clouds reduces the cold requirement for the formation of ice crystals that can fall into warmer layers of atmosphere as raindrops. At least these are some of the theories I have advanced.

I do not pretend to understand all the scientists talk about these subjects but they do seem more understandable than radio or television. If we knew the whole story, we would not need a national committee to record these experimental projects and to try to find the principles and natural laws which govern the results.

MY INTEREST IN WATER PROJECTS

I think most South Dakotans know that I have been interested in water projects of one sort or another ever since I have been in Congress.

Stock water dams, small irrigation projects such as the Deerfield and Angostura, started under the old Wheeler-Case Act, dams on the Grand River (Shadehill), Rapid Creek (Pactola), the Missouri, etc. Also, the "desalination" program—taking the alkali out of water under a law which I sponsored in the Senate a couple years ago. My interest in that, incidentally, grew out of the stoppage of the dam authorized at Bixby on the Moreau River, because of salty complications.

My interest in water, as such, however, really began back in 1910 and 1911 when Dad homesteaded on the bench above Spring Creek, north of Bear Butte. I was about 13 then. I remember how we dug three different wells one summer trying to keep household water within carrying distance—and would up hauling water in a barrel on a stone boat for the kitchen and driving the stock down to the neighbors' waterhole on Spring Creek.

Yes, we tried building dams—with a team and a scraper. You know how deep they ever got—good only for a few days after a flash rain.

So, in Congress, anything connected with water development has interested me. And in 1950, when I read of cloud-seeding experiments elsewhere, I got Harry Marshall and Paddy Ingvalson to go up in a plane one day with a box of dry ice.

They had no guide or rules to go by. They worked on one cloud that looked like a dozen others. They tossed out the dry ice with a tea cup. The cloud began to fluff and they had to keep climbing to stay on top of it—they went from 12,000 feet up to 18,000 finally. The cloud got whiter in the top, darker in the lower part. In about 21 or 22 minutes rain began to fall.

The next day, over Hill City, with lower humidity and a lighter cloud, they thought they failed. But snowflakes were reported in Hill City—that was in July. Months later Dr. Vincent Schafer, of General Electric, told me the snowflakes were the result to have expected under the existing conditions of altitude and humidity.

My first bill on the subject was introduced shortly before I left the House of Representatives. Nothing happened.

In 1951, I reintroduced the bill in the Senate. So did Anderson of New Mexico and O'Mahoney of Wyoming. Three committees held joint hearings.

In 1952 the Senate passed a revised bill which I introduced as an outgrowth of the hearings.

In 1953, in a new Congress, both Senate and House passed the revised bill and the President signed it.

Late that fall the newly appointed committee organized, and now, in 1954, it gets its funds to start formal operation.

Do not expect quick miracles. This is not a program for the Government spend a lot of money, but to find out what is happening where others are spending it, in this attempt get more rain from the clouds.

Congressman Ed Hart

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, when I was elected to the House 5 years ago and became a member of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee Ed Hart was chairman of that committee. As a freshman member of the House and of the committee I was a little green about procedures and perhaps a little inclined to be impetuous in some of my actions on legislative matters. Fortunately for me Ed Hart was on hand to lend me the benefit of his kindly wisdom and to steer me on the right course—the course which he has followed through his 20 years of service in this House. By following that course Ed Hart has accomplished much for his district, for the country, and particularly for our maritime industry; and he has done so without sacrificing the personal friendship of those with whom he has worked and with whom he may have been forced to disagree at times. That, it seems to me, proves the measure of the man.

I know that I shall sorely miss Ed Hart personally and that the loss of his wonderful moderating influence will make the work of our committee and of the House just that much more difficult. But certainly his tireless efforts during the past 20 years have entitled him to some measure of rest from the strain of his congressional labors. His home State of New Jersey could have made no wiser choice in picking a man to fill the important post which he is about to assume there. I am sure that he will give to that service to his own people the same unstinting devotion that has characterized the broader duties he has performed here in Congress, and that the people of New Jersey will be the richer for his efforts, just as the national scene will be the poorer for his retirement.

Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to say goodby to Ed Hart either publicly in these remarks or privately later. This could not be a permanent farewell to a man who has ahead of him many years of fruitful life, and during those years I sincerely hope and expect to see Ed many times and to continue to glean from him the sage advice and good counsel which he has so generously given during the too short years I have served with him here. So, to Ed, I will now say only "so long until next time, and may that next time be soon."

In the meantime, I will carry in my mind and in my heart the fond remembrance of Ed Hart as a great and kind gentleman; a distinguished leader of his party; a statesman whose service to his country was unmarked by any consideration other than the good of the people as a whole; and an outstanding friend. To say that Ed Hart is all of those things is no exaggeration. To say that the Congress and the Nation suffer an irreparable loss with his self-chosen retirement is also no exaggeration. But the ill wind which blows him away from Washington will, I trust, in bringing him home to New Jersey and his new career carry with it every possible source of personal satisfaction and contentment. Certainly he has richly earned those blessings. If the people of New Jersey appreciate him as we do here he cannot fail to find them. May God bless you and care for you, Ed, for many years to come.

Report to Constituents of the 12th Congressional District of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS E. DORN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. DORN of New York. Mr. Speaker, since my election to Congress, I have endeavored to remain in close contact with the people of the 12th Congressional District whom I have the honor to represent.

My congressional office here in Washington and my office in the Federal Building in Brooklyn have been open to them at all times. It has been my aim to assist them in their problems with the Federal Government. I have not waited for my constituents to seek me. Sometime ago I attached a trailer to my car and I have traveled throughout the district giving to each and every person an opportunity to present to me his or her problem and to inform me of their views and advise me how they thought I might be of the greatest service to them and the community in which we live.

Shortly after the President delivered his state of the Union message this year, I mailed a questionnaire to the registered voters of the district, requesting that they express their opinions concerning the legislative program the President had recommended. I deeply appreciate the assistance which I received from the thousands of voters who replied to the questionnaire. Knowing the will of the people, as their representative, I was enabled to vote so as to reflect their views. It is also my pleasure to report that the answers were overwhelmingly in support of the President's program.

Now that the 83d Congress is completing its work, I believe it only fair to let the people of my district know of my efforts to serve them, and in support of the President's program. I have prepared a report which I submit to the House, and which I shall give as wide circulation as possible in the 12th New York Congressional District.

The duties and responsibilities of a member of the majority are heavy. Constant attendance at committee meetings and a great deal of study is necessitated. My committee, Merchant Marine and Fisheries, has met most regularly and has fostered important measures looking toward the improvement of the condition of our depleted merchant marine. The committee initiated action to make the Merchant Marine Academy at Kings Point, N. Y., a permanent service institution.

In addition, I wish to report that bills which I personally sponsored have been enacted into law. One of the bills was a measure to increase the penalties for smuggling, from $5,000 to $10,000, and the term of imprisonment therefor from 2 years to 5 years. The bill was strongly urged by the Treasury Department. Also enacted was my proposal for Congress to authorize the President to present a gold medal to Irving Berlin in recognition of his services in composing many patriotic songs, including God Bless America. Legislation to assist some of our future citizens, as well as other persons whose difficulties could only be resolved by the Congress, has also been part of my program.

In addition to the legislation which I personally sponsored, I am proud of my membership in the Republican 83d Congress, which has become known as the "can do" Congress, for it has established an outstanding record of legislative achievement. The Fair Deal spending spree has been halted; inflation has been checked; long-suffering taxpayers will benefit from the first comprehensive tax revision in this century; national defense has been tightened; social-security benefits have been expanded; homeownership has been made easier; the St. Lawrence seaway is on the way to reality; Communists and security risks have been expelled from Government; and the people have at long last seen honesty, integrity, and forthrightness restored in Washington. Above all, the Nation is at peace.

The record of accomplishments by the Republican Congress is a long one, but here is a summary of major achievements:

Taxes: Taxes are being reduced by nearly $7,500,000,000 this year—the largest savings to taxpayers in any year in our history. These tax savings have been achieved in this way: A 10-percent cut in individual income taxes, effective January 1, 1954, and the ending of the corporation excess-profits tax on December 31, 1953, both of which were made possible as the result of slashes made in the previous administration's spending program; the excise-tax reduction, effective April 1, 1954, which lowered rates on most items to 10 percent and on household appliances to 5 percent; and the general tax revision, giving $827 million relief to individuals and $536 million relief to corporations.

Social security: A greatly expanded and improved social security program will bring under coverage approximately 9 million more of our citizens, who will also receive the increased benefits provided by the new law.

Housing: The Republican 83d Congress approved a housing program which will greatly accelerate private building, principally through lowered downpayments on both old and new FHA-approved homes, with 10 additional years to repay mortgages. Congress also provided for a 1-year extension of the public housing features of the program. Further, the widespread graft and corruption which existed in the housing program of the previous administration was disclosed and remedial provisions placed in the present housing law.

Atomic energy: The Atomic Energy Act of 1946 has been brought up to date and strengthened. It will permit development and use of atomic energy by private industry under AEC licenses.

Defense: The Defense Department and the Congress cut the fiscal 1954 appropriation by approximately $6,500,000,000 below the last Truman budget request for fiscal 1954. For fiscal 1955, the Congress approved a budget for the Defense Department of $28,800,000,000, which represented a reduction of approximately $9 billion below the last Truman budget request. Despite this reduction in appropriations, our national defense has been strengthened. The Army has maintained its 20 divisions and 18 regimental combat teams with 65,000 fewer men. It has added five antiaircraft battalions with radar units. Since January 1953, Army effectiveness and capability have been increased by introduction of the 280 millimeter atomic cannon and the Nike guided missile. The Navy added 19,600 men to the allowance for the active fleets. The Air Force is growing stronger and more effective and will have 121 wings by June 30, 1955, and 137 wings by June 30, 1957. The effectiveness of all branches has been increased by modernized methods and equipment. This Congress also approved legislation creating an Air Force Academy.

Mutual security: Authorized and appropriated funds to continue our Mutual Security Program of technical and financial assistance to friendly nations. One provision of the measure requires that the Foreign Operations Administration discontinue its operations by June 30, 1955, at which time its technical assistance programs will be turned over to the State Department.

Internal security: Approved legislation which will remove the legal rights and privileges of the Communist Party, and will impose stiff penalties on members of "Communist action" groups who did not register under the Subversive Activities Control Act. It will abolish the Government-guaranteed bargaining rights of business or labor organizations found by the Subversive Activities Control Board to be "Communist infiltrated." Also approved was legislation to cancel the citizenship of anyone found guilty in Federal court of conspiring to overthrow the Government.

Veterans: Passed legislation to give a 5 percent increase in compensation to 2 million veterans with service-connected disabilities. Under the new law there will also be increased compensation payments for childless widows of veterans and to a dependent mother or father of a disabled veteran.

Farm prices: The Congress approved legislation to provide for flexible farm supports. This will result in lessened cost of commodities, and the consumer will see it in the cheaper cost of foods at the markets.

St. Lawrence seaway: The St. Lawrence seaway project was approved by Congress this year after 30 years as an also-ran. Work has already started on the big ditchdigging and hydroelectric undertaking.

Government in business: With enabling legislation enacted by the Republican 83d Congress, the President has been able to take the Federal Government out of some 100 different private business enterprises, into which the previous Democratic administrations had become involved. These include such odd ventures as baking, furniture repair, sawmills, ropemaking, laundries and dry cleaning, tire retreading, the manufacture of paint and ice cream, making motion pictures, writing life insurance, and operating railroads and ships.

All of the foregoing, together with other cuts in Federal appropriations, has enabled the budget to come within $3 billion of being balanced, whereas, the last Truman budget put the Nation $9.5 billion in the red.

Of course, in the short space of 2 years, it would be completely impossible to correct the errors of the previous Democratic administrations. But, a fine start has been made and, with another Republican Congress, there will be more strides forward.

The record of legislation enacted by this Congress is by no means a complete measure of the activities of your Representative in the Congress and in his office. My work entails many calls upon members of the Cabinet and to the various commissions and executive agencies. Yet, during this session of Congress, I have missed only one vote, and that was because I was in the office of the Secretary of the Navy attempting to assure that the construction of the Navy's new CVA-62 would be assigned to the New York Naval Shipyard in Brooklyn. I might say, at this point, that my colleague, Representative John Ray, and I, with the assistance of our good Senator Ives, were successful in this endeavor and the keel is due to be laid early next year.

Along this same line, I have made every effort to keep the Federal agencies in Brooklyn so there would be as little displacement of employees as possible. While I have been only moderately successful in this, I have been able to have other agencies moved in to replace those which were taken away.

Among my other accomplishments, of which I am justly proud, is the pinpointing of funds for the Fort Hamilton Veterans' Hospital, so that the hospital could be operated at its full capacity, and in cooperation with other local Congressmen obtaining funds for the deepening of Gowanus Canal.

My Washington office is lined with cabinets filled with the files of those of my constitutents who have come to me with their problems with the Federal Government. I have done my utmost to be helpful to those who have asked, for I sincerely believe I am here at their request to act in their stead.

The Washington office of your Representative in Congress is a busy place. The mail is heavy and I, with my staff, often answer as many as 100 letters a day. Many of the good people of Brooklyn have called at my office, where they are most welcome. My office in Washington will remain open, in competent hands, for those having problems in the Capital. Also I can be reached at my Brooklyn office by those wishing to see me on any matter. I want all of the residents of the 12th New York Congressional District to know that I am at their service whenever they need me—and that I am "on the job."

Glenwood Tribune Pays Tribute to Hubert Humphrey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, Hubert Humphrey is one of the most effective Members of the United States Senate. He is well informed on all major issues of our day and expert in many.

Furthermore, the junior Senator from Minnesota possesses that rare talent of expression which has characterized so many outstanding Members of this body throughout its history.

Mr. President, we, his colleagues in the Senate, know these facts. It is gratifying to learn that in his own State these facts are likewise recognized and proclaimed.

I was born in Minnesota. I read its newspapers whenever I have opportunity.

I have encountered an editorial published in the Glenwood Tribune of June 24, 1954, which pays deserved tribute to our colleague. I ask unanimouns consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

We are confident the people of Minnesota will send Hubert Humphrey back to the United States Senate for further service to his State and country.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Senatorial Campaign Is On

The campaign for United States Senator has now officially opened, Senator Hubert

HUMPHREY, the incumbent, has been speaking in Minnesota as much as time has allowed him between his duties at Washington, and Val Bjornson, our State treasurer, officially opened his campaign at Minneota on Wednesday evening of last week. A rainstorm prevented the large open-air meeting that had been planned in the baseball park, and the 800 who attended had to be squeezed into the Legion building. The large radio audience heard Bjornson in spite of the electrical interference.

Val Bjornson is blessed with a wonderful radio voice and has an excellent delivery. He lacks that rapid-fire pace that Senator HUMPHREY can master and also the interest that HUMPHREY can create in his talks. At that Val Bjornson is the outstanding spokesman for the Republican Party today. Stafford King, present State auditor, who used to be the outstanding orator in past years has somewhat slackened his pace. Bjornson is ably taking over as the spokesman for his party.

It was an able address that Bjornson gave at Minneota. However, even Bjornson will have a hard time proving to the voters of Minnesota that HUMPHREY is not the man to keep in Washington. The argument that President Eisenhower needs more Republicans to put his platform through does not hold water when the facts are analyzed. The records in Washington show that during the first year and a half of Eisenhower's administration that he had more support from the Democrats on his program than he had from his own party men. In fact, unbiased commentators were saying that Eisenhower needed a Democratic House and Senate if he were to get his program through. It is only on the tideland oil deal and the farm program that the Democrats have refused to go along with President Eisenhower. On his foreign policy and the tariff legislation, it was the Democrats who stood by the President while his own party men failed him.

On the farm program Bjornson stated that he could not go along 100 percent with Secretary Benson, but he failed to give a clear cut picture of where he stood on parity. The strongest defender that the farmers could wish for has been Senator HUMPHREY who has always been in the forefront fighting for a just price for farm products. The farmers, knowing that they have had a true friend in Senator HUMPHREY, are not apt to desert him in the fall election.

As could be anticipated, Val Bjornson took a shot at HUMPHREY because of what he had said about the men in high places in Washington a year ago at the labor convention. At no time has Senator HUMPHREY ever attacked President Eisenhower although he has severely criticized some of his appointees. On this matter Senator HUMPHREY does not stand alone. Senator YOUNG, of North Dakota, Senator THYE, of Minnesota, as well as Congressman H. CARL ANDERSEN, have also differed sharply with the President's appointee, Secretary Benson, on his farm policy. Senator HUMPHREY has been very liberal in his praise for President Eisenhower when he has felt that the President was in the right.

While Val Bjornson's speech on the radio necessarily had to be brief, his listeners would like to have heard what his outlook was on world affairs. This is really the key subject in the campaign. For a year the national situation has been deteriorating rapidly and our relations with our allies is at present on dangerous ground. Russia and the other communistic nations have outmaneuvered us very much in the past year. A united European army with the American help seems to be going down the drain, and the Communists seem to be gaining ground the world over. One hint that Bjornson gave on this matter was an endorsement of what Senator HUMPHREY had done, and that was taking our surplus grain to the underfed of foreign nations. Senator HUMPHREY, more than any other Senator in Washington, pioneered this idea with advocating the shipment of grain to India a long time ago. Senator HUMPHREY believes that while we have to remain strong militarily to ward off any sudden attack, we must on the other hand, use every means and methods to do away with conditions that make a fertile field for the Communists. While the people in Minnesota may not realize the fact, in the East Senator HUMPHREY is considered to be the outstanding authority in the National Capital on foreign affairs. He is much sought after by prominent organizations for the knowledge he possesses and the efforts he is making for world peace. At a critical time in world history the Nation and the world could ill afford to dispense with the services of so capable a public servant as Senator HUMPHREY.

Hiring the Handicapped in the Federal Civil Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. DAVIS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 9, 1954

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I insert herewith a guest editorial written by Chairman Philip Young of the United States Civil Service Commission, appearing in Performance, the Story of the Handicapped, August 1954.

The objectives of the President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped should appeal to the hearts of all Americans interested in enabling our handicapped to better serve themselves and our country. These objectives are:

First. Better inform employers of the abilities of qualified handicapped workers.

Second. Increase community understanding of the value of rehabilitation and employment of the handicapped.

Third. Perfect community organizations so that the handicapped are better served through early rehabilitation and job placement.

Fourth. Plan and carry through imaginative and interesting promotional campaigns at State and local committee levels.

Fifth. Study community needs of the handicapped and facilities and opportunities for meeting these needs for the future.

Sixth. Interpret to employers and to the handicapped the services available through public and private rehabilitation and employment services.

Seventh. Gear community and State plans and programs so as to increase liaison between governors' committees and local committees in order to better carry out the above objectives.

The editorial follows:

HIRING THE HANDICAPPED IN THE FEDERAL CIVIL SERVICE

(By Philip Young, Chairman, U. S. Civil Service Commission)

Within the last 10 years, more than 126,400 physically handicapped workers have been hired by the Federal Government. The positions they fill cover the whole range of the Federal civil service, from the lowest grades to the highest professional levels. They have all qualified under regular competitive civil-service standards. Their placement has come about through cooperation by Government agencies with the Civil Service Commission's program for employment of the physically handicapped.

Whatever success the Commission has had in this program has been achieved because we have always taken the positive rather than the negative approach. Our objective has not been to discover conditions that will disqualify a handicapped applicant. It has been, and is, to discover the conditions under which he can best utilize his abilities, and give him an opportunity to contribute them to the betterment of himself, his government, and his country. Therefore we ask just two questions about him: Is he qualified for the job?—and, Can he do the work efficiently without hazard to himself or others?

We are proud of our program for employment of the physically handicapped, not only because it has opened the door of independence and self-support to thousands of capable, industrious, and loyal Americans who might otherwise have been shut out, but because almost without exception our handicapped employees have proved to be highly dependable and efficient workers—a real asset to the Government service.

We in the Civil Service Commission feel that our country has no more valuable asset than its precious human resources, and that it is our duty to make full use of the great reservoir of untapped manpower offered by the physically handicapped.

It is our hope that our success in the future will exceed that of the past, and that it will serve as an example to all employers.

Island of Cyprus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a resolution by the board of aldermen of the city of Somerville, Mass.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF ALDERMEN, CITY OF SOMERVILLE, MASS., AUGUST 17, 1954

Resolved, That the British Empire return to the Greek people an island in the Mediterranean known as Cyprus, as the inhabitants of this island are Greek, their language is Greek, and all their leanings are toward the Greek culture. The island in ancient times was a bulwark that had to be surmounted by the hordes of Persians. They, with the colonies of Asia Minor, were the last of the outposts of the western civilization that have come down to us from the Greeks; and be it further

Resolved, That this board of aldermen go on record as favoring the union of the island of Cyprus with the kingdom of Greece, and it is requested that copies of this resolution be forwarded to the State Department at Washington, to our Representatives in the Congress from our Somerville district, and to our United States Senators from Massachusetts.

Operation Farmer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL C. JONES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including herewith an editorial which appeared in the Dunklin Democrat, of Kennett, Mo., in its issue of August 19, 1954. The editorial follows:

OPERATION FARMER

(A one-act play)

CAST OF CHARACTERS

Patient: The American farmer.

Doctor: Agriculture Secretary Ezra Taft Benson.

Chief surgeon: President Dwight Eisenhower.

Fellow surgeons: Republican Congressmen.

Opposing surgeons: Democratic Congressmen.

THE PLAY

The operation is just about over.

The doctor calls it a victory.

The chief surgeon is well pleased.

The patient will soon be in worse shape than before.

The sharp scalpel cut parity from 90 percent.

The incision ran from 82½ percent to 90 percent.

It's called a flexible incision.

The doctor said the operation was essential even though the patient's income dropped 20 percent in 2 years.

The doctor wanted the operation so the patient could "stand on his own two feet" even though the patient couldn't afford it.

But the patient may be flat on his back.

The doctor was worried about the patient's growth.

"We need to reduce him," he declared.

"We'll take out that tumor called profits," he said.

The doctor's fellow surgeons applauded.

They watched the operation in the rotunda.

They helped all they could, voting almost to a man to operate on the patient.

Some surgeons dissented, however.

"A flexible incision will kill him," they cried.

"You can't help him by removing 'profits.'"

"You will only shorten his life."

The surgeon was confident, however.

He wanted the patient independent, regardless.

"But other patients are not independent," some surgeons said.

"Look at the crutches you gave Mr. Labor."

"And look at Mr. Business's crutches," they cried.

"But my patient is different," the doctor said.

"We are going to make him different."

"We're going to remove 'profits.'"

"I think they're malignant," the doctor said.

"And look how prolific he has been," the doctor said.

"He's been too efficient."

"We're going to change all that."

"We'll make him learn not to be so efficient."

"We'll make him suffer for sure."

"He needs no crutches."

But the opposing surgeons again argued.

"The patient is helpless to control his growth."

"He should not be penalized for being efficient."

"He should be encouraged for his nation's growth."

"He has less control than your other patients."

"You may need his growth some time soon."

"The country needs his profits too."

But the doctor was anxious to operate.

The chief surgeon looked at the other surgeons.

Some of them wanted to keep their jobs regardless.

Those voted to go along with the chief surgeon or else.

Some were more interested in the patient.

They opposed an operation now.

But a bare majority was more interested in their own jobs.

And less interested in the patient.

So they voted with the doctor and chief surgeon.

"Operate," they cried.

And operate they did.

The doctor made the "flexible" incision.

With the help of the others.

And removed the "profits" from the patient.

The Commemoration of the Acadians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement made by me in regard to the commemoration of the Acadians.

There being no objection, the statement was printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Henry Wadsworth Longfellow a century ago in his poem, Evangeline, described a people remarkable for the simplicity of their manners, the ardor of their piety and the purity of their morals. A century before, in 1755 and in 1758, the Acadian people were forcibly deported into exile. Some 12,000 were scattered along the coast from Boston to Georgia; some thousands, across the ocean. Some others escaped to the forests. Others found graves in the cold Atlantic. For 11 years the survivors were deprived of freedom and religious liberty.

Today, descendants of the Acadians number close to 400,000 in Louisiana, 300,000 in New Brunswick, 400,000 in Quebec; others are scattered throughout Canada and the United States. Many thousands of them are my constituents in Massachusetts. Marvelous to relate, almost all the Acadian descendants, though thoroughly merged into the mass and almost indistinguishable, proudly bear and carefully spell out an original Acadian name, and along with their English still speak the soft tongue of their forefathers.

In the valley of the Memramcook, in Canada, representatives of more than a million proud descendants of those Acadians, this week have begun a commemoration of the second century of the expulsion of their ancestors from their Acadie. This commemoration is observed also in Massachusetts, Louisiana, and in the Provinces. I join with them in this commemoration. I send my greetings and best wishes to the representatives met in Memramcook where the Acadians upon their return from exile, erected their first permanent church structure and later their first college.

My constituents of Acadian descent know that abundant providence answered the labor, the tears, and the prayers of their forebears. And recognition should be given to the devoted clergy who came to their side from France and Quebec. Today, more than 200 Acadians are ordained priests, thousands are in the learned professions, others are known to us as successful business men.

The Acadian people of 1755 suffered for its resistance in a cause which was not understood. The children suffered; the issue prospered. That resistance and providence with them, made the Acadian descendant a fine, prosperous, and thoroughly happy people. I am happy on this occasion to offer my sincere felicitations and hearty greetings to the Acadians.

De Gasperi: Fighter for Freedom to His Last Breath

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I want to pay tribute, along with so many millions of others, to that great friend of the West, Alcide de Gasperi, who lived and died for freedom, passing to his eternal reward on August 19, 1954.

ALCIDE DE GASPERI—A STANCH ALLY

Seven-time Premier of Italy.

Uncompromising foe of fascism, communism, and neutralism.

Early in life he took his stand for freedom and remained loyal to it until the end.

"Gesu, Gesu," were his last words, as he called to Jesus, before he died, heartbroken over the betrayal of his battle for a united Europe.

As he heard of those who, through fear, through lack of moral integrity, and through greed for temporary gain, would sell out freedom to Communist slavery.

Alcide de Gasperi was a shining example of the true Italian, faithful to his God and to his country.

He was a world figure as well, with the foresight and the will to work for the unification of free Europe, as the only means of curbing the Communist appetite for conquest.

He went to prison rather than fight for Austria and against the Allies during World War I.

Later, he was elected to the Italian Chamber of Deputies, but walked out in protest against the Fascists and their methods. He was jailed and persecuted by the Fascists. After the end of World War II, and in recognition of his lifelong devotion to freedom, he was elected Premier of Italy. He held this key post from December 1945 to July 1953. He thwarted the Communists at every turn; led Italy from the prostration of defeat up the difficult road of economic recovery to the position of partner in the defense of Western Europe. With De Gasperi as the leader of Italy during these critical years, we gained a trusted and valuable ally. He wore himself out in his successful efforts to save war-ravaged Italy from the clutches of communism.

He was a humble man who put principle above personal ambition.

His impressive strength was in his faith, his sincerity, and his courage.

A devout Catholic, he lived his faith day in and day out, helping others, translating Christian ideals into Christian practice, and stressing the need for faith, hope, and charity in the solution of all human problems.

He saw through the deceptive slogans of communism.

He exposed its fundamental cruelty, its terror, and its contempt for God and man.

To combat it, he brought a constructive program to Italy and the world, based upon reason, upon real cooperation, upon sublime faith in God and the unimpeachable honesty of his own character.

It is not enough to say that we shall miss him.

Real men with the courage of their convictions are rare in this age of expediency and of shameful compromise.

De Gasperi was one of these good men and true.

His death, at the end of a long and fruitful life, is a loss that defies measurement.

All of us in the United States and throughout the civilized world grieve over the passing of an able statesman and a dear friend.

The record of his exemplary life will strengthen and support us in the struggle against communism to make the world that better place for which Alcide de Gasperi worked with all his heart and soul.

Our Scientific Research and Development Challenged by Soviets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEROY JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, in the past, Americans have rightly felt that the superiority of our technological achievements permitted us to base our military program on quality rather than quantity.

Events of recent years, however, indicate that the Soviets are seriously challenging our technical superiority. First, the Soviets came out with the MIG–15 which proved to be almost as good a plane as our F–86. In 1949, the Soviets produced their first atomic bomb explosion—about 4 years earlier than the experts had thought it possible. One year ago, the Soviets exploded a hydrogen bomb—only 10 months after we had produced our first full-scale hydrogen explosion.

Within the past year, the Soviets have displayed their new jet bombers comparable to our medium B–47 and our heavy B–52. It is entirely possible that they are further along with the development of their heavy bomber than we are with the B–52.

A particularly disturbing fact about these new jet bombers is their engines. In their column on August 16, the Alsop brothers pointed out that the engines on these aircraft apparently produce 18,000 to 20,000 pounds thrust. Thus they are twice as powerful as any jet engines yet produced in the United States.

What has happened to our vaunted technological superiority? As the Alsops point out, it is easy to "see why Donald Quarles, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Research and Development, recently warned that the Soviets were challenging the American lead in weapons development. But one cannot see why Secretary of Defense Wilson came very close to complacently contradicting his own subordinate the very next day."

We would all do well to take heed of the facts of Soviet technological development. We cannot afford smug complacency. We must do everything possible to reestablish firmly our superiority in weapons development.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following column by Joseph and Stewart Alsop from the Washington Post and Times Herald and New York Herald Tribune of August 16:

SOVIET JET ENGINE

(By Joseph and Stewart Alsop)

WASHINGTON.—The Pentagon intelligence analysts have reluctantly concluded that the Soviet Union is already producing a jet engine about twice as powerful as any yet produced in the United States.

This is the biggest shock, the bitterest pill, in a development that was generally shocking and unexpected. Until a few months ago, the official forecasters were convinced that the Soviet aircraft industry would need at least 2 years more to turn out planes comparable to our B–47 and B–52. But now such planes are already in the air, as reported in this space, in the form of the Soviet TU–37 and TU–39.

To find the Soviet strategic air development 2 years ahead of schedule was unpleasant enough in itself. It was even more unpalatable to find that this remakable Soviet jump forward depended upon, and in fact probably resulted from the successful design of a jet engine greatly surpassing any jet engine as yet designed in the West. At first, therefore, the whole development was dismissed as fraudulent and imaginary.

There were pretty good reasons, at first to think that the Soviet display of new strategic air power was nothing but another proof of the Russian talent for building Potemkin villages. Potemkin had a strong interest in convincing the Empress Catherine that her realm was prosperous and he built his cardboard villages to prove it. So the Kremlin today has a strong interest in convincing the West of the power of the Soviet strategic air army.

The circumstances in which the first of the new planes was seen were also decidedly suspicious. As though inviting inspection, a TU–37, which is the equivalent of our B–52, not only flew low over Moscow, but also virtually circled above the American Embassy.

The new aircraft was slightly larger than its American equivalent. Where the B–52 needs the thrust of eight of the largest American jet engines to do its' job, the TU–37 showed only four engine nacelles.

To be sure, the air intakes of the TU–37 engines were startlingly huge. But the American analysts calculated that a four-engined bomber of this size would normally require engines with the unprecedented thrust of 18,000 to 20,000 pounds.

They calculated further that the TU–37 would look like the real thing with engines of 7,500 pounds thrust, provided it carried no pay load and fuel for only a couple of hours in the air. They remembered the apparent Soviet intention to impress. And so, initially, they wrote the whole thing off as fake.

Unfortunately, this comfortable conclusion did not stand up very long. It had hardly been reached indeed, when more than 20 TU–39's were observed, under very different circumstances, flying in formation. There was no indication this time, of a desire to impress. Whereas the TU–37 was flown publicly in the Moscow air show, the TU–39's have never been publicly flown to this day.

Furthermore, the TU–39 was a twin-engined jet bomber almost exactly comparable in size to our B–47, which has 4 engines. And in the TU–39 there were the same startlingly big air intakes that had so puzzled the experts in the TU–37.

It was not possible to believe that the sighting of a large number of TU–39's, flying formation in a way that indicated advance unit training, was just another Potemkin village. On the other hand, if you assumed the existence of a new engine powerful enough to need the out-sized air intake, the whole pattern made sense.

For all these reasons, in the language of a very high authority, "we have got to assume that there is nothing fake about the two new Soviet planes; and we have got to assume further that Soviet jet engine design has overtaken American jet engine design, at least in the cardinal point of thrust, which means power."

This kind of unpleasant shock has been repeatedly felt at the Pentagon from the first Soviet atomic bomb tests onward. For example, these reporters can well remember the late Gen. Hoyt Vandenberg arguing that the first MIG–15 was not an important phenomenon, but was a specially built plane mainly intended to impress the West.

At that time, the official analysts had told General Vandenberg the Russians could never produce MIG's in quantity, because we ourselves were then having such difficulty in quantity producing jet engines for our own fighters. But according to the now-accepted official estimate the Soviets have finally produced no less than 13,000 MIG–15's before shutting off the line.

One can see why Donald Quarles, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Research Development, recently warned that the Soviets were challenging the American lead in weapons development. But one cannot see why Secretary of Defense Charles E. Wilson came very close to complacently contradicting his own subordinate the very next day.

The Late Honorable Paul Shafer, of Michigan

SPEECH

OF

HON. THOMAS E. MARTIN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 18, 1954

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, our good friend and colleague, PAUL SHAFER, has answered the final rollcall. His passing is a personal loss to me. I sat next to him in the Committee on Military Affairs during my first 8 years in Congress, and throughout my entire service I enjoyed his friendship and was proud to work with him.

Paul served his district in Congress for nearly 18 years and he left a record for faithful, conscientious work and for accomplishment. His character and reputation in his home community, in his State, and throughout the Nation are of the highest. While we mourn his passing with deepest regret that his good work here has ended, we are all happy to know that the influence of his good work will carry on. He was a great patriot, a grand fellow, and a real friend.

Celler Versus New York Journal American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting herewith a letter I wrote to the editor of the New York Journal American, in answer to an editorial which appeared in that newspaper called Set of Values, which I also insert. In addition I include the editor's note, in answer to my letter:

To the Editor:

I read your editorial in your August 12, 1954 issue, based primarily upon the fact that I followed custom and uttered on the floor of the House a eulogy for a deceased former Member, Vito Marcantonio.

Regardless of the politics involved, it is expected of the dean of a delegation to lead in voicing regret. You do not mention the fact in your editorial, that there were eulogies by Representatives Keogh, Multer, and Klein of New York, Hoffman of Michigan, McCarthy and Blatnik of Minnesota, and Eberharter of Pennsylvania. Our views struck a responsive chord in the hearts of many Members who were present in the Chamber.

I send you herewith the page of the Congressional Record of Tuesday, August 10, containing the remarks of all who spoke concerning Mr. Marcantonio.

May I ask you to review my remarks and then correlate same with the quotation from Matthew XII, which you featured on your editorial masthead of that day. Matthew said that we are to speak "out of the abundance of the heart."

Death is a mighty leveler. Then all scores are even.

What would you have expected me and my colleagues to do? Malign the dead? That would have been easy virtue. The dead cannot defend themselves.

To say the least, your attitude is most macabre.

You did not relate to your readers that I was careful to remark that I disagreed with the deceased and that he was enthusiastically misguided.

Now, as to General MacArthur, both Representative Eberharter and myself objected, not to the MacArthur bill, but to its consideration on the Unanimous Consent Calendar, where there is no debate nor explanation of the contents of the bill. One must vote blindly, often without having the opportunity to read the bill, the report of the committee on the hearings had thereon, in such a case. I asked that the bill be placed on the regular calendar. It might interest you to know that many Members had arisen to object, as I did. The objection was not confined to Eberharter and myself. It was not a noncontroversial bill.

Your reporter in the House Press Gallery would tell you, if you were sufficiently interested, that scores of objections identical with mine are offered to many bills on the selfsame Consent Calendar for the same reason—namely, lack of opportunity for proper consideration of the bill.

You entitled your editorial Set of Values. You apparently have a cynical sense of values, especially concerning my remarks about a deceased member. I am reminded of Oscar Wilde's definition of a cynic: "One who knows the price of everything and the value of nothing."

If you present this statement to your readers, I shall put your editorial in the Record. How about it?

Sincerely yours,
Emanuel Celler,
Member of Congress
From the 11th District, New York.

Set of Values

We would like to call to the attention of his constituents in Brooklyn and to the reflection of Americans elsewhere the curious set of values of Representative Emanuel Celler, Brooklyn's gift to democracy.

Mr. Celler took the floor of the House to eulogize the late Vito Marcantonio, who, during his entire political life, in Congress and out, followed and fought for the Communist line.

The Brooklyn Representative said in effect that the hero of the Daily Worker, who gave aid and comfort to the Communists, was really a pretty good guy.

For this Mr. Celler made page 1 of the Congressional Record for Tuesday, August 10. We print the date so that his Brooklyn constituents may, if they wish, take a long, hard look at the Record, for we feel fairly certain that Mr. Celler will not be distributing many thousands of reprints.

It was a few days before this, on August 4, that Mr. Celler joined with Representative H. P. Eberharter, of Pennsylvania, to kill approval of a bill to extend to General of the Army Douglas MacArthur the profound gratitude and abiding appreciation of Congress.

In other words, Mr. Celler evidently did not feel it commensurate with the trust imposed in him to support a bipartisan action to extend recognition to one of our greatest generals and a truly great American.

But he did feel it in keeping with that trust to praise a man who spent his adult life working tooth and nail for the Communist cause.

We all have our sets of values, but this one is beyond our understanding. We are wondering whether it will be beyond the understanding of Mr. Celler's Brooklyn constituents, too. Just wondering.

Editor's Note.—We will give Mr. Celler a point in his right to stand up and say a few enthusiastic words for the "enthusiastically misguided" Vito Marcantonio on the occasion of Mr. Marcantonio's death.

But when it comes to General MacArthur we will not give Mr. Celler anything.

This was a bill calling on Congress to express its formal gratitude to General MacArthur for the services he has rendered his country. Only that and nothing more. No hidden amendments. No dastardly plot to abolish the House of Representatives.

Surely Mr. Celler will not assert he would have to "vote blindly" on this bill.

Surely he will not say he is unfamiliar with the subject and needs extensive research to determine just who General MacArthur is and what he has done.

If Mr. Celler was familiar enough with the deeds and policies of Mr. Marcantonio to make a speech about him, then it seems to us he ought to be reasonably familiar with the deeds and policies of General MacArthur, so that they did not need to be spelled out to him in committee.

It is a very simple question really: Does Mr. Celler think General MacArthur rates a vote of thanks from Congress?

Mr. Celler appears to like to quote Oscar Wilde. We can toss him a couple of Wilde quotes to ease his perturbation: "There is only one thing in the world worse than being talked about, and that is not being talked about." Also, "Experience is the name everyone gives to his mistakes." We will gladly check off Mr. Celler's action in the MacArthur matter to experience.

Case closed.

Foreign Policy Is the People's Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY

OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an article written by me and published in the Sunday New York Times magazine of August 8, 1954.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Foreign Policy Is the People's Business

(By John F. Kennedy)

Washington.—According to an ancient Celtic legend, the British giant Bran, suffering from a foot wound inflicted in battle by a poisoned arrow, commanded his seven surviving comrades to cut off his head and take it to London, where it was to be buried with the eyes facing in the direction of France. No foreign foe, he said, would be able to invade the island as long as his eyes were watching. But King Arthur, ages after, dug up Bran's head because he wanted Britain to owe her power in foreign affairs and military defense to strength and courage, not to magic.

We have no buried giants' heads in the United States. But American foreign policy is surrounded by a mythology of its own. There are myths based upon the untouchability of national sovereignty; the existence of inherently good, bad, or backward nations; the emphasis of governmental economy over national security; and the impairment of an aggressor's military power by refusing him our diplomatic recognition.

Many Americans persist in the myth that the scientific skill of the United States cannot be duplicated in any other country; that the democratic way of life, inasmuch as it is the best way, will inevitably be the victor in any struggle with an alien power; that the United States can never lose a war and that its shores can never be attacked. Many still hold to the belief that other allies owe homage and gratitude to the United States and to all of its views at all times. These myths are comforting to our sense of security and appealing to our sense of patriotism; and thus they continue to prevail.

Similar myths prevail in other nations—in France, for example, where the ancient fear of a rearmed Germany towers disproportionately over the menace of Soviet aggression. But while we concern ourselves with the erroneous judgments of others, let us not blind ourselves to our own. My daily mail indicates that American public opinion still contains dark corners of belligerent jingoism and narrow isolationism, and that many attitudes are frequently more influenced by ethnic and cultural ties with the problem areas involved, or with ancient hostilities, than by the necessities of world security.

There are those who insist we can have both high tariffs (at least on their own products, if no others) and a market for our goods abroad; those who simultaneously request reductions in Federal taxes and indebtedness and increases in expenditures for defense and civil functions; those who reject bargaining or diplomatic pressure as a method of dealing with international disputes, while at the same time insisting that Communist aggression be halted by all available means—except the use of American boys.

There are those who believe the United States can still halt aggression by the arrival of a few American gunboats and marines. There are those who oppose assistance to or cooperation with our allies, and at the same time resent the failure of our allies to follow blindly our leadership or contribute more to our mutual defense arrangements.

However secure the ancient Celts may have felt in their reliance upon a buried giant's head, this discouraging prevalence of myths and misinformation causes me to urge respectfully three propositions upon our 20th century officials and citizens.

(1) The present crisis requires greater participation of American public opinion in the foreign policy-making process.

It was once said that Great Britain's mastery of foreign affairs first began to deteriorate when British public opinion began to intervene with its slow-footed moralistic influences, incapable of meeting the swift fluidity and harsh practicality of real Politik. It is also the sophisticated view that an excess of public opinion would act as a drag on the foreign policymaking process which in 10 years of dizzying reversals has made enemies of former friends and friends of former enemies. But such assertions relate to an age wholly unlike that which confronts us today.

For today both war and peace are unique. In the past, public interest in American international commitments have reached their peak only in time of war, when extraordinary demands are made upon our manpower and material resources. Even then, war touched only indirectly the lives of many Americans. But the next world war, unlike any other, will sear the lives of every American, and bring for the first time massive death and destruction within our own borders.

Moreover, what is normal in peacetime is no more relevant to a discussion of public opinion than it is to an analysis of budgets and armies; for this is a peace which resembles none previously experienced. Frequent hostilities, uneasy truces, military alliances, a world-wide struggle for the minds of men and a furious armaments race characterize the war upon which we have placed the curious epithet "cold"—a struggle which will continue in our generation to maintain the same excessive wartime demands upon our lives and pocketbooks, and maintain the same heightened public interest.

Finally, American public opinion needs enlightenment on the United States new role as leader of the free world—a role assumed not because of the militarism or even the desires of our citizens, not because of the wishes of any nation or government, but as the result of destiny and circumstance, the sheer fact of our physical and economic strength, and our position as the only real counter to the forces of communism in the world today.

The leadership of a loose confederacy of heterogeneous nations is not without its burdens, as Great Britain learned in the past. In recent months, some have found our pace too slow, others too fast. Many Americans understandably respond to this criticism with an attitude of irritation and withdrawal. But unless we wish to break the alliance upon which our present security ultimately depends, we must rely upon public recognition of the burdensome and unpleasant responsibilities thrust upon us.

Thus we can no longer afford to exclude the man in the street from this Nation's foreign policy; for it influences him, and he in turn influences its decisions. His opinions, his votes, and his efforts define the limits of our policy, provide its guideposts, and authorize its implementation. In Lincoln's words, he "makes statutes possible or impossible to execute." His attitude toward the United Nations, toward the imports of friendly nations, toward the immigration of other peoples, and toward members of minority groups in his own country—all of these have an impact upon foreign policy far beyond his knowledge. Without his indispensable support and loyalty, no American foreign policy in times such as these can succeed.

Our choice, then, is not whether public opinion should influence our foreign policy, but whether its influence is to be good or bad. The hasty withdrawal and dispersal of American troops following World War II illustrates the effect which public opinion—no matter how shortsighted and ill-informed—can have upon foreign policy. On the other hand, Ernest Griffith has pointed out that "some great upsurge of popular opinion" on international issues may be "one of those waves of intuition which are not infrequently sounder guides than the supposedly more sophisticated reasonings of the 'experts.'" In any event, the public can no longer be excluded; and if its influence is to be a positive contribution, we must work to dispel the myths and mysteries we have created.

(2) Greater participation of American public opinion in the foreign policy-making process requires firm, candid and responsible leadership.

Public enlightenment is not only the task of the Government. The schools, churches, citizens groups, newspapers, and other mass media of communication play an increasingly significant role in molding opinion on world affairs. But it is to the Federal Government—and in the last analysis to the President, with his constitutional role of foreign policy spokesman—that we look for our initial information and guidance. Contrary to popular belief, it is the President—not the Senate—who ratifies treaties (although the consent of two-thirds of the Senate is required to give effect to such ratification). If the Government speaks with many and diverse tongues, if the President's statements lack firmness and consistency, then public opinion will flounder and drift, too.

If the public is unable to determine what our policy is in Indochina—that is, the policy of the United States, not the policy of the Vice President or the majority leader or the chiefs of staff—then whatever our policy may be, it cannot succeed. Whether or not we agreed with Franklin Roosevelt's foreign policy, he did give endless thought and effort—beginning with the famous "quarantine the aggressors" speech in 1937—to explaining our policies and molding public opinion.

Congress, too, has a growing responsibility. In 1925, only one act of Congress in twenty-five had any direct relationship to international relations, and that was generally inconsequential. Today, at least one of every six or seven enacted bills are of tremendous worldwide concern. Moreover, we do not provide the leadership needed if, in talking to (or for) our constituents, we ignore the international implications of legislation normally treated as domestic issues, such as the discriminatory provisions of the McCarran immigration act, the extension of the three-mile limit under the off-shore oil law, the offense to Mexico in a wetback labor measure, and even the failure of Congress to act on the President's reciprocal trade agreements program.

Unfortunately, those who work intimately in the foreign or military policy field and who have access to secret information generally look with condescending disdain on those who challenge their omniscience. The average layman—or Congressman—is deemed unable to comprehend the mystic intricacies and intrigues of foreign affairs. (With all due respect to President Eisenhower, this philosophy is heightened by repeated reassurances that now our President "can read a military map.") Classified status is given to all manner of documents, including those whose publication could do no more harm than the release of the Secretary of State's laundry ticket.

Basic decisions are only vaguely explained by the use of beguiling slogans, including most recently "the New Look" and "massive retaliation." Leaders of both parties, in Congress as well as in the executive branch, too often take partisan delight in offering to the public easy or dramatic answers to the complex problems of the world: a preventive war, withdrawal from the United Nations, the "unleashing" of Chiang Kai-shek, the renunciation of secret agreements and human slavery, or a mission to Moscow, Bermuda, Potsdam, Korea, or any other place. How we "lost" China or why we are in Korea are subjects of gross oversimplification. Thus is our foreign policy mythology created, chapter by chapter.

I hope this tendency can be reversed. I hope, too, that we shall realize that public confidence is heightened, not impaired, by candid admissions of our errors. Certainly it is apparent to all that the very foundation of American assistance in Indochina rested upon a miscalculation of the military program of the French Union forces and the success of the Navarre plan. Certainly it is apparent to all that our State Department—under both Democratic and Republican leadership—failed to recognize the nature and significance of the independence movement in Indochina, and consistently misled the American people—although not the people of Indochina—as to the degree of freedom granted by the French.

Would not our policies in that area have been more effective, and our citizens more willing to support effective action when the military deterioration became apparent, if our policy makers had abided by the popular and traditional opinion in this country favoring complete Vietnamese independence? On this issue, the intuitive judgment of the public was wiser than the cautious logic of our diplomats. Would it not in the long run be far wiser to confess error on these points to a knowing and mature public rather than to talk glowingly of "regaining the initiative"?

True, the line between "propagandizing the voters" and informing the public is frequently a fine one to draw, particularly in an election year. There is always a temptation to exploit public opinion for partisan purposes, and to inflame it along popular lines or brandish it as a threat, thus foreclosing some future course of action regardless of how necessary such action may subsequently be. But objective and responsible leadership, so necessary in all areas today, is particularly needed—and is now lacking—in the area of public opinion and foreign policy.

(3) If our Government is to look to public opinion for guidance on foreign policy issues before acting irrevocably upon them, improved methods of measuring such opinion must be devised.

Once we have recognized the necessity for dispelling the folklore of foreign policy in the hydrogen age, and have taken steps to enlighten public opinion for the positive contribution it can make, we are still faced with one of the most difficult problems of representative Government. The impact of the public will—whether for good or evil—should, if it is to give constructve guidance, be determined on particular issues before irrevocable steps are taken. The public may voice its displeasure at the polls or in communications of protest, but that is too frequently too late.

In 1795, the Senate, in debating the wisdom of the Jay Treaty, was acutely aware of public feeling on the issue—if in no other way, by observing the repeated hanging in effigy of Mr. John Jay. But such demonstrations today are rare indeed, when treaties and other single acts are of significance only as they relate to numerous other items. How, in the absence of mass meetings hanging us in effigy or in person, are members of Congress and the executive branch to gage opinion on foreign policy?

The State Department's Division of Public Studies compiles in its daily reports the opinions expressed in speeches, polls, editorials, columns, organization resolutions, correspondence, and similar sources. A Member of Congress may rely upon his mail, clippings, or his own private polls. But these are only the roughtest sort of measure.

They are relied upon primarily for justification of preconceived positions or as an ostentatious demonstration of concern for constituent attitudes. They are only rarely interpreted as accurate barometers of public opinion and used as guideposts on pending decisions.

Presumably the search for more scientifically accurate measures of public opinion will lead us to the overly abused (but also overly heralded) public opinion polls. In recent years, the poll has enjoyed a substantial vogue in all three branches of the Government as a means of ascertaining needs, encouraging compliance, and determining public reaction. But although the science of opinion research has made gigantic strides in recent years, most of the polling techniques employed by the Government, Members of Congress, and even some of the more reputable polling agencies fall far short of necessary standards of validity and reliability.

Moreover, public opinion on foreign policy issues deserves a particularly careful and sensitive barometer. Neither Congressmen nor diplomats are interested simply in mass opinion, a numerical counting of heads on a given issue at a given time. We are in the position of Judge Learned Hand, who in attempting to determine judicially the moral standards of a community questioned the value of a mere aggregate of individual opinions: "A majority of the votes of those in prisons and brothels, for instance, ought scarcely to outweigh the votes of accredited churchgoers." If public opinion is to make its potential contributions to our role in world affairs, we must require of our social scientists new and better techniques for gaging that opinion.

I would say, by way of conclusion, that our foreign policymakers must, however reluctantly, give up the luxury of their exclusive control over our role in world affairs. For upon our decisions now may well rest the peace and security of the world—indeed the very continued existence of mankind. And if we cannot entrust these decisions to the people, then, as Thomas Jefferson once said, "If we think them not enlightened enough to exercise their control with a wholesome discretion, the remedy is not to take it from them but to inform their discretion by education."

Thomas E. Martin, Champion Stockpiler of the Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEROY JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, Hon. THOMAS E. MARTIN, with whom I have served for 12 years, is leaving the House of Representatives. I served with him on the Military Affairs Committee for several terms up to the time that he transferred his committee assignment to the Ways and Means Committee.

We were serving together when the Stockpiling Act, under which we are now operating, was first enacted. The bill, which provided for stockpiling, became a statute on July 23, 1946. On that day, it was signed by President Truman. It seemed almost incredible to me that within 1 year after the shooting war had stopped, we were again developing a stockpiling program.

The purpose of building a stockpile is to have available certain critical materials, which in the event of war may be denied us, so we may have them for use in waging a victorious conflict. The most conspicuous example of being shut-off from critical materials necessary in the conduct of a war was the sealing off of southeast Asia by Japan in 1942. Southeast Asia had been our traditional supply of rubber, and the result of our being denied our usual source of rubber, was that we set up a large domestic rubber program, including synthetic rubber.

I soon learned that Mr. MARTIN was intensely interested in the stockpiling program. I wondered why he was so interested. The reason, I believe, was because when he entered Congress in the 76th Congress, he saw the shadows of the coming conflict, and he realized the need for preparation for the conflict by having critical materials available for utilization in building a war machine. Consequently, he was very active in getting two laws enacted, which became Public Law 117 of the 76th Congress and Public Law 520 of the 79th Congress.

All during the years, since that time, even though his committee duties have taken him into another field, he has taken a keen, active, and intelligent interest in the problem of stockpiling. He is recognized by the mineral industry as an intelligent and ardent stockpile advocate. He keeps in contact with the developments and the varying needs of our stockpiles. There is a provision in the law that requires the filing of a stockpiling progress sheet every quarter with the Armed Services Committees. For a time I was on the subcommittee, of which Mr. DURHAM was the chairman, to determine and check as to the progress of our stockpiling program.

Mr. MARTIN has kept abreast of what has been going on, although he has never asked us on the subcommittee that is required to check on the stockpiling progress, for any information.

I proclaim him the champion stockpiling Member of the 83d Congress. He has contributed much toward the realization that a sound stockpiling system is one step in the direction of adequate national security. No man in the Congress that I know of, or have heard of, has pursued the problem as much as THOMAS E. MARTIN.

We are sorry that he is leaving the House of Representatives. We are hoping that he may be successful in his present endeavor to change his congressional service to another body. His knowledge in a vital national defense field should not be lost now, considering the critical situation in which our country finds itself.

The Vanishing United States Merchant Fleets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, in the September issue of American Mercury there is a fine article written by Patrick McMahon under the pen name of Oliver Patrick which I think merits the attention of all Members of Congress who are interested in national defense, of which the American merchant marine is the fourth arm:

THE VANISHING UNITED STATES MERCHANT FLEETS

(By Oliver Patrick)

Despite the costly lessons of two world wars and the ever-present threat of a third, the United States merchant marine is on the verge of being swept from the seas for the third time since the turn of the century.

Since the end of World War II, the huge merchant fleet that we built at a cost of more than $14 billion has dwindled from more than 5,000 cargo ships and tankers to only 1,521 vessels of 1,000 gross tons or more in active service. And of these about 300 are being operated by the Government.

The reasons, of course, are easy to find. Ships flying the American flag simply cannot compete with low-wage foreign vessels for world cargoes. American seamen are the highest paid, the best fed, and the most comfortably quartered in the world. The average seaman on a United States ship is paid 4 or 5 times the wages of the seaman on a British vessel, 6 to 7 times those of the man on the Greek ship. And it costs the United States company anywhere from 3 to 6 times as much to feed and quarter him as it does the foreign competitor.

The difference is inevitably reflected in the operating costs. According to the Department of Commerce, a United States ship carrying 51 men has a monthly wage cost of $20,800. The same ship could have been operated by a European crew, under British practices, for $4,700, the Department's figures indicate. The foreign shipping company, under the simple rules of arithmetic, can quote far more attractive rates in competing for cargo—even for cargo bought and paid for by the United States taxpayer and shipped abroad as gifts to the other maritime nations of the world.

This brings up the second reason for the precarious state of United States shipping. Its demise is being hastened by a powerful group of internationally minded United States officials and Congressmen, led by the Department of State, who believe that in the interest of world cooperation we should allow our merchant fleets to die. They insist that the foreign maritime nations need the increased dollar earnings from their shipping services to maintain stable economies, and that it is in our own interest to allow them to carry our share, as well as their own share, of foreign trade. If war should come again, they insist that we can always rely on our friends to furnish us with adequate bottoms for our military and economic needs.

So they stubbornly, and for the most part successfully, oppose shipbuilding and ship-operating subsidies and preferential arrangements which might keep at least a reasonably sized American fleet afloat.

A quick look at the record indicates the extent to which we can count on foreign shipping in time of crisis.

Before World War I the once proud American merchant marine had dwindled to the point that 91 percent of all cargoes to and from the United States was carried in foreign bottoms. Then came the war, and our commerce was paralyzed. British and neutral shipowners eagerly grasped the opportunity to gouge United States shippers. Cargo rates jumped 700 percent in a matter of months, and at the peak of the war had risen 2,000 percent.

And in the end we had to build our own merchant marine, at war-boom prices. We built, by the end of the war, a fleet of 2,547 ships, of 15 million deadweight tons, and at the cost of $3 billion. A fleet of the same size could have been built before the war at a cost of about $800 million.

During the period between the wars our merchant marine had again dwindled under the competition of low-wage foreign vessels, many using oriental labor. By 1939 we had only 1,300 ships of over 1,000 tons in service (about the same as now). And when the war came again, we found that, instead of our friends and allies supplying us with cargo space, we had to build ships to give to them. In a time of critical shortages of all materials, the Nation was forced to build 54 million gross tons of merchant shipping, of which 5.5 million tons were delivered to our allies.

The cost of the World War II ship-building program was $14 billion. The same tonnage could have been constructed between the wars for about $4 billion.

But the price we paid for our neglect was by no means confined to money. The top military and naval leaders of the Nation have testified time and again that both wars were prolonged, and the loss of life increased, by our shortage of cargo ships and tankers. In fact, one top official has stated that we came within about 50 or 60 ships of losing World War II.

Yet now, for the third time, we are allowing the United States merchant marine to be torpedoed by foreign competition and well-meaning zealots, and are preparing to rely once more on our allies to carry our cargoes in event of an emergency.

Whether or not they will be able and willing to do so in event of war is something of a question. But there is no question of their willingness and ability to drive the American flag from the seas in time of peace, unless the Government acts promptly with a long-range program.

When World War II ended, more than 50 percent of the world's merchant shipping carried the United States flag. Today, less than 10 percent of the ships in operation are United States owned. Moreover, the ships we do operate are rapidly becoming obsolescent. More than 80 percent of our ships were constructed during World War II, and will have exceeded their estimated 20 years of useful life by 1960 to 1965. Meanwhile, the other maritime nations are rapidly building up modern, high-speed fleets—with the assistance of the Marshall plan and other aid programs.

Since the end of the war, 12 million tons of new merchant shipping has been built in the world, of which the United States completed only 2 percent. The British built 30 percent of the total, Norway 12 percent, France 8 percent, and other nations the balance.

At present there is not a single new cargo ship on the ways in an American yard, and not a single order on the books for 1953 or 1954. Two new cargo ships have been ordered for 1955.

The Department of Commerce estimates that we should build at least 60 new vessels a year to maintain our merchant fleet at minimum efficiency in event of an emergency, and to keep our shipyards going and available for a quick buildup. It plans to introduce a comprehensive program to the next Congress, including Government insured shipbuilding mortgages, shipping subsidies and shipbuilding subsidies.

But the screams of the internationalists are already being heard on Capitol Hill, and a long and bitter legislative battle is ahead if the United States merchant fleet is to be spared its third disaster in less than 50 years.

Section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHAUNCEY W. REED

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I wish to correct the RECORD of Friday, August 20, 1954, by inserting the correct text of a letter written by Representative FRANCIS E. WALTER, of Pennsylvania, to Senator PAT MCCARRAN, of Nevada, pertaining to an amendment to S. 2862, a bill which the House and the Senate passed on August 20, 1954.

The letter, as printed on page 14609 in the above mentioned copy of the RECORD, contains a typographical error, which could be misleading insofar as the interpretation of Mr. WALTER's amendment is concerned. The correct language of Mr. WALTER's letter is as follows:

AUGUST 20, 1954.

Hon. PAT MCCARRAN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Answering your inquiry, I want to say for the record and as a part of the legislative history of the bill, that my amendment to S. 2862, adopted by the House today, is intended to require the meeting of two standards, namely, the offense must be an offense which if committed in the United States would be a misdemeanor (not punishable by imprisonment for 1 year or more), and, second, the offense must be one for which the actual penalty imposed in the particular case was imprisonment not to exceed 6 months or a fine not to exceed $500, or both. If these two tests are met, under my amendment, the offense would not result in mandatory exclusion if there was only one offense and the alien was not otherwise excludable.

Sincerely,

FRANCIS E. WALTER.

Democrats Fight Against Atomic Monopoly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, the Democratic Party in the 83d Congress waged a fight to protect the public interest in atomic energy development. We were determined that the people's investment of $12 billion in the atomic energy program should provide a broad base for the industrial development and application of the peacetime uses of atomic energy.

We wanted all business to be on an equal footing, to have equal opportunity. We did not propose to stand aside and permit a few large corporations, already possessed of inside information as contractors of the Atomic Energy Commission, to monopolize the future development of atomic enterprise.

A key issue in the Democratic fight against monopoly control of atomic energy was the compulsory licensing of patents. An amendment to the atomic energy bill rushed through the House by the Republican steamroller would have opened the door to private patenting of inventions in the atomic energy field without any safeguards against monopoly bottlenecks. This amendment would have allowed a handful of giant corporations to get a stranglehold on the development of atomic technology. The benefits of this technology, built up by public funds, would have been channeled into the hands of a few companies strategically placed in the atomic energy program.

The Democratic Party stood firm against restrictive patents. We wanted the door opened to private enterprise, but not to be slammed shut again in the face of all American industry by a few corporate patent holders. We insisted on an amendment in conference, to require that all patents of primary importance to the atomic-energy program within a 5-year period must be licensed to other qualified companies desiring to use them on payment of a reasonable royalty fee.

The usual false cry of "socialism" was raised against the Democratic Party position. Our opponents tried to ignore the fact that the compulsory patent provision sponsored by Democratic Members of Congress also was supported by the President of the United States, the American Bar Association, a majority of the Senate, and outstanding patent lawyers. Our position was vindicated by the whole Congress.

A recent editorial in the Wall Street Journal suggests that repeal of the patent provisions should be an early order of business in the next Congress. I believe, on the contrary, that the period of compulsory patent licensing should be extended from 5 years to 10 years, as proposed in the Kerr amendment which passed the Senate. Furthermore, I believe that the Congress should correct other weaknesses in the atomic-energy bill which was rushed through the Congress by the Republican leadership in the closing days of this session.

Democratic Members made valiant efforts to plug the loopholes in the bill against monopoly and corporate favoritism and to prevent an atomic giveaway, but were successful only in part. The next Congress should take a close look at this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, one man stands out above all others in the fight to safeguard the public interest in atomic energy development. That man is CHET HOLIFIELD from the 19th District of California. The Nation owes CHET HOLIFIELD an everlasting debt of gratitude for his courage and leadership in the atomic energy fight.

As a distinguished member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, Representative HOLIFIELD insisted on exploring in full public hearings the many-sided features of the atomic energy bill.

He exposed many of the legislative loopholes by which self-seeking interests could monopolize the peacetime benefits of atomic energy.

He placed upon the public record essential facts about the notorious Dixon-Yates deal in an effort to stop this raid on the Public Treasury.

I was honored to join with Representative HOLIFIELD in a separate report on the atomic energy bill which revealed many of its basic defects and which told what could be done constructively to protect the people's $12 billion investment in atomic energy.

Without the Holifield-Price report and the courageous support given to it by many Members of the House and Senate, the atomic energy bill would have slipped through the Congress without full realization by the Members of its implications for the future of atomic energy development.

My Report to the People—The Work of the 1954 Session of the 83d Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARLAN HAGEN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Speaker, I am entitling these remarks "My Report to the People—The Work of the 1954 Session of the 83d Congress." I will deal exclusively with those acts, approved by both Houses of Congress, which are of most immediate interest to the people of my district. I feel that this report is a necessary part of the best performance of my job. Almost everyone has decisions important to his welfare which turn on the state of some Federal law included among those which I will hereafter describe and the overwhelming number of people do not have personal access to information concerning Federal statutes. With respect to those matters which are not hereinafter touched upon I hold myself and my office available at all times for the furnishing of information.

The Congress substantially revised the tax laws to create the following tax situation:

THE EXCISE TAX REDUCTION ACT

(a) Extended through April 1, 1955, existing rates on liquor—including beer and wines—cigarettes, gasoline and diesel fuel, trucks and autos and their parts and accessories.

(b) Reduced from 20 to 10 percent the tax on furs, jewelry, luggage, toilet preparations, electric bulbs and tubes, cameras and their lenses, and films.

(c) Reduced from 15 to 10 percent the tax on sporting goods, lighters, mechanical pens and pencils; reduced the tax on pistols and revolvers by 1 percent.

(d) Reduced from 10 to 5 percent the tax on electric, gas, and oil appliances, refrigerators, and freezers—exclusive of air conditioners.

(e) Reduced to 10 percent the tax on long-distance telephone and telegraph messages and local telephone and transportation charges.

(f) Renewed the 20-percent tax on nightclub and horse and dog track admissions but reduced tax on movies and other admission charges over 50 cents from 20 to 10 percent. Admissions to almost all school and college athletic events and nonprofit civic-type performances employing only amateurs are made tax exempt.

THE INCOME TAX ACT OF 1954

(a) The deadline for filing income-tax returns is extended by 1 month. Persons now required to file returns are persons under age 65 with a gross income of $600 or more and persons over age 65 with a gross income of $1,200 or more.

(b) Dividend income: The first $50 of dividend income is not included in taxable income. Amounts in excess of $50 are included but after calculating his tax with such income included the taxpayer can deduct an amount equal to 4 percent of the value of such excess dividend receipts.

(c) Child-care expenses: Amount actually expended for the care of a child under 12 years or an incapacitated child are deductible by the following people: An unremarried widow, widower, or divorced or legally separated person; a wife whose husband is unable to work; a working husband and wife team but if their joint income exceeds $4,500 every dollar of such excess reduces the child-care deduction.

(d) All persons over age 65 and those persons under that age who have retired under a nonmilitary government retirement plan can claim a $1,200 maximum retirement income deduction. Retirement income includes pensions, annuities, dividends, interest, and rent. Amounts of income already nontaxable, such as social security, railroad retirement, and military pensions are deductible from the maximum $1,200 amount and this taxpayer can deduct from his tax only 20 percent of the remainder.

(e) Children's earnings: Heretofore if a child earned over $600 the parent lost his exemption. Under the new law parents can still claim the child as a dependent regardless of earnings provided they furnish over half his support and he or she is under 19 years of age or, if older, is attending school continuously during any 5-month period. Scholarship receipts of the child are ignored in calculating dependency.

(f) The definition of other dependents for exemption purposes has been liberalized. The test is the provision of over half of the dependent's support or at least 10 percent of a mutual contribution of relatives to over half the support of a relative. Close relatives need not live with the taxpayer and nonrelatives can be claimed if they live with the taxpayer.

(g) Farmers: Can claim as a business deduction the cost of all soil and water conservation work, including land leveling, ditch building, windbreaks, up to 25 percent of his gross income. Amounts in excess of the 25-percent figure can be deducted from subsequent year's income.

Note: I secured a similar law for California during my service in the State legislature.

(h) Depreciation: Farmers and other businessmen can depreciate their income-earning property with a life of over 3 years by new methods which permit accelerated amounts of depreciation during the early life of the property.

(i) Medical expenses: Taxpayers can take the standard deduction but if expenses are large they can itemize and deduct the cost of all expenditures in excess of 3 percent of their gross income up to a maximum amount of $2,500 per person or, in the case of a family, $10,000.

NOTE.—Efforts to increase the personal exemption over $600 were defeated. The bill extended the present 52 percent corporate income tax for 1 year.

FARM LEGISLATION

The much-disputed farm legislation does the following:

(a) For 1955 crops of cotton, corn, wheat, rice, and peanuts establishes a parity support price which, in the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture, can range from 82½ to 90 percent of parity. Without further congressional action, support on post-1955 crops will range between 75 and 90 percent of parity.

(b) So-called modernized parity with respect to cotton, corn, wheat, and peanuts will apply beginning in 1956. This parity concept will reduce the actual support level on these crops and it is provided that such reduction can occur only at the rate of 5 percent each year until the modernized parity level is reached.

(c) Cotton: In addition to reducing the parity level of cotton, provision was made for permitting county committees, in their discretion, to distribute quota acreage on a history rather than a tilled acreage basis. Also provision is made for surrender of acreage, in a quota year, without future loss of such acres.

(d) Dairy products: Fluid milk is added to the list of dairy products made eligible for support but the level of support remains the present scale of 75 to 90 percent of parity discretionary with the Secretary. The expenditure of $50 million annually by the CCC to increase consumption of milk by school children is directed and provision is made for free distribution to the armed services and to veterans' hospitals of surplus dairy products when such distribution will not supplant the normal requirements of such bodies.

(e) Wool: For a 4-year period beginning April 1, 1955, wool will be supported up to 110 percent of parity through a system of payments back to growers to give them the difference between the parity figure and the market price of wool if below that figure. The price received by the individual grower is virtually ignored in making this rebate which will come out of funds received from tariffs on wool. Wool is presently supported at 90 percent of parity and this is an experiment in something similar to the Brannan plan.

Note: Growers should be reluctant to commit their clip for sale until the effective date of this act in order to secure the best price.

(f) The authority of the Secretary to impose regulation, under certain criteria, on the use of acres diverted from quota crops is recognized. In addition he is authorized to deny ACP payments to a farmer who knowingly violates his acreage allotment.

(g) Marketing agreements: Canned or frozen grapefruit is added to marketing agreement eligibles. Agreements can be retained in force though products selling above parity and order can include specifications of packaging. In addition foreign fruits and vegetables may be required to comply with American marketing agreement standards as to maturity, size, and quality.

Note: Quotas on cotton are almost a certainty in 1955 and farmers must work to secure the best regulations governing diverted acres and agitate for that method of county distribution of acres, historical versus tilled acres, which they deem desirable.

SENATE PROCEEDINGS SUBSEQUENT TO ADJOURNMENT

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED AFTER ADJOURNMENT

Subsequent to the adjournment of the Senate, the Secretary of the Senate reported that, on August 21, 1954, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 264. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain land in the State of Maryland to the Disney-Bell Post 66 of the American Legion, Bowie, Md.;

S. 738. An act for the relief of Maria Busa;

S. 906. An act to establish the finality of contracts between the Government and common carriers of passengers and freight subject to the Interstate Commerce Act;

S. 1259. An act for the relief of Anastasia Kondylis;

S. 1504. An act for the relief of the estate of Rev. Pang Wha Il;

S. 1604. An act for the relief of Margot Herta Matulewitz;

S. 1605. An act for the relief of James Arthur Cimino and Joan Cimino;

S. 1687. An act for the relief of T. C. Elliott;

S. 1873. An act for the relief of Ursula Wilke and Mike Mario Wilke;

S. 2033. An act relating to the labeling of packages containing foreign-produced trout sold in the United States, and requiring certain information to appear in public eating places serving such trout;

S. 2068. An act for the relief of Francesco Marinelli;

S. 2074. An act for the relief of certain Basque sheepherders;

S. 2301. An act for the relief of Katherina Picerkona and her minor son, Helmut;

S. 2316. An act for the relief of the Birmingham Iron Works, Inc.;

S. 2345. An act for the relief of Yun Tai Miao and his wife, Chao Pei Tsang Miao;

S. 2366. An act for the relief of Ito Yukiko;

S. 2618. An act for the relief of Ertogroul Osman;

S. 2636. An act for the relief of Arturo Rodriguez Diaz;

S. 2639. An act for the relief of Etsuko Tamaki (Shimizu);

S. 2640. An act for the relief of Esther Joanne Potter;

S. 2649. An act for the relief of Chaya Frangles;

S. 2731. An act for the relief of Jean Cantalini;

S. 2789. An act for the relief of Gianni Bernardis;

S. 2842. An act for the relief of Dr. Felix de Piniès;

S. 2849. An act for the relief of Elisa-Pompea Roppo (Elisa-Pompea Cardone);

S. 2879. An act for the relief of Peter Julian Newbery and Prudence Ellen Newbery;

S. 2884. An act for the relief of Sister Anna Scrinzi, Sister Giuliana Paladini, Sister Iolanda Mazzocchi, and Sister Giuseppina Zanchetta;

S. 2887. An act for the relief of Hon Cheun Kwan;

S. 2893. An act for the relief of Seraphina Papgeorgiou;

S. 2941. An act for the relief of Kim Kwang Suk and Kim Woo Shik;

S. 2945. An act for the relief of Eulalio Rodriguez Vargas;

S. 2954. An act for the relief of Christine Thum;

S. 2993. An act for the relief of Ruth Wehrhan;

S. 3056. An act for the relief of S. Sgt. Silvestre E. Castillo;

S. 3058. An act for the relief of certain nationals of Italy;

S. 3108. An act to modify the act of October 8, 1940 (54 Stat. 1020), and the act of July 24, 1947 (61 Stat. 418), with respect to the recoupment of certain public school construction costs in Minnesota;

S. 3112. An act for the relief of Emiko Watanabe;

S. 3138. An act for the relief of Wakako Niimi and her minor child, Katherine;

S. 3145. An act for the relief of Bonita Lee Simpson;

S. 3148. An act for the relief of Francesco Pugliese;

S. 3221. An act for the relief of Ingeborg Otto;

S. 3276. An act for the relief of Cleophat Robert Joseph Caron;

S. 3404. An act for the relief of Anni Stroee Jacobsen;

S. 3447. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code to permit the filling of oral prescriptions for certain drugs, and for other purposes;

S. 3485. An act for the relief of Liselotta Kunze;

S. 3577. An act for the relief of Milos Knezevich;

S. 3586. An act for the relief of Mrs. Hildegard Simon Walley;

S. 3601. An act to provide that the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to extend until not later than October 18, 1962, certain timber rights and necessary ingress and egress, and for other purposes;

S. 3625. An act for the relief of Mrs. Juana Padilla de Caballero (Mrs. Juana Padilla de Ontiveros);

S. 3652. An act for the relief of Francis Timothy Mary Hodgson (formerly Victor Charles Joyce);

S. 3840. An act for the relief of Klyce Motors, Inc.; and

S. 3844. An act to provide for a reciprocal and more effective remedy for certain claims arising out of the acts of military personnel and to authorize the pro rata sharing of the cost of such claims with foreign nations, and for other purposes.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Printing and binding for Congress, when recommended to be done by the Committee on Printing of either House, shall be so recommended in a report containing an approximate estimate of the cost thereof, together with a statement from the Public Printer of estimated approximate cost of work previously ordered by Congress within the fiscal year (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 145, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on Printing, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. The money derived from such sales shall be paid into the Treasury and accounted for in his annual report to Congress, and no sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

ber 1, 1954

ontinued

54

of

...	1,777
...	6
...	None
...	131

as

...	8,310
...	None
...	None
...	206

of

...	3,528
...	None
...	None
...	342

as

...	14,716
...	None
...	None
...	None

ed

..	4,755
...	None
...	None
..	11

ng

..	1,464
..	6
..	None
..	6

..	35,158
..	12
..	None
..	696
..	34,450

Appendix

NOTICE

Due to conditions beyond our control, this Record includes only a part of the material now at the Government Printing Office. The remainder of the material will appear in a Record to be printed on Friday, September 3, 1954.

By order of the Joint Committee on Printing.

WILLIAM E. JENNER, Chairman.

Address of Hon. Edward Martin, of Pennsylvania, Prepared for Delivery Before the Army War College, Carlisle, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the Appendix of the RECORD an address prepared for delivery by me before the Army War College at Carlisle, Pa.

There being no objection, the address will be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is always a pleasure to visit this historic post with a military record going back almost 200 years.

In the early days of our colonial development Carlisle stood at the crossroads of history. It was one of the most important outposts of our frontier defense in the days of the French and Indian Wars.

It was the starting point for the expedition led by General Forbes against Fort Duquesne that decided the future of the North American continent and shaped the destiny of two European empires.

Here was organized and equipped the march of Colonel Bouquet's Colonial and British troops across the mountains to defeat the Indians of Pontiac's uprising, making the Ohio Valley safe for settlement.

Here was formed a contingent of the First Regiment of the Continental Army, the first troops from west of the Hudson River to join General Washington's forces.

From those early days until the present Carlisle has served the defense of America.

It is, therefore, most appropriate to discuss in this center of patriotic tradition, the course we must take for the defense of our freedom, the maintenance of peace and the preservation of the American way of life.

In order to reach a sound understanding of national defense it is necessary to have a clear understanding of what America means and the elements that comprise our strength as a Nation.

First and foremost we must accept the fundamental principle that the defense of a free Republic is the solemn obligation of all its people.

If America is to be preserved as the greatest Nation of all time every citizen must accept a full share of individual responsibility. Every American must join with complete loyalty and unselfish devotion to the task of building a national defense so strong that no aggressor will dare threaten our safety and security.

We Americans are a peace-loving nation. We have never been guilty of aggression. We have never engaged in a war of conquest. We have never sought territorial gain by force of arms. We have never imposed tyranny on any people of the earth.

Whenever we have been forced into armed conflict we have fought on the side of honor, justice, and freedom. We have made terrific sacrifices in blood and treasure to liberate oppressed and persecuted people and to repel aggression that would rob free people of their liberty. For 150 years we have been able to keep our shores free from armed invaders. Of all the world's great nations we are the only one that has escaped the desolation and destruction of war.

With the new concept of military strategy, the conquest of space and time and the threat of total destruction brought into the world by the atom and hydrogen bombs our aim should be strength for victory—strength for peace.

To meet the challenge of these disturbing times we need a great new wave of patriotic fervor. We need the power and strength of a united people, combining 100-percent Americanism with the highest moral and spiritual standards. We need the resolute courage and the high morale of God-fearing, clean-living, law-abiding people who appreciate our precious heritage of liberty and independence and are willing to make every sacrifice in defense of our ideals.

A great American statesman, Daniel Webster, summarized the obligations of freemen in his inspiring statement which I quote:

"God grants liberty only to those who love it and are always ready to guard and defend it."

To guard and defend our liberty we must have military strength, but equally important, we must have economic, industrial, agricultural, and spiritual strength.

We must maintain a strong and expanding economy that will provide employment for our workers at a wage scale adequate to sustain the American standard of living.

We must have a high level of production in our mills, factories, and mines.

We must have the maximum production of food on our farms to meet the needs of our Armed Forces and our civilian population.

We must strengthen our financial position through economy in government and sound fiscal policies that will prevent inflation.

One of the great dangers we face at home is too much government, at too high a cost. This applies to all levels of government—Federal, State, and local.

Twenty-five years ago the total cost of the Federal Government was less than $3 billion a year. In 1953 it was close to $75 billion, which, I am glad to say, was greatly decreased in the current fiscal year.

Twenty-five years ago the national debt was about $18½ billion. Now it has just about reached the statutory limit, the staggering sum of $275 billion. And Congress, in the session just ended, found it necessary to authorize a temporary increase in the debt limit of $6 billion.

Twenty-five years ago there were 2,500,000 employees on the Federal payroll. Today there are about 2,300,000, a decrease of 200,000 from the high figure of a year ago. The total number of all government employees, Federal, State, and local, is now more than 8 million, while 25 years ago it was about 3 million.

The Federal payroll is now equal to the wages of all the workers in the steel industry of America and twice that of all the railroads.

Twenty-five years ago the cost of operating State government in all the 48 States was about $2 billion a year. It has now increased to the enormous sum of $12 billion. At that time the 48 States owed about $2 billion, which in 25 years has been expanded to near $10 billion.

Twenty-five years ago the total cost of all local government in the United States was about $5½ billion a year. It has now more than doubled. At that time local government had outstanding bonds of about $12 billion. That debt has now increased to $22 billion.

I bring these figures to your attention because the solvency of our country has an all-important bearing on the defense of our freedom.

I have in mind the fact that the American soldier is not only the defender of his country in battle, but takes a part of equal importance in his civilian capacity.

Under our system of government the administration of military affairs is in the hands of civilian authority. Policy dealing with our relations with foreign countries is made by the President in his civilian capacity and by Congress.

I am sure the President voiced the convictions of the American people when he rejected firmly and forcefully the suggestion of a preventive war against the Soviet bloc. The proposal to defeat communism by striking the first blow is contrary to all American tradition. Those who argue that the United States should take the offensive show a lack of faith in America's sincere desire for peace.

Now let us look at our defense situation from the military side and consider some fundamental principles.

Today more and more Americans are becoming convinced that we cannot defend the world, nor can be feed the world, without danger to our own economic security.

The tremendous cost of military preparation will be a heavy burden upon our people for many years to come even though we escape total war.

A free republic, such as ours, cannot rely on a large professional army. That is one reason why I advocate putting into operation without delay a system that would make basic military training a part of the education of every young man who is physically qualified.

I believe in universal military training as an effective instrumentality for peace.

Universal military training is American in origin, principle and character. It calls for equal service with equal opportunity. It distributes equal responsibility for our Nation's defense among all classes and creeds, the rich and poor alike.

Universal military training, properly administered, can be carried out at a cost we can afford without keeping millions of men continuously under arms. It will give us a great reservoir of trained officers and men—a citizen army ready for immediate action.

It will instill in the hearts and minds of our young men a better understanding of what America stands for and a deeper appreciation of the American way of life. In addition to the work of a soldier universal military training will teach the proper way to live and proper conduct under conditions of hardship and danger.

It will teach the value of organization, teamwork, and discipline.

Universal military training follows the principle laid down by George Washington who said, and I quote:

"Every citizen who enjoys the protection of free government owes not only a portion of his property but even of his personal service in defense of it."

Back in 1790 President Washington placed before the first Congress a defense plan which called for every able-bodied young man to be trained to defend his country.

Unfortunately Washington's plan was not adopted and as a result every war emergency has found us unprepared.

We have paid dearly in every war for our failure to heed Washington's advice. Vastly increased expense and heavy losses have always resulted from our tendency to postpone preparation until the actual outbreak of hostilities.

In both world wars we went into action before we were ready. The same thing happened when Communist aggression shattered the peace of the world in Korea.

Thousands of American boys paid with their lives because they did not have the training or the equipment to do the job to which they were called at a time of national peril.

It is not surprising that the most ardent supporters of military training are those who know the horrors of war. Every combat veteran knows from personal experience the tragic cost of unpreparedness in blood and suffering. They have seen brave comrades fall in battle who might be alive today if they had been better trained in self preservation under fire.

No American boy should be sent into battle who is not adequately trained.

That is so fundamental that it is not even a debatable question.

Shall we now wait until an enemy attacks before we begin training our young men?

Or shall we begin now, while there is still time, to build up a constantly growing reserve of trained manpower as the backbone of our National defense?

Our most dangerous weakness is our lack of reserves trained in the skills required by the many technical services of modern warfare.

The vast changes that have taken place in military science have not altered the basic principle that properly trained personnel, ably led and directed, is the decisive factor between victory and defeat. In the new military strategy only thoroughly trained men are qualified for combat service. We must have a great reserve of trained manpower, backed by high morale and the will to defend our ideals.

It is my firm belief that basic military training for every young man, excepting only those physically disabled, is the foundation of any plan for building the defensive strength of the American Republic.

Under that system approximately one million young men would be fitted into a definite military organization every year, trained and ready to be called to the colors in a matter of days.

I do not agree with those who favor a permanent policy of keeping large forces of ground troops garrisoned in foreign lands. That would require a standing army of such tremendous size that its cost could bankrupt our Nation in a short time.

I believe the more practical and effective plan would require that ground troops be provided by the anti-Communist countries of Europe and Asia. That would give us a well-rounded plan of defense when combined with great air and seapower provided by the United States and our allies.

In planning the military defense of our Republic, I believe we should have a highly trained Regular Army of modest size, based here at home. It should have the finest and most modern weapons and equipment. It should have the greatest mobility and the greatest firepower the world has ever known. It should be completely motorized and prepared to move by air and sea to any place where it might be needed.

Our National Guard should be under the control of the States until called into the Federal service. It should be trained by the best and most patriotic brains of the Regular Army. We should have a great Reserve Corps of citizens willing to continue their military training, and they must also be under the supervision of the best the Army can provide.

Instead of maintaining a huge standing ground force at tremendous cost, I advocate building an Air Force so big and so powerful that we could have complete supremacy in the air and enough planes to carry our ground troops to any part of the world.

With such an Air Force American jet fighters and bombers, in the event we are attacked, could speedily demolish the Communist lines of communication and could destroy the heart of the Communist military production.

We should build up the world's most powerful Navy so that we and our allies will have complete command of the sea. We should create the world's strongest merchant marine in readiness for the transportation of men and the material with which to fight.

The worldwide struggle between human liberty and tyranny will not be decided by military power alone.

We cannot defeat communism by force alone, even though we gain military victory.

In our striving for a world of freedom justice, and peace we must demonstrate that our system of free government has produced greater progress and more happiness than the Soviet rule of terror and enslavement.

We must set before the world an example of right living and decency, free from corruption, selfishness, and greed.

With faith in America, and loyalty to the ideals which made us a great nation, we can go forward to a brighter, better tomorrow for America and the world.

Our Shipbuilding Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, as the recent session of the Congress approached an end, there was grave concern among various interests in the maritime field over the lack of progress on vital maritime bills. It was deemed urgent that representations be made to the White House, to seek assistance toward advancement of these measures. I was happy to arrange for the meeting desired.

The distinguished senior Senator from Massachusetts, Senator SALTONSTALL, who very kindly had associated himself with me in sponsoring legislation for the relief of American shipping and shipbuilding, joined with me in this visit, as did the very able acting chairman of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, Congressman THOR TOLLEFSON.

Spokesman for the industry-labor delegation who met with the President on this occasion was Leigh R. Sanford, president of the Shipbuilders Council of America, whose assistance and advice on matters affecting the shipbuilding industry have always been most willingly tendered and most helpful.

Representing the important labor groups in the maritime field were James A. Brownlow, president of the metal trades department, American Federation of Labor, and Andrew A. Pettis, vice president and Washington representative of the Industrial Union of Marine and Shipbuilding Workers of America.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Sanford's statement to President Eisenhower on the occasion of this meeting be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR SHIPBUILDING PROBLEMS

(By Leigh R. Sanford, president, Shipbuilders Council of America)

Mr. President, we appreciate the opportunity to talk with you about our problems, which we feel most sincerely are also your problems.

An extremely critical situation exists in the shipbuilding and ship-repairing industry, which directly threatens the mobilization potential of that industry. Our purpose is to bring that situation to your personal attention, touch briefly on the present status of pending maritime legislation sponsored by the administration, and finally ask you to do certain things to insure the legislative success of your program and to assure an adequate mobilization potential of the industry.

We know that you know the importance of the merchant marine and the shipbuilding and ship-repairing industry to the national economy and national security. Your telegram of October 3, 1952, to the Propeller Club of the United States meeting in Los Angeles clearly states your personal convictions on that score as a result of your personal experience.

But we are not so sure that you have had an opportunity to acquire personal knowledge of the cold, hard facts applying to the shipbuilding and ship-repairing industry at the present time. We are here to afford you that opportunity.

Even such an impartial publication as Fortune has confirmed these facts by an independent survey, and, as a result, has seen fit to publish in this month's issue, a depressing feature article entitled "Gloom in the Shipyards," the second sentence of which reads as follows:

"The United States shipbuilding industry is not in danger of disappearing overnight, but is quite sick—sicker in fact than any other major United States industry, with the possible exception of soft coal."

We now give you the facts.

There has not been an order placed in an American shipyard for a major seagoing merchant vessel since November 1952. The backlog of orders placed prior to that time for Government mariners and private tankers fortunately has been sufficient to carry over to this year the major shipyards participating in those orders.

But now, and for some time past, it is and has been clearly evident that, without prompt additional contracts, placed in 1954, not next year, at least some of those shipbuilding yards will be forced to close down by the latter part of this year.

We show you a chart of the condition of the shipyard merchant order book from the first quarter of 1946 projected to the first quarter of 1955, based on present orders. It shows where the shipbuilding yards are headed as far as merchant ship construction is concerned.

We also show you a chart of the number of production employees in 9 shipyards from the first quarter of 1946 projected to the first quarter of 1955. Of the approximately 30,000 men still employed, it is estimated that not over one-half are employed on merchant shipbuilding.

The cooperation of the Bureau of Ships of the Navy in placing orders for new naval vessels in private yards has been excellent, but, as the Chief of the Bureau, Rear Adm. Wilson D. Leggett, has warned, the naval shipbuilding program alone is not sufficient to provide enough work to keep the shipbuilding yards operating on a basis consistent with mobilization requirements.

The layoff of skilled craftsmen in the shipyards has been underway all year at a rapidly accelerating rate. The skilled craftsman of today provides the material for the supervisor of tomorrow in any wartime expansion. The same is true of the technician. In addition, the loss of technical organizations inevitably will prevent this country from keeping in the forefront, or even abreast, of worldwide technological developments in the sciences of naval architecture, marine engineering, and the many other branches of engineering involved in the design and construction of ships.

It seems fundamental that the production of military equipment for stockpiling for a national emergency is only part of the assigned task. Provision must be made to transport that equipment overseas and, incidentally, the men who will use it. Rear Adm. R. E. Wilson, speaking for the Department of Defense, last spring, strongly recommended a phased merchant ship construction program of those ships required to bring the active operating United States merchant fleet up to the numerical limits required to meet the initial needs of the Department of Defense and provide the means for an orderly replacement of existing operating tonnage now rapidly approaching obsolescence. The Chief of the Bureau of Ships, Rear Admiral Leggett, stated no longer ago than June 29, 1954, that our defense effort, at the present time, is most vulnerable insofar as shipbuilding is concerned.

And yet the existing private shipbuilding and ship repairing industry is and necessarily must be relied upon to provide an adequate mobilization base for manpower and facilities from which to expand in the event of a national emergency.

It should be self-evident that an industry without work or with only a limited volume of work, cannot maintain itself at sufficient strength to provide an adequate nucleus of shipyard manpower or even maintain existing private shipyard facilities.

As for individual yards at least some of them are faced with the choice of liquidation, involving the disposal of valuable waterfront properties for other industrial purposes, or of maintaining idle shipyards on a standby basis for a substantial period at heavy expense. Neither choice is an easy one. The latter, however, is the more difficult because, once the hard core of technicians and skilled craftsmen have been dispersed to seek other more permanent employment, their reassembly, or what is more likely their replacement, is difficult and time consuming. It takes years to again obtain reasonable efficiency and economy.

The condition of the major ship repairing yards is much the same as that of the shipbuilding yards. Progressive reduction in the number of vessels in active operation has caused the volume of available repair work to dwindle to the point where continued solvent operation has become a problem for the respective managements.

In the Maritime Subsidy Policy Report, released May 3, 1954, by the Department of Commerce, one of the conclusions reached was that a construction program of 60 oceangoing ships a year would maintain the American shipbuilding industry at sufficient strength to provide a nucleus of shipyard manpower capable of expansion to meet estimated mobilization requirements, which nucleus was estimated at 36,000 shipyard workers on merchant ship construction. The present employment is less than half of that minimum and by the end of this year, it will consist of only a few hundred workers.

As for the status of maritime legislation pending before the Congress, this is the way matters stand as of today.

The funds requested by the administration for the four passenger cargo liners and those for the trade-in and build tanker bill were deleted by the House Appropriations Committee. The prompt and effective action taken by you has resulted in their reinstatement by the House.

The House has passed a substitute for the administration-sponsored long-term tanker charter bill, which had been passed by the Senate. The substitute House version requires the appropriation of funds for the construction of Government-owned tankers. The issue is now before the conferees and still in doubt. We know that you will take whatever additional steps are necessary to get this bill back on the track on which you started it.

In addition, legislation designed to create an economic atmosphere under which private ship construction and the private financing thereof may be stimulated is vital under present administration policy. The mortgage loan insurance bill and the cargo preference bill fall in this category.

It also is of utmost importance that you personally urge Government maritime agencies to leave no stone unturned to promote private ship construction under existing law by administrative action. Much more could be done in this manner than has been done.

It does not now appear that any ship construction that may be authorized or for which funds may be appropriated in this session, under any bill now under consideration, can possibly result in actual ship construction in the shipyards this year. The inevitable time lag involved is too great. But the situation is so critical in the shipbuilding yards that employment on ship construction cannot wait until next year. Some ship construction must be started now to tide the shipyards over until next year.

Rear Adm. Wilson D. Leggett, Chief of the Bureau of Ships, has repeatedly stated that what he called an interim emergency program of constructing 20 merchant ships is vital to supplement naval ship constructing in private shipyards now underway or to be ordered. In this connection, it must be assumed that the Maritime Administration has on hand up-to-date plans and specifications for strategic cargo ships and tankers, on which bids could be invited immediately and awards made without loss of time.

Hence, in addition to the Administration-sponsored bills on which we ask your help, we also ask you to give your active support to an interim emergency program of ship construction of not to exceed 20 ships at a cost of $150 million. This amount is exactly that required to be appropriated by the House version of the long-term tanker charter bill. Its appropriation and use for this interim emergency program, coupled with the enactment of the original long-term tanker charter bill already passed by the Senate, will result in the acquisition of a total of 40 strategic vessels needed by the Department of Defense on M-day, for the same capital expenditure by the Government as that required to construct only 20 Government tankers under the House substitute version.

With reference to the ship-repairing yards, there is before the Congress now S. 3546, the Emergency Ship Repair Act of 1954, which would permit certain merchant-type vessels designated by the Department of Defense as strategically necessary on M-day, and now laid up in the reserve fleets, to be placed in condition for practically immediate use on M-day, at a time when ship-repairing yards will be congested with all the ship repair and conversion work incident to the outbreak of hostilities. The repair of these particular ships now will anticipate that peak load and provide additional repair work now when it is most needed. The cost is $45 million.

The total cost of these 2 bills, 1 for shipbuilding and 1 for ship repairing, will be less than $200 million, a relatively small price to pay as insurance for the acquisition of ships vital to the national security and at the same time for the preservation of an industry equally vital to that security. They could still be passed in the present session of the Congress, Mr. President, provided they have your active support.

Portugal's Stand on Goa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. GLENN BEALL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, for many years one of my very good friends, Dr. Joseph F. Thorning, associate editor of World Affairs, has made a study of Portugal's position on Goa.

Dr. Thorning believes that any infringement of Portuguese rights in Goa would be a blow at the fundamental principles of international law. This, too, is the view of His Excellency Ambassador Luis Esteves Fernandes, of Portugal.

I request unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record a letter to the editor of the New York Times which was published on August 18, 1954.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PORTUGAL'S STAND ON GOA—POSSIBILITY OF NEGOTIATING QUESTION OF SOVEREIGNTY DENIED

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

Your editorial on the present Goa issue under the heading "Portugal and India" contains certain factual errors which I feel certain you will wish to correct, since to allow them to pass unchallenged might give American public opinion, as represented by your many readers, the mistaken impression as conveyed by that article that Portugal is ready to "retreat from its original die-hard position" of refusing to enter into negotiations with the Indian Union for the handing over of her territories in the Indian subcontinent.

Nothing could be further from the truth. The Government of Portugal, and with it the whole Portuguese Nation, have not and will not deviate in the slightest degree from their unwavering determination to exclude from any eventual discussions with the Indian Union all questions which should remotely or directly involve or affect their sovereignty in those territories.

GOVERNMENT NOTES

In the several notes which the Portuguese Government have lately addressed to the Indian Government in connection with the announced "peaceful Goan invasion" which failed so signally, it has been stated over and again in the most explicit terms that Portugal is perfectly willing to seek—in conjunction with the Union Government—an agreed solution to all problems resulting from the contiguity of Portuguese and Indian territories, but under no circumstances whatesoever will Portugal accept a discussion of questions of sovereignty. Up to the present the Indian Government have evaded giving a clear and precise answer to this sine qua non condition for the opening of negotiations between the two countries.

In view of this you will readily agree that the possibility of easing the present state of tension between Portugual and India does not depend on any assurance which India might give with regard to the preservation of the sacredness of St. Francis Xavier's tomb, as your editorial suggests. We have no doubt that India would give us not only such an assurance but also many other guaranties which we might care to ask for in various fields if only we were prepared to negotiate the surrender of our sovereignty in the territories which the Indian Union covets under the specious arguments of geographic unity and alleged anticolonialism. Such a hypothesis is of course unacceptable to Portugal.

LUIS ESTEVES FERNANDES,
Ambassador of Portugal.

WASHINGTON, *August 16, 1954.*

There Are Many Cases of Distress in This Country

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. USHER L. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I desire to insert the following news item taken from the Washington Post and Times Herald, Friday, August 20, 1954:

MOTHER PACKS 1902 PISTOL, ROBS STORE

LANCASTER, CALIF., August 19.—"When your kids are hungry you do stupid things."

Awaiting preliminary hearing on charges of robbing a liquor store with a 1902 model pistol that wouldn't shoot, a young mother of 3 children, the eldest only 4, told her story to newsmen.

Mrs. Janet Sarver, 25, remains in jail in lieu of $2,500 bail with the hearing set for Wednesday.

Officers said she took $189 in a liquor store holdup Tuesday night.

"I wouldn't do that again. Not for a million dollars," she asserted tearfully.

"My husband, Don, lost his job * * * our home burned * * * illness hit us.

"Last week I earned $10 as a part-time waitress. Don said he heard of job opportunities in Utah, I gave him $5 and he left last Sunday. When my money ran out we only had three cans of milk in the house. The neighbors gave me some pears and tomatoes. That's all we had for 2 days, and then I found that old gun."

Police seek her hitchhiking 30-year-old husband, who lost a leg in a motorcycle accident 6 years ago.

Mrs. Sarver told newsmen she was a machinist and a good one but couldn't find work in this desert community where the family came because a son, Steven, 2 suffered from asthma. The other youngsters are Terry, 4, and Patty, 3. She said she had to give up a job when the children got measles.

The first home they rented here burned last November, wiping them out financially, Mrs. Sarver recounted. They moved into another house furnished with castoffs donated by neighbors.

"We had to sell our last tangible asset, our pet goat, to pay the rent last month."

She first tried to rob a gas station but the attendant just laughed, Mrs. Sarver said. Then she went to the liquor store where a woman clerk handed over the money.

"After I thought it over I wanted to give it back, but I was afraid if I walked into the store I would get shot down. So I was walking to a telephone to call them and tell them I was bringing the money back when I was arrested."

Then she added, "At least the kids got fed at the sheriff's station."

Mr. Speaker, in this case a desperate mother, whose children were without food, took a pistol that would not shoot and held up a liquor store and got $189 but decided to give it back and was calling up the police when arrested. She is now in jail because of her inability to secure bond in the sum of $2,500. If I lived in that vicinity I would gladly go on her bond, because I feel that if my children were starving I would do the same thing, but probably would have contrived to put this $189 into food for the children before I was caught.

This woman should be turned out on her own bond and arrangements made by the public welfare board of that community to get food to this family.

Cases like this—where there is no food for children—should never happen in a country where we can give away billions to foreign countries.

Letter to Max Abelman From Hon. Herbert H. Lehman, of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, on September 30, 1954, a dinner will be given by the medical board of the Jewish Hospital of Brooklyn in honor of my old friend, Mr. Max Abelman, of Brooklyn. For more than half a century he has served the people of his community with great devotion and public benefit.

I am unfortunately unable to attend the dinner but I have taken pleasure in writing Mr. Abelman a letter of congratulation. I ask unanimous consent to have this letter printed in the RECORD as part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AUGUST 20, 1954.

Mr. MAX ABELMAN,
Brooklyn, N. Y.

DEAR MAX: I understand that a dinner will be tendered to you by the medical board of the Jewish Hospital of Brooklyn on September 30. I am very sorry indeed that other engagements of long standing will make it impossible for me to be present.

I know of the splendid service which you have rendered over long years in many, many worthy organizations and to countless thousands of people who were in need of help and encouragement. Your sympathies have had no bounds, and you have sought to better the lot of people everywhere without regard to creed, color, race, or national origin. Your service to the Brooklyn Jewish Hospital has been particularly noteworthy over a period of nearly half a century. I want to express my appreciation and thanks for what you have done for the people of New York.

I am glad that you are going to get some well-earned rest, but I am confident that you will continue your long and useful interest in many civic, philanthropic, educational, and religious fields.

I am sure the dinner will be both impressive and enjoyable. I send you my heartiest good wishes for full measure of happiness and success in whatever you undertake.

With kindest personal regards, I remain,
Very sincerely yours,
HERBERT H. LEHMAN.

Arab League Slush Fund

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 17, 1954

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following column by Barry Gray from the New York Post of August 11, 1954, is worthy of our earnest consideration and attention:

Some time this month an office will be opened in New York City that promises to be the focal point of a new nationwide campaign designed to stir up religious hatred in the United States.

It is all being done very quietly. Reports of the new enterprise have not appeared in American newspapers yet.

The office will be the reconstituted American arm of the Arab League and is the fruition of a secret meeting of the Arab League 4 years ago in Alexandria, Egypt. At that time, the Arab nations were still smarting under the defeat of their armies which had invaded Israel.

A major decision then made by the Arab League was to establish in New York City a progaganda office with one principal task—the destruction of Jewish influence in the United States.

The Arab League felt then, and still does, that the most effective way to undermine Israel was to encourage anti-Semitism in the United States, the one nation more than any other whose support Israel needed in order to survive.

The man selected to establish the Arab League propaganda apparatus in the United States was well qualified for his new assignment. He was Abdul Rahman Azzam Pasha, founder and then secretary general of the Arab League. A smooth international operator, Azzam had the most potent sponsor in the Arab world, Haj Amin El Husseini, the ex-grand mufti of Jerusalem, who collaborated with Hitler during World War II.

Azzam arrived in the United States in 1950 with a retinue of propagandists and newspapermen and Arab network. He quickly gathered within his circle certain American Congressmen, industrialists, columnists, radio commentators, and a fringe of lunatic anti-Semites, who found in the well-financed Arab invasion a new source of slander and inspiration.

Azzam was no piker, and used lavishly his $500,000 budget and private slush fund. He literally lived, ate, and slept anti-Semitism, and made contacts right into important Washington, D. C., offices.

In the true tradition of doublecross, Azzam conducted secret negotiations simultaneously with the United States State Department and with Communist delegates to the United Nations. Though Azzam was preoccupied with such high matters of state, he also found time to help stimulate the anti-Semitic smear campaign against former Assistant Secretary of Defense Anna Rosenberg.

By December 1950, when Azzam returned to Cairo, the results of his American labors were evident. New pro-Arab organizations and publications, handsomely financed, came into being, and an invasion of Arab lecturers and other propagandists was launched.

Azzam's aim was to make political capital of anti-Semitism—as did Hitler. The program of the Arab League in the United States was similar to that of the Nazi-German propaganda office in the 1930's. The objective was the same—to divide and confuse the American people by subsidizing and fomenting religious hatred.

The worthy successor to Azzam Pasha as director of the new Arab League office in New York City is Kamel Abdel Rehim. Kamel, once Egyptian Ambassador to Washington, is a foxy diplomat who knows the United States well.

He is violently anti-Jewish and in this respect fills Azzam's shoes well. With this background, and a first-year budget of $400,000, Kamel will undoubtedly try to reinvigorate the Arab League's anti-Jewish program in this country. Americans should be on guard against this imported troublemaking which victimizes Jews and Christians alike.

The Sentence of the Court

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. GLENN BEALL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, the Honorable Simon E. Sobeloff, Solicitor General of the United States, addressed the criminal law section of the American Bar Association at its Chicago meeting on August 16, 1954.

General Sobeloff spoke on the subject of The Sentence of the Court, and with his many years as a practicing attorney, as city solicitor for Baltimore City, and chief judge of the Maryland Court of Appeals, he has a great wealth of experience on which to base his remarks.

The subject on which he spoke is of particular importance to State legislatures and the Congress of the United States and I request unanimous consent to have his address printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The Government Printing Office advises that the text of the speech is estimated to make 2⅓ pages at a cost of $198.35.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SENTENCE OF THE COURT

(Address by Simon E. Sobeloff, Solicitor General of the United States)

In this assembly of judges and lawyers concerned with improving our criminal law and procedure, it would be a commonplace to say that often the real problem is not to establish the guilt or innocence of the accused but to decide on a proper sentence. An English jurist, Mr. Justice McCardle, is quoted as having revealed a not too obscure professional secret: "Anyone," he said, "can try a case. That is as easy as falling off a log. The difficulty comes in knowing what to do with a man once he has been found guilty."

It has been very impressive to me that the law is so solicitous of the defendant in safeguarding his rights at every stage of the trial before verdict and yet leaves him almost completely without protection when he stands before the judge to be sentenced.

We go to great lengths to insure a fair trial. Courts are gravely concerned if the prosecutor or the police publicize their version of the facts in advance of trial, because it is feared that this may prejudice the cause of the accused. We recognize as fundamental his right to be represented by counsel and this right has been given added vitality in recent decisions of the Supreme Court. Further emphasis has been put on this constitutional right in the recommendation of Attorney General Herbert Brownell, Jr., that public defenders or special counsel be provided for indigent accused at government expense to assure a competent and vigorous defense in every case where the defendant stands trial.

We insist upon strict requirements as to the form of the indictment, so as to inform the accused of the nature of the accusation. Carefully we exclude hearsay and demand that the defendant be confronted with the witnesses against him. Every act or circumstance which is liable to embarrass the defendant in court is discountenanced. He may not be brought into the courtroom manacled or otherwise restrained and he may not be photographed there against his will. The person charged may not be called by the prosecution to testify, but he is allowed to take the stand on his own behalf if he elects to do so. If he prefers to remain mute, the prosecutor may not comment on the fact that the defendant has refrained from giving his version of transactions peculiarly within his knowledge.

Many are the convictions that have been reversed because the judge erred on some technical ruling on evidence or refused to instruct the jury sufficiently as to the rights of the accused, particularly in respect to the presumption of innocence and the State's burden of proof. Extreme precautions are taken to exclude from the jury room all extraneous influences. Judgment of guilt will not be entered up in a Federal court, and in most State courts, unless all 12 jurors are convinced of guilt beyond a reasonable doubt.

Contrast this strict insistence on the rights of the accused during trial, when the issue is often not too doubtful, with the total absence of safeguards when the ultimate problem is reached, namely, what final disposition to make of the case. The really difficult question usually is what to do with the defendant after conviction. Here the trial judge is given in most jurisdictions, including the Federal, the widest latitude of discretion. He may suspend the sentence; he may put on probation; he may impose a nominal fine or a jail sentence for a short period; or he may "throw the book" at the defendant.

Under our practice, which permits multiple counts for the same or related acts, with cumulative sentences, the aggregated penalties can be oppressive indeed without transcending legal limits. In some jurisdictions the effect of mounting one sentence upon another consecutively is to deny the prisoner opportunity for parole till he has served a minimum part of the last of the series of sentences.

There is, it is true, a constitutional guaranty against cruel and unusual punishments but this has been interpreted in my State of Maryland, and I think generally, to mean only that the judge may not impose a sentence greater than the maximum allowed by statute. This is mighty little protection to the convicted man. The range between a suspended sentence and one of 300 years, such as was imposed recently by one judge, permits considerable leeway for differences of opinion, to put it mildly. There are no definite guides for the judge. He follows his sense of justice which, like the proverbial chancellor's foot, varies from judge to judge. The sentence in the particular case lies practically uncontrolled in the understanding and the conscience of the judge, and the criteria are vague and almost nonexistent.

Writers have listed some of the factors which are customarily considered in imposing sentence. It is often said that the prime objective in administering the criminal law is to protect society, and that the idea of meting out punishment as retribution has generally been discarded. But if the prevention of crime is the goal, how is this to be achieved?

A regrettable feature of much of the discussion in this field is the tendency to overwork pet simplifications. Some sweepingly insist that the nature of the crime is controlling, and they disregard the personality of the criminal. Others stress the character of the offender, with almost no attention to the character of the offense.

There are those who would limit the inquiry to questions such as these: Is the defendant subject to rehabilitation? Would he be a menace if set at large? What period of imprisonment and what type of treatment are needed to make it safe to restore him to society? They say with truth that you cannot equate crimes, or even all crimes, within a single category. The endless variety of fact and circumstance which distinguishes cases must enter into judgment.

But these factors may be unduly weighted at the expense of another consideration. No one will argue that the community sense of justice is not a contributing, even sometimes a decisive ingredient in arriving at the proper sentence. The public expectations—not to be confused with public passion and hysteria—are also entitled to consideration.

Furthermore, shall we stress the deterring effect of the public example in sentencing the convicted person? Some have argued that the deterring effect of a severe sentence is considerable, while others deny that a person contemplating a crime is often influenced by this. Yet we can be sure without demonstration that in the absence of sanctions in our criminal law violations would be so general as to destroy public order.

The fact is that each of these competing factors plays its part. Some validity is to be found in each, and all truth is to be found in no one of them. An alert and open-minded willingness to examine them all is necessary, and wisdom lies in knowing what weight to ascribe to each in the particular case. There are no pat answers anwhere, and certainly the search for a clue must not be restricted to the buckram-bound books. The world, as Alice in Wonderland was reminded, is full of a number of things. The necessary insights and experience for the delicate task of fixing criminal penalties must be sought in other fields as well as in the law.

As in other areas of public business, attitudes swing widely between extremes. People sway, sometimes with dramatic swiftness, from complete lethargy toward lax prosecution and sentimental softness in handling offenders, to shrill demands for extreme and excessive penalties. The same good people who express sincere abhorrence when they read sympathetic accounts of a disproportionately long or cruel sentence callously inflicted, are likely to shout for tough justice when a particularly revolting crime is not punished as promptly or as severely as they think it deserves. They favor the mitigations of our probation and parole systems, but when their indignation is aroused by some spectacular crime they abandon faith in these processes. They then demand Draconian laws, hard and inflexible, setting mandatory minimum sentences without the possibility of suspension or reduction by parole or pardon.

One of the most deplorable and self-defeating arrangements that then is likely to follow is the writing into law of a rigid formula under the illusion that it will automatically insure a good result in all cases. The desired ends cannot be achieved in that way. We, indeed, exalt a government of laws and not of men; but what is meant thereby is that men shall be limited by law and shall not be free to act arrogantly and arbitrarily. It does not mean that laws are or can be self-executing. It is quite beyond legislative ingenuity to invent a slot machine that will dispense automatic justice and make unnecessary the adjudicative function.

The very principle of the separation of powers—so basic in our form of government—is predicated on the concept that to declare a rule is one function and to apply it to specific cases is a distinct function; and that any attempt to combine the two is liable to prove unwise and dangerous. It is a tragic mistake to rule out thinking and feeling from the administration of justice. I do not go so far as to argue that a law which sets a fixed penalty for every violation is unconstitutional, but I need not remind you that not everything that is constitutional is necessarily wise. There will always be a need for the application of discriminating judgment, the exercise of compassion, and the use of that lubricating commonsense without which it is not possible to attain the satisfactory operation of any government machinery.

A depressing result of laws commanding the imposition of minimum penalties in disregard of the particular circumstances of the case is that they leave no scope to soften harshness and mitigate injustice. What Federal judge has not been torn in his heart by the inflexible minimum penalties prescribed in certain statutes? Recently I attended the judicial conference of the fifth circuit. Half of an entire session was devoted to the recital of instances of unconscionable penalties made mandatory by the Anti-Narcotic Act. One judge told of a case where a highly regarded pharmacist, with no prior criminal record, violated the law by giving someone a small quantity of a narcotic drug to relieve acute suffering. This he did for no personal gain but for humanitarian reasons, expecting that a doctor's prescription would follow. The evidence of the violation, however, was entirely clear and the jury was about to bring in a verdict of guilty. The judge related how he sent the jurors back after explaining that if they convicted, he would have no choice but to impose a minimum 2-year penitentiary sentence. The jury further considered the matter and brought in a verdict of not guilty, to the immense relief of the judge.

No one can fail to sympathize with a judge put in such a difficult position by a rigid law passed by men of good motives who fail to foresee and understand the consequences of their legislation. For all their training and discipline, judges are not unlike other men in their reluctance to serve as instruments of unnecessary inclemency and injustice. The tendency then is for the trial judge or the appellate tribunal to deflect the force of the law in the instant case by strained and unnatural constructions that may work havoc to the legal system in future cases. It is a truism that hard cases make bad law, and many of the technical absurdities found in the law had their origin in the humane effort of judges to escape from the imposition of excessive sentences.

If there is anything that the long experience with our system of criminal law and punishment should teach it is that mere severity in sentencing fails to prevent crime. In my law-school days I recall reading in Stephen's History of the English Criminal Law about sentences imposed in former times by British courts. They seemed inordinately cruel—tearing out of the tongue; branding; transportation for a period of many years. Several hundred offenses were punishable by death. Larceny was one of them and hangings were conducted in public the better to impress the populace and in the hope by the gruesome example to deter similar crimes. Nevertheless we are told that pickpockets were not deterred from plying their trade in the very crowd that stood witnessing the spectacle.

Until 1826, in fact, every felony in England was punishable by death. Now the English have reduced the number of crimes which are capital and they have standardized the method of punishment to terms in prison instead of the mayhems and physical tortures of ancient days. I dare say that Englishmen of our day are far more rational in their sentences than we are.

It is a striking fact that although the British and we have a common legal heritage there is a wide difference between them and us in the amount of crime and in the character of the penalties. We have 2½ times the number of prisoners they have per 100,000 population, and our sentences are longer. In all England in a recent year not more than 588 men received terms of 5 years or more and in the United States in the same year 18,000 offenders were committed for maximum terms of 5 years or more. The disparity is out of proportion to the size of the respective populations of the two countries; the difference is partly in the crime rate and partly in the unequal values the two countries ascribe to long sentences.

Likewise, to the north of us in the Province of Alberta, Canada, is a population of a million with less than 500 in prison. In contrast the District of Columbia with a population of slightly more than 800,000 has some 4,000 prisoners—more than 8 times as many.

There may be a lesson too in comparing the figures from different States in the Union. After making allowance for differences in statistical methods, it is still notable that many of the States that release their prisoners after shorter terms are the ones in which the crime rate is lower. Generally capital punishment is less in vogue than in the past, and there is nothing to warrant the belief that the crime rate is affected thereby. This was recently shown in a series of articles appearing in the New York Herald Tribune. The conclusion is strongly suggested that merely imposing heavy penalties does not diminish the incidence of crime.

There is another side to the coin. Misuse of the sentencing power is not always directed against the defendant. Sometimes judges impose grossly inadequate sentences, due to misunderstanding, defective judgment, caprice, or bias. In one case the cashier of a small national bank stole enough money to wipe out the bank's capital and surplus. By clever manipulation of a certain large inactive deposit account, the defalcations were concealed for many years, but at long last the crime was discovered. When the banker was indicted the judge was very critical of the form of the indictment and sustained a motion to quash, but on direct appeal to the United States Supreme Court he was reversed and the indictment upheld. The judge was chagrined but remained unconvinced. When the defendant, finding himself with no defense on the merits, pleaded guilty, the judge expressed his resentment by suspending sentence.

Yet in the same court a 16-year-old newsboy was given an 18-month term for selling song sheets printed without permission of the copyright owners of the songs. One may be permitted to doubt that either of these sentences would have been passed if the judge had known that his action might have to meet scrutiny on appeal.

Such fantastic vagaries tear down the mightiest sanction of the law—respect for the courts. We have good and wise men on the bench, but not all are wise and good; and even the best and most prudent, being human, are, like Homer, liable sometimes to nod. The truth is that passing sentence is too delicate and too powerful a function to lodge in any man's hands entirely unsupervised.

I shall not undertake to recount for this audience the various types of sentences which may be imposed in the different States. Most of you are doubtless more familiar with the prevailing systems than I am. We have in the Federal courts a system of definite sentences, except for the Federal Youth Correction Act, which allows commitment of young offenders to a special board without specifying a minimum period of confinement. Such offenders, after they have been studied, may be released at any time. In other jurisdictions, as in California, there are several kinds of indeterminate sentences where the courts merely set the maximum and leave it to some administrative board to determine the minimum. Some form of indefinite sentence is used in 9 States, and in 22 they are the predominant pattern. Actually definite sentences are being imposed now in upward of 40 percent of all felony convictions.

It is not unusual to expect the speaker in a discussion such as this to come up with some solutions, but I think it better not to be dogmatic. The wiser approach is not to offer solutions forthwith but to encourage inquiry. There is hope in the American Law Institute's formulation of a criminal code and its other undertakings, and in such projects as are now being planned by Mr. Justice Jackson's group under the auspices of this association. The participation of the able head of our Criminal Division, Assistant Attorney General Warren Olney III, bespeaks the cooperation of the Department of Justice.

Whether more objective criteria for sentencing can ever be developed than we have today or if it is possible to harmonize the various elements that demand consideration in the disposition of a criminal case, I do not know. I should, however, like to propose something for the attention of the researchers and students. There is need for a more effective protection of the rights of the individual not inconsistent with the needs of the community; there is need too to protect society's interest where that has been lost sight of in meting out sentences. I suggest a study of the desirability of providing for appellate review of sentences. I do not claim for the idea that it would accomplish a miracle but its merits deserve investigation.

It is not a radical idea and is not altogether untried. In England, as you know, legislation authorizing appellate courts to review sentences was enacted in 1907. In order to discourage frivolous and unfounded appeals, the law empowers the higher courts not only to quash or reduce sentences they deem excessive, but they may substitute such sentences as they think proper, whether they be more or less severe. The result is that sentencing judges exercise their power with moderation and restraint, and without going to unwarranted extremes of severity or leniency, for they know that the higher court will not tolerate abuses on their part. At the same time defendants do not lightheartedly seek review for they know that in appropriate cases the penalty may be increased.

For years the American Law Institute has recommended appellate examination of criminal sentences. New York and perhaps a dozen other States permit reduction of sentences on appeal in certain types of cases, and in the military system sentences as well as judgments of guilt are reviewable as a matter of course.

In a certain case an appellate court had before it the appeal of a man in his early twenties who had raped his young sister-in-law. There was no real doubt that he had committed the crime, yet there was a long, meticulous inquiry in the trial about a question that was hardly in dispute, namely, the man's guilt. However, when the verdict was pronounced the man was subject to the will of the one judge in the trial court. The defendant was sentenced to be hanged, and the case was then appealed. The appellate tribunal came inevitably to the conclusion that the man had been proven guilty in accordance with all the rules and in accordance, as the judges thought, with the justice of the case. Some members of the court, however, felt grave misgivings about the appropriateness and justice of the death penalty under the circumstances. Nevertheless they were powerless to interfere.

In that case the governor commuted the sentence to life imprisonment, thereby drawing upon himself considerable criticism for his so-called interfering with the courts. These unthinking critics did not realize that no court above the trial judge had ever examined the sentence. "The courts," spoken of with such unctuous veneration, was in this, as in other cases, only one man. Few people understand that on appeal the court is not permitted to pay any attention to the fitness of the penalty. Although in the case I have in mind the governor courageously intervened, it must be recognized that the duty of reviewing sentences should not ordinarily rest on the governor. The judicial process should have the internal means of overcoming its own mistakes.

It is no disrespect to trial judges to suggest that the provision of an appeal from the sentence, at least in the more serious cases, would have a sobering and moderating effect. Realization by the sentencing judge that extreme behavior on his part is subject to modification would prevent such an incident as the sentence of 140 years, imposed upon a 17-year-old boy—7 consecutive 20-year sentences for a series of robberies committed in 1 night. The possibility of review would make itself felt even in cases not actually appealed. The existence of the power would make its exercise unnecessary in all but a few cases.

If there is not to be a separation of the sentencing from the guilt-finding function, and if the bench is to retain the power to sentence with the vast discretion that the criminal law necessarily lodges in the trial judge, then it seems desirable to provide an appeal broad enough to prevent abuses and to lessen gross disparities. A proper measure of uniformity in sentences is to be achieved not by inexorable statutory commands of minimum penalties regardless of circumstances, but rather by the occasional review in an appellate court of sentences passed by the trial judges in its jurisdiction. Equally to be avoided are two extremes: On the one hand the undeviating rigidity of statutes and on the other unappealable and sometimes capricious and inflamed sentencing by a single man on the bench.

It is often said that the appellate court lacks advantages possessed by the trial judge who has seen the witnesses and the defendant. This is true. On the other hand the appellate court has some advantages that are denied the trial judge. On appeal there is less likelihood of emotional overtones from which even a conscientious trial judge may find it difficult to escape when he imposes sentence shortly after hearing of the defendant's outrageous conduct. The appellate court also has the advantage of a wider perspective of cases.

The fact that sentences must be determined without the benefit of definite and reliable formulas is no reason for denying opportunity to test the judgment of the court on appeal. On the contrary, precisely because the trial judge is forced to operate with so little guidance in the legal rules a second glance at the product is all the more indicated.

If it is not unfair to the trial judge in an equity case or a law case on the civil side, to test not only his conclusions of law but his findings of fact, I do not see why in a criminal case it should be considered an invasion of the trial judge's province for the higher court to review the sentence. Naturally, great weight should be given to the trial court's action, but it should not be considered sacrosanct.

To the sentencing judge in serious cases it should be a source of comfort to know that any error he may have committed in this most crucial step of the whole trial is subject to correction on appeal as rulings of less gravity may be tested and, if need be, corrected. Moreover, when affirmed on appeal, the trial judge would have the satisfying assurance that not only some technical rulings of his have been approved but that his judgment on the most momentous question in the case has been upheld. In exercising the pardoning power the Chief Executive, too, would be able to act with greater confidence if he knew that not only the judge at nisi prius thought the sentence proper, but that on appeal the higher courts had sustained that judgment.

If you hesitate at this extension of appellate authority, I remind you that the right to any kind of appeal in criminal cases is only a century old; yet no one today would dream of withdrawing this established feature of our law.

May I conclude with the confident hope that this, like any proposal aimed to prevent the miscarriage of justice, may command at least the interest of this body of lawyers, serious about their role as ministers of justice and devoted to the study and orderly reform of our system of criminal law.

The Way Reds Crossed the Atlantic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record a very enlightening article entitled "The Way the Reds Crossed Atlantic," which appeared in the August 20, 1954, edition of U. S. News & World Report.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

From Secret Reports—The Way the Reds Crossed Atlantic—Penetration of Americas Began in Guatemala's Labor Unions

How did Moscow call the tune for Guatemala before the recent revolution which caused the fall of President Jacobo Arbenz? Just how high did the Communist power in Guatemala reach? How were the Communists able to get so much power?

United States intelligence agents for years kept tab on Communist operations in Guatemala. Their findings were compiled recently for confidential use of American foreign ministers at a scheduled meeting about Guatemala. When Arbenz was ousted, that meeting was abandoned. Now the Department of State has issued the findings in a white paper.

Following is the text of excerpts from the white paper on communism in Guatemala, prepared early in July by the United States Department of State, and made public August 7, 1954:

"In the present memorandum the Government of the United States presents information which reveals the following concerning the means and methods by which the international Communist movement intervened in Guatemala to create this situation:

"1. That agents of international communism: (a) Infiltrated key agencies of the Guatemalan Government; (b) established a network of interlocking political, labor, and mass organizations through which they control the political activity of large groups of citizens; and (c) used subversion and the exploitation of indigenous political forces and social and economic problems in conformity with the established tactics and methods of international communism.

"2. That Guatemala has progressively identified herself with the Soviet Union in international affairs.

"3. That the shipment of arms and munitions of war to Guatemala from the Soviet orbit in the motorship *Alfhelm* * * * could have been made only with the authorization of Soviet leaders for purposes related to their struggle with the free world. * * *

"The situation in Guatemala is clearly the product of a bold and sustained attempt to establish a Communist-controlled state in Western Hemisphere. In this way Guatemala has become one of several points of conflict between the free world and the Soviet orbit, and has created a clear threat to the sovereignty of Guatemala and the peace and security of America.

* * * * *

"It is well known, however, that the Communist leaders in Guatemala, and wherever else in the hemisphere they may be active, are the servants of a foreign power which has its capital in Moscow. * * *

"It is clear * * * that the present strategy of the Kremlin with respect to Latin America is that of diverting the attention of the Western Hemisphere from Communist maneuvers elsewhere (in Europe and Asia), of promoting anarchy within and among the American Republics, of weakening their defenses by sabotage and the development of increased possibilities for sabotage, and finally of demoralizing the hemisphere by discrediting the inter-American system and throwing the organization of its common defense into confusion.

"The agents of international communism who came into Guatemala in 1944 and 1945 infiltrated the new labor organizations and political parties, where they were received because their knowledge of organizational techniques was at a premium in a country where labor unions and free political parties had long been suppressed. Using their influence within the parties, they quickly began the task of training a nucleus of young Gautemalans in Communist ideology and tactics. In 1945 they established a Marxist indoctrination school, the Escuela Claridad, within the first postrevolution national labor federation, Confederación de Trabajadores de Guatemala (CTG). Its leading director was Abel Cuenca. There was, however, at this time still opposition to communism within the revolutionary movement. This opposition focused on the Escuela Claridad indoctrination school. The result was a split in the labor movement, and a group of then anti-Communist unions split off from the CTG to form the Federación Sindical de Guatemala (FSG). In the end, the school was shut down by the Government early in 1946, but Marmol, Cuenca, Solórzano and the others persisted in the efforts, using the classic Communist devices of secret Marxist study groups, to train prospective Communists in the revolutionary movement. [The white paper refers to Miguel Marmol Chicas as a Salvadorean Communist, to Abel and Max Cuenca as leaders of a Communist-led insurrection in El Salvador, and to Alfonso Solórzano as a Guatemalan who had worked with Communists in Mexico.]

"The clandestine study groups in the Guatemalan revolutionary parties and the labor unions made international Communist agents of a nucleus of young men in the revolution, including José Manuel Fortuny, then a deputy and leading politician in the Partido Acción Revolucionaria (PAR), Mario Silva Jonama, a young teacher who was shortly to become Under Secretary of Education, and Victor Manuel Gutierrez, already secretary general of the leading labor federation at that time, the Confederación de Trabajadores de Guatemala (CTG).

"By 1947, matters had progressed to the point where a clandestine Communist Party was successfully organized with these younger men. * * * Its members hid the nature of their conspiracy by continuing to present themselves to the public as leaders of the progovernment revolutionary parties and the labor movement, and as government employees.

* * * * *

"From the cover of these positions, Fortuny and the rest of those trained in the tactics of international communism in the 'study groups' continued the program of infiltration of the revolutionary movement.

* * * * *

"At about the same time that the party was secretly founded, the Communists also began to establish the mechanism of 'mass' organizations to carry the Communist line to the youth, women, and students of the revolutionary movement. * * *

"The 'mass' organizations also provided a ready means to strengthen the links between the young Guatemalan Communist movement and the Soviet international Communist apparatus which controlled it."

TAKING OVER A REVOLUTION

"It was not until after Col. Jacobo Arbenz was inaugurated President of Guatemala on March 15, 1951, that the Communist Party totally divested itself of the veil of secrecy and openly advanced in its campaign: (1) to complete its ascendancy over the remaining non-Communist elements in the revolution, and (2) to eliminate the opposition, in order to achieve control of Guatemalan political institutions. Fortuny had been one of the President's campaign advisers during the election, and less than 3 weeks after the inauguration, on April 4, for the first time, he signed a public manifesto 'Secretary General of the Communist Party of Guatemala' thus proclaiming that a Communist Party existed in Guatemala. * * *

"Meanwhile in May, Louis Saillant, secretary general of the World Federation of Trade Unions (WFTU), and Vicente Lombardo Toledano, secretary general of the Confederación de Trabajadores de América Latina (CTAL), went to Guatemala to attend a public congress of transport workers' unions and advised the Communist leaders of the Guatemalan labor movement to unite in a single confederation. This was done at a labor congress in Guatemala in October, 1951, which established the Confederación General de Trabajadores de Guatemala (CGTG), and elected the Communist leader, Gutiérrez, as its secretary general. The principal members of the CGTG executive committee which was elected were also avowed Communists.

"The aims of the Communists who went to Guatemala to subvert the revolution were thus fulfilled in the sphere of labor organization, and there has since been no successful opposition to the Communist leadership in the national labor organization. Shortly after the CGTG 4-day congress * * * Gutiérrez left for * * * Berlin and went on to Moscow. * * *

"Early in 1952 the Communists began to lay the groundwork to exploit agrarian reform to their own advantage. A little over a month after Gutiérrez returned from Moscow the central committee of the Partido Comunista de Guatemala devoted its first plenary session of the year, on February 16–18, to agrarian reform, and heard Fortuny label it as the party's first task. After Congress convened on March 1 the Communists used their influence with the other government parties to obtain the election of Gutiérrez as president of the Congress' special Committee on Agrarian Reform. President Arbenz introduced the agrarian reform law on May 10, and it to Gutiérrez' committee that it was referred. * * *

"The final version of the agrarian reform law * * * did not merely provide for the expropriation and distribution of unused lands to satisfy the aspirations of the Guatemalan people but also contained within it means to advance Communist power in Guatemala. To administer the agrarian reform the law established a national agrarian council, departmental agrarian commissions, and local agrarian committees which were to be composed of representatives of the Government, of the Confederación General de Trabajadores de Guatemala (CGTG), and of the Confederación Nacional Campesina de Guatemala (CNCG). * * * The establishment of these bodies placed the Communists in a position to guide the course of the agrarian reform on every level. * * *

"Simultaneously with their successful campaign to gain control of the agrarian reform the Guatemalan Communists redoubled their efforts to establish a popular front, the tried tactic of communism. * * *

"Following the 1953 elections, the Communists next worked successfully toward the conversion of its temporary Democratic Electoral Front into a permanent National Democratic Front, which would group all of the revolutionary forces under their influence in accord with the classic Communist united front tactic. The revolutionary parties * * * allowed the front to be enlarged by the Communist-dominated CGTG and the Communist-controlled CNCG, thus giving the Communists preponderant control of it. This was a major achievement for the party, because out of the 10 representatives of the front who meet regularly with President Arbenz to decide questions of national policy, 4 are avowed Communists and the remainder follow the Communist line.

* * * * *

"Today * * * the international Communist movement has most of Guatemala's political life within its grasp. The Guatemalan Government is deeply infiltrated and its policies profoundly influenced by leaders of the Communist Party (Partido Guatemalteco del Trabajo), who travel frequently to Moscow. * * *

"At the top level of Government, the Communist Party openly enjoys the support of President Arbenz.

"At the levels of Government under the Presidency, Communist infiltration has become so effective that the Communist PGT is now able to sway Guatemala's policies through the standard Communist device of the 'National Democratic Front,' which is largely replacing the Cabinet as the policymaking body. * * *

"The number of Communist and Communist sympathizers on the directing committee of the front leaves no reasonable doubt whatever that this policy-forming body is under Communist domination. * * *

"Among the Government agencies, the Communist PGT has made its deepest penetration into the National Agrarian Department."

PRESS, RADIO CONTROLLED

"The field of Government information is also heavily infiltrated by Communists who control Government press and radio propaganda. * * *

"The infiltration of Communists into the field of public education is such that Rafael Tischler, a registered member of the Communist PGT and visitor to the U. S. S. R. in 1953, is secretary general of the National Teachers Union. * * *

"The Communist penetration of the social-security system is carried out under Alfonso Solórzano. * * *

"The Communist Party has also installed one of members, Hugo Barrios Klée, as Deputy Inspector General of Labor and infiltrated its members in other Government agencies. Although many of the Communists in the Government are known, it is almost certain that the full list has not been revealed. * * *

"There can be no reasonable doubt that the Guatemalan Communist Party and the organizations in control are instruments of the international Communist conspiracy."

Hasty Anti-Red Move in Congress Yields Bill of Dubious Wisdom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to direct attention to the following editorial that appeared in the Brooklyn Eagle of August 20, 1954:

HASTY ANTI-RED MOVE IN CONGRESS YIELDS BILL OF DUBIOUS WISDOM

In its effort to devise and enact a law for the more effective control of communism in the United States, the 83d Congress has not given an inspiring performance. From the beginning, when the first extreme measure was hastily thrown together on the floor of the Senate, the handling of the problem has been marked by hysteria, irresponsibility, and demogagic politics. The bill finally passed by both the Senate and the House is less objectionable than the original version introduced by Senator HUMPHREY but is nevertheless of dubious wisdom and value.

The Humphrey bill, which would have made Communist Party membership a crime, punishable by a $10,000 fine and 5-year imprisonment, saw the light of day under strange sponsorship. It was the brain child of the liberal forces in the Senate. Notwithstanding its severe provisions, it caused a stampede in the Senate. With an election just over the horizon and the menace of communism looming large in the minds of most voters, no one could afford to vote against it.

This piece of legislation may not have reflected either sincerity or responsibility, but it represented a shrewd political maneuver by Democrats goaded by Republican shrieks about Communists in Government and "20 years of treason." They induced the greatest deliberative body on earth to pass a bill which entered the danger zone of restriction of what a man may think.

The compromise bill finally passed by both Houses yesterday follows closely the lines of the House bill, which outlawed the Communist Party as such. It eliminates the Senate provision making mere membership in the Communist Party a crime punishable by a fine and imprisonment but provides that a member shall be subject to the penalties set forth in the 1950 Internal Security Act.

Under this act members of Communist-action groups are barred from employment by the Federal Government and in defense plants, also from obtaining a passport. In addition, if they fail to register, they are subject to imprisonment for 5 years and to a fine of $10,000.

Presumably, the bill will receive the approval of President Eisenhower. It will add nothing to the power of Federal agencies to restrain the progress of communism. J. Edgar Hoover, who has demonstrated so often that his men have this situation in hand, and Attorney General Brownell have warned against the danger of driving the Reds underground. However, the raising of the issue has enabled both Republicans and Democrats, looking to November, to present themselves to the electorate as uncompromising foes of subversion.

Dealing With Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a letter addressed to the editor of the New York Times by my good friend, the Reverend Dr. Joseph F. Thorning, associate editor of World Affairs.

I have known Father Thorning for many years and have held him and his opinions in high esteem. I am in full agreement with the sentiments he has expressed in this letter and feel that they should be brought to the attention of my colleagues in the Congress.

DEALING WITH COMMUNISM—EMPHASIS SHOULD BE ON IDENTIFICATION AND EXPOSURE, IT IS FELT

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

Due to the importance of the subject, may I be permitted to comment upon the excellence of the presentation made in the Times on August 5 by John R. Fitzpatrick on outlawing the Communist Party. The latter, whose legal talents are appreciated in our Capital, maintained that, in our efforts to deal with Soviet agents in this country, our emphasis should be upon proper identification and exposure.

This result, highly desirable on all security counts, can hardly be obtained with the Communist Party outlawed. The best evidence on this score is available in the testimony of J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. Both Mr. Fitzpatrick and the Director are speaking in the light of national traditions, principles, and ideals which have kept our country in an atmosphere of freedom.

To be sure, other nations with other traditions may find that legal ostracism is the right approach. The people of Chile, who cherish liberty and progress, have seen fit to outlaw the Communists. Panama, in close proximity to the canal, has done the same thing. Cuba, which once was a headquarters for the diffusion of Soviet propaganda and the center of a network of totalitarian agents, no longer tolerates the Red Fascist organization.

This attitude simply indicates that in some of the American republics local conditions demand drastic action. In our own country it can hardly be alleged that these conditions prevail. And we have good reason to cherish our own philosophy of good government.

Once public opinion can be educated to the point where instrumentalities of the Kremlin may be regarded in the same way as Nazi criminals, there will be no need to do more than to hold such foreign agents up to the light of day. That is precisely why the Soviets and Soviet sympathizers in the United States who have done the most damage to the national interest have masqueraded under a variety of front associations.

The Reverend Dr. JOSEPH F. THORNING,
Associate Editor of World Affairs.
WASHINGTON, *August 18, 1954.*

The Philippines and Her Neighbors—Vicente Villamin Discusses That Republic's Relations With Countries in East Asia and the United States, in Preparation for the Southeast Asia Conference To Be Held in the Philippines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, eight nations, including the United States, will meet at Baguio, the summer capital of the Philippines, to form the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization, the SEATO. It will create a common front against any Communist aggression.

For the information of all, Mr. Vicente Villamin, the well-known Filipino writer and student of international affairs has prepared a simple exposition of the situation in that part of the world, using the Philippines as the basis for his discussion. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I extend my remarks in the RECORD to include Mr. Villamin's statement.

Mr. Villamin's statement follows:

THE PHILIPPINES AND HER NEIGHBORS

(By Vicente Villamin)

(Pt. II)

THE PHILIPPINES AND THAILAND

The Philippines and Thailand are two countries in southeast Asia that are determined to fight the Communists. They repudiate communism, its principles and its evil works. They know that "peaceful coexistence" with the Communists is an invitation to all sorts of trouble leading to the overthrow of their governments.

The combined population of the Philippines and Thailand is roughly 40 million. The former has a mutual defense treaty with the United States, but the latter has not. However, Thailand and the United States maintain close relations with each other. Thailand is one of the stoutest upholders of the United Nations.

THE PHILIPPINES AND NATIONALIST CHINA

Nationalist China is temporarily located on Formosa. The Philippines, like the United States and a great majority of the free nations, recogniezs it as the only legitimate government of China.

The Philippines is vitally interested in that Formosa does not fall into the hands of the Communists. She does not forget that Japan attacked and captured her from that island, which is a short distance from Luzon.

It is thus but logical for the Philippines to render all possible aid and moral support to Nationalist China. It is self-defense for herself from the Communists. The first thing they should do is to examine their relations and eliminate all causes of misunderstanding. Those misunderstandings are infinitesimal compared to their common interests, especially in the field of international security.

THE PHILIPPINES AND JAPAN

Not having ratified the Japanese peace treaty, signed in San Francisco, the Philippines is still technically at war with Japan. It is the lack of agreement between the two countries on the question of reparations that held up the treaty's ratification by the Philippines.

There is a modus vivendi in the meantime between the two countries. Diplomatic missions are exchanged and trade relations are maintained on temporary basis. The bitter feeling among the Filipinos against the Japanese engendered by the last war has not yet completely abated.

The United States has a mutual defense treaty with Japan as she has with the Philippines. In a general war against the Communists in east Asia the Philippines and Japan might find themselves fighting together the common enemy. The choice of the lesser evil would become the rule and the Filipinos might be obliged to prefer the Japanese to the Communists. Associated with the United States, Japan is not a menace to the Philippines.

There should be formal peace between the Philippines and Japan and the reparations question settled. If there is a new general war in Asia before that is done, the reparations question will most likely be forgotten. The reparations provisions of the Versailles Treaty which ended World War I were forgotten when World War II started and not a word about them has been uttered ever since.

The American people have justified cause to be bitter against their former enemies, the Japanese and the Germans, but they have found it necessary to be broadminded and practical about it and maintain friendly relations with them now in the face of the greater evil of communism.

THE PHILIPPINES AND COMMUNIST CHINA

Communist China is the greatest menace to the security of the Philippines. Like Soviet Russia, it believes in imposing its authority on other countries. That is done by the process which they call "liberation." That process starts with propaganda against the constituted government, the beauty of communism, and the glories of Soviet Russia and Communist China. Then eventually a fifth column is organized, agents are smuggled in to act as advisors and leaders, and finally subversive actions are resorted to looking to the overthrow of the existing government.

Communist China is working the shibboleth of "Asia for the Asians" to their advantage. They are trying to convince free Asia that they should bow to its mandates as defined by them and throw overboard all their connections with the rest of the world. The Filipinos are too intelligent to be fooled by the Communists. But they cannot be too careful in keeping themselves untouched and unaffected by the subtle ways of the Chinese Communists and their sympathizers.

With few exceptions, the Chinese in the Philippines are anti-Communist and pro-Nationalist China. In time of need and emergency they can be expected to come to the aid of the Philippines. This thought should lead the Philippine Government and people to consider them as a national asset, which they are in more ways than one, and as such they deserve friendly consideration.

THE PHILIPPINES AND INDOCHINA

The Philippines has never recognized the three associated states of Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia as independent nations, although 36 nations, including the United States and the Vatican State, have accorded them recognition.

At the recent Geneva Conference the Philippines did not take part in the diplomatic negotiations which led to the agreements on Indochina. Since those agreements are generally considered as a sellout of the three associated states, the Philippines was spared of the humiliation of such an ignominy.

If and when the entire Indochina comes under Communist control, the security of the Philippines would be further endangered. It is improbable, at least for the present, that the Philippines would be called upon to send a military contingent to Indochina as she did to Korea. In fact, the three associated states are prohibited under the Geneva agreements to ask or receive any military aid from any foreign country.

Indochina produces two commodities—rice and rubber—that the free world needs. The Philippines can produce them. She should plan to produce them on a large scale in expectation that someday all Indochina might become Communist dominated.

THE PHILIPPINES AND INDIA

India has 370 million people. The Communists would not dare liberate or conquer India. They will do in India what they did in China—win the leaders over first and then help them overthrow the existing government.

India is described as neutralist on international communism. She is taken to be anti-Communist internally and not so internationally. She is in the twilight zone between the Communist and the free world. Her spokesmen in international conferences have often identified themselves with the positions taken by the Communists. India in her own way is trying to play the role of peacemaker and conciliator in the world.

India is the No. 1 champion of Communist China. She has not yet been able to settle her differences with Pakistan over Kashmir. She does not want to be a party to the projected southeast Asia alliance, the SEATO. Burma and Indonesia follow generally India's leadership in international affairs.

The Philippines cannot follow India. Her case is different. With only 21 million people, when the Communists want to bring her into their orbit they will resort to the conquering process of liberation. If China could be regained for the free world, Asia would be rid of communism and India's neutralism might become outright anti-Communist both internally and internationally. Then the Philippines could look at India with greater admiration.

THE PHILIPPINES AND INDONESIA

The Philippines and Indonesia are countries with the same agricultural products. But where the former has Manila hemp (abaca), the latter has coffee, quinine, and rubber—articles which the Philippines can grow in bigger quantities. The two countries are economic competitors, but their competition has not proved so far irksome to each other.

Although geographically she is a part of southeast Asia, Indonesia does not want to be a party to the SEATO (Southeast Asia Treaty Organization), the counterpart of NATO in Europe. She says that she does not want to be placed in a position to be committed to fight the Communists. She wishes to make the decision to fight or not by herself. But she does not say that if someday she has to fight the international Communist she would refuse the aid of other countries, especially those which are organizing the SEATO.

Indonesia's repatriations question with Japan is not yet settled. It awaits the settlement of the Philippines reparations question. This fact keeps Japan from being more liberal to the Philippines, for what she does for the Filipinos she has to give in equal proportion to the Indonesians. In parenthesis, the three Indochina states have not asked for reparations from Japan. And Communist China has not yet got the notion of asking Japan for reparations. She might do so and make it a bargaining point in her dealings with Japan.

THE PHILIPPINES AND THE UNITED STATES

Between the Philippines and the United States there is a special relationship. It sprung from their partnership of about 50 years' duration. Voluntarily the United States created the Philippine independent nation, continuing economic arrangements to buttress the economic foundation of the new nation.

As far back as 1902, in the act of the United States Congress under which the Philippines were to be governed, the Filipinos were given the same rights and privileges as are vouchsafed to American citizens under the Bill of Rights in the United States Constitution by incorporating the Bill of Rights in that act of Congress. Thus the Filipinos were never slaves under the American flag.

In the course of time the Philippines was granted, while still associated with the United States as a junior partner, two concessions which made the Philippines practically an independent political entity, and self-supporting financially. The Philippine Government was made a government by Filipinos, and Philippine products were considered domestic and admitted to the United States duty free.

Today the Republic of the Philippines has a mutual-defense treaty with the United States and maintains close and cordial relations with her. The United States considers the Philippines the show window of democracy in Asia, and she has every reason, especially under the present Chief Executive, Ramon Magsaysay, to be proud of the nation that she brought into existence on July 4, 1946.

Death of a Patriot: De Gasperi

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, in times such as these in the world's history, when loyalty and dedication to principles of national honor are attributes not always found in persons of high place in government, all of us note with a sincere and profound sorrow the passing away, on August 19, of Alcide de Gasperi, 8 times Premier of Italy and a true friend of the cause of democracy.

He was our friend and he will be missed.

Premier de Gasperi turned his every effort and energy, throughout the course of his 73 years of life, to the cause of his native land. He fought the good fight, from early youth, to raise the lot of his countrymen. His record of participation in public affairs is unexcelled. Under his leadership, the popular party of Italy broke with Mussolini. For this he was forced into retirement and later jailed.

But his spirit never broke.

His continued opposition to the forces of tyranny which had seized power almost cost him his life on a number of occasions. He was forced to seek sanctuary in the Vatican, together with others who were, during World War II, working to advance the cause of freedom.

At the close of the conflict on Italian soil he became leader and party secretary of the newly formed Christian Democrat Party. His rise was swift and by 1945 he had become Premier.

De Gasperi, taking over the reins of government at a time when confusion and chaos seemed ready to submerge all beneath its weight, accomplished incredible changes. He strove, with marked success, to raise conditions among the rank-and-file and it might well be said that he, by the power of his character and by dint of his unflagging energies, turned the tide for Christianity against communism in the famous election of 1948.

Since that time, he battled the Communists in Italy, assisting greatly in the work of European unity and defense within the framework of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. It was he who was most responsible for Italian participation in that group.

It has been said that in the turbulent story of many republics, the fate of all may, at one time more than all others, hang upon a people's ability to bring forth from their midst the man to meet the moment, and so doing, provide the strength to meet the hour.

Such a man was De Gasperi.

He seems to have been divinely ordained to light the way in the difficult task of reconstruction of his beleaguered country. His name and his stature were enough to swing the tide against the Red plague of communism, which since the end of World War II has beset his country on all sides. In fighting the cause of freedom at home, he greatly strengthened the position of the free alliance in Europe and throughout the world. Italy's situation was such that, had she fallen to communism, the West might have suffered an irreparable loss, not to mention the suffering which would have been inflicted upon a troubled people, weary from over a decade of strife and weakened by internal difficulties.

The name De Gasperi, as long as faith and courage and loyalty are counted as desirable traits in a man, will stand for firmness of character and strength of mind and purpose in the never-ending quest for freedom among the peoples of the earth.

As an implacable archantagonist of communism, he demonstrated, irrefutably, that communism can be beaten, if those who have the opportunity will but take strength and heart to do so.

He proved, through every day of his long and useful life, that it matters not what the odds may be, so long as you work unceasingly with what you have to further the cause of that which you know to be just and right.

Long and Distinguished Service of Hon. Robert Crosser in the House of Representatives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OREN HARRIS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to pay tribute to my colleague and associate, the Honorable Robert Crosser. For 14 years I have had the pleasure of serving in the Congress with Bob Crosser, or "Mr. Bob," as he is affectionately know to most of us. For 12 years out of those 14 years, I have been intimately associated with him on the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. And for 4 years, during the 81st and 82d Congresses, Mr. Bob served as chairman of our committee.

Bob Crosser has given unstintingly of his time and talents to the service of his fellowmen. If you try to describe Mr. Bob, you run into some difficulties, because he does not fit any conventional pattern. Born in Scotland, he has brought with him to this country a heritage of rugged independence. He has coupled this independence with indomitable courage. A lesser man might have given up struggling against difficult physical odds. Not so Mr. Bob.

One reason, perhaps, apart from his Scotch ancestry, for his courage and perseverance is Bob Crosser's deeply religious attitude. Again, Mr. Bob's religion does not fit a conventional mold.

Recently, we had an informal farewell luncheon in honor of Mr. Bob. The luncheon was attended by the Speaker, Mr. Martin; the majority leader, Mr. Halleck; the former Speaker, Mr. Rayburn; and most of the members of our committee. Those who spoke at the luncheon of Bob Crosser's service in Congress and on the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. When it was Bob Crosser's turn to say a few words, he did not speak of the many years which he has spent in Congress and of his achievements in the legislative field. Mr. Bob spoke in deeply felt words of his conception of man's relation to God.

If he were not the modest man that he is, Bob Crosser might well have spoken on this occasion of his achievements throughout his many years of service in Congress. He might have spoken of his struggle for the passage of legislation to achieve better working conditions for the working people and particularly for railroad workers. He might have spoken of his untiring efforts to secure legislation providing for retirement benefits for railroad workers.

Recently the House unanimously passed amendments to the Railroad Retirement Act broadening the benefits provided under that act. Bob Crosser is generally considered the father of this legislation. When these amendments were considered, many Members of the House paid tribute to Bob Crosser and his achievements in the Congress in behalf of railroad workers. Today, I want to take this opportunity to join the Members who spoke then praising Mr. Crosser's accomplishments.

As I have said, all through these years, Mr. Bob has maintained an independence of action and thought that has made him respected and honored by his colleagues on both sides of the aisle. All through his long years of service, he has been proud of the fact that he was not beholden to any political organization and that his actions and his votes in the Congress were dedicated solely by his best judgment of what is best for his fellowmen. His retirement will lose to the Congress and to our committee the services of a man whose services and talents are hard to replace and I assure you that I feel a great personal loss in Bob Crosser's retirement.

Farmers' Home Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. HILL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call your attention to an agency in the United States Department of Agriculture, the Farmers' Home Administration, where some remarkable improvements have been made under the Eisenhower administration.

The Farmers' Home Administration, through loans and other assistance, helps small farmers place their operations on a more efficient basis. The agency also provides emergency loans for farmers who because of drought, floods, or similar disasters need a supplemental source of credit.

Under the Eisenhower administration the lending activities of this agency have been increased 28 percent. Administrative overhead costs have been cut 20 percent. Loan making and servicing authority has been decentralized and placed at the county level close to the farmers. Additional powers have been given the agency that tremendously broaden its ability to help farmers develop their farms, build and improve farm homes, acquire land, weather emergencies, install irrigation and other water facilities, and carry out soil conservation measures.

Let me review each of these improvements briefly.

First, the expansion of lending activities. In fiscal 1954, during the first full year under the Eisenhower administration, the Farmers' Home Administration made or insured loans totaling $292,452,000. This was a 28-percent increase over the amount loaned in 1953—and more funds had been advanced in 1953 than in any previous year.

Two-thirds of the funds loaned were advanced through the regular programs of the agency to operators of family-type farms, who needed credit to improve and adjust their operations, buy and improve farms. More credit was advanced to these small farmers than had ever been advanced in any year by the Farmers' Home Administration or its predecessor agencies.

About one-third of the amount loaned was handled through the emergency-loan programs which serve the emergency credit needs of all farmers, including small ones. These loans, which include the livestock and economic emergency loans authorized in the 1st session of the 83d Congress, have enabled thousands of drought-stricken farmers to keep going, have prevented countless foreclosures and forced liquidations.

Now let us see what the Eisenhower administration has accomplished in this agency in the way of more efficient and economical administration. Since July 1, 1953, the administrative budgets for this agency have been reduced by $5,800,000, or approximately 20 percent.

It is hard to believe that such a reduction in the cost of operation could be made while activities were being increased. But such is the case.

Here are some of the things that were done to cut overhead costs. Four area finance offices and the national finance office of the agency were combined into one office in St. Louis. The Washington staff was reduced by 35 percent.

The State office staffs were also reduced. However, at the county level where the agency comes in direct contact with the farmer, care was taken in realining the offices to maintain an adequate number of contact points for loan making and servicing.

Further savings in time and money were achieved by eliminating a duplicate set of files on 60,000 real-estate loans, but cutting out unnecessary reports and forms by simplifying procedures.

At the same time the services of the agency were greatly strengthened and improved by the placing of added authority in the hands of the men who run the program at the county level.

The importance of this step cannot be overstated. In the long run it may prove to be the greatest improvement measure taken in the reorganization of the agency.

Here is what was done.

County supervisors, the men who work directly with the farmers, are being given the power of final approval on a much larger percentage of the loans. Many loans that in the past were held up until an official from a higher echelon could find time to review and approve them will, in the future, be approved quickly in the county.

County supervisors have also been given more authority in dealing with farmers and local lenders on loans servicing matters.

To expedite real-estate loanmaking the appraisal work of the agency is being placed in county offices, closer to the farmers to be served. Practically all the handling of real-estate insurance has been transferred from State to county offices.

In addition, greater use is being made of State and county committees. The new State committees, made up of five State agricultural leaders, are being asked to take an extremely independent view of the operations of the agency in their State. Any further improvements they suggest will be given the most careful consideration.

The three-member county committee, composed of men whose judgment is highly respected in their communities, will also be relied upon to a greater extent than in the past to help adapt national policies to local needs. These committeemen have all been reminded that it is their decision and not the Government's as to whether or not a farmer meets the eligibility requirements for the agency's services.

Services of other public and private organizations are being used to the fullest extent possible. During the past year the Farmers' Home Administration entered into an agreement with the Federal Extension Service under which the services of the extension home demonstration agents are being used to the greatest extent possible by the farm families who borrow from the Farmers Home Administration.

Every possible step is being taken to make sure that no Government funds are advanced when private or cooperative credit is available to meet the needs of the applicants. The agency does not lend funds when the farmer can obtain the funds from his regular credit sources. During the past year agency officials have contacted private lenders throughout the country to make sure that this policy was understood.

The record on legislation affecting the activities of this agency is as spectacular as all of the other improvements. I have already mentioned the special livestock and emergency loans provided by the 83d Congress last summer.

In addition, Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act amendments, placed on the statute books a few days ago, will greatly increase the ability of the Farmers Home Administration to meet the needs of small farmers who turn to the agency for assistance.

Here is the background behind these amendments. Under the insured mortgage program admministered by the Farmers' Home Administration, farmers can obtain loans to buy or develop family-type farms or to enlarge small farms to a point where they are efficient family-type units.

Funds for insured loans can be supplied by banks, insurance companies, or any other source of private or cooperative credit. The full value of the loan is insured by the Government. For several years the interest that private lenders receive on these loans has been set by law at 3 percent, and the money market has been such that only a few insured loans have been made each year. Lenders found they could get a better return elsewhere. Public Law 521 permits the Secretary of Agriculture to change the interest rate to match fluctuations in the money market. If necessary, he can place the return to the lender on insured loans as high as 4 percent.

As of today it is not known exactly what rate will bring in sufficient funds to carry on a reasonable program of adequate size to meet the needs. The agency is surveying the market and will set its sights accordingly.

The one thing that is clear, and the most important element, is that in the future thousands of eligible farmers will not be turned away because of lack of funds.

The agency has on hand about 24,000 applications for farm ownership loans. Many of these applicants are eligible for insured loans. There are also thousands of farmers who need a loan of this type, who have not applied for one, because it is common knowledge in rural areas that the agency for years has lacked funds for farm purchase and development. In addition these insured loans will take the place of direct Government loans for farm housing.

The principle of insuring private loans rather than making direct Government loans will soon be carried a step farther. With further immense benefits to the farmers of our country.

S. 3137, recently passed by both Houses, will make water facilities and soil-conservation loans available on a direct and on an insured basis throughout the Nation.

This is an extremely important piece of legislation. The water-facility loans enable farmers to buy pumps, drill wells, install irrigation systems, and take similar steps needed to supply their fields, their stock, and their families with an adequate water supply. The soil-conservation loans will enable farmers to build terraces, improve their pastures, and finance a wide variety of soil-conserving measures.

At a time when drought annually threatens thousands of farm enterprises, when soil conservation is needed on millions of acres, these new loans—only the water-facility loans have been available before, and they were limited to the Western States—these new loans will give farmers throughout the width and breadth of the land a chance to build for themselves a kind of security that heretofore they have always wanted but were never able to finance.

All in all, the record set by the Eisenhower administration in the Farmers' Home Administration is one worth noting.

A great increase has been made in the scope and the size of the services rendered the Nation's farmers. At the same time major economies have been achieved in administration. It is a record of which we can all be proud.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION

Comparison of amounts loaned in fiscal years 1953 and 1954

Program	1953	1954	Percent change, 1953-54
REGULAR PROGRAMS			
Farm ownership:			
Direct	$18,993,869	$19,538,667	2.9
Insured	10,689,227	9,530,793	−10.8
Total, farm ownership	29,683,096	29,069,460	−2.1
Farm housing	19,294,817	16,067,934	−16.7
Production and subsistence:			
Borrowed funds	119,999,931	139,996,321	16.7
State corporation funds	9,765,905	7,358,453	−24.7
Total, production and subsistence	129,765,836	147,354,774	13.6
Water facilities:			
Individuals	4,931,784	5,002,366	1.4
Associations	1,068,155	1,497,600	40.2
Total, water facilities	5,999,939	6,499,960	8.3
Subtotal, regular programs	184,743,688	198,992,134	7.7
EMERGENCY PROGRAMS			
Emergency:			
Production	43,099,739	31,740,044	−26.4
Economic	0	26,244,173	-------
Special livestock	0	35,164,561	-------
Fur	766,865	296,600	−61.3
Orchard	91,175	15,290	−83.2
Subtotal, emergency programs	43,957,779	93,460,668	112.6
Total, all loans	228,701,467	292,452,802	27.9

Prospects of War in Asia—The Challenge of Red China—The Organization of a Southeast Asia Alliance—"We Have a Just and Winning Cause Against the Communists"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, on September 6 eight nations will convene in Baguio in the Philippines to organize the southeast Asia alliance against Communist aggressions. That is a step in the right direction. I would have liked to have seen Nationalist China, the Republic of Korea, and Japan in that alliance, but I understand that their exclusion does not mean that they are not going to receive the aid of the free world in case they are attacked by the Communists.

I like to see the United States enter into a mutual defense treaty with Nationalist China as she has such a treaty with Japan, the Republic of Korea, the Philippines, New Zealand, and Australia. I understand that General Van Fleet, as the President's personal representative in a recent study of Asia, is in favor of it. I hope that in the next session of Congress such a treaty would become a reality.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to extend my remarks by making as a part thereof a statement of Mr. Vicente Villamin, a Filipino intellectual leader and sincere friend of the United States. I had the pleasure of inserting in the RECORD several of his previous statements and articles. They have been appreciated and praised by Members of Congress, administration officials, and private individuals and organizations. They are a valuable contribution to the real understanding of the Asian situation and the role the United States is playing in meeting Communist subversion and aggression. They also contain many timely and constructive ideas and suggestions.

Mr. Villamin's statement, being part III of a series, follows:

PROSPECTS OF WAR IN ASIA—SOUTHEAST ASIA TREATY ORGANIZATION, THE SEATO

(By Vicente Villamin)

(Pt. III)

Today America and Red China are face to face with each other as enemies in fact. Will there be a shooting war between them? That depends on Red China. America will not start it.

Red China is mad at America because America is preventing her from carrying out her conquest of free Asia. Like Soviet Russia, Red China believes in conquering other countries to make herself great and strong.

Red China has declared that she will take Formosa. America has let her understand that she will aid Formosa in resisting the attack. That is notice to Red China that there will be a shooting war if she attacks Formosa.

America's chief reasons for protecting Formosa were given by Gen. Douglas MacArthur in his address to a joint session of the United States Congress on April 19, 1951, when he said, "I have strongly recommended in the past as a matter of military urgency that under no circumstances must Formosa fall under Communist control." [Applause.] "Such an eventuality would at once threaten the freedom of the Philippines and the loss of Japan, and might as well force our western frontier back to the coasts of California, Oregon, and Washington."

What are the prospects of a shooting war with Red China?

Although recognizing the difficulty of crossing 90 miles of water from the mainland to attack Formosa and the chance of failing in the attempt, Red China might feel obliged to deliver the attack to save face and to maintain prestige, which at the moment is quite high.

At the same time Red China, in talking about taking Formosa and liquidating Nationalist China, may have for its primary purpose to induce the General Assembly of the United Nations which will meet on September 21 to admit her to its membership in the place of Nationalist China.

Red China believes that after becoming a member of the United Nations as the representative of China, the effect would be the outlawing of Nationalist China and then she would demand that America stop helping Formosa. That would, in turn, have the effect of facilitating the liquidation of Nationalist China by Red China and causing no end of embarrassment to America. That is why there is a respectable opinion in America to have her resign from the United Nations if Red China is admitted to its membership.

A deterrent on Red China is her knowledge that America is determined to meet her warlike moves. That knowledge was induced into Red China's consciousness by both America's words and deeds in dealing with her contemporary provocations.

What is the attitude of Russia toward the existing tensions between America and Red China?

It must be one of present ostensible cooperation with Red China and secret prospective desire to see America and Red China go to war with each other. Such a war would weaken or destroy the combatants and make Russia the overpowering nation in the world, which would thereby be compelled to adopt the Russo-Communist way of life.

Deep in the consciousness of Russia is a natural fear of the growing strength of Red China. Russia, old and new, is guilty of perpetrating all sorts of iniquities against China. She must know that, although the present Red Chinese leaders are functioning with her, the Chinese people have no love at all for Russia and her way of life. The day is bound to come when Russia would be public poison to China.

The Chinese people will realize more clearly that between America and Russia the former is their genuine friend and the latter their inevitable enemy. To make them realize that would be one of the most urgent and constructive tasks of America. It would lead to the disintegration of the Red Chinese regime and the winning of China back to the family of free nations. That, in turn, would make China a friend instead of an enemy of America.

As a token of America's good intentions toward the Chinese people and providing them with the means of a better life than what the present Red regime is giving them, she should assure them that she would finance and direct an economic plan for China if they reestablish Nationalist China on the mainland.

Such an economic plan might call for an outlay of $10 billion for a period of 5 years. That amount would represent less than 3 percent of the annual income of the American people. That investment is to make China a friend instead of an enemy. As a friend, China would save America in defense and other expenditures many times the amount of the investment and at the same time diminish substantially the power of Russia and thereby begin the dissolution of communism in the world.

The fact must be emphasized that if the Chinese people are not won over to the free world and they develop as the Russian people did under the Communist blueprint America will be faced simultaneously by the Russian menace in the Atlantic and the Chinese menace in the Pacific.

The latter menace would be even greater than the former when all of East Asia, including Japan, is overcome by Red China's overwhelming force.

The organization of resistance against Red China is obviously of the highest moment.

The first thing to do is to give adequate support to Nationalist China on Formosa. It is to enable her to roll back a Red invasion. When the invasion fails, then Nationalist China could proceed to the reoccupation of the mainland. There is when and where the Chinese economic development plan would help tremendously in the winning over of the Chinese people to freedom and democracy under Nationalist China.

The creation of an alliance of free nations in southeast Asia might not be of direct assistance to Nationalist China, but it would be a definite notice to Red China and to Soviet Russia that eight nations—the United States, Great Britain, France, the Philippines, Thailand, Pakistan, New Zealand, and Australia—will resist their trespass and aggression of defined areas in southeast Asia.

The pooling of the moral and material forces of those eight nations for the purpose of antagonistic cooperation against the Communists should have a sobering effect on the Communists themselves and stabilizing influence in the international condition in all of east Asia.

The participation of America in that alliance is in line with the objectives set forth in her treaties of mutual defense and security with the Philippines, New Zealand, Australia, Japan, and the Republic of Korea. It might be stated parenthetically that such treaties might likely be entered into between the United States and Nationalist China and Thailand as a logical part of her program of defense and peace in Asia.

Let a candid world witness what the American participation in the war in Korea and nonparticipation in the war in Indochina have meant. In Korea, the war stopped under a cease-fire and armistice and the Red Chinese and Red North Koreans got nothing in the way of territorial, political, and military concessions. On the contrary, in Indochina under a similar stoppage of the war, the Red Chinese and the Red Vietnamese got valuable territorial, political, and military concessions from France.

Free Asia is keen in its appreciation of the spirit and determination of America to uphold the reign of law and to oppose the evil works of the Communists. Free Asia will stand by and be with America, "sink or swim, live or die." The alternative would be domination by the Communists which is as tragic as death itself.

America's leadership in Asia thus acquired majestic significance. It is as certain as there is God in heaven that America will stand by and be with free Asia in the face of the onslaughts, the chicaneries and the trickeries of the Communists. The fate and destiny of the entire world hinge on what transpires in Asia in the immediate future.

We of the free world must convince ourselves that our cause against the Communists is not only a just cause but also a winning cause. Convinced of this, we cannot lose in the fight to uphold it.

We must never forget that in Russia, the center of communism in the world, not more than 3 percent of the people are Communists and in China less than 1 percent are Communists. In other words, 97 percent of the Russians and 99 percent of the Chinese do not see eye to eye with their respective governments, while the situation is the reverse of that in the free world. That is the first reason why we have a winning cause.

In China, as in Russia, the Communists are breaking up the home. For instance, they are making the children report on the daily doings and sayings of their parents to the Communist precinct leaders. That is intended to sow the seeds of disloyalty to and disregard of their parents in the hearts and minds of the children so they can give themselves up body and soul to the Communist government, which is a government of men and not of law, a government is daily proving that it is bereft of conscience, of decency, and or reason.

The issue in the world today is to whom shall humanity look for guidance, assistance, and protection—to America or to Russia?

The answer is to America, not to Russia and, for that matter, not to Red China.

And why? America is magnanimous, human, and constructive and she has the capability as well as the desire to be of help and service to other peoples. On the contrary, Russia and China do not possess such capability and desire. They are for their own aggrandizement, first, last, and always. Their propaganda to the contrary is a tissue of falsehoods and misrepresentations. On top of it all, their Communist principles are unhuman, inhuman, selfish, and wicked.

As the eight nations meet at Baguio, the pleasant summer capital of the Philippines, let free Asia give an overpowering demonstration of its devotion to freedom and democracy and its trust and confidence in America, her principles and institutions and her determination to save the world from communism and its evil works.

Trade With the Philippines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT C. BONNER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, the first of last July this Congress passed H. R. 9315 amending the Philippine Trade Act of 1946 by delaying the imposition of graduated tariffs on imports from the Philippines into the United States, which would have begun July 4.

When this matter was first brought up in this Chamber on June 22, I objected to its consideration by unanimous consent.

These objections were based on the fact that the Philippines, by Act 698, had materially limited the importation of American leaf tobacco and leaf-tobacco products into the Philippines, in violation of the spirit and intent of its trade agreement with the United States, under the Philippine Trade Agreement of 1946.

Subsequently, Gen. Carlos P. Romulo, special representative of President Magsaysay of the Philippines, with the rank of Ambassador, communicated and assured me, for the President and himself, that this situation would be eliminated at a special session of the Philippine Congress to be held shortly thereafter.

In view of these assurances from such high sources, I withdrew my objections and the bill passed the House, by unanimous consent, on June 23. Within the past 2 weeks the Philippine Congress has passed a bill, which not only fails to eliminate the discrimination against American leaf tobacco, but actually adds further restrictions to its importation into the Philippines. This new law provides that for 1956 and succeeding years, no American tobacco can be imported into the Philippines, except in quantities sufficient to maintain the manufacture of tobacco products in the Philippines at the level of the preceding year, after all locally produced tobacco has been bought and used. It further provides excessive and arbitrary support prices for local tobacco production, far in excess of world prices.

Mr. Speaker, the Philippines have failed to live up to their agreements, both in violating their trade agreement with the United States and failing to live up to the promises given me personally.

Any restriction on the volume of importation of tobacco from the United States into the Philippines is a violation of their agreement with us.

Increasing allowable imports for 1954 from 25 to 40 percent of 1950 imports is a mere gesture and is continuing a material violation.

But, in 1955 they go back—now by law and not by regulation—to the situation existing when I objected to considering H. R. 9315 and then in 1956 they go to a formula far more restrictive than those I called attention to on June 22.

Mr. Speaker, presumably there will be conferences between the Philippines and the United States, on an executive level, in the next few months. But, ultimately, this Congress must act to effect any change in the existing trade relations as requested by the Philippines.

I serve notice now that at that time I will remember commitments made, adhered to, and violated, and be influenced by the failure of the Philippines to live up to their commitments.

Reasons Why Mississippians Want Segregation Told by Legislator

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. STENNIS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I have a statement by the Honorable Edwin White, member of the House of Representatives, State of Mississippi, regarding segregation in the public schools. As Mr. White's statement is so clear, accurate, and fair and states the situation as to the relationship between the two races in the South, I believe it is of value to the people of the entire Nation. I commend Mr. White for his clear and worthwhile article and ask that same be included in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REASONS WHY MISSISSIPPIANS WANT SEGREGATION

In no State of the American Union has there been more real kindness and friendship between the white and colored people than in Mississippi.

Neither the white nor the colored people asked for the May 17 decision of the United States Supreme Court which declared unconstitutional our separate system of public schools for the races. Therefore, we should not let this Court decision come between us, or turn back the progress which we have all worked hard to bring about.

The Mississippi Legislature has been interested in and has greatly helped the colored people of this State.

They receive the larger part of the millions of dollars which the State spends for old-age pensions and public-health service.

They receive a major part of the millions spent by Mississippi for homestead exemption, free schoolbooks, and hospital service.

It is money appropriated by the legislature that largely pays for the experiment stations and demonstration agents which have helped the colored farmer make more money than he has ever made before.

At Whitfield and at the tubercular sanatorium at Magee, the buildings and medical treatment for the colored are of the best, and are paid for out of the treasury of this State. Likewise, great improvements have recently been made at Jackson College, Alcorn College, and at Mississippi Vocational College.

Before the Supreme Court decision the salaries of the colored teachers were sharply raised and a new bus transportation system provided.

The question then might be asked: If the white man is a true friend to the colored man, then why is he not willing to abide by the above Court decision?

The answer is plain and simple: There is only one thing in the whole situation the white man asks for, and that is, the privilege of his children, and his children's children, continuing to be white people. From this position he cannot and will not yield because it is God's law. Genesis 1: 11, 24, 25. Genesis VI: 19, 20. Genesis VII: 14. Numbers 36: 5, 6. Jeremiah 13: 23.

The white man feels that the colored man should also be anxious to preserve the integrity of his race, and just as willing to abide by God's law.

The reason why it is so hard for some people in other parts of this country to understand the position of the southern white people is that it is only in a few States in the South where each of the two races comprises about one-half of the population.

The history of the world teaches that where two separate races are in close contact with each other through the centuries they cannot retain their identity.

Now the Supreme Court decision says that in public schools the races must not be separated. If this were carried out here in the South then, from the lesson of history, in a few centuries the races would become amalgamated.

Thus to put this Supreme Court decision into effect would operate to violate God's creation and law, and when any court decision violates His law, it is sinful, unholy, and unworthy of obedience.

At the meeting before Governor White's committee in Jackson on July 30, one of the more conservative colored speakers made this statement: "90 percent of the colored people of Mississippi do want better schools for their children, and if they can get them, then 90 percent of our problems will be solved." It is my experience and opinion that this is a correct statement.

To discourage from lawsuits the radicals and troublemakers who would bring so much harm to the children of Mississippi, the legislature at its special session in September will in all probability submit to the people a constitutional amendment which will authorize the legislature, in its solemn discretion, to discontinue the public school system in Mississippi and to enact legislation for the encouragement of private schools.

If the above amendment is adopted by the people it will prove our best safeguard to a continuance of our system of separate public schools.

Moreover, if the amendment is adopted, it is my firm opinion that the legislature, through a spirit of friendship for and confidence in the colored people of this State, will promptly proceed to build and equip, for the colored children of Mississippi, good schools in all localities in which such schools have not already been built.

That all of the people in Mississippi may go forward under God's law in peace, friendship and prosperity should be the prayer of every one of us.

EDWIN WHITE,
Member of the Mississippi House of Representatives from Holmes County.
JACKSON, MISS.

Congressman Wayne L. Hays, of Ohio, Reports to His Constituents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WAYNE L. HAYS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a report to the people of the 18th Ohio Congressional District—Belmont, Carroll, Columbiana, Harrison, and Jefferson Counties:

IN WASHINGTON WITH WAYNE L. HAYS

AUGUST 19, 1954.

THE NATIONAL ECONOMY

"United States Acting To Give Business a Prod," reads a headline in the New York Times of July 30, 1954. The article goes on to say that the Government is speeding up planned Federal expenditures in the hope of prodding the national economy into greater activity, according to the Secretary of Commerce. Because I urged some weeks ago that the administration take positive action to avert depression my opponent, in a television appearance, called me a "Fear Dealer." I believe that the humor of this phrase will escape my constituents who have lost their jobs because of the decline in business activity. As the Representative in Congress of a district hard hit by unemployment, I have considered it no more than my duty to speak out on this subject, and will continue to work, through every avenue open to me, for the prosperity of our area and the country as a whole.

NEWSLETTER MAILING LIST

This newsletter is being distributed to some persons who have not received previous issues. If you have received more than one copy because of duplication in mailing lists, I would appreciate your passing the extra one on to someone else. I would be glad to have the names and addresses of any of my constituents not now on the regular newsletter list who might find these occasional communications from Washington of interest.

HOW YOUR REPRESENTATIVE VOTED ON MAJOR LEGISLATION BEFORE THE 83D CONGRESS

It has been my privilege to serve the people of the 18th District for 3 terms in the House of Representatives. During the 83d Congress, for the first time, I have been a member of the minority party in the Congress and the party in opposition to the administration. I have sought conscientiously to act as one of a responsible minority and a loyal opposition, casting my vote on each issue according to my evaluation of its effect on our district and the Nation. A brief explanation of some of the important legislation before this Congress and my position on these bills is given below.

First session

Hawaiian statehood, H. R. 3575: First major point in President Eisenhower's legislative program to come before the House, this bill was opposed by many Democrats because the administration had not endorsed Alaskan statehood also. I believed that both Territories deserved statehood but could not justify voting against admission of Hawaii on that ground. I voted "Yes." March 10, 1953.

Tidelands bill, H. R. 4198: Posed as a States' rights issue, this legislation was in fact a measure to give away to a few coastal States the offshore oil and gas resources which I believed should be developed for all of the American people. Ohio schools would have benefited, as would those of other States, from a share in the revenue from Federal leases, under an amendment which I supported. I voted "No." April 1, 1953.

Agriculture appropriation bill, H. R. 5227, amendment to reduce soil-conservation funds by $55 million: The worth of this program to conserve the productive soil of America's farmlands has been amply demonstrated. One of the few farmers in the House, I was particularly concerned about this threat to the effective operation of the soil-conservation program. I voted "No." May 20, 1953.

Reciprocal trade agreements extension, H. R. 5495: The trade-agreements program, in effect since 1934, is based on a sound principle, for economic isolationism is as unrealistic in the world in which we live as political isolationism. However, excessive concessions made under the program have worked to the detriment of domestic industry, including the pottery and glass industries of our area. Because it did not afford sufficient protection I could not support the bill. I voted "No." June 15, 1953.

Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act amendments, H. R. 5894, motion to recommit: A major provision of this bill, to give much-needed protection to domestic industries injured by unfair foreign competition, was the restriction of imports of foreign residual fuel oil, which have had an adverse effect on our coal industry. The motion to send it back to committee, which I opposed, in effect killed the bill. I voted "No." July 23, 1953.

Mutual Security Act of 1953, H. R. 5710: This was a bill to carry on the program to strengthen the United States by providing economic and military aid to free and friendly countries of Europe and Asia. I voted "Yes." June 19, 1953.

Second session

Tax revision bill, H. R. 8300: This bill, the first comprehensive revision of the Internal Revenue Code in many years, disappointed me in some respects, notably its failure to increase the personal exemption and grant meaningful relief to the small taxpayer. Because it partially eliminated double taxation of dividends and included other good provisions, I supported the measure. I voted "Yes." March 18, 1954.

Social Security Act amendments, H. R. 9366: This was a bill to extend the coverage and increase the benefits of the old-age and survivors insurance program. Further improvements in the social-security system are needed but must wait for another session. I voted "Yes." June 1, 1954.

Agricultural Act of 1954, H. R. 9680: The Wall Street Journal, which has a few farm readers, explains that flexible means lower. Ninety percent of parity means 90 percent of a fair price. There are some who would like to see the farmer get 75 percent of a fair price under some conditions. The bill was finally compromised in the House at 82½ to 90 percent. This is far removed from the 100 percent of parity promised in 1952 campaign speeches. As a farmer I look for the day when farm legislation will not be written for the special interests of the wheat growers west of the Mississippi and the cotton farmers. Because better legislation could not be secured in this Congress I voted for this bill. Passage came on a voice vote. I voted "Yes." July 2, 1954.

Health service prepayment plan reinsurance bill, H. R. 8356, motion to recommit: The health needs of the people, and their need for protection against the heavy financial strain occasioned by serious illness, would not have been met by this legislation. Indeed, its principal beneficiaries would have been the insurance companies to which subscribers to voluntary health plans pay their premiums. The motion to recommit killed the bill. I voted "Yes." July 13, 1954.

Reiterating opposition of House Representatives to seating of Communist regime in China in United Nations, House Resolution 634: To seat Red China in the United Nations would be to give the regime responsible for vast loss of American lives and treasure an opportunity to further push the designs of the Communist world and to impede the policies of the United States and our friends. I was proud to join my colleagues in a renewed expression of firm opposition to any such proposal. I voted "Yes." July 15, 1954.

Veterans compensation and pension increase, H. R. 9020: The principal provision of this bill was a 5 percent increase in all monthly wartime rates of disability compensation. It also increased payments to widows, children, and dependent parents of veterans. This was little enough for those to whom the country owes so much. I voted "Yes." July 21, 1954.

Atomic Energy Act amendments, H. R. 9757: With this bill's stated objective I fully agreed—to bring the 1946 law into accord with atomic progress, to make legislative controls better conform with the scientific, technical, economic, and political facts of atomic energy as they exist today. Because of certain harmful provisions in the legislation as reported to the House, however, I could not conscientiously vote for it. The American people have a multi-billion-dollar investment in atomic development, which would not in my judgment be properly protected under this measure. Specifivally it did not provide adequately for Government participation in atomic power, and it did not provide for compulsory licensing of patents. I voted "No." July 26, 1954. The conference report, however, included the compulsory licensing provision. I therefore supported its acceptance. Passage came on a voice vote. I voted "Yes." August 17, 1954.

Communist control bill, S. 3706, motion to direct House conferees to agree to Senate amendments to House amendments: Behind an intricate parliamentary situation lay a simple issue—after years of denouncing the Communist conspiracy and seeking to place the blame for its inroads into Government and other areas of our American national life, should the Congress make knowing and willful membership in the Communist Party a crime and provide punishment therefor. Opposed by the present leadership, the proposal came before us as a result of skillful management by Senator HUMPHREY, Democrat, of Minnesota, and Representative DIES, Democrat, of Texas. Although it was brought up late in the session, after many Members had returned to their districts, it passed 208 to 100. I voted "Yes." August 17, 1954.

ADT Robots Make Life Tough for Burglars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, a recent issue of the Saturday Evening Post contained a very interesting article by Mr. Alan Hynd entitled "They Make Life Tough for Burglars." Mr. Hynd presented a fascinating look at some of the newest devices designed to foil a thief. As he expressed it "one new gadget sets off an alarm the burglar can't hear in a safe he hasn't touched and another traps him if he just takes one deep breath." I invited this article to the attention of the Secretary of Defense because of the possibility of large savings in manpower and money through the use of electronic detection devices, and I have been assured that the Defense Department is making a survey to determine the applicability of these devices at its various establishments. I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

They Make Life Tough for Burglars

(By Alan Hynd)

One hundred and one years ago a man named Augustus R. Pope, of Somerville, Mass., was granted a patent on an electromagnetic device that rang a bell when a door or window was opened. Since then, robot detectives have given incalculable assistance to private industry in the no-armistice war on burglars. Several companies, whose contribution to the conflict between honest men and dishonest ones is little known to the layman, invent, manufacture, sell, and service a burglars' nightmare of electric and electronic alarms that protect life and property.

Through the years the struggle has seesawed, with the more scholarly criminals occasionally circumventing the snares and emerging on the sneering side. But the detection-device industry always catches up by dreaming up new burglar traps or applying fresh touches to old ones.

Discouraging problems beset the malefactor who becomes enarmored of a bank vault, a safe in a jewelry store or any other repository of concentrated negotiable values. Before he can lay siege to the object of his affections, he must surmount a barrier of electrically charged lead-tin foil on doors and windows, sound detection, invisable rays or an invention called Telapproach, which sets off an alarm he can't even hear in a safe he hasn't yet touched. There is even a device that will betray a loot-conscious character if he so much as draws a deep breath in a room charged with a constantly shifting cloud of ultrasonic waves.

The largest and most experienced organization in the field of manufacturing and selling robots that catch criminals is the American District Telegraph Co., which has been in the business for 80 years. ADT acts as a nationwide auxiliary to the police, the FBI and other law-enforcement agencies. Handling about 70 percent of the country's central-station protective business, it services many thousands of banks, stores, warehouses, factories, private estates and such United States Government institutions as Fort Knox.

ADT maintains a nationwide network of central stations servicing 652 cities. Each station, hooked up by direct wire to subscribers and to the nearest police department, is loud with ticker tapes and bright with multicolored lights. The tapes and the lights instantly alert round-the-clock watchers when a criminal has run afoul of an electric or electronic snare in a protected building, and pin point the locale of the intrusion. The ADT then alerts the police, so that, in effect, the criminals call their own cops. The service that the burglars get is so fast that the cops sometimes arrive to break up a crime before it is well under way.

Last year ADT's devices broke up more than 2,000 attacks on protected property and resulted in almost 1,000 arrests. The cagier criminals hide in the shadows after heaving a brick through a window to see what will happen, and flee if they see the cops coming. Although such criminals escape arrest, the loot escapes them.

The small percentage of malefactors who succeed in thinking their way around the ADT traps do so simply by finding or figuring out how the things work, when they are turned off, or by spotting places where there isn't enough protection. The so-called Halloween bandits who grabbed more than a million dollars from Brink's, Inc., in Boston in January 1950, got away with the crime because they either guessed or knew that a sound-detecting device in the counting-room vault where employees were busy making up payrolls was not turned on.

Seven weeks after the Brink's robbery, Willie Sutton, perhaps the most painstaking of the modern bank robbers and a student of protective devices, circumvented the ADT simply by making a study of a branch of the Manufacturers Trust Co. in Long Island City, N. Y. Sutton, who said he robbed banks because that was where the money was, somehow learned that this establishment was equipped only with a sound-detection device on the main vault and that the sound detector was turned off when the vault was opened at 9:15 in the morning.

Sutton and two confederates simply herded the bank employees into a corner as they reported for work and, waiting until 9:15, forced the assistant manager to open the vault at the usual time. Then they took what they had come for and departed.

Since ADT is in the business of turning honest dollars by baffling dishonest men, it tries to sell as much protection to a customer as it thinks the customer needs and can pay for. The cost of protection varies from about $100 a year to many thousands of dollars annually. The owner of a corner cigar store may be amply protected by electric-contact springs on his door—two pieces of electrically-charged metal which, separated when the door is opened, break a circuit. But the security devices around such places as Uncle Sam's gold-bullion deposits at Fort Knox and the silver deposit at West Point become expensive engineering projects.

ADT's average customer, big or small, is inclined to take a calculated risk and buy less protection than is actually needed for full security. It is in this area of disagreement between an ADT salesman and a customer that the clever criminal sometimes operates.

In some buildings all negotiable valuables are in safes or vaults under electrical protection, but many exterior openings are not wired because there's nothing worth stealing. One ADT customer, the United States Treasury Department, had the money in its San Francisco Mint completely guarded, but didn't have as much protection as it could have had on outside windows. Two days after Christmas of 1938, a couple of 15-year-old boys broke into the money manufactory in broad daylight. The boys, deciding it would be great sport to break into a mint, climbed to a second-story ledge, forced open a window, went in and grabbed a sheet of copper and beat it.

One of their playmates phoned the police and reported that the mint had just been robbed. The two pranksters were hanging around when the cops arrived, looking too innocent to be innocent. On being questioned, they admitted the whole thing. Nothing was done to the boys, but plenty was done to make sure that the mint could not be illegally entered again.

Similar case histories in the ADT files are talking points with ADT salesmen when they are trying to convince a prospect that he needs more protection than he thinks he needs.

ADT is fussy about whom it accepts for clients for burglary protection or for fire and industrial-process protection, which are equally important adjuncts of a business that grossed $30 million last year. It wryly recalls the case of an elderly millionaire, married to a young and vivacious blonde. He had a system of invisible rays installed around his estate a few years ago, ostensibly to prevent burglary.

The old millionaire, who did a bit of solo traveling, left instructions with the ADT to start things moving if an alarm came in after 9 p. m., at which hour the alarm was turned on. Police rushed to the estate several times. They found no burglars, but did find gentlemen friends of the wife paying her visits. ADT, which is not in the business of spying on cheating spouses, took out the system as soon as the client's true intention was plain.

THE INVISIBLE RAY AND A 3-MINUTE JOB

Late one night last August, two veteran burglars, bent on making a big haul of narcotics, broke into the Minneapolis plant of McKesson & Robbins, Inc., the drug manufacturers. They were in the plant less than 3 minutes when they found themselves surrounded by policemen.

"How did you ever know we was here?" asked one of the burglars.

"The ray got you," answered a cop.

"What ray?" asked the burglar, looking around.

"You can't see it," said the cop. "It's invisible."

ADT's version of the invisible ray, or electronic eye, is the invention of Maxwell H. A. Lindsay, a 49-year-old Newfoundlander who is a naturalized citizen. Lindsay, now ADT's chief engineer, looks, dresses and acts more like a brisk businessman than the popular conception of an absent-minded inventor. Before joining ADT in 1932, he was a physics instructor at Massachusetts Institute of Technology and a member of the technical staff of the Bell Telephone Laboratories, Inc., in New York City.

Shocked at the widespread robberies of banks and business establishments in the 1930's, Lindsay decided to perfect the conversion of the electronic eye, then used mainly to open doors in railroad stations, into an anticrime device. He put an infrared filter over the light, making it invisible. Then he chopped it into a frequency of several hundred vibrations a second, so that a criminal couldn't figure a way of counteracting it.

The electronic beam, which is projected from a hidden source, is criss-crossed in a protected area by means of hidden mirrors, until it contacts a photoelectric cell. The devices are connected by wires that go into an ADT station. When an intruder crosses the beam he breaks contact with the photoelectric cell and activates an alarm.

The electronic eye is one of ADT's most successful traps. It is particularly effective in outdoor locations where valuable materials are stored. It trapped 5 burglars in 2 weeks in the yard of an Akron, Ohio, plant. Within a period of 4 months it tripped up 10 intruders at 1 Baltimore plant and frightened off several others. It turned up a criminal in Fort Forth, Tex., who was wanted by the police of several States. All told, the magic beam snared almost 300 intruders last year. Some of them complained that it wasn't cricket to catch a man with something he couldn't see.

One night not long ago a seasoned safecracker slipped into a retail jewelry store in the Midwest, laid down his kit in front of the safe and, before getting down to work, paused for a smoke. He was just stamping out the cigarette when the police crashed in. He was curious to know what he had done to give an alarm, since he hadn't so much as laid a finger on the safe.

"Telapproach," explained a cop.

Telapproach, another Lindsay invention, is 15 years old and so weird that it was once introduced into an adventure comic strip. Like the man who was laughed at when he sat down to play the piano, Lindsay was given a double taken when he announced to the ADT brass that he thought he could product an alarm system that would even anticipate the approach of a burglar. His idea was that electrical emanations originating from a protected object, such as a safe, would be affected by the approach of a human body.

Lindsay got his idea for Telapproach during the early days of radio when a hand approaching the dial of a regenerative set changed the tone of the squawks coming out of the instrument.

Telapproach uses the same scientific principle. What happened when that burglar in the jewelry store sat down near the safe was that the electrical capacitance of his body altered the character of radio waves sent out from the safe. Thus the entire electrical system of Telapproach was thrown out of balance and the imbalance sent an alarm over a wire to an ADT station. From there it was relayed to the police.

Jimmy Valentine, the fictional safecracker, would be at a disadvantage with Telapproach. Jimmy would betray his presence in front of a safe before even touching it.

One night in September 1952, an intruder was the unwitting host at a police surprise party in Camden, N. J., less than 60 seconds after he had smashed a window and climbed into a clothing store. He had run afoul of ADT's lead-tin-foil burglar catcher. The glass in the window had been laced with electrically charged strips of the foil. When one of the strips was broken by the burglar, the resulting open circuit activated an alarm. This type of burglar catcher, having been in use since 1880, is ADT's second oldest anticrime device.

Augustus Pope's electric bell ringer was purchased in 1857 by Edwin Holmes, the inventor of the burglar alarm. Holmes, the founder of the Holmes Electric Protective Co., started in business in Boston and New York by connecting subscribers to central offices by telegraph wires. Not long after Holmes opened his crime-detecting business, the first district telegraph company began operating in New York City. It rented electric call boxes by which the subscribers could telegraphically summon a messenger, a cab, a doctor, policeman, or fireman. Similar businesses, all called district telegraph companies, sprang up all over the country.

With the advent of the competitive telephone in 1677, the district telegraph companies, realizing they were plugged in to a wrong number, began to look around for new sources of revenue. One day the district telegraph outfit in Cleveland got a hot flash.

A man who ran a small factory and who employed his wife's aged father as a night watchman was worried about both the factory and the old man. He wondered if the telegraph company could install a call box in the factory so that the watchman, who had a habit of falling asleep with a lighted pipe in his mouth, could report in every hour, thus indicating that neither he nor the factory had burned up. Why not, reasoned the telegraph company, go into the protective business and put watchmen's call boxes in banks and other places of concentrated value?

In the second year of the present century the American District Telegraph Co. (New Jersey) was organized and eventually acquired the capital stock of 59 other district telegraph outfits throughout the country. It bought out Holmes in Boston, although Holmes still retains its protective system in New York, Philadelphia, and Pittsburgh.

In the year ADT was organized, a notable nemesis of burglars, Richard M. Hopkins, was a 17-year-old electrician's helper in the Baltimore district office. Hopkins, who is now in his 70th year and living in retirement, was, according to Charles Steinmetz, the celebrated wizard of the General Electric Co., an electrician's electrician. Mainly self-educated, he was granted 67 patents on electrical burglar devices before he retired as chief engineer.

Hopkins' patents reduced some burglars to a state of insolvency. Hopkins, a quiet, reflective man, once received an abusive letter from an anonymous writer who blamed him for ruining his livelihood as a bank robber and driving him into a life of honesty.

Hopkins' father, Jeremiah, a retired sea captain, who was employed as a night watchman in a Baltimore warehouse, used to tell his son how some watchmen soldiered on the job. They attached strings to nonwired mechanical tour boxes that recorded their visits, ran the strings to comfortable rocking chairs, and made their rounds without rising from the rockers. Young Hopkins, disturbed by the fact that there was nothing between a burglar and a bag of loot but an indolent watchman in a rocker, determined to drive the watchmen out of the rockers.

Hopkins, in collaboration with C. C. Johnson, who retired 8 years ago as ADT president, invented the compulsory tour system in 1917. This consisted of a complicated key that would not work unless it was inserted into the watchmen's boxes in a certain sequence. Some of the watchmen outwitted the key by removing the boxes from the wall, mounting them on boards and punching them in sequence.

Hopkins then turned the boxes into informers on the lazy watchmen. He produced a mechanism so conceived that when a box was removed from the wall several springs would uncoil and send forth a surprise shower of tiny steel balls. No matter how hard a startled watchman tried, he could never put everything back on the wall just as it had been, and there he would be, stuck with the parts down.

After outwitting the watchmen, Hopkins devoted himself to outwitting vault burglars. He went to work on a sound-detection system that would activate an alarm if the system was placed inside a vault and the vault attacked. Hopkins, who was now living in New Jersey, carried on his labors at home nights and weekends.

"Dad rigged up my bedroom to look like something out of a crazy Rube Goldberg cartoon," says Hopkins' daughter, Mrs. Virginia Anderson, who is now assistant advertising manager of ADT. "I was only 6 years old at the time and dad's experiments with sound detection seemed like a fascinating game we were playing. There were microphones, batteries, wires, porcelain knobs, voltmeters and ammeters all around my bedroom. Dad would walk into another room after telling me to make little noises, like rustling papers or dropping small objects on the floor. Then, after I had done what he told me to do, he would come back into the room muttering to himself if the sound had not buzzed his test buzzer, or beaming if it had."

Hopkins was granted a patent on his sound-detection device, called phonetalarm, in 1925. Today, although ADT's basic thinking for the future is along electronic and ultrasonic lines, phonetalarm still remains a staple of the business.

One of Hopkins' brightest thoughts resulted in his invention of a burglar trap that ADT does not talk about, but which studious malefactors have found out about through perusal of public patent information and passed on by word of mouth. It is a device by which a watchman, making his rounds under the gun point of an intruder, can, while apparently sending in a routine signal, actually send in an alarm.

ADT officials are frequently touched by the faith placed in their devices by customers. Late one night in the summer of 1946 two co-owners of an auto-parts company in Columbus, Ohio, were driving past their business when they saw a man breaking in.

Drawing into the curb, the driver asked, "What'll we do?"

"Let's sit tight," said his partner, "and see how that ADT service we just put in works." In less than 2 minutes the police arrived and arrested the intruder.

A few years ago a bank in an eastern city decided to rip out the rear wall of its safety-deposit vault in the course of an expansion program. Since moving several hundred boxes to another location was impractical, the bank faced the problem of protecting the boxes during alterations. It decided that extra watchmen would constitute sufficient protection. But the insurance company that had underwritten the bank's burglary policy refused to continue the coverage under such conditions.

An engineer of the insurance company hired a locksmith to run tests of the time it would take to force open one of the boxes by methods a cracksman would use. He found that it took 15 minutes. So the engineer told the bankers that full coverage could continue if they installed a plywood wall laced with protective foil around the open end of the vault and connected the circuit to a central station. By the time a thief could crack any of the boxes, he explained, the police and ADT guards, alerted by the breaking of the sensitized plywood barrier, would have him surrounded. The suggestion was accepted, and the alterations were carried through.

ADT's illustrated catalog, which is passed out with caution, is believed to be required reading among the forcible-entry set. The catalog must be both fascinating and discouraging to a man who has dedicated himself to the illegal acquisition of other people's cash and property. It shows him how many of ADT's semisecret devices work; but at the same time points up the comparative futility of trying to beat them. If the student applying himself to the catalog craves statistics, he will encounter one that must beparticularly disheartening. ADT furnishes assorted burglar protection for almost $4 billion worth of property and annually the loss totals less than one one-hundredth of 1 percent.

Although most antiburglar devices are turned on at night, when protected premises are unoccupied, some of them are designed for daytime use, especially in banks. Some big-city police chiefs shudder to think what would happen if the banks were not electrically and electronically protected against daylight attack.

A desperado is playing against the percentages if he attempts a grab-and-run stickup in a bank alive with an assortment of robot detectives. He's in trouble if he pokes a pistol through the wicket and orders the teller to raise his hands, because when the teller obeys such a command he breaks an invisible beam running parallel to the cage and activates an alarm. A teller can send in an electric alarm simply by touching a footrail. Tellers' cash boxes, where bills of large denomination are kept, are equipped with secret alarm buttons. If a teller is ordered to open a box that is locked, he can touch off an alarm by inserting a key in the box in a certain way.

Back in 1936 ADT was summoned to cure a headache that Uncle Sam had developed worrying about the safety of all that gold bullion stored at Fort Knox. The company assigned a lean, taciturn engineer named Kenneth C. Edwards to supervise the project. The choice of Edwards is looked upon at ADT as a piece of inspired typecasting because Edwards, a native of Scotland, was equipped by instinct as well as technical know-how for the job of making sure that nobody pried any of that gold loose from its rightful owner.

Edwards, informed that price was no object, carefully pulled out all the stops at Fort Knox. He electrified the whole building housing the bullion vault so that hardly anybody could pass through a door or touch anything without the result showing up on a central control board. He installed phonetalarm on the door of the vault where the bullion is kept in cubicles. Then he electrified each cubicle.

Superimposed on Edwards' work are carefully thought-out top-secret plans to cope with any large-scale attack on the bullion depository. "All I can say," says Edwards, who sometimes wakes up in the middle of the night wondering how everything is down at Fort Knox, "is that if a gang ever tried to storm that place they'd be very sorry."

One day in May of 1941, Lindsay was giving a demonstration of his invisible ray for some Army brass in Washington. Michael F. Reilly, chief of the Secret Service detail at the White House, who was also present, thought that the ray should be installed at the residence of President Roosevelt at Hyde Park. With international tension increasing, Reilly feared that the President would become an increasingly desirable target for assassins.

At Hyde Park, Lindsay found thick woods on all sides of the President's home. It would have been possible for an assassin to sneak through the woods to a point within shooting distance of the residence before running much of a risk of being seen. Lindsay agreed with Reilly that Hyde Park needed the invisible ray. Reilly took the matter up with the President, and the President gave the nod to go ahead. Since it was Uncle Sam's job to protect the President and his family wherever they were, Uncle Sam was to pick up the tab.

ADT installed 3,500 feet of photoelectric perimeter protection at Hyde Park. Twenty-two double beams, ranging in length from less than 100 feet to almost 500 feet, were required. The lower beams were placed about a foot from the ground, to detect any intruder who might be crawling toward the house; and the upper beams were less than 5 feet above the ground, so that a walking intruder would be doubly detected. Each beam was 6 inches high and had to be blocked out 97 percent to activate an alarm.

While the installation was in progress, a problem arose about a dog—the President's scotty, Fala. Word came from the White House that Fala was to have the run of the Hyde Park estate, beams or no beams. So Fala was measured and the lower beams were placed sufficiently above the ground so that he could not activate an alarm, but sufficiently low to detect a crawling intruder.

Twice during the summer following this country's entry into the Second World War, Lindsay's beams detected intruders. Both were men and both were demented. Neither intruder was armed nor did either admit having designs on the life of the President.

After President Roosevelt died, the Hyde Park photoelectric equipment was considered for President Truman's place in Independence, Mo. But the terrain of Truman's property was not so advantageous to an assassin as that at Hyde Park so Roosevelt's robot detectives didn't go to Missouri.

When Truman left the Presidency and stored some of his historic papers in the Jackson County Courthouse in Kansas City, he asked ADT to install a system to protect them. ADT put in a burglar alarm. One night last June, Truman went into the courthouse to fuss with the papers and ran afoul of the alarm without realizing it. In a matter of minutes, the ex-President found himself surrounded with police.

The American District Telegraph Co. employs an average of 4,500 workers. Most of them operate in or out of the central station. Many travel in prowl cars. In some localities they have power of arrest.

The headquarters of the company is on lower Sixth Avenue in New York City, where ADT occupies ten floors of a 15-story building. More than 50 specialists work in a laboratory there, dreaming up new robots to catch criminals. Three floors are given over to the manufacture and assembly of the electric and electronic devices that the company sells. It also has a plant in St. Louis, where some of the robots come off the assembly line.

E. F. Gaston, the president of ADT, is a 63-year-old ex-electrician who held practically every kind of a job in the company before moving to the top spot. As a young man, he was greatly impressed by the play, R. U. R., which depicted a world wherein robots supplanted the human race. Gaston has never been able to get that play completely out of his mind. It has influenced his thinking ever since.

"During the past 20 years," says Gaston, "the trend in private-property protection has been away from human patrols. Businessmen like the economy and security of automatic safety devices. I always instruct our salesmen to point out to prospects that the robot releases the capable watchman for more essential work. Neither the electronic eye nor the Telapproach has ever been known to doze on the job, suffer a heart seizure or not be able to call for help if attacked."

Social-Security Law Is Greatly Improved

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RUSSELL V. MACK
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, the present Republican Congress did more to broaden, improve, and better the social-security law than any Congress ever has done since social security was first started in 1937.

The new Social Security Act, passed in August by Congress, give the protection and benefits of social security to 10,200,000 new and additional Americans. It gives coverage to 3,500,000 farm owners, to 2,500,000 farmworkers, to 50,000 commercial fishermen, and to 250,000 ministers, none of whom have had the protection of this law heretofore.

About the only groups now left uncovered by social security are lawyers, physicians, dentists, osteopaths, chiropractors, and veterinarians. Any of these will be covered by social-security protection if and when members of the group convince Congress that they want this protection.

BENEFITS INCREASED

The new social-security law increases the benefits of the 6 million people now drawing social-security pensions by $5 to $13.50 a month for single persons. It increases the benefits by $7.50 to $20.75 for married couples where the man and wife both are 65 years of age or older.

In some cases the increased benefits are larger due to changes in the formula on which the amount of an elder citizen's pension is based.

WORKER CAN EARN MORE

When I first came to Congress, 8 years ago, if a retired social-security worker earned more than $14.99 in any calendar month his pension was taken away from him for that month.

This I thought cruel and a great injustice. My first work in trying to reform the social-security law was in trying to get this measly limit of $14.99 a month on earnings increased.

Personally, I felt there should be no limit on earnings. I regarded social security as a form of insurance. The worker had paid for his policy through monthly withholding taxes. I thought he should get his pension check regardless of what his monthly earnings were. Also, I regard it as not only wrong but uneconomic to discourage a person, who wants to work, from working. The more goods produced the more goods there are to divide up among our people and the higher the general average of prosperity is. Men should not be penalized for working.

But I could not get my way with Congress that year. We could not get the limit on a pensioner's earnings eliminated entirely.

A number of us moved to have the limit raised from $14.99 a month to $50 and introduced bills to accomplish that purpose. Our proposal for raising the limit from $14.99 to $50 prevailed.

Next year, I put in a bill to raise the limit on earnings to $100 a month. The committee and Congress that year raised the limit on earnings to $75. While this was not as much as I had asked and thought it should be, it helped. It is always wise, I think, to take a half a loaf if you cannot get a whole one.

The 83d Congress, which just adjourned, raised the limit on earnings. It raised it to $1,200 a year.

Under this provision, a worker can earn $200 a month for 6 months and still draw his pension for all 12 months provided his annual earnings do not exceed $1,200. If his annual earnings do exceed $1,200 for the calendar year, the pensioner must forfeit 1 month of his pension for each $80 of earnings he has above $1,200.

By "earnings" is meant the money you receive in wages or salary on profits from your business. If you have income from rents, dividends or interest these do not count in making up the $1,200 limit on earnings.

HERE IS WHAT YOU GET

Here is how social-security benefits are figured:

Upon retirement at age 65 you are entitled to a pension equal to 55 percent of the first $110 of your average monthly earnings plus 20 percent of that part of your average monthly earnings that are above $110 a month.

Example: If your average monthly earnings were $200, you get $60.50—which is 55 percent of the first $110—plus $18, which is 20 percent of the remaining $90. Thus, on $200-a-month earnings, you receive $78.50 a month.

If your average earnings were $300, you receive $60.50 on the first $110 plus $38—which is 20 percent of the remaining $190—or a total pension of $98.50.

If and when your wife becomes 65, she is entitled to half of what you get. If you receive a pension of $78.50 she will be paid an additional $39.25. If you receive $98.50, she will receive $49.25, the two of you receiving a total monthly pension of $147.75.

When an insured person dies, his widow is entitled to receive, starting at age 65, three-quarters of the pension the insured received. If he received $100 a month, she will get for the rest of her life or until she remarries, a pension of $75 a month.

The system also provides a small amount of death benefits of $90 to $255 to cover funeral expenses. This must be applied for by the heirs in order to obtain it.

WHAT FARMERS MUST PAY

The new law treats farmers as self-employed people, not employees. When an employee is covered by social security, his withholding tax is 4 percent of his income. Half of this tax is paid by the employee and half by the employer.

In the case of farmers and all self-employed persons the tax rate is 3 percent instead of 4 percent and the full 3 percent is paid by the self-employed person.

Thus, if your annual income as a farmer is $2,000, your 3-percent withholding tax for that year will be $60; if your income is $3,000 your tax will be $90, and if your income is $4,200 your tax will be $124 a year.

A farmer's social-security tax does not become due until he pays his income tax. In short, his first withhholding tax for social security will not be due and payable until April 1, 1956. This tax will be on your income for the year 1955.

FARMER PROTECTION

Two years ago when a social-security bill was under consideration the Democrats refused to provide social-security coverage and protection. Mr. Doughton, the chairman of the committee, said there was no indication that farmers wanted coverage.

I rather felt farmers did want social-security coverage. I prepared a poll of public opinion and sent it to the 99 granges in my district. I asked the grange officers to discuss the matter with their farmers and report back to me how their farmers felt about social-security coverage. More than 90 percent of the answers received from farm groups were in favor of social-security coverage for the farmer.

Some of us Congressmen kept working for farmer's social-security coverage. Now the farmer has it.

MINISTERS AND FISHERMEN

The Republican 80th Congress and the Democratic 81st and 82d Congresses refused to provide social-security protection for ministers and for fishermen and shellfish bed workers. Members of these former Congresses felt ministers and fishermen did not want this protection.

I talked to many fishermen in my area. I talked to ministers about social security. Most of them said they wanted it.

I sent a poll to ministers and asked their opinion. In almost 150 replies from ministers all but 6 said they thought ministers should be covered by social security. I was happy to work to have the ministers obtain the protection of this law.

LIKE INSURANCE

Social security is something like insurance, during the earning years of your youth you pay something into an insurance fund every payday. Then, when you are 65, you are entitled to draw monthly pension benefits, that is social security.

This is not charity. You pay for your own old-age protection. You get your pension as a matter of right as something you bought and paid for.

Much of the credit for the development of a sound Federal social security law belongs not to us politicians but to the members of the Fraternal Order of Eagles, and sisters of their auxiliaries. It was the Eagles who sponsored the first old-age pension laws. Colorado, in 1933, was the first State to adopt an old-age system and Washington, also in 1933, the second State to adopt such a law. I am proud that my own aerie in Hoquiam, Wash., and my neighboring aerie in Aberdeen, supplied the leaders in this fight for the first old-age pension laws in our State.

I have been happy during my 8 years in Congress to work for a sound and enduring system of social security. I am glad that the 83d Republican Congress has enacted the best social-security law ever enacted.

This does not mean that the new law is perfect. It is not. It still needs improvements to eliminate remaining injustices and inequalities. These, in time, will come.

The new law, however, is a very good one. Most Americans, I think, will be happy with it.

Capitol Cloakroom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAM RAYBURN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, as a part of my remarks, I include herewith a verbatim report of the Columbia Broadcasting System public-affairs program Capitol Cloakroom:

Mr. BANCROFT. Representative RAYBURN, what are the accomplishments of the 83d Congress?

Mr. SHADEL. Mr. RAYBURN, will you Democrats win the election this year?

Mr. COSTELLO. Do you agree with President Eisenhower that prosperity is here to stay?

(Pause.)

Mr. BANCROFT. Representative RAYBURN, welcome to Capitol Cloakroom. A veteran of 41 years in Congress, you have been here longer than any other man and for a total of more than 10 years you were Speaker of the House, the longest time in history one man has held that post, but now with your party in the minority in the House, you are the Democratic floor leader. So let's get your views on this session. What do you think are the accomplishments of the 83d Congress?

Mr. RAYBURN. You know, Mr. Bancroft, in 1952 the Republicans went all over the country claiming that nearly everything was wrong. They were going to come into power and they would have a dynamic domestic program, they would have a dynamic foreign program. They were going to uproot many, many things that we had done in the last 20 years.

But I want to say this in the beginning: I don't know of any law, substantive law, that we passed during 20 years that anybody in this 83d Republican Congress has seriously talked about or proposed to repeal or modify to any great extent.

A great many of these things the Republicans in the House of Representatives and the Senate denounced as socialistic—public housing, social security, rural electrification, and all those things—but they haven't done anything about it because they found out when they came in that the people were for these programs and wanted them to be carried on.

As far as the accomplishments of this Congress is concerned, I want to say this: At the close of the first session of the 83d Congress, I said if I were just a Democrat, I would be laughing all over, but as an American, I was not, because they had failed to carry out their campaign promises, they had failed to make the country better. They got an uneasy truce in Korea, which I think could have been gotten by President Truman and Mr. Acheson months before that, but I don't think they would have accepted that kind of an uneasy truce.

In other words, the two things that they passed in the first session of the 83d Congress that were positive laws— and only two—one was to restore the tidelands to the States, and the other was to admit 214,000 displaced or refugee people.

Mr. BANCROFT. You were in favor of both of those measures, were you not, Mr. RAYBURN?

Mr. RAYBURN. That is correct.

All the other legislation, legislation measures except the appropriation bills which have to be passed every session of Congress, were renewals of these laws which they had denounced when we passed them.

That is about the record of the first session of the 83d Congress.

Coming down to this session—and we can go into the specifics if you want to by asking me some more questions—they have been renewing expiring New Deal and Fair Deal laws. All this session they passed appropriation bills, but only three positive pieces of legislation have passed this Congress.

Mr. BANCROFT. What were they?

Mr. RAYBURN. One was the St. Lawrence seaway proposition. The other was to revise the tax structure and the other was, after much Democratic urging in the House and in the Senate, they passed an anti-Communist bill. Those are the three pieces of positive legislation of a general nature that this second session of the 83d Congress has passed, and that makes 5 positive laws that this Republican administration—I mean of any consequence—that they have passed in 2 sessions of the 83d Congress.

Mr. BANCROFT. What about the Atomic Energy Act that was debated so long over there in the Senate?

Mr. RAYBURN. That had been in the works for a long time and we had a law on that already. They were simply revising it and setting it up.

Mr. COSTELLO. You had talked about the specific accomplishments, the five substantive bills that have been passed. Would you like to look at the other side of the picture? As a politician you are naturally going to go out and tell the voters that they haven't done certain things rather than what they have. What do you think the Republicans have failed to do?

Mr. RAYBURN. They promised sound, hard dollars. They put it into effect for a while, and the effect it had was to make dollars scarcer and harder to get. Now they have softened up that policy.

You know the promises they made about the Truman-Acheson foreign policy, that they were going to rip up that by the roots, and so forth and so forth. The only change I know of that they have made in the Truman-Acheson foreign policy is to administer it in a sorrier fashion and in such a way that we have fewer friends in the world, I am sad to say, than we have ever had in the history of the United States of America.

They went out and told the people that they were going to be for 90 percent of parity on the farm thing. They were going to hold up the price of farm products. Now they haven't done that, but President Eisenhower wanted a sliding scale from 90 to 75. They finally determined on a sliding scale of from 90 to 82½. I think everybody that has ever dealt with a thing like that knows that in a matter like that when you set a maximum and a minimum, the minimum immediately becomes the maximum.

The farmers of this country, their income is already down about 20 percent, and in some things much more than that. Take cattle, for instance. I sold my calves in 1951 for $150 apiece. In 1953 I sold them for less than $50 apiece. I will be lucky when I get home if I got $50 apiece for my calves.

I think this maximum of 82½—and the President got only half of what he wanted, he wanted 90 to 95 and got 82½, and he proclaimed that as a great victory because he got a sliding scale—I think that slide down to 82½ percent, and the farmer's income will be reduced 7½ percent.

Mr. Bancroft. Could you agree with the President that the record of the Congress will be the chief issue in the coming elections this fall?

Mr. Rayburn. We hope it is. We are going to try to hold them right to that. They cannot say anything now about 20 years of treason because we were the ones who led the fight to have an effective anti-Communist bill in the United States.

Mr. Shadel. In many of these bills that you mentioned there were many Democrats voting for them. Is it a case of the Democrats going along because there was no alternative or nothing better proposed?

Mr. Rayburn. Here is what I said, Mr. Shadel. I have said it on the floor of the House twice. We were not going to follow the gruesome example set by the Republicans of hating a President just because he was a member of another party. I have said several times we were not going to vote against Eisenhower's proposals just because he was a Republican President. We were not going to follow their example of hating. We don't operate that way. I think Mr. Eisenhower is a good man. That doesn't say he is making the greatest President the country ever had. I don't indulge in personalities. I wouldn't talk about any President of the United States as some of the Republicans talked about Roosevelt and Truman. I wouldn't do it. I think it is a terrible thing.

Any man who is President of the United States is my President. I want him to make a good President because I want the country to be prosperous and happy and at peace.

Mr. Shadel. Are you saying that there is a certain percentage of good in the Republican legislation but the percentage is not high enough?

Mr. Rayburn. That is exactly right.

I will tell you another thing about that, too.

President Eisenhower recommended the extension of many of the so-called New Deal and Fair Deal measures. Take foreign aid for instance. He said we had to have it in order to strengthen these countries so, when the time came when we needed allies in the world, they would be on their feet. They criticized the Marshall plan. I think the Marshall plan saved Western Europe from the bosom of communism.

He advocated the extension of foreign aid. When the authorization bill was up in the first session of the 83d Congress, 159 Democrats voted to give him what he wanted and 119 Republicans voted to give him what he wanted, and 82 Republicans voted against giving him anything.

This time I think there weren't quite as many on the floor when they passed the appropriations bill, but it got 141 Democratic votes, 116 Republican votes and 80 Republicans voted against giving him anything again.

You come to social security. Of course, that was denounced as one of those socialistic dreams of the Roosevelt administration. But they come along and they espouse it now. It is theirs. But more Democrats voted for the President's recommendations on that than did Republicans.

And I could name many measures along those lines.

Reciprocal trade, for instance; that was inaugurated, it was the Cordell Hull policy in the Roosevelt administration. I think everybody knows that we cannot live under the provisions of the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act because we must, as McKinley said at one time, we cannot sell where we do not buy. If we are to erect tariff barriers against the surplus of other countries, they will not have the dollars to buy our surplus. Since we have become the greatest surplus producing country in the world, we must trade more and more.

So on reciprocal trade, more Democrats voted for the extension. The President asked for 3 years. We were all for 3 years. We didn't get a chance to vote on 3 years in 1953. We got a chance to vote on the extension for 1 year. This year when the President advocated the 3 year extension, the Republicans gave him 1 year.

Take the Randall Commission setup. I think it was a grand commission and did a wonderful job and made far-reaching and splendid recommendations, but the Randall Commission's report hasn't been acted on by either House of the Congress.

Mr. Shadel. Aside from the farm legislation recommended by the President, would you say, then, that you are not too unhappy over his recommendations even though there is Republican opposition? In other words, should Mr. Eisenhower have run on the Democratic ticket in 1952?

Mr. Rayburn. I think he would have been a much happier man if he had run on the Democratic ticket and been elected and had a Democratic Senate and House. I think that is true.

Mr. Shadel. If the Republicans endorse the administration's record for these 2 years, that is, in this fall campaign, there is going to be an awful lot of uniformity and a lot of agreement, is there not?

Mr. Rayburn. That is right. As far as the extension of these laws that we passed that we have been for all the time.

Mr. Bancroft. I would like to ask you this, Mr. Rayburn. You say you hope the record of this Congress will be the issue on which the campaigns will be fought out.

Mr. Rayburn. That is right.

Mr. Bancroft. What about the 2 issues, 1 of Communists and internal Communist problems, and the other of the so-called McCarthyism? Do you think those will be major issues in the campaign?

Mr. Rayburn. I don't see how they can, because, as I say, the Democrats proposed—and the proposal in the Senate was made by a Democratic Senator—that this thing be strengthened, and then the Democrats in the House went along and concurred in the Senate amendment which was stronger than the House bill.

Mr. Bancroft. You mean the bill to outlaw the Communist Party?

Mr. Rayburn. The bill to outlaw the Communist Party, yes. I think that is a worn-out and frazzled issue myself.

Out in a district where a man is running for Congress, or the House, the people there know that fellow. I know an instance I can cite right now. A man had been a member of a State legislature. He started to run against the sitting member for the nomination. They sent down to the capital of the State and tried to prove that he had been associating with some Communists who were around the legislature. That made the people who knew that fellow so mad that they went out and beat the other fellow.

So I think the people of the district know whether their Congressman or candidate for Congress is a subversive or whether he is an honest, good straightforward American, and I don't think they are going to get away with that old stuff any more.

Mr. Shadel. Aside from your own personal feelings, we asked you at the outset whether the Democrats in your opinion would win the election this fall, have you any indications from the grassroots or in your mail or any other indications that would make you Speaker next year?

Mr. Rayburn. I have refused to answer that question. I will do it here. I have refused to answer it because somebody would say Rayburn is making a self-serving declaration, he wants to be Speaker again. That is not the reason why I want the Democrats to win the House. As Mr. Bancroft said, I have served as Speaker longer than any other man in the history of the United States, and I think that probably will be a record for another 162 years. But we had three elections last fall, in the fall of 1953, all of them with strong Republican districts previously. Two of those districts went for the Democratic candidate for Congress. I think if we had an election in 1953, we would have carried the House by 30 to 50 votes. I don't see anything that has improved their situation.

Mr. Bancroft. Mr. Rayburn, as of course you know, the Eisenhower ticket and the Republicans carried some Southern States and southern districts. Do you think those Southern States that Eisenhower carried in 1952 are now going to be back in the Democratic fold?

Mr. Rayburn. At a meeting out in Kansas City the other day there was a pretty well-to-do fellow from a State in the South. They came up and started to talk about raising some money. He said, "We are the fellows, we Democrats who voted for Eisenhower in 1952, we are the ones who should put up the money because that ought to be our card of admission to the party. We are glad to get back, and we ought to contribute to get back in good standing."

Mr. Bancroft. So you think the South is coming back to the Democratic homeland?

Mr. Rayburn. Yes, sir.

You take the State of Texas. Eisenhower was a native down there. He was born in my district. As I told him, I made some speeches last fall in my State. I didn't say anything very bad about him. I did say that he was born in Dennison, Tex., and that he was a good baby, but he went off to Kansas and after he was 60 years old, he decided he was a Republican.

Well, he got a good laugh out of that. But they were running Mr. Eisenhower down there as a native Texan, and they never put on a billboard that was put up for Mr. Eisenhower in the State that he was a Republican candidate for office. Vote for a native Texan. Get our tidelands back.

Mr. Bancroft. Such issues as your Governor Shivers and the Senator, Price Daniel, supported—they supported him in Texas.

Mr. Rayburn. They did.

Mr. Bancroft. They were running as Democrats, were they not?

Mr. Rayburn. They were.

Mr. Shadel. Mr. Rayburn, you mentioned some of the special elections last year. 1953 conditions, probably economic conditions had something to do with that. Isn't there supposed to be a term? President Eisenhower told us we were back on an even keel and that prosperity is here to stay. Aren't conditions different now?

Mr. Rayburn. United States Steel is down to 62 the last time I looked at it. So that doesn't look like it is out. Three and a half million people are unemployed.

Talk about a recession or a depression. A man who has had a job and loses it is in a depression.

They don't talk about the hundreds of thousands of people who have been working 40 hours a week and have been reduced to 35, 30, and some to 25, without any overtime.

That man or woman is in a recession, whether he or she is in a depression or not.

I think the fall campaign will go on economic conditions a good deal. I don't think it is good enough. The farmer isn't as prosperous as he has been. I know that labor is not in as good shape as it has been. The small-business man is not taking things off his shelf as he did because people do not have the buying power.

The only interest I have in any property in the world is in land, pasture land and farmland. What made this country so prosperous, with 62½ million people employed, was that we gave the twenty-eight or thirty million people on the farms of this country a price for their product, made them a buying power, and when you put those 30 million people where they have a buying power, they put everybody in the country to work.

Mr. Shadel. What will you do with the surplus if you continue to pay the high Government price support?

Mr. Rayburn. I think it will be absorbed some time. I think it is all right to have some wheat and corn on hand, and maybe some beef and hogs.

Mr. Shadel. You have to find storage for them.

Mr. Rayburn. Yes, sir; we have a lot of storage, you know. That is one thing that helped Mr. Truman to get elected in 1948. The Republican 80th Congress refused to build storage for the grain. They had to pile it on the ground or feed it to the hogs or get whatever they could get for it.

Mr. Costello. The President went to Illinois recently and made a speech and ridiculed the prophets of gloom and doom. I suppose he meant some of the Democratic Members of Congress. Do you feel the Democrats have an answer for that if he uses that as a principal theme in this fall campaign?

Mr. Rayburn. Of course. As I said last year, they talked about the Democrats trying to talk the country into a depression. Nobody can talk a country into a depression. It was proven in Mr. Hoover's day when he and Mr. Mellon said—at a time when we were in the worst slump we have ever been in—that prosperity is just around the corner, that nobody can talk us out of a depression either. That is nonsensical. I don't mean that your question is nonsensical. Such arguments are utterly nonsensical to me.

Mr. Bancroft. You were first elected to the House when Woodrow Wilson was elected President in 1912, and you came here in 1913.

Mr. Rayburn. That is right.

Mr. Bancroft. Over that long span of time, what do you think were the principal problems that Congress has had and what were the chief changes that have taken place in our country in that long length of 41 years?

Mr. Rayburn. At that time we were still acting like a new country and we were new, and we are still new. When you look the world over and how long civilization has been coming down to us, we are still new.

I think that Woodrow Wilson was one of the greatest intellects that ever occupied the White House. He was a great scholar and a great statesman. We were living then under the highest tariff laws that this country had ever seen. We were losing trade and commerce all over the world. The Underwood-Simmons Tariff Act came in then and things started. We passed the Clayton Antitrust Act. We passed the Federal Trade Commission Act. I happened to be a member of the subcommittee that wrote that act. We started out to act like we thought there were a lot of millions people in this country, not just a few. I think the League of Nations which Woodrow Wilson brought from Paris in 1919 was the only chance for bringing about permanent peace. When the treaty was spurned by the United States Senate, he cried out almost in anguish and said, if the United States of America doesn't join the other peace-loving peoples of the world and bring about a league for peace to try to maintain the peace of the world, this earth will be shaken by a greater and more destructive war in a quarter of a century than it has ever known. We spurned the treaty. We did not join. It folded up. It died. Twenty-five years later, almost to the day, we had this beginning of World War No. 2.

Mr. Bancroft. Do you think President Wilson was prophetic?

Mr. Rayburn. Very, yes, sir.

Mr. Bancroft. What do you regard as the major changes that have taken place in our country and our laws in that time?

Mr. Rayburn. I might be a little repetitious then.

We came into power in 1933. I think that was during the greatest depression this country' had ever seen. Fourteen million people were unemployed.

We had 133 million people in the United States. That doesn't look big. But suppose the breadwinner of the family had a wife and one child. That made 42 million Americans that didn't have any buying power.

There were 33 million people on the farms of our country. Not so many now. That makes 75 million. They were selling the product of their toil at a price so far below the cost of production that their buying power had vanished or been reduced to the very banishing point.

So you had 75 million Americans that had no buying power at all or practically none; 5,750 banks and trust companies closed their doors in those tragic years. Factories closed. Businesses closed. Bankruptcy came upon the whole country. We came into power and we started to do something about it.

Mr. Bancroft. You mean the Democratic Party when you say "we"?

Mr. Rayburn. The Democratic Party. They said we were spending the country into bankruptcy then. It happened not to be. People went to work. We raised the price of farm products. They had buying power. Everybody started to work. The banks were closed. We opened them. When we opened them everybody thought they were safe, and instead of rushing to the banks to take their money out, the first week the banks were open more than $800 million was taken out of people's drawers and socks and put back in the banks because they had faith and confidence.

We have had practically no bank failures since the middle thirties. Business has been very prosperous.

It is a funny thing. I have often said this about some of our people down in the State of Texas. When we came in they were selling cotton at 4½ cents a pound. My brother and I sold 1,000 bushels of oats for $90. That is 9 cents a bushel. Corn was 15 cents a bushel. Wheat 28 cents a bushel. Oil was selling for 28 cents a barrel. But as these things started up and they got a little income and had to pay a little taxes, some of them got awfully mad. The strange paradox to me in human nature is that the people who were the worst broke when we came into power and recovered the fastest and got the richest were the ones who hated us the most. I have said that a hundred times in my State and in other States.

Mr. Shadel. The Democrats have been charged with some rather free spending. This Republican Congress, so-called, has effected some economies or at least the spending has not been as great. It seems to me it is about 5 billion less this year for this fiscal year. Do you think the Democrats would have accomplished the same thing in these times?

Mr. Rayburn. I don't know. There is one thing we wouldn't have done, in my opinion, and that was to reduce our defense spending to what I think is a dangerous low. I think that is one thing the American people and I know, that we ought to spend all that is necessary to make ourselves strong enough so we can resist an aggressor here and abroad.

Mr. Costello. So you think, although they raised the spending for the Air Force, they should have increased it more for the ground forces, the Army?

Mr. Rayburn. The whole thing—yes. We were criticized. They turned down 43 wings that was advocated in the last Democratic administration. They said they would cut it down as low as 23. Now they are up to 37. Now they know they needed more than they thought they did, and they went up to that extent.

I took the floor as majority leader in 1938, 1939, and 1940, and the President of the United States, Mr. Roosevelt, recommended it. I said we'd better make ourselves strong so people would fear to attack us. I don't think we would have been attacked at Pearl Harbor if we had been as strong as that. They didn't want to spend the money. But by not being strong, we were attacked.

Do you know how much it cost us to get out of that war? More than four hundred billion. In addition to that we lost thousands and thousands of lives.

So in a world like we are living in—and I think it is the most dangerous world I have known the United States to live in—I think we must let the world know that we are strong enough to resist any attack upon us—land, sea, or air.

Mr. Bancroft. I am afraid that is all the time we have.

Thank you very much, Mr. Rayburn.

Where the Campaign Funds Come From

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE L. HAYS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include an article from Independent Editorial Services, Ltd., of August 11, 1954.

Inasmuch as some of the depletion allowance money was used in my district 2 years ago to attempt to defeat me, and since I anticipate that it will be used again, I think that the average citizen, who does not get this favored treatment, might be interested in this article.

The depletion allowance was originally intended to help the small producer, such as we have in eastern Ohio, to continue his operations. Apparently the law will have to be revised to prevent this abuse of power by Texas oil millionaires.

DEPLETION ALLOWANCE

The direct trend in this country's voting is liberal. The score this year is Sparkman, in Alabama; W. Scott Kerr, in North Carolina; the contender Ralph W. Yarborough, coupled with the slaughter of two far-right Congressmen, in Texas; and Kefauver, in Tennessee. The loosely used term "oil money"—meaning the political contributions from the oil billionaires of Texas who have been using their funds to elect their friends and defeat their enemies—has been applied in commentary in these contests.

That oil money is possible in these days of tax oppression by the act of Congress providing for the 27½-percent depletion allowance. That allowance builds up these vast fortunes, as expenses for new enterprises come off what is left. No business or salaried individual gets such an advantage. And not since the robber barons of the 1900's has a single group of big money people been exerting such power in this country. The depletion allowance has been protected as a tax domain by the Representatives and Senators from the oil States as a good thing to encourage the discovery and production of oil.

It has been a good thing, but only for a few people. Those people, as is customary with men afflicted with the love of money, are trying desperately to protect their flowing income from depletion. They have gotten into the political field through lavish contributions. This has not worked, and the reaction is setting in. The next Congress, if the liberal trend continues, will be far to the left of the present one. It is inevitable that a New Look at the depletion allowance will be in order. And every bitter taxpayer in the land will be in favor of making the depletion bonanza fit into the general tax picture.

The men who have held the line for the depletion allowance are the Southern Democrats. Many of them have watched this bonus money go to renegades in their own party. Will they still continue to hold the line? It is doubtful.

The oil industry nationwide will probably mobilize to fight any proposed changes. The present split in the industry between the small domestic producers and the big international companies will probably be healed. Everybody down to the filling-station man will probably be indoctrinated to keep the depletion allowance as the great incentive to progress in the business. But the tax-conscious public that pays taxes at the filling stations and sees the Texas zillionaires getting tax benefits, is not likely to consider the present arrangement fair.

The drive against the depletion allowance is not by any means unified as yet, mainly because there has been little leadership on the subject in Congress. Such leadership will be present and accounted for if the liberal trend continues, and if the Texas contributors still pour their money down the drain. The publicity which H. L. Hunt and the others have been getting is no help to their cause.

Millions of harassed and tax-gouged citizens listen to the high-sounding platitudes about saving the world with tax dollars, and then see how Hunt has an income of $160,000 a day after taxes. Many of these depletion boys pay no taxes at all.

This is the way it works. The tycoon takes out his 27½ percent. Then he deducts the intangibles from more drilling, which can go to 50 percent of the remainder. Then, he takes out business expenses. He can wind up paying a tax of from 2 to 5 percent—and does.

This compared to the national average is nothing.

The Engineer's Responsibilities Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD the commencement address given by J. T. Ryan, Jr., at Indiana Technical College, Fort Wayne, Ind., on May 23, 1954.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ENGINEER'S RESPONSIBILITIES TODAY

(Address by J. T. Ryan, Jr., at Indiana Technical College, Fort Wayne, Ind., May 23, 1954)

In discussing the responsibilities of engineers today, the three basic points to be covered are the engineer's responsibility to his profession, his responsibility to the community, and his responsibility to himself.

When we talk about the responsibility of the engineer to his profession, the first consideration has to be his basic competence. The engineer has to have knowledge, and he has to apply it soundly and carefully. That prerequisite applies with equal truth to any profession. All of you have had experience with other professions and you know that it is not really difficult, after a while, to distinguish the genuinely competent people from those who approach their problems in a sort of pedestrian manner.

There is a great deal of discussion today about the shortage of engineers. Very often it is a shortage not only in quantity, but in quality as well. To me, at least, that is the most disturbing aspect. It is possible to make up for a quantitative shortage, but there never seems to be any oversupply of thoroughly qualified engineering talent.

Studies have been made as to just what functions an engineer performs in industry. Many of these studies have disclosed that an astoundingly high percentage of the engineer's time is spent on nonengineering duties. I refer to the extra chores an engineer does in the course of his professional work.

Steps have been taken in many industries to provide assistance to the engineer by giving him people with semitechnical or nontechnical training who can take over some of his nonengineering functions. Even with these efforts, though, thoroughly competent engineers today are not equal in number to the demand.

I have been greatly impressed at the splendid contribution your institution, the Indiana Technical College, is making toward a solution of this problem by providing a technical education to students many of whom already have a sound foundation in practical experience. Such a combination of engineering education and sound practical experience is difficult to duplicate, and has been productive of excellent engineering ability.

Much can be done to ease the shortage of engineers by providing opportunities for nonengineers now in industry to receive the technical training for an engineering degree. It is in that field that your institution has done and can continue to do a great amount of good.

In the work of our company, with its great emphasis on development and research, we find that, contrary to what most people believe, there really is a very high degree of creative thinking required in sound engineering practice. An engineer, if he is a good engineer, must always be a creative thinker; and this ability to be creative, to bring new ideas and concepts into being, to produce new methods, new designs, new formulas, is the very basis of our engineering progress.

The successful development of a new electronic computer, a radar circuit, or a new manufacturing process requires creative engineering thought of the highest order. It is for this purpose that you have mastered the fundamentals of your profession. You should not be satisfied in your careers merely to find a position around the average. Our Nation needs competence, needs creative thought if its technical progress is to continue, and it is to you that the Nation will look to fulfill that need.

The second responsibility of the engineer is to his community. After all, a man's professional life is but one of many sides of his existence. An engineer is usually a social being living in a community of other social beings. I have not met any hermits who have been successful engineers. Therefore the engineer must bear a responsibility to the community.

We hear a great deal these days about the rights of the citizen, which is due and proper. We do not, however, hear nearly so much about the duties of a citizen.

For a number of years I have visited a small New England town where they still use the town-meeting system. Under this system, all decisions relative to the town's government are made by majority vote of the citizens of voting age assembled in a meeting. The elected board of selectmen, or the council, or whatever they call it, has no power except that of carrying out the dictates of the citizens as expressed by vote in the town meeting.

In a situation like that every person has a very real sense of duty and obligation to the community.

Now all of us are realistic enough to understand that in a larger town we could not today go back to such a system. I have a feeling though, that even in a city the size of Fort Wayne or Pittsburgh it may not be impossible to approach this individual participation idea in a small measure. Even in the large metropolitan centers there are in-individual communities recognized within the legal framework of the city. Local areas have civic clubs, church groups, political associations, athletic groups, playgrounds, and many similar institutions. Great good can be accomplished by these local groups and I have them in mind in suggesting individual participation.

I am not necessarily making a plea for you to go out and campaign for public office or even to participate in any political sense, although I personally wish that more engineers would consider political activities, because I think engineers can bring to the political area a new viewpoint, one that is sadly needed in many respects.

I am speaking of the great many worthwhile organizations, the Boy Scouts, hospital service groups, community chests, the Red Cross, church groups, and all other related community acivities. Particularly with our growing population of children coming of age, we have need for more leaders in work of this kind in community development. I believe the engineer can make a very great contribution to these civic endeavors. He brings to social and community affairs a clarity of thought, a respect for proven facts, a habit of logical analysis, and, in all, a viewpoint that is essential for sound development.

When I talk of the engineer's responsibility to his community, I am not restricting my remarks to the American community. I see that there are in this audience a few students from other lands. I appreciate your being here. I know that you will best benefit yourselves and your countries—and us, as well—by exchanging your own experience with the experience you have found here in the United States. And when you go back I hope you will take with you not just the technological know-how that you have acquired here, but also the intangible thing that we call the American spirit.

Finally, I would like to talk about the engineer's third responsibility, his responsibility to himself, as an individual. I do not necessarily put this last. Possibly it should come first. It is important to me because of the fact that in our business we are concerned very basically with the individual.

We design and manufacture equipment which is intended for the most part to protect human life. In most instances that equipment has to be worn by, or used very directly by, an individual. Therefore, we have to give great consideration to the individual's needs.

As an individual, the engineer has a responsibility to himself. After all, he is a citizen. He has a family life. He has some leisure time. He has many interests and activities.

It is fundamental, to my way of thinking, that the engineer must never become so imbued with the technological spirit that he gives technology precedence over all other forms of human activity and subordinates all other aspects of life to the essentially materialistic operations of pure technology.

There are today in industry many engineers who are being promoted to positions of administrative responsibility, where they must deal with problems of a very distinctly nonengineering nature—with public relations, with the Government, with community affairs. To be truly successful, the engineer must acquire a broad understanding of many subjects to which he would not be exposed in a strictly technical course of study.

Man was not created to become a name on a payroll card or a number on a social-security form. Man is an individual and knows many things not encompassed within the framework of a science or technology. Man has art and poetry and religion. He is a unique personality and one worthy of our respect.

We need among engineers today those who not only can appreciate the complexities of our science and engineering, but who also recognize the human values that can be enriched by the wise and thoughtful application of the great engineering advances of our time.

My plea to you gentlemen is that you continue to enlarge your understanding, so that you may truly represent the great profession of which you are members.

Chun Quon Yee Hop: Chinese Community Mourns Loss of Venerable Civic Leader

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELIZABETH P. FARRINGTON

DELEGATE FROM HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mrs. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an article appearing in the August 12 edition of the Chinese World, of San Francisco, telling of the death of Chun Quon Yee Hop, of Honolulu.

Mr. C. Q. Yee Hop, as he was known to all residents of Hawaii, had a very remarkable career and we of Hawaii are very proud of him.

The article follows:

CHUN QUON YEE HOP DIES IN HONOLULU—CHINESE COMMUNITY MOURNS LOSS OF VENERABLE CIVIC LEADER

HONOLULU, August 11.—Chun Quon Yee Hop, millionaire businessman and industrialist, who came to the United States from China 70 years ago with less than a dollar in his pocket, died at his home here today at the age of 87.

Chun, who preferred being known as C. Q. Yee Hop, amassed a fortune estimated at more than $4 million and was one of the biggest business property owners in Hawaii.

In addition to real estate, a brewery, food market, and other corporate interests here, he owned an import-export firm in Hong Kong and was principal owner of the New China Daily Press in Honolulu and the bilingual newspaper Chinese World in San Francisco.

Chun was a member of the Chinese Democratic Constitutionalist Party dedicated to the ultimate liberation of China by peaceful means, and was a delegate to the first National Chinese Assembly at Nanking in 1946, where the constitution for democratic China was drawn.

He became a naturalized citizen of the United States 4 years ago.

Funeral rites will be held August 22 at Nuuanu Memorial Cemetery.

BORN IN CHINA

C. Q. Yee Hop was born in 1867 in Chungshan district, Kwangtung province in a farmer's family. His ancestors made their homes in South China early in the 13th century. He grew up in the village and took up business in his youth.

At the age of 18, an uncle returned from America and gave a glowing account of the wonderful opportunities to be found in the United States and Hawaii. Next year he set out for Hong Kong where he said good-by to his father and sailed across the Pacific. After 27 days at sea, he arrived in San Francisco with 90 cents Hong Kong currency in his pocket. After 3 weeks of work near San Francisco, he earned enough for his passage to the Hawaiian Islands.

The year 1887 found him opening a meat market in Honolulu. For 12 years, he managed his business until 1900 when fire burnt down his shop.

In 1902 he opened the Yee Hop company together with 7 other partners. After finding another shop with the same name, they prefixed "C. Q." to their title. After 5 years, the firm C. Q. Yee Hop had to find new premises at King Street for their expanding business.

By 1912 the original capital of $8,000 had grown to $32,000. More partners were admitted and in 1920, the business was incorporated as a limited company, and more capital was added to the enterprise.

SUCCESS STORY

In 1930, Mr. Chun began branching out into other fields. Real estate, insurance, safe deposit boxes, brewery, food market, publishing, lumbering, manufacturing, agricultural, and numerous other financial, commercial and industrial interests were added. To go through the list of his many interests would take quite some time. In "C. Q." we find a success story quite fitting with the American tradition of pioneer enterprise and hard work up the ladder.

The late Mr. Chun did not confine his activities to business interests. He contributed to educational institutions, publishing enterprises, and other philanthropic work.

His zeal for democratic ideals is seen in the fact that he was among the first supporters of Liang Chi-chao in 1900 when the latter arrived in Honolulu with his ideals of constitutional rule for China.

He has been the president of both the New China Daily Press in Honolulu and the Chinese World in San Francisco, both newspapers strongly favoring a democratic constitutional government for republican China.

Congressman Mel Price, of Illinois, Puts His Finger on Some Political Irony

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE L. HAYS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article by Mr. Arthur Krock in the New York Times relative to the fine speech made by my good friend and able colleague from Illinois, the Honorable MEL PRICE.

Congressman PRICE deserves all of the good things said about him in this article. I was on the floor on August 19 when he made the speech and know that he did an outstanding job.

The article follows:

In the last hours of the 83d Congress the House was treated to an effective display of the art of satire, a rare talent in the political trade. The demonstrator was Representative MELVIN PRICE, of Illinois, and other Democrats promptly caught the idea.

Congress, as the material in the Appendix of the RECORD establishes every day during the sessions, is a forum in which constant attempts are made at wit and humor. But, as the Appendix even more thoroughly establishes, very few of the orators are imbued with the essential afflatus. The comment has even been made by close readers of the RECORD that the essays at wit and humor by Congressmen are less successful than the poesy with which they often adorn the publication, sometimes the products of their own muses.

Whether or not this evaluation is as untrue as it is unkind, the fact remains that congressional equipment for the production of satire—particularly the dead-pan kind—is so scarce that those who have possessed it are among the immortals. Proctor Knott's speech about Duluth, "the zenith city of the unsalted seas," is an eternal classic of Capitol oratory. Worthy of comparison was Millard E. Tydings' burlesque about "the canals of Vermont" in ridiculing an appropriation which carried the implication that the Green Mountain State is a replica of Holland. And the lethal use which the late Senators Isidor Raynor of Maryland and Pat Harrison of Mississippi could make of sarcasm is still recalled by contemporaries.

Representative PRICE's autobiography in the Congressional Directory includes several entries which may explain the gift he revealed. He was trained as a reporter of baseball, was sports editor of the East St. Louis News-Review and is a member of both the Elks and the Ancient Order of Hibernians. With this background he arose in the House to remarks that:

He had just seen a Springfield, Ill., dispatch in which it was related that the President, at the State Fair, appealed for an increase of the number of Republicans in the congressional delegation of Illinois. While the President was making this appeal the majority of the Illinois Representatives of the President's party was voting against one of the measures in the President's program. "On the vote taken this afternoon on the conference report for the foreign aid appropriation requested by the President, most Republican members of the Illinois delegation expressed themselves in opposition to the President's wishes. Those who were absent, possibly listening to and applauding the President at Springfield, were paired against this part of his program. The Illinois Democrats solidly supported the President."

THE VOLUNTEERS

The first Democratic colleague to catch the point, which PRICE made with the solemnest of facial expressions, was Representative JONES of Missouri. Did PRICE, asked JONES, think those Illinois Republicans considered it more important to have their pictures taken with the President than to support his program? Gravely PRICE replied that, of course, he could not say.

Representative GREEN, of Pennsylvania, recalled he had advised General Eisenhower in Paris that, if the general ran as a Republican and won, he would find that most Republicans in Congress would not support "anything in his program that was in the interest of the people." How right had this proved, said the seemingly grieving GREEN. Most Republican candidates next November will be running, he assumed, on the picture platform (the one they had taken with the President), not Eisenhower's. And he felt it a duty to note that if the Democrats had not stood with the President "when he was right, he [the President] would not have gotten anything through the Congress."

Representative ROONEY, of New York, chimed in to inquire if it were not a fact that the only part of the Eisenhower program that "amounted to anything is the Democratic program following the ideas of the Roosevelt administration." To this PRICE agreed with full preservation of his judicial gravity. And he maintained it when this first note of battle was introduced, fittingly enough, by Representative O'HARA of Illinois.

"I am wondering if the gentleman will agree with me that while the President expressed himself [at Springfield] as being sick and tired of hearing about unemployment, if the unemployed are not sick and tired because of hunger from experiencing unemployment."

Representative PRICE's satire was finally dispelled by Representative MCCARTHY, of Minnesota, who bluntly observed that some of the Illinois Republicans endorsed by the President have not been cleared by the Citizens' Committee for Eisenhower. But it was a beautiful performance while it lasted.

The comparison between what the President was saying in Illinois with what Illinois Republicans in Washington were simultaneously doing to a fervent Presidential plea was, of course, a perfect opportunity for inserting and then twisting the barb of irony in the very heart of an embarrassing problem which confronts the Republican managers of the congressional campaign of 1954. But PRICE did it skillfully, and few political fencers in Congress know how to ply the rapier.

An American Policy of Liberation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES J. KERSTEN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the policy of containment of communism is a war policy. It gives the Communists the opportunity that they so desperately need to digest their gains behind the Iron Curtain and to mold the captive peoples and nations into armies of aggression.

A policy of liberation is the true policy for peace with freedom. A policy of liberation does not mean war of liberation, as George Kennan so frequently likes to term it. The Communists cannot make all-out war against the free world unless they have the willing cooperation of a substantial part of their enslaved peoples. If the free world adopts a true policy of liberation the Communists would be paralyzed in their ability to make war.

The Communist press, of course, screams against a policy of liberation. They know that such a policy strikes at their weakest point, their Achilles heel.

I would like to include within my remarks a very fine speech made by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, professor of political economics at Georgetown University, and president of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, at the Institute of Slavic Studies, Marquette University, Milwaukee, Wis., last February 22. The text follows herewith:

AN AMERICAN POLICY OF LIBERATION—MORAL REALISM FOR PEACE AND VICTORY

(Lecture by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, professor of political economy, Georgetown University; president, Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, at the Institute of Slavic Studies, Marquette University, Milwaukee, Wis., February 22, 1954)

Professor Smal-Stocki, distinguished members of the institute, and guests, I am deeply honored by your invitation to deliver this fourth lecture on the subject of An American Policy of Liberation. It is a veritable distinction to appear before this institute principally because its reputation as a leading American center of sound scholarship on the captive non-Russian nations, both within and outside the Soviet Union, is nationally established. I have had the pleasure of meeting in Washington many of the trained products of this institute, and I can assure you that it is always a refreshing experience to witness the scope and depth of their knowledge which leaves no room of scientific tolerance for such current misconceptions as "the peoples of Russia," "satellite countries," "Soviet communism," "minority nationalities in the U. S. S. R.," and other misleading terms that fail to fit the real and even rudimentary facts.

In strict keeping with the standards of accuracy and truth observed here, it is my task this evening to present the nature and the rational necessity of a policy of liberation within the essential framework of the position of the United States in world affairs today. As every social scientist is well aware of, socioeconomic problems are always complex and intricate in character. But the omnipresence of complexity affords no ground of rationalization for any incapacity to abstract and reason through with those basically determining elements that shape situations and conditions of social and political existence. The capacity for this is nothing more than the power of clear, theoretic penetration generating certain dominant ideas in a logical pattern of thought without which sound understanding and a rational course of action are impossible. A constant deficiency of this power seems to characterize the several enigma-minded observers of the Soviet Union and those admittedly puzzled and confused experts on Russia who find ready shelter in this rationalized excuse of complexity that, from a psychological point of view, naturally lends itself to an obsession with the containment thesis.

There is nothing essentially enigmatic or puzzling about the Soviet Union or the calculating and businesslike behavior of its criminal tyrants. If this were so, then indeed some basis of justification would exist for the simplistic and unimaginative policy of containment. Because this is not so, within the limits of this lecture and at no risk of oversimplifying the subject, I shall dwell on the basis determinants in the objective world situation that necessarily render a policy of liberation as the only moral and rational course open to us. My sole aim is to enable you to see the situation clearly and to see it as a whole. For only by this path can we arrive at that certitude of knowledge and will which, after all, is the ultimate scalpel of historical formation and survival.

LIBERATION IN THE POLITICAL CONTEXT OF WASHINGTON

First, let us assess the status of the liberation doctrine in the political context of Washington. You will recall, as a matter of factual record, that the Republican victory in 1952 was founded in great part upon the advocacy of a policy of liberation. The generation of the liberation theme in the Republican National Committee, a year before the campaign itself, met with most favorable public reaction. Guided by this appeal, one Republican Congressman conducted a poll among his colleagues with the result of an almost 12-to-1 ratio in favor of a policy of liberation.[1] Soon the appeal grew enormously and an increasing number of Republican statesmen and leaders, like Senators Taft, H. Alexander Smith, Styles Bridges, Governor Stassen, and Congressmen Charles J. Kersten, L. H. Smith, Morano, and others made public declarations in support of the policy.

The record overflows with liberationist espousals, and perhaps the most vividly expressed have been furnished by President Eisenhower and Secretary of State Dulles. Of the many that may be cited is the one in which the President emphasizes that "Our determination must go beyond the negative concept of containment to the positive concept of expanding by peaceful means the areas of freedom. If this is not done, we will once again find ourselves at war. It must be done. It can be done."[2] The numerous remarks of the Secretary of State are equally unequivocal. "But liberation from the yoke of Moscow will not occur for a very long time, and courage in neighboring lands will not be sustained unless the United States makes it publicly known that it wants and expects liberation to occur."[3]

The advancement of this policy was, and is, by no means a monopoly of Republican spokesmen. It would indeed be a grave error to posit this exclusive association. Numerous Democrats of public eminence, like Senators McMahon, Lyndon Johnson, Humphrey, Kennedy, and Congressmen John W. McCormack, Feighan, and others, have declared themselves on elements that constitute the very foundations of a liberation policy. An expanding basis of bipartisan support existed long before the campaign of 1952, and one exists today. It is only on this basis that one is at liberty to view it as an American policy and not that of any particular political party.

There is, of course, no liberation policy in effect today. A critical examination of the concept of mass retaliation demonstrates it to be merely a policy of containment by threat. Shaped by our Korean experience, it is really a forceful military version of containment predicated on budgetary requirements and the power threat. It resolves none of the basic problems that in the long run can spell disaster for us. However, its recent advocation does not mean the repudiation of the liberation doctrine. On the contrary, a hard struggle within the Government is being waged on this fundamental issue, and the intensity of this contest serves to explain in part the seeming confusion and vacillation in our foreign policy. The informally organized adherents of Kennanism and its normal policy of containment still remain deeply entrenched in positions of policy influence and determination. What the outcome of this struggle will be depends essentially on the decisive factor of public judgment and its representative expression in Congress.

THE CONCEPT OF LIBERATION

Despite the extensive controversy that transpired 2 years ago on the liberation theme, much misunderstanding and confusion remained as to the nature of a liberation policy, even among those who professed it. This condition prevails today. Thus, backed by adducible evidence, a concise statement on the predominant characteristics and the substantial meanings of a policy of liberation becomes necessary.

Footnotes at end of speech.

If one carefully reflects on the logically determining aspects of this issue, he cannot but come to recognize the general proposition that any political course on the part of our Government that is not a policy of liberation is essentially a policy of containment. In the complex of contemporary circumstances there is a discernible internal determination which establishes the complete validity of this proposition and sets the groundwork for our free dynamic action that is something radically different from the drift of uncreative adaptation to altered conditions caused by enemy initiative. Fundamental in this respect is the fact that the concept of liberation rests on the unqualified rejection of the expedient Soviet theory of coexistence which, significantly, has baited the frequent support of Kennanism and those who wishfully impute into its intermittent use the success of containment.

This sound rejection, for which I scarcely need to present factual details here, is grounded in three forms of evidence proving the Russian Communist design for world domination: (a) abundant theoretic expressions in Russian Communist works, (b) an imposing record of imperialist conquests since 1920, and (c) the vast operations of the world Communist conspiracy directed by Moscow. It is also associated with a vivid awareness that the dynamics of historical movement disallow permanent statical relations and that for their control, they require more than what may prove to be the illusory deterrent of supposedly superior material power. Stripped of its characteristic verbal embroidery, the containment position depends exclusively on this power deterrent and the naive hope of institutional atrophy within the Soviet Russian empire. In this perspective of power deterrence, coexistence, and atrophy, containment served its limited and transient purpose in the immediate years following World War II, but, with rapid Soviet recovery and consolidation, it has borne an accruing disutility that with the passage of time can only result in unprecedented losses, not to exclude national disaster itself.

It is patently erroneous and misleading to identify the concept of liberation with the prosaic and hollow verbalism that we earnestly hope the captive nations will one day become free. Wishful verbalisms of this sort can be found in abundance in the varied output of those who knowingly or unknowingly espouse different shades of containment. Such verbalisms become meaningless when sober consideration is given to the animus of liberation which in essence is practical, positive, initiative-bearing, realistic, moral and, above all, supremely deterrent against a third world war; in short, outstanding policy characteristics that are inevitably obscured by self-defeating avowals of containment no matter how described. To repeat, any policy that is not essentially and functionally liberationist belongs by nature to the containment species and, consequently, will be found wanting in these preeminent qualities. A quick glance at the confusing and tortuous character of our current policy is sufficient to impress one with the truth of this observation.

The spirit of the liberation policy is thoroughly practical because it is unquestionably in our fundamental national interest to furnish concrete aid to the captive nations in the vast Russian Communist Empire. Practicable aid extended to Polish, Lithuanian, Ukrainian, Slovak, Hungarian, and other national patriots is a strategically well-placed investment not only in the desired restoration of their national independence and freedom but also—in fact more so—in the very preservation of our own Nation. The full import of this will be appreciated when we shall consider the ultimate variables in the calculus of world conquest below.

Moreover, the liberation animus is positive in that it is oriented toward the strengthening of the forces of freedom everywhere which necessarily entails the expansion of the areas of freedom rather than their mere negative conservation at the critical cost of the enslaved nations now undergoing genocidal consolidation. In its scale of values freedom precedes peace, for carried to its logical extent, peace can even be bought for total bondage. Where the world remains half free and half slave, the scaled precedence of peace to freedom, as fostered by Communist slogans of peaceful coexistence, creates an illusion concocted to serve as the opiate of the still free nations. In the illusion of peace we have shamelessly acceded to the tyrannical expansion of the Communist empire far beyond the wildest dreams of the past czars of Muscovy. Many who have succumbed to this illusion overlook the elementary fact that war, essentially a conflict of relationships, commences in the souls of men only to culminate on the battlefields of the world. Our record so far in the contest for the souls of men everywhere points to this disastrous culmination. And the most glaring effect of the opiate of peace over freedom is the insidious sensation that short-run truces add up into a long-run peace.

These qualities in themselves certify to the striking initiative-bearing characteristic of the liberation policy. With the fixed objective of expanded freedom, the imaginative employment of numerous, diverse means and a deep certitude of spirit, we can keep the unalterably self-dedicated enemy on a continuous defensive which alone is capable of exhausing the sources of Moscow's imperialist rule. The policy is realistic in that it is founded on a plain recognition of the mortal enemy and, with principled determination and courage, is formulated accordingly. In its full realism, without being emotionally crusading or sentimental in character, liberation postulates a moral commitment toward the captive nations, and this essential morality of the liberation idea is a primary fact. It is this fact that fundamentally distinguishes it from any form of containment policy which, by reasoned analysis, can only show for itself the tenuous basis of comparative technologic power. In the maze of his countless confused speculations and errors Mr. Kennan at least strikes upon this truth when, in behalf of containment, he admits that "I see the most serious fault of our past policy formulation to lie in something that I might call the legalistic-moralistic approach to international problems."[4]

Logically and by written evidence, containment in whatever form is by nature amoral. It involves no moral commitment because it is not predicated, as Mr. Kennan and other containment theorists well confirm, on determining moral and political principles. Little wonder that the eminent Father Walsh of Georgetown University was quick to score the above and similar statements uttered by Kennan. For an American foreign policy formulated in divorce from the constant guidance of moral principles would enjoy no better rational criteria than those underlying the policy of the Soviet Union. Contrary to Kennan's further error, had our past policy formulation adhered closely to absolute moral and political criteria, the course of contemporary history since 1918, notably with the dissolution of the Russian Empire, in real possibilities would have been by far more favorable for us and the world. Fortunately, numerous current expressions of this moral commitment toward the captive nations may be found in statements by President Eisenhower and Secretary of State Dulles, but these expressions will remain only verbalistic and hollow unless the commitment is functionalized by the only policy adaptable to it, namely the policy of liberation.

In the light of these outstanding qualities, how then can we define an American policy of liberation? Most succinctly, it is a policy girded to the concept of liberation which is a process of political warfare aimed at the defeat of the enemy and the independence of enslaved nations as a necessary and logical basis for European and Asiatic reconstruction along federative lines. Notwithstanding the misconceptions of many, liberation is not an end in itself, but a peaceable means to a double end, negative and positive in character. It engenders not only the fight against communism and its decisive defeat but also the positive fight for freedom and the independence of nations. It is the first vital link of a policy chain that makes for a rational, coherent and winning American foreign policy. As stated by the brilliant author of the most authoritative book on the subject, "Liberation, independence, federation: the three are links in the same policy chain."[5]

THE LIBERATION CONCEPT IN TRIADIC HISTORICAL CONTEXT

When thought through carefully and logically, liberation is an operational concept best fitted for the heavy requirements of the moment and of the desired future. In the present phase, that of the cold war, it provides the best possible insurance against the sudden outbreak of a hot war without appeasement, trucelife concessions and compromise of principle and national integrity. As an unfolding process of political warfare on the enemy's terrain, it affords us the only possible chance of curtailing the genocidal consolidation of the Russian Communist Empire which is the primary variable in the Communist calculus of world conquest.

The containment policy in effect today allows the formation of this essential variable which is being executed behind lavish Communist professions of peaceful coexistence, wide Communist participation in international conferences, and timed contributions to an apparent lessening of world tensions, all calculated to generate the illusion of a prolonged peace in order to gain the necessary time for this consolidation.

To contend, as some superficially do, that liberation entails the risk of a hot war is obviously an argument oblivious to the constant presence of this risk. Liberation alone can lessen this risk, for an enemy confronted by an increasing insecurity within his own domain is surely less apt to embark upon world conquest than without this circumstance. To hope, as many in vain do, that somehow, something might occur in the unaided slave world to precipitate an internal collapse, like the lost hope of a convulsion upon Stalin's death, is plainly indicative of an inadequate understanding of the highly technologized techniques of oppressive Communist rule. Pretty phrases of "cultural erosion," "territorial indigestion," and the like belong to diplomatic poetry, not to the field of real political action. To maintain, as several do in the very same breath, that the freedom of the enslaved nations cannot be attained without a hot war arbitrarily rules out all hope founded on the liberating effects of a backed cacophony of unrest, dissension, and calculated opposition reaching into all vulnerable strata of the empire. These planned effects counter the absurd argument of aimless uprisings, and constitute a real possibility which for its very existence in the coming short run can only be nurtured by liberation.

For the requirements of the ever-impending phase of a hot war it should be evident now that a policy of liberation places us in an infinitely more advantageous position than one of containment and its myopic wait-and-see attitude. Efficiently organized groups of national leadership, thriving in well-supported underground networks with

---

Footnotes at end of speech.

Footnotes at end of speech.

roots deeply implanted in the respective populace, cannot be expected to materialize with a narrow policy of containment no matter how extensive our intelligence and espionage activity may be. We are dealing with enslaved national bodies that in their present grave state of systematic genocide require our complete national effort which, again, can only be expressed through a policy of liberation. Their hope, their courage, their will to exist and fight can only be sustained by our effective moral commitment to the goals of their freedom and independence. Thus in the final, inexorable accounting, to the degree that we fail in the concrete preparation and support of these truly natural allies, to that degree and more, in the event of a showdown, we shall be forced to underwrite the undoubtedly heavy losses of open combat in grossly disproportionate amounts of American lives and treasure.

The great irony and paradox of our current containment policy reside in the inescapable fact that as we timidly attempt, on the insular bases of brute material power and passive institutional example, to stave off a global conflict marked by vast devastation, we are inadvertently, by the very nature of our present historical dilemma, contributing to this horrible outcome.

Let us honestly face the cruel fact that this is the tremendous responsibility of decision now weighing upon the shoulders of our policymakers whose anticipated pleadings of "we did our best in the cause of peace" could scarcely justify their failure to mold now the available alternative means to a swift, economical, and certain victory in the case of a hot war. The simplistic notion that all that is required is the massive capacity to bomb out the enemy, is purely a product of vacuous thinking with a show of arrogance toward all the determining factors of geography, history, economics, and sound psychological strategy. The detailed contents of these factors are certainly not the exclusive property of our policymakers to warrant the self-legitimating shroud of secret information upon which policy decisions are presumably formed.

---

[1] Republican Policy of Liberation or Democratic Policy of Containment, folder, Republican National Committee, 1952, p. 5.

[2] New York Times, October 21, 1952.

[3] A Policy of Boldness, May 19, 1952.

[4] American Diplomacy, 1900–50, p. 95.

[5] James Burnham, Containment or Liberation, p. 229.

Dulles' Surrender to Old Guard Paralyzes Our Diplomacy—Dulles' Bluffs Scare Free World More Than Moscow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. F. D. ROOSEVELT, JR.
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following article entitled "Dulles' Surrender to Old Guard Paralyzes Our Diplomacy" from Democratic Digest, July 1954, at page 9; article entitled "Dulles' Bluffs Scare Free World More than Moscow," Democratic Digest, August 1954, at page 16:

[From the Democratic Digest of July 1954]

Dulles' Surrender to Old Guard Paralyzes Our Diplomacy

One day late in February of this year, John Foster Dulles stepped out of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee room in the Capitol to face the microphones of the newsreel cameramen. In the glare of the special lights, it was plain that the Secretary had been under great strain during his meeting with the Senators; his shoulders were more hunched than usual; and his face bore a dejected, discouraged look. His appearance was so disturbing that reporters looking on were curious to know what had gone on in the closed-door session.

The Secretary had just returned from Berlin, where he had spent frustrating weeks at the conference table with Soviet Foreign Minister Molotov. Back at the State Department, his desk was piled high with problems accumulated during his absence. But the Republican Senators on the Foreign Relations Committee seemed to have little regard or sympathy for the Secretary's plight. One after another they pressed upon him a line of inquiry shot through with implications that Mr. Dulles had appeased the Communists at Berlin by agreeing to a later conference at Geneva at which Communist China would be allowed to have spokesmen.

Having borne weeks of abuse from Mr. Molotov, it seemed almost unbelievable to Mr. Dulles that he should return to face even more insulting treatment from members of his own party. He was so stung, in fact, that "his lips quivered and his eyes filmed," according to columnist Doris Fleeson's account of the meeting. "For an appalled moment, Senators thought he would burst into tears."

The Secretary recovered his composure, banged on the table with his fist, and for once spoke up to his Republican detractors:

"We won every point from the Russians at Berlin," he contended. "I don't think it is right that when we come home after making such a record we should have to face this kind of criticism. It hurts us, and hurts what we are trying to do."

His outburst brought only impassive stares from the hostile Republican Senators, and Mr. Dulles promptly gave ground. A few weeks later, in a speech to the Overseas Press Club, he publicly shackled himself with all the restrictions the Republican Old Guard had asked. So all the world knew that the Old Guard isolationists had again emerged as the dominant force in United States foreign policy.

This unhappy event, with its quick consequences, raised two questions in the minds of both Mr. Dulles' friends and critics.

The first was: Why should a Republican Secretary of State receive such treatment at the hands of his own party members? The answer most accepted by Foster Dulles' friends boils down to this: The radical Republicans of the right know that Dulles is a life-time internationalist. They suspect and distrust him because he played a prominent bipartisan part in the formulation of postwar foreign policy under the Democrats. He was an adviser at many important conferences; he served as a U. N. delegate and as top Republican adviser to the Democratic Secretary of State. They recall that as a Senator from New York he supported the Democratic foreign policy on 15 votes. In short, they know that, left to his own intelligence and experience, Dulles would pursue the same basic policy as his predecessors. This, of course, would fatally embarrass the Old Guard Senators who have made a career out of damning the Truman-Acheson policies, especially in the Far East.

Mr. Dulles' friends and admirers have been even more puzzled by a second question: Why doesn't Dulles openly challenge the Old Guard wing of his party? The answer seems to be that Dulles (like Stassen and other Cabinet members) is not sure of 100 percent Presidential backing, and fears that a real showdown with the Old Guard might ultimately cost him the job he has always cherished more than anything in life.

Some think that, just as President Eisenhower's troubles with Senator McCarthy began when he set out to appease the Senator during the 1952 campaign, Foster Dulles' difficulties also began in 1952 when he went to Chicago to write the foreign-policy section of the Republican platform. When it first became known that he was to write this plank, there was a widespread hope that this would pave the way for a continued bipartisan foreign policy. But the men in both parties who gained comfort from Mr. Dulles' assignment reckoned without his personal ambition. Ever since his grandfather had been Secretary of State for a few months under President Benjamin Harrison (Dulles was only 4 at the time) he is said to have set his heart on the Nation's No. 1 diplomatic job.

Now, in 1952, at the age of 64, faced with what would probably be his last chance for the No. 1 Cabinet post, Dulles was confronted with a seemingly impossible task: How to write a platform that would satisfy both the Taft isolationists and Eisenhower internationalists—and not close the door on his own ambitions, regardless of who was nominated.

It was at this juncture that Foster Dulles took the step which still concerns his close associates who have known him as prominent lawyer, leading church layman, and bipartisan diplomat.

The platform he wrote set forth no policy whatever. Instead it concentrated on a strictly partisan denunciation of the policies of the past, with apparent disregard for the violence that might be done to history, or for the role which both Mr. Dulles and General Eisenhower had had in advancing those policies which Dulles now condemned.

For example, the Dulles platform denounced the withdrawal of United States troops from Korea in 1949, although General Eisenhower had been Army Chief of Staff in 1947 when that military decision was reached, and Mr. Dulles himself had sponsored and pushed through the U. N., on behalf of the United States, two troop-withdrawal resolutions.

How does a prominent church layman justify such political trimming? Persons closely associated with Dulles at the time say he then believed that, once in office, he would be able to reform the Old Guard.

This romantic notion was quickly shattered when, early in the new administration, Mr. Dulles learned that he would probably not receive all-out White House backing if he challenged the right wing. The incident was a major foreign policy showdown with Senator McCarthy over who should negotiate trade restrictions with Greek shippers. Foreign Aid Administrator Harold Stassen made a brave attempt to stand up for the proper rights of the Executive, only to have the rug virtually yanked from under him by the President.

A more direct hint was given the Secretary when the White House picked Mr. Dulles' first major trial balloon. At an off-the-record session with a group of reporters, Dulles indicated what the Old Guard had always suspected were his real views: acceptance of Communist control of the Chinese mainland was a possibility, in Dulles' mind, if the Red Chinese would make sufficient concessions toward a permanent peace in Asia. The embittered reaction of the old guard brought an instant White House denial that these views had ever been considered.

That was the last anti-Old Guard flutter from Mr. Dulles. Since that time the Secretary has placed himself in a deepening dilemma, which has already had serious consequences for the Nation. Simply stated, that dilemma is: How to carry on the basic policies of the past, which are dictated by relentless reality, while at the same time seeming to carry out a new and different policy so as not to undermine the old GOP campaign oratory.

Dulles' increasingly desperate solution to this dilemma is twofold: It consists of dressing up old policies with new labels, and of conducting the public aspects of diplomacy more with an eye to pleasing the intransigents at home than to reaching agreement with our allies abroad.

The first tipoff to the administration tactic of dressing up foreign policy with new labels came in President Eisenhower's first state of the Union message, only 13 days after his inauguration, in which he announced the now-famous unleashing of Chiang Kai-shek's Formosa forces for attacks on the Chinese mainland. Not only have Chiang's aging legions not moved from their island safety in the ensuing months; it has been revealed that they were actually prevented from doing so by a secret agreement with the United States.

Then in January of 1953, Mr. Dulles journeyed to Europe, and began conducting public diplomacy for home rather than for European consumption. He gave the French an April progress deadline on the European army pact, and later told them, "The handout era is over." Again in December, Mr. Dulles publicly threatened the French with an "agonizing reappraisal" of our foreign aid plans unless the French ratified the pact.

In August, in an apparent Dulles concession to the Formosa-first school of Republican thought, the United States forced through the U. N. a measure barring India and other neutral nations from the Korean peace conference, over the bitter opposition of our European allies, and the uncommitted Asian sphere.

By January the administration's preparation of new labels for old wines was complete. On January 12, with no prior consultation either with allies abroad or Democrats at home, Mr. Dulles unveiled the concept of "massive retaliation"—an apparent threat that an all-out atomic attack would be launched against Moscow or Peiping in the event of future Communist expansionist moves. Ensuing clarification by the administration, as well as ensuing events (including obvious Chinese Communist intervention in Indochina) have robbed the Dulles rhetoric of all meaning.

Massive retaliation was closely related to the administration's New Look in defense, which involved heavy cuts in the Army and Navy. This surrender to GOP budget balancers and tax cutters had serious foreign policy consequences: the three Army divisions that were being eliminated by the New Look were precisely those we would have to send to Indochina if we wished to take such action without draining off troops from other areas.

Thus hampered militarily, Mr. Dulles soon shackled his own diplomatic hands in what many regard as his most serious concession to the Republican right wing. Mr. Dulles spoke to the Overseas Press Club and virtually foreclosed any possibility of recognizing Red China, no matter what concessions we might gain in return, as well as the possibility of negotiating for an honorable truce in Indochina.

Thus, by his own hand, Dulles had virtually doomed to failure his trip to the Geneva Conference. Negotiation was ruled out because Dulles had exposed his hand and revealed to the enemy that he had nothing to negotiate with. United action appeared out of the question, mainly because Mr. Dulles had chosen to spring the idea on the world without so much as asking our allies how they felt. And large-scale United States military intervention was virtually ruled out when President Eisenhower contradicted Vice President's NIXON's statement that the United States was prepared to send troops to Indochina if necessary.

Of course, as some of Dulles' own friends have pointed out, he himself could have predicted this turn of events when the Republican Senators had brought him close to tears back in February. He could have asked them how they expected him to conduct the foreign policy of the United States using neither negotiation nor force. He could have told them that he was determined to put the interests of the United States above partison advanage and campaign oratory.

But, as it might also be pointed out, Dulles could have done the same thing when he was called upon to write the GOP platform in 1952. But both then and now he yielded to the forces of partisanship.

After only 1 week in Geneva Dulles returned to the United States, his prestige, according to the Kansas City Star, "lower, both at home and abroad, than at any time since he became Secretary of State."

"The impression grows," commented the Washington Post and Times Herald, "that at Geneva the United States has just suffered one of the most humiliating diplomatic defeats in its history."

Upon his return from Geneva Dulles again appeared before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. Correspondent James Reston, of the New York Times, described him as "a weary and depressed man."

By coincidence, Dulles' appearance in the Capitol occurred while a Senate hearing room was the stage for a similar administration failure—the spectacle of McCARTHY versus Army Secretary Stevens—and in the background Stevens' Commander in Chief, President Eisenhower. All three were paying the price for their attempts to appease the wildmen of their party who seem determined to win dominant control of the GOP no matter what the consequences to the country.

"Isn't it wonderful," Vice President NIXON had asked rhetorically in the period between the Berlin and Geneva conferences, "to have a Secretary of State who stands up to the Communists?"

Not long after Mr. NIXON's artful question had been met with a notable lack of enthusiastic response both at home and abroad, a Republican was discussing Dulles' problems with some sympathy.

"Foster's in a fix," he said. "He can't get any help from the go-it-alone Republicans. Democratic Senators naturally feel cool to him for knifing policies he helped create. Internationalists of his own party are sore at him for trying so hard to prove to the Old Guard that he is a genuine, bona fide Republican. On top of this, or because of this, Foster has lost much of his influence with our allies. By and large, he has succeeded in almost completely isolating himself. In the circumstances NIXON might now ask, Isn't it wonderful that we have a Secretary of State at all?"

[From the Democratic Digest of August 1954]

DULLES' BLUFFS SCARE FREE WORLD MORE THAN MOSCOW

On the heels of Secretary Dulles' retreat from Geneva in the international jousting over Indochina, a western diplomat and a Russian official were talking during a momentary lull between tough-sounding statements from Washington.

The westerner asked the Russian about the Soviet view of a bristling speech by Adm. Robert B. Carney, Navy Chief of Staff, who warned that we had reached the parting of the roads and the time was near for a final military showdown.

"Oh," replied the Russian, "we don't take it seriously. We know that when the Americans talk that way they are bluffing."

This prompted the Washington Post and Times Herald to say:

"Here is, indeed, the epitaph to the sorry confusion of administration policy on Indochina. What we have witnessed has been a progression from massive retaliation to massive stagnation, if not massive disintegration."

As a further point, the Post cited the danger of a major war explosion growing from a foreign policy which encourages the Russians to regard American warnings as bluffs. "For one of these days the Russians are likely to think we are bluffing when we are not," the Post pointed out. "That is the way big wars start."

Both of these points have been stressed repeatedly in the wide reexamination of American policy inspired by the hasty United States backdown from threatened intervention in Indochina.

As many editors have pointed out, bluffs confuse Americans more than they do the enemy. They also dismay our allies and weaken the coalition which is the main bulwark against Soviet aggression. Bluffs are bad gambles which, when they fail, create situations in which the Nation finds itself dangerously overextended. Bluffing provokes crisis conditions which make it possible for military extremists to take over.

Beyond the threat from that form of subversion, there is the immediate danger to national security that is inescapable in the mass leaking of Government secrets and their handling by a Senator who defies constitutional and legal restraints. As was established by Democratic Senator STUART SYMINGTON's questioning of McCARTHY's staff director, Frank Carr, the screening of the staff personnel was lax and the methods of guarding the committee files were sloppy. The chance of smuggled Government secrets being diverted to other unauthorized channels through this pipeline is obvious.

This insight into the workings of the McCarthy underground was given the public at a time when many commentators, among them columnist Dorothy Thompson and the Trenton (N. J.) Times, were remarking on the Communist-like pattern of McCARTHY's operations. Citing the disruptive effect he has had on the Government, the national disunity he has provoked, and his efforts to shatter public confidence in the Army and the State Department, they have asked whether the Kremlin could have had a more effective agent in the United States.

Finally, there is the question as to the answerability of Senator McCARTHY and his secret informants to the Nation's laws. The intelligence officer who smuggled confidential FBI information to the Senator—for one example—is guilty of insubordination and has violated both his oath and a Presidential security order.

If ferreted out and court-martialed, the agent of that leak would face punishment ranging from a long prison term to a possible death sentence. (Art. 64 of the Articles of War says that "Any person subject to military law who, on any pretense whatsoever * * * willfully disobeys any lawful command of his superior officer, shall suffer death or such other punishment as a court-martial shall direct.")

Senator McCARTHY, the errant officer's accomplice, seems safe from a military tribunal. Though a Reserve officer, the Wisconsin Senator is not on active duty and therefore is not subject to court-martial. However, the question has been raised as to whether he is subject to prosecution under section 2387 of title 18 of the Criminal Code, which provides a fine up to $10,000 and a prison term up to 10 years for anyone who "advises, counsels, urges, or in any manner causes or attempts to cause insubordination, disloyalty, mutiny, or refusal of duty by any member of the military or naval forces of the United States."

And there, for the time being, the case of McCARTHY versus the United States stands.

Concern on this score is heightened by the fact that bluffing has not been confined to the Eisenhower administration's handling of the Communist threat in southeast Asia. For the first time in our history, extravagant pronouncements have been carried to the point of trying to make bluff serve as a substitute for real American foreign policy.

The extent to which bluff has progressed in Eisenhower-Dulles diplomacy is shown in a brief review of the incidents that have lowered America's international prestige since the change came to Washington.

The unleashing: Bluffing got off to a quick start early in 1953 when the administration served up to Congress Mr. Eisenhower's so-called dramatic order to the 7th Fleet unleashing Chiang Kai-shek. This was the first installment on the GOP campaign promise to be bolder and more dynamic than the Democrats. In the 18-month interval since the phony unleashing, Chiang's troops have not moved from their comfortable billets on Formosa. In fact, they have been under secret orders to stay put. Meanwhile, the world ponders the disclosures of K. C. Wu, former Governor of Formosa, who reports that Chiang has abdicated his powers to his oldest son, Soviet-trained Chiang Ching-kuo, who is accused of turning Formosa into a Communist-type state.

Agonizing reappraisal: This was a whizzer (a form of bluff sometimes successful in a poker game but seldom if ever used against a friend at the diplomatic table). It was directed against France, our key ally in Europe. Agonizing reappraisal was threatened by Mr. Dulles in an ultimatum designed to force speedy French ratification of EDC (European Defense Community). That warning meant, if it meant anything at all, that the United States was prepared to abandon France, either turning to a new arrangement with resurgent West Germany or withdrawing entirely from the Continent. Choice of either alternative would mean the wrecking of the western coalition. The ultimatum, of course, was not carried out, and the only result was to shake European confidence in American statesmanship.

Guatemalan grandstand: Another example of sloganeering confused with policymaking. Secretary Dulles hailed the American-sponsored resolution at the 1954 Caracas Conference as a momentous declaration of principle, a new Monroe Doctrine. Ludwell Denny, foreign editor of the Scripps-Howard newspapers, observed that the high-sounding resolution carried precisely because it involved no action now. Otside of a vague prescription for catching spies and Communist conspirators, the declaration added nothing to existing means for hemispheric defense and was notably silent on economic measures to eliminate the breeding grounds of communism.

Dulles' boast that the declaration had greatly discouraged the Communist conspirators was soon answered by a large shipment of munitions from Communist Poland to the Communist-directed Guatemalan regime.

The New Look: Also called "More bang for a buck." This was the slogan invented by the administration to bluff the Russians into thinking we had developed a more powerful military system, at the same time that appropriations for Air Force, Army, and Navy were being cut. It, of course, fooled no one, except some of the American people—for a short time.

Massive retaliation: The doctrine of massive and instant atomic retaliatory power—at places and by means of our own choosing—was simply a part of the New Look bluff; it was articulated by Secretary Dulles and Vice President NIXON. The results were summed up in a single sentence by Correspondent Fletcher Knebel, who wrote: "Secretary Dulles seized the initiative—and the Reds seized Dien Bien Phu." "The [Chinese] Communists called Dulles' bluff by actually stepping up their material support of the Viet Minh," noted Editor John S. Knight, of the Chicago Daily News.

When faced with a test in the Indochina situation, massive retaliation was shown to be inapplicable to the type of localized internal aggression in which the Communists were specializing. Meanwhile, wonderment grew over the inconsistency of an American New Look which scaled down American power in conventional weapons at the very moment when Communist activities placed a premium on possession of such restraining power. Army Chief of Staff General Ridgway and other experts warned that our Government was reducing the Army's capacity without a corresponding reduction in its foreign commitments.

Indochina intervention: The buildup was terrific. President Eisenhower spoke of the "transcendent importance" of southeast Asia; Vice President Nixon said we would send troops "if necessary." Secretary Dulles repeated warnings there would be "no privileged sanctuary" if the Chinese Reds committed overt aggression; he added that the Reds were "awfully close" to this danger line. Senator KNOWLAND trumpeted for intervention. The Washington gestures encouraged the French to request American intervention, which made the United States backdown all the more humiliating when it came.

United action: Improvised hastily as a last-minute stopgap against further Communist gains after the Dulles defeat at Geneva, this Dulles doctrine featured ultimatum-like language with a proposal for a broader Asiatic alliance. As a warning to the Communists, it reduced itself to a bluff because it placed the cart before the horse, serving notice of "action" before there was a vehicle for any such action. Significantly, the scheme was promulgated before there were consultations with any of our allies who were expected to participate in the system.

It was clear to both Moscow and Peiping that the only military action available to the West at the time was solitary American intervention, and it was also plain that the American people and Congress were in no mood for such an enterprise.

How events play into the hands of military extremists when a bluff fails was demonstrated in the Indochina crisis. It is now clear that at one point, President Eisenhower and Secretary Dulles, strongly encouraged by Admiral Radford, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, were on the verge of an intervention in Indochina that might have led to war with Red China and Soviet Russia.

Radford's plan was for American air strikes at Dien Bien Phu to relieve the embattled French garrison. It was reported that, though his proposal did not have the backing of the other members of the Joint Chiefs, it was advanced twice by the administration—once to congressional leaders, once to the British. On the second occasion, the plan was urged on our British partners even though Mr. Dulles himself admitted "there was doubt in the minds of American military leaders that the proposed air strike would, at that late date, save Dien Bien Phu," according to Washington correspondent Chalmers M. Roberts' report of the behind-scenes maneuvering. Cool heads in Congress and in the British Cabinet prevented this rash course from going farther.

"It was these intervention proposals which divided the Anglo-American alliance," reports Correspondent Roberts. And that division was what brought Prime Minister Churchill and Foreign Secretary Eden to Washington in June in an effort to patch up the alliance.

The root of the American trouble was defined as follows by Columnist Walter Lippmann:

"The interventionists, led by Admiral Radford, have an unlimited objective, namely, the overthrow of the Red Chinese regime. For this objective Secretary Dulles can never hope to organize a united front in Europe and in Asia, and there is not even a united front among the Chiefs of Staff, and with Congress, and with American public opinion. It is because of Admiral Radford's well-known views on the necessity of a general war with China that every military proposal he sponsors disunites the front that Secretary Dulles has been trying to organise."

"The division within the administration and within the party is," Mr. Lippmann concludes, "a disaster to American power, prestige and influence in the world."

There is wide concurrence in that view. Editor William R. Matthews, of the Arizona Daily Star, observes a growing drift toward general war as a result of the confusion, and warns that another world war would bring revolution as well as immense devastation. Expressing his alarm at the rising belligerency in America, he writes:

"It is time to recognize that there are limitations to our strength and the scope of the acceptance of our ideals and morality. We must stop this drift toward a world war, and the almost certain revolution that would follow it, by reconstructing the one basis that will win the united support of the people.

"We will best serve ourselves and all of our friends by consciously limiting our objectives to positions we can and will support, instead of plunging blindly ahead into what will grow into another world war and the eclipse of freedom at home and abroad."

Editor Knight, of the Chicago Daily News, has raised the same warning in a series of editorials. Observing that "the Republican Party is drifting without direction and that Ike must provide the leadership it needs," the Chicago editor underscores the urgency of that challenge in these words:

"No one knows where we stand on Indochina. If you add up all the statements made by Eisenhower, the Vice President, the Secretary of State, the military and assorted Republican leaders, the sum total is bluff, bluster, backdown and baloney."

Living on the Second Floor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD H. REES

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent heretofore granted me by the House, I am including a fine sermon delivered by Louis Evans, D. D., LL. D., former pastor of the Hollywood Presbyterian Church, and presently representing the Presbyterian Church on a nationwide basis. I believe Members of Congress and all those who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will be deeply impressed by this splendid message. This sermon was delivered at the National Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., on August 15, 1954.

LIVING ON THE SECOND FLOOR

(Sermon by Rev. Louis H. Evans, D. D., LL. D., August 15, 1954, at the National Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C.)

Moses was disturbed within himself. "And the Lord said unto Moses, Come up into the mount and I will give you rest (poise). And Moses went up into the mount of the Lord and he stood with God. And he talked with God. Then he came down and wist not that the skin of his face shone."

We are trying to sell our home in California. It has one drawback—it has a second floor. Westerners are shunning "second-floor living." They no longer wish to climb stairs. They are consigning themselves to a bungalow-type of life. Spiritually we may become one-story souls, living on the first floor of the secular, shunning the second floor of the spiritual, living on the mudsills of the mundane.

Yet mine is a message of optimism, in the main. I believe that America is moving to the second floor of the spiritual.

This is true of education. The academic process in America began on the second floor. Ninety-nine of the first hundred American colleges were founded by church people to train youth in righteousness. Harvard by John Harvard, the minister; Yale, by 6 magistrates and 6 clergymen, to fight the agnosticism of the 17th century. Princeton, Amherst, William and Mary—Bibles in their foundation stones. Then two forces struck American education to force it from the second floor of the spiritual. French infidelity on the one hand and the Germanic system of electives on the other. The student was no longer forced to choose the majors of the spiritualities: theology, the science of God; Christology, the science of Christ; or philosophy, the science of living and thinking. Shoving God out from the center to the circumference, until He was scarcely peripheral, the technologists became the "Messiah," and the technologies dominated.

Some time ago there appeared in a London newspaper the picture of an ostrich. Underneath it were these words: "After a diet of a bottlestopper, a canopener, a doorknob, some coins, and four nails, ostrich dies in a London zoo. The lack of proteins will kill anyone in time." So the students feasted on his curriculum of doorknobs—construction; bottlestoppers—chemistry; can openers—dietetics; nails—engineering; and coins—economics. The proteins of God were left out and something died.

Walter Lippmann, in his book, Education Without Culture, said, "We have established a system of education in which we insist that while everyone should be educated, there is nothing in particular that an educated man must know." But there is "The fear of the Lord is the begining of wisdom." Second-floor considerations still outweigh first-floor considerations in their import; purity is more important than soap, intention than invention, why we live than where we live, faith than facts, how we feel than how we look, what we are than what we have, God than gadgets.

We are moving up again. A great university president said, "I have looked about me and I am frightened. Our minds have outrun our hearts and I'm sick to death of engineering." I was walking down to a commencement exercise with the newly elected chancellor of one of our large State universities and he said to me, "Dr. Evans, come back in 5 years and you will see a change." "What change?" I asked. "God will be around here," he said decisively. From the late president of another eastern university came these words, "Without a moral regeneration throughout the world there is no hope for us. We will all go up in the dust of an atomic explosion."

A young man came into the doctor's office, his face swathed in bandages. In answer to the inquiry as to what had happened he replied, "I tried to climb a ladder that someone had taken down 2 weeks ago." Someone had taken down the ladder that led to the second floor of the spiritual in education and humanity got hurt badly. President Nathan Marsh Pusey, of Harvard, said that he believes that a search for truth involves more than a diet of facts and a catalog of criticisms. "Lawrence College was founded and is still really motivated on the principle that God is the central fact in the universe." To him the aims of Harvard should be no different from the aims of Lawrence. "Affairs are now soul-size." They are, and only those men of the second floor with large souls will ever solve them. Without such spiritually mature men we shall be, as Lincoln said, "merely tinkers trying to put together a universe that is too big for us."

Science, too, is moving upstairs. It is impossible to conceive of our civilization surviving an atomic age unless the scientific machines of power on the first floor are guided by the spiritual and humane motives of the second-floor dwellers.

Dr. Robert Milliken, late of California Institute of Technology, said that he felt that science drew us along on the horizontal and that religion lifted us up on the perpendicular. Without the upward pull of religion science would crawl along on its belly, a serpent with a deadly sting.

The Nazis made this mistake. Their progress, as someone has said, was "in gadgets instead of in God; in inventions rather than in spiritual intentions." Hitler, in his Mein Kampf, wrote: "Look at those young men and boys. What material. I shall eradicate the thousands of years of human domestication. Brutal youth—that is what I am after. I want to see once more in its eyes the gleam of the beast of prey. With these I can create a new world and create a new order." And he did—the order of the jungle in which men's fingers became claws and their hands became paws. That was "education for brutality" and we have had enough of it.

We face a new peril now—the peril of the educated savage. Paul E. Tracy stood one day gazing at the bronze statue of the Indian brave with posed bow and arrow, dressed in a loincloth. Comparing his harmlessness with the atomic power of the hour he wrote these lines, The Coppered Archer:

"Unlettered one, mute and alone, with your enduring tips of stone,
Sleep on, and take unbroken rest. Your sage is wet, your crags are dressed
In fog. Sleep while you can. The atom age is set for man.
Your bow and brittle flints did little more than make those wince
You sought to slay. You could not wince or scar mankind, like we today.
Sleep, simple one, ignoring change; your hunting ground is now a range
For bombs. Unduly bright and loud from Yucca Flat the mushroom cloud
Ascends and puny warfare ends. Sleep on and rest, untutored brave,
Tense is the air above your grave."

We are not advocating too little and too late again. Let America have a strong arm; but let her have a great soul as well. If we must cut may it be to cure; or hurt to heal. May God keep our motives clean, our aims unselfish, and may we march not as conquerors but as liberators. Science must find its soul.

The military is marching up the stairway with a sturdy tread. Sometime ago the Air Force asked me to give several days to a conference of military personnel in the North Carolina hills. They were to invite the military personnel to a retreat where for a few days they were simply going to talk about God. How many would come they did not know; this had never been tried before. The call went out and nearly a thousand military personnel flew in from a score of States and there for 4 days they just talked God. This was a sight—generals with stars on their shoulders, scientists, military personnel of every type and rank—praying, talking, singing about the things that have to do with a nation's soul. How thrilling to stand with them on the second floor. Speaking at West Point Academy, why the crowded chapels? They seemed somehow to feel they knew what the trouble was and they did not want to die for nothing next time. Out of the heart were the issues of life. General MacArthur started us thinking along these lines when he stated that these were theological wars, and there was nothing more the military could do. All it could ever do was to give the anesthetic, strap the erring nation to the operating table, and then hope that spiritual physicians would be wise enough to remove with spiritual instruments the tubercular ideologies and the cancerous theologies. Otherwise when the patient convalesced from war it would be the same as before it submitted to the expensive military anesthetic. Omar Bradley, late Chief of Staff, said, "We have too many men of science and too few men of God. We have grasped the mystery of the atom and rejected the Sermon on the Mount. The world has achieved brilliance without wisdom, power without conscience. Ours is a world of nuclear giants and ethical infants. We know more about war than about peace, more about killing than we know about living."

If for one generation we would send more missionaries abroad than marines—and God bless the marines. More Bibles than bombs; more men with God in their hearts than men with guns in their hands. If for one generation we spent our money and our energies on the second floor of things spiritual what a change we would have in a sick and paralyzed universe. Until you change the human heart—nothing is changed. Let us never forget that the operating room for a sick cosmos is on the second floor.

In the realm of law I was talking with one of the leading administrators of our United States courts and he contended that rehabilitation of the criminal had to start from the inside out and that spiritual therapeutics was our true hope. Opiates for conscience are not cures. It is easy for us Americans to take care of a bad conscience with a sleeping pill and of a hangover with a dose of Bromo Seltzer. But that never got at the root of the matter.

Edgar Hoover once said, "There is no possibility of wiping out crime by reforming criminals. The time to start is when youth is being molded into an adult. * * * What we need today is the inculcation of the immortal lessons of the Sermon on the Mount and the Ten Commandments in the minds and hearts of all Americans. This is the surest antidote to stem the rising tide of lawlessness." We pass and write the laws of the land on the first floor; we make them or break them on the second. Unless the soul of law lives on the second floor we shall merely spend another generation passing new laws for old sinners to cheat by.

The same thing is true of literature and art. The most beautiful things in a nation's culture are written, painted on the upper level. A few months ago I was giving a lecture to the assembled combined university classes in drama, journalism, and appreciation of literature. I asked one of the professors what the literature class was studying and he named a contemporary American work of fiction. Asking him if it were a classic, he replied, "Oh no, we are studying it as a concession to modernity." Why should we be in an age of cultural sterility? What ails us?

Why, when we want the best in literature, do we have to go way back to Shelley, Keats, and Milton? Why, when we want the best in art, do we have to go way back to Dore, Tissot, and Michelangelo? Why, when we want the best in music, do we have to go way back to Handel, Haydn, Mozart, and Bach? What is the matter with today? We have been living on the first floor.

You know how the Japanese make a stunted tree; they tie off the taproot. We have been tying off the taproot of the spirit. We have been living on surface things.

Rittelmeyer once said, "We permit ourselves to spend our whole strength on external things. We have all gone astray. The life outside us draws insistently away from the life within us. The wealth and variety of things we know and can do are out of all proportion to the poverty of spirit that stares us in the face when we are left alone. We have lost our way in things material; the scholar in his investigations, the politician in his campaigns, the merchant in his business, the minister in his organization. The challenge to which our age responds is the challenge of the outside world. That is the badge of our destruction."

But literature is moving up a story to a higher level.

The best sellers of 1940 were the "best smellers." Edwin Balmer, editor of Red Magazine, said, "We seem to be welcoming a new literary nudism. It is an artistic loss." Upon the pages of novels, as in nudist camps, we find too many people whose whole claim to attention is that they have their clothes off. It is a cheap way to stir up excitement. It is far easier to apply oneself with courage to copy the alley fence than to think up something really distinguished to say. It is far easier to be courageous than creative. An advertisement reads, "Some booksellers are afraid to recommend this book. Be sure to ask for it. It is the year's sensation—vigorous, original, and beautiful."

This movement upward, however, evidenced itself in the fifties. What were the best sellers in 1953? In the fiction group they were, first, The Robe, a story of the Master; third, Costain's The Silver Chalice, a spiritual treatise. In nonfiction works: first, the Revised Standard Version of the Bible, some 2 million copies; second, Norman Vincent Peale's Power of Positive Thinking; third, Dale Evans' Angel Unawares, the spiritual experience with a sick child; fourth (we got off the track a little here), Kinsey's Sexual Behavior of Women; fifth, Sheen's Life Is Worth Living; and sixth, Katherine Marshall's A Man Called Peter. Thus in 1 year 5 of the 6 best sellers had to do with the things of God and the soul. We are putting back the ladder. Writers are now taking their pens and manuscripts and moving to the second floor.

Let this honestly be said of the home also. You cannot build an American home adequately without a spiritual second story of the soul. Youth is realizing now in all earnestness that they must think marriage through. A careless puppy love may end in a dog's life. Naturally our youth were frightened at matrimonial prospects when they saw divorce leap from 1 divorce in 500 in colonial days to 1 in 3 today.

We used to be interested mainly in the physical, sexual approach to marriage. Our minds were largely Freudian. At Rutgers University there appeared on the bulletin board this announcement entitled in bold, black letters, "Sex and Free Love." Underneath in small print were these words: "Rutgers students have been asked to cast their ballots in a universitywide referendum on a proposed change in the student body constitution. * * * Because it directly affects every undergraduate this question should receive the utmost consideration of all. Voting on the amendment will be held in the Student Union from 9 to 6. (Please excuse the use of the heading on this editorial but the message is so urgent that we wished it to have full readership.)" There it is. It has been "sex o'clock" on the campus and to a degree it probably always will be.

Yet the shift to the spiritual is coming. Most campuses now have courses on preparation for marriage and there are spiritual considerations. We realize now that one cannot build a home merely on the mudsills of the sensate, on first-floor physical aspects alone.

Dr. Aram Scheinfield in an article on Cold Women and Why said, "Frigidity is on the increase because spirituality is on the decrease. To the man, sexual satisfaction is often merely a question of achieving a result; whereas to the woman it is more a matter of the kind of relationship, of what it implies, of how she feels toward her husband and how he feels toward her. * * * Anything that causes a woman to tighten up mentally or to be chilled emotionally will chill her physically. * * * Many marriages, based on purely physical attraction or a casual affair, go on the rocks. * * * Where frigidity does occur, most of it can be melted away by human warmth and understanding." Certainly, for even sex is of the spirit.

When anything or anyone is crowned it is from above. And when the physical relationship is crowned it is always from above with the things of the soul and of the spirit, since we are more than animals, since marriage is the mating of two souls as well as of two bodies.

No greater disappointment seizes husband or wife as that which finds one living always on the first floor of the secular while the other longs also to dwell on the second floor of the spiritual. He said to me one day, "Dr. Evans, I am married to a social butterfly. Her life is stuffed with sawdust. She has no spiritual depth. I married a religious adolescent." Tragic when a woman's soul has not kept pace with her body.

She came into my office, tears coursing down her cheeks, and exclaimed, "There is no religion in our home. He never prays, never thanks God for the food, no Bible, not even a mention of God. I cannot tell you, sir, what it means to wake up and realize that you have married a mere animal." Tragic too. Each must lead the other to the heights of the soul. This desire for second-floor relationships in marriage is expressed by this poem:

"You hold my stature, I can grow no higher
than you, for I grow in you.
I learn of love as you aspire. If your soul
shrivels then mine too will shrink.
I sip the very wine of living that you drink.
If you falter, then I have no goal.
You hold the boundaries of my very soul!
And since you hold me in your heart's still
garden,
I cannot go unless you hold my hand.
You know my zest for mountain tops, my
urge to glimpse eternity,
So, Lover, take my hand and blaze high
trails for me."

Moses was discouraged, as you at times have been. Harassment by his enemies, treason, hunger, rebellion and a golden calf. God said, "Come up into the mount and I will give you rest (poise). There he stood with God and talked with God. When he descended his face shone as the sun."

The first peaks to catch the crimson, golden rays of the rising sun are the tallest ones. The first to catch the optimistic brave radiance of life are those who have climbed high, stood tall with God.

But you might exclaim, "I am not Moses; I lead no nation, I direct no crowd." But someone is following your footprints in the sands of time. They, at the crib, in the kitchen, in the factory, at the desk, on the campus, in society, or on the city street, lead either to the mudflats of secular living or up to the highlands of a spiritual purpose and character. Follow the footprints of Christ—they will lead you to the heights—and always to the second floor where living is living—since He is the life.

Prayer:

"But, O my God! though groveling I appear
Upon the ground and have a rooting here
Which pulls me downward, yet in my desire
To that which is above me, I aspire
And all my best affections I profess
To Him that is the Sun of Righteousness.
O, keep the morning of His incarnation—
The height of His ascension, ever in my
sight
That, imitating Him in what I may, I never
follow an inferior way."

—*Wither.*

Amen.

Report to Wisconsin on My Activities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, August 13, 1954

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a summary of my activities during the past two sessions of the 83d Congress.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"What happened in Washington affecting our State during the 83d Congress?"

"What did our senior Senator, ALEX WILEY, do for his State? What legislation was he interested in? What Wisconsin causes did he advance? What sort of success did he achieve?"

To these and a great many similar questions, the people of Wisconsin have a right to receive factual answers.

Here, then, is my biannual report to you.

After each Congress, I make a similar report to the people of our State.

I am deeply appreciative of the wonderful reaction which these previous reports have received. Literally thousands of letters have poured into my office commenting favorably upon my overall record down here.

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY LAW

First off, the greatest single success insofar as Wisconsin is concerned during the 83d Congress was, of course, the passage of the Wiley St. Lawrence seaway law.

As you all know, for three long decades, we of the Badger State had been fighting for the seaway. Always we faced a desperate uphill battle.

A mass of selfish lobbyist interests had combined to prevent Wisconsin and the other Lake States from having deep-water access to the world.

Now, however, with President Eisenhower's signature of Public Law 358, the dream of three decades has come to pass.

In my office is a memorable picture of the President signing the Wiley law; alongside is one of the pens which the President used in the signing and which he then presented as a gift to me.

I will treasure these remembrances, symbolizing the climax of a legislative battle which I have waged since I came to the Senate 15 years ago.

I am grateful that I was in a position as chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to lead the fight for this historic law.

LAKE CONNECTING CHANNELS

Next, one of the highest priority issues in the coming Congress will be the passage of appropriations to deepen the connecting channels to the upper Great Lakes.

During this past 83d Congress, I helped lay the basis for this future connecting channel legislation.

Again and again I pointed out that Wisconsin must have 27-foot deep-draft channels in order to get the full benefit of the Great Lakes seaway.

Now, I am confident of early passage of the channel legislation. I have been working continuously with my colleagues to round up the necessary votes to help clinch this final chapter of the St. Lawrence seaway story.

ANTISUBVERSION BILLS

Another highlight of the 83d Congress was the passage of antisubversion legislation.

My readers are familiar with the fact that I am particularly interested in this subject because of my dual capacity as chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee and as ranking Republican on the Judiciary Committee (which is the group most directly concerned with internal security legislation).

Throughout the 2 years of the 83d Congress (as in previous Congresses) I had urged that we pass necessary bills against the Communist menace at home and abroad.

A great many of these bills fortunately were enacted, notably the bill to outlaw the Communist Party; the bill to confer immunity, where necessary, so as to open up the closed mouths of the stubborn "I refuse to answer pack"; the bill to punish espionage in peacetime with the severest penalty; the provision to end Communist domination of unions; and a great many other measures.

Unfortunately, not all of the antisubversive bills for which I had fought were enacted, but at least many of the important security goals for which I had labored were recorded into law.

PROTECTION OF CONSUMERS

Continuing with this account of the 2-year program, once again, in 1953 and 1954, I continued my fight for the protection of Wisconsin's hundreds of thousands of home and industrial consumers of natural gas.

Their gas rates have gone up and up and up and up. Skyrocketing rates have added to the cost of living. They have added to the cost of Wisconsin business; and this has caused harm in our State.

Therefore, I fought on the floor of the Senate, fought in messages to the Federal Power Commission, to protect Wisconsin consumers from arbitrary unjustified increases in gas rates.

I praised the Supreme Court decision which finally required protection of consumers from unfair treatment. Now that decision must be faithfully implemented.

Another issue on which I fought to protect our people was in relation to our natural resources. I fought against efforts to despoil our public lands, to open them up to certain private interests which might not have the well-being of the Nation's heritage at heart.

So, too, I fought to safeguard the right of the 48 States to the oil-rich submerged tidelands.

FIGHTING FOR FARMERS

I feel that special note should now be taken of efforts on behalf of the great farm segment of our State.

As my readers know, I have always felt that upon a healthy agriculture depends a healthy business and healthy labor segment of our population, and vice versa.

Accordingly, I fought to raise dairy parity, which has not been at fair levels in relation to the dairyman's heavy toil and heavy investment.

I fought, too, for adequate soil-conservation funds, adequate rural-electrification funds, adequate recognition of Wisconsin's and the Nation's great system of cooperatives.

I fought for greater agricultural-research funds so as to find more uses for dairy products. I urged stepped-up education to increase vital dairy consumption—the drinking of more milk and eating of far more vitamin-rich cheese, butter, and ice cream.

STRIVING FOR PEACE

A great deal of my efforts were, of course, directed toward that greatest of all goals—world peace.

Everyone realizes what an atomic-hydrogen war would mean: Mass slaughter of civilians, destruction of cities, the turning back of civilization into the Dark Ages.

Therefore, as chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, I devoted my principal endeavor toward strengthening the free world alliance against communism.

Unfortunately, the Red menace continues to surge against our ramparts across the earth. Half of Indochina has fallen to the Kremlin. Elsewhere throughout the world Communist internal subversion and external aggression threaten.

Right in our own backyard, so to speak, I particularly directed my fire against the Communist-dominated Government of Guatemala, which held power in a land but a few hours bomber time away from the Panama Canal. Fortunately, the Red regime fell at long last, thanks to the courage of insurgent forces under Col. Camillo Armas, a hero who with his men were willing to lay down their lives for Guatemala's liberty.

I may note now that a review of all my other activities on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee—together with the activities of my colleagues, is being published as a separate Senate document.

During a period of 2 years, for example, our committee held over 270 meetings. We evaluated a great many treaties, resolutions, and nominations. As the world situation dramatically changed from day to day, often from hour to hour, I called my colleagues repeatedly together so that our committee might consult with the highest leaders of our Government—military, political, diplomatic, economic—on matters affecting world peace.

BATTLE TO PROTECT CONSTITUTION

Looking back, one of the early battles in the 83d Congress was over this issue: "Shall the traditional system of checks and balances within the United States Government continue?"

In other words, shall the system, which has served us so well for a century and three quarters, the system of checks and balances between the executive, legislative, and judicial branches—shall it endure or shall we start tinkering and tampering with the Constitution, upsetting it and endangering it by giving more power to one branch over another?

Fortunately, President Eisenhower righly advised the Congress not to upset the delicate checks and balances under the Constitution—not to pass a dangerous amendment, identified as Senate Joint Resolution 1—an amendment which, in spite of its glittering dressing, contained so much legal dynamite that no one knew how severely it might explode our delicate international relations.

And so, it was my privilege, with the President's backing, to lead the fight against the amendment, against those who, in the name of allegedly protecting the Constitution, were unwittingly endangering it.

This was not only the President's and my position—to keep the Constitution intact, unimpaired—but it was the position of his entire Cabinet and administration, and the position of a great many legal, business, women's, church, conservation, and other organizations throughout the Nation.

Fortunately, we prevailed in this fight to protect the Constitution. We defeated Senate Joint Resolution 1. Even its backers retreated and never dared to offer for a vote some of the worst features of the proposed amendment.

SIGNIFICANT ANTI-RED PUBLICATIONS

Turning to still other matters, during the Congress, I helped bring about publication of numerous congressional booklets which, I am glad to say, many observers have kindly and highly commended.

They include:

(a) A 285-page Internal Security Manual, Senate Document No. 47, containing, for the first time within the covers of one book, all the laws, Executive orders, and resolutions of the United States on internal security. This book is sold for 70 cents by the Government Printing Office; already thousands have been purchased.

(b) A booklet on Worldwide Strength of the Communist Movement, exposing Red power in each region and country throughout the world, as well as many other publications.

FIFTEEN GOALS OTHERS AND I FOUGHT FOR

Of course, there were a great many issues in which all of us in the congressional majority joined for final successful action. These issues proved to be the major milestones of the 83d Congress. Among them were:

1. The reduction of taxes by $7 billion;
2. The revision and reform of the Nation's complicated and obsolete internal revenue system (which for the first time in three-quarters of a century was simplified and overhauled);
3. The extension and broadening of the Nation's social-security program, thus helping to assure a square break for the more than 10 percent of our population 65 years of age and older and for all those approaching elderly years;
4. Private development of the miracles of atomic energy, yet with adequate protection of the people's investments;
5. Greater economy in Government—reduction of the Federal payroll and budget—so as to conserve the taxpayers' resources;
6. More effective United States defense measures;
7. Stimulation of wider private homeownership by better mortgage terms;
8. Progress toward improved health for our people, including legislation for diagnostic centers, and hospitals for the chronically ill;
9. Expansion of vocational rehabilitation so that the handicapped are not left as drains on themselves, on their loved ones, on their community, but can gainfully earn their own way;
10. Research on the Nation's heavy challenges for expanded education;
11. Fourteen reorganization plans to streamline Government—wipe away the cobwebs, the overlapping and duplication;
12. Strengthening of the vital new Small Business Administration;
13. Curbing of the inflationary price rise by sound fiscal policy;
14. Cost-of-living increases in veterans' pensions and aid to their dependents;
15. Expansion of our Federal highway system.

All of these and other actions were principles for which ALEX WILEY stands and for which he voted; they are principles for which the Republican 83d Congress stood and voted.

Basically, they are the goals spearheaded by the great man who occupies the White House, Dwight D. Eisenhower.

TAKING UP INDIVIDUAL MATTERS

No report on the work of the 83d Congress would be complete without referring to that great mass of Wisconsin matters which never reached the floor of the Senate.

I refer to the hundreds of appeals from individual constituents asking some redress or action from some Federal Government agency, perhaps the Department of Agriculture or the Veterans' Administration, or the Department of Commerce or the Department of Labor or any of the other scores of Government agencies, commissions, bureaus, or divisions.

In each of these instances, it was my pleasure carefully to weigh each appeal, then I did what I could, wherever I felt that the cause of an individual Badger citizen merited submission of the case to governmental officials.

As a result, I am deeply appreciative of the many kind letters which have come to my office in response to these actions in our people's behalf. But such efforts for our citizens—for our farmers or our city people, for our Wisconsin tourist industry, for our boys in the Armed Forces, for citizens and immigrants, for lawyers and doctors, housewives and white-collar workers, factory hands and miners—should not surprise anyone.

After all, we, in the United States Senate, or in the House of Representatives, have been sent down here to Washington in order to serve you, to fulfill your needs, to represent you in the best, worthiest possible way. We are your servants; the joy of being a public servant is to perform the job faithfully and well.

THE FIGHT AGAINST CRIME

After all, this is only, of course, a partial report on 2 years of work in 1953 and 1954.

I could refer to a great many other issues: To my battle, for example, against the forces of crime at home and abroad.

In this respect, I fought for the enactment of the international opium protocol to control the vicious worldwide dope traffic (which has already cost us so much harm, particularly to our younger citizens. The protocol was ratified unanimously by the Senate.

I fought, too, for the mass of legislation which had been recommended by the Kefauver Senate crime committee, of which I had been a member.

Not only did I fight for bills which I regarded as sound, but I fought against bills which I regarded as unsound, notably the infamous Chicago water-steal bill, which has been traditionally opposed by our own and other Lake States.

SUGGESTIONS ON PRESIDENTIAL APPOINTMENTS

And while I fought for good bills and opposed bad ones, I fought for good leadership as well.

I submitted various suggestions to the White House on Executive appointments, and I am exceedingly gratified that several such suggestions were adopted by President Eisenhower, notably in his selection of able Wisconsin-born Lewis Castle to head up the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation.

CONCLUSION

And so I bring this brief report to an end. I hope you have found that it answers, if only in brief summary, your question, "What did Alex Wiley do for his State and Nation?" The answer is: He did everything he could to report what he humbly feels are the best interests of 3½ million Wisconsinites and 160 million other Americans.

I want to thank my readers for their attention and to invite their reactions to this report.

Industry Mourns Shafer's Passing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. AYRES
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to your attention Joseph E. Kuebler's column in the Akron Beacon Journal of August 20.

I believe that this article further illustrates what a great loss we all suffered with the death of our beloved colleague, Hon. Paul W. Shafer.

INDUSTRY MOURNS SHAFER'S PASSING

(By Joseph E. Kuebler)

The rubber industry lost one of its best friends in Government circles the other day with the passing of Representative Paul W. Shafer, Michigan Republican.

He had a better understanding of rubber problems, particularly synthetic, than any other legislator. The reason was that he made a study of the question and devoted a lot of time on it. It was Shafer who wrote the Rubber Act of 1948 that set up permanent Government controls over rubber after the war emergency was declared ended.

The preamble of the law was especially important to business. It emphasized that it was the intent of Congress to establish a free and competitive synthetic rubber industry as soon as conditions warranted.

This may be the year for the Government's disposal commission in negotiating with various companies on the purchase of the federally owned plants.

Congressman Shafer helped to write the bill last year which is now a law and which is designed to get the Government out of the rubber business.

An Akron visitor on various occasions, he was widely regarded as a conscientious public servant whose views were always respected. The rubber industry mourns his death.

A Veteran's Report on Senator Humphrey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an article by Col. J. M. Chambers, USNCR, retired, appearing in the current issue of the Veterans Appeal, entitled "A Veteran's Report on Senator Humphrey." This article sets forth in detail the outstanding record made by the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. Humphrey] on behalf of America's veterans. I think all of us can be proud to be associated with one who has so ably and earnestly labored on behalf of those who fought to preserve our democracy.

Colonel Chambers is a veteran of five major campaigns in the Pacific. He is the holder of three Purple Hearts, three presidential unit citations, the Legion of Merit for combat, the Silver Star, and the Congressional Medal of Honor.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

When I was asked to review the record of Senator Hubert H. Humphrey on veterans' matters, I approached my task with real curiosity. I knew of Senator Humphrey's many interests but I did not know what his veterans' record would show. I soon found that his record was an estimable one.

There are few, if any, men in the United States Senate today whose record on veterans' affairs surpasses that of the junior Senator from Minnesota. Too often we are asked to judge a man on what he says he will do, on his promises. However, America's veterans need only look at the long list of deeds, actions, and solid achievement accomplished by Senator Humphrey in their behalf.

Indeed, Senator Humphrey's concern for veterans already has been recognized by the numerous citations he has received from veterans' organizations. Among them are the certificate of merit from the Amvets and an award from the Marine Corps for his assistance in its postwar recruiting program. One citation from the Marine Corps League hangs in Senator Humphrey's office. It reads, "For meritorious service in the field of legislation on the rehabilitation of Marine Corps personnel and Marine Corps veterans."

KOREAN GI BILL OF RIGHTS

If I were to single out of this distinguished veterans service record of Senator Humphrey's the most notable piece of legislation to which he contributed, I would select the Veterans Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952. This act, which Senator Humphrey consponsored and vigorously supported, is better known as the Korean GI bill of rights. It carries on the fine work that was begun by the original GI bill of rights first signed into law by President Franklin D. Roosevelt on June 22, 1944. Like its predecessor it extends to the veterans of the Korean conflict the benefits of education and training, GI loans for homes and businesses, and readjustment allowances for periods of unemployment. As Senator Humphrey has said:

"These programs are an excellent example of how wise use of Government credit can prove beneficial to the entire Nation. These are not just spending programs, as some people would have us believe; they are sound investments in the Nation's future which not only pay for themselves but repay our Nation many fold."

LEGISLATIVE INITIATIVE TAKEN BY SENATOR HUMPHREY FOR VETERANS

But the Korean GI bill of rights was not the only legislation on which Senator Humphrey took the initiative. Recognizing the severe financial strain that is put on many members of the Armed Forces who are defending our country, Senator Humphrey has proposed additional income-tax exemptions for persons on active duty, increased allotments for dependents of enlisted men; a program of grants-in-aid to assist the States in providing a program of infant and maternity care for enlisted men's dependents.

Support for the enactment of this latter program was voiced by the major veterans' organizations, including the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the AMVETS, the American Veterans Committee, civic organizations and other groups concerned with the problems of servicemen and their families. Urging favorable action by the Congress, Senator Humphrey said:

"It is essential, Mr. President, that the Congress enact a program of maternity and infant care. Many cases have arisen where pregnant wives of our servicemen have found it financially impossible to meet their medical and health needs as the result of the fact that the family's income was substantially reduced when the family breadwinner was taken into the Armed Forces. At a time when we are calling millions of our young men and women to serve their Nation in the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps, it is vital that the Congress face up to its responsibilities and provide for their families. The program envisaged by my bill is but the beginning of our responsibility."

In explaining his bill to increase dependency allowances Senator Humphrey remarked:

"The very least our Government can do for those called to service is to help provide for their families at the same time they are serving our Nation in time of crisis. We have a responsibility as a nation to protect the health, morale, and the security of the wives, mothers, and children of our fighting men. A soldier who is worried about the welfare and safety of his family is a soldier whose effectiveness is reduced. * * * They are perfectly willing to be of service to their country; but they are chagrined, disappointed, and hurt by the fact that their country does not make adequate provision for the support of their families while they are away from home."

Other legislation which Senator HUMPHREY joined in sponsoring included a proposal to make the Commandant of the Marine Corps a member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Another bill provided for the distribution of waterproof cards to members of the Armed Forces on active duty advising them of the requirements for proving the incurrence of service-connected disabilities.

Senator HUMPHREY has always been a leader in the fight to assure the Veterans' Administration and other organizations that render services to veterans adequate appropriations to fulfill their vital tasks.

HELP FOR DISABLED VETERANS

Senator HUMPHREY has told me that he believes no group, other than the dependents of those who have made the supreme sacrifice in the defense of freedom, have a greater claim on us than America's disabled veterans.

While Senator HUMPHREY realized that no congressional measure could make up for the loss sustained by America's war widows, orphans, and bereft parents, he did everything he could to ease the additional financial crises that such losses often inflict. Therefore, he voted to appropriate $5 million for the payment of $10,000 indemnity to the beneficiaries of servicemen who lost their lives in active service. In another gesture of remembrance Senator HUMPHREY voted to install a carillon in the Arlington Memorial Amphitheater, dedicated to the dead of World War II.

For 4 years Senator HUMPHREY served with distinction as a member of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. In 1951 he was the chairman of a subcommittee to investigate Veterans' Administration practices and policies on medical care. The report said in part:

"We believe that no medical care program can operate successfully for very long in an atmosphere where * * * uncertainties can be exploited by bureaucratic strivings for power, justification or personal glorification * * *. In this regard the subcommittee strongly emphasizes the fact that the subject medical and hospital program is so essential to the well-being—even the very lives—of many of our veterans that it absolutely must be kept dynamic and alert to the continuous advances made in hospital care."

Senator HUMPHREY and his subcommittee recommended 5 administrative and 3 statutory changes in order to strengthen the veterans medical service program. Most of these changes were put into effect. The Humphrey investigation and report helped the VA medical program over a serious crisis which threatened to return the program to the shambles which made it a national scandal in 1945.

Thanking Senator HUMPHREY for his contribution to the high quality of VA medical care, Dr. Joseph C. Hinsey, chairman of the executive council of the Association of American Medical Colleges, stated:

"We wish to congratulate you and your committee upon the objective and thorough investigation you have made and for your constructive recommendations."

The sharp concern demonstrated for our disabled veterans by Senator HUMPHREY as he headed this subcommittee is further illustrated by his voting record. He has voted to increase compensation rates to a level adequate for a decent standard of living; provide vocational rehabilitation to those with service-connected disability; establish for World War II veterans a presumption of service-connected disability in the case of tuberculosis, progressive muscular atrophy existing within 3 years after discharge; restore full compensation rates to World War I service-connected disability cases; provide special housing assistance to disabled veterans; help disabled veterans purchase specially designed automobiles; extend to members of Reserve components including National Guard men, who are killed or injured during short training periods the same benefits they would receive if they had been called to the colors for periods in excess of 30 days.

Senator HUMPHREY has explained:

"When I vote for this kind of legislation I do not believe we are granting any 'special privileges' to veterans. America is the great land of opportunity. All America's veterans want is the same chance to seize the opportunity that they would have had, had they not been called to defend our Nation. When they responded to that call, they did so at a great sacrifice of time, money, and blood. And this is not to mention the anguish of prolonged separation from loved ones. I believe it is the duty, rather the privilege, of Congress to compensate for these sacrifices. It is our job to restore as fully as we can the opportunities the veteran lost when he spent 5 years patrolling the North Atlantic or when he left a torn limb on the bloody slopes of Mount Suribachi, or Heartbreak Ridge."

Senator HUMPHREY has recognized the important role our veterans organizations have played in protecting the interests of veterans and in enriching community life. He voted to authorize the Armed Forces to lend certain property to any recognized veteran's organization for use at any national convention or national youth, athletic or recreation tournament. Senator HUMPHREY also has voted for legislation designed to protect the badge, medal, emblem, and other insignia of auxiliaries to veterans' organizations.

There is no room here to detail or even to mention the more than 100 measures Senator HUMPHREY has supported for veterans' and servicemen's benefits. However, I do believe that the few I have mentioned give a good indication of how Senator HUMPHREY feels and acts on veterans' matters. This has been part of the record of Minnesota's Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, a man whose deep belief in the principles of American liberty and democracy will never let him forget the men who fought to preserve it. Veterans are fortunate to have such an advocate.

Incentive Is All-Important

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial which appeared in a recent issue of the Washington Reporter, Washington, Pa.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INCENTIVE IS ALL-IMPORTANT

Since 1926, oil consumption in this country has increased more than 257 percent. Yet, due to the industry's intensive exploration and development work, our known oil and gas reserves underground are actually 229 percent greater than in that year.

Something that few of us think about has been largely responsible for this achievement. It is the 27½ percent tax depletion allowance on income from oil producing activities.

The head of a major oil company recently had this to say about the depletion allowance's importance: Any reduction in this provision of the tax law would adversely affect the stability of the petroleum industry.

"In making provision for the depletion tax allowance, Congress recognized the basic fact that not only oil and natural gas, but all other minerals in the ground, are capital assets of the owner. Once used, they cannot be replaced.

"Exploring for oil, always tremendously expensive, is increasing in cost every year. Without the incentive and capital recovery provided by the depletion allowance, many companies and individuals would be unable to continue oil exploration and drilling."

In wildcatting operations, only 1 out of 8 or 9 wells sunk turns out to be a producer. The rest are worthless. If we want men to take such long risks as these, we must offer them suitable inducements.

Tenth Anniversary of the GI Bill of Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech dealing with the 10th anniversary of the GI bill of rights which was delivered during a nationwide radio broadcast by one of my constituents, Mr. Edgar C. Corry, Jr., of Chicago, Ill., president of the board of trustees of the AMVETS national service foundation.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Ten years ago—while the guns of World War II were still firing in Europe and Asia, in the Atlantic and the Pacific, and the outcome of that global struggle was in doubt, the United States Congress drafted a bill unparalleled in history. In the course of one decade it affected the lives of more than 10 million men and women, and stimulated the economic welfare of America.

On June 22, 1944, President Roosevelt signed into law the GI bill of rights (more formally known as Public Law 346). At that time he said, "This law gives emphatic notice to the men and women of our Armed Forces that the American people do not intend to let them down."

A new concept was thus introduced into American thinking—help the veteran help himself. For as far as possible, the cost of war and of victory was to be shared by all Americans—not just those who served or died in uniform. It substituted the helping hand for the handout.

It is appropriate now—10 years later—to measure the results and the cost of the GI bill of rights.

Under the GI bill, the door of opportunity was reopened to millions in whose faces it had banged shut with frightening decisiveness after Pearl Harbor. During the troublesome years since 1944, millions of veterans have passed through this door; some to acquire new homes or farms, or to enter new businesses made possible by the guaranteed-loan provisions; some to receive educational and on-the-job-training benefits; and some merely to receive readjustment allowances while seeking a job.

It was very hard for most veterans to readjust themselves to the challenging circumstances confronting them when they returned from the war. But thanks to the GI bill, the transition period was measurably shortened, the absorption of 18 million additional civilians into a peacetime society was accomplished with a minimum of difficulty, and a threatened depression turned into prosperity.

How different from the aftermath of former wars. If you came back then in one piece you were on your own—go pick up the shreds of life by yourself—if you had a family to support in the meantime, well, it was just your tough luck. If you hadn't been able to learn a peacetime trade, or hadn't finished your schooling, or had little actual job experience, well—you were a tough-luck Charlie. Vast numbers of odd-job drifters and unemployed were taken for granted as a necessary price of war.

This time America faced facts. Almost a whole generation of our youth had been put into uniform. You can't turn loose 18 million young men from whom you have taken the 4 most crucial years of their life—you can't just turn them loose without wrecking a large percentage of them, and thereby inviting national economic disaster. Our Congress evolved a way of assisting the GI to become integrated into the business and community life of this country.

As a past national commander of AMVETS, and as president of the board of trustees of AMVETS national service foundation, I know at firsthand some of the great good the GI bill has accomplished. The basic intent of the law—the restoration of opportunities lost through no fault of one's own, likewise was one of the motivating reasons for the establishment of AMVETS—the only World War II veterans organization chartered by Congress. To help fulfill this objective, the AMVETS service foundation was created in 1948.

The help the veteran needs, as conceived by Congress, fell into three categories: education, readjustment allowances, and financial loans.

Nearly 8 million World War II veterans obtained education and training under the GI bill—that's 1 out of every 2 veterans. Some finished high school, other entered colleges and postgraduate schools. Still others received business education in what was known as on-the-job training and on-the-farm courses. More than 3½ million went to trade and vocational schools. The cost of all these training benefits was $14½ billion, but the country is reaping a rich reward in that investment. Since the draft law was enacted in 1940, the Armed Forces have been channeling much of our youth away from colleges and universities, but, since 1944, the GI bill has been filling the vacancies so created, with veterans. Every level of education and training has boomed under the impact.

The GI educational benefits have helped build our reservoir of trained manpower in fields of endeavor ranging from atomic physics to airplane mechanics—from medicine to the ministry. It has assured that the productivity of our land will continue high because of new specialists in agriculture and animal husbandry. It has raised the education level of the entire country and likewise has raised the national income level. A Census Bureau survey discloses that 1947 to 1952, the median income of the veteran has shot up 40 percent while during the same period the nonveteran group has gone up only 10 percent. The Census Bureau further reports "the higher incomes of these veterans may reflect the combined influence of the increase in work experience and higher level of education which veterans have achieved as compared with nonveterans. The net result is that the veterans who have had GI training will be paying approximately $1 billion more each year in Federal income tax. Within the next 14 years, these same veterans alone will pay off the entire cost of this program.

The second category of help which Congress devised was the readjustment allowance program which permitted allowances of $20 a week for a maximum of 52 weeks for veterans seeking a job. For those millions who were seeking their first job, and who now had families and dependents, the situation was exceedingly grim. They didn't want to be on relief. Nearly 9 million veterans received some readjustment payments, but to show you what stuff these guys were made of, only 10 percent drew their full benefits. The average GI had his new job in hand in 6 weeks. The readjustment allowance program was often viciously attacked and ridiculed during its first 2 years of operation. It was nicknamed the 52–20 Club with the implication that everybody would take a free ride on the Government, would wait until they had drawn their full $1,040 before they even started looking for a job. Well, the boys proved the cynics were wrong in a big way, and that the faith Congress had in them was well justified. And, by the way, that $3½ billion spent on them was immediately pumped back into circulation—it went for food, clothing, and rent. With a perspective now of 10 years, it can be safely said that the readjustment allowance program which ended in 1949 amply fulfilled the need for which it had been created.

The third major category of opportunities was the GI loan. Under this provision, the veteran was given the right to borrow money for which he had to pay interest at 4 or 4½ percent. With a guaranty by the United States Government, over 3 million veterans acquired a home for themselves and their families. When a man becomes a homeowner, he becomes an important and stable member of his community. You will be interested in knowing that $23½ billion were borrowed from banks, insurance companies, building and loan associations and other lending institutions. What kind of homes did these veterans buy? Sixty percent of all the homes acquired were in the $10,000 to $15,000 bracket. Each home purchased or built added strength to its community, and provided an additional source of tax revenue. The veterans need for housing spurred a gigantic building boom, and the availability of credit thus furnished, stimulated a multibillion dollar exchange of money.

Much can be said for other types of loans guaranteed by the GI bill—such as business and farm loans. There are thousands of success stories emerging from modest beginnings aided by small business loans guaranteed by the Government in an amount not to exceed $4,000. More than 50 percent of the one-half billion dollars of these loans have been repaid in full. Now that is such a terrific fact, that I'm going to repeat it again—more than one-half of all the business loans have been repaid in full. How's that for ability, integrity, and drive?

Many were fearful that the veteran was being saddled with a financial burden that would result in wholesale bankruptcy and create national chaos. The facts prove that the veteran has been an exceptionally sound financial risk. Over $3 billion have been repaid in full. The total defaults on all loans have been less than 1 percent of the funds borrowed by veterans. Many cynics anticipating a very high default rate on the Government-guaranteed loans believed that the American taxpayer would be the big loser when these defaults were absorbed by the Government. That less than 1 percent of defaults I mentioned amazed not only the cynics but the hopeful endorsers of the GI bill. In actuality the Government received an additional source of tax revenue from all the individuals, businesses, and industries which profited and prospered as a result of this multibillion-dollar spending.

Has the task undertaken by Congress in 1944 been completed? In part yes, and in part no. In part yes, because, as I said, the readjustment allowances were terminated in 1949, and no new applicants for education and training benefits are being accepted. The only major benefit still in force today is the GI loan. Its deadline is 1957. The VA has done a monumental and praiseworthy job in processing and administering all these many benefits for the able-bodied as well as its vast work in the medical field for the disabled.

In part no, because the problem of lending a helping hand to those who need it never ceases. AMVETS and its service foundation were established for the purpose of helping the veteran help himself and to repay in what small way we can the moral debt we owe to the widows and orphans of our partners in combat. To accomplish this we have maintained a staff of national service officers and VA accredited representatives, who counsel free of cost with the veteran, acquainting him with his rights and assisting him in the complicated mechanics of obtaining them.

Another illustration of the work of the AMVETS service foundation is the annual 4-year college scholarship given to 6 deserving high-school students whose fathers died in combat or were totally disabled. These students, carefully tested by the National Association of Secondary School Principals, receive the sum of $2,000 prorated by semesters. By the way, they are setting a terrific pace in college.

The annual AMVETS Christmas party provides homeless orphans throughout the Nation with a real Christmas celebration complete with toys, individual gifts, and a TV set or radio-phonograph for the orphanages in which they live. Right now let me thank all of you whose generous donations have helped us carry out such programs.

American generosity has given much to those who bore the brunt of battle. The 10th anniversary of the GI bill heralds an enriched America whose heroic soldiers have become its most devoted citizens, its local, State, and national leaders. That bill was a humane as well as a sound business investment made in the youth, and therefore the future of America.

Federal Funds for School Buildings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Board of Aldermen, City of Chelsea, Mass., on August 17, 1954.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the Federal Government has spent millions of dollars for roads; and

Whereas the Federal Government is continuously spending enormous amounts of money to foreign countries; and

Whereas all this money that is being spent comes from the people of the United States; and

Whereas many cities, including Chelsea, are confronted with serious problems, especially school buildings, and due to lack of money are unable to provide suitable quarters for the schoolchildren: Be it therefore

Resolved, That the President of these United States, the Senators of Massachusetts, and our Congressman look into this matter and find ways and means of having the Federal Government help our citizens by enabling cities such as Chelsea to build new schools and bring up properly the citizens of tomorrow in a proper environment and proper education and become an asset to our country; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to President Eisenhower, Senators Saltonstall and Kennedy, and Congressman Lane.

In board of aldermen, August 17, 1954, adopted.

Approved August 19, 1954.

ANDREW P. QUIGLEY,
Mayor.

A true copy.
Attest:

JOSEPH A. TYRRELL,
City Clerk.

Housing Act of 1954—Gross Inadequacy in Face of Growing Need

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, one of the most crying needs of our economy in this year of 1954 is an enlarged and revitalized housing program.

Coming from the Detroit area as I do—one of the most hard-hit and afflicted regions in this matter of public housing—I can appreciate the inadequacies of legislation which passed the Congress this July and was approved by the President during the early part of August.

The Housing Act of 1954 is an unrealistic approach to a problem which, in its immensity and urgency, and in terms of internal economic stability, is exceeded by few others.

The necessity for more low-cost housing is, at this time, desperate.

The truth of the matter is that private industry, notwithstanding the fine job it does, cannot provide sufficient housing, at a cost which low-income families can afford. At a time in our history when population is jumping by unprecedented leaps and bounds, this situation is one which calls for the most immediate type of relief.

We have asked for bread and we have been given crumbs.

Of the 37.1 million housing units in existence today, 9 million, or approximately 24 percent, are considered substandard.

Eight million American families still live in houses unfit for human habitation.

Out of more than 40 million nonfarm homes, 20 percent are classed as substandard because of structural condition or lack of basic sanitary facilities.

In addition to these 20-percent substandard homes, 4 million American families live in houses that have deteriorated to near-slum conditions and do not meet health and safety standards.

The housing bill which was passed by this Congress authorizes a start in construction of a maximum of 35,000 low-rent public-housing units between now and next June 30.

The original 1954 recommendation—and it was by any standards insufficient—was for 140,000 units over a 4-year period.

The proposal hit upon what seems to be a traditional snag in housing legislation.

The Public Housing Act was begun in 1937. It called for federally aided low-rent housing projects that would be locally owned and operated. Included also was a PHA-administered slum-clearance and low-rent housing program.

The Housing Act of 1949 set up the first realistic postwar public-housing policy on a long-term basis. It called for 135,000 new starts for federally subsidized housing units a year. This program, in 1951, was diminished to a limit of 50,000. A year later it was further reduced to 35,000.

In 1953, the last of President Truman's budget messages, the need was estimated at 75,000 public-housing units.

Thus, the need increases while provisions for housing decrease.

It can be shown that slums and blighted areas comprise about one-fifth of the total metropolitan area. In these confined and inadequate quarters some 33 percent of the population is housed. It can also be shown that these same regions account for a tremendously overproportionate amount of major crimes, juvenile delinquency, fires, and tuberculosis.

And yet it cannot be said to be absolutely and entirely the fault of those who are forced to live in these areas, detrimental to health and invitational, at times, to certain elements of the people who are, on occasion, unmindful of their duties to society.

We are giving billions, as well we must for the sake of national security, to the raising of standards in underdeveloped countries all over the world, but we seem to be forgetting those of our own citizenry to whom we owe first allegiance and from whom we expect so much in the continuation of the free American way of life.

On March 30 of this year, while the House was debating upon the independent offices appropriation bill dealing with slum clearance and possible housing projects, I said that it was a privilege to stand in the well of the House and represent the little people of this Nation, those receiving $2,000 a year or less.

I said at that time that it is easy enough to dangle before their eyes 40-year mortgages and more expensive homes, but it is impossible for them to attain such homes. I asked my colleagues whether they knew that the home in America is sometimes the most treasured among those who have the least of this world's goods. "But for people and for homes and for the small folk of this Nation," I stated, "we will wreck the housing program and send them honeyed words."

It is my sincere belief that we should, as soon as is humanly possible to do so, set about to pump life into our housing program, and take vigorous steps in the direction of slum clearance and redevelopment of urban centers.

Otherwise, it becomes the rankest type of hypocrisy to preach equality and opportunity abroad and yet deny to those at home the first-class citizenship status which a decent dwelling or home can help to provide.

Happiness at home, be it ever so humble, could well be said to be the basis of contentment and prosperity within a nation. Surely, in this day and age, and in this land which has done so much to raise the standards of human dignity for so many, such a goal cannot be unattainable.

Our potential is so great, if we will but make the effort.

Highlights of New Social Security Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert at this point a brief summary of what I believe are the highlights of the new social security legislation which the Congress has approved. It is my feeling that many people would like to have a concise résumé of the principal features of this important milestone in the field of social legislation.

EXTENSION OF COVERAGE

Farmers: The bill extends social-security coverage for the first time to self-employed farm owners and operators. This means that old-age and survivors' insurance protection will be extended to about 3.6 million farmers, their wives, and their children.

Farm workers: The bill also extends coverage to about 2 million farm workers who are not covered today. In general, farm workers who are employed regularly by one farmer are covered at the present time. The bill extends this same protection to those farm workers who earn $100 or more in the course of a year from 1 employer.

Professional groups: The bill extends social-security coverage to accountants, architects, engineers, and morticians. As a result, the only professional groups which will not be covered by social security in the future are lawyers, doctors, dentists, and other medically related professions.

Ministers: The bill covers ministers and members of religious orders—except those who have taken the vow of poverty—whether self-employed or employees, if they elect individually for coverage on the same basis as self-employed individuals. It is estimated that this amendment will extend coverage to about 260,000 persons.

State and local employees: The bill extends coverage to the employees of State and local governments who are covered by State and local retirement systems—other than policemen and firemen—under voluntary agreements between the

States and Federal Government, if a majority of the members of the system vote in a referendum in favor of coverage. There are about 3.5 million persons in this group.

Domestic workers: The bill extends coverage to domestic workers in private homes—and others who perform work not in the course of the employer's place of business—who are paid $50 in cash wages by an employer in a calendar quarter, regardless of the 24-day test required in the present law. This provision will extend coverage to about 250,000 persons.

The bill also extends social-security coverage to the following groups for the first time:

First. American citizens employed outside the United States by foreign subsidiaries of American companies under voluntary agreements between the Federal Government and the parent American company—about 100,000.

Second. Home workers who are now excluded from coverage as employees—whether or not they are now covered as self-employed persons—because their services are not subject to State licensing laws—about 100,000.

Third. Employees engaged in fishing and related activities, on vessels of 10 net tons or less or on shore—about 50,000.

Fourth. American citizens employed by American employers on vessels and aircraft of foreign registry.

Fifth. Cotton-gin workers: The following is a breakdown for the additional coverage—3,600,000 farmer operators, 2,100,000 farmworkers, 200,000 domestic workers, 3,500,000 State and local employees, 250,000 ministers, 100,000 homeworkers, 50,000 fishermen, 100,000 employees of foreign subsidiaries, 50,000 in employment not in course of trade or business, 100,000 professional self-employed, and 150,000 Federal employees; totaling 10,200,000.

INCREASE IN BENEFITS

More than 6.5 million persons now on the benefit rolls will have their benefits increased as of September 1, 1954. The average increase for retired workers will be about $6 a month, with proportionate increases for dependents and survivors. The range in primary insurance amounts for those now on the rolls would be $30 to $98.50, as compared to $25 to $85 under present law.

Persons who retire or die in the future would, in general, have their benefits computed by the following new formula: 55 percent of the first $110 of average monthly wage—rather than $100 as in present law—plus 20 percent of the next $240—rather than 15 percent of the next $200. Thus, an individual's retirement benefit will be as high as $108.50 a month, and he and his wife together could receive as much as $162.75 in retirement benefits.

The minimum monthly benefit amount for a retired worker would be $30, and the minimum amount payable where only one survivor is entitled to benefits on the deceased insured person's earnings, would be $30.

The maximum monthly family benefit of $168.75 would be increased to $200; the provision of existing law that total family benefits cannot exceed 80 percent of the worker's average monthly wage would not reduce total family benefits below 1½ times the insured worker's primary insurance amount, or $50, whichever is the greater.

EARNINGS BASE

The total annual earnings on which benefits will be computed and contributions paid is raised from $3,600 to $4,200.

COMPUTATION OF BENEFITS

The individual will be entitled to drop out from the computation of his average monthly wage for benefit purposes up to 5 years of his lowest earnings.

RETIREMENT TEST

The earnings limitation would be removed entirely at age 72—instead of at 75, as under present law. For beneficiaries under age 72, the earnings limitation would be made the same for wage earners and self-employed persons. A beneficiary could earn as much as $1,200 in a year from covered work without loss of benefits. He would lose a month's benefit for each unit of $80—or fraction thereof—of covered earnings in excess of $1,200, but in no case would he lose benefits for months in which he neither earned more than $80 in wages nor rendered substantial services in self-employment. Beneficiaries engaged in noncovered work outside the United States would have their benefits withheld for any month in which they worked on 7 or more days.

ELIGIBILITY FOR BENEFITS

As an alternative to the present requirements for fully insured status, an individual would be fully insured if all the quarters elapsing after 1954 and up to the quarter of his death or attainment of age 65 were quarters of coverage, provided he had at least 6 quarters of coverage after 1954.

Benefits would be paid to the surviving aged widow, widowed mother, and children, or parents of any individual who died after 1939 and prior to September 1, 1950, and had at least 6 quarters of coverage.

PRESERVATION OF BENEFIT RIGHTS FOR DISABLED

The period during which an individual was under an extended total disability would be excluded in determining his insured status and the amount of benefits payable to him upon retirement or to his survivors in the event of his death. Only disabilities lasting more than 6 months would be taken into account. Determinations of disabilities generally would be made by State vocational rehabilitation agencies or other appropriate State agencies pursuant to agreements with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

RECOMPUTATION OF BENEFITS FOR WORK AFTER ENTITLEMENT

An individual may have his benefit recomputed to take into account additional earnings after entitlement if he has covered earnings of more than $1,200 in a calendar year after 1953 and after the year in which his benefit was last computed.

CONTRIBUTION RATES

Employers and employees will continue to share equally, with the rates on each being as follows:

Calendar year:	Rate (percent)
1954–59	2
1960-64	2½
1965–69	3
1970–74	3½
1975 and after	4

The self-employed would pay 1½ times the above rates.

PUBLIC ASSISTANCE

The provisions of the 1952 amendments, presently scheduled to expire on September 30, 1954, with respect to temporary increases in Federal payments to State for old-age assistance, aid to dependent children, aid to the blind, and aid to the permanently and totally disabled are extended through September 30, 1956.

The provisions of the 1950 amendments for approval of certain State plans for aid to the blind which did not meet the requirements of clause (8) of section 1002 (a) of the Social Security Act are extended from June 30, 1955, to June 30, 1957.

A Report on the Agricultural Conservation Program in Ohio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. POLK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. POLK. Mr. Speaker, I recently expressed my concern over the policies of Secretary of Agriculture Benson in administering the agricultural conservation program. He seems not to fully understand the importance of conserving our Nation's greatest asset—outside of our children—our topsoil. Since 1936 we have made great strides in Ohio in assisting farmers in carrying out soil conservation practices. Prior to the ACP we used only 175,000 tons of lime and in 1952 we used 2,641,173 tons. But in 1954 we are going to use less than 2 million tons—possibly as low as 1,500,000 tons. Our lime needs in Ohio are 4,900,000 tons annually, according to soil specialists at Ohio State University. Why have we reversed this trend?

Prior to the agricultural conservation program, we used 15,862 tons of superphosphate in Ohio and in 1952 we used 84,199 tons of superphosphate under the ACP on pastures and seedings of legumes. In 1954, to date, our farmers have not applied for one-third this much.

In 1953 the 91,346 Ohio farmers participating in the agricultural conservation program seeded 368,706 acres of green manure. In 1954 this very important practice has been completely eliminated from the ACP. Why? To date, less than half of the 91,346 Ohio farmers participating in this conservation program in 1952 have carried out any conservation practices under the 1954 program. Why?

From an examination of the 1952 Ohio ACP Handbook and of the 1954 Handbook it is quite apparent what the reasons are. Between the restrictions imposed in connection with the price-support program and the regulations set forth in the 1954 ACP Handbook, Ohio farmers are subject to more regimentation than at any time in our history. For example, practice 2, on page 6, is itemized as follows:

> Initial establishment on cropland of alfalfa, timothy, red clover, Ladino clover, and bromegrass to retard erosion and to improve soil structure, permeability, or water-holding capacity, as a part of crop rotation.
>
> This practice is applicable only in counties or parts of a county where it is determined that crop rotations for soil improvement which includes perennial grasses, perennial and biennial legumes, or mixtures of such legumes and perennial grasses are not now generally in use.
>
> Federal cost-sharing will be allowed for the establishment on cropland of legumes or legumes and grasses, up to 35 percent of the cropland and where the county committee determines it is not now an accepted practice.
>
> The seeding must be for the purpose of improvement of the soil structure, retard erosion, permeability or water-holding capacity.
>
> Federal cost-sharing will be limited to an acreage increase up to 35 percent of the cropland as of January 1, 1954, excluding land to be plowed for grain during 1954 and all approvals will be subject to a further determination of eligibility of acreage on or after July 1, 1954.
>
> The application of lime will apply only to land that shows need of at least 2 tons of lime per acre by an accepted soil test and then the minimum amount required by the soil test, or on land that has not grown alfalfa or sweet clover satisfactorily in the last 4 years. If a seedbed is prepared in the summer or fall, the surface of the soil should be tilled so as to provide sufficient loose soil needed to establish a firm seedbed.
>
> Federal cost sharing will be limited to the following operations:
>
> (a) Applying minimum total of 90 pounds of available phosphate, potash, and nitrogen.
>
> (b) Applying a minimum of 2 tons per acre of agricultural ground limestone or its equivalent or that additional amount of lime required as determined by the method indicated above.
>
> (c) Seeding a minimum of one of the following mixtures on each acre:
>
> 1. Alfalfa, 10 pounds; timothy, 2 pounds.
> 2. Alfalfa, 7 pounds; medium red clover, 3 pounds; timothy, 2 pounds.
> 3. Alfalfa, 4 pounds; medium red clover, 4 pounds; Ladino clover, one-half pound; timothy, 2 pounds.
> 4. Medium red clover, 7 pounds; Ladino clover, one-half pound; timothy, 2 pounds.
> 5. Alfalfa, 10 pounds; bromegrass, 6 pounds.
>
> One-half of 1 pound of Ladino clover may be added to any 1 of the above mixtures.
>
> Grazing must be delayed until the new seeding has obtained a near maximum growth.
>
> The county committee may approve substitutions for the above seedings if the cost of the substituted seeds are as much or more than the cost of the above-mentioned seeds and the percentage of legumes or grasses is about the same, and if 75 percent of the substituted seeds are of perennial nature.
>
> The seeding must remain for at least 2 years.
>
> All of the above-mentioned operations must be carried out in order to receive Federal cost sharing.
>
> This practice will not apply in a county unless the county PMA committee can supply evidence to the State PMA committee to the effect that this practice is not now generally used in the county.

Now, Mr. Speaker, did you realize how many restrictions are spelled out in this practice? Farmers' experiences in establishing this practice are to be completely ignored and each farmer must follow this practice to the letter to be entitled to any assistance. Less than 2 percent of Ohio farmers have signified their intention of utilizing this practice.

Ohio farmers are experienced businessmen. They furnish all the work and most of the money under the ACP program. Would it not be a sound public policy for the USDA to encourage them to engage in the agricultural conservation program instead of making it difficult or impossible for them to do so? I am firmly convinced that we certainly should be getting the maximum of soil conservation out of the ACP money which is appropriated instead of setting up administrative red tape to prevent farmers from fully utilizing the program Congress has provided.

In 1952 a farmer could seed alfalfa by applying the amounts of lime, fertilizer, and seed he determined were proper. Under this administration, the farmers are directed from Washington as to the exact amount of lime to use, the exact amount of seed, and the minimum amount of fertilizer. Farmers who have found that other rates are equally satisfactory are denied assistance under Mr. Benson's program.

I will not take the time to go into the other practices in the 1954 Agricultural Conservation Program Handbook but they are equally wrapped in red tape.

Could it be that Secretary Benson and his assistants are taking this means to overcome the wishes of Congress? When the Secretary asked that this program be drastically reduced to $140 million for 1954, the Congress insisted on a minimum of $195 million. Could it be that the Secretary has written in all these restrictions so that farmers will not earn more than the $140 million he originally wanted? Many of my constituents who have used lime in the past, seeded clovers, and alfalfas, and carried out many other conservation practices since 1936 under the ACP with great success, cannot understand why they must change their procedures to comply with rules laid down in Washington.

Like most Americans, when they are told they must do this, or they must do that, on their farms, they are refusing to participate in the 1954 agricultural conservation program. Is it just the farmers who are the losers? Oh, no, Mr. Speaker, it is our entire Nation and particularly future generations. If we do not continue conserving our soil, our Nation's leading soil scientists tell us this Nation could have difficulty providing the food and fiber future generations will need.

Under previous agricultural conservation programs, we increased the acreage of legumes and new seedings several hundred percent; the use of agricultural limestone went up over 10 times; the use of cover crops also went up over 10 times. Even so, our soil specialists at Ohio State University estimate we were only using 50 percent of the practices necessary to get our conservation job done. Now, instead of helping come closer to our goal, we find the trend has been reversed.

Thousands of Ohio farmers have decided that the red tape and restrictions are too complicated to allow them to continue their partnership with the Federal Government in carrying out soil-conservation practices. Unless immediate changes are brought about, Ohio will this year turn back the largest amount of conservation funds since these programs were begun. Not because they are not needed to bring about conservation practices on Ohio farms, but because Ohio farmers cannot comply with the red tape and restrictions prescribed by Secretary Benson.

Social Security—A Story of Progress in an Uncertain World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, one of the most fundamental yearnings of every man, aside from a natural desire to derive a full measure of enjoyment from the fruits of his own labor, is to be able to live out the last years of his life peacefully and without dependence upon others, secure in the knowledge that, should he pass away, either during his working days or retirement, his wife and minor children will be provided for.

It was in the middle thirties that a program was inaugurated, the intent of which was to make available to our elder citizens some of the means with which they might live out their lives, beyond their years of active productivity, and look to the care of their loved ones, with dignity and self-respect. This program is social security.

It was never intended, nor do its sponsors, of which I have been one of the most articulate since its inception, mean that social security is to take the place of private savings, insurance or pension. It is to supplement those financial safeguards. It is to provide a base upon which can be built other forms of protection.

In the year of 1954, social security takes on an increased meaning to those who are now and are to be covered in the future by its provisions. Rising costs of living have made the dollar diminish in buying power, below, in comparative worth, what had been anticipated when the program was first passed by Congress.

Our older citizens are continually faced with greater expenses of living, and in many cases they lack the wherewithal to obtain even a modest percentage of the basic necessities of human life.

On April 6 of this year, shortly after hearings were begun by the Ways and Means Committee of the House on the Social Security Amendments of 1954, I made seven recommendations, the carrying through of which I felt to be imperative, in the light of present cost-of-living and economic conditions.

Since that time, the Congress has wisely acted to extend protection and coverage on 6 of the 7 points and on the seventh it took partial action. The provisions to which I addressed my remarks in that earlier speech follow:

First. The present bill extends old-age and survivors coverage to approximately 10 million more people.

Second. The Federal Government has agreed to continue contributions to the State for public and old-age assistance to those who are not included within the insurance system.

Third. It was agreed that the $75 limitations on monthly earnings should be increased to $100, computed on a yearly basis. This would mean that $1,200 could be earned in any given year, or in any segment of that year before benefits would be lost.

Fourth. Provision has been made for those workers who become permanently and totally disabled. They will be eligible for benefits, to be computed on periods of time other than their disability interval.

Fifth. Monthly benefits have been increased.

Sixth. The 2-percent contribution remains in effect as is.

Seventh. The earnings base on which benefits will be computed and contributions paid is increased from $3,600 to $4,200. I had asked that it be raised to $4,800.

The great majority of those things which I recommended have been carried into being by the 1954 social-security bill. This measure is part of a continuing effort, begun under a Democratic administration and effectuated by subsequent Congresses, to perfect the social-security system.

The present bill makes coverage available to approximately 3.6 million farmers and to certain professional people, including accountants, architects, engineers, and morticians. It also covers, on a voluntary basis, ministers, and members of religious orders.

The individual, for purposes of computation of benefits, will be able now to drop out from the computation of his average monthly wage for benefit purposes up to 5 years of his lowest earnings.

For disabled persons, certain provisions are made. By freezing old-age and survivors insurance status during extended total disability, these periods of non-wage-earning time are excluded from any computation of retirement or survivors benefits. In addition, there is available to the disabled individual the 4- or 5-year dropout mentioned above.

Many persons will be interested to know that the earnings limitation will now be removed entirely at age 72. Previously, it has been age 75.

In the matter of increase of benefits, the range in primary insurance amounts for those now on the rolls would be $30 to $98.50, compared to previous highs of $25 to $85.

The following chart will show how these raises will affect the many classes of persons covered by social security:

Retired worker (65 or over)

Old monthly payment:	*New monthly payment*
$25	$30.00
$40	45.00
$55	60.00
$70	78.50
$85	98.50

Worker and wife (65 or over)

Old monthly payment:	*New monthly payment*
$37.50	$45.00
$58.40	67.50
$80	90.00
$105	117.80
$127.50	147.80

Widow, widower, parent, or child

Old monthly payment:	*New monthly payment*
$18.80	$30.00
$30	33.80
$41.30	45.00
$52.50	58.90
$63.80	73.90

Widow and 1 child

Old monthly payment:	*New monthly payment*
$37.60	$45.00
$58.40	67.60
$80	90.00
$105	117.80
$127.60	147.80

Widow and 2 children

Old monthly payment:	*New monthly payment*
$45.10	$50.20
$58.50	67.60
$80	90.20
$140.10	157.10
$168.90	197.10

It has been a gratifying thing to observe, Mr. Speaker, as one of those who at its beginning, and through the years, has worked to make social security a reality, to note the beneficial extent to which the program has come. It is my sincerest hope that social security will continue to expand to meet the needs of all Americans, and that in line with sound fiscal requirements its provisions will be examined constantly by our Congress to assure the most equitable and substantial benefits and protection to our elder citizens, through whose efforts our Nation has become great, and to their dependents who, one day, will follow in their footsteps.

Island of Cyprus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Board of Aldermen, City of Somerville, Mass., on August 17, 1954.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolved, That the British Empire return to the Greek people an island in the Mediterranean known as Cyprus, as the inhabitants of this island are Greek, their language is Greek, and all their leanings are toward the Greek culture. The island in ancient times was a bulwark that had to be surmounted by the hordes of Persians. They, with the colonies of Asia Minor, were the last of the outposts of the western civilization that have come down to us from the Greeks; and be it further

Resolved, That this board of aldermen go on record as favoring the union of the island of Cyprus with the Kingdom of Greece, and it is requested that copies of this resolution be forwarded to the State Department at Washington, to our Representatives in the Congress from our Somerville districts, and to our United States Senators from Massachusetts.

In board of aldermen, August 17, 1954, read twice and adopted.

A true copy.

Attest:

NORMAN E. CORWIN,
City Clerk.

United States Seeks Peace Through Ideas and Mutual Friendships

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEROY JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, although I have served on the Armed Services Committee for 12 years, I fully realize that the enduring world peace which we are hoping and praying for cannot come through military conflict. An atomic war would destroy the entire industrial areas of the world. Our military posture has been misunderstood by many nations. We have been accused of seeking peace by the rattling of our armaments. We know that is not the fact. The problem is how to convince the nations of the world, so there will be not a shadow of a doubt as to our purpose, that we are merely using our strength as a protecting vehicle while we help develop world peace by negotiation and working with the free nations toward that end.

Fortunately, the two individuals who hold the two most important positions in the United States, namely, that of President of the United States, and Chief Justice of our Supreme Court, have both made very significant statements which indicate clearly to any unbiased person that we are seeking peace through peaceful endeavors.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am enclosing a very interesting editorial printed in the Christian Science Monitor which clearly points out what the basic purpose and plan of the United States is in its endeavor to bring about world peace.

Parenthetically, I wish that every foreigner in the world could read it, as in my humble opinion it not only expresses the desire of the American people but the determination of the American Congress that world peace shall come by the method set out in the editorial.

The editorial follows:

VOICES OF AMERICA

The real voice of America has been speaking out strongly this week. Its tones should help infuse the western alliance with renewed conviction and assurance.

Addressing the assembly of the World Council of Churches at Evanston, Ill., President Eisenhower has urged prayers for peace by "every single person in every single country in the world who believes in the power of prayer to the Supreme Being."

Speaking at the American Bar Association's dedication of the American Bar Center in Chicago, Chief Justice of the United States Earl Warren has just declared that "we are living in a world of ideas and going through a war of ideas," and that a peaceful world will be won "through ideas rather than armaments; through a sense of mutual friendship rather than with guns and bombs and guided missiles."

At Washington meanwhile the United States decision to withdraw four more military divisions from Korea caused diplomatic experts to remark that the possibility of peaceful "containment" of world communism—in contrast to belligerent confrontation of it—now is attracting new attention in the American Capital.

America has thus spoken in actions as well as words. Both words and actions bespeak a fundamental American devotion to peace. This is a timely message.

It comes as Communist leaders are trying their subtlest to divide the western world at its very core—the Anglo-American Alliance—by appeals to European desires for peace through negotiation, trade, travel, and the trappings and possible entrapments of sudden friendliness. It comes when a long siege of "McCarthyism," plus misunderstandings over far-eastern policy, disappointments over American trade policies, and many minor irritations normal to all long and close friendships have somewhat corroded free world relations.

The Eisenhower and Warren statements spell out, with full intellectual awareness, an almost instinctive American faith. This is the faith, amounting to conviction: That peace, like freedom, is basically a matter of ideas—that it is the reflection of the activity of thought rather than a product of physical force or of mere tradition in national and world affairs.

When this faith first was stated it set the American Colonies against the ingrained beliefs of European rulers. But today its reassertion brings the United States and its European allies closer together.

The reason for this is that Communist moves on the economic, political, and cultural fronts in Europe have recently been inadvertently aided by some moves by Washington. These were intended to meet military and political crises brought on by Communist expansionism. But they did not take sufficient account of the growing belief in Europe that the West had become strong enough to deal with world communism through quieter, more roundabout, and more patient methods.

Many of America's best friends in Europe—those who were thoroughly convinced that in any world struggle the United States would be representing the righteous cause as between communism and the free way of life—still were led to believe that if a world war came it might come through some American rather than Soviet action.

Against this background of confusion in Western relations the value of such statements as President Eisenhower's and Chief Justice Warren's is obvious. We hope Europeans will hear these statements and that in them they will recognize an America long familiar to them, where ideas and not force have governed the national outlook—where the conviction that true freedom and peace are dependent on God's guidance has shaped a national spirit.

Anfuso's Great Record as Congressman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, it is my distinct pleasure to address the House of Representatives regarding our former colleague, the Honorable Victor L. Anfuso, of New York, who has distinguished himself as a jurist on the bench in Brooklyn.

Many of you, I am sure, will remember Judge Anfuso who served in the 82d Congress during the years 1951 and 1952. In that short period of only 2 years he established a brilliant record as a great legislator and humanitarian. He continued that record on the bench where his humane approach and wise decisions have elicited much praise and recognition for him.

POSTAL AND FEDERAL WORKERS

In Congress, Anfuso was a member of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, where he took to his work most diligently. He sponsored legislation to better the lot of the postal workers and Government employees, he labored earnestly to improve their working conditions and to enable them to cope with the high cost of living by advocating substantial pay increases.

Congressman Anfuso was then the only Member on the committee from New York City, which has the largest number of postal and Federal employees. He was literally deluged with letters, telegrams, and personal calls to use his great influence and prestige in behalf of these hundreds of thousands of people and their families. He was only too happy to champion their cause in Congress because he regarded it as fair, just, and humane.

After many months of effort and untold obstacles, a pay increase bill was finally voted out by the committee, thanks to the untiring work of Congressman Anfuso and some of his colleagues. The men and women of the postal service throughout the country have given evidence of their appreciation of the unselfish services of Representative Anfuso on their behalf.

In his own Borough of Brooklyn, the postal employees presented him with the following citation:

> In appreciation to Hon. Victor L. Anfuso for your magnificent effort in behalf of all postal personnel, your approach and study of our problem while a member of the House Post Office Committee, your careful and thorough consideration during long sessions, your equitable and just conclusions regarding our needs, your energetic and eloquent words in debate on the House floor.
>
> *Resolved*, That we, through our elected representatives, hereby express our heartfelt gratitude.
>
> BROOKLYN POSTAL EMPLOYEES

The bill was passed and the millions of postal and civil-service employees and their families were grateful.

Soon after the passage of this bill, Representative Anfuso canceled a trip abroad in order to make a study of the postal service in his own State. He traveled from town to town, city to city, at his own cost and expense in the winter of 1951, visiting large and small post offices, in order that he could learn at first hand the working conditions of those who handle our mail.

VETERANS

But it was not only on the Post Office and Civil Service Committee that Representative Anfuso distinguished himself.

He also championed the cause of the veterans and lent his full support to the GI bill of rights. To raise the morale of our troops in foreign lands he introduced a bill to provide free postage for members of the Armed Forces of the United States serving outside the continental United States and Alaska.

He was in Congress less than 1 month when he took up the fight of the hopelessly crippled veterans who were threatened with eviction from Halloran Hospital. He also received this commendation from the veterans:

> To Hon. Victor L. Anfuso, presented in behalf of the grateful veterans of Brooklyn in appreciation for your genuine and untiring efforts in retaining a Veterans' Administration regional office in Brooklyn.
>
> The veterans of Brooklyn will be forever thankful for your endeavors in their behalf.
>
> FRANK J. NEWELL,
> *Chairman, Citizens Committee.*
> FRED SCHEFF.
>
> BROOKLYN, N. Y., *May 25, 1951.*

IMMIGRATION

The first day he was in Congress Representative Anfuso, who had previously served as special assistant to the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization Service, introduced a bill to improve the immigration laws and to admit 34,000 aliens of Italian nationality unable to enter the United States during the war years.

Because of the inequities of the McCarran-Walter immigration bill, he spoke several times on the floor of the House in opposition to that bill, pointing out its discriminatory and racist features and the injustices it contains. He did everything possible to defeat that obnoxious bill. He not only voted against it but urged many of his colleagues to vote against it. When President Truman vetoed the bill in 1952 Congressman Anfuso voted to uphold the President's veto in the hope of preventing enactment of the measure.

Even after he left Congress at the end of 1952, Anfuso continued his fight against the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act in the hope of amending it to make it more liberal. He became chairman of the National Committee To Amend the McCarran Act and thus continued his efforts to eliminate those features which are discriminatory against all races and nationality groups.

When he returns as a Member of Congress next January Anfuso will make the immigration problem the first item on his legislative program in Congress.

SECURITY OF OUR COUNTRY

During his service in the 82d Congress Representative Anfuso took a deep interest in matters pertaining to the defense and security of the United States. He introduced a bill to increase the Marine Corps to help fight the war in Korea.

He investigated the security of the Panama Canal and rendered a report warning the country that Panama was open for air attack. On March 24, 1951, following this report, President Truman took precautionary steps to safeguard this strategic arsenal of defense in the Western Hemisphere.

As far back as August 1951 Representative Anfuso cautioned our allies not to deal with the North Korean truce negotiators as they "were unscrupulous agents and stooges of Russia and that for us to place any faith in Communist promises would be a clear betrayal of American interests and security."

POLISH REFUGEES

The Polish newspapers of America praised Representative Anfuso for his great service regarding Polish refugees and stated that "he had won the confidence of the Poles of Brooklyn and New York for his actions in Congress."

CRIMES AND CRIMES PREVENTION

First. Narcotics: On June 21, 1951, Representative Anfuso introduced a bill to establish a customs port patrol in order to improve the enforcement of the antismuggling laws. The bill was principally directed against the smugglers of narcotics into the United States. Its purpose was to apprehend the drug before it got into the country and thus rob the smuggler of the great profit he would have derived from its sale in this country. Women's organizations throughout the country, interested in the welfare of their children, supported this legislation.

Second. Bureau of Crime Prevention: On April 1, 1952, Representative Anfuso offered a bill to conduct a study of the causes of juvenile delinquency and to create under the Department of Justice a Bureau of Crime Prevention which he regarded as more important than fighting crime.

He had been interested in this problem ever since 1936 when he founded the Italian Board of Guardians to curb crime and prevent juvenile delinquency among youths of Italian extraction.

For his humanitarian work regarding youth he was first to be knighted in 1946 by Pope Pius XI a commander of the Knights of the Holy Sepulcher, one of the highest honors ever to be awarded to a laymen by the Catholic Church.

RECOGNITION OF BROOKLYN

Representative Anfuso brought recognition and fame to Brooklyn with the Battle of Brooklyn commemorative stamp issue. The Brooklyn Eagle of September 25, 1951, stated editorially that "the people of Brooklyn are indebted especially to Representative Anfuso for this action."

ISRAEL

In Congress, Representative Anfuso voted for grants-in-aid to Israel to enable that country to absorb the hundreds of thousands of Jewish immigrants who settled there since Israel was established as an independent state. On several occasions he urged the United States Government to give full support to Israel as a bastion of democracy in the Middle East. He will continue these efforts also in the next Congress.

ANFUSO AND TRUMAN

In 1952, due to reapportionment of the congressional districts in Brooklyn, Anfuso had to step aside as the junior Congressman of the borough and accept a judicial post. All his friends in Congress and all those who observed his work in Washington regretted his departure. Among these was President Truman.

Drew Pearson, on May 1, 1952, wrote of Representative Anfuso's conference with President Truman as follows:

> President Truman was very blunt. As Anfuso was leaving, Truman asked how the New Yorker's own campaign was going.
>
> "I may not be back," replied Anfuso, "the party has other ideas."
>
> "Oh, no," objected Truman, vehemently, "you should come back. We need men like you in Congress. Don't you agree to anything like that. Give 'em hell. You did it before, and you can do it again."

CONCLUSION

Anfuso did not return to Congress for reasons beyond his control. He was appointed to the bench where he served with great distinction as a jurist. This year the people of his district have once again turned to him for representation in Congress.

By public demand and popular acclaim Anfuso was prevailed upon to run for Congress. He has received formal designation of the Democratic Party as its standard bearer for Congress in the Eighth Congressional District of Brooklyn. The citizens of that district now have the opportunity to return Anfuso to Congress, where he has served them so well and so devotedly in the past.

Aw, Forget the Whole Thing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 18, 1954

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the New York Daily News of August 17, 1954, is quite apropos:

> AW, FORGET THE WHOLE THING
>
> The Senate last Thursday, disregarding the views of J. Edgar (FBI) Hoover and Attorney General Brownell, passed by an 85-to-0 vote a bill to outlaw the Communist Party and make membership in it a crime. Such a law would make much harder the job of fighting communism by driving this criminal conspiracy underground.
>
> Hoping to water down such possible damage, the House yesterday passed by 305 to 2 a bill taking all legal rights from the Communist Party, but not declaring membership in it a crime.
>
> We think the proposed substitute is a little better than the original, but not enough better to justify its enactment into law. It would still drive the Red Party underground, so that Mr. Hoover's Federal Bureau of Investigation would have more trouble planting operatives inside the organization up to and including the top echelons.
>
> This fight against communism is too deadly serious for political fooleries. Why not just forget the whole proposal to outlaw the Kremlin party in this country and continue to fight it under existing statutes such as the Smith Act? These latter produce results.

My Report to the People: The Work of the 1954 Session of the 83d Congress—Part II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARLAN HAGEN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 18, 1954

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Speaker, I wish to continue my report to the people of my district with respect to legislation.

HOUSING

The principal housing program of the Federal Government, with the addition of the GI loan program, has been the insurance by the FHA of mortgages to encourage lending at reasonable interest rates. This program is continued as follows:

(a) Repairs: FHA will continue to insure 90 percent, with a maximum Government insurance amount of $2,500, of the cost of repairs on single-family dwellings with a repayment period of 3 years and 32 days. With respect to multifamily dwellings these restrictions are $10,000 and 7 years and 32 days.

(b) Home purchases: On 1- and 2-family dwellings FHA will insure 95 percent of the first $9,000 of value and 75 percent of amount over that with a maximum commitment of $20,000 of insurance. The maximum for a 3-family dwelling is $27,500 and for a 4-family dwelling $35,000. The payout period can be as long as 30 years or the anticipated life of the property, whichever is lesser. These rules apply to both old and new dwellings with a new permissible interest rate of 6 percent. The increased insurance will result in lower down payments.

(c) Special provision is also made for low-cost housing in rural and suburban areas which do not qualify under ordinary FHA standards of location of property. A farm home can qualify here if it will be adjacent to a highway and situate on at least 5 acres. The maximum of FHA mortgage insurance is $6,650 to an owner-occupant-mortgagor.

(d) Provision is made for insuring repairs which substantially protect or improve the basic livability or utility of property already under FHA mortgage. Increments to the FHA mortgage obligation for this purpose can bring the total obligation in excess of the original FHA commitment if used for building additional enclosed space. A GI owning a home can now use his full $7,500 guaranty entitlement for this purpose.

(e) Special provision is made for insuring home loans for men in service.

VETERANS

The Veterans' Affairs Committee of which I am a member reported the following legislation which was approved by both Houses:

(a) Added 1 year to the present 2-year period during which Korean war veterans can exercise their option to take Government-sponsored college or other training. The same legislation clothed the VA Administrator to extend the time of initiation and completion of rehabilitation training of World War II and more recent veterans who were prevented from such training by their disability, a prior inability to establish the service connection of their disability, or a discharge which has been corrected to an honorable discharge.

(b) Very often private capital will not finance GI housing outside of metropolitan areas. To meet this problem a program of direct Government loans to GI's was instituted. This program was continued for 1 year and the appropriation therefore increased to $150 million.

(c) Briefly there are two categories of person receiving veterans' money payments. Veterans with a service-connected disability, their widows and surviving children and suriviving dependent parents. Veterans with a completely disabling non-service-connected disability which rendered them unemployable and their surviving widows and children. The latter groups must meet certain pauperlike income and property restriction. The Congress passed a bill increasing service-connected disability payments by 5 percent, increasing a childless widow's allowance by $12 and a surviving parent's allowance by $15 in the case of a sole parent and $10 in the case of 2 surviving parents. A subsequent bill increased benefits to non-service-connected pensions and their surviving eligibles by 5 percent.

(d) Appropriations for veterans' hospitals were inadequate because of the action of the Administrator and the Appropriation Committees.

(e) Authorization was granted for the establishment of plots in national cemeteries for deceased servicemen even if the remains of the deceased were not brought back from overseas.

SOCIAL SECURITY

The social-security system was liberalized as follows:

(a) Coverage was extended to self-employed farmers, architects, engineers, funeral directors, public accountants, domestic, and casual workers receiving as much as $50 from a single employer in a calendar quarter, and farm workers on the same basis except the monetary amount is $100, fishing industry employees; on a majority vote basis employees under State and local government retirement systems; ministers and members of religious orders can be included on a voluntary basis.

(b) Earning limitations: No limit now for persons 72 and older. Persons under such age can earn $1,200 without losing benefits.

(c) Amount of benefits depends on the average monthly wage. In making this computation under the new law 5 years of low or nonexistent earnings can be excluded. The limit of annual earnings which applies in such computation is increased from $3,600 to $4,200.

(d) Greater payments are permitted. For those presently on the rolls they may range from $30 to $98.50—for those qualifying hereafter $30 to $108.50. The percentage of average monthly wage in calculating benefit payments is increased. Survivors benefits are increased and the widow, widowed mother, or parents of a person who died after 1939 and prior to September 1, 1950, are made eligible even if the decedent had only 6 quarters of coverage.

(e) The contribution rates of employers and employees are reestablished as follows: 2 percent for 1954–59; 2½ percent for 1960–64; 3 percent for 1965–69; 3½ percent for 1970–74; and 4 percent after 1975.

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

Coverage of the act was extended and other minor changes were made.

(a) On the basis of service performed after December 31, 1955, Federal employees will be covered with the Government making the employer contribution on the basis of reimbursement to the States of claims paid. The amount and duration of benefits will be governed by the law of the State where the employee last worked.

(b) Otherwise eligible employers who employ at least 4 employees in each of 20 weeks will be subject to the act. This will not affect California which already qualifies an employer with a lesser number of employees. Although farmers and some farm workers were included under the social-security coverage attempts to include farm workers under unemployment insurance coverage were rejected.

(c) Employers with a good employment history can now qualify for reduction of payment after 1 year rather than the present 3 years. This is of benefit to new employers.

ANTISUBVERSIVE LEGISLATION

Both Houses passed a bill which would outlaw the Communist Party. The effect of this provision is uncertain, inasmuch as party membership is not made a crime, but apparently it will destroy the visible party apparatus such as its offices, its publications, its candidates on the ballot. The same bill provided that Communist infiltrated unions would be denied the protection of the labor relations law.

RAILROAD RETIREMENT

The Railroad Retirement Act was liberalized in a great many particulars. The age of eligibility for widow and dependent parents for survivors annuities was reduced to age 60. The maximum daily benefit rate under the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act was increased from $7.50 to $8.50.

BRYSON BILL

A number of my people expressed support of the Bryson bill which would establish regulation of the methods of liquor advertising on radio and TV. Neither the House nor Senate committees approved such legislation, but the House committee advised the industry of its concern with this problem by requesting a report from the industries concerned as to past efforts and future intentions for self-policing of disapproved practices.

MY VOTING RECORD

One of the tests of diligence of service is active participation in the affairs of the House. One of the evidences of such participation is the record of voting and being present. During the 1954 session of Congress there were 148 recorded rollcalls. Of these 76 were votes on issues and 72 were mere quorum calls. I failed to vote on an issue only once and missed only three quorum calls and had no absences from my committee meetings.

Religious Faith Groups Distribute 155 Million Pounds of United States Surplus Foods in Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 5, 1954

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following statement issued by the Church World Service of the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the United States is deserving of the widest possible circulation:

RELIGIOUS FAITH GROUPS DISTRIBUTE 155 MILLION POUNDS OF UNITED STATES SURPLUS FOODS IN YEAR—HANDLE 87 PERCENT OF ALL COMMODITIES RELEASED BY GOVERNMENT AS GIFT OF AMERICAN PEOPLE TO NEEDY OVERSEAS—THIRTY-SEVEN COUNTRIES SHARE IN $59,521,157 SHIPMENTS FROM OUR OVERABUNDANCE OF MILK, BUTTER, AND CHEESE

More than 155 million pounds of United States surplus foods—given by the American people through their Government for free distribution to the destitute and hungry overseas—were distributed to these victims of war, famine, and disaster through agencies of Protestant, Roman Catholic, and Jewish faiths during the year ended April 30, 1954.

This surplus food—butter, cheese, and powdered milk valued at $52,226,015—represented more than 87 percent of all such surplus foods distributed abroad during the last year by all American voluntary relief agencies.

Of the remainder, 7.6 percent—13,660,000 pounds valued at $3,870,850—was distributed through the Cooperative for American Remittances to Everywhere, Inc. (CARE), and 5.3 percent—9,545,000 pounds valued at $3,424,292—through 8 other nonsectarian agencies.

This was made known today in the quarterly report to its membership by the American Council of Voluntary Agencies for Foreign Service, 20 West 40th Street, New York City, in which are represented 46 agencies for overseas relief and service registered and recognized by the United States Government.

Total of the surplus foods released by the United States Commodity Credit Corporation for free distribution during this period was slightly in excess of 179 million pounds, with a total value of $59,521,157.

Distribution of the large amounts of foodstuffs by the faith groups was through their existing overseas networks of relief personnel and associated religious agencies in 37 countries abroad, and was carried out, religious agency leaders here said, in addition to their ongoing worldwide regular schedules of relief programs.

All handling costs of the "operation surplus," they said, were defrayed by voluntary contributions of their religious constituencies—in Protestant churches largely through the united appeal and "one great hour of sharing," in the Roman Catholic Church through the bishops' fund appeal, and through the United Jewish Appeal and other relief fund programs within the Jewish faith organizations.

Commenting on the surplus distribution by the American relief agencies, religious relief agency leaders pointed to its significance in view of pending legislation in the Congress looking toward a vastly increased program of disposal abroad of the Nation's huge stocks of overabundant commodities.

Moses A. Leavitt, executive vice chairman of the American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee and chairman of the American Council of Voluntary Agencies, said:

"The successful pattern for free distribution of our surpluses, set by this experience, the careful carrying out of our programs in such manner as to preclude unfavorable effect on the economies of the recipient peoples, and the response of the American people, particularly through their religious institutions, to further this achievement of true compassion and brotherhood are guideposts clearing marking the way for the greatly enhanced free distribution of our surpluses now being contemplated by the Congress."

Msgr. Edward E. Swanstrom, executive director of war relief services, National Catholic Welfare Conference, and vice chairman of the American Council of Voluntary Agencies, said:

"The Catholic Church everywhere rejoices in the increased aid to the hungry and destitute of the world made possible through this use of our excess foods for free distribution in the areas of distress to those there without means to buy, without strength or opportunity to work and earn, victims of circumstance who must eventually perish unless they are ministered to by the more fortunate of the world.

"There can be little excuse for us, blessed by God with so much more of His produce than we can use, if we fail to share it with our starving and homeless brethren in every way possible—through our governmental as well as through our personal abilities."

Dr. Wynn C. Fairfield, executive director of Church World Service, interdenominational relief arm of major Protestant churches, and honorary chairman of American Council of Voluntary Agencies, said:

"This sharing of our overabundance with those in need abroad, motivated by the religious ideals upon which our Nation was founded, gives expression to the ever-present spirit of thanksgiving in the hearts of our people, their gratitude to their Creator for the great goodness He has shown them.

"It is highly gratifying that they have so pointedly chosen their religious agencies to implement so largely this sharing of their good fortune.

"While our main joy, as regards the surpluses, is that they greatly increase our opportunity to relieve the suffering of people, we also recognize the services those surpluses perform for world peace, identified as they are as the gifts of the American people—freely given, people to people, with no strings attached, and without cost or obligation to the governments of the nationals concerned.

"To a hungry man, woman, or child, a gift of food is a most practical and potent ambassador of good will."

Surplus commodity shipments made during the year by the agencies

[In pounds]

	Dry milk	Butter	Cheese
RELIGIOUS FAITH GROUPS			
American Friends Service Committee	2,305,000	505,000	800,000
American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee	315,880	516,000	278,000
Church World Service	18,449,000	4,485,560	1,732,300
Hadassah	4,000,000	18,251,000	7,161,000
Lutheran World Relief	12,935,000	3,600,000	1,550,000
Mennonite Central Committee	280,000	60,000	28,000
Unitarian Service	116,000		
War Relief Services	52,125,000	12,000,000	14,125,000
Subtotal	90,615,880	39,507,500	25,674,309
NONSECTARIAN GROUPS			
American Friends of Austrian Children	80,000	460,000	80,000
American Middle East Relief	500,000	2,500,000	
American National Red Cross	1,200,000		
CARE	10,510,000	3,150,000	
Foster Parents' Plan for War Children	40,000	60,000	35,000
International Rescue Committee	2,630,000	1,150,000	300,000
Iran Foundation	380,000	60,000	
Save the Children Federation	40,000		
Tolstoy Foundation, Inc			30,000
Subtotal	15,380,000	7,380,000	445,000
Total	105,995,880	46,887,500	26,119,309

DOLLAR VALUE OF COMMODITIES SHIPPED, MAY 4, 1953–MAY 1, 1954

Milk	$16,805,910.80
Butter	32,472,854.20
Cheese	10,242,392.50
Total	59,521,157.50

(Based on Department of Agriculture figures.)

Impartiality Fails To Win New Friends in Middle East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, the August issue of the Democratic Digest, the monthly organ of the Democratic National Committee, contained what I consider a very forthright and detailed analysis of the changes which this administration has wrought in American policy in the Middle East and particularly toward Israel. While I may not subscribe to every statement made in this hard-hitting article, it is on the whole an excellent presentation of some aspects of a situation which has been brought about by the administration's policy of so-called impartiality in the Middle East.

I ask unanimous consent that this article from the Democratic Digest be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IMPARTIALITY FAILS TO WIN NEW FRIENDS IN MIDDLE EAST

A year ago, Secretary Dulles went off to the Near East in search of a new policy for that troubled and turbulent area.

He returned with a slogan—"Impartiality." Over a television network, on June 1, 1953, he offered a solemn new pronouncement.

"United States policies should be impartial, so as to win not only the respect and regard of the Israelis but also of the Arab peoples," Mr. Dulles said.

While Mr. Dulles' statement occasioned some misgivings in the minds of those who were troubled by its possible repercussions on both the Arabs and the Israelis, the general reaction was not unfriendly. For the word "impartiality" has a pleasant ring. Everyone wants our country to be the warm and sympathetic friend of all the peoples of the world.

But the trouble with the doctrine was that Mr. Dulles presented it as if it were something revolutionary. Accordingly, the inference to be drawn from his speech was that America had not been impartial in the past. This fitted in with the thinking of Arab leaders who have always accused America of preferring Israel. Their contention implicitly sustained, they were naturally inclined to believe that our interest in Israel would diminish and our solicitude for Arab favor would rise.

It is not clear that this was Mr. Dulles' intention. But, whether or not Mr. Dulles so intended it, the Arab States have been encouraged by the slogan to increase their pressure for concessions at Israel's expense. The inevitable result of the new policy has been a sharp increase in Arab-Israel tension, marked by a series of violent border incidents.

The Secretary of State is now being urged to take another look at his New Look in the Near East. It is evident that his policy, or slogan, has failed. It has not brought peace to the region; it has not improved relations between Israel and the Arab States. And it has not helped the United States itself for it has won us the friendship of neither side. What is even worse, there is ground for believing that we are less popular than ever before.

Mr. Dulles' basic blunder, some critics say, was his acceptance of the charge that America has been unfriendly to the Arab States. A look at the record is of value.

American policy toward the Near East first assumed importance in World War I when Woodrow Wilson captured the imagination of the world by calling for the self-determination of nations as one of his 14 points. At the close of World War I the Western Allies broke up the Turkish Empire's near-eastern rule, and opeed the way for self-government by 45 million people. Four Arab States then came into being in the historic land at the Mediterranean's eastern end.

The same principle of self-determination was reaffirmed in 1947 at the United Nations, when we backed the recommendations of an independent commission for the partitioning of Palestine in order to create a separate State of Israel. When armed conflict developed over the partition issue, the United States maintained a scrupulous neutrality by declining to sell arms to either side.

Higher economic standards for the entire area have been a cardinal point of more recent American policy. Through private American aid has gone exclusively to Israel, American Government assistance has been international in scope. The United States, for example, has contributed $124.5 million to a single Arab program, the United Nations help for Arab refugees.

From the self-determination of Woodrow Wilson to the 1952 Republican platform plank drafted by John Foster Dulles, this policy has been bipartisan. Like President Truman and Secretary Acheson before them, the Republicans in 1952 set their object as "peace between Israel and the Arab States" and "economic and social stability in the area."

Despite this aim, Secretary Dulles also set himself a new task when he said June 1, 1953:

"The United States should seek to allay the deep resentment against it that has resulted from the creation of Israel."

This revealed a readiness on the part of the Department of State to apologize for America's friendship for Israel and to disregard the contribution our Government has made to the development and progress of the Arab States. Moreover, critics of Dulles say, the utterance was tantamount to provocation. To what lengths would the United States go to allay Arab resentment? Arab leaders were invited to speculate on the answer to that question, to turn wide the faucets of resentment, for the more resentment, the further the United States might go to meet their demands and to cut Israel down to Arab League specifications.

Critics also say that in pursuit of Arab favor, we have made Israel the target of criticism and reproach, while we have exercised polite moderation in our reaction to acts committed by the Arab States.

Until the beginning of the new administration, American policy actively advocated direct negotiations in an effort to work out a peace treaty between Israel and the Arab States which are still technically at war. But under Mr. Dulles our Department of State changed its position. Today, we have a limited objective in the Near East. It is to reduce tension. But tension refuses to be reduced. On the contrary, tension has steadily risen.

Egypt has intensified its blockade of the Suez Canal, and even food shipments to Israel have been confiscated. There is a fusillade of violent threats from the Arab side. The youthful new King of Saudi Arabia has declared that the Arab world should be willing to sacrifice up to 10 million people to wipe out Israel. The Prime Minister of Iraq told his Parliament early this year:

"Whoever called for peace with Israel would be guilty of high treason and should be hanged."

All through the spring and summer of 1953, the Israel-Jordan frontier was a line of bloodshed. There was a succession of raid and retaliation. Scores of men, women, and children lost their lives on both sides of the frontier. The Israel Government formally presented an appeal to the great powers without results. Israelis then took the law into their own hands in a raid on a Jordanian village. The issue went to the United Nations Security Council. No one condoned the Israel raid. Jordan, however, had also been guilty of flagrant armistice violations. Nevertheless, instead of dealing with the whole complex of Arab-Israel relations, and instead of calling upon Israel and Jordan to sit down forthwith to try to restore the crumbling U. N. armistice agreement, the Western Powers, led by our Department of State, pushed through a resolution which singled out Israel for rebuke and censure. The Arabs went away exulting in a diplomatic triumph.

Border conflicts were related to the area's chronic water shortage. The River Jordan, in fact, is the only running water supply in this controversial area, where the only thing people can agree on is that water is life. Indeed, the river has been fought over since Biblical times.

In late 1953, the Israelis started construction on a hydroelectric and irrigation project using the Jordan waters. Syria promptly protested to the United Nations that Israel was violating a nonmilitarized zone. U. N. Truce Supervisor Vagn Bennike told the Israelis to stop work on the dam, which they at first refused to do.

This touched off a rapid fire series of incidents in the United States. First Mr. Dulles cut off aid to Israel for opposing Bennike. At a White House press conference, President Eisenhower said amen. Israel's Ambassador told the U. N. Security Council that Israel was blameless but would nonetheless halt construction while the delegates were considering the matter. It so happened that the United States had suspended aid on the eve of elections in New York City, where the feeling for Israel runs strong. The Republican candidate made a hasty visit to the State Department to intercede, and emerged from his interview reporting progress. Mr. Dulles announced that financial aid to Israel had been reinstituted, which the White House noted "with pleasure."

Shortly afterward Eric Johnston announced that he had been appointed as a special envoy to the Near East to sell a TVA-type plan for international development of the Jordan. He had already left the country by the time President Eisenhower confirmed his appointment.

The plan was advertised as a solution for the Arab refugee problem, but examination of the plan revealed it was a possible solution for only a small number of individual refugees and not for the refugee problem. Michael Straus, former United States Commissioner of Reclamation, indicated that the plan was more a tentative idea than a working document. It had been drawn "without field surveys and with somewhat theoretical hydrology and shadowy cost estimates," he said. "A remarkable thing about the plan was its studious avoidance of the chief cause of all the trouble—the international boundary lines between Israel and the Arab States which crisscross the watershed. It ostriched on such cruel facts by explaining that it was answering a hypothetical question about how the water might best be used if there were no national boundaries."

As it turned out, the merits of the plan were irrelevant. Jordan didn't even wait for Johnston to land at Amman to announce that it would have no part of the proposal. In rapid succession, Egypt, Syria, and Lebanon said that they did not care to buy, while Israel countered by announcing an entirely different plan. American prestige in this area was not boosted by the incident.

The Dulles regime has also been criticized for the proposal to make arms available to Iraq and any other Arab State which cares to apply for membership in the new Turkish-Pakistan alliance.

Even advocates of this plan concede that these arms are not scaled to stand off a Soviet invasion. Moreover, there is no evidence that the United States has obtained any assurances that the arms will not be used against the Israelis. There is concern that the combination of these two factors may be taken by the extreme nationalists as a tacit blessing on their turning the guns against Israel.

Many observers are convinced that these guns are far less effective American gestures than economic aid which will help raise the living standards of large numbers of people in the region. Moreover, they point out, unless our prestige is at a high point, we have no assurance that these weapons will be used on our side in the event of an East-West showdown.

While this point may be in dispute, there is no dispute that the road to reconciliation and peace between the Arabs and Israelis is a long and hard one. All we can insist upon is that both sides sit together in direct negotiations.

We can't impose peace on them, but we ought not to make peace more difficult by letting it appear that we have relinquished hopes of its attainment. We ought not to encourage any side in the delusion that we condone continued conflict. We should not arm one side.

That is the reasoning of those who say that it is time that Mr. Dulles took another look at his policy, and who would like to have him consider this question: Is so-called impartiality an adequate substitute for friendship? Is a slogan hiding a disruptive change in United States policy?

Editorial Views on the Communist Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I know of no bill, other than that to outlaw the Communist Party, offered to any Congress which has received almost unanimous support of the Congress and practically unanimous condemnation by the press of the country.

The following is but a small sampling of the adverse editorial comment across the country:

[From the New York Post]

Bill Is a Monstrosity

In a more rational time the revised bill would be generally recognized as a monstrosity, which it is. * * * A wretched repudiation of democratic principles. * * * An outrageous affront to free society. It deals not with underground Communist conspiracy but with the suppression of public political activity. It suggests to free men in other countries that our democracy has succumbed to panic. What happened was an almost total failure of nerve among men who had heretofore resisted the know-nothing crusade. The Republic is no safer today than it was yesterday. The bill's constitutionality is in grave doubt; there will be new and interminable litigation. The real damage has been inflicted, not on the crumbling Communist Party, but on the cause of liberalism and of freedom itself.

[From the New York Daily News]

Dubious on Fair Deal Move

We were against the outlaw-the-Communists bill originally introduced by a clique of Fair Deal congressional sharpshooters. We're in favor of anything that will hurt the domestic Reds, but feared this measure would do them more good than harm. We're dubious about the revised version that finally passed Congress, though we think it is better than the original.

[From the New York Daily Worker]

An Act of Betrayal

The mob spirit let loose in Congress by the cynical maneuver of the liberal Democrats to out-McCarthy McCarthy, and thus prove their innocence of 20 years of treason, has finally produced the get-the-Communist measure which both Congress and the White House could agree on. Whereas the 1950 [McCarran internal security] law was so drawn as to try to bypass the plain constitutional provision which forbids Congress to pass any bill of attainder—that is, a congressional law which finds a person or group guilty of a crime by taking a vote—the new

White House-McCarran liberal-Democrat compromise throws aside even this cynical precaution. This is an act of betrayal which recalls the eager servility with which the German Socialists and liberals unveiled Hitler as their anti-Communist Fuehrer in 1933—only to be marched off to concentration camps shortly after along with the Communists.

[From the Boston Herald]

Constitution Stretched

The Communist Control Act of 1954 adds nothing (with one minor exception) to the better control of communism. And in order to add that nothing, the act hinders the operation of existing anti-Communist measures and sets up hazards to our constitutional freedoms. * * * To accomplish this suppression of the Communist Party, Congress has severely stretched the Constitution. * * * The courts have already shown, by the convictions under the Smith Act and the upholding of those convictions in the highest tribunal, that they are ready to recognize the clear and present danger.

[From the Louisville (Ky.) Courier-Journal]

Ghost Being Outlawed

All that remains of the [Communist] party now is the disciplined and stealthy nucleus which has probably long since destroyed overt evidence of its membership. Outlawry invoked against these people is an empty gesture. They are already underground, but it is a gesture which denies our traditions and violates many of the protections of the Bill of Rights. Buried in the outlaw bill, in such confusion that only lawyers can really sort out its meaning, is a gesture of aimless malice toward Communist-dominated labor unions. Our representatives in Congress might well have devoted the last days of the session to serious affairs of state. Instead, they have presented to the world and to ourselves the dismal spectacle of hundreds of grown men tumbling over one another to outlaw a ghost.

[From the Hartford (Conn.) Courant]

Political Gesture

The politically inspired anti-Communist amendments * * * have now been simmered down by conference compromise. * * * If half the vigor in pressing these amendments had been exerted in the days when Pressman, Silvermaster, Hiss, and others were running the Government, we might have been saved many subsequent headaches.

[From the Washington (D. C.) Star]

Poor Performance

The compromise anti-Communist bill which Congress finally has passed is an improvement over the drastic outlaw bill which went to conference. But it remains a piece of hastily drawn, dubiously useful legislation. * * * It is the kind of legislation that could be expected to emerge from such confusion, with election-year overtones, as marked its 11th-hour consideration and passage. * * * The only part of the legislation which the administration really favored is the provision cracking down on labor organizations dominated by Communists.

[From the Washington (D. C.) Post and Times Herald]

Retreat Is Good Judgment

Sponsors of the drastic bill to fine and jail Communist Party members and fellow travelers have shown good judgment in their retreat from it. The strongest argument that had been advanced in favor of the bill was that Congress ought to strike directly at the Communist conspirators who are mortal enemies of the United States. But that is precisely what the Government is doing under present law. More than 80 Communist leaders have been convicted under the Smith Act, and the Communist Party stands condemned as an agency of Moscow policy, with only two court decisions required to make it final. * * * We cannot help thinking that it would have been much better for Congress to have passed the section of the bill curbing the rights of Communist-dominated labor unions and to have left any change in the status of the Communist Party up to the next Congress.

[From the Dallas (Tex.) News]

Warning of New Label

This country is guaranteed by its Consituation a republican form of government. But it is surely sound constitutional law that we cannot outlaw a political movement to alter that form, whether the proposed change is to an empire, a Soviet, or a Socialist hell. The only attribute that makes communism illegal is that it advocates overthrow of the Government by force. In so doing, it runs afoul of the police power of the state. In a sense, it outlaws itself * * *. But American Communists can placidly change their label into anything else and still hold their opinions. It will be much more difficult to prove that a new party advocates violence than to accept the fact that the soon-to-be-outlawed Communists so advocate.

[From the St. Louis (Mo.) Post-Dispatch]

Confusion and Compromise

The final bill emerges as a doubtful contribution to controlling subversion. The 1950 Internal Security Act already requires members of Communist action groups to register, thereby losing rights to public office and Federal employment. But the courts never finally decided whether the Communist Party was a Communist-action group. About all the new bill does is to end this remarkable distinction between the party and its subsidiaries. That, fortunately, is a good many liberty-loving miles away from outlawing a party, a drastic step the United States has never taken against any political organization. But the rash of legislation coupling administrative registrations and listings with legal restrictions punishes membership rather than overt acts. In that it differs sharply from the sound and basic laws against espionage and sabotage which Congress has just voted to strengthen * * * (in Chicago) Justice Warren warned that the United States must stand as champion of man's right to learn, to disagree, and to dissent from majority opinion. This is a timely repetition of the ancient American principle of freedom for the thought we hate. In that test legislation which punishes ideas or associations instead of actions is dangerous to all.

[From the Minneapolis (Minn.) Star]

Strange Liberalism

It is a strange political season indeed when liberal politicians who have heretofore vociferously denounced McCarthyism now attempt to out-McCarthy McCarthy. For that is the essence of the Senate's ill-considered, pellmell drive to outlaw the Communist Party and party membership * * *. There are, of course, arguments for the sort of action into which the Senate liberals have stampeded both Houses (and the more shame on the conservatives for being stampeded).

[From the St. Paul Dispatch]

Defense of Nation Is Issue

There is no doubt whatsoever that the Communist Party is a conspiracy against the Republic, in league with a foreign power, the Soviet Government, and that those whom it admits to membership and allows to retain membership are a part of the conspiracy. This has nothing to do with freedom of speech or thought or even political action in the accepted sense of the term. It is a matter of subversive and disloyal actions. What is involved is the basic right of a government and a nation to defend itself.

[From the Des Moines Register]

Matter of Election Tactics

Congressional action aimed at curbing the Communist Party no longer bears any resemblance to the real problems posed by Communists. At this point, it has become a matter of 1954 election maneuvering and tactics, rather than of substance. What this country could gain by striking the Communist Party off the ballot is difficult to see. The Communists themselves have no illusions about coming to power through the ballot. The sheeplike way in which Congressmen have gone along with the move to outlaw the Communist Party presents a discouraging sight of democracy in action. * * * It would be a tactical mistake to outlaw the party—as well as rejection of American traditions and constitutional methods.

[From the Los Angeles Times]

As matters stand, no one in Washington is sure what is accomplished by outlawing the Community Party. * * * Whether it accomplishes anything or not, however, it seems evident that outlawing of the party does no particular harm and that its moral effect may be considerable.

[From the Portland (Oreg.) Oregonian]

Faith in People Lacking

Congressmen are not so naive as to expect any practical achievement from such legislation. Its practical ends are served by Federal legislation, already on the books, that strikes at the Communist conspiracy where it hurts, in its underground roles. Restriction of open Communist activity may or may not be constitutional, but it certainly is unnecessary. Any avowed Communist who could qualify for the ballot would inevitably be overwhelmed. The propaganda of the party has long since been identified and stigmatized. Congress lacks faith in the American people if it believes they must be protected by law from the overt act of so discredited an organization.

Veterans' Legislation in the 83d Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARLAN HAGEN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 18, 1954

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Speaker, now that the 83d Congress is drawing to a close, I believe that it would be of interest to the Members of the House to know of the action taken by this Congress on veterans' legislation. The Veterans' Affairs Committee has been very active during the 83d Congress. There have been a total of 401 bills and resolutions referred to the committee and the committee has held hearings resulting in the printing of over 5,000 pages of testimony. Twenty-four bills reported by the committee have become public law. Many of these bills are most important to the veterans of the Nation and their families.

We have just passed and sent to the White House a bill which will extend the enrollment period for Korean veterans for a period of 1 year. Under the present law, a Korean veteran has 2 years after the date of his discharge in which to enroll in education or training. This period has been extended to 3 years. This action was very necessary in my opinion, since many of the first group of about 1 million veterans who were discharged before Public Law 550, 82d Congress, became law were reaching the end of their period of entitlement on August 20, 1954. This date is just short of the fall enrollment period and, as a practical matter, served to deny a great many veterans of the education and training which they badly needed. The bill which we have passed gives 1 additional year to all Korean veterans, or allows a total period of 3 years after the date of discharge during which a Korean veteran may enroll in education or training.

In this same bill we corrected a serious inequity which was working a hardship on some of our disabled veterans. A disabled veteran is entitled to rehabilitation training for the purpose of aiding him in overcoming his service-connected disability. The program for World War II veterans ends on July 25, 1956. We found that there are many veterans who are not able to take full advantage of the rehabilitation program as a result of the cut-off date. There are some veterans who have been continuously hospitalized since World War II who have been prevented from entering rehabilitation training and who are just now being released from the hospital. These veterans do not have sufficient time remaining to complete a rehabilitation objective. We also found the same problem occurs in the case of veterans who have only recently been successful in establishing service connection for their disability. By establishing service connection they become eligible for rehabilitation training only to find that sufficient time does not remain to accomplish their objective. There is also a small group of veterans who have service-connected disabilities but who had received an unsatisfactory type of discharge and were not eligible for rehabilitation training. Some of these individuals have been successful in obtaining a correction of their discharge by the Discharge Review Board and as a result have just become eligible for the rehabilitation training which they need. This group will also be given additional time to complete their rehabilitation objective.

Congress has passed and sent to the White House a bill which will extend for 1 year and expand the veterans' direct loan program. In view of the fact that private lenders are not interested in loaning money in certain areas of the country, particularly in small towns and rural areas, it has been necessary to provide a source of loan capital to veterans living in those areas. For the past few years $100 million a year has been made available for this purpose. This amount has proved inadequate; therefore we have increased the amount to $150 million a year for the coming year. I certainly hope that this increased amount serves to equalize the opportunity to obtain a home loan between rural veterans and veterans residing in the city. In my own district in California there are many areas where private capital is not available. I certainly hope that the increase in direct loan funds will serve to expand the opportunity for veterans in our rural areas and small towns to obtain a loan.

After a great deal of controversy, we have passed an increase in veterans' compensation and pensions. The Veterans' Affairs Committee recommended a 10-percent compensation increase; however, the administration refused to agree to this amount of increase and offered a 5-percent compromise. I suppose half a loaf is better than none, but in my opinion the 10-percent increase voted by the committee was justified and needed. Under the 5-percent legislation enacted by the Congress, veterans drawing disability compensation will receive a flat 5-percent increase. For instance, a veteran with a 10-percent disability now receives $15.75. This will be raised to $17. A veteran with a 50-percent disability receives $86.25, which will be raised to $91. A veteran with 100 percent disability now receives $172.50. This amount will be increased to $181. The rate of compensation for widows without children was increased from $75 to $87 per month and dependent parents of servicemen who lost their lives from a service-connected cause is increased from $60 to $75. Where there are two parents living, each parent's allowance was increased from $35 to $40 a month.

On veterans and their dependents receiving pensions, a 5-percent increase was granted. At the present time, there are about 475,000 veterans of World War I, World War II, and Korea who have been found to be 100 percent disabled from a non-service-connected cause and unemployable. These veterans are also earning less than $1,400 if single and $2,700 if they have dependents. This class of veterans now receives $63 a month. Under the 5-percent increase passed by the Congress, the amount will be $66.15. A widow with no children whose veteran husband has died from a non-service-connected disability now receives $48 a month. This amount has been increased to $50. This widow must meet an income limitation of $1,400 a year if she has no dependents or $2,700 a year if she has dependents. She also receives an additional allowance for children. The 5-percent increase affects all veterans and dependents of the Spanish-American War, Civil War, the Indian Wars, and the War with Mexico. About 2,300,000 veterans and their dependents will benefit from the compensation increase and about 975,000 veterans and their dependents will benefit from the pension increase.

I have considered the veterans' medical and hospital program one of the most important parts of the Veterans' Administration program. The Veterans' Administration hospitalizes about 100,000 patients every day. It is most important that the Veterans' Administration receive adequate funds to provide first-class medical care for veterans. The Veterans' Affairs Committee does not appropriate funds for the operation of the medical and hospital program; however, it has been necessary for our committee to take an interest in this question in order that adequate funds could be made available. An attempt was made in the first session to limit the basis of admission to Veterans' Administration hospitals for non-service-connected cases.

Fortunately, though a coordinated effort of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, the restrictive rider was stricken from the appropriation bill. One of the greatest problems confronting the medical and hospital program is care for the mentally disabled. We have about 15,000 to 20,000 veterans with non-service-connected mental disabilities on the waiting list at all times. It usually takes from 6 to 9 months to get one of these veterans in the hospital. I sincerely hope that we can find a solution to this serious problem in the coming years.

Some of the legislation reported by the Veterans' Affairs Committee during this session effects relatively small numbers of veterans and their dependents. These laws are, nevertheless, important and needed, since they serve to correct inequities which have developed. For instance, we have secured enactment of a law which will extend insurance coverage under the Servicemen's Indemnity Act to members of the Reserve Officers Training Corps when they are on active duty for periods of 14 days or more. We have had some ROTC students killed during summer training, yet these students had no insurance coverage.

We have passed a bill which provides for automatic renewal of 5-year level premium term policies of United States Government life insurance. This bill will serve to prevent the unfortunate lapse of insurance which has occurred in so many cases. We also passed a law which establishes a 3-year presumptive period for all types of tuberculosis and another piece of legislation reported by the committee and signed into law places the Korean veteran on a par with World War I and World War II veterans by granting them benefits for disability purposes if injury is incurred en route to final acceptance or induction for military service. It was necessary for us to secure favorable action on a bill authorizing outpatient dental care to Spanish-American War veterans and veterans taking training under Public Law 16. This action was necessary because of a rider placed on appropriations bills and demonstrates the inefficiency of attempting to legislate by appropriation.

The Veterans' Administration administers over 300 laws. It operates five major programs: the medical and hospital program; the compensation and pension program; education and training; loan guaranty; and insurance. Most of the 20 million veterans of our country participate in one or more of these programs. It is necessary that the Veterans' Affairs Committee give constant attention to assure successful operation of the 300 laws which govern veterans' benefits. I believe that we have been successful this session in removing some inequities which required correction and we have also been successful in expanding veterans' benefits in certain areas where expansion was needed.

The ACP Is Being Strangled to Death by Departmental Red Tape

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. POLK
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 18, 1954

Mr. POLK. Mr. Speaker, as one of America's 7 million farmers and as a Representative of thousands of other farmers in the Sixth District of Ohio, I am becoming increasingly concerned about the policies and programs of the present administration relating to the agricultural conservation program, commonly known as ACP.

Through the ACP the Federal Government shares with the farmers the cost of soil and water conserving practices deemed essential to the welfare of the Nation. The cost sharing is provided for conservation in addition to that which farmers may be expected to carry out with their own resources.

It is a well established fact that we in the United States are wasting our topsoil many times faster than India or China ever did. Millions of acre-feet of good topsoil are washed away each year. Every muddy stream, creek, and river is constantly carrying this topsoil away and depositing it in the oceans.

Furthermore, most if not all of the chemicals necessary for plant growth are being rapidly depleted from many of our soils by intensive farming practices, by soil leaching, by soil erosion and by a lack of grass cover for the soil.

In the lifetime of those in this generation we have seen the number of acres of good soil drop from over 3½ acres per person in the United States to just a little more than 2 acres per person. It is relatively easy to preserve the topsoil but it takes a long time and is an expensive job to build land back into productive capacity after the topsoil has been allowed to erode away, or after its plant food has been lost.

Our Nation's leading soil scientists from the 48 State agricultural colleges tell us we have only made a small start in preserving and protecting our soils. The figures of these soil specialists indicate that to just hold our own in preserving and protecting our soil it would be necessary to spend over $1,556,000,000 per year for this purpose.

Realizing the importance and urgency of the soil-conservation problem and particularly with reference to the difficulties surrounding this problem on the small family-size farm, the Congress, a few years ago, provided by legislation for the agricultural conservation program or ACP. The initial legislation authorized an annual appropriation not to exceed $500 million for this purpose. The full amount was never appropriated but for a few years appropriations ranging from $250 million to $300 million were made for this purpose.

Last year the new administration decided to curtail the ACP program and asked Congress to appropriate only $140 million for the ACP. The House and Senate disregarded this administration request and appropriated $195 million or $55 million more than asked for by the Secretary of Agriculture. Again this year a budget request for only $140 million was submitted to Congress for ACP and again the House and Senate raised the total amount to $195 million and stipulated that $55 million of this be used for soil conservation practices on diverted acres.

As originally planned the agricultural conservation program was largely planned and operated by farmers as a part of the work of the farmers elected to serve on what was then known as the PMA committees. Local PMA committeemen, well informed concerning soil conservation problems in their respective communities, made specific recommendations to the State PMA committee who in turn submitted the State plans and recommendations to the USDA in Washington for final approval. Generally, the PMA farmer committee recommendations were approved and were incorporated in the ACP Handbook, the official published list of approved soil conservation practices and the regulations to be followed by farmers in order to participate in the program.

Under this former system of procedure the ACP funds were used for the soil building and soil conservation practices which farmers themselves considered best for their local communities.

Now, I find the procedure is that the rules and regulations and the approved practices for the agricultural conservation program are largely formulated here in Washington by officials of the USDA.

Furthermore, I find that the rules, regulations, and approved ACP practices are so complicated and so arbitrary, in many instances, that farmers either cannot or will not comply with them for the small benefits they receive.

Secretary of Agriculture Benson has set up administrative procedures which are the most complex since the conservation program was started in 1936 and I believe this is the principal reason so many farmers are not participating in the program. For example, last year over $30 million was turned back to the Treasury because farmers could not get around the redtape and complete their conservation practices.

In 1952, the last year for which complete figures are available, 2,285,000 farmers participated in the agricultural conservation program by sharing with their Government the cost of carrying out sound conservation practices. To date less than one-third of that number have signified their intention of participating in 1954. The use of agricultural limestone which was over 27 million tons in 1952, to date this year has been less than an annual rate of 15 million tons. The use of superphosphate has dropped from 84,000 tons to 25,000 tons under this program. In 1952, 368,706 acres of cover crops were grown under the agricultural conservation program. This important practice has been eliminated in 1954. I could go on with practice after practice which, since the agricultural conservation program was started in 1936, have been greatly expanded on the Nation's farms. Now they are being greatly reduced.

It is not the tons of lime, superphosphate, and potash or the acres of cover crops which are in themselves important. It is the thousands of acres of clover and alfalfa that is growing, instead of ordinary grass, heavily fertilized with calcium from the lime, potash, superphosphate, and so forth, which makes for better animals and vegetables and ultimately healthier people, that is really important. The acres of clover and other legumes went from 43,538,000 in 1935, prior to our national agricultural conservation program, to 50,848,000 in 1944 the highest in our history, but dropped to 48,386,000 in 1953. Clover production is estimated to be slightly higher in 1954. Under the 1954 agricultural conservation program we are not going ahead, but we are losing a great deal of the gain we have made.

The problem poses some particular questions. Why did this administration ask for lower appropriations for ACP? Is it solely for the purpose of endeavoring to make a showing of economy?

Naturally we are all interested in economy and efficiency in Government, but this certainly is the highest form of false economy. To do anything to stifle the efforts and the interest of farmers in soil conservation would seem to me to be a very unsound public policy.

Why was the former policy of permiting farmers, through their elected committeemen, to formulate and carry out the ACP practices and procedures they thought were best suited to their needs, changed to a policy of sending out from Washington complex and impractical rules and regulations with which farmers must comply to the letter in order to receive ACP funds?

Is it because the administration wants to kill the program?

It is my belief that unless farmers and farm organizations and all other persons concerned with the problem of soil conservation wake up and start to fight for the continuance of the ACP, it is doomed.

The program will be abandoned not because Congress is opposed to it, but because the Secretary of Agriculture is opposed to its continuance. It is my opinion that the ACP is being quietly and deliberately strangled to death by departmental redtape.

This to me is an intolerable situation and one that should be called to public attention. I shall have more to say about it in the future.

Federal Employee Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARLAN HAGEN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 18, 1954

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Speaker, in my district I have two of the outstanding military research installations in the United States, to wit, the Edwards Air Force Base and the naval ordnance testing station. The splendid military and civilian personnel of these two stations have already made great contributions to our security and will continue to do so. In their interest and to them I would make herewith a brief report of the acts and failures of Congress and the Executive with respect to Federal employee legislation.

Although the President vetoed the bill to give a 5 percent pay raise and a number of other benefits to Federal employees, there are some other improvements in the Federal-employee program approved by both the Congress and the President. Regarding the pay question, most of the leading members of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee have agreed to reintroduce the Federal pay bill and push it through Congress early enough to override a Presidential veto. Other Federal employee developments were:

The restriction on accumulation of annual leave was removed. Previously an employee was required, by a future date, to use up all accumulated leave over 30 days. With removal of the restriction an employee can now either take the earned leave or, upon separation from the Government, receive pay for the leave which has not been taken.

Federal employees were brought under the unemployment insurance program. The amount of each employee's jobless pay will be determined by the amount paid for unemployment benefits in the State where the employee works. The amount due the Federal employee will be paid through the State system to the employee by the Federal Government but the Government will not be taxed to build up a reserve to pay benefits to its separated employees.

The so-called Whitten rider putting a ceiling on the number of permanent jobs was revised. Now there is a Governmentwide ceiling on the number of permanent jobs, permitting permanent appointments to 10 percent more Government jobs than were filled in September 1950. This is regarded as a congressional directive to the executive department to begin making permanent appointments and will provide an estimated 700,000 permanent Government jobs.

Time and one-half for overtime work was approved for additional Government employees in the upper middle pay grades. Under previous regulations many of these employees actually were paid less than straight time for overtime work.

Longevity payments were granted to most top-grade employees.

All Government employees were provided coverage under a group life-insurance program which sets up inexpensive term insurance with the Government paying a share of the premium.

A uniform allowance up to $100 a year was granted to general schedule employees required to wear uniforms.

Federal workers in crafts, protective, and custodial jobs were put under a regional wage board system so that their wages will be pegged at a level comparable to the prevailing wage rates in the area of employment.

The temporary retirement annuity increases approved by Congress in 1951 were made permanent, and the first $12,000 of civil-service annuities were exempted from income taxes.

Possibly of equal importance to the positive action taken by Congress on Federal employee legislation was the blocking of proposed legislation which could have damaged the Federal civil-service system.

This included proposals for removal of deputy marshals from civil service, repeal of overtime pay for customs and immigration embployees, and granting authority to the Department of Justice to dismiss employees regardless of civil-service laws and regulations. These, and a number of other damaging proposals, were defeated.

Never Did So Many Run So Fast

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 18, 1954

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker. The following editorial from the New York Post of August 17, 1954, should stir up some sober reflection:

NEVER DID SO MANY RUN SO FAST

No Member of the United States Senate found it politically possible to vote against the bill to outlaw the Communist Party in this country, even though many Senators agreed in debate that the measure was not practicable; was inconsistent with present laws and probably was unconstitutional. Few Members of the House of Representatives will be found voting against the bill if it comes to a vote there at this session of Congress.

So wrote a Washington correspondent for the Christian Science Monitor last Friday. His description of the Senate's mood was echoed by most reporters; his forecast about the House was drearily vindicated yesterday when what was quaintly called a "milder" version of the Senate bill passed with only two dissenting votes.

There are some men who sincerely favor the kind of legislation being enacted in this tumultuous, ill-considered fashion. We think they are wrong on grounds of anti-Communist strategy as well as democratic principle, but we respect them far more than we do the many men who have voted this way only because they are afraid to say what they think. These frightened souls are the real casualties of the McCarthy age.

America can endure many things, including both Communist agitation and unwise attempts to suppress it. What can undermine a free society is the corruption of spirit and loss of nerve exhibited in these wretched congressional scenes. If most legislators no longer feel free to voice even a fragment of their convictions on an issue so deeply affecting our historic traditions of freedom, JOE MCCARTHY and his mob have won their biggest victory.

We know all the easy rationalizations of the men who chose to run away in order (so they told themselves) to fight another day. It is true that the Communist movement is not a political party in our traditional sense. It owes its primary allegiance to a hostile power; it is a political foreign legion; it leads a double life. But the issue that was never honestly met and honorably debated in Congress is whether we must abandon our cherished concepts of political liberty to curb the public activity of this dwindling, ragged battalion.

The idiocy of the proceeding reached its climax in the compromise formula voted in the House. To avoid the issue of formal outlawry, it voted instead to bar the Communist Party from the ballot and strip it of all other rights. For a long time America has legitimately boasted that not a single candidate running as a Communist has ever won election to Congress, despite many efforts. Yet now we seem to be saying to the world that we fear a Muscovite landslide in 1954.

Amid the panic we salute the two men in the House who stood up against the onrush of know-nothingism. One was a Republican from North Dakota—USHER BURDICK; the other a Democrat-Liberal from Brooklyn—ABE MULTER.

We suppose many sticks and stones will be hurled at BURDICK and MULTER in the coming weeks. But a lot of Americans will honor them for insisting under fire that our Republic can combat Communist totalitarianism without rewriting the Bill of Rights.

An Ex-President Looks Back—Our Great Elder Statesman at 80

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted by the House, I present for insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD two editorials which were printed in the Daily Times, of Mamaroneck, N. Y., on the occasion of the 80th birthday of former President Herbert Hoover:

AN EX-PRESIDENT LOOKS BACK

At 80 Herbert Hoover has the experience and the wisdom which make him a good consultant on governmental matters. As he looked back over his public career on Tuesday, he warned America of two dangers—communism and bureaucracy.

It was first of all, he points out, the recognition by President F. D. Roosevelt of Soviet Russia which "opened the headgates for a torrent of traitors." And our tacit alliance, which Mr. Hoover opposed, undoubtedly helped to spread communism over the globe. When to this record we add the surrender at Yalta of 10 nations to slavery, the secret agreement which allowed Russia to communize China, and the mistakes of Teheran and Potsdam, the picture is not pretty.

"From the day Lenin rose to power in Moscow," Mr. Hoover declared, "the Communists have carried on an underground conspiracy against every other nation. The rank and file of our people are immune from this infection. The recruiting grounds for their agents are from our minority of fuzzy-minded intellectuals and labor leaders.

"Over a thousand such Communist agents have already been rooted out of responsible positions in our Government and other spots of influence. Many of these spies and traitors when exposed sought sanctuary for their infamies in the fifth amendment. Such a plea of immunity is an implication of guilt."

Amen to that, Mr. Hoover.

As to the growing centralization of power in Washington, the 30th President of the United States of America also speaks our mind.

Federal bureaucracy, he reminds, has expanded in only 20 years from 600,000 to 2,300,000. But it is not in mere numbers that the real danger lies. Rather, as Mr. Hoover specifically points out, "Innate in bureaucracy are three implacable spirits. They are self-perpetuation, expansion of their empires, and demand for more power."

Those are human weaknesses. They exist in almost every office, in almost every industry, in almost every organization. The executive with a little power wants more; the department head with some influence is ambitious for greater authority. To gain those objectives, the particular office or department must be expanded, more subordinates must be hired, a larger program must be undertaken. This, of course, costs more money—but how it puffs up the self-esteem.

"The progress of freedom," Mr. Hoover told the listening Nation Tuesday, "is a never-ending struggle to prevent the abuse of power whether by individuals, by groups, or by government, or nations."

And that is the second field on which we must stand our ground. Something in the air in Washington breeds a disposition on the part of those in power there to push other folks around. Said Mr. Hoover, "I have no fears of this evil from President Eisenhower, but he will not always be President."

So, on guard, America, against our two worst enemies—communism and bureaucracy. Either could defeat the purpose of our Founding Fathers—and will unless we fight.

Our Great Elder Statesman at 80

Tomorrow Herbert Hoover reaches the ripe age of fourscore. Fittingly, he will observe the day as the principal speaker at a celebration in his honor at the little western town where he was born, West Branch, Iowa.

Herbert Hoover is self-made in the best American tradition. Son of a poor blacksmith, he worked his way through college, worked hard in his mining exploits in Australia, Asia, Europe, and Africa. Comparatively early in life he became wealthy. But his money never swerved him from a sense of public obligation.

He was the United States Food Administrator in World War I under Woodrow Wilson, a Democrat. He was Secretary of Commerce under Warren Harding and Calvin Coolidge, Republicans. And, like the great man now in the White House, he had no background whatever of partisan politics and when nominated in 1928 for the Presidency, like Dwight Eisenhower in 1952, had held no elective public office.

The defeat for a second term might have embittered smaller men. The deliberate failure to recognize his genius in World War II might have soured less patriotic souls. But Herbert Hoover does not bear grudges. He does not refuse to answer the call of his country at any time. His leadership of the bipartisan Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government made the success of the Hoover Commission inevitable.

Here was the first Quaker to hold our Nation's highest office, the first President to be born west of the Mississippi, the first President trained in science. And now we find him at 80, the most long-lived of all our Presidents since the Civil War, and 1 of only 5 of our Chief Executives to have attained the fourscore mark. The others were the two Adams, Jefferson, and Madison.

At this memorable life-stone in his career, memory brings back the picture of Herbert Hoover as he addressed the 1952 convention of the Republican Party at Chicago.

"This is the fifth time I have had the high honor of addressing the convention of the Republican Party," he told the delegates. "From the inexorable course of nature, this is likely to be the last time I shall attend your conventions."

We can remember the cries from the floor: "No. No."

But we remember best his closing words. They were:

"If I have won some measure of your affections, it is a high award. But the greatest glory that can come to man is to be given the opportunity to fight for free men. And I shall continue the fight for those principles which made the United States the greatest gift of God to freedom. I pray for Him to strengthen your hands and give you courage."

What finer eulogy could be written than these modest words from his own mouth.

And to that we wish to add our own hope that this great elder statesman of our Nation may be spared to give many more productive years of honored service to America and mankind.

Civil Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARLAN HAGEN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 18, 1954

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Speaker, in view of the gravity of the state of world affairs I should like to insert in the Record, under leave to extend my remarks, the following letter with respect to certain phases of civil defense; it is directed to Civil Defense Director Val Peterson by Mr. Wesley G. Bruer, 2219 Quincy Street, Bakersfield, Calif.:

Bakersfield, Calif., *June 17, 1954.*

Mr. Val Peterson,
Director of Civilian Defense,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Peterson: In a recent talk you stated that the home was the best place to be in case of an atomic attack. This struck me as being a very sound idea, and it would seem to be worth amplifying. The following ideas which occurred to me (and they may not be new) might well result in a comprehensive and integrated civilian defense organization, raise morale, promote neighborliness, and possibly save many lives:

The basic idea is the city block as a survival unit. My home has a below ground level concrete lined partial basement which would be an excellent place to escape initial blast and radiation effects and in which to store emergency rations and rescue tools. But my neighbors on either side have no below ground installations. My basement is more than ample for my family, so I can invite my neighbors to use it also in case of an alert and to store their rations and equipment there beforehand. That takes care of 3 or 4 family units in the immediate vicinity. But what of the rest of the families on the block? Those with cellars may not invite their neighbors to use them because of apathy, lack of foresight, or natural personal reserve; and may not even stock their cellars for their own use. A simple solution to this problem would be to designate a "survival night" for every potential target city in the country on which night every city block would have a meeting attended by at least one adult from each family in the block. It could be held in a backyard, vacant lot, or garage. The purpose of the meeting would be primarily to elect a civil defense block warden but could also be social in nature. It would be the duty of the block warden to: (a) Determine what below ground facilities (shelter areas) are available on the block, and which families should use which shelter areas; (b) see that each family store rations adequate for 3 days (or whatever length of time deemed necessary) in their shelter area, preferably in a locked or sealed box; (c) see that each shelter area be equipped by the families using it with one or several axes, picks, crowbars, and other rescue implements, a first-aid kit, and possibly one or several firearms so that the block may protect itself from possible looters or saboteurs; (d) inspect each shelter area at regular intervals; and, (e) see to it that each family on the block knows what to do in the event of an alert or actual attack. A woman would be as well suited for the job as a man.

"Survival night" should be announced a month or 6 weeks ahead of time so that personal and business affairs would not conflict with the block meeting, and a week might probably be best. Intense advance publicity could be given to the affair at very little expense to the Government through public service radio, TV, and newspaper announcements and the public could thusly be informed as to what is to be expected of them.

After the blocks have been given a week or so to get their internal organizations established, each city should be divided off into block groups (9 blocks in a square, 3 blocks to a side would seem to be a good workable group since in such a grouping the central block would be adjacent to the other 8 blocks). The block wardens in each block group should then meet to elect a block group warden. The group warden's duties would be to: (a) see that all the block units in his group are shipshape which would include expediting the organization of any block which appears to be lagging in its efforts; (b) assignment of families in shelter deficient blocks to shelter areas in adjacent blocks; (c) report monthly (or bimonthly) to an area warden. The group warden should have a map of his block group showing shelter areas, and with some sort of numbering system for the individual blocks. An area should consist of on the order of 10 or 12 block groups bounded, if possible, by topographic features such as streams (the bridges would very probably be knocked out in case of attack), wooded areas (which would possibly be aflame), hills or other features which could hamper communication following an atomic attack. An area warden should be selected at a meeting of the block group wardens and would have approximately the same responsibilities in the area as the group wardens have in the block groups. The area wardens would be responsible to the civilian defense director of the borough or of the city, depending on the size of the city. The entire country could be (or may already be) divided into 6 or 8 regions for civilian defense purposes and city civil defense directors in each region could select a regional civil defense director who would be directly responsible to you. Regional and possibly even city civil defense directors should be full-time jobs and it seems reasonable that their salaries should be paid by the areas under their jurisdiction. Thus a tight civil defense organization would come into existence built on the neighborly family to family cooperation on every city block in every potential target city in the country, and the cost to the Federal Government would be negligible. It would seem important to proceed a step at a time from the block unit upwards, consolidating each step before proceeding on the next one. Also, the first step would be the most important one since the families in each shelter area would be self-sufficient for several days after an attack; and if attack comes it will undoubtedly be nation-wide so that there can be no immediate concerted national effort to dig out any one particular city. The shelter areas will not only be self-sufficient; their occupants will be in a position to start the rehabilitation of the devastated portions of the city. In this connection, after the civil-defense network outlines above is firmly established, it might be well to equip each block group with a Geiger counter (or even a scintillation counter) and train one man (or woman) in each block group in its operation. There would undoubtedly be at least one person with some technical training living in each block group who could readily assimilate such training—engineers, radio or TV technicians, X-ray technicians, doctors, radio hams, teachers, geologists (such as myself), chemists, etc. Dangerously radioactive areas could then be rapidly detected and evacuated after attack, and such equipment would also materially aid in rescue work. These instruments could be financed either by assessment or donation within the block group to which they are assigned.

It would be advisable for each warden to have a deputy warden, and, at the lower levels, either the warden or deputy warden (or both) should be a woman so that one or the other would be likely to be in their area of jurisdiction at most times. On the block level, the position of warden probably should not be permanent but should pass on to the deputy warden who could then appoint another deputy, and so on.

The advantages of the plan are manifold, not the least of which is the creation of a direct pipeline into every target-city home for civil defense literature from national headquarters as to what to expect in case of attack, what to do, where to go, and what to have on hand, how to survive after the attack, etc. (A handbook containing such information, if not already in existence, should certainly be prepared in large quantities.) The stimulus for neighbor to neighbor contact and cooperation necessitated by the plan would be worthwhile in itself even if attack never comes. And, since each family would provide most of its own civil defense needs, there would be no left-over civil defense bills to be paid by the Federal Government when a final peace is assured. The plan should also serve to awaken those who are oblivious to the possibility of sudden attack and partially reassure those who are (with good reason) greatly alarmed by the present state of our civilian defenses.

This letter has already become overly long but I would like to include some further ideas which are strictly in the embryo stage:

Since there will undoubtedly be an area or areas of total destruction in any city hit by atomic attacks, some sort of evacuation plan is the only hope to save the lives of those within the total destruction radius of "ground zero." At best, any city will have only a very few hours warning time, and total evacuation of any large city would be impossible in that time. The enemy undoubtedly knows the locations of most of our more vital defense centers and has them pinpointed for attack. We can draw a circle, using the latest calculated total destruction radius, around each of these centers which are located in populated areas and then formulate plans for rapid emergency dispersal or relocation of all persons within the circle into unsaturated shelter areas in the blocks surrounding the circle. If it is planned so that those within the circle nearest its outer edge travel farthest beyond the circle and those near the center travel to just outside the circle, the relocation could be carried out in a relatively orderly manner and with a maximum of speed, since no one should have to travel more than the length of the radius of the circle. This relocation plan presupposes the existence of shelter areas as outlined above. The plan would also necessitate two types of alerts: One which signifies there is only time to get to the nearest shelter at hand; and one which signifies that there is time enough to disperse from the potential total destruction areas. Trial runs would be necessary to determine dispersal time for each area. Several difficulties would have to be worked out, e. g., those who normally live or work at a specified place within the circle could know the location of their respective relocation shelter areas, but what is to be done with those who are shopping in or passing through the area? This could undoubtedly be worked out but would require some thought.

Although my family and I now reside in an area which would probably escape the first blow, we may not always be so fortunate. And it is particularly true now, as it has always been in the past, that the welfare of any one part of the country depends greatly on the welfare of all of its parts. May we all be here when they sound the "all clear."

Respectfully yours for an effective civil defense,

Wes Bruer.

More About Outlawing Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following column by Dr. Frank Kingdon appeared in the New York Post of August 17, 1954. It is deserving of our consideration.

To Be Frank

(By Dr. Frank Kingdon)

Judge Harold Medina is decidedly opposed to outlawing the Communist Party. "Such a blanket act," he says, "is an utterly un-American procedure. If we are letting our passions of the moment whittle away our hard-won concepts of justice, it will be a sorry day for us."

His unique standing gives these words unique weight. At last a leader of the legal fraternity in this country is speaking his word for American law as it was conceived by our founders. His boldness can make for him as honorable a place in this time of passion as Charles Evans Hughes and Elihu Root made for themselves when they recalled the fundamentals of liberty and helped to bring the country back to sanity in the mad era of Socialist persecution in the twenties.

The spectacle of conservative and liberal Senators jockeying for the credit of passing a bill to outlaw a political party marked what can be described as nothing less than the lowest point of senatorial degradation since reconstruction days. The confused, self-contradictory, unenforceable, and deformed bill which resulted was a perfect reflection of the distorted minds which produced it.

There is no way on earth of reconciling either the spirit or the letter of such a law with the Constitution. I recognize that Chief Justice Vinson justified one ruling of the Supreme Court on the grounds of the "inflammable nature of world conditions," and "touch-and-go nature of our relations with countries with whom [the Communists] were in the very least ideologically attuned." Even this standard cannot bring under the panoply of the Constitution a bill outlawing any association of American citizens based on a common political opinion.

Once allow the right of Congress to outlaw any political party, and you admit a precedent which will support the claim of a totalitarian party to outlaw all parties but its own. How long a step is it from outlawing the Communist Party to outlawing the party which is accused of being responsible for "20 years of Communist treason"?

I notice that there has been a rash of articles opposing this bill on the grounds that Attorney General Brownell and J. Edgar Hoover are against it because they think it will drive the Communist Party underground. This may be a persuasive argument with some, and I welcome it if it stops enactment of the bill. But it is not the true ground of opposition. The true ground in Judge Medina's words is that "such an act is an utterly un-American procedure." If we cannot think and act at this level we shall end with an un-American state.

There are on our statute books, as has been said so often, adequate laws for the apprehension and conviction of all persons engaged in espionage or in activities aimed at overthrowing the Government by force, or giving aid and comfort to the enemy. They should be enforced with all the resources of the Government in these days when all of us are aware that a relentless enemy is doing all he can to undermine our national security. Every individual of us should hold himself ready to go to extrarordinary lengths to cooperate wth our Government in this enforcement.

We can admit that such enforcement within a code of action which safeguards the civil liberties guaranteed under the Bill of Rights poses complicated difficulties. But the answer is not to repeal the Bill of Rights. It is to recognize that a contest with tyranny is precisely the setting for demonstrating the difference between freedom and tyranny. Liberty can justify herself only by her works. If we burden ourselves with the rigid armor of the power we oppose, we shall end by awkwardly stumbling into his ranks instead of slaying him.

Feather Bed in the Sky

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 16, 1954

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, in the closing days of the session just adjourned the House granted leave to me to insert in the Congressional Record an editorial published in the Daily Times, of Mamaroneck, N. Y., on August 11, 1954, titled "Feather Bed in the Sky."

I agree wholeheartedly with the editorial.

Feather Bed in the Sky

American Airlines is the only company serving Westchester at its county airport with regularly scheduled flights. We are, consequently, interested in the strike of the AFL Air Line Pilots Association which has closed down that service as well as all other flights by that company.

The pilots are striking because the westbound transcontinental nonstop flight requires a scheduled 35 minutes more than

8 hours, and in event of bad weather perhaps slightly longer. The union points to the 8-hour limit for a single crew flying domestic air routes. That rule went into effect in 1931, when flying conditions were far different from those of today.

Further, the Civil Aeronautics Board, which established the 1931 rule, has now specifically authorized nonstop transcontinental flights up to 10 hours in duration. And surely the CAB, as well as the company itself, is as interested in flying safety as is the union. On transoceanic flights, more dangerous, 12 hours are allowed.

Bear in mind, too, that this extra 35 minutes on the westbound transcontinental flight is not a daily strain upon the pilot. On these nonstop flights the pilot flies only 10 days a month, or 5-round trips, with an average 22-hour rest between flights. Too, much of the actual flying is done by "Iron Mike," the automatic pilot.

To work thus only 10 days a month, with 20 days off, at a salary ranging between $18,000 and $19,000 a year, does not seem to be an excessive hardship. To hire extra pilots for that extra scheduled 35 minutes on westbound flights, or possibly slightly longer in bad weather, might result in higher fares. And we are sure the public does not want that.

It adds up, in brief, to union-made work, featherbedding, as it is called. And like pie in the sky, that is as unjustified to demand as it is unreasonable to expect.

The Committee on Government Operations Blocks Its Chairman's Successful Efforts To Expose Racketeering and Extortion, Misuse of Health and Welfare Funds, and Then, the Value and Necessity Having Been Demonstrated and Its Publicity Value Being Apparent, Gives the Job to Congressman George H. Bender—Later Relents and Gives Chairman Authority To Appoint Special Subcommittee To Investigate Racketeering and Extortion—Why?

SPEECH

OF

CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 19, 1954

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, to understand the situation, obtain an answer to the above question, a rather lengthy factual statement is necessary.

THE LEGISLATIVE REORGANIZATION ACT

In an effort to promote efficiency and economy in the use of the legislative powers conferred upon Congress by the first 15 words of the Federal Constitution,* the Legislative Reorganization Act [1] and subsequent amendments were adopted. The fact that the act carried fringe benefits for Congressmen undoubtedly contributed to its early adoption, prevented a more thorough study of its provisions, which, in defining the jurisdiction of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, are confusing.

The prior excessive use by congressional committees, regular and special, of the authority to make investigations and hold hearings caused the Congress to limit the number of regular standing committees of the House to 19. The practice of appointing special committees without adequate consideration of the need was, for a short time, discontinued.

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS, FORMERLY COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

One of the 19 regular standing committees of the House recognized by the Legislative Reorganization Act, hereinafter referred to as the Reorganization Act, was the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.[2]

That committee was a 1927 consolidation of 11 former committees charged with the authority to investigate expenditures in 11 executive departments.[3]

The Reorganization Act and the Rules of the House gave that committee the same authority previously exercised by the 11 investigatory committees.[4] The Committee on Government Operations,[5] previously the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, will hereinafter be referred to as the committee.

It has been my privilege to serve continuously on the committee since January 14, 1935.[6]

When the Republicans obtained control of the House in 1947, because of seniority I was entitled to be named as chairman of the House Committee on Education and Labor or chairman of the Committee on Government Operations. Because no Member can hold two chairmanships, I was forced to make a choice and chose the chairmanship of the latter committee.

Since 1937,[7] when the sitdown strikes, following the pattern and methods of the Communists, who, in 1924,[8] had infiltrated into the labor movement, came to Michigan, I have been interested and active in efforts to expose and curb the unlawful methods, the vicious practices, employed by Communists in connection with labor disputes.

As early as June 1, 1937, from the well of the House,[9] naming some 40 individuals, I called attention to the fact that Communists were attempting to gain control of the labor organizations and were at that time a dangerous threat to our Government. That talk antedated by 16 years and 6 months the statement of J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the FBI—quoted in John Fisher's article in the Chicago Tribune and Washington Times-Herald of February 8, 1954 [10]—to the effect that Communist domination over trade unions operating in the maritime, mining, electrical, and communication fields poses a major and dangerous threat to our national security.

That threat was long recognized by the FBI and thinking people, who knew the facts, but was ignored or condoned in 1937—far more dangerous now—disregarded by law-enforcing officials, by legislative bodies—and in at least 1 State, West Virginia [11]—by vote-seeking politicians; and by the last 2 administrations.

Within the last year and after the press had, through news stories and editorials,[12] called special attention to the danger which was exposed in hearings held by two legislative subcommittees for whose existence I was responsible,[13] the present administration seemed to realize in part the situation.[14]

In this connection with this effort—to protect union as well as nonunion employees—I made many investigations,[15] many speeches, both in Congress and elsewhere, and because of my frank, factual statements by a certain section of the press and its commentators, was labeled as "antiunion," "antilabor," and "a labor baiter."

---

* All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States.

[1] Public Law 601, 79th Cong.

[2] Public Law 601, 79th Cong., sec. 121 (a) (8).

[3] H. Res. 7, 70th Cong., 1st sess.

[4] Public Law 601, 79th Cong., sec. 121 (b) (1) (h); House Rule XI, 8, 83d Cong.

[5] H. Res. 647, 82d Cong.

[6] H. Res. 50, 74th Cong.

[7] Talks in House, June 1 and 7, 1937.

[8] See S. Rept. No. 14, 68th Cong., st sess.

[9] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 1937, p. 5166 et seq.

[10] See Appendix A, Fisher article in Washington Times-Herald of February 8, 1954.

[11] Unions and the Courts in West Virginia, address by Robert G. Kelly, 67th annual meeting of the West Virginia Bar Association, September 5, 1953, e. g.:

"In no State in modern times has labor had a greater impact on State government. This is particularly true with regard to the executive branch, where freedom of unions to do as they please is notorious. While less apparent in the legislative and judicial branches, one must be blind to deny the apparent effect there. * * *

"In West Virginia but little curb has been imposed upon labor's so-called right to strike and picket, regardless of the public interest or the right of others to be secure in their persons and property. I have never been able to find in our basic law any foundation of a sacred right to enter into and carry out a conspiracy to cause others to breach contracts of employment or to close places of business or for mobs to prevent use of public streets and sidewalks. However, these special privileges seem secure to labor in West Virginia. It is to be regretted that the rights of those who want to work, of innocent bystanders, and of the general public are not so secure."

[12] See appendix B, quotes from editorials.

[13] See appendix C, (1) copy of order appointing Subcommittee of Committee on Government Operations; and (2) of order appointing Subcommittee of Committee on Education and Labor.

[14] Excerpt from the President's message on labor-management relations, Jan. 11, 1954; CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 112:

"The act presently prohibits an employer from making payments to a union to assist in the financing of union welfare funds unless the fund meets certain standards. These standards are not adequate to protect and conserve these funds that are held in trust for the welfare of individual union members. It is my recommendation that Congress initiate a thorough study of welfare and pension funds covered by collective-bargaining agreements, with a view of enacting such legislation as will protect and conserve these funds for the millions of working men and women who are the beneficiaries."

[15] See appendix D, list of labor hearings held by CLARE E. HOFFMAN in 80th Cong.

None of these charges had or has the slightest foundation in fact, for I have always expressed the opinion that unions—their affairs properly conducted under the direction of the membership—were not only beneficial but necessary, if in mass-production industries workers were to be treated as women and men.

As a member of the House Committee on Education and Labor, which wrote the House version of the Taft-Hartley Act—and under the direction of Fred Hartley, who was chairman of that committee during the 80th Congress, and also as chairman of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments—it was my privilege to, as chairman of a subcommittee, make investigations and hold hearings which exposed the abuses of labor legislation, disregard of court orders, violation of law generally, and racketeering practiced in connection with labor disputes.[16]

No complaint was ever made by my colleagues on the committees that those investigations or hearings were improperly conducted, witnesses unfairly treated, or the conclusions reached not supported by the record. Reports giving conclusions, making recommendations were written, adopted, printed, and became a part of official congressional records.

During the 80th Congress, I had obtained an amendment to the rules which extended the authority of the committee to make investigations and hold hearings.[17]

When, in the 80th Congress, it was my privilege to become chairman of the committee, to expedite the work of the committee, desiring to give each member a part therein, I appointed five subcommittees [18]—attempted to give to each a definite share of committee work. That laid the foundation of my trouble.

Because of the provisions of the Reorganization Act, it was impossible to establish definite lines beyond which the jurisdiction of one subcommittee should not go. The result was that on occasion one subcommittee found itself investigating and holding hearings, making reports, which might well have fallen within the jurisdiction of another committee. However, there was no serious conflict.

When the Democrats returned to power and organized the 81st and 82d Congresses, subcommittees with the same jurisdiction were retained.

When the Republicans again took over control in the 83d Congress, as chairman I, again, with the committee's approval, established five regular subcommittees and outlined the jurisdiction of each. I retained the chairmanship of the subcommittee which passed upon reorganization plans, though the activities of that committee were very limited.

This was due to the fact that, as the reorganization plans came up, I scheduled hearings on many of them before the full committee—the reason being that, coming from the administration, and the Republican margin being so narrow, a decision as to whether the plan should be reported or rejected would obviously be obtained more quickly and would more accurately represent the views of the members than if we were forced to go through the procedure first with the subcommittee, then with the full committee.

Ten reorganization plans were submitted by the administration during the first session of the 83d Congress. On plans 3, 4, and 5, no hearings were held, no disapproving resolutions having been introduced. Of the remainder, with the exception of plans 7, 8, 9, and 10 all were heard by the full committee and all were approved.[19]

I named as chairmen of the regular subcommittees R. Walter Riehlman, Military Operations Subcommittee; George H. Bender, Public Accounts Subcommittee; Mrs. Cecil M. Harden, Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee; Charles B. Brownson, International Operations Subcommittee.

During the 81st Democratic Congress a subcommittee, at Government expense, traveled to the Far East.[20] Another went to Europe.[21] Still another took a 42-day trip around the world at Government expense and in a Government plane.[22] Only one report was adopted and printed.[23]

In 1953 the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Brownson], who has been most active in stripping me of authority while seeking funds for his own subcommittee, with the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Meader], a member of his subcommittee, took another 24-day inspection trip, from September 27 to October 24.

That subcommittee traveled from Washington to San Francisco to Honolulu, to Tokyo, to Korea, to Tokyo, to Manila, to Honolulu, to San Francisco, to Washington, D. C.

It also took along Maurice J. Mountain and Edward C. Kennelly as staff director and counsel, as well as a representative from the State Department, apparently as liaison man.

The reported cost of the trip was $1,311.75. That, however, was not the total cost. That figure does not include the cost of transportation by Government plane, the cost of Government personnel. The figure given represents the $9 per diem cost of 3 committee, 2 staff members, not other costs.

Had the trip been made by commercial airlines for a party of five, by chartered plane, the cost would have been, in a DC-4, $51,514.75; in a DC-6, $79,301.75. Had the trip been made on a commercial plane, first-class reservation with berth, the transportation cost would have been $8,999. These figures, however, do not include costs of meals or lodgings away from the plane. In addition to the $1,311.75 voucher, Mr. Brownson vouchered expenses of $124.69, for transportation, and "room rent."

Mrs. Harden, now by my appointment chairman of the regular Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations; Mr. Brownson, likewise by my appointment chairman of the Subcommittee on International Operations; and Mr. Meader, Republican Representative from the Second District of Michigan, with one minority staff member, Mrs. Annabell Zue, went on the trip around the world. That subcommittee, which was under the chairmanship of Representative Bonner, of North Carolina, made a lengthy and instructive report. Other members of the committee, including Mr. Riehlman, chairman of the regular Subcommittee on Military Operations, and Mr. Bender, chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Accounts, were also abroad on one or two occasions.

It has been the chairman of these regular subcommittees who, with the members of their subcommittees—all evidently and naturally desiring to expand their own staffs and extend their authority to travel and hold hearings, have aggressively acted in denying me authority to expose and curb exortion and other abuses by lawless individuals.[24]

Again, I spent considerable time in preparing rules of procedure, and the rules proposed for consideration by the Republican members of the committee were, with 1 or 2 minor amendments, adopted by the full committee.[25]

Those rules remained in force and gave efficient hearings. They were changed on July 15, 1953, when the committee liquidated, within 10 days, all of the special subcommittees, including the one Special Subcommittee on Racketeering Activities.

In my opinion, based upon not less than 16 years of experience, the quickest, most economical, and efficient way to settle two-thirds of the complaints made to a standing committee is through the appointment of special 3-man subcommittees. This, in my judgment, is true because usually it is comparatively easy to, at all times, obtain the presence of at least 2 members of a 3-man subcommittee, who are to some extent familiar with the question at issue. If such a subcommittee encounters a controversial issue calling for political consideration, it can institute an investigation and then refer the whole matter back to the full committee. This view was finally adopted by the committee [26] over Democratic protest.

Thereafter several special subcommittees, sometimes calling for 3, sometimes 5, members were authorized. One, the Special Subcommittee on German Consulate/American House Program under the chairmanship of Mr. MILLER of New York, very quickly obtained satisfactory action in connection with the State Department's housing program in Germany.[27]

---

[16] See appendix D, list of labor hearings held by Clare E. Hoffman in 80th Cong.

[17] H. Res. 90, 80th Cong., 1st sess., passed February 10, 1947.

[18] Subcommittee on Surplus Property, Subcommittee on State Department, Subcommittee on Extra Legal Activities in Departments, Subcommittee on Publicity and Propaganda, Subcommittee on Procurement and Buildings.

[19] Committee calendar.

[20] Lovre Special Subcommittee to the Far East, 81st Cong. (no report printed).

[21] Blatnik Special Subcommittee to Europe, 81st Cong. (no report printed).

[22] Bonner Subcommittee Around the World, 82d Cong. (report printed).

[23] 16th Intermediate Report, Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, 82d Cong., title "Federal Supply Management (Overseas Survey)," H. Rept. No. 1894.

[24] Congressional Record, July 17, 1953, p. 9352, et seq. Also minutes of committee meetings of July 15 and July 24, 1953.

[25] Committee minutes, January 26 and February 18, 1953. See appendix E, rules adopted by Committee on Government Operations on January 26 and February 18, 1953.

[26] Committee minutes, February 18, 1953.

Another subcommittee of 3 was appointed, at the request of 2 Senators and a Congressman, to investigate the awarding of a contract for the repair of aircraft for a distressed-labor area.[28] While the facts developed did not result in the awarding of the specific contract to the distressed area, the plight of that area was called to the attention of responsible authorities for such other assistance as could properly and lawfully be granted.

In anticipation of an attempt to solve certain complaints which had been made, other special subcommittees were authorized but never actually established by the appointment of committee members. Staff investigations showed the complaints to be without sufficient sustaining evidence to warrant hearings.

Being aware of the existence of a gigantic, vicious conspiracy to collect millions, if not billions, of dollars from union as well as nonunion workers, from individuals and corporations engaged in business and from the Government itself, on June 4, 1953, I appointed a special subcommittee of 3, consisting of Mr. BENDER, of Ohio, Mr. CONDON, of California, with myself as chairman, to investigate and hold hearings in this field.

The purpose of the subcommittee was to expose the activities of those engaged in that conspiracy and to report, through the full committee, to the Congress as to whether additional Federal legislation would be advisable, and, incidentally, to call the attention of the Department of Justice to the obvious violations of Federal statutes where prosecutions seemed to be advisable.

Realizing that the House Committee on Education and Labor would, as a legislative committee, write such legislation, I requested the chairman of that committee, SAMUEL K. MCCONNELL, JR., to appoint a similar subcommittee. He appointed such a subcommittee on June 6, 1953,[29] naming WINT SMITH, of Kansas, as chairman, PHIL M. LANDRUM, of Georgia, as the Democratic member, and naming me as the second Republican member.

This gave us a joint subcommittee of five, over which, at my request, WINT SMITH presided as chairman. He performed a most difficult task in a very judicious and efficient manner. The field work was done by experienced investigators on the staff of the Committee on Government Operations, under the direction of William F. McKenna,[30] who had as his assistants Clyde W. Smith, Lester P. Condon, and, on the last Detroit hearings, Murray W. Jackson.

The two subcommittees authorized to investigate racketeering, extortion, and other subjects, held joint hearings at Detroit, Mich., on June 8, 11, 12, and 13, 1953. Those hearings were printed and a report, signed by all members of both subcommittees, except Mr. CONDON, was subsequently accepted by the full Committee on Government Operations, filed with the House, and printed as a House report.[31]

The chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor had, on June 23, 1953, appointed a second subcommittee to participate in such a hearing.[32] The two subcommittees held joint hearings at Kansas City, Mo.[33] on June 29 and 30, July 1, 2, and 3, 1953. Those hearings were printed and a unanimous report of the Labor Subcommittee, signed by WINT SMITH, WINGATE H. LUCAS, and myself, is now pending before the Labor Committee.

On June 29, 1953, knowing that Congress was about to adjourn, and being fully aware of the desire of certain committee members to travel and hold hearings not only in this country but abroad, and thinking there was need for practicing economy, I wrote the subcommittee chairmen[34] suggesting that they limit their activities and curtail their staff to 1 professional and 1 clerical member while Congress was not in session.

I was fully aware that this suggestion would not meet with the approval of the subcommittee chairmen. Naturally, being ambitious, each subcommittee chairman desired a little empire of his own with his own staff, unhampered by any restraints imposed by the chairman of the committee. However, I was in error in assuming that, if the subcommittee chairmen did not agree to my first suggestion, they would suggest a compromise and perhaps "bargain collectively" with me on that subject.

Had I desired to be arbitrary, as some looking for an excuse for their own arbitrary actions have subsequently charged, all I had to do was to have waited until Congress adjourned in July and then refused to sign their salary and expense vouchers. That authority was then vested exclusively in me.

The resolution allocating funds to the committee for the full committee and the subcommittees contained a provision that the expenses incurred not only by the full committee but by all regular subcommittees and special subcommittees were to be approved for payment only when the voucher was signed by the chairman of the full committee.[35]

I had protested that requirement during the 80th Congress, for the reason that, while I trusted the subcommittee chairmen to act wisely and economically, inasmuch as I could not oversee all of their activities, I objected to being required to sign vouchers for expenditures when I had no personal knowledge of either the wisdom of, nor the necessity for, such expenditures, nor of the efficiency of their staff members. At that time, that is, during the 80th Congress, at my request, I had been relieved of that responsibility. I had no objection to like procedure during the 83d Congress.

That did not mean I favored establishing subcommittees as autonomous bodies, which has now been done.[36]

My position was that I would not sign vouchers for the payment of salaries and expenses which were incurred without my knowledge.

Instead of suggesting to me that my request for a curtailment of their activities was unreasonable, the chairmen and members of the regular subcommittees—at least a majority of them—evidently got together and formulated a plan of action to in effect establish their own subcommittees as regular standing committees of the House, and to end my investigation of extortion.

On the 15th day of July 1953, they came into the regular meeting of the committee with a resolution,[37] which was offered by Mr. OSMERS, of New Jersey, as their spokesman, and which was adopted by the committee.[38]

That resolution not only gave to the regular subcommittees the same authority given the regular standing committees of the House, thus in effect increasing from 19 to 24 the regular standing committees of the House, but it abolished the special subcommittees I had established, none of which, except one, hereinafter referred to, had operated or was operating.

---

[27] German Consulate/America House Program, hearings, February 17, 1953; H. Rept. No. 168, 83d Cong., 1st sess., 1st intermediate report of committee.

[28] Fontana School of Aeronautics, Inc., hearings, February 27, 1953.

[29] Appendix C (2) copy of order appointing Subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor.

[30] McKenna had established an enviable reputation through his work which blocked a $5¼ million claim against the Government (Home Loan Bank Board) by numerous investors in Long Beach Federal Savings and Loan Association, of Long Beach, Calif., which had overlong been in litigation in the courts. McKenna, who at first was Government counsel, later counsel for the Republican minority, assisted by minority members MILLER of New York and HOFFMAN of Michigan, blocked the attempt to end legal opposition to the payment of the claim. Congressman CHET HOLIFIELD, of the 19th District of California, had headed a special subcommittee during the 81st and 82d Congresses in an effort to compel the Federal Government to cease its opposition to the payment of this claim. See appendix F, extension of remarks of CLARE E. HOFFMAN in CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 7, 1952, vol. 98, pt. 11, pp. A4853–A4857.

[31] H. Rept. No. 1324, 83d Cong., 2d sess.

[32] See appendix G, copy of order appointing second Subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor.

[33] At the Kansas City hearings, Congressman JEFFREY P. HILLELSON, of that district, served in place of Mr. BENDER.

[34] See appendix H, letter of June 29, 1953, to subcommittee chairmen.

[35] See appendix I, H. Res. 150, 83d Cong., 1st sess.

[36] See appendix H, H. J. Res. 339, 83d Cong., 1st sess.

[37] See appendix K, Osmers resolution adopted on July 15, 1953.

[38] Committee minutes, July 15, 1953. Republican members of the committee—except Mrs. CHURCH, of Illinois; Mr. JUDD, of Minnesota; Mr. MCDONOUGH, of California; and Mrs. ST. GEORGE, of New York; who were not present, and Mr. HILLELSON, of Missouri, who voted "present"—joined with the Democrats (except Mr. CONDON, of California, who voted "present") in denying my request.

Notwithstanding the provisions of the Reorganization Act, the House now has more than 27 regular standing and special committees.

The Osmers resolution also denied to me the authority exercised by every other chairman of every other regular standing committee of the House; that is, the authority to appoint special subcommittees and direct their activities.

Subsequently, a request was made by me for an extension of the life of the subcommittee which had been investigating racketeering and extortion. That request was denied. On July 24, 1953, the committee adopted 2 resolutions—1 extending that subcommittee for 60 days to complete investigation in Kansas City, and the second, extending the life of the same subcommittee for the same period to complete the Detroit investigation,[59] the 60-day limitation being a restriction which made effective action impossible and which temporarily at least, gave comfort to the extortionists.

Some of the committee members had argued, first, that there was no necessity for such hearings, and, second, that the Committee on Government Operations had no jurisdiction over the subject.

Later, those objections were apparently abandoned. The administration itself stressed the necessity, in the President's message on January 11, 1954, on labor-management relations, of a study of the manner in which health and welfare funds were administered—see footnote No. 14.

Precedents and the language of the Reorganization Act itself sustained the jurisdiction of the Committee on Government Operations.

In one instance in the press, and on the floor of the House, some of the committee members attempted to justify their action in liquidating the special subcommittee which had done such a good job, and, among other things, stated:

Mr. Lantaff, Congressional Record, July 17, 1953, page 9352:

> I join with the gentleman from California in the statement he is making, and I want to say that all of us regret that the chairman of the committee has seen fit to air this so-called family controversy in public.

Mr. Holifield, Congressional Record, July 17, 1953, page 9352:

> During the past 7 months the chairman of the full committee has seen fit to appoint 12 special 3-man subcommittees for investigative purposes.

Note: Only one of these subcommittees was actually functioning. Two others had completed their work, and no one had yet been named to any of the others.

> I will say that this (passage of the resolution by Mr. Osmers) was brought about by many different actions by the chairman of the full committee which were not in accord with the viewpoint of the members of the committee. Among those actions was the appointing of a multitude of subcommittees, 3-man subcommittees, which conflicted with the jurisdiction of the standing subcommittees.

Note: Rule 3 expressly gave the chairman authority to appoint special subcommittees, and in no way had the jurisdiction of any subcommittee been interfered with.

Mr. McCormack, Congressional Record, July 17, 1953, page 9354:

> In taking the action we did, he ought to thank us, in a sense, because we absolved him of any opportunity of engaging in even any unintentional arbitrary actions. So I do not apologize at all for anything I did.

Mr. Brown of Ohio, Congressional Record, July 17, 1953, page 9353:

> That I join in expressing deep regret that there has been any misunderstanding over the House Committee on Government Operations the other day. * * * We have had, I might say very frankly, Mr. Speaker, an intolerable situation develop in our committee. * * * But I voted for the resolution because I thought it was necessary to correct the intolerable situation in which our committee found itself, and to protect the integrity of the membership of our committee and of the subcommittees.

Note: Why did he not define the "intolerable situation"?

And, of good measure, the gentleman from Ohio also said:

> We realize that our chairman is getting old. Like many of us, he is growing in age. Perhaps he has not been well. Some of us have not been. I have not been well myself. Sometimes I get a bit testy, for which I often turn around and apologize once in awhile.

Although he struck these statements from the revision of his remarks, they were widely quoted in the press.

Note: Mr. Brown does not allege—he cannot truthfully charge—that either age, ill health, or anything else has kept me from performing my full duty.

Nor did the gentleman from Ohio cite any specific instance of testiness; and my so-called criticism of the subcommittees to which he referred will, by reference to a copy of the letter written the subcommittee chairman—appendix H—be shown to be no criticism whatsoever, just an economy suggestion.

It is significant that each member seeking to defend his action used only general language. No one laid on the line a specific statement or charge of improper conduct or action on the part of the chairman. Even one alleged to be a thief is entitled to be told what he stole, when, where, and from whom.

Mr. Bender, Congressional Record, July 17, 1953, page 9354:

> I do not believe that the chairman of any committee here, irrespective of how much we love him, has the right to be constitutionally unconstitutional all the time. * * * And I have put up with considerable malarky on occasions. I have tried on every occasion to stand by him here on the floor and in committee, and sometimes when the gentleman would be hopelessly negative I would find myself in a rather awkward predicament. * * * I do not like to be bullywagged any more than anyone else does.

Note: Why not be specific and cite the chairman's offenses? I have challenged the gentleman to name one example.

Mr. Bender, Cleveland News, January 14, 1954, interview by Webb Seely:

> Question. Has Congressman Hoffman abused his power by asking for his own subcommittee to investigate labor racketeering here and elsewhere?
>
> Answer. He has. Hoffman has organized special committees at the drop of the hat. He does this without consulting other members of the Government Operations Committee. He has so many special activities he is abusing his power. I won't be a party to anything illegal.
>
> Question. What was illegal about Representative Hoffman's racketeering committee?
>
> Answer. Setting up and obviously abusing his power. I won't be a party to doing anything wrong.

Reprinted in Congressional Record, January 18, 1954, page 370.

Mr. Bender's charge that the chairman acted illegally is an illustration of either his lack of knowledge or a deliberate misrepresentation.[60] Committee rule 3 until repealed by the committee on July 15, 1953, expressly authorized the chairman to appoint special subcommittees consisting of two or more members.[61]

Mr. Bender was present on January 26, 1953,[62] when the rule was discussed and adopted, and he voted in favor of that rule. Moreover, Mr. Bender served without objection on a special three-man subcommittee.[63] Why did he twice deliberately make a false statement?

Following the action of the full committee on July 24, 1953, I immediately requested Wint Smith, chairman of the subcommittee which had been appointed by the chairman of the House Committee on Education and Labor, to ask for the continuation of his subcommittee.

Mr. Smith made that request, and, on November 13, 1953, the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor authorized a subcommittee, naming Mr. Smith as chairman, Mr. Landrum as the Democratic member, and me as the second Republican member, to complete the investigations we had previously started at Detroit and Chicago.[64]

That subcommittee held hearings on November 23, 24, 25, and 27, 1953, which hearings have been printed, and there is pending before the Labor Committee the subcommittee's unanimous report thereon.

---

[59] Committee minutes, July 24, 1953.

[60] See remarks of Clare E. Hoffman in Congressional Record of January 18, 1954, pp. 369–375.

[61] Rule 3 of Rules of Committee on Government Operations in Committee Calendar No. 1, March 1, 1953:

"Rule 3. A majority of the committee shall constitute a quorum; provided, however, that special subcommittees consisting of two or more members—at least one of whom shall be a member of the minority—may be appointed by the chairman, and in such case, one member of the special subcommittee shall be a quorum for the purpose of taking sworn testimony only, provided that the other member or members of the special subcommittee shall have received reasonable notice thereof. Four members of a regular subcommittee shall constitute a quorum."

[62] Committee minutes, January 26 and February 18, 1953.

[63] Special Subcommittee To Investigate Federal-State Cooperation in Enforcement of Anti-Racketeering Laws and the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, and other Federal Labor Legislation, Clare E. Hoffman, chairman, Mr. Bender and Mr. Condon.

[64] See appendix L, order appointing third Subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor.

Following the hearings held in June in Detroit and the hearings held at Kansas City in late June and early July, some twenty-odd indictments were returned. Following the hearings held at Detroit in November, the United States district attorney announced that he would make an investigation and take appropriate action, and some indictments were subsequently returned.

The press, especially the three Detroit papers, the News, the Times, and the Free Press; the Kansas City Star, the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, the Minneapolis Star and Tribune, the Des Moines Register and Tribune, and the Chicago Tribune, gave favorable publicity to the Detroit and Kansas City hearings. In editorials from these and other papers, the necessity for such hearings was repeatedly pointed out.[45]

An article in the February 1954 issue of the Sign, Big Racket in Small Change, by Milton Lomask,[46] and a story in the March 9, 1954, issue of Look, How Labor Bosses Get Rich, by Clark Mollenhoff,[47] will give some idea of the nationwide interest in and scope of the subject.

In the meantime, the members of the full committee were forced to the conclusion, through statements which I had made and filed with them, that the Committee on Government Operations had jurisdiction over the subject matter.

The committee was also apparently convinced from statements inserted in the record that the public was demanding that these hearings be continued.

In fact, the administration itself apparently seemed to be convinced that millions of dollars which had been entrusted to those handling union health and welfare funds were being wasted, perhaps misappropriated.

As previously stated, the President, on January 11, 1954, in his message to Congress on labor-management relations, included a paragraph on the subject—footnote No. 14.

The committee may have reached the conclusion that not only were the proposed investigations which I was asking authority to continue necessary, but that they would provide a publicity bandwagon on which politicians might ride into office. This conclusion I reached because neither the committee as a group, nor any individual member thereor, so far as I know, ever uttered 1 word of criticism as to the manner in which the hearings which I held or in which I participated had been conducted or found 1 word of fault with the results which had been obtained; nevertheless, at every opportunity, denied me the authority to continue such investigations and hearings.

On January 20, 1954, I presented to the committee a resolution asking for authority to continue to investigate racketeering and extortion, to determine the necessity of amending the Taft-Hartley Act and the advisability of writing additional legislation to protect interstate commerce and the civil rights of the citizens.[48]

A substitute resolution was offered by Mr. OSMERS, using substantially the same language carried in the resolution which I had offered, but granting the authority to make such investigation to Mr. Bender,[49] the announced candidate for the Republican primary nomination for Senator from Ohio.

That substitute, as has been previously stated, was adopted by a vote of 19 to 1; 7 Republicans being present and voting, 9 Democrats being present and voting, 2 Republicans and 1 Democrat absent but voting aye by proxy; 1 Republican, Mrs. CHURCH, and 4 Democrats, Messrs. DAWSON, CONDON, FOUNTAIN, and PILCHER present but not voting; 5 Republicans, Messrs. GRAHAM, JUDD, MCDONOUGH, MILLER, and POFF, absent and not voting.

The committee action giving the Subcommittee on Public Accounts authority to do the things which I had requested authority to do, while denying that authority to me as chairman of a special subcommittee, was a confession that the committee's previous position was wrong—an acknowledgment that I was right; that the committee itself did have jurisdiction over the subject matter, and that the hearings which I had brought about and in which I had participated had performed a valuable and necessary service.

Keeping in mind the fact that Mr. BENDER's regular subcommittee had no jurisdiction over the proposed investigation, the committee action was, in effect, the appointment of a special subcommittee—to perform a function which the committee had denied me as chairman of the full committee.

Mr. BENDER, for his Public Accounts Subcommittee, requested, and the House Committee on Administration approved, $100,000, but when that resolution, House Resolution 419,[50] came before the House on February 25, 1954, it was, on a standing vote, recommitted to the Committee on House Administration.[51]

Then, on March 4, Mr. BENDER went before a subcommittee of the Committee on House Administration with a request for $52,000, for his regular Public Accounts Subcommittee—no request for funds to uncover extortion and racketeering; Mr. RIEHLMAN requested, for his Military Operations Subcommittee, $51,000, and Mr. BROWNSON requested, for his International Operations Subcommittee, $52,000.[52]

The special subcommittee which I had appointed would probably have completed the work for less than $50,000. Our expenses in the previous hearings had been far less than the $52,000 now asked by Mr. BENDER; in fact, the total expenses—including salaries of investigators charged wholly to that investigation, although some work was done on other matters, for the previous hearings, were but $40,322.98.

We come now to the reasons for the committee action when, on three occasions,[53] it denied me the authority to make the investigations, hold the hearings—authority which they subsequently conferred upon Mr. BENDER. He has never, so far as I know, previous to this occasion, expressed any condemnation of labor racketeering or extortion or of unlawful activities in the jukebox or the horseracing businesses, which have resulted in the paying of tribute to crooks.

The real issue in the proposed hearings, if I understand the press releases correctly, will be to determine whether the Hobbs amendment to the Antiracketeering Act of 1934 is being flagrantly violated, whether that law needs amendment. Mr. BENDER voted against the adoption of the Hobbs amendment. I spoke for it, voted for it, and, after it was enacted, a special subcommittee, of which I was chairman, and which I appointed during the 80th Congress, and, notwithstanding the opinion of the then Attorney General that the law was not being violated at Philadelphia, Pa., developed facts which resulted in the indictment and conviction of a union and some of its officers for a violation of that act.[54]

The action of the committee on the 15th and the 24th of July 1953 and the 20th of January 1954 are not the only times that I have been opposed by an overwhelming majority of the committee.

On July 1, 1953, R. WALTER RIEHLMAN; CECIL M. HARDEN; GEORGE H. BENDER; CHARLES B. BROWNSON; GEORGE MEADER; FRANK C. OSMERS, JR., CLARENCE J. BROWN; LOUIS E. GRAHAM; WALTER H. JUDD; GORDON L. MCDONOUGH; KATHARINE ST. GEORGE; WILLIAM E. MILLER; RICHARD H. POFF; WILLIAM L. DAWSON; CHET HOLIFIELD; FRANK M. KARSTEN; JOHN W. MCCORMACK; BILL LANTAFF; FRANK IKARD; JACK B. BROOKS; THOMAS J. DODD; ROBERT H. MOLLOHAN; L. H. FOUNTAIN; J. L. PILCHER, members of the committee, filed a report favoring H. R. 5228, which I had opposed, and insisted on putting through the House that bill to give the Comptroller General, on retirement because of disability or after the expiration of his term, an annual pension of $17,500 during life.

That bill also provided that, if a Comptroller General who had served less than 10 years retired because of disability, even though he had served but a day, he should receive a pension of $8,750 per year.

---

[45] Appendix B, quotes from editorials.

[46] Appendix M, article in the Sign, February 1954.

[47] Appendix N, article in Look, March 9, 1954.

[48] Appendix O, resolution of CLARE E. HOFFMAN of January 20, 1954.

[49] Appendix P, OSMERS' resolution of January 20, 1954.

[50] Appendix Q, H. Res. 419, 83d Cong., 2d sess.

[51] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, February 25, 1954, p. 2192.

[52] Appendix R, H. Res. 468, 83d Cong., 2d sess.

[53] Committee minutes of July 15 and July 24, 1953, and of January 20, 1954.

[54] Hearings of enforcement of the Antiracketeering Act, February 14, March 6, 10, 13, 14, 19, and 20, 1947, 80th Cong., 1st sess.; First Intermediate Report of Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, H. Rept. No. 238, 80th Cong., 1st sess.

Most astounding is the fact that the recipient of this gratuity is not required to contribute to the fund as are other pensioners.

While Lindsay Warren, then serving as Comptroller General, had done a magnificent job, in my judgment it was unsound policy to establish a precedent which undoubtedly will be invoked by other executive officers.

From a moral as well as from a political standpoint, refusing to give taxpayers a $700 to $800 exemption, while granting a lifetime pension of $17,500 to an officeholder, does not seem quite equitable.

THE HOUSING ISSUE

Under authority previously granted me as chairman of the Committee on Government Operations, I had authority under the rules of the committee to appoint special subcommittees for the purpose of investigating subject matters which would not normally fall within the jurisdiction of any one of our regularly established subcommittees.

Early in 1953, information had come to my attention to the effect that there were certain irregularities in the operations of the housing agencies of the Government, particularly the Public Housing Administration and the Federal Housing Administration.

In February a special subcommittee was established which held a hearing on the administration of the affairs of the Federal Housing Administration. That hearing showed the prevalence of gratuities and maladministration in the operations of that agency.

In May of 1953, I appointed a special subcommittee which was to concern itself with public housing. It held hearings in Los Angeles which showed clear-cut evidence of violation of criminal statutes of the United States.

We had in our possession enough evidence of widespread irregularities to fully justify, and even demand, an overall housing investigation. However, the committee saw fit to stop that investigation.

It further prevented the adoption of the report on the irregularities uncovered in Los Angeles, which should have been made submitted to the Department of Justice for prosecution.

If the investigation had continued, in my humble judgment, there is no doubt that the widespread scandals which are now a matter of so much notoriety would, by the work of this committee, have been corrected a year earlier.

The present scandals in the housing field, which are of such magnitude that it was necessary for the President of the United States to order a clean-up and for a Senate committee to hold hearings, should be sufficient proof to cause anyone to realize that there did exist a situation in the housing field which needed investigation and should have been investigated at the time I was attempting to do so, but was prohibited by the action of the full committee.

This action on the part of the full committee—whatever the interest—resulted in a cover-up and continuation of these scandalous activities, until, after a further investigation by our former counsel, many top housing officials, some 20 in number, were discharged and the Capehart committee of the Senate took over.

REASONS FOR COMMITTEE ACTION

From what has been said, it is evident that—

First. A comparatively few but able, greedy, unscrupulous individuals have been and are using their authority and positions as high-ranking union officials to, through fraud, deception, and by the use of force, extort millions of dollars for their own use, not only from the members of their unions but from workers and businessmen generally, and on occasion from the Federal Government itself. Because of their assumed political power, they were feared and in some instances given consideration by officeseekers and politicians.

Second. Through the efforts of a subcommittee which I appointed, and in cooperation with a similar Subcommittee of the House Committee on Education and Labor, of which I was a member, and the hearings which were held, a very few instances of the illegal activities of these individuals were brought to the attention of the public. Without exception, the press in Detroit and Kansas City, where the hearings were held, courageously, through accurate news stories and forceful editorials, stressed the need for law enforcement by local and Federal officials.

Third. No complaint was ever voiced by members of the Committee on Government Operations or by the press as the manner in which the hearings were conducted, the methods, or the conduct of our investigators, nor of the results obtained.

Fourth. It was evident that, if the investigations and the hearings were continued by the same staff and under the direction of the chairman of the special subcommittee, the trail might eventually lead to results which, from a political standpoint, would be detrimental to individuals financially and politically powerful in both political parties. In Michigan, the CIO for several years openly supported the Democratic candidates by financial contributions, as well as by workers and in its publications.

Fifth. While acting as chairman of the House Committee on Government Operations—and I have been a member of that committee since 1935, and was its chairman during 1947 and 1948—I sought to hold down committee expenses, committee travel, both in this country and abroad, and suggested, on June 29, 1953, that, while Congress was not in session, subcommittees which had been created at my suggestion curtail their activities.

My expressed wishes ran counter to the ideas of subcommittee chairmen and subcommittee members, and, in retaliation, on July 15, 1953, the committee changed committee rule 3, denied me the right to appoint special subcommittees—a right exercised by every other chairman; liquidated the special subcommittee which, according to the press, had performed a necessary, worthwhile service, but which had merely scratched the surface of the corrupt mess, the cleaning up of which was a part of the job we promised the voters at the 1952 election to undertake.

Of the 16 Republican members, 10 were present. Eight who were present and two who were absent, whose proxies were voted, voted to abolish the subcommittee. I voted in the negative. One Republican who was present did not vote.

Of the 14 Democratic members, 11 were present. The 11 who were present and 2 who were absent, whose proxies were voted, voted to abolish the subcommittee. One who was absent whose proxy was cast voted "present."

It should be noted that 13 Democrats voted to end the hearings, and 10 Republicans voted to end these hearings. The political attitude of the Democrats is easy to understand; that of the Republicans not so easily understood.

Sixth. Whether the committee was induced to change its position that it had no jurisdiction and there was no necessity for such investigations by the statements in the public press and by protests received from individuals, or whether it had some other reason for its action on the 20th of January 1954, it conceded the committee had jurisdiction over the subject matter, and that a continued exposé of unlawful activities in connection with labor disputes and the administration of health and welfare funds was necessary.

On that date, reversing itself on these two positions, the full committee gave authority to the regular Subcommittee on Public Accounts, of which the Honorable George H. Bender, Congressman from Ohio, who is a candidate for the Republican primary nomination for United States Senator from Ohio, to continue such investigations and hearings. A statement of that vote has been heretofore set forth in these remarks.

Seventh. The only reasons ever given by any of the committee members to justify their action were purely personal, and might be summed up with the statement that they did not like me personally, nor my methods. But they never made a specific charge as to their dislike, except that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Brown] suggested that I was "old, ill, and testy." Another asserted that my methods were "intolerable." Another, that I was "constitutionally unconstitutional." None ever gave any bill of particulars, other than the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bender]. He, in an interview with the Cleveland News, said that I acted illegally in appointing special subcommittees—a false charge that he was forced to eat on the floor of the House.

Undoubtedly, the gentleman from California [Mr. Holifield] was greviously displeased because I had a part in blocking his effort to have the Congress force the Department of Justice and the Home Loan Bank Board to abandon its court action which was blocking the payment of a claim of some $5¼ million filed by a California outfit, and which it had not been able to maintain through the courts.

Draw your own conclusions for the committee action.

If there is any reason for the action of the committee members in denying to me authority to carry on these investigations, after more than 16 years' experience in ferreting out and exposing unlawful activities of crooked union and public officials, other than their personal dislike of me, they have as yet failed to meet my challenge to do so from the well of the House.

They either know, or they should know, that their action, regardless of their good intentions, gave encouragement to racketeers and extortionists, discouraged union members, and local union officials, who are hoping for a fair deal.

COMMITTEE RESTORES CHAIRMAN'S POWER TO APPOINT SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE LABOR RACKETEERING AND EXTORTION

Apparently the public demand for an investigation and report on the widespread racketeering and extortion practiced by a few labor leaders convinced the members of the committee that the Bender subcommittee should be supplemented. For, on June 10, 1954, the committee passed a resolution, amended June 16, 1954,[55] authorizing the chairman to appoint a special subcommittee consisting of 3 members, to make investigations and hold hearings. Under the rules of the committee, the 3-man subcommittee became a subcommittee of 5.

The House also granted a fund of $75,000 by resolution adopted on June 23, 1954,[56] to be expended under the direction of the chairman of the whole committee, to carry out the investigations authorized by the committee.

Subsequently, 4 days of hearings were held in Washington, ending on Thursday, August 5, 1954. The following Tuesday, that is, on August 10, 1954, a Washington grand jury indicted a contractor and a business representative of District Council No. 51.

Testimony taken at these hearings disclosed that, in order to carry out a contract for painting, decorating, or paperhanging in the Washington area, and that area included a part of Virginia and Maryland, it was necessary to come to terms with the business representative of District Council No. 51. These terms included the payment by contractors of substantial sums to the business representative of District Council No. 51, none of which found its way into the treasury of either the council or the local.

It is assumed that other hearings will be held, and it is hoped that the statutory provisions designed to prevent extortion will be more adequately enforced by Federal authorities.

In my judgment, had the committee not destroyed the authority of the chairman to appoint special subcommittees of the Committee on Government Operations, it would have been unnecessary to have created a special subcommittee to investigate the alleged misuse of health and welfare funds or to appropriate $75,000 for those investigations. That job would now have been well on its way to completion.

Moreover, had the subcommittee previously appointed by the chairman been permitted to follow its original program, sufficient testimony would have already been taken to justify demands for a prompt and efficient enforcement of Federal legislation. Any need for additional legislation would also have been disclosed.

To date, the work of the committee has been greatly hindered—in fact, except as to routine work of the regular subcommittees and of the special Antiracketeering Subcommittee, has been successfully blocked.

Every well-informed Member of the House must realize that corruption is still in some departments all too prevalent.

In my humble opinion, and with all due respect to the opinions of my colleagues, the action taken by the committee was based not only on a lack of information as to the situation then existing, but as to the objectives which it was desired to attain and the methods to be followed.

Notwithstanding the action taken by the committee, a determined, continuous effort has been made, and will be continued, to render a worthwhile service to my constituents and to the Congress, as well as to the country.

As of today, August 19, my efforts to carry out the request of some in this administration to continue the housecleaning in certain departments are being continued.

Early in July several individuals high in the administration called my attention to certain facts which indicate that certain executive employees had been involved in transactions which did not reflect credit upon the prior administration under which they served.

A very brief preliminary investigation indicated that it would be advisable to hold the hearings which had been suggested. However, I advised my informants that, due to the previous action of the committee in declaring that I should not appoint special subcommittees without approval of the full committee, it was not advisable—in fact, it would be impossible—for me to make a thorough investigation or hold hearings, unless the committee members could be induced to rescind their previous action. Democrats on the committee refused to help in this situation, though the former Speaker of the House [Mr. RAYBURN] said he, personally, had no objection to the adoption of House Resolution 709—see footnote 57.

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. KARSTEN] said he thought I should have the authority, that he would vote in committee to give me what I asked—well knowing a quorum of the committee could not be obtained.

Republican members of the committee were advised of the situation and, while a majority individually expressed a willingness to grant me authority to appoint a special subcommittee and only one contacted, Mr. MEADER, refused, I never was able to obtain a quorum of the members of the committee at either a specially called committee meeting or at the regular scheduled committee meeting.

The House leadership finally expressed its willingness to action by the committee which would have granted authority to the committee chairman to appoint a special subcommittee to make the requested investigations, hold the desired hearings.

This information was also conveyed to the Republican members of the committee, but because of other duties a quorum did not attend the last regular meeting of the committee, and I was therefore left without authority to comply with the wishes of those who had called the situation to my attention.

As a last and a final effort, and to show that the responsibility for the failure to investigate the deplorable situation to which attention had been called does not rest upon me, I, on August 18, 1954, after carrying it in my pocket for several days, introduced an appropriate resolution in the House.[57] As just stated, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. KARSTEN] refused to consent to the adoption of House Resolution 709. Any responsibility for the failure to make the requested investigations, to hold hearings thereon, rests not upon me, but upon the leadership of the House.

APPENDIX A. FISHER ARTICLE IN WASHINGTON TIMES-HERALD OF FEBRUARY 8, 1954

[From the Washington Times-Herald of February 8, 1954]

HOOVER TELLS CONGRESS OF SECURITY RISK

(By John Fisher)

Communists are now concentrating upon infiltration of national defense industries in the United States, J. Edgar Hoover, FBI director, reported to Congress in secret testimony released Sunday night.

He declared that Communist domination over trade unions operating in the maritime, mining, electrical, and communications fields poses a major and dangerous threat to our national security.

Hoover's testimony was given last December 9 in closed session before a House appropriations subcommittee considering the Justice Department's appropriation request for the 1955 fiscal year, which totals $177,732,000, a reduction of $1,148,000, below the current year.

DATA LOST

The testimony released Saturday night also disclosed:

1. That an FBI report on Soviet espionage sent to the Attorney General's office in 1945, became lost and didn't reach the internal security section of the Criminal Division until last September.

Similarly, FBI reports on Harry Dexter White, last Government official accused of spying, and the operation of Soviet espionage rings in this country were mislaid or lost. Warren Olney, Assistant Attorney General, testified that a recent housecleaning turned up 20,000 items of lost investigative reports, files and letters. Some unanswered letters dated back 15 years.

2. The Department is still considering a retrial of Judy Coplon, former Government girl, indicted on Soviet spy charges, but whose conviction was thrown out on charges of illegal evidence was used against her.

CRIME COST HIGH

3. Crime cost the Nation about $20 billion last year and probably set a new all-time high, with 1,047,290 major crimes committed in the first 6 months, or at the rate of one major crime every 14.9 seconds.

Concerning the Communist movement, Hoover testified they are concentrating upon underground activities, using all sorts of security measures to avoid detection, which makes surveillance by the FBI much more difficult. He said it now requires 9 or 10 FBI agents for proper surveillance where formerly 1 agent could do the job.

---

[55] See appendix S, resolution adopted June 10, 1954, as amended June 16, 1954.

[56] See appendix T, H. Res. No. 542, 83d Cong., 2d sess., adopted June 23, 1954.

[57] See appendix U, H. Res. 709, 83d Cong., 2d sess., introduced on August 18, 1954.

Last year, he said Communist Party propaganda and efforts were directed toward: peaceful objectives geared to settlement of the Korean war; recall of American troops from abroad; a five-power peace pact, including Communist China; and resumption of trade with Iron Curtain countries.

He said the party in this country is under domination and control of the Russian Communist party and advocates overthrow of the Government by force and violence. The largest membership of the party, Hoover said, is concentrated on the east and west coasts and in urban industrial centers.

Hoover said above-ground operations have been handicapped by the imprisonment or conviction of party leaders, but the underground or secret leadership has been assuming more and more authority to administer the entire party movement if necessary.

"Through the perfection of the underground apparatus, the party aims to preserve intact a hard core of militant Communists to carry out the aims and objectives of the international Communist movement under the forms of adversity," the head G-man asserted.

Hoover said 105 leaders of the Communist movement have been indicted as a result of FBI investigations, resulting in conviction of 61 who were sentenced to prison terms totaling 261 years and fines totaling $361,000.

SEEK LABOR CONTROL

He said a national party conference last August reaffirmed the premise that control of labor unions is of primary importance in development of the Communist revolution in the United States.

Hoover said the Communists picked the automobile industry as a particular target because of its vital role in defense production.

"In New York, the party has set a goal for 65 percent of its membership to become employed in the basic industries of the country," Hoover continued. "Instructions were issued for the reorganization of the Communist Party in Los Angeles recently to organize on an industrial basis and party members were requested to secure work in the basic industries in that area, thus showing the trend of placing as many members as they can in the key industries of the country—the basic industries which if disrupted would materially affect our national defense."

TRADE UNION BASES

"Currently, some trade unions operating in the maritime, mining, electrical and communications fields are chief strongholds of the Communist Party. The Communist Party still maintains its strongest bases in those unions, which were expelled from the CIO during 1949 and 1950.

"All of this poses a major and dangerous threat to our national security, because it involves these various unions that were expelled by the CIO. One of those unions represents a large portion of all employees in the electrical industry of the United States. Another union that was expelled exercises life and death control over our Pacific coast commerce; another union has members employed in the production of copper and zinc which are essential to the national defense efforts."

Concerning the crime wave in this country, Hoover said "it exists on a scale so enormous that it is difficult to grasp it." He said there were 6,470 murders and 54,000 other violent assaults by rapists or potential killers during the first 6 months of 1953. He said the $20 billion annual cost is a reasonable estimate and represents a cost of $495 for each family in the United States; or for every $1 donated to churches, $10 goes to crime; and for every dollar spent on education, $1.82 goes to crime.

Attorney General Brownell testified that of 1,456 security risks discharged from the Government, 8 including 1 former Communist, were in the Justice Department. President Eisenhower has since released a later figure of more than 2,200 security risks fired since the administration took office.

RESULTS AMAZING

Assistant Attorney General Olney testified that sometime ago the criminal division became concerned about lost and mislaid files and correspondence so a housecleaning was instituted.

"The results of that housecleaning were amazing," he said. Twenty thousand items turned up in the course of it—letters, files, investigative reports, everything. None, or at least most, of the material had ever been to the Department's Record Branch for recording.

Many unanswered letters were found, some of them dating back 15 years.

"Among other things found was the FBI report on Soviet espionage. This report on Soviet espionage that was prepared by the FBI, a copy of which was sent to the Attorney General's office in 1945, had never been seen by Mr. Foley and the Internal Security Section until September of 1953. (Foley is Chief of the Section.) That report may have been received in 1945, but it was not found until we had this housecleaning. We still do not know where it came from. It was somewhere in this mess of papers.

"It was the same way with the special report on Harry Dexter White. That also, was never seen and never reviewed by the Internal Security Section.

"We found that the FBI had made this very extensive investigation of these espionage rings and yet the individual cases of the people who were in those rings have never, to this day, been evaluated by the Internal Security Section. The reason it was not was because they did not know about it.

"In the FBI file on the principal investigation of the ring there are handwritten notes all through it, so that someone did go through it. Someone did read and did make notes, but there is no evaluation of it. * * * The result is that we are now, of course, going back and reviewing the individual cases of every one of these people who were mentioned there.

Olney said the Coplon case is in "a state of suspended animation" but "is a case I live in hopes of being able to retry." He said it is sufficient legal usable evidence to be presented in court.

Appendix B. Labor Racketeering Excerpts Taken From Newspaper Editorials

LABOR RACKETEERING

The following are excerpts taken from editorials of the various newspapers throughout the country, which reflect a demand for the continuation of the racketeering investigation by the chairman of the House Committee on Government Operations:

[From the Detroit News of December 1, 1953]

The Tasks Before Us

Racketeering is another name for the mess that figured more decisively than any other issue in the voters rejection of the Democratic Party last year * * * wherever the use of terror offers a way to easy money, the underworld can be expected to move in.

[From the Chicago Daily Tribune of November 27, 1953]

Loose Money

RE COMMISSIONS

Inasmuch as someone is going to be paid, it occurs easily to a labor skate anxious for a fast buck that it might as well be he, or someone he designates. * * * This loose money is the biggest bonanza that has appeared in the history of the labor movement. It deserves congressional attention.

[From the Detroit News of June 13, 1953]

Case for a One-Man Jury

One day of hearings by Representative HOFFMAN's congressional subcommittee sufficed to expose conditions of criminality in the jukebox and coin-machine trade that shame local law-enforcement agencies. * * * It will take a one-man grand jury to deal with the jukebox racket, whose threat to the peace of the community the congressional inquiry has left clear for all to see. * * * The shame to which the congressional committee has exposed local law enforcement is the shame, rather, of a failure to recognize the limitations of the most diligent police work.

[From the Detroit Free Press of September 4, 1953]

Juke Jury Indicts Seven

The grand-jury investigation was called following revelations regarding the racket-ridden industry at a congressional committee hearing conducted here by Representative HOFFMAN.

[From the Detroit Free Press of December 1, 1953]

By All Means a Grand Jury

Editorial demanded a Federal grand-jury investigation as a result of the testimony and disclosures made to the congressional subcommittee.

[From the Detroit News of November 4, 1953]

The Workers Betrayed

What Detroit is hearing today about widespread extortion, bribetaking, and other forms of racketeering by officials in the teamsters union is hardly a new story. * * *

It's leaders continue the same outrageously illegal activities and the sellout of the legitimate collective interests of the rank and file. * * *

If in times past the average worker belonging to the teamsters union was able to deceive himself that the racketeering of the bosses was just a little extracurricular activity, done for pocket money and implying not betrayal of his personal interests, he is no longer in position to hug that illusion * * * when the bosses accept bribe money to keep a truck fleet operating or to deal workers out of their holiday pay, they pick the pockets of their own following and deprive them of their right to negotiate for a higher wage.

[From the Detroit News of December 29, 1953]

Baring Tolerated Corruption

Representative HOFFMAN has announced that with the return of Congress in January he will seek authority to extend an investigation of labor-union racketeering into every State and city appearing in need of the treatment. * * *

These inquiries have resulted to date in 2 grand juries, in Detroit and Kansas City, and in 17 indictments of union officials for extortion, embezzlement, and illegal gift taking. * * * Evidently there are those, other than the persons indicted, to whom the inquiry is embarrassing.

There is much speculation about the source of alleged pressure. It is probable the motives are in fact several and of varying degrees of respectability. * * * However, one obvious motive for pressure would be nothing more complicated than the reluctance of Federal, State, and local law enforcement agencies to be shown up as ineffectual or, at any rate, inactive in this connection. It does look odd that a congressional committee can tour about the country uncovering the existence of crime seemingly unsuspected by those whose business is to deal with it.

There may even be a respectable motive for questioning the desirability of Congress, thus assuming, in effect, the role of prosecutor. * * * As long as that role is not being fulfilled (enforcement by city, State, Federal agencies), the reasons why in themselves, form a sufficient justification for congressional concern with the subject * * * the proposed broadness of his investigation will be welcomed by all who have worried over the spread of lawlessness in the operations of some labor unions.

[From the Detroit Free Press of September 5, 1953]

Juke Racket

Seven men have been indicted by Circuit Judge Miles N. Culehan, one-man labor-rackets grand juror, on charges of extortion and using the muscle in jukebox activities in the Detroit area * * * racketeering has been going on for too many years in the Detroit jukebox industry, with the knowledge, at least, of Wayne County and Detroit law enforcement authorities.* * * Back in February of 1951 the Senate Crime Investigating Committee (Kefauver) questioned some of the men now indicted by Judge Culehan, about Detroit jukebox racketeering and its connection with the national syndicate. Local authorities didn't do their duty. * * * Nothing was done.

Then, Representative Clare Hoffman, Republican of Michigan, came here last June as a cochairman of a congressional committee to investigate the jukebox racket. * * * Judge Culehan, in less than 2 months, and with an expenditure of less than $4,000, which is unusually small for a grand jury investigation, has been able to unearth enough evidence to indict leaders in the jukebox union, affiliated with the local teamsters union.

[From the Kansas City Times of June 27, 1953]

Congress Moves In

Now the national implications of the Kansas City construction crisis are recognized by House investigation. * * * This includes the national concern over the closed defense construction and wider implications, as well as any violations of Federal laws. The findings could be used as the basis for amending or writing laws. * * * The joint committee * * * has no enforcement powers and needs none. Most important, it has the means of getting the facts and of presenting the facts forcefully to the public. Public opinion is the powerful force that no organization, or leader of high station, can afford to ignore. Such congressional interest is not hard to understand. In Greater Kansas City alone, some $35 million of defense construction is shut down, and a large part of it is urgent construction. Standing out among all the lesser factors is a reckless drive for power by the construction teamsters. * * * The international is pushing hard to expand its power. What has happened in Kansas City, Detroit, or St. Louis, can happen in any American city. Local defense construction has gone through a long period of harrassment with quick trigger shutdowns, arrogant roving stewards, impossible demands, and all the way, jurisdictional pressure against other unions. If such a campaign could succeed on the Kansas City battleground, Congress would have to expect the same attacks in other centers of defense construction.

[From the Kansas City Times of June 29, 1953]

One Step for Labor Peace

Today Greater Kansas City and Congress should begin to get a fuller picture of the forces at work in this city. * * * The general tactics and reckless goals of the Teamsters O. L. Ring are apparent. * * * The spotlight attracted by a congressional investigation is formidable encouragement to witnesses.

Many persons have seen reason to hope that the congressional investigation would bring the local—and possibly the national—situation to a head. * * * The hearing is the important next step. At the very minimum it should focus national attention on the consequences of overreaching union leadership. * * * The congressional hearing should encourage the local union leaders who want to put an end to this disastrous internal strife. If there is evidence of major law violation, the hearings should lay the groundwork for a grand-jury investigation.

Still essential is the specific plan to put the men back on the construction jobs. To mean anything, it will have to be a plan that will end the quick-trigger strike intimidation, for one-union power. For the first responsibility is on the leadership of the thousands who are paying the price of the strike.

[From the Kansas City Times of July 2, 1953]

Grim Story to the Public

The wretched story is unfolding before the eyes of television viewers throughout this area. Such a closeup contact with witnesses from both union leaders and business gives a special force to the ominous purpose and methods that have produced this virtually total shutdown of the Greater Kansas City construction. * * * From J. O. Mack, president of the carpenters district council, and others, the public has received a direct report on Ring's drive for power over other unions by strong-arm methods.

From many witnesses the public has been told of reckless actions by arrogant representatives of the teamsters and allies—roving stewards forced on the contractors at fantastic wages, union control of construction, and featherbedding. * * * The cost to the public is increases ranging up to 15 percent in the amount of the contractors' bids. * * *

A ruthless campaign has been directed against both employers and other unions for the same apparent purpose—complete domination. Greater Kansas City is left with a shutdown that undermines its economy. * * *

Ruthless goals don't thrive in a spotlight such as has been attracted to the congressional investigation. The public, including the thousands of men off the jobs, is getting the story with all the force of direct contact. Congress is putting together a vast story of aggression that reaches into other cities. The forces of law enforcement are finally starting and so, we suspect, are the top officials at the Pentagon. They are responsible for military construction.

[From the Kansas City Times of July 1, 1953]

Strike Peril for the Nation

Established at the beginning of this Kansas City congressional hearing is a ruthless stab at national defense. Most urgent construction, both at the Sunflower Ordnance Works and the Lake City Arsenal, already has been set back by approximately a half year. * * *

At the very least, this is a case of total irresponsibility and complete disregard for the national interests. * * * With support of our fighting men at stake, so far no agency of the Federal Government has attempted to cope with it. Government has appeared helpless to protect itself and its Armed Forces against a stab at home. But, through many emergencies, there has always been a point at which the Government has risen to assert itself. In this case the turning may be the present congressional hearings. * * *

For the moment, Kansas City appears to be the battleground of a nationwide war for power, in which the teamsters with their allies are driving hard against the other AFL construction unions. Unless the campaign of intimidation and strikes can be stopped here, Congress can expect other battles to demoralize defense construction in other cities.

We believe that members of the two congressional committees know this Kansas City battle for part of an internal labor war that challenges the United States at home.

[From the Kansas City Times of July 16, 1953]

Grand Jury on the Job

The local answer to violence and intimidation has been delivered by Judge Ben Terte. * * *

It is assumed that in the near future a Federal grand jury will dig into any and all evidence of Federal law violations.

Through the hearings of congressional committees, Kansas City received a frightening picture. It suggested a breakdown of lawing relations among construction unions, and between unions and employers. Such a situation, involving both Federal and State laws, calls for powerful action on both fronts.

[From the Kansas City Star of July 21, 1953]

Back to Work

This day that ends Greater Kansas City's worst construction strike should be the beginning of a new era of peace for the long harassed industry. * * * There should have been a better way to settle the deep-grown issues, but nobody found it. The issues were a bewildering complex—union against union, unions against contractors, challenges against the Government itself.

The chaos caused a general stirring in Congress, in the courts, and in the high levels of the AFL. The AFL meeting laid the groundwork for a settlement and started the movement to restore the Building and Construction Trades Council which should be an executive body in the future."

[From the Herald Press of December 1, 1953]

Keep the Probe Alive

The Hoffman subcommittee investigations into the AFL Teamsters tangled affairs in Detroit is dredging up any amount of interesting facts.

Our own guess is that the administration, with an eye cocked to the 1954 and 1956 elections is turning handsprings to placate certain segments of the AFL who have never been particularly friendly to the Democrats, but who might be outraged beyond endurance once the truth is known about the racket-ridden aspects of many an AFL affiliate.

The administration is falling into the same trap that the Democrats did in covering up the Commie infiltration into the New Deal and Fair Deal.

The GOP won the election last year partly on the promise to clean out communism, racketeering, and other barnacles, wherever found and to whomever attached. This is scarcely the time to backtrack on that promise.

[From the Detroit Free Press of June 13, 1953]

Who's to Blame

Detroit has gone along in recent years with the secure feeling that the city has been relatively free from bigtime rackets. * * * The testimony elicited under subpena by the committee headed by Representatives Clare Hoffman suggests that there has been going on here an organized racket, who had hoodlumism and terrorism surpassing anything uncovered by the Ferguson-O'Hara grand jury of more than a decade ago. * * * Most law-abiding people will ask why it was necessary for a committee from Congress to look into this situation? Where have the local law-enforcement authorities been all this time? We think the people of the community are entitled to a straightforward answer to that question from their public officials. * * * Individual operators of rival coin-machine businesses and proprietors of public places have told frightening stories of extortion and threats which are reminiscent of the worst type of prohibition era gang operations. * * * Witnesses testified that they sought action from police and the prosecutor and failed to get it. The argument that it was impossible to get evidence, the one usually fallen back on by the prosecutor, is hardly valid. Representative Hoffman seems to be getting it.

Appendix C-1. Copy of Order Appointing Subcommittee of Committee on Government Operations (June 4, 1953)

June 4, 1953.

Establishment of Special Subcommittee

Pursuant to the resolution of January 26, 1953, of the Committee on Government Operations, the following special subcommittee is hereby established and appointed to continue until terminated by the chairman of the committee or by the committee:

SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE FEDERAL-STATE COOPERATION IN ENFORCEMENT OF ANTIRACKETEERING LAWS AND THE LABOR MANAGEMENT RELATIONS ACT, 1947, AND OTHER FEDERAL LABOR LEGISLATION

Because of certain charges of the violation at Detroit, Mich., and other places of the antiracketeering law, as amended by the Hobbs amendment, a special subcommittee of three is appointed to investigate Federal-State cooperation in the suppression of racketeering, to evaluate the effectiveness of the administration and enforcement of statutes to suppress racketeering, to inquire into matters within the jurisdiction of the committee, and to report to the Committee on Government Operations.

Because of certain charges of the violation at Benton Harbor, Mich., and other places of the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947, and other Federal labor legislation, and of the improper administration of such legislation, the special subcommittee of three is authorized to investigate the administration and enforcement of the said legislation, to inquire into matters within the jurisdiction of the committee, and to report to the Committee on Government Operations.

For the purpose of performing its duties the Special Subcommittee To Investigate Federal-State Cooperation in Enforcement of Antiracketeering Laws and the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947, and other Federal labor legislation is authorized to sit, hold hearings, and act at Washington, D. C., at Detroit, Mich., and at such other place or places within the continental limits of the United States and at such times, whether or not the House is in session, is in recess, or has adjourned, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such papers, documents, and books, and to take such testimony as it deems necessary.

On the special subcommittee above established the chairman of the full committee will serve as chairman; Mr. Bender will serve as the other majority member, and Mr. Condon, nominated by the minority leadership, who is hereby appointed, will serve as the third member.

In the event that any member of the special subcommittee is unable or declines to serve, the chairman of the special subcommittee will name a substitute, who shall have the same authority as would the member originally named.

Clare E. Hoffman,
Chairman.

Appendix C-2. Copy of Order Appointing Subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor (June 6, 1953)

(Note.—Appointed at request of Clare E. Hoffman.)

House of Representatives,
Committee on Education and Labor,
Washington, D. C., June 6, 1953.

Hon. Wint Smith,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Congressman Smith: By virtue of the authority vested in me as chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor of the House of Representatives, and, pursuant to House Resolution 115, of the 83d Congress, 1st session, I hereby appoint you as chairman of a special subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor to investigate alleged violations in and around Benton Harbor and Detroit, Mich., of the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947, and other Federal labor legislation coming within the purview of the Committee on Education and Labor, and allegations as to the improper administration and enforcement of such legislation.

I have also appointed Representative Clare E. Hoffman of Michigan and Representative Phil M. Landrum of Georgia to serve with you on this subcommittee.

The subcommittee is hereby authorized and directed to conduct a thorough study and investigation of the aforementioned allegations and any matter or subject coming within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Education and Labor under rule XI, 6, of the Rules of the House of Representatives, 83d Congress, which is covered by these allegations.

You are further directed to hold such public or executive sessions at St. Joseph, Mich., and Detroit, Mich., as you may deem advisable.

Sincerely yours,

Samuel K. McConnell, Jr.,
Chairman, Committee on Education and Labor.

Appendix D. List of Labor Hearings Held by Clare E. Hoffman During the 80th Congress

(a) As chairman of special subcommittee of House Committee on Education and Labor:

October 15, 16, 1947: Clinton, Mich. (strike at Clinton Machine Co.).

October 20, 21, 22, 1947, St. Joseph, Mich. (Remington-Rand, of Benton Harbor).

October 23, 24, 1947: Dowagiac, Mich. (Heddon Bait Co.).

October 28, 29, 1947: Michigan City, Ind. (Joy Manufacturing Co.).

October 30, 31, 1947: Galion, Ohio (North Electric Manufacturing Co.), and at Washington, D. C., November 14, 19.

January 20, 26, 28, February 2, 3, 10, 11, 28, March 6, 8, 9, 1948: Government Services, Inc., at Washington, D. C.

July 30, 1948: South Haven, Mich. (National Motor Castings Co.).

August 2, 3, 11, 1948: Dayton, Ohio (Univis Lens Co.), and at Washington, D. C., August 5 and 6.

August 26, 1948: Jackson, Mich. (Aeroquip strike).

August 27, 1948: Grand Rapids, Mich. (Aeroquip strike).

December 4, 6, 17, 1948: Kalamazoo (Shakespeare Co. and Shakespeare Products Co.), and at Washington, D. C., on December 22.

(b) As chairman of a subcommittee of the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments:

February 14, March 6, 10, 19, 20, 1947: Washington, D. C. (effectiveness of Hobbs amendment in suppressing racketeering).

March 13, 14, 1947: Philadelphia, Pa. (effectiveness of Hobbs amendment in suppressing racketeering).

May 20, 21, 1948: Chicago, Ill. (strikes in meat-packing industry in 20 States).

Appendix E. Rules Adopted by Committee on Government Operations on January 26 and February 18, 1953

Rules

Rule 1: (a) The rules of the House, insofar as they are applicable shall govern the committee and its subcommittees.

(b) The rules of the committee shall be the rules of the subcommittees.

Rule 2: The regular meetings of the committee shall be held on the first and third Wednesday of each month at 10 a. m., at room No. 1501, New House Office Building, at such other times as the chairman may appoint, and on the written request of a quorum of the committee. Subcommittee meetings shall not be held when the full committee is meeting.

Rule 3: A majority of the committee shall constitute a quorum; provided, however, that special subcommittees consisting of two or more members—at least one of whom shall be a member of the minority—may be appointed by the chairman, and, in such case, one member of the special subcommittee shall be a quorum for the purpose of taking sworn testimony only, provided that the other member or members of the special subcommittee shall have received reasonable notice thereof. Four members of a regular subcommittee shall constitute a quorum.

Rule 4: A member may vote by proxy on any issue he may specify providing his proxy is in writing, dated, and signed, but a proxy may not be used for the purpose of creating a quorum.

Rule 5: The chairman and the ranking minority member of the committee shall be ex officio members of the regular subcommittees but not of special subcommittees unless appointed to such subcommittee, and shall have the right to vote on all matters pending before the regular subcommittee. Any member of the committee shall have the privilege of sitting with any regular subcommittee during its hearings or deliberations and may participate in them but shall not have authority to vote on any matter before the subcommittee.

Rule 6: Questions as to the order of business, the procedure of the committee, or subcommittee, shall, in the first instance, be decided by the chairman, subject always to an appeal to the committee or subcommittee.

INVESTIGATIONS

Rule 7: Investigations, insofar as possible, should always be made by experienced individuals of sound judgment and with the single thought of obtaining the facts without in any way infringing upon the rights of the citizen.

Rule 8: No major investigation by a subcommittee shall be initiated without approval of a majority of the subcommittee.

HEARINGS

Rule 9: For the purpose of performing its duties, the committee, or any subcommittee thereof when authorized by the committee, is authorized to sit, hold hearings, and act at such times and places within the United States, whether or not the House is in session, is in recess, or has adjourned, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such papers, documents, and books, and to take such testimony as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or of any subcommittee, or by any member designated by any such chairman, and may be served by any person designated by any such chairman or member.

Rule 10: Attendance at executive sessions shall be limited to members of the committee or subcommittee and of the staff and such other persons whose presence is requested or consented to by the committee or subcommittee.

Rule 11: All hearings conducted by the committee or any subcommittee shall be open to the public, except executive sessions for marking up bills or where the committee or subcommittee by a majority vote orders an executive session.

Rule 12: No one other than a member of the committee or subcommittee as designated by the chairman or subcommittee chairmen shall hold hearings.

Rule 13: Hearings—the taking of testimony—are to be conducted in an orderly, dignified manner, the committee keeping in mind the power of the Congress, the authority of the committee, the attainment of the objective sought, and the rights and privileges of the witness.

WITNESSES

Rule 14: All witnesses at public or executive hearings shall be sworn or shall affirm.

Rule 15: So far as is practicable, all witnesses appearing before the committee or subcommittee shall file advance written statements of their proposed testimony and their oral testimony shall be limited to brief summaries of their argument. The staff shall prepare and furnish to the chairman of the committee (or subcommittee) before each day's hearings, so far as is practicable, a short summary of the statement and of what is expected to be developed by the testimony of each witness.

Rule 16: Any witness summoned at a public hearing, unless the committee or subcommittee by a majority vote determines otherwise, may be accompanied by counsel who shall be permitted to advise the witness as to his rights. Counsel shall not testify or make any statement without consent of a majority of the committee or subcommittee present.

Rule 17: Members, as called upon by the chairman, may, by clear, brief, and relevant questions, interrogate the witnesses, consuming—in the first instance—not more than 5 minutes. After each member has used or waived the 5 minutes allocated to him, other members may then continue their interrogation under the direction of the chairman.

Rule 18: An accurate stenographic record shall be kept of all testimony. Any witness, by paying therefor, may have a stenographic transcript of his testimony given at public hearings. The witness will be permitted, in the presence of a member of the committee staff, at the office of the committee, to examine the transcript of his own testimony given at executive hearings, at such time as may be specified by the chairman.

Rule 19: Evidence received in executive hearings shall not be released or included in any report without the approval of a majority of the committee.

REPORTS

Rule 20: No committee or subcommittee report shall be made without the approval of a majority of the committee or subcommittee; provided, however, that any member of the committee or subcommittee may make a report supplementary to or dissenting from the majority report.

Rule 21: No summary of a committee report, prediction of the contents of such report, or statement of conclusions concerning any investigation should be made by a member of the committee or of the staff prior to the issuance of the report of the committee.

Rule 22: No member of the staff shall publish or release any report or statement alleging misconduct by any person in any matter under investigation by the subcommittee.

Rule 23: No member of the staff shall, for compensation, publish any article or deliver any speech or lecture concerning the committee or its activities while such person is a member of the staff.

Rule 24: Inasmuch as the chairman of the full committee is required to approve and sign the vouchers for expenses, not only those incurred by the full committee and its professional and clerical staff but by the subcommittee employees and professional staff, and to coordinate the activities of the committee and its subcommittees, the chairmen of all subcommittees shall, before undertaking investigations or holding hearings, outline the purpose and scope of the proposed activity and furnish to the chairman an estimate of the expenses to be incurred.

Before employing personnel, the chairman of the subcommittees shall obtain the approval of the chairman to the employment and terms thereof.

When submitting vouchers for the approval of the chairman, subcommittee chairmen shall certify that the disbursements were necessary and reasonable in amount; that the items for which charges are made have been received; that the services for which payment is sought have been rendered.

Rule 25: All subcommittee requests for printing shall be filed with the clerk of the committee and copies of hearings and reports of every nature shall, except as otherwise requested by the chairman, be delivered to the committee.

Rule 26: Inasmuch as the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, section 140 (a), requires the clerk of the House to collect all committee records, each subcommittee shall file with the clerk of the committee at the close of each Congress, all of its records with an index in triplicate of all material filed.

Appendix F. Extension of Remarks of Clare E. Hoffman in Congressional Record, July 7, 1952, Volume 98, Part 11, Pages A4853 to A4857

An Attempt To Substitute the Judgment of a Congressional Committee for a Judicial Decision

(Extension of remarks of Clare E. Hoffman, of Michigan, in the House of Representatives Monday, July 7, 1952)

Mr. Hoffman of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, neither the subcommittee of the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments—now the Committee on Government Operations—nor the full committee, though extensive hearings were held by the Holifield subcommittee, were able to agree upon a report. Nor was any report authorized to be printed in the Record.

The Expenditures Committee declined to adopt a report which would have had the effect of substituting its judgment for that of the United States courts on matters in litigation in the California savings and loan controversy. In view of the mutual respect which should exist between Congress and the courts, this was the only proper action the committee could take.

Individual Members of the House, and especially members of the committee, were at liberty, however, to place their views in the Record.

Inasmuch as my colleague from California [Mr. Holifield] exercised that right and privilege by expressing his views in the Congressional Record, it seems appropriate that the following statement be made:

STATEMENTS OF FACT

The Long Beach Federal Savings & Loan Association, of Long Beach, Calif., was and is a corporation organized and existing under and by virtue of the terms and provisions of the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, as amended—United States Code, section 1461, et sec.—and functions as a mutual thrift association in the city of Long Beach, Calif. It is hereinafter referred to as Long Beach Federal.

The Federal Home Loan Bank of Los Angeles, hereinafter referred to as Los Angeles bank, was a body corporate—later dissolved by order of the Commissioner with the prior approval of the President—a Federal Home Loan bank established by the Federal Home Loan Bank Board under authority and within the meaning of chapter 11 of title 12 of the United States Code.

The Federal Home Loan Bank Act—Public Law 304, 72d Congress—provided for a board of five members, known as the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, but Executive Order No. 9070, issued by the President on February 24, 1942, pursuant to the First War Powers Act, abolished the Board and designated the then Chairman, the late John H. Fahey, as Commissioner and sole administrator of the Federal Home Loan Bank Administration.

Mr. Fahey, acting as Commissioner, on March 29, 1946, ordered—order No. 5082—that the Federal Home Loan Bank of Los Angeles should be liquidated and reorganized, and its assets turned over to the Federal Home Loan Bank of Portland, which was ordered to assume its liabilities.

On May 20, 1946, by order No. 5254, which the Government contends is unrelated to order No. 5082, Mr. Fahey, acting as Commissioner, appointed Mr. Ammann, who was assistant chief supervisor of Federal-and-State-chartered insured institutions, conservator of Long Beach association.

SMITH COMMITTEE INVESTIGATION

The Los Angeles bank, the Long Beach association, and various members and stockholders of both, complained of the actions of the Commissioner in dissolving the Los Angeles bank and appointing a conservator for the Long Beach association, to a Select Committee of the House To Investigate Executive Agencies Acting Beyond the Scope of Their Authority. That committee was created by House Resolution 88 of the 79th Congress, 1st session.

Among other things, the complainants alleged that the Commissioner was biased, acted arbitrarily, and without authority.

Hearings were held beginning on the 12th day of June 1946, continuing on the 13th and ending on the 14th of June 1946, and covering 273 pages of printed testimony.

Mr. Hyman Fischbach was counsel for the committee, made the investigations, and conducted the hearings.

The committee filed a report, being the 10th intermediate report of the Select Committee To Investigate Executive Agencies Acting Beyond the Scope of Their Authority, House Report No. 2659, 79th Congress, 2d session.

That committee recommended:

"RECOMMENDATIONS

"The recommendations of your committee are—

"(1) That the Commissioner revoke the order reducing the number of districts from 12 to 11 in the Federal Home Loan Bank System.

"(2) That the Commissioner take all necessary steps to reestablish a Federal Home Loan Bank of Los Angeles and a Federal Home Loan Bank of Portland, and revoke the order or orders by which the assets of these two district banks were intermingled.

"(3) Should the Commissioner, in the light of the evidence adduced before your committee, still adhere to the opinion that the number of districts should be reduced from 12 to 11, and is still of the opinion that he has the legal authority to reduce the number of districts, he should proceed to give due notice of such intention to all of the associations in the area affected, hold hearings, and give due weight to the recommendations of the officials of the banks involved and to the views of the associations which are members of the regional banks affected, and should likewise take into consideration the views of the industry generally. Any sudden and unheralded action, such as that taken in the case of the Los Angeles bank, is certain to have an unfavorable effect on the confidence of the public in the institutions involved.

"(4) That the Commissioner revoke the order appointing a conservator for the Federal Savings and Loan Association of Long Beach and restore the assets and affairs of the association to its duly elected management, and render a proper accounting for the same, as expeditiously as is consistent with judicial determination of the questions at issue. Your committee questions whether the law ever contemplated that the Board should have the extraordinary power to seize and appoint a conservator for a solvent institution as a part of the supervisory functions entrusted to the Board over member banks.

"(5) That the appropriate committees of Congress give consideration to the necessity (if, in the opinion of such committees, the necessity exists) of amending the Federal Home Loan Act in the following particulars:

"(a) Clarifying the authority of the Board in the matter of approval of elective officers of the regional banks to the end that neither the Board nor other officials may exercise such authority arbitrarily.

"(b) Clarifying the authority of the Board or the Administrator to increase or decrease the number of regional banks, and specifying the condition and procedure under which such changes may be made.

"(c) Prohibiting the agency from appointing conservators for any member association, except under specific and well-defined limitations.

"(6) It developed in the hearings that the order relating to the appointment of a conservator for the Federal Savings and Loan Association of Long Beach had not been filed with the Federal Register, as required by law. The Division of the Federal Register advised your committee that only on three occasions has the Federal Home Loan Bank Administration complied with the requirement that its orders be filed with the Federal Register. Your committee further recommends that the Administrator comply with the law in this respect in the future."

The Commissioner, Mr. Fahey, did not comply with any of the recommendations; nor did the Congress enact legislation to correct the alleged abuses of which complaint was made, except that Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1947 established a three-man Home Loan Bank Board.[1]

The United States Court of Appeals in the Mallonee case—*Home Loan Bank Board et al.* v. *Mallonee et al.* (C. A. 9, 196 F. 2d (adv. sh.) 336, at 390)—said:

"And it is to be noted that despite the recommendations of a congressional committee in a report made on July 25, 1946, Congress has not seen fit to amend that statute so as to curtail the supervisory powers of the Board."

If the House did not deem it wise to fully implement that report by legislation, there would seem to be no sufficient reason for the assumption of jurisdiction by the present committee as a controversy is now pending in the courts.

THE LITIGATION

On May 27, 1946, the Long Beach Association and, shortly thereafter, others interested, brought court action against Fahey, individually and as Chairman—Commissioner—of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board; and Ammann, individually and as conservator, challenging the legality of the actions hereinbefore referred to.

These actions reached the Supreme Court in *Fahey* v. *Mallonee* (332 U. S. 245). That Court upheld the constitutionality of the laws under which the Commissioner acted and the validity of his regulations.

Later, the pleadings were amended, other parties joined, and an award of damages—$36,465,000—sought, relief being predicated upon the charge that Home Loan Bank Board, Fahey, Ammann, and more than a hundred private individuals joined in a conspiracy to by fraud and illegal action injure the plaintiffs.

These actions were later consolidated and the issues raised, as well as the issue as to the reestablishment of the Los Angeles bank brought before the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

The decision of the Supreme Court was subsequently construed by the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit on April 2, 1952, in an opinion written in the case of *Home Loan Bank Board et al.* v. *Malonee et al.* (C. A. 9, 196 F. 2d (Adv. Sh.) 336). That court commented at page 355 upon it as follows:

"The length of the Fahey-Mallonee decision forbids setting out the full text but its importance justifies a summary of the decision. The Supreme Court said: (1) Section 5 (d) of the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, as amended, was constitutional; (2) that the removal of the conservator of association by the three-judge court, supra, was improper and that its drastic decree could stand only if 5 (d) was unconstitutional; (3) that institutions like associations are created, insured, and aided by the Federal Government; (4) that the provisions of the statute under attack were regulatory; (5) that the Board adopted rules and regulations governing appointment of conservators and they provide grounds upon which a conservator may be named, these being the usual and conventional grounds found in most State and Federal banking statutes, and these rules and regulations are sufficiently explicit to be adequate for proper administration and for judicial review if there should be proper occasion for it; (6) that the regulations provide for a hearing after the conservator takes possession and while this is a drastic procedure it is an almost invariable custom to exercise supervision in this summary manner, and it is not unconstitutional; (7) that in this case an administrative hearing was demanded by and accorded to association, and a specification of charges against its management was requested and furnished by the Board; (8) that the causes for the appointment of a conservator set forth by the Board were (the Court enumerates the serious charges laid against the management of association, p. 254 of opinion); (9) that plaintiffs nevertheless demanded and obtained an injunction to prevent the administrative hearing and they have therefore cut off the making of a record as to whether these charges are well founded."

The Supreme Court decision did not end the litigation. Comment by the Court in *Home Loan Bank Board* v. *Mallonee*, supra, decided last April, gives some idea of the magnitude of the parties and issues involved. That Court[2] said—page 368:

"The long record is a vivid portrayal of the melange of issues and parties finally and inevitably drawn within the expanding boundaries of the controversy as a result of failure to lay at rest in the very beginning the matter of the validity of the Ammann appointment. The vast array of parties and issues we here note came into this litigation after, and we think as a result of, the amendments to the pleadings of Mallonee and association which were authorized by the lower court on November 10, 1947. We refer to these amendments at a later point in this part of our opinion. This tremendous expansion of the litigation deserves more than a passing glance for it makes apparent the fact that the new flood of litigants arising out of this expansion of the area of controversy, injected into the litigation a host of serious and highly complicated problems of law and fact for the consideration of and adjudication by the lower court—in fact, the parties accent the very difficult task the court faced by reason of this fact. It finally appointed a master to handle some of the multifarious problems besetting the court and a controversy over liability for the master's fees is now on appeal in this court.

"To add to the complications, it appears from the brief of association that 10 associations (not parties to this appeal) brought suit in the United States District Court for the Northern District of California, to enjoin and prevent a settlement of the litigation. These associations (referred to as the northern 10) are similar in character to appellee association and are located in the San Francisco Bay area. Prosecution of this action was halted by a preliminary injunction issued by the lower court on the ground that all of the issues raised by the action were already pending in the lower court since all parties in the northern action were already parties in the instant consolidated actions. The position and the contentions of these litigants are not pertinent on this appeal.

"Facts revealed in the record and in comments in the briefs present a bewildering picture and one that adds prophetic emphasis to the June 1947 comment of the Supreme Court in *Fahey* v. *Mallonee*, supra, that 'there is more to this litigation than meets the eye on the pleadings.' The briefs indicate that the litigation finally brought within its orbit 15 proceedings in State and Federal trial and appellate courts and 2 congressional investigations. The printed part of the record in the instant appeal contains approximately 11,500 pages necessitating a separate index of 129 pages. The full record on this appeal contains nearly 20,000 pages (in addition to 5,000 pages of reporters' transcripts) and is a narrative of proceedings in which there were more than 50 interpleaders and more than 100 hearings which are asserted to have resulted in 10 final judgments. Thousands of parties were named defendants, including 8,000 'John Doe borrowers' from association; 100 'intermeddling Does'; 100 'John Doe receivers'; 100 'John Does' names as trustees under deeds of trust; hundreds of 'John Does' and 'Jane Does,' 'Roe and Doe' copartnerships; 'Black & Co.' corporations, 1 to 100 inclusive, and 'Red associations.' The amounts of the individual interpleaders have varied from as high as $6,300,000 in one proceeding, to clear the titles to approximately 4,000 homes of 8,000 local borrowers. These individual homeowners became involved in their efforts to clear the tangled titles to their individual homes and in this effort causing various amounts to be deposited into court as the balance due on home loans. Numerous other parties were specifically named as parties defendant including past and present officers and directors of the Federal Home Loan Bank of San Francisco; the Federal Savings & Loan Insurance Corp.; 10 savings and loan associations located in northern California; the 80 officers and directors of said associations; Land Title Insurance Co., a corporation which allegedly undertook to insure titles of borrowers during the period of the conservatorship."

---

[1] The hearings show—pp. 163 and 198—that committee counsel, whose employment by the Smith committee ended some time in 1946 and who was subsequently employed at some date unknown to the writer to serve as counsel for the present subcommittee, received some $2,500 from interested Los Angeles Savings & Loan people, which he contends was paid to him for drafting a statement and to oppose Reorganization Plan No. 3.

[2] Since the opinion of the United States court of appeals covers the same subject matter as the investigation of the subcommittee, and represents a consideration of the entire record, that opinion is incorporated into these remarks by this reference. Needless to say, no member of the subcommittee has had the time necessary to read the tremendous record of this litigation, the printed portion of which alone fills 24 volumes.

THE PRESENT INVESTIGATION

Evidently, complaint of the failure of the Home Loan Bank Board to follow the recommendations of the Smith committee, as hereinbefore referred to, was made to the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

The record shows that a special subcommittee investigating the Home Loan Bank Board, composed of Hon. Chet Holifield, chairman, and Representatives Lanham, Hardy, Karsten, Lovre, and Hoffman was appointed.

The present hearings were held on 36 days. The first day's hearing was on October 27, 1950, in Los Angeles, Calif. On November 14, following, hearings were held in Long Beach, Calif.; then on November 28, 1950, and on subsequent days, down to and including August 10, 1951, in Washington, D. C.

Hearings were held on November 2, 1951, in Memphis, Tenn.; on November 6 and 7, 1951, and March 28, 1952, in Los Angeles, Calif.

The printed hearings cover 2,181 pages.

The investigation was made by Mr. Hyman Fischbach and his associates. At times, members of the committee were present. At other times, Mr. Holifield, the chairman, and Mr. Fischbach conducted the hearings.

The hearings in October and November 1950 in Los Angeles and Long Beach were secret. When the hearings moved to Washington, committee members received numerous representations from both sides of the Capitol, and from savings and loan associations throughout the United States, that, if such proceedings had to continue, they be open to the public. The first day's proceedings in Washington were also secret, but on November 29, 1950, the hearings were opened to the public.

The proceedings in California in October and November 1950 took place before the special subcommittee had been appointed. These proceedings were described, at a meeting of the subcommittee held in Washington on November 28, 1950, by Subcommittee Counsel Fischbach as follows:

"Mr. Fischbach. Mr. Chairman, before swearing the witness and before starting any proceedings this morning with respect to taking additional testimony. I would like to report to the subcommittee assembled here that during the course of the field investigation which was made under the auspices of the chairman of the subcommittee, it was necessary to take the testimony of various individuals. We proceeded in that respect on the 27th of October 1950, in the Federal Building in Los Angeles, and had before us Robert F. Rhoades, J. Arthur Younger, J. H. Hoffman, who were officials of the Citizens' Federal Savings & Loan Association of San Francisco, and had such proceedings by way of testimony and documentary evidence submitted as is indicated by the transcript prepared by Mack M. Racklin, an official court reported at Los Angeles.

"We also had occasion to proceed in the same manner at Long Beach, Calif., on November 14, 1950, and on that occasion the chairman presided at the taking of the testimony of the following witnesses: Charles E. Bradley, Harold L. Newendorp, Charles T. Smith, Thomas A. Gregory, Clair Van Horn, and Victor Roddick, and received the exhibits indicated by the transcript, which was prepared by Mr. Racklin, the official court reporter from Los Angeles, whose services we had had on the 27th of October.

"I would like to offer, and I ask the chairman to move acceptance of, the testimony as well as the exhibits identified in the transcript of the proceedings to which I have referred.

"Mr. Lovre. Mr. Chairman, was this a staff investigation made out in California in October that you are talking about?

"Mr. Holifield. Yes. Mr. Hyman I. Fischbach and Mr. Herbert Roback, who are on my regular subcommittee staff, acted as investigators pursuant to directions from Chairman Dawson, transmitted through me, to make this field investigation. This testimony was taken under oath administered by myself and these are witnesses who had testimony and certain documents which we believe are necessary for this investigation. The hearings are available for any of the members to read and the exhibits will be shown then.

"Mr. Lovre. Another question: Were any members of the subcommittee present at any of these hearings?

"Mr. Holifield. There were no members except myself. They were not in the nature of public hearings. It was merely the taking of testimony.

"Mr. Fischbach. I might say for the benefit of the members of the subcommittee that there is included in these two transcripts evidence of the most vital nature which will be extremely helpful to the subcommittee in evaluating the record which will be made here.

"Mr. Lanham. Was there anybody present to cross-examine the witnesses?

"Mr. Fischbach. No, sir.

"Mr. Holifield. With this exception, that Mr. Fischbach examined them.

"Mr. Lanham. Usually where two sides are involved, there is some opportunity for cross-examination. I do not know that it was necessary in this case, but I just asked the question for the record.

"Mr. Fischbach. No; I do not think you will find that it was necessary in relation to the testimony which was secured.

"Mr. Holifield. I might say that the witnesses were informed of their constitutional rights and they answered all questions voluntarily. There was no protest to the questioning by either myself or Mr. Fischbach. They were informed of their constitutional rights and could protest and refuse to answer if they wanted to.

"Mr. Lovre. This is the first information I have had of these depositions or hearings, whatever you call them. May I ask this: Was the Department of Justice represented at any of these hearings that have been conducted by the staff?

"Mr. Fischbach. No; the Department of Justice would not be represented any more than the Department of Justice would be represented in the proceedings before this committee. This committee's investigation would not necessarily proceed either in the presence of a Department of Justice representative or in the presence of any counsel for any of the parties. We have today by invitation Mr. Newell A. Clapp, of the Department of Justice, because Mr. Clapp is in a position to be of substantial assistance not only to the Department but to this subcommittee and it was deemed advisable to invite Mr. Clapp to attend this session of the committee despite the fact that it is an executive session, so that the subcommittee's work could possibly be facilitated by his presence and by subsequent contact with him and others in the Department of Justice.

"Mr. Holifield. I might say that the reason of taking testimony in the field investigation was the fact that it was impossible to get a subcommittee together right before the election, and also due to the expense involved of bringing these witnesses here to Washington, and sending them back, which would amount to about $500 apiece, if they were here for just a few days. That is for railroad fare and so forth."

In addition to these hearings in California in 1950, which take up 142 pages of the printed record, the hearing at Memphis, Tenn., and Los Angeles, Calif., in 1951, and the hearings in Los Angeles, Calif., in 1952, must also be classed as investigations of committee counsel for they were conducted without authority of the House or the Expenditures Committee.

A reading of the record discloses that the apparent purpose of the hearings was, through congressional action to force the Department of Justice and the Home Loan Bank Board to discontinue their resistance to the court actions[3] and force settlement of the claims filed by the parties who had brought the various court actions, to renew the recommendations of the Smith committee, and to suggest legislation which would restrict improper or arbitrary action by the executive agencies having to do with the administration of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act. However, the United States court of appeals, with the entire record before it, noted that a tenable basis for compromise that would be "within the law"[4] had not been suggested.

The committee was asked to criticize the defending parties in the litigation brought against them by the plaintiffs Mallonee and association for not settling the litigation by making available to the plaintiffs economic benefits which were estimated to be worth approximately $5,250,000. However, the United States court of appeals held that the pleadings of the plaintiffs "failed to state a claim upon which any relief could be granted by a Federal court."[5] We were also asked to find in effect that the charges of the Federal examiners against the management of the Long Beach Association were lacking in substance. Likewise we were requested to condemn the bringing on of these matters to an administrative hearing. The United States court of appeals, however, found as follows:

"In this order for a hearing the Board makes serious charges against association and we do not doubt that under the law, and under the rules and regulations of the Board which deal with its supervisory power over such institutions as association, it may lawfully and properly require association to answer these charges in the manner and under the conditions prescribed in this administrative order. The authority of the Board to require compliance with an administrative order of this character seems clearly spelled out in the holding of the Supreme Court in *Fahey* v. *Mallonee*, supra, and we hold that in issuing the said order the Board validly exercised a power of supervision lodged in it."[6]

---

[3] Before the subcommittee had been created, Subcommittee Counsel Fischbach entered an appearance on behalf of the subcommittee-to-be in the litigation in the Federal courts and took a position in opposition to that of the Home Loan Bank Board and the Department of Justice. See the transcript of the proceedings of November 17, 1950, *Mallonee et al.* v. *Fahey et al.*, No. 5421–PH, United States District Court for the Southern District of California.

[4] *Home Loan Bank Board et al.* v. *Mallonee et al.* ((C. A. 9) 196 F. 2d (Adv. Sh.) 336 at p. 387).

[5] *Home Loan Bank Board et al.* v. *Mallonee et al.* ((C. A. 9) 196 F. 2d (Adv. Sh.) 336 at p. 378).

[6] *Home Loan Bank Board et al.* v. *Mallonee et al.* ((C. A. 9) 196 F. 2d (adv. sh.) 336 at p. 388).

The evidence before the committee did not, and, because the committee was not the proper forum, for their determination, could not prove or disprove the charges made against the management of the Long Beach Association. Those charges were repeated under oath before the subcommittee by Federal examiners. The nature of the charges makes it clear why the United States Court of Appeals found that a tenable basis for compromise within the law[7] had not been suggested. Whether the charges are true or false, they are of an extremely serious nature and require agreement with the United States courts that if they are true the Home Loan Bank Board must take action. See pages 1753, et seq., of the printed record.

The committee was asked to criticize private attorneys and Government personnel for reporting apparent income-tax deficiencies running at least into hundreds of thousands of dollars. It is alleged that tax prosecutions were urged which would not have been urged except for the litigation. The record before the committee does not justify a conclusion on these tax matters. The prosecution of alleged tax concealments should not be instigated or withheld because of other pending litigation involving the same persons. It is pertinent to state, however, that hundreds of thousands of dollars of apparent tax liabilities to the Government were uncovered by the efforts of the persons criticized, and, while some of these persons were frequently, some of them almost constantly, before the subcommittee, subcommittee counsel never questioned anyone of them about any of these tax matters although going into great detail about other items the significance of which is not at all apparent in the record.

THE DECISION OF THE NINTH CIRCUIT

Following the decision of June 23, 1947, in *Fahey* v. *Mallonee*, supra, which, among other things, held that the litigants had not exhausted their administrative remedies, the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals, in Home Loan Bank Board against Mallonee, quoted the Supreme Court as follows:

"'The Board adopted rules and regulations governing appointment of conservators. They provided the grounds upon which a conservator might be named, and they are the usual and conventional grounds found in most State and Federal banking statutes. They are sufficiently explicit, against the background of custom, to be adequate for proper administration and for judicial review if there should be a proper occasion for it'."

The court of appeals further said:

"At the conclusion of its decision in *Fahey* v. *Mallonee* the court summarized its views in the significant statement that it was error for the lower court to oust the conservator or to enjoin any of his proceedings or to enjoin the administrative hearing and this without prejudice to any other administrative or judicial proceedings which may be warranted by law. Here we have not only a blunt appraisal and condemnation of the initiatory proceedings in the lower court but also a significant reference to "any other administrative * * * proceedings." The last words of this pronouncement would be void of meaning if we disregard the fact that the court was referring to further administrative proceedings which would eventuate in a final agency determination which decided the validity of both the Ammann appointment and the order setting the field hearing on July 3, 1946, this final decision to be promulgated either under the then rules and regulations of administration or possibly (if delay ensued) under provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act which had been approved only a few days prior to the date of this decision. The Supreme Court certainly did not overlook the presence of that legislation or its possible application to this litigation." [8]

During the present hearings, there was testimony to the effect that the litigation to which reference has been made, which is still pending in the ninth circuit, was expensive and a waste of money.

Undoubtedly, that charge is true. But the United States court of appeals placed the responsibility for the delay and expense of the litigation squarely upon the shoulders of those who instigated the present hearings and upon others who have joined with them. This is made clear on page 367 of the opinion, and in the following excerpts from the opinion:

"The clear and undisguised purpose of the Mallonee-association group was to seek immediate injunctive relief at the outset of this litigation which would forbid recourse to and thereby bypass the entire administrative process including judicial review of any final determination of administration after completion of the field hearing held at Los Angeles. * * * *

"The presently involved state of the record which resulted from failure to exhaust the administrative remedy in the initiatory stage of this litigation thereby causing this litigation to fan out and proliferate into its present complications provides no sound reason in law for another judicial repudiation of a procedure clearly authorized under law and the rules and regulations of the Board. The answer to the unhappy and regrettable involvements of this long, drawn-out, and costly litigation is not to be found in a further resort to a court injunction to completely thwart an administrative process which Congress has seen fit to approve." [10]

Private parties are involved on both sides of the pending litigation. Many of the defending litigants are men of stature in their own communities and even nationally. They have a right that the charges against them be litigated in the proper courts and that they be free of pressure from Congress to refrain from defending against those charges. The matter is one for judicial determination.

As Circuit Judge Stephens, concurring in the opinion by Judge Bone, aptly stated:

"I agree with Judge Bone's conclusions as detailed in his exhaustive review of this super complicated litigation and join in the order contained in the last paragraph of the opinion. The whole subject matter from the beginning presented highly difficult legal questions, solvable in certainty only by the court with the last say. I thoroughly agree that *Fahey* v. *Mallonee* (1947, 332 U. S. 245), must be followed as indicated in the main opinion."

THE SUGGESTED RECOMMENDATIONS

At the end of the draft of the report which was submitted but not accepted by either the subcommittee or the committee, there were listed some 15 recommendations which it was proposed that the committee make to Congress. These 15 recommendations except possibly 2 were never a matter of dispute in the committee. Quite probably there would be a substantial area of agreement on some of the recommendations. The difference of opinion involved was whether or not a committee of Congress should attempt to influence the course of the pending litigation in the United States courts. The committee properly declined to attempt to influence that litigation.

With these views I think a majority of the committee is in agreement, though I am not authorized to speak for them.

APPENDIX G. COPY OF ORDER APPOINTING SECOND SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR (JUNE 23, 1953)

WASHINGTON, D. C., *June 23, 1953.*

Hon. WINT SMITH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SMITH: By virtue of the authority vested in me as chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor of the House of Representatives, and pursuant to House Resolution 115 of the 83d Congress, 1st session, I hereby appoint you as chairman of a special subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor to investigate alleged violations in and around Kansas City, Mo., of the antiracketeering law, as amended by the Hobbs Act, and other Federal labor legislation coming within the purview of the Committee on Education and Labor, and allegations as to the improper administration and enforcement of such legislation.

I have also appointed Representative CLARE E. HOFFMAN, of Michigan, and Representative WINGATE H. LUCAS, of Texas, to serve with you on this subcommittee.

The subcommittee is hereby authorized and directed to conduct a thorough study and investigation of the aforementioned allegations and any matter or subject coming within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Education and Labor under rule XI, 6. of the Rules of the House of Representatives, 83d Congress, which is covered by these allegations.

You are further directed to hold such public or executive sessions as you may deem advisable and you are hereby authorized and designated by me to issue and have served such subpenas as may be necessary in this investigation.

This supersedes my letter to you of June 22, 1953.

Sincerely yours,
SAMUEL K. MCCONNELL, Jr.,
Chairman, Committee on Education and Labor.

APPENDIX H. LETTER OF JUNE 29, 1953, TO SUBCOMMITTEE CHAIRMEN

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS,
Washington, D. C., June 29, 1953.

Hon. ——— ———,
Chairman, ——— ——— Subcommittee,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ———: Congressional investigations, with attendant publicity, long seemed to be the only effective weapon against the inexcusable waste, extravagance, and sometimes corruption, prevailing to such a great extent in the two preceding administrations.

The inability of the Congress to obtain economy and efficiency from the expenditure of public funds was enhanced by the reluctance of executive officials charged with the proper interpretation and administration of the laws to seek to ascertain and implement the will of Congress as expressed in legislation.

However, the futility of congressional investigation was all too often emphasized by the fact that after an investigation had disclosed an enormous and utterly inexcusable expenditure of billions, those responsible, either because of retirement or transfer to other duties, could not be disciplined.

In addition, almost without exception, the funds wasted could not be recovered, nor could any assurance be obtained that similar misuse of public funds would not reoccur.

With the coming of the present administration and its desire to clean up the mess in Washington, we were led to expect the fullest cooperation in the effort to meet at least in some degree the public's desire and demand that the ever-increasing tax burden be lessened, instead of increased. We expected that the tax dollar would be made to produce its equivalent in service rendered.

---

[7] *Home Loan Bank Board et al.* v. *Mallonee et al.* ((C. A. 9) 196 F. 2d (adv. sh.) 336 at p. 387).

[8] *Home Loan Bank Board et al.* v. *Mallonee et al.*, supra, p. 378.

[9] *Home Loan Bank Board et al.* v. *Mallonee et al.*, supra, p. 353.

[10] *Home Loan Bank Board et al.* v. *Mallonee et al.*, supra, p. 390.

Current investigations calling attention to improper, sometimes criminal, activities on the part of individuals or agencies in the executive departments which have resulted in absurd and ridiculous expenditures tend to leave the false impression that such improper activities may be chargeable to the present administration. Newspaper stories and letters from individuals indicate that many of our people think we are now charging the Eisenhower administration with the undesirable activities exposed by our reports. Without reason, many people believe that as these stories are given publicity, they relate to acts of the departments occuring since January 20, 1953.

Assurance has come from some of those who direct the executive departments that, if attention is directed to specific instances of improper and wasteful misuse of tax dollars, those in authority in the departments where such actions have occurred will without delay make a vigorous effort to create a situation where similar improper or unlawful activities cannot again occur.

This attitude tends to curtail the need for congressional invesitgations. It suggests the advisability of transferring complaints of maladministration direct to the head of the executive department involved, rather than to a congressional committee.

The trend in the Congress seems to be to give, at the request of the administration, the executive departments ever-increasing authority—authority granted to the Congress under the Constitution and which a continuation of constitutional government seems to demand should be exercised by the Congress.

This trend in recent years was implemented by the enactment of so-called reorganization legislation, which made it possible for an administration to bypass constitutional provisions and legislate subject only to a veto by one House of the Congress.

Within the past few weeks, the Committee on Government Operations reported out and the House adopted H. R. 992, introduced by Congressman Brown, which creates a commission to perform a duty which is properly the duty of the Congress.

The committee also reported out, and the House adopted, H. R. 4406, introduced by Congressman Halleck. This bill establishes a Commission on Intergovernmental Relations.

Apparently, it takes over a part of the jurisdiction heretofore given the Committee on Government Operations—especially the jurisdiction of the Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee, which was charged with the duty of studying the relationships between the United States and the States and municipalities. There would appear to be no longer any reason for this particular subcommittee.

Incidentally, in connection with H. R. 4406, kindly note that last Saturday, June 27, Congressional Record, page 7731, Mr. Halleck called up the companion bill, S. 1514, with a Senate amendment to the House amendment, and agreed to the Senate amendment to the House amendment. I called attention to the fact that the bill did not go to conference, that a conference was necessary if a bill as passed by one House was amended, and that later Mr. Halleck stated (though this was not on the record) that inasmuch as, in his opinion, there was no objection to the amendment he had agreed to it.

I did not care to make a point of order and disagree with the majority leader as to the legislative procedure, but if the majority leader, without action by the House legislative committee, can agree to amendments made in the Senate and never submitted to the House legislative committee, there is little need for subcommittees of the House Committee on Government Operations to function.

If the full committee is to retain any substantial part of its own jurisdiction, it will be necessary to be on the alert and make a vigorous protest.

It may have escaped your attention, but H. R. 5406 recently came out of a legislative committee and that bill, if enacted, will take over further jurisdiction of the House Committee on Government Operations. The same attempt was made last year on the floor of the House, but was defeated. It is not my duty to carry the full burden of maintaining this committee's jurisdiction, and I haven't the slightest intention of assuming that burden.

Under the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended, a succession of reorganization plans has come to the Congress. Some, if not all, of these plans include legislative proposals which, under our form of government, heretofore have properly been referred to regular standing legislative committees of the Congress.

In view of the foregoing, it appears to be evident that the present administration and the House leadership desire to lessen the activities of the Subcommittees of the Committee on Government Operations to which heretofore have been referred questions involving the propriety and effectiveness of Federal expenditures and the necessity, if any, for remedial legislation.

As this committee and the Congress apparently desire and intend to follow the administration's lead, and in view of the fact that the Congress expects to adjourn July 31 next, will you kindly begin to curtail the activities of your subcommittee, by confining your investigations to one complaint, advising me of its nature, and cut your staff so that beginning August 1 it will consist of no more than 1 investigator and 1 clerk or stenographer.

A determined effort will also be made through more direct control and supervision of the committee's activities to obtain effective action looking toward both economy and efficiency.

Sincerely yours,

Clare E. Hoffman,
Chairman.

Appendix I. House Resolution 150, 83d Congress, 1st Session

House Resolution 150

Resolved, That the expenses of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by clause 8 of rule XI incurred by the Committee on Government Operations, acting as a whole or by regular or special subcommittees, not to exceed $355,050, including employment of such experts, special counsel, and such clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, and which shall also be available for expenses incurred by said committee or its regular or special subcommittees within or outside the continental limits of the United States, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by and signed by the chairman of the Committee on Government Operations, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

Sec. 2. The official committee reporters may be used at all hearings held in the District of Columbia, if not otherwise officially engaged.

Appendix J. House Resolution 339, 83d Congress, 1st Session

House Resolution 339

Resolved, That the first section of House Resolution 150, 83d Congress, is hereby amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting in lieu of such period a colon and the following: "*Provided, however,* That (1) such expenses heretofore or hereafter incurred by any such regular subcommittee shall be paid out of such contingent fund on vouchers authorized by such subcommittee and signed by the chairman thereof, and approved by the Committee on House Administration; and (2) such expenses incurred by any such regular subcommittee, other than the Executive and Legislative Reorganization Subcommittee, shall not exceed, for the Military Operations Subcommittee, $64,425; for the Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee, $59,625; for the Public Accounts Subcommittee, $65,000; and for the International Operations Subcommittee, $66,000; and (3) the aggregate of such expenses incurred by the Committee on Government Operations acting as a whole, by special subcommittees, and by the Executive and Legislative Reorganization Subcommittee, shall not exceed $100,000."

Appendix K. Osmers' Resolution Adopted on July 15, 1953

Resolved, That—

(1) after the adoption of this resolution, special subcommittees may be created only upon the approval of the full committee; and

(2) upon the expiration of the 10th day following the day on which this resolution is adopted, each special subcommitee heretofore created shall cease to exist, unless, after the adoption of this resolution and prior to the expiration of such 10th day, the continuance of such special subcommittee shall have been approved by the full committee; and

(3) each regular subcommittee is hereby authorized, for purposes of the conduct of studies and investigations coming within its jurisdiction—

(A) to appoint, fix the compensation of, and remove, such experts, special counsel, and such clerical, stenographic, and other asistance, as it deems necessary, the compensation of such personnel to be paid out of the funds available to the subcommittee under House Resolution 150; and

(B) to sit, hold hearings, and act at such times and places within or outside the United States, whether or not the House is in session, is in recess, or has adjourned, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such papers, documents, and books, and to take such testimony, as it deems necessary; and any such subpena may be issued under the signature of the chairman of such subcommittee or by any member of such subcommittee designated by such chairman and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member; and

(4) the jurisdiction, membership, and chairmanship of the Executive and Legislative Reorganization Subcommittee, the Military Operations Subcommittee, the Public Accounts Subcommittee, the Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee, and the International Operations Subcommittee shall be as specified in the printed legislative calendar for April 1953 (No. 2), unless modified hereafter by action of the full committee; and

(5) the chairman and the ranking minority member shall serve as ex officio members of each subcommittee and shall have the right to vote on all matters before the subcommittee; and

(6) the rules, policies, and minutes of this committee, as heretofore in force, are hereby repealed and superseded to the extent that they are inconsistent wth the foregoing provisions of this resolution.

Appendix L. Order Appointing Third Subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor (November 13, 1953)

House of Representatives,
Committee on Education and Labor,
Washington, D. C., November 13, 1953.

Hon. Wint Smith,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Congressman Smith: By virtue of the authority vested in me as chairman of the

Committee on Education and Labor of the House of Representatives, and pursuant to House Resolution 115 of the 83d Congress, 1st session, I hereby reappoint you as chairman of a special subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor to complete the investigation in the Detroit, Mich., area as authorized under my letter of June 6, 1953. In completing this investigation your subcommittee is further authorized and directed to hold hearings in Chicago, Ill., on matters directly pertinent to and directly connected with the aforesaid investigation at Detroit, Mich. This further investigation is to encompass alleged violations of the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947, and other Federal labor legislation coming within the purview of the Committee on Education and Labor, and allegations as to the improper administration and enforcement of such legislation.

I have also reappointed Representative Clare E. Hoffman, of Michigan, and Representative Phil M. Landrum, of Georgia, to serve with you on this subcommittee.

The subcommittee is hereby authorized and directed to conduct a thorough study and investigation of the aforementioned allegations and any matter of subject coming within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Education and Labor under Rule XI, 6, of the Rules of the House of Representatives, 83d Congress, which is covered by these allegations.

You are further directed to hold such public or executive sessions at Detroit, Mich., and Chicago, Ill., as you may deem advisable and you are hereby authorized and designated by me to issue and have served such subpenas as may be necessary to complete this investigation.

Upon the completion of your study and investigation, you are directed to prepare a report to the Committee on Education and Labor with such recommendations as in your judgment the facts shall warrant.

Sincerely yours,

Samuel K. McConnell, Jr.,
Chairman, Committee on Education and Labor.

Copies to Hon. Clare E. Hoffman and Hon. Phil M. Landrum.

Appendix M. Article in the Sign, February 1954

Big Racket in Small Change

(By Milton Lomask)

(The slot machines have become a big racket—so big and profitable that an official warned: "Anyone who prints these things is dead.")

The American people last year shoved a billion dollars' worth of small change into vending machines, and at least a tenth of it eventually landed in the cash drawer of a syndicate whose top brass reads like a Who's Who in the underworld.

That the mobsters were cutting themselves a slice of the industry's dollar first came to light during the Kefauver hearings in 1950 and 1951. Subsequent investigations, including a 2-day congressional hearing in Detroit last summer, plus information from vendors and their customers, round out the picture.

It isn't an edifying picture. It hasn't been edifying to assemble. A union official said, "Anyone who prints these things is dead." Said a smalltime Brooklyn vendor, "People have been known to get into trouble digging up stuff like this."

What is the vending machine industry? It's 2 million vending machines, including 400,000 juke boxes. It's some 1,600 suppliers and manufacturers. It's 1,200 operators ranging from the Automatic Canteen Co. of America, with a 1952 gross of $40 million, to individual owners of from 50 to 100 machines each.

To "operate" a machine is to find a "spot" for it. The operator services the machine and collects the proceeds. The owner of the spot—bar, restaurant, factory, filling station—receives a commission, usually 5 percent.

At the turn of the century, the only things you could get out of a vending machine were a ball of gum or a fistful of peanuts. Today you put your nickel, your dime, or your quarter in here and anyone of 50 different items tumbles out there.

At St. John's University in downtown Brooklyn, the New York Automatic Canteen Corp. maintains a battery of machines out of which a student can dine from soup to nuts. Over the country, some 25 percent of all cigarettes, candy bars, gum, and drinks are disbursed in this manner. There are coin-operated typewriters, coin-operated letter mailers, and coin-operated washers. A few years ago, a Texas operator pocketed a nice profit from a machine that dispensed whiffs of pure oxygen for hangover sufferers.

The vending-machine racket, not to be confused with the industry, employs the usual shakedown methods. To stay in business, an operator often finds it advisable to join both a trade association and a union. Association and union work together. Together they see to it that outsiders leave their members' spots alone and that no member covets another's customers.

In the case of a legitimate industry, the higher the turnover the lower the cost per item. Gangland entrepeneurs work the other way around. Their product is freedom from terror. The more they sell, the more they charge, and the consuming public ultimately foots the bill. In Cleveland, Detroit, New York City, and 1 or 2 other cities, many operators pay off to an association, a union, or both—or else.

"Or else," in the words of a terrified witness before last summer's congressional hearings in Detroit, "something strange happens. Where a minute ago there was a plate-glass window across the front of your place, suddenly there ain't."

Or you turn out to be antilabor and a picket line appears.

Or suddenly there's a loud noise.

"That's the dynamite," said the witness. "Gentlemen, even now my wife is at home hysterical. * * * I am afraid of my life."

In Cleveland a few years ago, a man and his son-in-law went into the cigarette vending-machine business. One morning, the son-in-law received callers in his office, three unprepossessing fellows. They said they were representatives of a teamsters' local and they wanted the partners to join the union. Dues would be 20 percent of the company's profits.

The young businessman asked them to return next day, when his partner could be on hand. The three fellows returned. This time their conversation was recorded on a wiretape concealed on the premises. When the partners took the wiretape to police headquarters, they were met with what amounted to a stall. Returning to their office, they found the three labor goons cooling their heels.

"We hear you been to the Commissioner," they said. "We'll take that wire tape."

The partners had no choice but to hand it over. At home that evening, at 7 o'clock, the younger partner answered his phone. Said a voice:

"Your wife and your two kids went shopping this afternoon in a Plymouth station wagon. She bought $25 worth of groceries. You, your wife, and your kids are about to sit down to a nice steak dinner."

The voice hung up. It was on the line again later. All night, every hour on the hour, came the ring, the voice, the veiled threat.

The next morning the partners joined the union. Some idea of what their employees probably got out of it is obtainable from testimony before last summer's congressional hearing. A vendor said that before his men joined the union, their take-home pay averaged $69 a week. After they joined, it averaged $69—less union dues.

The vending-machine racket is, of course, a part of a larger picture. It is one of several interlocking syndicates engaged in what Congressman Clare E. Hoffman, of Michigan, has called a nationwide conspiracy to extort millions of dollars from the American people.

Every year or so, the top directors of these enterprises convene to review their varied activities. These sessions are held either at a Wisconsin boys' camp or on a dude ranch near Gulfport, Miss. Among those more or less regularly in attendance are names familiar to newspaper readers.

There's Paul Dorfman, who as head of a little ragpickers union in Chicago, ekes out a yearly income reputed to be in the vicinity of $600,000. Dorfman's son runs an insurance agency which brokers the group welfare policies of a large eastern company, policies purchased by at least one of the teamster locals to which vending-machine service employees belong.

When the elder Dorfman issues an RSVP, big shots put on boiled shirts. A few years ago, at an American Federation of Labor convention in Houston, he gave a cocktail party. Guests included A. F. of L. President George Meany and Alex Rose, head of the Millinery Workers Union and a director of the New York Liberal Party. Subsequently, another guest registered a protest. David Dubinsky, president of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union, said he was not invited directly by Dorfman, that he was embarrassed and angered on learning the identity of his host.

There's Abner (Longy) Zwillman, New Jersey underworld czar and mayor-maker par excellence. Like Dorfman, Zwillman seems to be an untouchable. During a long career, launched as a prohibition rum-runner, he has had no serious skirmish with the law. Zwillman owns the Public Service Tobacco Co., which supplies cigarettes to vendors. One of his subsidiaries places coin-operated washers in apartment house cellars.

There's Michael Lascari, Zwillman's business partner and a lifetime pal of gangster Lucky Luciano, now of Italy, courtesy of the Federal deportation authorities.

And there's Meyer Lansky, whom Senator Kefauver once identified as a kingpin in the New York City underworld. Lansky used to be in the television-set business with mobsters Frank Costelo and Joe Adonis. He's been active in sundry vending-machine activities.

These men and their peers administer the vending-machine racket the country over. In most areas their major interest is the profitable cigarette machine business. In Detroit, it's juke boxes.

Testifying in the Michigan industrial capital last summer before the subcommittee headed by Congressman Hoffman, a building service labor consultant shook his prepared statement and contemptuously denounced "the Hoffas * * * and the Bufalinos."

James R. Hoffa is no pebble on the labor beach. He's a boulder, smoothed by 20 runins with the law on assorted criminal charges. As second in command to International Teamster Chief Dave Beck, currently a prime mover in the attempt to tidy up the New York waterfront, Hoffa breathes the heady air of upper A. F. of L. regions.

Himself a witness at the Hoffman hearings, Hoffa took frequent refuge in the great 20th-century cliché. "I decline to answer on the grounds that * * *." He declined to say whether or not he had a financial interest in any corporations. It is a matter of record that he does, or at any rate did as of 1951.

He does, or he did, own half interest in 6,000 shares of stock in the Columbus Trotting Association, and Detroit newspapers recently reported that he was trying to oust the building service local which now has jurisdiction over the racetrack employees and replace it with an outfit of his own.

He declined to say whether or not his wife was an employee of Teamster Local 985, which another witness called a paper operation engaged in finding favorable jukebox locations for members of the Michigan Music Operators Guild, a Detroit trade association composed of juke box operators and dominated by known gangster elements.

William Eugene Bufalino, under indictment at this writing, is president of local 985. Mr. Bufalino was unable to attend the Hoffman hearings. He was in a Detroit hospital suffering from what was originally billed as a respiratory ailment, subsequently altered to severe psychoneurotic depression.

A witness at the Hoffman hearings called Bufalino the dictator of the Detroit juke box industry. The statement is subject to the reservation that Bufalino obviously takes his orders from a person or persons upstairs. In New York City last summer, a Mr. Frank Calland died suddenly. Calland was not well known to the public, but was well known along what the racket boys call the vending-machine circuit. Among the floral pieces at his funeral was a $100 spray, sent by Bufalino and paid for by his union.

Bufalino's wife is a sister of Vincent Meli, a director of the Michigan Music Operators Guild, the trade association previously mentioned. Vincent's uncle, Angelo Meli, is no stranger to Detroit law enforcement authorities. From his $25,000 home in Grosse Pointe Park, Mich., Angelo is reputed to oversee some of the major operations of the Detroit underworld.

The situation in New York City has never been subjected to extensive official scrutiny. Reputable vendors and their customers, however, are not averse to supplying details.

The organization which cigarette vending machine operators are urged to join is the Cigarette Merchandisers Association, Inc. Vendors say the association guards its member's spots. If John Jones, tavern owner, becomes dissatisfied with his cigarette vending machine and tries to replace it with that of another company, he's likely to get no place at all. Chances are any company he calls will be a member of the association. Instead of sending him a machine, the company gets in touch with the association. After which, pressure is put on Tavern Owner Jones to keep the machine he has.

Matthew Forbes, director of the association, says only one-half of the 140 operators in this area belong to the association. He offers this as evidence that there is nothing to the allegation that nonmembers are frequently "superpersuaded' 'to join up. He concedes that his members do 80 percent of the business in the five boroughs of New York City and in nearby Westchester, Nassau, and Suffolk Counties. This is a sizable amount as there are some 30,000 cigarette machines in the area. Nonmembers, however, say the association boys do 90 percent of the business.

Reached by phone, Mr. Forbes was at first reluctant to talk. "All information about the association," he said, "must be obtained from the national." Meaning the National Automatic Merchandising Association, a reputable trade group headquartering in Chicago.

"We're an affiliate of NAMA," said Mr. Forbes, "and I'm not permitted to give out any data whatsoever."

Apprised of charges made against the association, Mr. Forbes became communicative. "All the association does," he said, "is keep members abreast of developments in the field. We take no interest whatsoever in any member's business affairs."

Asked how a member did business, Mr. Forbes said: "Oh, you know. He puts his machine in a spot and signs a contract. In return for the contract, he gives the spot owner an advance on commissions or a loan or a bonus."

The union to which many New York vending-machine service employees belong is Teamsters' Local 805. Its vice president and welfare fund administrator is Abe Gordon, Gordon is the owner of the Abe Gordon Trucking Co. and the A. & P. Cordage Co., both of New York City.

A partner with Gordon in these enterprises is Phil Kovalick, alias Spic Farvel, alias Joseph Phillips, etc. In 1939, a New York prosecutor called Kovalick "one of the most important figures in the New York underworld." At that time, he was being held by police as a material witness in connection with strong-arm activities by racketeers in the New York City garment district.

As a truck-company owner, Labor Leader Gordon is also an employer of labor. "But my men don't belong to this local," he said, speaking of 805. "They belong to a different local."

Gordon is a surly conversationalist. To each of a half a dozen questions concerning the activities of his local, he gave 1 of 2 replies: "You guess," or, "Ask the international." He volunteered: "You try to con-ect Dave Beck and you're dead. Beck has thrown out his best friends. If he saw a man on a truck out there, he'd yank him off." Loosely translated, this doubletalk seems to mean that, in Gordon's opinion, Teamster Chief Beck is trying to keep his big union clean.

Among several medium-sized vending enterprises in New York is the National Vending Corp., which places cigarette machines directly or through a number of subsidiaries in Greater New York, Florida, Dallas, and Los Angeles. President of National is Harold Roth, of Hewlett Neck, Long Island.

In 1952, Roth and an associate applied to the New York State Liquor Authority for a restaurant liquor license. On October 23, 1952, the two applicants were summoned to a State liquor authority hearing conducted by Deputy Commissioners Sol Johnson and Michael J. Monz.

Portions of what transpired at this hearing are "must" reading for every serious student of the problems confronting one of America's fastest growing industries.

In 1942, according to a transcription of the testimony, Roth and a partner purchased the assets of a small Brooklyn vending concern called the Kings County Cigarette Service. Roth admitted knowing that one of the former owners of Kings County—one of the men from whom the purchase was made—was Gambler Joe Adonis, Brooklyn's foremost gangster, who is currently sweating out an appeal from a court conviction which, if upheld, will exile him to Italy. Roth explained that he and his partner had not bought the stock of Kings County, only its assets, the right to use its name and what Roth termed its "dubious prestige."

Asked Commissioner Johnson: "When you realized you were buying something with which Joe Adonis was associated, didn't it occur to you that possibly" the bar owners and others who were using those machines were doing so "because of that association?" Later, Roth was asked another pointed question. Had he no compunction about doing business with mobsters?

He replied that not only had he no compunction, but that in doing business with mobsters, he had done the vending-machine industry a service. He pointed out that the industry is full of undesirable elements and that in buying out Joe Adonis he had got rid of at least one of them.

Further testimony brought out a touching fact, namely that after doing his good deed for the industry, Mr. Roth had modestly proceeded to keep it a secret. He never told the customers of Kings County that the company whose machines they were using had changed from bad hands to good. On the contrary, by his own admission, Roth made a special effort to give these customers the impression that Joe Adonis still had a financial interest in their cigarette-vending machines.

Roth was asked where he purchased his cigarette vending machines. He mentioned three companies, among them the Rowe Corp. Rowe, with a 1952 gross of $37 million, is the largest manufacturer of vending machines in the country. Some idea of what long arms grandmother racket has is shown by the well-authenticated fact that in 1949 a group of men claiming to be representatives of the Rowe Corp. offered officials of a United Automobile Workers-CIO union in New Jersey $4,800, with more to come, if they would persuade their negotiators to permit Rowe to speed up production in its manufacturing plant at Whippany, N. J. The union officials turned the offer down.

In addition to its production branch, Rowe maintains 53 retail vending distributor companies in American cities, including New York, and one of the corporation's officers is also listed as an officer of the trade association headed by Matthew Forbes. An attempt to find out whether the Rowe officials were aware of the 1949 bribery attempt was met with a statement by the corporation's public relations agency that "You're barking up the wrong tree."

So it goes—a case history of what is happening to one of the dozen or more industries on which, according to Senator Kefauver, organized crime has improved an enervating share-the-wealth program.

The story is becoming shamefully commonplace. It is becoming so, according to many troubled observers, because law-enforcement authorities are forced to work in a climate of public opinion hamstrung by a philosophy of moral relativism. Even a Catholic publication has complained that there is too much moral indignation today about "labor racketeering." The editors say people are all too ready to believe the worst of labor. They imply that many businessmen also live in a glass house.

The point is not who is committing these sins, but that they are being committed and that the public is permitting them to happen.

What is at stake is simple human freedom. If a man cannot go into business without paying tribute to human parasites, if he cannot competitively bid for customers on the open market, it is flim-flam to talk about freedom in America and to scatter over the world pious pronouncements about democracy.

There is no such thing as freedom from this or that. There is no such thing as political freedom or economic freedom or religious freedom or freedom from want, fear, or nagging wives. There is only freedom. It is indivisible; and when these snakes in the underworld lash their fangs into a phase of it, they poison the whole business.

The public is rightly indignant at the presence in America of a Red fifth column. But these gangsters are doing the country every bit as much harm as any addlepated, communistic technician snooping in the archives at Fort Monmouth, N. J. They comprise a black sixth column with a gun at the back of every American, employer or employee, liberal or conservative, rich or poor, God-fearing or otherwise.

Appendix N. Article in Look, March 9, 1954

How Labor Bosses Get Rich

(By Clark Mollenhoff)

LOCAL LABOR CZARS ACROSS THE COUNTRY ARE SHAKING DOWN EMPLOYERS AND JUGGLING THEIR UNION'S FUNDS IN A RACKET FEW PUBLIC OFFICIALS DARE TRY TO STOP

Racketeering bosses of local unions are enriching themselves, or at least their relatives and friends, in a rash of shady deals uncovered recently across the country.

They are playing loosely with the millions of dollars in union funds they control. And they are dabbling in a sea of sideline enterprises that overlap their union responsibilities in such a way that the worker is the loser. Musclemen, blackmail, and murder dot the trail of the unscrupulous local labor boss who uses his respectable union as a cynical front for private plunder.

He is so strongly entrenched that national labor leaders either won't or can't get rid of him. Even local and State enforcement officials for the most part have abdicated to him. And neither major political party has dared to undertake a major investigation of him.

The whole story is being muted by labor pressures on Members of Congress. But a shocking insight into the racketeering operations of many local labor bosses has come from two congressional subcommittees.

Fighting against odds, they have laid bare part of the record of extortion, bribery, and ruthless use of union funds for private gain. The investigations of Representative Clare Hoffman, Republican, of Michigan, and the late Senator Charles Tobey, Republican, of New Hampshire, have revealed the same ugly story in New York, New Orleans, Los Angeles, St. Louis, Kansas City, Minneapolis Detroit, and Chicago.

THE LABOR SHAKEDOWN SKYROCKETS THE PRICES OF GOODS EVERYBODY NEEDS

The big labor shakedown, they found, soaks employers, swells defense costs and skyrockets the prices of goods and services everybody needs—with the ordinary union member the biggest victim of all.

Take the case of Joseph (Joe the Gent) Giantomasi, a notorious New Jersey racketeer. E. Treverton Clark, the vice president of a stevedoring company, testified that Giantomasi took a $500 bribe from him to avert a threatened dispute. Giantomasi was business agent for two longshoremen's locals and was in a position to tie up the company's operations. Clark also told Senators that Giantomasi later tried to shake him down for $20,000, but that he refused to pay it.

Wages, hours, and working conditions for union members were unimportant in feuds between jukebox owners and William E. Bufalino, head of Local No. 985 of the Teamsters Union in Detroit. Congressional investigators heard testimony that Bufalino used his powers as head of the union to enforce dictatorial control over the lucrative jukebox industry. Some employers said they were even forced to join the union in order to avoid bombings and other terror tactics that beset their locations.

In Kansas City, Robert D. Sheehan, a pipeline-construction official, testified that he had to make money payments and buy clothing for several union officials to keep labor peace on construction projects. His statement, denied by the accused, was one of many charging union officials with soliciting or accepting bribes.

THE BLUES IN ST. LOUIS

And in St. Louis, Federal grand jury indictments charged 17 labor chiefs in that area with getting several hundred thousand dollars in shakedowns of construction company officials. Union members' earnings dropped as physical violence, work stoppages and jurisdictional disputes set the stage, it was charged, for shakedowns of as much as $50,000 at a time.

Another way of operating has emerged in New Orleans. There, it was found that a 5-percent cut was being taken out of the take-home pay of every member of Local 1419 of the International Longshoremen's Association for union dues.

The initiation fee for joining Local 1419 is $200—as much as it would cost to join a good golf and country club. But the 5-percent cut the union has taken out of each member's pay is where the really big money has come in. Workingmen have been nicked by the local for a total of more than $1 million in 4 years. The money has poured into a fund that the high-living president of the local, Dave A. Dennis, has been investing in various union enterprises. Local authorities recently started an investigation of the enterprises.

Accountants warned Dennis that the accounting system used was inadequate, but he told congressional investigators that it would take too much time and money to install a better system. The union books showed that the 5-percent dues brought in a total of $335,000 in 1952. Congressional investigators, figuring from employers' payrolls, said the union books should have showed $404,000 in that year. Over a period of 4 years, the investigators reported, the discrepancy between employers' payrolls and the union books indicated that approximately $287,000 in dues was not accounted for. Dennis maintained that the investigators erroneously included in their computations the salaries of many nonunion workers who were not subject to the 5-percent levy.

Dennis was borrowing money for living expenses in 1948 before becoming president of local 1419; but by the time congressional investigators caught up with him, he had acquired real-estate holdings and was dabbling in other side businesses. One enterprise he set up was the Monarch Investigating Agency, which was hired on 1 or 2 occasions to work for his own local 1419.

According to his own testimony, Dennis furthered his personal interests by borrowing thousands of dollars belonging to the union without the knowledge or authorization of the members. Following the congressional investigation, an information was filed against Dennis chargng him with misusing unon funds.

Abuse of the workingman by labor czars was brought down to a system on the New York-New Jersey waterfront. That system—now barred under rules of the recently established New York-New Jersey Waterfront Commission—was the notorious "shape-up," under which all-powerful hiring bosses each day chose enough men for the day's work.

RYAN DID NOT OUST GANGSTERS IN THE ILA

Congressional hearings laid bare almost every conceivable type of labor racket on the bi-State waterfront. It was a condition that was choking off commerce in one of the world's greatest harbors, thus reducing the jobs available to union members. Shipping-company owners and stevedoring-company officials made cash deals with ILA officials that left union members with no representation.

The Senate subcommittee that made the investigation blamed much of the trouble on Joseph P. Ryan, who had been president of the ILA since 1927. He is under a multiple-count indictment for misapplication of his union's funds, but his major offense, as far as investigators were concerned, was his resistance to changing the corrupt shape-up and ousting of gangsters from union office.

One of the most notorious hoodlums among Ryan's top aides was Edward J. Florio, who served as an organizer from 1948 until 1952, when he was arrested and convicted on two perjury counts. Now serving a 3-year prison term, Florio got a 10-percent cut in a public-loading operation on the docks while he was acting as business agent for the ILA.

The danger of union members being sold out by conspiratorial deals between employers and corrupt labor bosses has been recognized as long as labor unions have been operating. The advent of new fringe benefits, like health and welfare insurance, now has created new problems and what congressional investigators call new scandals.

In Minneapolis, Eugene Williams, a business agent for local 544 of the Teamsters Union, was made administrator of the transfer and warehouse employees' pension fund and got a 7-percent cut of the fund for his troubles. He arranged a $10,000 advance through the union pension fund to finance a night club and bar. He also borrowed $1,800 in cash from the union office safe to help finance his bar. Williams says he repaid these sums to the union.

A classic example of the problem of controlling insurance placement and the resulting huge commissions has been found in the dealings between labor leaders and the Union Casualty & Life Insurance Co., of Mount Vernon, N. Y.

HE KNEW THE RIGHT PEOPLE

Dr. Leo Perlman, executive vice president of the company, was quick to see the advantages of cultivating such powerful labor bosses as James R. Hoffa, the Michigan teamsters' boss; Owen Bert Brennan, his top aide; Paul (Red) Dorfman, head of the Waste Material Handlers Local 20467 in Chicago, and Frank Darling, head of local 1031 of the Brotherhood of Electrical Workers in Chicago.

Dr. Perlman guided Union Casualty & Life to a spectacular rise in a brief 4-year period. Union health and welfare insurance provided the impetus. A House committee investigative report said that the direct premium payments jumped from $1,460,000 in 1948 to an astounding $8,900,000 in 1952 and that nearly 77 percent of the 1952 premiums came from 3 big union insurance coups:

1. Health and welfare insurance covering more than half of the 35,000 to 37,000 workers in Darling's local 1031 in Chicago.

2. The health and welfare insurance of the Central States Conference of Teamsters, of which Hoffa is chairman. Hoffa is also trustee of the Central States Conference welfare fund, which deals directly with the insurance-placement problem.

3. The health and welfare insurance of the Michigan Conference of Teamsters, of which Hoffa is president.

Perlman, a 56-year-old immigrant, cleaned up more than $400,000 from 1948 through 1951 through Union Casualty & Life and the United Public Service Corp., also of Mount Vernon, N. Y. The latter concern, a general insurance management agency which he also headed, obtained the insurance for the former.

But the huge profits Perlman received were only the beginning. In 1949, the Union Insurance Agency of Illinois, in Chicago, came into being as an agent for Union Casualty & Life. It was a partnership operated by the wife and son of Dorfman, who is a labor chief with influential contacts spread far outside his Waste Handlers Union.

Allen Dorfman, 30, and his mother, Rose Dorfman, were immediately successful. Between 1949 and June 1953, investigators reported, the Union Insurance Agency of Illinois received over $1 million in commissions, expenses and allowances from Union Casualty & Life and the United Public Service Corp.

Congressional investigators turned up another fact. During the first two policy years, Hoffa's Central States welfare fund received premium refunds of $256,000. No refund was made in the third year. The fund's trustees, it was also found, agreed with Union Casualty & Life to reduce the insurance benefits to employees and their dependents. "An unsatisfactory loss experience" had created a drain on the insurance company, it was explained.

THE RACKETS ARE LUCRATIVE ENOUGH FOR MURDER

Meanwhile, the insurance executives wined and dined Teamster Chief Hoffa and even went into a number of joint business ventures with him that proved profitable. Hoffa said he received no money for swinging the insurance to the Dorfmans and Perlman, but he insisted on his right to draw a normal profit from joint business enterprises with these same people.

It wasn't his contacts in the insurance business that first propelled Hoffa into outside business enterprises. In fact, he's had so many little business operations going on that he has had difficulty remembering what precisely some of them were for. Here, however, are some that have come to light:

Hoffa and his aide Brennan became stockholders in the Terminal Realty Co. without putting up a dime. Oren DeMaas, former liquor commissioner of Michigan, put up $25,000 for them ,and held their share of the stock as security for the loan, Hoffa has testified.

HE WAS A BUSY MAN

He got into a brewery operation with attorneys George Fitzgerald, former Democratic national committeeman from Michigan, and Carney Matheson, legal representative for large midwestern trucking interests. He testified he lost $20,000 on the venture and invested no more in it.

Hoffa also set up what he called a little syndicate known as PMI to loan money. And a few years ago he had a one-sixteenth or a one thirty-second interest in the Columbus Trotting Association.

Hoffa's wife, too, has been in business. She held a one-third interest in the Theater Trucking Co. in her maiden name. With Brennan's wife, she operated the Test Fleet Corp., a haulaway firm leasing equipment to big commercial-trucking firms. Over a 4-year period, they have collected $65,000 in dividends.

In his insurance activities, Hoffa today has moved his Michigan Conference of Teamsters' welfare fund into a position where it could gain substantial control of the managemeent of Union Casualty & Life. In June 1951 the fund's trustees put $250,000 in the company's preferred stock. This made the fund the largest holder of preferred stock. With the payment of another $40 a share, the stock can be converted into common stock with voting privileges.

Congressional investigators have pointed out the problem involved when union ownership in an insurance company is such that union officials have an interest in curbing the claim rate of members of other unions insured by the company. But it took an eruption in New York to demonstrate how much of a menace the health and welfare insurance problem could be.

A long-time feud over representing workers at Yonkers Raceway, north of New York, ended last August 28 with the murder of Thomas E. Lewis, president of Local 32-E, Building Service Employees.

It wasn't clear until after Lewis was murdered just why the presidency of that local union could be such an important piece of property. The investigation showed that the welfare funds of the union were handled through Alcor Agency, Inc. Labor boss Lewis, his relatives, business associates and friends had used that agency to drain off more than $400,000 of the $1,479,000 contributed in a 5-year period, the investigation showed. Those commissions were more than double the normal administrative costs, and the State insurance department started a broad investigation of insurance firms that handle welfare policies for labor touching off in turn more insurance scandals.

The murder of Lewis and the insurance scandals were not the only labor-racketeering operations on the edge of the multimillion-dollar harness-racing business.

Indictments returned by a Nassau County (N. Y.) grand jury have spelled out the basic story of plunder by labor bosses and their associates. William C. DeKoning, Nassau County labor leader, and 12 others were indicted for an alleged extortion of $345,000 in kickbacks from employees at Roosevelt Raceway. It was also disclosed that the labor leader was sharing in 10 percent of the profits of a catering firm operating at the raceway.

It has taken the probing of two congressional committees to prove that labor racketeering is more widespread than the few cases the Nation's prosecutors have had the courage to tackle. The late Senator Tobey, the righteous New Hampshire Republican, was the driving force behind Senate labor-racket investigations on the waterfront in New York, New Jersey, and New Orleans. When Tobey died, Senator John Bricker, Republican of Ohio, dissolved the subcommittee, and other labor rackets uncovered by chief counsel Downey Rice had no airing.

CONGRESSMEN WERE NOT HAPPY

The most tenacious of the labor-racket investigators has been Representative Hoffman, the sharp-tongued Michigan Republican. Hoffman and Representative Wint Smith, a Kansas Republican, have been the mainsprings behind House investigations that have touched labor racketeering in Detroit, Chicago, Los Angeles, and Minneapolis.

Even many House Republicans were fearful of the political consequences of a labor-racket investigation when Hoffman put the first congressional spotlight on the plunder of labor bosses. Republicans joined with Democrats to hobble Hoffman's investigating, but the aggressive Congressman continued his work. Although they had no power to hold hearings, Chief Counsel William McKenna, Assistant Counsel Clyde Smith, and Chief Investigator Les Condon produced enough evidence for Hoffman to force hearings.

Hoffman's investigators exposed the close tieup between Bufalino, head of Teamsters Local 985 in Detroit, and the Jukebox Owners Association which was dominated by Vincent Meli, Bufalino's brother-in-law.

Following the hearings, Bufalino, Meli, and five others were indicted by a Wayne County grand jury on charges that they used threats of physical violence and bombings to prey on jukebox operators, restaurant, tavern and bar operators, owners of automobile wash racks, and parking-lot operators.

A few days later five more Teamsters officials from the Detroit area were indicted on charges of milking construction firms of hundreds of thousands of dollars.

Frank Fitzsimmons, vice president of Teamsteral Local 299, and Daniel J. Keating, president and business agent of local 614, Pontiac, Mich., were among the five indicted.

POWER CAN CORRUPT

Congressional hearings in Kansas City were followed by indictment of Orville L. Ring, president and business agent of Teamsters Local 541, on two charges of embezzlement and two counts of second-degree robbery. Four others were also indicated in connection with violence, extortion, and misuse of funds in the Kansas City area.

The right to represent labor can mean big money. The wages and working conditions of the ordinary union member are only a handy tool when racketeering labor bosses seek to fatten their purses. The underworld has been quick to see the chance for big profit in the economic and political positions labor czars are able to control.

Some rank-and-file members of local unions tried to break the stranglehold, and were declared ineligible to hold office. Some were summarily ousted from their union and deprived of the right to work in the only trade they know.

Employers find it to their immediate advantage to let the labor boss have his way when he insists that a dishonest employee be retained, or that insurance or pension funds be used in a certain manner.

The Taft-Hartley Act and the rules of the unions themselves were designed to stop some of the sidelines of plunder, but the act is often inadequate or it is improperly enforced by the politicians who fear the labor bosses.

Although there were substantial numbers of indictments in the wake of congressional hearings, prosecutions alone are not the solution. All of the plunder has not been illegal.

It is up to Congress to expose fully what has happened under the present laws, and to draft new laws that preserve the institution of organized labor and provide democratic processes that will protect the interests of labor-union members in the future.

Appendix O. Resolution of Clare E. Hoffman of January 20, 1954

Be it resolved, That the chairman of the Committee on Government Operations is hereby authorized to appoint a special subcommittee consisting of 2 members of the minority, to be designated by the ranking minority member, 3 members of the majority, 1 of whom shall be the chairman of this committee and who shall serve as chairman of the special subcommittee.

That said subcommittee is hereby authorized to inquire and determine, insofar as is practicable either by investigation or hearings, or by both:

(1) Whether executive departments, Federal agencies, the officers and employees thereof charged with the duty of interpreting and administering Federal legislation, are using Federal funds efficiently and economically;

(2) Whether Government activities, at all levels, which were authorized or exist, and the purpose of which is, to make effective the intent of Congress in enactinig legislation, are efficiently and economically performed, and whether, if Federal legislation is not sufficient to create and maintain the conditions, benefits, and standards of conduct and welfare sought by the Congress, what, if any, new legislation or amendments to existing Federal legislation should be proposed and enacted to correct the existing situation, attain the objectives proposed by that legislation.

The special subcommittee is hereby authorized to exercise the authority and powers granted to the full committee and the regular subcommittees under the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, the rules of the House, and the rules of the committee, as heretofore adopted, and now in force.

Said special subcommittee is further authorized and directed to, when it has completed its investigation or hearings, or both, to report to the full committee its recommendations, if any, as to what specific action, if any, should be taken by the full committee and by the Congress.

Appendix P. Osmers Resolution of January 20, 1954

Whereas matters pertaining to alleged unfair and improper labor practices have been called to the attention of the committee; and

Whereas there is a duly constituted regular subcommittee; to wit; the Public Accounts Subcommittee, which is authorized to study the operations and activities of all Government departments except the State and Defense Departments; and

Whereas the committee is of the opinion that such allegations of unfair and improper labor practices and labor racketeering should be thoroughly and vigorously investigated: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Public Accounts Subcommittee is hereby authorized and directed to investigate—

(1) Whether present Federal legislation and Federal agencies, officers, and employees adequately and properly protect individuals and business organizations from extortion;

(2) Whether, if such extortionary payments are made, they arise from ineffectiveness or lack of proper interpretation or enforcement of Federal statutes designed to protect civil rights, the free movement of interstate and foreign commerce, the Anti-Racketeering Act of 1934, as amended, Federal legislation relating to the collection and distribution of welfare funds created by contributions from employers, and legislation relating to the levying and collection of Federal taxes, and the sufficiency thereof;

(3) Whether Federal agencies, officers, and employees charged with the duty of interpreting and administering the legislation above mentioned are using Federal funds efficiently and economically;

(4) Whether Government activity at all levels, designed to implement such legislation, is effective and economical; and, whether any amendments to the Federal legislation above referred to, or any other Federal legislation should be proposed to correct the existing situation; be it further

Resolved, That the Public Accounts Subcommittee is further authorized and directed to report to the full committee its recommendations, if any, as to what specific action, if any, should be taken by the full committee and by the Congress.

APPENDIX Q. HOUSE RESOLUTION 419, 83D CONGRESS, 2D SESSION

House Resolution 419

Resolved, That House Resolution 150, 83d Congress, as amended by House Resolution 339, 83d Congress, is hereby amended (1) by striking out "$355,050" and inserting in lieu thereof "$455,050", and (2) by striking out "$65,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$165,000."

APPENDIX R. HOUSE RESOLUTION 468, 83D CONGRESS, 2D SESSION

House Resolution 468

Resolved, That the further expenses of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by clause 8 of rule XI of the Rules of the House and House Resolution 150, 83d Congress, as amended by House Resolution 339, 83d Congress, incurred by (1) the Military Operations Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations, not to exceed $51,000 additional, (2) the Public Accounts Subcommittee of such committee, not to exceed $52,000 additional, and (3) the International Operations Subcommittee of such committee, not to exceed $52,000 additional, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by the subcommittee which incurred the expenses, signed by the chairman thereof, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

APPENDIX S. RESOLUTION ADOPTED JUNE 10, 1954, AS AMENDED JUNE 16, 1954

Be it resolved, That a special subcommittee of three, referred to as the Antiracketeering Subcommittee, be appointed by the chairman of this committee, and it hereby is established, directed, and granted authority equal to that conferred by this committee to its regular subcommittees, to, under the direction of the chairman of the full committee, and on vouchers authorized by him, conduct investigations and hold hearings pertaining to Government operations insofar as they relate to or control racketeering practices. The investigation shall include, but not be limited to, the following matters:

(1) Whether Federal agencies, officers, and employees, with the public moneys appropriated, adequately and properly defend and protect individuals and organizations from racketeering and extortion.

(2) Whether Federal agencies, officers, and employers charged with the duty of interpreting and administering Federal legislation are using Federal funds efficiently and economically.

(3) Whether Government activity at all levels, designed to implement existing legislation, effectively and economically corrects such racketeering practices as may exist.

APPENDIX T. HOUSE RESOLUTION 542, 83D CONGRESS, 2D SESSION, ADOPTED JUNE 23, 1954

House Resolution 542

Resolved, That the expenses of conducting investigations, within the limits of the authority granted by clause 8 of rule XI of the Rules of the House and House Resolution 150 as amended by House Resolution 339, 83d Congress, with respect to matters pertaining to Government operations insofar as they relate to or control racketeering practices, incurred under the direction of the chairman of the full committee by the Antiracketeering Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations, not to exceed $75,000, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized and signed by the chairman of the Committee on Government Operations, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

APPENDIX U. HOUSE RESOLUTION 709, 83D CONGRESS, 2D SESSION, INTRODUCED ON AUGUST 18, 1954

House Resolution 709

Resolved, That the chairman of the Committee on Government Operations be, and he hereby is, authorized during the recess or after the adjournment of the Congress to appoint a special subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations consisting of not ot exceed five members of that committee with authority equal to that of the regular subcommittees, to make investigations and hold hearings in connection with the expenditure of public funds by executive agencies and the manner in which those agencies are interpreting and administering Federal legislation: *Provided, however*, That the investigation of such subcommittees shall not encroach upon the jurisdiction of the House Committee on Education and Labor, nor interfere with the investigations and hearings of the regular subcommittees of the Committee on Government Operations: *And provided further*, That all expenses of any investigations or hearings held hereunder, shall be paid out of the funds heretofore authorized to be appropriated for the use of the Committee on Government Operations and not out of the funds heretofore authorized for the use of the regular subcommittees of said committee.

Report to the People on the 83d Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH F. HOLT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 16, 1954

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I should like to take this opportunity to report to the folks of the 22d Congressional District of California, which I represent in Congress, on the accomplishments—both locally and nationally—of the 83d Congress. This report is being made in order to assist my friends and neighbors to have a greater understanding of the happenings in Washington.

As the first Congressman for this fast-growing area consisting of Hollywood and the San Fernando Valley, I have published weekly Report From Washington news columns in all newspapers, and have mailed special bimonthly legislative reports to a mailing list of over 10,000 constituents. Incidentally, I have shouldered the expenses of these reports myself.

Now that the 83d Congress has ended, I believe it is vital that each American knows exactly what we have accomplished. Right off the bat, I want to say that I am proud to have played a part in the accomplishments of the 83d Congress. I should like to start off with a report on legislation of special local interest to my district.

BIRMINGHAM STORY

Conversion of the old Birmingham General Hospital site to the permanent Birmingham educational center has been my No. 1 project for my district since I first became the elected Representative from the 22d Congressional District. Happily, I can announce that our city schools received the deed to the Birmingham property. Because of its historical significance and the part it played in World War II, I feel that the Birmingham story should be made a matter of official record for the folks of my community. Inasmuch as I grew up in my congressional district and received my own elementary, junior high, and high school education there, I have followed the Birmingham story closely. My personal investigation proved to me that for the good of our community, the Birmingham site should be immediately made available for an educational center.

BIRMINGHAM GENERAL ARMY HOSPITAL

On what used to be a farm belonging to a pioneer valley family, the Birmingham General Hospital site was born. It was chosen for its location, beautiful landscape, and marvelous weather conditions. Actual breaking of the ground began on June 18, 1943, in the center of a lima bean and carrot patch. The property is comprised of 117.31 acres owned outright by the Government and 14.12 acres leased by the Government. The land owned outright by the Government was originally composed of three tracts. These three tracts were acquired by the Government in the United States district court. The hospital was activated during the construction stage as an unnamed general hospital. The War Department on August 24, 1943, gave the hospital its present name, Birmingham General Hospital, in honor of Brig. Gen. Henry Patrick Birmingham, of the Medical Corps of the United States Army. Shortly after original activation orders were received, duty personnel began to arrive, and civilian personnel were employed on a small scale.

BIRMINGHAM VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION HOSPITAL

Birmingham General Army Hospital was transferred to the jurisdiction of the Veterans' Administration on April 1, 1946, and was known as the Veterans' Administration hospital at Van Nuys, Calif., although many still referred to it as Birmingham Veterans' Administration Hospital. Under the operation of the Veterans' Administration, Birmingham Hospital was a 1,500-bed hospital.

BIRMINGHAM EDUCATIONAL CENTER

We have an exceptional number of children per family unit in our valley. This is because the area is populated by a young group of parents with large families. As the only Californian serving on the Education and Labor Committee of the House of Representatives, I have had an opportunity to get the overall picture of the tremendous educational problem before our country. Our children must receive the very best of education in the most modern facilities, with every opportunity to prepare themselves for the trying times ahead. The new Birmingham educational center will consist of an elementary school, a junior high school, and in all probability, a senior high school. A school for physically handicapped high-school students is needed right now and the therapy facilities now at Birmingham can be put to good use for this program. For each of these schools, space for agriculture and horticulture training is available in the total acreage. As these youngsters progress through school and the enormous growth continues in the San Fernando Valley, there is no question that a technical training or trade school will be needed to serve the community and training needs of business and industry.

I should like to take this opportunity to extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to the many folks who have assisted me in my negotiations to obtain the Birmingham Hospital free of charge for an educational center.

FLOOD CONTROL FOR YOU

As your Congressman, I am proud to report that the Los Angeles River flood-control project is being completed to the extreme west end of the San Fernando Valley. At the present time, as you can observe daily, the United States Army Engineers are completing construction on the project from Sepulveda Boulevard to Reseda Boulevard. The county of Los Angeles is the coordinating authority under the Los Angeles County Flood Control District. The city and county have the responsibility of building drains that carry the water from our streets into the Los Angeles River where it is carried away in the event of flood. The next step of the project to be undertaken in the overall plan is that portion from Reseda Boulevard to Corbin Avenue.

HIGHWAYS FOR YOU

The record breaking $965 million a year highway program for the next 2 fiscal years—1956–57—under the new Federal-Aid Road Act of 1954 will be of help to our community. The traffic situation is rapidly becoming impossible within our community and I have pledged my assistance to local public officials who are in charge of the program. I favor toll roads if local and State funds are not available.

EDUCATION FOR YOU

As the only Californian of either party serving on the Education and Labor Committee of the House, I have been able to work for our community, State, and Nation. My legislation calling for a White House Conference on Education has just been signed into law by President Eisenhower. It will be held in the fall of 1955 in Washington, D. C. Prior to the National Conference, the various States will hold statewide conferences to determine the educational needs of their respective States. There will be a conference held locally where the parent-teacher associations in our community and other interested parents and citizens will participate. The future of America depends on our children, and we must face facts immediately and solve the shortages of teachers and classrooms throughout our country.

I was fortunate in serving on the Subcommittee on Education which wrote Public Laws 815 and 874 to assist in the construction and maintenance of schools in critical defense areas.

WELFARE FUNDS

While in recess, I am participating as a member of the Special Labor Subcommittee to recommend legislation to protect the welfare funds of union members. At the present time unions and employers agree that regulation is needed to protect the individual's money and that a financial accounting should be made to a responsible agency.

Also during the recess, I am making a 4-week tour of Asia combining a 2-week tour of active duty as a captain in the United States Marine Corps Reserve with an additional 2 weeks' personal survey at my own expense.

OUTSTANDING PROGRAM ENACTED

The 83d Congress will go down as one of the best in America's history as it was responsible for many notable achievements. In two busy, exacting sessions, the 83d Congress has carried through to enactment an outstanding program of constructive legislation.

We ended the fighting and sacrifices of American lives in Korea; kept the United States out of the war in Indochina; strengthened the free nations; and confronted Russian imperialism and Communist aggression with the firm determination to safeguard freedom and attain genuine peace. We successfully bridged the difficult transition from war to peace and maintained prosperity at the highest level in the Nation's history. Price, wage, and rent controls were ended, freeing American enterprise from undue Government interference. The national economy was stabilized and the value of the dollar strengthened, ending the cheating of our people by inflation and avoiding the distress of deflation, while employment, production, wages, and earnings remained high.

POSITIVE FOREIGN POLICY

By placing American interest foremost and with firm, realistic policies, the following was accomplished: The exchange of Korean prisoners was secured and the peaceful reconstruction of that war-torn country began. Several American divisions were brought home as a result of the strengthening of the Korean troops. The initiative was taken against communism in all parts of the world as follows:

By exposing Communist hypocrisy, designs, and tactics at Berlin and Geneva Conferences.

By a congressional resolution supporting a united Germany.

By a resolution condemning the Soviet mistreatment of minorities and its callous disregard of human rights.

By reaffirming official policy denying Red China's admission to the United Nations.

By leading American states at Caracas in the adoption of a resolution declaring communism to be a threat to freedom and peace in the Americas and pledging full consultation in the event of any aggression.

By negotiating arms pacts to strengthen Central American countries against Communist subversion.

By taking appropriate steps to oust Americans in the United Nations who serve the Communist cause and by instituting an FBI check on the fitness of Americans for loyal service.

By undertaking to share information on atomic weapons with allies in the common defense against Communist aggression.

And by proposing an international pool of atomic energy for peace.

At the same time, the defenses of the free world were reinforced. Training and building up of the NATO forces and equipping them with planes, guided missiles, atomic weapons and other materiel was continued. New airbases were acquired in Spain and the bases elsewhere improved. European recovery and security are now so well advanced that American aid may be steadily and safely reduced. Military aid was given to Pakistan and aid to Nationalist China continued.

STRONG NATIONAL DEFENSE

By department reorganization, better management, and a thorough overhaul of the entire national-defense program, a highly flexible, mobile Army, Navy, and Air Force capable of handling anything short of a major international war requiring all-out mobilization has been built. Should an all-out war occur, this program would and could be rapidly enlarged. Most significant are the actions, first, to maintain a large, well-rounded, highly trained and equipped military force for the indefinite future; second, to incorporate atomic and other new weapons into the regular military arsenal for strategic and tactical use; third, to establish an Air Force Academy comparable to West Point and Annapolis; and fourth, to gear our military program to our foreign policies and commitments. These are history-making decisions. They result from a fresh appraisal of our defense program by a new team of military and civilian officials following the end of fighting in Korea.

NATION IS PROSPEROUS

The depression predicted by calamity howlers and partisan critics did not materialize. Prosperity was not an accident, however. The Congress and the administration took positive steps to instill public confidence, to spur peacetime activity to supplant declining war demands.

COST OF LIVING STABILIZED

The cost of living was stabilized. In contrast to the 6 percent average annual increase in living costs under the postadministration, the post of living has been held down to only slightly more than 1 percent. Likewise the value of the dollar has varied only one-half cent in the past 18 months.

CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITIES ENCOURAGED—SMALL BUSINESS AIDED

Congress enacted a great number of laws to help maintain a healthy, growing economy. In the construction field alone, this Congress compiled a notable record. It voted funds and encouraged building. Small business already is benefiting from the Small Business Administration, created by the 83d Congress to make loans, sublet prime contracts, and otherwise strengthen the backbone of America. All business will be stimulated and more jobs created as a result of the new tax laws.

ATOMIC ENERGY ACT

More impetus than ever before has been given to the development of atomic energy for peacetime use by our people. The Congress passed legislation bringing the Atomic Energy Act of 1946 up to date. The act permits limited exchange with United States allies of information about atomic developments by private industry. The Atomic Energy Commission is permitted to dispose of electric energy it produces in the course of its own operations, but not to produce electricity for commercial purposes unless authorized by Congress. Private industry will be permitted to use atomic reactors and related facilities under a licensing system.

ACTION ON COMMUNIST ISSUE

Action has been vigorous and results tangible in the 83d Congress on the Communist issue. With the threat of Communist domination hanging over the entire world, Americans must be alerted to the danger of communism at home and abroad. A series of measures was passed by both Houses of Congress and sent to the President strengthening the hand of the Executive in combating the Communist conspiracy in this country. These measures include:

First. Legislation which outlaws the Communist Party and provides for the determination of the identity of certain Communist-infiltrated organizations.

Second. Legislation to gain facts by the granting of immunity to witnesses testifying before congressional committees.

Third. Legislation which imposes heavier penalties for concealing persons from arrest.

Fourth. Legislation which imposes heavier penalties on bail jumpers.

Fifth. Legislation known as the Alger Hiss bill, which denies a Government pension or retirement benefits to any Government employee convicted of a felony.

Sixth. Legislation approved by the President July 29, 1954, amended the Internal Security Act by requiring that all printing presses owned or controlled by Communists must be registered with the Attorney General.

Seventh. In addition to the various types of legislation enumerated above, some 2,400 security risks were weeded out from Federal employment between January 1953 and June 30, 1954. As of August 16, 1954, 105 alien subversives had been deported since January 1953 and, in addition, 355 new deportation proceedings and warrants for arrest had been issued against alien subversives.

NEW HOUSING ACT

The 83d Congress has made it possible to help fulfill the fundamental desire of American families to have good homes of their own.

LOWER DOWNPAYMENTS, LONGER PERIODS TO REPAY

The new housing law permits lower downpayments, lower monthly payments, longer payment terms of up to 30 years, and increased mortgage limits of up to $20,000. More money is made available for home loans by the merger of all FHA mortgage insurance activities into one authorization which was increased by $1.5 billion. Under the new FHA-insured mortgage program, it is possible, for example, to buy a $12,000 home for $1,200 down, instead of $2,400, with monthly payments of less than $60. Home buyers also are protected by guaranties required from builders or sellers using FHA-insured mortgages.

AID TO VETERANS

This Congress insisted that the human approach rather than the cold casework approach be made toward veterans and their problems. This resulted in a reorganization of the Veterans' Administration along functional lines, giving veterans and their dependents faster, better service at less overhead cost. Among the more important specific benefits given to our veterans was the increase in compensation payments to those with service-connected disabilities as well as an increase in the monthly payments to widows and dependent parents of veterans. Non-service-connected disability pensions were also increased.

The 83d Congress extended to July 1, 1955, the act providing for Federal contributions of dependency allotments for more than 1 million enlisted personnel. Over 11,000 Korean war prisoners and soldiers missing in action were benefited for a period well beyond the truce by extension of the Missing Persons Act to July 1, 1955, which provides for a continuance of pay checks and family allotments. Privileges of soldiers overseas to send home gifts duty free and bring back their personal possessions free of duty were extended for another 2 years.

The Congress increased by $100 million the revolving fund to finance direct Veterans' Administration loans to war veterans unable to finance home and farmhouse loans through private lending sources.

Under the old-age and survivors insurance system, military personnel under certain circumstances are provided wage credits for active duty without payment to the OASI fund.

Congress simplified the handling of veterans' life insurance policies giving better protection for the insured veteran as well as realizing savings of about $600,000 a year through less paperwork.

A law was passed which provides that all types of tuberculosis among veterans causing 10-percent disability within 3 years of discharge is presumed to be service connected.

Korean war veterans were granted the same preferences as World War II veterans in war housing, civil-service appointments, and free postage service. Time has been extended for Korean veterans to initiate training under the GI bill of rights.

To take care of the ever-increasing load of hospitalized veterans and to provide them with adequate facilities, the Congress enacted the largest appropriation ever provided for the highest number the VA feels it can use and staff properly.

NEW LANDMARK IN CIVIL AND POLITICAL RIGHTS

In 1953–54 the frontier of progress in basic civil and political rights moved forward.

A Government Contract Committee has been established to promote equal job opportunities on all Government work done by private industries. This is a direct effort to prevent discrimination among employees of those industries engaged in Government work. Forthright action was taken to eliminate segregation in the Armed Forces.

HEALTH

To safeguard the Nation's health, the Hill-Burton Act was extended to 1957 and expanded for hospital facilities for the aged, chronically ill, and physically disabled. A broader program of vocational rehabilitation has been established to increase State financing and activities, and to encourage closer Federal-State-local cooperation. It includes the training of doctors, physical therapists, occupational therapists, rehabilitation counselors, and psychologists. Increased emphasis is placed on improvement of rehabilitation techniques and special facilities such as community workshops. Increased grants were made for research on cancer, heart, mental health, and arthritis. As a health protective measure, Congress passed a law specifically giving the Food and Drug Administration power to inspect factories where pharmaceutical and food products are manufactured.

SOCIAL SECURITY

A social security act was passed bringing some 7 million more persons into the Federal retirement system and increasing the benefits of the 5 million already retired. Under this act, social security beneficiaries now have the advantage of a much more liberalized program. They may now earn as much as $1,200 a year from covered work without loss of benefits. In addition, the new formula makes it possible for beneficiaries to earn more than $100 in any one month without losing all 12 months' benefits. The age of beneficiaries for earning unlimited amounts without losing their benefits has been lowered from 75 to 72 years. Those under the railroad retirement system have benefited by a change in the law which increases the benefits of some 36,000 an average of $24 a month, retroactive to October 30, 1951.

ACHIEVEMENTS BENEFIT WORKERS

Without fanfare and without the aid of a lot of new laws, the administration and Congress set a record of substantial achievements benefiting workers throughout the Nation. Foremost among these was the successful transition from a war to peace economy. Extremes of inflation and deflation which are most harmful to wage earners were avoided by Government policies. Where employment difficulties arose, as in scattered pockets of labor-surplus areas, the administration moved swiftly to meet them with a corrective program. Special "set asides" in defense procurement were held open for firms having idle capacity and surplus labor.

SENSIBLE AGRICULTURAL PROGRAM

The President recommended and Congress adopted flexible, rather than rigid, price supports, for the basic commodities, with adjustment to the flexible program to be accomplished gradually in the interest of both the farmers and the Nation's economy as a whole.

GOVERNMENTAL EFFICIENCY AND ECONOMY PRACTICED

Through reorganization of executive departments and agencies, reduction of Federal personnel and large-scale paring of appropriations and expenditures, the 83d Congress made the Government more efficient and economical. We have come over two-thirds of the way toward balancing the budget and, remember, this was done while putting into effect a tax program which will return nearly $7½ billion to the people.

Over 200,000 unnecessary persons were removed from the Federal civilian payroll. Congress approved all 12 of President Eisenhower's Government reorganization plans. These plans included creation of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and authorized departments and agencies to operate on a sounder, more businesslike basis. Congress also established two commissions, the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government—called the Hoover Commission—and the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations. The Hoover Commission has a mandate to survey all Federal functions and recommend changes to promote economy and efficiency, including abolition of any functions found no longer to be of value to the American people.

HIGHLIGHTS OF THE TAX REVISION BILL

This is the first comprehensive revision of the internal-revnue laws since before the turn of the century and the enactment of the income tax.

Approximately a half a million manhours of work have gone into this gigantic achievement.

Over 3,000 changes in the revenue laws are contained in the tax revision measure. In general, the purpose of these changes has been to remove inequities, to end harassment of the taxpayer, and to reduce tax barriers to future expansion of production and employment.

The new law closes over 50 loopholes through which taxpayers today can avoid paying their fair share of taxes.

Without attempting to give a technical interpretation, the following represents some of the highlights of the new tax law. These changes in general are effective last January 1 so that the taxpayers will receive the benefit from them this year.

DEPENDENTS

First. A parent can claim a deduction of $600 for each child regardless of the child's earnings if the child is under 19 and the parent continues to furnish more than half the child's support.

Second. A parent can also claim the $600 dependency deduction for a child over 18 regardless of the child's earnings if the child is attending school or college, or receiving on-the-farm training, and the parent continues to furnish more than half the child's support.

Third. An aged parent or other dependent cared for by several members of a family can be claimed as a deduction by one of the members of the family.

Fourth. A taxpayer can claim a $600 dependency deduction for a foster child.

Fifth. A taxpayer can claim a $600 dependency deduction for a child awaiting adoption.

Sixth. A taxpayer can claim a $600 dependency deduction for any other person, regardless of relationship, if the taxpayer supports that person in his home.

Seventh. A taxpayer can claim a $600 dependency deduction for a cousin who is institutionalized because of physical or mental disability.

Savings to taxpayers, $85 million.

CHILD-CARE EXPENSES

First. Single working parents, such as a widow, are allowed a deduction up to $600 for the expense of child-care for children up to 12 years of age.

Second. The same deduction is allowed for a married woman who must work because her husband is incapacitated.

Third. The same deduction is allowed with respect to any dependent, regardless of age, who is mentally or physically incapable of caring for himself.

Fourth. A similar deduction is allowed a married woman if the combined income of her husband and herself does not exceed $5,100.

Savings to taxpayers, $130 million.

MEDICAL EXPENSES

First. Medical expenses can be deducted when they exceed 3 percent of income, instead of 5 percent as under present law.

Second. Example: A family with $3,000 gross income and medical expenses of $150 will be able to deduct $60. The same family can deduct nothing today.

Third. The bill doubles the present maximum limit on the amount that can be deducted.

Savings to taxpayers, $80 million.

HEAD OF FAMILY

First. A single taxpayer who has a dependent son or daughter will be entitled during the first 2 years after the death of his spouse to the same income-splitting privilege as is accorded married couples.

Second. A single individual can receive half the benefits of income splitting if he has a dependent parent and if the taxpayer maintains a household for the father or mother.

Savings to taxpayers, $11 million.

RETIREMENT INCOME CREDIT

First. All retired people 65 and over, including schoolteachers, firemen, policemen, and civil servants, will in effect be exempt on all retirement income up to $1,200. This will mean a tax reduction for these retired people of up to $240 a year.

Second. Example: A retired single individual over 65 who has a total retirement income of $3,000 today pays about $300 in income tax. Under the bill, his tax is reduced to $60—a saving of $240.

Third. The same exemption will extend to individuals under 65 if they receive a pension from a public retirement system, such as do teachers.

Savings to taxpayers, $141 million.

CREDIT PURCHASES

The bill allows a deduction for interest up to 6 percent on installment purchases.

Total saving to taxpayers, $10 million.

CHARITABLE CONTRIBUTIONS

The bill increases from 20 to 30 percent the allowable deduction for charitable contributions to churches, hospitals, and educational institutions.

Total saving to taxpayers, $25 million.

SICKNESS AND ACCIDENT PLANS

First. Premiums paid by employers to health and accident plans will not be taxable to their employees.

Second. All accident and health benefits paid as reimbursement for actual medical expenses to employees, their wives, or children, are completely exempted from tax.

Third. Payments to employees for loss of wages due to injury or illness are exempted up to $100 a week.

DEATH BENEFITS

The bill exempts all death benefits up to $5,000 paid by an employer to the widow or other beneficiary of an employee.

PENSIONS AND ANNUITIES

The bill also provides a simpler method for taxation of pensions and annuities.

Savings to taxpayers, $10 million.

DIVIDEND CREDIT

First. Excludes first $50 in dividends from taxation and provides a credit against tax equal to 4 percent of the balance.

Second. Example: An individual with $50 or less in dividends from his savings will be entirely exempt from tax on that amount.

Third. Example: An individual with $250 in dividends from his savings will exclude the first $50 entirely, and then reduce his total tax by $8—4 percent of the balance of $200.

Savings to taxpayers, $204 million.

DEPRECIATION

The bill will permit the more liberal writeoff of the cost of new equipment.

Savings to taxpayers, $375 million, of which $75 million represents savings to individuals such as farmers, shopkeepers, and salesmen.

DECLARATIONS OF ESTIMATED TAX

The requirements are eased for filing declarations of estimated tax.

FILING TAX RETURNS

Tax returns will be due April 15 instead of March 15.

ACTION FOR TAXPAYERS

The 10 percent reduction in Federal income taxes which went into effect last January 1 saves individual taxpayers a total of $3 billion annually.

The excise-tax reduction law saves taxpayers an additional $1 billion.

The tax revision act will save taxpayers $1,400,000,000.

A total of $827 million of this tax saving is for individuals. The remainder, $536 million, is tax relief for business.

The overall tax-cut program will save $7,400,000,000. Of this amount, individuals receive an overall total tax saving of $4,700,000,000. The tax savings so far surpass any previous total in the history of Congress.

Isn't It Wonderful?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, early this year the Vice President used the rhetorical question "Isn't it wonderful?" in referring to the handling of diplomacy by the present administration.

Just how wonderful the administration's efforts have been is set forth in a letter to the editor of the Washington Daily News from William Philip Simms, former foreign editor for the Scripps-Howard chain of newspapers, which was recently published as an article.

Of course the conditions reported by Mr. Simms are far from wonderful; it indicates the Vice President might better have used the rhetorical question: "Isn't it tragic?"

While I do not necessarily subscribe to every phase of Mr. Simms' program to restore the initiative to the West, he is sufficiently experienced and sufficiently knowledgeable that what he suggests is worthy of sober thought.

I include the letter from Mr. Simms as a part of my remarks:

Where Are Our Allies?

(We're privileged to share with our readers today a private, informal letter from William Philip Simms, whom we regard as one of the best-informed, clearest and soundest-thinking observers of United States foreign relations. Long-time foreign editor of the Scripps-Howard Newspapers, now in semiretirement, Phil never has eased up in his acute interest in our foreign policy. Actually, this wasn't intended as a newspaper article—but we thought you would like to know his views—The Editor.)

Baix (Ardeche), France, August 1954.—I'm greatly worried about the state of our relations abroad. The United States is about as popular in Europe today as Hitler's Germany was in 1938–39.

Thanks to the drumfire of Communist propaganda, plus our own errors, our aims are more and more misunderstood. Our allies more often say nice things about Malenkov and Molotov than they do about Eisenhower and Dulles.

I doubt that we have a single ally we really could depend on if the Reds let fly with an atomic bomb on New York coupled with a warning to London, Paris, et al., to stay neutral or else.

And unless there is a drastic change, things stand to get worse rather than better.

Europe is sick and weak and tired. She welcomes anything that calls for less, rather than more, effort. She prefers panaceas to the drastic operation without which she can never hope wholly to recover. She will settle for even the bare illusion of a few years of peace.

Moscow knows all this and is acting upon it. So the Kremlin will keep right on handing out the same old lies about the United States. It will keep on demanding—and getting—new peace conferences, new soundingboards from which to blast us.

We are being pictured day in and day out, year in and year out, as wanting war while the Soviet Union cries for peace. We are pictured as forcing upon a reluctant world a costly armaments race while Russia pleads for disarmament; of seeking to force Europeans to fight an American war of conquest against the peace-loving Soviets; of using American dollars to buy the bodies of Europe's youth to make cannon fodder of them in order to save our own; that if it were not for American greed, the world would have had peace long ago.

The Journal de Geneve, one of the most intelligently edited newspapers on the Continent, has just had a front-page editorial on this subject. After describing Moscow's two latest demands for a new conference to "settle" Europe's problems, it said:

"If it is easy to discern Moscow's motives and, having discerned them, to condemn them and say 'No,' it is far less easy to convince world opinion of the wisdom of that decision. Yet it is becoming more and more important that the world should be so convinced. Simply to say 'No' is confusing. In all sincerity, an important part of the public asks itself just what it is that the West has to fear by negotiating, and whether it has no better response to make the Communists than silence.

"It must be admitted that the monotony of the Soviet's maneuvers can only be matched by the errors and dissensions of the Occident.

"The West nurses many illusions, particularly in Washington where, for 2 long years, they have kept on repeating that the initiative has changed hands. Just how wrong they are can be measured by imagining this inverse situation: Washington, London, or Paris proposes to Moscow a conference the sole convocation of which would throw the Communists into such embarrassment that the only answer they could think of would be 'No.'

"The day when that happens, and not before, one may talk of the initiative having changed hands. Until then, however, Soviet diplomacy can look forward to many more fine days."

Two years ago when this anti-American feeling really began to take hold, I wrote that it was high time for the United States to do something to take the play away from Moscow.

Today I can only say that some such action is long overdue if we hope to regain, or even retain, some of our dwindling prestige abroad.

We cannot remain forever on the defensive. If we do, we are lost.

It is imperative that we take the initiative—that we do something dramatic, something constructive, something arresting, something to catch and to hold the world's imagination.

We must do something to prove to the world—even to the West—that we would have more to lose by war than any other nation, and that we stand ready and eager to go to almost any length to insure peace.

Our very top man, President Eisenhower himself, should seek and find a forum big enough, important enough, and solemn enough to launch a live-and-let-live plan that would make peoples clear around the globe sit up and take notice.

The plan should be bold, dramatic, and sincere, down to the very last punctuation, without boast, without bluster, and without bluff.

The President should offer to disarm down to a mere police force if others would do the same, under proper regulation.

He should offer to abolish all offensive weapons, including the atomic variety, or submit them to foolproof international control.

He should propose a new world agreement which would guarantee the East against western aggression vice versa.

He should reiterate the God-given right of the peoples of all countries, large and small, to governments of their own choosing, at genuinely free elections by secret ballot.

He should invoke the lofty principles and the spirit of international decency and justice which gave birth to the United Nations and pledge our support for any and all nations which live up to those principles.

He should ask all nations, including the Iron Curtain countries, to subscribe to the same rules—open their frontiers to the world, with free access not only to duly accredited international control missions but to others, including journalists.

Certainly most of these things have been heard before. But it has been one at a time—when a broadside is needed.

If we take the play away from Moscow, we've got to do more than we have in the past. We've got to let our aims ring out so that they can be heard around the world. And we must repeat them and repeat them and repeat them until there is no further room for doubts.

True, it is seriously to be doubted that Russia could or would dare accept such a proposition, however simple, fair, and reasonable it is. She is too afraid of her own people to open her doors and windows to the clean air from the outside. She is afraid to let visitors from the free world come and mingle among her own unfree, lest her subjects find out how badly and how long they have been duped.

Even so—even if Russia said "No"—Washington at last would be coming close to fulfilling the Journal de Geneve's condition for the initiative's changing camps.

Of course, we would have to keep the peace offensive going, just as Moscow does, on all fronts—in the United Nations, at all international conferences, month in and month out.

Our global defense policy is equally in need of overhaul. We have been too lavish with our billions and too sparing of our brains. Europeans now accept our aid as nothing more than their due, as they cut down on their own efforts, including military service.

We should reduce drastically our foreign establishments, bring home all our token forces in uniform, repatriate the swarm of Americans in civvies, drop our giveaway programs, and use some of the taxpayers' money thus saved to make the United States as impregnable as humanly possible.

I am not suggesting that we abandon our allies. Far from it. I am merely suggesting a better way to serve them, and us, and the free world. We must support NATO, EDC, and similar pacts, including the Pan

American, until Russia returns to civilization. But why should we, by way of illustration, be expected forever to supply Western Europe with manpower when we have only 160 million inhabitants against her 270 million?

Moreover, in the light of today's facts of life, how much longer are we going to keep putting the national-defense cart before the horse? America's first line of defense is no longer Europe. It is in Detroit, Pittsburgh, Washington, New York, in the air over Canada and the North Pole. And Europe's first line of defense is in the same place.

Certainly, the Red Army could be on the English Channel in 10 days if it got the order to march. But it will never get any such order so long as Moscow knows that to stay there it must first whip America.

The corollary is that the best thing we could possibly do for Europe is to make America secure.

Probably no man knows more about the principles of leadership than President Eisenhower. He knows first-hand that it has nothing to do with bluster and hurrah, or of constantly picking up the other fellow's tabs. He knows that it is that indefinable, intangible something that attracts and holds followers because they feel they are being led in the right direction.

He knows that effective alliances cannot be held together by ropes—even ropes of gold.

If we make, and keep, ourselves strong, and if we take the trouble to show the world what are our aims and convince the world that we intend to use our strength generously and constructively, we won't have to go abroad, hat and moneybags in hand, looking for allies. They will come to us, and gladly.

Sorry I've let my sermon run along to such length. But thanks—if you've stuck with me this far.

PHIL.

Accomplishments of the 2d Session of the 83d Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDNA F. KELLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mrs. KELLY of New York. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include herewith my report on the accomplishments of the 2d session of the 83d Congress to the people of the 10th Congressional District in New York.

The 83d Congress has adjourned. The record of this Congress is now history. The future will judge what contribution this record will have made toward the prestige of the United States at home and abroad. Whether issues were faced fairly and decisions were made courageously, remain to be seen. To what degree the action or lack of action affected both home and world conditions or whether a new historic pattern was set up will be decided. Conclusions will be drawn also from the promises pledged by this administration and from their fulfillment.

At the end of the 1st session of the 83d Congress, I reported to my constituents on that session. In that report, I summarized the action of the first session by stating that most of the laws enacted were extensions of the laws of the previous Democratic Congresses with the following exceptions:

Public Law 31, the tidelands oil bill, giving the States the submerged lands beneath navigable waters within boundaries of affected States—within the 3-mile limit except on the Texas and Florida gulf coasts, 10½ miles;

Public Law 212, the submerged lands amendment confirming Federal jurisdiction over the natural resources of the subsoil and seabed of the submerged lands seaward from historic State boundaries in the Continental Shelf;

Public Law 205, authorizing the disposal of the Government-owned rubber producing facilities; and

Public Law 203, providing for the admission of 214,000 refugees and special quota immigrants. As of Friday, August 13, 1954, only 3,734 refugees had been admitted under the provisions of this act.

Also during the period of the 1st session of the 83d Congress, numerous commissions were created to report their findings to the Executive and to make recommendations for change in the subject of each assignment.

The 2d session of the 83d Congress began with action anticipated to establish the New Look program of the Republican Party. To accomplish this, the New Deal legislation of the past 20 years was to be repealed. Study commission reports were submitted, their findings to be used to enact the new legislation which would amend or discredit the old.

A check with Library of Congress reveals 35 advisory or study groups have been established since President Eisenhower took office. Of these 35 groups, 15 have reported, 10 have not reported their findings, and the remaining 10 groups are of a continuing nature.

As one examines the record of the 83d Congress, it is difficult to characterize. Numerically controlled by the Republicans, with a President representing the more liberal Republican viewpoint, it followed a continuously see-saw movement in an attempt to overcome intraparty difficulties, causing confusion and uncertainty which prevailed on almost every issue. This contributed to the indefinite foreign policy and to the misunderstanding of that policy by our allies. Such enigmatical phrases as "massive retaliation" and the "united action" policy for southeast Asia have in no way helped to clear the atmosphere. When the actual recommendations of the President were submitted to Congress, the true division within the party emerged.

The findings of the various study groups referred to above, did not repudiate the Democratic legislation of the past as had been predicted during the 1952 campaign. It was realized that the Democratic policies were substantially sound. They were well conceived and of long-range character. Instead of being repudiated, they have been amended and broadened to fit present needs. For example, the social-security laws and the unemployment-compensation law were accepted by this Republican administration: the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act was extended for 1 year, and the Public Housing Act of 1954, although nominally extended for 1 year, was actually killed by a Republican amendment.

Democratic support saved the Eisenhower program is so many instances it brought forth this remark from one of the Old Guard Republicans, "You have no strong virile party if you continue to do the things"—as a member of the majority—"which you condemn as the opposition."

The investigations which consumed so much time in this session have widened the great cleavage in the Republican Party and caused unnecessary misunderstanding and distrust at home and abroad.

President Eisenhower has declared many times that the program emerging from this Republican Congress must be the issue on which the new Congress will be chosen. My report to you briefly covers the work of the 2d session of the 83d Congress.

INTERNATIONAL—MUTUAL SECURITY ACT

The Mutual Security Act of 1954 is the implementation of our United States foreign policy. It represents the cost to the United States of collective security. It is the United States' share of our partnership with other free nations for the security of the Free World.

The Mutual Security Act of 1954 provides the basic authorization for assistance to two groups of nations. The first, which receives approximately 75 percent of this year's funds, consists of nations which have joined with us in carrying out a common military effort. These nations must have either joined with us in a regional defense undertaking—such as NATO—or have entered into firm bilateral agreements with us for military cooperation. Most of this aid is in the form of weapons, airplanes, tanks, ammunition, and so forth, for the use of the armed forces of the cooperating countries. In addition, direct forces support is given in limited amounts. This consists of commodities and other aid to maintain larger forces than could otherwise be provided in certain nations where their military budgets are overextended. Some defense support is also given to a few of our military allies. This consists of aid to support the economies of these countries so as to make it possible to devote a larger proportion of their resources to military purposes than would otherwise be possible.

The other group of nations provided for in the mutual security program are those which have not yet been able to develop effectively their own resources. Assistance is given in the form of technical cooperation—point 4—and also as "development assistance." The act this year specifically limits the use of technical cooperation funds to technical training purposes together with equipment and commodities necessary for instruction or demonstration purposes. These restrictions have been enacted to prevent large-scale economic or commodity assistance to be given under the guise of technical cooperation.

In the case of certain underdeveloped countries, it is recognized that major capital investments are essential. This is particularly the case where land reclamation and water development programs are needed. The act provides that assistance of this character can be given for 1 year only. Development assistance must terminate—except for necessary liquidation—after June 30, 1955.

The Mutual Security Act, as has been the case in previous years, also continues the authorization for a number of smaller programs which have to do with foreign nations. These include provision for United States contributions to the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration, for the United Nations Children's Fund, for the Palestine refugees in the Near East, for ocean freight charges on relief shipments by United States voluntary nonprofit relief agencies, for Chinese and Korean students, and for United States support of multilateral technical cooperation programs of the United Nations and the Organization of American States.

For the administration of the Mutual Security Act of 1954 the President requested an appropriation of $3,438,549,805. The Congress allowed an appropriation in the amount of $2,781,499,816.

I sponsored in the Committee on Foreign Affairs an amendment to the Mutual Security Act to prevent the supplying of military aid to Iraq. Although my amendment was defeated, language was included in the bill as enacted which should assure that military aid to Iraq cannot be used for aggression against Israel.

The Foreign Aid Act also contains authority for the expenditure of 6 million Irish pounds in Ireland. This sum remained in the accounts from former ECA programs for Ireland and will be used to develop the agricultural production and marketing potential of Ireland and for the exchange of students between the United States and Ireland.

The new legislation continues the program ICMME for the movement of migrants and refugees, escapees and expellees, from Europe to other parts of the world. This provision was included in the original Mutual Security Act as a result of an amendment which I sponsored—called the Kelly amendment.

At the request of President Eisenhower, the new law gives greater authority to the President than that given in previous legislation. The President can terminate the Foreign Operations Administration whenever he chooses and can turn over its functions to any existing department of the Government or to a new agency at his discretion. The law contains specific termination provisions, however. All development assistance—economic aid to countries without military programs—must end June 30, 1955. The Foreign Operations Administration also must cease operations on that date if not terminated before. The technical assistance—point 4—programs must be turned over to the State Department by June 30, 1955.

Included in the Mutual Security Act is a section which tightens the controls of shipments of arms, ammunition, and implements of war into or out of the United States. Because of my special interest in this subject, in connection with my work on the Battle Act—which deals with strategic exports by foreign countries to the Soviet bloc—I regard this as an important improvement.

During this Congress, there has been a powerful drive from abroad to seat Communist China in the United Nations. Red China, with its long record of crime and violence, which violates all the principles upheld by the United Nations, has rightly been termed an aggressor. Red China is still at war with the United Nations. North Korea is still occupied by Chinese soldiers.

Fear that the present administration might succumb to an acceptance of this pressure, led the Congress to pass several resolutions and amendments. I was one of the members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs who wrote President Eisenhower warning him that acceptance of a Locarno pact with Soviet Russia and Red China would result in a complete reappraisal of the foreign-aid program. Our letter was timed to arrive at the White House on the day of the conference with the British on the southeast Asia policy.

RECIPROCAL TRADE

The Commission on Foreign Economic Policy, known as the Randall Commission, submitted a report which became a matter of controversy. Basically, it recommended "trade not aid" with the nations of the free world. At the same time, it recommended retention of the peril-point and escape-clause features. These are extremes, diametrically opposed to each other.

If the United States wants to maintain its present world markets and its high record of industrial expansion, it not only must seek new markets, but also it must meet competition from foreign trade. With the dollars thus gained, the foreign nations can then purchase United States goods. Otherwise, our allies will be forced to trade with Russia and her satellite nations in order to survive. There is grave danger that this is happening at the present time. Because of the uncertain policy on trade of the present administration, nations have made trade agreements with the Russian bloc. Previously, this had been prevented by foreign aid which was equivalent to the dollar gap—difference between United States exports of about $15 billion and United States imports of about $10 billion. The average amount of foreign aid was about $5 billion a year.

The recent decision of President Eisenhower to increase by 50 percent the tariff on Swiss watches is inconsistent with his advocacy of freer trade. This strikes at the one nation which pays wages comparable to the wage levels in the United States. It is shocking to have the President assure the world that this action is in the interest of the United States national defense. It is also shocking when one realizes that the Swiss are one of the largest importers of United States industrial products.

In March, President Eisenhower selected certain recommendations from the report of the Randall Commission. One was a 3-year extension of the reciprocal trade program. The system had been set in motion two decades ago in the first administration of President Franklin D. Roosevelt. Republican resistance was so strong that President Eisenhower agreed to settle for a 1-year extension. He made it clear that he would have more to say on the subject next year. This is ducking the issue until next session. The Republicans did this last year, too. Their excuse then was to gain time for a complete study of the foreign economic policy. But, economic conditions have a way of not waiting while their ramifications are being investigated.

STATEHOOD FOR HAWAII AND ALASKA

The President approved of statehood for Hawaii but not for Alaska. A bill admitting Hawaii to the Union passed the House and, along with many of my colleagues, I tried to have Alaska admitted at the same time. This action failed. In the Senate, the one-package bill admitting both passed by a vote of 46 to 43. When this issue reached the House, however, individual bills were presented and at the request of the Republican leaders, the measures were killed. Incidentally, I was honored to receive from the Hawaiian Legislature, a commendation for my favorable action to the Territory.

NATIONAL

In my 1953 report to my constituents on the 1st session of the 83d Congress, I commented on Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey's statements concerning the $81 billion carryover which he claimed was the I O U of the past administration about which he could do nothing. At that time, I pointed out that 74 percent, or more than $62 billion of this $81 billion, was for national defense, with charges included for guns, tanks, planes, etc. I charged then that the President and the Secretary of the Treasury were presenting this carryover as waste and unnecessary authorizations and appropriations by Congress and if they wanted to do something about it, they could ask the Congress to rescind these programs for defense. This they did not do and it is interesting to note that we no longer hear the Secretary referring to the $81 billion carryover as an I O U of the previous administration.

After the Republican administration had analyzed these authorizations, they no longer criticized this balance, but used it for their so-called New Look economy. They deemed it possible to reduce appropriations in 1954–55 programs on account of this carryover.

It is important to note that deliveries made now, along with those which have been made for the past 2 years, are carrying out programs which were generated by the previous Democratic administration. Jet planes being delivered now, those delivered to Formosa, Japan, and Indochina, were authorized 3 years ago. The lead time in new scientific equipment is long. Therefore, what the Republican administration has economized on is the future security of the United States, and that is my reason for criticizing this as false economy.

Table of appropriations, 83d Cong., 2d sess.

Title	Budget estimates	Amount as passed House	Amount as passed Senate	Amount as enacted	Public Law No.
2d supplemental, 1954	$27,942,616	$25,785,707	$27,917,616	$27,517,616	304
Treasury [1]	578,783,000	577,855,600	577,855,600	577,855,600	374
Post Office	2,760,000,000	2,755,386,000	2,754,877,100	2,754,877,100	
State	116,191,960	108,410,000	113,783,280	113,910,000	471
Justice	177,732,000	176,542,000	177,352,000	176,864,500	
Commerce	930,997,000	808,222,000	769,072,000	837,022,000	
U. S. Information Agency	89,000,000	75,814,000	80,614,000	73,914,000	
Army civil functions	465,160,000	430,983,700	484,095,500	457,071,300	453
3d supplemental, 1954	430,458,241	456,470,496	476,248,741	505,218,741	357
Independent offices	5,987,622,360	5,566,118,763	5,700,775,413	5,651,770,063	428
Interior	427,751,110	364,337,989	427,601,006	405,936,149	465
Agriculture	698,741,813	720,102,654	725,351,971	723,683,150	437
National defense	29,887,055,000	28,684,250,486	29,217,106,486	28,800,125,486	458
Legislative	73,704,406	54,775,995	71,034,006	70,695,754	470
Judiciary	28,645,505	27,579,950	27,739,135	27,501,740	
Labor [2]	299,635,000	298,714,000	299,286,000	299,030,000	472
Health, Education, Welfare	1,652,509,261	1,658,913,761	1,671,138,761	1,663,413,761	
District of Columbia [3]	172,476,546	168,487,838	170,438,847	169,928,099	468
Supplemental, 1955	2,132,330,908	1,303,334,628	2,034,513,749	1,659,101,929	--------
Mutual Security [4]	3,438,549,805	2,895,944,000	2,790,824,816	2,781,499,816	--------

[1] Does not include permanent and indefinite appropriations, such as interest on the public debt, $6,800 million (estimated); refunding internal revenue collections, $2,728 million (estimated); and disbursements from trust funds, such as old-age and survivors insurance, $5,980 million (estimated), unemployment insurance, etc.

[2] Also carried in this bill, but not included in above figures, are appropriations for: National Labor Relations Board, $8,400,000; National Mediation Board, $1,220,500; and the Mediation and Conciliation Service, $3,134,000.

[3] Payable from District of Columbia revenues except for Federal contribution of $21,890,000.

[4] Also carried in this bill $2,462,075,979 of unobligated funds previously appropriated.

INCREASING NATIONAL DEBT LIMIT

The administration succeeded in raising the national debt limit from $275 billion to $281 billion. Interest on this debt is nearly $7 billion.

EXCISE TAXES

Public Law 324, the Excise Tax Reduction Act of 1954, reduced revenues by $999 million a year; extended for 1 year certain excise taxes which would automatically have been reduced April 1, 1954 (these included the tax on distilled spirits, wine, beer, cigarettes, gasoline, cars, trucks, buses, motorcycles, parts and accessories, and diesel fuel); and made the following reductions:

Reduced to 10 percent the 20-percent excise tax on furs, jewelry, toilet preparations, electric light bulbs and tubes, cameras, lenses and film, leases of safe deposit boxes, and most general admissions if price exceeds 50 cents; the 25-percent tax on long distance telephone calls; the 15-percent tax on sporting goods, mechanical pens, pencils, and lighters, transportation, and local telephone and telegraph messages.

Reduced to 5 percent the 10-percent tax on home appliances—refrigerators and freezers—but excluding air conditioners.

Exempted from any excise tax all admissions costing 50 cents or less, and admission to school athletics, to amateur civic theater performances, and to nonprofit museums and planetariums.

TAX BILL

Before giving details on the tax bill which was enacted in the 2d session of the 83d Congress, I would like to point out that the 10-percent tax reduction which became effective January 1, 1954, was the only real tax relief afforded the average taxpayer and this was given by the Democratic 82d Congress.

The Revenue Act of 1954 is a recodification of the tax laws. Included in this new law are the following provisions:

First. It eliminates inequities on many individuals with special needs or problems; for example, allowances for medical expenses, child care expenses, and so forth.

Retirement income: Allows retired taxpayers 65 years or older who have earned more than $600 in any 10 years prior to retirement to exclude from taxes the first $1,200 of retirement income from rents, pensions, annuities, dividends, and interest. It extends the retirement income credit to persons under 65 whose retirement income is derived from public retirement systems.

Charity: Under the new law, the maximum deduction for charitable contributions is raised from 20 percent to 30 percent of adjusted gross income but an additional 10 percent deduction can apply only to contributions to educational institutions, hospitals, churches, conventions of churches, nonprofit cemeteries and burial companies.

Child-care expenses: The new law permits a workingwoman, widower, divorced person, or working wife who files a joint return with her husband and whose combined income does not exceed $4,500, to deduct for tax purposes up to $600 for actual child-care expenses. This deduction can be taken only for children under 12 years except in the case of a workingwoman or widower whose dependent is mentally or physically handicapped. This last item is of special interest to me because I was the original sponsor of the law to grant such tax relief to widows and widowers. I regret the Congress did not see fit to allow a more liberal deduction. Where $600 a year is actually spent for child care, the deduction amounts to approximately $12.50 per week.

Dependents: Parents can now claim $600 dependency exemption for children who are under 19 and who are students in high school or college, regardless of the dependent's earnings.

Second. The second category includes benefits for corporations and other business firms. It permits companies to depreciate new plants and equipment faster in the early years of use.

Third. The date for filing individual income tax returns is changed in the new law from March 15 to April 15.

The tax bill of the 83d Congress gives very little relief to the average taxpayer. Eighty percent of our people earn less than $5,000 a year. This group receives $311 million reduction—approximately 9 percent—while corporations and individuals earning over $5,000 a year will enjoy 90 percent of the tax relief provided in this act. This is known as the "trickle down" policy under which tax concessions are made to the well-to-do with the hope that they will seep through to those below.

I voted to increase the individual tax exemptions which would benefit all taxpayers but this motion was not adopted. It failed in the House by a 210 to 204 vote; a victory as narrow as it was important.

ATOMIC ENERGY

The 2d session of the 83d Congress enacted a bill for the revision of the Atomic Energy Act of 1946—the McMahon Act. The act of 1946 was essentially concerned with the atom as a weapon. Control of the atomic potential was entirely in the hands of the Government for military purposes. One does not have to be a scientist to realize what a stupendous move it is to view this power in another perspective.

Because of the far-reaching importance of the bill for the revision of the Atomic Energy Act, it should have been brought to the floor at the beginning of the session to permit ample discussion and debate. Instead, it was brought up during the closing days of the session under the suspension rule which limits debate to 40 minutes and prohibits amendments. It was a one-package bill combining both international and domestic provisions. Although there is urgency in the international concept, the domestic provisions look to the distant future and should be weighed prudently.

THE BILL WAS DIVIDED INTO THREE PARTS

First. To enable the United States to give nuclear weapons information to its allies;

Second. To share peacetime information with friendly nations; and

Third. To turn over to private American enterprise industrial application of atomic energy.

In respect to the first and second, the law is so restrictive that it is meaningless. In respect to the third, which regulates the role private enterprise should play, the bill is so loose as to endanger the public interest. This involves the private against public power issue along with the nonmilitary use of atomic energy.

A provision of the bill has made the Atomic Energy Commission a power broker between TVA and a private utility group. A directive, requested by the President, instructed the Commission to buy its additional power from a private powerplant which would be constructed for that purpose with public Government funds.

Here is another giveaway program. Fourteen billion dollars of public funds have been used for research and building of atomic-energy plants. When the Government disposes of its investments, it should be reimbursed by the private investors. These funds could then be relayed to the taxpayers in the form of tax reductions.

HOUSING

Public Law 570 is the Housing Act of 1954. Public housing is a necessity but the 83d Congress ended this noteworthy program. It is true that there may have been some mistakes in the execution of the housing program, but the good far surpassed the errors. Because of the FHA-engineered revolution in housing finance, nearly 60 percent of United States families own their own homes today or have good equity in them. Prior to 1934, the average family of moderate means was unable to own or to look forward to owning a home. The lower downpayment, lower interest rates, and long-term self-amortizing mortgages sponsored by FHA changed all this.

The Democratic Party accepted governmental responsibility in assisting low-income groups to obtain decent housing. It recognized this program as a social and moral imperative and initiated it for that reason.

I have always given full support to public-housing legislation, but I voted against the Housing Act of 1954 because I desired no part in any fraud. This law put an end to public housing. For many years, a bloc in Congress has led the fight against this critically needed social legislation. This same group can vote for subsidies to other facets of American life and yet claim it is socialistic to make decent homes available to a large number of people. This same group can vote to draft all boys to protect our homes but they deny the veterans and the low-income groups the homes they fight to protect. When private enterprise or local governments are unable to cope with a problem, it is the duty of the Federal Government to encourage and initiate a solution.

This bill as passed by the House contained no future public-housing units. The Senate restored the original request for additional units but when the bill was reported from conference, it stipulated new units could be built only to house persons displaced from slum-clearance projects. This means no new units will be built. A bill with a title only is the record of the 83d Congress in public housing.

In referring to this bill Senator Ives said that the compromise rules out adequate public housing in any part of the country and particularly hits the State of New York. He declared:

> It sounds the death knell of Federal public housing which is so desperately needed to prevent further deterioration of our main urban communities.

Senator Lehman charged:

> This bill actually prohibits public housing. * * * In the guise of a 1-year extension it snuffs the whole program out.

AGRICULTURE

The Agricultural Act of 1954 establishes new flexible farm price supports. The administration asked supports ranging from 75 to 90 percent of parity while the farm bloc fought for retention of the present 90-percent rigid supports. Congress accepted the flexible principle but narrowed the range from 82.5 to 90 percent.

I believe in farm price supports, but I do not believe that these supports should provide waste in the form of Government storage of perishable food surpluses. The present support program was initiated in an emergency period when the economy of the country was at its lowest ebb. At that time, this agricultural support program of parity stabilized the economic life of this Nation. President Roosevelt claimed it an emergency program as did President Truman. Both Presidents approved the Brannan plan which permitted perishable goods to be sold in the open market.

In the 1948 campaign President Truman recommended flexible supports, and later, in his state of the Union message, he recommended these be written into the law. The law was enacted because it was recognized that rigid supports did not fit present-day needs. During the Korean war, our agricultural products were disposed of and the law was not enacted.

At the present time, the whole farm program must be reviewed to meet changing conditions. I voted for flexible supports as a step in this direction, but I realize that it is far from being the complete answer. The issue must be faced "head on" and looked at from the standpoint of the consumer, the taxpayer, and the industrialist as well as the farmer. The consumer is overtaxed and overcharged in this process which encourages the excessive production of food, not for the consumer's family, but for storage and spoilage. The food surpluses cannot be dumped on the foreign market. Greater adaptability in the farm program is needed to allow for allocating surpluses to school lunch programs, institutions, and to our armed services. Some of these provisions are now being adopted. Along with other colleagues, I have recommended them. In 1952, I sought to have the armed services supplied by these Government-owned stocks. This has not been carried out. The present administration has sold surpluses to the services at a lower price over and above the normal purchase of the services. This does not alleviate conditions. During the next session I hope that this problem will be extricated from political entanglements and be studied by a commission. Then it will be viewed, as it should be, as a factor in the economy of the whole country. The cost to the Federal Government to store its surpluses is about $750,000 a day.

AGRICULTURAL TRADE AND DEVELOPMENT ACT

This act gave the President authority to dispose of $1 billion of surplus commodities to foreign countries during the next 3 years. To relieve famine and other emergencies, $300 million may be given away. Foreign currencies can be collected for that which is sold, and those currencies must be used abroad. This is an attempt to reduce the stockpile of agricultural surpluses owned by the Government. It is not a solution to the basic problem which will have to be met after the effects of the flexible-support program are determined.

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Public Law 312 increases the borrowing power of the Commodity Credit Corporation from its present borrowing limit of $6.75 billion to $8.5 billion. I was not in favor of this increase of $1.75 billion as it means the right to purchase more agricultural surpluses. As of August 19, 1954, the Government owned the following: 457 million pounds of butter representing $306 million; 426 million pounds of cheese representing $171 million; 254 million pounds of dry milk representing $42 million; 324 million bushels of corn representing $528 million; 756 million bushels of wheat representing $1,928,000,000, 803 million pounds of cottonseed oil representing $143 million. Total holdings including the above amounted to $3,739,000,000. This does not, however, represent the total investment by the Government in agricultural support, which is evident by the authority granted to the Commodity Credit Corporation.

PUBLIC WORKS

Public Law 358 authorizes United States participation with Canada in the development of the St. Lawrence seaway, a construction project which will deepen the St. Lawrence River channel to permit ocean shipping. This will enable large vessels to sail from the Atlantic ports to ports on the Great Lakes. Every President since World War I had recommended this action. Beneficial economic aspects and continental defense aspects caused many previous opponents to vote favorably on this measure in this Congress. Its soundness is still questioned because it is felt that the 27-foot channel will prove too shallow for oceangoing ships and that severe winters will make traffic icebound for at least 5 months of the year.

Public Law 350 authorized $966 million for highway construction in fiscal 1956 and 1957.

Also authorized is $1.08 billion for rivers and harbors improvements and flood- and beach-erosion control projects.

SOCIAL SECURITY

The Social Security Act of 1954 expands and increases the benefits of old-age and survivors insurance system. The 1954 amendments to this law extend coverage of the old-age pension plan to 10 million persons and grant a slight increase in the monthly benefit payments. When this bill was under consideration by the House Committee on Ways and Means, I urged the committee to extend coverage to self-employed farmers and professional people, and to repeal that provision of the law which limits to $75 per month the right of a recipient to earn by his own labor more than that figure. I stated that persons able and willing to continue working past retirement must be encouraged to do so without penalty of loss of benefits. I recommended a gradual increase in social security payments so that the ultimate return to the retired worker might be greater. The committee recommended raising the limitation on earnings to $1,000 a year in accordance with the President's wishes. But, this merely allows a recipient of social security benefits to earn $83.33 per month instead of the original $75 a month, if the worker's earnings are spread over a 12-month period.

Among other programs continued by the 83d Congress were the extension of Federal aid for construction of medical facilities; aid for improvement of vocational rehabilitation services to handicapped persons; aid to schools in defense areas; assistance to construction industry and Federal insurance of home mortgages. It will be noted that these laws continue worthwhile projects originally enacted by previous Democratic administrations.

The unemployment compensation system was extended to cover Federal employees and workers in thousands of small business establishments. After December 31, 1955, the law will apply to employers of 4 or more workers. The old law applied to employers of 8 or more.

VETERANS AND SERVICEMEN

The 2d session of the 83d Congress enacted the following laws of benefit to veterans and servicemen:

Extending for 1 year the time limit for initiating training under the GI bill of rights for veterans of the Korean conflict;

Providing a 5-percent increase in rates of compensation for service-connected disabled veterans of all wars, survivors and dependents;

A similar increase in rates of nonservice-connected pensions for veterans and dependents;

Extending to July 1, 1955, authorization to continue pay and allowances of servicemen missing in Korea;

Exempting from limitation on dual compensation certain officers retired for disability;

Extending for 1 year to June 30, 1955, authority of the Veterans' Administration to make direct loans for home and farm purchase;

Prohibiting reduction of disability rating in effect for 20 years or more;

Increasing reenlistment bonuses;

Extending time for filing claims by prisoners of war;

Increasing Federal aid to State homes for disabled veterans;

Giving veterans of Korean conflict the same preference right of entry to homesteads as World War II veterans; and

Making WAC's eligible for veterans' benefits under certain conditions.

AIR FORCE ACADEMY

Public Law 325 established a United States Air Force Academy similar to the Military Academy at West Point and the Naval Academy at Annapolis. The first class of 300 cadets will be enrolled in July 1955. Each Member of Congress from New York will be permitted to appoint 10 candidates to compete in the entrance examinations. Twenty-one boys from New York State will be chosen to enter the first class at the Academy. I welcome applications from those boys residing in my congressional district who are interested in a career in the United States Air Force.

MEASURES DEFEATED IN 83D CONGRESS

The following measures failed of enactment in this Congress:

Hawaiian statehood: The House Rules Committee refused to consider the Senate version of this bill and the measure was thereby killed.

Taft-Hartley law amendments: The House Committee on Labor pigeonholed all bills designed to correct inequities in this labor law.

Wiretapping evidence: The Senate shelved the bill to permit the use of evidence gathered by wiretapping in criminal cases of treason, espionage, and sedition.

Constitutional amendment: The Senate defeated an amendment to lower the voting age from 21 to 18.

McCarran-Walter Immigration Act: No action was taken in this session to provide correction of inequities in this Immigration and Nationality Act.

The Congress failed also to adopt uniform rules of procedure to control the conduct of legislative investigating committees.

Health plan: This was actually a reinsurance plan. It provided a $25-million fund which would guarantee the losses to insurance companies by their expansion of voluntary health insurance. This bill was defeated in the House on the grounds that it was unworkable and inadequate.

SALARY INCREASE FOR FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

In an effort to obtain passage of a bill to increase first-class-postage rates, the Republican leaders in Congress tied this provision into the bill to increase the salaries of postal employees. The rate increase was originally contained in a separate bill but this measure had been unpopular in the House and the leadership felt that by including it in the popular pay-raise bill, the administration recommended rate increase would win support. Also included in the pay-raise bill was a provision giving the Postmaster General the authority to reclassify positions in the post office. The tactics used in the consideration of this legislation were unwise and, in my opinion, mere subterfuge. Those of us who voted against this bill did so with the understanding that this was not the only way to bring the postal pay-raise bill to the floor.

In the final days of the session, the Congress passed a bill granting a 5-percent pay increase to classified Government employees and postal workers. It was obvious to the supporters of this measure that the Republican leadership, in permitting the bill to be brought up in the final week of the session, did so in the complete knowledge that the President would veto the bill and, with the Congress in adjournment, there would be no opportunity to override his veto. I favored an increase in salary for Federal employees; I signed the petition to discharge the committee on the Corbett bill and I voted against adjournment of the session when an attempt was made in July to adjourn without giving consideration to the needs of our postal workers and other employees of the Government.

ANTISUBVERSION LAWS

The Communist threat is the basic problem of the whole free world. It should be faced squarely outside the realm of partisan politics because it undermines the foundation principles of our Government. Those ill-advised individuals who make it a political issue are playing into the hands of the Communists who view with equal hatred all freedom-loving individuals. The gravity of this menace warranted sincere consideration of anti-Communist legislation early in the session. Instead, bills were brought up near the end of the session, when debate was limited and amendments prohibited. The Congress enacted the following laws on the subject of internal security:

Making the death sentence instead of life imprisonment the maximum penalty for peacetime espionage and otherwise strengthening present law;

Outlawing the Communist Party and bringing Communist-infiltrated labor unions under authority of the Subversive Activities Control Board;

Increasing the penalty for harboring convicted felons;

Making bail jumping by Federal prisoners a separate offense and imposing stronger penalties;

Authorizing congressional committees to grant immunity to witnesses under certain conditions;

Revoking the citizenship of persons convicted of conspiring to advocate the overthrow of the United States Government by force or violence;

Denying retirement annuities to Federal officials convicted of Federal felonies or pleading fifth amendment;

Requiring all organizations required to register under the Internal Security Act to register with the Attorney General all printing and publication equipment.

When the administration-backed bill depriving Communist-infiltrated labor unions of their rights to collective-bargaining privileges reached the floor of the Senate, Democratic Members attached a rider outlawing the Communist Party and making membership in it a crime. This was passed by the Senate, with the vote 85 to nothing. In the House the bill to outlaw the Communist Party was passed. I am recorded for this bill. In conference the bill was changed, and, when finally enacted, the Communist Party was outlawed, but membership in it was not declared a crime. Instead, individual members of the Communist Party were put under obligation of registering with the Government or being subject to fine and imprisonment. Under the Internal Security Act, Communist-action groups had already been thus listed.

Let us recall the bitter criticism by the Republicans of the foreign policy of the previous Democratic administrations. The Republicans pledged that communism would be stopped; that Soviet-dominated nations would be liberated; that the United States would have a new, dynamic foreign policy.

What is the record of the past 2 years? As a result of the unsatisfactory truce in Korea, the Communists control the northern sector. This success of the Soviet strategy for world conquest permitted the buildup of forces in Indochina and the catastrophe of the century—the partition of Vietnam with millions added to the tyrannical rule of communism. The so-called peace has been purchased at a dreadful price. Instead of a new, dynamic policy, the unity of the free world has been crumbling under this administration's leadership, and the nations of the world are seeking to appease rather than to retard the Communists.

In addition to the Communist advances in Asia and the weakening of Allied unity in Europe, the Western Hemisphere is facing a grave threat in Central America—Guatemala. In spite of these advances, military appropriations were cut back, funds were decreased for the mutual-security program—including point 4—and for anti-Communist propaganda. All this in a world where the Soviet Union is bending every effort to launch a successful large-scale propaganda campaign.

I believe in a careful spending of the taxpayers' money, and I have great concern that a sound economic policy be established, but I do not believe that drastic cuts in defense should be made at the expense of the security of the United States. The failure of the New Look is admitted. The bluff of "massive retaliation" did not work. As a result, the National Security Council has ordered several groups of experts to analyze the plan of United States strategy in its military, economic, and diplomatic phases. This is the reappraisal. It is predicted that the agonizing result will be a sizable increase in security spending because of the great advances of the Communists.

Russia has not increased her divisions but has mechanized them with the most advanced equipment. Meanwhile, the United States has lulled herself into a cruising speed in order to balance the budget and is depending upon retaliation with the bomb.

Today the world is at a critical period. Each day brings about problems which can be faced only by a responsible citizenry. It is urgent that each one bear his responsibility with a sense of understanding based on equity. One must always bear in mind the common good—the common goal. In this way the principal figures in public life throughout the world will be given the help they need to bear their extraordinary burdens. We, as Americans, are singularly blessed because loyal citizens of this free country can help to make the world a better place for everyone. That is why I, as a legislator, want to emphasize this fact: achievements must be viewed as to whether they are contributions toward our ultimate goal, or whether they are roadblocks which may be used as a breathing spell for our enemies.

Whether we like it or not, America cannot stand alone in a place of isolation. Scientific accomplishments have taken us out of the stronghold to which we once adhered. Knowing this, we cannot be optimistic about a world where the resolution of so many grave problems is still pending. An uneasy truce in Korea, the unhappy settlement in Indochina, and the growing menace of communism are not accomplishments. They constitute a serious challenge to be faced only with forthright decisions by all Americans and the free world. We must not only pray for peace, but pray for a peace under God, for without God there can be no just peace.

Russian Air-Atomic Power Growing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, today, we and all freedom-loving peoples find ourselves gravely threatened by the force of aggressive Soviet communism. This is not the first time our Nation has been threatened by external foes. We have prevailed before—and we will prevail again.

Let us recognize, however, the unique dimensions of the threat now confronting us. In the form of the Soviet dictatorship, we face an enemy whose mad ambition is the domination of our entire planet. In the eyes of the Russian rulers, peace—if by peace we mean the absence of actual armed conflict—is but a breathing spell which must be used to prepare for fresh aggression. Moreover, the Russian rulers now have at their command a growing stockpile of atomic and hydrogen bombs, plus the planes needed to carry these weapons to targets here in America. In short, a totalitarian regime whose aim is the total conquest of the entire world is coming into the possession of total military power.

Reflect with me for a moment on how atomic weapons have changed the strategic position of our Nation. Up to now, our American atomic stockpile has been probably our greatest material asset in our effort to prevent the outbreak of a third world war. We and our allies have not begun to match the Communist world in number of men under arms. Yet our atomic preponderance has served to offset this disadvantage—we have canceled out Communist superiority in raw brawn power with the superiority of our air-atomic power.

So long as we possessed a monopoly in atomic and hydrogen weapons, it was reasonable to hope that the fact of our monopoly could indefinitely deter the Soviets from launching an all-out war. But we have such a monopoly no longer. In 1949, the Russians tested their first atomic bomb—sooner, much sooner, than most of us had expected. A year ago this month, the Russians also achieved a thermonuclear—a hydrogen—explosion, only 9 months after our own first full-scale hydrogen test. As if this were not enough, we learned this spring of the existence of two new Soviet jet bombers, comparable to our own B-47 and B-52. Once more, most officials in Washington were surprised at the speed with which the Russians mastered the art of producing high-performance bombers.

The meaning of these ominous increases in Russian air-atomic power for our strategic position in the world should be plain for all to see. In World War I and World War II, the cities and industries of America enjoyed immunity from direct enemy attack—thanks to the 3,000 miles of ocean which separated us and our enemies in Asia and Europe. When we found ourselves at war, we therefore still had time to convert our unrivaled economy to the production of armaments, and—despite initial setbacks—to triumph in the end.

Today, bombers now actually in the Red Air Force can take off from Russian bases and reach the cities of America in a few hours. Carrying the nuclear bombs which are today actually in Russia's stockpile, such planes might devastate our Nation and keep up from undertaking the industrial mobilization which made possible our victory in the First and Second World Wars.

I am sometimes forced to believe that too many Americans are whistling in the dark when they speculate on the consequences of a nuclear attack against our Nation. Perhaps this is not too surprising except for those of us who have served in the Armed Forces, or who have seen the devastated cities of Europe or Japan, few of us can comprehend the effects of even a World War II blockbuster bomb—which contained, at most, a few tons of TNT. How, then, can we comprehend the real meaning of atomic and hydrogen weapons—whose destructive force is measured in thousands or millions of tons of TNT equivalent.

Think back for a moment to the destruction inflicted on Germany and Japan during World War II. Today, as a result of the development of hydrogen weapons, a single plane—on a single mission—can carry a cargo of destructive force greater than the force of all the bombs dropped by all the planes on all of Germany and Japan during all the 6 years of the Second World War.

I am not sure how many of you witnessed, in the movie theater or over your television screen, the pictures of our first full-scale hydrogen test, held at our Pacific proving grounds in the fall of 1952. The effects of that hydrogen explosive extended over an area covering 300 square miles. If a weapon of equal destructive force were dropped over St. Louis, that city would cease to exist. It is as simple and terrible as that.

One thing is certain. All our history proves that, when the American people are acquainted with the hard facts of national survival, they measure up to them. It is not in our American tradition to turn our backs upon reality, and to close our eyes to it. We cannot wish Russian atomic and hydrogen bombs out of existence. They are real, appallingly real.

I believe it is high time that the American people be told more about the nature of the atomic peril now facing us, and about what we must do to overcome it. Do not mistake my meaning. It is vital that atomic secrets be kept closely guarded. The American people neither want to know nor need to know the secret details of our national atomic program. But they do want—and they do need—to know the precise nature and dimensions of the threat now facing our country.

Our civil-defense officials, I hasten to add, have said many times that a Soviet nuclear attack could now inflict grave damage upon our Nation and that the capacity of the Russians to wound us is rapidly increasing. But the real meaning of these abstract phrases has somehow not been driven home to the people. Our fellow countrymen do not yet really know, in terms they can really understand, the calamitous nature of atomic warfare. I do not say this in any partisan sense, since I can sympathize with the difficulties of bringing this message home. Nonetheless, I urge with all the power at my command that the administration now leave no stone unturned in getting across to all Americans throughout the length and breadth of our land the true meaning of the ominous growth in Soviet air-atomic power.

I reject the notion that atomic war is inevitable. But in the same breath I warn you that atomic war could be made inevitable by the weakening of our resolve to remain militarily and economically strong and by any faltering in our determination to help other free nations help themselves in our common task of standing up to aggressive communism.

Do all of us regret the necessity of using our moneys, our skills, and our resources to manufacture armaments? Of course we do. But all recorded history shows that dictators have only contempt for military weakness. If we now make the mistake of failing to build the defenses we need to stay alive and free, we may never have a chance to correct this mistake.

Strong military defense is a strong offense. The first military requirement of national survival is therefore an air force capable of answering any nuclear attack against us with devastating atomic reprisal. Our military posture must be such that an aggressor will know an atomic attack against the cities of America would mean the inevitable ruin and downfall of the dictator who perpetrated it. We must not stop there, however. The threat of atomic retaliation must remain the foundation of our national military strategy in this nuclear age. The threat of reprisal—by itself—is not enough. We also need—if it is possible to secure them—a continental defense and civil defense of such efficiency that our enemies will know that an atomic attack—even a sneak attack—could never destroy us.

All of us hope that the fear of reprisal will serve to keep our enemies from striking. But we can never be sure this will be the case. Therefore, if our enemies do strike, we need a continental defense program capable of intercepting and destroying attacking bombing fleets, and a civil defense program capable of minimizing the consequences of the bombs which penetrate our defenses and fall on our cities. In fact, an offensive continental and civil defense—coupled with maintaining our capacity of retaliation—represent our best and surest way of preventing a nuclear attack. The reason for this is apparent. If our foes know that we can blunt the power of their offensive against our Nation, and destroy the industries of their nation at the same time, they may choose never to strike.

Do we have an offensive defense today. The answer is "No." Today, we could in all probability destroy not more than a small fraction of any hostile aerial fleets which might be sent against our country. Will we have an effective continental and civil defense 3 or 4 years from now, in 1957 or 1958? Unless there is a bold stepup in our programs in the meanwhile, the answer must again be "No." It is true that new inventions in the field of guided missiles and radar detection are improving our ability to intercept enemy bombing planes. But our defenses are growing more slowly than the growth which is now taking place in Russian offensive strength. Soviet scientists are feverishly working to develop more powerful and more efficient nuclear bombs. The result is that, without a stepup in our own defensive preparations, an attack against us 3 or 4 years from now would be far more devastating than an attack today.

In this age of offensive missiles, hydrogen bombs, and jet bombers flying at almost the speed of sound, no defense against air attack can even begin to be 100 percent effective. Yet there is much we can do—and must do—to achieve a higher level of continental defense than we enjoy presently. If we now stepup the rate of our defensive preparations—without diminishing our offensive strength—we may have it in our power to create a continental defense of such efficiency as to tip the balance against war and for peace.

Let us never make the mistake, however, of imagining that the threat of air-atomic attack is the only danger now confronting us—though it is by far the greatest danger. We must reckon with the tremendous conventional military forces of the Red army and the satellite nations. We must also reckon with the fact that the Communists are adept in using the techniques of subversion, infiltration, propaganda, and political, and economic warfare to achieve their ends.

When we say that the Communist threat is a total threat, we should not be blind to the full meaning of that phrase. To meet a total threat we must develop a total response. As in the case of the downfall of Czechoslovakia, communism often achieves its ends through political infiltration—and you cannot stop infiltration with an atomic bomb. Today untold numbers of misguided people throughout the world have been duped by the vicious outpourings of the Moscow propaganda machine—and you cannot counter lies with atomic bombs. Today also millions of people in Asia and Africa—lacking the elementary necessities of a life of dignity—have been tempted to cast their lot with the way of Moscow—and you cannot fill empty stomachs with atomic bombs.

I have spent my entire period as a United States Congressman working for the military defenses our country needs if it is to survive. I, nonetheless, tell you most solemnly that armed strength, standing by itself, cannot bring to this world a just and lasting peace. We of this free-world civilization know that in its fundamentals the wanting and maintenance of true peace depends, not on things material but on things spiritual. We know that the only lasting foundation of true peace is the brotherhood of man. We also know that material forces—even the terrible forces of atomic energy—cannot be held accountable for the plight in which the world now finds itself.

Like any other force in the physical world, atomic energy is indifferent to the hopes of man. Like every other force in the physical world, atomic energy is neither good nor is it bad. It is for man to choose whether the atom will be used to lighten man's burdens and to improve our material lot here on earth or whether it will be used to destroy man. The identical atomic material which, in the form of atomic bombs, can lay our cities waste is the same material which, in the form of fuel for peacetime atomic-power reactors, can bring new riches, new dignity, and new hope to the peoples of the world. Every pound of uranium-235—the material which can be used either in an atomic bomb or in a power reactor capable of lighting cities and running the wheels of factories—contains more energy than 2½ million pounds of coal. This incredible fact will be the key to a world in which civilization as we know it will be destroyed or to a world made richer beyond the wildest dreams of our forefathers.

Within the next decade, our country will have in actual operation several atomic power reactors which will be actually producing electricity. In time, atomic power will provide an important supplement to our coal, oil, and hydroelectric resources. Our Nation, however, is uniquely endowed with great quantities of cheap natural fuels which can be used in power-production. Other nations are far less fortunate. For such nations, atomic power will represent a God-given opportunity to raise standards of living.

I am sure I voice the deepest thoughts of every person here today when I say that we Americans stand ready to share the benefits of the peacetime atom with all those who share our vision of a better world. Last December, when President Eisenhower addressed the United Nations and expressed our willingness to explore with other nations the possibility of using the atom in a common fight against common enemies of all mankind—poverty and disease—I believe he spoke for the conscience of all America. It now appears all too clear that the Russian rulers would be unwilling to join in a peacetime international atomic energy agency, and to assure the minimum requirements of membership in such an agency. This fact, however, need not keep us from joining with the free nations in such an international pool. I earnestly hope that President Eisenhower will now move affirmatively and vigorously to bring such an international atomic energy agency into being.

The prospect of international regulation of nuclear weapons, and all other weapons as well, now appears dim. But let us never cease hoping—and working—for that goal. If all the energies now expended on the output of the tools of war could somehow be diverted to a crusade against poverty and want, the consequences would stagger the imagination. Were this to happen, those who follow us might be able to look upon a world transformed. They might be able to look upon a world in which, thanks to the atom, the age-old poverty of Asia and Africa was conquered—a world in which, thanks again to the atom, the scourge of cancer was eliminated. Almost a century ago, when our Nation was locked in a terrible struggle which pitted brother against brother, Abraham Lincoln spoke to his fellow countrymen in words whose wisdom has not been diminished by the passage of time. He said: "We cannot escape history." He said, "We will be remembered in spite of ourselves."

Neither can we Americans of this generation escape history. We, too, will be remembered in spite of ourselves. We in America represent the last bright hope of the decent people of the world for a better tomorrow. This responsibility has been thrust upon us, and we cannot evade it—even if we would.

Let us therefore now pledge our minds, our hearts, and our souls to the great task of this generation—building the better world of tomorrow.

More About the Anti-Communist Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to add to the Record, the following editorial from the Charlotte (N. C.) News:

Usher L. Burdick and Abraham Multer

Seventy-six years ago Usher L. Burdick was born near the little town of Owatonna, Minn. He moved with his parents to the prairies of Dakota Territory, where he helped on the farm and learned the Sioux language. He was an end for Minnesota's galloping Gophers in 1903 and 1904, when they won Big Ten championships. He earned a law degree and by 1907 was in the North Dakota State Legislature. He went through the rough and tumble life of North Dakota politics as a member of that storied combination of ornery, unconventional, independent northwesterners, the Nonpartisan League and as a member of the Republican Party. He wrote books about the Sioux, range cattle, and farm political action. He has been in Congress since 1934.

He was a grown man when Abraham Multer was born in New York City. Multer went to Public School 80 on Coney Island, Boys High School in Brooklyn, and night school at City College, then on to Brooklyn Law School for his law degree. He was a joiner, active in the affairs of his synagogue, Tammany Hall, the Flatbush Boys Club and a host of civic and philanthropic organizations. He served as counsel to many city, State, and Federal committees, had his own law firm and, in 1947, went to Congress.

The careers of these two men are thus strikingly dissimilar. But they, alone among the United States Senators and Representatives, had the courage to voice and vote convictions which their colleagues shared but feared to express when the measure to outlaw the Communist Party went before Congress.

"If you can do away with the Communist Party today," said Multer, "tomorrow you might do away with the Democratic Party or the Republican Party or any religious or social or business group."

"I am for freedom of speech, freedom of the press," said Burdick. "I am opposed to silence from fear, instead of reason."

Most Members of Congress knew that there are sufficient laws regarding Communist espionage and subversion now, and that the hastily contrived bill is likely to hinder more than it will help in the ferreting out of real subversives. They also knew that the bill was of questionable constitutionality, and posed a threat to non-Communist organizations. But, rather than try to explain that to the electorate, rather than to talk sense to the American people, they took the easy way out. "Look here," they can say, "at my vote against communism." Perhaps, they hope, if their constituents think about this vote they won't worry about the votes their Congressmen didn't cast in favor of a really effective program against world communism.

There is a measure of poetic justice in the fact that Democratic liberals, led by Senator Humphrey, decided to stiffen the anti-Communist Party bill, and thus cut the ground out from under the Republicans who had charged Democrats with "20 years of treason." As Senator George explained, "They [Republicans] brought in a political bill so we just put a little more politics into it." But the Congressmen who yielded to this temptation yielded considerable principle too. When the election is over, when hysteria subsides, many of these men will feel deservedly ashamed of their action. But not Usher Burdick, the nonpartisan leaguer, and Abraham Multer, of Tammany Hall.

Trading With Our Enemy, or Cutting Our Own Throats

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I include an excellent, thought-provoking editorial which appeared in the Omaha (Nebr.) World-Herald, It's Trading With the Enemy.

As you may know, I have always opposed trading with our enemies. The memory of American scrap iron—converted to bombs, bullets, airplanes, warships, and tanks by the Japanese—raining destruction on our boys during World War II is still very fresh in my mind.

Then, too, one of the major underlying reasons for the fall of Germany and Italy was the unrest from within resulting from lack of food and fuel. Remember how oppressing gasoline, sugar, coffee, meat, and other rationing was here in the United States? Compared to our enemies, we were eating and living like kings. It does not take much stretch of the imagination to fully realize the impact of shortages of any product in time of war.

Today we are faced with another enemy—an enemy which, in my opinion, is a greater menace to our liberties than the Axis Powers were. That enemy is communism—a tyrannical form of government which today has enslaved nearly half the population of the world. The natural resources of these countries are much greater than Italy's or Germany's. Should we provide our resources to help our enemies develop their resources? The answer is very obvious.

Of course, I realize there are some—especially those from the industrial East—who feel we must trade with Iron Curtain countries. Our productive ingenuity, our mass production unequaled anywhere in the world, has far outdistanced the demands of our people in the continual race of supply and demand in many instances. They feel our surpluses must be channeled to new markets. And these new markets, necessarily, are the present closed doors of Iron Curtain countries.

Also, there are those who feel coexistence is very necessary in the world today. They sincerely feel that world peace can be achieved through trading and becoming better acquainted with our enemies—both real and potential.

However, I feel we should take a realistic look at the whole picture, being objective and projecting into the future.

Since the end of World War II, our Nation has given away over $50 billion in foreign aid. Match that amount in military assistance and take an incalculable number for the lost lives and bloodshed in Korea. Add that up and you have the direct outlay in American dollars to foreign countries. It is a staggering figure, especially so when you look around and find that we have bought no friends.

Now, for the indirect outlay. Besides the tax dollars it is costing Americans, what is the amount we have lost in business to these countries we have persisted in building up. Some of these countries are stronger industrially today than they were before World War II. American business is beginning to feel the effect; throughout the world we are being underbid consistently. Countries which once imported our farm commodities have been subsidized by our funds and now are exporting the same products and competing with us for the world market. In other words, our acts have backfired on us; rather than developing markets, we have subsidized our competitors. We have, in effect, used our own tax dollars to cut our own throats.

Perhaps we, as the Congress of the United States, should take note of the World-Herald's suggestion that Congress give this an early and thorough airing. I am a firm believer that when you give the people the true facts, they are able to make the right decision. I, for one, feel we should bathe our entire Foreign Operations Administration in the spotlight of publicity and let the people know what they are paying for.

I commend to my colleagues the reading of the following editorial:

It's Trading With the Enemy

The Messrs. Harold Stassen and Sinclair Weeks have announced substantial changes in the rules which govern trade with the Iron Curtain countries.

With the Iron Curtain countries of Europe, that is. The regulations regarding the Reds in Asia remain unchanged.

In brief, the Messrs. Stassen and Weeks are taking a great many kinds of goods and materials off the strategic list and reclassifying them as nonstrategic.

Meaning what?

Simply that henceforth the United States and its dependents in Europe will be allowed to sell this reclassified stuff to Soviet Russia and her satellites.

In announcing the changes, Mr. Stassen was acting under the authority granted to the executive branch in the Battle Act. This act was intended to forbid American aid to countries which sell stuff of military value to the Reds. However, the administration was allowed to write its own definitions, and because of this and other gimmicks the act has been largely ineffective.

When this whole business was under discussion in Congress a few months ago, Senator FERGUSON, of Michigan, made the very sound observation that almost everything which is salable has military value. For example, a plan then under discussion would have permitted the sale of surplus American butter and cheese to Soviet Russia. Senator FERGUSON remarked that this would improve the Russian diet, and presumably reduce the general discontent. Since discontent is a military weapon of great importance, he reasoned, the trade in dairy products should not be permitted.

It is not necessary to go so far into the realm of the abstract, however, to question some of the decisions announced by Foreign Operations Director Stassen.

One of the materials liberated for free trade with the Red bloc is crude oil. Could a modern war be waged without it? And if a bountiful supply of it is made available to Russia by America's subsidized allies, is it not obvious that Russia will be made stronger—and more menacing?

Another liberated item is "nonmilitary tires." What in heaven's name are those? Does a tire know whether the person in the car above is a general or a fashion model? And if tires may be imported to meet Russia's civilian needs, does that not free Russian rubber and labor for the making of tires for jet bombers?

And what about the distinction between the European Red nations and the Asian Reds? Has Mr. Stassen not heard about the railroads which connect them all?

Obviously this whole matter should have an early and thorough airing by Congress.

It may be that the Messrs. Stassen and Weeks and others can make a case for the abandonment of all restrictions on trade with the Reds. If so, the Battle Act and other limiting legislation should be repealed forthwith.

But the issue should not be settled by executive nullification.

After all, the United States is still in a state of war with the Communists in Korea. It is well known that world communism comprises one huge economic complex. Trade with one part of it amounts to the same thing as trade with any other part.

Therefore any commerce with the Iron Curtain nations amounts to trading with the enemy—an issue of such commanding importance to the Nation, and to the conscience of the people, that only the people's Congress should pass judgment on it.

O'Fallon Centenary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial which appeared in a recent issue of the Belleville (Ill.) Daily Advocate. The editorial entitled "O'Fallon Centenary," follows:

O'FALLON CENTENARY

Next week O'Fallon celebrates the 100th anniversary of its founding.

That is a respectable span for any city.

What makes it especially noteworthy in the instance of O'Fallon is the fact that over the span of years, which included four major wars, it has shown a steady growth in population and in civic effort to attain high standards.

It began as a water tank whistle stop on a branch-line railroad.

The good Col. John O'Fallon, after whom it was named, is widely known for his philanthropies and justly remembered as a good man with a touch of greatness.

But when the Ohio & Mississippi Railroad set up a water tank and called it O'Fallon Station, neither the good colonel nor anyone else could have foreseen that it would expand into the present community.

However, this expansion began to be obvious in 1874 when it was incorporated as a village and still further appreciated when it assumed the status of a city in 1905.

The population, 3,022 by the 1950 census, an increase of 975 over the 2,047 of the 1940 census, consisted mostly of honest, earnest citizens who earned their bread and lodging by the sweat of their brows in the mines and at other lines of honorable but arduous toil.

It is a population which generally has a wholesome respect for the righteous things in life and a belief that the simple things are best.

We congratulate O'Fallon on attaining this centenary and anticipate for it greater things during the ensuing hundred years.

Crusaders Take the Rap—Gangsters Show Their Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, because some local, State, and Federal officers charged with the enforcement of the law are either incompetent or lack courage, those who are lawabiding, desire to see equal justice under the law enjoyed by all citizens, and who have the courage to fight the gangsters and corrupt politicians, all too often learn by bitter experience that the road which must be traveled by a courageous citizen seeking justice for his community is a rocky one.

A recent article in the U. S. News & World Report carrying an interview with MARTIN DIES, who, as chairman of a House committee, so courageously fought communism, demonstrates the truth of the above statement.

A recent editorial in the Saturday Evening Post, which I will read later, comments generally on this situation.

The recent vigorous and unfailing efforts of the Communists and of some internationalists to destroy JOSEPH MCCARTHY and any and all others who consistently speak out and act as courageous, patriotic Americans likewise demonstrate the power of some of those who would destroy us as a nation, impose a dictatorship by gangsterism upon communities throughout our land.

Then, there are a host of so-called little fellows who just cannot understand that in some local communities where law-enforcing officers are under the domination of the gangsters and the professional crooks, who must suffer personally if they challenge the forces of evil.

Let me give a recent illustration of a point I am trying to make.

I knew when I started the investigation into labor racketeering that the opposition would be both ruthless and powerful.

How ruthless the racketeering element and their allies can be is set forth in the article of Westbrook Pegler which appeared on August 4, 1954, which calls attention to the Chevlin case.

Unfortunately, the facts related in Mr. Pegler's article are correct.

Subcommittees of the Committee on Education and Labor and the Committee on Government Operations held joint hearings on labor racketeering in Kansas City last year. The entire construction industry in the metropolitan area of Kansas City was stopped by strikes. The basic reason for the strikes was gangsterism and racketeering which were dominant in a few unions to a degree that the more responsible leaders of other unions were unwilling to expose their members to beatings and violence by goons in order to exercise the privilege of working for a living. So business stopped, and a dark blanket of unemployment covered the Kansas City area.

One of the most courageous opponents of the racketeering element was Edward Chevlin. Mr. Chevlin is a tiny little man, well along in years. Goons, in the hire of the labor racketeers, had threatened, beaten, and abused him. We brought these professional beat-up artists before the committee. Many of them were huge, powerful men, some of them inches over 6 feet tall and weighing as much as 250 pounds. Little Mr. Chevlin still had the courage to testify before the committee.

The goons who threatened, beat, and abused Mr. Chevlin, and many others, have spent not a day in jail nor paid a dollar fine for their flagrant abuses of law and common decency. Neither have their bosses.

But because, when his life was threatened, he undertook to protect himself, Mr. Chevlin has been prosecuted and convicted by the Truman-Pendergast machine, sentenced to jail and fine, while many others guilty of violations were never prosecuted.

Mr. Pegler's article follows:

KANSAS CITY LABOR EXPOSÉ

(By Westbrook Pegler)

NEW YORK, August 3.—Such terms as "shocking," "disgraceful," and "corrupt" are trite and weak applied to the final result of a congressional exposé of union terrorism, graft, and sabotage of the national defense in Kansas City and vicinity.

The teamsters' union was the principal figure, but one union of heavy construction workers and a local of the American Federation of Labor electricians also were concerned. An association of contracting employers and many individual contractors engaged in Government armament construction jobs were involved, too.

The final result is that one union man who resisted gang rule within a local of the teamsters is the only person who has been sentenced to prison. He is Edward Chevlin. He was tried three times and finally got 6 months and a fine of $400 for theoretical felonious assault. The first two juries disagreed.

The Kansas City Star covered this reign of terror with both initiative and regular, heads-up reporting on the congressional hearings and the subsequent developments in the local grand jury and court.

ONLY ONE SENTENCE

On the day of Chevlin's conviction, Al Delugach, of the Star, wrote that "of all the county grand jury indictments returned last September, after an intensive labor investigation, one jail sentence has resulted—for Edward Chevlin, an outspoken foe of the ruling powers of the AFL teamsters' union. The circuit court docket, after 9 months, finally has been cleared. Under the jurisdiction of Richard K. Phelps, county prosecutor, the record includes one jury conviction."

Phelps, his office and the local courts are gears in the Truman-Pendergast machine.

So a man who fought the dictatorship which thrives under Dave Beck, the great labor statesman lavishly extolled by the Associated Press, the New York Times and Look magazine, goes to prison to add 6 months to 3 weeks that he spent in a hospital in February 1951 when he was slugged on the head.

HIT BY TEAMSTER BOSS

He said the man who hit him was Orville Ring, formerly president and business agent of teamsters' local 541 and boss goon of the whole sordid situation. Ring was indicted by the county grand jury on 2 charges of embezzlement, 2 charges of robbery, 2 charges of falsification of records, and 2 charges of felonious assault.

Phelps personally prosecuted Chevlin.

The prosecution of Ring and all other defendants who were prosecuted at all was done by his assistants. Chevlin had been a stand-up witness against the terror before two subcommittees of the House, which reported that the teamsters absolutely shut down the building industry in the Kansas City area, including important military preparations.

The committees' joint report said "violence has become the adjuster of these jurisdictional claims; force has replaced reason in the industry."

The Federal Department of Justice ignored this challenge to Government although it was not too busy to persecute New York and Chicago policemen for using their natural physical weapons, but not guns or blackjacks, to arrest wild drunks inciting to race riot and other disorderly characters who fought back when they were arrected in trivial incidents.

CLAMPED SHUT

In Detroit, teamsters' locals were shown up by Congressman CLARE HOFFMAN in fabulous rackets, including the jukebox and trotting-horse industries. But that investigation was suddenly clamped shut by a mysterious political decision in the Republican camp. Comparable conditions were disclosed in Ohio cities tributary to the Detroit jurisdiction and in Minneapolis.

And James Hoffa, a vice president of the national union and Dave Beck's regional satrap for the Midwest, with jurisdiction over 26 States, had general authority over all the depredations, including an insurance or welfare operation amounting to many millions of dollars. Beck, the great labor statesman, was at the top, claiming 3 million subjects.

Chevlin risked his life to fight gunmen in his union. He was used as a witness in the prosecution of Ring, the man who had slugged him. But when his own attorney tried to use the congressional committee report in his defense Circuit Judge Duvaul Strother ruled it out on the ground that it was inflammatory. Phelps, the prosecutor, objected to the use of this evidence in favor of a man whom his own office had used as a witness against Ring.

SHOWED REVOLVER

Chevlin's felonious assault consisted of brandishing a revolver to force his way through a group of men at the foot of the stairs as he left a violent meeting of teamsters' Local 838. He already had been beaten twice and fired upon. He had been witness to other beatings in the same union hall. His wife testified to telephone calls at night, warning her that her husband must not oppose Ring. On the night that he displayed the pistol two carloads of men followed Chevlin as he drove home.

Chevlin has been fighting rackets and gangsterism in the unions from within, as a member, for 30 years.

The clean sweep of the docket is a dramatic defeat of the public and Government by this unique American fascism. Here again the mob won in court and the victim got the works in Harry Truman's bailiwick.

WINT SMITH, of Kansas; WINGATE LUCAS, of Texas; and JEFFREY HILLELSON, a freshman representing Truman's home district, all Republicans, were associated with HOFFMAN in the futile exposé. Their counsel was William F. McKenna, who also ran the equally futile Detroit examination, and is now digging into the housing racket in Washington.

The editorial from the Post reads:

LEFTIES WANT NO NEW COUNT OF LOYALTY RISKS

On the political front, from last October to this March, the average person heard more numbers thrown around than he'd listened to since the annual report of the picnic committee at the Volunteer Firemen's Association. That was the time they had the argument over debits and credits, and nobody could figure whether the result showed a profit or a loss.

It all began on October 23, 1953, when White House Press Secretary Hagerty announced that up to that time 1,456 persons had been separated from the Federal service for security reasons. All but five, he said, were holdovers from the Truman regime. These figures were then used in speeches by Attorney General Brownell, Senator McCarthy, and Postmaster General Summerfield.

That started the uproar. The revelation in the President's state of the Union message that the total had then risen to 2,200 only increased the din. Columnists and commentators on the left spoke darkly of a "numbers racket" designed to show that the security problem was a GOP fiction. They pointed to Interior, where there had been, said a spokesman, only two security separations. Secretary Humphrey, of Treasury, said he didn't know of any in his Department. And what about Justice, supposed to have flunked only eight?

Besides, security did not always mean loyalty. It might just finger a guy you didn't want around for any one of half a dozen reasons. At once, snuffing victory, the lefties demanded a breakdown of the figures, appealing to Chairman Young, of the Civil Service Commission, to expose this unconscionable hoax. He promised to get one, but meanwhile the Appropriations Committee announced that in 1953 there had been 1,057 security dismissals, of which only 40 were loyalty risks.

The clamor on the left rose to a new high pitch of righteous wrath, calling on Chairman Young to hurry up with that breakdown, and warning the administration by no means to conceal the truth, however embarrassing.

Within the past few months there has come a sudden lull in the storm. You could hear pins dropping all over the place when Mr. Young released the official analysis of the CSC. It appeared that of the security separations in 1953 no fewer than 355 represented Federal employees invited to leave because their records showed subversive associations which raised a legitimate doubt of their loyalty. The infiltrators hadn't been as dead as the liberals said they were.

If there has been a crashing silence on the left, it's because the liberals never expected anything like 355 to come up in the loyalty column. They could hardly boast that there were only 355 potential traitors in Government jobs.

The Reed-Dirksen Tax Limitation Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. GWINN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, on April 27, 1954, I appeared before the Senate Committee on the Judiciary which was then holding hearings on Senate Joint Resolution 23, the so-called Reed-Dirksen tax limitation amendment. The underlying theory of the proposed amendment has my enthusiastic support as the following excerpts from my testimony indicate:

STATEMENT OF HON. RALPH W. GWINN, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF NEW YORK

We have been for some years, Mr. Chairman, in the House, submitting proposed constitutional amendments limiting the power of Congress to tax and spend and borrow.

One of those limits the total amount that Congress may tax and spend for the civilian purposes of Government to 2½ percent of the national income.

Excluding the military, veterans, and interest charges on the national debt 2½ percent of the national income, or roughly $7 billion will cover all legitimate civilian functions of the Government.

Another resolution limits the total tax that may be taken to one-tenth of the national income, which would be roughly $30 billion for all purposes, including war, veterans, and interest charges except that three-fourths of the membership of Congress may increase that percentage as an emergency such as war might require.

I appear for this resolution, the Dirksen-Reed resolution, because it, too, proposes to pull the purse strings and to take from Congress unlimited power to tax and spend. That is the only way to stop the socializing of our economy.

We thought we had defined and limited the functions of Government in the Constitution. The forefathers provided a second limitation on Congress by depriving it originally of the power to tax as we now have it.

Since we have broken down the constitutional limitation concept and Congress can do anything that it wants to do, provided it can find the money, we must provide a defense for ourselves.

We now have no defense as Members of Congress against the demands of a multitude of groups. Any group that is organized, and they seem to be coming up in increasing numbers, can come forward and say, "You gave these people houses across the street; you built power plants for this group in 1 or 2 or 10 States; you have made loans; you have given subsidies here, there, and yonder; now we have just organized the fruit industry, or the spinach industry, and we want subsidies for our group."

Congress is unable, so long as it has this unlimited power to tax, to defend itself against those groups. Nobody knows that better than the chairman.

We are not going to defend ourselves against any group so long as any group well organized can come to Congress and say, "You have done it for others, you must do it for us."

The equalitarian rule in politics is an absolute rule.

The Reed-Dirksen proposal limits the power to tax and relieves those who carry the principal burden of all taxes, viz, the workers who earn $5,000 or less. They pay about 85 percent of all taxes however levied.

This proposal is honest. It tells each group the truth of tax burdens it must bear. It reduces the amount all must pay. Instead of concealing or pretending to shift the burdens of taxes, it limits the total taxes for the benefit of all.

We have already limited State, county, and city taxes. By this proposed amendment, Congress, too, will be limited as the city council or the board of supervisors or the State legislatures are limited as to what they may tax, spend, or borrow.

We do not have socialism in Milwaukee or Bridgeport, although we elect a Socialist mayor. We do not have Communists and Socialists down at the city hall in our smaller political subdivisions for the simple reason that all those political subdivisions have exhausted the amount of money they have by the time they have provided for their streets, police, health, and education. They levy their 2½ percent on the real estate or their sales taxes, spend it all for their regular, constitutional functions and go home. Very few have income taxes, but even if they do, they are limited in functions so they can't go Socialist. They are all forced to spend whatever they have on their traditional services. They have nothing left for socialism. There is nothing left in the till, so Socialists and Communists do not hang around the tills. They go to Washington.

You find no group going down to city hall in any of our cities and saying, "We have organized a little group of voters in the east end that want some houses and we have 1,500 votes out there. If you will build us the houses we will deliver you votes."

It sounds absurd just because we have not done it in the cities where the money is. It is really absurd because we have done it in Washington where the money is not. If we are going to go Socialist or Communist why not go Socialist in the city where the money is?

I resent the Federal Government coming into Yonkers, taking $1,400 per family out of that community, bringing it down to Washington and mushing it around for an incredible period of time and then sending it back only 2 or 3 cents on the dollar to build houses or remove slums or make power or loans or gifts.

Now, we must limit the power of the Congress to do these outrageous things under pressure, to come into those communities to take the money away and then come back and say they are going to give us our dams, our power, our houses, our loans, our subsidies, or what not.

We cannot repeal the socialism that we have. The big argument for this type of legislation, it seems to me, is that by constitutional procedure an overall limitation on all functions of Government is provided. No particular group getting special benefits will be hurt while the others will continue to receive their special benefits. All will be treated alike. All will be deprived of special privilege and the free economy thus restored at once. We must resort to constitutional procedures to restate the theory of government for all because Congress cannot repeal our Socialist measures one at a time.

We cannot say to any group, "Come up to the mourner's bench now and confess your sins and give up your loot that you are getting."

I have tried it. I have talked to the farmers in Indiana, in Iowa, and Nebraska only last week. They say, "We know this is bad. We are not comfortable about taking this money, having our corn and wheat put in the cribs and bins to be owned in common. We don't believe in Government-owned or communal corn, wheat, cotton, and all the rest. But don't talk to us about giving up our particular benefits so long as the other groups are getting theirs."

So Congress is in the hopeless situation of being unable to repeal laws one at a time and restore our constitutional limited functioning voluntarily.

Until we restate the constitutional theory of government and limit its taxing and spending power Congress will go on and on voting special favors for one group after the other. Each group will insist upon getting theirs for no other reason than that the others are getting theirs.

The gentleman, Mr. Ruttenberg, suggested that many of these things ought to be decided at the ballot box. You cannot decide these questions at the ballot box. You cannot even frame the questions to go before the people in a vote.

How absurd it would be to say to the people, how many houses do you want? How many loans would you like to have? How many dams do you want? How many subsidies, this, that, and the other.

Mr. RUTTENBERG. You got a vote on the wheat quota restrictions.

Representative GWINN. We certainly did. Seven to one.

Mr. RUTTENBERG. Overwhelmingly for it.

Representative GWINN. That is right. That does not make it right.

Mr. RUTTENBERG. That is what the people want.

Representative GWINN. But when the people are in the position I described of having to get theirs because the others are getting theirs, you don't have a democratic election process of a constitutional character; you have an auction. Our candidates on the Federal side are traveling across this country now in contrast with our local, State and county and city candidates for office, saying, "How much do you bid for the vote of Tennessee in terms of appropriations for Tennessee Valley for the 20th year straight on end? How much for the subsidies for wheat in Kansas?" and so on, State after State after State.

Our Federal candidates are in this humiliating position of trying to outbid the other candidates for the vote.

That, I submit, Mr. Chairman, is not a free election in a free country. It is not a constitutional republic functioning at all.

It makes our party system ridiculous and it already indicates that we are at the point where we must do away with the party system if we are going to have that kind of bidding for largesse from the Treasury.

The proposed amendment before the committee, as I understand it, is an effort to restore the constitutional theory of government, Mr. Chairman. We have no theory now. Each day we operate according to the day's needs or pressures. We have no constitutional limitation on what we may do.

It is just as if we were going to court each day with no theory of contract or tort or equity by which to resolve the questions before the court.

It is even suggested that we submit everything to the vote of the jury, including the validity of the contract itself. We are in that impossible position in Washington today.

Now, if the constitutional or contract theory of government can be restored by limiting the amount of taxes that can be collected to the point where the taxes collected will be exhausted when the traditional functions of the Government are provided for, then we will restore the republic by that process.

With this evil progressive tax we now have, the Senators in 1913 predicted when the 16th amendment was proposed just exactly what has happened. I would like, Mr. Chairman, to give you some interesting excerpts from the debates.

Many of them predicted that this was the beginning of the socialization of our economy. Congress would have no limitation on its power to tax and therefore would be undefended by constitutional limitations on what could be demanded of them.

The attitude of the American people regarding income taxes prior to the passage of the 16th amendment deserves more study than it has received. Most of us are familiar with the incident that occurred in Congress wherein one Member of that body was derisively hooted down when he predicted that the rates of the proposed income tax might conceivably reach 10 percent of a man's income. His fears came to pass at the early date of 1918, just 5 years after the 16th amendment became law. In 1918 the maximum rate of the tax climbed to 69 percent.

Justice Brewer of the United States Supreme Court, speaking at a graduation exercise in Oregon said this:

"We shall probably have an income tax. They will amend the Constitution so as to permit it. None of us are very long remembered but if I should be remembered at all, I should like to be remembered for my position on this question. Let me indulge in a little prophecy. * * * We shall have, as I remarked, an income tax. It will turn out to be the greatest incentive to extravagance the world has ever seen. The boys on Capitol Hill will think that they can put the screws on a comparative few without endangering their popularity, and they will increase the pressure and squeeze until there is nothing left to squeeze."

Congressman Sereno Payne, of New York, speaking on the floor of the House on July 12, 1919, made this observation:

"The character of the argument which has been made, that this tax is for use in time of war, leads me to observe that the chief purpose of the tax is not financial but social. It is not primarily to raise money for the state, but to regulate the citizen and to regenerate the moral nature of man. * * * You are creating here an ideal condition for corruption and for the political Jack Cade of the future to levy blackmail."

Both Justice Brewer and Congressman Payne proved to be good prophets. Income-tax rates are now at the confiscatory level of 91 percent of the incomes in the highest tax bracket and the money is used to institute a new social order. Under this social order, or New Deal as it has been called, certain of the citizenry are provided with low-rent housing, cheap power, subsidies, handouts, and the myriad other characteristics of the socialized state. The cost of the largesse is distributed among the rest of the people who are told that the program is necessary to improve the living conditions and thus the morals of the few to be benefited. The extent of this robbing of a thousand Peters to pay a few Pauls is only limited to the notions of virtue at the moment prevailing in Washington.

Now such a program is doomed to fail. It has failed. A few examples will indicate the extent of the failure. TVA is one of the pet schemes of the socializers, who justify this vast monopoly by the low rates at which it sells the power it produces. Those cheap rates are only possible because the people of 41 States are compelled to pay each year $150 to $200 millions to TVA to make up the deficits incurred in its operations. It is further subsidized by complete exemption from local, State, and Federal taxes. Those facts are common knowledge. It is not widely known, however, that statistics prove that the productivity of the people in Tennessee has severely declined since the advent of TVA. The natural consequence of that loss is that they become ever more dependent on the Federal dole.

Public housing is another example. Again it is common knowledge that Government housing units are paid for out of general funds and are tax exempt. But the Socialists justify public housing because it tends to decrease crime rates. The facts prove them wrong. In the city of Los Angeles, according to police records, the incidence of crime in the public housing developments is 96 percent greater than in the slums themselves and 1,000 percent greater than in private housing developments.

One of the characteristics common to the socialistic projects is the exemption from taxation enjoyed by them. Thus a Government project appears to operate more cheaply and efficiently than the private enterprises with which it competes. The fallacy of the reasoning is obvious of course. The practical results of the fallacious reasoning are not always immediately apparent and thus responsible citizens are often not aroused until they are faced with the accomplished fact of the socialistic state. It is brought about in this manner:

Suppose X represents a Government project such as TVA, which is tax exempt and subsidized from tax revenues. Let Y represent a private enterprise in competition with X and which pays the taxes necessary to subsidize X. Now it is fundamental that X can operate only as long as Y operates and pays taxes. In order that the existence of X can be justified, it must be able to sell its product more cheaply than Y, and in so doing, X attracts business away from Y. Y, faced with this loss of business, while its operating costs and tax burden remain constant, is forced to go out of business. Result—abolition of private enterprise and complete Government monopoly which is now in a position to charge whatever it wishes for its product. X can now charge three, ten, or a hundred times more for its product than Y and could in a free economy. Witness what has happened in Russia. In any event, X must now base its prices on the actual costs of production since taxes from Y can no longer hide the deficits.

There is another result of this evil cycle. So long as customers of X can get a product at half cost, an exaggerated demand for the product will be created. The demand will increase so enormously that the whole community will be threatened with a shortage of the product and the Government cannot tax Y fast enough to meet the abnormal demand.

What I have just described is not just theoretical. It has happened. When TVA went into the Tennessee Valley, 21 private power companies were forced out of the area. Today the people of Tennessee must pay whatever rates TVA may see fit to exact. What those rates would be if the TVA were run as an honest business and could not depend on the annual subsidy from Congress, I leave to your imagination.

Further, the cheap power produced and sold by TVA has led its consumers to abandon the use of coal and oil as fuel, and has created such a tremendous demand for the cheap electricity, that there is a serious shortage of power in the TVA area.

There is an estimated $19 billion worth of taxable property in the city of New York. Of this amount $7 billion, including public housing and the subway system, is tax exempt and the city is now in desperate financial straits because it can find no more ways to tax the Y's that are still in business.

The subway system in New York City is classic instruction in the lessons of socialism. The subways are owned and operated by the city and the whole system is tax exempt. For years the nickel fare was cited as proof of the proposition that government-owned and operated transportation was the best, cheapest, and most efficient transportation. But what has happened? The rolling stock has become old and needs replacement. The fare has gone from a nickel to a dime to 15 cents and a 20-cent fare is probable. The service often leaves much to be desired. The city cannot raise any more revenues for further subsidies since it has reached the maximum rate level of 2½ percent on the assessed valuation of taxable property in the city. The State legislature in Albany has refused city requests for further State aid. Thus the millions of New Yorkers who must depend on the subway for their daily transportation are faced with the grim prospect of riding in ancient trains and paying higher and higher fares.

The corruption and crime in New York City is well known. But at least the amount of waste, graft, and corruption is limited to tolerable proportions by the municipal charter which limits taxes to 2½ percent of the assessed valuation and city debts to 10 percent of such valuation. The Federal Government is under no such prohibition, and consequently the possibilities of graft, waste, and corruption are unlimited. The exposures of the corruption that have already taken place should not have surprised anyone. They were inevitable, for if money is taken forcibly from the people of Massachusetts to provide cheap power for the people of Tennessee, it is perfectly obvious that everyone connected with the administration of that operation is tempted to graft, waste, and steal. For if Government is dishonest and immoral it follows that those who conduct the affairs of Government are or will become dishonest and immoral.

This proposition is proved in the case of public housing. There is no morality in a transaction where private property is taken from one group to provide half-cost tax-exempt housing for another group, with schools, streets, and police thrown in for free. Witness the current exposures and scandals of FHA. Yet the apologists for socialized housing and similar schemes find nothing immoral in this. Their thesis is simply that these dishonest schemes fail merely because they cannot get honest administrators. That is the same as saying that the only thing wrong with the narcotics traffic is that Lucky Luciano conducts it.

The immorality of public housing and the corruption of its administrators is bad enough, but there is yet a greater evil, and that is the corruption of the tenants. The regulations in effect at a public housing development in Houston, Tex., allow each apartment one illegitimate child; but if the offense should be repeated, the whole family must move out, the innocent as well as the guilty. Now isn't it perfectly obvious from this illustration that as the Government undertakes to provide near-free housing, cheap power, and the like, for the people, in that very process the Government becomes the sole arbiter of what is moral, of what is right and wrong?

The bins, cribs, and storage facilities of the Nation are bulging with communal agricultural property, the purchase price of which was wrongfully taken from the taxpayers. Now we don't know what to do with the ill-gotten goods that remain after the rats and mildew have done their work. It is even suggested that the cure for this immoral consequence of the original immoral act is to sell our communalized butter at 30 cents per pound to our brothers and sisters in Russia suffering from the poor production of their particular kind of communism, while our own taxpaying housewives must pay 80 cents per pound.

The charge that the income tax leads to socialism and communism was advanced at a very early date. Senator Bartlett in 1894 said the following on the floor of the Senate:

"Mr. Chairman, this is not democracy; it is communism. * * * Such a road leads on to the social conditions of semibarbarous countries, where no one dare show any sign of the possession of wealth unless he be in a position to heavily bribe Government officials."

On April 9, 1894, Senator Hill, of New York, branded the proposed income-tax law "a step toward socialism." He said:

"It is charged agains the friends of a Federal income tax that they are artfully driving a thin edge of a wedge to offset a forced redistribution of property. * * * Taxation of all sorts, taxation at every turn, taxation upon income, with all the necessary bureaucracy, machinery, and inquisition, has long been the appropriate and most perfect instrument with which European governments have multiplied their functions and prolonged their supervision, their control, their repression of the people's doings."

Joseph Choate, noted attorney who argued for the appellants in the famous case of *Pollock* v. *Farmer's Loan and Trust Company*, made this argument when appearing before the Supreme Court:

"The act of Congress which we are * * * [attacking] * * * is communistic in its purpose and tendencies as is defended here upon principles so communistic, socialistic * * * as ever have been addressed to any political assembly in the world."

The question of limiting the power of the Government to tax received attention in the 1913 debates regarding the income tax. Listen to the exchange between Senator Weeks, of Massachusetts, and Senator Norris, of Nebraska:

"Senator Weeks. I would like to ask the Senator from Nebraska where we are likely to stop in the unequal taxation which is proposed in this income tax provision, and I think the country would like to know where the limit is to be placed. Are we to adopt the suggestion of the gentlemen to whom I refer that eventually if a man has $100,000 income we will take one-half of it, on the theory that he will have enough left, or are we to approach this subject in moderation and determine where we can get the most income with the least danger of unduly sacrificing reasonable equality in our system of taxation?

"Senator Norris. The question of the Senator from Massachusetts could be raised every day upon a proposition to tax anything to raise revenue anywhere. You could ask, Where is the limit going to be? Every man must know that there is no limit."

Senator Norris' candor is engaging but his premise is faulty. There is a limit. That limit is reached when you tax the incentive for profit to death. That limit has been reached already. Everyone has heard or knows of cases where an individual simply ceases working for more than a certain salary on the grounds that his take-home pay is too small to be worth the additional effort. Such an attitude, had it existed earlier in our history would never have developed the tremendous, capitalistic industrial complex that characterizes America. Does anyone believe that Henry Ford would have built his empire if he had known that his personal income would be subject to a 91-percent tax and that his estate would be subject to a 77-percent bite? Or even if he were personally willing, does anyone believe that he could have succeeded had he been subject to such rates? Of course, if the premise is that America does not need men like Henry Ford, or that large private industry is undesirable, the question becomes academic.

The proponents of the amendment to limit the power of the Federal Government to tax, borrow, and spend have several reasons for their proposal.

1. Encourage the profit incentive of American ingenuity.
2. Reduce the number of Federal employees.
3. Eliminate bureaucracy as far as possible.
4. Reduce the possibilities of graft, waste, and corruption in the Federal Government.
5. Reassert the jurisdiction of the States over matters of State concern, i. e., redefine the concept of the division of powers.
6. Use tax moneys for the benefits of those communities which paid the taxes.
7. Return to the philosophy of taxation for raising revenues and not as a device to accomplish political and social ends.
8. Get the Federal Government out of competition with private enterprise.
9. Eliminate subsidizing special groups at the expense of the whole Nation.
10. Return the Federal Government to its legal and moral functions of preserving the peace and protecting the life, liberty, and property of its citizenry.

Most of the 10 propositions have been already discussed but I would like to say just a few additional words about 2 of them.

The number of Federal employees totals today 2,361,057, costing in payrolls alone $10.5 billions annually. The number of employees in 1930 was 604,948, costing $1 billion and serving a population of 123,191,000. Stated in percentages, the population of the United States increased 30 percent between 1930 and 1954 while the number of Federal employees increased 300 percent; the payroll increased 900 percent. If the number of Federal employees had increased in direct proportion with the increase in population, the figure would be around 900,000, costing an annual $5 billion. I submit 900,000 employees is enough to administer the proper functions of the Federal Government.

The 16th amendment, more than anything else, is responsible for the complete breakdown of the traditional American concept of the division of powers. It must be remembered that the founders of the Republic intended the Constitution to be a contract between the States and the Federal Government wherein the latter was given only such powers as were surrendered by the former. The bulk and residue of governmental power was intended to remain in the hands of the States. The tremendous revenues made possible by the income tax has been used to bribe the States to surrender practically all of their remaining powers. The device used is the now familiar Federal grant-in-aid. The States today are mere agents of the Federal Government. The prostitution of the States is so complete that only very little Federal money is required in many cases to keep the States quiescent. For example, in the year 1953, the Bureau of Internal Revenue collected $12,996,197,025 in the State of New York. During that same year New York received from the Federal Government the princely sum of $286,076,374, representing a 2.20-percent return. I have no doubt if the above figures had been available to the people of New York in 1789, they would never have ratified the Constitution of the United States. Certainly they would never have consented to the proposition that the boundaries of New York State were to be only convenient geographical aids without any political significance.

Mr. Chairman, the history of the years that have transpired since the adoption of the 16th amendment, and particularly the last 25 years, present powerful, persuasive, and irresistible proof that the people must curb the powers of the Federal Government. Since it has been amply demonstrated that the Constitution as it now is written and interpreted is not sufficient, we must amend it, if constitutional government is to survive.

The principal threat to America is not Russian communism, but our own attempts at socializing the Nation. I frankly admit that I support this amendment because I view it as an instrument to dry up the socialistic swamp. If the Federal Government has only a limited amount of funds at its disposal, it will be deterred from embarking on any further socialistic ventures and will be compelled to abandon those to which it is already committed.

I will not admit that the concept of a constitutional republic is obsolete. I consider it my obligation and duty to preserve the Republic of the United States of America; it is not my obligation and duty to be party to any further attempts at sovietizing the Republic.

"The power to tax is the power to destroy"; it is the better part of wisdom to contain such power with the fetters of constitutional limitations.

It is appropriate to include in my remarks a story that Dean Clarence Manion, former dean of the Notre Dame Law School, tells, and which was recently placed in the Congressional Record. It goes like this:

"TEN WORDS

"I rode to Chicago on an airplane a short time ago with a very influential man from New York. I gave him this business all the way from LaGuardia Field to the Midway Airport. He sat silently, stoically listening and nodding. Finally he began to take notes. I felt encouraged, and gave him more; but when he left the airplane he gave me his notes. He said: 'Manion, watch your blood pressure, my friend.' He said: 'You can't do anything about this despotic trend. The fate of our civilization is in the cards. Here,' he said, 'is the 10-word cycle of civilization. It has happened to everybody; it will happen to us.' The 10 words burned themselves into my recollection.

"Do you know them? Ten short words—none of them very sweet.

"Civilization begins in 'bondage.' Bondage is word No. 1.

"And out of bondage comes 'faith in God,' word No. 2.

"And with faith in God comes 'courage,' and its comes from no other place. Courage is word No. 3.

"And with courage, men acquire their 'liberty,' No. 4.

"And after liberty comes 'abundance,' word No. 5.

"And then, after abundance, 'selfishness.'

"And after selfishness 'complacency.'

"And then after complacency, 'apathy.'

"And after apathy 'dependency,' the 'gimme' stage.

"And after that, back to bondage again: Bondage to bondage in 10 fateful steps.

"Where are we on this vicious circle of civilization? Would you hazard a guess? We have passed the point where faith gave us liberty and procured abundance. Are we in the stage of selfishness, or complacency, or apathy, or perhaps even dependency? God save the mark."

I want to conclude on a happier note than that which is struck by Dr. Manion's fatalistic little story. The brief interlude in man's political history alluded to in the 10 words as "liberty" and "abundance" is like the short time in the flight of a bird when it passes through a lighted room in its journey from outer darkness to outer darkness. That light is only effective as long as the walls keep out the overwhelming darkness. Even so, the light of liberty can only shine as long as the walls of constitutional limitations can deflect the surge of totalitarian darkness. The sole genius of the American political structure is its recognition of the immutable law that the degree of liberty of the individual is in direct proportion to the degree of restraint on governmental power.

This Nation was conceived in bondage, and was born when the chains of bondage were broken. Our constitutional shield has been battered and buffeted by those who would deliver us again into bondage, and it is time that we strengthen our defense by again reasserting the concept of constitutional limited government. If we do this we need not fulfill the prophecy of the 10 words, but remain forever in the lighted room.

I would like to insert in the Record as part of my remarks, the following survey compiled by the Tax Foundation, regarding debt limitations on the various States and the general remarks on this subject of Dean Clarence Manion, former dean of the Notre Dame Law School:

"Alabama: Governor may negotiate temporary loans up to $300,000 to meet treasury deficiencies. After 1933 no additional State debt is possible without a constitutional amendment.

"No amount beyond money on hand and appropriated shall be spent.

"Arizona: The State may contract debts for casual deficits up to a $350,000 total. Additional borrowings require constitutional amendments with retirement within 25 years specified.

"Legislature must provide for revenues, sufficient to meet the annual expenses of the State, including debt.

"Arkansas: Except for highway purposes, education, war pensions, and existing debts, the general assembly is prohibited from appropriating or expending more than $2½ million in any biennium which may be exceeded by three-fourths vote in both houses. Additional State debt must be approved by a majority of the voters at a general or special election.

"California: Legislature may create debt up to $300,000. Additional debt requires authorization by voters at an election and must be accompanied by provisions by which the principal and interest can be met within 75 years. A sinking fund also is required.

"If expenditures in the proposed budget exceed revenues, the governor must recommend additional revenue.

"Colorado: If the appropriations of the legislature exceed the total tax provided for by law additional taxes must be levied within the defined limits or the appropriations reduced.

"Limit of $3,015,000 by legislature permitted for public buildings, refunding, and casual deficits. Additional debt requires a constitutinal amendment. Existing amendments authorize highway bonds and earmark certain revenues.

"Connecticut: No applicable provision.

"Delaware: Debt may be created by concurrence of three-fourths of all members of each house.

"Florida: A constitutional amendment would be needed to create State debt.

"The legislature must provide for raising revenue sufficient to meet expenses and retire State debt.

"Georgia: Debt shall not exceed taxes lawfully levied each year; however, $500,000 is permitted to meet casual deficiencies, plus $3.5 million for school teachers' salaries. Additional indebtedness requires sanction by constitutional amendment.

"The legislature may make supplementary appropriations only when there is an un-appropriated surplus in the treasury or a tax to raise the money has been provided.

"Idaho: Appropriations or expenditures may not exceed the total tax unless provision is made to increase the tax within the overall limitation.

"Legislature can create debt of $2 million in aggregate for any purpose.

"At a general election the voters may authorize borrowing exceeding $2 million but these must be accompanied by measures to raise the necessary amount to pay interest and principal within 20 years.

"Illinois: Loans up to $250,000 are permitted to meet casual deficits. Additional borrowing must be submitted to the voters at a general election and receive the approval of a majority. Provision must be made for a tax to be levied sufficient to meet the interest payments, with the tax also approved by the voters.

"Approved by the voters.

"Appropriations may not exceed revenues, and all appropriations requiring money to be paid out of the treasury shall expire at the end of the fiscal period.

"Indiana: With passage of law, debt may be contracted for the purpose of meeting casual deficits in the revenue and to pay interest on the State debt.

"Additional debt must be authorized by a constitutional amendment.

"Iowa: Debts up to $250,000 are permitted to meet casual deficits. Other debts must be authorized by law which shall also provide revenues to meet interest and repay the principal within 20 years. Law creating additional debt and the tax for revenue to retire it must be approved by majority of votes cast in general election.

"Kansas: Debts up to $1 million are permitted for extraordinary expenses. Every other debt shall be authorized by a vote of the electors at a general election; such debts must be accompanied by provision for taxes to pay the principal and interest. Debt for highways is specifically prohibited.

"Kentucky: Debt not to exceed $500,000 may be contracted to meet casual deficits or failures in revenue. Additional debt, along with provision for a tax to pay principal and interest within 30 years, must be approved by majority vote at a general election.

"The legislature shall provide for an annual tax which, with other resources, meets the estimated expenses of each fiscal year.

"Louisiana: Borrowings to meet deficiencies in revenue are limited to $1 million during a fiscal year and cannot at any time exceed $2 million. Additional borrowings require constitutional amendment.

"Maine: Aggregate debt created by the legislature may not exceed $2 million. Additional debt must be approved by a majority of voters at a special or general election.

"Maryland: Legislature may borrow up to $50,000 to meet temporary deficiencies in the treasury. Additional debt may be authorized by the legislature, with a tax enabling retirement within 15 years. However, veterans' compensation bonds authorized by the legislature must be approved by the people.

"Revenues sufficient to cover appropriations must be provided.

"Massachusetts: The legislature may borrow in anticipation of revenues, with payment of the loan made within the year. Additional debt may be created by two-thirds approval of each house of the legislature.

"The Governor's budget must include taxes, revenues, loans, and other means to meet proposed expenditures.

"Michigan: $250,000 is debt limit to meet deficits in revenue. Fifty million may be borrowed for highways.

"The legislature must provide an annual tax, sufficient, with other resources, to pay estimated expenses, interest on debt, and deficiencies that occur in resources.

"Minnesota: For meeting extraordinary expenses, up to $250,000 may be borrowed by law which shall include a tax sufficient to retire debt within 10 years. Legislature may authorize highway bonds not to exceed $75 million at any one time. Additional loans would require a constitutional amendment.

"Mississippi: No applicable provision.

"Missouri: From the present time on borrowing in excess of $1 million must be submitted by the assembly to the voters who must give the measure approval by a majority of those qualified. Assembly must provide for the retirement of bonds so approved within 25 years.

"The Governor's budget must recommend revenues sufficient to meet expenditures.

"Montana: No appropriation shall exceed the total tax provided by law applicable to such expenditure.

"Borrowing for casual deficits must not exceed $100,000. Additional debts must be approved by a majority of the voters and means must be provided to meet principal and interest.

"Nebraska: Legislature may borrow up to $100,000 for casual deficits. Additional debt requires constitutional amendments.

"Appropriations cannot exceed revenue authorized to be raised in a fiscal period.

"Nevada: Debt must not exceed 1 percent of assessed valuation. All debt authorization must be accompanied by provision to pay principal and interest.

"The legislature must provide an annual tax sufficient to meet estimated expenses for each fiscal year. When yearly expenses exceed income, a tax sufficient to remove the deficiency must be provided.

"New Hampshire: No applicable provision.

"New Jersey: Debt is limited to 1 percent of appropriations in general appropriation law, and must be approved by a majority of voters at an election. Provision to pay interest and extinguish principal in 35 years must be made for all debt.

"No appropriations shall be made in a fiscal period which exceed the total amount of revenue on hand and anticipated.

"New Mexico: Debt of $200,000 is permitted for casual deficits. Additional debt must be approved by a majority of State electors and there must be provision for payment of interest and principal within 50 years. Additional debt may not exceed 1 percent of the assessed valuation of all property subject to taxation. In some cases, however, highway bonds may exceed the 1 percent limitation, except that those payable from proceeds of taxes on property may not exceed $2 million.

"New York: Legislature may borrow in anticipation of revenues. All other State debt requires approval by majority of voters, except that debt not exceeding $300 million for the elimination of grade crossings does not require approval of voters.

"The Governor must recommend legislation when necessary to provide revenue sufficient to meet proposed expenditures in his budget. All payments from the treasury must be under appropriation, and such payments must be made within 2 years after the appropriation act.

"North Carolina: The legislature may borrow in anticipation of taxes due within the year not to exceed 50 percent of such taxes, to meet a casual deficit and, in a biennium, up to two-thirds of the amount by which the State's outstanding debt was reduced in the preceding biennium. Additional debt must be approved by the voters.

"North Dakota: State may borrow up to $2 million, with borrowing beyond that secured by mortgage on State property. Borrowing beyond the value of State property requires constitutional amendment.

"Ohio: Debts to meet casual deficits are limited to $750,000. Additional debt must be by means of constitutional amendment and there must be means provided to meet interest payments and to provide a sinking fund to redeem the principal.

"The legislature must provide for raising revenue sufficient to meet annual expenses, and able to pay the interest on the State debt.

"Oklahoma: $500,000 may be borrowed to meet casual deficits. Additional borrowing must be authorized by law and approved by a majority of the people voting at a general election. Such law must provide for payment of interest and principal within 25 years.

"The legislature in the year following one in which expenditures exceed revenues must levy a tax which, with other resources, removes the deficiency.

"Oregon: $50,000 debt is permitted and up to 4 percent assessed valuation for highways. Other debts require constitutional amendment.

"The legislature shall provide for raising revenues sufficient to meet annual expenses and to pay interest on the State debt, if any.

"Pennsylvania: $1 million is permitted for deficiencies in revenue and $100 million may be borrowed for highways—by legislative action.

"Rhode Island: $50,000 is the express limit on borrowing by the general assembly, but it may also borrow in anticipation of revenues up to 30 percent of actual receipts from taxes during the prior fiscal year. Money so borrowed must be paid back within the fiscal year. The consent of the people must be given for further borrowing.

"South Carolina: The legislature can borrow for the ordinary and current business of the State. Additional debt must be approved by two-thirds of the State's voters and the assembly shall levy a tax sufficient to pay interest on debt approved by voters.

"An annual tax sufficient to meet annual expenses must be levied and the legislature in the year following one in which expenditures exceed revenues must levy a tax sufficient with other income to remove the deficiency.

"South Dakota: $100,000 may be borrowed for casual deficits. Other indebtedness (for rural credits) up to one-half of 1 percent of valuation may be made by a two-thirds vote of the members of each branch of the legislature.

"An annual tax sufficient to meet annual expenses must be levied, and the legislature in the year following one in which expenditures exceed revenues must levy a tax sufficient with other income to remove the deficiency.

"Tennessee: No applicable provision.

"Texas: $200,000 may be borrowed for casual deficiencies in revenue. Veterans' land bonds limited to $25 million (legislative approval only). Additional borrowing requires a constitutional amendment.

"If an appropriation bill exceeds estimated revenue, the appropriation must either be reduced or additional revenue provided.

"Utah: Appropriations must not exceed the total tax.

"Borrowings to a maximum of 1½ percent of assessed valuation may be made for revenue deficiencies.

"Vermont: No applicable provision.

"Virginia: Casual deficits may be met by borrowing. Other debts must be approved by the voters and a sinking fund must be provided, but such debt may not exceed 1 percent of assessed real property in the State.

"Washington: $400,000 may be borrowed to meet failures in revenues. Additional debt must be approved by voters and provide means to pay interest and principal within 20 years.

"West Virginia: Debt may be contracted to meet casual deficits.

"When expenditures exceed revenues in a fiscal year, the legislature shall in the ensuing year levy a tax sufficient with other income to remove the deficiency.

"Wisconsin: $100,000 debt is permitted for extraordinary expenditures.

"Legislature must provide an annual tax sufficient to meet estimated expenditures of the States for 1 year. If expenditures exceed income in any one year, the legislature must, in the ensuing year levy a tax sufficient with other income to remove the deficiency and sufficient to pay the estimated expenses for that year.

"Wyoming: Total debt created by the legislature may not exceed 1 percent of the assessed value of taxable property.

"No debt in excess of taxes for current year may be created without approval of the voters."

"THE CONSTITUTION IS YOUR BUSINESS

"(By Clarence Manion)

"We are a country of highly organized special interests. Everybody is concerned with his special interest and indeed has to be in this highly organized and thoroughly competitive age. But what alarms me is that seldom, if ever, do I find any organization that is brought together in the general interest. And it is precisely the general interest of the United States that is in need of help and attention. If I should ask you to tell me what phase or branch of industry you represent, we would call the roll of all the enterprises, manufacturing, merchandising, exploration, advertising, transportation. That's your business, isn't it? That's the great mistake we all make. Your business is only incidentally the business of merchandising and manufacturing and selling and transporting.

"The Constitution is your business. It's the only business you have. If it weren't for the Constitution, there wouldn't be any business in this country that is private in nature. And if you permit the foundation of all business enterprise to be innervated or subverted, then you won't be in business any longer. You will be at the beck and the call of totalitarian direction.

"Let me give you two recent historical events, both of which ought to be well known to you. A few months ago, the Government of Guatemala seized 230,000 acres of land belonging to the United Fruit Co. What did the United Fruit Co. do about it? Nothing. There isn't anything that anybody can do about the seizure of their property in Guatemala. There isn't any constitution in Guatemala worthy of the name. It's full of escape hatches through which the dictator can crawl at his convenience. And Guatemala is not behind the iron curtain yet. Guatemala is just behind our backs.

"About the same time, the then President of the United States seized the steel properties of the country and what did the owners of the steel mills do about it? They went to the courts and asserted their constitutional rights. The courts and, ultimately, the Supreme Court decided that the President had exceeded his powers and they ordered the President to return the properties to their owners, which the President did. All of us took that news calmly. Here and there, there was a toast to the good old Constitution. Beyond that, there wasn't a ripple of interest or of recollection.

"But I want to remind you and urge you to remember the disparity between the Guatemalan seizure and the seizure in the United States of America. What took place in Guatemala is what is taking place all over the world. Not merely behind the Iron Curtain but in front of it. What took place in the Steel case takes place only in the United States of America.

"This is the only place on earth where an individual can force his Government to respect his rights * * * and that's the very definition of liberty; and that is why I say the Constitution is your business. It is the license under which you continue to operate as a private property owner and as a private enterpriser. And I direct your attention to the Constitution and to the jeopardy in which it finds itself.

"The United States of America, which is the hope and envy of mankind, is merely the incarnation of four basic political convictions; and when those convictions disappear, disintegrate, or are subverted, the United States will collapse. The hope of the world will disappear.

"What are those four facts? After all, it isn't difficult to recall when the United States was a vacant lot and there wasn't any United States; and onto that vacant space some architects came with a plan for reconstruction—the only time in the world when a political organization was planned in advance. It didn't evolve; it was made, deliberately, according to a prescription which was advertised to the world. And that expression, that plan, that blueprint, is known as the American Declaration of Independence.

"Did you ever hear of it? Well, try to find a copy some place. It's difficult. There you find the four facts of American life expressed with the first breath of the new life of this Republic.

"No. 1: 'We hold this truth to be self-evident,' they said, 'that all men are created * * *.' There is a God, in other words. God exists according to this blueprint, not as a matter of faith, but as a matter of fact; the fact of God's existence is postulated and built into cornerstone No. 1 of the Republic. And remember that 'We hold this truth to be self-evident * * *.'

"No. 2: 'That all men are created equal.' And here is the most bedeviling phrase in anybody's language today—human equality. How equal can people be? What are the limitations and potentialities of human equality? The Russians are selling a brand of human equality around the world, and millions of people are buying it. They want to be equal. What is the natural law of equality? What is the fact of equality?

"It says here, 'All men are created equal.' All men, in other words, are equal in God's sight. That's the precise expression, 'in God's sight'; and for that reason, they are equal before the law of the land, because if I know anything about the law of the land it is merely a projection of God's law—equality before God—equality before the law and beyond that inequality in every conceivable way. Did you ever hear anybody advertising the limitations of human equality? Do you think you're all equal, one to another? Do you think it is possible to make you equal?

"I ask you to take a look at that fingerprint of yours, J. Edgar Hoover says there is only one like it on earth. You are the only man or woman who now lives or who has ever lived who had that distinctively individual trade-mark. Contemplate it. Think of an all-wise providence that breathes into you a mark of differentiation from everybody else on earth. And do you think that's the end of your individuality? No, that's only the beginning. Everything about you is different. God made men and women, each of whom is different from every other one; and in that difference lies the secret of civilization.

"Thank God for those differences. Some want to be farmers, some what to be fabricators, some want to be politicians, professors; out of that great difference in ambition and in energy and in aptitude and in intellect, we are fed and clothed. Did you ever realize that? There's only one thing missing in that great heterogeneous mass of differences necessary to spark a great civilization like ours—that's freedom. These intellects, these energies, these ambitions, this enterprise need to be free in order to achieve; and that brings us to:

"No. 3: 'We hold this truth to be self-evident,' they said, 'that all men are endowed (not by the Constitution or the Bill of Rights, but) by their Creator with certain unalienable rights and amongst these are life and liberty.' It so says, 'life and liberty' joined together, inseparable, unalienable, as gifts of God. Liberty is as important to human nature as life is. Without liberty, man disintegrates—so that's the third great fact of life—the divine origin of rights and obligations because obligations are just the reverse side of the coin of right. And now, finally, for the fourth fact of life.

"How to preserve this human freedom—that's the $64 question. How to keep men free? Now, they had not to observe but to invent * * * to make something—Fact No. 4: 'We hold this truth to be self-evident,' they said, that to secure these rights, to protect these gifts of God, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed. Man makes government to protect the gift God gave to man.

"We begin to get perspective. Government is last, not first. God is first; government is last; and now the opposition to communism begins to be rationalized. It's the fact of God's existence that puts government in its place—that puts natural limitations upon government which man has a moral obligation to enforce—that keeps government a servant, lest it develop into a master.

"Every totalitarianism that ever existed was materialistic and godless because where there is no God government is God. That's why communism is godless—that's why every tyranny from Herod to Hitler was godless. It's the fact of God that subordinates government. You businessmen better advertise the fact of God, not to save your souls (I'm not worried about them); I'm worried about saving your civilization. The fact of God is first in the order of importance.

"Now about government—how to keep it confined—how to keep it in its place. There are many unfortunate notions about government today. Government is, according to these specifications, a tool, a device, manufactured to do a special job, like a lathe or a drill press. It's a dangerous tool. And then, for the first time, in any age of history, they tied their government down, they limited it, they controlled it. They made it serve rather than master them. And that's the rationale of your history, this inseparable, logical linking between the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States.

"There are three things that you must sell. You must sell the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution of the United States, and, yes, the Ten Commandments of God. Because when all this was done, somebody asked James Madison why this Government won't work. 'Nobody has ever done this to government before. It won't function. You can't treat government like this; it has no power.' And Madison answered classically. He said, 'We have staked the whole future of American civilization not upon the power of government, far from it, but upon the capacity of mankind for self-government.'

"Better advertise that. Tell them what William Penn said 100 years before the Declaration of Independence was written, 'Those people who will not be governed by God will be ruled by tyrants.' The Founding Fathers knew it. Our generation should know it. Those people who will not, in other words, govern themselves according to the laws of their Creator, will be ruled by a despotism. It was so in every age of history. It will be so with us.

"Self-government, self-restraint, moral consciousness, that's the price of your constitutional system, and so the ten commandments have come back into currency. Sell those three things: God's commandments, the blueprint for freedom, the Declaration of Independence, and the constitutional confinement of government in the interests of freedom because there isn't any definition of freedom that isn't contained in the phrase 'limited government.'

"Forty years ago, Woodrow Wilson said something that ought to be on a few billboards. Woodrow Wilson said, 'The history of liberty is the history of the limitation of governmental power.' He said, 'When we resist the concentration of governmental power, we resist the processes of death, because,' he added, and this is important, 'a concentration of governmental power is what always precedes the death of human liberty.'

"Today, 40 years later, the Communists have taken Wilson's phrase and paraphrased it into a command. The Communists say, 'A concentration of governmental power is what must precede the death of human freedom.' And so they first concentrate power and then they seize it, as they seized it in Czechoslovakia and in Hungary and in Bulgaria and Rumania and Latvia and Lithuania—in 15 separate nations containing 600 million people, since the end of World War II.

"First, they consolidated control over the police; then they consolidated control over the ballot boxes; and then the people, in terror of the police, voted themselves behind the Iron Curtain. There wasn't any marching Russian army. There was no dropped bombs. Czechoslovakia voted almost unanimously to go behind the Iron Curtain; so did 600 million people in that greatest conquest of all time.

"You think they won't try it on us? Their first objective is to concentrate power and when the Communist conspirator comes to this country he looks first for the centralized control of the police. And where does he find that? He goes to Washington. He has Dexter White or Alger Hiss or somebody ready to take over the job. But he can't find the centralized control over the police because, with the remarkable previsions of their generation, the Founding Fathers decentralized the control of the police. It is not in Washington. Police are controlled in the States of the Union, and the cities and the hamlets of the United States, by constitutional provision. There isn't any consolidation over the power of the police. Police control is a State control, not because of anything you did or I did but because of something the Founding Fathers wisely did before the word 'Communist' was current.

"And then they look for the ballot boxes, and where do they find those? In Washington, controlled by the minister of voting? They find the ballot boxes dispersed through 48 independent constitutional jurisdictions called States. Voting qualification is a State right; 48 different places, 48 different rules.

"And last of all is the land. The land which they want to confiscate is the first act of the Communist government. Where is the central control of the land? How can they get their hands on that? They look for it in Washington and they don't find it there. They find land controlled by the wise prevision of the Founding Fathers—not in Washington but—in 48 separate, individual constitutional jurisdictions called State land, and properly is locally controlled under State law. Keep it that way; States rights is your best defense against communism. Defend States rights. Learn about them. Understand them.

"Of course, the Pentagon has its part to play; so do the other expensive measures that we use to defend ourselves against marching Russian armies and dropping Russian bombs. But I remember what the Communist told me in Notre Dame, who had lately escaped from the Daily Worker, a decade ago. 'The Constitution,' he said, 'is the greatest frustration of the Communist conspirators in the United States of America.' And how few of us know it. They know it. The Constitution of this country is your greatest protection.

• • • • •

"I know how human we are, how reluctant to take upon ourselves the burden of saving our fellow man, but it isn't George's job. Don't expect George to do it. He won't do it. He hasn't done it. I've talked to him. He isn't interested at all. You must do it, each and every one of you. If you're troubled with apathetic sickness, I'll tell you how to get rid of it.

"I had a client the other day, believe it or not; and what is more extraordinary, a paying client. We had been working with him for weeks to try to insulate him against the post mortem impacts of the Federal tax collector. You know what I mean? Don't know how much good we did but we went through all of the usual motions. We had created a big trust agreement. He'd rewritten his will and the will of his wife. We made gifts, inter vivos of course. They were all inter vivos; none of them were causa mortis, lawyers take notice. We had had deeds of land, oh yes, life insurance policies reassigned, bank accounts readjusted, a big stack of documents on the desk.

"My client had reached the signing stage and he was signing away with a big smile on his face. At that point, I interrupted him. I said, 'John, you seem to be getting a kick out of this.' I wasn't getting any kick out of it. I was fed up with it, tired and disgusted.

"John laid down his pen and looked at me, still smiling. He said, 'Pat, I certainly do get a kick out of this. You know, I'm an old man. I'm ready to admit it to you. I've been pretty successful. I've accumulated quite a bit of property, more than I ever thought I would be able to count. Unfortunately, I lost my wife a few years ago. I have some lovely children and grandchildren. I'd like to have them have some of this property. I knew that unless I sat down and did something like this, it would all go to the four winds and the rest of it would go to the Government.' He said, 'I think we've done the best we could. I'm very happy. I'm going to sleep tonight.' He started to sign again.

"At that, I interrupted him a second time. I said, 'John, now that you've taken care of their property, what are you going to do about their liberty?' John didn't even stop this time. He just laughed out loud, shrugged his shoulders. 'Liberty,' he said, 'I don't know anything about liberty. I'm just a merchant. I'll have to leave liberty to the politicians and the professors.'

"Then I told him something that I'm going to tell you. 'Tear up the trust agreement. Tear up the will. Throw away the life-insurance policies. Forget the bank account. Forget the common stock. Forget everything, because unless you leave your children liberty, you leave them nothing at all.

" 'Ask the Jews in Germany. Ask the well-propertied Jews in Germany what good their property and their wealth did them when they were faced up against the concentrated, unlimited power in the hands of Adolf Hitler. Ask the ghosts of 10 million kulaks murdered by Joe Stalin. Ask those ghosts, "Say, fellows, you had lots of property. What good did it do you when you were faced up against the concentrated unlimited power called communism?" '

"Wherever you ask the question and of whomsoever you ask it, the answer comes back, always the same. In time of unlimited, concentrated government, your property is going to buy your children just one thing—a ticket to the concentration camp—a one-way ticket to the point of no return. So, will you please think about that the next time you pay that life insurance premium, the next time you put a codicil on that will, the next time you stash away a few dollars for the new grandchild?

"Think about it, please, particularly when you look at those children and those grandchildren. Gather them around you and take a look at them, as I have looked at mine. Then ask yourself one question: 'How much power, how much unlimited, concentrated power is my Government going to have when these youngsters are as old as I am?'

"Ask yourself that question, my friends. That will do it. I guarantee that it will do it. Then and there you'll make a resolution that your legacy, not of property but of liberty, to these, your children, is going to compare favorably to the big fortune of freedom that the Founding Fathers left to you."

The Right of a Minority To Reject Government Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. GWINN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure and a source of pride to give my colleagues the benefit of good sound thinking, well written. Here is some of it coming right out of the very splendid soil of my native State by Dr. Doenges, of Indiana:

THE RIGHT OF A MINORITY TO REJECT GOVERNMENT BENEFITS

(By James L. Doenges, M. D.)

(Dr. James L. Doenges is an outstanding surgeon and an active, public-spirited citizen of Anderson, Ind. The following is excerpted from his statement of July 6, 1954, made before the Senate Finance Committee in opposition to H. R. 9366, on behalf of the Association of American Physicians and Surgeons, of which he is president-elect and on behalf of the Madison County Medical Society of which he is president.)

You Members of Congress are so frequently pressed for doles, appropriations, grants, special favors, and other privileges for certain groups at the expense of others, that it would seem to me somewhat refreshing, and I certainly hope impressive, that this testimony is directed in the opposite direction. We ask no special favors. We ask no Federal funds. We ask merely that you refuse to take from us certain of our rights as citizens, our rights to plan our own futures, and that you not extend the questionable "benefits" of a Federal dole to this minority, the members of which do not desire to become wards of the Government.

This Government cannot dispense 1 benefit, 1 gift, cannot grant 1 appropriation, 1 favor, or spend 1 cent which it has not wrested by force, actual or implied, from the individual citizens of this Nation. Congress cannot grant benefits to the recipients of old-age assistance without first extracting the funds from other citizens.

Many individuals believe, or represent themselves to believe, that Government is the source of benefits (handouts) for all people. They ask for gifts, money, and what they regard as their share of the Federal Government's largess. They follow the pattern which has proven so successful in attaining the authoritarian state in many European nations, actual socialism in many instances. Permit me to illustrate.

In the last 100 years, one of the best examples of the so-called progress of so-called social insurance and social security, carried to the ultimate, is to be found in the history of the German nation under Bismarck. This example is used because the course of this program in the United States has been, and is, quite parallel. Leaving out all detail, we find that the Bismarckian social insurance first encompassed only those who were in the very low-income groups and the aged poor. It promised them certain benefits in return for a ridiculously small tax. Careful manipulation and very clever propaganda caused other groups of slightly higher incomes to demand that they be included and be given similar Government benefits. This process continued, each group of a slightly higher income being brought under the system in gradual steps, usually through well-calculated demands. After all, why should not a worker earning only a few marks more than another, cry out for his share of Government gifts? Soon every segment of the economy was included. The funds thus obtained were utilized to meet current expenses, and so-called indebtedness was incurred for future benefits. No longer was there need for the fiction of a special tax. Everything came from the tax providing the general funds.

This identical procedure has been followed in many countries. It has been followed here. At this moment, we stand at the final point of resistance with only a very few relatively small groups, including those I represent, requesting that Congress not remove our rights, but permit us to maintain our individual liberties to plan our future, to permit us to do as we see fit with the products of our labors, and that Congress refuse to force us to become a part of an impossible, immoral, and fraudulent scheme.

Basically, the system is wrong, if you believe in the sovereignty of man and the Christian ideals upon which this Nation was founded. The system is wrong because it removes personal responsibilities as well as personal rights.

It seems to be generally accepted that the system referred to as social security is not insurance. It is patently not secure, and there is serious doubt if there is anything social about it, except that it has—in every nation—led to, and been a most important part of the imposition of socialism upon the people. So there will be no doubt about my meaning, permit me to quote Webster. Socialism is defined as: "A political and economic theory of social organization based on collective or governmental ownership and democratic management of the essential means for the production and distribution of goods; socialism favors extension of government action."

We are told now that the groups presently excluded should be brought into the social-security system, to pay their rightful share of a welfare program for all. We reject this type of thinking. It is false. It is a mask for the acceptance of the Communist idea of the redistribution of wealth, as a number of the proponents have admitted that most of the professionals will never claim one benefit from the program. This last group is, in essence, regarded as a source of funds to attempt to salvage an impossible, actuarially unsound system of Federal grants. It is no less than another tax, a very poorly disguised and unfair class discrimination tax at that.

The intent of the social-security law is clear. It is to make everyone a ward of the Government, destroy personal responsibility and incentive, and to be an agent in the process of leveling.

In the publication Social Security Financing, published by the Social Security Administration in Bureau Report No. 17, 1952, frequent reference is made to acceptance of this principle and it is plainly stated and admitted in a number of places in that publication that one of the principal features of universal social security involves the redistribution of wealth. Another publication by the same Agency, entitled "Common Human Needs," states on page 57, and I quote, "Social security and public assistance programs are a basic essential for attainment of the socialized state envisaged in democratic ideology, a way of life which so far has been realized only in slight measure."

Social security has been used as one of the very important levers to secure compulsory retirement at the age of 65. The ramifications of this single act are too extensive and too numerous to mention. However, we must admit that social security is, and has been used as an important part of the argument used to force many perfectly capable individuals to retire, to leave productive activity. A great number of these individuals, by far the majority of them, are still in some of their very productive years. No one denies that the strength of this Nation depends upon the productivity of its people. Social security and other similar measures have done irreparable damage to the moral fiber and the morale of our people, and has reduced the total productivity of our Nation, by forcing them out of productive activity at this arbitrarily set early age.

I feel certain that you Senators would never approve a measure forcing legislators to retire at the age of 65. We have had several Presidents and many Senators and Representatives who have served their country well at ages far in excess of that set up by the social-security system for retirement.

We do not understand how the supply of physicians can be increased by forcing our senior physicians, our consultants, to retire at the age 65. Especially in the field of medicine and its allied arts, we find the men of 65 and over, to be our best consultants. Every one of them carries a definite and sizable patient load. Those of us who have not reached that stage of maturity, depend upon them for opinions based on their years of experience. They help us become more proficient in our profession, and we learn from their experience. At the age of 65, a physician's judgment, as a whole, is certainly at or near its peak. It is well known that very few physicians ever retire. The percentage is so small that to apply compulsion to force any of them to retire at that age would do serious damage to the practice of medicine, and could create a very real and serious shortage in our numbers. It would remove many of the best minds of medicine from availability to those of us who need and desire their assistance and counsel.

Since very few doctors retire, we must in turn admit that Congress would be forcing a calculated fraud upon the physicians to compel them to enter the social-security system. You are very well aware of the fact that if the physician, or any other person, fails to retire he does not receive the benefits for which he will supposedly have paid. He will, in this manner, have been forced to pay an additional discriminatory and unfair tax.

A feature of the law which is totally wrong, and even dishonest, is the provision which prevents any individual from drawing his so-called benefits if he refuses to be relegated to a life of useless inactivity and finds a job at which he earns more than a stated figure. It matters not what that figure may be, it is wrong, even dishonest, to punish any individual for refusing to become a ward of the Government.

This is not a funded program. All agree it is actuarially unsound. Many realize that the obligations are rapidly approaching, even exceeding, our total national worth. It is not insurance. It has no guaranty to the taxpayer. At this moment it has an obligation of between one hundred and seventy-five and two hundred billion dollars, with less than twenty-two billion so-called reserve to meet this obligation. It is difficult for anyone to explain how recipients can continue to receive not less than six times the amount of their tax, in so-called benefits, and in many instances even a hundredfold return on their tax.

There is another point which should be of vital importance to every Member of Congress and especially to the members of this committee. You do not want to destroy initiative. I am certain you do not believe in or desire socialism. Does this not make it all the more important that you leave the small minority, as a nucleus to oppose the ever-increasing Federal control? You do not want to destroy all opposition to the ever-expanding power of the Federal Government. The number is small.

The minority is an important group. Many feel, however, that Congress has accepted the idea that might makes right. Many believe that Congress does not care for the rights of the minority. They point to such measures as these to emphasize their position. But you, gentlemen, are charged with the right and responsibility of upholding the rights of the minority, even if it is a minority of one. It is your sacred duty to do so. The utilization for force, coercion, to beat down the minority is not right and can never be right. It can be given statutory legality but it cannot be made constitutionally or morally right.

This protest is made, in spite of our favorable position, since we, as physicians, feel that we have a citizenship responsibility which precedes and even surpasses our professional responsibilities to the community. We would be grossly remiss in our duties and obligations to our fellowmen—other professionals, other self-employed—and all other citizens, if we did not state our opposition to this type of program. After all—we are all citizens together, and that which hurts any citizen hurts every citizen. Liberty is not divisible.

Nevada Miners Helped by 83d Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFTON (CLIFF) YOUNG
OF NEVADA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, for nearly a century the rugged hills of Nevada have poured forth mineral wealth in abundance. Indeed, so fabulous were shipments of precious metals from Virginia City and other mines in my State that the impact of this newly mined wealth was felt in foreign capitals.

Historians say the European nations commanding top positions in world monetary circles viewed with alarm the immense silver production from the Comstock lode. Their efforts to demonetize silver were eventually crowned with success by the enactment of legislation that came to be known as the crime of 1873. Thereafter, the price of silver declined; and numerous western mines were closed.

During the past several decades, foreign influence has again exerted its baneful effects on western mining. At present the chief concern is not the production of silver or precious metals, but the production of lead, zinc, mercury, and strategic minerals vital to national security. The harmful influence is in the form of imports which threaten the very existence of important segments of the American mining industry.

There are some in our country who say that we should obtain our minerals abroad and thereby conserve the limited quantities we have in this country. Still others say we must trade with other nations or lose our friends in foreign lands. Whatever the reasons for supporting the purchase of metals abroad, records show that from January 1, 1951, to June 1, 1953, nearly $180 million was spent by our Government in developing and exploiting mineral resources in foreign countries. In the same period the Defense Minerals Exploration Administration, which was set up to encourage mineral development in our country, spent less than $25 million.

Mr. Speaker, while at first glance the arguments in favor of securing our metals from foreign countries may appear sound, they do not stand up under careful analysis.

First. If we depend largely on foreign sources, then in time of war these sources of supply may not be accessible—or worse—they may even fall into enemy hands. We do not depend on foreign munitions factories for our grenades and shells and bombs. Strategic minerals are of no less importance to our national security program.

Second. Experience shows that as our dependency on foreign sources increases, the price of minerals that we buy shows a corresponding rise. What was a deceptive bargain initially becomes an ever more costly expedient.

Third. America is far from being a have-not nation in the field of mineral resources, as some people advancing this economic theory would have us believe. We have only scratched the surface of metal reserves. To develop our domestic sources we must stimulate exploratory and development work; we must furnish prospectors with incentives; we must encourage additional investment. These things cannot be done without a sound, well-defined, long-range mineral program.

Fourth. Friends and allies are necessary in a world confronted by a Communist menace, but we should not buy them at the sacrifice of a sturdy domestic mining industry, which is capable of supplying our wartime needs in conjunction with a sound stockpiling program. This is too great a price to pay.

There are those who say that if American mines cannot compete with foreign producers, it is against our national economic interest to give them protection from imports. They do not consider the many factors which place the American mining industry at a disadvantage, no matter how efficient its operations, no matter how rich the ore bodies, no matter how sound the management. Foreign producers have at their disposal an arsenal of economic weapons not available to American miners operating within the traditional structure of our American economy. These include currency manipulations, international cartels, nationalized industries which can place the total resources of a country behind its exports, and low-cost labor which receives in some cases one-tenth of the wages paid in this country. Against this formidable array of economic weapons, all foreign to our way of life, American miners have no hope whatsoever of competing successfully. Without protection our mines become mere puppets, opening and closing as the economic strings are loosened or pulled by foreign interests.

I am pleased to report a change in the policy followed by our Government in past years, which showed more apparent concern for mining welfare in foreign lands than in our country. This previous policy was well illustrated by the statement made by former President Truman when he signed the Strategic and Critical Materials Stockpiling Act. His statement revealed that the previous administration had little regard for the welfare of the domestic mining industry. Mr. Truman said:

> It is only because of the overriding importance of this purpose that I am able to overcome my reluctance to sign a bill which reaffirms the application to stockpile purchases of the provisions of title III of the act of March 3, 1933, known as the Buy-American Act * * * there can be a serious conflict between its provisions and the foreign economic policy which this Government is actively pursuing.

In most instances, the Truman administration ignored the provisions of the Buy-American Act in making stockpile purchases, by declaring that such purchases were determined to be inconsistent with the public interest or the cost to be unreasonable.

I should like to use this opportunity to summarize briefly developments occuring during the past year which are grounds for optimism about the mining future in this country.

First. The 83d Congress has discontinued the practice of spending funds to develop mines in foreign countries which will later compete with United States producers. Furthermore, Congress abolished the Metals and Minerals Staff of the State Department and directed that the Department, in dealing with the metals and minerals program, should look to the Interior Department for information and policy guidance.

Second. Congress in the past 2 years has made the most thorough investigation in the history of our country on the status of production in the strategic mineral field. This investigation should make possible the formulation of recommendations for a sound, long-range program in the years ahead.

Third. The President announced early this year a new stockpiling program based on long-range requirements recognizing the nonavailability of metals from foreign sources and the dangers of interference with these sources through enemy action. The announcement of a program to purchase 200,000 tons of lead and 300,000 tons of zinc in newly mined ore from domestic sources during the next few months is further evidence of concern for the welfare of this industry. Such a measure is, of course, a short-range policy, but it should help sustain lead and zinc producers until a long-range policy of quota limitation against foreign imports—or a flexible tariff—can be developed.

Fourth. A determined effort is under way to return our currency to the gold standard. Our departure from this helpful restraint against inflation is the cause of many of our monetary ailments today. For the first time in many years there are strong forces in Washington working for the return of the gold standard.

Fifth. The 83d Congress passed legislation in the field of taxation providing for greater depletion allowances and deductions for cost of exploration, both of which should stimulate mining activities.

Sixth. In the Department of the Interior a new concern for the welfare of the western mining industry has been evidenced. A thorough study of the operations and organization of the Bureau of Mines has been completed. This should result not only in greater efficiency, but in better service.

Seventh. A Minerals Policy Commission of Cabinet level has been appointed to work out a minerals policy for our country. It is hoped that the recommendations of this Commission will contain elements of a long-range program and a discontinuance of the day-to-day operations causing such uncertainty in the past. The program of geological survey in Nevada has already been greatly accelerated.

Eighth. A multiple-mineral development bill was enacted which will open additional lands for mining claims in Nevada and eliminate doubts heretofore arising over the validity of claims based on a discovery of uranium. Because of the complex nature of this bill, which changes basic mining law, I prepared a summary of it for Nevada miners. Copies have been sent to each county recorder in our State for distribution when mining claimants file their affidavits of performance of annual assessment work. Additional copies are available from my office.

Mr. Speaker, these are the highlights of advances in the mining field during the past year. While much remains to be done, we have made significant progress in the right direction. I join with other Congressmen from mining States in expressing hope that our Government will continue its progress in formulating a sound, long-range mineral program, giving not only sorely needed stability to American miners, but also complete assurance to those responsible for national security that minerals necessary for free-world defense will be available in the event of a national emergency.

The Pennsylvania State Employment Service Is Another Prophet of Doom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VERA BUCHANAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mrs. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, on the same day the President was declaring how sick and tired he was of listening to what he termed "the prophets of doom," the Pennsylvania State Employment Service released the July Pittsburgh Labor Market Letter. This letter covers a four-county labor market area—Allegheny - Beaver - Washington - Westmoreland—and the lead paragraph is entitled "Recession Continued Through July." The paragraph reads as follows:

> Unemployment, estimated at 86,000 in July, tripled the year ago level of 28,000. The recent rise has resulted from layoffs in major industries and also because approximately 8,000 new entrants to the labor market were unable to secure work. In previous summers, students or graduates were able to find temporary vacation jobs or permanent work. Such openings are not available now because of the large number of regular workers laid off in various industries.

Tax Reform and Other Achievements of the Eisenhower Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, perhaps the most notable accomplishment of the Eisenhower administration has been the tax-reduction bill, a monumental act that grants benefits to every citizen in every walk of life.

Because it covers so many situations, I feel my constituents in the 30th District of California would appreciate knowing the more salient features of this bill. I am going to list them here, but first, I want briefly to review the significant performance of the Eisenhower administration, which, since January 1, 1953:

Acted resolutely to stop the war in Korea and put an end to the casualty lists.

Ended burdensome price and economic controls and gave our people more freedom.

Stabilized the dollar and the soaring cost-of-living that had increased 50 percent in 10 years.

Gave industry incentives to provide new jobs, and to build a sound peacetime economy.

Returned ownership of the tidelands, with valuable oil reserves, back to the States.

Cut taxes $7.4 billion—including a 10-percent income tax cut—the greatest total cut in history.

Reorganized our military defense with new emphasis on air power, including naval air.

Took courageous action on farm surpluses in an attempt to end mounting excesses.

Revised the Housing bill to provide better terms and special provisions for military.

Gave increased benefits to social-security recipients and disabled veterans.

Passed stringent anti-Communist laws and eliminated disloyal workers from the Government.

As San Diego's Representative in Congress, I naturally had a special interest in legislation and administrative decisions that benefited the area. These are some I worked on:

Federal Narcotics Office established in San Diego for the first time.

Mission Bay channel dredging appropriation of $750,000 to end the bottleneck there.

Additional beds at the Naval Hospital for veterans of San Diego County.

Additional judgeship for the San Diego area, including $220,000 for new courtroom.

Fisherman's Protective Act to help our tuna fishermen regain their freedom of the seas.

Extension and revision of legislation to bring over $10 million to San Diego schools.

Simplified customs clearance for boats entering and leaving Mexico via our port.

Sale of Linda Vista homes to the occupants, and elimination of temporary housing.

Awarding of the F-102 contract at San Diego by insisting on condemned lease of plant 2.

Wetback control bill to provide orderly system and control of Mexican workers.

Fifteen million dollar naval construction authorizations and appropriations for this area.

Action by Maritime Administration in reducing rates, $5 per ton at port of San Diego.

Inclusion of San Diego in proposed sea-water conversion program.

Stabilization of employment at naval station, repair facility, and naval air station.

Repeal of Thomas rider and passage of vital fringe benefits laws for Federal workers.

Increase of military household goods allowance, and repeal of restrictions on retirement.

Three new harbor patrol boats to the San Diego Coast Guard station.

The 83d Congress has given the taxpayers of this country more tax relief than at any time in the history of our country.

DEPENDENTS

First. A parent can claim a deduction of $600 for each child regardless of the child's earnings if the child is under 19 and the parent continues to furnish more than half the child's support.

Second. A parent can also claim the $600 dependency deduction for a child over 18 regardless of the child's earnings if the child is attending school or college, or receiving on-the-farm training, and the parent continues to furnish more than half the child's support.

Third. An aged parent or other dependent cared for by several members of a family can be claimed as a deduction by one of the members of the family.

Fourth. A taxpayer can claim a $600 dependency deduction for a foster child.

Fifth. A taxpayer can claim a $600 dependency deduction for a child awaiting adoption.

Sixth. A taxpayer can claim a $600 dependency deduction for any other person, regardless of relationship, if the taxpayer supports that person in his home.

Seventh. A taxpayer can claim a $600 dependency deduction for a cousin who is institutionalized because of physical or mental disability.

Savings to taxpayers, $85 million.

CHILD-CARE EXPENSES

First. Single working parents, such as a widow, are allowed a deduction up to $600 for the expense of child-care for children up to 12 years of age.

Second. The same deduction is allowed for a married woman who must work because her husband is incapacitated.

Third. The same deduction is allowed with respect to any dependent, regardless of age, who is mentally or physically incapable of caring for himself.

Fourth. A similar deduction is allowed a married woman if the combined income of her husband and herself does not exceed $5,100.

Savings to taxpayers, $130 million.

MEDICAL EXPENSES

First. Medical expenses can be deducted when they exceed 3 percent of income, instead of 5 percent as under present law.

Second. Example: A family with $3,000 gross income and medical expenses of $150 will be able to deduct $60. The same family can deduct nothing today.

Third. The bill doubles the present maximum limit on the amount that can be deducted.

Savings to taxpayers, $80 million.

HEAD OF FAMILY

First. A single taxpayer who has a dependent son or daughter will be entitled during the first 2 years after the death of his spouse to the same income-splitting privilege as is accorded married couples.

Second. A single individual can receive half the benefits of income splitting if he has a dependent parent and if the taxpayer maintains a household for the father or mother.

Savings to the taxpayers, $11 million.

RETIREMENT INCOME CREDIT

First. All retired people 65 and over, including schoolteachers, firemen, policemen, and civil servants, will in effect be exempt on all retirement income up to $1,200. This will mean a tax reduction for these retired people of up to $240 a year.

Second. Example: A retired single individual over 65 who has a total retirement income of $3,000 today pays about $300 in income tax. Under the bill, his tax is reduced to $60—a saving of $240.

Third. The same exemption will extend to individuals under 65 if they receive a pension from a public-retirement system, such as do teachers.

Savings to taxpayers, $141 million.

CREDIT PURCHASES

This bill allows a deduction for interest up to 6 percent on installment purchases.

Total saving to taxpayers, $10 million.

CHARITABLE CONTRIBUTIONS

This bill increases from 20 to 30 percent the allowable deduction for charitable contributions to churches, hospitals, and educational institutions.

Total saving to taxpayers, $25 million.

AID TO FARMERS

First. Deductions up to 25 percent of farm income are allowed for soil and water conservation.

Second. The bill permits more rapid writeoff of the expense of farm machinery, equipment, and construction.

Third. Removes tax on the proceeds of the sale of cattle when the sale is necessitated by disease.

Savings to taxpayers, $10 million.

SICKNESS AND ACCIDENT PLANS

First. Premiums paid by employers to health and accident plans will not be taxable to their employees.

Second. All accident and health benefits paid as reimbursement for actual medical expenses to employees, their wives, or children, are completely exempted from tax.

Third. Payments to employees for loss of wages due to injury or illness are exempted up to $100 a week.

Savings to taxpayers: No estimate possible.

DEATH BENEFITS

The bill exempts all death benefits up to $5,000 paid by an employer to the widow or other beneficiary of an employee.

Savings to taxpayers: No estimate possible.

PENSIONS AND ANNUITIES

In addition to the $1,200 exemption extended to retirement income, the bill also provides a simpler method for taxation of pensions and annuities, ends annual 3-percent tax paid on annuities, and provides instead a method of computing tax on basis of cost divided by years of life expectancy.

Savings to taxpayers, $10 million.

DIVIDEND CREDIT

First. Excludes first $50 in dividends from taxation and provides a credit against tax equal to 4 percent of the balance.

Second. Example: An individual with $50 or less in dividends from his savings will be entirely exempt from tax on that amount.

Third. Example: An individual with $250 in dividends from his savings will exclude the first $50 entirely, and then reduce his total tax by $8—4 percent of the balance of $200.

Savings to taxpayers, $204 million.

DEPRECIATION

The bill will permit the more liberal writeoff of the cost of new equipment. For example, in the first year of life of new equipment the taxpayer will be able to write off twice the amount now allowed.

Savings to taxpayers, $375 million, of which $75 million represents savings to individuals, such as farmers, shopkeepers, and salesmen.

DECLARATIONS OF ESTIMATED TAX

The requirements are eased for filing declarations of estimated tax. Upward of a million taxpayers will be relieved of the present requirement for filing.

FILING TAX RETURNS

Tax returns will be due April 15 instead of March 15, giving taxpayers 1 additional month in which to prepare their final tax returns and make their final tax payments.

RESEARCH AND EXPERIMENTATION

The bill grants taxpayers an option to either deduct as an expense or to amortize research and experimental expenditures.

No revenue estimate possible. The provision is designed to encourage business research, with the objective of creating new products, new processes, and new jobs.

METHODS OF ACCOUNTING

The bill brings tax accounting rules into harmony with business accounting, thereby eliminating to a great extent two sets of books. It provides realistic computation of net income for tax purposes, in conformity with sound business practices.

Savings to taxpayers, $47 million.

DEPLETION

The bill increases the rate of percentage depletion on a variety of critical and strategic minerals in order to encourage the development of domestic sources of supply.

Savings to taxpayers, $34 million.

PARTNERSHIPS

First. The bill adopts comprehensive provisions concerning the tax treatment of partners and partnerships in order to remove confusion of existing law. Principal objectives are simplicity, flexibility, and equity between partners.

Second. Certain proprietorship and partnerships are given the option to be taxed as corporations.

Savings to taxpayers, $20 million.

INVENTIONS

The bill extends capital-gains treatment to proceeds realized by an inventor on the sale or exchange of a patent.

No revenue estimate possible. The new provision is designed to encourage invention and thereby promote a healthy economy and an improving standard of living.

NET OPERATING LOSS

The bill extends the net operating loss carryback to 2 years and makes certain other adjustments.

Savings to taxpayers, $120 million.

LIFE INSURANCE

The bill lessens the estate tax on the proceeds of certin life-insurance policies.

Savings to individual taxpayers, $25 million.

CONSOLIDATED RETURNS

The bill removes the 2-percent penalty tax with respect to consolidated returns filed by regulated public utilities.

Savings to taxpayers, $35 million.

IMPROPER ACCUMULATIONS

The bill eases the penalty tax on certain accumulated earnings in order that business, especially small businesses, may have greater freedom in retaining their funds for legitimate business purposes.

Savings to taxpayers, $10 million.

CORPORATION INCOME TAX

The bill extends for 1 year the present 52-percent corporation income tax.

The total increase in revenue, $1.2 billion.

REPUBLICAN ACTION FOR TAXPAYERS

The 10-percent reduction in Federal income taxes which went into effect last January 1 saves individual taxpayers a total of $3 billion annually. This tax cut would not have been possible if the Congress and the administration had not cut the Truman budget for fiscal 1954 by $12 billion.

Nor would the $2 billion tax saving by elimination of the excess-profits tax have been possible without this budget cutting.

The Republican excise-tax reduction law saves taxpayers an additional $1 billion.

The Tax Revision Act will save taxpayers $1,400,000,000.

A total of $827 million of this tax saving is for individuals. The remainder, $536 million, is tax relief for business.

The overall tax-cut program will save $7,400,000,000. Of this amount, individuals receive an overall total tax saving of $4,700,000,000. The tax savings so far surpass any previous total in the history of Congress.

Report to the People of the Sixth District by Hon. DeWitt S. Hyde, of Maryland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DeWITT S. HYDE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I have made a report to the voters of the Sixth Congressional District of Maryland on my voting record during the 2d session of the 83d Congress. At this time, I would like to make a short report on my work and some of the things I was able to accomplish during my first term in Congress.

I was fortunate enough to have 11 of my own bills enacted into law. So far as we have been able to discover from the record, which is not complete at this time, we succeeded in enacting more of our own bills into law than any other freshman Congressman; we do know that was true so far as the first session was concerned.

For the benefit of the Sixth District of Maryland, one of my bills enacted into law will permit the industries and municipalities of Maryland to have access to and use of the water in the Potomac River by giving authority to the Department of Interior to grant rights-of-way across the canal.

Another bill provides for the transfer of national park lands in Frederick County. It permits a consolidation of Federal holdings through an exchange for lands owned by the Church of the Brethren. The church owns two tracts in the area, separated from each other by Government-owned tracts, therefore the bill is of benefit to the Church of the Brethren and to the Federal Government.

We also introduced a bill providing for a metropolitan area transit commission to regulate public transportation in the Washington metropolitan area. This bill was passed by Congress in the form of an amendment to another bill which had been introduced on this subject.

We had adopted by the Public Works Committee, a resolution providing for a review of records and surveys to determine what might be done at the Savage River Dam and Reservoir to provide a water supply for the town of Westernport.

As a member of the Judiciary Committee and of Subcommittee No. 1 of that committee, we handled all of the major bills dealing with the control of communism. An examination of the record will show that I took a major part in the action on the floor of the House which resulted in the favorable adoption of the bill to control espionage and sabotage; the bill to grant immunity in subversive investigations before congressional committees and the so-called wiretapping evidence bill.

I was also a member of the Committee on the District of Columbia which is an important committee to western Maryland because of its control over laws dealing with the Washington milkshed. As a member of this committee I introduced six bills which became law and which are of vital importance to residents of Maryland who have businesses or business connections in the Nation's Capital.

There are, of course, many other major pieces of legislation on which I took an active part either before committees or on the floor of the House. Some of these are: The railroad retirement bill, a bill to outlaw the Communist Party, a bill of benefit to labor-surplus areas by authorizing loans to assist in building industrial plants—incidentally, we also introduced a bill to help obtain Government contracts for labor-surplus areas and we were happy to see that as a result of such congressional proposals, the President executed directives which were helpful in locating the new Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co. in Allegany County. Other bills on which I took an active part were a bill to continue the flood-control project in Allegany County; the control of slum areas in the Nation's Capital; a bill to repeal the 15 percent transportation tax—this was cut to 10 percent in the excise-tax bill; a bill to provide assistance to federally impacted areas in school construction; a bill for which I was coauthor and which became law to authorize the District of Columbia to enter into civil-defense compacts—this will allow cooperation between District and Maryland officials.

While engaged in this heavy legislative schedule, our office has managed to handle the problems of hundreds of residents of the Sixth Congressional District involving the Federal Government.

We are grateful to the people of the Sixth District of Maryland for the opportunity to serve them and the Nation as a Member of the United States House of Representatives.

Former President Harry S. Truman Receives Awards of the Eloy Alfaro International Foundation, Honorary Life Membership in the National Council of Business and Professional Men, Inc., and the American International Academy

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 16, 1954

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I insert highlights of the proceedings of the national council on the occasion of the 70th birthday of former President Harry S. Truman, at which the El Alfaro Grand Cross and Citation, honorary life membership in the national council, and honorary life membership and the star and cross of the American International Academy, were bestowed upon him, on Saturday, May 8, 1954, in the Waldorf-Astoria Towers, in the presence of the officers and members of the national council.

I am particularly happy to make note of this occasion, since it gives me the opportunity of doing honor to our former President, the Honorable Harry S. Truman, and to the National Council of Business and Professional Men, which has associated itself with the magnificent work of the Eloy Alfaro International Foundation and the American International Academy toward peace and democracy.

Mr. Herman A. Bayern, American provost of the Eloy Alfaro International Foundation, made the opening remarks, and addressed himself in part to Mr. Truman, as follows:

> You have been an astute administrator of the affairs of our country. You have been a valiant leader in the struggle to stem the onrushing tide of militant atheism that threatens the peace of the world. Your vision has sustained the spiritual bulwark of our civilization. Your concern has been with the welfare of the common man of this and other countries of the world. You have sounded the call to sustain the dignity of man, wherever and whenever it has been threatened. With impartial judgment, yet with great loyalty to those who have sustained your aims, you have furthered the social weal of the vast masses of the people of this country and the whole world.
>
> To you, champion of the rights of man and the finest ideals of America, we are greatly honored to present this grand cross and citation, as you particulary personify those cardinal virtues and ideals which Eloy Alfaro fought and died for in his struggle to emancipate the common man.

Señor Humberto Calamari, personal representative to His Excellency, Eusebio A. Morales, made the first award; a biribboned Grand Cross and Citation, inscribed in Spanish with appropriate remarks concerning the great appreciation Latin America has for the outstanding advancement achieved by Mr. Truman in promoting and cementing the friendship between Latin America and the United States.

The Honorable Aaron Frank, president of the national council, and former deputy police commissioner of the city of New York, awarded Mr. Truman honorary life membership in the national council, in recognition of his intellectual distinction, scholarship, and accomplishment, as a humanitarian, statesman, and philosopher.

The final award and citations were made by Dr. Harry Cohen, provost, American International Academy, during which he made the following remarks to Mr. Truman:

> This academy, that I have the honor to represent, received its charter in Washington over 50 years ago. Included in its membership are many illustrious names from all over the world. It is a world organization of famous scholars. I hope that when the Harry S. Truman Library is completed, you will find a worthy place for these citations among your souvenirs. I hope that the good Lord will grant you many, many happy years of health, life, and happiness, so that you may continue to carry on with your wonderful work.

The Honorable Harry S. Truman, in accepting these honors, made this address:

> Thank you, Mr. Bayern, Commissioner Frank, Dr. Harry Cohen, and ladies and gentlemen of the national council. I am overwhelmed with these great honors which you have bestowed upon me, for which please accept my sincere thanks and gratitude. It is very kind of all of you to join with me in celebrating my 70th birthday. Brother Colon Eloy Elfaro, director general of the foundation, and I, were active in promoting the Simon Bolivar Memorial Foundation, at the time I was in the Senate and Mr. Alfaro was the Ambassador from Ecuador, in Washington, D. C. Sr. Diogenes Escalante, the Ambassador of Venezuela in Washington, was first vice president, and my good friend, Colon Eloy Alfaro was second vice president. Ambassador Escalante was recalled by his government. I went to the White House, and Colon Eloy Alfaro then did all the work of the Bolivar Foundation.
>
> I recall, too, that we both made the trip to Missouri in connection with the ceremonies in commemorating the presentation of the statue of Bolivar that the Government of Venezuela had presented for the erection in the town of Bolivar, Mo. on July 5, 1948.
>
> Let me say that in the world struggle to consolidate the ideals of democracy, the American Continent has contributed the philosophy, the work—and what is more—the heroic sacrifice of its most representative citizens. Ranked with Bolivar, Lincoln, Jefferson, Jackson, Roosevelt, Marti, and other immortal American martyrs in the world struggle for the institution of the principles of democracy, Eloy Alfaro occupies an outstanding position for his great heart, and his great mind, dedicated completely to the defense of the less privileged.
>
> Inspired by the work of this great American patriot, the Eloy Alfaro International Foundation has instituted a decoration which is awarded to men in the fields of public affairs, education, science and religion, who dedicate their lives to eternal vigilance over human rights—sacred patrimony of mankind.
>
> I shall always cherish these awards and citations, and I again express my great appreciation for your kindness in conferring all these honors on me, from the bottom of my heart. May God bless us all and bring peace on earth and good will to all men.

Mr. Theodore Fred Kuper, chairman of the legislative committee and vice president of the national council, called upon all present to sing Happy Birthday, which everyone present sang heartily.

Impressions of Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. SMITH

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Henry Crosby, of Greenville, Miss., a member of the Board of Supervisors of Washington County, Miss., recently returned from an extended visit to Europe. Mr. Crosby's report on the trip, as reported in the Mississippi Pilot, is such a thoughtful one that, under unanimous consent, I include it in the RECORD in order that my colleagues might have an opportunity to read it. His report follows:

"Stability is what Europeans in all walks of life have more of than we Americans," Henry Crosby said the other night on his return from a summer tour of Europe.

The county supervisor and civic leader and his wife toured the British Isles, the channel countries, and Scandinavia. Mrs. Crosby remained in England an extra week after her husband came back to the States on a BOAC flight. She was to return home by ocean liner Tuesday.

"Europeans have more stability than Americans because most of them have their roots so deep in the places where they live. Some of the families have lived over 200 years in one house.

"They feel a sense of security in living in the same houses, walking in the same streets, and farming the same fields or working at the same trades as their ancestors."

Crosby added that he noticed too that no job is taken as one without dignity. "The doorman of a hotel stands at his post as though his job is the most important one he can have. He is proud of his job, and, unlike impatient Americans, plans to make it a lifetime career by doing the job well.

"It is the same with the chimney sweepers of London, the waiters in French cafes, and the bus drivers traveling Italian highways. They see their jobs as being important; and at times they are almost pompous in performing their everyday duties.

"It was evident too that they felt compelled to give an honest day's work in their employment. Work is the accepted rule of the people I saw in Europe. They expect to work, and try to do their best."

He pointed out that the State of Mississippi could get inspiration from the beautiful crops of grain, sugar beets, potatoes, and vegetables raised with a minimum of equipment and mostly by hand labor in the European countries.

"Since the last war there has been little money with which to buy farm equipment (the little they do use) and horses and cattle. These three having been largely confiscated or destroyed during the war. Many of the horses and their cattle were slaughtered for meat.

"On many highways in Italy I saw oxcarts loaded with hay being pulled by oxen. Several were pulled by Holstein cows on the way home to be milked. They are trying to build up their herds again, but that will take years of striving."

Europeans' consciousness of the unusual weather conditions, from too much rain, was illustrated by an elderly Irishman, whom the Crosbys met at an agricultural fair in southern Ireland.

"He engaged us in conversation, and spoke out against 'the blasted American atomic bomb,' and blamed it for ruining his vegetable garden.

"They fail to realize that the bomb is being perfected for the preservation of their gardens, homes, and themselves.

"We found apprehension over Russian expansion in all the countries we visited. Yet they expressed fear that by being impulsive America would cause another world war. 'We simply cannot go it,' they maintain.

"While we were in England we found that the English press was playing up the fact that English world leaders can curb the United States and Russia can curb China, and in that way Russia and England will save the world from an international conflict. England is all for trade since trade is her life's blood.

"People on the street in England have been sold the idea that if Americans would go through the ravages of a war in the United States, Americans would be less eager for a world conflict now.

"They fail to realize that the United States does not want a war, nor do we want slavery under Russian rule; so the United States is standing its ground against the Communists.

"During the current period England and France feel it is necessary to negotiate with Russia and its satellites to preserve the uncertain peace we have at the present time. Under their lead in the negotiations the West continues to make concessions desired by the Communists; but they profess this is the only way to survive."

The county political leader brought out that his visit to England made him more understanding of the British attitude that anything beats nothingness. "England has an area the same square miles as Mississippi, and is crowded with 40 million people. It would take only one hydrogen bomb and the thousand years of England's history would be ended. 'The English are very conscious and concerned about that simple fact.

"England is sacred to the Britsh people like Paris is sacred to the French. So they are willing to make any kind of concession in order to preserve their first loves.

"Somehow, they don't seem to realize that we're no more willing to send our sons to war and pay the expense of war than they are. But the difference in the English viewpoint and the American, Canadian, and Australian viewpoint is that where the English fear total destruction, the latter three nations fear slavery.

"The American, the Canadian and the Australian doubt that their countries could be destroyed by bombings, because of their vast spaces; but the English envisage their small country as disappearing under the Atlantic Ocean to join the lost city of Atlantis after one hydrogen bomb.

"The discussions of Churchill and French Premier Mendes-France are motivated by that kind of thinking."

He stated that, judging from natives talked with in Norway and Denmark, that the people of those two countries do not want war either, "but they, like the Americans, abhor the idea of slavery.

"Sweden, located close to Russia, is still playing the neutral game like it did during World War II, but Sweden at heart is on our side."

Crosby said it was gratifying to see at first hand the splendid recovery Europe has made since World War II. "Meat rationing went off in England while we were there. New buildings, built during the past 9 years, were pointed out to us; and the main damage from the German bombings has been repaired. And it was the same over most of Europe, though less so in the interior of France.

"France has made a slower recovery, largely due to the instability of the vacillating French Governments, strikes of labor, and lack of determination. Many of the public buildings, other than those in the war, were in bad need of repairs.

"It's a truism in Europe that France cannot be depended upon to fight wholeheartedly now. I believe that this is a combination of two factors: The nature of the people and bad government.

"They are pleasure minded, especially in the cities. Frenchmen generally worship the city of Paris in a pagan way. That was partly the reason, I am told, the nation capitulated so quickly when the Germans began to attack the country at the beginning of World War II. They wanted more than anything to save Paris from bomb damage. This later galled the English and even the Germans, because so many of their own cities were destroyed, while Paris was preserved intact with all of its beauty.

"Denmark, the Netherlands, Belgium, and Norway suffered almost as heavily as France during the last war. They were also occupied for the duration; but you can hardly find any signs of war damage in those countries. They have worked like beavers in their determination to build back."

He remarked that the rank and file of people over Europe appreciate what the Marshall plan has done in aiding European recovery. "Take Norway, for instance. The Germans made a 'scorched earth' retreat from that country near the end of the war and left the northern part of the nation almost destitute. The Marshall plan has helped Norway to get back on its feet and meet its own needs.

"Incidentally, I asked what happened to the Norwegian traitor Quisling (whose name became a synonym for all World War II traitors and collaborators). My guide replied simply, 'We shot him.'

"We found, in conversations with guides, waiters, and natives in France, Denmark, and Italy that they are mortally afraid of German rearmament, and insist the United States must be responsible for German conduct on their borders.

"The Italians especially abhor Germany. Shortly before the Germans were forced by American troops to withdraw from Italy, the Germans massacred 300 Italian soldiers and officers, accusing them of not being diligent enough in trying to quell an anti-German riot. There were many other occasions like this in Italy. And many of the Italians remember."

After visiting in Rome, Crosby said it was easy to understand why Keats and Shelby chose to live there. "The cadence is not as exciting in Rome as in Paris; but Rome is a stable and a wonderful city.

"There's quite a bit of building going on now in Rome. There were 100 or more large new multiple unit apartments under construction, and also many offices and stores being built."

He was interested in viewing the different types of highway construction in the countries of Europe, most of which had blacktop and rock roads. "It was amazing to see that the Appian Way, leading into Rome, and built about 10 B. C. was still in good condition. Also at Coventy, England, we rode over a main highway built by Romans in 50 A. D.

"I was very much interested also on the way the hospitals were handled in the Scandanavian countries through local sick clubs and government aid programs. In Italy and France, the hospitals were largely maintained and staffed by the Catholic orders. With them it is a labor of love."

After concluding his tour of Europe, Crosby decided that a southern accent "is the best gadget you can take with you to Europe. Strangely enough, when an European hears a southern accent he invariably engages you in conversation and tries to add to your pleasure.

Many of our most enjoyable experiences came to us that way.

"Now at home I'm trying to figure out how the United States has done all it has done since the revolution. So short a time."

Record of the 83d Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, the 83d Congress has come to a close.

It was the first Republican-controlled Congress since the 80th Congress. It was the first Republican Congress since 1929 to serve under a Republican President.

Unlike the 80th Congress, the 83d Congress has given no one justification to refer to it as a "do nothing" Congress. As a matter of fact, with the close of the second session, the administration leaders could very properly point to it as having, in varying degrees, accomplished a large portion of President Eisenhower's program. It was an active Congress, though slow moving throughout the first session and for several months of the final session. In the last 3 months, however, it became a hard-working Congress and produced a fair volume of work.

Having said all these things, however, I do not wish to convey the impression that I was in full agreement with everything done in the 83d Congress. I found it necessary at times to vigorously oppose much of this legislative effort, especially when it tended toward the ofttime mentioned giveaway program. I did, however, support a great deal of the administration's program. I think the voting record of the 83d Congress will show that I probably gave more support to the President's program than many of my Republican colleagues from the State of Illinois. This, I might add, is true of the entire Democratic delegation from the State of Illinois.

APPROVED DEMOCRATIC PROGRAMS

In its accomplishments and achievements, the 83d Congress could take little credit for originality. Most of its major efforts were directed toward the continuation of programs initiated in previous Democratic administrations under President Roosevelt and President Truman. Among these were: The Mutual Security program, housing legislation, expansion of social security, unemployment insurance, railroad retirement, atomic energy, vocational rehabilitation, hospital construction, public health grant-in-aid, reciprocal trade agreements, highway construction, and extension of other programs created by Democratic Congresses.

I cannot think of a single program considered in the 83d Congress which was initiated by the new administration except its giveaway program, such as tidelands oil, the Dixon-Yates contract, raids on national parks and forests, announced new policies on reclamation, irrigation and power, and timberland grabs. Many of these did not show themselves in the final box score of Congress, because an administrative approach was used to institute new policies in these fields, which, in my opinion, were not in the public interest.

Frequently, however, as in the timberland grab, the grazing grab, and a few other grabs, it was necessary that the groups, seeking distribution of our national resources to private interest, had to come to Congress to get what they wanted. And, although they came with White House approval, we were able to muster sufficient support to defeat their plans. These defeats rightfully should be charged against the President's program.

REPUBLICANS OPPOSED EISENHOWER

Major controversies during the 83d Congress evolved around increasing the debt limit and tax revision, housing, flexible price supports in agriculture, Taft-Hartley revision, and on the final form most of the legislation previously mentioned was to take. In most of the instances, the Democratic minority was found supporting the request of President Eisenhower while the obstacles and major opposition to many of his proposals were coming from within his own party. It was not an infrequent situation in the 83d Congress, both the first and second session, to find the Democrats carrying the ball for the White House and pushing the enactment of the worthwhile sections of the President's program.

The box score on the success of President Eisenhower's program during the 83d Congress, as announced by the White House, is most certainly open to challenge. It is ridiculous for White House aides to claim that nearly all the legislation the President asked for was enacted, and more ridiculous still is their claim that his batting average in this regard was .830 or that he struck out only 11 times in 65 tries, as his press secretary, James C. Hagerty, stated.

Actually, little of the President's program was enacted in the form he requested. In many cases, the only similarity between the legislation he suggested and the final bill enacted into law was the title. Throughout both sessions of the Congress, it was apparent that administration congressional leaders either were not clear on the President's position on housing, social security, atomic energy, reciprocal trades agreements, and foreign aid, or they were careless in presenting his position in floor debate.

DEMOCRATS TOOK INITIATIVE

In many cases, the action of both the House and the Senate on important parts of the administration's legislative program was considered in the Congress itself as defeats for the administration. In many more instances the Democratic minority took the initiative to save major parts of the President's program. On at least four different occasions the minority embarrassed Republican leadership in the House into following Democratic efforts to enact vital sections of legislation requested by the President.

It was noted also that the White House claimed credit for the enactment of several pieces of veterans legislation. The record will show, however, that the administration vigorously opposed the enactment of several of these veterans' measures, for which it now takes credit, to the extent of threatening veto. The administration's attitude on H. R. 9020, a bill to increase benefits for veterans was such as to draw condemnation from the National Tribune, regarded as the voice of the veterans of the United States. It comes in poor grace now for White House aides to claim any credit for the veterans' legislation enacted during the 83d Congress.

In retrospect, reviewing the first 2 years of the new administration, its successes and failures, I intend to comment herein principally on its legislative program, but I do not feel that we can overlook action early in the present administration to create the "hard dollar." Nor can we overlook the failure of the Republican administration to arrest inflationary trends or to stop the rising cost of living.

VALUE OF DOLLAR DECLINES

Nearing the half-way mark in the Eisenhower administration and at the end of the first Congress during that administration, we find that the value of the dollar is at its lowest mark in history and living costs are at an all-time high. Quite naturally, these portend serious problems for the administration to solve in its remaining 2 years. Up to this time, and with little hope for success in the future, the administration has not been able to balance the budget.

It has increased the national debt to $18 billion, which they seek to hide with tricky bookkeeping.

Under previous methods of determining the public debt, a $100 savings bond was charged as a $100 obligation of the Federal Government. Under the Eisenhower administration, the obligation is charged as a $75 obligation although at its maturity the Government owes the holder of that bond $100. With this bookkeeping gimmick, the Eisenhower debt of $274 billion would be $286 billion, $18 billion greater than the $268 billion debt under President Truman.

Undoubtedly in 1952 many people turned to President Eisenhower for leadership with the feeling that he could bring unity to the Nation and to the world. These must be sorely disappointed when they look at the lack of unity and the steadily increasing conflict among the nations supposed to be allied.

CONFUSION INSTEAD OF CONFIDENCE

As we look around us at the end of the 83d Congress, we see that the grand hopes of our people and of friendly people of foreign lands have been crushed in disillusionment. We witness confusion instead of confidence. We see dismay and uncertainty, instead of pride and courage. We have lost the initiative in foreign policy, and we have seen our influence diminish.

Despite boasts of a firm foreign policy dressed with high-sounding slogans, we at the moment see the European Defense Community, which is the cornerstone of the NATO program, near collapse. It is ironical that the build-up of NATO and the ground work of EDC was one of the greatest achievements of General Eisenhower, serving under appointment of President Truman.

But the sad fact is, since the Eisenhower administration took over, this Government has not won a battle on a foreign diplomatic front.

NATIONAL SECURITY

As a member of the House Committee on Armed Services and the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, my time and interest have been directed principally to matters of national security.

During the first session, Congress cut $5 billion from the Air Force, and the Secretary of Defense said he was going to economize by having fewer war planes, but better defenses. Senator RUSSELL, of Georgia, was prompted to suggest that we might be even stronger if the administration cut $10 billion from the Air Force.

In the 1954 budget, some of the Air Force strength was restored, but there were still cuts in the defense budget. These were instituted over the objections of our military leaders—whose selection had been heralded with the thought of having new men take a New Look at requirements. Following the unprecedented action of having the Budget Director sit in on sessions of the National Security Council, the dollar philosophy overrode the safety philosophy.

The 1954 cut was sold by the sloganmakers as giving more "bang for a buck," and being a "New Look," based upon "instant, massive retaliatory" power. When the facts were closely analyzed, it was found that we were getting less bangs for fewer bucks; that our power of retaliation was decreased rather than increased.

Events in the Far East of last spring brought home the weaknesses of the plan to substitute economy for safety in the defense. Since then the administration has been giving the New Look a new look.

Manpower goals destined to go down, now are to go up.

Defense spending was to decline. Now it is to rise.

The Air Force was to have fewer fighting wings. Now it is to have more fighting wings—nearly as many as the Truman administration said were needed.

Universal military training is out one day, in another, and denied by the White House, until at least after the November elections.

ATOMIC ENERGY

In the field of atomic energy, Congress provided a pretty good bill. Except in the section applying to international sharing of materials, the bill was not the one requested by the administration. Domestically, the Republican leadership would have gone so far as to let a relatively few private interests take over Government patents on atomic energy, which truly belong to the taxpayers who contributed $10 billion to the development of this source of limitless energy. Only the determined efforts of the Democrats in Congress prevented this policy being written into law as a part of the revised atomic-energy bill. We were given a last-minute assist from the President.

GIVEAWAY DIXON-YATES CONTRACT

The administration's giveaway program started early; perhaps the first bill to go through the 83d Congress was one turning over to a few coastal States the offshore oil resources that are properly the property of all the people. In their zeal to achieve this giveaway, which reversed several Supreme Court decisions, Congress and the administration went too far even for themselves. They quickly enacted another law taking back anything beyond the continental shelf.

The utility interests then began demanding the giveaway of the Tennessee Valley Authority. They have continued their efforts, and finally may have succeeded in the form of an indirect attack. The Dixon-Yates contract with the Atomic Energy Commission is designed to hamstring TVA's ability to serve as a yardstick for electric-power rates. I have opposed this contract because I do not believe the Atomic Energy Commission should be used for this purpose.

The Commission has enough to do to handle our nuclear weapons and atomic energy program for peaceful uses without involving itself in the controversy over power policy.

A bold attempt was made to give away our timberlands, but fortunately enough Members of Congress saw the dangers to stop it. Under the terms of this bill, cutover timberland, acquired by the Government in connection with dams or target ranges, would have paid for by an equivalent area of virgin timberland from the national forests. At present owners of such land are reimbursed in cash.

Two attempts were made to turn over the national forests to the big cattle-grazing interests, but this, too, was defeated.

VETERANS

Veterans have received few benefits from this Congress and from the administration. In the administration of veterans' affairs, as in all other matters, the administration looks at the dollar sign rather than the service rendered. Appropriations have been cut, and many needed services have been curtailed. The administration has had the hospitalization program under constant attack.

In Congress, in response to great demand to enable veterans, widows, and dependents to help meet rising living costs, the Committee on Veterans' Affairs—where bipartisanship actually works—brought out a bill, H. R. 9020. It was roadblocked for weeks by the Republican leadership, who used the threat of a veto. They finally forced the committee to vastly curtail the measure, so that millions of disabled veterans, as well as all veterans of the Spanish-American War, were denied increases. Then it was brought up under a gag rule, so that it had to be accepted as it was, or completely rejected. This was the reason for the unprecedented censure in the pages of the National Tribune.

The President recommended, and Congress agreed, that the day, November 11, be renamed Veterans Day.

LABOR

Candidate Eisenhower told the American Federation of Labor that he thought certain provisions of the Taft-Hartley law could be used to break unions. He promised to repeal these union-busting sections. In September 1953, Martin Durkin, who had been assigned the job of eliminating these provisions, resigned as Secretary of Labor, claiming he had been doublecrossed. When the Taft-Hartley recommendations were finally sent to Congress, the sections labor felt were union busting were intact. Congress then failed to act; in fact, only united Democratic effort in the Senate prevented even more obnoxious provisions from being written.

AGRICULTURE

Candidate Eisenhower told an audience at Brookings, S. Dak., in 1952, that the Republican Party was pledged to give the farmer 100 percent of parity, with the guaranty of the price supports of 90.

In June of this year the President told a news conference he never implied or insinuated any such thing.

Meanwhile, he and his Secretary of Agriculture, Ezra Taft Benson, were asking for a flexible support system, with the minimum of 75 percent of parity. When Congress gave him a bill putting price supports at from 82½ to 90 percent, he and his White House aids proclaimed a victory.

Had no bill been written, the President would have had his 75 to 90 percent of parity.

The administration, which campaigned so ardently against what it called the socialistic Brannan plan, recommended a Brannan plan for wool, and points to this measure as a victory.

Secretary Benson told a congressional committee that the Nation can remain prosperous with farmers receiving a gradually declining percentage of national income. He said this just a few weeks after he had reduced the price of dairy products by 20 points, although there was no correspondingly large decrease in the price to the consumer.

One of the early acts of the new administration was to wreck the Soil Conservation Service by a reorganization which left much of the work up to individual States. This resulted in the loss of most of the highly trained experts in this field from the program.

The 1954 drought, which brought suffering to Illinois farmers, dramatically highlighted the need for a program which would assure an ever-normal reservoir of water, one of the goals of a well-rounded soil-conservation program.

WELFARE—SOCIAL SECURITY

The social-security expansion bill was the major highlight of the positive action of the Congress, but in passing this legislation the President was dealt a blow, for the congressional leadership failed to achieve his goal of increasing coverage by 10,500,000.

We of the minority, however, welcomed the final endorsement of this program by the Republicans. When this program was instituted by the Roosevelt administration in 1934, it was met by Republican cries of "socialism" and "radicalism." Every Republican on the Ways Means Committee in 1934 voted to kill the bill. The Republican platform of 1936 contained a plank promising to repeal the law.

The law, as amended, raises benefits, raises payroll deductions, provides waiver of premium and no loss of equity for the permanent and totally disabled, and includes some new workers.

Other phases of the welfare program did not fare so well. The health reinsurance program was defeated; while the housing program was virtually emasculated. The President had requested a watered-down public-housing program of 35,000 units a year for 4 years. Democrats tried desperately to save this program; the best that could be accomplished was 35,000 units for 1 year. The tricky language of the bill is such, however, that only a very small portion of these needed homes will ever be constructed.

School construction legislation, promised by Candidate Eisenhower, was not even recommended by the administration, despite a survey by the Office of Education, showing the need for 345,000 new classrooms.

Authorizations to expand grants in aid for health services, vocational rehabilitation and hospital construction were enacted. Much of this worthwhile program—all of it carrying out legislation adopted by the previous Democratic administrations—was negated by budget cuts.

TRADE NOT AID

The Republicans in 1953 offered a catchy phrase, "Trade, not aid." In order to carry out this program, the President forwarded a comprehensive foreign trade bill to the Congress, which provided for a 3-year extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act (a Democratic program), and asked for permission to further reduce tariffs. The best he could obtain was a flat 1-year extension, and the threat was made that he probably would not get more than that next year, if, in fact the Republican leadership did not repeal the whole program. This has been one of the victories claimed by the White House staff.

The extension adopted by the Congress does nothing to further the exportation of farm products, of which we have a surplus, nor does it provide any means of correcting inequities in the administration of the law which have been harmful to such industries as coal and chemicals.

TAX REVISION

Individual income-tax reductions went into effect at the beginning of 1954. They were automatic, having been provided for in a law passed by a Democratic Congress and approved by a Democratic President. The 83d Congress adopted a tax-revision law, which provided for some worthwhile reductions, and which I supported. I joined, however, the Democratic effort to increase the personal exemptions of individual taxpayers which would have greatly increased general consumer purchasing power.

POSTAL AND FEDERAL EMPLOYEES PAY RAISE

House and Senate Members were practically unanimous in approving a 5-percent pay raise for all Federal employees including all employees in the postal service. It was vetoed, however, by President Eisenhower because it did not carry with it postal rate increases. Congress had refused to increase postal rates at the request of Postmaster General Summerfield, particularly due to opposition to any increase in first-class mail rates.

SUMMARY

On the whole it would seem that claims of administration victory fall far short when it is remembered that the following major proposals were rejected by the Congress:

First. Revision of the Taft-Hartley Labor Act.

Second. Statehood for Hawaii and Alaska.

Third. Trade, not aid.

Fourth. Health insurance.

Fifth. Eighteen-year-old vote.

Sixth. Internal security proposals.

Of all the bills enacted in the program, even those which were watered down by compromise, only five fall into the category of positive law. These were the tidelands bill; the emergency refugee act—the beneficial effects of which have been negated by the investigative zeal of Scott McLeod in the State Department; the St. Lawrence waterway—long advocated by the Democratic administrations; the tax revision law; and the anti-Communist bill. This last bill was not requested by the administration but was enacted under the leadership of the Democrats in Congress and is a stiffer bill than that requested by the White House.

One thing stands crystal clear about the 83d Congress. While it spent many hours in oratory denouncing the Roosevelt and Truman administrations, it did not, during 2 entire sessions, seek to repeal 1 piece of welfare legislation initiated under Democratic administration.

For political reasons they have not dared to make a direct approach, but have chose, rather, to wreck these programs by the indirect method of withholding appropriations, or feet dragging in the administrative level.

To Safeguard Our Fundamental Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, when I took my stand against the bill to outlaw the Communist Party I thought I would stand alone. The avalanche of mail and telegrams supporting my position has been overwhelming.

Our colleagues may have momentarily forgotten the importance of safeguarding our fundamental rights, but the people have not. I would like to place in the Record all of the communications I received, but I realize that limtations prevent that.

I set forth one which is so typically American. It follows:

Brooklyn, N. Y.

My Dear Congressman Multer: Though I'm not one of your constituents, I'd like to appreciatively congratulate you on your brave stand against the bill to ban the Communist Party.

Actually it was a bill to repeal the Bill of Rights, something that my ancestors fought in the Revolutionary War to establish. Democracy embodies the logical corollary of respecting the rights of those who disagree with us. That principle you courageously vindicated and your stand will be remembered once that all these hysterical enactments have been deservedly junked.

Sincerely,

Harold Preece.

Senator Wiley Insists Foreign Aid Is a Bargain For Wisconsin Taxpayers—I Do Not Agree

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, my good friend and distinguished senior Senator from Wisconsin, Mr. Wiley, has replied to my statement in the Record on August 5. In it I called attention to an extended statement on the floor of the Senate by him in which he asserted that the foreign-aid program was a highly profitable scheme for the people of Wisconsin and the Nation.

I pointed out, Mr. Speaker, that it was true some business firms in Wisconsin did secure some contracts for goods and services, thus giving employment to their employees but notwithstanding, Wisconsin taxpayers paid out $2 for every dollar received under the foreign-aid program. The Senator did not answer that charge, except to say that it was not a new one and has been repeated many times.

He then proceeds to mention many intangible benefits of "what might have happened" if we had not engaged in this great giveaway program.

Nor does he, Mr. Speaker, meet the main contention of my argument, that although foreign aid has cost the United States more than $60 billion that communism still marches on. Twelve million Indochinese have just disappeared behind the Iron Curtain while American military equipment is about to be seized by the same Communists and in the last 3 years $2 billion of American dollars have gone down the drain. And it will be only a matter of a few months when all of Indochina will be lost to the free world.

France and Italy, the Senator says, might have succumbed to communism but they have not. Well, there is considerable doubt about that statement. Italy teeters on the brink of communism—the Communists are so powerful that they control all labor unions and the Government is impotent to proceed against them.

And France, Mr. Speaker, which is the key to the NATO organization, backed so strongly by the United States, is at the mercy of the Communists. They have succeeded in preventing approval of the European Defense Community and it now appears that EDC is on the rocks.

How can it be said that France and Italy have successfully prevented domination by the Reds? In outward appearances only is that true. France and Italy are not presently on the Soviet timetable, not until all of Asia is safely under control of the godless Communists.

American dollars, Mr. Speaker, are not the answer to this problem. Public officials and private citizens in untold numbers who have been abroad have said that the foreign-aid program is not meeting its objective. We cannot help people who do not want to be helped. Nor will dollars buy friends. Oh yes, there are many countries that want our money but without strings attached.

Mr. Speaker, the issue of communism is a political one. It is not primarily economic or military and until we realize those facts, American dollars are going down a rathole.

In the matter of following the President, who is the leader of my party, I can only say that I opposed this policy when a Democrat was in the White House. My respectful disagreement with the President and with my good friend, Senator WILEY, is based on the conviction that the foreign-aid program has not and is not now suceeding. Time only will tell. I realize, too, that Mr. WILEY has supported the program under Mr. Truman as well as under Mr. Eisenhower, and he no doubt is convinced that foreign aid is doing a good job. We are in respectful disagreement.

Mr. Speaker, do we provide hope to enslaved millions, as the Senator has said? I do not agree. Every day there are reports that our allies and, yes, the United States, through Mr. Stassen are actively engaged in a drive to do business with Russia and its satellites. The friendly underground movement in those countries are alarmed over the prospect that war material will begin to flow to the industrial machine that is building weapons and ammunition to put down the underground and ultimately to be used against our own armies.

What are we doing to encourage these people? Our State Department has refused to consider breaking off diplomatic relationships. No, our policy seems to be that we will do business with the Communists, as usual. Britain, France, and Germany are all striving for increased trade with the Reds.

There is very little encouragement for the underground under these circumstances.

Mr. Speaker, yes, Wisconsin is willing to pay its share toward foreign aid. It has no other choice. But the people of Wisconsin and in all the other States should have an opportunity to express themselves on this issue.

In a very recent poll of my constituents, I asked the question of their attitude on the foreign-aid program. Result: Yes, 443; no, 828. Statewide, I believe the same results would prevail.

And Mr. Speaker, I think it is quite significant, as one attempts to analyze the sentiment of the people of Wisconsin on this subject, to note that the vote in the Wisconsin delegation to Congress was 8 to 4 against the foreign-aid program.

Communism and the Admission of Red China to the United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, as much as any time in the history of our Nation and the long course of its external relations with neighbor countries of the world, we are being called upon continually to adjust our thinking to the changing pace of international events. We are faced—as the leader of the free-world alliance—with the necessity for maintenance of peace and security. Cognizant of our strength, it is to us that our less fortunate friends have turned, for assistance in the age-old battle against the ravages of hunger and poverty, and the diseases of despotism which would crush the spirits and warp the minds of all mankind.

In the field of foreign affairs the problem haunting us today is unquestionably godless communism. Its poisoned tentacles seek to pervade the lives and way of life of every human upon the face of this earth. It feasts upon weakness and indecision. It preys especially upon those who have little of this world's possessions, promising always the millennium and making payment ever in terms of human slavery, torture, and anxiety. Its argument is a compelling and persuasive one, yet a so-called logic which, carried to its correct and final conclusion, denies the freedom of men's minds and wills and substitutes therefor an all-thinking and all-providing state. It is a highly malignant cancer which may strike all of us down.

There are many areas of the world in which this global conspiracy is at work. Hardly a day passes by in which we do not hear of some new Red atrocity or do not become painfully aware of some new Communist tension or aggression. Working in the shadows of human indifference and ignorance, it woos and wins by lies and trickery what it has failed to subjugate by force of arms.

To many Americans, one of the most brazen, though certainly not the latest act of Communist effrontery, is the attempt by the Red China "peoples' republic" of Peiping to gain admission into the United Nations. Many of its friends have argued that it is in the interests of world peace that this be done. However, a look at Red China's record can only serve to convince us otherwise.

It has been almost 5 years since the Communists seized power in China. Since that time, and with a ruthless dispatch, they have moved to wipe out all vestige of political freedom for their opponents. In November of 1950, without cause or reason, they turned loose into Korea hundreds of thousands of troops, who engaged the United Nations and Republic of Korea in battle. The Chinese were supplied with munitions and materiel by the Soviets. If there could have been any questions about the peaceful tendencies of the Mao-Tse-Tung regime before this, the invasion of Korea dispelled those doubts.

As a result of this open and unprovoked act of hostility the Red Chinese were branded as aggressors by the United Nations.

Since the conclusion of the Korean armistice, on July 27, 1953, there has been little indication that the Peiping government has changed its views, internationallywise, in any important respect.

It supported the Communist inspired and led Viet Minh army in its predatory moves against the rightful Indochina States of Cambodia, Vietnam, and Laos.

It has given aid and comfort to the divisive and subversive forces of Communist guerrillas in nations within the southeast Asian sphere.

It has maltreated and humiliated, on many occasions, nationals from foreign nations who had the misfortune to be detained within China's borders.

The Red Chinese have continued, unabated, their campaign of hate against the United States and other Asian and western nations with whom we have allied ourselves in the furtherance of peace.

They have violated, consistently and with a shameless lack of concern, many of the solemn provisions of the Korean Armistice.

Following that truce meeting, and in direct and diametrical contravention of its terms, they have stymied the neutral Nations Supervisory Commission in the work which had been assigned to it in North Korea. They have made a minimum and disruptive effort to carry into effect the provisions of the armistice with regard to the holding of the political conference, which would have dealt with some of the many problems which, following the Korean conflict, remained to be settled. The Reds did everything in their power to block the successful accomplishment of that aspect of the agreement pertaining to nonrepatriated prisoners of war.

Those in authority in the Peiping government have demonstrated, in the clearest and most unmistakeable of terms, that they are not to be trusted and that to them the honor which civilized men attach to a solemn promise is worth nothing.

Of greater importance than all these considerations is the fact that the Communists do not represent the millions who populate their country. Order, such as it is, is maintained there only by the strongest and most stringent type of controls, and police action. Property, belonging to both native chinese and to foreigners has been confiscated. The family, basic unit of society that it is, has been attacked with an increased and malevolent dedication. To the authorities there, human life and liberty are the cheapest of commodities.

It is especially important to Americans that they take an increased notice of this attempt by the Red Chinese to "shoot" their way into the council halls of the United Nations. It is important because efforts will be made, at the time that organization convenes early this fall, to plead the unholy cause of its admission. It is alarming, for the United Nations was originally set up as an international group dedicated to world peace.

Red China's friends, however, will say that we must face reality. To them we say that if we would truly face reality, we would realize, in our heart of hearts, that there can be no dealing with the Communists on an honorable, brother-to-brother basis. The Iron and Bamboo Curtains which move farther and farther over the earth each day leave within their awful confines many peoples and nations who believed the promises which communism made and reached for the sugar-coated delights which communism has always offered to the unwary and the guileless.

We cannot compromise nor bargain nor coexist with communism.

No amount of rationalization or pressure should compel us to admit Red China to the United Nations. In every agreement to which the Reds have become a signatory party, they have violated their word. They have been branded as agressors, and are still, actually, at war with the very group to which they seek admission. In Korea and Indochina they have perpetrated the most unbelievable atrocities. Murder, pillage, and attack upon unarmed and defenseless peoples are their normal standards of behavior.

And even so, for sake of trade considerations, or for lack of moral strength and courage, many nations would do business with them, even upon such terms as the Reds themselves lay down.

The Communist Chinese have shown neither the ability nor the disposition to put aside their warlike tendencies and abide by normal, civilized rules of human conduct.

We would fail to keep faith with those of our sons who died on Korean soil in defense of freedom—some of them the victims of the most unutterable brutality and calculated murder—were we to allow Peiping's representatives to enter into the conclaves and councils of the United Nations.

It would be the gravest of mistakes to permit the entry of Red China into the United Nations, there to impede and disrupt the cause of peace to which that international organization professes, above all, to be dedicated.

At this time a matter of such paramount importance merits the thoughtful reflection and consideration of every loyal American.

My Record in the 83d Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. BONIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. BONIN. Mr. Speaker, at the close of my first term in the House of Representatives I take this means to report to my constituents. The people of Luzerne County elected me to office because they wanted a change from what they had. I feel that it is now my duty to tell them what I have done, and equally as important, what I have not done.

It has been a great honor for me to be a Member of the Republican 83d Congress. In spite of a slim GOP majority, we have accomplished more in 2 years than any Congress before us. The task has not been easy. It has involved long hours of work and little relaxation. I have probably seen less of Washington than most tourists. However, the record we achieved is well worth the effort put into it. We can truthfully announce that over 90 percent of our campaign promises have been enacted into law during the first half of the President's term. Ike's program, which I have supported, has been truly dynamic and energetic.

During the first session of the 83d Congress the Republican Party was smeared by its opponents as the "do-nothing party with the do-nothing Congress." They could not have been more wrong. This slogan backfired in their faces. Indeed, the press has consistently referred to the 2d session of the 83d Congress as the "get it done" Congress. We did not rush into hasty measures merely to get our names in the newspapers. Instead, we spent almost an entire year in study and thoughtful planning. This year the planning bore fruit in the tremendous legislative accomplishments of the Republican Party.

LEGISLATIVE ACCOMPLISHMENTS

The primary job of a Congressman is to pass the laws necessary to preserve the national well-being. We have done that job. The economy and efficiency achieved by the 83d Congress is only a small example of what can and will be done in the future. We have kept our campaign pledges. The Korean "police action" has been stopped; the mad spending spree and giveaway program has come to a halt; inflation has been checked without a nationwide depression—although the anthracite industry in our area has been sick for many years, it now appears that some real help will soon restore its place in our national economy through the export of coal to European countries—the national defense has been streamlined and we are receiving more protection for much less money; social security, railroad retirement, and veterans' benefits have been liberalized; fringe benefits for Federal employees have been greatly increased; homeownership has been made easier; the program for starting new public works, discontinued by the Democrats in 1950, has been revitalized, with Luzerne County receiving a share; the absurd high parity for western millionaire wheatgrowers has been equalized in an attempt to lower food prices; some surplus foods have been distributed to unemployed families, and plans are under way to expand this program; a record-breaking highway-construction program has been approved, with Pennsylvania receiving a grant of $38,513,000; foreign aid has been wisely reduced; the budget has been brought closer to balance by careful expenditure and economy without reducing services; the Government is getting out of business, and such corrupt institutions as the RFC are finished; the Atomic Energy Act has been revised to allow citizens to receive the blessings of atomic energy without harming the security of the Nation; Communists and security risks have been expelled from the Government; loyal and honest individuals have been appointed to Government positions; and an aggressive foreign policy has recouped many of the former administration's blunders.

TAX LEGISLATION

The Republican Congress reduced taxes by $7,400,000,000. This is the largest single tax cut in the history of the world. It is a very detailed piece of legislation, which revised the entire code of internal-revenue laws. The Republican Congress was able to reduce your taxes by reducing the Truman budget by $13 billion and by plugging former loopholes which enabled large industries and wealthy taxpayers to evade paying their full share. I am now preparing an explanation of this law for distribution to you.

FOREIGN POLICY

The Republican administration has supplanted former appeasement policies with new and vigorous stands. We ended the war in Korea. We averted a war in Indochina without involving a single American soldier and without giving up territory not already lost. On the other hand, we are attempting to redeem the tragedies of Yalta and Potsdam. Every effort is being made to aid the people of Poland, Lithuania, Hungary, Eastern Germany, and other countries to maintain their faith in God and democracy. We have vowed that we will not surrender them completely to Communist subjugation but will take every step possible to peacefully raise the bloody heel of bolshevism from their backs.

BOX SCORE

What we have not done is just as important as what we have done. The Republican Party has not succumbed to the Communist hoax. We have prevented the attempt of New Dealers to socialize medicine and other phases of American life. We have not allowed the Federal Government to spend us to destruction with lavish giveaway programs to false foreign friends. We have eliminated the practice of paying Federal employees a full day's wage for a few hours work. We have not accepted any mink coats or deep freezers. And we have not paid spies high salaries that they might eat well while they stole our secrets. Nor have we knowingly hired or promoted any spies or subversives.

What is our box score? The Republican 83d Congress batted an average of almost .950 on campaign pledges and major legislation, leaving the past Democratic Congress—whose average was only .420—well in the cellar.

COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS

In my first 2 years here, I have served on four different congressional committees. According to veteran Congressmen, this is quite unusual, as new Congressmen generally receive only one committee post. I was quite honored when one old and distinguished Member of Congress told me: "Your excessive number of committee assignments is a fitting tribute to your reliability, responsibility, integrity and willingness to serve your people." I have endeavored to do no more than to give Luzerne County my best in this job and I am highly encouraged that, through me, Luzerne County is honored by such statements. However, I am not a vain man and wish no greater reward save that of knowing that I have fulfilled the obligations I assumed when I came to Washington.

My first committee assignment was the Post Office and Civil Service Committee. This committee has been very busy with salary proposals and position reclassification programs for the 2,600,000 Federal employees. These measures required months of study and debate. This committee also initiated the action which deprived Alger Hiss and other traitors, employed by the Democratic administration, of their pension rights. While the salary increase was vetoed by the President this year, the fringe benefits provided in other bills should prove a real boon to the career official whether he be a civil servant or a mailman.

The Veterans' Affairs Committee, my second post, dealt with all of the legislation concerning our veterans. Much detailed, noteworthy legislation was written in this committee. As a veteran who served as an enlisted man in both the Army and the Navy, I have been acutely aware of the veterans' problems and have worked for their best interests. Disability schedules were revamped this year. The educational benefits for Korean veterans have been extended. And, I have made great effort, both in committee and in individual cases, to cut redtape left over from the old administration. I have also worked in close cooperation with all the veterans' organizations and am very grateful for their advice on veterans' legislation.

My third committee assignment was to the Committee of Objectors. Much of the work of the Congress consists of private bills authorizing relief in hardship cases and those involving immigration and naturalization problems. While each of these appear small, they represent a tremendous amount of work. It was my duty to study all of these bills and decide that public funds were not spent unwisely or that subversives did not sneak into this country. This work took a great deal of time, especially at night, when I studied these bills. It also brought me into close liaison with Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey and the FBI.

My final committee assignment was to the Select Committee on Communist Aggression. This committee investigated the methods of Communist infiltration, take-over and subjugation of the Baltic States and the eastern and central European nations. We heard witnesses from all of the Communist-dominated peoples of the world. The reports of the Committee on Communist Aggression are now available in limited quantity and I shall be most happy to supply individuals with a copy so long as the supply holds out.

ATTENDANCE RECORD

I am happy to state that my attendance record is one of the best in Congress. According to the Clerk of the House, who keeps the records, I answered 100 percent of the rollcalls until late in June of this year. The only votes I missed were those which took place during my absence on official business of Congress.

LETTERS FROM CONSTITUENTS

The letters and telegrams sent to me have been most helpful in my work here. The advice, the encouragement, and the criticism have aided me in all of my activities. I received an average of 300 letters a week from Luzerne County, plus others from various sections of the State and Nation. I have answered each of these letters and explained my stand on the issues. I have always told the truth in my letters home, because I sincerely believe that the people of Luzerne County have had enough political bluffing in recent years. I do not believe in making false statements merely to get votes; for, if I do not live up to my oath of office, I do not deserve to be here.

All letters are filed according to the subject matter, in the case of bills before the Congress. When legislation came before the House, or when attempting to decide how I should vote on any issue, I went through the appropriate files to see for a second or third time what had been written. The suggestions and recommendations, as expressed in your letters and in the questionnaires, were important factors in making my decisions. I have supported most of the President's program because the people believed in it and because it was obviously in the best interests of the Nation.

It is my conviction that I have an obligation to keep my constituents currently informed on issues. With the start of both sessions, I circulated a detailed questionnaire on public policy. Many thousands of these were returned. All were studied, analyzed, and used. I published the results of this survey in the Congressional Record and received many comments on it from other Congressmen. I also had the results printed at my own expense and circulated to those who sent in questionnaires and to many others who requested the results. These questionnaires have been a constant source of information and guidance; I am greatly appreciative of your help in answering them.

A second practice which I initiated was my bimonthly newsletter. This newsletter is published at my own personal expense and contains a brief report of my activities during the preceding 2 weeks. The newsletter currently has a circulation of over 12,000 and is growing rapidly as more people request it. It is my hope to continue these newsletters now that Congress has adjourned. The administrative branch of our Government will be issuing regulations with which many people will be concerned. I will be able to report on new legislation before us during the next session of Congress. Committees in Congress will be hearing testimony on various important issues, and the national current events will keep me well supplied with data for you.

UNEMPLOYMENT

Much time has been spent in discussing what should be done about our unemployment situation. However, I should like to point out what has been done. I have made it a practice not to issue publicity statements on these things and will only briefly touch on my intensive activities in this field.

Luzerne County has received a large share of Federal funds for construction and reconstruction. The sum of $800,000 has been appropriated during my 2 years for the river-control project at Swoyersville and Forty Fort.

A new Reserve armory is to be constructed at Wilkes-Barre to replace the present building, which has been condemned. This will enable more men to receive the financial benefits of the active Reserve. The new armory will be heated with anthracite, not oil, as some individuals rumored in the Luzerne County papers.

I was able to secure an appropriation for the necessary expansion and completion of the control tower at the Avoca Airport.

A large portion of the highway development funds will be spent in Luzerne County as the new Turnpike extension is pushed northward.

I was successful in stopping any further conversion from coal to oil in all Federal buildings in our area. Such conversion plans were apparently "in the mill" when the Republican Congress took control.

I have been in constant contact with many of our manufacturing firms regarding Government contracts. Although not widely publicized, many of these small firms have received, or are under consideration for, contracts or subcontracts. Through the Small Business Administration, established by this Congress, small manufacturers are in a better position to obtain Government contracts.

The program of importing cheap residual oil which cut out anthracite markets has received much of my attention. This practice was initiated by the past administration supported by the oil lobby. I introduced legislation to prohibit this but these same interests were able to kill it. The fight was continued on the floor of the House where I opposed the extension of the treaties which permitted such importation. While we could not kill this legislation completely, we did limit its extension to 1 more year. I am confident that a Republican Congress will put an end to this disastrous practice next January.

I am using my efforts to have an Internal Revenue Service field office established in Kingston.

The United Mine Workers Journal said the Eisenhower administration is doing something definite to help the ailing coal industry:

> Increasing Government concern over the sagging economy of the American coal industry, which threatens the national security in case of war, has brought concrete action by Uncle Sam in the announcement that 10 million tons of anthracite and bituminous coal will be purchased by the Federal Government for shipment, under the economic aid program, to fuel-short Allied Nations in Europe and Asia.

I am pleased to have an active part in revitalizing the anthracite coal industry. With the continued cooperation of the coal mine workers, it is hoped that the coal industry will regain its market and bring increased employment to the people of Luzerne County.

Several conferences have also been arranged by me with the President and Cabinet members for our community business leaders to discuss our situation. I have personally discussed various concrete proposals, with the President, Secretary of Defense Wilson, and Mobilization Director Flemming. They have assured me that everything possible will be done to aid our community and plans are currently being studied to devise an active program to accomplish this end. The President told me, however, that he wants a long-range, sound program and not half-baked measures designed to get a few votes. I think we will all agree with Ike on this.

During the past 20 years, many temporary solutions were tried; look what they resulted in. I am confident that we will see great changes in the next few years of the Republican administration—changes which will build for the future and not for election day.

I also made a protest over the alleged removal of our social-security offices to Baltimore, only to verify that the local newspaper, carrying the story, had not published the truth. Mrs. Oveta Culp Hobby, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, called me personally to tell me that the story was untrue. Actually, my Democratic predecessor voted both in the Appropriations Committee and on the floor of the House to construct the new building in Baltimore. Mrs. Hobby has told me that, under revised plans, they will be moving only old papers and records to the new building and that Luzerne County will not lose any jobs. She has stated that the President, deeply concerned with our community, does not want anything done which will hurt us.

CONCLUSION

I regret that this report is all too brief, as I feel that you are all entitled to know what went on in Washington. However, because I am circulating this at my own expense, I must, of necessity, keep it short. If any of you have any questions about my activities, I shall be glad to answer them for you. It has been a high honor to serve Luzerne County in this office, and I sincerely hope that I have fulfilled the confidence which you placed in me.

Bob Crosser

SPEECH

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, ROBERT CROSSER, who is retiring at the end of the 83d Congress, has a great record to his credit. I have never known a Member of Congress to have such a conscientious feeling about his duty to his constituents. It has been my privilege to serve with BOB CROSSER 25½ years, and during that time, I have been closely associated with him. His every thought and action, as a true Representative of the people of his district, were in consideration of whether or not they would redound to the benefit and help of the people he represented. In order to effectively represent his people, it was necessary that he have a fine working relationship with his colleagues in the House. This he succeeded in doing—not by yielding his beliefs and principles in any respect, but by fair dealings, loyalty, and faithful performance of duty. Such a Member always has the admiration and respect of his colleagues, and no Member was admired or respected more by Democrats and Republicans than BOB CROSSER. He was always on the side of right and never, knowingly, on the side of wrong. His quick, intelligent mind and tremendous backlog of knowledge and information caused him to be one of the most powerful Members of Congress.

BOB was an able debater and was always fair and honorable. He did more for the retired railroad worker than all the rest of the Congress combined while he was serving. He was our leader in that fight, and without his vigorous and intelligent leadership, the railroad workers would probably not have the most generous and favorable retirement system in the United States today.

BOB was also a great friend of independent business, particularly, small business. He was always fighting for rights and benefits for the workers, veterans, aged, and particularly, the classes and groups of people who did not have special representatives in Washington to look after their interests.

Although BOB CROSSER has retired, I am sure he will be called upon many times for his advice and counsel in connection with so many public questions and proposals that he knows so much about, and many of them he knows more about than any other person. In his case, there will be no retirement because I know that he will continue to work in the interest of the people of this Nation and the country in the way and in the capacity that it will be possible for him to serve without being a Member of Congress.

The example set by BOB CROSSER in his conduct as a Member of the House, as chairman of one of the greatest committees of the United States Congress, as a great debater upon the floor of the House, and for the many far-reaching achievements to his personal credit will continue to be an inspiration to the present Members of the United States Congress and those who serve after us.

Victory on the Farm Front

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted by the House I present for insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following editorial published in the New York Times on August 20, 1954, titled "Victory on the Farm Front":

VICTORY ON THE FARM FRONT

The passage of the conference version of the new agricultural-support bill means a major victory, in principle, for the concept of flexible farm price supports. Instead of being forced to support such prices at 90 percent of that mythical concept, parity, the administration will have a choice of support prices down to 82.5 percent of parity for 5 crops—cotton, wheat, corn, peanuts, and rice. It is disappointing, of course, that the President was not able to get the minimum support price reduced to 75 percent of parity, as he originally desired, but even the compromise version represents a welcome defeat for the most obstinate members of the congressional farm bloc.

That this partial victory has been won is a credit not only to President Eisenhower but also to Secretary of Agriculture Benson. Mr. Benson's refusal to surrender in the face of heavy political pressure, his insistence that economic necessity could not be junked merely for political advantage, and his patient explanatory work to Congress and to farmers all form a pattern which we might wish followed by all major members of the President's team.

Welcome as is this recognition of the principle of flexible supports, the new law is no cure-all for our present and future farm problems. We have $6,500,000,000 worth of farm products in Government storage, and ways must be found to get these products into the channels of consumption. In the case of several major crops, even the lowest support level permitted by the new legislation will require continued Government control over production and measures that ultimately tell farmers how much they may grow and how much they may sell. The real goal, toward which only the first step has now been taken, is an American agriculture economically strong, with adequate domestic and foreign markets for its produce, so that neither Government bounty nor Government regulation is required.

A Tribute to a Great Humanitarian

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I wish to say that I cannot let this House adjourn without spreading on the Record an expression of the high esteem in which I hold one of our distinguished colleagues, the Honorable Peter W. Rodino, Jr., of the 10th New Jersey District. It is a feeling which I know is shared by all Members of this House, Republicans as well as Democrats.

Although he is young in years, I know of no Member of Congress of either party who has greater ability than Mr. Rodino, or who has used his abilities more diligently in the interest of his constituents and of our beloved country.

As minority whip, moreover, I can testify few Members have been more conscientious in attendance at sessions of the House or at committee meetings and hearings than our young friend from New Jersey. I need not remind you, Mr. Speaker, how important this conscientiousness is in the conduct of the affairs of this House or in the passage of legislation, for you were minority leader in this House for many years, and no doubt have had many occasions when you wished that your party colleagues were as diligent in the performance of their duties as our young friend from New Jersey has been in his.

It is not, however, of Mr. Rodino's ability or of his devotion to duty that I wish to speak today. It is, rather, to his great heart, his warm human sympathies, his deep humanitarianism that I wish to pay tribute. For Peter Rodino, more than any other Congressman I have ever met in all the many years I have been in Congress, has revealed repeatedly that in his every action, his every word, he is guided and governed by a desire to help his fellow man and especially those men, women, and children who dwell in the 10th District of New Jersey.

I could cite innumerable examples of how Mr. Rodino has revealed this trait in his daily performance as a Member of this House. I daresay that you, too, Mr. Speaker, could also cite additional examples of his humanitarianism that have come to your attention. But for the sake of brevity it probably would be better to dwell for a moment on only one.

This was the case of John Hvasta. Although the rescue of this young American soldier from behind the Iron Curtain has been emblazoned on the front pages of all our daily newspapers and has been told many times over the radio and on the television screen, I doubt if, notwithstanding this enormous publicity, a sufficient number of people realize that the prime mover in the rescue of Hvasta, indeed for a long time the only American who concerned himself with Hvasta's fate, was Peter Rodino.

As a colleague of Mr. Rodino, however, I have had an unusual opportunity to know how much Mr. Rodino did in this case and also why he did it.

As we all know know, John Hvasta was the son of naturalized American parents of Czech birth. A veteran of World War II, during which he had fought valiantly for the preservation of the democracy of the land his parents had adopted, Hvasta was in Czechoslovakia after the war on a visit, when he was arrested by the Communists as a spy. He was thrown into jail and, without a trial, or given one of those travesties of justice that the Communists call trials, he was sentenced to 10 years in prison as an American spy.

As soon as he learned of this outrage, my good friend Represenative Rodino sprang into action. It mattered not that Hvasta and his parents did not live in Mr. Rodino's own district but lived rather in Hillside, N. J., outside the 10th District; the fact that a fellow American was in trouble and was being abused by the Communists was sufficient.

Indeed, it is these two factors in the case that give us the key to Peter Rodino's character. The first factor was that a fellow human being was in trouble. The second was that an American was being mistreated by Communists. These two elements of the case fused in Peter Rodino two outstanding characteristics: his love for his fellow man and his hatred of communism.

Spurred by these two great emotions, Representative Rodino lost no time in starting his campaign to obtain Hvasta's freedom. He went to the State Department, he went to the White House, he went to the press, he took to the air over the radio. Day after day, until his efforts were finally crowned with success, he devoted all his great talents and energies to the cause of John Hvasta. And he never let up until he saw with his own eyes that Hvasta was freed from the Communist grip and was reunited with his parents in Hillside, N. J.

I wish to emphasize, however, that while the Hvasta case captured the headlines, it in no way represented all that Representative Rodino has done for people. I know, because I have made it my duty to know how all our Congressmen conduct their affairs, that Representative Rodino has been tireless in serving his constituents. No errand is too trivial, no trouble is too great for this young Congressman, if by performing this errand or incurring this trouble he can benefit one of his constituents. And, incidentally, I might add that the political faith of the constituent is never a consideration to Representative Rodino when he is called upon for help. Republicans as well as Democrats have reason to be grateful that in Congress they are represented by Peter Rodino and that in Peter Rodino they have a friend.

This House is about to adjourn. Soon all of its Members will be scattered all over the country, back in their home districts. Among them will be Peter Rodino. Although you, Mr. Speaker, and I, myself, will be back in our home districts, I am sure since I have known you for many years, that you must share with me a wish for something that is quite unattainable. That wish is that I be allowed to accompany Representative Rodino among his constituents when he returns to his district. I would like to make this trip because it would give me great pleasure to see the warm, friendly greeting his constituents are certain to give to Peter Rodino when he walks among them again. I am confident that this will be their feeling because, just as all his friends here in Congress have responded to Representative Rodino's deep human sympathies, so must the people of his district, who know him even better than we do, give him their friendship and appreciation.

While it will be impossible for me to be with the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Rodino] when he returns to his home in New Jersey, I am confident, nevertheless, that I shall see him again soon. For, when Congress reconvenes in January, I am sure that, thanks to the good sense of the intelligent, discerning voters of the 10th New Jersey Congressional District, Peter Rodino will have been reelected as a reward for his splendid service and will be back here for another 2 years as a Member of this House.

Report to My Constituents in the Sixth Congressional District of Maryland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DeWITT S. HYDE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, at the close of my first term in Congress I feel it is my duty to make a report of my voting record to the voters of the Sixth Congressional District of Maryland. An analysis of this report will show that I cast my vote on every bill that was brought to a vote except one which involved water control of Lake Michigan. I missed this vote because I was absent from the city on official business as a member of a special committee studying immigration and labor problems in the Virgin Islands.

Following is the itemized statement of my complete voting record for the 2d session of the 83d Congress:

Date	Bill	Description and vote	My vote
Jan. 21	H. R. 5337	To provide for establishment of an U. S. Air Force Academy. (Passed, 331 to 36.)	Yea.
Jan. 27	H. J. Res. 358	To discharge indebtedness of Commodity Credit Corporation, thus increasing available lending funds. (Passed, 323 to 27.)	Yea.
Feb. 4	H. R. 3300	Authorize State of Illinois and the Sanitary District of Chicago, under direction of Secretary of Army, to help control lake level of Lake Michigan; on Ford amendment. (Failed, 177 to 202.)	Paired; for.
Do	do	Same bill; on motion to recommit. (Failed, 150 to 234.)	Paired; for.
Feb. 17	H. R. 4646	Provide for the exchange of certain public and private lands; on motion to recommit. (Passed, 226 to 161.)	Yea.
Feb. 25	H. Res. 400	Providing funds for the operation of the Committee on Un-American Activities; on agreeing to the resolution. (Passed, 363 to 1.)	Yea.
Mar. 2	H. J. Res. 355	Amending act of 1951 relating to the supplying of agricultural workers from the Republic of Mexico; on motion to recommit. (Failed, 156 to 250.)	Nay.
Mar. 5	H. R. 8067	Appropriations for Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce and the U. S. Information Agency for fiscal year ending June 30, 1955; on Clevenger amendment. (Passed, 265 to 105.)	Yea.
Mar. 10	H. R. 8224	To reduce exicse taxes; on motion to recommit. (Failed, 200 to 213)	Nay.
Do	do	Same bill; vote on passage. (Passed, 411 to 3)	Yea.
Mar. 18	H. R. 8300	Revision of the internal revenue laws of the United States; on motion to recommit with instructions on dividend credit and $100 additional exemption. (Failed, 204 to 210.)	Nay.
Do	do	On same bill; on passage of bill. (Passed, 340 to 79)	Yea.
Mar. 30	H. R. 8224	To reduce excise taxes; on adoption of conference report. (Passed, 395 to 1)	Yea.
Mar. 31	H. R. 8583	Appropriations for the Executive Office and independent agencies for fiscal year ending June 30, 1955; on motion to recommit with instructions to require sell mortgages at par. (Failed, 180 to 214.)	Nay.
Apr. 2	H. R. 7839	To aid in the provision and improvement of housing, the elimination and prevention of slums and the conservation and development of urban communities; on motion to recommit. (Failed, 176 to 211.)	Nay.
Do	do	Same bill; on passage. (Passed, 353 to 36.)	Yea.
Apr. 8	H. R. 8649	To authorize the admission into evidence in certain criminal proceedings of information intercepted in national security investigations; on amendment requiring court order. (Passed 221 to 166.) (I believed it would cause undue delay.)	Nay.
Do	do	Same bill; on passage. (Passed, 378 to 10.)	Yea.
Apr. 29	H. R. 8873	Appropriations for Department of Defense and other related independent agencies for fiscal year ending June 30, 1955; on passage. (Passed, 378 to 0.)	Yea.
May 6	S. 2150	St. Lawrence seaway; on motion to recommit. (Failed, 157 to 242.)	Yea.
Do	do	Same bill; on passage. (Passed, 241 to 158.)	Nay.
May 10	H. R. 2556	Amend sec. 3185 of title 18, U. S. Code, to strike the enacting clause to permit extradition of certain fugitives from United States to countries occupied by United States jointly with 1 or more other powers. (Passed, 228 to 68.)	Nay.
May 11	H. Res. 533	A resolution certifying the report of the Committee on Un-American Activities as to refusal of Bernhard Deutch to answer questions before committee; on agreeing to resolution. (Passed, 346 to 0.)	Yea.
May 12	H. R. 9040	To authorize cooperative research in education; on passage, (Passed, 296 to 55.)	Yea.
Do	H. Res. 532	Resolution providing for consideration of H. R. 7434, to establish a National Advisory Committee on Education; on agreeing to resolution. (Passed, 194 to 140.)	Yea.
May 13	H. R. 7434	To establish a National Advisory Committee on Education; on passage. (Passed, 179 to 157.)	Yea.
May 19	H. R. 7601	To provide for a White House Conference on Education; on passage. (Passed, 269 to 69.)	Yea.
May 26	H. R. 9242	To authorize certain construction at military and naval installations and for the Alaska communications system; on passage. (Passed, 346 to 0.)	Yea.
June 1	H. Res. 568	Providing for consideration of H. R. 9366, a bill to amend the Social Security Act; on ordering previous question. (Passed, 270 to 76.)	Yea.
Do	H. R. 9366	To amend the Social Security Act and the Internal Revenue Code to extend coverage under the old-age and survivors insurance program, increase the benefits payable, preserve the insurance rights of the disabled, and increase the amount of earnings permitted without loss of benefits; on passage. (Passed, 356 to 8.)	Yea.
June 11	H. Res. 580	Providing for consideration of H. R. 9474, to extend authority of the President to enter into trade agreements under sec. 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930; on passage. (Passed, 274 to 63.)	Yea.
Do	H. R. 9474	To extend the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements under sec. 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930; on passage. (Passed, 281 to 53.)	Yea.
June 15	H. R. 9517	Appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia for fiscal year ending June 30, 1955; on motion to increase contribution. (Passed, 186 to 168.)	Yea.
June 16	H. R. 8729	To extend for 2 years authority of Federal Reserve banks to purchase securities directly from Treasury; on motion to recommit. (Failed, 80 to 250.)	Nay.
June 17	H. Res. 583	Providing for sending to conference H. R. 7839, a bill to aid in the provision and improvement of housing; on agreeing to resolution. (Passed, 361 to 19.)	Yea.
June 29	S. Con. Res. 91	To express the sense of Congress on interference in Western Hemisphere affairs by the Soviet Communists; on agreeing to resolution. (Passed, 372 to 0.)	Yea.
June 30	H. R. 9678	To promote the security and foreign policy of the United States by furnishing assistance to friendly nations; on Vorys amendment stating it to be the sense of Congress that no funds be used for governments which are committed by treaty to maintain Communist rule over any defined territory in Asia. (Passed, 389 to 0.)	Yea.
Do	do	Same bill; on passage. (Passed, 260 to 126.)	Yea.
July 2	H. R. 9680	To provide continued price supports for agricultural products, to augment the marketing and disposal of such products and provide greater stability for agricultural; on amendment to provide flexibility in price supports from 82½ to 90 percent of parity. (Passed, 228 to 170.)	Yea.
July 8	H. R. 9540	To amend Vocational Rehabilitation Act to promote and assist in the extension and improvement of vocational rehabilitation services; on passage. (Passed, 347 to 0.)	Yea.
Do	H. R. 9709	To extend and improve the unemployment compensation program; on motion to recommit. (Failed, 110 to 241.)	Nay.
Do	do	Same bill; on passage. (Passed, 309 to 36.)	Yea.
Do	H. R. 9580	To revise and extend the laws relating to espionage and sabotage; on passage. (Passed, 324 to 0.)	Yea.
July 13	H. Res. 623	Providing for consideration of H. R. 8356, to improve the public health by encouraging more extensive use of voluntary prepayment method in the provision of personal health services; on agreeing to resolution. (Passed, 274 to 88.)	Yea.
Do	H. R. 8356	Health service prepayment plan reinsurance bill; to improve the public health by encouraging more extensive use of the voluntary prepayment method in the provision of personal health services; on motion to recommit. (Passed, 238 to 134.)	Nay.
July 15	H. Res. 627	Reiterating the opposition of the House of Representatives to the seating of the Communist regime in China in the United Nations; on agreeing to the resolution. (Passed, 381 to 0.)	Yea.
July 20	H. R. 7839	To aid in the provision and improvement of housing, the elimination and prevention of slums and the conservation and development of urban communities; conference report, on motion to recommit. (Failed, 156 to 234.)	Nay.
Do	do	Same bill; conference report, on adoption. (Passed, 358 to 30)	Yea.
July 21	H. R. 9888	To extend the period for granting education and training benefits to veterans under the Korean GI bill of rights; on motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed, 400 to 0.)	Yea.
Do	H. R. 9020	To provide increases in compensation and pension to veterans of all wars and their dependents; on motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed, 399 to 0.)	Yea.
Do	H. R. 9245	Providing for postal pay increases, amended to provide for postal rate increases and reclassification; on motion to suspend rules and pass. (Failed, 228 to 171.) (Two-thirds vote needed.)	Yea.
July 23	H. Res. 664	Certifying the report of Committee on Un-American Activities as to refusal of Bolza Baxter to answer questions before committee; on agreeing to the resolution. (Passed, 377 to 0.)	Yea.
Do	H. R. 9757	To amend the Atomic Energy Act; on Cole amendment on patents. (Passed, 202 to 161)	Yea.
July 26	do	To amend the Atomic Energy Act; on motion to recommit. (Failed, 165 to 222)	Nay.
Do	do	Same bill; on passage. (Passed, 231 to 154)	Yea.
July 28	H. R. 10051	Appropriations for Mutual Security for fiscal year ending June 30, 1955; on passage. (Passed, 266 to 126)	Yea.
Do	H. R. 8300	To revise the internal revenue laws; conference report, on motion to recommit. (Failed, 169 to 227)	Nay.
Do	do	Same bill; conference report, on adoption. (Passed, 315 to 77)	Yea.
Do	H. Res. 626	Providing for consideration of H. R. 236 to authorize construction, operation, and maintenance by Secretary of Interior of Fryingpan-Arkansas project, Colorado; on agreeing to resolution. (Failed, 188 to 195).	Yea.
July 29	H. R. 9756	To increase the borrowing power of the Commodity Credit Corporation; on passage. (Passed, 317 to 57)	Yea.
Do	H. Con. Res. 265	Providing for sine die adjournment of 2d sess. of 83d Cong.; on agreeing to resolution." (Failed, 183 to 193)	Yea.
July 30	H. R. 7840	To amend Railroad Retirement Act, the Railroad Retirement Tax Act and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act; on passage. (Passed, 361 to 0.)	Yea.
Do	H. R. 9666	To amend sec. 1001, par. 412 of the Tariff Act with respect to hardboard; on passage. (Passed, 235 to 109.)	Yea.
Do	H. Con. Res. 266	Providing for adjournment sine die of 83d Cong.; on agreeing to resolution. (Passed, 180 to 167.)	Yea.
Do	H. R. 8384	To authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Talent division of the Rogue River Basin reclamation project, Oregon; on passage. (Passed, 163 to 144.)	Yea.
Aug. 4	S. 16	To authorize Federal courts to grant immunity from prosecution to witnesses who testify before either House of Congress or their committees; on motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed, 294 to 55.)	Yea.
Aug. 9	H. Res. 590	Providing for the consideration of H. R. 9245; on motion to discharge Committee on Rules from further consideration. (Passed, 346 to 29.)	Yea.
Do	H. R. 9245	Providing for postal pay increases, amended to provide for postal rate increases and reclassification; on passage. (Passed, 352 to 29.)	Yea.

Date	Bill	Description and vote	My vote
Aug. 9	H. Res. 687	Providing for consideration of S. 2033, bill relating to the labeling of packages containing foreign-produced trout sold in the United States; on agreeing to resolution. (Passed, 209 to 159.)	Yea.
Do	H. R. 9678	To promote the security and foreign policy of the United States by furnishing assistance to friendly nations; on motion to recommit. (Failed, 97 to 266.)	Nay.
Aug. 16	S. 3706	To outlaw the Communist Party, to prohibit members of Communist organizations from serving in certain representative capacities; on motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed, 305 to 2.)	Yea.
Aug. 17	do	Same bill; on motion to instruct conferees to agree to Senate amendment to the House amendment. (Passed, 208 to 100.)	Nay.
Aug. 19	H. R. 10051	Appropriation for Mutual Security for fiscal year ending June 30, 1955; on adoption of the conference report. (Passed, 188 to 77.)	Yea.
Do	do	Same bill; on motion to recede and concur in Senate amendment No. 31, assistance to Spain. (Passed, 188 to 76.)	Nay.
Do	S. 3706	To outlaw the Communist Party, to prohibit members of Communist organizations from serving in certain representative capacities; on adoption of conference report. (Passed, 265 to 2.)	Yea.
Aug 20	H. R. 2236	To establish a Commission on Area Problems of Greater Washington Metropolitan Area and to set up a Commission to regulate transportation in the Greater Washington metropolitan area; on motion to recommit. (Failed, 95 to 164.)	Nay.

Edward J. Hart

SPEECH

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, ED HART is retiring as a Member of Congress at the end of this Congress. He will never retire from public service because ED will continue to be in the harness working in the public good as long as he lives; he is just that type citizen and devoted servant of the people.

It has been my privilege to work with ED HART on a number of important congressional matters. ED is entitled to a lion's share of the credit for the passage of the Maximum Employment Act of 1946. He was on the committee that considered the proposal and assisted in getting the bill favorably reported by the committee and assisted in getting the bill passed by the House of Representatives, which resulted in the bill becoming a law. It is now one of the laws that is recognized as containing more of our Government's economic policy than any other law that has ever been enacted. ED HART was a member of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report since its organization 8 years ago. This committee has made a number of wonderful and lasting contributions to the economy of our Nation.

He has always been an aggressive, vigorous fighter in the interest of the plain people of the country and just as hard a fighter against special interests and benefits for a few. He demonstrated his loyalty to the little man, the small-business man, the independent merchant, and for the competitive free-enterprise system. He was a bitter foe of monopoly and always an effective watchman for the people.

The people of his district were fortunate in having a Representative like ED HART. His record as a Member of Congress proves conclusively that the people who elected him have a right to be very proud of the type service he has rendered and the fine Representative that he has made. ED HART is highly regarded and admired by all of the Members of Congress on both sides of the aisle who served with him.

I personally regret very much to see him leave as I have learned to depend upon him for guidance and advice. Although he does not expect to continue as a Member of Congress, I understand he will continue in public service, and we expect to see him on Capitol Hill from time to time and as often as possible.

How Free Is Formosa?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, when Japan attacked China in July 1937, most of the alleged western experts on China shook their heads and announced gloomily that the new Chinese Government under Chiang Kai-shek could not last 6 months against Japan's superior arms, industry, organization, and so forth. Yet it held out 8 long years, not only against Japan, but against a constant barrage of charges and criticisms from powerful forces in America and China's other supposed allies. These criticisms and predictions of disaster followed a quite uniform pattern: the Government of China was "inept, incompetent, inefficient, undemocratic, and corrupt." Therefore, America must not give it wholehearted support and assistance of the sort we were giving Greece, Turkey, France, England, and a dozen others.

Despite all the attacks and the resulting withdrawal of effective American assistance for 4 years, July 1946 to July 1950, the Government of China still lives—17 years after it was supposed to collapse. Furthermore, on Formosa, it moves steadily ahead toward better government—more competent, more efficient, more democratic, more concerned for the well-being of its people. Its progress has been uneven, but as consistent as that of any government in Asia even though its basic problems are more difficult than any other country's, with the exception of war-torn Korea.

Recently the attacks designed to discredit the Nationalist Government have been stepped up again in our country, principally in the so-called liberal press, and, perhaps significantly, at about the same time as Communist spokesmen throughout the world have resumed their propaganda assaults. The attacks follow the same old sure-fire line—that Chiang's government is a police state and does not deserve our help. That approach diverts our attention from the essential fact that American aid to other countries is not based primarily on whether they are good enough to deserve our help, but on whether American boys deserve the better chance to live that they will have if those countries are free and on our side than our boys will have if those countries are not free and on our side.

The most universally respected Chinese of our century is Dr. Hu Shih. He is primarily a Chinese scholar, historian, and philosopher, and has never been a member of the Kuomintang, the dominant political party in free China, although he was drafted to be China's Ambassador to the United States from 1938 to 1942. Moreover, Chiang Kai-shek sought to have Dr. Hu elected as the first President of China after its constitution was adopted in 1947, but his health would not permit. He has recently returned from another extended visit to Formosa, and if anyone is confused as to the truth about conditions there, Dr. Hu's report can be accepted without question as the most accurate and trustworthy. He has no political ax to grind, no enemies or rivals to discredit, and no personal actions to rationalize or seek to justify.

Dr. Hu declares that, contrary to recent charges, freedoms have been gradually expanded on Formosa despite a state of war and the constant threats of Communist attack and infiltration. The article, published in the New Leader, follows:

HOW FREE IS FORMOSA?

(By Hu Shih)

Recently, within a single month, there appeared two contradictory estimates of the state of freedom in Formosa. In the May 17 issue of the Freeman we read these statements by Rodney Gilbert, who had just returned from 3½ years' residence in Formosa:

"An inspection of Formosa today reveals that the 8 or 9 million Chinese now on the island are getting the best government that any part of China has had for many generations—the freest, most efficient, and, yes, most honest. * * *

"As for common, ordinary freedom of speech—unthinkable in any Communist country—nobody on Taiwan (Formosa) who has a critical word to say about this or that Government person or policy ever has to give a thought to possible eavesdroppers. * * *

"There is no censorship of news, incoming or outgoing. * * * Correspondents of all nationalities come and go without let or hindrance, and the resident correspondents of the Associated Press, United Press, Reuters, and the French Press Agency send out exactly what they please. * * *

"Other freedoms * * * which are taken for granted in free China are those of freedom of movement and freedom of choice of employment. It is no longer easy to get into Taiwan * * *. But once a person is legally on Taiwan and has a police card showing that he resides there, he can ride the railroads, the buses, the planes, or wander about by car, pedacab or on foot, as freely as though he were in Vermont, Kansas, or Oregon. What is more, he can work at any job he can find, or just sit on a rock, looking out to sea, reciting poetry and reveling in dolce far niente."

Within 4 weeks, the newsstands were selling the June 29 issue of Look, which contained an article by Dr. K. C. Wu, governor of Formosa from December 1949 to May 1953. The article was entitled "Your Money Has Built a Police State in Formosa," and had this to say:

"Formosa has been perverted into a police state, not unlike that of Red China * * *.

"The dictatorial moves [of Gen. Chiang Ching-kuo, son of President Chiang Kai-shek] to establish a secret police and control of the army, to rig elections and corrupt legal processes were only a start. Today, a program is under way to control the minds and souls of youth and suppress freedom of speech and of the press * * *.

"He [Chiang Ching-kuo] is fast building a regime that in many ways follows exactly the pattern of a Communist government; he has even organized a youth corps modeled after the Hitler youth and the Communist youth * * *.

"There is no such thing as freedom of speech any more. Freedom of the press has become a farce * * *. Newspapers that annoy or offend Formosa's rulers are forced to suspend publication, and reporters and writers have often been jailed. Formosa's newspapers now print only the party line."

Which of these two sets of judgments on Formosa are we to accept? My own answer is that Mr. Gilbert and Dr. Wu were referring to two different groups of phenomena. Mr. Gilbert was painting a general picture of the life and freedom of the 8 or 9 million Chinese now on the island of Formosa. He honestly admitted that there were important exceptions to this general description. For instance, he wrote: "You can talk yourself hoarse about the shortcomings of the municipal, provincial, or national authorities and there will be no comeback. But start preaching communism—and look out."

On the other hand, it was exactly those exceptions—those particular cases of criminal offenses which under the national emergency law were placed under the jurisdiction of military courts—which Dr. Wu utilized to build up his sweeping generalization about Formosa as a police state. This logical fallacy of generalizing from particular and exceptional cases assumes a more serious form of misstatement when he makes this categorical assertion:

"As Formosa had been declared under a state of siege, all cases of any nature were sent to the military courts for trial."

This statement is baseless and untrue. At no time since the Communist conquest of the mainland have the military courts of Formosa had jurisdiction over "all cases of any nature."

When Formosa was declared in early 1950 to be "a region adjacent to a battle zone," 10 categories of crimes were placed under the jurisdiction of the military courts of the Taiwan Peace Preservation Force. These were: Offenses against the internal security of the state; offenses against the external security of the state; offenses against public order; offenses against public safety; counterfeiting of currency and negotiable securities, and forging of official documents and seals; homicide; offenses against personal liberty; robbery and piracy; kidnaping for ransom; damage and destruction of property. All other criminal offenses were under the jurisdiction of civil courts.

In April 1951, when the "new Taiwan currency," which had replaced the old currency in the summer of 1949, was threatened by inflation, the Government issued a series of emergency regulations on currency stabilization which gave authority to the military police and military courts of the Taiwan Peace Preservation Force to deal severely with three types of violation of the currency laws: Illegal transmission of money abroad, illegal traffic in gold or foreign exchange, and high-interest money lending through underground banking.

These are all the categories of criminal offenses that were ever placed under the jurisdiction of the military courts of the Taiwan Peace Preservation Force, of which Governor Wu himself was chief commander, and Gen. Peng Meng-chi was deputy commander. Military courts of the army, navy, and air force and other military establishments had no jurisdiction over crimes committed by persons not in active military service.

As a result of public dissatisfaction and criticism of the incompetence and inefficiency of the military courts, and of known abuses of power by the military police, the Central Government, under the leadership of Premier Chen Cheng, moved toward reducing the jurisdiction of the military courts. A decree of the Executive Yuan on October 20, 1951, restored 4 of the original 10 categories of offenses to the jurisdiction of the civil courts. A second decree on June 1, 1952, ordered that the jurisdiction of the military courts be henceforth limited to:

1. Offenses by military personnel.
2. Offenses under the act on Communist agents and the law on insurrection and treason.
3. Offenses under the law on banditry.
4. Civilians conspiring with military personnel in smuggling.
5. Grave offenses (subsequently defined by the Ministry of Justice in minute detail) against public order and public safety.

Since June 1, 1951, offenses against currency stabilization had been removed from the jurisdiction of the military police and military courts.

These successive reform measures represented partial success for the movement for the separation of the jurisdiction of the military and civil courts, a movement in which many Chinese leaders, both inside and outside the Government, have taken an active part. It is a part of the fight for civil liberties and constitutional government in Free China.

The success has been only partial, and the fight is still going on. Last month, the new Premier, O. K. Yui, was severely questioned in Parliament (the Legislative Yuan) about the constitutional guaranties in times of national emergency, especially the right of habeas corpus under article 8 and article 9 which says that "no person, except those in active military service, may be subject to trial by a military court." At the end of the session, Premier Yui declared:

"The new Cabinet will see to it that the constitutional guaranties of freedom of person under article and civil-court trials of nonmilitary personnal under article 9 are upheld."

In discussing this question of the jurisdiction of military courts, I have gone into some detail, not only to refute the irresponsible generalization of Dr. Wu that all cases of any nature were sent to the military courts for trial, but also to correct the impression created by many of his statements—the impression that Formosa was actually achieving the "rule of law and democracy * * * at one time in the past," but only recently has been perverted into a police state, especially since Dr. Wu's resignation from the governorship.

The fact is that Formosa was far from the rule of law and democracy in those early years of 1949–51, at the height of the fear of Communist invasion and infiltration and of the dangers of currency inflation, and only in the last 3 years, and notably since June 1952, has there been a far greater measure of civil liberties and the rule of law than at any time in the past.

Let me cite an example of the present state of freedom of the press on Formosa a year after Governor Wu's resignation. The April 1 issue of the fortnightly magazine Free China editorially questioned President Chiang Kai-shek's power of reviewing the decisions of the military courts and, in some cases, ordering an increase in the severity of the sentence.

"The constitution," says the editorial "under article 40 gives the President only the power of 'granting amnesties, pardons, remission of sentences, and restitution of civil rights.' But the constitution nowhere gives him power to increase the sentence of any court. What the President has done on a number of occasions is clearly a violation of the constitution. One of our best wishes of his reelection is that no unconstitutional act of this kind will ever happen again during his second presidential term of 6 years."

No such open criticism of President Chiang was published at any time in the past. I may add that the same question, among others, was earnestly discussed early last April at the home of Vice President-elect Chen Cheng in 3 evening sessions participated in by 6 invited members of the National Assembly and about 20 leaders of the government and the Kuomintang, including General Chiang Ching-kuo. I am happy to report that President Chiang Kai-shek has now given written instructions to his new secretary general, Chang Chun, that in the future, when the military tribunal requests him as commander in chief of the armed forces to review the graver sentences of the military courts, he will never again order any increase in the sentences.

Dr. Wu will probably retort that the freedom of Free China magazine has always been an "exception." He has said in his Look article:

"There is no such thing as freedom of speech any more. Freedom of the press has become a farce. There may be an exception in the case of a weekly [sic] sponsored by Dr. Hu Shih, the philosopher and diplomat, with his special eminence and international reputation."

The weekly he referred to is the fortnightly Free China, edited and published by a score of my liberal friends (including a few independent members of the Kuomintang), who, because I wrote the principles of faith of the Free China Association, honored me by making me its publisher from 1949 to 1953.

I want to say, in the first place, that Free China is not an exception, and that this freedom of speech and the press is now shared by all who have the moral courage to speak out. The best proof of this is found in the numerous critical articles on the May elections published in many independent newspapers both before and after the elections.

Secondly, I would like to ask: How and why did the weekly sponsored by Dr. Hu Shih come to enjoy what to Dr. Wu was an exceptional freedom of the press in the police state of Formosa? Has he ever known of a police state that permitted exceptional freedom of speech and the press to any individual or publication?

Free China magazine certainly did not enjoy any such exceptional freedom in the summer of 1951, when it got into serious trouble with the Taiwan Peace Preservation Force by publishing an editorial entitled "The Government Must Not Entrap the People to Commit Crimes." The editorial pointed out the inherent danger of the Government policy of offering heavy monetary rewards—30 percent of the confiscated property of the convicted offender to the informer and 35 percent to the prosecuting agency—in offenses under the emergency regulations on currency stabilization. It cited a recent case of high-interest money lending in which $1.1 million of local currency was involved and more than 20 money lenders were arrested by the peace preservation police and sent to military courts for trial. The editorial asked:

"Why were only the lenders, and not the borrowers, named in the prosecution? Could it not be that the borrowers were themselves the informers who enticed and entrapped the innocent victims into criminal offenses? Could it not be that the Government, by its offer of over attractive monetary rewards, was guilty of entrapping the people to commit crimes?"

This editorial so greatly enraged Governor Wu's deputy commander of the Taiwan Peace Preservation Force that he threatened to arrest the editor of Free China. After mediation by mutual friends in the Government, the editor was forced to print an editorial in its June 16 issue stating that the previous editorial had implied no intentional insult to the moral integrity of the Government agencies prosecuting the case discussed.

Apparently in June 1951 neither Dr. Wu, the "democratic" governor and commander of the Taiwan Peace Preservation Force, nor the "special eminence and international reputation" of the absentee publisher of Free China afforded any protection to that magazine.

Three months later Free China got into more trouble. On September 1, 1951, it published on its editorial page a letter written by myself from New York requesting that the words "Publisher: Hu Shih" be dropped from its back cover. I said, in part:

"I was led to ponder: If Free China could not enjoy freedom of speech and publication, if it were denied the right of responsible criticism of Government policy, that would be the greatest disgrace in the political life of Taiwan.

"I formally resign from the titular honor of being the publisher of Free China magazine, partly because I want to express my 100-percent approval of the editorial entitled 'The Government Must Not Entrap the People To Commit Crimes' and partly because I want to voice my protest against such interference with the freedom of the press by any military organ."

Again, neither "democratic" Governor Wu nor the "special eminence" of Dr. Hu Shih could afford any protection to the magazine. The Taiwan Peace Preservation headquarters took the unusual action of buying up all the available copies of Free China at the newsstands and ordered the Northwest Airlines not to carry the issue out of the island.

Then Premier Chen Cheng intervened. In a letter which he wrote me on September 14 and sent to Free China magazine to be published in its September 15 issue, the Premier thanked me for my outspoken words, which "we accept with gladness." While defending the urgent need for drastic measures to protect the new currency, he admitted unintentional mistakes in their enforcement. His letter concluded with an assurance that there would always be freedom of the press on Formosa, which, he said, was evidenced by the publication of my letter in Free China magazine.

Thus, if the weekly sponsored by Dr. Hu Shih has in any sense enjoyed some exceptional freedom in Formosa, it has earned it by fighting 5 long years and winning it—winning it not only for itself, but for all Formosa papers and for all the non-Communist and anti-Communist papers of Hong Kong which come into Taiwan every day by air transport. Its existence and its influence eloquently refute K. C. Wu's charge that Formosa is a police state. The battle for freedom and democracy has never been fought and won by craven, selfish politicians who remain silent while they enjoy political power and safely out of the country, smear their own country and government, for whose every mistake or misdeed they themselves cannot escape a just measure of moral responsibility.

I cannot conclude this discussion without answering a few questions I have been asked ever since Dr. Wu started his smear-Formosa campaign.

How about the free elections which Governor Wu claims to have initiated in Formosa and which he says are no longer free?

In December 1952 I watched the local elections in the eastern coastal and partially aboriginal district of Taitung, and I was greatly impressed by the extraordinarily high percentage of voters of both sexes who came to the polls. It was to be expected that the Kuomintang, the powerful Government party, had great advantages over the minor parties and those candidates with no party affiliations. But because of the very high literacy of the Taiwan population and because the secret ballot is always the most effective weapon of democratic control, the elections have been and still are quite free.

In the recent May 2 elections, the Kuomintang candidate for mayor in the capital city of Taipei, on whose election the party had staked all its great power and influence, was overwhelmingly defeated by a nonparty candidate. The same was true of the central-west district of Chia-yi, where the Kuomintang candidate for magistrate was badly defeated by a candidate with no affiliation to any political party. After the elections, many newspapers, including the New York Times and the Hon Kong Times, editorially commented on the defeat of the Kuomintang candidates at Taipei and Chia-yi as the best evidence that elections in Formosa are free.

What do you think of General Chiang Ching-kuo, son of President Chiang, whom Dr. Wu regards as the heir and successor of the Gimo?

I have known Chiang Ching-kuo for many years. He is a very hardworking man, conscientious and courteous, patriotic and intensely anti-Communist. His intellectual outlook is rather limited, largely because of his long years in the Soviet Union. Like his father, he is free from corruption and therefore not free from self-righteousness (again not unlike his father). He honestly believes that the most effective way in dealing with the Communists is to be as ruthless with them as they are with anyone opposing them.

While I strongly disagree with Chiang Ching-kuo's methods in dealing with Communists and suspected Communists (and I said so publicly on the first day of my arrival on Formosa in 1952), I have grave doubts about the mental state of anyone who says: "Who can guarantee that, in the event of the Gimo's death and an attractive offer from Peking, he [Chiang Ching-kuo] may not turn Formosa into a rich province of Red China?" In any case, there is no possibility of his being the heir and successor of President Chiang. Politically, he has no place in the government and plays no important role. His exact position is that of a faithful factotum to his father. He is not popular with the armed forces, and there is absolutely no constitutional or organizational channel through which he can become his father's heir and successor.

How about the youth corps which young Chiang has organized in Formosa and which, according to Dr. Wu, is modeled after the Hitler youth and the Communist youth?

Here is a perfect example of Dr. Wu's methods. Listen to his own description of the youth corps: "Then Ching-kuo organized his youth corps. He ordered all superintendents, professors, and teachers to become officers and all students enrolled as members. We now have a Red version of the Hitler jugend.

Have you ever known a Hitler or a Stalin so stupid as to enroll all students in his youth corps, and to order all superintendents, professors, and teachers to become their officers? Was K. C. Wu really so ignorant? Or was he trying to deceive the public?

When the so-called Young Men's Corps of Anticommunism and National Salvation was first organized in 1952 (apparently with the loud approval of Governor Wu), one of the wisest educators in Taipei remarked to me:

"When they take in all students as members and all teachers as their officers, it means there is no secret organization, and no secret training and indoctrination will be possible. They are merely wasting more money and more of the students' precious time to have another parading and slogan-shouting organization to be added to the New Year's Day parade."

That is what Dr. Wu calls a Red version of the Hitler jugend on Formosa.

May I conclude by quoting the wise observation of Rodney Gilbert: "The very fact that there is public objection, and chance of change, is part of Formosa's pattern of freedom."

Four-Laned Highway 40 Proved Vital

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFTON (CLIFF) YOUNG

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include an article appearing in the San Francisco Examiner under date of June 28, 1954, entitled "Four-Laned Highway 40 Proved Vital." Although civil defense is making progress in this country, we are losing ground in our footrace with the enemy's war-making potential. One of the important parts of our civil-defense program is the mass evacuation of our people from cities in the event of attack. This evacuation will be possible only with adequate highways to carry the heavy civil and military traffic which will follow in the wake of an enemy attack. A particularly serious situation exists with respect to U. S. Highway 40 over the Sierra Nevada Mountains. The recent command-post exercise has underscored the need for an improvement of this route.

The article follows:

FOUR-LANED HIGHWAY 40 PROVED VITAL—DEFENSE MANEUVERS SHOW NEED FOR WIDER ROAD

(By Will Stevens)

Four-laning of California's strategic U. S. Highway 40 over the Sierra—or chaos along that lifeline in the wake of an enemy attack against major targets in northern California.

Those two alternatives, the Examiner learned yesterday, have highlighted virtually every critique prepared from city through county to State levels in the wake of California's participation in the June 16 nationwide command post exercise (CPX). The exercise was staged to test America's defenses against A-bombs, guided missiles, sabotage, and high explosives.

TWO-LANE BOTTLENECK

Results of a breakdown on the critiques, assembled unofficially by the Trans-Sierra Highway Committee with headquarters at Auburn, showed that traffic over the four-lane sections of U. S. 40, during Operation Alert, were controlled without difficulty.

Along the two-lane bottleneck sections of the highway, the critiques revealed, civilian traffic blocked military traffic with a resultant 4-hour delay.

BRANDLIEN VIEW

Ninety miles of U. S. 40 wind through Placer County. George Brandlien, coordinator of the Placer County Disaster Council, who would have a major role in a mass evacuation over U. S. 40 wrote in his report:

"The four-laning of Highway 40 is recommended as being of utmost importance, inasmuch as military traffic was unable to move, resulting from civilian traffic having blocked the road.

"The result was a 4-hour delay before the road could be opened. This would be very costly as minutes might be the difference between the recovery of this Nation and defeat.

"As the flow of traffic over the 4-laned portions was controlled without difficulty, it is recommended that Highway 40 be completely 4-laned through the Sierra Nevada Range in order to expedite troop and supply movement in case of a national disaster."

VIRTUAL NECESSITY

Maj. Gen. Walter M. Robertson, State Director of Civilian Defense, on the basis of official reports reaching his desk, declared:

"We need a four-lane transcontinental highway—it has become a virtual necessity.

"A four-lane transcontinental route is required both for the dispersal of populated areas, in case of a major disaster, and for bringing in supplies and equipment."

Rear Adm. A. G. Cook, director of the San Francisco Disaster Council and Corps, wrote in his report to the Trans-Sierra Highway Committee:

"I desire to go on record as being in favor of increasing the number of roads crossing the Sierra, in order that it may be possible to expedite the movement of emergency material in the event of disaster.

"The size of the present-day weapons and the devastation they can cause would make it impossible for any one community or area to provide the necessary facilities for the care of the homeless and injured following an attack. We are going to need help from all over the country."

ROUTE SURVEYED

D. K. Chacey, one of the Nation's ranking highway engineers, already has surveyed U. S. 40 on orders of Brig. Gen. Paul F. Yount, Army Chief of Transportation.

Chacey, who made the survey strictly on the basis of what a four-lane, realigned highway over the Sierra would accomplish in military terms, reportedly made a favorable recommendation.

His report, cleared by the Transportation Corps, and subsequently by the Department of the Army, eventually was forwarded to the Department of Defense. The report was never made public, however.

The State legislature already has earmarked $20 million to be matched by the Federal Government for 4-laning and realining the highway as a super $40 million 4-lane trans-Sierra defense highway.

The Department of Defense, it is understood, now is considering approval of a special Federal appropriation of $20 million carrying the official sanction of the Department.

Prophets of Doom and Gloom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, the Commerce Department, in its regular monthly business review, says that employment continued "to drift downward through July."

Secretary of Commerce Weeks and his coworkers must be prophets of doom and gloom.

Outlawing the Communist Party

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the New Reporter is deserving of our attention:

OUTLAWING THE COMMUNISTS

There is so much to object to in the Communist Control Act of 1954 that it seems necessary to record at once that the authors of the act and the editors of this journal start with the same assumptions. The findings of fact, which introduce the act, are themselves an arrogation by Congress of a role that belongs to the courts. Yet they set forth facts which we believe to be true. We agree that the Communist Party is "an authoritarian dictatorship within a republic." We do not doubt that "its members have no part in determining its goals." We are sure that it is "an agency of a hostile foreign power." And we believe with the authors of the act that the Communist Party "is the means whereby individuals are seduced into the service of the world Communist movement, trained to do its bidding and directed and controlled in the conspiratorial performance of their revolutionary duties."

All this is argument why Americans should work as citizens to expose, to isolate, to minimize the Communist Party. This action is not simply negative, in protecting the right of reformism in America to develop along sound lines. It can serve the positive purpose of inducing the Soviet leaders to behave more like Russians and less like Bolsheviks. The alternative to war is the evolution of the Soviet state away from revolutionary doctrines, and this evolution is suppressed while strong Communist parties overseas provide extremists in the Kremlin with hope in the opportunities for revolution. The shrinking of the Communist parties can help to bring forward elements within the Soviet ruling group which seek the security of their nation in legitimate relations with other states rather than in their overthrow.

For these reasons, Americans as citizens must combat the Communist Party. Their task has not been made easier by the measure passed in a mood of haste and political maneuver by the Congress in the closing days of the 1954 session. For the sake of doubtful gains in combating the Communist Party, the great majority of Americans have suffered through a further compromise of the constitutional guaranties of free speech.

The act first deprives the Communist Party of "the rights, privileges, and immunities attendant upon legal bodies created under the jurisdiction of the laws of the United States or any political subdivision thereof." This would seem to mean that the Communist Party can no longer hold bank accounts, make leases, and obtain judicial enforcement of contracts; it cannot sue or be sued; it cannot run candidates for public office, at least in Federal elections. Is this really a blow at the Communist conspiracy? If it is in truth a conspiracy, its bank accounts are not likely to be made even now in its own name. On the other hand, serious legal precedents are raised to haunt non-Communists as to the extent to which the Federal Government can deprive an organization of its rights and privileges under State laws. Never before has the United States attempted to dictate to the States what rights they shall grant to organizations that are in full compliance with State laws.

Next, the Communist Control Act subjects anyone who knowingly and willfully becomes or remains a member of the Communist Party to all the provisions and penalties of the Internal Security Act of 1950 as a member of a Communist-action organization. The provisions of the 1950 act include registration with the Attorney General. The penalties include a prohibition upon members of the Communist-action organizations from holding Federal or defense jobs or applying for passports. Violations can result in imprisonment up to 5 years, in fines up to $10,000, or both. But, again, these are not new restrictions. They are already provided by the Internal Security Act. The new act states principally that the 1950 act meant what it said. However, it confuses the 1950 act by imposing untried statutes on others now 4 years in the courts. And by introducing new threats of criminal charges, it prepares the way for Communists to cite the fifth amendment in refusing to register, a defense prohibited by the 1950 act.

What is a Communist? The new act creates 14 criteria for the guidance of the jury. The criteria may include the posting of a letter, the signing of petitions, the support of a Communist-led union, the passing of any information, knowingly or unknowingly, to a Communist. These criteria are surely unnecessarily broad in the identification of hard-core revolutionaries. But they may well result in punishing the innocent and the unknowing.

The remaining sections of the new law amend the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950. Only in these sections are new powers conferred on the Executive which the Executive wants, and intends to use.

The new law adds the category "Communist infiltrated organization" to the previous categories of Communist-action and Communist-front groups. A Communist infiltrated organization is one substantially dominated or controlled by individuals who have aided the Communist movement. The thrust is at Communist-led trade unions, and once they are found to fall within the category, they are deprived of all relationships with the National Labor Relations Board.

Once again it is worth asking, What is the objective, and is it best achieved by measures of this kind?

The objective is to dismantle the hard core of Communist-led unions, and it is one which has steadily advanced without legislative assistance. There were 9 such unions in 1949 with a membership of 1 million. Operating without the lever of the law, non-Communists in the labor movement have reduced their strength today to 6 unions with about 250,000 members. The United Electrical Workers is down from 500,000 in 1949 to 100,000 and is steadily losing out to its CIO rival. The Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers Union has less than 50,000 members and is challenged by the CIO Steelworkers. Only the International Longshoremen's Association, with 50,000, remains steadfastly loyal to Harry Bridges. And in this one case legislation may backfire for Bridges may well be strengthened by Government intervention against his union.

It is true that Communist leadership in these unions has died hard. To hasten its death, the non-Communist oath was written into the Taft-Hartley Act. Its legality was upheld by the courts, but the provision proved largely useless. Communist leaders formally relinquished their outward ties to the party. The National Labor Relations Board found no way of determining the validity of the non-Communist affidavits they submitted.

It was to remedy this situation that legislation was brought forward by Senator Butler which formed the basis of the present law. The men who have driven the Communists out of organized labor believed without exception that the Butler bill was essentially a threat to themselves. And while the Senator could point justifiably to the fair record of the factfinding agency, the Subversive Activities Control Board, it is true that the criteria he set for determination of Communist-domination were vague. As against the immediate gains of his measure in bringing new pressures to bear on the few remaining Communist-led unions, the general dangers implicit in his bill were emphasized by the minority of the House Un-American Activities Committee, to whom the bill was referred:

"This bill is a step toward Government licensing of trade unions. Such a step should be taken only after the most careful consideration and the clearest demonstration of necessity."

It was to head off the Butler bill that Senator Humphrey introduced his amendment to outlaw the Communist Party. In the mood of 1954, as he might have foreseen, the end result of his intervention was to get both his own bill and the Butler bill in a somewhat softened form. Together, they are now combined in the Communist Control Act. And we doubt if anyone is safer. There were dangers in the Butler bill. Like all subversive-control bills, it vested in Government powers which can be misused. Yet most Americans who do not believe that unions are above the law might prefer to live with the risks with the Butler bill than to add to them the certainties of the new law of which it now forms a part. For this outcome the country must thank Senator Humphrey, Senator Morse, and others who sponsored the Humphrey bill.

The bill which Humphrey produced was first drafted as a substitute to the McCarran Act of 1950. The same Senators tried then to sell it to President Truman, but he rejected it with indignation. This year Lyndon Johnson welcomed it on behalf of the Democratic Party. The few voices that were raised in opposition to the bill echoed the view of a policeman, J. Edgar Hoover, that it was impracticable. In principled terms only, Senator Estes Kefauver and Representatives Multer and Burdick raised the basic issues of the constitutional guaranties of free speech.

Why did the remaining Democrats surrender the principle? The answer was best given by Senator Humphrey:

"I am tired of reading headlines about being 'soft' toward communism. I am tired of reading headlines about being a leftist and about others being leftists. I am tired of having people play the Communist issue as though it were a great overture which had lasted for years. I want to come to grips with the Communist issue. I want Senators to stand up and to answer whether they are for the Communist Party or are against it. The proposal in the amendment will place Senators right on the line."

Of course Senator Humphrey is tired—and embattled in the current campaign. But neither fact is justification for saddling the Nation with restrictive laws. Nor is outrageous oratory from the Republicans reason for similar oratory from the Democrats in holding that anyone who opposed the Humphrey amendment is "for the Communist Party."

Sam Rayburn summed up the issue when Congress adjourned. "They cannot say anything new about 20 years of treason because we were the ones who led the fight to have an effective anti-Communist bill." By the same logic Mr. Sam could have deprived the Republicans of the globaloney charge by leading the Democrats to oppose every cent of foreign aid.

The sad truth is that the Democrats were running after a wraith called public opinion, no longer leading as they were elected to lead, but blindly following the election returns of 2 years before. They were weak in judgment, in miscalculating the course of public opinion. Far more important, they were weak in spirit—lacking wholly the greatness of LaFollette and Norris who made public opinion; who had the courage of their convictions and dared to tell people the truth.

The Case Against Recognition of Communist China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, recognition of Communist China and its admission to the United Nations would be the greatest possible diplomatic victory for that regime and, in my opinion, be enough to make almost certain its conquest of all Asia, leading almost inevitably to war with the United States. Naturally, Communists will not cease their constant pursuit of such recognition. Americans might weaken under the constant barrage of propaganda and clever maneuvers, alternating threats with honeyed trade offers and flattery to our allies. We need to know the hard facts and the arguments on both sides, so that we can be sure of our ground.

The case against recognition has been thus presented in an article for Collier's by Dr. Stanley K. Hornbeck. There is no more eminent authority. Dr. Hornbeck was our top expert on Asia, serving in the State Department in that capacity under three Presidents. He steadfastly opposed appeasement of communism—Chinese or Russian—during the war years and was eased out of the Far East Division by being appointed our Ambassador to the Netherlands. Had his advice been followed instead of that of the Institute of Pacific Relations crowd which undermined his position in the Department, we would not have built up a Frankenstein monster in China which now threatens our own peace, even our survival.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include Dr. Hornbeck's article:

THE CASE AGAINST RECOGNITION

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

China, the oldest of now existing states, has been and is, by virtue of its location, its size, and its resources—human and material—the center of political gravity in eastern Asia. In China, in the year 1911, a small group of revolutionary leaders overthrew the then ruling imperial dynasty and, influenced by what they knew of American history, decided to make their country a republic. Some 10 years later, another group decided that what had been imposed in Russia, a Communist regime, could and should be imposed in China. Soon China's Nationalists accepted a proffer of Soviet-Communist support. In 1926, Nationalist and Communist armed forces set out together from Canton to unify the country. In the next year the Communists attempted, as they had intended, to seize control of that movement; whereupon the Nationalists, having thwarted the attempt, adopted the principle of no compromise with communism—which has since been a constant feature of their policy. In 1928, the Nationalists brought into existence the National Government of the Republic of China. That Government soon was accorded recognition by the United States and most other of the world's then existing states. Throughout the years since then, the Communist Party in China has, with the backing of Communists everywhere, worked to destroy that Government and make of China an affiliate in the Soviet-Communist drive for world dominion.

From the earliest days of American contact with China, the people of the United States have been outstandingly well disposed toward the Chinese, and until the end of World War II it was the policy and practice of the United States to befriend the Chinese state, to oppose policies and acts of other countries prejudicial to the sovereignty and independence of that state, and to refrain from interference in that state's affairs. However, toward the end of World War II and in the early years thereafter, American leaders—preoccupied with military problems, intent on creating an organization for collective security, knowing and thinking little about Soviet and world communism, and misled by Soviet maneuverings and propaganda—made commitments and pursued courses which, widely at variance with the traditions of United States foreign policy, have resulted in worldwide involvement of the United States in power politics. More than a little of this involvement came of steps taken regarding China, wherein there were ignored in several contexts both principles and precedents which had previously prevailed in United States policy toward that country.

At and after the conference at Teheran (November 1943), American negotiators collaborated with Soviet negotiators in formulating the "agreement regarding Japan" (basically an agreement about China) which—signed at Yalta by Stalin, Roosevelt, and Churchill and confirmed later at Potsdam—authorized the subsequent Soviet occupation of Manchuria and gave countenance to pursuance thereafter by the Soviet authorities of courses advantageous to it, favorable to the Chinese Communists, and highly inimical to the rights and interests of China and its National Government. After Yalta, American negotiators fostered the conclusion at Moscow of a treaty wherein the National Government confirmed, in return for Soviet pledges, the concessions regarding China made to Stalin at Yalta. Little did the American policy-makers or the Chinese surmise in the spring and summer of 1945 that within 18 months the Soviet authorities would have virtually made Manchuria a part of the Communist empire, taken from Manchuria into Siberia a huge increment of industrial equipment, deviously handed over to the Chinese Communists a vast amount of munitions, and openly disregarded their pledges that in relations with China the Soviet Union would support the Nationalist Government and that government only.

With the sending of General Marshall to China to "bring to bear the influence of the United States," the American Government embarked upon a policy of direct diplomatic intervention in the internal affairs of the Chinese state. Three important effects of the efforts of the Marshall mission were: (1) the Chinese Communists were given "face" and the prestige of China's National Government was relatively diminished; (2) the Communists were given time in which to consolidate their positions in various strategic areas and to take over with Soviet connivance munitions surrendered by the Japanese to Soviet armies; and (3) by the United States Government's imposing at a critical moment an embargo on export of munitions to China, its ceasing to give financial assistance and its declaring itself neutral in relation to the "civil war" in China, the capabilities of the National Government were decreased and those of the Communists were relatively increased.

After the failure of the Marshall mission, the utterances and acts of the United States Government in regard to China were suggestive of a slanted neutrality animated by a sense of frustration, a distaste for both of the contending parties, an inclination to be more critical of the Nationalists than of the Communists, and a belief that the latter were going to win. Two at least of its acts were definitely inimical to the interests of the National Government: (1) The Department of State prepared, published, and circulated throughout the world in August 1949 a book (the white book entitled "United States Relations With China"), the contents of which were highly critical of China in general and of the National Government in particular; and (2) after the National Government and many of its followers had retreated in December 1949 to the island province of Formosa, top-level American officials gratuitiously declared that the United States would give no military assistance of any sort to that government.

A remarkable concurrence of circumstances and developments favorable to them enabled the Communists to gain, in 1949, physical control of practically the whole of the Chinese mainland, and in October of that year they announced the creation of a Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China. So, since 1949, there have been in China 2 governments—1 based in and operating from Peiping, the other based in and operating from Taipeh in Formosa.

CHINESE REPRESENTATION IN THE UNITED NATIONS

China is a member, a founder member, of the United Nations. China holds a permanent seat on the Security Council. The United States and a majority of the world's other states still recognize China's National Government, and that Government still represents China in the United Nations. The Soviet Union, all of its satellites, and many other states—among them the United Kingdom (but no other English-speaking country in the Western Hemisphere)—some 25 in all, have recognized China's (Communist) People's Government; and several of those countries—conspicuously the Soviet Union, the United Kingdom, and India—vigorously champion the demand of that Government that it be recognized by other powers and be seated in the United Nations.

In that context, the exigencies of power politics pose for the United States not a question of recognizing a state, China, or of advocating or opposing admission of that state to the United Nations, but the question: What should this country do or not do in regard to the demands of a new government, the "People's Government" of China. Should the United States (a) accord recognition of the "People's Government"; (b) terminate its recognition of the National Government, its withholding of recognition from the "People's Government," and its opposition to the demanded transfer of seats in the United Nations? These questions are evidently interrelated and interdependent.

THE MEANING OF RECOGNITION

First things first: Should the United States recognize the Communist "People's Government of the People's Republic of China?"

The according of recognition is a matter of affirmative official action decided upon and taken by political authorities in pursuance of political ends and with legal consequences. There should not be, but there all too often is, confusion of recognition with cognition. Withholding of recognition does not constitute or imply failure to take cognizance of or refusal to do business with. The Government and the people of the United States take cognizance of the existence of the "People's Government" in China; they realize, admit, and affirm that that government exercises authority de facto over a large part and many people of China; the American Government communicates with that government, and American nationals do business with people in the area under that government's control. But the United States has not seen fit to affirm, by act of recognition, that in its opinion and for its purposes that government is the government de lege of China. Recognition may facilitate but is not essential to interchanges between and among governments and peoples. Witness the carrying on of business between the United States and Soviet Russia for 15 years before the United States finally recognized the Soviet Government.

There exists no generally accepted rule of international law requiring that any country or government accord recognition to another or be given recognition by another. There has evolved, however, a tendency in modern thought and practice to emphasize the view that, to be morally entitled to recognition, a claimant government should be known to possess several standard qualifications. Three, in particular, are (a) effectiveness of authority; (b) ability or capacity to fulfill international obligations; and (c) disposition or willingness to perform in accordance with those obligations.

An excellent exposition of the modern United States official view appears in the course of a communication sent by Secretary of State Cordell Hull to a Member of the Congress under date May 16, 1936. Mr. Hull wrote: "It is the rule of the United States 'to defer recognition [of a new government] until it shall appear that it [such government] is in possession of the machinery of the state, administering the government with the assent of the people thereof and without substantial resistance to its authority, and that it is in position to fulfill all the international obligations and responsibilities incumbent upon a sovereign state under treaties and international law.' You will appreciate that the length of time necessary to satisfy our government upon these points will vary." (Hackworth, Digest of International Law, Volume I, p. 175.)

Recognition in a situation wherein a new government has eliminated an old government and is exercising undisputed control of a people and country is one thing. Recognition in a situation wherein there are two or more governments each controlling some of a people and a part of a country is quite another thing. In both cases, decision to recognize or not calls for weighing of political—including moral—considerations pro and contra in terms of national and international interest and with due reference to over-all national objectives and policies. In the second of such differing situations, there is call for maximum circumspection. Such is the situation which now prevails with regard to China.

POLITICAL SIGNIFICANCE AND RESULTS

Decisions to accord or to withhold recognition are made by political, not by judicial, authorities. In the United States, decisions regarding policy are, of course, substantially influenced by public opinion. During recent years it has been increasingly indicated that, in the light of courses pursued by China's Communist authorities, the American public is opposed to recognition of the People's Government. Majorities in Congress have passed resolutions which testify to their concurrence in that opposition. And, hortatory expression by Americans of the view that their Government should stand firm in opposing admission of that government to seats in the United Nations is on the increase.

China's National Government gave China during the years 1928-45 more unity than that country had known in any preceding period subsequent to the overthrow of the monarchy. It has resisted communism from an earlier moment and more presciently than has any other government anywhere. It kept China united in resistance to Japanese attacks from 1931 on and as an ally of the United States and other powers throughout World War II. True, in the aftermath, many of its war-weary followers transferred their support to the supposedly liberal opposition—as similarly happened in Great Britain—but it retreated with a substantial following to Formosa and there, still on Chinese soil and functioning more liberally and more effectively than before, it is keeping Nationalist China in the orbit of the free world. It is the symbol and rallying point of Chinese resistance, local and overseas, to communism and Communist aggression. It possesses a substantial military establishment. It has reciprocated and fostered the spirit of good will which had traditionally prevailed in the attitude of the United States in relations with and regarding China. In its defense of Formosa, it is serving purposes common to it and to the United States—especially those of resistance to Soviet-Communist imperialism and of keeping alive the influence in the western Pacific and eastern Asia of ideas and instrumentalities of progress introduced there by or from the West. It favors ways of life of the free peoples, especially those of the United States. It has, generally speaking, shown respect for China's international obligations and to the opinions of mankind. Its representatives in the United Nations speak in terms intelligible to and acceptable among free peoples, and their votes are on the side of the free world.

China's People's Government has been in control of most of mainland China for 4 years. It has employed, with amplification, most of the methods and devices conceived and found useful elsewhere in the Communist Empire for acquiring and maintaining power. It has done its utmost, as Communist regimes do everywhere, to destroy all practices or thought of individual freedom and to impose upon the 450 million people of China a regime patterned upon and allied with that which functions in the Soviet Union. Associating itself with the Soviet and other Communist governments in the cold war upon the free world, it makes of China, always influential in Eastern Asia, a focal point—a transforming and boosting center—for propagation and dissemination of Communist thought and effort among the peoples of Asia. It openly declares itself indebted to the Soviet Union for its very existence, and it has entered into formal alliance with that country. It villifies the United States, declares this country its No. 1 enemy, and seeks to inflame its own and other peoples against this and other countries of the free world. It has a very large and ever-growing military establishment, much of the materiel of which is supplied by the Soviet Union. It employs tens of thousands of "advisers" and technicians, military and civilian, of Soviet origin. It abuses its own nationals and many nationals of other countries. It has made China an aggressor, attacking the Republic of Korea and defying the United Nations. It disregards and it expresses contempt for various of China's international commitments. There is ample warrant for believing that its representatives, if seated in the United Nations, would follow the Communist "line" and that its voice and its vote there would add greatly to the strength and the capacity for maneuver of the Soviet-directed Communist bloc.

China's People's Government simply does not qualify under tests of attitude and performance for recognition by the United States. Nor does it qualify under specifications in the charter of the United Nations for admission to that organization. Recognition of that government has in few, if any, cases greatly profited the accorder. Great Britain recognized it in January 1950. Since then British nationals and British firms have been driven out of mainland China, and not yet has the Ambassador of the United Kingdom been given access to top-level Communist officialdom. There is no warrant for an assumption that recognition of that government by the United States would in any substantial and lasting way advance the interests of the United States and the free world.

Such recognition, would, however, substantially advance the interests of the Communist world. Recognition has a value—to the government to which it is accorded and to supporters of such government or of its claims. That this is a fact is attested by the vigor and persistence with which demands for recognition are pressed. Recognition amounts to much more than a mere taking cognizance of a de factor reality. It confers a de lege standing or status. It accords to its recipient the right to speak for a nation in relations with the according country and it imposes upon the latter duties reciprocal to that right. The contention that it does not signify approbation or approval is suggestive of wishful thinking, mental astigmatism, or willful imprecision on the part of those who advance it. Recognition need not—it often may, however—signify moral approbation, but it certainly and undeniably does signify and certify political acceptance and legal approval. Recognition by the United States of China's "People's Government" would terminate the right of the United States to object to completion by that government of the Communist conquest of China. It would insure admission of that government to seats in the United Nations. It would facilitate carrying on of trade by Communist China. It would impress the people of China and of other countries, and thus would facilitate further movements by the Communist world in pursuit of its current and its ultimate objectives. There is no warrant for believing that it would cause that world or any part of it to modify those objectives and thus abidingly resolve or diminish the causes of tension in eastern Asia—or anywhere else. Instead, its net effect probably would be to increase the self-confidence, the will to conquer, and the capabilities of the Soviet-Communist empire. All this at the expense of and with detriment to the United States and the free world.

Were the United States to recognize the Chinese Communist Government, it would have either to terminate its recognition of the National Government or to take a position that China has been or should be divided. The United States has, however, always felt that China should not be divided, has opposed impairment of China's administrative and territorial integrity, and has supported efforts to strengthen China's unity. Moreover, it is unlikely that either the Nationalists or the Communists—or the people of China—would assent to a division. Recognition of the Communist government by the countries which have thus far accorded it has involved withdrawal, express or implied, of recognition of the National Government. Recognition of the Communist government, if, and when, by the United States would presumably have the same concomitant. Termination by the United States of its recognition of the National Government would be a deathblow to that government and to the cause of Chinese resistance to communism. It would be followed by similar withdrawal of recognition by other countries. It would virtually insure the consolidation of Communist authority throughout all of China, including Formosa, and would facilitate the onward march of communism at other points. It would be regarded in eastern Asia, and elsewhere, as an abandonment by the United States of a friend, an ally, loyal affiliates, and a strategic sector in the struggle between the free world and the Communist world. In return, the United States would have received and accepted mere Communist promises. Thereafter, what peoples would be disposed to associate themselves with the United States in a common policy of resistance to Communist demands or attack?

In the situation and circumstances which now prevail in world affairs, any action by the United States which would give comfort and aid to the Communist campaign for power in Asia and for increase of influence in the United Nations would be inconsistent with and destructive to the overall foreign policy and effort of the United States. The outstanding objectives of United States foreign policy are to safeguard legitimate American interests, first among which is that of national security, and to advance the cause of world peace—with justice and, if possible, without war. Those ends cannot be served by procedures of opportunism, expediency, and assent, or by contribution to settlements profitable to states or governments committed to the objective of national and world conquest. They can and will be served by steadfast adherence to sound moral and legal principles, together with self-reliance, adequate measures for self-defense, reasonable and dependable aid to and support of other free peoples, and refusal to bargain with or appease any state or government at the expense of any other state or government or people friendly to us and acting affirmatively, as are we, in defense of the right of nations to independence and of human beings to be free.

In the light of these many considerations, the United States should not, rebus sic stantibus, recognize the "People's Government" of Communist China.—S. K. H.

The Committee on Labor and Public Welfare in the 83d Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. ALEXANDER SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, it has been a high privilege for me to serve as chairman of this important committee as successor to the late beloved Senator Robert A. Taft. But I cannot claim sole credit for the fine accomplishments of this committee. Every member of the committee, both Democrats and Republicans, has contributed to our record, and I want to take this occasion to thank all the members of the committee for their constructive cooperation.

It is with great sorrow that we record the death of Senator Dwight Griswold, of Nebraska, who served this committee faithfully and effectively in the 83d Congress until his untimely death on April 12, 1954. Mrs. Eva Bowring, of Nebraska, who was appointed to fill the vacancy, has served on this committee since her appointment with great and deeply appreciated effectiveness.

The work of the committee was done by the standing Subcommittees on Labor, Civil Rights, Health, Education, and Veterans' Affairs and the special Subcommittee on Railroad Retirement Legislation. I owe a special debt of gratitude to Senator Ives for his constructive work in the field of civil rights, and his initiation of the investigation of employee welfare and pension funds, as recommended by President Eisenhower. Senator Ives also served as chairman of our special Subcommittee on Committee Rules and Procedure.

In the field of health, the initiative has been vigorously carried forward by Senator Purtell and, as the following report shows, we have gone a long way toward carrying out the President's recommendations by the important health legislation passed this year. The failure to make definite progress in the health-reinsurance program was due primarily to the apparent misunderstanding on the part of the House of the experimental nature of the proposals. We plan to pursue this matter vigorously in 1955.

Senator Cooper, of Kentucky, has headed up the committee's efforts in the field of education. The measures recommended by the administration were all adopted. The committee regrets that the important emergency school-construction program was not adopted this year.

Senator Goldwater, of Arizona, acted as chairman of the Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs. The report brings out clearly the accomplishments in this field. Following the death of Senator Griswold, Senator Goldwater took over, as additional duty, the chairmanship of the Special Subcommittee on Railroad Retirement Legislation.

I desire to add a word of special commendation for all members of our staff for their faithful and efficient work.

I also want to express my gratitude to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Mrs. Hobby, and to Mr. Nelson Rockefeller for their aid and guidance in the field of welfare legislation; and to Secretary Mitchell, of the Department of Labor, for his advice in the field of labor legislation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record the report of the committee activities in the 83d Congress.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Report on Committee Activities

The Committee on Labor and Public Welfare is 1 of the 15 standing Commitees of the Senate. Its area of responsibility, as defined by the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, covers a wide area of legislative matters in the social field. In general, the committee has jurisdiction over legislation of a substantive nature relating to the Department of Labor and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. It deals with hospitalization and medical care, vocational rehabilitation, education and training matters, and soldiers' and sailors' civil relief matters, all of which are within the purview of the Veterans' Administration. Railroad retirement matters, United States employees' compensation matters, the Federal school-lunch program, the National Science Foundation, and certain educational and welfare activities of the government of the District of Columbia also come before this committee.

HEALTH LEGISLATION

During the 83d Congress, 43 bills dealing with various aspects of the Nation's health problems, exclusive of measures relating to health problems of veterans, were introduced and referred to this committee. These bills were subsequently assigned to the Subcommittee on Health for preliminary consideration and report. Among these bills, which covered a great range of health subjects, were the following principal measures upon which action was completed by the committee.

(a) *Extension of the Hospital Survey and Construction Act*

During the 1st session of the 83d Congress, the committee considered and favorably reported S. 967, which had been introduced on February 16, 1953, and which extends for 2 additional years, that is to June 30, 1957, the Hospital Survey and Construction Act. Experience has demonstrated the value of this program and the soundness of its basic administrative provisions. Its survey and planning provisions have promoted ordinary planning for hospital service in all of the States. A total of 106,000 beds have been constructed or have been approved for construction under this act. S. 967 became Public Law 151 on July 27, 1953.

(b) *Medical Facilities Survey and Construction Act of 1954*

During the 2d session, the committee considered and favorably reported a bill (H. R. 8149) to broaden the base of the hospital construction program. This bill, which was a companion to S. 2758, was designed to carry out this part of the program of the President as submitted to Congress in his health message of January 18, 1954. It authorized appropriations of $20 million annually for the construction of diagnostic and treatment facilities, $20 million annually for the construction of hospitals for the chronically ill, $10 million annually for the construction of comprehensive rehabilitation facilities and $10 million annually for the construction of nursing or convalescent homes. The bill also authorized an appropriation of $2 million in order to enable the States to survey their respective needs for these categories of facilities and for revising State plans to provide an overall program for the construction of such facilities.

Extensive hearings were held on the measure. It was passed by the Senate on June 22 of this year and was signed into law by the President on July 12 of this year. It is now Public Law 482 of the 83d Congress.

(c) *Vocational rehabilitation*

A bill (S. 2759) to amend the Vocational Rehabilitation Act was introduced on January 19, 1954, to implement another aspect of the President's health program contained in his special health message of January 18, 1954. After extensive hearings on this measure, the bill was reported to the Senate on June 22, 1954. The Senate passed the bill on July 7, 1954, and on August 3, 1954, it was signed into law by the President. (Public Law 565.)

This bill is one of the most important pieces of welfare legislation enacted by the Congress in many years. In general, it provides for greatly increasing our efforts to rehabilitate the physically handicapped. It authorizes annual appropriations for rehabilitation purposes of $30 million for fiscal year 1955, $45 million for fiscal year 1956, $55 million for fiscal year 1957, $65 million for fiscal year 1958, and for each year thereafter such sums as Congress may determine.

Among the innovations contained in this legislation is authorization for the first time for the making of Federal grants for the purpose of training the professional personnel required in rehabilitation work. The rehabilitation of our physically handicapped has lagged for many years because of failure to train and utilize the necessary personnel. Furthermore, new techniques in physical medicine have been developed in recent years which make possible the rehabilitation of a much larger proportion of our handicapped people than was true in earlier years. This act seeks through demonstration and special project grants not only to encourage the training of personnel but also to make more widely applicable throughout the Nation these new discoveries in physical medicine. The act also gave greater latitude to the States in the administration of the rehabilitation program on the State and local level.

It is expected that the number of handicapped persons rehabilitated each year will increase from the past level of 60,000 to a total of 200,000 per year by 1959.

(d) *Factory inspections*

On July 29, 1953, the committee favorably reported to the Senate, with an amendment, H. R. 5740, enactment of which had been requested by the President in order to more fully safeguard the public health.

The bill was designed to provide clear and enforceable statutory authority for Federal Food and Drug Administration inspection of factory and other establishments in which food, drugs, devices, or cosmetics are manufactured. Legislation of this kind became necessary as the result of a Supreme Court decision which indicated that existing law did not provide proper authority to make the necessary inspections.

The measure was passed by the Senate on August 3, 1953. The House disagreed with the Senate amendment and thereafter the Senate receded from its amendment and passed the measure without amendment. On August 7, 1953, the President approved the bill and it became Public Law 217.

(e) *Food standards regulations*

On March 9, 1954, the committee favorably reported to the Senate, with an amendment, H. R. 6434, which amended various sections of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act so as to simplify the procedure governing the establishment of food standards. The bill was passed by the Senate on April 5, 1954, and was signed into law by the President on April 15, 1954. (Public Law 335.)

This important measure was designed to facilitate the making of changes in food standards regulations, the old standard making procedures having become slow and cumbersome. The old standards required formal hearings whether or not a proposed regulation was controversial. These old procedures resulted in useless expenditure of time and money by both the Federal Government and the food industry concernd. This measure (H. R. 6434) will greatly expedite the prescribing of food standards, and thus will aid in the protection of the public health.

(f) *Regulations governing residues of pesticide chemicals on agricultural commodities*

The committee conducted hearings and thereafter acted upon and favorably reported, with an amendment, H. R. 7125. The measure, as amended, was passed by the Senate on July 6, 1954. The Senate amendment was concurred in by the House, and on July 22, 1954, the President signed the measure into law. (Public Law 518.)

This measure is designed to insure greater protection of public health by improving, simplifying, and speeding up the procedure under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act for regulating the amount of residue of pesticide chemicals which may remain on agricultural commodities. It is clearly in the interest of protecting the public health that poisonous substances, as contained in most pesticide chemicals, be kept out of foods to the fullest extent possible. When the use of pesticide chemicals is required in the production of agricultural crops, a tolerance must be established in order to overcome possible injurious effects of such chemicals. The old procedures governing the establishment of such tolerances were cumbersome, time-consuming, and impracticable. Under this measure, the procedure will be more simple and the process speeded up without jeopardizing the public health.

(g) *Health Service prepayment-plan reinsurance*

In his health message of January 18, 1954, the President recommended the establishment of a limited Federal Reinsurance Service to encourage health-insurance organizations to offer broader health-protection policies to more people. A bill to carry forward this recommendation, S. 3114, was introduced in the Senate on March 11, 1954. It was subjected to extensive hearings in the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and was favorably reported to the Senate, with amendments, on July 12, 1954.

This measure would provide support services and a financial backstop for private efforts for the expansion of prepayment protection against the cost of medical, hospital, and other health care. It is designed to remove obstacles to the extension of coverage for broader ranges of benefits and to additional groups of people. This would be accomplished through the reinsurance of prepayment offerings to groups with difficult enrollment problems, and the reinsurance of health plans which offer new or more liberal benefits, so that prepayment insurance carriers may be encouraged to experiment in extending coverage and benefits.

This measure frankly seeks to encourage a greater risk taking by health-insurance organizations with a view to bringing about necessary improvements in the scope and the coverage offered by voluntary health-insurance plans. The bill proceeds on the assumption that voluntary prepayment health-insurance plans, with further experimentation and experience, can meet the need for protection against the costs of illness for a large majority of the population who are able and willing to give voluntary health-insurance premiums a priority in their family budgets.

The bill proposes a self-supporting, completely voluntary reinsurance program. It would establish a central pooled reserve or reinsurance fund to consist of reinsurance premiums and of fund earnings. While this fund is designed to be self-sustaining, provision is made for repayable capital advances to the fund by the Federal Government to the extent of $25 million, if needed. Participation in the program by insurance carriers is entirely voluntary in the same manner as participation in prepayment health-insurance plans is entirely voluntary with respect to the individual citizen. Reinsurance premiums to be charged to participating insurance carriers would be calculated with a view both to keeping the fund self-sustaining and to stimulating and encouraging plans in furtherance of the program's objectives. There are provisions in the bill designed to preclude the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, who would administer the program, from exercising control over the carriers' premium rates or subscription charges. In every respect, the bill seeks to follow the principle of furthering the development of voluntary health-insurance protection by maintaining and fostering competition among private health-insurance plans.

A similar measure, H. R. 8356, was brought before the House of Representatives on July 13, 1954, and by a vote of 238 to 134, was recommitted to the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. The bill before the Senate, S. 3114, was on the Senate calendar when the Senate recessed on Friday, August 20, 1954.

I was so much shocked by the action of the House in recommitting the President's health service prepayment plan reinsurance proposal that I released a statement to the press, dated July 14, 1954, as follows:

"WASHINGTON, July 14.—As chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare I feel very much concerned over the action of the House yesterday in sending back to committee and virtually killing President Eisenhower's Federal health reinsurance bill, which is really the heart of the President's health program. Our committee in the Senate has just reported this bill to the floor and we had expected to have it come up for debate here within the next week or 10 days.

"I have been in the Senate for 10 years and have been on the Committee of Labor and Public Welfare for that entire period. We have had facing us each year the consideration of an overall health program for the American people which would avoid the dangers of socialized medicine, but which would establish a voluntary system providing for our families the necessary health care, and particularly would provide for those catastrophies overtaking families with a sudden or prolonged illness, especially of the breadwinner.

"We have seen the failure of socialized medicine in England and I have been opposed to any such approach to the question. I am a son of a physician and my younger years were lived in a physician's family where I came to understand the values of the relationship of doctor and patient. There is no profession I respect more than the medical profession, and I admit I am prejudiced from the noble life that my father lived. I never could tolerate the thought of mechanized medicine where the patient becomes a number merely and he may be assigned to a doctor that may be good, or may be second rate. Anything that even tends to threaten the intimate relationship between patient and doctor is a distinct loss to this country. For that reason in talking over some kind of voluntary health insurance with Secretary Hobby and her very efficient staff, it was decided that we should endeavor to build on the voluntary health insurance plans that have been growing up in this country, as the Blue Cross, and the Blue Shield, and on the plans of the many insurance companies which have been studying this subject for years. The problem was whether these insurance coverages could be expanded in two directions (1) to cover more of our population at a reasonable premium, and (2) to widen the scope of the coverage. As of today I am advised that there are 54 million persons covered by the Blue Cross and 29 million persons covered by the Blue Shield in addition to the various insurance company coverages, etc.

"Secretary Hobby has mobilized all the important insurance experts in the country, as well as other advisers who have studied both the medical side, and the social side of the problems involved. We have come up with a plan, which, admittedly, may not be perfect, but which has all the earmarks of intelligent experimentation with the principle involved. With our 48 States as laboratories we should find an ultimate sound solution.

"We want no interference with the individual family having its own family doctor, but we do want to develop that sense of security in our people so that if catastrophic illness overtakes them they will have at least reasonable coverage against such a disaster.

"Much to my amazement the opposition to this wonderful conception has come principally from two groups of people. First, the American Medical Association, which shortsightedly and without adequate study, has suggested that this plan is a step in the direction of socialized medicine, and, second, from our large labor groups who have been favoring the compulsory program of socialized medicine.

"I have been conscious in my own office as chairman of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee of a barrage of high-pressure endeavors to kill this bill based on statements which are totally inadequate and totally untrue, which can have no motive other than the desire to frustrate this important program which President Eisenhower and his group are trying offer to the American people at this critical time.

"As chairman of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee, as I said at the opening of these remarks, I must protest vigorously against this sort of thinking and against this hysterical runaway under pressure of political groups from the responsibilities that lie before us."

(*h*) *Overtime compensation for United States Public Health Service Quarantine Service employees*

On June 22, 1953, there was introduced a bill, S. 2167, which posed to entitle Foreign Quarantine Division employees of the United States Public Health Service to overtime and holiday payments identical with those payable to Customs and Immigration employees. The bill also provided, just as do the special statutes applicable to the Customs and Immigration employees, that the carriers reserving such overtime or holiday services would reimburse the Federal Government for the amount thereof.

A companion bill, H. R. 6253, was introduced in the House. Public hearings were held thereon and the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce reported H. R. 6253 favorably, with an amendment relieving motorbus carriers, as well as rail and air carriers operating on published schedules, from the obligation of reimbursing the Federal Government for overtime and holiday services received. As amended, the bill, H. R. 6253, passed the House on the call of the calendar on July 6, 1954, and was referred to this committee on July 7, 1954.

This committee unanimously approved the House bill, H. R. 6253, and it passed the Senat on the call of the calendar on August 11, 1954. It was vetoed by the President on August 27, 1954.

LEGISLATION RELATING TO EDUCATION

Growing out of its responsibilities in the field of education, the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare received 46 bills during the 83d Congress dealing with problems of education, exclusive of bills concerned with veterans' education and Federal aid for education in the health field. These bills were subsequently assigned to the Subcommittee on Education for preliminary consideration and report to the full committee. Among these bills, which covered a wide range of educational matters, where the following principal measures upon which the committee acted.

(*a*) *Federal assistance for school construction in areas affected by Federal activities*

In the first session the committee considered and formally reported a bill, H. R. 6049, the purpose of which was to amend and extend for 1 year Public Law 815 of the 81st Congress which had been enacted in 1950 primarily to deal with the Federal Government's responsibility for aiding school construction in communities that had been burdened with substantial increases in school attendance as a result of defense and related Federal activities. This was in accordance with a request of the President. The Senate passed the measure on August 1, 1953, and it was signed by the President on August 8, 1953. It became Public Law 246 of the 1st session of the 83d Congress.

In the closing days of the second session, another bill was reported from the committee to further extend Public Law 815. This bill, S. 3628, authorized appropriations for school construction in so-called impacted areas for 3 additional years, namely, 1956, 1957, and 1958. It proposed also to extend for an additional 3 years the authority of the Commissioner of Education to provide minimum school facilities for the education of children residing on Federal property with respect to whom no local educational agency is able to provide suitable free public education.

The bill, S. 3628, was passed by the Senate on August 11, 1954. On August 16, 1954, the bill was amended (reduced by 1 year) and was passed by the House of Representatives. The Senate thereafter agreed to the House amendments and at the time this statement was sent to the printer, S. 3628 had already gone to the President.

(*b*) *Federal assistance for maintenance and operation of schools in areas affected by Federal activities*

In the first session the committee considered and favorably reported a bill, H. R. 6078, to amend and extend Public Law 874 of the 81st Congress which had been enacted to provide a program of financial assistance for the maintenance and operation of schools in areas affected by Federal activities. The bill was passed by the Senate on August 1, 1953, and was signed into law by the President on August 8, 1953. This bill, which had been requested by the President, became Public Law 248 of the 1st session of the 83d Congress.

In the closing days of the 2d session of the 83d Congress, the committee considered and favorably reported a bill, S. 3629, to eliminate the so-called 3-percent absorption requirement contained in Public Law 248 of the 1st session of the 83d Congress. S. 3629 was passed by the Senate on August 11, 1954. The bill was passed by the House on August 16, 1954, and at the time this statement was sent to the printer S. 3629 had gone to the President.

(*c*) *State and White House Conferences on Education*

After hearings on a companion Senate measure (S. 2723), the committee reported H. R. 7601, to provide for State and White House Conferences on Education. The measure authorized appropriations to the States in order to assist them in holding State conferences and preparing reports prior to the holding of a White House Conference in 1955 to consider and advise the President on significant and pressing problems in the field of education. This legislation was specifically requested by the President in order that careful deliberation, beginning at the State and local level, could be given to the Nation's educational problems. The Senate passed the measure on June 17, 1954, and on July 26, 1954, it became Public Law 530.

(*d*) *National Advisory Committee on Education*

Following hearings on a companion Senate measure (S. 2724), the committee reported H. R. 7434 to establish in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare a 9-member National Advisory Committee on Education. The committee is required to meet not less than three times each calendar year. Its function is to recommend to the Secretary the initiation of studies of national concern in the field of education and the law requires that it propose to the Secretary appropriate action indicated by such studies. In addition, the committee is required from time to time to advise the Secretary on the progress being made in carrying out its recommendations. The Secretary, in turn, is required to advise the Congress annually in regard to the studies initiated under the act, the recommendations made by the committee, and the action taken with respect to such recommendations. This bill was passed by the Senate on June 17, 1954, and became Public Law 532 on July 26, 1954.

(*e*) *Cooperative research in education*

The committee also held hearings on S. 2856, a bill which had been introduced to authorize cooperative research in education. Committee action was taken, however, on H. R. 9040, a companion measure which had been received from the House of Representatives. This measure authorized the Office of Education and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to enter into contracts on jointly financed cooperative arrangements with universities and colleges and State educational agencies for the conduct of research, surveys, and demonstrations in the field of education. Prior to the enactment of this bill, the Office of Education had no legislative authority to enter into such arrangements. A prime advantage of cooperative research work with organizations in the field of education is that such procedure makes full use of existing facilities and avoids the centralization of the staff and facilities in Washington, D. C. The same general procedure has been followed in the field of public health and in that field has resulted in notable improvements and great returns for each Federal dollar expended. This bill became Public Law 531 on July 26, 1954.

LABOR LEGISLATION

(a) *National Labor Relations Act amendments*

During the 1st session of the 83d Congress, the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare conducted extensive hearings lasting 6 weeks on proposed revision of our fundamental labor relations laws. Scores of witnesses representing labor, management, and the public testified in person before the committee or submitted statements dealing with every aspect of the National Labor Relations Act of 1947, more familliarly known as the Tart-Hartley Act. Thereafter, numerous conferences were held which were participated in by various officials from the executive departments who are concerned with labor-management relations matters.

Shortly after the opening of the 2d session of the 83d Congress—on January 11, 1954—the President submitted to the Congress his recommendations for changes in the Taft-Hartley Act. The President's recommendations, while endorsing the fundamentally sound principles on which the Taft-Hartley Act is based, proposed certain improvements which the experience of 7 years under the statute had shown to be desirable.

Simultaneously with the receipt of the President's message and in order to carry forward and place in legislative form the President's recommendations, I introduced a bill, S. 2650. Two and one-half weeks of public hearings were then held during which testimony was taken on every phase of the bill. Then followed numerous meetings of the committee in which every provision of the bill was thoroughly debated and discussed. On April 15, 1954, the bill was favorably reported to the Senate with certain modifications and amendments. On May 7, 1954, the fifth day of debate on the bill, a motion to recommit was carried by a vote of 50 to 42 in which 46 Democratic Members of the Senate voted solidly for recommitttal. This action, for all practical purposes, removed all possibility of securing desirable or necessary amendments to our labor-management relations laws during the remainder of the 83d Congress.

(b) *Investigation of employee welfare and pension funds*

The President, in his labor message of January 11, 1954, recommended, among other things, that "Congress initiate a thorough study of welfare and pension funds covered by collective bargaining agreements, with a view of enacting such legislation as will protect and conserve these funds for the millions of working men and women who are the beneficiaries."

Implementing this recommendation, the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare considered and reported Senate Resolution 225. This resolution, which was approved by the Senate on April 28, 1954, authorized the creation of a special subcommittee "to make a full and complete study and investigation with respect to the establishment and operation of employee welfare and pension funds under collective-bargaining agreements, for the purpose of ascertaining whether legisaltion is necessary for the conservation of such funds and the protection of the interests of the beneficiaries thereof." The resolution authorized expenditures not to exceed $75,000 for carrying out its objective. Thereafter, the committee considered and adopted a second resolution, Senate Resolution 270, to broaden the scope of the inquiry to include all "plans and funds subject to collective bargaining." This resolution, which also raised the limit of allowable expenditures to $125,150, was approved by the Senate on July 17, 1954.

Senator IVES was designated chairman of the subcommittee and with gratifying celerity chose a highly competent staff of trained specialists. Without delay, the subcommittee began to develop the data and information essential for the making of sound recommendations in this area. Under the able direction of the distinguished senior Senator from New York, the subcommittee is enlisting the cooperation of labor unions, employers, insurance and banking institutions, as well as appropriate Federal and State agencies and is conducting its investigation and study in an objective and impartial fashion. The subcommittee's sole purpose is to develop the facts upon which to base remedial legislation in the interests of the millions of working men and women who are the beneficiaries of these funds.

(c) *Repeal of the dual benefits prohibition of the Railroad Retirement Act*

The Labor Committee's special Subcommittee on Railroad Retirement, under the chairmanship of the late Senator Griswold, held 4 days of hearings in February 1954, on S. 2178, H. R. 356 (a previously House-passed bill) and other bills to repeal the duel benefit prohibition of the Railroad Retirement Act. This prohibition had been written into the Railroad Retirement Act in 1951.

Witnesses before the subcommittee represented all interested parties. Spokesmen of the operating railroad groups and pensioners testified in favor of this legislation. Spokesmen for the nonoperating railroad groups and the railroads opposed it. The subcommittee, after careful consideration of the matter, concluded that the so-called "dual benefit ban" was unfair and productive of undue hardship on persons who were eligible for benefits under both the social security and railroad retirement systems.

On May 24, 1954, the committee favorably reported S. 2178, which was a companion measure to H. R. 356, already passed by the House. The bill was passed by the Senate on June 2, 1954, and it was approved by the President on June 16, 1954. It is now Public Law 398 of the 83d Congress.

(d) *Railroad retirement amendments*

Late in the 2d session the committee favorably reported H. R. 7840, a companion bill to S. 2930, upon which hearings had been held by the Special Subcommittee on Railroad Retirement Legislation, which was then under the chairmanship of Senator GOLDWATER. These bills proposed a series of amendments to the Railroad Retirement Act, the Railroad Tax Act and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act.

H. R. 7840 was favorably reported by the committee on August 2, 1954. It was passed by the Senate by a voice vote on August 19, 1954, and at the time this statement was sent to the printer, H. R. 7840 had already gone to the President.

In general, H. R. 7640 liberalized the so-called fringe benefits for various beneficiaries under the Railroad Retirement Act. It amended the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act so as to increase the maximum monthly compensation for both benefit purposes. It increased the tax base from $300 to $350 a month, effective July 1, 1954. The tax rate of 6¼ percent was left unchanged.

(e) *Federal Equality of Opportunity of Employment Act*

The Subcommittee on Civil Rights of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare held 6 days of hearings during February and March 1954 on S. 692, a bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, color, religion, national origin, or ancestry. This bill was introduced by Senator IVES, the chairman of the subcommittee, on January 29, 1953, for himself and 18 cosponsors.

During the hearings all witnesses testified that the bill would not be disruptive, would be workable, and would be a significant step forward. No witnesses appeared in opposition to the bill.

On April 28, 1954, the bill was favorably reported by the full committee and was on the Senate calendar awaiting action when the Senate adjourned on August 20, 1954.

VETERANS' AFFAIRS

During the 2d session of the 83d Congress the committee acted upon a number of bills relating to veterans' affairs, among which the following are the most important:

(a) *Extension of educational privileges for veterans of the Korean war*

On August 2, 1954, the committee reported and thereafter on August 11, 1954, the Senate passed H. R. 9888, to require that veterans of the Korean war initiate courses of instruction or training under the Veterans' Readjustment Act of 1952 by August 20, 1954, or 2 years after discharge, whichever is later. Section 1 of this bill simply extends that period for initiating a course from 2 years to 3 years after date of discharge. The present law requires that a course of training be completed within 7 years from date of discharge and this is extended for 1 additional year.

Sections 2 and 3 relate exclusively to veterans undergoing training under Public Law 16 of the 78th Congress (World War II veterans), or Public Law 894 of the 81st Congress (Korean veterans), both of which relate to education and training for service-connected disabled veterans. There is no time limit set in which to initiate training under these acts. However, there is an overall completion date of 9 years after date of discharge for World War II veterans which will expire on July 25, 1956. This date would be extended 4 years for those persons who have not (a) attained vocational rehabilitation because of mental or physical disability, (b) had not met nature of discharge requirements, such requirement later being corrected pursuant to law, (c) had not timely established the existence of compensable disability connected with service.

Section 3 of the bill provides the same coverage to a Korean veteran training under Public Law 894, and at the same time limits vocational rehabilitation in line with the precedent set with World War II training to 9 years after the enactment of this proposal or 9 years after date of discharge of the veteran, whichever is the earlier.

H. R. 9888 was signed into law by the President on August 20, 1954. It is Public Law 610.

(b) *Increased Federal aid for State veterans' homes*

In the closing days of the second session the committee favorably reported H. R. 8180, a bill to increase from $500 to $700 per year the Federal aid to States for the support of veterans, domiciled or hospitalized in State homes, who are eligible for such care in Federal hospitals or domiciliaries. Prior to enactment of this measure the payment of the $500 rate was restricted to June 30, 1956. This bill, in addition to raising the rate from $500 to $700, would remove the restrictive date of June 30, 1956, thus establishing $700 as a permanent rate for Federal aid to State homes.

This bill was signed into law by the President on August 21, 1954, and is now Public Law 613.

(c) Hospitalization of Filipinos who served in the United States Armed Forces

On June 2, 1954, the committee considered and favorably reported H. R. 8044, a House-passed bill which extended for 5 additional years the authority for the American Government to bear a portion of the expense incident to hospitalization of Filipinos with service-connected disabilities incurred in behalf of the United States during World War II.

The bill was amended by the committee to make payments on a graduated scale, to expire in December of 1959 when the program itself will come to an end.

The bill, as amended by the committee, was passed by the Senate on June 7, 1954. The Senate amendments were accepted by the House and on June 18, 1954, the bill was signed by the President. It is now Public Law 421.

(d) Outpatient dental service for Spanish-American War veterans

The committee considered and favorably reported without amendment, H. R. 6412, to restore for Spanish-American War Veterans and veterans taking training under Public Law 16, their eligibility for outpatient dental service. Public Law 16 provides in general for the education and training of veterans of World War II and the Korean War suffering from service-connected disabilities. H. R. 6412 would allow such veterans to receive outpatient dental service.

The bill was passed by the Senate on July 6, 1954, and is now Public Law 494.

In addition to the above bills, the committee acted upon several bills of a minor nature in regard to veterans affairs. Among these was a bill (S. 2719) to permit the Veterans' Administration to deny or to order discontinued the pursuit of the course of education or training by a veteran in a foreign country if the pursuit of such course of education or training was determined by the Veterans'Administration not to be in the best interests of either the veteran or the Government of the United States.

Among the bills of a minor nature and of a somewhat different character considered and reported by the committee was S. 3393, which authorized the conveyance to Milwaukee County, Wis., of 28 acres of land, located on the Veterans' Administration center at Wood, Wis.

There was also reported from the committee S. 631, a bill to permit veterans to suspend or delay their programs of education or training under the GI bill of rights in order to perform services as religious missionaries. This latter bill was passed by the Senate and, along with the above-mentioned minor bills, was still pending in the House of Representatives when the Congress adjourned. Enactment of this measure is no longer necessary, however, inasmuch as its purpose has been achieved by administrative action of the Veterans' Administration.

NOMINATIONS

In addition to its legislative functions, the committee, during the 83d Congress, considered, approved, and recommended the confirmation of hundreds of nominations. Among these were the Secretaries and other top echelon officials in the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare. The committee also considered and approved nominations to the Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review in the Department of the Interior, the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, the National Labor Relations Board, the National Mediation Board, the Railroad Retirement Board, and the National Science Board. Most numerous of the nominations considered were appointments and promotions in the regular corps of the United States Public Health Service. The most controversial and time consuming nomination considered by the committee was that of Albert C. Beeson to be a member of the National Labor Relations Board. None of the nominations passed on by the committee were rejected by the Senate.

COMMITTEE RULES

At its meeting on March 24, 1954, the committee adopted and incorporated into its standing rules suggestions in regard to rules and policies governing Senate investigating committees and subcommittees which had been made by the majority policy committee. These rules governing investigations were incorporated into the committee rules as rule 14. Committee rule 14 was redesignated as rule 15.

At the same time that this action was taken, the chairman was authorized to appoint a five-member subcommittee to study the subject and report back to the committee with specific suggestions in regard to rules for governing investigations to be made by this committee or any of its subcommittees.

To this date, only three other committees of the Senate have followed the example of the Labor Committee in adopting the majority policy committee's suggestion. These committees are Armed Services, Select Committee on Small Business, and District of Columbia.

COMMITTEE STAFF

The record of accomplishment made by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare in the 83d Congress would not have been possible without efficient and able assistance at the staff level. The permanent staff of the committee in the 83d Congress consisted of only 14 employees. Of that number, six employees, including the majority and minority staff directors, are professional employees. The remaining eight employees are clerical.

A special Subcommittee To Investigate Employee Welfare Funds was authorized late in the second session. This subcommittee's functions are kept separate from those of the standing committee. Its personnel, consisting of 7 professional employees and 4 clerical employees, are not integrated with the staff of the parent committee.

COMMITTEE BUDGET

During the 83d Congress, there was appropriated from the contingent fund of the Senate a total of $15,000 for the use of the full committee for the payment of contingent expenses. An additional $125,150 was appropriated for expenditure by the special subcommitee on employee welfare funds for both contingent expenses and salaries of personnel assigned to that subcommittee. Together, these amounts total $140,150. This latter figure does not include the salaries of the staff of the full committee which are estimated at $109,459.39 for the whole of the 83d Congress.

This compares with total committee expenditures of $476,309.91 in the 82d Congress and $335,178.64 in the 81st Congress.

A Timely Review—A Parting Thought

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILL E. NEAL
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, the 83d Congress is now past history. It has set an outstanding record of achievement. House leaders and committee chairmen have worked hard and long to evolve a legislative program designed to turn the Nation from a highly geared foreign-war quasi-prosperity to one based on fundamental American principles.

Every important piece of legislation has been carefully studied, thoroughly debated, and properly amended to fit the needs of the times and the existing economic situation created by years of wars, war fears, and inflation.

At home, as a result of laws passed during this Congress, every citizen and every businessman will receive tax relief. Pensioners and welfare recipients will be given an increase in pensions. The Republican administration has achieved cutbacks of approximately $12 billion.

Communism has been recognized for what it is and has been legally outlawed as a political party.

The program for national defense has been greatly augmented and its cost is being scrupulously guarded. Future wars cannot escape atomic destruction: No nation engaged in atomic war can ignore the dangers of unexpected attack. Atomic war is unthinkable and must be prevented if humanly possible. But we dare not relax our efforts to build adequate defense. The administration, fully realizing this, has adopted measures to defend our country against aggression from any source.

Progress is being made toward getting the Federal Government out of competition with private business. Private investment, the bedrock of industrial success, is assured more freedom to build new plants and provide employment for more people.

A Presidential committee has been appointed to review the coal industry's declining markets in an effort to find remedial measures conducive to the proper maintenance of an industry so essential to the Nation's welfare. This is of particular interest to the people of my State, West Virginia.

The unnecessary waste of our productive soils and the high cost of overproduction is being attacked by legislation to preserve the independence of the farmer, maintain his standards of living, and prevent the cost of storage of unnecessary overproduction.

War recession fears are fast fading. The people of America are looking to the Republican Party as the peacetime party. More people are employed now than ever before in peacetime, and there are fewer unemployed than before the Korean war.

Housing and home financing, making possible the supply of needed homes for our growing population, is being met by carefully prepared legislation. For the first time the country has a coordinated housing bill with benefits in every one of the fields of housing, new, existing, urban, suburban, and rural. The new housing bill will provide more homes, smaller downpayments, and longer terms. For example, the minimum payment on a $12,000 home now is $1,200, just half what it was under previous law. The period for paying back loans has been extended to 30 years, which means that the monthly payments on a $10,000 mortgage over a 30-year period is $54, while under the old law it was $67. Limits on the amounts of mortgages for individual homes have been increased from $16,000 to $20,000. This will help our families to have better homes.

A very important item of the new housing law is the provision to insure mortgages on lower cost homes to help those whose needs are the greatest. FHA can now insure mortgages up to 95 percent of the value of semicompleted homes. Under the old low-cost program the mortgage was $5,700. Now it is $6,650.

The buyers of new homes are given certificates showing the FHA appraisal. This reassures and fortifies the buyer that his judgment is good as to the house he is buying, and gives him the opportunity of making his final decision after he has seen the appraisal. The new act provides substantially the same benefits for buying older homes as those provided for new homes. On a $6,000 older home, the downpayment now is only $600, just half the former amount. These more liberal terms will encourage enlargement and modernization of older homes and the purchase of larger older homes. Also, a man can buy his house and get an appraisal that will take into account the repairs that will be needed.

Remember, FHA does not operate a Government subsidy, either for the buyer or for the builder. FHA does not lend money and does not build homes, but it enables millions of families to own far better homes than they could otherwise afford, and safeguards have been written into the law for the protection of all the people.

Every piece of legislation passed by this Congress has been planned to stabilize the Nation economically and to readjust to peacetime activities with the least possible disturbance to the people and their purchasing power.

These facts certainly justify the Republican reputation for successfully handling the Government's affairs during periods of peace. The administration deserves much credit for its successful readjustment program to solve the problems of our domestic economy, but our foreign policy presents the greatest challenge. This administration inherited a foreign policy that grew out of years of overexpansion and mistaken judgment. It continues to be the most serious problem facing the Nation today. The free world faces a serious challenge. America, in her attempts to unite and strengthen her allies, is faced with many provocations and many failures, due to the lack of cooperation on the part of allied countries whose interests are much in common with ours. Thirty-five years and three foreign wars have involved this Nation far beyond our wishes. We have made mistakes and have suffered both military and diplomatic defeats by assuming that our foreign allies fully understand our intentions. It has taken us a long time to learn that we cannot buy friendship. American foreign policies must be revised in the light of psychological reactions. Then our people will no longer be taxed so heavily to carry unwelcome handouts to people in foreign lands.

We must not continue to spend ourselves poor and become more deeply entailed in the affairs of nations beyond our shores. With so much to be done toward developing and improving our own America, with such great opportunities to utilize our resources to improve the lot of our citizens, America can and must stand strong in her philosophy of free men, free enterprise, world peace, and normal trade among nations.

The Republican administration has made an excellent beginning. We must make sure that there will be a majority sympathetic to its policies and principles to finish the job.

What the Changes in the Social Security Law Mean To You

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, in my contacts with the people in my district, I have discovered that there is one subject, above all others, in which there is a great amount of interest. As a very large percentage of my constituents will now be covered by the Social Security Act, I have been asked repeatedly by individuals, what the amendments just made by Congress, will mean to them.

The past 2 years have seen a number of changes in my district. Many houses have been torn down to make room for expanded businesses, parking lots, low-rent housing projects, and so forth. This has resulted in the removal of many of my constituents and therefore, to attemp to reach them individually by mail, in the usual manner, is difficult, if not impossible. Under the circumstances, I am taking this means of conveying to them the information on the Social Security Act changes, in which they are interested.

Briefly, they are as follows:

The amended act extends coverage to employees of State and local governments who are covered by State and local retirement systems, under voluntary State-Federal agreements on condition that a majority of the system members vote for coverage in a referendum.

To farmworkers who receive at least $100 in cash wages in a calendar year by a given employer,

To domestic workers and casual workers receiving $50 in cash wages in a calendar quarter by a given employer,

To ministers and members of religious orders on a voluntary self-employed basis,

To American citizens employed outside the United States by foreign subsidiaries of American companies, if parent company agrees.

To homeworkers now excluded because their services are not subject to State licensing laws.

To employees in fishing and related activities on vessels of 10 net tons or less or on shore thereby covering all fishermen, and American citizens in the employ of American employers on vessels and aircraft of foreign registry.

To self-employed farm operators and self-employed members of the following groups: architects, engineers, funeral directors, and public accountants.

The amended law increases from $3,600 to $4,200 the total creditible and taxable earnings upon which benefits would be computed.

It removes earning limitation of beneficiaries at age 72—now 75. It allows beneficiaries under such age to earn up to $1,200 per year—now up to $75 per month—without deduction of benefits, and provides for loss of 1 month's benefit for each unit of $80 or fraction thereof of covered earnings in excess of $1,200, no loss of monthly benefit, however, for any month in which he neither earned more than $80, nor rendered substantial services in self-employment. Withholds benefits to beneficiaries engaged in noncovered work outside the United States for any month in which they worked on 7 or more days.

It excludes periods of permanent and total disability in determining insured status and amount of benefits payable on death or retirement. An individual's insured status is frozen at the point of disability.

It allows the recomputation of benefits to take into account additional earnings after entitlement to benefits, if the employee has covered earnings of more than $1,200 in a calendar year after 1953 and after the year in which his benefit was last computed.

It sets the contribution rates for employers and employees at 2 percent up to $4,200 through 1959, and one-half percent increase each 5-year period thereafter through 1975; and 4 percent after 1975. The self-employed would pay 1½ times the above rates.

It extends through September 30, 1956—now through September 30, 1954—the public assistance provisions with respect to temporary increases in Federal payments to States for old-age assistance, aid to dependent children, aid to the blind, and aid to the permanently and totally disabled. It extends provisions for approval of certain State plans for aid to the blind which did not meet the requirements of the Social Security Act from June 30, 1955, to June 30, 1957.

The following tables show the increases current beneficiaries of old-age and survivors insurance will receive beginning with the September checks, which will be delivered the early part of October:

Retired worker

Old monthly payment:	*New monthly payment*
$25	$30.00
$40	45.00
$55	60.00
$70	78.50
$85	98.50

Worker and wife (65 or over)

Old monthly payment:	*New monthly payment*
$37.50	$45.00
$58.40	67.50
$80.00	90.00
$105.00	117.80
$127.50	147.80

Widow, widower, parent, or child

Old monthly payment:	New monthly payment
$18.80	$30.00
$30.00	33.80
$41.30	45.00
$52.50	58.90
$63.80	73.90

Widow and 1 child

Old monthly payment:	New monthly payment
$37.60	$45.00
$58.40	67.60
$30.00	90.00
$105.00	117.80
$127.60	147.80

Widow and 2 children

Old monthly payment:	New monthly payment
$45.10	$50.20
$58.50	67.60
$80.00	90.20
$140.10	157.10
$168.90	197.10

GATT Loaded for Another Round

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. MALONE

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by me on the so-called General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade to be held at Geneva, Switzerland, in November.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The State Department is apparently up to its old tricks, planning new giveaways to take place after the Congress has adjourned or recessed.

Preparations are under way, I am informed, for a ninth go-around of GATT, or the so-called General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, to be held at Geneva, Switzerland, in November.

It is my further understanding that formal announcement of this session, and of any hearings to be held preceding it, will be made shortly after Senators and Representatives have cleared their desks and returned to their homes.

GATT is an arrangement which grew out of proposals made in part by the late Harry Dexter White and V. Frank Coe "for expansion of world trade and employment"; and in subsequent preparations of a "suggested charter for an international trade organization of the United Nations," in which Mr. Coe and also Victor Perlo participated. The ITO was repudiated by the Congress but GATT was substituted to accomplish the same purposes.

GATT has never been submitted to the Congress for approval or rejection, and the State Department apparently feels that the Congress and the American people should know as little about it as possible, and the sessions held in foreign lands when the Congress is not in session.

GATT sessions have been held successively in Geneva, Switzerland; Annecy, France; Geneva again; Torquay, England; and back again to Geneva, where the ninth session will be held. They are foreign resort cities, remote from American industries, investors, and workers.

At these sessions the so-called contracting parties, of which there are now 34, including Communist Czechoslovakia, appear at these conferences with their baskets on each arm for the United States to fill with trade subsidies and concessions. It is a one-way street and American mining and manufacturing industries can only suffer further losses at these sessions; many have already been injured or sacrificed completely by State Department giveaways at these conferences.

There is every reason to believe that this is the intention at the ninth session, in which Japan has been invited to participate, which may explain the State Department's great secrecy in the matter while the Congress remained in session.

In other words, the State Department has set itself up as a final and dictatorial arbiter in these matters, and in clear defiance and contravention of article I, section 8, of the United States Constitution which provides that the Congress of the United States shall lay duties and imposts—meaning tariffs—and regulate the commerce of the United States with foreign countries.

No treaties that the State Department makes at any of these sessions—and it has made treaties with all of the so-called contracting parties who have brought their empty baskets to these foreign vacation watering places for the State Department to fill out of American pockets—have ever been submitted to the Senate as required by the Constitution.

And, as I stated before, GATT itself has never been submitted to the Congress, although it is a loaded gun held at the head of every American industry.

As a matter of fact there is a great reluctance on the part of the State Department to even discuss its GATT activities, or its procedures, at least while the Congress is in session.

On August 10, 10 days before the Congress recessed, I directed a number of questions to the State Department concerning the preparations it was making toward the coming session, and the procedures being followed.

I received a list of the so-called contracting parties but no other information.

Subsequently a list of written questions was prepared and submitted to Mr. Thruston B. Morton, Assistant Secretary of State for Congressional Relations, five of which related to intersessional meetings at Geneva which already have taken place in preparation for the November junket. I have received no answer.

The answers, however, will be forthcoming when the Congress returns, even should it be necessary to call Mr. Morton, or his superior, Secretary Dulles, as a witness for interrogation by a Senate subcommittee.

The State Department assumes authority to participate in these multilateral trade shuffles as growing out of the Trade Agreements Act of 1934. That act contemplated only bilateral agreements and it is so stated in the hearings that prefaced its approval by a New Deal Congress.

GATT grew out of postwar conferences in which Mr. White and Mr. Coe participated, and embraced a blanket, one-world socialistic concept of multilateral schemes to divide the markets of the world with our low-wage of slavery-wage competitors.

GATT is based on no law ever passed by the American Congress, but is conducted as an artificial superstate by so-called contracting parties of which the United States for one has never had authority to be a party or to contract away the jobs and investments of American workingmen and investors.

It would be better judgment for the State Department to withdraw from the coming session at Geneva.

The State Department is apparently determined to keep our record intact, of never having won a conference.

Withdrawal from GATT would at least prevent its losing another one in which the Nation's wealth, prosperity, industry, and commerce is the stake thrown into the world pot by an irresponsible State Department.

Television and the Current Public Interest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by me on television and the current public interest.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TELEVISION AND THE CURRENT PUBLIC INTEREST

As this significant session of Congress nears adjournment there are a number of compelling reasons, in my opinion, for calling both congressional and public attention to some timely and relevant matters in the field of television.

Certain of these have come to my particular attention during recent extended hearings of the Subcommittee on Communications of the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. Pending a public report from the subcommittee, which has many complex details to consider, I believe it may serve a real purpose to offer some summary comments of my own on this subject of television, so new and yet so obviously important to our way of life.

The very fact that no previous session of the American Congress has been so closely followed by so many of the Nation's citizens is itself a commentary on this miracle of modern communication. And I would add that the significance of this goes far beyond the special television attention that has been paid to the several spectacular hearings of recent months.

What is of really lasting significance is that television has shown itself to be a valuable new tool of the democratic process itself.

Moreover, television is a tool of communication that I am sure we are only beginning to use to its fullest capacities for public enlightenment and enrichment. It is in this latter respect that I want to talk about television today.

One thing that has stood out in the hearings to which I referred is that the average member of the public has only what might be called a "spectator knowledge" of television. Because people cannot see behind the scenes that appear on their TV sets, they have many questions—both about what they see and what they cannot see on television. Many of these are why questions about television itself.

One of the biggest why questions about television is why we don't have more of it—more stations as well as more and better programs of many kinds.

The public is generally aware that the Federal Communications Commission has provided spectrum space for over 2,000 stations, yet with fewer than 400 on the air. There now seems little hope of local station coverage for hundreds of communities. My own State of Kansas has 49 potential TV stations on the big chart over the FCC. Yet we have only 4 on the air and 5 more in the works.

Many other States have very similar situations. As a result many millions of citizens have only fringe TV service from some distant city, or none at all. They wonder with good reason why this wonderful new service that everybody wants is so scarce.

Other millions of citizens are confused over the fact that we have two kinds of television, and that very few of the 30 million sets in use will receive both kinds of TV broadcasts. Most television service is broadcast by what are called VHF stations—those in the very high frequency band of wave lengths. These include most of the oldest and biggest stations. On the other hand, many of the newer and smaller stations are in the UHF, or ultra high frequency band. And so many of television's worst headaches seem to be concentrated here that they are sometimes referred to as the "Un Happy Frequencies." Indeed, this UHF situation is so unhappy that about 70 permits to build such stations have been returned, unused, to the FCC. Twenty more UHF stations which were on the air have given up the ghost.

Now, if television is such an obviously useful and popular new service, why should this be? There are some reasons, but we are still looking for practical answers to the problems behind the reasons. Having heard or read more than 3,000 pages of testimony on this whole TV question, I would like to offer some personal comments and recommendations.

In so doing I do not presume, of course, to speak for my colleagues on the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee nor for those on the subcommittee.

To begin these personal views, I can sum up what seems to me to be the basic problem of television; in some terms very familiar to folks in my part of the country—TV suffers from a drought.

Television's drought has nothing to do with weather or the atmosphere. As a matter of fact, there seems to be no shortage of air waves or channel allocations for TV stations except in isolated cases. As I have said, the FCC has made provision for more than 2,000 commercial stations, plus 242 educational stations.

Television's drought is an economic drought. Television lives off the dollar revenue it receives from advertisers, and over many parts of the country there is not enough advertising rainfall to grow a television station. Even in the biggest cities we seem already to have TV stations planted too close together for the advertisers to water them all profitably.

We also find that it takes a good many commercial announcements to irrigate each TV program. And there are a good many kinds of programs that simply can't bloom in the limited economic moisture of TV.

I sometimes think that may be why we have so many cowboy movies on television. It doesn't take much rainfall to keep cowboys going—and it doesn't take too much economic revenue to put old cowboy films on TV. It does cost too much to put first-run, modern movies on TV. The same is true for good Broadway plays, opera, and even many of the feature sports events. The big prize fights now have to be "blacked out" on TV because if they are seen on television, it dries up the dollar rainfall at the stadium box office.

Having hard all this explained by station owners, network presidents and others, I certainly can't say this is any fault of the advertisers. In fact, they deserve a great deal more credit than they receive for picking up the bills for all the television service we now receive. Not everyone is aware, indeed, that the advertising revenue of the stations must be stretched to pay for all the public service broadcasts of speeches, hearings, and other special events covered by television.

However, these questions remain: How do we make it possible to extend television service to those areas where advertising cannot support stations? How do we add to television service the many fine programs that are too costly or not suited to advertising sponsorship? How do we make still more public service broadcasts possible so that television can truly meet its potentials as a modern communications marvel?

And in this last area, how do we find the money to build those 242 educational stations? They properly cannot sell advertising so they have no direct revenue support at all. So far only six have found enough money, from public and private grants, to get on the air.

We have heard a variety of suggestions on these matters from many witnesses in our hearings. We are considering and will explore further all the data we can get. As interim efforts to help the struggling UHF stations, we have encouraged the Senate Finance Committee to allow a tax credit of $7 per unit on TV sets capable of tuning in both VHF and UHF stations. We are also exploring liberalization of the limitation on network or other group ownership of UHF stations.

But I am frank to say that when it comes to this basic economic drought that is stunting the growth of television, I have so far heard of only one suggestion that seems broad enough and bold enough to have some major possibilities.

That suggestion is to provide television with a "subscriber" source of revenue so as to broaden its economic base and also its services. Apparently this is not only technically possible but would be as economically feasible for television as it is for newspapers or magazines.

Because magazines and newspapers get about a dollar from their subscribers for every $2 they get from their advertisers, they can do far more for their readers, and many more of them can exist. Similarly, if television stations could collect fees from viewers for some kinds of programs beyond what the advertisers can sponsor, then I believe we could have more TV stations and more and better program service.

I first heard a detailed report of such box office television possibilities in a speech by Dr. Millard C. Faught, delivered here in Washington before the National Small Businessmen's Association. It made so much sense to me that on April 7 of this year I requested its insertion in the Congressional Record. Since then, having heard the detailed economic problems of television paraded before the Senate Subcommittee on Communications, I am more persuaded than ever that this potential new subscription use of TV should be thoroughly explored.

For that reason I have urged the subcommittee to request the Federal Communications Commission to look into this matter with a view to action. In this I am encouraged by a recent declaration by Mr. Rosel Hyde, Chairman of the FCC itself. He has advised the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee that the FCC has sufficient present authority to explore such new services from television and, if subscription TV can be shown to be in the public interest, to authorize its use.

In that case the reasonable question seems to be, What are we waiting for? In some recent weeks permits to build new television stations have been returned to the FCC unused at a greater rate than new ones have been issued. The reason offered in nearly every case is the same—not enough revenue prospects from advertising in the given area to justify the rising costs of a TV station.

Yet many of these disappointed broadcasters recognize that the addition of subscription service to the advertising programing that could be done in many market areas might well make the difference between a profitable and effective local station and no station at all. As a result a group of UHF broadcasters have themselves urged the FCC to authorize subscription TV. I would go further and conclude that if such an expansion of TV service is good for UHF it ought to help all TV stations, large or small, VHF or UHF.

There are a number of reasonable prospects as to why this should be so. For one thing, I am told on good authority that the gadgetry necessary to equip regular broadcasting stations and regular TV receivers, both old and new, to receive the special subscription programs has been highly perfected. Various field tests of it have already been held under FCC temporary authorizations. There seems to be no technical reason why this service could not be added to TV right along with the advent of color.

Secondly, as I understand the economics involved here, the new programs offered to viewers in their homes for a fee would have to be the same kind and quality of entertainment that people now pay for outside the home. As a firm believer in human nature, I am sure of one thing—the home box-office TV programs would have to be much better than the advertising-sponsored shows, or nobody would pay for them. They would have to add something to television, not just substitute for what we now have.

The advocates of this new TV service point out that the first prospect of benefit from this expansion of television usage would be the increase in stations, especially in the smaller cities and areas of scattered population. That I am certainly for.

They also argue that the new source of revenue should not only ease the cost burden on advertisers but actually give them more choice of stations to cover their markets and ease their present dependency on the limited network affiliations. I believe Senator Bricker would be interested in this prospect, since he is concerned about network control of TV in this country.

In the speech on this subject to which I referred earlier, subscription television is described as "an instantaneous economical electronic distribution system"—and no one denies that we could use some cost-reducing progress in distribution, especially after hearing Congressman Hope's recent report on farm distribution costs.

It is also pointed out that if you add up all of the oldsters, plus those who are ill or infirm and those with infants in their homes, we have a total house-bound audience of people, who can't or prefer not to go out to the movies or for other entertainment, larger than the present average weekly movie audience—some 50 million people. If this system will bring many new kinds of entertainment and enrichment to those people in their homes at nominal cost, then I am for it on that score.

Obviously, any major new economic opertion, such as this would be, will cause competitive adjustments in the status quo. This new use of TV would probably require some new rules of the game among broadcasters and perhaps in allied industries like the movies. The FCC would wisely want to take this into account. However, I believe that after these new services had been established and adjusted, the broadcasting industry and the overall economy would greatly gain from the expansion of public service thus to be derived from the modern miracle of television.

I will not take the time to pursue all the arguments for or against this new television idea here. I merely wish to call attention to a central and timely thought, which is this: Television has already proved itself to be a vital new factor in our lives in the United States—and clearly affected with the public interest. There is no dispute on that score. I merely wish to point out that we have so far only scratched the surface of what TV can really do to help our citizenry understand and enjoy modern living. If millions of our people still do not have television, and if those who do can have still better television service, then let's speed up the process of expanding all types of TV service.

In this broad objective I use this idea of giving TV a home box office only as an example. It sounds to me like at least one major new way of moving television forward. There are other things to be done and appropriate congressional committees are looking into them.

However, while we are in recess, I see no apparent reason why the FCC, with the authority it says it already has to do so, should not explore thoroughly this major new subscription concept of television service with a view to helping end the economic drought that is slowing down television growth.

If we have spectrum space for 49 TV stations in Kansas, I would like to see them on the air. And I believe the folks who live in the more than 1,500 other American towns and cities with a TV allocation, but no station, feel the same way.

Better Than 400 Hitter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FREDERICK G. PAYNE

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an editorial entitled "Better Than 400 Hitter," which appeared in the Portland Press-Herald, Portland, Maine.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

BETTER THAN 400 HITTER

The White House, reflecting an interest in our national game, put out in terms of baseball batting the President's average for the session just ending. Some of his staff members found it a pretty good batting average, and that is correct, for President Eisenhower "struck out" only 11 times, when bills were defeated or shelved, but "connected" 54 times for hits ranging all the way from singles to home runs. That summary was good up to yesterday afternoon; it may have to be amended down a bit when the final accounting of congressional action is made.

The game in which the President did the hitting and the Congress scored so many runs was a comprehensive one—a long-range program that set the sights for the entire life of the administration. It was a middle-of-the-road one, which sometimes had less than great support because of the thin majority that the GOP had in both Houses. If truth were to be told, parts of the program had hard sledding because of the defection of Republicans, though bills were voted with the help of sufficient Democrats.

The homeruns scored were the St. Lawrence seaway; the compromise housing program; revision of the Atomic Energy Act; debt limit increase; extension of the Reciprocal Tariff Act; reduction of Federal expenditures; the new farm price flexible support legislation; old-age and security liberalization; the Tax Revision Act.

Besides these the President got milder Mexican farm-labor legislation; more aid for road and hospital construction; a new rivers and harbors authorization which sometimes is "pork barrel"; and the creation of the Air Force Academy. The President grounded out on Hawaiian statehood; revision of the Taft-Hartley Act; votes for the 18-year-olds; postal rates increase; reinsurance of health plans.

There were other successes. The President was able to defeat the Bricker amendment to give the Congress power over foreign policy thus tying the hands of the Chief Executive; more pump-priming—boondoggling, perhaps; and the southern Democratic attempt to raise income-tax exemptions. And there were some minor defeats.

But the record of the Eisenhower administration in the session of Congress now almost or quite over is one that must be deemed highly satisfactory, one that gives promise of more progress to come, and one that warrants not only the reelection of Republican Representatives and Senators this fall, but the election of more of them to give the Eisenhower administration sufficient strength in the Congress to implement more of its full program by legislation not perhaps so hard to pass.

The Fair Dealers had fun and found some political ammunition by calling the 80th Congress a do-nothing Congress. That was not a true charge. Certainly nobody may with truth label the 83d Congress a do-nothing one. The record of its activity and of its support of President Eisenhower speaks for itself.

Representative Craig Hosmer's Report to the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I feel this report is a necessary part of the performance of my duties as the Representative in the 83d Congress of the people of California's 18th Congressional District. The strength of our Republic and the American way of life depends on the extent to which the people know the facts about our "government of the people, by the people, and for the people."

This report, which is not printed at Government expense, covers in part one my personal activities and, in part two the general activities of the Congress in cooperation with President Eisenhower's administration. It necessarily is in broad outline and covers only highlights. But with respect to further details, I hold myself and my office available at all times for additional information.

PART ONE

Membership on the House Select Committee on Small Business gave me opportunity to coauthor the law setting up the Small Business Administration and to assist numerous small businesses in our area.

Membership on the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee brought me directly into the successful fight to defend our vital Colorado River water supply against an onslaught by the upper Colorado Basin States of Wyoming, Utah, Colorado, and New Mexico. Regarding this activity the Santa Fe New Mexican, a newspaper hostile to our southern California interests, said on August 15:

> Congressman CRAIG HOSMER * * * is the Member * * * most likely to be hung in effigy * * * throughout this four-State area. HOSMER is the southern California Congressman who led bitter opponents of the upper Colorado River Basin project in their fight to kill the bill in the House. HOSMER's team won.

Other activities in which I was privileged to play a part include the following:

Leadership with Senator KNOWLAND in arousing United States public opinion to reverse the British decision to allow Red China membership in the United Nations.

Amendments to education appropriations restoring substantial Federal-aid funds for our school district.

Appropriations for flood-control work on the Los Angeles River.

Constant activity to keep Long Beach Naval Shipyard open and employment at levels comparable with other naval shipyards.

Blocking confiscation of Catalina Island sport and commercial fishing grounds by the Navy Department.

Appointment of outstanding young men to Army and Naval Academies on strict merit basis.

Retaining naval commissary at Terminal Island for benefit of Armed Forces dependents.

Preventing cut in medical personnel at Terminal Island Naval Dispensary.

Passage of tidelands law with provisions most favorable to 18th district and which avoided expensive litigation.

Appropriation of $8 million to begin $16 million renovation and modernization of Long Beach Veterans' Hospital and Paraplegic Center.

Advanced deliveries of steel to construct urgently needed Long Beach Harbor fireboats.

Obtained establishment of Moulton Commission to develop means to improve medical service for Armed Forces dependents.

Obtained passage of new law guaranteeing southern California homes an adequate supply of natural gas from Texas for cooking and heating.

Sponsored legislation restoring VA benefits to GI dependents in Germany and Japan.

Carried on constant campaign to awaken American public to dangers of illegal narcotics which included appearances on all major television networks.

Obtained consolidation of city of Lakewood into a single postal delivery area.

Represented problems of hundreds of local citizens and groups to various Federal departments and agencies.

Reprints of my July 22 speech in Congress, entitled "Revolution in Russia," were obtained by anti-Soviet forces for clandestine circulation amongst resistance groups behind the Iron Curtain.

PART TWO

With mutual respect and a shared goal of peace and prosperity, both at the same time, President Eisenhower and the 83d Congress worked together in the best interests of the people's lives and the people's pocketbooks. The theme of this cooperative effort was expressed by the President when he said:

> In all those things which deal with people, be liberal, be human. In all those things which deal with the people's money or their form of government, be conservative—and don't be afraid to use the word.

I summarize the results of this effort under various headings for convenient reference:

TIDELANDS

The first major act of the 83d Congress was to restore to the States their proper title to the submerged coastal lands. This will benefit the 18th District and other California areas by billions of dollars.

INTERNATIONAL

Sacrifice of American lives in Korea stopped. United States kept out of Indochina war, and a truce was made under circumstances giving us opportunity again to tackle the southeast Asia problem. Communist drive for huge oil reserves in Iran defeated. Explosive Suez dispute settled. Communist regime in Guatemala destroyed.

State Department reorganized. Voice of America improved. Opposition to admission of Red China to U. N. reaffirmed. Frequent bipartisan foreign-policy consultations. Limited sharing of atomic weapons and benefits commenced with allies.

Mutual-security funds pared by billions and earmarked 80 percent for military aid. Foreign Operations Administration overhauled.

Housecleaning made amongst United States employees in the United Nations.

St. Lawrence Waterway undertaken in cooperation with Canada.

Reciprocal trade promoted with friendly nations to allow them to make a living through trade and thus remove need for foreign aid. Customs procedures simplified.

DEFENSE

Defense Department organization and policies overhauled. Army-Navy-Air Force coordinated and balanced for greater armed strength at less cost. Billions of defense dollars saved in 1½ years by efficient manpower utilization, standardized procurement, and other modernized business practices.

Air Force upped to 143 wings and Air Academy established. New air and naval bases acquired in Spain.

Modernization of United States merchant marine undertaken.

Trend started in 1946 to whittle away fringe benefits of servicemen and their families stopped. Measures begun to restore these benefits, make service life more attractive, and reduce turnover of military personnel.

INTERNAL SECURITY

Security regulations tightened. Thirteen new anti-Red laws adopted. Pensions denied to Alger Hiss and other disloyal employees. Two thousand four hundred security risks detached from Government jobs after persistent investigation. FBI given prime responsibility for internal security. Fifty Communist Party leaders jailed and 22 more to stand trial. One hundred additional organizations declared subversive. Four hundred and sixty subversive aliens deported or under deportation warrants. Communist Party outlawed.

GOVERNMENT SPENDING AND TAXES

Federal spending slashed—not by meat-ax approach—but selectively to bring 100 cents return for every tax dollar spent. By squeezing out waste and duplication, this 83d Congress appropriated $26 billion less than did the 82d Congress to run the Government for 2 years.

Federal budget deficit cut by two-thirds.

One hundred and fifty million dollars saved annually by improving Government "housekeeping" activities of the General Services Administration. Senator KUCHEL's lease-purchase program adopted, saving millions in outlays for new post offices and other Federal buildings.

Taxes cut by $7.4 billion, the greatest tax cut in the history of the United States or any other country. Income taxes cut 10 percent and excise taxes cut an average of 50 percent.

Tax laws revised completely for the first time in over 75 years. Loopholes were eliminated. Hardships were eliminated on working mothers, parents of dependent children, retired persons, persons burdened with large medical bills, and so forth.

The Internal Revenue Service speeded up and cleaned up. Vigorous prosecutions of tax cases begun.

THE ECONOMY

Government controls on wages, prices, and rents abolished. Small business people aided by establishment of the Small Business Administration with lending powers as an independent agency of the Government. Major revision of atomic energy laws to provide peacetime uses for atom secrets through cooperation of Government and private initiative.

Inflation halted. Cost of living which had risen 6 percent per year during 1948–52 stabilized within a 1 percent range during last 18 months. During same period, value of dollar has varied less than one-half cent.

Successful transition from a war to peace economy without economic distress. Employment pushed to 62 million. The 1954 estimated national income of $285.5 billion is $750 million better than in 1953, which was the most prosperous year in United States history.

GOVERNMENT REORGANIZATION

Health, Education, and Welfare Department established. Thirteen reorganization plans streamlining Government departments and agencies adopted. Nearly 250,000 unnecessary Government jobs abolished.

Hoover Commission kept on the job.

Crooks, grafters, and influence peddlers weeded out of all branches of the executive and legislative departments.

Commissions established to study complexities of relations between the Federal Government and the States, and the activities of the Government as they relate to private business.

Legislation passed to get the Federal Government out of competition with private business and to dispose of such items as hotels, barge lines, rubber planes, and so forth. RFC liquidated.

Pay increases, voted by House for postal and civil service workers, vetoed by President because Senate unreasonably insisted on eliminating postal-rate increases needed to help pay for them.

Development and conservation of natural resources, public lands and water resources revitalized, and States taken into partnership with Federal Government in this effort. Presidential-Hoover Commission-congressional Water Resources Policy Committee put in action. I was appointed a member of this group.

VETERANS

Veterans' Administration reorganized. Benefits increased for 2,347,000 deserving disabled veterans, widows, and dependent parents. Largest appropriations in history for VA hospital beds. New hospitals constructed. Korean GI bill extended. Veterans' loan fund increased by $100 million. Median income for veterans in the 25-to-34 age bracket today is $3,631, a 51-percent increase over $2,401 in 1947.

AGRICULTURE

Flexible farm price supports substituted for rigid support program which was costly to consumers both in higher prices and higher taxes. Additional borrowing power given Commodity Credit Corporation, and adequate disaster relief funds provided. Administration of rural electrification and telephone programs speeded up.

SOCIAL PROGRESS

Social-security coverage broadened by 7 million persons and payments liberalized. Similar action taken with respect to Railroad Retirement Act. Coverage under unemployment compensation system extended to 4 million additional workers.

Three-year, $182 million program adopted for construction of diagnostic centers, hospitals for chronically ill, vocational rehabilitation, and nursing homes.

Largest appropriations in history for cancer, heart, mental health, and arthritis research.

Education research fostered. Aid given for school construction and operation in areas overcrowded because of Federal activities.

Bold $1.9 billion highway construction program enacted.

Housing measures adopted to make certain every American family has opportunity for a decent home, in a good neighborhood. Downpayments on homes reduced, mortgage payment periods extended. Slum clearance continued. Vigorous crack-down on FHA irregularities.

Supreme Court antisegregation decision implemented; Armed Forces and other segregation being eliminated at top speed. Restrictions on citizenship rights of Indians removed.

To have been privileged to take part in this tremendous effort by our Government during these historic times has been a great honor. In concluding, I wish to express my heartfelt appreciation to the citizens of California's 18th Congressional District for permitting me to serve them in the 83d United States Congress.

National-Interest Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FREDERICK G. PAYNE

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "National-Interest Congress," by David Lawrence, which appeared in the Washington Evening Star.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL-INTEREST CONGRESS—EIGHTY-THIRD SESSION'S ACTION ON TAX LAW AND FARM PROGRAM IS LAUDED AS AIMING FOR GOOD OF NATION AS A WHOLE

(By David Lawrence)

Something so unusual has happened with respect to the 83d Congress which has just finished its labors that it can be noted as a milestone in legislative history.

For this was one of the few sessions of Congress in the last 50 years which could be justly characterized as a national-interest Congress.

Thus the Democrats in the Senate who voted for the new tax law recently to make a majority could have killed that legislation even though in the House of Representatives the Republicans had a clear majority without the aid of the Democrats. But so strong was the pressure of the people for the new tax law—it was in the national interest—that many of the Democrats in the Senate felt they could not conscientiously vote against the interests of so many of their constituents.

This does credit to the minority party which of course might not feel inclined to vote for a Republican measure in the Senate if it were known in advance that the Republicans had sufficient votes to pass it anyhow.

There was a national-interest majority on the farm legislation. Many Republicans as well as Democrats voted along sectional lines but the majority were looking at the proposed law from the broad standpoint of desirability for the Nation.

With a narrow majority for the Republicans, therefore, the Democrats felt it impracticable to defeat the legislation because the benefits to the citizens conferred by national laws do not, of course, follow party lines.

The session just ended had other distinguishing marks about it. There was a noticeable recognition of the demand of the people for economy in Government. This is just the reverse of the spending policies which for such a long time have dominated the thinking and voting of Members of Congress.

Also, despite the fears abroad that the Republican Party if given power would prove itself to be an isolationist party, the amounts voted for foreign aid are almost as substantial as in previous years. Only a handful of votes from both parties were cast against the policy of building a bulwark against communism abroad by bolstering the economic strength of the allied nations.

To say all this is not to ignore the fact that partisanship did exist and play an important part in the proceedings of Congress. The squabble over public power versus private power cut to some extent across party lines but it was largely a fight and filibuster engineered by the Democratic Party.

The blame for the failure of the amendments to the Taft-Hartley Act is a difficult one to explain because motives for the large Democratic vote cast to kill the amendments sponsored by the administration are not easy to expose to view. Actually the Southern Democrats who helped to bury the Eisenhower proposals were temporary allies of the Northern liberals who thought the amendments not liberal enough. But behind the scenes many of the conservative Democrats in the Senate feared the amendments actually were too liberal.

Naturally the President's leadership in proposing legislation which even many of the Democrats could not afford to oppose will come in for political praise on the stump but it should not be forgotten that Speaker MARTIN and Representative HALLECK of Indiana, the majority leader, and Representative DAN REED, Republican chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, did as orthodox a job of lining up the Republicans as has been done in many decades.

In the Senate, WILLIAM KNOWLAND, of California, emerges as one of the ablest legislative leaders of our times. For despite the brickbats thrown at him from time to time he had a task unprecedented in the Senate's history. He was in name majority leader but actually his party was in the minority and this prompted him to use some vigorous and assertive tactics at times which occasionally caused resentment among the Democrats. But at the same time this aggressiveness was necessary in order to challenge the Democrats to dare to vote down some of the national-interest proposals that were on the "must" list. Senator KNOWLAND learned a lot at this last session and the miracle is that he was able to get through as much legislation as he did despite the fact that unlike other leaders of their parties in the Senate when in control he never had a working majority of Republicans. He will be an even better leader if the Republicans get a substantial majority next time.

As for Senator LYNDON JOHNSON, of Texas, the Democratic Party leader in the Senate, he showed himself a master of strategy and revealed a quality of statesmanship especially on foreign affairs which had been all too rare in the past in both parties.

It was a national interest Congress in more ways than one.

VFW Commends Senate Subcommittee on Minerals, Materials, and Fuels Economics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. MALONE

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a resolution titled "Stockpiling Critical Materials for War," submitted at the recent national encampment of the Veterans of Foreign Wars held in Philadelphia, Pa., by its committee on national security and national and foreign affairs, and unanimously adopted by the 55th annual encampment.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION 417—STOCKPILING CRITICAL MATERIALS FOR WAR

Whereas in a time of actual future war the United States Government will have little or no access to needed strategic minerals required to prosecute a defense against an enemy; and

Whereas this question has been thoroughly explored by the so-called Malone subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs in consideration of Senate Resolution 143, authorizing a study of the accessibility of such critical materials: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the 55th National Encampment of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, That this encampment go on record as approving the findings of the subcommittee; that we recommend the closest cooperation between nations of the Western Hemisphere as the only dependable source of necessary critical materials in time of war; recommend that the spirit of the 130-year-old Monroe Doctrine prevail in our relations with Western Hemisphere nations; recommend that this country adhere and conform to the principles laid down in the Constitution of the United States to assure American workers and investors access to American markets, and recommend acceleration of a Federal stockpile of critical and strategic minerals and materials to assure a ready supply in the event of war; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to Committee Chairman Senator GEORGE W. MALONE, of Nevada.

Letter From Rhode Island Textile Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I desire to insert in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter, dated August 20 and addressed to me by Mr. E. F. Walker, secretary-treasurer of the Rhode Island Textile Association.

I believe this letter will be of interest to all those concerned with the textile situation—especially manufacturers and employees in the New England area.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AUGUST 20, 1954.

Hon. THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR GREEN: The Rhode Island Textile Association desires to express to you its thanks for your forthright and constructive speech on behalf of the textile industry made in the Senate on August 19.

The Rhode Island textile industry, which has been fighting hard for survival, is always glad to have the help of anyone who has something to contribute and help from our senior Senator is not only valuable in Washington but very valuable right here in Rhode Island, where we need all the help we can get in order to overcome the difficulties which continue to plague us.

The statements made by Dr. Alfred C. Neal, first vice president of the Boston Federal Reserve Bank, before the American Institute of Banking, are characteristic of many such statements which have added greatly to the burden of criticism under which the New England textile industry has been forced to labor.

A certain school of economic thought has repeatedly, in the past few years, been guilty of similar statements. As an example, we draw your attention to the statement made by Prof. John P. Miller, of Yale University, on January 6, 1952, as published in the daily press that "about the worst thing that could happen to New England would be for the Government to allot a greater proportion of defense contracts to the region's textile mills" and that "empty factories are a real inducement to new firms to locate in a town."

In answer to Dr. Neal's suggestion that "the region's loss of textiles may lead to higher living standards," we quote from the report on the New England textile industry published in 1952 by a committee appointed by the Conference of New England Governors and headed by Prof. Seymour E. Harris, of Harvard University, a widely recognized economist which, in its conclusion, stated in part that "on the basis of the record, even today new industries have not solved the unemployment problem of the textile towns. * * * The new industries generally pay lower wage rates and require lesser skills, and in the process of transfer valuable skills are lost. These industries also depend more on female labor, thus depressing average wages and often providing jobs for women while men remain unemployed."

As you probably know, Mr. Kenneth B. Cook, at that time president of the Rhode Island Textile Association, and the writer, during 1951, 1952, and part of 1953, made a vigorous campaign throughout southern New England in an endeavor to arouse people to the necessity for taking such steps as might be indicated to retain in our area the great textile industry, whose importance you have so forcefully demonstrated.

In Rhode Island, at least, labor, management, and a considerable proportion of the general public are aware of the disaster which liquidation of the textile industry would bring about and it is a matter of the greatest gratification to us that our senior Senator has added the weight of his influence and experience to our own efforts to keep the industry here and to give employment at good wages to our thousands of loyal textile employees.

Sincerely yours,
RHODE ISLAND TEXTILE ASSOCIATION,
E. F. WALKER, *Secretary-Treasurer.*

House Committee on Agriculture Report on Farm Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith a part of the report of the House Committee on Agriculture on the bill H. R. 9680, the Agricultural Act of 1954:

America is blessed by the most productive agriculture of all the nations. Our people are the best fed and clothed. Our storehouses are stocked against our needs and are our security, in peace or war. We have food and fiber to share with friendly peoples of other nations.

Yet this very abundance has brought great economic problems to our farm people. Their income has dropped and their costs have increased. Abundance is a blessing that belongs to all our people. Its problems should be shared by all.

THE PROBLEMS

These problems derive from the vast expansion of our agricultural output, in response to appeals from our Government for ever-increasing production of food and fiber during World War II, and to meet foreign obligations following the war.

In the postwar era a large part of the world was scarred and destitute and the products of our farms fed and clothed the people. The Korean conflict with the worldwide threat of communism called for a new surge of production, and the farmers again responded to the appeal of their Government.

Food and fiber output attained a rate more than 40 percent above prewar levels.

Our increase in population and ever-rising standard of living absorbed a large part of this. But the recovery of world agriculture, and reductions in our foreign-aid programs, have seriously curtailed farm exports.

This decline of foreign markets, combined with the fact that we cannot instantly cut off agricultural production as we can curtail factory output, has brought about the accumulation of so-called surplus which is the root of agriculture's troubles today.

ABUNDANCE IS SECURITY

Our Government now has many billions of dollars invested in materials for defense—guns, planes, ships. These materials are not charged as surplus against industry. Food is equally as important in war and its abundance must be recognized as an essential element of the Nation's safety. The Government now has around $6 billion invested in food and feed stocks, only a small fraction of the annual military budget.

It should be pointed out that after World War II industry was protected against the competition of surplus war material. Trucks and cars, and other Government surplus items were kept off the normal competitive market. Industrial war plants were recognized as surplusage, and charged off to war.

The farm program, with very little expense compared to the disposal of the surplus of other war materials, protected agriculture, and the country averted a repetition of the farm bankruptcy that followed World War I.

In any discussion of the present farm problem, all Americans should realize:

1. That they should be thankful that our problem is one of too much—and not too little;

2. Our farm program is a small price to pay to prevent a collapse of agriculture such as brought on the depression after World War I;

3. Abundance is an essential element of security in a troubled world.

THE FARMERS' CRUCIAL POSITION

Net farm income has declined 13 percent in the past 2 years while other sectors of our economy have achieved new records. This loss of income already has been felt by business and industry that supply the needs of our farm population. Without the price support, surplus removal, and marketing agreement programs, farmers' incomes in 1953 would have been $3 billion lower or a net income of 25 percent less, according to the estimates of competent economists.

Our present integrated program—price supports, surplus removal, and marketing agreements—covered 70 percent of the value of all crops produced and livestock and livestock products in 1953. (See accompanying map.) About 90 to 95 percent of all farmers producing crops and livestock for market were directly or indirectly benefited by existing price stabilization and market-agreement programs that prevented further impairment of agricultural income.

But now agriculture is in a crucial position. This should be the concern of city people as well as farmers.

1. Farmers face impairment of income by their voluntary actions severely limiting the acreage of major crops in order to bring production into balance with consumption.

2. Unless Congress acts, the 1949 Agricultural Act will take effect in 1955, supplanting the 90 percent of parity price supports for the basic crops by a system of flexible supports that may drop the support level for several major crops to around 75 percent of parity.

Such a sudden deterioration of prices would be dangerous not only to agriculture but to the whole economy.

THE REMEDY

The committee, in H. R. 9680, presents a farm program to protect the income of farmers while comprehending the interests, the needs, and the security of all segments of the economy and of all our people.

The bill continues 90 percent of parity price support on the basic crops for 1 year, and maintains other elements of the present integrated program for farm-income stability.

It moves in the direction of greater freedom of choice by farmers.

It provides better management of abundance, and a means of moving surpluses into useful purposes.

It encourages the expansion of markets and consumption at home and abroad.

It reduces the cost of farm programs.

H. R. 9680 conforms to the spirit of the recommendations of the President with respect to adjustability, moderation, and greater farmer freedom in the operation of farm programs.

The legislation embraces the President's request for a $2,500 million commodity set-aside, as an arsenal of food for peaceful use and for safety in any emergency. It meets his recommendation for incentives aimed at making the United States more self-sufficient in the production of wool.

NO ISSUE ON PRINCIPLE

Congress and the people long since have accepted the principle of price supports for agriculture and such policies have been in effect for more than 20 years.

No matter of principle is involved between supports at 90 percent of parity and supports at 75 percent of parity. Anyone who accepts the theory that the Federal Government ought to support prices of agricultural commodities at a level as high as 75 percent, or between 75 and 90 percent of parity, is subscribing to the same principle as those who say it should be 90 percent.

The sole question involved is what is the best way to do the job, and the committee feels that under the conditions existing at this time 90 percent supports, with effective production controls, will work better than a flexible price program at lower levels.

POPULAR MISCONCEPTIONS

There are serious misunderstandings and misconceptions of the general farm program. They should be corrected.

Misconception No. 1: That the present program of 90-percent supports on the basics is primarily responsible for the accumulation of existing surpluses. The facts refute this.

The present accumulation of food and fiber has occurred in the last 2 years. This was due to the 30-percent drop in farm exports, near record production by a war-expanded agricultural plant, and the failure of the former Secretary of Agriculture in 1952 to proclaim controls for the 1953 crops when evidence indicated that our agriculture was moving into a surplus position. Although a 90-percent support program on the basic commodities was in effect for the 10 years previous to 1952, we accumulated no surpluses during that time.

At the onset of the Korean conflict our Government encouraged expansion of the production of food and fiber. We were blessed with favorable weather, and did not need all that was produced. A large part of the surplus went into Government-supported storage and has been charged against the farm program, although the overproduction was brought about by Government policy related to national defense—and by the fact that the then Secretary of Agriculture did not use the tools available to him through acreage allotments and marketing quotas.

Misconception No. 2: That a flexible price-support program, at 75 to 90 percent of parity, would of itself discourage production and help remove the surplus problem. Evidence before the committee indicates that with all farm products in ample supply farmers will maintain or increase their production as they seek to protect their income in the face of lower prices. Had flexible price supports been in effect since 1952 there is no reason to believe our surplus problem would have been any less.

Milk production has not been reduced by the cut in the support price level from 90 percent of parity to 75 percent on April 1. It continues at 4 to 5 percent above levels of a year ago in spite of lower prices.

The only evidence before the committee in support of the theory that flexible price supports would reduce production is a statement by the Secretary of Agriculture that certain studies showed that a 10-percent reduction in the price of a farm product would mean 2 percent less production of that product in the following year.

Misconception No. 3: That flexible price supports would result in important price reductions to consumers and a substantial increase in consumption. That, too, is fallacy. The farm price of the basic commodities supported at 90 percent of parity is only a small part of the retail cost of consumer products made from them. A drop of 10 to 20 percent in the farm prices of these commodities would reduce consumer prices for their products less than 3 percent.

Misconception No. 4: That flexible supports would mean less Government controls and less expense. The committee studies indicate this is not true for the immediate years ahead. Since the evidence indicates that lower support prices of themselves have little effect in curtailing production, it is obvious that the same controls must be used with either 90 percent or flexible price supports in effect. The legislation proposed for flexible supports requires exactly the same controls that we now have under the 90-percent supports for the basic crops.

Misconception No. 5: That agriculture is subsidized to a greater extent than other segments of our economy. While it is the earnest hope of this committee that the farm program, by balancing production to need, soon will eliminate the current costs of price supports, we respectfully submit that the subsidy is the oldest economic principle written in the laws of the United States. Only recently has it been used to any appreciable extent to protect agriculture. The first Congress in 1789 set up the principle to encourage the development of an American merchant fleet. Many billions in subsidies have gone to business and industry. A House Appropriations Subcommittee in January 1954 published figures indicating subsidies amounting to $45,662,835,506 for business since World War II, a large part of this for business reconversion payments. In contrast, farm price support and surplus removal operations in the last 20 years have cost only $3,500,000, or 1 percent of the value of crops and livestock marketed.

FLEXIBILITY IS INHERENT

The committee emphasizes that flexibility is inherent in the farm program provided in this bill.

The fundamental parity concept itself is flexibility of supports for agriculture. It gears support prices to the prices of things farmers must buy. When the prices of manufactured articles drop, the farm price supports automatically are reduced by law.

Moreover, wheat producers in H. R. 9680 are given a choice for 1956 between the provisions of the then existing law or a two-price system which has gained much favor among wheatgrowers. The two-price program, if adopted in an election by growers, would support at 100 percent of parity that part of the wheat crop consumed domestically as human food, and let the remainder go into other use and into world markets at world prices. After a two-price system becomes established, the curbs on production would be reduced or eliminated. If wheat farmers find this program satisfactory, with appropriate enabling legislation the plan may be expanded to other major export crops.

FARMERS' INCOME TO DROP FURTHER

The farmers already have moved at their own election, and at great sacrifice in income, to bring supplies of price-supported crops into line with demand.

Wheat farmers voted 390,221 to 57,536 to reduce their 1954 wheat crop to 62 million acres, against 78 million acres in 1953, and they are expected to follow the Secretary of Agriculture's call for a further reduction to 55 million acres in 1955. Assuming normal yields and stable prices in 1955, this will mean a slash in farmers' income on wheat from $2,349 million in 1953 to $1,644 million in 1955—a cut of $705 million or 30 percent. In the case of cotton, the producers voted 458,382 to 29,071 to reduce their acreage from 27 million in 1953 to 21,379,000 in 1954. A further reduction to around 17,500,000 acres is the prospect for 1955. Assuming normal yields for 1955; this will mean a cut in cotton income from $3,007 million in 1953 to $1,771 million in 1955—a slash of $1,236 million or about 42 percent.

Without H. R. 9680, the 1949 Farm Act would become operative, and these farmers would have a further reduction of 15 percent in price on their smaller 1955 crops.

This shows the reductions of income that the producers have accepted in their own efforts, under present law, to adjust production to demand. We do not believe they should take a heavier loss by lower supports through a flexible price system in 1955.

CONSUMERS' POSITION

Consumers get more and better food today with an expenditure of a smaller percentage of their total income than in any other period in history.

Figures prepared by Department of Agriculture economists show that in 1914 the average factory employee could buy 3½ pounds of bread with an hour's earnings; in 1929 he could buy 6¾ pounds with 1 hour's earnings; and in 1953 he could buy 10 7/10 pounds.

These economists have set up a table for other major foods, showing what 1 hour's average factory pay bought in 1914, 1929, and 1953, as follows:

	1914	1929	1953
Round steak.................pounds..	0.9	1.2	1.9
Pork chops.......................do....	1.0	1.5	2.1
Butter..............................do....	.6	1.0	2.2
Milk..............................quarts..	2.5	3.9	7.5
Eggs..............................dozen..	.6	1.1	2.5
Potatoes.......................pounds..	12.4	17.7	32.6
Oranges.........................dozen..	------	1.3	3.6
Bacon...........................pounds..	.8	1.3	2.2
Tomatoes................No. 2 cans..	------	4.4	10.0
Cheese..........................pounds..	1.0	1.4	2.9

It must be noted that the largest reduction in the price of food in comparison with wages has occurred during the years of the development of the present program that has as its aim a parity of income for agriculture. It is evident, therefore, that consumers have gotten their greatest concessions in prices of food and fiber in the time of their growth of farm-income stability.

FARM PRICE—CONSUMER PRICE

We recommend an examination of the current-wide marketing margins for farm products. Take wheat and cotton, 2 of the biggest of the 6 basic crops that get 90 percent of parity price supports:

A loaf of bread—the 16-ounce loaf—by Government figures, sells at an average of 16 cents. The farmers get 2¼ cents for the total amount of wheat in the loaf. So if the price of the wheat were cut in half, this would not mean much in the cost of bread. The price a farmer gets for wheat would have to be cut about 75 cents a bushel to reflect a 1-cent reduction in the cost of a loaf of bread.

A shirt—a $3.95 cotton shirt—contains about 30 cents' worth of cotton. That is what the farmer gets. Cutting back the price of cotton would mean very little in the price of a shirt.

In the case of tobacco, the producers in 1953 received about $800 million for that part of their crop consumed in the United States. Federal, State, and local taxes on the 1953 crop, by the time it reached the consumers, amounted to approximately $2,100,000,000.

A spokesman for confectioners, during the hearings on this bill, proposed removal of the 90-percent support on peanuts. It was disclosed that a 5-cent peanut candy bar contains about one-half cent of peanuts; and if the confectioners got their peanuts free, this would not change the price on the 5-cent candy bar, although a few more peanuts might be added.

RURAL-URBAN INTEREST INSEPARABLE

The committee deplores any tendency in the consideration of farm programs toward a separation of the interests of the farmers and our great consuming populations of the cities. These interests are one and the same. They are inseparable. Stability for agriculture is equally as important to urban people as to the people on the farms.

GRASSROOTS STUDY

The committee has made an exhaustive study of agriculture. Between last August and February, its members traveled 20,000 miles into every major agricultural region in an effort to learn at the grassroots the kind of agricultural program the Nation needed. Traveling by bus along much of the way they made frequent stops for interviews with farmers in their fields and in small groups in the farm villages.

Spokesmen for various segments of the economy appeared at the committee's public hearings. Hundreds of farmers testified. A vast majority asked for a continuation of the 90 percent of parity supports for the basic crops, and for a continuation of the various other price stabilization mechanisms, including marketing agreements and surplus removal for perishable crops. Spokesmen for organized labor, representing sizable consumer interests, appeared at these hearings and generally endorsed farm price supports at 90 percent, or more, of parity.

OBJECTIVES

Out of its experience and study, and convinced that a prosperous agriculture is essential to the well-being and security of all of us, city and farm folk alike, the committee presents this bill dedicated to these vital objectives:

1. To attain a fair share of the national income for agriculture;
2. To assure continued abundance of food and fiber for the American people, at fair prices to consumers;
3. To use our abundance for the greatest good of our own people, to develop foreign markets and to meet our obligations to friendly peoples across the seas;
4. To keep our vast agricultural plant in readiness for mobilization against any emergency that may be thrust upon it;
5. To conserve our soil, and maintain and improve our production facilities against a growing population's demands for an ever higher standard of living;
6. To maintain a maximum of freedom of enterprise in farming, keeping it a business in which free and self-respecting men and women can earn a decent living for themselves and their families.

Vital Role of Democratic Party in Our Nation's History

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, the Democratic Party, our oldest major political party, has played a most significant vital role throughout the history of the Nation, and I firmly believe that it is destined to play an even greater and more glorious role in the future.

TWO-PARTY SYSTEM IMPORTANT

The two-party system, which distinguishes our American Government from the chaotic, splinter-party governments of Europe now suffering from the ills and evils of socialism, is fully accepted by the American people, as well as recognized by leading political scientists, as one of the great stabilizing influences of our democracy. It is well said to be the balance wheel between the extremes of ultraconservative, special privilege on the one hand, and unbridled, proletarian radicalism on the other. As one of our two great political groups, the Democratic Party has a traditional and honored place in this system.

CHANGE NOT NECESSARILY PROGRESS

A great political theorist once characterized change as progress, yet common experience readily discloses that not all change is progress. On the contrary, change without stability often represents retrogression. It may work, as it has so many times in the cycle of history when peoples abandoned basic moral values, and traded liberty for bread, to revert great governments and prosperous nations back into the slough of mediocrity, ultimate collapse and the oblivion of nameless dust. It is the kind of change, rather than change itself, therefore, which determines whether it is good or bad for free government, good or bad for the people, and that is a basic problem for political and party leaders.

EXTREMES IN BOTH PARTIES

Man has mastered many things in this age of miracles and wonders, yet he does not seem to have mastered the art of avoiding extremes in directing social and political change. If we have not yet learned apparently how to stop the pendulum of social change at the central point of the golden mean, this failure, if it be such, cannot be ascribed to the Democratic Party any more than to the opposing party, because it is a fact that extremes as well as mistakes have certainly typified past administrations in both parties, and I may state, parenthetically, the process still continues up to the present hour.

DEMOCRATIC PARTY DOMINANT IN SOLVING NATIONAL EMERGENCIES

One fact stands out boldly, however, that in almost every national crisis, war, depression and stress, our Democratic Party has been called upon trustfully by the American people to furnish the inspiring, effective leadership that ultimately pointed the way to decisive victory over ruthless enemies as well as to the most desirable containment of forces of domestic greed and selfishness whose excesses were responsible for economic and social evils which, in several periods, notably in the early 1930's, brought stagnation, unemployment, poverty, and distress into the lives of millions of Americans and whipped up fires of dissension and radical agitation which at this time constitute such a grave peril to our free way of life.

Will history repeat itself, will the Nation be plunged into world war III? Will we suffer serious economic reverses? While I am a confirmed optimist concerning the future, only time, and the quality, skill, and courage of current leadership can or will determine these questions. Most assuredly the Democratic Party will join patriotically and constructively in their solution.

GREAT DEBT TO DEMOCRATIC PARTY

That the Nation owes a great, eternal debt for the achievements and contributions of past Democratic leadership rising up as it did, in so many emergencies, from the very loins of the common people of America, grappling so courageously, so effectively, so successfully, with dangerous foreign aggression and fearful domestic problems alike, is undeniable.

It is said that the times invariably produce great men to lead free governments out of the wilderness of despair, away from the shoals of danger. The history of the Democratic Party convincingly testifies to this fact. From the immortal Jefferson to Jackson, Cleveland, Wilson, Roosevelt, and Truman, without regard to differences of opinion in the Nation, and divisions of outlook in the party, acting with firm purpose, strongly supported by repeated and emphatic expressions of the popular will, the Democratic Party stood for and fought for the basic principles of the Constitution, the rights of sovereign States, for civil and religious liberty and toleration, for individual freedom, of conscience, inquiry, and action, for the security, welfare, and elevation of the great rank and file.

Democrats can be justifiably proud that down through the years, on the whole and with very few exceptions, the Democratic Party, by its pledges, its program, and its affirmative action has given meaning, substance, and realization to the great American ideal—"the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

To summarize: In time of crisis, peril, threat to our security, military or economic, the majority of the American people selected the Democratic Party and its great historic leadership to solve the most difficult and urgent of national problems. It is to our great credit that no matter how grave, challenging, or momentous these problems were, our party has tackled them with unshakable faith, inspiring confidence, successful achievement, and consequent benefit to the Republic.

PARTY NOT INFALLIBLE

A political party, whatever can be said for it, is merely a human institution, a human instrumentality directed by men and women who believe in its basic principles, and who conceive it as the best vehicle for promoting the national and general interests. Like every other human institution, it is capable of error and mistake, subject to the weaknesses and limitations of the human character and the human mind. I would be the last to claim infallibity for my great party, though in view of its tremendous achievements for the country in every period of American life, it requires no defense from me or anyone else. If it erred, its errors arose like the errors of the opposing party arose and still arise, from ordinary human frailty of individual leaders vested with temporary power, and indeed its shortcomings were shared by the American people who time and time again followed its leadership.

PARTY'S ILLUSTRIOUS LEADERSHIP IN STATE

From the time of the great Jefferson, one of the greatest political thinkers and prophets of all times, the record of the Democratic Party rings and resounds down through the unbroken channels of history acclaimed by triumphant and grateful voices of millions of loyal Americans who have adhered to its principles, sustained its leadership and benefited by its policies.

This record comprises a series of contributions and achievements in behalf of the struggling masses of America and Massachusetts which cannot possibly be equalled by any other party or any other political group.

Great personalities whose vision and ability changed the course of history made this impressive record:

The fearless David I. Walsh, trail blazer of the Massachusetts democracy, one of the greatest statesmen of our time, first great progressive governor of our beloved Commonwealth, father of practically all the first, great, social legislation of our era in the interest of ordinary men and women, who later rendered renowned service to our State and Nation in Washington as our United States Senator; outstanding, enlightened leader in the House of Representatives, able, humane, and courageous, Congressman John W. McCormack; brilliant young Senator John F. Kennedy, of noted heritage, whose great ability and zeal for the people's cause will elevate him to still higher national office; former Gov. James M. Curley, unsurpassed orator, gifted personality, friend of the poor; former Gov. Paul A. Dever, powerful, capable, champion of labor, distinguished orator and leader; former Governor and Secretary of Labor Maurice J. Tobin, beloved by all, vigorous exponent of the workingman, so tragically taken from us at the height of his powers; former Gov. Charles F. Hurley, of late, lamented memory, a man of great sincerity and forward-looking spirit; former Gov. Joseph B. Ely, great lawyer, gifted administrator, the man whose brilliant speech nominated his close friend, the idol of millions, the Happy Warrior, Gov. Al Smith for the Presidency; former Senator Marcus F. Coolidge, another able fighter for social justice, and others too numerous to mention—all represented and typified the central theme of the Democratic Party's objective—the betterment and advancement of the common people.

And there were and are many more in the service of our Commonwealth, its various subdivisions, and of the Nation, including my own very distinguished Massachusett's Democratic colleagues in the House of Representatives at Washington, distinguished members of our great general court, outstanding constitutional officers of the State and many others, whose leadership and unselfish service has furthered and protected the interest of the people.

COSMOPOLITAN CHARACTER OF PARTY

The Democratic Party in State and Nation is comprised of many groups of different origin and racial stocks, from different geographical areas, of different color and creed, of varied economic levels—workers in the factories, farmers in the fields, clerks, skilled artisans, professional classes, scientists, preachers, journalists, scholars, businessmen, housewives—people drawn from every calling and station. They have joined together in a great united movement to promote the cause of humane, forward-looking government under the Constitution, to stand for government of laws by men, government for the benefit of the people who compose the country, and not just merely for special groups of wealth, power, and affluence who seek selfish and ofttimes antisocial ends.

GREAT BENEFITS TO THE PEOPLE

In truth, every generation of Americans has been the beneficiary of the wisdom, foresight, and humane judgment of leaders of the Democratic Party. In fact, there is hardly a person in America today who, in some way or other, has not been specifically benefited by virtue of the policies and program of the Democratic Party or the service of some of its leaders. It has been a great humanizing influence in American life. Protector of the weak, refuge of the poor, defender of liberty, champion of the oppressed, promoter of social justice, advocate of the defenseless, militant apostle of the great American principle of toleration and equity for all, the Democratic Party more than any other agency, more than any other single force save the spiritual strength so beneficently engendered by the Almighty in the minds and hearts of loyal Americans, the Democratic Party has been responsible for the greatest social, political, and economic progress of the Nation.

STIMULUS TO PROSPERITY AND WELL-BEING

It not only provided leadership but furnished the stimulus, the direction and the guiding genius for the incredible advancement and improvement which the Nation has made in living standards and state of well-being during the past few decades. Our party has done more to improve the lot of the individual average American, to promote a very high level of general prosperity among all classes of our people, businessmen, farmers, as well as workers, to improve the health, housing, education, the general welfare of our people, I repeat, than any other human agency at any time in history.

Can it honestly be doubted that were it not for the Democratic Party and its enlightened leadership in State and Nation during the past quarter century that our average citizen would ever be in the position of self-sufficiency, prosperity, and happiness in which he so happily finds himself today?

PEOPLE GRATEFUL AND WILL RETURN TO FOLD

The American people have reaped a rich harvest from their devotion to the Democratic Party and I have every confidence that they will return to its fold. If the Democratic Party is to assume its great responsibilities during this desperate crisis, it must be the purpose of its leaders to maintain and expand the great gains which have been made under Democratic leadership for ordinary Americans and their families under our cherished free enterprise system—the most fabulous economic system the world has ever known.

We are fortunate indeed that the Democratic Party is not static and moribund, but rather abounds with vigor, vitality, and a progressive spirit.

HIGH AIMS—SOUND APPROACH

Our Democratic program, in line with its best traditions, must be soundly grounded in morality and truth. It must be grounded also in respect, devotion, and reverence for the great immutable verities of our matchless Constitution. In our support of stable government and a stable flexible economy, we shall need not only sound convictions but a sound approach to public questions and sound interpretation of our mission.

We must stand erect and resolute against the great Red lie of communism and godless Marxism at home and abroad.

We must be intent upon preserving the Bill of Rights and the precious liberties of the individual gained by freemen only after centuries of struggle and bloodshed.

We must be vigilant against those kinds of human selfishness which tend to stultify our progress so that we may work wholeheartedly to eliminate poverty, disease, distress, and low standards, to uphold our free system and the cause of freedom against the irreligion, slavery, and the debauchery of communism.

The Nation that could afford to pour out about $90 billion in cold cash to foreign nations since 1946 can certainly afford a substantial portion of its huge national product to take care of the urgent social needs of the American people.

We must never lose sight of the great fundamentals—the spiritual ideals and political principles which have made this Nation the greatest on earth.

TOLERANCE FOR DIFFERENT VIEWPOINTS

We know the reasons for our recent defeats and must act to correct them by rooting out the causes. Thus we will command public confidence and support.

While there is bound to be widely different interpretations of principle and method in the formulation of party programs and differences on policy as well, if our party is to regain the trust of the people there must be room for different shades of opinion and different viewpoints on public issues. No party membership can agree fully on every issue. Frank discussion, critical appraisal, and honest independent judgment are desirable. Our leaders as well as workers must be something more than automatons; our elected officials, something more than "yes" men for would-be bosses or so-called braintrusters. They must reflect the will of the people who elect them and work primarily for the good of the country. They should lend themselves neither to hysteria nor expediency, remembering that our party spreads out over every section and must therefore welcome to its ranks every person and group accepting the fundamental philosophy that government exists by popular consent to protect freedom and to promote the best interests, prosperity, and happiness of the people and that our party is the most effective instrument for achieving these commendable ends.

RADICALS SHOULD NOT DOMINATE

The Democratic Party is not a revolutionary party. In origin and outlook, it is committed to American institutions, to free enterprise and free initiative which have contributed so greatly and invaluably to the building of this nation. Since we believe that we can accomplish all necessary and desirable reforms without destroying or shackling this peerless economic system, we can never allow radical doctrinaires who do not believe in the essential principles of our free way of life, but who sponsor and strive for a bureaucratic, socialistic, or communistic state, to infiltrate and dominate the affairs, policies, and machinery of our party.

We must fairly and impartially seek an area of agreement among the party's component parts, sectional, social, and occupational, that will enable us to appeal to a maximum majority and thus attain our chosen goals. If the program and policies of the party are wisely and soundly shaped responsively to public need and with reference to truly progressive doctrine, and trusted, capable, experienced leadership is selected, we will be entitled to popular support and can reestablish our position in State and Nation.

A BROAD PROGRAM

Many vital issues impend in this distressed world and in the Nation the outcome of which will decide the destiny of free government for generations to come, perhaps for all time. I shall not presume here to outline them in detail, but in a broad sense these are some of the considerations which will have to be met by our party:

First. Wholehearted international cooperation with the United Nations and with all nations of good faith and honest motives to check communism and promote peace. Of utmost importance, is a strong, resolute, unwavering foreign policy, backed up by overwhelming streamlined modernized armed power, uncompromisingly rejecting appeasement.

This policy must be designed to prevent Communist aggression and infiltration.

It must imply sincere participation of the free nations according to their abilities and potential power.

It should avoid hysterical, unfounded fears concerning war, atomic energy, or the power of communism.

It should be willing to help alleviate distress and reinforce democracy within our means, but should eschew international flying saucers spraying American cream and honey over foreign landscapes.

We should not move too fast economically or militarily in these matters. Unprotected atomic pooling could present the greatest of perils and revolutionary military concepts are always difficult to implement.

In Europe, in Asia and elsewhere, we must squarely reject any partnership, or material support of those who are acting as part of, or in concert with, the world Communist conspiracy to destroy us.

To recognize diplomatically, or consent to its admission to United Nations of any nation whose hands are dripping with the blood of American boys, must be squarely rejected by this Nation.

Second. The continuance of our efforts to uncover and expose Communists and subversives in the United States and ruthlessly drive them out of positions in Government and their entrenched places of influence in American life.

Third. A strong reaffirmation of our position on civil rights, racial and religious toleration, and determined protection of those great constitutional safeguards set up to defend the sacred rights of the individual against unwarranted, illegal, interference with his liberties.

Fourth. An immediate program on the domestic, social, and economic front to reverse unfortunate current recessionary trends in the economy which are responsible for releasing the dangerous forces of fear and confusion in the Nation and have already caused substantial unemployment.

We must recognize always that communism and dangerous social unrest are easily promoted by unemployment, fear, and want.

We must seek to rule out not only the letter but the spirit of antilabor discriminations and assures stability for labor, business, and agriculture with employment for all.

In short, we must declare war against recession, depression, and need by proposing the immediate use of all necessary resources of this great, powerful Government to strengthen the American economy and restore confidence and prosperity for all our people, since any weakness in our national armor, military or economic, would be the strongest weapon our potential enemies could have.

With a fundamental program carried forward by honest, courageous, forward-looking and sensible leadership, the Democratic Party can and will, God grant, once again as in the past lead State and Nation along the way to prosperity, security, and peace.

Our great party founder, Thomas Jefferson, once said, "The same God who gave us life, gave us liberty at the same time."

It is for every American, regardless of race, creed, or party to preserve it. With courage, faith, hard work, unflagging allegiance to American institutions, and abiding faith in the Almighty we will.

Report to Nevada

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. MALONE

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a brief statement to my fellow Nevadans to summarize my own participation in the accomplishments of the 83d Congress. Much of my time during the second session was necessarily devoted to the work of the Minerals, Materials, and Fuels Senate Economic Subcommittee, of which I am chairman. The heavy schedule imposed by that task did not, however, prevent my full participation in the consideration and action required by a long list of bills vitally affecting the lives and future of not only Nevadans but of all Americans. In each such case I acted and voted in accordance with what I sincerely believed to be the best interests of the United States and of Nevada.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPORT TO NEVADA

AGRICULTURE

In respect to this intensely important measure, I supported the major farm bill containing a system of flexible farm price supports and other provisions to help solve the agricultural problems that have disturbed this Nation since the end of World War II.

Important provisions of the bill included flexible price supports ranging from 82.5 percent to 90 percent parity for wheat, cotton, corn, peanuts, and rice.

A $2.5 billion set-aside of surplus crops for a national stockpile and for domestic and foreign relief.

A new direct payment program to encourage the production of wool as a security measure.

A modernized parity formula effective in 1956.

More work remains to be done. As is known to all of us, accumulated surpluses had become a real problem by 1953, and a real effort will be made to solve it.

ATOMIC ENERGY ACT REVISION

Production of nuclear commercial power is a real possibility in the high cost power areas in the near future. Hence, the Atomic Energy Act was amended to permit, for the first time, private firms to build and own atomic energy plants, and to produce and use fissionable fuels, such as uranium, that are the source of atomic energy. The measure denies to private companies the right to own these fissionable raw materials, which will be owned by the Government, but leased to private users.

Private firms will be permitted to obtain private patents on atomic energy processes if such processes had no origin within the operations of the Atomic Energy Commission.

Preference is given to rural cooperatives and other public bodies in the purchase of atomic power. On August 13, 1954, the Conference Report on the Atomic Energy Act was rejected by the Senate and sent back to conference, chiefly because of my objection to the wording of that part of the bill pertaining to preference to States and municipalities on federally financed power.

As reported from the conference, section 44 read: "In contracting for the disposal of such energy the Commission shall, insofar as practicable, give preference and priority to public bodies and cooperatives." I pointed out the fact that as Senator Newlands had caused the preference clause to be adopted in 1901 in the Reclamation Act, this section should be more clearly expressed, and requested the elimination of the words "insofar as practicable." The Senate sent the bill back to conference, where the phrase was eliminated from the preference clause.

INTERNAL REVENUE CODE REVISION

As a member of the Senate Finance Committee, I took an active role in rewriting and amending the Internal Revenue Code, a tremendous job done in a very limited time. This is the first time in 78 years that we have made a complete revision of our tax laws. The new law will provide tax reductions of approximately $7.5 billion—the largest cut made in our history.

Three important amendments which I introduced are included in the new law.

Veterans: An amendment which provides that bequests to or for the use of any veterans organizations are allowable deductions—exemptions from inheritance tax.

Depletion allowance: Raised the depletion allowance on 32 strategic and critical minerals from 15 percent or less to 23 percent.

Retirement income: Provides a credit against tax liability equal to 20 percent of retirement income up to $1,200, received by an individual who is 65 years of age or over and who has received earned income in excess of $600 in each of any 10 calendar years before the taxable year. Extends credit to individuals under 65 retired under public retirement systems, such as policemen, firemen, and teachers.

MUTUAL SECURITY ACT—FOREIGN AID

I bitterly opposed this continued dole to foreign nations.

I succeeded in eliminating section 412 of the act, under which it was proposed that funds be reallocated to assist in the procuring, stimulation, and increase abroad of the mining of critical and strategic materials.

I offered an amendment which would authorize the appropriation of $13,079,000,000 (the entire amount requested for foreign aid in 1954) for construction within the United States of military aircraft for the Armed Forces of the United States.

I offered an amendment which provided that none of the funds authorized to be appropriated for foreign aid shall be used to furnish assistance to any nation recognizing Communist China.

MINERALS, MATERIALS, AND FUELS ECONOMIC SUBCOMMITTEE

Report 1627 contains the findings and recommendations of accessibility and availability of supplies of critical raw materials to the United States in time of war and for our expanding economy. Copies of the report are available. The subcommittee found that the Western Hemisphere can be defended, and that it can be made self-sufficient in production of the necessary critical materials.

Senate Resolution 271 provides for the continuation of the work of this subcommittee for further investigation of the accessibility of critical materials, including substitutes and replacements.

SOCIAL SECURITY

As a member of the Senate Finance Committee, I played an important role in amending the social-security law to provide extended coverage and increased benefits.

COLUMBIA INTERSTATE COMPACT COMMISSION

The Malone bill, S. 3336, was enacted as Public Law 484 to promote the apportionment of the waters of the Columbia River and tributaries for irrigation and other purposes, by including the States of Nevada and Utah among the States authorize to negotiate a compact providing for such apportionment.

ANTIGAMBLING

Several antigambling bills were introduced in the Senate and House which, if enacted, would have had an adverse effect on the legalized gambling industry in Nevada. I was successful in blocking passage of two such bills which reached the Senate floor.

TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT OF 1934

I opposed any extension of the 1934 Trade Agreements Act, for which an extension of 3 years was sought. The Randall Commission's recommendation for a 3-year extension, reduced tariffs and added billions to European countries for stabilization of currencies was turned down by Congress and an extension of only 1 year was granted.

June 24, 1954, I made a 2-hour speech on the Senate floor, putting up a vigorous fight against extension of the Trade Agreements Act.

During the 1st session of the 83d Congress I offered a substitute bill which would have returned to Congress its constitutional responsibility to regulate foreign trade through the adjustment of duties, imposts and excises, commonly known as tariffs and import fees. In fighting for fair trade I am fighting for adequate protection to the small business of this Nation, and the workers and investors who, because of the free-trade policy, have to compete with the low-wage standard countries of Europe and Asia.

VETERANS

In addition to my amendment to the Internal Revenue Code revision, which exempted bequests to veterans organizations from inheritance tax, I supported or sponsored other measures for the benefit of veterans.

I supported the measure which provides a 5 percent increase in compensation for disabled veterans. Following that I personally pushed through an additional measure which provides a 5-percent increase in compensation to all veterans and their dependents.

At the time when the Veterans' Administration appropriations for 1955 were being considered on the Senate floor I vigorously protested any provision which would reduce the bed capacity in the Veterans' Administration hospital at Reno, and stressed that the Reno facility should have funds to operate at full capacity of 166 beds. The appropriation for the fiscal year of 1955 calls for an average patient load of 123.

I supported the bill which grants Korean veterans 1 additional year in which to begin or complete education or training under the GI bill. The existing law gives Korean veterans 2 years after discharge to begin education or training; the new bill extends this period to 3 years.

HAWAII-ALASKA STATEHOOD

In the Interior Committee and on the Senate floor, I voted to tie Alaskan statehood in with the bill for Hawaiian statehood.

I am against statehood for either Alaska or Hawaii, and believe few citizens have considered the full import of the precedent of admitting to statehood with full voting rights in the Senate and House of Representatives of offshore, noncontiguous areas. In 1947, I, with five other Senators, reported on Puerto Rico's application for statehood after a full investigation of that territory. Our report was adverse to statehood, and favored a self-governing area, electing its own governor and adopting its own constitution, approved by the Congress of the United States. This was done in 1951 and Puerto Rico has experienced satisfaction with its self-government.

In the 1st session of the 83d Congress, I introduced S. 2003, a self-government bill for Hawaii which would grant the people of that territory the right to elect their governor and to adopt a constitution, approved by Congress. The late Senator Hugh Butler, former chairman of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, introduced a similar bill for the Territory of Alaska. Both bills should be reintroduced and passed in the 84th Congress providing for each territory to elect its own governor, elect or appoint their own judges and otherwise govern themselves.

INTERNAL SECURITY AND SUBVERSION

Several important security measures passed by the 83d Congress to which I gave my support included: The Defense Facilities Production Act of 1954, which authorizes the Federal Government to guard strategic defense plants against sabotage, espionage or other subversion; the Espionage and Sabotage Act of 1954, making espionage a capital offense and removing the statute of limitations on peacetime espionage. The present limitation is 10 years. The bill also requires registration with the Attorney General of persons who have received any espionage, counter-espionage or sabotage training from a foreign government or a foreign political party.

POSTAL AND FEDERAL SALARY INCREASE

The measure to increase by 5 percent the salaries of postal and Federal employees was given my support.

PUBLIC WORKS

The omnibus rivers and harbors and flood-control measure is the first such bill passed in 4 years and was given my support. It authorizes $1.07 billion for 183 projects throughout the Nation, including funds to start the Carson-Truckee project, to be commenced when the entire Washoe reclamation project is authorized.

PUBLIC LAND DEVELOPMENT

I worked for and supported important new laws revising Federal land acts to aid and expedite the systematic and multiple development of strategic minerals, such as oil, gas, and uranium on public lands. One of these, Public Law 585, revises the statutes to permit mineral leases and locations for exploration and development of more than one mineral on the same piece of land. Before the new law went into effect only minerals covered by the Leasing Act could be developed.

INDIANS

It is encouraging to note that for the first time in history the 83d Congress has acted to end, rather than extend, Federal control over the American Indians. Legislation has been approved which would "start the ball rolling to get the Government out of the Indian business." Legal machinery can now be set in motion by provisions of various measures which would free about 10,000 reservation Indians in five States—Oregon, Utah, Texas, Alabama, and Wisconsin.

Among other important Indian legislation enacted by Congress were bills designed to improve the Government's health and hospitalization facilities for Indians of the Nation by transferring the health program from the Interior Department to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; give the Indians the right to own and sell property and possess firearms and liquor; and provide more efficient law enforcement on reservations.

In July 1953 I introduced a bill to abolish the functions of the Bureau of Indian Affairs. Additionally the bill would have removed guardianship over Indians and trusteeship over Indian lands, all within 3 years. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee did not take action on this measure but I am encouraged by the strides made this year on Indian legislation and am hopeful that I will succeed in my long endeavor to make our American Indians complete citizens.

My Report to the Railway and Other Workers in the Ninth District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 3, 1954

Mr. HAGEN of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, in the 15 counties of northwestern Minnesota, comprising the Ninth Congressional District, there are many fine men and women engaged in railroad work. We have division points at places like Dilworth, Thief River Falls, Breckenridge, East Grand Forks, and other places in the district.

I am proud to say that, in past elections, I have been endorsed by most of the railroad organizations upon my record in their behalf.

I can recall that in 1947 the so-called Jennings bill was before the House. This bill was strictly a railroad law and provided that if a railroad employee was injured or a passenger was injured, or there was a freight claim, that the lawsuit must be brought in the county or Federal district where the accident occurred. I do not need to go into detail on this except to say that every labor organization of railroad men bitterly opposed this railroad-sponsored bill and I was able to line up many votes against it.

I always have supported liberalization of the railroad retirement law, and just a few months ago we passed a law raising average payments by $24 a month.

We also brought 10 million more persons under social security and liberalized that law so that it will benefit every person when they reach the age of 65 and raised their benefits materially. In 1947, when the Taft-Hartley labor law was passed, I was one of 113 Members out of 435 who voted to recommit that law to committee. I felt then, and I feel now, that the law needed many amendments in order to make it more fair to the workers, employers, and the public.

However, I voted for final passage of the Taft-Hartley law because it had the following good points:

In the first place, it required that officials of the unions should file with the Government sworn statements that they were not Communists. This has done a great deal to check and stop the rule of a few unions by men and women who would destroy America. The Taft-Hartley law also provides that the huge amounts of money collected in dues and initiation fees should be accounted for to the members of the unions. Previously, some of the officials of some unions made a racket and also made themselves hundreds of thousands of dollars because they did not have to account for funds.

The Taft-Hartley law also provided that union officials should be elected with a secret ballot. Previously, a few labor bosses perpetuated themselves into office through tricky phrases in their constitutions. The Taft-Hartley law also provided that when a strike threatens the Nation the President could declare an emergency and delay a strike for 80 days. Previously, John L. Lewis, or labor leaders of that type, could paralyze the Nation with a suddenly called strike.

The Taft-Hartley law permits unions to sue bosses who break their contracts and permits companies to sue unions which break their contracts.

The Taft-Hartley law outlaws the closed shop. That means that a worker could not get a job unless he belonged to the union, which meant that a few labor bosses were doing hiring for companies which had their money invested in business. Under the Taft-Hartley law the union shop is legalized, which means that a worker, not a union member, can be hired, but must join the union within 30 days after going to work if that union is the bargaining agent.

Previously, unions forced employers to check off union dues, but under the Taft-Hartley law, this now could be done only with the consent of the jobholder.

Previously, some labor bosses took millions of dollars of union dues and put it into political campaign funds to elect radicals, and in some cases Communists, to office.

All corporations are forbidden by law to make political campaign contributions and the Taft-Hartley law prevents unions from taking their union dues and using it for political purposes.

However, any individual worker may make a voluntary contribution to campaigns.

I wanted this law amended to make it more fair but because of its good features, I supported it on final passage.

My thought that it should be amended has long since been approved because Senator Taft himself piloted through the Senate 27 amendments to the law, which were stalled by House Democrats who wanted to make it an issue. And President Eisenhower also recommended certain changes, but the Democrats of the Senate killed the bill for the 1954 session.

Immigrant Law Threatens To Tear 7-Year-Old From Parents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, the July 21 issue of the Columbus Citizen, of Columbus, Ohio, contained a front-page article which gives a further illustration of the effect and impact of the McCarran-Walter Act. In this case the tragic impact is on a young boy 7 years old, and even more on his adoptive parents, both of whom are American citizens. His father served his country in the Armed Forces and now as a reward he receives the choice of either giving up his adopted son or facing a costly and virtually impossible trip abroad in order to have his son apply for admission into this country as a permanent resident. That provision of the McCarran Act which produces the tragedy described in the attached article is the one which makes an unrealistic distinction between natural born children and adopted children.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this interesting article, from the Columbus Citizen be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

IMMIGRANT LAW THREATENS TO TEAR 7-YEAR-OLD FROM PARENTS—FAMILY GIVEN 6 MONTHS TO RAISE MONEY TO SEND HIM TO GERMANY

(By Lowell K. Bridwell)

Little Bobby Woods romped through a game of cowboys and Indians with his playmates today unaware that the Federal Government may take him from his home and deport him to Germany.

Bobby, 7, is the victim of a quirk in the immigration law, which says he is an alien and can't legally live here with his parents, both of whom are American citizens.

Congress didn't know about Bobby when it passed the McCarren Act. But now that law is plaguing the lives of his parents, Robert and Frieda Woods.

The Immigration and Naturalization Service has given blond Bobby's parents 6 months to raise the money to pay his way back to Germany.

The order is a technical compliance with the law. Actually, it appeared that the immigration officials handling Bobby's case would be delighted if they could find a loophole in the law to let the youngster stay in the United States.

But the father, 26, and his lovely 27-year-old German war bride are desperately worried that the loophole can't be found.

"If they take my boy away," Mrs. Woods said, "then mama will go with him."

Woods met his wife while he was stationed as a military policeman in her hometown of Bayreuth in Bavaria. He had been sent overseas in 1946. They fell in love, and were later married.

Mrs. Woods and her son were brought to the United States and Bobby was legally adopted.

But Frieda and her husband didn't understand. Despite her application for citizenship which she made and the adoption, Bobby still was considered an alien visitor.

Now, after all this time, immigration authorities have notified Robert and Frieda their son has 6 months before he must be deported.

"That boy would be lost over there," said Grandfather Harry Woods. "He's not leaving the country if I have to stand out here with a shotgun."

However, the immigration authorities aren't anxious to deport Bobby. But J. S. Hanscom, in charge of the Columbus office, says his hands are tied.

Hanscom said the only way he sees out of the problem is for one or both of the parents to take Bobby to some other country and get him readmitted on a permanent visa, then start citizenship proceedings.

But that presents a sizable practical problem for Robert and Frieda, who are trying hard to save enough money for a downpayment on their own home.

The only other way out of the dilemma is for Congress to pass a bill especially for Bobby, making him eligible for citizenship.

Wood's attorney already has asked Ohio Senators John W. Bricker and Thomas A. Burke, and Representative John W. Vorys if such legislation can be passed for Bobby.

And the youngster, vaguely aware that some crisis was developing around him, looked fearfully at his mother and father.

"I want to stay here with you," he said.

The Constitution and Foreign Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. MALONE

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the Record and include the resolution on world trade adopted by the 36th Annual Department Convention of the American Legion, Department of Nevada, held at Ely, Nev., August 5 through August 7, 1954.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF NEVADA RESOLUTION 12a

Whereas the promotion of world trade should be on the basis of fair and reasonable competition and must be done within the principle long maintained that foreign products of underpaid foreign labor shall not be admitted to the country on terms which endanger the living standards of the American workingman, the American farmer, and the miner, or threaten serious injury to a domestic industry;

Whereas article I, section 8, of the Constitution of the United States provides that "the Congress shall have the power to lay and collect duties, imposts, and excises (tariffs or import fees)" and "to regulate foreign commerce"; and

Whereas the Congress transferred this constitutional responsibility to the executive branch through the 1934 Trade Agreements Act as extended from time to time: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Unitd States Congress is hereby urged to resume its constitutional responsibility of regulating foreign commerce, through the adjustment of duties, imposts, and excises, and allow the 1934 Trade Agreements Act, which transferred such responsibility to the Executive, to expire in June of 1955.

Railroad Employees Benefit by Action of 83d Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFTON (CLIFF) YOUNG

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, from the early days of settling the West, the railroads have played an all-important part in building the economy and strengthening commerce in my State. Several important Nevada communities were founded on this vital industry. Hundreds of railroad employees in Nevada have participated in making the railroad network in the United States the outstanding system of rail transportation in the entire world.

During World War I and World War II, the railroads made a magnificent contribution to the military effort of our country. A large part of the success of our Nation's railroad transportation system is due to the skilled and capable workers who are employed by the railroad companies. Their efforts, together with capable management, have given us a railroad system that is the envy of the world.

Mr. Speaker, I was glad to support legislation during this session to improve the Railroad Retirement Act, the Railroad Retirement Tax Act, and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act. Many of these provisions were desired by the railroad employees in my congressional district, and I am sure they were pleased to see Congress take favorable action on the two measures that contained these meritorious changes.

One of the bills enacted—Public Law 398—repealed retroactively an amendment to the Railroad Retirement Act passed in 1951, which prohibited payments of annuities under the Railroad Retirement Act and the Social Security Act, which has been referred to as the dual-benefit provision. Under that provision, the railroad retirement annuity, or pension of an individual, was reduced if the individual had creditable railroad service before 1937 and was entitled to receive old-age benefits under the Social Security Act.

This law will increase benefits for approximately 36,000 annuitants presently on the rolls by an average of $24 a month. It is estimated that over the next 50 years about 120,000 railroad workers will benefit.

Another bill contains amendments to provide the following benefits:

First. Reduces the eligibility age from 65 to 60 years of widows, dependent widowers, or parents, for survivor's annuities.

Second. Relieves hardship of widowed mothers of physically or mentally disabled children over 18 years of age.

Third. Provides full survivor benefits to widows, dependent widowers, and dependent parents who are also eligible for a railroad retirement annuity in their own right.

Fourth. Increases the creditable compensation from the present maximum of $300 a month to a maximum of $350 a month in the calculation of a retirement or survivor annuity.

Fifth. Disregards the compensation earned after age 65, if the crediting of such compensation would diminish the annuity.

Sixth. Changes the disability work clause to a maximum of $100 in earnings for any month without loss of the annuity for that month.

Seventh. Excludes the service of certain delegates to national or international conventions of railway labor organizations from coverage under this act.

Eighth. Eliminates the requirement in the present law that a child over age 16 and under 18 years must attend school regularly in order to be eligible for a survivor's annuity.

Ninth. Provides waiver of retirement benefits for certain individuals who are receiving non-service-connected veterans' pensions.

The principal amendment to the Railroad Retirement Tax Act increases the tax base from $300 to $350 a month, at the tax rate of 6½ percent now in effect. In return for the tax on their additional monthly compensation in excess of $300, but not in excess of $350, employees would obtain benefit rights on the average at the rate of $3 for each $1 in taxes they pay.

The amendments to the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act alters slightly the schedule of base-year compensation, and the daily benefit rates for unemployment are increased by 50 cents a step, with a maximum daily rate of $8.50.

Mr. Speaker, the improvements that have been accomplished by the 83d Congress in the laws affecting the welfare of railroad workers and their dependents are forward steps in an overall program which recognizes the important contribution of the working people to the continuing growth of our national economy. I hope that when the next Congress convenes it will continue the study of certain other proposals with a view toward further improving the Railroad Retirement Act.

My Report to the People of the Ninth Congressional District of Minnesota

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. HAGEN of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, this is in the nature of a partial report of my activities during the 83d Congress for the last 2 years. Despite all that the DFL candidates can say, this is 1 of 2 Congresses in the past 30 years that has cut taxes, reduced appropriations, and approved many other excellent measures for the people's welfare.

I voted to cut all your excise taxes and that became law. I voted to cut from 10 percent to 5 percent the tax on refrigerators, stoves, fans, water heaters, flatirons, air heaters, electric blankets, grills, toasters, broilers, juicers, food choppers and grinders, clothes dryers, dishwashers, floor polishers, waxers, mangles, garbage disposals, power lawn mowers, and home freezers.

I voted to cut the tax on furs from 20 percent to 10 percent, which not only means much to the women who wear fur coats but also to the persons who produce furs and do trapping in northern Minnesota.

I voted to cut the tax on jewelry from 20 percent to 10 percent and to cut the tax on matches and cutting oils.

I voted to cut the taxes on luggage, including handbags for ladies, from 20 percent to 10 percent.

I voted to cut the tax on toilet preparations from 20 percent to 10 percent. This was of particular importance to the woman, since cosmetics, powders, rouges, and other toilet preparations have now become a necessity instead of a luxury to the women. Also, this tax cut applied to powders and other preparations used for babies.

I voted to cut your tax on long-distance telephone calls from 25 percent to 10 percent, and your telegram, cable, and radio messages from 15 percent to 10 percent.

I voted to cut the tax on your local telephone bill from 15 percent to 10 percent.

You have been paying 15-percent tax on your tickets on trains, airplanes, and buses for many years. I voted to cut that tax from 15 percent to 10 percent and on sporting goods from 15 percent to 10 percent which is an item of importance to your children and youngsters who are interested in baseball, football, basketball, and other athletics.

I voted to cut the tax on electric light bulbs from 20 percent to 10 percent and on fountain pens and mechanical pencils and ballpoint pens from 15 percent to 10 percent and on cameras, lenses, and films from 20 percent to 10 percent.

In order to save your motion-picture theater from disaster I voted to cut the tax on tickets from 20 percent to 10 percent on tickets costing 51 cents or more and to totally eliminate the tax on tickets costing 50 cents or less, thus saving you from a tax when you send your youngsters to the movies. I also voted to cut the tax on baseball and other amusements, the same percentage, and eliminated entirely the 20-percent tax on college athletic events and amateur theater performances.

REDUCED TAXES

When my Democratic-Farmer-Labor opponents attack our record in the 83d Congress, let them explain how we reduced taxes by $7,400,000,000 this year, the largest tax cut the American people ever enjoyed in a single year.

ALWAYS FOR VETERAN

My record on supporting legislation for veterans has been such that I have in my files at least two dozen letters from the leaders of the American Legion, the DAV, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the AMVETS, and other veteran organizations highly commending me for my support of laws which would benefit the men and women who lost time out of their young lives in order that America would not be conquered.

I shall not attempt to go into detail on these matters, since the veterans' officials themselves will notify their membership through their various publications as to my record with regard to the bills that they sponsored or opposed. Any official of State or National veterans' organizations will gladly testify to anyone of my 100-percent record for veterans, their wives, and their dependents.

FRIEND OF THE INDIAN

We have numerous Indians in the Ninth Congressional District of Minnesota—more than the remainder of the State combined. I think every leader among them knows that I always have sponsored the bills to give them the money to which they rightfully were entitled and also to relieve them as much as possible from the old bureaucracy in Washington, D. C. I have been the author of school bills and much legislation for their welfare.

SUPPORTER OF SMALL BUSINESS

We have established in Congress small-business committees. I have actively supported anything and everything that would help small business, because in my district virtually all business is small business.

It is not good when you see vast organizations of capital gradually gobble up the economy and throttle the independent industrialist and businessman. I realize that this is heresy to some of my ultraconservative friends, but they should realize that if the thousands of small businesses in the Ninth Minnesota District are forced to the wall by huge organizations of capital, that gradually we will have an economic bureaucracy. I shall do everything in my power in the future as I have in the past, to stop this trend.

HELPED THE AGED

With regard to the aged, the blind, and the dependent children who get payments from Uncle Sam, let me say that in every case I have supported raises for these unfortunate persons. All of us should realize that those who have reached their declining years of life have contributed in some way to the building of America and that the few dollars that they receive for a mere subsistence, they earned in their contributions to American economy. I would like to see the payments to the aged and the blind and the dependent children substantially raised. I always have felt that if we can send $50 to $60 billion to foreign nations in 9 years that we should be able to spend at least part of that amount so that the aged, the blind, and the dependent children could at least have a decent standard of living in this richest nation of the world's history.

FAVORS CUTTING FOREIGN AID

And while we are talking about sending $60 billion overseas in 9 years, let me tell the voters of the Ninth Congressional District of Minnesota that I did not vote for one dime of that foreign aid with this one exception:

I did vote for military aid to Greece and Turkey. I visited Greece in 1945 and I realize that here were two allies who would use military aid to hold off the Russian threats and keep them from taking over the Near East, the Mediterranean Sea, and north Africa.

I have no apologies to make for voting aid to Greece and Turkey, because they have proved with their wonderful armies and their wonderful spirit that that money was well invested.

But I cannot say as much for some of our other so-called European allies. I have voted against continuing to send billions for those nations because I traveled through them several times and know something about the conditions. I think present conditions in the European Defense Community and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization justify my votes against sending these billions of dollars to people who put up signs: "Go home, Yanks."

If your Federal taxes are high because of the fifty to sixty billion dollars sent overseas to these ungrateful nations, you cannot blame United States Representative HAROLD C. HAGEN. I would far prefer to put some of those billions into building schools, into building hospitals, into building roads and highways and farm-to-market roads, into cutting your taxes substantially, and into building an Air Force against which no aggressor would dare to attack us.

If my giveaway Democrat-Farmer-Labor opponents want to attack that record of my voting against billions of dollars to ungrateful foreign nations, they are welcome to do it. I think you farmers, workers, and business and professional people of the 15 northwestern Minnesota counties comprising the Ninth Congressional District will overwhelmingly support my stand.

And I hope the day comes when Congress will quit giving billions of dollars a year to ungrateful nations, most of which, at the turn of a hat, would double-cross us if it paid them and their economy.

Incidentally, I have always voted against trade with the Communist nations, and for appropriations for the House Un-American Activities Committee, which has exposed so many Communists and undercover organizations trying to destroy the American way of life.

MISCELLANEOUS ISSUES

Briefly I voted for and supported the following:

Commodity Credit: Price-support borrowing power raised $1.5 billion.

Stockpiling program: New appropriation of $380 million granted.

Housing Act: Provides lower downpayments, longer mortgage period.

Lease purchase: New program to promote special building for Government use. Cost is less to taxpayers.

St. Lawrence seaway construction.

Ending of wage, price, rent, and materials controls.

Increasing health research funds: Three-year, $182 million hospital program adopted.

The creation of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Increased benefits to veterans and to their dependents.

The extension of social-security coverage to 10 million more citizens and benefits increased. Unemployment insurance expanded to 4 million more persons.

The restoration of offshore tidelands to States while protecting and safeguarding Federal rights.

More State control provided for modern highway and rural road program of almost $2 billion in 1956 and 1957.

A stronger defense program with heavier reliance on atomic weapons and airpower. Voted for establishment of the Air Force Academy.

Shortage of space prevents me from mentioning the details of all the legislation. I will be glad to answer any inquiry from anyone about anything not covered in this report. Just write me a card or letter.

AGAINST POSTAL RATE INCREASE

There are a number of fine daily and weekly newspapers in my district. I am proud to say that, as a member of the House Post Office Committee, and its vice chairman, I have opposed the drastic increase of the postal rates not only for newspapers and magazines, but all postal raises.

The post-office system does many things for the average citizen such as selling Government bonds, duck stamps, postal savings, rural services to farmers, and a host of other activities which mean so much to every man, woman, and child in the Nation.

To me the postal system is a service system and not one which is run as a business with a balanced budget. If the postal system loses $300 million a year that means that each man, woman, and child in the Nation pays $2 a year for the wonderful and marvelous services they get from the post offices of America. I also feel that the fourth-class offices, some of which are being closed, are the neighborhood gathering places and dispense services to small communities; they should not be canceled out for the sake of a few dollars unless as good service can be given by other means.

Again I say that if Uncle Sam can spend 50 to 60 billion dollars in 9 years building up the economy and competition of foreign nations to America that we can well afford to spend one-third of $1 billion a year to give America the many services the post-office system renders.

Furthermore, newspapers and magazines, because they are able to offer themselves to you folks for reasonable prices, make the United States the best informed and best educated nation in all the world, and that is something that cannot be weighed in dollars and cents.

This is just a brief summary of my activities in Congress since I first was elected in 1942.

Let me say to all of you men and women in the Minnesota Ninth District who have so loyally supported me the past 12 years, that I thank you from the bottom of my heart for your votes, and I hope to continue serving you so long as my health and abilities will hold out and as long as you reelect me.

More than 20,000 letters a year come into my office from the Ninth District, and I am proud to say that none of them received at my office ever have remained unanswered. I and my loyal staff try to answer every letter the day it arrives and to get action on any request from any constituent whether he be a Democrat, DFL, or Independent, or Republican. Every letter is read by me and every letter going out is signed by me.

I feel that as your Congressman, Representative **Harold C. Hagen**, that I have a duty to each and every one of you, whether you support me for reelection or not. Please do not hesitate to write me on any official problem you may have and also please write as to your ideas and opinions on the important issues and problems before the country and the Congress so I may have the benefit of your views and suggestions regarding legislation.

I try to get things done, and I think I have built up a reputation of getting things done for every constituent who has asked my aid in the past 12 years.

If I am reelected on November 2, I only pledge to keep running my office efficiently, honestly, and to serve you to the best of my ability as long as I am your Congressman.

Strategic Materials Shipments to Soviet Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. MALONE

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the Record and include a resolution titled "Opposing Shipment of Strategic Materials to Soviet Russia," which was presented by the Department of Pennsylvania at the recent 55th National Encampment of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, held in Philadelphia, Pa., and unanimously adopted by the encampment.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Resolution 301 Opposing Shipment of Strategic Materials to Soviet Russia

Whereas the board of trade of the country of Great Britain has announced that as of May 3, 1954, all restrictions on the sale of rubber to the Soviet Union and her recognized satellite countries be lifted; and

Whereas the United Nations ban on shipments to Red China, North Korea, and Tibet, as well as the non-Communist south China coast ports of Hong Kong and Macao, remain in force; and

Whereas it being the common knowledge of the entire world that the Soviet Russia and her satellites are behind the planning board in this cold war, to overthrow all freedom-loving governments by all means, and by all methods; and

Whereas the shipment of strategic materials to the Soviet Union and her recognized satellite countries by an Allied country at a time when all relations between the East and the West are crucial, would be helping Soviet Russia to build its material strength, thus further endangering the blood and lives of more freedom-loving people: Now, therefore be it

Resolved by the 55th National Encampment of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, That we protest the shipment of all strategic materials to Soviet Russia and her satellite countries.

Benefits for Federal Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFTON (CLIFF) YOUNG

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I have been privileged to represent in Congress a State which has perhaps the highest percentage of Federal employees in the country—more than twice the national ratio.

A sizable number of hardworking, loyal Americans are making a great contribution to the efficient operation of the Federal Government in Boulder City, Babbitt, Reno, Las Vegas, and throughout the State of Nevada.

During the past year I have received letters from many of these employees of the Federal Government, in which they expressed their views and presented constructive suggestions with respect to bills before Congress. I should like, therefore, to summarize the excellent steps which have been taken in behalf of Federal employees by the 83d Congress.

GROUP LIFE INSURANCE

A sound group life insurance plan is now available to Federal employees. The principal features of the plan are:

First. Low-cost insurance without requiring a medical examination.

Second. Voluntary participation, with coverage for term life insurance in an amount of employee's salary raised to the next $1,000.

Third. At a biweekly cost per $1,000 not to exceed 25 cents to the employee and 12½ cents to the Government.

Fourth. Payment of double indemnity for accidental death.

Fifth. Payment for accidental loss of eyesight or limbs.

Sixth. Insurance provided without further cost after retirement on annuity, either for disability or after 15 years of creditable civilian service.

Seventh. Free insurance if employee is 65 years of age or older, with reduced coverage.

Eighth. If an insured employee leaves Government service, the insurance continues in effect for 31 days, during which he may purchase without a medical examination an individual life insurance policy at standard rates.

Ninth. All Federal employees are eligible except (a) noncitizens employed overseas or (b) the small group excluded because of type of employment, such as part time, seasonal, or intermittent employment.

This legislation is a part of the program to improve the Government's personnel system. In signing this measure on August 17, 1954, President Eisenhower urged all eligible employees to give serious consideration to this program as a source of additional economic security for their families.

SOCIAL SECURITY

Old-age and survivors' insurance benefits under the Social Security Act have been extended to over 100,000 additional part-time and temporary Federal employees. Also, the survivorship and retirement benefits of 800,000 Government workers already covered will be increased.

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

Unemployment benefits have been provided for Federal employees for the first time. This valuable financial protection against unemployment will be provided by the Government without cost to the employee, on the same basis as it is available to persons employed in private industry.

Federal civilian employees as a group are subject to the risk of unemployment on nearly the same scale as nongovernmental workers in the same type of work. Involuntarily separated Federal employees in the past have been forced to rely upon accrued annual leave and refund from their retirement accounts while looking for other jobs. This course obviously defeats the purpose of the retirement program, as well as annual leave.

Unemployment compensation will be payable to eligible Federal workers who are unemployed after December 31, 1954. A Federal worker's rights to benefits are to be determined under the unemployment compensation law of the State to which his Federal services and wages are assigned.

I was pleased to support this measure to include Federal employees in the unemployment-insurance system.

SUBSTANTIAL FRINGE BENEFITS

Additional benefits have been provided by the 83d Congress which are of special interest to Federal employees, and which indicate that forward steps have been taken on personnel legislation. These can be summarized as follows:

First. Restrictions on permanent promotions and reinstatements of Federal career employees have been removed, and the statutory limit on the number of permanent employees in the executive branch has been adjusted to meet present-day needs. This modification of the so-called Whitten amendment raises the ceiling on permanent appointments by 10 percent, thereby opening 358,000 permanent jobs. As a result, the promotions and reinstatements of career employees will be made permanent and many thousands of present indefinite employees can achieve permanent career status.

Second. Arbitrary restrictions on the accumulation and use of annual leave have been repealed.

Third. Longevity pay increases have been authorized for all except the three highest classified service grades. This action makes additional pay increases available to many long-time career employees.

Fourth. More equitable overtime pay practices have been established.

Fifth. Crafts, trades, and manual labor positions previously under the Classification Act will be transferred to the wage board pay system, generally resulting in some pay increase for the employees involved.

Sixth. For positions where increased pay is necessary to recruit scarce skills, the Civil Service Commission has been authorized to establish entrance rates above the minimum rates of the grade involved. In the localities and positions where such action is taken, present employees will in many instances receive the benefits of the higher rates as will those being recruited.

Seventh. Temporary increases in annuities of retired Federal workers voted several years ago have been made permanent.

Eighth. Federal employees paid on a per diem basis have been granted the benefit of excused absence with pay like that available to employees paid on an annual basis, when such absence is authorized by administrative order.

Ninth. Government incentive awards programs have been expanded and made applicable to all employees.

PAY BILLS

Mr. Speaker, during the early months of this session of Congress, I gave careful study to the existing pay rates for postal and other Federal employees in relation to the cost-of-living index. It was my conclusion that a raise in pay should be provided for these workers, and I submitted testimony to this effect, urging the House committee to report a bill. Thereafter I supported the measure to increase the pay of postal workers, and also the measure subsequently considered and passed to provide salary increases to classified, postal and other employees of the Government, and for other purposes.

The final form of the latter measure was considered during the closing days of the 83d Congress. It provided for a 5 percent general pay increase, but lacked provision for the correction of existing inequities in Federal pay scales. These provisions were proposed to improve the civil service system, reward individual merit, and provide steady pay increases for Federal employees.

In withholding approval of this measure as inadequate to meet the vital and urgent need of legislation for pay increases and classification adjustments, the President stated his intention to pursue this objective next January when the 84th Congress convenes.

Mr. Speaker, at this time Federal employees know that the 83d Congress recognized the real value of their service to the efficient functioning of our vast governmental operations. The enactment of the legislative program to which I have referred in detail reflects the notable progress made toward the development of a personnel system that will attract and hold competent men and women in public service.

Furthermore, this group of workers shares with all citizens of our country the many benefits of legislative action which reduced taxes, expanded hospital and health facilities, encouraged home ownership, as well as the benefits of ever increasing security made possible by the extensive legislative program enacted by the 83d Congress.

Republican Social Security Law Benefits Millions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD M. SIMPSON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the Republican 83d Congress accomplished an historic expansion of social security, bringing into the program in one instance millions of the Nation's farm owners and workers as well as providing dependency and survivors benefits to their spouses and dependent children.

As a result of this and other improvements in social security, more than 6.4 million Americans already receiving benefits will get larger benefit checks starting October of this year.

In a short time, also, a total of 10 million more Americans, including farmers who previously were ineligible, will start building credits toward retirement and survivorship benefits in their own social security accounts to help them through their years of retirement, or to ease the burden of their widows and dependent children.

The improvements in social security approved by the Republican Congress are the most extensive in the history of this program. The Congress has substantially expanded the coverage provisions of the law so that we have achieved virtually universal coverage under the OASI program.

Taking cognizance of the rise in living standards in the Nation, the Republican Party designed a social-security program that would provide more adequate benefits.

For instance, maximum monthly benefits for families dependent upon social security as a result of the death of the head of the family, were increased from $168.75 per month to $200.

Let us look at what this means in the way of security for the family of a young worker with an average covered earnings of $300 a month. The family would include 3 children, ages 7, 5, and 2. If this worker should die his widow would receive:

(a) An initial lump-sum payment of $255.

(b) Two hundred dollars per month for the first 11 years—until the eldest child reaches 18 years of age.

(c) One hundred and ninety-seven dollars per month for the next 2 years.

(d) One hundred and forty-seven dollars per month for the next 3 years.

(e) Seventy-three dollars per month for life, beginning at age 65.

Under the old law the maximum payment for single retired workers was $85 per month. The maximum payment for a husband and wife, both over 65, was $127.50. As a result of the Republican revision single workers already retired at the maximum will now receive $98 a month. A husband and wife will receive $147 a month. Single workers planning retirement in the future, will receive $108 per month, provided their average annual earnings are $4,200 per year. Husband and wife, both age 65 or more, can receive as much as $162 per month.

In addition, a retired worker can earn outside his social-security payments as much as $1,200 per year without loss of any benefits; and at age 72, instead of 75, all restrictions on outside earnings are lifted.

Our farmers—long neglected in social-security planning by previous Congresses—now for the first time in our history have full partnership in a program that is designed to ease the burden of their own retirement, or the dependency of those who outlive them.

For the first time, self-employed farm owners and operators—3,600,000 of them—are now covered by old-age and survivors insurance protection—and this means their wives and children as well.

Farm workers, more than 2 million of them, for the first time are now participants in social security. The Republican improvements in social security extend coverage to all farm workers who earn $100 or more a year while working for one or more farm owner.

For all of our agricultural workers included in the expanded social-security program the new benefits accrue quickly.

A farm worker at or near 65 years of age must have 6 quarters of coverage after January 1, 1955, to qualify.

For example, a single farm worker with an average wage of $150 per month, would draw monthly retirement benefits, at age of 65, of $68 per month. If the worker is married and his wife is 65 he would receive $102 a month. The maximum benefits for farmers based on an annual earning of $4,200 per year, would be $108 for a single retired person or $162 per month for husband and wife, both age 65.

For a self-employed farm operator, the retirement date is 1956, at age 65. Paying his own social-security tax on annual earnings of $400 or more, the self-employed farm operator is also eligible for the the maximum monthly benefit of $108.50, assuming that his earnings for 18 months prior of mid-1956 are at an annual rate of $4,200. If less, the benefits on retirement will be below the maximum monthly payment of $108.50.

By increasing coverage for 10 million more Americans, the Republican Congress brought into the program, in addition to our American farmers, 200,000 domestic workers; 250,000 ministers; 100,000 additional homeworkers; 50,000 fishermen; 100,000 employees of foreign subsidiaries; 100,000 accountants, architects, engineers, and morticians; 50,000 miscellaneous employment groups; 150,000 Federal employees not otherwise covered, plus 3,500,000 State and local government employees.

Many other additional equitable refinements to social-security payments were adopted by the Republican 83d Congress.

In the event of total disability, a worker no longer suffers a loss in the accumulation of benefit payments for the period of his disability. Nor are the 5 years of lowest income to be computed in the accumulation of social-security credits for employment.

The law governing Federal payments to States for old-age assistance, aid to dependent children, and aid to the blind and permanently disabled was scheduled to expire on September 30, 1954. This was extended through 1956 to allow the Congress to give the subject further study, and to continue increased benefits to those eligible for aid, who also have to meet the higher cost of living which was the harvest of continued inflation and waste for two decades before the new administration took office.

For those widowed, survivors benefits have been boosted so that, on the basis of the deceased husband's earnings, the payments will be more in line with the higher cost of living. A widow, with 1 child, now drawing $127.60 per month, will receive monthly payments of $147.80 hereafter.

For domestic servants, the social-security law has been simplified to provide for eligibility if the earning is at least $50 in cash wages in any 3-month period.

Previously, social-security benefits for a widowed woman with 2 children, based on the deceased husband's earnings ranged from $45 a month to $169.90. his range has been broadened, with an increase to $50.20 per month at the base, to $197.10 for a mother with 2 dependent children.

Not a single retired social-security worker eligible for benefits was neglected by the Republican 83d Congress. Each 1 of the 6½ million previously on the rolls is eligible for at least a $5 a month increase in benefits payments. The range increases up to almost $20 a month for the single retired person under the new program.

For families, the basic increase ranges from a rockbottom boost in payments of $6 a month to an increase of more than $20 per month.

The improvements in social-security legislation were also designed so that those presently on the rolls or who will be added to the rolls in the future need do nothing themselves to acuire the increased benefits due them. The administration of the social-security agency will automatically increase the payments for all receiving benefits.

For those approaching retirement age who are presently contributing earnings to the social-security system at the maximum covered wage of $300 per month, the payment upon retirement is $98.50 per month.

For the farmers and other self-employed who have been added to social-security rolls by the Republican 83d Congress, the first report on their earnings for social-security coverage is to be filed in conjunction with income-tax payments in April 1955.

Social-security tax, designed to pay for the increased coverage, is to be paid when a self-employed worker or farmer earns more than $400 per year.

The total annual earnings on which benefits will be computed in the future were extended from $3,600 to $4,200 for eligibility in drawing maximum benefits.

As a result of the efforts of the Republican 83d Congress, most of the inequalities in social-security coverage were eliminated—eliminated in less than 18 months after years of procrastination by previous administrations.

Now our farmers, long desirous of social-security eligibility, our ministers, homeworkers, and others who sought social-security equality with their fellow Americans, have had their pleas answered—answered by sensible, considerate, and equitable improvements in social security, improvements which were designed to benefit more of our citizens at a lower cost to all of us.

The Jewish New Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, with the approach of the Jewish New Year which will be widely and appropriately celebrated by a very substantial number of citizens, I, as their Congressman, would like to extend the following greeting to my constituents; "On this Jewish New Year, 5715, may I wish you and your families a New Year of peace and happiness that will bring fulfillment of all your dearest wishes."

Buffalo Harbor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDMUND P. RADWAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. RADWAN. Mr. Speaker, the gratifying announcement that Buffalo is to receive a substantial Federal appropriation for its harbor this year represents an excellent opportunity to reassess our whole port picture.

As in the case of other leading ports of the Nation, we are constantly confronted with problems which must be met and solved if we are to maintain our preeminence as a port. Some of these problems arise out of the passage of the St. Lawrence seaway bill. Others existed long before the St. Lawrence represented a practical possibility.

First and foremost of these problems, in my opinion, is that of securing appropriations to complete existing authorized projects specifically for the improvement of Buffalo Harbor. This year we have been able to secure the first appropriation for that purpose in 3 years. It is, I believe, the largest appropriation yet received for these current projects. And the administration has recommended an even larger appropriation for the next fiscal year. For the first time, we are making substantial progress toward completion.

When completed, these projects will provide greatly needed additional depths for existing commerce of the type that has made the port of Buffalo great. But in addition these depths have the effect of better adapting the port to any potential St. Lawrence seaway commerce, because that is essentially a deep-water project.

New project authorizations may be needed to implement the St. Lawrence seaway. They should be thoroughly surveyed and enacted by Congress, if warranted. We shall continue to be vigilant in that connection and to cooperate with local interests in procuring deserved Federal assistance. This includes Federal initiative in the replacement of the Ohio Street Bridge over the Buffalo River, probably one of the worst obstructions to navigation in the United States.

There are other port problems which we must face up to and attack as purely local matters, if we are to meet the competition of other Great Lakes ports. Any worthwhile program for the port of Buffalo should include the following:

First. A survey of new traffic patterns.

Second. An examination of the need, if any, for a municipal St. Lawrence type terminal to supplement existing facilities.

Third. The stimulation of new trade.

Fourth. The construction of new outer harbor terminals in aid of existing Lakes traffic.

Fifth. Beautification of the whole waterfront for recreational purposes.

Sixth. Rehabilitation of blighted reaches of the harbor.

Seventh. Revival of passenger traffic out of Buffalo.

In this entire program for the port of Buffalo, it is important to point out that the problem is primarily a local one. The initiative lies with the city, the mayor, and the common council. Such initiative properly taken will require the cooperation of other communities, outside of the city of Buffalo; the Chamber of Commerce of the City of Buffalo, as well as the interest, time, and cooperation of all civic-minded citizens.

Your Federal Government, as represented by your Congressman, can fulfill an important supporting role in some instances, but only a supporting role. A Congressman is merely the agent of the people's will. For example, the harbor funds that Buffalo will receive as a result of the appropriation were obtained because the people of the city of Buffalo united and demanded their proper share of such Federal appropriations. Without the help of the people at home, the newspapers, representatives of labor and industry, and the chamber of commerce, your Congressman would meet with little success in achieving present good news. Another example, the creation of new deep-water terminals and recreational areas in the outer harbor involves the creation of a new land mass from the existing shore line to tthe harbor line. There exists no better way of accomplishing this than by use of the rock and earth generated under Federal dredging contracts. The Federal appropriation we have just received makes it possible for the city to make an appropriate arrangement with the United States in that direction. Here again I must emphasize that the initiative lies with the city.

Recognition of the respective roles played by your city and by your Congressman in the matter of port development represents perhaps the biggest step forward in the accomplishment of results.

Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED E. BUSBEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 3, 1954

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, on June 14, 1954, the President approved House Joint Resolution 243, to amend the pledge of allegiance to the flag of the United States of America, by inserting the words "under God" after the word "Nation." This resolution had been unanimously adopted by both the House and the Senate and became Public Law 396 of the 83d Congress. The law now reads as follows:

> SEC. 7. The following is designated as the pledge of allegiance to the flag: "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the Republic for which it stands, one Nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all." Such pledge should be rendered by standing with the right hand over the heart. However, civilians will always show full respect to the flag when the pledge is given by merely standing at attention, men removing the headdress. Persons in uniform shall render the military salute.

Throughout the ages, the greatest blessings of life have come to mankind "under God." The inclusion of these words in our oath of allegiance has added a sacredness which makes our pledge even more inspiring. Our success as a Nation is due to our recognition of God, our faith in that divine source of strength, and our dependence upon Him for guidance.

As we pledge our allegiance to the flag "under God," we proclaim the dedication of our Nation and its people to the Almighty. Let us always remember that devotion to God by this and all other nations of the free world will ultimately mean victory and security against the forces of evil which deny God.

Mr. Speaker, because I have received may inquiries from my district regarding the present wording of the pledge of allegiance, I am inserting it in the Record at this point, so that I may have reprints made at my own expense and make it available to residents of my congressional district.

Fight for Full Parity Must Continue—Hagen Speaks Up for 90 to 100 Percent Parity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 3, 1954

Mr. HAGEN of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, some of my Democratic Farmer-Labor opponents in this 1954 congressional race are misrepresenting to the men and women of the Ninth District the position of Harold C. Hagen on various issues and problems—and particularly with regard to the farm program.

They are falsely telling them that I was not for 90 percent parity for farm products. They complain and criticize. The are just now talking 90 percent.

But United States Representative Harold C. Hagen has been advocating, fighting for, and speaking up for full parity for 20 years. He has made dozens of talks to business groups, Rotary Clubs, Lions' Clubs, civic and commerce groups, women's clubs, as well as farm groups explaining why full parity is justified and necessary. None of my now critical DFL opponents have a record of this kind. In fact, they are only newcomers in this fight for parity of any kind. Furthermore, Adlai Stevenson, the Democratic Party leader gives them no support on 90 to 100 percent parity.

I think virtually every voter in the Ninth District received my campaign newspaper for 1952, the Ninth District Congressional Gazette. On the front page in large type, three columns wide, is this headline: "Hagen Asks 100 Percent Farm Price Parity."

Further down under this headline are these words:

> Hagen is fully aware of the fact that a healthy and prosperous agriculture means a prosperous economy and is in the best interests of all our citizens.
>
> Bankrupt farmers and prosperity simply do not go together. What the farmers need and want is 100-percent parity for farm production and less bureaucratic meddling.

I have been in the House of Representatives, representing you, since the election of 1942. In each campaign I have issued a newspaper, sent to all the homes in my district, and in every instance, I have advocated full parity of 100 percent for the farmers of my district, my State, and the whole Nation. And, of course, we must accept some less and reduced acreage if and when the crop production is high, but this reduction should be greater for the big farmers and less for the small family-size farmer. In other words let us give the small farmer a chance to make a decent living.

During the campaign you will receive another campaign newspaper, issued by my volunteer committee, with photographs and proof of the headlines from my previous campaign papers, and with facts and references exposing any opponent who deliberately may present falsehoods to you when they try to misrepresent my stand on agriculture. Furthermore, contrary to political gossip or newspaper stories, I have never missed a rollcall in the House on a farm-parity vote or issue.

The Ninth Congressional District is composed of 15 counties in the northwestern portion of Minnesota and is mostly a farming region, called many years ago the breadbasket of the world.

Every druggist, gas-station operator, storekeeper, tailor, doctor, lawyer, worker, newspaperman—in fact almost every person in these 15 counties is absolutely and directly dependent upon the farmer and on agriculture for his or her living. There can be no argument or question about this. Everyone of you realize that if all the land in the 15 counties of the Ninth Minnesota Congressional District tomorrow turned to dry white sand, and so could not produce forestry products, food, fiber, meat, and other agricultural products, that every village and city in those 15 counties would be a hollow shell. The district would be full of ghost towns within a few months.

My record on all legislation and laws pertaining to agriculture is an open book, of which I am proud.

Not only have I always voted for 90 percent and even higher supports and spoke up for any law, bill, or proposal which would help agriculture, thus benefiting everybody in the Ninth District, but I have been a leader in writing many of these laws and pressing for their passage in my 12 years as your United States Representative in Congress. I have introduced several important farm legislative proposals and many have been approved.

ALWAYS SUPPORTED REA

This also is true in the case of the programs for rural electrification of farms and telephones for rural areas. When I was a comparative youngster on my grandfather's farm in Pennington County and on my Uncle Jacob Brovold's farm in Johnson Township in Polk County, only 2 or 3 percent of the farms in northwestern Minnesota were electrified. Today, due to the REA, which I have enthusiastically supported in all my public life, the wives of most farmers do much of their work with electricity and the men of the farms are able to produce far more food with far less help than in the olden days of hand labor.

I am proud of my record on REA, and for the rural telephone program, and I will never be satisfied until every farm in these 15 northwest Minnesota counties have electricity and telephone service, provided the farmer and his wife want those services. I have always voted for and spoke up for these programs which should be expanded.

As the farm and REA leaders well know, I have always supported the preference clause in the Federal power policy and program. I have fought for and often spoke for the appropriations necessary to build high transmission lines into Minnesota from Missouri River dams so Minnesota people can get more low-cost electricity and power.

When my opponents attack our record in this Congress, let them explain how we reduced taxes by $7,400,000,000 this year, the largest tax cut the American people ever enjoyed in a single year.

Your individual income taxes were reduced by about 10 percent beginning January 1, 1954, the first tax cut since the Republican 80th Congress of 1947–48. I voted to slash Government spending by billions of dollars, and the present administration's budget was $10 billion—ten thousand million dollars—under the Truman budget.

I am very proud that, in this new tax reform bill, I was a coauthor of some of the provisions and amendments which greatly benefited every farmer in my district.

Under this new tax law farmers can claim the $600 dependency deduction for a child, regardless of the child's earnings, if such dependent is receiving on-the-farm training and the farmer continues to furnish more than one-half of his support.

This new tax law also allows farmers deductions up to 25 percent of farm income for soil and water conservation and flood-control expenses, even though it may be an assessment payable to a conservancy district or some other civil unit, agency, or association. I was the author of this provision, and I fought it through the Congress to adoption.

More rapid writeoff of the cost of new depreciable assets is given on farm machinery, equipment, and so forth. Under the declining-balance method of depreciation now permitted, the farmer can write off in the first year twice the amount allowed under the straight-line method. Another benefit is the removal of the tax on proceeds from sale of cattle, when the sale is necessitated by disease, provided the proceeds are reinvested in cattle within 1 year after the closing of the taxable year.

Previously, where a farmer did not file a declaration of estimated tax by January 15, he had to file his final income-tax return by January 31. This deadline is now extended to February 15 and his final return is now not due until April 15.

Farmers' accounting requirements have been eased to permit the use of the farmer-preferred hybrid bookkeeping system.

Another law I voted for provided for rapid amortization of farm grain-storage facilities, whereas before, such facilities could be amortized only over their useful life. This now can be done over a 5-year period.

OPPOSED DAIRY-SUPPORT CUT

I have disagreed very strongly with Secretary of Agriculture Benson over his slash to 75 percent of parity for the dairy products of my district.

It is my firm belief that while the price of what the farmer buys, especially machinery, fertilizer, repairs and other products containing steel, continues to rise, and the price of what the farmer sells continues to drop, that we are going to have lots of trouble in the farm belt. This trend must be reversed, and something will have to be done in the next Congress.

I did everything in my power to stop this drastic slash to the farmers, but many of the city-machine Democrats of the North and some other Democrats and Republicans who believed wrongfully that the farmer gets a major portion of what the consumer pays for food, were largely responsible for sliding through Congress the 82½- to 90-percent parity amendment.

But, in justice to the present Republican administration, it should be remembered that from February 1951, to January 1953, the farm price average dropped 17 percent. Since January 1953, when Eisenhower took office, the drop has been less than 8 percent. The drop was more than twice as much during the Democratic administration.

WOOL PARITY 90 PERCENT

There are a number of wool producers in the Ninth Congressional District and I am happy to say that I supported, and it now is law, 90-percent parity on wool.

Congress decided to vote this support for woolgrowers because of the reciprocal trade treaty laws, strongly supported by Democrats over the years. These laws have often harmed Minnesota agriculture.

This law first was passed in 1934 and provided that the Secretary of State can make treaties with other nations cutting our tariffs as much as 50 percent—later 75 percent—without any protection to the farmer, and little to the industries of America.

Because of treaties signed under this Democratic law—wool shipments from Australia, New Zealand, Argentina, and other nations—paralyzed the wool market for domestic producers. Canadians still ship barley, wheat, oats, and other grains into Minnesota and this lowers our markets.

In the Orient, the workers are paid from 30 to 80 cents a day in American values, and shiploads of coconut, palm, and cottonseed oils have come into these United States produced by that cheap labor.

Also butter, cheese, meat, and other farm products have come from nations where the scale of wages for workers is about one-third of what Americans receive.

I could mention many instances where American agriculture and American industry have been hard hit by the cheap labor products of various nations. For example, in Japan the average wage for a worker who produces cotton cloth is 13 cents an hour, and in India it is 9 cents an hour. This is only one striking illustration of the DFL ideas of reciprocal trade. It was not until 1947, when the Republicans had control of Congress, that amendments were made to the reciprocal trade treaty law, which provided that, when American industries were being destroyed, the Tariff Commission could recommend to the President that these low tariff rates be suspended. Generally, the Democrats opposed this so-called peril-point amendment.

If anyone desires further information on any problem not mentioned in this message, just drop me a card or a letter. My address is: United States Representative Harold C. Hagen, 205 Post Office Building, Crookston, Minn.

My office there is open daily when Congress is not in session and you are invited to come in to see me at any time.

The Honorable Thomas E. Martin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD M. SIMPSON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, one of the most able Members of the House will complete his distinguished service as a Representative with the expiration of this Congress, but will return in the 84th Congress as a Member of the United States Senate.

I refer to the Honorable Thomas E. Martin, Congressman from the First District of Iowa. Since January 1939 he has been one of our most capable Members. Accountant, lawyer, farmer, statesman—these are the accomplishments one should stress in attempting to describe Tom Martin. Before he came to the House he served outstandingly as mayor of Iowa City. He has long been active in State and National Republican affairs.

Mr. Martin's service in the House of Representatives has been marked by a devotion to duty and a capacity for detail. He became a member of the Committee on Ways and Means in 1947. He has always actively and zealously fostered the welfare of the farmer, the businessman, and the worker. He has worked diligently to strengthen and improve our social-security system and to protect our domestic workers and producers from excessive imports of foreign goods produced by cheap foreign labor.

One of the accomplishments for which he will be remembered as a Member of the House is the National Stockpile Act, which became public law in 1939. Mr. MARTIN was one of the sponsors and, in fact, is known as the father of our national program of stockpiling strategic war materials. He has always been an outspoken proponent of national preparedness. He achieved a splendid record as a commissioned officer in the United States Army in World War I, and has a son who served as an officer in World War II and the Korean conflict.

While serving the Nation through his important committee assiguments, Mr. MARTIN has also conscientiously represented the interests of his Iowa constituents. His devotion to the progress of his State and the welfare of its people stems from the fact that the Martins are a pioneer Iowa family. His great-grandfather settled in Monroe County, Iowa, in 1843.

As a colleague of TOM MARTIN in the House of Representatives and on the Committee on Ways and Means, I regret his decision not to seek reelection as Representative of the First Congressional District of Iowa. However, I am confident that when he takes the oath of office next January as the junior Senator from Iowa, he will continue his illustrious career as a legislator and a statesman.

The Poor Must Wait

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, from now until election day the air will be blue with political arguments over the work of the 83d Congress—whether it was as good a Congress as the Republicans are trying to claim or as bad as the Democrats insist.

Of course, both sides will have a lot of convincing arguments for particular groups.

In other words, the Republicans—as usual—should get enthusiastic support for their efforts and their record in Wall Street, in the big utility combines, in the board rooms of the giant corporations, and in the realm of the rich generally. For this has certainly been a Congress determined to give to the wealthy every conceivable kind of special consideration on everything from taxes to the exploitation of natural resources.

But what about the rank and file of the people? When they look at the results of the work of this Congress, they see little indeed in the way of accomplishments which benefit the people generally.

The one big achievement—virtually the only one—has been a series of amendments to the Social Security Act. These improvements, in line with the steady progress made by the Democrats over the years in keeping the Social Security Act abreast of changing requirements, found the Republican Party for the first time on our side in this respect.

In 1936 the Republicans promised in their platform to repeal social security. In Congress after Congress after that time, Republican Members voted against expanding coverage and improving benefits. In the 80th Congress, which they controlled, they tried to take away social security from nearly a million persons.

This year they came around to supporting the Democratic view on social security. And that represents one of the very few achievements of this Congress in behalf of the people.

It was a Congress which did absolutely nothing about improving the level of unemployment compensation benefits, despite an alarming increase in joblessness. It was a Congress which failed utterly to take effective steps toward restoring prosperity. It was a Congress which refused to raise income-tax exemptions, but insisted instead on giving all real tax relief to corporations and their big stockholders. Some people—those who have suffered serious hard luck—get minor adjustments in their taxes, but the average wage earner will keep on paying present high rates without any break.

But Congress alone is not entirely to blame. It has had no real leadership from the administration in seeking to correct economic dislocations. The Republican Party, of course, have never been noted for its ability to handle bad times.

So, when the Republicans boast about this Congress, they—as usual—will convince the well-to-do. And when the Democrats protest about the failures of this Congress, I suppose no one will agree with us except—as usual—the rank and file of the people. They can see how bad a failure this Congress has been just by looking at their own family budgets and bank accounts.

Report of Hon. Don Magnuson, of Washington, to Constituents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, in the 2 sessions of the 83d Congress, it has been my privilege and honor to represent the people of the great State of Washington in the House of Representatives.

With the closing of the second of those sessions, I consider it fitting that I give here something of an accounting of my efforts of the past 2 years, so that my constituents better may judge the work which I have done. This report will deal only with such subjects as have specific local applications to the State of Washington.

As Congressman at Large, I represent all the people of my State. Washington has almost 2,500,000 residents, and this means that I have, I believe, the largest constituency of all the Members of this body save one. To that constituency I address this accounting, necessarily brief and incomplete:

MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

As a member of this great committee, I am gravely aware of the low estate to which our merchant marine and our shipbuilding industry have fallen. I worked vigorously to improve this situation and gave my support to the several measures approved by the 83d Congress to that end. They were few enough, but a start. I also supported the allocation of some $3 million a year from fish-products-tariff revenue to research in the important fisheries industry and was active on behalf of other measures I considered beneficial to our fisheries.

I am gratified to have been named to a subcommittee which will hold hearings later this fall on the west coast in an attempt to find a solution to the perplexing problem of the deterioration of our shipbuilding industry.

PUBLIC POWER

It is no secret—either here in this body or in my home State—that I am a strong supporter of public power. That inexpensive public power is the key which unlocked the golden door of economic and industrial expansion of my State and the entire Pacific Northwest is not arguable. I introduced a bill for Federal construction of Hells Canyon Dam—it is gathering dust, as was inevitable—urged the fastest possible completion of dams now building, did everything possible to obtain adequate funds for the Bonneville Power Administration and resisted with all my strength the no-new-starts policy of this administration and the various administrative blows at public power in the Northwest.

PRIEST RAPIDS DAM

The Priest Rapids law, of which I was cosponsor in the House, proposes what might be termed a slightly modified form of public power. It gives local public agencies the opportunity to finance and construct this great dam on the Columbia River for integration into the comprehensive plan of development. I sponsored the legislation when it became apparent that there was no other immediate prospect for meeting the grave shortage of electricity which is threatening the Northwest. If financing indeed becomes available, as we have been assured it will, this well could be the most important piece of legislation enacted by the 83d Congress insofar as the people of the State of Washington are concerned.

FORT LEWIS SEWAGE TREATMENT

I was fortunate enough to persuade the House Armed Services Committee that the pollution of Puget Sound by Fort Lewis sewage—in violation of State law—was both reprehensible and dangerous to health. As a result, the committee and the Congress authorized construction of a sewage-treatment plant at Fort Lewis, and later appropriated the necessary funds—$793,000—to pay for it. A most serious situation of long standing, which for years has defied correction, soon will be eliminated.

RECLAMATION

The staggering financial blow which the administration's original budget struck at the Columbia Basin reclamation project startled and dismayed my entire State. Cutting the Reclamation Bureau's request almost in half, the budget proposal would have disrupted utterly the orderly development of the project. With other members of Washington's delegation, I went to bat for the Columbia Basin. A substantial increase in the appropriation resulted, and the same was true of the Roza division of the Yakima project.

RIVERS AND HARBORS, ZINTEL CANYON

Washington was exceptionally well treated in the 1954 omnibus rivers and harbors law in point of the number of projects authorized. I testified on behalf of all the projects ultimately included in the law and find it gratifying that they were approved. Funds with which to carry them out must await another Congress, but authorization is at least a long first step. In the case of Tacoma's port industrial waterway, among the projects authorized, my State's Senators even were successful in amending the supplemental appropriations bill to include the appropriation required, but the House Appropriations Committee knocked out these funds.

In this same general field, the Corps of Engineers, at my request, was directed to survey Zintel Canyon, in the Horse Heaven Hills, for flood-control possibilities. Waters from this canyon periodically flood and damage the city of Kennewick.

NONLEGISLATIVE

The nonlegislative duties of a Member of Congress can be counted by the score each day. Most are for individuals, some are for industries, some are for entire communities. Again, just touching the high spots, I should like to mention that I have participated in the effort, gratifyingly successful, to maintain a stable work schedule at the Puget Sound Naval Shipyard; in the successful drive to obtain approval of a new terminal post office for Seattle; in obtaining a market for Cle Elum-Roslyn coal; in the arrangements for storing grain in the reserve fleets at Olympia and Astoria, which not only provided profitable activity for men at the ports of Tacoma, Seattle, and Vancouver, but also put those idle vessels to work; in gaining substantial additional military sea transport service activity for Puget Sound; in attempts to solve the economic problem created for the Port Townsend area by the closure of Fort Worden.

I have resisted, in those cases where I thought opposition was justified, the steady parade of removals of Federal offices and activities from my State. The administration, I would observe, seems bent on making Washington a poor stepchild of California.

Finally, I should like to take this means of informing my constituents that my Washington, D. C., office will remain open, and that I shall be in the State from now until near the year's end, with offices in the United States Courthouse, Seattle.

The Honorable Carl T. Curtis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD M. SIMPSON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, for the past 16 years the First Congressional District of Nebraska has been ably represented in the House of Representatives by my distinguished friend and colleague, the Honorable CARL T. CURTIS. It is with great regret that I wish to advise you that this is the last Congress in which Mr. CURTIS will be a Representative. Our loss, however, is the Senate's gain. Mr. CURTIS will surely serve in the 84th Congress, but in a different capacity, that as the junior Senator from Nebraska.

Although only 49 years old, CARL is dean of the Nebraska congressional delegation. He enjoys a long record of achievement in the House of Representatives. I predict that his service in the United States Senate will be marked by the same integrity, industry, and capacity as a legislator and statesman which he evidenced as a Congressman.

I believe all Members of the House know that Mr. CURTIS was elected to the 76th Congress and took office January 3, 1939. It is also well known that he became a member of the Ways and Means Committee in 1945. However, as one of those who has had the privilege of knowing CARL CURTIS intimately, as a colleague and friend, I want to bring to your attention and the attention of the country some of his achievements which, because of his innate modesty, Mr. CURTIS may have permitted to be overlooked.

I served with CARL CURTIS on the Ways and Means Committee and have first-hand knowledge of his influence upon legislation affecting the entire Nation. Not only is he an outstanding authority on social security, but he has also been the author of many provisions in our Federal tax laws which have aided the farmer and the businessman. His interest in the youth of America, as a family man, has made him particularly active in supporting the 4-H groups.

It is doubtful, to my mind, that any congressional district in the United States has ever been more ably served than has the First Congressional District of Nebraska, during the busy and fruitful years Mr. CURTIS has represented its interests here in Washington. Now that he has been called upon by his State to serve in the United States Senate, we in the House will miss his forceful personality and cheerful friendliness. However, I feel sure that all Members on both sides of the aisle will join with me in wishing CARL CURTIS continued success in the discharge of his new responsibilities.

The First Congressional District of Nebraska is losing an excellent Congressman, but the entire State of Nebraska will gain a most able and qualified Senator.

Farm Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN B. BENNETT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I voted against the farm bill providing for flexible price supports when it was before the House recently and was against the conference report, which was even worse than the original bill which passed the House. The prosperity and stability of American agriculture is one of the most important domestic problems which has faced this Congress. What is good for agriculture is good for every other segment of our economy and the country as a whole. What is bad for agriculture is, likewise, bad for the remainder of our economy. It is a matter of fact our national welfare and prosperity depends in large degree on the welfare and prosperity of the American farmer.

Secretary of Agriculture Benson made a serious mistake on April 1, of this year when he reduced the support level on dairy products to 75 percent of parity. This action on the part of the Secretary of Agriculture has caused the dairy farmers of my district—and elsewhere around the country—considerable hardship and loss of income. That is the reason I introduced a bill to forbid the Secretary of Agriculture to reduce the support level on dairy products by more than 5 percent in any one year. That is also the reason I supported the amendment of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. O'KONSKI] to restore the 90 percent parity level for dairy products. In all fairness, this amendment should have been adopted and I regret very much that it was rejected.

The advocates of a flexible support program tell us this action is necessary in order to reduce surpluses of dairy products which are now on hand; but, the truth is that a flexible program may have just the opposite effect. The best and most effective way to unload the surplus of dairy products which the Government has on hand is to dispose of it through school lunch programs; various public welfare programs; and to permit people who are receiving old-age assistance and other forms of public aid to buy these products at prices they can afford to pay. I am sponsoring a bill which would provide for the disposal of surplus food stocks in this very manner.

It is true that surpluses of farm products are troublesome, but we should thank God we live in a land of plenty rather than a land of scarcity. The farmers and the support program are being blamed for these surpluses—but nothing could be further from the truth. The truth is that the present surplus is caused not by the support program, nor by the farmer, but by the Government, itself. During the war period our Government pleaded with the farmer to increase their plants in order to provide necessary food and fiber for our own people and for our allies. Our farmers responded patriotically and produced to the fullest extent. After the war it was the policy of the Government to rehabilitate our allies and supply them with food. With American aid European farms were restored and the productivity reestablished. Since that time the need for export of farm commodities has not been as great. Surely the farmer cannot be blamed for doing the very thing his Government asked him to do.

Mr. Speaker, we have invested billions of dollars during the last decade in materiels of war. These materiels are not charged as surplus against American industry. Food is also a materiel of war and, therefore, its present abundance should not be charged against the farm program which has protected not only the farmer but every segment of our economy.

It has also been charged that agriculture has been and is subsidized more than any other part of our economy. Nothing could be further from the truth. The truth is that since the beginning of World War II subsidies related to our war production have cost some $45 billion. Yet, our country's farm price support and surplus removal operations in the last 20 years have only cost $3½ billion—less than 1 percent of the total value of the crop and livestock marketed.

It is also argued that a flexible system would result in lower living costs. This, too, has been proven a fallacy. Let us take a look at a few items on today's prices. If cotton were reduced to 75 percent of parity, it would lower the price about 5 cents per pound. The average amount of raw cotton in a shirt is three-quarters of a pound. This would save the consumer 4 cents on a $2.50 shirt; a housedress three-quarters of a pound saving consumer 4 cents on a $2.98 or $4.98 dress. A similar small saving would be made on other cotton goods.

Let us take a look at wheat. The value of the farmer's wheat is a 1-pound loaf of bread in 1953 was 2½ cents. The average sale of 1-pound loaves during 1953 was 60.4 cents. The farmer would have to reduce the price of wheat 80 cents per bushel to save the consumer 1 cent per loaf.

In 1952 the price of the farmer's tobacco going into cigarettes averaged about 55 cents per pound. The farmer's share in a regular size package was 3.3 cents. To save the consumer 1 cent per package of cigarettes the farmer would have to reduce his price over 15 cents per pound. Likewise the 75 percent level on dairy products leaves little, if any, saving to the ultimate consumer, but it will mean a tremendous financial loss to the farmer.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to make one final argument. These proponents of the flexible system contend that the 90 percent support program is pricing our farm goods out of the world market. There may be some truth in this contention, but it is likewise true that our industrial goods and finished products are also being priced out of the world market for the simple and obvious reason that our wage scale on the farm and in the factory is at much higher levels than in any other place on the face of the globe. We cannot compete with slave wage rates which are paid in foreign countries. Therefore the argument that farm prices are too high for export does not hold water. The farmer cannot walk alone. He cannot be asked to sell his products in a free market and buy them in a protected market. All the American farmer wants is a fair and equal chance.

The Automobile Industry: In War or Peace a Productive and Dependable Giant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, there never has been any question in my mind, since the time I first entered the House in 1935, as to the importance and the preeminence of the automobile industry in the free American way of life. I have watched the city of Detroit and the State of Michigan and the entire Nation grow in strength and vigor and prosperity because of the automobile. We have seen how, heretofore, in line with increased standards of living and lowered production costs, almost every family either owns or can look forward to owning a motorcar. We know that the automobile has become the symbol of Yankee ingenuity and genius, no matter in what section of this earth you may go.

The automobile is as truly and typically American as is soda pop on a warm summer afternoon or baseball or hamburgers and hot dogs.

The automobile industry is one of the sturdiest props upon which our entire economic structure rests. Yet, in 1954, it is in trouble.

Earlier this year, Mr. Speaker, while this House was debating passage of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, I spoke out in behalf of the area from which I come and which I have served in Congress for 18 years. These were my words:

> I want to make a special appeal to the Members of the House today in the name of the great automobile industry, which is located in the Great Lakes area. The automobile industry has brought wealth into the economy and a change into the lives of the people of almost every section of the world. It has done a tremendous job for the United States. It has increased real estate values in every section of the country. Almost everyone of you would admit that you could not live where you reside if it were not for the good roads and if it were not for the automobiles. You who bring your produce to market from your districts recognize that the automobile is the cause of the good roads. It is the goose that laid the golden eggs. That industry has served so well, it has grown from a luxury to a necessity in our very way of life.
>
> The automobile industry purchases products from every State in the Union. It has made a tremendous business throughout the Nation. It is the first business of the Nation, surpassing in gigantic strides every other phase of economic activity in the country. The automobile is dependent upon steel, and the Detroit area in the dark days of World War II earned for itself, because of its significance, its know-how, its genius, and its manpower the name of the "hub of the arsenal of democracy." This is the industry that is dependent upon the Great Lakes area. This is where it exists. It appeals to this House today for its support of this bill.

The automobile industry still has the manpower, the productive capacity upon which it has become famous. It still retains its genius and its vision. But it no longer has the market. It no longer has the buyers.

As a consequence, this industry is reeling. It may well be that, if something is not soon done to rectify this great problem, our working people—with their ability and know-how, and our unrivaled auto manufacturies may suffer severe hardship. Even now, unemployment in Michigan, the home of the auto, has reached staggering heights, disaster proportions.

The problem of recession, grave as it is, has affected other sections of our country also.

For the first 6 months of 1954, the national percentage of those who have been forced to cash in life insurance policies has been up 22 percent. Loans on life insurance for the first 6 months of 1954 are up nearly 27 percent from last year. In manufacturing, the average wage has dropped to approximately $71 a week. Prices continue to creep upward. Foreclosures are on the increase. Overtime pay is virtually nonexistent; the average weekly timesheet is less than 40 hours. Mortgages are up 11 percent.

We need jobs to increase buying and to halt retrogression and possible depression.

We must take steps to stimulate a market which, up to this time, has served as an indicator of the healthful condition of our econonmy. We must do something to invigorate our sagging economy.

Yet, at a time when work is down and unemployment is up, we have seen that tax relief is parceled out to those who stand least in need of it.

We have the goods on our shelves, the autos in our showrooms, but we cannot buy them. There was a time when we could, but it seems past.

It can be said, generally, that what is good for the auto manufacturing industry is good for the entire national economy. Its byproducts are sold and its influences are felt in every corner of our land. It is the chief customer of the steel industry and what affects the former works a hardship or otherwise, as the case may be, upon the latter. Rubber is dependent, in great measure, upon the automobile.

In short, the auto indutry is one of our pivotal American industries, the success and furtherance of which should be the deep concern of our Government, our policymakers, and of every citizen in our land.

For, in war and in peace, it has been a stanch defender of our liberties and a most productive and dependable friend.

Accomplishments of the Committee on Ways and Means in the 83d Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to commend my colleagues on the Committee on Ways and Means for their outstanding record of accomplishment made during the 83d Congress. This record was compiled only as the result of the most diligent and conscientious effort on the part of every committee member.

Since the convening of the 83d Congress on January 3, 1953, the Committee on Ways and Means has acted favorably on 16 major bills and several bills of somewhat lesser importance. The major legislation included revision of our Federal tax laws, tax-reduction measures, amendments to our social security and unemployment compensation programs, customs simplification and tariff revision, and amendments to the renegotiation act of 1951. For the most part this legislation represented important measures in the President's legislative program. All this legislation was considered most carefully and deliberately by the committee before reporting it to the House of Representatives. Public hearings were held on much of the legislation reported by the committee followed by a thorough study in executive session.

This distinguished legislative record should provide a source of satisfaction and a realization of accomplishment to the committee membership. It is a tribute to the unceasing effort, cooperation, and ability of my collegaues on the Committee on Ways and Means.

I would like at this time to briefly refer to the legislative activity of the committee and other matters affecting the committee during the 83d Congress.

In the 1st and 2d sessions of the 83d Congress, the Committee on Ways and Means reported a total of 52 bills. The status of those bills is as follows:

Legislative status:	*Bills*
Enacted into law	[1] 41
Passed by the House	[2] 7
Recommitted by the House	[3] 2
Rule not granted	[4] 2
Passed House and Senate but Presidential approval withheld	[5] 1

During the Congress, the committee held 104 days of public hearings on a variety of subjects and heard the testimony of approximately 1,135 witnesses. Data concerning these hearings follow:

Subject	Days	Witnesses
Graduated cigarette tax	3	28
Extension of distilled spirits bonding period	2	20
Unemployment insurance	26	50
Admissions tax on movie theaters	1	52
Reciprocal trade extension	16	205
Customs simplification	7	43
Excess profits tax extension	11	112
Revenue revision	25	504
Social security	12	110
Increasing free entry limitation allowed American tourists	1	11

A more detailed breakdown of the work of the committee follows:

I. GENERAL TAX REVISION (H. R. 8300, PUBLIC LAW 591)

During the 83d Congress the Committee on Ways and Means conducted an unprecedented and intensive study of our tax laws designed to develop a more equitable and more precise Internal Revenue Code. This project was initiated pursuant to a motion adopted by the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation on August 15, 1951. In response to a questionnaire sent out to the general public, over 15,000 taxpayer suggestions for improvements in the Internal Revenue Code were received. Groups of leading tax experts throughout the country were organized to study specific problem areas in our Federal tax structure. These groups furnished reports to the committee. Many organizations conferred with the technical staff on tax proposals.

The committee conducted public hearings on 40 different topics of major importance in connection with general tax revision. In the course of these hearings, the committee heard testimony from over 500 witnesses. It conducted hearings on 25 days and 10 nights. The committee remained after adjournment of the first session for 2 weeks to conclude this program of hearings.

The staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, the committee staff, and the staffs of the Treasury Department and the Internal Revenue Service conducted joint studies covering the entire code. This work continued intensively while Congress was in adjournment between the 1st and 2d sessions.

When the Congress convened for the second session, the committee started promptly to work in daily executive sessions on the preparation of the new code. The bill which was reported, H. R. 8300, is the first comprehensive revision of the Federal tax laws ever undertaken. Almost 900 pages long, it is the largest piece of legislation ever enacted by the Congress. The bill was signed into law by the President on August 16, 1954. This legislation was referred to by the President as the cornerstone of his legislative program. It has been estimated that over 500,000 man-hours of work have been spent on the bill by the members of the committee and the technical experts who participated in its preparation.

II. OTHER LEGISLATIVE WORK DURING THE FIRST SESSION

Many of the bills which the committee reported during the first session were enacted into law during the second session.

A. TAX LEGISLATION

H. R. 1: This bill provided for an individual income-tax reduction for the calendar year 1953 by moving back by 6 months the termination date of the individual income tax increase imposed under the Revenue Act of 1951. The Revenue Act of 1951 provided an increase in individual income tax liability of about 11 percent of the then existing tax, or 9 percent of the income after tax, whichever was smaller. Under present law this increase terminated as of December 31, 1953. Under H. R. 1 the termination date would have been June 30, 1953. This legislation was not considered by the House of Representatives.

H. R. 62: This bill amends sections 371 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 so as to permit distilled spirits and wines rectified in bonded manufacturing warehouses, class 6, and distilled spirits produced in proof and bottled in such warehouses, to be withdrawn therefrom without payment of duty or tax for shipment to Guam, American Samoa, Panama Canal Zone, or the Virgin Islands.

This bill passed the House but was not acted on by the Senate.

H. R. 157: This bill provided for the removal of the 20-percent excise tax on admissions to motion pictures if the principal amusement offered in connection with such admission is the showing of motion pictures.

This bill was passed by the House and the Senate but was killed by pocket veto. Note, however, that some excise tax relief was accorded to the motion-picture industry by H. R. 8224 enacted during the second session.

H. R. 3370: This bill eliminates a hardship on taxpayers who served in the Armed Forces of the United States and acquired children in the Philippines by providing that such children, born or adopted prior to January 1, 1953, may be claimed as dependents by taxpayers who were members of the Armed Forces of the United States at the time the children were born or legally adopted. The provisions of this bill were incorporated into the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

H. R. 4152: This bill extended for 1 year the provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 which excluded from taxable income the compensation of members of the Armed Forces of the United States received as the result of active service in combat zones, such as Korea, or hospitalized as the result of wounds, disease or injury incurred while serving in a combat zone.

This bill became Public Law No. 213. Note that H. R. 8300 enacted a permanent provision which will continue this relief while the draft law is in effect.

H. R. 4927: This bill amends section 3656 (b) (1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 so as to permit the acceptance of uncertified checks in payment for stamp taxes. The result of the bill is that uncertified checks may be used in payment of all types of Internal Revenue taxes without regard to whether they are collectible by the use of stamps.

---

[1] Includes one bill (S. 3447) enacted without being reported.

[2] Of these 7 bills, 2 (H. R. 3370 and 4927) were embodied in H. R. 8300 (Public Law 591).

[3] H. R. 5894 and H. R. 6413.

[4] H. R. 1 and H. R. 5534.

[5] H. R. 157.

This bill has passed the House but was not acted on by the Senate. Note that the substance of the bill was incorporated into H. R. 8300.

H. R. 4980. This bill provided that a person entitled to the drawback of taxes paid on distilled spirits used for designated nonbeverage purposes can elect in writing to file monthly claims and receive the refund on a monthly basis upon the filing of an appropriate bond.

The bill became Public Law 283.

H. R. 5257: This bill made applicable to the Trust Territories of the Pacific Islands the sections of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 which are derived from the Harrison Antinarcotic Act enacted in 1914. The legislation in question is designed to provide for the orderly supply of narcotic drugs for medical purposes in the trust territories.

This bill became Public Law 238.

H. R. 5407: This bill extends from 8 to 12 years the period during which certain distilled spirits may be retained in internal revenue bonded warehouses before the payment of tax.

The bill was passed by the House and reported by the Senate Finance Committee.

H. R. 5898: This bill provided for a 6-month extension of the excess profits tax as requested by the President so as to extend until December 31, 1953, the period with respect to which the excess profits shall be effective at the full rate.

The bill became Public Law 125.

H. R. 6403: This bill provided for abatement of jeopardy assessments when jeopardy does not exist.

The bill became Public Law 274.

H. R. 6413: This bill provided that employees of the Federal Government subject to an income tax imposed by cities with a population of 500,000 or more persons shall pursuant to an agreement between the Secretary of the Treasury and the proper State authorities have such city income taxes withheld from their pay.

This bill was recommitted by the House.

H. R. 6426. This bill, known as the Technical Changes Act of 1953, contained 17 sections amending various provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939. Among the most important of these was a section eliminating the provision of the Code which permitted citizens of the United States to avoid United States income taxes upon amounts earned abroad if they remain absent from the United States for 17 out of 18 consecutive months, even though they did not acquire a foreign residence. Another provision of the bill permitted the amortization of farm grain storage facilities over a 5-year period.

The Senate amended the bill so that citizens who remained abroad 17 out of 18 months could retain as exempt income the first $20,000 earned abroad.

The bill became Public Law 287.

H. R. 6440: This bill extended the benefits of section 345 of the Internal Revenue Act of 1951 which abates the income tax on the income of trusts accumulated for the benefit of servicemen who were subsequently killed on active duty between December 7, 1941, and January 1, 1948, to cases which, prior to the 1951 legislation, had been adjudicated by the courts.

This bill was reported by the Senate Finance Committee with amendments but was not passed by the Senate.

B. TARIFF AND CUSTOMS LEGISLATION

H. R. 222: This bill suspends for 2 years the import duty imposed under paragraph 207 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, on crude bauxite.

The bill became Public Law 499.

House Joint Resolution 293: This joint resolution would permit articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the Washington State Third International State Fair, Seattle, Wash., to be admitted without payment of tariff or duties.

The resolution became Public Law 185.

H. R. 568: This bill extended until June 30, 1954, the suspension of the 2-cents-per-pound import tax on copper imposed under section 3425 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939.

The bill became Public Law 4.

H. R. 2763: This bill amends the Tariff Act of 1930 so as to provide for the assessment of duty and import tax on dowels of certain species of wood at the same rate applicable to lumber of the same species of wood and to provide for the duty-free entry of dowels not of certain specific types of wood.

The bill became Public Law 595.

H. R. 3658: This bill continued for an additional 2 years the existing law which permits the entry of bona fide gifts that do not exceed $50 in value without the payment of duties or taxes, when such gifts are sent from abroad by members of the Armed Forces.

The bill became Public Law 19.

H. R. 3659: This bill continued until July 1, 1955, the existing law which allows the exemption from duty of personal and household effects brought into the United States under Government orders.

The bill became Public Law 20.

H. R. 5148: This bill continued the existing exemption of metal scrap from import duties and taxes for another year, until June 30, 1954, but excluding the zinc scrap from the suspension unless such zinc scrap is imported under the terms of a written contract entered into prior to July 1, 1953.

The bill became Public Law 221.

H. R. 5534: This bill, as reported, would suspend for 1 year the duty upon silicon aluminum, or certain aluminum silicon, aluminum, aluminum scrap, or aluminum alloy.

The bill did not pass the House.

H. R. 5495: This bill, known as the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1953, extended until June 12, 1954, the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements, as requested by the President, reduced from 1 year to 9 months the period within which the Tariff Commission must make its investigation and report on applications for relief under the escape clause, and established a temporary bipartisan commission to be known as the Commission on Foreign Economic Policy.

The bill became Public Law 215.

H. R. 5561: This bill was designed to make it clear that chemically synthesized cocaine and other narcotic drugs are covered by existing provisions of law, and to the same extent, as are those narcotic drugs which are produced from natural sources.

The bill became Public Law 240.

H. R. 5877: This bill, known as the Custom Simplification Act of 1953, represented a major overhaul and modernization of the administrative and procedural provisions of the customs law. It contained 24 sections designed to simplify customs operations, reduce both to the Government and to the public the expense and delay incident to customs administration, and eliminate certain inequities.

The bill became Public Law 243.

H. R. 5894: This bill proposed to amend the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951 and certain other provisions of law in order to provide protection for American workers, miners, farmers, and producers.

The bill was recommitted by the vote of the House.

H. R. 6465: This bill closed the loopholes in the tariff laws by which foreign producers have avoided the import duty imposed for the protection of the domestic rubber-soled footwear industry.

The bill became Public Law 479.

H. R. 6548: This bill amended certain administrative provisions of the Tariff Act, as amended, with respect to the determination of value, the conversion of currency, and reentry of certain American metal products exported for further processing.

The bill passed the House but was not acted on by the Senate.

C. SOCIAL SECURITY AND RELATED LEGISLATION

H. R. 2062: This bill permitted the coordination of the Wisconsin retirement fund with the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system by permitting members of the Wisconsin retirement fund, while retaining the protection of that fund, to be covered by old-age and survivors insurance if the State so desires.

The bill became Public Law 279.

H. R. 4151: This bill provided for the extension until July 1, 1955, of the existing wage credits with respect to the Old-Age and Survivors Insurance system of individuals who have served in the active military and naval service of the United States since September 14, 1940.

The bill became Public Law 269.

H. R. 5173: This bill provided that the excess of collections from the Federal unemployment tax over unemployment compensation administrative expenses shall be used to establish and maintain a $200 million reserve in the Federal unemployment account. Under the bill this reserve is to be available for advances to the States. The bill also provided that the remainder of such excess collections shall be returned to the States.

The bill became Public Law 567.

H. R. 5303: This bill amended sections 1606 and 1607 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 in order to permit unemployment insurance coverage under

State unemployment compensation laws for seamen employed on certain vessels operated for the account of the United States.

The bill became Public Law 196.

D. OTHER LEGISLATION

H. R. 5256: This bill provided for a system of judicial retirement for the judges of the Tax Court of the United States. It provided that a judge of the Tax Court may elect to retire with pay after serving for a period of 10 years and reaching the age of 70, or after serving an aggregate of 18 years, or more. His retirement pay under the bill varies in proportion to his length of service. Judges who elect to retire under the plan may be recalled at the discretion of the chief judge up to 90 days of service annually.

The bill became Public Law 219.

H. R. 6287: This bill amends the Renegotiation Act to extend the renegotiation authority to December 31, 1954. The present expiration date is December 31, 1953. In addition, the bill provides three amendments dealing respectively with synthetic rubber, prime contracts for machine tools, and standard commercial articles.

The bill passed both Houses of Congress and is now awaiting approval by the President.

H. R. 6672: This bill provides for a temporary $6 billion increase in the statutory debt limit.

The bill became Public Law 686.

In addition to the foregoing, the committee held 3 days of public hearings and heard 32 witnesses on H. R. 1417, a bill to provide for a graduated excise-tax rate on cigarettes in lieu of the present flat rate. However, the committee took no further action on this bill.

III. LEGISLATIVE WORK DURING THE SECOND SESSION

A. TAX LEGISLATION

H. R. 8300: This bill, constituting the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, has been referred to above.

House Concurrent Resolution 263 and House Concurrent Resolution 268: These concurrent resolutions were designed to make certain technical and conforming changes relating to the enrollment of H. R. 8300.

H. R. 8224: This bill granted excise-tax relief of $1 billion and removed certain discriminatory features of the excise-tax provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939. Under the bill most excise-tax rates which were in excess of 10 percent were reduced to 10 percent.

The bill became Public Law 324.

B. TARIFF AND CUSTOMS LEGISLATION

H. R. 7709: This bill continues until the close of June 30, 1955, the suspension of certain import taxes on copper.

The bill became Public Law 452.

H. R. 8155: This bill continues until the close of June 30, 1955, the suspension of duties and import taxes on metal scrap. The bill became Public Law 678.

H. R. 8628: This bill amends the Tariff Act of 1930 to insure that crude silicon carbide imported into the United States will continue to be exempt from duty.

The bill became Public Law 689.

H. R. 8932: This bill would reclassify dictaphones under the Tariff Act of 1930 so that they will be dutiable as business machines rather than as musical instruments.

The bill became Public Law 693.

H. R. 9248: This bill provides for the deferment of the filing of a customs bond in connection with the entry of certain racing vehicles and craft brought into the United States to participate in nonpurse-type races.

The bill became Public Law 694.

H. R. 9315: This bill provides for an 18 months' extension on a reciprocal basis of the period of the free entry of Philippine articles into the United States.

The bill became Public Law 474.

H. R. 9474: This bill extends the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930 for a period of 1 additional year.

The bill became Public Law 464.

H. R. 9666: This bill would change the tariff classification of hardboard under present tariff law. The bill has passed the House. The Senate Finance Committee did not report the bill, but adopted a resolution directing the United States Tariff Commission to make a study of the hardboard industry and to report on the proper classification of hardboard on or before February 28, 1955.

H. R. 10009: This bill provides for the review of customs tariff schedules, improves procedures for the tariff classifications of unenumerated articles, and makes other changes in the customs laws.

This bill is awaiting approval by the President.

House Joint Resolution 256: This joint resolution permits articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the First International Instrument Congress and Exposition, Philadelphia, Pa., to be admitted without payment of tariff.

The resolution became Public Law 481.

House Joint Resolution 537: This joint resolution permits articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the Washington State Fourth International Trade Fair, Seattle, Wash., to be admitted without payment of tariff.

The resolution became Public Law 485.

House Joint Resolution 545. This joint resolution permits articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition of the International Trade Sample Fair, Dallas, Tex., to be admitted without payment of tariff.

The resolution became Public Law 486.

C. SOCIAL SECURITY AND RELATED LEGISLATION

H. R. 9366: This bill constitutes an overall revision and liberalization of the social-security program. Among the amendments which it makes in present law are those which extend coverage under the old-age and survivors insurance program to 10.2 million additional persons, increase the benefits for those already retired and those who will retire in the future, preserve the insurance rights of disabled individuals, and increase the amount of earnings permitted without loss of benefits. Aided by the extensive analysis made by its Subcommittee on Social Security, the committee held extensive public hearings and lengthy executive sessions in order carefully to consider this important legislation.

The bill was approved by the President on September 1, 1954.

H. R. 9707: This bill extends and improves the unemployment-insurance system. It extends unemployment compensation coverage to millions of workers to whom this protection has not heretofore been available. The bill is awaiting approval by the President.

D. OTHER LEGISLATION

S. 3605: This bill abolishes the offices of Assistant Treasurer and Assistant Register of the Treasury and provides an Under Secretary for Monetary Affairs and an additional Assistant Secretary in the Treasury Department. The bill became Public Law 516.

S. 3447: This bill will amend the Internal Revenue Code to permit the oral prescription to certain nonhabit-forming narcotic drugs. The bill is awaiting approval of the President.

In addition to the foregoing the committee held public hearings on H. R. 8352, a bill which would have increased from $500 to $800 the additional exemption from customs duties allowed to residents under existing law thereby raising the total free entry privilege to $1,000. The committee took no further action on the bill.

SUBCOMMITTEES

The Committee on Ways and Means has four subcommittees.

First. Subcommittee on Administration of the Internal Revenue Laws: This subcommittee is composed of Congressmen Robert W. Kean, Republican, of New Jersey, chairman; Thomas E. Martin, Republican, of Iowa; John W. Byrnes, Republican, of Wisconsin; Antoni N. Sadlak, Republican, of Connecticut; Cecil R. King, Democrat, of California; Thomas J. O'Brien, Democrat, of Illinois; and Hale Boggs, Democrat, of Louisiana.

Since January 15, 1953, this subcommittee has held public hearings concerning revenue administration on 41 days, at which 73 witnesses testified. In preparation for these hearings and in the course of related studies, the subcommittee staff has interrogated 182 witnesses in Washington and 7 other cities.

The subcommittee's public hearings have dealt with four subjects: First, improper political influence in selection and promotion of Bureau of Internal Revenue personnel, in particular in the Alcohol and Tobacco Tax Division; second, interference by former high Treasury officials in disposition of tax cases for personal or political reasons; third, efforts by several taxpayers and their representatives, to "fix" tax cases and prevent tax fraud prosecutions through the exertion of influence on Bureau, Treasury, and Department of Justice officials; and fourth, progress made by the Internal Revenue Service in implementing subcommittee recommendations for the improvement of the administration of the internal revenue laws.

Collateral studies by the subcommittee staff concerned the recent reorganization of the Bureau of Internal Revenue and the Tax Division of the Department of Justice. These studies, as well as analyses of many cases involving the problems dealt with in public hearings, furnished material for the subcommittee's concluding report.

During the second session this subcommittee met in public and executive session to receive the testimony of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue on the progress being made to improve the Internal Revenue Service.

Second. Subcommittee on Social Security: This subcommittee is composed of Congressman CARL T. CURTIS, Republican, of Nebraska, chairman; ANGIER L. GOODWIN, Republican, of Massachusetts; HOWARD H. BAKER, Republican, of Tennessee; THOMAS B. CURTIS, Republican, of Missouri; JERE COOPER, Democrat, of Tennessee; JOHN D. DINGELL, Democrat, of Michigan; and WILBUR D. MILLS, Democrat, of Arkansas.

The Subcommittee on Social Security carried out a study of the social security program and held extensive public hearings on the old-age and survivors' insurance and public assistance programs.

Third. Subcommittee on Unemployment Insurance: This subcommittee is composed of Congressmen THOMAS A. JENKINS, Republican, of Ohio, chairman; NOAH M. MASON, Republican, of Illinois; VICTOR A. KNOX, Republican, of Michigan; JAMES B. UTT, Republican, of California; NOBLE J. GREGORY, Democrat, of Kentucky; AIME J. FORAND, Democrat, of Rhode Island; and HERMAN P. EBERHARTER, Democrat, of Pennsylvania.

In connection with unemployment insurance, reference is made to the activities of the full committee in regard to H. R. 5173 and H. R. 5303.

Fourth. Subcommittee on Taxation of Life Insurance Companies: This subcommittee is composed of Congressmen THOMAS B. CURTIS, Republican, of Missouri, chairman; VICTOR A. KNOX, Republican, of Michigan; JAMES B. UTT, Republican, of California; WILBUR MILLS, Democrat, of Arkansas; and NOBLE J. GREGORY, Democrat, of Kentucky. The subcommittee is conducting a study of the problems involved in the treatment of life-insurance companies for Federal income-tax purposes which are presently taxed under a temporary formula. The subcommittee has held numerous meetings with interested individuals and groups for the purpose of securing factual information. It is engaged in formulating various alternative proposals for a permanent method of taxing life insurance companies which are to form the basis of public hearings at a future date.

OTHER ACTIVITIES

As previously pointed out, H. R. 5495 provided for the creation of a temporary bipartisan Commission on Foreign Economic Policy. The Commission studied and reported on the subjects of international trade and its enlargement consistent with a sound domestic economy, our foreign economic policy, and the trade aspects of our national security and total foreign policy. Three members of the Committee on Ways and Means were named as members of the Commission; viz.: Honorable DANIEL A. REED, Republican, of New York; Honorable RICHARD M. SIMPSON, Republican, of Pennsylvania; and Honorable JERE COOPER, Democrat, of Tennessee.

IN MEMORIAM

With the death on July 24, 1954, of Representative A. Sidney Camp, of Georgia, the committee lost one of its ablest and most distinguished members who will long be remembered for his keen mind, devotion to duty, and judicial temperament.

Senate Resolution 301

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, within the next few days I shall prepare a documentation supporting the bill of particulars which I have filed by way of amendment to Senate Resolution 301. I ask unanimous consent that my amendment to Senate Resolution 301 in the form of a bill of particulars, along with the documentation material which I shall prepare in support of that amendment, be inserted in the body of the final issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for this session of Congress.

There being no objection, the matter referred to will be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate Resolution 301

(In the Senate of the United States, July 31, 1954)

Amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. MORSE to the resolution (S. Res. 301) to censure the Senator from Wisconsin, Mr. McCARTHY, viz:

On page 1, lines 4 and 5, strike out the words "and such conduct is hereby condemned.", and insert in lieu thereof the following: "because the said Mr. McCARTHY—

"(a) declined to comply with a request made by letter on November 21, 1952, by the chairman of the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections of the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration, that he appear before the subcommittee to supply information concerning certain specific matters involving his activities as a Member of the Senate;

"(b) unfairly accused his fellow Senators GILLETTE, MONRONEY, HENDRICKSON, HAYDEN, and HENNINGS of improper conduct in carrying out their duties as Senators;

"(c) as chairman of a committee resorted to abusive conduct in his interrogation of Gen. Ralph Zwicker, including a charge that General Zwicker was unfit to wear the uniform, during the appearance of General Zwicker as a witness before the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Senate Committee on Government Operations on February 18, 1954;

"(d) received and made use of confidential information unlawfully obtained from a document in executive files upon which document the Federal Bureau of Investigation had placed its highest classification; and offered such information to a lawfully constituted Senate subcommittee in the form of a spurious document which he falsely asserted to the subcommittee to be 'a letter from the FBI';

"(e) openly invited and incited employees of the Government to violate the law and their oaths of office by urging them to make available information, including classified information, which in the opinion of the employee would be of assistance to the junior Senator from Wisconsin in conducting his investigations, even though the supplying of such information by the employee would be illegal and in violation of Presidential order and contrary to the constitutional rights of the Chief Executive under the separation-of-powers doctrine;

"(f) attempted to invade the constitutional power of the President of the United States to conduct the foreign relations of the United States by carrying on negotiations with certain Greek shipowners in respect to foreign trade policies, even though the executive branch of our Government had a few weeks previously entered into an understanding with the Greek Government in respect to banning the flow of strategic materials to Communist countries; and

"(g) permitted and ratified over a period of several months in 1953 and 1954 the abuse of senatorial privilege by Mr. Roy Cohn, chief counsel to the Permanent Investigations Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Government Operations of which committee and subcommittee the junior Senator from Wisconsin is chairman, Mr. Cohn's abuse having been directed toward attempting to secure preferential treatment for Pvt. David Schine by the Department of the Army, at a time when the Army was under investigation by the committee.

"SEC. 2. It is the sense of the Senate that such conduct is hereby condemned."

DOCUMENTATION OF CHARGES UNDER CONSIDERATION BY THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON THE RESOLUTION (S. RES. 301) TO CENSURE SENATOR JOSEPH R. McCARTHY

(Submitted by Senator WAYNE MORSE)

I appreciate the invitation tendered by the chairman of the select committee, on its behalf, to submit documentation of the charges contained in the amendment, in the nature of a bill of particulars, which I submitted to the resolution to censure Senator McCARTHY.

The original resolution and the amendments to it consist of allegations of misconduct and proposals for action to be taken by the Senate.

Implicit in the Senate's action of August 2, 1954, creating the select committee and referring to it the resolution and amendments were instructions to the committee to do three things:

(1) To determine whether the evidence supports the specific allegations that Senator McCARTHY has committed improper acts;

(2) To recommend what action should be taken by the Senate to discipline Senator McCARTHY, if, as I believe it will, the evidence supports the allegations of improper conduct;

(3) To recommend to the Senate what action, in the committee's opinion, should be taken to remedy the unwholesome situation that has developed over controversial investigations.

The committee has not invited comment upon the latter two tasks and I will not volunteer them. My views are a matter of record.

I do not possess any special sources of information, either as a Senator or as an individual, as to the charges of misconduct brought against Senator McCARTHY by Senators FLANDERS and FULBRIGHT and me. The documentation which is hereby submitted is based upon data and testimony and the statements of Senator McCARTHY himself which are contained in transcripts and a report of Senate committees and public statements. This material is confined to the allegations of misconduct contained in the bill of particulars of my amendment to Senate Resolution 301. In some instances those allegations are the same or similar to the allegations made by the Senator from Vermont and the Senator from Arkansas.

This material is submitted with the hope that it will be of assistance to the commitee in discharging its duties and will expedite its work.

Respectfully submitted.

Wayne Morse,
United States Senator.

(Copies to all members of select committee, Senator Joseph McCarthy.)

COMMITTEE ITEM I

Incidents of contempt of the Senate or a senatorial committee, referred to in the following:

A. Amendment proposed by Mr. Fulbright to the resolution (S. Res. 301) to censure the Senator from Wisconsin, Mr. McCarthy, viz: "(3) Although repeatedly invited to testify by a committee of this Senate headed by the Senator from Iowa, the junior Senator from Wisconson denounced the committee and contemptuously refused to comply with its request."

B. Amendment proposed by Mr. Morse to the resolution (S. Res. 301) to censure the Senator from Wisconsin, Mr. McCarthy, viz: "(a) Declined to comply with a request made by letter on November 21, 1952, by the chairman of the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections of the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration, that he appear before the subcommittee to supply information concerning certain specific matters involving his activities as a Member of the Senate."

C. Amendment proposed by Mr. Flanders to the resolution (S. Res. 301) to censure the Senator from Wisconsin, Mr. McCarthy, viz: "(17) He has continued to show his contempt for the Senate by failing to explain in any manner the six charges contained in the Hennings-Hayden-Hendrickson report which was filed in January 1953. This involves his bank transactions, possible income-tax evasions, and the Lustron deal. The taint persists until he satisfactorily explains these matters, which he refused to do, although invited six times to appear, during the 82d Congress."

Documentation

Report of the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections to the Committee on Rules and Administration, United States Senate, pursuant to Senate Resolution 187 and Senate Resolution 304.

Summary of facts

1. On August 6, 1951, Senate Resolution 187 was introduced in the Senate by Senator William Benton of Connecticut. The resolution called for an investigation of Senator Joseph McCarthy's participation in the 1950 Maryland senatorial general election and "such investigation with respect to his other acts since his election to the Senate, as may be appropriate to enable such committee to determine whether or not it should initiate action with a view toward the expulsion from the United States Senate of the said Senator Joseph R. McCarthy." The resolution was referred by the President of the Senate to the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration and, in turn, to its Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections for consideration. (Report, p. 1, appendix, pp. 59–60.)

2. By letter of September 17, 1951, Senator McCarthy informed Senator Guy Gillette, chairman of the subcommittee, that he proposed to cross-examine witnesses "who appear to ask for my expulsion because of my exposure of Communists in Government." (Appendix, p. 60.)

3. By letters of September 25 and October 1, 1951, Senator Gillette advised Senator McCarthy that cross-examination of witnesses before the subcommittee would be limited to subcommittee members. Senator Gillette also stated:

"It is hoped that if you desire to appear and make any statement in connection with this matter, that a time can be fixed before the 10th of October. I should be glad to have your comment relative to a convenient time for you if you desire to come before us." (Appendix, p. 61.)

4. By letter of October 4, 1951, Senator McCarthy acknowledged the letter from Senator Gillette, stating as follows:

"This is to acknowledge receipt of your letter of October 1 in which you offer me an opportunity to appear before your committee and answer Senator Benton's charges.

"Frankly, Guy, I have not and do not intend to even read, much less answer, Benton's smear attack. I am sure you realize that the Benton type of material can be found in the Daily Worker almost any day of the week and will continue to flow from the mouths and pen of the camp followers as long as I continue my fight against Communists in Government." (Appendix, pp. 61–62.)

5. By letter of December 21, 1951, Senator Gillette advised Senator McCarthy (in part):

"As I have told you before, if you care to appear before the subcommittee, we should be glad to make the necessary arrangements as to time and place. Your letter and this reply will be made available to the members of the subcommittee by copy and you will be promptly advised as to what action the subcommittee decided to take.

"In the meantime, as I have stated above in this letter, I shall be glad to confer with you personally as to matters concerning our staff and its work." (Appendix, pp. 65–66.)

6. On April 8, 1952, Senator Hayden, chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration, introduced on the floor of the Senate, Senate Resolution 300 (exhibit 14 at p. 68 of report), which recited a charge by Senator McCarthy "that the subcommittee lacked jurisdiction to investigate such acts of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCarthy] as were not connected with election campaigns" and which stated the purpose of the resolution to be as follows:

"Now, therefore, to determine the proper jurisdiction of the Committee on Rules and Administration and to express the confidence of the Senate in its committee in their consideration of Senate Resolution 187, it being understood that the following motion is made solely for this test and that the adoption of the resolution is opposed by the Members on whose behalf it is submitted, be it

"*Resolved,* That the Committee on Rules and Administration be, and it hereby is, discharged from the further consideration of Senate Resolution 187." (Report, p. 5, appendix pp. 68–69.)

7. On April 10, 1952, the Senate voted on Senate Resolution 300, and, by a vote of 60–0 upheld the jurisdiction of the Senate Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections to continue its investigation of Senator McCarthy and confirmed its confidence in the honesty and integrity of the Members of the subcommittee. (Report, p. 5.)

8. On April 10, 1952, Senator McCarthy introduced Senate Resolution 304 to investigate Senator Benton of Connecticut. The resolution requested the Committee on Rules and Administration of the United States Senate to make such investigation of Senator Benton's 1950 senatorial campaign funds and other activities, and his associates, as the committee deemed necessary in order to recommend action to the Senate. (Report, p. 5.)

9. On May 7, 1952, Senator Gillette, as chairman of the subcommittee, wrote Senator McCarthy:

"My Dear Senator: The Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections in executive session this morning voted to hold public hearings on Senate Resolution 187 which was introduced in the Senate by Senator William Benton of Connecticut on August 6, 1951, and was thereafter referred to this subcommittee for action.

"It was further decided that the hearings are to begin on Monday, May 12, and that the first charge to be heard will be Senator Benton's 'Case No. 2,' wherein it was alleged that you had improperly received a fee of $10,000 in 1948 from the Lustron Corp. for an article on housing which was included in an advertising booklet published by that company.

"The subcommittee has not yet determined the order of witnesses for this first case but we expect to do so by Friday after consultation with the staff.

"In the meantime I do wish to extend to you the opportunity to appear at the hearings for the purpose of presenting testimony relating to this charge. The hearings in this case will probably continue for several days and we shall make whatever arrangements for your appearance are most convenient for you." (Appendix, pp. 79–80.)

10. By two letters dated May 8, 1952, addressed to Senator Gillette, Senator McCarthy acknowledged the invitation to appear before the subcommittee. In one letter Senator McCarthy discussed the Lustron case. In the other he discussed his resolution calling for an investigation of Senator Benton. (Appendix, pp. 80–82).

11. On May 10, 1952, Senator Gillette again wrote Senator McCarthy. His letter stated in part:

"You will note from my letter of the 7th that I stated in the concluding paragraph 'I shall extend to you the opportunity to appear at the hearings for the purpose of presenting testimony relating to this charge. The hearings in this case will probably continue for several days and we shall make whatever arrangements for your appearance are most convenient for you.'

"The subcommittee, in determining its further action relative to the Benton resolution, decided to take up the charges one by one and, if additional evidence was desired in addition to the staff report that was before us, that the subcommittee would undertake to develop further testimony where it seemed desirable to do so. At their meeting on May 7 the subcommittee concluded that they wished to take some additional testimony with reference to charge No. 2 and fixed next Monday, May 12, as the date for the hearing, at which witnesses under them could be heard.

"It seemed the courteous thing to do to invite you to attend so you could have full opportunity to present additional evidence or, at a later period, to present any evidence you might wish to make available to us in refutation or explanation of any evidence which you adduced at the hearing. That was the purpose of my letter to you and you were assured that the opportunity will continue to be yours to present such matter as you wish to present to us in connection with this hearing and to attend, if you desire to do so." (Appendix, p. 83.)

12. On June 9, 1952, Senator Gillette advised Senator McCarthy that he had "fixed this Thursday, 10 a. m., for you to present a statement to us relative to your resolution concerning Senator Benton." Senator Gillette stated that hearings would be held in room 104B (Senate Office Building). (Appendix, p. 86.)

13. By letter of June 11, 1952, Senator McCarthy advised Senator Gillette that he would be unable to attend the hearing on Thursday, and that he would be "tied up" Monday and Tuesday of the following week. (Appendix, p. 86.)

14. In a letter dated June 12, 1952, addressed to Senator Gillette, Senator McCarthy stated:

"This will confirm our conversation on the Senate floor that I will be available either Thursday or Friday of next week to appear before your committee. As I told you on the floor, it may be extremely difficult for me to appear on Wednesday. I understand from our conversation that Benton wants to be present but will be unable to appear Thursday or Friday.

"Under the circumstances, it will be perfectly agreeable to me to appear Saturday, if necessary. There is also the remote possibility that I may be able to meet with your committee Wednesday, although I doubt it very much at this time." (Appendix, p. 87.)

15. By letter of June 18, 1932, Senator Gillette advised Senator McCarthy that he had ordered a meeting of the subcommittee to be held on Monday, June 23, at 10 a. m., and that the subcommittee would at that time receive from Senator McCarthy a substantiation of the charges contained in S. Res. 304. (Appendix, p. 87.)

16. By letter of June 19, 1952, Senator McCarthy advised Senator Gillette that it was necessary that he, Senator McCarthy, appear in court in Syracuse, N. Y., on Monday, June 23. (Appendix, p. 88.)

17. By letter of June 20, 1952, Senator Gillette advised Senator McCarthy, "We will consult your convenience as to the fixing of another date for hearing you on your resolution which pertains to Senator Benton." (Appendix, p. 91.)

18. By letter of June 23, 1952, Senator Gillette advised Senator McCarthy that he would expect to hear from Senator McCarthy on his return from Syracuse. (Appendix, p. 92.)

19. Senator Gillette received a letter dated June 24, 1952, from Mary B. Driscoll, secretary to Senator McCarthy, stating that Senator McCarthy "suggests a date be set far enough in advance so that all concerned will have ample time to arrange their schedules and so that no excuse can be made to postpone this hearing any longer." The letter referred to a hearing on Senate Resolution 304. The letter concluded, "Senator McCarthy will be available for this purpose on July 3." (Appendix, p. 92.)

20. On June 25, 1952, Senator Gillette sent the following telegram to Senator McCarthy:

"Re your letter June 24, signed by your secretary, Mary Driscoll, I have acted on your suggestion and fixed July 3, 10 a. m., as the time to hear your testimony on your Resolution No. 304. The place will be Senate Caucus Room and you will receive card confirming this in due time." (Appendix, p. 93.)

21. By letter of July 1, 1952, Senator McCarthy advised the subcommittee in part as follows:

"I understand you want additional material to implement that contained in the resolution presented on Benton. I shall appear in accordance with your request. However, I want it definitely understood that I have never requested, nor do I now request, the opportunity of appearing before your committee on the Benton matter. I feel that your committee was given ample leads in my resolution if you cared to conduct the same kind of investigation of Benton that you conducted of McCarthy.

"I am far too busy with more important matters to waste much time on Benton. However, in view of your request, I shall appear and try to give you such material on Benton as is available to me without making a detailed investigation of his case. If an investigation is to be made, it will have to be made by your staff as they did in my case." (Appendix, p. 93.)

22. On September 10, 1952, Senator Gillette wrote to Senator Hayden, suggesting that in view of the resignation of Senator Welker from the subcommittee, the membership of the subcommittee be reduced to three members. Senator Gillette tendered his resignation from the subcommittee. (Appendix, p. 95.)

23. On November 7, 1952, Mr. Paul J. Cotter, chief counsel for the subcommittee, sent the following letter to Senator McCarthy:

"Dear Senator McCarthy: In connection with the consideration by the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections of Senate Resolution 187, introduced by Senator Benton on August 6, 1951, as well as the ensuing investigation, I have been instructed by the subcommittee to invite you to appear before said subcommittee in executive session. Insofar as possible, we would like to respect your wishes as to the date on which you will appear. However, the subcommittee plans to be available for this purpose during the week beginning November 17, 1952.

"It will be appreciated if you will advise me at as early a date as possible of the day you will appear, in order that the subcommittee may arrange its plans accordingly." (Appendix, p. 96.)

24. The following telegram was sent to Senator McCarthy, apparently on November 14, the day on which the subcommittee received a letter from Mr. Ray Kiermas, administrative assistant to Senator McCarthy (see letter in appendix, p. 98):

"Reference is made to our letter of November 7 again inviting you to appear before this subcommittee and to the reply of your administrative assistant received today. You are advised that this committee does not consider the aforementioned letter of your assistant to be an adequate or satisfactory answer. This committee desires an opportunity to examine you under oath to clarify if possible certain questions that have been raised from facts at hand, particularly with respect to your intricate financial transactions and certain of your activities. Your continued refusal to carry out the instructions of the United States Senate would appear to present a conscious disregard by you for the Senate's authority and a desire to prevent a disclosure of the facts. Failure to receive a reply by return wire that you will appear before this committee in executive session no later than November 20 can only be construed as a final refusal to testify under oath before this committee.

"Thomas C. Hennings,
"Chairman, Subcommittee on
"Privileges and Elections."

(Report, p. 99.)

25. On November 21, 1952, Senator Thomas C. Hennings, who had succeeded Senator Gillette as chairman of the subcommittee, addressed a letter to Senator McCarthy which stated in part:

"Dear Senator McCarthy: As you will recall, on September 25, 1951, May 7, 1952, and May 10, 1952, this subcommittee invited you to appear before it to give testimony relating to the investigation pursuant to Senate Resolution 187."

The letter contained a copy of the November 7 letter to Senator McCarthy, together with the following communication received by the subcommittee on November 14, 1952, dated November 10, 1952:

"Dear Mr. Cotter: Inasmuch as Senator McCarthy is not now in Washington, I am taking the liberty of acknowledging receipt of your letter of November 7.

"I have just talked to the Senator over the telephone and he does not know just when he will return to Washington. It presently appears that he will not be available to appear before your committee during the time you mention. However, he did state that if you will let him know just what information you desire, he will be glad to try to be of help to you.

"Sincerely yours,

"Ray Kiermas,
"Administrative Assistant to Senator McCarthy."

The letter signed by Senator Hennings further stated in part:

"Pursuant to your request, as transmitted to us through Mr. Kiermas, we are advising you that the subcommittee desires to make inquiry with respect to the following matters:

"(1) Whether any funds collected or received by you and by others on your behalf to conduct certain of your activities, including those relating to communism, were ever diverted and used for other purposes inuring to your personal advantage.

"(2) Whether you, at any time, used your official position as a United States Senator and as a member of the Banking and Currency Committee, the Joint Housing Committee, and the Senate Investigations Committee to obtain a $10,000 fee from the Lustron Corp., which company was then almost entirely subsidized by agencies under the jurisdiction of the very committees of which you were a member.

"(3) Whether your activities on behalf of certain special interest groups, such as housing, sugar, and China, were motivated by self-interest.

"(4) Whether your activities with respect to your senatorial campaigns, particularly with respect to the reporting of your financing and your activities relating to the financial transactions with, and subsequent employment of, Ray Kiermas involved violations of the Federal and State Corrupt Practices Acts.

"(5) Whether loan or other transactions which you had with the Appleton State Bank, of Appleton, Wis., involved violations of tax and banking laws.

"(6) Whether you used close associates and members of your family to secrete receipts, income, commodity and stock speculations, and other financial transactions for ulterior motives.

"We again assure you of our desire to give you the opportunity to testify, in executive session of the Subcommittee, as to the foregoing matters. The 82d Congress expires in the immediate future and the subcommittee must necessarily proceed with dispatch in making its report to this Congress. To that end, we respectfully urge you to arrange to come before us on or before November 25, and thus enable us to do our conscientious best in the interests of the Senate and our obligation to complete our work. We would thank you to advise us immediately, so that we may plan accordingly." (Appendix, pp. 98–99.)

26. By letter of December 1, 1952, Senator McCarthy acknowledged the letter of November 21 sent to him by Senator Hennings. Senator McCarthy's letter to Senator Hennings questioned the honesty of the subcommittee, stated that Senator McCarthy would "ordinarily not dignify" the subcommittee by answering the letter of November 21, and further stated in part:

"However, I decided to give you no excuse to claim in your report that I refused to give you any facts. For that reason you are being informed that the answer to the six insulting questions in your letter of November 21 is 'No.'" (Appendix, p. 102.)

The foregoing itemization presents only the essential facts dealing with the charges under this heading. A fully rounded account is contained in the subcommitte's report.

Conclusion

By continued failure to appear before a competent subcommittee of the Senate, culminating in his failure to respond to the request of November 21, 1952 to appear and testify on charges of irregularity against him, the Senator from Wisconsin did not discharge his duties as a Senator and should be censured therefor.

COMMITTEE ITEM II

Incidents of encouragement of United States employees to violate the law and their oaths of office or executive orders, referred to in the following:

A. Amendment proposed by Mr. Fulbright to the resolution (S. Res. 301) to censure the Senator from Wisconsin, Mr. McCarthy, viz: "(5) The junior Senator from Wisconsin openly, in a public manner before nationwide television, invited and urged employees of the Government of the United States to violate the law and their oaths of office."

B. Amendment proposed by Mr. Morse to the resolution (S. Res. 301) to censure the Senator from Wisconsin, Mr. McCarthy, viz: "(e) Openly invited and incited employees of the Government to violate the law and their oaths of office by urging them to make available information, including classified information, which in the opinion of the employees could be of assistance to the junior Senator from Wisconsin in conducting his investigations, even though the supplying of such information by the employee would be illegal and in violation of Presidential order and contrary to the constitutional rights of the Chief Executive under the separation-of-powers doctrine."

C. Amendment proposed by Mr. Flanders to the resolution (S. Res. 301) to censure the Senator from Wisconsin, Mr. McCarthy, viz: "(14) He has publicly incited Government employees to violate their security oaths and serve as his personal informants, thus tending to break down the orderly chain of command in the civil service, as well as violating the security provisions of the Government."

Documentation

1. Hearings before the Special Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations, United States Senate, 83d Congress, 2d session, pursuant to Senate Resolution 189 (printed).

2. Stenographic transcript of hearings, Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations, United States Senate. (Transcript used where printed hearings not available. When used, date of testimony will be indicated for convenience in matching material when printed hearings become available.)

SUMMARY OF FACTS

1. On May 5, 1954, when Senator McCarthy was questioned by Mr. Joseph Welch, special counsel for the Army, regarding the source from which he obtained a classified document, which is further described in the documentation to committee item III, he replied in part:

"Senator McCarthy. Mr. Welch, I think I made it very clear to you that neither you nor anyone else will ever get me to violate the confidence of loyal people in this Government who give me information about Communist infiltration. I repeat, you will not get their names, you will not get any information which will allow you to identify them so that you or anyone else can get their jobs." (Hearing, pt. 20, pp. 767–768.)

2. The following are excerpts from statements made by Senator McCarthy before the subcommittee on May 27, 1954:

"Senator McCarthy. Mr. Chairman, in view of Senator McClellan's statement and his request, I would like to make it clear that I think that the oath which every person in this Government takes, to protect and defend this country against all enemies, foreign and domestic, that oath towers far above any presidential secrecy directive. And I will continue to receive information such as I received the other day. In view of Senator McClellan's statement that he feels that it is a crime for someone to give me information about traitors in Government, I am dutybound not to give the Senator the names of those informants." (Transcript, vol. 22, p. 3915.)

"Senator McCarthy. May I say that that will be my policy. There is no power on earth that can change that.

"Again, I want to compliment the individuals who have placed their oaths to defend the country against enemies, and certainly Communists are enemies, above and beyond any presidential directive. And none of them, none of them, will be brought before any grand jury because of any information that I give. If any administration wants to indict me for receiving and giving the American people information about communism, they can just go right ahead and do the indicting." (Transcript, vol. 22, p. 3916.)

* * * * *

"Senator McCarthy. * * *

"I am at this point deeply concerned to find my two Democrat colleagues in effect notifying the 2 million people who work for this Government that they think it is a crime for those employees to give the chairman of an investigating committee evidence of Communist infiltration, treason. I think that will serve to discourage them. As far as I am concerned, I would like to notify those 2 million Federal employees that I feel it is their duty to give us any information which they have about graft, corruption, communism, treason, and that there is no loyalty to a superior officer which can tower above and beyond their loyalty to their country." (Transcript, vol. 22, p. 3918.)

* * * * *

3. The following are excerpts from statements made by Senator McCarthy before the subcommittee on May 28, 1954:

"Senator McCarthy. * * *

"If I am wrong, I would like to get the committee's advice on that. I still advise all of those employees that anything they have given me in confidence will be treated in confidence." (Transcript, vol. 23, pp. 4260–4261.)

* * * * *

"Senator McCarthy. * * *

"May I say in answer to Senator Jackson—he says that J. Edgar Hoover—it is odd how J. Edgar Hoover is used as a shield for some of our friends—that J. Edgar Hoover said it would be a violation of law to give information to unauthorized people.

"Of course that is true. But Senator Jackson knows that the chairman of a committee, a committee set under the Reorganization Act to get all the information from the executive, is not an unauthorized person.

"* * * Senator McClellan talked about the indiscriminate handing out of information. We are not talking about that. We are talking about Federal employees giving the chairman of a committee, which has been set up to investigate the executive—that was made very clear in the Reorganization Act—that chairman getting information.

"* * * I hope my Democrat friends will finally, at long last, agree with me that we should not try to punish the loyal Federal employees who say, 'I will not protect any crookedness, any dishonesty in Government, merely because my boss or someone else takes a "secret" stamp and stamps it on a document.' If we can do that, I think we can perform a great service.

"May I say, Mr. Chairman, the reason I have taken so much time on this is because I do want to make it very, very clear to all of the Federal employees, as I have said before, that there is no power on earth which will force me to disclose the names of individuals who are respecting their oath, their oath to defend this United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic, and giving the head of a committee information." (Transcript, vol. 23, pp. 4269–4271.)

* * * * *

4. The following are excerpts from a colloquy between Senator McCarthy and Senator McClellan which took place in the hearings before the subcommittee on June 1, 1954:

"Senator McClellan. * * *

"I do take this position, that I am talking about classified information. If the Senator has a right, as chairman of this committee or as a United States Senator, to have the secret files of this Government, the classified files, dealing with the security of this country, to have them pilfered, and the documents given to him, then I say it will destroy the security system that protects this country at this hour." (Transcript, vol. 24, p. 4433.)

* * * * *

"Senator McCarthy. * * *

"I pointed out, Mr. Chairman, previously that as chairman of the Investigating Committee I have no choice, under the Reorganization Act I have the duty, but to examine and expose any wrongdoing in the executive branch.

"I pointed out that you cannot hide wrongdoing behind a stamp of secrecy. Let's not bring J. Edgar Hoover into this. J. Edgar Hoover made no decision as to whether or not these documents could be made public. That was made by the Attorney General.

"Let me finsh, please. I didn't interrupt you, Senator McClellan.

"I want to make it very clear that while I am chairman of the committee, I will receive evidence of wrongdoing, graft, corruption, treason, from any Government employee who will give that to me. I feel those Government employees have a high duty to do that. They all take an oath, as I recall, to defend this Nation against all enemies, foreign and domestic.

"I believe that oath towers far above any loyalty to a superior officer who might be jailed if they give us the facts." (Transcript, vol. 24, p. 4438.)

* * * * *

"Senator McCarthy. Let me say this: If a Presidential directive, one I think mistakenly made, unwisely made—I don't think this Congress is bound by any Presidential directive of secrecy. When Truman wrote his blackout order in 1948 which protected the Alger Hisses in the Government, I thought he was making a grievous error. When President Eisenhower, whom I respect greatly, passed his secrecy order which went far beyond the Truman order, I thought he was making a grievous error and I felt he was not entitled to do it.

"May I say, Senator, just for your benefit, I am not setting myself above any law. I feel that I have an oath as a Senator, an oath as the chairman of an investigating committee. That oath binds me to get information of wrongdoing in government. I feel that there is no valid directive of any kind which can say that, as chairman of the committee, I must not do that.

"If the Congress passes a law and the President signs it, saying the chairmen of these investigating committees must not get information of wrongdoing, that the American people must not know what is going on, that the American people must not hear of treason, that they must not hear of graft and corruption, if we pass that law and it is made a law, then there is nothing I can do except abide by it. But, Senator, I just will not abide by any secrecy directive of anyone. I think you and I have seen and will see Presidents come and go." (Transcript, vol. 24, pp. 4446–4447.)

5. The following are excerpts from a colloquy between Senator McCarthy and Senator Symington which took place in the hearings before the subcommittee on June 16, 1954:

"Senator Symington. Senator McCarthy, as I see it, based on your own words, if a man or if an employee of the Army gave an unauthorized person secret, top secret, or confidential material, would that be a violation of the Espionage Act?

"Senator McCarthy. An unauthorized person, yes. I believe, Senator, however, to get a conviction for a violation of the Espionage Act, the information would have to be of such a nature that it would be of benefit to an enemy. But essentially, I think that you are correct in that.

"Senator Symington. Thank you. That act, as I read it, makes it a felony punishable by a fine up to $10,000 and by a jail sentence up to 10 years for any person having control of classified documents who divulge them to an unauthorized person; is that correct?

"Senator McCarthy. You are speaking about the McCarran Act. I think that is the penalty provided in the McCarran Act, an excellent act.

"Senator Symington. United States Code, Annotated, title XVIII, Crime and Criminal Procedures, 701–1698, paragraph 793." (Transcript, vol. 35, p. 6983.)

6. The following are excerpts from a colloquy between Senator McCarthy and Senator McClellan which took place in the hearings before the subcommittee on June 16, 1954:

"Senator McCarthy. I think you are completely wrong, Senator. I don't think any Government employee can deny the people the right to know what the facts are by using a rubber stamp and stamping something 'secret'." (Transcript, vol. 35, p. 7013.)

* * * * *

"Senator McCarthy. Senator, may I make it very clear so there is no question about it: Regardless of who tries to sustain me or vice versa, while I am chairman of the committee I will receive all the information I can get about wrongdoing in the executive branch. I will give that information to the American people.

* * * * *

"Senator McCarthy. And I will protect anyone who gives me that information." (Transcript, vol. 35, p. 7014.)

7. The following are excerpts from a colloquy between Senator McCarthy and Senator Symington which took place in the hearings before the subcommittee on June 16, 1954:

"Senator Symington. Regardless of instructions from his superior, anybody can decide themselves, regardless of the classification of a document, if they believe that it is wrong, whatever their superior does, therefore they have the right to tell it to a congressional committee, is that right?

"Senator McCarthy. Senator, so there is no question, let me repeat again, anyone who has evidence of wrongdoing, has not only the right but the duty to bring that evidence to a congressional committee." (Transcript, vol. 35, p. 7037.)

8. The following are answers given by Senator McCarthy to questions asked him by Mr. Welch in the hearing before the subcommittee on June 16, 1954:

"Senator McCarthy. Well, I will answer it as I think it should be answered. No. 1, we have received no information from the FBI. No. 2, I do think, Mr. Welch, and I know you are asking for the information, No. 2, if the FBI has been issuing reports to a certain agency, that, we will say, Mr. X is a traitor, is guilty of spying, espionage and what have you, if someone in that agency knows that the reports were being ignored, I think he has a duty to bring that to his committee, to the Jenner committee, to the Velde committee, some committee with jurisdiction." (Transcript, vol. 35, p. 7039.)

* * * * *

"Senator McCarthy. * * * Let me answer your question. If the FBI, as in the Alger Hiss case, has reported evidence of treason to a department, if the head of that department knows all about it, if he refuses to act on it, then I think it is the duty of any American who loves his country, to bring that to the attention of the proper investigating committee, and I think that is the rule that we should follow, not only in 1954 but in 1964, 1974, 1984, 1994. Otherwise, Mr. Welch, if we can cover up wrongdoing, if we can cover up treason by a stamp of secrecy, then you and I won't—strike that. Let's say that this Nation certainly won't have too long to live." (Transcript, vol. 35, p. 7041.)

Conclusion

By the statements set out above, Senator McCarthy invited Government employees to submit to him classified executive information without regard to their oath of office, provisions of law, executive regulations and ethical obligations. For this invitation to anarchy, the Senator from Wisconsin should be censured.

COMMITTEE ITEM III

Incidents involving receipt or use of classified document or other confidential information, from executive files, referred to in the following:

A. Amendment proposed by Mr. Morse to the resolution (S. Res. 301) to censure the Senator from Wisconsin, Mr. McCarthy, viz: "(d) Received and made use of confidential information unlawfully obtained from a document in executive files upon which document the Federal Bureau of Investigation had placed its highest classification; and offered such information to a lawfully constituted Senate subcommittee in the form of a spurious document which he falsely asserted to the subcommittee to be 'a letter from the FBI'."

B. Amendment proposed by Mr. Flanders to the resolution (S. Res. 301) to censure the Senator from Wisconsin, Mr. McCarthy, viz: "(13) He received and held a valuable classified document in possible violation of the Espionage Act. (Revealed in the Army-McCarthy hearings that he had improperly obtained J. Edgar Hoover's report on subversives from the Army, and failed to restore the document to properly authorized hands.) He permitted the document to fall into the hands of a gossip columnist (Walter Winchell)."

Documentation

Hearings before the Special Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations, United States Senate, 83d Congress, 2d session, pursuant to Senate Resolution 189.

Exhibits

(a) Copy of Federal Register of March 16, 1948, volume 13, No. 52, containing Presidential directive of March 13, 1948 (Confidential Status of Employee Loyalty Records).

(b) Copy of Federal Register of April 29, 1953, volume 18, No. 82, containing Executive Order 10450 of April 27, 1953 (Security Requirements for Government Employment).

Summary of facts

1. At a hearing before the special subcommittee on May 4, 1954, during an examination of Secretary Robert T. Stevens, Senator McCarthy produced a 2¼-page document to which he referred as follows:

"Senator McCarthy. Mr. Secretary, I would like to give you a letter, one which was written incidentally before you took office but which was in the file, I understand, all during the time you are in office—I understand it is in the file as of today—from the FBI, pointing out the urgency in connection with certain cases, listing the fact, for example, that Coleman had been in direct connection with espionage agents—" (Hearing, pt. 18, p. 703.)

* * * * *

"Senator McCarthy. I want to question the Secretary as to whether or not the original of this and other letters like it are in his file. I want to make it clear that I have gotten neither this letter nor anything else from the FBI." (Hearing, pt. 18, p. 704.)

2. The following colloquy between Mr. Ray Jenkins, subcommittee counsel, and Mr. Stevens occurred on May 5, 1954:

"Mr. Jenkins. Mr. Stevens, since yesterday afternoon, have you or not, through yourself or those under your command examined the files of the Intelligence Department of the Pentagon with special reference to the original of the letter about which you were questioned yesterday afternoon?

"Secretary Stevens. Yes, sir.

"Mr. Jenkins. State whether or not such a letter was found in that file or any other file.

"Secretary Stevens. No, sir." (Hearing, pt. 19, p. 720.)

3. Mr. Robert Collier, assistant counsel to the subcommittee, was then called to the stand and sworn. He was interrogated regarding a conference between himself and Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the FBI, on the subject of the above document. The following are excerpts from Collier's testimony:

"Mr. Collier. Upon receiving your instructions, I communicated with the FBI, and within a short period of time obtained an appointment with Mr. Hoover. I went to see him, having advised him of the date and the type of letter involved. Mr. Hoover at that time informed me that they had not found such a letter. He did have another letter of the same date.

"In order to be perfectly sure that they had obtained the correct letter, I returned to the Senate Office Building and obtained from Roy Cohn, in Senator McCarthy's office, the letter which I now have in my hand and which was the one produced yesterday by Senator McCarthy. I took that letter to Mr. Hoover, and at that time he compared this letter with the letter in his possession of the same date.

"I can now report to you that Mr. Hoover advised me that this letter is not a carbon——

"Mr. Jenkins. Identify the letter when you say 'this letter.'

"Mr. Collier. This is the letter produced yesterday by Senator McCarthy. This is not a carbon copy or a copy of any communication prepared or sent by the FBI to General Bolling on January 26, 1951, or any other date. The FBI has in its files a letter——

"Mr. Jenkins. Are you now stating what Mr. Hoover personally told you?

"Mr. Collier. Yes, sir.

"Mr. Jenkins. You may proceed.

"Mr. Collier. The FBI does have in its files a file copy of a letter dated January 26, 1951, the same date, prepared and sent by the FBI to General Bolling, which was a 15-page interdepartmental memorandum. A carbon copy of that went to Maj. Gen. Joseph F. Carroll, United States Air Force.

"Mr. Hoover, in comparing the two documents, advised me that the form of the carbon copy which I have, the one introduced, and the yellow copy of the FBI memorandum prepared on January 26, are materially different in form." (Hearing, pt. 9, pp. 721, 722.)

* * * * *

"* * * Mr. Hoover advised me, and examined the two documents in my presence, advised me that the substance of the original FBI 15-page memorandum and the substance of the 2¼-page carbon copy, contain information relating to the same subject matter, and that in some instances exact or identical language appears in both documents." (Hearing, pt. 19, p. 723.)

Note.—On pages 722 and 723, Mr. Collier recounted in detail the differences between the two documents. See also Mr. Collier's testimony on pages 749 to 754, of part 20.

4. The following are excerpts from the testimony of Senator McCarthy before the special subcommittee on May 5, 1954:

"Mr. Jenkins. There was handed to me, Senator McCarthy, a letter dated January 26, 1951, and referred to herein as a 2¼-page letter. As I recall, Senator, that letter was handed to me by you; is that correct?

"Senator McCarthy. That is correct. It was passed along the table by me." (Hearing, pt. 20, p. 759.)

* * * * *

"Mr. Jenkins. Senator McCarthy, you are bound to aware of the fact that some attack has been made upon that letter. I want to ask you at this time to tell this committee all of your knowledge, without my asking you any specific questions at this time, with respect to the 2¼-page letter, particularly where you obtained possession of it, when you obtained possession of it, when it came, and give any other knowledge that you may have pertaining to that 2¼-page letter.

"Senator McCarthy. First let me make it very clear, Mr. Jenkins and Mr. Chairman, that I will not under any circumstances reveal the source of any information which I get as chairman of the committee * * * I will give you the information that you request, Mr. Jenkins. This came to me from someone within the Army.

"As I recall the time, I do not recall the date. I recall he stated very clearly the reason why he was giving me this information was because he was deeply disturbed because even though there were repeated reports from the FBI to the effect that there were Communist infiltration, indications of espionage in the top-secret laboratories, the radar laboratories, that nothing was being done, he felt that his duty to his country was above any duty to any Truman directive to the effect that he could not disclose this information. * * *" (Hearing, pt. 20, pp. 759–760.)

Note.—See exhibit "a"—the so-called Truman directive of March 13, 1948, which states in part "all reports, records, and files relative to the loyalty of employees or prospective employees (including reports of such investigative agencies), shall be maintained in confidence, and shall not be transmitted or disclosed except as required in the efficient conduct of business."

See also exhibit "b"—Executive Order 10450, April 28, 1953, section 9 (c), which states: "The reports and other investigative material and information developed by investigations conducted pursuant to any statute, order, or program described in section 7 of this order shall remain the property of the investigative agencies conducting the investigations, but may, subject to considerations of the national security, be retained by the department or agency concerned. Such reports and other investigative material and information shall be maintained in confidence, and no access shall be given thereto except, with the consent of the investigative agency concerned, to other departments and agencies conducting security programs under the authority granted by or in accordance with the said act of August 26, 1950, as may be required for the efficient conduct of Government business."

"Mr. Jenkins. * * * Then, Senator, you did not get the 2¼-page document from the Federal Bureau of Investigation?

"Senator McCarthy. I did not, sir.

* * * * *

"Mr. Jenkins. But, as I do understand it, Senator McCarthy, and we are trying to pursue this question to its logical end so that the committee may know all the facts, that 2¼-page document was delivered to you by someone from the Army?

"Senator McCarthy. Yes. I can go a step further, Mr. Jenkins.

"Mr. Jenkins. And perhaps in the Intelligence Department? Can you go that far?

"Senator McCarthy. An officer in the Intelligence Department.

"Mr. Jenkins. Very well. Senator, when was that letter, that 2¼-page document, delivered to you?

* * * * *

"Senator McCarthy. Mr. Jenkins, I would have difficulty giving you an exact date, but it was early last spring, roughly a year ago." (Hearing, pt. 20, p. 766.)

* * * * *

"Senator Symington. Senator, I have two questions.

"First, did you discuss this article or letter with Mr. Hoover, or the FBI, before you offered it for evidence?

"Senator McCarthy. I did not. * * * I have never discussed with Mr. Hoover any report that appeared to have originated in the FBI I have used my own judgment and the one that I thought should be used I have used." (Hearing, pt. 20, p. 766.)

* * * * *

"Mr. Welch. Do you understand that J. Edgar Hoover sent to the Army a document 2¼ pages in length? Just 'Yes' or 'No.'

"Senator McCarthy. I don't know the length of these other documents.

"Mr. Welch. Let us face up to it, Senator. Do you understand that J. Edgar Hoover sent to the Army a document 2¼ pages in length?

"Senator McCarthy. As far as the document on January 26 is concerned the answer is 'No'." (Hearing, pt. 20, p. 774.)

5. The question of whether or not the contents of the documents (the 15-page memorandum and the 2¼-page document produced by Senator McCarthy) could legally be disclosed arose during the questioning of Mr. Collier on May 5, 1954. The following colloquy took place between Senator Mundt, subcommittee chairman, and Mr. Collier:

"Senator Mundt. * * * You were quoting Mr. Hoover, then, when you said that in some instances the language was identical, that the subject matter was identical, and that as Mr. Hoover interprets the security laws, the subject matter, both of the FBI copies and of the copies from Senator McCarthy's files, because they deal with an identical subject, should not be revealed in public short of a ruling of the Attorney General. Is that correct?

"Mr. Collier. I want to make it clear. Mr. Hoover did not, of course, refer to this carbon copy when he stated that, because actually this is not a carbon copy of any FBI document. He was referring to his own document, the 15-page memorandum, when he suggested that 'I respectfully refer you to the Attorney General for his opinion'." (Hearing, pt. 19, pp. 724–725.)

6. The following are excerpts from a colloquy between Senator McClellan and Mr. Collier before the subcommittee on May 5, 1954:

"Senator McClellan. * * * From what you have seen of the two documents, the one that has been presented here, and the one that you discussed with Mr. Hoover, I will ask you to state whether it would be possible for anyone to compose or present the document now before us except that they had access to the original document or the original copy thereof which still remains confidential and restricted.

"Mr. Collier. You are asking for my personal opinion on that?

"Senator McClellan. From what you have observed of the two. Would it be possible, except that the author of the document now before us must have had access to the original or the original copy thereof?

"Mr. Collier. I would say that since seven of the paragraphs are identical, that the person who wrote this document must have had access to the original, because the identical language is contained therein.

"Senator McClellan. It is still restricted so far as the FBI is concerned?

"Mr. Collier. Mr. Hoover told me, and as I have stated to the committee at the beginning of this testimony, that it carries the highest classification the Bureau can place on a document, confidential, that he does not feel that he has any right to declassify it." (Hearing, pt. 20, p. 755.)

7. On May 5, 1954, Senator Mundt, as chairman of the Special Investigating Subcommittee, addressed a letter to Attorney General Brownell, asking the opinion of the Attorney General as to whether or not the contents or any part of the 2¼-page and the 15-page documents could be released to the public. (Exhibit No. 15, hearing, pt. 21, p. 819.)

8. On May 6, 1954, there was introduced in the hearing before the subcommittee a letter from Attorney General Brownell to Senator Mundt (exhibit No. 16, hearing, pt. 21, pp. 820, 821) which stated, in part, with regard to the 2¼-page document introduced in the hearing by Senator McCarthy:

"Your second request refers to a 2¼-page document, dated January 26, 1951, a copy of which was delivered to us by Mr. Robert A. Collier, assistant counsel of your subcommittee, and which is returned herewith. This document purports to be a copy of a letter with a salutation: 'Major General Bolling, Assistant Chief of Staff, G–2, Department of the Army, Washington, D. C., Sir:'. It is marked 'personal and confidential.' It closes with the following typewritten signature: 'Sincerely yours, J. Edgar Hoover, Director.'

"Mr. Hoover has examined the document and has advised me that he never wrote any such letter. However, this document does contain phraseology which is identical in words and paragraphs with those contained in the 15-page memorandum referred to previously. In addition this document contains the listing of names identical with names contained in the 15-page memorandum.

"After these names there appear the words 'derogatory' or 'no derogatory' which were not contained in the original memorandum. Although the 2¼-page document purports to be a letter signed by J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the FBI, these evaluations of 'derogatory' or 'no derogatory' were not made by him nor by anyone on his behalf. In fact, there is nothing contained in the 2¼-page document to show who made such evaluations. In view of these facts and because the document constitutes an unauthorized use of information which is classified as confidential, and for the reasons previously stated, it is my opinion that it should not be made public."

"Sincerely yours,

"Herbert Brownell, Jr.,
"*Attorney General.*"

9. Although there has not to my knowledge been a definitive decision declaring the receipt of such classified information as that contained in the 2½-page document to be a violation of Federal law, a reading of the applicable Federal statute casts great doubt upon the legality of such receipt. Title 18, United States Code, section 793 (f), provides:

"Whoever, being entrusted with or having lawful possession or control of any document, writing, code book, signal book, sketch, photograph, photographic negative, blueprint, plan, map, model, instrument, appliance, note, or information, relating to the national defense, (1) through gross negligence permits the same to be removed from its proper place of custody or delivered to anyone in violation og his trust, or to be lost, stolen, abstracted, or destroyed, or (2) having knowledge that the same has been illegally removed from its proper place of custody or delivered to anyone in violation of its trust, or lost, or stolen, abstracted, or destroyed, and fails to make prompt report of such loss, theft, abstraction, or destruction to his superior officer—

"Shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned not more than 10 years, or both."

The foregoing is followed by a subsection (g), which reads as follows:

"If two or more persons conspire to violate any of the foregoing provisions of this section, and one or more of such persons do any act to effect the object of the conspiracy, each of the parties to such conspiracy shall be subject to the punishment provided for the offense which is the object of such conspiracy."

Conclusion

The testimony set out above indicates that Senator McCarthy made use in a hearing before the Special Subcommittee on Investigations of a document which he knew had been extracted from executive files in contravention of an Executive order. The receipt of such a classified document may also have been in violation of the Espionage Act, and certainly was in violation of the spirit and intent of the sections of the Espionage Act set forth above. For this improper use of classified executive material the Senator from Wisconsin should be censured.

COMMITTEE ITEM IV

Incidents involving abuse of colleagues in the Senate, referred to in the following:

A. Amendment proposed by Mr. Flanders to the resolution (S. Res. 301) to censure the Senator from Wisconsin, Mr. McCarthy, viz: "(30) He has ridiculed his colleagues in the Senate, defaming them publicly in vulgar and base language (regarding Senator Hendrickson—'a living miracle without brains or guts'; on Flanders—'senile—I think they should get a man with a net and take him to a good quiet place')."

B. Amendment proposed by Mr. Morse to the resolution (S. Res. 301) to censure the Senator from Wisconsin, Mr. McCarthy, viz: "(b) unfairly accused his fellow Senators Gillette, Monroney, Hendrickson, Hayden, and Hennings of improper conduct in carrying out their duties as Senators."

Documentation

Report of the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections to the Committee on Rules and Administration, United States Senate, pursuant to Senate Resolution 187 and Senate Resolution 304.

Summary of facts

1. On August 6, 1951, Senate Resolution 187 was introduced in the Senate by Senator William Benton, of Connecticut. The resolution called for an investigation to determine whether expulsion proceedings should be instituted against Senator Joseph R. McCarthy. The resolution was referred by the President of the Senate to the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration and, in turn, to its Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections for consideration. There was also referred to this committee and subcommittee on April 10, 1952, a resolution (S. Res. 304) introduced by Senator McCarthy, calling for an investigation of Senator Benton. (Report, pp. 1, 5.)

2. During the course of the above investigations, Senators Gillette, Monroney, Hendrickson, Hayden, and Hennings served on the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections, as did Senators Welker and Margaret Chase Smith.

3. During the time that Senator Gillette was chairman of the subcommittee, Senator McCarthy on numerous occasions was invited to appear and assist the subcommittee on its investigations. Senator McCarthy failed to appear before the subcommittee, and instead he made attacks upon the integrity of the subcommittee and its members. The following are quotations from letters written by Senator McCarthy. The letters are reproduced in their entirety in the appendix of the report of the subcommittee.

December 6, 1951: "* * * a horde of investigators hired by your committee at a cost of tens of thousands of dollars of taxpayers' money, has been engaged exclusively in trying to dig up on McCarthy material covering periods of time long before he was old enough to be a candidate for the Senate—material which can have no conceivable connection with his election or any other election. This is being done in complete disregard of the limited power of your elections subcommittee. The obvious purpose is to dig up campaign material for the Democrat Party for the coming campaign against McCarthy.

"When your elections subcommittee, without Senate authorization, spends tens of thousands of taxpayers' dollars for the sole purpose of digging up campaign material against McCarthy, then the committee is guilty of stealing just as clearly as though the members engaged in picking the pockets of the taxpayers and turning over the loot to the Democrat National Committee." (Appendix, p. 62.)

"While the actions of Benton and some of the committee members do not surprise me, I cannot understand your being willing to label Guy Gillette as a man who will head a committee which is stealing from the pockets of the American taxpayer tens of thousands of dollars and then using this money to protect the Democrat Party from the political effect of the exposure of Communists in government. To take it upon yourself to hire a horde of investigators and spend tens of thousands of dollars without any authorization to do so from the Senate is labeling your elections subcommittee as even more dishonest than was the Tydings committee." (Appendix, pp. 62–63.)

December 19, 1951: "As I have previously stated, you and every member of your subcommittee who is responsible for spending vast amounts of money to hire investigators, pay their traveling expenses, etc., on matters not concerned with elections, is just as dishonest as though he or she picked the pockets of the taxpayers and turned the loot over to the Democrat National Committee." (Appendix, p. 65.)

4. On April 8, 1952: Senator Hayden, chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration, introduced on the floor of the Senate, Senate Resolution 300 (exhibit No. 14, appendix, pp. 68–69), which pointed out the issue involved with respect to Senator McCarthy's charge that the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections lacked jurisdiction to investigate such acts of a Senator as were not connected with an election campaign, and his attack upon the honesty and motives of the members of the subcommittee.

On April 10, 1952, the Senate voted on Resolution 300, and, by a vote of 60 to 0, upheld the jurisdiction of the Senate Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections to continue its investigation of Senator McCarthy and confirmed its confidence in the honesty and integrity of the members of the subcommittee. (Report, p. 5.)

5. In May 1952 Senator McCarthy wrote letters to the subcommittee containing the following statements:

May 8, 1952: "I am sure that you would never knowingly allow your committee to serve the Communist cause. However, the damage done is the same whether it is knowingly and deliberately done. There can be no question in your mind or in anyone's mind that this year-long investigation by your subcommittee would never have been commenced if I had not been exposing Communists in Government." (Appendix, p. 81.)

• • • • •

"If you have evidence of wrongdoing on McCarthy's part, which would justify removal from the Senate or a vote of censure by the Senate, certainly you have the obligation to produce it. However, as you well know, every member of your committee and staff privately admits that no such evidence is in existence. It is an evil and dishonest thing for the subcommittee to allow itself to be used for an evil purpose." (Appendix, p. 82.)

May 11, 1952: "Some shallow thinkers may say that you gentlemen are dishonest to have planned to use your committee as a sounding board to headline the statements of a witness after your staff had reported he was mentally unbalanced. I beg you not to let this distract you from the honest, gentlemanly job you are doing. Those critics fail to realize that everything is ethical and honest if it is done to expose the awfulness of McCarthyism." (Appendix, p. 83.)

• • • • •

"I ask you gentlemen not to be disturbed by those who point out that your committee is trying to do what the Communist Party has officially proclaimed as its No. 1 task. You just keep on in the same honest, painstaking way of developing the truth. The thinking people of this Nation will not be deceived by those who claim that what you are doing is dishonest. After all, you must serve the interest of the Democrat Party—there is always the chance that the country may be able to survive. * * * After all, isn't McCarthy doing the terribly unpatriotic and unethical thing of proving the extent to which the Democrat administration is Communist ridden? Unless he can be discredited, the Democrat Party may be removed from power." (Appendix, p. 84.)

6. On September 9, 1952, Senator Welker resigned from the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections. On September 10, 1952, Senator Gillette submitted his resignation from the subcommittee in a letter to Senator Hayden, chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration. The following statement was contained in Senator Gillette's letter:

"If Senator Welker carries out his announced intention and sends his resignation to you, the opportunity is clear for a return to a three-man membership. My resignation would be clearly indicated and would leave Senators Hennings, Monroney, and Hendrickson. As you know, there are no three Members of the Senate who are more capable, or more high minded, than these men. They have always been scrupulously fair in their consideration of the difficult problems laid before the subcommittee. There is no doubt in my mind that it would be in the best interest of the work of the subcommittee to take the action I have suggested." (Appendix, p. 95.)

7. On December 1, 1952, Senator McCarthy wrote a letter to Senator Hennings, who had replaced Senator Gillette as chairman of the subcommittee. The following are excerpts from Senator McCarthy's letter to Senator Hennings:

"I was interested in your declaration of honesty of the committee and would like to believe that it is true.* * * Senator Gillette also resigned without giving any plausible reason for his resignation from the committee. Obviously, he also couldn't stomach the dishonest use of public funds for political purposes. For that reason it is difficult for me to believe your protestations of the honesty of your committee." (Appendix, p. 102.)

"I thought perhaps the election might have taught you that your boss and mine—the American people—do not approve of treason and incompetence and feel that it must be exposed." (Appendix, p. 103.)

• • • • •

"This letter is not written with any hope of getting an honest report from your committee. It is being written merely to keep the record straight." (Appendix, p. 104.)

Conclusion

For these unwarranted attacks upon members of a duly constituted subcommittee of the Senate, Senator McCarthy should be censured.

COMMITTEE ITEM V

Incident relating to Ralph Zwicker, a general officer of the Army of the United States, referred to in the following:

A. Amendment proposed by Mr. Fulbright to the resolution (S. Res. 301) to censure the Senator from Wisconsin, Mr. McCarthy, viz: "(4) without justification, the junior Senator from Wisconsin impugned the loyalty, patriotism, and character of Gen. Ralph Zwicker."

B. Amendment proposed by Mr. Morse to the resolution (S. Res. 301) to censure the Senator from Wisconsin, Mr. McCarthy, viz: "(c) as chairman of a committee resorted to abusive conduct in his interrogation of Gen. Ralph Zwicker, including a charge that General Zwicker was unfit to wear the uniform, during the appearance of General Zwicker as a witness before the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Senate Committee on Government Operations on February 18, 1954."

C. Amendment proposed by Mr. Flanders to the resolution (S. Res. 301) to censure the Senator from Wisconsin, Mr. McCarthy, viz: "(10) He has attacked, defamed, and besmirched military heroes of the United States, either as witnesses before his committee or under the cloak of immunity of the Senate floor (General Zwicker, General Marshall)."

Documentation

Hearings before the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations, United States Senate, 83d Congress, 2d session, pursuant to Senate Resolution 189, part 3, January 30, February 18, and March 4, 1954.

Summary of facts

1. On February 18, 1954, Gen. Ralph W. Zwicker, commanding officer, Camp Kilmer, appeared as a witness before the permanent subcommittee in connection with its investigation of alleged Communist infiltration in the Army. The subcommittee met in executive session in room 110, Federal Building, New York, Senator Joseph R. McCarthy (chairman) presiding. The chairman was the only subcommittee member present. (Hearings, p. 145.)

2. General Zwicker was asked questions about the honorable discharge from the Army of Major Peress, a witness at an earlier hearing who had refused to answer whether or not he was a member of the Communist Party, claiming the privilege of the fifth amendment. Certain of the questions asked General Zwicker he refused to answer on the grounds of a Presidential directive. (Hearings, pp. 146, 147.)

3. When asked about the Peress testimony, General Zwicker stated that his knowledge of what Peress had been asked and had refused to answer was confined to what he had read in the press, but that he knew generally the reasons for calling Peress before the subcommittee, and he knew that Peress had refused to answer some questions. The following colloquy ensued early in the hearing:

"The Chairman. Did you know that he refused to answer questions about his Communist activities?

"General Zwicker. Specifically, I don't believe so.

"The Chairman. Did you have any idea?

"General Zwicker. Of course I had an idea.

"The Chairman. What do you think he was called down here for?

"General Zwicker. For that specific purpose.

"The Chairman. Then you knew that those were the questions he was asked, did you not? General, let's try and be truthful. I am going to keep you here as long as you keep hedging and hemming.

"General Zwicker. I am not hedging.

"The Chairman. Or hawing.

"General Zwicker. I am not hawing, and I don't like to have anyone impugn my honesty, which you just about did.

"The Chairman. Either your honesty or your intelligence; I can't help impugning one or the other, when you tell us that a major in your command who was known to you to have been before a Senate committee, and of whom you read the press releases very carefully—to now have you sit here and tell us that you did not know whether he refused to answer questions about Communist activities. I had seen all the press releases, and they all dealt with that. So when you do that, General, if you will pardon me, I cannot help but question either your honesty or your intelligence, one or the other. I want to be frank with you on that." (Hearings, pp. 147, 148.)

4. Later in the hearing, the chairman (Senator McCarthy) asked General Zwicker the following question:

"The Chairman. Do you think, General, that anyone who is responsible for giving an honorable discharge to a man who has been named under oath as a member of the Communist conspiracy should himself be removed from the military?"

General Zwicker asked whether the question was general or specific, and after stating that he was dealing in generalities, the Chairman (Senator McCarthy) asked General Zwicker the following hypothetical question:

"The Chairman. Let us assume that John Jones is a major in the United States Army. Let us assume that there is sworn testimony to the effect that he is part of the Communist conspiracy, has attended Communist leadership schools. Let us assume that Maj. John Jones is under oath before a committee and says, 'I cannot tell you the truth about these charges, because, if I did, I fear that might tend to incriminate me.' Then let us say that General Smith was responsible for this man receiving an honorable discharge, knowing these facts. Do you think that General Smith should be removed from the military, or do you think he should be kept on in it?"

General Zwicker stated that the hypothetical General Smith should be kept if he were acting under competent orders to separate the man, and then the chairman asked him to assume that General Smith originated the order directing the honorable discharge. General Zwicker stated that "that is not a question for me to decide, Senator." The following colloquy then took place:

"The Chairman. You are ordered to answer it, General. You are an employee of the people.

"General Zwicker. Yes, sir.

"The Chairman. You have a rather important job. I want to know how you feel about getting rid of Communists.

"General Zwicker. I am all for it.

"The Chairman. All right. You will answer that question, unless you take the fifth amendment. I do not care how long we stay here; you are going to answer it.

"General Zwicker. Do you mean how I feel toward Communists?

"The Chairman. I mean exactly what I asked you, General; nothing else. And anyone with the brains of a 5-year-old child can understand that question.

"The reporter will read it to you as often as you need to hear it so that you can answer it, and then you will answer it.

"General Zwicker. Start it over, please."

(The question was reread by the reporter.)

"General Zwicker. I do not think he should be removed from the military.

"The Chairman. Then, General, you should be removed from any command. Any man who has been given the honor of being promoted to general, and who says, 'I will protect another general who protected Communists,' is not fit to wear that uniform, General. I think it is a tremendous disgrace to the Army to have this sort of thing given to the public. I intend to give it to them. I have a duty to do that. I intend to repeat to the press exactly what you said. So you know that. You will be back here, General." (Hearings, pp. 152, 153.)

5. At the conclusion of the hearings, the following statements were made:

"The Chairman. General, you will return for a public session at 10:30 Tuesday morning.

"General Zwicker. This coming Tuesday?

"The Chairman. Yes.

"General Zwicker. Here?

"The Chairman. Yes.

"General Zwicker. At what time?

"The Chairman. 10:30. In the meantime, in accordance with the order which you claim forbids you the right to discuss this case, you will contact the proper authorities who can give you permission to tell the committee the truth about the case before you appear Tuesday, and request permission to be allowed to tell us the truth about the——

"General Zwicker. Sir, that is not my prerogative, either.

"The Chairman. You are ordered to do it.

"General Zwicker. I am sorry, sir, I will not do that.

"The Chairman. All right.

"General Zwicker. If you care to have me, I will cite certain other portions of this.

"The Chairman. You need cite nothing. You may step down." (Hearings, p. 157.)

Conclusion

The abusive and threatening conduct resorted to by Senator McCarthy, as set forth above, in his questioning of Gen. Ralph Zwicker, for declining to testify in violation of instructions issued by his superiors and contained in an Executive order, was unwarranted and unjustified and an abuse of the Senator's position of chairman of the Subcommittee on Investigations, for which the Senator from Wisconsin should be censured.

ALLEGATIONS NOT INCLUDED IN NOTICE OF HEARING

The select committee's notice of hearing did not include two allegations of misconduct contained in my bill of particulars, by way of an amendment to Senate Resolution 301. These omissions may not be based upon any final determination not to consider the allegations. In the case of the conduct which was the subject of the so-called Army-McCarthy hearings, the select committee may have felt that it should not take any action until the Subcommittee of the Government Operations Committee had completed its work by the filing of reports.

It is respectfully submitted that the two omitted allegations make a prima facie case of improper activities warranting censure. I am therefore providing the following summary of the material upon which those two charges are based for the further consideration of the select committee.

ITEM F OF MORSE AMENDMENT

Charge

(Senator McCarthy) "attempted to invade the constitutional power of the President of the United States to conduct the foreign relations of the United States by carrying on negotiations with certain Greek shipowners in respect to foreign trade policies, even though the executive branch of our Government had a few weeks previously entered into an understanding with the Greek Government in respect to banning the flow of strategic materials to Communist countries."

Documentation

Hearings, Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations, United States Senate, 83d Congress, 1st session, pursuant to Senate Resolution 40, part I, March 30 and 31, 1953.

Summary of facts

1. On March 29, 1953, Senator Joseph McCarthy, chairman of the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, announced that he had effected an agreement with Greek owners of 242 merchant ships to break off all trade with Communist China, North Korea, and Far Eastern ports of the Soviet Union. He stated that although the vessels were all owned by Greek nationals, only 51 flew the Greek flag; 17 were registered as British, 34

Canadian, 52 Liberian, and 88 Panamanian. (See hearings, pp. 1-5.)

2. Before effecting the above agreements, Mr. McCarthy had been informed by Mr. Harold Stassen, Director for Mutual Security, that the Government was dealing with foreign governments, and in particular the Greek Government, to stop trade with the Communist nations. (Hearings, p. 4.)

3. Mr. McCarthy carried out the negotiations for the above agreements and effected the agreements secretly, without advising the State Department or other governmental agencies, and in fact refused to reveal the manner in which said agreements had been obtained. (Hearings, p. 3.)

4. On March 23, 1953, 6 days before the agreement between Mr. McCarthy and the Greek shipowners, the Government of Greece, after negotiations with the United States Government, gave notice forbidding merchant ships under the Greek flag to ply at ports controlled by the Communist China Government and the North Kerea Government. (Hearings, appendix, p. 63.)

5. Prior to the time of the agreement between the Greek shipowners and Mr. McCarthy, ships of the Liberian and Panamanian flags had been forbidden by their governments to transport goods to and from Communist China and North Korean ports. (Hearings, p. 17.)

6. At the time of the agreement between Mr. McCarthy and the Greek shipowners, the United States was working with the countries of the United Kingdom and other countries on agreements to stop shipments of articles of military value to Communist and North Korean ports. (Hearings, pp. 18-21.)

7. On March 30, 1953, Mr. McCarthy stated that he and his assistants had been able to do what the State Department had been unable to do, and that he wanted to give his assistants credit for dealing a heavier blow to the Communists than had the State Department. (Hearings, p. 36.)

8. On March 30, 1953, Mr. McCarthy stated that he intended to continue to try to get agreements with foreign shipowners to remove their ships from trade with the Communists, even though he had been informed by Mr. Harold Stassen, Director of Mutual Security, that his efforts were impairing the ability of the United States Government to negotiate with other governments in this field. (Hearings, p. 36.)

Conclusion

The agreements effected by Senator McCarthy were an infringement upon the exclusive power of the executive branch of the Government to negotiate with foreign governments and execute agreements (including those governing the activities of their nationals and vessels), and such actions by Senator McCarthy threatened the ability of the United States to carry on negotiations and execute agreements in this field. For this infringement upon the jurisdiction conferred exclusively upon the executive branch by the constitutional doctrine of separation of powers the Senator from Wisconsin should be censured.

ITEM 6 OF MORSE AMENDMENT

Charge

(Senator McCarthy) "permitted and ratified over a period of several months in 1953 and 1954 the abuse of senatorial privilege by Mr. Roy Cohn, chief counsel to the Permanent Investigations Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Government Operations of which committee and subcommittee the junior Senator from Wisconsin is chairman, Mr. Cohn's abuse having been directed toward attempting to secure preferential treatment for Pvt. David Schine by the Department of the Army, at a time when the Army was under investigation by the committee."

Documentation

Hearings before the Special Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations, United States Senate, 83d Congress, 2d session, pursuant to Senate Resolution 189.

Statement

The transcript of the Army-McCarthy hearings will show that Mr. Roy Cohn while chief counsel of the Permanent Investigations Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Government Operations, with the knowledge and acquiescence of Senator McCarthy, sought from the Department of the Army preferential treatment for his friend David Schine.

The following incidents illustrate a few of Cohn's improper activities while serving as a staff member of the subcommittee of which the junior Senator from Wisconsin was chairman:

In a telephone conversation, Cohn told one Lieutenant Blount he was "never going to forget" the names of persons whom he believed had refused to give preferential treatment to Private Schine.

Cohn threatened to "wreck the Army" and to secure dismissal of the Army Secretary.

Cohn also threatened to keep the investigations of the Army going indefinitely and to "get General Ryan for the way he had treated Dave at Fort Dix."

The extended hearings are replete with other examples of Cohn's shameful use of threats of reprisal and investigation in order to secure preferential treatment for Schine. They demonstrate an abuse of his office. His activities were of a type that should have been prevented and prohibited by the chairman of the subcommittee.

Senator McCarthy as chairman of the subcommittee that would be directly and adversely affected, should have been the first to put a stop to such derelictions.

United States Representative Harold C. Hagen Will Have Office in County Seat Towns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 3, 1954

Mr. HAGEN of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, in line with a policy I established some years ago, it is my plan this year to set up temporary congressional offices in each of the 15 counties of the Ninth Congressional District of Minnesota.

This will be done shortly after my return to Minnesota to reopen my official congressional office at Crookston, which is centrally located geographically in the district. My office there will be on the second floor of the post office building in Crookston, room 205.

My office staff, including my executive secretary, Earl McArthur, will be there daily to meet constituents and friends who may come into the office for a personal call or on some problem of an official nature. We are always ready and willing to be of every possible service and assistance to citizens of the district who may have matters to take up with the Federal Government. My Washington, D. C., office also remains open and the address there is 1405 New House Office Building. Office hours at both places are from 9 a. m. to 5 p. m.

I will be at the office at Crookston part of the time, but for the most part until November 2, election day, I will be traveling throughout the district campaigning for reelection to Congress.

We will establish a temporary office in the various counties and local citizens from throughout the area will have an opportunity to confer informally with their own Representative to the United States Congress, namely, myself, Representative Harold C. Hagen. One or two members of my office staff will accompany me and assist me at these conferences and during the office hours which will be from 9 a. m. to 12 noon and 1:30 p. m. to 5 p. m. at each county seat.

In other words, the office of the Ninth District Congressman will be moved to each county seat in the Ninth District for 1 day.

At most of the county seats, my congressional office for the day designated for the county will be at the courthouse. In a few instances, at the city hall, or perhaps at the community building.

The schedule for each county follows:

Roseau County: Tuesday, September 28, 9 a. m. to noon; 1 p. m. to 5 p. m., county courthouse, Roseau.

Lake of the Woods County, September 29, 9 a. m. to noon; 1 p. m. to 5 p. m., courthouse, Baudette.

Beltrami County: Thursday, September 30, 9 a. m. to noon; 1 p. m. to 5 p. m., city hall, Bemidji.

Cleawater County: Friday, September 31, 9 a. m. to noon; 1 p. m. to 5 p. m., courthouse, Bagley.

Mahnomen County: Monday, October 4, 9 a. m. to noon; 1 p. m. to 5 p. m., courthouse, Mahnomen.

Norman County: Tuesday, October 5, 9 a. m. to noon; 1 p. m. to 5 p. m., courthouse, Ada.

Red Lake County: Wednesday, October 6, 9 a. m. to noon; 1 p. m. to 5 p. m., courthouse, Red Lake Falls.

Pennington County: Thursday, October 7, 9 a. m. to noon; 1 p. m. to 5 p. m., courthouse, Thief River Falls.

Kittson County: Tuesday, October 12, 9 a. m. to noon; 1 p. m. to 5 p. m., courthouse, Hallock.

Marshall County: Wednesday, October 13, 9 a. m. to noon; 1 p. m. to 5 p. m., courthouse, Warren.

Becker County: Friday, October 15, 9 a. m. to noon; 1 p. m. to 5 p. m., courthouse Detroit Lakes.

Clay County: Tuesday, October 19, 9 a. m. to noon; 1 p. m. to 5 p. m., courthouse, Moorhead.

Otter Tail County: Wednesday and Thursday, October 20 and 21, 9 a. m. to noon; 1 p. m. to 5 p. m., courthouse, Fergus Falls.

Wilkin County: Friday, October 22, 9 a. m. to noon; 1 p. m. to 5 p. m., courthouse, Breckenridge.

Any changes in the location of the meeting place and office will be announced in the local newspapers and over the radio.

Everyone is welcome to come in to these temporary congressional offices in each county seat. No appointments are necessary for these conferences. You are invited to come in anytime to see me. Any or all of my constituents are urged to meet with me on the date and place convenient to them to discuss any problems on which my office staff and I may be of assistance and service, or you may want to come in to discuss some of the issues or perhaps stop in for just a social call.

I have long fought for and spoken loudly and strongly for 90 percent to 100 percent of parity on farm crops from the average small farm. I voted for 90 percent at all times. I wish you would come in and discuss the farm problem with me whether you agree with me or not.

We will serve coffee, cookies, and doughnuts all day. I will be seeing you.

Comment and Criticism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have published in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Manchester Guardian Weekly for July 1, 1954, which sets forth a vigorous English criticism of some phases of American diplomatic policy.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMENT AND CRITICISM

Only the United States can lead the Western World, and it is no longer doing so. Only the United States has (or had) the resources, vigor, and idealism for the task. Its leadership is failing for two reasons—weakness within the administration, and an honest divergence of view between America and the other western nations. The weakness of the administration is sadly evident. The United States Government now speaks not with a united voice but with many and divided voices. What is its policy? Is it to find means of "getting along" with the Communists in Asia (as President Eisenhower says) or to reject all negotiation as worthless (as Senator KNOWLAND insists)? Is it to send troops to Indochina (Mr. NIXON on April 16) or to keep out of Indochina (Mr. NIXON on April 20)? Is it to help small nations with all possible speed (Mr. Lodge on Siam's appeal to the United Nations) or to let them stew in their own juice (Mr. Lodge on Guatemala's appeal to the United Nations)? True, more public discussion precedes the forming of policy in the United States than in other countries, and that is healthy. But now we have the discussion without the policy. The Secretary of State, who should give direction to the discussion, seems a prisoner of his own rigid prejudice. The President, who above all must speak with authority, is silent or ambiguous. Under the American system the President must act firmly if there is to be any policy, since otherwise Congress will squander its time on sideshows. Roosevelt dealt firmly with Congress, as did Mr. Truman; but not Mr. Eisenhower. In America, also, the President must reconcile the discord between departments, since there is no Cabinet system of shared responsibility. Mr. Eisenhower ordered the National Security Council to coordinate foreign and defense policies—an excellent notion—but in practice the Defense Department goes one way, Commerce another, and State a third. The 18th-century Constitution can be made to meet the demands of 20th-century government only through the force of a President's personality. Today that is absent.

The divergence of American and other views was especially evident at Geneva. The United States—both its Government and apparently most of its people—believes that negotiation with the Communists is a dangerous waste of time. This view is shared by no other major government in the West. The United States believes that agreements negotiated with the Communists are worthless, because they will be torn up as soon as it suits the Communists, just as Yalta and Potsdam were by Russia (and, earlier, as Locarno was by Hitler). Others, while uncertain of Russian and Chinese intentions, think that a change may have occurred in Russia since Stalin's death and that the Chinese have never been given a fair chance (and they remember that Locarno was followed by fourteen years of peace). The United States holds that further aggression by the Chinese is inevitable and will be encouraged by weakness in negotiation. Others hold that, although further aggression may come, it may not come immediately; further, they hold that even a temporary lowering of international tension may be helpful, and that since any war may quickly become a devastating world war we have a moral duty to be ready always to negotiate. The United States increasingly tends to see the Indochinese war as a clear case of evil against good. Others cannot always see it that way, remembering that much of the nationalist movement there was driven by wrong treatment into alliance with the Communists and that most of the people are indifferent. The United States believes that instead of talking to the Chinese we should be building military defenses against them urgently. Others are against unthinking haste and want full consultation with the Asian countries first. The divergence of view is wide. The United States cannot lead the Western world while others disagree so deeply with its judgment.

Who should give way? The United States can justly claim the longest experience in dealing with the Chinese Communists, from the Marshall mission through to Panmunjom. Its friends may reply, sorrowfully, that the most perceptive American advisers are no longer heard by the administration, because they told unpalatable truths. America's friends must also, most regretfully, point to the weakness of the administration. But it can raise legitimate objections. Other nations—especially the British, both Government and Labour Party—have seen China too often through rose-tinted spectacles. In arguing against American rigidity they have gradually forgotten the reservations they once had in their minds. They have forgotten, for example, that until recently every attempt at friendship with China was rebuffed, that China's change of tone may be a temporary expedient, and that we are all in the dark about China's ultimate intentions. These matters were discussed in Washington. But the divisive forces at work—the weakness of the American administration, its honest divergence of view from others, and the yearning among others for agreement with the Communists—are greater than a weekend at the White House can overcome. It is a grave thought that the Western nations now lack clear leadership. It is more grievous that the United States, if present trends continue, may gradually withdraw from many of its commitments in the outside world.

Veterans' Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFTON (CLIFF) YOUNG

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, this year—1954—for the first time November 11 will be designated Veterans' Day instead of Armistice Day, as in the past.

This new designation of the day we honor those valiant men and women who have served our country faithfully in time of war is a fitting tribute to the courage of those who sacrificed their lives, and to the loyalty of all those who continue to serve their country in their individual and joint endeavors to preserve for our Nation the freedom and peace they won at great personal sacrifice.

The city of Washington is soon to be the place of assembly of one of these groups of veterans which have, through the years, won for themselves nationwide acclaim for their responsible leadership as civilians in considering the course of our national administrative and legislative policy. The Nation's Capital is preparing to welcome veteran members of the American Legion when they convene here for the first time. I know that my colleagues from every State join with me in extending a cordial greeting from the Members of the House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, during recent months we have acted upon various legislative measures in an overall program for veterans, and the record of the 83d Congress in this respect has been exceptionally good. I should like to refer first to some of the important measures enacted, and then to the several charges that have been made against the Congress which do not accurately reflect legislative attitude toward the American veteran.

The interest and welfare of veterans has been advanced by measures which provided these benefits:

First. Increased monthly rates of service-connected compensation payable to veterans of all wars and peacetime, and their dependents.

Second. Increased by 5 percent monthly rates of non-service-connected pension payable to veterans and their dependents.

Third. Prohibited the reduction of any rating of disability or permanent total disability for compensation or pension purposes where the rating has been in effect continuously for 20 or more years.

Fourth. Continued the direct home-loan program to June 30, 1955, and authorized the sum of $150 million for continuation of this program.

Fifth. Extended for 1 year the time for initiating a course of education and training under the Korean GI bill.

Sixth. Extended for an additional 4 years the time disabled veterans qualified under Public Law 16 may take advantage of training opportunities.

Seventh. Automatic renewal of 5-year life insurance term policies under United States Government life insurance and national service life insurance.

Eighth. Extended to Korean veterans homestead rights given to other veterans.

Ninth. Placed Korean veterans on a par with veterans of World War I and World War II by authorizing veterans' benefits to persons disabled in connection with reporting for induction in the Armed Forces.

Tenth. Extended coverage of Servicemen's Indemnity Act to members of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps, when ordered to active training duty for periods of 14 days or more.

Eleventh. Granted veterans' benefits to women who served in the Women's Auxiliary Army Corps, who were honorably discharged for disability which rendered them physically unfit for service in the Women's Army Corps.

Twelfth. Authorized outpatient dental care for Spanish American War veterans and disabled veterans in training under Public Law 16.

Thirteenth. Made uniform the service-connected presumption for all types of tuberculosis among veterans causing 10 percent disability within 3 years of discharge.

Fourteenth. Appropriated a total of $3,500,000,000 for the activities of the Veterans' Administration during the coming fiscal year.

Fifteenth. Activated an additional 3,000 hospital beds, making a total of 127,000 available beds throughout the country.

Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of a better understanding of legislative procedure and action, I should now like to review the several charges made against the Congress. Unfortunately, there are probably few fields of Government activity needing clarification more than that of the veterans' program.

The charges alleged are, first, that there was an economy move to cut veterans' benefits; second, that defeat of the Teague amendment harmed the hospitalization program; and third, that there was an attempt to destroy the veterans' preference law.

The following information is respectfully presented.

First. There was no attempt to economize on the veterans' program. This charge resulted from a misunderstanding of the appropriation procedure in Congress.

When officials of the Veterans' Administration appear before Congress early in the session to make their budget requests for the next fiscal year, it is impossible to submit an estimate in the exact amount required for the entire year for pensions and benefits. In 1953, Congress appropriated part of the funds in the initial appropriation bill, with the understanding that as soon as the Veterans' Administration could determine the exact amount required, it would be submitted for consideration in a supplemental appropriation bill. In the subsequent appropriation bill some $215 million—the exact additional amount required—was appropriated, instead of the rough estimate of $300 million submitted for the first appropriation bill.

Had Congress appropriated all of the money included in the initial estimate, it would have resulted in an excess appropriation in the amount of $85 million. There are two objections to appropriating more money than is required. First, it means the American taxpayer must pay interest on these funds, since the amount is added to the national debt; and, second, the availability of surplus funds in department accounts is a powerful temptation for unnecessary spending. This is borne out by the record in the past of some departments to indulge in a spending spree the month preceding the end of the fiscal year.

It should be pointed out that there was no attempt on the part of Congress to avoid any obligation which the law provides.

Second. The Teague amendment was properly rejected. The amendment was offered during consideration of the second supplemental appropriation bill in 1953. It called for $10 million to be appropriated for the Veterans' Administration, ostensibly for medical services and hospitalization. It was voted down for a number of reasons. These are as follows:

It was not requested by the Veterans' Administration and it probably would not have been expended had it been appropriated.

It had not been considered by the House Appropriations Committee, whose duty it is to conduct hearings on all appropriation bills.

The wording of the amendment was such that there was no requirement that it be spent for medical services. It might have gone for any one of a dozen other uses.

There was then a surplus in the fund for which the appropriation was requested. Further, it was known that there would be a surplus in this particular fund of approximately $6 million at the end of the year. Thus, the only result would have been to increase this surplus by $10 million. It would not have meant expanded or improved medical services for veterans.

To have appropriated funds to be added to the surplus would have increased the overwhelming national debt, upon which the American taxpayers now pay more interest than it took to run the entire Federal Government each year only several decades ago.

The regular appropriation bill for the next fiscal year, starting July 1, 1953, to be considered shortly thereafter, was the logical place to appropriate funds for an expanded veterans' program. In fact, nearly $4 billion was appropriated for the Veterans' Administration in the bill several months later.

Third. There was no attempt to destroy the veterans' preference law. It was said that an attempt was made to destroy veterans' preference laws by giving the Attorney General authority summarily to dismiss certain employees in the Department of Justice.

The circumstances involved were as follows: There were certain security risks and undesirables in the Department of Justice that the Attorney General wanted to eliminate for the good of the service. This did not represent any wholesale attempt to destroy veterans' preference among Federal employees. It affected only a small segment of the total employees in an agency of great responsibility. Similar authority to dismiss employees in the State and Commerce Departments had been given several years previously to the then President, Mr. Truman, and to Mr. Acheson. No one has charged that former President Truman and Mr. Acheson violated veterans' preference in those two Departments. I am sure that President Eisenhower and Mr. Brownell would not have violated this authority had it been granted by the 83d Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I trust that this review of the facts and circumstances involved in the widespread misunderstanding of this legislative action will serve to establish a better understanding of procedure in the National Legislature and to confirm the cooperative attitude of the 83d Congress in considering the interest and welfare of veterans. In conclusion, I might add that there are times when Members of Congress themselves find parliamentary procedure somewhat complex.

McNary, for Whom Dam Named, Worked for Public Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the Record a special feature article from the Oregon Journal entitled "McNary, for Whom Dam Named, Worked for Public Power." One of the interesting things about this article, Mr. President, is that it shows very clearly that Senator McNary's public power program could not be reconciled with the giveaway Eisenhower-McKay power program. It is perfectly clear from his record that McNary never would have supported the Eisenhower-McKay scheme for giving away to the private utility monopoly in this country even though this gift is dressed up in the political slogan called "Partnership with local interests the public's heritage in the power resources of the streams of America."

There being no objection, the article will be printed in the Record, as follows:

McNary, for Whom Dam Named, Worked for Public Power

(By Walter Mattila)

Why was the monumental dam which the Democratic administration started on Umatilla Rapids named after the great Republican, Charles L. McNary?

The Oregon Senator took up building of a dam on the rapids in the Columbia when he called on President Herbert Hoover at the latter's summer camp on the Rapidan River.

It was July 5, 1930, but then McNary, who had been in the Senate since 1917, had worked for comprehensive development not only of the Columbia but the rivers of the Tennessee Valley.

Senator McNary again conferred with President Hoover on November 13, 1930. The topic: Muscle Shoals, the only Federal dam then built in the Tennessee Valley. The Washington bureau of the Journal reported the President "was as strong as ever against Government operation at Muscle Shoals and Senator McNary as equally emphatic in his expression for Government operation and says he expects the Norris bill for Government operation to be enacted now or later."

From this Muscle Shoals grew TVA, for which Senator McNary voted.

A month before his last Muscle Shoals visit McNary dropped in on President Hoover with a large volume under his arm—the famous 308 report of the Corps of Engineers on the comprehensive development of the Columbia River.

Included in the plans were dams at Umatilla Rapids, Grand Coulee, Bonneville, The Dalles, John Day, and on the Snake as well as at the Chief Joseph, Hungry Horse, and other sites.

This 308 report which Senator McNary brought with him to dinner at the White House had not yet been released, but McNary already had legislation drafted to put it into effect. After the dinner Senator McNary told the Journal's Washington correspondent that he did not feel at liberty to reveal the President's reaction, but did say that the President was deeply interested.

This Senator for whom the great dam on the Columbia Rapids is named had labored during the Coolidge administration to get appropriations for the Corps of Engineers to make the surveys for 308 report. In subsequent years it was forgotten that this bible of multiple-purpose dam development had been prepared before the days of Roosevelt.

It was less often forgotten that McNary was a strong friend of Columbia power development before the New Deal was dealt out. As early as 1921 McNary introduced a reclamation bill that had the imagination and scope that characterized such legislation in the early days of the New Deal.

The Oregon Senator's bill called for reclaiming of millions of acres of wasteland with appropriations sought in New Deal figures—$250 million for the West and $250 million for the South.

There was another Republican pushing power development in the Senate in pre-New Deal days. A dam has been named for him, also by the Democrats. It is called Norris Dam in honor of Senator George W. Norris, of Nebraska.

When the New Deal came in and the Public Works Administration got a big purse Senator McNary—as Republican as ever and leader of the Senate minority—with the Oregon Democrat, Representative Charles L. Martin, got President Roosevelt to commit $31 million in PWA funds on Bonneville Dam.

One dam wasn't enough for Senator McNary's conception of the wealth that power would bring to the Columbia Basin. He urged President Roosevelt to dip into PWA funds for Grand Coulee Dam and reclamation project. He labored until his death on congressional appropriations for additional dams.

Senator McNary was calling at the White House again. President Roosevelt asked him to introduce the Bonneville Power Act after reaching an understanding on its terms.

These included such controversial matters as the postage stamp rate, Federal distribution and regulation of power and the old Republican drafted preference for PUD's. This bill was not passed until 1939 with Senator McNary lining up generally with the Democratic majority on its salient features. He was for the Corps of Engineers distributing the power as well as generating it at the dams. This feature, however, was eliminated but Senator McNary won out on the Corps of Engineers running the dams not built by the Bureau of Reclamation.

When Wendell Willkie was nominated for President by the Republicans in 1940 that candidate—now honored as "the great liberal"—needed a running mate who had the confidence of public-power minded people.

Senator McNary offered the Republicans much more. He was a highly regarded conservationist and his remedial legislation for farm price—equalization—twice vetoed by President Coolidge—had won him gratitude among the farmers.

His nomination for Vice President was welcomed in Oregon. Even labor liked him. Said John Brost, president of the Oregon CIO: "I don't think Wilkie has labor's viewpoint, but McNary's different. There are many things I like about him."

Said Monroe Sweetland, then secretary of the Oregon Commonwealth federation, "It will take more than Senator McNary to take the curse off Willkie's holding company connections." Other Democrats were less grudging with praise.

But public power was not in issue in the campaign despiste the fact that Willkie had represented southern power companies in the bitter fight against TVA. The public was satisfied with both Willkie's and McNary's views on power.

In accepting the nomination for Vice President on August 28, 1940, at the State fairgrounds in Salem, Senator McNary said on the power issue, "Unfaltering, the Congress has granted to the public preferential rights to power generated from navigable streams.

"Such power should be a common heritage. The Government, having made this power available, should have an indisputable right to control its utilization and distribution. Maximum benefits for domestic consumers, farmers and small users of power should be the yardstick by which we measure the usefulness and serviceability of every Federal development."

It was speeches such as those that the Democrats remembered as well as what he had done for the full development of the Columbia's water resources when they came to name the great dam on Umatilla Rapids.

Present Administration's Policy Toward Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following speech recently delivered by me on the occasion of the annual conference of the Greater New York Mizrachi Council, at Richman's Hotel, Long Beach, Long Island, N. Y.:

It is indeed a privilege and an honor to address the annual meeting of the Greater New York Mizrachi Council.

The devotion of your 20,000 members to the welfare of the land of Israel is well-known. We who take a close interest in the development of Israel follow your activities with a great deal of admiration. We applaud your achievements in the effective mobilization of religious thinking in behalf of Israel.

Yet your group is but a small part—although the largest single unit—of a great organization which is the largest religious Zionist body in the world.

I am particularly happy to address you at this time, because Mizrachi will celebrate its 40th anniversary within 3 short months.

In these 40 years, Mizrachi has accomplished literally miracles in its crusade to create a truly religious Jewish state. I wish to single out particularly your creation of a network of schools throughout Israel which have been incorporated into the unified school system. You have played a decisive role in the establishment of the first Jewish religious court system in modern times. And, crowning your educational endeavors, is the opening next year in Tel Aviv of a great new university, a modern college of arts and sciences, which will prepare Israeli youth for positions of leadership in the new state.

I am especially pleased that you asked me through Mr. Norman and Mr. Spar to join you this afternoon because I am Irish, and proud of it, and a Roman Catholic, and proud of it. Both my mother and father were born in Ireland and came to this country as immigrants. We Irish feel a special bond with the Jewish people. We both know what it means to struggle against great odds, and under almost hopeless conditions, for a national homeland. And we Catholics have an equally close bond with Jews, for as Pope Pius XI said: "We are the children of Abraham."

Let me emphasize to you that I am proud of my record in support of the creation and the development of the State of Israel.

At the end of World War II, I served on my local executive council of the American Christian Palestine Committee, which was set up, as you know, to further Israel's interests. I opposed the policies of the British Government which endeavored to restrict immigration to Palestine. I intervened with my own Government to insure support of the United Nations partition plan which resulted in the establishment of the Jewish state. In the Congress, I joined with more than 100 Members in 1951 to support economic assistance to permit Israel to absorb hundreds of thousands of destitute refugees.

As a member of the Foreign Aid Subcommittee of the great House Committee on Appropriations, I have for the past four sessions done my utmost to see that Israel was granted sufficient funds to progress with her noble task of creating a new life for the half of her people who have come to her shores since 1948. I derive a great deal of personal satisfaction and pleasure from my modest role in securing these appropriations.

I cite this record merely to let you know something which, of course, you already know—that I have been a consistent friend and admirer of the State of Israel and of those like yourselves, who have labored so long and with so much effort to create a Jewish state.

Later in my talk, I am going to discuss the relations of our Government and the Government of Israel. I am going to be critical—but it will not be criticism in a partisan sense. It should be emphasized that support for Israel has been and is a bipartisan cause. It has been bipartisan for more than four decades.

I am happy to recall that it was a Democratic President—Woodrow Wilson—who voiced the overwhelming desires of the American people when he approved the Balfour Declaration in 1917. This policy of support for the national aspirations of the Jewish people has been continued by every President since that day—by Republicans and Democrats—by Presidents Harding, Coolidge, and Hoover, and, of course, Roosevelt and Truman. President Eisenhower has also voiced sympathy for the same cause.

Both Houses of Congress have given enthusiastic backing to this policy. Unanimous resolutions were adopted by both Houses back in the twenties in favor of a Jewish national homeland in Palestine. Congressional leaders on both sides of the aisle in 1939 expresseed vigorous disapproval of the British white paper intended to limit Jewish immigration. At that time, the American Palestine Committee was organized under Democratic and Republican direction, including membership by 68 Senators and 200 Representatives of both parties.

When Israel was created in 1948, both parties hailed prompt American recognition and wished the new state well. Israel's request in 1951 for economic aid received generous bipartisan support. This assistance has been voted for the past 4 years. During the last presidential campaign both the Democratic and Republican candidates in public statements expressed friendship for Israel.

Unfortunately, the present administration is not reflecting in its current policies this overwhelming support which Israel has found in the past in the Congress, in the White House, and among the American people.

This change of policy can be traced to the trip which Secretary of State Dulles took to the Middle East 15 months ago. When he returned, he announced that from then on the United States was going to be, as he called it, impartial in the Middle East. A policy of impartiality sounds fine. Yet it was unfortunately phrased, because inescapably it inferred that America's policy in the past had not been impartial.

This fitted in completely with Arab charges of past American favoritism for Israel.

What are the facts about American support for Israel and the Arab States? As I have described, our Government has played a prominent role in the creation of Israel. Yet we have also had a great deal to do with Arab independence. We have supported their legitimate national aspirations and helped their economic development. Western sacrifices in 2 world wars and western diplomacy have brought independence to 8 Arab States in the past 4 decades, with little effort or sacrifice on their own part. Our country took a leading role in sponsoring their membership in the United Nations even though they played little or no part in the war against Hitler and even helped the enemy at times. We owe no apology for our record on this score.

In other words, we have been impartial in the past, having helped both peoples, and rightfully so. Therefore, when Mr. Dulles announced that we were about to adopt a new policy of impartiality, he was not being accurate.

As a matter of fact, as it has turned out, this policy of impartiality is not that at all. It has become a policy of the grossest and most flagrant partiality toward the Arab States and against Israel.

Let us look at the record.

Within past months Jordan intensified its guerrilla warfare against Israeli border settlements. When Israeli farmers, exasperated beyond endurance, dared to fire back at those who shot and killed these pioneering men, women, and children and destroyed their property, the administration had harsh words and supported United Nations censure—for Israel but not for Jordan.

When a United Nations official on the spot insisted on telling Israel she could not construct a vital project on the upper Jordan without Syria's consent, Mr. Dulles immediately cut off economic aid to Israel. Wisely, he restored it soon after.

Israel wants to meet with Jordan to straighten out their border difficulties. Jordan is required to do so under United Nations commitments. Yet Jordan refuses, and the administration will not require her to carry out those commitments.

As a matter of fact, peace in the Middle East has been abandoned as an American goal. No longer will American diplomats even admit that peace is possible. They refuse even to mention the word for fear it will antagonize the Arabs. All they talk about is patching up one quarrel here, putting a "band aid" on another quarrel there. As they must understand but will not admit, such a policy cannot possibly reduce existing tensions.

The top State Department official concerned with middle eastern affairs dared to appear before an insignificant organization devoted solely to Israel's destruction, and from that soiled platform, to call for Israel to abandon her sovereign and sacred right of permitting immigration of any Jew who wished to enter, and even to criticize American citizens who insist on helping their coreligionists.

But the most alarming aspects of American policy against Israel are in the field of military strategy. These policies carry grave danger for Israel's contined development and even for her existence.

Early this year the State Department announced its approval of a program to supply arms to Iraq. Before then and since then, Iraqi leaders have openly stated their intention of using these arms against Israel. Iraq had participated in the Arab war against Israel and had been soundly beaten by a much smaller Israeli force. Although Israel's four Arab neighbors signed armistice agreements to end the fighting, Iraq refused to do so. Within the Arab League, she has led attempts to foment intrigue against Israel.

Yet this is the country we are planning to give arms, in the fond hope of securing additional protection against possible aggression. History records that the Iraqi revolt on the side of the Nazis and against the Allies in 1941 had been crushed by a handful of British troops. Yet we are now going to rely on this country to repel the giant from the north.

This error is being compounded a thousandfold in the current negotiations with Egypt on the Suez Canal. It can be nothing but a source of gratification that Egypt and Britain are settling their long-standing controversy over this sore spot. Yet the result may be a worsening of conditions in the area unless our Government takes definite action to see that Egypt fulfills her international responsibilities.

Since the end of the Arab-Israel war, Egypt has closed the Suez Canal to all shipping bound to and from Israel. This action was condemned by the United Nations Security Council in 1951, which ordered her to end the blockade. Egypt has ignored that order as well as principles of international law which forbid her to do what she insists on doing. By keeping American ships out of the canal, Egypt is violating the tradition of freedom of the seas, a hallowed principle in American history, a principle for which we have in the past even gone to war to preserve. Yet our Government has done nothing to see that Egypt reverses this illegal act.

Logically, it would seem that the settlement of this issue should be an integral part of any negotiations over the canal. Since there is bargaining back and forth between Britain and Egypt, with both sides making concessions in order to reach a compromise, there is no reason why the abandonment of the blockade should not be made a part of any final agreement.

The United States has taken an active part in these negotiations and it has also taken a good deal of the credit for the preliminary agreement which has been reached. We therefore have a clear responsibility in seeing that this issue is resolved. Yet the administration will not intervene on the specious grounds that we must wait until after an agreement is reached so that Egypt can stop the blockade of her own free will. Apparently, it does not occur to our diplomats that once the agreement is signed, sealed, and delivered, there will be no inducement for Egypt to make a further concession without the possibility of getting anything more in return.

The State Department is in a position to make this failure even more serious by its announced approval of an arms program for Egypt once the Suez agreement is completed. The Egyptians are gleeful about this prospect of shiploads of American arms, and an army spokesman recently estimated it would permit the Egyptian Army, to double its forces within 5 years.

What does Egypt intend to do with her increased military strength? Will she aim her guns toward any invaders who may come from the north? Apparently the Egyptian rulers are giving no thought to any possible Russian threat, but they are thinking about their peace-loving neighbor. Last July 22 Premier Nasser warned in unmistakable terms that, with the coming British withdrawal from the Suez, Egypt will have its long-awaited opportunity to settle scores with Israel. This warning is being echoed by other Egyptian officials down the line.

The United States has a clear responsibility not to arm either Egypt or Iraq or any other Arab state until there is stable peace in the Middle East. When we signed the Tripartite Declaration of 1950, together with Britain and France, we gave our pledged word that we would not permit upsetting the balance of power in this area. Yet not only are we permitting it, we actually are upsetting it ourselves by giving arms to one side.

This can only lead to a ruinous arms race. At the very least it will seriously impede Israel's economic development because more and more of her slender economic resources will have to be devoted to military purposes. At the worst it can lead to a disastrous war.

We in the Congress from both parties are seriously alarmed over these developments. We are taking whatever steps we can to reverse this trend in American policy.

When the arms program for Iraq was first made public 6 Senators and 29 Representatives from both parties wrote to Secretary Dulles expressing grave concern over these plans. They asked for a meeting to discuss this vital matter.

The meeting was held soon after with Mr. Dulles' top assistants. Views were exchanged, but no assurances were received that the arms offer might be withdrawn. Most of these Members of Congress later sent another letter to Mr. Dulles warning him of the consequences of such action.

Last July 27 a small group of Members of Congress—3 Senators and 6 Representatives, and again from both parties—wrote Mr. Dulles requesting the State Department to intervene in the Suez negotiations to secure an undertaking from Egypt to abandon her blockade of the canal.

The group warned—and here I quote—"Failure to act on this issue at this time may actually cause a deterioration in the situation because it could be interpreted by the Government of Egypt as an indication that we do not regard the blockade as a matter of sufficient concern."

In the reply sent August 2, the State Department said it could not intervene because to introduce a new issue at this time would—and I quote again—"undoubtedy hinder the achievement of a final agreement."

However, the Department did put in writing that it stands fully behind the 1951 Security Council resolution ordering Egypt to end the blockade and that it will continue to urge Egypt to comply with it. Whether this is more than a pious declaration remains to be seen.

I have gone into some detail on these exchanges to show you what a lively interest we in the Congress are taking on this issue and to emphasize that Members from both parties are trying to get the State Department to modify its policies.

Another area in which we are trying to do something is within the congressional committees. As you know, top State Department officials appear every year before the Foreign Affairs and the Appropriations Committees of both Houses to justify their requests for foreign aid appropriations. Here they have been questioned about their plans—by myself among others—though I must say they tell us they are determined to go ahead. However, we have placed on the record our concern over these plans and we have emphasized to Department officials that it is their responsibility to insure that such arms, if they are delieverd, will not be turned against Israel.

I believe that not enough attention is being paid to this issue in the national press, though I would like to point out that the Democratic Digest, the official publication of the Democratic National Committee, carried an article in its August issue emphasizing the failure of Mr. Dulles' supposed policy of impartiality.

More and more, thoughtful Americans from all walks of life are beginning to question this New Look in our policy in the Middle East and are warning that it could lead to disaster. I concur in this view. And I am doing all I can to see that the gravity of the situation is brought home to our policymaking officials.

In concluding, may I outline for you what I personally believe should be the changes which this administration should make in its Middle East policies.

First, we should immediately cancel any shipments of arms to any Arab state as long as it refused to ease its hostility to Israel. If we do send these arms, it would upset the balance of power in this area, which the United States is pledged to maintain, and would launch a ruinous arms race which could bring a bloody conflict. Border raids against Israel's settlements and threats to Israel by Arab leaders should be strongly and immediately condemned.

Secondly, the State Department should intervene in the Suez negotiations to demand an Egyptian commitment to end the Suez blockage. This is the proper time for action because, although agreement in principle has been reached, the negotiators are working on the details of the final agreement, in which the abandonment of the blockage should be made a part. If we wait for the negotiations to be concluded, Egypt will have no inducement to compromise on this issue. The United States must do all it can to see that Egypt complies with United Nations decisions and the requirements of international law.

Thirdly, the Middle East can best be made safe for the West and fortified against possible Russian aggression by assistance to aid all of its peoples to raise their living and health standards. Only by giving these peoples a personal stake in democracy—which most of them do not have now—will they be made friends of the United States and true allies of the free world. Therefore, we should continue to provide much-needed economic aid to this area. Unless we do so, widespread poverty and disease will make it an easy prey for Communist penetration.

Finally, the United States should use the full force of its international leadership and prestige to secure a stable and honorable peace in the Middle East. We must see to it that both sides enter into negotiations to turn the present unstable armistice agreements into peace treaties. No one can dictate the terms of the peace—this must be left to the parties themselves to work out in a spirit of constructive compromise—but we can and must create the international atmosphere which will make such negotiations possible.

I am firmly convinced that unless some changes are made in State Department policy in the Middle East, changes along the lines of those I have suggested—unless that is done, that area will become even more inflammable than it is at the present time.

However, there is still time for our policymakers to realize the gravity of the errors they have made, and to adopt a policy which would bring peace to the Middle East, and a better life for the teeming millions of the area.

I look forward to the day when there will be constructive cooperation between the Arab countries and the land of Israel, so that the people of Israel can fulfill the great promise of the promised land.

Congress Should Take a Second Look at the Farm and Dairy Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, it was my intention sometime during the closing days of the session to deliver a speech which I have prepared on the subject, Congress Should Take a Second Look at the Farm and Dairy Program.

It is a speech which seeks to pay tribute to some very outstanding work in research on dairy problems which has been conducted by the department of dairy husbandry at Oregon State College under the leadership of Prof. P. M. Brandt. For many years Professor Brandt has been at the head of the dairy department of Oregon State College, and I consider him to be one of the keenest students of the dairy farmers' problems not only in the State of Oregon but in the Nation. In fact, on several occasions in recent years, I have recommended to the United States Department of Agriculture that very careful consideration should be given by Federal agricultural officials working on dairy problems to the findings, suggestions, and recommendations of Prof. P. M. Brandt.

In the speech which I have prepared for delivery in the Senate I have not presented the detailed research material which has been prepared under Professor Brandt's directorship, on the new protein solids-not-fat program. However, I have placed all the material in the hands of the responsible officials in this field working in the United States Department of Agriculture.

I am making my speech on the need for taking a second look at the farm and dairy program today a matter of public record because I am hopeful that it will receive consideration by Members of the Congress between now and the convening of the 84th Congress next January. I am confident that by that time the present policy being followed by the United States Department of Agriculture will have resulted in such further harm to the dairy industry that the new Congress may look with more favor upon a dairy program that will do justice to the dairy farmers.

I hope between now and January to have further consultations with Professor Brandt and obtain the benefit of his up-to-date suggestions and recommendations based upon developments within the dairy industry since his early studies to which I allude in my speech.

In view of the fact, Mr. President, that there is an informal gentleman's agreement within the Senate that we should adjourn before midnight tonight, I will not take the time to read my entire speech on this dairy topic at this time. However, I do ask unanimous consent to have my speech printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRESS SHOULD TAKE A SECOND LOOK AT THE FARM AND DAIRY PROGRAM

The Congress has passed and sent to the President for signature the administration's 1954 New Look agriculture bill. In my judgment, the Eisenhower-Benson bill represents a backward look, not a forward look toward a solution to the farm and dairy problems of our Nation. Concentrating on the reduction of farm price supports, it takes away an agriculture program which has shown many beneficial results and substitutes in its place nothing more positive than reliance on the "law of supply and demand."

The dairy industry is one of the great agricultural industries of the State of Oregon. In my opinion, the people of Oregon will not condone the Eisenhower-Benson agriculture program which presupposes a conflict of interest between producers and consumers, which tells the man in the city that he can secure more and better dairy products only at the expense of the man on the farm. I think the people of my State are looking for a program built on the mutual interest and the mutual benefit of farm producers and city consumers.

DEVELOPMENT OF OREGON DAIRY INDUSTRY

An important factor in the development of the dairy industry in Oregon has been the work of the Department of Dairy Husbandry at Oregon State College, under the intelligent and far-sighted leadership of Prof. P. M. Brandt. Through his work at Oregon State College, Professor Brandt has served the dairy industry and the people of Oregon since September 15, 1917. During his 37 years in this field he has built up a vast store of knowledge about dairy problems.

Today I propose to draw upon some of Professor Brandt's observations on dairy problems in the State of Oregon for the purpose of calling the attention of the Senate to some of the points to be considered in the development of a sound dairy program. On January 8, 1954, Professor Brandt told the Oregon Dairymen's Association at its 60th annual meeting:

"We dairymen are living in a new age. We have been in it longer than most of us realize because of the circumstances of its origin. These circumstances came upon us during a time when the industry was struggling to meet the problems of daily life complicated by those of World War II. When the national emergency had passed, the first natural move was to think of rebuilding the industry on its old foundation. But the foundation was not there. And so we find ourselves building on a new one in a new era. It has taken time to realize this and to become adjusted to the changed conditions.

"We have lived in an era in which milk fat determined the price of all dairy products. But fat has abdicated and we have a new king. It is protein.

"The dairy industry must offset the losses in the market value of its products, due to the substitution of the cheaper vegetable fats, by capitalizing upon the use of other components of milk which have heretofore occupied a secondary position. This is where the proteins and other solids-not-fat come into the picture. Once we fully understand the problem and realize the possibilities to the industry of its solution, the progress that can be made on the new protein solids-not-fat program should be parallel to that which followed the discovery of the vitamins."

MODERN APPROACH TO DAIRY FARMING

"Changes in values that will be reflected in prices and a new understanding of food values may excel in significance to the industry the developments which characterized its entrance into certain new eras in the past. It is likely that the introduction of the farm separator and the discovery of the Babcock test for fat will be considered of no greater significance as history-making milestones than will be the protein milestone when its possibilities are fully realized. There is nothing to be feared in this new era by those who enter it with courage and the determination to meet its challenges intelligently.

"But the problems of this current age cannot be solved by an approach characterized by an obstinate determination to maintain status quo, any more than they can be solved by those whose proposals are based upon low ideals, selfish motives or face-saving urges. If we take the wrong road on occasion in exploring this new field, let's find the right one as soon as our mistake is discovered and then proceed about our business of remodeling our dairy industry on a broad, sound, and modern foundation."

I am in complete agreement with Professor Brandt when he states, in effect, that the problems of a new age can best be solved by the adoption of new methods. The success of the dairy industry in the State of Oregon can be measured by its willingness to apply new technologies to the production, processing, and marketing of its products, and its determination to take to market the best possible product at the lowest price commensurate with a reasonable profit for its producers.

Prior to 1920, Oregon was primarily an importing State insofar as dairy products were concerned. Cheese of good quality was produced in Oregon, and it found a ready sale in out-of-State markets. Evaporated milk was sold on world markets by manufacturers who operated on a regional or nationwide basis. Ice cream, however, was manufactured for local sale only and was of relative minor economic importance. Butter had to be imported, and the imported product was generally of low quality.

In the early 1920's the dairymen of Oregon inaugurated a program which resulted in the development of a butter industry that was thriving at the time of the entry of the United States into World War II. I quote some of the observations of Professor Brandt on the experiences of Oregon dairymen during the development period of the Oregon butter industry:

"In the early 1920's when Oregon first produced surplus butter it was quite common for the brokers from terminal markets to appear on the programs of various manufacturers' meetings to describe as diplomatically as possible the low quality of the butter manufactured and to plead for its improvement. This led Oregon State College to undertake a study to determine exactly what was wrong with the quality of Oregon butter and what was the actual effect of its quality upon its marketability. As a result of this study it was definitely established that if Oregon expected to find a ready sale for its surplus butter, marked improvement would have to be made in its quality. Of course, this improvement was equally necessary if any industry growth was anticipated.

"During this same period there was an increase in the number and in the producing ability of the dairy cows in the State. This was due to improvement in their feeding and management and in the progress in the eradication of destructive diseases. This was a reflection of the determination of Oregon farmers to develop a strong and virile dairy industry.

"DEVELOPMENT OF MARKET FACILITIES

"The growth and development of the dairy industry on the farms, and the awakening of progressive manufacturers, particularly the cooperatives, to the real problems involved in the production of a quality product, led to statewide quality improvement programs and efforts. One of the first and most important of these was the inauguration of the Federal market-grading service in Portland. This was accomplished through the cooperation of producers and processors. This service gave reliability to the quality grading of butter, and for the first time put a stable footing under the price structure by providing reliable and honest market quotations. This development took the guess out of the quality angle so far as butter was concerned, and made it possible for the manufacturers to offer the dairy farmer a sound and workable cream-grading program.

"STANDARDIZATION OF PRODUCT

"The next step was improvement in butter-manufacturing methods to produce a more standardized product. This was followed by the organization of a central sales agency which serviced most of the cooperatively owned creameries. Thus we find, in retrospect, that the chaotic conditions in the dairy industry, particularly with reference to butter in the early 1920's, was stabilized by the early 1930's. In general, by the mid-1930's, Oregon had developed a reputation as favorable for the quality of its butter and all other dairy products as it was unfavorable in the late teens and early twenties. It continued in that status until the impact of pre-World War II population shifts, when the picture changed with reference to the utilization of fluid milk."

World War II brought an increased demand for fluid milk, and one of the problems which faced the Oregon dairy industry during the wartime period was a shortage of farm labor. Professor Brandt described the results of these wartime conditions:

"The result was a gradual slackening of interest in the production of cream for butter and milk for manufacturing purposes, except for cheese. The tendency was to divert fluid milk production to grade A or its equivalent. There was also a special wartime quality known as market milk. It was accompanied by a decrease in the number of dairy cows and incongruously caused many farmers, well-equipped to produce grade A or the equivalent quality of milk, to discontinue dairying, first because of labor shortages, and later because of good prices received for competing products under the various price-support programs."

CREAM-GRADING PROGRAM DESTROYED

"Government war price control regulations reduced the spread permitted in the price to be paid for first-grade and second-grade cream to 1 cent for each pound of milk fat. This effectively destroyed Oregon's State-wide cream grading program. It restored 1920 butter quality. That, together with the Government purchasing program which took the better grades of butter away from civilians, effectively subordinated the butter business to other products, to the joy of the oleomargarine and many Midwest butter manufacturers who specialized in a low-grade product. This characterized the picture in the early 1940's."

GROWTH IN USE OF SUBSTITUTE PRODUCTS

"To recapitulate, war pricing procedures had virtually eliminated an effective cream-grading program, and had deprived the civilian consumers of the better grades of butter, thus encouraging the use of substitutes. Another factor was the repeal by Congress of the 10-cent-per-pound tax on oleomargarine which in turn led to the repeal of most of the remaining State laws controlling the sale of colored oleomargarine. Concurrently with this development, but on the favorable side, was an increase in the production of milk powder. At this writing there is continued interest in the increased utilization of nonfat milk powder and certain components of milk other than fat."

Today in the State of Oregon 50 percent of milk produced is used in fluid form. This is compared to a 30-percent use of milk in fluid form in the 1930's. Professor Brandt states that it is unlikely that we will ever again see as low a per capita consumption of milk as in the 1940's, and it is unlikely that we will ever again see so much milk produced in the State of Oregon that the normal population will consume only 30 percent of the total production.

At the same time, dairy experts believe that it is unlikely that discriminating consumers will ever again buy much butter scoring less than 92 (grade A). The butter market has given way to the cheaper substitutes of vegetable origin. The market for cheese and other dairy products of high food value because of their protein content is as yet comparatively unexplored.

The agricultural industry is characterized by high risk, uncertainty and high fixed costs. The national importance of an increasing supply of wholesome food products makes it imperative that our dairy industry produce at a high level. We cannot afford to decrease dairy production, yet at the same time the dairyman cannot be asked to keep up high production unless the Government is willing to underwrite some portion of his financial risk and assist in the development of demand for his larger production.

In his speech to the Oregon Dairymen's Association, Professor Brandt listed a number of guideposts to be followed by dairymen in their efforts to meet today's problems in the dairy industry. In my opinion, this list merits the attention of the Committee on Agriculture when it deliberates upon proposals to be submitted to the Congress in the next session. The following are Professor Brandt's recommendations:

"1. A practical method for determining the solids not fat in milk is required. Research at Oregon State College on this subject has been fruitful in developing a test, based on the protein content of milk which appears to be very satisfactory. It is hoped that the industry will be willing to use this new tool.

"2. The consumer must be given reliable information on the nutritional value of solids not fat and especially of the protein of milk.

"3. The dairy industry must demonstrate to the consumer how to get more of his daily protein needs from milk and milk products. It is available at relatively low cost and has unique nutritional quality. There is an unlimited opportunity for the expansion of the use of dairy products on the basis of protein and nutrient energy value if the consumer is fully informed as to its value, cost, and availability.

"4. Industrial uses must be found for the low-quality milk fat and milk solids now destroying the market for good quality products. The low-quality products should not reach the consumers' table. The future dairy industry must be built on quality. Government research laboratories have been established with a legal obligation to find other uses for these low-grade products. The acceleration of this research program should be insisted upon.

"5. While satisfactory progress has been made by the dairy farmers of this country in improving production per cow this progress must be further intensified particularly through artificial insemination. The national goal should be a dairy cow that will produce 12,000 pounds or more of milk per year, containing 1,050 pounds or more of solids-not-fat and a consistent amount of milk fat. The new era demands new standards of production based on volume of milk and solids instead of pounds of fat.

"6. The quality of milk from a sanitary standpoint must be continuously improved. Quality dairy products of all kinds will do more to promote the welfare of the dairy industry and its relations with the consuming public than any other one thing. One quality of milk, all good enough for grade A use, should be the goal for Oregon.

"7. Improved and lower cost of dairy housing goes hand in hand with better quality of milk. The capital investment in dairy farm buildings must be reduced without a sacrifice of quality in the milk produced. The increasingly high cost of labor makes imperative the adoption of labor-saving devices and improved buildings, built around this objective.

"8. Public health and economy of production demand increased emphasis upon the control and eradication of livestock diseases. This will call for further restrictions on the unregulated movement of all kinds of livestock. Such restrictions are in the public interest.

"9. The Oregon Dairy Products Commission has now inaugurated a comprehensive program of education, promotion, and advertising to increase the consumption of dairy products in Oregon and to bring about a broader understanding by the public of industry problems. If this program is successful, it should be expanded. The extent of such expansion should be determined by the needs of the time and the success of the then current program."

Today Professor Brandt and other far-sighted and progressive-thinking persons outside of Government are doing their part in the development of new methods for meeting new problems in the dairy industry. In my judgment, the representatives of the people in the Congress should be equally willing to explore new approaches directed to the solution of our farm and dairy problems.

It is time for a second look at what can be done to assure for America a healthy and expanding agricultural economy, which means a healthy and expanding national economy for all of our people.

A Record of Achievement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT P. MORANO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to reprint the following newspaper column by Carey Cronan in which my views on the accomplishments of the 83d Congress are outlined. This account appeared in the Bridgeport Post.

WASHINGTON CLOSE-UP

(By Carey Cronan)

WASHINGTON, August 20.—Representative ALBERT P. MORANO, Republican of Connecticut, rounding out 4 years in this Capital, says that: "The 83d Congress under Republican control has been characterized by economy which has been careful not to impair the efficiencies of Government services to the people of the United States."

He added that: "Congress has accomplished much more than it appeared willing and able to accomplish last April, but under Republican leadership we have seen the spending spree of nearly two decades brought to a much-needed halt and the inflation, which threatened our postwar economy checked by a new and enforced awareness of the responsibilities of both the legislative and executive branches of our Government. At last the taxpayers will receive the relief for which they have waited so long, the national defense has been tightened, social security benefits have been expanded sensibly, home ownership has been made easier, farm prices stabilized, anti-Communist legislation enacted and honesty and integrity restored to the ranks of civil servants everywhere. This has been a year not only of great decisions but of great and beneficial results. The Republican Party has met the challenge of the hour with a legislative record that will eventually be the source of pride and progress for every honest-thinking American."

SOME REGRETS

Representative MORANO, in reviewing the record, declared: "Of course I have some regrets as I look at the present picture. I was sorry to see that the President's housing program, based on a 4-year plan, was not fully enacted, but then at least a portion of it will become law to benefit many of our citizens. It is also a disappointment to me that statehood was not granted to Hawaii, but such a move should pass the 84th Congress. I fought for the reinsurance bill, which the President wanted, and I hope that this measure will be one of the first matters passed and sent to the White House for his signature early next year. The Republicans in Congress all have a high batting average considering the tactics resorted to by the minority, the Democrats, who did all that they could to obstruct and hinder needed legislation and to obscure the real issues involved before the Congress. The failure of the Senate to go along with revision of the Taft-Hartley Act is a setback for those, who sought needed reform and modernization of this law. Both management and labor have expressed views for such revision and I believe I can assure everyone that these changes, despite the opposition, will be written into law in 1955. The record of the 83d Congress is not and cannot be expected to be perfect. No Congress is that. But it is a record of hard work, a majority of beneficial accomplishments, and one on which the Republican Party can rely to win the continued and renewed confidence of the majority of the voters of this Nation."

SLIM MARGIN

"It must be remembered," the Greenwich legislator asserted, "that the Republican Party held both the House and Senate by slim margins and so it is remarkable that despite Democrat attempts to sabotage many key proposals so many phases of the President's program were passed. It was the Democrats who killed the granting of the vote to 18-year-olds; statehood for Hawaii; the health reinsurance bill, and the needed changes in the National Labor Relations Act. But the Eisenhower philosophy of undoing the mesh resulting from the creed of centralized government has begun and will go forward I am sure. The President does not believe in the predominance of any branch of the Government over another but in the threefold system which the fathers of our country laid down. Unlike Mr. Truman, the President does not believe in trying to dictate to Congress. He has restored dignity to the White House as the living symbol of the executive power and he has declined to attack the dignity of the legislative branch."

TAXES

Asking what the record really is in detail, Representative MORANO pointed out that: Our taxes are being reduced by almost $7.5 billion this year, which is the monumental accomplishment of the Republican leadership. There is a 10-percent cut in individual income taxes, which became effective January 1, 1954, and the corporation excess-profits taxes died December 31, 1953, both of these benefits being the result of slashes in Federal spending which characterized the loose days of the Truman regime.

"And then we have the excise-tax reduction, a move sought by countless consumers, which went into effect April 1, 1954," he said. "This lowered the rates on most items to 10 percent, on household appliances, 5 percent, thus granting tax revisions of $827 million in relief to individuals and $536 million to corporations."

ATOMIC ENERGY

Turning to atomic energy, he added: "The Atomic Energy Act of 1946, which was in need of revision to meet the changes of the last 8 years, was brought up to date and strengthened despite the filibustering of the Democrat bloc. The program has three main phases: to permit limited exchange with our allies of information relating to the development of atomic weapons, to lay the basis to further the President's historic proposal for an international atomic pool, and to allow for the accelerated development and use of atomic energy by private industry under the supervision of the Atomic Energy Commissi[illegible]

OTHER ITEMS

Representative MORANO also singled out highway construction for which a record-breaking $965 million a year will be available for the next 2 years, which was voted in the Federal Aid Road Act of 1954; the United States participation in the St. Lawrence seaway construction, which after 30 years of effort, will be an invaluable aid to business and commerce; and in housing downpayments have been lowered and an additional 10 years added to the mortgage period, besides extending the public-housing program for another year to help kill slums.

He also called attention to the fact that the President on August 3 signed into law a bill allowing for the broad expansion of the vocational rehabilitation program, an extremely meritorious measure. Under this law persons who are physically handicapped and who are entitled to such benefits will be increased from 60,000 to 250,000, thus widening the good such a type of measure can do.

Representative MORANO also stressed that: "Congress has given the President a year's extension of the mutual security military assistance and economic and technical development program, which will enable the administration to carry on this highly important part of our foreign policy. We have seen $837 million granted for the building of Armed Forces bases and the creation of an Air Force Academy at Colorado Springs.

"But above all, perhaps we should not forget," he went on, "that the 1954 fiscal figures, ending June 30, 1954, demonstrate without fear of contradiction, that, while Federal expenditures amount to $67.6 billion, revenues were $64.6 billions, thus leaving a deficit of only $3 billion. The expenditures were $10 billion, yes, actually $10 billion less than the budget which Mr. Truman drew up before President Eisenhower took office, so the deficit was $6.8 billion less than if the Republican administration hadn't cut down the Democrat budget. The economies in all branches of Government have been of immense benefit to the people."

GOVERNMENT IN BUSINESS

"History shows that in 20 years the big government philosophy resulted in bureaucrats sticking their noses into some 100 enterprises of private business," Representative MORANO declared. "When the Republicans took over they found the Government engaged or involved in such odd ventures as baking, furniture repair, sawmills, rope making, laundries and dry cleaning, tire retreading, clothing manufacture, paints and ice cream, the making of movies, the writing of life insurance and the operation of ships and even railroads. To date the administration has succeeded in unloading such projects valued at about $40 million. The Inland Waterways Corporation has been sold for $9 million; the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, with its tale of chicanery and favoritism, has been liquidated; Bluebeard's Castle Hotel in the Virgin Islands, a 40-room ultraluxurious hostelry built as a New Deal scheme in 1934, has been unloaded for $410,000. Rubber and tin facilities are now in private hands. The uniform factory at the Brooklyn Navy Yard has been closed. There has been a substantial reduction in Government paint manufacture, an elimination of sawmill operations, a reduction of coffee-roasting operations in the Armed Forces, the return of airport control towers to communities, and the elimination of certain mapmaking facilities in the highway field. In keeping with the American tradition of private enterprise and free competition the hungry hands of bureaucracy are loosening their hold upon projects that should belong to the people."

OBSTRUCTIONISTS

Representative MORANO reiterated that "the Democrats have been obstructionists," explaining that "in the House 193 of them tried to send the tax bill, a long-needed reform, back to committee, but they failed, fortunately; 147 House Democrats voted in vain against flexible price supports for basic farm crops; 146 opposed streamlining of the Atomic Energy Act; in the Senate, Democrats tried, by the offering of crippling amendments, to halt the Eisenhower program; they are to blame for the blocking of Hawaiian statehood because they added Alaska to the bill, knowing that such a move would kill the admission of Hawaii, and 42 Democrats are on record as voting for this move; when the Taft-Hartley revisions came up, 46 Democrats voted for recommital, knowing this would kill all chances for reform this session; and when the tax-revision bill came up in the Senate, 43 Democrats tried to increase personal income-tax exemptions by $100, which they knew was an unsound suggestion, in view of our defense and security requirements, and this move was only defeated by 3 votes. The Democrats have a lot to answer for today."

Administrator Nelson's Alibi Not Good Enough

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, another subject matter which I intended to discuss in the closing days in the Senate by way of a brief speech deals with an attempt of Administrator Nelson, of the REA, to alibi his inadequate support of a much-needed speeding up of the rural-electrification program. However, the early adjournment hour which we have set for ourselves here in the Senate renders it impossible for me to take the time of the Senate to deliver a few brief comments that I wanted to make on the subject. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a brief statement under the subject Administrator Nelson's Alibi Not Good Enough.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADMINISTRATOR NELSEN'S ALIBI NOT GOOD ENOUGH

Mr. President, on July 19 I inserted in the Appendix to the RECORD an editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch which was critical of the Republican administration's actions, or halfhearted actions, on the rural electrification program.

Mr. Fred Strong, Deputy Administrator of REA, has sent me a copy of Administrator Nelsen's letter of reply in the event that I wished to insert it in the RECORD also. It reads as follows:

JULY 1, 1954.

The EDITOR, ST. LOUIS POST-DISPATCH,
St. Louis, Mo.

DEAR SIR: Our attention has been called to an editorial in your issue of June 12, 1954, concerning the REA program.

We feel that your impression that we are "not very enthusiastic" about the REA program must be based on inaccurate information, and we believe that you will welcome the facts.

During the past year, we have made electric loans totaling $181 million that will bring service to 180,500 consumers. In both dollars and consumers, that surpasses what was done by REA during the 12 months before we took office. We have reduced the backlog of loan applications from $220 million to $130 million. We have pushed the power supply program, and our percentage of loans made for generation and transmission facilities equals the longtime level. In the rural telephone program, the past year has been by all standards the biggest in the 5-year history of that program. Loans for the year are expected to reach $74 million—nearly twice the $41 million program the year before. Rural telephone construction and subscriber connections are running about one-third ahead of the previous fiscal year. Moreover, we have reduced the administrative cost of the two programs substantially.

In our judgment, the effectiveness of REA is to be measured by how well REA meets the needs of its borrowers—not by the number of dollars loaned. We think you will agree, however, that even looking at the dollar volume alone, the record made so far in our administration could not have been established by those who are out of sympathy with the program.

Sincerely yours,

ANCHER NELSEN,
Administrator.

Mr. President, the Administrator's letter puts the best face on an ugly situation. But the unattractive facts are not changed.

1. Mr. Nelsen begs the question on the "not very enthusiastic" charge by citing his record of electric loans for 1954. The loan program for 1954 was almost identical with that of preceding years, fiscal 1953, 1952 (when the Korean War required minimum expenditures). Mr. Nelsen's loan program record was made possible by funds which the administration did not ask for and the authorization of which they opposed. Mr. Nelsen is very proud of lending $167,104,100 in electric funds. It should be pointed out, however, that the administration originally planned only a $120 million loan program. When the Congress—in opposition to the administration—increased the funds available this planned program was increased to $135 million. After more than half the fiscal year had passed, and after REA had been severely criticized for a slowdown on loans the planned program was finally increased to $165 million. It is this last figure of which Mr. Nelsen is so proud, but it took funds which the administration did not want authorized, and a lot of pressure from the Congress to get him to carry out the program of which he is now so proud in print.

When Mr. Nelsen says "We have pushed the power-supply program." It is well that he limits himself to comments on generation and transmission loans for proof, because the administration has attacked power supply from almost every other possible angle throughout the country.

The telephone program has been growing slowly as it got under way. At the rate the program is moving, it will be something like a half century before all farmers have telephones. Compared to the old crusading spirit of REA when it was launching the REA electric program, the attitude on the telephone program is almost negative.

On the reduction of administrative costs, Mr. Nelsen has been so successful that he was criticized by the House Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations. Whether he has actually reduced administrative costs by promoting efficiency is a question. There is no question about his having reduced administrative expenditures by sharply slashing important technical and advisory service to the rural systems.

2. The rural electrics do not and cannot exist with REA alone, even though it is run in a manner entirely satisfactory to them. They are dependent upon the Federal power program in many areas for low-cost power, for adequate supplies, for bargaining power with the private utilities. Anyone, including Mr. Nelsen, who says that the Federal power program has or is being run with the best interests of the rural electric systems in mind is simply in error. One could recite a volume of changes made in the Federal power program which are harmful and potentially destructive to the rural electric systems. This is an incomplete list: The gutting of the staffs of Southeastern Power Administration, the Southwestern Power Administration, and Bonneville Power Administration: the violation of the SPA-co-op contracts; the marketing criteria for the Missouri Basin; the reshuffling of cost allocations to power on multiple-purpose projects which are under way and are designed to increase power costs to the rural electric systems; the refusal of the administration to recognize the rights of the Georgia cooperatives to the power from Clark Hill Dam; the President's attack upon TVA (from which 52 co-ops get their power) as "creeping socialism" and his order to AEC to help the private utilities invade TVA. To say that the administration is "enthusiastic" about the rural electric systems in the face of the frontal assault upon their power supply which makes up 32 cents of every dollar taken in by those systems requires a new definition for the word.

Hon. Edith Nourse Rogers, of Massachusetts, Replies to Hon. John C. Phillips' Statement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement which I have prepared as a reply to the charges made by Hon. JOHN C. PHILLIPS against our Committee on Veterans' Affairs and others:

I have read with deep regret the statement issued by the Honorable John C. Phillips under date of July 19, which was just recently released, in which he attacks veterans' operations generally, and in several instances attacks the operations and procedure of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs in particular.

First, I would like to plead guilty to the charge which Mr. Phillips makes that I am "a veteran enthusiast." I make no apology for my position on veterans' matters. In fact, I take great pride in it. It is hard for me to imagine any reasonable person being other than enthusiastic about what our veterans have given for this country and for the entire world. All that we have and enjoy today has been bought at a precious price by our veterans. Yes, I am a veteran enthusiast.

Congressman Phillips has seen fit to criticize Representative Radwan and myself concerning the bill H. R. 9020, which provides for a 5-percent increase in the rates of compensation. Mr. Phillips makes the statement that the Veterans' Affairs Committee "apparently operates by asking the professional veterans what they would like to have." It is quite true that we seek the advice and counsel of all veterans' groups and all Government agencies concerned in the field of veterans' affairs. The compensation and pension bills were considered on two different occasions by the Subcommittee on Compensation and Pensions headed by the gentleman from New York [Mr. Radwan]. Two days of hearings were held during the 1st session of the 83d Congress in 1953, and 4 days of hearings were held during the second session. In all, over 100 bills were considered on this subject before the 2 measures which were approved were finally reported by the committee. The hearings which were held resulted in the printing of approximately 400 pages of printed testimony. Approximately 12 individual Members of Congress appeared before the subcommittee to express their belief and conclusion on legislation of this sort. I submit that the record shows that our legislation has been carefully considered in every detail. In addition to the hearings the subcommittee held three executive sessions before it recommended H. R. 9020 to the full committee. The full committee then went over the bill on three different occasions before it was reported favorably to the House. For anyone to say that we did not consider the legislation fairly and adequately, and particularly H. R. 9020, is to fly in the face of the facts.

Mr. Phillips makes quite a point of the fact that there are a few cases of people earning good salaries who are at the same time drawing compensation from the Government for a service-connected disability. The Congress has long recognized that the loss which a man suffers in the defense of his country should be compensated, or an attempt made, at least, to compensate him for his injury. Many injuries cannot be compensated, no matter what amount of money is finally appropriated or granted. The least we can do is make an effort in that direction.

Other intemperate and unfounded charges were made by Congressman Phillips, but the most outrageous one was that made upon Miles D. Kennedy, the legislative director of the American Legion. Mr. Kennedy needs no defense from me. He is a fine, upstanding and stalwart citizen with whom I have enjoyed working in behalf of the veterans and the group which he represents. He is a man of high principle, and of a pleasing personality, and I believe that any reasonable man will be able to sit down with Miles Kennedy and come to a meeting of the minds. To characterize Miles Kennedy as Congressman Phillips has done, and the American Legion as being "on the side of homosexuals and subversives" is an outrageous charge, and one which does not have any basis in fact whatsoever. The simple proposition presented to the House when that question was up for debate was whether or not the Secretary of State, the Attorney General and the Secretary of Commerce should be given authority to wipe out the Veterans Preference Act if they so desired in the administration of their departments. The American Legion and Members of Congress rightly opposed this, and it is important to note that a majority of both the House and Senate voted against this provision and it was not contained in the appropriation finally enacted into law.

Furthermore, it was a clear invasion of the jurisdiction of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service by attempting to do by appropriation rider something that the legislative committee did not believe was warranted. The Appropriations Committee has for a number of years been desperately trying to invade the field of veterans' affairs, and we must be constantly on the alert to prevent them from invading this legislative field.

I regret the necessity of making this statement, but the ill-tempered charges which Congressman Phillips has made, charges which I repeat are without foundation, leaves me no other course to follow. I shall continue to be a veterans' enthusiast, and I shall continue to work for the best interests of all the American people, including its 21 million veterans and their dependents.

Proclamation To Commemorate the 300th Anniversary of Jewish Settlement in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert herewith the proclamation issued to commemorate the 300th anniversary of Jewish settlement in the United States:

To our Jewish brethren in the United States of America:

Peace Be With You and Your Neighbors

Be it known unto you that in Elul 5714 (September 1954) the Jewish community of the United States will commemorate the 300th anniversary of Jewish settlement in this country.

By the grace of God and under the protection of the Constitution of the United States, we have lived and prospered in this land. We have been an integral part of American life. We have worked with all other Americans in the never-ending search for the democratic way of life and for the light of faith. Our ancient prophetic ideals and the teachings of the sages have been foundation stones of this Nation. Our work, our hopes, and above all, our living religion, have been among our proudest offerings to the American community.

In some lands across the seas our brethern have felt the searing flame of prejudice, persecution and death. We in America have had the sad yet inspiring opportunity to save the lives of scores of thousands—to bring comfort to the oppressed, to help in the making of a new and honored nation on the ancient soil of Israel, and to acquire a new recognition of our responsibility for human welfare in keeping with the ancient teachings of our faith. In some lands across the seas our brethren have been pressed to give up their religious beliefs and practices and to disappear in a well of namelessness. But within the home of America we have succeeded in preserving the unique identity of the Jewish religion, worshiping in keeping with our historic traditon; and we have preserved our ancient teachings, our ethics, and our religious ideals in the free climate of our Nation. Our religion is strong, as our American loyalty is strong.

Mindful of these blessings and with deep gratitude in our hearts to the God of Israel, who, in 1654, led our fathers to the shores of this great new land, we hereby proclaim the period from Elul 5714 (September 1954) to the end of Sivan 5715 (May 1955) as one of thanksgiving, prayer, study, and celebration of the American-Jewish Tercentenary.

We call on all our brethren throughout the Nation to participate in the observance of this anniversary; to offer thanks unto the Lord for the blessings bestowed on us in America; to pray for the continued peace and prosperity of our country and all its inhabitants and to rededicate ourselves to the ideals of our faith within the freedom of American democracy.

Bennett R. Briedner, Central Conference of American Rabbis; Simon G. Kramer, American-Jewish Tercentenary; Theodore L. Adams, Rabbinical Council of American; Harry Halpern, Rabbinical Assembly of America; Max J. Etra, Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations of America; Chas. Rosengarten, United Synagogue of America; Maurice N. Eisendrath, Union of American Hebrew Congregations; Norman Salit, Synagogue Council of America.

Resolution of the Board of Directors of the Oregon United Nations Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the following resolution inserted in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Oregon United Nations Association,
Portland, Oreg.

At a meeting of the board of directors of the Oregon United Nations Association, July 19, 1954, the following resolution was accepted:

"Whereas opinions have been expressed that this country should withdraw from the United Nations in the event that delegates representing Communist China should be seated in that body.

"Now, therefore, the Oregon United Nations Association reaffirms its conviction that only through continuing participation in the United Nations can this country effectively promote international welfare, peace and justice and advance its own national objectives.

"*Be it further resolved*, That the admission of delegates of Communist China should be postponed until such time as the authorities of China manifest adherence to the principles set forth in the Charter of the United Nations."

Karlin M. Capper-Johnson,
President, Oregon United Nations Association.

The Gallant Story of the REA Cooperatives in Idaho

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GRACIE PFOST

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mrs. PFOST. Mr. Speaker, the story of REA cooperatives in Idaho is the story of democracy on the march—a fine example of people working together cooperatively to build a better and freer democratic world. It is a pleasure to review that gallant story today.

Statistics are pretty dull things. Only when we breathe life and meaning into them do they take on real significance. Nothing illustrates the progress of people working together better than these two sets of statistics:

In 1935, when the Rural Electrification Administration was established, only 29.8 percent of Idaho's 13,443 farms had rural electrification from central stations on what is known as high-line service.

Latest figures show that 96.8 percent of all Idaho farms, or 38,994, were receiving central-station service.

In other words, there has been an increase from 29 percent to nearly 97 percent. I believe you will agree with me that not only Idaho but all America can be proud of such progress.

THE LONG UPHILL ROAD

This has been no easy achievement. REA had slim pickings when it started out. There were many long, sparsely settled country roads with just a few members to the mile, and main highways with not many more.

Nevertheless, Idaho was in the REA program right from the start. The first Idaho loan was approved in September 1935, and the first REA line placed in operation on July 6, 1936. I am happy to report that the Idaho pioneers in this program live in the congressional district I represent. That first loan went to the Northern Idaho Rural Electrification Association of Sandpoint.

THE REA PROGRAM IN IDAHO

The dreams and visions of the pioneers have paid off in solid achievement. REA approved over $15,146,000 in electrification loans in Idaho to 10 borrowers. All of them are cooperatives.

These loans will make possible the construction of 6,622 miles of line and other rural electrical facilities to serve 16,632 rural consumers. Considering 5 an average family, this means that over 80,000 rural people will receive the benefits and blessings of electricity.

As of January 1 of this year, REA had actually advanced $13,333,869 of the amount approved for loans, and the REA cooperatives who had received these funds were actually operating 5,969 miles of line which served 14,876 families and other rural consumers, or some 75,000 people.

That is a good-sized operation and accomplishment—in anybody's language.

REPAYMENT OF REA LOANS

The REA program is American democracy at its best. People form their own cooperatives under local laws just as in any other private business enterprise, only they work together as a group. The repayment record demonstrates this is no handout program. Idaho borrowers have already repaid to the Federal Government $1,235,178 in interest and $1,782,401 in principal on their REA loans. Some $132,253 was paid ahead of the time it was due. Only the small amount of $30,856 was more than 30 days overdue. On an advanced total of more than $13 million, that is a pretty spectacular financial record.

WHAT IDAHO PAYS FOR ITS REA ELECTRICITY

What, on the average, do Idaho families pay for their electricity? The answer can only be fully appreciated by first recalling the good old days before REA was established. Beginning rates of 20 cents, 17 cents, and 15 cents per kilowatt were quite common. According to the latest REA compilation, the average rate paid by Idaho farm consumers in 1952 was 2½ cents a kilowatt-hour retail.

This figure is even more remarkable when it is realized that today's retail rate includes repayment of principal and interest on the REA loan. One day the REA borrowers will own the whole system themselves.

INCREASE IN CONSUMPTION

Not too long ago, electricity meant an occasional electric bulb overhead. It means far more than that in Idaho today. During the period from December 1947 to December 1953, the average monthly consumption of electricity on REA lines more than doubled.

Having a public power yardstick in neighboring Washington and Oregon has undoubtedly helped push down REA cooperative rates in Idaho. In Oregon, REA families pay 1.9 cents retail per kilowatt-hour for their rural electricity; in Washington it costs them an average of only 1.6 cents. There is nothing like public power competition in your own backyard to push down power rates.

Washington and Oregon cooperatives can buy power directly from Federal multiple-purpose projects. Their example has spurred me on in my consistent advocacy of Federal construction of the high, multiple-purpose Hells Canyon Dam in accordance with well-laid, long-established and sound engineering plans.

NORTHERN LIGHTS, INC., SANDPOINT

There are six lusty cooperatives operating in the congressional district I represent. Each has an impressive record. The first in the field is Northern Lights, Inc., at Sandpoint, which, under the name of the Northern Idaho Rural Electrification Association received that initial loan back in 1935. I challenge any Member of this House to show a finer record of accomplishment.

REA has approved nearly $3 million in loans and advanced $2,809,358. As a result this fine cooperative has 1,140 miles of line energized for the benefit of 3,434 members and their families.

The people are paying back on the dotted line. They have already repaid $246,732 in interest and $268,336 on the principal. Moreover, they made advance payments of $8,405 before they were due, and have no overdue payments.

CLEARWATER VALLEY LIGHT & POWER ASSOCIATION, LEWISTON

The Clearwater Valley Light & Power Association at Lewiston has done an equally fine job. Its first loan received in 1937, and its first electricity turned on in 1938.

Its original loan was for $400,000. A total of $3,388,000 has now been advanced by the REA. Clearwater Valley is a little larger than Northern Lights, with 1,911 miles of line energized which serves 4,055 members, or about 20,000 persons.

This well-managed cooperative has also fared well financially. It has repaid to REA $541,132 in interest and $647,307 in principal. Here again the payments have been made before they were due. Also the records are as clean as a whistle, with no payments overdue.

KOOTENAI RURAL ELECTRIC ASSOCIATION, INC., COEUR D'ALENE

The Kootenai Rural Electric Association secured its first REA loan, which was for $214,000, in 1938, and power was turned on for the first time in 1939. Up to the present time this cooperative has had $1,211,288 in loans approved, most of which has been advanced.

Somewhat smaller than its neighbors, it has 693 miles of line energized, and 2,137 members, which means that it is serving around 10,000 persons.

Kootenai is another upstanding cooperative. It shows what the folks back home can do when they are given the opportunity to provide essential services for themselves. It has repaid the Government $132,780 in interest and $242,744 in principal. It has also made advance payments of $52,044 before they were due.

IDAHO COUNTY LIGHT & POWER COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION, GRANGEVILLE

Let us go to Grangeville next and see what kind of a job the Idaho County Light & Power Cooperative Association is doing. The first REA loan for $191,000 was made on September 12, 1938. The electricity was first turned on on September 22, 1939.

At present, REA has approved loans totaling $1,156,776. Of this sum, $1,074,299 has actually been advanced to this cooperative. With 615 miles of energized line, it has connected 1,157 consumers, or approximately 6,000 persons.

Its financial record is a splendid one. It has paid the Federal Government $93,569 in interest. It has repaid $153,687 in principal. At the same time it has made advance payments of $47,035 before being due. No amount is overdue.

LOST RIVER ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE, INC., MACKAY

The Lost River Electric Cooperative of Mackay started a little later. Its first loan was made on July 1, 1940, for $79,000, and electricity was turned on for the first time just a little less than a year later.

To date REA has approved loans of over $1,337,000, over $850,000 of which has actually been advanced. This system has 259 miles of energized line and

831 consumers, or some 4,100 people receiving the benefits of electricity.

Its financial record is excellent, too. It has paid back to the REA $43,005 in interest and $58,921 on principal. Advance payments total $9,000. No sums are overdue.

SALMON RIVER ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE, INC., CHALLIS

Youngest and smallest cooperative in my district is the Salmon River Electric Cooperative, Inc., at Challis. The date of its first loan was May 8, 1950. It was for $655,000. Electricity was turned on for the first time on June 30, 1951.

From the beginning, the total loans approved for the Salmon River Cooperative now amount to $1,350,000. Practically all of this has been advanced by REA. The exact figure of the advance is $1,248,957.

There are 313 members, or some 1,500 persons, being serviced. There are no overdue amounts on this system.

REA IS A PEOPLE'S PROGRAM

Mr. Speaker, there are two sides to this power question—the people's side and monopoly's side. Either you are for electricity at a price the average man can afford to pay, or you go along with the monopolists and believe charges should be all the traffic will bear.

I have tried to make my position clear. I am for the average man and small business. They are the heart and sinews of America. We preserve and promote democracy in proportion as we build solidly from the average man up.

The REA is a program for the average farmer, and at the same time it brings great benefits to the towns and cities which surround the rural area served. Until every farmer and rural resident who can reasonably be reached receives the benefit of REA electricity, the job in Idaho will not be finished.

I am happy to have had this opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to present the distinguished record of REA cooperatives in Idaho—and particularly in the congressional district I represent. I want to assure these REA folks here and now that they can count on me as their stanch supporter and friend.

Enter the Silly Season, Hot and Humid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the Record an excellent column appearing in the July 4, 1954, issue of the New York Times and written by James Reston, entitled "Enter the Silly Season, Hot and Humid."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

ENTER THE SILLY SEASON, HOT AND HUMID

(By James Reston)

Washington, July 3.—The official silly season in Washington runs from the Fourth of July until Labor Day, but it's a little ahead of time this year.

Even before the tar has begun to blister Pennsylvania Avenue the politicians have started saying and doing things that wouldn't make sense even in the middle of August.

This year the fashion seems to be running to political threats. For example, Senator William F. Knowland, of California, threatens that if Red China is admitted to the United Nations, he will resign as majority leader of the Senate.

This was the finest non sequitur of the week and illustrates the sort of thing that happens here when it begins to get hot. The threat was directed at the British, the French, and Secretary of State Dulles, but do they care?

Nothing would please the British more than the resignation of the Senator from California, except perhaps the resignation of the Senator from Wisconsin. The French are too preoccupied to be bothered, and the Secretary of State is in a mood to welcome good news from whatever quarter.

DON'T TEMPT MR. DULLES

Mr. Dulles doesn't want to bring the Reds into the U. N., but Mr. Knowland shouldn't tempt him. Ever since the majority leader left his own administration on the Bricker amendment and attacked the Secretary of State publicly for agreeing to discuss Indochina at the Geneva Conference, Mr. Dulles' enthusiasm for Mr. Knowland has been somewhat restrained.

Senator Lyndon Johnson, of Texas, followed Senator Knowland with an equally picturesque suggestion, thereby proving that the heat falls on Democrats with equal fury. He did not threaten to resign as Democratic leader of the Senate if Red China got into the U. N., but he said, in effect, that if they came in the United States would go out.

The U. N. is a disappointment now, but it would be a menace if the Communist bloc were strengthened by the addition of Red China and the non-Communist members were deprived of the membership and leadership of the United States.

In that event the organization would lose the only power capable of balancing the Communist power and might even be transformed into an effective instrument of Communist policy. Mr. Johnson doesn't want this, of course; in the heat he just didn't think about it.

This is not a new phenomenon. The heat has been bothering politicians in Washington for a long time. John Burroughs wrote about it when he lived here during the Civil War.

"What does not the dweller in the National Capital endure in * * * these days," he exclaimed. "Think of the agonies of the heated term, the ragings of the Dog Star, the purgatory of heat and dust, of baking, blistering pavements, of cracked and powdered fields, of dead, stifling night air from which every tonic and antiseptic quality seems eliminated. * * *"

This, of course, was before the days of weather machines, but the problem still remains. The only difference seems to be that the politicians now express their frustrations by making threats to one another, or preferably to allies across the sea.

Sherman Adams, the Assistant to the President, threatens that if the President doesn't get a Republican Congress after this year's election, he (Mr. Eisenhower) may not run again in 1956.

Mr. Adams qualifies this with a mystifying clarification. He says there are two other things that might induce the President not to run again, but he doesn't tell us what they are.

President Eisenhower, displeased with Peiping, threatens to unleash Chiang Kai-shek. Mr. Dulles, displeased with France, threatens an agonizing reappraisal. Mr. Dulles and Vice President Nixon, displeased with the Communists in general, threaten massive retaliation. Mr. Dulles, annoyed by his difficulties with the British, implies that he is going to loosen the alliance.

THE COLLECTIVE THREAT

Nor are these threats limited to individuals. The House of Representatives spent a good deal of time this week threatening India about neutralism, warning Europe about disunity and threatening southeast Asia about "Locarno."

There are very few Members of the House who know more about Locarno than about Willie Mays, but the fact is that a majority of those present and voting backed an amendment to the foreign aid bill (drafted originally in the State Department) which threatened to deny United States funds to any country that signed a Locarno-type treaty in that part of the world.

The House beat down the no-aid-to-India-unless-she-gets-off-the-fence amendment, but the threat to France and Italy—get into the European Defense Community, or else—still stands.

The odd thing about these Washington threats is that they are seldom carried out. Officials and politicians make them, but when the time comes the retaliation is not massive, the alliance is not loosened and the aid is not cut off.

Accordingly, the diplomatic or congressional threat has been devalued, like so many other things here, if not debased. It does not impress the other politicians or the allies, but it eases tempers on hot days, and it still catches headlines.

Statement That American Legion Is "Squarely on the Side of Homosexuals and Subversives" Is the Most Absurd Statement of the Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, one of our colleagues has written a 17-page memorandum in which he purports to defend his action on certain appropriation matters relating to the Veterans' Administration medical and hospital and other programs. In view of the fact that the statement is largely composed of misinformation, innuendo, and gross error, I feel obliged, as a member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, to answer a few of the many unfounded charges appearing in the memorandum. Appearing below is a letter which I have written to the Member for this purpose:

Hon. John Phillips,
Member of Congress,
Banning, Calif.

Dear Colleague: I have before me your memorandum regarding Veterans' Administration budget figures for fiscal year 1955, with material to be used in reply to correspondence from American Legion rehabilitation officers and from other correspondents. The memorandum states that it was dictated by you and indicates that it is used for circulation to Members of Congress and other correspondents raising questions concerning appropriatiosn for the Veterans' Administration.

The memorandum contains erroneous and derogatory statements concerning the Veterans' Affairs Committee, of which I am a member. The statement regarding the $10 million amendment which I introduced is completely in error and the memorandum contains an unfair and unjustified attack on the American Legion.

The following statement regarding the $10 million amendment which I introduced appears at the bottom of page 1:

"Members will particularly recall the propaganda spread over the entire country regarding a request for '$10 million additional money for hospitalization' represented by an amendment introduced on the floor by Representative Teague, of Texas. I pointed out, at the time the amendment was defeated, that there had been no request for this money; that it was a general appropriation to the VA and not, as Mr. Teague thought, an addition confined to hospitalization, and finally, that it would simply be left over at the end of the year."

You stated "there had been no request for this money." Hearings held by the Veterans' Affairs Committee on Wednesday, February 18, 1953, page 139, included a statement by Mr. McNamara, of the Bureau of the Budget, in which he stated that the Veterans' Administration had requested $16,700,000 for the medical program. On page 150 of the same hearings, Mr. Baker, budget officer for the Veterans' Administration, stated that the Veterans' Administration had asked for $16,700,000. Mr. Phillips, who can we believe as to whether the Veterans' Administration asked for the additional $10 million—the Veterans' Administration and the Bureau of the Budget or you? The Bureau of the Budget cut the Veterans' Administration request for $16,700,000 to $5 million and forwarded the budget to your committee. You know that the Veterans' Administration is not allowed to ask Congress for more money than the President's Bureau of the Budget recommends. The hearings before your committee do not indicate that you asked the Veterans' Administration how much money they needed and how much they had requested from the Bureau of the Budget. Were you afraid the facts would be printed in the Record and that they would be a handicap in your attempt to sabotage the Veterans' Administration hospital program?

With reference to the $10 million amendment, you also stated "it would simply be left over at the end of the year." Gen. Carl R. Gray, Jr., Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, stated at that time in a letter which appears in the Congressional Record on May 25, 1953, page A3060, as follows:

"If an additional $10 million had been provided it could have been utilized throughout the medical programs. The medical and dental outpatient program could have utilized the entire sum of $10 million. In fact, the current dental backlog of 347,000 cases would require an estimated $19,802,971 to reduce to manageable proportion.

"If the entire sum had not been utilized in the medical and dental outpatient program, it could have been utilized to restore funds to danger areas which developed as a result of initial curtailments, such as additional funds for Federal contract hospitalization of veterans in emergencies and in areas where no VA hospitals are located; to fill staff voids by use of consultants in hospitals operating with low staff ratios; and to provide funds for consultant specialist care."

In defending the Veterans' Administration's request for additional funds, Adm. Joel T. Boone, Chief Medical Director, Veterans' Administration, made the following statement before the Veterans' Affairs Committee relative to the inadequacies of the $5 million recommended by your committee:

"Under the supplemental [$5 million recommended by the House Appropriations Committee] we cannot raise the level or ceiling of the old hospital staffs and for that reason we cannot open beds and wards in old hospitals [referring to the 2,300 beds vacant at that time]. There is a backlog of pending cases that requires millions of funds. These cases are all service-connected. Delay means that the pathology is getting worse and with the rising cost of living implies higher cost of treatment. To dispose of the backlog you will either have to appropriate many millions, or the Congress will have to default on their commitment to veterans with service-connected conditions." (Hearings before Veterans' Affairs Committee, February 18 and 19, 1953.)

In effort to develop information as to the needs of Veterans' Administration hospitals, the Veterans' Affairs Committee contacted the managers of Veterans' Administration hospitals throughout the United States. The managers of Veterans' Administration hospitals located in your own State of California made the following comments with reference to lack of funds:

VA hospital, Los Angeles, Calif. (general medical and surgical): "Due to the rapid expansion of the medical program at this center we were unable to secure ceiling and funds adequate to properly cover all activities, especially civil-service personnel who support the Department of Medicine and Surgery group, even before the reduction in force and freezing actions started."

VA hospital, San Francisco, Calif. (general medical and surgical and neuropsychiatric): "Additional finance and help. It is impossible under the present moneys allocated to this station to maintain our usual 90-day stock supply. During the last few months, owing to the lack of funds, our stock supply has dropped from a 90-day level to its present 60-day level, and, if this continues, before this year is over we will not have sufficient funds to carry a normal monthly supply."

VA hospital, Fresno, Calif. (general medical and surgical): "The most pressing need in our hospital is the provision of adequate personnel in order to adequately staff the hospital."

You may also be interested to know that at the time your committee refused the Veterans' Administration's request for funds, there were 27,123 service-connected outpatient cases approved for treatment in California for which adequate funds were not available and it was estimated that it would have required $1,695,000 to clear up the service-connected out-patient backlog for the State of California alone. At the time your committee refused funds for the Veterans' Administration, a serious situation existed in California as far as the care of mentally disabled veterans was concerned. On May 18, 1953, your colleague, the Honorable William S. Mailliard, of California, made the following remarks, which appear on page A2828 of the Congressional Record:

"The California Department of Mental Hygiene reports that there are over 4,600 veterans hospitalized in State mental institutions. For the most part, California taxpayers are paying for their care, although approximately 40 percent of them came to California from other States. The Veterans' Administration has only two hospitals in California, plus one under construction, to take care of neuropsychiatric patients from Arizona, Nevada, and other Western States, as well as those from California. There are long waiting lists of eligible veterans. This situation is intolerable, both from the standpoint of the veteran who needs and is entitled to hospitalization, and also from that of society, to whom many of these veterans may at any time become dangerous."

When I offered my amendment for $10 million on the floor, it was offered for the specific purpose of granting additional funds for the veterans' medical and hospital program and, as you know, could have been used only for that purpose had it been approved. At the time my amendment was offered, there were over 2,300 beds vacant in Veterans' Administration hospitals for lack of funds. These beds are listed on page A2842 of the Congressional Record of May 18, 1953. At that time, the Veterans' Administration had a backlog of 301,365 approved service-connected dental cases, which would require in excess of $17,778,000 to reduce to manageable proportions. The refusal of your subcommittee to grant the funds requested by VA required the vacant beds to remain unused and constituted a default on veterans who had been approved for service-connected dental treatment under existing law. At the time your committee refused additional funds for the Veterans' Administration, there were 24,834 eligible veterans on the waiting list approved for admission to VA hospitals. These included 11,779 neuropsychiatric cases and 2,378 TB cases.

In various statements which you have released, you have repeatedly used the argument that additional funds were not necessary for the Veterans' Administration, since they would be left over at the end of the year. As a member of the Appropriations Committee, I know that you are aware that no department can make expenditures in excess of appropriations and, as a result, is very fortunate if it can utilize more than 99 percent of the funds appropriated, regardless of their adequacy. It is a well-known fact that the Veterans' Administration regularly returns about one-half of 1 percent of its annual appropriation. It will continue to return several million dollars a year, regardless of the adequacy of the appropriations voted by your committee. The presence of these unexpended funds has nothing to do with the legitimate needs of the agency.

You have included a derogatory statement to the leadership of the American Legion regarding their action on the 1954 appropriations bill for the State, Commerce, and Justice Departments. The statement to which I refer is as follows:

"I resent the fact that Miles Kennedy, the national legislative representative, put the American Legion squarely on the side of homosexuals and subversives, as you will all recall, when the appropriation bill for State, Justice, and Commerce was before the House, last year."

This is the most absurd statement of the year. The rider to which you were referring proposed to give the heads of the State, Commerce, and Justice Departments absolute authority to fire any employee at their discretion. This authority would have been a circumvention of the Veterans' Preference Act and had nothing to do with security risks. Only 2 weeks before this issue came to the House, the administration had published its new security program, giving the heads of all governmental agencies specific authority to dismiss any security risk. The House repudiated the attempt by the Appropriations Committee to circumvent the Veterans' Preference Act on a rollcall vote of 181 to 168. The issue was revived in the Senate and it was defeated there by a vote of 36 to 35. It is interesting to note that 27 Republican House Members joined in voting against the rider, including the chairman and most of the Republican members of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee. (See rollcall vote No. 33.) I hardly think that it is your intention to characterize the vote of these individuals as being on the side of homosexuals and subversives.

Your statement does not go into the action of the Appropriations Committee on the appropriations bill for 1954; however, you do emphasize in several places that your committee has always given the Veterans' Administration everything it asked for. Perhaps it will refresh your memory if I remind you that the Bureau of the Budget revised the budget of the Veterans' Administration and cut the amount previously recommended for medical, hospital, and domiciliary programs for fiscal 1954 from $719,809,900 to $664,379,600, or a cut of $55,430,300. Before the Easter recess of the first session, you made a series of speeches on the floor of the House, in which you indicated your general approval of the action of the Bureau of the Budget. This brought about considerable pressure from the veterans' organizations, which culminated in a meeting in the Speaker's office attended by you, representatives of the major veterans' organizations, and the House leadership. This meeting was held for the specific purpose of placating the veterans' organizations and it resulted in your receiving directions from the House leadership to go on the floor of the House and dispel any idea that the Appropriations Committee was about to make any large cut in Veterans' Administration medical and hospital funds. The statement which you did subsequently make was unprecedented during my period as a Member of Congress, in that it presented the spectacle of a subcommittee chairman being forced to go on the floor of the House and disclose in advance the probable recommendation of his subcommittee in order to quiet intense criticism which his statements and actions had evoked.

Your memorandum was critical of the veterans' service organizations for sending telegrams to Members of Congress and your committee urging that the Congress approve $921 million for the Veterans' Administration administration, hospital, and domiciliary services appropriation. Nine hundred and twenty-one million dollars was the amount recommended in the original printed budget. Your committee placed the veterans' service organizations in the position of having to appear before your committee to testify on a budget which was in the process of revision; therefore, they had no other course than to support the amounts requested in the last printed budget. As I recall, several of the organizations were so resentful of this maneuver on your part that they later demanded an opportunity to be heard again when the revised budget was released just a few days before your committee voted out the appropriations bill.

I have read the hearings of your subcommittee on the Veterans' Administration budget for fiscal 1955 and can thoroughly understand and appreciate the statement of Dr. Joel T. Boone, the VA Chief Medical Director, at the conclusion of the hearings:

"I cannot leave this conference room without making a statement. Never in my long years in the Government and in my present position, which I never sought nor wanted, and which anybody can have whenever he wants it, have I been castigated the way I was castigated yesterday. I have been accused of using pressure to make patients come to Veterans' Administration hospitals and of opening beds just to spend money." (Hearings, subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, 83d Cong., 2d sess., independent offices appropriations for 1955, p. 1888.)

The treatment of Dr. Boone before your committee was disgraceful and could in no way be characterized as a sympathetic inquiry into the bona fide needs of the veterans' medical and hospital program. I certainly cannot concur with the statement appearing on page 7 of your memorandum to the effect that Dr. Boone has completely lost the confidence of practically all members of the legislative Committee on Veterans' Affairs. So far as I know, no member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee has indicated a lack of confidence in Dr. Boone. It is my impression that the committee is unanimous in its admiration of Admiral Boone in standing up and fighting for adequate funds for the veterans' medical and hospital program in the face of a hostile Appropriations Subcommittee chairman. Admiral Boone has done an outstanding job in his capacity as Chief Medical Director. He has supervised the orderly expansion of the new hospital program with great skill and has maintained and improved the quality of medical care for veterans. Admiral Boone has an outstanding record of public service and is a winner of the Congressional Medal of Honor. His efforts in defending the veterans' hospital and medical program in the face of your attempts to curtail it have earned him the thanks of every veteran in this country. In every instance where it became necessary for the Veterans' Affairs Committee to consider matters relating to the medical and hospital program on which you and Dr. Boone differed the committee supported Dr. Boone. It would appear, therefore, that if the committee had a lack of faith in the motives of anyone, so far as the hospital and medical program is concerned, it would be you, and not Dr. Boone.

I shall not attempt to discuss in detail your committee's action on the 1955 VA budget for the medical and hospital program, except to point out that the committee's inquiry into the needs of the medical and hospital program was so inadequate that it became necessary for the committee to direct the Veterans' Administration to submit a supplemental appropriation request to the independent offices appropriation bill for 1955 before that bill had actually become law. The Appropriations Committee reported H. R. 8583, the independent offices appropriation bill for 1955, on March 26. The bill was passed by the House on March 31. The bill was reported to the Senate by the Senate Appropriations Committee on May 14 and passed on May 19. It was signed into law by the President as Public Law 428, 83d Congress, on June 24. On June 10, representatives of the Veterans' Administration and the Bureau of the Budget were called before your subcommittee to discuss the inadequacies of the appropriation bill reported by your committee and the Veterans' Administration was directed to submit a supplement request to the Bureau of the Budget. This was done on June 14. The supplemental request was eventually approved for $3 million. Approval of this supplemental request by the committee must be considered in the nature of an admission of inadequate consideration on the part of the committee when the regular budget was under consideration. This error would probably not have occurred if you had concerned yourself more with a sympathetic discussion of the agency's need, rather than attempting to question the motives and integrity of Dr. Boone. It is certainly unique, to say the least, that a committee finds it necessary to consider a supplemental appropriation to an annual appropiration bill before the annual appropriation bill has even become law.

On page 14 of your memorandum, there is a misstatement regarding the action of the Veterans' Affairs Committee in approving compensation and pension bills. The statement to which I refer is as follows:

"I now want to talk about the matter of compensation and pensions. Mrs. ROGERS' committee, which apparently operates by asking the professional veterans what they would like to have for the current session, and then voting out those bills without opposition, and sometimes without hearings, has voted out H. R. 9020, which increases compensation and pensions for the disabled."

You are completely wrong in your statement that the Veterans' Affairs Committee has operated by asking professional veterans what they would like to have and then voting out those bills without opposition and sometimes without hearings. The veteran service organizations appeared before the Veterans' Affairs Committee and made one unanimous request. In passing out H. R. 9020, the committee did not agree to the veterans' organizations request. The same may be said regarding the request of the Spanish-American War Veterans on pension legislation.

You are completely wrong when you state that the Veterans' Affairs Committee operates by voting out pension and compensation bills without hearings. I am enclosing copies of hearings held by the Veterans' Affairs Committee on March 31, April 15, April 21, and April 28, 1953, and March 31, April 1, 2, and 6, 1954. Testimony taken in these hearings covers 531 pages. It is interesting to note that in these hearings, which, according to you, did not occur, about 25 Members of Congress, including a number of your colleagues from California, appeared before the committee in behalf of pension and compensation legislation being considered by the committee. In addition to the open hearings referred to above, the subcommittee and the full committee held at least a half dozen executive sessions, during which the reports of the subcommittees were considered. I seriously doubt that there is a legislative committee in Congress which worked harder during this session than the Veterans' Affairs Committee. It has taken over 5,000 pages of testimony on a variety of subjects and has been unanimous in most of its reports.

In recognition of its responsibility in the field of veterans' affairs, the committee met in executive session on at least 3 occasions during the 83d Congress for the purpose of discussing methods of dealing with your attacks on the Veterans' Administration hospital, medical, and other programs. In each instance, the committee agreed that coordinated action on the floor of the House on the part of the committee would be necessary if the rights of veterans were to be preserved and it was this coordinated action by Democratic and Republican members of the committee that led to the defeat of your attempt to curtail the basis for admission to Veterans' Administration hospitals.

Your conflict with the veteran organizations and with the Veterans' Affairs Committee has been brought about because you have attempted to usurp the responsibilities and prerogatives of the legislative committee through your position as chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee handling the Veterans' Administration budget and have tried to dictate legislative policy in the field of veterans' affairs. In order that there can be no doubt as to the record on this score, I will briefly review it:

1. You attempted to limit the basis for admission of non-service-connected cases in Veterans' Administration hospitals by including a rider on H. R. 5690, the independent offices appropriation bill, which included appropriations for Veterans' Administration for fiscal year 1954. This rider became the subject of rollcall vote No. 55 and as a result your effort to curtail the basis of admission to Veterans' Administration hospitals was defeated by a vote of 217 to 179.

2. Your committee has included restrictive riders on the Veterans' Administration appropriation bills for fiscal years 1954 and 1955 (H. R. 5690 and H. R. 8583), which have restricted the basis for eligibility for outpatient dental care. At the time the appropriations bill for 1954 was brought to the floor of the House, there were about 247,000 veterans who had been declared eligible and in need of outpatient dental care under existing laws. The riders which you brought out on the appropriations bill rendered all of these veterans ineligible and constituted a direct default in these cases (including 27,123 cases in your own State of California). At the time, you denied that it was your intention to eliminate outpatient dental treatment for Spanish-American War veterans and disabled veterans training under Public Law 16, but the inept wording of the rider (to H. R. 5690) did precisely that; therefore it was necessary for the Congress to pass a bill, which became Public Law 494, 83d Congress, to correct your error and restore eligibility to these two groups.

3. A rider was placed on H. R. 5690 and H. R. 8583, the appropriations bills for fiscal 1954 and 1955, which eliminated payment of the first year's interest rate to veterans obtaining a Veterans' Administration guaranteed loan. This action cost each veteran purchasing a home under the GI bill an average of $158 each, or a total of $55 million a year. Without commenting on the merits of this particular piece of policy, it suffices to say that this question should have been determined by the Banking and Currency Committee, rather than the Appropriations Committee.

4. Your subcommittee included a rider on the 1954 and 1955 appropriations bills for VA which reduced from $1.50 per month to $1 the amounts paid to colleges and other schools for handling certain administrative details in connection with veteran students.

In addition to these actions, other subcommittees of the Appropriations Committee attempted to circumvent veterans' preference by inserting a rider on the State, Commerce, and Justice Departments appropriations bill for 1954 and refused funds to the Office of Education for use in connection with the veterans' education program, when that office is clearly obliged under law to carry out certain functions to protect the veteran from exploitation by fly-by-night schools.

There is no doubt that you have been the leading Member of Congress in attempting to disrupt and demoralize the veterans' medical and hospital program. The legislative Committee on Veterans' Affairs is as fine a committee as there is in Congress. I have complete confidence in them, and I resent your attempting to take over their duties through your position as chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations handling Veterans' Administration appropriations.

Very truly yours,

Olin E. Teague,
Congressman.

The Republican Smear of ADA Unwarranted in Fact

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, it had been my intention on this last day of this session of Congress to deliver a speech in defense of the organization, Americans for Democratic Action, by way of answer to the unwarranted smear attacks of certain Republican spokesmen against ADA. Because of the lateness of the hour and the general informal understanding existing in the Senate that each Senator shall be privileged to have inserted in the Congressional Record speech material that he had intended to deliver today, I shall forego the pleasure of making this particular speech on the floor of the Senate at this time. However, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the body of the final issue of the Congressional Record for this session of Congress the speech that I had intended to make entitled "Republican Smear of ADA Unwarranted in Fact."

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Republicans' Smear of ADA Unwarranted in Fact

Recent statements by the conservative leadership of the Republican Party make it abundantly clear that the 1954 congressional campaigns will not be waged on the merits of programs. It is apparent that these leaders do not want to talk about such issues as employment, public power, taxes, offshore oil, and national defense. They would engage the country in sundry diversionary issues by attacking individuals and organizations and impugning their motives rather than debating the programs for which they stand. It is my hope that the liberal candidates will refuse to be sidetracked by these tactics and will take the poor record of the 83d Congress and the Eisenhower administration to the people of America. So that the record may be clear, and perhaps some of the false charges be put to rest, I want to expose one of the principal diversions being used today.

Americans for Democratic Action has been selected by the leaders of the Republican Party as the whipping boy in the 1954 campaign. The President of the Senate and Vice President of the United States has on a number of recent occasions attacked ADA. The Vice President told a GOP gathering in San Francisco that "The Democratic Party, unfortunately, is controlled in California and nationally by its ADA left-wing, a group of men honestly, but I believe mistakenly, dedicated to the socialization of basic institutions in this country." Later he told a GOP audience in New York that ADA was in control of the Democratic Party of that State.

Senate Majority Leader Knowland has implied that ADA is attempting to take over the leadership of the Senate.

ADA is generally called left-wing or Socialist by Republican leaders, but there is no attempt to argue against the programs for which the ADA stands. As an ADA vice chairman, let me put the record straight. Americans for Democratic Action is dedicated to a program of constitutional liberalism and its policies are dictated by the needs, aspirations and desires of the American people.

Few, if any, of ADA's attackers would attempt to stick a Communist label on it. They argue that the organization is a group of determined Marxists seeking to destroy our democratic free enterprise system and replace it with socialism. This is the line of those politicians who oppose any social or economic program in America—cry "socialism" when the Communist charge cannot be made to stick—at everyone and everything standing for progress. The baiters of ADA have been pretty careful not to label it Communist. Its record and public reputation of vigorous anticommunism is too clear.

What is ADA, and what does it stand for? I'll tell you.

ADA was organized in 1947 by a group of distinguished Americans with the general purpose of restoring the influence of liberalism in the national and international policies of the United States.

ADA has operated in the politics of ideas, believing that in a democracy progress comes as ideas are proposed, debated, accepted, rejected or modified by the people themselves. I have always considered this one of the sources of our country's political health. Some of the things ADA has advocated have been accepted; some have not—at least, not yet; some, no doubt, never will be. The point is that ADA has laid its views on the line for all to see. Those who disagree can dispute the soundness of the views, and many have. It has seemed to me that those who denounce ADA and its views as subversive—which is ridiculous—do so because they are afraid of the ideas, afraid that the ideas will be accepted on their merits, and find it easier and safer to denounce than to refute them. For myself, I believe, as did Thomas Jefferson, that in a free country we can tolerate any error of thought as long as reason is free to combat it.

The first task ADA set for itself after it was founded was to expose and frustrate the attempt of the Communists to trap American liberals into supporting their sinister objectives. In 1948 ADA exposed the Communist domination of the so-called Progressive Party in a series of widely distributed, well-documented pamphlets. It continued this opposition and exposition through subsequent campaigns.

In policy, platform, and performance ADA has opposed the Communists on all the important issues of our time. ADA supported aid to Greece and Turkey, the Marshall plan, point 4, the North Atlantic Pact, the military-aid program, and antiaggression action in Korea. ADA's anticommunism has not been confined to mere opposition to Communist lines. ADA has not only exposed Communist machinations within political movements, but has kept them out of civil-rights mobilizations and other liberal organizations, and has revealed the hidden purpose of Communist propaganda.

Early in 1953 the ADA publicly warned of a developing new Communist line calling for a revival of the popular front which deceived so many Americans in the thirties and which still, unfortunately, is a real factor in several European countries. In March of this year, 1954, the ADA again called public attention to the new Communist official program brazenly identified as "the American way."

"The ADA describes this new attempt of the Communists to deceive Americans this way: 'The real purpose behind this Yankee Doodle pose * * * [is] disrupting the unity of the free world.'

"In their main and sole immediate purpose, weakening and isolating America," continued this same statement just 4 months ago, "the Communists set themselves in diametric opposition to the ADA and the broad movement of American liberals who believe that the unity of the free world and the strength of the United States are the two major premises of our national policy."

I cite these instances of ADA's continuous and continuing opposition to communism not because the record of ADA needs defense, but because the technique of distortion used by some Republican leaders is first to concede that ADA is not a Communist-front organization, and to go on to say that ADA is "doing the work of the Communists."

What is the work the ADA is doing for the Communists? What is the socialism it seeks to foist on the United States? Let us revive an old American custom and look at the record.

It has been charged, for example, that Americans for Democratic Action wants "every teacher to have the right to be a member of the Communist Party, and to teach communism to our youth." The policy statement of ADA, adopted at its annual convention in Chicago in April 1954, says this: "We oppose legislative interference with academic freedom. We have confidence in the will and the ability of those who are charged with the conduct of our educational institutions to exclude from teaching positions all persons who have surrendered their own freedom of thought to Communist or fascist control." What sane or honest person can see in this any support for the right of Communists to teach our youth?

It has been charged that ADA urges that "Communists be guaranteed the right to serve in at least 90 percent of all Federal and State positions." What fanciful nonsense—the truth is that ADA says, and again I quote its recent convention position: "We recognize the important necessity for guarding sensitive agencies from the activities of Communists or fascists." ADA does believe that more than 99 percent of all Government workers, Republican and Democrat, are loyal, decent Americans and that far too many of them have suffered deep injustices because of the ill-defined standards and faulty administration of the loyalty-security programs. We have seen in the recent juggling of figures on security risks, the ease with which the program can be perverted into a political purge when so many basic rights are denied the accused.

ADA has always held the view expressed by President Eisenhower in his memorable speech at Columbia University, when he said, "Here in America we are descended in blood and spirit from revolutionaries and rebels—men and women who dared to dissent from accepted doctrine. As their heirs, may we never confuse honest dissent with disloyal subversion."

In fairness to a difference of point of view that exists within ADA on the issue of outlawing the Communist Party, I wish to point out that there are those in the organization who do not share the position taken by me and the Senator from Minnesota, Mr. HUMPHREY, on the Humphrey-Morse-Kennedy amendment recently adopted by the Senate which sought to outlaw the Communist Party. The difference of opinion is one which exists within other groups—for that matter within the Senate of the United States itself—and is based upon very sincere and honest opposing contentions. As I see it those within the ADA and within other organizations who hold to the point of view that it is a mistake to outlaw the Communist Party argue from the assumption that the Communist Party is in fact a political party. I do not accept that assumption as being a sound one. The burden of the argument of the Senator from Minnesota, Mr. HUMPHREY, who incidentally is a past president of ADA, and of the rest of us who supported the Humphrey-Morse-Kennedy amendment proposing the outlawing of the Communist Party, is based upon the contention that the Communist Party is not a political party. Such being our argument, it is fair to ask us the question, "If the Communist Party is not a political party, then what is it?" Our answer is that the Communist Party in fact is a criminal conspiracy dedicated to the overthrow of the United States Government by force. It is a criminal conspiracy that participates in a gamut of subversive activities including sabotage, espionage, and treasonable conduct. It is a conspiracy which has always operated underground as far as its criminal conspiratorial activities are concerned. We who would outlaw the Communist Party take the position that the so-called aboveground activities of the Communist Party are but political window dressing, political propaganda, and political deception.

Further, we take the position that any individual who knowingly, willfully, and intentionally joins the Communist conspiracy, recognizing full well the conspiratorial objectives of the organization, should be made criminally liable for the act of joining the conspiracy. Those of us who supported the Humphrey amendment which sought to outlaw the Communist Party made very clear that the conspiracy, which we were seeking to make a Federal criminal offense, was one which required the existence of a criminal intent or mens rea on the part of the defendant. Therefore, we have not been able to accept the argument of those in the ADA and in other organizations including Members of the United States Senate who have contended that our amendment violated some way, somehow, freedom of speech and freedom of thought and would lead to thought control.

Neither have we seen any logic to the contention that our amendment seeking to outlaw the Communist Party and making the willful and intentional joining of the Communist Party a criminal offense constituted a threat to our political parties in the United States. When opponents of our point of view have asked the question, "Would not the outlawing of the Communist Party be a precedent sometime, when a tyrannical majority may prevail in the United States, for outlawing the Republican Party or the Demcratic Party?" Our answer to the question is "No" and for the simple reason that our amendment proposing to outlaw the Communist Party is based upon the allegation that the Communist Party is not a political party at all, but is, in fact, a conspiracy to overthrow our Government by force.

Under our judicial system in the United States no political party could possibly be jeopardized by our amendment because it is perfectly obvious that a legitimate political party under our constitutional system would not be one which has as its objective the overthrowing of our constitutional system of government by force. However, we fully appreciate the fact that there are many people in our country just as sincere in their devotion to our form of government as are those of us who think that the Communist Party should be outlawed and who believe that we are mistaken in the course of action which we have followed in our support of the Humphrey-Morse-Kennedy amendment.

As I've said before, there are those in the ADA—and for all I know, possibly a majority in the ADA—who hold to a point of view contrary to those of us who supported the the Humphrey-Morse-Kennedy amendment. The debate in the Senate shows that there are many in the Senate who at least felt that the Humphrey-Morse-Kennedy amendment should be watered down before final adoption and they succeeded in doing so in the conference report recently adopted by the Senate.

For that matter, the record is clear that even the President of the United States and J. Edgar Hoover have not favored going as far as we went in the Humphrey-Morse-Kennedy amendment. Therefore let me make very clear that the difference of opinion within the ADA over the issue of whether or not the Communist Party should be outlawed does not in any way justify any smear attack on the ADA under such a false charge that it is soft on communism.

There are many organizations in the United States which are strongly anticommunistic, but I want to say here and now that I do not know of any organization that is more anti-Communist and is more dedicated to check the spread of communism in the United States than is the Americans for Democratic Action.

Now that the conference report has been adopted on the so-called Butler subversive control bill, I am satisfied that in the next session of Congress the new law is going to need a considerable amount of revising and amending. I am perfectly aware of the fact that the introduction of the Humphrey-Morse-Kennedy amendment resulted in the offering of a great many amendments to the Butler bill here on the floor of the Senate. We all know—if we're to be frank about it—that it resulted in a considerable amount of compromising of legislative proposals in connection with the bill here on the floor of the Senate.

If time had permitted, the best procedure to have followed would have been to send the entire bill, along with the Humphrey-Morse-Kennedy amendment and the rest of the amendments which were proposed here on the floor of the Senate, back to the Judiciary Committee for further hearings and consideration. Many Members of the Senate in our cloakroom discussions on the bill agreed that it was most unfortunate that the Butler bill did not come up for debate on the floor of the Senate at least 2 months ago. If it had been considered earlier, then the sound course of action would have been to send it back to committee for consideration of such amendments as the Humphrey-Morse-Kennedy amendment. Personally I wish that course of action could have been followed, but with the adjournment date hanging over our heads like a sword Damocles, time did not permit of further committee hearings and consideration on the bill.

I am satisfied that the final bill which we passed from a draftsmanship standpoint is not a very good example of legislative art. Likewise I am fearful that it has some legislative hodgepodge characteristics and it may very well be that it has some legal inconsistencies within it. Undoubtedly it is one that is going to raise a good many administrative problems and serious questions of public policy. Therefore I wish to say here and now that as one of the cosponsors of the Humphrey-Morse-Kennedy amendment, I intend between now and the next session of Congress to do a great deal of legal research work on the Butler bill as amended, and prepare whatever amendments I decide are necessary in order to meet any fair and sound criticism of the bill which may develop in the weeks and months between now and the opening of Congress.

Mr. President, on the subject of ADA's opposition to communism I wish to read an editorial in the August 6, 1954, edition of the Commonweal. The editorial reads as follows:

"THE IDEA OF COMMUNISM

"Communism is a three-way danger. It is, first of all, an idea that has won the allegiance of millions throughout the world. As an idea, communism presents a more or less coherent philosophy of life and of man rooted in dialectic and historical materialism. Secondly, communism is a political conspiracy; as such it is an internal threat wherever it has followers to carry out party orders. Thirdly, communism is a worldwide military force embarked on a program of expansion and aggression.

"The three aspects of communism go hand in hand. The idea comes first; the party is able to enlist from convinced ideologues followers ready to carry out subversion or, when the climate is right, to change social disorder and discontent into the coin of mass political action. This latter activity is hopeless in the United States at the present time, but such was not the case during the bleak depression years and in countries like Italy and France the unhappy social scene is still a fruitful vineyard for Communist apostles. In both these countries communism is able to command a large number of votes. The votes come not from convinced Communist ideologues but from dissatisfied people who take that way to express discontent with their lot.

"The problem of fighting communism is to keep each of these three avenues of Communist approach closely guarded. It would not do, for instance, to concentrate so exclusively on counteracting communism as an idea that the avenue of internal subversion was ignored. It would not do to concentrate so completely on the problem of subversion as to ignore the military aspects. In this place or that, one or the other danger may be greater than the others, but the 3-way attack must be met by an alert 3-way defense.

"Communism as an idea has probably been the most neglected of all three, both here and abroad. Both leftwing and rightwing opinion in the United States has been guilty of obscuring the real nature of communism as an idea. For years—with notable exceptions—many patriotic liberal Americans neglected to take a good hard look at just what communism means in terms of ideas. The rude awakening that came after the war was really unnecessary. In the glow of the wartime alliance with Russia even stalwart generals were saying that the difference between communism and democracy was just about as crucial as the difference between American Democrats and Republicans. If the philosophy of communism had been seriously examined, we might have avoided many well-meant but disastrous moves. Too many Americans felt that communism was undoubtedly foreign and perhaps even on the screwball side, but were not yet sufficiently ordiented to the ideological age to believe that the future of the world might actually be dependent on the abstruse dialectics found in dull, barely readable Marxist tomes. By and large, we were pushovers for the sentimentality that colored so many of our attitudes toward Russia when we fought a common enemy. That sentimentality afflicted all strata of society. It is as easy to find it in back issues of Life magazine as in the glowingly liberal-opinion weeklies. (Long-time Commonweal readers will recall that in July 1945, this magazine and the Catholic World were attacked by Pravda as the two worst examples of 'the warmongering Catholic press,' so do not read the above as an apologia.) A more general knowledge of the idea behind communism would have saved Americans from many of the illusions that drugged the Nation at the time.

"On the other hand, there is a segment of American society which still stands in as much need of education about the idea of communism as those who thought about the subject so hazily in those days. This is a group which is ready to bracket every idea which does not conform to its own hardy right-wing convictions as communistic.

"There is no more affinity between communism and the kind of liberalism espoused, say, by the ADA or the American Veterans Committee than there is between the native fascism of Gerald L. K. Smith and the stanch republicanism of the late Senator Taft. But, for political and propaganda purposes, this group is forever ready to attribute every idea left of Dwight Eisenhower's fictitious dead center to Karl Marx. These terribles simplificateurs have created all kinds of mischief by consistently tarring patriotic and idealistic people with the Communist brush. 'If supporting public housing is communistic,' many have felt through the years, 'then I don't mind being communistic.' A good example of this sort of thing was found recently when a supposed authority on communism before a congressional committee identified the writings of two Popes as communistic. As long as good people and good ideas are arbitrarily associated with communism, for partisan gain, the essential wickedness of communism as an idea will be obscured.

"There are proposals now for a more general education in communism, notably a widely publicized plan offered by the American Bar Association. We heartily approve such a program, provided it truly means education about communism and is not used as a means for partisan propagandists and lobbyists to include as communistic the teachings and beliefs of just about everyone who disagrees with them, from the Popes who wrote the social encyclicals to the liberals of Americans for Democratic Action.

"The so-called right wing cannot alone defeat communism in America. The attack of the Communists is directed against Americans of both parties and from every shade of the political spectrum. We need to fire our volleys against communism from both left and right. The sooner this simple fact is generally understood the better all around. No group of Americans is the special target of communism, and none has a monopoly on anticommunism. With wider understanding of the Communist idea, it might become clear to all that however we Americans may disagree among ourselves we face in communism a common enemy and will either have to hang together or hang separately."

Much is made in attacks upon ADA of its opposition to loyalty oaths. ADA does oppose loyalty oaths for private individuals and says that "to the extent that any oath can have meaning, we believe that the traditional oath by Government employees in support of the Constitution and the laws of the United States is sufficient." I am puzzled, too, by the attitude on loyalty oaths of some of the self-styled professional anti-Communists, experienced and knowing as they are in the ways of Communist deceit and treachery. Do they think that a disciplined Communist agent would, for an instant, hesitate to sign an oath or anything else if it suited his purpose?

The charge is made that ADA advocates the destruction of the FBI and is supporting the abolition of congressional committees investigating communism. ADA does not believe that in a free country any person or agency of the Government is sacrosanct and above criticism. It has criticized the methods of the FBI a number of times, particularly for the use of wiretapping—a position, incidentally, consistently sustained by the courts. ADA maintains that, so long as wiretapping is against the law—and ADA opposes its legalization—it should not be permitted especially by that agency—the Justice Department—responsible for the enforcement of Federal law. But ADA insists that the job of hunting down spies and saboteurs is the work of the professionals in the FBI and intelligence agencies. It upholds the position of former President Truman and President Eisenhower and that the FBI and other confidential files of executive agencies should not be disclosed, for any purpose whatever, without presidential authorization.

On the question of the operations of certain investigating committees of the Congress, many thoughtful leaders, both Republicans and Democrats, as well as millions of Americans have learned a bitter lesson in the kind of havoc, close to anarchy, that a free-wheeling investigating committee can create when operating in defiance of any rules of procedure and responsible conduct. The ADA has long warned of such dangers. Several years ago it called for the abolition of the House Un-American Activities Committee, a position, incidentally, which it has not advocated since that committee has adopted a code, however imperfect, of procedure. The organization is very specific in its emphasis on "the vital need for legislative investigations."

I shall not attempt to trace the origins of all the distortions and misstatements that have been made about ADA, or to attempt to place them back in the context of either the printed page nor of the times from which they were torn. It is always easy to find a sentence or two uttered by a public official or an organization at some time or other and twist it to serve one's own purpose. Recently, before a committee of this House, we saw an example of this when excerpts from one of the encyclicals of the Pope were publicly identified as a Communist-line document.

It has been charged that ADA is a dangerous Socialist outfit, selling the Communist line "under another brand name." The most specific example of ADA's socialist tendencies generally cited is that the organization favors "a series of regional duplicates of TVA." President Eisenhower also has talked about TVA in terms of "creeping socialism." I am sure ADA offers no apologies for its support of the brilliant success of TVA, nor for its advocacy of more such successes for the American people.

There are social and economic ideas which have taken deep root in America and which any parties or politicians would seek to uproot at their own peril. The origins of many of these ideas are obscure. I am told that the earliest proposal for a graduated income tax appeared in some kind of socialist manifesto. I know it appeared in the Communist Manifesto of 1848. Does that make it a bad idea? Unlike some of my colleagues, I have deep faith in the common sense and good judgment of the American people, who have the greatest opportunities for self-enlightenment of any nation. As long as they remain free, uninhibited, fearless, and curious, they are perfectly capable of directing the destiny of this Nation within the traditional framework of our Constitution and laws. I fear that some of my colleagues do not share my faith in the wisdom of the people.

I do not believe that even the Grand Old Party with the unprecedented millions it is pouring into election propaganda can foist on the American people ideas which are not sound and good for the country. I do not believe that all the commercials and slogans the ad men can concoct will, in the eyes of the voters, obscure the record of the Republican Party in office.

Many charges are leveled at the foreign policy stands of ADA. It is said that "they" (meaning Americans for Democratic Action) "are extreme internationalists and one-worlders." In the present state of the world, I just do not see what, if any, meaning can be any longer attached to the phrase internationalist. Atomic power, the hydrogen and the dreaded colbalt bomb combined with the threat of Soviet power has robbed such dictionary terms as isolationist and internationalist of all rational meaning. As Wendell Willkie said, there is one world, and the United States, by act of history, is leader of the free nations in it.

Even the most painstaking efforts by the ADA opposition have failed to make the Communist smear stick. And this, of course, is maddening and frustrating to those who seek to destroy the organization. It undoubtedly accounts for the fact that the anti-ADA hucksters have had to dream up some new slogans. In the coming campaign we can expect to hear a lot of loose talk about ADA and socialism and statism.

ADA will continue as an independent political organization. It does not try to control any other political organization or party. Let those who would attack ADA by innuendo come forward and debate the programs for which it stands.

ADA is for the United Nations, free world opposition to Communist aggression, point 4 aid to underdeveloped areas, and a strong national defense.

ADA is for small business, it is for the protection of the legitimate rights of big business, and it stands for a policy which will assure a fair share of the Nation's income for the farmers, a vigorous antimonopoly program, and much needed housing, health, education, and social-security programs. ADA also supports a conservation program which seeks a development of the Nation's resources in the interest of all the people. It is opposed to a giveaway of the people's heritage in the natural resources of the country even though that giveaway may be clothed in such plausible slogans as a partnership relation between the Federal Government and local interests, including private utility monopolies. The ADA is dedicated to the sound American constitutional principle of equal protection under the law for all of our citizens.

For the record I list just a few of the names of prominent and distinguished Americans who are members of Americans for Democratic Action:

Arthur J. Altmeyer, Francis Biddle, Joseph A. Bierne, L. S. Buckmaster, James B. Carey, Joseph S. Clark, Jr., Elmer Davis, James E Doyle, David Dubinsky, Thomas K. Finletter, A. J. Hayes, Averell Harriman, Hubert H Humphrey, W. P. Kennedy, Leon H. Keyserling, Herbert H. Lehman, Robert R. Nathan, Reinhold Niebuhr, James G. Patton, Walter P. Reuther, Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., Arthur M. Schlesinger, Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., Telford Taylor, Harold Urey, Robert F. Wagner, James A. Wechsler, Mrs. Quincy Wright.

And the late Senator Brien McMahon and the late Hugo Ernst, president of the AFL Restaurant Workers, were among its membership.

Let those who oppose the principles and programs of ADA as set forth in this speech say so. Let them meet advocates of the principles of ADA in public discussions and let the public decide the issues. Let us have an end to this disgraceful campaign of untruths which many Republican spokesmen are conducting against Americans for Democratic Action. Citizens generally should recognize the attacks against the ADA for what they are, namely, political smear attacks. They are part of the big lie technique that has come to characterize so much of the campaign strategy of the reactionary wing of the Republican Party. The attacks against the ADA are obviously based upon the fear of political reactionaries in America that they have reached the end of their political rope insofar as frightening the American people any longer with their political scarecrow arguments. The time has come for the American people to call a halt to the political hysteria which reactionary political forces so dominant under the Eisenhower administration have tried to stir up in our country. The vicious attacks that have been increasing in recent months against the ADA are good examples of the political desperation of the reactionaries.

I conclude by saying, Mr. President, that the truth is that the average patriotic citizen in America will find himself in agreement with the principles and objectives of the program of the Americans for Democratic Action if he will only take the time to familiarize himself with that program. I have complete faith in the fairness of the American citizenry once it takes the time to find out the facts about a given matter, and therefore I'm satisfied that those political reactionaries who think that they can smear the ADA into political oblivion are themselves going to be repudiated by the voters of America.

Record of Activity of the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHAUNCEY W. REED

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is with pleasure that I make this report on the activity of the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives of the 83d Congress. The accomplishments of the committee are due entirely to the interest and labors of the members of that committee and its staff. The record of the committee in this Congress is, in my humble opinion, outstanding. A total of 16,363 measures were introduced in the House and Senate during both sessions of the 83d Congress, of which 36.2 percent were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. Of this total, 11,855 were House bills. A total of 44.2 percent of all the bills introduced in the House in this Congress were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The total number of House and Senate bills referred to the Committee on the Judiciary consisted of 1,010 public bills and 4,921 private bills.

Out of the total number of 1,246 Senate bills which passed the Senate, 704 were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, which was 56.5 percent of all bills passed by the Senate. Of the 704 Senate bills referred to the House Judiciary Committee, 62 were public bills and 642 were private bills..

The work of the committee was assigned to five standing subcommittees, as well as to special subcommittees, whose reports are as follows:

SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 1: GENERAL JURISDICTION OVER BILLS AS ASSIGNED, SPECIAL JURISDICTION OVER IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

In the first session, Subcommittee No. 1 held public hearings on legislation pertaining to submerged lands and after having drafted a bill introduced by Representative GRAHAM, it steered through the House the Submerged Lands Act, enacted on May 22, 1953 (Public Law 31). The act of August 7, 1953 (Public Law 212), amending the Submerged Lands Act so as to provide for the jurisdiction of the United States over the outer Continental Shelf and to authorize the lease of such lands, was also prepared and piloted through the House and through conference by the subcommittee.

During the first session, the subcommittee also conducted extensive hearings on 12 bills providing for an emergency immigration program recommended by the President. The hearings referred to above, together with executive consideration of draft legislation prepared by the subcommittee staff, led to the enactment of Public Law 203, known as the Refugee Relief Act of 1953.

The subcommittee drafted and recommended for enactment a bill to provide for the naturalization of persons serving in the Armed Forces of the United States after June 24, 1950, Public Law 86, enacted on June 30, 1953.

Further, during the first session of the 83d Congress the subcommittee recommended for enactment a bill permitting the entry of 500 orphans under ten years of age, adopted by United States service personnel or civilian employees of the United States Government (Public Law 162); also a bill to provide for the creation of a Commission on Judicial and Congressional Salaries.

In the second session, most of the subcommittee's time was consumed by public hearings and executive sessions on legislation pertaining to the strengthening of internal security. The committee held public hearings on over 20 bills designed to outlaw the Communist Party, to provide for strengthening of administrative and judicial controls over organizations and individuals intending to overthrow the United States Government by force and violence, etc. Public hearings on that subject took up 10 sessions of the subcommittee. Numerous executive meetings, conferences with Government officials, and meetings of the full committee led to the enactment of the following statutes:

Subversive Activities Control Act Amendments of 1954 (to outlaw the Communist Party, etc.);

Espionage and Sabotage Act of 1954 (strengthening the statutes pertaining to sabotage and espionage);

Amendment to title 18, United States Code, section 3486 (granting immunity to witnesses in proceedings relative to internal security);

Expatriation Act of 1954 (providing for loss of citizenship of persons convicted for violation of the Smith Act).

The subcommittee has held hearings and spent considerable time on a bill to permit review of decisions of the heads of departments, or their representatives or boards, involving questions arising under Government contracts. This bill was enacted into law on May 11, 1954.

Having investigated the operations under the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, the subcommittee has recommended for enactment, and succeeded in having enacted, an amendment to the said act, providing for a more flexible distribution of immigrant visas allocated under the act and facilitating the entry of certain orphans.

In addition, Subcommittee No. 1 recommended for approval several statutes of lesser importance, such as, a law facilitating the entry of Philippine traders, and a law providing for the immigration of skilled Basque sheepherders.

The extent of work of this subcommittee cannot be appreciated without a review of its activity in the area of private legislation. The following table sets this forth:

House bills:	
Private laws	428
Pending in Senate	45
Passed by Senate (withdrawn from the White House)	1
Adverse action by Senate committee	20
Reported in House—Senate bills substituted on House floor	4
Tabled	303
Tabled (House or Senate companion bills were passed in lieu)	73
Deferred by subcommittee	51
Departmental reports submitted—no action taken	1,709
Reports requested and not submitted	314
No reports requested	399
Total	3,347
House joint resolutions:	
Private laws	2
Pending in Senate	1
Not acted upon	1
Total	4
Senate bills:	
Private laws	323
Vetoed	2
Recommitted	1
Tabled	16
Deferred by subcommittee	2
Not acted upon	205
Total	549
Total number of bills referred to the committee	3,900
Total number of private laws	753

In addition, congressional action on individual cases referred to Congress by the Attorney General under the provisions of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended; the Refugee Relief Act of 1953; the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended; and the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952, is set forth below:

Disposition of immigration cases referred to Congress under the provisions of sec. 4 of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended

Number of immigration cases (sec. 4 of Displaced Persons Act) pending at the beginning of the 83d Cong	876
Number of cases referred to the committee during the 83d Cong.:	
1953 cases	1,439
1954 cases	1,068
Total	3,383
Number of cases approved on House concurrent resolutions (Nos. 29, 73, 110, 197, 227, and 254, 83d Cong)	2,697
Number of cases which were not approved	195
Number of cases withdrawn by the Attorney General	9

Disposition of immigration cases referred to Congress under the provisions of sec. 4 of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended—Continued

Number of cases being held for further information	8
Total	2,909
Number of cases in process at close of the 83d Cong	474

Disposition of immigration cases referred under sec. 6 (Refugee Relief Act of 1953)

Number of cases referred to the 83d Cong. under sec. 6 (Refugee Relief Act of 1953) (no action has been taken on these cases)	36
Number of cases left in process at close of 83d Cong	36

Disposition of immigration cases referred under sec. 19 (c) of the Immigration and Naturalization Act of 1917

Number of immigration cases under sec. 19 (c) (2) of the 1917 act pending at the beginning of the 83d Cong	4,092
Number of cases referred to the committee during the 83d Cong.:	
1953 cases	5,417
1954 cases	2,051
Making a total of	11,560
Number of these case which were approved	9,943
Number of these cases which were not approved	1,347
Number of these cases which were withdrawn by the Attorney General	129
Making a total of	11,419
Number of cases in process at close of the 83d Cong	141

Disposition of immigration cases referred under sec. 244 (a) (1) of the Immigration and Naturalization Act of 1952

Number of cases referred to the 83d Cong. under sec. 244 (a) (1)	301
Number of cases approved during the 83d Cong	6
Number of cases left in process at close of 83d Cong	295

Disposition of immigration cases referred under sec. 244 (a) (5) of the Immigration and Naturalization Act of 1952

Number of cases referred to the 83d Cong. under sec. 244 (a) (5); no action has been taken on these cases	86
Number of cases left in process at the close of the 83d Cong	86

Subcommittee No. 2: General Jurisdiction Over Judiciary Bills as Assigned—Special Jurisdiction Over Bankruptcy and Reorganization

Due, perhaps, to the complete revision of the Bankruptcy Act in the previous Congress, only a few of the bills referred to Subcommittee No. 2 in the 83d Congress related to its special jurisdiction over bankruptcy and reorganization. Of these, one proposal was to amend the Bankruptcy Act so as to take the reorganization of wholly intrastate railroads from under the provisions of section 77 (which govern railroad reorganizations and provide for proceedings before the Interstate Commerce Commission) and place such reorganizations under the provisions of chapter 10 and of section 178 of the Bankruptcy Act which govern reorganizations of intrastate public utilities, involving proceedings only before the appropriate State utility commission. This proposal was intended to benefit the Long Island Railroad, the only class I railroad that would be affected by the legislation. Hearings were held on this proposal by the subcommittee and study was given to the important and complex issues involved. However, no action was taken because of the course pursued by the Long Island in petitioning the district court to be dismissed from the pending bankruptcy proceeding and to be permitted to reorganize under laws of the State of New York.

The only bankruptcy bill handled by the subcommittee which was enacted into law in this Congress was one to permit referees serving the District of Columbia to reside outside the District (Public Law 194).

Two other bankruptcy bills upon which the subcommittee conducted hearings passed the House, but were not acted upon in the Senate. One of these was designed to clarify and confirm the validity of State tax liens against bankruptcy trustees (H. R. 5796); and the other permits 2 notices in bankruptcy proceedings to be combined so as to authorize 1 mailing instead of 2, thereby effecting an economy in the administration of bankruptcy cases (H. R. 8210).

A preliminary hearing was held in the second session on the various bills proposing to amend the Bankruptcy Act to grant special relief to farmer-debtors (agricultural compositions), but the subcommittee took no action on these proposals.

With respect to general judiciary bills assigned to subcommittee No. 2, a considerable amount of the subcommittee's time was required to handle six bills providing for the temporary continuation of various emergency statutes, either with or without amendments. The House bills were enacted in all but one instance, where the Senate companion bill was substituted. These extensions related to title II of the First War Powers Act, 1941, the Emergency Powers Continuation Act, and the war-risk hazards and detention statutes, among others (Public Laws 12, 97, 99, 100, 443, 457).

The subcommittee handled a bill which was enacted to strengthen title VI of the Espionage Act so as to insure effective seizure action and to simplify and modernize the procedure for forfeiture and disposition of property thereunder. (Public Law 264.)

Another bill assigned to the subcommittee, and which was enacted, increases the penalties for smuggling goods into the United States to a fine of not more than $10,000 (formerly $5,000) or imprisonment for not more than 5 years (formerly 2 years), or both.

Other general judiciary bills handled by the subcommittee and enacted into law included one that declares the United States Court of Claims to be a court established under article III of the Constitution and amends the act creating the court to improve its effectiveness and efficiency in administration. (Public Law 158.)

Another such bill authorized the publication of the Federal Register and Code of Federal Regulations with cumulative annual pocket supplements. (Public Law 200.)

A substantial amount of the subcommittee's time was necessarily devoted to bills proposing new Federal corporate charters or proposing amendments to old ones. Amendments were made to the congressional charters of the Veterans of Foreign Wars (Public Law 43), the American War Mothers (Public Law 79) and the American Legion (Public Law 80). Bills were enacted to incorporate the National Conference on Citizenship (Public Law 257), the National Safety Council (Public Law 259), the Board of Fundamental Education (Public Law 507), the National Fund for Medical Education, and the Sons of Union Veterans of the Civil War.

The subcommittee conducted hearings on a group of bills proposing constitutional amendments or legislation relating to the power of the President to veto bills passed by Congress. Most of these proposed the so-called item veto. No action was taken thereon.

Hearings were held also on three bills sponsored by the American Bar Association as a part of its anticrime program. One of these, H. R. 7404, was passed by the House but was not acted upon in the Senate. This bill sought to amend the Criminal Appeals Act to permit the Government to appeal from an order granting a motion to suppress evidence in a criminal prosecution. Time did not permit action by the subcommittee on the other two bills, one of which sought to punish the use of interstate commerce in furtherance of conspiracies to commit organized crime offenses against any State (H. R. 7118). The other would prohibit certain acts and transactions with respect to gambling materials.

Subcommittee No. 2, Committee on the Judiciary

Number of bills referred to subcommittee	81
Number of hearings held	30
Number of bills reported to House	23
Number of bills passed the House	21

Subcommittee No. 3: General Jurisdiction Over Judiciary Bills as Assigned—Special Jurisdiction Over Patents, Trade-Marks, and Copyrights, Also Monopoly Power

Among the bills handled by subcommittee No. 3 which were enacted into law was one which permits all civil actions against the United States for recovery of taxes erroneously or illegally assessed or collected, to be brought in the district court of the taxpayer's residence with a right of trial by jury. (Public Law 559.) This is considered an important liberalization in the remedies available to taxpayers.

Important assistance to State enforcement agencies is expected to result from the enactment of a bill to prohibit the transportation of fireworks into any State in which the sale or use of such fireworks is prohibited by State law. (Public Law 385.)

Following a full public hearing on the New Jersey-New York Waterfront Commission compact, which sets up a bi-State agency to improve waterfront labor conditions in the port of New York area, a bill was enacted granting congressional consent to the compact pursuant to the Constitution. (Public Law 252.)

Other miscellaneous bills which were handled by the subcommittee and enacted into law included a bill to provide a cutoff or termination date after which claims against the Government may not be filed under section 17 of the Contract Settlement Act of 1944 (Public Law 431); a bill to amend the Copyright Act with reference to the time for depositing material in the Copyright Office; and two bills authorizing the transfer by the United States to designated individuals of interests in patents inadvertently assigned to the Government.

The subcommittee also handled the bill H. R. 7740 which passed the House but was not acted upon in the Senate. Under the provisions of that bill, the crime of arson was added to those crimes enumerated in the Federal Fugitive Felon Act.

In reporting the bill H. R. 1067, which was eventually enacted into law, the subcommittee provided for the authorization of the Supreme Court to make and publish rules of procedure for the review of decisions of the Tax Court of the United States.

The subcommittee also reported favorably the bill S. 984, which provided for judicial review of certain Tax Court decisions. This bill, however, was not considered by the House although a rule for its consideration had been adopted.

One of the most important legislative subject matters considered by the subcommittee during the Congress was that of wiretapping. The subcommittee had referred to it four bills dealing with the interception of communications in the interest of national security. Extensive research both with regard to law and legislative history were conducted prior to the holding of hearings on the legislation. Extensive hearings were held and the views of experts, as well as all interested parties, were obtained. Subsequently, a series of executive sessions of the subcommittee were devoted to the consideration of the legislation. As a result of all this work, the House finally passed the bill H. R. 8649 which permitted the introduction into evidence of intercepted communications in certain specified criminal cases relating to national defense and security. That bill as passed by the House was not reported by the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate. In regard to this legislation, it should be noted that a bill to permit the use in evidence of intercepted communications was a major plank in the antisubversive legislative program.

Considerable time of the subcommittee was expended in conducting full public hearing on the five so-called patent extension bills and in evolving a single amended bill (H. R. 3534) which the subcommittee recommended. This proposal would authorize the extension of patents covering inventions whose practice was prevented or curtailed during certain emergency periods by service of the patent owner in the Armed Forces; by production controls; or by the owner having granted a license to the United States, either royalty free or for a nominal royalty, for a national defense program since September 1, 1939. This bill, with the committee amendments, passed the House on July 27, 1954, and was favorably reported by the Senate Committee on the Judiciary on August 5, 1954, but no action thereon was taken by the Senate in the closing days of the session.

One of the most important bills enacted into public law during the 83d Congress was the bill (H. R. 6616) which amended title 17 of the United States Code entitled "Copyrights." This legislation, which amended certain sections of title 17 of the United States Code, was made necessary when the Senate approved the Universal Copyright Convention. The revisions of the copyright law contained in this legislation conform our statutes with the standards prescribed by that Convention. The ratification of the Convention, together with the implementing legislation, represents considerable progress in the field of international copyright relationships. The subcommittee also handled two bills, H. R. 5420, relating to the patenting of plants, and H. R. 6280, which provided for the temporary extension of the rights of priorities of nationals of Japan and certain German nationals with respect to patent applications, both of which have been enacted into law.

Only one bill handled by Subcommittee No. 3 and which was favorably reported to the House by the Committee on the Judiciary failed to pass on a vote. That bill, H. R. 2556, requested by the Department of State, sought to correct certain oversights and omissions in our extradition statute (sec. 3185, title 18, U. S. C.) and to bring that statute in line with provisions customarily included in current extradition treaties and to cover certain practices in modern military occupations.

In its special area of antitrust legislation, the activities of the subcommittee were largely confined to the first session. This was due to the announcement early in the second session of the appointment of the Attorney General's National Committee To Study the Antitrust Laws, whose report is not expected until shortly before the next Congress convenes.

A preliminary hearing, at which the authors only were heard, was held on six bills relating to the clarification of the antitrust laws and to pricing practices under those laws.

A full hearing was held on a bill to amend the Clayton Act in order to provide for discretionary treble damages in private actions under the antitrust laws (H. R. 4597). This proposal was incorporated in H. R. 467 and reported to the full committee without recommendation. The provisions of H. R. 467, which the subcommittee recommended to the full committee would amend the Clayton Act so as to permit the United States to recover actual damages sustained from antitrust law violations and to provide a uniform statute of limitations, applicable to such actions and to private treble damage suits as well. Preliminary discussion of these proposals was had in the full committee, but further consideration thereof was deferred, pending the receipt and study of the report of the Attorney General's committee.

Subcommittee No. 3, Committee on the Judiciary

Number of bills referred to subcommittee	60
Number of hearings held	24
Number of bills reported to House	18
Number of bills passed the House	16

Subcommittee No. 4: General Jurisdiction Over Judiciary Bills as Assigned—Special Jurisdiction Over Revision of the Laws

REVISION OF THE LAWS

The primary function of the subcommittee with respect to the revision of the laws—the classification of public laws of the United States Code and the District of Columbia Code—has been carried on in conformity with the policy of classifying the laws immediately upon their promulgation. With the large number of bills awaiting the President's signature the total of public laws will probably exceed 800 or 900. These last laws will be classified as soon as practicable upon their receipt from the Government Printing Office.

The 1952 edition of the United States Code containing the laws up to the beginning of this Congress was completed and delivered during the early part of the second session. It consists of 6 volumes comprising over 10,000 pages and contains many new editorial notes and cross-references. Supplement I containing the additions to and changes in the laws enacted during the first session of this Congress was prepared and was delivered in July. It consists of 1 volume of about 550 pages.

Supplement II of the District of Columbia Code containing the laws to January 5, 1954, and notes to the decisions as of the beginning of this Congress was also prepared and delivered early this year. It consists of 2 pocket parts to be inserted in the 2 volumes of the 1951 edition.

As soon as possible after the classification of all the laws of this session, copy will be forwarded to the Government Printing Office for the printing of Supplement II of the United States Code and Supplement III of the District of Columbia Code. It is hoped that these supplements will be available in the early part of next year.

The other phase of the subcommittee's function—that of preparing bills to enact into law separate titles of the United States Code—has been going forward steadily. Bills have been introduced to enact into law Title 13, Census; Title 20, Education; Title 21, Food and Drugs; Title 23, Highways; and Title 43, Public Lands. Of these, the bills to revise titles 13 and 21 have been passed by both Houses. In addition, an improvement bill designed to make clerical and technical changes in the laws to conform them to the revised titles of the code was also prepared and has passed both Houses. Comprehensive reports on all these bills were prepared showing in detail precisely what the bill is intended to do.

In addition to the codification bills that have been introduced, committee prints have been prepared and published covering the proposed codification of the laws relating to the Armed Forces. These drafts have been prepared in cooperation with the armed services and are intended as a basis for a bill to consolidate Title 10, Army, Title 34, Navy, and includes provisions relating to the Air Force and the Department of Defense. Committee prints of a proposed bill to revise and codify title 16 of the United States Code, Conservation and Reclamation, have been printed and distributed widely. In addition, a committee print of a comprehensive proposed report on this bill has also been printed and given wide distribution with the view of introducing a bill at the beginning of the 84th Congress.

The subcommittee has cooperated with the other subcommittees of the Committee on the Judiciary with respect to the form of bills, particularly those affecting titles of the United States Code that have been enacted into law.

One of the judiciary bills which was assigned to subcommittee No. 4 and which was enacted into law, makes bail jumping a separate Federal offense and provides penalties therefor. (Public Law 603.) Another such bill makes applicable to the Canal Zone section 1362 of the Criminal Code relating to the injury or destruction of Federal communication lines or systems. (Public Law 192.) Twelve other enacted bills pertain to national holidays or days of observance or celebrations.

Several bills handled by the subcommittee passed the House but were not acted upon in the Senate. One of these would authorize the United States district courts to allow to counsel assigned by the court to represent indigent defendants charged with felonies, fees for such services not exceeding stated maximum amounts. (H. R. 10158.) Another such bill sought to expand the application and modernize the provisions of the law prohibiting postal employees from inducing the purchase of postage to increase the emoluments or compensation of postmasters or post-office employees. (H. R. 7326.)

A substantial amount of the time of the subcommittee was devoted to holding public hearings on important assigned bills and in the consideration of such proposals in executive sessions. Several of these bills proposed amendments to the Constitution of the United States to fix the number of justices of the Supreme Court; to provide for the retirement of Federal judges at age 75; to specify certain appellate jurisdiction of the Supreme Court; and to restrict the eligibility of justices of the Supreme Court for the offices of President and Vice President (S. J. Res. 44, H. J. Res. 27, 91, and 194); to provide that the executive power of the United States shall not be construed to extend to any taking of private property other than in a manner presented by an act of Congress (S. J. Res. 3, H. R. 640, H. J. Res. 21); and to redefine treason to include adhering to any group which advocates the overthrow by force or violence of the Government of the United States, or in collaborating with any agent of a foreign nation in working for the overthrow or weakening of our Government, whether or not by force or violence (H. J. Res. 4, 45, and 483).

On June 10, 1954, the subcommittee favorably reported to the full committee with amendments Senate Joint Resolution 44, relating to the Supreme Court. The Committee on the Judiciary laid the resolution on the table.

A full public hearing was held also on proposals to establish a public-defender system in the district courts of the United States for the representation of indigent defendants in criminal cases. Although the subcommittee did not recommend a so-called public-defender bill, it did recommend the bill which would allow the payment of fees to counsel assigned to represent indigent defendants in felony cases. As mentioned above, that bill passed the House but died in the Senate.

Subcommittee No. 4, Committee on the Judiciary

Number of bills referred to subcommittee	180
Number of hearings held	53
Number of bills reported to House	21
Number of bills passed the House	16

SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 5: GENERAL JURISDICTION OVER JUDICIARY BILLS AS ASSIGNED—SPECIAL JURISDICTION OVER CLAIMS BILLS

This subcommittee, with reference to general legislation, had referred to it 69 bills dealing with a variety of subjects. Among the subjects were such matters as Government contracts, pledge of allegiance, the Federal judicial administration, judicial review of the rulings of the Veterans' Administration, and sundry amendments to title 18 of the United States Code, which is the Federal penal law.

The subcommittee disposed of 48 public bills. Among those enacted into public law was an omnibus judgeship bill which provided many additional circuit and district judges throughout the country. In addition, it contained provisions providing for additional places for holding court and also rearranged some of the judicial districts. Another bill enacted into law was one which amended the pledge of allegiance to the flag.

The subcommittee also handled the bill which provided for an increase in the penalties for the harboring of fugitives. That bill, which covers all Federal crimes of harboring, was one of the main points in the President's program of antisubversive legislation.

Another measure enacted into law extended the Federal Declaratory Judgment Act to the Territory of Alaska and another also enacted into law provided for the registration of judgments in and from the district court for Alaska.

This subcommittee also handled claims bills, both of a public and private nature. In the consideration of these bills, hundreds of hearings were conducted by the subcommittee in the course of their deliberation. In addition, this subcommittee conducted hearings in California on a bill amending the Japanese-American Evacuation Claims Act of 1948.

The volume of the workload of this subcommittee in regard to claims against the Government is clearly set forth in the following tabulation:

Subcommittee No. 5

Private laws	95
Public claims laws	4
Pending in Senate	121
Deferred	59
Tabled	17
Recommitted	2
On House calendar	3
Departmental reports received and no action taken	167
Departmental reports requested and not received	76
Adversely reported	72
Rejected under rules	69
No action	157
Vetoed	8
Pocket vetoed	5
Settled administratively	18
Sent to court of claims by House resolution	17
House resolution (Texas City)	1
Rereferred to subcommittee No. 1	1

SENATE BILLS

Private laws	34
Vetoed	4
At White House (House and Senate as of Sept. 1, 1954)	73
Total number of claims bills before subcommittee No. 5	1,022

SPECIAL ACTIVITIES

In addition to the work of the standing subcommittees, the Committee on the Judiciary performed other functions.

Pursuant to a committee resolution, a special subcommittee was appointed to investigate the Department of Justice. This special subcommittee continued the work which a similar subcommittee had started in the 82d Congress. A report of the previous work was filed with the committee in the first session of this Congress. The subcommittee in this Congress conducted extensive hearings both in Washington and in various cities throughout the country. At the conclusion of its work, the subcommittee submitted reports on various matters which it had investigated and included in its reports specific recommendations for legislation to improve the administration of the Department of Justice.

A special subcommittee also was constituted to consider a resolution of impeachment of Associate Justice Douglas, of the Supreme Court. After hearing was held, this subcommittee reported adversely on the resolution to the full committee which then tabled the resolution.

The Committee on the Judiciary was also charged by the House of Representatives to handle the problem which arose when members of the Un-American Activities Committee and its employees, as well as former members, were served with processes in civil action arising out of their work as members of that committee. An interim report was filed on this matter and the consideration of this problem is continuing.

Another special subcommittee was appointed to consider the claims which arose out of the explosion in Texas City, Tex. That subcommittee conducted several days of hearings both in Washington and Texas City. A bill providing for relief was introduced after a study of the testimony and it passed the House. In the closing days of the Congress, the Senate passed the resolution with amendment, but due to the lack of time, the measure was not considered in conference.

The Special Antitrust Subcommittee, on September 14, 1953, filed its final report on the newsprint problem. The report portrayed the important considerations which had prompted the subcommittee, with the cooperation of the Department of Commerce, to undertake a careful exploration of the factors impeding expansion of newsprint production in the United States. The report reviews the prior activities of the subcommittee, beginning in 1950, and refers to the importance of newsprint, its economic background, its prices and recurring shortages in supply, its future outlook, and the factors affecting future production and demand. The subcommittee's report deals at length with the progress report submitted October 2, 1953, by the Department of Commerce, at the request of the Committee on the Judiciary, entitled "Study of Newsprint Expansion." The Department's study and its report related primarily to the use of bagasse (a sugarcane waste product) in the manufacture of newsprint. Other promising sources for newsprint were also discussed in that report.

In its final report the subcommittee made a number of findings and recommendations, including the recommendation that studies by the Department of Commerce of new sources of raw materials for newsprint be continued, to assist the program for newsprint development.

In accord with the subcommittee's recommendation and pursuant to its previous request, the Department of Commerce submitted to the Committee on the Judiciary, on August 5, 1954, a second progress report in its study of newsprint expansion, entitled "Newsprint Production From Hardwoods." This most comprehensive report deals with a major investigation of the Department of Commerce into the technical and economic feasibility of utilizing hardwood resources for the manufacture of newsprint in the United States.

The record thus compiled in the field of newsprint is a most important accomplishment. Apart from the fact that the Department's reports have stimulated interest and attracted recognition throughout the Nation and abroad, they will also constitute an invaluable source of reference material for congressional legislation for many years to come.

American Shipbuilding

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 17, 1954

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include the following letter from Mr. John J. P. Curran, international representative of the International Brotherhood of Boilermakers, Iron Ship Builders, Blacksmiths, Forgers and Helpers, as well as the newspaper clipping mentioned therein:

INTERNATIONAL BROTHERHOOD OF
BOILERMAKERS, IRON SHIP BUILDERS,
BLACKSMITHS, FORGERS, AND HELPERS,
Washington, D. C., July 28, 1954.

Hon. JOHN J. ROONEY,
Member of Congress, House of Representatives, New House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ROONEY: I am enclosing herewith a clipping from the front page of Labor paper, which is self-explanatory.

I want to personally extend my appreciation for your efforts in having the $71 million replaced in the appropriations for shipbuilding and ship repair. I only wish that the people back home could know the splendid job you are doing in their interests. You can be assured that I will endeavor to the best of my ability to tell them of your splendid efforts in our behalf.

I wish to extend my best wishes to you, and to Mrs. Rooney. With kind personal regards, I remain

Sincerely yours,
JOHN J. P. CURRAN,
District Representative,
Navy Yard Lodges.

Copy to lodge 43, Brooklyn, N. Y.; lodge 67, Brooklyn, N. Y.

[From Labor of July 24, 1954]

IKE BACKS BOOST IN SHIPBUILDING—TELLS DELEGATION HE'S FOR ADEQUATE PROGRAM

Leaders in Congress, labor, and industry called upon President Eisenhower this week for support on programs to strengthen the Nation's shipbuilding industry and bring jobs to the Nation's idle shipyard workers.

Spokesmen for the group said the President backed a full study to developing a permanent and sound program that will lead to strengthening the merchant marine. Shipyard unions have repeatedly appealed for such a program.

President Eisenhower also pledged his full support for ship legislation now before Congress. He particularly urged passage of a $45 million repair and modernization bill. That measure, backed by the unions, has passed the Senate and as Labor went to press the House Merchant Marine Committee had completed hearings and was considering the bill in executive sessions.

BROWNLOW REPRESENTS A. F. OF L.

The A. F. of L. was represented at the conference by James A. Brownlow, president of the Metal Trades Department. Members of Congress participating included Senator SALTONSTALL, Republican, of Massachusetts; Senator BUTLER, Republican, of Maryland; and Congressman THOR TOLLEFSON, Republican, of Washington.

The President was reported pleased with House action that restored $71 million in ship construction funds previously cut out by the House Appropriations Committee.

Labor leaders gave most of the credit in the House for getting the funds back to TOLLEFSON and two Democratic Congressmen, JOHN ROONEY, of New York, and JOHN SHELLEY, of California.

The restored appropriations will finance a tanker trade-in program and construction of four new passenger-cargo ships. Labor also will gain from a simultaneous move whereby the House specified that all the shipbuilding work affected by the appropriations be done in American yards.

Legislation of Interest to Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, each session I make a report to the veterans of my district concerning legislation of special interest to them and their families. While the veteran is interested in legislation that especially applies to veterans, he and his family are equally interested in legislation that helps the overall economy and well-being of their country. He is particularly interested in legislation that protects his home and country against enemy aggression from abroad and subversive boring from within.

This Congress has been unusually successful in enacting legislation that I believe will assist in curbing communism in this country. A brief summary of what has been accomplished in this field follows:

First. Gave Government more time to prosecute Communists by extending statute of limitations.

Second. Provided means for compelling a Communist to testify by granting him immunity from prosecution.

Third. Set death penalty for spying in peacetime.

Fourth. Outlawed Communist Party.

Fifth. Denied Federal pensions to convicted subversives.

Sixth. Required Communist agencies to register their printing equipment.

Seventh. Stiffened penalties for jumping bail.

Eighth. Took United States citizenship from convicted Communist conspirators.

Ninth. Cracked down on Communist labor unions.

Tenth. Increased penalties for harboring fugitives from justice.

Eleventh. Tightened espionage and sabotage laws.

Twelfth. Took pensions from Federal employees who hide behind fifth amendment or give false testimony.

In the field of national defense, the overall expenses have been cut and the number of men under arms decreased. By improving weapons and ammunition, especially as applies to jet aircraft and atomic advancements, the armed potential of the United States has greatly increased.

The veterans' hospital program has been improved and the number of beds increased, although there is still a great deficiency of hospital beds for veterans. We have been making efforts which we hope will soon be successful in getting more hospital beds for Indiana, but the situation in Indiana is still critical. Indiana is one State where the number of general surgical and medical beds has been decreased instead of increased. This condition is principally in the Indianapolis area. Both the Cold Springs Hospital and Billings Hospital were general medical and surgical hospitals and provided a fairly adequate number of beds. Then the Veterans' Administration built a fine, new, modern hospital with 494 beds near Indiana University Medical Center on West 10th Street in Indianapolis. This would have adequately taken care of the needs of Indiana; but in 1950 the Billings Hospital, which had been an Army hospital at Fort Benjamin Harrison, was ordered abandoned because it was deteriorating. About the same time the Cold Springs Hospital of 500 beds was changed to a tuberculosis hospital. The result is that Indiana has 353 less beds available for medical and surgical use than were available before the new hospital was built.

The situation in Indiana regarding the hospitalization of the mentally ill veterans is deplorable. At the present time there is not even room for the service-connected cases in the hospital at Marion, and many of our service-connected, mentally ill veterans are being confined in jails throughout the State.

I have had many conferences with officials of the Veterans' Administration in an attempt to get an increase in veterans' hospital facilities in Indiana. Indianapolis is well suited for additional hospital facilities for the reason that it is centrally located in an area badly in need of veteran hospital beds. Also it is one of the few locations in the United States with ample doctors, nurses, and technicians available. This is due to the great facilities of the Indiana University Medical Center in Indianapolis. We should be able to get additional facilities in the Indianapolis area soon.

Over the country as a whole one of the reasons for the present shortage of veterans' hospital facilities is that, in many instances veterans' hospitals have been located where there was insufficient available medical personnel to adequately staff the hospital. So we have many veterans' hospitals that are not fully utilized because of the lack of adequate medical personnel. I hope that we have eliminated that difficulty and that future hospital construction will be properly placed. There has been a notable increase in the number of available beds in the country as a whole for mental and tubercular cases but there is still a great shortage.

There has been considerable publicity over some veterans receiving hospitalization to which they were not entitled. Unfortunately, there are some such cases but I believe that the number is small. The veterans and veterans' organizations do not and have not condoned dishonesty in this matter. A special congressional committee, appointed from the Veterans' Affairs Committee, after making an exhaustive study recently, issued a resolution concerning hospitalization of veterans. This resolution is fair and is receiving the support of the Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, and Disabled American Veterans. Few can find fault with it. This resolution follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Veterans' Affairs approves the present unlimited hospitalization of service-connected veterans; and be it further

Resolved, That the committee urges the cooperation of all veterans' groups and all other parties interested in medical care for veterans that the new admission policy be given a fair trial and period of operation before any final conclusion is reached on its workability or feasibility; and be it further

Resolved, That no legislation be considered on this subject until the effect of the new policy has been determined; and be it further

Resolved, That the committee approves the continued hospitalization of non-service-connected neuropsychiatric and tubercular veterans; and be it further

Resolved, That the committee approves the continued hospitalization of other groups of non-service-connected veterans where beds are available and the veteran does not have the ability to pay for private hospitalization.

It may be necessary for the Veterans' Administration to change some of its regulations to insure that chiselers do not endanger the veterans' hospitalization program.

In this session of Congress I am happy to state that adequate appropriations were made for the activities of the Veterans' Administration.

Two bills raising the pensions and compensation for veterans and their dependents were passed by this Congress. One of the bills took considerable effort on the part of those of us who were interested in getting it passed.

The American veteran does not want any special privileges, but our country, since its founding, has recognized that the veteran has certain fundamental rights. We intend to see that these rights are protected.

German Realities, 1954

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the growing challenge of Soviet communism has compelled the United States to strengthen its political and military alliances all over the world. Toward that end, the United States has sought to develop the full political, economic, and military potential of Western Europe, including West Germany. Many of us in the Senate have been hopeful that the European Defense Community would become a reality, but there is growing evidence that France and possibly Italy will refuse to become parties to the proposed implementation of the EDC treaty without modifications which seem to be unacceptable to most of the other nations involved. It is obvious that the United States State Department, through our Secretary of State, has not improved American relations with France over the EDC issue. A great deal of anti-American feeling has been aroused in France because of the French popular conception that Secretary of State Dulles is seeking to diplomatically pressure France into accepting EDC without any modifications.

Those of us who favor EDC as a general policy should not overlook the fact that French fear of German military might is a deep-seated historical one, and with cause. Likewise, we should not overlook the fact that dismissing French obligations to EDC on the ground that they stem from a French emotional attitude toward Germany does not in any way change the hard cold reality that the spirit of French nationalism is a very deep one when it comes to French and German relations.

I think great progress has been made since the end of World War II, in minimizing some of the high psychological barriers that have stood for so many decades between the French and German people. There is a great danger, as I see it, that the apparent intransigent attitude of our Secretary of State in connection with the EDC issue and his apparent take-it-or-leave-it attitude as far as the French population is concerned, have only served to intensify French opposition to EDC.

I happen to be one who believes that this cause of freedom in Europe requires a cooperative military and economic program among all free nations, including France and West Germany. I happen to be one who believes that France and West Germany have as much to lose from any aggressive course of action by Russia against the United States as has the United States itself. In fact, it should be perfectly obvious to West Germany and to France that they probably would be the first to fall in the event of a third world war that would involve a military contest between communistic nations on the one side and free nations on the other.

It is also true that not only are the people of France concerned about the direction taken in Europe by the free nations in respect to building defenses against communism, but the people of West Germany are also concerned and they have a right to be. Great differences of opinion exist in the United States and, for that matter, right here in the Senate of the United States, as to whether or not West Germany is ready for all the indepedence and sovereignty that EDC and other proposed international agreements would grant to her.

It has been my position, and still is, that West Germany should be brought back into the family of free nations just as rapidly as the facts show that she is ready and willing to assume the obligations and responsibilities of a democratic nation. I recognize that there are many individuals and groups in the United States who fear that those of us who have supported EDC in the Senate and who have supported other benefits and aids to West Germany which have been aimed at restoring national sovereignty to West Germany as rapidly as possible, are mistaken in some of our judgments and policies. I hope I have always evidenced here in the Senate a willingness to weigh both sides of an arugment, and consider various conflicting points of view on any issue.

Thus I know that I, along with other Members of the Senate, have received protests from those who believe that the United States is moving too rapidly in strengthening the military position of Germany. Those who hold to such a point of view raise such questions as these: Can we depend upon Germany as a trustworthy ally of the free world? Do Germany's fundamental interests coincide with those of the United States and the countries of West Europe? Does the participation of Germany as a leading factor in West European alliances strengthen or weaken the unity of West Europe?

It was about a year ago that the Society for the Prevention of World War III, Inc., published an analysis of such questions in the society's magazine, Prevent World War III. The analysis was submitted to Members of the Congress, and upon request and because I thought the point of view presented should be studied on its merits, I placed the analysis in the Congressional Record under the title, "German Realities."

As a followup to this study, the Society for the Prevention of World War III, Inc., has now published German Realities, 1954, in the latest issue of Prevent World War III. Again, upon request, I have been asked to insert the analysis in the Congressional Record, and I hereby ask unanimous consent to do so, but with the clear understanding that inserting it in the Congressional Record does not mean that I agree with all the observations of the analysis. However, I do agree that the points of view expressed in the analysis should be considered as we study and formulate American foreign policy.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

German Realities, 1954

United States policymakers contend that a powerful remilitarized Germany would be a reliable and indispensable bulwark against the aggressive forces of communism led by Soviet Russia. It was with this in mind that the society submitted to Members of Congress, during the spring of 1953, its analysis of the German problem in relationship to Western Europe and Soviet Russia. In the introduction to our analysis it was stated:

"However great Germany's economic and military potential may be, it does not follow that Germany's real interests are commensurate with ours or those of our western allies. A country no matter how strong, cannot be a trustworthy and effective ally if its interests are basically opposed to the other members of the proposed alliance. The effective and enduring strength of any coalition must ultimately rest on a common heritage and a harmony of interests shared by the major participants. Allies must be reckoned in terms of reasonably certain performance—not in terms of wishful thinking.

"A realistic assessment of the qualities of the proposed major ally—in this case Germany—is essential in determining whether Germany will serve the western alliance or disintegrate the cohesiveness of the West."

The memorandum submitted below provides additional evidence in support of our original appraisal.

I. German-Soviet Economic Relations

In our analysis we cited facts to show that Germany's "natural economic ties are with Russia and the East." It was further stated that the rapid rebuilding of Germany's industrial potential increased the pressure for the resumption of these economic ties. Additional information has now come to light lending further support to this view:

(a) The Christian Science Monitor (April 17, 1954) carried a report revealing that 3 months after the contractual agreement with Bonn had been drawn up, a secret conference was held in Copenhagen in August 1952 between authoritative representatives of German business and delegates representing Soviet Deputy Prime Minister Anastas Mikoyan. "The conference was called at West German initiative with the knowledge of the West German Government, presumably Chancellor Adenauer himself." The sensational disclosure was made by Foreign Minister Molotov during the Berlin Conference. As far as we know, Molotov's revelation did not appear in the American press until it was reported in the Christian Science Monitor. According to the Christian Science Monitor correspondent "talks between Moscow and Bonn, or rather Düsseldorf, the economic center of the Ruhr, have been going on for about 3 years."

In this connection the United Press (October 14, 1953) reported that West German businessmen had closed their first postwar foreign trade deal with Russia "with the blessings of the West German Government at Bonn." The United Press reported, "West German financial experts insist if the cold war were ended, West German trade with the Soviet bloc would jump up a billion dollars in 12 months."

(b) In an interview with the magazine World (May 1954) West Germany's leading industrialist and convicted war criminal Alfred Krupp said:

"In the long run West Germany cannot continue her economic advancement without being reunited with East Germany, because both parts of Germany must be considered an organic whole. An expansion of trade volume (with East Germany and Soviet-bloc countries) would without doubt contribute considerably to a solution of West Germany's export problems."

(c) Hitler's financial adviser and accused war criminal Hjalmar Schacht, now a private banker in Düsseldorf, told Fortune magazine (April 1954): "Germany's future? Trade with the East. Wonderful market, Russia."

(d) There is a close similarity between the views expressed by Krupp and Schacht on the one hand and those of Chancellor Adenauer. Thus, the Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung (July 7, 1953) reported the Chancellor as stating that it was to Russia's interest to resume friendship with Germany. In this connection he noted:

"Already today the states of the European Schumann plan have formed a market of 157 million people. Thus, these countries are for the Russian economy a highly interesting trading partner. The German and Russian economies once before complemented each other in a magnificent way. The economy of an integrated Europe, including Germany, could offer even more. The greater the economic meshing (between Western Europe and Russia), the greater the political security."

(e) The executives of one of Germany's largest shipbuilding companies, the Howaldt Works of Kiel, recently went to Moscow to negotiate with Kremlin authorities for the construction of ships, with a total estimated value of $28 million.

(f) The Associated Press (June 2, 1954) reported that the first West German trade delegation to Russia since the end of the war would leave for Moscow shortly. Representatives from Germany's leading industrial, trade, and banking circles will negotiate with the Russians for the greatest possible volume of trade.

II. GERMANY'S ECONOMIC RELATIONS WITH COMMUNIST CHINA

Trade with Communist China is regarded as vital to Germany's interests. The importance of the China market is discussed frequently in the German newspapers and financial journals. Thus, according to Handelsblatt, the leading economic journal in the industrial Ruhr, many German businessmen view the China mainland as the greatest future market in the world (New York Herald Tribune, March 21, 1954). The following newspaper items highlight the growing importance of Germany's trade with Communist China:

(a) The Associated Press (February 5, 1954) reported that Red China's trade delegation located in East Berlin was swamped with offers from West German businessmen seeking to trade with China.

(b) The Associated Press, (April 2, 1954) reported that West German exports to Communist China have increased ninefold in the last year. The main German exports to China are iron goods, machinery, electrical goods, high precision and optical instruments, and pharmaceutical products.

(c) It has been reported that 10,000 West German firms registered with East German Chamber of Commerce, hoped to do at least $40 million worth of business with China. (New York Post, April 5, 1954.)

(d) During the Geneva Conference, a group of leading German businessmen were scheduled to meet with Lei Jenmin, Communist China's Vice Minister for Foreign Trade. According to the New York Herald Tribune (June 5, 1954), "the West German group is coming with the knowledge of the Adenauer government."

III. POLITICAL RELATIONS BETWEEN GERMANY AND THE SOVIET BLOC

The resurgence of Germany's economic dealings with the Communist East has prompted prominent German leaders to suggest closer political ties. It will be recalled that the consummation of the notorious Hitler-Stalin pact of 1939 had been preceded by marked reactivation of trade between Russia and Germany:

(a) While German businessmen were negotiating their first postwar trade agreement with the Soviets in October 1953, Chancellor Adenauer granted an interview to the United Press, in which he stated: "If the Soviet Union desires a special one [separate political agreement] with Germany, let them have one."

(b) Karl G. Pfleiderer, a leading member of the conservative Free Democratic Party, which is part of Chancellor Adenauer's governmental coalition, has publicly advocated diplomatic ties with the Soviet bloc. In a speech in the Bonn Parliament, he urged that West Germany end its isolation from the part of the world that extends "from Warsaw, Prague, Budapest, Sophia, and Bucharest through Moscow to Peking in the Far East."

(c) This proposal received strong support, as reflected in a statement by West Germany's leading conservative newspaper, the Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung. This paper stated, in part: "It lies in the nature of [West German] 'independence' and 'equal rights' that our Foreign Ministry cannot in the long run be prevented from sending representatives to the Eastern States." (New York Herald Tribune, April 12, 1954.)

The Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung was repeating a view which it held as early as April 1, 1950, when it said:

"Germany was always the bridge between the East and the West. * * * The Allies are not able to come to an accord with the Russians. * * * What is then more natural than for us to say, in view of the present pressure: If until now, within the framework of world events, the others were not able to make an intelligent agreement, then it is our duty finally to arouse ourselves in order to obtain at least an economic understanding. * * *

"In doing so we will not turn to the little bosses of the Eastern Zone but directly to the big boss in Moscow. There is where decisions are being made."

(d) Chancellor Adenauer himself told the press in Hamburg (Associated Press, May 17, 1953) that diplomatic relations between West Germany and the Soviet Union "might be established in the not too far future." When asked to elaborate he replied, "one should not make an excursion into high politics."

(e) The New York Times (June 5, 6, 1954) reported important speeches by Hans Luther and Heinrich Bruening, former German Chancellors, before the powerful Ruhr industrialists at their exclusive Rhein-Ruhr Club. Both speakers called for the scrapping of the so-called pro-Western policy, a rapprochement with Russia and the restoration of the Stresemann strategy, i. e., the playing off of the East and West against each other so as to strengthen Germany's world position.

IV. UNDEMOCRATIC TRENDS IN GERMANY TODAY

In our analysis it was stated that "extreme nationalism and adherence to authoritarian concepts are controlling factors in German public opinion." It was also noted that traditional German political ideology is a much more logical ally of Russian communism than of Western democracy. In this connection there has been a general upsurge of extreme nationalism and militaristic propaganda. This ominous development is partially reflected in the widespread campaign to free Germany's war criminals, to absolve Germany's war guilt and to glorify German militarism. Moreover, it has been observed that key figures in Germany's political life have aided and abetted this campaign.

(a) The Associated Press (March 14, 1954) reported that at the annual convention of the so-called German Soldiers Union representing 100,000 former members of Hitler's Wehrmacht, a resolution was unanimously passed demanding freedom for the "still imprisoned innocent German soldiers." The meeting was addressed by leading German figures, Hermann Ehlers, President of the German Bundestag, told his audience: "We German soldiers have the right to be shown the same respect that is given abroad to those who have done their duty like us." Former Admiral Gottfried Hansen denounced the Allies for imprisoning these war criminals, Franz Josef Strauss, a member of Chancellor Adenauer's cabinet, told the cheering audience that there must be "continuity of tradition between German soldiers of World War II and the German soldiers of the future."

(b) The Christian Science Monitor (March 5, 1954) reported that the Germans intended "to honor Nazi war criminals." Mention was made of officials of the town of Hamelin in Germany who announced that they would exhune the bodies of 91 executed Nazi war criminals including the leaders of the Belsen concentration camp. The German authorities said that these criminals would be given "a worthy final resting place" in the city cemetery. According to the Christian Science Monitor public sentiment "seems in favor of the transfer." One German newspaper referred to the Nazis as "alleged" war criminals.

(c) The development of extremist sentiment and activities is also indicated by the deliberate campaign to arouse irredentism among the Germans.

(1) Old militaristic songs such as We March Against England and Victoriously We Shall Defeat France are being sung again at the meeting of German veterans.

(2) Sudeten Germans are encouraged to agitate for the seizure of a part of Czechoslovakia which had been handed over to Hitler on the basis of the Munich pact. Theodor Oberlaender, Minister for Refugees in the Adenauer Cabinet, has insisted on a solution of the so-called Sudeten German question in the spirit of the Munich pact." (Reuters November 6, 1953.)

(3) Minister President Karl Arnold of the State of North Rhine-Westfalia has demanded the return of territories which are now part of Belgium and the Netherlands. (Associated Press, March 8, 1954.)

(d) German justice has not been unaffected by the above-mentioned undemocratic trends.

(1) In December 1953, the West German Supreme Court decided to reject an application from the Dutch for the extradition of a number of Dutch Nazi war criminals who had broken out of a Dutch prison and sought refuge in Germany. The decision of the court was based on a decree issued by Hitler in May 1943 granting German citizenship to foreigners who joined the SS.

(2) The Associated Press (March 31, 1954) reported that 20 former Nazi policemen who had admitted massacring 110 Jews in the Warsaw ghetto, were acquitted by a German court on the grounds that their scant formal education prevented these criminals from realizing that they committed a misdeed. Some of the defendants are still in the police force in Dortmund and are eligible for promotions and pensions.

(e) The German press has also been adversely affected by these dangerous trends. It is a fact that important sections of the German press today are controlled by the very same elements who gave aid and comfort to Hitler and the Nazis. The following are examples:

(1) Giselher Wirsing, a ranking senior officer in the SS and an old friend of Ribbentrop, has been appointed political adviser to the editor of Die Welt which until a year ago was under British control. (New York Post, February 1954.)

(2) The former Nazi editor Zogelman is now chief editor of the German newspaper Fortschritt which speaks for big business interests in Düsseldorf.

(f) Propaganda and intrigue against the Western democracies are rising. Such notorious supporters of Hitler as Franz von Papen and Otto Skorzeny maintain close contact with the Nazi geopolitical center in Madrid for the purpose of facilitating the dissemination of anti-American and antidemocratc propaganda throughout the world. Herr Hjalmar Schacht, Hitler's financial adviser and accused war criminal, has also been busy in bolstering Germany's interests abroad at the expense of the Western democracies. He has been particularly active in the Middle East, where German militarists and businessmen help fan the fires of antiwestern sentiment. Simultaneously with these activities neo-Nazis are working hand in glove with Communist propagandists in Germany. These machinations were exposed at length in the Reporter magazine (April 13, 1954) under the title, "Germany: Where Fascism and Communism Meet."

(g) Antiallied sentiment within Germany is by no means confined to the lunatic fringe of the extreme right or extreme left. Thus, the leader of the Socialist-Democratic Party, Erich Ollenhauer, attacks the Allied High Commissioners alleging that they had made it "coldly and brutally clear to us that we have not such sovereignty as entitled us to decide upon such constitutional amendments." Dr. Thomas Dehler, chairman of the Free Democratic Party (part of the Adenauer coalition) declared, "every German must be pained at the thought that changes in our constitution still depend upon the will of the allies." (Christian Science Monitor, April 26, 1954.)

V. FORMER NAZIS AND HITLER SUPPORTERS IN THE BONN GOVERNMENT

There has been a marked influx of former Nazis in leading positions in the German Government.

(a) Members of Chancellor Adenauer's Cabinet who were Hitler supporters and Nazis are: Waldemar Kraft, minister without portfolio; Theodor Oberlaender, Minister for Refugees and Expellees; Gerhard Schroeder, Minister of Interior; Victor Emanuel Preusker, Housing Minister. The Nazi background of these persons was reported in the New York Times (April 17, 1954).

(b) The head of Dr. Adenauer's Chancellery is Hans Globke, who was legal adviser to the Nazi Minister of the Interior in the Hitler regime. Dr. Globke helped write the official commentary on the Nuremberg racial laws.

(c) The counselor of the Bonn Ministry of Justice is Dr. Franz Massfeller, who wrote the official commentary to the Hitlerite laws "for the protection of German blood and honor." He participated in the Wannsee Conference which was concerned among other things with the question of instituting compulsory sterilization.

(d) Former Nazis are infiltrating government departments to an alarming degree. A case in point is the Bonn Foreign Office, where 66 percent of its leading personnel, according to Chancellor Adenauer, are former Nazis and Ribbentrop diplomats.

VI. GERMAN MILITARISM AND THE EDC

It has been stated that a military contribution by Germany through the European Defense Community (EDC) is essential to the defense of the West against Communist aggression. However, in our 1953 analysis it was pointed out that the EDC would not be legally binding for a united Germany. Hence, in the event of German unification, the West will be confronted with a remilitarized, united Germany which can make alliances on its own terms and conditions. Certain aspects with regard to the proposal to remilitarize Germany deserves to be examined here:

(a) It has been publicly stated by leading German officials including Chancellor Adenauer, that the major costs for the rearming of Germany must be borne by the United States (statements by Chancellor Adenauer, Associated Press, Dec. 6, 1952; U. S. News & World Report, Dec. 26, 1953). On the other hand, the German Finance Minister has recently proposed a drastic reduction of the tax burden. For example, he has suggested that corporate taxes on undistributed income should be cut from a rate of 60 percent to 45 percent. (Business Week, Mar. 20, 1953). Commenting on these tax proposals, the financial editor of the New York Journal-American exclaimed: "Who won the war?" and further pointed out that taxes on United States business will top those obtaining in Germany (March 12, 1954).

(b) On June 22, 1953, the New York Times reported that Chancellor Adenauer "was giving serious consideration" to a proposal that former high officers of Hitler's Waffen SS or elite guard be permitted to serve in the proposed German army. This in spite of the fact that the Waffen SS was declared to be a criminal organization by the International Tribunal at Nuremberg. In reply to an inquiry relative to the employment of Nazis and members of Hitler's Waffen SS in the proposed German army, the United States State Department did not indicate opposition to the employment of such individuals per se.

(c) The granting of respectability to war criminals may be seen by the fact that a calendar distributed by the Deutsche Soldaten Zeitung (a newspaper published by German militarists), carried an article contributed by the Blank Office which is responsible for the rearming of Germany. This very same calendar had as its frontispiece "a flattering page portrait of the former grand admiral, Erich Raeder, now serving a life term in the Spandau prison at Berlin as one of the major military associates to Adolf Hitler. (New York Herald Tribune, Dec. 9, 1954.)

(d) The chief military adviser to Chancellor Adenauer, General Heusinger, has publicly eulogized the war criminal General Jodl hanged at Nuremberg. The State Department has not requested Heusinger's removal because it is satisfied that he is "reliable."

(e) The war criminal, former field marshal, Albert Kesselring who was responsible for the massacre of Italians when he commanded the Nazi troops in Italy, was granted permission to tour an American air force base in Germany. Kesselring is the head of the revived militaristic organization, the Stahlhelm, which actively collaborated with the Nazis before the war. (Associated Press Feb. 7, 1954.)

(f) The efforts to accord unwarranted lenient treatment to German war criminals is indicated by their premature release by clemency boards in which the Germans themselves participate. Though the release of these war criminals is a matter of great public concern, the allied authorities decided to cease publication of the names and the reasons for granting clemency. The Allied, prodded on by Chancellor Adenaur, have sought reconsideration of the status of the major war criminals located in the Spandau prison in Berlin. The New York Times (April 6, 1954), commenting on this action, stated:

"* * * The decision to reconsider the status of these men culminates a long series of actions by the western powers to ameliorate the condition of German war criminals. The moves have been made in response to German pleas for clemency and to clear the way for West German participation in the European Defense Community."

VII. RECARTELIZATION OF GERMANY

It is a matter of record that the German cartels and trusts played a notorious role in undermining normal commercial relationships among the nations and in helping Germany to secretly rearm after World War I. Today, in spite of allied laws and regulations, the German cartels and trusts are reviving.

(a) Wall Street Journal (August 27, 1953) carried a special report declaring that German trade and industry "are returning to their traditional prewar patterns of cartels and trusts."

(b) German heavy industry is in the forefront of the movement to revive the prewar steel and coal cartels of Europe. By dominating these cartels prior to World War II, the Germans were able to exercise a decisive influence on the economies of her future victims.

(c) The New York Times (April 13, 1954) reported that the Ruhr coal and steel industrialists are campaigning to scuttle the Schuman plan organization. The German industrialists are beginning to fear that the Schuman plan organization may thwart their efforts to dominate Western Europe. As reported by the New York Herald Tribune (April 9, 1954), the Germans regard themselves as "being dominant among the partners in industrial power but as having only a limited ability to influence the group's (Schuman plan organization) policies." The German cartelists' resentment toward the Schuman plan organization as a roadblock to their ambitions was also reported in the U. S. News & World Report (April 30, 1954) and in the New York Times (May 4, 1954).

(d) Though the allies adopted policies which were designed to break up the cartels and giant monopolies, effective implementation has not been achieved in many important cases. Now the responsibility has been turned over to the Germans, and they are in the process of passing phony legislation on the subject.

VIII. CONSEQUENCES OF GERMANY'S RESURGENT POWER

(a) The authoritarian and aggressive spirit is on the march again. Postwar moods of defeatism and ingratiation, often mistaken as signs of progress toward democracy, have been replaced by bluster and arrogance. Important sections of the German press reflect this ominous trend. Thus, there have been frequent warnings in German newspapers to the effect that unless Germany has its way, it will not collaborate with the West.

The Hamburger Anzeiger demands that the Bonn Government "make it clear to the western powers much more energetically than before, that the intensity of our friendship for them will depend on the intensity of their efforts to solve the German problem." (Quoted in Paris edition of the New York Herald Tribune, Mar. 1, 1954.)

The Rheinische Post (December 8, 1953) which is a mouthpiece of Chancellor Adenauer's party, warned the West that unless the French become more tractable, Germany may support the Tauroggen policy. Tauroggen refers to the time when the Germans, in a sudden turnabout, allied themselves with the Russians to defeat Napoleon.

Under these circumstances it is a source of wonderment that German technicians have been permitted to work on "the United States Army's new top secret 200-millimeter atomic cannon in West Germany." (Associated Press, February 28, 1954.)

(b) It is no coincidence that the opposition to European unity marked by divisions among the western allies and domestic strife, has grown in direct proportion to the increasing efforts of the United States policymakers to place Germany on the pedestal of power. European unity is being destroyed on the rock of Germany's resurgence. Yet, our policymakers persist in expending time, effort, and money trying to reconcile the irreconcilable.

CONCLUSION

Never before in our history has the United States based so much of its policy in Europe on a people who have time and again demonstrated their unreliability and untrustworthiness. The challenge of Communist expansion can be overcome through the coalition of freedom-loving peoples who share common interests and purposes. That such a coalition is practical and necessary goes without saying, but the present policy of expediency can only end in disaster.

Citizens' Public Expenditure Survey, Inc., of New York State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ROONEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 17, 1954

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following letter, addressed to me by

Mr. Garth A. Shoemaker, president of the Citizens' Public Expenditure Survey, Inc., of New York State:

CITIZENS' PUBLIC EXPENDITURE SURVEY, INC., OF NEW YORK STATE,
Albany, N. Y., July 30, 1954.

The Honorable JOHN J. ROONEY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ROONEY: I congratulate you most heartily on your vote in the House of Representatives last Wednesday when the House refused to consider the Fryingpan-Arkansas project bill. As stated in my telegram to you on July 14, the Fryingpan-Arkansas project would be a waste of taxpayers' money on a gigantic scale.

You acted in the best interests of the people of New York State and the taxpayers of the Nation in voting against the rule for consideration of that bill by the House.

The upper Colorado River storage project (H. R. 4449) is a still more wasteful spending proposal. The bipartisan minority report of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives states that the upper Colorado project bill "includes a concealed subsidy from the Nation's taxpayers of over $1 billion." Taxpayers in your State would pay approximately $125 million of that subsidy.

I trust that if the upper Colorado bill is brought up for vote you will oppose it as an economically unfeasible project in itself and as an unjustifiable tax burden on the people of your State.

Sincerely yours,
GARTH A. SHOEMAKER,
President.

Representation in Principle and Practice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURR P. HARRISON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, a Member of Congress is sent to Washington as a representative of the people. It is his duty to protect their interests and to promote their welfare and desires.

There are those who now are trying to make it appear that a Congressman should not exercise his own independent judgment. They imply that, like a robot, he should assume any position the bureaucrats have induced the President to endorse.

This is not my conception of the duties of a Member of Congress. I believe that a representative of the people should give careful and fair consideration to any recommendation made in the name of the President of the United States. I believe he should support the recommendation whenever he finds it in the best interest of the Nation and in accordance with the welfare and wishes of the people he represents.

If, after sincere and fair consideration, however, a Congressman believes that a measure is contrary to the best interests of the people, he should oppose it—regardless of pressure from the executive branch of the Government.

Conscientious representation—without dictation or blind obedience—is a fundamental principle of our democratic form of government. I have observed that principle in considering the recommendations made by President Eisenhower.

On 59 recorded votes, I supported the position of the Eisenhower administration. These votes are:

First. Extend the authority of the President to reorganize executive departments, as recommended by Hoover Commission.

Second. Create a new Under Secretary of State.

Third. Supplemental appropriation bill for 1954.

Fourth. Annual personnel review in military service.

Fifth, sixth, seventh, and eighth. Four votes to carry out presidential recommendations as to State ownership of tidelands.

Ninth and tenth. To follow administration recommendation on temporary admissibility of foreign seasonal farm laborers.

Eleventh. To liberalize national bank report requirements.

Twelfth. State, Justice, Commerce appropriation bill for 1954.

Thirteenth. Agricultural appropriation bill for 1954.

Fourteenth. Health, Education, and Welfare appropriation bill for 1954.

Fifteenth. To authorize reorganization of Department of Agriculture.

Sixteenth. To extend President's authority to negotiate reciprocal trade agreements, 1954.

Seventeenth. Independent offices appropriation bill for 1954.

Eighteenth, nineteenth, twentieth, and twenty-first. To carry out Presidential recommendations on Mutual Security Act, 1954.

Twenty-second. To give wheat to Pakistan.

Twenty-third. To carry out President's recommendations as to disposal of synthetic rubber plants.

Twenty-fourth. To reorganize Department of Defense to provide additional assistant secretary.

Twenty-fifth. To end leave for top officials.

Twenty-sixth. To carry out President's recommendation as to appropriation for Air Force.

Twenty-seventh. To pass defense appropriation bill for 1954.

Twenty-eighth and twenty-ninth. To carry out President's recommendation as to unemployment compensation.

Thirtieth. To provide emergency drought aid.

Thirty-first and thirty-second. To extend excess profits tax for 6 months.

Thirty-third. To approve creation of United States Information Agency.

Thirty-fourth. To keep Red China out of United Nations.

Thirty-fifth. To provide Federal airport funds.

Thirty-sixth and thirty-seventh. To carry out President's recommendation to permit continued importation of Venezuelan oil.

Thirty-eighth. To end Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

Thirty-ninth. To permit use of surplus foods for foreign relief.

Fortieth. To create an Air Force Academy.

Forty-first. Cancel CCC debt.

Forty-second and forty-third. To reduce taxes on excises.

Forty-fourth. To permit wiretapping in security cases after approval of a court.

Forty-fifth. Defense appropriation for 1955.

Forty-sixth. To carry out President's recommendation for military construction.

Forty-seventh. To expand social security.

Forty-eighth. To extend President's authority to negotiate reciprocal trade agreements through 1955.

Forty-ninth. To carry out President's recommendations as to bond-buying authority of Federal Reserve.

Fiftieth. To express congressional disapproval of Communist interference in Western Hemisphere.

Fifty-first. To prohibit use of mutual security funds to any government maintaining Communist rule in Asia.

Fifty-second. To provide a flexible supports for basic agricultural commodities.

Fifty-third. Resolution to oppose seating of Red China in United Nations.

Fifty-fourth and fifty-fifth. For atomic energy bill.

Fifty-sixth. To increase borrowing limit of Commodity Credit Corporation.

Fifty-seventh. To restrict immunity of witnesses under fifth amendment.

Fifty-eighth. To strengthen laws to deal with subversives.

Fifty-ninth. To provide surplus agricultural commodities to Spain.

Other proposals of the Chief Executive which I supported are not included because record votes were not had.

On the following 13 measures, I disagreed with and voted against the recommendations made by the executive branch of the Government. It will be seen that included among these are a number of proposals originated by President Truman as part of his Fair Deal, and now adopted by the Eisenhower administration as its own. Apparently, in some cases, what was regarded yesterday as creeping socialism has suddenly become "a dynamic program of progress."

A measure unsound when advocated by President Truman does not suddenly become sound when advocated by President Eisenhower.

These 13 proposals are:

First. Permanent increase of the national debt limit to $15 billion: This administration was elected on a promise to balance the budget. I was utterly amazed when the proposal was made to increase the national debt permanently, so that deficit financing might be continued. Since I believe in sound government finance and a balanced budget, I opposed this suggestion, but it passed the House, and a temporary compromise later was approved.

Second. Reed tax revision bill: There were some relatively small items in this bill which were in the public interest, but I could not give my approval to the large items of tax relief awarded limited segments of the population and financed out of borrowed dollars.

Third. The St. Lawrence seaway project: This proposal, originally made in the New Deal days, ultimately will cost a billion dollars for a project in Canada which will be ice blocked over half the time.

Fourth. Creation of Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: I believe that these fields, particularly education, are primarily problems for the States.

Interference by the Federal Government should not be encouraged, therefore, by elevating these bureaus to department status.

Fifth. Bills for Federal educational conferences: I opposed these measures for the same reason. The decision of the Supreme Court of the United States had invaded the rights of the States in the field of education far enough, without giving legislative sanction to further abuses in the guise of Federal cooperation.

Sixth. Bill to permit 245,000 additional immigrants from countries behind the Iron Curtain: In the preceding Congress, I supported the McCarran-Walter Act, which was intended to place further admission of immigrants on an orderly basis, favor nationalities which had demonstrated their assimilability, and recognize that a population deficiency no longer exists in our Nation. It was and is my conviction that this law, properly administered, could give adequate effect to our humanitarian impulses, while endeavoring to safeguard our national interests. I could not support a proposal for the early admission of large numbers of persons from behind the Iron Curtain, outside the quotas provided in existing law and with the inherent danger of welcoming many subversive agents cloaked as refugees.

Seventh. Bill to change the number of members of Tariff Commission so as to give one political party a majority: The Tariff Commission has always been bipartisan, and should have continued to be. The question of markets for our agricultural products and an outlet for our surplus production is too vital for decision on a partisan basis.

Eighth. Hawaiian statehood: This proposal, advocated so long by President Truman and now by President Eisenhower, would make a State out of these faraway islands. I voted against this, and it has not yet become law.

The notorious Harry Bridges and his Communist-dominated union are very powerful in Hawaii. Only 16 percent of the people are of the Caucasian race. The rest are Japanese, Chinese, Portuguese, Mongolians, Koreans, Filipinos, Melanesians, and dozens of other races and nationalities.

If Hawaii becomes a State, this polyglot population would have two United States Senators and a Congressman. Virginia probably would lose a Congressman if Hawaii became a State, through the reapportionment process.

Ninth. Public housing: To my surprise, President Eisenhower has endorsed much of President Truman's program to spend hundreds of millions of dollars to socialize the housing industry. Pressure from the White House caused part of this program to become law, but I opposed it.

Tenth. Foreign-aid program: Although I have generally supported measures for mutual security and for aid to other nations which show a willingness to help themselves, I voted against bills which gave $135 million to Nehru's India and which provided over $2 billion for Indochina and southeast Asia to be spent almost in any way the military wants.

Eleventh. Subsidies to airline corporations: I voted against an administration proposal to raise the appropriation committee's recommendation for $23 million to $70 million for subsidies to these corporations.

Twelfth. Wiretapping: I supported a bill permitting use in evidence in security cases of evidence obtained by wiretapping, provided a court order first was obtained, but I voted against an administration proposal to permit wiretapping of a citizen's calls after mere approval of a politically minded Attorney General.

Thirteenth. Health reinsurance plan: This was a proposal by the President to make the taxpayer pay insurance corporations for certain losses in health insurance policies. I opposed it and it was defeated, but the President says it will be presented again in the next Congress.

The Atomic Energy Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am convinced that the atomic energy bill containing the notorious Dixon-Yates principle as it recently passed the Senate, will arouse such overwhelming public disapproval between now and the convening of the new Congress in January, that one of the first legislative tasks which will be before us at that time will be the revising of the atomic energy bill which the Congress just put on the statute books. My mail continues to show a very strong support from every section of the country for the fight that I made against the atomic energy bill and for the fight that I have been making against the Eisenhower administration's giveaway program in the field of natural resources. I am sure that there will be those who will attempt to criticize me for inserting in the Congressional Record a good cross-section sampling of the mail which I have received in support of my opposition to the Eisenhower administration's atomic energy proposals and natural resource proposals. However, I am asking unanimous consent to have some of the communications I have received inserted in the Record because it is a very effective way for me to answer some of the Republican smears against me. One of the misrepresentations being made by much of the reactionary Republican press in the country and particularly in my own State is that the position which the representative of the Independent Party has taken in the Senate in opposition to many of the features of the Eisenhower program is that I do not speak with any substantial public support behind me. I not only know that this Republican attack against me is without foundation in fact, but I am convinced that as more and more people in our country come to understand the facts that support my opposition to the reactionary policies of the Eisenhower administration, it will become clear to my critics that a very large part of public opinion shares my point of view. Therefore, Mr. President, even though some of the communications that I now ask to have inserted in the Appendix of the Record are very laudatory and at the risk of being criticized for immodesty, I ask unanimous consent to have them inserted in the Record. I do so only because I think it is only fair that my supporters in Oregon be furnished with some evidence which shows very clearly that there is a great deal of support throughout the country for the fight which I have been making this year in trying to protect the people's heritage in the natural resources of the country against the continued attempts of the Eisenhower administration to turn them over to selfish economic interests at the expense of the American taxpayers.

I also wish to have these communications inserted in the Record, Mr. President, because they are an answer to some of the misrepresentations and unfair attacks which certain newspapers in Oregon have been making upon me. Their attempts to create the impression in Oregon that my arguments in the Senate go unheeded, both in the Senate and in the country, are not supported by the record. As my colleagues here in the Senate will readily admit, my position on many issues here in the Senate, the atomic energy bill being the most recent, frequently results in amendments to and modifications of bills in the Senate which never would have been made except for the floor fights that I have made on those measures.

The following correspondence which I now ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the Record is clear evidence that the point of view of the representative of the Independent Party is not without many supporters across the country. I have edited from the communications any reference to other Senators, which references would violate rule 19 of the Senate, and any other references which would not be relevant to the subject matter.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

MILLBOURNE, PA., *July 21, 1954.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senator from Oregon:

Filibuster against atomic and TVA giveaway if necessary.

JAMES A. MCGUIGAN,
Republican Councilman, Borough of Millbourne, Pa.

PORTLAND, OREG., *August 14, 1954.*
The Honorable Senator WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Your stand on the atomic energy bill is greatly appreciated, as it indicates your continued effort to keep America in the hands of its rightful owners—the American people—rather than have it turned over to Wall Street as the Republican administration is attempting to do.

I appreciate the reports I am receiving from you and again wish to thank you for your continued fight for the American people on all items of legislation.

Yours very truly,
STANLEY MILLER.

PORTLAND, OREG., *July 22, 1954.*
Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senator, State of Oregon,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations on your splendid fight against giving away atomic energy to private power monopoly. Keep up the good fight and please convey our congratulations to your colleagues who are joining you in this fight.

INTERNATIONAL WOODWORKERS OF AMERICA, CIO,
By J. E. DICEY, *First Vice President.*

ATASCADERO, CALIF.
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: This is to assure you that I appreciate yours and Mr. HUMPHREY's stand against the wrecking crew.

LYNN REYNOLDS.

FIRST CONGREGATIONAL CHURCH,
The Dalles, Oreg., August 9, 1954.
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Thanks for your regular reports on your activities in Washington. I have followed you with keen interest through these reports and the daily news. Moreover, I appreciate the abuse you have taken as a result of your clear-cut stand. As you may recall, in my correspondence with you, we have not always agreed, but I want to commend you for your forthright stand on the atomic energy bill and other measures involving the public interest. I believe the general public will support you in your fight for Hells Canyon and other public power interests. I am only urging you to keep up your courage and the good work.

Sincerely,
JOHN D. LANGENES.

VERNONIA, OREG., *August 15, 1954.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate House Building,
Washington, D. C.:

May we urge your strong support to hold the Senate amendment in the atomic energy bill.

GUY R. THOMAS.

PORTLAND, OREG., *August 6, 1954.*

DEAR SENATOR: I wish to express my most sincere appreciation for the brave battle of words you recently fought.

I really believe you have the interest of the common people and taxpayers than anyone in the United States Congress.

It is just too bad this great country couldn't have more men of your ability and courage to lead the way to a better way of life and to really fight to retain what liberty we still have.

Your friend and admirer,
J. H. THARP.

TOLEDO, OHIO, *August 12, 1954.*
Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Most of us write to Senators when we wish some favor or service. It is well also to write a note of appreciation for your championing of a cause and winning it for us.

Reference is made to that revised atomic-energy law, a cause of whose meaning some of us were hardly conscious. And so, I wish to thank you for skillful use of a parliamentary ruse to gain time.

Respectfully,
MRS. ROMAN HAVLICEK.

RED WING, MINN., *August 19, 1954.*

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I wish to thank you for the efforts you put forth to keep for the American people (as a whole) the use of atomic energy. I believe that what you have done in this respect is one of the greatest peacetime services possible. It seemed to me that what the administration proposed was what it would have been like 50 years ago if the Government had granted all water rights to private companies. Thank you again for your hard work.

Sincerely,
JOHN C. FRIEDUCT.

AUGUST 18, 1954.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We here at home hold the utmost admiration for your efforts on behalf of the American people in regard to the atomic-energy issue and the McCarthy censure issue.

We feel sure that, despite the fact that you are an Independent, the people of your State will see to it that you are reelected. The people of this great country are very reluctant to discard as goood a friend as you have been. May God always walk by your side.

Yours sincerely,
GERALD M. CAPLAN.
EVANSTON, ILL.

AUGUST 19, 1954.
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Congratulations on your courageous fight to force an improvement on the atomic-energy bill.

Some day the people of Oregon will realize what their junior Senator has accomplished for their country.

Looking forward to hearing you speak at the Democratic picnic August 29.

Most sincerely,
MRS. KATIE STREY.
PORTLAND, OREG.

BROOKLYN, N. Y., *August 14, 1954.*
Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Chamber,
Washington, D. C.

HONORED SIR: I note the temporary victory that the 48-to-41 vote indicates on the atomic bill.

I know that this result is largely the result of the herculean efforts you made by insisting that the people of the country would never support the present bill, if educated, and amid slurs from most of the press, you kept up the fight until some understanding reached enough Senators.

I thank God for a man of your vision and determination.

Yours sincerely,
LLOYD A. RIDER.

RALEIGH, N. C., *August 8, 1954.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

The atomic energy bill as reported out by the conference committee has either eliminated or definitely impaired the effectiveness of most of the previously adopted amendments which protected not only the rural electric cooperatives but the interests of the American people as a whole. Some have contended that our concern over certain aspects of this legislation is out of proportion to the facts involved. This contention was unanimously rejected via a most thorough deliberation of the bill by our association on Thursday of this week. We urge you most respectfully to do everything possible to force this bill back to conference committee with instructions to reincorporate the referred-to amendments. That failing, we appeal to you to vote against this bill. In its present form this bill, in our opinion, is inimical to the best interests of both the Federal Government and the American people, and is definitely violative of some of our oldest and most respected principles.

Sincerely yours,
TARHEEL ELECTRIC MEMBERSHIP ASSOCIATION,
By WILLIAM T. CRISP,
Executive Manager and General Counsel.
W. C. CARLTON,
Chairman, Legislative Committee.
J. H. GREENLEE,
FRENCH H. SMITH,
D. B. CROW,
LEWIS OUTLAW,
Members of Legislative Committee.

SOCIAL JUSTICE COMMITTEE,
THE COMMUNITY UNITARIAN FELLOWSHIP OF SAN DIEGO COUNTY,
San Diego, Calif., August 8, 1954.
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We wish to commend you on your recent stand in opposition to the proposed atomic energy bill. It is the courageous and untiring efforts of farsighted men like yourself which must keep our Nation a free and democratic society. We pledge you our full support on this measure.

Sincerely,
DOROTHEA G. KLENNER,
Secretary, Social Justice Committee, Community Unitarian Fellowship of San Diego County.

MARSHALL, TEX., *August 9, 1954.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building:

Amendments to atomic bill previously adopted by Senate will be ineffective if House-Senate committee report adopted. Urge report be recommitted to conference.

GEORGE W. ROSS, Jr.,
Panola-Harrison Electric Co-op., Inc.

DENVER, COLO., *August 11, 1954.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We have all too seldom written a representative to express our point of view, but because of the gravity of the situation we are anxious to inform you of our opinions, opinions shared by many other Americans.

First, you are to be congratulated for your outstanding part in the atomic energy fight. For the first time this Congress came alive and showed its possibilities in stopping the gigantic giveaway of this country's resources to private industry. We urge that you do all you can to muster efforts to make this new law as fair as possible when it comes before the Senate again.

Thank you for your consideration.

Very truly yours,
Mr. and Mrs. C. E. JENCKS.

TUCSON, ARIZ., *August 12, 1954.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Your stand on the atomic energy bill debate was most commendable and deserves the gratitude of all citizens who place a constructive social order above monopolistic profits for a favored few.

The function and the only content of government pertains to the rational guidance of practical affairs in the various areas of human purposes and relations. Therefore, whoever manages such practical matters involving human relations through vast capital resources exercises political power. Thus corporations exercise political functions in proportion to their control over the means and materials of life. This, I take it, is the logical ground for the position you defend: the need for wisdom in civic policy, the rational guidance of the state of fact in and through laws conducive of order.

Could the development and use of atomic power, together with the tidelands oil be made into instruments for the reduction of the national debt? Might you be free to affirm and promote such measures either in or outside of the Halls of Congress?

Very truly yours,

E. T. Hiller.

Seattle, Wash., *August 13, 1954.*

Hon. Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Senator: Thank you and all the other valiant fighters against the infamous Eisenhower atomic energy giveaway.

Thanks again.

Very truly,

Warren W. Brown.

July 31, 1954.

Dear Senator Morse: You are to be highly commended for your vigorous defense of the public's interests in the atomic energy program issue.

Good luck.

James Martin.

Paris, Ill.

Philadelphia, Pa., *August 6, 1954.*

Senator Morse,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

My Dear Senator Morse: May just a housewife write to the Senator? (Independent.) Because you have the spirit of an independent, that is why I address you, that is the spirit that will preserve our beloved America.

But not to digress, I read of the fight in the Senate against turning over the atomic-energy program to private interests. Selling it to them, possibly. But this is the property of the American people—hard earned, dearly bought.

And they propose to increase the national borrowing power. We to whom the atomic-energy program belongs have increased our own production power by our own creative efforts; our gray matter is our wealth, which gray matter properly productive produces our gold.

My thought is to organize the parents of today through our PTA societies—our own grassroots with our own publications, our school paper; locally, statewide, nationally; our own TV program—PTA—Parent Teachers Authority.

Yours, with esteem,

Mary Jane Magee,
Mrs. Charles F. Magee,
Just a Housewife.

Atlanta, Ga., *August 2, 1954.*

Hon. Wayne Morse,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: May I as a humble citizen express my deep appreciation for the manner in which you are meeting the issues of the day.

Your willingness to sacrifice yourself in connection with the TVA atomic proposed legislation is also another evidence of your deep interest in your country.

In the meantime, believe me, with all good wishes and assurance of my high admiration.

Sincerely yours,

Armand May.

Shelton, Wash., *August 3, 1954.*

Hon. Wayne Morse,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Morse: I extend my deepest appreciation for the wonderful fight you put up to protect the people's interests in the atomic energy bill.

We need more men like yourself, Mr. Jackson, and Mr. Magnuson.

Yours sincerely,

Herbert G. Nelson.

Eunice, N. Mex.

Senator Morse:

Thank you for working against the atomic energy bill.

A. O. Ogden.

Rock Island, Ill., *August 23, 1954.*

Dear Senator: As an individual and wage earner I am pleased to know that there are those of you who are trying to keep present administration from another great giveaway to power and light interests commonly known as utilities.

They have in last 15 months sneaked up few pennies on every or nearly every item the wage earner and others have to buy not mentioning cigarets, gasoline, utility rates—gas, electricity, fuel oil, coal, and telephone.

Beyond clothing, rent, heating, groceries, or just food for the one who eats out like myself the wage earner is stripped of nearly all buying such as automobiles, radio, television, electric washers, ironers, etc.

In view of all those things it's easy to see why the numbers of factory workers getting less and less, so naturally buying power drops and drops.

Sincerely,

C. J. Peterson.

Salem, Ill., *August 4, 1954.*

Hon. Wayne Morse,
Independent Senator of Oregon.

Dear Senator Morse: I am taking the liberty of congratulating you in your stand on the atomic power question. The people of Oregon should be proud of you, and the efficient efforts you have at all times fought for labor, farmer, and small-business people, not only for Oregonians, but for the people of all United States and possesions.

I am 76 years old and have carried a union labor card for 55 years. One I carry at present in Lathers for 48 years in good standing. I belong to Labor League for Political Education. This journal gives voting records of Senators and Congressmen. Also receive A. F. of L. News Reporter, and todays paper contained your picture where you were grabbing a few minutes sleep in your 181-hour fight to reserve for the people, labor, and farmer, their rights to electric power and atomic power.

More power to you, Senator Morse, and we, the people, need more Senators like you and our Senator Paul H. Douglas, of Illinois.

Excuse me for bothering you, but I can't help but commend you.

Very truly,

Wm. Page.

Los Angeles, Calif., *August 2, 1954.*

Dear Senator Morse: Wish to commend you most highly on your valiant efforts on the filibuster against the giant giveaway of atomic energy to the monopolies, developments paid for by the people.

Best of luck.

Yours very truly,

Sol and Hettie Pimstone.

Seattle, Wash., *July 25, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: Let me preface my letter by saying that I know that I am a very poor typist, but I still think this will be easier on you than deciphering handwriting.

The issue in debate at present is worthy of the hard fight you are waging, together with the men in Congress from my adopted State. It seems utterly ruthless to turn over to private industry the mammoth projects originated with the taxpayers money, for the advantage of all Americans, under the pious term of private enterprise. That term, I believe in, but not when it is used to benefit greedy men. No private industry could have developed them, so why should they step in and demand the profits? We the people are the Government; our Constitution says so. That isn't socialistic. A social benefit is one of the advantages of development of a whole Nation; it is not, as those who want to frighten the uninformed would have us believe, socialism. Our system has worked pretty well, and it is a two-party system, with no room for socialism.

Respectfully and gratefully,

Margaret H. Rodgers.

Selmer, Tenn., *July 22, 1954.*

Senator Morse, of Oregon:

Your efforts against the Dixon-Yates contract will long be remembered as a fight for the people against an extremely selfish proposition. We urge you to continue to fight against the Dixon-Yates contract and for the amendment protecting the electrical cooperatives interest to the Atomic Energy Act.

Pickwick Electric Membership Corp.,
Wm. M. Roberts, *Manager.*

Springfield, Mass., *July 18, 1954.*

Dear Sir: I am writing to support you in your efforts to defeat the Eisenhower plan to hand over the atomic energy control to the utility giants, coupon clippers, and absentee owners.

With the $12 billion invested it should be of the people, by the people, and for the people.

Sincerely,

Raymond Randig.

Long Beach, N. Y., *July 27, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

My Dear Sir: Sometimes I wonder whether it is an accident that so vital a measure as this atomic-energy bill comes up in the summer at the end of the session when so many citizens are absorbed in vacation (me, too) and so many Congressmen are anxious to close the session in a hurry.

I heard this morning that Senator Sparkman referred to the administration's "gigantic giveaway program." More power to him. For a long time it has seemed to me that a New Deal program that does or gives a few little things to ordinary people is socialism, while giving enormous hunks of public property to a select few is conservatism.

I've just come back from a trip to the TVA area. I've been wanting to do this for 15 years. It was a most gratifying trip; and I can also see why such an effort is being made to destroy TVA. Too many people have been helped, and it is too clear how little it costs to maintain a huge hydroelectric powerplant once it is constructed.

May I congratulate you and Senator Sparkman and the others who are fighting so valiantly to prevent:

1. A repetition of the notorious Ford contract for developing Muscle Shoals, now Wilson Dam. How nearly that succeeded. Now there is so much more to be given away there.

2. The infamous electric power sale deal to Alabama Light & Power Co. at about the same period. How long they milked the Government.

You ought to go down and talk to the plain people in the TVA area. One man said, "What did I know about electric appliances in the past?" Now he has every conceivable gadget on his farm, and talks and acts like a man. Thank you. Keep it up.

Sarah Rader.

Berkeley, Calif.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator: You are so right in your standpoint on the giveaway program of atomic energy, on your suggestion of the use of surplus wheat, on the seniority rights in the Senate, etc., that I just want to be among those to encourage you to keep up the good work.

We, the voters, have to be forever grateful for the tremendous sacrifices you put into your efforts. Men like you—and they can be counted—are the backbone of true democracy and we need them badly.

Respectfully yours,
Charlotte Rosenfeld.

Hernando, Miss., *August 6, 1954.*

Senator Wayne L. Morse,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: I read all the arguments made in the Senate on the Atomic Energy Act, and while all the arguments made by the liberal Senators were fine, in my opinion the speech you made, the one lasting all night was by far the most logical, and completely covered all phases of the concept of government which we the liberals of this country believe in. My congratulations to you for this masterly presentation of the issues involved in this giveaway program of the reactionary element so fully endorsed by the present Republican administration. I noticed that besides the argument of Senator Hickenlooper who had charge of the bill very little argument was made by other Republican Senators.

I am enclosing an editorial which came out in the Memphis Commercial Appeal on July 29, 1954. This paper with the other Memphis paper, the Memphis Press-Scimitar, are Scripps-Howard papers, and supported Eisenhower in his race. This paper was highly critical of President Truman and since the 1952 election has continued to heap insults upon him. It has endorsed every act of Eisenhower. However, this paper insisted on Eisenhower making a speech in Memphis in order that he might clarify his stand on TVA. He made the statement in his speech that was brought out in the debate that it would be his policy to see that TVA was operated at its maximum capacity. He was accompanied to Memphis by Sherman Adams. After his comments to the press that TVA was in his opinion a complete example of "creeping socialism," this paper became lukewarm, for this section of the country is practically 100 percent for TVA. There were a few editorials slightly critical of his stand on TVA, and the editorial I am sending you is the final culmination of what was a beautiful friendship. In the Republican primary held in the State of Tennessee yesterday, in Memphis and Shelby County, where there are 192,000 qualified electors the GOP polled about 4,000 votes. There are 2 factions in Shelby County, the Old Guard and New Guard Republicans, and both factions together poled about 4,000 votes. Republicanism is at a low ebb in all Southern States. In the 1952 general election the Republicans came within 2,000 votes of carrying Shelby County. There will be an overwhelming majority for the Democrats in the coming general election.

Yours very sincerely,
John W. Barber.

[From the Memphis Commercial Appeal of July 29, 1954]

A Sad Revelation

A determined group of Senators has scored a major accomplishment in their 13 days of opposition to the atomic-energy bill.

By insisting on airing the peculiarities of this bill on the Senate floor they have brought to nationwide attention the war on public power.

More than that, they have put public power into the middle of the elections this fall. A Democratic Congress next winter is assured.

For those of us who have had hopes for a strong two-party system in the South, this atomic-energy plan was the deathblow.

It is a double tragedy for the Republican administration to have put such objectionable features into a revision of the atomic-energy legislation. Revision was unquestionably needed. For the private power forces to be able to put into the bundle, with the needed changes, an assortment of raw deals was sufficient to announce the failure of modern and moderate men to hold control of the Republican Party.

President Eisenhower, sensitive of his military background, has avoided the man-on-horseback role. He has allowed the old ironheads to lead the party right back down the road to futility.

The President is being led around by people who have always been set against rejuvenation of the Republican approach to our national problems. Dwight Eisenhower represented the fresh newness of Republican policy in the Chicago convention days, and he defeated the stale accumulation of wornout policies there. In the campaign he went on to defeat the staleness that had settled into 20 years of Democratic Party management of national affairs.

What has happened since in the recapture of the reins of power by Republican agents of the vested interests was spread before the Nation's voters by means of senatorial debate on the atomic-energy bill. The Senators who attacked made it plain—glaringly plain—that even the progressive features of the essentially conservative Republican strength of recent years have been thrown into the trash can in this shifting of control at the highest levels.

Senator Albert Gore, a Tennessee Democrat, has led a campaign against great odds to force the Senate and the Nation to see what has happened. Strength grew as other Senators and newspapers far from the scene began to see outlines of the bigger picture and as the public responded.

This debate that became a filibuster held up where all could see a most remarkable return to free enterprise without free enterprise. It showed the Atomic Energy Commission required to buy private power without bidding among producers of private power. If there had been a sincere wish for private enterprise, there would have been the competition that is the distinctive mark of true private enterprise, as the senatorial orators said.

It showed specifications written for one company—and one alone—the firm chosen by a power trust back in the saddle.

It showed this deal of such doubtful legality when it was made that the administration was required to amend the law in the midst of the debate, to make it legal.

The attackers showed that this deal included an attempt to excuse a business firm from Federal income taxes, and they obtained from the Senate the Gore amendment under which the income tax law remains—even for the power barons. Our tax laws apply to everyone, and any exemption would have been a betrayal of this principle.

The objecting Senators forced the administration to permit the AEC to use atomic fuel for its own production of power, when the original bill would have turned over entirely this method of producing electricity to private power companies.

If the AEC becomes a power producer it will offer its power first to publicly owned power distributors. This has been the law for Federal powerplants since 1906. It was left out of the power lobby plans for the AEC, and the protesting Senators forced it into the law.

Senatorial attacks on these points have had the overall result of building an attack on administration power policy as a giveaway program.

Public power against the Power Trust is a familiar case before the bar of public opinion. Having been soundly and repeatedly defeated, the power moguls might have reformed their ways and come back into politics with a scrubbed-up face. Instead they have undertaken to put over their old ways again.

Caught in the spotlight of the Senate debate, they bulled ahead to a margin of rollcall votes, while preenting the public power advocates and the real progressives of both parties with ammunition that will be fired from political battlefronts for years ahead.

Seattle, Wash., *August 4, 1954.*

Dear Senator Morse: Thank you for doing so much in trying to prevent the atomic giveaway. Although I am no longer a resident of Oregon and cannot give you the support of my vote, I have followed your career with great interest and approval.

The words used to describe a real patriot are rather tired and worn now—and misused; so let me say that I wish there were more Americans with your drive and ideals. Keep up the good work, and thank you again.

Very sincerely,
Mrs. Phyllis D. Schromer.

August 11, 1954.

Senator Wayne Morse,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: We (my family and I) wish to thank you for your valiant efforts to defeat the atomic giveaway.

If it is possible to continue the fight against it during the closing weeks of the Senate, I hope you will keep trying to prevent its final passage.

Thanks again for your many good fights for the people of the United States.

Sincerely,
Sarah Smith.
Brooklyn, N. Y.

August 7, 1954.

Dear Senator: Again we say we would be derelict in our civic duty if we failed to remind you of your incessant zeal to most faithfully serve the public interest. You are a shining beacon light of hope.

May your health continue to be robust and vigorous. And may you continue to lead the way and show the light to the perpetual dissenters.

God bless you and yours eternally.

Your devoted,
Olive M. and Arthur A. Temple.
Denver, Colo.

New York, N. Y., *July 26, 1954.*

Dear Sir: Again you are in the forefront of a fight for the people. For this, thank you, and I hope you will keep up the fight.

Thank you again, and I wish I could vote for you.

Sincerely and respectfully yours,
Miss Clara Wander.

San Jose, Calif., *August 2, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
National Capitol,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: The people of the United States and coming generations owe you a great debt of gratitude for your splendid fight to keep atomic power in the hands of the people where it belongs.

Many thanks for your strong stand on such an important issue.

Sincerely,
Vernon A. Wallace,

Chappaqua, N. Y., *July 17, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse of Oregon:

Honorable Senator: The common people are with you in your courageous fight against giving away the $8 billion atomic energy to private monopolies which was paid by the American taxpayers. The present administration instead of representing the people at large represent the monopolies. You are following Senator George W. Norris, of Nebraska, deceased, who was the father of public power. Keep up your fight—the people are with you.

Harry Weinberg.

Seattle, Wash., *August 2, 1954.*

Senator Morse,
Senate Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Sir: I for one, wish to thank you for the stand you are taking against the atomic giveaway. Every American I have talked to is in agreement with you. More and more people are seeing that this administration is one for big business and not for the people.

You have the thanks of my family and we know you will keep fighting for what is right for us.

Very sincerely,

Gloria Warner.

Borough of Ambridge,
Beaver County, Pa., August 3, 1954.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
Senator, Senate Office Chambers,
Washington, D. C.

Honorable Senator: Again I extend to you my sincere congratulations for the magnificent stand you made with respect to the administration's atomic legislation.

Regarding the new housing legislation signed by the President, I would appreciate very much if you would forward me a copy of the new act for my consideration.

Thanking you in advance and with best wishes, I remain

Respectfully yours,

Walter Wuycik.

Pendleton, Oreg., *July 14, 1954.*

Wayne L. Morse,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Suggest use your considerable influence all legitimate ways"oppositic a AEC power measure.

Regards,

Burnett.

Washington, D. C., *August 6, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse:
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Believe compromises made in atomic-energy bill in conference defeat all major gains you fought so hard for in Senate debate. McMahon Act should not be superseded by bad legislation. Sincerely and strongly urge you oppose conference report.

Wallace J. Campbell,
Cooperative League of U. S. A.

Detroit, Mich., *July 22, 1954.*

Senator Morse,
United States Senate:

Keep up the good work; we are with you 100 percent.

Adam and Ida George.

Chicago, Ill., *July 22, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building:

We appreciate and encourage your around-the-clock efforts on the atomic energy bill. More than ever before, great vigilance is necessary to protect the reckless giving away of the resources of the people.

Independent Voters of Illinois.

Lexington, Mass., *July 22, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building:

The American people thank you for your great courage.

Marion Coletta.

Ads, Oreg., *August 12, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator: We want you to know that we are proud of our junior Senator. We are proud of the way you stood up for the taxpayers' interest in the recent filibuster fight in the Senate, over the atomic energy in connection with hydroelectric power.

The dams and power plants that the taxpayers' money paid for is the property of the taxpayers—the public, and we are glad that we have a champion from our own district who could and did stand up to the test. More power to that wonderful voice of yours.

Our thanks to you and the other Senators who were in there pitching with you. Our hearts are with you and our votes when you need them (they are considerable).

These lines to let you know that we appreciate your efforts and are keeping posted by radio and newspapers on what is going on in Washington.

Sincerely yours,

E. L. Worthylake.

Portland, Oreg., *August 17, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: I want you to know how much I appreciate the outstanding job you are doing in connection with the Atomic Energy bill. I have heard many favorable comments on the fine things you are accomplishing.

Very truly yours,

Rowena Hoven.

Provost Marshal's Office,
Stead Air Force Base,
Reno, Nev., July 27, 1954.

The Honorable Wayne Morse,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: Normally the electorate concerns itself with congressional representation every other November, and I am no less apathetic than most. However, reading these past few days of your fight to save a valuable natural resource, I have commenced to wonder how much encouragement comes from the citizens who are enlightened enough on the subject that they should be appreciative. So I have decided that I, for one, will send along my applause.

I prefer to think that a cogent public is warmly encouraging the men in Congress who, like yourself, support their welfare over that of select groups. But there are times when momentary doubts assail. So I give a rousing cheer.

In this hope, I remain, with greatest admiration, yours,

Sincerely,

Paul R. Carlsten.

San Pedro, Calif.,
July 23, 1954.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator: I have hesitated to write you, as I realize you are a very busy man, day and night, protecting the United States from reactionary forces.

But I want you to know that I, and millions of others who will not write you, appreciate, and thank you very much, for your efforts in behalf of all the people.

Again thanking you, I am

Sincerely,

H. Brown.

Austin, Tex., *July 28, 1954.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
United States Senate, Senate Office
Building, Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: Let me begin this rather unorthodox letter by stating that I do not expect an answer to this letter nor do I want one. You and your staff have enough work to do in the interests of the people of this country.

I have watched with a great deal of interest your participation in the debate on the President's various programs in the Senate. From your opposition to the tidelands giveaway to your recent opposition to the atomic energy bill you have fought consistently on the side of the people. I only wish that there were more Senators with your convictions in the Senate.

Rest assured that there are millions of people in this country who believe as you believe and who do not think that the President and his various giveaway programs are interested in what a majority of the people want. He will have ample opportunity to see this in the next congressional elections. I know that the people as such support you, and I personally want to commend you for the part you have played in uplifting the standards of the Senate.

Best wishes for continued success. You have the respect and support of the people of this country.

With best wishes, I remain,

Sincerely,

Roscoe Martin, Jr.

Eugene, Oreg., *August 10, 1954.*

Dear Senator Morse: Even Mr. Tugman's newspaper has been unable to convince me that your efforts in behalf of the atomic-energy program are not heroic.

I and many others appreciate greatly the vigor, and direction, of the representation you are giving us in Washington. It takes a special kind of man not only to vote according to his beliefs but to put himself out to such an extent as to take physical action.

Sincerely,

Mrs. Carol Richman.

Portland, Oreg., *July 22, 1954.*

Hon. Wayne L. Morse,
Senate Office Building:

Oregon A. F. of L. on record opposing release to private utilities of patents on reactors held by Atomic Energy Commission and urges control of atomic-energy development and use be kept exclusively in hands of Federal Government including development for peacetime uses. Resolution being airmailed.

J. T. Marr,
Executive Secretary, Oregon State Federation of Labor.

Portland, Oreg.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Sir: I am a regular listener of your weekly program Senator Morse Reports to the People of Oregon. I would like to commend you on your fine broadcast of Sunday, July 25, in which you explained the glaring faults of the administration's atomic-energy bill. I am a political science major at Portland State College and I am pleased to hear of your gallant stand.

A job well done, Senator Morse.

Sincerely yours,

Calvin G. Billeter.

California Farm Research
and Legislative Committee,
Santa Clara, Calif., August 6, 1954.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: We wish to commend you for the courageous battle you are waging to protect the people's interest in their atomic resources.

Our committee concurs in the atomic-energy statement issued by 17 national farm, labor, co-op, and public-resource agencies. We urge that atomic-power bills be laid aside until the American people have had greater opportunity to learn the scope and purpose of such legislation.

Telegrams to this effect were sent to Senators William Knowland and Thomas Kuchel and Representative Chet Holifield.

If it is not too much trouble, will you send a copy of the Congressional Record of July 27, containing the letter signed by our chairman to Joe C. Lewis, Post Office Box 64, Buttonwillow, Calif.

Keep up the good fight.

Sincerely,

Grace McDonald
Mrs. Grace McDonald,
Executive Secretary.

August 3, 1954.

Senator: Thanks a thousand times for the gallant struggle in my behalf on the AEC bill. The people of Oregon should be very proud of you. Perhaps Colorado will elect a statesman in the next election—someone to give you some assistance.

Yours truly,

M. D. Remley.
Denver, Colo.

July 22, 1954.

Dear Senator: Let me add my little voice to the many I hope you are hearing to thank you for the fight you are carrying on against the power lobby. I feel that if more citizens knew more of the activities of the big power trust, it would be a big influence in the next election.

Larry Supove,
Consulting Engineer.
Portland, Oreg.

Monmouth Junction, N. J.,
August 9, 1954.

Hon. Senator Morse:

Energy to run my wife's hearing aid costs $3.25 for 2 to 3 weeks' supply.

This high cost is due to monopolistic practices and patents of private enterprise. This is the American way. She could go without the aid if we were not willing to pay.

Now I am a small part of my Government's enterprise as a taxpayer whose taxes helped bring the energy of the atom under the control of man.

Thanks many times for your interest in protecting my interests from predatory private enterprise. Make them pay development costs plus dividends on the capital investment.

Don't let Congress give away the taxpayers substance.

Yours,

Herbert E. Wright.

Phoenix Mutual Life Insurance Co.,
Hartford, Conn., August 13, 1954.
Hon. Wayne L. Morse,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator: I wish to write you to congratulate you on the nice job you did in your effort to stay off the atomic giveaway. Thanks a lot for all that you did on this piece of legislation.

Sincerely yours,

Roy A. Gage.

Pacific Supply Cooperative,
Walla Walla, Wash., August 16, 1954.
Wayne Morse,
United States Senator, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: Just a personal letter to express my appreciation for the fine fight you made on the atomic energy bill. I concur fully with the position which you took on the measure, and was very happy to see that the efforts of yourself and your colleagues were successful.

With kind regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

Chas. Baker,
Secretary-Treasurer.

Washington, D. C., *August 10, 1954.*
Hon. Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Urge you vote to recommit atomic energy bill with instructions to conferees to insist on Senate amendments in regard to compulsory licensing of patents and adequate safeguards on preference rights of rural electric cooperatives.

James G. Patton,
President, National Farmers Union.

Portland, Oreg., *August 17, 1954.*
Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: Congratulations on the atomic energy bill vote. You have done a magnificent job. This would have given Harry great satisfaction and pride. Your weekly letter is a valuable source of up to the minute news.

Sincerely,

Lena Kenin.

Northwest Business Research
and Advisory Service,
Portland, Oreg., August 11, 1954.
Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: I thank you for the magnificent fight which you and a few colleagues put up against the atomic energy giveaway bill. I feel that this fight was a personal one for me and thousands of other Oregon voters. I am one of those who realize that you have sacrificed your health, and years of your life in our service. We are living in the days of monopoly control of Congress and if it were not for the determined efforts of the small band of liberals our entire national heritage would be given away to the privileged classes.

Again my personal thanks and best wishes.

Yours sincerely,

Laurence E. Gage.

Empire, Oreg., *August 14, 1954.*

Dear Senator Morse: Congratulations and thanks for your battle over the people's rights in that atomic energy bill. We are proud and happy to call such a farseeing man our Senator.

Yours very truly,

Chas. L. and Mary A. Hilliker.

Pilot Rock, Oreg., *August 18, 1954.*
Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: We are writing this letter to offer you our very sincere thanks for the determined fight you made for us, as part of the American people, on the atomic energy bill.

I know none of us can realize how much of your physical strength you put into such a battle but we do appreciate it. We are very proud that our State has a man like yourself representing it.

Sincerely yours,

Vernon and Mildred Vedder.

Omaha, Nebr., *August 19, 1954.*

Dear Senator Morse: We are not in Oregon but this will inform you that you have a couple of constituents in Nebraska. We have liked you since you first declared your independence.

Glad we didn't miss you on Meet the Press last Sunday p. m.

According to the enclosed clipping you may still be in Washington.

Good luck and best wishes where ever you are.

Most sincerely,

Mrs. Rose Quackenbush.

North Bend, Oreg., *July 27, 1954.*
Senator Wayne L. Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

My Dear Senator: Although you have no doubt already had a look at the Coos Bay Times, of present date, I wanted to be sure you had a look at the editorial concerning yourself in today's edition, which is built around Mr. Leonard Lyons' column in the Washington Post.

It seems to me at long last the Times and perhaps a lot of people in the State of Oregon are at long last getting their heads unstuck from the sand that has mired them for so long.

I will not waste your very valuable time in commenting on the editorial for it speaks for itself.

I would like to compliment you on the great fight, yourself, Senator Anderson and the other liberal Senators are putting up in regards to the AEC bill.

Best wishes to you, Senator, in all of your undertakings.

Sincerely yours,

Ernest D. Wieler.

August 10, 1954.

Mr. Wayne Morse,
Senator From Oregon.

Dear Wayne: Just a line to let you know I follow your good work every day. Wayne, some day the whole world will realize how important your good work is; you certainly must be close to God. I believe, Wayne, the rivers belong to God, the ocean belongs to God, and God has created this wonderful universe for the benefit of all mankind. We are only here a short time, and if we had more Senators working for the benefit of mankind then I believe peace would cover the world.

We all remember Abraham Lincoln, the roadblocks he had to cross, yet the wonderful work he did will live to eternity. So Wayne, I know you have much opposition, but I believe some day the ones that are opposing you will realize the work you are doing is unselfish and perhaps a little too far-reaching for some to understand. Yet Wayne, if anyone on this earth would be fair in judging you, I am sure they would have to give you credit for being an outstanding example for honesty and for the good things that God has created.

The oil that flows on the shores of the Pacific belongs to God for the benefit of all mankind, not for the selfish ones. So I want to thank you so very much for your untiring work and I know the God of love will guide you and show you the way to benefit all the world.

Sincerely,

John F. Roberts.
Portland, Oreg.

Empire, Oreg., *August 10, 1954.*
Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Sir: Many of us, I believe I can truthfully say most of us, greatly appreciate your untiring efforts in our behalf and will do our small best toward giving you democratic support after (in) the November election.

If fire could be fought with fire by increasing Federal projects instead of decreasing them, Federal tax reduction given to increase purchasing power of the worker rather than tax relief at the top, the Taft-Hartley law invalidated in favor of a slightly modified Wagner Act (perhaps under a new name), it would do more to prevent the spread of communism among the working people than all the McCarthy investigations that could be piled up. Thinking folk, of whom the number is increasing, are not going to plan overthrow of a government in which they have a share and a "square deal."

You are working for that square deal for us. We thank you and wish you future success.

Mr. and Mrs. Chas. L. Hilliker.

Los Angeles, *August 21, 1954.*

Dear Sir: This is simply to express my thanks for the courage and skill you showed during the last Congress. Liberals everywhere are indebted to you.

Very truly yours,

Ross von Metzke.

Purcell & Nelson,
Washington, D. C., August 13, 1954.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
United States Senator,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Morse: I have been meaning to thank you for sending me your collection of speeches on wiretapping. As a matter of fact, a friend of mine in St. Louis had mentioned them to me, and I was very glad to see a copy.

In this instance I see your work has been successful, at least for this Congress.

I do want to express my admiration for the fight you put up against the atomic energy power bill last month. I was on vacation at the time, and had the opportunity to read your speeches as reported in the New York Times. For once the press gave you decent coverage, I thought.

You will be interested, I'm sure, in hearing that Gerry Levenberg is serving as a lieutenant in the Procurement Section of the Air Force at Wright-Patterson Field. He has just recently become father of a little girl.

With kindest regards.

Respectfully yours,

Franklin M. Schultz.

Appropriation Acts of the 83d Congress, Second Session—Part IV

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 18, 1954

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent, I am extending my remarks to continue my report to my constituents on the appropriation acts of the 83d Congress, 2d session, as follows:

PUBLIC LAW 428

H. R. 8583, Independent Offices Appropriation Act

A. Appropriates $5,651,770,063 for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955. Continues antistrike provisions and veterans reemployment rights.

B. Item.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

	Appropriations
Compensation of the President	$150,000
The White House Office	1,895,000
Executive Mansion and Grounds	366,200
Bureau of the Budget	3,382,500
Council of Economic Advisers	285,000
National Security Council	215,000
Office of Defense Mobilization	2,161,000
Emergency fund for the President (national defense)	150,000
Expenses of management improvement	300,000
Total, Executive Office of the President	8,904,700

H. R. 8583, Independent Offices Appropriation Act—Continued

INDEPENDENT OFFICES

	Appropriations
Advisory Committee on Weather Control, salaries and expenses	$120,000
American Battle Monuments Commission:	
Salaries and expenses	775,000
Construction of memorials and cemeteries	3,500,000
Total, American Battle Monuments Commission	4,275,000
Atomic Energy Commission:	
Operating expenses	1,098,962,300
Plant and equipment	110,882,400
Total, Atomic Energy Commission	1,209,844,700
Civil Service Commission:	
Salaries and expenses	15,575,600
Investigations of United States citizens for employment by international organizations	400,000
Annuities, Panama Canal construction employees and Lighthouse Service widows	2,354,000
Payment to civil service retirement and disability fund for increases in annuities	29,623,000
Total, Civil Service Commission	47,952,600
Federal Communications Commission, salaries and expenses	6,544,400
Federal Power Commission, salaries and expenses	4,150,000
Federal Trade Commission, salaries and expenses	4,045,000
General Accounting Office, salaries and expenses	31,981,000
General Services Administration:	
Operating expenses, Public Buildings Service	95,900,000
Emergency operating expenses	15,647,000
Repair, improvement, and equipment of federally owned buildings outside the District of Columbia	12,000,000
Operating expenses, Federal Supply Service	2,600,000
Expenses, general supply fund	12,066,800
Operating expenses, National Archives and Records Service	5,000,000
Administrative operations	3,789,500
Hospital facilities in the District of Columbia (liquidation of contract authorization)	4,500,000
Buildings management fund	500,000
Remodeling the Congress Street Post Office, Chicago, Ill	
Total, General Services Administration	152,063,300
Housing and Home Finance Agency:	
Office of the Administrator:	
Salaries and expenses	2,868,500
Capital grants for slum clearance and urban redevelopment	39,000,000
Total, Office of the Administrator	41,868,500
Public Housing Administration:	
Administrative expenses	6,950,000
Annual contributions	63,950,000
Total, Public Housing Administration	70,900,000
Total, Housing and Home Finance Agency	112,768,500
Indian Claims Commission, salaries and expenses	117,000
Interstate Commerce Commission:	
Salaries and expenses	
General expenses	9,816,000
Defense transport activities	170,000
Railroad safety	974,500
Locomotive inspection	709,500
Total, Interstate Commerce Commission	11,670,000
Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin, contribution to the Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin	8,000
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics:	
Salaries and expenses	51,000,000
Construction and equipment	4,620,000
Total, National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	55,620,000
National Capital Housing Authority, maintenance and operation of properties	43,000
National Capital Planning Commission:	
Salaries and expenses	$143,000
Land acquisition	545,000
Total, National Capital Planning Commission	688,000
National Science Foundation, salaries and expenses	12,250,000
Renegotiation Board, salaries and expenses	4,500,000
Securities and Exchange Commission, salaries and expenses	4,750,000
Selective Service System, salaries and expenses	29,003,063
Small Business Administration:	
Salaries and expenses	2,025,000
Revolving fund, Small Business Administration	25,000,000
Total, Small Business Administration	27,025,000
Smithsonian Institution:	
Salaries and expenses	3,000,000
National Gallery of Art, salaries and expenses	1,300,000
Total, Smithsonian Institution	4,300,000
Subversive Activities Board, salaries and expenses	170,000
Tariff Commission, salaries and expenses	1,327,000
Tennessee Valley Authority:	
Salaries, expenses, and construction	120,000,000
Resource development	
Total, Tennessee Valley Authority	120,000,000
The Tax Court of the United States, salaries and expenses	1,000,000
Veterans' Administration:	
General operating expenses	167,672,300
Medical administration and miscellaneous operating expenses	14,654,000
Inpatient care	590,992,500
Outpatient care	82,134,000
Maintenance and operation of supply depots	1,654,000
Compensation and pensions	2,435,000,000
Readjustment benefits	387,000,000
Military and naval insurance	4,932,000
Hospital and domiciliary facilities	47,000,000
National service life insurance	30,570,000
Servicemen's indemnities	30,000,000
Grants to the Republic of the Philippines	1,564,000
Major alterations, improvements and repairs	3,480,000
Veterans' miscellaneous benefits	
Total, Veterans' Administration	3,796,652,800
Total, title I, Executive Office of the President and independent offices	5,651,770,063

Unemployment in the Coal Mines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, finally the efforts of the United Mine Workers and the coal industry have been recognized, at least to a slight degree, by our Government. For years the Government has turned a deaf ear to the critical and dangerous plight in which the coal industry in the United States finds itself. Our Government apparently does not yet completely comprehend the grave disaster which hovers over our coal industry in America, but for the first time in many years sane and constructive steps are being taken. However, these steps are only a fraction of what is needed to revive the coal industry, which is so necessary to our American economy.

The United States Foreign Operations Administration is negotiating for the purchase of 10 million tons of American coal to be sent abroad. I called Harold Stassen, Director of FOA, and requested that the coal operators of Indiana be given an opportunity to bid on part of this order. I was assured that this would be done.

Another step which has given us some occasion for hope is that President Eisenhower has named a top level committee:

First. To recommend action on the Nation's requirements for defense purposes of all forms of fuel;

Second. William Hahman, of the United States Bureau of Mines, a career man in Government and an expert on the coal problems, has been appointed as staff director of this committee.

Senator **George W. Malone**, of Nevada, chairman of the Subcommittee on Minerals, Materials, and Fuels Economics of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee of the Senate, has launched an investigation of the country's fuel resources, with special emphasis on coal.

One of the greatest disasters which has ever happened to our coal industry is the importation of residual fuel oil from Venezuela. It seems that our country in its zeal to help or bolster the economy of foreign countries has lost sight of home commodities. The domestic coal industry is suffering from such neglect. In 1953 alone, 136 million barrels of residual fuel oil were imported into this country. This would have meant $75 million to the American miners. The transportation of this coal would have meant $88 million to American railroads, one-half of which would have been paid to railroad labor. These industries and workmen pay taxes to support America. Venezuela makes no such contribution. In addition, Venezuela is now building walls against the United States exporting goods to their country.

This situation is not a political matter, because both parties have been deaf to the cry of the American coal industry.

I introduced H. R. 3912, which was aimed at curtailing the importation of residual fuel oil. We finally got to vote on the Simpson bill, which was similar to the one which I introduced but included other commodities. Although this measure was defeated, I am proud that I voted and worked for the bill. I have voted against the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act extension each time it has come to the floor of the House as a protest against this mistreatment of the American coal industry.

I also introduced H. R. 8441, which proposed that the retirement age under the Social Security System be reduced to 60 years. This change is especially needed in the mining industry, and it would have stimulated employment by encouraging earlier retirement.

Mr. Speaker, the welfare of the coal industry in America has been ignored for too many years. The only bright light in the country's dismal failure to properly recognize the problems of the coal industry is that our Government is at last becoming aware of conditions which have been wrecking the coal industry, and is beginning to think in terms of the fundamental economic relation of coal to our whole industrial system. Everyone knows that the quantity of oil and gas in the world, especially in the United States, is limited. How many years our supply will last, no one knows; but we do know that if a war today should shut out the South American and Near East oil, there would be gasoline rationing in the United States within a short time. Millions of furnaces now served by oil would of necessity be converted to coal, or they would grow cold.

The production of power in the United States will become increasingly dependent upon coal. The further development of hydroelectric power is limited in the United States.

Recently, when I pointed out to a group this almost complete disregard for the coal industry, one person said, "I realize that sometime we will need coal badly, but when that time comes is time enough to start digging it." Such ignorance is appalling. Coal miners cannot be created by merely pressing a button. It takes years of training to make a good coal miner. The young men who should be learning to mine coal are leaving the mining areas because there is no work there. In Indiana miners are often the sons and grandsons of miners. They are real Americans from pioneer stock that believe in honesty and freedom, and are not guilty of "featherbedding." The American miner produces more coal per capita by far than any other miner on earth. However, unless some affirmative action is taken there will be no one to mine the coal when that great emergency and need of coal arrives.

The following is a quotation from John L. Lewis in the United Mine Workers Journal of January 1, 1952:

> In times of war, the United States coal industry has always been called on to supply the needs not only of domestic industry but also of our allies. This it has done—

He observed—

> without any Government subsidy. Yet, in peacetime, our foreign coal market is allowed to vanish as foreign shippers take it over.

If America ever suffers for fuel it will not be because the fuel is not available. There are known deposits of coal in the United States which will last us for 2,000 years. There will be coal many centuries after the oil and gas are gone. As for power produced by atomic energy, the fact is that the atomic plants in the United States are one of the largest users of coal. A recent United States Geological Survey report on coal resources says:

> The contribution of coal to the total production of energy in this country must inevitably be enlarged to include some of the needs now served by petroleum and natural gas.

It should be self-evident that there is much which can be and should be accomplished for the coal industry and American miners. The future is still dark in this industry, but as I have pointed out, there is a ray of hope which is encouraging. I intend to continue my fight to see that everything possible is done to revitalize the coal industry and to help the coal miners.

To Secure These Rights the Fight Must Go On

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 19, 1954

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, at the close of the first session of this Congress, on August 3, 1953, I reviewed for my constituents the accomplishments, and lack thereof, of our distinguished body. I pointed out the great divergence between the pledges and promises by the Republican Party and its presidential candidate in 1952 and their performance or lack thereof as the majority party in power in 1953.

Another legislative year has now gone by. It is time again to take a look. Perhaps not a New Look, but certainly a good look, even though we know it will not look good. I intend today to reverse the usual form of stating first the facts and then the conclusion.

CONCLUSION

When the 80th Congress was dubbed the worst Congress of history, our contemporaries overlooked that worse than a "do-nothing Congress" is a Congress that does nothing but give away the birthright of a nation.

The 83d Congress and this Republican administration have earned the right to be charged with doing nothing but giving away the people's rights and property.

The balance of this report will be devoted to documentation of the foregoing conclusion.

HUMAN RIGHTS

This is an excellent time to refresh our memories with a quotation from our Declaration of Independence of these immortal words:

> We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed, that whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the right of the people to alter or to abolish it, and to institute new government, laying its foundation on such principles and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their health and happiness.

Those principles have been written into our Constitution as rights accorded to our citizens, and with restrictions against any impairment by executive, judicial or legislative action.

If they are to be changed, that change can be accomplished only by constitutional amendment.

Nevertheless, we have seen during these last 2 years, a complete disregard of those basic concepts.

Fear runs wild, and hysteria has taken over.

Laws have been enacted in violation of article I of the Constitution, prohibiting ex post facto laws and bills of attainder.

Laws and executive orders violative of the Bill of Rights, as contained in our Constitution, have been enacted and promulgated.

I have done my best to resist such utterly un-American conduct, first because it is fundamentally wrong and secondly, because it strengthens our enemies and weakens our will to withstand their totalitarian philosophy.

I favor the right, under safeguard of court order or search warrant, to obtain evidence, even by wiretapping, to convict criminals. I opposed the bill to give the right to use such evidence previously obtained without court order or search warrant.

I favor empowering the courts to require witnesses to testify in criminal proceedings by granting them immunity where otherwise some other criminal might escape trial. I oppose giving that right to Congress, because Congress is a legislative body and not a court. Congress is supposed to investigate solely for the purpose of legislating; it is not the FBI; it is not a grand jury; it is not a petty jury; it is not a judge; it is not a prosecutor; it is not a President with power to pardon. No legislative body in our entire American history has ever been blocked from legislating because a witness or group of witnesses refused to testify.

The best evidence that I am correct in that statement is that despite witnesses who have refused to testify about communism, the Congress has, nevertheless, enacted a law finding that the Communist Party is not a political party but a criminal conspiracy.

I agree with the finding, but urged that the law was a very bad one because it usurps the function of the judiciary.

The bill to outlaw the Communist Party violates every principle of good government. Aside from being a bill of attainder and an ex post facto law, it denies not only free speech but free thought; it denies the right of assembly and the right of petition for redress of wrongs. It is a completely totalitarian technique.

The manner in which these bills were foisted upon the Congress was even worse. Not only was gag rule imposed by limitation of debate, but they were brought before the House without having had adequate hearings, without reports for guidance of the Members, without copies of the bills, and under rules permitting no amendments.

That is the horribly terrifying manner in which a heretofore deliberative body struck down our liberties and impaired our freedom by pushing through in the closing days of this session bills which do violence to the things for which men and women have fought and died since before Magna Carta.

I attribute these bad bills to what has come to be known as McCarthyism. Those who contend that McCarthyism has alerted the country to the danger of communism must now concede that the direct result has been the creation of an unhealthy atmosphere of fear and suspicion which may easily destroy the very vitals of good government.

LIBERALISM VERSUS CONSERVATISM

Our President has repeatedly told us that as to human values and human rights, he is liberal, but as to property and property rights, he is conservative. It sounds good. I wish it were true. I will not repeat here the many failures of President Eisenhower to perform the pledges of Candidate Eisenhower. They have been previously documented. Let us today analyze what has happened under our President's leadership and thereby make apparent his and the Republican Party's fulfillment of the converse of his declared policy.

OPERATION GIVEAWAY, OR BUNDLES FOR BILLIONAIRES

The gift of the submerged-oil lands was camouflaged as a return to certain States of their property. You cannot return to a State what it never had. The United States Supreme Court three times ruled that these lands and rights never belonged to any State. As a matter of fact, most of them were bought with funds from the United States Treasury.

If Congress and the President had not given them away for the benefit of the big oil companies and not the few States involved as is claimed, the revenues from those lands would have been used to educate the children of every State of the Union.

OUR NATIONAL RESOURCES: CREEPING FAVORITISM

The Nation's resources have been the subject of a whole series of gigantic giveaways, beginning with the offshore oil bill endorsed by President Eisenhower.

Perhaps the most incredible giveaway of all, deals with atomic energy. The people of the country have spent $12 billion of their tax money in developing an atomic-energy program. The Eisenhower administration and the Republican-controlled Congress, however, chose to set the wheels in motion for giving away the rights to atomic energy to the few private power monopolies. The most fantastic Republican proposition was the Dixon-Yates contract whereby a certain private group was granted contract rights to provide power without competitive bidding; it was arbitrarily selected for the benefit, although other firms offered to do the job more cheaply. The Eisenhower administration even offered to pay all their taxes for them and guarantee them against any loss. I am proud of my vote against the atomic energy giveaway.

The efforts to dispose of our synthetic-rubber and tin-smelting plants and the attempt to wreck TVA and our entire public power program, are more of the giveaway philosophy in action.

MONEY: HARDER TO GET

I spent considerable time and effort in opposing the Republican giveaway to bankers through higher interest rates. The so-called hard-money policy actually made money harder to get. Republican bankers took over the Treasury Department and promptly proceeded to raise the interest rate to the highest level since 1933. They sold Government bonds below par value to bankers who profited immensely from unnecessarily higher interest rates. I joined with other Members of Congress in protesting this giveaway to bankers, and my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD are quite numerous on this subject.

Not only did this hard-money policy constitute excessive profit for bankers, but it was perhaps the principal cause of the recession we have had. With interest rates excessively high, consumers and small-business men could not borrow money. As a result, mass unemployment occurred, causing a serious recession because of a lack of consumer purchasing power to buy the products of American industry.

The Eisenhower administration was disastrously slow in taking action against this recession; indeed, we still have close to 4 million Americans unemployed, with many more in jobs at only part time. Because of our constant pounding, the administration finally reversed itself and repudiated the hard-money policy, although its evil effects are regrettably still with us.

Call me a prophet of gloom, Mr. President. But it is your Secretary of Commerce who says that the gross national production is down $9 billion from 1953 to 1954, and it is your Federal Reserve Board that says that industrial production is down $12 billion from 1953 to 1954.

VETERANS' RIGHTS

Part of the liberal Republican policies was the increase of interest rates on veterans' mortgages. This was among the very first accomplishments of this administration.

As soon as we achieved a reversal of the hard-money policy, I started a campaign to decrease the veterans' loan interest rates to what they had been.

The chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, on the floor of the House, promised me such legislation would be enacted.

It has not even been reported to the Congress.

We did succeed in enacting a bill to increase veterans' pensions by 5 percent. Liberal, indeed. A monthly pension of $50 is now $52.50.

But all veterans' services—medical care, hospitalization, and the like—have been cut and cut more than 5 percent.

That was not being illiberal as to humans; it was being conservative as to money.

I have consistently supported measures to adequately compensate our Armed Forces and veterans for the sacrifices they make in the Nation's behalf. I have introduced bills providing free postage on letters to and from members of our Armed Forces, extra compensation for prisoners of the Korean war, income-tax exemption for members of the Armed Forces, and various adjustments to secure equitable pensions, compensation, and retirement pay.

THE CONSUMER'S POCKETBOOK AND THE FARMERS' PLIGHT

During these 2 years of Republicanism, the cost of living has reached an all-time high, as any shopper can testify and as Government statistics prove in black and white. Coupled with this record high cost of living have been the hardships caused by the recession, so that many millions of Americans have suffered reductions in their standard of living.

Particularly pernicious has been the price of food. Consumers are forced to pay twice for their food, first in their tax bill to the Government and then in the marketplace. There is something radically wrong with the present agricultural program, as I have often said in Congress. Official reports show that food prices to the consumer have actually risen, while prices to farmers have declined.

Yet the Republican leadership has done nothing to remedy this situation. The only solution the Secretary of Agriculture offers is to reduce farmers' incomes below their present level, despite his claim that no appreciable reduction in consumer food prices will result. The proposal I have made is to try the Brannan plan for all agriculture, which Candidate Eisenhower termed "moral bankruptcy," but which President Eisenhower has instituted for the wool industry.

The President and his agriculture experts pretend that a flexible price support program will reduce prices to the consumer and increase income to the farmer.

They continue in that fallacious claim even after they have proved themselves wrong.

We have never had rigid but only flexible price supports for the dairy industry.

One of the first things done by our Secretary of Agriculture, with the hearty approval of our President, was to drop price supports for this industry from 90 percent of parity to 75 percent.

Result: The farmer is getting less and the consumer is paying more.

That is not caused by any failure of the cut in prices to seep through.

I am talking about milk produced one day and sold the next day for which the farmer receives less and the consumer pays more.

How can they urge that any different result can come from products that will be stored for long periods of time.

Do not be fooled by any pretense that we will store less of the staples or basic commodities.

On the basis of the representations of the President and his Secretary of Agriculture that we will store more, this very session of Congress increased the buying, lending, and storing authority of the President and his Department of Agriculture from $6½ billion to $10 billion. That is in addition to all the billions to be taken out of storage and not charged to the authorization.

LABOR AND UNEMPLOYMENT

One of the most important Republican pledges was amendment of the Taft-Hartley law. I favored the elimination of the Taft-Hartley Act's repressive measures against organized labor. I have always sought to promote legislation fair to labor and management.

But, as you may remember, President Eisenhower reversed himself when he refused to go along with Secretary of Labor Durkin's program for labor legislation, which followed Candidate Eisenhower's promises. Mr. Durkin resigned. The Republican leadership did not allow Congress to pass on the bills seeking to right the wrongs of the Taft-Hartley Act.

I sponsored a number of bills in the labor field, but as usual the Republican leadership did nothing. One called for equal pay for equal work and an end to discriminatory wage practices against women. Still another case where the Republicans did nothing was the minimum wage. My bill called for an increase in the minimum wage from 75 cents to $1 an hour. Secretary of Labor Mitchell agreed there should be an increase, but President Eisenhower's economic report flatly opposed one.

The most serious problem in this field is that apparently the Republican Party is not concerned over the tremendous loss of earnings of the wage earners of our country. I have called attention to the millions of Americans without jobs, largely due to the administration's hard-money policy, and to the millions more earning smaller wages and working only part time.

In the present Congress, I have been a cosponsor of H. R. 9430, the Forand bill, dealing with unemployment-compensation standards. I introduced H. R. 1270 to permit an increase in earnings without loss of social-security benefits. My bill, H. R. 1277, called for income-tax exemption on annuities and pensions, a principle adopted in part in the new tax law.

This administration takes credit for enactment of a broader social-security law, but soft-pedals the fact that this was a New Deal-Fair Deal measure that was supported and fought for by Democrats during all the years Republicans were resisting it as creeping socialism.

PUBLIC HEALTH AND HOUSING

I have always insisted that effective government action must be taken to improve the national health. Proper medical care must be put within the reach of every American. It is a duty of the Government to assure that and to do it without socializing medicine.

Yet the Eisenhower budget cut cancer research 28 percent, heart disease research 33 per cent, and the National Institutes of Health allotment 34 percent.

The so-called health reinsurance bill, the administration proposed, merely came to the aid of certain insurance companies, and did nothing for the health of the individual American man, woman, and child. The only public health in the bill was in its title. It made neither health nor insurance available to any citizen.

A similar situation was the Republican housing bill, which I called "a sham and a fraud upon the American people." I have long maintained a particular interest in public housing, and the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is replete with my attempts to try to provide decent housing for all Americans. I proposed amendments to legislation to deal with FHA abuses, but Republicans joined as a unit to vote them down, as they did my efforts to prevent discrimination against minority groups and to provide low interest rates on housing loans and veterans' home loans.

However, the Republican leadership insisted on guaranteeing excessive profits for builders and lenders and blocked my efforts and those of my colleagues to write into law even the minimum number of public-housing units requested by the President.

Here too, the only public housing in the bill was in the title. I think it is outrageous that the people of this country should be denied an opportunity to live in decent shelter.

The so-called housing bill passed this year prevents any new public housing and effectually kills the program. The same bill, however, makes it easier for the bankers, mortgage lenders, and builders to get richer. It contains no real safeguards against a repetition of the FHA scandals now filling the newspapers. It does contain a provision subsidizing the mortgage lenders, guaranteeing them not only against loss, but also a profit, all at Government risk.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS: BEWITCHED, BOTHERED, AND BEWILDERED

The present world situation is one of crisis, and I have wholeheartedly supported the administration's continuation of the bipartisan policies initiated by prior Democratic administrations, including the point 4 program and foreign aid. I have urged the strengthening of our greatest potential instrument for peace, the United Nations.

Our position in world affairs, however, has worsened markedly under Republican leadership. World communism has increased, and we have lost much of the good will painstakingly built up by Democratic administrations with the non-Communist nations of the world. The present administration has cut our military strength and has foolishly tried to compensate for it by a series of transparently hypocritical slogans.

No one knows where we stand on anything. If you add up all the pronouncements made by the President, the Vice President, the Secretary of State, and assorted Republican leaders, the sum total is bluff and backtalk, threat and retreat.

If the matter were not so very serious, we could sing Bewitched, Bothered, and Bewildered. We have learned a bitter lesson that Indochina could not be saved by the threats of Mr. Dulles and his colleagues. The situation in the Far East is bad.

The same muddled thinking is causing the situation in the Near East to worsen from day to day. This administration refuses to recognize that an enemy of a friend cannot be a friend and that you do not arm one who may use the arms against your friend.

I opposed the Bricker amendment, which would paralyze the President's right to conduct our foreign affairs.

I have supported the extension of reciprocal trade agreements and lower tariffs to aid our allies, even though the President backed down from the request he had termed "essential."

I have tried to build up friendly relations with the Latin American Republics, and with Italy, whose late Premier Alcide de Gasperi I had the pleasure of greeting on his visit here in 1951.

I have striven for peace in the Near East and the proper development of that new addition to the family of free nations, Israel.

OPERATION TAKEAWAY: GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

I have long felt that the Government should act as a model employer, and I have been deeply distressed by the methods of the present Republican administration as regards civil service. Aside from the reprehensible "numbers game" reflecting on many loyal civil servants, the Eisenhower administration has conducted the crudest sort of spoils system in taking away the jobs of Government employees for political reasons.

I have opposed the transfer of Government agencies from the New York and Brooklyn areas for political reasons, such as the Quartermaster Purchasing Agency and the diversion of contracts from the Brooklyn Naval Yard. I have sponsored bills to extend Federal compensation coverage to civil defense workers, for longevity step increases in the civil-service scale, to exempt compensation and pensions from income tax, to excuse Government employees from work to permit them time to vote in elections, and similar measures aimed at making the Government an employer of which every citizen can be proud.

I realize full well the inadequate salaries paid civil servants, and I have supported proposed increases. Having worked as a railway mail clerk, I know the hardships of postal employees, and on their behalf have testified before the House Committee on the Post Office and Civil Service.

It is nothing less than reprehensible to deny postal and Federal employees a 5-percent increase in their pay. From the President down, every Republican concedes that these loyal men and women are underpaid.

To deny them a pay increase unless we simultaneously provide additional revenue is a fraud and a sham. The subsidy given to business, by the Post Office Department alone, exceeds the entire amount of such increase. The dividend tax exemption alone exceeds the cost of such a pitifully inadequate increase. The additional depreciation tax cut to big business is about double that cost.

Conservative policy indeed, as to wages for the underpaid and liberal, as to tax cuts for the greedy.

IMMIGRATION

The inequities of our present immigration laws make a mockery of the splendid inscription on the base of the Statue of Liberty in New York Harbor. I was happy to serve as a cosponsor with Senator LEHMAN and many other Members of Congress of a bill designed to rewrite completely our immigration laws and to remove every trace of bigotry therefrom.

In addition, I introduced a bill calling for 240,000 special visas during the fiscal year 1953–54, and have sponsored many private bills for the relief of my constituents and their families.

In this field, as in so many others, the fight must go on, and I am confident that someday the faults of our present immigration system will be corrected. They still remain under President Eisenhower's administration, although candidate Eisenhower pledged prompt reform.

TAXES: THE TRICKLE-DOWN BILL

Surely no part of the activities of government is more important than taxation—and it is in this field that we find the most glaring and ineqitable giveaway.

Ninety-two percent of American families have good reason to be unhappy about the Republican tax bill that is now the law of the land, for they do not own any corporation stock. This Republican Congress and administration, however, have given tax benefits to the 8 percent of American families who do. In fact, the Republican program of "bundles for billionaires" especially benefits only six-tenths of 1 percent of American families, who own 80 percent of all publicly held stock.

The new Republican tax law provides benefits for stockholders, to the detriment of those Americans who earn their income through the sweat of their brow. Let us take as an example two families, each with husband, wife, and 1 child, and an income of $5,000. One of these two families has an income consisting entirely of wages or salary; its income tax will be $420. The other family, with income entirely from stock dividends, will pay an income tax of only $328. Thus unearned income is to be taxed less than earned income of the same size.

Of course, the tax difference increases greatly as income increases. Seventy-three and seven-tenths percent of taxpayers with incomes over $25,000 reported dividend receipts, while only 4.5 percent of taxpayers with incomes under $5,000 did so. It is primarily those with incomes of $10,000 or more per year who report dividend receipts. I might point out further that the Eisenhower administration asked for much greater benefits for stockholders, but Democrats in Congress managed to cut them down.

This Republican tax bill gives corporations, and the 20 percent of American taxpayers with incomes over $5,000, 77 percent of the total tax benefits. The 80 percent of American taxpayers with incomes less than $5,000 get only 23 percent of tax relief, thanks to Republicanism. It seems that the basis for Republican taxation is the old "trickle-down" idea, which we thought had disappeared forever; it gives the wealthy the benefit of tax relief although they need it least, in the hope that some of the benefit will trickle down to the great mass of the people. I am proud of my vote against the trickle-down tax bill.

I believe in giving tax relief to those who need it most. Ever since 1948 I have introduced resolutions calling for an increase in personal exemptions to $3,500 for heads of families as the first step in reducing taxes. But of course this was in conflict with the policy of the Republicans in control who insist on giving tax preference to those wealthy enough not to need it. One of my proposals, however, was partially carried into effect: An exemption will be provided for the first $1,200 of retirement income. Another of my proposals gained some ground, too; child-care allowances were provided, but much less than adequate and much less than I called for in my bill.

One further fact should be mentioned here about taxes, because Republicans are very unlikely to mention it themselves; the general 10-percent decrease in individual taxes that became effective the first of this year was passed by a Democratic Congress and signed by a Democratic President. The Republican tax bill is the one benefiting the well-to-do, and that is the giveaway I opposed.

Please understand, I am not opposed to eliminating double taxation. But I insist that inequities be remedied equally. The taxpayer earning interest on a savings account is entitled to the same relief as a taxpayer receiving dividends on stock. Furthermore, if we cannot remove all inequities because we will lose too much revenue, do not select one class as against another.

Do not increase and continue depreciation and depletion allowances at the expense of the wage earner. If we cannot save taxes for all, save taxes for him first. He spends all of his earnings almost as fast as he gets them. That is what makes for prosperity.

CIVIL RIGHTS AND BROTHERHOOD

Unfortunately, the Republican leadership defeated my efforts to prohibit discrimination in regard to public housing projects, and did nothing about my measures to prevent Federal aid to National Guard units practicing discrimination and to secure similar acts to guarantee civil rights for all.

I have always recognized the role of religion in life, and I have been privileged to participate in many religious and interfaith activities.

Although I recognize the separation of church and state guaranteed by our Constitution, I appreciate that the fundamental principles of civil rights are based on the brotherhood of man under the fatherhood of God.

We can legislate on these principles intelligently only if we understand them. We understand them only if we know religion.

That is why I constantly direct my colleagues' attention to the activities of all religious groups and do my utmost to stir them into action against all antireligious groups and activities.

In opposing McCarthyism and in deploring the current wave of hysteria in this country largely inspired thereby, I do not lessen my hatred of communism and all its works. My constituents may well remember the campaign of 1948 when my opponent was Lee Pressman, once described as the No. 1 Communist of the country. In that year the Communists spent a quarter of a million dollars trying to defeat me, and I was viciously attacked because of my vigorous anticommunism. I am happy to associate myself with the remarks of the Most Reverend Bernard J. Sheil, auxiliary bishop of Chicago and a leading Roman Catholic churchman and genuine anti-Communist. He said, among other things:

> I take it that a genuine anti-Communist is one who despises the court methods of the Communists. I take it he hates the Communist idea that one is guilty until proved innocent. I take it that the genuine anti-

> Communist is one who above all believes in the democratic procedures and is willing to stand by them, even in the face of great temptations to lose one's temper and to lose one's faith in the methods of freemen.

I am proud to stand alongside him in this vital fight for our civil liberties.

I am the only Member of any Congress who had an opponent who dared to avail himself of the privilege of running for office under the name and emblem of the Communist Party.

I am also proud of the autographed photograph given me by one of the great statesmen of the free anti-Communist world, the late Premier Alcide de Gasperi of Italy, for my efforts in behalf of Italy's fight against communism. Indeed, when I think that a certain Senator first discovered communism in 1950, 2 years after I had opposed and defeated communism in a congressional election; when I think of my votes for foreign aid to bolster the anti-Communist allies of this country and the contrast with his votes against all foreign aid; when I think of his apparent objective, the catching of headlines rather than Communists, and the demoralizing effect of his wave of fear, then I am certain that even my humble efforts have done more against communism than his ever will.

I have called attention to the McCarthyite actions of the staff of the Reece investigating committee, branding as communistic the encyclicals of two Popes of the Catholic Church. I have opposed—even when almost alone—the serious threats to our civil liberties posed by actions taken during a wave of hysteria, when some legislators abdicated their responsibilities because of fear. In my position, I have been happy to coincide with the views of J. Edgar Hoover, Chief of the FBI, and Judge Harold Medina, who presided over the trial which resulted in the conviction of the top Communists of the country.

THE FOLKS BACK HOME

It is with mixed humility and pride that I present this report. It is with humility, because I recognize my responsibility as a servant of my constituents and of the public interest. It is with pride, because I have never failed to carry out a campaign pledge, and because I have consistently striven to serve the public interest as I saw it to be.

My services have always been at the disposal of my constituents. I have never failed to try to help with their individual problems so far as I was able to do so. I joined with my colleagues in trying to keep local Federal services operating efficiently and at a maximum.

While I do not expect the electorate to agree with me at all times on all matters, at least we will make every effort to understand one another so that our respect for each other will survive our disagreement.

That is the American way.

The Challenging Problem of Falling Farmer Income

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ED EDMONDSON
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, with the possible exception of the danger of atomic warfare, there is no more urgent problem before the American people today than our steady and alarming fall in farmer income.

According to recent figures, the American farmer's income in 1954 is going to be about 25 percent below the 1952 figure. In some sections of the country, where the drought has caused terrible damage to both pasture and crops, the farmer's 1954 income will not even be one-fourth of what he made 2 years ago.

This does not mean that the people of America are eating less food, or that food prices are down in proportion. On the contrary, the prices of many foods are above the 1952 figures, and food consumption is well above the level of 2 years ago.

The simple truth is that the farmer is getting a smaller share of America's food dollar. I understand that only about 40 cents out of the total food dollar is received by the men whose productive effort on the farm is chiefly responsible for the food itself.

On the so-called basic commodities the farmer's percentage is much smaller.

Most people who complain about price supports for farm products do not know the plain facts about the share which goes to the farmer.

Recently the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives published these surprising figures:

Although wheat is the principal ingredient in a loaf of bread, less than 3 cents of the 17 cents loaf price is received by the wheat farmer.

The peanut farmer receives less than one-half a cent for the peanuts in a 5-cent peanut bar.

As for clothing, in an average $3 cotton garment the cotton farmer's share is about 30 cents.

These are typical examples of the farmer's share in prices paid by American consumers, and it was understandable that the Committee on Agriculture reached the conclusion that 90 percent price supports on the basic commodities were having very little effect upon the cost of living of the average American family.

Unfortunately the administration in power in Washington has decided to ignore the findings of the great House committee, and to follow an independent course of action which is sure to result in further reduction of farmer income.

This decision, which was announced in many newspapers as "a great administration victory," was at the same time a costly defeat for the farmers of America.

The subsidies paid out to farmers under our farm program have been only a minor fraction of the great Government subsidies paid out to the Nation's industry and business—from transportation to manufacturing to many other branches of commerce. There has been no attempt by the administration to scale down subsidies for the shipping industry, for the airlines, for the great factories which are protected by high tariff walls. The solitary victim has been the American farmer.

It is a great injustice, and I cannot protest too strongly against the action. If the facts are brought home to the people, I feel sure they will register their protest as well when they go to the polls in November.

Black or White

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the Globe and Mail of Canada will help complete the record on the anti-Communist bill:

BLACK OR WHITE

> Awards are given for military bravery, but none, to our knowledge, for political bravery. One wishes there were an award of this nature, so that it might be presented to two Members of the United States House of Representatives, Mr. ABRAHAM MULTER, Democrat from New York, and Mr. USHER BURDICK, Republican from North Dakota. Messrs. MULTER and BURDICK were the only two Members of Congress to vote against the Communist Control Act (1954) which outlaws the Communist Party in that country. The Senate approved it by a vote of 79–0, and the House by one of 265–2.
>
> Why did only two Members of Congress dare to oppose this highly dubious piece of legislation—so dubious that President Eisenhower seems likely to veto it? The reason is plain enough. Washington's politicians were afraid that by opposing legislation against communism, they would give the appearance of being for communism. Thus, in the House debate, Representative FRANCIS WALTER, of Pennsylvania, said the Communist Control Act was bad legislation. But he voted in favor of it. And even Representatives MULTER and BURDICK in voting against were at pains to emphasize their dislike of communism.
>
> This development is not too surprising. The climate of opinion in the United States, at any rate in Washington, today is such that a man who is not aggressively anti-Communist lays himself open to the charge of being pro-Communist. If he is not on Senator MCCARTHY's side, he must be on

Owen Lattimore's. The Russians, of course, have the same thing in reverse. Unless a man there is aggressively anticapitalist, he is held to be procapitalist.

This is the black-or-white attitude. If you are not one thing, you must be its polar opposite. If you are not an ally, you must be an enemy. And if you oppose the means, you must be against the end. This newspaper is accused in some quarters of being antilabor. Why? Because, while supporting labor's aims of higher living standards, it has at times criticized labor's efforts to win them by repressive methods. But we object to repressive methods in any quarter.

We heartily dislike—and said so on Thursday—the repressive methods in which Prime Minister St. Laurent broke the railway strike. Does this, then, make us prolabor? The Toronto Star, which we understood favored labor's right to strike, has not breathed one word against the Prime Minister's action. Does this make it antilabor? We can guess the Star's quandary. To criticize what a Liberal government did would make it Conservative. And to support what that government did would make it antilabor. So it remains silent.

The Star has something to say, however, about people who oppose the Government's present arrangements about the St. Lawrence seaway. They are Conservative critics, Conservative detractors, vociferous Conservatives. Who but a Conservative would criticize anything done by a Liberal government? And for what reasons but partisan ones? Yet we could name some Liberals who have done just that, indeed, walked out of the Liberal government. The reason they gave was not that they were Conservatives, but that they were Liberals.

A world in which everything is colored black or white, and everybody labeled Liberal or Conservative, pro-Communist or anti-Communist, prolabor or antilabor—such a world is pleasant enough for people who don't want to think. They can take sides and join battle, as they did in olden times. But reason and principle and justice get lost in that kind of world, and so does freedom. For simplicity, even for the security which goes with simplicity, that seems to us a high price to pay.

SENATE PROCEEDINGS SUBSEQUENT TO ADJOURNMENT

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED SUBSEQUENT TO ADJOURNMENT

Pursuant to Senate Concurrent Resolution 109, adopted August 20, 1954, the following enrolled bills and joint resolutions were signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President pro tempore of the Senate subsequent to the adjournment of the Congress:

S. 2862. An act to provide relief for the sheep-raising industry by making special nonquota immigrant visas available to certain skilled alien sheepherders;

S. 3868. An act authorizing the payment of salary to any individual given a recess appointment as Comptroller General of the United States before the beginning of the 84th Congress;

H. R. 951. An act for the relief of the Trust Association of H. Kempner;

H. R. 1107. An act for the relief of the J. A. Vance Co.;

H. R. 1254. An act to provide authorization for certain uses of public lands;

H. R. 2032. An act for the relief of Clarence D. Newland;

H. R. 2233. An act to provide for the acquisition of lands by the United States required for the reservoir created by the construction of Oahe Dam on the Missouri River and for rehabilitation of the Indians of the Cheyenne River Sioux Reservation, S. Dak., and for other purposes;

H. R. 2235. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct the Santa Maria project, Southern Pacific Basin, Calif.;

H. R. 2236. An act to provide for a Commission to regulate the public transportation of passengers by motor vehicle and street railroad within the metropolitan area of Washington, D. C., and for the establishment of a metropolitan Washington Commission;

H. R. 2876. An act for the relief of Leo F. Pinder;

H. R. 3300. An act to authorize the State of Illinois and the Sanitary District of Chicago, under the direction of the Secretary of the Army, to help control the lake level of Lake Michigan by diverting water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois waterway;

H. R. 4340. An act for the relief of Charles J. Abarnem and others;

H. R. 4638. An act for the relief of David W. Wallace;

H. R. 5420. An act to amend section 161, title 35, United States Code, relating to the patenting of plants;

H. R. 6451. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain public lands in Utah to the occupants of the land;

H. R. 6573. An act to provide for the promotion, precedence, constructive credit, distribution, retention, and elimination of officers of the Reserve components of the Armed Forces of the United States, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6616. An act to amend title 17, United States Code, entitled "Copyrights";

H. R. 6808. An act for the relief of Col. Samuel J. Adams, and others;

H. R. 7130. An act to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide for the loss of nationality of persons convicted of certain crimes;

H. R. 7774. An act to increase the rates of compensation of classified, postal, and other employees of the Government, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7840. An act to amend the Railroad Retirement Act, the Railroad Retirement Tax Act, and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act;

H. R. 7886. An act for the relief of Mrs. Cecil Norton Broy;

H. R. 8606. An act for the relief of Neil C. Hemmer and Mildred Hemmer;

H. R. 9366. An act to amend the Social Security Act and the Internal Revenue Code so as to extend coverage under the old-age and survivors insurance program, increase the benefits payable thereunder, preserve the insurance rights of disabled individuals, and increase the amount of earnings permitted without loss of benefits, and for other purposes;

H. R. 9580. An act to revise and extend the laws relating to espionage and sabotage, and for other purposes;

H. R. 9680. An act to provide for greater stability in agriculture; to augment the marketing and disposal of agricultural products; and for other purposes;

H. R. 9728. An act to revise, codify, and enact into law, title 21 of the United States Code, entitled "Food, Drugs, and Cosmetics";

H. R. 9729. An act to revise, codify, and enact into law title 13 of the United States Code, entitled "Census";

H. R. 9730. An act to amend various statutes and certain titles of the United States Code, for the purpose of correcting obsolete references, and for other purposes;

H. R. 9859. An act authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes;

H. R. 9987. An act to amend certain provisions of title XI of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to facilitate private financing of new ship construction, and for other purposes;

H. R. 9988. An act for the relief of the Federal Republic of Germany;

H. R. 10051. An act making appropriations for mutual security for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes;

H. R. 10187. An act to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to provide for the payment of appraisers', auctioneers', and brokers' fees from the proceeds of disposal of Government surplus real property, and for other purposes;

S. J. Res. 173. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim the week of November 28, 1954, through December 4, 1954, as "National Salvation Army Week"; and

H. J. Res. 565. Joint resolution to amend the joint resolution providing for the membership of the United States in the Pan American Institute of Geography and History and authorize appropriations therefor.

ADDITIONAL ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED AFTER ADJOURNMENT

Subsequent to the adjournment of the Senate, the Secretary of the Senate reported that, on August 25, 1954, he presented to the President of the United States the following additional enrolled bills and joint resolution:

S. 2862. An act to provide relief for the sheep-raising industry by making special nonquota immigrant visas available to certain skilled alien sheepherders;

S. 3868. An act authorizing the payment of salary to any individual given a recess appointment as Comptroller General of the United States before the beginning of the 84th Congress; and

S. J. Res. 173. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim the week of November 28, 1954, through December 4, 1954, as "National Salvation Army Week."

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized book dealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by book dealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the Record.

Director's Office

PRR

Congressional Record

United States of America

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 83^{d} CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 100 WASHINGTON, FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 3, 1954 *No. 166*

Appendix

Farm Problems and the Agricultural Program and Legislative Record of the Eisenhower Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN S. COOPER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by me on farm problems and the agricultural program and legislative record of the Eisenhower administration.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I desire to make a brief statement on farm problems and the agricultural program and legislative record of the administration of President Eisenhower.

I do not make this statement in a narrow partisan vein. The farmers of my State of Kentucky know that I am genuinely interested in their welfare. They know that I have demonstrated this interest in work for them and in actual legislation for them in the Senate.

At the outset, I want to mention specifically some of the things that have been done during the present administration to help Kentucky and Kentucky farmers.

1. The permanent support price for tobacco has been maintained at 90 percent of parity. The amendment which I introduced in 1948, which became law, and which gave to tobacco farmers for the first time in history a permanent 90 percent support price, was approved by President Eisenhower in his recommendation to the Congress. It is the first time that a President ever specifically recommended permanent 90 percent support prices for tobacco.

2. The Department of Agriculture, in 1953, gave support prices for the first time in history to N2 and NK categories of lower grades of dark air-cured tobacco.

3. The Rural Electrification Administration released in 1953 and 1954 to the Eastern Kentucky Rural Electric Cooperative Corp. $22,175,033 to complete its generating and transmission system. The funds had been held up for over 13 years. The funds released will give Kentucky the largest generating REA plant in the United States and the second largest REA system. It will serve 84 counties and 135,000 farm consumers with cheap power.

4. The Department of Agriculture made available to Kentucky the largest amount for projects in the new watershed and conservation programs established by this administration.

5. The new tax law contains a provision which allows farmers to deduct as expenses money spent for soil and water conservation, including expenditures for the prevention of land erosion. This will cut taxes by a total of $10 million per year.

6. The Congress passed a Federal aid for highways bill, which increased total authorizations from $575 million to $875 million, and Kentucky's annual share from $10,170,437 to $15,666,480.

7. The Department of the Treasury for the first time recommended against the passage of the graduated excise tax on cigarettes—a tax opposed by tobacco growers and the entire tobacco industry.

8. For the first time in history a Secretary of Agriculture appointed Kentuckians, Mr. Clarence Miller, of Shelbyville, to be head of the Tobacco Branch of the Commodity Credit Corporation, which administers the tobacco support program; and Mr. Robert Owen, of Cynthiana, to be head of the Tobacco Branch of the Foreign Agriculture Service, to increase tobacco exports.

In addition to working on the above major accomplishments for Kentucky, and particularly urging on the President and the Secretary of Agriculture the continuation of permanent 90 percent supports for tobacco, I was happy to take the following specific action for the farmers of Kentucky:

1. I introduced with Senator SCHOEPPEL, of Kansas, an amendment to increase funds for our State agricultural experiment stations to promote markets and research for farmers. It became law.

2. I introduced with Senator MUNDT, of South Dakota, an amendment to provide that the Commodity Credit Corporation shall be reimbursed for surplus commodities used abroad in bartering for strategic stockpile materials. This amendment which was passed is designed to encourage the disposal of surplus crops, such as tobacco, but give the Commodity Credit Corporation a financial incentive to dispose of it.

3. I joined Senator CLEMENTS, of Kentucky, in an amendment to increase the penalty on excess tobacco from 40 to 50 percent. It became law.

4. Department of Agriculture approved my request in 1953 to allow flat storage of wheat when regular storage facilities were not available.

5. The Interstate Commerce Commission withdrew its so-called trip-lease order after I had introduced an amendment to force its action. If the order had been maintained, it would have removed part of the exemptions enjoyed by farmers in hauling their crops.

6. I introduced, and as chairman of the subcommittee, reported a bill to furnish Federal aid in the construction of school buildings in the amount of $250 million for the next 2 years. The bill did not come to a vote this year, but the unanimous vote it received in the committee gives me faith that it will be approved by the Congress next year.

I introduced an amendment to the Tennessee Valley Authority appropriations bill in 1953, which was passed, giving TVA $1.75 million of additional funds.

After a conference with the President and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget in 1953, in which I recommended an additional steam plant unit be included in the budget, funds for the additional steam plant unit were included for TVA.

There are 5.4 million farms and 24 million farm people in the United States. Approximately 1 million farm people live on 220,000 farms in Kentucky. The standard of living of our farm families, and their opportunities rest upon an honest and real solution of present farm problems. The prosperity of the Nation requires that the purchasing power and the prosperity of the farmer be maintained and advanced.

I am convinced that farm problems are economic and not political. They are not going to be solved by self-seeking politicians, by demagogery, or by the desire of either great party to win political advantage.

Farm problems can only be solved by farmers, by their representation in Congress, and by an administration willing to look honestly at the facts, and willing to take the action necessary to cure real causes of farm difficulties.

The farmers that I represent know that I have always given them the facts, and the truth. It is the purpose of this short statement, to give them the facts as I see them.

The first thing I want to say is this: While I have not agreed with Mr. Benson, the Secretary of Agriculture, on several points, I say frankly that I believe the Secretary, and this administration are actually and earnestly striving to face up to the real and basic causes of the decline in farm income, and to do something to remove and cure these basic causes. Let us look at some of these problems on the basis of facts.

First. What are the facts about falling farm prices?

The highest net income in the history of the farmers of the United States for any 2-year period was enjoyed in 1947 and 1948.

After the Korean war began, Government spending and inflation pushed the average price of all farm products to their highest level in February 1951.

From that date, in the administration of President Truman, prices fell steadily for 2 years, before the administration of President Eisenhower took office. In this 2-year period, under the administration of President Truman, they fell 45 points from their high level. The average price level dropped only 20 points after the new administration came into office and has partly recovered and stabilized.

It is the same story with cattle. Following the removal of controls after World War II, cattle prices advanced, and the cattle population increased to its highest figure in history—approximately 94 million head of cattle.

Cattle prices reached their highest level in April 1951, during the inflation of the Korean war—an average of $30.30 a hundred. Then, under the administration of President Truman, cattle prices began to fall, and fell steadily, to an average of $19.10 in January 1953, when President Eisenhower assumed office. This decline in prices, plus the drought in 1952 and 1953, sent to the market in 1953, the largest slaughter in history—one-half billion pounds more meat than could be consumed. Average cattle prices dropped in 1953 from $19.10 to $14.50.

I do not think I can be judged as political when I say that the present administration was not responsible for the drought, or for the tremendous production of cattle during the previous 7 years which were the real causes of lower cattle prices.

The general price level of all farm prices has gone up 3 points and the average price of cattle has gone up $1.40, and have reasonably stabilized since President Eisenhower assumed office.

I point out these facts, and remind my farmer friends, that farm prices had been falling for 2 years under the previous administration and the greatest percentage of fall had taken place before President Eisenhower came into office. Prices have stabilized since he came into office. Some prices, as tobacco and hogs, are at the best since the administration came into office.

I remind my friends that farm prices fell for 3 years while fixed 90-percent support prices on the basic crops were in effect. I do this to emphasize that the farm problem is not political—but economic. We must look honestly for the real causes. We must build a better farm program—one that is good in peacetime as well as in war. This the administration of President Eisenhower is doing.

FARM PRODUCTION AND CONSUMPTION

It is an unfortunate fact that at least a part of the high price levels of recent years is a result of war and war inflation. During World War II there were markets for practically everything that the farmer produced. The American farmer, with limited help, equipment, and fertilizer, literally mined his soil to produce food and fiber for our troops and workers, and the troops and civilian population of our foreign allies. After the close of the war, agriculture enjoyed for a few years a large foreign market in war-destroyed countries which could not yet produce their own food. With the Korean war, large war export demands opened up again. Now, the countries of Western Europe and of other allies have recovered. Some produce sufficient food and fiber for their needs. Others, because our prices are too high for them, will not buy our farm products. Ordinarily, to assure farmers of good prices at present levels of production, it would be necessary for 1 out of every 3 bales of cotton, 1 out of every 2 bushels of wheat, 20 percent of our corn, and 25 percent of tobacco produced to go into export to foreign countries. Exports of tobacco have slightly increased, but exports of agricultural products as a whole in the 1952–53 crop year fell 31 percent from the previous year. This loss of exports, occurring before the administration of President Eisenhower, is a major cause in the decline of farm prices.

But, while exports have gone down, the tremendous production of the war and postwar years has been maintained. For example, at the present time the Government has purchased or has under loan wheat, corn, and cotton equivalent to from 25 to 75 percent of a whole year's production.

This production is reflected in Government purchases through the Commodity Credit Corporation. Today the Government owns, or has in loan, crops reprsenting over $6.1 billion in value; 804 million bushels of corn, 879 million bushels of wheat, 7.2 million bales of cotton, are in its stores. This administration has extended price supports of over $6.7 billion by loans and purchase of surplus agricultural commodities to hold up farm prices, on production built up before it came into office.

Present Government stocks of surplus dairy products are valued at more than $520 million. Purchases of additional surplus dairy products are being made at the rate of nearly $1 million per day while storage charges on the existing stocks are costing approximately $53,000 per day.

Personally, I believe that we should be thankful that we have a surplus of food and fiber, as a protection against future shortages, and to aid less fortunate nations. But it is a fact that the large surplus stocks held by the Government have the effect of driving down farm prices. That is what has been happening. Also under the provisions of law passed before this administration came into office surpluses require acreage reductions.

It would have been impossible for any administration or any Secretary of Agriculture to have cured within a few months the causes built up in the previous administration which have produced a decline in farm prices.

The following facts are clear:

1. The high price levels of the war years were caused by the unusual demands of our Armed Forces and those of our allies and the demands of war-stricken countries for food.

2. As foreign countries have recovered, the export markets for our crops have declined.

3. While demand has declined, our large production has been maintained, and the surpluses have had the effect of depressing farm prices.

4. War inflation increased wages, transportation costs, and taxes, which have raised the price of the equipment and supplies that farmers must buy.

5. These facts make it plain that if we are to have a sound farm program in peacetime, our farmers and Government must work together to increase the markets for farm products at home and abroad. While this is being done, it is necessary to bring total farm crops into better balance with present consumption.

We must face these facts. They cannot be solved by political magic. The previous administration would not face these basic problems. The administration of President Eisenhower is honestly trying to find increased markets for farmers and at the same time bring production into balance with present consumption. At the same time, it has given full support prices under the law for farm products. Let us see what the administration has done in a year and a half to honestly work at these problems.

OVERPRODUCTION

It was the duty of the Secretary of Agriculture under the law to call for acreage reductions, because of surplus crops. As required by law, the Secretary has proclaimed market quotas for corn, wheat, and cotton, which will withdraw for the time from production about 30 million acres. Some acreage reductions for tobacco were also required. If these reductions required by law had been taken by the previous administration, we would not have had a part of the surpluses which have depressed prices. The Secretary's action will have a helpful effect on corn, wheat, cotton, and tobacco prices.

MEASURES TAKEN BY THE ADMINISTRATION TO DISPOSE OF SURPLUS CROP AND INCREASE EXPORTS

Among the many steps which this administration has taken, I will name a few:

1. In 1953 and 1954, Congress authorized the sale of $600 million of surplus crops to our allies in exchange for their currencies.

2. In 1954, Congress authorized the President to dispose of $1 billion of surplus crops over a 3-year period at home or abroad for relief, disaster, and economic aid.

4. In 1953, Congress authorized a gift of 1 million tons of wheat to Pakistan and extended the International Wheat Agreement which will dispose of 811 million bushels of wheat abroad, at an estimated price of $1.5 billion.

5. 1954—the President asked and the Congress gave him authority to set aside $2.5 billion of surplus farm stocks as a reserve for emergencies. This has never been done before and will have the effect of removing their pressure on farm prices.

6. In 1953 and 1954 the Department of Agriculture bought 225 million pounds of beef, representing almost a million head of cattle, to stabilize beef prices.

7. The present administration has made the strongest effort in history for research to find new uses for farm products.

8. The present administration has made the strongest efforts in history to help farmers sell their crops abroad.

A special division has been set up in the Agriculture Department to work out an improved export program. Government trade missions have been sent throughout the world to sell American agricultural products. In some instances price adjustments have been made to meet world levels. Research has been undertaken in both marketing and utilization of farm products abroad. Congress has passed legislation which will make foreign trade in agricultural products easier by authorizing currency convertibility, bartering agreements, and other means of using surplus commodities. As a result of these efforts, tobacco, grains, cotton, dairy products, fats, and oils are moving in increasing quantities into foreign trade rather than warehouses. Robert Owen, a Kentuckian, is head of the Tobacco Branch in the Foreign Agriculture Service.

DOMESTIC CONSUMPTION

Upon the domestic side, the situation is favorable and there is ground for optimism. In 1953 and 1954, following the end of the Korean war, there has been unemployment in some areas, although not as great as in 1949. At the same time, because of the honest and sound financial policies of the administration, total national income, wages, total employment, construction, and savings are the highest in history. Our population, now 160 million, is increasing at the rate of 2½ million a year. Food consumption is high, and beef consumption the highest in history. If the honest economic measures this administration has begun are continued, our growing population and food consumption will use our farm production.

I have pointed out these basic facts to emphasize that this administration is doing the things that are needed, to place agriculture on a sound peacetime basis.

Now I want to talk to you about price supports, because there is a great deal of misunderstanding about this question.

PRICE SUPPORTS

In the first place, I think it should be made clear that during the war most crops were selling above their price supports and many crops which had no price supports were selling at high prices. It must be remembered, too, that since 1951, although 90-percent fixed supports have been in effect on the basic crops at all times, farm prices declined. These two facts show that while price supports are needed to put a floor under farm prices, price supports will not alone assure high prices for farm products. As I have said before, the real problem is to find markets for farm crops.

At the close of the recent Congress, Senate bill 3052 was passed, amending the permanent price-support law. Price supports on five basic farm crops—corn, wheat, cotton, rice, and peanuts—were fixed on a flexible basis, ranging from 82½ percent to 90 percent of parity, as the Secretary of Agriculture may decide. The support price for milk products was fixed at 75 percent to 90 percent of parity. The old permanent rate for the basic crops was 75 percent to 90 percent.

I want my record on price suports to be absolutely clear. In 1948 I introduced the amendment which passed, which gave tobacco for the first time in history a permanent 90 percent of parity support price. Last year, in 1953, I introduced Senate bill 2578 to continue the support of the five other basic crops—corn, wheat, cotton, rice, and peanuts—at 90 percent for an additional 2-year period. In the session of Congress just ended, I voted for every amendment to maintain support prices at 90 percent of parity. I have supported, and voted for 90 percent support prices because I believe that in this period of adjustment after war, farm income should be supported and protected. That is my position now.

Nevertheless, many misrepresentations and untruths about price supports are being continually made and told to farmers. The chief untruth told farmers, is that flexible supports—or sliding scale supports, as they call them—is a Republican plan, one adopted for the first time by the Eisenhower administration. This is not true. The exact opposite is the truth. Flexible supports first became a part of the agricultural law in 1938 under the administration of President Roosevelt and they have remained the law ever since that time. What has really happened is that from time to time, the percentage of support has been increased. These are the true facts:

1. From 1938 until the beginning of World War I, six basic crops—corn, wheat, tobacco, cotton, rice, and peanuts—were supported at 52 to 75 percent of parity, a flexible scale.

2. At the beginning of World War II, to encourage production, support prices on basic crops were raised to 90 percent temporarily, but to return to the old flexible scale of 52 percent to 75 percent on December 31, 1948.

3. In 1948, upon recommendation of President Truman, who asked in a special message for flexible supports, a Republican Congress raised permanent price supports from a level of 52 percent to 75 percent to a level of 60 percent to 90 percent of parity. The vote in the Senate for passage of the farm bill was 79 to 3. The two Kentucky Senators at that time, Senators Barkley and COOPER, voted for the bill which established flexible supports from 60 percent to 90 percent on five basic commodities and 90 percent on tobacco.

4. In 1949, under the administration of President Truman, a Democratic Congress continued permanent flexible price supports, raising the level to a range of 75 percent to 90 percent.

5. The recent Congress raised the level of permanent supports from 82½ percent to 90 percent, the highest level of permanent supports since 1938. I point out this fact because of the misrepresentations that have been made and because there are many who do not know that since 1938, permanent supports for the basic crops have been flexible and the 90 percent support has been only upon a temporary basis. This has been true under both Republican and Democratic administrations. What was done in the last session of the Congress was to fix the permanent supports at 82½ percent to 90 percent, the highest in history, and remove the temporary 90 percent supports on five basic crops on January 1, 1955. This administration has supported all the basic crops at 90 percent of parity during 1953 and 1954.

TOBACCO

To those of my own farmers in Kentucky who will ask about tobacco, I am happy to say that the permanent 90 percent support prices for tobacco were not changed and remain in full force and effect. Tobacco is one of the six basic commodities. But unlike corn, wheat, cotton, rice, and peanuts, the support price of tobacco is fixed by law at 90 percent of parity on a permanent basis. Prior to 1948, its permanent support price was 52–75 percent and its temporary price 90 percent.

In 1948, I introduced in the Senate an amendment to the basic Agricultural Act requiring that tobacco be supported at 90 percent of parity on a permanent basis. The amendment was passed by the Congress and became law. In his message to the Congress on January 11, 1954, President Eisenhower recommended the maintenance of permanent 90 percent support prices for tobacco,. saying:

"Tobacco farmers have demonstrated their ability to hold production in line with demand at the supported price without loss to the Government. The relatively small acreage of tobacco and the limited areas to which it is adapted have made production control easier than for other crops.

"The level of support to cooperators is 90 percent of the parity price in any year in which marketing quotas are in effect.

"It is recommended that the tobacco program be continued in its present form."

Tobacco is a relatively small crop compared to corn, wheat, and cotton. Its market is limited to a few major tobacco companies. Tobacco farmers have cooperated in the control of production. During the time that it has been supported, the Government has not suffered any loss of money because of its support. On the contrary, in its total operation since 1933, the Government has profited in the sum of $1,884,565 through its support operations, according to the reports of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

During the course of the debate on the farm bill, in response to my questions, the distinguished chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture, Senator AIKEN, and other members of the committee, stated that it was the unanimous opinion of the committee that the support price for tobacco should be maintained at 90 percent of parity in accordance with the amendment which I first introduced in 1948.

The amendment which I introduced in 1948, and which has been the law since that time, maintaining permanent support prices for tobacco at 90 percent of parity, has brought millions of dollars to Kentucky tobacco growers and the growers of other States. For the past 2 years, I urged the Department of Agriculture and the President to recommend to the Congress the continuance of permanent 90 percent supports for tobacco. They did this, and I am glad that I have again been able to help our Kentucky tobacco growers. Tobacco prices in 1953 were the highest in history. This administration has helped to increase burley tobacco exports, and I am sure that tobacco prices will be good again this year.

FARM PROGRAMS AND FARM APPROPRIATIONS

The charge has been made, without any supporting facts, that the present administration would cut farm programs and farm appropriations. Again, what are the true facts?

First, every farm program has been maintained, strengthened and placed on a basis to provide more permanent benefits to farmers. Research, and export programs have been strengthened.

Second, the facts show that the level of agricultural appropriations has remained about the same since the close of World War II, whatever party has been in power. In 1953, the present Congress appropriated $718 million for agriculture. This year, 1954, we appropriated $724 million. Appropriations for different programs remain about the same. The largest 2-year appropriation in history for loans for REA was in 1947 and 1948. In these past 2 years, 1953 and 1954, $412.5 million has been appropriated for REA loans to local cooperatives. The REA has moved quickly to loan the funds, and today has the lowest backlog of applications in history. The agricultural stabilization and conservation program, formerly known as the PMA program, the Soil Conservation Service, FHA, the Extension Service, and all the farm-credit agencies, have received adequate appropriations. The administration has spent in these 2 years more than $6.7 billion to support farm prices, the largest sum in all history.

I know that no farmer and no farm mother wants a program that will only succeed through war. We cannot build an honest and moral prosperity on war and the bloodshed of the young men and the young farmers of the Nation.

I am sure that the record which I have given above shows that this administration is earnestly and honestly striving to build a farm program that will work in peace. It is succeeding. The administration will complete a sound program for peace, if the farmers will give it a chance and their cooperation.

It has been a matter of great pride to me that I have been able to work and strive for the farmers of Kentucky and the Nation. I believe that they deserve and must have a fair share of the Nation's income; living opportunities in roads, schools, electric power, hospital, and health facilities equal to city population; and full opportunity for the advancement of their children. For no group of our people are more energetic, reliable, and patriotic than the farm families of America.

SOCIAL SECURITY

Upon the recommendation of President Eisenhower, the Congress passed into law a new and better social security program. Under the new law, more than 3½ million farmers and their families will receive social-security protection. The new law has a special provision to make it easier for low-income farm operators to compute their net earnings. In addition, special provision is made for approximately 1⅓ million farmworkers so that they too can have this protection.

Atomic Energy Chairman Defends Hunter Vote Position

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. STERLING COLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, it has recently come to my attention that one of my esteemed colleagues, Hon. OAKLEY HUNTER, of California, has been unjustly criticized by the press in his area for voting for the House version of the atomic energy revision bill.

Ordinarily, I would not take it upon myself to rush to the defense of the gentleman from California because I know that he is well able to protect himself against such unfair attacks. However, it seems that another member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, Representative Melvin Price, of Illinois, has seen fit to take a hand in the situation from the seemingly authoritative position of one, as he puts it, who is familiar with this legislation.

In the Congressional Record for August 20, 1954, Mr. Price had caused to be reprinted an editorial from the Fresno Bee, one of the McClatchy newspapers, which denounces Mr. Hunter's vote for the House version of the atomic energy revision bill as "imperiling public power and as a vote against the welfare of his region." The editorial inferentially mentions Mr. Hunter's denial of the newspaper's interpretation, and Mr. Price observes that he believes "the gentleman from California is mistaken."

I should like to point out, Mr. Speaker, that I am chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and that I also am familiar with the legislation which Mr. Hunter wisely supported with his vote.

And I want to go on record unqualifiedly as stating that Mr. Hunter in supporting the House version of the atomic energy revision bill, did not vote against public power nor did he vote against the best interests of his district. Quite the contrary, he voted in the best interest of the people of his district, of the United States, and of the free world. In effect, he voted for a revolution in the American standard of living by unshackling the atom from the out-dated restrictions which the advocates of Government monopoly had allowed to remain in force.

Further, let me emphasize that public power was never involved in the question of revising the atomic energy law except insomuch as some groups tried to involve it for their own political purposes. Mr. Hunter was absolutely correct when he stated:

> The atomic energy bill is not a power bill. It is a bill to advance research and development in aid of the art of making atomic machines or of using atomic fuel for the generation of power. It was not the intention of the framers of this legislation to turn the Atomic Energy Commission into a federally sponsored commercial electric power generating agency. The Atomic Energy Commission is basically a development and regulatory agency. Its only production is in connection with weapons.

Richmond, Va.: Rich Both in History and in the Knowledge of Its History

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES R. HOWELL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, in his justly famous speech at the Mosque Auditorium in Richmond, Va., on September 20, 1952, Gov. Adlai E. Stevenson paid high tribute to a city rich both in history and in the knowledge of its history.

Regarding the rich and deep cultural tradition of the South, he said:

> The task of striking off the shackles of the South begun by Woodrow Wilson (born in Staunton, Va.) has brought you to your rightful place in the Union, not as a matter of charity, not as a sectional matter, but because a happy, purposeful people in a strong, prosperous country is the democratic goal. The Southern States, too, it seems to me, have played a large part in liberating men's creative energies and reaching these goals.
>
> Everywhere this liberation of man's powers during the Democratic decades has brilliantly succeeded, but nowhere has its success been more marked than in the South. Here has come the richest flowering of a great region our Nation has witnessed. A new vitality and creative energy is apparent in every aspect of southern culture, material, intellectual, and spiritual. Your colleges are crowded. There is a keen interest in the arts.
>
> Some years ago a famous American critic said that the South was the wasteland of the mind. Yet at that very moment, I am told, so many of your housewives had novels simmering with the soup—among them Gone With the Wind—that many husbands had to wait for supper. And men—in an effort perhaps to keep up with their women, among them your own Ellen Glasgow—were writing books and plays, too. So it was that the Nobel prize for literature came to the Mississippian, William Faulkner; a prize that he accepted in an exalted address, extolling the unconquerable spirit of man.
>
> If this means much to the Nation, it also, I am sure, means much to you. Your way has often been hard. Yet you have always held that civilization is something more than the bending of the resources of nature to the uses of man. Man cannot live without bread, but his spirit cannot live by bread alone.

Among the many institutions through which the government of the Old Dominion serves its people is the Virginia Museum of Fine Arts. This museum and the New Jersey State Museum are two of the leading museums of the country. Both receive support by their respective States and play a major role in the cultural life of the citizens of their State. Both are outstanding instruments of public education.

In the following article from the July 1954 issue of the fine magazine State Government, published monthly in Chicago by the Council of State Governments, Martha H. Newell, until recently public information head of the Virginia Museum, tells how it came into being, indicates the scope of private and public grants for it, and describes what it is today.

The House Education and Labor Subcommittee on Arts Foundations and Commissions recently held hearings on the bills before the 83d Congress to establish an American National Arts Act as a national war memorial. Some 10 Members of the House and 6 Members of the Senate joined in sponsoring this plan for a national war memorial. These bills reflect the concern and hope of their sponsors that institutions similar to the Virginia Museum of Fine Arts and the New Jersey State Museum will be developed in each of the 48 States to serve the needs of the people.

The article follows:

The Virginia Museum of Fine Arts

(By Martha H. Newell)

In the Commonwealth of Virginia, often described as "that gracious, old State where the past still lives on," there is a vigorous movement under way which defies precedent, and is so solidly built on the future that one wonders whether a more contemporary description of Virginia would be "that progressive State where the people own their art museum." The people of Virginia, by successfully combining public and private interests, have created a unique institution, America's first State art museum. The remarkable growth of the Virginia Museum during the 18 years of its existence now has made it necessary to construct a new wing of the headquarters building in Richmond. Scheduled for a fall 1954 opening, the new wing will triple its gallery space and cultural potential.

The history and development of this State museum is a tribute to the Commonwealth of Virginia and to its citizens.

After the Civil War, the South struggled through a long and painful period of recovery. There was precious little money to be spent in recapturing the artistic advantages destroyed by the conflict. However, in other sections of the country, some fortunate citizens were assembling vast financial empires which, happily, often found expression in civic art centers, as those in Boston, New York, Philadelphia, Chicago, and Omaha.

In 1919, Judge John Barton Payne, for years national chairman of the American Red Cross, and for a time Secretary of the Interior during Woodrow Wilson's Presidency, presented a collection of paintings to his native State. Since there was no suitable State building for this gift, the paintings were placed in "Battle Abbey," a Confederate museum in Richmond.

By 1930 the incoming Governor, John Garland Pollard, observed that art gifts to the State were gradually being accumulated, and he determined that some adequate provision for their preservation and exhibition should be made. Remembering the interest of Judge Payne in promoting art in Virginia, Governor Pollard discussed the problem with the judge, who expressed his willingness to give $100,000 toward the construction of a building if the State would match the sum. The General Assembly accepted the conditional gift, but with the coming of the depression, it was unable to appropriate money for the proposed building. Governor Pollard then undertook to raise the required amount through private citizens. By December 1933 this had been done. With Judge Payne's gift met by a like amount, and with the aid of a Federal grant of $77,500, construction was begun.

The following spring the general assembly approved an act defining and providing for the management, control, maintenance, and operation of the new Virginia Museum. Full power and authority over it were vested in a board of trustees of 23 of the originators and donors; 4 ex officio members, the Governor and the Lieutenant Governor of Virginia, the speaker of the house of delegates and the mayor of the city of Richmond. The board of trustees was authorized to appoint a director for the museum, and the staff. State funds were allocated to supply salaries and building upkeep.

In April 1935 the Governor of Virginia, George C. Peery, recognizing the progress toward completion of the building, stated in the Four Arts magazine:

"I am happy to observe that the Virginia Museum of Fine Arts is nearing completion, and to know that the eminent board of directors of the museum are taking careful and well-considered steps toward launching it in the not so distant future. We are watching the birth of a monumental Virginia institution, the existence of which has been the desire and effort of many Virginians for over a hundred and fifty years. The realization of this desire in the fine building now being constructed wil stand as a noble and fitting monument to the public-spirited Virginians of today who are making the institution a reality.

"The very remarkable fact about this nascent institution is that it took practical form in the midst of a most acute depression. It is true also that this depression has concentrated thought on the necessary increase of leisure time, that science, invention, and the machine have brought to our people. What could be more appropriate, therefore, than that the depression which emphasized leisure, should also provide the means whereby that same leisure may be most beautifully spent? Practically, the museum will fulfill a need, both as a necessary addition to the plant and buildings of the State, and as the answer to the lack of such an organization of proven merit among the institutions of Virginia. As a State building, it will house the accumulating art treasures that have been continuously accruing to Virginia. As an institution, it will study, represent and preserve the artistic culture of the Commonwealth and will foster the love, practice, and understanding of art and beauty for the people of the State."

With a dedicatory reception, attended by State and national officials, the Virginia Museum was turned over to its board of trustees on October 26, 1935. Thousands of guests came to inspect the fine, mansionlike building. During the next few months, the museum staff installed the State's art treasures in preparation for the first exhibition. The formal inaugural opening took place on January 16, 1936, with Judge John Barton Payne's gift of 53 paintings, which had been the impetus of the museum's birth, on exhibition.

Through the years, and particularly during the period from 1949 to 1953, under the leadership of Director Leslie Cheek, Jr., the Virginia Museum has become a major instrument of public education throughout the State. As set forth in the establishing act, its purpose is "to promote throughout the Commonwealth education in the realm of art and * * * to receive and administer gifts." It is important to note that all art collections are the result of private gifts or endowment funds for additional purchases. The many activities of the museum, in Richmond and elsewhere in the State, are financed by dues from members. Membership is open to all who care to join.

The museum's program has been designed to meet its special functions: to serve the art needs of the State to which it belongs, simultaneously with the art needs of the city in which it is located.

Its statewide activities are invested in a vast program called State services, under the supervision of Mrs. Muriel B. Christison, associate director of collections and education. The backbone of the State services plan is group membership, which allows any club, library, museum, or society interested in the visual arts to become a group member of the museum by paying a $10 fee. This entitles the group to a full and, in most cases, free use of the impressive State services. Although any and all groups in Virginia are invited to make use of the services, it is more beneficial if advantage is taken of the group-membership privileges.

Traveling exhibitions presented under the auspices of the museum's State services are or five types: Special rental exhibitions, exhibition loan library, circulating slide sets, films and filmstrips, and the artmobile—America's first art gallery on wheels.

Special rental exhibitions—sections of major loan exhibitions held at the museum in Richmond—are circulated in the State for a limited time only, because many of the original art objects are the property of other museums or private owners, or are from the Virginia Museum's permanent collection. Because of their size, these exhibitions usually travel in the museum van to the exhibitor who has requested them.

Exhibition loan library sets are composed principally of flat-mounted material, boxed for easy shipping. At present 60 of these displays are available. They cover a variety of fields, such as architecture and furnishings, crafts and design, historic backgrounds of contemporary art, the graphic arts, painting, sculpture, and photography.

The slide sets are colorful, educational aids, accompanied by explanatory material. The films and filmstrips include series on the history of art, on American art, and on special individual topics.

The artmobile is the newest and most elaborate part of the State services program. It is a maximum-sized trailer truck, specially designed and built as a traveling art gallery, and it takes original objects of art to every community in Virginia on a planned itinerary. The artmobile's present exhibition comprises 16 paintings loaned from the Walter P. Chrysler collection of Dutch masters of the 16th and 17th centuries. Financial support for the artmobile came from many sources. Miller & Rhoads, a Richmond department store, gave the trailer; Mrs. Alfred I. duPont and Mr. John Lee Pratt, museum trustees, gave funds for educational materials and the purchase of the truck, respectively. Funds for the first year tour were donated by the Virginia Federation of Women's Clubs, which assists further by expediting the artmobile visits to each town. In all, the artmobile represents a $40,000 investment.

Other State services are found in the Virginia Art Alliance, an organization of all group members of the museum. The alliance meets twice a year to exchange ideas and suggestions and to make comments and criticisms on the cultural health of the State.

Through the generosity of an anonymous patron, the museum's statewide program yearly awards from 3 to 6 fellowships to aid young Virginians in the visual arts field. Training in colleges or professional schools in America or Europe is financed, and later stipends assist in the transition from education to practice.

The museum also holds a biennial exhibition of work by Virginia artists, open to any artist born or reared or living in the State. The work of five young Virginians was purchased for the museum's permanent collection for the 14th Virginia Artists Exhibition, held last spring at the museum, when paintings, sculpture, ceramics, metalwork, and weaving by a total of 110 artists were chosen by a nationally known jury of 2 artists and a museum director.

Virginians living in the Richmond area see still another side of their museum.

From September to June temporary exhibitions open regularly. The range of subject matter is as the wide realm of visual art allows. During the 1953–54 season these exhibitions included Design in Scandinavia, a 700-object display of contemporary industrial design in the 4 Scandinavian countries. This international show made its debut at the Virginia museum and is now on a 4-year tour of the United States and Canada.

Exhibitions are on view for about 6 weeks, and each opens with a gala Friday night preview. Special speakers, all experts in their field, are on hand to enlighten first-night audiences. Previews range from informal affairs, with the artist himself on the podium explaining, defending or discussing his work, to black-tie receptions, complete with refreshments and photographers' flashbulbs.

Friday night is museum night not only for previews but for members who have taken advantage of free season tickets to the Richmond Film Society series or season tickets, free of charge, to the concerts given by the Richmond Chamber Music Society.

For artist members of the museum there are Friday evening sketching sessions and, whenever possible, discussion groups highlighted by the presence of visiting dignitaries in the art world.

Believing that children need a very special place in any visual arts program, the museum has a Saturday workshop for children. There are 3 classes; the curriculum includes imaginary trips to foreign lands, with an itinerary paralleling the nationalities represented in the permanent and temporary collections on view in the galleries. Color games, treasure hunts and blissful hours spent experimenting with crayons, pastels, watercolors and clay complete the program.

Enjoying increased popularity each year is the loan library of paintings. To enable members to experiment with contemporary works of art in their homes before making purchases, the museum provides a loan system for paintings, prints, and sculpture. One or more objects may be borrowed for a period of 4 months; an insurance fee is the only cost. Largely by Virginia artists, the paintings range from highly original designs and abstractions—if the borrower has the courage—to landscapes of familiar Virginia mountain and seashore views, portraits, and still life. Often an entire family will turn up to consult, converse with the museum staff and finally carry off their choice.

Advice concerning the conservation and repair of paintings also is available to museum members, and many a Virginia ancestor has benefited from the cleaning, restoration and revarnishing bestowed upon his portrait.

Members of the museum are kept informed on coming events by a variety of publications. A monthly bulletin brings a calendar as well as brief feature articles on paintings and biographies of personalities who participate in the museum's programs. For all special occasions, including important exhibition openings and receptions, invitations are mailed to remind members to come and bring their friends. Printed catalogs are issued for many exhibitions. These are sold at cost or, whenever possible, distributed free of charge.

The original group of renaissance paintings from Judge John Barton Payne has been greatly expanded, chiefly by the gift of the Adolph D. and Wilkins C. Williams collection, including works by such masters as Titian, Rubens, and Rembrandt. Nineteenth century painters are represented in gifts from the Geddes family of paintings by Corot, Diaz, and many works by Gari Melchers, on loan to the museum by Mrs. Melchers; this is in addition to her generous gift in 1942 of the artist's home, Belmont, near Fredericksburg. The T. Catesby Jones collection contains 80 modern European works, including paintings by Picasso, Lurcat, and Braque. Contemporary American paintings are added yearly by purchase. Important renaissance tapestries have been donated by Mr. and Mrs. Arthur G. Glasgow, Mrs. Alfred I. duPont, Mrs. Arthur Kelly Evans, Mrs. Alisa Mellon Bruce, and Mrs. A. D. Williams. In the decorative arts, outstanding are the famed imperial Russian jewelry collection, including the fabulous easter eggs given by Lillian Thomas Pratt, and fine 17th and 18th century ceramics presented by Lady Nancy Astor and Mr. Charles B. Samuels. The present value of the museum and its collection is nearly $10 million.

Concrete recognition of the Virginia Museum's place in the life of the Commonwealth is seen in the new wing, now under construction, for which the general assembly appropriated a total of $1.3 million. The State appropriation is augmented by $1.5 million from private sources.

The director, Mr. Cheek, who administers this large investment in Virginia's cultural future, combines comprehensive knowledge of art, managerial acumen and his own brand of refined showmanship. Old fashioned museum austerity has no place in Mr. Cheek's scheme of things. Before succeeding Thomas Colt, Jr., as director of the Virginia Museum in 1948, Mr. Cheek organized and directed the fine arts department of the College of William and Mary, was director of the Baltimore Museum of Art and served in the Army as Assistant to the Director of Camouflage and Chief of the Army Camouflage School. After the war he was associate editor of Architectural Forum.

"The pleasure of the arts must be made more available," Mr. Cheek has said, "because there's no point in having a statewide visual arts system with exhibitions, programs, and traveling shows unless there's somebody to see them, enjoy them and want to see them again."

The accent is on enjoyment. With the opening of the new wing this October, Director Cheek is confident that the Virginia Museum, America's statewide art pioneer, will give to Virginians ever increasing enjoyment of the visual world about them.

How Social Security Affects You

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, every man, woman, and child in the United States is affected by social security. All should be aware of their rights, privileges, and responsibilities under the program.

From my mail and questions asked me personally, I realize that there is gross misinformation and lack of information regarding the social-security program. This is easily understandable, for this legislation has been changed many times in its history of 20 years, and the laws relating to it cover many pages in various volumes of statutes.

On the following pages I am merely attempting to outline the many features of the program, and to highlight the many changes incorporated in the new law which was passed by the 83d Congress and signed by President Eisenhower.

The new law amends and extends social-security benefits in many ways. The old-age and survivors insurance program now covers about 8 out of 10 of the Nation's jobs. During the course of a year about 62 million people work in employment or self-employment that is covered under the program. The new law extends coverage to about 10 million additional people who in the course of a year work in jobs that are not now covered. Coverage has been extended to self-employed farm operators and certain self-employed professional groups, members of State and local government retirement systems—other than policemen and firemen—additional farm workers and domestic workers, ministers and members of religious orders, most Federal employees not covered by retirement systems, and certain other smaller groups.

The new law amends the method for computing the average monthly wage, on which benefits are based, and works to the advantage of all insured persons. The new law also increases the maximum amount of earnings considered for both tax and benefits purposes from $3,600 a year to $4,200 a year, effective January 1, 1955.

The new law makes provisions for newly covered workers, who, if continuously engaged in employment after 1954, die or retire before they can meet the regular requirements for insured status. The law provides that a person is fully insured at the time of his death or the attainment of age 65, if all of the quarters elapsing after 1954 and up to that time are quarters of coverage, provided he has at least 6 quarters of coverage after 1954.

Prior to enactment of the new law workers lost or suffered reduced social-security rights when they experienced periods of total disability before reaching retirement age. Unless the person was fully insured at the time of disablement, he sometimes lost his fully insured status when he reached retirement age because the entire period of his disability was included in the time which is the basis for determining his insured status. The new law provides a freeze of old-age and survivors insurance status during extended total disability.

In social-security provisions you frequently come across references to "quarters of coverage." A calendar quarter is a 3-month period beginning January 1, April 1, July 1, or October 1. Thus the first quarter of any year is comprised of the months of January, February, and March; the second quarter is April, May, and June; the third is July, August, and September; and the final quarter is October, November, and December. A quarter of coverage under the program is a quarter in which you were paid $50 or more in wages—or in which you were credited with $100 or more in self-employment income covered by the law.

Some specific provisions under the social-security program are as follows:

Increased benefits: Under the new law all present recipients of retirement benefits will receive increases ranging from $5 to $13.50 per month. Benefits for dependents and survivors are increased proportionately. The benefit schedule for future retired workers is increased as much as $23.50 per month.

Earnings limitations: The past law imposed a loss of benefits on annuitants under age 75 who earn more than $75 a month in wage employment covered by the social-security-system, or more than $900 a year from self-employment. The new law changes this limitation to $1,200 a year for both wage earners and self-employed, thus increasing the amount of allowable earnings and spreading earnings from seasonal employment over the year. For earnings above $1,200, one or more benefits would be withheld depending on the amount earned and the number of months worked. Earnings from any type of work, whether or not covered by social security, will be figured in applying the limitation. The age at which benefits are payable without regard to earnings is reduced from 75 to 72.

Dropout: Your social-security benefit is based on your average earnings of past years. The new law permits dropping out up to five of your lowest years, making your average earnings, and consequently your monthly benefit, larger.

Tax rate: The present 2-percent tax rate on employees and employers remains the same under the new law, but the tax base is increased from $3,600 to $4,200 annually. That means persons in covered employment will pay 2 percent of their wages each year on the first $4,200. The law increases the future tax rates—previously scheduled to rise to 3¼ percent in 1970—to 3½ percent in 1970 and to 4 percent for 1975 and thereafter. The self-employed pay 1½ times the employees' rate.

Disability freeze: In the computation of benefits, the new law will waive any period of more than 6 months during which the wage earner is totally disabled, provided he had been working regularly under social security before he became disabled. Otherwise these months of little or no income would reduce the average monthly earnings and consequently the monthly benefit.

Farmers: The self-employed farm operator will report his net income for social-security purposes by transferring the information from his income-tax return to a simple supplementary form. If his net earnings from self-employment do not amount to as much as $400 or more in a given year, he pays no self-employment tax on such income and receives no credit toward benefits.

The special provisions for low-income farm operators is as follows: A self-employed farm operator with gross income of not more than $1,800 in a year who reports his income tax on a cash basis could report, for credit toward benefits under old-age and survivors insurance, either his actual net earnings from farm self-employment, as determined on his income-tax return, or 50 percent of his gross income. If he elects to use the latter option, he will be spared the necessity of keeping records of his expenses, computing depreciation, and so forth. Practically all farmers know their gross income and could apply the 50-percent rule.

A farm operator whose gross income from self-employment is more than $1,800 will have to compute his net earnings. If his actual net earnings as computed are less than $900, he can, if he wishes, report $900; otherwise he will have to report his actual net.

Rentals received in the form of crop shares, like other rentals from real estate, are excluded from gross income for social-security purposes.

Farmworkers: Under the new law a farmworker will be covered in his work for any one employer if he receives cash wages of $100 or more in the year from that employer. This provision brings into the program about 2.1 million workers, while continuing to exclude those farm employees who are normally engaged in other activities and who do farmwork only in the peak-harvest periods.

Farmworkers' earnings will be reported annually. Therefore, provision must be made for converting annual earnings into quarters of coverage. Farmworkers will be given 1 quarter of coverage for annual earnings of more than $100 but less than $200; 2 quarters of coverage for earnings amounting to $200 but less than $300; 3 quarters for earnings amounting to $300 but less than $400; and 4 quarters of coverage for annual earnings amounting to $400 or more.

Professional people: The new law extends coverage to about 100,000 people who during the course of the year are self-employed in the practice of certain professions—architects, engineers, accountants, and funeral directors. These professional people will report their earnings for social-security purposes annually with their income-tax reports.

Employees of State and local governments: Prior to the new law State and local government employees were covered under voluntary agreements between the individual States and the Federal Government, excluding, however, employees who are in positions covered by a State or local retirement system. There are about 3.7 million employees in positions covered by State and local retirement systems in the course of a year.

Under the new law a State can bring members of a State or local retirement system—except policemen and firemen—under its old-age and survivors insurance agreement provided that a referendum by secret written ballot is held among the members of the system, and that a majority of the members of the system who are eligible to vote in the referendum vote in favor of old-age and survivors insurance coverage.

The law continues the previous exclusion of approximately 200,000 policemen and firemen who are covered by a State or local retirement system. Policemen and firemen, because of the arduous nature of their work, have special provisions in their retirement systems such as lower retirement ages, and feel it would be unwise to attempt to integrate these provisions with old-age and survivors insurance.

In the past, employees whose positions were covered by a retirement system but who were not themselves eligible for membership in the system received the same treatment as employees who were members of the retirement system. The new law provides for covering these employees—other than policemen and firemen—without a referendum.

The new law also provides for covering without a referendum employees who could not be covered when their coverage group was covered because they were under a retirement system, but whose system was later dissolved by action taken prior to enactment of this law.

Teachers: The status of teachers in the State of Indiana regarding the new social-security legislation is somewhat different from that of the employees of municipal or local government. The teachers retirement system of Indiana is under the jurisdiction of the State government and cannot be changed except by the State legislature.

These courses of action are possible by the Indiana legislature:

First. To authorize by law the taking of a referendum by the Indiana teachers whereby they could come under the social-security system in addition to the present State teachers' retirement system.

Second. Take no action and in this case the Indiana teachers will not come under the social-security system.

Third. Pass legislation whereby the Indiana teachers would have a combination of social security and teachers' retirement.

It is doubtful if the third plan, to wit: That the State teachers' retirement system be coordinated with the social-security system would meet with favor as there is a considerable pride in the workings of the Indiana State teachers' retirement system and past proposals to coordinate this retirement system with the social-security system have never been very popular. Any coordinated system would still be completely independent of the social-security system.

There are, however, teachers who in exceptional cases cannot come under the Indiana teachers' retirement. A plan may be worked out by the State whereby these teachers would be eligible to participate in the social-security system.

Various colleges and universities in Indiana can participate in the social-security program by action of the institution, together with a referendum by the members under the system.

Any additional employment or self-employment under social security while engaged in teaching or after retiring from teaching can make a teacher eligible to receive social-security benefits as well as his or her teachers' retirement benefits.

Domestic workers: This law covers all domestic workers who work in nonfarm private homes and who are paid $50 in cash wages by an employer in a calendar quarter. It would delete the unnecessary and complicated requirement of the past, limiting the coverage of domestic workers to those who work for a single employer on 24 days during a calendar quarter. The simplified test of coverage for domestic services in private homes provided by the new law would cover, during the course of a year, about 200,000 more household workers than does the present law.

Ministers and members of religious orders: Ministers and members of religious orders who have not taken a vow of poverty, whether self-employed or employees, may secure coverage by filing a certificate indicating their desire to be covered as self-employed persons. Christian Science practitioners may be covered on the same basis. In general, these people would have a 2-year option after coverage becomes available on January 1, 1955, or a 2-year option after the individual becomes a minister, member of a religious order, or practitioner, in which to elect coverage.

Federal Government employees: The law extends coverage to approximately 150,000 civilian employees of the Federal Government and its instrumentalities who are not covered by retirement systems.

United States citizens employed abroad: The law makes old-age and survivors insurance coverage possible, at the option of the employer, for about 100,000 United States citizens who are employed outside of the United States by foreign subsidiaries of parent American companies.

Home workers: The law extends employee coverage to about 100,000 additional homeworkers. Homeworkers who have the status of employees under the usual common-law rules applicable in determining employer-employee relationship have been covered since 1937. In addition, homeworkers who do not have employee status under the usual common-law rules are now covered as employees if they work according to specifications of the person for whom the work is done on materials or goods furnished by that person and required to be returned to him or his designee and if they are paid cash wages of $50 or more during a calendar quarter by a given employer.

Railroad retirement: Railroad employees now have some protection under the Social Security System, as well as under the Railroad Retirement System. Legislation was passed a few years ago which partially coordinated the two systems.

Retirement age: There has been considerable interest in having the retirement age on social security lowered, and bills have been introduced to that effect. It has been pointed out that such lowering of retirement age might be especially beneficial in times of unemployment, and it would also be in harmony with some retirement plans which have fixed the retirement age at 60 years, such as the United Mine Workers system. However, the Ways and Means Committee did not recommend any change of retirement age this year. The matter will probably be given more study during the next session of Congress.

Wives and widows: There was also legislation introduced to lower the age at which a widow would be eligible to begin drawing social-security benefits. However, no change was made in the law regarding the retirement age of a wife or widow. The law now provides that the widow, unless she has children under the age of 18, cannot begin drawing social-security benefits until she is 65, regardless of the time that her husband was deceased. It has been pointed out that in many instances this has caused great suffering, as the widow has no means of livelihood until she reaches 65. There was also an effort made to lower the age at which the wife could begin drawing social-security benefits once her husband has begun drawing his. There was some precedent for consideration of this matter in the recent railroad-retirement legislation which lowered to 60 the age at which a widow can draw railroad retirement.

Legislation was introduced to change the amount drawn by the wife or widow under certain conditions. Under the present law if a husband is covered by social security, when his wife reaches the age of 65, she ordinarily receives an amount equal to one-half of the amount of her husband's benefits. Unless the wife's separate entitlement for employment and contributions under social security is equal to more than half the amount that her husband is entitled to receive, she receives no extra payment for the contribution she has made. There was legislation introduced to change this situation, but no action was taken on it in this session of Congress.

Self-employed: This phase of the law is misunderstood to a greater extent than any other provision. I have personally received inquiries from several people who were entitled to social-security benefits and were not aware of it. Two typical examples were brought to my attention recently.

A man 74 years of age who had worked as an employee and contributed to the Social Security System 3 quarters was totally unaware that his later earnings of $800 per year sharpening lawnmowers entitled him to social-security coverage as self-employed. All he had to do was to file schedule C, of income tax return form 1040, showing the amount that he had earned each year since he became self-employed since 1950, and pay the proper amount into the social-security system as a self-employed person. He was then entitled to draw social-security benefits.

Another case was that of a school-bus driver, 65 years of age, who was not entitled to draw social-security benefits as an employee of the school township because the political subdivision for which he had rendered services had not entered into an agreement to have its employees covered. He was, however, entitled to social-security coverage as a self-employed person. All that was necessary for him to do was to file schedule C of form 1040 showing his earnings as a self-employed person and paying his social-security tax as such. He is now drawing his social-security benefits. There are many similar cases and each must be studied individually to see if it is covered by social security.

Veterans: I am anxious to explain just what credits for social security a veteran receives. I know of specific instances where veterans' widows and children receive social security and the only time the veteran was under social security was while he was in the Army. I would like to explain that as simply as possible.

A social security wage credit of $160 is provided for each month of active military or naval service performed between September 16, 1940, and July 1, 1955. These credits count the same as earnings for covered work in determining whether a veteran is insured for old-age and survivors insurance benefits, and in computing the amount of the benefit. The credits may not be counted for social security purposes, however, if a benefit based in whole or in part on the same period of military service is determined to be payable by a Federal agency other than the Veterans' Administration.

Any specific question regarding social security coverage can be answered at the field offices, which in the Seventh District counties are as follows:

Greene, Morgan, Monroe, and Owen: 205 South Walnut Street, Bloomington.

Daviess, Knox, and Martin: 204 La Plante Building, Vincennes.

Clay and Sullivan: Room 306, Post Office Building, Terre Haute.

Johnson: 36 South Pennsylvania, Indianapolis.

Gibson: Courthouse, Fourth and Vice Streets, Evansville.

I will also be happy to obtain any information you need and work with you in any way I can if you will write me at my office: WILLIAM G. BRAY, Member of Congress, Room 1017, New House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

Buying Out the Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. GWINN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure today to insert in the RECORD an essay entitled "Government in Business Versus Conservatism" by Dr. Russell Kirk. It supports the idea of buying out the Government where it is engaged in unconstitutional functions. He shows the evils that are inevitable in government the instant it goes beyond its true constitutional function of protecting life and property.

Dr. Kirk is one of our foremost scholars and was recently the author of a book entitled "The Conservative Mind" which attracted great attention as a scholarly development of the basic tenants of American society. Dr. Kirk's essay deals directly with the problem before the Congress of how to liquidate big paternalistic government so that we do not lose our liberty and moral integrity.

The essay follows:

GOVERNMENT IN BUSINESS VERSUS CONSERVATISM

(By Russell Kirk, D. Litt.)

In a popular magazine, recently, I noticed a reference to "the rich conservatives, the well-off liberals, and the poor laboring men." This notion is nonsense. Some millionaires are fanatically radical, and some workingmen are fiercely conservative, and the well-to-do may be anything under the sun. Conservatism and liberalism and radicalism are states of mind, not of the pocketbook. Though the United States has been a Nation substantially conservative throughout most of its history, rich men have exerted less direct influence upon government in America than almost anywhere else in the world. Conservative regimes are in power today in Britain, Germany, France, Italy, Japan, and many smaller states, though in none of these countries do the rich amount to more than 1 percent of the population. Conservatism, then, must be something more than mere anxiety to protect large incomes.

Conservatism, indeed, is a word with an old and honorable meaning—but a meaning almost forgotten by Americans until recent years. Even nowadays, though there are a good many conservatives in both national and State politics, in neither major party do many leading politicians describe themselves as conservatives. Thus, paradoxically, the people of the United States became the chief conservative Nation of the world at the very time when they had ceased to call themselves conservatives at home. For a whole generation, the word "liberal" has been in fashion, particularly in universities and among journalists. The liberal, in American parlance, has been a person in love with constant change; often he has been influenced directly by the system of ideas called pragmatism and the writings of John Dewey; commonly the liberal has tended to despise the lessons of the past and to look forward confidently to an endless vista of material progress, in which the state will play a larger and larger role, and a general equality of condition will be enforced. But the shock of the First World War somewhat disturbed this complacency of the liberal; the rise of the totalitarian states and the coming of the Second World War shook this complacent liberalism to its foundations; and the spectacle of Soviet Russia, together with certain alarming indications of moral decay and political decline in most of the rest of the world, put an end to the popular ascendancy of liberalism. The Liberal Party of Britain was annihilated at the polls; in America, the words "liberal" and "liberalism," formerly so commendatory, have become terms of derogation or suspicion, in many quarters. It is time, then, for people who know that they are not liberals or radicals to ask themselves just what they believe, and what they must call themselves. The traditional system of ideas opposed to liberalism and radicalism is the conservative philosophy. Already the words "conservative" and "conservatism" are being employed as terms of praise in the popular press and by a good many serious thinkers, and books by conservative writers are receiving an attention that they have been denied for decades. Before long, party leaders probably will be describing their own programs as conservative. In politics, as in physics or in law, it is scarcely possible to make any progress until you have defined your terms. What is conservatism? Who are the conservatives?

Aristotle was a conservative, and so was Cicero, and there have been intelligent conservatives in every age. John Stuart Mill, a century ago, called conservatives "the stupid party." But they have outlasted most of their enemies, and today the conservatives show a power of mind which is one of the few heartening aspects of the present decade. Modern conservatism, as a regular body of ideas, took form about the beginning of the French Revolution, when farseeing and patriotic men in Britain and America perceived that if humanity is to conserve the elements in civilization that make life worth living, some coherent philosophy must resist the leveling and destructive impulse of the fanatic revolutionaries. In England, the founder of true conservatism was Edmund Burke, whose Reflections on the Revolution in France turned the tide of British opinion, and influenced incalculably the leaders of men in the continent and in America. In the newly established United States, the Fathers of the Republic, conservative by instinct and by practical experience, were determined to shape constitutions which should guide their posterity in ways of enduring justice and freedom. The American War of Independence had not been a real revolution, but rather a separation from England; the authors of the Federal Constitution had no desire to turn society upside down. In their writings, particularly in the words of John Adams, we find a sober conservatism founded upon an understanding of history and human nature. The Constitution which they drew up has proved to be the most conservative device in all history.

Conservative leaders, ever since Burke and Adams, have subscribed to certain general ideas that we may set down, briefly, by way of definition. Conservatives distrust what Burke called "abstractions," or absolute political dogmas divorced from particular circumstances. Nevertheless, they do believe in the existence of certain abiding truths which govern the conduct of human society. Perhaps the chief principles which have characterized American conservative thought are these:

1. Men and nations are governed by moral laws; and those laws are ordained by a power that is more than human. Political problems at bottom, are moral and religious problems. An eternal chain of duty links the generations that are dead, and the generation that is living now, and the generations yet to be born. We have no right, in our own brief existence, to alter irrevocably the shape of society, in contempt of our ancestors and of the rights of posterity. Politics is the art of apprehending and applying the justice which is superior to statutory law.

2. Variety and uniformity are the great gifts of truly civilized society. The uniformity and standardization of liberal and radical planners would be the death of all real vigor and freedom in existence—what Tocqueville calls democratic despotism, a monotonous and endless life-in-death, every man precisely like his neighbor—and, like the damned of the Inferno, deprived forever of hope.

3. Justice, by definition, is the rendering to each man of the things which best suit his nature; it is not mere envious leveling. Civilized society requires orders and classes, division of responsibility, and true leadership. A free society will endeavor, indeed, to afford to men of natural abilities every opportunity to rise by their own efforts; but it will resist strenuously the radical delusion that exact equality of station and wealth benefits everyone. The only true equality is equality in the sight of God; all other attempts at leveling lead to despair. Society longs for just leadership; and if a people destroy natural distinctions among men, presently some Bonaparte fills the vacuum—or worse than Bonaparte.

4. Property and freedom are inseparably connected; economic leveling is not economic progress. If the ancient institution of private property is destroyed, liberty must go with it. Independence of action, freedom of criticism, and representative government all are possible only in a society founded upon private property. Conservatives value property for its own sake, of course; but they value it even more because without it all men are at the mercy of an omnipotent state—in short, they are slaves. Freedom of worship, of the mind, and of political organization all are dependent upon the survival of private property. Sir Henry Maine's historical studies show how any higher civilization is the product, in large part, of the growth of several property. Unless we call civilization a mistake, Paul Elmer More writes, any attempt to ignore the rights of property must produce general misery: "Security of property is the first and all-essential duty of a civilized community." Life is a primitive thing; we share it with the beasts; but property is the mark of man alone, the means of our elevation.

5. The individual is foolish, but the species is wise; therefore we rely in most matters upon the wisdom of our ancestors. History is an immense storehouse of knowledge. We pay a decent respect to the moral traditions and ancient customs of mankind, knowing that men who ignore the past are condemned to repeat it. The conservative distrusts the radical visionary and the planner who would chop society into pieces and mold it anew. The conservative appeals beyond the fickle opinion of the hour to what Chesterton called "the democracy of the dead"—that is, the considered judgment of the wise men who died before our time, the experience of the race. Men must put a control upon will and appetite, and ought to feel humble before the vastness and antiquity of society. To presume that men can plan rationally the whole of existence is to expose mankind to a terrible danger from the collapse of existing institutions; for conservatives know most men to be governed more by emotion than by reason. Tradition and custom and our constitutions of government provide checks upon men's anarchic impulses.

6. The crying need of modern society is not collectivism, but true community. Men do not stand alone, as atoms of humanity—or, if they do, they do not stand for long. Men, as Aristotle knew, desire community. An arrogant and selfish individualism is nearly as dangerous as an oppressive collectivism—and such exaggerated selfishness, indeed, may provoke the reaction of collectivism. But conservatives do not elevate selfishness to the condition of a virtue; nor do they surrender blindly to the fallacy that the only alternative to sterile individualism is stifling collectivism. The true conservatives believe in community in local government, in local and private associations, in the rights of the several States, in a sense of common interest among men engaged in common economic endeavors, in all those venerable ties which link man to man voluntarily and beneficially, and which the collectivists, if they were to triumph, would destroy mercilessly. The conservatives know that the real instruments of community are church, voluntary associations, and established state and local bodies, not the Leviathan of the unitary nation-state.

7. In the affairs of nations, the thinking conservatives seek always to remind Americans that their chief necessity is national humility. It is a law of politics, as well as of biology, that every living thing loves above all else—even above its own life—its distinct identity, which sets it off from all other things. If Americans try to remake all the nations of the world in their own image, they awaken this deep-seated resentment of any people against a power that would absorb their identity into the being of another. The conservative American, while never forgetting that he cannot ignore the part which Providence has ordained the United States to play in the modern world, is cautious in his expenditure of money and of advice abroad. Conservatives never tire of saying that America's highest obligation in the affairs of nations is to provide the example of a just, honest, dignified, and prospering state, a republic free and secure.

8. Change and reform, the conservatives know, are not identical: political innovation is a destructive blaze more often than it is a torch of progress. All human institutions must alter, for slow change is the means of conserving society, as it is the means of renewing the human body. But the true statesman combines an ability to reform with a disposition to preserve. The American conservatives endeavor to reconcile the growth and alteration essential to our complicated economy with the strength and wholesomeness of our moral and social traditions. The conservatives see a stern Providence at work in the affairs of men, and they try to lead Americans into courses consonant with the profound natural tendency of things, rather than presuming to sweep away all the good of existing society along with the evil which no society ever wholly eradicates.

From the inception of the American Republic, the spirit of conservatism has been strong among us; but it has not been confined to a single party, nor has it borne any close relationship to distinctions of wealth, occupation, and birth. Of the people whom we call conservative, some are physicians, and some locomotive engineers, and some professors, and some clerks, and some bankers, and some farmers, and some diemakers, and some soldiers. Often, however, American conservatism has been instinctive, rather than reflective. The time is now upon us, it appears, when conservatives must think soberly and lucidly. It will not suffice simply to express a vague opposition to collectivism if, at the same time, conservatives let the enemies of traditional society obtain control over the instruments of political and economic survival, and the media of directing public opinion. Centralization, extension of the economic functions of government, the increase of taxation and national debts, the decay of family life and local association, and the employment of formal schooling to enforce uniformity of character and opinion—these influences are at work among us with a dreadful power. We are beginning, perforce, to work our way back to the first principles of politics and ethics. The time is perilously short, nevertheless. The conservative instinct of America, just now reawakening, must draw its vigor from every man and every woman who believes in enduring truth, in liberty under law, and in the social arrangements essential to the maintenance of a just and free and tranquil Nation.

Americans have more to conserve, probably, than have any other modern people; and conservative impulses are congenial to American character. We all are partners in the gigantic concern of American society, whether our material share in the national partnership is large or small; the man with the smallest portion has as much a right to that share as the man with the largest possessions has to what is his own. Correspondingly, we all have the duty of standing by our common heritage of the Republic, without envy or evasion. The majority of conservatives, in every country, always have been men of slender means and obscure station. These conservatives are not interested primarily in free competition or in the American standard of living, valuable though those possessions are. What gives the true conservative his strength in our time of troubles is his belief in a moral order which joins all classes in a common purpose, and through which men may live in justice and liberty. It is high time that the leaders of political conservatism began to speak in terms of ethics, of right and wrong. If they do so, they will find that they enjoy a free field, for their liberal and radical opponents are morally bankrupt in 1954.

"We are told that a workingman cannot be conservative," Disraeli said in 1874, "because he has nothing to conserve—he has neither land nor capital; as if there were not other things in the world as precious as land and capital." The workingman, in free society, has liberty, security of person and home, equal protection by the laws, the right to the fruits of his own industry, and opportunity to do the best that is in him. "Surely these are privileges worthy of being preserved. * * * And if that be the case, is it wonderful that the working classes are conservative?" Eighty years later, Disraeli's words ring true. The American workingman rarely is a true radical, and often he is a thorough conservative; and this is true also of a large part of the British working classes. Conservative principles are not simply economic concepts, and they are not confined to a single class. They are intended to shelter the rights and the hopes of everyone in society. If we adhere to the wisdom of our ancestors and to venerable social institutions, Burke said in his overpowering reply to the radical Duke of Bedford, then we all are safe together, rich and poor, old and young, the powerful and the humble. But if we once sweep aside our established ways of living together and working together, the way is opened for any ruthless adventurer or knot of unscrupulous men to master society and plunder it lawlessly. Precisely this happened to France in Burke's time, and has happened in half the world in the 20th century.

Conservatism, then, is not simply the concern of the people who have much property and influence; it is a social concept important to everyone who desires equal justice and personal freedom and all the lovable old ways of humanity. Conservatism is not simply a defense of capitalism.

(Capitalism, indeed, is a word coined by Karl Marx, intended from the beginning to create the impression that the only thing conservatives try to defend is vast accumulations of private capital.) The true conservative does defend private enterprise stoutly; and one of the reasons why he defends it is that private enterprise is the only really satisfactory system of economic endeavor; but more than even this, he defends private enterprise as a means to an end. That end is a society just and free, in which each man has the right to what is his own, to what he inherits from his father, and to the rewards of his ability and industry; a society which recognizes a moral order that governs every man, whatever his station; a society which cherishes variety and individuality, rising superior to the dreary plain of socialism. A conservative society enables men to be truly human persons, not mere specks in a collective tapioca-pudding society; it respects their dignity as persons—or, as Chesterton says, the right of every man to be "his potty little self."

As more and more people come to apprehend the shocking injuries inflicted upon civilization by collectivistic systems in our century, it is no wonder that conservatism appears to be gaining ground in every element of the American Nation. But the task before intelligent conservatives still is tremendous. Conservatism's most conspicuous difficulty in our time is that the men who wish to preserve our old liberty and security are confronted by a crowd that has come to look upon society, vaguely, as a homogeneous mass of identical individuals, with indistinguishable abilities and needs, whose happiness may be secured by direction from above, through legislation or public-school indoctrination or State-directed economic enterprise. To an appreciable extent, both in domestic policy and in foreign affairs, the American Government has reflected this belief in recent years. Conservatives must teach humanity once more that the germ of public affections (in Burke's phrase) "is to love the little platoon we belong to in society." If conservatives cannot redeem modern men from the sterile fallacies of collectivism, then a general misery, impoverishing to body and soul, impends over all western society—the collectivism that has deluged Europe east of the Elbe and the Austrian Alps, the collectivism (as George Orwell wrote) of "the streamlined men who think in slogans and talk in bullets." The prospect of this collectivism, affrighting the most stubborn liberals of the West, is the immediate impulse behind the revival of popular conservatism in the United States.

Mere negative opposition, clutching in despair at what we still retain, but drifting with the current of affairs and offering no clear alternative to collectivism, is futile; and it is not true conservatism. Men who believe in justice and order and the old decencies must apply the general principles of conservative thought to the necessities of the hour. The effort is being made, although by too few, as yet. In the realm of the intellect, some of the most encouraging signs of this revival of a positive and courageous conservatism have been certain recent books: Mr. Richard Weaver's Ideas Have Consequences, reminding us that if our philosophical postulates are mistaken, our actions will be disastrous; Dean R. A. Nisbet's The Quest for Community, describing how liberal programs have failed to satisfy the deep-seated longings of human nature, and how an intelligent conservatism can bring us back to real community; Mr. Clinton Rossiter's Seedtime of the Republic, examining the conservative foundations of American politics.

In the realm of practical affairs, some men of high talent in the arts of government and of business have begun to turn their attention toward the formation of positive conservative policies, in political and economic action, that will lead us away from the morass of collectivism.

Among the most intelligent and detailed of these proposals is Mr. Charles E. Wilson's plan for returning a great variety of economic enterprises, assumed by the Federal Government during the late war or earlier, to the private control which not only is the most efficient form of management, but—still more important—makes possible that diversity of ownership and that diffusion of property-holding which sustain free political institutions. Sale of governmentally owned manufacturing facilities, transportation systems, service activities, and construction and maintenance systems, at an economic price, to private corporations and individuals, would be the most important reversal of the drift toward a repressive collectivism which any nation has experienced in many years. This is conservatism intelligently applied to our present discontents.

By ideas, good or bad, the destinies of nations are governed. Fraudulent and fallacious ideas, in the ascendant over much of the world, have brought modern civilization close to destruction. The task for the conservatives is to lead our nation, now, with a high reason and a high imagination. "Men of intemperate minds never can be free," Burke wrote. "Their passions forge their fetters." Temperance, prudence, fortitude, and justice are the four massive pillars of conservatism.

Appropriation Acts of the 83d Congress, 2d Session—Part V

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 18, 1954

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am extending my remarks in continuance of my report on the appropriation acts of the 2d session of the 83d Congress, as follows:

PUBLIC LAW 437

H. R. 8779, Department of Agriculture and Farm Credit Appropriation Act

A. Appropriates $723,683,150 for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955. Continues antistrike provisions.

B. Item:

	Appropriation
Agricultural Research Service:	
Salaries and expenses:	
Research	$35,353,000
Plant and animal disease and pest control	17,689,579
Meat inspection	14,325,000
Total, salaries and expenses	67,367,579
Payments to States, etc	19,453,708
Foot and mouth and other contagious diseases	2,134,000
Research	1,900,000
Total, Agricultural Research Service	88,721,287
Extension Service:	
Payments to States, etc	39,675,000
Federal Extension Service	3,867,500
Total, Extension Service	43,542,500
Farmer Cooperative Service	408,000
Forest Service:	
Salaries and expenses:	
National forest protection and management	30,490,200
Fighting forest fires	6,000,000
Control of forest pests	4,937,500
Forest research	6,538,500
Total, salaries and expenses	47,966,200
Forest roads and trails	$16,000,000
Acquisition of land:	
Weeks Act	125,000
Special acts	(10,000)
State and private forestry cooperation	10,683,690
Cooperative range improvements	(400,000)
Total, Forest Service	74,774,890
Soil Conservation Service:	
Conservation operations	59,085,671
Watershed protection	5,500,000
Flood prevention	7,482,000
Water conservation and utilization projects	480,000
Total, Soil Conservation Service	72,547,671
Agricultural Marketing Service:	
Marketing Research and Service:	
Marketing research and agricultural estimates	10,215,000
Marketing services	11,575,500
Total, marketing research and service	21,790,500
Payments to States, etc	900,000
Repayment to Commodity Credit Corporation	441,655
School lunch	83,236,197
Total, Agricultural Marketing Service	106,368,352
Agricultural conservation program	191,700,000
Foreign Agricultural Service	965,000
Commodity Exchange Authority	673,000
Commodity Stabilization Service:	
Agricultural adjustment programs	41,250,000
Sugar Act	59,600,000
Total, Commodity Stabilization Service	100,850,000
Federal Crop Insurance, salaries and expenses	6,000,000
Rural Electrification Administration, salaries and expenses	7,285,000
Farmers' Home Administration, salaries and expenses	22,500,000
Office of Solicitor	2,030,000
Office of Secretary	2,080,000
Office of Information	1,196,000
Library	659,950
Total, title I, regular activities	723,351,650
Title III, special activities	331,500
Total appropriations	723,683,150

PUBLIC LAW 458

H. R. 8873, Department of Defense Appropriation Act

A. Appropriates $28,800,125,486 for military functions administered by the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955. Limits cost of family quarters for military personnel and provides for schooling of dependents of such personnel. Directs the Secretary of Defense to assist American small business to participate equitably in the furnishing of commodities and services financed with funds appropriated hereunder. Continues antistrike provisions. Requires the use of domestic food, clothing, cotton or wool, if possible, when needed.

B. Item:

TITLE I—NATIONAL SECURITY TRAINING COMMISSION

	Appropriations
Salaries and expenses	$55,000

TITLE II—OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

Salaries and expenses	12,250,000
Office of Public Information	500,000
Total, title II—Office of Secretary of Defense	12,750,000

TITLE III—INTERSERVICE ACTIVITIES

Claims	7,680,000
Construction of ships, MSTS	50,000,000
Contingencies	40,000,000
Emergency fund	25,000,000
Retired pay	404,500,000
Court of Military Appeals	320,000
Total, title III—Interservice activities	527,500,000

TITLE IV—DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

Military personnel	4,150,479,000
Maintenance and operations	2,795,722,986
Military construction, Army Reserve Forces	15,000,000

H. R. 8873, Department of Defense Appropriation Act—Continued

TITLE IV—DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY—continued

	Appropriation
Reserve personnel requirements	$90,000,000
Army National Guard	218,530,000
Research and development	345,000,000
National Board for Promotion of Rifle Practice, Army	100,000
Alaska Communication System: Operation and maintenance	4,235,000
Total, title IV—Department of the Army	7,619,066,986

TITLE V—DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

Military personnel, Navy	2,417,000,000
Military personnel, Naval Reserve	78,100,000
Navy personnel, general expenses	75,030,000
Military personnel, Marine Corps	612,180,600
Military personnel, Marine Corps Reserve	16,750,000
Marine Corps troops and facilities	167,994,500
Marine Corps procurement	129,974,000
Aircraft and facilities	780,895,500
Aircraft and related procurement	1,973,568,000
Ships and facilities	818,681,000
Construction of ships (1948–51 programs)	57,600,000
Shipbuilding and conversion (1952–55 programs)	1,042,400,000
Ordnance and facilities	457,436,000
Ordnance for new construction (liquidation of contract authorization)	34,000,000
Medical care	63,600,000
Civil engineering	104,294,000
Military construction, Naval Reserve Forces	15,000,000
Research and development	419,874,900
Servicewide supply and finance	340,300,000
Servicewide operations	104,570,000
Naval petroleum reserves (transfer authority in 1954)	3,575,000
Total, title V—Department of the Navy	9,712,823,500

TITLE VI—DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

Aircraft and related procurement	2,760,000,000
Major procurement other than aircraft	674,364,000
Research and development	418,070,000
Maintenance and operations	3,502,792,000
Military personnel	3,356,704,000
Reserve personnel	28,000,000
Air National Guard	160,000,000
Contingencies	28,000,000
Total, title VI—Department of the Air Force	10,927,930,000
Total appropriations, titles I, II, III, IV, V, VI	28,800,125,486

American Ideal Courses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. GWINN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, here is a letter I would like to share with my colleagues from Mr. Place:

JULY 25, 1954.

Hon. RALPH W. GWINN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN GWINN: An overwhelming majority of Americans are loyal and patriotic, and the very thought of an atheistic Communist dictatorship regimenting all mankind as yes men to a political boss demanding obedience to his decrees rather than to God's will and Christ's teachings is repugnant to them.

Unfortunately, however, the task of exposing Communist activities in our midst has been neglected by many citizens, and not enough Americans have countered fraudulent Communist propaganda by acclaiming the blessings and privileges guaranteed to them by our Constitution.

In our approach to the problem of communism, perhaps, the tendency has been to "accentuate the negative and eliminate the positive."

Generally the evils of communism have been played up in the headlines and articles in the press considerably more than the virtues of Americanism.

While it is true that we cannot combat communism intelligently unless we know what it is and what its objectives and methods are, it is also a fact that Americans must be thoroughly familiar with the basic concepts of our form of government and way of life, as set forth in the Declaration of Independence, the Bill of Rights, the Constitution, and other historic documents, in order that they and their children may intelligently guard and defend those basic concepts (which are the antithesis of Marxist principles):

Here in the Nation's Capital, the Washington Board of Trade, composed of approximately 6,000 business and professional men, takes a positive approach to preserving American liberties and freedom through the maintenance and support of its American ideals committee. This committee is not new. It was formed some years ago to "consider methods of inculcating in uninformed residents an understanding of and a regard for traditional American principles of Government."

Without fanfare, the American ideals committee has been performing a valuable service to the District of Columbia and to the Nation for a number of years.

It has been my privilege to serve as chairman of the American ideals committee during 1953–54 during the administration of Harry L. Merrick, an advertising executive, who, together with Liaison Director E. K. Morris, president of the Federal Storage Co., inspired to committee to unprecedented activity.

I wish to report to you on the programs of this committee because I sincerely believe that is a pilot operation which could benefit our Nation tremendously if the businessmen in communities throughout the land instituted a similar committee either in the local chamber of commerce or board of trade, or any other existing civic-minded organization of business and professional men.

It is conceivable to me that American ideals committees in every city, town, and hamlet throughout America could mean the difference between saving and losing our precious heritage. The hour is late but not too late.

The organization plan of the American ideals committee this year was designed to give every one of the 60 members a job or jobs to do.

Therefore, nine subcommittees were set up under the chairmanship of capable business and professional men with the special background and talents for this assignments, as follows:

Americanization, under W. Gilbert Dent, Jr., of the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. This subcommittee worked closely with the Americanization School of the District of Columbia and its administrative principal, James T. Gallahorn, and participated in welcoming new citizens at regularly sponsored receptions inaugurated last February by the Women's Bar Association of the District of Columbia.

Internal security, under Julius N. Cahn, counsel of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. This subcommittee obtained experts from Senate and House investigating committees as speakers, and also prepared bibliographies and other material for increasing knowledge of the security problem and steps being taken to meet it.

Special projects, under W. Jeffries Chewning, Jr., Hamilton National Bank. Through this subcommittee, arrangements were made for board of trade representation in such civic and patriotic events as the observance of the birthday anniversaries of Abraham Lincoln, Thomas Jefferson, and Maj. Pierre L'Enfant, sponsored by the Military Order of the Loyal Legion, the Sons of the American Revolution, and the Columbia Historical Society, respectively. On July 16, the color guard composed of American ideals committee members, participated in the patriotic services held in conjunction with Recognition of District of Columbia Flag Day, sponsored by the District Commissioners and a citizens' committee.

Awards, under James E. Palmer, Jr., attorney who served until recently in the Department of Justice for many years. It was the policy of this subcommittee to recommend citations from the committee and awards of recognition from the board of trade to Americans rendering an important service in advancing American ideals. Those so honored included John Jay Daly, journalist and author of the Toast to the Flag, familiar to millions of Americans; Willard Edwards, journalist; Hon. Jennings Randolph, a former Member of Congress now serving on the American ideals committee in recognition of extensive public speaking endeavors on behalf of keeping America strong; David Lawrence, editor and columnist who has been a relentless foe of communism. Other awards were given to the sponsors of the WTOP television series, I Led Three Lives, based on the experiences of Herbert Philbrick, counterspy for the FBI, and to the American Security & Trust Co., for conducting a newspaper advertising campaign portraying the advantages and accomplishments of the American free enterprise system.

National defense, under Col. John V. Hinkel, public relations consultant. This committee arranged a luncheon in conjunction with the 29th celebration of National Defense Week (February 12–22) with the Reserve Officers Association and other groups. Awards were made to the outstanding enlisted reservists of all services of the metropolitan area.

Speakers, under J. R. Pat Gorman, trade association attorney. Principal function of this committee was to recommend and sometimes supply speakers to patriotic and civic groups as well as for schools, radio, and television. Mr. Gorman personally gave many flannel board talks on American Ideals in cities throughout the country.

Publications, under James D. Owens, of D. N. Owens & Co., Inc. This subcommittee not only collected publications and prints for committee files but also for distribution to committee members to keep them informed.

Public relations, under Edward R. Place, public relations consultant, working closely with the public relations staff of the Board of Trade, as well as communications media.

Reception, under Soterios Nicholson, attorney. Purpose of this subcommittee was to welcome new members and develop cordial relations among all members as well as esprit de corps.

Fred L. Dixon, of Folger, Nolan & Co., rendered valuable service cooperating on the Your Federal Government at Work project with Charles T. Lloyd, its director, at American University.

Upon the recommendation of the American Ideals Committee, the board of trade endorsed legislation since enacted into law to revise the Pledge of Allegiance by the addition of the two words "under God," following the words, "one Nation" and preceding the word "indivisible." The revised pledge was consistently used at committee functions.

Sixteen major events featured the year's program of the American Ideals Committee, as follows:

September 1: Eighth Annual National Conference on Citizenship at the Statler Hotel.

September 2: Organization meeting at the Burlington Hotel.

October 3: Joint award luncheon at the Burlington Hotel with American Public Relations Association (citations to John Jay Daly and Willard Edwards).

November 4: Award luncheon meeting at the United States Capitol (citation to David Lawrence).

November 5: Guided tour of FBI exhibits.

December 6: Award luncheon at the Burlington Hotel (citation to the Honorable Jennings Randolph).

January 7: Joint award luncheon meeting of the Sertoma Club at the New Colonial Hotel (citation to the National Brewing Co. and Sertoma American Way of Life Award to Herbert Philbrick).

February 8: Lincoln Day ceremonies (represented by color guard and in wreath-laying).

February 9: National Defense Week award luncheon at Burlington Hotel, with military and naval affairs committee and the Reserve Officers Association (ROA certificates of merit awarded).

March 10: Business and planning luncheon at the University Club.

April 11: Patriots' Day award luncheon meeting at the Burlington Hotel with the military and naval affairs committees and Massachusetts State Society (certificate of recognition to the American Security and Trust Co.).

April 12: Jefferson Day ceremonies (represented by color guard and in wreath laying).

May 13: Americanization School luncheon, participation in student assembly and tour of classrooms (certificate of recognition to Americanization School).

May 14: Joint luncheon meeting with cultural development committee at the Raleigh Hotel to honor Dr. H. Paul Caemmerer, retiring Secretary and administrative officer of the Commission of Fine Arts.

June 15: Business meeting for review and planning at the University Club.

July 16: "Recognition of District of Columbia Flag Day" at the District Building(represented by color guard).

On August 2, the American Ideals Committee will be represented by a color guard at the exercises at the tomb of Maj. Pierre L'Enfant at the Lee Mansion.

The committee participated in the television programs A Free Man Faces Communism (WMAL-TV) and I Led Three Lives (WTOP-TV) and judged an essay contest based on student editor interviews with Herbert Philbrick.

Speakers, not previously mentioned, who addressed the committee during the past year include Maj. Gen. Bonner Fellers, United States Army, retired; War Correspondent Jim Lucas; Robert Kunzig, counsel of the House Committee on Un-American Activities; Benjamin Mandell, research director of the Jenner Subcommittee on Internal Security; Adm. Leland Lovette, United States Navy, retired, director of public relations of the Veterans of Foreign Wars; Karl Baarslag, research director of Senator McCarthy's Government Operations Committee.

Working in the open and with full publicity, business promoting American ideals enjoy a tremendous advantage over subversive groups, which, of necessity, must operate underground and strive to avoid publicity.

Washington businessmen know that they cannot relax, however, in promotion of American ideals, especially among our youth, because there has come into their hands recently copies of a 23-page pamphlet which is entitled "The American Way to Jobs—Peace, Democracy—Draft Program of the Communist Party." One such pamphlet was mailed to a recent college graduate and was postmarked College Park, Md.

The Communists are typically deceitful in publicizing the title, "The American Way."

The writer is president of the Sertoma Club of Washington, D. C., and knows that the American way program has been carried on for several years by Sertoma International, and features distribution of copies of the Declaration of Independence to school children; recognition of outstanding Americans through presentation to them of the Sertoma American Way of Life award; celebration of American Way Day in communities; singing the national anthem at sports events; selling freedom with the flannelboard before audiences of all kinds.

Nearly a dozen members of the board of trade American ideals committee were among the charter officers and members of the Sertoma Club of Washington, D. C., illustrating how business and professional men spread the gospel of Americanism to all the organizations to which they belong if influenced in the right way.

In closing, may I point out that one large American company, Food Machinery & Chemical Corp., working with Stanford Research Institute and Stanford University Press, has tried out a new kind of employee program called the American ideals course. This program was created in response to requests from employees for more information on the why and how of our economy, and consists of a series of lectures with films.

Multiply the Washington Board of Trade's American ideals committee and American ideals courses all over America, and I believe that we can cast away all fears of communism and socialism making any headway in the United States of America.

Sincerely yours,

Edward R. Place,
Chairman, American Ideals Committee,
Washington Board of Trade.

Biennial Report to Citizens of the Fifth Congressional District of Connecticut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, it has been my custom in the past four sessions of Congress to make a report to the people of the Fifth Connecticut District at the end of each session. This condensed summary deals with major legislation that has been passed by Congress, and my own participation in this legislation, as well as other personal activities which had a direct bearing on the people I represent in our Nation's Capital.

The President, in his state of the Union message, outlined in general terms what he was to propose more specifically in later stages as his program. The President thus demonstrated from the very beginning that he comprehended the problems confronting the Nation and the whole world and proposed logical and down-to-earth solutions. The major portion of this program emerged from Congress without serious or damaging alterations.

The President's legislative program constituted 64 proposals, and Congress, in cooperation with the administration, attained the very high batting average of 0.828. This percentage is far greater than any for prior Congresses in modern history. It is evident from this fact that the President and the Republican Congress worked in concert and harmony for the general welfare of the Nation. This has been a Congress of constructive achievement.

The end of the fighting in Korea in July of 1953 fulfilled the promise made by the President in his campaign for election. The President and Congress kept faith with the American people and brought an end to the burdens and sufferings which were largely being borne by us. Here was an example of decision contrasted to indecision by the previous administration. In the first year of this administration, peace came to the world and we were ready to chart a course which involved no bloodshed and no loss of American lives. From then on, we seized the initiative in world affairs from Soviet Russia, and have maintained it. We are the bulwark of the free Western World and the hope to which subjugated peoples in totalitarian nations cling for survival.

Civil rights has been the subject of demagoguery for so long that it seemed impossible to accomplish anything substantial in this area. Yet, quietly and effectively, the Republican administration has done more to break down the dividing line between differing groups of Americans that has been done since the days of Abraham Lincoln. The color of one's skin, his race or national origin is not a criterion for judgment but rather we are rapidly approaching the proposition that man shall be judged by his ability alone. This is due, in large measure, to the outlawing of segregation in our school systems, the integration of men and women in our military forces, and the appointment of Negroes to positions of great responsibility in government.

The economic planners, who had controlled the course of government for so long, brought the encroachment of the Federal Government into all types of business enterprises. We found, upon taking office, that the Government was roasting coffee, making ice cream, manufacturing paint, maintaining shipping facilities, and otherwise engaging in many other practices which very obviously should be a part of our private economic system.

This situation has been corrected and already billions of dollars have accrued to the Government through the sale of many of these operations. The business ventures stripped of government subsidy are now tax paying members of the national community. This program is a continuing one, and it is expected that the amount which will revert to the Federal Treasury will approximate $40 billion.

A vigorous campaign to rid the Government of potential subversives was instituted and has been strengthened by the passage of legislation by the Congress. The Communists who had found it convenient to bore from within are now stripped of positions of influence in the Government and are being dealt with in a judicious manner by our courts. The Communist Party, as such, will no longer have the rights and privileges of a political party, and other enactments assure that the Government may protect itself through adequate espionage and sabotage laws. In addition, peacetime spying has become a crime to the same degree as treasonous activities in time of war. To assure the effectiveness of congressional investigations involving subversives, immunity from self-incrimination can now be extended so that spies and traitors may no longer take refuge in evasion or silence.

The "mess" exists no longer in Washington. Honesty and integrity are the rule rather than the exception. These homely American virtues have become part of the accepted rules of procedure in Government. There has been a housecleaning of those who sought to make Government their private prey for nefarious schemes and undertakings.

Energetic investigations by congressional committees in the internal revenue and housing fields have brought about correction of inadequate legislation.

A 20-year attempt to bring into being American participation in the St. Lawrence seaway has been realized. This will broaden the economic frontiers of America and strengthen the bonds of friendship between us and our Canadian neighbor to the north.

The so-called tidelands dispute has been ended after several years of bickering. The rights of the several States involved, to the marginal lands off their coastlines, had a far deeper meaning than the oil reserves which figured so prominently in the debate. Under this statute, Connecticut, for instance, is assured that there will be no Federal interference with the harbor facilities, oyster beds, and other valuable properties on the coast of our State.

A monumental accomplishment of this Congress has been the first complete revision of our tax laws in decades. Through the modernization of the Internal Revenue Code, savings of $7.4 billion in taxes came to the American people. This is certainly one facet of Government which directly affects each and every one of us, and will be dealt with at greater length later in this report.

It is appropriate that I hereafter discuss in some detail the most significant legislative actions of the 83d Congress.

ATOMIC ENERGY

This subject occupies a prominent place in this report because of my assignment to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and my chairmanship of its Subcommittee on Security. I consider myself to be partially responsible for the outstanding record of this Congress in the atomic field.

Through major revisions of the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, we not only fulfilled Republican Party pledges but opened this Nation's vast nuclear potential both for defense and peaceful purposes.

Basically, the secrecy provisions are modified to permit disclosure of sufficient information to our allies so that their armed forces may be trained in the use of the latest atomic weapons. Secondly, the changes make possible the development of a domestic nuclear power industry and allow for the pooling of atomic resources and knowledge so that our friends and allies may share with us the peacetime benefits of atomic research.

One of the most satisfactory and important results of this bill is the avenue it opens for American private industry to put its skill to work developing special applications of atomic energy in commerce, agriculture, and medicine. This conforms to the American principle of private enterprise and initiative to which—at long last—the policy of our country is directing itself.

This was no easy task as we were hamstrung by a small group of self-appointed Democrat guardians of Government monopoly. But in the end, the atomic revision program sailed through by a resounding vote. It represents a tribute to the drive and leadership of the President and the administration, and I am proud of my part in the formulation of this bill.

In the administrative field, the most important international development in the area of atomic energy in the postwar era was President Eisenhower's plan for the pooling of information and know-how by the nations of the world. His grasp of the initiative has assured us of the cooperation of many countries in the peacetime use of atomic power, and has enhanced the possibilities of an effective free-world coalition to a great degree. The fulfillment of this proposal will result in the economic betterment of all nations and counteract very thoroughly the Soviet propaganda line that our efforts in atomic and nuclear energy are directed toward destruction.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

My membership on the House Armed Services Committee makes me particularly aware of the need for maximum defense and security of our country. The times in which we live make necessary the maintenance of a strong military force devoted to the protection of our citizens against any potential aggressor.

During the 83d Congress and because of the very special knowledge of the President and this administration, there has been a radical overhaul of the Nation's defense structure. The results add up to a highly maneuverable Army, Navy, and Air Force capable of reacting instantly in an emergency. There are now specific lines of policy in our national defense program arrived at after careful deliberation and constituting decisions aimed to meet changing conditions. These include, first, a military force geared to the indefinite future, well-rounded, highly trained, and superbly equipped with the best material and weapons our technology can produce; second, the integration of atomic and other newly developed weapons into the Armed Forces; third, the establishment of an Air Force Academy comparable to West Point and Annapolis; fourth, bringing into balance our resources and commitments, our military capabilities and our foreign policies and obligations, so that any position our Government takes can be backed up by strength in being.

All of this has been accomplished with due regard for the abilities of our citizens to pay a fair share for our national defense. We have not subordinated the economic well-being of our Nation to military inefficiencies and waste. Continuation of these policies will result in increased strength at a far lower cost than has heretofore been possible.

NATIONAL ECONOMY

The 83d Congress saw 1953 end up as the most prosperous year in the Nation's history. Evidence is accumulating that 1954 will measure up as another year of sound business and plenty. Inflation has been halted. For the housewife, wage earner, and producer this is good news and part of the change the American people voted for when the Republican Congress and the President were handed the reins of government in 1952.

The Republican administration provided an area development program to work with the States and communities in searching for new industries. Under the Office of Defense Mobilization, surplus labor regions were helped by tax amortization benefits and assistance was given to local firms in obtaining Government contracts. A permanent agency was created—the Small Business Administration—solely responsible for the job of aiding small business.

As Republicans, we have tackled our economic future without crisis, and have made a good start toward a better tomorrow for all our people.

TAXES

The outstanding change in the fiscal policy of the United States is the fact that the overall tax-cut program will leave an additional $7.4 billion in the pockets of the American people. This tax cut would have been impossible without savings effected by the Republican administration. The history of the United States records no such relief to the American taxpayer for any previous year. It influences for good the prosperity and well-being of millions of Americans and thousands of business enterprises. What makes this fiscal achievement even more remarkable is the fact that in the face of returning $7.4 billion to the American people by these tax cuts, we expect the cost of the Federal Government for the next fiscal year to be less than any other prior to World War II. This budget reduction represents a savings of $125,580,000 to the taxpayers of Connecticut.

The tax-revision bill of 1954 was the greatest economic undertaking of any single Congress. It resulted in the first complete overhauling of our revenue laws in 75 years. This act alone will save the American taxpayers $1.4 billion. Millions of people who are retired or living on pensions; people who have heavy medical bills; working people with dependents; farmers who are concerned about soil-conservation costs; working widows and widowers with dependent children; people who have heretofore suffered double taxation of their dividends—all these become the beneficiaries under the new tax law.

The one welcome change which must be evident to all citizens is the complete repeal or reduction of the so-called nuisance taxes in the excise field. The everyday services you use and items you purchase were classified as "luxuries" and subject to taxation on that basis. About one billion dollars will be retained in the pockets of our people through reductions of the Federal tax on transportation, cosmetics, movie admissions, telephone calls and telegrams, as well as numerous other items in common use.

And this is only the beginning. There is still work to do in cutting spending and balancing the budget. But we are on the way to a bright future, and the largest tax saving in history is but one step in that direction.

I am extremely proud of the role I played in this Congress to assist my fellow citizens in keeping for themselves a greater share of their earnings. The combination of reduced taxes and a severe cut in Federal spending makes this possible.

VETERANS AND SERVICEMEN

The principles of sound business which we applied to the defense dollar were found to be effective also in their application to the Veterans' Administration dollar. Here, we sought and found the opportunity to get more for our money by lowering administrative costs and retaining the largest portion of the money appropriated for the benefit of veterans and their dependents. It was thus possible to amplify and increase veterans' benefits without excessive expenditures.

Action taken by the Congress and the Republican administration includes provision for a 5-percent increase in compensation for service-connected disabled veterans, survivors, and dependents; extension of the act authorizing dependency allotments; continuation of the Missing Persons Act to July 1, 1955, to help the families of Korean servicemen missing in action; extension for 1 year of the time limit for initiating training under the GI bill of rights for veterans of the Korean conflict; and simplification of veterans' life-insurance policies with better protection.

There are many other enlargements of the veterans' program—all of which showed sound judgment, respect, and gratitude for those who bore the brunt of battle.

LABOR

A strong national economy is the first desire of the laboring man and women. This is so because the person who lives by his wage-earning ability is the first and most seriously injured by economic dislocation.

Perhaps no greater benefit has accrued to our working people than the stability which has been evidenced in our economy for the past 2 years. 1953 and 1954 are certain to be the most prosperous peacetime years of our history. Wages are high, strikes are few, and a more pleasant relationship exists between labor and management.

The working force of our Nation totals over 60 millions, and our national income is extremely high. For the first time in 40 years inflation has been halted and our dollars retain their purchasing power.

It was the intention of the President to effect needed revisions of the Taft-Hartley Act. It was my feeling also that this action was essential to augment the welfare of the American workingman. Unfortunately, a willful majority in the Senate, composed almost entirely of Democrats, thwarted the desire of this administration for the revisions which had been sought. Conservative Democrats and the so-called liberal wing of that party united for vastly different reasons to kill the changes which had been recommended.

Notwithstanding this setback, there were several accomplishments in the field of labor relations, including such enactments as extended coverage under the unemployment compensation program; improved system of vocational rehabilitation for the physically disabled and handicapped; liberalized benefits under the Railroad Retirement Act; and strengthening of the State unemployment tax systems.

AGRICULTURE

After extensive hearings and long debate on the floor of both Houses, the agriculture bill providing flexible price supports of 82.5 to 90 percent of parity on basic crops was passed. This is a start toward giving back to our farmers some of the economic freedom taken from them by previous administrations through the rigid high price support policy.

Other enactments by the administration and Congress to help the farmer were measures to move surplus farm products from storage to the table of the consumer; off-farm and on-farm grain storage was substantially increased so that price-support operations could be rendered more workable; REA loan funds were extended; conservation work on soil, water, and forest was intensified; there was assistance to drought-stricken farmers; cotton farms were aided; agricultural research expanded; and the Department of Agriculture was reorganized to give farmers better service and to cut down overhead so that a greater portion of Agriculture Department appropriations will directly benefit farmers.

SOCIAL SECURITY, HEALTH, AND WELFARE

As Republicans, we can look with pride on the positive action taken in this field. The liberalization of the Social Security Act is perhaps the major achievement.

Coverage under this act was broadened, adding 10 million citizens to the eligibility rolls who were not previously covered. This list includes farmhands, domestic, and self-employed workers. The new act also increases benefits for the more than 6 million people now entitled to and drawing benefits.

Moreover, the Republican Congress and administration extended aid for school construction; authorized the Office of Education to cooperate in research and surveys looking to general improvements in our educational system; granted Federal money to the States to help build diagnostic and treatment centers, rehabilitation facilities, and nursing homes; expansion of the vocational rehabilitation plan; increased the power of the Food and Drug Administration for the protection of the public; and approved programs for home construction loan guaranties, slum clearance, and community rehabilitation.

PERSONAL ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Because of the highly industrialized economy of our State, and particularly of our own Fifth District, the development and furthering of industry and employment is without question the area in which most of my time and energies have been directed during my four terms as your Congressman. I have always felt that not only must our existing businesses be given all possible aid and encouragement but it is of equal importance to the prosperity and well-being of the State that new industries be induced to locate in our midst and, by so doing, create new employment opportunities for our people. I have attended innumerable meetings and conferences in Connecticut and Washington for the purpose of fostering business and employment in the district. Meetings with manufacturers, union members, small-business men, civic groups, and Government officials all contributed to a better understanding of mutual problems whose solution will benefit all of us.

I initiated two proposals during this session of Congress which are aimed at increasing the general prosperity and employment of all our people. I am quite sure that these proposals are familiar to most of you, but I will run the risk of being repetitious and mention them again very briefly.

You will remember some months ago I advocated that the Government should give serious consideration to an industrial educational program in conjunction with national defense by placing Government contracts now in those defense plants which under the Government's war plans would be used for the production of war materiel. This would have the dual result of keeping our highly skilled workers employed and, at the same time, would encourage the training of other workers in operating and maintaining the modern complex machinery which makes up our industrial might. With the advent of the atomic age, this training assumes even greater importance. I have been assured by the Office of Defense Mobilization that a review is being maintained of all industries in which the loss of critical skills is threatened, and whenever this occurs the ODM will attempt to devise measures to preserve these skills. In this connection, the Defense Department, the Atomic Energy Commission, and the Maritime Commission have been ordered to select defense facilities which should be maintained to the fullest extent possible. This move will cover industries which produce over 1,000 military items, and the contracts to be let will amount to several hundred million dollars a year.

The preservation of our industrial mobilization base assures there will be no industrial Pearl Harbor in the event of military action, and it further envisions a practical and comprehensive program for the retention of the skills so laboriously learned. The practical application of this policy has already been demonstrated in the case of the watch industry, where it was feared that tariff reductions had brought about a serious decline in the employment of very necessary skills for the national defense. Connecticut has thus benefited already from the program which parallels my policy recommendation to the Executive Office of the President.

The President has also recognized the corollary problem concerning our lack of scientists and engineers and has appointed a committee at the Cabinet level to study ways and means of encouraging our young people to pursue higher technical and scientific studies in our colleges and universities.

The second proposal is the establishment of an atomic reactor plant in our area, under the provisions of the Atomic Energy Act. To encourage the construction of these atomic plants throughout the country, the Atomic Energy Commission has indicated that it will pay the difference between the building of a conventional and a nuclear powerplant. The first utility company to sign such a contract with the AEC is in Pittsburgh. The plant will be finished in 1957 and will be capable of turning out 60,000 kilowatts of electricity, or enough for a city of 60,000 people. Such a plant in our area would provide increased employment opportunities, as it is doing in the Pittsburgh area, and would also be the first step in attracting new industries. It behooves us to lose no time in pushing this project to an early completion.

I have, during the past 2 years, continued my usual policy of advocating suitable tariffs for commodities manufactured in our district to offset unfair competition by foreign goods which undersell the American market through use of slave and low-wage labor. For that reason, I voted against the extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. In addition, I have made countless representations before the Tariff Commission regarding higher tariffs on Swiss watches, which rates were recently raised by the President; bicycles; wood screws, pins, and many other commodities of local importance. I assisted in getting legislation passed closing a loophole in the law which had permitted the importation of rubber-soled footwear that was unfairly competing with our local products.

The well-being of our people depends almost completely upon the protection of jobs in industry. The safeguards we have placed in State and Federal law to assure fair wages under good working conditions are being subverted by the domination of imported goods in the American market. Without assurance of a sales place for the products our working people manufacture, the progressive labor legislation under which we operate would be useless. Job opportunities are being lost and wages depleted by tariff preferences which seriously lower the production of goods in our industrial plants. I am devoted to the program of enhancing, not retarding, the production and sale of Connecticut-made goods.

I found that legislation passed for the benefit of industry in Guam was being used as a means of circumventing the custom laws of the United States by the transshipment of foreign-made goods through Guam to the United States. I introduced legislation to correct that situation. I feel that in pursuing this policy on tariff matters, I am protecting the welfare and economic livelihood of the people I represent.

The opening of the new veterans' hospital at West Haven last year was a great satisfaction to those of us who had worked so diligently for its establishment. However, I am still distressed that so many of our Connecticut veterans who need mental treatment are not able to secure this treatment in veterans' hospitals within our own State. Consequently, I introduced legislation in this session which directed the Veterans' Administration to survey the 300-bed veterans' hospital at Newington for the purpose of converting this facility into a neuropsychiatric hospital exclusively for veterans. This move has the support of all veterans' organizations in the State and I intend to press for the survey and subsequent favorable action early next session.

I was able to secure an appropriation of $500,000 during this sesion for the dredging of the Housatonic River. One of the advantages which will result from this operation will be the delivery of coal by barge to the power companies producing electricity. Under Connecticut law, the savings in transportation costs will be immediately reflected in the cheaper rates charged consumers.

Since the original passage of the Patterson Copper Act of 1947, extensions have been granted which are now effective until June 30, 1956. So great a portion of our working force is concentrated in the copper and brass industries that an unimpeded flow of copper is essential for a healthy economy in the Fifth District. The saving in cost of copper ore through the Patterson Act enables our plants to compete more readily with fabricators in other areas. In these two ways the workers of the Fifth District have materially benefited by its passage and extension.

A goodly number of textile firms are located in Connecticut, some of them in the Fifth District. The provisions of the Flammable Fabrics Act would have injured these operations, although there was no intent on the part of Congress to interfere with the manufacture of standard textiles. Without in any way rendering ineffective the standards of safety in the act, changes proposed by me were adopted by the Congress. Thus, the continued operation of Connecticut textile mills was assured.

I also sponsored legislation for the benefit of our veterans such as the giving of Government employment preference to the children of veterans whose lives were lost in active duty; a sliding scale of service for doctors and dentists having World War II military service and currently being recalled to active duty; a 10-percent increase in the retirement pay of disabled veterans; and the appointment of female nurses in the National Guard.

Of direct interest to all taxpayers in Connecticut is legislation I introduced in the House which would allow the collection of tolls on federally aided superhighways as is now possible on federally aided bridges. This would stop the general levying of State taxes to pay for these highways. Action has already been taken to assure this type of financing for the Killingly-Greenwich Expressway.

The increased number of tragedies resulting from the entrapment of children in discarded refrigerators and iceboxes brought this problem to national attention. To guard against future cases of this kind, I introduced legislation to require inside latches as standard equipment in the manufacture of refrigerators. Hearings in both Houses of Congress on this measure brought together representatives of firms manufacturing these items and those of an inventive mind who had devised systems for escape from refrigerators. Most assuredly, much good will result from these meetings.

I was successful in securing extensions of mail-service delivery routes in the Fifth District, and obtained a supplemental appropriation for extra clerical help in the Bethlehem post office to permit Christmas mailings.

In addition to answering voluminous correspondence on legislative matters, my office has processed unlimited inquiries of a more personal nature relating to veterans' compensation and insurance claims, immigration cases, selective service and military personnel problems, and many other matters of the utmost importance to the people concerned.

In conclusion, may I say that the elections this year will determine whether President Eisenhower's program, endorsed by a large majority of our citizens, will go forward to completion. This election will determine whether the historic record of Republican accomplishments since January 1953 will be continued—or whether it will be sabotaged and defeated by a hostile Congress. It is the duty of every voter to make this decision according to his own conscience.

My service in the Congress has been rewarding in the spiritual sense, as I have had the opportunity to meet thousands of you wonderful people, and have gained satisfaction from the thought that I have been able to serve as your Representative in our National Government. I am particularly proud of my association with the 83d Congress, one which accomplished much for the good of America. Please feel free to call upon me or my office for any service which I may be able to render.

They Call It Old-Age Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include my statement, which reads as follows:

THEY CALL IT OLD-AGE SECURITY

There has been, and will continue to be, in this election year much beating of gums and drums concerning the passage of a bill to improve our social-security system.

They forgot, however, to ask about the reactions of those affected by this legislation, those already trying to eke out a living from old-age and survivors insurance and old-age assistance.

Their answer would be, "Disappointment."

After all the political oratory has gone with the wind, we find that the average benefit to those now on the rolls will be increased by the munificent sum of $1.50 a week.

At a time when the dollar itself is but a ghost of its former purchasing power.

Of course we were pleased to see more potential beneficiaries brought under the coverage of the act. It is encouraging to note that the amount of income that may be exempted from benefit calculations has been raised. These and other slight renovations are signs of progress, snail-like though they be, pointing toward the distant day when all Americans will be covered adequately.

Our immediate responsibility, however, is to those now 65 or older who must live today; who cannot eat and clothe themselves and find shelter on promises that the future holds in store.

They need help now.

The administration has failed to exercise that leadership which could provide real instead of shadow benefits.

It cannot understand why we do not rejoice because the benefits for those at the bottom of the list have been increased from $25 to $30 a month. It maintains correctly—and according to mathematics—that this is an increase of 20 percent; conveniently forgetting that some States will confiscate this gain when it applies to those who must seek old-age assistance to supplement their meager old-age and survivors insurance benefits.

I repeat: "The average increase for all beneficiaries amounts to $6 per month."

Looks like something, on paper.

But, did any member of this administration go down to the corner grocery store and see what he could get for $6, and spread this over a month?

To an older person trying to keep his head above water with no other means of support, $72 a year extra doesn't make much difference. A cheap suit, a pair of cardboard shoes, and a few more loaves of bread. That's all.

Organizations like the National Pension Federation have been waging a valiant fight to correct this shameful injustice toward the aged, whom we should honor and respect.

There is no reason in the world why we, the most prosperous Nation on earth, cannot do more for our senior citizens.

We act like spendthrifts where foreign aid is concerned and like misers when it comes to our own people.

Liberal Congressmen in both parties are fighting against this contradiction. We know that the United States will be strong and secure only to the extent that it builds security for all of its people. Then, and only then, can we expect others to follow the example of our leadership. We cannot preach to the world when we neglect the deserving in our own homeland.

With unflagging zeal we must work to put life into the Social Security Act so that it will provide at least $100 a month to bring freedom from worry and want to all of the oldsters in our ranks.

Public Laws 548 to 559, Inclusive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 18, 1954

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent, I am extending my remarks to include my report to my constituents on Public Laws 548 to 559, inclusive, as follows:

PUBLIC LAW 548

H. R. 8571, Construction of naval vessels: This authorizes the construction of 3 mine warfare vessels and 8 partrol vessels (to add to our present antisubmarine force) at an estimated cost of $115 million. The entire planned naval construction program for 1955 will provide 30 new ships and 17 conversions of existing ships, also many new service and small landing crafts.

PUBLIC LAW 549

H. R. 6725, Navy and Marine officers: Under Public Law 549 the Navy and Marine Corps may give regular commissions—up to navy lieutenant, marine captain—to reserve and temporary officers who qualify. During 1955 a total of 700 officers will be integrated into the regular service.

PUBLIC LAW 558

S. 3561, Neighbors for hospitalized veterans: In 1952 the Veterans Administration opened a 546-bed hospital, largely for neuropsychiatric patients, at Salt Lake City, Utah. Public Law 550 conveys to Utah 35 acres of land in the hospital reservation as site for 2 armories, a drill hall, a warehouse and a garage. VA interposed no objection and the Bureau of the Budget gave the measure the green light.

This act passed the House in the rush late in July, 2 days later the Senate, and was given scant attention. Fortunately, it does provide that if the administrator of the VA hospital finds that the armories, drill hall warehouse, and garage interfere with the treatment of the hospital patients the deal is off. I do not believe in taking chances with our hospitalized veterans; think this is a matter for investigation and possible action by our veteran organizations.

PUBLIC LAW 551

H. R. 8026, property in irrigation districts: This is merely a clarification of the authority of the Department of the Interior to transfer title to movable property to irrigation districts when they take over operation.

PUBLIC LAW 552

H. R. 130, Navaho Indians: Uranium and oil leases have brought sudden riches—several millions—to the Indians of the Navaho Reservation in New Mexico. Public Law 552 gives them the right to prosecute their claim against the Government for the return of a helium lease which on expiration the Continental Oil Co. surrendered to the Government—the trustee—instead of to the tribe.

PUBLIC LAW 553

H. J. Res. 534, sale of Pacific liners: American President Lines, which lost 17 vessels in World War II, since then has been using in its passenger service in the Pacific the *President Cleveland* and the *President Wilson* under a charter arrangement with the United States.

Public Law 553 authorizes the outright sale of the 2 vessels to the steamship company for $6,500,000; this is $1,100,000 more than the figure for which the Maritime Commission had proposed to make the sale and thus is a vindication of the position of the Honorable Raymond S. McKeough in battling singlehanded the other members of the then Maritime Commission. Lindsay C. Warren, former Comptroller General, in severely criticizing the majority members of the Maritime Commission in promoting a sale at $1,100,000 less than the amount finally decided upon, said: "* * * with the outstanding exception of Mr. Raymond McKeough, who not only voted against the subsidy but continued thereafter to voice his vigorous dissent."

We in the second district may take an exceptional pride in this since Mr. McKeough for 4 terms (1935–43) brilliantly represented us in the Congress.

PUBLIC LAW 554

S. 1281, commonsense and corn: Commodity Credit Corporation owns agricultural products in very small lots in storage all over the country. Public Law 554 permits it to rotate and consolidate its stocks to prevent their spoiling. Here is how the new law will work: CCC sells 100 bushels of locally stored corn at the going price in a community where there is a demand, replaces with 100 bushels purchased in another community where the market is stagnant. Another example: CCC has 5,000 pounds of cheese in storage at one point, 100 pounds at another; it may consolidate its holdings by selling the isolated 100 pounds, buying a 100-pound replacement at the point of the larger storage.

PUBLIC LAW 555

S. 2380, mineral leases: Here is an illustration of how legislation affecting the holdings of the American people in the vast public lands domain of the country was enacted by the 83d Congress.

Public Law 555 liberalizes the Mineral Leasing Act of 1900 (a) by increasing the acreage holdings of any one person from 15,360 to 46,000 acres in any one State, 100,000 acres in Alaska, (b) by increasing the maximum area held under option from 100,000 to 200,000 acres in any one State, and (c) by extending option terms from 2 to 3 years. Over 300 million acres of public land in the West are subject to the provisions of the law. The possible wealth in oil and minerals is beyond imagination. Big operators want the green light to move in.

Now note please the manner in which a law of such tremendous importance to the American people was put on the statute books.

(1) It was brought to the floor of the House on July 21, 1954, in the period of a frenzied drive for adjournment.

(2) It was brought up under suspension of the rules limiting debate to 40 minutes and closing the door to amendments.

(3) The 14-page report of the committee consisted largely of letters from the Office of the Secretary of Interior, no reference to the subject that in the Senate occasioned the question, "Did the committee consider the possibility that this might result in a concentration of oil leases in the hands of a few big concerns and in the hands of 2 or 3 individuals?" and to which the brushoff answer was: "It was considered."

(4) There was no record rollcall, the measure being passed by voice.

Main argument for the enactment was the Secretary of the Interior's statement stressing the importance of minerals to the Nation's economy and of encouraging the discovery of new sources. Costs of prospecting now are higher, diggings are deeper, necessary to raise more risk capital.

The reasons may be valid. They sound plausible enough. But I thought you would not wish me to take a chance with your vote and the wealth under your public land. I voted "No."

PUBLIC LAW 556

S. 3630, Hog Island, Philadelphia: In 1930 the United States sold to Philadelphia the tract known as Hog Island at a fixed price of $3 million. Philadelphia made a downpayment of $450,000, for 10 years made annual ground rent payments of $76,500, then annual payments of $153,000. Public Law 556 releases the city of further obligation, conditioned on the land being used as an air, rail and marine terminal for the encouragement of interstate commerce.

PUBLIC LAW 557

S. 2766, registering printing presses: Requires registration of printing presses used to produce communistic literature.

PUBLIC LAW 558

Senate Joint Resolution 96, international communications: Establishes a commission on international telecommunications to recommend to 84th Congress measures for effective use of telecommunications in advancing understanding among the free nations.

PUBLIC LAW 559

S. 252, jury trial in tax cases: Income-tax payers suing the Government for return of taxes erroneously or illegally assessed are granted the right to a trial by jury.

The Republican Excise Tax Reduction Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, an important part of the Republican tax reduction program was accomplished in the Excise Tax Reduction Act of 1954. This legislation granted $1 billion in tax relief to the American consumer. As this 83d Congress comes to a close, I would like to remind my colleagues of what we accomplished in this major excise tax reduction act.

The Federal revenue needs limited us in the extent to which we could grant excise tax relief. In view of this fact the Congress very wisely reduced to 10 percent those ad valorem rates which previously exceeded that percentage. Accordingly, we cut in half, from 20 percent to 10 percent, the excise taxes on toilet preparations, luggage, admissions, furs, jewelry, and long-distance telephone calls. We reduced by one-third, from 15 percent to 10 percent, the excise taxes on sporting goods, mechanical pencils and pens, mechanical lighters, transportation services, and local telephone services. We have removed entirely the excise taxes on general admissions where the cost of tickets is 50 cents or less. We have also cut in half, from 10 percent to 5 percent, the excise tax on electric, gas, and oil appliances, refrigerators, and quick-freeze units of the household type. The appliances on which the reduced tax rate will apply included such things as stoves, clothes dryers, dishwashers, electric fans, and so forth.

The effect of these excise tax cuts is to reduce Federal receipts from excise taxes by $1 billion. This means that the American consumers will have $1 billion of additional spending power. The housewife is relieved of the need of paying prohibitive excises on articles that are essential to the health and welfare of her family. The businessman will find that these retained tax savings will provide his customers with the means of making additional purchases from him. Thus, not only have the dealers benefited who sell articles on which the excise tax rates have been reduced but we have also found that other dealers have benefited as well.

These excise tax reductions took effect April 1, 1954, and beneficial results have already manifested themselves in my State of Ohio and I am sure in every other State in the United States. Small-business men owning jewelry stores, sporting goods shops and drug stores have all expressed their approval of this important tax reduction legislation. Many housewives have also told me of of how they are now purchasing articles which their families have needed for years but which they delayed buying because of the prohibitive excise tax rates. Shortly after this Excise Tax Reduction Act went into effect, my wife purchased a new refrigerator. When she handed the money to the salesman, he said, "Oh, yes, I must refund to you the tax reduction allowed under the new law which amounts to $22.50."

The reduction in the admissions tax was particularly essential to thousands of small-theater operators throughout the United States. These small-business men were threatened with bankruptcy if the 20-percent admissions tax had been continued. By exempting completely general admissions costing 50 percent or less we have assured that these theaters in small communities will continue to provide sometimes the only form of entertainment available in the vicinity.

The fact that these excise-tax reductions will enable the small shops, theaters, and businesses to continue to operate will mean continued payrolls for wage earners in the communities.

The Excise Tax Reduction Act of 1954 was an important step in the Republican Party's record of making good on its campaign promises. Since 1933 the Democrats have imposed or increased excises on 94 different classes of items. This figure does not take into account the increases in regulatory excises. In 1932 the revenue yield from excise taxes was $450 million, which represented approximately 1 percent of our national income. In 1952 the revenue yield from excises was $9.8 billion, which represented over 3 percent of our national income. Thus, the Democratic Party has a record of talking about tax reduction while enacting only tax increases. The Republican Party, on the other hand, has not only talked about tax reduction, but they have granted tax reduction.

In the Excise Tax Reduction Act of 1954 the Republican 83d Congress and the Eisenhower administration have provided an additional $1 billion in savings for the national wage earners and home buyers to use for the things they want and need. I am proud of that record because of the tax saving it means to every American family.

As a ranking Republican member of the tax-writing Committee on Ways and Means and as a member of the House-Senate conference committee, it was my privilege to participate in the preparation of the Excise Tax Reduction Act of 1954. This very substantial and significant start in Republican tax relief will benefit every American housewife, businessman, and wage earner. There follows a table showing the rate changes made by the Excise Tax Reduction Act of 1954 and the tax savings that are resulting to the American people:

Excises under which rates were reduced as of Apr. 1, 1954

Excise	Old rate	Rate as of Apr. 1, 1954	Tax saving in fiscal 1955 (millions)
Retailers' excises:	*Percent*	*Percent*	
Furs	20	10	$20
Jewelry	20	10	100
Luggage	20	10	40
Toilet preparations	20	10	55
Manufacturers' excises:			
Electric, oil, and gas appliances	10	5	85
Sporting goods	[1] 15	10	3
Mechanical pencils, pens, and lighters	15	10	4
Electric light bulbs and tubes	20	10	20
Cameras, lenses, and film	20	10	15
Pistols and revolvers	11	10	(2)
	Cents		
Matches (per thousand)	2	(3)	4
Cutting oil (per gallon)	6	(3)	1
Miscellaneous excises:	*Percent*		
Long-distance telephone, leased wires, etc	25	10	235
Domestic telegraph, cable and radio dispatches	15	10	
Local telephone	15	10	125
Transportation of persons	15	10	95
Admissions:			
General, over 50 cents	20	[4] 10	146
General, 50 cents or less	20	0	40
Miscellaneous nonprofit organizations	20	0	6
Safe deposit box rentals	20	10	5
Total			999

[1] Scheduled under the Revenue Act of 1951 to be reduced to 10 percent on Apr. 1, 1954; excludes fishing equipment which was taxed at 10 percent.

[2] Negligible.

[3] Not to exceed 10 percent of manufacturers' price.

[4] Excludes dog and horse races, cabarets, club dues, and initiation fees, which are still taxed at 20 percent.

Public Laws 560 to 581, Inclusive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 18, 1954

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent, I am extending my remarks to continue with the report of the new laws of the 83d Congress that I began making to my consitutents on our convening in 1953 and have continued to this time:

PUBLIC LAW 560

H. R. 7839, Housing Act of 1954: Fear of a developing recession was a strong force in the drafting of the Housing Act of 1954. It admittedly is a pump-priming measure, intended to keep construction booming. Representative of the life insurance companies, who have a real estate investment running into the billions, under questioning by me at the public hearings of our committee, frankly admitted that he was fearful of the ultimate effect on real estate. Trouble is there is no provision for new housing within the financial reach of most people, certainly not when and if deflation lowers wages and ability to meet mortgage commitments.

For your ready reading here is a simplified analysis of the act.

Title I, Federal Housing Administration: Title I of the National Housing Act authorizes FHA insurance of home repair or improvement loans up to $2,500. Formerly the FHA insured 90 percent of a lender's title I portfolio which in effect meant 100 percent insurance against losses. Now FHA will insure 90 percent of each individual loan. It is felt that this will make the lenders more conservative in extending credit for home repairs.

Title I was originally enacted in 1934 as an antidepression measure and Congress has never seen fit to make it permanent legislation. The interest rate on these loans is in reality over 9 percent; pretty steep, I would say, considering they are virtually riskless.

Title II provides for FHA mortgage insurance on 1- to 4-family dwellings. Under Public Law 560, on both new and existing 1- and 2-family houses, the maximum mortgage limit is raised from $16,000 to $20,000. Downpayments are reduced. The loan to value ratio is set at 95 percent of the first $9,000 plus 75 percent of the excess above $9,000. The President is given authority to raise the $9,000 figure to $10,000. Mortgage maturity limits are set at 30 years but cannot exceed three-fourths of the remaining useful life of the property.

Liberalization of FHA terms in the long run could prove unwise as it will accelerate FHA's tendency to provide more and more housing for the upper middle income group and less for the lower middle and lower income groups. We may eventually find ourselves in a situation similar to that of the late 1920's when there was a shortage of good housing for the mass of people but on the other hand, the building industry had overbuilt for the higher income groups. Real reason for liberalization was fear of a recession, need for pump priming is that in the immediate future it will, of course, act as a very effective pump-priming device.

Builders warranty: In the future buyers of VA or FHA 1 and 2 family houses will receive a so-called warranty from the builders that the house has been built in substantial conformity with the plans and specifications. This is a provision for which I with others on the House Banking and Currency Committee had long fought. Recent housing scandals finally brought home the arguments we had been shouting into deafened ears.

Title II: The present wholly Government-owned secondary mortgage market, the Federal National Mortgage Association, is to be abolished. In its place there is established a new FNMA, its stock to be initially subscribed by the Secretary of the Treasury. Its remaining equity capital will be obtained in the following manner: When a lender sells mortgages to FNMA he will be required to purchase its stock equal to 3 percent of the value of the mortgages sold. FNMA will also get funds by selling its obligations both to the Secretary of the Treasury and to the investing public. Eventually the stock and obligations held by the Secretary of the Treasury are to be retired and the lenders will then own FNMA.

In regard to the 3-percent fee it seems plain that the lenders will pass this on to the builder who in turn will add it to the price of his house, thus the home buyer is paying for the lender's stock in FNMA. This corporation which will be built on Government credit and home buyers' money will be ultimately owned by lenders. The lenders thus will control the very organization which was created to insure an adequate supply of mortgage money. The obligations which this new FNMA sells to the investing public will be exempt from the public debt limitation as they are not regarded as Government bonds.

Title III, slum clearance and urban renewal: This title amends title I of the Housing Act of 1949 which authorizes loans and grants by the Federal Government to local communities for slum clearance and urban redevelopment. The chief amendment would require that in the future before a community can qualify for a Federal loan or subsidy for slum clearance. It must have an approved overall plan for the prevention of slums and urban blight.

Title IV, low-rent public housing: The Housing Act of 1949 authorized the construction of 810,000 units of low-rent public housing. Not quite 200,000 of these are constructed or being constructed at the present time. President Eisenhower in his housing message to the Congress recommended that the Congress authorize the starting of 140,000 of the remaining 600,000 units at the rate of 35,000 units per year. As it passed the House the housing bill contained no authorization for public housing. In the Senate an amendment was added to the bill to carry out the President's program. In conference it was agreed that contracts for 35,000 additional units might be signed prior to June 30, 1955, with the proviso, however, that only communities which had slum clearance or urban renewal projects under title I of the Housing Act of 1949 could qualify.

It is important to understand this section clearly. It does not merely provide that to get some public housing a community must tear down some slums. It is quite specific. It is necessary for the community to have a slum clearance or urban renewal project under title I of the Housing Act of 1949. About 215 communities in the United States have taken the first step in the establishment of such a project but only about 50 of those have reached what is termed the "final loan and grant contract stage." The law is not clear as to where or when in the slum clearance process a community may take action to get public-housing units.

It is possible the 35,000 units will never be built. Several of the approximately 50 communities which qualify either have all the public housing they desire or their urban redevelopment projects are commercial or industrial in nature. About 10,000 units at the most are likely to be built.

Title V, amendments to the Home Loan Bank Board Act: These amendments are essentially administrative and technical in nature.

Title VI, voluntary home mortgage credit program: This program provides that the Government and private lenders will cooperate in an organized manner in facilitating the flow of private mortgage funds to remote areas and small communities. No one expects this to work. If private lenders could supply a secondary mortgage market, there would have been no necessity for FNMA in the first place.

Title VII, urban planning and reserve of public works: This authorizes loans and grants to local communities for the planning of public works. It does not go far enough. For one thing, no reference is made to planning for an atomic attack.

PUBLIC LAW 561

S. 2381, oil and gas leases: This is similar to the amendment to the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920 previously discussed except that Public Law 561 relates to oil and gas leases. It increases the amount of public land any one person or corporation may hold under oil and gas lease from 15,360 to 46,080 acres, 100,000 acres in Alaska. The public domain contributes about 5 percent of the total production of crude petroleum in the United States.

PUBLIC LAW 562

S. 3466, more Assistant Secretaries: Public Law 562 doubles the number of Assistant Secretaries of Army, Navy, and Air Force. There were 2 each, now there will be 4. This follows the pattern set in the honeymooning days of 1953, when another Assistant Secretary of State was authorized as a gracious gesture to the new administration. I voted against that proposal because I thought a Congress pledged to economy should start practicing economy. It all ended up with the 83d Congress setting an all-time high in the creation of new high-salaried Assistant Secretaries. The pity is that with each new Assistant Secretary the taxpayers are burdened not only with his keep but also with that of his secretaries, stenographers, clerks, messengers, and what have you.

PUBLIC LAW 563

S. 3518, District of Columbia: Merely relates to fees and personnel in the office of the Recorder of Deeds in the District of Columbia.

PUBLIC LAW 564

H. R. 7128, District of Columbia: Routine District of Columbia legislation regarding qualification of personnel in Assessor's office.

PUBLIC LAW 565

S. 2759, vocational rehabilitation of the disabled: There is a backlog of 2 million disabled persons in the United States who could be rehabilitated. Add to that 250,000 new cases a year. Under the Vocational Rehabilitation Act of 1920, when the program started, some 60,000 disabled persons annually are rehabilitated for self-sustaining employment. Public Law 565 contemplates a progressive expansion of the program for the next 5 years. As Senator PAUL DOUGLAS pointed out, the act falls far short of dealing adequately with the massive human and economic problems of the physically handicapped. It will increase in 1955 only by 10,000 the number of persons accorded rehabilitation opportunity, leaving 180,000 to add to the 2 million left in the cold.

PUBLIC LAW 566

H. R. 6788, soil conservation and watershed programs: In 40 years the Federal Government has spent $3 billion on flood-control projects, and still the floods persist. Public Law 566 tries a new approach by (a) uniting the agricultural soil and water conservation program with the programs for development and flood protection of major river valleys, and (b) establishing standards for joint participation by the Federal Government and local governments and groups with proper sharing of the costs in proportion to benefits received.

PUBLIC LAW 567

H. R. 5173, unemployment insurance: 10 per cent of the Federal unemployment tax is reserved to cover the cost of administration. But the cost of administration has been running some $60 million a year under the intake and this has been going into the general fund of the United States to pay other bills. Public Law 567 provides that (1) what is left over hereafter will go to establish a $200 million reserve available for advances to the various States in times of need, and (2) remainder will be allocated to the trust accounts of the States.

PUBLIC LAW 568

H. R. 303, hospitals for Indians: This is part of the program to get away from practices setting Indians apart from other citizens. It terminates the authority for Indian hospitals under the Secretary of the Interior, puts conservation of Indian health in the hands of the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service.

PUBLIC LAW 569

S. 2371, angary: Angary is a right in international law of war under which ships of a neutral nation are taken over by the country where berthed. Louis XIV of France went for it in a big way, taking over not only the ships but also the crews. Under an act of 1941 the United States combined the right of angary with the right of the state in emergency to seize foreign property and to make therefor proper compensation. Under that law of 1941 we acquired by requisition 103 foreign-flag vessels and by purchase and charter 42 others to help fight World War II. Public Law 569 makes the act of 1941 permanent.

PUBLIC LAW 570

S. 3589, Export-Import Bank: Export-Import Bank, established in 1934, makes loans on good banking security in friendly foreign countries. It plays a vital part in our effort to broaden the market for our own products by building up the economies of backward areas. Public Law 570 increases its lending authority from $4½ billion to $5 billion and vests full responsibility in conduct of the bank in a board of directors, consisting of the bank's president ($17,500 salary) and vice president ($16,000 salary) and 3 others ($15,000 salary), to be appointed by the President.

PUBLIC LAW 571

H. R. 6080, District of Columbia: Authorizes $475,000 appropriation for grade separation to integrate traffic from Washington-Baltimore Parkway with other highways in the District.

PUBLIC LAW 572

S. 1244, postal service: Permits the Postmaster General to renew star-route or screen vehicle service contracts after 6 months' satisfactory service rather than 1 year. Reason: Many widows of deceased subcontractors carry on the business; new law gives them same protection husband would have enjoyed.

PUBLIC LAW 573

S. 2864, Haystack Reservoir: North Unit Irrigation District in Oregon serves water users in an irrigated area of 50,000 acres. Public Law 573 authorizes the construction of Haystack Reservoir as part of the project.

PUBLIC LAW 574

S. 2408, tankers: Provides for the sale of obsolete tankers.

PUBLIC LAW 575

S. 3458, tankers: Navy is giving priority to speeding up tanker construction. In 1945 over 50 percent of world-wide tanker tonnage was American, now only 25 percent. Public Law 575 authorizes 20 new tankers on a time-charter basis. They must be built within 2 years and in American shipyards.

PUBLIC LAW 576

S. 3683, District of Columbia: There are 12 credit unions in the District of Columbia. Public Law 576 turns their supervision over to the Director of the Bureau of Federal Credit Unions, relieving the Comptroller of the Currency of the responsibility.

PUBLIC LAW 577

S. 2846, Securities Exchange Act: Experience has shown up defects in the Securities Act of 1933 and the Securities Exchange Act of 1934. Public Law 577 is expected to remedy them. The purpose of the basic act is full disclosure and protection of the investing public.

PUBLIC LAW 578

S. 3699, waters of the Sabine River: This grants consent of Congress to the compact between Texas and Louisiana relating to the waters of the Sabine River. Congressman Brooks of Louisiana, and Congressman Brooks of Texas, were the sponsors of the act; case of the brooks taking care of the river.

PUBLIC LAW 579

S. 3713, Pacific fisheries: United States, Canada, and Japan are mutually interested in the preservation of the fisheries of the North Pacific Ocean. Public Law 579 adopts the recommendations of the fisheries convention of those nations. It introduces the new principle of abstention into international conservation practice. Example: Japan will not fish for salmon off North America, Canada to keep out of certain places in the Bering Sea.

PUBLIC LAW 580

Senate Joint Resolution 67, fishing vessels: Repeals a wartime law relating to the return of fishing vessels.

PUBLIC LAW 581

Senate Joint Resolution 149, John Marshall Bicentennial Month: September 24, 1955 marks the 200th birth anniversary of John Marshall, who was appointed to the Supreme Court of the United States in 1801. Public Law 581 designates September of 1955 as John Marshall Bicentennial Month and creates a commission to arrange a proper observance of the occasion.

America's Policy of Exaggerated Neutralism in Near East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM T. GRANAHAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 19, 1954

Mr. GRANAHAN. Mr. Speaker, on May 13 of this year, on the day before the sixth anniversary of the independence of Israel, I called to the attention of the House the gradual change in emphasis over the past year and a half in official American policy toward Israel.

In connection with what I described as the developing negativism of that policy, I submitted for the Congressional Record as part of my remarks an exchange of correspondence between myself and high officials of the Department of State which, if anything, deepened my belief in the fact that our official policy is today one of exaggerated neutralism, if not disguised anti-Israel bias.

Events since May have not in anyway reduced my concern in that respect. On top of the agreements to ship arms to Arab States which are neighbors of Israel—and which are still dedicated, it appears, to the obliteration of Israel as a nation—we have the situation involving the assumption by Egypt of full control over the Suez Canal. Egypt has repeatedly exercised power in respect to the canal in a way to harm the State of Israel. So far, our Government seems to have shown little concern even when American ships are directly involved in searches and embargoes.

What bothers me most, Mr. Speaker, is that our Government today is following a policy which seems to accept at face value, and as having a valid basis, Arab statements that by continuing to welcome refugees to her shores, Israel automatically is to be suspected as a potential aggressor.

How absurd.

Perhaps more than any other nation outside the Western Hemisphere, Israel is acutely conscious of world opinion and desirous of world confidence. It is not aggressor minded. It wants to live in peace to develop its resources for its hard-pressed people. It is the aggression and antagonisms of its neighbors which have been primarily responsible for the troubles in the Near East.

TWO ATTITUDES TOWARD NEUTRALISM

Many of our high Government officials are very much upset about the neutralism of India in the cold war between the East and West and efforts are sometimes made in the Congress and elsewhere to punish India for not recognizing more clearly where its long-term interests really lie. India could never live free in a Communist world. We know that, but India sometimes seems to think differently. In any event, Indian neutralism has been a difficult situation and we are much upset about it and would like to see her more actively allied with the forces for peace and freedom.

But, Mr. Speaker, it is rather inconsistent for the United States to be upset about India's neutralism in the world struggle between the forces of freedom of the West and the forces of tyranny, oppression, and slavery of the Communist East, while at the same time the United States Government itself officially adopts a kind of neutralism as between the freedom-loving and peace-loving people of Israel and their belligerent, aggression-minded neighbors.

We should not have a double standard in our attitudes on foreign policy.

A Tribute to the Honorable Carl T. Curtis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, as this 2d session of the 83d Congress draws to a close, I would like to pay tribute to the Honorable Carl T. Curtis, of the 1st Congressional District of Nebraska. When the 84th Congress convenes in January 1955, Mr. Curtis will no longer be in our midst as a colleague. Instead, Mr. Curtis will be in the United States Senate as the junior Senator from the great State of Nebraska.

I have watched with interest Mr. Curtis' career in the House of Representatives since he was first elected to the 76th Congress and took office on January 3, 1939. During much of the intervening 16 years, Mr. Curtis and I have served together on the Committee on Ways and Means.

I need not recite to the membership of this body the fact that Mr. Curtis has distinguished himself by his outstanding record of accomplishment. Mr. Curtis is perhaps our most able authority on social-security legislation. During this Congress he has served as a chairman of a Subcommittee on Social Security. This subcommittee has made a major contribution to the development of the social-security amendments of

1954. Mr. CURTIS is also an eminent tax authority and has been the author of many provisions in our Federal tax laws which have aided farmers, businessmen, and labor.

Mr. CURTIS has always served Nebraska well; he has also ably filled his responsibilities to the people of the United States. The people of the entire State of Nebraska could make no better choice in selecting for its United States Senator the man that the people of the First Congressional District of Nebraska have elected to represent them in the United States House of Representatives for eight consecutive terms.

As CARL CURTIS leaves the House of Representatives, I am certain that he will take to his new responsibilities as Senator the same attributes of integrity, industry, and ability which he has brought to his duties in the House of Representatives.

Attack on California Is Designed To Deceive Congress and Delude Taxpayers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY R. SHEPPARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, for a number of years various spokesmen of several Colorado River Basin States have continued a slanderous and malevolent campaign against water agencies and officials of California.

I suspect that one purpose of these ill-advised assaults, in addition to injuring California, is to delude the residents of certain other States, chiefly those of Colorado, Utah, Arizona, Wyoming, and New Mexico. The officials of these States have found it necessary, on several recent occasions, to invent excuses for their own shortcomings. They have stormed up Capitol Hill with fantastic and costly water and power projects, only to find themselves unable to browbeat Congress into approving them.

In the main, these projects would have irreparably damaged the economy of my State, and therefore the Representatives of California were obliged to oppose them, and this opposition provided an escape hatch which the proponents of these water and power monstrosities welcomed. What better way was there in which to conceal their own failures from the people at home than to blame California? California the water hog. California the industrial octopus. California the incomparable water thief. California the cunning. California the opulent. California the agricultural despot.

Even an amateur propagandist knows that it is not difficult to make people believe that something big is wicked. California is the biggest Colorado River Basin State—biggest in size, in wealth, in population, in production. Persons who make it their life work to avoid sound reasoning would find it quite convenient to charge big California with being impiously wicked. Especially is this true of persons who must devise a smokescreen to hide their own efforts at deception.

It must be said, however, that by virtue of its bigness California has been able to withstand these nefarious attacks and to assimilate them with the ordinarily difficult job of maintaining dignity, building, progessing and protecting its citizens, while at the same time making an honest living.

The truth of the matter is that since the 80th Congress there has been an intensive drive to deprive California of Colorado River water to which it is legally entitled under contracts with the Federal Government, contracts that were authorized by Congress.

But long before the 80th Congress, the upper basin States joined the State of Arizona, which is both a lower and an upper basin State, in attempting to prevent development in California. Arizona led a concerted fight to prevent the building of Boulder Dam. The upper basin States joined Arizona in blackmailing California into paying tribute for their permission to allow the great dam to be constructed. California is still paying this unjust protection money.

Arizona sent its militia to stop the construction of Parker Dam, for which California was paying, but Congress quickly put an end to that nonsense. Three times Arizona went to the United States Supreme Court in its frenzied fight to prevent California progress, and each time was either thrown out or defeated.

The Colorado Basin States ganged up against California to force through the Senate the Mexican Water Treaty. California stood alone against this irrational scheme which depleted irreparably one of the West's greatest natural resources. California warned the Colorado Basin States that they would suffer grievous consequences if they gave enormous amounts of Colorado River water forever to Mexico. Those States today admittedly are ruing their rashness.

The Colorado River compact of 1922, which is the acknowledged law of the river, was written as a seven-State pact. But Arizona refused to ratify it, and the other 6 States were forced to adopt it as a 6-State pact. Not until 1944, when Arizona devised a scheme to steal large amounts of California's legal share of the river, did Arizona see an advantage in being a member of the compact. Then suddenly Arizona hailed the compact as a great device, and knocked on the door of the family entrance, begging permission to come in and be forgiven. Whether Arizona is a member still remains a question which must be answered by the Supreme Court. The fact is there is no such animal as a seven-State compact. There is only a six-State compact. But a ruling in this matter must be made by the Court.

The compact was intended to be a basinwide covenant, and it did not divide the waters of the river between individual States. It created a lower and an upper basin, and it left it to these basins to write compacts of their own. Thus the upper basin States were to enact an agreement among themselves which would divide the water to which they were entitled under the main compact. The same procedure was to be followed by the lower basin States of California, Nevada, and Arizona.

It took the upper basin States 27 years to negotiate their own compact, and the lower basin States have never been able to agree.

In the 80th Congress Arizona introduced the central Arizona project bill, an unbelievable vehicle for helping big landowners to get richer. For years Arizona had been destroying its underground water resources. War-boom growers wanted to continue to open up more desert land, but underground water supplies were swiftly diminishing. There was only one way in which these speculators could carry on, and that was to take water from the Colorado River. But there was not enough water in the river to which Arizona was entitled for this scheme, so they planned to take it away from California. The upper basin States thought this was a fine idea, and gave their wholehearted support to Arizona.

We of California were not overly enthusiastic about a plan to open our back door to burglars. We said so. "California is a water hog," screamed Arizona and the upper basin States.

At this time, for the previous 25 years, California and Arizona had been involved in a controversy that was obviously insoluble by any means of their own. Therefore, California proposed that the old Colorado River controversy be taken before the Supreme Court for final adjudication. It was necessary to get the permission of the Congress to do this, as the Federal Government was a required party, and the Government could not be taken into court without congressional permission. Proper resolutions were filed by California Members of Congress for the purpose of achieving this.

Arizona and the upper basin States descended on Washington in force to block these resolutions. Through three Congresses California sought vainly to get the controversy before the court, and in each Congress Arizona and the upper basin States defeated the resolutions.

It should be mentioned here that the proposed central Arizona project was also defeated.

The Arizona speculators were getting nowhere fast. And suddenly they reversed their course. They did the very thing California had been trying to do for years. On August 13, 1952, the State of Arizona took the lower Colorado River controversy into the Supreme Court on an original action. It is now in progress.

The suit was a severe shock to the upper basin States. Their old crony Arizona had let them down by doing what California wanted done. So the only thing the upper basin States could do was to howl publicly that California had tied Arizona up in the Supreme Court.

I regret that my esteemed colleague, Congressman ASPINALL, of Colorado, saw fit to accept the false statements emanating from professional upper basin California haters. In the Congressional Record of August 24, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. Aspinall], speaking of California, stated:

> Thus far, she has her sister State of Arizona tied up in the Federal courts and has petitioned the Court to blanket all of the other Colorado Basin States into her linen-washing expedition.

I feel certain that the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. Aspinall] is aware that it was Arizona which filed the Supreme Court suit against California, with the hearty approval and assistance of his own State of Colorado.

It is quite true that California has petitioned the Court to make the States of Colorado, Wyoming, Utah, and New Mexico parties to the action. The suit asks for interpretations of basic principles of the Colorado River compact and for decisions which would affect the rights of every basin State. Thus, it would seem reasonable to assume that what affects one State in the basin would affect all States in the basin, and what applies to the rights of one State would apply to the rights of all States.

For years the upper-basin States have been spending midnight oil to concoct a scheme for development of their water and power resources at the expense of others. They came up Capitol Hill last year with a proposal that almost defies description. If Congress thought the central Arizona project was unbelievable in its scope, its ridiculous financing, and its nefarious concepts, they have not seen anything. The proposed Colorado River storage project was simply out of this world by comparison.

I shall not repeat here the facts which reveal these projects as the most costly, infeasible, and unjust schemes ever placed before Congress under the guise of reclamation. That has been done numerous times by experts, and these revelations brought about the defeat of the projects. Just let me say that the central Arizona project would have cost the taxpayers of the Nation more than $2 billion in lost interest alone. The upper Colorado project more than doubles that figure. For what? For something that is totally unnecessary to the economy of the Nation.

The upper-basin rangers came into this Congress with what they considered to be a slick program. First they put up the Fryingpan-Arkansas project as a kind of test bill. It was comparatively small itself, but it was in reality a forerunner for a gigantic project which would take a million acre-feet of the purest Colorado River water completely out of the basin, never to be recovered. If they could get by with that, they figured Congress would swallow anything.

California did not think that was so wise. We said so.

The Fryingpan slipped through the Senate; but when it got to the House, aroused Congressmen from many States prevented it from getting a rule on the floor, and it died.

Meanwhile, the upper Colorado project was being pushed out of the Senate and House Interior Committees. The House Rules Committee balked, and there it was spiked. Vain efforts were made to pass it in the Senate. Its demise took place on the Senate floor on the last night of the session.

Why? Because only California objected? Not at all. Senators and Congressmen from other States were not about to let their constituents be burdened with a gigantic new taxload. None of these projects could pay for themselves. They would have to be paid for by the people of all States, and mostly by the people of the States which are the largest taxpayers. That includes California.

But taxation was not California's only reason for opposing these projects. There was an even more important reason: these projects would seriously damage California's rights to waters of the Colorado River, waters which California must have to live and progress, waters which California owns, waters that California has spent hundreds of millions to develop and to bring to its farms, homes, and industries.

Because California has defended itself and its rights, California has been branded a thief, a scoundrel, an octopus, a hog. Because California has refused to pay to have its own water stolen, California is accused of trying to prevent development in other basin States. How silly can you get? If other neighboring States were more developed and were prospering, California would benefit. But must California ruin its own economy to achieve this end?

The criticisms of California by my friend, Congressman Aspinall, are only the latest in a long line. There have been others more vitriolic, and I have no doubt there will be more of the same. But Mr. Aspinall's words have a familiar ring, and in the main his theme is typical of the "blame California war" that other basin States have been carrying on for years to conceal their own efforts to fleece the taxpayers of the Nation.

All of the terriers snapping at the California bear charge that California has consistently obstructed or opposed the building of reclamation projects in the upper basin. The fact is that California has not only failed to oppose upper basin development, but has repeatedly supported such development.

Let us look at the record:

In the year 1940 the Boulder Dam Project Adjustment Act was adopted by Congress with the active support of California, and its delegation in both Houses. That act provides that for 15 years there shall be paid out for investigation and construction of projects located exclusively in the upper basin States—Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming—the sum of $500,000 per year, a total of $7,500,000. Further, for the next 35 years a like sum each year shall be equitably distributed for the same purposes among the seven States of the Colorado River Basin. From this it will follow that at least another eight or nine million will fall to the share of the upper basin States. This money is being derived and will be derived from the rates paid for power produced at Hoover Dam. Most of the money is being taken from the pockets of the household and commercial power users in California.

These provisions of the act were not only agreed to by California but vigorously supported in Congress by the California delegation. They confer a special benefit upon the upper basin States, which have these funds available in addition to their fair share of the funds appropriated to the Bureau of Reclamation for general investigation of projects throughout the West.

Furthermore, in each and every one of the following named projects, the California representatives on the congressional committees voted for the projects and either supported and voted for them on the floor or permitted them to be adopted without objection by unanimous consent. In no case did California oppose any of these projects.

Provo—Deer Creek—project, Utah.

Mancos project, Colorado. In this instance, the Colorado River Board of California affirmatively supported reauthorization of the project before congressional committees and with the California delegation.

Paonia project, Colorado. In this instance California took the same affirmative position as in the case of the Mancos project.

Eden project, Wyoming.
Weber Basin project, Utah.
Fort Sumner project, New Mexico.
Vermejo project, New Mexico.
Big Thompson project, Colorado.

California officially and repeatedly joined with representatives of other States in commending the efforts of the upper basin States to come to an agreement upon an upper basin compact and repeatedly expressed the hope and the belief that they would be able to harmonize their views and make such a compact. When the compact had been made and ratified by the legislatures of the upper basin States, it came here for the consent of the Congress. The bill sets up certain criteria for the measurement and administration of the waters of the upper basin States which are distinctly different from those which are applicable to all seven Colorado Basin States under the original Colorado River compact of 1922.

In the hearings which were held on the upper basin compact bill before the House Committee on Public Lands representatives of California appeared and testified on one point only. They stated that California had no interest whatever in how the upper basin States proposed to handle their affairs among themselves, but they asked that it be made crystal clear that the action of Congress should not be taken so as to interpret or vary the terms of the original Colorado River Basin Compact. It developed then that the official representatives of the upper basin States disclaimed having any such idea and, quite harmoniously, language was agreed upon between California and the upper basin States which was added to the act and properly preserves all questions of interpretation of the Colorado River Compact. This being settled, California approved the passage of the bill and it was passed on the Consent Calendar in both Houses.

Certainly no fair-minded person would consider that there was anything in the nature of obstruction or opposition on the part of California in these proceedings. The suggestion made by California was promptly and frankly accepted and agreed to by the upper basin States as being in proper order. The bill was not delayed nor was it jeopardized nor lost.

There should be an end to irresponsible whisperings that California has been a dog-in-the-manger as regards upper basin reclamation projects. It is not true. The record is plain.

Inasmuch as the statement of Mr. Aspinall reflects the general tenor of previous attacks on California, I wish to comment briefly upon it.

Mr. Aspinall, like all the others before him, says he "would question the motives of the vociferous members of the vanguard operating for the well-oiled and carefully prepared propaganda barrage of the lower basin."

The motives, Mr. Aspinall, of the Members of Congress to whom you refer are simple and open: they are to preserve and to protect the vital Colorado River water supplies of California. These water supplies belong to California by virtue of contracts required by Congress, and California presumes that the sincerity of Congress is not to be questioned.

Mr. Aspinall, in his statement, bemoans the fact that he has "no trained lobbyists, no well-heeled specialized groups grinding out propaganda for my use. I have no battery of trained engineers and specialists at my disposal."

Is Mr. Aspinall referring to officials of the water agencies of California? These agencies are political subdivisions of the State of California and they have the power to tax. Their representatives come to Washington to help California Members protect and preserve California's water rights. Is Mr. Aspinall referring to the attorneys for these agencies? Is he referring to the engineers of these agencies?

I should like to remind these attackers of California's representatives who come to Washington that similar officials appear regularly in Congress from all other Colorado Basin States. Attorneys and engineers from the upper basin States spend a great deal of time on Capitol Hill lobbying for their own projects. Colorado even has a Federal judge that will take off for Washington on short notice, leaving his judicial robes scattered behind him, whenever there is an opportunity to assault California.

My colleague mourns that the upper basin has no great metropolitan areas, no great centers of industrialization.

Is that the fault of California?

Then he goes on to say that, unless the underdog upper basin can obtain public sympathy, "we shall have seen superior political power used to squeeze legitimate benefits from people of a deserving area so that the greedy can hog the public trough."

Is Mr. Aspinall saying that California should not defend itself, should not protect its rights and its citizens? Is he saying that California should throw away billions of investments made by its citizens, just to help some upper-basin farmers get water on a few acres of high-altitude sagebrush?

Mr. Aspinall says that California is opposing its neighbors' development to fatten its own political nest, and that this explains California's proclivity "to hide as much of this as possible behind the cleanest possible skirts that can be prostituted for this end."

Since when has it been prostitution to keep burglars out of one's house?

The central Arizona project, the Fryingpan-Arkansas project, the Colorado River storage project, all are designed to steal water from California, water that rightfully belongs to California under legal mandate approved by Congress. These projects would seriously damage California's farms, homes, and industries. These projects would rock the foundations of billions of investments made by California citizens in good faith and with reliance on the integrity of the United States Government.

Do the officials and representatives of the upper basin expect California to stand idly by while its last horse is being stolen from the barn?

If Arizona and the upper basin States want to develop and progress—and I would be the first to wish them well in this respect—let them come into Congress with proposals that are founded on sound and reasonable principles. If they want to build projects, let them propose projects that need not injure others in order to be built. Let them come to Congress with proposals that do not inflict hardships on the entire Nation. Let them not ask Congress to approve schemes that benefit a few Rocky Mountain farmers to the detriment of all other farmers thousands of miles away. Let them not ask for gigantic gifts from the taxpayers of this country to grow more crops of the kind that are already in great surplus and heavily subsidized.

If Arizona and the upper basin States want to build, let them build justly and fairly with their own materials and not with materials that others have acquired by industriousness and forethought.

If California is big, it is because California has builded wisely, has paid its own way, and has applied its God-given abilities.

And so help me, I for one, intend to protect and preserve what California has done. I shall continue to oppose every attempt to destroy or diminish the advantages which we have created with our sweat and our money. Let those who depreciate and malign California remember that, and be duly warned.

Communist Control Act

SPEECH

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 16, 1954

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am availing myself of the general leave to extend remarks at this point for the sole purpose of explaining what is here transpiring to those who in later days and years will be reading this Record.

The 83d Congress is near the close of a long session. Many Members, most of whom were punctilious in their attendance, already have left for home with the understanding, general among the Membership, that there would be no further legislation of major importance not already cleared by the Rules Committee or otherwise scheduled. A point of quorum raised earlier in the day resulted in a rollcall—No. 141—showing 140 absentees. From this it is fair to conclude that approximately one-third of this body already had left under the assurance that the work of the session was completed.

In this situation a measure requiring the most careful study and particularity to keep our legislative actions, in serving a worthy end, still within the limitations of the Constitution, is brought before us under suspension of the rules. That means that there can be only 40 minutes of debate, which of course is inadequate for proper presentment by ranking Members and denies to others any opportunity of participation. The general leave to extend remarks will permit those who wish to do so to put into the Record what they might have said in fact and prior to the voting had this important legislation been before us in the usual manner with the House sitting as Committee of the Whole and every Member free to participate under the 5-minute rule.

Moreover, there is no printed copy of the bill available. There is no committee report. No one seems to know exactly what is in the measure. The distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Walter] a ranking member of the Judiciary Committee and a lawyer of recognized preeminence, says that it is "so loosely drawn that it rattles," and that in the few minutes he has had to examine it he has only started finding the bugs hidden in it. The distinguished former chairman of the Judiciary Committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. Celler], says that it will take a long time to get from the courts exact judicial definitions of what the bill entails.

We have been in session since January. All that time the United States has been engaged in a continuing cold war with the communist world. It is beyond my understanding why this legislation, effectively to confine communism, was not brought before us long ago and in the regular order. Why this waiting until a third of the Members had gone home? Why this coming in with a bill unprinted and which may or may not be constitutional, may or may not be more harmful than helpful to the purpose we seek? No one knows.

Despite my objection to this manner of legislating, and the confusion as to the real meaning of the provisions of this bill, I am voting for it. Whenever there is doubt, I resolve the doubt in favor of my country. I have lived by this rule. I am sure that the same holds true with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle.

This is not a normal time. It is a period of continuing emergency that requires military service of our youth, makes great demands upon our resources, torments us with the constant fear of a civilization-destroying atomic war. Soviet Russia and her communistic satellites have forced that upon us.

Communism as a political philosophy ceases to exist when communism becomes the instrument of Godless tyrants to subdue the free will of men everywhere. We must distinguish between that which by a label is a philosophy and that which in reality is a conspiracy to destroy our way of life.

I have voted consistently against legislation which I thought unwise because any temporary advantage that might attend its enactment I foresaw would be offset by the permanent injury to constitutional foundations supporting the rights we cherish. In a time of passions natural to an emergency, and popular indignation over the abuse of the Bill of Rights, I consistently have sought to hold my head and keep my feet on the ground.

As I see it, and as the issue is here presented on voting for this bill, imperfectly drawn though it be and of uncertain legal validity, we are putting the Congress of the United States definitely on record against communism both openly organized and subversively operated. That is ground upon which all Americans can stand, conservatives and liberals, Democrats, Republicans, and Independents. The issue then is one of confession of faith. The imperfections in a hastily drawn and scantily considered bill we must leave to experience and to the courts.

Hon. Charles W. Vursell, of Illinois, Supports REA 100 Percent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, after 12 years of my constant support of the farmers and farm legislation, on every front, I have learned that a false campaign is being made against me in an effort to deceive the farmers in my district. Of course, those who are circulating the report that I have voted against REA appropriations know the charges they make are false. They are not interested in the welfare of agriculture. They are only interested in trying to secure the farmers' vote, and apparently, have little regard for the truth and facts.

I have always believed the truth is more powerful than deception or falsehoods. I want to destroy these charges by smothering them with the truth.

HERE IS THE TRUTH

Some months ago I mailed the farmers of my district my complete official voting record, proving, without question, that I voted for the REA loan fund in the past 12 years I have been in the Congress for a total of $2,659,000,000; that this amount was $75 million more than was requested by the Presidents under whom I served: Mr. Roosevelt, Mr. Truman, and Mr. Eisenhower. All of these loan funds, of course, are paid back by the cooperatives with interest, and is a worthy investment in the good cause to bring light and power to the farmers of Illinois and America. It is from these loan funds that every expense of REA is financed.

No one can search the record and offer any facts tending to prove the above statement does not give the absolute truth. Most farmers are familiar with my constant interest in behalf of agriculture, and have observed my record year after year. Those who have, know the above statement gives the facts. The official CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will further prove the truth of my statement.

Mr. Speaker, when I came to Congress in 1943, only about 45 to 50 percent of the farmers of Illinois had REA light and power. Now, about 95 percent of the farmers in Illinois have light and power, and for the past 12 years I have voted for every dollar of the money used to extend this light and power to the farmers. Having owned and operated farms most of my life, and having helped to organize the Marion County Farm Bureau over 40 years ago, of which I am a charter member, and having been a leader in the Congress for 12 years in my support of REA and soil conservation, I feel confident the sound-thinking, honest farmers I have supported, on every occasion, with beneficial legislation, will not be easily deceived by one who has never done anything, whatsoever, for agriculture or for farmers.

Mr. Speaker, a false and misleading circular has been handed out over my district comparing my voting record on REA with that of the senior Senator from Illinois, which carries the name of my opponent promising to support REA, if elected.

I do not come to the farmers with promises becaue I have already delivered the goods supporting REA 100 percent, and I shall continue to fully support rural electric light and power because of the great service it has rendered, and will continue to render, to the people.

I have not looked up the Senator's voting record. I am not interested in what position he took on legislation.

Mr. Speaker, however, since my opposition has seen fit to use this deceptive means by falsely comparing the Senator's record with mine, I want to give you the facts.

COMPARISON OF RECORDS

I was elected to Congress in 1942, and had the privilege of serving for 6 years in the House of Representatives in the Congress before the senior Senator was elected in 1948.

During these first 6 years, beginning January 6 of 1943 through 1948, I voted for REA loan funds totaling $1,405,000,000. This was before the Senator was elected.

During the following 6 years, while both the Senator and I served in the Congress, from 1949 through 1954, I voted for REA loan funds for another total of $1,254,000,000. That makes a 12-year total I voted for of $2,659,000,000, which is $75 million more than was requested by all of the 3 Presidents under whom I served.

These facts cannot be challenged or disapproved by anyone. In the face of such a record, the false charges being made against me fall flat. They are smothered with the facts and the truth.

THE SENATOR'S RECORD

Mr. Speaker, I do not know how the Senator referred to voted on REA loan funds during the past 6 years he served. However, since my opponent has made a comparison, I would like to point out that during the past 6 years the Congress appropriated about $1,254,000,000 for the REA loan fund. If the Senator voted for all of these appropriations passed during the past 6 years, he could have only voted for a total of $1,254,000,000, which is less than half of the REA appropriations I have voted for during 12 years of service, which total $2,659,000,000.

It would seem that anyone who seeks the great responsibility of representing 350,000 people in this district in the Congress, on the vast and important problems of government with which we have to cope, should run on his own merits, if he has any, rather than to try to discredit and tear down, by misrepresentation, my record of 12 years of earnest service in behalf of agriculture, and in behalf of the farmers of southern Illinois and the Nation.

Appropriation Acts of the 83d Congress, 2d Session—Part VI

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 18, 1954

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent, I am extending my remarks to include my report on Public Laws 465 and 469, as follows:

PUBLIC LAW 465

H. R. 8680: Interior Department appropriations law

A. Appropriates $405,936,149 for the Department of Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955. Continues antistrike provisions.

B. Item:

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

	Appropriation
Office of the Secretary:	
Connally Hot Oil Act, enforcement of	$140,000
Operation and maintenance, Southeastern Power Administration	1,228,000
Southwestern Power Administration:	
Operation and maintenance	1,765,000
Research in utilization of saline water	400,000
Oil and Gas Division	250,000
Emergency flood and storm repairs	100,000
Total, Office of the Secretary	3,883,000
Commission of Fine Arts	21,200
Bonneville Power Administration:	
Construction	24,314,000
Operation and maintenance	6,200,000
Total, Bonneville Power Administration	30,514,000
Bureau of Land Management:	
Management of lands and resources	11,913,000
Construction	2,500,000
Total, Bureau of Land Management	14,413,000

H. R. 8680: Interior Department appropriations law—Continued

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR—con.

	Appropriation
Bureau of Indian Affairs:	
Health, education, and welfare services	$59,647,215
Resources management	12,881,245
Construction	7,673,000
General administrative expenses	2,750,000
Total, Bureau of Indian Affairs, exclusive of tribal funds	82,851,460
Tribal funds (not included in totals of this tabulation)	3,000,000
Bureau of Reclamation:	
General investigations	3,350,000
Construction and rehabilitation	126,637,000
Operation and maintenance	21,500,000
General administrative expenses	4,000,000
Emergency fund	200,000
Total, Bureau of Reclamation	155,687,000
Geological Survey: Surveys, investigations, and research	25,735,000
Bureau of Mines:	
Conservation and development of mineral resources	13,500,000
Health and safety	5,000,000
General administrative expenses	1,000,000
Total, Bureau of Mines	19,500,000
National Park Service:	
Management and protection	9,098,390
Maintenance and rehabilitation of physical facilities	8,425,000
Construction	8,056,099
General administrative expenses	1,084,000
Total, National Park Service	26,663,489
Fish and Wildlife Service:	
Management of resources	6,301,000
Investigations of resources	4,127,000
Construction	300,000
General administrative expenses	725,000
Administration of Pribilof Islands	(1,650,000)
Total, Fish and Wildlife Service	11,453,000
Office of Territories:	
Administration of Territories	3,400,000
Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands	5,000,000
Alaska public works	9,500,000
Construction of roads, Alaska	8,000,000
Operation and maintenance of roads, Alaska	3,500,000
Construction, Alaska R. R.	2,900,000
Virgin Islands public works	
Total, Office of Territories	32,300,000
Administration, Department of the Interior: Salaries and expenses	2,330,000
Total, Department of the Interior	405,351,149

TITLE II—VIRGIN ISLANDS CORPORATION

Revolving fund	
Grants	510,000
Administrative expenses	(130,000)
Total, Virgin Island Corporation	510,000

TITLE III—FEDERAL COAL MINE SAFETY BOARD OF REVIEW

Salaries and expenses	75,000
Grand total, titles I, II, III	405,936,149

PUBLIC LAW 469

H. R. 9517: District of Columbia Appropriations Act

A. Appropriates $169,928,099 for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955. Sets the Federal contribution at $21,890,000. Continues antistrike provisions.

B. Item:

OPERATING EXPENSES

	Appropriations
Executive Office	$307,565
Department of General Administration	2,945,522
Office of Corporation Counsel	428,585
Compensation and retirement fund expenses	10,207,000
Regulatory agencies	918,204
Department of Occupations and Professions	264,000
Public schools	27,626,570
Public Library	1,611,000
Recreation Department	1,641,000
Metropolitan Police	12,757,520
Metropolitan Police (municipal services, Legion convention)	80,000

H. R. 9517: District of Columbia Appropriations Act—Continued

OPERATING EXPENSES—continued

	Appropriations
Fire Department	$6,266,641
Veterans' Service Center	93,000
Office of Civil Defense	150,000
Courts	3,163,410
Department of Public Health	22,636,000
Department of Corrections	4,374,674
Department of Buildings and Grounds	1,675,642
Department of Public Welfare	8,885,061
Office of Surveyor	149,200
Department of Licenses and Inspections	1,378,000
Department of Highways	5,768,600
Department of Vehicles and Traffic	1,238,365
Department of Sanitary Engineering	9,732,740
Washington aqueduct	2,127,000
National Guard	114,800
National Capital Parks	2,344,000
National Zoological Park	645,000
Judgments and claims	
Total, operating expenses	129,529,099

CAPITAL OUTLAY

District debt service	250,000
Public building construction	15,712,000
Miscellaneous capital outlay	966,000
Department of Highways	11,810,000
Department of Sanitary Engineering	7,491,000
Liquidation of contract authorization	270,000
Washington aqueduct	3,900,000
Total, capita. outlay	40,399,000
Grand total	(169,928,099)

Your Congressman Reports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CECIL R. KING

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. KING of California. Mr. Speaker, as we come to the close of the 83d Congress I wish to again make my report to the people I am honored to represent in our 17th District of California. For the past 12 years I have had the privilege of serving this district as its Representative in the Congress of the United States, one of the most populous and fastest growing constituencies in the country with perhaps more industries and varied problems of any other district. It includes two of the Nation's greatest ports of entry—our Los Angeles Harbor and our Los Angeles International Airport, as well as a major portion of the Navy's Roosevelt base on Terminal Island, the Army's Fort MacArthur at San Pedro, and the world-renowned Catalina Island. It also includes the greatest food-fish producing port in the world; the greatest aircraft production, with hundreds of subsidiary manufacturing concerns; one of the greatest oil-refining and export centers; one of the greatest shipbuilding centers during the war; and is one of the heaviest industrial areas in the West.

It will not be possible to discuss in detail or even touch upon all the bills considered, or the unfortunate controversies that arose during this session which have been amply covered by the press from day to day. As a member of the most important Committee on Ways and Means, having so much vital legislation before it, including revision of the Social Security Act as well as the tax revision bill, the 83d Congress proved a very busy one for me. The tax revision itself entailed our committee hearing the testimony of over 1,100 witnesses consuming 84 days in public hearings alone, and the new law comprises over 1,000 pages of several thousand sections. I will be obliged to confine my report to those proposals that have dealt largely with the general welfare of our people and in which my constituents have indicated their greatest interest.

TAXATION

The tax revision bill, originating in my Committee on Ways and Means, has afforded tax benefits which have been widely publicized. I supported the major portion of the revision proposals, however, I was not at all satisfied with the meager benefits afforded the great proportion of our citizens earning low or moderate incomes. I was the author in the House of Representatives of the proposal to grant increased personal income tax exemptions, which was hotly debated and only defeated by 6 votes in the House, 204 to 210 and by but 3 votes in the Senate, 46 to 49. It is my contention that, in addition to the much needed tax relief this amendment would have afforded the millions of moderate and low income earners, the tremendous added purchasing power would have provided a marked stimulus toward insuring a steady economy by its distribution through trade channels.

Several of the bills I authored were incorporated in this tax revision bill, including increased allowances for dependents, increased allowances for retired persons, allowances for child care expense, as well as the reduction of tax on theater admissions and the legislation that closed the loophole through which millions of dollars in income taxes had been avoided in the past on incomes earned outside the United States.

I also supported the excise-tax reductions, but am dissatisfied with many phases of that legislation inasmuch as it still places a heavy burden on the householder and merchandiser by retaining the relatively heavy tax on many home appliances that are now considered essentials and not luxuries in the modern home.

The principal benefit accorded the average taxpayer is the 10 percent reduction on individual incomes voted by the 82d Congress under the previous administration.

SOCIAL SECURITY

The Social Security Act is also under the jurisdiction of my Committee on Ways and Means, and as a strong advocate over the years, I was in accord and supported the improvements and worthwhile revisions that were made in the act. There were, however, a number of proposed amendments which I regret were not approved by the committee. One of the most important of these was the increase in earnings allowed retired persons before forfeiting their benefits. I was not only in favor of raising the limit, but introduced legislation and advocated that the limitation be removed altogether. I am also the author and have long been an advocate of legislation calling for reduction in the age of eligibility for retirement to at least 62 for men and

60 for women, and have always supported the grants in aid to the States for aid to the aged, blind, handicapped, and other victims of impoverished circumstances.

In spite of the strong opposition through the years to the social security law, and the prejudiced attempt to tag it as a form of creeping socialism, the law is now an integral part of the American way of life, and the sooner it is perfected and established on a sound actuarial basis, the sooner will be abolished the fear of insecurity in later life and the lifting of the heavy burden of direct relief from the local tax rolls. What greater bulwark against communism could there be than the contentment of a citizenry assured of a feeling of security they have earned when they reach the waning of their productive years.

FULL EMPLOYMENT

Full employment in our country should be one of the paramount aims of all of us, as it is the heart and strength of our country's economic well-being to which nothing could contribute more than a continuing healthy business cycle kept alive by full employment. In the interest of those temporarily out of employment, I was 1 of the group of 80 Members of the House of Representatives who sponsored a proposal to liberalize and revise the unemployment-compensation benefits.

EDUCATION

America's educational needs are well known to every parent who sends a child to an overcrowded classroom operating 2 or 3 shifts a day. They are well known to every overworked teacher responsible for handling a classroom jammed with children.

I have been an active advocate of every possible aid to education. One of the prime problems in our great State is the extreme overburdening of local educational facilities with the constant influx of citizens from other sections of the country—particularly to southern California—which will require continuous close attention. I believe that every possible incentive should be offered to the teaching profession, particularly in the matter of adequate compensation, to encourage and insure the perpetuation of a high standard of education in our great State.

I was one of the authors and sponsors of the legislation enacted that has eased the tax burden on our retired teachers, and later retired firemen, policemen, and civil servants were added as beneficiaries of this legislation. A number of school districts in our area have been included in the program of assistance to schools in crowded defense areas, and I am pleased to have been instrumental in having obtained Federal funds, which eased the tax burden for these school districts.

VETERANS

I have consistently through the years, as in this Congress, supported legislation in behalf of our veterans and their dependents, their benefits, their pensions, their hospital and medical care. The continuing influx into southern California of veterans from all areas of the United States, much as in our school situation, continues to present a serious problem. Leading veteran organizations have rated my voting record in behalf of our veterans at 100 percent, and I shall continue to work to expedite correction of the inadequacy of facilities for their benefit and comfort.

SMALL BUSINESS

It has always been an unquestioned American tradition that this Government shall aid, counsel, and protect the interests of small business in order to preserve our democratic system of free competitive enterprise. With the dissolution and absorption of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and the Small Defense Plants Administration, a great number of Congressmen, including myself, favored legislation to create a new permanent independent Small Business Administration with the paramount duty of encouraging and assisting small enterprises in peacetime as well as in any emergency period.

Recognizing the importance of our small businesses in defense-production efforts and the national economy, I have consistently urged reasonable Federal assistance and guidance to them throughout my congressional service. Our small-business firms have a substantial employment figure. By granting reasonable help to keep these firms going we are taking safety steps in the prevention of threatening unemployment. I have assisted in the establishment of industries in our area—both large and small—and through the years have devoted my best efforts to aid the businesses of my district where discrimination or other inequitable treatment was evident, and have succeeded in enacting corrective legislation for their relief.

CONSERVATION AND NATURAL RESOURCES

I have remained alert at all times in my determination to protect and preserve our vast national forests and parks that have been set aside for the enjoyment of all our people, to insure against the incessant attempt at encroachment by special interests. I am also alert to the attempts of certain private power interests to acquire for personal profit the remaining great water and power potential of the West. A like concern was alerted in this session of the Congress over the partially successful attempt of certain private interests to control the vast peacetime atomic energy program of our Government which was paid for so dearly by the people of our country whose equity to date in this program amounts to more than $12 billion, and I voted to protect the people's investment.

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA WATER RIGHTS

Southern California has been confronted since the turn of the century with the problem of an adequate water supply. Very critical complications are now presenting themselves due to the threatened encroachments from other States that are parties to the Colorado River compact, because of the machinations of land speculators and promoters who seek to deprive southern California of its contractual rights and its fair share of the water of the Colorado River. Water represents to the people of southern California a basic necessity to insure the needs of its thriving, evergrowing population, industry and agriculture, and I am pleased to be considered one of the leaders in the Congress in the fight to protect southern California's water rights.

POSTAL AND FEDERAL WORKERS

One of the keen disappointments of this session was the outcome of the long and vigorously debated proposal for pay increases for our postal workers and other Federal employees. I feel our Government's service generally has suffered greatly due to the inadequacy and unattractiveness of Federal pay scales, and have long felt they were entitled to a substantial increase to somewhat compensate for the rise in living costs. I was a member of the group in the House that vigorously supported this enactment and regret that after overwhelming approval in both the House and Senate, the President saw fit to veto this legislation.

COMMUNISM

My constituents will recollect that in my previous report to them I covered quite fully the legislation I had introduced for the outlawing of the Communist Party in our country. My bill, H. R. 5941, was the first introduced in the House of Representatives, and I am gratified that the major provisions of my bill were overwhelmingly approved by both the Senate and the House. I also voted to revise and extend the laws relating to espionage and sabotage.

NARCOTICS

I am the author of three bills as a result of extensive study and conferences with our country's chief narcotics enforcement authority, Commissioner Harry J. Anslinger, the details of which I have previously reported to you. As you may recall, these bills are designed to augment and strengthen the enforcement and authority of the enforcement officers in the various fields dealing with the vicious narcotics menace. Because of the unprecedented heavy schedule of the Committee on Ways and Means, also having jurisdiction over such bills, we were able to conduct hearings on but one of these bills, which was approved for presentation to the House, and I have been assured that early hearings will be accorded the others following the convening of the 84th Congress in January.

DISTRICT ENTERPRISES AND DEVELOPMENT

Harbor: Our Los Angeles Harbor, serving 7 million people of southern and central California and 14 million people in a 12-State area, is one of the leading ports of the Western Hemisphere and one of the greatest man-made harbors in the world, embracing 1,800 acres of channel and anchor area, with 28 miles of water frontage served by 3 major railroads. It has been my privilege to have been of every possible assistance toward its continual growth and development, including the establishment of foreign trade zone No. 4 at our harbor, and sponsoring a bill this session which gained Federal assistance for the dredging and improving of the east basin to enhance the usefulness of the new $8 million terminal, which is rated the largest and most modern passenger cargo terminal in the world.

With regard to the Redondo Beach project, I am pleased to report that following my success in securing approval of my proposal authorizing construction of a breakwater at Redondo Beach for the protection of the shoreline and the creation of a small-boat harbor, I have in this session succeeded in securing an appropriation of $50,000 for further engineering to bring the project to construction stage, and trust the next session will approve the full appropriation in conjunction with local support of this much-needed shore protection and boat haven. This small boat harbor will be a priceless asset not only to Redondo Beach, but the whole surrounding area.

Airport: Our Los Angeles International Airport is one of the finest and most important air terminals in the world, of which we may also justly be proud. I have taken particular interest in insuring its designation as an international port of entry. My most recent accomplishment toward its growth and development was in assisting in having it designated as the west coast terminal for the Scandinavian Airline System's transpolar service. I am continuously working with the Federal agencies in Washington and the interested organizations locally toward its further development and expansion to maintain its position as one of the most important airports in the world.

Fishing industry: The world's largest fishing industry operates out of our port of Los Angeles. The annual catch is estimated at around 1 billion pounds with a value of some $75 million, and recently a new $3 million fishermen's wharf has been completed. I have worked very closely with this important industry all through the years of my congressional service and am constantly in touch with the industry's local and Washington representatives on their problems.

I have sponsored numerous legislative proposals in behalf of our great fishing industry, including a proposal for the protection of our fishing vessels on the high seas, and another of vital interest to the sports fishing and water-taxi craft operators which were enacted into law this session. The National Fisheries Institute, in its most recent bulletin, lists me as among the leaders in the House noted for championing the welfare of the fishing industry.

Merchant marine and shipbuilding: This industry is also of vital importance to our port and the 17th Congressional District. I have long been associated with those interested in shipping and our United States merchant marine, and served for several years on the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries of the House of Representatives. I authored, and was successful in securing enactment into law this session, legislation providing relief for the shipping industry from the imposing of certain unfair and arbitrary duties. This legislation was enacted, keeping in mind the highly competitive conditions American shipping meets from foreign lines, and is not now in a position to bear further inequitable burdens.

I was also the sponsor of a successful legislative effort in this session providing for a program of merchant ship construction in American shipyards, as well as legislation to maintain ship construction and ship-repair yards, in addition to an enactment providing that 50 percent of all cargoes originating in the United States be carried by American shipping.

VOTING RECORD

Being mindful that the voters of my district have reposed trust and confidence in me for many years, my energies and efforts have been dedicated to meeting that challenge. My overall attendance and voting record is one of the best in the Congress, according to the records of the Clerk of the House of Representatives.

Much has been said about relative support of the President in this administration. In the first session of this Congress, my voting record of support of the legislative recommendations of the President was 82 percent, which was high on the list in both the Senate and the House regardless of party. During the second session of this Congress, I am unable as yet to say what my percentage rating will be, or how the rating will be determined, as it is well known there have been many controversial votes on amendments that will complicate the record, to say the least.

One of the occasions on which I have most vigorously addressed this House was against the present administration's recommendation to reduce the Air Force appropriation which I felt would imperil our national security, and I feel my stand has subsequently been clearly justified by the restoration of this reduction.

I realize full well that my legislative record may not please each and every one of my constituents, which is to be expected in a democracy where each of us has the right to his own opinion—a right that we must respect and safeguard. I have always voted as my perception and conscience dictates, and have determined my stand on what I considered best for the people of our district and the country.

TO KEEP THE RECORD STRAIGHT

I have noted that quite a number of Members have brought to the attention of the House and their constituents, the distorted analysis bearing on their voting record by the active opposition in their districts. This seems to be a popular new technique intended by constant repetition to shake the faith of the people in their Representatives. My own opposition in the last and this present campaign has repeatedly resorted to the use of this device with a premeditated intent to mislead the voters.

Undue critical implications are repeatedly directed to absences over the years from certain rollcalls, but obviously omitting the fact that the Member was paired on a vote which records his stand on such legislation and disregarding absences when excused from the House on official business of investigating committees or on more urgent official business than adding his vote in most instances to an already unanimous vote.

Knowing full well that a Representative with Communist leanings would be distasteful to the voters of any constituency, some zealous aspirants to seats in Congress, including my own, are resorting to the cunning device of misrepresentation and setting forth a distorted analysis of voting records associating the votes to preserve and protect the civil rights, liberties, and constitutional guaranties of our citizens, with softness toward communism.

The guilt by association technique is employed also by listing Members on certain votes with the former Republican Member of the House from New York, the now deceased Vito Marcantonio.

In my district the opposition has gone a step further in widely circulating a Communist newspaper's denunciation of me, by cunningly removing its identity as a Communist newspaper.

It would appear the time has come to recognize that the philosophy which made this Nation great was a philosophy not of hypocrisy and deceit, but one of truth and reason.

CONCLUSION

As your Representative in the Congress these past 12 years, confronted with the difficulty of having to serve the better part of each year 3,000 miles distant from my constituency, I have conscientiously endeavored to serve you and bring credit and distinction to our district. My office staff and I take pride in the reputation our office has gained for promptness and efficiency in handling congressional services.

My files are replete with letters of appreciation from individuals and organizations for services rendered. I treasure these "thank you" expressions and encouraging good wishes, and shall always strive to justify your confidence and good will.

The measure of success we have achieved has been with your guidance that I have welcomed on all important congressional matters in our partnership in public affairs.

Federal Civil-Service Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN D. JOHNSTON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by me relative to Federal civil-service employees.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I believe Federal civil-service employees should know of the fine representation they have received at this session of Congress through the American Federation of Government Employees and the other member organizations of the AFL Government Employees Council.

Many of the important provisions of the fringe-benefit bill which was passed at this session appear to be taken intact from the legislative program adopted by the American Federation of Government Employees 2 years ago.

At every hearing held by the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee, representatives of the AFGE were on hand to express opinions, suggestions for improvement, and facts regarding proposed legislation.

We are all familiar with the fine work done by the great postal unions on behalf of post office employees. I think classified employees should know that the path to improvement of their wages and working conditions would have been many times more difficult had it not been for the intelligent and effective activity of the AFGE and its officers and representatives.

It has been a pleasure to have had the cooperation of this patriotic and public-spirited organization of Government employees.

Appropriation Acts of the 83d Congress, 2d Session—Part VII

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 18, 1954

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am extending my remarks to include my report to my constituents on Public Law 470, as follows:

PUBLIC LAW 470

H. R. 9203: Legislative-Judiciary Appropriation Act

A. Appropriates $98,197,494 for the Legislative and Judiciary Branches for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955. Continues antistrike provisions.

B. Item:

TITLE I—LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

Senate:	*Appropriations*
Senators:	
Compensation of Senators	$1,200,000
Expense allowance of Senators	240,000
Mileage of the President of the Senate and of Senators	51,000
Compensation of the Vice President	30,000
Expense allowance of the Vice President	10,000
Total, Senators	1,531,000
Salaries of officers and employees:	
Office of the Vice President	55,410
Chaplain	2,946
Office of the Secretary of the Senate	444,020
Committee employees	1,767,045
Conference committees:	
Majority, clerical salaries	33,310
Minority, clerical salaries	33,310
Administrative and clerical assistants to Senators	6,207,625
Office of the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper	1,276,875
Office of secretaries for the majority and minority, salaries	62,165
Total, salaries of officers and employees	9,882,706
Contingent expenses:	
Legislative reorganization	100,000
Senate policy committees	149,340
Joint Committee on the Economic Report	120,775
Joint Committee on Atomic Energy	188,060
Joint Committee on Printing	47,585
Vice President's automobile	5,835
Automobile for the President pro tempore	5,835
Automobiles for majority and minority leaders	11,670
Reporting Senate proceedings	135,785
Furniture	3,190
Do	19,000
Inquiries and investigations	1,224,120
Folding documents	27,000
Materials for folding	1,500
Fuel, etc	2,000
Senate restaurants	$55,000
Motor vehicles	9,560
Miscellaneous items	981,087
Packing boxes	3,000
Postage stamps	825
Airmail and special delivery stamps	10,400
Stationery	126,400
Communications	14,550
Total contingent expenses	3,251,517
Total, Senate	14,665,223
House of Representatives:	
Members and Delegates:	
Salaries	5,492,500
Mileage and expenses	1,273,500
Total, Members and Delegates	6,766,000
Salaries, officers and employees:	
Speaker's office	47,285
Office of the Parliamentarian	43,885
Office of the Chaplain	4,200
Clerk's office	737,530
Committee employees	1,820,000
Sergeant at Arms office	384,045
Doorkeeper's office	657,915
Special and minority employees (several items)	191,485
Postmaster's office	189,880
Official reporters	124,435
Committee reporters	133,855
Studies and investigations, Committee on Appropriations	450,000
Total, salaries, officers and employees	4,784,515
Members' clerk hire	11,500,000
Contingent expenses:	
Furniture	220,500
Miscellaneous items	898,800
Reporting hearings	125,000
Special and select committees	1,250,000
Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation	200,000
Joint Committee on Immigration and Nationality Policy	20,000
Coordinator of Information, salaries and expenses	73,750
Telegraph and telephone	800,000
Stationery (revolving fund)	525,600
Attending physician's office	3,985
Postage stamps	94,050
Folding documents	125,000
Revision of laws	13,700
Speaker's automobile	7,200
Majority leader's automobile	5,835
Minority leader's automobile	5,835
Total, contingent expenses	4,374,255
Total, House of Representatives	27,424,770
Capitol Police:	
General expenses	17,900
Additional protection	22,345
Total, Capitol Police	40,245
Legislative Counsel:	
Salaries and expenses	259,000
Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures	20,000
Expenses, Interparliamentary Union	------------
Education of House and Senate pages: Expenses	47,280
Miscellaneous:	
Penalty mail costs	1,169,700
Statement of appropriations	6,000
Total, miscellaneous	1,175,700
Architect of the Capitol:	
Salaries	138,000
Capitol buildings	630,000
Reconstruction of Capitol terraces	------------
Capitol Grounds	342,500
Legislative garage	34,200
Subway transportation	3,500
Senate Office Building	796,400
House Office Buildings	984,200
Capitol Power Plant (operation)	1,237,000
Capitol Power Plant, changes and improvements	1,500,000
Library buildings and grounds:	
Structural and mechanical care	400,000
Furniture and furnishings	50,000
Total, Architect of the Capitol	6,115,800
Botanic Garden: Salaries and expenses	223,100
Library of Congress:	
Salaries and expenses	$4,717,636
Copyright Office, salaries and expenses	1,100,000
Legislative Reference Service, salaries and expenses	875,000
Catalog cards, distribution of	1,332,000
Increase of the Library:	
General	200,000
Law library	90,000
Books for Supreme Court	25,000
Books for the blind	1,000,000
Total, Library of Congress	9,309,636
Government Printing Office:	
Printing and binding for Congress	8,500,000
Revolving fund	------------
Superintendent of Documents, salaries and expenses	2,825,000
Total, Government Printing Office	11,325,000
Grand total, title I	70,696,754

TITLE II—JUDICIARY BRANCH

Supreme Court of the United States:	
Salaries	1,016,000
Printing and binding Supreme Court reports	91,200
Preparation of Rules for Civil Procedure	4,300
Miscellaneous expenses	52,650
Care of the building and grounds	338,300
Total, Supreme Court	1,502,450
Court of Customs and Patent Appeals: Salaries and expenses	210,160
Customs Court: Salaries and expenses	495,630
Court of Claims:	
Salaries and expenses	618,000
Repairs and improvements	8,000
Total, Court of Claims	626,000
Courts of Appeals, district courts and other judicial services:	
Salaries of judges	5,472,500
Salaries of supporting personnel	12,850,000
Fees of jurors and commissioners	3,950,000
Travel and miscellaneous expenses	1,800,000
Administrative Office, salaries and expenses	595,000
Referees, special account:	
Salaries	(1,083,700)
Expenses	(1,443,550)
Total, other courts and services	24,667,500
Total, title II, the Judiciary	27,501,740
Grand total, all titles	98,197,494

Letter From Max Ascoli, Editor and Publisher of the Reporter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, it has been called to my attention that yesterday, August 19, the distinguished senior Senator from New Hampshire made some comments concerning the well-known bimonthly publication the Reporter, which is published in New York City. Senator BRIDGES also made some comments about the editor and members of the staff, some, if not all, of whom are my constituents. Today I have received from Dr. Max Ascoli, editor of the Reporter, who is a distinguished journalist and scholar, a letter setting forth certain facts deemed to be in reply to the statements made on the floor yesterday by Senator BRIDGES.

Mr. President, I am not in a position to vouch, of my own knowledge, for most of the detailed facts set forth in the letter from Dr. Ascoli, but I have a high regard for the publication and a very high esteem for the attainments, achievements, and reputation of Dr. Ascoli. I thing it only fair and appropriate, therefore, Mr. President, to ask unanimous consent that Dr. Ascoli's letter to me be printed in the Appendix of the Record in order that the statements made by him in reply to Senator Bridges be made a part of the Record.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

August 20, 1954.

The Honorable Herbert H. Lehman,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Lehman: As you know, on August 19, Senator Bridges attacked the Reporter in a speech on the floor of the Senate (Congressional Record, Thursday, August 19, pp. 14472 to 14480). The occasion for this speech was an article published in our issue of July 20, entitled "Senator Styles Bridges and His Far-flung Constituents." The Senator called this article "one of the most vicious smears ever directed at a man in public life." He made no allusion to the facts of the article but confined himself to denying "every implication, insinuation, or innuendo." He attacked the magazine's reputation, its staff, and myself. He called into question our loyalty as American citizens and our professional integrity as journalists. He accused me, personally, of ingratitude to the country which gave me political refuge; he questioned my financial honesty; he charged me with harboring the intent to undermine our democratic institutions.

I am writing to you in the hope that you may see fit to include in the pages of the Record some facts which, in all honesty and fairness, should be made part of the record. I address this communication to you not only because you are the Senator from New York, which is the home of the Reporter, of its editor and most of its staff, but also because you are, I know, a defender of truth and integrity. I would like to present to you, and hopefully for the record, some incontrovertible facts in answer to the baseless allegations made by Senator Bridges.

The article on Senator Bridges was written by our Washington editor, Douglass Cater. Contrary to the Senator's insinuations, Mr. Cater, despite his comparative youth, has made a distinctively anti-Communist record. He was a wartime member of the Office of Strategic Services, as part of an operation charged with gathering intelligence data on Soviet Communists. He was not, as Senator Bridges stated, a delegate to the World Youth Festival. Instead, after his return to Harvard in 1946, he was chosen to represent the official student government at the International Student Congress held in Prague at a time when Eduard Benes was President of the Czechoslovak Republic. Mr. Cater fought the efforts by Communists to dominate this important postwar student movement, strongly denouncing them, among other places, in the Boston Globe in February 1948. In 1947 Mr. Cater helped organize the United States National Student Association, which has actively carried on the fight to win students of Western Europe and Free Asia away from the Communist conspiracy. Contrary to the Senator's accusation, Mr. Cater never testified or spoke against the teachers' loyalty oath. In his commencement oration delivered at Harvard in June 1947, Mr. Cater described the Communist as a "twisted individual" and communism as "a totalitarian philosophy which breeds on the ills of the world" and "repugnant to our democratic beliefs." More recently Mr. Cater has served as special assistant to the Secretary of the Army, for which he received complete security clearance.

Turning to other staff members, the Senator charged Senior Editor Philip Horton with attending meetings of the Institute of Pacific Relations "long after it was cited as a Communist-front activity," and stated that his writings on the China lobby in the Reporter "parallel the party line." The IPR is not and never has been on the Attorney General's list of subversive organizations. It is true that Philip Horton, though not a mmeber of the IPR, traveled to Honolulu for an IPR conference on Japanese-American relations in January 1953. Other Americans attending this conference were Gerard Swope, president of General Electric Co.; J. Ballard Atherton, president of the Mutual Telephone Co., Honolulu; E. B. MacNaughton, chairman of the board, First National Bank of Portland, Oreg.; James H. Shoemaker, vice president, Bank of Hawaii; Robert R. Trent, of the Hawaii Sugar Planters' Association.

As to the China lobby, recognition of its existence is certainly not a Communist monopoly. For instance, the New York Times of January 15, 1954, reported Arthur H. Dean, President Eisenhower's special Ambassador to Korea, as saying "that the China lobby * * * was playing into the hands of the Communists and doing their propaganda work for them."

Mr. Horton held an important civilian position in the Office of Strategic Services during the war in London and Paris and received the United States Army Medal of Freedom. After the war he became chief of the CIA liaison mission to the French intelligence service and was attached to the United States Embassy in Paris. He later joined Time magazine as an associate editor and served in that capacity until his resignation to join the Reporter staff.

The Senator proceeded to state that our national correspondent, Theodore H. White, had been fired from Time magazine for pro-Red reporting on China. The files of Time magazine will show that Mr. White resigned of his own choice and by mutual consent. He is the author of two books—Thunder Out of China and Fire in the Ashes—both Book-of-the-Month Club choices. Thunder Out of China, criticized as anti-Communist by the Daily Worker, was one of the first books to show the Communist not as simple agrarian reformers but as tough, ruthless men. Fire in the Ashes describes the West's attempt to build a firm bulwark in Western Europe against Communist aggression. Mr. White has been a distinguished foreign correspondent for over 15 years, having established the first news bureau of Time magazine in the Orient before World War II, and flown with the United States Air Force as a war correspondent during the first raids against the Japanese. For these flights he received the Air Medal, and after the war he received a Certificate of Commendation from Secretary Patterson.

The Senator charged that our executive editor, Harlan Cleveland, "either through design or incredible stupidity" aided "the sellout" of Nationalist China. The facts are that Mr. Cleveland, after holding several positions of high responsibility in the Government during the war, and receiving the United States Army Medal of Freedom, was sent to China as head of the UNRRA China office. There he worked closely with the Nationalist Government of China in building up its strength with economic aid in the face of daily Communist charges that he was the tool of American imperialists. He received from Chiang Kai-shek one of the Chinese Republic's highest decorations. Returning to the United States, he became a consultant to the China aid program and accepted an invitation from the Republican members of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs to testify in favor of increased aid to the Chinese Nationalists in their fight against communism. Mr. Paul G. Hoffman, the first Administrator of the Economic Cooperation Administration, later appointed Mr. Cleveland as Director of ECA's China program. Still later, he became Assistant Director for Europe of the Mutual Security Agency.

In his speech, Senator Bridges considered himself the latest victim of what he defined the Reporter's technique of "smear and vicious attack." He called the illustrious roll of those who have received a smear citation from this journalistic disgrace called Reporter. The roll is headed by the name of Dwight D. Eisenhower. This I do resent, since the Reporter has been occasionally critical but consistently and scrupulously respectful toward the President. Frequently we have enthusiastically praised him. After his inaugural address we wrote: "But it was a great and noble speech, which expressed the best that is in the speaker himself and in the people he leads. * * * And we love to be among the apparently not too many people naive enough to be deeply moved by what the President said."

In an editorial commenting on the April 16 speech of last year I wrote: "At least for 1 day, April 16, the skies were clear, the air bracing, when the President made his memorable speech to the American Society of Newspaper Editors and to the world. * * * On April 16, the former Allied commander in Europe, the man who 1 year ago was still the NATO chief, proved that his capacity to rally the Nation and the world is still utterly unimpaired. * * * One thing is certain. Whenever he shows his mettle as the leader of the free world, he is bound to strike at the unity of his party. The President must choose: He cannot live up to the task he has assigned himself and at the same time keep the Republican Party united. Between the interests of the free world and those of the Republican political underworld there can be no possible compromise."

In its issue after the President's message to the U. N., the cover line on the Reporter magazine read, "The President Takes the Lead," and my editorial said: "On December 8, a large number of people at home and abroad were happy to recognize in that grinless, dedicated leader the same man whom for too long a time they could not help criticizing. On this magazine it did our hearts good to applaud the President heartily."

Coming now to the other names on the "illustrious roll" of those whom the Reporter has "smeared," I can only say that the list is a strange one indeed. Some on this list have been barely mentioned by us—Senators Butler, Maybank, McClellan, and Publisher Roy Howard, for instance. Others were only briefly mentioned in connection with certain facts we thought might be of interest. We described the contents of a report by General Wedemeyer on China; of Wedemeyer himself we had little to say.

Several of the persons on Senator Bridges' list have been both criticized and praised by us. We praised Senator Symington for cleaning up the RFC promptly and effectively, and deplored the fact that he took away a reproach and got no thanks from President Truman for the good job he had done. We spoke of Senator George's steady pursuit of the subject at hand and his thunderous eloquence, and we called him perhaps the truest conservative in the Senate. Our article on the late Senator Wherry said that "It is hard to dislike Ken Wherry," and expressed the opinion that Wherry's favorite statement—"I'm sincere about that"—was entirely true. We said of Senator Byrd: "He did so many things to the antiquated State government that his 4-year term—as governor—is still looked back upon as Virginia's new deal."

We certainly did disagree with Senator Taft, but of the various articles we published about him there is not a single one that could be called vicious—indeed, one of the most vicious in the history of the magazine.

Curiously enough, Senator Bridges omits from his roll the name of the one Republican Senator whom we have consistently opposed, Senator Joseph McCarthy.

Senator Bridges said "In their magazine, there is no room for honest differences of opinion." He forgot that we have published articles by men with whom we have some difference of opinion, like Representative Hugh Scott, for instance, former chairman of the Republican National Committee, just as we have frequently praised men whose views on many problems differed from our own. This was the case with Senator Millikin of Colorado, Senator Capehart of Indiana, and, incidentally, Senator Lyndon Johnson of Texas, and Senator Russell of Georgia, who expressed their sympathy with Senator Bridges when he attacked the Reporter.

The heart of Senator Bridges' argument, I think, is to be found in the following passage: "With them the technique is smear and vicious attack—the technique we have come to know so well as used by those who follow the Communist Party line as fellow travelers and bedfellows. Why the staff of this magazine should be so familiar with the technique will be apparent as I continue."

I have already written about my staff. Now I must write about the "captain of this evil crew"—myself. He said that I had been several times jailed in Italy for my socialistic activities. The fact is that I have been jailed only once, and most certainly not for socialistic activities. This occurred on April 30, 1928, when, together with some other Italian anti-Fascist university professors, I was arrested, as far as I and my fellow prisoners could make out, for no other reason than a summons to repent "or else." I was kept in jail about 3 weeks, and when released I was asked to write a leter to Mussolini in whcih I would announce my conversion to the Fascist faith. I did no such thing and was kept under strict police supervision from then until I left Italy in September 1931.

In the spring of 1931, when I was the only remaining member of my university who refused to join the Fascist Association of University Teachers, I was offered a Rockefeller fellowship by the representative of the Rockefeller Foundation in Italy, Prof. Luigi Einaudi, now President of the Italian Republic. Two years later I joined the graduate faculty of the New School in New York. Later I became dean of the faculty. The list of my "agreeable associates and companions," mentioned by Senator Bridges is about as peculiar as the roll of statesman the Reporter has smeared. Earl Browder, who heads the list, gave one lecture at the New School in the fall of 1938 at the current events course where representatives of all political parties were invited, including Lawrence Dennis, then leader of the American Fascists.

Entirely out of context, Senator Bridges quotes from a book, Intelligence in Politics, which I published in 1936. He cites the following sentence: "The intellectuals know better than any other group how to enjoy a civilization and how to undermine it." He vehemently proceeds: "Shades of Alger Hiss, Harry Dexter White, and Klaus Fuchs; from the grave and from prison they applaud." Had the Senator proceeded in his reading from that sentence, all those shades would have remained unsummoned, for the point that follows is that when the intellectuals undermine democracy, they bring about their own enslavement: "They are never left alone nor are they allowed to rest in pauses of silence, which are imperative if the confused voices of the world are to be harmonized. They are commandeered at any moment and cannot escape being commandeered." Of the other quotes from Intelligence in Politics, one is not to be found in the book.

Intelligence in Politics was severely criticized by Frederick L. Schuman in the Nation and by Matthew Josephson in the New Republic. It was warmly approved, on the contrary, by Prof. Charles Beard, who wrote, "A profound and moving book. American democracy and its fateful possibilities illuminated by a mind rich in imagination, penetrating, and informed by the political philosophy of more than 20 centuries."

In 1948 I published another book, The Power of Freedom. Alf M. Landon, Republican Presidential candidate in the 1936 election, wrote to the publisher as follows: "It is seldom that I had read a book so provocative of thinking and yet captures your interest from start to finish. I think I will be reading and rereading it many times."

Charles P. Taft wrote: "His own solution in freedom as the dynamic relation of men to their work, to their institutions, and to each other is not far from the effective processes worked out during these last 25 years by our university research in industrial relations, but he has given it a much wider foundation in intelligent philosophy, and in sound and practical politics."

In the Daily Worker, David Carpenter wrote: "Professor Ascoli's concept of freedom is arid and abstract, but his purpose in writing this book is certainly concrete. As a spokesman for the maintenance of the capitalistic system, he is explaining to our ruling class how to delude the working class into a belief that this system is the best conceivable."

I do not care to follow Senator Bridges in his comments on my personal and family life. But I cannot help mentioning a few things I did in this country which he scrupulously omits. For instance, from 1940 to 1943, I was president of the Mazzini Society, at that time the major organization in the United States of Italo-American and Italian anti-Fascists. The secretary of the society was Alberto Tarchiani, who since 1945 has been Italian Ambassador to Washington. To the two of us, Tarchiani and myself, goes the credit for having kept the Italian Communists in this country out of the Mazzini Society—a unique feat in those days of "united front." I must also add that I have paid dearly for my anticommunism, for the Italian Communist press in this country has repeatedly attacked me and my family with a violence that until recently has remained unequaled.

During the war, I served as Associate Director of Cultural Relations with the Office of the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs. I think that my services were of some use, as the letters I received when I finished my work can testify.

Senator Bridges does not omit mentioning a loan of $4,600,000 that "he receives from the Export-Import Bank what would appear to be a loan, but was later termed by his Italian handicraft company as a grant of which $2,900,000 was disbursed and the rest withheld because of the shaky position of his Italian handicraft company, which was unable to repay the loan." The facts are as follows: At the end of 1944, I started a nonprofit corporation, called HDI (Handicraft Development, Inc.), to assist the Italian handicraft producers—a substantial section of the Italian working class—and help them export their products to the United States. As a result of the good work HDI did as unpaid brokers between Italian producers and American consumers, the Export-Import Bank offered the Italian Government a loan to be administered by a company, the Compania Nazionale Artigiana, established to continue on a commercial basis the nonprofit work HDI had been doing. The loan—as all the Export-Import Bank loans—was guaranteed by the Italian Government. Mr. William McChesney Martin, Jr., the Chairman of the Export-Import Bank, in order to have a continuity established between the work of HDI and that of CNA wrote me in a letter dated December 3, 1947, that HDI should subscribe part of the CNA capital and be represented on the board of directors. Later when I severed my connection with the Italian company, Mr. Herbert E. Gaston, then Chairman of the Export-Import Bank, wrote me on June 3, 1952: "You can be sure that we appreciate your self-sacrificing efforts to make the handicraft experiment a success and are grateful for them." Finally, let me add, that the loan was never termed a grant and that it has been in fact substantially reimbursed.

As far as the Reporter is concerned and the reputation it has achieved, let me quote the opinion of men belonging to Senator Bridges' own party who wrote to us on the occasion of the Reporter's fifth anniversary.

"You have done some particularly useful and striking work during your short life, and I hope it can be kept up as the years go on." (Ralph E. Flanders, U. S. Senate.)

"Your success in serving as a forum of alert liberal information for 5 years is evidence of good writing, good reading and good thinking." (Hugh Scott, House of Representatives.)

"The Reporter has paved some new and valuable roads in the fields of journalism. With its very special type of reporting and commentary it is making a unique contribution toward public opinion on various questions and issues relating to public and international affairs. May your magazine have a long and successful life." (Peter Frelinghuysen, Jr., House of Representatives, Washington.)

"During the 5 years of its publication, the Reporter has certainly stimulated a large amount of good discussion, debate, and dissent. That makes the Reporter significant, because it is discussion, debate, and dissent that give vitality to our society. More power to you." (Paul G. Hoffman, chairman of the board, the Studebaker Corp.)

As for myself I can only say that I am proud to be one of the countless men who, fleeing the loss of freedom in their native lands, have found in America a new home and a new hope. Since I first landed over here I have considered American citizenship as a precious privilege to be constantly cherished and constantly earned. For me, the way to earn this privilege is to dedicate all my energies to the defense of freedom, for I have known what it means to lose it. This I will keep doing as long as I live.

Respectfully and gratefully,

Max Ascoli,
Editor and Publisher, the Reporter.

The Atomic Energy Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy it has been my privilege to assist in the preparation of the 1954 amendments to the Atomic Energy Act. These amendments will have far-reaching effect in bringing our atomic law into line with the scientific, technical, economic, and political facts of atomic energy as they exist today. These amendments will also insure that our atomic-energy program will be designed to maximize atomic energy defense utilization and also to give greater opportunity for the peacetime utilization of this form of energy. These amendments are designed to permit cooperative endeavor between the Government and private enterprise in developing uses of atomic energy without jeopardizing our national security.

We have all read and been told about the military implications of atomic energy. Therefore, I do not propose today to dwell on that aspect of the program. Instead I would like to discuss the peacetime application of this new source of energy which, with proper handling, can provide limitless benefits to the American people.

ATOMIC ENERGY AND MEDICINE

In medical circles the atomic energy program has offered up vistas in diagnostic fields comparable to those resulting from the invention of the microscope and the X-ray machine. This is accomplished through the use of radioactive isotopes. These isotopes are infinitesimally small chemical particles which are introduced into the body by means of drinking an atomic cocktail, intravenously, or otherwise. They go into every organ, vein, and cell. Their passage can be traced with minute accuracy. These tracers have proved particularly valuable in diagnosis of cancer, brain tumors, and glandular diseases. The Atomic Energy Commission now manufactures more than 100 types of radioactive isotopes which have peaceful uses only. Through the use of isotopes, doctors can now have a picture of what goes on in every part of the living body. Our men of medicine can unerringly locate sources of disease. Thus, atomic energy proffers for the future an assurance of greater longevity through medical science.

THE ATOM AND INDUSTRY

Fission—or the splitting of the atom—generates terrific heat. This heat can be used to produce steam which in turn generates electricity. When this energy is harnessed, and tremendous strides have already been made to that end, our entire power industry will be revolutionized. In view of that fact, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy has taken an active part in stimulating the atom-for-peace program. The Atomic Energy Commission has a 5-year development and research program underway at the present time to advance the peaceful use of the atom.

The 1954 atomic energy amendments have made it possible for private industry to participate and aid in this development program. Greater productive efficiency and a more abundant way of living are in the offing to the American people through this application of atomic energy to our great industrial resources.

ATOMIC ENERGY AND AGRICULTURE

The role of the atom in agriculture is equally as intriguing as in the fields of industry and medicine. Detailed study of plant characteristics and growing habits has been possible with the advent of the atom. New types of disease-resistant crops are being developed. Experiments now underway will result in spectacular new varieties of fruits and flowers in the next decade. Through exposure to atomic radiation, crops can be preserved for years without refrigeration or any other type of preservative. By using atomic energy to assure a greater output of farm produce, man's oldest industry—agriculture—will be assisted immeasurably by man's youngest industry—atomic energy.

In the summer of 1953, as a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, my committee colleagues and I visited our atomic military installations overseas and also inspected our sources of raw materials necessary to the development of atomic energy. I am pleased to report to the American public based on this exhaustive inspection trip that our atomic-energy program is being carried out in the most effective and efficient manner possible.

The 104-page Atomic Energy Act Amendments of 1954 will provide us with a law that will permit this program to go forward with even greater speed. Under this legislation enacted by the Republican 83d Congress, we are making tremendous strides in developing atomic energy for use in national defense and in the development of a prosperous, peacetime economy.

Appropriation Acts of the 83d Congress, 2d Session—Part VIII

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 18, 1954

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, my report on Public Law 472 to my constituents in the Second District of Illinois follows:

PUBLIC LAW 472

H. R. 9447: Department of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriation Act

A. Appropriates $1,195,198,261 for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955. Continues antistrike provisions.

B. Item:

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

	Appropriation
Office of the Secretary: Salaries and expenses	$1,327,000
Office of the Solicitor: Salaries and expenses	1,450,000
Bureau of Labor Standards: Salaries and expenses	722,500
Bureau of Veterans' Reemployment Rights: Salaries and expenses	300,000
Bureau of Apprenticeship: Salaries and expenses	3,100,000
Bureau of Employment Security:	
Salaries and expenses	4,705,000
Grants to States	216,400,000
Unemployment compensation for veterans	55,600,000
Mexican farm labor program	1,881,000
Total, Bureau of Employment Security	278,286,000

H. R. 9447: Department of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriation Act—Continued

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF LABOR—continued

	Appropriation
Bureau of Employees' Compensation: Salaries and expenses	$2,030,000
Bureau of Labor Statistics: Salaries and expenses	5,350,000
Women's Bureau: Salaries and expenses	348,000
Wage and Hour Division: Salaries and expenses	6,116,500
Total title I, Department of Labor	299,030,000
TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE	
American Printing House for the Blind: Education of the blind	205,000
Columbia Institution for the Deaf:	
Salaries and expenses	410,000
Construction of buildings	259,000
Total, Columbia Institution for the Deaf	669,000
Food and Drug Administration:	
Salaries and expenses (general)	5,100,000
Salaries and expenses (certification and inspection services)	
Freedmen's Hospital: Salaries and expenses	2,880,000
Howard University:	
Salaries and expenses	2,720,000
Construction of buildings	4,808,000
Liquidation of contract authority	1,150,000
Total, Howard University	8,678,000
Office of Education:	
Promotion and further development of vocational education	23,673,261
Further endowment of colleges of of agriculture and the mechanic arts	2,501,500
Salaries and expenses	2,900,000
Payments to school districts	55,000,000
Assistance for school construction	70,000,000
Total, Office of Education	154,074,761
Office of Vocational Rehabilitation:	
Payments to States	23,000,000
Salaries and expenses	635,000
Total, Office of Vocational Rehabilitation	23,635,000
Public Health Service:	
Assistance to States, general	13,000,000
Venereal diseases	3,000,000
Tuberculosis	6,000,000
Communicable diseases	4,300,000
Engineering, sanitation, and industrial hygiene	3,565,000
Disease and sanitation investigations and control, Territory of Alaska	1,125,000
Grants for hospital construction	75,000,000
Salaries and expenses, hospital construction services	850,000
Hospitals and medical care	33,000,000
Foreign quarantine service	2,900,000
National Institutes of Health:	
Operating expenses	4,675,000
National Cancer Institute	21,737,000
Mental health activities	14,147,500
National Heart Institute	16,668,000
Dental health activities	1,990,000
Arthritis and metabolic disease activities	8,270,000
Microbiology activities	6,180,000
Neurology and blindness activities	7,600,500
Subtotal, National Institutes of Health	81,268,000
Gorgas Memorial Laboratory	131,000
Retired pay of commissioned officers	1,141,000
Salaries and expenses	2,780,000
Total, Public Health Service	228,060,000
St. Elizabeths Hospital:	
Salaries and expenses	2,445,000
Major repairs and preservation of buildings and grounds	709,000
Construction, maximum security building	110,000
Total, St. Elizabeths Hospital	3,264,000
Social Security Administration:	
Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance	(64,400,000)
Construction, Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance	
Grants to States for public assistance	1,200,000,000
Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Public Assistance	1,487,000

H. R. 9447: Department of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriation Act—Continued

TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—continued

	Appropriation
Social Security Administration—Con.	
Salaries and expenses, Children's Bureau	$1,525,000
Grants to States for maternal and child welfare	30,000,000
Salaries and expenses, Office of the Commissioner:	
Appropriation	173,000
Transfer from OASI	(123,500)
Operating fund, Bureau of Federal Credit Union	-------------
Total, Social Security Administration	1,233,185,500
Office of the Secretary:	
Salaries and expenses, Office of the Secretary:	
Appropriation	1,112,500
Transfer from OASI	(171,000)
Salaries and expenses, Office of Field Services:	
Appropriation	1,800,000
Transfer from OASI	(350,000)
Salaries and expenses, Office of the General Counsel:	
Appropriation	350,000
Transfer from OASI	(365,000)
Transfer from "Salaries and expenses, certification and inspection services"	(22,500)
Surplus property disposal	400,000
Total, Office of the Secretary	3,662,500
Total title II, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare	1,663,413,761
TITLE III—NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD	
Salaries and expenses	8,400,000
TITLE IV—NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD	
Salaries and expenses	425,500
Arbitration and emergency boards	300,000
National Railroad Adjustment Board, salaries and expenses	495,000
Total, National Mediation Board	1,220,500
TITLE V—RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD	
Salaries and expenses (trust fund limitation)	(6,108,000)
TITLE VI—FEDERAL MEDIATION AND CONCILIATION SERVICE	
Salaries and expenses	3,124,000
Boards of inquiry	10,000
Total, Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	3,134,000
Grand total, all titles of bill	1,195,198,261

A Tribute to the Honorable Thomas E. Martin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, with the convening of the 84th Congress in January 1955, the House of Representatives is going to lose to the United States Senate one of its most distinguished Members. I refer to the Honorable THOMAS E. MARTIN, of the First Congressional District of Iowa.

TOM MARTIN and I have served together in the House of Representatives and on the Committee on Ways and Means for many years. In that time I have been impressed by his industry, wisdom, integrity, and effectiveness.

Many of the provisions of our Federal tax laws that have been of particular benefit to the American farmer are attributable to the diligent efforts of the future junior Senator from Iowa, TOM MARTIN. He has been instrumental in obtaining excise tax relief for farmers on certain automobile parts used in farm machinery, in extending capital gains tax treatment to breeding stock and dairy stock, in obtaining rapid tax amortization for grain and crop storage facilities, and in providing tax deductions for soil and water conservation projects.

Mr. MARTIN is a veteran of World War I and had members of his immediate family serve in both World War II and in the Korean conflict. As a consequence, he is a man who has taken great interest and has demonstrated a keen insight in matters affecting our foreign affairs. To no other man can greater credit be given for our program of stockpiling strategic materials. Mr. MARTIN is not only the author of this legislation but he has also been its most able supervisor to make certain that it is being properly administered.

As a distinguished soldier, lawyer, legislator, and statesman, Mr. MARTIN's record clearly demonstrates his fitness for the office he seeks. As he leaves the House of Representatives, I wish him well.

Congressman Granahan Seeks To Speed Painfully Slow Immigration Procedures

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM T. GRANAHAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 19, 1954

Mr. GRANAHAN. Mr. Speaker, the Refugee Relief Act, which was supposed to have meant a substantial increase in immigration into the United States, not only of escapees from behind the Iron Curtain but also of Italian and Greek relatives of American citizens, has been one of the worst administered acts in history. During the first year of its operation, only a handful of persons was admitted. The whole idea behind the administration of the law seems to be not how to speed up admissions but how to keep people out.

Responsibility for administration of the law was turned over to the State Department's chief cop—its security officer. He and his subordinates seem to look upon every potential immigrant as a potential enemy of the United States. Certainly we have to be careful of the kind of people we admit to this country; no one opposes that. But under the strict provisions which already exist in the immigration laws for admission of aliens to the United States, and under the requirements for American sponsorship of these immigrants and assurances that there is a place for them here, it is nonsensical to go the extreme lengths our Government is going in order to try to find excuses to deny admission to every possible applicant.

Many of the residents of the Second Congressional District in Philadelphia have informed me of the great difficulties they have experienced under this law, and under the immigration laws generally, in having relatives admitted to this country. It has really become a national disgrace.

The Refugee Relief Act, as many of us insisted at the time it was passed, was in many respects poorly drawn and mistakenly conceived, particularly in its provisions affecting people in Italy. There are many thousands of Italian relatives—close relatives of American citizens who are eligible for admission to the United States but who have to wait and wait and wait for visas under the small quota assigned to Italy. Only a small group of Italian residents, on the other hand, are eligible for admission to this country as escapees from behind the Iron Curtain. Yet the Congress provided many thousands of non-quota visas for escapees and refugees in Italy and only 15,000 for Italians who are not escapees but who are close relatives of American citizens.

LOPSIDED ASSIGNMENT OF VISAS FOR ITALIANS

I am glad that we were able to get through the House and Senate legislation to make available to the relatives of Americans unused visas presently set aside for escapees and refugees in Italy. As I understand it, only about 1,000 Italian nationals have applied altogether for the 45,000 special nonquota visas reserved for refugees and escapees, while more than 44,000 petitions have been filed by American citizens for relatives in Italy to come here under 1 of the 15,000 nonquota visas set aside for relatives. So we have the lopsided situation of providing 44 times as many visas as are needed in Italy for refugees, but only one-third as many as are needed for close relatives of American citizens.

The bill we have succeeded in getting through, and which I sincerely hope the President will agree to, would allow qualified Italians who are relatives of Americans to obtain these unused visas now set aside for refugees and escapees.

I know well, Mr. Speaker, how heartbreaking and tragic it has been for many fine Americans in my district to try to get action on their applications to bring over to this country from Italy parents and other close relatives who have waited and waited for their visas to come through. Most heartbreaking of all have been those cases where the wait was so long that the loved ones died before their names were reached.

On the other hand, there is nothing to warm the heart of the friend and onlooker more than to see the reunion in this country of families long separated by immigration red tape.

I have seen this happy event occur frequently in my city, and when it does it is the kind of celebration one never forgets. The close-knit nature of families of Italian extraction always makes the reunion of such a long-separated family memorable. Their joy is so unbounded that it puts joy in the heart of everyone who sees or experiences such a moving demonstration of family affection and love.

My concern over excessive redtape and unnecessarily restrictive rules in immigration has been a matter of record for many years, Mr. Speaker. I shall always continue to fight for more liberal immigration policies—for the renewal of the terrible injustices in the present immigration law, and for prompter and more speedy administration of the immigration process.

LEADING OPPONENTS OF RESTRICTIVE IMMIGRATION LAW

In this respect, I appreciate the substantial support we have received in this continuing fight to correct immigration injustices from such organizations as the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the United States of America, the National Catholic Welfare Conference, the National Council of Catholic Men, the National Council of Catholic Women, the National Lutheran Council, the Protestant Episcopal Church, the Baptist World Alliance, the Synagogue Council of America, the American Jewish Congress, and many, many others so numerous I could not begin to mention all of their names. Americans of Italian and Greek descent have always been in the forefront of this fight for better immigration standards because they know from personal experience how the low quotas assigned to their homelands act to keep out of this country so many deserving relatives who would make good citizens.

The McCarran immigration law, when it was passed, could have been used as a means for improving the situation greatly. But even though President Truman vetoed the bill in the hope of getting much more generous treatment for deserving cases, and although he bitterly attacked the unfairness of the quota system, those of us who supported that view did not, unfortunately, have enough like-minded Congressmen with us to help us sustain the veto. This administration has failed to attack the problems which President Truman cited in vetoing the McCarran Act—it has done nothing to help remove the antialien aspects of the law. Instead, it has made the law even more restrictive by assigning its administration to unfriendly officials—to security officers who believe in trying as hard as possible to get something on prospective immigrants in order to keep them out of this country.

We need a new immigration law; we also need more sympathetic and friendly administration of the immigration laws. We need compassion and reasonableness in the administration of the immigration laws, not the kind of brutal disregard of family considerations we have seen evidenced so often under the present setup.

I will continue, Mr. Speaker, to do everything I can to speed up the painfully slow immigration procedures and to get better legislation on the books.

Inquiry Dramatizes Evils of Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, this month a subcommittee of the Select Committee To Investigate Communist Aggression held hearings on the Communist takeover and cruel control of Hungary. It was my privilege to serve as a member of this subcommittee. Two days of hearings were held in Cleveland, Ohio, the district which I have the honor to represent. Following the hearings, the Cleveland News, which has one of the finest editorial staffs in the country, carried an editorial which is most timely and informative. This editorial sounded the warning of what happens when communism takes over in a country and how necessary it is for all Americans to be vigilant in combating this evil force. Under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD the following editorial from the Cleveland News entitled "Inquiry Dramatizes Evils of Communism":

INQUIRY DRAMATIZES EVILS OF COMMUNISM

The significance of the testimony heard here last week by a congressional committee on Communist operations in Hungary is that it presented a picture of medieval torture and sadism difficult to associate with this century.

It revealed the general pattern of viciousness that goes with the attempt to impose a sordid philosophy and way of life on an unwilling people.

The awful stories heard here by the Bentley-Feighan subcommittee expose the methods of Communist conquest and should serve as a warning to others who might be tempted to listen to the false persuasive note of Red propaganda.

It happened in Hungary, it happened in Poland, Rumania, and in other places. It will happen again if the Kremlin-dominated puppets take over any other nation. It could even happen here.

That's why the Cleveland hearings served a useful purpose. They dramatised the dangers and the barbaric cruelty that mark Communist conquest so that all could understand the need for combating such evil forces.

Edward J. Hart, Devoted Public Servant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES R. HOWELL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, for many years, the House of Representatives has gained from the presence of EDWARD J. HART. His well-informed, reasoned counsel has guided the House to wise decisions on many occasions. While constantly devoted to the needs of his constituents in Hudson County, he was able at all times to perceive and understand national needs.

When I first came to Congress in 1949, I benefited greatly from the advice that ED HART freely gave me. I am sure that all of us from New Jersey on the Democlatic side of the aisle have been able to perform our duties with greater effectiveness because of ED HART's personal interest in our activities and problems.

As chairman of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, he used his expert knowledge of maritime affairs to the best advantage. His interest in shipping grew from the great port of New York, an important part of which was included in his district. The committee will miss his thorough understanding of the shipping industry.

ED HART has given the rich years of his life to his State and country. With his retirement, the Nation, New Jersey, and Hudson County lose a true friend and a devoted public servant.

The Record of the 83d Congress and the Eisenhower Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE MEADER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, for my colleagues and my constituents I want to summarize and appraise the record of the 83d Congress and the Eisenhower administration.

Through the legislative and executive decisions of the first Republican administration in two decades has run this common theme: The resurrection and application of traditional American principles of economic and political freedom. A government planned and controlled economy has been rejected. We have turned our back on socialism.

The record covers a wide variety of fields of national and international concern: Atomic energy, the St. Lawrence seaway, taxation, appropriations, government in business, economic controls, the Korean war, an expanded highway system, national defense, subversives, housing, social security, reorganizations in the Executive departments, and many other aspects of government.

GETTING GOVERNMENT OUT OF BUSINESS

Under the New Deal the empire builders made the Federal Government the biggest lender, the biggest ship line operator, the biggest warehouser, the biggest landholder and the biggest tenant in the country. The Eisenhower administration took steps to get the Government out of competition with private business. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation is being liquidated; the Federal barge line has been sold; synthetic rubber plants owned by the Government are being sold and drastic curtailment is in process in rope-making, paint-making, box-manufacturing, scrap-processing, retail merchandising and a host of other activities in which the Government ought not to be engaged. The curtailment of these activities is reflected in a reduced number of employees in the Federal Government and a reduction in its cost.

EFFICIENT ADMINISTRATION

President Eisenhower selected a strong cabinet of citizens of stature and wide business experience. Businesslike and economic methods were put into practice in the executive branch of the Government. Reorganizations, such as that of the Defense Department and the creation of a new Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, brought about improved service at reduced cost. That again is reflected in reduction of Federal personnel and cost of operations.

FINANCES

The Eisenhower administration inherited from the Truman administration a backlog of commitments in excess of $100 billion for which there was no money in the Treasury. Until those obligations can be discharged, a balanced budget cannot be attained, and tax relief of necessity has to be limited. Nevertheless, a reduction in the deficit was achieved, tax relief was granted, and we are making strides toward a balanced budget.

APPROPRIATIONS

The budget of the outgoing Truman administration was cut by over $12 billion for the first fiscal year under the new Republican team. Subsequent budgets presented by the Eisenhower administration have been at substantially lower levels.

TAXES

Economies made it possible to cut excise and personal income taxes substantially and to eliminate the excess-profits tax. Such tax relief totals $7½ billion a year.

The Internal Revenue Code was revised completely for the first time in 75 years, eliminating inequities which had grown up during previous administrations.

HOUSING

Existing housing laws were revised facilitating home building for individual ownership in contrast to Government-subsidized rental housing. Under new legislation it is expected that a record number of new dwellings will be built and older houses modified.

The housing law has been tightened to keep out chiselers and windfall profiteers who flourished under the lax administration of the Democrats.

HIGHWAYS

President Eisenhower and the Congress recognized early that national highway needs were not met under 20 years of Democratic rule. Both long- and short-range programs of highway improvement were advanced to meet our rapidly expanding national economy and defense requirements.

Current Federal highway aid was nearly doubled. The President also proposed to spend $50 billion in the next 10 years for highway improvement, inviting State cooperation.

SOCIAL SECURITY

Financial assistance to the Nation's aged has been substantially expanded. New provisions cover more of our citizens and benefits have been increased.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

The military establishment was reorganized to give greater power to the Secretary of Defense. The new power, exercised by able administrators, eliminated much of the waste, inefficiency, and duplication which had made our defense costly under Democratic rule, while limiting its effectiveness.

SUBVERSIVES CONTROL

Democrats pooh-poohed and called a "Red herring" Communist infiltration of our Government, labor unions, educational circles, and other important segments of our national life.

Immediately on taking office, the Republican administration recognized subversion and espionage and dealt with them effectively and forthrightly.

A tougher program against subversives was initiated without any loss at all in civil liberties and individual rights.

We outlawed the Communist Party and provided enforcement agencies with the tools to ferret out and prosecute those who would overthrow our Government.

ECONOMIC CONTROLS

Controls on wages, prices, and industrial materials and the huge bureaus administering them were abolished promptly. In place of them, the Republican administration substituted intelligent use of indirect controls on credit, stabilizing wages and prices and halting inflation.

We proved we can have prosperity without war and without strait-jacketing bureaucratic regulation or our national economy.

FARM PROBLEM

Republicans have made a start in solving the tremendous problem of Government owned and stored surplus farm products. Rigid supports under Democrats resulted in Federal ownership of huge stocks of grains and dairy products. High support prices raised the food bill of consumers, unfairly increased costs of production of nonsupported agricultural commodities and resulted in a discriminatory squeeze. Storage facilities, maintained at public expense were at the bursting point.

To face the controversial problem was an unpleasant task, requiring courage and intelligence. Despite determined and misguided opposition, a system of flexible price supports was adopted, and bureaucratic control of agriculture is on the way out.

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

The Democrats, under strong Presidents and weak Congresses, gave lip service to the St. Lawrence seaway, but the power and the navigation potential of our great international water system went undeveloped. The St. Lawrence seaway under Republicans is now a reality—a milestone in American history. The economic benefit to our great industrial and agricultural heartland and to the whole Nation will be tremendous. Perhaps equally important is the concrete demonstration of a successful way to conduct foreign relations. By joining with our sister nation to the north in an international public work of common benefit to both our peoples, we have emphasized our common interests and thereby minimized our differences.

ATOMIC ENERGY

Because of its use as a weapon, nuclear fission has been a Government monopoly. Now the vast new field of peacetime commercial and industrial uses of atomic energy has been opened to the pioneering ingenuity and inventiveness of the American citizen. Diehard New Dealers sought to exclude private individuals from developing this new resource and to preserve it as a socialistic Government monopoly. Here again the Republican administration demonstrated its sincere and abiding faith in those principles of freedom upon which America has grown great.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

The bankrupt foreign policy of Roosevelt-Truman-Acheson left to the new Republican administration a disastrous heritage in international affairs. While New Dealers coddled Communists, Russian imperialism since World War II engulfed 800 million peoples in China and eastern Europe. We were bogged down in a stalemate war in Korea. Iran, a crossroads between east and west, was embroiled in a bitter, debilitating dispute over rich oil deposits. Egypt and Britain were at swords' points over Suez. Viet Minh Communists were gaining ground in Indochina. Puppet communistic governments showed their heads in the Western Hemisphere, in British Guiana and Guatemala. The billions poured out to stem the tide of communism seemed to have little effect. As Senator Taft said of the Korean war, the world situation we inherited from Roosevelt, Truman, and Acheson seemed to hold no possibility of a satisfactory solution.

The Korean fighting was stopped, and on honorable terms. The tension in Iran and Egypt was eased, and lasting solutions to those difficulties are on the verge of becoming a reality. Communistic regimes in British Guiana and Guatemala were overthrown. Prospects of peace and progress in international affairs are better now than they have been at any time since World War II.

CONCLUSION

The record I have outlined briefly was made through teamwork. It is refreshing to have a President who recognizes the prerogatives and independence of the legislative branch of the Government—who works with rather than on the Congress. Without this atmosphere of cooperation and mutual respect, the Eisenhower administration and the Republican 83d Congress could not have progressed so far in such a short time in their crusade to advance our national welfare under time-tested principles of economic and political freedom and efficient and honest government.

The Record of the 83d Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, the 83d Congress which began in January 1953 will come to an end in a few months in January 1955. With the adjournment of this second session it is likely that we will not convene again until the 84th Congress meets to take up the Nation's legislative business next January.

I think that the 83d Congress will be recorded in history as a hard-working Congress that left a distinguished record of legislative accomplishment. The convening of the 83d Congress marked the first time in 20 years that the Republican Party has been in power in both the executive and legislative branches of our Federal Government. During the 80th Congress from 1946 to 1948, when the legislative branch was under Republican control, many changes for the good of the country were effected. Of these, not the least salutary change was the repeal of the many repressive economic controls with all their accompanying dishonesty and ill effects.

In the election of 1952, the people showed that they had had enough of the New and Fair Deals, with all their favoritism and extravagance, their program of cold wars and manufactured emergencies, and their failure to stamp out communism despite the expenditure of countless thousands of lives and billions of dollars.

In 1952 the people elected Dwight D. Eisenhower as President, and elected a Republican majority in the House and Senate. I should like to discuss briefly what has been the result of that election of a Republican President and Congress.

The most pressing problem confronting the new President was to bring an immediate halt to the trend of 20 years of extravagance, irresponsible deficit financing, ever-increasing taxes, improvised and profligate foreign policy, economic encroachment on our free-enterprise system, and the never-ending growth of our bureaucratic Federal Government.

From the standpoint of the American family, the most serious situation that President Eisenhower inherited was the Korean war, which Mr. Truman glibly characterized as a police action, but which cost us the lives of over 33,000 American boys, and the maiming of over 100,000 of other American boys, not to mention the terrible waste of our natural resources.

Another serious situation that President Eisenhower inherited from the Truman administration was the critical condition of our Federal fiscal affairs. The Truman administration left unpaid bills in excess of $80 billion, a scheduled deficit of $9.9 billion for fiscal 1954, and a public debt that was perilously near its statutory limit.

A further serious situation that the President found was the program of extravagant expenditures that had characterized the terms of Roosevelt and Truman with their philosophy that the Federal Government could spend the taxpayer's dollars better than the taxprayer.

I shall discuss, as a Member of Congress, each of these situations to which I refer. The President could not well remedy these serious situations except by the concerted, courageous cooperation of the Congress of the United States. For my part, I can say that, from a somewhat extended service as a Member of Congress, the 83d Congress has been the most diligent, effective Congress of any during my service.

The President with the loyal support of the Congress was able to end the Korean war. He accomplished this by demanding justice and doing so in a firm, determined way. He supplanted New and Fair Deal methods of diplomacy—tainted and tinted as they were with timidity, improvisation, and unfortunately in some cases questionable loyalty. President Eisenhower lent direction to our foreign affairs. He has made great strides in halting the advance of international communism. The Republican Congress encouraged him in his work and approved his actions. Communist Moscow now knows that it cannot double-deal President Eisenhower. There is much work to be accomplished in the field of foreign affairs and President Eisenhower, aided by a Republican Congress, is best qualified to effectively do the job.

The President with the aid of the 83d Congress, proceeded to relieve the Nation from the threat of fiscal insolvency. The President courageously tackled the job of reducing Government expenditures. The Truman-planned deficit of $9.9 billion for fiscal 1954 was slashed to an actual deficit of $3.3 billion by instituting the most stringent economy measures. With the cooperation of an alert Congress, many thousands of Government employees, most of whom spent their time defending the Roosevelt and Truman extravagances, were removed from the Federal payroll.

In all, Federal expenditures have been slashed over $12 billion, taxes have been cut $7.4 billion and the Federal budget has been brought almost into balance.

Every student of government knows that the President could not have accomplished much, except for the loyal cooperation of the Congress. I shall attempt to recount how the Congress of the United States in the 83d Congress has assisted the President's program and has put the country back on a program that is distinctly American.

The 83d Congress recognized the terrific plight in which your great country found itself. It also recognized the fact that it was the duty of the 83d Congress to assist the President and that it was, likewise, the duty of the President to cooperate with the Congress.

The Congress indicated its willingness to work with and support a thoroughly American President in his dynamic program to bring peace and prosperity to the world. President Eisenhower's policies have clearly indicated that we would not countenance aggression by any country, and that by working in consonance with our allies we have established our determination not to approve the dishonest methods pursued by the Communist countries of the world.

The Republican 83d Congress made tax reduction possible to the extent of $7.4 billion. This total amount was composed of $3 billion in individual income tax cuts, $1 billion in excise tax cuts, $2 billion from the expiration of the excess-profits tax, and $1.4 billion from the Internal Revenue Code of 1954. The excise tax cuts were effective April 1, 1954, and have already done much to stimulate business activity and to provide a substantial tax saving to the American consumer. We reduced the excise taxes on such articles as toilet preparations, jewelry, communications services, transportation, sporting goods, furs, admissions, and electric, gas, and oil appliances. This $7.4 billion in tax reduction would not have been possible without the most stringent Government economy on the part of the Eisenhower administration and the Republican 83d Congress.

Social-security benefits have been increased for the over 6 million retired individuals now drawing annuities under the old-age and survivors insurance program. These increases have ranged from a minimum of $5 to a maximum of $13.50 for those persons now on the benefit rolls. We have extended old-age and survivors insurance coverage to 10.2 million persons who were previously denied the opportunity to participate in the program. The retirement test under the social-security program has been greatly liberalized so that a person may earn up to $1,200 a year without loss of benefits and at age 72 he will be able to earn any amount without being deprived of his benefit entitlement.

Unemployment insurance coverage has been extended to over 4 million additional American workers. The unemployment insurance program has been placed on a sound financing basis which will assure that taxes collected for this purpose are used solely for the administration and payment of benefits under the program.

As a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, it was my privilege to work on the preparation of a new atomic energy law which will permit the development and use of atomic energy by private industry. We have also laid the groundwork for an international atomic pool devoted to peaceful uses of this form of energy.

During the 83d Congress substantial strides were made in removing the Federal Government from activities which were in direct competition with private enterprise. An example of this is found in the case of the Government owned synthetic rubber industry which is being profitably sold to private businesses. Government owned barge lines were sold to private operators. The artificial restraints caused by wage, price, rent, and materials controls had been eliminated so that our free-enterprise system can develop and expand.

This enumeration briefly summarizes but a few of the major highlights of the Republican legislative program. I have not mentioned the vast hospital construction program designed to improve our national health, the highway development program allotting $875 million a year to States, the authority for participating in the development of the St. Lawrence seaway, the many aids to small business, the housing program which will permit longer mortgages, thus stimulating home ownership, the strengthening of Government loyalty and security programs, and so forth.

This constructive and dynamic legislative program for the development of a peaceful and prosperous America has already proved itself effective and is the result of the combined efforts of the Republican 83d Congress and the Eisenhower administration.

The citizens of my Tenth Congressional District in the great State of Ohio have honored me by electing me to represent them in 15 consecutive Congresses of the United States. It is gratifying to me to be able to report to them such a distinguished record of accomplishment as was achieved in this, the Republican 83d Congress.

Appropriation Acts of the 83d Congress, 2d Session—Part IX

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 18, 1954

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent, I am extending my remarks to include my report on Public Law 663 to my constituents, as follows:

PUBLIC LAW 663

H. R. 9936, Supplemental appropriation law

A. Appropriates $1,650,101,929 to supply supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955. Continues antistrike provisions.

B. Item:

CHAPTER I—DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, OPERATING EXPENSES

	Appropriations
Regulatory agencies	($15,000)
Settlement of claims and suits	(13,967)
Judgments	(15,132)
Audited claims	(14,624)
Division of expenses	
Total, chapter I	(58,723)

CHAPTER II—LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

Senate:	
Beneficiaries of deceased Senators	87,500
Office of the Secretary	11,725
Office of the Sergeant at Arms	21,925
Offices of the secretaries of the majority and the minority	1,405
Offices of the majority and the minority whips	9,140
Contingent expenses of the Senate:	
Legislative reorganization	25,000
Reporting Senate proceedings	4,000
Inquiries and investigations	60,000
Miscellaneous items	45,000
House of Representatives: Beneficiaries of deceased Members	25,000

H. R. 9936, Supplemental appropriation law—Continued

CHAPTER II—LEGISLATIVE BRANCH—continued

	Appropriations
Capitol Police force:	
Salaries, Capitol Police force (fiscal year 1955)	
General expenses, Capitol Police force (fiscal year 1955)	
Architect of the Capitol:	
Senate Office Bldg	$4,100
Additional Senate Office Bldg	6,000,000
Total, legislative branch	6,244,795
The Judiciary:	
Supreme Court of the United States—automobile for the Chief Justice	5,835
Courts of appeals, district courts, and other judicial services:	
Fees of jurors and commissioners (fiscal year 1954)	220,000
Salaries of referees (fiscal year 1955)	(18,500)
Total, Judiciary branch	225,835
Total, chapter II	6,470,630

CHAPTER III—DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Acquisition of buildings abroad	500,000
International Educational Exchange Activities	300,000
Total, Department of State	800,000
Department of Justice:	
Legal activities and general administration:	
Salaries and expenses, general legal activities	300,000
Salaries and expenses, United States attorneys and marshals	450,000
Immigration and Naturalization Service: Salaries and expenses	3,000,000
Federal Prison System: Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Prisons	750,000
Total, Department of Justice	4,500,000
Department of Commerce:	
Bureau of the Census: Census of business, manufactures, and mineral industries	8,430,000
Civil Aeronautics Administration:	
Salaries and expenses	430,000
Federal-aid airport program, Federal Airport Act	22,000,000
Claims, Federal Airport Act	69,449
Maintenance and operation, Washington National Airport	1,350,000
Construction, Washington National Airport	240,000
Land acquisition, additional, Washington Airport	16,297
Maritime activities:	
Ship construction	82,000,000
Ship mortgage foreclosure or forfeiture contingencies	2,500,000
Repair of reserve fleet vessels	12,000,000
Business and Defense Services Administration: Salaries and expenses	
Bureau of Public Roads:	
Inter-American Highway	4,780,000
Reimbursement to the District of Columbia	290,000
Weather Bureau	
Total, Department of Commerce	134,775,746
Total, chapter III	140,075,746

CHAPTER IV—TREASURY DEPARTMENT

Bureau of Accounts: Salaries and expenses, Division of Disbursement	350,000
Internal Revenue Service: Salaries and expenses	7,750,000
U. S. Secret Service:	
Salaries and expenses	(229,000)
Salaries and expenses, White House Police	(62,000)
Bureau of the Mint	1,500
Coast Guard:	
Acquisition, construction, and improvements	4,000,000
Retired pay	(80,000)
Total, chapter IV	12,101,500

CHAPTER V—DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Bureau of Labor Standards: Salaries and expenses	12,500
Bureau of Employment Security:	
Salaries and expenses	87,500
Grants to States for unemployment compensation and employment service administration	13,100,000

H. R. 9936, Supplemental appropriation law—Continued

CHAPTER V—DEPARTMENT OF LABOR—continued

Bureau of Employment Security—Con.	*Appropriations*
Unemployment compensation for veterans	$70,400,000
Unemployment compensation for Federal employees	10,000,000
Salaries and expenses, Mexican farm labor program	175,000
Total, Department of Labor	93,775,000
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare:	
Office of Education: White House Conference on Education	900,000
Office of Vocational Rehabilitation:	
Grants to States and other agencies	4,000,000
Training and traineeship	900,000
Salaries and expenses	200,000
Public Health Service:	
Grants for hospital construction	21,000,000
Surveys and planning for hospital construction	2,000,000
Salaries and expenses, hospital construction service	250,000
Social Security Administration:	
Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance (trust fund)	(5,000,000)
Construction, Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance (trust fund)	(20,000,000)
Salaries and expenses, Children's Bureau	75,000
Office of the Secretary:	
Salaries and expenses	50,000
National Advisory Committee on Education	25,000
Civil Defense Activities	1,000,000
Total, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare	30,400,000
Total, chapter V	124,175,000

CHAPTER VI—DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Forest Service:	
National forest protection and management	250,000
Forest research	505,000
Forest roads and trails	6,500,000
Soil Conservation Service: Watershed protection	1,750,000
Commodity Exchange Authority: Commodity exchange authority	93,000
Farmers Home Administration: Loan authorization	(5,000,000)
Office of the Solicitor	45,000
Total, chapter VI	9,143,000

CHAPTER VII—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Bureau of Indian Affairs:	
Health, education, and welfare services	1,180,000
Resources management	100,000
Construction	6,931,000
Relocations of the Yankton Sioux Tribe	50,000
Bureau of Reclamation:	
General investigations	400,000
Construction and rehabilitation	7,120,000
Bureau of Mines: Construction	6,000,000
National Park Service: Construction	5,562,101
Office of Territories: Administration of Territories	
Total, chapter VII	27,343,101

CHAPTER VIII—INDEPENDENT OFFICES

Commission on Intergovernmental Relations: Salaries and expenses	414,000
Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government: Salaries and expenses	653,150
Federal Power Commission: Salaries and expenses	
General Services Administration:	
Additional court facilities	2,970,600
Federal Supply Service: Operating expenses	60,000
Records survey	300,000
Strategic and critical materials	380,000,000
Housing and Home Finance Agency:	
Office of the Administrator:	
Salaries and expenses	1,100,000
Reimbursement to Federal Bureau of Investigation	500,000
Public facility loans	2,000,000
Reserve of planned public works	1,500,000
Urban planning grants	1,000,000
Public Housing Administration: Administrative expenses	400,000

H. R. 9936, Supplemental appropriation law—Continued

CHAPTER VIII—INDEPENDENT OFFICES—continued

	Appropriations
National Science Foundation: International Geophysical Year	$2,000,000
Small Business Administration: Salaries and expenses	200,000
Veterans' Administration: Inpatient care.	3,000,000
War Claims Commission: Administrative expenses (trust fund)	(400,000)
Total, chapter VIII	396,097,750

CHAPTER IX—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

Department of Defense:	
Interservice activities, access roads	13,500,000
Family housing	75,000,000
Department of the Army: Alaska Communications System, construction	503,000
Department of the Navy: Public Works, Navy	98,000,000
Department of the Air Force: Acquisition and construction of real property	630,000,000
Total, chapter IX	817,003,000

CHAPTER X—DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY—CIVIL FUNCTIONS

Rivers and Harbors and Flood Control: Construction, general	5,985,000
Total, chapter X	5,985,000

CHAPTER XI—EMERGENCY PROGRAMS AND ACTIVITIES

Department of State: Government in occupied areas	15,000,000
Funds appropriated to the President:	
Emergency Fund for International Affairs	5,000,000
Construction of tankers	30,000,000
Refugee relief	8,000,000
Department of the Army, Civil Functions: Government and relief in occupied areas	3,100,000
Federal Civil Defense Administration:	
Operations	10,025,000
Federal contributions	12,000,000
Emergency supplies and equipment	26,000,000
Independent Offices:	
Jamestown-Williamsburg-Yorktown Celebration Commission	100,000
Alexander Hamilton Bicentennial Commission	10,000
Total, chapter XI	109,235,000

CHAPTER XII

Claims, audited claims, and judgments	11,472,202
Total, chapter XII	11,472,202
Total, all chapters	1,659,101,929

Congress Fails To Face Issue of Segregation in Transportation—Granahan Antisegregation Bill Dies for This Session

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM T. GRANAHAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 19, 1954

Mr. GRANAHAN. Mr. Speaker, the 83d Congress is now preparing to adjourn and go out of existence, thus allowing all bills on which we have not taken final action to die on the House Calendar. This includes measures on which some of the committees have worked long and hard, devoting much study to their provisions before recommending their enactment.

But when we adjourn today we wipe the slate clean on all these bills, so that when the 84th Congress comes into existence next January it will have to start all over from scratch on each of these measures. Thus, all the time we have devoted to them in these past two sessions is pretty much wasted.

Among important bills in this class is H. R. 8160, which I introduced on March 2, to prohibit segregation and discrimination for reasons of race, creed, or color on transportation facilities of carriers engaged in interstate commerce.

This bill, or some bill incorporating its provisions, could have been passed and should have been passed in this session of Congress. This historic Supreme Court decision outlawing segregation in the schools put into a legal ashcan the old idea of separate-but-equal facilities as an excuse for segregation. This decision underscored the need for follow-up action by the Congress in this important field of transportation.

GRANAHAN ANTISEGREGATION BILL WOULD CORRECT INJUSTICES

Witness after witness before the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, on which I serve—the committee to which my antisegregation bill was referred—told of deeply disturbing incidents on railroads, buses, and other transportation facilities involving insulting and un-American discrimination against American citizens, including servicemen. So the practice persists. It is immoral, indecent, and unworthy of our democracy.

Here is what my bill stated:

[H. R. 8160, 83d Cong., 2d sess.]

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
March 2, 1954.

Mr. GRANAHAN introduced the following bill, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

"A bill providing relief against certain forms of discrimination in interestate transportation

"*Be it enacted, etc.,* That (a) all persons traveling within the jurisdiction of the United States shall be entitled to the full and equal enjoyment of the accommodations, advantages, and privileges of any public conveyance operated by a common carrier engaged in interstate or foreign commerce, and all the facilities furnished or connected therewith, subject only to conditions and limitations applicable alike to all persons, without discrimination or segregation based on race, color, religion, or national origin.

"(b) Whoever, whether acting in a private, public, or official capacity, denies or attempts to deny to any person traveling within the jurisdiction of the United States the full and equal enjoyment of any accommodation, advantage, or privilege of a public conveyance operated by a common carrier engaged in interstate or foreign commerce, except for reasons applicable alike to all persons of every race, color, religion, or national origin, or whoever incites or otherwise participates in such denial or attempt, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and shall, upon conviction, be subject to a fine of not to exceed $1,000 for each offense, and shall also be subject to suit by the injured person or by his estate, in an action at law, suit in equity, or other proper proceedings for damages or preventive or declaratory or other relief. Such suit or proceeding may be brought in any district court of the United States as constituted by chapter 5 of title 28, United States Code (28 U. S. C. 81 et seq.), or the United States court of any Territory or other place subject to the jurisdiction of the United States, without regard to the sum or value of the matter in controversy, or in any State or Territorial court of competent jurisdiction.

"SEC. 2. It shall be unlawful for any common carrier engaged in interstate or foreign commerce, or any officer, agent, or employee thereof, to segregate, or attempt to segregate, or otherwise discriminate against passengers using any public conveyance or facility of such carrier engaged in interstate or foreign commerce, on account of the race, color, religion, or national origin of such passengers. Any such carrier or officer, agent, or employee thereof who segregates or attempts to segregate such passengers or otherwise discriminate against them on account of race, color, religion, or national origin shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and shall, upon conviction, be subject to a fine of not to exceed $1,000 for each offense, and shall also be subject to suit by the injured person in an action of law, suit in equity, or other roper proceeding for damages or preventive or declaratory or other relief. Such suit or proceeding many be brought in any district court of the United States as constituted by chapter 5 of title 28, United States Code (28 U. S. C. 81 et seq.) or the United States court of any Territory or other place subject to the jurisdiction of the United States, without regard to the sum or value of the matter in controversy, or in any State or Territorial court of competent jurisdiction."

ICC SAYS CONGRESSIONAL ACTION IS NEEDED

Following the introduction of my bill, Mr. Speaker, the chairman of our committee invited comments on it from the Interstate Commerce Commission. This is the reply he received:

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION,
Washington 25, March 12, 1954.

Hon. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON,
Chairman, Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CHAIRMAN WOLVERTON: Your letter of March 4, 1954, addressed to the Chairman of the Commission and requesting a report and comment on a bill, H. R. 8160, introduced by Congressman GRANAHAN, providing relief against certain forms of discrimination in interstate transportation, has been referred to our Committee on Legislation and Rules. After careful consideration by that committee, I am authorized to submit the following comments in its behalf:

This bill, if enacted into law, would provide that all interstate travelers "shall be entitled to the full and equal enjoyment of the accommodations, advantages, and privileges of any public conveyance operated by a common carrier * * * and all the facilities furnished or connected therewith, * * * without discrimination or segregation based on race, color, religion, or national origin."

Under section 3 (1) of the Interstate Commerce Act, it is now unlawful "for any common carrier * * * to make, give, or cause any undue or unreasonable preference or advantage to any particular person * * * or to subject any particular person * * * to any undue or unreasonable prejudice or disadvantage in any respect whatsoever." This provision relates principally to rail carriers. There are similar provisions in other parts of the act applicable to motor and water carriers and freight forwarders.

Soon after the Interstate Commerce Commission was established in 1887, it was called upon to decide whether the provision above quoted prohibited the railroads in certain sections of the country from requiring that Negro and white passengers occupy separate coaches and other facilities, as they were compelled to do by statutes in a number of States. In all such cases, which have become increasingly numerous and complicated in recent years, the Commission has limited its inquiry to the question whether equal ac-

> commodations and facilities are provided for members of the two races, adhering to the view that the Interstate Commerce Act neither requires nor prohibits segregation of the races. Judicial opinion has supported this restricted conception of our powers in the premises.
>
> It is well known that dissatisfaction with the so-called separate but equal principle, wherever applied, is now to be found in a considerable segment of public opinion. Opponents of the principle are pressing their contentions in judicial proceedings which raise the issue in one field or another.
>
> The essential question presented is the same in all these areas of controversy, and it is a social question much broader than the transportation aspect of it presented in H. R. 8160. This problem is therefore one of broad legislative policy upon which we are not qualified to express a helpful opinion based on our experience in transportation regulation.
>
> Respectfully submitted.
>
> J. M. Johnson,
> *Chairman, Committee on Legislation and Rules.*
> Charles D. Mahaffie,
> Howard G. Freas.

It will be noted, Mr. Speaker, that the ICC's rather vague answer was prior to the Supreme Court decision in the school case. Nevertheless, cautious as this reply was, it demonstrated a need for corrective legislation by the Congress.

JUSTICE DEPARTMENT, BUDGET BUREAU, APPROVE GRANAHAN BILL AIMS

This was further confirmed by the Department of Justice in a report to the committee, and also by a statement from the Bureau of the Budget which, in commenting on my bill and others of a similar nature, told our committee in a letter from Budget Director Rowland Hughes on June 25:

> Certain concepts underlying prior judicial decisions defining the duties of common carriers in interstate commerce in the matter of nondiscrimination among passengers in their use of transportation facilities, it would seem, have been superseded by the segregation cases decided recently by the Supreme Court. Legislation redefining those duties as embodying the principle of nonsegregation is, in the opinion of the Bureau of the Budget, desirable.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what this collection of $10 words really adds up to is that the Budget Bureau, which supposedly speaks for the President on legislation, says we need nonsegregation legislation such as embodied in the Granahan bill on railroads, buses, and so on.

HOUSE FAILS TO ACT ON PENDING MEASURE

I stress that, Mr. Speaker, because—although my committee, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, approved such a bill and recommended the House pass it—the nonsegregation in transportation bill is dying on the House Calendar and is not even being called up for debate. Yet the President's Budget Director says we need such legislation. His Department of Justice says we need it, but a Congress dominated by his own party, in which Republicans hold all key leadership positions, is refusing to pass it.

Worse, it is refusing to give us a chance to vote on it.

This I bitterly resent. I resent it on behalf of not only the Negroes of my congressional district, some of whom have from time to time been insulted and discriminated against in some parts of the country by railroad and bus company officials, but I also resent it on behalf of all of the people of the Second Congressional District, who believe, as I do, that segregation and discrimination are un-American.

MY TESTIMONY ON THE GRANAHAN BILL

Formal hearings by the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on the Granahan antisegregation bill and similar measures were held May 12, 13, and 14 of this year. Among witnesses were spokesmen for the National Council of Negro Women, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, the Antidefamation League of B'nai B'rith, the American Missionary Association Division, Fisk University, and other groups interested in this sore-spot problem in American society—this question of unfair and un-American segregation and discrimination. Among Members of Congress who appeared were two Negro Congressmen, Adam C. Powell, Jr., of New York, and William L. Dawson, of Chicago, both of them exceptionally able Democratic Members.

Prior to these public hearings, however, the committee held a special session on March 22 devoted entirely to Congressmen discussing their own bills before our committee. At that time I took up with the committee my bill, H. R. 8160, dealing with this matter of segregation and discrimination in travel.

Following is the text of my statement at that time:

Ending Segregation in Transportation

(Statement by Congressman William T. Granahan, Democrat, of Philadelphia, before House Committee on Interstate Commerce in support of H. R. 8160, the Granahan bill to prohibit discrimination or segregation in interstate transportation, March 22, 1954.)

Mr. Chairman and fellow members of the committee, from our years of association together on this committee of Congress assigned responsibility for all legislation dealing with interstate and foreign commerce, I know that there is general agreement here that the bills we recommend for House passage should be directed toward advancing the best interests of the United States and of all of the people of this country.

For that reason, I have no hesitation in urging your support for, and agreement to, the provisions of H. R. 8160 which I introduced on March 2, to make it a Federal offense, punishable by a fine of up to $1,000 for each offense as well as by private damage actions, for denial of full and equal enjoyment of the accommodations, advantages or privileges of any public conveyance operated by a common carrier engaged in interstate commerce.

Of course there would be no violation of this law involved in situations or circumstances under which the conditions or limitations imposed were applicable to all persons, without discrimination or segregation based on race, color, religion or national origin. But where this segregation or discrimination is employed, the Federal Government would have jurisdiction to step in and enforce fairness to all passengers.

FIGHT AGAINST SEGREGATION NOT YET WON

We have already made tremendous progress, primarily through Supreme Court decisions arising out of cases brought in the previous administrations by the Department of Justice, in eliminating this discriminatory practice of segregation and other denials of equal treatment because of race, color, religion, or national origin, but the practice still exists in some areas and should be ended. The Granahan bill would enable us to achieve that result.

As it is now, we know of instances where carriers engaged in interstate commerce will enforce segregation and discrimination on its intrastate routes and then drop the discriminatory rulings on its interstate runs. This makes a sham of the whole business.

If the carrier is engaged in interstate commerce—railroads, buses, and so on—then it should carry out its obligations to all of the people of the United States and conduct its affairs at all times and in all places as an interstate carrier, observing not only the letter but the spirit of the laws and regulations dealing with interstae commerce.

OLD CUSTOMS BREAKING DOWN AS FIGHT GOES ON

Some years ago, this might have been considered as a revolutionary doctrine in some parts of the country. That would hardly be true today. For where segregation long entrenched has finally been eliminated—such as in most of the armed services, in eating establishments here in Washington, such as on the interstate trains and buses and so on—there has been no uproar, no disruption, no riots, no mass civil disobedience, no revolt. It has had a wholly good effect. It has worked. It has worked particularly in the armed services in Korea, where Negro and white, for instance, have fought valiantly and well not only side by side but in the same units and with officers from both races commanding men of both. The success of that policy was far greater and far more significant than appears on the surface. One thing it did was to confound and destroy the propaganda of the Communists attempting to persuade Negroes they would have more opportunity under communism. Very, very few of the many colored boys among the prisoners in Korea fell for those brain-washing tactics and those few who did were in the same class as the few white prisoners who also went over the hill to communism—sick mentally so that they didn't and couldn't know what they were doing.

THEY FOUGHT TOGETHER IN KOREA BUT OFTEN CAN'T RIDE TOGETHER AT HOME

Now isn't it a strange thing that men who fought together side by side in Korea can't ride together side by side if they want to in the same train or bus operated by an interstate carrier in some of our areas of the country?

I repeat, the carriers subject to this law are interstate carriers now subject to other laws of the Congress dealing with their operations. We cannot force a strictly local carrier, one operating only within State lines, to pay heed to a law of this kind but I am sure that if the provisions of this bill I have introduced become law, it will not be long before the sham of segregation will be so well recognised that even the local intrastate carriers will eventually come around to observing its spirit.

We have had so many incidents—unpleasant, at least, and sometimes very serious—in the practice of discrimination and segregation by reason of race, and color particuularly on some of our transportation systems that they have hurt the United States. They have even hurt our foreign policy, our international relations.

Outstanding citizens of other nations have been subjected to rudeness, insult, and, I'm afraid, even physical pushing around by arrogant employees of some transportation systems, because their skin is dark in color. Should that be permitted?

SEGREGATION A BLOT ON AMERICA'S WORLD POSITION

The many days of debate in the Senate of the United States on the Bricker amendment

to the Constitution raised the point over and over that the States have no role in foreign policy under our Constitution. Yet when practices within a State on an interstate carrier permit or encourage the insult, abuse, and embitterment of officials, representatives, or citizens of other nations, how can it be maintained that such a State is not in fact exceeding its proper role and, in fact, interfering in foreign affairs? That is one very serious aspect of this whole problem.

But even more important is the pretense it attempts to keep alive that we have first- and second-class citizens in America, that some are entitled by divine right, based on the color of their skin or their church of worship or some other factor such as that, to enjoy certain privileges and advantages denied to others because of the circumstances of their birth and background.

To the extent the Congress can help to eliminate these practices we should do so. The Granahan bill is a part of that attempt.

I WILL RENEW THE FIGHT IN THE NEXT CONGRESS

Mr. Speaker, it is with a heavy heart that I see us nearing final adjournment of the 83d Congress with this matter unresolved. It looks as if the antisegregation bill will be one of only a handful of measures which will be left on the House Calendar untouched when we adjourn—only a few out of the hundreds of bills which have been approved by our committees for House debate and passage. That proves it was not a question of time in getting this bill through; it was a question of deliberate neglect. Had there been a will in this Congress to pass the antisegregation bill outlawing discrimination on trains and buses of carriers engaged in interstate commerce, the bill would have been brought up for debate and it would have passed.

We know that this illegal discrimination exists—discrimination which the Supreme Court in particular cases has said over and over is unconstitutional. But one young soldier of Camden, N. J., right across the river from Philadelphia, testified before our committee that when he was arrested on a bus in Florida, while traveling to Alabama, for refusing to change his seat, he cited Supreme Court decisions but the bus driver and the local police officials said there was no Federal law on the subject and they followed Florida law on this matter. As someone remarked at the hearing, bus drivers do not read Supreme Court decisions.

I say this, Mr. Speaker: Failing to pass the Granahan antisegregation bill, or some bill like it, to outlaw segregation and discrimination in travel on facilities of carriers in interstate commerce has been a great blunder for this Republican Congress, and makes a mockery of its claims to be for civil rights.

In the next Congress, which convenes next January—and which will be, I firmly believe, a Democratic Congress—I intend to reintroduce my bill and renew the fight for this legislation. I intend to fight this matter through to a finish, so that no longer can decent, law-abiding Americans of any race or color or creed be insulted and discriminated against on a bus or train operated by a company which is in interstate commerce and thus subject to congressional jurisdiction. And I know the people of the Second Congressional District in Philadelphia will be behind me on this.

The Coffee Story—A Fantastic Deception

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, there is every sign now that the worst of the coffee-price gouge is over and that prices will go down to more realistic and legitimate levels. But for months now, the housewives of this country have paid out in tribute to speculators and others an extra 30 cents a pound in the price of their favorite brands of coffee. A family using a pound a week has thus been held up at the annual rate of about $15 a year on coffee alone.

The story of the sudden and precipitate increase in the price of this much desired beverage is the story of a fantastic deception. It has certainly been an expensive deception, too, for the average family.

Much of the story has now come out. Some of it is still wrapped in mystery. I hope we will get to the bottom of it and bring the whole story out in great detail. For I am sure we could learn from the full facts in this case how to protect ourselves in the future—how to protect the consumers of the United States—from this kind of fraud and deception and unconscionable robbery in the price of what most households regard as an essential cost-of-living item.

The price of coffee in the green bean as imported from Brazil and other countries has been going up gradually but steadily over the years since 1939, along with the prices of most commodities. During World War II, of course, and also during the first wave of inflation which followed the Korean war, there were strong pressures on coffee prices, but they did not run completely out of hand. The reason why some semblance of reasonableness was maintained over this period was that Brazil, as the main coffee-producing nation of the world, was still working off huge surpluses accumulated from other years. Europe, which has always been a big market for coffee, was practically out of the market in World War II and after that many nations of Europe had little dollar exchange for coffee purchases. So Brazil's stocks remained very high.

In recent years, however, Brazil's output had been steady or declining, and demand increased, both from Europe and the United States. The surplus carry-over stocks were dwindling.

CONDITIONS RIPE FOR A "SCARE" MARKET

Coming on top of this potential narrowing of the supply-demand situation was a severe frost in Brazil last year which damaged or destroyed millions of young coffee trees. Perhaps the extent of the damage was not realized at first, or perhaps the fact that the repercussions of this tree damage would not show up in coffee supplies for at least another year acted to maintain stability in the coffee markets. In any event, prices of the green bean did remain fairly stable at around 58 cents a pound.

There was a small flurry in coffee import prices in July and August of 1953, but after prices rose altogether only about 5 cents a pound, the market quieted down and coffee beans fell back to 58 cents, wiping out the increase entirely. And the price of the green bean remained fairly constant from then until December. Coffee was coming into the country in normal volume and there seemed to be no crisis of any kind.

Sometime around December, however, crop reports out of Brazil began to predict dire shortages in the supply due to come to market 7 months later—that is, in the crop year beginning July 1, 1954. Reports described the extent of the 1953 frost in Brazil as being much more severe than had been thought at the time.

These factors came at a time when conditions were ripe for a "scare" in the coffee market. And that is exactly what resulted.

GREEN COFFEE PRICES ZOOM FROM 58 TO 94 CENTS A POUND

According to the Federal Trade Commission in its report many months later on this situation, "the trade"—that is, the coffee-importing trade—"behaved as though Brazilian coffee were the world supply of coffee."

Even though the 1953-54 crop—that is, the coffee coming to market between July 1, 1953, and June 30, 1954—was as large as those of previous years and supplies were coming through normally, the scare talk about the extent of the deficiency in the new crop coming to market after July 1, 1954, set off the kind of frenzied buying in New York which did, in effect, create a shortage where none existed. That always happens when there is scare talk of a big shortage in any popular commodity—scare buying at a time when supplies are normal will actually cause a shortage as buyers try to lay in stocks against future price rises.

In this case the scare buying spree was a violent one. And it was furthered, according to the Federal Trade Commission, by the abnormally excessive purchases of green coffee by a few big American firms.

Everyone knows what happened after that to the price of a pound of coffee in the corner grocery store. It skyrocketed from about 90 cents or so a pound on the average to about $1.25 a pound, with vacuum-packed tins running substantially higher.

Meanwhile, stocks of coffee on hand in the United States rose tremendously, but we did not know too much about that at the time because the Census Bureau, which used to make regular monthly reports on this matter, had been cut so in funds that it no longer was making its monthly coffee reports.

So the American public was paying out 30 or 35 cents more a pound for coffee on the basis of a shortage which by then had not actually occurred—and which we know now was never destined to occur. It was a price gouge based on many factors, including poor crop reporting, belated statistics, an artificially created domestic shortage attributable largely to overpurchasing and hoarding by big roasters, and a propaganda campaign waged by coffee-producing interests to keep the bubble rising as long as possible and as high as possible.

And all through this fiasco, as the Federal Trade Commission now tells us, the trade behaved as if the Brazilian supply of coffee was, in fact, the whole world's supply. Actually, Brazil's crop represents only about one-half the world's supply.

So while it is true that the Brazilian crop this year is below last year's crop, the total available crop will be, we are told, at least as big as in previous years.

OFFICIAL DO-NOTHINGNESS AS COFFEE PRICES ROSE

But first, Mr. Speaker, let me outline the situation here in Washington as the prices of green coffee beans and of the roasted product in the grocery stores continued their dizzy rise from December until very recently.

As soon as the imported bean began to shoot up in price on the New York Exchange, the prices in the grocery stores began to go up, too—at the rate of 5 cents every time the customer turned around. As I understand it, this did not represent any great profit-taking on the part of the independent grocer—his wholesale price was rising by leaps and bounds. But the markups as they occurred were made on tins of coffee and on bags of coffee which had been made out of green beans roasted a long time before the import price began to rise. The small grocer who cannot stock far ahead got none of this markup.

But while coffee was becoming one of the great luxuries of American life, official Washington was completely silent and apparently disinterested. Yet I noticed from periodic reports on the financial pages of the newspapers that despite all the talk of great coffee shortage, imports were holding up normally and stocks on hand were relatively favorable.

It was on the strength of these reports, and other information I was able to obtain, that I first called to the attention of the Congress in mid-January the apparently unjustified gouge in coffee prices to the consumer. On the same day, I wrote to the Secretary of State urging that this country seek to work out some arrangement with Brazil to assure adequate supplies for import into this country in the face of what we were then told would be a world shortage. As I pointed out, when shortages impended in zinc, lead, copper, or other strategic materials, we had always in the past arranged to make sure that the United States received adequate supplies from friendly and allied producer nations. I urged we do the same thing in regard to coffee.

The State Department, in effect, informed me, however, that the price increase in coffee seemed to be completely legitimate in view of the shortage, that we had no controls on prices in this country and therefore should not suggest Brazil hold coffee prices from going berserk, and that there was really not much we could do about the situation but be patient and wait 7 years for the new coffee trees recently planted in Brazil to begin bearing fruit.

Nevertheless, following my protest on the House floor, the President suggested the Federal Trade Commission investigate the spiraling price of coffee and report on the factors involved, particularly whether any laws were being violated. This was about the only constructive step the administration took in this matter.

A Senate subcommittee began a much-publicized investigation, but so far—and it is many, many months since it began—I have not seen any report or explanation or clarification from the Senate subcommittee.

In the meantime, in company with Senator GILLETTE, of Iowa, I sought to get action on legislation to bring coffee trading under the same sort of exchange controls as apply to many other commodities. It seems strange to me that we exercise supervision over the exchanges which handle many domestic agricultural commodities, but leave completely free from any control trading in a wholly imported commodity which most Americans use and consider, if not essential, then at least very desirable.

But the House Agriculture Committee has never reported out the bill to control coffee trading.

In another step I tried to provide means by which the Census Bureau could resume its previous studies of monthly reports on stocks of coffee on hand. The information I had was that we had ample stocks of coffee in the United States. But official figures were lacking. In a similar situation of rising coffee prices in the late 1940's Senator GILLETTE arranged for the Census Bureau to make such studies, and he has told me they were instrumental in helping to correct excessive price increases based on artificial shortages.

I appreciate the fact, Mr. Speaker, that the House agreed to my amendment to the Commerce Department appropriation bill to earmark a modest $10,000 of the Census Bureau appropriation for these regular coffee studies. But when the bill got over to the Senate this amendment for some reason—never clearly or intelligently explained or even defended—was knocked out of the bill. I wrote to the members of the conference committee on this appropriation bill, pointing out that the Senate action would eliminate the possibility of conducting these monthly studies. But the conference bill failed to contain the Sullivan amendment. So the Census Bureau cannot make the regular reports everyone agrees are necessary if we are to know accurately how much coffee we do have on hand.

The startling thing about the Senate action was that in killing my amendment, the Senate Appropriations Committee implied it was providing money in another way for these same studies. The report of the committee said the studies should be made. It said they would be made out of a different item in the Census Bureau appropriation.

But, Mr. Speaker, the same committee which made that statement in its report failed to include a single cent in the appropriation for the other items it said would finance the coffee studies.

Is it any wonder I was puzzled? And though I wrote to all the Members of the conference committee, none has ever told me why the funds for coffee reports were never included in the Census Bureau appropriation. I thought at first it was a technical error. But when the conference committee failed to correct that technical error in the bill, the answer had to be that it was a deliberate decision not to have the coffee studies made each month by the Census Bureau. And, of course, they are not being made.

FIRST PRICE DECLINE CHECKED BY BRAZILIAN DECREE

In the late spring, Mr. Speaker, the United States Department of Agriculture made a very significant report on world coffee supplies. It showed there was no shortage either in the 1953–54 crop or in the prospective 1954–55 crop. For some reason, this report received little attention outside the coffee trade. It seemed to have some effect there, however, for the coffee market in New York began to show signs of softening—prices came down a bit.

At this point, however, Brazil issued a decree setting the minimum export price on green coffee at 87 cents a pound at shipboard, which represented a price higher than the then-prevailing price in New York—in other words, a minimum export price at about the highest level Brazilian coffee had brought during the previous months of shortage scare.

When this occurred, I wrote again to the Secretary of State urging that this country intervene with Brazil to have the decree relaxed. I warned it would cause all sorts of difficulties to Brazil, as well as to the American consumer.

The State Department again replied to the effect that the coffee crop in Brazil had been badly damaged—ignoring the fact that world supplies were up to normal—and again implying that there was not too much we could do about the situation until the supplies increased. The letter did acknowledge, however, that the American Embassy in Brazil had informed the Brazilian Government that the artificially high minimum export price would be regarded by many Americans as a Brazilian attempt to maintain prices at an excessive level.

But nothing happened to bring prices down. The market price in New York remained high—the downward trend previously noticed was halted by the reaction to the Brazilian decree. But one thing did happen: Importers began to cut down on their purchases. Some had already as much coffee on hand as they could handle. Many independent roasters were finding the price too high to compete. The result: Brazil lost a lot of coffee sales.

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION REPORT BRINGS OUT FACTS

When the Federal Trade Commission completed its long study and made its report late last month, Mr. Speaker, it confirmed my fears—that we were made the victims of a huge hoax on coffee prices and coffee supplies.

The Commission flatly stated that the coffee price spiral "cannot be explained in terms of the competitive laws of supply and demand."

It placed the blame on poor crop reporting, speculation in the New York Exchange by both Brazilian and American interests, abnormal buying for inventory purposes, trading irregularities on the unsupervised and uncontrolled exchange, the Brazilian decree attempting to freeze export prices at an artificially high level, and a certain amount of concentration in the coffee-roasting industry.

But fundamentally, the report stressed that there was no real shortage of coffee and that there had not been one and would not be one. It also stressed that the price was bid up and was held up without relationship to supply-demand factors.

And the American housewife paid through the nose.

Was it necessary? Could it have been avoided?

I think the facts as brought out by the Federal Trade Commission clearly show the increases were unnecessary and could have been avoided.

I particularly believe that if the Federal Government and the Congress had been alert to this budget headache for the American housewife, and if they had been inclined to do something about it, we could have avoided this whole mess.

America, Beware

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, recently I had the pleasure to address the 39th biennial convention of the National Association of Letter Carriers, held in Cleveland this month. The subject of that address was America, Beware. Since I believe the subject matter of this address will be of interest to both the Members of Congress and a very large segment of the American people, under unanimous consent, I include it in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICA, BEWARE

During the past session of Congress I had the good fortune of being named a member of the select committee of the House of Representatives to investigate Communist aggression. This, of course, is in addition to my responsibilities as a member of the Judiciary Committee. This committee has been holding hearings in Europe and the United States for the purpose of taking first-hand testimony on communism—how it takes over a country, what happens when it does take over, what the real power behind communism is, and what its final objectives are. This is a large undertaking, but one which must be done, if we want to deal properly with the common menace.

In my considered judgment, the greatest, most dangerous problem facing the American people today is the constant threat of Red aggression. I say this because if we do not face up to and firmly resolve the problem of Communist aggression it will not be long before the only problem we will have will be the hard struggle to keep body and soul together. This is no overstatement, nor is it an oversimplification of the world crisis in which we live today. This is one of the lessons our committee learned from hundreds of reliable witnesses who have appeared before our committee during the past 3 months. These were no ordinary witnesses. All had lived under the tyranny of communism. Many of them had suffered unbelievable tortures at the hands of the Communists, and all of them gave us first-hand eyewitness evidence. They came from every walk of life—clergymen of all faiths, doctors, farmers, teachers, laborers, and skilled craftsmen; students, government workers, and officials; labor leaders, bankers, and even children. These witnesses all testified under solemn oath. What they told us followed an unbelievable trail of human torture and cruel inhumanity. No one under communism escaped the cutting whip of the slave masters of the Kremlin—not even their dedicated followers and agents in the countries they subverted and captured.

During the past week, our committee held 5 days of hearings in Washington, New York, and ended up here in Cleveland on the case of the Hungarian nation. Hungary is 1 of the 28 nations now enslaved by communism. Before the year is out, we expect to complete the investigation on all the other nations held in the totalitarian grip of the Russian Communists.

The persons who appeared before us all had been eyewitnesses to the Russian rape of the Hungarian nation. They described how no women between the ages of 10 and 70 years were safe from the primitive men the Red army turned loose on the Hungarian nation. The only ones who were safe from the terror machines of the Russians were their advance agents and local collaborators among the Hungarian people. But their safety was short-lived—as soon as they had served the purpose of the Russian Communists, they were liquidated or otherwise disappeared. One witness, in describing the first 3 years of Russian occupation of Hungary, described it as "a horrible nightmare he was trying to forget."

Another witness told us how he was picked up off the streets of Budapest by the NKVD and, along with several thousand others, was deported by boxcar to the Soviet Union. He spent 3 years there as a slave laborer and was sent home because he became too weak to work and doctors expected him to die. A former high government official of Hungary told us that several hundred thousand Hungarian civilians were picked up off the street and deported in a similar manner. He made his estimate of the numbers so deported based on the number of petitions received from mothers, wives, and children by a department of the Hugarian Government which he headed at that time.

Still another witness who had been an ordinary foot soldier in the Hungarian army, told us how he was captured and deported to the Soviet Union as a slave laborer. He was assigned to labor at a military base. In the early fall of 1945—just 2 or 3 months after the Nazis surrendered in Europe, he worked long hours each day with thousands of other slave laborers lengthening the air strips at a large air base in Odessa. The Russians were feverishly busy with war preparations at a time when we were rapidly disbanding our magnificent Armed Forces and preparing the way for real world peace. The Russians certainly were not engaged in this feverish war preparation because of any Nazi or Fascist threat. Both those evil forces had been defeated and destroyed. Only the most naive will fail to recognize that these war preparations were directed at the free world.

Still another witness, a distinguished protestant bishop of the Unitarian Church of Hungary, Reverend St. Vianyi, told us of the terrible persecution of all the protestant churches of Hungary by the Russian Communists. He made it crystal clear that under communism there is absolutely no freedom of religion for any faith. Only those religious leaders who collaborate with or serve as espionage agents for the Kremlin, are now permitted to leave Hungary. These facts were substantiated and corroborated by other religious leaders of all faiths from Hungary.

When asked whether they thought our free way of life could peacefully coexist with Russian communism, all the witnesses responded with a firm, and many times impassioned "No." Their reasons were sensible. They said the Russian Communists do not want peace—they want war. More than anything else they want to enslave the United States because we stand as the only real obstacle in their path to world empire. No matter how hard we work for peace, the Russians are going to have their war one way or another.

As I see the problem, based upon the voluminous testimony and documents in possession of our committee, the following are basic to the Communist conspiracy:

1. Communism has fashioned a vast empire which enslaves Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Byelorussia, Ukraine, George, Armenia, Adzerbaidzahn, North Caucasia, Idel-Ural, Cossackia, Poland, Slovakia, Czechia, Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, Albania, China, Manchuria, Inner Mongolia, Outer Mongolia, Tibet, Kassakstan, Turkestan, Usbeck, Tirgish, Kirgish.

2. Communism, more than anything else, is Red colonialism, a colonialism more reactionary, repressive, and predatory than any other known in the long history of mankind.

3. The central authority of the Red Communist empire is Moscow—the historical seat of tyranny and autocracy.

4. The masters of this empire are located in the Moscow Kremlin where they, hour by hour, plot the destruction of all the still free nations. Their goal is a world colonial empire with all mankind made abject servants of a new master race of Russian Communists.

5. That the United States is the principal target of the Russian Communists in their drive for world empire. They have a timetable for our destruction which they began to implement 20 years ago when they entered into diplomatic relations with us.

6. That less than 3 percent of the 800 million people enslaved within that Red colonial empire are loyal to or will act in support of the Russian Communists. At this point in history we can count upon the support of over 90 percent of the people in the non-Russian nations of that empire. But time runs against us, as the Communist masters are bending every effort to convert the youth of the enslaved nations into fanatical fighters for communism.

7. That as soon as the masters of the Moscow Kremlin feel they have a 50-50 chance of defeating us in a hot war, they will immediately launch an all-out sneak attack upon the United States.

This is a very bleak picture, but it is an accurate and honest one. We Americans are brought up in a system which teaches us to face the facts and act wisely according to such facts. We still have a golden opportunity for peace. We can avoid world war III, but the certain road to world war III is following the line of peaceful coexistence which the fuzzyheads in the career Foreign Service of the Department of State are spoon feeding to President Eisenhower.

The only way we can avoid world war III is to launch an all-out political offensive against the masters of the Moscow Kremlin and their relative handful of henchmen in the enslaved non-Russian nations. That political offensive should be based upon the cornerstones of freedom which themselves stand as a bulwark of our way of life. They are: Freedom of religion, free labor, free enterprise, enlightened nationalism.

In conclusion, I would warn the American people to be alert to a sneak attack by the Russian Communists. While they call for peace, they are working day and night to reach the point where they feel they would have a 50-50 chance of beating us in a hot war. Just as surely as day follows night, they will launch a sneak attack against us as soon as they reach that position.

Republican Party's Tax Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, as a ranking majority member of the House Committee on Ways and Means, it is appropriate that I should at this time review briefly for my colleagues in the Congress and for the people of our great Nation the accomplishments of the Republican 83d Congress with respect to Federal taxation.

Greater tax reduction was granted to the American taxpayer during the Republican 83d Congress than has ever been granted by any other Congress in our history. In fact, the only other Congress that has ever come close to granting as much tax relief was granted by another Republican Congress. I refer, of course, to the 80th Congress.

Tax reduction and reduced expenditures have been the traditional fiscal policy of the Republican Party as a formula for achieving a balanced budget and debt retirement. Under this formula, the Republican Party has dedicated itself to a high standard of living for all the people under a peaceful, free-enterprise system. During the present Congress, we have continued in this tradition.

We Republicans can be proud of the outstanding record that the 80th Congress achieved with respect to taxes. Taxes were reduced $5 billion per year, the budget was balanced for the first time in 17 years, $7 billion was paid on the national debt, and a surplus of $8.4 billion was left in the Treasury in 1948. We are all aware of the tremendous boom that occurred simultaneously in our economy.

That Republican policy, which was so ably carried out in the 80th Congress, represented a marked departure from the philosophy prevailing during the 20 years of Democratic rule, when 14 major revenue measures were enacted into law increasing taxes.

In the Republican 83d Congress, we have even improved on our past record and have made a long-overdue departure from the New and Fair Deal programs of tax and tax, spend and spend.

Since January 1, 1954, this Republican 83d Congress has given the American people $7.4 billion in tax relief—a startling figure. This $7.4 billion tax-reduction program consists of $3 billion in individual income-tax cuts, $2 billion from the expiration of the excess-profits tax, $1 billion in excise-tax reduction, and $1.4 billion in tax relief from the new Internal Revenue Code of 1954, H. R. 8300.

These tax cuts were accomplished despite the fact that when the Eisenhower administration took office in 1953, the Truman administration had left $81 billion in unpaid bills which would fall due and have to be paid by the new administration. These tax cuts were accomplished despite the fact that the Truman administration had proposed a planned deficit of $9.9 billion for fiscal year 1954.

The Eisenhower administration and the Republican 83d Congress reduced this planned deficit of $9.9 billion to an actual deficit of $3.3 billion by instituting the most stringent economy measures. In all, Republican fiscal policy has slashed expenditures by the Federal Government over $12 billion. It is obvious that the $7.4 billion in tax reduction was made possible by sound Republican economy measures which have not adversely affected our national security.

During the current session of the 83d Congress, we have passed the Excise Tax Reduction Act of 1954 which has the effect of reducing excise tax collections by almost $1 billion. In this important tax reduction legislation, we have cut in half the excise tax rates on such articles as cosmetics, admissions, ladies handbags, jewelry, electric light bulbs, and so forth. We have also markedly reduced the excise taxes on telephone services, transportation tickets, and so forth. These excise tax reductions have already done much to stimulate business and employment, not only in those industries directly affected by the taxes, but also in other industries. Consumers have had to pay less for many of these taxed items and have thus more money available for other purchases. Certainly the housewife has found our excise tax structure less harassing than it has been in the past.

The President has recently signed into law, the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, H. R. 8300. This is generally conceded to be the most important legislation and the most monumental piece of legislation to be enacted into law since the founding of our Republic. H. R. 8300 represents the first complete overhaul of our Federal tax laws in over 75 years.

This revision includes a rearrangement of the provisions of the code to place them in more logical sequence, the deletion of obsolete material, and an attempt to express the Internal Revenue laws in a more understandable manner. This new code also contains many substantive changes, the purpose of which is to remove inequities, to end harassment of the taxpayer, and to remove tax barriers to further expansion of production and employment. We have sought to create tax laws which will be conducive to the dynamic development of our national economy. Over 500,000 man-hours of work have gone into the careful preparation of H. R. 8300.

Time does not now permit me to enumerate and describe the many long-overdue improvements which H. R. 8300 makes in our Federal tax laws. I can say without contradiction, however, that these improvements will have a beneficial effect on every American taxpayer and his family. Persons from all walks of life—whether he be a businessman, a housewife, a farmer, or a laboring man—will find that because of H. R. 8300, his taxes are being more fairly applied to him.

I am proud to have been a member of the committee that wrote this legislation and presented it to the House of Representatives. I am proud to have been a Member of the 83d Congress, which has given this new tax law to the American people. The Internal Revenue Code of 1954 now belongs to the people. I am confident they will find that we have succeeded in eliminating many tax restraints that had an adverse effect on the proper operation of our free enterprise system. I am confident that from it the American people will realize a higher standard of living and a more prosperous well-being.

The tax program of the Republican 83d Congress without question stands as a monumental achievement in our great history.

What Congress Does, or Fails To Do, Affects You, Your Family, Your Home, Your Job, Your Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, when the House adjourns at the close of business today we will have written the complete and final history of this Congress, except for any actions the Senate may take later in the year and except for any emergency which may require us to reconvene before the 83d Congress goes out of existence shortly after New Year's Day.

The final weeks of this congressional session have been almost nightmarish. Attempts were made in the final weeks to pass complex bills which were entitled to much more careful consideration than the time permitted us would allow. We did not know until today, for instance—until the very last day of this Congress—what the final provisions would be of the social security bill which has been before Congress since early this year. The conference report compromising the differences between the House and Senate versions of the social security bill was not presented until today.

Other bills, just as important to the people of our districts, came through the House in such a rush these past weeks that it was like being in the middle of a Mississippi flood.

It seems to me that we could have avoided much of this last-minute rush and accorded more careful consideration to these important bills. I hope the next Congress convening in January will make an effort to schedule the work on a more continuous and consistent basis over the life of the Congress rather than to let so many things drag out to the very end when it is almost impossible to know all the details of all the important bills descending on the Congress in a flood of legislation.

OUR WORK IS TOO IMPORTANT TO TOO MANY PEOPLE TO EXCUSE SLIPSHOD LEGISLATION

Mr. Speaker, it is hard to think of a single aspect of the lives and happiness of the people of the United States that is not affected by the work we do here in the Congress. What we do or fail to do affects each person, each family, each home in a variety of important respects. The wage earner's job, the widow's social security benefits, the veterans's hospitalization or homeownership or educational rights under the GI bill, the rehabilitation of the handicapped, the prices of things people buy in the stores, the safety of our population from atomic attack, the taxes we pay, the state of prosperity in the country—all these things are directly involved in the bills we pass in the Congress.

I have tried since coming to the Congress to examine into legislation—into all bills which come before us—from this standpoint of their effect upon people; that is, how they affect homelife and the family, what influence they would have in the prevention of juvenile delinquency or in the improvement of educational opportunities, whether they would mean better homes or poorer homes for the families which make up our country.

From that standpoint the 83d Congress has done some good work but has left a lot to be desired. The housing program which we have passed in effect would kill the very successful public-housing program. It would on the other hand, seek to make home ownership easier for more people by further reducing downpayments on FHA housing, but there is a strong possibility that this might have the unfortunate consequence of making prices of housing higher as the downpayments are lowered. If more people can afford the downpayment to buy houses, the market price might well go up. That means monthly carrying charges would also rise.

It is not enough to make it easier for our families to buy homes if the monthly payments are so high that during any short period of economic downturn, they lose their homes.

This is just one illustration of the complexity of the problems we face as they affect people and families. Obviously when we legislate in a hurry, in a last-minute rush, "jokers" can easily be slipped into the bills with unexpected and unfortunate consequences.

MAJOR ISSUES OF THIS CONGRESS

Among the important issues which we attempted to deal with in this Congress, in addition to housing and social security, were such things as:

Taxes, including a complete rewriting and codification of all of the income-tax statutes; removal of what nearly all of us on the Democratic side and which President Eisenhower in his 1952 campaign also called the "union busting" provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act; better unemployment compensation provisions; and aid to our hard-pressed schools; strengthening of national defense; improvement of civilian-defense programs; the Voice of America program for counteracting Communist lies throughout the world; correction of a gaping loophole in the food and drug inspection program which resulted from a Supreme Court decision; statehood for Hawaii and Alaska; the reciprocal trade agreements program begun under Cordell Hull in 1934 to expand world trade and thus lessen the tensions which lead to war; the ownership of the so-called tidelands; continuation of the mutual security program, including the tremendously successful point 4 program first outlined as the fourth major point of former President Truman's 1948 inaugural speech; the peacetime uses of atomic energy.

Mr. Speaker, the list is endless. All of these things and many more are of direct concern to every American family. On some of these issues, Congress went through the motions of legislating but did little; on others it accomplished some worth-while things. On balance, however, the record was not the kind we could have made if there had been more of a will here to legislate in behalf of the great mass of the people. In so many instances, this Congress legislated on behalf of the few—of those with wealth and power, leaving only crumbs for the average citizen.

THE TAX BILL

Nowhere was this more evident than in the tax-revision bill. We passed a bill—a bill jammed down the throats of those of us who tried to improve it—which accords tremendous increases in take-home pay for people with substantial income from stock dividends and which gives business corporations very attractive means of increasing their net profits through lower taxes, but which gives to the average citizen not a single important means of reducing this tax bill. As one news story which I saw recently pointed out: If your luck has been bad enough, you will get some tax relief under this bill. If a husband or wife dies during the year, or if medical and hospital bills are a substantial part of your income, or if a low-income family has to hire help to care for the children because both parents have to work to assure even the barest kind of subsistence, then there are some benefits in the tax bill for moderate-income families.

But the average wage earner gets no break in lower tax rates or higher exemptions. Our efforts to write an additional $100 exemption per person into the law, making the individual exemption $700 a year instead of $600, were voted down. Thus a family of 4 will still have to pay income taxes on income over $2,400 a year. Can anyone tell me how a family of 4 can live today—can pay the basic costs of living without any frills or luxuries—and get along on $2,400 a year Yet this tax bill seems to assume that such a family can get along all right and that on anything over that it should pay income taxes. Even the $2,800-a-year basic exemption we tried to provide for such a family would have been less than enough tax relief for those who need it most.

THE TIDELANDS ISSUE

Early in the 83d Congress, the administration launched one of its strongest crusades—to give away to a few coastal States valuable natural resources under the ocean floor, chiefly oil. The Supreme Court has said over and over that these valuable resources belonged to all of the people of the United States. President Truman vetoed efforts in past Congresses to give away these resources. I was one who tried to get the royalties from these offshore oil deposits earmarked for educational purposes but the administration insisted on pushing through the bill to sign away all Federal Government claims to these resources. Consequently, while four of our coastal States were made very happy by this tremendous windfall of natural resources which the Supreme Court insisted belonged to you and me and all of the people of this country, our schools continue in a desperate financial situation which has mean tovercrowding, lack of proper facilities, underpaid teachers, and alarming deterioration in the quality of education.

A DISTRESSING DOWNTURN IN ECONOMIC ACTIVITY

The past year saw what had been the most prosperous economy the United States, or any other nation, has ever known, turn into a nationwide recession. St. Louis, one of the great industrial centers of the world, almost overnight became a distressed area, which means unemployment of more tha 6 percent. Many other major business centers of the country also went on the distressed list. Unemployment mounted by leaps and bounds. Job opportunities shrank.

In this situation, the Congress provided no constructive solutions. My bill, which I cosponsored, for a Federal-local public-works program was pigeonholed in the House Public Works Committee and was never even called up for hearings on the need for this kind of legislation. While our jobless were experiencing prolonged periods of hopelessness verging on despair, the inadequate unemployment-compensation rates were not raised. Not a single State today has an unemployment-compensation rate which is in line with the cost of living.

The cost of living itself—the Consumers' Price Index—has not reflected this general downturn in economic activity. Prices today for the consumer are higher than they were before this recession began. Creeping inflation has been cheating the housewife every day of more and more money out of her limited budget.

THE COFFEE HOAX

In one item alone—coffee—she has paid out 30 cents a pound more than a year ago. I began last January to try to expose the hoax behind this unnecessary and unconscionable increase in coffee prices, based on a much-publicized shortage which never, in fact, existed. I am happy that as a result of my protests and the facts I presented on the House floor the Federal Trade Commission agreed to look into this matter, and recently—after many months of study—confirmed what I said here in January.

The proof of that pudding was in the sudden and sharp price decline which came almost immediately after the Federal Trade Commission made its report showing no shortage and no ligitimate economic reason for the tremendous hike in coffee prices. The break in coffee prices has been attributed to a change of currency regulations in Brazil. That may have had some effect—an effect such as putting the last straw on the camel's back. Actually, it was an action which recognized the futility of trying to keep coffee prices high in the face of the FTC study. Brazil had no choice but to change its regulations, since its exports had already come almost to a halt. But the speculators who had bought up huge and extraordinary stocks of coffee beans, although they tried to prolong the high price as long as possible, finally had to participate in the long overdue downward march of coffee prices.

In the period between the time when I first pointed to the hoax of a coffee shortage and protested the unconscionable prices for coffee until the Federal Trade Commission, months later, confirmed the facts, I tried repeatedly, but without success, to get the Congress and the administration to take action in this matter. I pleaded for passage of legislation to place the coffee exchange under the same regulations as apply to other commodity exchanges. That was blocked in the House Agriculture Committee. I succeeded in persuading the House to write an amendment into the Commerce Department appropriation bill to renew the regular monthly tabulations of coffee stocks on hand in the United States, as a means of preventing price rises based on nonexistent shortages, but this amendment was mysteriously killed in the Senate Appropriations Committee. I tried to get the State Department to intervene strenuously with Brazil to end restrictive practices intended to help boost coffee prices even higher, but was told by State Department officials there was nothing to be done—that there was a tremendous coffee shortage and that was all there was to it.

The coffee hoax perpetrated on the American consumer, Mr. Speaker, has been one of the most mysterious and effective gouges we have seen in this country in a long time. We have not yet gotten to the bottom of it. I intend to pursue this matter until we do get all the facts and expose those most responsible.

DISTRIBUTION OF SURPLUS FOOD

In view of the joblessness and distress in the Nation, Mr. Speaker, and the actual hunger which has occurred among some of our people, I have tried, as you know, to seek a sensible approach to the problem of getting some of our surplus food to needy families. My solution was based on the use of a food-stamp plan such as was in effect during the first and second Roosevelt administrations prior to World War II.

Unfortunately, I could get no support whatsoever from the Department of Agriculture on this matter. The agriculture people seemed to be much more concerned about dumping and getting rid of these surpluses abroad or anywhere, on any basis whatsoever, just to get rid of them, than joining in any sensible program which would assure some of this food getting to those who need it. The surplus food distribution system now in effect is hopelessly inefficient and inadequate in many parts of the country. Complaints have been coming in daily that foodstuffs are not available when and where needed; that the wrong people in some cases have been getting much of this food; that the ones really in need are often pushed around and ignored and tied up in redtape so that the food items they receive are not worth the horrible amount of time and trouble necessary to get them. No funds have been provided for certification of the needy, putting a tremendous burden on State and local welfare agencies.

Consequently, since the present system seems clearly to be inadequate for the needs of these times, I intend to press in the next Congress for a more sensible approach and will reintroduce my food-stamp bill.

FOOD AND DRUG INSPECTION

One accomplishment of this Congress in which I am deeply proud to have played an important part was in the passage of legislation clearly defining the rights of the Food and Drug Administration to inspect the conditions under which food and drugs shipped in interstate commerce are actually manufactured or prepared. The Supreme Court had decided that a loophole in the law prohibited the Federal agents from making factory inspections except by invitation of the factory owners. Obviously, a factory producing filthy or contaminated or unfit products injurious to health is not going to invite a Federal inspector to come in and see how the work is being done.

Shortly after the Supreme Court decision, I worked for passage of a bill to restore the rights of the inspectors to go into these factories on their own initiative. But it was a shock to me, after the law was finally passed and put into effect, that the Congress and the administration were reducing the number of food and drug inspectors and thus making it impossible for the Food and Drug Administration to do its job properly. I have been fighting against these appropriation cuts which so affect every kitchen and dining-room table in the Nation, and which make it more possible for unsafe drugs to get into our medicine cabinets. Even though we gave the Food and Drug Administration broadened powers, including now the right to control residual pesticides on foods, its appropriation is still substantially less than under the Truman administration. This is another continuing fight of mine which I intend to renew when the Congress reconvenes. These battles are never won unless they are fought over and over again.

SOCIAL SECURITY

The best job done by this Congress, and one of its few accomplishments in behalf of ordinary people, has been on the social-security law. A year ago there was a strong drive on the part of powerful interests to destroy the basic soundness of the social-security system by turning it into a general dole and disbursing the reserve fund. This was called putting social security on a pay-as-you-go-basis. What it would have done, however, would have been to destroy the reserve fund built up over the past 17 years and make future social-security benefits dependent upon current revenues. As our population got older, the day-to-day expense of social-security payments would become so great that benefits would have to be slashed almost to nothing, or the program would collapse of its own weight. Instead of each wage earner during his working lifetime contributing, along with his employer, to his future benefits, the youngest wage earners would be carrying the burden for those who retired.

We blocked this attempt to kill off social security. I am glad that President Eisenhower did not join in that attack on the program but instead proposed changes in line with the kind of program the Roosevelt and Truman administrations had pioneered and improved over the years. The new law expands coverage to more people, raises the amount of each wage-earner's paycheck which can be credited to benefits, and thus makes possible a further increase in benefits. This will be of tremendous help to our beneficiaries and those who look forward to retiring under the social-security system.

I favored the changes in the law as far as they went. I joined in a proposal to liberalize the law much further, both in benefits and coverage; but since this was the best we could do in this Congress, and since it was really a substantial improvement, I have no desire or intention of trying to minimize the importance of what was done.

As a sponsor of improvements in the Railroad Retirement Act, which is the social-security system for railroad workers, I helped to bring about a reduction from 65 to 60 in the minimum age at which widows of railroad workers can begin receiving their survivorship benefits. I intend to work for similar treatment in the Social Security Act, too. It will be one of the first bills I will introduce in the new Congress.

A widow who has spent her entire adult life as a housewife finds it extremely difficult and sometimes impossible to try to find employment at age 60 and begin supporting herself. To have to wait until 65 in order to begin collecting social-security survivorship benefits is a serious hardship which I hope to see corrected by reducing this minimum age to 60, as we did on railroad retirement.

AID TO VETERANS, TO THE HANDICAPPED, TO THE SICK

The modest increase voted by this Congress in veterans' benefit rates, including disability benefits, does not begin to reflect the increases in the cost of living and the needs of the veteran. We had to agree to this bill or get nothing. That is exactly how the matter was presented to us in the final days of the session. This is an area where more compassion and less budgeteering is necessary.

A bill which would expand the Government's program for rehabilitation of the physically handicapped was passed, but the appropriations necessary to carry it out were not forthcoming in sufficient amount. It is regrettable that the Congress should attempt to persuade the handicapped that we are doing a lot for them and then fail to appropriate sufficient funds. A similar deception was practiced on the matter of special hospitals and clinics for a variety of chronic diseases—a law which says we will do something about it, but an appropriation which fails to include enough money.

THERE IS SO MUCH YET TO BE DONE

Mr. Speaker, this Congress is adjourning with a tremendous amount of necessary work still undone. Undoubtedly, a criticism like that could probably be made about any Congress as it adjourns, but I know of few instances over the years in which I have watched Congresses in action where so little was accomplished of value to the average family.

This is particularly hard to excuse in view of the fact that our economic machine is definitely not running at full strength. It is almost as if the powers that be here in Washington believe a rate of unemployment of 3 or 4 million persons is not unusual or even disturbing. To me, it is alarming. It is alarming that we are not trying to build a solid foundation of full employment, but seem to be content with partial employment and vast unemployment.

The fact that we are not now experiencing a 1929–33 depression is hardly gounds for complacency in the face of genuine recession. We cannot be complacent in this situation. We must organize our efforts and our resources and our intelligence to restore prosperity for all and to keep this country growing stronger and better for all of our people. That is my goal as a Congresswoman.

Peaceful Coexistence Leads to War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I have had called to my attention some excerpts from an address given this month by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, professor at Georgetown University, at a patriotic rally of Ukrainian-American Associations of Pittsburgh, Pa. In his address Dr. Dobriansky points out the dangers involved in the Communist theory and myth of peaceful coexistence. He also calls for consistency in the conduct of our foreign relations and particularly in the use of diplomacy as a political weapon against the international Communist conspiracy. He offers a choice with respect to diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union and its satellites. He holds that we should have diplomatic relations with all the satellites and should exploit our hand in those countries or else we should withdraw all of our diplomatic representatives from the countries behind the Iron Curtain. This is timely advice and should receive the most careful attention from our policymakers in the executive branch of the Government. Under unanimous consent, I include these excerpts in the RECORD, as follows:

> The Russian Communist theory and myth of peaceful coexistence is being peddled again in the free world to lull us into a false feeling of security. This is not the first time, but it can always be the last time. The aim behind this latest stress on peaceful coexistence is to gain time for the vast genocidal consolidation now going on in the Russian Communist empire, from the Danube to the Pacific. Moscow's efforts at more liberal East-West trade relations are guided by this aim. Since no commodity can be construed as nonstrategic in the constant war economy of the Russian Communist empire, more liberal trade relations will only facilitate and accelerate this genocidal consolidation. Once it achieves this empire consolidation, Moscow will be in basic position to launch its inevitable drive for world conquest and domination.
>
> The illusion of peaceful coexistence is, therefore, the surest path to war. It permits Moscow to consolidate its empire through the genocide of nations subjugated by its rule, including the non-Russian nations in the U. S. S. R. It affords Moscow the necessary time to liquidate the patriotic leadership of every non-Russian enslaved by it since 1920 and to develop a robotic mass of 800 million people as fodder in its gigantic war machine. With this, and given the guaranteed opportunity of initial attack, which can create for us regional Pearl Harbors, Moscow doesn't even need a superiority in arms to attain to a reasonable expectation of success in its design for world rule.
>
> A preventive war is not the only alternative to peaceful coexistence. The real alternative of a policy of national liberation—which means a political offensive in behalf of freedom on the empire terrain of the enemy—alone can prevent this genocidal consolidation for war and thus prevent a global war itself. It is our only alternative by which we can maintain our natural allies behind the Iron Curtain who, in many respects, are more valuable to us than some of our allies in the free world. Peaceful coexistence means their extinction and exposes us to a grave disadvantage in the real possibility of war, made more real by the myth of peaceful coexistence itself.
>
> Much of practicable worth can and must be done to launch this political offensive by peaceful means. Practical aid to the still existing national undergrounds in Poland, Ukraine, Slovakia, Hungary, East Germany should be given for their expansion and the conservation of the national interests of their countries. The Kersten amendment to the Mutual Security Act should be implemented by the President, and free national military units of Poland, Ukraine, Slovak, Lithuania, and others be formed in the free world as an electrifying symbol of freedom to their enslaved brothers in the satellite and Red armies. Skillful American diplomacy can be employed. If there is intelligence and other value in maintaining American ambassadors in the Communist capitals, then let us extend our representation to the two most restive areas in the empire, Ukraine and Byelorussia, as called for by House Concurrent Resolution 58. If there is no need for this, then let us withdraw all of our representatives from behind the Iron Curtain.
>
> These are only a few of the many things that can be done to wage a political offensive to prevent the Russian Empire consolidation for war. A wait-and-see (really do-nothing) attitude, predicated only on the tenuous buildup of mass material power for possible retaliation, is hardly the mark of free-world leadership and imaginative application of the spiritual resources of our Nation. If we timidly choose to follow the appeasement course of France and England, let us remind ourselves that twice in this century they were forced, as a result of their foreign policies, to turn to us for their national salvation. In a possible third world war, to whom would we turn? Our effective leadership is being sought by numerous other peoples and nations in the free world, and even more so, by our natural allies behind the Iron Curtain. Unity among our allies is not a concept subordinating these ardent anti-Communist peoples and nations to minor positions in the struggle against a dedicated, mortal enemy. Time is on the side of Russion Communist imperialism, not on the side of freedom.

Justice for the Farmer and Dairyman

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOSEPH P. O'HARA

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 17, 1954

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I certainly would like to express my appreciation for the tremendous amount of work which the Committee on Agriculture has done on this very complex and very difficult problem dealing with farm legislation.

I do not think there is any one problem of the many problems that have faced us in the last year to which I personally have given more thought and consideration. I confess at this hour it is still a very difficult problem.

Last fall I announced to people who asked me, privately or publicly, that I felt that this was a time when we should continue our present farm program for at least 1 year. I realize there are those who differ in that view, some of them farmers in my own district, but I think that economically the farmer has been in a very, very difficult squeeze.

I am supporting this bill and the great Committee on Agriculture in the position they have taken. I think to do otherwise would not be right.

It is unfortunate, in the consideration of this bill, that over the past months a concerted drive has been on in this country to line up the consumer against the farmer. That does not work either for the welfare of our country or our economy.

Agriculture is the Nation's basic industry and the prosperity of the entire country depends upon the prosperity of the farmer and the dairyman. Some people may say that other segments of our economy are just as important as agriculture; there may be some justification for their position. However, when the Lord made man and placed him on the earth He provided food for him, and man consumed that food so that he could work. Whether it is the worker in the machine shop or the factory, or the minor in the bowels of the earth, he could not survive nor perform his labors without food.

Whether in war or in peace, one of the first important considerations which must be given by the military is what food do we have for our troops, and it matters not that our Armed Forces are on the land, in the air, on the sea, or under the sea. Food must be available for them in order that they may survive and accomplish whatever their mission may be. That is why agriculture is so different from other segments of our economy.

FARM INCOME

The net farm income has declined over the past 3 years. It has declined some 13 percent in the last 2 years and some 25 percent since 1947. At the same time other segments of our economy have reached new heights as far as net income is concerned. In other words, the farmer has been confronted with getting less in the market place for what he has to sell and has been compelled to pay more and more for that which he has to buy.

Unfortunately, many people fail to understand that whenever the farmer's income declines, his purchasing power declines, and it is felt by business and industry all over the country—and almost immediately. It must not be forgotten that an equitable price for farm products is absolutely essential if we are to generate income which will maintain employment and prosperity. It stands to reason that when the farmer's income diminishes he will purchase less consumer goods. In fact, he is likely to buy only those things which he actually needs to carry on his farm operations and to support his family.

In my particular section of the country, the very minute farm income declines it is felt in every store on Main Street. It is felt in the stockyards in south St. Paul—the second largest stockyards in the country, and it is reflected in other markets all over the country.

A little over a year ago I happened to be visiting with a couple of banker friends in my district. They came from different parts of my district but both were from excellent farming communities with heavy dairy production, comparing with any of the mixed production that we have in southern Minnesota. Without mentioning any names or disclosing any confidences, I can relate this incident. I asked, "What would you estimate has been the drop in deposits of your farm depositors for the last 2 years?" That would be 3 years now altogether. They said very frankly, both of them, that they felt that the deposits of their farm depositors had dropped at least 25 percent.

COST-PRICE SQUEEZE

The farmer is in a unique position in our economy. He has nothing to say about the cost of things he has to buy. Someone else always sets the price for his tractor, plow, or combine, his car and his wearing apparel. Oftentimes someone else fixes the wages that he is required to pay his hired help because the wages of his hired man is usually fixed by competition of high wages in the city. Someone else fixes the farmer's taxes, determines the cost of his insurance and the cost of his transportation. Someone else tells him what he has to pay for his cattle and other livestock which is not raised on the farm. In short, the farmer usually pays what the seller demands.

On the other side of the picture, the farmer has very little, if anything, to say about the price of the things he has to sell. When he takes his cattle to the livestock market at South St. Paul, or to some other market, he takes what the buyers offer him. If he does not like the price, his alternative is to take his cattle back to the farm. The same is true of his milk and the eggs which the housewife sells. The farmer is confronted with the fact that when his cattle or hogs are ready for market he must sell them. The same is true of his milk. His milk and cream must be sold fresh. In other words, the farmer must sell as the products of the farm are produced.

When the farmer hauls his grain to the country elevator he takes what the operator of that elevator offers him. If he does not like the price, he has the privilege of taking the grain back to the farm. Generally speaking, he does not have the opportunity of selecting the best time nor the best market for the things he has to sell.

THE FARMER AND THE CONSUMER

Consumers of the country have the impression that the farmer is responsible for the high cost of food and no one is doing much to dispel that idea. I would like to point out that food is the biggest bargain of the year 1954. Fewer hours of work buy more food now, and better food, than ever before. The world should know, and certainly the consumer should be advised, that out of each dollar the consumer receives as his income, only 26 cents is used for food. The other 74 cents can be used for other things. Of the $1 the consumer spends for food farmers get only 45 cents. Thus, less than 12 percent of consumer income reaches the farmer.

If farmers gave away their wheat the price of bread would only fall less than 3 cents a loaf. Not only do consumers now get more food for an hour's wage but they get more convenience, wider selections, and better quality. The consumer has a wide selection of farm products. He can buy breasts of chicken or he can buy only chicken legs or livers. He can select his vegetables and meats wrapped in individual transparent packages. He can buy his milk in paper cartons with no bottles to return. Few farmers, however, get any of the money that these extra services cost.

Only a part of the food sold over the grocery counter comes from supported farm crops. Much publicity is given to farm subsidies. Some people like to magnify the situation and take great delight in giving misleading information to the country about the cost of our farm programs. Farmers are by no means the only group who have received Federal support at taxpayers' expense. Let us not forget the subsidies to business, the railroads, the airlines, the shipping industry, and the subsidy granted to labor by providing a minimum wage.

Consumers can depend on it that their jobs will disappear if farm returns for foodstuffs fall to nonprofit levels. Agriculture's purchasing power creates high employment as sure as general prosperity helps agricultural sales.

Farmers today produce so abundantly that 85 percent of our population can choose other kinds of jobs. If farmers were not so efficient, a lot more people would have to go to work on the farm. This is an efficiency that since before the war has increased farm output by 40 percent, doing the job with 17 percent less labor. There should be a better understanding between the farmer and consumer. In the last analysis we are all farmers because we are all so dependent upon the fruits of the soil.

PRICE SUPPORTS

If it had not been for price supports, surplus removal, and marketing agreements, the farmer's net income last year would have been $3 billion less than it is now, or 25 percent less, according to some of our most eminent economists. Had it not been for price supports we might well today have a general economic recession.

Our present program of price supports, surplus removal, and marketing agreements covered 70 percent of the value of all crops produced, livestock, and livestock products last year. About 90 to 95 percent of our farmers producing crops and livestock for market were directly or indirectly benefited by existing stablization and marketing agreement programs, thus preventing further impairment of agricultural income.

Farmers have already voluntarily limited the acreage of major crops in order to bring production into balance with consumption. Under cross-compliance provisions of basic law already being enforced by the Secretary of Agriculture for wheat, the farmers will have less acres than ever before. All this means less income. If it applies to wheat it can be applied to corn and to other commodities.

In substance, therefore, the opponents of the continuation of the 90-percent-rigid support program are saying, "Look, Mr. Farmer, even though farm income is going down, and even though things you have to buy are still very high, and even though you are in a price squeeze, and even though you have taken out of production voluntarily and through cross-compliance regulations many of your tillable acres, and even though all of this will make it very difficult for you to maintain your normal income, still we want to assure you, Mr. Farmer, in spite of all these handicaps we want to guaranty you less income than you had before." That quoted statement simply does not make commonsense nor fair dealing.

FARM PRODUCTION

The farmer is being called upon to provide the food and fiber, not only for the people of the United States, but for many other areas of the world. The American farmer is today feeding over 160 million people in the United States alone, and by 1960 it is estimated, at the present rate of our increase in population, we will have 175 million people in the United States.

It has been said that the world's population is increasing more rapidly than the world food supply. We have, therefore, a hungry world on our hands. These facts should cause us to stop, look and listen when we discuss the problems of farm surpluses, for the growth of our own Nation and of the population of the world means that if people are to be fed the farmers must produce more agricultural products, rather than less, in the years that lie ahead.

With few exceptions we have already reached the saturation point as far as new farmland is concerned, so if we are to expand production to meet an expanding population we will have to increase the productivity of the land.

Of course, no matter how good a farm bill we may write, Congress cannot legislate what the weather will be. That is something on which every farmer has to gamble. He never knows whether he will be facing a drought or flooded acres; when he plants his crops in the spring he does not know whether he will have a bountiful crop, a medium crop or practically no crop at all. However, I think we ought to get down on our knees every night and thank the good Lord that he has been so good to us for the production we have had.

FARM SURPLUSES

We hear much these days about farm surpluses. Frankly I admit they are an aggravating problem in some instances, but by and large I would rather have an economy of abundance than an economy of scarcity. It is not the fault of the farmer that we have these present surpluses. During the war he was asked and implored to produce and produce and produce and produce—and he did.

Many of the so-called surplus problems have been overemphasized and overmagnified. For example, take the corn situation. It is estimated that we will have on October 1, 1954, a carryover of some 900 million bushels, which only constitutes about a 3 months' supply with which we must feed the entire livestock population of this country. Corn is no problem. I do not know of a single informed expert, including the Secretary of Agriculture, who claims that corn constituted a surplus problem. Our supply of corn has already proved a blessing in disguise in those areas where crops have been blighted by droughts.

Corn has been the foundation of our livestock industry. Approximately 80 percent of the corn produced in the United States is fed on the farm, and cheap corn inevitably means cheap livestock. The higher the price for corn the higher the livestock price.

Although corn has been supported at 90 percent of parity since 1944, without any controls whatever, except acreage allotments, there has never been, and does not exist today, a burdensome surplus of this commodity. Not only has it helped the feeder by providing a dependable supply, but it has served the consumer by providing a better and more stable supply of food from livestock sources. By stabilizing the price of corn a floor has been placed under the livestock industry. Further, we must not forget that the price-support program for corn has served to place a floor under competitive crops within the commercial corn areas.

It has been charged that the present farm program has encouraged farmers to produce corn and wheat for storage rather than for meat, eggs, and other livestock products. However, the 1953 spring crop in the South Central States was 32 percent below 1952. Hog production has gone up, not down, in this period when so-called high price supports were in effect. Meat production in 1953 exceeded that of any peacetime year. Consumption of red meat per person, at 154 pounds, was the highest since 1908. What I want to emphasize is that price supports at present levels have not made the farmer quit raising hogs, and hogs eat corn, lots of it, as everyone knows. Neither have price supports cut national production of meat and livestock products.

THE DAIRY SITUATION

In 1950 Minnesota had 147,509 farms which owned cows. As of January 1, 1954, there were 1,542,000 milk cows on these farms. On a nationwide basis, milk-cow numbers reached 25.6 million head in 1944, and thereafter declined to a low of 21.6 million head in 1951 and 1952. Milk-cow numbers increased again, however, in 1953 to 22.3 million head, and current reports indicate that they are slightly higher today than they were a year ago.

DAIRY SURPLUSES

As with farm commodities, one of the much-discussed bugaboos has been the surplus of dairy products. I take the position that if the Secretary of Agriculture will move the supplies now in the hands of the Commodity Credit Corporation into the hands of the consuming public, the storage charges and the cost of handling these commodities will be eliminated. It is up to him.

I do not wish to appear critical of Mr. Benson, but I do say that during the past months he has said he is going to do something and that he has a program to move butter out into the hands of the consumers of the United States. Up to the present time, however, I do not know of anything he has done to dispose of these surpluses. I do hope the Secretary of Agriculture will work out a program and put it into effect during the 2-year period allowed by this bill so that these surpluses may be disposed of.

I do believe that within 2 or 3 years we will have the surplus dairy problem licked. It is estimated that in 1954 there will be 4 million babies born in this country that should have a quart of milk each day. The present farm bill provides that we are going to furnish additional milk for school lunches. There are 23 million children in the United States going to schools that do not have milk or do not have the school-lunch program. We have provided in this bill $50 million a year for the next 2 years to supplement the milk program from Commodity Credit Corporation funds. We want all of these children to have at least a pint of milk a day. We also want the men in the armed services who are on rations to have at least a pint of milk a day. In fact, we would not have enough cows producing enough milk in the United States if we were to take care of the boys and girls, and men in the armed services, and in veterans' hospitals, to say nothing of the other people in this country who want to drink milk.

The dairy industry can do a great deal on its own accord to promote the increased consumption of dairy products. It might be well for the industry to take a look at some of the modern TV advertising of certain beverages and to use more modern radio and newspaper advertising.

Mr. Speaker, during my entire service in Congress I have spoken, supported, and voted for sound farm legislation. I will therefore vote for a continuation of the 90-percent price-support program. I will also vote in favor of a sound support program for dairy products, for I feel that we must give to the farmer and to the dairyman of our country a sound farm program. To do otherwise would render an injustice not only to the farmer and the dairyman but would result in the serious impairment of the economy of our entire Nation.

The farm problem is a tremendous challenge to all of us who are close to agriculture. Sometimes it seems as if the questions presented cannot be solved. However, in these times of crises we must work together. The Congress alone cannot solve the problems presented to us. Our free-enterprise system is still the greatest in all the world. I have great faith in our system and am convinced that we will, in time, solve the farm problem as we have heretofore solved economic problems which sometimes seemed insurmountable, but which in the end were solved through perseverance and a determination to come up with a solution.

Appropriation Acts of the 83d Congress, 2d Session—Part X

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 18, 1954

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, this concludes my report to my constituents in the Second District of Illinois on the Appropriation Acts of the 83d Congress, 2d session, supplementing previous reports covering all the appropriation acts of the first session. I have thought they would wish to know, and in reasonable detail, just what we in the 83d Congress had done with their money and their credit.

The final public law, which follows, is not numbered for the reason that at this writing it had not been signed by the President:

PUBLIC LAW

H. R. 10051: Mutual Security Appropriation Act

A. Appropriates $2,781,490,816 for Mutual Security for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955. Requires the reporting to the Committee on Appropriations of the paying of engineering fees and services to any individual engineering firm on any 1 project in excess of $25,000. Prohibits the use of funds for the payment of debts of foreign countries, and prescribes conditions of payments to the European Payments Union. Directs the transportation of at least 50 percent of the gross tonnage of commodities procured hereunder and transported on ocean vessels be transported on United States flag vessels. Requires procurement of domestic equipment and materials except under certain specified conditions. Continues antistrike provisions.

B. Item:

MILITARY ASSISTANCE	*Appropriations*
General military assistance	$1,092,700,000
Infrastructure	100,000,000
Development of weapons of advance design (mutual special weapons planning)	
Total, military assistance	1,192,700,000
DIRECT FORCES SUPPORT	
Southeast Asia and Western Pacific	700,000,000
Production for forces support (manufacturing in United Kingdom)	35,000,000
Common-use items	60,000,000
Total, direct forces support	795,000,000
DEFENSE SUPPORT (MUTUAL DEFENSE FINANCING)	
Europe (excluding Greece and Turkey for 1955)	45,000,000
Special assistance in joint control areas in Europe	25,000,000
Near East, Africa and South Asia (including Greece and Turkey for 1955)	73,000,000
Far East and Pacific	80,098,195
Korean program (relief and rehabilitation in Korea)	205,000,000
United Nations Korean Reconstruction Agency	3,000,000
Total, defense support	431,098,195
DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE (SPECIAL REGIONAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE)	
Near East and Africa	115,000,000
South Asia (India)	60,500,000
India and Pakistan	----------
American Republics	9,000,000
Total, development assistance	184,500,000
TECHNICAL COOPERATION	
General authorization	105,000,000
United Nations expanded program of technical assistance (multilateral technical cooperation)	9,957,621
Organization of American States	1,500,000
Total, technical cooperation	116,457,621
OTHER PROGRAMS	
Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration (movement of migrants)	10,000,000
United Nations Children's Fund (international children's welfare work)	12,500,000
North Atlantic Treaty Organization	1,169,000
Ocean freight charges	4,400,000
Control Act expenses	1,175,000
Administrative expenses (other than defense)	32,500,000
Total, other programs	61,744,000
Total, Mutual Security	2,781,490,816

Republican Revision of Our Federal Tax Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, the Republican 83d Congress has completed one of the most monumental legislative undertakings in the history of our Nation in giving final congressional approval to the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, H. R. 8300. The President of the United States, who has termed this bill the "cornerstone" of his legislative program, signed this important measure into public law on August 16, 1954.

This legislation represents the first complete revision of our Federal tax law in over 78 years. Since the adoption of the previous Internal Revenue Code in 1939, 14 major revenue measures have been enacted into law increasing taxes. This has resulted in a Federal tax law that is fraught with complexities, inequities, and obsolete provisions.

The Internal Revenue Code of 1954 contains over 3,000 changes in our tax laws. The purpose of these changes is to remove tax barriers to further expansion of production and employment and to make our tax laws apply more fairly to our citizens. Over 500,000 man-hours of work were devoted to this project.

I am proud that as a member of the Committee on Ways and Means and as a member of the House-Senate tax conference committee, I helped to write this legislation. I am confident that this new tax law will remove many artificial restraints on our free enterprise system to permit the dynamic development of a peaceful and prosperous America.

This new Federal tax law of 929 pages will correct the countless inequities that were present in the old code and which were permitted to work against some of the most deserving groups of our taxpayers, such as working mothers, retired pensioners, widows, widowers, heads of families, and those burdened with high medical expenses. This new tax law also closes loopholes which were present in the old code and which permitted some taxpayers to avoid their fair share of the tax burden.

This Republican tax revision will result in a saving to the American taxpayer of $1.4 billion. This figure, when added to the $6 billion in tax reduction already made possible by the Republican 83d Congress, brings the total tax relief which has been granted since January 1, 1954, to a total of $7.4 billion. I might point out that the bulk of this total tax relief has gone to the individual taxpayer.

I would now like to briefly enumerate some of the highlights of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 without endeavoring to give a comprehensive recitation of these benefits or a technical explanation thereof.

RETIREMENT INCOME CREDIT

This provision allows a 20 percent tax credit on retirement income up to $1,200 for retired persons. This means a tax reduction for these retired people of up to $240 a year. It is estimated that over 1.5 million taxpayers will benefit from this provision at a tax saving of $141 million. I am pleased that it was my motion in committee which resulted in this important provision being included in the Internal Revenue Code of 1954. This relief will assure that our teachers, public employees, and other senior citizens will enjoy a more bountiful retirement.

DEPENDENTS

The $600 dependency exemption has been liberalized under the new Internal Revenue Code with respect to the requirements for qualification as a dependent. A taxpayer will be allowed to claim a deduction of $600 for each child under 19 years of age regardless of the child's earnings if the parent provides more than half of the child's support. If the child is over 18, the taxpayer can claim the child as a dependent if the child is attending school or college or receiving on-the-farm training. In this case, also, the parent is required to furnish over half the child's support. An aged parent or other dependent cared for by the contribution from several members of the family can be claimed as a deduction by one of the members of the family. Foster children and children awaiting adoption can similarly be claimed as dependents. If a taxpayer supports a person in the taxpayer's home, a dependency exemption of $600 may be taken regardless of relationship. In excess of 1.3 million taxpayers will benefit from this liberalized treatment of dependents with a tax saving of $85 million.

CHILD CARE EXPENSES

Under the 1939 code a taxpayer was not permitted to deduct amounts paid for child care expenses incurred to permit the taxpayer to be gainfully employed to provide for the child's support. The 1954 code will permit single working parents, such as a widow, to deduct up to $600 for the expense of child care for children up to 12 years of age. The same deduction is allowed for a married woman who must work because her husband is incapacitated. A similar deduction is allowed regardless of age where the dependent is mentally or physically incapable of caring for himself. A $600 deduction is also allowed in the case of a married woman if the combined income of her husband and herself does not exceed $5,100; 2.1 million taxpayers will realize an estimated tax saving of $130 million.

MEDICAL EXPENSES

Medical expenses can be deducted when they exceed 3 percent of adjusted gross income, instead of 5 percent as under prior law. The Internal Revenue Code of 1954 also doubles the maximum limit on the amount that can be deducted. It is expected that 8.5 million taxpayers will save $80 million in taxes as a result of this liberalized medical expense deduction provision.

HEAD OF FAMILY

Under the 1939 code a relative was required to reside in the taxpayer's household to qualify the latter as a head of household. The new code permits a taxpayer to qualify as a head of a household if he maintains a household for his dependent parent or parents, which need not be the same residence as his. Also a single taxpayer who has a dependent son or daughter will be entitled during the first 2 years after the death of his spouse to the same income-splitting privilege as is accorded married couples. This provision will grant the American taxpayer a tax saving of $11 million.

AID TO FARMERS

The Internal Revenue Code of 1954 permits a deduction of up to 25 percent of farm income spent for soil and water conservation. A more rapid writeoff of the expense of farm machinery, equipment, and construction is permitted under the new law. The tax is removed on the proceeds realized from the sale of cattle where the sale is necessitated by disease. These tax savings to American farmers will amount to over $10 million a year.

CREDIT PURCHASES

On installment purchases a deduction for interest of up to 6 percent is allowed. The total saving to the American taxpayer from this provision will be $10 million.

EMPLOYEE ACCIDENT AND SICKNESS BENEFITS

Employees will no longer be taxed on any employer contributions to an accident or health plan whether this plan is insured or noninsured. All accident and health benefits paid as reimbursement as medical expenses are completely exempted from tax. Compensation received by employees for loss of wages due to injury or illness is exempt up to $100 a week.

DEATH BENEFITS

All death benefits up to $5,000 paid by an employer to the widow or other beneficiary of the deceased employee will be exempt.

PENSION AND ANNUITIES

In addition to the $1,200 exemption extended to retirement income to which I previously referred, the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 also provides a simpler method for taxation of annuity and pension income based on purchase cost divided by years of life expectancy. This new provision will represent a saving of $10 million to the American taxpayer.

LIFE INSURANCE

The estate tax on the proceeds on certain life insurance policies will be reduced under the new code with a saving to individual taxpayers of $25 million.

DOUBLE TAXATION OF DIVIDENDS

The Internal Revenue Code of 1954 grants partial relief from the double taxation of dividends. This is accomplished by excluding the first $50 in dividends from taxation and providing a credit against tax equal to 4 percent of the balance. This provision will benefit millions of American taxpayers and will provide increased funds for equity investment to insure the development of American productive facilities.

DEPRECIATION

The Internal Revenue Code of 1954 has greatly liberalized the write-off of the cost of new equipment. This more rapid recovery of investment cost will make it easier for small business to obtain credit for modernization and expansion. It will assist the farmer in maintaining modern equipment and buildings on his farm. It will also encourage greater availability of jobs for the American worker.

TAX RETURNS

The requirements are eased for filing declarations of estimated tax with millions of taxpayers relieved from the present requirement for filing. Tax returns will be due April 15 instead of March 15, giving taxpayers 1 additional month in which to prepare their final tax return and make their tax payments.

SCHOLARSHIPS, PRIZES, AND AWARDS

The new code will exempt payments for fellowships and scholarships for individuals who are candidates for degrees unless the payments are made for services rendered. Certain prizes and awards that are given in recognition of religious, charitable, scientific, educational, artistic, literary, or civic achievement will generally be tax exempt.

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT COSTS

Taxpayers are given an option to either deduct as an expense or to amortize research and experimental expenditures. This provision will encourage business research with the objective of creating new jobs, new processes, and new products.

INVENTIONS

The new code extends capital gains treatment to proceeds realized by an inventor on the sale or exchange of a patent. This new tax treatment will encourage invention and thereby give impetus to an ever-improving standard of living and a healthy economy.

CONSOLIDATED RETURNS

The 2 percent penalty tax with respect to consolidated returns filed by regulated public utilities is removed. Also the stockownership requirement of an affiliate group was reducer from 95 percent to 80 percent.

NET OPERATING LOSS

The new code extends the net operating loss carryback 1 additional year to make it 2 years and makes certain other adjustment in this area.

IMPROPER ACCUMULATION OF SURPLUS

The penalty tax on certain accumulated earnings has been eased so that business, especially small business, may have greater freedom in retaining funds for legitimate business purposes.

Other important changes were made in the provisions of the Federal tax law affecting the taxation of partnerships, corporate adjustments and distributions, depletion, and similar areas of interest of both individual and corporate taxpayers.

In the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 we have, Mr. Speaker, greatly simplified our Federal tax structure. I am confident that as these provisions have their full effect upon our American economy, we will find our free-enterprise system operating more effectively for the welfare of all Americans. Citizens from my great State of Ohio and from every State in the Union will find that this cornerstone of President Eisenhower's legislative program as enacted by the Republican 83d Congress will provide an economic atmosphere conducive to expanding business, greater employment, and an ever-increasing well-being on the part of the American people.

Granahan Finds Government's Distressed Area Procurement Program a Dud, but Urges Philadelphia Firms To Seek To Participate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM T. GRANAHAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 19, 1954

Mr. GRANAHAN. Mr. Speaker, the Philadelphia labor market area continues to be one of the so-called distressed areas of the country with a high incidence of unemployment. This Congress is unfortunately adjourning without taking any really important steps toward the alleviation of unemployment in Philadelphia or anywhere else. Therefore, we can look to a continuation of high unemployment in the country for some time under present policies. It is a grim prospect. It is a tragic thing that this country cannot maintain the prosperity which we had begun to take almost for granted under Democratic administrations.

I have spoken here from time to time on the necessity for better unemployment compensation benefits in order to maintain some semblance of purchasing power among the involuntary unemployed, but our efforts to increase benefits were blocked here by the adverse votes of the majority party.

I have urged an expansion of work at the naval shipyard, including the award of one of the new *Forrestal*-type carriers, but that was refused by the Navy Department.

I have sought an increase in the minimum wage so that Philadelphia firms will no longer lose as much business to unscrupulous competitors who wax prosperous on the low-wage rates they are permitted to pay in some areas of the Nation where wage rates are not only far below Philadelphia standards but below minimum standards of decency. This Congress showed no interest in that.

And so it has gone in connection with virtually every proposal which has been made here to try to bolster our economy and give it greater strength, thus assuring more prosperity for all.

DISTRESSED AREA PROGRAM WAS SUPPOSED TO HELP

One of the few constructive steps which have been taken by the Government in the past year to try to help the areas of high unemployment was a program borrowed from the Truman administration intended to channel Government orders into the group IV, or substantial-surplus labor areas.

I have been most interested in this program, particularly since Philadelphia became a group IV area in June and thus became eligible for special consideration under this program.

But the results of it have been almost nil. They are summarized, I think, in the opening paragraphs of a press release which I issued on July 18, which began as follows:

> Granahan Finds Government's Distressed Area Procurement Program a Dud, But Urges Philadelphia Firms To Seek To Participate
>
> Congressman William T. Granahan, Democrat, of Philadelphia, last night urged Philadelphia firms to go after Government contracts under the distressed area procurement program, but warned them the program so far has been a dud.
>
> "The General Services Administration isn't even participating in it and the Defense Department has done practically nothing under it up to now," Granahan reported.
>
> The Second District Congressman revealed that he wrote GSA Administrator Edmund F. Mansure and Secretary of Defense Charles E. Wilson more than a month ago—shortly after Philadelphia was placed in the group IV category of substantial labor surplus—to inquire how the special procurement program in distressed areas has been working and to learn what Philadelphia firms can do to participate in it.
>
> "I received a reply in about 2 weeks from the General Services Administration," he reported. "They said that at this time in GSA there is insufficient area for effective implementation of the defense manpower policy directive dealing with negotiated contracts and special set-aside orders in surplus labor areas. So they aren't doing anything about it.
>
> "The Defense Department took nearly a month to inform me it has done practically nothing under this program except to advise the various branches of the military that where appropriate they are to try to channel some of their procurement into surplus labor areas as long as prices are no higher than they would otherwise be.
>
> "In the first 3 months of operation of this program since its much-publicized announcement by the Eisenhower administration as an antirecession move, the Defense Department apologetically states it placed only four contracts in labor surplus areas under the special machinery of this program. It explained that it takes time to get a program like this into operation."

THE 4 CONTRACTS TOTALED ONLY $163,159

Mr. Speaker, the 4 contracts the Defense Department referred to as representing the total of its contract awards under this program during the first 3 months of operation came to the grand total of $163,159—a drop in the bucket.

During the same period, the military awarded $35 million worth of defense contracts in labor surplus areas under normal procedures without regard to this special program. So it is obvious that the special program has been pretty much of a failure.

Nevertheless, I have urged Philadelphia firms in need of work to keep their plants and payrolls occupied to take the following steps suggested by the Defense Department to learn about and apply for Government contracts:

First. Register on the bidders' list of every military purchasing office which may procure items of supply that the firm is capable of manufacturing.

Second. Obtain from the Government Printing Office two Defense Department publications: One entitled "How To Sell to the Department of Defense," listing procedures to be followed in getting on appropriate bidders' lists; and another entitled "Purchased Items and Purchasing Locations of the Department of Defense," giving a commodity listing of items purchased and the purchasing offices which do the buying.

Third. Subscribe, for $7 a year, to the daily fact-sheet publication of the Department of Commerce entitled "Synopsis of United States Government Proposed Procurement and Contract Awards," listing all current or future procurement items on which bids are invited.

The special defense manpower policy dealing with labor surplus areas was first set up in the 1949–50 period by former President Truman to channel Government orders into group IV areas—where 6 percent or more of the labor force is unemployed. The program was revived early this year by President Eisenhower.

MANY PROCUREMENT OFFICES IN PHILADELPHIA AREA

Under it, Government agencies are to give preference on tie bids to firms from group IV areas. In addition, they are authorized to set aside up to 20 percent of their procurement of a particular item for award on a negotiated price basis to firms in group IV areas, provided the price on these contracts is no higher than the price arrived at through open bidding on the other 80 percent.

Among Defense Department purchasing offices listed in Philadelphia by the publication Purchased Items and Purchasing Locations are the Corps of Engineers, City Centre Building, 121 North Broad Street; Frankford Arsenal; Philadelphia Ordnance District, 1500 Chestnut Street; Quartermaster Depot; Signal Corps Supply Agency, 225 South 18th Street; Navy General Stores Supply Office, and Navy Aviation Supply Office, both at 700 Robbins Avenue; Submarine Supply Office, Rittenhouse Square Building, 19th and Walnut Streets; the Navy Shipyard and the Naval Air Material Center at the Naval Base; and the Marine Corps Depot of Supplies.

The document gives a breakdown of the types of items purchased by each of these and all other Defense Department installations.

Prior to Philadelphia's recent designation by the Labor Department as a group IV labor surplus area eligible for participation in the special procurement program, Mr. Speaker, I had been seeking to persuade the Defense Department to take steps to keep the ACF-Brill Motors Co. plant from closing down for lack of orders.

The Department informed me at that time that ACF-Brill was certainly familiar with what Government contracts were available and that nothing special could be done for the firm unless it won its own contracts on a competitive basis.

FIRMS MUST STILL FIND OWN BIDDING OPPORTUNITIES

When Philadelphia was placed in group IV, however, I renewed this inquiry with special reference to the procurement program for distressed areas. I asked what not only ACF-Brill but all firms in the Philadelphia area could do to get Government contracts under the Defense Manpower Policy Directive. The answer still seems to be that they have to go out and find their own bid opportunities.

Obviously, with so few contracts awarded in surplus areas under the set-aside feature in the first 3 months of operation, the program has not been accomplishing what it was set up to do. Probably it is up to the individual firm to prove to procurement officials that a set-aside on a particular item would be deemed appropriate.

In my letters to Wilson and Mansure, I had asked:

> In view of the alarming increase in unemployment in many areas of the Nation, resulting in the current listing of 51 major industrial centers as group IV areas of substantial (6 to 12 percent) or very substantial (12 percent or more) unemployment, does the Department of Defense or GSA have any present plans for a substantial increase either in the tempo of this special manpower policy program or in the total overall amount of defense procurement?

Al E. Snyder, Assistant Administrator of GSA, replied for Mansure that unless and until the scope and size of GSA procurement for Defense and certain civilian agencies are expanded, GSA has no plans for participating in the set-aside program.

DEFENSE DEPARTMENT INDICATES PROGRAM IS SMALL

T. P. Pike, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Supply and Logistics, replying for Wilson, said:

> Military requirements, of course, are limited by the amount of appropriations made available for procurement purposes. As a consequence we are unable to increase the overall amount of procurement. Our requirements verification is based upon the concept that delivery schedules as well as particular items and quantities of such items must be accurately stated and planned. Thus, we are unable to substantially increase the tempo of the procurement program without correspondingly disrupting the entire program.

Mr. Speaker, I guess this means "No."

At least, however, Pike has assured me the Defense Department is sympathetic with the unemployment problems and that in the procurement of our requirements, appropriate consideration will be given to bids received from firms located in the Philadelphia area.

What all this adds up to is that it obviously is not much of a program to date, but in view of our unemployment problems and the need for more contracts, I urge all Philadelphia area firms with idle plant capacity to go after these Government contracts wherever possible.

THE OFFICIAL DIRECTIVE ON SET-ASIDES

Defense Department procurement officials have been ordered by the Pentagon to conform to the Defense Manpower Policy Directive by doing the following:

First:

> Use their best efforts to award negotiated procurements to contractors located in labor surplus areas for performance substantially within such areas to the extent that procurement objectives will permit; provided, that in no case shall price differentials be paid for the purpose of carrying out this policy.

Second:

> Where deemed appropriate, set-aside portions of procurements for negotiation exclusively with firms located in labor surplus areas at prices no higher than those paid on the non-set-aside portion.

Third:

Assure that firms in labor surplus areas which are on appropriate bidders' lists are given an opportunity to submit bids or proposals on all procurements for which they are qualified and on which small business joint determinations have not been made.

EXCHANGE OF CORRESPONDENCE WITH GSA, DEFENSE

Mr. Speaker, following are the texts of the letters which I sent to General Services Administrator Mansure and Defense Secretary Wilson on this matter and the replies which I received:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., June 15, 1954.

Hon. EDMUND F. MANSURE,
Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MANSURE: In view of the recent designation of Philadelphia as a group IV–A labor market area (substantial unemployment of between 6 and 12 percent), and in view of the special program outlined in ODM Defense Manpower Policy Directive No. 4 last November directed at relieving unemployment in group IV areas, will you please let me know:

1. What steps can Philadelphia firms take—and where can they obtain complete and accurate information—to enable them to qualify for portions of pending Government procurement contracts under General Services Administration jurisdiction in pursuance of ODM Defense Manpower Policy Directive No. 4?

2. Is the program outlined under this policy directive actually in operation on GSA procurement? If so, can you advise me what contracts have been channeled to what firms in what localities pursuant to this policy? I ask this because I have received conflicting information—on the one hand that no procurement has been carried out under this policy directive, and on the other hand that only about $130,000 worth of orders have been so placed by GSA and the Department of Defense combined. My inquiry to you concerns only the GSA experience under the program.

3. In view of the alarming increase in unemployment in many areas of the Nation, resulting in the current listing of 51 major industrial or business centers in the group IV category, does your agency have any present plans for a substantial increase in the tempo of procurement under the ODM Defense Manpower Policy Directive No. 4?

I will very much appreciate an early reply, so that I can pass this information on to interested business firms and employee groups in the Philadelphia area.

Sincerely yours,
WILLIAM T. GRANAHAN.

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., June 25, 1954.

Re Defense Manpower Policy No. 4.

Hon. WILLIAM T. GRANAHAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN GRANAHAN: Your letter of June 15, 1954, requests certain information as to the activities and policy of this Administration with regard to ODM Defense Manpower Policy No. 4, in order that you may advise interested business firms and employee groups in the Philadelphia area.

Pending completion of arrangements with the Department of Defense and certain civilian agencies, which will enlarge the scope and size of General Services Administration procurement, it has been determined, and the purchasing offices of this Administration so advised, that, at this time, there is insufficient area for effective implementation of those paragraphs of Defense Manpower Policy No. 4 (revised) which provides for the negotiation of contracts and the use of set-asides to place contracts within surplus labor areas.

The remaining provisions of the implementation applicable to all procurement agencies are being implemented with respect to procurement by the Federal Supply Service, with particular emphasis on paragraphs IV.B 3 and 4, with regard to "bidders' list" and "tie bids," respectively.

Separate mailing lists are maintained by each GSA regional office. Philadelphia firms interested in bidding on GSA procurement should make application direct to these offices for the inclusion of their names on the appropriate bidders' mailing list. For your information, a list of the General Services Administration purchasing offices is enclosed.

No plans are being made at this time to alter our present policy with regard to Defense Manpower Policy No. 4. However, to the extent that procurement directives will permit, we will continue to cooperate to the fullest extent with the Office of Defense Mobilization.

Cordially yours,
AL E. SNYDER,
Assistant Administrator.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., June 15, 1954.

Hon. CHARLES E. WILSON,
Secretary, Department of Defense,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WILSON: As you may recall, I wrote to you May 10 in regard to the situation of the ACF-Brill Motors Co., whose employees had indicated to me that the company might have to close its Philadelphia plant because of lack of defense orders, and asked what prospect there was for an increase in orders to this important Philadelphia facility.

I received in reply a letter from T. P. Pike, Assistant Secretary for Supply and Logistics, dated May 29, which stated that there is no means by which the Brill Co. could be accorded any preferential treatment and indicating that price considerations almost entirely determine the award of defense contracts.

Since that time, Philadelphia has been designated as a group IV surplus labor area by the Department of Labor. Under Office of Defense Mobilization Defense Manpower Policy No. 4 issued last November, I understand that provision is made for a set-aside on Government procurement contracts so that up to 20 percent of any such contract can be channelled to group IV surplus labor areas on a matching-bid basis—that is, if suppliers can meet low bids submitted by contractors bidding on the other 80 percent.

In view of the designation of Philadelphia as a group IV area eligible for this special consideration, I should like to broaden my earlier inquiry of May 10 to ask the following:

1. What steps can Philadelphia firms take—and where can they obtain complete and accurate information to enable them to qualify for portions of pending procurement contracts under Defense Manpower Policy No. 4?

2. Is the program outlined under this policy directive actually in operation? If so, can you advise me what contracts have been channeled to what firms in what localities, pursuant to this policy? I ask this question because I have received information that no procurement has been carried out so far under the policy directive of last November. I have also received information that the dollar value of contracts so awarded under this program totals only about $130,000. In view of the conflicting information, I would appreciate an authoritative report on the actual status of the program.

3. In view of the alarming increase in unemployment in many areas of the Nation, resulting in the current listing of 51 major industrial centers as group IV areas of substantial (6 to 12 percent) or very substantial (12 percent or more) unemployment, does the Department of Defense have any present plans for a substantial increase either in the tempo of this special distressed area procurement program or in the total overall amount of defense procurement?

While my original inquiry to you on May 10 was based primarily on the prospect of a shutdown of the Brill Co. plant because of lack of defense orders, I am now seeking information which can be useful not only to that firm but to all of the firms in the Philadelphia area which could benefit from increased defense orders and which could thereby help relieve our serious unemployment problem.

Sincerely yours,
WILLIAM T. GRANAHAN.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D. C., July 7, 1954.

Hon. WILLIAM T. GRANAHAN,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. GRANAHAN: Further reference is made to your letter of June 15 in which you request additional information regarding the awarding of defense contracts to firms in the Philadelphia area.

The Department of Defense has implemented Defense Manpower Policy No. 4 through the Armed Services Procurement Regulation. Essentially this regulation directs the military departments to comply with the following:

"Use their best efforts to award negotiated procurements to contractors located in labor surplus areas for performance substantially within such areas to the extent that procurement objectives will permit; provided, that in no case shall price differentials be paid for the purpose of carrying out this policy.

"Where deemed appropriate, set-aside portions of procurements for negotiation exclusively with firms located in labor surplus areas at prices no higher than those paid on the non-set-aside portion.

"Assure that firms in labor surplus areas which are on appropriate bidders' lists are given an opportunity to submit bids or proposals on all procurements for which they are qualified and on which small business joint determinations have not been made."

The above policy was published in revision No. 28 to the Armed Services Procurement Regulation on January 9, 1954. Distribution of the revision to all procurement offices was not fully accomplished until the first part of February and was applicable only to procurements initiated after receipt. Most procurements require a processing period of from 1 to 3 months between the time of invitations and the time of awards. Consequently, the first and only available report under the revised policy, January–March 1954, perhaps does not reflect a true picture of the program. During that period 4 contracts totaling $163,159 were placed in labor surplus areas through the setaside preference. In the same period contracts totaling approximately $35 million were placed in labor surplus areas through our normal procurement procedures.

In order to participate in defense procurement or receive consideration because of location in a labor surplus area it is essential that manufacturing firms in the Philadelphia area be registered on the bidders' list of every military purchasing office which may procure items of supply that the firms are capable of manufacturing. Reviewing the list of firms from Philadelphia that have been prime contractors to the military departments and those which at present have contracts, it is evident that these firms are familiar with military procurement and thoroughly understand the procedures for obtaining defense contracts.

There are no doubt firms in the area which have not in the past endeavored to obtain defense contracts. The chamber of commerce or other civic organizations should encourage such firms to participate in the program. To this end certain information should be passed on to these firms.

The Department of Defense has recently published two pamphlets designed to assist manufacturing firms in doing business with the military. The first pamphlet, How To Sell to the Department of Defense, contains general information about Government contracts and the procedures to be followed in getting on appropriate bidders' list. The second pamphlet, Purchased Items and Purchasing Locations of the Department of Defense, contains a commodity listing of items purchased and the purchasing offices which do the procuring. Copies of the above pamphlets are enclosed for your information. Manufacturing firms or prospective suppliers may purchase these pamphlets from the Superintendent of Documents, United States Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C.

Information with respect to proposed procurements and contract awards is published daily by the Department of Commerce. This publication Synopsis of United States Government Proposed Procurement and Contract Awards may be subscribed to by business firms at $7 per year as indicated on the copy which is enclosed for your information.

There are some 8 or 10 military purchasing offices in Philadelphia as indicated in the enclosed pamphlets. Firms located in that area may obtain procurement information from any of these offices.

Military requirements, of course, are limited by the amount of appropriations made available for procurement purposes. As a consequence we are unable to increase the overall amount of procurement. Our requirements verification is based upon the concept that delivery schedules as well as particular items and quantities of such items must be accurately stated and planned. Thus we are unable to substantially increase the tempo of the procurement program without correspondingly disrupting the entire program.

Please be assured that the Department of Defense is sympathetic with the unemployment problems and that in the procurement of our requirements appropriate consideration will be given to bids received from firms located in the Philadelphia area.

Sincerely yours,

T. P. PIKE.

Does the Eisenhower-Churchill "List" Include the Restoration of Freedom and Independence by Self-Determination to All the Once Free and Independent Nations Now Captive and Enslaved by Communist Russian Red Colonialism?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I should like to bring to the attention of the House some reactions of Americans of eastern European descent to a matter which I brought to the attention of the House 3 days ago, August 17. I refer to the confusion caused by Churchill's statement concerning the "list," which he claimed was drawn up between himself and the President of the United States on the occasion of their recent meeting in Washington. This "list" would appear to have included those nations occupied by the Russian Communists, the restoration of whose freedom and independence, the United States and the United Kingdom still seem to have some interest. From this "list," declared Churchill, some nations were excluded.

There is no other interpretation possible with regard to this extraordinary disclosure, than that those nations, excluded from the famous—or should I say infamous—"list," are about to be bargained away under the pressures of the requirements of a coexistence policy.

This obvious interpretation of Churchill's statement, I am certain has already spread throughout all of Europe, both sides of the Iron Curtain, and has caused renewed anxiety and widespread discouragement among our most dependable allies. Aggravated by the present moves of the Kremlin to create a paralysis of the forces of freedom by advocating peaceful coexistence, our friends of central and eastern Europe, and all thinking Americans have expressed alarm at these developments.

As an example of the reaction to the administration's appeasement program, many people of the Rumanian-American group have expressed to me their foreboding, recalling what happened in 1944, when Churchill ceded Rumania to Stalin, in order to have an illusory free hand in Greece, and they fear a similar deal could have been envisaged in Washington as part of the overall objective for insuring coexistence between the expanding Soviet tyranny and the shrinking free world. This foreboding is confirmed in their view by the determination of the Soviet Union to destroy a country of 20 millions, which since the outbreak of the Bolshevik revolution, proved to be one of the most intransigent anti-Russian and anti-Communist outposts of Europe.

In addition to this strong and continuous insistence of the Soviet Union on strengthening its control over Rumania, they mention the well-known attitude of Great Britain, as well as the apparent disinterest of American propaganda for that region. The fact was brought to my attention, for instance, that a so-called Iron Curtain propaganda agency, like the National Committee for a Free Europe, while spending huge sums for propaganda in other less important sectors, ignores almost completely the cause of the Rumania nation.

These same feelings have been expressed to me by responsible leaders of other American organizations representative of persons from other non-Russian nations now imprisoned in the Red colonial empire. It is therefore apparent that the Churchill statement, together with the ominous silence of the White House, has cast a dark and harmful shadow upon United States intentions toward the non-Russian nations enslaved by the Russian Communists.

Similar rumors are spreading in other national groups, I have been informed.

Commonsense dictates that we must not forget the hundreds of millions of non-Russian people who are enslaved behind the Iron Curtain, who in the event of an all-out war with the Russian Communists, will prove to be our real secret weapon.

It is of vital importance to us not to lose faith and support of those hundreds of millions of anti-Communist people.

Cyprus Is Entitled To Exercise the Right of Self-Determination

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 18, 1954

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, in a few days, when we are concluding our deliberations here and returning to meet our constituents in our respective districts, the General Assembly of the United Nations will be starting on the important work of its agenda. The petition for the extension of the right of self-determination to the people of the Mediterranean island of Cyprus will come before the General Assembly. It is vitally important to our position in world esteem that the full force and influence of the United States should be thrown in support of this petition.

As indexing the tremendous interest of the people of the United States, and the profound sympathy they feel with the islanders of Cyprus in their yearning to return to the motherhood of 33 centuries, is the monster mass meeting scheduled for Orchestra Hall in the city of Chicago. Similar gatherings are being held in other cities throughout the United States. John L. Manta, outstanding civic leader in Chicago and a distinguished constituent of mine, is chairman of the Justice for Cyprus Committee that has arranged the great mass meeting in Chicago's Orchestra Hall. Other members of the committee are: Dr. Basil J. Photos, first vice chairman; John Manos, second vice chairman; Peter Shepis, treasurer; Costas Proussis, Secretary; James Gregory, Van A. Nomikos, James Glyman, Paul Demos, Peter Gianakos, William Belroy, A. A. Pantelis, George Bourlos, Apostolos Flambouras, Prof. Philip Constantinides, Dr. Nicholas T. Drake, Dr. E. Despotes, Dr. S. Soter, Takis Christopoulos, Dem. Athanasopoulos, Mark Mamalakis, Arthur H. Peponis, Themis Anagnost, Theodore Constant, George Askounis, Prof. Kostis Argos, D. Michalaros, Andrew Fasseas, George Porikos, George Kolettis, Helen Tangalakis, Helen Sanichas, Adeline Jay Geo-Karis, Kay Proussis, James Michael Mezilson, Andrew Teacherson, Paul Javaras, Demetrios Papageorge, Peter Mantzoros, and George Smainis.

CYPRUS IS GREEK

Over 80 percent of the inhabitants of Cyprus are Greek. For close to a century they have sought by petition, plebiscites and manifestos, to affect reunion with the fatherland. Five years ago they voted in the last plebiscite 96 percent of the entire Greek adult population of Cyprus for union with Greece.

What answer to their prayers can be made except that to them as to all the other peoples of the world shall be given the right of self-determination? Not to do so would be to make a hollow mockery of the words with which we define for the free world the goals of freedom to meet the aspirations of peoples everywhere.

Why should Cyprus in the hands of Great Britain be denied the right of self-determination in any less degree than that enjoyed by the islands of the Philippines when the fate of those islands was in our hands? We gave to the Philippine Islands everything that we could to help them as one brother helps another, and we climaxed it by keeping to the letter our promise of full sovereignty as a free and independent nation.

Should Great Britain do less? Can I as a veteran of the Spanish-American War, which placed in our lap the destiny of the Philippines, and as a Member of the Congress of the United States of America, withhold the raising of my voice to demand that as we gave self-determination to the peoples of the islands of the Philippines, so shall Great Britain do with the peoples of Cyprus?

GOES BACK 33 CENTURIES

It has been over 33 centuries since the Greeks from Arcadia settled in Cyprus. That is a long, long time. It began 14 centuries before, from a cradle in Bethlehem came the Light of the World. All during these centuries the blood of the Greek has coursed in the veins of the men, the women, and the children of Cyprus. Great world-shaping events have changed the course of history, empires have risen and have fallen. Cyprus through it all has remained a land of Greek blood, of Greek sentiment, and of Greek culture.

Greece, the birthplace of democracy, is today as always a bulwark of democracy. Of the very essence of democracy is the right of self-determination. It is for the retrenchment of that right to be enjoyed by all peoples everywhere that the United States is throwing the full force of her tremendous manpower and wealth into the fight of the free world for a better world than any we have known. It has not been an easy fight, and before the end is reached there will be many other severe demands for sacrifice, for courage, and for faith.

It is not an easy fight because there are so many inequities, now deeply rooted in their practice, that have to be eradicated until from the old world of imperialism, of colonialism, and of small nations existing only at the pleasure of strong nations, we have built the new world of our dreams, and I might say of the dreams of the philosophers and the statesmen of the ancient Greece whose descendants in Cyprus now are knocking at the door of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

I have mentioned the Philippine Islands. There were these in the United States who strongly advocated the retention of those islands as a possession of the United States. Had that been done, and we had broken our pledge to the islanders, there is no place in all the world where our voice in the court of public opinion would have been listened to with respect. But when we voluntarily gave to the islanders the full sovereignty which they desired, we proved to the world that the peoples and the Government of the United States practiced what they preached.

STUPID TO BE STUBBORN

Great Britain was allied with the United States in World War I and in World War II. In the present international crisis these two great nations are still standing together, firmly bound for mutual assistance and defense. There should be no lessening of the bonds that unite. Great Britain also has been united by close ties of friendship with Greece. There should be no lessening of the ties that bind Great Britain and Greece.

It is unthinkable that Great Britain in this critical point in history would risk the lessening of these bonds by a stubbornness the like of which under similar unjustified circumstances there have been few, if any, incidents in all recorded history.

Cyprus is of no material value to Great Britain. Her only valid reason for wishing to continue her political domination is for the maintaining of military bases. Greece as a friend and ally is willing that Great Britain should continue to maintain in Cyprus the military bases necessary to her protection. That is the arrangement we have with the Republic of the Philippines. If the arrangement is satisfactory to us, can Great Britain expect us to interpret her attitude in a similar situation as anything less than sheer and stupid stubborness?

GLADSTONE FAVORED UNION

In 1897—57 years ago—the great Gladstone told his countrymen that the population of the Hellenic island of Cyprus should be organically united with their brethren of Greece.

In 1907, Winston Churchill spoke of the aspiration of the people of Cyprus for union with their motherland as an ideal earnestly, devoutly, and fervently to be cherished.

To be stubborn for a day can be annoying. To be stubborn for a year can be provocative. To be stubborn for a half a century and more is going away outside the limitation of tolerance and patience.

BRITAIN SHOULD RECEDE

I hope and pray that the statesmanship of Great Britain will free itself of this deep-rooted stubbornness. I hope and pray that graciously the Government of Great Britain will recede from its position and join the rest of the free world in ushering in the new day of the return of Cyprus to the Hellenic fold.

If that gracious course Great Britain declines, preferring to be stubborn rather than wise and cooperative, then there is but one course to be pursued by the General Assembly of the United Nations.

Cyprus belongs where her people wish her to be, again after centuries of separation back in the Hellenic fold.

Sound Liberal Programs and Policies Provide Impetus To Development of the West

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS H. KUCHEL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement I have prepared.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The past 2 years have brought marked and reassuring changes in the attitude of the Federal Government toward the progressive, energetic, venturesome, and determined people of the West.

In my home State of California dissatisfaction had developed about the way on occasion after occasion the expanding West had been virtually ignored by the National Government. There was, in the past, undeniable and widespread resentment that many pressing problems received scant attention in the National Capital. It is heartening to know that sentiment has changed. The millions of devoted citizens of the West are grateful that their problems now receive sympathetic consideration, that their ambitions are being nourished, and that their energies are appreciated.

The accomplishments of the 83d Congress have wiped out the basis for earlier complaints that the West, despite towering evidence of its expanding economy and mounting population, was being neglected.

These constructive and reassuring achievements were made possible because of the unselfish, patriotic fashion in which this Congress labored. The passage of bills for the welfare of the Nation and my State was facilitated by the unusual degree of bipartisan harmony and the readiness of Members on both sides of the aisle to cooperate in advancing the multiple interest of our people.

The developing history of our Nation contains clear evidence of a departure from a paternalistic and a sometimes domineering attitude on the part of the Federal Government toward its constituent units. In California, especially, we are thankful for the trend toward willing cooperation and consultation, the determination to carry on a program of sound liberal approaches to successive problems, and the cautious conservatism that fosters our energies and our resources.

The record of the 83d Congress has been characterized as "can do" and as "will do." In my estimation, the 83d Congress actually did. It enacted a host of measures which will benefit our Nation as a whole. It displayed respect for the independence and the stature of our people. It acknowledged the rights and responsibilities of other units of Government. It passed legislation to promote the economic and social welfare of the entire country.

Many analyses and reviews of the legislative record have highlighted the disposition of Congress to improve and perfect and extend activities and procedures which make Government the servant, not the master, of the people. Appraisals of the measures which have been shaped on the anvil of discussion and debate emphasize the way in which liberal and conservative viewpoints have been blended to the advantage of a forward-looking America.

A number of my colleagues have directed attention to the many achievements of Congress during the first 2 years of the Eisenhower administration. I wish to register the appreciation of California for different particular pieces of legislation which are vital to a State with many growing pains, assorted interests, and promising potentialities.

California will share with all other States in future benefits flowing from various new laws inscribed on the statute books. Because of its cosmopolitan makeup, its wide variety of conditions and concerns, and numerous challenges to the courage and ability of its people, California has extraordinary reason to approve the course on which the Federal Government is proceeding.

The 2d session of the 83d Congress wound up with an impressive boxscore of accomplishment. I desire to enumerate a number of constructive actions of distinct importance and value to my State. There is considerable satisfaction in having been able to play a small part in bringing them to an acceptable conclusion.

BENEFITS FROM GENERAL LAWS

Pieces of legislation of national scope which are decidedly beneficial to California include the following:

The Federal highway law: Because it extends so far along the coast, is traversed by key segments of the national highway system, and has an unusual concentration of motor vehicles, California is grappling constantly with traffic congestion problems this bill is intended to help alleviate. In company with 11 colleagues from both sides of the aisle, I was grateful for the chance of becoming cosponsor of a bill extending the Federal aid program for another 2 years because good roads are so vital to America's economy. The feature allocating part of future Federal grants with regard to population will materially aid my State, which is entitled to a total of $46,988,000. Having 5.11 percent of the national total of interstate highway mileage, California's $9,746,000 for this kind of construction will give an impetus to improvement of routes used by hundreds of thousands of visitors as well as our own people. Under the formula set out in the law, California also will receive $14,459,000 for primary, $7,444,000 for secondary, and $15,339,000 for urban highways.

The lease-purchase law: An inevitable consequence of California's phenomenal population increase in the past two decades is a dire need for new and larger buildings to overcome space shortages and crowding in post offices, courthouses, and other Federal structures. Scores of California communities deserve buildings better located, more efficiently laid out, and with adequate space. As the person assigned to steer this bill on the floor of the Senate, I appreciate the backing of so many of my colleagues who supported our amendments designed to safeguard the National Treasury and the interests of the taxpayers against possible extravagance, waste, and needless expenditures. The novel program for acquiring buildings made possible by this law should result in better service to the public, saving of time and money by Government agencies in their operations, and speedier transaction of business.

The Federal Housing Act: Several features were specially designed to help solve unique problems in my State. The terrific demand for homes in California's spreading communities cannot be filled for a long time, so we may be expected to use the revised housing program enthusiastically. Particular provisions I proposed to fit particular situations clear the way for a commendable redevelopment plan in the City of Richmond and will enable southern California Indians to replace unsanitary, deteriorating homes.

The Omnibus Public Works Act: Urgent protection to several sections of our State against floods will be provided, port facilities will be improved, and restoration of beaches encouraged through the authorization of Federal expenditures exceeding $50 million for projects in California. These carefully planned undertakings, most of which call for a high degree of local participation, will promote our economy and make the State a more attractive place to live. The Senate Public Works Committee, by adding four projects I advocated wholeheartedly, made this measure of material significance to our State. The program includes the dredging of Los Angeles-Long Beach, Richmond, Port Hueneme, and Playa del Rey harbors; beach erosion control and repair at Anaheim Bay, between Point Mugu and San Pedro, and between Carpenteria and Point Mugu; and further or new flood protection in Los Angeles County, in the Sacramento Basin, on the lower San Joaquin River, on the Santa Maria and San Lorenzo Rivers, and on San Lorenzo Creek. Total work in California made possible under the bill will exceed $184 million in cost.

Maritime legislation: The Fishermen's Protective Act, bolstering our traditional insistence on freedom of the seas, will remove a threat of seizure by certain foreign nations that has brought uneasiness to boat owners and crew. My part as cosponsor in putting this measure through Congress was prompted by the far-reaching effect of maritime activities on California's commercial activity and employment. The measure implementing the North Pacific fishing convention will further conservation of varieties of fish important to our fishermen and canneries and is related measure that will safeguard the future of our State. The various new construction laws, such as the Emergency Ship Repair Act with I cosponsored enthusiastically because it is a form of national life insurance, should check the decline of California building and repair yards and in time increase our commerce. With west coast shipyards allotted 29 percent of the work of modernizing vessels from the mothball fleet, more employment for California workers appears in prospect.

School and airport construction appropriations: California, one of the leaders in all branches of aviation, always has been progressive in providing airport facilities, but even the most awake communities have been unable to keep pace with the mounting demands of air transportation and private flying. As I noted in remarks in the Senate, America's transportation system must be geared to the atomic age and the $22 million fund reviving the Federal airport program will allow a number of projects to go forward in my State, which has been allotted over $900,000. Because of the varied activities of Federal agencies in California, dozens of communities have suffered an "impact" on schools and been certified as eligible for Government financial aid in overcoming classroom shortages. California had the largest number of unfilled "entitlements," for which $36,756,933 was needed, so the $55 million appropriation I backed to make possible pro rata payments is of great importance to 68 school districts in the State.

Agriculture measures: Since only 13 percent of the income of California agriculture in 1952, as I pointed out in recent debate on the Senate floor was derived from the 6 basic commodities, California was gravely concerned about the question of flexible versus rigid support prices. The high-level support policy worked against, rather than for, the bulk of California agriculture and pushed upward the painfully-high cost of living. By moving toward a better balanced agricultural economy, Congress has taken a direction that should benefit producers and consumers of my State considerably. Three other measures I had the opportunity to cosponsor will help California agriculture substantially. One piece of legislation of particular concern to California, which Senators Anderson and Eastland joined me in framing, was the amendment to the Agricultural Adjustment Act averting threatened painful and unfair cuts in cotton acreage. The revised allocation formula, recognizing recent expansion of cotton culture in the Southwest and West allowed California farmers to plant 237,285 more acres than were permissible under the 1938 statute quotas. This means in the neighborhood of $200 million of cash receipts to our growers. The Water Facilities Act, which raised the ceiling on loans for systems bringing supplemental water to farms, should lead to added benefits from the many irrigation-reclamation developments under way in the State. The bill permitting expenditures for insect and pest control in neighboring countries was necessary to head off a threatened invasion of the Mexican fruitfly that could have taken a costly toll of our citrus and other fruits.

Social-security law amendments: California, it is well known, is the home of a near-record number of retired citizens and a conspicuous exponent of generous aid to all unfortunates. Hence, California naturally favored the liberalization of pensions, annuities, and grants-in-aid voted by this Congress. The special provisions which I joined in introducing that guarantee recipients against cuts in their benefits and which I urged the Finance Committee to include to simplify procedure through which public employees may participate in the system are of extra significance to my State.

Natural resources legislation: Several measures—like the Water Facilities Act listed above—giving an incentive to industries and activities founded on our Nation's bountiful assortment of natural resources are of concern to California. One measure of which I was cosponsor that will react to the advancement of our State's economy modernizes the mining and leasing laws and knocks down obstacles in the way of multiple development of public lands of the West.

TOWARD A BETTER CALIFORNIA

Although classified as a measure primarily intended to end a distressing situation in California, the DeLuz Dam bill approved by this Congress will do much more than provide an equitable sharing of water of the Santa Margarita River between residents of the Fallbrook area of our State and the national-defense establishments on the stream. The greatest significance of the law lies in recognition that under the unique dual system of Government in this country the Federal Government cannot disregard the laws and established procedures of the States making up the entire Union.

Passage of the legislation which we hope will conclude the Santa Margarita River controversy was the outcome of months of negotiations, discussions, hearings, and conferences which occupied much time and tested the ingenuity of my colleague, my predecessor, and my fellow Californians in the House as well as myself. I believe the bill which President Eisenhower signed July 28 assures the Marines at Camp Pendleton, as well as two other naval installations in the area, of a dependable water supply without jeopardizing the future development of the residential and agricultural communities in the vicinity. The measure as finally worked out in conferences between the Senate and the House should enable the military and the civilian residents of this basin to live amicably, as real neighbors.

In view of California's unusual geographical and topographical characteristics, it is not surprising that a great variety of measures was proposed in Congress to help agencies and groups dealing with regional and local problems and to promote the welfare of different segments of our population. The 83d Congress showed heartening readiness to consider these legislative proposals sympathetically.

Unquestionably our people were disappointed Congress did not see fit to further their efforts to attach a costly and distressing menace to their health, comfort, and property, the exasperating phenomenon known as smog. Our hopes were bolstered, however, that early assistance will be extended for cleaning up the atmosphere in metropolitan and industrial centers.

This problem is by no means peculiar to my State, though the popular mind conceives of it as being most acute there. We appreciate the serious attention that was given the proposed legislation the senior Senator from Indiana and I sponsored to spur anipollution programs. When Congress reconvenes, we trust more data will be available and a coordinated air cleansing plan will have been worked out through studies and consultations President Eisenhower has advised us he believes to be a worthwhile undertaking.

In this regard, I should like to inform my colleagues that Senator CAPEHART and I wrote the President recently suggesting steps the Federal Government might take to reinforce our cities, counties, civic and industry organizations, and individual citizens in their efforts to bring air contamination under control. We suggested an interdepartmental commission might link the forces of the Federal Government which could be strong allies in the fight against smog. Since the second session ended, we have been encouraged by the following letter from one of the Chief Executive's aides:

"Your suggestion for the establishment of an interagency committee has been discussed with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Secretary agrees that the proposal is an excellent one.

"Such a group could define the nature and magnitude of the problem, evaluate the steps which need to be taken to abate air pollution, and canvass the resources of the Government which might be employed to assist in such abatement.

"The Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is presently seeking to ascertain what other Federal agencies should be represented and is taking steps leading to the establishment of this group."

Repeatedly I have said that rigid economy in Federal operations is essential to the preservation of our form of government. Nevertheless, within the limits of reduced expenditures many activities must and can be carried on. This Nation never can or will turn the clock back on progress. It is necessary that public works be maintained, for instance, to help us raise levels of living and protect our people. For these reasons, I have proposed a variety of measures and urged a number of appropriations that will stimulate development of California resources, broaden opportunities for employment and production, and create more attractive environments.

In addition to the projects authorized in the omnibus public-works bill, Congress has approved a number of my bills. Among those which will benefit different sections of the State are one making available a few hundred acres of land in the Camp Roberts Military Reservation for a site for Nacimiento Dam and the resulting reservoir that will replenish shrinking water supplies and a similar measure authorizing construction of Vaquero Dam, in the Santa Maria Basin which will provide flood control, restore the falling underground water level through better percolation, and prevent salt-water intrusion into irrigation supplies. The replacement of a temporary weir with a permanent diversion dam for the Palo Verde irrigation district, made possible by a bill I am happy the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee agreed should be reported with amendments, will save the Government money in the long run besides overcoming an engineering difficulty in putting water on parched land in Imperial Valley.

Several appropriation items which I strongly urged and which received final approval will promote the interests of many people in specific sections of my State. These include $750,000 for reopening the entrance to Mission Bay where a number of persons lost their lives in treacherous waters, a preliminary sum of $50,000 to initiate studies of problems and development possibilities in San Francisco Bay and tributaries, an increase of $1,200,000 in flood-control funds to speed up protection for thickly settled foothills communities of the Los Angeles metropolitan area, an additional $250,000 for more intensive fire prevention on Government-owned lands comprising much of the Los Angeles and San Diego watersheds, an extra $1 million to finance relocation of residents being forced out of the area to be flooded by Monticello Dam, a $100,000 fund to conduct a study into problems affecting migratory workers, and the $1 million needed to replace the pipefitters' shop at San Francisco Navy Yard, which was destroyed by fire.

Besides the foregoing items, which were more or less of an emergency character, this Congress granted necessary funds for continuing California programs which affect wide areas of my State. We are grateful Congress responded to my appeals for $2,500,000 for the lower San Joaquin Valley, including the Cherry Valley Reservoir, $3 million for the Sacramento River project, and $8,500,000 for the Los Angeles County drainage program.

One humanitarian accomplishment of the recent session which should be cited was the voting of money to begin a too-long-delayed reconstruction of the Long Beach Veterans' Hospital. The $8 million item which I urged in order to start replacing dilapidated, overcrowded, temporary structures is belated recognition of the debt this country owes a most tragic class of former servicemen, the paraplegics and quadraplegics who face years of heart-tugging discomfort and handicaps. With the fund to build 4 up-to-date wings of permanent character, the Congress started redeeming a neglected pledge made 4 years ago when several score of crippled veterans were abruptly moved to what really were only makeshift quarters and many dozen others were required to travel long distances for outpatient treatments at an institution with pitifully inadequate facilities.

This meritorious investment supplements the appropriation of a year ago to provide sorely needed neuropsychiatric facilities in northern California. With the funds previously provided, the Veterans' Administration already has chosen a site at Palo Alto on which a hospital will be constructed so treatment can be provided a large number of veterans whose unfortunate condition calls for attention at the earliest practicable minute.

In the drive for adjournment, bills which regrettably died on the calendar included two reported from the hard-working Interior and Insular Affairs Committee on which I had the privilege of serving. Because plans have been carefully worked out, I particularly disliked to have the session end without action on my bill to extend Federal credit to the South San Joaquin and Oakdale Irrigation Districts for the $50 million Tri-Dam project. I introduced this legislation at the request of these two public agencies of California to make posible carrying out the proposed work, the cost of which would be defrayed through sale of electric energy but unfortunately the time-consuming filibuster in the last month jammed the calendar so badly that consideration of this needed legislation was impossible.

Other measures in which I had a deep interest involve rather complex problems which need more time for study. The consideration given this year will help smooth the way in the future for legislation authorizing the Trinity-San Luis units of the great Central Valley project and remedying the tax revenue losses suffered by political subdivisions when the Federal Government acquires large amounts of property. The need for some type of "in lieu tax" compensation to local governments denied the right to assess federally owned land and buildings has been demonstrated and acknowledged. I trust that a satisfactory formula for correcting the inequitable situation will be forthcoming from the Commission set up by President Eisenhower to recommend a solution of the problem.

A Comparative Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MORGAN M. MOULDER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Speaker, many Republican candidates for Congress are asking the people to vote for them because they claim that they will support all legislation proposed by the Eisenhower administration.

I hold the deep conviction that the first duty of a Member of Congress is to serve and represent the best interests of the people of his district and his country. In carrying out that duty, he should vote for legislation he believes good and against legislation he considers contrary to the best interests of the people, regardless of pressure from the executive branch of the Government.

Conscientious representation—without dictation or blind obedience—is a fundamental principle of our democratic form of government. I have followed that principle during my service as your Representative in Congress from the 11th District of Missouri.

The following important issues were among those presented for consideration during the 83d Congress. On some of these issues I voted with the Eisenhower administration; on others I voted against it. But on every issue I voted for what I honestly believed to be the best interests of the people I represent.

In the following table I have indicated my vote on each of these issues, together with the position of the administration. I ask you—the people I represent—how you would have voted?

	Eisenhower position	My vote
1st sess., 83d Cong.		
Provide more funds for veterans' medical care (Feb. 19, 1953).	(?)	Yes.
Give away tidelands oil reserves (Apr. 1, 1953).	Yes	No.
Restore funds for Southwest Power Administration transmission lines (Apr. 28, 1953).	Yes	Yes.
Increase funds for rural telephones by $10 million (Mar. 10, 1953).	(?)	Yes.
Provide funds for stronger Air Force (July 2, 1953).	No	Yes.
Reduce REA funds by $15 million (Mar. 19, 1953).	(?)	No.

	Eisenhower position	My vote
1st sess., 83d Cong.—Continued		
Extend President's authority to make reciprocal trade agreements (June 15, 1953).	Yes..	Yes.
Provide additional funds for hospital construction (May 26, 1953).	Yes..	Yes.
Extend excess profits tax on corporations (July 10, 1953).	Yes..	Yes.
Increase national debt limit by $15 billion (July 31, 1953).	Yes..	No.
Authorize emergency aid for drought areas (July 9, 1953).	Yes..	Yes.
2d sess., 83d Cong.		
Provide funds for Un-American Activities Committee (H. Res. 400, Feb. 25, 1954).	(?)...	Yes.
Prohibit foreign aid funds to governments committed by treaty to maintain Communist rule in Asia (H. R. 9678, June 30, 1954).	(?)...	Yes.
Appropriate new funds for foreign aid (H. R. 10051, July 28, 1954). NOTE.—Foreign Operations Administration already had on hand more than $9 billion in unexpended funds.	(?)...	Yes.
Prohibit importation of Mexican laborers without consent of Mexican Government (H. J. Res. 355, Mar. 2, 1954).	No...	Yes.
End tax on admission tickets of 50 cents or less (H. R. 8224, Mar. 10, 1954).	No...	Yes.
Reduce excise tax rates (H. R. 8224, Mar. 10, 1954).	No...	Yes.
Increase personal exemption for all taxpayers from $600 to $700 (H. R. 8300, Mar. 18, 1954).	No...	Yes.
Appropriations for Department of Agriculture for fiscal year 1955, H. R. 8779, Apr. 14, 1954.	Yes..	Yes.
Amendment to H. R. 8779 to increase amount provided for the national school lunch program by $6,452,584, Apr. 14, 1954. NOTE.—The Committee on Appropriations recommended increased appropriations requested by the Bureau of the Budget bringing the total for the National School Lunch Program to $9 million. This restoration of funds plus the additional 6 million provided in the amendment mentioned above provided $15 million for the school lunch program as in previous years.	-------	Yes.
Provide lower flexible support prices on basic farm commodities (H. R. 9680, May 6, 1954).	Yes..	No.
Extend coverage and increase benefits of social security program (H. R. 9336, June 1, 1954).	Yes..	Yes.
Extend and improve vocational rehabilitation program (H. R. 9640, July 8, 1954).	Yes..	Yes.
Increase unemployment compensation benefits (H. R. 9709, July 8, 1954).	No...	Yes.
Establish death penalty for peacetime spying (H. R. 9580, July 8, 1954).	Yes..	Yes.
Oppose admission of Communist China to United Nations (H. Res. 627, July 15, 1954).	Yes..	Yes.
Extend deadline for education and training for Korean veterans (H. R. 9888, July 21, 1954).	-------	Yes.
Increase veterans disability compensation payments (H. R. 9020), July 21, 1954.	-------	Yes.
Increase salaries of postal workers (H. R. 9245), Aug. 9, 1954.	No...	Yes.
Provide criminal punishment for membership in Communist Party (S. 3706), Aug. 17, 1954.	No...	Yes.
Omnibus river and harbor and flood control bill (H. R. 9859) July 26, 1954. NOTE.—In addition to previous authorization of 3 reservoirs in the Osage River Basin, this bill authorizes the appropriation of $144 million for the comprehensive plan for the Missouri River Basin and includes provision for a system of 9 reservoirs for flood protection on the Osage River and tributaries in Missouri and Kansas in accordance with the recommendation of the Chief of Army Engineers.	-------	Yes.

Crisis in Our Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELIZABETH KEE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, as this Congress approaches its final hours, I want to call attention again to the fact that we have failed to take any genuinely effective step to solve the crisis in our schools.

I have cited this problem to the House at various times and in connection with various legislative proposals which have been before us. It is with great disappointment that I find the Congress getting ready to terminate the work of the 83d Congress with not a single dent made in this problem.

While it is true that we have passed some minor legislation dealing with the schools—and they are, indeed, minor bills—we proceeded to negate even that little bit by providing insufficient appropriations.

For instance, we authorized a series of State conferences on education over the coming year culminating in a White House conference next year. The House at first refused to appropriate any money whatsoever for this purpose. The Senate did approve funds for the White House conference and for contributions toward the States' preliminary conferences. But in the final settlement of the differences between the House and Senate versions of the Supplemental Appropriations Act, a compromise figure was provided which will not go nearly as far as it should in financing the cost of the various conferences on education.

As I told the House when we had this measure before us, and also in connection with other bills we passed for an Advisory Commission on Education and for Cooperative Research with the colleges on educational problems, we have been authorizing a lot of studies into a problem which we already know could be effectively helped if not entirely solved by financial help to our schools.

But we have given no help of that nature. The administration has said that it thinks we ought to wait on this problem until after the White House conference is held. That would mean no possible financial help to our schools from the Federal Government until sometime after December 1955, which would mean no help whatsoever until the start of the school year beginning in September of 1956. In other words, if the administration recommended an aid-to-education program following that White House conference late next year, the first time the Congress could take it up would be in 1956 for the fiscal year of 1957 which starts July 1, 1956. So it would not be applicable for the first time until 2 years from now.

Many bills were introduced to provide Federal aid to education immediately. On the tidelands bill, many of us tried to earmark royalties from offshore oil for Federal aid to education. Because of the opposition of the President's advisers, anxious to give away these natural resources belonging to the people of the United States, we were unable to add that provision to the bill.

And so our overworked teachers and overcrowded schools continue a situation which is a disgrace to our country. Here we are, a nation of vast resources, but unable to provide the kind of educational facilities our children require.

I was thinking of this situation recently when I happened across a news article reporting on an analysis presented by a team of psychiatrists and psychologists at a professional convention in one of our largest cities. They were reporting on attitudes toward our schools.

And their major finding was this: that as citizens we tend to expect too much from our schools. We tend to blame the schools, as they put it, for everything that goes amiss with the State and its citizens.

We expect our schools to solve the growing divorce problem, bad or reckless driving habits on our highways, the lack of international understanding among peoples, the apathy about religion, the increase in mental illness.

Forgetting that there is a home before there is a school, we even have the tendency sometimes to blame the schools for all juvenile delinquency, all adult crime, all cases of fraud and deceit and brutality and injustice.

Truly, we expect too much from our schools. And yet, so inconsistent are we, so inclined to wishful thinking and shortcut thinking, that while expecting miracles from our schools, we starve them out for funds, relegate them to unsafe or horribly overcrowded facilities, and even deny to the men and women who spend their lives as teachers the basic fundamental of decent minimum salaries on which they can live in dignity.

PENALIZING AMERICA BY NEGLECTING OUR SCHOOLS

Perhaps we have come to expect so much from our schools—too much, according to that scientific report presented at the American Orthopsychiatric Association convention—because we have found among our school teachers, underpaid and abused as they are a dedication to a great cause seldom found in any profession outside of the clergy. Instead of rewarding them for that, however, we punish them for it.

Schoolteachers are not angels, but we expect them always to conduct themselves with the utmost propriety and serve as good examples to the children at all times.

Schoolteachers have all the human desires of all the rest of us, but we expect them to live in near poverty and not complain.

Schoolteachers put in an exhausting day at the job, but we nevertheless expect them to have the reserves of strength and of interest necessary to carry them through unlimited hours of unpaid overtime on extracurricular activities, on parent-teacher association matters, on civic and community enterprises.

Schoolteachers, in other words, are considered special servants of democracy, and as such are expected to do more and give more—and get less—than other public servants or private employees.

The amazing thing, Mr. Speaker, is not that we expect these things from our schoolteachers but that they generally are so willing to do what we expect from them.

But is it fair?

Certainly it is not fair to the teachers who are so poorly treated. But is it fair to the community? Is it fair to the Nation? Is it fair to our way of life?

I think not.

As our society has become more complex, we have not permitted our educational system to keep pace. We have denied it the necessary facilities, the necessary funds, the necessary support. And we are—and will be—paying a high price for that neglect.

I would like to equate that, at least briefly, to our concern about defense appropriations, our insistence here, whenever a military appropriation bill comes before us, that the administration seek and obtain sufficient funds to man our Defense Establishment and provide the weapons we and our allies need for the security of freedom. If the President fails to ask for as much money for defense as we feel he should receive, we insist on giving it to him anyway.

Now I am heartily in favor of adequate appropriations for defense, but freedom is not guaranteed by guns alone. Freedom is also a state of mind, an attitude, a philosophical conception which we learn, and which we learn to appreciate. Once appreciated, once learned, it is a concept which commands our total allegiance. We do not, as a people, compromise on freedom. We accept no substitutes for it. We demand the pure, unadulterated product—or as pure and unadulterated a variety as we can achieve in a far-from-perfect society.

DEMOCRACY IS ROOTED IN OUR EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM

The psychiatrists and psychologists notwithstanding, I believe that the fundamental strength of our democracy lies today—and has reposed for many, many years—in our educational system. While we learn much of democracy in our homes as children, the biggest contribution in that regard is most often made, I believe, in the group activities of the school, particularly when good teachers relate these activities to the problems of living together and working together and striving together in a democratic society.

Probably no one single factor has contributed as much as our universal free public educational system to the durability and strength of the American democracy we know today—to make us at the youthful age among nations of only 165 years one of the few nations in the world today able to boast of a continuous period of constitutional democracy stretching back that many years.

That thought is both reassuring and disturbing as this session and this term of Congress near their final hours with no attention having been paid to the needs of the schools and no prospect of a real attack on this problem in the near future under present leadership. It is reassuring to remember how great a contribution our educational system has made to our democracy. It is disturbing to know that in a time of crisis in our schools, our Nation is failing them. How long can our schools continue to bolster our national life when we ignore their needs?

In the 84th Congress, it will be my purpose to work with all my strength for better treatment for our schools and our hard-working teachers. I trust we shall have the kind of Congress at that time which will find sympathy in its heart and resourcefulness enough to face up to this problem effectively.

The Major Accomplishments of the Republican Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN S. COOPER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record a statement I have prepared on the major accomplishments of the Republican administration.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

THE MAJOR ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE REPUBLICAN ADMINISTRATION

Now that the work of the 83d Congress has been completed, I should like to review briefly the record which the administration and Congress have made in the interests of the United States. The record of achievement is a most impressive one.

The accomplishments of our administration mean different things to different people. To all of us they mean a new honesty in Government. To many of us they mean the return of a son or husband from war, to yet others lower taxes, more industry, better schools and roads and hospitals.

We have the assurance of a firm foreign policy, of a strong national defense.

It is a record of which all of us can be proud. Here are some of the major accomplishments of President Eisenhower and the Republican 83d Congress:

1. We have peace. The war in Korea—with nearly 160,000 casualties—has been ended. The United States has not plunged recklessly into another war. There have been no crises or national emergencies declared by the President. Wartime controls have been repealed. Our foreign aid program has been tailored to meet defense needs. Our national defense is the strongest in peacetime history and the deterioration of our military forces after World War II was not allowed to recur after the end of the Korean conflict.

2. Financially our house is in far better order. Savings in Government spending have amounted to $6.5 billion, despite the fact that we found $81 billion in unpaid Government bills when President Eisenhower took office. Nearly all of the savings have been returned to the taxpayers in four tax reductions. The first general tax reduction in more than half a century was completed, benefitting 26 million individual taxpayers. Inflation has been halted and the value of the dollar has been stabilized so that income and savings are no longer threatened by constant devaluation of the currency.

3. We have fully proved that the United States can have both peace and prosperity. The economy of the previous 12 years was based on a war economy. The 2 years of the Eisenhower administration have been the most prosperous in our history. We have the biggest total employment in our history, whereas the level of unemployment is still considerably less than during 1949. Over 62 million people are employed today, as compared to fewer than 59 million in 1949. At the same time, unemployment is 700,000 less than in July 1949. During 1953–54, average hourly earnings reached the highest level in history, peacetime expenditures for new plants and industries reached their highest point, construction reached its highest value; retail sales are the highest, and so are personal income and savings.

4. The disastrous drop in farm prices—which brought on a decrease of 45 points in the farm-price index—during the previous administration has been stopped. Farm prices have not only been stabilized but have begun to increase. A large-scale farm surplus disposal program has been undertaken and export markets are being expanded. Soil and water conservation programs have been improved. Drought relief has avoided a catastrophe for thousands of farmers and stockmen. Funds for rural electrification and the Tennessee Valley Authority have been increased.

5. A new housing program has been enacted to make home ownership easier for millions of Americans. This will mean an unparalleled expansion of the construction industry. Special provision is made for housing in agricultural areas, small towns, and for veterans.

6. The new road bill will improve our highway system, by increasing Federal assistance. Kentucky will receive nearly $15 million per year, as compared to $10 million under the present law. Not only will it be easier for all of us to travel, but improved transportation will help commerce and expand production.

7. Social-security payments have been increased and social-security coverage extended to 10 million more people. Protection is extended to millions of farmers and professional people. The act also provides coverage for persons who become totally disabled.

8. School and hospital construction funds have been approved in greater amounts. A new hospital program will make hospitals, nursing homes, and convalescent homes available to more people. A rehabilitation program has been passed for the physically handicapped. Schools in federally affected areas will receive aid in construction and operation of schools.

9. The Veterans' Administration has been reorganized to give better, more effective service to our veterans. Two laws have been passed to increase compensation and pension payments for all veterans. GI benefits for Korean veterans have been extended. The largest appropriation in our history for medical services has been passed, providing a total of 114,415 hospital beds for veterans.

10. A new Government security program has been put into effect. Legislation has

been passed to outlaw the Communist Party, to protect defense industries against sabotage, and to effectively punish treason. Two thousand and four hundred Government employees have been separated as security risks; 41 Communist leaders have been convicted, and 208 have been deported.

Mr. President, all of us who have worked together for the achievement of this program can be proud that the job which the people have given us in 1952 is being done. The cooperation between the Congress and the President has made it possible to put into law this tremendous legislative program. I believe that the confidence of the people in this administration is well deserved.

Federal Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MORGAN M. MOULDER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply concerned about the educational crises which continues to face us in this country. We all know that the completion of a school year is no more final than the formal ending of Congress, because the problems go on. The need for Federal aid to education is not a dead issue because you know, as well as I do, that the urgent need for aid to our schools is still with us.

It is still with us because almost nothing short of a miracle could pull us out of this situation. The facts of the case we all know. Nationwide surveys reveal that our schools are in desperate need of more teachers, more buildings, and money to finance them through this period. The statistics of elementary and secondary education point out to us the increased demand for school services and the decreases in qualified manpower and the purchasing power of our school dollars.

During World War II the enrollment in schools declined slightly, many fully qualified teachers left the profession, school construction practically stopped, and financial support lagged.

By 1947, however, constructive forces among all citizens began to move rapidly to remedy this wartime neglect and loss. The Council of State Governments published a very fine study in 1949 of our 48 State school systems in an effort to assist the States in working out solutions of the problems which faced their respective school systems.

A great deal has been done by citizens' groups in local communities to alleviate our school problems, but to date the overall needs have not been completely relieved. In this year we still find that our school manpower is affected, as well as financial support, and school construction. Meanwhile enrollments steadily continue to increase, the purchasing power of the school dollar declines, and school administrators find that they are forced to employ many people to teach who do not meet the State requirements for certification. These conditions are in turn affected by worldwide economic forces and unrest. In our present position of world leadership in the necessary struggle for national security and for peace and freedom for all peoples everywhere, the expenditures of the Federal Government have increased by leaps and bounds, resulting in turn in tremendous increases in our Federal taxation. This combination of heavy Federal expenditures for defense and foreign aid, together with lower purchasing power and higher local and State governmental costs produces a general public reaction against any increase in local taxation for any purpose, no matter how essential. With this understandable reluctance to increase local and State taxes, it follows that any effort to meet the need for higher teachers' salaries, new school construction, and recruitment in teacher education is seriously handicaped.

Many of us in Congress are well aware of these existing conditions in our schools. Although it was limited aid, the 83d Congress recognized the responsibility of the Government for the impact caused by Federal activities upon the local educational agencies and enacted some emergency legislation to provide assistance to schools in federally affected areas. Under one of these laws the United States Commissioner of Education was authorized to make contributions toward operating costs of the local schools overburdened with increased attendance, as the result of Federal activities, and deprived of local revenues because of the tax-exempt status of Federal properties.

A recent report of the United States Office of Education shows that Missouri was entitled to receive $809,113 for school operation and maintenance in our federally affected areas.

The other school-aid legislation passed by Congress provided for grants to the States for inventory surveys of their existing school facilities and to determine the need for constructing additional school buildings. It also authorized financial assistance for school construction in federally affected areas. Under this law, Public Law 815, Missouri had $2,971,661 reserved of the Federal funds for the construction of vital school construction projects in the fiscal year 1954.

Although this legislation indicates the Federal Government's recognition of its responsibility for federally affected areas, you and I know perfectly well that it meets only to a very slight degree the pressing problems of our schools.

I am concerned that the Congress has not, up to this time, approved any constructive measures for overall Federal aid to education because I earnestly believe that it is of vital importance. It seems to me that the details and opposition which have bogged it down are quite small, in comparison to the overall need for Federal aid to meet the emergency facing our school systems.

We understand and can justify our expenditures for defense, social security, public health, veterans' benefits, and many other vital programs. However, we must find the means and a way to convince people that our schools are of equal importance.

Our school systems have helped this Nation reach its peak of leadership today among the nations of the world. And to our loyal teachers we owe a great deal. For generations we have confidently placed our children in their hands. In recent years, in many cases, our teachers have accepted even more school responsibility in the guidance of our young people. More extracurricular activities have been added to our educational systems and our teachers have graciously accepted this additional responsibility.

I cannot help feeling—and I hope others will realize it—that our teachers are our first line of defense. I am sure, in fact, that they always have been, but we have never talked about it enough. Our schoolteachers, who are so grossly underpaid, are the quiet force in this country that molds our most precious resource—our children. The full impact of the valuable service teachers give to the people of this country and its future, in a sense, ultimately guides the destiny of the free world. I earnestly hope, in the near future, that we can find a way to provide for our school systems the additional financial support which they so urgently need.

Development of the Green River

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN S. COOPER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement I have prepared on the development of the Green River.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEVELOPMENT OF THE GREEN RIVER

At the end of the congressional session, I wish to express the appreciation of the people of Kentucky and particularly those of western Kentucky to the administration and the Congress for bringing at last to reality the plans and hopes for the development of the Green River which had been held for years. This year the Congress has enacted and the President has approved appropriations totaling $5.6 million for locks and dams 1 and 2 on the Green River. This amount includes a regular appropriation of $4.8 million for the 1955 fiscal year and a supplemental appropriation of $800,000 for fiscal year 1954. Both these items were recommended by President Eisenhower in his budget message. In addition, we have obtained the enactment of legislation which authorizes the expenditure of an additional $3.4 million for the dredging of the Green River.

The Green River project is a new start made by this administration, and no appropriation had been previously approved for the modernization of its locks and dams. The existing structures are old and obsolete and not usable for present-day traffic. For example, it is interesting to note that lock 1 was built in 1835 and has dimensions of 35 by 139 feet. Lock 2 is only 36 by 114 feet.

Modernization work will make modern river transportation accessible to the coal fields of western Kentucky. The high benefit-cost ratio of this work (1.5 to 1) derives from the fact that coal can be shipped economically from the Green River Valley for use by the Tennessee Valley Authority and the Atomic Energy Commission. The AEC has stated that our atomic project at Portsmouth will save 40 cents per ton on 1.78 million tons of coal from western Kentucky when the work is completed.

Additional savings of 30 cents per ton on about 3 million tons per year can be made by the TVA steam plants. Since both AEC and TVA are the property of the people of the United States, the savings will go directly to the Government and to the people of the United States.

In a very real sense, therefore, the funds which have been and will be appropriated for this work represent an investment of the United States Government which will rapidly repay itself and begin piling up financial dividends. The total Federal cost of this project is placed by the Corps of Engineers at $14,399,000. It will be repaid from these savings. In one instance alone, the Federal Government will make an annual saving of nearly $1 million when this work is completed. I refer, of course, to the reduced cost of coal which is to be purchased for the generation of power for use by the Atomic Energy Commission.

Additional benefits in lowered cost of private and public transportation for the benefit of all the people of the region will increase the benefits to be derived from this construction beyond the saving from the transportation of coal alone.

The real importance of the Green River project can be clearly recognized from the unusual efforts taken during the past year by both the legislative and executive branches of this administration to secure the appropriation of funds for the work to get underway.

Before actual construction on a river project can begin, the work must be authorized by the Congress, money must then be allocated by the Corps of Engineers to complete planning, and finally appropriations must be made by the Congress for actual construction. These steps sometimes take years. None of these steps had been taken before 1953. Every one of these necessary steps have been taken since January 1953 by the administration of President Eisenhower and the present Congress.

1. Both the Senate Public Works Committee and the House Public Works Committee at the call of their chairman, Senator Edward Martin, of Pennsylvania, and Congressman George Dondero, of Michigan, took the unusual action in 1953 to recommend to the Department of the Army that the reconstruction work on Green River was justified under the act of 1909. Acting upon this recommendation, the Secretary of the Army, Hon. Robert Stevens, approved the project. It was the only such authorization made during 1953.

2. At the very close of the session of Congress in 1953, the vital need for this project led the Senate Committee on Appropriations to urge the Corps of Engineers to allocate $100,000 to complete planning of the project so that construction could begin in 1954.

Senator Bridges, chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, and Senator Knowland, chairman of the Subcommittee on Civil Functions, which considered the Green River project, spoke and gave their support on the Senate floor to the allocation of the $100,000 of planning funds.

3. This year, despite the urgent necessity of the Bureau of the Budget and the President to balance Government expenditures with receipts, President Eisenhower recommended that funds be included in the appropriations bill for fiscal year 1955 to begin these improvements on the Green River. The President also recommended a supplemental appropriation of $800,000 for fiscal year 1954 so that work could begin at the earliest possible time. As President Eisenhower pointed out in his budget message to the Congress, the Green River project is one of those selected for speedy action to assure expeditious movement of traffic in existing harbors or waterways serving important requirements of commerce or national security.

4. A toal sum of $5,600,000 was appropriated this year by the Congress for the Green River improvement. It represents the 14th largest appropriation for river improvement in the budget.

Finally, it is important to point out that the Green River appropriation has had during the past year the support of the major agencies of Government concerned with this question, including the Atomic Energy Commission, the Department of the Army, the Bureau of the Budget, and, of course, the President of the United States.

I am glad to have had a part in urging personally before every committee, before the Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of the Budget, and the President of the United States, the necessity for the authorization and appropriation of construction funds for the development of the Green River.

Mr. President, I want to emphasize here that this project has had the long-time and enthusiastic and strong support of my colleague, Senator Clements. It has been a pleasure to work with him for the advancement of the Green River project.

It has also had the long support of the Green River Valley Citizens League, Inc. Many people of the region have joined in the support of this league and all deserve great credit. I would like to mention particularly the names of their officers who have pursued this work with great energy. The present officers of the Green River Citizens League, Inc., are James R. Hines, president, Bowling Green; Albert P. Harding, executive vice president-secretary, Central City; J. Morton Williams, treasurer, Beaver Dam; and C. A. Reis, honorary president, South Carrollton. The board of directors consists of the following persons: James R. Hines, Bowling Green; Albert P. Harding, Central City; J. Morton Williams, Beaver Dam; William C. Sumpter, Bowling Green; Fred E. Massey, Central City; R. A. Demunbrun, Brownsville; Dr. W. H. Washburn, Beaver Dam; John Q. Adams, Hartford; Homer Boyd, Rockport; I. G. Reynierson, Island; Landon Wills, Calhoun; Chester A. Hope, Drakesboro-Paradise; Edward Delker, Owensboro; James Hays, Rochester; W. A. Moore, Morgantown; Col. Oren Coin, Livermore; J. E. Wood, Greenville; Ross Morton; Centertown; James J. Turner, Dundee; Byron Royster, Sebree; Harry Wheeldon, South Carrollton; and Harry Scott, Henderson. Some of those who gave their energies for their people have passed on.

The beginning of this improvement, too long delayed, will mean the completion of the entire project. As the modernization of its navigation facilities are completed and the reservoir projects are begun (the Mining City Reservoir on Green River, Nolin Reservoir on Nolin River, No. 2 Barren Reservoir on Barren River, No. 2 Green Reservoir on Green River, and Rough River Reservoir on Rough River), a great industrial expansion in this area will inevitably result. Its certain result will be to increase the production of coal in the area and to supply work for its miners. Benefits will accrue to miners, farmers, businessmen, consumers and, indeed, to all the people of the Green River Valley. I am glad that this great project has been started by President Eisenhower and the Congress and that its completion is assured.

Agricultural Price Support

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, during the debate on the recently adopted farm bill, it was quite apparent that there is considerable confusion about the attitude of the present administration on the price support program. The administration made campaign promises that price supports would be retained at 90 percent of parity and hinted broadly that supports might be raised to 100 percent of parity. Shortly after assuming office, this promise was abandoned and a great deal of publicity was given to a study of agricultural programs conducted under the supervision of the Department of Agriculture. We waited for more than a year for the results of the study and a concrete recommendation from the administration. Early this year, the President confirmed the statements of his Secretary of Agriculture which the latter had been making since assuming office, and announced the administration's sliding-scale price-support program.

During the past year, Mr. Speaker, the Secretary of Agriculture has had authority to adjust the basis of price supports for milk and butter-fat products and has known that quantities of stored commodities were becoming unmanageable; nevertheless, few constructive steps have been taken to dispose of this surplus, although a number of ideas have been advanced. The present plan under the recently enacted farm bill for support of dairy products has not met with approval of those dairymen in my district and I seriously question if it is a sound approach to the problem.

I am flatly opposed to the sliding scale program since I do not feel that it offers any sort of overall solution to our agricultural problems. I do not believe that the reduction of price support levels will discourage production to any great degree. Many of the responsible agricultural leaders of Texas express the opinion that it may result in an actual increase in production. Their explanation is simple. They say that farmers have fixed expenses, such as cost of living, payment of taxes, production costs, and payments on equipment and land, which must be met. If the return per unit is reduced, it will force the farmer to produce more units at a smaller return to meet his fixed expenses. The result will be increased production.

The administration has given a great deal of publicity to its year-long study of the agricultural problem. Unfortunately, it has used a broadside approach which does not take into account the peculiarities and problems of various types of agricultural commodities, actually fits none. The problems relating to price support of the basic commodities and designated nonbasic commodities are entirely different. It is doubtful that the 2 can be placed together in 1 program. I was hopeful that the administration would recognize the problem and come up with a new recommendation designed to meet the peculiar problems confronted in various types of agricultural activities. The administration has failed to meet the problem and offers a sliding scale price support program which can have only one result—loss of income to the farmer.

Mr. Speaker, the economy of our country is based on three great activities: business and industry, labor, and agriculture. Our country cannot be prosperous unless these three major groups prosper and share fairly in the Nation's wealth. Contrary to popular belief, the industrial and business activities of the Nation are subsidized, protected, and bolstered by a variety of Federal programs. A general tariff structure protects practically every manufacturer in the Nation. Retailers and wholesalers are protected in most States by fair trade acts. The Federal Government has virtually subsidized entire segments of industry for many years, such as the airlines, merchant marine, and railroads. The oil and mining industries are greatly affected by the depletion allowance. Other great industries, such as the publishing business and the highway transport industry, are dependent on facilities maintained at the taxpayer's expense. During periods of emergency, when the Federal Government has contracted with the great manufacturing concerns of the Nation for implements of war, it has guaranteed those concerns a profit and has encouraged expansion through the medium of tax concessions. In an effort to encourage expansion of industries necessary to the defense of the country, our Government has granted over $6 billion in tax concessions. Two billion eight hundred million dollars have been granted to the private power companies alone in tax concessions spread over the next 33 years.

We have passed a framework of laws and established a series of programs aimed at strengthening the position of organized labor. The Federal Government has underwritten the social-security program. We have paid out hundreds of millions of dollars in the last 20 years for unemployment insurance. The rights of labor unions to bargain and strike are guaranteed by Federal law, with the result that wages for organized labor are at an all-time high. The laboring man is guaranteed a minimum wage of 75 cents an hour.

It is obvious, therefore, that if the Government is to protect and subsidize industry and business activities and underwrite the position of labor, it cannot then neglect the third great segment of our economy the agriculture industry. The price-support program maintained by the Federal Government for the past 20 years is nothing more than a minimum wage law for farmers. Contrary to popular belief, the price-support program does not guarantee the farmers a profit. He continues to be subjected to the hazards of weather and insects. His production is not guaranteed. The price-support program only guarantees that if he is successful in producing a product, he will receive a certain minimum price for that product.

There is widespread misunderstanding in the public mind as to the operation and cost of the price-support program. The record shows that the price-support program has cost the taxpayers a little more than a billion dollars in the last 20 years. In return for the billion dollars, the Nation has developed a stable agricultural economy, maintained an orderly system of marketing, and developed a method for storing and handling surpluses which has proved to be a great asset in 2 great wars which we have fought during the last 20 years. We have also made great strides in conserving our land.

By June 30, 1953, we had lost only $20,720,931 on the basic agricultural commodities, corn, cotton, peanuts, rice, tobacco, and wheat. We had lost $707,815,005 on the designated nonbasic commodities, milk, and butterfat, honey, irish potatoes, tung oil and wool. Irish potatoes alone accounted for $478,097,057 of the loss. The total loss on milk and butterfat products for the last 20 years has been $136,524,896.

Investors Diversified Services

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record a statement prepared by me.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Faith in tomorrow, a willingness to invest in America's future, is a pillar of our free enterprise system. This faith is a characteristic of Investors Diversified Services, now observing its 60th anniversary. It was founded on July 10, 1894, and today is one of the leading financial institutions of the world with assets of approximately $1½ billion.

Investors Diversified Services has taken a leading role in building the resources, facilities, and services of the United States and Canada. The IDS, among other operations, is one of the principal mortgage financiers in the United States and has helped create hundreds of thousands of home and business buildings throughout the land. The investments of IDS range from small first mortgages on single family dwellings to multimillion dollar commitments in American industries from food products to transportation.

We need not fear for the future of the private enterprise so long as there are such companies with vision, faith in the future and an understanding of the needs of a growing Nation in a changing world.

Report of Antidefamation League on Civil and Minority Rights in Western Germany

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, in the spring of this year the Federal Republic of Germany invited an American human relations agency to make an investigation of the status of civil and minority rights in Western Germany. The Antidefamation League of B'nai B'rith, America's oldest and largest Jewish service organization, undertook this task. The Adenauer government gave the ADL study team complete freedom to go wherever they wanted and to talk to whomever they wanted.

The Antidefamation League group, in a balanced and comprehensive report, found that a number of heartening democratic developments had taken place in Germany since the destruction of the Nazi regime, but that at the same time dangerous old prejudices still linger beneath the surface. The full ADL report was delivered last month to our State Department and to the German delegation in this country. A press summary of that report makes interesting and important reading, and for that reason I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Antidefamation League of B'nai B'rith, in an analytical report submitted to representatives of the Bonn Government here, expressed the belief that democratic growth in West Germany still is, 9 years after World War II, "a formidable task of self-reeducation" for the German people.

"Nor is it possible for outsiders to perform such a feat, as the occupation forces have learned," the league reported. To help "restore the faith of the free world in Germany," it recommended a German-sponsored and executed program of mass education, supported by substantial government funds, in which democratic purposes and concepts can penetrate the minds of a people who, the ADL said, still do not participate fully in public affairs and whose older generations are still burdened with an authoritarian tradition and the Hitler virus of anti-Semitism.

The study found that anti-Semitism in Germany has gone underground. "Germany will avoid overt anti-Semitism for years to come, according to experts long on the scene, but the receptivity to anti-Semitism is there if any group that comes to power should want to exploit it."

Copies of the ADL report, based on a study made at the invitation of the Adenauer government, were presented by an ADL delegation headed by Henry Edward Schultz, national chairman of the Antidefamation League, to Albrecht von Kessel, chargé d'affaires of the German mission in Washington, and to Geoffrey Lewis, acting director of the United States State Department's Office of German Affairs.

The ADL delegation included the three-member study team which traveled throughout West Germany during March and April, examining the attitudes of Germans toward civil rights and investigating conditions among the 25,000 Jews who remain or have returned to Germany since the Hitler days. The study team was composed of Jacob Alson, chairman of the league's committee on German affairs; Benjamin R. Epstein, the league's national director; and Nathan C. Belth, its public-relations director. All are from New York.

The ADL representatives urged that the United States continue on the German scene and maintain its present program in West Germany as necessary to that nation's successful integration with Western Europe. They cited the study's finding that most Germans, though complaining that the occupation is irksome, nonetheless prefer that Americans remain for some time to come because "our presence is comforting and we act as an agent that mitigates the distrust which the rest of Europe has for Germans."

Similarly, the report notes that German liberals, fearing the reestablishment of a national German army, take hope in the plan for a European Defense Community, in which German troops would be associated with the defensive armies of other European powers, as a means of eliminating the aggressive tradition of German militarism.

Germans "find themselves being pushed into the world political arena at a rate faster than their political development at home permits them to do with safety," the league's study declares. "To those concerned with German democracy, it seems that just as the people are beginning to understand how their aggressive military tradition has caused so much trouble for Europe and the world, they are being told to forget it and to rearm. So they seek the best safeguards available and hope democratization can keep pace with militarization."

In total, the ADL study, a 15,000-word document, finds conditions in West Germany "marked by signs of hope."

"The negative factors present," it declares, "come out of the past. We are not always able to free ourselves from the urge to look back over our shoulders."

On the positive side, the league cites the Bonn Government's efforts (1) to make some amends for the horrible crimes against Jews committed by the Nazis, (2) to curb successfully the neo-Nazi parties, and (3) to establish democratic governmental procedures.

"It does not detract from these achievements to say that in each of these areas there are problems that have not even begun to be solved and situations that will take years of earnest and continued effort to solve," the league declares.

The Germans themselves, perhaps, do not realize how great the reservoir of anti-Semitism is or can be, the study says. "The illusion that anti-Semitism has disappeared as a German phenomenon is helped along, for those who want to believe it, by the fact that there are no conspicuous tension areas where anti-Semitism can erupt. There are few contacts between Germans and Jews, and therefore, few opportunities for clashes. Even the refugee camps, focal points for trouble in recent years, have nearly all been closed."

The 25,000 Jews currently in West Germany represent a community that threatens to die out within a generation, the report declares. It quotes statistics which show that the average age is close to 60 years and that no more than 10 percent of the group are children or young people. It also discloses how the bombed-out synagogue in Frankfurt, rebuilt in modern style by the State of Hesse at a cost of 800,000 marks, is rarely used, lacking a decent-sized congregation. "It stands empty—the almost perfect symbol of Jewish life in Germany today, and of German-Jewish relationships," says the league. "The old-age home is today the principal communal institution in the Jewish community in Germany."

The 3-man study team in its visits to 8 major cities of West Germany, including Berlin, found that "9 years after Hitler, the traveler's impression is one of shock at the utter devastation which meets his eye; his second is one of amazement at the high degree of economic activity and the feverish efforts at rebuilding. But it is the third, and delayed, impression which really gives him a jolt. This comes after some days or even weeks.

"The traveler finds he has met dozens of people—Germans, Americans, refugees from the East, liberals, conservatives, Protestants, Catholics, Jews, and even an unreconstructed Nazi or two. He has met people who are perplexed, depressed, resigned, feverishly active, thoughtful, or strictly on the make, but seldom a really contented man.

"The returned liberal, talking bravely to keep up his courage, finds that he has returned to a spiritual desert; the people are suffering from a deep trauma and will not listen to him. The returning Jew finds himself isolated—separated from the rest of the nation by a two-ply invisible wall; he has erected one himself, because he cannot forget what has happened and doesn't know which of the hands he shakes has the blood of his kin on it; the other has been erected by his neighbors to whom his mere presence is a subconscious reminder of their guilt and their shame. They'd rather he went away."

On the other hand, "those who are concerned with the creation of a democratic Germany—liberals, churchmen, important leaders in government—earnestly want a Jewish community to survive in Germany. They readily admit that, in a moral sense, a permanent Jewish community in Germany may be more important to Germans than to Jews * * * [because of] a feeling that something vital has gone out of German life with the loss of the Jewish community, that the moral fiber of the nation, so severely damaged during the Hitler years, can never be repaired without restoring the Jewish factor which had contributed so much to that moral fiber."

It is the league's feeling that "Jews can never forget their tragic history under nazism; Germans must not forget. The Jews in Germany in order to live at all, however, must be able to set that history aside and build their lives anew. Germans, on the other hand, in their daily acts and in their future development as a society, must give encouragement to those who suffered that the evils which the Nazis perpetuated will not happen again. It is the Germans who must extend the hand of friendship to Jews living in their midst—not with a flourish, but in consistent acts of friendship and understanding that will restore the faith of Jews that they can once more live normal lives in that country."

In this respect, the league notes that while the Adenauer government is committed to a policy of making restitution to Jews through the German-Israeli and the Jewish material claims agreements, through individual compensation and by restoring civil rights, the restitution program does not have the popular support of the German people.

The league also recommends that the federal indemnification law, which it says is not adequate, its implementation marked by delays, be improved so that "rapid and equitable completion of restitution and indemnification matters can be an important contribution not only to justice but to the morale problems faced by Jews in Germany."

The ADL study team was encouraged by the fact that "neonazism and nazism as an organized political movement without substantial financial aid or press support, or an effective press of its own, has not taken form or size."

"But in the matter of reeducation of Germany so as to eliminate anti-Semitic feeling and to instill democratic ideas, the Adenauer government is faced by a reluctant dragon. Those active in the field, in and out of government, are pessimistic about their ability to change the thoughts and behavior patters of the adult generations."

Thus, says the league, German democrats are concentrating on the nation's youth and are "hard at work at the reconstruction of their educational institutions. It will take many years to make them completely effective instruments of training for citizenship in a democratic Germany.

"Among educational leaders there is a recognition that the hidebound traditionalism of German schools is a stumbling block to the democratization of Germany. The remark that 'democracy is always ordered in Germany after a lost war' ruefully explains the major reason for the failure of the reeducation efforts of the American occupation administration."

But now, the ADL observes, German educators are showing "particular concern with the orientation of the teaching personnel and with the limited teaching materials suitable for citizenship training. It is undoubtedly easier to solve the problem of creating appropriate materials than that of retraining teachers. The latter is a massive and long-range task which can be accelerated by a broadened interchange of ideas and facilities with countries of the West.

"An expanded foreign exchange program for German teachers can contribute greatly toward breaking the grip of the authoritarian tradition in German schools."

An impressive development in postwar Germany, the report says, is "the effort of German citizens to organize civic, educational, and other voluntary societies to stimulate participation in public affairs. However, their task is so formidable that no great impact will be made unless such civic leadership and civic groups receive very substantial Government aid.

"From an American viewpoint, such assistance to private groups may be a negation of the basic principle of voluntary association. But until the public in Germany has developed a history of voluntary financial support for such groups, only 'pump priming' by a governmental agency can provide them with the means of eventual success and independence."

Soil, Water, and Our Survival

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I wish to include the following speech which I delivered on May 28 at Corsicana, Tex.:

We human beings are suspended in three dimensional time—the past, the present, and the future. We are apt to disregard the past and we are very uncertain about the future. Only of the present are we sure—and I wonder if we are sure about the present. A moment ago it was the future, and in another moment it will be the past. If the future is to be less uncertain, we must look into the past.

We are living in what is undoubtedly the greatest Nation which has ever existed. But if you go back to history, Greece was just as great in her day, but she has passed on and only about 20 percent of her land can be cultivated today. She has sorely needed help to feed her people. Then the Roman Empire—and what an empire she was. I have read that the Romans reached the point where they believed they were so perfect that if any member of their legislative body introduced a bill which failed to pass into law, there was one less Roman and a new member of that legislative body. The Roman Empire is no more. In studying history, it becomes more revealing if we can discover the causes which led to the decline or disappearance of once great nations. The death of a nation is like that of an individual, seldom due to one cause. But beginning with the breakdown of the near eastern civilization and on through history there is one fact which stands clear in the case of each nation which was great and passed on. Their land lost its productivity and their resources failed them. In many cases a cradle of civilization became a desert.

I want to quote a statement made over 2,000 years ago. The statement was made by Plato about Attica, a part of Greece at that time:

"At that period, however, with which we are dealing, when Attica was still intact, what are now her mountains were lofty soil-clad hills. Her so-called shingle plains of the present day were full of rich soil and her mountains were heavily forested, a fact of which there are still visible traces. There are mountains in Attica which can keep nothing but bees, but which were clothed not so long ago with fine trees producing timber available for roofing the largest buildings, and roofs hewn from this timber are still in existence. There were also many lofty cultivated trees, while the country produced boundless pasture for cattle. The annual supply of rainfall was not lost as it is at present, though being allowed to flow over the denuded surface into the sea, but was received by the country in all its abundance into her bosom, where she stored it in her impervious potters' earth and so was able to discharge the drainage of the heights into the hollows in the form of springs and rivers with an abundant volume and wide territorial distribution. The shrines that survive to the present day on the sites of extinct water supplies are evidence for the correctness of my present hypothesis."

Now don't forget—this statement was written by Plato over 2,000 years ago. He recognized that forests, water supply, and fertile soils were very much related. He sensed that land illness would inevitably injure the country's welfare.

Now if we go on to Italy and the Roman Empire, first it is interesting to note that according to historians the Romans had agricultural techniques as competent as any produced during the Middle Ages, or even those of modern Europe 150 years ago. This fact should make us stop and think, today, that the failure of 2,000 years ago was not caused by inadequate knowledge, but by the fact that people would not apply that knowledge. Italy in her early days was famous for her wheat. She not only supplied her own people, but exported to Greece and to many other countries. But it was not long before they had hundreds of thousands of depleted, abandoned fields. There is no question that the failure of agricultural processes contributed to the disintegration of this nation.

Now, if we can believe history, and in this case certainly we should, every great nation back through history has had a failing of agriculture as one of the reasons for its decline. When we study history and realize that every great nation from the near eastern civilizations on through Greece, Rome, and Spain, began to decline when their agriculture began to fail, it seems to me that this fact should give us cause to stop and think. We should stop and think of the relationship between people and the resources of the earth.

Man is becoming aware of the limits of the earth. We have today a great conflict between the East and the West and over and over it is stated that this is a struggle of ideologies. It is not only a battle for the minds of men, but for the resources of the earth—the inadequate resources, the resources of which there are fewer for each person the world over each day. Communism has become the social and political manifestation of need or want. Democracy flourishes best with people who have plenty to eat.

Why the Communist push into Indochina today? There are a number of reasons, but the compelling reason is resources. All resources are derived from plant or animal life, whether they come from the land or the sea. Communists know they must have more minerals if they are to succeed in Asia and that is why they are concentrating on the area of Indochina. If they succeed in Indochina, other countries in that area will come next because of resources the Communists need.

We have considered the past, now let us try to analyze the situation as it is today. I suspect that many continually think of our surpluses. Butter, potatoes, and wheat are virtually running out our ears. I will deal with this before I am through. While world food production has recovered from the World War II low on a per capita basis, this does not mean that the world is well fed. This means only that the world as a whole has made little or no improvement in food consumption in the last decade. There are many exceptions, of course, but the fact remains that there are about 1½ billion people in the free world who exist on a diet of about one-half what our average diet is in this country today.

A recent report of the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization states that today only five countries in the world are capable of producing more food than their own people need. These five countries are Australia, New Zealand, Canada, Argentina, and the United States. This report makes another interesting observation—that compared to an average of the years 1934–38 the world population has increased approximately 12 percent, while the world food supply has increased 9 percent. This is an average for all countries and in many countries the gap is much wider and is widening all the time. But let us take a look at the five countries which produce more food than is needed for their own people.

First, Australia. Australia is a very interesting country from two aspects. Not too long ago Australia was almost in the same condition as we are today, with surpluses of agricultural products, and at that time was an important food-exporting country. The Government of Australia decided that in the postwar world there would be no food problem other than to dispose of surpluses. They also decided that the quicker the farm population could be shifted to the city, the better. Australia followed a policy of industrialization to such an extent that today Australia has more factory workers in relation to her population than we in the United States. Australia is almost the size of the United States and has a population of 8 million, which is approximately the population of New York City. It is predicted that by the end of the century, Australia will have 40 million people. There were recent headlines in the papers of Australia which read—"Hunger Ahead?" "Remember the Land—Danger of Famine." Some may call these scare headlines, but actually it is a fact. The other big problem in Australia is water, which is also a problem right here in Texas. In Australia, only 7½ percent, or 144 million of their 1,904 million acres, has the climate and the soils, suitable for crop and intensive livestock production. There are two lessons that we might learn from Australia. First we should not forget agriculture while we are striving so hard for industry. The second lesson concerns the importance of water, of which we are becoming more conscious all the time.

Next, let us take a look at New Zealand as a surplus food producing country of the world. New Zealand is about the size of the State of Colorado in land area. Because of its size you can see that it is not of any major importance as far as world food supply is concerned.

Canada is a country of large potential. The expansion of economic activity is proceeding with great rapidity. Since the beginning of World War II, its rate of economic development has exceeded that of the United States. Since the beginning of World War II, Canada has had a population increase of 21 percent and has increased its agricultural production 22 percent.

Only about 10 percent of the land in Canada is suitable for cultivation. It is estimated that the maximum acreage in Canada would total 130 million acres, which for the sake of comparison is less than a third of the agricultural lands in the United States. Almost all agricultural land in Canada is handicapped by being subject to severe late frosts in spring and early frosts in the fall. In fact, there is frost in every month of the year in most of Canada. This frost boundary sharply limits the length of the growing season in Canada. Despite the fact that climate is a stern master, regardless of the will of man, Canada is one of the world's most important agricultural producers today.

The country next to be considered is Argentina. Argentina and Australia followed exactly the same pattern as far as industrialization is concerned. It is interesting to note that Argentina has a dictator government and Australia is a democracy, but both followed the same road of running the country at the expense of the farmer. I would warn the chamber of commerce of the cities—don't forget your farmers. Not too many years ago, Argentina was one of the world's greatest exporters of foodstuffs, but today her whole agricultural position has changed drastically for the worse.

Austrailia and Argentina exemplify the strong trend throughout the world to overemphasize industrial production at the expense of agriculture. Argentina is one of the most fertile regions of the earth.

The Argentine pampas until recently produced large surpluses of wheat, corn, flaxseed, fodder and more cattle than the meat-loving Argentine could consume. What are the causes of Argentina's present plight? What is it that forced a nation accustomed to a diet of 200 pounds of meat per capita per year suddenly to institute a regime of meatless days? The answer is very simple. The government of Argentina in order to carry out its program of industrialization, forgot its agriculture. Agricultural products in Argentina were bought at cut throat prices, sold on the foreign markets to the highest bidder, and the profits were used by the government on vote-getting welfare plans.

When all is said and done, there are actually two nations which have a surplus of food, and ours is the really important one.

What about our country? Should we concern ourselves with the numbers of people living in this country and the food and fiber they will need?

First, let us talk a little about population, then agriculture. In the 1930's it was believed that our population was about to reach a peak and would then either level off or decline. At that time, death rates and birth rates were almost the same and we had virtually stopped immigration. It was predicted that by 1960 our population would reach 140 million and by 1980 it would be about 154 million. All of these ideas have been discharged and three things have happened. Immigration has been permitted to increase drastically, there has been a decline in our death rate; and a rapid increase has taken place in our birth rate. The summary of the situation is that our population is increasing at the rate of 2½ million people each year. The last estimate I was able to secure indicated that by the year 2000, we will have from 200 to 300 million people in the United States. The first question we should ask ourselves is—can our farmlands produce sufficient food for this increase in our population? It is the opinion of the experts that within the next few years we will not go hungry, but they are not so sure about the year 1975—less than 20 years from now.

At the present time, our total cropland is, according to the Department of Agriculture, approximately 464 million acres. In the year 1974—I repeat within 20 years—it is predicted that we will need 577 million acres, or 113 million more than we have today, and 70 million more than the Department of Agriculture believes possible through land development or reclamation. There are, of course, other factors, such as improved techniques, and it is estimated that this alone will be equivalent to production on 64 million acres. Factors on the other side will also be at work, and the chief one of these is soil erosion. Throughout our country we are losing the soil-erosion fight. In Iowa, one of our most productive States and one of the easiest to control, it is estimated that soil went downhill at the rate of 1 percent last year. It takes nature from 300 to 1,000 years to build back a single inch of topsoil, yet sometimes 1 rain or 1 dust storm will destroy that much topsoil in Texas. The Soil Conservation Service has estimated that each day in the United States, as a result of erosion, we are losing 200 40-acre farms. In Washington, D. C., I drive along the banks of the Potomac each day to work. The Potomac is almost always a muddy river and, although there are some 25 soil-conservation districts in the watershed, the Soil Conservation Service estimates that 5½ million tons of soil will pass Washington going down the Potomac River this year.

Another factor which is critical in our country is water supply. In our country as a whole, last year 40 million people had cause to worry about water. During the past 50 years, our per capita consumption of water has doubled—and since our population has doubled it is evident that our water needs have increased 4 times since 1900. Today, throughout the country, we average using 1,200 gallons per person each day. In Texas, future increases in industrial and agricultural production will depend to a large extent on the size of the assured water supplies.

Out in west Texas, in the High Plains area, there has been an insufficient amount of surface water to be impounded and many wells have been sunk into the ground. In 1936, there were approximately 300 wells. Now there are over 9,000. As a result of so many well being dug, in one country the water levels dropped 30 feet—in another county 19 feet. So even tremendous ground reservoirs are not limitless.

The prediction of water needs for industrial use along the gulf coast are almost unbelievable. During the war, industry was pumping water from wells beneath Texas City which were from 500 to 1,000 feet deep. By 1945, the amount of water used had increased 500 percent. The water level in some wells dropped as much as 165 feet below sea level and the salt water began to find its way in and the land surface dropped as much as 1½ feet. The big celanese plant at Bishop has had its troubles—the paper mill at Lufkin. It all boils down to the fact that we need a national water policy as water will become more important each year for agriculture and for industry.

To briefly summarize the whole situation, we must realize that the protection of our agricultural base is the first need of a national defense program. By this I do not mean military defense, but the defense of values that make American life what it is.

We in America have used, in 40 years, more of the earth's riches than all people the world over have used in 4,000 years. Can we keep it up? Time passes on. Within 24 hours there will be 75,000 additional people on the earth to feed and clothe.

Coal Miners Will Benefit Under Mutual Security Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT B. CHIPERFIELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of the House the fact that approximately $200 million of the foreign aid funds which we have voted this year are to be used to finance the shipment of coal from mines in the United States to foreign nations. It is expected that as a result of this program 10 million more tons of coal will be produced in this country during the present fiscal year than would have otherwise been possible.

I represent one of the major coal producing areas in the State of Illinois. Conditions in this industry have been far from satisfactory. I am sure that families who derive their livelihood from the mining of coal will find conditions better as a result of this program than would otherwise have been the case.

It is my understanding that this program for sending coal to nations which it it in our interest to help is comparable in concept to the program for disposing of surplus agricultural commodities which is specifically provided for in the Mutual Security Act this year. Both programs are based on the proposition that we should send commodities which are excess to our own needs to foreign nations whenever we can rather than to send money to be spent wherever the recipient nation desires. I am sure we render them an important service and at the same time recognize the needs of our own people when we operate in this manner.

In addition to the export plan other steps have been taken to bolster the coal industry. President Eisenhower has named a top-level Cabinet committee to make recommendations.

This action marks another step the present administration is taking to improve the situation of the coal miners of the United States. But my chief objective is to see that the coal industry does not have to meet unfair competition from other competitive power-producing products.

Drought Conditions in Texas Sixth Congressional District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, as early as July 16, I began to receive indications from my congressional district that the future crop conditions were threatened by the continued drought and that cattlemen were already faced with a feed shortage.

With continued requests for aid pouring in, I dispatched the following wire to the administrative officer of the Agriculture Commodity Stabilization Service and the county committee chairmen of 5 of the 8 counties in my district where it was most apparent that some sort of assistance would be needed:

> Receiving letters and wires from your county concerning possible designation as disaster area. If you concur suggest your county committee immediately send application to State drought committee, College Station, and contact Governor in Austin.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, I sent the following wire to the county supervisors and county committeemen of the Farmers' Home Administration following my conversation with the national drought committee at which time I was advised a personal representative of the Secretary of Agriculture was to visit in Texas:

> Have received wires and letters from your county asking for relief on drought situation. Mr. Robert Ragains, Washington office, Farmers' Home Administration, will be in Hamilton, Tex., July 26. Suggest you attend meeting.

In a concerted effort to learn of the situation as it really existed, and to be in a better position to assist the farmers and ranchers in my district, under date of July 27 I wrote to the president of each bank in the Sixth District the following letter of request for information:

> I have been receiving considerable mail from farmers and farm groups describing the extent of drought conditions in the Sixth District, and requesting emergency drought relief.
>
> As you know, the Department of Agriculture can designate a drought area as eligible for emergency relief and farmers and ranchers in the area become entitled to purchase livestock feed at a reduced price and obtain emergency loans. It would be most helpful to me in evaluating the situation if I could receive advice from you as to conditions in your own area. I would like very much to have information about general crop and livestock conditions and an opinion as to the seriousness of the situation.
>
> Your cooperation will be most helpful in assisting me to chart a course of action most suitable to the needs of our district.
>
> Sincerely yours,
>
> OLIN E. TEAGUE,
> *Congressman.*

This request brought back much needed information which was of great help to me in preparing requests to both the State and national drought committees.

Samples of the type reply received appear in order:

Hon. Olin E. Teague,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Teague: This is the 21st day of temperatures from 100 to 112 and this day is hitting the top. At a meeting of workers of the various agencies Friday afternoon the information from their records were that our last rain, and that was spotted in this county, was May 14. The drought along with the extreme heat has burned up pastures and severely reduced grain crops. Now, it is felt that if we do not receive a rain during this month, cotton will be very, very short. It is burning and many small bolls are prematurely opening.

All of us surely appreciate your interest as manifested in your telegrams. I am enclosing clipping from the Daily Sun which reflects the efforts by all agency workers. We are to follow this with a meeting Wednesday morning to follow up our efforts in a formal way.

Many thanks and with continued best wishes for you and yours, I beg to remain,

Sincerely.

P. S.—We hope to contact Mr. Ragan.

Hon. Olin Teague,
House of Representatives,
Washington D. C.:

Need your help in getting Leon County drought relief so livestock men can get protein concentrate or grain and hay. Only 9.07 inches of rain this year compared to 22.49 inches. Supplemental feeding or marketing cattle only solution.

Have sent petition to ASC headquarters with 90 farmers' and ranchers' signatures. Must have relief.

July 30, 1954.

Hon. Olin E. Teague,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Tige: Thank you for your letter about drought conditions in your district. I am glad to give you the most accurate picture that I can of the situation and hope it will be of some help to you.

My personal opinion is that Leon County is in worse shape than at any time within my memory. The cotton crop is short, no silage to speak of was harvested, and drought cut the corn and pea crops alarmingly. As for the ranchers, I do not see how they can meet their obligations. There is no grass now, and several good rains will be needed to do any good. Some stockmen are feeding now, while others have sold or are getting ready to sell because cows and calves are losing weight every day. An inch of rain that fell today isn't enough to give much relief, with the pastures in the shape they are in, and, of course, it is too late to help crops.

I am sorry the picture is such a gloomy one, but it is really a serious situation. It is encouraging to know that you are interested in the condition and needs of the district. If there is any further information I can give you, please let me know.

Sincerely.

July 29, 1954.

Hon. Olin E. Teague,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Teague: Answering your letter of date July 27 with reference to the extreme drought throughout this area, I beg to advise I think our county is entirely eligible for emergency relief and the farmers and ranchers in this area are entitled to purchase livestock feed at a reduced price and obtain emergency loans.

The grass on our ranges and pastures is burning up very rapidly and in a number of places stock water is getting very scarce. We have not had any rain to amount to anything since about the middle of May and, with the extreme heat we are experiencing at this time, the grass is burning very fast. We shall appreciate your assistance in getting our county placed on the emergency drought-relief program.

Thanking you for writing me, and with best wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours.

July 28, 1954.

Hon. Olin E. Teague,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Olin: In reply to your letter of the 27th, the Thornton-Kosse-Groesbeck area and all other surrounding towns, have no prospect for cotton crop. Grass is burned up and unless farmers feed cattle now, I predict a tremendous loss due to starvation. I have never seen conditions as serious, and if it does not rain in the next few days, do not know how farmers will get financed next year.

Unless farmers are helped by rain or by Government aid, many farmers will be out of business next year.

July 29, 1954.

Hon. Olin E. Teague,
Congressman, Sixth District of Texas,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Teague: In response to your letter of July 27, in regard to drought conditions in this area will say that it appears to me that it is worse than last year. Our pastures have burned up on account of the lack of moisture. The alfalfa fields look like they are dead to me.

Your help in this district will certainly be appreciated by our people.

July 29, 1954.

Hon. Olin E. Teague,
Congressman, Sixth District of Texas,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Congressman: Your letter dated July 27, 1954, and addressed to president of our bank, has been handed to me with a request that I make reply.

You ask to know about the drought and the extent of its damage. Well, it's very bad and getting worse as the days go by. Our cotton crop is maturing and burning every day, we have had no rain during the month of July and only .40 of an inch during June.

Some of the very early corn will make a little, and there is a small amount of hay and alfalfa being saved.

I have talked with several farmers and they seem to think Robertson County should be designated as in the drought area and that the farmers and stockmen should be able to buy hay and obtain emergency relief loans.

My opinion is that if we do not receive rain within the next week or 10 days, many of our small cattlemen will be forced to dispose of their herd, as they will not be able to purchase feed during the winter.

I hope the above will be of some help to you in charting your course of action.

With personal good wishes, I am,

Yours very truly.

July 29, 1954.

Hon. Olin E. Teague,
Congressman, House Office
Building, Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Teague: Your letter of the 27th instant with reference to drought conditions in this area received and carefully noted.

I have personally discussed the drought, conditions of cattle ranges, and general crop conditions in this section with cattlemen, farmers, and businessmen in order to attempt to obtain a survey of this section.

Grasshoppers were very numerous during the spring and summer of this year, and still exist in large numbers. They have destroyed considerable vegetation and grasses before the seriousness of the drought began.

At the present time range conditions are bad in certain sections of our trade area, while in others rains have occurred that were limited to a small area, that have made conditions fairly normal in those sections, which, however, are small compared to the general area. The corn crop is possibly 50 percent of normal, while cotton has deteriorated badly on the black and mixed lands, and shows small chance for much production unless rains occur at an early date. I have been advised that hay is difficult to purchase locally, and the necessity of feeding cattle exists at this time in part of this section.

As to emergency loans, I do not believe that in our particular area these are necessary now, but should there be no rain loans of this type might be essential at a later date.

Thanking you for your inquiry, and with kindest regards, I am,

Sincerely yours.

July 29, 1954.

Hon. Olin E. Teague,
Congressman From Texas,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Teague: This is in reply to your letter of the 27th addressed to my father, and I am taking the liberty of answering it because he is ill.

Robertson County, and I am sure most of the other counties in your district, are suffering a severe drought. Farmers and ranchers tell us that they are feeding their cattle because there is not enough good grass in their pastures to carry them. Also livestock feed that can be located is priced in excess of their financial ability or credit rating to purchase it. With our farmers complaining about the drought and the feed situation, as well as their cattle losing weight because of insufficient feed, there is no doubt in our minds that Robertson County should be declared an emergency and being eligible for USDA drought relief.

Your interest in this matter is greatly appreciated, and we feel sure you will take the necessary steps to help our cattlemen secure hay and other feed during this drought.

Sincerely yours.

July 29, 1954.

Hon. Olin E. Teague,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Congressman Teague: Replying to your letter of July 26, general crop and livestock conditions in Ellis County are deteriorating rapidly due to the lack of rain. The following comparative figures for 1954 and 1953 will speak for themselves:

1953:	*Inches*
January	0.88
February	1.33
March	3.03
April	4.76
May	4.92
June	.64
Total	15.56
1954:	
January	2.20
February	.84
March	.69
April	1.83
May	2.04
June	.55
Total	8.14

July to date—only a trace.

The early grain such as wheat and maize made a fair crop, but the late grain will probably be a failure. Cotton, the cash crop, is hardly knee high and blooming in the top. The continued dry and hot weather is seriously retarding the growth of the cotton plants and if there is no rain within the next 10 days or 2 weeks at the most, the crop will be extremely short.

Many of the farmers are having to sell their livestock due to lack of feed and no water. Prices are already depressed and are being further depressed as the hot weather continues, forcing still more farmers to liquidate. Pastures are burned up and gone. This affects the dairyman even more than the cattleman.

I think that the farmers and livestock people of this county are entitled to emergency drought relief. Rest assured that this bank is most sympathetic with our farm and livestock customers and is cooperating to the maximum degree possible under Federal banking regulations. In other words, we are riding with our customers in these trying times.

I certainly hope that you will be able to give our people equal treatment to people elsewhere suffering the same drought conditions.

Sincerely yours.

JULY 30, 1954.

Hon. OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Congressman, Sixth District,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR OLIN: I have your letter of the 26th with reference to the drought conditions in this vicinity of Ellis County.

As your letters will reflect, we have had more than 23 days of extreme hot weather and unless we get some rain immediately, we will be in the worst condition than any period in many years. If we get rain, we will only make a very short crop.

It seems to me what this vicinity will need will be some form of emergency loans to farmers who will not be able to finance themselves or where the bank cannot carry them over for such a great amount. Of course we are going to try to take care of every account that we have and will go the limit with them; however, I do feel that we will have a good number that will either have to sell out or get a longer term of loan than can be arranged with local banks.

The feed and hay arrangement will help but believe that the emergency loans will do the most actual good here. I certainly feel that Ellis County should be included in the drought area.

Thanking you for your good work for our district and assuring you of my help in any matter in which I may cooperate with you or your staff.

With sincerest best wishes, I am,
Yours truly.

JULY 27, 1954.

Hon. OLIN E. TEAGUE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Your letter of inquiry as to the drought condition in this area has just been received. I am a native of Ellis County, and to my knowledge there has not been a worse situation confronting this section in the past 30 years. Our rainfall, as you know, has been deficient for the past several years, and there has been no rain of any consequence for the past 60 days, and this is the 22d successive day of maximum temperatures of over 100°.

I would estimate the hay crop, including Johnson grass and native meadows, at 25 percent of normal, and without moisture in the next 10 days there will be no second cuttings. The corn crop is very short. Some early maize produced a fair yield, 1,500 pounds or more per acre, but the late planted maize is almost a complete failure. The pastures are completely burned up and I doubt if rain at this time would improve them enough to give much grazing before winter. The cotton crop is deteriorating rapidly, and looks like 4 to 10 acres to the bale. A good rain by August 1 would still give ample time to produce a normal crop of cotton.

It seems to me that the stockmen need relief in the marketing of their cattle more than they need reduced prices on feed. Most of the cattle are going to be forced to market within the next 30 days. I see no incentive in buying feed to carry cattle through the winter, regardless of its price, when the cattle will not sell for the cost of the feed when they do go to market.

The facts given describe the situation as I see it, and I trust they may be of some assistance to you in arriving at the actual conditions prevailing in our district.

Sincerely yours.

JULY 26, 1954.

The Honorable OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR OLIN: Mr. ——— came in and talked to me a few minutes ago about the drought situation in Ellis County. It has been 3 weeks or longer that the temperature has been 100° and a large part of the time it has been 105° and 108°. We haven't had a rain in about 3 months.

As a whole, our oat crop was short and this hot July weather has ruined the corn crop and if we don't get an extremely large rain on the cotton within the next week or 10 days, I don't think we can possibly mave over half a crop, and a sorry crop of cotton on the reduced acreage we have in this county, will place some farmers in an awfully bad circumstance. Pasture in practically all the county have burned brown and all the farms that have cattle have been feeding them for about a month. A good rain, if it comes immediately, would change our picture some but if it is longer than a week or 10 days it would not help much.

I will write you a letter in about a week or 10 days and give you a more accurate picture of Ellis County. Thanking you for past favors, I remain,

Respectfully yours.

JULY 29, 1954.

Hon. OLIN E. TEAGUE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. TEAGUE: I appreciate your letter of July 27th, asking about drought conditions in our locality.

We have a record drought here, according to the oldtimers the driest on record. Our shallow wells are all dry. We do not have any feed here and have not made any in 4 years. We do need relief here if any one does. Most farmers and ranchers have sold below their normal stock herd because of dry weather. Our cotton crop this year looks very bad, looks like 6 to 10 acres to the bale.

People in this community are in need of this relief and would appreciate very much if they could get some relief with cheap feed for livestock.

Sincerely yours.

JULY 30, 1954.

Representative OLIN TEAGUE:

The board of directors and officers of the Ellis County Farm Bureau in a special session Thursday night in Waxahachie resolved to urgently request you to do all in your power to influence the inclusion of Ellis County in the Federal disaster relief area. The rainfall here has been only ⅕ of normal so far this year. Present feed supplies are dwindling at an alarming rate. A 1- or 2-inch rain will not alleviate this condition. This organization of 1,560 farm families in Ellis County urgently request your immediate attention to this matter.

Respectfully yours.

JULY 29, 1954.

Mr. OLIN TEAGUE,
Texas Congressman,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: This is the worse drought that this county has experienced in the past 50 years. The stock farmers are on full feed for cattle in part of the county and on half feed in other parts. Hay is not to be had—and too late even though we had rain to make a hay crop. Many farmers are placing their cattle on the market due to shortage of feed. One farmer remarked that it doesn't make sense to feed a $50 cow on 75-cent hay for the next 8 months.

If we do not get a good rain by the end of the first week in August, we should definitely be placed in the distressed area.

Yours very truly.

JULY 28, 1954.

Hon. OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Congressman,
Washington, D. C.:

Replying to your letter in regard to the drought condition in our community, it is the worst drought that we have had in the past 25 years. Our people will have to have some outside help if the conditions do not change in the near future.

Sincerely yours.

JULY 28, 1954.

Hon. OLIN TEAGUE,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. TEAGUE: This acknowledges your letter of the 26th, and I was glad to receive it because on this proposition of having Hill County declared in the emergency drought district. I have been on the fence heretofore; but it looks like I am going to have to fall off on the side of those favoring putting Hill County in the drought relief district.

It is needless to say that we have certain pepole who will suffer greatly if conditions continue as they are, and will lose their foundation stock and probably everything else they have unless conditions change. Up to this time our conditions have been fairly favorable and I have always been optimistic, but certain things could happen in a short while that would turn it around completely.

Right now I am willing to join those in favor of having Hill County placed in position to get emergency drought relief when and if conditions continue as they are and it becomes necessary to have some help in the reduction of the price for their herds.

With kind personal regards.
Yours very respectfully.

JULY 30, 1954.

Hon. OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Thank you for your letter regarding drought conditions in our section.

It appears that the situation is even more serious than when this section was previously declared to be in a drought relief area. This is a community which normally raises large quantities of hay—i. e. enough for its own cattle and enough to sell for a cash crop. This year we have numbers of cattle owners who will not raise enough for their own use and some will be 75 percent short of this. On my own farms I have 50 acres devoted to hay crops. I expect to bale about 10 percent of normal.

In my opinion, if nothing is done, fully 50 percent of the cattle from our community will have to go to market within the next 60 days, and, it is questionable whether or not complete dispersals of local beef-type herds of cattle would not be wise.

Yours very truly.

JULY 29, 1954.

Hon. OLIN TEAGUE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN TEAGUE: It seems as if the drought we are experiencing is the most severe we have had in several years.

The oat, corn, and hay crops are practically complete failures. Pasture land and ranges are in very poor condition and an abundant supply of moisture, which we have not received, will not benefit them this year. Cotton is deteriorating fast and the crop will be extremely short unless we receive ample rainfall within the next 2 weeks.

It is my candid opinion that emergency drought relief is essential for this territory if ranchers hope to keep their foundation herds and some farmers obtain the necessary funds to make a crop.

Sincerely yours.

JULY 28, 1954.

Hon. OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Sixth District of Texas,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. TEAGUE: In response to your letter of July 26 will say that the present agricultural prospects in this area are not at all encouraging.

After receiving your letter I contacted one of the outstanding farmers of the community and he is of the opinion that this area should be designated as eligible for emergency relief for farmers and stockmen to purchase feed at reduced prices.

At the present time our section is suffering from the most severe drought in the memory of many older people. The oat crop was a near failure and other small grain is in about the same category. Unless rain falls in a sufficient amount within the next few days the cotton crop will be the shortest in the history of this county. Pastures are as dry as in midwinter and many of the stockmen are disposing of their herds due to the lack of grass and water.

Until the present time a majority of the people have not been in favor of asking for any emergency relief for this area but conditions are now different. The people of our section are very high-class citizens and are not asking for a gift but would appreciate being placed in a position to carry on their operations by being in a position to purchase feed at a price they could pay.

Yours very truly.

JULY 23, 1954.

Congressman OLIN E. TEAGUE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN TEAGUE: The anxiety of farmers and farm groups in the Sixth District over drought conditions in this distract is certainly very substantial.

The continuing lack of moisture this summer has dried up pastures and farmlands to such an extent that most farmers and cattlemen in this district face a very critical situation. The very slim prospect for a good crop year dwindles more each day. It is a certainty that livestock owners will have to purchase feed for most of the fall months as well as for winter and spring.

At present feed prices the forced purchase of the needed feed to tide livestock owners over until next year practically forces them to take a substantial setback unless some sort of emergency relief can be appropriated.

With the urgency of this predicament in mind, I feel sure that your experience in these matters will come to the front in relieving the distress so prevalent at this time.

Sincerely yours.

JULY 28, 1954.

Hon. OLIN E. TEAGUE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. TEAGUE: I received your inquiry about the drought conditions in the area that our bank represents and I can say that the situation is very serious. We have dairy, cattle, and general farmers in our area.

We have made a complete failure of feed crops such as corn, hay, grain sorghum, and our cotton will be the shortest crop that I remember unless we receive rain soon, and then it would be cut to a short crop.

Due to the long period that cattle will have to be fed, I do not think that the farmers, ranchers, and dairy farmers will be financially able to pay a high price for feed unless they receive emergency drought relief.

I can recommend to you to place our area under the drought relief program.

Yours very truly.

JULY 28, 1954.

Hon. OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Congressman, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. TEAGUE: We have your letter of July 26, regarding the drought situation in our county.

Mr. TEAGUE, the condition in our county is just about as bad as it could possibly be. Our pastures are dried up and the cattlemen are without feed, as well as water. We have had about as hot weather in the past, but this is the driest we have ever had, at least, since I have been in the bank which has been 47 years.

We think our farmers and ranchers will need and are entitled to all the drought assistance the Government can provide.

Sincerely yours.

JULY 26, 1954.

Hon. OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Congressman, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN TEAGUE: We certainly appreciate your special interest in Hill County farmers during this drought situation. Our condition is more serious than at any time since this county was first declared a disaster area. The major portion of Hill County has received 5 to 6 inches of moisture this year. Native and supplemental pastures, hay and grain crops have failed or have produced very little. Cotton will have to receive ample moisture soon to produce near normal.

I am attaching a copy of the recommendation made by the Hill County mobilization committee that Hill County be placed in a drought disaster area under Public Law 875.

We believe the necessary steps have been taken to get Hill County designated. We shall appreciate all you can do toward that end.

This letter is to answer your telegrams to Mr. ——— and to me, also, to again thank you for your interest and help.

Sincerely yours.

JULY 23, 1954.

To: State Mobilization Committee, College Station, Tex.
From: Hill County Mobilization Committee, Hillsboro, Tex.
Subject: Drought relief.

As a result of personal observations made by members of the Hill County Mobilization Committee, and requests made by farmers, ranchers, and dairymen, the mobilization committee felt that it was in order to grant to a group of farmers, ranchers, and dairymen a hearing to study the effect of the continuous drought in this area.

At the hearing testimonials from more than 40 farmers, ranchers, and dairymen emphasized the following:

1. Grass on pasture and rangeland is depleted.
2. Feed reserves are running extremely low.
3. Supplemental pastures are grazed down.
4. Subsoil and topsoil moisture is gone due to the very scant rainfall this year.
5. No prospects in sight for the production of forage this summer and fall.
6. Some farmers are already in debt for feed and others have sold off a few head of cows in order to feed the balance of the herd, and
7. Under normal rainfall conditions it will take at least 3 years to get pastures back to normal production.

We, the Mobilization Committee of Hill County, recommend that Hill County be placed in a drought-disaster area and that farmers, ranchers, and dairymen be allowed to receive the maximum benefits provided by Public Law 875.

JULY 29, 1954.

Mr. OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Congressman Sixth District,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. TEAGUE: We appreciate very much your concern for the farmers of our area, and in general we think we have the most serve drought of all time.

As you probably know the drought started much earlier and the effect is that where we usually make a feed crop before dry weather sets in there will be very few farmers that will make any feed at all.

The cotton acres were drastically cut in our section this year and due to dry weather there are a lot of acres with very poor stand and some farmers were unable to get part of their cotton up at all.

The cotton doesn't have enough stalk to make more than 50 percent of a crop even though we could get moisture now. We are out of grass and cattle are losing a lot of weight, also water has played out in a lot of cases.

We don't hesitate to say it is the most severe drought that we have ever known.

We think that if something could be done so the farmer and cattleman could get help that it would be for the benefit of the country in general.

Hoping this to be the information which you seek and praying that something can be done.

Very truly yours.

JULY 29, 1954.

Hon. OLIN E. TEAGUE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN TEAGUE: In reply to your letter of July 27, asking for information in regard to the seriousness of the drought situation, all we can say is that it is very critical.

We have gone for over a 2-month period without any rain, causing a grain and hay crop failure with the pastures burned to a crisp.

In view of the above we are going to ask that Freestone County be designated as a drought area in order that our farmers and ranchers be eligible for emergency relief under the Government program.

Sincerely yours.

JULY 29, 1954.

Mr. OLIN TEAGUE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN TEAGUE: We are in receipt of your letter of the 26th regarding drought conditions in our area and surrounding territory.

Most all of our cattlemen and farmers are out of grass; I would say that 90 percent of them are out of grazing or limited seriously in relation to normal conditions for this season of the year. Very little hay has been made, and in our immediate area we at present have very poor promise of making a cotton crop and getting the use of the seed and their byproducts. I have talked with several of our leading cattlemen and farmers this week, and they seem to think that our local condition is worse than at any time within the past 4 or 5 years. If we could get good rains within a few days, we still could increase our cotton production and improve our pastures. But we are very short on grass, hay, proteins, and even water in a lot of farms and pastures.

Sincerely yours.

JULY 28, 1954.

OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Old House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Committee voted yesterday to request Freestone County be placed in disaster area. Letters to State committee and Governor.

JULY 28, 1954.

Hon. OLIN E. TEAGUE,
House Office Building:

Yours of 26th received. Crop conditions 25 percent normal; pasture and livestock less. Situation serious. Letter in detail to follow.

JULY 28, 1954.

Mr. OLIN E. TEAGUE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN TEAGUE: On account of the drought in this area, it is my belief that this area in Navarro County should be eligible for emergency drought relief.

We have lost our feed crops; and if we do not get a rain in a very short time, there will be very little cotton made.

The cattle in this area are suffering from the drought and will have to be sold unless our farmers can get relief.

Sincerely yours.

Mr. Speaker, following the receipt of these replies, I had them photostated and forwarded them together with a personal request for designation of seven counties in my district to be named disaster areas. Following is the letter of transmittal to the national and State drouth committees which I mailed on August 5:

AUGUST 5, 1954.

Mr. KENNETH SCOTT,
National Drought Disaster Committee,
Department of Agriculture,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SCOTT: For the past 3 or 4 weeks I have been receiving letters concerning the drought situation in my district. I do not know which counties have requested that they be designated as a drought-disaster area. I do know that a number of the counties have made this request.

As a result of the letters from individual farmers and agricultural people in every county, I wrote a letter to each banker of my district that I knew was interested and had knowledge of the agricultural situation, and I am enclosing the letters I received in answer from Ellis County, Freestone County, Hill County, Leon County, Limestone County, Navarro County, and Robertson County. At this date I have not received a reply from Brazos County. To further point out the severity of the situation, I am enclosing extract of a letter from an individual who would have knowledge of conditions in Limestone County.

A year ago when these same counties were being considered, I wrote the bankers and their replies were considerably different. I believe these letters from the bankers to be very accurate and I want to urge your committee to give careful consideration to declaring these counties drought-disaster areas.

Sincerely,

OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Congressman.

AUGUST 5, 1954.

STATE DROUGHT COMMITTEE, STATE OF TEXAS,
College Station, Tex.

DEAR SIRS: For the past 3 or 4 weeks I have been receiving letters concerning the drought situation in my district. I do not know which counties have requested that they be designated as a drought disaster area. I do know that a number of the counties have made this request.

As a result of letters from individual farmers and agricultural people in every county, I wrote a letter to each banker of my district that I knew was interested and had knowledge of the agricultural situation, and I am enclosing photostatic copies of answers received to my letter from Ellis County, Freestone County, Hill County, Leon County, Limestone County, Navarro County, and Robertson County. At this date I have not received a reply to my letter from Brazos County.

A year ago when these same counties were being considered, I wrote the bankers and their replies were considerably different. I believe these letters from the bankers to be very accurate, and I want to urge your committee to give careful consideration to declaring these counties drought disaster areas.

Sincerely,

OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Congressman.

On August 12, I received advice from the State drought committee that the seven counties in my district about which I wrote had been included in a list forwarded to the national drought committee for designation as disaster areas. On August 18 Mr. Kenneth Scott, of the national drought committee, announced that an additional 42 counties in Texas were named as disaster areas, but the 7 in my district were not included.

On the morning of August 20, however, the national drought committee released a new list of disaster areas, including the seven counties in my district; but I fear that the designation came much too late to be of any real help to my farmers and ranchers.

Workload of the Committee on Foreign Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT B. CHIPERFIELD
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the House Foreign Affairs Committee is preparing a survey of its activities during the 83d Congress. I believe this document will prove useful to the Members of the House of Representatives, to the Congress in general, and to the press and public, in giving a review of activities which form an important part of the formulation and implementation of United States foreign policy.

The Committee on Foreign Affairs during this 83d Congress has just concluded legislative activities which demonstrate not only the time-consuming nature of the activities, but also the complexity and far-reaching effects of foreign affairs. Particularly significant is the fact that the committee broke new ground in the formation of foreign policy in several respects:

First. During the first session it wrote into the Mutual Security Act of 1953 a provision that 50 percent of the military equipment for Europe should be delivered only on condition that the European Defense Community comes into being. Up to that time there apparently had been no other instance in which the Congress had taken initiative to such an extent in giving direction to the Executive for the conduct of foreign affairs in this manner. In the Mutual Security Act of 1954 the committee wrote into the act a modification which was adopted by the Congress. Countries will now be eligible to receive military aid financed from funds appropriated for fiscal years 1954 and 1955 on the condition that they have either joined together in or are developing collective defense programs in a manner satisfactory to the United States as determined by the President. The basic requirement remains that a signatory of the European Defense Community Treaty must have ratified that instrument before it can qualify for assistance. The provision recognizes the fact that a new approach to mutual American and European security objectives may be necessary if the European Defense Community Treaty is not ratified and provides the President with the means to pursue such an approach.

Second. Under the Mutual Security Act of 1954, considered during the second session, as a result of committee action concurred in by the Congress, the Foreign Operations Administration is to be terminated at the close of business on June 30, 1955. For the first time in many years, we will not have an independent agency or semi-independent agency dispersing foreign aid. Beginning July 1, 1955, the regular departments of the executive branch will take over such activities as will proceed under the mutual-security program.

Third. As I stated in my remarks on the conference agreement on the Mutual Security Act of 1954:

> Another significant feature of this bill has been the changing pattern of foreign aid from economic to military. We all recall that under the Marshall plan foreign aid was almost 100 percent economic, but with the initiation of the mutual-security bill there has been a most significant change until now this year's bill carries between 75 and 85 percent for military support to our allies and only a relatively small proportion for economic aid which is largely devoted to carrying out the point 4 program. So we have seen a shift from 2 years ago when our aid was about equally divided between economic and military to the vast majority of our aid being for military purposes to our allies for our own security and the defense of the free world.

Fourth. In the Mutual Security Act of 1954, the House Foreign Affairs Committee insisted on putting in a loan provision, which was substantially adopted by the Congress. Under the act, not less than $200 million can be used only to make loans. This should result in a subsequent saving of this amount for our hard-pressed taxpayers.

Fifth. The downward trend in our foreign-aid spending has been considerably accelerated due in large part to the committee's activities in this regard. The original Executive request for the Mutual Security Act of 1953 was $5,828,732,500. The committee cut this amount by almost $500 million. The final amount appropriated was $4,531,507,000.

In the Mutual Security Act of 1954, President Eisenhower asked for $3.6 billion, in contrast to President Truman's last budget request in 1952 for $7.9 billion. The committee cut the $3.6 billion by $7,500,000. The final amount appropriated was $2,731,499,816.

It should be noted that this session of the Congress cut our foreign aid more than 50 percent below the 1952 figure.

While the mutual-security legislation has been the most important work of the committee during this Congress, mention should be made of the multitude of other bills and resolutions which have been a part of committee activity. Such measures include international bridges and power projects, international claims, reorganization of the Department of State and of the Foreign Service of the United States, the question of the seating of the Chinese Communists in the United Nations, Soviet Communist interference in Latin America, international telecommunications, international organizations such as the International Labor Organization and the Pan American Institute of Geography and History, congressional expressions of sympathy and good will following drought and flood disaster to the Netherlands, Great Britain, and Belgium, good-will expressions on Pan American Day, international sanitation projects, controlling the exportation and importation of arms and munitions, the charter of vessels to citizens of the Philippines, and even the question of increasing the fee for executing an application for a passport from $1 to $3. This is by no means an exhaustive list, but it does give an indication of the variety of the subjects with which the Foreign Affairs Committee has dealt.

In connection with its consideration of measures on these diverse subjects, the committee received 38 messages from the President and executive communications. The committee made 75 requests to Government departments and agencies for reports on legislation under consideration.

The fact that a bill or a resolution is small or may involve little or no money has made little difference to the committee in considering every measure fully and carefully. The increasing workload of committee activities was amply demonstrated during the 83d Congress. Two hundred and sixty-five full committee and subcommittee meetings were held, during which 361 witnesses were heard—totaling 701 appearances—and 11,507 pages of printed and typed record were compiled. The time spent in session by the full committee was 306 hours, 54 minutes, and by the subcommittees 158 hours, 42 minutes, making a total of 465 hours and 36 minutes of House Foreign Affairs Committee activity in this respect.

A statistical summary of committee operations is given in the following table:

Analysis of activities

Number of consultative subcommittees		8
Number of special legislative subcommittees		4
Miscellaneous subcommittees		4
Number of conference committees		2
Number of meetings of conference committees		6
Number of bills and joint resolutions referred to the committee		111
(Of this number 24 are duplicates.)		
Number of simple and concurrent resolutions referred to the committee		175
(Of this number 60 are duplicates.)		
Number of bills and joint resolutions considered by the committee		48
(Includes duplicate measures.)		
Number of bills and joint resolutions reported favorably		25
(Includes separate bills incorporated by committee.)		
Number of bills and joint resolutions favorably reported by committee and passed by House		25
Includes separate bills incorporated by committee.)		
Number of bills and joint resolutions enacted into law		20
(Includes separate bills incorporated by committee.).		
Number of simple and concurrent resolutions considered by the committee		28
(Includes duplicate measures.)		
Number of simple and concurrent resolutions reported and acted upon in the House		11
Number of hearings		265
(Open and executive.)		
Number of pages of committee hearings		11,507
(Includes printed hearings, stenographic transcripts, and committee minutes of open and executive sessions.)		
Number of pages of reports		1,723
Number of witnesses		361
Number of witness appearances before committee		701
Number of meetings with Rules Committee		7
Number of committee reports:		
Reports on legislation	31	
Minority reports on legislation	2	
Conference reports	2	
Reports on resolutions of inquiry	0	
Subcommittee reports on legislation (printed and mimeographed)	6	
Special reports	11	
Total		52
Number of messages from the President and Executive communications referred to the committee		38
Number of House documents referred to the committee		38
Number of memorials and petitions referred to the committee		128
Number of reports requested from Government departments and agencies on legislation referred to the committee		75
Approximate number of pages in Congressional Record of House consideration on bills and resolutions reported by committee		348
Number of Members sponsoring measures referred to the committee		152
Number of studies and memoranda prepared for the members of the committee by the staff		513
Time spent in sessions:		
By committee:		
Executive, 261 hours, 54 minutes.		
Open, 45 hours, 0 minutes.		
By subcommittees:		
Executive, 97 hours, 1 minute.		
Open, 61 hours, 41 minutes.		
Total		465 hours, 36 minutes
Approximate total authorization in measures considered by committee and passed by House and enacted into law		$8,411,748,775
(By way of comparison, the money involved in public bills before the committee during the 73d Cong. was $102,000.)		

Recognizing the tremendous stake that the public has in what the House Foreign Affairs Committee does, I have tried to make as much information as possible available to the public. With the committee's cooperation, it has been my practice after each secret session meeting to give the press a digest of information received or action taken during the meetings, consonant of course with security regulations. Practically all documents published for the use of the committee, with the exception of those having a security classification, are available either for distribution to the public or for inspection by the public. These include the committee's legislative calendar, legislative hearings, reports on legislation, reports of study missions, background studies on special subjects, and the survey of its activities.

I believe this practice of informing the public to the greatest possible extent is a vitally important part of our responsibilities as representatives of the people.

The Federal Trade Commission Investigation of Coffee Prices—Summary and Conclusions, Part 1

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 16, 1954

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent of the House, I include herewith the first portion of the text of the Summary and Conclusions of the Federal Trade Commission's Economic Report of the Investigation of Coffee Prices, as follows:

SUMMARY

In summary, the results of the Federal Trade Commission's investigation of the coffee price spiral of 1953–54 can be stated as follows:

1. The increase in green coffee prices, as reported by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, from $0.58 to $0.96½ which occurred between December 1953 and April 1954, and the corresponding increase in average retail roasted coffee prices from $0.91 to $1.18 (popular brands increased to $1.32) cannot be explained in terms of the competitive laws of supply and demand.

It now appears evident that while frost damage may reduce the 1954–55 Parana coffee crop by 3.5 million bags as reported, this damage was as—perhaps more—important psychologically than materially. The frost had no significant effect upon the 1953–54 crop; it did reduce the prospective Brazilian crop for 1954–55. It would, therefore be normal to expect higher prices during the closing months of the 1953–54 crop year to meet the anticipated deficiency in the 1954–55 crop. However, the price rise was far in excess of what might be expected under the competitive laws of supply and demand—greater than was necessary to accomplish the carry-over.

An examination of price behavior and crop forecasts reveals the unrealistic behavior of all factors in the coffee trade. Brazil appears to have produced a little over 19 million bags of coffee in 1953–54. Giving full weight to the announced curtailment of production in Parana where the frost damage was most severe, it appears that Brazil's coffee crop in 1954–55 will amount to 18 million bags, or a reduction of less than 8 percent. World coffee production in 1953–54 appears to have been between 41.5 and 41.9 million bags; if there were no increase in production elsewhere, the predicted decline in Brazilian output would amount to less than 4 percent of world production. Yet during the year ending July 1, 1954, the spot price of green coffee in New York advanced 57 percent, and on the New York Coffee and Sugar Exchange the price of the September future advanced 61 percent. What is known with respect to the nature of the demand for coffee in the immediate past would indicate that a price increase of less than 15 percent would have accomplished any reduction in consumer purchasing necessary to equate demand with supply. If due allowance is made for a higher sensitivity of price because stocks were lower at this time than in previous years, the expected price increase could scarcely have exceeded 20 to 25 percent. Furthermore, estimated increases in coffee production in other areas of Brazil, other Western Hemisphere countries, and elsewhere will more than offset the estimated reduction in output in Parana. Hence, the world supply outlook, barring future frosts and droughts, is for about 42 million bags for the crop year 1954–55—a slightly larger crop than in 1953–54—and for continuing larger crops thereafter.

Nor can the 1953–54 price spiral be explained in terms of increased world demand. Over the past several years per capita consumption in the United States has declined in the face of rising prices. Until now this decline has been offset by increased consumption in Western Europe. However, now that per capita consumption in Europe has just about regained its pre World War II level, it is unlikely that henceforth it can increase sufficiently to offset the reduction in United States consumption that will result from the current high prices. On the contrary, nearly all Western European countries except Western Germany anticipate reductions in consumption following recent price increases.

With production increasing and consumption decreasing at present coffee price levels, prospects are for lower coffee prices in the future barring excessive crop damage and provided supply and demand are permitted freely to run their course.

But if the current level of coffee prices cannot be explained altogether in terms of competitive supply and demand, to what additional factors may it be attributed?

2. The inadequacy of present crop reporting systems in coffee growing countries was a basic cause of the spectacular price increase, and this condition permitted other forces to operate on price. Coffee is produced in relatively underdeveloped countries and is consumed principally in the economically more advanced countries—especially the United States. Crop reporting in the coffee producing countries, as would be expected has not progressed nearly so far as it has in the more commercially developed countries. In the absence of a reliable reporting system, producing countries historically have tended to estimate their annual crops with a conservative bias, which explains why they have generally tended to overstate the severity of crop damages. The members of the coffee trade in consuming countries appear in the past intuitively to have adjusted themselves to discounting these biases in crop reports. Accordingly, when reports from Brazil indicated severe frost damage to coffee trees in Parana in July 1953, it elicited scarcely any reaction from the coffee trade in consuming countries. However, by December it became evident that some, perhaps all, of the reported July frost damage was real. Since no reliable data on the world coffee crop was available, members of the coffee trade in consuming countries apparently expected the worst and, going to the other extreme, acted as though world coffee supplies would be less in 1954–55 than in 1953–54 by 3.5 million bags, the predicted loss in Parana due to the July frost.

3. Simultaneously, activity on the New York Coffee and Sugar Exchange produced an upward price spiral that appeared to confirm the trade's worst expectations. On December 1, 1953, a small group of Brazilian speculators entered the futures market, and by December 2, the day on which the Brazilian Government decreed that coffee farmers would be financed at a loan rate of Cr$1,500 rather than Cr$1,200 per bag, they had taken over a substantial percentage of the total long position. The price of December futures on that date was $0.5840 per pound. Immediately the price of green-coffee futures began an upward spiral, and was followed closely behind by green coffee spot prices. Private Brazilian speculative interests, which comprised this inisial group and two succeeding small groups, held substantial long positions in the coffee-futures market until January 13, 1954, by which time the price of near futures had risen to $0.725 per pound. In the meantime unusually large long positions were taken by United States speculative interests.

Throughout most of December coffee-futures prices were slightly above spot prices. The price spiral continued with only momentary interruptions until April 2, at which time the price of July futures stood at $0.9635 per pound. Thereafter, as expectations with respect to the 1954–55 crop were adjusted in the light of increased crop forecasts, spot and futures prices declined until by May 6 the price of July futures had fallen to $0.8340 per pound. This downward adjustment was brought to an end when the Brazilian Government announced its new minimum export price of $0.87 per pound. The price of green coffee in the spot and futures market has remained in the neighborhood of Brazil's minimum export price since that date.

4. In the face of rising coffee prices, United States importers and roasters commenced accumulating coffee stocks by early December. These unseasonable inventory accumulations created in the immediate market the shortage that the trade expected in the light of December reports of the frost damage, and were reflected in unseasonably high monthly imports into the United States from December until March 1954.

5. Imperfections in the domestic coffee market also became apparent during the period of rising coffee prices. The concentrated state of the coffee-roasting industry places considerable power in the hands of a few large roasters to influence price. Indeed, the changes in the overall pattern of industry activity appear, during the period studied, to be assignable almost wholly to the activities of the five large coffee roasters. In a less concentrated industry, there presumably would have been a less extreme reaction to the news of the impending shortage. At least the smaller factors in the coffee industry would not have possessed sufficient working capital to have bought on a comparable scale, and this stimulus to rising prices would have been absent. One of the possible consequences of the 9-month coffee-price spiral may be an even more concentrated domestic coffee industry; most roasters found their costs mounting faster than they were able to advance prices and remain competitive with producers of the large-selling national brands.

6. Next in importance to inadequate crop reports, and the attendant expectations they generate, the restrictive contract used in futures trading on the New York Coffee and Sugar Exchange was among the basic causes of the 1953–54 coffee-price spiral. The Santos 4 (new) contract for practical purposes permits delivery of only those coffees shipped from the port of Santos to the port of New York. This amounts to about 10 percent of the coffee consumed annually in the United States. Since the exchange has provided no effective means whereby other coffees can be readily substituted for Santos coffee, the contract is not a useful hedging device for the coffee trade. For example, during the months of December 1953 and January and February 1954, when trading on the exchange was unusually heavy, only 615 individual accounts traded in coffee futures; and only 121 of these accounts represented domestic coffee trade interests. Accordingly, the coffee futures market is unusually thin and restricted, and hence unduly maneuverable and subject to wider price swings under abnormal speculative and commercial trading than are consistent with the actual conditions of supply and demand.

7. Sudden and unreasonable price fluctuations intrinsic in a thin market are amplified by the failure of the New York Coffee and Sugar Exchange to institute proper safeguards followed by regulated exchanges and to prevent trading abuses and irregularities. Unlike regulated exchanges, no limit is placed on speculative trading so as to restrict the manipulative capacity of speculative accounts. Moreover, the exchange's control committee mechanism is inadequate in that it fails to provide adequate safeguards for the prevention of manipulation of prices and the cornering of a commodity.

Furthermore, the New York Coffee and Sugar Exchange has failed adequately to police its members and enforce established trading rules and procedures, as evidenced by (1) condoning the practice among floor brokers of exchanging information of a confidential nature, and thereby violating a confidential relationship to the detriment of the agent's principal and other traders to whom the information is not made available; (2) permitting ex-pit transactions, i. e., trading off the ring without benefit of public outcry, which is a form of bucketing and considered an illegal practice on regulated exchanges; (3) condoning passouts when not permitted by the rules and failing to take disciplinary action against a member for misusing passouts; and (4) permitting a member to take the other side of an order, i. e., to act as an agent and principal in the same transaction, without prior consent in each transaction of the party for whom he acts as agent.

The exchange's rule concerning margin requirements is loosely drawn in that speculators can be classified under the rules as members of the trade and hence post lower margins. Although margin requirements compare favorably with those of regulated exchanges in terms of percentage, the facts developed raise serious questions as to adequacy of margin requirements in view of the sudden and unreasonable price fluctuations which are inherent in a thin market.

Recommendations

The question thus arises as to what remedial action the Federal Trade Commission should take, or recommend that the Congress take, in order to remove the market imperfections and restraints and trading irregularities uncovered in the course of its investigation. In view of the nature of the specific interferences with the free interplay of supply and demand developed in this report, it appears that such remedies, if they are to be comprehensive, are principally legislative. Accordingly, the Commission recommends that the Congress enact legislation designed to remedy the following market imperfections:

(1) The narrowness of the futures contract.

(2) The inadequacies of basic marketing information.

(3) The trading irregularities, consisting of unpoliced passouts, expit transactions, and breaches of broker-customer confidential (fiduciary) relationships.

It is further recommended that Congress appraise the adequacy of present margin requirements against the facts developed in this report.

In view of the complexities of the coffee market, however, it is recommended that Congress take action in providing these remedies only after appropriate committee hearings at which representatives of the coffee trade, the New York Coffee and Sugar Exchange, and the Commodity Exchange Authority, be heard. On the matter of contracts, there appears to be no unanimity of opinion, or even an overwhelming majority opinion, in the coffee trade that any particular contract yet devised will incorporate the features necessary for the desired broadening of the basis of trade. Coffee, because of its taste and other attributes, is a heterogeneous commodity. Hence, while the contract can easily be broadened, much study will be required before it can be broadened enough to create a broad competitive futures market.

Nevertheless the adoption of a satisfactory contract should be made mandatory. The contract must be made attractive to the entire trade, and if conflicts exist, the needs of those who use the exchange for hedging should be preferred over those who use it for speculative dealings. Hedging offers a better prospect for creating a broad market than does speculation. If the contract is to be adapted to the needs of the coffee trade, it must be a universal contract. It probably should provide for commercial differences between grades and growths and allow for deliveries at New Orleans and San Francisco as well as at New York.

Moreover, since coffee is produced outside the political jurisdiction of the United States, an adequate (or improved) crop-reporting system requires cooperation by the coffee-producing countries. The fundamental problem of inadequate and sometimes misleading market information cannot, therefore, be easily or unilaterally solved. As a first step, it is recommended that the Congress provide for increases in the staffs of United States agricultural reporting officers stationed at embassies in the principal coffee-producing countries.

Certain of the irregularities and restraints can perhaps be remedied through Federal Trade Commission or judicial action as well as by legislation. The Commission is now considering the question as to whether action can be taken under present statutes to correct certain of these irregularities—for example, use of restrictive contracts by agreement and breaches of broker-customer fiduciary relationships. However, in view of the fact that such remedies would be piecemeal and partial in nature and would not strike at all the basic causes of the price spiral, it is recommended also that Congress give concurrent consideration to these trading irregularities in its comprehensive study of the entire problem.

In conclusion it should be pointed out that while removal of the above-cited market restraints, imperfections, and irregularities would probably prevent in the future such excessive coffee-price movements as the price spiral of 1953–54, such action will not make the coffee market freely competitive. The supplies of coffee, and the price at which these supplies move to market, are affected by minimum export prices, domestic price supports (similar to those in effect in the United States), exchange regulations, and other policy measures of the coffee-growing countries. However, these patently lie beyond the judicial and legislative powers of the United States Government.

American Press Comments on Foundations Investigation Commends Position of Congressman Wayne L. Hays, of Ohio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WAYNE L. HAYS

OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, a select House committee investigated tax-exempt foundations in the 82d Congress and filed a report generally commendatory of their purposes and operations. Because I considered a further congressional study in this field unnecessary, I voted against the resolution introduced in the 83d Congress to create a Special Committee To Investigate Tax Exempt Foundations. However, I was glad to accept appointment as its ranking minority member and resolved to undertake my duties with an open mind.

It soon became apparent that whatever their good intentions, the majority and the staff were to be governed by strong preconceptions concerning social and economic developments in the United States in recent decades and the role of the foundation in bringing them about. After the hearings opened on May 10 of this year, it became further apparent that certain witnesses would seek to use the committee as a forum for smearing prominent persons through the guilt-by-association technique. This I could not countenance. The committee majority, on July 1, voted to close the public hearings, although the foundations had had no opportunity to reply in open session to charges made against them in open session. The favorable public response to their vigorous written statements, filed with the committee in lieu of testimony by their representatives in public hearings, does not alter the fact that they were done an injustice in being denied their day in court.

Mr. Speaker, I have been gratified by numbers of thoughtful letters received from my own district and from all over the United States, and by the editorial reaction to our minority position. Following are some of the comments on the foundations investigation which have appeared in the press of the country:

Cleveland (Ohio) Press, See-Hear With Stan Anderson, May 12, 1954:

"Congressman Wayne L. Hays of this State deserves today's medal for distinguished service. According to a late news story yesterday, the Congressman demanded that someone look into the Facts Forum radio program. He made his demand as a member of a Special House Committee Investigating Tax-Exempt Foundations. It seems Hays has some serious doubts about the right of Facts Forum to claim exemption. It is said, however, that the program claims it is educational and impartial. I do not know the legal aspects of this matter, but I do know what I hear over the radio. * * * If what I hear should be exempt from taxation, then I submit that Zoo Parade, Adventure, Mr. Wizard, and sundry other programs should get a rebate from Uncle Sam."

New York (N. Y.) Herald Tribune, May 15, 1954, The Reece Investigation:

"Judging by the intellectual acumen of the opening statement, the investigation is not likely to do as much harm as its ideas theoretically render it capable of; moreover at least one member of the committee, Representative Hays of Ohio, seems to sense that something is very wrong with the underlying assumptions. Thus the worst may be avoided."

Port Huron (Mich.) Times-Herald, May 20, 1954, We'd Bet It's Not Subversive:

"The first witness before the committee was Norman Dodd, research director for the committee. Representative Wayne L. Hays, member of the committee, said that the testimony given by Mr. Dodd 'implies that foundations gave nothing to pro-American activities.' And Representative Hays of Ohio—very appropriately—said that statement was 'a serious indictment of foundations.' The Ford Foundation does not devote its vast resources to improper activities—that has been proved repeatedly. While the House committee was holding its first meeting in Washington, the Ford Foundation presented a check for $500,000 to the Detroit civic building fund."

Corpus Christi (Tex.) Caller, May 26, 1954, Show Good Judgment:

"Hays objected to a witness implicating individuals in his testimony without those individuals being present to defend themselves. Hays properly asked Chairman Reece, Republican, of Tennessee, for an executive (closed) session if the witness was going to be allowed to level continued accusations. Reece, using two Republicans' proxies, defeated Hays' request as well as a motion to recess. But Hays wasn't finished. He asked Reece if the committee would meet if Democrats were absent from the hearing. Reece replied the group would adjourn. So Hays, a man of action, picked himself up and said: 'Goodby.' We are elated that Representative Hays took this action. Together with his Democratic colleague, Representative Gracie Frost, of Idaho, who joined him in his walk, Hays helped to return some sanity and decency to congressional hearings. * * * We congratulate Representative Hays and Representative Frost for doing what was right."

Washington (D. C.) Post and Times Herald, May 27, 1954, Shaking the Foundations:

"The Democratic members of the House committee investigating tax-exempt foundations have ample ground for their objections to the conduct of the hearings to date. * * * The plain fact is that this investigation has a political purpose and is aimed at a predetermined result; its function is to ride Mr. Reece's anti-internationalist and anti-intellectual hobbyhorse."

Cincinnati (Ohio) Times-Star, Doris Fleeson, May 27, 1954:

"The Reece investigation, so far at least, has left entirely to Democrats the defense of freedom of thought. Minority Members Wayne Hays, of Ohio, and Gracie Frost, of Idaho, walked out of the committee Monday in protest against allowing free rein to a self-styled expert on subversive influences in education."

Martins Ferry-Bellaire (Ohio) Times-Leader, Editor's Notebook, May 28, 1954:

"Congressman Wayne L. Hays has vaulted into national prominence through his protests against the tactics being used by the House committee investigating tax-free foundations. In case you haven't been following the story, Hays is a minority member of the committee and has voiced outrage over alleged smear testimony against prominent people, such as Senator Paul Douglas, of Illinois, and radio-TV news commentator Edward R. Murrow. The story has received page 1 attention in newspapers throughout the country and probably would have rated even greater play were it not for the fact that the investigation of the foundations has been obscured somewhat by the Army-McCarthy hearings. Hays said that, in making his objections, he has been merely following the dictates of his conscience and insisting on fair play. As a result, he is rather pleasantly baffled by the acclaim he is receiving. Knowing Wayne Hays, I am not surprised that he is now making national headlines. In view of his willingness to take a forthright stand or enter a controversy, I'm surprised it didn't happen sooner."

Louisville (Ky.) Courier-Journal, Robert L. Riggs, May 30, 1954:

"The score of Senators who are sponsoring legislation to reform the conduct of congressional investigations could have spent some time profitably this week looking in on a hearing on the House side of the Capitol. They would have found that there never has been anything quite like the inquiry conducted by the special House committee headed by B. Carroll Reece, of Tennessee. This new technique in handling witnesses has little to do with Reece. It's the sole property of a belligerent Democrat from Ohio, 43-year-old Wayne L. Hays. It's possible that Hays has shown the way to reform congressional investigation procedures without any additional legislation."

Cleveland (Ohio) Plain Dealer, June 14, 1954, An Expert Who Didn't Know Who Said That:

"A coup of sorts was achieved last Wednesday when an Ohio Representative, Wayne L. Hays, Democrat, of Flushing, questioned the committee's associate research director, Thomas M. McNiece. McNiece had charged that funds from tax-exempt groups had promoted a 'world-wide social revolution' and that certain groups which had access to foundations' funds had channeled money to leftist outfits. Hays read three statements and asked McNiece if he could identify sources. McNiece couldn't, but said they were 'closely comparable' to Communist literature he had read. He further said they paralleled very closely Communist ideals. Hays then announced the excerpts were from encyclicals of two Popes—Leo XIII in 1891 and Pius XI in 1931. Hays, a Protestant, emphasized that the Catholic Church has been a great anti-Communist bulwark. The committee aides blunder is asinine, of course, a sympton of some 'experts' to see Red in everything."

Baltimore (Md.) Sun, June 10, 1954, Will the Lesson Be Learned?:

Representative Hays made his point: namely, that quotations taken out of context frequently distort and often contradict the real meaning of their author. Will Representative Hays' lesson teach zealous witnesses to mend their ways? We doubt it."

Brooklyn (N. Y.) Eagle, June 11, 1954, Warning to Investigators:

"Never has there been a more graphic demonstration of the unfairness and danger of using paragraphs lifted out of a full context as a basis for sweeping conclusions than was made evident in the House committee hearing on tax-free foundations."

New York (N. Y.) Times, June 11, 1954, Inexpert Expert:

"How inexpert can an expert be? The country now has one indication of the answer in Wednesday's demonstration by Thomas M. McNiece, associate research director of the House committee investigating foundations. He was the expert who was so unwary as to conclude that several unidentified quotations 'paralleled very closely Communist ideals,' only to learn that they were quotations from papal encyclicals—one of them a half century old. Representative Hays, who arranged this demonstration, has emphasized one useful lesson—namely, the ease with which quotations out of context can be misinterpreted."

Louisville (Ky.) Times, June 11, 1954, A Witch Hunter's Device Exposed to Light:

"Not only the neatest trick of the week but also the most useful was done by Representative Hays of Ohio. * * * The lesson the Congressman taught was valuable—especially if considered in its full implication."

Youngstown (Ohio) Vindicator, June 12, 1954, Quoting Out of Context:

"One of Ohio's few Democratic Congressmen, Representative Wayne L. Hays, of Flushing, has just given a striking demonstration of how far wrong one can go by lifting quotations out of their context. Mr. Hays, a member of the Special House Committee To Investigate Tax-Free Foundations, has good reason for not being in sympathy with methods used by the committee's staff, as directed by the reactionary chairman, Carroll Reece, of Tennessee."

Washington (D. C.) Post and Times Herald, June 12, 1954, Plot Psychosis:

"Representative Wayne L. Hays coined an apt and illuminating name for the thinking that lies behind Representative B. Carroll Reece's current investigation of tax-exempt foundations. He referred to it as a 'plot psychosis.' The plot appears to be * * * that the tax-exempt foundations have used their funds to promote a social revolution in the United States. Mr. Hays demonstrated the psychosis when he led Mr. McNiece on Wednesday into characterizing three excerpts from papal encyclicals as paralleling 'very closely communistic and socialistic ideals.'"

Hartford (Conn.) Courant, June 14, 1954, Words and Sources:

"Congressman Wayne Hays pointed up the dangers of failure to think carefully about opinions the other day. He is leading the Democratic counter-attack on Carroll Reece's committee attempt to find subversion in the oft-investigated educational foundations * * * the lesson Mr. Hays was stressing was that many people, in many ways, have sought a betterment of man's condition on earth. It is a sign of ignorance and stupidity to stigmatize as Red each and every path away from the status quo."

Hartford (Conn.) Times, It Is Not Funny:

"We need more men like Representative Wayne L. Hays, Democrat of Ohio, to demonstrate the ease with which investigators can manipulate a context either through ignorance, prejudice, or plain trickery."

Winston-Salem (N. C.), Twin City Sentinel, June 14, 1954:

"Representative Hays, Ohio Democrat, caught a congressional investigator flatfooted the other day. * * * Taken out of context, removed from historical perspective, many statements can be interpreted in any way that will serve the interpreter's purpose. This is a favorite stunt of our more radical investigators. * * * Mr. McNiece fell into a nice trap. It is one everybody should avoid."

Milwaukee (Wis.) Journal, A Verdict Before the Trial in Foundation Inquiry:

"The worst charge that the committee has put into its record as hearing started is that foundations are guilty of empiricism—which sounds horrible unless you realize that it means the kind of study that emphasizes the assembling of data. This seems to shock Reece and his staff. No wonder, after sitting in on this ridiculous business and being presented with conclusions before starting the investigation, the two Democratic members of the committee walked out the other day. This isn't an investigation. It's an outrageous attempt to destroy the foundations, whose great sin, it appears, is that their activity is not in accord with the Neanderthal thinking of Reece and Dodd."

New York (N. Y.) Times, June 20, 1954, The Reece Investigation:

"The first month of the hearings—apart from Representative Hays' sharply probing comments—has been a show of ineptitude almost beyond belief and one which bears very little relation to the purpose for which the committee was appointed. Through the use of reports by members of the committee staff, whose previous experience hardly qualified them for their assignment, and through the testimony of a few witnesses who gave no convincing evidence of having made a 'full and complete study' of foundation activities, the committee has painted a truly bizarre picture."

New York (N. Y.) Times, July 5, 1954, Another Stupid Inquiry:

"Under the conditions laid down by Chairman Reece the suspension of public hearings by the special House of Representatives committee to investigate foundations is inexcusable. * * * The history of this committee has been a disgrace to Congress. There was no need for it to begin with. * * * The activities of the Reece committee have been a travesty of this assignment. Far from 'a full and complete study' Mr. Reece, often over the vehement objections of committee members Wayne L. Hays and Gracie Pfost, has staged a crude and ignorant attack on foundations through a series of public hearings featuring the report of staff members and a few witnesses, none of whom gave evidence of the thoroughgoing objective knowledge of foundations which the occasion required."

Baltimore (Md.) Sun, July 5, 1954, The Reece Committee Retires to the Showers:

"The Reece committee continues to lurch along its zigzag course, like a child who is 'it' in a game of blindman's bluff. Its history promises to become a textbook of do's and don'ts in the art of conducting congressional investigations. * * * A succession of adverse witnesses was brought forward, and all hope of smooth sailing promptly disappeared. For as fast as an adverse witness came forward with his story, the minority membership of the committee, led by Representative W. L. Hays, Democrat, of Ohio, proceeded to tear the story into pieces by cross-questioning. Progress in the development of what might be called Reece's theses was negligible. * * * On Friday the majority voted to abandon public hearings altogether. Tte defending foundations, having been accused, are to be denied the right to reply in open hearings. * * * Chairman Reece and his majority colleagues have no more stomach for the vigilant cross-questioning of their minority colleagues. * * * Moral: The potential poison of an ill-conceived congressional investigation can always be neutralized by a vigilant minority."

New York (N. Y.) Post, July 6, 1954, Run for the Exits, Men:

"Since May 10, former GOP National Chairman Carroll Reece has been using congressional money to run another GOP sideshow. Ineptly disguised as a public investigation of the tax-exempt foundations, Representative Reece and some colleagues have been trying desperately to promote the notion that the Rockefeller and Ford Foundations, and others, have been undermining the Republic. * * * An able and conscientious Democrat, Representative Wayne Hays, of Ohio, let the Republicans climb out on limb after limb and sawed them off with deadly regularity almost daily. When Hays proposed, for instance, that the committee explore the works of H. L. Hunt's Facts Forum, the Republicans exploded and shed their last trappings of impartiality. Now Reece and his colleagues have finally faced the facts of their disaster. Recognizing that the only political pickings to be had by continuing this folly would accrue to the Democrats, they voted to call the whole thing off. In announcing his show was folding, Reece refrained from the charge that he had been lured into a trap by Clark Clifford. Instead he blamed the whole thing on Representative Hays. He charged the Ohio Democrat with interrupting testimony and vigorously cross-examining witnesses."

Boston (Mass.) Christian Science Monitor, July 9, 1954, A Sorry Maneuver:

"By a strict party vote of 3 to 2 the Reece subcommittee investigating educational foundations has voted to abandon its hearings. * * * Having spread abroad these accusations and innuendoes, Mr. Reece and his associates called but one witness in behalf of the foundations. Then, because Representative Hays, a minority member, had frequently and sharply questioned some of the hostile testimony, Mr. Reece called off the hearings, telling the foundations they might file sworn statements. Thus is repeated a sorry maneuver all too common in the political arena of the last few years: Accusations are given a sounding board; the answers are not. And the targets of the maneuver are left under a cloud and the public with a one-sided impression."

Chicago (Ill.) Sun-Times, July 13, 1954, Rendering the Verdict Without the Evidence:

"Representative Wayne Hays, of Ohio, * * * made a determined assault on the tactics Reece employed and succeeded to a great extent in showing up the fraud Reece was trying to perpetrate. The probe became obviously such a phony that Reece himself decided to run for cover."

Washington (D. C.) Post and Times Herald, July 15, 1954, Let the Donor Beware:

"Embarrassment drove the Reece committee investigating tax-exempt foundations into hiding; shame ought to drive it entirely out of existence. The committee began by making itself ludicrous; then, having sponsored what Representative Wayne Hays, a minority member of the group, quite properly called a 'fantastic, nonfactual, nonsensical, and slanderous attack on the great foundations,' it decided to hold future hearings only in executive session, denying the foundations, which had been publicly attacked, any chance to defend themselves in public."

Steubenville (Ohio) Herald-Star, July 16, 1954, Closed Without Notice:

"The outspoken vigor of a complaint by the Carnegie Corp. against the premature ending of a congressional investigation of tax-exempt foundations is justified. * * * Carnegie Corp. said it was like closing a courtroom as soon as the defendants appeared, after giving full publicity to the charges of the plaintiffs. The position of the tax-exempt foundations has been made harder to accept, moreover, by the apparent reason for calling off the investigation. The chairman of the investigating committee, Representative B. Carroll Reece, of Tennessee, said he was unable to control what he described as the 'obstructionist' actions of Representative Wayne L. Hays, of Ohio. Representative Hays had made no secret of his belief that he thought the investigation was a waste of time and tinged with prejudice. To all the other questions about congressional investigations which Congressmen are trying to answer before the 84th Congress convenes next January has been added one more: Can an individual or an institution be denied the right to reply to accusations on the same terms as those granted the accusers?"

St. Louis (Mo.) Post-Dispatch, Roscoe Drummond, July 20, 1954:

"The committee, having run out of adverse witnesses, is closing down its public hearings without giving the favorable witnesses the public opportunity to reply. The explanation which Representative B. Carroll Reece (Republican, of Tennessee), committee chairman, gives for adjourning the public hearings at the point where the foundations' witnesses were to testify is that committee member Wayne L. Hays (Democrat, of Ohio) engaged in obstructionist tactics. Hays' obstructionism consisted of an unwillingness to take at face value the unproved assertions of selected witnesses and staff experts. Editorial opinion across the country—most of it Republican—was at least 90-percent critical of the Reece committee and that the committee has scurried to cover."

Boston (Mass.) Christian Science Monitor, Roscoe Drummond, July 24, 1954:

"Mr. Reece, of course, does not admit that he called off his public hearings because he did not want to give the foundation representatives the right to appear publicly before his committee. His explanation is that a Democratic member of the committee, Representative Wayne L. Hays, of Ohio, engaged in obstructionist tactics. Mr. Hays simply refused to take at face value the bland assertions of selected witnesses and staff experts without thorough cross-examination, and to Mr. Reece this kind of cross-examination was obstruction."

Youngstown (Ohio) Vindicator, July 25, 1954, Probing a Prober:

"The latest hassle in the House might be billed: 'Inquiry Into an Inquiry,' or 'The Probers Probed.' It revolves around the request by Representative Javits, of New York, that the House Rules Committee investigate the investigation into charitable foundations made by its own subcommittee. The subcommittee, headed by B. Carroll Reece, of Tennessee, made what Representative Hays, of Ohio, justly called an Alice in Wonderland investigation, in which a verdict against the foundations was entered before the evidence was heard. When the attempt collapsed under its own absurdities, Mr. Reece halted it abruptly without giving the foundations a chance to present their defense, except by filing written statements. As far as any results of the sorry spectacle are concerned, the Reece probe might be allowed to retreat into oblivion from the Bronx cheers and horselaughs it aroused. Yet there have been so many examples of runaway committees discrediting Congress that the House would do well to make an example of this one."

The Federal Trade Commission Investigation of Coffee Prices—Summary and Conclusions, Part 2

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 16, 1954

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent of the House I include herewith the second portion of the text of the Summary and Conclusions of the Federal Trade Commission's Economic Report of the Investigation of Coffee Prices, as follows:

CONCLUSIONS

I. SCOPE OF INVESTIGATION

The rise in the price of coffee following the news of the July 1, 1953, cold wave and frost in Brazil set in motion a developing crisis in the coffee trade, domestic and international. The Bureau of Labor Statistics, which had recorded average retail prices in the vicinity of 91 cents a pound for the closing months of 1953, reported 94.5 cents a pound in January, 99.4 cents in February, and by May the price had reached $1.18.

This increase in coffee prices received widespread attention in the press, where forecasts of $1 coffee in January were soon followed by predictions of $1.15 and $1.25 a pound for coffee. In Washington, $1 coffee became a reality on January 11, when the A & P stores announced prices of $1.02 for Maxwell House, Chase & Sanborn, and Wilkins coffees, to be followed by Safeway and Giant stores on January 13 and by Food Fair on January 15. By May the price of most of these brands had increased to $1.32.

Coffee prices quickly became of concern to the coffee trade, to consumers, and even to the Congress and other branches of the Government. Certain committees of the Congress announced hearings in an attempt to satisfy the public demand for a critical scrutiny of the facts and factors responsible for the rapid rise in coffee prices. The Federal Trade Commission received many complaints, as did other Government agencies. These complaints were accompanied by allegations of artificial restrictions on coffee supplies, of manipulations on the New York Coffee and Sugar Exchange influencing green coffee prices, and of artificial and deliberate inflation of coffee prices from the green bean to the roasted product.

In response to these complaints the Federal Trade Commission adopted the following resolution on January 26, 1954, directing that a comprehensive investigation be undertaken with respect to the coffee industry:

"Whereas the Commission has information to the effect that there have been substantial increases in the price of coffee during the past several months and information that there may be still further substantial increases in the price of coffee, and the Commission having received numerous complaints from members of the public; and

"Whereas the Commission has reason to believe that at certain times in the past various unfair methods of competition and monopolistic practices have been prevalent in this industry and that the recent substantial increase in the price of coffee may have resulted from unfair methods of competition and monopolistic practices; and

"Whereas it appearing that the public is entitled to a full disclosure of relevant facts and the application of such legal remedies applicable to such facts as may be developed by a full investigation of this industry; and

"Whereas it appears to the Commission that, for the reasons stated herein, and for the purposes set forth in section 6 of the Federal Trade Commission Act, an investigation of this industry by the Federal Trade Commission would be in the public interest; and

"Whereas section 9 and subsection (a) of section 6 of the Federal Trade Commission Act authorizes the Commission to investigate corporations engaged in commerce, as commerce is defined in the act, and subsection (b) of section 6 of the Federal Trade Commission Act authorizes the Commission to require such corporations to file special reports: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the Commission, in the exercise of the powers vested in it by section 6 of section 9 of the Federal Trade Commission Act, and with the aid of any and all powers conferred upon it by law and any and all compulsory processes available to it, do forthwith proceed to investigate, for the reasons and purposes herein stated, the organization, business, conduct, practices, and management of corporations engaged in commerce, as commerce is defined in the Federal Trade Commission Act, in the purchase, sale, contract for sale, or distribution of coffee and the relation of these corporations to each other and to other corporations, and to individuals, associations, and partnerships."

The full resources of the Federal Trade Commission were immediately assigned to the investigation. For 4 months a team of attorneys attorney-investigators, economists, statisticians, and accountants devoted full-time to investigating the several sectors of the coffee trade. The Bureau of the Census assisted in preliminary machine tabulations. Additional assistance and overtime work has been supplied from various divisions of the Commission. Throughout the investigation, indispensable assistance and consultation have been furnished by the State Department, whose embassies gathered much essential information from foreign sources, and by the Department of Agriculture, especially by members of the Commodity Exchange Authority and the Foreign Agriculture Service.

The investigation has been conducted by interviews, by an examination of the records of the New York Coffee & Sugar Exchange, Inc., the New York Coffee & Sugar Clearing Association, Inc., and their members, and other organizations identified with the coffee industry, and by special reports required of roasters and coffee importer-jobbers and merchants. The questionnaires addressed to the coffee industry were drafted only after consultation with members of the coffee trade. Despite these precautions and preparations, the inadequacy of the records maintained by the coffee trade and the rule-of-thumb practices which appear to guide many of their operations militated against completely comprehensive and comparable returns. In consequence, the statistical picture which the report has developed is incomplete, supplying reliable answers to some questions and permitting only tentative conclusions to others.

In the authorization of the coffee investigation, the Federal Trade Commission's staff was charged with two responsibilities: To explain as precisely as possible the underlying factors behind the coffee price spiral which commenced in the closing weeks of 1953, and to identify and report on whatever improper practices the investigation might develop. The specific findings of the staff in regard to both of these responsibilities are set forth in detail in the body of this report. The conclusions are summarized here.

The investigation was planned to answer certain fundamental questions relating to the coffee trade and the recent rise in prices. This posed some exceedingly difficult problems in estimation. It became evident at an early stage in the investigation that there was no actual current shortage in the volume of coffee moving to market which would fully explain the price increase. The 1953–54 crop-year supply of coffee is now estimated at a little in excess of the 1952–53 crop-year supply, which in turn was the largest crop since that of 1948–49. Moreover, according to the United States Department of Commerce figures, coffee imports into the United States during the last quarter of 1953 and January and February 1954, the months in which the greater part of the price spiral occurred, were unseasonally high. Finally, after replies to the Federal Trade Commission's questionnaires were tabulated, it was discovered that stocks of green coffee in the hands of importer-jobbers and roasters were also at unseasonally high levels. Clearly, then, to the extent that the price spiral was due to supply and demand factors at all, it must have been due to anticipated future supply and demand conditions. Hence, no small part of the Federal Trade Commission's investigation has comprised a study of the supply of coffee to determine the quantities available from all producing areas for the current year, 1954–55, the year when the frost-damaged crop will come to market, and for the years immediately following. Changes in reserve supplies, production, exports, and exportable surpluses have been examined insofar as data are available. An attempt has been made to assess the reliability of such information and the adequacy of statistics of the trade. An examination of the potential supply situation has required a consideration of various institutional factors in the producing countries which affect exports, including such matters as the regulation of exports, the establishment of port quotas, the fixing of minimum prices, the availability of government-sponsored credit to growers and traders, and the very complex currency-exchange regulations which many of the producing countries have adopted.

The examination of demand has sought to appraise changes in the demand for coffee in the United States and in other consuming countries, and to judge the probable response of consumer buying to changes in the price of the product.

The critical questions raised in this report have been concerned with identifying and understanding the underlying market factors behind the spiraling prices of coffee. An attempt has been made to determine whether price changes of the magnitudes experienced have been necessary to equate supply with demand or whether they have been more than was required to compensate for any prospective shortage.

The domestic coffee trade has been examined in order to weigh in part how the several factors in the trade—importers, jobbers, brokers, roasters, wholesalers, and retailers—performed their respective functions. The adjustments which they have severally made to an expected shorter supply, especially with respect to accumulation of inventories and pricing policies, have been examined. The effects of the rise in prices upon the different factors in the trade, with a sampling of their costs and profits during this period, have been considered.

Moreover, since the New York Coffee and Sugar Exchange has been the subject of recurrent criticism whenever coffee prices have risen precipitously, considerable attention has been devoted to the organization and management of the exchange. However, before any judgments as to these matters could be expressed, it was necessary to weigh critically the principles which govern freely competitive futures markets in order to provide a yardstick by which to measure wherein the Coffee Exchange conforms or fails to conform to the standards of competitive markets. The activities of various exchange committees, the adequacy of its contracts, and the manner in which trading is conducted have all been scrutinized. The extent to which the exchange has been used by members of the coffee trade for hedging and for other purposes has been ascertained. And finally, a detailed study of 3 months of trading on the exchange, from December 1, 1953, to February 28, 1954, was undertaken on the basis of data obtained by subpena from brokers and clearing members on the exchange, including, for a more limited period, all trades by customers of these brokers.

II. COFFEE PRICES AND SUPPLY AND DEMAND

Coffee, perhaps more than any other important world crop, is without an adequate and reliable system of crop estimates and production reports by the leading producing countries. For other important commodities reliable reports often are lacking for some important producing countries, but, for coffee, the reports of most of the principal producing areas are of uncertain reliability. This is in part a result of the way in which coffee culture is carried on; much of the world supply originates on small, single family farms remote from cities and uncertain with respect to their production. However, even in such important coffee-producing countries as Brazil and Colombia, crop estimates are not prepared on the systematic and scientific basis to which traders in other commodities are accustomed. Hence, both government and trade interests must act on the basis of imperfect information. A comparison of forecasts with actual production for Brazil and Colombia reveals that both the official forecasts of the producing countries as well as those of the American Embassies have been subject to significant wide margins of error and have generally underestimated the actual production. For example, for the 5 crop years ending with 1952–53, the original estimates of total registrations to ports in Brazil by the Brazilian National Coffee Department were lower than actual total registrations by substantial margins in 4 of the 5 years; the Embassy's estimates were lower by less substanial margins in 3 years. Also the forecasts of the Federation of Coffee Producers of Colombia tend generally to be lower than production.

The conditions of supply confronting the world in 1954 have been shaped in part by the depression of the 1930's and restrictions on world trade during the Second World War. The disastrous collapse in coffee prices during the 1930's was followed by systems of control of supply and by agricultural practices which the coffee economies of Brazil and Colombia still reflect. Plantations were abandoned, new plantings were restricted, interest in developing better varieties lagged, and coffee production moved to low levels as heavy surpluses hung over the market. The hardships of the economic depression and World War II restrictions fell principally on Brazil, which produced over half of the world's coffee supply in the early thirties and 48.7 percent for the 5-year period, 1939–44. The last of the accumulated abnormal surpluses reportedly disappeared from the market in 1949, but the effects of nearly 20 years of coffee surpluses still influence the market policies of buyers and sellers.

The postwar years saw a gradual return to normal conditions in the coffee-producing countries, and in Brazil important new plantings were undertaken and new areas were opened for the first time to coffee culture. Meanwhile, coffee production had developed on an important scale in other Latin American countries, as well as in Africa. For the 5-year period 1909–14, Brazil accounted for 68.7 percent of the world production; for the 5-year period 1939–44 its share of world production was 48.7 percent; and for the year 1953–54 it had dropped to 46.7 percent. Consequently, although Brazil is still the most important coffee-producing country, changes in its production must be weighed against other factors affecting the world supply.

An examination of the prospective production for the 1954–55 crop leads to the conclusion that the world supply in 1954–55 will be approximately the same as in 1953–54. Recent crop-estimate figures developed for Brazil indicate that, after allowance for the loss of 3.5 million bags in Parana due to the reported frost damage, Brazilian production will probably amount to 18 million bags in 1954–55, as compared with about 19 million bags for 1953–54. This expected reduction of approximately 1 million bags in Brazilian production is much less than was originally anticipated, because prospective increases in coffee production in the rest of Brazil will substantially offset the decrease in Parana. Moreover, despite the decrease in Brazil, it is estimated that world production will amount to 42.1 million bags for the crop year 1954–55, in comparison with about 41.5 to 41.9 million bags for 1953–54. The moderate increase is expected to come principally from Western Hemisphere countries other than Brazil and Colombia, an increase in production from 7.9 to 9.2 million bags being forecast for those countries. This gain is in part the result of the rising trend of production in those countries and in part the result of the fact that in several, notably Mexico and Guatemala, 1954–55 is the "up" year in what appears to be a rather normal biennial production cycle. A slight increase for Colombian production from 6.9 to 7.1 million bags is expected, and a somewhat smaller increase for Africa, from 5.4 to 5.5 million bags, is predicted. The net result is that the probable reduction of 1.5 million bags for Brazil will be counterbalanced by a probable increase of 1.3 million bags from other Latin American countries alone, with some additional increase from Africa and other producing areas.

The opinion is widespread that the supply of coffee, principally that part coming out of Brazil, is subject to restrictions arising from various institutional factors. Numerous regulations surround the conduct of the coffee trade in Brazil. Coffee, as Brazil's most important export crop, has been subject to exchange controls intended to bolster the dollar-cruzeiro exchange rate. Brazil has long followed a practice of limiting port stocks and regulating the flow of coffee from the interior to the ports of embarkation. In 1951 definite monthly quotas for movement to ports and for export from ports to particular consuming areas and, somewhat later, quotas for movement from growing areas to ports were imposed. The quota regulations respecting exports were enforced by restrictions against further shipments when particular ports had filled their monthly quotas.

The Brazilian government has also followed a policy of sponsoring loans for the coffee trade. On December 2, 1953, Brazil advanced the loan rate on coffee from 1,200 cruzeiros per bag to 1,500 cruzeiros per bag. This event, in a market which was already nervously reflecting higher prices as a result of downward estimates in the 1954–55 crop, together with heavy trading in futures by Brazilian nationals on the New York Coffee Exchange and the accumulation of green-coffee inventories in the United States, appears to have precipitated the upward spiral of coffee prices which began in December.

There has been an inflationary trend in Brazil in recent years, which leads those who possess commodities, including coffee planters, to prefer to hold their assets in the form of an appreciating commodity rather than in the form of depreciating cash. However, there is no evidence that coffee has been withheld by Brazil. Brazilian export figures show that coffee has been leaving that country at a rate roughly comparable to that of earlier years. Brazilian exports for the crop year 1952–53 were 15,403,000 bags compared with 16,460,000 bags for 1951–52; however, the 10-month period ending April 30, 1954, showed exports of 13,749,000 bags compared with 13,394,000 bags for the 10 months ending April 30, 1953. Similarly, coffee arrivals in the United States have been maintained at a high level; total arrivals for 1952–53 were 20,394,000 bags compared with 19,891,000 bags for the previous year; and arrivals for the 10 months ending April 30, 1954, were 16,905,000 bags compared with 16,568.000 bags for the 10 months ending April 30, 1953, and 16,012,000 bags for the 10 months ending April 30, 1952.

Under Brazilian exchange regulations, coffee exporters have been required to convert dollar exchange derived from the sale of coffee into cruzeiros at a price below the free market rate of exchange for the dollar. The purpose of this and similar regulations has been to tax for the government a part of the proceeds from the export of coffee to support the government's efforts to foster other exports and to meet import requirements in other sectors of the economy. The existence of these exchange regulations, allegedly discriminating against coffee exporters and producers, has been said to be responsible in part for the current shortage of coffee. However, it is doubtful that exchange controls have been significant in curtailing coffee supplies, although possibly the continuance of a lower rate of exchange for coffee than for other export commodities over a long period of time and under different cost relations might tend to divert capital from coffee production. In the short run, exchange regulations can have only a limited effect upon current supplies of coffee because of the large requirements of fixed capital in coffee production: The trees, once planted, produce for 40 years; the out-of-pocket costs of producing coffee are limited largely to labor expense. Of course, these exchange regulations provide an incentive for coffee traders to attempt to bargain with their government to improve their profit opportunities through changes in exchange regulations, and in August and October of 1953, there may have been a temporary incentive for exporters to hold their coffee until the new and more favorable rates should become effective. However, it is believed that the exchange regulations are more significant in explaining such practices as those looking to obtaining free dollar credits by coffee traders by registering coffee for export at prices lower than those at which it was actually sold, and to speculation on the New York Coffee and Sugar Exchange. The first of these practices results in what is known as the "underdraw," in which the American buyer pays the Brazilian exporter the price registered in Brazil and deposits the balance of an actually higher selling price in New York to the credit of the Brazilian exporter. Profits from speculation in futures on the exchange likewise remain in New York, where these dollar balances are also available for conversion to cruzeiros at the higher free exchange rates.

Foundations Investigation Statement of Representative Wayne L. Hays

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE L. HAYS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, Mr. CARROLL REECE, the chairman of the Special Committee To Investigate Tax-Exempt Foundations, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 20, made an unwarranted and flagrant attack on three of the Nation's leading newspapers—the New York Times, the New York Herald Tribune, and the Washington Post and Times Herald. He has coupled his intemperate remarks concerning these newspapers with a similar attack on me and on my work as the ranking minority member of that committee. I want to make it perfectly clear that Mr. REECE gave me no notice of his intention to make this assault and that he reserved his statement until the closing hours of the session and inserted it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD under permission to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. REECE has accused these three great newspapers of deserting their traditional principles of honest and unbiased presentation of the news. Not content with that reckless assertion, he has in his statement deliberately linked the names of these newspapers with that of the Daily Worker in an effort somehow to infer guilt by innuendo since he has not one iota of evidence to present.

This statement by Mr. REECE is thoroughly in keeping with the manner in which the hearings of the Reece committee were conducted. The obvious purpose of the hearings was not to present the facts but rather to indict the tax-exempt foundations. The witnesses included some members of the staff and certain others who testified not to facts but to their own biases, prejudices, and opinions. Finally, public hearings were terminated just as the foundations were preparing to have their day in court and to answer the charges against them in the same forum in which the charges had been made.

Perhaps the most astonishing part of Mr. REECE's entire denunciation is his effort to justify his refusal to permit the foundations to testify in open hearing. While this denial of the most basic right guaranteed to our citizens is thoroughly in the pattern of the entire hearings, it is shocking to hear a Member of Congress seek to justify a refusal to grant equal rights under the law, a refusal to permit one who has been accused to testify publicly in his own defense, and to imply that the right to take the witness stand and to answer questions under oath isn't particularly important. Mr. REECE then adds the gratuitous insult that under the committee's system of taking evidence the foundations will "completely avoid having to substantiate their claims through cross-examination." I for one won't be a party to so cynical an approach to the fundamental American guaranties of public hearings, of testimony under oath and of examination and cross-examination. Further, I do not think that our people will look with favor upon that sort of procedure by a committee of Congress.

It is not at all surprising that a member of Mr. REECE's own party, Representative JAVITS of New York, introduced a resolution calling on the Rules Commitee of the House to examine into the Reese inquiry to determine what remedial steps should be taken in the interest of fair procedure.

For my own part, the course which Mr. REECE proposed to follow became clear to me early in the hearings. I determined that I would insist that the basic rights of the American citizen be protected and that I would not stand by and see the rules of fair play abandoned by a committee on which I was sitting. At this time, I want to pay tribute to the integrity, courage, and honesty of Representative GRACIE PFOST, of Idaho who joined me in insisting that this committee observe the safeguards of fair procedures. I also want to repeat for the RECORD that the decision to end public hearings before the foundations had been afforded an opportunity to testify publicly was reached by a three-to-two vote, in which Mrs. PFOST and I voted "No."

The hearings were characterized by the testimony of certain witnesses who linked the names of patriotic Americans with persons, causes, and organizations whom the witnesses held to be either subversive or too liberal to suit their own biases. In the same manner, the testimony of these witnesses contained quotations taken from context so that time after time an impression was created completely at variance with the viewpoint of the person quoted.

The task of seeking to protect the good name of fellow Americans and of insuring that statements were not taken from context was aggravated by the frequent committee practice of refusing to require that all written statements of witnesses be submitted in advance in accordance with committee rules. The insistence of Mrs. PFOST and myself that this be done met with rebuffs and excuses. The result, I regret to add, was that the names of many fine Americans were subjected to unjustified attack.

Mr. Reece has seen fit to assail my performance of my duties as a member of the committee. I want to say to Mr. Reece here and now that all of my life I have stood for fair play and the protection of the rights of every citizen. It was those principles that conflicted with the judgment he wanted to obtain through the committee, and I want him to understand perfectly well that neither he nor anyone else can frighten me into retreating from them.

The attack by Mr. Reece upon me has even been placed upon religious grounds. My response to Mr. Reece is that in these hearings and out of them I have respected the beliefs and tenets of every religious group in this country, and I shall continue to do so. I invite Mr. Reece or anyone else to prove a single instance in which I have ever disparaged the religious faith of anyone. I do not think that Mr. Reece has advanced himself, the committee, or the Congress by raising this issue.

Mr. Reece has spoken of me as a part of the New Deal. That to Mr. Reece is the vilest epithet which may be hurled at anyone. The philosophy of Mr. Reece and most of the witnesses throughout the hearings was that the New Deal and the foundations were a part of a plot which from 1932 on deceived the American people, the United States Congress, the Supreme Court, and the executive branch of our Government. As a result of this plot, the Congress legislated, the President administered, and the Supreme Court upheld laws which gave us social security and unemployment insurance, which protected the rights of the laborer and the farmer, and which safeguarded the health of our families. By reason of this plot which Mr. Reece sees, we have bank insurance for our deposits, we have our present educational system, and we have the multitude of other benefits which our Government has made possible during this time. If the forces who have guided the Reece committee could have their way and could wipe out this plot, then all of us would be living in the depressed conditions which existed before our people elected into office the New Deal which Mr. Reece hates so bitterly. I know that I am speaking for the people I represent when I tell Mr. Reece that we are thankful that the conditions of labor and our farmers have been improved, that our health and educational standards have advanced mightily, that our savings cannot be wiped out by bank failures, and that our Government has given us protection against the specters of unemployment and a penniless old age.

I have been heartened by the courage which the foundations have shown in the reports they have filed with the committee since the public hearings were abruptly and arbitrarily halted. In those statements, the foundations have told their story and have made out their case as best as they can under the unfair conditions imposed upon them. They have faced up to the greatest evil with which the Reece committee has threatened the country. That evil is that the foundations may be so intimidated by the committee that they will knuckle under to the forces of reaction and will no longer be willing to make grants to those who seek only freedom to think and to speak according to their own consciences. If this committee were to succeed in instilling an icy fear into the hearts of the men who operate our foundations, then it would have won its ultimate victory. It would have stifled one of our greatest sources of freedom in thought, deed, and word.

The evidence which has come to our committee from the foundations has supplied impressive and dramatic proof of the benefits which they have brought about in our land. When we consider the advances in education which they have made possible, their grants to our institutions of higher learning, the miracles of science and the freedom from pain and disease which they have given to old and young and their magnificent cooperation with our Government, then it becomes clear that the statement which Mr. Reece has made is so utterly at variance with the facts as to discredit his entire course of procedure in this investigation.

Federal Trade Commission Investigation of Coffee Prices—Summary and Conclusions, Part 3

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 16, 1954

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent of the House, I include herewith the third portion of the text of the Summary and Conclusions of the Federal Trade Commission's Economic Report of the Investigation of Coffee Prices, as follows:

> As a part of its control over foreign exchange, Brazil has established minimum prices at which coffee for export must be registered and the receipts converted into cruzeiros. So long as the Government loan price was materially less than the export registration price, and the latter was determined daily on the basis of spot prices in Brazil, there is little evidence that these prices influenced materially the prices of coffee in the world markets. However, the recently established price of 87 cents per pound for Santos 4s effective July 1, 1954, an increase of 34 cents over the previous support price of 53 cents, and 19 cents above the loan price of 68 cents made effective in June 1954, undoubtedly will tend, if world prices weaken, to hold the price of coffee above the level dictated by world production and consumption. Indeed, there is evidence that it has already had this effect on June 1954 coffee prices. The difficulties which now confront Brazil in trying to maintain this price have already caused comment in the coffee trade. (The New York Times, July 11, 1954, p. 15.)
>
> Colombia has also adopted exchange regulations which are intended to function as an anti-inflation measure, but the economic effects of these regulations have not been examined in detail.
>
> It is concluded, therefore, that the best available supply statistics do not support coffee trade assertions that recent price spirals are solely attributable to frost damage in Brazil. Indeed it is believed that the unreliability of crop estimates and Brazilian policies toward crop loan and currency exchange rates and minimum export prices may have contributed as much to the upward spiral of coffee prices, and to the present level of prices, as the actual frost damage to the 1954–55 Brazilian coffee crop. Furthermore, it now seems certain that the decreased supplies from Brazil in 1954–55 will be compensated for by increased supplies from other Western Hemisphere countries and Africa.
>
> An attempt has been made to assess the demand for, as well as the supply of, coffee. No basis is found for anticipating any important increase either in the per capita consumption or in the aggregate consumption of coffee in the next 2 years.
>
> An examination of the nature of the demand for coffee indicates that, despite its important place in the American diet and its significant price inelasticities, radical increases in price such as have been experienced since December must be expected to curtail appreciably the consumption of coffee. Inasmuch as the price has moved to a new plateau since December and as no historical precedents are available, it is not possible to reach a documented conclusion as to the extent to which demand may be curtailed by recent price increases. But if previous experience is a reliable guide to consumer response in the United States, it must be anticipated that a curtailment of the quantity of coffee demanded on the order of 10 to 15 percent would not be an unreasonable consumer response to the present level of prices.
>
> A survey of informed opinion in important European coffee-consuming countries indicates that reductions in coffee imports into many countries on the order of 5 to 10 percent are anticipated in the wake of the recent rise in world coffee prices, but these reductions will be substantially offset by a prospective increase of imports into western Germany following a reduction in taxes applicable to coffee. Hence, on balance, demand for coffee at present high prices is expected to fall noticeably short of supply at those prices.
>
> The evidence at hand supplies on basis for finding that present prices of coffee are justified by either present or prospective conditions of demand and supply. Moderate increases in coffee prices were an inevitable response to the reports of severe frost damage in Brazil, but the upward spiral which began in early December appears to represent market reactions which are inconsistent with freely competitive markets where all traders are fully and accurately informed with respect to supply and demand.
>
> If the present level of coffee prices does not accurately reflect competitive market conditions, two questions must be asked: What factors have been responsible for pushing the price of coffee to unprecedented heights? Why have not corrective influences appeared earlier?
>
> On the whole the coffee trade reacted tardily to the news of the July frost, although some American interests increased their long positions as early as July and August. After this short flurry which temporarily advanced green coffee about 5 cents per pound, prices dropped back about 2 cents, to 58 cents per pound, and continued at that level until about December 1, 1953. Beginning in December, however, the trade behaved as though Brazilian coffee were the world supply of coffee, and as though the precipitous rise in coffee futures prices on the New York Coffee and Sugar Exchange accurately reflected the future course of all coffee prices. Continued crop reports indicating heavy damage to the Brazilian crop favored such behavior. The violence with which the trade undertook to adjust to the anticipated shortage in the 1954–55 crop—the 1953–54 crop was as large as those of preceding years—created the immediate market shortage which the trade

anticipated. Further evidence that the exchange prices behaved as if Brazilian coffee were the world supply is to be noted in the fact that spot prices for Brazilian coffee followed the futures price and exceeded the prices for Colombian and other growths which normally sell at premiums over Brazilian coffees.

The increased market activities of importers, roasters, and speculators, including perhaps retailers and consumers, were met by no immediate market correctives bringing expectations back into line with realities. Prices on the New York Coffee and Sugar Exchange not only paralleled the rising prices for actual coffee; they at times actually led the spot market, and by the rapidity of their rise, exaggerated the expectations of continued high prices. This market behavior continued throughout the winter with the result that the July 1954 future reached a peak of over 96 cents per pound at the 1st of April, and thereafter fell to about 84½ cents in the latter part of April.

Underlying the failure of market correctives to make their appearance earlier were continued reports of crop damage and shortage of Brazilian coffee, and considerable uncertainty respecting statistics of supply for other growths. When market correctives did finally appear in April, their normal operation was offset by the Brazilian Government's announcement early in May that the minimum export price for Brazilian coffee effective July 1, 1954, would be increased sharply to 87 cents per pound. The effect of this announcement in a market still behaving as if Brazilian coffee were the world supply was temporarily to peg the prices of coffees of all growths at about that level.

III. COFFEE PRICES AND THE DOMESTIC COFFEE TRADE

The Commission's investigation of the coffee trade in the United States uncovered a number of factors that bear upon the 1953–54 coffee-price spiral. However, while it is possible to identify those factors that contribute to the price increases, it is impossible in most instances to measure their causative effects in quantitative terms.

There was a more than seasonal upsurge in trading and inventory accumulation in the domestic coffee trade in late 1953 and early 1954. Coffee importer-jobbers increased their month-end inventories in December 1953 over January of the same year by about 37 percent, compared with an increase of 4.4 percent between January and December of 1952. With the exception of several large integrated firms, importers responded slowly to the green-coffee price increases of July and August of 1953, and did not begin to build up stocks until November. Although frost damage reports were received early in July, and although prices had advanced significantly in July and August, importers delayed purchases until they received further reports regarding the frost. In October prices actually slumped by about half of the July-August increase. Essentially during the second half of 1953, there was a test of bargaining strength between the importers and the exporters.

When it became apparent that some of the reported frost damage was real and that exporters would not reduce prices, the importers (including some large roaster-importers) began buying heavily. Some increases in buying and inventory accumulation by importers occurred prior to the upswing in green coffee prices in December 1953, and their purchases and inventories continued at high levels through December 1953 and January 1954, during which time the spiral of green coffee prices gained momentum. However, the Federal Trade Commission's investigation discovered that a portion of the inventory accumulation was in anticipation of a threatening New York dock strike and that a still larger portion was in response to an accumulation of unfilled orders for green coffee.

In summary, the month-end inventories of green coffee of 81 importer-jobbers totaled 73.3 million pounds in January 1952 and increased only slightly to 76.5 million in December of that year. However, in 1953 the total inventories of these same companies increased from 71.3 million pounds in January 1953, to 97.5 million pounds in December, or approximately 26.2 million pounds. Also, the green coffee inventories of these 31 importer-jobbers increased from 52.5 million pounds in October 1953 to 75.6 million in November, an increase of 23 million pounds. By contrast, from October to November 1952, total inventories of these same jobber-importers declined 2.5 million pounds. Their buying in 1953, therefore, apparently contributed significantly to the price rise of December 1953 and January 1954. However, in view of the large accumulation of unfilled orders for green coffee, the increase of inventories cannot be regarded as being entirely speculative in character. The financial results of operations based on inventory accumulations during this period are not reflected in the 1953 financial statements of importers, which indicate that their margins and profits in 1953 were not significantly different from prior years studied.

The activity of coffee roasters in late 1953 and early 1954 paralleled substantially that of the importer-jobbers. Inventories of green coffee in the hands of the 76 roasters were larger at the end of January and February 1954 than such stocks had been at the close of the corresponding months in 1952 and 1953. Stocks of green coffee held by these roasters declined from about 222.8 million pounds at the end of January 1952 to about 214.5 million pounds at the year's close. This represented a decrease of nearly 4 percent. In 1943, however, green coffee was held by these roasters in larger amounts at the end of the year than at the beginning. Stocks amounted to about 215.8 million pounds at the end of January 1953 and were up to approximately 245.3 million pounds at the close of 1953. That is, inventories of green coffee were about 14 percent larger at the end of the year than at the end of January. As in the case of importers, the business operations based on these inventories was not reflected in the 1953 operating statements of roasters, whose rates of return on investment were the lowest shown in any of the years 1949 to 1953, inclusive.

In late 1953 and the first 2 months of 1954 the large roasters greatly expanded their purchases of green coffee, most of which went into inventories. The five largest roasters—A & P, General Foods, Hills Bros., Standard Brands, and Folger & Co. of Kansas City—generally held about three-fourths of the green coffee inventories of the 78 roasters whose inventory records were studied. The increased buying and inventory accumulation of these and other firms, especially the Nestle Co., contributed to and helped sustain the spiral in the spot prices of green coffee. Accumulations of coffee purchase contracts and inventories by the large roasters after July 1953 were on such a scale, and were accomplished with such rapidity, as to have been a significant factor in translating the expectations of shorter supplies and higher prices into an immediate market shortage in 1953–54. In particular, the increased purchases by General Foods were of startling proportions. From July to September General Foods increased its holdings of green coffee purchase contracts from 23 million pounds to 71 million pounds. At that time its inventory of green coffee amounted to 54 million pounds and its net long position to 157 million pounds. Thereafter its net long position declined somewhat, but as of the end of February 1954 its green coffee inventory of 66 million pounds, plus its coffee purchase contracts of 57 million pounds, represented holdings of approximately a 4-month's supply of coffee for General Foods.

The combined buildup of inventories and purchase contracts by the five leading coffee roasters followed a similar pattern. The month-end net market position of the 5 leading coffee roasters may be defined as the total of their inventory of green coffee less undelivered sales contracts, green coffee purchase contracts, roasted coffee inventory less undelivered sales contracts, and their net long position in New York Coffee and Sugar Exchange futures contracts. (A trader is "net long" on an exchange when he has purchased more futures contracts than he has sold, his "net long position" being the difference between his purchases and sales.) Over the past several years the total monthly position of the 5 leading coffee roasters has tended to run from about two and three-quarters to four times the size of their total monthly sales—sales of green, roasted, and instant coffee and undelivered sales contracts—which indicates that about an 11 to 16 weeks' supply of coffee has generally been maintained. A buildup in this total position occurred from April 1952 until March 1953, when the OPS controls ended. This situation was followed by a slump in the total position, which may have been seasonal in part since it also appears in approximately the same months of 1952, and it may have been in part an aftereffect of a buildup anticipating the end of OPS controls. After July 1953, the net position of the 5 leading roasters increased significantly and by December had reached the level of nearly 380 million pounds, compared with a little over 310 million pounds for the comparable month of the previous year.

The green coffee inventories of the 5 largest roasters were relatively stable through the period. The fluctuations in total position were due principally to variations in the total volume of undelivered purchase contracts. Undelivered purchases were relatively low in the spring and early summer—or fall and early winter in Brazil—in both 1952 and 1953, indicating that this form of purchase may play an important part in making seasonal adjustments in green coffee holding. This is also borne out by the fact that roasted inventories and coffee futures usually comprise a comparatively insignificant part of the large roasters' total position.

Although sales and production of roasted coffee increased during August, September, and October 1953, the output of roasted coffee was above sales and the result was an inventory accumulation. While a buildup of green coffee inventories and purchases of contracts for forward delivery may be expected following the beginning of each new crop year, any pronounced increase in roasted coffee inventory appears to be unusual. However, this inventory was worked off rapidly from November through January 1954, as sales increased. The greatest reduction in roasted inventory took place in January 1954, when prices and sales made sharp advances. Roasted coffee sales appear to have increased each time there was an abrupt increase in roasted coffee prices; but during the month following a rapid increase in prices and sales, there were precipitous declines in sales. This pattern of market behavior occurred in March–April 1953, July 1953, and in January and February 1954.

From the evidence available it appears that the larger roasters change their roasted coffee prices as changes occur in the price of green coffee. That is, changes in roasted coffee prices are responsive to changes in the replacement cost of green coffee rather than in changes in the cost of green coffee currently entering roasting operations. To the extent that roasters buy green coffee by purchasing contracts calling for delivery of coffee at some future date, prospective cost rather than the current costs of roasted coffee appear to establish the level of roasted coffee prices. The smaller roasters on the other hand, apparently purchase their green coffee in the spot market and find their costs determined by spot prices; however, their prices generally follow closely those of the national brands of the larger roasters. Under these circumstances, replacement-cost pricing of roasted coffee by the leading roasters on a rising market quickly translates price changes in the spot and futures green coffee markets into corresponding price changes for roasted coffee. This explains why the green coffee price increases of December 1953 and the first quarter of 1954 were so quickly reflected in the price of roasted coffee.

Roasted coffee is sold by roasters to wholesalers, restaurants and retailers. The limited data available to the Commission on wholesalers reveal that they do not play a significant role in the domestic coffee trade. In many instances coffee moves directly from roaster to the retailer, bypassing the wholesaler. The coffee wholesaler usually is not a specialist, but a general grocery wholesaler, and on coffee sales his margin is small, limited in most cases to 1 or 2 percent above cost. It was the view of the wholesalers interviewed that during 1953 and the first quarter of 1954 wholesalers had not ordered coffee in anticipation of price rises and had not accumulated larger than normal inventories.

The Commission made no study of coffee sales to the restaurant trade, but information from secondary sources indicates that the cost of coffee in a 5-ounce cup of brewed coffee is estimated to be only $0.02 per cup with coffee costing $1 a pound, and only $0.028 with coffee costing $1.40 a pound. Hence the recent coffee price spiral added less than $0.01 to the cost of a cup of coffee. Yet, restaurants generally raised prices from $0.05 up to $0.10 per cup, and a considerable number increased prices from $0.10 up to $0.15, $0.20, or even $0.25 a cup.

The retailer of roasted coffee is the last intermediary between the trade and the final user. The evidence with respect to retailers indicates that changes in retail coffee prices lag behind wholesale price increases but apparently respond immediately to wholesale price decreases. It was the opinion of most retailers interviewed that the large chain stores, such as A. & P., Kroger and Safeway, are the leaders in making price changes at the retail level, and the statistical evidence available tends to support this opinion. Retailers appeared to realize a gross markup on coffee ranging from 6 to about 10 percent.

The retailers interviewed reported that they had not increased their purchases or accumulated inventory in late 1953 and early 1954, and that they had not observed consumers purchasing in excess of immediate requirements. As noted above wholesalers reported no inventory accumulations. These views, however, appear to be unrepresentative, for roasters increased their sales of roasted coffee in the late months of 1953 and in January 1954. In fact, the January 1954 increase was very pronounced. Since roasted coffee prices were also increasing in this period, it is unlikely that more coffee was consumed by final users though some may have gone into consumer hoards. However, definite statistical data are lacking upon which to establish whether at the time of the Commission's survey there were more than normal quantities of roasted coffee in the hands of either the wholesaler, the retailer, or the consumer.

Facts About Facts Forum

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE L. HAYS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an analysis which I have had made of the radio program Facts Forum.

This program, which is only one of the operations conducted by the Dallas, Tex., organization of the same name, purports to present both sides of a public issue, the commentator debating himself.

The analysis has been made in connection with my duties as ranking minority member of the Special Committee To Investigate Tax Exempt Foundations.

The facts set forth were secured by listening to tape recordings of Facts Forum broadcasts. Quotations used are identified by tape number.

The analysis follows:

FACTS ABOUT FACTS FORUM

Facts Forum claims to present both sides of important issues. To some degree, it does present two sides, rather than both sides. Although there is a good deal of factual material in its presentations, the two points of view it presents are not necessarily the only points of view possible, nor even the principal points of view held by most people.

The program is in no sense impartial. Although two sides are presented, there is no doubt which side Facts Forum itself is on. That is the key to its partisan character.

The technique used is that of presenting an important question and two contrasting viewpoints, and then, almost in every case, identifying one viewpoint on this single question with the entire philosophy of government to which Facts Forum adheres. The program is also characterized by half truths, distortions, generalizations, and exaggerations. One program (No. 53, dealing with the Bricker amendment) even misquoted the Constitution, stating that article VI reads, "All treaties * * * shall be the supreme law of the land * * * anything in the Constitution to the contrary notwithstanding." The actual language of the Constitution simply asserts the supremacy of the Federal power over the State and reads: "This Constitution and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof and all treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land, and the judges in every State shall be bound thereby, anything in the Constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding."

A single program may not have too much effect on a casual listener, but it is the cumulative effect that takes its toll—the steady hammering away of Facts Forum's own isolationist and reactionary views, the repetitious identification of liberalism and internationalism with subversion and communism.

How does this program differ from a truly impartial program, such as American Forum of the Air? Listening to American Forum week after week will not give you even a hint of how the producer and moderator feel about the subjects under discussion. Listening to American Forum regularly will not produce a consistent line of political thought. On the other hand, listeners know all too clearly where Facts Forum stands and what its political thinking is.

This is indicated by the flood of mail coming to newspapers and Congress from listeners in support of the side which Facts Forum supports, such as the Bricker amendment and Senator MCCARTHY.

In addition to its technique in regular programs, Facts Forum frankly discloses its own views in the infrequent programs where it presents only one side. Such a program was The American Bill of Rights and Thanksgiving (No. 104). Here is Facts Forum speaking for itself:

"Today, all over the globe, people are promoting a philosophy of government which they like to call liberal and progressive, but which, in its essence, is a return to the dark ages of human civilization. * * * It is a philosophy which holds that government has the power and the responsibility to do something for the people; that the force of government must be used to control all the lives of all the people all the time, in order to insure them economic security. It is a philosophy which has been promoting in this century throughout the world an implacable drive toward a monolithic uniformity; a leveling off of mankind to a dull level of mediocrity; a drift toward a great one world of animated puppets where everyone will have his equal share of a little bit of nothing. * * * In the 20th century, this fearless American philosophy of freedom is despised, not only by the totalitarian governments, but also by the so-called free governments throughout the world. * * * Countless numbers of Americans today apparently, by what they say and do, are not only willing but eager to sell their birthright of freedom for the mess of pottage which goes under the label of government subsidies and economic assistance to the public."

Some of its views seeped through in another broadcast, an otherwise neutral Christmas program last year (Hope of the World), where the following political ideas were expressed in the context of an appeal for religious faith:

"I do not look to government for rights, privileges, or assistance, knowing that government can give me nothing that government has not first taken away from me."

Here, in capsule form, are the views which Facts Forum tries to inculcate in its listeners through its technique of presenting both sides. Here are the keys to Facts Forum's political thinking: the linking of liberal with dark and dictatorial rule; the idea that government assistance of any kind brings the people under its complete control and kills their spirit; the attack on the one world ideal of the United Nations; the denunciation of our allies as so-called free governments equal to the totalitarians.

There is a close identity between Facts Forum's message and the personal opinions of H. L. Hunt, who, in the words of Facts Forum moderator, Dan Smoot, "was among the original founders of Facts Forum and is its heaviest financial contributor" (No. 112).

In a pamphlet written in 1950 (quoted in an interview in the Washington Post, February 16, 1954, p. 1), Hunt said, "The public is entitled to the facts on both sides of all issues and cannot be pacified with the * * * kind of news which leftwing workers are willing to let them have." Hunt's ideas of how to present "the facts on both sides" without including leftwing views is apparently carefully followed in the Facts Forum format.

According to the same interview, Hunt does not like the words "liberal" and "progressive" which he identifies with "vicious, radical, spendthrift elements" and with "alleged people's parties ruled by ruthless and murderous dictators who say they are also liberals." Next to Communists, he is quoted as saying that the word that seems to arouse him most is "liberal."

These and others of Hunt's basic political ideas seem to be faithfully reflected in Facts Forum.

The following conclusions have been drawn from a careful study of Facts Forum programs of the past year:

1. The major technique of Facts Forum is to identify a legitimate viewpoint with all of Facts Forum's political philosophy.

This permits it to use factual material in presenting the side to which it is opposed, thereby leading to the claim that it is completely fair and unbiased. But that may be compared to the situation involved when a lynch mob rushes its victim to the nearest tree, loops a noose around his neck, gives him 2 minutes to speak in his own defense, and then strings him up. Under those conditions, a casual bystander is not apt to be in the mood to believe him.

It should also be noted that many of the facts presented on the anti-Facts Forum side are carefully selected. Much of this material is actually neutral in character, deliberately chosen for its lack of persuasive capacity. Some of the arguments presented on the other side actually damage the case in behalf of which they are ostensibly introduced.

Facts Forum's theories are communicated via a "shotgun marriage" between a valid point of view and its entire position. It deliberately ignores the fact that other positions are possible. A person holding one view similar to that of the program finds himself driven toward swallowing a whole philosophy.

The result is that, although the question may be reasonable and the pro and con is sometimes valid, the arguments presented produce extreme positions. There is no room for moderates on either side. (This is apparently in line with H. L. Hunt's advocacy of both sides without what he calls the left-wing side.)

If Facts Forum has its way, Americans will be driven to choose between its own extreme views and the other extreme, leaving no moderates and no middle way.

The world of Facts Forum becomes a black and white world where wishy-washy liberals, and some Democrats and Republicans, at best naive and wooly-headed and at worst conscious traitors, are contrasted with red-blooded Americans upholding the principles of the Constitution to save America from communism, and in the process becoming advocates of isolationism, McCarthyism, and against the United Nations, antiforeign aid, antiliberal, antilabor, antilarge segments of both great parties.

Examples:

In No. 98, the affirmative side holds that an adequate national defense can be secured together with tax reductions and a balanced budget. The negative says an adequate defense is impossible without higher taxes. This is legitimate, but the prejudice is disclosed when the affirmative is linked with an advocacy of isolationism and Herbert Hoover's theory of hemisphere defense, implying that one is not possible without the other. Thereby no possibility is conceded of believing that adequate defense is possible with lower taxes but without isolationism and hemisphere defense, nor the belief that adequate defense may be secured without increasing taxes by cutting fat from the defense budget, yet having no truck with isolationism.

In No. 101, the affirmative says the United States should remain in the U. N. if Red China is admitted. The negative says "No," but it also becomes a general argument against the U. N. itself. This ignores the middle position of opposing Red China's entry in the U. N. and still supporting the U. N.

In No. 103, the affirmative holds that the administration is antilabor because of its failure to carry through the proposed Taft-Hartley amendments. The negative says it is not antilabor for that reason, but it also contains strong arguments against unions and union domination of government in general. This leaves no room for the view that Taft-Hartley may be right, but unions are legitimate.

In No. 105, the affirmative says that the Democrats won a great victory in the 1953 elections, referring to the Wisconsin and New Jersey congressional votes and the New Jersey gubernatorial race. The negative denies it, but also denounces "New Deal Republicans" for aping the Democratic foreign policy, being soft on communism, and attacking McCarthy. It leaves out the moderate republicanism which opposes the Democrats and yet is not isolationist and is against McCarthy.

In No. 106, the affirmative wants the United States to depend on the U. N. to get Russia and China to release American prisoners in Korea and demand an accounting for prisoner atrocities. The negative says "No," but the argument becomes pro and anti U. N. There are many who may disapprove of the U. N.'s handling of the Korean prisoner issue, but may yet be unwilling to have support for the U. N. itself depend on such an explosive and emotional issue.

In No. 110, approval of the Eisenhower foreign policy is opposed to disapproval, but disapproval is linked with isolationism. What is opposing Eisenhower's foreign policy, but for completely different reasons than isolationism?

In No. 115, the affirmative favors picketing as part of strikes, while the negative does not. But the negative also opposes unions in general. This eliminates the possibility of wanting to limit picketing, but still favoring unions.

In No. 116, the affirmative wants the United States to continue to support the International Labor Organization, while the negative says "No," but it also includes arguments against the U. N. and for the Bricker amendment. This ignores opposition to ILO, but at the same time still favoring the U. N. and opposing the Bricker amendment.

In No. 123, approval of foreign aid is opposed to disapproval, but disapproval becomes part of a general argument for isolationism. This would cut out the middle position of disapproving foreign aid to various degrees and yet not being isolationist.

In No. 126, one side favors Eisenhower's housing program, while the other argues that housing and other Government aids are socialistic and communistic. This would have us believe that those who favor Government aid in housing and other fields, whether they are for or against Eisenhower's policy specifically, are dupes of the Communists.

2. The anti-Facts Forum side is often exaggerated, distorted, or oversold, or presented in such fashion as to raise doubts.

Examples:

In No. 98, on national defense and taxes, the argument that we cannot provide adequate defense and still reduce taxes is oversold.

References are made to "these costly efforts * * * the fate of the free world depends on active, all-out cooperation—on unlimited effort * * * no sacrifice is too big, no expenditure too large, no effort too great * * * we must be ready to accept these burdens * * * no matter what the cost may be * * * lofty spirit of generosity and sacrifice."

Such a presentation could well frighten a person who has hitherto believed that making some sacrifices is necessary, but who would reconsider his position if "sacrifices and expenditures" had to be "unlimited" and "all-out" and other such unnecessary superlatives.

Again in No. 98, the listener hears a tongue-in-cheek presentation on the anti-Facts Forum side: "At this critical moment in history, it is worse than dangerous nonsense to be agitating for tax reductions and balanced budgets." When it is put this way, one may well question the value of a position which considers it dangerous nonsense to be advocating such pleasant prospects as tax reduction and budget balancing.

In No. 117, the anti-isolationist side says: "The announced motive of isolationism—politely called neutrality—is to prevent America from becoming involved in any future foreign wars." It goes on to answer this argument rather weakly, but isolationism doesn't look so bad when defined as the prospect of not getting into wars. The implication is left that internationalism has the motive of getting us into wars. This is presented as supposedly an argument against isolationism.

In the same section, our system of alliances is oversold. We hear: "More than 1,500,000,000 people in the world * * * are * * * willing to stand and die with us against our common enemy." The headlines in the daily paper would shake anyone's belief in this extreme and naive view. A true presentation of the internationalist position would admit differences between us and our allies.

In No. 106, another tongue-in-cheek view is presented: "The United Nations is the only agency which can operate effectively in the present chaos of world affairs and eventually emerge with a permanent peace, because within the framework of the United Nations, all nations can meet and intelligently resolve their difficulties." In the same script: "The United Nations is working toward permanent peace in Asia."

True enough, but put this way, it is highly unrealistic. A true pro-U. N. view would say the U. N. is the best way to get peace, but not the only way; that permanent peace is a fine ideal, but the U. N. would be satisfied with some temporary peace, too; that sometimes "all" nations do not always act "intelligently" to solve their problems. In other words, by not admitting imperfections in the U. N. doubts can be raised.

In the same script, the pro-U. N. side, for no reason whatsoever, contains a factual recital of six cases of horrible atrocities against Americans in Korea, and urges, tongue in cheek, that this should not "destroy our faith" in the U. N. It has the opposite effect of arousing anger against the U. N.

3. A major characteristic of the program is the deliberate and constant repetition of language discrediting liberals in general and liberal Democrats and Republicans and lumping them with Socialists, Communists, and totalitarians (in keeping with H. L. Hunt's views, coincidentally).

Here are a few examples, among many:

No. 99: "Adlai Stevenson, Dean Acheson, and their friends in the Socialist wing of the Democratic Party."

No. 100: "The Roosevelt-Truman New-Fair Deal * * * has all the characteristics of the totalitarian movement."

No. 101: "Totalitarian liberals and left-wingers."

No. 102: "Twenty years of New Deal socialism. * * * It will matter little whether we call the final result progressive capitalism, social democracy, economic planning, New Dealism, or just plain communism."

No. 103: "In the late 1930's * * * we were caught in a strong tidal drift toward the philosophy of a Socialist labor government."

No. 105: "'Me-too' tactics of liberal Republicans—promising to do everything the New Deal had done, only better. * * * If their only choice at the polls is between

New Deal Republicans and New Deal Democrats, voting is meaningless."

In No. 107: "During the past 8 years * * * fundamental decisions in American policy have been made by traitors or by men under the influence of traitors whose allegiance lay in Moscow."

No. 111: "During the New and Fair Deals, the Socialist revolution made enormous advances in America."

4. The anti-facts forum side is generally presented less strongly.

Examples:

In No. 100, the truth is told but not enough of it. We hear: "Government business corporations, although operating as efficiently and economically as possible, are dedicated primarily not to making a profit, but to serving the people."

This is true. But a sincere partisan of that position would have mentioned that some Government corporations nevertheless have more profits and turned them back into the Treasury—like FCIC, FHA, and HOLC. Without this, there is the implication that Government corporations always lose money.

The same program says, rightly enough, that Government-owned businesses pay no taxes. But since there is a great deal of discussion of TVA on the program, mention might have been made of one of TVA's strongest arguments that also applies to other Government agencies—because of TVA, private corporations do more business than they would otherwise do, make more profits, and thereby pay higher taxes.

In No. 103, pro and con on Taft-Hartley, ex-Secretary of Labor Durkin's case for the Taft-Hartley amendments is presented, but about half of the prolabor time is wasted on a recital of the contents of the disputed 19 amendments. This is boring to listen to, and means nothing to listeners uninformed on the technicalities of one of the most complicated laws on the books.

It is not balanced when on the prolabor side you hear such statements as: "The definition of the word 'supervisor' in the original act should be limited," and "The holding of a representation election should be delayed for a period of 4 months after the commencement of a strike," while on the other side, you hear such colorful and emotion-packed phrases as "irresponsible power in the hands of monopolistic labor bosses; government was in the hands of those who had allied themselves with the labor bosses; President Eisenhower's labor advisers appear dedicated to the old New Deal philosophy that the political support of powerful union leaders must be bought at any cost."

5. The program often makes vital issues of subjects which are not really current at all, but which provides the opportunity of presenting arguments that have been generally discredited, or else gives another chance of attacking an issue Facts Forum is very much interested in.

Examples:

No. 115 deals with union picketing in strikes. Surely this is not much of an issue at the present time. The documentation for the script proves this, since every single reference is taken from technical books and economic periodicals, and not one from a newspaper or speech, as in other scripts. The idea, apparently, is to question a principle accepted to a large degree and to take another whack at unions.

No. 116 deals with the International Labor Organization, again not an issue of vital importance to the news of the day. Yet it gives the program an opportunity to again attack totalitarian liberals and socialism in the U. N. and to reflect on unions, too.

6. The program fosters the technique of the "smear."

Example:

In No. 88: "One of the most powerful Communist fronts is the Methodist Federation for Social Action. * * * This Communist front's credo—rejecting the profit motive as an economic base for society—is closely similar to a resolution passed by the World Council of Churches in Amsterdam in 1947, rejecting the ideologies of both communism and capitalism, and also very similar to a statement along the same line issued in late 1950 by His Holiness Pope Pius VI."

The reaction of one of the top Government officials to Facts Forum's supposed impartiality is presented in this item written by the Washington staff of the New York Herald Tribune (August 15), in a regular Sunday column devoted to inside Washington items:

"Unlike most members of the Cabinet, Secretary Dulles had refused to appear on television shows sponsored by Facts Forum, the program supported by H. L. Hunt, Texas oilman.

"Facts Forum is said to be nonpartisan and nonpolitical, which normally would satisfy Mr. Dulles' determination not to participate in political affairs while running the State Department. However, he is not satisfied the program is either nonpartisan or nonpolitical.

An excellent example of why Mr. Dulles should feel this way is provided by the program of July 3, last, discussing the Jenner-McCarran resolution to break diplomatic relations with Communist nations. The following quotes should be studied carefully, because they typify how Facts Forum can claim to be impartial, and yet be guilty of the grossest partiality:

"Same day, May 13, 1954, while Republican Senator JENNER was standing on the floor of the Senate introducing his resolution to break off diplomatic relations with the Soviets and their captive satellites, Republican Secretary of State John Foster Dulles was at Geneva, Switzerland, in formal conference with the Soviets and one of their captive satellites. The fascinating coruscations of life is the kaleidoscope of history.

"It may or may not have embarrassed Republican Secretary of State Dulles to have Republican Senator JENNER introduce such a resolution. Be that as it may, Senators JENNER and McCARRAN posed for the American people a question of immense and far-reaching importance, should America break off diplomatic relations with all Communist countries.

"Facts Forum believes that a question of such great significance to the American people should be answered by the American people. Nowhere is an informed public opinion more critically needed than in the area of Soviet-American relations. Here is a problem that both underlies and overrides every other national problem we have. If we could find a correct and positive answer to the question of what to do about American-Soviet relations, we would thereby make an enormous contribution to the peace, security, and well-being of our Nation. Here then is an excellent answer to those millions of sincere Americans who frequently and, it must be confessed, honestly say to themselves, 'I know things are in bad shape, but what can I do. I'm just one little individual with no influence or authority, not too much information, not sure of my own convictions and with rather poor ability to express the ideas and communicate the information I have. If the greatest people in our land are confused and divided about the terrible problems of our times, what on earth can I do about it?' "

Notice how subtly these words have been phrased. Nowhere can you put your finger on the words which say specifically that Facts Forum questions Mr. Dulles' Geneva conference with the Soviets, and supports the Jenner move to break relations. Yet that is the impression which is inescapably drawn.

Remember, too, that these words are not read, so that they can be studied at leisure. They are listened to. They are heard fleetingly. What other conclusion can a listener reach when these successive ideas are flung at his eardrums:

"Secretary * * * Dulles * * * in formal conference with the Soviets."

"It may or may not have embarrassed * * * Dulles."

"Senators JENNER and McCARRAN posed * * * a question of immense and far-reaching importance, Should America break off relations with Communist countries."

"If we could find a correct and positive answer to the question of what to do about American-Soviet relations."

"Here then is an excellent answer."

Who is to be blamed for thinking that JENNER's resolution to break relations is an excellent answer to American-Soviet relations and Secretary Dulles is wrong to confer with America's enemies?

This is the technique of the "poison tongue" which insidiously pours venom into the unsuspecting listener's ear as Claudius poured poison into the ear of Hamlet's father as he slept.

No wonder Mr. Dulles refuses to credit Facts Forum's claim of impartiality, as the Tribune reports.

It is time the American people and the authorities also recognized the spuriousness of that claim.

The Federal Trade Commission Investigation of Coffee Prices—Summary and Conclusions, Part 4

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 16, 1954

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent of the House I include herewith the fourth portion of the text of the Summary and Conclusions of the Federal Trade Commission's Economic Report of the Investigation of Coffee Prices, as follows:

IV. THE NEW YORK COFFEE AND SUGAR EXCHANGE AND THE COFFEE PRICE SPIRAL

Certain activities on the New York Coffee and Sugar Exchange, in combination with imperfections and restraints in the total coffee market, were important factors in the recent coffee price spiral.

Imperfections and restraints that stem from the exchange's organization and operating methods are, of course, subject to remedy by the exchange itself, or by public regulation which can be provided by legislative authority. Beyond this, however, lie structural imperfections in the coffee market which neither the exchange nor public regulation can entirely remedy. The two segments of the matter, therefore, should properly be considered separately since the exchange cannot be responsible for market imperfections which are beyond its control, although these may be publicly revealed through the apparatus of future trading.

Two cardinal standards by which exchange organizations and operations are to be judged are:

1. Whether the contracts adopted provide a trading medium useful to the wide variety of traders necessary for the maintenance of a broad competitive market, or whether they embody imperfections and restraints which limit their usefulness to narrow trade interests.

2. Whether the rules governing trading and the manner in which they are policed are such as to maintain and protect those relations of confidence and trust among

buyers and sellers and their agents which, by custom or law, or both, are regarded as trade secrets, and to provide an open market place for the free interplay of competitive forces.

The economic effects of the varied activities carried on by exchange managements and memberships generally are assayable under one or both of these broadly stated criteria, or under collateral standards directly derivable from them. These criteria involve primarily a determination whether the price of futures reflects the reasoned judgment of many traders on both sides of the market or whether it is subject to false starts, erratic movements, concentrations in trading, and maneuvers that both reflect and create expectations and trading patterns inconsistent with actual supply and demand.

In the coffee trade, a highly important factor is the matter of the contracts traded. Judged by the first standard, the "S" (new) contract is too restrictive to reflect the interaction of total supply and demand for coffee. This, the only contract currently traded in on the New York Coffee and Sugar Exchange, is limited in its base to Brazilian coffee shipped from the port of Santas, and with certain penalties, from the ports of Paranagua, Angra dos Reis, and Rio de Janeiro. To be deliverable, coffee from any of these ports must be strictly soft, solid bean, yet coffee shipped from Paranagua must be delivered on the contract at 1 cent below Santos coffee of like grade, and coffee shipped from Angra dos Reis and Rio de Janeiro at ½ cent less than Santos. This in itself tends to narrow the effective commodity basis for futures to Santos coffee for the reason that no coffee shipped from any of the penalized ports will normally be delivered on the contract unless its commercial price in the spot market is lower than the Santos price by as much as the differential.

The "S" contract, therefore, relates to coffee grown in a single geographical region and country whereas, in fact, coffee is produced in many nations spread over an immense geographical area. This means that the price of coffee futures in the short run is tied closely to coffee production and conditions of marketing in a limited geographical producing area. This is at variance with one of the principal prerequisites to competitive, orderly, and serviceable exchange operations; namely, that the contract should be based upon as broad a production base as possible, and especially that the commodity should be geographically as ubiquitous as possible in order to eliminate the effects of weather, political conditions, national policies, labor troubles, and other factors which may greatly affect the supply or its movement from a single geographical area or country.

Furthermore, to be deliverable on futures contracts, coffee must be in New York City. This contract provision still further limits the commodity base for all trading in futures in the United States. Brazilian coffee represents about 50 percent of all coffee imported into the United States, about 50 percent of which is shipped through the port of Santos. About 40 percent of all Brazilian coffee imported enters through the port of New York. Thus, no more than 10 percent of United States coffee imports are readily available as the basis for trading in futures. But this potential base is still further reduced by the fact that a large percentage of the Brazilian coffee imported through New York is owned by coffee merchants and processors who have scheduled their imports for their own merchandising and this coffee would be available for delivery on futures only under exceptional circumstances. Thus the effective commercial pipeline supply upon which the whole structure of futures trading is based is materially less than 20 percent of all Brazilian coffee imports and less than 10 percent of all coffee imported into the United States, for no coffee in store at any other port of entry is deliverable on the futures, and to transport it to New York would not only take it out of its natural channels of distribution but would also entail unnecessary, and often prohibitive, cost.

Hence, an important factor in the thinness of the coffee futures market which makes it subject to erratic price movements is that the Brazilian coffee basis contract is not a satisfactory hedging medium even for Brazilian coffee, and is patently not a satisfactory hedge for "mild coffees" grown in other countries, the commercial prices of which vary widely and with a considerable degree of independence from the prices of Brazilian coffees.

The narrowness and unsatisfactoriness of the futures contract as a hedging medium thus drives would-be hedgers to seek similar protection through trading in "to arrive" contracts which are claims to all kinds and grades of coffee. A significant volume of trading in these contracts has grown up in spite of the fact that they give only uncertain assurance of the grades of delivery and are not subject to margins to assure performance.

Furthermore, the limitation of New York delivery places the coffee trade outside of New York at a competitive disadvantage. Importers, merchants, and processors who operate in the New York area, to the extent that the futures contract affords them a reasonably satisfactory hedge, or enables them to draw outside capital into their business through their hedging operations, enjoy some advantage in those market areas where they come into competition with similar importers and processors operating through other ports.

All of these factors arising out of the nature of the "S" (new) contract makes the coffee futures market highly sensitive to manipulation, or even to any unusually large commercial operation.

Evidence of the sensitiveness of the market is to be noted in the fact that the purchase of contracts for no more than 4,500 bags at the close of trading on December 22, 1950, when the trading floor was bare of selling orders, caused such a run-up of prices that it was made the subject of inquiry by the exchange coffee control committee.

Traders and brokers at New Orleans have joined with large brokerage interests in New York in urging that the contract be broadened to make other growths deliverable at commercial differences instead of the fixed differences applying on the Santos base contract. The exchange has considered this matter, but as yet has failed to adopt New Orleans delivery or come to grips with the collateral problem of commercial differences for coffees deliverable on the Brazilian basis contract. In adopting the broad basis "U" contract, the exchange did provide a broader contract, but flexible commercial differences were not provided. This was especially true for growths other than Brazilian coffee. The contract continued to be a Santos contract and the fixed differentials set up under it did not make it a satisfactory trading medium.

The narrowness of the contract was a facilitating factor in the recent price increases. Had the contract been broader and more serviceable to larger segments of the trade, it would have attracted more traders to the market, and there probably would have been many more sellers willing to take short positions to offset the build-up of long positions that launched the price spiral. Moreover, under a much broader basis for trading, it would have taken more purchases of long contracts to precipitate the price spiral, and the market would have been less violently responsive to large commercial and speculative trades.

Moreover, coffee futures prices, which are, of course, intertwined with spot market prices, are thereby subject to the monetary, fiscal, and agricultural policies of coffee-growing countries, especially Brazil. As is evident from the price history of coffee contained in this report, coffee prices are influenced by changes in Brazil's policy with respect to the exchange value of the cruzeiro, which in turn is related to its foreign trade policy, and more recently by its policy with respect to coffee crop loans and production and marketing controls, and by the actions of the Brazilian Coffee Institute. For example, Brazil's devaluation of the "coffee cruzeiro" to 23.28 to the dollar on October 9, 1953, precipitated a decline in futures prices from $0.595 to $0.5675 per pound, and a decline in the spot market price from $0.6125 to $0.58 per pound. Again, when on December 2, 1953, Brazil decreed that the loan rate on coffee would be increased from 1,200 to 1,500 cruzeiros per bag, both the futures and spot market prices of coffee increased immediately by $0.0125 per pound and continued to increase rapidly thereafter. Finally, when the Brazilian Government announced in May 1954 that the minimum export price of Brazilian coffee would be increased to $0.87 per pound, it reversed a 5-week downward trend in the spot and futures prices of coffee, which had reached a peak of $0.9635 per pound about the 1st of April 1954.

These policies inevitably influence trading in the New York Coffee and Sugar Exchange, but are in no way integrated with those of the Government having jurisdiction over the Exchange itself. Thus price on the Exchange is not determined altogether by the free interplay of supply and demand, and traders instantly apprised of decisions as they are made in Brazil can capitalize upon them on the Exchange because of their possession of more complete knowledge. For example, a group of 7 Brazilian traders entered the coffee futures market on December 1, 1953, and on the following day, the day the Brazilian Government announced its increased crop-loan rate, took substantial long positions. Hence a second important prerequisite for a competitive, orderly, and serviceable futures market is not present; namely, that futures prices and expected futures prices should not be subject to the arbitrary actions of any particular commercial or political group, and that channels of information that affect prices should not be restricted to a favored group of traders.

The extent to which these aspects of the coffee futures market can affect coffee prices is adequately illustrated by the trading that took place on the exchange between December 1, 1953, and February 26, 1954, a period covered more thoroughly than others by the Federal Trade Commission's investigation. From January 1952 until February 1953, when prices reached the OPS ceiling, the prices of both the near futures and spot coffee moved within a modest range of about 3 cents, the near future moving between a high of 54.70 and a low of 51.15. When the market reopened on March 16, prices were sharply up over the previous high, starting in the neighborhood of 60 cents for the near future, and then falling until, at the beginning of July 1953, quotations were approximately 55 cents for the September future.

The news of the frost during the first week of July moved prices up sharply, advancing from 55 cents to 60.3 for the September future on July 31. Prices thereafter declined, being about 58 cents at the beginning of December. Beginning with the first week in December 1953, however, the futures prices moved steadily into new highs, reaching a peak of 96.35 cents for the July contract on April 1, 1954. The movement of the futures market, while influenced by activity in other sectors of the coffee market (note the inventory accumulation previously mentioned), was an important factor in creating widespread expectations of higher prices and in inducing behavior which brought those expectations to reality. An examination of both open positions and trading during the 3 months, December 1 to February 26, attempted to identify the trading patterns which were responsible for the sustained upward movement of prices. The following table summarizes the results of this study for 4 principal groups of traders consisting, respectively, of Brazilian traders, traders engaged in the United States spot coffee business, other domestic traders not engaged in the spot coffee business, and finally, foreign traders other than Brazilian. The data shown are the total number of contracts bought and sold by the traders classified in each of these groups in each of the 3 months from December 1953 through February 1954.

Purchases and sales of specified trading groups during the months of December 1953 and January and February 1954

Month	Volume of trading	Types of trading account				
		Brazilian	United States in spot coffee business	United States not in spot coffee	Foreign other than Brazil	Total trades covered [1]
December	Bought	2,865	3,322	1,470	181	7,838
	Sold	1,719	4,070	1,488	473	7,750
	Net trades, long or short	[2] 1,146	[3] 748	[3] 18	[3] 292	[2] 88
January	Bought	1,479	2,365	1,686	230	5,760
	Sold	2,019	1,923	1,636	184	5,762
	Net trades, long or short	[3] 540	[2] 442	[2] 50	[2] 46	[3] 2
February	Bought	490	1,510	1,175	146	3,321
	Sold	781	1,470	924	143	3,118
	Net trades, long or short	[3] 291	[2] 40	[2] 251	[2] 3	[2] 3

[1] Failure of trades to balance is due to minor discrepancies in reports by carrying brokers.

[2] Long.

[3] Short.

Editorial Comments on Foundations Investigation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE L. HAYS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remards, I include the following editorial comments on the investigation of tax exempt foundations conducted by a special committee of the House of Representatives during the 83d Congress:

Denver (Colo.) Post, May 7, 1954, We Must Keep an Eye on Mr. Reece:

"One of Mr. Reece's complaints at the time the committee was created was that foundations finance social and economic studies based on liberal rather than conservative viewpoints. Even if that were true, what possible business is it of the Congress of the United States? In a free country of free institutions, is Congress going to undertake thought control, by requiring foundations to use their funds for conservative propaganda?"

Hempstead (N. Y.) Newsday, May 13, 1954, Inquiry, or Inquisition?:

"The pattern for the newest Congressional investigation has been put on display—a pattern that belies the name of investigation and more rightly should bear the name of inquisition. A group of Congressmen, under the leadership of Tennessee's reactionary Representative B. Carroll Reece, are looking into the activities of educational and philanthropic foundations such as the Rockefeller, Carnegie, Sloan, Ford, Guggenheim, Pulitzer and hundreds of others. Under the House resolution adopted last July, the committee is authorized to see whether the foundations are using their funds for un-American or subversive activities, or to sponsor or defeat legislation. The facts, as shown by the outline made public Tuesday, are that the committee is far more concerned with an investigation of ideas that do not jibe with those of Representative Reece. * * * Agreed that the foundations should stay out of politics. But we want no group of headline hunters decreeing by intimidation what we should think, how we should think, or whether we should think at all. We would like to see more foundations, not fewer."

New York (N. Y.) Times, May 13, 1954, Foundation Inquiry No. 2:

"The opening statement of Norman Dodd, director of research for the special House committee investigating tax-exempt foundations, can hardly fail to arouse grave apprehension as to the direction this inquiry will take. Its tone is, however, not surprising in view of the remarks made by Representative Reece, of Tennessee, last July when, in persuading the House to establish the committee, he suggested that the foundations were participants in a diabolical conspiracy whose aim is the furtherance of socialism in the United States. * * * The new group, of which Mr. Reece is the chairman, seems to be heading into a frontal assault on the whole spirit of free inquiry in this country as it has been promoted and advanced by the foundations for the last half-century."

Nashville (Tenn.) Tennessean, May 14, 1954, The Goblins Will Get You:

"The report * * * views with alarm most of the current trends in American political and economic thought which Mr. Reece and a handful of colleagues in Congress condemn in their speeches. To their minds, for instance, many viewpoints expressed by such agencies as the Committee for Economic Development, the National Council of Parent-Teacher Associations, and the National Education Association represent dangerous thinking. These are named in the staff report as agencies for which on occasion the Ford and Carnegie Foundations have underwritten research activities. It is a well known fact that Mr. Reece and those who think as he does have long been suspicious of the too enlightened views of such big businessmen as Mr. Paul G. Hoffman and others who have directed the politics of the Committee for Economic Development. The knowledge that CED's viewpoints rarely are more radical on any subject than those of the United States Chamber of Commerce obviously does not reassure Mr. Reece or Mr. Dodd."

Boston (Mass.) Christian Science Monitor, May 17, 1954, Education: Brave or Safe:

"This second, obviously hostile investigation may conceivably unearth some infiltration, find some errors of judgment not discovered by the first committee. But if this staff report is any index, its basic philosophy is a century behind the times."

Middletown (Ohio) Journal, Ashland (Ohio) Times-Gazette, Athens (Ohio) Messenger, Lima (Ohio) News, Galion (Ohio) Inquirer, and other papers, May 21, 1954, House Study of Foundations:

"In a country proud of constant change, the committee may be hard put to demonstrate that change is some sort of sin. And it may be even harder to show that foundations like Carnegie, Rockefeller, and Ford, which have poured out copious funds to advance our understanding and our welfare, are engaged in a devlish and subversive plot against the American people."

Baltimore (Md.) Sun, May 21, 1954, Censoring Research?

"If the Federal Government undertakes to use the power of taxation to direct these private enterprises, no area of research in this country will be free. Indeed, if the power of taxation can be used to control research, it can also be used to control private education. This kind of an investigation raises serious misgiving. The more so because of the personality of the chairman, Mr. Reece, who is a manipulator of Southern political patronage with no really constructive achievements to his credit. An inquiry of the kind he is conducting has to be watched. It could easily lead to the gravest sort of abuses of power."

Providence (R. I.) Bulletin, May 22, 1954, Probing the Foundations:

"If the investigation is devised to make a field day for neoisolationists, then it will do a lot of harm. If the investigators have set out to discredit the several big and illustrious foundations, to intimidate and to inhibit them, to force them into a narrow orthodox cast of thinking and conduct, if in short they are trying to impose a particularist point of view on the foundations, then the foundations have the obligation in conscience to resist this form of tyranny and defend the high purposes to which foundation work in America, by and large, has been dedicated. This investigation should be closely watched."

Gadsden (Ala.) Times, May 24, 1954, Another Probe of Nation's Big Foundations Off to Biased Start:

"In this country of change and progress it may be difficult to demonstrate that change is in itself a sort of sin. Likewise it may be hard to show that foundations like Carnegie, Rockefeller, and Ford, which have poured out vast sums in education and welfare programs are engaged in a plot against the American people."

St. Louis (Mo.) Post-Dispatch, Roscoe Drummond, May 26, 1954:

"You really ought to know what the Reece committee is up to these days. Two members of the committee already protested against the way the investigation is being conducted. Its hearings are not as explosive as the Army-McCarthy investigation, but they are highly controversial and something very significant is at stake. No one can foresee what will emerge from these hearings, if anything, but it is clear that if Representative Carroll Reece, of Tennessee, long a partner of the most conservative forces in Congress, has his way, the Nation's history books covering the past half-century will have to be rewritten, but quickly."

New York (N. Y.) Herald Tribune, May 27, 1954, Challenge to Freedom of Thought:

"Congress has a constitutional right to investigate research foundations, exempt as they are from public taxation. This happens to have been done a little more than a year ago. The new investigation was superfluous to begin with; it is now carrying on in such a way as to make itself ridiculous. Fortunately the obligation of scholars to investigate and report—'even though their conclusions may be unpopular'—is too well established in this country to be in danger now. Yet the fact that this concept should be solemnly challenged within the Congress makes an unhappy footnote to these times."

Pittsfield (Mass.) Berkshire Evening Eagle, May 28, 1954, Two-Pronged Assault:

"On one point we think the Republican Party is to be congratulated. In having the assault on intellectualism led by Representative Reece it has selected a man who should have approval from both camps. Mr. Reece from the point of view of fitness is the perfect choice; his views and his record make him almost the symbol of anti-intellectualism The aproval of the opposition will stem from the conviction that if anyone can mess up the investigation and make it ridiculous, Mr. Reece can—and will."

San Francisco (Calif.) Chronicle, May 31, 1954, The Foundations Must Be Free:

"The Reece committee probing into the activities of the tax-exempt educational foundations of this country—Rockefeller, Carnegie, Ford, and others—heard last week from Aaron M. Sargent, a San Francisco attorney, who appeared as head of the Fund for American Leadership, Inc. This general line of attack by Witness Sargent is familiar to Californians, who have heard it all before. The State board of education, the State curriculum commission, and the State PTA found no foundation for his charges. If the Reece committee took the trouble, as the responsible authorities in the California educational system did, to read the Building America books, it would discover that Mr. Sargent's charge is simply not true, and that his elaborate attempt thereby to make socialistic conspirators of the Rockefeller Foundation and the NEA falls to the ground."

Sacramento (Calif.) Bee, June 8, 1954:

"In all the lurid fever of the present investigation epidemic no other inquisitor has tried what Reece has undertaken, namely, to assert his conclusions first and find the facts to justify them afterward."

American Israelite, Robert E. Segal, June 10, 1954:

"We had best be alerted to the mischief the Reece committee is creating. We had best redouble our efforts to break up this nightmare effort on the part of Congressmen to tell us what orthodoxy is. And we had best pray that they come around to the proposition that education is not a subversive monster but the best of the weapons in our arsenal. For education, in the finely chiseled words of John Ruskin, 'does not mean teaching people to know what they do not know; it means teaching them to behave as they do not behave.'"

Washington (D. C.) Catholic Standard, June 18, 1954:

"Objecting to certain practices he said were being followed in a House investigation of tax-exempt foundations, Representative Wayne L. Hays of Ohio last week read three quotations and then handed them to Thomas M. McNiece, the investigating unit's assistant research director. Mr. Hays takes the position that the really effective anti-Communists are those who stress social justice. His comment that the church is a bulwark against communism drew a few unfavorable letters, but the great majority of the letters on his exchange with Mr. McNiece approved his idea of bringing the church into the discussion."

The Christian Century, nondenominational Protestant weekly, July 28, 1954, Free Foundations:

"If Government gains control, either by laws passed by Congress or by intimidation through the remorseless and unfair methods of the Reece committee, few foundations will be established and those that exist will find ways of going out of business. And if our shrinking freedoms are driven from this area also, what will that do to our conception of ourselves and of our system of Government? What will it do to the incentive to earn? What will it do to freedom of thought, to progress in research in the natural and social sciences?"

The Federal Trade Commission Investigation of Coffee Prices—Summary and Conclusions, Part 5

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 16, 1954

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent of the House I include herewith the fifth portion of the text of the Summary and Conclusions of the Federal Trade Commission's Economic Report of the Investigation of Coffee Prices, as follows:

The general showing is that Brazilian interests were the only group that bought far more heavily than they sold in December, while all three of the other groups sold more than they bought. In January the trading patterns of the groups were reversed; the Brazilians sold more than they bought, and all three of the other groups bought more than they sold, with domestic traders in the coffee business assuming the bulk of the long position developed in the trading. In February much the same pattern continued, with the Brazilians still selling more than they bought, and the other three groups all buying more than they sold, but the predominant long buying interest now shifted from domestic traders in the spot coffee trade to the group of domestic speculative traders not engaged in the spot coffee trade. Thus the principal accretions of buying in December were by Brazilian interests; in January, by domestic coffee trade interests; and in February, by domestic speculative interests not engaged in the spot coffee business. Foreign interests other than Brazilian were not important buying interests at any time during the period covered, although they, like the American trading interests, shifted from a net selling interest in December to a small net buying interest in January and February.

In connection with this general showing, the following facts not revealed by the table are important. During the first 2 weeks of December, a small group of seven Brazilian traders took substantial long positions in the market. This group was followed a week later by a second group of seven Brazilian traders, which also took substantial long positions in the market. The members of the first group began selling out their long position on December 21 and 22, while the members of the second group similarly began withdrawing from the market later in December. While the members of the first group were leaving the market, a third group of Brazilians, again consisting of seven traders, was entering the market. This third group absorbed many of the long contracts liquidated by the first and second groups. The members of the third group carried over their contracts into January and liquidated the bulk of them by January 13, when prices for the March future closed at 72.75. This represented an increase of 15.12 cents per pound, or 26 percent, over the closing price bid for the March future on November 30, 1953. It marks the price level at which the last of the Brazilians appear to have been willing to take their profit. Further, there is scattered evidence in the form of correspondence in the files examined by the Federal Trade Commission that this was the highest price certain Brazilian traders thought coffee would reach.

The rising price of futures contracts in December set up expectations that reverberated throughout the entire United States coffee market. Confronted with what appeared to be a rapid rise in coffee prices, domestic traders first bought to offset their previous short positions, and then continued in the market to become buyers taking long positions, which may or may not have been speculative. Important processors who were long also stood for delivery in December, which tended further to squeeze the market and enhance prices. As the covering of short positions and Brazilian buying drove the price of coffee still higher in December, other bandwagon traders, who normally jump aboard in any major price movement on the exchanges, also took long positions in the market, in expectation of further price rises, thereby driving the price still higher. In the meantime, as stated above, domestic importer-jobbers and roasters continued to accumulate inventories in anticipation of higher spot market prices. During the period when these Brazilians were in the market, all of them behaved as speculators, buying heavily, holding their long positions for a price increase, and then selling out the holdings at a profit when prices advanced. By an unexplained combination of circumstances, the entry of the second group as buyers, when the first was selling out its long holding, continued the upward trend of prices initiated by the buying of the first group, while the entry of the third group did the same late in December, when both the first and second groups were taking their profits and withdrawing from the market. When the third group of Brazilians began selling out their long positions during the first 2 weeks of January, there was no equally strong buying interest to take their place, and prices fell 5 cents a pound between January 11 and 18. Thereafter, there was a period of about 2 weeks during which it appeared that coffee prices might become stabilized between 70 and 72 cents per pound. The rapid price rise during December, however, apparently led other traders, including both those dealing in coffee and speculators, to expect and be willing to pay still higher prices. With trading on the exchange greatly reduced in January and still further reduced in February to less than half the December volume, a small volume of long purchases over sales by the domestic and foreign trading groups other than Brazilian became the stimulus to the further price rise which began in February and continued through March 1954.

During the months covered by the Commission's survey, domestic interests in the spot coffee trade could have contributed directly and significantly to the price spiral only in January, when these trade interests bought more than they sold by a total of 442 contracts, while other domestic interests not in the spot coffee trade and foreign interests (other than Brazilians) bought more than they sold by less than 100 contracts. Thus, the domestic spot coffee interests became the predominant long buying interest during January. (During December, there was a substantial volume of long buying by domestic coffee interests, but their purchases of 3,322 long contracts were more than offset by short sales by interests in the domestic coffee trade to the amount of 4,070 contracts.)

In February, however, domestic interests not in the spot coffee business bought more than they sold by 251 contracts, as compared with an excess of purchases by domestic spot coffee interests of only 40 long contracts, and an excess of only 3 long contracts by foreign interests other than Brazil.

In brief summary, the interaction of demand for larger inventories and the scurrying to cover short positions in both the spot and futures markets in December precipitated a coffee-price increase quite out of proportion to the actual supply-demand situation. After a period of unusually heavy speculative buying by Brazilian interests, there was a period in January when it appeared that the market might become stabilized at the level at which Brazilian speculative buying was largely withdrawn. Thereafter, continued demand for long contracts by domestic coffee trade interests, accompanied by moderate increases in buying by domestic and foreign speculative interests other than Brazilian, in a market rendered thin by the withdrawal of selling interests, produced increases late in January; while in February, with the total volume of trading further reduced, comparatively small buying by domestic speculators and trade interests started the market on the second upswing which carried it to its all-time peak at the end of March. The Commission has made no study of trading subsequent to February 1954.

An important factor of uncertainty underlying these violent increases in prices is the fact that crop and other supply information on coffee is questionable as to its accuracy. In the absence of the Brazilian Government's publication and dissemination of reliable crop information, the groundwork is laid for humors and strategically worded guesses to become the basis for expectations with respect to the present and future supplies of coffee in Brazil, and such rumors and guesses cannot be verified by American traders. Hence, in the event of frost, excessive rains, other vagaries of the weather, crop diseases, output curtailment, and all the other factors which influence exportable Brazilian coffee production, domestic traders are put in a position where they must operate on the basis of a composit hearsay, rumor, and fact. The situation in this respect is no better in other coffee-producing countries.

V. EXCHANGE OPERATIONS

An examination of trading on the New York Coffee and Sugar Exchange reveals many respects in which the behavior of the exchange fails to satisfy the standards required for a freely competitive and broadly based futures market. The total volume of trading in the market has been quite small, for the domestic and international coffee trade makes relatively little use of the market in carrying on their trade operations. Indeed, it may be said that the most consistent use of the market is by Brazilians, and that except for the upward price movement whose pattern has just been described, the typical pattern of behavior by Brazilian accounts has been to take a long position in a distant future, and transfer to a more distant future when that contract becomes a near future in order to profit by the rise in price as the distant futures approach maturity.

This pattern of trading on the part of Brazilians has been favored by the fact that, prior to the rise initiated in the latter part of 1953, distant futures sold quite consistently at discounts below the prices of near futures. When, however, the market started upward in December 1953, the spreads between the near and distant futures became exceedingly erratic, reflecting recurrent reappraisals of the market situation stemming in part from the lack of reliable knowledge as to conditions of supply.

The small volume of trading and the limited participation of domestic trade and speculative interests in the coffee-futures market render it especially susceptible to price fluctuations unwarranted by actual supply-demand conditions. A relatively limited volume of trading can significantly affect the course of prices on the exchange. And when, as during December 1953, the futures prices advanced sharply, it is to be expected that the futures market will significantly influence the course of prices in the spot market.

The coffee-futures market has been used by the coffee trade to a limited extent for hedging, but no consistent policy of hedging has been followed by the trade. Members of the domestic coffee trade have on occasion used the futures market to increase their long position and to accumulate supplies of actual coffee. However, out of the 238 roasters responding to the Commission's roaster questionnaire, only 20, or 8.4 percent, traded on the exchange at any time in 1949, 1952, 1953, and the first 2 months of 1954. It should be pointed out, however, that this failure to use the futures market for hedging is consistent with the roasters' practice of tying roast-coffee prices to replacement and expected replacement costs rather than to the cost of inventories being processed. Over the same period, 40, or over 75 percent, of the 53 reporting importer-jobbers traded on the exchange, but many traded only lightly and sporadically, and were sometimes on the same side of the futures market as they were in the spot market. In the latter case the traders were either using the futures market as an alternative and supplementary source of coffee stocks rather than as a mechanism for hedging, or were simply speculating in futures.

Defects in rules and conduct of the exchange

Aside from the above factors, the New York Coffee and Sugar Exchange has permitted certain practices which are not conducive to a competitive, orderly, and serviceable futures market. Officials of the New York Coffee and Sugar Exchange have opposed, in hearings before the Congress, attempts to place it under governmental regulation, asserting that the exchange's mechanism for self-regulation is adequate and renders Government regulation unnecessary. However, the Federal Trade Commission's investigation disclosed that the rules and regulations in some instances are loosely drawn, susceptible to abuses, and improperly policed.

Speculative Limits

On the basis of a legislative finding that excessive speculation may cause sudden and unreasonable price fluctuations, the Commodity Exchange Authority was given power to set maximum limits on the daily volume of speculative trading and net speculative futures holdings of individual traders so as to restrict the manipulative capacity of purely speculative accounts. No limit is imposed by the rules and bylaws of the New York Coffee and Sugar Exchange. Its rules merely limit the number of open contracts that a clearing member is permitted to carry to 2,500 contracts. This upper limit can scarcely be regarded as an effective curb on excessive speculation, inasmuch as it exceeds in many instances the combined total open contracts carried by the approximately 38 members clearing coffee futures.

Price Manipulation and Cornering

An additional safeguard which is contained in the Commodity Exchange Act is the provision which places primary responsibility on the governing board of an exchange to prevent manipulation of prices and the cornering of any commodity. Direct reference is not made in the rules and regulations of the New York Coffee and Sugar Exchange to "manipulation of prices and cornering of any commodity" although a provision is made for the appointment of a control committee when "a situation or an interest exists in any one month or months that might jeopardize the normal functioning of the exchange."

The Federal Trade Commission's examination of the activities of the control committees of the exchange, which are charged with the responsibility of providing the appropriate safeguards against price manipulation and cornering, revealed evidence of deficiencies both in organisation and operation: (1) The inability of the control committee to expose corners and manipulation of prices in event they should occur was conceded by the various members who acted as chairmen of control committees in the past; (2) one of the firms once investigated by the control committee reported to its customer that it had been "whitewashed"; (3) control committees were not impaneled on several occasions when officials of the exchange felt that a "squeeze" was imminent; (4) on one occasion the president of the exchange asked a large account whether it could be relied upon not to squeeze the market.

Segregation of Customers' Funds

One of the provisions of the Commodity Exchange Act designed for protection of customers is the requirement that futures commission merchants segregate and separately account for margin funds deposited with them by customers. In rejecting a proposal made by an exchange member that this safeguard be adopted, the commission committee of the New York Coffee and Sugar Exchange reported to the exchange's board of managers that "a rule of this kind would hardly be effective unless it were properly policed. There would appear to be no objection to such a rule, but as a practical matter we believe that this one rule, lifted by itself from CEA regulations would not materially add to the proper handling of accounts by member firms."

Taking the Other Side of the Customers Order

The rules of the New York Coffee and Sugar Exchange permit a member to act as an agent and a principal in the same transaction pursuant to a general course of dealing between the broker and his customer. This practice is objectionable in that all brokers could demand that such general authority be given by the customers. Such an arrangement is specifically prohibited by the Commodity Exchange Act which requires that prior consent be obtained for each transaction in which the broker takes the other side of a customer's order. The practice of acting as an agent and principal in the same transaction without the prior consent of the customer is subject to abuses. It permits the setting up of accommodation trades having the appearances of genuine transactions.

Passouts

Passouts occur when a broker, having both bought and sold a particular future on his own account on a given day at the same price, substitutes the buyer for himself with the seller, and the seller for himself with the buyer, thereby eliminating himself as a party to the contract. They are permitted on some exchanges regulated by the Commodity Exchange Authority, subject to regulation to prevent their misuse and provided they are reported to the clearing association.

Passouts were not permitted on the New York Coffee and Sugar Exchange prior to an amendment in the bylaws effective December 14, 1953. Although complaints concerning misuse of the practice were directed to the floor committee prior to the amendment, disciplinary action was never taken. Instead, the rules were amended to permit the practice. The irregularities under existing exchange rules were of common knowledge and condoned by the floor committee members whose own dealings were not free of the same practices. In addition, disciplinary action was not taken against one member who used passouts to his own advantage, although the floor committee regarded it as an evasion of the established trading procedure, and an act detrimental to the best interests of the exchange.

There is no requirement in the amended rule of the New York Coffee and Sugar Exchange that passouts be reported to the clearing association, as required by regulated exchanges. Reporting all transactions to the clearing association assures the maintenance of a permanent record and provides a means for checking for possible abuses of the trading rules and for settling disputes between members. Investigation disclosed the trading records evidencing passouts are not being preserved by members for the period required by the amended rule.

Expit transactions

The rules of the New York Coffee and Sugar Exchange, like those of other exchanges, require in general that all trades recorded by the exchange and submitted for clearance through the New York Coffee and Sugar Clearing Association shall be made at open outcry on the floor of the exchange An exchange official's attention was called to the existence of certain practices, such as pocketing of orders by floor brokers and secret trading not made by public outcry. These practices are a form of bucketing (offsetting orders or becoming a buyer or seller with respect to an order for which a member is a broker), and are unlawful on regulated exchanges. A comparison on the exchange records with those of the clearing house revealed repeated discrepancies of such magnitudes between these two records that it can reasonably be concluded that nonpermissable expit transactions were made and cleared. The records of the exchange do not disclose that a thorough investigation of the allegations of the expit transactions was ever made by the exchange.

Broker-customer relationship and breach of confidential relationships between principals and agents

In the course of the Federal Trade Commission's investigation, it was found that floor brokers who act in the legal capacity of agents for large accounts have for many years followed a practice of exchanging information concerning the detail of the orders executed in behalf of their various principals. A report on this information is made available daily to a small inner group. This information enables traders to reconstruct the net open long and short positions of the various clearing members and thereby identifies in effect the principals from whom they trade. Disclosure of this information can influence the judgment of others or attract others into the market by revealing how important traders, for example, Brazilian principals who are assumed to be acting on the basis of advance information respecting the coffee situation, are placing their transactions. Those not receiving the information are placed in a disadvantageous position. It can be assumed that market positions are taken in reliance in part on this information, causing price fluctuations not warranted by the best estimates of individual traders acting solely on their independent judgments as to supply and demand factors.

Margins

Margins appear adequate, if judged simply in terms of the percentage margins customary on other commodity exchanges in the United States. Whether these margins are adequate for a market having the characteristics of the New York Coffee and Sugar Exchange is not so easily judged. Moreover, the rules of the exchange permit the classification of speculators as "members of the trade," and thereby permit the former to post smaller margins than are required of speculators on regulated exchanges.

Mr. Speaker, this completes the FTC summary and conclusions.

World's Most Modern Beet-Sugar Plant Opens—Hon. Harold C. Hagen, of Minnesota, Urges More Sugar-Beet Acreage, New Sugar-Processing Plants

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 16, 1954

Mr. HAGEN of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, a $10 million up-to-the-minute modern sugar-beet plant has been opened at Crookston, Polk County, Minn., my home city.

It was my privilege to participate in the dedication exercises of this sugar factory, which means so much to the Red River Valley of the North.

The plant was built by the American Crystal Sugar Co., which also has fine sugar-processing plants at East Grand Forks and Moorhead, also in the Red River Valley, and in the Ninth Minnesota Congressional District.

This new Crookston plant will produce 100 million pounds of sugar a year, will employ about 400 people, with an annual payroll of $800,000. This means a great deal, not only to the many farmers who raise sugar beets, but also means employment for these 400 people in the late fall and winter months, when, ordinarily, jobs are scarce. This payroll and the approximately $4 million that will go to the sugar-beet farmers also means much to every business and professional man in the upper Red River Valley, because this is cash, which can be and will be put in circulation or in savings by the thousands of persons affected by this wonderful new industrial enterprise in our area.

The sugar plants at Crookston, Moorhead, East Grand Forks, and Chaska, Minn., all owned by the American Crystal Sugar Co., means a $3 million payroll to workers in these 4 areas and approximately $17 million per year in beet payments to the farmers of our State.

Before giving details of this wonderful dedication, I want to say that the United States Department of Agriculture is considering a proposal to cut sugar-beet acreage in Minnesota next year by approximately 5,000 to 7,000 acres. This sounds like the old Democratic policy.

This certainly should not be done and is a wrong policy. I shall strongly oppose this effort, and I believe we will defeat such a move.

There are about 7,000 babies per day born in these United States. Our population is growing by leaps and bounds. These 7,000 new Americans per day, plus the other thousands who come in from foreign nations, must be fed, and sugar is not only an important food but a vitally necessary staff of life.

ACREAGE SHOULD BE RAISED

Instead of planning to cut the sugar acreage in Minnesota next year, the Agriculture Department should substantially raise the acreage so that at least seven or eight thousand more acres in the Red River Valley can be used in the production of sugar beets.

We need more sugar-processing plants in the Red River Valley, and I believe that important places where these may be placed would be Breckenridge, Halstad, Ada, Oslo, Warren, Hallock, and other places in the Ninth Congressional District. Research by soil scientists has revealed that the Red River Valley soil comprises one of the two important parts of these United States, where sugar beets can be produced at less cost than in other parts of the Nation. The other economical beet-producing area is in the State of Washington, some 2,000 miles from the Red River Valley, and offers no economic interference with our activities in the Ninth Congressional District.

If the voters of 15 counties, comprising the Minnesota Ninth Congressional District, honor me on November 2, 1954, with my seventh election as their Congressman, I pledge to the farmers of this area, to the workers in these sugar beet factories, and to the thousands of business and professional persons and workers who profit from these activities, that I shall immediately take steps, as your Congressman, to show the Department of Agriculture that thousands more acres should be allotted in northwestern Minnesota to sugar beet production.

Those of you who are familiar with procedures in Congress realize that a Congressman who would have 7 terms, and the seniority and the power that goes with 14 years of service, who has made many friends and acquaintances in official Washington, D. C., can be of tremendous value and help, far more than some newcomer who must spend many years in reaching the same relative position in the House of Representatives that I now have.

It must be kept in mind that the Democrats for a century have traditionally favored free trade and low tariffs. The Democrats also passed and have maintained as law the reciprocal trade treaty law, which permits the importation of sugar, farm products and other commodities into these United States, either free of any duty whatsoever, or with a tariff cut by at least 50 percent.

Those of you who live near the Canadian border know about the bringing in of products from our neighbor to the north. But possibly you do not realize that sugar produced in the Philippine Islands or Puerto Rico, or Cuba, is produced by labor which draws wages of less than 75 cents per day in American money and in the Philippines the wages of some of these workers runs about 30 cents per day.

I am proud to say that I never have voted for extension of the present reciprocal trade treaty law, because I feel that American producers should receive first consideration from their Congressmen instead of the coolies and low-paid workers of other lands. And my viewpoint applies not only to sugar, but to the importation of all farm products and industrial products that would weaken our American way of life.

FINE DEDICATION PROGRAM

The dedication program of this new sugar processing plant at Crookston was an event attended not only by thousands of persons from the Red River Valley, but by newspapermen, radio commentators, and television operators. The wide publicity given to this splendidly planned dedication will do much to help create a market for Red River Valley products and especially for the fine sugar produced in the three great sugar factories at Crookston, East Grand Forks, and Moorhead. There were some splendid addresses made and it was my privilege to be on the platform with the distinguished speakers and guests and to be introduced to the thousands who inspected this plant and attended these ceremonies.

In the space I have it will be impossible to report to you all of the fine speeches that were made at the Crookston plant's dedication programs. However, I am going to offer you, in part, or in their entirety, four of the oustanding addresses.

John M. Budd, president of the Great Northern Railroad, reviewed the part that James J. Hill and the Great Northern had in helping to develop the Red River Valley from a wilderness, just one long life ago, into its present outstanding position in American economy. Mr. Budd said:

> It gives me much pleasure to be here today and on behalf of the Great Northern Railroad to take part in the formal opening of the new Crookston plant of the American Crystal Sugar Co. This is the third such plant to be built in this area, and the second one to go into production since World War II ended.
>
> I am sure you people of Crookston take as much pride in this plant as the people in Moorhead and East Grand Forks do in theirs. I hope that you have all enjoyed as I did the inspection of this magnificent plant. Mr. Summerton doubtless will have many volunteers for management of the affairs of the American Crystal Sugar Co. in Crookston, since we all now know exactly how sugar is extracted from beets and made ready for marketing; what becomes of the byproducts and all of the other details necessary to run the plant.
>
> One cannot make even a brief trip through the new refinery without realizing that here is an investment of very substantial magnitude, for it is obvious that millions of dollars have been spent in creating this modern, up to the second, magnificent installation. My own experience assures me that sums of this size are not idly spent on expansion, but only after very thoughtful study and definite proof of the soundness of the investment. Planning for every phase of the operation must be incorporated into the facilities, and all of the mistakes that went into other plants must be eliminated from this one. This plant is here for a long, long time, and must remain efficient and modern for years to come.
>
> From the time the plans for the construction of this refinery were announced, I have speculated on the reasons why the American Crystal Sugar Co. has staked so much of its future in the Red River Valley. Naturally the soil conditions and climate must be favorable for beet culture.
>
> Bill Duncan, director of Great Northern's agricultural development department, tells me the Red River Valley is one of the two regions in the United States in which sugar beets can be grown at the lowest cost. The other is the Columbia Basin in the State of Washington. However, where agriculture in the Columbia Basin is dependent on irrigation, the normal rainfall in the Red River Valley assures abundant production.
>
> But I am confident that this was not the only consideration of Mr. Summerton and his associates in their decision to build this new plant in Crookston. I feel sure that another decisive aspect is the human factor—the character of the people in the valley. In the background thought of those who built this new industry there obviously was great consideration of the quality of the valley's men and women—their intelligence on the science of agriculture and proven ability to make the soil produce so abundantly. These great human qualities will continue to justify the faith of the company in the years ahead.
>
> Farming, it seems to me, is a satisfying kind of industry because of the continuing productivity of wealth from the soil. Your neighboring State, which also has an important agricultural economy, has developed in recent years an oil industry of considerable consequence and promise. North Dakota also has a lignite development in several places, and Minnesota has an iron-mining activity second to none in the Nation. Yet, in the petroleum and mining industries there are definite limits to the supplies, and once oil and ore are taken from the ground the harvest has been forever concluded. In farming another crop always is ahead. In farming, value keeps flowing from the ground. It is true that timber grows, is cut, and grows again; but the process is slow and tedious, demanding infinite patience—and you can't eat wood. Farm products, on the other hand, constitute one of the most basic needs of man: food. Farm crops also provide food for animals, and animals, in turn, provide foor for humans.
>
> This valley has been producing food for at least 75 years; and those years have been dramatic ones. What in the early seventies was little more than raw wilderness now is a prosperous, well-populated region of tremendous economic importance to our Nation. In the wake of those who traversed the valley en route north to the Selkirk colony and Pembina, to the fur-trapping and trading posts beyond those settlements, came a great man and significant changes in the order of things in this part of the country.
>
> James J. Hill went to St. Paul as a young man in 1856, and settled there by accident rather than by choice. His interest in transportation started early when he became agent for a steamship line on the Mississippi River. His second interest was in fuel, the result of contract to supply wood to steamboats. His third interest, farming, was a natural heritage, but really was awakened in him when he saw the fertile lands of Minnesota, particularly in the Red River Valley. He envisioned the tremendous possibilities of the productivity of Minnesota farmlands combined with cheap transportation to markets.
>
> Transportation facilities for people and goods were crude in this part of the country at that time. The famed Red River oxcart was the principal means of overland transportation between St. Paul and settlements to the north, and there was some movement of freight and travelers by river craft.
>
> In 1862 a railway with the modest name of St. Paul & Pacific began the first rail transportation in Minnesota and the Northwest. The railway extended from St. Paul and not to the Pacific but to Minneapolis, a distance of 10 miles.
>
> By 1878, the year Mr. Hill and three courageous associates acquired the St. Paul & Pacific, the rails of the pioneer railway had moved gradually in a northwesterly direction. Crookston became a station on the railway in 1872, when the line was extended from Barnesville to Warren. The next line that helped make Crookston a growing community was built in 1875. It ran from Crookston to Fisher's Landing on the Red Lake River. The building company was the Red River Valley Railroad, owned by Mr. Hill and Norman W. Kittson, who were associated in steamboat transportation on the Red River. This 10½-mile line between Crookston and Fisher's Landing was, in reality, Mr. Hill's first railroad.
>
> The trail of the iron horse expanded rapidly under Mr. Hill's impetus throughout this region after he and his associates acquired the St. Paul & Pacific in 1878 and created the St. Paul, Minneapolis & Manitoba Co. The Red River Valley became laced with a network of rails, with lines on each side of the Red River extending from Breckenridge to the Canadian border. Lines also were built to the East and West, and by 1896 the Manitoba had completed the basic network, of which Crookston is the hub.
>
> With an outlet to markets, the Red River Valley was soon settled by people from other parts of the country and from Europe. Mr. Hill encouraged settlers by selling at low prices lands acquired from the State by grants. He was steadfast in the belief that his railroad could prosper only as the people along it prospered. It is significant that freight rates went down steadily for several years after Mr. Hill took control.
>
> But, Mr. Hill reasoned that settlement of land and availability of railway services were not enough. He supported his confidence in the fertility of Red River Valley land and his faith in the ambition of those who settled on it by showing farmers how to improve their methods. He preached crop diversification, imported purebred livestock, created an agricultural development department for his railway, established experimental farms of his own and helped to institute schools for the teaching of agriculture.
>
> Among the many living evidences of Mr. Hill's interest in agriculture is the Northwest School and Experiment Station. In the early 1890's he offered the State a plot of land near Crookston for use as an experimental farm. In 1895 Minnesota Legislature created 2 of these farms, one at the Crookston location. The Hill gift was formally conveyed to the State a year later, and the Northwest Experiment Station was created.
>
> In 1908, just 8 years before his death, Mr. Hill was principal speaker at the dedication of Stephens Hall at the Crookston School of Agriculture. In his address he said:
>
> "I need hardly say to you how much pleasure it gives me to see evidences of progress that I see here today. * * * These 450 acres upon which your college is now about to be opened, lying close to Crookston, I had reserved for another purpose * * * but I felt that it would be of greater value as the starting point of an agriculaural farm in the Red River Valley. * * * Now the years have rolled by and many changes have occurred."
>
> The progress of agriculture in this region in the 46 years since Mr. Hill made those observations would have been highly pleasing to him; but, I feel that he would not have been surprised had he lived to see what has been accomplished in the Red River Valley. Mr. Hill had a tremendous vision for the future. He invested great confidence in the soundness of his doctrine for better agriculture, and in the desire of farmers to benefit from his ideas. It is noteworthy, I believe, that Mr. Hill's faith in the principle of crop rotation not only is generally practiced today, but also is regarded as a principal contributor to the continuing productivity of Red River Valley farmland.
>
> Those who have succeeded Mr. Hill in the leadership of the Great Northern have continued his principles and program of encouragement of and assistance to the man on the land.
>
> This is a basic policy of the railway's management.
>
> Evidence of the fruit of vision is abundant everywhere in the vast Red River Valley, and the newest manifestation of agricultural and industrial progress is this modern refinery for the processing of a crop so suitable to this land—the sugar beet.
>
> The dedication of this new plant brings into perspective conditions governing the

production of beet sugar. I am aware of the fact that under existing laws the sugar industry is a controlled economy, and that national prices normally are maintained somewhat above the world market price structure. When the Sugar Act formula was developed allotments were made to beet and cane producers on a national basis. Offshore quotas were established in relation to the production capabilities and the need for supplementing the various economies affected.

The Great Northern is entirely sympathetic with the proposal that domestic producers be permitted to increase production at least in direct relation to increases in this country's population. This position we take not solely for the interest we might have in the production of more sugar in our territory. Our interest is far broader than that.

A contracted crop strengthens the stability of a community because many economic benefits accrue to an area in which sugar beets are grown and processed. But even more important to an agricultural community and to a railway interested in the prosperity of the country it serves is the improvement in farming methods—better use of soil capabilities with improved yields and equality in all production, made possible through a sugar-beet program.

The Great Northern understandably is pleased to share with Crookston and its farming community in welcoming the establishment of the third American Crystal sugar plant in the Red River Valley. This plant is a new fruit of vision and a symbol of faith in tomorrow.

MR. SUMMERTON SPEAKS

Another outstanding address was made by J. A. Summerton, president of the American Crystal Sugar Co., with headquarters in Denver, Colo. Mr. Summerton has had 36 years of service with the company, starting as the voucher clerk and working up through smaller positions to become vice president and in 1952 president of the company.

This is what he had to say at the dedication:

This is a memorable day for all of us. For the many who have spent countless hours in the planning and construction of this, the company's 10th plant, it marks a day of accomplishment. The fulfillment of a vision—a dream come true. The griefs and disappointments that are encountered in an undertaking such as this are now forgotten. Instead, there is the pride of achievement—the satisfaction that comes from a task well done.

Yet as this day marks the end of one period, it more dramatically marks the beginning of another. The beginning of a period which will contribute materially to the happiness and prosperity of a far greater number than have benefited to date. The beet growers, the local merchants, the professional men, and the plant employees who will come from this area, all will benefit for years to come from the completion of this beet sugar plant which we are dedicating here today.

Speaking on behalf of our company, may I say that we are happy to have led in the development of the beet sugar industry in the Red River Valley. Each of you here honors us with your presence. I wish to personally thank Congressman Harold Hagen, Senator Thye, and other notables, and also members of the press, radio, and television representatives for taking time to come here today. Many of you have come long distances to attend the dedication and to inspect the plant. I wish to express our sincere appreciation for the interest shown.

Our experience in its construction has been most pleasant. The many courtesies and the cooperation we have received from the good people here in Crookston and in the surrounding area are deeply appreciated. We hope that we will continue to merit your goodwill.

To Mayor Thomforde, may I say—we are glad to be located here near your progressive city, and to have a part in the future growth of this community. On this occasion we wish to give assurance that we look forward to serving and to becoming an active partner in the growth and prosperity of the area. We trust our presence will be welcomed over the many years that lie ahead of us, and that the hopes we all share here today will be fulfilled in a greater future for the Red River Valley.

SENATOR THYE GIVES FINE TALK

Senator Ed Thye, of Minnesota, needs little introduction to you voters of the Ninth Congressional District. Himself a farmer, and former commissioner of the Minnesota Department of Agriculture, he long has fought the good fight of the producers and the Nation. Senator Thye showed in his splendid address where the American system of private initiative is so far superior to communism, socialism, or Democratic New Dealism that I am placing his talk in the Congressional Record so all Americans may be able to read and analyze it:

Senator Thye's Address

We are gathered to welcome an important addition to Minnesota's facilities for processing farm products. We are gathered to congratulate you, Mr. Summerton, upon American Crystal Sugar's farseeing plans and your completion of this project. And to congratulate you, Mayor Thomforde and Judge Sylvester, upon your city's and the surrounding farm community's receiving this addition to your economic stability.

My friend, Congressman Harold Hagen, and I, as representatives of the State of Minnesota, are proud to welcome a new source of industrial and agricultural wealth within our borders. We are, all of us, happy to see additional crop dollars and the payroll dollars flowing into this area of Minnesota and North Dakota.

But when we've congratulated ourselves, as Minnesotans and Dakotans, as businessmen and farmers and workers, let's take another look. Is there something else here, too—something with far wider implications for us and for the Nation?

As representatives of Minnesota, but also as small cogs with responsibility for our National Government, and with the same concern and responsibility for our welfare as every good citizen carries, Congressman Harold Hagen and I say, "Yes; there is something else here we should look for, and note, and pay honor to."

We should here honor the basic principle of American Government and free enterprise that makes it possible for the friendly, profitable cooperation we see here between the men who raise the goods and the men who process the goods. Here we have a close look at free enterprise at work in logical and harmonious surroundings.

This is decentralization of industry at its best. Processing on the spot where the crops are grown—here where the sugar beet fields extend almost to the doors of the plant. This is sound business, sound agriculture, sound American progress.

And on this spot and for this occasion, I think we should pay honor here to the two parties who have made this enterprise possible: The farmers of the Red River Valley who raise the sugar beets and the company that processes their beets, the American Crystal Sugar Co.

Over the years these two mutually dependent groups have learned to live with and respect each other. Surely not completely without friction, but in a remarkable spirit of good will. They've learned that basic business lesson and human lesson that no bargain is truly profitable unless it's profitable for both sides. They've learned to work together—to respect each other—to make the contribution to the growth and life of our upper Midwest and indeed of the entire country.

Here—it seems to Harold Hagen and me—is a good example of the Golden Rule in practical action. Here are men who realize that neither can get along as well without the other—yet neither party is taking advantage of it. They are interdependent—dependent upon each other for their prosperity.

And there is this important thing about interdependence—unless we fully recognize it—our dependence, one upon another—we in America are going to have trouble keeping our independence.

Yes, here in this valley of the Red River is a living and successful example that all America can well note. Interdependence helps make independence.

Let us look for a moment at each member of this remarkable interdependent duo.

First, the beet growers who are so well represented here today:

All honor, we say, is due these sturdy, self-reliant people who inhabit the Red River Valley. They are bred in a sturdy individualism—in a strength to match their rich valley's vigorous weather. They've stood up under dry years, under devastating floods. They are smart farmers, good citizens, worthy directors of their own destiny.

We see more opportunity and more security opening for you beet growers with the opening of the gates of this factory. I know you will meet this opportunity with the same composure and the same calm good judgment as you have met trials and difficulties in the past.

I predict that some day you folks of the Red River Valley who are gathered here will find that you or some of your children will grow into an important and leading part with this company that is so intertwined in your lives and in your destinies. I welcome this opportunity for you. I welcome your capacity and your ingenuity which also has made it possible.

Yes; honor the men who raise the sugar beets.

And what about the processors? The men who change the raw beets into a white crystal stream of sweetness that flows to all America—that brightens our breakfast table, that sweetens our drinks, that pampers our sweet tooth?

Yes; let's a long look at this fellow—the processor. Where does he fit into our economy?

Well, let's start with this figure. I looked it up—and it surprised me—and maybe it'll surprise you, too. Who eats up our farm crops—where do they go? Well, the Department of Agriculture figures tell me that three-fourths of all our farm crops are eaten up by processors—creative processors, if you will—who take these products and process them in some way, change their form, make them ready for human consumption. Only one-fourth of our farm crops are actually eaten by animals on the farm or by the farmers themselves. That's an amazing figure, isn't it?

Down around Northfield where I live, we raise a lot of corn and soybeans. Of course we know most of our corn is fed to livestock. But at the same time I note that each year on the average 600 million bushels of corn go to processors who make everything from paste and corn meal to alcohol, feed, and desserts.

Soybeans, as you know, are practically all handled by processors before they can become of use to mankind. In the hands of the processor they become cooking oil, plastics, paints, feed ingredients and 50 other useful items.

Everywhere you city folks go—in every store—you see processed farm products—in the grocery store, in the hardware, in the clothing store. First somebody had to raise the farm products. Then somebody had to provide the scientific research, the know-how, the factory (like this building), the warehouse and the money to process those farm products into forms usable for our civilization.

The processor—and fortunately more and more often he is becoming a creative processor—has, to my mind, two functions:

1. He creates new markets for more and more farm products.

2. He creates new products to make our farm life better and more profitable than before.

As an example of the first kind of creative processing, take this whole sugar beet industry. The first struggling sugar beet processors fought with planting and growing problems, processing problems, public indifference * * * to create a new product from a farm product. But in finally succeeding, they created a new market for farm products—sugar beets now the key crop on tens of thousands of acres of Red River Valley land alone.

We have to go no further for an example of the second kind of creative processing—the processing that creates new products to make our farm life better. Through the work of Dr. Hass and his Sugar Research Foundation (and many of the individual companies), the residue, the sugar beet pulp from the refining process, has been made into a nourishing low-cost animal feed ingredient that has improved and lowered the cost of feeding beef and pork.

We're seeing here today with our own eyes what it means to be a processor, what it means in plant and machinery, what it means in the ingenuity of plant and engineering design, what it means in investment in refined product that must be stored unsold for as long as 9 months.

Mr. Summerton, your company is to be congratulated on the ways it has accepted its responsibility as a processor—a creative processor, may I say—of farm products. And further, you are to be congratulated upon the way you have accepted the responsibility in dealing with those equal partners of yours—the men whose effort and toil raises the sugar beets upon which your plants depend.

And so we do honor to both of you here today: the men who raise the beets and the men who process them.

This blending of interests and effort is a wonderful example.

Certainly one of my guiding principles and what should be the guiding principles of truly American administration should be to see that the conditions under which this fine working partnership can exist are never destroyed. Rather they should be strengthened and encouraged that free men working together can make this sort of a dream of steel and bricks and concrete come true.

They tell me that in Russia it takes two farm families working full time to provide their food plus the food and other farm products for one family living off the farm. In America, 1 farm family provides enough for more than 5 families living off the farm.

What's the difference? Better mechanization, yes, certainly. Better farming methods—surely. But beyond all these and standing with them is the peculiarly American relationship of the man who raises the crops and the man who processes them. The man who processes the crops must pay a fair price for them or the farmer will not raise them—not over a series of years. The man who processes the crop must process it attractively, effectively, and at a low enough cost that it can be resold in the markets of the city and in the markets of the world. Otherwise he ceases to be in business. The tremendous appetite of Americans' agricultural processing plants like this sugar refinery is a more powerful prop under farm prices than any the Government can devise by itself. That appetite that eats up three-fourths of our farm-produced items is something we must nourish and encourage in every way we can.

I am glad to note that there are representatives of the press, radio, and television here today not only from the immediate area, but from all of the upper Midwest. Because this is not just a local thing that affects only Crookston or only Polk County. And I am glad also to see on the platform here Representative Harold Hagen, your fine and able Congressman.

It is important, too, in Grand Forks and Fargo, in St. Cloud, and Northfield, and in Twin Cities—important for all the upper Midwest.

The dollars for cash crops—the dollars for payrolls—multiply themselves many times as they pass from hand to hand. Each dollar becomes $10 or $20 in total business as it moves along.

Mr. Budd will tell you. His railroad knows. They like the direct traffic that comes from a plant like this. But they also know that the payroll dollars and the crop dollars mean more total business for the community, and indirectly, but just as surely, more total goods to be hauled by a railroad.

Take a simple example: Beet farmer Engberg buys a tractor for his farm. The tractor had to be hauled in by railroad. Part of the dollars that pay for the tractor pay for the hauling. Part of those hauling dollars go into the wages of switchman Peterson at Great Northern's division point at Grand Forks. Peterson buys bread for his family. The baker profits, and also buys flour from one of our great Twin City mills, who pay salaries and buy wheat, and so it goes, on and on, even throughout the Nation. The single dollar paid for raising sugar beets has been multiplied many times in the business volume of our State.

Now, I'm not starting a one-man crusade to have us buy only products made in Minnesota. We are far too interdependent with our sister States to do that. I'm not even making a slogan out of "buy Minnesota," or "buy upper Midwest." But I do feel this:

These people—the growers, and the workers, and the company—have a right to say to their fellow Minnesotans and Dakotans, from the Red River Valley to the Twin Cities, and south to the very borders of the State—they have a right to say:

"Don't forget where the Crystal sugar originates. Don't forget some of the dollars are flowing back to your pocket too—however indirectly. Let's encourage more closely knit farming and processing in Minnesota. Let's give our Minnesota-grown-and-processed sugar a break."

To you people of the upper Midwest, some of your sweetest things in life are going to be coming from this plant—in your jelly, cakes, candy, in your soda pop, coffee, breakfast. The effect upon our economy can be just as sweet, if a little less noticeable.

I am glad to be with you today. It was a pleasure and a privilege to talk to you. Goodby to you all.

THIRD DEDICATION SPEECH

A very interesting personage at this dedication was Mr. H. E. Zitkowski, general consultant for the American Crystal Sugar Co., at Denver, Colo. He is called the dean of the sugar industry because he entered it 60 years ago at Norfolk, Nebr., and he has had the unusual privilege of attending the dedication of the three plants in the Red River Valley at Crookston, East Grand Forks, and Moorhead. He served the company from waterboy, chief chemist, general superintendent, vice president, then general manager. Virtually everybody in the sugar industry knows this great figure, and this was his statement at the dedication:

This is the third time I have had the opportunity and the pleasure to meet with you good people of the Red River Valley on an occasion of this nature. In 1926 when the pioneer sugar-beet processing plant in the Red River Valley was placed into operation; again in 1948 when the Moorhead, Minn., plant was dedicated; and now this plant at Crookston. It also gives me great pleasure to note that quite a number of persons are in the audience who were present on the two former occasions.

Thirty years ago last month, I first scouted the Red River Valley as to its potential sugar-beet growing possibilities for my company, then known as the American Beet Sugar Co. I was favorably impressed and so reported to my company. In my report I recommended that steps be taken to acquire the Northern Sugar Corp.'s plant at Mason City, Iowa, and the Minnesota Sugar Co.'s plant at Chaska, Minn. Both of these companies had trial plantings of sugar beets in the valley which trial plantings were quite encouraging. I also recommended that steps be taken to build a sugar beet processing plant in the Red River Valley at the earliest possible moment. Such a plant was placed into operation in 1926 at East Grand Forks, Minn. We then envisioned that additional sugar-beet processing plants would be established in the Red River Valley in the not too distant future. However, we had to learn many things and adjust ourselves to a new set of agricultural and climatic conditions to produce sugar beets in this northern area. It was not until the early 1930's that sugar beets were produced in quantities to give the East Grand Forks plant capacity operations. Then, as many of you will recall, the drought conditions of the 1930's dealt a severe blow to the Middle West including this valley and seriously reduced sugar beet production. These drought conditions were broken by 1939 and 1940, but the outbreak of World War II in 1939 in which this country also became involved, prohibited construction of new processing plants in order to fulfill the war demands.

Immediately after the cessation of hostilities, plans were designed and authorization was obtained from the directing heads of the by then American Crystal Sugar Co. to proceed with the construction of a second sugar beet processing plant. And now we are about to add another link in the chain of prosperity in the Red River Valley here at Crookston. Much thought, toil, and sweat has gone into the project and I want to commend the efforts and assistance given to this project by the engineering and purchasing departments of our company, the general contractors, and the various subcontractors; our own local construction people and the many craft workers who made this the newest and most modern plant of its kind a possibility.

To one who has been associated with the beet sugar industry of this country these many years, and who can well recall the cost of construction of sugar beet processing plants 30 or 40 years ago, this plant cost an unconscionable sum of money. It has taken a lot of courage and confidence in the future of our country and of the Red River Valley for the board of the American Crystal Sugar Co. to authorize so huge an investment; but we believe such confidence will prove to have been justified. You have seen, or will see, the magnitude of this plant. Unfortunately, it is not in operation, but an invitation is extended to you to view this plant when in operation after it has passed through its initial shakedown period—say after October 15.

In closing, let me repeat the statement by Mr. Benson, Secretary of Agriculture, on April 1, 1954, at Grand Forks, N. Dak.: "The sugar program has operated successfully in the past. We would maintain it on the same basis. Here in the Red River Valley, you

> have built a thriving sugar-beet industry. I am confident that it will continue to prosper."
>
> To you, Elmer Lindquist, as superintendent of the Crookston plant, I turn over the golden key of this new plant and may the results be likewise. And now the Crookston sugar beet processing plant is dedicated to the welfare and prosperity of the Red River Valley, the State, and the Nation.

I feel it my duty to repeat that if I am returned to Congress on November 2, that my first order of business will be to show the United States Department of Agriculture that there should be a greatly increased acreage for sugar beets in the Red River Valley. As I said before, the experts have proven that beets could be raised at a lower cost on the wonderful soil of our area than in any other part of the Nation except one area in the State of Washington on the Pacific coast, which is about equal to ours.

The Red River Valley farmers want more acreage. The workers in these villages and cities want more jobs and the business and professional persons in the Red River Valley want to see this extra money in circulation. To all of you, I pledge my full efforts toward building the sugar-beet industry and sugar-beet production in the Ninth Congressional District of Minnesota.

Michigan Archers Revive Old Sport

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, we in Michigan are proudly proclaiming our State as the "water wonderland" and with our year-round outdoor recreation facilities which nature has bestowed upon us and which has been perpetuated by wise planning of our people, I hope many of my colleagues will find time to come to Michigan after we adjourn and enjoy our many attractions.

Michigan leads the way in many phases of conservation and outdoor recreation development, and today I would like to refer to one particular phase of recreation in which our State has contributed tremendously to the revival of an ancient sport. I refer to modern archery which is truly becoming the sport of sportsmen.

Man probably owes his very survival in his life with the beasts of the field and forest to his invention of the bow and arrow. This combination was one of the earliest weapons used in quest of meat supplies for the family larder. One writer has said that the invention of the bow and arrow probably marked the time in history of man when he first gained control over the beasts of the earth.

The Bible tells us of Elisha's discussion of the use of the bow and arrow with the King of Israel and the Israelites were known as great archers as were their opponents, the Egyptians.

Mounted bowmen were an important part of the Roman legions. Henry the Eighth, King of England, was considered a crack marksman with the bow and arrow. These pieces have long been associated with the American Indian.

Invention of gunpowder in the 17th century changed man's hunting habits and the bow and arrow began to lose popularity. In recent years, however, modern pioneers have revived this noble sport but the powerful glass-powered weapons of today are a far cry from the bows of the ancients or of yesteryear's Indian.

MICHIGAN LEADS ARCHERY REVIVAL

Michigan is far out in front in promoting this modern revival of archery. The sporting goods trade calls this the fastest growing sport in the Nation. It is a healthful, inexpensive sport in which all members of the family can participate and it can be enjoyed either in the backyard, on the range or along field and stream.

Proof that sportsmen are really turning to the skill of archery in Michigan is indicated by the latest reports of the Michigan Department of Conservation showing that about 27,000 archery permits are being sold annually for hunting deer during a special bow-and-arrow season which our State provides. Bow-and-arrow hunters from other States are also finding the Michigan program attractive as indicated by the conservation department report that 2,300 out-of-State bowmen obtained Michigan archery permits last year to hunt deer—an increase of 30 percent over the previous year.

MICHIGAN ARCHER SHOWS SKEPTICS

One of the men who deserves a great amount of credit for his part in the present day revival of this ancient sport is Fred Bear, founder and president of the Bear Archery Co., located in Grayling, Mich., in the district I represent in Congress. Mr. Bear is a champion, crack bowman but more than that, in my opinion, he exemplifies our American system of private initiative.

When Fred Bear and a companion went to Canada a few years ago in quest of moose, being equipped with only a bow and arrow for weapon, he was laughed at and some Canadian operators even cancelled his reservations. An Ojibway Indian told him, "Moose big. String gun too little." The veteran Canadian guides who accompanied the party were skeptical—skeptical that is until they had to help drag out the huge half-ton hulk of an arrow-pierced bull moose. I have a picture of Mr. Bear and that moose hanging in my office and I am proud of it because it not only demonstrates the skill of one of my constituents but shows that this is still the land of opportunity and it refutes the claim that we are loosing the pioneering instincts of our elders.

Mr. Bear has turned a hobby into an industry. As word of his successful bow-and-arrow expedition into the Canadian wilds spread among other sportsmen there was a spurt in bow-and-arrow production. Back in 1937 Michigan had only 173 deer hunters who carried a bow and arrow instead of a powerful rifle. Today we have over 27,000 such hunters in Michigan.

While some people sit on their hands and complain that there's little new under the sun, Fred Bear has gone into ancient history and revived an old business—the bow-and-arrow business—which he has streamlined considerably.

In pioneering this revival he designed and shaped his own bows and arrows and friends began asking for duplicates of his equipment. As the result we found a new industry had sprung up in the heart of our northwoods game country near the town of Grayling, Mich. He is president and actively directs the affairs of the Bear Archery Co., which makes a popular widely used bow known for its maple core and fiberglass back and belly as well as arrows and other archery supplies. The firm employs over 100 people in the design and production of the highest quality archery equipment—a real example of the American private enterprise system.

Every schoolchild has recited the poem which, in part, says, "I shot an arrow into the air; it fell to earth, I know not where." But not so with Mr. Bear; for when he shoots, the record indicates he pretty well knows where his arrows fall, since he is three times Michigan archery champion and has piled up laurels in other competition. In addition, he has promoted the sport by assisting archery organizations and in providing instruction.

POPULARITY SPREADS ACROSS NATION

Today the popularity of the sport of archery has spread from coast to coast and border to border. The National Field Archery Association is probably the leading organization of archers, and it has done much in fostering archery contests, activities, and good will. A few months ago this association came forward with a commendable program to help cement farmer-hunter relations by guaranteeing its members to be sportsmen and gentlemen. Under this plan, every member of a club affiliated with the National Field Archery Association subscribing to the sportsmanship guaranty is given an identification card, which reads:

> LANDOWNER'S GUARANTY AGAINST PROPERTY DAMAGE
>
> The National Field Archery Association has confidence that our member, whose name appears on the front of this card, is a gentleman and a sportsman. May we request that you allow him to hunt with bow and arrow on your property with the understanding that if he in any way damages your property or livestock, and refuses to make settlement, we will, upon presentation of his name and proper proof of damage, pay for said damages up to the amount of $100.

That is an example of the spirit among archers.

Most States recognize the bow and arrow as legal weapons for hunting game. Many States, like Michigan, establish preseason periods for deer hunting before the time allocated the gun hunters. In Michigan if the archer does not bag his buck during the bow season he may obtain a special permit to continue to hunt deer with either bow and arrow or gun during the regular season.

As Mr. Bear had said:

> When you go hunting with bow and arrow, you will be extracting the greatest value from our outdoor heritage. You will look for more than just the game you are after: you will observe the soil and the trees that grow on it, the streams and the waters that flow in them, the chickadees that may perch on your bowstring and the squirrels that eye you as you sit silently in your blind. Then you will indeed feel kind to the world.

So for pure relaxation and sporting fun I hope you will journey to the heart of Michigan's water wonderland in the 10th Congressional District.

Social Security, 1954 Model

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, at long last the 1954 amendments to the Social Security Act, about which so many words have been spoken and so many promises made—have been passed. These amendments, if I may say so, caused more sound and fury than any other social-security proposal of the past, with the possible exception of the first Social Security Act back in 1935. At great cost a special subcommittee spent many months last year for a study of the existing system preparatory to legislation. During this session the Ways and Means Committee in the House and the Committee on Finance in the Senate conducted further hearings. You have heard extravagant claims as to the great improvements in social security which will be made this year. Now, at last, the dust has settled a little and we can examine what has happened.

What kind of improvements in our Social Security System do we find? Benefits will be a little bit higher. The work clause will be a little bit more lenient. The totally and permanently disabled will get a little lift through the wage-credits freeze, but no benefits, mind you. These are, in fact, "Let's do a little bit" amendments.

In other words, with a tremendous grinding of the gears, and a great amount of tooting of the horn, the 1954 model of amendments to the Social Security Act have finally been passed—and it looks very much like the old with a few minor improvements. In many respects, it does not even meet the standards set by the Advisory Council on Social Security in 1947 during the 80th Congress. Somehow or other the discussions of the bill seem to have got bogged down in technicalities and to have lost sight of what would be the effect, in terms of meeting their daily needs, on the people who must depend upon social-security benefits.

In just one respect—namely the extension of the coverage of the system to about 10 million jobs—does this bill improve the existing social-security system in any really substantial way.

As I have said, it increases benefits—but only by a little bit. Now I am concerned with this matter because my experience and my conscience tell me that the benefits now being paid by our social-security system are, in most cases, completely inadequate for our times. The 1954 amendments increase benefits slightly—by an elaborate method of providing a small increase in the wage base, by a revised benefit formula, and by a 5-year dropout provision which would permit retiring workers to eliminate the 5 years in which wages were lowest or nonexistent in computing the benefit amount. But I am not convinced that this will make enough difference in the amount of benefits which will average around the starvation figure of $57 per month.

And on this point I want to say another word. We heard cries against too great an increase in benefits at this time from a number of sources, on the ground that the Congress has consistently increased benefits every time an election comes around. Now the facts of the matter are that benefits have been increased only twice since the system was inaugurated in 1935: once in 1950 and once in 1952. It simply is not true, therefore, that the benefit structure of our social-security system has gradually crept up and up, as some people would have you believe, and that we must therefore proceed cautiously at this time.

None of the people, I am sure, who are worrying about the size of benefits being too large have ever tried to subsist on a payment of $57 per month. We must not succumb to the easy assumption that social-security payments are simply a small segment of the retirement income for most Americans: a segment supplemented by income from investments, or from private pension plans. A recent survey of persons receiving old-age and survivors insurance benefits showed that almost half—or 45.3 percent—had no other income.

Let us not allow ourselves to believe, then, that the increases in benefits—increases ranging between $5 and $7 per individual, I am told—will provide any kind of genuine security for those thousands of Americans who have no other source of income for their declining years. It is small wonder that of present beneficiaries 1 in 6 men, 1 in 5 women, and 1 in 8 aged widows are finding it necessary to ask for supplementation from public assistance because their benefits are not adequate to meet their needs.

This is no time, in my opinion, for a slight increase in benefits. It is a time, rather, for us to recognize that the benefits of our social-security system should provide the assurance that at least the minimum daily needs of our senior citizens can be provided.

As a measuring rod for the adequacy of this bill I would like to use the proposals which I have made, in company with some 61 other members of this House, for necessary improvements in social security.

At the very least, according to this measuring rod, the present wage base for benefits should be increased to $4,800, in order that a larger proportion of wages paid can be covered. The 1954 amendments increase the wage base—again by a little bit—from $3,600 to just $4,200. Now I call your attention to the fact that this small increase is far below 1935 standards with respect to the proportion of wages covered. For when the original Social Security Act in 1935, adopted the wage base of $3,000, 97 percent of all covered workers had earnings under that amount, and thus could qualify for benefits on the basis of all their earnings. Today, with wages more than doubled over the low wage scales of 1935, it is not enough to increase the wage base to only $4,200. As I have said, it should have been increased to at least $4,800.

Now it must be clear to everyone that unless the wage base bears some reasonable relationship to the total amount of wages, the amount of wage-replacement furnished by benefits is going to diminish. In other words, there is no replacement at all for wages received above the maximum set for the wage base. Thus, under previous law, any earnings in excess of $300 per month could not be counted toward benefits. Under the recent amendments this amount will be increased slightly to $350 per month. But this, in my opinion, is just a half-step forward. To bring our system more nearly in line with present wage rates and present working conditions—and to increase the amount of benefits—we proposed that, at the least, wages up to $400 per month, or $4,800 per year, should be creditable. I am convinced that $4,800 is the minimum figure we should accept at this time.

Now let us see how the bill measures up in another respect. My measuring rod calls for benefits—as well as a waiver of premiums—for workers who have become permanently and totally disabled. The "little bit" social-security bill, which has now been enacted into law, provides only for a waiver of premiums—no benefits. It says, in effect, that a worker will not be penalized if he is not working in covered employment because he is completely disabled. That is a little bit better than the existing system which reduces the amount of the benefit for periods of such disability. But it completely overlooks what will happen to the disabled worker and to his family because the paycheck has ceased with the disability. It simply says that if that man and his family can wait patiently until he gets to be 65 years of age, he will not be penalized then because he could not work.

I remind you that, in connection with the 1950 amendments, the House passed a bill which would have provided payments beginning with the time when the family breadwinner is disabled. We lost out in conference and succeeded only in getting a compromise measure which set up an assistance program for the totally and permanently disabled. This means that the family of a worker so disabled must wait until all resources are exhausted, and then submit themselves to the fine-tooth-comb investigation which is part of the means test of public assistance, before they can get any help.

My proposal to provide benefits would, on the other hand, mean that the family could be assured of a minimum income in lieu of the wages which the breadwinner brought home when he was able to work. And I suggest further that failure to provide benefits at this time overlooks the significance of one of the most important developments of the last decade, namely, the remarkable advances which have been made in rehabilitation and retraining techniques. A sound benefit system for the totally and permanently disabled could, of course, use these services—through an expansion of the already established State vocational rehabilitation services—to provide the retraining services and prosthetic appliances which would make it possible for such workers to return to a new job or a new vocation.

This, I may say, is one answer to those persons who protest at the cost of a benefit system for the disabled, or who assure us that it would encourage malingering. In terms of costs alone, I insist that a benefit system, which can make use of rehabilitation techniques for those men and women who can return to work, would not be expensive. It would provide benefits for the period during which the family is readjusting to a completely new—and a completely harrowing—situation caused by an unpredictable and a serious handicap of the breadwinner. I must add that cost is, to my mind, not the major consideration in such tragic cases. Far more fundamental are the human considerations of what happens to the family of the victim of an unforeseen disablement. If we are concerned, in our social-security system, with providing security against wage loss caused by death or retirement, surely we shall not have a genuinely protective system until we have added protection against wage loss caused by a complete disablement. I look forward to the day when we shall have achieved this goal. It has not been achieved in 1954.

Finally, the 1954 amendments make a revision in the retirement test—or work clause—which will allow earnings of up to $1,200 per year without deduction. My measuring rod for a minimum was also $1,200 per year, because I was convinced that we must revise the existing work-clause provision which, in effect, penalizes beneficiaries for working to supplement their inadequate benefits.

I am glad to report that in this respect, at least, the 1954 amendments were brought up to meet our yardstick, for the original bill as proposed by the administration would have set the minimum at $1,000 rather than $1,200. I am glad to report, too, that by an amendment proposed by Senator George, the age at which no deduction can be made for earnings is lowered from 75 to 72. This means that people aged 72 or over will get full benefits regardless of their earnings.

But I call your attention to one part of this section of the bill which has received little attention and which certainly was not contained in my yardstick—namely, that its retirement test would apply to all earnings, whether in covered or in uncovered employment. This will mean that many retired individuals whose earnings have not affected their benefits because they were working in uncovered employment, would be subject to the retirement test.

As I have said, the bill has at least one adequate feature, in that it extends the coverage of the old-age and survivors insurance system by about 10 million jobs, making an important advance toward the goal of practically universal coverage. The retirement test, as I have just said, has been improved in one direction but made more restrictive in another. I am glad to see, too, that the amendments retain the matching formula for Federal grants to State public assistance programs which was established by the 82d Congress. In this, you will note, it departs from the original proposal, contained in H. R. 7200, which would have decreased the amount of the total Federal contribution at the expense of 30 States for old-age assistance and 20 States for aid to dependent children—including my own State of California in both cases.

But I am concerned with the fact that the 1954 amendments to the Social Security Act, are simply stopgap legislation. Let us be very clear in our minds that, at best, this is piecemeal legislation. Let us remember that we are here concerned with the food and the shelter and the way of life of millions of our fellow citizens. And let us look forward to the day when our social security system can become a genuinely protective and genuinely secure program along the lines which I have suggested. A little bit of improvement in our social security system at this time is just not enough.

The Record of the 83d Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. GLENN BEALL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record a statement by me on the record of the 83d Congress.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The record of the 83d Congress is now in, and it is one of which we may be justly proud. President Eisenhower and a Republican Congress have successfully put this country on the road toward peace and prosperity.

At adjournment the score was added up, and President Eisenhower figures he asked for 64 specific bills, and 54 were passed, giving him a batting average of 0.830. As he says, that is a good rating in any ball club.

When Congress adjourned, the Baltimore Sun gave the administration's box score as 16 recommendations approved and 6 failures. The Washington Star commented that the President's batting average actually will run below 0.830, but well over 0.500. The Star said: "And 0.500 was way over the horizon during recent Democratic years. President Truman in the years 1947 through 1952 averaged 0.477, 0.457, 0.441, 0.442, 0.404, and 0.349."

The Star said further: "A close look at the 20 rollcall votes, which in the long run will likely prove the most significant of the session, shows President Eisenhower took a stand on 16. His views prevailed 10 times, a 0.625 average."

Comments by leading newspapers and reporters verify that the administration and the Congress have been successful in enacting a program which, as the President said in his state of the Union address, has as its objective the building of a stronger America, "a nation whose every citizen has good reason for bold hope; where effort is rewarded and prosperity is shared; where freedom expands and peace is secure—that is what I mean by a stronger America."

Roscoe Drummond, chief of the New York Herald Tribune Washington bureau, wrote that most Washington correspondents agree the the 83d Congress "has been an extraordinarily productive Congress. As much significant legislation has been put on the statute books as during any comparable 2-year period in recent years, and more than most. This Congress has been more responsive to the President's requests on domestic matters than any previous Congress since the first 2 years of the New Deal."

The Baltimore Sun commented editorially that the Eisenhower administration stuck to "its announced principles when the going was tough and won the victory." The editorial concluded, "The main thing is that the President has stuck to his announced political philosophy. In a middle-of-the-road country, he has held to the middle of the road."

On the President's activities the Baltimore Sun said, "He has played the game straight with the people of the country and his report last night made mention of his failures as well as his successes. Something else that came through was that buoyant hopefulness—some call it indomitability—of a man who knows his own mind and is not dismayed by occasional setbacks."

The Washington Star stated that this was a "do-something Congress" in an editorial and said "the Democrats will never win this year by attacking a 'do-nothing Congress.'"

Upon adjournment the Washington Post and Times Herald said: "The President has been successful in getting a very large part of his program enacted, and on the whole it is a good program." The editorial concluded with "in general the outcome is good enough to warrant hearty congratulations to both the President and Congress."

The Washington Post and Times Herald said: "It is worthy of note, however, that the President has established excellent relations with Congress. He has reversed the 'honeymoon' theory of dealing with Congress—that a major portion of a President's program must be enacted at the first session after the presidential election before the inevitable family feuding begins. Mr. Eisenhower was notably more successful in the 2d session of the 83d Congress in getting his measures throught, despite the loss of Senator Taft's able leadership."

In its appraisal the New York Times wrote "Judged in the light of the President's own program, which in general we have supported, we would say that the record on the whole has been a creditable one. While there have been some notable failures, there have been some notable successes * * * as the weary legislators start homeward they have a right to feel that, whatever else may be said about them, they cannot be fairly accused of having constituted a 'do-nothing' Congress."

Commenting on President Eisenhower's activities the New York Times said, "Even the most hard-bitten opponent of the President would be forced to admit in all honesty that a very great deal of positive accomplishment has been achieved in the last 19 months, that fears of a recession have been pretty well dissipated, that important legislation has been adopted and that in some spheres—though not all—the international outlook is better than it was."

"On domestic matters," the Times editorial said, "the President had every right implicity to claim credit on behalf of his administration for checking inflation, for cutting the Federal deficits and for directing the Nation toward instead of away from a balanced budget."

During the 10 years I served in the House of Representatives, I do not recall any session of Congress which received the commendation and praise that has been given the 83d.

The objective which President Eisenhower has is a worthwhile one and as he stated "all branches of this Government—and I venture to say both of our great parties—can support the general objective" of the program he gave for building a stronger America.

Let us review the record of the 83d Congress by comparing it with the recommendations President Eisenhower made in his state of the Union address before a joint session of the Congress last January 7.

AGRICULTURE

President Eisenhower: "The well being of our 160 million people demands a stable and prosperous agriculture. Conversely, every farmer knows he cannot prosper unless all America prospers. * * * Therefore, a farm program promoting stability and prosperity in all elements of our agriculture is urgently needed."

The record: President Eisenhower was able to go before the American people and say:

"When we took over you will recall farm income was toppling and we had such unmanageable surpluses which continued to grow at an alarming rate that they were depressing the market and there was literally nothing you could do as long as the growth of these surpluses wasn't checked to bring prosperity and the promise of real stability to the farmer.

"So we started with the knowledge that every hour we were paying $30,000 of your money, every day $700,000 of your money, just for storage of these crops which we could not dispose of and which were depressing the market and further cutting prices.

"Now we've gotten a program that will encourage efficient production, will stimulate consumption and stabilize farm income."

The President recommended, and Congress passed, a farm bill providing for flexible, in place of rigid price supports for basic commodities. The law sets price supports for the basic commodities within a range of 82½ to 90 percent of parity, depending upon the supply outlook for each commodity. Tobacco price supports will remain at 90 percent because of the strict acreage control.

In addition the administration and the Congress took action which slowed the decline in farm prices, which had their greatest drop during the last 2 years of the Truman administration.

Congress and the administration acted in many other ways to strengthen the farm economy and the Republican record on the rural electrification program is considerably better than that of the Democrats. Also farmers will benefit greatly under the new tax revision law which was enacted this session.

The record shows that the Republican Party fully recognizes the importance of the farmer to the national welfare.

LABOR

President Eisenhower: "The Labor Management Relations Act of 1947 is basically a sound law. However, 6 years of experience have revealed that in some respects it can be improved."

The record: The Republican administration recommended and the Congress was ready to pass improvements to the Taft-Hartley Act but Democrats voting as a bloc in the Senate killed the legislation.

The Republican administration aided the working people in many other ways, and one was by putting a clause into effect in all Government and defense contracts eliminating discriminations on account of race, religion, color, or national origin in the recruitment, employment, pay, training, and promotion of employees.

President Eisenhower: "Protection against the hazards of temporary unemployment should be extended to some 6½ million workers, including civilian Federal workers, who now lack this safeguard."

The record: Congress broadened the unemployment compensation law for the first time since 1935, bringing 4 million additional workers within its coverage. Congress strengthened the Federal-State system of unemployment compensation by providing for a $200 million reserve out of unemployment tax revenues and earmarked this reserve for loans to States.

To encourage industrial peace the Republican administration made it a policy to keep Government out of labor disputes and restored collective bargaining to full force and effect. By ending wage controls it released the backlog of negotiated wage increases previously blocked by Government regulations of the Truman administration.

TAXES

President Eisenhower: "The new budget provides for a lower level of taxation than has prevailed in preceding years. * * * As additional reductions in expenditures are brought gradually but surely into sight, further reductions in taxes can and will be made."

The record: A $7.4 billion tax reduction was passed, the largest tax cut the American people ever had in a single year.

Individual income taxes were reduced by 10 percent beginning January 1, 1954, and that was the first reduction since the Republican 80th Congress. It is worth remembering that Democratic Congresses are responsible for 14 of our 15 income-tax increases since the first income-tax law was passed in 1913.

Further, excise tax cuts by this session of Congress means $999 million in savings for the people of this country.

The biggest single improvement was the enactment of the tax revision law, an 875-page document which is the first complete overhaul of tax laws in 75 years. On August 10, 1954, I prepared an analysis of this bill showing how it benefits the small taxpayers—individuals, small-business men, and farmers. It appears on page A5903 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and copies are available for distribution to the people of Maryland.

Because of the previous summary, I shall not elaborate on this achievement of the Eisenhower administration and the Congress, but everyone will benefit by this bill, and under its provisions individuals will save a total of $827 million.

Furthermore, Congress and the administration reduced appropriation requests by a total of $6.9 billion, which means that the taxpayers will have $6.9 billion to spend as they see fit rather than have it collected as taxes by the Federal Government. The Council of State Chambers of Commerce figures that Maryland's share of this saving is $129,030,000.

The Republican administration cleaned up the corrupt practices in the Internal Revenue Service, and now treats each taxpayer honestly, fairly, and equally.

INTERNAL SECURITY AND COMBATING COMMUNIST INFILTRATION

President Eisenhower: "The subversive character of the Communist Party in the United States has been clearly demonstrated in many ways, including court proceedings. We should recognize by law a fact that is plain to all thoughtful citizens—that we are dealing here with actions akin to treason, that when a citizen knowingly participates in the Communist conspiracy he no longer holds allegiance to the United States."

The record: Legislation denying legal rights to the Communist Party was passed, and as the President requested a bill to take away citizenship of persons convicted of conspiracy against the United States Government was passed. Five other bills which will make it easier for the Government to combat Communist infiltration and subversion were passed.

The result was that President Eisenhower could report to the people the Republican program for combating communism had been successful. He said, "It is a record during this past year not only for operation as we went along—getting rid of people, deporting many people that shouldn't be here—but getting up the plan that will make us even better and stronger in the future."

APPROPRIATIONS AND SPENDING

President Eisenhower: "This budget is adequate to the current needs of the Government. It recognizes that a Federal budget should be a stabilizing factor in the economy. Its tax and expenditure programs will foster individual initiative and economic growth."

The record: Budget requests for the 1955 fiscal year were $56,958,616,690 and Congress appropriated $54,288,093,410, of which $28,800,125,486 was for defense purposes.

The Council of State Chambers of Commerce reported on August 19, 1954, that congressional actions "indicate that a commendable effort has been made in cutting what was generally conceded at the outset to be a pretty tight budget."

President Eisenhower himself reduced requests for 1955 appropriations by $4.3 billion below the $61.2 billion provided for the fiscal year 1954. Thus the total reduction by the administration and the Congress from the 1954 amount was $6.9 billion.

These reductions in Federal spending mean two things. First, we are approaching a balanced budget and the end of Federal deficits. Two, tax reductions will follow reductions in expenditures.

President Eisenhower could proudly state that we have reduced Federal deficits by two-thirds, and "We're well on the way toward the goal finally of achieving balanced budget in our income and our outgo. Now we haven't used any meat ax in reducing the expenditures that are making this possible. It's been a selective type of reduction of expenditures, and it's taken a very great amount of work."

As he has explained many times, this administration is liberal where people are concerned, but conservative with the people's money.

CIVIL AND POLITICAL RIGHTS

President Eisenhower: "Segregation in the Armed Forces and other Federal activities is on the way out. We have also made progress toward it's abolition in the District of Columbia. These are steps in the continuing effort to eliminate interracial difficulty."

The record: The Republican Party was founded for the protection of the individual's civil and political rights, and during the 83d Congress the party lived up to its great tradition.

The Justice Department filed a brief with the United States Supreme Court urging in behalf of the Republican administration that segregation in the public-school system be found a violation of the 14th amendment to the Constitution. On May 17, 1954, the Court unanimously outlawed segregation in the Nation's public elementary and high schools.

Segregation in the Armed Forces was ended as soon as the Republican Party took over administration of your Government, and that was followed with the abolition of segregation in military post schools and among civilian employees on military and naval reservations.

The Veterans' Administration began eliminating segregation in all its hospitals, and a Government contract committee began working to promote equal job opportunities in all Government work done by private industries.

Elimination of segregation in the Nation's Capital progressed and the Republican Department of Justice successfully argued before the Supreme Court for the ending of segregation in Washington's restaurants and public places.

Legislation giving American Indians more rights of citizenship was passed, also laws making it possible for members of the Armed Forces and civilians serving overseas to vote in National and State elections.

Negroes have been appointed to fill high Government positions, and for the first time in American history a Negro attended a meeting of President Eisenhower's Cabinet as the representative of a department.

The Democratic Party, voting in a bloc, killed the President's bill to give the vote to 18-year-old citizens; and Democratic opposition ended chances of statehood for Hawaii during the 83d session of Congress.

CORRUPTION IN GOVERNMENT DURING PREVIOUS ADMINISTRATION

President Eisenhower: "It is manifestly the joint purpose of the congressional leadership and of this administration to justify the summons to governmental responsibility issued last November by the American people." That was stated in the President's first message to Congress on February 3, 1953.

The record: The Republican Party is exposing rather than covering up evidence of corruption, and a high sense of integrity has been restored to your Government. The 5-percenter finds the atmosphere in Washington changed.

There have been no scandals in the Eisenhower administration and that can be stated categorically. Compare that with the horrible headlines of the previous administration when 10 Federal agencies were involved in scandals. The record shows 78 headlined scandals in Agriculture, 48 in Internal Revenue, 19 in the Defense Department, 10 in RFC, 9 in Justice, and 5 in the Post Office.

The Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, of which I am a member, continues to investigate and expose scandalous activities in the housing field; and undoubtedly further investigations will reveal more corruption in other agencies which the Democratic administration covered up.

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

President Eisenhower: "American freedom is threatened so long as the world Communist conspiracy exists in its present scope, power, and hostility. More closely than ever before, American freedom is interlocked with the freedom of other people * * *. In the task of maintaining this unity and strengthening all its parts, the greatest responsibility falls to those who, like ourselves, retain the most freedom and the most strength."

The record: The world enjoys a greater feeling of peace at this particular time than during any period since World War I.

The Republican administration ended the fighting in Korea; kept us out of a war in Indochina; and was successful in ending the reign of a Communist government in Guatemala—the only place where communism had been successful in getting control of a government in the Western Hemisphere.

To our network of security pacts with 39 nations were added a treaty with Korea, a mutual-assistance agreement with Japan, and work was begun on a security pact for southeast Asia.

This administration continued to work for peace through the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and the United Nations.

The President, who has the responsibility for conducting our affairs with other nations gave an accounting of his stewardship in this field by saying: "* * * we tried to talk frank and full talks with our allies to establish better relationships—to get closer to them—to know exactly where we were going. In spirit, in the development of our economic measures and in the building of our military measures * * *. We will make certain that our friends understand us better * * *. We're going to develop better partnership in all parts of the world between us and our cooperating friends."

Most important was that the President advised and cooperated with Members of Congress on a bipartisan basis. The Republican Party realizes that our foreign policy is too important to our national survival to permit it to become a subject of political argument.

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE AND TRADE

President Eisenhower: "Military assistance must be continued. Technical assistance must be maintained. Economic assistance can be reduced. * * * The fact that we can now reduce our foreign economic assistance in many areas is gratifying evidence that its objectives are being achieved." What is necessary, the President said, is "the creation of a healthier and freer system of trade and payments within the free world—a system in which our allies can earn their own way and our economy can continue to flourish."

The record: In the field of mutual security the President asked for a little over $3 billion in new money and Congress appropriated $2,781,499,816. The President asked for and Congress granted authority to transfer funds between areas, and authority to move funds originally intended for Indochina and to use this money to strengthen the defenses of southeast Asia and the western Pacific.

Congress approved continuing military assistance and technical cooperation but declared that in the opinion of Congress the economic aid and the Foreign Operations Administration should end by June 30, 1955.

Congress and the administration went on record as being opposed to admission of Red China into the United Nations, and by amendment to the foreign-aid bill Congress provided that new military assistance is to be held back from France and Italy until they ratify the European Defense Community treaty.

"The foreign-aid law," President Eisenhower declared in his report, "is not one merely to be—to help other people for humanitarian purposes—but it is to serve our enlightened self-interest. To give us a greater security—a greater feeling of peace and confidence in the world."

Going along with President Eisenhower's trade not aid theory the Congress extended the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act for 1 more year, and the Republican administration announced its intention of negotiating a trade agreement with Japan under the provisions of that act.

The President's idea was again expressed in his Denver address when he said, "Reciprocal trade is another problem that is now under earnest study and will be taken up by the next Congress. We got another year—as a result of the Randall report—in which to study certain features of this whole business so that our friends could, with us, make a living through profitable trade and which would eliminate the need for these great grants in the future."

NATIONAL DEFENSE

President Eisenhower, after enumerating five considerations which had been given in planning our defense program, said: "This new program will make and keep America strong in an age of peril. The international and defense policies which I have outlined will enable us to negotiate from a position of strength as we hold our resolute course toward a peaceful world."

The record: Congress voted $28.8 billion for operations of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, supplemented by $55 billion in carryover funds, so that a total of $83.8 billion will be available.

Also approved was a military public-works program of $887 million, including secret projects abroad, and a $450 million naval-construction program for patrol and submarine-warfare vessels.

The objective is to bring our defense program into line with the latest developments in policy, technology, strategy, and tactics. The Republican defense program is designed to have this Nation militarily ready to meet any emergency.

Congress also approved construction of a United States Air Force Academy, which will be built near Colorado Springs, Colo., at a cost of $126 million.

NATIONAL ECONOMY

President Eisenhower: "The American economy is one of the wonders of the world. This administration is determined to keep our economy strong and to keep it growing. At this moment, we are in transition from a wartime to a peacetime economy. I am confident that we can complete this transition without serious interruption in our economic growth. But we shall not leave this vital matter to chance. Economic preparedness is fully as important to the Nation as military preparedness."

The record: The Nation is enjoying the greatest period of prosperity in American history, without the stringent economic controls favored by the Democrats, and in spite of the transition from a war to a peacetime economy.

Under the Republican administration the cost of living has gone up only slightly more than 1 percent as compared to the 6 percent annual increase under the Truman administration.

One of the first acts of the Republicans was to abolish economic controls. Also the administration removed the Federal Government from competition with private business and disposed of 28 synthetic-rubber plants, sold barge lines, rope plants, coffee-roasting plants, and numerous others.

Mineral rights under offshore waters were returned to the States where title has historically rested.

A Small Business Administration replaced the RFC and makes small loans to American businesses, and Congress and the administration created a national atmosphere which will stimulate business and strengthen the economy.

The lie was given the predictors of gloom and doom, and the President could say, "Every fact today that we have gives the lie to those prophets of gloom and doom that saw we were going to be in economic depression and forming bread lines at this time in our history."

Time magazine stated that the Eisenhower administration "had met a recession and licked it, not by the kind of pump-priming and governmental interference dear to the hearts of New Dealers, but by trimming Government expenditures and by giving private industry the kind of climate and incentive that allows enterprise to flourish."

The Republican administration has maintained a strong and prosperous economy, and is prepared to see that the economy expands and our standard of living constantly rises.

NATIONAL RESOURCES AND PUBLIC WORKS

President Eisenhower: "Part of our Nation's precious heritage is its natural resources. It is the common responsibility of Federal, State, and local governments to improve and develop them, always working in the closest harmony and partnership."

The Republican administration returned to the States their rights to submerged lands, and took a number of steps to conserve and protect our natural resources by revising the Federal Lands Acts, authorizing irrigation and reclamation projects, making surplus seed available for reseeding of rangelands, revising the Water Facilities Act, and authorizing construction of what may be the largest public-power dam in the Nation, the Priest Rapids Dam on the Columbia River.

In the public-works field the Congress authorized construction of new tankers which will build up our defenses and give new contracts to the critical shipbuilding industry.

President Eisenhower proposed a $50 billion national roadbuilding program, and Congress authorized Federal expenditures of $966 million yearly for 1956 and 1957 on a matching basis with the States. This is about $250 million more than was available for the last 2 fiscal years.

The Congress also approved a lease-purchase plan so that private enterprise may construct public buildings which the Government may pay for like rent, with ownership after a specified number of years. It is estimated this will save the taxpayers millions of dollars in outlays for new buildings.

The omnibus rivers and harbors bill authorized more than $1 billion for 105 navigation improvements. This included $101 million for deepening and widening the Chesapeake & Delaware Canal, which links the Port of Baltimore with the Delaware River and the Philadelphia port. With the improvements, the canal will be a 24-hour, all-weather channel for the largest seagoing vessels.

Improving the C. & D. Canal will place Baltimore's port in a more competitive position with ports affected by the new St. Lawrence seaway, which the 83d Congress authorized after 30 years' debate, despite the active opposition which I gave to the project.

In the atomic-energy field, the 83d Congress and the Eisenhower administration made great strides in development of atomic energy for peacetime purposes. Private enterprise will be encouraged to enter this new field and assist in bringing atomic power into everyday use.

HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

President Eisenhower: "Now, along with the protection of freedom and maintenance of a strong and growing economy, this administration recognizes a third great purpose of Government: concern for the human problems of our citizens."

The record: Two of the most important actions of the 83d Congress in this field was increasing social-security benefits, and increasing coverage to about 7 million people not previously covered by the program; and the second was passage of the housing bill, including 35,000 units of public housing.

Higher benefits for social-security annuitants will give 6 million retired people more money beginning in October, and the maximum family benefit was raised from $168.80 to $200 per month. Among those groups now included in the program are self-employed farmers and farm workers.

The housing bill will expand construction of housing and is intended to make certain, as President Eisenhower said, "that every American family has an opportunity for a decent home in a good neighborhood among good citizens."

Also the bill contained provisions to prohibit "windfall" profits, and to avoid a repetition of the scandals which characterized administration of the law under previous administrations.

Congress continued authorization of Federal assistance to schools in federally impacted areas, and the funds will cover expenses of about 1 million pupils. Other educational benefits were authorization for research and surveys into educational problems, and a $1 million appropriation for surveys prior to a White House conference in November 1955.

In his report to the people President Eisenhower reiterated his desire to formulate a program which will give every American access to good medical facilities.

Congress extended the Hill-Burton Act which gives Federal assistance for expansion of hospital facilities; and under an improved vocational rehabilitation program, closer Federal-State-local cooperation is being encouraged.

The administration opened a new medical center at Bethesda, Md., to seek cures for certain diseases, and grants for research on cancer, heart, mental health, and arthritis were increased.

VETERANS

President Eisenhower: "The internal reorganization of the Veterans' Administration is proceeding with my full approval. When completed, it will afford a single agency whose services, including medical facilities, will be better adapted to the needs of those 20 million veterans to whom this Nation owes so much."

The record: Congress passed bills providing increase in compensation to veterans with service-connected disabilities and for widows and dependent parents of veterans. Also disability pensions for non-service-connected cases were increased.

Congress increased the revolving fund to finance direct VA loans by $100 million, and military personnel, in certain circumstances, will be given wage credits for social security while on active duty.

A law was also passed providing that all types of tuberculosis for veterans suffering 10-percent disability within 3 years of discharge will automatically be assumed to be service-connected.

The largest appropriation ever provided for operation of VA hospitals was authorized by this Congress. The program calls for 114,415 beds, the largest number the VA feels it can use. And under the appropriation all VA hospitals will continue to operate, in fact additional hospitals in a number of cities throughout the country are being opened or are under construction.

Korean war veterans were granted the same preferences as other veterans in housing, civil-service appointments, free postage, and the time extended for Korean veterans to apply for GI bill of rights training.

MAJOR LEGISLATIVE ACTIONS

The Office of Coordinator of Information of the House of Representatives, in its final edition of the Major Legislative Actions of the 83d Congress, records that during this session the Congress:

Passed 20 bills for governmental reorganization that have become public laws, while 3 others await the President's signature; and 11 reorganization plans became effective.

Twenty-six public laws affecting veterans and servicemen are now on the books, and six other bills are to be signed by President Eisenhower.

The Congress passed, and the President signed, 37 bills pertaining to the national defense and internal security, and 7 others remain to be signed.

Presidential action awaits 3 bills on our national economy, and 25 others have already become public laws.

In the field of natural resources the President has signed 34 bills, and 4 others await his signature.

Twenty-eight bills were passed and signed concerning international affairs, and six others are yet to be acted on by the President.

The agricultural industry will be affected by 21 new public laws, and 3 other bills are now before the President.

Social security, health, and welfare were of great concern to this Congress, and 21 new public laws on these subjects have become effective, and 6 other bills await signature.

MY PERSONAL BILLS AND ACTIVITIES

During this session I sponsored a total of 69 bills—ranging from bills for the relief of individuals to one which would abolish the Federal National Mortgage Association—and at the end of the session a total of 22 had been favorably acted on by the Congress and have become public laws. Two were still before the President for his signature. Four others were passed by the Senate, but were not acted on by the House of Representatives, and two remained on the Senate Calendar when Congress adjourned.

As a member of the Senate Committees on Banking and Currency, Public Works, and the District of Columbia, I participated in committee work on such major legislation as the housing bill, the omnibus rivers and harbors bill, and the huge public-works bill for the Nation's Capital City.

When retail prices of coffee skyrocketed early this year, I introduced a resolution calling for a study of the coffee situation and was appointed chairman of a special Subcommittee on Coffee Prices. Public hearings were held and our investigation coincided and we cooperated with the Federal Trade Commission, which was investigating at the request of President Eisenhower.

My committee is continuing to study the factors which rapidly brought coffee prices to over $1 per pound, and in its report the Federal Trade Commission said the coffee price spiral "cannot be explained in terms of the competitive laws of supply and demand."

We are now studying the voluminous report by the Federal Trade Commission, and we will prepare such legislation as will meet the recommendations of FTC for introduction in Congress next January, and file our report before Congress convenes.

Since January 1953 my office has handled thousands of requests from the people of Maryland and we have been of service to numerous veterans, and at all times assisted and cooperated with anyone who has had a problem with any governmental agency.

Our efforts to have the new social-security building, which employs several thousand, located in the Baltimore area were successful and Congress appropriated over $20 million for construction. This new building and the over 4,000 employees will continue to add to the economic progress of Baltimore.

The project which gave me the greatest satisfaction was the granting by the Office of Defense Mobilization of a Certificate of Necessity for tax amortization to the Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co., which will build a new plant in Cumberland.

The Cumberland area has had a labor surplus for a number of years and the location of this new plant in Cumberland will help the city regain its place in the industrial world.

THE JOB AHEAD

This has been a very successful session of Congress as the record shows, and the Eisenhower administration has made great progress toward its goal of building a stronger America, but much remains to be done.

During both sessions of the 83d Congress I was proud of my voting record, which consistently supported President Eisenhower. Believing, as I do, that the President's program was in the best interest of every person in this country and that in order for that program to succeed it needed the support of every Republican in the Congress, I pledged myself to cooperate with, and to assist, the President in effecting that program.

The Congressional Quarterly, an independent authoritative congressional news service, selected 10 votes which they determined crucial in putting the President's program through Congress. In 9 out of 10 of those key votes I supported President Eisenhower, and the 1 time I defected was to vote against the St. Lawrence seaway, a project which might take commerce away from the port of Baltimore.

The Baltimore Sun in a news story stated, "Senator J. GLENN BEALL, a stanch outspoken administration supporter, came through with a near perfect record for the Eisenhower program in the 83d Congress.

"Take away the St. Lawrence seaway issue, an administration-backed measure," the article continued, "that both Senators voted against for sectional reasons and Senator BEALL gets a perfect 'A' in his backing of Mr. Eisenhower's program."

Earlier this year the Congressional Quarterly listed me as 1 of 18 Republican Senators who had been a consistent supporter of the President. The record shows that other than for the St. Lawrence seaway my votes were for the Eisenhower program, and that includes every item on the President's list and I was pleased that my votes helped make it possible for the President to report that 54 of his bills had been passed by Congress.

Beginning in January I will continue to support President Eisenhower's program in the 84th Congress and I will join with him in his efforts to achieve "peace abroad, greater security, and greater and greater prosperity at home."

More Than 100 Laws for Veterans Voted For and Supported By Harold C. Hagen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 16, 1954

Mr. HAGEN of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, my service in the House of Representatives began in January 1943, during World War II.

In the 12 years that I have served the citizens of the Ninth Congressional District, which comprises 15 counties in northwestern Minnesota, I have voted for more than 100 laws favored by the veterans and their great organizations.

The 80th Congress, which was in session in 1947 and 1948, and was controlled by the Republicans, passed 188 different bills and measures for the benefit of the veteran, his family, or other dependents.

In the past year Representative HAGEN has favored a 15-percent increase for the disabled veterans; but since all legislation in Congress is a compromise, only a 5-percent increase in benefits to disabled veterans and their widows was voted. However, if I am reelected for my seventh term on November 2, 1954, I shall advocate more compensation for the men who have suffered and the dependents and widows whose husbands have died in our various wars.

One of the things that I did help gain for Minnesota and the Ninth Congressional District was an enlargement of the veterans' hospital in Minneapolis. I also have been helpful in getting increased facilities and personnel at the veterans' hospital at Fargo, N. Dak. This is the hospital for Ninth District veterans.

There are more than 422,000 men and women in Minnesota who have served their Nation in all wars. It is my considered judgment that those who have suffered because of the call to arms, whether it be in the Air Force, in the Army, in the Navy, Marines, in the Coast Guard, or in some of the auxiliary organizations, should be given serious consideration by those of us who make the laws and pass the appropriations in Congress.

Among the laws I have favored:

Raise burial and funeral expenses for veterans from $100 to $150.

Give widows and wives of disabled veterans preference for Government jobs.

Provide higher pay for the doctors and other professionally trained persons in the Veterans Bureau.

As a result we now have some very able physicians and surgeons taking care of the injured and sick service men and women.

We have passed a law providing psychiatric care for what formerly was called shellshock cases.

As your representative in the Ninth Minnesota District HAROLD HAGEN supported the $10,000 insurance law; compensation ranging up from $300 a month for injured men; automobiles for amputees, artificial arms and legs for those who lost theirs in the war; terminal leave pay; pensions to widows and dependents of veterans; to pay $50 per month to a wife; $30 for the first child, and $20 for each additional child for fathers in World War II, or $37 per month to a parent.

Where the pay of servicemen used to begin at $13 per month, later $30 to $33 per month, now the minimum pay of men or women in the services runs from $75 a month up.

HAGEN supported mustering-out pay; the payments of $75 to $120 per month, together with tuition and books, for those exservice men and women who wanted to get an education.

He supported a law giving seeing-eye dogs for the blind, relief from lawsuits and forelosures, so service men and women could not be bothered while serving their country; he favored giving alien veterans their citizenship and several times has voted for veterans preference on housing.

He voted extra pay for aviators and the 20 percent extra for foreign service; he supported laws to give veterans first chance at buying surplus property after World War II.

He also supported laws giving veterans first right to land entry and the filing on claims; he fought for the right of overseas veterans to vote in all elections since 1942; he helped pass the law for vocational rehabilitation which has permitted thousands of veterans to learn trades and professions and to study farming; he voted for a new court's martial law to give the ordinary GI an even chance with officers when being tried for offenses.

He has done everything within his power to make the American service man and woman the best fed, best equipped, and best armed, services in all the world's history.

During the first session of the 83d Congress, the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, reported favorably to the House a total of the 17 bills and in every case, I was happy to vote "Aye," which is the official word for voting yes, and assist in making them law. Some of these pertain to giving the veterans of the Korean War, many of the same privileges which were accorded to veterans of World War II. After all, in spite of the fact that the Democrats said this was not a war, the United States did have more than 140,000 killed, wounded, and missing, and that is war in any person's language.

I voted that the men and women in this so-called Truman episode were entitled to the same privileges and rights as those of World War II because a bullet or a bomb would kill a man or woman just as fast in Korea as in Germany, Okinawa, Guadalcanal, or any place else on earth.

I need not enumerate all the laws I supported for the Korean veterans or the World War veterans because officers of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, officers of the American Legion, officers of the Disabled American Veterans, or any other organization of veterans can certify as to my record on veteran legislation.

I was against the law which provided that American veterans should be tried under the law of foreign countries in which our troops were quartered. I do not think our former enemies could give a fair deal to American servicemen, and therefore opposed this obnoxious legislation.

I voted for the law which would give the enlisted serviceman the same rights and privileges in courts-martial as it would to officers and give all soldiers and sailors, and other service men and women, a fair deal on this type of proceeding.

There will be issued by the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs a pamphlet detailing the legislation which was considered by that committee through 1953 and 1954. Any interested veteran who wants a copy of this may write me at Crookston, Minn., and if I am furnished enough of these by the committee, I shall be happy to send one to you. The supply, however, may be limited, so I suggest that those who want this pamphlet write me at the earliest possible time.

In my 12 years in Congress I have promised very little, I have made few so-called campaign promises, because the voter, man or woman, is a little bit dubious and skeptical about election promises. The only pledge I make to the men and women who served in our Armed Forces in any war is: That I shall continue to do just as I have done since January 1943.

And that is, in case of any doubt whatsoever, to give the man or woman who sacrificed his or her time or physical ability in fighting for this Nation better than an even break.

That is the least that you veterans are entitled to and that is the pledge of HAROLD C. HAGEN, your United States Representative in Congress.

Your Right To Know

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, our form of government requires an informed citizenry. The people, themselves, must make decisions of basic importance. Obviously channels of communication between information sources and the people must be kept open and available to the maximum possible extent. In totalitarian countries the government monopolizes the channels of communication and shapes public opinion by depriving the people of all but one side of any question. Nothing is more vital to us than to guard against news monopolies in our country.

NEWSPAPER SUBSIDY

To encourage wide dissemination of information, newspapers and other news media are delivered by our post office at less than cost. The press is in this way subsidized by the taxpayers to the extent of $100 million annually. The newspapers quite properly fight for this subsidy in order to keep their mail subscription rates down and enable more persons to read their newspapers. They argue that the post office renders a governmental service and need not pay all its costs out of postal revenue as does private enterprise.

OTHER INFORMATION CHANNELS

But less-than-cost postal service to newspapers cannot of itself insure adequate public information. Most newspapers hold partisan views. In some areas the press is dominated by one political party. So, as a safeguard, other channels of communication are also kept open at less than cost by you, the people of America. One of these is the congressional frank which makes it possible for you to receive official speeches from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD without postage. This method of keeping you informed at minimum cost is widely used by members of both political parties. It serves to prevent the party with large campaign funds from monopolizing the mail as a means of communication. It is a time honored and tested means of insuring you of the opportunity to learn both sides of public questions. It does involve some cost but not nearly so much as the annual subsidy you pay to have newspapers, magazines, and similar media delivered to you at a low rate.

SUBSIDY JUSTIFIED

Any newspaper that criticizes use of the congressional frank to keep you informed should pay first-class postage rates on its own product. If all newspapers published all sides of all questions the situation might be different. But as matters stand it is well that others besides the newspapers can use subsidized postal service to keep you informed. The newspapers, which are after all private profit enterprises, have no right to a monopoly on less-than-cost postal service. Most of them would not want this. I have always had great respect for our free press. I have consistently tried to maintain and protect the privilege they have of getting their product delivered to you through the mails at less than cost. I think this is important to you as a citizen who must have full information.

POSTAL PAY VETO AND RATES

The President vetoed a bill increasing the salaries of postal employees because the Congress failed to increase postal rates to cover the increased cost. But the administration had proposed an increase in first-class letter rates from 3 cents to 4 cents, although this class of mail more than pays its way at 3 cents and is the class used by most citizens for everyday correspondence. The administration also wanted to increase airmail rates which are already high enough. The proposed increase in mail rates for newspapers was relatively small but was opposed by most of the press and I think properly. Newspaper mail subscription rates should be kept as low as possible, not for the benefit of the newspapers but for the benefit of the public.

ADVERTISING TECHNIQUE IN POLITICS

We live in an age of high-powered propaganda and advertising techniques. Of course, the party in power enjoys an advantage in getting into the news columns. No administration in the history of our Nation has relied on advertising-agency techniques and professional publicity men to the extent of the present one. Even a simple Presidential report to the people is elaborately staged with teleprompters, cue cards, rehearsals, and all the tricks and paraphernalia of the professionals. I think this has been carried to such an extreme that the President's naturalness is effected. His true personality is lost in a maze of elaborate props. He loses something and so do the people.

The use of professional propaganda techniques by the administration has made a true appraisal of its actions more difficult. The press releases for public consumption and the actual facts are hard to match up. Then, too, there is often as much significance in what is omitted as in what is said.

ANTI-CALIFORNIA ACTIONS

There has not been much emphasis in the administration's news releases in California concerning the administration's attack on California's vital water rights by its backing of the Frying Pan-Arkansas diversion and the upper Colorado storage project. Our competent engineers and lawyers are alarmed at the implications of these bills. The bills were stopped primarily by the Democrats, but with the help of many independent Republicans, but they will be back next session with administration support and California will be hard put to stop them. Incidentally, the administration seems to be inclined to be unfriendly to California. Troopships were, without careful consideration, transferred away from San Francisco at great loss to our State. Not even the fourth *Forrestal* aircraft carrier was scheduled for west-coast construction. Our shipyards have not been awarded a fair proportion of available work. The Air Academy went to Colorado although California would have provided an ideal site. The great Trinity River project is still stalled while far less feasible projects in other States are pushed. All in all, it certainly cannot be said that the Republicans are good for California.

FARM FACTS

Other facts need to be carefully considered by our citizens. Farm prices are to be flexed further downward although farm mortgage debt is increasing, prices paid by farmers are up, prices received by farmers are down, and prices paid by consumers are as high as ever. No real effort to end surpluses by increased consumption has been made. In fact a cut in school-lunch funds was attempted.

UNEMPLOYMENT

Unemployment has returned to haunt the homes of many of our workers. We are now supposed to be pleased when unemployment just does not get worse, although our growing population makes it essential that we constantly expand our labor force. We are asked to think it unimportant that 4 to 5 million willing workers are without employment. Among them are many veterans in need of special job placement help, yet Veterans' Employment Service funds are being diverted to other purposes and the service sharply curtailed.

ROAD PROGRAM DEFERRED

Our roads are literally falling apart. In spite of the glowing, deceptive news releases the much-heralded roads-expansion program was only authorized for commencement in the middle of 1955. The sound and meritorious Hearst highway program was shunted aside.

NO SCHOOL FUNDS

A modest appropriation for construction of school classrooms was refused, although even the wealthier States like California are critically short of school facilities.

TAX FAVORITISM

Taxes were reduced, but except for special groups there was no real attempt to help those least able to pay. Dividends from corporation stocks were granted preferred tax status. An increased personal income-tax exemption of benefit to all was refused. In spite of the boasting of a great overall tax revision, the discrimination against individual workers, professionals, and business proprietors as compared with those doing business in the corporate form, was not even remotely removed. For example, the individual cannot add to his personal tax-free income by driving a corporation-owned car at corporation expense, and charging many other items to the corporation.

The much-discussed double taxation of dividends fails to take into account the 52-percent ceiling on corporation taxes as against a ceiling in the 90's for individuals.

SOCIAL SECURITY

The Democratic-sponsored social-security system was improved, but the changes cannot be classed as substantial and appear to be motivated by political opportunism. This is so because the administration originally tried to put over a social-security tax freeze which would have jeopardized the social-security fund and made any increase in benefits impossible.

Those receiving old-age assistance were given no real help. The same is true of the totally disabled.

The health insurance proposals were so patently of no real merit or consequence that no one lamented their defeat.

DIPLOMATIC WEAKNESS

If one turns away from domestic affairs and turns to international matters, the need for public access to facts is even more pronounced. Cuts in our military strength were hailed as just the opposite. The Air Force program was first slashed and then subsequently restored with a consequent loss of 2 years time and a huge undisclosed waste of tax money. Military cuts contributed to diplomatic weakness and set off a chain of diplomatic defeats the like of which we have never seen. The bluff, bluster, and slogans failed to frighten our enemies. They must not be permitted to deceive our own people. Partisan propaganda and the administration press must not be permitted to obscure the facts of these international reverses, which are certain to have far-reaching consequences. Our people are entitled to the truth, irrespective of the effect upon the political fortunes of the party in power.

All in all, I do not think the Republican record in Washington is one in which they can take much pride. Hard money, unemployment, lower income, distressed farmers, diplomatic weakness, and a tendency to cut back and contract—to underrate the great American potential for expansion cannot be obscured for long by advertising agency techniques. The facts are certain to get out.

This Nation is comparatively new. We have come far but there are vast new horizons ahead if we have the faith and confidence to move forward in the bold manner befitting the great talent of our people.

Problems Facing the Military Establishment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. BROWNSON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. BROWNSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks and include other matter, I wish to insert a penetrating analysis of one of the vexing problems facing our Military Establishment, made by our colleague, the Honorable THOMAS B. CURTIS, of Missouri, in a speech before the Seabee Veterans Convention in St. Louis, Mo.

The gentleman from Missouri very ably points the way to a more economical use of the fighting men in our armed services by adopting the wartime system used by the Navy in forming its naval construction battalions.

Current estimates show that nearly 80 percent of our uniformed forces are used exclusively for noncombat duties. To free more men for the job, they are trained and equipped to do, namely, to fight is the goal of Mr. CURTIS. I feel every Member of the Congress can benefit by a study of his speech. It follows:

I regard it as a distinct honor to be asked to speak at the annual banquet of the Seabees. I served in the United States Navy for almost 4 years in World War II and, being a lawyer in civilian life and not being in the construction battalion, but rather in the aviation branch of the Navy, I was assigned to engineering duties. My entire work was with seaplanes rather than carrier based planes. The result was that I was concerned with shore installations and landing strips and fields ashore. The further result was that I became intimately associated with an assortment of Navy personnel called Seabees.

I have several times had the occasion of stating publicly, on the floor of the House during debate, and in other public addresses that, in my opinion, the accomplishments of the Seabees was the most outstanding accomplishment of World War II.

For the life of me I cannot understand why those who agree with that conclusion, and I might state, with no intention of flattery, most people in and out of the Military Establishment agree with this conclusion or come close to agreeing with it—putting in first place only a branch of service they were personally associated with—I cannot understand why those who agree with this conclusion are so unwilling to examine into the matter as to why this performance was so outstanding, in the hopes that there might be some lessons to be learned and applied across the board to other branches of the military service.

Now, first of all, I don't believe there is much basic difference between any large groups of Americans. In other words, the thousands of men in the Seabees coming almost entirely from civilian life were no different from the thousands of men in the antisubmarine branch of naval aviation with which I was associated. Why then did one group turn in such a tremendous record and the other—and I am weighing my words—turn in such a mediocre record. The individual men in both groups were equally patriotic, intelligent, hard working, and God fearing.

I suggest that the difference was an important and basic difference. A difference, indeed, which if we continue to fail to grasp in this society of ours will spell its ultimate destruction either through losing a war to a more accomplished enemy or through losing the essential features that go to make up this great peaceful society.

I refer to the basis for selection of personnel. I do not believe that it was by accident that the man responsible for the Seabee basis of selecting personnel was not a graduate of the Naval Academy at Annapolis. I say this with no reflection on either the patriotism, integrity or basic intelligence of the graduates of the Academy at Annapolis. I do say it with full implication of what I consider to be the failure of our basic system of training officers for the United States Navy, of which the curriculum, faculty, and educational system at Annapolis is the corner stone.

The man responsible for the key to the success of the Seabees was a graduate of an engineering school about a mile from the place of this meeting—a graduate, if you please, of Washington University here in St. Louis. I refer, of course, to Adm. Ben Moreell.

Ben Moreell's idea of personnel training and selection was a very simple one. If the Navy needed a bulldozer operator, you didn't necessarily have to start from scratch and take men fresh from civilian life with complete disregard for their civilian skills and assign a certain number, by the number, if you please, and that was the way it was done and the way it is done today, to go through boot training camp and thence to a newly established school set up and operated by the Navy to train bulldozer operators.

No indeed. You first looked around to see if in the civilian society there were bulldozer operators. And if you found one and even though he were fat and 40 and didn't come up to front line physical specifications you took him. And you didn't send him to boot training camp because you wanted him to operate a bulldozer not be a boot. Furthermore, to get him you didn't tell him he had to be a seaman striker and work his way up to be a first class petty officer or whatever rate a good bulldozer operator warranted. No, the rate was given him from the beginning.

Furthermore, for officers you needed men who were used to handling construction crews. If they were college graduates, fine. But if they weren't and could handle construction crews through years of doing it, you took them.

The net result was obvious. With the exceptions which will arise through error in any system, the men in the Seabees were put into jobs they already knew. The guiding light of the personnel system was to utilize civilian skills.

General Hershey has publicly stated that civilian skills are largely of no value to the Military Establishment. As a matter of fact they are somewhat of a detriment, he says. The military has to, in effect, untrain them and then retrain them. And General Hershey, as head of the draft machinery, is expressing exactly the personnel philosophy of the heads of our Military Establishment. This is the philosophy that Adm. Ben Moreell had to fight in order to go ahead with the Seabees. Let no one here believe that it was an easily won fight, nor that the fight remains won today. Indeed, that fight was hard won and won against men who remained unconvinced and the unconvinced men remain in the Military Establishment setting up the personnel policies today.

General Hershey's philosophy is the philosophy of the present Military Establishment. Oh yes, you can get lipservice to the idea of putting round pegs in round holes but from the specific cases sent to me by my constituents, either their own case or that of a son or husband which I have carefully pursued to the bitter end, I can assure you it is only lipservice.

The order of the day is that civilian skills are of no value to the Military Establishment; in fact they are somewhat of a detriment because the military has to untrain them and then retrain them.

Now, maybe, in spite of the success of the Seabees in World War II, perhaps General Hershey and the Pentagon group are correct in their philosophy. Certainly we should pause a little to see.

The most effective plea used on the floor of the House during the debate on UMT and, indeed, the most effective plea coming from letters from home was, if my boy is to fight I want to be certain that he is trained to defend himself, that he is not sent up to the frontlines untrained.

Certainly, this is true. And certainly it is true that when it comes to fighting and the art of fighting, civilian skills are of little value and, indeed, what skills that exist must largely be untaught and the new ones relearned.

If our present day uniformed forces of the Army, Navy, and Air Force were used for direct fighting, General Hershey and his group would have some basically sound argument. But is that the case?

Admiral Moreell knew that the job of the construction battallion was to construct and not to fight; the incidental fighting that the Seabees did, though quite effective at times, was purely incidental. Hershey's argument applied to construction battalions is unsound.

When we examine, as I have, in considerable detail, the work performed by men in uniform for the military establishment, we will find that at least 80 percent—and some even estimate higher—is not fighting nor will it ever be fighting. It has to do with supplies, transportation, warehousing, maintenance, overhaul, bookkeeping, housing, feeding, overhead. Nor am I referring to the borderline cases, such as field or frontline maintenance, or front line feeding, et cetera. Obviously any work on the frontlines will involve the need for military discipline.

Now if 80 percent of the men in uniform are never going to be engaged in fighting—and I challenge as I have challenged before any responsible person in the Military Establishment to refute this estimate, what in heaven's name are we talking about training 100 percent to fight. If, indeed, an analysis of the job requirements of these 80 percent reveal, as it does, that the skills required are essentially civilian skills as where the skills needed in the Seabees, then we had best follow the Seabee formula in our personnel practices as it relates to the 80 percent.

There are other ways of perceiving what I am talking about is true. As a lawyer I can testify to the limitations, injustices and inadequacies of the Code of Military Justice in force during World War II. But, as a student of the law, I can assure you that I hesitate a long time before I junk common law—that is, law which has grown up through centuries of human experience—and replace it with law conceived out of the minds of men sitting around a table. Our previous code of military law was essentially derived from the experience of centuries of fighting. But it was frontline law, law for battle conditions. When it was applied to nonbattle operations, as it was during World War II, it failed miserably. So, instead of analyzing the picture and realizing our error lay not in the battleline law but in applying battleline law to what were essentially civilian and not military operations, we compound our error and junk the battleline law.

What we have now is something worse. And yet a realization of the meaning of the Seabee success would have taught us the proper lesson. We were putting into uniform, if you please, many men who needn't be in uniform and we were placing under the military code men whose occupations did not call for military law.

The Seabees were notorious for their failures to observe military etiquette and respect. And rightly so. You don't run a maintenance or construction crew in that fashion and get results. But, let me tell you, from all frontline military leaders' statements, you do need this when you are getting men to march into bullet fire. General Patton, who is regarded as one of our best frontline leaders, was also one of the greatest martinets. I am convinced that frontline occupations require this training and background.

Now let's examine the matter from another angle, the medical profession's angle. What are the physical requirements the Military Establishment has set up for their personnel? It, too, is based upon the assumption that 100 percent will be used for fighting, when less than 20 percent will ever be used. The German Army, on the other hand, had 9 different categories; there was even a place for a 1-legged man. Rightly so. There are many occupations performed under the Army's aegis that require personnel with no more than one leg. If the class 1 physical category (frontline) became depleted, there was a system for dipping into physical category 2. But our Military Establishment puts some of the finest physical specimens behind desks or driving trucks or issuing stock, all by the number.

The Army will state officially that they have a limited duty status which lets them use men physically handicapped. Yet I can tell you that this, too, is mainly eyewash. I have in my unfinished files the case of just such a limited duty person who was on the frontlines in Korea and his asthma became so bad he left the frontlines to seek medical relief. He is serving a prison sentence for leaving under fire and the court-martial authorities and those in the Military Establishment who are responsible for reviewing these cases did nothing about the fact that, under their limited duty formula, the man should never have been on the frontlines and those who were responsible for infringing the policy, if indeed it were a policy and not eyewash, should have been called to account. Yes, deafmen, men subject to epileptic fits are sent to the frontlines although they are listed as limited duty status. I have these cases in my files and they were called to the attention of the top military authorities with no redress resulting.

And then, if further convincing is needed, consider the case of Mickey Mantle with a trick knee. He could not be used in limited-duty status, although a boy who lived in my district came into the Army with a broken back and lay in the hospital with a broken back because he could be employed in limited-duty status. The only answer I find is the limited-duty status is Army eyewash.

Finally I come to the educators. I am deeply interested in the vocational education programs. It is a constant battle to get Federal funds for vocational education. In my appearances (successful, I am happy to say) before the Appropriations Committee in behalf of funds for vocational education, I have stated that before you cut civilian vocational education look at the Military Establishment's great movement into this field. They are duplicating the systems already set up through this great land. They are building duplicate and costly classrooms and workshops. They are competing for teaching personnel with our high schools. The military knows full well that they need civilian skills. What they have not yet learned is that the civilian enterprise is better equipped to train men in these skills than the military, and, incidentally, at one-tenth the cost because we don't have to provide room, board, and wages for our civilian trainees.

For 4 years I have been following military procurement and supply—or should I say procurement and supply by the Military Establishment—because only a portion has to do with military procurement. I have pointed out in committee hearings, reports, and testimony that the Military Establishment has been moving into the fields of civilian manufacture and distribution and maintenance in an alarming fashion. The employment of civil service instead of uniformed technicians is only one way in which this movement is made apparent.

It is time we got the glamor of the military uniform out of our eyes and got down to the realities of the 20th century and modern warfare. It is warfare between societies in which those trained in the military profession have an important but limited part to play. Men trained in military science are not men trained in education, training, manufacture, distribution, maintenance (except for field maintenance), construction, etc. If this society of ours is to successfully compete, we must follow the Seabee formula of placing trained men in positions they are trained for. Following such a formula, we need neither UMT, military socialism, or destructive high taxes. If we fail to follow the formula, we will have all three, and that, I regretfully predict, spells the doom of any bright future for this potentially great society of ours.

Communist Aggression Unmasked

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, this month I had the privilege of appearing on the Georgetown University Radio Forum with two of my colleagues, Congressman CHARLES J. KERSTEN, of Wisconsin, and Congressman ALVIN M. BENTLEY, of Michigan. The subject of our discussion was "Communist Aggression Unmasked" and this broadcast marked the 405th consecutive broadcast of the Georgetown University Radio Forum. Mr. KERSTEN is chairman of the Select Committee To Investigate Communist Aggression, of which Mr. BENTLEY and I have the honor of being members.

During this forum program, I drew attention to a man-made famine in Ukraine during the years 1932–33. This famine was created by the Russian Communists in an effort to break the national spirit of the Ukrainian patriots. At that time Eduard Herriot, a French statesman, was invited to Ukraine to make an investigation of this matter. He reported that everything was perfectly normal in Ukraine and that there was no starvation at all. This is the same Eduard Herriot who has been fighting against the European Defense Community and who has been urging the French Assembly to defeat its ratification. It is safe to say that Mr. Herriot's judgment is as faulty today as it was in 1932 when he allowed himself to be taken on a conducted tour in Ukraine by the Russian Communists. Under unanimous consent, I insert our broadcast in the RECORD:

COMMUNIST AGGRESSION UNMASKED

Mr. WARREN. Communist Aggression Unmasked is the topic for the 405th consecutive broadcast of the Georgetown University Radio Forum, another in a series of educational and informative programs from Washington. The Georgetown University Forum was founded in 1946.

This is Matthew Warren speaking by transcription from the Raymond Reiss Studio, on the campus of Georgetown University, historic Jesuit seat of learning in the Nation's Capital.

Today's discussion will be Communist Aggression Unmasked. The participants are the Honorable CHARLES J. KERSTEN, Republican, of Wisconsin; the Honorable ALVIN M. BENTLEY, Republican, of Michigan; the Honorable MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN, Democrat, of Ohio.

Transcripts of today's broadcast are available. Ssend 10 cents to cover the cost of printing and mailing, with your name and address to Georgetown University Forum, Washington 7, D. C. Please mention also the subject matter of the transcript desired.

The phrase "just the facts ma'am" has become a byword of viewing audiences. Here today from three Congressmen noted for their understanding of communism, armed with the record of hearings held in New York, London, Munich, and Berlin, you will get the facts about Communist aggression as actually it happened.

Mr. KERSTEN, would you tell us first about your committee?

Mr. KERSTEN. Mr. Warren, our House Committee on Communist Aggression has been having hearings for the past year. We have heard the testimony and accepted evidence from hundreds of witnesses. Testimony was received from Poles, Hungarians, Bulgarians, Rumanians, Estonians, Latvians, Lithuanians, Ukrainians, Byelorussians, Germans, Czechs, Slovaks, and Russian people from every country behind the Iron Curtain. They were screened. They were checked, cross-checked, and they came from every walk of life, government leaders, peasants, former members of free parliaments, clergymen of all denominations, heads of great institutions of learning, teachers and students, businessmen, labor leaders, seamen, housewives, intellectuals, and even children. They came from all the different countries and from all sections of society, and they came primarily with one story. They told the story of the terror of living under Communists, living under a Communist government, living under a system of real Red colonialism the like of which the world has never seen.

Mr. WARREN. We understand these were all from behind the Iron Curtain. Can we take any credence in what they say? Are they really reliable witnesses?

Mr. KERSTEN. I would say, Mr. Warren, if it were a matter of hearing a few, ten or a dozen witnesses from behind the Iron Curtain, one would have to look with a great deal of suspicion on what they might have said. But having come from every country, cross-checked with one another, one not knowing what the other would say, and having been carefully screened, their testimony is of overwhelming conviction. It bears the stamp of truth. They gave the objective story of what it really means to live under Red colonialism.

Mr. WARREN. Congressman FEIGHAN, Mr. KERSTEN has used the phrase "Red colonialism," as you just heard here. What does that mean?

Mr. FEIGHAN. The finding of our committee is that communism is in fact Red colonialism and the worst kind of colonialism known to mankind. What do we mean by "Red colonialism"? Communism has created an empire, indeed the largest empire in the history of the world. In that empire there are many captive non-Russian nations. For example, once free and independent Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania. In 1939, Communist aggression destroyed the national independence of these nations and made them unwilling colonies. Next came Poland, Slovakia, Hungary, Rumania, and Bulgaria. These nations all lost their national independence after 1945 at the hands of the ruthless Communist aggressors.

I want to tell you about the first nations to lose their national independence to the new Red colonialism. I refer to the non-Russian nations enslaved by the Russian empire which had declared and held their national independence from the period of 1917 to 1922. They are Byelorussia, Ukraine, Georgia, Armenia, Azerbaijan; also the once independent Turkistan Republic, which has now been divided up by the Russian Communists into five areas, Turkmen, Uzbek, Tadzhik, Kazakh, and Kirgiz. There are over 30 million Moslem people in that area. Also, there is North Caucasia, Cossackia, the Idel-Ural nations which also lost their national independence to Communist aggression. Communism has in fact created a Red colonial empire. All the nations in this prison of nations are ruthlessly exploited. The central authority of this Red colonial empire is located in Moscow. The men of the Kremlin want to make the entire world into a Muscovite colony, including the United States of America. We sometimes forget that World War I brought about the destruction of three empires, the Czarist Russian, the Austro-Hungarian, and the Ottoman empires. This led to a golden era of national independence for the many nations of those broken empires. The new Red colonial empire has now forcibly annexed most of those once free and independent nations. It is the most repressive reactionary colonialism in all history. Communism is the opiate of nations.

Mr. WARREN. Let us examine one of the current examples. Congressman BENTLEY, you were in Hungary when the Communists took over. Will you tell us, please, firsthand, how it was done?

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Warren, to give you a complete, firsthand accounting of how the Communists took over Hungary during the 2 years when I was fortunate, perhaps unfortunate also, to be there would, of course, take more time than this program would allow. But I would like to say briefly and basically that the method by which they took over Hungary was, first of all, to build up their own strength. They were aided and abetted by the presence of Soviet military forces during the entire time, and they are still there today.

They built up their own strength of the Communist Party principally among the working-class elements, first of all. They formed political coalitions with other political groups, with other organizations and parties, which we might call somewhat part of the left. Then they concentrated upon certain parts of the government which they felt to be necessary to control for the purpose of taking over. First and foremost among those were, of course, the police. Most of the time I was there, as a matter of fact, the police force, the Communist-controlled police force was much larger than the Hungarian Army itself. They concentrated upon certain other parts of government, such as, for example, the Department of the Ministry of Communications, the Ministry of Reconstruction, and many others. Then they pinpointed where they could expect to find centers of resistance to their programs and devoted themselves singlemindedly to the elimination of those centers of resistance.

For example, they first of all went after any all political opposition. All political opposition, all political resistance parties that may have been formed and permitted in Hungary were slowly and systematically liquidated, the members either forced to flee the country, or imprisoned, or forced to turn over and sort of collaborate with the Communists and their allies in power. Then they went after what you might call the social and cultural centers of resistance, which, of course, first and foremost, was organized religion, both Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish. Eventually all three of those great religions were forced to collaborate, and those leaders and those members of the various faiths who didn't, first and foremost, of course, being the great Cardinal Mindszenty, we know what happened to them. They do suffer imprisonment and what I call literal martyrdom.

Now they have been concentrating pretty much upon what you might call economic resistance. In Hungary that specifically implies resistance among the farmers. I am very happy to say with specific reference to Hungary they have met a certain amount of opposition that has been actually somewhat successful, and part of their attempted collectivization of the Hungarian peasant holdings has had to be abandoned. But that is basically the method by which they take over.

I might say they do it with a very small, almost a handful of people, but they grow and they grow and they grow and for reasons of opportunism or blackmail or other things they are able to swell their ranks out of all proportion to their actual strength, whereby today they are the controlling element in that country. That is basically the Communist technique. But, as I say, for time reasons that has to be a very limited description of it.

Mr. WARREN. Gentlemen, in your report on Communist aggression, in your third finding, you enumerate Communist techniques for enslavement. One of them is genocide. Mr. KERSTEN, what evidence do you have of genocide?

Mr. KERSTEN. Mr. Warren, we had a great deal of evidence of the purpose on the part of the Communists to exterminate whole nations within their border. We had a great deal of evidence of mass graves, mass murders in which one particular area, as I recall the testimony, there were the bodies of 10,000 people found, and then there were 19 other mass graves, making a total of 200,000.

But perhaps the most striking and dramatic testimony was that of a high-level defector, a lieutenant colonel of the MVD, operating in the dread Soviet secret police. He came from out behind the Iron Curtain not long ago. He confirmed the stories of many witnesses who were on the victim side of the operation. He told about his participation in the genocide of the entire nation of the Chechen-Ingush, a nation of about 500,000 people. He described how this entire nation in this area was gathered together, the people were gathered together in the several towns, and how the Red Army at a given signal marched all of these people, men, women, and children, into the waiting conveyances, boxcars and the like, to deport them to Siberia. Most of them died. So that this nation has been effectively extinguished.

I recall he also told of the deportation of the Kalmuck nation, a nation of 200,000, of the Crimean Tartars, a nation of over 300,000, exterminated, wiped from off the face of the earth. One of the most impressive things was his description of how after these thousands of people were deported, in one afternoon approximately, just a matter of several hours, of going through the deserted towns at night to see the lights still lit, the doors open, the animals, the cows and chickens, but not a single human being there, ghost towns, the whole nation exterminated in a few hours. This is one of the techniques that the Soviets have been using ever since they have been in power. This is what I mean by genocide, the murder of a nation.

Mr. WARREN. That is a tragic and a startling picture you paint, Congressman. Another one of your discoveries is manmade famine. Congressman FEIGHAN, did your witnesses testify to this respect?

Mr. FEIGHAN. Yes; our committee heard extensive evidence on the brutal methods that the Communist Central Authority must use in order to keep the non-Russian nations enslaved within their empire. I believe an outstanding example of the brutal methods they used is the manmade famine they created in the Ukraine during the years 1932 to 1933. It is important for us to realize that Ukraine is the largest non-Russian nation, next to Germany in all of Europe. Historically it has been known as the breadbasket of Europe, just as it has been known for its indomitable national spirit.

In 1932 the harvest in Ukraine was much better than average, yet during that year somewhere between six and seven million people died of starvation. Our committee received eyewitness testimony relating how the Communists confiscated all the grain and stored it in the churches which they had already desecrated. They put armed guards around the churches and other buildings where they put the grain, and anybody who attempted to get any of this grain would be shot on the spot. As a consequence of this action, six or seven million people were dying of starvation at a time when the crop in Ukraine was far above average.

Our committee also learned that the reason behind this manmade famine was to break the national spirit of the Ukrainian people and force them to accept collectivized farming. I take pleasure in saying despite this terrible crime visited upon the heroic Ukrainian people the Communists could not break their national spirit or their desire for national independence.

Another witness appearing before our committee told us about the visit of Eduard Herriot, a well-known French statesman, to the Ukraine during the time of this manmade famine. We learned every minute of his visit, ever home he saw, every person he spoke with, every route he followed was carefully prearranged without his knowledge. He was allowed to see houses newly painted while directly in back of them people were living like animals in holes in the ground. He saw loaves of bread in certain store windows, but he was not allowed to see directly behind those stores that the police were holding back the starving people. He was not permitted to see any of the terrible human tragedy caused by this manmade famine. That is why after his return to France he stated he saw no famine or starvation in Ukraine. The visit of Eduard Herriot to Ukraine is very much like the visit of Clement Attlee and his entourage to the present red colonial empire.

Mr. WARREN. Now, as we explore the Communist techniques for enslavement, Congressman BENTLEY, what did your witnesses say about mass deportation and slave labor?

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Warren, Congressman KERSTEN has already touched somewhat upon the question of mass deportation. So for me it will suffice to say that the witnesses of every country whose case we have examined so far have testified as to the tremendous numbers of people who have been deported from their homelands to slave labor within the Soviet Union.

I believe that reliable witnesses have stated that there are approximately, at the present time, 20 million slave laborers within the Soviet Union alone. That is approximately one-tenth of the entire population of the Soviet Union. A comparable figure would be if there were 16 million American citizens who had been deported for slave labor from this country. That would be the relative percentage over here. The slave-labor problem is, of course, a very expedient one for the Soviets because not only do they get rid by one fell swoop, whether it is taking a number such as a half million from the Chechen-Ingushi, as Congressman KERSTEN mentioned, or smaller groups not only do they get rid of large numbers of their opposition, the opposition that I described previously in Hungary, but they also gain very cheap and very useful slave labor for the development of their vast resources of their country, for the vast reaches of Siberia, for example.

Their planned technique, of course, is, whether these people are sent to slave-labor camps for 1 year, 4 years, or for life, to keep them on what you might call a semistarvation diet, which would of course obtain maximum amount of work out of them with the minimum amount of care and upkeep. For a person to survive in these slave labor camps for more than a few years is very rare indeed, although we have had testimony of people who have actually come back, and that is why we are able to paint such a true picture of the conditions which exist all over the Soviet Union of slave-labor camps still filled with people, people-not only from the Soviet Union but people from Eastern Europe. And I say that is a condition that we have found to be contingent on every country, every country has witnessed tremendous mass deportations. I know, for example, that there isn't a single person today, when I was in Hungary 5 years ago, there isn't a single person in Hungary today that I knew that hasn't either been deported or hasn't been imprisoned or hasn't fled.

Mr. WARREN. That is a tragic picture. But everyone in America hopes there is some resistance behind the Iron Curtain. Mr. KERSTEN, did you find any evidence of this?

Mr. KERSTEN. Well, the resistance of course, having in mind the nature of the regime, the resistance among the mass of the people is tremendous. I first would like to say this one word about their destruction of religion. They oppose all religion, and under the Communist state, the state is god. They are actually teaching their children that the dictator is god, by such devices as having them say a prayer to "Thee, our Father," praying for their daily bread, and when they get no bread and after that prayer remains unanswered they wheel in the food with the compliments of Mr. Stalin or Mr. Malenkov. We have seen actual textbooks along this same line. So that Protestant, Catholic, Jewish, Moslem, and Orthodox religions are the enemies of the Communist state and exterminated by it. As a consequence, there is tremendous resistance for this and other reasons.

I might point out here, too, that we had a great deal of evidence that the Voice of America was heard in many areas behind the Iron Curtain, also, Radio Free Europe, showing that our information programs are getting across. There is a great deal more we can do along this line, but these information programs, the Voice of America and RFE, are getting across and the people are listening to them and it is giving them some hope to keep up this resistance in Poland, Slovakia, among the Czechs, Hungary, Lithuania, East Germany, Rumania. These people are our greatest friends. They are actually the strongest anti-Communist force in the world. They are the people who really know communism for what it is. When their children are taught this way and their institutions and families are destroyed—these are antihuman things. Any human being would rebel against this, and the people behind the Iron Curtain being human would rebel against it, too, if they had the opportunity. So, there is this tremendous spirit of resistance.

Mr. FEIGHAN. We had before our committee Father Hrynoch, a former underground fighter in the Ukraine. He told us about the heroic exploits of the Ukraine insurgent army. He presented documents to show in the period from 1944 to 1950, 35,000 MVD secret police were killed in fights with the Ukraine underground army.

We also learned this resistance movement fights on today with not one bit of help from the United States or any other free nation. One can well imagine how much more effective they would be if we would give them moral and material support. In my opinion, as long as there is one Ukrainian in Ukraine there will be resistance. We had witnesses who described the Russian seizure of the Ukraine, Byelorussia, and all the rest of the captive nations. The pattern and technique is always the same.

Mr. WARREN. Gentlemen, what are your conclusions with respect to this terror of Communist aggression?

Mr. KERSTEN. Our fundamental conclusion, Mr. Warren, is that the free world cannot coexist with communism, that coexistence with communism is a miff, because it gives a free hand to the Communists to develop a striking force finally to assault the free world and tends to lull into a false sense of security. It is just like trying to coexist with a cancer. You can't do it. Actually, a policy of coexistence is the sure road to war. This is the real war policy, the policy of coexistence. It would result in a situation where we would be sitting ducks for a sneak attack by the Communist forces once they had mobilized and digested their gains, and that they are in the process of doing.

It is an oversimplification to say that there are only two alternatives to the free world, to say it is either coexistence or preventive war. There is a third alternative, the alternative of a political offensive, an alternative wherein the people of the free world, the people of the free nations, join hands with the people behind the Iron Curtain to exterminate the Communist conspiracy. Our committee has made specific recommendations along this line.

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Warren, I think it should be pointed out in this connection that the very first recommendation of our committee was, and I quote from our last interim report: "That the President of the United States take the initiative in convening an international conference of all free non-Communist nations for the following purposes: The first to express formal recognition of the fact that the Communists control these people; secondly, to seek an agreement whereby the free non-Communist nations will as a body withdraw diplomatic recognition from all Moscow-controlled Communist government; thirdly, to reaffirm the friendship and the solidarity of the free peoples with enslaved peoples; fourthly, to develop a program to terminate rapidly and completely all commerce of any form with Communist governments and to allow for that by stepping up trade among the non-Communist nations thereby strengthening our security; and fifthly, with this conference to develop an overall dynamic program for the defeat of the international Communist conspiracy." That is the committee's first and prime recommendation.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Other elements are the Political Asylum Act which is now pending before Congress, which would stimulate the escape of more important people from the Red colonial empire. Another is the establishment of an international juridical commission to fully record the crimes of communism so that the guilty ones can be tried at a later date. And more important than any other single step would be the creation by President Eisenhower of the national military units long advocated by Chairman KERSTEN.

Mr. WARREN. Do you think this is just idealistic thinking or is it practical from the standpoint of a national military unit?

Mr. KERSTEN. Actually, Mr. Warren, we already have the specific authority in the law for the creation of such free national military units formed from escaped Poles, Hungarians, Czechs, Slovaks, Rumanians, Bulgarians, Ukrainians, and Russians. Congress has already appropriated $100 million for this purpose. There are plenty of escapees in Western Europe waiting to join such units when they are created, units in which they would wear their own national identifying uniforms and fly their own free national flags, attached to American forces and integrated in NATO. These units would not only relieve some of the drain and expense of American manpower in Europe, but would tend to destroy the will to fight of the satellite and Soviet soldiers now under Communist control.

The well-timed defections from Western Germany of Otto John and now Bundestag member, Schmidt-Wittmack, are obviously part of the Soviet propaganda effort to create the world-wide impression that there is a large revival of nazism. The purpose behind this Soviet bogey of nazism is to destroy the Adenauer government, to scare off the French and Italians from ratifying EDC and cause fear, despair, and resignation among the captive people of Eastern Europe. We must explode this Soviet propaganda immediately. The best way I know is the creation of free national military units made up of Poles, Hungarians, Czechs, and the rest, flying their free banners, flying with those of our American forces and with the military forces of free Germany. This would knock the Nazi scare into a cocked hat. Such a bold move on our part and the part of the free world, symbolizing a truly united Europe, would immediately explode the dangerous Soviet propaganda and would give the forces of freedom the moral and political stimulation that they need at this moment.

Mr. Warren. Thank you, gentlemen. We have been discussing Communist Aggression Unmasked. You have attended the weekly discussion program of the Georgetown University Radio Forum, broadcast of which was transcribed in the Raymond Reiss Studio on the campus of historic Georgetown University in Washington, D. C.

The participants on today's program were the Honorable Charles J. Kersten, Republican, of Wisconsin; the Honorable Alvin M. Bentley, Republican, of Michigan; the Honorable Michael A. Feighan, Democrat, of Ohio.

Next week you will hear discussed, Who Will Teach Your Children? Our panel at that time will consist of the Honorable Samuel Brownell, Commissioner, United States Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; Miss Waurine Walker, president, National Education Association; Msgr. Frederick Hochwalt, department of education, National Catholic Welfare Conference, secretary general of NCEA.

We welcome your comments and suggestions. Address the station to which you are listening. Transcripts of today's broadcast are available. Send 10 cents to cover the cost of printing and mailing with your name and address to Georgetown University Forum, Washington 7, D. C. Please mention also the subject matter of the transcript desired.

This program has been presented in the interest of public education by Georgetown University. Your moderator: Matthew Warren.

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY ON CAPTIVE NATIONS IN RED EMPIRE

1. Report of the Select Committee To Investigate Communist Aggression against Poland, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, Rumania, Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, East Germany, Russia, and the non-Russian nations of the U. S. S. R. Second interim report of the Select Committee on Communist Aggression, House of Representatives, 83d Congress, 2d session, August 9, 1954, Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C.

2. The Black Deeds of the Kremlin, a White Book. Ukrainian Association of Victims of Russian Communist Terror, Toronto, Canada, 1953.

3. Baltic States investigation, hearings. Select Committee To Investigate the Incorporation of the Baltic States into the U. S. S. R., 83d Congress, Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C., 1953.

4. The Nationality Problem of the Soviet Union and Russian Communist Imperialism, by Roman Smal-Stocki of Marquette University. Preface by Lev E. Dobriansky, Georgetown University. The Bruce Publishing Co., Milwaukee, 1952.

5. The Katyn Forest Massacre. Interim report of the select committee, pursuant to the House Resolution 390 and House Resolution 539, 82d Congress, Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C., 1952.

6. Containment or Liberation? by James Burnham. The John Day Co., New York, 1953.

7. The Genocide Convention, hearings. Subcommittee of Committee on Foreign Relations, United States Senate, 81st Congress, 2d session, Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C., 1950.

8. The Ukrainian Insurgent Army in Fight for Freedom. Introduction by Hon. Michael A. Feighan, of Ohio. Dnipro Publishing Co., New York, 1954.

9. Russia and Her Colonies, by Walter Kolarz. F. A. Praeger, New York, 1952.

10. The Origin of Russian Communism, by Nicolas Berdyaev. Geoffrey Bles, London, 1948.

11. The Impact of Russian Culture on Soviet Communism, by Dinko Tomasic. The Free Press, Illinois, 1953.

12. The Journals of the Marquis de Custine, Journey for Our Time, edited by Phyllis P. Kohler. Pelegrini and Cudahy, New York, 1951.

United States Representative Harold C. Hagen Always Has Supported REA and RTA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 16, 1954

Mr. HAGEN of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, several years ago one of the weekly newspaper editors in my Ninth Congressional District of Minnesota falsely attacked my voting record on supporting the Rural Electrification Administration. It has been reported to me that he may do so again. However, I personally doubt it because this editor now knows the facts and he is a man of good judgment and integrity.

There are approximately 60 weekly and daily newspapers in the Ninth Congressional District and none of them would reprint or give any recognition to the false and malicious statements made. A great majority of the editors at that time, as this year, are supporting me for reelection to Congress.

In this 1954 campaign, for Representative in Congress, from the Ninth District of Minnesota, comprising 15 counties in northwestern Minnesota, I have some overzealous, misguided, and misinformed Democrat-Farmer-Labor opponents, who are misrepresenting my position just as maliciously and as ignorantly as was done several years ago.

To those who have read my campaign newspapers over the years, to those who read the Congressional Record, and to those who know the facts, it is no surprise that I always favored 100-percent parity for farm produce and have never voted for anything less than 90-percent parity.

However, I want to confine my remarks today to rural electrification and the rural-telephone program.

Since I first came to Congress in January 1943, it has been my pleasure to know that power and light has been turned on in more than 15,000 farm homes of Minnesota's Ninth Congressional District as a result of the REA appropriations, for which I have voted in every instance. In some cases, the Ninth District has been given more than its proportionate share of Minnesota's allocation of REA money. Up to 1948, I helped REA co-ops to secure money from Congress to build 5,092 additional miles of lines serving 4,640 additional farms in my district.

I am very happy to say that as of 1954 that 9 out of 10 farms in America have electricity, and that almost every farmer in the Ninth Minnesota District who wants power and electricity has it today. REA should be extended to help some additional hundreds of farmers get this electric service and power.

HAGEN SUPPORTS REA

Due to my support of the telephone program, many more farmers in these 15 northwestern Minnesota counties have a telephone, or can have or will have, within the next 2 years.

I voted for every REA appropriation and for the telephone funds which soon will connect most farms, who want that service with every part of the Nation and of the world of the future. In case anyone again starts misrepresenting my farm record or my REA record, I want to review briefly some of my votes on REA.

Let it be done by former editor of the Bemidji (Minn.) Daily Pioneer, H. Z. Mitchell, who has a reputation all over the upper Midwest as a fine, truthful newspaperman who looks at the record of Congressmen and other officials in an objective and factual way.

When my record was misrepresented and misquoted, Editor Mitchell, of Bemidji, wrote in part:

> In every case, Congressman Harold Hagen has vigorously supported REA since he first became Congressman in January 1943.

Mitchell goes on to write that the first recorded vote on REA, which Hagen had an opportunity to cast, was on June 23, 1943, as shown on page 6361 of the volume 89 of the Congressional Record.

> This was a rollcall. during the war year, raising REA money from 20 million to 30 million, and this page shows that Hagen voted in favor of the increase.
>
> The 79th Congress—

Mitchell said—

> met during 1945 and 1946 and Hagen supported all REA appropriations during that time.
>
> The 80th Congress met January 3, 1947, and recessed June 19, 1948.
>
> On July 18, 1947, the House considered H. R. 3601 the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill for 1948.
>
> On that day, Representative Rankin made a motion that the House increase REA funds from $225 to $250 million.
>
> The rollcall is shown on page 9466 of the Congressional Record for July 18, 1947, and shows that Hagen voted for this increase.
>
> On February 24, 1948, the same Representative Rankin moved that rural electrification be provided with $300 million extra. His reason for that amount was that there was virtually no copper wire or other supplies available to REA during the war years, or immediately after and, as a result, there was a huge backlog of applications for loans to electrify farms.

MONEY TO REA ARE LOANS

Incidentally, every voter in the Ninth Minnesota District should know that any moneys voted to REA is not a gift from Uncle Sam. Every penny of this money is paid back with interest to the Federal Treasury, through the charges for power and light to the farms and customers in the areas served by REA.

Hagen voted on April 1, 1948, to raise the REA appropriation from $300 million to $400 million for 1949, and this carried.

Every year since 1949, when REA or farm appropriations have been voted upon by the House of Representatives, Hagen has voted with the farmers of his Ninth Minnesota District and the farmers of America generally.

Any poppycock, gossip, rumors, or declarations to the contrary, spread by anyone running for United States Representative in the Ninth Minnesota District should be discounted 100 percent.

There is no other candidate for this office on any ticket who has more consistently supported the farm programs, rural electrification, the farm telephone program, the bringing in of extra electric power from the great Missouri River dams in North Dakota and other regions, or any other legislation or laws which would help the farmers and the villagers and the townspeople of northwestern Minnesota than Harold C. Hagen, who has been your Representative since January 1943.

This statement is borne out by the hundreds of newspaper clippings and articles showing Hagen's activities in every field of endeavor. These clippings and letters received tell the situation in this manner:

> At least 20,000 letters a year have come into Hagen's office from the people of the ninth district since 1943, asking help and service on hundreds of different matters and problems, of an official Federal nature.
>
> You can hunt all through the 15 northwestern counties and you will find that in virtually every case, Representative Hagen has answered his mail the day it was received and has given prompt and efficient service to all concerned, regardless of party, creed, race, religion, or anything else.
>
> His record is unsurpassed in the history of the ninth district and if you want a continuation of this fair, impartial, and nonpolitical service, Harold C. Hagen should be returned as the United States Representative in Congress from the Ninth Minnesota District.

Hon. Robert Crosser, a Representative From the State of Ohio

SPEECH

OF

HON. ROBERT CROSSER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Speaker, and my good friends, it was always somewhat natural for me to express myself vigorously in behalf of a cause in which I wholeheartedly believe, but I am somewhat awkward in trying to reply to complimentary remarks by good friends in regard to myself.

Many, many years ago, at the request of Members of the House, I endeavored to pay a most deserved tribute to a distinguished colleague, who as a very young man had enlisted in the Union Army as a private at the beginning of the war against secession. He had served with distinction throughout that war and was frequently praised by his superior officers and was discharged at the end of the war with the rank of brevet brigadier general. He served later in public office, including a number of terms in Congress. He was 92 years of age and was leaving the House at the close of the session on March 4. He passed from this earthly scene within a very short time. He had served his country with great distinction in time of war and also as a public official in time of peace.

At the beginning of my tribute I said: "Earnest devotion to one's highest conception of right is the sublimest expression of life."

My colleagues' added experience causes me to say now even more emphatically: "Earnest and continuous support of his best understanding of right is the individual's sublimest expression of life."

In what I trust has been the attitude of true humility, in an effort to enable my fellow man to enjoy equal rights in the bounty of the Creator, I have tried constantly to observe, uphold, and promote the standard of life which I have just stated. Men may continue to talk learnedly on subjects labeled with impressive titles such as moral philosophy, political economy, political science, religion, ethics, methaphysics, and other titles to identify their discourses, may be expert elocutionists or skillful dramatists in their presentations to assemblies, but when all will have been said, that which every person desires more than all else is to know what is right, otherwise called the truth or the real.

If, constantly, day in and day out, without equivocation or hesitation, the individual, during every moment when he is conscious, instantly obeys the "still small voice," or as William Ellery Channing urged when he said, "be obedient to the promptings of your own soul" or as others sometimes say, "obey your highest inspirations or intuitions," then the individual will know of the right, that is, the truth which will make men free. Moreover the more constantly and persistently we obey the promptings of "the still small voice," the more certain and unerring will be its guidance and the more vivid will be the joy and bliss in realizing the right, that is, the truth.

Regular and immediate responsive action to one's inspiration, or "obedience to the promptings of your own soul" as Channing urged, makes certain that there will soon awaken in the individual, the realization of more and more perfect and reliable guidance toward increasing enjoyment of unalloyed good.

Long ago I became convinced that the philosophy of democracy is substantially the same in principle as that which had been taught almost 2,000 years ago by the Galilean, as the universal brotherhood of man, the understanding and realization of which, I have earnestly strived to promote.

Because of my unqualified acceptance of and support of that principle, as just explained, and in order to have freedom of mind, I have considered it proper to deny myself membership in humanly devised organizations which might in any way induce partiality on my part in deciding, according to principle, what is right or wrong in disputes between persons or groups of persons. In deciding what is right between persons or even groups of persons, our minds, so to speak, should proceed on the straight line of principle to the just decision, without any inclination toward one side or the other because of partiality or attachment to any person or persons. We should endeavor continually to have the freedom of mind which makes it possible to decide and to act at all times according to the right, the truth, which embodies the eternal principles of justice.

I have given much study and thought to such subjects as ethics, political science, political economy, metaphysics, and so forth. After all, however, treatises in regard to such subjects are simply classifications for the purpose of simplifying the task of ascertaining what may be designated as the right, the truth or the real. As already stated, right is that which is in accord with, indeed identical with the Supreme Power of the Universe and its activity. Truth means the same as right and both words mean the same as the word "real."

I am, of course, well aware of the fact that when one emphasizes the importance and necessity of knowing and living the truth, the sneering egotist is always ready to bark the hackneyed question: "What is truth?"

Instead of giving what might be called the stereotyped answers of the market place or the street, I would say that the most perfect answer to that question was given by the man of Nazareth to Pontius Pilate, who was at the time groping for some excuse for his decision to execute Jesus. Pilate stated that the people were angry because He—Jesus—claimed to be their king. Jesus explained to Pilate that he had made no such statement but had said to the people that the kingdom of heaven is within and that he had also told his hearers that if they would live the truth as he had explained it to them they would experience joy and bliss always. Pilate, still trying to baffle Jesus, then asked him "What is truth?" Jesus instantly answered Pilate saying "he that doeth the will of the Father shall know of the doctrine." By the word "doctrine," Jesus, of course, meant the truth. Pilate then snapped back, "How can we know the will of the Father?" Jesus answered, "Be obedient to the still small voice."

As I have already noted, Channing said, "Be obedient to the promptings of your own soul." Other statements of that truth might be quoted, but it is unnecessary to do so.

A more complete statement of the principle just mentioned is that in order to realize fully the life with which man is endowed by the Creator, it is necessary to think and act in harmony with the supreme power and the law of creation.

With no intention of being in the least sacrilegious in the analogy, I might suggest that if a person should devise a very useful mechanism which would increase man's comfort and improve human standards of life, everybody would assume that the device in question should be operated in accordance with the plans and ideas of the person who had devised the mechanism. Now, if that proposition is correct, then surely, in order to live the right, which means the truth, that is, in accordance with the law of the Infinite Mind, the individual must constantly accept the guidance designated by the greatest of all men as "the still small voice."

There are many distractions, mistakenly believed to be harmless but which obstruct the prompt recognition and availment of the perfect unfolding guidance of the all-knowing, unlimited mind and its activity, which is the source of all that may be designated as truth, the real, or the right.

Many persons, for example, engage in the observance of conventional formalities of one kind or another, various symbolisms, ceremonies, and other erroneous conceptions which are of a concrete nature, and generally materialistic. As a result of such practices men become contentious in their efforts to uphold and promote programs, and even fetishes or cults of groups with which they may be associated. The more numerous may be such distractions, the more it must be emphasized that always the most important requirement is that the individual be constantly conscious of the existence of absolute right. There is no other reality or existence whatsoever. Whether or not we fully understand at any moment the exact nature of right, if nevertheless we continue to know that right, the truth, the real is all that exists or can exist, we can be sure that a state of serenity and true happiness will be manifest and experienced more and more fully as the individual continues to be in accord with the law of the perfect government, call it the true law of life if you will. It is the only law which can be properly observed. Failure to observe that law results in the so-called evil or wrong which seems to plague mankind.

For the purpose of illustration, let us take the office of the legislator, that is membership in the policy determining branch of government, in other words, the body which officially determines the policies, the interpretations of right, the truth, which is to prevail among the people collectively. Unless the person is what may be described as afire with zeal for a specific policy or policies which he is very certain would increase the people's realization of justice, their fuller enjoyment of infinite good, he should not even seek membership in any lawmaking body. Indeed it may be truly said that when a person seeks membership in any lawmaking body, because of the desire for a title, he greatly, and very harmfully lessens his fellowman's enthusiasm in his search for and understanding of the "Truth that will make men free." Such a title seeker promotes one of the wrost of all evils which the cynics call "playing the game of politics."

The principle which I have been trying to explain is expressed in the lines of Horatio Bonar, as follows:

Thy soul must overflow if thou
  Another's soul wouldst reach;
It needs the overflow of heart
  To give the lips full speech.

Think truly and thy thoughts
  Shall the world's famine feed;
Speak truly, and each word of thine
  Shall be a fruitful seed;
Life truly, and thy life shall be
  A great and noble creed.

In these lines the poet has made it clear that in everything we do, but more especially when as lawmakers we undertake to formulate public policies, we should search our consciences thoroughly and constantly to make sure that we are not trying to serve what is wrongly considered as even personal material advantage instead of promoting the good of all. No person, young or old, should seek office in the lawmaking branch of government of any kind, unless he is constantly obedient to the still, small voice. He may believe that no one will know the difference, but finally when less and less often the promptings of right elevate his thought he will then realize the fatal error of promoting what is mistakenly regarded as the material interests of so-called self.

Some may say, of course, that no person controls his own conduct in accordance with the strict standards just now discussed. Such reputation assassins will sneeringly say that even those who sincerely advocate and work earnestly for fundamental principles which they are certain would promote justice, yes, such malicious slanders say that such earnest, sincere workers for the right are first of all, if not altogether concerned about personal profit, personal advancement and glorification.

Cynics may ask if I have at any time set aside what was regarded as being of great material advantage to me in order to make certain of better serving the cause of justice for our fellowmen.

My answer to such questions is that not once but many, many times have I disregarded what was generally considered to be of great material advantage to me in order that I might do my very best to establish and to promote the success of a principle which I knew would make men free in a politico-economic sense, and which would hasten and finally establish economic justice.

Because it was one of the earliest tests of my fidelity to a great cause, yes, a sacred principle, I mention an instance which might be regarded by the cynic as trifling, although I did not so consider it. When I had graduated from Cincinnati Law School and began the practice of law in Cleveland, I immediately tendered my services to Tom Johnson, the greatest mayor in Cleveland's history, who was serving his first term. My reason for doing so was because I had learned that he had become an earnest advocate, champion, and I might almost say evangelist for a great principle of political economy advocated by P. E. Dove, the French physiocrats, John Stuart Mill, Herbert Spencer, and by Henry George.

I had previously become a convert to the same principle of political economy, and having learned also that Johnson had abandoned a marvelously successful business career—which from the status of a newspaper boy during the war against secession had made him a millionaire shortly after he was 30 years of age—in order that he might devote his whole time, his energy—yes, he had quit a most prosperous business in order to promote the cause which he believed would abolish the distress and suffering of humanity and assure his fellowmen of justice.

Shortly after I had settled in Cleveland, some of the people in the neighborhood where I resided were urging me very earnestly to be a candidate for the city council. I was, of course, complimented by their urgence, but to make sure of not doing anything that would harm the cause to which I was as much devoted as was my then leader, Tom Johnson, I called to see Mr. Johnson and asked him what he thought of the suggestion that I become a candidate for the council. He was very complimentary, said that he was very desirous of having my cooperation. He said that he was aware of my devotion to the principle of political economy of which he had become such an earnest champion. He said, however, that for the advantage of the cause which he knew was close to my heart, as it was to his, he thought that it would be better to support another man who had already become a candidate and was a long-time resident of the ward, and for that reason might be more certain of election than myself. He explained that he knew that, like himself, I would be concerned primarily with the cause for which he, Johnson, was fighting and like himself, my first concern would be to make sure of the election of a sufficient number of councilmen who would be friendly to our cause. I promptly agreed and said that I was not there to ask for his support or to urge any special viewpoint, but because I regarded him as the leader in a struggle for the governmental approval of the sound principle of political economy which, if put into effect, would assure justice to all men. I cheerfully assured him at once that I would not be a candidate because he had satisfied me that for the good of the cause I should accept his judgment as to what was the best course under the circumstances.

At the risk of overemphasis, but because of the transcendent importance of the principle, let me again stress the fact that what may be designated as the truth, the right, the real, has always existed. Infinite mind, infinite spirit, or principle and the law of its action are all in all. It is clear therefore that the individual can create nothing. He can, however, become conscious of, that is discover, and continues to do so ad infinitum with joy unlimited.

The philosopher Zeno, who was called the father of logic, forcibly expressed the idea as follows "ex nihilo nihil fit." Everyone who has had experience in public life, or indeed has been engaged in any field of human activity, is well aware of the constant effort to sway him from his own ideas of what is right and the human inclination is to try to please our fellows as far as possible.

Since I started as a Member of the House on March 4, 1913, it has been my desire to merit the good will of all of my colleagues and I do not believe that I have neglected any proper course of action to earn such good will. My philosophy of life does not permit me to hate a single human being, notwithstanding the fact that many times in election strifes I have been the victim of tactics which most people would have felt justified a person to be not only hostile but almost violent in retaliation.

It is well known that, as a close student of the philosophy of democracy, I have always contended that every individual must have absolute freedom of thought and speech and be subject to no coercion in the performance of his public duty. That is the way in which we secure the cross section of public opinion, that is, ascertain the voice of democracy. I have felt also that it was especially important that a person who aspires to public office should be always absolutely free in mind to decide what he believes to be right in reference to any particular subject that may require a decision during his tenure of public office.

In my effort to uphold that standard of conduct I realize that I have displeased persons whom I would, of course, have preferred to please, if I could have done so consistently with what I believed to be the requirements of ethics and justice. Let me say again, however, that whether I have displeased or disappointed persons in connection with political campaigns in my home territory or disappointed some of my colleagues in the House, with whom I may have found it necessary at times to disagree, I bear no ill will to anyone.

We should all, of course, as already said, earnestly endeavor always to uphold the right or truth as determined by the Supreme Power, the only lawgiver, in the absolute sense. In earnestly serving the cause of truth, let us, however, avoid any histrionics about the sacrifice made in doing so. We often hear sentimental balderdash about dying for one's faith, and as answer to that kind of talk, my colleagues, I shall close this address by quoting the lines of Ernest Crosby:

LIFE AND DEATH

So he died for his faith. That is fine.
More than most of us do.
But, say, can you add to that line
That he lived for it, too?
In his death he bore witness at last
As a martyr to the truth.
Did his life do the same in the past,
From the days of his youth?
It is easy to die. Men have died
For a wish or a whim—
From bravado or passion or pride,
Was it harder for him?
But to live—every day to live out
All the truth that he dreamt,
While his friends met his conduct with doubt
And the world with contempt,
Was it thus that he plodded ahead,
Never turning aside?
Then we'll talk of the life that he lived.
Never mind how he died.

Will Atomic Energy Serve or Destroy Humanity?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the encouragement and support I have received in my fight on the atomic energy bill are heartening indeed. Many people in my district, in personal talks and letters, have shown that they understand the fundamental issues at stake. Leading newspapers and magazines have endorsed my views. Many Members of the House and Senate stood with me in this legislative battle. Their kind and generous remarks about my work on the atomic energy bill are deeply appreciated.

HOLIFIELD FIGHTS AGAINST ATOMIC MONOPOLY

Why did I make this fight? The answer is simple enough. As a member of the Joint Congressional Commitee on Atomic Energy—the committee that keeps watch on the atomic energy program—I know that we stand on the threshhold of a new atomic era, charting in these Halls of Congress the future course of atomic energy development. This great new source of energy can serve humanity or destroy it.

If we legislate wisely, untold benefits will be realized by our people and by those of other lands. If we legislate carelessly, atomic energy development will be fenced in by a few giant monopolies, withholding from the people the full benefits of atomic enterprise and causing other nations to turn away in disillusionment.

The people of the United States have brought about wonderful progress in atomic energy with their hard-earned tax dollars. The American people own the huge plants and the laboratories that are producing atomic weapons for defense and pioneering new peacetime uses for the atom. It is only right and fair that the people get back some real dividends when peacetime benefits begin to flow from their $12 billion investment in atomic energy.

ATOMIC BENEFITS MUST BE WIDELY SPREAD

That is why I fought for the right of all industry—big and little—to participate in atomic enterprise. I fought against restrictive patent provisions and concealed subsidies that would enable a few large corporations to maintain a stranglehold on this new field of industrial activity.

That is why I fought for the right of all agencies—public and private—to produce and distribute electrical power from atomic fission. I fought against the efforts of giant utility combines to put heavy toll charges on the flow of atomic power to our factories and farms and homes.

This is no academic debate. Within our lifetime atomic energy will come out of the laboratories and go to work. The tremendous energy generated in the splitting of atoms will be harnessed for heating and lighting our homes, for turning factory wheels, for doing the work of farm, mine, and mill. Atomic science will discover new and better ways of producing and preserving food, of testing metals and industrial equipment, of treating cancer and other dread diseases.

MEDICAL PROGRESS IN ATOMIC FIELD

Nearly 1,800 scientists are hard at work in research programs applying atomic discoveries to medicine and biology. New knowledge has been gained about cancer, heart disease, arthritis, and other serious maladies. I witnessed personally an important experiment in treating human brain tumor with atomic radiation at one of our national atomic laboratories.

In addition to supplying radioactive materials—radioisotopes—for medical research in hundreds of hospitals, medical schools, and clinics, the Atomic Energy Commission gives grants-in-aid for cancer research and has established four of its own clinical facilities for such research. The Argonne Cancer Research Hospital in Chicago, a $4 million project, is the largest ever built for this purpose.

Recently a portable X-ray machine, weighing under 20 pounds, has been developed. This device, costing less than $250, does not have to be connected with a power outlet. A radioactive thulium capsule in the machine does the work. Mobile units of this type in place of expensive and immovable X-ray machines, will bring medical care to more people at less cost.

At Los Angeles the UCLA atomic-energy project covers the complete range of the applications of atomic energy in the field of biology and medicine. Both in the breadth of its activities and the importance of its work, the UCLA atomic-energy project is one of the world centers of atomic knowledge in medicine and biology.

The University of California Medical School in San Francisco has a radiological laboratory which is one of the best equipped facilities of its kind in the world. This is one of the Nation's important centers for the development of methods for the treatment of certain types of cancer.

CALIFORNIA HAS LEADING ATOMIC ROLE

As a matter of fact, California is one of the leading States in the Union in atomic-energy activities.

The Atomic Energy Commission has more than 39 contracts for unclassified research projects with California educational institutions and research establishments. Through these projects, the Commission and its contractors are seeking new knowledge in such varied fields as chemistry, physics, biology, biophysics, medicine, metallurgy and reactor development. California contracts represent nearly 10 percent of the Commission's unclassified research work.

The great University of California is certainly one of the most important organizations in the national atomic-energy program. The university, under a contract with the Atomic Energy Commission, operates the widely known Los

Alamos Scientific Laboratory in New Mexico. In this facility the first development and production work on atomic weapons was carried out during the war. It is today the outstanding institution of its kind in the world.

The world center of development of electronuclear accelerators is at the University of California's radiation laboratory at Berkeley. This is the site of the Bevatron, the most powerful atom-splitter in the world.

An important part of the complex of atomic energy research installations in the bay area is the Livermore Laboratory, which is primarily a weapons development center.

The naval ordnance research at Inyokern has been an important contributor to the Nation's atomic energy program. The Salton Sea area is the site of test activities in connection with ballistic problems in the development of atomic weapons.

Two low-power research reactors are in operation in the State of California, one at Livermore and another at the North American Aviation Laboratory at Downey. Both were designed and built by North American Aviation.

Two of the important centers for both classified and unclassified research work in California are at the California Institute of Technology and Stanford University.

California's large stake in atomic energy is reflected in the fact that three of the State's congressional representatives are members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. I am privileged to be a senior member of the committee, having served on it since it was established 8 years ago. Serving with me on the committee are the Senate majority leader, Senator KNOWLAND, and Congressman HINSHAW, of the 20th District.

The recent 16th semiannual report of the Atomic Energy Commission lists about a dozen important advisory groups to the Commission, covering all phases of the national atomic energy program, with one or more Californians on each board or committee.

The same report of the Commission shows an even 100 California users of radioactive isotopes supplied by the Commission. These 100 users include manufacturing plants, industrial and university research groups, hospitals, clinics, individual doctors, and medical schools. Their experiments in every field of knowledge involve more than 250 different radioactive isotopes.

ATOM SPELLS INDUSTRIAL PROGRESS

Among the California business firms actively engaged in the atomic-energy program are the Pacific Gas & Electric Co., the Bechtel Corp., the Fluor Corp., and Kaiser Engineers, Inc. Many others are doing important work of a developmental nature. Some are producing important items of equipment, particularly in the field of atomic instruments.

The value of the atom in making industrial production jobs easier, faster, and cheaper is recognized by leading California industries. Thus the petroleum industry, important in our State, uses radioactive instruments and materials in prospecting, well drilling, pipeline operations, and refining processes.

Experiments are going forward in the use of atomic energy to propel vehicles and to provide a new source of electricity. A pound of uranium, no bigger than two lumps of sugar, can produce as much energy as 1,500 tons of coal.

Already the Government has built and launched a submarine, the U. S. S. *Nautilus*, to be powered by atomic energy. If experiments on land-based models prove out, a submarine of this type can travel submerged around the circumference of the earth at high speed.

The time may not be too far off when ships, airplanes, and locomotives will be driven by atomic power.

An $85 million project is underway for the construction of a full-scale atomic reactor to produce 60,000 kilowatts of electricity. That is enough to supply a fair-sized city.

The Army engineers, jointly with the Atomic Energy Commission, have called for bids on the construction of a package atomic reactor that can be transported by the Army to remote places, such as Greenland, and used to provide heat and power.

As a member of the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy, I have insisted that the Government take steps to widen the basis of reactor construction so that many companies will acquire know-how in the atomic field. The Atomic Energy Commission has now agreed to sponsor the building of five different types of atomic-power reactors. One of them, to cost $10 million, will be built for the Atomic Energy Commission by the California firm, North American Aviation. The company will assume $2.5 million of the total cost, and will furnish the reactor site, to be located near the company's field test laboratory in the Santa Susana Mountains, north of Los Angeles.

THE SHADOW OF ATOMIC WAR

As we strive to put the atom to work for peace and the welfare of mankind, we cannot ignore the ominous shadow of atomic war that hangs over our civilization.

The death-dealing capacity of atomic and hydrogen bombs has become so great that their use in modern warfare seems too horrible to contemplate. Yet we dare not let apathy and indifference rule our lives.

Now, if ever, there is a need for leadership of the highest type and cool, clear thinking by our Government officials. Above all it is imperative that the people know exactly the facts about atomic destruction. Only then can we begin to plan for a realistic and effective civil defense.

A few months ago, as an official observer, I flew in a helicopter over the site of a hydrogen bomb test explosion in the South Pacific. I saw a gaping hole in the ocean floor, at least a mile in diameter and almost 200 feet deep in the center. It has been estimated that it would take more than 4 million truck loads of gravel to fill this gigantic crater.

What this terrible explosive force could mean in the destruction of our homes and communities and our way of life must be stated again and again in clear, simple, and understandable terms by the most responsible authority in Government. I believe that the President of the United States is the official in the best position to know the real facts about atomic-hydrogen bombs and to share this knowledge with the people for the sake of national defense and survival. I have appealed to the President to make the facts known to the utmost degree consistent with national security.

I was pleased to note that the President permitted motion picture films of the first atomic-hydrogen test explosions made in November 1952 to be shown to the public. I helped to make this film available to the people of my district. The scenes shown, impressive and startling as they are, pale into insignificance beside the results of the latest hydrogen bomb explosion.

WE NEED REALISTIC CIVIL DEFENSE

In the Congress, I have introduced legislation which would put civil defense authorities on a par with the military and which would prepare the way for a realistic civil-defense program. I believe our people would be more willing and able to assume the burdens and sacrifices of self-protection if they are fully informed and convinced that our Federal Government can offer a workable civil-defense program.

Less big talk by national officials about massive retaliation and more sound planning to avert atomic warfare or to reduce its ruinous impact should be the order of the day.

The dangerous times in which we live offer no easy solutions. Yet I cannot believe that the destiny of mankind, under divine guidance, is a world of death and desolution, an atomic desert brought about by warring nations. A people alert, informed, and confident will exercise that powerful instinct for survival and keep their leaders striving constantly for peace.

I have faith in the American people. I believe they have the right to know the possibilities and the handicaps in their struggle to survive and be free. Without knowledge hope is empty and aspirations are blind.

HOLIFIELD WORKS FOR PEACETIME ATOMIC USES

It has been a fascinating and sobering experience for me, as a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, to watch the development of this revolutionary new source of energy. The atomic program, dedicated these past 10 or 12 years mainly to building bigger military weapons for defense, now can direct more effort to the peaceful arts. The vistas of opportunity it opens up are breathtaking. It holds forth the exciting promise of scientific and industrial progress, improved health and better living. As an individual citizen and as a Member of Congress I shall continue to work toward the goal of making the atom the kindly servant and not the evil destroyer of mankind.

Hagen Supported the New Social-Security Program With Increased Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 3, 1954

Mr. HAGEN of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, during the 83d Congress which is now coming to a close, I have worked for and supported legislation to increase the benefits under the social-security program. I was especially concerned to see that farmers were included.

I believe every person in the United States should come under social-security protection. The benefit age should be reduced from 65 years to 62 years.

Social security should be so improved that it will take the place of our present outdated old-age pension system.

Social-security payments at the age of 62 should not be denied on account of any other retirement or income benefits a person may be getting.

Although all the benefits I have worked for have not been enacted into law, I do believe this Congress has made a step in the right direction.

For the benefit of the citizens of my district, I would like to outline the benefits under the social-security program enacted by this Congress which I have supported and worked for during the past years:

INCREASED BENEFITS UNDER THE NEW SOCIAL-SECURITY PROGRAM

First. Average monthly wage: Your average monthly wage determines the amount of your benefits. The following chart will apply only if you worked at least 1½ years under the program since January 1, 1951.

(a) List by years all your earnings covered by social security, plus an estimate of your covered earnings up to the time you retire at age 65 or later. To realize the largest possible average monthly wage you may use either 1937 or 1951 as the starting date in your computation. Maximum covered annual earnings are as follows: 1937 through 1950, $3,000; 1951 through 1954, $3,600; after 1954, $4,200.

(b) In computing your average wage, you may cross out four of the lowest income years listed. You can cross off an additional year if you have more than 5 years of covered employment at any time. You can also cross off years in which you were under an extended total disability.

(c) Next, add the total wages earned in the years not crossed off. Divide by the number of months involved in the remaining years. This will give you your average monthly wage. Now locate this amount on the chart below under the heading "Average monthly wage."

Second. Monthly retirement pay: You and your wife, if both 65, will receive benefits as shown on the chart below. If your wife is under 65 when you retire, you will receive the benefit of a single person until she reaches 65. Your widow, at 65, will receive payments indicated whether or not you retire before your death. A woman with a wage record receives benefits in her own right if a higher amount will be realized.

INCREASED FAMILY SECURITY (SURVIVOR'S MONTHLY BENEFITS)

Third. Surviving widow: Your widow, if you leave children under age 18, is entitled to benefits shown on the chart below, regardless of her age as long as any child is under the age of 18 years.

Fourth. Surviving parents or orphans: Your mother or father who are dependent on you are eligible for benefits only if there is no surviving widow or child. Benefits for a parent, age 65, and also for one orphan under 18 years, are shown on the chart. Two parents, or two or more orphans receive correspondingly larger amounts.

Fifth. Lump sum at death: Lump-sum payments are in addition to benefits to eligible survivors. In the event there is no widow or widower surviving, the payment is made to the person paying burial expenses.

Now find the amount payable in your case in the columns opposite the amount you have determined to be your average wage:

Estimated average monthly earnings to age 65	Monthly retirement payments at age 65			Monthly payments to surviving widow with—			Monthly payments to dependent parents or orphan	Lump-sum payment at death
	Husband and wife	Single	Widow	3 children	2 children	1 child		
$54	$45	$30	$30	$50	$50	$45	$30	$90
$80	66	44	33	66	66	66	33	132
$100	82	55	41	82	82	82	41	167
$120	93	62	46	96	96	93	46	189
$140	99	66	49	112	112	99	49	195
$150	102	68	51	120	120	102	51	205
$160	105	70	52	128	128	105	52	211
$170	108	72	54	136	136	108	54	217
$180	111	74	55	144	144	111	55	223
$190	114	76	57	152	152	114	57	229
$200	117	78	58	160	157	117	58	235
$210	120	80	60	168	161	120	60	241
$220	123	82	61	176	165	123	61	247
$230	126	84	63	184	169	126	63	253
$240	129	86	64	192	173	129	64	255
$250	132	88	66	200	177	132	66	255
$260	135	90	67	200	181	135	67	255
$270	138	92	69	200	185	138	69	255
$280	141	94	70	200	189	141	70	255
$290	144	96	72	200	193	144	72	255
$300	147	98	73	200	197	147	73	255
$310	150	100	75	200	200	150	75	255
$320	153	102	76	200	200	153	76	255
$330	156	104	78	200	200	156	78	255
$340	159	106	79	200	200	159	79	255
$350	162	108	81	200	200	162	81	255

The Pledge of Allegiance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN L. HRUSKA

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. Speaker, the amendment of the pledge of allegiance to our flag by addition of the words, "under God," is being received well by the people of our Republic. One proof of this is the fine editorial contained in the August 1954 Sovereign Visitor, official magazine of the Woodmen of the World Life Insurance Society, of Omaha, Nebr. It is written by Farrar Newberry, president of the society.

Mr. Newberry is a most enthusiastic and persistent scholar of American history. Under his leadership, his society has pursued an active program of fraternity in action.

This program includes placement of suitable markers and monuments in commemoration of various historical events and sites; granting of awards to outstanding students in American history; presentation of flags in schools, and many related activities. Thus the true role of the fraternal life society as a builder of good citizenship and as a patriotic organization is being achieved.

Mr. Newberry's statement reads, as follows:

"UNDER GOD"

> New words recently added by resolution of Congress to the pledge of allegiance make it now read, "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."
>
> Though credit for this amendment is accorded the American Legion, the first time I heard it was from the lips of Mr. Luke E. Hart, who, as president of the National Fraternal Congress of America, strongly recommended it in his report to that body at Boston in 1952. This Boston meeting, by the way, stressed the importance of American history by placing a bronze plaque honoring William Dawes, Jr., a God-fearing patriot, who, before we had any national flag, made the same midnight ride as Paul Revere, though by a different road, to warn the colonists that the redcoats were on their way to Lexington and Concord.
>
> How fitting indeed that the words "under God" be a part of our creed of salutation to the United States flag. The men who founded this Republic worked in fear of the God, seeking to make sure that reverence for the Almighty should underlie all plans and purposes of succeeding generations; and we of this day are ever conscious of His presence and ever anxious for His favor.
>
> As we stand during the opening ceremony of our camp or elsewhere, our right hands

over our hearts, and pledge our loyalty to Old Glory and all it stands for, let us be mindful of the significance of these new words of the pledge—"under God."

Fraternally,

FARRAR NEWBERRY,
President.

Administration of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 19, 1954

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I have requested information concerning the results of the administration of the Refugee Relief Act in the following letter to Hon. Scott McLeod, the Administrator of the program:

DEAR MR. MCLEOD: The end of the fiscal year 1954 affords an appropriate opportunity for reappraisal of the administration of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953 in the light of the goals and objectives established. The difficulties of the act in facilitating the entry of refugees and escapees are recognized, of course. Yet it is essential that administration within the terms of the act utilize to the full the potential which it creates. The critical importance to the success of the foreign policy of the United States of encouraging escapees, especially those with special skills and information, from behind the Iron Curtain is by now well understood; also, that a safe and sought-after place of resettlement is a very important factor in that regard.

1. Information furnished by your office indicates that as of July 2, 5,633 visas were issued under the act, with 7,688 visas issued to date. This compares with a goal of 10,000 visas by June 30, 1954, a reduction from the original goal of 15,000 which was, as I understand it, established by your office. Could you advise me why the goal was not met and could you let me have your latest figures on the actual arrival of refugees and escapees under the program into the United States as of the end of 1954 fiscal year?

2. Attention is invited to the large proportion of preference immigrants constituting those receiving the visas issued, aggregating for Italy and Greece alone as of the end of the fiscal year some 5,400 of the aggregate amount of visas issued and as of the last reported date 7,350. I favor help with this problem as proposed by H. R. 8193 now nearing presidential approval. One of the important objectives of the act was also in the issuance of visas to escapees. I would very much appreciate receiving now your views as to the reasons why the modest goals established for escapees under the act have not been attained.

3. Recruitment of staff called for a target of 697 civilian employees in field positions as of June 30, 1954, according to the March testimony before the Appropriations Committee. I would very much appreciate being advised as to the extent to which this target has been attained and the field staff goals now established.

4. It will be recalled that there were some problems regarding the certificates of readmission required under the act. I have had called to my attention and in turn call to your attention the problem of utilizing the quota for 2,000 Polish war veterans refugees under the circumstances of the refusal of the Government of the United Kingdom where most of them are located to issue readmission certificates to them.

5. Progress made in the implementation of section 6 of the act and problems encountered.

6. You will recall, too, our discussion regarding the proper relationship under the program with voluntary agencies who have organized themselves into the American Council of Voluntary Agencies for Foreign Service. I should appreciate knowing from you the way in which this cooperation has been developed in the course of the administration of the act over these months.

I would deeply appreciate your early reply also to the following questions:

(a) Do you believe that the act can be administered and its objectives attained within the period specified under administration by your office?

(b) What amendments or other changes in the act are recommended by you which would facilitate its implementation to attain its objectives?

I have received information in response as follows:

As a matter of convenience, I have quoted your paragraphs in toto for ready reference:

"1. Information furnished by your office indicates that as of July 2, 5,633 visas were issued under the act, with 7,688 visas issued to date. This compares with a goal of 10,000 visas by June 30, 1954, a reduction from the original goal of 15,000 which was, as I understand it, established by your office. Could you advise me why the goal was not met and could you let me have your latest figures on the actual arrival of refugees and escapees under the program into the United States as of the end of the 1954 fiscal year?"

The original goals established for the issuance of visas were, of course, planning estimates which had to be revised from time to time in the light of prevailing circumstances. The difficulties encountered with staff expansion, promulgation of regulations, and administrative provisions by the Department and the multiple participating agencies, together with the diplomatic negotiations with the various foreign governments concerned, reflect but a few of these intervening circumstances which prevented the attainment of our original issuance goals. However, as of August 20, over 35,000 alien applicants have been advised of the documentation requirements under the act, 8,010 visas have been issued, 943 have been refused, and some 4,000 additional applications have been approved and await final visa action in the next 2 or 3 weeks. This totals almost 14,000 cases satisfactorily dealt with to date.

At the end of the 1954 fiscal year, 819 persons had entered the United States under the act, all of whom were in the preference categories. As of August 13, the Immigration and Naturalization Service reports that this figure has increased to 3,734, including 198 orphans and 41 aliens residing in the United States whose status was adjusted by the Attorney General under section 6 of the act.

"2. Attention is invited to the large proportion of preference immigrants constituting those receiving the visas issued, aggregating for Italy and Greece alone as of the end of the fiscal year some 5,400 of the aggregate amount of visas issued and as of the last reported date 7,350. I favor help with this problem as proposed by H. R. 8193 now nearing Presidential approval. One of the important objectives of the act was also in the issuance of visas to escapees. I would very much appreciate receiving now your views as to the reasons why the modest goals established for escapees under the act have not been attained."

While it is true that the emphasis has been on the preference category of cases during the early stages, this, once again, was the result of practical operating necessity, particularly in Italy and Greece. In these two countries, a vast number of duly registered aliens under the regular quotas were also potential applicants under Public Law 203. Consequently, the supervisory consuls general, with the concurrence of the Department, desired to concentrate their efforts on this backlog. They were not in a position to process nonpreference cases in the absence of the required assurances, which, as you undoubtedly know, are still not being received in the desired numbers. In this connection, a program for stimulating sponsorship by United States citizens of potential immigrants under the act has been initiated by the Department. As the first step in this direction, President Eisenhower has sent letters to the governors of 47 States suggesting formation of State advisory committees similar to that established in New York by Governor Dewey. As the Administrator, I followed up the message from the President with letters to each of the governors, outlining our aims and needs.

I am extremely pleased by the response the appeal is bringing forth. To date we have in hand letters from any of the governors pledging their wholehearted support, and advising us that we may expect grassroots sponsorship in volume within a short period of time. Until such time as the assurances are forthcoming, the allocations of visas for escapees, refugees, and expellees under the act cannot be fully utilized.

The bulk of the escapee, refugee, and expellee cases will flow from operations in Germany and Austria, where studies indicate that these groupings are largely concentrated. As you may know, the Army was delegated the responsibility for operations in these two countries. However, owing to a difference of opinion between the Bureau of the Budget and the Army on budgetary allocations generally, there was an initial setback to operations in these areas. After exerting every effort consistent with my responsibilities to obtain a satisfactory solution, including an appeal to certain levels at the White House, I now feel that the Army is geared to handle an ever-increasing number of these cases. Refugees in certain of the NATO countries and in the Far East are now being processed on a regular basis.

"3. Recruitment of staff called for a target of 697 civilian employees in field positions as of June 30, 1954, according to the March testimony before the Appropriations Committee. I would very much appreciate being advised as to the extent to which this target has been attained and the field-staff goals now established."

The June 30 target of 697 American civilian employees included 142 domestic and 525 field positions. As of July 31, there were a total of 513 American civilian employees on the rolls, including 146 domestic and 367 field positions. The 1955 budget estimate requested a total of 708 American civilian positions, including 146 domestic and 562 field positions. As congressional action on the 1955 budget has just been completed, time has not permitted a revision of current authorizations. However, it is expected that the funds appropriated will not significantly affect the number of positions requested for 1955.

"4. It will be recalled that there were some problems regarding the certificates of readmission required under under the act. I have had called to my attention and in turn call to your attention the problem of utilizing the quota for 2,000 Polish war veteran refugees under the circumstances of the refusal of the Government of the United Kingdom where most of them are located to issue readmission certificates to them."

The problem of the 2,000 Polish war veteran refugees under section 4 (a) (4) of the act has been satisfactorily resolved. By diplomatic negotiation, the British Government has seen the wisdom of permitting the activation of the program in the United Kingdom and is wiling to issue the required readmission certificates.

"5. Progress made in the implementation of section 6 of the act and problems encountered."

The implementation of section 6 of the act, you will recall, is primarily the responsibility of the Attorney General. The appropriate regulations have been promulgated by the Department of Justice (HCFR 481). The recent amendment to the act, which at this writing is still awaiting the Presidential signature, makes certain modifications which will greatly facilitate its implementation, especially the abrogation of the restriction which required the alien to establish that he could not return to his native land because of events which have occurred subsequent to his entry into the United States. Although considerable progress has been made, innumerable detailed problems do exist, however, all of which are currently under review by the Commissioner of Immigration.

"6. You will recall, too, our discussion regarding the proper relationship under the program with voluntary agencies who have organized themselves into the American Council of Voluntary Agencies for Foreign Service. I should appreciate knowing from you the way in which this cooperation has been developed in the course of the administration of the act over these months."

The administrative unification of the various voluntary agencies into a single coordinating organization has greatly facilitated the exchange of ideas and information to our mutual satisfaction. Periodic joint meetings take place, and other sessions are called as the need arises. From the modest beginnings of some 8 organizations actively participating in the program, we now have the impressive representation of some 24 such voluntary agencies. I am of the opinion that the atmosphere is one of understanding and confidence.

In the light of these comments, I foresee no insurmountable obstacle to the successful completion of our assigned mission. The recent amendment to the act should prove to be most helpful to its sound administration, notwithstanding certain additional inherent administrative burdens. Indications are that some inequalities may arise in the orphan groupings when that category of cases is considered on a world-wide basis. Also, a certain degree of rigidity in the implementation of the act may tend to follow from the stringent compartmentalization of categories. However, greater experience is needed in the refugee, escapee, expellee groupings before firm proposals can be made for amending the act. I am hopeful of good and substantial results by the first of the year from which we may be able to draw more definite conclusions. If circumstances warrent, I will have no hesitancy in recommending amendments which will permit us to meet our goals. I look forward to discussing such proposals with you early in the next session of Congress if the need arises.

I am, of course, indebted to you for your keen personal interest in the matter at hand as I am of the opinion that such success as we may have will be attributable in large measure to those Members of Congress who have this problem foremost in their thoughts.

I have also requested a report from Rev. Rev. Msgr. Edward E. Swanstron, chairman of the committee on migration and refugee problems of the American Council of Voluntary Agencies for Foreign Service, Inc., but that has not come to hand. I will continue my efforts, first, to ascertain the results of the administration of this important law, and second, to make recommendations as to how it may most successfully be administered.

Communist Control Act of 1954

SPEECH

OF

HON. GORDON CANFIELD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 16, 1954

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the Communist infiltration of our economy represents a strategic and vital threat to the Nation. The infiltration of certain organizations constitutes one of the deeply ingrained phases of the menace of communism in the United States. The great labor unions of our country, the CIO and the A. F. of L., have dealt with the menace vigorously to the limit of their capacity to do so. The CIO in 1949 and 1950 expelled 10 unions because of their Communist domination. We now have the opportunity through H. R. 9838, to crack down on Communist infiltration from the Government level. This brings about the highest and the most effective form of cooperation between the Federal Government and the respected organizations of American labor.

This bill has been carefully considered in relation to anti-Communist legislation that already exists, in relation to the scope and the nature of the Communist menace, and was evolved slowly and thoughtfully out of congressional knowledge and experience. H. R. 9838 gives the people of the United States a weapon in law. It enables our Government to deal with Communist infiltrated labor unions. The rule of Communist labor leaders over these unions is despotic and absolute. The notorious Harry Bridges tyranny over his International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union is a case in point.

But in creating this proposed legislation the American tradition of justice and fair play was not thrown to the winds. The bill calls for substantial criteria that must be presented to the Subversive Activities Control Board before it can determine that a labor organization is Communist infiltrated. Under the bill—section 8—the Attorney General files a petition with the Subversive Activities Control Board on the basis of evidence he has secured of Communist infiltration. The petition asks for a hearing to determine whether or not that union is in fact a victim of Communist infiltration. There is due notice to all concerned before the hearing. If the evidence proves infiltration to the satisfaction of the Subversive Activities Control Board their findings are certified to the National Labor Relations Board and are published in the Federal Register.

The effect is to deny to the guilty union the benefits of the services of the National Labor Relations Board under the National Labor Management Relations Act of 1947, as amended. The bill operates in precisely the same way toward the Communist infiltrated employer.

As I see it this is the judicial, the American, the correct way to take the Communist infiltrated labor union and Communist infiltrated employer out of America's economic and political life. The result of this bill—H. R. 9838—is to strangle Communist infiltration through due process and in the best American tradition of lawful self-defense against the enemies of our country and to drastically discourage such infiltration. I believe the measure to be an answer to the Communist problem on the economic and the labor front and I wish to give it my wholehearted endorsement.

Thaddeus Kosciuszko

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT CROSSER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Speaker, because of my admiration for the character and life of Thaddeus Kosciuszko, who was born February 12, 1746, at Siechnowicze, Poland, more than 200 years ago, I wish at this late hour of the session to refer briefly to the statement written by America's great champion of democracy, Thomas Jefferson, at the time he was Secretary of State, to Gates:

> I see Kosciuszko often. He is the purest son of liberty among you all that I have ever known, the kind of liberty which extends to all, not only to the rich.

On January 23, 1798, Congress authorized the Secretary of the Treasury to issue to Kosciuszko a certificate of indebtedness of $12,260.54 with interest at 6 percent, from January 7, 1793, to December 31, 1797. The final settlement of the account was made by a payment amounting to $15,227.87.

I desire also to have reprinted in connection with this statement a copy of Kosciuszko's will, which is in the following language:

> I, Thaddeus Kosciuszko, being just in my departure from America, do hereby declare and direct that should I make no other testamentary disposition of my property in the United States thereby authorize my friend, Thomas Jefferson, to employ the whole thereof in purchasing Negroes from among his own as any others and giving them liberty in my name in giving them an education in trades and otherwise, and in having them instructed for their new condition in the duties of morality which may make them good neighbors, good fathers, or mothers, husbands or wives in their duties as citizens, teaching them to be defenders of their liberty and country and of the good order of society and in whatsoever may make them happy and useful, and I make the said Thomas Jefferson my executor of this.
>
> T. KOSCIUSZKO.
>
> Fifth day of May 1798.

There was difficulty in putting this testament into effect as Jefferson was of advanced age at the time of Kosciuszko's death. It was never carried out, but in 1826 the legacy went to found the Colored School at Newark, the first educational institute for Negroes in the United States, and which bore Kosciuszko's name.

The foregoing quotations give evidence of the fact that Kosciuszko was a man of very great character, a sincere and earnest champion of liberty. Many men who lived 200 years ago, or even less time ago, had demonstrated skill in warfare, which was a common occurrence in the Old World at that time. No European of whom I know, who had training and ability in military affairs, was in any way to be compared with the great Thaddeus Kosciuszko. None of them, I say, had developed the true love of liberty and understood the importance of freedom to the human race, and the degree of unselfishness and high understanding of political principles of popular government as had Kosciuszko.

I am pleased to have the opportunity to pay this brief tribute to a character whom I have so long admired.

East-West Trade and Peaceful Coexistence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRAZIER REAMS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. REAMS. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to leave heretofore taken, I include in the RECORD the following address which I prepared for the Interparliamentary Union Conference regarding the subject East-West Trade and Peaceful Coexistence:

"Let us beware of the contents of the packages which they [the Communists] would sell and deliver to us under the respectable labels of 'East-West trade' and 'peaceful coexistence.' "

Mr. President, and fellow members of the Interparliamentary Union, I wish to endorse wholeheartedly the statements made as to the widespread and unshakeable support for the United Nations among the people of the United States of America. If the sentiment of my own district in Ohio is typical of the general sentiment—and I believe that it is—then the allegiance to the basic concepts of the United Nations is firmly anchored in American public opinion.

The greatest danger I see in a conference to review the Charter of the United Nations organization comes from the perfectionists, from people who take "an either-or" approach.

I like the priceless French proverb, "Le mieux est l'ennemi du bien," (the absolute best is the enemy of the good). It carries with it a warning against debating charter revision to the point where the United Nations itself may be undermined. There are times when it is better to struggle along with an incomplete charter, than to run the risk of losing the entire organization.

However, in the conference for charter review which is ahead of us, our governments will be wise to think through carefully the scope of the revisions to be considered. The sections to be revised must be selected with restrain and prudence.

Our committee was discreet to point up the question of the veto as one of the leading problems involved in this effort to strengthen the charter. I have a strong personal conviction that the revision conference should be held and that it should remove the veto on the admission of new members. Exercise of the veto has kept out of the United Nations many nations highly worthy of membership. Those which have been victims of the veto are Austria, Cambodia, Ceylon, Eire, Finland, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Republic of Korea, Laos, Libya, Nepal, Portugal, and Vietnam.

Removal of the veto in this respect would also make possible a closer approach to the universal membership which is stressed in the draft resolution before us. Adequate protection against this concession can be provided by a better definition of criteria for membership in the United Nations. The understandable desire for universality should not open the gates to new members whose conduct is clearly hostile to the basic precepts of the organization, and whose membership would tend to sabotage rather than improve the chances for obtaining international peace and justice.

May I speak on the subject of representation by the Chinese Communist regime in the United Nations. The parliamentary body of which I am a member has several times made plain its overwhelming opposition to such representation in the United Nations. The basis for our attitude does not seem to be widely known or appreciated in other countries, but to us it is practically self-evident. As the principal contributor to the United Nations defense forces in Korea, the United States of America suffered more than 100,000 casualties. The lives that were lost and the men who were maimed are not so quickly forgotten. Universality would become a farce if carried to the absurd result, that aggressors are welcomed into the organization even before giving the least indication of a change of conduct, and even while holding some of our soldiers as prisoners of war—without the slightest justification. I earnestly hope that our discussions here and our continuing concern with this problem in our own parliaments and countries, will bring us nearer the goal of peace and brotherhood we seek.

Mr. President, may I move rapidly to another phase of peace and neighborliness which I believe to be associated with the question under discussion. The delegates to this conference from Hungary and Poland have spoken of east-west trade and of peaceful coexistence. Through the magic of simultaneous translation we have understood the meaning of their words. But the acts of their governments and of the power which directs those acts give a far different meaning. It is a meaning which must be interpreted in the light of the record of facts from recent and present day history.

Commerce and trade are among the greatest instrumentalities for development of understanding and friendship among the peoples of the world. The countries outside the Soviet bloc have always cherished such trade. After the present government of Russia had established itself, most of the non-Soviet nations represented here accepted the invitation to trade with her. Goods, machinery, and human skills from many of our countries went into the building of the factories, dams, and powerplants of Soviet Russia.

We believed in 1920 and believe now that it was for the common good of humanity and a movement toward a peaceful world that all people should exchange goods, skills, and instruments of production throughout the world.

But, this exchange with the Soviets has caused our disillusionment to be very great. Their government has accepted this trade to build a machine to divide and to subjugate and not help establish a peaceful family of the nations and friendships among the people of the world.

That is why we look behind the meaning of the catch phrases "East-West trade" and "peaceful coexistence." What the Soviet-dominated nations are doing speaks so loudly and so clearly that we cannot hear what their delegates in this conference and in the United Nations are saving.

Trade in the true sense of the word must be a fair exchange of goods and services. It must be for economic—not political uses.

It must be primarily for the benefit of people, not rulers and governments.

Trade by the Soviets is carried on by the government. Goods are given and taken away with utter disregard of the benefits to the people of either party to the trade. Prices are regulated not on the basis of costs or supply and demand but on the political end to be served at the particular time.

That is not trade—that is bribery on a gigantic scale. It cannot develop into an economic exchange whereby the free nations of the world can build a sound and lasting economy for their people. One need only to look at the record to document and substantiate my statements.

Now let us look at the shibboleth of peaceful coexistence. I believe that the record of peaceful living together with our neighbors in the Western Hemisphere furnishes some basis for an historic definition and example of "peaceful coexistence." There are numerous other exhibits of true neighborliness on every continent. You may choose the examples which are closest to you and with which you are most familiar. I am sure that the memories of our fellow delegates from Poland and Hungary are not so short as to fail to remember that only a few years ago there was true coexistence and mutual trade between their countries and all nations.

Now let us compare these real instances of fair trade and peaceful coexistence from the record with the conditions being imposed by the Soviet bloc. Look at Austria today—almost 10 years after the end of the war. Still suffering under the economic and political restraints of a Soviet definition of "East-West trade" and "peaceful coexistence." Look with your own eyes at the conditions wrought by the Soviet power in Austria, in Germany, in Korea, and in Vietnan. Examine the worldwide cold war it has imposed on a world hungry for peace. What the delegate from Hungary speaks of is not free trade. It is trade imposed by the superior power of the Soviet. It can last only until this dominant power has gained its end or until its people have acquired the ability and right to deal fairly with their fellow human beings.

These are not examples of peaceful coexistence. There is nothing peaceful about it. There is no place in it for the prefix "co" which connotes a cooperative living together. It is only an existence—and not the kind of existence ordained for mankind by the great God and Father of us all.

My fellow delegates, let us in this forum established for the discovery of means for building a peaceful world hear our fellow delegates from Poland and Hungary—but let us beware of the contents of the packages which they would sell and deliver to us under the respectable labels of "East-West trade" and "peaceful coexistence."

Accomplishments of the 83d Congress and Eisenhower Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER FERGUSON

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by me relative to the accomplishments of the 83d Congress and the Eisenhower administration.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Through cooperative effort the Republican 83d Congress and the Eisenhower administration attained three major goals which can be simply stated as peace, preparedness, and prosperity.

These were our major accomplishments:

We guided the Nation away from involvement in war and toward the heartfelt desire of all Americans for peace.

We put into effect a preparedness program for military strength necessary for long-range security while maintaining a sound economy.

We demonstrated that there can be even greater prosperity for the American people under peacetime conditions than in wartime.

Here are the highlights of the Republican record covering the 19 months since President Eisenhower took office and the two sessions of the 83d Congress:

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Ending of the war and the casualties in Korea.

Keeping of United States troops out of Indochina and support of the truce to halt the prolonged conflict there.

Ratification of a mutual defense treaty with Korea and launching of a Korean rehabilitation program.

Signing of a mutual assistance agreement with Japan.

Support of the successful effort of a majority of the Guatemalan people to regain control of their government from the Communists.

Strengthening of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO).

Adoption of a resolution by both Houses of Congress against Red China's admission to the United Nations.

Senate adoption of a resolution calling upon President Eisenhower to take appropriate steps consistent with our constitutional processes to restore German sovereignty. This resolution takes on added significance in view of the French National Assembly's vote of August 30, 1954, to postpone debate indefinitely on the 6-nation European Defense Community (EDC) Treaty.

Acquisition of military bases in Spain and the Netherlands and strengthening of bases elsewhere.

Ratification of treaties on the status of United States forces in Europe.

Signing of the declaration by Western Hemisphere nations at the Caracas, Venezuela, conference holding Communist imperialism to be a menace to all.

Settling of the oil controversy in Iran, thus thwarting Communist designs on the oilfields there.

Continuance, but on a reduced basis, of foreign aid.

Improvement of the international information program, including the Voice of America.

Extension of the trade agreements program.

Passage of the Refugee Relief Act to admit up to 214,000 persons to the United States in excess of the quota limitation, including many orphaned children.

Sending of food to East Germany and the Danube River flood sufferers behind the Iron Curtain.

Launching of a large-scale surplus food disposal program to help hungry peoples of the world.

Senate adoption of the resolution condemning persecution of minority groups by Russia and Soviet satellite countries.

Adoption by both Houses of Congress of a concurrent resolution urging free elections in East Germany and early unification of Germany.

Laying of groundwork for an international pool of atomic energy resources for peacetime uses.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

Overhauling of national defense program to achieve adequate security for the long pull with emphasis on combat effectiveness and mobility of the Armed Forces and elimination of waste and extravagance.

Appropriation by Congress of $28.8 billion for the defense establishment. This sum, plus $55 billion in carryover funds, makes a total of $83.8 billion available for defense. While this gigantic sum is available, our defense strategists, headed by President Eisenhower, has determined that only $36 billion should be spent this year if we are to keep a strong peacetime economy.

A steady buildup and improvement in the Nation's air power. Today the Air Force has 115 wings activited—70 percent more wings in the highest category of readiness than last year. Plans call for 120 Air Force wings by June 1955, and 137 wings by June 1957.

Greater attention to continental defense.

Revision of the Atomic Energy Act, including authority for Government to share information on atomic weapons with allies in a common defense against Communist aggression.

Establishment of an Air Force Academy, to be located at Colorado Springs, Colo.

Enlargement of the military and naval construction program.

NATIONAL ECONOMY

Greatest prosperity in Nation's history achieved since the start of the Republican administration and the 83d Congress, despite adjustments required in a changeover from a war to a peace economy.

Wages, income, employment, production of goods, and services—all higher in 1953 and 1954 than in the years of most favorable economic activity when Democrats were in power.

Freeing of workers, farmers, and businessmen from wage, price, and other restrictive controls.

Cost of living held down. Purchasing power of the dollar has varied only one-half cent in the last 19 months. Under the Truman administration the cost of living rose an average of 6 percent a year.

Special aids extended to small business, including creation of Small Business Administration to make loans to small business firms and assist them in obtaining an equitable share of Government orders for equipment and supplies.

Extension of unemployment insurance benefits to 4 million additional workers and improved financing of unemployment insurance program.

Reduction of Federal Government competition with private business.

Restoration of collective bargaining through Government policy of nonintervention in labor-management affairs of nonemergency nature.

Increase in Federal research funds for development of new ideas and technological processes which will create more jobs and better products.

RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT—PUBLIC WORKS

Inauguration of vast public-works program for all America. It includes:

St. Lawrence seaway project to connect the Great Lakes with the Atlantic Ocean. Democrats talked about the seaway project for years; Republicans acted.

Most comprehensive Federal-State highway construction program in history for development of 40,000 miles of roads in the Nation. Even greater road development will result from President Eisenhower's proposed $50 billion highway program.

Authorization of more than $1 billion for flood control, river and harbor work, and beach-erosion projects.

Provision in new Atomic Energy Act for development of peacetime uses of atomic energy, with private enterprise taking an important part.

Reclamation projects, power dams, and public-buildings construction.

A ship modernization and construction program for improvement and strengthening of the merchant marine.

All of these new public works will create more jobs, stimulate manufacturing, and bolster the entire economy.

Congress also authorized return to the States control over submerged lands within their historic boundaries with retention by the Federal Government of all of the offshore lands on the outer Continental Shelf. The outer shelf contains almost nine-tenths of all offshore lands and it is estimated that 83 percent of mineral deposits in offshore lands are in the outer shelf.

HOUSING

Through passage of the Housing Act of 1954 and related laws home ownership was brought within reach of additional thousands of American families. This act authorizes lower down payments, lower monthly payments, and longer periods of loan repayment under the FHA mortgage insurance program. The act also provides for clearance and redevelopment of slum areas and includes authority for construction of up to 35,000 additional federally aided public low-rent housing units. The public projects are to be used primarily to house families displaced by slum-clearance work.

FINANCE AND TAXATION

Republican administration advanced over two-thirds of way toward balancing the Democratic deficit-riddled Federal budget by substantial cuts in appropriations in both sessions of the 83d Congress.

Reduction of fiscal year 1954 appropriations $20 billion below those of fiscal year 1953 was the largest peacetime decline in the level of appropriations in a single year in the history of the Government.

Federal expenditures for fiscal year 1954 were $10 billion below those proposed by Mr. Truman in his last budget, and $6.5 billion under the amount spent in fiscal year 1953. The budget deficit declined from $9.4 billion for fiscal year 1953 to $3 billion for fiscal year 1954.

Republican economy made possible tax reductions totaling $7.4 billion. Millions of persons and thousands of businesses throughout the Nation will be benefited by income-tax reduction, excise-tax cuts, and reductions and adjustments provided for in tax revision act, the first complete revision in Federal tax laws in 75 years.

AGRICULTURE

Long farm-price decline arrested.

New long-range flexible price-support program devised to promote stable, productive, prosperous agriculture for benefit of entire Nation. Agricultural Act of 1954 designed to provide an effective floor under farm prices while avoiding accumulation of price-depressing surpluses.

Improvements initiated and funds increased for REA electricity and telephone programs, soil, water, and forest-conservation work, and agricultural research and education.

Grain-storage facilities expanded to increase effectiveness of price-support operations.

Drought-stricken farmers and stockmen aided.

Legislation enacted to dispose of surplus agricultural commodities through barter arrangements with foreign countries, expansion of school-lunch program, and distribution of food to those in need both at home and abroad.

Agricultural attachés transferred from State Department to Department of Agriculture in the interest of promoting increased markets abroad for products of American farms.

SOCIAL SECURITY

New Social Security Act brings 10.2 million more persons into social-security system and increases benefits to persons now drawing social-security checks. Railroad retirement benefits also liberalized.

HEALTH, EDUCATION, WELFARE

Nation's health, education, and welfare activities given a big push forward by consolidation of all major agencies and programs in these fields into a single department, headed by Mrs. Oveta Culp Hobby.

Federal aid in the operation and construction of schools in areas overcrowded because of national-defense activities continued.

Federal Office of Education authorized to contract and cooperate with institutions of higher learning and other educational agencies for research, surveys, and demonstrations, and to establish a National Advisory Committee to aid in supervising educational problems.

To safeguard the Nation's health, the law authorizing Federal aid in hospital construction was extended and expanded to help the aged, chronically ill, and physically disabled.

A broader program of vocational rehabilitation authorized.

CIVIL SERVICE

The 83d Congress and the Executive Department also combined to develop and adopt a program of improvements for the civil-service system that constitutes a marked advance in the benefits received by Government employees.

For the first time in history, group life insurance and unemployment compensation benefits similar to those enjoyed by workers in private industry were provided most Federal employees under the terms of two congressional acts. Longevity-pay increases were authorized for the civil-service scale except in the three highest classified service grades. An equitable system for overtime pay was established in the executive departments.

The Republican administration liberalized incentive award programs and made them applicable to all employees. Arbitrary restrictions upon the accumulation of annual leave were repealed. Restrictions on permanent promotions and reinstatements of former career employees were removed and the statutory limit on the number of employees in the executive branch was adjusted to meet present-day needs.

VETERANS

In the field of veterans' legislation, the Republican Congress approved a 5-percent increase in pensions for veterans of all wars and their widows and other dependents. The fund for building veterans' hospitals was increased to a record high and construction speeded. Financing of homes and farms for veterans was made easier. Korean veterans were given the same benefits and preferences as World War II veterans. The system of veterans' life insurance was simplified. The Veterans' Administration itself was reorganized for greater service.

CIVIL RIGHTS

Republicans vigorously pushed civil and political rights. The administration's Attorney General argued strongly for the Supreme Court decision ending segregation in the public schools. Discrimination came to and end in the armed services, veterans' programs, and in the awarding of Government contracts. Negroes were appointed to more high political and civil service posts than ever before.

COMMUNISM

After 20 years of stubborn minority effort, Republicans obtained the position within the Government in 1953 from which they could really grapple with the Communist issue. Fellow travelers in the Government are no longer protected. The net result is this: at last governmental machinery for dealing with the threat has been designed, set up, and put into vigorous action. The United States is now the only country in the free world equipped to do this job and do it with due regard for the Constitution and the Bill of Rights. It is a Republican triumph of the first magnitude.

The President has established new security regulations that are fair, honest, and written in language anybody can understand. The new Internal Security Division in the Department of Justice was organized to give exclusive attention to vigorous prosecution of antisubversive laws. Communist leaders have been convicted and jailed. Subversive aliens have been deported. Security risks have been weeded out of Federal employment. Labor unions have been given weapons to protect themselves against Communist inroads. In short, Republicans take seriously the idea this is a free country and that Americans do not propose to surrender their freedom.

A series of eight measures enacted by Congress strengthens the hand of the Executive in combating the Communist conspiracy in this country. These laws provide for—

No. 1. Outlawing the Communist Party and determining the identity of certain Communist-infiltrated organizations.

No. 2. Making it possible to grant immunity to witnesses testifying before congressional committees. Under this measure subversives will no longer find an easy refuge in the fifth amendment. Furthermore, witnesses, who otherwise might be perfectly willing to testify but who dread penalties, are now encouraged to give evidence that will throw additional light on the conspiracy.

No. 3. Imposing heavier penalties for concealing persons from arrest. Only light penalties could be imposed upon the four Communists who concealed Robert Thompson in the Sierra Mountains for months before the FBI ran him to ground. Thompson was 1 of the 11 Communist leaders convicted in 1949 in the first Smith Act trial. Under the new measure much stiffer penalties can be imposed for harboring fugitives.

No. 4. Imposing heavier penalties on bail jumpers. The genesis of this measure was the Gerhardt Eisler case. Eisler, a top Communist agent, escaped from New York on the Polish ship *Batory* after he had been indicted for passport violation.

No. 5. Denial of a Government pension or retirement benefits to any Government employee convicted of a felony. This measure is known as the Alger Hiss bill.

No. 6. Revocation of citizenship of persons convicted under the Smith Act of engaging in treason, joining a movement to overthrow the Government by force and violence, or plotting against the Government.

No. 7. Making peacetime spying a capital offense, including the death penalty. The 10-year statute of limitations on peacetime espionage was removed.

No. 8. Requiring all printing presses and other processing equipment owned, controlled, or used by Communists to be registered with the Attorney General.

HONESTY IN GOVERNMENT

The Republican Congress and the Eisenhower administration worked together to clean up the mess inherited from the Truman administration. Honesty and integrity in the Federal Government have been restored. Crooks and grafters have been ousted from Federal office. Several hundred tax evasion cases have been referred for prosecution—cases which were hidden in desk drawers during the previous administration. Some of these cases involved tax exemption of racketeers and underworld characters who had contributed to the previous administration's campaigns. A total of 388 Internal Revenue officials have been separated from their positions and 60 were convicted in 1953 alone. Nine high-placed individuals were indicted in a crooked surplus ship deal. All pardons are now made public. Both the Congress and executive department uncovered irregularities and windfall profits in FHA-insured housing project loan cases.

The Antarctic Continent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the RECORD a number of letters appearing in recent months in the Washington Post and Times Herald and the Washington Evening Star in regard to a proposed expedition to the Antarctic. Another article appeared in the National Bulletin, the Military Order of the World Wars, for September 1951. They follow:

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of May 12, 1954]

ANTARCTIC EXPEDITION

It was heartening to note that on April 29 Congress received a bill regarding a proposed Antarctic expedition. Senator CASE and Congressman TOLLEFSON, who introduced the measure, are indeed foresighted. There is no doubt whatever that United States citizens will reap much benefit from any and all Antarctic expeditions formed "in furtherance of the interests of the United States," to quote from the bill. Capt. Finn Ronne of the Washington, D. C. area, who will lead the planned trip, is an experienced Antarctic explorer, whose winter expedition of 1946-48 did remarkable work. There has been no expedition since then from this country.

No doubt taxpayer-readers would appreciate knowing a great deal more about Antarctica and its meaning for them along the lines of future military and economic security. Obviously, 10 percent of the land surface of the earth will not remain forever undeveloped. It is well for the United States to be on her toes, awake, alert. The measures in Congress (S. 3381 and H. R. 8954) would seem to mean that there is to be a really sensible break in the indifference of the United States during the years since 1948.

E. A. KENDALL.

CHEVY CHASE, MD.

[From the Washington Evening Star of May 14, 1954]

ANTARCTIC EXPEDITION

Without doubt many taxpayers noted with interest your story on April 30 about a bill in Congress relative to a proposed Antarctic expedition to be led by Capt. Finn Ronne of the Washington, D. C., area, who led the expedition of 1946-48. I, for one, certainly believe that "furtherance of the interests of the United States in the Antarctic," to quote from a bill itself, may well prove to be the outstanding economic step of which the 83d Congress will boast in future years.

It is refreshing to know that progressive and constructive plans of this nature are before Congress. Especially at a time of some pessimism and disappointment about our world relationships it is heartening to redirect our thoughts—to look ahead to new horizons instead of back toward lost opportunities and perhaps costly errors. "Advancing the legitimate claims of the United States in the territory and resources of the Antarctic continent" (again quoting from the bill) means that the authors, Senator Francis Case of South Dakota and Representative Thor Tollefson, of Washington, are foresighted legislators. Taxpayers of this and future generations probably will be benefited by their courageous thinking as well as by that of Senator Ralph Flanders, of Vermont, who, too, has given positive attention to the matter of protecting United States Antarctic interests.

As a taxpayer I certainly hope that all Members of the Congress favor this and other American Antarctic expeditions, bases, and claims. It is simply a matter of common sense. And I hope some day soon to read editorial opinion on this question in your alert newspaper.

Taxpayer E. A. Kendall.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of July 22, 1954]

UNITED STATES AND THE ANTARCTIC

The Senate Armed Services Committee will have a last chance today, at the present session of Congress, to start another American expedition rolling toward the Antarctic. Senator Case will bring up his bill to lend Government vessels, airplanes, supplies, and equipment to the American Antarctic Association, which proposes to send an expedition of 36 men under Capt. Finn Ronne to spend a couple of years in the Gould Bay area. The explorers would give their first attention to mapping a huge unknown region about the size of the United States.

Captain Ronne is an old hand at Antarctic exploration. His father was with Amundsen when he discovered the South Pole in 1911, and Captain Ronne himself has been a member of three expeditions to the frozen polar continent. The most recent American expedition in 1946–48 was under his leadership. Obviously Captain Ronne is well qualified to direct the new venture, and it is merely a question of whether Congress wishes to support the expedition to the extent of lending equipment and authorizing an expenditure of $200,000.

The Antarctic is still a land of mystery, but enough is known about it to indicate that it may have great value in the future. Some coal has been discovered, and a large copper deposit with higher grade ore than that yielded by the great open-cut mine in Utah. Geological exploration is an important part of Captain Ronne's proposal, with the hope that new sources of uranium as well as other minerals may be found.

The United States has never taken an imperialistic attitude toward the Antarctic. In 1948 this country proposed internationalization of the area, but got no favorable response from other interested nations. The State Department is not now proposing to stake out any official claims, but it does recognize the need for continuing exploration by Americans in the frozen continent. Great Britain, Australia, France, Norway, Chile, and Argentina are occupying Antarctic bases and conducting research there. As a means of protecting its interests and adding to general knowledge about the Antarctic, the United States needs to send a competent group of explorers there, and Captain Ronne has offered a reasonable opportunity of doing so.

[From the Washington Evening Star of July 26, 1954]

BACK TO THE WHITE CONTINENT

The lure of the White Continent is more than Adm. Richard E. Byrd can withstand, even though he is now at the age when men of more sedentary habits go into retirement. Three trips of exploration to Antarctica have served only to stimulate his interest in the south polar regions. After his return from the 1947 expedition he made it clear that he was determined to go back to the bleak, cold wastes at the bottom of the world. His announcement of plans for organizing another exploration party has come as no surprise to his friends, therefore.

Admiral Byrd is known to have a sentimental attachment for the south polar land of icy ridges, high winds and low temperatures. But more than the spirit of romantic adventure is behind his desires to know more about this remote area. He told a Cleveland audience that economic and strategic considerations are involved in his latest plans. The Arctic is a pathway for aerial travel—or attack—over the top of the world. The Antarctic, Admiral Byrd pointed out, is a gateway between the South Atlantic and the South Pacific for ships in the event of destruction of the Panama Canal. The nation which controls this gateway, he said, will control the movement of vital shipping in such an emergency.

Of no less importance to the world, however, are the untapped natural resources of the vast continent. There was a time when such precious minerals as gold and silver were foremost in the thoughts of those who weighed the economic worth of the Antarctic. Coal, iron, and copper also may be in abundance beneath the thick sheath of ice that covers the land. More recently the prospects of uranium deposits have been mentioned by geologists in several countries. Admiral Byrd mentioned the importance of finding new sources of uranium. He indicated a search for such strategic materials would be conducted.

The admiral gave no details about his new expedition. Several years ago he sought Federal aid in financing and sponsoring a fourth. visit to the South Pole. A pending bill to give Federal assistance to another Antartic expedition—that of Capt. Finn Ronne—has not gotten very far. But, if Admiral Byrd is correct in his estimate of the strategic and economic potentialities of the weird continent which the Star's Tom Henry so vividly described in his recent book, the Government ought to give an adequate measure of support to such new ventures.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of July 28, 1954]

ANTARCTIC CLAIMS

I have come to Washington only recently, although I have always lived on the eastern seaboard. Since coming here I have heard some talk about the possibility of the United States claiming land in Antarctica, but I have seen nothing whatsoever in newspapers (except some letters) until this morning, when I noted your editorial.

Although I am not a student of the subject, as probably your editorial writer is, nevertheless, I cannot go along with him on the use of the word "imperialistic," as he seems to use it in implying that if the United States did claim land in the Antarctic we would be imperialistic. This would not be so. A glance at United States history indicates that we bend over backward in not being imperialistic. We have withdrawn from Japan, we gave up the Philippines, voluntarily; sometimes we almost seem to be withdrawing from Hawaii and Alaska. We have been only lukewarm about claiming Pacific Islands that we had the opportunity to claim. Our history indicates that we have not ever been imperialistic and the word does not, in my opinion, even enter the Antarctic picture.

From what I have heard and read, some of our early sealers saw the Antarctic Continent. Since those old days, Americans have done a great deal of exploring down there. According to your editorial we would do some more. All this, I gather, is on land herefore not explored by other countries, at least not to the extent it has been explored by us. Surely, claiming the land we ourselves have explored would have no taint of imperialism, and this is especially true because there are no natives.

Sidney Kasmir.

Washington.

[From the Washington Evening Star of August 4, 1954]

UNITED STATES NEGLECTS ANTARCTIC

If I can believe what I have read lately and what I have heard regarding the lack of United States expeditions to the Antarctic, it seems to me that there is some very strange thinking going on somewhere. If the United States has technical know-how, if the United States has able seamen, if the United States has any wealth at all, then why under the sun do we neglect the Antarctic while other nations are, and have been, busy there?

I do not exactly see how other nations can afford bases and expeditions down there if we cannot. It is very strange. If there really is an Antarctic continent, and if we really have explored there, then why can we not claim land there, look it over for resources, etc.?

Why should men of the caliber of Byrd and Ronne have to make any effort at all to arrange expeditions? The Federal Government can spend money to entertain visiting diplomats, to raise monuments to deceased dignitaries, to celebrate past feats of daring and accomplishment, such as the Wright Brothers' adventure. Why then cannot the Federal Government finance a few Antarctic expeditions and bases for the United States, even to the tune of several millions? Even if the expedition brought back only meager knowledge of resources, it would be a worthwhile project in the sense of proving the United States awake. I understand that intense activity will take place in the field of science in both polar regions in 1957—the International Polar Year. Fine. But why wait in the matter of United States expeditions? Are we to remain asleep until 1957?

Sidney Kasmir.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of August 4, 1954]

UNITED STATES AND THE ANTARCTIC

Your July 22 editorial on the "United States and the Antarctic" brings to the attention of the public the importance of a proposed exploring expedition which is most important but which I have not seen mentioned in the press previously.

The United States has good claim to parts of the great Antarctic continent by reason of our early explorations there, yet our State Department in 100 years has not established our rights there. Your editorial states that the State Department is not now proposing to stake out any claim to the areas we have discovered.

Future articles by you might arouse the public to what the United States is losing by inaction.

Adm. Wm. Rea Furlong, *Retired.*

Washington.

[From the Washington Evening Star of August 5, 1954]

ANTARCTIC EXPEDITION

I certainly was pleased to see the Star carry an editorial about the Antarctic. For some time I have taken an interest in the matter as it has been presented to various members of Congress, but as the press has seemingly ignored the question heretofore it really was good to see some attention paid in your paper. Of course, I have noted the writings of Thomas Henry, but he expresses no editorial opinion pro or con regarding the proposed expeditionary activities. You hit the nail on the head when you declared that the Government certainly should be able to provide adequately for some sort of Antarctic expedition. The sooner the better, I say.

Interested Citizen.

[From the Washington Evening Star of August 20, 1954]

ANTARCTIC EXPEDITION

Since your excellent editorial was printed regarding a proposed Antarctic expedition, I have been pleased to note the Senate Armed Services Committee adopted a resolution to send to President Eisenhower urging that "an expedition be undertaken at the earliest possible date, under the direction of the President, for the purpose of validating the territorial claims of the United States, etc."

Surely Chairman Saltonstall and members of the committee passing this notable resolution may well merit the gratitude of their own constituents and of all United States citizens. Such example of looking forward in the interests of the United States may mean much in our future.

It is to be hoped that our President knows of the growing grass-roots interest in Antarctic matters. As Senator Wiley recently said on the floor of the Senate, we must "not lose sight of the great Antarctic frontier." The junior chamber of commerce has recently joined the growing number of national organizations that have passed resolutions expressing interest in the Antarctic. Jaycees in national convention in June at Colorado Springs passed a resolution by two-thirds majority which stated, in part, that they "recomemend that the United States Government take immediate and necessary steps to continue charting the Antarctic regions and establish its rightful and just claims to all areas explored by the United States of America." It may well interest Star readers to know that Maryland Jaycees submitted the resolution in the first place.

Among other national organizations that have passed some such expressions of opinion are the DAR, SAR, and National Sojourners.

E. A. Kendall.

[From the National Bulletin, the Military Order of the World Wars, for September 1951]

OUR STAKE IN THE ANTARCTIC CONTINENT

We have been anything but attentive to our duty to future America in the matter of our sovereignty over parts of Antarctica. Many arduous days of exploration and discovery have resulted in claims of land for the United States which a timid or neglectful Government has failed to declare as ours.

Long before the World War there was an attempt to have an assertion made of our sovereignty over certain islands of the South Pacific based on early American discovery. But nothing was done, so during World War II we had the spectacle of the British claiming islands on which our Navy and American whalers had been the first to lay claim but without action by our Government to assert our sovereignty.

On July 13, 1951, Representative Tollefson introduced House Joint Resolution 291, declaring the right of sovereignty of the United States over certain areas of the Antarctic Continent based on discoveries by United States nationals and by expeditions carrying the United States flag.

The resolution has been referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, of the House of Representatives. It is hoped that our usual timidity will not prevent a declaration of sovereignty by our Congress.

William Rea Furlong.

A Tribute to Robert Crosser on His Departure from Congress

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the farewell to my good friend Bob Crosser awakens in me a deep sense of sorrow for in him I have had always an adviser, a leader, and a friend.

Nearly always we voted together as liberals, as progressives, especially so in legislation pertaining to the great railway brotherhoods and their members for whom Bob spoke and carried on even before my arrival on the scene in this Chamber 22 years ago. He was my guide and I voted with him because he was railway labor's outstanding friend, and I had confidence in the course he outlined. In turn the dean of Ohio's congressional delegation consulted and voted with me in matters pertaining to taxes, social security, and other important measures brought forth by the Committee on Ways and Means.

I shall miss him as will so many of you. He will never be forgotten because of the splendid service he rendered unto all the people of this Nation, and particularly to Ohio and his own district. He will be succeeded by another, but never quite replaced, for the Crosser course was always lofty, but not always the easiest to follow.

Good luck Bob, and may God bless and keep you always safe and happy.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Printing and binding for Congress, when recommended to be done by the Committee on Printing of either House, shall be so recommended in a report containing an approximate estimate of the cost thereof, together with a statement from the Public Printer of estimated approximate cost of work previously ordered by Congress within the fiscal year (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 145, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on Printing, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

DISTRIBUTION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

To the Vice President and each Senator 100 copies; to the Secretary and Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, each, 25 copies; to the Secretary, for official use, not to exceed 35 copies; to the Sergeant at Arms, for use on the floor of the Senate, not to exceed 50 copies; to each Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress, 68 copies; to the Clerk, Sergeant at Arms, and Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives, each, 25 copies; to the Clerk, for official use, not to exceed 50 copies; and to the Doorkeeper, for use on the floor of the House of Representatives, not to exceed 75 copies; to the Vice President and each Senator, Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress there shall also be furnished (and shall not be transferable), 3 copies of the daily Record, of which 1 shall be delivered at his residence, 1 at his office, and 1 at the Capitol.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided,* That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized book dealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by book dealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the Congressional Record is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Frank Brodie is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the Record at $1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

PRINTING DOCUMENTS AND REPORTS

Documents and reports of committees with the evidence and papers submitted therewith, or any part thereof ordered printed by Congress, may be reprinted by the Public Printer on order of any Member of Congress or Delegate, on prepayment of the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 162, p. 1940).

PRICE OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

The Public Printer is authorized to furnish to subscribers the daily Record at $1.50 per month, payable in advance.

Remit by money order payable to Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the Record.

Appendix

A Report to South Dakota From Your Senator

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD my report to the people of South Dakota regarding the achievements of the current session of the 83d Congress and its effect on the State of South Dakota.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

As we near the end of another session of Congress, I want to follow my custom of making a report to the people of South Dakota concerning some of the achievements of special interest to our State which have taken place during the current session of Congress.

In a way, this has been an unusual session of Congress in that it is only the second Republican Congress to sit in Washington since 1930 at which time the Republicans lost control of Congress to the opposition party midway in the administration of President Hoover. In addition, this session of Congress has been the first Republican Congress to serve under a Republican President for nearly a quarter of a century. Thus a report on its activities and accomplishments is something of more than normal interest to all Americans.

If I were asked to select a single word to characterize the record of this 83d Congress—this Republican Congress working together with President Dwight D. Eisenhower—I would select the term "active." It has been one of the most active sessions of Congress and one passing more legislation of direct benefit to more people than any to convene in Washington since the turn of the century.

Very definitely it has been a "do-something" hard working constructive session of Congress. Credit for its remarkable record of achievement must go to both Democratic and Republican Members of Congress since the margin of majority in both Houses was so slender that it took bipartisan support by both Democrats and Republicans to pass virtually every item on our agenda of achievement. In freely extending these words of commendation to our Democratic colleagues, I do not detract one iota from the great credit due President Eisenhower, himself, and to Speaker MARTIN of the House of Representatives and to Majority Leader KNOWLAND of the United States Senate. Indeed, in this great record of achievement there is credit enough for all.

It can honestly be reported to the good folks of South Dakota that this 83d Congress was in a very true sense "a peoples' Congress." No one segment of our economy, no one section of the country, no one political party, and no one class or group such as labor, agriculture, industry, small business, or the professions was singled out for special treatment or favored considerations. Under the leadership of that great American whom millions of our citizens call "Ike," this Congress kept its eye on the general welfare of all the people and its record clearly demonstrates that its goal was in fact "a fair chance for a free people" rather than favors for some and penalties for others.

Of course, the greatest achievement of the first 20 months of the Eisenhower administration was one for which Congress cannot alone claim credit. I refer, naturelly, to the ending of the Korean war and the development of foreign policies which have helped bring to all the world the global peace for which all of us, regardless of party, have for so long hoped and prayed. Had President Eisenhower done nothing else than to provide the needed world leadership to bring order out of chaos, to present a firm front against Communist aggression, to put an end to the blood letting in Korea, and to start the welcome homeward trek of American boys in uniform from far-flung battle lines to their homes on the farms and in the towns and cities of America he would go down in history as a President of remarkable achievement.

Not since the opening days of World War II, have we had actual world peace until the ending of the Korean war followed by the peace settlement in Indochina brought to people everywhere the blessings of peace and the prospect for orderly world affairs. While the menace of imperialistic, warlike, and aggressive communism still haunts the world the fact that for the first time for a quarter of a century it can be reported in August of 1954 that no armies anywhere are shooting and killing the defenders of another country is indeed most encouraging evidence of the accomplishments of President Eisenhower and Secretary Dulles in world leadership. The implementation of these foreign policies by congressional resolutions, by appropriations, and by legislative acts ranks high among the achievements also of this 83d Congress.

Turning to specific accomplishments which should be brought to the attention of Americans everywhere, Mr. President, permit me now to list in separate sections some of the achievements of this Republican 83d Congress and the Eisenhower administration which are of special interest to the great farm State of South Dakota:

Indicative of the validity of using the term "action" as the best word in the English language to describe the record of the 83d Congress is the fact for example that on four separate fronts this session of Congress took action on problems on which earlier sessions of Congress have done nothing but talk for many, many years. For over 20 years, Congresses have talked and Presidents have proclaimed about the desirability of building the St. Lawrence seaway which ultimately will make a salt-water port of Duluth, Minn., and greatly reduce transportation rates for heavy freight moving in and out of South Dakota. However no Congressional action ever materialized until this year when with Eisenhower's urging from the White House and Members of Congress working "on the Hill" the legislation authorizing the building of the great seaway finally and firmly became law.

Likewise with taxes. This session of Congress passed the first major tax-reform legislation in 75 years. Others had talked of the need of simplifying income-tax returns, of giving tax credits to farmers and small-business men on the same basis as have long been enjoyed by large industries and corporations, and of extending other credits and considerations to hard pressed taxpayers all along the line. Again, the tax reform proposals never got beyond the talking stage until the 83d Congress under the leadership of Secretary of the Treasury George Humphrey actually went to work developing the correctives. As a result, taxpayers paying taxes in 1955 will be both surprised and gratified by the many new concessions and reductions accorded them. In addition, new studies are already underway for the purpose of adding still more correctives and concessions in the next session of Congress. All of this was made possible, of course, only because of the vigorous economy program of President Eisenhower's administration and the sharp decreases in Federal expenditures both at home and abroad. For example, we already have more than 245,000 fewer employees on the Federal payroll than when President Eisenhower took office.

Highways are as essential to the growth and development of farm and community opportunities, today, as railroads were 100 years ago. Hence, this Congress devoted itself to that problem and as a result the largest highway building program in American history was voted by Congress and signed by President Eisenhower. Special emphasis was placed on farm-to-market roads as was right and proper. In addition, President Eisenhower has recently announced advocacy of a still larger and more extensive program of improving the Nation's highways. As every American shares in the increased safety and convenience of motoring and the availability of roads leading to market, this is a national program of direct benefit to every American citizen.

The fourth important action area of the 83d Congress as contrasted with the talkative pattern of earlier Congresses was the legislation establishing a West Point of the air in the form of a new national Academy to train young men for flight duty with America's growing Air Force. This has been talked about by many Congresses as our national defense has come to rely increasingly upon aviation and its associated activities. Not until President Eisenhower and the Republican 83d Congress came along, however, was action secured. Like West Point and Annapolis, this new National Air Academy will be something of which all Americans can take pride and training in which will be something to which many young Americans can confidently aspire.

AGRICULTURE

Speaking as a member of the Senate Committee on Agriculture, Mr. President, and as a South Dakotan representing one of the great agriculture States of the Union, I am convinced that agriculture is America's basic industry. The success of farming underlies the prosperity of our entire economy. I think it is correct to say, "As the prosperity of agriculture goes, so goes the prosperity of our entire Nation."

I was personally disappointed that Congress by a narrow majority adopted a price-support range of crop loans running from 82½ to 90 percent of parity for the 6 basic crops in place of the straight-across-the-board, 90-percent price-support loans which I advocated and which have been in effect for some time. I was one of those who worked and talked and fought and voted for an extension of the 90-percent price-support formula.

In fact, it was my vote as a member of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry which gave us the 8 to 7 majority in committee to report out favorably the 90-percent price-support extension provisions. I was also a member of the group writing the strong committee report favoring the continuance of 90-percent price supports on the basic farm commodities of corn, wheat, rice, tobacco, peanuts, and cotton. However, on the Senate floor we fell short by 5 votes of having sufficient support to have our committee bill adopted and those favoring a sliding range running from 82½ to 90 percent of parity defeated us by a narrow margin of votes.

The final action by Congress was secured by bipartisan action by those representing areas on the west and east coasts and by those representing city constituents. There was much crossing of party lines and on both the Democratic and Republican side of the center aisle were found active proponents as well as vigorous opponents of the 90-percent provisions. As Newsweek reported the farm vote, "it cut party lines into ribbons."

The determining factor was the area of the country from which a Senator or Representative came rather than the political party to which he belonged. Actually the strongest and most effective opponents of our 90-percent price-support position were 2 Democrats and 1 Republican: Senator Clint Anderson, New Mexico, Democrat; Senator Spessard Holland, Florida, Democrat; and Senator George Aiken, Vermont, Republican. This so-called big three of our Senate Agriculture Committee have long led the fight for so-called flexible price supports.

On the other hand, the strongest and most effective supporters of the 90 percent price support extension were also recruited from both political parties. They included Senator Milton Young, of North Dakota, Senator Ed Thye, of Minnesota, both Republicans; and Senator Hubert Humphrey, of Minnesota, and Senator Allen Ellender, of Louisiana, both Democrats. All are members of our Senate Agricultural Committee. In that capacity, I was happy to join with the foregoing Senators and others of my colleagues in waging the best fight we could to support the extension of 90 percent price supports on our basic farm commodities.

As I stated immediately after the Senate vote, a single defeat on a single vote is not going to end the battle for farm parity. That fight shall and will go on. We are already at work planning amendments to be introduced in the next session of Congress to move toward the goal of securing for every farmer in America the full parity income to which he is entitled.

While our efforts in this session did not result in a total victory neither were they marked by total defeat. The Anderson-Aiken-Holland group had favored sliding price supports ranging from 75 percent of parity to 90 percent. On the other hand, the Young-Thye-Humphrey-Ellender-Mundt group had votes enough to defeat that proposal. Hence, in last-minute strategy those opposing the 90 percent price supports extension modified their position and moved to raise their price support proposal upward so that the bottom level would be 82½ percent rather than 75 percent of parity. By this strategy they picked up enough additional votes to defeat our straight 90 percent proposal but the compromise of course means that price supports on basics must be set at 82½ percent or higher and that they cannot drop below that halfway point between 75 and 90. While we did not get all we fought for this will give us the highest price supports in peacetime American history.

There is another element of real hope for the future of farming in the big Senate debate on agriculture and the final action that was taken. Advocates both of the sliding scale ranging from 82½ to 90 percent and of the straight 90 percent price support extension on the 6 basic commodities (of which only corn and wheat are produced in South Dakota) publicly expressed their desire and determination that farmers should receive full parity income. That means that while the price of any single commodity might range below parity the prices of other commodities must be enough above parity so that the whole income picture of the farmer should attain 100 percent parity with that of his city cousins working in industry or operating industrial enterprises. It is encouraging to realize that the fight for parity has at least been won to the extent that Senators and Representatives from all farming sections of the country now advocate the desirability of developing programs designed to give the farm family full parity.

The dispute and the argument is all about methods. Some argue that flexible supports for the basics with other programs designed to help producers of the nonbasic farm products will more quickly give the farmer 100 percent parity income for his full farm operation than will a program of 90 percent straight-out price supports for the basic commodities. Since this theory is now to be given an opportunity to test itself in actual practice (between the price ranges of 82½ to 90 percent), I naturally hope that it will work and that as a result farmers can start receiving a fair price for a full crop without the necessity of curtailing production and of having many acres of their farm tract lying idle in each crop year. Obviously, even 100 percent price supports for wheat, for example, will not provide a farmer with full parity income if he is required to leave from 20 to 40 percent of his wheat acres lying unproductive every year.

At best, such a 100-percent price-support program would result in a "parity income" for that farmer of from only 80 to 60 persent insofar as his wheat acreage is concerned. What is needed is a program to produce 100 percent parity income from the farm—and that will require that all of a farmer's acres contribute to his income and that all of his products sell at prices which will average out at parity. It remains my personal conviction, Mr. President, that the program of 90 percent price supports which I supported is best designated to produce this result until we can evolve and legislate some better formula for farm prosperity. However, if the revised program will do the job, I shall be among the first to salute it. If it does not do the job, however, I shall remain among those insisting that we replace it with a program which will result in our farmers receiving the 100 percent parity income they deserve. As a member of the very important Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, I pledge myself to this assignment. The fight for parity will go on until its objectives are achieved.

Quite apart from the big debate over the best method to employ to assure our farmers of parity income, this 83d Congress has taken some very important and noteworthy steps to benefit the American farmer. In fact, except for the change in the parity-producing formula, I would label this Congress one of America's best insofar as producing helpful results for our farmers is concerned.

Let me list here, sir, a few of these helpful steps which this Congress and President Eisenhower have taken during the past 20 months which are certain to make farming more attractive and more profitable. Of special note are several actions by Congress enabling the farmer to keep on the farm more of the income which he receives for his labors and his products. After all, stay-on-the-farm income for the farmer is all that actually counts. Whenever the tax collector or the manufacturer takes from the farmer an undue amount of what he gets for his products, he is decreasing the farmer's stay-on-the-farm income and depriving him of money he needs to support and educate his family. Our farmers are not simply interested in handling a lot of money—what they want and need is a program of economic life which will enable them to keep on the farm and in their family bank account the money required to prosper and to get ahead. This Congress has moved rapidly and far in the direction of enabling the Nation's farmers to retain for themselves more of the money that they take in.

Included in the new farm bill, for example, are many features of which South Dakota farmers generally are certain to approve once they learn all the details. Let me list some of them here: (1) Wool is an important product in South Dakota—this new bill for the first time provides price supports for well up to 110 percent of parity in an all-out effort to increase American wool production and to make woolgrowing attractive and profitable. (2) Agricultural surpluses have been placed in a setaside category to the tune of $2½ billion in surpluses. Henceforth they will not be figured in acreage allotments, in parity formula, or in determining price supports. Instead they are earmarked for use in war emergencies, in famine relief, for foreign aid, for school-lunch programs, drought relief in the United States of America, and for charitable institutions and undertakings. (3) South Dakota farmers and others practicing summer fallowing will be gratified to learn that the new farm bill makes special provisions for them by providing "bonus acres" to be planted to wheat as compared with areas where summer fallowing is now regularly practiced. (4) To further assist small farmers next year unclaimed acres will be redistributed within the county to farmers with the smallest tracts and farming the smaller farms. (5) The new farm bill also for the first time sets up "commercial wheat areas" which will mean great benefits for South Dakota wheat producers since it takes out of the wheat picture altogether those areas of the country raising only small patches of wheat for domestic feed purposes.

As I stated earlier, I did not vote for this new farm bill because I am dedicated to the extension of 90-percent price supports for our basic commodities until such time as I am convinced a better farm program is available. I shall continue my fight for parity for the American farmer in the next Congress. It is, however, only fair to point out that the five factors in the new farm bill which I have mentioned above are important steps in the direction of developing permanent farm prosperity and in providing conditions which will help our farmers achieve the full parity which they deserve and require. They are indeed five important steps in the right direction, and as a member of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry I voted for all of them in committee and, in fact, helped to develop and write some of them which are of special importance to South Dakota.

FARMERS RECEIVE OTHER ASSISTS FROM 83D CONGRESS

In addition, our American farmers have received still other direct benefits from the Eisenhower administration and from this Republican 83d Congress. As the full program of Congress is carefully studied and understood, it will be realized that a great deal has been accomplished in providing our farmers with that cherished goal of "peace with prosperity" and "progress with freedom."

In fact, from the standpoint of "stay-on-the-farm-income"—and I repeat, that is the income which really counts and which actually helps the farmer—this Republican 83d Congress has granted concessions and established rights for the American farmer which he has never before had. I am mighty happy to have been among those supporting these new "assists" which are going to mean so much to American agriculture.

Permit me to list some of these new farm benefits at this point: (1) The new tax reduction bill for the first time gives the farmers of America the rights and privileges to depreciate the farm machinery and equipment which they buy as the same fast depreciation rate for tax purposes that the Democratic Congresses have for the past several years provided to the large corporations producing farm machinery, equipment, and supplies. To farmers purchasing large supplies of equipment, this can save the average farmer many hundreds of dollars and will, alone, more than compensate for a few cents per bushel less income which peacetime prices may bring in as against the higher prices always accompanying a bloody war. (2) Also, I am the author of an amendment which passed the Congress enabling farmers to deduct from taxes the cost of replacement animals which they must buy to compensate for animals which are condemned and must be sold because of epedemic animal diseases. (3) The new Republican tax measure contains another even more important tax concession for the American farmer. Now for the first time when he pays his taxes the farmer can deduct the money he has spent for soil and water-conservation practices up to a full 25 percent of his total farm income. Thus many conservation-minded farmers will be enabled to engage in soil and water-conservation practices who could never afford to do so before and hundreds of dollars will be used in rebuilding their productive acres instead of going to the tax collector.

Economists predict that the completion of the St. Lawrence seaway will increase the price received by South Dakota farmers as much as 15 cents per bushel since the low-water rate of shipping grain to eastern terminals is so much cheaper than the high costs of railway transportation. This is positive, definite farm aid which continues in peacetime or war, in good economic times or bad. While Democratic Presidents promised this for years, they failed to authorize this seaway. President Eisenhower and the Republican 83d Congress faithfully kept their promises and now the long-hoped for seaway is to become a reality. Already there is talk of cheaper freight rates to South Dakota farmers as the railroads prepare to meet this new form of transportation competition and before the year is out we may well begin to realize cash dividends from this constructive Republican action.

As every farmer knows, there has been a drop in farm prices which began even before the end of the Korean war which was brought to a halt by President Eisenhower in keeping with his campaign promise. For example, from 1951 to 1953—the last 2 years of the Truman administration—farm prices dropped from 113 percent of parity (their wartime level) to 94 percent of parity, with the war still raging in Korea. That was a drop in the last 2 years of the Truman administration of 19 percent. Since that time and since President Eisenhower took office, peace has replaced war but the great drop in farm prices which had been predicted with the coming of peace did not take place. Instead, farm prices have dropped from the 94-percent level prevailing in the war-ridden months at the end of the Truman administration to a range running from 93 to 88 percent, with an average of 92 percent of parity for the first 2 years of the Eisenhower administration during which time peace has come not only to America but to the entire world.

Thus even in time of peace the sharp slide of farm prices starting in 1951 has been virtually stopped and the price range has leveled off. Our next job, of course, is to start the trend of farm prices upward again but this time we are determined to do it without war. We must not trade our boys for bank accounts. Blood money is not the goal of any American farmer.

For too many years we have been trying to build our American economy on borrowed money and on bleeding men. President Eisenhower is determined to provide peace with prosperity; progress with freedom; security with solvency. In a short 20 months, he is already making great strides toward those goals.

REA AND RTA

As a member of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, I am happy to report that the 83d Congress has supplied more money for REA loans than was available during the past 2 years of the Democratic administration. In fact, we have supplied more money than the REA co-ops have required and more than they have been able to use but I think this is wise procedure because we must always be ready for emergencies and ready for such new developments as atomic power and the development of additional transmission lines.

From the standpoint of rural telephone improvement, the Republican 83d Congress is the unchallenged and unchallengeable "champion of them all." In fact for the improvement of rural telephones, the 83d Congress has provided more money than all other American Congresses combined. As a member of the Appropriations Subcommittee providing funds for RTA, I, personally, made the motion to provide some of these extra funds and I take real pride in the fact that South and North Dakota now lead the entire Nation in the rate at which our rural telephone service is being improved. All those who read this report need do is to talk with South Dakota farmers who have applied for rural telephone loans to realize what a real friend the Republican 83d Congress has proved to be to those desiring modernized telephone service.

OTHER DIVIDENDS FROM SOUND, HONEST, LOYAL GOVERNMENT

I must admit that in this report to South Dakota I have talked mostly about agriculture and about governmental measures and policies of special interest to farmers. That is because South Dakota is the most agricultural State in the Union and my main interest in the Senate is to help produce and maintain farm prosperity. That is why I prize so highly my position on the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and the fact that the subcommittees on which I serve as a member of the Senate Committee on Appropriations deal mainly with such South Dakota matters as river development, REA and RTA, soil conservation, reclamation, Indian affairs, weed eradication, agricultural research, and similar activities in which South Dakotans have a special interest.

However, the Eisenhower administration and the Republican 83d Congress—this new Republican team of which so much has been said and written—has a great record of achievement in the general field of good government.

Let me list here, in quick summary, some of the outstanding accomplishments which resulted from the fact that in November 1952, the American voters put an end to Trumanism and placed in the White House one of the greatest of our alltime Americans—Dwight D. Eisenhower, who is affectionately called Ike by millions of his fellow citizens.

1. The terrible war in Korea has been ended and in the month of August peace was brought to the entire world for the first time in 25 years as the Indochina war was also brought to a close without the involvement of America or the loss of a single American soldier.

2. Despite the prophets of gloom and despair, we have moved from war into a peacetime economy without suffering from either a recession or a depression. Construction is taking place at an alltime high. We have the highest employment of any year in our peacetime history with more men working for more pay than ever before. That makes for a good market and helps account for the record-breaking consumption of such farm products as beef and pork.

3. Federal spending has been sharply reduced. We already have more than 240,000 fewer people working on the Federal payroll than when Eisenhower took office. Your Government is costing you less so you can keep more of what you earn to spend on your own family and for your own needs.

4. Taxes have been sharply reduced. Nearly a billion dollars a year have been cut off from the so-called excise taxes alone. These are the Federal sales taxes which Democratic Congresses imposed and which are paid in part when you buy a watch or a suitcase or a ticket to travel or a ticket to the movies and which are paid in part, indirectly, as they are "covered in" on the cost of an automobile, a suit of clothes, or anything else you have to buy. In addition, your income taxes were dropped on an average of 10 percent and many special exemptions and considerations were given the so-called little taxpayer. In all, $7,400,000,000 have been saved the Nation's taxpayers of which $4,700,000,000 is saved to the individual taxpayer. This is the first tax reduction bill since the Republican 80th Congress made a cut in taxes.

5. Building the St. Lawrence seaway—a project which will save every South Dakota citizen money as he buys heavy products shipped in from the east and which will increase his income on everything he raises and ships east.

6. Conservation and REA and RTA: These vast achievements I have previously mentioned, Mr. President, but the 83d Congress has well been called the most conservation-minded Congress since the days of Teddy Roosevelt. And our record on REA and RTA is above all criticism.

7. Honesty has been restored to Government. Once again public office has become a public trust. Perhaps this can be demonstrated by the fact the Chamber ofCommerce in Washington reports that since the inauguration of President Eisenhower, "Sales of whisky have fallen off 25 percent and the sale of alarm clocks has increased by 35 percent in the District of Columbia."

8. President Eisenhower pledged himself to get the Communists out of Government. The statistics show that since he took the oath of office he has removed from the Federal payroll 2,486 security risks which the FBI and other security agencies reported would jeopardize our security and endanger our peace if they remained in office. All 2,486 of these faithless Americans and Communist agents were placed in office by either the Fair Deal or the New Deal, but, like George Washington, President Eisenhower believes that "only Americans should be placed on guard" in public office.

9. Veterans' benefits and social security benefits have been greatly increased under the new administration. Benefits to our elderly citizens have been expanded as much as $25 per month.

10. Price and wage controls were ended by the 83d Congress so that markets could be reopened for our farm products and so that workingmen could again have a full and fair opportunity to get ahead and to care for their families.

11. Special attention was devoted to the highway situation in America. We passed the first billion dollar highway improvement program in our Nation's history. Much of this was earmarked for improvement of farm-to-market roads and many millions of dollars from this appropriation will be utilized in South Dakota.

12. Benefits for farmers: Except for the "no decision" fight fought over price sup-

port levels, as I have previously stated, this 83d Congress has compiled a tremendous record of tax concessions, conservation aids, and overall farm benefits looking to the permanent prosperity of our American farmers. Among other things, more effective steps have been taken to keep out competitive farm imports than at any time in the past 20 years. No change was made in the price support program for nonbasics and the Department of Agriculture has announced that next year corn will again be supported at 90 percent. Thus, in South Dakota, only wheat has been effected by the new legislation and it is reported that wheat will be supported at $2.05 per bushel. I insist we must find a better support level and provide better prices for wheat producers and I pledge myself to continue the fight for full parity income for the American farmer. In the meantime, we can be gratified that our farm bloc was able to defeat the effort to substitute flexible price supports ranging from 75 percent to 90 percent of parity for our prevailing farm program.

13. National defense: In this dangerous era of Communist aggression and of Russian imperialism, it is good to know that President Eisenhower has brought a New Look to our national defense establishments. Our defense is costing us sharply less but our defenses against aggression have been greatly strengthened. We lead the world in jet planes, in electronic defenses, and in fighting strength in the air and on the sea. Boys are no longer being drafted from their homes to fight in foreign lands and not since the days of George Washington has our Nation had a leader as able as President Eisenhower to protect our peace and to safeguard our national security. Here is a President who is respected and admired throughout the world and if given adequate and proper support he is indeed, the world's best hope for peace.

I have listed only 12 of the 54 significant achievements of the Eisenhower administration and the 83d Congress which is about to adjourn. The Eisenhower batting average is 0.830 percent—a mighty fine batting average unequaled by any big league batter in American baseball history. Of the 64 Eisenhower proposals, 54 of them have been enacted into law by this Republican 83d Congress.

As a freshman Member of the Senate, like all other freshman Senators, I have had to start "at the low end of the totem pole" on my committee assignments, through lack of the seniority which comes with a second and third term in the Senate. However, my years of experience in the House of Representatives helped me to get committee assignments so I now hold envied positions on three very important Senate committees—Appropriations, Agriculture, and the Republican policy committee. I am grateful for these significant assignments and it has been a pleasure to work with my older and more experienced colleagues, shoulder to shoulder, in advancing our legislative record. I am also grateful for my assignment to the Committee on Government Operations, which "rides herd" on wasteful spending and stands guard against dishonesty and disloyalty in government. As a member of that committee, I was able to help push through to successful passage the bill to deny to Alger Hiss a Federal pension when he is dismissed from the Federal penitentiary, where my efforts in the House, along with those of now Vice President Nixon, helped to place him.

In Government, there is no substitute for experience insofar as service in Congress is concerned. I am sure I have made my fair share of mistakes in the past, as have we all, but I assure you they were mistakes of the head and not of the heart. I shall try to improve my personal batting average as experience gives me additional insight and judgment. In conclusion, Mr. President, I congratulate this Congress and President Eisenhower on the fact that by working together in harness this team has made a record of achievement which ranks high among that of all American Congresses. Out of the dark days and nights of the Korean war, this team has brought us into the broad daylight of world peace. And it has made the passage from war to peace without serious economic repercussions and without the customary postwar depression. With peace in the world and with continuing prosperity at home, we can all look forward to an era of increasing opportunity for all the people of America.

When I first ran for Congress I set as my goal the determination to help provide "a fair chance for a free people" in America. Our freedoms remain intact. The spirit of liberty and independence which settled this continent and made us the leader of the modern world still functions in our cherished Republic. Toward these goals the 83d Congress has indeed contributed much. As we approach adjournment, we can take satisfaction in our work as we rededicate ourselves to still greater and more fruitful results in the years ahead.

The Appropriation Bills

SPEECH

OF

HON. CLARENCE CANNON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, standing here on this floor, I have witnessed the close of 53 sessions of the United States Congress. And this is the gloomiest close of any session of the Congress I have attended in those 44 years.

Both at home and abroad, we are confronted with failure of American policies and a consequent menace to American prosperity and security unprecedented in the history of our Government from 1784 down to the present day.

Abroad our prestige and influence is at its lowest ebb.

Here in the House at the close of the fiscal year, we have failed to achieve vital assurances given the American people when Congress met in January of 1953.

When this Congress convened we had unqualified assurance—as announced through the press and from the hustings—by those in a position to speak with authority, that this Congress would balance the budget; that it would reduce the national debt; that it would eliminate deficit spending; that it would enhance the buying power of the dollar; and that it would reduce the cost of living.

President Eisenhower, in his campaign, had promised to reduce spending by 40 percent. Secretary Humphrey had assured us that a balanced budget was possible by July 1. Chairman Taber told the newspapers it would be no trouble to wipe out the anticipated $2.9 billion deficit, and Budget Director Dodge reiterated that there was no qualification of any kind in the Eisenhower administration's determination to balance the budget.

They came in at the opening of the session with a long and ambitious list of promises of drastic retrenchment. As the session proceeded they have had to repeatedly revise their schedule and back away from their widely advertised programs and bring in supplementals to replace the cuts. As the Wall Street Journal disconsolately inquires, "If the 1955 deficit exceeded expectations it is fair to ask when, if ever, the administration proposes to balance the budget."

Today Congress is adjourning and the Government reports that it had gone into the red by $2 billion during the month of July—the first month of the new fiscal year 1955.

This deficit resulted from the expenditure of $4,827,000,000 during the month of July as against receipts of $2,828,000,000.

It is to be noted that this deficit for the first month of the fiscal year 1955 was higher than the deficit for the first month of the fiscal year 1954.

Congress voted $54.3 billion in new money for Federal operations in fiscal 1955, which is $2.6 billion below the budget estimates.

"There have been some bigger cuts but not in recent years," said Chairman Taber. But the 82d Congress is within recent years and the cut below the budget estimates for that year was $10 billion after the last conference report was signed—and then $8.5 billion after the Senate had reopened the appropriation for atomic energy.

Two of the supply bills sent to the White House this session actually appropriated more money than the administration asked. And a third reached the President in exactly the amount he had requested. It has been some time since we heard of the meat ax.

Following the failure of the special squad of business experts drawn from the financial centers of the Nation in the 80th Congress, the system was revised in the 83d Congress. Instead of taking the corporation executives themselves, they mobilized some 29 or more first lieutenants from the big-business units to knock the billions out of the administration's budgets. The identities of these Sherlocks are a carefully guarded secret and there is no way of knowing whether they pass on the amount of the funds for Federal agencies which regulate the business of the investigators under the law, or whether in some instances—notably REA and TVA and so forth—they are recruited from interests which hope to take over the business of the units which they investigate or otherwise promote private enterprises in that particular field. Or whether farm cooperatives and Federal farm agencies are being investigated and criticized by men in the grain or packing industries whose profits are enhanced by low prices for farm products. It is all done in the dark and is strictly a star chamber proceeding.

It is doubtless true, as the chairman explains, that these business representatives are "some of the highest grade people in the country." But their point of view is not necessarily that of the consumers whom the Federal untilities serve or of the Members of the Congress who wrote the laws and established and financed the agencies under investigation. And as has been seen, they were no more successful in balancing the budget than their predecessors in the 80th Congress. In the end the effective work of the hearings had to be turned out by the staff of the committee.

In this connection, it is to be noted that a local paper editorially referred to the passage of the 10 supply bills before June 30, the end of the fiscal year, as a major achievement and the President addressed a letter to the chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations felicitating him on this exceptional accomplishment.

I am always glad to see the House given credit where credit is due. But it must be confessed that the enactment of the supply bills before the end of the fiscal year is a Senate achievement. When we reported the one-package bill in the 81st Congress, it included all bills enacted before the June 30 deadline this year. The committee reported it out March 21 and notwithstanding the obstacles placed in its way, it passed the House May 10—more than a month before the last of the same bills passed the House this year. The only difference was that the Senate, unable to get in many increases, as they did this year, delayed consideration of the bill until August. Had the Senate acted as promptly that year as this year, we would have made a record indeed. So, reluctantly, it must be conceded that the credit is due the Senate rather than the House.

Notwithstanding the assurances of every congressional and administration leader, the budget has not been balanced and there is no indication that it can be balanced in the remaining 2 years of this administration.

And for every deficit expenditure there is a corresponding increase in the national debt. This administration was swept into office on a platform promising an end to deficit spending and a reduction in the national debt. The only attention it has given the subject is to continue deficit financing and to increase the public debt until it was necessary to enact a bill raising the statutory limit on the debt from $275 billion to $290 billion. As a result the purchasing power of the dollar has dropped, the cost of living has increased, the value of government bonds has deteriorated, and the United States Government is that much further along the road to bankruptcy. No more deplorable record has ever been made in the fiscal history of the country.

On March 18 last, I made some remarks in the House on the measure pending at the time to revise the internal-revenue laws of the United States, a revenue-reducing measure. These remarks appropriately apply here and I wish to voice them again. I said:

> Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of tax reduction. I think there can be no Member of the Congress on this floor or on the floor of the other body, who has been or is today more emphatic and insistent in his advocacy of approximate tax reduction.
>
> Both political parties, in their platforms, and every Member of the House and Senate, collectively and individually are committed to tax reduction; have pledged themselves directly or indirectly, to their various constituencies to retrench expenditures, to balance the budget, to lower the national debt and to reduce taxes, especially to reduce taxes.
>
> Notwithstanding these assurances we have not balanced the budget. We are every day consistently spending more than we take in. The national debt is growing steadily, and we are now asked to raise the statutory ceiling on the debt so that we may increase it instead of decreasing it.
>
> Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of lower taxes, not only because we have promised it but because it is imperative if we are to avoid financial and economic castrophe.
>
> But for everything under Heaven there is an appointed season and an appropriate time. "There is a time to weep and a time to laugh. There is a time to mourn and a time to dance." There is a time to levy taxes and a time to reduce taxes.
>
> And this is not the appointed or appropriate time to reduce taxes.
>
> Never before in the history of the Republic, since Hamilton took office as the first Secretary of the Treasury, have our national finances been in such desperate straits. And the situation grows daily progressively worse.
>
> I daresay a majority of the Members of the Congress are on the boards of directors of hometown banks. There are Members of the Congress who are serving today on the boards of directors of some of the greatest banks in the United States. There are many more Members who like myself are on the boards of various small country banks of such limited capacity and resources as to require minute scrutiny of every application for credits and discounts. But there is not a Member here serving on the board of any bank, large or small, who, if the United States were a corporation or an individual, applying for a loan of $5 or $5 billion, would not immediately upon the submission of its statement of financial worth, demand that the applicant immediately come in and start payment on its obligations and promptly and drastically curtail its overdrafts of deficit spending.
>
> And that is what we should do here today. We should provide irrevocably—in this bill or in the next germane bill enacted—that the first $5 billion paid into the Treasury of the United States each fiscal year should be applied as a payment on the national debt. That should be the minimum. Even at that pitiful rate of payment it would require 55 years to liquidate the debt. It would be the year of our Lord 2009 before the last of the bondholders were paid in full. And unless some steps are taken—and taken soon—the bondholders will eventually find themselves with these beautifully engraved certificates fit only to be used as wallpaper along with similar certificates issued by fly-by-night gold-mine promoters and duster oil stocks.
>
> Mr. Chairman, these are times of peace, such as we had from the close of the Second World War in 1945. Let us look at the record of those years. In 1946 we took in $45 million more than we paid out. In 1947 we took in $5 billion more than we paid out. In 1948 we took in $6 billion more than we paid out. In 1950 we took in $450 million more than we paid out, and in 1951 we took in over a billion dollars more than we paid out. But today, with no all-out war, and with the highest national income and highest Federal revenues in history we are spending vastly more money than we take in.
>
> Notwithstanding all our pledges to balance the budget, we are not balancing the budget and there is no prospect that we will balance even next year's budget. At the close of the World War in 1945, the national debt stood in round figures at $279 billion. We steadily reduced that debt until at the close of 1952 it had dropped to approximately $267 billion. Today they are clamoring to raise the legal debt ceiling of $275 billion. Instead of retrenching expenditure and balancing the budget and reducing the national debt they propose further deficit spending, and an increase in the national debt, and a corresponding reduction in the buying power of the dollar.
>
> Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to ask a very serious question, and the country is entitled to an honest answer. If, with the revenue coming in from all these taxes, we can't pay expenses and balance the budget and hold the national debt down to where it is now, how can we hope to pay expenses and hold down the national debt and keep the dollar at its present value, when we cancel these taxes, and all this revenue we have derived from these taxes stops coming in? That is the one question before the Congress and the country today.
>
> And twisting statements of facts will not help the situation. It was astonishing to hear on the floor recently—after repeated and complete disproval in former sessions—the claim that the 80th Congress balanced the budget. Nothing could be further from the facts. We went in the red in the Hoover administration. We took over the Government in 1933 still in the red. We turned it back in 1948 in the black. The budget was not balanced by the 80th Congress. If anyone has any apprehension of misgivings on that score they have but to turn to table 5, on page A10, of the budget submitted in 1948. It is there in black and white.
>
> But, Mr. Chairman, this is not a simple matter of political or partisan issues. It is a matter fraught with the most serious consequences. We are engaged today in a cold war of extermination. It is a battle for survival. It is nonetheless awesome because it is an economic war. Because if we lose the economic war, we have lost the military war. Stalin sat by waiting for us to spend ourselves into bankruptcy and then expected to take us over without a blow. This bill, reducing the national revenues, accelerates our rate of speed on the downgrade to the very situation for which he was waiting.
>
> This bill is a bill to reduce national revenues, a bill to defer indefinitely hope of balancing the budget, a bill to increase the national debt, a bill to further decrease the purchasing power of the dollar, a bill to forfeit the confidence of the investing public.
>
> Mr. Chairman, let me appeal to sound business commonsense. Let us refuse to spend more money than we take in. Let us retain sufficient taxes to pay our way. Let us insist on the adoption of some orderly method of servicing the national debt that will bring our bonds back to par. While we continue to negotiate with every form of foreign banditry, let us pay our debts and keep our powder dry.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Republican Social-Security Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM C. COLE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 19, 1954

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the enactment of H. R. 9366, to extend and improve the social-security system, represents one of the most outstanding achievements of this the 83d Congress. It extends vital retirement and survivorship protection to over 10 million Americans for the first time. Moreover, the bill provides substantial increases in benefits both for those who are already drawing benefits and for those who will become entitled to benefits in the future.

This new legislation is of such importance to my constituents that I shall set out some of its highlights and, at my own expense, have reprints made of this speech in order to make this information available to every family in my congressional district. These highlights are as follows:

I. EXTENSION OF COVERAGE

First. Farmers: The bill extends social-security coverage for the first time to self-employed farm owners and operators. This means that old-age and survivors insurance protection will be extended to about 3.6 million farmers, their wives, and their children.

Second. Farm workers: The bill also extends coverage to about 2 million farmworkers who are not covered today. In general, farmworkers who are employed regularly by one farmer are covered at the present time. The bill extends this same protection to those farmworkers who earn $100 or more in the course of a year from one employer.

Third. Professional groups: The bill extends social-security coverage to accountants, architects, engineers, and morticians. As a result, the only professional groups which will not be covered by social security in the future are lawyers, doctors, dentists, and other medically related professions.

Fourth. Ministers: The bill covers ministers and members of religious orders, whether self-employed or employees, if they elect individually for coverage on the same basis as self-employed individuals. It is estimated that this amendment will extend coverage to about 260,000 persons.

Fifth. State and local employees: The bill extends coverage to the employees of State and local goverments who are covered by State and local retirement systems—other than policemen and firemen—under voluntary agreements between the States and Federal Government, if a majority of the members of the system vote in a referendum in favor of coverage. There are about 3.5 million persons in this group.

Sixth. Domestic workers: The bill extends coverage to domestic workers in private homes—and others who perform work not in the course of the employer's place of business—who are paid $50 in cash wages by an employer in a calendar quarter, regardless of the 24-day test required in the present law. This provision will extend coverage to about 250,000 persons.

II. INCREASE IN BENEFITS

First. More than 6.5 million persons now on the benefit rolls will have their benefits increased as of September 1, 1954. The average increase for retired workers will be about $6 a month, with proportionate increases for dependents and survivors. The range in primary insurance amounts for those now on the rolls will be $30 to $98.50, as compared to $25 to $85 under present law.

Second. Persons who retire or die in the future will, in general, have their benefits computed by the following new formula: 55 percent of the first $110 of average monthly wage—rather than $100 as in present law—plus 20 percent of the next $240—rather than 15 percent of the next $200. Thus, an individual's retirement benefit will be as high as $108.50 a month, and he and his wife together can receive as much as $162.75 in retirement benefits.

Third. The minimum monthly benefit amount for a retired worker will be $30, and the minimum amount payable where only one survivor is entitled to benefits on the decreased insured person's earnings will be $30.

Fourth. The maximum monthly family benefit of $168.75 wil be increased to $200; the provision of existing law that total family benefits cannot exceed 80 percent of the worker's average monthly wage will not reduce total family benefits below 1½ times the insured worker's primary insurance amount or $50, whichever is the greater.

III. EARNINGS BASE

The total annual earnings on which benefits will be computed and contributions paid is raised from $3,600 to $4,200.

IV. COMPUTATION OF BENEFITS

The individual will be entitled to drop out from the computation of his average monthly wage for benefit purposes up to 5 years of his lowest earnings.

V. RETIREMENT TEST

The earnings limitation will be removed entirely at age 72—instead of at 75, as under present law. For beneficiaries under age 72, the earnings limitation would be made the same for wage earners and self-employed persons. A beneficiary can earn as much as $1,200 in a year from covered work without loss of benefits. He will lose a month's benefit for each unit of $80—or fraction thereof—of covered earnings in excess of $1,200, but in no case will he lose benefits for months in which he neither earned more than $80 in wages nor rendered substantial services in self-employment. Beneficiaries engaged in noncovered work outside the United States will have their benefits withheld for any month in which they worked on 7 or more days.

VI. ELIGIBILITY FOR BENEFITS

(a) As an alternative to the present requirements for fully insured status, an individual will be fully insured if all the quarters elapsing after 1954 and up to the quarter of his death or attainment of age 65 were quarters of coverage, provided he had at least 6 quarters of coverage after 1954.

(b) Benefits will be paid to the surviving aged widow, widowed mother, and children, or parents of any individual who died after 1939 and prior to September 1, 1950, and had at least 6 quarters of coverage.

VII. PRESERVATION OF BENEFIT RIGHTS FOR DISABLED

The period during which an individual was under an extended total disability will be excluded in determining his insured status and the amount of benefits payable to him upon retirement or to his survivors in the event of his death. Only disabilities lasting more than 6 months will be taken into account. Determinations of disabilities generally will be made by State vocational rehabilitation agencies or other appropriate State agencies pursuant to agreements with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

VIII. RECOMPUTATION OF BENEFITS FOR WORK AFTER ENTITLEMENT

An individual may have his benefit recomputed to take into account additional earnings after entitlement if he has covered earnings of more than $1,200 in a calendar year after 1953 and after the year in which his benefit was last computed.

IX. CONTRIBUTION RATES

Employers and employees will continue to share equally with the rates on each being as follows:

Calendar year:	*Rate (percent)*
1954–59	2
1960–64	2½
1965–69	3
1970–74	3½
1975 and after	4

The self-employed will pay 1½ times the above rates.

PUBLIC ASSISTANCE

First. The provisions of the 1952 amendments, presently scheduled to expire on September 30, 1954, with respect to temporary increases in Federal payments to State for old-age assistance, aid to dependent children, aid to the blind, and aid to the permanently and totally disabled are extended through September 30, 1956.

Second. The provisions of the 1950 amendments for approval of certain State plans for aid to the blind which did not meet the requirements of clause (8) of section 1002 (a) of the Social Security Act are extended from June 30, 1955, to June 30, 1957.

Mr. Speaker, these are only the highlights of this legislation and many of my constituents will probably have questions regarding the way this legislation affects them individually. If such is the case, I will be delighted to furnish complete information, if they will write to me at 403 Old House Office Building and give me the facts in their particular case.

Question of the Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, what was that those "experts"* were saying about the weakness of Chiang Kai-shek's Formosa forces?

*Synonym for Democrats.

First Catholic Slovak Union of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech that I delivered before the First Catholic Slovak Union of the United States at Harrisburg, Pa.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am happy to be here tonight because your organization represents the spirit of American patriotism—loyalty to the Republic, Christian service to your fellow man, devotion to your religious faith, and faith in God.

The First Catholic Slovak Union has gained a place of high honor and prestige because its members are joined together in good will, brotherhood, tolerance, and mutual helpfulness.

It serves America by preaching and practicing good citizenship, civic responsibility, true allegiance to the ideals of freedom, and obedience to the laws of God and man.

I am proud to join you in this 40th year jubilee of the Jednota Home and to offer you my warmest and most sincere congratulations.

This home stands as a living monument to get Christián principles—to do good, to brighten the lives of orphan children, and to help in their development into upright men and women of high moral character.

No more noble purpose can be served than that which guides the footsteps of little children toward a better life.

May the Supreme Ruler of the Universe bless your work and may the Jednota Home prosper for greater service in the cause of human brotherhood.

Our Nation is made up of the world's people. All of us, or our ancestors, came here because in this free country we could live in liberty, in peace, tolerance, and good will.

We wanted freedom to worship God in our own way. Many sought a haven from persecution and tyranny. All found in the New World opportunity to grow and prosper and to build a better life for themselves and their children.

Every race, every religion, and every national origin is represented in the great melting pot that is America. Here is combined the ancient traditions and culture of the Old World with the youthful vigor of the new.

We take pride in our ancestry, and it is proper that we should, but we are all Americans first.

When the vicious forces of aggression twice plunged the world into war no barrier of race or color, religion, or national origin blocked the way to service under the Stars and Stripes.

Men with racial names of half the world fought and died as heroes. They covered themselves with everlasting fame and glory in defense of these United States and the ideals of freedom that are symbolized by our flag.

Your organization may be proud of its outstanding contribution to the cause of freedom. Of your total membership one-fourth served in the Armed Forces during World War II.

Six hundred and fifty names of American heroes are listed on the honor roll of your members who gave their lives to protect our freedom and our flag.

But the issue between human freedom and the forces of enslavement has not been settled.

We have learned that there can be no compromise with communism—that strength is the only language that the Kremlin understands.

We have learned by bitter experience that appeasement is not the way to peace.

We have learned that weakness is an invitation to further aggression and a threat to the safety and security of our Republic.

We recognize that the only threat to peace and freedom comes from the ambition of Soviet imperialists to dominate and enslave the world.

So long as communism conspires behind the Iron Curtain for the destruction of all human liberty, we are not free from danger.

So long as a godless, ruthless enemy of honor and morality looks upon the United States as its final goal for world conquest, we must be prepared.

It would be extreme folly, if not a major crime, to underestimate the military capabilities of Red Russia and its satellites.

Inside the Soviet there is the most vigorous war-like preparation. The Communists have millions of men under arms. They have more millions of potential reserves to be drawn from the 800 million people under their absolute power in Europe and Asia. They have the most intense program of military training the world has ever known.

And, remember this, they are not far behind us in the development of atomic weapons and the hydrogen bomb.

We pray that war may not come, but if it does, we know it will strike with lightning speed.

For the first time in our history our civilian population, your home and mine, your family and mine, will be targets for direct attack with weapons more terrifying than anything ever before used in warfare.

It will be more terrible, more destructive of human values, than any other conflict in all history. In such a war there will be no victory—only death and destruction. All the civilization built by man's genius through the centuries will be blasted off the face of the earth.

That is a grim picture. It is not pleasant to think about. But you and I know that no matter how much we love peace it will not be achieved through weakness.

I place no confidence whatever in the idea that we can live at peace with the enemies of freedom who now rule the Soviet.

We had high hopes when the United Nations entered into a solemn pact with the preservation of peace as its great objective. But from the very beginning Russia has done everything within its power to defeat the purposes of the United Nations.

Communist Russia has sabotaged every effort for peace and will continue to do so. Now Communist China seeks a place in the United Nations to stand with Moscow in opposition to ideals of freedom and human dignity.

The American people are overwhelmingly opposed to the admission of Red China to the United Nations.

There is no doubt in my mind that the majority of Americans would favor a new organization of nations, truly united for peace in the world.

Such an organization should include only those nations that are dedicated to the principles of honor and justice and the right of freemen to govern themselves.

It would be an organization that looks to God as the Supreme Ruler of the universe and is obedient to the will of the Almighty.

Such an organization, standing together, would have the moral and military strength to free the world from the threat of enslavement under communism.

I believe the most effective step to prevent Communist aggression would be a warning that any attempt to violate the peace of the world would bring total destruction to the heart of Russia with the hydrogen bomb.

I believe that such a warning, backed by the combined strength of the free nations and the great productive capacity of the United States, would put fear in the heart of every Communist in the Kremlin.

It would encourage the millions of courageous men and women behind the Iron Curtain who despise communism. It would brighten their hope that one day they too will live in freedom—free to choose their own form of government by their own free will.

The principle of self-determination is an integral part of human freedom which the Founding Fathers of our Republic declared to be a sacred endowment from divine providence.

In the immortal Declaration of Independence they proclaimed that governments instituted among men derive their just powers from the consent of the governed.

If that great principle had been honored, civilization would not now be facing the threat of destruction in atomic warfare.

If the nations of the world could accept and observe that principle it would solve many of our problems. The cause of all freedom-loving people would be advanced if Slovakia and all other nations held captive behind the Iron Curtain could gain the right to determine their own destiny.

All men of good will support the aspirations of the Slovak people for freedom and independence. We pray that God in his infinite mercy, may speed the day of their liberation.

We pray that America may never turn away from its historic mission—to defend liberty, to oppose oppression, to stand against injustice, and to support the aspirations of all men of good will for a world of peace.

We hope and pray for the day when all nations will lay down their arms and live in brotherhood under God.

But until that day dawns we must be prepared to defend the God-given freedom that we hold sacred.

We want a strong America.

We want an America in which every citizen is fully conscious of his individual responsibility for the preservation of our freedom.

We want an America in which every citizen will recognize his obligation to take an active interest in the affairs of government.

We want an America with the highest moral and spiritual standards to set before the world an example of honor, courage, and righteousness.

Standing before you tonight I am proud to praise the leaders and members of this great organization for their loyal, vigorous, and determined dedication to these objectives.

Again, I am happy to congratulate the First Catholic Slovak Union on its magnificent contribution to the cultural, spiritual, and patriotic strength of the United States.

Asian Pact Reached in Manila Marks United States Leadership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, nations do not reach positions of world leadership easily or quickly. The British, under the direction of a series of brilliant Foreign Ministers, seized international prestige in the 19th century and retained it well into the 20th. Two world wars have reduced her influence, but the tradition of diplomatic skill remains even to this day. Our own country has been thrust into the role of No. 1 spokesman for the free world because of our economic, military, and strategic position. But the retention of this rank requires active, intelligent direction.

We have begun to exercise this direction. Our participation in every constructive program has been marked by difficulties and setbacks, to be sure, but they were not caused by American errors. They were prompted by foreign fears. In Asia, the SEATO agreement marks the first time in world history that the millions of people in this undeveloped area have attempted to unite for any major purpose. Critics charge that the pact does not include still larger groups.

In Asia, times move slowly, and a beginning is difficult to achieve. Nothing can be gained unless it is started, and we are starting.

The Record of the 83d Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD S. MILLER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, as a Member of Congress representing the First Congressional District of Kansas, I avail myself of the unanimous consent of the House to review briefly the record of the 83d Congress that has completed its last session, and to explain what has been my stand upon some of the main issues that have come before this honorable body. I wish just to state that my respect and admiration for the Members of this body increase with my acquaintance with them, and that I am happy to learn that the broad center aisle that separates the membership of the two parties has little or no significance in the decisions arrived at upon most of the questions that arise for debate and settlement.

One of the first questions to arise in the 83d Congress was included in the bill to give to the States of Florida, Louisiana, Texas, and California the interest of the Federal Government in the tidelands oil area off the coast of these States. The Supreme Court had already decided that this was Federal property. It was estimated to be worth many billions of dollars. I did not see then, and I cannot see now, any justification for the Federal Government giving to four States billions of dollars' worth of property belonging to all the States. The center aisle did not mean a thing in the vote upon this issue. It is likely the greatest giveaway in the history of the world. I am glad that I opposed it, as I would do again. I also opposed giving, without consideration, to private power interests, the potential power of Niagara Falls. There was no talk of mink coats or deep freezes in connection with these transactions. They would have been peanuts when billions were involved. In my opinion, the enactment of these laws is an entry on the debit side of the national ledger and is difficult to explain as anything other than the payment of a political debt.

It is with a feeling of relief that I pass to the enactment of legislation which was of undoubted benefit to all the people. Such was the enactment of legislation making possible a beginning of joint soil-conservation and flood-prevention practices which will, in one integrated program, expedite such a water-control program as will at the same time save our soil, conserve the use of water, and largely prevent waste and destruction from excessive rainfall upon the land. The invention and development of modern earth-moving machinery has made such a program possible as it never was until within the last 20 years. Congress, under the leadership of able, progressive Members—both Democrats and Republicans—has wisely harkened to the admonition of soil-conservation experts in the Department of Agriculture and has enacted progressive legislation in keeping with the times. It is to be regretted that some of the agencies in other departments of the Government have not yet come to understand the great changes that have recently come about in modern, up-to-date methods of flood control and succeeded in having inserted into the bill when in the other body crippling amendments which will interfere with effective compliance with the wishes of the Members of Congress. In time this will be corrected as the new program proves its worth as it is bound to do.

Flood prevention and soil conservation go hand in hand; in fact soil-conservation measures must precede flood-prevention measures. It was with this in view that I introduced a bill to make expenses incurred in soil-conservation practices deductible from farm income for income-tax purposes. This bill was referred to the Ways and Means Committee, and I appeared before that committee to explain its meaning and the justice of my stand. The committee brought out a tax bill containing all the essential provisions of my bill, and they are now a part of the law of the land. These provisions will greatly encourage soil-conservation practices and expedite the flood-prevention program depending upon them.

However great the importance of flood-prevention measures on the land where the rain falls, they are only a part of the measures needed in the river basin and on the river channel. Nothing can take the place of channel improvement, bank stabilization, dikes, and proper flow ways. They are needed in any case, and it is a subversion of justice to attempt to tie them in with controversial issues. Any comprehensive, sensible water-control program must include all these measures. They are needed beyond any question, and it is a disservice to the public to attempt to tie them in with the controversial issue of big dams on the river channel. It only clouds the issue, creates dissension and controversy between segments of society that should intelligently seek to understand each others problems and work them out together.

There was no more controversial issue to arise in the 83d Congress than that of the so-called farm program. The entire problem revolves upon the question of prevention or handling of surplus farm commodities arising out of our superabundance of rich agricultural land. The problem is as old as the Nation, but practically nothing was done about it until the early thirties, when the economic situation of agriculturalists became unbearable, and led to a general depression.

The following are excerpts from the Record of comments I made on the floor of the House during debate on the farm bill:

> I just want to say in conclusion, if we ruin the farmer, if we just put him in straits, we will all feel it. I do not care whether you are a white-collar man, a merchant, a manufacturer, a professional man, or who you are, you will all feel it up and down Main Street. Who was it that came before this House saying, "We must do something for the farmer" in the lean years of the early thirties? It was everybody, for we were all in distress. That could happen again. It is because we do not want it to happen, it is because we are determined that it shall not happen, that we should pass this bill giving the American farmer equal consideration with other segments of our population.
>
> Where is the most distress now? Why, it is among the manufacturers of farm machinery. The workers in that industry are nearly all out of a job. Why? Because the farmer cannot buy these tractors at the price he is getting for his products at the present time. I know, because I went through this situation. I know what happened to the cattlemen a year ago. I had 110 head of cattle on feed when I came to Congress, and I know I put up about $10,000. I know what is happening to the dairymen now. Those are things we have to think about. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say just one more word in passing about parity. Parity means equality; equality means justice; and 100 percent of parity is just equal justice. We farmers are willing to take off that 10 percent just as a margin, give it to you, just as a bargaining figure. But when you do anything more than that you are simply asking the farmer to take less than is coming to him.

The Winter Veterans Hospital: During the past session, legislation that affected the veterans was of great interest to me. I was especially pleased that the 83d Congress saw fit to appropriate $21,133,000 to construct a new Winter Veterans Hospital in Topeka, Kans. This was a most needed project, and one in which I was most interested. All too often we forget the debt the Nation owes to its war veterans, to those who made it possible for this Nation to exist. I supported the measure to increase the pension benefits to those with non-service-connected disabilities. After all, the wars were not won solely by those who were killed and maimed, but equally by those who survived.

On railroad retirement I said for the Record:

> I rise in support of this bill. I have received from the leaders of the railroad brotherhoods nothing but approval of its provisions. These facts, coupled with the

additional consideration that the funds involved in this bill are all contributed by the railroad management and the members of the railway brotherhoods, together with the fact that it is an economically sound arrangement, make it imperative that this bill shall be passed. I shall vote for the bill.

On vocational training I quote for the Record:

I would like to identify myself with this very popular program. I am sure that we are not going to have a record vote on it. Mr. Chairman, it is with much satisfaction that I rise to support this amendment increasing the Federal appropriation for vocational training. Now that more and more youth of the country are given the opportunity, even compelled to attend school for a longer time than formerly, it is all the more important that they be given opportunity to learn some of the arts of making a living. Formerly, it was the custom that every male child should learn a trade and the custom of apprenticeship was universal. With the arrival of universal education that custom has been discontinued, but the basic reason for its existence in the past remains with us. While the arts and customs of making a living have changed, the necessity remains. There can be no more important undertaking on the part of the Federal Government than that of sharing with the several States the responsibility and expense of contributing to the vocational training of the young people of the Nation. I shall support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia to increase the participation of the Federal Government in that program.

On the motion to increase the postal rates, this is my record:

After listening attentively to arguments on both sides, I am thoroughly convinced that this motion should not pass. The postal rate bill provides for an increase on first-class matter from 3 cents to 4 cents on weights up to 1 ounce, notwithstanding the fact that first-class mail is making a profit of more than $100 million per year. It provides for only a slight increase in postal rates for third- and fourth-class mail; not nearly enough to make up for the loss now sustained in those categories. Now, is it reasonable and just to increase the postal charge against the part paying its way for the benefit of the section that is not paying its way? To do so is to make every man, woman, and child, rich and poor alike, pay tribute of 1 cent to the users of the third- and fourth-class mail every time they drop a letter in the mailbox. It is not fair, and it is unjust to try to put the Members of Congress in a position where they would have to vote for this injustice in order to support a well-deserved increase in the salaries of postal employees.

If we defeat this motion it is likely that the petition to bring out the Corbett bill before the House will receive the eight additional signatures which it now lacks and there may be time to do justice by the postal employees without at the same time levying unjust tribute upon every man, woman, and child in the United States every time they buy a postage stamp.

On social security, I stated for the Record on June 1:

This bill is not perfect. No bill so comprehensive in nature and covering so broad a field could be perfect. But it is an improvement over the present law, as it should be, and it will be further improved in the future sessions of Congress. It has, at their own request, brought under coverage millions of people not heretofore enjoying the benefits of social security. It has increased the cost of coverage to make more secure those already covered. This is something that had to be done in any case, as social security is a business undertaking and must be on a business basis. Next to the United States Government this is the greatest business in the Nation. It must be actuarily sound. It is with great satisfaction that I support this bill.

I made the following remarks when efforts were being made to cut appropriations to land-grant colleges:

Kansas State College is an institution of national importance with several thousand students from every part of the Nation. It seems to me that it is poor business on the part of the National Government to seek to economize at the expense of our schools. I submit the telegram from President McCain to be included in the Record.

The appropriation which had been denied was restored.

On juvenile delinquency, I said for the Record in part:

Mr. Speaker, not only as a father, but as a citizen, I am greatly concerned about the increasing juvenile delinquency in this country. We are all concerned. Every man and woman in the Nation with any appreciation of the higher motivations of human beings must be greatly concerned. The question arises: What is the cause of this increase in delinquency among the youth of our land? Not until we have ascertained the cause can we intelligently even consider the remedy.

It is important to notice that this problem is acute only in the great centers of population where there is little or no opportunity for young people to find employment. There is no period in life wherein there is so much surplus energy and exuberance of spirit as in that of youth. I am confident that if the Government—local, State, and National—will devote half the time and effort in finding useful employment for the youth of our land that is now spent in apprehending and punishing them for misdemeanors, there will be no problem of delinquency.

On impacted schools: I supported legislation making appropriation to alleviate the burden imposed upon certain school districts by the influx of Federal employees working in defense plants and military installations.

On dairy price supports: No more vexing problem came before Congress than that concerning a support price on dairy products. It was plainly a belief among Members from the larger cities that butter is too high. I quote from the Record:

Mr. Miller of Kansas. As I remember, one of our colleagues from New York City raised the questions of why these farmers should not produce this butter at 50 cents a pound. I would suggest that if he would get up at 5 or 6 o'clock in the morning, go out and feed those cows and milk them, then churn the butter, he would know the reason why.

On farm subsidies:

Mr. Miller of Kansas. From all I have heard here today, if I did not know any better, I would think that the farmers of this country were the only people being subsidized. The fact of the matter is that during the last 12 years the American people have paid $40 subsidy to other segments of this country where they have paid $1 to the farmer.

Liquor advertising bill—I had this to say:

Members of the committee, I belong to a fraternal organization that will not accept as a member any person who is in any way connected with the manufacture and sale of alcoholic liquor. It is a part of the unwritten law. As a citizen of the United States, I do not wish to have one one-hundred-sixty-millionth part in promoting the liquor business.

I am proud to have been a Member of the 83d Congress. I believe that history will show that in the main it has been a good Congress. Many beneficial laws have been enacted. During its sessions I voted on each issue upon its merits as I saw them without regard to political considerations. I accepted office acknowledging no obligation to any party, interest, or group.

I have in every case voted my honest and considered convictions. This has been my conduct in the past, and it is my sole aim for the future.

The Dairy Farmer and Milk Marketing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker a statement published recently in the Detroit News deserves prominence in the Congressional Record, and is submitted for the purpose of being imprinted. The statement is as follows:

THE DAIRY FARMER AND MILK MARKETING

Just what part does the dairy farmer play in supplying that always available bottle of pure fresh milk, without which our enjoyment of life would be seriously impaired?

We all know that milk comes from cows but it's a long way from the cow to the tables of the great majority of us. Not too long ago, there was a time when most people either owned a cow or obtained milk from a neighbor who did. But since the turn of the century, our population has been centering rapidly in cities until today a dairy cow is as remote from most of us as are foreign lands.

But with milk it is not so—milk is a part of our daily lives—on milk we depend for 30 percent of the food consumed—and we know that milk is fresh, and pure wherever it is obtained in the Detroit area and environs.

The marketing of his milk supply is not a simple problem for the average farmer, especially if he is serving a big city where health regulations are strict and the greatest of care must be used in producing milk of highest quality and purity.

Of course there is an answer to these problems, otherwise, the dependability of your milk supply might not be certain as it is today.

That answer comes from dairy farmers banding together in a democratic way and maintaining an organization to cope with their marketing problems after they have produced their milk in accordance with all of the health provisions laid down by city, State, and Federal authorities.

The vast majority of dairy farmers supplying the Greater Detroit market depend upon their cooperative organization in the disposition of their milk from the time it is placed on a hauling truck at their milk houses until the check for payment is received. The farmers have complete control of their association—only actual dairy farmers have a voice in its management and operating policies.

The Michigan Milk Producers Association is the dairy farmer's own answer to his marketing problem—self-help, it could well be called, through the medium of working together to attain a common goal.

Briefly here are some of the things Michigan dairy farmers are doing for themselves through collective effort:

Guaranteeing themselves a market for all of the milk they produce.

Guaranteeing themselves prompt payment in full every month for all milk shipped, with their own reserve fund for use in emergencies.

Operating their own quality control program, constantly seeking to produce higher grade products by means of research and education.

Checking both weights and butterfat content of milk shipped to insure accurate payments for both quantity and quality.

Operating under a plan of equalized production which levels the supply of milk throughout the year and protects consumers from shortages during the winter months when supply naturally is down. This method of production control, known as the "base and excess plan" has worked to the great benefit of the consuming public, as well as the producers, in the past, and has been widely copied throughout the country. It was adopted by the Michigan Milk Producers Association more than 20 years ago.

Maintaining a highly efficient transportation system.

Operating nine milk receiving depots throughout the producing area, which insures all dealers and distributors an adequate supply at competitive handling transportation costs.

Operating two manufacturing plants to process surpluses of milk whenever necessary. There always is a flush season in milk production and without these standby facilities, large amounts of milk might be lost to the farmer members.

There are many other self-helps provided through this method of cooperation in a nonprofit association—things which no individual farmer could do for himself. But, collectively, these farmers have solved many of their problems, which from the consumers' standpoint means orderly marketing at lowest possible wholesale cost of the most important of all foods—milk and dairy products.

Dairy farmers are using every means at their command to increase sales and provide an outlet for the high production brought about largely through the urging of our Federal Government. Until such time as production and sales are brought more nearly into balance, dairy farmers feel it necessary to look to the Government for some assistance in helping to solve the problem it was so largely responsible in creating. To have a sound total economy, the farmer must have prices for his products in keeping with labor's wages and the prices of all other manufactured commodities.

PARITY AND FARM PRICES

Parity means equality. Parity is a word often used and almost as often misunderstood. Parity for farm products refers to a price to the farmer in keeping with the prices he must pay for all other commodities he purchases. Guaranteeing the farmer a percentage of parity makes it possible for the farmer to remain solvent, provided that percentage is great enough to let him break even on the crops he produces. Breaking even means survival at about the lowest level. It doesn't include increases in wages, extra pay for overtime nor paid vacations.

As of June 15, farmers were receiving an average of 88 percent of parity on all farm crops but milk and dairy products brought only 82 percent of parity. With city wages still climbing, the farmer is getting less and less for his labor.

Dairy price supports have been severely criticized. Out of more than $6 billion investment in farm commodities by the Commodity Credit Corporation on May 31, 1954, only $257 million was in storage butter or a drop in the bucket compared to the total.

Converting industry from a wartime basis cost the Government $65 billion. The Government's investment of about $6 billion in farm products compares with a $25 billion write-off on the wartime industrial accumulation.

Farming is an industry just as is building tanks or airplanes—increasing production rapidly is expensive—getting back from a wartime basis also takes time and money—the same protection is merited by the farmer as was and is being given to all other industries—that is democracy.

Summary of the Work of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN

OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a summary of the work of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry during the 83d Congress.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY.

Attached is a list of all bills approved by the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry during the 83d Congress.

A total of 196 bills, including 160 Senate bills and 15 resolutions and 21 House bills and joint resolutions, were referred to the committee during the 83d Congress. Of these, the committee reported 59 and 43 were enacted into law.

The committee considered 47 nominations during the Congress, including the Secretary, Under Secretary, and five Assistant Secretaries of Agriculture. Nominations to the newly created Farm Credit Board were among those considered. All nominations were reported favorably and confirmed.

During the first session, the committee conducted 60 days of hearings and held 23 executive meetings. During the second session, the committee conducted 40 days of hearings and met in executive session 29 times, making a total of 100 days of hearings and 52 executive sessions during the 83d Congress.

In addition to handling specific legislation, the committee held a series of hearings on foreign trade in agricultural commodities during the first session. This laid the groundwork for future legislation, since foreign trade in agricultural products and our policies with respect to it have a profound effect on our domestic agricultural program. The testimony has been published in five volumes.

Hearings were held in both sessions on the importation of wheat classified as "unfit for human consumption." The hearings brought forth testimony showing that small quantities of Canadian damaged wheat had been brought into this country prior to 1950, but that during the years 1950, 1951, and 1952 over 60 million bushels of wheat classified as "wheat unfit for human consumption" had been imported into the United States. It was made evident that this wheat imported during the past 3 years into the United States on a tariff loophole displaced the sale of good United States wheat, thereby depressing prices and making our import quota limitations ineffective. As a result of these hearings and investigations by the Department of Agriculture, large importations of feed wheat have ceased and normal amounts are now being imported for legitimate purposes. Criminal and civil action has been taken against the importers who were converting such wheat to human use and to export under the International Wheat Agreement.

LIST OF BILLS ACTED ON BY SENATE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY, 83D CONGRESS

S. 725: National survey of forest resources extended to include Alaska and other territories and possessions. Approved August 8, 1953. (Public Law 224.)

H. R. 2458 (S. 731): Authorizes the transfer of certain land at Cherry Point, N. C. Approved August 8, 1953. (Public Law 234.)

H. R. 3107 (S. 894): Provides for the conveyance of certain national forest land in Basalt, Colo. Approved August 8, 1953. (Public Law 233.)

S. 1152: Extends for a period of 5 years the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture to make loans to fur farmers. Approved August 13, 1953. (Public Law 255.)

H. R. 3480 (S. 1207): Extends until December 31, 1955, the period for which foreign agricultural workers may be made available for employment in the United States. Apprived August 8, 1953. (Public Law 237.)

S. 1276: Amends title I of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act to permit increased interest rates and second mortgage loans. Approved July 22, 1954. (Public Law 521.)

S. 1367: Extends the authority of the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation to expand the crop-insurance program into additional counties. Approved August 13, 1953. (Public Law 261.)

S. 1381: Permits the Commodity Credit Corporation to rotate its stocks of commodities to prevent deterioration and for other reasons. Approved July 29, 1954. (Public Law 554.)

S. 1386: Adds coffee to the list of commodities covered by the Commodity Exchange Act. Referred to House Committee on Agriculture February 12, 1954.

S. 1399: Authorizes sale of certain improvements on forest lands to the Salt River Valley Water Users Association at their fair appraised value, the proceeds to be used for a Forest Service ranger dwelling. Approved June 18, 1954. (Public Law 401.)

S. 1400: Permits the Secretary of Agriculture to release reversionary rights in and to a tract of land located in Wake County, N. C. Approved June 21, 1954. (Public Law 428.)

H. R. 4353 (S. 1505): Reorganizes the Farm Credit Administration to provide increased farmer participation in management, and to make it an independent agency under a Federal Farm Credit Board. Approved August 6, 1953. (Public Law 202.)

S. 1577: Authorizes the exchange of town lands for forest lands in Eagle County, Colo. Referred to House Committee on Agriculture January 25, 1954.

S. 1679: Consolidates and simplifies agricultural extension service authorizations. Approved June 26, 1953. (Public Law 83.)

S. 1990: Would provide subpena power for investigations (now limited to proceedings) under the Commodity Exchange Act, and provide for injunctions against violations of the act. Referred to House Committee on Agriculture February 12, 1954.

S. 2055: Provides for the control of scrapie and blue tongue in sheep, and incipient or potentially serious minor outbreaks of diseases of animals. Approved August 8, 1953. (Public Law 227.)

H. R. 5451 (S. 2099): Provides for 62-million-acre minimum wheat allotment for 1954 and for wheat-marketing penalty equal to 45 percent of the parity price. Approved July 14, 1953. (Public Law 117.)

S. 2112: Provides for the transfer of price-support wheat to Pakistan to relieve famine, the proceeds from the sale of part of such wheat in Pakistan being used for benefit of people of Pakistan and other programs of mutual interest. Approved June 25, 1953. (Public Law 77.)

S. 2163: Authorizes the transfer of cotton-field station near Statesville, N. C., to the State of North Carolina. Approved August 13, 1953. (Public Law 265.)

S. 2249: Authorizes the President to use surplus agricultural commodities to assist in meeting famine or other urgent relief requirements of nations and peoples friendly to the United States. Approved August 7, 1953. (Public Law 216.)

H. R. 6054 (S. 2267): Provides for additional emergency assistance to farmers and stockmen through economic disaster loans in production disaster areas, special livestock loans, and feed and seed assistance. Approved July 14, 1953. (Public Law 115.)

S. 2313: Adds wool to the list of commodities covered by the Commodity Exchange Act. Referred to House Committee on Agriculture February 12, 1954. The substance of this bill was passed as part of H. R. 9680, the Agricultural Act of 1954.

S. 2367: Authorizes the Department of Agriculture to contract for general research work. Approved July 28, 1954. (Public Law 545.)

S. 2404: Authorizes bonding of packers. Reported to Senate with an amendment January 11, 1954.

S. 2475: (The Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954) provides until June 30, 1957, for the sale of surplus agricultural commodities for foreign currencies and for the transfer of surplus agricultural commodities to friendly nations for famine and other relief, and contains various permanent provisions for the use of agricultural commodities for domestic and foreign relief and for barter for strategic materials. Approved July 10, 1954. (Public Law 480.)

S. 2548: Provides for improved administration of national forest and certain Bankhead-Jones Act lands by providing encouragement for range improvement by permittees, compensation for such improvements lost through Government action or transfer of the permit, regulations governing base property standards and transfer of permits, procedures for review of departmental decision, and multiple-use advisory boards. Referred to House Committee on Agriculture April 8, 1954.

H. R. 6788 (S. 2549): (The Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act) provides for technical and financial assistance to State and local agencies in undertaking flood-prevention work and agricultural phases of water management in watersheds and subwatersheds. Approved August 4, 1954. (Public Law 566.)

S. 2583: Provides indemnities for persons whose swine were destroyed in July 1952 (prior to the beginning of the Federal-State indemnity program), because of infection or exposure to vesicular exanthema. Approved July 27, 1954. (Public Law 535.)

H. R. 6665 (S. 2643): Increases the 1954 national cotton-acreage allotment from 17,910,448 to 21 million acres, plus (1) 315,000 acres allocated one-half to Arizona, California, and New Mexico, and one-half to the remaining States (with certain exceptions); (2) 59,374 acres to provide each State with at least 66 percent of its 1932 acreage; and (3) 4,968 acres to give Florida special relief, making the total acreage to be allotted 21,379,342 acres. Also provided for distribution of the additional acreage allotted, made other changes in the cotton-quota law, provided increased allotments for types of wheat in short supply (durum), and permitted section 32 operations for Irish potatoes. Approved January 30, 1954. (Public Law 290.)

S. 2714: Increases Commodity Credit Corporation borrowing authority to $8,500,000,000 (from $6,750,000,000). Approved March 20, 1954. (Public Law 312.)

S. 2715: Provides a statutory penalty for "excess" peanuts picked or threshed in violation of producer's agreement. Referred to House Committee on Agriculture June 8, 1954.

S. 2786: Consents to Southeastern Interstate Forest Fire Protection Compact. Approved July 27, 1954. (Public Law 536.)

S. 2911: Provides price support for wool and mohair through payments and other methods at levels necessary to obtain desired production. Referred to House Committee on Agriculture April 28, 1954. The substance of this bill was passed as part of H. R. 9680, the Agricultural Act of 1954.

S. 2987: Provides for transfer of hay and pasture seeds by the Commodity Credit Corporation to certain agencies administering grazing lands. Approved July 26, 1954. (Public Law 524.)

S. 3050: Increases marketing penalty for tobacco to 50 percent (from 40 percent) of the average market price for the preceding marketing year. Approved June 22, 1954. (Public Law 425.)

H. R. 9680 (S. 3052): (The Agricultural Act of 1954) provides support at 82½ to 90 percent of parity for the 1955 crops of the basic agricultural commodities, provides an incentive support program for wool, and makes numerous other changes in the law with respect to price support, use of diverted acres, disposition of surplus commodities, quotas and acreage allotments, marketing agreements and orders, soil conservation, and agricultural attaches. Approved August 28, 1954. (Public Law 690.)

S. 3137: Extends the benefits of the Water Facilities Act (previously limited to the arid and semiarid areas) to the entire United States, Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands, changes the limitation of $100,000 for any one project to a limitation of $25,000 on the indebtedness of any individual and $250,000 on the indebtedness of any corporation or agency, provides for loans for general soil and water conservation work, and provides for a program of insured loans in addition to direct loans. Approved August 17, 1954. (Public Law 597.)

S. 3207: Removes the $10 limit on fees for registration of commission merchants and floor brokers under the Commodity Exchange Act. Referred to House Committee on Agriculture June 8, 1954.

S. 3245: Authorizes until June 30, 1955, up to $15 million in emergency loans to farmers and stockmen in areas where other credit is temporarily not available. Approved August 31, 1954. (Public Law 727.)

S. 3339: Authorizes the Farm Credit Administration to make land bank commissioner type loans until June 30, 1959. Referred to House Committee on Agriculture July 19, 1954.

S. 3487: Permits the central and regional banks for cooperatives to issue consolidated debentures. Approved August 23, 1954. (Public Law 630.)

S. 3601: Authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to extend certain timber-cutting rights of the M. R. Prestridge Lumber Co. for 5 years. Approved August 31, 1954. (Private Law 949.)

H. R. 9756 (S. 3686): Increases Commodity Credit Corporation borrowing authority to $10 billion (from $8,500,000,000). Approved August 31, 1954. (Public Law 754.)

S. 3697: Authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with Canada and Mexico in controlling incipient or emergency outbreaks in those countries of insect pests or plant diseases. Approved August 13, 1954. (Public Law 586.)

S. 3774: Extends the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act to Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico. Referred to House Committee on Agriculture August 16, 1954.

S. 3800: Prohibits the introduction of cattle which have been infested with or exposed to ticks into the Virgin Islands, except from the British Virgin Islands for slaughter; and restores the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture to prohibit the introduction of live poultry into the Virgin Islands to prevent the spread of disease. Passed Senate August 10, 1954.

Senate Joint Resolution 119: Validates conveyance of a 40-acre tract in Okaloosa County, Fla. Approved June 18, 1954. (Public Law 425.)

House Joint Resolution 355 (S. J. Res. 121): Permits continuation of the Mexican farm labor recruitment program in the absence of agreement with Mexico. Approved March 16,1954. (Public Law 309.)

House Joint Resolution 458 (S. J. Res. 134): Authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to quitclaim certain retained rights in land to the board of education of Irwin County, Ga. Approved July 2, 1954. (Public Law 473.)

H. R. 107: Authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to consent to the transfer of the site of the original Fort Buford, N. Dak., to the State of North Dakota. Approved June 18, 1954. (Public Law 409.)

H. R. 3097: Provides for the transfer of certain land in Napa County, Calif., to the University of California. Approved June 28, 1954. (Public Law 430.)

H. R. 4017: Provides for the conveyance of certain land and improvements to the England Special School District, Arkansas. Approved August 31, 1954. (Public Law 739.)

H. R. 4928: Authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain land to the city of Clifton, N. J. Approved July 27, 1954. (Public Law 541.)

H. R. 6263: Authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain lands to the Rotary Club of Ketchikan, Alaska. Approved July 26, 1954. (Public Law 525.)

H. R. 6393: Consents to the south central interstate forest fire protection compact. Approved August 24, 1954. (Public Law 642.)

H. R. 6435: Includes onions and coffee in the list of commodities covered by the Commodity Exchange Act. Passed Senate with amendments June 18, 1954.

Hon. Lester C. Hunt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement prepared by me regarding the death of Senator Lester C. Hunt.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President, as we come to the close of this 2d session of the 83d Congress, I want to say that I am saddened by the absence here of my good friend and colleague, Lester Hunt.

He was a distinguished governor of a great State before representing that State in the Senate of the United States. We served together on the Judiciary Committee and we served together, during many trying days, as members of the Senate Crime Committee.

Lester Hunt was a devoted servant of the people, not only of his own State, but also of the United States. We will miss him greatly in the years ahead. America has suffered a loss in his passing.

The Late Honorable Paul W. Shafer—Funeral Address by the Reverend Dr. Carleton B. Miller

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JESSE P. WOLCOTT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the address made by the Reverend Dr. Carleton Brooks Miller, pastor of the First Congregational Church of Battle Creek, Mich., at the funeral services of our late colleague, Paul W. Shafer:

In the year that Christ was born, there lived a Latin poet by the name of Horace. He was at the peak of his career at the beginning of the Christian era. He wrote that immortal classic, Odes From Horace from which I now quote:

"I have raised a monument more lasting than bronze
Loftier than the royal peak of pyramids.
No biting storms can bring it down:
No impotent north wind
Nor the unnumbered series of the years,
Nor the swift course of time.
I shall not wholly die."

Paul W. Shafer has moved on into that house appointed for all the living and his death is mourned by thousands in this Third Congressional District.

I thought he was in very normal health, though deeply grieved, when we shared with him the loss of his wife, Ila, here 6 weeks ago. After the service was over, Paul met us out here in front of the church and shook hands and he greeted us in his winning friendly way. But, of death and its coming no man can tell.

"Leaves have their time to fall,
And flowers to wither at the north wind's breath,
And stars to set; but all thou,
Thou hast, all seasons for thine own, O death.
We know when moons shall wane,
When summer birds from far shall cross the sea,
When autumn's hue shall tinge the golden grain,
But who shall teach us when to look for thee."

And the part in us that does not die is our deeds, our accomplishments, our achievements.

Let me speak for a moment of Paul W. Shafer, the Congressman. Oh, how proud we were of his work in the Halls of Congress. Since his death was known, many have paid him full and proper tribute; but the greatest tribute to Paul was paid by the voters of this district, when, just before the coming of his death, they nominated him for reelection for the 10th time. And, from the start, when Paul went to Congress, he went with this deep conviction—Congress is the servant of the people. There were other branches of Government that had their place, there were other high offices that commanded his respect. But, bound up soul and heart in Paul Shafer was the faith and the conviction of the worth and the dignity of the Congress of the United States and there he served these terms fearlessly as a contender for the time tested experiences in government.

Some of us were privileged to receive his weekly letters and we always opened them with a good deal of care and concern because here was a reliable report to the folks back home. We were never in doubt where Paul Shafer stood. We knew what he was for and he was for the principles and the practices that have made us a great people. This morning when I came back, his last letter lay unopened on the desk and I opened it to read it and there he was just as brave and fearless as he's always been. How many men would dare to come out for the termination of diplomatic relations with Russia?

Will you indulge me in a little fantasy? You know they say that kinspirits find one another in heaven. Now it is true that kinspirits get together in the world beyond. I see Paul's spirit with a little group of men. The spirits of those men are the men who made up the Boston Tea Party, who dared to oppose an unjust tax. I see him talking with the spirit of Paul Revere who protested the coming of the British and with such men as James Otis and Patrick Henry, who stood for the fundamentals on which our Nation is built and all those who through the years have fought for the fundamental ideas of a Christian democracy.

And if you read your Gospel with care, you will find there was one Jesus of Nazareth who was bold to speak out against the Scribes, the Pharisees, and the hypocrites who gave away their nation to foreigners, the Romans, and, in less than one quarter of a century after the crucifixion, not one stone in the great capital of Jerusalem stood upon another.

No man can wholly die whose life is measured in such achievements and such accomplishments.

"I love the man who dares to face defeat,
And risks a conflict with heroic heart;
I love the man who bravely does his part
Where right and wrong in bloody battle meet.
When bugles blown by cowards sound retreat,
I love the man who grasps his sword again
And sets himself to lead his fellow men
Far forward through the battle's din and heat.
For, he who joins the issue on life's field
Must fully know the hazard of the fray
And dare to venture ere he hoped to win;
Must choose the risk and then refuse to yield
Until the sunset lights shall close the day
And God's great city let the victor in."

This, Paul W. Shafer, our Congressman.

Now, may I add a few words about Paul W. Shafer, the man.

To me, he was truly human. Persons had meaning for him. Paul was warmhearted because some men, when they come to a place of power, influence, and honor, somehow lose their common touch with the people. And there is no part of us that lives after we are gone so much as the part of us that we have put into other lives in love and friendship. The honors that he won will fall. Another will sit at his desk—new issues and problems will come in future days before our Congress. But the manner in which he lived and the spirit with which he moved with the people is going to survive the grave.

I have just come down from the Straits of Mackinac and up there they are building a great bridge which is going to span our upper and lower peninsula in this great Commonwealth of Michigan.

You know, bridges are simple. A bridge is like a great arm of friendship that connects those who are separated.

Thornton Wilder, who wrote a book some time ago, called The Bridge of San Luis Rey, ends it with this:

"There is a land of the living and there is a land of the dead and the bridge is love—the only survival, the only meaning."

And all the time Paul was taking his stand on these issues and doing his work as a Congressman, he was building a bridge of friendship in the hearts of the people of this district. Even though now his physical presence is gone and the sound of his voice is still, we are going to be able to cross on that bridge of friendship in memory and, in that way, he will never die.

Again, will you permit me a personal incident?

You know, I gave Paul his first airplane ride. It was back in 1929 and Paul had agreed to speak to the Shrine Club over in Kalamazoo. One of his dear friends in Battle Creek had bought an airplane and I was flying it for him. So, the three of us agreed we would make the trip by air. Now in 1929, flying was pretty much a pioneering venture. Later, you know, Paul flew all around the world and he said, "In all that flight, I never got the thrill I did that day we went to Kalamazoo." It was a beautiful day. Everything was functioning just as it should but, naturally, I was tense knowing the precious cargo I had in that open cockpit up ahead. When we had left Kalamazoo and were on the way back, I heard a strange sound now and then coming above the roar of the motor and the whir of the propeller. I could not account for it. Naturally, I was worried for fear that we might have a forced landing. We finally came in all right and I said to Paul, "Paul, weren't you afraid?" And he said, "No, I wasn't afraid. Why did you think I was afraid?" I said, "Well, didn't you hear those strange noises as we were coming along?" He laughed heartily and said, "Why, you know—I was singing."

Now, isn't that a parable for us today? Here we are in the midst of life's anxieties and fears and the noisy onrush of the days and can't you hear above that, Paul's singing spirit—singing to us to have courage over fear, to have faith in God and our country?

It was Theodore Roosevelt who said, "I pay with my body for the price of my soul." And I think that Paul Shafer, going away from us at 61, paid with his body for the price of his soul. Well, no man knows his appointed time but, when it comes, may we go out in a cloud of glory. May we, like Paul, be giving our utmost to the highest.

To quote the words that Robert Browning puts on the lips of Pompelia in the poem, The Ring and the Book:

"Comradeship of the steep ascent,
Comradeship through such souls alone,
God, stooping, shows sufficient of His light
For us, in the dark, to rise by."

And because we have had such intimate fellowship with a man like Paul Shafer, that comradeship through such a soul as he, God will show us the light in the dark to rise by.

So, whoever we are and wherever we serve, when the dark days come as they will—to the world—to the Nation—in our own personal lives, through a fellowship and comradeship of the fine, the great, the good, the wonderful who have walked with us and shared with us the way of life, God's light and truth will come to lead us and to guide us on our way.

And so, let us say without regret, and without tears to Paul, "Hail and farewell." We shall not find his like again. But remember, death is a transforming experience. It has transformed him from the earthly into the heavenly, and those of us who say we are truly moved and touched by this experience, we will be transformed into instruments of his spirit or a spirit akin and like his own.

"O, strong soul, by what shore
Carriest thou now?
For that force surely has not been left vain!
Somewhere, surely, afar
In the sounding labor house vast
Of being is practiced that strength,
Zealous, beneficent, firm!"

Eternal God and Heavenly Father, Father of our spirits and shepherd of our souls, humble, gratefully we thank thee for a man like Paul Shafer whom we have known and had and shared throughout the road of life. Father God, open the gates of Thine eternal kingdom and receive his spirit unto thyself. Give him a blessed reunion with his wife, Ila. May they know the joy and the beauty and the wonder of spirits reunited and to be together eternally. Let every one of us who have come here with heavy hearts or gloom or grief because of our loss of the parting now go out of here with high courage in our hearts and a new spirit and a new vision and a new strength to do our utmost for the best. Let us not be afraid, rather let us stand firm for that which is right and good and beautiful and true, and give our best for it and our most for it, so that whatever time Thou shalt decree that we shall come home today, we shall bow down ready and willing and worthy and shall have fulfilled the mission of our existence here on earth. Bless his memory to us, oh God, and let the spirit of his life and the warmth of his friendship go with us all together again. Those that we have loved long since and lost awhile. And now, may the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ and the love of God, who is our Heavenly Father, and the comradeship of the Holy Spirit be in our hearts today. Go with us, guide us and keep us evermore. Amen.

Atoms for Peace Without Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, President Eisenhower's famous address to the U. N. last December is still having its effect throughout the world. When he offered to cooperate with the nations of the earth in the development of atomic energy for peacetime purposes, the world applauded. But, as usual, the Russians abstained. Now their abstention has revealed itself as dissent.

Despite the negative response from Moscow, we are going ahead. Along with our friends, principally Britain and Canada, the process of utilizing atomic reactors to develop new power resources is going ahead. What this can mean to countries like Italy, India, and other areas without substantial coal or other powermaking resources, is incalculable. If industrialization can be brought to these areas, they will become producers in their own right of the material elements which have made American and western civilization the most comfortable in history.

Simultaneously, our readiness to share this atomic resourcefulness in the face of the Soviet Union's refusal to join is another demonstration of the empty and meaningless protestations of the Communists for the poor and backward areas of the world.

Uncle Sam does not enjoy the prospect of doing it alone in any international undertaking, but if we cannot induce others to join us for mutual help, we can—and will—do what must be done ourselves. We are confident that as our intentions become clear, others will move to our side.

The Record of the 83d Congress: Too Much for the Few, Too Little for the Many

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SIDNEY A. FINE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. FINE. Mr. Speaker, now that the 83d Congress has concluded its work, it is appropriate to assess the record of the Republican Party in carrying out the responsibilities it sought and received from the people of the United States in the 1952 elections.

The Republican Party asked the voters to sweep the Democrats out of office and to elect the party of the "great crusade." This was the "crusade" that was to bring us a dynamic new foreign policy, strengthened national defense, a balanced budget and reduction of the national debt, higher prices to the farmer and lower prices to the housewife, and even "a new moral climate in Washington."

It has been nearly 2 years since those promises were made. Many people are beginning to wonder just when the "crusade" will get underway—and some of the crusaders are probably grateful that the law provides no punishment for obtaining election by false pretenses.

Those who expected a bold, new foreign policy have been disappointed. The only thing noticeably new about Republican foreign policy is the disturbing practice of making meaningless—and sometimes harmful—foreign policy statements for the sake of domestic political advantage. Too often our actions have not been based on the realities of the world situation, but on the apparent intention of the administration to satisfy the extreme rightwing of the Republican Party.

The inevitable result has been a serious deterioration of our position as a world leader. The uneasy truce in Korea only freed the Communists to concentrate on Indochina, where millions of Vietnamese were surrendered without a fight. EDC is apparently dead, leaving the western alliance shaky and disunited.

All our troubles are not the fault of the present administration. Successful conduct of our foreign policy would require no great ability or effort if we lived in a world composed solely of reasonable, peace-loving nations. And in a world afflicted by the godless Communist conspiracy, even devoted and intelligent labors are often unrewarded by success. Every American should recognize that it is the Communists—not the Republicans or Democrats—who are to blame for the world crisis.

It would be unthinkable to accuse the Republicans of failing because they are soft on communism or to question their good intentions.

But we can justifiably criticize the present administration for failing to play square with the American people. Instead of a realistic, bipartisan approach to the serious problems facing us, we have had far too many irresponsible statements designed for home consumption.

We can hardly blame our allies for being confused, for we have given them no clear foreign policy to follow. The contradictory statements of a multitude of self-appointed spokesmen only serve to add further confusion.

It is time to realize that empty slogans about massive retaliation and seizing the initiative—whatever their value for political purposes—do not constitute a foreign policy. No matter how often repeated, they are no substitute for wisdom, consistency, and determination.

We cannot possibly succeed in this battle for survival unless we are strong. We have learned through bitter experience that the ruthless men in the Kremlin will not be deterred from their plans for world domination by any regard for morality or justice. The only law they recognize is that of superior military strength.

It is tragic that, in the face of this clear dependence on strength for survival, the Republicans have drastically reduced the funds for our defense establishment. Next year we will have fewer men, fewer ships, and fewer combat divisions to stop the Communists.

The administration has recognized its error in cutting the Air Force $5 billion last year—over Democratic opposition. They have now provided more funds for the Air Force, but they can never replace a year's loss of time and production.

The record of the Republican Party on foreign affairs has not been good.

In the past, the Republicans tried to blame every foreign policy failure—either real or fancied—on the party in power. Now, however, they tell us our troubles are solely the fault of the Communists.

The Communists are the motivating cause of the present situation—but I am afraid their advances have been made easier by the inept actions and lack of leadership of the present administration.

But one thing is clear. The Republican Party cannot blame its domestic shortcomings on the Communists. It must stand or fall on its own record.

Let us take a look at that record.

About the only really new legislation passed by the Republicans is the authorization of the St. Lawrence seaway project. It is true that the administration was practically forced to seek action on the seaway project because of Canada's announced intention to "go it alone" if the United States did not act. It is also true that some of the traditional opposition to the seaway changed to support because of discovery of tremendous ore deposits in Canada, and that the Republican seaway bill left out the Federal power development that Democrats had proposed. Even so, we Democrats are willing to mark the St. Lawrence seaway legislation up as a real accomplishment.

But that is just about all the 83d Congress did in the way of constructive new legislation of major importance. The 83d Congress passed other good legislation—but practically all of it simply extended or revised existing Democratic programs.

Social security coverage was extended and benefits were raised. The Republicans hardly deserve much credit for this action, however—their chief contribution was to finally stop opposing the program the Democrats had been advocating for years.

The reciprocal trade program—Cordell Hull's enlightened plan for increasing world trade—was extended for 1 year. But this was a hollow victory for the administration, which refused to fight for the 3-year extension recommended by its own Randall Commission when the Democrats in the Senate tried to enact it.

The legislation continuing established Democratic programs was good legislation, though it did not go far enough in many cases. But it was not a great accomplishment. It was merely reluctant acceptance by the Republican leadership of the progress they had fought so many years to prevent. And we Democrats, rejoicing at the long-overdue repentance of our Republican friends, gave them complete cooperation in enacting this legislation.

It must be admitted that the Republican Party has carried out some of its campaign promises. But, almost without exception, the pledges it has redeemed have been the public and private commitments to big business and special interests.

There is no secret about it. Secretary of Defense Wilson expressed the theme of the new administration pretty clearly when he said "What's good for General Motors is good for the country." In the eyes of the men who now run our Government, he was only putting first things first.

It did not take long to start putting the "big business first" policy into practice.

Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey started by raising interest rates on Government bonds. This so-called hard-money policy has now been abandoned, but it still costs the taxpayers millions of dollars a year in higher interest rates to large banks and lending agencies.

Billions of dollars in offshore oil reserves—which belonged to all the people of the United States—have been given away.

A $12 billion investment by the taxpayers in the development of atomic energy is being turned over to private industry without adequate provision for return of the people's investment.

The tax-revision bill offers a bonanza in special tax favors to corporations and their stockholders, while granting little or nothing to the small taxpayer.

Low-cost public power projects are getting a cold shoulder from official Washington, while private interests are casting greedy eyes on the TVA.

While special interests have been growing fatter at the expense of the taxpayer, what has happened to the average American?

Except for those in a few selected categories, the small taxpayer has received no reduction in his income tax from the Republicans. A Democratic attempt to raise personal exemptions for every taxpayer by $100 was defeated by a solid Republican vote.

A Republican Congress refused to enact even the minimum public housing program proposed by their own President and passed instead a crippled and inadequate measure, designed not to provide housing but to save face.

Instead of a realistic approach to the problem of making adequate medical care available to all at a price they can pay, the administration proposed a reinsurance plan for the benefit of insurance companies so inadequate that it was overwhelmingly rejected by Congress.

An attempt by Democrats to help relieve the serious unemployment situation by increasing unemployment compensation benefits was beaten down by the Republicans.

Farm income has declined sharply under the Republicans, while the price of food to the consumer remains near record levels. And the farmer—who thought he had been assured 90 or 100 percent of parity—has found to his sorrow that the administration's solution to the problem of declining farm prices is to further reduce support levels.

The administration opposed a 10 percent increase in disability compensation for our disabled war veterans, reluctantly allowing a 5 percent increase to become law.

The President vetoed a pay increase for Federal employees—admitting that it was deserved and needed—because Congress had refused to accept an administration edict for an unfair increase in first-class postal rates.

The Republicans failed to balance the budget—an understandable situation in view of their rush to give away billions in national resources. And instead of reducing the national debt, they have increased it the the point where it was necessary to raise the legal limit on its size.

The 83d Congress cannot properly be described as a do-nothing Congress—but some of its actions would have been far better left undone.

Some Republican campaign promises have been carried out—but almost all of these have been pledges to a favored few, while promises to benefit the majority of the people have been forgotten.

The Republicans sought election with the slogan "time for a change"—but the few good things they have done have consisted mostly of continuing Democratic programs they condemned when they were in the minority.

The record of the Republicans is bad enough standing alone. It appears even worse when compared to the Democratic record during the first 2 years after assuming office.

When the Democratic Party took office in 1933 after 12 years of Republican rule, our country was in the midst of the worst depression in its history—13 million of our 48 million workers were unemployed. Thousands of banks had failed. Farm prices were far below the cost of production, and our great cities were haunted by breadlines.

Under Democratic leadership, immediate steps were taken to meet this crisis.

The National Banking Act was passed, insuring bank depositors against loss and saving the American banking system from complete collapse.

The securities and exchange law was enacted to protect investors in the stock market and to prevent repetition of the abuses which had contributed to the depression.

The reciprocal trade program was established.

Steps were taken to help bring farmers fair prices and cheap credit through a farm price-support program and the Farm Credit Act.

The Tennessee Valley Authority was established, bringing new prosperity to an entire region through low cost public power.

Legislation was enacted to help Americans own their own homes and to save homes with defaulted mortgages.

All these constructive steps—and many others—were taken by a Democratic administration and a Democratic Congress in less than 2 years.

Why have the Democrats accomplished so much for the people of America—and why have the Republicans accomplished so little?

There's nothing magic about it. The answer can be found in the basic principles of the two political parties.

Republican administrations have consistently operated our Government on the theory that if every possible advantage is given to big business and the few at the top of our economic structure, some benefits will then trickle down to the rest of us. That may be a good theory for the few who get the benefits, but for the rest of the people it just doesn't work.

The Democratic Party, on the other hand, believes that a prosperous economy must be based on the well-being of all the people, not on great wealth for a few. And by putting that philosophy into practice, the Democratic Party established a record of 20 years of lasting legislative achievements. Social security, Federal insurance of bank deposits, public housing, minimum-wage legislation—these and hundreds of other constructive legislative measures stand as permanent mouments of our concern for the future of America.

The records of the two parties show that the Republicans have consistently favored special interests and big business at the expense of the people, while the Democratic Party has worked to benefit all Americans by establishing and maintaining a broad base of prosperity.

The basic differences between the two parties were obscured in 1952 by the 20 years since Hoover and the popularity of a national hero. But in the coming elections, the issues are clearly drawn. I am confident the people will choose wisely.

Porter on Eisenhower

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I should like to insert in the RECORD the following article by Mr. Philip W. Porter, of the Cleveland Plain Dealer, regarding President Dwight D. Eisenhower and his accomplishments:

PROGRAM PUSHED THROUGH DESPITE OBSTACLES—PUNDITS WRONG—GREAT NATURAL LEADER

(By Philip W. Porter)

Congress has just about folded, and what do you know, the entire Eisenhower program is on the lawbooks, just about the way Ike recommended it in January. Amazing? Not at all.

I won't pretend not to be an "I told you so" guy. I enjoy it. (Who doesn't really?) I enjoy calling them right, even more so than an umpire. I'm not only pleased at having diagnosed this extraordinary man as a big winner in 1952, long before most folks were conscious of his impact, and more so that as President he has performed exactly as I thought he would. What's more important, I believe the program he has persuaded through Congress is good for the country and just what we needed in these troubled times.

Months ago, a good many Washington journalistic pundits were sobbing crocodile tears over their old-fashioneds about poor old Ike. He wasn't leading, he wasn't firm enough, he was letting crafty Congressmen get the best of him, he was listening to bad advice, he was too New Dealish for the hard-shelled Republicans, he was too conservative for the liberals, he was going to come a cropper and get a Democratic House and Senate in 1954.

Well, here it is August, and Ike has proved himself in the stretch to be not only a statesman who got us out of one Asiatic war, and kept us out of another, but a consummately skillful politician who cut taxes, stopped inflation, and raised the social-security take for old people.

WHAT CAMPAIGN FODDER?

I'm darned if I can see what the Democrats are going to use for campaign fodder this fall, except the same old New Deal stuff which failed in 1952. The law of averages or a freak break might still give him a Democratic Congress, but the closer we come to November, the more I'm inclined to doubt it. It wouldn't surprise me a bit that as a result of his completed legislative program and his stumping in doubtful States, he'd even increase the Republican majority in both Houses.

He won all the major legislative battles he really wanted to win—he got through his private enterprise atomic-energy bill; he got flexible farm price supports in a display of doggedness and purpose that was believed incredible; he finally got a bill to suit him on how to really conk local Communists, in spite of last-minute Democratic maneuvers to trap him. And in the most sweeping taxation reform in several generations, he made income taxes more sensible by liberalizing exemptions, cutting out redtape, and giving the little guy a break.

How could the wise birds go so wrong, and what has he got that he suddenly came out on top, in this most fortunate political position? Just exactly what he had all along, as a military commander dealing with difficult allies, as a campaigner, as a real executive. He waits till all the evidence is in, before making up his mind. He doesn't leap before he looks; he doesn't panic at bad news. He tries to be reasonable, until it's obvious that cracking down is the only thing that will work.

He timed the pressure on Congress so beautifully that in spite of a razor-thin majority in both Houses, in spite of a filibuster, in spite of public attention being diverted for weeks by the McCarthy-Army hassle, the major items on the program came through with few important alterations. And he did it the hard way, by waiting until the second year of his term, just before an important election, to press for the program, instead of socking it through in the first few months, a la Franklin D. Roosevelt.

NO ORTHODOX POLITICIAN

Ike has said himself, and he had a lot of shortsighted folks around Washington believing it, that he's no politician. Nothing could be further from the truth. If he means he's no orthodox politician, that's right. But when it comes to doing the right political thing instinctively, he's the greatest natural we've had in public life for many years. Whenever he's had difficulty, it came from listening too hard to the self-styled pros. Whenever he's had great success, it's because he did what came "natcherly."

Scotty Reston, head of the New York Times Washington bureau, and a profoundly accurate observer, hit the nail on the head neatly when he said, "There never has been a period in American history when politics were less scientific or when the professional politicians were more confused." The voters hop around all over the country; they move from one party to another. They spot phonies at once on TV. Yet, they turn more and more to individuals who convey a deep sense of personal integrity and faith in himself and the people.

That's Ike all over. That's why most people still like Ike, and why he will come in future years to be regarded as one of our greatest Presidents.

Congressman Hunter Reports Accomplishments of the People's Congress, the 83d

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OAKLEY HUNTER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 17, 1954

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I welcome this opportunity to submit to my colleagues in the Congress and to the people of my district a summary of the major accomplishments of the 83d Congress in the first 2 years of the new administration. It is a record of which the American people can well be proud, for it accomplished more for the average citizen than any Congress since the outbreak of hostilities began World War II.

PEACE

As the fighting ended in Korea in the first year of the new administration and an exchange of prisoners was secured, the Congress faced the gigantic task of legislating for an economy changing from a period of active hostilities to more peacetime production and still engaged in a worldwide cold war to contain communism. We succeeded in beginning peaceful reconstruction of war-torn Korea and supported President Eisenhower in the strengthening of Korean troops so that several American divisions of men could be brought home.

TAXES REDUCED

Tax reductions totaling $7.4 billion annually have gone into effect. This is the biggest tax cut in history. Not only have taxes been cut, but the Nation's tax laws have been given their first major overhauling since 1890. Countless inequities, harassments, duplications, and loopholes have been removed.

Individual income tax rates were cut 10 percent. Excise taxes were slashed on ladies' handbags, telephone bills, athletic equipment, baby oils, cosmetics, and numerous other items. The 10 percent tax on home washing machines was eliminated entirely.

Other changes include: First, bigger medical deductions for 8.5 million people; second, special tax relief for 2.1 million working mothers; third, tax cuts on retirement income for 1.8 million old people; fourth, new tax savings for 1.6 million installment buyers; fifth, bigger soil-conservation deductions for 500,000 farmers; sixth, new rules on dependents for 1.3 million parents; seventh, easier depreciation rules for 10.2 million taxpayers.

BUDGET AND APPROPRIATIONS

Tax savings would not have been possible if Congress and the administration had not cut the final proposed budget of the previous administration for fiscal 1954 by more than $10 billion. Also, under the directives from Congress, the administration actually cut fiscal 1954 spending by more than $6½ billion under the amount spent in fiscal 1953. This reduction in spending resulted from a constant effort to improve the management of Government activities and to find better and less expensive ways of doing the things which must be done by the Federal Government. For example, a quarter of a million unnecessary Federal jobs have been eliminated, and there are 7,055 fewer Government automobiles in service today. Since January 1953, the General Services Administration, the Government's housekeeping and supply agency, has saved $150 million. Small savings bring big results.

COST OF LIVING STABILIZED

The value of the dollar has varied only one-half cent in the past 18 months. This contrasts with the 6-percent annual increase in living costs under the previous administration. The tragic loss of the purchasing power of the dollar—50 percent between 1939 and 1952—has been stayed. This stabilization was accomplished while ending Government control on wages, prices, and rent.

DEFENSE

By departmental reorganization better management and a thorough overhaul of the entire national defense program, the administration has built a highly flexible Army, Navy, and Air Force capable of handling anything short of major international war requiring all-out mobilization. Should an all-out war occur, this program can be readily and rapidly enlarged. Compared to previous years, the administration has achieved greater actual defense power at lower cost and with substantial savings to taxpayers.

COMMUNISM

A hard-hitting attack was launched on domestic Communists, pinks, and other security risks. During the first year of the administration 2,486 Government employees were separated for security reasons. This program was based on the principle that working for the Government is a high privilege—not a right.

Congress has tightened and strengthened the Nation's antisubversive laws. New legislative weapons include: First, S. 3076, which outlaws the Communist Party; second, S. 16, which makes possible the granting of immunity to witnesses testifying before congressional committees—under this measure subversives will no longer find an easy refuge in the fifth amendment; third, H. R. 7486, which imposes heavier penalties for concealing persons from arrest; fourth, H. R. 8658, which imposes heavier penalties on bail jumpers; fifth, H. R. 9909, known as the Alger Hiss bill. This measure denies a Government pension or retirement benefits to any Government employee convicted of felony. Another measure requires that all printing presses owned and controlled by Communists must be registered with the Attorney General.

HOSPITALS AND HEALTH

The 83d Congress has taken important and vigorous steps to promote and protect the Nation's health. One of its first acts was to create a new executive Department of Health, Education, and Welfare with Cabinet rank.

Legislation has been passed to provide Federal aid in the construction of public and nonprofit hospitals, diagnostic and treatment centers, rehabilitation facilities, and nursing homes. Research into health problems was encouraged through the National Heart Institute and the National Institute of Dental Research. Additional funds have been appropriated to expand the State-Federal vocational rehabilitation system, which is designed to help disabled persons to become economically independent.

Congress has been working on but has not yet taken final action on legislation to encourage the establishment of expansion of voluntary private health insurance plans—permitting a broadening of their coverage in some cases, with increased protection, or lower rates in others. Approximately 92 million Americans are already covered by private plans, but better protection is needed, particularly against long-term illness.

SCHOOLS AND EDUCATION

Congress has authorized an extension of the program of assistance in construction of schools in crowded defense centers and other areas which have grown abnormally because of Federal activities. Congress has also granted similar assistance for school operating expenses. Legislation has been enacted to allow greatly expanded use of surplus foods in the school-lunch program.

HOUSING

The Housing Act of 1954 will raise housing standards, help more of our people to acquire homes, assist communities in getting rid of slums and in improving older neighborhoods, and strengthen our mortgage credit system. In the future, the new law will also stimulate the Nation's entire economy, particularly the construction industry.

The new act makes it possible to buy both new and existing homes under FHA-insured loans with lower downpayments and more time to pay.

HIGHWAYS

A highway bill program second to none in history was adopted. This sorely needed program will provide nearly $2 billion for highway construction in fiscal years 1956-57. It will allow about $875 million a year to the States—an amount approximating the money American motorists spend each year in Federal gasoline taxes. California will get a big share of these funds, so that its citizens can drive their cars with greater convenience and better safety.

VETERANS

The Veterans' Administration has been reorganized along functional lines, giving veterans and their dependents faster, better service at less overhead cost.

Among the more important specific benefits given to veterans was the increased compensation payments to those with service-connected disabilities as well as an increase in the monthly payments to widows and dependent parents of veterans. Non-service-connected pensions were also increased.

The Congress increased by $100 million the revolving fund to finance direct Veterans' Administration loans to war veterans unable to finance home and farmhouse loans through private lending sources.

Korean war veterans were granted the same preferences as World War II veterans in war housing, in civil-service appointment, and in free postal service. The time has been extended for Korean veterans to initiate training under the GI bill of rights.

To take care of the ever-increasing load of hospitalized veterans and to provide them with adequate facilities, Congress this year appropriated funds to cover 117,700 operating beds, the highest number the VA feels it can use and staff properly and a greater number of beds than in any other year.

RAILROAD RETIREMENT

New legislation enacted by the House liberalized the provisions of the railroad retirement system by reducing the eligibility age of widows from 65 to 60, raising maximum earnings from $75 to $100, increasing maximum creditable compensation from $300 to $350, and in many other ways. In the meantime, the unemployment insurance was raised from $7 to $8.50 a day.

SOCIAL SECURITY

During the session just ended, Congress passed legislation establishing a record expansion of social security coverage and payments adding 10 million persons to the eligibility rolls and increasing monthly benefits for 600 million persons already receiving payments.

One of the most unfair restrictions concerned an earning limitation on retired persons under 75 years of age. Many lost part or most of their benefits because they sought work to supplement their retirement pay. Now retired workers can earn up to $1,200 a year without loss of benefits.

The new act also includes the disability freeze provision which guarantees that an individual who has no earnings for several years because of a disability does not suffer any reduction in his retirement pay thereby.

UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION

Congress strengthened the Federal-State system of unemployment compensation by providing a $200 million reserve out of unemployment tax revenues and earmarked these reserve loans to States. In the past, unemployment compensation did not cover firms with less than eight employees. Under legislation passed this year, all firms employing four or more workers will be covered by the jobless benefit system.

TAFT-HARTLEY ACT CHANGES

The administration proposed and many of us worked for more than a score of carefully considered changes and improvements in the Taft-Hartley Act. The legislative action on this was not completed primarily due to action in the other body but the many weeks of work on this matter were not wasted as this will be one of the first matters before the 84th Congress.

RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT

Congress authorized construction of 183 navigation, flood-control, and beach-erosion projects throughout the Nation. It also authorized construction of many new irrigation, reclamation, and power projects.

Approval of the St. Lawrence seaway project settled a congressional issue of 30 years' standing. It set up a method of cooperation with Canada and opened the midcontinent of the United States to oceangoing commerce from all regions of the United States and from abroad. The economic advantage is to the Nation as a whole.

The Atomic Energy Act was modernized and brought up to date for the first time since its original enactment. The legislation is designed to speed up the development of nuclear energy for peacetime use through both public power development which was given preference in the bill and through private enterprise development by establishing availability of nuclear energy.

It restored the tidelands to the States, keeping the Continental Shelf for the Federal Government.

In my own district, this year marked the completion at long last of Pine Flat Dam and Reservoir, which will provide flood control and irrigation benefits to the San Joaquin Valley of California and also make possible upstream generation of hydroelectric power. This year also saw the appropriation of sufficient funds to complete the Merced County stream group project, a flood-prevention project of great importance to Merced County. Approximately $22 million has been appropriated for the Central Valley project, the major portion of which will be used to finance irrigation distribution systems and related works.

There is much yet to be done, however. The continued growth in population, industry, and agriculture in Merced County will require further power development, water storage, and flood-control work on the Merced River. Irrigation and flood-control benefits can be gained from building dams on the Chowchilla and Fresno Rivers in Madera County.

In the west side of the valley, the construction of the San Luis project will bring much-needed water to that area. The future prosperity and well-being of the people of my district are dependent upon successful prosecution of these and other projects. For that reason, I have given them, and shall continue to give them, my wholehearted support. The work we have accomplished in the 83d Congress on these matters should enable us to move rapidly on them when Congress reconvenes in January.

FOREIGN AID

Foreign aid has been continued, but at a reduced rate. Many changes and improvements have been made in handling the foreign-aid program. Continuing its great humanitarian tradition, the United States sent food to East Germany, wheat to Pakistan, and entered upon a comprehensive program for distributing farm surplus commodities for famine and distress relief.

AGRICULTURE

In policy and action, the 83d Congress and the Eisenhower administration fully recognized the importance of farmers and farming to the national welfare. Month after month of hearings and many days of debate hammered out an impressive record of accomplishment for the benefit of agriculture. This subject is so important that I went into it at great length in my remarks appearing in the Congressional Record of August 17, 1954, which I have advised the people of my district are available upon request.

Thus, without going into detail at this time, it is sufficient to say that the revision of the agricultural laws of the United States perform a distinct service to the farmers, the consumers and the general economy by bringing more into balance the agricultural economy with the needs of today.

Mr. Speaker, in summation there was no segment of our people who were forgotten by the 83d Congress. The benefits to the worker, the businessman, and the farmer can best be realized in the coming months and years ahead. The tools provided by this Congress will enable the United States to use her position of world leadership to forge a strong and dynamic world peace and a prosperous economy for her citizens here at home. Certainly, this has been a people's Congress.

Achievements of the Eisenhower Administration and the Republican 83d Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, the achievements of the Eisenhower administration and the Republican 83d Congress have been highly satisfactory. As the session comes to a close it is my desire to set forth some of the accomplishments for the benefit of the constituency that I have had the honor and privilege of representing.

Taking an overall view of the situation since President Eisenhower was inaugurated in January 1953 and the Republican Congress assumed its duties, the accomplishments have been very worthwhile. It is the general opinion that taken all in all it has been a good program and will prove highly acceptable and beneficial to the people.

The task that was assumed by President Eisenhower and the Republican Congress in January 1953 was no easy one. In fact, the conditions that were found to exist upon taking over the Government, after the preceding administration, were far more difficult than expected. But with resolute purpose the task of cleaning up and improving conditions was undertaken.

In order that the people of the First Congressional District may fully understand what has been the accomplishments of the present administration, it is my purpose to first set forth what was expected of it and, then, what was done by it.

WHAT WAS EXPECTED OF THE REPUBLICAN PARTY?

The people wanted the Republican Party—

First. To end the war in Korea.

Second. To restore sound policies consistent with American ideals and principles of government.

Third. To end extravagant and wasteful expenditures in government.

Fourth. To provide relief from the increasing burden of taxation.

Fifth. To require loyalty to American ideals by all who held offices of public trust.

Sixth. To establish freedom from bureaucratic control and regimentation.

Seventh. To maintain a strong national defense.

Eighth. To maintain our dignity as a nation in foreign affairs and to promote peace and security upon honorable terms and conditions.

These were the fundamental demands of our people. To meet these demands was the responsibility of the Republican President and Republican Congress. The task was no easy one as the result of the limited majorities in both Houses of Congress; but, nevertheless, the obligation existed.

Thus, it is appropriate that at this time, as the November elections are approaching, to take an account of what has been accomplished in view of what was desired. In my opinion, it shows a record of achievement that justifies continued support of President Eisenhower and Republican control of both Houses of Congress.

KOREA

Our people had grown weary of war and its exacting sacrifices. World War II was ended only to be followed by the Korean conflict. The sacrifices of our best in manhood brought distress to the families of America, our national resources were being depleted, and our burden of taxes increasing. All of this created an understandable desire for an honorable peace. To accomplish this became the first task of the Republican administration. President Eisenhower took the leadership and with courage and firmness sought an end to the conflict. He and the people of the Nation gave thanks to God that these efforts proved successful. And it is our fervent hope and prayer that our Nation will continue to be wisely guided through the treacherous conditions that are all about us, especially in the Far East, that we may avoid war there and every other place where trouble exists.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

Under the leadership of President Eisenhower on questions relating to military strategy and the elements necessary to provide adequate national defense and security, together with the executive ability of Secretary of Defense Wilson with respect to production, the country now has more defense at less cost than at any time in recent years. The consequent decrease in appropriations has helped very materially in reducing the cost of government, resulting in corresponding decrease in the burden of taxation. The fact that this has been done while providing adequate defense in these troublous times has been a most outstanding and worthy accomplishment.

REDUCTION IN COST OF GOVERNMENT

The record that has been made by the Republican administration, since it assumed office in January 1953, with respect to the elimination of waste and extravagance in government, and the reduction of cost of government has been most commendable.

In the two sessions of Congress since January 1953, the reduction in the expenses of government as compared to the last administration has totaled approximately $12 billion. Because of this policy of economy the Republican 83d Congress has been able to enact the largest tax-saving program in the history of our country. No Congress in history has ever adopted a tax-saving program equal to that voted by the present Republican Congress. For 20 years, with the single exception of 2 years during the Republican 80th Congress, taxes against the earnings of our people went upward and never downward. The theory of previous administrations has been to spend and spend and then tax and tax until the burden had become unbearable. Waste and extravagance went hand in hand producing the need for higher and higher taxes. The upward trend of ever-increasing taxation has not only been stopped, but the trend has been reversed and is now downward instead of upward

Today, I am happy to report, the annual tax bill for the American people is $7,400,000,000 less than it was when the Republican administration took up the reins of government This is an achievement unparalleled in the history of our Government

Personal income taxes are 10 percent lower; excise taxes on commodities in general use are in most cases 50 percent less; our retired schoolteachers, firemen, police, working mothers, the disabled and handicapped, investors in enterprises that provide jobs for wage earners are all benefiting by a reduced taxation policy. Furthermore, the extensive revision of our Internal Revenue Code, correcting hundreds of inequities that developed in the course of years, brought deserving relief to millions of our citizens.

The large share of the tax savings will go to individuals as the 52-percent corporation tax on our larger business enterprises has been continued.

BUREAUCRATIC CONTROL AND REGIMENTATION ENDED

Not only has the burden of taxation been decreased, but the irritating effect of bureaucratic control has been eliminated. This has become a thing of the past. No longer are we faced with the danger of an increasing tendency to adopt foreign ideologies that could lead to regimentation of a kind not in accord with our American principles. No longer are we restrained by controls or in fear of regimentation. In times of peace there is no need nor justification for a system of controls or regimentation whatsoever. To prevent such, is the present and future policy of the Republican Party.

INFLATION HAS BEEN STOPPED

The adverse result of inflation, with the consequent reduction of the value of the dollar, is something with which we are all unfortunately familiar. For a decade and more the purchasing value of the dollar has been continually decreasing. Such a trend once started is not easy to stop. However, we can all be thankful that this continual downward trend has been stopped as a result of the policies adopted by this Republican administration. To millions of our citizens, particularly our older citizens living on fixed incomes from pensions, annuities, or life savings, as well as veterans and their dependents, this accomplishment of the Republican Party brings to an end the fear of a reduced standard of living. A continuation of these policies can and will bring further advantageous results.

HOUSING AND HOME OWNERSHIP

Good housing and living conditions make for a stronger America. The need for improved living conditions for a vast number of our people has been recognized, and, the present Republican Congress has provided for the need by a program which will materially meet the existing need.

The program adopted not only makes possible the elimination of so-called slum areas, but, also make it easier for individuals in rural or city areas to construct and own their own homes. All of this is being done within the concept of a free enterprise system. The result of this legislation will undoubtedly be helpful to all who seek better living conditions and look forward to the day when they can own their own home.

SOCIAL SECURITY

While it is gratifying to realize that we have in America the highest standard of living in all the world, yet, there is need for an ever-increasing system of old-age and survivors insurance. The Republican Congress has recognized this need and has accordingly brought upward of 10,200,000 more earners under the social-security plan.

This additional coverage includes 3,600,000 farm operators; 2,100,000 farmworkers; 200,000 domestic workers; 3,500,000 State and local employees; 250,000 ministers; 100,000 homeworkers; 50,000 fishermen; 100,000 American employees of foreign subsidiaries of American companies; 50,000 in employment not in course of trade or business; 100,000 professional self-employed, such as accountants, architects, engineers, and morticians; and 150,000 Federal employees; totaling 10,200,000. Lawyers, doctors, and dentists are not included but should be. In my opinion this will be done in the near future.

More than 6,500,000 persons now on the benefit rolls will have their benefits increased as of September 1, 1954. The average increase for retired workers will be about $6 a month, with proportionate increases for dependents and survivors. The range in primary insurance amounts for those now on the rolls would be $30 to $98.50, as compared to $25 to $85 under previous law.

The bill also provided for a continuation of the increases in Federal payments to the States for old-age assistance, aid to the blind, and aid to the permanently and totally disabled.

This legislation presented by the Republican administration and adopted by the Congress leaves no doubt of a sincere and honest desire to be helpful to the aged and handicapped among our people. I trust and expect that further additions in coverage and benefits will be possible in the near future.

RAILROAD RETIREMENT AND UNEMPLOYMENT ACT

The Railroad Retirement and Unemployment Act was amended at this session of Congress to liberalize retirement and unemployment benefits to railroad workers and their dependent survivors.

Henceforth, widows, dependent widowers, and dependent parents of covered workers can qualify for benefits at age 60 instead of 65; dependent children permanently and totally disabled before the age of 18 and their mothers will continue to receive survivor benefits beyond the present cut-off age; maximum daily unemployment benefits are increased from $7.50 to $8.50 and disabled workers drawing retirement benefits are now allowed to earn $100 monthly from outside sources without losing their annuities.

HEALTH

I have been particularly interested in providing additional health facilities and adopting ways and means to meet the increasing cost of medical and hospital attention. The cost of such has gotten to a point where the burden is too much for a family to bear in cases of prolonged illness. While much has been accomplished in the endeavor to provide additional facilities, yet there remains much to be done in alleviating the cost of medical and hospital attention. This will be a subject that will receive renewed attention in the next session of Congress.

However, the Congress did adopt important measures in the field of health. One of the most worthwhile bills adopted was that for a 3-year health and hospital program providing $182 million for the construction of diagnostic centers, hospitals for the chronically ill, as well as rehabilitation and nursing homes.

Furthermore, a $2 million fund has been provided for surveys by State authorities to determine the needs in the field of health. Research programs have also been provided for to continue the assault against the Nation's major killers—cancer, heart ailments, and other disorders of the mental and nervous systems including poliomyelitis, arthritis, rheumatism, muscular dystrophy, cerebral palsy, blindness, and many other diseases that bring so much distress to individuals and their families. For these purposes the present Republican Congress voted the greatest amount of money our researchers in these fields have ever had available. I am proud to have had a part in formulating this humane program. I give assurance of my continuing interest in this and all similar programs that have as their objective the alleviation of disease, the care of the ill, and making more comfortable the aged, chronically ill, and handicapped in life.

AGRICULTURE

The question as to what should be our farm policy was one that created a distinct division of thought. Midwest and southern farmers were generally in favor of maintaining a fixed parity of 90 percent for wheat, corn, cotton, and peanuts. The administration favored a policy of flexible parity ranging from 75 percent to 90 percent. This issue was finally decided by adopting a flexible policy ranging from 82½ percent to 90 percent.

This issue is not one that in any great measure directly affects New Jersey farmers. It is due to the fact that the crops of New Jersey are mostly of a diversified character and the so-called basic crops covered by parity are not grown in great quantities in New Jersey when compared with the quantities raised elsewhere.

However, as the effect of subsidy, whether fixed or flexible, is to hold up the price of grain, it does have a detrimental effect on the poultry business in the State of New Jersey. This arises from the fact that the price of poultry feed is made higher as a result of the subsidy policy or price maintenance of crops that go into the manufacture of poultry feed. The fact that the administration demanded a flexible rather than fixed parity is most gratifying as a step toward getting away from the former policy that created a definite problem for our poultrymen.

The New Jersey poultry farmers in my opinion are entitled to some assistance in meeting the high price of poultry feed. With the price of eggs going down at this time, and feeds costs remaining high, a distinct problem is created that makes it difficult for the poultry farmer to remain in business except at a loss.

There have been several suggestions made by poultry farmers to relieve or better the conditions they presently face, namely, first, that the Government buy 1 million cases of eggs for school lunches and relief clients; second, that Government-owned surplus grains be made available to them at reduced prices; and, third, that New Jersey be declared a drought disaster area, making its farmers eligible for emergency loans.

At the present time the subject is under consideration by the Department of Agriculture in an effort to find a basis upon which help may be extended. If none is found voluntarily by the Department, then it should be a matter of congressional consideration and the adoption of legislation that would provide a helpful remedy.

HIGHWAY CONSTRUCTION

The Republican 83d Congress has enacted the most comprehensive and expanding road program ever adopted by Congress. It seeks to put our road-building program on a basis that will insure up-to-date roads throughout the Nation. For the next 2 years upward of a billion dollars will be provided annually for the purpose. This means for the first time in our history, virtually 100 percent of the tax money collected by the Federal Government on gasoline and oil sales will be returned to the States for road-building purposes. This will bring to an end the previous policy of diverting as much as 40 percent of such revenue to other and unrelated purposes.

It is also important to note that this new policy also returns to the States, counties, and local municipalities greater control over the type of roads they can build—control that had been heretofore lodged in a Federal bureau. Thus, now for the first time the funds made available for road construction in certain areas may be used to build highways in accord with the localities served.

WAR CLAIMS

Important legislation has been adopted that will be helpful in dealing with many kinds of problems that have arisen in connection with prisoners of war and others who were made subject to hardships and losses incident to improper and illegal enemy action.

EDUCATION

The basis for an attack on how we can best provide better educational advantages for our children has been established by appropriate legislation. These bills provide close cooperation between the Federal and State Governments to the end that there may be a complete cooperation in our research to determine regional needs thus avoiding duplication of effort and diffusion of our resources in meeting the problems of education arising from the increasing number of children to be educated.

VETERANS

The rights of the men and women who served their country during the Korean conflict have been safeguarded and there has been extended to them the same benefits accorded to those men and women who served in World War I and World War II.

Furthermore, the Congress has recognized the necessity of providing more adequately for our disabled veterans of all wars. Thus, a program has been adopted that will increase benefits to them, to widows, survivors, and to dependent parents. This is in accord with the Republican policy to recognize our obligation to those who served their country and are in need, their widows and survivors.

DISPLACED PERSONS

Recognizing the hardships placed upon individuals and families abroad who were separated as the result of war, this Nation, under Republican leadership, has sought to alleviate their unfortunate condition in every possible way, including the admission into this country of a limited number under strict security regulations.

INTERNAL SECURITY

The present administration has sought diligently to ascertain the existence of any and every disloyal employee in the Government service. As a result of this effort, some 2,400 persons were found to be security risks and have either resigned or been discharged from Government employment. As a result our people can feel confident that secrets vital to our welfare will not fall into the hands of our enemies through the activities of spies and traitors. Additional powers have been given to the Justice Department, and additional penalties provided to adequately and effectually deal with this traitorous class.

COMMUNISM

There is no doubt where the present administration stands on the issue of communism. The active and aggressive prosecution by the Department of Justice has resulted in the conviction of 50 Communist Party leaders on charges of conspiring against the United States Government. Twenty-two more are on trial or scheduled for trial. Almost 100 additional organizations have been declared subversive in character by the Department of Justice. Orders to deport 268 aliens with records of Red activity have been issued by the Republican Attorney General. Congress has passed laws that will outlaw the Communist Party and make it a crime to belong to any political party or organization that advocates the overthrow of our Government by force.

Congressional committees, regardless of the complaints from subversive sources will continue to press their investigations against subversive elements as long as the need exists.

ATOMIC-ENERGY PROGRAM

This is an atomic age. It brings both fear and hope. Fear because of the known disastrous results that follow its use. Hope because of the claim that it can be adapted to useful and beneficial purposes. The future alone will show whether the good uses will prevail over the harmful uses of which it is capable. Whatever may be its possible uses this Nation is alert to the necessity of keeping ahead in all that pertains to its use.

During President Eisenhower's first year in office he inspired the free world by a proposal for a world atomic energy agency to promote the use of atomic energy in peaceful pursuits for all mankind. The failure of the Soviet Union to accept the proposal made plain that the underlying purpose and intent of the Kremlin is not for peace but for war. Notwithstanding this setback our Nation through the action of the Congress and the approval of the President has adopted legislation that brings this whole subject of atomic power into its proper relationship from the standpoint of national security in time of war, as well as peaceful use of its powerful elements that can promote the welfare of mankind.

EFFICIENCY AND ECONOMY IN THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

It was immediately apparent when the present administration took over the management of our Government that there was a surplus of employees in Government service. As a result of this condition efficiency was at a low ebb and economy ignored.

In promoting both efficiency and economy the executive departments of our Government immediately upon assuming their respective departments began a careful study of the situation to ascertain how the evils could be best remedied, and, with as little distress as possible to the surplus employees whose services were not necessary to the proper functioning of the Government.

As a result of these studies nearly a quarter of a million jobs have been abolished or consolidated by executive departments, thereby saving millions of dollars to the American taxpayer and at the same time greatly improving the efficiency of Government departments. At the same time loyal employees have been assured that they will be treated fairly in their Government careers. In this connection there has been a revision of civil-service standards whereby there has been restored to the civil-service system equitable rules and regulations in the place of the inequitable standards previously utilized in a program of employment and advancement based on political favoritism.

Furthermore, in an effort to provide a continuing program of promoting efficiency and economy in the Federal Government there have been established commissions to make close and careful studies of governmental departments and their operations. It is expected that the result of these studies will be to show other ways and means of obtaining more efficiency and economy in our Government. To attain this objective will mean further reduction in the cost of government and consequent reduction of Federal taxation to the individual taxpayer. It can also be expected by continuing this effort that a balanced budget will be accomplished in the not distant future.

CONFIDENCE RESTORED

The conduct of Republicans in high office in the Federal Government, under this administration, has brought renewed confidence in the existence of honesty and integrity in the fulfillment of public duties. These, together with the necessary ability to fulfill the duties of the respective office, are the elements that make for good government.

With this type of leadership our policies of government represent the honest convictions of the officials who formulate them, and, are based upon previous experience and success in their individual affairs that has made them recognized leaders in their respective activities.

Already there are signs that our Nation is stronger financially and economically than it was at the time the Eisenhower administration took over. Today we have a prosperity based upon peace and not the false prosperity of war. There is an adherence to the principles that make a strong foundation by recognizing and utilizing the old and tried principles that have contributed greatly to the strength of our Nation.

THE FUTURE—OUR DUTY

The accomplishments of the present administration, worthwhile though they may be, do not entitle us to rest on our oars. There is important work yet to be done. The welfare of our people can be still further promoted by the fulfillment of the magnificent program of President Eisenhower.

What can and should be done by our citizens to make certain that the President's program is made effective in its entirety? The answer is plain—election of another Republican Congress in November.

President Eisenhower needs and deserves the help of another Republican Congress during the last half of his first term of office. Election of an unsympathetic Congress could wreck the magnificent gains already made. Furthermore, there is need of a larger Republican majority than he had during the first half of his present term of office.

The small Republican majorities in the House and Senate have made it difficult to accomplish all that was desired by the President and, in the way he desired. At times because of such limitation it has been necessary to compromise and thereby take less than was desired. But, notwithstanding the lack of a large working majority that has been a distinct handicap, the accomplishments have been highly satisfactory. However, if the present administration is to accomplish all that is expected of it there must be a sufficient majority in both House and Senate to give an unquestioned Republican control to the President in both Houses of Congress. Thus, the issue in the coming election in November will be the control of Congress. It cannot be too strongly emphasized that a Republican control in both branches of Congress is necessary if President Eisenhower is to accomplish all that is expected of him during his administration.

Aside from political considerations that might be urged to give support to the President by electing a Republican Congress, the overruling consideration should be our national welfare.

The uncertainty that pervades the world requires a strong hand at the helm with a Congress in sympathy with the captain of the old ship of state. Division between captain and crew as to the course to be followed could easily bring us upon the rocks. The situation is too serious to be trifled with. We must sail a straight course or take the dire consequences that could follow a change in policies. Today we have peace. Tomorrow we could have war if the wrong course is followed.

When things are going along all right, we should let well enough alone. Things that may require a remedy can be dealt with as they arise by those who have had the experience and shown good judgment in bringing us where we are today. The importance of experience in these treacherous and uncertain times cannot be overemphasized nor should it be overlooked.

President Eisenhower and the Republicans in the Senate and House are working as a team. They have accomplished much notwithstanding the handicaps with which they were faced. The conditions that confront us call for the strength that comes from continued unity of purpose and unity of action by a sympathetic Congress.

I See Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks, I should like to insert a recent broadcast of Mr. Hubert Holloway, of the Cincinnati Times-Star:

I see today that no matter what the statements or headlines say, the 1954 ballot issue is party responsibility. We have a national habit of getting all excited about men, electing 'em President, and then pulling the rug from under 'em halfway through the presidential waltz. We did it to the Democrats in 1918, and wrecked the League of Nations. We did it to the Republicans in 1930, and came near wrecking the country by shackling Herbert Hoover's efforts to end a depression. And we did again to the Democrats in 1946, and mixed up postwar responsibility. America kicking herself in the pants in off-presidential years is one of our sad political spectacles. It's like stopping in the midst of the championship season to put some opponents in your backfield. Giving the President a vote of no-confidence in midterm is a funny way to run a country. I reckon that parties are the closest approach to government by the people that the world has ever known. But when it comes to giving 'em a 4-year contract to end poverty, we ought to stick by our bargain and make 'em stick by theirs.

You know, some folks are trying to make communism the issue. Communism is not an issue, it's an affliction the Grand Old Party inherited. Democrats and Republicans alike are trying to keep it from becoming a plague on both their houses. There's some difference of opinion of the method of treatment. But there's no quarrel over it being quarantined. Whether you like Ike or don't like Ike, whether you are a Republican or a Democrat, whether you are a blond or a brunet, the simple truth is that party responsibility is an urgent need. We can't have it with a leader of one political faith and the guardians of the purse strings and statute books of another.

I mean that the issue of party responsibility touches the broader issue of the welfare of America. Our country runs in spite of political parties, not because of 'em. Well, in 1916, we elected Woodrow Wilson because he kept us out of war, and 2 years later vetoed his ideas to keep us out permanently. In 1928, we elected Herbert Hoover because he was a great humanitarian, and 2 years later we substituted politics for humanity. We sowed some political winds and reaped a whirlwind of a depression.

All I know is that we talk about how politics ought to be harmonious. It's because TV, radio, planes, and cars have brought us too close. We ought to step back and look, like you do at paintings. There's perhaps more harmony today than ever before. Many sincere men differ sometimes from party policy. A ballot organization in complete harmony would be like sheep waiting to revolt. The purpose of parties is to bring the nearest possible harmony out of wide discord. Congress used to have many Senator Joe's. Duels were staged with "pistols for 2 and coffee for 1." Now everybody just wrestles for the microphone. Out of it all should come party responsibility so that political parties can rise above their press agents. Good night, friends.

Congressman Frank E. Smith, of Mississippi, Reports From Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. SMITH

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include my newsletter of August 20, reporting to my constituents on the work of the 83d Congress:

YOUR CONGRESSMAN REPORTS FROM WASHINGTON—FRANK SMITH'S NEWSLETTER

The 83d Congress has concluded its legislative business after a session that has often seemed to be more concerned with investigation than with legislation. Newspapers and commentators friendly to the administration have made much of the success achieved in writing into law a large portion of President Eisenhower's "dynamic, progressive" program. On two of the most important issues for the country as a whole, and especially for the people of Mississippi, however, the Congress has taken definite steps backward.

The new farm bill represents a major victory for those who have been attempting to place the blame for high food prices on the American farmer. It appears likely to further accelerate the decline in farm income now in progress. Interestingly enough, the withdrawal of assistance to the farmer has come at a time when business and industry are getting greater assistance than ever in the form of the new tax and housing bills, and various rulings and regulations of the administrative departments.

Thanks to the set-aside gadget in the farm bill, it now appears likely that the support level for cotton in 1955 will continue at 90 percent. After 1955, however, the support price is virtually certain to be reduced, unless the law is changed at the next session of Congress. Thanks to the strong effort being made to divide consumers from farmers, the prospects for any major change in the law are not good.

If cotton farmers are ever to achieve 100 percent of parity at the market place, they must have an active export market. The same holds true for the producers of most other important farm commodities. This Congress has passed a bill which will be of some assistance in the disposal overseas of some surplus commodity stocks, but nothing has been achieved toward building up and strengthening a permanent export market.

President Eisenhower submitted a limited, but commendable, trade program to the Congress, and then completely turned his back upon virtually all of it. As a result the Congress failed to pass any important measures designed to improve world trade, and several proposals which would offer serious new restrictions were narrowly defeated. At the administrative level, for the first time in more than 20 years the President personally approved additional new tariff barriers when he directed an increase in the duty on imported watches.

At a time when our country should be doing everything possible to outmaneuver Russia in the field of trade warfare, we are virtually inviting other free nations to increase their trade with Communistic countries by making it harder for them to trade with the United States.

The 84th Congress will inherit some perplexing problems.

Results of Questionnaire, First Congressional District, Wisconsin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend by remarks, I am including a recent questionnaire on important issues confronting the American people, as we go into the next congressional campaign. These issues involve both foreign and domestic policies. I include the tabulated results at this point:

Final tabulation of results, questionnaire from Congressman Lawrence H. Smith, 1st District, Wisconsin

	Yes	No
1. Do you favor increasing the Federal debt limit?	192	1,321
2. Do you favor return to the States of all Federal gasoline and oil tax revenues for highway construction purposes without Federal dictation?	1,137	379
3. Do you think that the Taft-Hartley Act is fairer to all parties than the old Wagner Act?	1,455	70
4. Do you think that employers should have the right to talk freely to their employees about all labor-management matters?	1,509	60
5. Do you favor reciprocal trade agreements regardless of competition of foreign products with domestic products?	437	999
6. Do you approve of Government buying up and storing farm surpluses?	287	1,085
7. Do you believe that the Federal Government should go into the business of producing and selling electric power?	161	1,377
8. Do you favor old-age insurance payments to all persons 65 and older, regardless of need or prior eligibility?	457	1,060
9. Do you believe that the administration and control of health and medical services to all the people is a proper function of the Federal Government?	160	1,380
10. Do you favor socialized medicine?	86	1,452
11. Do you favor a constitutional amendment making treaties with foreign nations of no force and effect if they deny or abridge any right enumerated in the United States Constitution?	995	401
12. Should the United States continue its program of economic aid to foreign countries?	484	909
13. Do you believe atomic and hydrogen bomb know-how should be shared with other countries?	152	1,325
14. Do you think that the United States should continue to pay ⅓ of the cost of maintaining the United Nations?	134	1,398
15. Should the United States sever diplomatic relations with Russia?	876	543
16. Do you believe American military aid to foreign countries should be continued?	736	627
17. Do you favor keeping American troops abroad?	628	871
18. Do you think we should demand that our allies halt all trade with Russia and her satellites?	1,048	300
19. Do you feel that the President should have the power to commit the United States to active resistance in aggression in Europe and Asia without the consent of or consultation with Congress?	129	1,415

More and Better Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, the biggest single factor in brightening the economic forecast during the past year has been the record established by the construction industry. Homes, highways, and public utility expansion have been high on the agenda of activity. In August, the figure reached a new record of more than $3½ billion. In 1953, the building set its high level at $35,250,000,000. At the present annual rate, 1954 should do better than $36½ billion.

What is most cheerful about this picture is the tremendous amount of private residential construction throughout the country. People have always been home conscious in America. Nowadays this attitude has become more pervasive than ever. "A home for every family" sounds like a slogan out of Aladdin and his magic lamp to most countries where homes are luxuries. But in our own land, there is every good prospect for reaching this ideal for every family which desires a home. With our liberalized lending facilities underwritten by new congressional legislation, the possibility becomes more than a dream.

In its spreading effects, homeownership means the manufacture and purchase of household goods, extension of utilities, school buildings, employment expansion, and a steadily widening influence upon the economy. More and better housing is the sign of a healthy economy.

Broadcasts of Hon. Michael A. Feighan, of Ohio, to the Enslaved Peoples of Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, while in Europe as a member of the Select Committee To Investigate Communist Aggression, I was afforded the opportunity to speak, through the Voice of America, to the enslaved peoples of many of the non-Russian nations in the Red colonial empire. Our committee was in Munich, Germany, during the period June 21 through July 4. I feel the broadcasts I made to the enslaved people of those nations will be of interest to the Members of Congress and to patriotic Americans.

To the People of Hungary:

It gives me great pleasure to have the opportunity to let the Hungarian people know that in the course of the Munich hearings of the congressional committee on Communist aggression a great number of most valuable Hungarian witnesses have been heard who revealed in detail the dastardly ways by which the Communists and their puppet regime terrorizes and holds in bondage with the aid of Communist arms the liberty-loving Hungarian nation. I wish to let our Hungarian friends know that these testimonies have not been given in vain. The congressional committee, of which I am a member, shall do everything in its power to bring these appalling facts of Communist tyranny before the people of the United States and indeed before the public opinion of the entire world. It is our firm conviction that the consciousness of the world will eventually bear down with such tremendous force upon the satanic clique bent on enslaving all of humanity for its selfish purposes that those inhumane antichrists will be forced to release from their grip all those people who now are pressed into slavery. I know many Americans of Hungarian ancestry and have met also a great number of Hungarian patriots living now outside of Hungary. Based on my impression and acquaintance with them I am certain that the innate talent and genius as well as the glowing spirit of the Hungarian people will not only survive these dark days but rise in glorious victory over their oppressors. For centuries the holy crown of St. Stephen has stood as the real symbol for the Hungarian nation. In time of strife and suffering the Hungarian people have always remembered the strong admonitions of King Stephen. This has given the Hungarian people the courage and stamina to defeat the barbarians in past generations—just as it preserves them today in their struggles with the new Red barbarians. At this point in history the cause of the Hungarian nation is the cause of all freedom-loving people throughout the world. This is so because the Red barbarians is the moratal enemy of all nations and people. Just as surely as day follows night the Red tyrants will be defeated in their aggressions against humanity and the way will be cleared for the golden era of peace and tranquillity among all nations.

I am happy to speak today over the Voice of America from its studios in Europe to the courageous Lithuanian people and to express my profound admiration for your indomitable spirit in the face of Communist tyranny and oppression to which you are now subjected.

As a member of the American congressional committee investigating Communist aggression, I have heard from the lips of Lithuanian witnesses of the terrorism and brutality which has been visited upon the people of Lithuania by the tyrannical Kremlin rulers. I have heard, too of the Communist attempts to eradicate your faith in God and to stamp out your traditional love of God, country, and freedom. These efforts will not succeed.

In my own city of Cleveland, Ohio, there is a substantial Lithuanian community which is well aware of your unhappy situation. They have their parishes, many organizations, their radio programs, and a weekly newspaper Dirva. They and all the rest of the American people know of your slavery under the heel of the mad Kremlin leaders, and they are doing everything in their power to help you to bring that slavery to an end. Moreover, they are praying to Almighty God that the light of freedom will come soon again to Lithuania.

Lithuania regained its national independence after World War I. Then the Muscovites illegally incorporated Lithuania into the U. S. S. R. during World War II. It is the same story all over again. That story is one of a despotic empire but this time it masquerades as the Communist empire.

The American people will not be fooled by this propaganda maneuver. The American people have not forgotten their Lithuanian friends, and we will never cease our relentless fight for freedom, peace, and justice to all nations of the earth.

To the People of Poland:

It gives me great satisfaction to speak to the Polish listeners of the Voice of America in Europe about the work being done by the congressional Committee on Communist Aggression.

I say this as the Representative of a district which boasts a very high percentage of Americans of Polish descent. In my city of Cleveland in the State of Ohio they are served there by a newspaper in the Polish language, the Polish Daily News, edited by my good friend, August Kurdziel. We Americans know well of the rich culture of the Polish nation, the vigor of its people, and their unwavering support of Christian principles.

The people of Cleveland, the people of Ohio, of the United States, and of the whole free world are becoming more and more aware of the oppression, the religious persecution, and the godless Communist occupation of Poland.

The recently concluded hearings of the Kersten committee in Munich and in London have provided us with a true picture of life in Poland today. The eyewitness accounts of the appalling inhumanity of the Communists were told in detail. As a member of the Kersten committee I will do my best to reveal these terrible details of Communist oppression to the whole world. Our official report to Congress and to the American people will carry every fact and every name and every torture used on the Polish nation.

Your relatives and friends in the United States and in the free world know that you are suffering and they want to help you. We pray for you and we are looking forward to the day of your liberation. God is on our side. America and all the free world will never rest until Poland is free and independent again.

It is clear to me that the Russian Communists have created the greatest prison of nations ever known to mankind. The present rulers of the Kremlin are carrying out the legacy of Peter the Terrible but now seek to bring the entire world under the domination of Moscow. This is the issue before all the people of the world—those who are free and those who today are enslaved. We must—we will—meet this challenge and in the end defeat the historic enemies of all mankind. Nyeh jeeye Polska.

To the People of Estonia:

I am speaking to you today as a member of the select committee of the United States House of Representatives established to investigate Communist aggression.

In the present worldwide struggle against Communist brutality, and the Communist menace, our committee is a fact-finding body—our task is to gather all the evidence about the enemy. Having started to fulfill this mission by investigating Communist aggression against Estonia and the other Baltic States, we are now extending our investigation to include the rest of the Communist-subjugated nations in order to bring to light the whole truth and make it known to the world.

From our investigation we know that you in Estonia are an outpost which had to bear the brunt of Communist aggression. We are well aware, however, that you have shown yourselves stanch supporters of the cause of freedom, in spite of all the dangers, hardships and sufferings which you are forced to endure.

For this reason, I am calling on you, my stanch Estonian friends: Remain firm and strong, no matter how fiercely the enemy may try to break your resistance and suppress you. I can assure you that we Americans shall always be with you and shall continue to do everything we can to bring back your freedom and national independence. The same assurance was recently given—as you may know—by our President who in his special Baltic Deportation Day message said: "We are resolved to continue to do all that we can to establish in the world conditions under which these countries will regain and retain their freedom." Estonia was illegally incorporated into the empire of Moscow. Estonia is now in the historic prison of nations. But Estonia and all the other nations now enslaved in this empire must be set free. Justice is on our side, Estonians. We Americans are with you. Victory shall eventually be ours. Long live free Estonia. Elagu vaba Eesti.

To the People of Bulgaria:

It has been 9 years since the Communists took over Bulgaria. Since then other countries in Eastern Europe have fallen under Communist domination. For many of you, especially for the young Bulgarians, the details and the dreadful circumstances of the happenings of 9 years ago are becoming very dim. The only thing which remains before you is the result of the 9th of September, 1944, the aftermath of hangman Vishinsky's visit to Bulgaria, who set in motion the Red aggression planned by the Kremlin masters.

My Bulgarian friends, the oppression and misery of your present life in Bulgaria should not cause you to stop and think only of the past. Perhaps you even think the free, outside world has forgotten you. Some of you think that we, on the free side of the Iron Curtain do not know what has happened since the days of 1944 and what is going on in the Communist empire today.

For those of you who may think that way, as few as they may be, I have this to say: We, the free people of the United States, are well aware of your present plight. We know freedom and we know how to guard it. We also know that if freedom is threatened anywhere in the world our freedom cannot be secure.

This is the reason why we are using all the measures necessary to protect ourselves and our way of life. This is the reason we consider your state of oppression as a matter of vital concern. This is the reason why the Congress of the United States created the Committee on Communist Aggression. And this is the reason why the committee is now here in Europe. We, the members of the committee, have heard many people from the countries behind the Iron Curtain. We also have heard Bulgarians. We learned a lot about you from the testimony—about your past and present—about your fight against enslavement in the years past, and about the unheralded resistance of the Bulgarians against the present Communist regime in Sofia. We also heard of your determination to be once again freed of the chains of Moscow. The people of the United States will be fully informed of what is going on in Bulgaria, Rumania, Hungary, Poland, Lithuania, Estonia, Latvia, Czechia, Slovakia, Ukraine, Georgia, Armenia, and other captive non-Russian nations. The free world, on the basis of what we here have learned, will find added reason to step up its efforts for the liberation of the enslaved people in the Communist empire. The free world will also learn, as a result of the hearings of the United States congressional Committee on Communist Aggression, what it means to believe in Communist promises and what happens to nations who try to deal with Communists.

The free world, the American people and the Congress of the United States are and will always be on the side of the freedom-loving and liberty-deserving Bulgarians.

Letter to Sidney Davis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record a copy of a letter I recently wrote to Mr. Sidney Davis, a very capable young lawyer of the firm of Phillips, Nizer & Krim, of New York, who has been serving as counsel for the Antimonopoly Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee. Mr. Davis was formerly law secretary to Judge Jerome Frank and to Mr. Justice Black. He was a special assistant to the Attorney General in the Antitrust Division of the Justive Department and is an authority in the field of antitrust law. Working without any appropriation or staff, he has conducted very revealing hearings into the workings of the private power lobby and I feel he merits the recognition accorded him by the following letter.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

August 19, 1954.

Mr. Sidney Davis,
Care of Senator Langer, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

Dear Sidney: I just wanted to write you, at the close of this session, and tell you what a fine job I think you have done, in the face of great obstacles, as counsel for our antimonopoly subcommittee.

I hope that you will be able to continue on leave from your firm, so that we can continue the investigation and hearings on the Dixon-Yates deal and the other aspects of encroachment of the private power monopoly.

Your services have been invaluable in this regard.

With best wishes, I am,

Yours sincerely,

ESTES KEFAUVER,
United States Senator.

Record of Republican 83d Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES J. KERSTEN
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the domestic record of the Republican 83d Congress has been outstanding restoring sound and effective government for the people. The dangerous trend toward socialistic, ever-increasing government interference in the people's private affairs has been arrested and measures which encourage private enterprise and foster self-reliance have been adopted.

BIG GOVERNMENT TRIMMED DOWN

The Republican Congress and Republican administration have substantially helped the people by cutting down big government and by spending less of the people's money. The people are now able to determine for themselves to a greater extent how they shall dispose of their own money, instead of having the Government spend it for them.

More than 200,000 persons have been removed from the Federal civilian payrolls—a large saving to the American taxpayer. Congress also approved all 12 of President Eisenhower's government reorganization plans, which enable Government departments to operate on a more efficient basis.

The spending budget for fiscal year ending July 31, 1954, proposed by Truman before he left office was reduced more than $10 billion by the Republican administration after it came into office. Truman had predicted a budget deficit of $9.9 billion for fiscal 1954. The Republican administration cut this predicted deficit to an actual $3 billion.

TAXES CUT

Because of these cuts in Federal spending, the Republican 83d Congress was able to pass on substantial tax cuts to the American people. During the Democratic administrations taxes had constantly increased, until they had become a tremendous burden even on the poorest people. The Democrats had turned the income tax into a soak-the-poor tax with their extremely high rates and their niggardly tax exemptions. During all their long rule in Washington the Democrats had never increased the personal tax exemption, in fact, they had constantly decreased it. Now when they are out of power they loudly proclaim that they are in favor of increasing the tax exmption. The fact is, however, that the only increase in tax exemption—from $500 to $600 per person—in the past 22 years was enacted by a Republican Congress over Truman's veto.

The Republican 83d Congress slashed excise taxes by 33 to 50 percent on many items such as stoves; refrigerators; clothes driers; handbags; cosmetics; railroad, bus, and airline tickets; sporting goods; telephone calls and telegrams; movie tickets and tickets to our Milwaukee Braves' games.

Personal income-tax rates are now 10 percent lower. The Republican 83d Congress has also provided special income-tax consideration to retired schoolteachers, firemen and police, and other persons living on retirement income, to working mothers, to persons supporting dependents, to disabled and handicapped, to persons injured at work, to installment buyers, to small-business men in more rapid despreciation rates, to shareholders in business, and to persons with medical expenses. Everyone has benefitted from these lower income-tax rates and the special changes relieve previous inequities in the tax laws.

SOCIAL-SECURITY BENEFITS INCREASED

The Republican 83d Congress expanded the social-security program to include 7 million more persons. Farmers, farmworkers, accountants, architects, engineers, ministers, State and local government employees are all newly included under social-security coverage.

Social-security benefits were also substantially increased. The maximum monthly family benefit is increased from $168.75 to $200. The minimum monthly benefit for a retired worker is increased from $25 to $30. An individual retired worker can now receive up to $108.50, and together with his wife can receive up to $162.75.

Earnings limitation under the new law is removed at age 72, instead of at 75, under the former law. Thus, anyone over 72 may earn any amount without forfeiting his social-security benefits. For those under 72 the law is modified to permit such person to earn up to $1,200 per year without loss of benefits; and even if earnings are between $1,200 and $2,160 per year his benefits are only proportionally reduced.

MORE HOMES

The Republican 83d Congress has made it possible to help fulfill the fundamental desire of American families to have good homes of their own by changes in the law respecting FHA mortgages.

The Republican-sponsored housing law permits lower downpayments, lower monthly payments, longer repayment terms of up to 30 years, and increased mortgage limits of up to $20,000. More money is made available for home loans by the merger of all FHA mortgage insurance activities into one authorization, which was increased by $1.5 billion.

Under the new FHA-insured mortgage program, it is possible, for example, to buy a $9,000 new home for $450 down and monthly payments of $46.83.

This example of the new lower downpayment—in this case less than half the former downpayment rate—indicates how housing opportunities can open up in areas and for income groups never before reached. Mortgage amounts under the new law are now 95 percent of the first $9,000 of the value of a new home plus 75 percent of the value in excess of $9,000. A $12,000 home can be purchased for $1,200 down, instead of $2,400, with monthly payments of less than $60. Home buyers also are protected by guaranties required from builders or sellers using FHA-insured mortgages.

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

The St. Lawrence seaway has at last become a reality for Milwaukee and Wisconsin. This seaway will eventually mean more jobs, more income, more business for Milwaukee. Milwaukee can become the most important port on the Great Lakes by serving as a point of exchange between the industrial and agricultural Midwest and the markets of Europe and South America.

The St. Lawrence seaway project had been proposed and reproposed repeatedly over the past 30 years. Yet it remained for the Republican 83d Congress and the Republican administration to finally give the green light to this important project.

SMALL BUSINESS AIDED

The 83d Congress helped small business not only through needed tax relief but also by creating the Small Business Administration as an independent agency of the Federal Government. The Small Business Administration is authorized to make loans up to $150,000 to help small businesses. Large loans which created so much scandal during the Democrat administration are not permitted to be made; it is the intent of the law to see that the primary benefit goes to small entrepreneurs.

INTERNAL SECURITY

About 2,400 persons found to be security risks have left or been discharged from Government employment during the first year and a half of the Republican administration. Fifty Communist leaders have been convicted in court and 256 Red aliens have been ordered deported.

Various measures have been adopted to make it more difficult for the Communists to operate in our country. The Communist Party has been outlawed; their power to control certain unions is being limited. Witnesses testifying before congressional committees may be granted immunity under certain circumstances, in order to enable these committees to ferret out more facts on Communist activities in our midst.

KERSTEN COMMITTEE EXPOSES COMMUNIST TACTICS

Congressional committees continued their excellent work of exposing Communist activities in America during the 83d Congress. The House Select Committee on Communist Aggression, of which I was chairman, brought to light many facts regarding the Communist seizure of the eastern European countries and of the treatment of the various people subjected to Communist rule. The Department of State has praised the committee for its work in thus helping American foreign policy against the

Reds by bringing out these hitherto little known details of Communist brutality.

CLEANING UP THE CORRUPTION MESS

The Republican Party, when it came into office in January 1953, inherited a mess. Members of the Truman administration had been convicted of fraud. The involvement of no less than 14 Government officials in instances of favoritism and influence had been exposed. Members of Truman's official family had accepted valuable gifts; mink-coat and deep-freeze scandals had disgusted the Nation. Hundreds of Federal employees had been caught trying to improve their private fortunes through their positions on the public payroll. Ten Federal agencies were entangled in shadowy manipulations.

There were 78 headlined scandals in the Agriculture Department, 48 in the Internal Revenue Bureau, 19 in the Defense Department, 10 in the RFC, 9 in the Justice Department, 5 in the Post Office Department.

Machinations of influence peddlers had spread through the land. Mixed up in the awarding of many Government loans and contracts were corrupt political bosses and underworld characters.

In their 1952 platform, the Republicans pledged to put an end to corruption, to oust the crooks and grafters, and to restore honest government to the people.

That pledge is being kept. Under leadership intent upon exposing rather than covering up corruption, the Congress and the Executive are cooperating in providing the kind of government in which decent citizens can take pride.

I believe that the American people are well satisfied with the record of the Republican 83d Congress and of the Republican administration in restoring sound, efficient, and effective government in the United States Government which is responsive to the true needs of the people, but which does not overwhelm the people's liberties in a socialistic morass.

An Astounding Record of Cutting Government Spending by the Republican Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, the Republican Congress and the Eisenhower administration have fulfilled a solemn pledge to the American people—we have cut Government spending and increased the efficiency of Federal functions without impairing the Nation's security. This is how we accomplished our objective:

BUDGET FOR FISCAL 1954

First, take the final Truman budget, for fiscal 1954. President Truman asked for $66,568,819,353 in new funds—regular annual and supplemental appropriations. He said this figure could not be cut. But the Republican Congress and the administration knew there was plenty of fat in each item of that budget, and they accomplished one of the greatest feats in the history of free government—they reduced the Democrat spending program for fiscal 1954 by $12,029,378,802.

To do this, the legislative branch and the executive branch worked in close harmony and cooperation, as the Constitution intended. The departments, now headed by economy-minded Republicans, revised their Democratic predecessors' estimates and were able to reduce the budgets for their departments by many millions. Then the Republican Congress finished the job for fiscal 1954 by further trimming the Truman cannot-be-cut budget.

BUDGET FOR FISCAL 1955

The tremendous job was not finished. The Republican administration was determined to further reduce spending, to bring the cost of your Government down to a place where we could ease the staggering load on American taxpayers. It accomplished this in the present fiscal year.

Listen to President Eisenhower's appraisal of the fiscal 1955 budget. In his message to Congress on January 21 of this year, he said:

> This new budget is the first prepared entirely by this administration. It provides adequately, in my judgment, for the national defense and the international responsibilities of the Nation. * * * The budget also provides adequately for the current needs of the Government and for constructive forward steps in our domestic repsonsibilities and programs.
>
> This budget marks the beginning of a movement to shift to State and local governments and to private enterprise Federal activities which can be more appropriately and more efficiently carried on in that way.
>
> This budget also benefits from material savings from the decreased costs of Federal operations resulting from our constant effort to improve the management of Government activities and to find better and less expensive ways of doing the things which must be done by the Federal Government.

And President Eisenhower renewed the Republican Party's pledge to the American people. He said:

> This administration is dedicated to greater efficiency and economy in meeting the Nation's security requirements and the necessary and valid functions of the Government.

FOUR YEARS OF APPROPRIATIONS

The best way to show the remarkable accomplishments of the Republican Congress and the administration is to compare appropriations for the 2 years of Republican control, fiscals 1954 and 1955, with the last 2 years of Democrat rule, fiscals 1952 and 1953.

In fiscal years 1952 and 1953, when a Democrat Congress and a Democrat President were in control, Congress gave the Federal Government a total of $166,416,788,116.

In fiscal years 1954 and 1955, with a Republican Congress and a Republican administration managing the Nation's budget, Congress has appropriated a total of only $102,181,571,756.

In just 2 years, the Republican administration has cut the cost of Government by $64,235,216,360. In just 2 years, it cut the cost of Government almost 40 percent.

ONE THOUSAND SIX HUNDRED DOLLARS SAVED FOR YOUR FAMILY

Here is what the $64,235,216,360 cut in appropriations means to you. It figures out to an average saving of $395 for every man, woman, and child in this country, based on a population of 162 million.

In the average family of 4 persons, this means a saving of nearly $1,600. That is $1,600 of your family's much-needed money that the Government will not be spending.

Another way of looking at it is to realize that this $64,235,216,360 reduction in Government costs for 2 years is nearly equal to the total amount that Mr. Truman asked to run the Government in his last budget request, for fiscal 1954. Thus, the Republican administration has in effect eliminated nearly a whole year of typical Truman spending.

REPUBLICAN VERSUS DEMOCRAT SPENDING

A Republican administration has been able to make these tremendous cuts and savings because, for the first time in 20 years there has been a real desire by both the administration and the Congress to save money.

One of the biggest headaches inherited from the Truman administration was the matter of purchase commitments it had entered into involving payment at some future time. As of June 30, 1953, President Eisenhower was faced with spending authorizations which had been made in the past but for which cash had to be found in future months.

Much of the $81 billion in unpaid Truman bills was the result of the military buildup contracted for at the start of the Korean was in 1950. President Truman and his budget experts predicted in the finanl Democratic budget that fiscal 1954 would be a peak spending year. In fact, Truman predicted that the first full fiscal year of the Eisenhower administration would wind up with a deficit of $9,992,000,000.

But here is what actually happened in fiscal 1954, under the economy-minded Republicans:

The deficit for fiscal 1954 is only $3,020,000,000. That is $6,893,000,000 less than Truman forecast, and it is $6,411,000,000 below the Truman deficit for the preceding year.

A 55-YEAR COMPARISON

The Republican Party has a long record of low spending. To prove this, I am going to compare Republican and Democratic spending for the last 55 fiscal years.

Since 1900, America has experienced 26 years of Republican administrations. Republicans have spent $186,525,000,000 in those 26 years, and we have kept the country at peace. Democrats have spent $821,795,000,000 in 27 years, and they kept the country at war—hot and cold.

Republican administrations have spent, on the average, $6,663,000,000 a year for 26 years.

Democrat administrations have spent, on the average, $29,350,000,000 a year, or almost 5 times more.

SMALL SAVINGS BRING BIG RESULTS

In August of 1953, President Eisenhower ordered the heads of all Government departments and agencies "to take every possible step progressively to reduce the expenditures of your department during the fiscal year 1954." Here are some examples of the results.

Some 216,243 unnecessary Federal jobs have been eliminated in the period of January 1953 to June 1954, saving the taxpayers $851 million.

There are 7,055 fewer Government automobiles in service today, for a saving of about $2 million a year.

General Services Administration, the Government's housekeeping and supply agency, has saved $150 million since the Republicans took over management of Government property and supplies.

The Government's rent bill was decreased by about $8 million in 1953. Government-leased space was cut from 41 million square feet to 36 million square feet.

The Budget Bureau has halted the practice established by Democrat administrations of running wild in making needless and extravagant purchases in the final days of each fiscal year so that no appropriation would be returned to the Treasury. Now, when purchases in the closing days of a fiscal year exceed the level of the preceding months, the excess buying is charged to the guilty agency's new appropriations for the next year.

In the Republican-controlled House of Representatives, the Appropriations Committee set 15 task forces to work to lay the groundwork for reductions in appropriations. These task forces were composed of 80 of the country's foremost business and management experts, who were borrowed temporarily for the most part from some of the country's most efficient businesses. They were assisted by experienced staff members of the General Accounting Office, an agency which is responsible to Congress.

These engineers, certified public accountants, researchers, and business executives worked for months in the Government departments and agencies and found innumerable instances of waste, inefficiency, and unnecessary expense that had built up during the previous 20 years. With the reports of the task forces to guide them, Members of the House were able to achieve the tremendous budget reductions.

Any individual who has been in financial difficulties well knows that these troubles cannot be straightened out overnight. The same holds for your Federal Government. But in the short space of time the Republicans have been in control in Washington, the record shows what they have been able to do, with economy and efficiency our guiding policies.

Much more remains to be done, and it will be done. Every citizen, his children and his children's children, will ultimately reap the benefit in further lowering of taxes, steady prices, a solvent Government, and a future you can rely on.

To assure the realization of such a future, the President should have a Republican Congress again in 1955 and 1956.

Rural Electrification

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 19, 1954

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, under leave heretofore granted me to extend my remarks in the Record, I am enclosing herewith a copy of a letter addressed to Mr. Joe Jenness, executive secretary of Kansas Electric Cooperatives, Inc.:

House of Representatives, U. S.,
Washington, D. C.

Mr. Joe Jenness,
Executive Secretary, Kansas Electric Cooperatives, Inc., Topeka, Kans.

Dear Mr. Jenness: I received your good letter of May 21 with which was enclosed a copy of the June issue of the Kansas Electric Farmer containing a record of the votes of Kansas Members of Congress o na number of measures during the past 9 or 10 years. It is my understanding that this list of bills together with the votes of the members of the Kansas delegation thereon was not compiled by the Kansas Electric Farmer but was taken from a compilation of votes prepared by the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association.

I sincerely appreciate your fairness in offering to publish in the Kansas Electric Farmer any statement which I may wish to make on these voting records. That certainly reflects a fine spirit of fairness in the matter, and I do want to avail myself of your offer. Although I do not want to take any more of your space than is necessary, I do want to point out in the very beginning that it is possible for anyone to select a list of votes over a 10-year period and by taking these few votes and putting his own interpretation on them, make the position of a Member of Congress look quite different than it really was. I say this without criticizing whoever selected these votes and put an interpretation on their meaning.

I am sure that anyone who has gone through this particular list of votes has noted that few of them pertain to REA matters. Out of the list of 23 House votes, only 7 are of any interest to Kansas REA members. Four pertain to the Bonneville Power Administration in Oregon. Three refer to the Bureau of Reclamation projects. Two relate to the construction of a steam plant in the Tennessee Valley. Two cover the Southwestern Power Administration in Texas and Missouri. One is on the Southeastern Power Administration in Virginia and North Carolina. Two relate to a project at Niagara Falls, N. Y. One deals with the Cheatham Dam in Tennessee, and the remaining vote concerns both the Southwestern and Bonneville Power Administrations.

I don't want to take too much of the time of your readers to discuss these non-REA votes because they cannot conceivably be of interest to Kansas REA cooperatives or their members. Just as an illustration though, let me use my votes on the proposal to make an appropriation of $4 million to start work on the Johnsonville steam plant in the TVA system. I voted against this $4 million appropriation. The argument made for the construction of this steam plant, the total cost of which was $92,183,507, was that it and other steam plants were needed to firm up the power generated by hydroelectric dams in the Tennessee Valley. The TVA was sold to the country and established on the theory of developing the hydroelectric possibilities of the Tennessee Valley. These possibilities have now been fully developed. However, the tremendous industrial development which has taken place because of TVA cheap power has exhausted the capacity of the hydroelectric plants and several steam plants have been or are now being constructed by Federal funds. The fact is that when steam plants now under construction are completed 70 percent of the power generated by TVA will be from steam plants and 30 percent from hydroelectric power. I have supported the development of hydroelectric power and flood control in the Tennessee Valley but if the Government is going to build steam plants in the TVA to give agriculture and industry cheap electricity, why shouldn't it build steam plants in Kansas for the same purpose and let us build up our industry and supply our farmers with cheap electricity and fertilizer just as is being done in Tennessee? The same argument applies to all of the other public power projects which I have mentioned. Some of them are steam plants, some are hydroelectric, but they all involve the question of whether the Federal Government should spend large sums of money in other parts of the country ranging all the way from Niagara Falls, N. Y., to the State of Oregon for development of cheap power to be used in competition with Kansas industries and agriculture. I have voted for some projects of this kind under certain conditions, particularly where they were multiple-use projects and had other features such as flood control and reclamation. I might say, however, that most of the feasible projects in this country have already been constructed and all that are being proposed these days are on a pretty shaky foundation. I do not think that the REA consumers in Kansas are going to get any benefit from Government-built steam plants in Tennessee and other States. Therefore, in the particular instances that are contained on your list, I voted against these expenditures with the exception of vote No. 6 which added a comparatively small amount to the Bonneville Power Administration. I think I voted right on these propositions, but whether I did or not, I am perfectly willing to leave the question up to your readers and abide by their decision.

Now with respect to the strictly REA votes, I am listed as voting favorably twice and unfavorably five times. I am listed as voting favorably on the rural telephone bill and on one vote on REA loan funds in 1948. That was an amendment to increase REA loan funds by $300 million. The amendment lost. I am recorded as voting unfavorably on a motion to add $100 million to REA loan funds in the first deficiency appropriation bill in 1948. I am also charged with having voted against an additional loan authorization of $10 million for REA in 1944. Then I am charged with having voted wrong by three cases on REA administrative funds for 1948. The fact is, there have been dozens of votes on REA funds during the 10 years covered by this voting record. Most of them were simply voice votes. The important point is that never during all this 10-year period has there been a time when the REA did not have sufficient funds to meet its loan applications or administrative funds to process them. If there is any one subject upon which Congress has been insistent on providing plenty of funds, it is for REA. There have been delays in making REA loans—delays for many reasons. I think I am familiar with practically all of the REA loans made in my district in this period of time, and I cannot now think of a single instance when the loan was delayed because of a lack of funds. If such a situation had arisen at any time, Congress would promptly have made the money available.

I do not care to take any more time with respect to this list of votes, but with your indulgence I do want to refer to two of the most important pieces of legislation affecting REA which have ever been passed by Congress. The first is the Department of Agriculture Organic Act, which reduced the interest rate on REA loans to 2 percent and provided for the amortization of loans over a 35-year period. At least half of the REA projects in my district would never have been found feasible except for this legislation, and extensions of many other projects would have been in the same situation. I mention this act because I was 1 of the subcommittee of 5 members of the Committee on Agriculture of the House which formulated this legislation and submitted it to the House as a part of the organic act of 1944. I worked for it in the full Agriculture Committee. I worked for it in the House and on the conference committee between the House and the Senate. Yet this tremendously important measure is not even included on the list of votes which you published. This is because there was no rollcall on it, just as has been the case on most REA appropriations. Everyone is for them, so why have a rollcall.

The other important proposal to which I refer is the legislation setting up the rural telephone system. That legislation originated in the Committee on Agriculture. I supported it there. I spoke for it and supported it in the House of Representatives and served on the conference committee which ironed out the differences between the House and Senate bills—the result of which was we came out with a practical bill much like the House bill and eliminated most of the restrictive provisions which had been contained in the Senate bill.

As far as rural electrification and rural telephones are concerned, I am willing to rest my case on the record of what I did on these two fundamental bills. I have already discussed the matter of appropriations but want to reiterate I have voted for every REA appropriation which was needed. It is the easiest thing in the world for someone who wants to demagog in Congress to get up and move to amend an appropriation for REA by adding ten million or twenty million or one hundred million dollars whether it is needed or not. For that reason, there is simply no point in discussing whether a Member voted for or against any appropriation or whether the appropriation was needed or not because the answer is that Congress has always appropriated all of the money that has been needed for REA, and in fact many times Congress has authorized more loan funds than could be used in the fiscal year for which they were authorized. That hasn't hurt anything, of course, but I simply point it out to show that ample funds have always been available.

I am sure that the people of my district know full well of the support which I have always given REA and RTA. I shall of course continue to give it the same consistent support as a member of the Agriculture Committee and the House. I will do this because I believe that nothing has happened in the last hundred years to do away with drudgery on the farm, to lighten the burden of farm families, and to make farming a more businesslike enterprise than rural electrification and rural telephones.

With best wishes, I am

Very sincerely yours,

CLIFFORD R. HOPE.

The Role of Airpower in Our National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the following statement with respect to the role of airpower in our national defense, as enunciated by Roy T. Hurley, chairman of the board and president of Curtiss-Wright Corp., one of the leading executives of the aircraft industry in America.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ROLE OF AIRPOWER IN OUR NATIONAL DEFENSE

The Curtiss-Wright Corp. was formed on August 9, 1929, through a combination of two outstanding aviation organizations—the Wright Aeronautical Corp. and the Curtiss Aeroplane & Motor Co. and associated companies. Wright Aeronautical, founded in 1919, grew directly from the companies founded by the Wright brothers following their first successful flight on December 17, 1903.

During World War I—as the Wright-Martin Co.—the organization began to specialize in the design and building of powerplants. The Curtiss organization was the outgrowth of the pioneering efforts of Glenn H. Curtiss, designer of many famous planes, including the NC-4, first aircraft to fly the Atlantic Ocean.

During World War II, Curtiss-Wright was the largest producer of aircraft products in the world, and its dollar volume of shipments in these years was the greatest of any aircraft manufacturer in the United States. Curtiss-Wright operated 19 plants for the production of engines, propellers, and aircraft and achieved a distinguished wartime record of deliveries. For example, the company built 150,000 aircraft engines, an unprecedented accomplishment to that time and a record that still stands.

Curtiss-Wright today is an organization employing approximately 30,000 men and women in 7 manufacturing divisions that operate plants in New Jersey, New York, and Ohio. Curtiss-Wright products are widely diversified, and the company is achieving a high degree of integration.

In the field of aircraft engines, Curtiss-Wright designs, develops, and builds all major types of powerplants, including reciprocating piston and turbocompound engines, turboprop, turbojet, ramjet, and rocket engines. These engines are presently in use on more than 28 of the world's leading airlines, in guided missiles, and in military bombers and fighters characterized by unusually long range or extraordinarily high speed.

Curtiss-Wright, a pioneer propeller builder in the electrically controlled constant speed and hollow-steel propeller field, currently is producing a turboelectric series that has been approved for all turboprop engines selected for production by the military services. The company has carried out outstanding accepted development of turboprop engine controls. These propellers include types designed to operate at subsonic, transonic, and supersonic speeds. Curtiss-Wright was responsible for the development of full-feathering, reversible propellers and, in cooperation with the United States Air Force, has perfected a process for extruding hollow-steel blades.

Alone of all aircraft organizations, Curtiss-Wright has its own casting and forging plants, one of which is the metals processing division. This unit presently is making forged turbine blades and nodular iron castings for aircraft engines and stainless steel castings for applications where corrosion resistance is necessary.

Through its electronics division, the corporation has revolutionized pilot and air crew training by developing and producing Curtiss-Wright dehmel electronic simulators and duplicators.

The Marquette Metals Products Co., a wholly owned subsidiary of Currtiss-Wright, is a manufacturer of specialized metal products including windshield wipers for jet and piston aircraft.

Four other divisions in Curtiss-Wright are concerned with the overhauling of aircraft engines for military and commercial customers, the development of new products, the sale in the export field of the products of Curtiss-Wright and of other companies, and the coordination of overseas production of engine parts.

Curtiss-Wright believes that airpower is essential to our way of life, and our understanding of airpower is to have the military, the commercial airline, and the industry in balance—coordinated and working as a team. In the next 10 years the Atlantic Ocean will be only 5 hours wide for the military man, and no man on earth no matter where he tries to hide out can get more than 24 hours away from you, whether he be friend or foe. So, as the earth becomes relatively smaller and smaller, airpower becomes more essential to our way of life.

Not only is airpower essential to our way of life, but in America it must be progressively sustained and technologically more advanced in design and capability than any other airpower in the world. This is a continuing process which if allowed to lag would in a short time leave us with an outmoded Air Force.

At the present time it is questionable as to whether or not this country has the airpower capability to counterattack an aggressor and to achieve complete mastery of the air.

World War II is a good example of how long it can take to build airpower to a peak. The war began in two small areas in 1939, and we in America at that time had very little capacity to counterattack. In fact, we were almost helpless to stop it and to ward it off. In 1940 the war was spreading very rapidly while we were trying to build up capacity and ability to fight back. In 1941 we still had very little capacity to fight back, and in 1942 the situation was much the same. In 1943 we were beginning to build up, and the Navy had begun to push the enemy back on the seas, and the offensive had begun. In 1944 our capacity grew to sizable proportions, and we recaptured much of the area that was lost to the enemy. In 1945 we had what it took to do the job. We bombed the industries in the homeland of the enemy, destroyed their ability to supply the weapons to their military forces, and thus the war came to a rapid and decisive end.

You will remember that this took 7 years to accomplish. In those 7 years America spent over $300 billion for all war need, and suffered over 1 million casualties primarily as a result of not being prepared. If war were to come again, we would not have 7 years; instead, we might only have 7 hours. The route the next time can come from almost any direction, and with the airplanes we know to be available today, the enemy, in a matter of hours, can be anywhere in our country. You are reminded that one airplane with one bomb could destroy a city of a million people. These are the conditions under which we are living today; and therefore, we cannot gamble with 7 years when possibly we only have a matter of hours.

The future role of military aviation is primarily the responsibility of the team comprising the military and the aviation industry. The aviation industry must be in a position to furnish the aircraft engines, the propellers, and the simulators for these airplanes to the military for our expanding national defense. We in Curtiss-Wright must supply our turbo compound engines for speeds up to 425 miles an hour. The next step, up to 800 miles an hour for long-range, heavy loads, requires the turboprop; up to 1,500 miles an hour, the jet; and above all, the rocket and ramjet. All these engines are a must for airpower in the United States.

Speed requires power, and our power requirements for airplanes are skyrocketing. We are today putting together more power in some planes than is required in a substation to light a city or to propel the *Queen Mary* or the *Queen Elizabeth*. Power in turn increases the weight of the airplane. Gross weights are reaching 200,000 pounds and are headed for 400,000 pounds per airplane. We are, therefore, in a business that is changing and is fluid. It is not static or standing still.

We must be in a position to design and provide the best defensive air weapons in sufficient quantities in the event of a national emergency. Few people realize or show a willingness to realize that this is a matter of simple economics. To have the best defensive weapons requires continuing and extensive engineering research, development and testing, and the facilities with which to do such work. This is particularly true of aircraft, and especially of the engines which set the limits of size, speed, range, altitude, and operating performance of the airframe. In other words, the quality of the engine virtually determines the effectiveness of the aircraft. We all know how rapidly changes in engine design are taking and must take place.

A strong independent aircraft industry, if it is to grow and expand and fulfill its mission as an instrument of the national defense, must be financed on a sound economic basis. Progress in the aeronautical art constantly dictates special and new additions of machinery and buildings to produce advanced types of engines and airframes. It is also obvious that the rapid changes in the type of aircraft engines, size, and materials require vastly different machines, tools, test equipment, and buildings which, because of the very rapid change in product, become obsolete more quickly. Replacing such facilities more frequently requires first the need for allowing normal profit levels for this industry so that funds can be invested in newer and more efficient facilities, and second, the recognition of more rapid depreciation of those facilities in the cost and price of our product. Applying these fundamental rules of business economics will decrease rather than increase the end price of product because new and more efficient machines and methods will reduce costs to a much greater extent.

The problem of financing the required added plant facilities is an ever-present one. However, Government policies make financing of the necessary additions to plant facilities difficult, if not impossible. As an example, accelerated depreciation (based on useful economic life) of buildings, machinery, equipment, and other facilities required by the aircraft industry is not presently allowed in costs or prices by the Defense Department. In order to provide the necessary financing and develop needed strength within the aircraft industry, such depreciation should be recognized in the price of the product. The development of such a policy in the Department of Defense will allow the aircraft industry to (a) keep pace with the rapid obsolescence of aircraft; (b) avoid much of the procurement of unsuited, high-cost equipment and facilities as was of necessity experienced during the rapid buildup for the Korean emergency; and (c) provide facilities on a continuously well-planned basis rather than requiring the Government to finance facilities whenever an emergency arises.

It is estimated that about 80 percent of the facilities and financing of the aircraft industry is presently being furnished by the Government. On this basis, we have virtual nationalization of the industry. This trend to nationalization should not be allowed to continue. If the industry is to function at top capability in the national-defense picture, it must be allowed to develop the necessary economic strength and capacity on its own.

Furthermore, the aircraft industry is subject to price redetermination on practically all contracts. Subsequently, renegotiation must also be faced. Funds recovered under price redetermination are available to the Defense Department for further orders, but funds recaptured under renegotiation go directly to the Treasury and are not available for additional procurement. This accounts for the growth in popularity of so-called fixed-price contracts with price redetermination provisions. Price redetermination techniques, carried on under ever-restricting procurement regulations, have progressively weakened the aircraft industry. As a result, the net profit of the aircraft manufacturers has become less and less throughout the years. Unless the aircraft industry can achieve reasonable earnings, not only will it fail to attract necessary additional capital, but research and development vital to our national defense will be retarded, and its remaining resources may, in time, be drained away. Consequently, it shall be our goal to create a strong independent aircraft industry which may be expected to expand its facilities with set-aside earnings so that the quality of the product may be improved, research and development expanded, performance increased, rate of deliveries accelerated, and prices reduced.

In effect we recommend that the aircraft industry be geared in peacetime to a 40-hour week; and then when war comes, start second and third shifts and accelerate on this basis. In this period of acceleration it would not be necessary to compete with other industry for machine tools and all the other things we need. We will have them in the plant working at a lower level. In 1 year the aircraft industry could be full mobilized and doing its job. Other industries could simultaneously acquire their machines and tools without competition from us, and at the end of the first year they would be in a position to expand and grow. Such a program is very important to the survival of the United States.

There are some people who feel that war will not come because Russia will collapse from within. We hope they are right. There are others who think war will come any hour, and we hope they are wrong. There are still others who are so frightened by war that they, ostrichlike, don't even think about it. In our opinion, it is inconceivable that the Russian industrial machine will equal our production capability in our lifetime nor possibly in our children's lifetime. Consequently, the way to avoid war is (a) by not allowing our industry to become disarranged in this so-called peacetime period and (b) with the aid of a well-planned industrial mobilization program be in a position to convert expeditiously to the requirements of any national emergency.

We are sure in Curtiss-Wright that we can provide the facilities to run on that 40-hour-a-week basis, and we can do it without taxpayer subsidy and without high cost.

In the years 1943 to 1952 the leading manufacturers in the country—and these reports are given to us by the banks and the Government agencies—increased their net worth by 93.6 percent; the leading automobile companies increased by 96.7 percent; and in that period the aircraft companies only grew 54.4 percent. If you were to cut back the growth of the leading manufacturing and automobile companies to the level of the aircraft industry, you would have a depression in the United States; our standard of living would be way down; our unemployment would be terrific.

When you compare net returns or profit after taxes to sales for the same period, the leading manufacturers earned 5.9 percent; the automobile companies, 6.1 percent; and we in our business, 1.7 percent. Again, we are not getting the wherewithal to do our job.

We believe we in the aircraft industry are entitled to the same treatment and responsibilities accorded to the television manufacturer, the automobile manufacturer, or, for that matter, any other manufacturer. The pattern of manufacturing, selling, building, designing, and developing in the United States is the thing that has made this country great. On the other hand, when it comes to building aircraft, our Government officials do not always apply that knowledge, know-how, and good, clear, sound thinking.

To demonstrate that we as an industry are not accorded the same treatment as other manufacturers, we present the following tabulation. It indicates the shipments for the year 1953, and it lists the companies whose earnings were between $10 million and $12 million after taxes for the year. Our company's net income of approximately $11 million places us just about in the middle. Curtiss-Wright was required to build and ship products with difficult and complex manufacturing problems to the amount of $439 million to earn a net of approximately $11 million. On the other hand, Wrigley Chewing Gum Co., with sales of $81 million, and Scott Paper Co., with sales of $165 million, and all the others realized the same earnings as an aircraft producer whose continued operations are vitally necessary to the defense of our country.

Companies which earned $10 million to $12 million net for the year 1953

Companies:	Sales (*in millions*)
Curtiss-Wright Corp	$439
Standard Brands	408
Pullman, Inc	404
Consolidated Vultee	371
Burlington Mills	361
Budd Co	336
Electric Auto-Lite Co	285
National Cash Register	261
Revere Copper & Brass Co	251
Standard Oil (Kentucky)	250
Food Machinery & Chemical Co	229
Minneapolis-Honeywell Regulator Co	214
Dana Corp	203
Hercules Powder Co	190
Container Corporation of America	188
Cannon Mills	186
Timken Roller Bearing	178
Celanese Corporation of America	166
Scott Paper Co	165
Sterling Drug, Inc	162
Merck & Co	160
Cincinnati Milling Machine	151
Westinghouse Air Brake	145
West Virginia Pulp & Paper	118
Lion Oil Co	90
William Wrigley	81
Rayonier Co	73

We do not quarrel with the accomplishments and earnings of these companies. In fact, we applaud them. That is the American way of life and that is the way it should be. All we are saying is that we in the aircraft industry should be entitled to similar profit ratios. Furthermore, an examination of the above list of companies indicates that Curtiss-Wright has a greater investment (over and above the Government's interest) in plants and facilities and a larger net worth than any other company indicated with one exception.

In the final analysis the security of this Nation depends on the cooperation and coordination of all segments of our military and industrial economy. Curtiss-Wright will continue to use its technological know-how and resources to achieve this end. Furthermore, we will continue to advocate the creation of a strong and independent aircraft industry. Only through the accomplishment of these objectives will this country of ours be in a position to provide the speed, the power, and the design necessary for the finest air weapons, in sufficient quanity to reach the maximum goal of our military requirements, and thereby secure our way of life.

Civil Rights Advanced by Republican Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 18, 1954

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, throughout the long struggle for equality for all Americans, there have been several basic steps which had to be taken before the tide of man's inhumanity to man could be turned.

Within 2 short years, the Republican administration has established landmark after landmark in the field of human rights.

In his inaugural address on January 20, 1953, President Eisenhower reaffirmed a promise made during the 1952 campaign. He said:

> We reject any insinuation that one race or another, one people or another, is in any sense inferior or expendable.

On April 2, 1954, the Chicago Defender, a leading Negro newspaper which had long supported the Democrat administrations, said that in 15 months of the Eisenhower administration, "the admittedly low stock of the Negro has risen to a new high and the potentialities are even greater."

This is high praise indeed from those who have endured decades of broken promises from political manipulators who used the frustrations of many of our citizens to promote their own political goals.

THE RECORD OF DEVELOPMENTS

There have been 17 important developments during the short time the Republican administration has been able to proceed in fulfilling its campaign pledges on civil rights.

These are historic steps which stand in glowing contrast to the shocking neglect that existed from 1932 to 1952.

Segregation at Army post schools was abolished by the Eisenhower administration.

Employment discrimination in the District of Columbia service contracts and segregation in District eating establishments has been outlawed by the Republican administration.

Segregation in United States naval installations in the South was ended by the Republican administration.

Racial discrimination has been effectively banned on Federal contract jobs by the President's Government Contract Committee.

Segregation has been outlawed in major veterans' hospitals in the South.

Segregation has been abolished in District of Columbia recreation facilities.

A total of 45 qualified Negroes have been appointed to high positions in the Federal Government, including J. Ernest Wilkins, of Chicago, who was appointed Assistant Secretary of Labor. In addition, Mrs. Lois Lippman, of New York City, has the distinction of being the first Negro woman ever to serve as a White House secretary.

REAL EQUALITY IN THE MILITARY

In other areas of the civil-rights question, the Republican administration moved forward steadily to improve the equality of all of our people.

Legislation has been presented to Congress by the Attorney General requesting the establishment of a public defender so that all, rich and poor alike, will be provided with full justice under the law when called before the bar of justice.

The Department of Justice under a Republican Attorney General has also expanded its investigative staff which goes into action when violations of civil rights are apparent. In 1 year the Attorney General has called on the Federal Bureau of Investigation to conduct preliminary investigations in 9,000 complaints of civil-rights violations.

In one branch of our military services, the Navy, the steps taken to restore equality among civilian employees at installations are worthy of recounting in detail.

In a report to the President, Navy officials stated that out of 60 naval bases in the South, 20 reported on August 1, 1953, the first year of the Republican administration, that segregation practices had ceased.

In 17 additional installations, segregation has been ended since that date. In 21 other naval bases, the gradual cessation of segregation in cafeterias, washrooms, and other facilities has been under way and is now about completed.

On March 1, 1954, the Navy Department announced it was ending separate enlistments for Navy stewards, a move aimed at changing the predominantly Negro composition of its stewards' branch.

The Secretary of Defense on February 1, 1954, issued a memorandum to the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force directing the services to end all segregation in all military post schools by September 1, 1955. The order forbids services to open any new segregated schools. It orders the end of segregation of Negro and white children on 21 bases still maintaining separate schools.

The order also secured from the United States Office of Education an agreement to operate unsegregated schools in States where, because of delays in implementing the Supreme Court decision, segregated schools are being retained temporarily.

PREJUDICES BREAKING DOWN

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is actively assisting the Defense Department in its nonsegregation policy by providing assistants and funds so that the quality of teaching and facilities will not suffer.

Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, Republican, of Massachusetts, chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, said in regard to this decision on March 1, 1954:

> This is an educational experience of incalculable importance for the American people. Its effects are already spilling over from the uniformed services into many other aspects of life in the United States. Prejudices are being broken down everywhere, North and South, by the demonstrated fact that men and women can work side by side in a common task without regard to color or creed.

These are gains, however, that have been made only since the Republican administration and the Republican Congress tackled the problems with courage and insight.

THE REPUBLICAN RECORD

In 18 of 19 civil-rights tests, a majority of Republicans voted favorably; 3 times Republicans lined up 100 percent on the issue.

The only Fair Employment Practices Act passed in the history of the House of Representatives was backed by Republicans 142 to 42, rejected by Democrats 134 to 116.

The House has passed an antipoll tax bill five times. Ninety-one percent of the Republicans voted for these bills, only 9 percent against. Democrats lined up 45 percent against, 55 percent for.

The same ratio held for antilynch bills passed by the House on two occasions.

THE REPUBLICAN PLEDGE

I direct attention to the words of the Republican candidate for President, Dwight D. Eisenhower, who, in October 1952, said:

> There is discrimination. This crusade is pledged to use every single item of leadership and influence it has to eliminate it. It intends to enforce the full Constitution, not part of it.

Human equality in America is a weapon against communism.

Knowing this and aware that deeds, not promises, will help build a better, more secure America, the Republican Party has and will continue to fulfill its pledges on civil rights. The record is outstanding. Progress so far has encouraged the fine American citizens who for so long were denied the rights of full citizenship. A Republican administration will continue to serve as a guarantee that the rights of all Americans can and will be preserved.

Francis Cardinal Spellman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article by Abercrombie Holmes from the Albuquerque Journal concerning Francis Cardinal Spellman, a Catholic Church leader whose career is unparalleled in the history of the church in America.

The excellent résumé of this outstanding leader of the Roman Catholic Church follows:

From Altar Boy to Cardinal—Visiting Cardinal Is Product of Wide, Varied Experiences

(By Abercrombie Holmes)

When Francis Cardinal Spellman flies to Albuquerque Saturday to visit Kirtland Air Force Base and Sandia Base and returns Monday to dedicate a new chapel at Newman Center. Albuquerqueans will see a Catholic Church leader whose career is unparalleled in the history of the church in America.

The cardinal, who is archbishop of New York and the Catholic Church's military vicar for the United States, was the first United States priest ever raised to hierarchy in St. Peter's Basilica in Rome and the first American to serve as the Vatican attaché.

The cardinal will arrive at Kirtland about noon Saturday from Clovis Air Force Base, where he will attend a reception Saturday morning.

He will go immediately to the Sandia Base Officers Club, where he will be honored at a luncheon attended by chaplains and top officials of Kirtland and Sandia Bases and executives of the Atomic Energy Commission, Sandia Corp., and base sodalities.

TO DEDICATE TABERNACLE

Cardinal Spellman will dedicate a tabernacle in the Catholic chapel at Sandia Base. Following this will be a reception at the chapel for personnel of Kirtland and Sandia Bases. This reception will be closed to the public.

He will leave for the Santa Fe fiesta late in the afternoon.

Cardinal Spellman probably is the most traveled churchman in America.

Numerous trips during World War II and the Korean campaign took him to American fronts in many parts of the world.

A longtime believer in air travel, Cardinal Spellman, as a young priest, took up aeronautics and became a licensed pilot.

He also is a believer in sports. As a boy he took part in sports activities of all types.

PITCHED HORSESHOES

He was the horseshoe pitching champion of the neighborhood in his hometown of Whitman, Mass., 20 miles south of Boston. Young Spellman played on the Whitman High School football team, but baseball was his favorite sport, and he was manager and a competent shortstop on the Whitman High team.

Frank Spellman was born May 4, 1889, the first son of William and Ellen Spellman in Whitman, which was predominantly a non-Catholic town of 7,000 population. The Catholics in Whitman were so few when the future cardinal was born, the town was a mission of nearby Abington. The town did not have a parish church of its own until Frank was 9 years old, and did not have a parochial school.

The future cardinal's first church position was altar boy of the new church.

HIGH SCHOOL LINGUIST

In high school he won high marks, especially in English and Latin, and in later years it was his knowledge of languages which led to his being named attaché of the Papal Secretariate of State. His duties included translating papal pronouncements and other documents from Latin into English, in order to speed them to the tens of millions of English-speaking Catholics throughout the world as well as for the secular press. The Reverend Spellman became the first American in history to serve in that capacity.

After graduating from high school, he enrolled at Fordham University in New York City in September 1907. He didn't make the Fordham baseball team but became particularly interested in science. His favorite extracurricular activities were debating and reporting college news for the university newspaper.

FIRST MASS

William Cardinal O'Connell, of Boston, acting on reports of Frank Spellman's record in high school and at Fordham, selected him to make his theological studies in Rome's North American College and the College of Propaganda.

After 5 years of study, he was ordained a priest on May 14, 1916.

He immediately returned to the United States and his first mass in his homeland was said at St. Patrick's Cathedral, a church he was later to head.

Cardinal O'Connell appointed him assistant in the Church of All Saints, Roxbury, a part of Boston.

When World War I broke out, Father Spellman wished to volunteer as a chaplain, but Cardinal O'Connell decided he was the one priest who could not be spared.

The Boston cardinal named him director of Catholic literature of the Boston diocese and then assistant chancellor.

In 1925 a pilgrimage went from Boston to Rome and Father Spellman was one in the party, little realizing he was approaching a major turning point in his life.

PERFORMANCE PLEASED POPE

He attracted the attention of Pope Pius XI when a bishop, not too certain of his Italian, asked Father Spellman to translate the Pope's speech from Italian to English for his party. The Pope was impressed by Father Spellman's clear, concise, and yet comprehensive manner in which his words were promptly given in English.

This resulted in his being named attaché of the papal secretary of state. In addition to his work as translator, he was a contact for numerous visitors from the United States. This was one of the main factors in the development of the Knights of Columbus playgrounds in Rome.

His active participation in sports on the playground astonished the Italians. He modernized public relations at the Vatican by having it adopt the plan of issuing mimeographed translations of important documents in various languages at the time they are issued instead of having correspondents get them from the Obervatore Romano, the Vatican City daily.

AIDED PRESENT POPE

In 1930, Cardinal Pacelli, who later became the present Pope Pius XII, returned from Germany to become papal secretary of state, under whom Spellman worked. Father Spellman by this time had been a member of the papal household with the rank and title of right reverend monsignor.

With Mussolini dictator of Fascist Italy, Monsignor Spellman often had to use tact and courage.

In 1931, Mussolini was directing against the church a campaign seeking to abolish Catholic action and youth activities sponsored by the church. The Pope responded with an encyclical denouncing the action of the Fascist government. But the press of Italy was under Mussolini's control. In order to get the news to the world, Cardinal Pacelli suggested a plan to the Pope. It was approved.

So Monsignor Spellman unobtrusively made his way out of Italy, and the first that Mussolini knew of the Pope's denunciation was when the news was flashed around the world from Paris. Mussolini was enraged and the Fascist newspapers were filled with hate-breeding caricatures of Monsignor Spellman. But the clergyman returned calmly to Rome. Two Fascist detectives were assigned to shadow him. At first this amused Monsignor Spellman. Later it annoyed him. One day he turned on them and asked them what they wanted. Apparently their instructions didn't cover this. The detectives were speechless and retired as gracefully as possible. That was the last Monsignor Spellman saw of them.

TRANSLATED BROADCAST

When the Vatican established a radio station, also in 1931, Spellman translated the Pope's first broadcast.

He was the constant companion of Cardinal Pacelli (now Pope Pius XII) on vacation trips. On one occasion Cardinal Pacelli jestingly gave the pastor of the church at which they asked to say Mass the impression that Monsignor Spellman was the greatest of importance in the party. The pastor insisted that Monsignor Spellman say Mass, as the cardinal secretary of state, to his amusement, was assigned to the side of the altar.

When Cardinal O'Connell's assistant at Boston was named bishop of Manchester, this created an opening in Boston. Spellman was the natural choice. Pope Pius XI elevated him to bishop in a ceremony in St. Peter's Basilica. He then went to Boston as Cardinal O'Connell's auxiliary.

In 1936 Cardinal Pacelli came to the United States to tour the country. The cardinal insisted that Bishop Spellman accompany him on the train. The trip brought them through Albuquerque. Catholic leaders met them at the airport and talked with them there during the plane stop.

NAMED ARCHBISHOP

When Cardinal Pacelli was elected to succeed Pope Pius X in 1939, the see of New York was vacant. Seven weeks after he became Pope, he named Bishop Spellman archbishop of New York.

In 1946 the Pope elevated Bishop Spellman to cardinal in a ceremony in Rome.

From the early days of World War II Cardinal Spellman dedicated himself to the personal visitation of Catholic chaplains and the men and women they served all over the world. In August 1942, he went to the Aleutians. In February 1943 he went to Spain and then received the unique privilege of being allowed to pass through Italy, a country with which the United States was then at war, to visit the Vatican and Pope Pius XII.

Later he went to Algiers, Egypt, and north Africa.

From Africa, the cardinal flew to London, where he met with American troops already preparing for the invasion.

He took down names of American servicemen and communicated later with their parents about seeing their boy or girl. It is estimated more than 14,000 servicemen sent messages home through the archbishop.

PLEADS FOR ROME

After the Allies had entered Italy, Cardinal Spellman issued a plea that Rome be spared bombing and expressed the hope "military ingenuity would overcome military necessity."

After the Pope's summer residence at Castlegandolfo was bombed, Cardinal Spellman deplored the bombing, declaring it was neutral and no troops were stationed there.

In the summer and fall of 1944, he again visited the war fronts, including Rome, France, England again, and the First and Third Army sectors along the border of Germany. He completed his 19,000-mile, 3-month tour of the European war theater on October 18, 1944.

Just a few days before the surrender of Japan, the cardinal left on a visit of America's fighting men in the Pacific. He visited Pearl Harbor, Guam, Saipan, Okinawa, and the Philippines and said Mass later on a battleship in Tokyo Bay. On V-J Day he led Mass in Manila stadium for 5,000 GI's and civilians.

TOURS PACIFIC

On this tour he also offered Masses at Kwajelein and Saipan. Tinian, and Iwo Jima.

He entered Korea with the occupation forces, spent 9 days in Japan, including a visit to Hiroshima. He returned by way of China, India, Cairo, Rome, Paris, the Azores, and Bermuda.

Throughout the war he had appealed for support on bond-selling drives.

New Mexico Boys' Village Padre Hails Borough Sponsor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to direct the attention of our colleagues to the following very heartwarming article concerning one of my constituents which appeared in the Brooklyn Eagle of August 1, 1954:

NEW MEXICO BOYS' VILLAGE PADRE HAILS BOROUGH SPONSOR

Out in sparsely settled New Mexico, where there are no publicly supported orphanages, and religious groups are strongly relied on to care for homeless youngsters, the name of Louis S. Libutti, a Brooklyn ex-GI, is often mentioned in prayers of thanksgiving at the Lourdes Boys Village, 5 miles south of Albuquerque.

The village, a school workshop, open to needy boys of any race, religion, or language, is run by the Fathers of the Pious Society of St. Joseph of Murialdo, a society founded in 1873, which today has some 1,000 priests, brothers, and novices at work among boys in Italy, Brazil, Ecuador, Chile, Argentina, and other countries.

Mr. Libutti, who lives at 8755 19th Avenue, helped bring the society to America. "His story," Father Cajetan Menegatto, superior of the New Mexico Boys village, said recently, "should inspire all Catholic laymen."

Queried about "his story" in an interview in his Bath Beach home, where he lives with his aunt, Mrs. Mamie Viggiano, Mr. Libutti modestly said that what he had done to help establish the society in New Mexico was overrated.

Yet Mr. Libutti's efforts as a United States Army Air Force staff sergeant on behalf of hundreds of Italy's ragged, homeless, hungry boys in bomb-shattered Foggia in World War II paved the way to great interest in the society's work.

In that Italian city he promised the superior general of the order that, if ever the opportunity arose to bring the society to America, he would do his part to realise the dream. He made good on that promise.

Mr. Libutti, who grew up as a member of the Flatbush Boys Club, learned as a volunteer at the club how to meet the needs of underprivileged boys. He entered the service at the age of 25 in 1942 and was part of a B-17 Flying Fortress crew.

The story of Mr. Libutti's work among Italian boys was given wide publicity during the war years. He helped establish a virtual Boys Town of Italy at St. Michael's Church in Foggia, where he came to know Father Mario Canova of the Pious Society of St. Joseph of Murialdo.

Father Mario is now a missionary priest in the jungles of Ecuador and Mr. Libutti is determined to bring him to New Mexico. He will appeal to the society's superior general in Rome for Father Mario's transfer. He's confident that his wish will be granted.

After the war, Mr. Libutti journeyed westward to rehabilitate himself and became director of the Santa Fe Boys Club. There he met Archbishop Edwin V. Byrne, who expressed the need for some order to work in this poor New Mexico. That represented Mr. Libutti's opportunity to fulfill his promise made in Foggia.

For a long time after Mr. Libutti returned to Brooklyn, following a year in Santa Fe, correspondence kept up—"from Santa Fe, to Brooklyn, to Rome, to South America," he recalls.

Two of the society's priests, American-born but who had trained in Italy and worked in South America, came on, visited Mr. Libutti at his home here and went on to New Mexico. They had to become "reacquainted" with their native land and, after 2 years of parish work, were given the opportunity to open the school workshop known as Lourdes Boys Village.

This past year the school had 30 boarding students and 22 day students. Classes are only a part of the village's program. There's training in carpentry, music, sports, and agriculture. The farm has chickens, ducks, pheasants, pigeons, rabbits, and pigs. The village, on a 66-acre tract, will soon cultivate all its acreage and there will be an "ole swimmin' hole."

Mr. Libutti, only member of the Boys Village Associates living east of the Rockies, has friends here who continually support the village, either financially or with gift packages. The village is New Mexico's newest and fastest growing home for boys.

Among the Brooklynites who are helping are Mr. and Mrs. Patsy Fioriglio, Mr. and Mrs. John Di Mernardi and ther daughters, and Angelo Bandel, president of the Bandel Saw Co., who made a substantial contribution of jigsaws and other equipment for the carpentry shop.

Speaking of his interest in boys, Mr. Libutti says, "Coming along the road, we have to stop and 'give a hand up.' If we don't, the road may not be clear for the next generation. We don't grow up by ourselves but as products of our environment and with the aid of those who help us."

Mr. Libutti is associated with a stocks, bonds, and commodity investment firm at 42 Wall Street, Manhattan, as a rubber trader.

Egyptian Blockade of the Suez Canal Against Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES J. KERSTEN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, ever since the State of Israel was established in 1948, the Government of Egypt has persisted in denying the facilities of the Suez Canal to all ships, including American vessels, engaged in trade with Israel. Egypt has sought to justify this blockade by contending that it is in a state of war with Israel and, therefore, entitled to block her shipping.

Neither our Government nor other western powers have accepted this defense, and twice in the United Nations Security Council, the delegation of the United States has voted to condemn the blockade as a breach of the U. N. negotiated Israel-Egypt armistice, and to rule that the Egyptian Government open the canal. The Egyptians refused to comply with the first decision handed down on September 1, 1951. On the second occasion, when this matter was brought before the United Nations, Egypt was rescued from an adverse ruling by the Soviet veto.

This blockade has resulted in a serious economic hardship to Israel. While certain foodstuffs are permitted to come through now, nevertheless, many products are prevented from shipment into Israel. As a result Israel presently is obtaining her necessary petroleum from the Soviet Union in exchange for oranges. Israel could get petroleum through the canal and not be obliged to go to the Soviet Union for it.

Presently the Egyptian officials examine the manifests of the cargo of American ships going to Israel. This is an indignity which the United States should not suffer.

It is to be hoped that when the British and Egyptians conclude their final agreement, that the relationship between Egypt and Israel will be relaxed and that the Egyptians will withdraw their unjust blockade.

I have addressed a letter to the Secretary of State requesting that the United States take a position in this matter to bring about the end of the unjust blockade which is hampering the economic well-being of the State of Israel.

A Commendable Record of Republican Congress in Providing Hospital and Medical Facilities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, I have been greatly interested during the present session in pressing for additional facilities to meet the demand that exists for research as to the causes and cure of the diseases that bring so much distress to individuals and expense to the families in which the long term illnesses exist.

While it has always been a subject in which I have been deeply interested during my 20 and more years of service on the committee, yet, this year there was more interest shown by the Congress, and, greater accomplishments attained than at any previous time. This accelerated interest was in no small measure due to the personal interest that was taken by President Eisenhower and his Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Oveta Culp Hobby. In response to their request and interest it was possible to obtain additional legislation that expanded the hospital construction program and the research facilities so necessary for a proper and effective treatment of disease.

It was most gratifying to have appropriations made for this worthy purpose that far exceeded that of any previous

Congress. The record of the 83d Congress was most commendable. The following is a short summary of the appropriations made for the institutions and facilities set forth:

HOSPITAL CONSTRUCTION

A 3-year health program costing $182 million was approved by the Republican Congress. It authorizes grants to nonprofit organizations for the construction of diagnostic centers, hospitals for the chronically ill, rehabilitation centers, and nursing homes.

In addition, the legislation provides a $2 million fund for surveys by State health authorities to determine their hospital and nursing-home needs.

All of the construction of facilities now made possible by this action is to be in connection with established hospitals or similar institutions.

For diagnostic centers there is a $20 million fund available for each of the next 3 years.

For chronic disease hospitals a similar amount is available annually for the next 3 years.

For rehabilitation centers a $10 million fund is available annually for a like period, and for nursing homes a similar amount has been provided annually for the next 3 years.

The President requested an amendment to the Hospital Survey and Construction Act to provide these funds. The Republican Congress prepared and passed this new program to facilitate the construction of these specialized types of institutions for the victims of long-time illnesses.

By providing more nursing and convalescent home facilities, beds in general hospitals will be released for the care of the acutely ill. This will also help relieve some of the serious problems created by the present short supply of trained nurses.

In addition, many illnesses can be cared for outside of any institution and, for this reason, the 83d Congress has provided Federal funds for the diagnosis and treatment of ambulatory patients. The provision of such facilities, particularly in rural areas and small isolated communities, will attract physicians to the sparsely settled sections where they are urgently needed.

DISABLED FIND NEW HOPE

In addition, your Republican Congress provided funds for the new Department so that disabled Americans could be rehabilitated into performing useful tasks.

The program in effect in 1952 barely cared for the current rate of disabled, creating a larger backlog each year.

We know that the greatest benefit in rehabilitation is in values such as happiness and the living of a useful life, but there is also a commonsense money value attached to the problem. In 1953, for instance, one-fifth of the support for the disabled was provided by public-assistance funds.

But the cost of rehabilitating disabled individuals is less than the cost of 1 year of public assistance.

For this reason, the number of disabled civilians to be rehabilitated is being stepped up from the total of 60,000 in 1952 to a total of 200,000 annually by 1959.

MILLIONS ADDED FOR MEDICAL RESEARCH

In 1947 the Republican 80th Congress authorized the construction of the National Institutes of Health in Bethesda, Md., a great research center devoted to the prevention and cure of diseases. It was an outgrowth of a single unit which was established in 1930 during the administration of President Herbert Hoover.

Fittingly enough, the expanded center, now one of the great research institutions of the world, was opened during the first year of the Eisenhower administration.

Funds which increased the requests by the administration by as much as $1 million in many cases were provided by the Republican Congress for cancer research, mental health, heart disease, neurology, and blindness research. These are the major killers and disablers in the Nation today, and the Republican Congress took steps to combat them on a modern research scale.

We knew that these killers, which strike at the heart, the mind, the bloodstream, and essential organs of our body, can be eliminated only by the most intense research effort.

In recognition of this need for painstaking, slow, basic probing of the secret of life and the killers which destroy it, the 83d Republican Congress examined at length the possibilities for what may be, in many cases, a final blow against many of our fatal diseases.

The leading cause of death in the United States today is heart disease—over 80,000 died as a result of such disorders in 1953. What the toll may be in 1954 no one knows.

Next is cancer—its toll this year will be 25,000 American lives, with a total of 530,000 stricken, unless the present rate is slowed.

We recognized also that mental diseases will continue to claim this mounting toll unless we put adequate weapons in the hands of those who have been fighting on this disease front. Each year our hospitals treat 900,000 mental patients, and the annual bill for treatment and care is more than $1 billion.

Another great disabler and killer is neurological diseases, which now affect more than 20 million Americans. They cause blindness, deafness, epilepsy, muscular disorders, and other cripplers.

The Republican Congress decided that now is the time to press whatever advantages medical science has over these diseases. In cancer, for instance, we learned that scientists now have an inkling of what happens in the healthy cells of our body. New chemicals are proving effective against the leukemias that so tragically and frequently strike our defenseless young. The cancerous disorders in women are better understood, and our scientists and research experts tell us that we may soon have good news for those who are or may be the victims of this tragic disorder.

In heart research, the chemical basis of the diseases is being laid before the eyes of our researchers. New drugs are on the way to alleviate hypertension, and cardiac surgery and assaults of rheumatic heart diseases are going forward now into the preventive stage.

We are near the break-through point in the wall of ignorance over the cause of epilepsy—a disorder that claims 1,500,000 victims today.

Therefore, when the Republican Congress considered legislation for research into the causes for so many of our human ailments, it increased the funds by $1 million for cancer research; $1 million for heart disease research; $1 million for research in neurological diseases, including blindness and deafness; and $1 million for research into mental disorders.

For cancer research alone, the funds was increased to $21,237,000. Mental health research funds were increased to $13,095,000; heart research funds increased to $16,168,000, and neurological and blindness research funds increased to $6,913,000.

By these actions, we are making an investment in the future for all of us, as well as moving forward on the economic front. Each year disease causes tremendous losses in wages and expensive medical and hospital care. It is sound economy to do what is essential in an effort to lessen this burden on the American people.

Postal Employees Deserve a Raise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES J. KERSTEN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am still firmly of the opinion that the postal workers are entitled to a raise in pay. The raise in pay should not have to be dependent on a raise in rates, although a raise in rates may well be in order, too.

I am of the opinion that the great gains in efficiency in administration brought about by the businesslike effectiveness of the Republican administration created such savings in efficiency that a raise in the postal workers' pay would not disrupt our Federal budget.

When the discharge petition was before the House on the original bill to raise postal workers' pay, I was then in Europe with the Committee on Communist Aggression, of which I was chairman, and was hence unable to sign the petition. Had I been here I would have done so.

I am sure that the postal workers are well aware of my interest in their situation. When the pay-raise bill was before the House on August 20, I expressed myself as follows:

> Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the passage today of the increase for the salaries of postal workers and other Federal employees is well merited. Postal employees and other Federal employees do not have a labor union to bargain for them. They are employees of the United States Government and therefore do not enjoy the right of collective bargaining. Therefore we in Con-

gress have a special duty to see that they receive a just wage. All too often the postal employees have had to do supplemental work in order to eke out a living wage for themselves and families.

The postal employees of Milwaukee, like every other large city, perform a vital service for the community both for industry and the millions of private communications. They are deserving of adequate support in this vital service.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that when the new 84th Congress convenes in January 1955 the first item of business should be consideration of a raise for the postal workers.

The 83d Congress and Farm Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, on this closing day of the 83d Congress, I cannot refrain from briefly reviewing the course of farm legislation in this session. I am also prompted to say a few words because I have today received the following kind and generous letter from my good friend, and chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, the Honorable CLIFFORD R. HOPE, of Kansas:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U. S.,
COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D. C., August 20, 1954.

Hon. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR AUGUST: I would not want to leave Washington without taking this opportunity to express my appreciation of the great contribution which you have made to the Committee on Agriculture during the sessions of the 83d Congress.

This has been a busy Congress as far as the Committee on Agriculture is concerned and I feel that the committee can well be proud of the legislation which it has reported. Your knowledge of agriculture and your conscientious attention to the problems before the committee have made it possible for you to make a real contribution to all of the important legislation which the committee has considered.

I have depended much on your judgment, not only on those matters (dairying, livestock, research, improved marketing, and conservation) to which you have given particular attention, but on all important problems before the committee. Certainly, you have represented the farmers and others in your own district and State magnificently and I am sure that they are grateful for the splendid work which you have done. Your hard work for American agriculture has always been beneficial to the economy of our entire country.

Looking forward to seeing you in January and with kindest regards, I am,

Very cordially yours,

CLIFFORD R. HOPE,
Chairman.

I want to publicly thank Congressman HOPE for his very kind and unsolicited expression of my work as a member of the Committee on Agriculture. We have served together on this committee for many years, during which time we have worked in close cooperation for what we and other members of the committee believed to be for the best interests of American agriculture. We have always taken the position that it is vital to the economy of our country to have a strong and prosperous agriculture to assure an abundant supply of food and fiber for the consumption and use of American consumers at reasonable prices. I regard CLIFFORD HOPE as one of the outstanding agricultural leaders in the United States. He is intimately acquainted with all phases of American agriculture and the problems of our farmers. Serving as a member of the Committee on Agriculture, under the leadership of Chairman CLIFFORD HOPE, is a distinct privilege. All of the members of our committee are men of outstanding ability intimately familiar with the farm problem. Although the committee is divided along political party lines, there is no political partisanship among our members in the consideration of farm legislation. We all want to do what is for the best interests of American agriculture. The membership of the committee represents all parts of the country and all types of agricultural production.

When Mr. HOPE and I first came to Congress, approximately 28 percent of the American people were engaged in agricultural pursuits. According to the last estimate of the Census Bureau, only 13.3 percent of our people are engaged in agricultural production. This large reduction in our farm population has had a material effect upon the membership of the House of Representatives in the consideration of legislation to establish an equitable and sound farm program.

Due to modernized farming and favorable growing weather, our country has been blessed with an abundance of production in all types of agricultural products during the last decade. This has created a surplus problem with which the Committee on Agriculture and the Congress have sought to deal in this and past sessions. Abundant supplies of food should be a blessing instead of a curse.

Members of Congress do not administer laws. This is in the hands of the executive branch of the Government, and many times during my service, I have found that the executive branch does not always administer laws in accordance with the intent of Congress. While I firmly believe in separate and independent branches of our Government, I nevertheless feel that it would be better for American agriculture if closer cooperation could be maintained between the legislative and executive branches of the Government.

Our country is now passing through a transition period from a wartime inflated economy to peacetime operations. Unfortunately, it appears that during the past 3 years, the reduction in the income of farmers for the sale of their products comes first without any appreciable reduction in the things that farmers must buy. The cost of labor has gone up which has been reflected in higher prices of manufactured and other articles. It should also be noted that falling of farm prices, whether under fixed or flexible supports, has not been materially reflected in the price of food to consumers. It is argued that labor and distribution costs are going up and therefore the consumer has not had any material benefit from the reduction in prices of farm products. Many economists have erroneously argued that a reduction in farm prices would bring cheaper food to the people.

I became a member of the Committee on Agriculture when I first came to Congress. I selected this committee for my service because I felt that abundant food production would be for the benefit of the entire country and its economy. Most of the members of the committee feel as I do. We believe that in order to avoid serious economic trouble in this country, we must have a sound and prosperous agriculture.

AGRICULTURAL LAW OF 1954

Our Committee on Agriculture held hearings for nearly 12 months. We heard the testimony and recommendations of more than 2,000 witnesses representing every farm product and from every section of the country. We also heard the testimony of leading representatives of all farm organizations and the spokesmen for the Department of Agriculture. During my service in Congress I have never found so many sharp differences of opinion and variety of recommendations for farm legislation, as were presented to us in this session. All of this added to the difficulty which faced the committee in the drafting of a new farm law.

There are 30 members on the Committee on Agriculture. Finally, after months of deliberation, a large majority of the committee favorably reported a bill, H. R. 9680, to the House of Representatives for consideration. This bill provided for 90 percent of parity support for basic farm products for the 1955 crop year and 80 percent to 90 percent support for dairy products for the same period. My motion made in the Committee on Agriculture to fix 85-percent support for dairy products failed by a close vote. This was due to the large amount of dairy products in the hands of the Government acquired under the dairy support program.

When the House of Representatives debated and considered H. R. 9680, the farm bill, a large majority of the House membership approved the 80-percent support for dairy products as reported by the committee. However, the House set aside, also by a large majority, the 90 percent of parity support for basic commodities recommended by the committee, and established a support price for such commodities at 82½ percent to 90 percent of parity. The Senate adopted the same support level for basic commodities, but refused to agree to a support for dairy products from 80 percent to 90 percent of parity and established the support price for dairy products at 75 percent to 90 percent of parity over my vigorous protest. I also did my best to secure a change in the attitude of the Senate conferees when we met in conference to consider both House and Senate bills, but without success. Therefore, the support price on dairy products will remain at 75 percent of parity until such time as the Secretary of Agriculture, at his discretion, increases the support level.

In dealing with a price-support program for dairy products, the difficulty has been in handling the huge surplus of butter, cheese, and milk powder which has accumulated in the hands of the Government. If it were not for the surplus, there would be no problem for the dairy farmers of this country. The Secretary of Agriculture has been given blanket authority in the new farm law to use any method he may deem necessary to dispose of Government stocks of dairy products. As a part of the surplus program, the following proposals, offered by me and approved by the House, were adopted:

First. Milk, as well as other dairy products, now may be purchased by the Government in support operations from 75 to 90 percent of parity.

Second. The Secretary of Agriculture may use any method necessary to dispose of Commodity Credit Corporation stocks of dairy products.

Third. Fifty million dollars a year for 2 years was approved for boosting fluid milk consumption in schools. This additional consumption of milk should reduce the amount of milk now used for manufactured products.

Fourth. Fifteen million dollars annually was directed to be used for the next 2 years for the brucellosis-eradication program. It is estimated that there are approximately 1,500,000 brucellosis-infected cows in this country. This congressional policy provides that up to $50 per head can be paid as an indemnity in the disposal of reactor cattle. If this program is properly and successfully administered, milk production should be reduced by an estimated 2 billion pounds a year.

Fifth. Donations of CCC stocks of dairy products to the military services and veterans' hospitals was fully authorized. Many of our soldiers have been fed oleomargarine and given very little milk.

Sixth. The Secretary of Agriculture is directed to make a study of the various methods of production control and of the various methods of price support which could be made applicable to milk and butterfat and their products, including programs to be operated and financed by dairymen; and to submit to Congress on or before the 3d day of January 1955, a detailed report thereof showing among other things the probable costs and effects of each type of operation studied and the legislation, if any, needed to put it into effect. The purpose of the study and report is to develop basic material which can be used by Congress in formulating an improved agricultural program for milk and butterfat and their products. Alternative programs are to be submitted for consideration by Congress and for possible submission to a referendum of dairy farmers. The Secretary may conduct such hearings and receive such statements and briefs in connection with such study as he deems appropriate.

Seventh. Laws heretofore enacted provide authority for the Secretary of Agriculture to dispose of dairy stocks and other surplus farm commodities in the hands of the Government for relief and other purposes in this country and abroad.

The surplus problem is not an easy one to deal with, but I hope that with the authority given to the executive branch of the Government a solution may be found. With the increase in population in this country, it is my estimate and hope that inside of a few years, the present problem confronting dairy farmers will be solved. Incidentally, but very important, is the fact that around 4 million babies are born in this country every year and they each should have from a pint to a quart of milk a day. The dairy industry is also giving serious consideration to improving the marketing and advertising of dairy products. All of our citizens should consume more milk and other dairy products, because there is no better food in the world.

When the new Congress convenes, I will urge immediate consideration of new farm legislation. I will also urge a study to develop the facts as to the reason why consumers have not had their cost of food reduced, when you consider the lower prices received by farmers. In other words, I want a thorough investigation on the whole food situation in an effort to find a satisfactory solution that will encourage our farm population to continue abundant production under more prosperous conditions.

BUTTER, A CASUALTY OF WAR AND GOVERNMENT EDICT

Dairy farmers of the United States are being blamed by some for the surplus situation which has now occurred in the case of butter and other manufactured dairy products. This criticism is not justified. Government records will show that butter and other dairy products are a casualty of World War II, and Government regulations.

The per capita consumption of butter in 1939 was estimated by the Department of Agriculture at 17½ pounds. In 1942, butter was placed under the ration system, and by 1945, butter consumption was reduced to 10½ pounds per capita. Consumers in this country were urged by agencies under the Roosevelt administration to use less butter and to eat more oleomargarine, and other substitutes so that our butter could be shipped to England, Russia, and other allies during the war. Several hundred million pounds of butter were sent to our allies. During the same period around 1½ billion pounds of butter were consumed by men in all branches of our fighting forces in all parts of the world. In the past 4 years our men in the Army have been fed mostly oleomargarine.

Prior to World War II, dairy farmers fed a considerable amount of milk produced on each farm to poultry, hogs, and other livestock. To use this milk, the Government devised an attractive proposal for dairy farmers to convert both whole and skim milk into milk powder. Millions of dollars were spent by the Government in the construction of milk-drying plants. This was a part of the war effort in order to supply our soldiers and allies with millions of pounds of milk powder which could be reconstituted into liquid milk and used for all edible purposes. Since the termination of the war in Korea, the demand for milk powder has disappeared, and hundreds of millions of pounds of this product has passed to the Government as a part of the surplus.

FARMERS NOT RESPONSIBLE FOR DAIRY PROBLEM

When Paul V. McNutt was Federal Security Administrator, an order was issued by his Department and under his direction permitting oleomargarine manufacturers to flavor their synthetic product with a butter flavor so that oleomargarine would become more acceptable to the general public. He also issued an order permitting oleomargarine manufacturers to inject up to 16,000 units of vitamin A into oleomargarine so that the manufacturers could claim that their synthetic product contained the same vitamin content as butter. These Government regulations encouraged the consumption of oleomargarine as a substitute for butter and the per capita consumption of butter continued its downward decline to the detriment of every dairy farmer in this country.

TWENTY-EIGHT OLEOMARGARINE COMPANIES WIN

For more than 20 years prior to 1950, the oleomargarine companies tried to secure the enactment of legislation to permit the coloring of oleomargarine yellow in imitation of butter without the payment of any tax. Yellow is the historic color of butter, and the oleo companies felt that if they could imitate butter by coloring their synthetic product to look like butter, they could capture the butter market in the United States. They finally succeeded in putting through such a law in the 81st Democratic Congress under President Truman. This action increased the production and consumption of oleomargarine and further displaced the use of butter. It is estimated that for the year 1954 the consumption of oleomargarine will equal or exceed that of butter.

I have called these facts to your attention because I feel that you should be informed as to who is responsible for the plight of our great American dairy industry. A few hundred million dollars invested by the Government to save the dairy industry during the postwar period is a wise investment. Dairy products are vital to the health and welfare of all American consumers. It may take several years before proper readjustment can be made by dairy farmers, and they cannot do the job alone. They need the aid and assistance of the Federal Government, because the Federal Government is responsible for what has been done to this great industry, and by no stretch of the imagination can it be charged to our dairy farmers.

I also wish the record to show that I vigorously opposed the reduction in the support price on dairy products from 90 percent to 75 percent established and put into effect by Secretary Benson on April 1, 1954. I definitely felt that this drastic reduction was going too far at one time, and I offered legislation providing that the drop in the support price should not be more than 5 percent in any 1 year if a reduction was found to be necessary. I strongly believed that this large reduction in the support price would be very detrimental to dairy farmers and have a decided downward effect upon their purchasing power which in turn would affect the rest of the country.

I have introduced and am pressing for legislation to remove trade barriers in this country which now prohibit the shipment of milk from one section of the country to large consuming areas. There should be no trade barriers within the United States against the free flow of any commodity in domestic commerce.

As I have already stated, I will urge the new Congress to consider farm legislation in the coming session which will deal with the problems of all farmers whether they be engaged in dairy, poultry, grain, or livestock production. We must have a sound and lasting program for American farmers that will assure prosperous conditions in agriculture and also for the benefit of our entire economy. In these remarks, I have dealt with the dairy problem because it is the most pressing and difficult to solve, but I am equally interested in all types of agricultural production and in the success of every sound farm program.

The Need for a Republican Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, today we stand at a pivotal point in history.

We have arrived on the threshold of a new era full of promise and abundance for the American people.

Whether we step over that threshold and lay immediate claim to the great heritage which is ours depends in large part on the decisions ahead of us.

One of those decisions will confront us in the 1954 election for Congress. At that time the American people will be called upon to pass judgment on the historic Republican accomplishments of the past 2 years. They will decide whether they want that far-sighted program to go forward to completion—or whether they want to be curtailed and defeated in large part by a Congress unfriendly to President Eisenhower.

The choice is a fateful one.

For the accomplishments of the Republican Party in the past 2 years have been vastly and fundamentally important. The Congress and the administration have put more money into the pockets of the American workers by reduction of Federal taxes; they have reduced the threat of socialism and communism within our borders; they have strengthened our defense against aggression from abroad; they have added in a thousand different ways to the continued peace and prosperity of all our people.

Much of what has been done would not be fully realized or felt until a later date. It will find its ultimate expression in the useful things a family can buy with its share of the $7,400,000,000 tax reduction. Or in the new and improved highways the Republicans provided to make future motoring safer and happier for millions of Americans.

It will be seen and appreciated when new housing and hospitals spring up in the wake of Republican-adopted legislation. It will be realized in the increased wealth and jobs which will be created all over America as a result of Republican moves to stabilize the dollar, balance the budget, overhaul our tax laws, revise our atomic-energy program, expand social security, and revitalize our farm economy.

PRESIDENT PLANS FOR EVERY AMERICAN

Seldom in history has an administration done so much in so short a time to add to the personal health, wealth, happiness, and safety of the American people.

These achievements of the 83d Congress and the Eisenhower administration were the results of months of planning and painstaking work to implement in law the solemn pledges of the President and his coworkers on Capitol Hill.

And this was long-range planning. It envisioned a program adapted to the needs of the American people which would be inaugurated by the 83d Congress and perfected by the 84th Congress. Like most Presidents before him, President Eisenhower mapped his plans with the idea that they would take 4 years—the length of his term of office—to complete.

Part of the reason for this is in the nature of the plans themselves. They are ambitious plans for a great and growing and powerful Nation. They are plans that reach into every American home, touch every American man, woman, and child; encompass every facet of national life—social, economic, and political—with two great aims: To make the country totally safe, and to increase the standard of living.

Is there any wonder that these were long-range plans? The job that confronted the Republicans when they took office in January 1953 was tremendous. To expect the President to complete his program in 2 years, or without a Republican Congress, would be like asking a ballplayer to make a home run with one hand.

This is what makes the forthcoming elections the most crucial nonpresidential balloting of our times. Under President Eisenhower's leadership, the American people have begun their march along the road leading to a prosperous free economy based on individual freedom.

In November, we must decide whether we wish to stick with the job of restoring our country to solvency, of keeping our economic and moral integrity, of making the United States a bulwark against world communism, or whether we want to swing back along the easy downhill stretch that leads to bankruptcy, bungling, and appeasement to the Red threat.

WHY REPUBLICAN MAJORITY IS ESSENTIAL

A Republican majority in the coming 84th Congress is essential if we are to continue to have honesty, integrity, and efficiency in Government in place of the old chiseling, influence peddling and extravagance.

A Republican majority is essential if we are to continue the largest tax-cutting program in the history of this or any other country.

A Republican majority is essential if we are to go on cutting Government spending, checking the ruinous forces of inflation, and preventing further devaluation of the dollar.

A Republican majority is essential if we are to continue the program of cleaning the Communists and subversives out of our Government.

A Republican majority is essential if we are to have a foreign policy whose aim is peace with freedom and security.

A Republican majority is essential if we are to carry out the greatest highway program ever voted into a transportation system equal to the needs of a rapidly growing nation.

A Republican majority is essential if we are to have a streamlined defense system based on commonsense expenditures and the realities of the atomic age.

A Republican majority is essential if we are to capitalize on the great start we have made toward full development and utilization of atomic energy for peacetime purposes as well as defense.

A Republican majority is essential if we are to continue the gains we have made in the fields of housing, social security, unemployment compensation, and agriculture.

ORGANIZING VOTE MOST IMPORTANT

And why is this majority so vital? Let me explain. The most important vote in both the House and Senate is the vote to organize each body at the start of Congress. This vote determines which party will control the legislative machinery for the next 2 years.

In the House of Representatives, the vote to organize decides who will be Speaker and which party will have a majority on the all-important committees. It is the Speaker and the committees who control to a large extent the flow of legislation through the House. Consequently, if opponents were to control Congress in 1955 and 1956, it is certain they would seek to scuttle the Eisenhower legislative program—and they would be in position to succeed.

Make no mistake about it. Opponents, in such a situation, would work full time trying to embarrass and handicap the Eisenhower administration and thus lay the groundwork for their own victory in 1956.

And do not be misled by some Democrats in Congress who boast that they have supported the Eisenhower program. The fact is, they have supported the Eisenhower program only when such action served their own purposes. Incidentally, we Republicans welcome their support when they admit that the Republican program is so good they have to vote for it. I say this because our program deserves the support of every good American—Republican, Democrat, or Independent.

It is difficult to appraise the true worth of the Republican accomplishments in the past 2 years because so much has been done. But the accomplishments in whole or even in part are a strong argument for voting President Eisenhower another Republican majority in Congress.

Take taxes, for example. Here is a Republican record that the newspapers have variously described as monumental and historical. The reason is plain enough. Not only did the Republican Congress vote the American people a $7,400,000,000 tax reduction, but it also brought about the first major overhauling of the Nation's tax laws since 1890.

THE REPUBLICAN TAX-CUT PROGRAM

This record-breaking tax reduction came in four parts. On January 1, 1954, individual income taxes were cut 10 percent for a saving of $3 billion. On the same date, the excess-profits tax was eliminated with a resultant saving of $2 billion. On April 1, it reduced Federal excise levies as much as 50 percent on many items and the saving here was nearly $1 billion.

The remainder of the reduction—$1,400,000,000—was voted in the general tax-reform bill which effected same 3,000 changes in the tax laws and provided welcome relief for millions of individual taxpayers as well as some businesses. The reform bill also removed countless inequities, harassments, duplications, and loopholes and provided a new climate in which American business could thrive and expand.

This, I submit, is a truly staggering feat and a very drastic and welcome change from the constantly increasing taxes of our predecessors.

In this vital sphere, the voters' choice is a simple one. The Republicans have demonstrated and proven that they are dedicated to a policy of letting the American people keep their money and spend it themselves. The Democrats have demonstrated and proven—with 20 years of recurrent tax increases—that they are committed to a policy which says the Government shall take the people's money and spend it for them.

The Republican Congress laid the groundwork for the tax cuts by launching the greatest economy program in American history. In fact, the 83d Congress cut appropriations for fiscal 1954 and 1955 $64 billion below the appropriations for fiscal 1952 and 1953.

Broken down: The tax cuts by the 83d Congress mean on an average a saving of $200 a year for each family of four. The cut in appropriations over the spending in the 2 previous years under the former administration means a saving of nearly $1,600 for each family of four.

THE TWO SPENDING RECORDS

Let me point out that since the turn of the century America has experienced 26 years of Republican administration and 27 years of Democrat administration in Washington. In those 26 years, the Republicans spent a total of $186 billion, and the country was at peace. On the other hand, the Democrats in 27 years spent $821 billion, and the country was at war, hot and cold.

Republican administrations have spent, on the average, about $6,663,000,000 a year.

Democrat administrations have spent, on the average $29,350,000,000 a year.

During the past 2 years of the Eisenhower administration, the Democrats have shown no inclination to change their expensive habits. They have continued to propose—and the Republican 83d Congress has repeatedly voted down—numerous plans for extravagant new programs and costly additions to existing ones.

If you approve of the Republican tax-cutting program and of the Republican economy drive, then your only choice is to vote for the party that made them possible. If you agree that your money should be spent by the Government with extreme caution and go for the greatest service possible, then it is clearly your duty to vote for Republican congressional candidates in November.

The task of cleaning up a Federal budget that has been out of control for more than a decade is no short-range proposition. But we have made an auspicious start. Next year and the year after, we expect to bring about more economies and more tax cuts. However, to do that we need your support at the polls.

The tax-cutting and economy drives were the two great cornerstones of national solvency on which the Republicans began building one of the greatest programs ever devised for the welfare of the American people and the good of the world. But even before they began to take shape, the President and his coworkers had a house-cleaning job to do in the Federal Government.

Just think back to this time 2 years ago. That is when every American felt shame for the disgraceful scandals that were being unearthed in Washington. This was the time when Americans rose up and demanded that something be done about those scandals.

Their confidence in President Eisenhower was not misplaced. The Government has been cleaned up, and no longer do you read of almost daily scandals in Washington.

SUBVERSIVES ON THE RUN

President Eisenhower made his appointments on the basis of honesty and integrity. He ended the days of the "windfall profiteer" and the "five percenter" and the "influence peddler" in Washington. Now, anyone with business to transact in Washington knows there is a new atmosphere, and once more all Americans can again take pride in the high standards that prevail in their Government.

In another kind of cleanup, the Republicans launched a hard-hitting attack on domestic Communists, pinks, and other security risks which completely reversed the old attitude of laxity and blindness.

The new Republican security program was inaugurated on May 28, 1953. By March 10, 1954, a total of 2,486 Government employees were separated for security reasons. Of this total, 1,086 were fired and 1,400 resigned. In addition to this, the Justice Department has taken action against a long list of Communist leaders and subversive aliens, and Congress has tightened and strengthened the Nation's antisubversive laws.

This program was based on the principle that working for the Government is a high privilege—not a right—and anybody whose background cannot meet the test does not belong in the Government.

Your vote for the Republican Party in November can assure a continuance of this vigorous drive to end the threat of Red treachery on the home front.

When the Eisenhower administration took office in January 1953, inflation was a great national problem. Today it is not, for we have ended inflation. The cost-of-living index, which had been climbing steadily for 12 years under our predecessors, has leveled off. The honesty of the dollar is being restored. In addition, we have ended the unnecessary controls on the wages you receive.

THE TRANSITION TO PEACE

One of the things that makes our great Republican program a standout is that it was inaugurated at the most difficult possible time—during the transition from a wartime to a peacetime economy.

The Eisenhower administration supplied the understanding and the economy necessary to make that transition with the least possible difficulty. You all remember how the prophets of doom were spouting pessimism and despair only a few months ago. They nearly talked us into the kind of a recession that our Republican policies were able to avoid. They wanted the Government to step in with drastic emergency measures to give the economy a false shot in the arm that it did not need.

I do not believe there is a greater tribute that can be paid to the courage and steadfastness of the Eisenhower administration and the 83d Congress than to point out that they refused to be stampeded in that uncertain period. They stuck to their guns while their opponents yelled "panic." They quietly went about the business of smoothing the way for inevitable adjustment from war to peace. And they succeeded in bringing about the desired upturn in business activity and employment without resort to the crisis technique of the New and Fair Dealers.

During this unsettled period, neither the 83d Congress nor the administration missed its stride. Working together, they continued to carry on the huge job of shifting the course of Government away from Federal control and regimentation and into new channels calling for greater individual responsibility, a new brand of State's rights, and an enlightened policy of home rule. They pushed ahead on their program to take the Government out of business by liquidating the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, selling the costly Federal barge line, arranging the sale of the Government synthetic-rubber industry, and surveying all areas of more than 100 business-type operations the Federal Government had gotten into during former regimes.

GOVERNMENT REORGANIZED

The Republican administration began reorganizing the entire structure of the Federal Government in the interest of economy and efficiency. Twelve plans for reorganizing and streamlining the Federal departments were approved by

Congress. A Commission is hard at work formulating new reorganization proposals to supplement the original Hoover report recommendations.

FARM PROGRAM

Congress worked out a new farm program devoted to the best interests of all the people—farmers and city folks alike.

HIGHWAY PROGRAM

A highway building program second to none in history was adopted. This sorely needed Republican program will provide nearly $2 billion for highways in the fiscal years 1956 and 1957. It will return about $875 million a year to the States—an amount approximating the money American motorists spend each year in Federal gasoline taxes.

SOCIAL SECURITY

The Republican Congress approved a record expansion of social-security coverage and payments, adding 10 million persons to the eligibility rolls and increasing monthly benefits for 6 million persons already receiving payments.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

Congress implemented, at President Eisenhower's request, a genuine military defense program while at the same time cutting $20 billion out of the military budget by eliminating waste and extravagance. This was accomplished without weakening our national defense and security.

HOUSING

Under the Republicans, a new housing law was adopted which will make home ownership available to additional thousands of our people. The Republican program permits longer mortgages, stimulates modernization and home repairs, and prescribes effective new slum-clearance methods.

The Republicans also wrote into the housing act safeguards against a recurrence of the windfall profiteering which the old law, enacted by our Democrat predecessors, made possible. This flagrant and vicious racket was uncovered by the Eisenhower administration during the past year. It is still under investigation by Republican committees of Congress.

SOME MORE ACCOMPLISHMENTS

HEALTH

In the field of health, the Republicans created a new Cabinet post—the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare—to make sure that our people's problems are handled at the highest possible administrative level. We also voted a 3-year, $182 million hospital building program and provided a $2 million fund for State health authorities to use in determining their hospital and nursing-home needs.

ATOMIC ENERGY

At the President's urging, the Republican Congress rewrote and modernized the Nation's basic atomic-energy law for the first time since its passage in 1946. This monumental achievement will enable our people to make greater use of the benefits which nuclear fission offers to our peacetime development. It also will enable our military leaders to add atomic planning to the free world's defense against possible Communist aggression in Europe.

FOREIGN AID

A start was made toward reducing and eliminating foreign-aid expenditures, and provided that a sizable part of the present $3 billion aid program be extended in the form of loans rather than gifts.

TRADE AGREEMENTS

The Trade Agreements Act was extended and our foreign economic policy was further implemented through the adoption of a 3-year $1,300,000,000 program for disposing of American farm surpluses abroad. We also voted a broad revison of the Nation's customs laws.

SHIPBUILDING

Legislation was passed that provides for a real shipbuilding program to revive, restore, and maintain our dwindling shipbuilding industry.

These are only some of the major accomplishments of the 83d Congress and the Eisenhower administration. Others were registered, in conformity with our campaign pledges, in many other fields such as veterans' affairs, civil rights, and immigration.

We feel that they are a good start toward a better tomorrow for all of our people. And we feel that they deserve the endorsement of the American voters in the congressional elections.

The Republican administration has endeavored since January 1953 to give the best Government service possible.

Two years ago you voted for a change. President Eisenhower and the 83d Congress have given you that change in a way that has built dignity and honesty and purpose into our governmental structure. They have more than earned the chance to complete that job. I urge you to give it to them in November.

Postmaster Thomas A. Wilkinson, of Lynn, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an article in tribute to Postmaster Thomas A. Wilkinson, of Lynn, Mass.

Many men have spent their working years as members of the Lynn post-office family. None can claim a greater share of affection from the hearts of his fellow workers or a deeper respect for the nature of his services than Tom Wilkinson.

The article follows:

LYNN POST OFFICE KEEPS EFFICIENCY

In the 20 years that Thomas A. Wilkinson has been postmaster, the Lynn post office has never fallen below a 98-percent rating for efficiency and performance in the annual inspection by Post Office Department inspectors, Henry H. Johnson, Jr., Assistant Superintendent of Mails, told members of Lynn Rotary Club yesterday.

This high rating is unusual for cities of this size, the speaker emphasized, at the club's weekly luncheon at the Oxford Club.

Mr. Johnson also paid tribute to the loyalty and efficiency of the 328 employees of the Lynn postal district whose aggregate wages and salaries last year totaled $1,500,000. He pointed out that since all but five of these employees reside within the Lynn district, most of that money is spent in this area.

The speaker said that the volume of business done at the Lynn post office is one reason why the postal department has been called the biggest business in the world. Last year alone 49,500,000 letters went through the Lynn office, each piece requiring three separate handlings. In addition, 9 million circulars, vast quantities of newspapers and magazines and large quantities of parcel post are handled each year. Not only does every train coming into Lynn from Boston bring mail, but 4 32-foot vans bring in 700 sacks of parcel post every 24 hours and take out 500 sacks.

The Lynn post office not only handles mail, but conducts a postal savings bank, a license bureau to issue Federal stamps of various kinds, a printing office to provide return addresses on stamped envelopes bought in quantity, an information center to trace people wanted by other Federal agencies, a collection agency through its c. o. d. system which delivered 14,000 packages last year, a registration bureau for aliens and provides quarters for civil-service examinations.

Among the other duties of the post office, Mr. Johnson, who has been employed there since 1919, is to notify other Federal agencies when a pensioner dies so his name can be stricken from the rolls, to provide American flags for the caskets of war veterans, and to assist Department of Justice agents in loyalty checks on local individuals.

The speaker was introduced by John Marsh.

A Strong and Adequate Merchant Marine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the remarks made by Secretary of the Navy Charles S. Thomas before the Massachusetts Maritime Academy at Faneuil Hall, Boston, August 15.

The Secretary's remarks substantiate the position I have often expressed that a strong integrated merchant marine is vitally necessary as the first arm of our commerce and the fourth arm of our defense.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A STRONG AND ADEQUATE MERCHANT MARINE

(Remarks by Secretary of the Navy Charles S. Thomas, before the Massachusetts Maritime Academy, Faneuil Hall, Boston, Mass., Sunday, August 15, 1954)

Mr. Hurley, Rear Admiral Wison, distinguished guests, and members of the graduating class of the Massachusetts Maritime Academy, I am happy to be here today for three reasons.

First of all, to stand in this hall is a signal honor. It is awe inspiring to recall that these walls have echoed the voices of such men as James Otis, John Hancock, Paul Revere, George Washington, Lafayette, John Quincy Adams, and Daniel Webster. It is also inspiring to remember that in this historic setting American freedom and liberty were given birth.

Secondly, it is a genuine pleasure to be in Boston again, where the Navy is always welcome, and where seapower is always understood.

And lastly, it is an honor to address you gentlemen upon your graduation from the Massachusetts Maritime Academy, some of whom will be serving in the United States Navy, and all of whom will be officers in our American merchant marine.

At first thought, there may be no seeming relationships among these elements. Yet if you will consider them a moment, you will observe there a timely and peculiar connection between Faneuil Hall, the city of Boston, and this Academy. Paraphrased, these elements represent liberty, seapower, and knowledge, and in these times of great danger, their combination is fundamental to the strength and security of our country.

One of the vital elements of seapower is a strong and adequate merchant marine, and this is what I want to speak briefly about this afternoon.

In this age of supersonic speed and atomic power, there are many Americans who wonder why the United States needs a strong and adequate merchant marine. As Secretary of the Navy I would like to make it emphatic and clear that we of the Navy regard the marchant marine as an indispensable element of our defense, fully as important and vital as the Army, Navy, or Air Force.

In the first place, our merchant marine does not serve just the coastal areas or the Great Lakes. The entire Nation benefits from a strong merchant marine. With all our wealth and our abundance of natural resources, it is hard to convince the average American that we must import and export to live, to assist our friends and neighbors, to maintain our standard of living, and to survive in the event of war.

Let us consider one example—our modern combat airplanes flying today. With only American and overland resources they could not be built in the numbers adequate for a total defense.

Essential to their manufacture are such raw materials as aluminum, chromium, titanium, antimony, tin, cobalt, mica, and tungsten. The largest percentages of these materials must be brought in merchant ships from overseas sources. I need not mention rubber for their tires, fuel for their tanks, and uranium for their atomic weapons. Even prosaic but necessary items such as coffee, sugar, and vegetable oils must be carried to our ports by merchant vessels.

The first answer, then, as to why we need a strong and adequate merchant marine in these modern times is that it is important to our peacetime economy and prosperity.

The second reason why we need a strong and adequate merchant marine is that it is essential to our success and security in time of war.

Military production, like our peacetime industrial production, is dependent upon the importation of strategic materials, and the exportation of the finished products of war for ourselves and for our friends. The protection of our friends against aggression, as well as the defeat of the enemy will demand that we be able to project our strength across the seas. To do this, we must have an adequate merchant marine in peace—one which is rapidly expansible in time of war.

I need not tell you gentlemen that historically the United States Navy and the American merchant marine have been closely, even inseparably, related. All of you know that John Paul Jones was a merchant mariner for 16 years before he became famous in the Continental Navy, that Stephen Decatur commenced his naval career as a privateer. You also know that the American Navy was created entirely from the American merchant marine. One of our early Congresses first acts was to establish and encourage a merchant marine, for to our forefathers, it was fundamental that if our country was to grow and prosper, it must have the world's best merchant marine. This our rugged and talented merchant mariners proceeded to give us, with the succession of the fast packets, the New Bedford whalers, the famous clipper ships.

In every war, the merchant marine has played a vital though sometimes unpublicized role. The war in Korea is the most recent example. Every fighting man sent to Korea was accompanied by 5 tons of supplies and it took 64 pounds of supplies and equipment every day to keep him there. Five million passengers, 22 million tons of petroleum products, and 52 million tons of dry cargo were transported to, from, and within the Korean theater to support that war. Of these totals, more than 80 percent of the dry cargo was carried by merchant shipping.

I think figures such as these are eloquent proof of why we need a strong merchant marine. Neither I, nor any responsible officer who advises me in Washington, have ever given credit to the idea that in a future war, atomic weapons and modern submarines will sever the United States lifelines. We recognize that to prevent this is one of the Navy's primary problems at the outbreak of war—to keep open our sea communications to our forces overseas, to our allies, and to our sources of raw materials. Our enemy will undoubtedly try to isolate us as he tried in two past wars, but we are going to do our best and I am sure he will not succeed.

These fundamental facts are well known to you gentlemen, and to this audience. I regret to say, however, that despite the vital and obvious need of a strong and adequate merchant marine both for peace and for war, I view with mounting concern the condition of our merchant marine today, and more especially, for the immediate future. Eight-tenths of our merchant fleet will be obsolete in 8 to 10 years; nine-tenths of it is now too slow for wartime use and we presently are seriously short of tankers. What is more alarming, there is virtually no merchant shipping being constructed on our ways and our development of new ship types is virtually at a standstill. In short, there is grave prospect that, unless promptly rectified, our country is to slowly slip downward and backward as a maritime power allowing our foreign trade to be brought in and taken away in foreign bottoms. You may be surprised to learn that since 1939, 13 nations which did not even have merchant fleets have since entered the maritime scene. Even landlocked Switzerland now has a 30-ship merchant marine.

As Secretary of the Navy, it is my earnest opinion that we cannot allow our merchant marine to approach disuse and decay on the grounds that we can trust to luck and improvise to meet our next emergency as we did in World War I and World War II. There will not be time, if general war breaks out again, to resurrect a merchant marine. Our survival will be vitally dependent upon the merchant shipping which is available during that critical initial period.

To fully support our peacetime economy, and to provide a reasonable base for wartime, a joint survey by the Navy Department and the Maritime Administration has revealed that we should have an active merchant marine of approximately 1,750 ships—about 1,300 cargo, about 425 tankers, and about 25 troopships. It is also specified that these ships should be fast—in the neighborhood of 18 knots for cargo, 18½ knots for tankers, 22 knots for troopships—not only for protection against the modern submarine, but to expedite delivery of their cargoes. These ships should be capable of rapid loading and unloading, and thereby reduce to a minimum the turnaround time. These ships should be designed for use in the great majority of the world's ports. They should have the latest propulsion systems which emphasize fuel economy.

I might also add that our ship designers should be mindful of the possible future need for merchant ships capable of rapid loading and unloading under conditions where major ports are unusable. And designers should also be alert that the economical use of nuclear energy for ship propulsion may not be far away.

Such a merchant marine it a tall order, I will admit, but it is certainly not beyond the capacity or genius of our people.

Specifically, what should we do today to obtain such a merchant marine?

First, we should commence at the earliest possible date a construction program of new merchant ships which will revive our lagging shipbuilding industry, retain its skilled craftsmen and designers, and which will replace with modern vessels the large group of Victory and Liberty ships which become obsolete in mass between 1962–65.

Secondly, we need to develop, build, and test certain prototype vessels so that mass production of them could proceed in wartime.

Thirdly, we must reaffirm the spirit of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936. I would like to read you just a few lines from the preamble of this act:

"It is necessary for the national defense and development of its foreign and domestic commerce that the United States shall have a merchant marine.

"1. Sufficient to carry its domestic commerce and a substantial portion of the waterborne export and import foreign commerce of the United States and to provide shipping service on all routes essential for maintaining the flow of such domestic and foreign waterborne commerce at all times;

"2. Capable of serving as a naval and military auxiliary in time of war or national emergency;

"3. Owned and operated under the United States flag by citizens of the United States insofar as may be practicable; and

"4. Composed of the best equipped, safest, and most suitable types of vessels constructed in the United States and manned with a trained and efficient citizen's personnel.

"It is the declared policy of the United States to foster the development and encourage the maintenance of such a merchant marine."

If we would fulfill the spirit of that passage, we will have no cause for worry about our merchant marine.

As Secretary of the Navy, I assure you that the Navy shall do all in its power, as it has in the past, to work for and support a strong and adequate merchant marine.

I do not want my words of warning about the present state of our American merchant marine to be misrepresented by you young gentlemen. In my opinion the situation is grave, and immediate steps should be taken to rectify a dangerous trend. However, this does not imply discouragement or a lock of hope on my part. The American people, I have observed, when given the facts always act promptly, resolutely, and intelligently. I do not believe for an instant that, once informed, they will allow their merchant marine to fall into decay and disuse and thereby endanger our peacetime prosperity or our security in the event of an emergency.

You gentlemen are stepping into important and demanding duties in a vital field. I believe your job is one with a fine future, and I know that it is one which is indispensable to our country's prosperity and security. Your education and training here at the Massachusetts Maritime Academy have given you the basic qualification for this important task and have prepared you to meet not only your responsibilities in mercantile shipping, but have also prepared you to meet your basic responsibilities in contributing to national defense.

You take with you today my best wishes for a happy ship and fair sailing. Good luck and God bless you.

Charter Review as a Means of Strengthening the U. N.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to direct the attention of our colleagues to the following very fine address by Mr. David W. Wainhouse, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for United Nations Affairs, before the American Bar Association convention on August 17, 1954, in Chicago, Ill.:

CHARTER REVIEW AS A MEANS OF STRENGTHENING THE U. N.

(Address by David W. Wainhouse, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for United Nations Affairs)

I am pleased to have the opportunity to bring to you today the views of the Department of State on the problem of charter review. In the fall of 1955 the General Assembly will vote on the question of calling a general conference to review the present United States Charter. Secretary Dulles has already gone on record in favor of holding a review conference. If the General Assembly votes in favor of holding the conference, as is expected, it will presumably take place either in 1956, or at least by 1957.

PREPARATIONS FOR CHARTER REVIEW

Preparations for the review conference are moving ahead. Last year the General Assembly voted overwhelmingly to have the Secretariat prepare important background documentation in connection with the charter review conference. This will include the publication of some unpublished documents of the original San Francisco Conference in 1945, a survey of precedents of United Nations organs, and a detailed index of the San Francisco Conference documents. This preparatory work can give all members of the United Nations a general idea of the practical adjustments to changing circumstances which have been made in carrying out the charter's provisions. It will show to what extent the charter has adaptability and capacity for development as a constitutional instrument. It should help clarify where the imperfections of the charter are. It should show how many, if not all, of the deficiencies in the charter can be corrected by solutions not involving charter amendments.

When the eighth session of the General Assembly was debating whether to vote the preparatory studies as an aid to consideration of the charter review problem, the United States representative made it perfectly clear this this country was favoring review of the charter and not necessarily revision. He told the Assembly:

"We do not know now whether changes in the charter will bedesirable or possible."

Other countries similarly saw the question as one of holding a general conference to survey the charter in the light of the United Nations' experience since 1945—to look it over, without any advance commitments or preconceived notions favoring change.

But this view was not taken by all the members of the Assembly. The Soviet bloc of five, which alone voted against the preparatory studies, interpreted the discussion of charter review as a campaign to amend the charter, and to amend it in one particular—by eliminating the principle of unanimity among the great powers, or the veto as it is commonly known.

Apart from the Soviet attitude, there is much interest in a number of countries in charter review. Government commissions and citizen groups have been formed in such diverse countries, for example, as the Netherlands and Egypt.

DEVELOPMENT OF PUBLIC CONSENSUS

It is a healthy sign that so much interest has developed and that so much preparation is under way 2 years before the Review Conference. The Department of State keeps in close touch with public opinion in this country. Our public opinion analyses indicate that the interest on the part of the American people on the subject of charter review is great. We are aware also that the American people today are more realistic and analytical in their appraisal of the United Nations than they were in the optimistic days of the San Francisco Conference. This balanced understanding of the American people is a firm foundation for examining the crucial issues which will arise in a Charter Review Conference.

The policies which the United States will follow at the Conference will be decided upon after the democratic consensus in this country has made itself felt on the important problems. Already we are moving on many fronts. In the first place, a subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, chaired by Senator WILEY, has already completed several excellent studies, on subjects such as membership, the development of the United Nations, and the veto. The Senate subcommittee is performing the important task of tapping the grassroots of public opinion by holding hearings in many cities and areas throughout the United States. Hearings have already been held in Akron, Milwaukee, Asheville, and Louisville, and others are scheduled during the ensuing months.

Secondly, private organizations, such as the Brookings Institution and Carnegie Endowment, are supporting or are themselves preparing serious and detailed studies and are holding seminars with a view to placing at the disposal of our Government their findings. We welcome the efforts being made by organizations such as yours to study the issues involved.

Thirdly, the Department of State itself is preparing detailed studies of the problems which have arisen during the last 9 years. It is expected that sometime late in 1955 American public opinion will have developed, the advice of the Senate will have been received, and our own detailed studies completed.

CONSULTATIONS WITH OUR ALLIES

We will then be ready to consult in detail on specific proposals with our free-world allies. Charter review is essentially a political problem, and must be considered in the context of existing relations among states and the demands of the world situation from the standpoint not only of United States interests but also of the parallel interests of the rest of the free world. The United Nations is a voluntary association of sovereign states, which depends for implementation of its decisions on the free cooperation of its members. Care must therefore be taken at a review conference to avoid action that would jeopardize this cooperation, and to assure that the decisions reached will contribute to, rather than detract from, the free world's sense of common interest. If the Charter Review Conference is to succeed as an instrument for strengthening the United Nations, it can only do so if the views of other members of the free world are taken into account fully. As Secretary Dulles has aptly put it:

"While the Charter Review Conference should be welcomed as a means of strengthening the United Nations, differences of opinion about how to do this should not then be pressed to a point such that the Review Conference would result in undermining the United Nations or disrupting it. The United Nations as it is, is better than no United Nations at all."

SCOPE OF REVIEW

President Eisenhower has said of the United Nations that "it still represents man's best organized hope to substitute the conference table for the battlefield" and he has characterized it as a "sheer necessity." There is in this country strong support for the United Nations, as shown, for example, by last week's Gallup poll. There is also some disillusionment. There are those who feel that the failure of the United Nations to fulfill all their hopes arises from the fact that it does not go far enough. They advocate its transformation from a voluntary organization of sovereign states into some sort of superstate. At the other extreme are those who are basically skeptical of all worldwide efforts toward international cooperation. They would like to see the United States withdraw from the organization. Still others would like to see the U. S. S. R. and its satellites expelled and the United Nations turned into a closely knit military alliance.

Secretary Dulles in his testimony of January 18 before the Senate subcommittee said that such proposals do not fall within the proper scope of charter review, since the purpose of such review is to strengthen the existing organization—not to destroy it or completely to change its character. To try to write a completely new charter would, in the words of Secretary Dulles, "open a Pandora's box," and the chances of bringing together in a new organization anything approaching the present membership of the United Nations would not be good.

PRINCIPAL ISSUES

No decision has yet been taken on what amendments to the charter, if any, the United States should advocate. The past 9 years' experience in the United Nations points to certain major questions as likely to arise at any review conference.

1. Membership

One of these questions is the scope of United Nations membership. Would it be desirable to make that membership as nearly universal as possible, always remembering, of course, that there are some regimes that still completely disregard accepted standards of international conduct? The United Nations was in a sense much more nearly universal 9 years ago than it is now. Since 1945, many new nations have come into being, and the ex-enemy states, excluded from original membership in the United Nations, are again becoming important members of the world community. There are now 19 applicants for United Nations membership, 14 of which would have been approved except for Soviet veto. The other 5—sponsored by the Soviet Union—have never received a majority vote since it has not been thought they meet the charter qualifications for membership. This impasse with respect to new members has caused growing concern, and at a review conference two questions in this connection may be raised: Does article 4 of the charter set forth the proper criteria for membership, and should the veto on the admission of new members be eliminated; the Vandenberg resolution of June 11, 1948, recommended a voluntary agreement among the 5 permanent members of the Security Council to remove the veto in this regard.

2. Security

The Security Council has been unable in this sharply divided world to exercise its primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security. This raises the basic question whether there are any feasible charter changes that would enable the council more effectively to discharge this responsibility or whether we should rely on alternative arrangements. For example, could the charter provisions for membership and voting in the council be improved? Should the veto be removed from the pacific settlement of disputes under chapter VI of the charter? This also was recommended by the Vandenberg resolution, which you will recall was adopted by the Senate on June 11, 1948, by a vote of 64 to 4. Carrying forward the line of development begun in 1950 with the uniting for peace resolution, should greater responsibility in the security field be assigned to the General Assembly, where there is no veto? Or in the present world situation might we consider leaving primary responsibility for security to collective self-defense and regional organizations authorized by articles 51 and 52 of the charter?

3. General Assembly

The growing importance of the General Assembly in the security field, together with the increasing attention being given by the Assembly to economic and social problems and to colonial issues, suggests the question whether some type of weighted voting is needed in that organ reflecting the capacity of members to assume economic and military responsibilities. Further, there is the question whether in these circumstances, some reallocation of functions as between the Assembly and the Economic and Social Council and the Trusteeship Council is needed to enable the United Nations to function more effectively. The magnitude of the program in the economic and social field, as well as its importance in strengthening the free world, points also to a reexamination of the relationship between the United Nations itself and the specialized agencies to see whether any greater integration of the latter with the former would contribute to the efficient operation of this program.

4. Domestic jurisdiction

There has been a growing tendency in the United Nations for states whose sympathies are aroused by conditions outside of their own boundaries to bring these conditions to the attention of the organization. This development has given rise to questions and in some cases grave apprehension concerning the interpretation of article 2 (7) of the charter, which stipulates that the United Nations shall not intervene in matters essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of a state. It may be asked, therefore, whether article 2 (7) adequately delimits the competence of the United Nations, or whether a more precise line should be drawn between the common interests within the scope of the association and the individual interests that remain the exclusive concern of a member state.

5. Armaments

While the question of regulations of armaments did not receive particular emphasis in the writing of the charter, the awful destructiveness of atomic and nuclear weapons has since heavily underscored this problem. Much effort therefore has been and is being spent by the United Nations in seeking a solution to it. The lack of progress is directly attributable to Soviet policy, but the question still remains whether anything was omitted from the United Nations basic structure that if added now might assist our continuing effort to reach general agreement on a comprehensive program of safeguarded arms regulation and reduction.

6. International law

The role of the U. N. in the advancement of international law is one that particularly commends the attention and faculties of lawyers. Secretary Dulles has asked whether the charter provisions are adequate in view of the importance of law as an accepted standard of international conduct. Article 13 of the charter calls on the General Assembly to initiate studies and make recommendations for the purpose of encouraging the progress and development of international law and its codification. We would all agree, I am sure, that so far too little progress has been made in this field. The difficulty is not too hard to find. With one-third of the world's population ruled by those who do not recognize any moral law and look upon law as another means whereby those in power destroy their enemies, we can understand the difficulties encountered in expanding the scope of international law.

The question which will confront the Review Conference is what can be done to improve present U. N. activities in the field of codification and development of international law. What can be done to make the actions of nations more orderly? Should efforts to prepare codes of international law be pressed? Should other countries which have not already done so be encouraged to make declarations accepting compulsory jurisdiction of the Court? Should there be established, as suggested by some members of the bar and writers on international law, regional international tribunals with jurisdiction of private international claims cases submitted by one government against another when negotiation has been unfruitful? Could the composition of the International Law Commission be improved and could its terms of reference be revised to place emphasis on the restatement of international law? Can greater emphasis be placed on the disposition of legal questions on the basis of law? On these queries there can be a productive exchange of ideas among individuals and groups in the United States who are interested in the charter review problem.

In conclusion let me say that the case for charter review is a strong one. At San Francisco in 1945 many States had accepted charter provisions to which they strongly objected on the understanding that there would be an opportunity to review these provisions at the end of 10 years, and we should keep faith with them. Moreover, charter review can be the means to achieve a real strengthening of the U. N. Let us not be deterred by the presence of the veto. A careful review of the charter against the background of 10 years' experience should bring greater understanding to our people and to the peoples of the world of how essential the U. N. is to the peace, security, and well-being of Americans and the rest of the world. At least the review conference should serve to make clear that the failure of the U. N. to fulfill entirely the high hopes held for it at San Francisco is primarily a matter of political actions and attitudes of member states, and particularly, the Soviet Union. Charter review should bring about a greater understanding of the potentialities of the charter. It should bring a clear realization of the development within the charter framework that has already taken place in order to meet a world situation not foreseen in 1945. Such a reappraisal could also serve to develop improved practices under the charter. These give some indication of the potential value of a review conference. On the other hand, we must bear in mind that it has its dangers; we recognize that calling the conference might arouse false hopes and might stimulate efforts to rewrite the charter which could seriously endanger the U. N. I am hopeful that we shall avoid these pitfalls and that from the charter review conference there will result the stronger U. N. we seek.

Communism—The Record of the Republican Party in Fighting Its Insidious Influence in America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, when President Eisenhower and the new Republican Congress took office in January 1953 they faced no greater challenge than the American people's overwhelming demand for a two-fisted, head-on, all-out attack on communism in this country. What the Republican administration has given the people during the past 2 years is exactly that.

BENDING TO THE RED WIND

During the two decades between 1933 and 1952 there was evidence galore of the Federal Government's laxity and blindness toward communism. But even today the country is shocked again as new evidence comes to light showing the past softness toward Communists. For example, Look magazine on December 15, 1953, published an enlightening entry which the late Harold Ickes, Democrat, then Secretary of the Interior, wrote in his diary on July 16, 1935. In this entry Ickes is discussing a conversation he had with George H. Dern, then Secretary of War.

The diary said:

> He (Dern) feels about Red hunting just as I do and thinks it is absurd to deny Communists an opportunity to express themselves or to have a ticket on the ballot. He thinks, as I do, that we are working toward a society of modified communism, although I believe he would be as unhappy in a Communist state as I. He feels, as I do, that it is better to bend to the wind than be torn from the trunk of the tree and dashed to the ground.

Bending to the Red wind certainly describes the attitude of our predecessors. And standing up against the wind and defying it describes how the Republican administration feels about communism.

Here is an example of what our predecessors' easy-going attitude meant. When our new Republican officials went into the Justice Department in Washington in 1953, they found the files in such incredible condition that the FBI's now famous report on Soviet espionage in 1945 had never been seen by the Department's Internal Security Section. Nor had the FBI's later special report on Harry Dexter White ever been seen by the Internal Security Section. In fact, until the Republican administration came in, the cases of the individuals cited in the espionage reports had never been evaluated by the Internal Security Section for possible prosecution.

Warren Olney III, Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Criminal Division, said the Republican housecleaning had turned up 20,000 letters, files, investigative reports, and the like which had been lying around the Department. He said the filing system which he inherited was "in such shape, in such condition, that those documents can—or could have at that time—come in and be in that office for years without ever getting the attention of the people who were especially assigned for that purpose."

One of the first things Olney did was to order Justice Department attorneys to go back and analyze the case of every single individual mentioned in the reports to determine whether prosecution was still possible, or whether they had been saved from the penitentiary by the statute of limitations.

A similar condition was found in the State Department. The Senate Permanent Investigating Subcommittee discovered chaotic conditions in the personnel files indicating widespread destruction of confidential information. The subcommittee reported that from 300 to 400 persons wandered in and out of the supposedly secret file room where personnel records on 8,000 Foreign Service officers were kept. Derogatory information could be removed at will. In many instances when State Department officers were up for promotion, material was stripped from the files so that the promotion panel might not see information unfavorable to the State Department officer under consideration.

THE COMMUNIST WEB OVER WASHINGTON

One of the most powerful and comprehensive exposés of Communist infiltration was the report issued by the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee on August 23, 1953. This report documents the charges Republicans have been making for years and demolishes Democrat attempts to whitewash their administration's failure to crack down on the Reds.

David Lawrence, the newspaper columnist, said the Senate report discloses "a deliberate conspiracy against the United States Government unparalleled since the treason of Aaron Burr." The report was signed by all members of the subcommittee—5 Republicans and 3 Democrats.

Here are a few of the subcommittee's conclusions about subversion in Government under our predecessors:

> The Soviet international organization has carried on a successful and important penetration of the United States Government. * * * This penetration has extended from the lower ranks to top-level policy and operating positions in our Government. * * *
>
> Thousands of diplomatic, political, military, scientific, and economic secrets of the United States have been stolen by Soviet agents in our Government and other persons closely connected with the Communists. Despite the fact that the Federal Bureau of Investigation and other security agencies had reported extensive information about this Communist penetration, little was done by the executive branch until congressional committees brought forth to public light the facts of the conspiracy.

One of the worst scandals revealed by the Senate committee report was the Harry Dexter White case, which was later amplified by Attorney General Herbert Brownell, Jr., and FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover. Harry Dexter White had a meteoric career in the Government, beginning in 1934 and culminating in appointment to the position of Executive Director for the United States in the International Monetary Fund in 1946.

As Attorney General Brownell revealed, White was discovered by the FBI in the early days of his Government career to be a Russian spy. FBI reports on his espionage activities went to the appropriate officials, including three reports to President Truman, before White's confirmation to his Monetary Fund job by the United States Senate. Later in 1946 President Truman received four additional reports on White's espionage activities. Yet White was never fired. He remained in the Government, receiving promotion after promotion, until he resigned voluntarily in 1947 with the best wishes of Harry Truman ringing in his ears.

Whittaker Chambers, the former Communist spy whose testimony sent Alger Hiss to prison, has said it was "a magic power" that was constantly operating in the United States Government to protect Harry Dexter White and the hundreds of other Russian agents. Two groups who did not succumb to his magic Red power, Chambers says, were the FBI and the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

Still another example of how the magic Red power functioned was given last winter to the Senate Internal Subcommittee by Spruille Braden, a top State Department official during the Roosevelt and Truman administrations. Braden served as Ambassador to Colombia, Cuba, and Argentina and as Assistant Secretary of State until his resignation in 1947.

Braden testified that penetration of the State Department by communistic or socialistic officials during the Roosevelt and Truman administrations may yet cause the loss of Latin America to the Communists, just as China was lost. Braden pointed to strong Communist influences in Guatemala and another unnamed Latin American country, and declared:

> This undermining of our national security has been countenanced and even at times abetted by our own Government.

Braden disclosed he constantly ran into "roadblocks" in the State Department in his efforts to prevent the spread of communism in the Western Hemisphere. He cited instances in which his own anti-Communist warnings never reached the officials for whom they were intended and disappeared mysteriously. Today we are reaping the results in the form of the Communist troubles in Guatemala.

THE TOUGH REPUBLICAN LOYALTY PROGRAM

When President Eisenhower delivered his first state of the Union address in January 1953, he instructed the heads of all executive departments and agencies to put into effect immediately effective programs of security with respect to Federal employees. The President chose his words wisely, knowing the ineffectiveness of what had been done before.

In May 1953, President Eisenhower laid down, after careful study, his detailed program for Government personnel. This program was based on the simple fact that working for the Government is a privilege—not a right—and therefore the Government has the duty to demand the utmost in loyalty and reliability from its employees. Any doubts are to be resolved in favor of the Government—the United States Government.

The tough, new Eisenhower security program went into effect on May 28, 1953. From that date until March 10, 1954, the amazing total of 2,486 Government employees were separated for security reasons. Of this total, 1,086 were fired and 1,400 resigned. These figures were given by Philip Young, Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, in hearings before the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee.

No breakdown of these figures was available, but the Civil Service Commission did disclose a breakdown of the 2,429 security separations that took place from May 28, 1953, through December 31, 1953. This breakdown is as follows:

	"Risks" found	Number who were fired	Number who resigned
Agriculture Department	74	33	41
Air Force	189	75	114
Army	219	91	128
Atomic Energy Commission	1	--------	1
Central Intelligence Agency	48	1	47
Civil Service Commission	2	--------	2
Commerce Department	58	29	29
Civil Defense Administration	5	3	2
Foreign Operations Administration	83	164	19
General Services Administration	150	100	50
Health, Education, Welfare Department	78	11	67
Housing and Home Finance Agency	23	4	19
U. S. Information Agency	38	--------	38
Interior Department	117	29	88
Justice Department	156	53	103
Labor Department	17	2	15
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	17	5	12
National Labor Relations Board	10	6	4
Navy	235	135	100
Post Office Department	284	180	104
State Department	117	5	112
Tennessee Valley Authority	5	--------	5
Treasury Department	52	39	13
Veterans' Administration	302	92	210
White House Office	1	1	--------
Other Federal agencies	48	16	32
Total	2,429	1,074	1,355

Our opponents have tried to minimize these figures by saying "only" 2,400-plus employees had to be separated for security reasons. Our answer is that only one security risk is one too many. We Republicans will never ease up as long as even one security risk may be working in the Government.

We believe that one Alger Hiss was one too many; one Judith Coplon was one too many; one William Remington was one too many.

In connection with these figures, it should be kept in mind that many of these separations were based on information in files that were available to the Truman administration for a long time. Our predecessors looked the other way. We acted.

We are doing more than getting rid of the security risks we inherited. We are doing everything possible to keep out new security risks by insisting that newly hired Federal employees meet rigid standards.

OUSTING SECURITY RISKS FROM THE ARMED SERVICES

We recognize that the armed services are a key object of Red infiltration.

Secretary of Defense Charles E. Wilson announced on April 8, 1954, a new policy for keeping the armed services as free as humanly possible of subversives and other security risks. Secretary Wilson instructed the Army, Navy, and Air Force to set up uniform standards in order to get security risks out of the services and keep them out.

Under the new program, all officers and enlisted men are required to sign a loyalty certificate before entering service. If an individual refuses to fill out the loyalty form completely or discloses derogatory information, he is placed on a nonsensitive assignment pending investigation. If the investigation shows he is a security risk, he is separated under "conditions other than honorable." Known Communists are not taken into the services.

The Wilson order makes it "the duty of every member of the armed services to report any information coming to his attention which indicates that retention of any member of the armed services is not clearly consistent with the interests of national security."

CRACKDOWN BY THE JUSTICE DEPARTMENT

Here is the record of what the Justice Department, in cooperation with the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the Immigration and Naturalization Service, accomplished from January 1953 through May 1954:

First. Convicted 41 Communist Party leaders—13 in New York City, 7 in Honolulu, 5 in Pittsburgh, 5 in Seattle, 6 in Detroit, and 5 in St. Louis.

Second. Indicted 27 additional Communist leaders, including 9 who were put on trial in Philadelphia and 11 scheduled for trial in Cleveland.

Third. Ordered the addition of 62 new organizations to the Department of Justice list of subversive groups, making a total of 225.

Fourth. Convicted four persons for harboring fugitive Communist Party leaders.

Fifth. Secured the conviction of 1 person for treason and 2 for espionage. Eight others have been convicted for making false statements to the Government, and 7 others have been indicted. Three persons have been convicted for perjury, and one other indicted.

Sixth. Deported 93 alien subversives.

Seventh. Issued final deportation orders against 286 persons with records of subversive activity or affiliation.

Eighth. Started deportation proceedings against 349 subversive aliens.

Ninth. Started denaturalization proceedings against 24 naturalized citizens charged with being subversive.

Tenth. Barred entry into this country of 128 subversives aliens who had arrived at ports of entry.

As President Eisenhower has said:

> The constant surveillance of Communists in this country is a 24-hour, 7-day-a-week, 52-week-a-year job. It is carried out by the appropriate Federal agencies, in conformance with due process of law. It is being done quietly and relentlessly, and those who best know its effectiveness are the Communists themselves.

CLEANING UP UNITED STATES EMPLOYEES TO THE UNITED NATIONS

One of the worst messes inherited by the Republican administration was the situation among United States employees at the United Nations.

A House committee was told early in 1953, just before the Eisenhower administration took over, that more than 50 United States employees of the United Nations had refused to testify on whether or not they were Communists, for fear of incriminating themselves. When this was called to the attention of the then Secretary of State Dean Acheson, he in effect shrugged off this incredible condition with the remark that he was not "particularly aware" of the situation.

The new Republican administration was very much aware of this mess and very much determined to clean it up. The first official action of the new United States Ambassador to the United Nations, former Senator Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., was to request the FBI to make a full field investigation of the 144 members of the United States delegation who were serving under him. He also requested an investigation of all 1,680 Americans on the payroll of the United Nations itself.

Later, Lodge announced he would do "everything in my power" to resist payment by the United Nations of a $135,000 award to 11 Americans who had been fired as security risks. The 11 persons had refused to answer questions about Communist connections before a Senate subcommittee. Lodge said the award by the U. N. Administrative Tribunal "was all wrong and should be reversed."

CONGRESSIONAL INVESTIGATIONS

Investigating committees of the 83d Congress have vigorously pressed their probes of Communist activities, especially infiltration of the Federal Government in past administrations.

The House Committee held extensive hearings in Washington, Chicago, Detroit, Seattle, Los Angeles, San Francisco, Albany, New York City, Philadelphia, and Columbus, Ohio. It has investigated Communist infiltration in Government, the entertainment industry, defense areas, industry, labor unions, and education. The committee also heard several refugees who had fled from behind the Iron Curtain and were now ready to tell the free world their firsthand experiences with the Red dictatorship.

During 1953, a total of no less than 305 witnesses before congressional committees hid behind the fifth amendment privilege against self-incrimination in their refusal to answer questions about Communist affiliations. This is a higher figure than in any previous year and reflects the accelerated fight against the Communist conspiracy waged by Republicans.

Of this total of 305 refusals, 85 of the witnesses were employed at one time by the Federal Government, while 7 were employed by 1 State government. The other refusals included 40 in elementary or secondary education fields, 57 in higher education, 26 in arts and entertainment, 28 in the literary field, and 13 in printing and publishing.

In October 1953, President Eisenhower, taking note of the frequent refusal by Communist witnesses to testify, issued an Executive order permitting the firing of any Federal employee who refuses to testify on the grounds of self-incrimination before a congressional committee concerning alleged misconduct or disloyalty.

In discussing the President's order, Attorney General Herbert Brownell, Jr., said:

> I have not overlooked the fact that the loyalty and honesty of the overwhelming majority of all Federal employees is beyond question. But their good reputations and character are far better protected from unwarranted criticism when we root out the few who are unreliable and disloyal.

FIGHTING COMMUNISM THROUGH THE REPUBLICAN PARTY

The Republican drive against Communists is under constant attack, much of it from persons who call themselves liberals. J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the FBI, has accurately tagged the pseudoliberals as more destructive than even known Communists.

Hoover declared, in an address in Washington on April 23, 1954, that it is an established fact that every person who has dared to speak out against the threat of communism has become the target of vile and vicious attacks. Hoover said that whenever a person "has dared to expose the Communist threat, he has invited upon himself the adroit and skilled talents of experts of character assassination."

Mr. Hoover said it is unbelievable the way in which "otherwise respectable, seemingly intelligent persons, perhaps unknowingly, aid the Communist cause more effectively than the Communists themselves." Then he went on, "The pseudoliberal can be more destructive than the known Communist because of the esteem that his cloak of respectability invites."

The Republican assault on communism will not be stopped by the smears and jeers from the left. In fact, as long as the smears and jeers continue, we can be sure we are doing a real job for America.

We can recall with pride the statement made in 1953 by Mrs. Oksana Stepanova Kasenkina, the former Russian school teacher whose dramatic leap to freedom from the Soviet consulate in New York in 1948 won world attention. At last reports, Mrs. Kasenkina had applied for United States citizenship and was living quietly in New York City. Here is what she said last year:

> I have never been a member of a political party. My party is this country and this Government * * * The United States is my party. But I love the Republicans because I believe the Republicans can save this country from the Communists.

Let us remember that the official blueprint for political action of the Communist Party, U. S. A., which rolled off the press in April 1954, calls for:

Defeat of Republican congressional candidates in 1954.

Defeat of the Republican presidential candidate in 1956.

It is nothing new for the Communist Party to use well-established and respectable organizations as vehicles for reaching their goals. Nor is it anything new for the Republican Party to serve as the chief roadblock, in the Communist path. We accept the challenge with pride, knowing there is no higher service we can render to our country.

The Republican administration deserves the support of all citizens who believe communism should be uprooted from our Government. The work already done by the Republican administration is a guaranty of what it will do in protecting our people against the insidious influence of communism.

The European Community for Coal and Steel—Its Organization, Its Aims, and Its Activities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRAZIER REAMS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. REAMS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD a very significant statement entitled "The European Community for Coal and Steel—Its Organization, Its Aims, and Its Activities," by Dr. H. C. Hermann Pünder, member of the Bundestag, vice president of the common assembly.

The statement follows:

THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITY FOR COAL AND STEEL—ITS ORGANIZATION, ITS AIMS, AND ITS ACTIVITIES

(By Dr. H. C. Hermann Pünder, member of the Bundestag, vice president of the common assembly)

Mr. President, ladies, and gentlemen:

I

1. When we decided at the meeting of the Council of the Interparliamentary Union in Monte Carlo last spring to request from the European Community for Coal and Steel, the Coal and Steel Parliament in brief, a report on this new, great European organization, it was our hope that M. Paul Henri Spaak would give us this report. In those spring weeks the presidency of the Coal and Steel Parliament was still held by that untiring champion of Europe. But as a result of his appointment, immediately afterward, as Belgian Foreign Minister, M. Spaak was unfortunately unable to prepare and deliver this report. The bureau of the Coal and Steel Parliament thereupon asked the new president, Signor de Gasperi, or—if he should be prevented from doing so—myself to render this report. As it were, fate has prevented him from doing so in a manner which we could not foresee and which has brought us great sorrow: Alcide de Gasperi died 2 weeks ago today. Only a few weeks ago I received from President de Gasperi this letter in his own writing in which he says that he would have been very happy to see and admire Vienna again—the city in which he studied. But in view of the fact that his health is still not as good again as it might be, he asked me to help and to render the requested report in my capacity as vice president of the Coal and Steel Parliament. At the same time he asks me to convey his cordial greetings to his old friends and also the new friends of the Interparliamentary Union in Vienna. In conforming now to this request of the revered deceased, let me commence my report with a melancholy farewell to this great European.

It gave me all the greater pleasure to comply with this request as I have the privilege of participating in the efforts for the unification of Europe both in the European movement and in the consultative assembly of the Council of Europe as well as, for the past 2 years, in the common assembly of the Coal and Steel Community. Finally, I need hardly add that I have expressed my personal views in the report which I shall now render to you, ladies and gentlemen. But on the strength of my experience gained in many years of intimate cooperation I am convinced that I am expressing thus not only the unanimous view of the bureau but also of the overwhelming majority of the Coal and Steel Parliament.

2. The conception of replacing the disintegration of the old continent of Europe by unification is not a new one, but has a long history. After the First World War politicians like Briand, Chamberlain, and Stresemann, advocated such unification; Count Coudenhove-Calergi with his pan-European movement unceasingly strove for the same object. But it was only after the Second World War that the first concrete steps toward the achievement of a united Europe were taken. In the face of horrible collapse the European idea evoked a strong response in all the countries of our continent; personalities of all parties rallied in the efforts for the sake of Europe, disregarding national and political conflicts.

3. At a very early stage the United States of America supported these endeavors for the unification of Europe. The Marshall plan—an attempt such as the world had probably not seen before to assist both, friend and foe—contributed decisively to economic recovery and to European unification after the war. The OEEC and with it the EPU, both of which were given the utmost support by the United States in their establishment and development, are working for economic cooperation among the countries of Europe. Other examples are provided by the European cultural center in Geneva, the European college at Bruges, exemplifying the common aspects of European education and culture while the European municipal congress constitutes the focal and rallying point for the local government politicians of Europe. Everywhere people are striving to transcend the national frontiers which they feel to be too narrow. In the political sphere, too, this development was promoted by the European movement of Spaak and Winston Churchill and by the European Parliamentary Union of Count Coudenhove-Calergi. The conferences of the Hague and Interlaken in 1948 and of Brussels in 1949 mark the milestones of this progress. When, finally, the Council of Europe was created in 1949 the representatives of 14 states of a free Europe were for the first time able to work on a European level for the solution of common problems. It was during the session of the consultative assembly of the Council of Europe in August 1949, that the representatives of several European countries—Reynaud, Boothby, and others—put forward the demand for the unification of the European economy. Toward the end of the same year the economic committee of the Council of Europe submitted a plan for the coordination of the production and consumption of steel.

4. A few months later the then French Foreign Minister Robert Schuman on May 9, 1950, in a declaration on behalf of the French Government proposed the pooling of the coal and steel industries of France and Germany under one unified authority and called upon the other countries of Europe to join this scheme, soon to be known as Schuman plan. The Governments of Belgium, of the Federal Republic of Germany, of Italy, Luxembourg, and the Netherlands endorsed the French Government's declaration. In negotiations lasting almost a year the treaty was drafted which today provides the foundation of the European coal and steel community. This treaty was signed on April 18, 1951, and ratified by the parliaments of the six countries during the following 12 months. It was very noteworthy that the consultative assembly of the Council of Europe, far removed from any kind of jealousy, was the first to debate and approve this treaty.

II

5. Which, then, were the motives in favor of the concept of coal and steel integration?

The most important reason lay in the consideration that—if a comprehensive integration in the political and economic sphere was not possible yet at the moment—an attempt should be made at last to attain genuine integration in a limited but particularly important sector.

Coal and steel are, after all, the foundations of our entire industry; also, they are the point of departure par excellence for any further gradual integration. Furthermore, coal and steel constitute the most essential raw materials for any armament industry. Any war between the states of the community is rendered impossible by the integration of coal and steel on the European level. Henceforth the potential of the Ruhr or of the northern French and Lorraine regions or the Belgian coal and steel regions can no longer be used for unilateral nationalist purposes.

6. The improvement of the competitive power of European industry and the expansion of the internal exchange of goods had likewise become an urgent necessity. Modernization and rationalization are to be effected with less difficulty and more quickly within the community.

During the past decade steel production in the United States and in the Soviet bloc has greatly increased while the expansion of output in the countries forming the community was comparatively small. The fact that the annual steel per capita consumption—which also indicates the standard of living—is only 200 kilograms in the European community but 600 kilograms in the United States shows only too clearly the rears to be made up by Europe.

The six countries forming the coal and steel community have a total population of 160 million people and an annual coal output of about 240 million tons, an annual iron-ore production of 66 million tons and an annual raw steel output of about 40 million tons; altogether 1.5 million people are employed in these various branches of production.

7. The object of the community, as defined in the preamble and the introductory articles of the treaty, is of a political, economic, and social nature:

"This first European community shall provide the foundation for a more extensive and closer community among nations which for a long time had been kept apart by bloody conflicts, and establish the principles by which the future common destiny is to be guided;

"In harmony with the national economies of the member states and on the basis of a common market for all the products subject to the community, the community shall contribute to economic expansion and to an increase in employment;

"The community shall aim, not last, at an improvement of the living and working conditions of the workers in each of the industries within its sphere, thus helping to raise the standard of living in the member states."

Finally, it must be emphasized that by its very character the community is not limited to the six countries wishing to join it or to be associated with it in some other form. Thus, it marks a beginning only, not the end.

III

8. I should now like to try to give you an outline of the structure of the European Community for Coal and Steel and its methods of work in order to show how the objectives are to be attained and the tasks to be fulfilled, with particular reference to the parliament of the community, the common assembly.

One of the outstanding features of the community is that the states participating in it have transferred sovereign rights to the community on this supranational level whereby such genuine sovereign rights have become vested in the community itself. But where there is sovereignty there must also be a structure insuring the exercise of these sovereign rights. Accordingly, the community is composed of organs designed to meet this requirement:

A quasi-governmental body: the high authority, assisted by a consultative committee;

A parliament: the common assembly;

A judicial organ: the court of justice; and

A representation of the member states: the council of ministers.

All these bodies commenced their functions between August 1952 and January 1953.

9. The high authority consists of 9 members, 8 of whom are designated by the governments of the member states by agreement among themselves, while the ninth member is coopted by the 8 appointed members. The term of office is 6 years; members must be chosen from among nationals of the 6 countries but there may not be more than 2 members of the same nationality at any time.

The members of the high authority—who took office just 2 years ago—exercise their functions in complete independence and they do not accept directives from any government or any other agencies. The high authority is responsible only to the parliament of the community, the common assembly, to which it must submit an annual account of its activities. For the purpose of discharging its functions the high authority has been vested with power to issue decrees, i. e., it can issue decisions binding in law. But it may also make recommendations binding with regard to the object but leaving open the choice of method by which to attain this object, and finally the high authority may issue noncommittal opinions. The high authority works on the collegiate principle. This ensures that in each case it is not the view of an individual member on a specific matter which can be decisive but only the joint attitude adopted by the body as a whole. This collegiate body is headed by the Frenchman, Jean Monnet, as president, with the German, Etzel, and the Belgian, Coppé, as first and second vice presidents, respectively. The members of the high authority are assisted in their work by specialized divisions and technical services corresponding to the various functions of the community. Thus, we have a general economic division, a market division, a production division, an investment division, a finance division, a cartel division, a legal division, a transport division, a statistical division, an extensive linguistic service, documentation, library, etc. The high authority, which has its provisional seat at Luxembourg, employs a total of more than 500 persons, a very large proportion of whom are accounted for by the technical services.

10. The high authority is assisted by a consultative committee which might be compared to the economic and social council existing in some countries. The representatives of the producers, the employees, the consumers and traders are represented on this consultative committee. The treaty lays down that in a number of cases and important decisions the high authority shall hear the consultative committee before action is taken. The members of the consultative committee are appointed by the council of ministers.

The high authority takes all its decisions as the result of continuous contact with all the parties concerned, that is, the representatives of the coal and steel industry, of the manufacturing industry, of the trade unions, of the governments as well as of the other organs of the community. When it appears that a decision does not fully correspond to the actual requirements the high authority initiates renewed negotiations to bring about a modification of this decision. Altogether the high authority endeavors to carry out its work not in any rigidly authoritarian spirit, but by means of elastic adjustment to the facts.

The consultative committee, for its part, seeks to discharge the functions of striking a balance vested in it by the treaty and loyally to assist the high authority in an advisory capacity. Where such fundamental questions are concerned as the opening of the common market for coal and steel, the general economic policy of the high authority, and the problem of investments, the special committees of the consultative committee, with the cooperation of outstanding experts, have endeavored to provide the high authority with the necessary material on which to base its final decisions.

11. The court of justice is composed of 7 judges and 2 general counsels who are appointed, as are the members of the high authority, by the governments acting in agreement. They, too, are appointed for a period of 6 years, but a partial change in the membership of the court occurs every 3 years. On principle, the court of justice has jurisdiction in all matters arising in connection with the work of the community. It safeguards the law in the interpretation and application of the treaty and of the implementing regulations.

The court, presided over by the Italian professor, Massimo Pilotti, formed two senates and adopted rules of procedure. The judges and general counsel are assisted in their work by lawyers of the six countries forming the community. Several cases have come before the court of justice since it was set up, but so far the court has always succeeded in securing a settlement before proceedings were officially opened.

12. The council of ministers is composed of representatives of the member states, each state designating a member of its government. The chief function of the council of ministers is to coordinate the activity of the high authority with the general economic policy of the six countries. In addition to this general clause the treaty provides, in a number of articles, that the council of ministers' views must be heard, or its approval by a simple or qualified majority be obtained, before decisions by the high authority are taken. Of great importance was a resolution adopted by the council of ministers on October 13, 1953, by which a close cooperation between the high authority and the six governments was initiated with a view to the coordination of the countries' general investment and trade policy with the policy of the high authority.

13. I assume that you, ladies and gentlemen, as parliamentarians, will be particularly interested in hearing something about the common assembly, the first sovereign supranational European parliament.

The numerical strength of the delegates representing the six countries is as follows: France, Italy, the Federal Republic of Germany designate 18 delegates each; Belgium and the Netherlands 10 delegates each; and Luxembourg 4 delegates. The assembly thus consists of 78 delegates.

The aim underlying this distribution was to secure a balance in numbers in order to avoid a preponderance by the larger states as against the smaller ones. The assembly convenes every year in May at the Maison d'Europa in Strasbourg for an ordinary session, at the request of a majority of its members or of the high authority or of the council of ministers it may also be convoked in extraordinary session.

The bureau of the common assembly consists of a president and five vice presidents. I mentioned before that the Belgian Paul Henri Spaak was the first president of the assembly who conducted its business with a sure hand during the early and, therefore, particularly difficult period. On May 11 of this year the assembly elected, as I have also mentioned before, the late Italian statesman Alcide de Gasperi as its president; by placing for the second time a distinguished European at its head the assembly created a tradition by which it demonstrates that it means to be and is a truly European assembly.

14. In the case of the coal and steel community the legislative functions normally vested in a parliamentary body have very largely been discharged by the treaty itself; the sections of the treaty dealing with economic, financial, and social policy provide a codification of the legal norms to be applied by the community. But in one very important respect the assembly has genuine legislative power: On the expiry of a period of 5 years, in the treaty described as transition period to which apply special provisions set out in a separate agreement, a revision of the treaty is possible on the basis of the experience gained during this transition period. Proposals for such revision are drafted jointly by the high authority and the council of ministers, and examined by the court of justice with a view to their legal compatibility with the objectives of the treaty which might be compared to the basic rights of a constitution. The proposals are then submitted for final approval to the assembly which may decide on constitutional amendments by a qualified (three-quarters) majority.

Above all, however, the assembly has a supervisory function. This function is very clearly indicated in article 24 of the treaty which stipulated that the assembly shall discuss at its ordinary session the general report on the work of the community submitted by the high authority. A vote of censure may be presented on this general report; if the motion of censure is adopted by two-thirds of the members present and voting, representing a majority of the total membership, the members of the high authority must resign in a body. This also means that the high authority is required to render account to the assembly alone and to submit to its judgment.

15. It was clear from the beginning that the assembly would be unable to discharge this supervisory function if it were to confine itself only to the debate of the general report in plenary session during the ordinary session. Furthermore, the sphere of activities of the community is so extensive and varied that it would be practically impossible to scrutinize the report in the 7 weeks—at most—of a session. The assembly therefore immediately instructed an organization committee to submit a proposal on the numbers, composition, and competence of the committees required for the assembly's work. In a subsequent extraordinary session the assembly accepted the proposal submitted by this organization committee and formed seven permanent working committees with exactly defined competencies. Thus there are three committees specifically concerned with economic affairs: the market committee, the investment committee, and the transport committee; also, there is a committee on social policy, a committee for political affairs and foreign relations, a committee on budget and administrative matters, and, lastly, the committee on standing orders, immunities, and petitions which is necessary to any parliament.

These seven committees not only have the task of preparing the sessions of the assembly but also to insure the continuity in the assembly's work and the exercise of its supervisory powers in between sessions. I am glad to be able to tell you, ladies and gentlemen, that in spite of the short initial period the committees already discharge these functions effectively and have greatly contributed to fruitful cooperation with the high authority.

16. The parliamentary groups constitute another important element in the life of the assembly, as they do, presumably, in all parliaments. It would, indeed, be incompatible with the spirit of the treaty and the tasks of the assembly if there had been a division into national delegations, as is the case in international organizations. Since the work of the assembly is conditioned, rather, by the community as a whole, the formation of national delegations was, fortunately, never attempted. On the contrary, from the outset there was noticeable an evergrowing desire for cooperation according to the political views of members. It is, perhaps, a good omen that the formation of such parliamentary groups was not brought about artificially and abruptly but came into being by an organic process. During the second extraordinary session of the assembly last May it was notable that the parliamentary groups had begun to organize a genuine activity in forms very much alike to those of our national parliaments.

Three groups have formed in the common assembly:

The group of the Christian-Democratic Party with 36 members; its chairman is the former Dutch Minister of Economic Affairs, E. M. J. A. Sassen.

The Socialist group with 23 members; its chairman is the leader of the French Socialists and president of the consultative assembly of the Council of Europe, Guy Mollet.

The Liberal and associated groups with 13 members under the chairmanship of the former French Premier Ivon Delbos.

Thus only 6 of the 78 members of the assembly do not belong to a parliamentary group.

The parliamentary groups, which have already established permanent bureaus at Luxembourg, do not meet only on the occasion of plenary sessions of the assembly but also at other times, for example when several important committee meetings take place within a short time.

17. The sessions of the assembly have also taken place at shorter intervals than seemed at first likely under the terms of the treaty. So far six sessions of the common assembly have been held and in a few weeks, on October 25 we shall gather once more in Strasbourg for an extraordinary session.

I think I am right in saying that each of these sessions of the assembly has meant another step forward in the development of the community. The high authority, which is responsible to the assembly, was able to clear its mind on necessary decisions as a result of these debates. The assembly itself succeeded in establishing the fact that the problems and objectives are common to all and in laying down this principle in resolutions which to a great extent have become the directives for the future policy of the community.

18. Cooperation with the Council of Europe and contact with the European countries which do not belong to the community of the six is promoted by means of joint sessions of the consultative assembly of the Council of Europe and of the common assembly of the Coal and Steel Community. These joint meetings are held in response to an urgently and unanimously expressed desire. Fruitful results were attained especially at these joint sessions at which the representatives of the United Kingdom and Ireland, of the four Nordic countries, Turkey and Greece and not last, as welcome guests, the representatives of Austria were able to discuss European problems with the parliament of the community and with the high authority. In addition the parliament of the Coal and Steel Community each year gives a report to the consultative assembly of the Council of Europe which further strengthens this cooperation. In this context it should also be mentioned that on several occasions committees of the consultative assembly at Luxembourg and Strasbourg have discussed with the high authority problems relating, in particular, to nonmember countries.

IV

19. Allow me to say a few words on the work of the organs of the community and on the results achieved so far.

Even at the time of drafting the treaty on the establishment of the community it was clear that especially the initial period would be particularly difficult for the community. In the case of every new organism doubts and obstacles of every kind are bound to arise in the early stages. For this reason the advocates and authors of the treaty provided for an initial and for a transitional period during which the coal and steel industry, hitherto isolated in national markets, was to be gradually brought into a common market. The initial difficulties gave rise to all sorts of criticism in many cases. Yet it was frequently overlooked in this connection that the common market was opened at a time when there was a certain decline in the business conditions of Central Europe. The boom caused by the Korean war was followed by a sobering period which affected in the first place the steel industry and, consequently, coal mining as well. Apart from the fact that in the meantime there has been a gratifying revival in European business conditions, it was, of course, a fallacy to trace this temporary recession to the coming into effect of the Coal and Steel Community.

20. The organs of the community and particularly the high authority, while being firmly set in their purpose, have always endeavored to proceed gradually in order to avoid grave dislocations of an economic and, especially, a social nature. When the common market was established the raw materials, such as coal, iron ore, and scrap iron were first brought into it. Less than 3 months later the common market was extended to steel; it was not until August 1, 1954, that the common market for special steels was established. The same prudent course, in harmony with economic conditions, was adopted in respect of price policy, the removal of subsidies and transport discrimination, the suppression of cartels, freedom of movement for labor, etc. Today it can hardly be denied that this European community has become a reality and that the new order based on a common market, created by it, can no longer be reversed.

21. I have already pointed out that the object of this community of six countries is by no means to be looked for in any isolation from the other countries of Europe and the world. On the contrary, the community is trying to bring about the maximum degree of cooperation with those countries which remain outside the community.

A clear example of this is provided by the Council of Europe which welcomed and assisted the community from the outset. Since the community has begun its activity the interest of the Council of Europe in this first concrete example of Europe integration has not lessened; the representatives of the countries outside the community, in particular, have repeatedly expressed their appreciation and sympathy in the consultative assembly. I have already explained how the organs of the community endeavor to maintain and consolidate contacts with the Council of Europe. It would be quite wrong, thus, to assume that there is some sort of rivalry between the Council of Europe and the community; there are, rather, joint efforts being made in various forms and by various way to attain the same object, a Europe united and pacified on a genuinely democratic basis.

Another proof of the will for such cooperation lies in the fact that third countries maintain delegations at the seat of the community which are in continuous contact with the organs of the community. Such delegations are maintained by the United Kingdom, the United States, Sweden, Norway, Denmark, Switzerland, and, not least, by Austria. Furthermore, fruitful cooperation has developed with those international organizations the functions of which concern the community. Let me mention here, in particular, the OEEC, the International Labor Office, the Economic Commission for Europe, GATT, the European Conference of Ministers of Transport.

22. In this connection I should not like to fail to refer to the question of cooperation with one country above all which has demonstrated its special interest in the European Steel and Coal Community. The United Kingdom which was unable to join the community because of her leading position in the Commonwealth nevertheless attaches great importance to a particularly close cooperation with the community. As early as November 1952 a joint committee composed of representatives of the United Kingdom and of the high authority was formed to discuss questions of common interest to the community and to the United Kingdom. On the basis of an exchange of letters between the president of the high authority and the British Government concrete preliminary talks are to be initiated presently on the United Kingdom's association with the community. I am certain my British colleagues will agree with me in expressing the hope that President Monnet, on his return from London, will be able to report progress in these talks on association.

23. My report would be incomplete if I were not to refer briefly to the investment policy of the Coal and Steel Community and its first results. You, ladies and gentlemen, will presumably be aware that the United States Government has granted a $100 million loan to provide initial support for the investment projects of the high authority. The conditions of this American loan are particularly favorable; this is the first Government loan for some time to be approved in Washington. Insofar this loan constituted a mark of special confidence in the

Coal and Steel Community on the part of the United States; furthermore it provides clear proof of Washington's readiness to promote the integration of Europe by this method, too. On the basis of this significant initiative taken by the United States, as the free world's strongest economic power, the hope is justified that this first success of the high authority in floating a loan will soon be followed by others in the international money market.

24. When I enumerated the objectives of the community at the beginning of my remarks you were, perhaps, somewhat surprised to hear that these are so extensive and general, although the community's competence is limited to the commodities of coal and steel. To the authors of the treaty, as well as to those holding responsible position in the organs of the community or working in association with these, it was and is no secret that the powers vested in the community are, in the long run, by no means adequate for a satisfactory achievement of these objectives. In many fields this is recognizable even now. Whether it be the effects of national taxation laws on the prices of the coal and steel products or the financial assistance for projects deserving support or whether it be the coordination of transport necessary to the proper functioning of the common market or a constructive social policy in respect of those employed in the industries of the community—it is everywhere clear that problems must be solved which far transcend the competence of the community. But these problems involved in partial integration must not be regarded as an obstacle but as an encouragement for further political action. In the preamble it is clearly stated that the establishment of this economic community is to lead to the foundation of a wider and closer community among the peoples. The few examples, which I have quoted, clearly demonstrate that a return into the isolation of national states is no longer possible, and, in fact, would be extremely dangerous to Europe, its countries, and its people. Such difficulties will not be overcome by timidly yielding but only by courageously advancing.

25. It gives me great pleasure to be able to tell you that the common assembly has acknowledged this principle, in particular, and acted accordingly. At the request of the council of ministers the common assembly constituted itself on September 15, 1952, as ad hoc assembly to draft a statute for a comprehensive European political community. During a period of 6 months a constitutional committee under the chairmanship of my German party friend Von Brentano, which set up a number of subcommittees, completed such a draft. Following the example of our Coal and Steel Community this draft provides for a European executive, a parliament of two chambers—the people's chamber and the senate—and a body representing the member states, the national council of ministers, as well as a supreme court of justice. The draft is based on an extensive measure of integration in the economic, social, financial, and political spheres. Having been passed by the assembly, this draft statute of a European constitution was presented to the council of ministers on March 9, 1953. Since then 18 months have passed but no agreement has been reached yet among the participating governments. A sad and bitter statement for a strong advocate of the European unity plan to make.

In spite of this we must not and will not give up hope that this delay—caused mainly by extraneous issues of high policy—may be ended in the not too distant future and that the final draft of a European constitution will then be submitted for ratification to the national parliaments.

I have come to the end of my remarks; let me thank you for your attention. The best reward for me will be if I have succeeded in leaving the impression with you that the European Coal and Steel Community and especially the common assembly in their endeavors for a united Europe also want to contribute to the cause of peace and freedom in the world.

A Report to the People by Congressman Rhodes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to report to the people of Berks County, the 14th District of Pennsylvania.

This report deals with the work and the record of the 83d Congress and gives my position on important national issues. I realize full well that my legislative record may not please each and every one of my constituents. That is to be expected in a democracy, where each and every one of us has the right to his own opinion—a right that we must always respect and safeguard.

Nevertheless, I believe that the voters have the right to know how their Representatives stand on issues of importance to our Nation. For that reason, I have always reported to my constituency on my actions as their Congressman. I wanted them to know the real truth and the facts about their Government and about important matters that are not always available to them through normal news channels. I have conscientiously tried to keep people informed and to represent them honestly and sincerely. In all of my actions I have tried to do what I thought would promote the greatest good for the greatest number and what was in the public interest.

On numerous legislative proposals I have supported the Eisenhower administration. However, such legislation was similar to the proposals which liberal Democratic Members have sponsored and supported in the past. On many important issues I opposed the Eisenhower administration.

I was strongly opposed to the Eisenhower administration's hard-money policy and curtailment program. It had a devastating effect on the millions of workers and their families who suffered heavy loss of income because of part-time employment and unemployment. It raised the interest on private and public debts and placed an added and disproportionate tax burden on the average citizen.

In many areas throughout the Nation there was a sharp decline in business and a heavy increase in unemployment as a result. Berks County is only one of the many areas affected. The people of the entire State of Pennsylvania have been gravely hurt as a result of the new economic policy adopted by the Federal Government. Only great monopolies and industrial and financial empires gained as a result.

It is quite apparent to Members of Congress and to folks who try to understand economic problems that the economic decline was no accident. It was the result of a definite policy of adjustment by White House advisers. There are definite advantages to be gained by big business monopolies by curtailment policies, but at a terrible cost to the average citizen.

It can be understood why administration leaders attempt to evade responsibility for the effect of this policy on families of jobless or part-time workers. The attempt by administration leaders to evade responsibility causes statements to be issued that there is no recession, that the decline in business and increase in unemployment is but a normal adjustment of the economy.

It is this attempt to evade responsibility that causes critics of the administration program to be called philosophers or doom and to even infer that the critics are responsible for the recession trend. Those of us who challenge the Eisenhower administration policy of curtailment insist that the real philosophers of gloom are those who accept as normal what they called a necessary float of unemployment, or a standing army of unemployed workers of about 4 million.

A DISTRESSING DOWNTURN

The past 2 years saw what had been the most prosperous economy the United States, or any other nation, has ever known, turn into a nationwide recession. Almost overnight, Reading and Berks County became a distressed area, which means unemployment of more than 6 percent.

In this situation, the Congress provided no constructive solutions. My bill, which I cosponsored, for a Federal-local public-works program was pigeonholed. Several antidepression bills I introduced got nowhere with the GOP leadership. While our jobless were experiencing prolonged periods of hopelessness verging on despair, the inadequate unemployment-compensation rates were not raised. Not a single State today has an unemployment-compensation rate which is in line with the cost of living.

The cost of living itself—the Consumers' Price Index—has not reflected this general downturn in economic activity. Prices today for the consumer are higher than they were before this recession began. Creeping inflation has been cheating the housewife every day of more and more money out of her limited budget.

THE COFFEE HOAX

The phony shortage and the indirect tax on the people by coffee speculators was made possible by the do-nothing attitude of the administration in stopping this highhanded robbery.

ADMINISTRATION RESPONSIBLE

Mr. Speaker, it is hard to think of a single aspect of the lives and happiness of the people of the United States that is not affected by the work we do here in the Congress, and what policies are planned and carried out by the Eisenhower advisers and administration leaders. What we do or fail to do affects each person, each family, each home in a variety of important respects. The wage earner's job, the widow's social security benefits, the veteran's hospitalization, or homeownership, or educational rights under the GI bill, the rehabilitation of the handicapped, the prices of things people buy in the stores, the safety of our population from atomic attack, the taxes we pay, the state of prosperity in the country—all these things are directly involved in the bills we pass in the Congress.

I have tried since coming to the Congress to examine into legislation—into all bills which come before us—from this standpoint of their effect upon people; that is, how they affect homelife and the family, what influence they would have in the prevention of juvenile delinquency or in the improvement of educational opportunities, whether they would mean better homes or poorer homes for the families which make up our country.

MAJOR ISSUES OF THIS CONGRESS

Among the important issues which we attempted to deal with in this Congress were such things as:

Social security, housing, taxes, and a complete rewriting and codification of all of the income-tax statutes; better unemployment compensation provisions; aid to our hard-pressed schools; strengthening of national defense; improvement of civilian-defense programs; correction of a gaping loophole in the food and drug inspection program; statehood for Hawaii and Alaska; the reciprocal trade agreements program begun under Cordell Hull in 1934 to expand world trade and thus lessen the tensions which lead to war; the ownership of the so-called tidelands; continuation of the mutual-security program; and the peacetime uses of atomic energy.

Mr. Speaker, the list is endless. All of these things and many more are of direct concern to every American family. On some of these issues, Congress went through the motions of legislating but did little; on others, it accomplished some worthwhile things. On balance, however, the record was not the kind we could have made if there had been more of a will here to legislate in behalf of the great mass of the people. In so many instances, this Congress legislated on behalf of the few—of those with wealth and power, leaving only crumbs for the average citizen.

THE TAX BILL

Nowhere was this more evident than in the tax-revision bill. We passed a bill—a bill jammed down the throats of those of us who tried to improve it—which accords tremendous increases in take-home pay for people with substantial income from stock dividends and which gives business corporations very attractive means of increasing their net profits through lower taxes, but which gives to the average citizen not a single important means of reducing this tax bill.

The average wage earner gets no break in lower tax rates or higher exemptions. Our efforts to write an additional $100 exemption per person into the law, making the individual exemption $700 a year instead of $600, were voted down.

THE TIDELANDS ISSUE

Early in the 83d Congress, the administration launched one of its strongest crusades—to give away to a few coastal States valuable natural resources under the ocean floor, chiefly oil. The Supreme Court has said over and over that these valuable resources belonged to all of the people of the United States. President Truman vetoed efforts in past Congresses to give away these resources. I was one who tried to get the royalties from these offshore oil deposits earmarked for educational purposes, but the administration insisted on pushing through the bill to sign away all Federal Government claims for these resources. Consequently, while four of our coastal States were made very happy by this tremendous windfall of natural resources which the Supreme Court insisted belonged to you and me and all of the people of this country, our schools continue in a desperate financial situation which has meant overcrowding, lack of proper facilities, underpaid teachers, and alarming deterioration in the quality of education.

GOOD LIVING STANDARDS BULWARK AGAINST COMMUNISM

The real strength of America is centered in its people. There loyalty, patriotism, high standard of living, and security for the family and home are all solid barriers against communism. The human factor in our economy is the bulwark of democratic government and our first defense against communistic slavery.

TRICKLE DOWN ECONOMY

Communism cannot thrive in a land where government is dedicated to better homes, expanding educational facilities, and good working conditions. Any government whose constant aim is the progress of human welfare will never fall. Back in the lush 1920's, we experienced national leadership which disregarded the human element and worshipped at the shrine of real estate and stock-market speculation—creation of large holding companies and a nationwide drive to make business bigger and more profitable. The millions of little people, including the wage earners, farmers, and small business were forgotten. Our Nation's purchasing power diminished to an all-time low. Farm prices dropped, banks, factories, and mills closed, and financial panic struck. Millions of homes and farms were foreclosed and 14 million men were unemployed.

In 1931 and 1932 Communist agitators were active in the industrial areas of America and they made great progress. Riots incited by Communists took place at relief stations and employment offices. Discontent, disunity, and defiance of law and order were rampant. That unfortunate period should serve as a warning that our Government might not survive another depression.

OUR FOREIGN POLICY

The limitations of this report will not permit me to comment on all the issues considered by the 83d Congress, but, before concluding, I want to say a few words about the poor performance of the present administration in the important field of foreign policy.

All of us will long remember the bitter criticisms heaped upon the foreign policy of the past administration by the Republicans. We will also recall the GOP campaign assurances that communism would be stopped in its tracks, that liberation of the Soviet-dominated nations would be at hand, and that our Nation would receive a new, dynamic foreign policy as soon as the Republicans were elected to office.

The miserable and even tragic record of the present administration in the field of foreign affairs makes mockery of those promises.

In less than 2 years, Communists have made great gains. Their hold on one-half of Korea was sanctioned. The Reds then took over a big portion of Indochina, while our leaders stood by, piously pledging that they would not condone any agreements which would provide for the enslavement of free peoples. In the meantime, 7 million Vietnamese were committed into Communist bondage through the Indochina armistice agreement.

What is even more tragic, is that the unity if the free world has been crumbling under the inept leadership of our Government during the past 21 months. Further, in the face of new Communist advances, our administration has been cutting back our military, mutual security, and anti-Communist propaganda appropriations.

SOCIAL SECURITY

The social-security program was enacted by the Democratic Party in 1935. In the intervening period of almost 20 years under Presidents Roosevelt and Truman, the program has been expanded. Each effort to establish social security with with opposition by Republican Party leaders. In 1935, every Republican member of the Ways and Means Committee voted against social security. It was called welfare statelsm. I am glad to report that the Republican Party in this session finally joined with the Democratic minority in adopting a social-security expansion program. The bill enacted by the 83d Congress was a step in the right direction, although it was far from adequate to meet the needs of the people. There was no desire on the part of administration leaders to consider bills which I and other liberal Members introduced for a more realistic social-security program.

AID TO VETERANS AND HANDICAPPED

The modest increase voted by this Congress in veterans' benefit rates, including disability benefits, does not begin to reflect the increases in the cost of living and the needs of the veteran. We had to agree to this bill or get nothing. That is exactly how the matter was presented to us in the final days of the session. This is an area where more compassion and less budgeteering is necessary.

A bill which would expand the Government's program for rehabilitation of the physically handicapped was passed, but the appropriations necessary to carry it out were not forthcoming in sufficient amount. It is regrettable that the Congress should attempt to persuade the handicapped that we are doing a lot for them and then fail to appropriate sufficient funds. A similar deception was practiced on the matter of special hospitals and clinics for a variety of chronic diseases—a law which says we will do something about it, but an appropriation which fails to include enough money.

RAISING THE DEBT CEILING

The administration waited until the 11th hour before raising the ceiling on the national debt. The raise in the debt limit was in contradiction to everything that was promised last November when the people were told that the budget would be promptly balanced and the national debt reduced.

VOTING RECORD

Being mindful that the voters of my district have reposed trust and confidence in me, my energies and efforts have been dedicated to meeting that challenge. My overall attendance and voting record is one of the best in Congress, according to the records of the Clerk of the House of Representatives.

AVAILABLE FOR PUBLIC MEETINGS

During the past year my office has given assistance to many individuals on many different problems which they had pertaining to the Federal Government. Student groups have been assisted by my office on their visits to the Nation's Capital. Many other groups had my cooperation when they visited Washington. These included youth, religious, and women's organizations.

During the period when Congress is adjourned, it is my purpose to make myself available to appear before any group of citizens in my district at no cost to them. I will appear to answer questions, to speak on any specific national issue or to debate with any person selected by interested organizations.

Tribute to Hon. Robert C. Hendrickson, of New Jersey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter which I wrote to Senator ROBERT HENDRICKSON on August 20, 1954.

I do this because I hold Senator HENDRICKSON in such high regard. His services in the Senate were an inspiration to every other Senator.

He is a man of great courage and fixed purpose. He will stand up for what he believes is right, come what may. At the same time he is the personification of kindness and good will toward all.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND
FOREIGN COMMERCE,
August 20, 1954.

Hon. ROBERT C. HENDRICKSON,
Commitee on Armed Services, Senate Office, Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR ROBERT: I rejoiced in the wonderful tributes paid to you yesterday on the Senate floor. The good part about them is that they are so richly deserved and sincere. You have been a splendid Senator dedicated and devoted to your task.

I am especially indebted to you for your courageous and timely crusade on juvenile delinquency. That is the major problem of this day. You tackled it with determination and understanding. The loss of your leadership in this vital cause is a tragedy.

As I bow out of the Senate the most precious thing which I take away with me is the friendships and the memory of my association with my beloved colleagues. From them and from you I have gained inspiration and renewed faith in men.

Whatever you do and wherever you may go, I hope for you happiness in abundance and success without stint.

With affectionate regard, I am
Most sincerely,
EDWIN C. JOHNSON,
United States Senator, Colorado.

Unfair to Cornbread and Beans?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Times-Herald, Newport News, Va., relative to the celebration of the Rochambeau Commission at Yorktown, Va., October 19, 1954.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNFAIR TO CORNBREAD AND BEANS?

Southern cornbread and New England baked beans are going to be the luncheon menu for Governors of eight States and other guests at the Yorktown celebration of Surrender Day, October 19. So says General Chairman Charles Parmer of the Interstate Rochambeau Commission of the United States, whose organization will celebrate the anniversary of the surrender of Lord Cornwallis to American and French forces at Yorktown to end the American Revolution in 1781.

There's a fitness about the menu, Mr. Parmer points out. For to paraphrase Mr. Kipling's observation that "when it comes to slaughter, you'll do your work on water," the Americans and their French allies in the Battle of Yorktown forged their way ahead on beans plus stanch cornbread. Some punster might remark that it was impossible for the British to beat the starch out of the allies who were so well fortified with that source of energy.

Beans and cornbread are good eating in their own right when properly prepared. The designation of "southern" assures us of the palatable quality of the bread. Just as New England has a similar guaranty for the savor of the beans. Each section is noted for the cookery of its contribution to the feast.

However, we suspect the beans would be a bit more appealing and the cornbread more palate tickling if the diners had the sort of whetted appetites that the soldiers on our side carried to the mess tables on the day these United States were freed from British rule.

And here and now we might stop to wonder what would have been the result of the conflict had the British gone into battle after a hearty meal of beans and cornbread. Perish the thought that our liberty would not have been won from a revitalized host of redcoats under Cornwallis. That all of this has gone unrecognized over the years this Nation has been in existence is unfair to beans and cornbread. Napoleon said an army travels on its belly. Which, translated into the more scientific language of today, means that victory rides with vitamins.

Report to Seattle's Maritime Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, now that the 83d Congress is history, it is appropriate that we make reports to the people we represent. I have compiled such a report for the maritime industry of Seattle and, under general leave to extend my remarks, include it in the RECORD for the information of my colleagues.

In representing the city of Seattle in Congress during the past 2 years, shipping and ship construction have been foremost in my mind for two reasons: First, the industry was sick; and second, Seattle's waterfront and affiliated economy is our basic industry.

In the Congress, my first remarks on this subject to the House of Representatives occurred on February 9, 1953, when I informed the Members that the Navy's Bureau of Ships was letting a contract to build 23 air rescue boats to a Canadian shipbuilding firm under the Defense Department's offshore procurement policy. In these remarks I said:

> If, as I believe to be the case, our American workers are suffering from lack of employment while foreign boatbuilding plants are relatively busy, then such a policy of diverting work to foreign countries is distasteful to me and I am sure is distasteful to every American citizen and taxpayer.

On February 12, 1953, I again spoke to the House of Representatives, saying I had discovered that the Navy was under compulsion to spend $100 million a year in Canada under a long-standing procurement agreement. I said I was requesting the Secretary of Defense to review this policy and that it seemed to me "the economy of our American workers is the one that needs bolstering."

My efforts were successful. In response to my protest, Secretary of Defense Wilson rescinded the former policy. Since then $100 million of naval construction is allocated to American, rather than Canadian, shipyards. Since then, too, I have tried to be ever alert to protect our American shipping industry.

To try and restore our American merchant marine has been a discouraging effort. However, since Congressman Thor Tollefson, of Tacoma, became acting chairman of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, prospects for improvement have increased greatly. My membership on the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee dovetails with Congressman Tollefson's work, and we have cooperated closely.

Whenever legislation like the gift in 1953 of a million bushels of wheat to Pakistan came before the House we have tried to insure shipment of at least 50 percent in American bottoms—likewise with agricultural commodities used for foreign aid. Against strong opposition from the farm bloc, we have sought to amend laws to allow delivery charges to be paid by the Commodity Credit Corporation. In the closing days of the past session the 50–50 bill was passed and has been signed by the President—getting this matter into permanent law so it does not have to be fought out each year. Congressman Tollefson deserves great credit for this legislation, and I enjoyed working with him for its passage.

Some of us in Congress have been regularly warning our colleagues of the need of maintaining a merchant marine. On February 2, 1954, when the subject of tariffs was under consideration, I addressed the House criticizing the Randall Commission report, which called for eliminating partial use of American vessels for cargo shipments financed by the Government. I said direct aid to our shipping industry, which the Commission report recommended, is not enough. We do not want a subsidized stockpile of idle ships. We need cargoes and trade to employ ships' crews, and keep the ship repair trades busy.

The Congressional Record contains my frequent remarks calling Congress attention to the fact that we had no private shipbuilding program and that we needed fast, modern merchant vessels to compete with foreign low-wage shipping. Time and again those of us who were interested in maritime problems called the House's attention to the need, in the event of war, for a fleet of such modern ships.

I was active in obtaining increased appropriations for naval ship construction, and for legislation to authorize construction of merchant ships. Any measure which would aid our shipping industry had my support. Both Houses of Congress passed one of my own bills to aid the shipowners by allowing them to reimburse the Government for quarantine officers' overtime pay. This legislation would have speeded up shipping and resulted in substantial savings to ship owners, but because the administration wanted all overtime for Government employees studied first, the President vetoed my bill.

Last year I was successful in persuading the Military Sea Transportation Service to allocate passengers to the Alaska Steamship Co., and the service continued. But now the problem is before us again, and there is apparently no satisfactory basis on which to operate these passenger ships. At my request, the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee will hold hearings in Seattle on passenger service to Alaska. Some sort of Government operation or subsidy may be necessary.

Our efforts to have more MSTS ships using the Seattle port of embarkation have been successful and, of course, this puts overhaul and repair work in our local yards.

Every month, at my request, I am being furnished a report by the Maritime Commission to ascertain the number of reserve merchant-marine ships decommissioned in Budd Inlet. Only of late are we being given our fair share. This has meant we have not been getting our share of regular overhauls. I have assurance from the Maritime Administration of greater utilization of the moorage at Budd Inlet.

Incidentally, largely through my personal efforts, certain of these vessels were used for grain storage, which has helped our payrolls locally. On July 19 and 20, 1954, the supplemental appropriation bill came before the Congress. I was active in support of an amendment to restore approximately $44 million for construction-differential subsidies and national defense allowances on four passenger-cargo ships to be built by private operators as replacement for outmoded ships.

Congressman Rooney, of New York, when I promised support of his amendment, said:

> I would fully expect the support of the gentleman from Washington.

He said he knew of my interest in the American merchant marine, and that he and I were in agreement with regard to the important matter of unemployment in our shipyards.

I mention this because it shows that constantly and continually during the 83d Congress I have been working for a shipbuilding program. Sometimes this effort was, during limited debate, to yield my time to Congressman Tollefson so he could adequately present his argument for a bill; sometimes it was simply to rise and not allow some unfair statement about the industry to go unchallenged. Actually the record will show that I have been one of the most active supporters in Congress for the maritime industry.

But what the printed record does not show is my efforts in behalf of local shipyards to help them obtain Government construction and repair contracts. Any and all shipyard and small boat plant operators who have sought contracts, or bid on work will testify as to my personal attention and endeavors.

Our community hopes last spring were centered on a $13 million bid of the Puget Sound Bridge & Dredging Co. to construct two destroyer escorts. Unfortunately this company's bid was $800,000 above the low bid. Since then the Department of the Navy has established a policy of inviting bids on an area basis and I am hopeful that an award for two destroyer escorts will be made to a Seattle bidder this October.

The Federal program for conversion of Liberty ships and for construction of tankers and cargo ships is meager, but in my opinion the stage is set for a future building program to meet the deficiency of 214 needed merchant ships to provide for essential defense requirements and also to provide for replacement of outdated ships.

As for myself, I look forward to continuing efforts to maintain our various shipbuilding skills and employ a full workload of various trades whose livelihood is dependent on construction and maintenance of an adequate American merchant marine. This effort must go hand in hand with a program of expanding the activity of Seattle and other Puget Sound ports. The trend of construction and operation under foreign flags by American money must be reversed. American standards, working conditions, and pay must be protected.

On June 30, 1954, speaking in Congress, I said:

> In World War II when victory was only possible because of these American ships, American seamen were patted on the back; now they are hit below the belt.

Since those remarks were made there have been certain developments which lead me to express more kindly remarks. The administration has not only recognized the need of cargoes to sustain our merchant marine, but has approved the proposal to embark on a ship construction program to replace our outdated fleet of merchant ships.

I hope, as Representative in Congress from Seattle, to have an active part in restoring our maritime industries in the future.

The 10th Anniversary of the Communist Revolt in Slovakia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. BONIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. BONIN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to insert in the Congressional Record two statements by the Slovak League of America, headed by Mr. Philip A. Hrobak, president.

It is my deliberate opinion that the Slovak people should have a desk of their own in Radio Free Europe. If they were permitted to have this, the true Slovak cause could be presented to the people in Slovakia in its true light and an effective program of truth could be offered to all the people concerning the freedom and independence for the Slovak nation.

The statements follow:

The 10th Anniversary of the Communist Revolt in Slovakia

On the occasion of the 10th anniversary of one of the darkest moments in Slovak history—the Communist rebellion of 1944 in Slovakia—when for the first time in its history the Slovak earth received into its entrails thousands of innocent people buried in mass graves, we must bow in deep respect to the victims of Communist brutality and treachery.

Already during the First World War the American Nation contributed considerably to the liberation of the Slovaks. Here, on American soil, in the great metropolis of Pittsburgh, Thomas G. Masaryk, the first president of Czecho-Slovakia, drafted and signed the Pittsburgh Agreement with representatives of Americans of Slovak descent. This agreement was supposed to be the foundation for the building of Czecho-Slovakia as a federative state. Wilson's 14 points, the basis of which was self-determination and which stressed the right of all nations to a life of freedom, were joyously acclaimed in Slovakia. Gen. Milan R. Stefanik, leader of the Slovak resistance movement, requested the aid of America during the First World War to assure freedom for his Slovak people. And almost 2 million Americans of Slovak descent, who have already contributed so much materially and spiritually to the welfare of America, ask us daily to give some attention to their fatherland and help it in its struggle for liberation. In the world today there is probably no nation which sympathizes with America as does the Slovak nation. Practically every Slovak family over there has a relative or acquaintance in America.

In the summer of 1944 Soviet partisans, parachuted into Slovakia by the Soviets, began to murder innocent people and plunder the property of Slovak citizens. At Kunerad and Sklabina partisan courts were set up hurriedly and many people were liquidated in a sadistic manner. The activities of the partisans aimed at creating chaos and confusion in the countries neighboring on Germany and were to prepare the ground for seizure of power by the Communists. The leftwing Slovak politicians, joined to Moscow and Benes' pro-Soviet government in London, had a hand in the violence perpetrated by the partisans. After murdering the military mission of the German General Otto and several Slovak officers, these politicians provoked a military rebellion in Banska Bystrica on August 29, 1944, which they called the Slovak national uprising. This Communist-inspired rebellion is written in somber letters in Slovak history not only because it was staged against the state independence of the Slovak nation, but also because it left in its wake a number of mass graves and indescribable horrors.

The Slovak Army, in agreement with Slovak political factors, was itself preparing to bring Slovakia on the side of the Allies; the Slovaks wanted to save their state and at the opportune moment to show the world just where they stood and with whom they wish to be allied. Moscow and Dr. Benes, however, were aware of this and worked feverishly to have their provocateurs and saboteurs start a rebellion prematurely in Banska Bystrica. General Malar, who enjoyed great popularity among Slovak soldiers, begged the soldiers of the Slovak Army over the radio not to take part in the Communist rebellion "because our time has not yet come, but when it does come, then we shall all pull on the same end of the rope." At that time some of the garrisons in central Slovakia were already occupied by the partisans and the ill-fated revolt could not be halted.

It was this Communist-inspired rebellion which brought German units into Slovakia. The rebellion against the independence of the Slovak nation was liquidated within 2 months. The Slovak people were hit by the partisans on the one side and the Germans on the other. Instances of German brutality were noted in some places, but they did not even faintly compare with the atrocities committed by the partisans. There were instances where Slovak villages gladly welcomed liberation by the Germans from the Communist beasts. Such is the true story of the so-called Slovak uprising of 1944. It cannot be denied even by those who even today would like to present this revolution to America and the rest of the free world as a revolution of liberation.

Today America is known throughout the world for her fight against every aggression and oppression; the tearful eyes of millions enslaved peoples are turned toward America as their last hope. It is, therefore, only fitting and right that we remind ourselves and the world that central European nations were exposed to Communist terror already in 1944 and 1945. In 1944 thousands of Slovaks were buried in mass graves and placed in the concentration camp at Slovenska Lupca; all were victims of Communist aggression. Once the Slovak nation is free again, it shall show the world its sacrifices, not only the sacrifices of its daily fight against Communist terror since 1948, but also those it made during the Communist-inspired rebellion of 1944.

Because of lack of information or because of misinformation, some people in America still regard sympathetically the Communist-inspired revolt in Slovakia in 1944 as a revolt against Hitler's nazism and his stooges in Slovakia. But this is only a legend which the creators of the ill-fated uprising fabricated. If there is any one who claims that this uprising was a revolution of liberation, we ask him in the name of the principles upon which American freedom rests whether a revolution of liberation is marked by such signs as the liquidation of one's own State independence without the agreement of the nation and, furthermore, by such signs as are mass graves and concentration camps? Over 4,000 Slovak nationals are buried in these mass graves. Is not the conscience of those who dared to present this revolt to the western world as a "national uprising" shaken by the thought of these mass graves?

Right here in America we have an organization called the Council of Free Czechoslovakia, which annually celebrates the Communist revolt of 1944 as a revolt of the Slovak nation. The gentlemen at the head of this celebration are doing everything possible to escape the responsibility for the ill-fated, bloody rebellion which they sponsored with the Communists. Thus far not a single one among them had the courage to tell us the truth about the revolt of 1944. They are silent about the mass graves and concentration camps and they are silent about the terrible suffering which they brought upon their own nation. Worst of all, they are still trying to convince the free world that the revolt was a part of the military operations of the Allies against Hitler.

America does not need allies who operate and govern by means of concentration camps and people's courts during peacetime and who in wartime liquidate their political opponents by means of mass shootings and mass graves. Just as we condemn the acts of the Soviet NKVD during the war, namely, the mass murder of the Polish officers and soldiers in Katyn, so we must also condemn the terrible acts of mass murder during the Communist revolt in Slovakia in 1944. We must condemn these acts in America, because by keeping silent about them we would, in fact, be preparing the same fate for others and even ourselves. It is in the interest of America that no American institution shall lend itself to the celebration of this Communist-inspired revolt in Slovakia, even though some Czech and Slovak exiles, who collaborated with the Communists, present it in an innocent garb. Alas, thus far we have often believed what was told to us by people whom we considered our friends. It is high time indeed, that we were a bit more careful and alert, especially when it comes to people whom we do not know very well.

For the past several years American enterprises, such as the Voice of America and Radio Free Europe, celebrated or commemorated the so-called Slovak national uprising in the same manner as the Communists. That was bad and it was very bad propaganda. The Communists identify themselves with acts that serve their politics. They claim the revolt of 1944 as their very own; and it has all the marks characteristic of Communists. By their mass graves we know them everywhere: in Poland, Ukraine, Slovakia, Korea, China, Indochina, etc.

America stands for the great principles of freedom and the rights of every nation and, therefore, Americans and their institutions must not commemorate something which is in conflict with their democracy and human freedoms. Such an occasion as the commemoration of the Communist revolt in Slovakia forces us to search the activity of exiled groups very carefully and not to accept whatever might be in conflict with the thoughts and desires of any nation. The Communist revolt of 1944 in Slovakia is for us an opportunity to bow our heads out of respect for the victims of the revolt and the fight of the nation, which is still stubbornly resisting Communist rule. It must not, however, be an occasion for celebrations, because we would thereby destroy the faith of those who have not ceased believing in the democratic way of life.

Those who together with the Communists declared in 1943 that they desire close cooperation especially with the U. S. S. R., in which they see a guaranty of free life and general growth of small nations generally and Slavonic nations especially—such people cannot be our true friends even today. Such a statement was signed by Dr. Joseph Lettrich, Mathias Josko, and Nicholas Ferjencik, who are members of the Council of Free Czechoslovakia. This is the very same conception which was expressed by Dr. Eduard Benes in 1946 when he said: "Czechoslovakia is definitely orientated to the East. In case of a conflict between the West and the East we must give all our forces and resources to the Soviet Union."

In 1944 individuals with such a pro-Soviet conception provoked and initiated the revolt in Slovakia; the same people who repudiated the state independence of their own nation and united with the Soviet partisans against their own nation. Is it possible, then, to accept and support such people as representatives of the Slovak nation in the free world? Thus far they were successful, because they beautified their collaboration with the Communists since 1943 with beautiful democratic legends. But how long shall be believe the words of politicians who glorified Stalin and the Soviets when they were in power, but today are against Communists because they were thown out of government by them? What they did together with the Communists then, they commemorate or celebrate with them even today. So it is with the Slovak revolt of 1944. We ask these gentlemen: was the revolt of 1944 in Slovakia with its mass graves a democratic deed and whether the people's courts, confiscation of property and the establishment of concentration camps also were democratic deeds?

In the name of truth and the rights of the Slovak nation, we raise our voice today in defense of its honor, just as the eminent Norwegian poet Bjornsterne Bjorson and the English historian Seton-Watson did before the First World War. We do that because by defending the truth and honor of small nations we also defend the freedom and honor of America.

Our country is the hope of the enslaved nations and these nations our America must not disappoint. When the Slovaks shall be free to decide for themselves in free elections about their future destiny, we must not support those Slovak politicians who today, claim that the Slovaks have no right to decide about their own fate in a democratic manner. We cannot suffer American institutions like the Voice of America and Radio Free Europe to be used by only one political group—a group which willfully collaborated with the Communists and, therefore, carries the responsibility for the mass graves of 1944 and the murder of the first Slovak president, who even today is the symbol of the anti-Communist fight in Slovakia.

We bow in reverence before the victims and the heroic fight of the Slovak nation. If thus far, because of our lack of correct information, this small nation was put under the rule of other nations, today, when we recall the horrible events which this nation suffered 10 years ago, we proclaim that in the future the Slovak nation shall enjoy full freedom in its own state. We bow in prayer for the victims of the mass graves in Slovakia and send words of hope and consolation to the Slovaks in Communist jails and concentration camps. May the good God protect our freedom in the same measure that we sincerely wish to validate the rights of others.

The Free Europe Committee and the Slovaks

1. By its constant propaganda for the concept of the Czechoslovak state, the Free Europe Committee is practically imposing upon the Slovaks a framework which after an experience of 36 years they must consider as a Czech power construction. It is clear that no democratic Czechoslovak state could be established against the will of the Slovaks. The Free Europe Committee seems, however, to ignore such a fundamental reality.

It has been said that the Slovaks try to be admitted to the Free Europe Committee with the idea of doing a separatist propaganda through the Radio Free Europe. It is not true. They try only to convince the American authorities that in the struggle between the partisans of a Czechoslovak state and of a Slovak state, rather than giving an exclusive help to the idea of a Czech-dominated Czechoslovakia, an impartial attitude would be more in accordance with the American tradition and concept of equal chance for everybody. In fact, the consolidation of the relations between the Czechs and the Slovaks in exile are in the hands of the Free Europe Committee. The unilateral favoritism conflicting with American tradition could only provoke a strong criticism on the Slovak side. This situation would change if the before-mentioned agency would take a neutral position in that dispute. The application of the principle of nonpredetermination of the political status of the Slovaks and the Czechs in the future would be highly indicated. After long discussions the same principle has been also adopted by the American Committee for Liberation From Bolshevism dealing with the problem of the Soviet Union and the mutual relations of the nationalities which live in it.

2. By an agreement that Edward Benes concluded with Klement Gottwald at the beginning of 1945 in Moscow, four political parties of Slovakia were suppressed: the Slovak People's Party, the Agrarian Party, the Slovak National Party, and the Artisan Party. They had 33 deputies—19, 12, 1, 1, respectively—that is the majority of the 56 deputies that Slovakia had in the Prague Parliament before World War II. The principal leaders of the Slovak Democratic Party, created only in 1945, approved this undemocratic decision. In spite of that fact, those politicians who have mostly joined the Council of Free Czechoslovakia are considered as speakers for Slovakia, while the conservative forces constituting a great majority of the Slovak emigration are without any representation in the Free Europe Committee. These Slovak refugees can hardly understand why the left wing of the Slovak political emigration should enjoy a greater favor of the American agencies than its more conservative and decidedly more anti-Communist center.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *August 18, 1954.*

Procedure for Amending the Constitution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. GWINN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, here is a fundamental and possibly a necessary next amendment to the Constitution. It clarifies the fifth article of the Constitution, making it possible for three-fourths of the States by identical resolution to amend the Constitution without calling a convention or making it necessary for Congress to take action:

House Joint Resolution 568

Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the procedure for amending the Constitution

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That in lieu of article V of the Constitution of the United States, the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which, when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States, shall be valid, to all intents and purposes, as part of the Constitution:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. The Congress, whenever two-thirds of both Houses shall deem it necessary, shall propose amendments to this Constitution, or on the application of the legislatures of two-thirds of the several States shall call a convention for proposing amendments; or the legislature of any State, whenever two-thirds of each house shall deem it necessary, may propose amendments to this Constitution by transmitting to the Secretary of State of the United States and to the secretary of state of each of the several States a certified copy of the resolution proposing the amendment, which shall be deemed submitted to the several States for ratification when certified copies of resolutions of the legislatures of any 12 of the several States by two-third of each house shall have been so transmitted concurring in the proposal of such amendment; which, in any case, shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of this Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States: *Provided*, That no State, without its consent, shall be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate.

"SEC. 2. The act of proposal, concurrence in a proposal, or ratification of an amendment, shall not be revocable.

"SEC. 3. A proposal of an amendment by a State shall be inoperative unless it shall have been so concurred in within 7 years from the date of the proposal. A proposed amendment shall be inoperative unless it shall have been so ratified within 15 years from the date of its submission, or shorter period as may be prescribed in the resolution proposing the amendment.

"SEC. 4. Controversies respecting the validity of an amendment shall be justiciable and shall be determined by the exercise of the judicial power of the United States."

SEC. 2. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years from the date of its submission.

Agricultural Legislation in the 83d Congress, 1st and 2d Sessions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, when this Congress convened, the country was confronted with declining farm prices, a marked slackening of foreign demand for the products of our fields, accumulating surpluses, a gathering drought in the midcontinent, and other problems of vital interest to our agriculture.

The Congress took steps immediately to halt a serious decline in livestock prices, and a program was developed to aid farmers in the drought-devastated areas.

Attention then turned to the general problems and objectives of agriculture.

The Congress passed the Agricultural Act of 1954, conforming in major respects to the recommendations of the President, in the overall program he presented to Congress on January 11, 1954, "to achieve the stability and growth of income over the years to which our farmers are entitled and which the Nation must assure in the interest of all 160 million of our people."

It wrote into law the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, aimed at greater utilization and enjoyment, at home and abroad, of the abundance of food and fiber produced on the farms of the United States.

The Congress authorized direct Government loans and federally insured private loans for water facilities and conservation. It enacted a watershed development program, to enable and encourage expansion of conservation work and better use of America's two greatest resources—the soil and water.

It revamped and improved the farm credit system.

It expanded the crop insurance program, modernized the laws authorizing the Agricultural Extension Service, and took numerous other actions relating to the welfare of farmers and their families.

It extended the benefits of the social-security program to 3,600,000 farm operators.

Increased appropriations were provided for the growth of REA, for research and extension, for FHA and other programs.

Following is a review of the actions in the various fields that are of interest to the farmers of the Nation and to the consumers who depend upon them for their food and fiber:

THE AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1954, PUBLIC LAW 690

1. BASIC CROPS

A flexible price-support program at 82½ to 90 percent of parity is established for the 1955 crop of wheat, corn, cotton, peanuts, and rice, according to supply conditions. In 1956 and thereafter the support level of these crops will be at 75 to 90 percent of parity, unless Congress takes action to change these flexible levels. The support level of the sixth basic crop—tobacco—remains at 90 percent so long as marketing quotas are in effect.

These new provisions are made with respect to specified basic crops:

CORN

Existing marketing quota authority is repealed, while acreage allotment authority is retained. The act amends the definition of "normal supply" of corn to increase the carryover allowance from 10 to 15 percent of the domestic consumption and exports. The time for determining the average yield of corn in computing the national acreage allotment for corn is reduced from 10 years to 5 years, and the trend adjustment in computing such yield is eliminated. Likewise, the period of years used in apportioning the national corn allotment to counties is reduced from 10 to 5 years. The definition of "normal yield" for corn is amended by changing the period of years used from 10 to 5 years and by eliminating the adjustment for trends in yields.

WHEAT

(a) Commercial area: The act defines the noncommercial wheat-producing area, the effect being that producers in the commercial wheat area would be subject to acreage allotments and marketing quotas when required by law, while producers in the noncommercial area would not be subject to these limitations and would receive only 75 percent of the level of support accorded producers in the commercial area. The noncommercial area will consist of States that plant 25,000 or less acres of wheat annually. According to the best information available at this time this would place in the noncommercial area the 12 States—Alabama, Arizona, Connecticut, Florida, Louisiana, Maine, Massachusetts, Mississippi, Nevada, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, and Vermont. The provision is effective for 1955 and subsequent years. The allotments for other States will not be increased by the elimination of any State from the commercial area.

(b) Proclamation date: The final date for proclaiming the national acreage allotment of wheat is changed from July 15 to May 15, and for proclaiming the national marketing quota for wheat from July 1 to May 15.

(c) Summer fallow: The act provides, in areas where a summer fallow crop rotation of wheat is a common practice, for establishing minimum 1955 farm acreage allotments for farms on which a summer fallow and wheat rotation was practiced for the 1952 and 1953 crops of wheat. This is intended to give equitable treatment to wheat producers in the recognized summer fallow areas who practice summer fallowing.

(d) Normal supply: The allowance for carryover in the computation of "normal supply" of wheat is increased from 15 to 20 percent of domestic consumption plus exports.

(e) Surrender of acreage: Any part of a 1955 farm acreage allotment of wheat can be voluntarily surrendered and reapportioned to other farms in the county or, if not needed in the county, transferred to the State committee for reapportionment. Such surrendered acreage, for the purposes of farm history, shall be regarded as having been planted on the farm from which it was transferred rather than on the farms to which the allotment was transferred.

COTTON

Additional discretion is given to county committees in allotting cotton on a basis of the history of plantings on individual farms. In addition the county committee may limit any farm acreage allotment to not more than 50 percent of the cropland on the farm. The act makes permanent a temporary provision in present law that a cotton farmer may voluntarily surrender any of his cotton allotment he does not intend to plant, for reallocation in his county or State, with such surrendered acreage being counted in the history of his own farm for the purposes of computing future acreage allotments. A special provision is made relating to the support level for extra long staple cotton.

PEANUTS

The act as finally approved makes no change as to acreage allomentt and penalties relating to peanuts.

RICE

The Secretary of Agriculture is directed to make a study of multiple-price systems as applied to rice and report to Congress thereon by March 1, 1955.

2. DAIRY PRODUCTS

No change is made in the support level—75 to 90 percent of parity as may be determined by the Secretary. The Secretary has set the dairy support level at 75 percent for the current marketing year. The Secretary is given authority to use any method he determines necessary to dispose of surplus stocks of dairy products now owned by the Commodity Credit Corporation. Up to $50 million annually for a 2-year period may be used by the CCC to increase the consumption of fluid milk by school children. Surplus dairy products may be distributed free to the armed services and veterans hospitals after they have purchased their usual quantities in the commercial markets. An accelerated brucellosis eradication program is authorized for the next 2 years. The Secretary also is directed to make a study of alternate dairy price support methods and report back to Congress on or before January 3, 1955.

3. WOOL

Use of incentive payments to producers for 4 years, beginning April 1, 1955, is authorized to support the price of wool at a level, up to 110 percent of parity, as the Secretary determines necessary to encourage an annual domestic production of approximately 300 million pounds of shorn wool. When such goal is reached, the price of wool is to be supported at such level between 60 and 90 percent of parity as the Secretary determines necessary to encourage 360 million pounds of wool annually. Pulled wool is to be supported at such level in relationship to the level for shorn wool as will maintain normal marketing practices. Support prices for mohair may deviate from the support price for shorn wool to the extent of 15 percent above or below the comparable percentage of parity at which shorn wool is supported. If approved by producers, deductions may be made from payments to finance advertising and sales promotion programs. Wool is added as a commodity which is subject to regulation under the Commodity Exchange Act.

4. HONEY AND TUNG NUTS

No change is made in these commodities which now have mandatory supports at 60 to 90 percent of parity. Under this authority the support price for honey is 70 percent for the current marketing year and for tung nuts 65 percent of parity.

5. ALL OTHER CROPS

No change is made in the discretionary power of the Secretary of Agriculture to support prices of other crops at 0 to 90 percent of parity, except that Irish potatoes are made eligible for support along with all other nonmandatory commodities at 0 to 90 percent. Under this authority these supports are in force for 1954: Barley, oats, rye, and sorghums for grain, 85 percent of parity; flaxseed, 70; soybeans, 80; dry edible beans, 80; cottonseed, 75; and crude pine gum, 90.

6. SET-ASIDE

Authority is provided for the Commodity Credit Corporation to set aside reserves up to a value of $2,500,000,000 from the present CCC stocks. The commodities in the set-aside may be disposed of for (a) foreign relief purposes, (b) developing new or expanded markets, (c) donation to school-lunch programs, (d) transfer to the national stockpile, (e) research, experimental, or educational purposes, (f) disaster relief purposes in the United States, (g) sales to meet the need for increased supplies, in which case the sales price shall be not less than 105 percent of parity. The commodities in the set-aside will be excluded from the computation of "carryover" for the purpose of determining the price support level, but will be included in the computation of the total supplies for the purpose of determining marketing quotas and acreage allotments.

The CCC shall, as rapidly as the Secretary of Agriculture shall determine to be practicable, set aside within its inventories not more than the following maximum quantities and not less than the following minimum quantities of agricultural commodities or products thereof heretofore or hereafter acquired by it from 1954 and prior years' crops and production in connection with its price-support operations:

Commodity	Maximum quantity	Minimum quantity
Wheat .... bushels..	500,000,000	400,000,000
Upland cotton .... bales..	4,000,000	3,000,000
Cottonseed oil .... pounds..	500,000,000	0
Butter .... do....	200,000,000	0
Nonfat dry-milk solids. do....	300,000,000	0
Cheese .... do....	150,000,000	0

7. MODERNIZED PARITY

Under existing law modernized parity will go into effect on wheat, corn, cotton, and peanuts for the crop year beginning January 1, 1956. On the basis of present price relationships, this would amount to a reduction in 1956 of 39 cents per bushel for wheat; 22 cents per bushel for corn; 1.8 cents per pound for cotton; and 2.8 cents per pound for peanuts. In order to prevent this abrupt drop, the present bill contains a transitional parity provision providing that the parity price shall be decreased only 5 percent per year until the gap between old parity and new parity is closed.

8. SUPPORT THROUGH PROCESSORS

Whenever price supports or surplus removal operations are carried out through purchases from, loans to, or payments to, processors the Secretary is required to obtain assurances that the producers of the agricultural commodities involved will receive the maximum benefits from the price support or surplus removal operations.

9. DIVERTED ACRES

The bill gives the Secretary no new or expanded authority to deal with diverted acres. However, in any programs for diverted acres, first, the Secretary may make his regulations applicable on an appropriate geographical basis; second, in semiarid or other areas where good husbandry requires maintenance of a prudent feed reserve, his regulations relating to diverted acres shall be administered in such manner as to permit the production of forage crops for storage and subsequent use in farm feeding operations; and, third, in areas declared to be disaster areas, the regulations shall be administered in such a manner as will most quickly restore the normal pattern of the agriculture of such areas.

10. ACP PAYMENTS

The agricultural conservation payment program is extended for 2 years. The legislation permits the Secretary to fix fair prices on conservation materials and services, although this is not mandatory as in existing legislation. Compliance with acreage allotments on basic crops is made a condition to eligibility for ACP payments, with the stipulation that this provision shall apply only to farmers who knowingly harvest crops in excess of their allotments, after a determination by the Secretary that a farmer's plantings are in excess of his allotment. The Secretary is required to give farmers a reasonable opportunity to get into compliance on plantings of basic crops if they are found to be in excess of allotments. Although application of this general provision on eligibility will not be possible in the current year, the provision relating to the opportunity of farmers to adjust their basic crops so as to comply with the acreage allotments will be effective for the 1954 crops which have not yet been harvested.

11. MARKETING AGREEMENTS

Producers of fruits and vegetables, in the new legislation, are permitted under marketing agreements to fix the type of package used. The legislation authorizes marketing orders to continue in operation during periods when the price of the regulated commodity is at or above parity. Grapefruit for canning or freezing is included in those commodities for which marketing orders may be issued. Funds collected under marketing agreements may be used for market research and development. Imported fruits and vegetables may be required to comply with the standards of maturity, size, and quality required in the marketing agreements adopted by domestic producers.

12. AGRICULTURAL ATTACHÉS

The new act provides for the establishment of a new and more effective representation of American agriculture and agricultural interests in our Embassies and missions abroad, by transferring the agricultural attachés from the jurisdiction of the Department of State to the Department of Agriculture.

The act provides that appointed employees and officers of the Department of Agriculture shall be regularly and officially attached to the diplomatic missions of the United States in foreign countries upon the request of the Secretary of Agriculture and the concurrence of the Secretary of State. Overseas agricultural representatives henceforward will be directly under the Secretary of Agriculture with respect to agricultural matters and their agricultural duties, and will make their reports directly to him. This should greatly improve the efficiency and value of our foreign agricultural representation.

13. TERMS OF COMMITTEEMEN

The Secretary of Agriculture is prohibited from imposing any limitation upon the number of terms for which members of the agricultural stabilization county committees may be reelected.

14. SALE OF CCC FEED GRAINS

The new act authorizes the Commodity Credit Corporation, for the period ending March 1, 1955, to sell feed grains it owns at the support price plus 10 percent at the point of storage. This temporarily relaxes a provision of the 1949 act prohibiting CCC from selling storable commodities into the commercial market at less than the current support price plus 5 percent plus a reasonable carrying charge. This is intended to make the feed grains available at a lower price to feeders who are unable to purchase the grains on the market except at prices above parity. A situation has developed in some parts of the Corn Belt in which farmers, fearful of the effects of the drought on this year's corn crop, are holding in storage their farm-stored stocks of corn.

AGRICULTURAL TRADE DEVELOPMENT AND ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1954, PUBLIC LAW 480

This act declares it to be the policy of Congress that America's abundance of food and fiber shall be managed to expand international trade, to promote the economic stability of agriculture in the United States and the national welfare, and to further this Nation's foreign policy.

It permits the President, to the extent of $300 million in the next 3 years, to furnish emergency assistance on behalf of the people of the United States to friendly peoples of other nations, for meeting famine and other urgent relief requirements.

It makes commodities available for relief distribution abroad by private nonprofit welfare organizations. It expands the availability of food for needy persons in the United States, for the school-lunch program, and for other nonprofit uses.

While opening our storehouses wider for distressed people in other countries, the act places particular emphasis on the expansion of foreign-trade outlets for our farmers. To develop the new markets, the act authorizes sales for the local currencies of other countries, under the specific safeguards that the President shall—

First. Take reasonable precautions to safeguard against displacement of usual marketings of the United States or friendly nations, and to assure insofar as practicable that sales will not disrupt world prices.

Second. Take appropriate steps to assure that private trade channels are used both with respect to sales from privately owned stocks and from stocks owned by the Commodity Credit Corporation, so far as practicable.

The $700 million authorized for the trade program will be employed to reimburse CCC for commodities taken out of CCC stocks, to convert to dollars the local currencies of other countries received by private American exporters for goods delivered abroad under this program, and in meeting other expenses of the program.

Definite stipulations are made for the use of foreign currencies, which accrue to the Government, including purchase of stockpile materials, procurement of military equipment, materials and services, purchase of goods or services for other friendly countries, increasing production for domestic needs in friendly countries, to pay United States obligations abroad, and encouragement of multilateral trade and economic development.

The legislation is intended to make the best possible use of the production of American farms that is beyond commercial demands.

Moreover, the Mutual Security Act of 1954 embraces an important provision relating to the disposition in other countries of the products of American farms. It earmarks $350 million for the purchase and export of surplus agricultural commodities to be sold for foreign currency rather than supplied on a grant basis. The foreign currency thus obtained will be spent to promote the objectives of the Mutual Security Act, but with particular emphasis on the purposes expressed in the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act which are in harmony with the Mutual Security Act.

DROUGHT AND DISTRESS IN THE LIVESTOCK INDUSTRY, PUBLIC LAW 115

In January 1953, the cattle industry was suffering severely from falling prices, and a few months later the stability of this great segment of agriculture encountered a more serious threat—the worst drought since 1936 that dried up the grazing lands of the Central and South Central States.

A subcommittee of the House Committee on Agriculture was constituted promptly and given the job of finding some remedy for the falling cattle prices.

This group called for an end of price controls on beef, which had been imposed during the Korean emergency. This was done with beneficial results to both producers and consumers of beef. The subcommittee then recommended: First, acceleration of purchase of beef for the Armed Forces; second, emergency credit for the producers; third, purchase of beef for the school lunch program; and fourth, management of the imports of beef in a manner not depressing to the price of domestically produced beef.

Administrative machinery was organized in the Department of Agriculture to direct a price stabilization program.

In the midst of this program the full force of the drought caused wide devastation. This called for new action expanding the emergency program already in operation.

Congress enacted Public Law 115.

This permitted loans to farmers and stockmen for any agricultural purpose within the drought disaster area if such disaster had caused a need for emergency credit that could not be met by normal credit sources.

This law authorized, for 2 years, loans to established ranchers and livestock producers anywhere in the country whose operations were jeopardized by economic conditions resulting from drought.

It authorized the Secretary of Agriculture to furnish feed and seed to distressed farmers, ranchers, or stockmen, within the disaster area.

As a result, the cattle price decline was checked, stability was restored to the livestock industry and beef consumption rose to a new high in the United States.

At present, drought conditions are again a serious problem and, using the authority already provided by Congress, assistance is being extended to the damaged areas.

In addition, going to the aid of farmers and ranchers in the duststorm areas of the Great Plains, Congress approved a special appropriation of $15,000,000 last spring to be used in defraying the cost of listing, chiseling and other measures taken to check wind erosion.

These emergency programs have relieved much of the distress of the Nation's farmers who have seen their pastures wither and their crops damaged or destroyed.

CONSERVATION (WATERSHEDS AND WATER FACILITIES)

The greatest contribution made by the 83d Congress to the long-range interest of Agriculture was in the field of conservation. The Congress responded fully, with major pieces of legislation, to the great and growing dedication of farmers to the conservation and improvement of the Nation's greatest resources—soil and water. The good effects of this legislation, in terms of food and clothing for the growing population will be felt by the generations that follow.

In addition to extending the existing agricultural conservation payment program, the Congress enacted these far-reaching measures:

THE WATERSHED PROTECTION AND FLOOD PREVENTION ACT, PUBLIC LAW 566

This act provides the legislative authority for attacking the problems of upstream soil and water conservatior and flood prevention, by concentrating the combined efforts of the Federal Government, States, counties, and other local government entities, soil conservation or watershed districts, and local citizens' groups. Costs will be shared by participants in proportion to the benefits to each. The program supplements both the present agricultural soil and water conservation programs and the programs for development and flood protection of major river valleys. It bridges the gap now existing between these two types of programs and will greatly enhance the ultimate benefits of both.

To be eligible for consideration under this act the size of the watershed cannot exceed 250,000 acres.

The initiative for all projects must come from people of the locality where the proposed program is to be carried out. The first step is the establishment in the local community of an organization—if such does not already exist—capable of acting as the sponsoring agency. Such local sponsoring organizations must be authorized by State law to carry out such works of improvement.

The next step is to make an outline of the general proposal for the project and submit this to the State or local representative of the Soil Conservation Service and to the governor of the State. If such application is not disapproved the Soil Conservation Service will assign technicians and other personnel to work with the local organization in making such surveys and studies as are necessary in working out detailed plans.

Conditions of eligibility for Federal aid include first, acquisition by the local organization of all land, easements, or rights-of-way necessary for the project; second, evidence that the local organization is willing and able to assume its proportionate share of the cost and to maintain and operate the improvements; third, assurances that landowners have acquired necessary water rights; and, fourth, agreements from owners of at least 50 percent of the land above each retention reservoir to carry out recommended soil-conservation measures and proper farm plans on their land.

EXTENSION OF WATER FACILITIES ACT, PUBLIC LAW 597

This act—

First. Expands the benefits of the old Water Facilities Act, now applicable only in the arid and semiarid areas, to the entire Nation and sets up a new system of Government-insured private loans, as well as direct loans from Federal appropriations, to finance these facilities. The old act has been operating in a limited area to finance such facilities as irrigation equipment, pumps, and wells. It has been of great assistance to many farms in the drought areas.

Second. Sets up a new system of direct Government loans and Government-insured private loans for general conservation work and development, including the improvement of farmland by soil or water conserving or drainage facilities, structures, or practices, improvement of soil fertility, establishment of improved permanent pasture, sustained yield afforestation or reforestation, or other erosion preventatives, and such other related measures as may be determined from time to time by the Secretary of Agriculture.

Loan limitations are set at $25,000 on the outstanding indebtedness to the United States of any individual farmer or rancher, and $250,000 in the case of an association or agency. This is applicable both to water facilities and to general conservation projects.

In addition to its great importance in advancing conservation work, the loan program should, first, materially assist in facilitating long-needed land-use adjustment, including the useful recovery of wornout croplands; second, aid substantially in bringing about desirable uses of acres diverted from production of surplus crops; and third, relieve the impact of drought conditions in various areas of the Nation.

The interest rates and the amount of insurance on loans will be fixed by the Secretary of Agriculture at levels intended to bring substantial private investments into the conservation and water facilities fields. The length of the loans will be adjusted to the repayment ability of individual borrowers. The program is administered by the Farmers' Home Administration.

The Watershed and Water Facilities Acts, combined with the programs now at work, should open a new era of effective conservation for the protection and improvement of the resources that will insure a future of continued abundance of food and fiber for America's growing population.

FARM CREDIT EXPANSION, PUBLIC LAWS 597, 521, 727, AND 255

The Congress opened the way for development through the Farmers' Home Administration of immense reservoirs of agricultural credit in the future. It expanded the authority for the Government to insure private loans, and authorized adjustments of interest rates to attract larger private investments in loans on farm properties and for farm improvements and operations.

The broadened field of operations in Public Law 597, which expands the Water Facilities Act, already has been discussed fully.

Public Law 521 amends the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act permitting the Farmers' Home Administration to make direct loans on the security of second mortgages where the combined value of the first and second mortgages does not exceed the value of the farm as certified by the county FHA committee. It permits the Secretary of Agriculture to increase the rate of interest to not to exceed 5 percent in the case of direct loans and to base interest of not in excess of a percent on insured mortgage loans. This act is intended to encourage private lenders to make more money available for agricultural loans.

Public Law 727 authorizes the Secretary, until June 30, 1955, to make emergency loans for any agricultural purpose, except for refinancing of existing indebtedness, and not to exceed an aggregate of $15 million, to farmers and stockmen in any area where the Secretary determines there is need for such credit which cannot be met for a temporary period from commercial banks, cooperative lending agencies, the Farmers' Home Administration under its regular programs or under the act of April 9, 1949, or other responsible sources. Such loans shall, first, be made only to individuals or partnerships actively engaged in the operation of farms or ranches and shall not exceed $15,000 in the case of any one loan and $20,000 to any one borrower; second, be made at such rates of interest and on such terms and conditions as the Secretary prescribes; and, third, be secured by the personal obligation and available security of the producer.

Public Law 255 amends the Government Corporations Appropriation Act so as to extend for 5 years, ending June 30, 1958, the authority for making loans to fur farmers, for the purpose only of making necessary supplemental advances to such farmers now indebted for loans made under previous authority.

COOPERATIVE FARM CREDIT SYSTEM IMPROVED, PUBLIC LAWS 202 AND 630

This system is farmer owned and controlled, being operated with advisory direction from the Farm Credit Administration which is an agency of the Government. It is an entirely separate operation from the Farmers' Home Administration which makes direct loans from appropriated funds for many farm purposes where private funds are not available and insures private loans in several fields.

The lending institutions of the Cooperative Farm Credit System are the Federal land banks which make long-term farm mortgage loans, the Federal Intermediate Credit Bank, production credit associations, and the banks for cooperatives which finance the operations of farmers' cooperative associations.

The 83d Congress enacted Public Law 202 providing for greater farmer ownership and control of the cooperative farm credit agencies. This legislation laid the groundwork for retirement of more Government capital in these agencies, directed the Farm Credit Administration to delegate to the various Federal land banks and other district credit agencies more duties and authority; established a 13-member Farm Credit Board with full responsibility for policies of the Farm Credit Administration; eliminated the offices of the Land Bank Commissioner, Production Credit Commissioner, Cooperative Bank Commissioner, and Intermediate Credit Commissioner, whose functions now are carried out under direction of a governor appointed by the 13-member Board; and transferred the Division of Cooperative Marketing to the direct control of the Secretary of Agriculture.

Public Law 630 amended the Farm Credit Act of 1933 to authorize issuance and sale of consolidated debentures of the 12 regional banks for cooperatives and the Central Bank for Cooperatives, such debentures to be joint and several obligations of the 13 banks and to be secured by the pledged of collateral consisting mainly of obligations taken by the banks in connection with their loans to farmers' cooperative associations.

EXTENSION SERVICE LAW STREAMLINED, PUBLIC LAW 83

By enactment of Public Law 83 Congress simplified and facilitated the work of the Extension Service. Ten separate laws relating to this important service, devoted to agricultural education, were consolidated and codified, incorporating the substance of the various later acts into the Smith-Lever Act which is the basic law authorizing extension work.

Moreover, the act broadens the language of the Smith-Lever Act to define cooperative agricultural extension work as embracing "the giving of instructions and practical demonstrations in agriculture and home economics and subjects relating thereto." The phrase "and subjects relating thereto" was added to make certain that the new act authorizes all those extension activities, such as 4-H Club work, education in rural health and sanitation, and similar aspects of the manifold extension program heretofore carried out under existing law.

The House Committee on Agriculture emphasized, in reporting this legislation to the House, that it is especially interested in seeing that 4-H Club work is expanded as rapidly as can be done.

The new act authorized the appropriation of such sums as are deemed necessary for operation of the overall program of the Extension Service.

CROP INSURANCE EXPANDED, PUBLIC LAW 261

Congress through Public Law 261 authorized the expansion of the Federal crop insurance program as the experience of the Crop Insurance Corporation and the desires of farmers for such insurance indicates the operations should be broadened.

The legislation will permit the writing of crop insurance in 100 additional counties each year. It set up for the first time standards to be followed by the Crop Insurance Corporation in expanding the program, to assure that insurance will be made available first to those crops and counties where it is most needed and where there is the soundest experience in this field.

This program now appears to be on the way to providing farmers generally with a sound and businesslike insurance against such hazards as weather and pests.

CONTINUED IMPORTATION OF FARM LABOR, PUBLIC LAWS 237 AND 309

Producers of many crops, particularly fruits and vegetables, made a showing that continued importation of farm labor is necessary to assure adequate help in tending and harvesting these crops. The first session of this Congress approved Public Law 237 extending for 2 years, to December 31, 1955, the program permitting Mexican nationals to enter the United States to work on farms. The farmer-employers pay for this labor.

When the second session of this Congress convened last January it then seemed that the United States and Mexico were unable to come to terms for continuation of this program, and that this source of farm labor might be closed. The Congress enacted Public Law 309 authorizing the Department of Labor to carry on its program of placing Mexican farmworkers in temporary agricultural jobs pending the negotiation of a new agreement or, if after every practicable effort it was found impossible to reach a new agreement, to continue the program in the absence of an agreement. However, a new agreement was signed shortly after the adoption of the resolution.

Mexican farmworkers now are employed on American farms, where American citizens are not available to do this work, and they enjoy protection as to wages and as to working and living conditions.

GRAIN STORAGE, PUBLIC LAW 287

Such is America's abundance of food as to create problems of storage. In the grain-producing regions our warehouses and bins were packed to overflowing.

Congress, by Public Law 287, moved to provide adequate storage by encouraging private investment in facilities. This law allowed accelerated amortization over a 5-year period, instead of 20 years, for tax-payment purposes in relation to investment in such facilities. Supplementing this action the Department of Agriculture made storage-use guaranties to responsible commercial firms, including cooperatives, in order to encourage the construction of additional commercial storage facilities for wheat, corn, rye, oats, barley, grain sorghums, flaxseed, and soybeans, in areas where additional facilities were needed.

WHEAT PROGRAM FACILITATED, PUBLIC LAW 117

Because of the accumulated surplus, wheat farmers faced a cut in their crop from 72 million acres in 1953 down to 55 million acres in 1954. It was generally agreed that such an abrupt cut would place too severe a strain upon the financial situation of farmers and upon the general economy of the wheat-producing regions.

Congress, by Public Law 117, amended the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 to provide an increase in the minimum national wheat allotment for 1954 from 55 million acres to 62 million acres.

This legislation also provided a reserve of not to exceed 1 percent of the national acreage allotment for distribution to new producing areas, and statutory recognition for the use of past acreage of wheat as a factor in making farm allotments.

COTTON PROGRAM ADJUSTMENTS, PUBLIC LAW 290

Similarly, cottongrowers were confronted with a cut from 25,284,600 acres in 1953 to 17,910,000 acres in 1954. This, too, would have meant a severe loss of income for farmers and a strain on the economy of the cotton-producing regions.

Congress passed Public Law 290, providing a minimum national cotton allotment of 21,379,000 acres in 1954.

This legislation also provided for special adjustment of allotments among the States, and to counties and individual farms. Provisions were made to prevent hardships and inequities in the assignments of acres. Certain long-range improvements were made in the cotton program.

REORGANIZATION AUTHORITY

Reorganization of the Department of Agriculture, to promote efficiency in its functions, was authorized by Reorganization Plan No. 2, which became effective June 4, 1953.

Two of the most important steps taken under this authority were: First, the placing of all domestic marketing activities in one agency—Agricultural Marketing Service; and, second, organization of the Foreign Agricultural Service, which revitalized the functions of the old Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations.

The Agricultural Marketing Service has brought together such closely related functions as crop, livestock, and price reporting; market news, inspection, and grading; agricultural economics and statistics; food-distribution programs; marketing agreements and orders; regulatory acts on marketing; and marketing research.

Prior to the reorganization, marketing research, for example, was scattered among five major agencies of the Department. Now it is centered in one division of the Agricultural Marketing Service where unified policies and procedures can be used to improve the effectiveness of the many research studies conducted within the Department and with public and private organizations.

The placing of all domestic marketing activities in one agency has enabled considerable expansion and improvement of the food-distribution programs of the Department, including the national school-lunch program, getting the surplus foods to needy persons, and the plentiful food program in which the agency works closely with the food trades to increase consumption of foods in plentiful supply.

The Foreign Agricultural Service has been strengthened, in preparation for important service in disposing of American farm products in foreign lands, with particular emphasis on developing new markets and offering various services to aid the people who are in the business of selling these products abroad. These functions should be aided materially by the transfer of the agricultural attachés from the jurisdiction of the Department of State to the Department of Agriculture.

These are the major specific provisions of Reorganization Plan No. 2:

First. Transferred to the Secretary of Agriculture all the functions not heretofore vested in him of all other officers, and of all agencies and employees of the Department of Agriculture, except the functions of hearings examiners, USDA corporations, the boards of directors and officers of such corporations, Commodity Credit Corporation's Advisory Board, the Farm Credit Administration or any agency, officer, or entity of the FCA;

Second. Provided for two additional Assistant Secretaries appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate;

Third. Provided for an Administrative Assistant Secretary appointed by the Secretary of Agriculture with the approval of the President;

Fourth. Authorized the Secretary to delegate to any other officer, agency, or employee any of his functions, including any transferred to him by the provisions of this plan;

Fifth. Required the Secretary to give appropriate advance public notice and afford opportunity for interested persons and groups to present their views on proposed major changes in organizations, or delegation of functions;

Sixth. Required the Secretary in delegating functions to simplify and make efficient the operation of the Department, to place the administration of farm programs close to State and local levels, and to adapt the administration of the Department's programs to regional State, and local conditions; and

Seventh. Authorized the Secretary to make incidental transfers within the Department of records, property, personnel, and so forth.

PUBLIC LAW 216 (FAMINE RELIEF) AND PUBLIC LAW 77 (PAKISTAN)

Early in the 1st session of the 83d Congress steps were taken to combat hunger and starvation in other nations.

Upon the request of the President, the Congress enacted Public Law 216, authorizing him to use stocks of agricultural commodities acquired by the CCC through price-support operations to relieve famine and other urgent relief requirements abroad.

This authority, running to March 15, 1954, provided such assistance up to a total of $100 million.

In the same spirit, the Congress enacted Public Law 77, making a gift of up to 1 million long tons of wheat, from CCC stocks, to the Government of Pakistan, to relieve starvation and mass suffering by famine.

PUBLIC LAW 30, INSURANCE

The Congress took an important step to expand exports of agricultural commodities, prior to enactment of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954. Through Public Law 30 it provided insurance for such commodities held in storage in friendly countries. The insurance protects the owners against loss or damage and is intended to encourage holding of these commodities nearer the foreign markets so that the exporters may have the advantage of prompt delivery in these markets.

PUBLIC LAW 180, INTERNATIONAL WHEAT AGREEMENT

By Public Law 180 the Congress extended the International Wheat Agreement. Through this agreement the nations arrange for orderly movement of this food grain between exporting and importing populations.

Moreover, in the interest of building foreign trade generally, the Congress extended the Reciprocal Trade Act under which this country, through trade agreements, seeks to lower the barriers to the interchange of goods among nations.

OTHER ACTS FOR AGRICULTURE AND RELATED ACTIVITY

To provide ample funds for the price-support operations authorized by law, the 83d Congress increased the borrowing authority of Commodity Credit Corporation from $6,750,000,000 to $8,500,000,000 and then to $10 billion.

Public Law 536 grants the approval and consent of Congress to the southeastern interstate forest fire protection compact, including the States of Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Virginia, and West Virginia.

Public Law 642 grants the consent and approval of Congress to the south central interstate forest fire protection compact, including the States of Arkansas, Louisiana, Mississippi, Oklahoma, and Texas.

The purpose of these two compacts is to promote effective prevention and control of firest fires in the southeastern and south central regions of the United States by the development of integrated forest fire plans, by the maintenance of adequate forest fire fighting services by the member States, by providing for mutual aid in fighting forest fires among the compacting States of the region and with States which are party to other regional forest fire protection compacts or agreements, and for more adequate forest protection.

Public Law 586 amends the authority of the Department of Agriculture to cooperate with States, and so forth, in the control and eradication of incipient and emergency outbreaks of insect pests and plant diseases and the use of the Department's contingency funds designated for such purposes, so as to permit use of the contingency funds for similar emergencies in Canada and Mexico. The new authority would be used only to carry out in such countries necessary measures to control incipient or emergency outbreaks of insect pests or plant diseases where immediate action is deemed necessary to eradicate, suppress, control, and prevent or retard the spread of such outbreaks into the United States.

Public Law 227 amends the act of May 29, 1884, which established the Bureau of Animal Industry, so as to provide for cooperation with States and political subdivisions in the eradication and control of scrapie and bluetongue of sheep.

Housing assistance.—The Congress extended for another year the farm-housing assistance program which provides financing, and grants in some cases, to qualified farmers unable to get housing loans from private lending sources.

MOVING FARM PRODUCTS

The 83d Congress authorized expenditures totaling $420 million during fiscal years 1956 and 1957 on farm-to-market roads. The previous Congress authorized a total of $330 million in fiscal years 1954 and 1955 for this purpose.

After many years of debate in Congress, the St. Lawrence seaway was approved. This should provide low water rates for the shipment of agricultural commodities from the Central States to world markets.

FARMERS' TAXLOAD LIGHTENED

Important changes were made in tax laws to ease the tax burdens on farmers, in addition to the general lowering of income and excise taxes for all taxpayers. These included:

First. The Internal Revenue Code was revised to permit farmers to charge off for income tax purposes the costs of certain soil and water conservation practices not heretofore deductible. This should be a substantial stimulus to conservation works. Previously such expenditures generally have been capitalized rather than deducted as current expenses. Under the new act farmers can count as current expenses their expenditures for soil and water conservation works such as leveling, grading, and terracing, contour furrowing, construction of diversion channels, drainage ditches and earthen dams, control and protection of water courses, outlets and ponds, eradication of brush, and planting of windbreaks.

Second. Depreciation allowances were liberalized, applying to all types of tangible depreciable assets, including farm equipment, machinery, and buildings. Henceforward the depreciation allowances will be considerably larger in the early years of the life of a property. The new method allows depreciation for tax-reporting purposes, of 40 percent of the cost of an asset in the first quarter of its service life and two-thirds of the cost in the first half of its life. This faster tax writeoff will increase available working capital. Farmers particularly have a vital stake in a more liberal depreciation policy. They are especially dependent on their current earnings or short-term loans to obtain funds for expansion. The faster recovery of capital investment provided by the new act will permit them to get short-term loans which otherwise would not be available.

Third. The principle of involuntary conversion is extended for farmers. Property involuntarily converted through fire, storm, and so forth, previously has gotten the tax advantage of not having to report gain if the insurance or other proceeds exceed the basis of the property—if the property is replaced. The new law embraces two additional types of losses as involuntary conversion: First, sale of property lying within an irrigation project that is sold to conform with acreage limitations of Federal reclamation laws and, second, livestock lost by disease or sold or exchanged due to disease.

Fourth. Accelerated amortization, for tax reporting, of storage facilities, already discussed under "Grain storage."

SOCIAL SECURITY FOR FARMERS

The 83d Congress extended social security—old-age retirement benefits and insurance protection for the family—to 3,300,000 farm operators. The program has been in operation for some 18 years for industrial workers.

The coverage for farm operators becomes effective January 1, 1955, but the first payment on the social-security taxes will not fall due until April 15, 1956. The program will apply to all farm operators with net earnings of $400 or more annually.

As in the case of other persons in the program, a farmer reaching the age of 65 will be entitled to monthly payments ranging between $30 and $108.50 a month, if he is single, or $45 to $162.80 monthly, if his wife is 65 or older. The actual level of payments, between the figures mentioned, depends upon the level of the individual farmer's earnings upon which he paid social-security taxes before he reached 65.

If a farmer dies before 65 and leaves a widow and 1 child under 18, these survivors will receive between $48 and $162.80 monthly. The benefits can go up to $200 a month if there are several children below 18.

To qualify for these benefits, farmers through 1959 will pay as social-security taxes 3 percent of their net earnings between $400 and $4,200. Thus the annual social-security tax for a farmer with net income of $400 will be $12. This will be progressively larger up to a tax of $126 annually for farmers with net earnings of $4,200 or more. As with all other persons in the program, the tax rate will increase slightly in 1960. A simplified method of paying the social-security taxes is provided for farmers.

The new act also covers 2,100,000 additional farmworkers. Some regularly employed farmworkers were brought into the program in 1951.

Commenting on the extension of coverage of farm operators and farmworkers, the House Committee on Ways and Means said:

> With extension of old-age and survivors insurance coverage to farmers and farmworkers, far more of these workers will be qualified for benefits under old-age and survivors insurance and thus have less need of old-age assistance. Another advantage of extending coverage to these and other groups now outside the system is that not only more of the aged but also more of the young widows and children will be receiving benefits without a means test. Accordingly, these old-age and survivors insurance beneficiaries are able to maintain a sense of their own continued independence and of their dignity and worth as individuals, even though their support from earnings has been cut off by the retirement or death of the insured worker. The knowledge that benefits will be paid irrespective of whether the individual is in need, supports and stimulates his own thrift and initiative, since he can add his personal savings (including homeownership and insurance) as well as pensions he may receive as a result of his work, to the basic old-age and survivors insurance benefits.

FUNDS FOR AGRICULTURE

The 83d Congress, in its two sessions, approved appropriations and loan authorization aggregating $2,778,400,000 for the Department of Agriculture, exclusive of the actions restoring the capital of the Commodity Credit Corporation. The previous Congress authorized $2,483,500,000 for the Department.

Liberal appropriations and authorizations were approved for research, education, and soil- and water-conservation programs.

A compilation of House Committee on Appropriations figures showed specific appropriations and authorizations of the 83d Congress and the comparative figures for the previous Congress as follows: Research—83d $129,600,000, 82d $112,100,000; REA electric facilities—83d $270 million, 82d $150 million; REA rural telephones— 83d $150 million, 82d $60,200,000; Farmers' Home Administration loan authorizations—83d $330 million, 82d $317 million; and Extension Service—83d $78,800,000, 82d $67,100,000.

Funds provided by the 83d Congress enabled marked progress in rural electrification and rural telephone service. Reporting on REA during the 1954 fiscal year, the Department of Agriculture noted an increase in rural electrification loan volume, a reduced backlog of loan applications and increased power consumption by farmers. In the rural telephone program, the Department reported that during the past year telephone borrowers completed more cutover to modern dial service, built more miles of new lines and connected more subscribers than during the 4 previous years combined.

ECA Farm Surplus Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. GWINN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include in the RECORD a letter received from Albert Fotino, business agent, local 42, International Union of United Brewery, Flour, Cereal, Soft Drink, and Distillery Workers of America. Mr. Fotino deplores the fact that certain efforts our Government is making to help our needy friends abroad are, unfortunately, having a bad effect on our economy at home, and he cites specifically actual job losses at Standard Brands, Inc., Peekskill, N. Y., in my district. Mr. Fotino's letter follows:

PEEKSKILL, N. Y., *August 6, 1954.*

Congressman RALPH W. GWINN,
Old House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN GWINN: The membership of local 41, International Union of United Brewery, Flour, Cereal, Soft Drink, and Distillery Workers of America, CIO, whose members work at Standard Brands, Inc., Peekskill, N. Y., strongly urges that you employ all honorable means on behalf of many of your constituents, either through the Committee on Labor or other appropriate committee or agency, to study the effects of the ECA farm surplus program.

According to the limited facts at our disposal, it has all the appearances of "a grand swindle," not only an imposition and burden on the taxpayers, but also responsible for actual job losses in this particular plant. Further, it is a cancer on the American free enterprise system; it gnaws at our economic structure and destroys the American principle of self-initiative.

We are particularly concerned over the loss of five jobs and the actual abolition of the industrial alcohol production department in this plant. We have reason to believe that the ECA's use of farm surplus grain, in particular, to aid the French people in Europe and/or her possessions elsewhere, is directly responsible.

As we understand it, this is what is happening:

Our Government buys at the taxpayers' expense surplus grain from the farmers to maintain certain price levels.

Our Government then stores this grain at the taxpayers' expense also.

Then the ECA ships this grain, again at the taxpayers' expense, to France and her possessions to aid the needy and less fortunate.

Up to this point this is a costly subsidization program. All of it at the taxpayers' expense, with the very same taxpayer forced to pay higher prices for food at home to keep this farm surplus program in effect.

Now, to continue, our major problem begins with these next few steps:

The ECA consigns these shipments to free nations primarily to feed the starving. We have no quarrel with this humanitarian principle.

But, as we have been informed, the French Government uses our grain to feed the starving. In turn, the French Government takes its own production of grain, beet and cane sugar, or similar products, and uses them for the production of industrial alcohol, in this instance for export.

And because of low tariff rates this industrial alcohol can be bought cheaper by importation than if produced here. This alcohol was, in effect, produced from the grain produced for the French Government, which did not need it for its people, because it gets enough for that purpose gratis from the American taxpayers.

Thus, five taxpayers working in this plant who paid their share to buy the surplus grain, to store the surplus grain, and to ship the surplus grain, are now unemployed.

Likewise, an industrial department was abolished.

This adds up to unemployment and it forces a manufacturer out of this phase of operation.

Morally and spiritually, we accept our obligations to help other free nations with food, clothing, and other essentials. But when such a program backfires on our economy and own well-being, we must rise in protest.

We de not believe ours is an isolated case; it is more the example than the exception. It is conceivable that this practice has cost many jobs across the Nation over and above the cost of financing the farm-subsidy program.

The French Government profits through its subsidization of the industrial alcohol production at the expense of our subsidization of farm surpluses.

If the French have enough grain to feed their own people, why do we ship more grain for their use, grain which, in effect, provides an excess of the product which is converted into a product resold to our own people cheaper than we can produce it ourselves even with our own grain?

The tariff question, too, plays as large a part in this situation as does subsidization.

The American taxpayer needs relief from whatever corner it comes. Congress has the responsibility to enact legislation which is fair and just, protective and honorable. Neither the Congress nor the American people must shirk our responsibility in combating Communist infiltration and domination by helping other free nations. But, if such a practice as described in this letter continues, unemployment rises at home and more people here become ripe for the American brand of communism.

We, of local 42, respectfully urge that your office exert all influence necessary to correct this particular situation if the American system of free competition and free enterprise is to survive. We would appreciate an explanation from any authority on the subject, and we will be grateful for clarification and any elaboration of the basic facts as we have presented them.

Respectfully submitted.

ALBERT FOTINO,
Business Agent, Local 42, Peekskill, N. Y.; Also Member, Executive Board, International Union of United Brewery, Flour, Cereal, Soft Drink, and Distillery Workers of America, CIO.

(Copies to: Senator IRVING M. IVES, Senator HERBERT H. LEHMAN.)

The Communist Party and the Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have an article written by Charles E. Wyzanski, Jr., judge of the United States District Court of Massachusetts, entitled "The Communist Party and the Law," printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. The article appeared in the Atlantic Monthly in May 1951.

Judge Wyzanski is a noted jurist and democratic philosopher. He has previously served as secretary to Judge Augustus Hand and special assistant to the Attorney General of the United States.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE COMMUNIST PARTY AND THE LAW

(By Judge Charles E. Wyzanski, Jr.)

I

This is a time of trial for Americans. For some few it has been a period of public probing of what they personally believed and with whom they associated. For all it has been and is a time of trial in the religious sense—the occasion for self-scrutiny and for the choice of ground on which to take a final stand.

From the outset of our history the American has declared that his is the open mind. Now he is called upon to look at what has been uncovered by a series of dramatic Federal trials involving Communist activities in the United States and by the even more informative 1946 Canadian investigation, and to ask himself just where he stands on the future status of the Communist Party of America and on its relation to the perennial problems of allegiance, loyalty, security, and liberty.

In one sense, none of these issues is new. During the more than 30 years since the Russian Revolution there have been sporadic legal efforts to checkmate the growth and spread of communism within our land. From the days of the First World War State authorities sought to bring the movement within the cover of legislation usually designed to reach other forms of political danger such as anarchy, syndicalism, or even slave rebellion. Simultaneously in these three decades Congress has been moving step by step to close the net by successive enactments specifically aimed, though in circuitous language, at the Communist Party. In 1918 congressional concern reached only aliens seeking the privileges of immigration and naturalization. In 1939 it covered persons holding public office. In 1940 it led to novel additions to the criminal law. In 1947 it included labor leaders. In 1950 it embraced every member of the party, all who mailed its literature, and all who came under its dominance.

Though each of these advances in minatory legislation evoked wide attention, there was little in the way of fresh domestic evidence to consider until the Canadian investigation, the recent trials, and the reports of the President's Loyalty Board created in 1947. Up to then the alert American could reasonably contend that in the period since the 1920's there had been laid before him few facts which were both new and adequately authenticated. That plea is no longer available to him. And if he is to be true to himself, he must now candidly and courageously check the drift of his arguments in the light of the disclosed dangers.

For a generation we have been warned that the Communists are not a legitimate political party. The thrust of this charge has not been directed at the Communists' ultimate economic, political, or religious goals. In short, it is not a condemnation of radicalism as such. It has been an indictment of the immediate means they use to reach what they regard as utopia. Perjury, espionage, sabotage, and violence stand at the head of the list. And those specifications are rounded out by the catchall condemnatory phrase "unconstitutional methods."

A frequent reply has been that this indictment confused fulmination and prophecy with fact and plan. Defenders of the party admitted that its manifestoes were filled with revolutionary rhetoric but asked where was the evidence that in any concrete instance the party's members and supporters had been the first to cross the lines of conduct permitted under law. Radical might be their belief but righteous was their behavior.

This defense has been, or so it seems to me, in at least two vital points adequately disproved.

From many witnesses we have the most circumstantially buttressed testimony that the American Communist Party as an organization has acted as the belt for the transmission from this country to the U. S. S. R. of documents held in trust for the United States. Without directly or by implication expressing any opinion upon the guilt of Alger Hiss or William Remington, or any individual whose case is still under judicial consideration, every fairminded person must concede that Chambers, Wadleigh, Bentley, Fuchs, and Gold—to cite only the most prominent—have used the apparatus of the American Communist Party to "defraud the United States" by depriving it of its secrets, not to mention, in some cases, the honest services of its employees. These have not been casual unrelated transactions. They have been part of a system which, though it certainly was not known to every member of the Communist Party, was more than a miscellaneous collection of isolated episodes of misguided zeal.

In addition to the pattern of espionage, we find beyond cavil a pattern of planned perjury. Here it is of the highest importance to make a sharp distinction. No one mindful of the history of political and religious liberty would charge with perjury a sincere heretic on the mere basis of his heterodoxy. Honest conflict on fundamental values must be tolerated unless we are to betray the heritage of western liberty. Even in those cases where we suspect that a revolutionary is not only misguided but insincere in his rejection of orthodoxy, we should hesitate to charge him with fraud. In matters of religious and political belief the best—some might say the only satisfactory—proof of insincerity must come from a man's own explicit admission.

But in the case of the Communists the problem is not whether they sincerely believe their gospel. It is whether they respect their legal duty truthfully to answer relevant questions put to them by duly constituted authorities. Browder, Chambers, Bentley, and numerous witnesses in the long trial before Judge Medina have given abundant examples of the Communists' tactic of telling what they knew were material falsehoods under oath to public officials authorized to issue passports, address interrogations, or make other lawful inquiries. Again, we need not say—and I for one do not suppose—that every member of the Communist Party agreed to follow a superior's direction to commit perjury whenever it was in the party's interest. Yet the record shows that the use of perjury was a frequent and approved tactic of party members and followed directly upon the express teachings of their literature. Thus the only inference which seems to me reasonable is that the use of perjury is a means which the party has officially accepted.

II

Now I come to what is a much more debatable problem. Does the Communist Party in America seek the overthrow of our Government by force and violence? The critical nature of this issue is obvious. If this is one of the means used by the party, it is the most dangerous imaginable. It would present a peril far transcending a pattern of espionage and a pattern of perjury. Moreover, this is the specific means which Congress has selected for emphasis in the statutes to which I previously referred. And it is the charge which Judge Medina's jury considered and found proven.

There is evidence that the 60,000 American Communists are an army indoctrinated with the belief that at an appropriate day they must seize the power of the state, habituated to conspiratorial (if lawful) practices of meeting secretly and disguising their thoughts in Aesopian language, disciplined to respond to the orders of a foreign hostile government, and articulated into a world organization which has already been engaged in military battle with American forces.

Let us not dispute the evidence. It is more important to decide whether such evidence is enough to satisfy the standards of liberty to which we have pledged "our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor." Is articulation into a hostile power's organism the equivalent of armament upon our own shores? Have the Communists in America taken le premier pas qui coûte as surely as the would-be murderer has when he takes his gun from the shelf and enters his would-be victim's home? The greatest of living American jurists, Judge Learned Hand, has given an affirmative answer. Considering "the gravity of the 'evil' discounted by its improbability," he has concluded that a democracy faithful to the canons of freedom has the legal right to convict the leaders of the Communist Party of advocating the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force and violence.

Yet the answer does not satisfy all fair-minded critics. Some of them turn to the earlier opinions on free speech of Julge Hand himself, of Justice Holmes, of Justice Brandeis, and of the majority of the Supreme Court in the Herndon case decided in the 1930's and the Schneiderman and Bridges cases decided in the 1940's. From those sources they derive the teaching that neither political speech nor political organization is punishable as a crime unless the surrounding circumstances show that there is a strong probability that such speech or organization will cause violence within the United States before there is either repentance, or change of heart—as a result of discussion, or alteration of the surrounding circumstances, or resort to legal remedies less drastic than the criminal law. If this be the test, then these critics say it was not met by the evidence of the conduct of the American Communist Party at least in the 1940's.

This fundamental disagreement is likely to find its echo in our highest tribunal. Moreover, there are policy reasons why we should hesitate to outlaw the Communist Party for purely political crimes.

Unlike the problems of perjury and espionage, the problem of alleged incitement to political violence is one of the most difficult issues for courts, for juries, and for executive authorities to handle dispassionately.

Moreover, those who contend that the Communist Party of America is a disciplined battalion, ready to use force, are apt to rely for proof on the asserted loyalty of the American Communists to the U. S. S. R. and its interests. Despite the force of the contention that our domestic Communists have a divided loyalty and have been up to now slavishly responsive to the nod of a government that shows us marked hostility, there is grave danger in deciding that an American is a criminal because he has a sympathetic attachment to a foreign power currently unfriendly toward the United States and is in organizations affiliated with that power. To be sure, in time of war there is a risk that such a devotee may become our enemy. Yet the magnitude of the risk should be tested by our experience during the Second World War with those Nisei and first-generation Japanese-Americans who were in racial and political clubs with strong Japanese ties.

III

It is not then solely for legal reasons that I leave aside the charge regarding incitement to violence and confine myself to the evidence of espionage and perjury. On that evidence alone can we escape the conclusion that those who control the Communist Party and use it as their instrument have sought and still seek to achieve political ends by means that are unlawful under the ordinary criminal law of the land? If Robin Hood and Little John, having the laudable political platform of a more equitable division of the world's goods than society now provides, organize a group of men of like view and then proceed to rob Peter of his cloak in order to keep Paul warm, Robin Hood and Little John are indictable not merely for common-law robbery but also (if Peter and Paul are in Federal territory) for conspiracy under a Federal statute enacted two generations ago. The purpose is laudable but the means are criminal. By parity of reasoning, if those who control the Communist Party agree to commit perjury before Federal agencies and to deprive the Federal Government of its secrets or of the faithful service of its employees, they are personally guilty under the Federal conspiracy statute of 1909.

Of course, men who joined Robin Hood's band on the theory that it was a debating society or a club for the preservation of fish and game did not by such action become guilty of abetting robbery or joining a conspiracy. By hypothesis they were innocent of their fellows' plan to do wrong. And they could not properly be convicted of crime for their original action. However, if, after the courts had convicted a dozen of the top men in Robin Hood's company and the trials had exposed the unlawful means used by the band, one who knew of these facts continued to adhere to the organization by membership, or by financial support or other material assistance, it would be difficult to resist the inference that he had conspired in connection with any subsequent similar robberies perpetrated by the band.

Would there be any difference in the status of those who chose to remain members in or give material assistance to the Communist Party after it became apparent to them that those in control of that party regularly furthered its purposes by criminal means? Logically I see no difference. But before the doctrine is applied the Government of the United States should set forth in clear terms a statement, buttressed by incontrovertible examples, of the grounds on which it has concluded that those directing the Communist Party have with regularity used means that are unlawful under Federal statutes. The Government should then state that anyone who thereafter remains a member of or gives material support to the party will be subject to prosecution as a coconspirator.

Such an announcement (without immunizing those who had already committed perjury or espionage) would segregate those who had been duped in the past from others who gave continued conscious adherence. Even after this segregation, a discriminating prosecutor before initiating a presentment would no doubt carefully inquire as to the moral culpability of any potential defendant. Some who knowingly give material support to wrongdoers are more properly regarded as victims of folly or of economic circumstances than as abettors of crime.

The program that I have suggested offers these advantages.

It places the Communist Party within the context of the normal substantive criminal rules. This to a large extent forestalls any criticism that we are stretching our law to condemn our political opponents. And it does much to quiet the debate which has accompanied the special legislation of the last decade.

It assures the application to suspected Communists of the familiar procedure of the common law. This implies all the safeguards of the Bill of Rights and the protection inherent in open examination and cross-examination.

In recognizing that communism in America has been not a mere heresy but a criminal conspiracy and in proceeding accordingly, we return to our traditional American doctrine that heresy itself is lawful. If there is no resort to unlawful means, an individual or group may entertain any religious or political doctrine, no matter how radical. When we did not sharply distinguish between the objectionable goals of the Communist Party and the criminal means, support appeared for the notion that the liberties of speech and organization are available only to those who themselves believe so mightily in freedom that they would be prepared, were they in power, to accord freedom to their opponents. Here was a revival in modern dress of the indefensible proposal by John Locke to deny toleration to Catholics. And if the notion had been permanently incorporated in our political thought, it would have undermined the very bases of our Constitution. We shall be better off to return to the formula that belief is free, behavior alone is regulated.

Another important advantage of the proposed program is that it strengthens the moral fiber both of innocent past associates of the Communist Party and of the rest of us. The person who previously associated with the party and has remained innocent of individual participation in espionage and perjury is encouraged to break his dangerous ties. He is told that he will be prosecuted only if he adheres in the future. The rest of us are reminded of our spiritual obligation as well as our civic duty to join in the condemnation of what is incontrovertibly wicked. To use espionage and perjury or any other criminal means in order to achieve even a praiseworthy end cannot be defended unless we are prepared to accept the most subversive of all theories—that the end justifies the means.

The most significant byproduct of the proposed program remains to be considered. For a decade we have been wrestling with what is loosely called the loyalty problem. We have set up special licensing systems to test the loyalty of Government employees, union leaders, university teachers, lawyers, broadcasters, and other special classes. These systems seem to me to have confused our proper concern with four different matters: the lawful conduct of the individual, his allegiance, his loyalty, and the safety of the state.

To isolate the Communist Party as a criminal conspiracy is the first step in straightening out our thinking. Membership in or support of that party or any successor so long as it regularly uses unlawful means warrants penal sanctions no matter who the offender is or what may be his occupation. It is irrelevant that he is an alien or a citizen, a professor or a labor leader, a government clerk or a motion-picture actor. It is the right and duty of the state to punish him. To hand his entire case over to an administrative agency or a private employer trivializes the offense, places in the wrong hands the problem of ascertaining guilt, and establishes inadequate sanctions.

Our country has, and always has had, in time of peace as in time of war, the right to the allegiance of all our citizens and all who seek our protection. The freeman is a descendant of the Saxon "ledig" and from him takes the obligation of allegiance. Like him, he has the duties, first, of giving and of swearing obedience to the laws and, second, of rejecting the political authority of any foreign prince or potentate. A man is not false to his duty of allegiance and is not unattached to the principles of our Constitution because he has an abiding interest in the culture or ideals of a foreign land or in philosophical, religious, political, or economic views not shared by a majority of Americans. Indeed the peculiar strength of our national fabric has come from an unprecedented diversity of strands.

Loyalty is a moral, not primarily a legal, relationship. It is a free-will offering to authority not because it is powerful, but because it is worthy. This is not to deny that there are areas in which the state for its own safety should inquire with painstaking care into the loyalty and other moral qualifications of persons placed in trust. In those particular posts either in or out of the Government service where there are secrets which must be kept secure, it is the proper concern of the Government to see that only men of responsibility and reliability are trusted. Where such offices are in question, the inquiry may justifiably extend into the uttermost corners of a candidate's career, beliefs, and associations. For safety is the first law of every state.

Yet positions which have this type of security risk are also often positions which can best be filled by men of original creative power. Here we frequently deal with that type of man who tends to be unconventional in many aspects of life, not merely in his own specialized area. And if what we seek is the maximum gain to the state, we must be sure that we weigh from its point of view the advantage of attracting that man and his ilk against the risk that he and his kind will, by indiscretion or worse, betray the state. Balancing such interests is a task of utmost delicacy. The best performances in appraising employees have been rendered by those agencies, such as the Atomic Energy Commission, which have approached the problem of security as a specialized managerial problem. The lesson is that persons familiar with the requirements and risks of a particular assignment are the best fitted to consider whether a given individual should be offered, or retained in, employment.

Certainly there is no retraction of the promise of American life in the adoption of a sound managerial system for scrutinizing public and private employees engaged in security jobs in sensitive areas. Here, as in the forthright condemnation of the Communist Party's use of criminal means, the American remains true to what he has always professed. Has not the believer in our constitutional system always said that it was not only possible but desirable to deal with domestic dangers within the framework of the ordinary law? Has he not repeated that liberty historically and pragmatically has always placed its primary emphasis on procedure? For is not the difference between despotism and freedom a difference in means—a distinction not between benevolence and malice but between arbitrariness and due process?

Our Current Farm Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS A. BURKE

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. BURKE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement prepared by me regarding our current farm program.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President, any farm program that is devised must meet the test of being good for the country as a whole and fair to the farmers. Judged by this standard, it is my opinion that neither the 75 percent to 90 percent of parity flexible supports nor the firm 90 percent of parity supports program is fully adequate or satisfactory.

Prices received by farmers dropped 20 percent since 1951.

The net incomes of farmers dropped 13 percent in the 2 years 1952 and 1953. According to official United States Department of Agriculture estimates just released, net income of farmers in 1954 will be 17 percent lower than in 1951.

The per capita income of nonfarm people in 1952 was $1,842. Farmers in that year, when farm prices averaged 100 percent of parity, received per capita incomes of slightly less than half of the national average for nonfarm people—only $905 per person, or 49 percent of the average per person income of nonfarm people. The average income of farm people was only $882 per person in 1953, only 46 percent of the average of $1,898 per person received by nonfarm people in that year, when farm prices had dropped to 92 percent of parity.

This very pronounced disparity between the incomes of farm people and others will be widened even farther in 1954, with farm prices now running below 90 percent of parity and smaller marketings due to drought and acreage reductions.

Obviously, farmers are not now receiving their fair share of the national income.

Moreover, dropping farm prices and farmers' incomes are seriously injuring our whole economy. Historical evidence proves that national depressions have always been led by farm depressions.

Farm prices dropped below 100 percent parity at the end of 1952. For about 1 year the rest of the economy continued to prosper. One year ago only 1.8 percent of the American labor force was unemployed. But about that time the fall-off in purchasing power of farmers began to show up in the rest of the economy. It is easy to understand what happened. Farmers quit buying farm machinery and household appliances and conveniences and other things that they could put off. Declining sales to farmers created cuts in the buying power of those industries dependent upon the farm market, which in turn resulted in further cuts in overall purchasing power. Unemployment has tended to increase steadily since last fall, fluctuating as high as 6 percent, and now stands at over 5 percent of the labor force. The Nation will lose an estimated $31 billion in lost production this year as a result of our failure to maintain full employment and full consumption. That's about half as much as the entire Federal budget. It is about as much as the entire cost of our national-defense program this year.

REDUCED PRICE SUPPORTS NOT THE ANSWER TO OVERPRODUCTION, ELIMINATION OF GOVERNMENT CONTROLS, OR CONSUMER PRICES

Lower price supports will not cure the so-called overproduction problem. Surpluses were not created by 90-percent supports in the first place. The tremendous needs of our Nation for food during the war did that. High wartime prices encouraged farmers to expand their productive ability, and good incomes made it possible for them to obtain the fertilizer, machinery, and improved practices to do so. In addition, the Government appealed to farmers to produce more food needed to supply our fighting men and our allies, and farmers responded with their characteristic patriotism. While other industries were granted enormous subsidies totaling some $45 billion in the form of tax write-offs, free or below-cost plants, etc., farmers were given nothing beyond the promise of 90 percent parity supports as protection against disastrous losses resulting from their increased productivity.

We have our present surplus problem because our farm productivity was geared up beyond our present market demands to meet the needs of wartime, we have had several unusually good crop years in a row, and we have lost some of our wartime foreign markets. Lower price supports will not reduce production. If anything, they will force farmerse to produce more intensively than ever in order to meet their high and rigid operating costs.

GOVERNMENT CONTROLS

Nor will reduced price supports avoid Government controls on farmers. The administration has already demonstrated that the reduced price supports going into effect next year won't cut production, by ordering the most extreme Government restrictions on farmers in history into effect next year along with their reduced supports.

CONSUMER PRICES

Nor will reduced price supports cut the price of finished products to consumers. While prices received by farmers dropped 20 percent in the past 3 years, the cost of food to consumers has remained almost unchanged at close to the all-time record high. The House Committee on Agriculture, in its official report, on Farm Prices and the Cost of Food, July 23, 1954, stated: "Thus far, almost none of the lower prices received by farmers since 1951 has been passed on to consumers in the form of lower retail food prices." Although we had the so-called rigid price supports in effect, the spread between farm income and consumer costs continued to widen—and was emphasized by the consistency of gradualness.

This further cut in farm prices and farm income will be a serious blow to family-sized farmers. It will be most dangerous in respect to those young farmers—many of them war veterans—who are just getting started, under a heavy burden of debts, high-priced land, livestock, and equipment, and high-operating costs.

An individual farmer has only to compare the different support price levels to see what the administration's program will mean to his income. Ninety percent of parity for wheat is $2.23 per bushel; for corn it is $1.62 per bushel; for manufacturing milk it is $3.74 per hundredweight. Those are the support prices that are in effect, excepting for milk, before Secretary Benson's reductions take effect next year. Milk supports were set at 90 percent of parity for last year, but Mr. Benson chose to support the price only at 84 percent of parity. He has cut milk supports to 75 percent of parity for this year, but prices received by farmers have ranged between 72 percent and 74 percent of parity ever since.

Next year the support price floor will drop to $2.05 per bushel for wheat and $1.48 per bushel for corn. The law requires that milk prices be supported at not less than 75 percent of parity, but Secretary Benson has juggled the parity computation for manufacturing milk so as to permit him to cut the actual support price by another 15 cents per hundredweight, to $2.99 per hundredweight.

In 1956 additional sharp cuts in the price support floors for both wheat and corn are provided for by the administration's flexible supports law. The support floor in 1956 will drop to 75 percent of parity, and, in addition, parity itself will be cut by 5 percent. The resulting support price floors will therefore be $1.76 per bushel for wheat and $1.28 per bushel for corn.

How can anyone maintain that such drastic reductions in farm prices and incomes, below present levels that are already so low as to be causing grave injury to the national economy, will be in the national interest I simply ask each of my farm readers to apply these reduced price floors to his own situation, consider the extent to which they will cut his own purchasing power, and then consider the effect upon overall employment and economic well-being of similar cuts spread generally throughout the Nation's agriculture.

The Joint Committee on the Economic Report, comprised of 7 Senators and 7 Representatives of both parties, voted almost unanimously in the last session that such a policy would be extremely dangerous to the national economy under present conditions. I agree wholeheartedly with the opinion of this distinguished committee. For that reason, and because I think such a cut in farm income would be manifestly unfair to the Nation's farmers, I voted against the substituting of the flexible program for 90 percent of parity supports.

SUGGESTED PROCEDURE

Instead of proceeding in the dangerous direction of lower farm income, it is my opinion that the shortcomings of the rigid 90 percent of parity supports program should be carefully and fully explored and remedial measures applied gradually.

Erie Airport Gets Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARROLL D. KEARNS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to comment on the sound judgment and foresight shown by the 83d Congress in restoring to the supplemental appropriation bill $22 million for furthering the development of private airports in the United States.

I am particularly interested because the Port Erie Airport which serves the area embracing the third largest city in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania will be the recipient of over $300,000 of this fund to improve its facilities.

This appropriation will make possible the construction of additional runways sufficiently long and properly conditioned to accommodate four-motored planes, which to date have been unable to land at Port Erie.

My good constituents of the 24th District of Pennsylvania, and particularly those of Erie County, join with me in expressing appreciation and tribute to my colleagues for recognizing Port Erie as one of the vital air centers of the United States.

The Essentials of Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT CROSSER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Speaker, many times during my life as a legislator I have been asked what principles and procedure must be observed at all times in order to assure the existence and continuance of truly democratic government.

First of all, the meaning of the term "democracy" in itself is very significant. The word is derived from two Greek words—"demos" meaning "people," and the verb "kratein," meaning "to rule." The combination of the two words into the English word "democracy" means "the rule of the people."

Our Federal Government functions entirely through the agency of elected representatives. Many of the State governments have, however, made it possible for the will of the people to prevail regardless of the arbitrary decisions of the representatives of such State governments. In such States, the lawmaking power, when exercised by the duly elected representatives, is subject to control by the direct vote of the people, and in many States the power of removal or recall is reserved to the people themselves, so that in the true sense of the word, real democracy prevails in such States. The lawmaking branch of the Government, of course, is the policymaking branch. In Ohio, however, the action of the legislature in passing a law which is not in harmony with public sentiment, can be reversed.

The filing of a petition, with the secretary of state, signed by the legally required number of voters, demanding a popular vote on such law assures a vote by the people themselves at the following general election on the question of approving or disapproving the measure passed by the legislature. If the majority of the people vote against the measure submitted to the referendum vote then the action of the legislature becomes null and void.

Early in the history of our country, party nominations were made by party conventions, and the conventions were often completely dominated by one or a few persons, with the result that the wishes of the people were generally given very little consideration. The result was that between 40 or 50 years ago, the great majority of the States adopted the principle of the direct primary, on the theory that the people would then be able to express their wishes directly at the polls in regard to candidacies for office.

While a primary system at its worst is far better than the old convention system where one or a few men could invariably dictate the policies of the party, the primary system has, however, not been altogether free from some of the same objections which made the actions of the old-time conventions a travesty on democracy in the sense that was intended by Jefferson, provided in the Declaration of Independence, when he stated that "the will of the people should be the law."

Under almost all of the primary laws which are in effect in the different States, there is an invariable tendency toward the control of party affairs in the hands of one or a very few people at most who are officials of the party. Having such power in their hands, the chairman or heads of the party committees is in a position which enables him almost always to determine the governing policies of party candidates as a condition for the candidates receiving the support of the chairman or head of the party. Almost invariably, therefore, a person elected to a policy-determining office finds himself not free to support or oppose a governmental policy if the head of the party committee requests a decision of a contrary nature from the person elected to the office which determines such public policies.

The general result, therefore, of the prevailing primary election systems, particularly in larger metropolitan areas, where the population is congested to a great degree is that the nominees of a party for public office feels practically forced to comply with the wishes of the head, or chairman, of their party committees. Even a little careful thought and consideration on the part of a student of the science of government would make clear the fact that, without additional safeguards, the system falls far short of carrying into effect the statement in the Declaration of Independence that the will of the people should be law.

It must be crystal clear to any careful observer that public officials elected to office with the understanding that they are to support the views of the chairman or head of the party to which they belong could not be free to serve their own best ideas of right.

I have discussed some of the essential principles and procedures of fundamental democracy partly because of my hope that it will be helpful to those considering entrance into public life, but who are without experience or great study, and particularly because it is desirable to understand the course of action I have personally pursued since beginning public life officially, almost 45 years ago. I realize, of course, that many persons I know were unable to understand why I pursued a course in contests for nominations and elections that almost invariably met with hostile opposition of a few persons holding the commanding positions in the party with which I have always been allied, namely, the Democratic Party. It surely must be evident to all who will give the subject a moment's thought that I did not invite or enjoy opposition by persons of political influence in my own party.

My course of action in all cases was pursued because of my positive and unshakable judgment that in order, at all times, to serve one's best understanding of the right a person must, at all times, whether as a candidate or elected official, keep his mind absolutely free from any promise or commitment to any person or group of persons to do, or not to do, what is intended by such promise or commitment.

The term "Right or truth" means that which is the expression or activity of the Supreme Power of the universe, whether that power be called the Infinite Mind, Infinite Spirit, Principle, God, or some other title designating the Supreme Power, and is all-knowing, all-powerful, benign, all-wise, and universally present action. A general abandonment of right thinking, that is, of the thinking which ultimately discovers the right, although it does not create it, would bring chaos throughout the world in a comparatively short time. It is what has destroyed civilization after civilization, and has caused dark ages to follow dark ages throughout the long history of the world. Surely it must be evident to anyone, therefore, that the failure to live according to our highest standard of right is the failure to try to obey the law of the Supreme Power of the universe.

In the light of what I have said, therefore, I would most earnestly state that I have held no personal hostility against anyone merely because I could not yield to that person's request or urgence, to do what did not appeal to my sense of right. One of my oldtime and most valued friends almost 35 years ago said to me one day, "You are a d— fool for devoting your life to the crowd. They do not appreciate you or your qualities." My answer was, "It is too bad if they do not appreciate me, but, after all, my duty, as I see it, is to be right rather than to do what is necessary to purchase appreciation."

Often, of course, in regard to questions of legislative policy it happens that between Members of the House who are very good friends indeed, there is a wide difference of opinion as to the proper course to be pursued by the Government. Fortunately, however, almost always, Members of the House who are at all acquainted with one another have not the least inclination to be hostile or impatient with a fellow Member who holds a different view of the same subject. That is as it should be, and that is the way it should be also among members of the party in connection with candidacies and party politics. They should all realize that the important thing for anyone to do is try to understand and support the right in every case to the best of his ability. Accordingly, his fellow members of the same party should be pleased, rather than offended, because he may insist on doing what he believes to be right, regardless of consequences. That is the way public opinion improves from time to time. When there is a general agreement among all those in a certain group that each must do the thing he believes to be right, regardless of how it may appear to others, then there will be a gradual improvement in the judgments of those who are honestly striving to ascertain the right and support it. Such general conduct will then tend toward the development of a truer democracy and better civilization as it continues.

As for myself, I repeat what I have already said on many occasions, that I think it necessary to avoid committing myself in advance to the support of what others may decide, even sincerely, to be good, because I may myself with equally earnest mind believe such a course to be wrong. But even when it is necessary to make such a decision, the persons with whom I am forced to disagree may be very sure that I have no ill will or hate towards them of any kind whatsoever. The earnest effort by the individual to determine what is right, otherwise known as the truth, and the continuous support of his best understanding of right, is the sublimest expression of life by any individual. Every member of society should earnestly endeavor to induce his fellowman to constantly seek to learn the truth about the right at every moment of his existence, and in that way the progress toward the ideal life will not only be rapid but will bring increased joy and bliss to the individual. The thought is beautifully expressed in the lines entitled "The Sculptor Boy," which in conclusion I now quote as follows:

Chisel in hand stood a sculptor-boy,
  With his marble block before him;
And his face lit up with a smile of joy
  As an angel dream passed o'er him.

He carved the dream on that shapeless stone
  With many a sharp incision,
With Heaven's own light the sculptor shone—
  He had caught the angel-vision.

Sculptors of life are we as we stand
  With our lives uncarved before us,
Waiting the hour when at God's command,
  Our life-dream passes o'er us.

If we carve it then on the yielding stone
  With many a sharp incision,
Its heavenly beauty shall be our own—
  Our lives that angel-vision.

The Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag: "Under God" This Nation Lives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, on June 14, Flag Day, 1954, the President signed into law House Joint Resolution 243, which added to the pledge of allegiance to the flag of the United States the compelling and meaningful words "under God."

As the author and originator of this measure in the 83d Congress, Mr. Speaker, I wish to include in the Record at this time a short history and discussion of the pledge of allegiance and of the recent "under God" change which the Congress has wisely chosen to make upon it.

The following comments I made, in substance, on the floor of the House of Representatives on May 5 of this year. I believe, and it is a belief based upon a tremendous volume of correspondence which has been sent to me urging the adoption of the "under God" addition, that it may be of interest to the many members of my constituency to know the background of our pledge of allegiance to the flag.

An early and one of our most devoted and articulate American patriots once said that what we obtain too cheap we esteem too lightly. May we, as present-day Americans, never forget our sacred traditions and the incomparable and religious nature of our heritage.

"Under God" in the pledge of allegiance to the flag expresses, aptly and forcefully, a grateful nation's attitude of dependence upon Almighty God. Certainly the spirit of the change should inspire and permeate every loyal citizen, no matter how humble or great his origin.

For under God this Nation lives.

The original author of the pledge was Francis Bellamy, who was born at Mount Morris, N. Y., May 18, 1855, and died August 28, 1931. Bellamy was trained for the ministry and was ordained in 1879 at the Baptist Church in Little Falls, N. Y., but at the time he wrote the pledge, he was an employee of the Youth's Companion magazine, and the chairman of the executive committee for the national public school celebration which was being held throughout the country in connection with the dedication of the World's Columbian Exposition grounds in Chicago on October 21, 1892, the 400th anniversary of the discovery of America.

In its original form, the pledge first appeared on the original program of the celebration, and has been recited from that day to this, with some changes, by school children all over America.

Bellamy's original wording was changed slightly by the First and Second National Flag Conferences in 1923 and 1924 and his work was officially designated as the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag by Public Law 287, 79th Congress, approved December 28, 1945.

The pledge, as it now appears in law, reads as follows:

> I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the Republic for which it stands, one Nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

My reason for introducing this resolution may be briefly stated. The most fundamental fact of this moment of history is that the principles of democratic government are being put to the test. The theory as to the nature of man which is the keystone in the arch of American Government is under attack by a system whose philosophy is exactly the opposite. This conflict may be waged with the material implements of war, either hot or cold, but ultimately it will be won by the system of government which is founded upon true and lasting principles, and whose people cling to those principles regardless of the sacrifices entailed.

> We are a religious people—

Said Mr. Justice Douglas, of the United States Supreme Court, in a recent decision—

> whose institutions presuppose a Supreme Being.

This is true in a very fundamental sense. Our political institutions reflect the traditional American conviction of the worthwhileness of the individual human being. That conviction, in turn, is based on our belief that the human person is important because he has been created in the image and likeness of God and that he has been endowed by God with certain inalienable rights which no civil authority may usurp. These principles of the worthwhileness of the individual human being are meaningless unless there exists a Supreme Being. That is why, in four separate places in our Declaration of Independence, the fathers of our Nation referred to God, justifying, by the law of nature and nature's God, the aspiration of the Thirteen Colonies to the status of an independent nation, invoking the Supreme Judge of the world to determine the rectitude of their actions, and seeking the blessings of divine providence on their undertaking.

Truly, therefore, this Nation is founded under God.

I think it proper that the phrase "under God" is added after the word "nation." The religious influence in the origins of American Government was not directed to any particular attribute of our political institutions; rather, it permeated the whole tremendous effort of the fathers of our country to erect this monument to human freedom and liberty. It is the Nation itself which was born and lives under God.

The manner in which Lincoln inserted this phrase in his Gettysburg address was not, I believe, mere coincidence.

This Nation, at the moment he spoke, was in its darkest hour. The field on which he spoke had been the scene of a bloody battle to preserve the Union. This fact must have been uppermost in Lincoln's mind. He could have invoked divine providence to uphold the Union of the States. These, however, were the words he used:

> That this Nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom.

Clearly, he meant this phrase to apply to the life of the Nation as a whole.

Now, in our pledge of allegiance to the flag, we salute the symbol of this Republic, and I think it most proper that this pledge express everything for which this Republic stands. The pledge is a reaffirmation of our love of country, of our devotion to an institution that finds its origin and development in the moral law and commands our respect and allegiance so long as it provides that "liberty and justice for all" in which free men can work out their own immortal destinies.

Has it ever occurred to you that the former wording of the pledge could serve any republic claiming to be indivisible and to insure liberty and justice for all? Remember, when you heard your own children recite the pledge of allegiance, that these same words could have come from little Muscovite children standing before the Red hammer-and-sickle flag of Soviet Russia. You know and I know that the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics would not, and could not, while supporting the philosophy of communism, place in its patriotic ritual an acknowledgment that their nation existed under God. Indeed, the one fundamental issue which is the unbridgeable gap between America and Communist Russia is belief in Almighty God.

By the addition of the phrase "under God" to the pledge of allegiance the consciousness of the American people will be more alerted to the true meaning of our country and its form of government. In this full awareness we will, I believe, be strengthened for the conflict now facing us and more determined to preserve our precious heritage.

More importantly, the children of our land, in the regular recitation of the pledge in school, will be daily impressed with a true understanding of our way of life and its origins. As they grow and advance in this understanding, they will assume the responsibilities of self-government equipped to carry on the traditions that have been given to us. Fortify our youth in their allegiance to the flag by their dedication to one nation under God.

Be Sure To Check Your Social Security Rights Unless You Are a Self-Employed Lawyer or Doctor or Practitioner in One of the Related Medical Arts Fields—You Are Probably Now Eligible for Coverage and Valuable Benefits—Monthly Rates Raised in Nearly All Cases and Substantially in Some Categories as Act Is Again Improved To Keep Abreast of Changing Conditions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELIZABETH KEE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, I wonder how many of the Members who are over 35 or so will remember the spectacular success of one of the early motion pictures which was one of the first great "tear jerkers" of the screen—a picture called Over the Hill to the Poorhouse. While it portrayed primarily the ingratitude and loneliness which often were the lot of the aged when their productive years were over, it struck home and was so successful largely because millions of Americans in those days always had the melancholy feeling that for them, too, the county poorhouse might be the final stopping place on life's road.

I was recalling this lachrymose epic of the silent screen as we completed action here in the House of Representatives on the newest social-security bill. And I was struck by the phenomenal progress America has achieved not only since Over the Hill to the Poorhouse was first produced, but particularly in the 23 years since one of the Hollywood firms still thought enough of the popularity of its theme to remake this old movie into a talking picture. It occurred to me that the 1931 remake of the movie is now probably too old even for television—because the concept behind it is today completely out of date in the America we know. Today's youngsters would probably need a commentary in the way of a translation to understand what the movie was all about—and what a poorhouse is or was.

For that change I think we can thank—more than any other single piece of legislation—the Social Security Act first written into law in 1935 in the first administration of Franklin Delano Roosevelt. It was a historic and almost revolutionary change in American social thinking—that instead of humiliating charity in one's old age the average worker could look forward to a lifetime annuity which he and his employer had helped to pay for during his working career.

We accept social security today as a normal, everyday kind of program. This bill which we have just passed to further expand coverage and to increase benefits has had almost unanimous support here. The only reservations which have been expressed about it in the House have come from those of us who feel that even with these valuable changes in the statute it still does not quite go far enough. But there has been no violent condemnation of the program this time, no attacks on it as socialism, no threats to repeal it in the next Congress.

SOCIAL SECURITY HAD TEMPESTUOUS BEGINNING

It was not always thus. When the act was passed originally 19 years ago, it was bitterly attacked and condemned as "un-American," "Communist," "radical," "wild-eyed." The Nation was told that under this law people would stop saving their money, would stop buying life insurance, would refuse to make any effort to provide for their own security, would lose all self-respect, and would turn this country into a lot of loafers, bums, and panhandlers.

Furthermore, the Republican Party in its 1936 presidential nominating convention adopted as part of its platform for the candidacy of Alfred Landon, then Governor of Kansas, a plank pledging the Republican Party to repeal the social-security law in toto. During the latter months of the campaign billboards sprouted all over America condemning this law as a tax on wages and attempting to whip up support for the Republican nominee by opposing social security.

Does not that seem a very long time ago, Mr. Speaker? Almost as long ago as the existence of the conditions in the

United States which made a movie like Over the Hill to the Poorhouse so familiar a theme to millions of sad-eyed moviegoers. Yet it was less than two decades ago.

Even so, attacks on the social-secruity system continued for many years. Some of the same Members of Congress who took a leading role in this session in helping to pass this new bill were, as recently as the 80th Congress in 1947–48 seeking to remove people from the social-security rolls rather than add more to those rolls. And each time President Truman or the Democrats in Congress acted to increase benefits and coverage, there was tremendous Republican opposition.

WE CAN'T ALWAYS AFFORD 19 YEARS OF DELAY IN SUPPORTING PROGRESS

I feel now that insofar as social security is concerned, the Republican Party has probably learned the errors of its earlier ways. I am sorry that it has taken 19 years for this lesson to be learned. It now appears, however, that it is also taking 19 years on the average for the average Republican Congressman to learn some of the other lessons of American progress brought about by Democratic Congresses of recent years, such as the need for better defenses against recession and depression, the need for better unemployment compensation, the need for better housing for our people, the need for better schools, the need for a more unified free world in the fight against communism, the need for fairness to our civil servants, including postal workers and other Government workers, the need for a strong, prosperous coal industry.

We waited 19 years for the Republican Party nationally and in the Congress to come around to social security. Must we wait 19 years for a similar awakening in each of these other important areas? American progress cannot wait 19 years while the Republican Members of Congress catch up.

I am proud, Mr. Speaker, that throughout the last 25 years in crisis after crisis on the national scene the Democratic Party and particularly the Democrats in the Congress of the United States were always ready to meet any crisis with constructive proposals and effective legislation. It is inconceivable to me that a Democratic Congress, had there been one these past 2 years, would have sat idly by while millions of Americans lost their jobs, while plants shut down, payrolls were cut, and the railroads, the mines, the factories and the foundries, and the farms of our country headed into what we now know is a widespread recession. A Democratic Congress, I feel sure, would have provided the kind of vigorous spirit and intelligent approach which a new President, unskilled in political affairs, needed and could have found extremely helpful in restoring and maintaining prosperity. The President will need such Democratic legislative help and vitality in the coming session, too.

MAJOR NEW CHANGES IN SOCIAL SECURITY LAW

In making these comments, Mr. Speaker, I do not want to give the impression that the work on the social security law in this session has not been successful. This has been one of the best jobs this Congress has done. It was a bipartisan job with the improvements representing by and large most of the proposals made by Democrats on the Ways and Means Committee and concurred in by their Republican colleagues. In several important instances, such as the proposal to provide social security benefits to permanently disabled workers instead of making them wait until age 65 to begin collecting their annuities, and another to increase the amount of the average worker's paycheck subject to social security credit, the Democratic suggestions were not agreed to in full. These represent areas of needed future action.

This bill is so much better than the kind of social-security bill which was being favorably discussed by some leading Republican members of the Ways and Means Committee a year ago that the difference is really startling.

It is, however, a highly technical piece of legislation. Therefore, it would be virtually impossible to provide here in complete detail all of the provisions affecting each individual. Even if it were attempted, it would be something of a disservice to many workers or their dependents, because they might not then bother to check further into some of the technical provisions, thereby missing out on added benefits which might be available to them. I would certainly urge, Mr. Speaker, that each person now receiving benefits, or about to retire in the near future, or who is newly covered by this bill, seek out specific information on the provisions which affect them.

Particularly, Mr. Speaker, the following newly covered groups should inquire further:

Farmers: They are brought under the act for the first time. Although farm operators have recently been paying social-security taxes for their hired hands, they did not have the protection of the social-security system for themselves or their dependents. They are now covered beginning January 1, but will not make their first self-employment tax payments until they file their 1955 income-tax returns, which would be due by April 15, 1956.

Other self-employed such as architects, engineers, public accountants, funeral directors.

Ministers and Christian Science practitioners and members of religious orders employed by nonprofit organizations, other than employees of religious orders who have taken a vow of poverty. Those in this particular group are included as individuals on a voluntary basis as self-employed persons, but would be required to make the election within the next 2 years as to whether or not they desire to be included.

As far as coverage under the new law is concerned, it extends generally to everyone except self-employed lawyers, physicians, or practitioners in related medical arts fields such as dentists, osteopaths, veterinarians, chiropractors, naturopaths, and optometrists, and except, also, to persons in the armed services—who can, however, later receive social-security credit for this service—and to very casual part-time workers. Virtually everyone else is covered.

CHANGES IN BENEFITS, CREDITS

For those already receiving social-security benefits, many changes and improvements are made. Benefits are raised a minimum of $5 and in some instances will run much higher. There is a provision for recomputation of credits to drop out of the worker's earning record up to 5 years during which he had not been earning or had earned a less-than-average income. Thus, in arriving at such a worker's monthly benefit, these low-income years would not act to bring down the average on which his benefit is based. Workers who were disabled before reaching age 65 and are now receiving a reduced annuity will also be entitled to a recomputation. And surviving dependents of a worker who died before September 1950, with at least 6 quarters of payroll credit will also, in many cases, profit by the changes in the new law.

Other important changes to help those now on social-security benefits include provisions to do the following:

Allow the retired worker under age 72 to earn up to $1,200 a year without loss of monthly benefits, and to collect his monthly check in any event for any month in which he does not earn more than $80.

Allow the worker of 62—instead of the previous minimum of 75—to collect a monthly social-security check without regard to how much money he may still be earning.

For persons on the retirement rolls at this time, here are some examples of the new rates which will be paid:

If present primary benefit is:	New primary benefit will be:
$25 to $59	$5 higher
$60.80	$66.30
$66.60	$73.90
$72	$81.10
$77.10	$88.50
$81	$93.10
$85	$98.50

Dependents are given proportionate increases subject to a maximum family benefit of $200.

CHANGES IN FUTURE BENEFITS

For persons who have not yet retired under the social-security system, benefits will be larger in the future, up to a maximum of $108.50 in the primary benefit for the insured worker, under a new system of payroll credits and payroll taxes.

Instead of crediting only the first $3,600 of a worker's wage or salary toward social security—the amount on which both the employer and the employee make tax contributions—the maximum is now raised to $4,200. The higher tax collections will, in turn, make possible higher benefits.

In order to build up the higher benefits resulting from this increase in payroll credits, the worker would have to be covered at the higher income figure for about a year and a half or more, assuming he earns at least $4,200 a year in that period.

The combination of higher payroll taxes resulting in higher benefits in the future, plus the provision for allowing a dropout of low-income years from the computation of average monthly wages on which benefits are based, will mean substantial increases for many workers when they do retire, or for their surviving dependents in case of death.

The provision on permanently disabled workers, which does not go as far as I would like, nevertheless does give a break to these unfortunate individuals by freezing their payroll credits and their rights under social security until they are 65. Their ultimate benefits will therefore be based on the money they earned during their working careers, and will not be reduced as they have been in the past by averaging the earning credits over entire period of coverage prior to age 65.

DON'T NEGLECT YOUR RIGHTS UNDER SOCIAL SECURITY

As a final word, Mr. Speaker, I would again like to urge all retired persons or the surviving dependents of deceased workers to check their own status under the amended law to be sure they are accorded the full benefits to which they are entitled. The higher benefits for those now on the rolls are to become effective in October. If the higher checks are not sent out in October, I am assured they will be sent later retroactively to October.

Ministers, who must declare their intention of coming under the system individually on a voluntary basis within 2 years, should inquire into all of the details. I think most of them will elect to accept coverage. Widows of workers who died prior to September 1950 must make application for any additional benefits to which they are now entitled, and they should look into this matter promptly.

State and local government employees, including schoolteachers, having their own retirement systems have the opportunity to come into the system on a group basis, if they so desire. These groups must vote by referendum on whether they desire to be included. I am sure their organizations will promptly interest themselves in this matter and see to it that all the facts pro and con are made available to the individuals affected.

Mr. Speaker, it is a source of great satisfaction and deep pride to me as a Member of Congress to have had a hand in the enactment of legislation such as this social-security bill. I wish this present Congress had brought forth more accomplishments of this nature. I hope the forthcoming Congress meeting here next January will be more closely oriented to the needs of the people of our country than this Congress has been, and will have much more than one bill such as this to rank among its major achievements for the average person.

Erie Peninsula Saved

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARROLL D. KEARNS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity on behalf of my constituents in northwestern Pennsylvania, particularly in the city of Erie and Erie County, to express my deep appreciation to the Committee on Public Works of the House of Representatives—to the subcommittee headed by the Honorable HOMER ANGELL, of Oregon, as well as to the full committee under the chairmanship of the Honorable GEORGE DONDERO, of Michigan—for reporting unanimously the bill authorizing aid to the Erie Peninsula. This was a major request for authorization from the Congress in order that the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania might participate in a matching program.

My confidence in the integrity of the Committee on Public Works was highly justified by the manner in which its members weighed this vital project whereby $2,006,000 was authorized as the Federal share for the preservation of Presque Isle Peninsula.

I would like also to commend Governor Fine and the Pennsylvania Legislature for their foresight and assistance in appropriating the Commonwealth's share for this project. And, too, I would like to pay special tribute to the citizens of Erie, headed by John Dwyer, chairman of the Save Our Peninsula Committee, which did yeoman service both in Harrisburg and Washington.

The Northwestern Miller Agrees With Harold C. Hagen's Views on Post Office Department

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. HAGEN of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I have been on the Post Office Committee of the House for the past 12 years and I have always believed and said that the postal department should not be run as a business institution, based on profits, but as a service to every man, woman, and child in America. I often have pointed out that the Post Office sells duck stamps, runs the postal savings department, serves the millions of farmers and other citizens of America at a loss, and otherwise always has offered numerous privileges and services to all the people.

It gratifies me to find that the Northwestern Miller, of 2501 Wayzata Boulevard, Minneapolis, Minn., in its latest edition, has a thoughtful and able editorial along the very lines of the work I have done on the Post Office Committee for the past dozen years.

The editorial so ably discusses this subject, so important to every man, woman, and child in America, that I reproduce it here so that my colleagues in Congress and the public generally may see a fine exposition of the very points I have been making over the years.

This is the editorial:

VAGRANT POSTAL PHILOSOPHIES

Failure of Congress and the administration to get together on a pay raise for Federal employees, chiefly in the postal service, is backgrounded by two basic errors in political judgment and philosophy which have persistently beclouded the problem of how to deal with the so-called postal deficits. The greater of these errors is a convenient but unwarranted assumption that the post office is a business which must pay its own way. The other is the equally convenient but entirely specious assumption that whenever costs go up in the Post Office Department the sole budgetary recourse is an increase in postal charges. The second of these errors gave birth to the odious expediency of tacking a postal rate increase onto the Federal pay bill, a devious device which even Congress could not stomach.

Price of product, in industry, is not determined by cost of production alone. Operating efficiencies and economies usually are the most critical factors, and in the field of competitive private business no enterprise survives when its price is required to reflect every caprice of labor and materials cost. This truism, of course, applies to the post office if it is to be considered as a business which must pay its way in the world. Only if the post office is not a business but is a public service can automatic reflection of pay increases in rates charged for the service be tolerated.

There are many people who do not believe the post office should be a self-supporting business. The historical record shows that in fact it never has been and never was intended to be. During the last 100 years there have been 13 years when post office revenues exceeded expenses, and 87 when they did not. Had the post office paid taxes, as private business does, this Department of Government always would have been in the red. The cost of Government buildings used by the post office totals some $705 million. No part of this capital expense, or interest upon it, or depreciation, is included in postal cost. Clearly, if the so-called current deficits were to include these items, and they were to be reflected automatically in postal rates, postage charges would be far greater than is now proposed and probably beyond the public's ability or willingness to pay.

Can there be any other reasonable conclusion to the matter than that the Post Office already is to a large degree a public service? Government-owned buildings are a subsidy—and so is any operating deficit. This is the situation and the original intention, and it simply is error—to use the mildest name for it—to assume that the Post Office has any inherent or traditional obligation to make both ends meet. Raising postal rates, therefore, in such a manner as Congress recently rejected, is merely a form of taxation shifted arbitrarily from the whole public to a selected area of business and industry.

As so often has been said on this page, publishers have no stubborn aversion to increases in postal rates. Neither do they resist appropriate changes in the original Post Office philosophy. All they ask is that such changes should be made on their merits and not under cover of a budget blitz designed to remedy department deficits which are as likely to be due to inefficiencies of operation as to inadequate rates. They demand, too, honest recognition of the fact that the Post Office is neither wholly a business that must be self-sustaining at whatever level of fancy or inefficiency it chooses nor wholly a public service that must be subsidized, as are nearly all other departments of government, but in practice has become a combination of both business and service. The basic question before the bar of public interest, therefore, is what is the right proportion. Unhappily, to the intense irritation of publishers, the political mind does not adjust itself to such a reasonable procedure as clearly determining this proportion, but appears deliberately to avoid it.

Free Speech

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. USHER L. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, the acme of liberty bequeathed to citizens of this country by the Constitution is found in the Bill of Rights or the first amendment to the Constitution. When the Constitution was first set up at Philadelphia, none of the first 10 amendments were contained in it; and the very first one written was the amendment guaranteeing free speech, a free press, and free religion. That must have been uppermost in the mind of Jefferson when he presented the Bill of Rights.

The greatest weapon a Member of Congress or anyone else can have is the right of free speech. Any attempt, therefore, to curtail, modify, or abridge this guaranteed personal right of liberty should be stopped where it begins. While serving in this Congress I always have and will continue to guard this right.

The Genocide Convention directly attacks this privilege, and that is the reason why I have fought this convention with all the power I possess. In this country we are accountable for what we say if it is not within the authority granted in the Constitution, but we are accountable here in this country under the Constitution and the laws of the various States. In this Genocide Convention, that right is taken away completely and under it we are subject to prosecution for our speech. Under the terms of this convention we can be tried in any country fixed by the judicial tribunal of the United Nations. How would anyone feel who was to be taken out of this country, shipped across the ocean and tried in Russia? You can imagine what kind of trial you would get. Yet there are many dupes in this country who, in the name of world peace, are willing to have this limitation placed on the provisions of the Constitution. What is peace without liberty? I am surprised that so many ministers are willing to surrender this, the greatest right conferred on us by the Constitution. Any contrivance engineered by ingenious men and women to subvert this provision of our Constitution should demand serious examination before we embrace it. I am as strong for world peace as anyone in this country, but in order to have peace and quiet I am not willing to give up my liberty. That I will fight for regardless of those who are willing to meekly surrender their own liberty.

I do not know why American-born citizens—those whose ancestors went through all our wars for liberty—can be persuaded at this late date to give up any of the freedom won on the battlefields in our history. What would the old patriots who fought in the Revolution, and who framed the Constitution think of their offspring who in 1954 are so eager for peace that they are willing to surrender their liberties? I hope I shall never see the day when the people of this country cower before some foreign potentate or some world government; when they are afraid to address or petition a government, and do their thinking through fear and not through reason. Those who live in dungeons, shackled with chains, are more free than men who do not dare to speak. We must be growing soft. Edmund Burke in the House of Commons said, "It is easier to make freemen slaves than slaves freemen." As long as we are comfortable and do not have to face war, are we to quietly surrender to the enslavement of our minds, which is worse than the enslavement of our persons? I think not; and as soon as the people of this country realize what is about to be done to them by a sinister organization like a world government, hatched up and planned by the United Nations, they will rise up in their might and drive these money changers out of the temple. Do these plotters believe the American people will be willing to play Little Red Riding Hood and let the wolves devour our Constitution and place liberty-loving people in a straitjacket?

I will answer them now, We will not do it.

Our Privilege and Duty To Vote Election Day, November 2, 1954

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS E. MARTIN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, in this wonderful country of ours citizenship is a serious responsibility. If a government of the people, by the people, and for the people is to be maintained, our citizens must be alert about taking part in elections.

The results of the primaries throughout the entire Nation show an alarming negligence on the part of hundreds of thousands of American citizens in their failure to go to the polls and vote. In neglecting to vote they fail to take advantage of a great privilege—the privilege of helping to select the type of representatives who they feel would best protect their interests and benefit the country as a whole.

The importance of the November 2 election cannot be too strongly emphasized. Every citizen who has reached the age of 21 should vote.

I appeal to the people of Iowa to come out and vote for Governor and other State officials, United States Senator and United States Representatives in Congress, State senators, members of the State legislature, and county officers, so that our State, district, and counties will have the right type of representation in public office.

No American citizen should neglect the privilege and let others do the voting. The character of our Government is largely what the voters make it. Every voter is part of the Government, and we should protect and cherish our right to participate in its elections.

A policy of indifference can no more win the peace than it could have won the war. Ask any returned serviceman the value of each person contributing his share and doing his own part in an outlined program of action. The parents, wives, and sweethearts of veterans will remember that our servicemen fought for the freedoms we enjoy, and I hope that they will impress upon their friends and neighbors that the perpetuation of our Republic depends upon a wide-awake and vigilant electorate.

Every American citizen should take advantage of the opportunity to exercise our franchise. If we do this, we will express our will by voting for the candidates who we think will represent us best.

Let everyone vote, and get your friends and neighbors to vote. If each community leader secured two extra votes, this effort could change the entire election record.

It is our patriotic duty to vote at the general election, November 2, 1954.

The Voting Record of Your United States Representative in Congress, Harold C. Hagen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. HAGEN of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, for six successive campaigns I have circularized my district and every voter there should know that I am not a Johnny-come-lately on parity. I have been for full parity for all storable farm products in my 12 years of the official life.

In the 12 years I have been Congress there have been more than 300 laws passed benefiting the veterans, their widows and dependents, and creating opportunities for the millions of young men who were in our Armed Forces in the form of education, farm training, and the learning of trades. I have voted in every case for those who made the sacrifice of giving up from 1 to 7 years of their life to protecting this Nation.

In the past 9 years Congress has voted these billions to foreign nations, mostly in cash or in materials of war. With the exception of aid to arm Turkey and Greece, I have voted against all of these give-away programs. I was overseas twice—1945 and 1953—and learned that potentates and dictators and politicians were using American taxpayers' money to further their own selfish desires and that many Americans were riding the gravy-train over there and billions of these dollars have been wasted.

I believe that charity begins at home. I believe we should take some of these billions and build better farm-to-market roads, hospitals, and above all, schools because our entire educational structure in America is in jeopardy for lack of facilities to educate our children and our children's children. I also believe we should take some of this money we have been giving away and give our old people higher pensions and assistance and take care of our own problems first.

The farm surplus problem has been greatly added to by imports of foreign farm products. Tens of millions of dollars worth of cheaply produced grain, dairy products, oils, cheese, wool, and other farm commodities that compete with American-produced commodities are coming into the Nation under the so-called Reciprocal Trade Treaty law. In my 12 years as Congressman I have always voted against extension of this law because I realize that some nations produce farm products and pay wages as low as 30 cents to 50 cents per day for farm labor. The American standard of living and wages cannot stand that kind of cheap competition.

Briefly, my record on some of the important issues before the Congress in recent years follows.

We are in a transition from a wartime to a peacetime economy. Because of this some segments of our economy are being badly hurt. To ease those harmful effects, here is how I have voted:

For increased social-security benefits and to improve the present program.

For placing all aged under social security so that present inadequate old-age pension system can be given a better substitute program for our old people.

For increased unemployment compensation benefits and to extend the benefits to 1 year.

For 90 to 100 percent parity for dairy, wheat, and other farm products—see paragraph 1.

For increased school, hospital, and necessary public works—aids to create more employment.

For increased road aids with special emphasis on farm-to-market roads to create more employment and give farmers better highways.

For increased REA electric and telephone loans to help northern Minnesota rural areas and to create more employment.

For increased retirement benefits and increased tax exemptions for persons receiving retirement benefits.

For increased pensions and benefits for disabled veterans and their dependents—see paragraph 2.

For increased and easier loans and credits to homeowners, small business, farmers, and veterans.

For tax reduction to incomes below $5,000, and for greater medical deductions and deductions for students while attending college.

To help balance the budget and lower taxes, here is how I have voted:

Against dishing out $60 billion all over the world—see paragraphs 3 and 4.

Against unnecessary and wasteful military spending which weakens our defense rather than strengthens it. Supported building up of our Air Force.

Against increasing our national debt and passing on our bills to our children.

Against imports of foreign goods that create unemployment and loss of income to American farmers, workers, and business—see paragraph 5.

Against foreign entanglements which are sapping our blood and money, making enemies all over the world. If the United States had not played Santa Claus and dished out over $100 billion—no country in the world could afford a war or fight a war. If Communist Russia had not been given many billion dollars even Russia could not afford to start any wars.

Contemporary Africa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 19, 1954

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, during the week of August 9 to 13 the School of Advanced International Studies of Johns Hopkins University, true to its tradition of courage and vision, held a conference on contemporary Africa at the Sheraton Park Hotel here in Washington.

You will perhaps recall that this school exists largely because of the wisdom and determination of one of our colleagues who is now the Governor of Massachusetts, the Honorable Christian A. Herter.

Among the challenging subjects considered at the conference were:

First. The Position of Africa in World Affairs.

(a) Africa and the West. Speaker: Sir Philip Euen Mitchell, former Governor of Kenya.

(b) The African Cultural Background in the Modern Scene. Speaker: Melville J. Herskovits, Northwestern University.

(c) Africa's Strategic Significance. Speaker: Adm. Richard L. Conolly, president, Long Island University.

(d) The European Heritage: Approaches to African Development. Speaker: Paul Henry, secretary general of the Commission for Technical Cooperation in Africa.

(e) The Impact of Western Education on the African's Way of Life. Speaker: Lorenzo D. Turner, Roosevelt College.

(f) Fears and Pressures in the Union of South Africa. Speaker: Cornelius W. De Kiewiet.

(g) Recent Developments in African Dependencies. Speaker: Kofi A. Busia.

(h) The Impact of the United Nations on Africa. Speaker: Vernon McKay, one of my advisers at the Eighth Assembly of the United Nations and a lecturer at the School of Advanced International Studies.

Other exceedingly important and interesting topics were presented and informally discussed.

On the last evening the program was changed, due to the illness of the main speaker. Three exceedingly interesting speeches were given, one of them by Prof. Kofi A. Busia, of the University College of the Gold Coast. It was Africa speaking to the West—speaking most of all to us here in the United States. Simple and from the heart, it made a deep impression upon all who heard it.

Mr. Speaker, under the unanimous consent granted me, I present this address to the Members of this House with the earnest hope that it will stimulate their desire to come closer to the people of this great continent of Africa, whose brothers we are:

THE UNITED STATES AND AFRICA

(By Prof. Kofi A. Busia, delivered at the final session of the Conference on Contemporary Africa, August 13, 1954, sponsored by the School of Advanced International Studies of the Johns Hopkins University)

I would first of all like to take this opportunity to express on behalf of those of us who have been guests at this conference our thanks to the School of Advanced International Studies for organizing it.

I am specially grateful, too, that the main theme of the conference has been Contemporary Africa. The increasing interest which the United States is taking in our continent fills us with hope for the future.

As Mr. Nitze has said, the papers and discussions we have had during the last few days have revealed how extremely complex are the problems which face us in Africa today. Even the most optimistic may well ask if we have any reasonable cause for hope.

I think we have cause for hope. My confidence is based on the belief that the potentiality of Africa, what will ultimately shape her future, does not lie in her material resources, but in the unpredictable mystery of her human resources. This unpredictable, but determining factor of man himself is often ignored in our analysis.

In my view, there are two challenges that face mankind in the 20th century. There is the challenge presented by the atom bomb, the latest symbol of man's ever-widening conquest of nature, which nevertheless threatens mankind with annihilation.

There have been two strands in man's quest for knowledge and truth: the first which was predominant in the heyday of Greece, and for a long time after, was the quest for the understanding of man himself: his nature, his society, his goals, and the meaning of his earthly existence.

The second strand is the one with which Europe and America have been largely preoccupied for the last 200 years or so: the search for the understanding and conquest of nature.

The second challenge of the 20th century derives from the quest for the understanding of man himself. That challenge does not offer the possibility of annihilation but of survival. This discovery made from the long and arduous quest along tortuous paths of learning for the understanding of the nature of man and society does not appear to be startling or revolutionary. It is merely the apparently commonplace discovery that mankind is one species, and that we all share a common humanity, or, as John Masefield would put it, we are "brothers akin, * * * questing awhile in the rooms of a beautiful inn."

Commonplace as this may seem, it does really present the nobler challenge of our time. We are apt to divide men into primitive and civilized, superior and inferior, and so find justification for injustice, or selfish greed, or the exercise of power, or benevolent paternalism. But the stark fact is that the earth is inhabited by man. There is no primitive man or civilized man. Some men live in primitive conditions and others in civilized conditions, but there is only one species of man on the earth.

I think this both important and relevant to the problems we have been discussing this week. The conditions of life in Africa are harsh and primitive, but the inhabitants of Africa have the intelligence, the spirit, and the capabilities of contemporary man. Therein lies our ground for optimism.

Why must America take an interest in Africa? Various good reasons have been given—for self-preservation, in the interest of peace, to secure strategic bases, for the interchange of goods and services, to secure Africa against communism, to help raise the standards of living of the African. Laudable as these reasons are, they stem from either a negative or materialistic approach to the problem.

I think international questions might be approached by focusing much greater attention on man himself than on the conditions of his life.

I would plead with you in America and Europe to help us in Africa first of all by expressing your faith in us as belonging, like yourselves, to the "old proud pageant of man."

Show by your actions toward us, whether in the New World or the Old, that you accept and believe in the fact that we all share a common humanity. That this can be done, and glimpses of what it could achieve, have been shown at this conference.

We in Africa can and will respond to the outstreached hand, our hearts can beat in tune to the warmth of friendship, our hands can turn to new skills, our minds are open to new ideas.

This human approach does indeed involve practical tasks; but they will be rightly directed toward the achievement of a true and positive goal.

I believe that the positive goal we must aim at is the creation of a world community of freemen, bound by ties of friendship and mutual respect, united by fundamental agreement in the democratic way of life, and by faith in the equality and dignity of man, freely cooperating for the enrichment of human life by the unhindered interchange of our diverse gifts.

To aid in this common purpose we in Africa offer our richest potential—the unpredictable mystery of our manhood and womanhood.

"Full many a gem of purest ray serene,
  The dark unfathom'd caves of ocean bear,
Full many a flower is born to blush unseen,
  And waste its sweetness on the desert air."

We ask you to help us through the communication of ideas of skills, and the interchange of goods and services, on the basis of our common humanity, to develop our human potential; we shall then together solve not only the problems of Africa, but also through the links of friendship, indeed of brotherhood, that we shall thus forge, we may discover a new way of creating a world society in which homo sapiens may live a richer, fuller life, free from war, and from the haunting fear of annihilation.

We in Africa contemplate the future with hope, because we believe mankind will rise to the challenge of our time, by recognizing our common humanity and by shouldering the responsibilities that that recognition entails. We are happy to have evidence that America, this great Nation that has won for herself the leadership of the world; intends to play a leading role in this the heroic adventure of building a world community of freemen freely associated for the realization of man's highest aspirations.

St. Lawrence Seaway Approved

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARROLL D. KEARNS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I want to reiterate my firm belief that the passage of the St. Lawrence seaway legislation by the 83d Congress was an excellent step toward advancement of international trade and improved business for all the Great Lakes ports in this country.

I am particularly interested in the great port of Erie, and I feel that when the St. Lawrence seaway is completed that many of the foreign ships will have Erie as their destination, and others will follow their lead, because of the great potential of the Erie Harbor and its vast mooring possibilities whereby many ships can have secure anchorage without facing bad seas.

I look forward to the railroads being the beneficiaries of shipments into Erie, and I predict that their tonnage will increase manyfold after the seaway is opened and the ships begin making Erie Harbor their port.

I sincerely hope that many Members of Congress will avail themselves of the opportunity to inspect the Erie Harbor and learn for themselves the great potential that lies ahead for our part of the country through legislation that made the St. Lawrence seaway possible.

The Republican Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement I have prepared.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Republicans always run on their record.

The record of the Republican 83d Congress is outstanding.

The record of the Eisenhower administration is praiseworthy.

Together, in 2 years, the Congress and the administration have cut the cost of Government $64 billion.

Taxes have been reduced by $7.4 billion.

The first revision of our system of taxation in more than three-fourths of a century has been enacted. The purpose was to cure inequalities and to give help to the average American, the widows, the aged, the retired, and the parents of children in school.

The enactment of a new social security law covering an additional 10 million Americans and increasing benefits for 6.5 million already covered.

The enactment of the largest highway program in the history of the Nation, and returning to the States practically all of the gasoline taxes collected by the Federal Government.

The enactment of a lease-purchase bill which will permit the Government to own public buildings now being leased, without additional national cost. Within 25 years this will add several billion dollars to the assets of the Federal Government and permit the Government to give better service.

The omnibus flood control bill of more than a billion dollars will increase the facilities of water transportation in all parts of the United States, improve rivers and harbors, and add to our flood-control projects. In this bill, among many other approvals, Pennsylvania was authorized $91 million for deepening the Delaware River channel from Philadelphia to Trenton. This is bound to create long-term employment and industrial development.

The Eisenhower administration is cleaning out communism in the United States. Exactly 2,429 doubtful risks have been removed from the employment of our Government.

The internal security of our country has been strengthened by eight newly enacted anti-Communist laws.

The Communist Party has been outlawed.

Labor unions whose membership has become Communist infiltrated will not be recognized by the National Labor Relations Board.

Peacetime spying has been made a capital offense.

The statute of limitations on peacetime espionage was eliminated.

Our defense plants will be protected from Communist infiltration by a rigid system of security.

Unemployment compensation coverage was increased.

The atomic energy law was revised to permit development and use of atomic energy by private industry.

The hospital construction program of $182 million was approved.

The Small Business Administration was established on a permanent basis.

Federal equity in submerged lands beyond State boundaries was established.

The housing program was approved, stimulating home ownership and encouraging the modernization and repair of homes.

A new agricultural law was enacted to protect farmers on the price of things they sell and to develop export markets for American farm products.

The $1.3 billion farm-surplus program for disposal abroad was adopted.

Twelve new reorganization plans were enacted to provide for greater Government economy and efficiency.

Benefits to veterans and their families have been increased.

The customs code was revised and amended to eliminate inequities and inefficiency.

Wage, price, rent, and materials controls were ended.

Foreign aid was revised, with provision for a large percentage of aid in the form of loans rather than grants.

Defense was strengthened, but military spending was reduced.

The Eisenhower administration, by firmness of policy, is transferring our country from a wartime to a peacetime economy. The unemployment, regardless of the fact that our population has increased 31.5 million since 1939, is one-third of what it was at that time under a Democratic administration.

Through the wise leadership of the Eisenhower administration we attained peace. The Korean Defense Pact was ratified.

Now let us look at our State. During the last 94 years, the Republicans have been in power 82 years. What has been the result?

Our taxes are lower per capita than three-quarters of the States.

Our rivers and harbors have been improved and cleaned of pollution.

Our systems of public welfare, aid to the blind, public health, and public education are looked upon by most States in the Union as standards of excellence.

By careful administration we have encouraged agriculture, labor, and industry.

We had the first compensation laws in the United States.

We have the finest transportation system in the country.

We have the finest highway system of any State and the greatest mileage of improved highways in America.

We have a greater diversity of industry than any similar area in the world.

We have 170,000 family-sized farms.

Our workmen are more highly skilled than those to be found anywhere else.

We have more churches and accredited colleges than any other State in the Union.

All these combined make us the arsenal of democracy and a mighty cultural, agricultural, commercial, and industrial empire without equal.

Do we want to take a chance on returning to the theory of tax and tax and spend and spend?

Do we want higher taxes?

Do we want corruption in Government with Communists and fellowtravelers in high places?

Do we want controls on our business and our natural resources?

Do we want an administration that says taxes can be reduced without reducing Government expenditures?

This is demagoguery of the worst order—it is impossible to reduce taxes unless Government expenditures and commitments are correspondingly curtailed.

The Republicans in Pennsylvania and America have a great record on which to run. The Republican record over the years has been one of great accomplishments.

The 2 years of the Eisenhower administration have been years of great accomplishment in the finest Republican traditions.

Seldom in history has so much been done for the people in so short a time.

We stand at the threshold of a great new era in America.

The long-range, far-sighted Republican program for Pennsylvania and for our Nation must go forward vigorously and forthrightly with a Republican President, a Republican Congress, a Republican Governor, and a Republican legislature.

The Outstanding Accomplishments of the 83d Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARROLL D. KEARNS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith the following outstanding accomplishments of the 83d Congress:

First. Two million six thousand dollars authorized for preservation of Presque Isle Peninsula in Erie, Pa.

Second. Appropriation of approximately $300,000 for improvement and repair of Erie Airport.

Third. Approval of $500,000 multiple-purpose building for Sharon, Pa.

Fourth. Income taxes cut 10 percent; excise taxes cut 50 percent; tax law revised. Total tax saving $7.4 billion.

Fifth. Korean war ended. Seized initiative for peace; new foreign policy based on firmness and strength.

Sixth. Appropriations for 1954–55 cut $64 billion below appropriations of previous Congress in 1952–53.

Seventh. Federal spending in 1953–54 cut $6.7 billion below amount spent in 1952–53.

Eighth. Social-security coverage extended to 10 million more citizens and benefits increased. Unemployment insurance expanded to 4 million more persons.

Ninth. Communist Party stripped of all legal rights and Red infiltration of unions checked; 50 Communist Party leaders convicted; 93 alien subversives deported; 62 organizations added to subversive list; 2,486 security risks separated from Government service.

Tenth. More State control provided for modern highway program of almost $2 billion in 1956 and 1957.

Eleventh. New farm price program adopted to protect farmers and develop exports of farm products.

Twelfth. St. Lawrence seaway approved.

Thirteenth. Stronger defense program adopted. Heavier reliance on atomic weapons and airpower. Air Force Academy established.

Fourteenth. Wage, price, rent, and materials controls ended.

Fifteenth. New housing program raises limits on Government-insured home mortgages, lowers down payments, makes home ownership easier for thousands.

Sixteenth. Investigations underway into 200 housing frauds; 23 FHA personnel convicted, 34 indicted.

Seventeenth. Foreign aid for 1954–55 $6 billion below 1952–53. Greater emphasis on military aid and loans.

Eighteenth. Health research funds increased. Three-year, $182 million hospital program adopted.

Nineteenth. Atomic-energy law revised.

Twentieth. Segregation ended in Armed Forces, VA hospitals, Government agencies.

Twenty-first. Reorganization plans adopted. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare created.

Twenty-second. RFC abolished. Small Business Administration established. Federal operations competing with private enterprise sold or abolished.

Twenty-third. Offshore tidelands restored to States; Federal rights safeguarded.

Twenty-fourth. Trade Agreements Act extended to 1955; $1.3 billion program adopted for disposal abroad of farm surpluses; Customs Code revised.

Twenty-fifth. Two hundred and sixteen thousand two hundred and forty-three unnecessary Federal jobs abolished.

Humphrey Anti-Communist Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from a recent issue of the Journal published in Watson, Minn.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HUMPHREY ANTI-COMMUNIST AMENDMENT

Effective, courageous, anticommunism is thoroughly consistent with intelligent, sincere liberalism.

Totalitarianism is the greatest enemy to liberal democratic institutions.

It is the liberal who should be the most sensitive to the threat of domestic and international communism.

In acting constructively, concisely, and directly against specific members of the Communist Party, Senator HUMPHREY, as a leading spokesman of American liberal democracy, has performed a great service to his country, to his political principles and to the Democratic Party.

He has assumed in behalf of responsible and honest American politics the reins of leadership in the fight against communism. In his person and through his activities, the struggle for democratic survival and for the growth of the democratic spirit is united through effective positive programs for equal social and economic opportunities for all Americans regardless of race, color, or creed, together with necessary protective program against internal and external subversion of democracy.

The growth of democracy and the protection of democracy are both essential to survival.

Senator HUMPHREY represents both objectives, in his political life. In so doing, he is undermining the effectiveness of political demagogues in the American body politic and is helping to strengthen the fabric of American democracy.

BACKGROUND AND OBJECTIVES

Senator HUMPHREY on August 12 offered in the Senate a proposal to declare the Communist Party an illegal conspiracy working in cooperation with a foreign power, to overthrow the Government of the United States by force and violence.

In explaining his amendment, Senator HUMPHREY declared that such a conspiracy should not under our laws receive immunity or otherwise be free of the consequences of its position simply by attaching to itself the label of "political party."

Under our laws, political parties receive rights and privileges in a democracy. These rights and privileges belong to a political party—but not to an illegal subversive conspiracy. The Communist Party, Senator HUMPHREY's proposal stated, did not meet the standards of a political party in a democracy in that it did not compete for votes, did not attempt to achieve success by depending on majority support, was not subject to membership control, and was part of an international hostile force aimed at subverting the democratic processes of our system.

Senator HUMPHREY's proposal provided that the Communist Party, or any other name that the Communist movement might call itself, was to be outlawed. It further provided that any members of the Communist Party who "knowingly, willfully, and intentionally" joins or remains a member with knowledge of the purposes of the party was guilty of a crime as a part of that illegal subversive conspiracy.

CONSTITUTIONALITY

It is Senator HUMPHREY's judgment based upon consultation with leading Washington attorneys that his measure to outlaw the Communist Party is not only desirable, but also constitutional.

When he drafted his resolution the first member of the Senate to whom he took the resolution for consultation and discussion was his colleague, Senator MORSE, of Oregon, noted constitutional lawyer and noted dean of the University of Oregon Law School. Senator MORSE not only enthusiastically approved of the bill, but asked for the privilege of cosponsoring it. He was soon joined with 18 Members of the Senate who asked for the opportunity to cosponsor it.

It is the opinion of the leading Washington attorneys that a democratic system has the legal and constitutional right to defend itself against internal subversion. The evidence that the Communist Party is an international conspiracy to overthrow the Government of the United States by force and violence is overwhelming. Judicial decisions support this view.

It is likewise clear that this action is in no way a precedent by which the Congress could or would illegalize other political parties or movements, for the Humphrey proposal specifically points out that the Communist Party is not a political party in the legal or democratic sense of the word. The Congress, therefore is not outlawing a political party—it is outlawing an international subversive conspiracy.

The Humphrey proposal is not a violation of our judicial civil liberties in that it addresses itself solely to "members of the Communist Party who knowingly, willfully, and intentionally join the party with knowledge of its purposes." This is a specific application designed to relate to specific membership and thus participation in a conspiracy. It provides no basis for its application against nonmembers or against people who innocently and unknowingly join. It does not scatter its shots, and does not endanger any individual other than a member of the Communist Party.

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY

Senator HUMPHREY would have preferred to have his proposal and other similar antisubversive proposals referred to an impartial, scholarly, and respectable commission to be appointed by the President and the Congress. It was his feeling that the political atmosphere in the Congress at this time was such that it might be best to have these serious proposals affecting our national welfare and our constitutional liberties discussed in an area free from political pressures and critical tensions. He, therefore, joined Senator MAGNUSON in support of an amendment designed to refer this whole question to a commission which would make recommendations to the Congress after the elections. It was his belief that there was a tendency on the part of a great many Republicans to keep communism as a political issue in the campaign, and there was a tendency on the part of a great many Democrats to resent what they considered to be this "unfair" Republican political strategy. Nevertheless, the administration leadership in the Senate insisted upon defeating the Magnuson amendment, and insisted upon acting on antisubversive legislation in the present atmosphere. With that decision made, Senator HUMPHREY felt that he could not in good conscience bind himself from carrying a legislative proposal that he considered to be in the national interest—namely, the proposal to illegalize the Communist Party. After a series of votes both the Senate and the House of Representatives overwhelmingly supported the Humphrey proposal.

THE EFFECT OF THE HUMPHREY LAW

A recent editorial in the New York Times stated:

"Many people believe that it might be approaching the Communist problem more frankly and openly to outlaw the party itself as the conspiracy it is, in accordance with the sanctions now applied so universally to party members. It does not seem impossible to find a constitutional way of doing this."

The Communist Party has attacked the Humphrey proposal in strong terms. There is reason to believe they consider the Humphrey proposal to be a serious threat to their activities in the United States.

Officials in the Justice Department state that the Humphrey proposal will strengthen the antisubversive activities of the United States Government. In declaring the Communist Party to be an illegal conspiracy, the Humphrey proposal strengthens the application of the Smith Act when that act is applied against members of the Communist Party. In declaring the Communist Party to be organized to overthrow the United States Government by force and violence, the Humphrey proposal is making it possible for the Justice Department to require members of the Communist Party to conform to the requirements of the Internal Security Act of 1950 without further delay.

It has been argued that the Humphrey proposal, although legal, is undesirable in that it will tend to drive the Communist Party underground and make it more difficult for the FBI to do its job. This argument was seriously considered by Senator HUMPHREY and his colleagues, but the evidence was overwhelming that the consideration did not apply. Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, head of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the various Attorneys General and leading Members of Congress have all testified to the effect in recent years that the Communist Party is already now underground specifically as a result of the Smith Act and since the passage of the Internal Security Act of 1950. The Humphrey proposal recognizes the fact that the Communist movement in the main operates underground and adds to the arsenal of our Government another legal weapon with which to defeat the Communist conspiracy.

Veterans' Legislation in the 83d Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELIZABETH KEE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, from the earliest days of our country there has been a consciousness of the sacrifices made by the veterans of our Armed Forces, and the Nation's gratitude has been expressed in the form of various special programs designed for relief, protection, and benefit for them and their dependents.

In reviewing the history of legislation pertaining to veterans and their dependents, we are impressed with two fundamental principles firmly established by the Congress of the United States: First, the recognition of a Federal obligation to provide liberal benefits for those who bore the ardors of service and their dependents; and, second, a constructive progress in development of the system of benefits to meet changed conditions and resultant needs.

It may be of interest as indicating the magnitude of the Government's undertakings for its veterans and their dependents to point out a few figures on expenditures and numbers participating in some of the major programs.

As of July 31, 1954, there were 20,903,000 estimated living veterans. Then there were 3,378,270 cases of living and deceased veterans on the active compensation, pension, and retirement rolls of the Veterans' Administration. More than $25 billion have been expended through the Veterans' Administration and its predecessor agencies for these benefits alone.

More than 8,000,000 veterans have taken some GI bill training with a direct expenditure by the Government of more than $14½ billion. More than 600,000 disabled veterans have participated in the vocational rehabilitation program for the World War II and Korean conflict group at a direct cost of more than $1½ billion.

Disbursements for unemployment and self-employment allowances for World War II veterans approached $4 billion.

More than 3½ million loans have been guaranteed or insured under the GI bill, most of them being loans for the purchase or construction of homes. The default rate on these loans has been very small, a record of which the Government may well be proud as indicating the high character of its veteran population.

The story is not one that can be told merely in terms of laws, numbers, or dollars. The whole story can only be found in the hearts and minds of the great numbers of men and women whose bodies have been healed, whose minds have been improved, whose hands have been trained, whose families have been aided and protected, and whose opportunities to regain and maintain their positions as self-reliant, happy, and useful citizens have been made possible by a grateful Government and a grateful people.

I deem it a high privilege and a distinct honor to be a part of this movement as a member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the House of Representatives. In my work with this committee I have discovered how much it has contributed toward the building of this great structure of veterans' benefits. The traditions of the committee impel it to look continually to the welfare of the veteran and his dependents and to strive tirelessly toward providing and perfecting sound legislative provisions in their behalf.

As evidence of the earnest desire of the committee to safeguard the legitimate interests of our veterans, we have in the 83d Congress reported favorably to the House of Representatives 36 bills of which 25 are now law, 2 have passed the House and are pending in the Senate, and 14 remain on the House Calendars. I shall not try to cover all of these proposals, but would like to mention some of the important measures.

One of these enactments increases by 5 percent all basic and certain special monthly wartime rates of disability compensation under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration. An increase from $75 to $87 monthly is provided in the wartime rate of death compensation for a widow without children, and from $60 to $75 monthly for a dependent mother or father or if both are dependent from $35 to $40 each. The peacetime rates of death compensation are in all cases 80 percent of the wartime rates—Public Law 695, 83d Congress, approved August 28, 1954.

Similarly, one of these laws increased by 5 percent all monthly rates of pension—nonservice connected—payable to war veterans and their dependents, with few minor exceptions—Public Law 698, 83d Congress, approved August 28, 1954.

Another measure which was first considered and reported by our committee, in effect, freezes a rating of total disability or permanent total disability for compensation, pension, or insurance purposes if the veteran's rating has been continuously in force for 20 or more years—Public Law 311, 83d Congress, approved March 17, 1954.

One of these laws provides that on and after June 27, 1950, and prior to a date thereafter to be determined by the President or the Congress, any person who suffers a disability in line of duty, and not the result of his or her own misconduct while en route under orders to report to a place for final acceptance, induction, or entry upon active duty, or while at such place or en route home, shall be considered to have incurred such disability in active service in the Armed Forces. This places the veterans of the Korean conflict on a parity with veterans of World Wars I and II in this regard—Public Law 463, 83d Congress, approved June 30, 1954.

A bill from our committee, which became law, provides that any person with service of at least 90 days in the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps who, prior to the establishment of the Women's Army Corps, was honorably discharged for disability incurred in line of duty rendering her unfit to perform further service in the Corps shall be deemed to have been in active military service for the purposes of laws administered by the Veterans' Administration—Public Law 650, 83d Congress, approved August 24, 1954.

Another law, flowing from a bill reported by the committee July 19, 1954, extends by 1 year the time for initiating and completing courses under the Korean GI bill, thereby allowing 3 years in which to start such courses instead of the prior limitation of 2 years. It also extends from 7 to 8 years the period following discharge or release from service or following termination of the period beginning June 27, 1950, whichever is the earlier, within which a veteran must complete his education or training. Further, it grants trainees under Public Law 16, 78th Congress, who have been prevented from completing training by reason of disability or correction of discharge 4 additional years to complete their courses—Public Law 610, 83d Congress, approved August 20, 1954.

Provision was made for the automatic renewal of level premium term insurance at the expiration of the 5-year term. This is a definite protection to insured veterans who otherwise might fail to take timely action to continue their policies—Public Law 148, 83d Congress, approved July 23, 1953.

The Committee on Veterans' Affairs has been especially vigilant concerning the hospital and medical treatment rights of veterans. It has been anxious to see that no unwarranted curb be placed on these rights. The Subcommittee on Hospitals, of which I am a member, held lengthy hearings on the matter in 1953 at which veterans' organizations and other groups were represented.

Shortly after the adoption of House Resolution 34, authorizing the committee to make an inspection of the Veterans' Administration, our subcommittee on hospitals devised a comprehensive questionnaire which was submitted to each one of the 161 Veterans' Administration installations throughout the country. This questionnaire asked such pertinent questions as the average length of stay, the actual number of patients in the hospital at the time, the number of consultants, the number of attending physicians, the type of hospital care provided, and so forth. The data from the replies were published as House Committee Print 53, together with a series of 15 tables prepared at the subcommittee's request by the Bureau of the Census. This study has been acclaimed as one of the best documents ever prepared in this field.

You are aware, of course, of the form P-10 addendum which was adopted by the Veterans' Administration requiring the listing of assets and liabilities in nonservice-connected cases. By a resolution of March 24, 1954, the committee recognized that this addendum does not preclude hospitalization for needy cases, expressed its approval of present unlimited hospitalization for service-connected veterans, urged cooperation of all concerned in the new admission policy to give it a fair trial before any final conclusion is reached on its feasibility, resolved that no legislation be considered until the effect of the new policy is determined, registered approval of the continued hospitalization of non-service-connected neuropsychiatric and tubercular veterans, and declared approval of the continued hospitalization of other non-service-connected veteran groups where beds are available and the veteran does not have the ability to pay for private hospitalization.

Legislation enacted in the 83d Congress, other than that mentioned as emanating from the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, but which nonetheless had the consideration of the members of the committee, included the following as salient measures:

The Housing Act of 1954 which made various provisions affecting loan assistance under the GI bill, including the extension of the $7,500 home-loan guaranty provisions to loans for the alteration, improvement, or repair of veterans' homes under certain conditions, and provisions for warranty by the seller or builder that a family dwelling of a certain type substantially conforms with plans and specifications where loan guaranty is to be made—Public Law 560, 83d Congress, approved August 2, 1954.

On the 1st of June of this year the President approved an enactment of Congress which changed the name of the annual legal holiday known as Armistice Day to a new name to be known as Veterans' Day. On this annual occasion we shall honor all of the veterans and all of those who have died in service, including those who served in the early wars, in World War I, World War II, the Korean conflict, and at other times and places. Thus, their supreme contribution to the survival and progress of this Nation will always be recognized by every citizen—Public Law 380, 83d Congress, approved June 1, 1954.

Still another law extends to the sons of persons who have died or who may die as a result of service in the Armed Forces during the Korean conflict the same opportunities for appointment to the Military, Naval, and Air Force Academies as are now available to the sons of members of the Armed Forces who have died or who may die as a result of service in World Wars I and II—Public Law 381, 83d Congress, approved June 3, 1954.

The major benefits now available for veterans and their dependents include, first, compensation for wartime and peacetime veterans for disability or death due to service; second, pension for nonservice-connected disability or death for wartime service, or service on or after June 27, 1950, and before such date as shall thereafter be determined by Presidential proclamation or concurrent resolution of the Congress; third, medical and domiciliary care by the Veterans' Administration for service-connected disabilities or, under certain conditions, for nonservice-connected disability for veterans who served during a war, or on or after June 27, 1950, or if discharged for line of duty disability or if in receipt of compensation for service-connected disability; fourth, outpatient treatment for veterans with service-connected disabilities at Veterans' Administration hospitals or clinics or from approved private physicians, all Spanish-American War veterans being presumed to have service-connected disabilities for this purpose; fifth, vocational rehabilitation to overcome a handicap because of a compensable service-connected disability for veterans of World War II and those serving on or after June 27, 1950; sixth, education and training regardless of service connection for veterans of World War II and those who served on or after June 27, 1950; seventh, guaranteed or insured home, farm, or business loans under title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act, as amended, for veterans of World War II or with service on or after June 27, 1950, and unremarried widows of such veterans who died of a service-connected condition; eighth, United States Government life insurance, issued prior to April 25, 1951, for World War I veterans, but no such new insurance may be issued since April 25, 1951, except in certain specified cases; ninth, National Service life insurance issued prior to April 25, 1951, and the issuance of such new insurance after that date in certain specified cases; tenth, free indemnity to survivors in the immediate family of persons dying in the Armed Forces on and after June 27, 1950, in the amount of $10,000, less any amount of Government insurance in force; eleventh, a contribution by the Government of $1,600 towards the purchase price of an automobile or other conveyance for veterans of World War II or those serving on or after June 27, 1950, and who are entitled to compensation for the loss or permanent loss of use, of one or both feet, or one or both hands, or for permanent visual impairment of both eyes to a prescribed degree; and twelfth, for a war or peacetime veteran entitled to compensation for permanent and total directly service-connected disability for loss or loss of use, of both legs due to certain specific conditions such as to prevent him from moving about without the aid of braces, crutches, canes, or a wheelchair, a Federal grant of not more than 50 percent of the cost of a specially adapted home or a maximum of $10,000 with which to buy or build a new home, or remodel an existing home, or pay off indebtedness on such a special home already acquired.

We have today a system of veterans' benefits which is without parallel in other nations. It is a shining manifestation of the grateful spirit of the American people. It is a feature of our national life which is in keeping with the position of leadership which this country now occupies in the world. I know you will all join me in the high resolve that as a Nation we shall never forget the enduring patriotism of those who have so nobly served in our first line of defense.

Report to My Constituents on the 83d Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 19, 1954

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, the 83d Congress, which convened on January 3, 1953, is almost history. It has been in session through two momentous and trying years—years of decision, both nationally and internationally. As one who took an active role in many of the decisions which were made during that time, I would like to say that I am immensely proud at having been a Member of this distinguished House.

At this time I would like to review briefly some of the highlights of the 83d session, for my colleagues and for the information of my constituents in the great 22d District of Ohio.

With the inauguration of President Eisenhower on January 20, 1953, both the legislative and executive branches of our Government became a Republican responsibility for the first time in two decades. This responsibility was delegated to every member of the Republican Party, but most especially to those of us in the Congress who were given the immense task of writing legislation for some 160 million Americans.

Majority responsibilities are considerably heavier both in Congress and in committee. On the floor one must take a far more active role on the many matters that come before the Congress. In committee there are often chairmanships added to regular committee duties.

Upon the convening of the 83d Congress, I reassumed the chairmanship of the Subcommittee on the Near East and Africa and also became ranking member of the Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements, both of which are part of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs. I need not point out that the precarious situation of international affairs put a gigantic burden on the Committee on Foreign Affairs and each of its subcommittees. This year, for instance, we sat in full committee for 46 days to consider the Mutual Security Act of 1954. My Near East subcommittee was equally busy, for we were hearing, among others, two Assistant Secretaries of State for our area as well as various others of the State Department Foreign Service who came from and were going into those countries.

EISENHOWER LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

President Eisenhower, in his state of the Union message last January, said:

> Our position as a sovereign nation in relationship to other sovereign nations overshadows and influences every other problem to which this Government falls heir.

When the new administration took office in 1953, there were six major trouble areas in the world: One, Korea; two, Indochina; three, Iran; four, Guatemala; five, the Suez Canal area; and six, the European Defense Community area. The first two were major shooting wars. Today there is no major war anywhere in the world.

The carnage has stopped in Korea. The French are no longer fighting in Indochina, although the peace terms were not at all to our liking. However, we have made outstanding gains more recently when the United States joined seven other nations in signing the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty—which created SEATO—and the Pacific Charter to prevent further aggression. These treaties have been described as a triumph of American foreign policy in the Far East. In Iran, Mossadegh and his Communist friends in the Tudeh Party are no longer in control. The recent settlement of the oil problems, the withdrawal of the British from Suez, the conferences over the waters of the Jordan, all suggest that an era of prosperity is in the offing for the Near East. In Guatemala the dangerous Communist stronghold was crushed.

The 83d Congress showed its active support of the Eisenhower foreign policy. We passed the St. Lawrence seaway legislation, in which the people of Greater Cleveland took a very deep personal interest. This country and Canada have at last agreed formally to start joint construction of this project, which is vital not only to our security, but will be a great stimulant to our economy.

Also in foreign policy, we passed a completely overhauled Mutual Security Act, which took a realistic view of the needs of our friends overseas.

DOMESTIC PROGRAM

The achievements of this Congress in domestic legislation are all the more considerable in view of what we inherited. In the face of the inefficiency, waste, and even corruption which preceded us, we had to devote much time and effort toward establishing new patterns of efficiency and economy which had been absent from government for all too many years.

In taxation, this Congress made some of its most signal achievements. We not only reduced burdensome taxes generally, but in modernizing the antiquated tax structure we passed a human tax bill providing for many people in real need. I had worked hard and long to have exemptions for many thousands of police and fire widows living on the pittance of retirement income. It was delightful to see the Committee on Ways and Means include the spirit of my bill H. R. 379 into the tax bill which is now law. After years of effort on the part of many of us, there are now deductions for widows and widowers who must work to support their children. There are higher exemptions for parents whose children work, and higher deductions for medical expenses—a provision advocated by my son, the Honorable Oliver P. Bolton. Moreover, the business and industry provisions of this tax law provided a psychological stimulus to our economy which, I believe, we can credit with the healthy upturn in economic affairs now making itself felt.

In defense, this Congress established an Air Force Academy; passed an Atomic Energy Act, which also holds great promise for future civilian development of that new source of energy; revised and tightened the espionage and sabotage laws; took pension rights away from the traitor Alger Hiss and any other Federal employee convicted of a major crime; and passed a Defense Department appropriation bill which shifts some of the military emphasis toward airpower and new weapons. This last law provided for an average military strength twice what it was at the start of the Korean war.

In social legislation, the 83d Congress showed a real appreciation for the needs of the American people. We authorized $60 million a year for each of the next 3 years to assist the States in building hospitals, rehabilitation centers, and nursing homes. Our State of Ohio will get about $2,250,000 of that sum. I voted in favor of a health reinsurance program, but it was defeated on a motion to recommit. In education we authorized educational conferences, a National Advisory Committee on Education, and more educational research. I spent much time working for a better social-security system. We enacted legislation extending social security to millions more people and increasing benefits to all.

Highways capable of handling increased motor traffic are of vital interest to every State. We enacted legislation to step up the roadbuilding program, with an authorization for $800 million a year, of which Ohio will receive some $32 million, instead of the $22 million it now receives.

Better housing has long been on my working schedules. It became one of my principal efforts in this Congress. It was a fight every step of the way. But we succeeded in passing the Housing Act of 1954, which will raise dwelling standards and help more of our people acquire their own homes. For communities such as

Cleveland this act will help in getting rid of slums and in improving older neighborhoods. Although we who voted for and fought for the President's housing program did not succeed in getting the full number of low-rent public housing units passed for the 4-year period which the President requested, we did pass a bill which will give the administration the 35,000 housing units requested for this year. In my district, for instance, this will mean that there will be some 900 low-rent units into which we can move the families who will be dispossessed in our slum-clearance program.

In veterans' affairs, this Congress increased by 5 percent pensions to war veterans with disabilities, and to their dependents.

In agriculture, we passed the President's flexible price-support program. This will do much toward moving our surplus foods out of warehouses and into markets at lower prices which housewives can pay.

This is but the halfway mark of the Eisenhower Republican administration. If the President has in the 84th Congress a good majority to work with he will be able to go far along the road he has set his feet upon—a road which will insure to the rank and file of our people ever greater assurance that this is a country where all can find happiness and peace.

Statement Condemning Persecution of Religion by the Communist Government of Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, not so long ago the people of the free world were shocked upon hearing about the Russian Communists' mistreatment of that great Polish patriot, Cardinal Wyszynski. When the Russian Communists found that they could not bend Cardinal Wyszynski to their evil will they resorted to their usual practice of house arrest followed by the disappearance of their opponent. Cardinal Wyszynski had no fear of the terror of the Kremlin and openly challenged the Communists for their persecution of religion and their oppression of the Polish people. For his courageous stand he paid the penalty of arrest and imprisonment.

Right here in Washington the quisling Poles, who act as stooges for the Russian Communists, then carried on a propaganda program in the United States in an effort to convince the American people that the surviving Catholic bishops of Poland had entered into an agreement with the Communist occupiers of Poland—which would guarantee the peaceful coexistence between religion and communism in Poland. This action, of course, was a gross violation of the rules of diplomacy and common decency. While it proved again that the so-called diplomatic missions of the satellite countries to the United States are nothing but spy and propaganda nests, I regret to say that no action has as yet been taken by the executive branch of our Government to correct this dangerous situation.

On the occasion of these events, which happened almost simultaneously, I joined with the distinguished Senator from Tennessee, the Honorable ESTES KEFAUVER, in making a public statement condemning these actions of Communist aggression against the freedom-loving people of Poland. Under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD the statement issued jointly by us at that time:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR ESTES KEFAUVER, OF TENNESSEE, AND CONGRESSMAN MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN, OF OHIO, CONDEMNING PERSECUTION OF RELIGION BY THE COMMUNIST GOVERNMENT OF POLAND, OCTOBER 13, 1953

The entire world has been shocked by the brutal action of the Polish Communist government arbitrarily removing from office Stefan Cardinal Wyszynski, Primate of Poland. This event took place over the weekend of September 26, 1953. This action was taken without formal charges being placed, without even the usual mock trial so characteristic of the Communist system.

While the arbitrary removal of the cardinal as head of the Catholic Church in Poland has been cofirmed, a great deal of mystery remains concerning the manner in which it was carried out and where the Cardinal is presently detained. The Polish Government has broadcast a statement accusing the cardinal of violating the agreement of April 1950 between the church and the government. This so-called agreement has been described as the modus vivendi through which the peaceful coexistence of church and state would be made possible.

The Polish Embassy in Washington on September 26, 1953, released a statement which seeks to establish the concurrence of the remaining Catholic bishops in Poland with the removal from office of the cardinal. A reading of this press release shows that it is either a complete falsehood or some of the remaining bishops of Poland were forced to issue it under circumstances of extreme duress. The Polish Embassy is obviously engaged in a propaganda campaign to distort the facts and keep the real truth concerning their persecution of religion from the American people.

The Polish Ambassador to the United States has in the past several days sent to many if not all the Members of Congress an English edition of the Polish constitution. This is hardly a coincidence. It is tied directly with the case of Cardinal Wyszynski. On May 8, 1953, the Polish bishops conference, of which Cardinal Wyszynski is chairman, sent a long and historic memorandum to President Boleslaw Bierut. This memorandum sets forth the violations by the government of the modus vivendi agreement established in April 1950. It states in clear and courageous language the diabolical plan of the state to either completely destroy religion or make it a vassal servant of communism. More than anything else it reflects the heroic struggles of Christian life against atheistic communism in the battle now raging in Poland. This historic document concludes with the following statement: "The Polish episcopate demands from the council of ministers that, in accordance with article 32, point 7 of the constitution of the Polish People's Republic, it undertake the defense of the rights of Catholics in the Polish People's Republic."

It is, therefore, hardly a coincidence that the Polish Ambassador to the United States should be giving wide distribution of English text copies of the constitution of the Communist Polish People's Republic at this particular time. It is apparent that he is taking an active part in the Polish Communist propaganda campaign here in America—calculated to deceive and mislead the American people. This is in violation of every accepted norm of diplomacy. What is more important is that this conspiracy must be brought to public attention and appropriate action taken by our Government.

The violent persecution of religion in Poland is a crime which must be vigorously condemned. Freedom of religion is a prime requisite to peace and those who violate it endanger the security of all freemen. All Americans, no matter what their religious beliefs may be, will view the Communist effort to stamp out religion in Poland as a threat to peace.

The Government of the United States can perform a service to all mankind by exposing the Communist propaganda campaign being carried on in the United States through the Polish Embassy and by making an official protest against the diabolical persecution of religion now taking place in Poland.

Accomplishments for Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, the Republican Party has always been interested in advancing the interests and welfare of veterans.

Evidence of this is the new law enacted this year granting a 5-percent increase in disability compensation for veterans. The new law also increases the rate of compensation for widows without children from $75 to $87 a month. Dependent parents are increased $15 a month, from $60 to $75. Where both parents are living, payments are increased $5 a month to each, from $35 to $40.

The Republican attitude toward veterans was expressed by President Eisenhower in his state of the union message to Congress on February 2, 1953, when he said:

> Proper care of our uniformed citizens, and appreciation of the past service of our veterans are part of our accepted governmental responsibility.

This Republican attitude has shown itself in the generous legislation enacted by the present Congress to benefit veterans.

RECORD NUMBER OF HOSPITAL BEDS

The Republican veterans' program in the 83d Congress provided more hospital beds and medical care for a greater number of veterans than in any other year. In the first year under the new Republican budget, fiscal 1954, the number of beds in operation was increased by nearly 5,000 to a total of 114,315. An additional increase of nearly 3,400 was provided for fiscal 1955. Appropriations were made to cover 117,700 operating beds.

The Republican administration has also provided money to give medical treatment to an additional 6,890 sick and injured veterans. Under the Republicans, this was increased to 102,370 in fiscal 1954, and to 105,100 in fiscal 1955.

The Republican Congress has also provided another important protection for sick and disabled veterans by prohibiting the Veterans' Administration from transferring funds intended by Congress to be used for hospital facilities to other programs.

The 83d Republican Congress has appropriated $33,032,875 a year more for veterans' hospitals than the Democratic Congress did for the fiscal year 1953, and nearly $55 million a year more than the Truman appropriation for fiscal 1952.

A VETERANS' CHAMPION FOR VETERANS' ADMINISTRATOR

Knowing the veteran and his problems intimately, President Eisenhower wanted a Veterans' Administrator who shared this knowledge and understanding with him. He found the ideal candidate in Harvey V. Higley, of Marinette, Wis., a prominent industrialist who has been active in American Legion projects for 32 years.

Mr. Higley, a lieutenant in World War I, is a past departmental commander of the American Legion for Wisconsin. In 1921 he was chairman of a special committee which created the department service office of the American Legion. He is chairman of the American Legion Retirement Fund, and indicative of his interest in veterans, Mr. Higley is chairman of the American Legion convalescent camp at Lake Tomahawk, Wis.

So favorably was the nomination of Mr. Higley greeted that the White House received telegrams of commendation from past and present national commanders of the American Legion, AMVETS, and Veterans of Foreign Wars. All agreed that Mr. Higley was a sound selection whose service would redound to the benefit of veterans everywhere.

OTHER ACCOMPLISHMENTS FOR VETERANS

In line with its policy to help the veteran in every way possible, the Eisenhower administration and the Congress have acted on many fronts. Here is the record of action taken by the President and the Congress in behalf of the veteran population:

First. Approved an appropriation of $3,977,000,000 for fiscal 1954, and $3,796,652,800 for fiscal 1955, for the Veterans' Administration, to be used for medical, hospital, and other benefits, for compensation and pensions, for readjustment benefits, and miscellaneous functions.

Second. Enacted two extensions of authority of the VA to make direct home loans in nonmetropolitan areas to veterans who are unable to get private financing. The legislation provides a total of $250 million to be used for such direct loans during fiscal years 1954 and 1955.

Third. Approved simplification of procedures in the handling of veterans' life insurance policies. The measure provides for automatic renewal of 5-year term policies, and eliminates the sending of premium-due notices. It will save an estimated $600,000 a year and give veterans better service.

Fourth. Continued the so-called Missing Persons Act to February 1, 1954. The legislation provided for continuance of paychecks and family allotments for approximately 11,000 Korean war prisoners or soldiers who were missing in action.

Fifth. Extended the privilege of free postage to veterans hospitalized outside the United States as a result of service in Korea.

Sixth. Extended to veterans of the Korean war the same preferences in occupancy of public housing as other veterans possess.

Seventh. Facilitated the appointment of veterans who lost civil-service opportunities due to service in the Armed Forces after June 30, 1950.

Eighth. Approved legislation providing an additional $75 million to pay World War II veterans for compulsory labor or inhumane treatment suffered as prisoners of war.

Ninth. Passed legislation providing that all types of tuberculosis among veterans causing 10 percent or more disability within 3 years of separation from service shall be presumed to be service connected.

Tenth. Passed legislation defining the preferential status of veterans in Federal employment.

Eleventh. Enacted a law prohibiting reduction of veterans' disability ratings which have been in effect for 20 years or more.

Twelfth. Enacted a law to restore eligibility for outpatient dental care to Spanish-American War veterans and veterans receiving vocational training under Public Law 16 of the 78th Congress.

Thirteenth. Authorized veterans' benefits to persons disabled in connection with reporting for induction into the Armed Forces.

Fourteenth. Extended for 1 year the time during which veterans may initiate courses of training under the Korean GI bill of rights. Veterans may now begin training up to 3 years after discharge—formerly eligibility was limited to 2 years—and they have until 8 years after discharge to complete their training—formerly only 7 years was allowed.

Pelly Pledges Continued Pay Effort

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, in the move to obtain passage of the pay raise bill for postal and classified civil-service workers, I have been in the forefront. At this time, I pledge to the thousands of people in my congressional district to vigorously continue my efforts in their behalf.

Congress recognizes the fairness of the raise at this time. To tie in needed revenues with the needed pay raise is unfair. Two wrongs will not make a right. The Post Office Department needs more revenue, and Government employees are entitled to more pay, but there should be no connection between the two.

Congress further realizes the need of an increase in pay for all Government employees and, in my opinion, they will receive it next January, if not during this session of the Congress. As for increased revenue, that is a matter which should be handled separately.

Again, I reiterate my pledge. I will unrelentingly pursue my efforts for a pay raise for all Government employees.

Farm Surpluses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD S. MILLER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, it is after much serious thought that I come before the membership of the House to make a final statement in this session of my position upon the very difficult problem of farm surpluses. Let me first state that the American people are very fortunate in that this is a problem of surpluses rather than of deficiencies. This fact alone prevents the problem from becoming serious rather than simply difficult. At least it is not necessarily serious and can become so only by neglect or mishandling on the part of the people and the Government of the United States.

Let us review briefly the situation: From year to year, throughout the history of the country, the farmers of the Nation have produced more food and fiber than was necessary to feed and clothe the people. It was therefore necessary to find a market abroad for the surpluses. Now it is a well-known principle of economics that, barring governmental interference, the selling price of a surplus article determines the domestic price. For this reason, because there was no effective action taken by the Government of the United States to control the price of the surplus of farm products up to the passage of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933, the farmers of the Nation were compelled by economic factors to accept for their products whatever price they would command in the free, competitive market of the world. This was the situation of agriculture as a part of the overall American economy during the 144 years from the inauguration of Washington to the passage of the AAA in the first administration of Franklin D. Roosevelt.

During all this time the American people, in their desire to build up a manufacturing industry so as to be independent of any foreign nation, enacted protective and sometimes prohibitive tariff laws to shut out or limit foreign competition with our domestic manufacturers. This policy greatly increased the cost of living to every person residing in the United States, and became a hardship upon those not directly benefited by the increased price of manufactured goods.

There can be no doubt that there was an indirect benefit accruing to every segment of society. For instance, the manufacturer of steel products, because of the increased price at which he sold his goods, could afford to pay a higher wage to his employees. But did he do it? To a limited degree, yes. The American worker in the steel mills did receive a higher wage than those of Great Britain or Germany for similar work, but the difference was not to a degree commensurate with the higher cost of living. The truth is that the American employers in industry encouraged and fostered immigration into this country of cheap European labor so as to hold down the cost of their labor regardless of the profits accruing to industry. This led to great economic injustice and inequality. It produced in our Nation Fifth Avenues of wealth and pride and arrogance and poverty rows of poverty and hopelessness and degredation. Inevitably, in a country of freedom of speech and assembly, the downtrodden people, sooner or later, will find a leadership and unite to demand redress of their wrongs.

It was out of this situation, long drawn out, that the great organizations of laboring men and women arose in the closing decades of the 19th and the early part of the 20th century. It was a momentous struggle often marked by violence as the opposing forces of organized industry threw roadblocks into every line of advance in a determined effort to prevent united action on the part of the employees. I well remember as a boy reading of the Chicago massacre and the homestead strikes in which blood was spilled and lives were lost. What progress has been made. We now read in the preamble to our National Labor Relations Act the statement that the right of labor to unite and bargain collectively is fully recognized.

But it was not to give a brief summary of the history of organized labor that I set myself to write this statement for the RECORD. It was rather to place before the House the situation of that other segment of the people who do a great part of the manual labor of the Nation—the farmers and the farm families. The farmer and the farm family have always been the hardest working, poorest-paid, segment of the Nation. Even at its worst, day labor was better paid than was agriculture. The farmer has survived and sometimes even prospered, in spite of his disadvantages. In some respects he was in an enviable situation. He was isolated. He needed little expensive clothing. He could produce nearly all his food. He could deny his children educational opportunities without too much criticism. He could work the whole family in his enterprise, and he did. He was in a favorable position to produce and rear a large family, and this also he did; that is, until recently. He was in business for himself, and he therefore had some feeling of independence. He could plant what he wanted to plant and as much as he wanted to plant. His wages were tied up in the products he produced and to realize on them all he had to do was to haul them to market and ask the dealer what he would give for them. It was as simple as that. No worry about what he should pay for the shoes for his children—they wore shoes in the wintertime—all he had to do was to ask the merchant. No worry about what the wife should receive for her butter and eggs. It was only necessary to ask the merchant. No worry about the price of corn and wheat. The dealer at the elevator could look at the Liverpool quotations, subtract the required number of cents, and tell him to a penny. And everybody seemed to envy the farmer for his independence. He did not need to know anything about markets or to worry about the price he should get or the price he should pay. All he needed was a strong back and a willingness to submit to economic servitude. What if they were called "clodhoppers" and "hayseeds" when they went to the city. And many a town or city boy regretted the time when he was too close to the ragged country boy who came to town with a load of corn or hogs or wheat.

I remember well on one occasion witnessing a whole flock of town boys—mostly merchants' sons—making sport of a country lad coming to town with a load of hogs. The boys were shouting: "Hayseed, hayseed." The farm boy wrapped his lines on the top endgate, leaped to the ground, and chased the whole gang to cover. Then he calmly climbed into the "three-box wagon" and proceeded to the stockyards as if nothing had happened. I particularly enjoyed this incident because I was at the time myself a farm boy, and it was an unwritten law among us to stand and fight even if you knew you would get licked.

Well, the time came in the history of American agriculture when the farmer made up his mind to stand and fight.

He has made up his mind that after subsidizing the manufacturing industry for 140 years, and now that labor has organized and is getting a fair share in the national economy, out of self respect and in justice to his family, he will demand a fair share.

Some one has termed this parity for the farmer. I prefer to call it equality. It is more easily understood and therefore less easily questioned. Since I have lived with this problem all my life, worked and pinched and saved so that father and mother could pay the interest and taxes, and later required my own children to do the same thing, I should be able to explain what I mean.

Here it is in a nutshell: We demand a price for our products that will put us on an equal or nearly equal status with other segments of society doing equal labor. Ninety percent of parity is a concession we voluntarily make, is all the concessions we are willing to make. We are willing to go to great length to prevent burdensome surpluses by way of production control. If price supports are justified at all—and they are—they are justified on a basis of parity.

We object to any effort to reduce these supports below the established 90 percent to which we accede as a matter of convenience and not of right.

Any further reduction is a brazen attempt to make of us second-class citizens, and we have graduated from that status.

Be it understood that the proposed reduction of price support to less than 90 percent of a just price will not and cannot result in reduced production, but rather in increased production, for no farmer will be forced to reduce his planting on that basis. No one who understands the first principle of the economic laws governing agriculture would advocate or countenance such a measure to reduce production of surplus products. I repeat that the farmer, like the laboring man, has graduated from the status of second-class citizenship and it will be bad luck to the pseudo-statesman who is late in finding it out.

Damao and Goa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY J. LATHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, a major catastrophe seems to have been averted now that Indian and Portuguese police prevented a so-called people's army of liberation from entering the Portuguese overseas territories of Damao and Goa on the Indian continent. India has long been on record that she is against the use of force and that she believes in the peaceful coexistence between states of different political traditions. Her record on this still stands unblemished.

It is very important that the Indian leaders who declare their belief in peace continue to use peaceful means of solving territorial problems. It is equally important that the Indian leaders prevent irresponsible elements among their population from taking the law into their own hands.

In this modern age what may seem a local problem can too easily explode into a serious international crisis with unstoppable chain reactions.

I hope that all will be done to prevent the very threatening situation, which has already caused some needless bloodshed, from expanding into an international crisis where great loss of life and property will result. Irresponsible groups who seek to stir up clashes between different peoples have no concern regarding the consequences of their actions on innocent people. It is the duty of sovereign governments to repress irresponsibility. The dignity of government everywhere is at stake. Its standing in the world community can be seriously jeopardized if it does not take whatever steps are necessary to protect all the peoples all the time.

It is my sincere hope that there will be no more bloodshed in Portuguese

India, and that the international crisis which has been brewing there will soon be settled amicably as has been agreed on by both parties—the governments of India and Portugal. No issue is too big for discussion over the conference table.

The American people are interested in one aim—peace. This applies to local conflicts as well. It is a good omen that India and Portugal seemed to have yielded to reason.

The following articles will be of interest to my colleagues:

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of August 12, 1954]

NEHRU AND SALAZAR

Jawaharlal Nehru has accepted the "urgent" plea of the Portuguese Government to work out a plan in common for an impartial investigation of the violence in Portuguese India.

We hope the dispute will be settled smoothly. The outside world has gained from the Portuguese-Indian affair a view of the less pleasant side of the Nehru character. What was going on in Portuguese India bore a strange resemblance to Communist technique. Nehru, being a disciple of Gandhi, disavows the use of force, yet he is not averse to the action of toughs, or volunteers, to force a position in the holy name of patriotism, anticolonialism, nationalism, or what not. If it had not been for the firm stand of Premier Salazar, Portuguese India would today have been Indianized—and Indianized by lawlessness and dishonesty.

Nehru seeks to show that anticolonialism is at the root of the spat with Portugal. He is taking advantage of the anticolonial sentiment of the American people, but he is also taking advantage of their gullibility. The fact is that in this matter aggression was involved, not anticolonialism, an aggression on India's part, whether officially inspired or not.

Portuguese India is composed of three enclaves totaling the size of Rhode Island and is an integral part of Portugal. Nehru or the Indian rowdies had just as little right to rush Goa as the French would have had in rushing Monaco. Portuguese rule goes as far back as 1510, and the worthy who made this outpost for Portugal was none other than Albuquerque. And the man from whom he captured the territory was a Muslim sultan.

So, if there is to be any "liberation" of the articularistic Goans or any retrocession of Goa—assuming that Nehru is not laying claim to the whole subcontinent—the beneficiary would be Pakistan.

[From the New York Journal-American of August 8, 1954]

PEACEFUL INDIA? — HERE'S HOW NEHRU'S FORCES INVADE PORTUGUESE COLONIES

(By Dr. Paulo Cunha, Foreign Minister of Portugal)

LISBON, August 7.—The popular statement that now, for the first time in 23 years, there is no war in the world is misleading.

Aggression of a very familiar pattern has been committed and is now being committed by India against the properties and peoples of the Portuguese territories on the Malabar coast.

The situation is extremely critical and can easily result in extensive and uncontrolled bloodshed.

Portugal is historically a nation of peace which has not known war in its territory for nearly a century and a half.

But now my country has been viciously attacked by elements originating from its neighbor, India, a nation that has continually professed to follow a policy of no violence.

Prime Minister Nehru is not discouraging and not stopping the violent aggression. On the contrary, the Indian union is favoring and inciting it.

Is it not aggression when a neighboring nation sends armed troops to surround a territory and then permits well-armed Indian volunteers to enter and attack the people of that territory?

That is what happened as recently as July 22 in the Portuguese village of Dadra. Of 7 Portuguese policemen, all of them born in Portuguese India, not led by European officers, 4 were killed during their gallant fight, the others were wounded or captured.

The population offered resistance to the attack. But how long could they hold out knowing they were isolated and surrounded by armed Indian troops?

Since then a few other small villages in Nagar-Aveli have been surrounded and attacked, and over 4,000 Portuguese were forcibly, against their free will, put under foreign yoke.

The land borders of the important seacoast city of Damao have been closed by Indian troops who have dug trenches. All communications to the embattled Portuguese towns inland have been cut off.

Is this India's policy of no violence? Why does Mr. Nehru continue to permit these war-like actions if he believes in peace?

[From the New York World-Telegram and Sun of August 12, 1954]

PORTUGAL SEES INDIA'S OTHER FACE ON COLONIES

(By Jim G. Lucas)

DIU, PORTUGUESE INDIA, August 12.—The India of Premier Nehru has two faces—one it shows the world and one it shows India's close neighbors.

The 24,000 people who live here know India's second face better.

Diu is a small Portuguese island territory 300 miles north of Bombay on the west coast of India. It's been Portuguese—together with the larger colonies of Goa and Damao—since early in the 16th century when it was settled by Portuguese explorers.

Portugal contends that these areas in India are not colonies but actual parts, or provinces, of Portugal.

WAR OF NERVES ON

But Premier Nehru seems determined to liberate Diu and what he calls foreign pockets in India.

The people here haven't sought any liberation. The great majority are Portuguese citizens. They are loyal to their motherland and have little in common with their would-be liberators.

Thus, the war of nerves is on. It's somberly remindful of the methods of a Communist aggressor state before it is ready to pounce.

The situation is hardly less explosive here and in Goa and Damao for the fact that Nehru has relented slightly in accepting Portugal's proposal for appointment of neutral observers to study the controversy.

WORK OF VOLUNTEERS

So far, the Indian Government has left the dirty work to volunteers, just as the Communist regime of Peiping sent volunteers to fight United Nations forces in Korea.

The so-called volunteer liberation army of unknown size stands ready to march into Diu.

It is speculated that the invasion may come Sunday—which is India's Independence Day. Portuguese officials here say they are prepared to use whatever force is necessary to repel the invasion.

For months—without a single protest from the outside world—India has been starving Diu into submission.

CUT OFF FROM FOOD

This tiny island of 20 square miles is cut off from India's mainland, on which it has depended for its food supply for 400 years.

Now its survival—even without a war—depends on what it can catch from the sea, or bring in by ship from more friendly neighbors. But India is doing its best to block any food shipments into Diu.

What happens now cannot be concealed from the world. The Portuguese reasoning: Premier Nehru can overrun us, or he can continue his pose as the great peacemaker. It's no longer possible to do both.

The United States and Africa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 19, 1954

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, at the final meeting of the Conference on Contemporary Africa sponsored by the School of Advanced International Studies of Johns Hopkins University, Paul H. Nitze, president of the Foreign Service Education Foundation, delivered an address so perceptive of the problems Africa presents that I have asked and been granted unanimous consent to insert it with my remarks:

THE UNITED STATES AND AFRICA

(By Paul H. Nitze)

Most of the papers and the discussions of the last 5 days have been directed toward helping us to a better understanding of the complex and interrelated questions and challenges which contemporary Africa presents. Rarely have I participated in a series of discussions which have given me a greater sense of the deep seriousness and dynamic interaction of living cultural, political, and economic forces.

Any policy worth its salt must start from understanding. We in the United States must confess to only a dim and partial understanding of Africa, but I believe that understanding is growing and will continue to grow. A policy worth its salt, however, also implies choice and decision, perhaps tentative, perhaps subject to future modifications and amplifications, but nevertheless decision. And finally, it implies action. Action can consist in part in the use of words or even the nonuse of words, but in general more than mere words are required if policy is to be effective.

I take it that the central issue presenting a choice to the United States with respect to Africa is the issue of colonialism. Perhaps colonialism is the wrong word. Certainly the south African problem is not that of the relations of a metropolitan power to a dependent territory, nor does it involve any other external restraint upon the sovereignty of a nation. It is rather an internal problem of the adjustment of cultural differences symbolized by race differences and the attendant problems in internal allocation of political power and responsibility and the direction of its interest. Even though this problem is internal in origin it has implications and concerns for all of us to whom Africa is important.

Perhaps there is some more meaningful and precise word than colonialism to describe the central issue presenting itself in Africa. But whatever the word the question is what alternatives present themselves to

United States policy. One alternative would be to support holding fast to things as they now are in the dependencies of Africa. This would mean that we would encourage the metropolitan powers to "hold on the lid" in areas of their responsibility and would signify our willingness to see the legitimate aspirations of both Moslem and black Africa sacrificed to a short-term interest in order and administrative coherence.

I do not need to dwell on the fact that such a course would be abhorrant to American sensibilities and would fly in the face of our traditional sympathy for the underdog and for the ideals of self-government and self-determination. But even if such an attitude were psychologically tolerable we should certainly be compelled to examine its effects on the strategic interests of Africa and of the United States in Africa.

Several of you are historians, and I need not cite examples of the fate which overtakes nations that misconstrue stagnation for stability. A repressive colonialism, even one tempered by fatherly benevolence, will only increase the force of the ultimate explosion and create the conditions of a nationalism, fanatical and sterile in form. We have already seen too many examples of this type of development.

A second course would perhaps offer greater psychological satisfaction for the average American but would, I think, be equally fatal to the long-term interest of Africa. We would simply swim with the current and decide that since there is no resisting the tide of nationalism we may as well move with it without restraint, and give it our full inspiration and support. If we would adopt such a course we might earn a short-term popularity among some of the inhabitants of the continent. We would, however, also be encouraging within the dependent areas divisive tendencies whose existence is today masked and controlled by the presence of the protecting and administering power. We should risk setting Berbers against Arabs, Bantus, Indians, and Europeans one against another and fanning the fires of dissension between Islam, Christianity, and tribal religions. We would also gravely endanger that solidarity of the Atlantic community which is necessary to the defense of Africa against a new and more permanent colonialism from without.

The consequence would be weakness in all those things in which the United States would like to see Africa strong—weakness in protecting human rights, weakness in maintaining order, weakness in the bases from which social and economic justice can grow, weakness in safeguarding that external security within which independence can develop. The results of unthinking encouragement of extremism in Africa could be as harmful to the interest of Africa as the results of unthinking acquiescence to old-style colonialism.

The United States does not dispose with respect to Africa. Our relations with colonial Africa are in large measure through those European countries which do have responsibilities and commitments in the area. This is not to discount our relations with the dependent peoples nor our interest in their welfare and advancement. We have never had any colonial commitments in Africa and have no intention whatever of undertaking any. Nevertheless, the historic development of world forces has placed the United States in a position where it must, somewhat against its tradition and prior disposition, assume responsibilities or share the responsibilities formerly assumed by others. This is not an enviable position, for it requires of us, if we are to fulfill the role of protecting ourselves and the non-Soviet world generally, that we enlist and secure the cooperation of those who aspire to greater freedom while, at the same time, maintaining the cooperation of our European friends. On the practical side, it is quite clear that in conducting our day-to-day business with colonial Africa we must deal in the first instance with our European friends who now administer those areas.

Some are troubled by the fact that the United States today has two concurrent lines of interest. One springs from its anticolonial tradition; the other springs from its strategic interest in dependable bases and safe lines of communication necessary to the support of the strategic responsibilities it has been forced to assume. The fact that there are two lines of United States interest does put on us a far greater responsibility for careful and well-considered choice and action than was ours when we could follow sentiment alone. In large measure, however, the two lines converge toward a common line, a third course which is neither the course of "keeping on the lid" nor the course of unthinking inspiration of conflict and revolt. This is the course of throwing our weight behind the acceleration of self-determination for all peoples under conditions which will see preserved these precious freedoms once attained. As in most things in life really worthwhile, success in this course is not easy. It does not lend itself to catchy propaganda slogans easy for those whose policy seeks to destroy rather than to build. It does not seek to raise illusory hopes. It seeks instead to build, step by step, the solid foundations of independence coupled with that voluntary interdependence necessary to an association of viable self-governing States in a free world.

Fortunately, with few exceptions, this is the course being followed by our friends both in Europe and in Africa. If they are to succeed, they may need wise and sympathetic help from the United States. Perhaps together new ways can be found, not simply to accelerate the process but also to achieve a broader common understanding of our mutual interest in seeing that this process develops along constructive lines. Everyone, including the Africans, would stand to suffer from an exacerbation of conflict.

Some argue that such a third course is tantamount to avoiding a decision one way or another. I do not believe this to be so. In relations between contending friends it is unseemly if not also unwise to take the initiative in seeking a solution, yet the very absence of an initiative combined with friendly counsel and an inconspicuous display of one's views may represent a decisive action of the highest importance. In this sense the third course, as I have called it, seems to me to have involved already decisions of great consequence in the cases of Iran and Egypt.

Some have argued, at this conference, that the British-Egyptian agreement with respect to Suez was a debacle. I can remember only too clearly the brickbats that were hurled at us for urging restraint in contemplating the use of force in Iran and for arguing instead for patient negotiation. Just as the Iranian settlement now gives hope for a return to progress and the patient steps of cumulative economic and political development so the Suez agreement may well be the foundation on which the mutual interest of one of the countries of Africa and of the West can be developed.

I am not suggesting that the United States has been all-wise in its judgments on the crucial issues of the relations of one nation to another or of one group to another within nations. As has been brought out at this conference, there are deep philosophical problems as well as practical and theoretical issues on which we may have much to learn from Africa as well as to give. In large measure it is this willingness both to give and to learn which sustains our hope and our confidence.

Differentials in Milk Evaluation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, August 20, 1954

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have just finished reading a scholarly article by Prof. G. A. Richardson, of Oregon State College, entitled "Differentials in Milk Evaluation." It was sent to me by Prof. P. M. Brandt, head of the department of dairy husbandry of Oregon State College. Professor Brandt has been working on this general problem for some time past, and I presented in the Senate, in a speech inserted in the Congressional Record, a synopsis of Professor Brandt's point of view on the advantages accruing from use of the energy concept to establish equitable differentials in the marketing of milk. I have urged, and shall continue to urge, the United States Department of Agriculture to give favorable consideration to the research studies of the department of dairy husbandry of Oregon State College, unless it can be clearly demonstrated that the recommendations contained in such research studies as Professor Brandt and Professor Richardson presented are without merit. It would appear to me on the basis of my layman's understanding of the problem that the proposals of Professor Brandt and Professor Richardson make a lot of horse-sense which should be applied in an endeavor to solve marketing problems in the dairy industry.

I ask unanimous consent to have Professor Richardson's treatise inserted in the Congressional Record.

Differentials in Milk Evaluation [1]

(By G. A. Richardson, Oregon State College, Corvallis)

"As a business becomes more complex, it must be made more simple." (Harry Arthur Hopf.)

The dairy industry is progressing, and the price of progress is problems. One of these arises out of the growing appreciation of the economic and nutritional worth of the nonfat portion of the milk solids. The fact that milk administrators, market reporters, and others have joined the dairy scientists in substituting the term "milk fat" for the once-popular term "butterfat" is evidence of progress but also introduces the problem of how to evaluate the fat—dissociated from butter—in relationship to the value of its companion milk solids. Dairy scientists have an obligation to dairying to provide facts and ideas for coping with this and other problems, in the interests of both simplicity and accuracy.

The problem of differentials is one of considerable complexity if the fat is not the sole determinant or if it is assigned a fixed value high enough to discount that of the nonfat solids. In many instances differentials are set arbitrarily or by agreement; i. e., they are manmade, and, therefore, are apt to be irregular and inconsistent. In the economic field price, not nutritional value, usually determines the differential. But, according to Haecker (1914), the feed energy required for lactation is directly proportional to the energy value of the milk solids. It follows, therefore, that differentials should reflect differences in nutritional indexes of milks if the price is to reflect differences in the cost of production.

---

[1] Presented at the Conference on Milk Pricing and Marketing. Published in proceedings, 35th annual meeting, western division, American Dairy Science Association, Corvallis, Oreg., July 1954.

Some of the ideas as to the significance of the term "differential" are naive. In the discussion to follow it implies the adjustment in the price, value, compositon, or energy of 100 pounds of milk for each change of 0.1 percent fat, or of 0.1 percent protein, and the accompanying change in the nonfat or the nonprotein solids. The term "milk differential" connotes the correct meaning as here used; butterfat or protein differential would be incorrect. Also, differentials will largely be restricted to producer milks; and cost of production, as a major factor in pricing, will be of primary concern. It would seem that differentials in distributor prices, even from market or handler pools, should bear some relationship to cost of production. This latter becomes more logical and simple if prices of dairy foods reflect their relative nutritional values.

Common usage makes it simple to refer to milks according to the fat test. Figure 1 [not printed in the RECORD] illustrates the differential existing between the solids-not-fat and the fat percentages. Curve J, representing the familiar Jacobson equation (10), s. n. f. $\% = 7.07 + 0.4f$, shows an increase of 40 units of solids-not-fat per unit of fat increase. Curve C, representing the California equation (9), s. n. f. $\% = 7.07 + 0.444f$ indicates a constant increase of 44.4 units per unit of fat. The three-segment curve O, representing compilations and calculations from data secured from individual cow samplings in California (15), Illinois (13), and Oregon (14) indicates a solids-not-fat differential of approximately 38, 63 and 27 units per unit of fat for blended milks of low, medium and high tests respectively. The J and C curves have the advantage of simplicity; the O curve appears to be more accurate, at least from Oregon milks at the cow level. The tables and figures to follow are based on the data compiled in the Oregon study.

Figure 2 [not printed in RECORD] illustrates the inequity incident to pricing cream on the fat content alone and skim milk on the hundred-weight basis. The well-known and simple equations for calculating the solids-not-fat contents of creams and skim milks might well be utilized to evaluate these fractions of milk.

Table 1 requires little comment other than to call attention to the protein relationships to the total and the nonfat solids. The variation in the protein content of the latter (35 to 40 percent) may have significance when dry nonfat milk solids are used for standardizing and in nutritional studies. It is doubtful if it has significance in cost of production studies. The rather constant relationship between the total solids and the protein percentages was utilized by Olson to calculate the protein content from the total solids content (12). It is apparent from table 1 that the total solids can be estimated from the equation: total solids $\% = 3.89 \times \text{protein}\ \%$. The reciprocal of this relationship (table 1) indicates that protein comprises approximately 25.8 percent of the total solids of milk. A value of 26.5 percent was used by Whittier (18) to formulate a method for pricing milk to the producer. This method was proposed to give greater consideration to the relative nutritive values of the individual major milk constituents as well as to those of the milk constituents and competitive nondairy products than the Wisconsin (5), California (3) or Oregon (2) proposals.

It would be redundant to review the development of the protein concept for the evaluation of milk but the early contributions of Sherman (1903, 1906), Van Slyke (1908), Olson (1908), Lythgoe (1914), and others should be acknowledgded. The modern trend toward utilizing either the protein alone or its relationship to the fat, total solids, nonfat solids or nonprotein solids in pricing structures was illustrated at the 12th International Dairy Congress (reference vol. I, sec. 1, 363–376). It is recognized, however, that the fat-protein relationship is too variable to justify calculating the protein content from the fat test especially in milks representing blends from different breeds and from individual cows (17). Evironment and heredity also induce variations. The protein+solids-non-fat relationship has been shown to be sufficiently constant to warrant use of the equation (16), s. n. f. $\% = 1.266p + 4.74$. Likewise (14), the solids-not-protein may be calculated from the equation. s, n. p. $\% = 2.8059p + 0.2683$. These relationships, if generally substantiated, coupled with the use of the formal titration method of protein determination (16) make it possible to evaluate differences between natural milks of different fat tests.

For many years dairymen have used the simple fat-corrected milk method of compensating for differences in milks of varying tests (6). This is based on the gross energy relationships between milk of different fat test and all milks are expressed in terms of 4-percent milk. Table 2 shows the distribution of the gross energy among the three energy sources in milk. Thus, in a 4-percent milk the fat contributes 49.2 percent, the solids-not-fat 50.8 percent, of the total energy. Protein is responsible for 24.9 percent of the total energy or 48.1 percent of the solids-not-fat share. Gaines and Overman (7), Andersen (1), Hansson (8), found a high correlation between calories of milk energy and fat percentages which could be expressed by the equation: E cals./lb$= 51.76f + 138.26$, $51.48f + 135.91$, $51.07f + 138.91$, respectively. Using the Illinois, California 1950 and Oregon data, and standard values for the combustible energy of milk fat, milk protein, and milk sugar, the high correlation is confirmed and may be expressed by: E cals./lb.$= 55.54f + 118.98$. The curves are shown in figure 3. It will be noted that 1 pound of 4-percent milk has an energy value of 345, 342, 343, and 341 calories, respectively. The differences appear to be due largely to the different values assigned to the heats of combustion of fat, protein, and lactose.

In figure 4 [not printed in RECORD], the relationship between milk energy and protein percent is shown to be linear, although the agreement between the Illinois and Oregon data is not as good as in the case of the fat-energy relationship. The Oregon compilation represents a much wider geographical distribution as well as a larger number of samples of a greater number of herds than the Illinois data. It includes the Illinois data except that from the Ayrshire and crossbred cows.

It may be of importance to note that both sets of data indicate that milk energy yield is much more nearly a simple multiple of the protein yield than of the fat yield. This lends support to the generalization made by Gaines and Oberman (7) that "In general, the total (and often enormous) energy transformations of milk secretion depend on and are proportioned to the elaboration of milk protein."

These simple but direct relationships between milk energy yields and fat and protein yields, coupled with the fact that the feed energy required for lactation is directly proportional to the energy value of the milk solids suggest that when producer prices are based on cost of production, equitable differentials may be calculated according to the energy differences between milks of various fat or protein tests. For example: Consider that 4.0 percent fat milk is the base and priced at $6 per hundredweight. This milk may be expected to test approximately 3.3 percent protein.

1. The original fat-corrected milk formula (F. C. M. (4 percent) = 15 × lbs. of fat + .4 × lbs. of milk) was recognized by its originators as being only approximately correct. The Oregon compilations suggest the formulas: (a) Energy-corrected milk (4 percent fat) = 16.25 × lbs. of fat + 0.35 × lbs. of milk.

(b) Energy-corrected milk (3.3 percent protein) = 39.9 × lbs. of protein − .318 × lbs. of milk. The (a) equation agrees well with that derived from Forbes data (4) by Overman and Gaines (12), F. C. M. = 16.11 F + .3557 M.

Thus, since 1 pound of the base milk (4 percent fat or 3.3 percent protein) is priced at 6 cents and 100 pounds of 3.5 percent fat (3.1 percent protein) milk has the same energy as 91.875 pounds of E. C. M. milk, the price of the 3.5 percent should be $5.51 per hundredweight. Similarly the price of 5 percent fat (3.7 percent protein) milk should be $6.98 per hundredweight. The differential is 9.8 cents per point fat or 24 cents per point protein. The first encourages a high fat test, the latter, a high protein test.

2. An equally logical and simple method for determining differentials based on the energy differentials shown in figures 3 and 4 is possible. The constant (55.54) in the energy/fat equation is approximately 16.29 percent of the energy value of 1 pound of 4 percent milk (341 calories) or the energy differential is 1.629 percent of the 4 percent base milk per point fat. Misner (10a) suggested a 2 percent differential when 3.5 percent milk is the base. The percentage obviously depends upon the energy value of the base milk. In this example, the price differential would be 1.629 percent of $6 equals 9.77 cents per point fat, or 97.7 cents for each change of 1 percent fat. The formula thus becomes: Price per hundredweight of milk equals $(.977 × fat percent + 2.09). Similarly, the price differential based on the protein test can be shown to be 3.984 percent of $6 equals 23.9 cents per point protein or $2.39 for each change of 1 percent protein. The formula becomes: Price per hundredweight of milk equals $(2.39 × protein percent − 1.89).

Table 3 illustrates a pricing schedule based on this principle of deriving differentials. It should be noted that no price for fat or protein is assumed.

When it is required to price cream and skim milk separately it becomes necessary to distribute the energy of milk between the milk fat and the skim solids, and take into account the skim solids in the cream. This can be done from the data shown in table 2 and figure 2. Table 4 shows the schedule of prices, based on a price of $4.75 for 4 percent fat milk. As indicated in table 2, the fat in 4 percent milk contributes 49.2 percent of the feed energy and, therefore 4 pounds of fat are responsible for $2.337 of the cost, i. e. 58.4 cents per pound fat. The 8.91 pounds of skim solids, then, command $2.414 or are priced at 27.1 cents per pound. The right-hand column of the table shows the price schedule based on the direct energy concept without fixing a price for either fat or skim solids. The differential in this case (1.629 percent of $4.75) is 7.74 cents per point fat and the formula is: Price per hundredweight equals $(.774 × fat percent + 1.65). If only the protein percent is known, the differential is 3.98 percent of $4.75 equals 18.92 cents per point protein and the formula is: Price per hundredweight equals $(1.89 × protein percent − 1.49). The agreement among the three methods is substantial.

Table 5 shows a comparison between the method of payment for producer milks being followed by a successful cheese factory in Oregon and a method based upon the energy distribution between the fat and nonfat solids. In the former (column 1) milk fat is priced at 73 cents per pound. The price of solids-not-fat is based on the balance of the total payout using the Jacobson formula (figure 1) for calculating the solids-not-fat. In this schedule the nonfat solids are priced at 21.13 cents per pound. In column 2, the Oregon formula (figure 1) was used to calculate the solids-not-fat, the calculated price being 20.54 cents per pound. In column 3 the solids-not-fat were calculated according to the California (figure 1) formula, the calculated price, therefore, being 20.7 cents per pound.

For column 4 it is assumed that the average test of the milk received is 4 percent and thus (table 2), the fat share of the milk energy and therefore of the base price is 49.2 percent. Fat, then, is priced at 58.4 cents per pound. The remainder, $2.41, may be allotted to either the solids-not-fat or the protein, preferably the protein in a cheese plant. This prices protein at 73 cents per pound. Column 5 shows the schedule when the average test of the milk is 4.5 percent and is priced at $5.15 per hundredweight.

A comparison of the price schedules in table 5 shows essentially the same results obtained regardless of which formula is used to calculate solids-not-fat, when fat is high priced and the other solids, especially the protein, are underpriced in relation to their nutritive value and their cost of production. The schedule in columns 4 and 5 appear to justify consideration.

SUMMARY

An attempt has been made to simplify the evaluation of milk and the establishment of equitable differentials, particularly in connection with producer pricing. Certain clear-cut interrelationships between the major components of milk have been established. Stress has been laid on the relation of the gross energy of milk to the relative cost of production of milks of different fat contents and on the relation of the fat content to the energy value. Differentials have been calculated as percentages of both the energy value and price of selected base milks. Use has been made of proportionate shares of the energy and/or price to be borne by the fat, nonfat solids and/or protein.

Among the advantages accruing from using the energy concept to establish differentials the following appear significant:

1. Fexibility in adjusting to changes in the base price.
2. No assumptions are necessary as to the price of butter, powdered, or evaporated milk.
3. No incentive to watering or creaming is afforded.
4. All breeds are treated equitably.
5. An incentive is provided to breed and select for high solids, especially for high protein.

It is suggested that milk be evaluated using both the fat and protein tests and that the protein test be utilized either as representative of or as a means of calculating the nonfat solids.

REFERENCES

(1) Anderson, A. C. Cited from Gaines (6). 1926.

(2) Brandt, P. M., and Richardson, G. A. The Energy Basis for Milk Evaluation. Mimeograph, department of dairy husbandry, Oregon State College, May 1953.

(3) Clarke, Jr., D. A., and Hassler, J. B. Pricing Fat and Skim Components of Milk. California Agricultural Experiment Station Bulletin 737, 1953.

(4) Forbes, E. B. The Mineral Requirements of Milk Production. Pennsylvania Agricultural Experiment Station Bulletin 319, 1935.

(5) Froker, R. K., and Hardin, C. M. Paying Producers for Fat and Solids-Not-Fat in Milk. Wisconsin Agricultural Experiment Station Research Bulletin 143, 1942.

(6) Gaines, W. L. The Energy Basis of Measuring Milk Yield in Dairy Cows. Illinois Agricultural Experiment Station Bulletin 308, 1928.

(7) Gaines, W. L., and Overman, O. R. Interrelations of Milk-Fat, Milk-Protein and Milk-Energy Yield. Journal Dairy Science 21: 261–271, 1938.

(8) Hansson, Nils. Cited from Gaines (6), 1926.

(9) Jack, E. L., Roessler, E. B., Abbott, F. H. and Irwin, A. W. Relationship of Solids-Not-Fat to Fat in California Milk. California Agricultural Experiment Station Bulletin 726, 1951.

(10) Jacobs, M. S. Butterfat and Total Solids in New England Farmers' Milk as Delivered to Processing Plants. Journal Dairy Science 19: 171–176, 1936.

(10a) Misner, E. G., Methods Used in Determining Basic Milk Prices and Butterfat Differentials. Cornell University. Agricultural Experiment Station Mimeographed Report A. E. 488, 1944.

(11) Olson, G. A. A New Method for Calculation of the Proteins in Milk. Journal Industrial and Engineering Chemistry 1: 253–256, 1909.

(12) Overman, O. R. and Gaines, W. L. Linearity of Regression of Milk Energy on Fat Percentage. Journal An. Science 7: 55–59, 1948.

(13) Overman, O. R., Garrett, O. F., Wright, K. E. and Sanmann, F. P. Composition of Milk of Brown Swiss Cows. University of Illinois Agricultural Experiment Station Bulletin 457, 1939.

(14) Richardson, G. A. and Associates. Composition of Normal Cow's Milk, Project 11, Oregon Agricultural Experiment Station, unpublished. A partial summation was made in mimeographed report at the annual meeting, American Farm Bureau Federation, Seattle, December 1952.

(15) Richardson, G. A., Folger, A. H., and Hankinson, C. L. Compositional Quality of Milk. I The Relationship of the Solids-Not-Fat and Fat Percentages. Journal Dairy Science 33: 135–146, 1950.

(16) Richardson, G. A., Young, J. O., Dalal, S. H., Pearce, S. J., and Narula, P. N. The Use of the Protein Test (Formol Titration) To Estimate the Solids-Not-Fat. Proceedings, Western Division, American Dairy Science Association, pages 70–79, 1953.

(17) Stüber, O. and Gobelt, J. Die Fett-Eiweiss-Korrelation und ihre Bedeutung für die Praxis. Milchwissenschaftliche Berichte (Austria), No. 1, 1952.

(18) Whittier, E. O. A System of Payment for Milk. The Milk Products Journal 45 (1): 27–28, 1954.

TABLE 1.—*Some interrelationships between the fat, solids-not-fat and protein contents of natural milks*

Milk fat (percent)	Total solids		Solids-not-fat		Protein		
	Per pound of fat	Per pound of protein	Per pound of fat	Per pound of protein	Per pound of fat	Per pound of solids-not-fat	Per pound of total solids
	Pounds	*Pounds*	*Pounds*	*Pounds*	*Pounds*	*Pounds*	*Pounds*
3.0	3.82	3.88	2.62	2.86	0.98	0.349	0.258
3.5	3.47	3.92	2.47	2.79	.89	.359	.256
3.8	3.31	3.91	2.31	2.73	.85	.366	.256
4.0	3.23	3.90	2.23	2.69	.83	.372	.256
4.5	3.05	3.86	2.05	2.59	.79	.386	.259
5.0	2.90	3.85	1.90	2.52	.75	.397	.260
5.5	2.75	3.91	1.75	2.49	.70	.402	.256

TABLE 2.—*The distribution of the gross energy of milks among the fat, lactose, and protein*

Fat test (percent)	Gross energy per pound milk, calories	Sources of energy as percent of total energy		
		Fat	Lactose	Protein
3.0	286	44.0	29.6	[1] 26.4 (47.1)
3.5	313	46.9	27.7	25.4 (47.7)
4.0	341	49.2	25.9	24.9 (48.1)
4.5	360	51.2	24.1	24.7 (50.6)
5.0	396	53.0	23.6	24.4 (51.8)
5.5	424	54.4	22.2	23.4 (51.3)

[1] Protein share of the solids-not-fat energy—percent.

TABLE 3.—*Milk price differential based on milk energy differential*

Fat (percent)	Price [1]	Protein (percent)	Price [2]
3.0	$5.02	2.9	$5.03
3.5	5.51	3.1	5.50
4.0 (base)	6.00	3.3	6.00
4.5	6.49	3.5	6.46
5.0	6.98	3.7	6.94
5.5	7.46	3.9	7.41

[1] Price/cwt. = $(.977f+2.09)—Differential = 1.63 percent of price of 4 percent fat milk.

[2] Price/cwt. = $(2.39p−1.91)—Differential = 3.98 percent of price of 3.3 percent protein milk.

TABLE 4.—*Paying for cream solids and skim solids*

Base: 4% milk @ $4.75/cwt.
Fat share = 49.2% = $2.337 = 58.4¢/lb.
Solids-not-fat share = 50.8% = $2.413 = 27.1¢ per lb.

Milk test, percent fat	Price of cream (40 percent) solids per hundredweight of milk	Price of skim solids per hundredweight of milk	Total	Price on energy basis [1]	Price on energy basis [2]
3.0	$1.86	$2.18	$4.04	$3.98	$3.99
3.5	2.17	2.21	4.38	4.35	4.37
4.0	2.49	2.26	4.75	4.75	4.75
4.5	2.80	2.32	5.12	5.13	5.12
5.0	3.12	2.37	5.49	5.52	5.50
5.5	3.44	2.38	5.82	5.81	5.88
6.0	3.76	2.39	6.15	6.29	6.07

[1] See table 3. Differential per point fat = 1.63% of $4.75. Price/cwt. = $(7.74 f+1.65).

[2] See table 3. Differential per point protein = 3.98% of $4.75. Price/cwt. = $(18.91−1.49).

TABLE 5.—*Paying for cheese factory milk*

Base: 4 percent milk @ $4.75/cwt.

Fat (percent)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
3.5		$4.33	$4.34	$4.30	$4.28
4.0	$4.75	4.75	4.75	4.75	4.71
4.5	5.15	5.18	5.16	5.19	5.15
5.0	5.56	5.60	5.57	5.67	5.59
5.5	5.97	5.99	5.98	6.06	6.02
6.0	6.38	6.38	6.39	6.42	6.39

(1) Actual payout; 73¢/lb. fat and 21.13¢/lb. solids-not-fat, calculated according to Jacobson.
(2) Actual payout; 73¢/lb. fat and 20.54¢/lb. solids-not-fat, calculated according to Oregon data.
(3) Actual payout; 73¢/lb. fat and 20.7¢/lb. solids-not-fat, calculated according to California equation.
(4) 49.2% to fat=58.4¢/lb. fat; Remainder to protein 73¢/lb. protein} Base milk, 4% @ $4.75/cwt.
(5) 51.2% to fat=58.6¢/lb. fat; Remainder to protein=71.8¢/lb. protein} Base milk, 4.5% @ $5.15 cwt.

SENATE PROCEEDINGS SUBSEQUENT TO ADJOURNMENT

REPORT ON NAVAL PROCUREMENT OF TUGBOATS BY SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. THYE, from the Select Committee on Small Business, pursuant to the order of the Senate of August 19, 1954, submitted on August 24, 1954, a report (No. 2506) on naval procurement of tugboats; which was printed.

REPORT ON INVESTIGATION INVOLVING THE SECRETARY OF THE ARMY AND SENATOR JOSEPH R. McCARTHY ET AL.

Mr. MUNDT, from the Committee on Government Operations, pursuant to the orders of the Senate of August 17 and August 19, 1954, submitted, on August 30, 1954, a report (No. 2507), together with a summary and finding of fact on the part of the minority members of the committee, and individual views of Mr. DIRKSEN and Mr. POTTER, relating to charges and countercharges involving the Secretary of the Army Robert T. Stevens, John G. Adams, H. Struve Hensel, and Senator Joseph R. McCarthy, Roy M. Cohn, and Francis P. Carr.

APPROVAL OF SENATE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SUBSEQUENT TO ADJOURNMENT

The President of the United States, subsequent to the adjournment of the Senate, notified the Secretary of the Senate that he had approved and signed the following acts and joint resolutions:

On August 20, 1954:

S. 16. An act to permit the compelling of testimony under certain conditions and to grant immunity from prosecution in connection therewith;

S. 3546. An act to provide an immediate program for the modernization and improvement of such merchant-type vessels in the reserve fleet as are necessary for national defense;

S. 3655. An act to provide that the Metropolitan Police force shall keep arrest books which are open to public inspection; and

S. J. Res. 140. Joint resolution to establish a commission for the celebration of the 200th anniversary of the birth of Alexander Hamilton.

On August 21, 1954:

S. 1845. An act for the relief of Dr. Ian Yung-cheng Hu.

On August 23, 1954:

S. 232. An act for the relief of Hugo Kern;

S. 546. An act to authorize payment for losses sustained by owners of wells in the vicinity of Cold Brook Dam by reason of the lowering of the level of water in such wells as a result of the construction of Cold Brook Dam;

S. 1184. An act to authorize relief of authorized certifying officers from exceptions taken to payments pertaining to terminated war agencies in liquidation by the Department of State;

S. 1225. An act for the relief of Brunhilde Walburga Golomb Hartsworm;

S. 1308. An act for the relief of Leonard Hungerford;

S. 1904. An act for the relief of Ottilie Theresa Workmann;

S. 1959. An act for the relief of Mrs. Annemarie Namias;

S. 2420. An act to amend section 32 of the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended;

S. 2744. An act to provide for the termination of Federal supervision over the property of the Alabama and Coushatta Tribes of Indians of Texas, and the individual members thereof; and for other purposes;

S. 2958. An act for the relief of Ida Reissmuller and Johnny Damon Eugene Reissmuller;

S. 3028. An act to require the Postmaster General to reimburse postmasters of discontinued post offices for equipment owned by the postmaster;

S. 3085. An act for the relief of Mrs. Helen Stryk;

S. 3379. An act to amend section 4 of the Flammable Fabrics Act, with respect to standards of flammability in the case of certain textiles;

S. 3487. An act to authorize the Central Bank for Cooperatives and the regional banks for cooperatives to issue consolidated debentures, and for other purposes; and

S. 3816. An act to authorize the replacement of certain Government-owned utility facilities at Glacier National Park, Mont., and Grand Canyon National Park, Ariz.

On August 24, 1954:

S. 3706. An act to outlaw the Communist Party, to prohibit members of Communist organizations from serving in certain representative capacities, and for other purposes;

On August 26, 1954:

S. 2456. An act for the relief of Martin Genuth;

S. 2461. An act for the relief of Berta Hellmich; and

S. 3233. An act to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to provide permanent legislation for the transportation of a substantial portion of waterborne cargoes in United States-flag vessels.

On August 27, 1954:

S. 3239. An act to authorize conveyance of land to the State of California for an inspection station;

S. 3302. An act granting to the Las Vegas Valley Water District, a public corporation organized under the laws of the State of Nevada, certain public lands of the United States in the State of Nevada;

S. 3303. An act granting to Basic Management, Inc., a private corporation organized under the laws of the State of Nevada, certain public lands of the United States in the State of Nevada;

S. 3393. An act authorizing the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey certain property to Milwaukee County, Wis.;

S. 3532. An act to provide for the partition and distribution of the assets of the Ute Indian Tribe of the Uintah and Ouray Reservation in Utah between the mixed-blood and full-blood members thereof; and for the termination of Federal supervision over the property of the mixed-blood members of said tribe; to provide a development program for the full-blood members of said tribe; and for other purposes;

S. 3769. An act to amend section 709 of title 18, United States Code, so as to protect the name of the Federal Bureau of Investigation from commercial exploitation; and

S. J. Res. 183. Joint resolution to extend greetings to the Gold Coast and Nigeria.

On August 28, 1954:

S. 22. An act to validate certain payments for accrued leave made to members of the Armed Forces who accepted discharges for the purpose of immediate reenlistment for an indefinite period;

S. 1748. An act to incorporate the National Fund for Medical Education; and

S. 3873. An act to provide survivor benefits for widows of the Chief Justice and the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States.

On August 30, 1954:

S. 1042. An act to abolish the Commission for the Enlarging of the Capitol Grounds;

S. 3187. An act to authorize the United States of America to quitclaim all its right, title, and interest in and to certain lands in Arizona, except for mineral interests therein, and for other purposes;

S. 3189. An act providing for the conveyance by the United States to the Monterey County Flood Control and Water Conservation District, Monterey County, Calif., of certain lands in Camp Roberts Military Reservation, Calif., for use as a dam and reservoir site, and for other purposes;

S. 3595. An act to direct the Secretary of the Army to convey certain property located in El Paso, Tex., and described as part of Fort Bliss, to the State of Texas;

S. 3744. An act to change the name of Gavins Point Reservoir back of Gavins Point Dam to Lewis and Clark Lake;

S. 3750. An act to direct the Secretary of the Air Force or his designee to convey certain property located in proximity to San Antonio, Bexar County, Tex., to the State of Texas;

S. 3822. An act to authorize the conveyance to the State of Texas of approximately 9 acres of land in Houston, Tex., to be used for National Guard purposes; and

S. J. Res. 147. Joint resolution to establish the Woodrow Wilson Centennial Celebration Commission, and for other purposes.

On August 31, 1954:

S. 264. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain land in the State of Maryland to the Disney-Bell Post 66 of the American Legion, Bowie, Md.;

S. 361. An act to provide for renewal of and adjustment of compensation under contracts for carrying mail on water routes;

S. 541. An act to extend benefits under the War Claims Act of 1948 to certain classes of persons, and for other purposes;

S. 555. An act for the relief of Charles W. Gallagher;

S. 599. An act for the relief of Cpl. Robert D. McMillan;

S. 1183. An act for the relief of John L. de Montigny;

S. 1203. An act for the relief of Lt. Col. Rollins S. Emmerich;

S. 1504. An act for the relief of the estate of Rev. Pang Wha Il;

S. 2070. An act for the relief of the estate of Givens Christian;

S. 2074. An act for the relief of certain Basque sheepherders;

S. 2147. An act for the relief of Terrence Waller;

S. 2259. An act for the relief of Rev. Charles V. Rossini;

S. 2266. An act for the relief of Walter P. Sylvester;

S. 2308. An act to authorize and direct the investigation by the Attorney General of certain offenses, and for other purposes;

S. 2553. An act for the relief of Joseph V. Crimi, father of the minor child, Joseph Crimi;

S. 2632. An act for the relief of the Epes Transportation Corp.;

S. 2639. An act for the relief of Etsuko Tamaki (Shimizu);

S. 2649. An act for the relief of Chaya Frangles;

S. 2693. An act for the relief of Robert Lee Williams;

S. 2789. An act for the relief of Gianni Bernardis;

S. 2893. An act for the relief of Seraphina Papgeorgiou;

S. 2954. An act for the relief of Christine Thum;

S. 2980. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York to hear, determine, and render judgment upon a claim of the Bunker Hill Development Corp.;

S. 3017. An act for the relief of Thomas Barron;

S. 3058. An act for the relief of certain nationals of Italy;

S. 3108. An act to modify the act of October 8, 1940 (54 Stat. 1020) and the act of July 24, 1947 (61 Stat. 418) with respect to the recoupment of certain public school construction costs in Minnesota;

S. 3110. An act for the relief of the Portsmouth Sand and Gravel Co.;

S. 3148. An act for the relief of Francesco Pugliese;

S. 3245. An act to provide emergency credit.

S. 3329. An act to amend the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1953 to correct certain inequities;

S. 3447. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code to permit the filling of oral prescriptions for certain drugs, and for other purposes;

S. 3482. An act to amend the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act, and for other purposes;

S. 3485. An act for the relief of Liselotta Kunze;

S. 3494. An act for the relief of the Central Railroad Co. of New Jersey;

S. 3562. An act for the relief of the McMahon Co., Inc.;

S. 3601. An act to provide that the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to extend until not later than October 18, 1952, certain timber rights and necessary ingress and egress, and for other purposes;

S. 3627. An act to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended;

S. 3628. An act to amend Public Law 815, 81st Congress, in order to extend for 2 additional years the program of assistance for school construction under title III of that act;

S. 3629. An act to postpone the effective date of the 3-percent "absorption" requirement in Public Law 874, 81st Congress, for 1 year;

S. 3712. An act to authorize the commander, Air University, to confer appropriate degrees upon persons who meet all requirements for those degrees in the Resident College of the United States Air Force Institute of Technology;

S. 3840. An act for the relief of Klyce Motors, Inc.;

S. 3844. An act to provide for a reciprocal and more effective remedy for certain claims arising out of the acts of military personnel and to authorize the pro rata sharing of the cost of such claims with foreign nations, and for other purposes;

S. 3868. An act authorizing the payment of salary to any individual given a recess appointment as Comptroller General of the United States before the beginning of the 84th Congress;

S. J. Res. 170. Joint resolution to approve the conveyance by the Tennessee Valley Authority of certain public-use terminal properties now owned by the United States; and

S. J. Res. 173. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim the week of November 28, 1954, through December 4, 1954, as National Salvation Army Week.

On September 1, 1954:

S. 738. An act for the relief of Maria Busa;

S. 1259. An act for the relief of Anastasia Kondylis;

S. 1604. An act for the relief of Margot Herta Matulewitz;

S. 1605. An act for the relief of James Arthur Cimino and Joan Cimino;

S. 1873. An act for the relief of Ursula Wilke and Mike Mario Wilke;

S. 2068. An act for the relief of Francesco Marinelli;

S. 2156. An act for the relief of John Enepekides, his wife, Anna, and his son, George;

S. 2301. An act for the relief of Katherina Picerkona and her minor son, Helmut;

S. 2345. An act for the relief of Yun Tai Miao and his wife, Chao Pei Tsang Miao;

S. 2366. An act for the relief of Ito Yukiko;

S. 2496. An act for the relief of Harvey Schwartz;

S. 2636. An act for the relief of Arturo Rodriguez Diaz;

S. 2640. An act for the relief of Esther Joanne Potter;

S. 2670. An act to provide for the termination of Federal supervision over the property of certain tribes, bahds, and colonies of Indians in the State of Utah and the individual members thereof, and for other purposes;

S. 2731. An act for the relief of Jean Cantalini;

S. 2842. An act for the relief of Dr. Felix de Pinies;

S. 2849. An act for the relief of Elisa-Pompea Roppo (Elisa-Pompea Cardone);

S. 2879. An act for the relief of Peter Julian Newbery and Prudence Ellen Newbery;

S. 2884. An act for the relief of Sister Anna Scrinzi, Sister Giuliana Paladini, Sister Iolanda Mazzocchi, and Sister Giuseppina Zanchetta;

S. 2887. An act for the relief of Hon Cheun Kwan;

S. 2941. An act for the relief of Kim Kwang Suk and Kim Woo Shik;

S. 2945. An act for the relief of Eulalio Rodriguez Vargas;

S. 2993. An act for the relief of Ruth Wehrhan;

S. 3056. An act for the relief of S. Sgt. Silvestre E. Castillo;

S. 3112. An act for the relief of Emiko Watanabe;

S. 3138. An act for the relief of Wakako Niimi and her minor child, Katherine;

S. 3145. An act for the relief of Bonita Lee Simpson;

S. 3221. An act for the relief of Ingeborg Otto;

S. 3251. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain mineral rights to Mrs. Pearl O. Marr, of Crossroads, N. Mex.;

S. 3276. An act for the relief of Cleophat Robert Joseph Caron;

S. 3404. An act for the relief of Anni Stroee Jacobsen;

S. 3577. An act for the relief of Milos Knezevich;

S. 3586. An act for the relief of Mrs. Hildegard Simon Walley;

S. 3625. An act for the relief of Mrs. Juana Padilla de Caballero (Mrs. Juana Padilla de Ontiveros); and

S. 3652. An act for the relief of Francis Timothy Mary Hodgson (formerly Victor Charles Joyce).

On September 2, 1954:

S. 2316. An act for the relief of the Birmingham Iron Works, Inc.; and

S. 2618. An act for the relief of Ertogroul Osman.

On September 3, 1954:

S. 2862. An act to provide relief for the sheep-raising industry by making special nonquota immigrant visas available to certain skilled alien sheepherders.

DISAPPROVAL OF SENATE BILLS SUBSEQUENT TO ADJOURNMENT

The message also announced that the President had disapproved bills of the Senate of the following titles:

On August 26, 1954:

S. 154. An act for the relief of George Pantelas.

S. 154. I am withholding my approval of S. 154, for the relief of George Pantelas.

The beneficiary of the bill is an alien who is deportable on the ground that at the time of his last entry he was not in possession of a valid immigration visa and because of his record of crimes involving moral turpitude.

The bill would authorize and direct the Attorney General to discontinue the pending deportation proceedings, cancel any outstanding order of deportation, warrant of arrest and bond which may have been issued, and would exempt the alien from deportation in the future by reason of the same facts upon which the current proceedings are based.

The alien was born in Greece on February 12, 1903. He originally entered the United States in 1921. On May 3, 1929, he was convicted in California of issuing checks without sufficient funds and sentenced to an indeterminate term of imprisonment for not more than 14 years. He was subsequently deported from the United States on June 18, 1931, because of his criminal record. Thereafter, the alien reentered the United States as a temporary visitor on May 28, 1940, under an assumed name. In proceedings before the Immigration and Naturalization Service he testified that in order to obtain a Greek passport in another individual's name he paid $100 for a birth certificate and thereafter committed perjury and forgery in securing the necessary passport visa for his reentry.

While I am in sympathy with the evident purpose of this legislation to provide support for the family of the alien, the record of bad conduct presented in this case convinces me that the granting of the relief proposed would not be in the best interests of the United States.

Accordingly, I am withholding my approval from this bill.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *August 26, 1954.*

S. 3064. An act for the relief of the estate of Mary Beaton Denninger, deceased.

S. 3064. I have withheld my approval from S. 3064, 83d Congress, an act for the relief of the estate of Mary Beaton Denninger, deceased.

The bill would authorize and direct the Secretary of the Treasury to pay to the estate of Mrs. Denninger the sum of $780.36 in full settlement of all claims of the estate against the United States for payment of certain installments of an indemnity under the Servicemen's Indemnity Act of 1951.

Robert William Denninger died in service on November 20, 1952. The proceeds of a policy of United States Government life insurance, $2,443.27, were paid on behalf of Mary Beaton Denninger, the designated beneficiary. However, in order to determine whether she was also entitled as a widow to an indemnity of $7,000 under the Servicemen's Indemnity Act of 1951, for which no beneficiary had been designated, it was necessary to obtain evidence of the interlocutory judgment of divorce which the serviceman had obtained from her effective March 12, 1952, as well as evidence pertaining to the dissolution of one of her prior marriages. Upon receipt of evidence establishing her eligibility, settlement was authorized on her behalf and, without knowledge that she had died 2 days previously, a check for $780.36 representing 12 accrued installments of indemnity was mailed to a Veterans' Administration agency on October 27, 1953, for delivery to the payee. Because of the death the check was returned and canceled.

The law prohibited payment to Mrs. Denninger's estate, and thereafter the Veterans' Administration made settlement of the indemnity in favor of the serviceman's parents, the next entitled beneficiaries. This settlement included the installments totaling $780.36 which had accrued during the lifetime of Mrs. Denninger. The bill proposes that, in addition, the Government pay $780.36 to Mrs. Denninger's estate.

Favorable action by the committees which considered the bill appears to have been based upon the view that the installments which accrued prior to Mrs. Denninger's death became her property and, accordingly, should be paid to her estate. The specific language of the law clearly expresses a contrary intention on the part of the Congress. I cannot agree either that the mandatory provision of the law should be abrogated in this case to the exclusion of other similar cases, or that the Government should be subjected to double payment of those installments of indemnity which accrued during Mrs. Denninger's lifetime. To do so would obviously be discriminatory and precedential.

As I have previously stated, if the law is to be changed it should be changed for all. Uniformity and equality of treatment under general law applicable equally to all must be the steadfast rule if the Federal programs for veterans and their dependents are to be operated successfully. Heeding the special plea of individual cases would obviously destroy the effectiveness of these programs.

For the foregoing reasons, I am unable to justify approval of S. 3064.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *August 26, 1954*.

On August 28, 1954:

S. 1706. An act to provide for taxation by the State of Wyoming of certain property located within the confines of Grand Teton National Park, and for other purposes.

S. 1706. I have withheld my approval from S. 1706, to provide for taxation by the State of Wyoming of certain property located within the confines of Grand Teton National Park, and for other purposes.

The bill would permit the State of Wyoming and any taxing authority of the State to levy taxes on privately owned hotels or lodging facilities within Grand Teton National Park. It further provides that if the United States acquires such properties in the future, payments in lieu of taxes will be made by the United States in amounts equal to the last annual taxes assessed against the property by the State or locality when it was privately owned.

This legislation is unnecessary for two reasons: First, the State now has authority to tax privately owned hotel or lodging facilities in the park and has collected such taxes for some time. Second, there appears to be no disposition on the part of the United States to acquire any such property in Grand Teton National Park, either through purchase or donation. However, I am withholding my approval not only because the bill is unnecessary but also because of the precedent it might establish for piecemeal action in this field.

The present Congress approved my recommendation that a Commission on Intergovernmental Relations be established to study the means of achieving a sounder relationship between Federal, State, and local governments. I have requested that the Commission's report include recommendations as to how to solve the difficult problems which arise in the field of intergovernmental tax immunities. The Commission has a special study committee on in lieu payments and shared revenues. The Commission's report is expected in the near future, and it is anticipated that the administration will recommend legislation to accomplish its recommendations shortly thereafter.

I believe that questions of Federal tax immunity should be decided broadly and deliberately, rather than through a succession of piecemeal decisions and that this decision should await the recommendations of the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations on this question.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *August 28, 1954*.

On August 31, 1954:

S. 820. An act for the relief of the estate of Carlos M. Cochran.

S. 820. I have withheld my approval from S. 820, for the relief of the estate of Carlos M. Cochran.

This enrolled enactment would pay the sum of $5,000 to the estate of Carlos M. Cochran, who was killed in line of duty when he was a member of the Armed Forces in 1942.

The soldier decedent was discovered lying beside a highway just outside the entrance to the military installation where he was stationed. Although he appears to have been temporarily of unsound mind at the time, the sentry at the gate to the installation who discovered him and took him into custody was not aware of this fact. While the sentry was telephoning for military policemen to come to the gatehouse for the decedent, he attempted to escape. He failed to obey the sentry's three shouted commands to halt. The sentry then aimed his shotgun at the decedent's legs and fired. Just at this moment the decedent jumped into a ditch. As a result, he was struck in the chest rather than the legs, and was instantly killed.

A board of officers, which subsequently considered the case, determined that the sentry's actions had been reasonable under all of the circumstances. The board also determined that since the decedent was known to have been in a state of mental confusion at the time of the shooting, his death should be considered to be in line of duty.

The records of Army show that the regular death gratuity was paid in this case and that at the time of the decedent's entry into the military service he was offered but specifically refused national service life insurance.

The decedent's closest survivor seems to be a sister, who presumably would be the ultimate beneficiary of the bill. She is not entitled to survivorship benefits under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration, since sisters are not included within the categories of survivors eligible to receive benefits under such laws.

Laws administered by the Veterans' Administration and other Federal agencies provide systems of benefits for certain dependent survivors of members of the Armed Forces killed in line of duty. Benefits so authorized are generous and are payable to the specified survivors regardless of whether death results from the negligence or willful misconduct of fellow servicemen or any other person. Under the circumstances, I think it only fair and reasonable to consider the generous, uniform, and assured protection which these systems afford as the exclusive remedy against the United States on account of the death of a member of the Armed Forces killed in line of duty. Any other view would be productive of anomalies and serious inequities.

The foregoing view accords with that taken by the Supreme Court in denying relief in a negligence case brought under the Federal Tort Claims Act in which, as here, a member of the Armed Forces was killed not only in line of duty but incident to his actual military service. Such a view is in no sense novel. Military and veterans' survivorship benefits are the equivalent of civilian workmen's compensation benefits. The Federal Government and most of the States have abolished actions for damages between employers and employees and superseded them with workmen's compensation statutes, which provide the sole basis of liability in most cases.

Additionally, as already noted, the decedent had the opportunity to apply for a policy of national service life insurance in the maximum amount of $10,000. He was specifically offered this opportunity, but refused to take advantage of it, as is indicated by his service record.

Accordingly, while regretting the tragic death of the decedent, I am constrained to withhold my approval from S. 820.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *August 31, 1954.*

S. 2083. An act for the relief of Lawrence F. Kramer.

S. 2083. I have withheld my approval from the bill (S. 2083) for the relief of Lawrence F. Kramer.

The bill provides for payment to Lawrence F. Kramer of Paterson, N. J., of the sum of $67,500 in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for (1) compensation for services rendered by him during the period from 1935 to 1952 in assisting and enabling the United States to prosecute successfully criminal proceedings against certain defendants who had defrauded the Government in connection with fixed prices on work projects in the State of New Jersey, and (2) for reimbursement for expenses incurred by him in rendering such services.

It appears that in late 1935, Mr. Kramer complained to the Works Progress Administration concerning the existence of a possible fraud conspiracy, collusive bidding, and bribery in connection with certain sand and stone supply contracts awarded, and to be awarded, by the Works Progress Administration in northern New Jersey. His sole information was that his father, Philip Kramer, operator of a stone quarry at Paterson, N. J., had been approached by one George Brooks to participate in the scheme, and had refused, and that as a result of his refusal, stone supplied by him had been rejected by the Works Progress Administration (apparently due to the influence of the conspirators), with the consequence that he suffered heavy business loss.

As a result of this complaint, an investigation was undertaken by the Government which culminated in the conviction of the lawbreakers in 1941 and a civil recovery (by way of settlement) in 1952. Apart from the initial tip concerning the existence of a possible conspiracy, and the furnishing of the names of certain persons having knowledge of the approach made to his father, it does not appear that claimant contributed anything to the successful prosecution and civil recovery.

There is nothing to distinguish this case from any other case in which the Government receives from a private citizen information concerning wrongful action with reference to which criminal proceedings are brought and civil recoveries are obtained. The vast majority of such proceedings are made possible by citizens who either because of their normal interest in law enforcement and good government, or because of self-interest supply law enforcement officers with information of the character here involved.

Even if claimant were to be treated as if he had commenced suit as an informer, he would be entitled to no more than the 10 percent of the civil recovery, whereas the bill proposes to award him 30 percent of that amount.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *August 31, 1954.*

S. 2801. An act for the relief of Graphic Arts Corp. of Ohio.

S. 2801. I am withholding my approval from S. 2801, for the relief of Graphic Arts Corp. of Ohio.

S. 2801 provides that the Secretary of the Treasury be authorized and directed to pay the sum of $84,359.19 to the Graphic Arts Corp. of Ohio, Toledo, Ohio, in full settlement of all claims of the said Graphic Arts Corp. against the United States. The bill would afford financial relief to the Graphic Arts Corp. for losses alleged to have been incurred in the performance of contract W-33-038i ac-2023 with the Army Air Corps durng the period January 1 to June 1, 1946.

It is the contention of the corporation that it was not supplied with the full quantity of work contemplated by the contract during the contract period, and that the contractor was assured by representatives of the Army Air Corps that it would be protected against losses in its operation under the contract. However, it appears that the contractor did accept extensions of time and other amendments to the original contract under various change orders and supplements pertinent thereto by executing said documents. It is reported that payments totaling $2,029,185.29 were made to the contractor.

Insofar as furnishing work under the contract was concerned, it appears that there was substantial compliance by the Government within the contract period as extended.

There is an established rule that a formal written contract entered into on the basis of negotiations between the parties merges all such previous negotiations and is presumed in law to express the final understanding of the parties. Contract W-33-038 ac-2023, as amended, was entered into on a fixed-price basis. It contained no provision for payment of additional compensation merely because the contractor might suffer a loss in performance. Hence, while the contractor's claim is based primarily upon the premise that certain representations were made by Government officers at the time the contract was negotiated to the effect that the Government would protect the contractor from any loss in performance, the terms of the contract relating to the work to be performed and to the prices to be paid therefor were clear and unambiguous and such extraneous representations, even if established, legally could not be resorted to for the purpose of imposing an additional obligation on the Government. If the contractor felt that the formal contract and change orders and extensions, et cetera, did not afford it sufficient protection against losses in performance, it should not have signed the contract and accepted the extensions. Having done so, it seems clear that there is no liability for any further payment to the contractor, based upon the contract provisions.

Government audit of the contractor's records indicates that this corporation, although claiming a loss of $67,952.31 in the operation of the Gadi division for the 5 months' period beginning January 1, 1946, actually sustained a loss of only $46,213.94 during that period. Of this amount, the audit report shows only $29,432.29 was applicable to Army Air Corps contract W-33-038 ac-2023. Despite this loss of $29,432.29 on this contract for the first 5 months of 1946, the contractor actually earned a profit of $34,202.86 on the entire contract. The audit report also discloses that this contractor earned a profit of $392,329.15 on all other Government business for the years 1944, 1945, and the first 5 months of 1946. Its commercial business during the same period also operated at a substantial profit.

My approval of this bill would establish the undesirable principle of Government underwriting any wartime losses incurred by contractors providing goods and services to the Government, regardless of the fact that such contractors did not sustain a net loss. I am unable to perceive any circumstances which would warrant preferential treatment for the claimant to the detriment of other wartime contractors. I am satisfied that it is my duty to oppose this bill.

Although my examination of the record in this case does not lead me to believe that there is an equitable basis for this claim, it is possible that a court through judicial processes might be led to determine otherwise. In complex situations like this one, it is my opinion that judicial rather than legislative remedy should be sought. I would, therefore, be willing to give my approval to a jurisdictional bill waiving the bar of any statute of limitations against the claim.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *August 31, 1954.*

On September 1, 1954:

S. 45. An act for the relief of Mrs. Merle Cappeller Weyel.

S. 45. I am withholding my approval of S. 45, a bill for the relief of Mrs. Merle Cappeller Weyel.

This enrolled enactment would pay the sum of $5,437.21 to Mrs. Merle Cappeller Weyel in full settlement of her claim arising out of the death of her husband after his release from active duty in the Navy in 1948.

The husband of the beneficiary of this bill was recalled to active duty in 1947, after having been retired following the completion of 30 years of service. Prior to his release from this tour of duty, he was given a particularly thorough physical examination because of indications, that he might be suffering from high-blood pressure. However, a board of medical survey determined, as a result of this examination, that he was physically qualified for release from active duty, and he was accordingly again returned to his retired status in February 1948.

Subsequently, this officer was treated and X-rayed by a private physician in September 1948. The X-ray disclosed that he was suffering from a malignancy which caused his death in December 1948, after two unsuccessful operations in private hospitals.

This deceased officer's case was twice considered by the Board for the Correction of Naval Records, which was established by statute to correct records where this was necessary to remove an injustice. It was contended by the beneficiary that the malignancy should have been discovered at the time her husband was released from active duty and that, if it had been discovered, he would have been kept on active duty until his death. On the basis of this, it was further contended she was entitled to be paid the usual death gratuity, the difference between her husband's active and retired pay for the period between his release from active duty and his death and the amount of private medical and hospital expenses incurred on his behalf. The present measure is based on these same contentions.

After twice reviewing the case, the Board concluded that it was to be presumed that the malignancy had existed at the time the decedent was released from active duty and that, had its existence been discovered, he would not have been released at the time he was. However, the Board concluded that the decedent would not have been kept on active duty until his death, but in all probability would have been retired for physical disability not later than July 1948.

I can perceive no justification for the payment which the bill would make on account of the cost of private medical and hospital care incurred on behalf of the decedent. He was, at all times, entitled to such care at facilities operated by the Navy Department. There is no showing that any attempt was made to take advantage of these facilities. But, on the contrary, it appears that, for personal reasons, the decedent elected to be treated privately. If the Government is to establish medical facilities and make provision for the care of servicemen and veterans, as it has done, it cannot, at the same time, be expected to undertake reimbursement of such personnel when they decide, for personal reasons, to obtain care at their own expense from private physicians and hospitals.

Another reason why I am unable to approve this measure is that, as enacted, it is either unfair to the beneficiary or to the Government. This results from the fact that the bill excludes payment of the death gratuity of 6 months' pay which was originally claimed by the beneficiary but recognizes and authorizes the payment of the difference between active duty pay and retired pay for the entire period between the date of the decedent's release from active duty and the date of his death. It is obviously inconsistent to exclude the one and recognize the other. If the decedent is to be considered on active duty for the entire period in question for pay purposes, he certainly should be so considered with respect to the payment of the death gratuity. On the other hand, if his active duty is considered to have ended prior to the date of his death, then it is equally obvious an adjustment should be made in the pay differential award. In all fairness, it would appear that this inconsistency should be resolved one way or the other.

It should be stressed that notwithstanding disapproval of the bill, the beneficiary can now have her claim settled administratively. Since the time when the case was last reviewed by the Board for the Correction of Naval Records, legislation has been enacted which permits administrative settlement of claims based on changes in records made by the Board. Reconsideration of the beneficiary's claim under such legislation would result in an award which, I am confident, will be equitable from the standpoint of both the beneficiary and the Government. In this connection I should like to express my belief that the Board should take into account, in its reconsideration of the case, the possibility that had it been discovered prior to his release from active duty medical treatment of the decedent's condition might very well have led to his retention on active duty until the date of his death.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *September 1, 1954.*

S. 46. An act for the relief of E. S. Berney.

S. 46. I have withheld my approval from S. 46, entitled "For the relief of E. S. Berney."

This bill would pay to E. S. Berney the sum of $4,750 as compensation for damages allegedly sustained by him as a result of certain representations made by a representative of the Navy during World War II.

It appears that in the summer of 1943 a representative of the Navy discussed with the beneficiary the potential use of his Nevada ranch and certain adjoining ones as a bombing range. Although the evidence on this point is conflicting, it appears that such representative indicated that he expected the Navy to begin operations that fall and that, prior to the beginning of such operations, all livestock would have to be removed from the land. The beneficiary alleges that on the basis of this information he disposed of his cattle and other property and vacated his ranch early in the fall. It developed, however, that the Navy did not need or begin to use his land until the following spring.

In subsequent condemnation proceedings, the court refused to recognize any damages occurring prior to the time when the Navy began using the land in question in the spring of 1944. On this premise the court awarded the beneficiary $766.67 for damages occurring after use by the Navy began. The present bill was designed to afford compensation for damages which were excluded by the court and which the beneficiary alleges were due to the premature vacation of his land.

Conceding the facts in this case to be as stated by the beneficiary, it still does not follow that he is entitled to the award proposed here. It has not been established that the damages allegedly sustained by the beneficiary were due to a reasonable reliance upon the representations of the Navy representative. There appears to have been no such reliance on the part of other ranch owners whose land was taken under similar circumstances and whose statements appear in the committee reports in support of some aspects of the beneficiary's claim.

In addition, there appears to be confusion as to the basis for measuring the damages which the beneficiary allegedly sustained. He made an unverified claim of damages in the amount of $12,000. Part of the damages so claimed are covered by the $766.67 condemnation award. The Congress reduced the claim to $4,750, with no indication as to how this sum was arrived at.

From the foregoing, it seems to me, that the record in this case is inconclusive both with respect to the merits of the beneficiary's claim and as to the damages which he may have sustained. These uncertainties compel me to withhold my approval from this bill.

I would, however, be willing to approve legislation which would permit adjudication of the case by the appropriate district court. Such legislation should authorize the payment to the beneficiary of such damages as the court might determine to be reasonably attributable to his reliance upon the alleged representations made to him by the Navy representative. I believe that only by such means can the rather obscure elements of this case be considered and resolved in a manner fair to both the Government and the beneficiary.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *September 1, 1954.*

S. 417. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of New Mexico, to hear, determine, and render judgment upon certain claims arising as a result of the construction by the United States of Elephant Butte Dam on the Rio Grande.

S. 417. I have withheld my approval from S. 417, a bill conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of New Mexico, to hear, determine, and render judgment upon certain claims arising as a result of the construction by the United States of Elephant Butte Dam on the Rio Grande.

Under S. 417, jurisdiction would be vested, notwithstanding any statute of limitations or lapse of time, in the United States District Court for the District of New Mexico, "to hear, determine, and render judgment upon any claim against the United States for compensation for the taking of or for damage to real or personal property as a result of the construction by the United States of Elephant Butte Dam on the Rio Grande."

The bill does not identify the persons to whom it would open the doors of the district court. It does not identify the date or dates on which the alleged taking of property or damage occurred. It does not identify the events which might be alleged to have caused the damage or the taking. Its only requirement is that suit be filed within 2 years from the date of enactment of the bill.

Construction of Elephant Butte Dam was commenced by the Interior Department in 1912. Approval of the bill would thus be an open invitation to anyone who believes that he has, at any time over the last 42 years, been injured in his property by the construction of this dam to bring the United States into court, no matter how stale his claim may be.

It appears that the cases around which the hearings on the bill principally turned are those of a number of persons who believe that the existence of the dam, taken in conjunction with the severe floods that descended the Rio Grande Valley in 1929, resulted in the permanent seeping or swamping, from and after that year, of their lands in the neighborhood of the now abandoned town of San Marcial. I am aware of no showing, however, that these landowners did not have an adequate opportunity to pursue their legal remedies within the period prescribed by general law or that there were sound reasons for their failure to do so. Still less am I aware of any reasons for including within the coverage of the bill not only these landowners, but also all others who, regardless of time, attribute a damaging or destruction of their property to the construction of Elephant Butte Dam.

The very purpose of a statute of limitations—whether it relates to suits between private citizens or to suits brought against the Government—is to avoid stale claims and to procure a reasonably prompt initiation of judicial action before records are lost or scattered, memories grow dim, and witnesses die or become unavailable. To say this is not to say that compliance with the statute must be insisted upon in cases where its waiver would avoid a clear inequity. The instant bill, however, is not in this exceptional category. On the contrary, the controversies with which it deals necessarily involve the resolution of questions of fact, of which some, at least, would require oral testimony from persons familiar with conditions as they were at the time when the claims originally arose. Thus, the nature of the claims here involved emphasizes the justice and wisdom of the general rule. Against this background, nothing in the terms or history of S. 417 of which I am informed offers any sound ground for the departure from existing law which the bill would sanction.

Beyond these considerations there is, in my judgment, no more merit to waiving the statute of limitations in order to permit the trying of cases which may range over all the forty-odd years of Elephant Butte history than there would be in the case of any other Federal river-control structure. In other words, I am seriously concerned that an exception as broad as that which S. 417 proposes to make in the case of Elephant Butte would be a precedent for attempts to secure similarly overgenerous legislation in the case of every other Federal river-control structure that anyone believes has caused him harm, regardless of how long ago the harm occurred.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *September 1, 1954.*

S. 3304. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims of the United States to consider and render judgment on the claim of the Cuban-American Sugar Co. against the United States.

S. 3304. I am withholding my approval from S. 3304, which would confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims of the United States to consider and render judgment on the claim of the Cuban-American Sugar Co. against the United States.

The problem at the root of the lawsuit and the private relief bills involves the company's World War I excess-profits taxes for the year 1917. The specific facts in this 34-year-old controversy are set forth fully in the report of the Senate Judiciary Committee (S. Rept. 1963, 83d Cong., 2d sess.). Basically, the taxpayer, for the year 1917, computed its excess-profits tax liability on the invested capital method. Some years thereafter, it felt that its tax liability was excessive and requested the Commissioner to compute the tax under the relief provisions of the law. When this was done, additional taxes were found to be due, and were paid. Several years later, in 1927, a claim for refund was filed on the ground that the tax computation by the relief method was erroneous. This claim was rejected on March 15, 1933, although later that year the taxpayer attempted to amend it, claiming that the invested capital method should be used. This method had been used in a settlement of the years 1918, 1919, and 1920, controversy with respect to which had been going on concurrently. The claim for refund filed in 1933 was rejected on the grounds it was not filed within the statutory period.

The overall effect of the legislation would be to direct the Court of Claims to determine the 1917 liability of the taxpayer by applying the invested capital method used in settling the years 1918, 1919, and 1920, before the Board of Tax Appeals (even though sec. 3 of the enrolled enactment states that nothing in the act is to be construed as an inference of liability on the part of the United States) since, as the committee report indicates, there is no question but that the taxpayer's taxes were overpaid.

Since the bill grants relief from the operation of the statute of limitation, special equitable circumstances should appear which require that this taxpayer be singled out for special relief. It is difficult to find such circumstances in this case. Basically, the Senate report urges that the taxpayer was denied a proper hearing by the Commissioner with respect to this claim. Yet, as the Senate committee report itself indicates, both prior to 1921, and after 1927, the taxpayer and the Commissioner's representatives had numerous conferences with respect to the taxpayer's 1917 liability. It would have served no purpose to hold further conferences in 1933 on a refund claim which was filed after the statute had run and based on another method of computation.

It is also suggested that the Bureau of Internal Revenue and the taxpayer "agreed" to postpone any action on the 1927 claim for refund until the 1918, 1919, and 1920 cases were determined.

No valid evidence appears that there was such an agreement. Indeed, the only information regarding any such discussion is, as the Court of Claims stated in a decision rendered in 1939 on this matter and involving this taxpayer, that a representative of the taxpayer had written a letter to the Bureau "purporting to confirm a conversation" with a representative of the Bureau that further conferences on the year 1917 were to be indefinitely postponed for the reason that nothing further could be done regarding the special assessment question until such question had been settled by the Bureau or the Board of Tax Appeals. This unilateral statement not only does not seem adequate evidence of such an agreement but illustrates the desirability of a statute of limitations which disposes of stale claims and the necessity for retaining or securing evidence with respect thereto.

Finally, the bill requires the Court of Claims to use a specific method of computing invested capital—assuming the taxpayer has overpaid his taxes—to be based upon an amount arrived at in settling the controversy before the Board of Tax Appeals for the years 1918 through 1920. The year 1917 was not involved in that settlement, nor, as the Court of Claims indicated in its 1939 decision, "does the action taken with respect to subsequent years constitute conclusive proof as to 1917." Even assuming the desirability of granting jurisdiction to the Court of Claims for this year, it does not seem desirable to preclude the court from determining the correct tax liability for the year.

Since the proposed legislation would be discriminatory and would single out a particular taxpayer for relief from the statute of limitations without adequate reason therefor, and since it would preclude the Court of Claims from determining the true tax liability, I feel constrained to withhold my approval of S. 3304.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *September 1, 1954.*

On September 2, 1954:

S. 906. An act to establish the finality of contracts between the Government and common carriers of passengers and freight subject to the Interstate Commerce Act.

S. 906. I have withheld my approval of S. 906, to establish the finality of contracts between the Government and common carriers of passengers and freight subject to the Interstate Commerce Act.

This legislation provides that rates established under the provisions of section 22 of the Interstate Commerce Act, when accepted or agreed to by the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of Agriculture, or the Administrator of General Services, or by any official or employee to whom the authority is delegated by them, shall be conclusively presumed to be just, reasonable, and otherwise lawful, and shall not be subject to attack, or reparation, after 180 days, or 2 years in the case of contracts entered into during a national emergency declared by Congress, after the date of acceptance or agreement upon any grounds except actual fraud or deceit, or clerical mistake.

The determination of what is a just, reasonable, or otherwise lawful rate on interstate shipments is now vested in the Interstate Commerce Commission. All shippers, including the Government, are bound as a matter of contract to pay the agreed rate, whether it be in the form of a tariff rate or a section 22 quotation. This contractual obligation is subject, however, to an overriding right of the shipper to appeal to the Interstate Commerce Commission to determine whether the agreed rate is lawful. The statute of limitations for such action in the present law is 2 years. This act would require the Government to determine the lawfulness of the rate, with finality, and through agencies other than the Interstate Commerce Commission, within 180 days at ordinary times, or within 2 years during a national emergency declared by Congress. Whereas the commercial shipper could contest the rate while it is in effect, the Government would apparently be required to cancel or refuse the rate and pay higher charges during any test of the lawfulness of the rate.

I am therefore unable to approve this legislation, which relegates the Government in its role as a user of transportation services to a position inferior to that of the general shipping public and restricts its access to the Interstate Commerce Commission, the body of experts authorized by Congress to determine the reasonableness of rates.

I see no reason why the Government should not be subject to the same limitations on retroactive review of its freight charges as the commercial shipper. That result could be accomplished equitably by an amendment to section 16 (3) of the Interstate Commerce Act specifying that the Government shall be subject to the 2-year limitation presently applicable to commercial shippers. The Government would then be on exactly the same basis under that section as all other shippers, and existing inequities in the present ratemaking relationships between the Government and the common carriers would be removed. I recommend that such legislation be enacted at the next session of the Congress.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *September 2, 1954.*

S. 1687. An act for the relief of T. C. Elliott.

S. 1687. I am withholding my approval from S. 1687, "For the relief of T. C. Elliott."

The purpose of this enactment is to pay to T. C. Elliott, of Daytona Beach, Fla., the sum of $15,000 as compensation for his services in preparing and furnishing certain information to Members of Congress. The bill provides that payment authorized shall be free of Federal income tax.

This bill is faulty for two reasons. First, the exemption of the award from all Federal income taxes is totally unwarranted. Second, it is stated in the enactment that the payment is "compensation for services rendered." The record demonstrates that the sum to be paid is not true compensation, but a monetary award for special services.

The claimant, T. C. Elliott, was an employee of the Federal Government from November 1, 1900, until his retirement, January 31, 1944. During this period of employment Mr. Elliott was an auditor in the Navy Department, the Treasury Department, and the General Accounting Office. In such a position he became conversant with freight rates and transportation problems and furnished data on these subjects on many occasions to individual Members of Congress and to various committees of the Congress.

It is conceded that Mr. Elliott, in addition to performing his regular duties, rendered valuable service to Members of Congress. His efforts undoubtedly contributed to a saving to the Government of large sums of money, but the record is also clear that these services were rendered by Mr. Elliott voluntarily, after office hours, on his own time, or on his leave time, and were completely aside from his official duties or the requirements of his office. Mr. Elliott, like thousands of other devoted Government employees, is to be commended for the unselfish manner in which he made his knowledge of freight rates available to others.

Each year there accrue to the Government the beneficial results of extraordinary services rendered by interested private citizens and organizations who volunteer much useful information and experience to the Congress, to its individual Members, and to the executive branch agencies as well. I do not believe that claims for compensation for such volunteer services should be encouraged. Approval of legislation for that purpose would ratify an irregular and unformalized employment relation, and would also place the Congress and the executive agencies in an unacceptable and unbusinesslike position. If such services are to be on a regular or recurring or even a sporadic basis, formal arrangements for employment should be made. There are numerous alternatives. A regular full-time or part-time appointment, appointment as a consultant at a per diem or an hourly rate, and performance of work by contract are the most common. If the service is performed outside of a formal employment relationship, whatever recognition may be given to it should not be considered compensation.

I do not want my action in withholding approval of this bill to be construed as derogation of Mr. Elliott's services or as criticism of recognition by the Congress of special services afforded to its Members. While I cannot approve the bill in its present form for the reasons given above, I shall be glad to approve a bill which is by its terms an extraordinary monetary award for special service and which removes the tax-free status of the award.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *September 2, 1954.*

S. 2033. An act relating to the labeling of packages containing foreign-produced trout sold in the United States, and requiring certain information to appear in public eating places serving such trout.

S. 2033. I am withholding my approval from S. 2033, relating to the labeling of packages containing foreign-produced trout sold in the United States, and requiring certain information to appear in public eating places serving such trout.

The bill would amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act by making its criminal sanctions—imprisonment up to 3 years or a fine up to $1,000, or both—and certain civil sanctions applicable to the sale, offering for sale, possessing for sale, or serving of foreign-produced trout in violation of special provisions which the bill would add to the act with respect to such trout, except a certain species of lake trout largely imported from Canada. (These special requirements would be in addition to any of the other requirements of the act and to any applicable requirements of State law.)

These special requirements—none of them applicable to domestic trout—are as follows:

1. Foreign-produced trout would have to be packaged and, if the package is broken while held for sale, each unit for sale consisting of one or more trout would have to be in a separate package.
2. Each such package would have to be clearly and conspicuously stamped or labeled, in type or lettering of specified size, with the word "trout" preceded by the name of the country in which such trout was produced.
3. It would be unlawful for any restaurant or other public eating place to possess, in a form ready for serving, any foreign-produced trout unless the restaurant or eating place displayed prominently and conspicuously a notice stating that "____________ trout is served in this restaurant," with the name of the country of origin inserted in the blank space.

According to the committee reports, the bill has the three-fold purpose of (1) protecting the public and consumer against deceptive and unfair acts and practices by requiring truthful disclosure of the origin of the trout being sold, (2) protecting our domestic trout producers against unfair competition from foreign producers of trout, and (3) protecting our source of supply for stocking the streams of our Nation with game trout.

It is claimed that in recent years certain merchants and restaurants have indulged in the practice of serving imported trout to restaurant patrons and other consumers as Rocky Mountain trout, Rocky Mountain rainbow trout, or under other descriptive names which, to the consumer, indicate their domestic origin. If domestic trout producers are deprived of this market, it is feared that they may be unable to continue their other important function of supplying eggs and fingerlings for restocking our streams of the sportsman-angler.

Fraud and deception in the marketing or serving of food or any other product cannot, of course, be condoned. I am convinced, however, that to the extent that the provisions and sanctions of the bill properly involve Federal functions, they are unnecessary to prevent fraud and deception. The Tariff Act and the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act already provide for necessary labeling of imported products. Furthermore, the provisions of S. 2033 are discriminatory and oppressive against foreign trade, and to a very substantial extent they would invade a field of regulation and enforcement which I believe should be left to the States and localities. Finally, the costs of enforcement would be out of all proportion to funds available to the Food and Drug Administration for vital functions affecting the health of the American people.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *September 2, 1954.*

PROCEEDINGS OF THE HOUSE SUBSEQUENT TO SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

Pursuant to a special order agreed to on August 20, 1954, the Clerk of the House received a message from the Senate announcing that on August 20, 1954, the Senate had passed bills and a concurrent resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 3300. An act to authorize the State of Illinois and the Sanitary District of Chicago, under the direction of the Secretary of the Army, to help control the lake level of Lake Michigan by diverting water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway;

H. R. 10187. An act to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to provide for the payment of appraisers', auctioneers', and brokers' fees from the proceeds of disposal of Government surplus real property, and for other purposes; and

H. Con. Res. 262. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the payment of damages to certain American employees in the United Nations who were dismissed because of their refusal under the fifth amendment to answer questions before a committee of Congress.

APPOINTMENTS BY THE SPEAKER SUBSEQUENT TO SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE

TWO HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BIRTH OF JOHN MARSHALL

The SPEAKER, pursuant to the provisions of section 2, Public Law 581, 83d Congress, and the order of the House of August 20, 1954, empowering him to appoint commissions, boards, and committees authorized by law or by the House, did, on August 21, 1954, appoint as members of the United States Commission for the celebration of the 200th anniversary of the birth of John Marshall the following members on the part of the House to serve with himself: Mr. Betts, Ohio; Mr. Poff, Virginia; Mr. Walter, Pennsylvania; Mr. Gary, Virginia.

ALEXANDER HAMILTON BICENTENNIAL COMMISSION

The SPEAKER, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 601, 83d Congress, and the order of the House of August 20, 1954, empowering him to appoint commissions, boards, and committees authorized by law or by the House did, on August 21, 1954, appoint as members of the Alexander Hamilton Bicentennial Commission the following members on the part of the House to serve with himself: Mr. Martin, Iowa; Mr. Coudert, New York; Mr. Rooney, New York; Mr. Rodino, New Jersey.

WOODROW WILSON CENTENNIAL CELEBRATION COMMISSION

The SPEAKER, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 705, 83d Congress, and the order of the House of August 20, 1954, empowering him to appoint commissions, boards, and committees authorized by law or by the House, did, on September 2, 1954, appoint as members of the Woodrow Wilson Centennial Celebration Commission the following members on the part of the House: Mr. Wampler, Virginia; Mr. Harrison, Virginia.

COMMISSION ON GOVERNMENTAL USE OF INTERNATIONAL TELECOMMUNICATIONS

The SPEAKER, pursuant to the provisions of section 2, Public Law 558, 83d Congress, and the order of the House of August 20, 1954, empowering him to appoint commissions, boards, and committees authorized by law or by the House, did, on September 14, 1954, appoint as members of the Commission on Governmental Use of International Telecommunications the following members on the part of the House: Mr. Vorys, Ohio; Mr. Richards, South Carolina.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION ENROLLED SUBSEQUENT TO SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE

Mr. LeCOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, subsequent to the sine die adjournment, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 951. An act for the relief of the Trust Association of H. Kempner;

H. R. 1107. An act for the relief of the J. A. Vance Co.;

H. R. 1254. An act to provide authorization for certain uses of public lands;

H. R. 2032. An act for the relief of Clarence D. Newland;

H. R. 2233. An act to provide for the acquisition of lands by the United States required for the reservoir created by the construction of Oahe Dam on the Missouri River and for rehabilitation of the Indians of the Cheyenne River Sioux Reservation, S. Dak., and for other purposes;

H. R. 2235. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct the Santa Maria project, Southern Pacific Basin, Calif.;

H. R. 2236. An act to provide for a commission to regulate the public transportation of passengers by motor vehicle and street railroad within the metropolitan area of Washington, D. C., and for the establishment of a metropolitan Washington commission;

H. R. 2876. An act for the relief of Leo F. Pinder;

H. R. 3300. An act to authorize the State of Illinois and the Sanitary District of Chicago, under the direction of the Secretary of the Army, to help control the lake level of Lake Michigan by diverting water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway;

H. R. 4340. An act for the relief of Charles J. Abarno and others;

H. R. 4638. An act for the relief of David W. Wallace;

H. R. 5420. An act to amend section 161, title 35, United States Code, relating to the patenting of plants;

H. R. 6451. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain public lands in Utah to the occupants of the land;

H. R. 6593. An act to provide for the promotion, precedence, constructive credit, distribution, retention, and elimination of officers of the Reserve components of the Armed Forces of the United States, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6616. An act to amend title 17, United States Code, entitled "Copyrights";

H. R. 6808. An act for the relief of Col. Samuel J. Adams, and others;

H. R. 7130. An act to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide for the loss of nationality of persons convicted of certain crimes;

H. R. 7774. An act to increase the rates of compensation of classified, postal, and other employees of the Government, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7840. An act to amend the Railroad Retirement Act, the Railroad Retirement Tax Act, and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act;

H. R. 7886. An act for the relief of Mrs. Cecil Norton Broy;

H. R. 8606. An act for the relief of Neil C. Hemmer and Mildred Hemmer;

H. R. 9366. An act to amend the Social Security Act and the Internal Revenue Code so as to extend coverage under the old-age and survivors insurance program, increase the benefits payable thereunder, preserve the insurance rights of disabled individuals, and increase the amount of earnings permitted without loss of benefits, and for other purposes;

H. R. 9580. An act to revise and extend the laws relating to espionage and sabotage, and for other purposes;

H. R. 9680. An act to provide for greater stability in agriculture; to augment the marketing and disposal of agricultural products; and for other purposes;

H. R. 9728. An act to revise, codify, and enact into law, title 21 of the United States Code, entitled "Food, Drugs, and Cosmetics";

H. R. 9729. An act to revise, codify, and enact into law, title 13 of the United States Code, entitled "Census";

H. R. 9730. An act to amend various statutes and certain titles of the United States Code, for the purpose of correcting obsolete references, and for other purposes;

H. R. 9859. An act authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes;

H. R. 9987. An act to amend certain provisions of title XI of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to facilitate private financing of new ship construction, and for other purposes;

H. R. 9988. An act for the relief of the Federal Republic of Germany;

H. R. 10051. An act making appropriations for Mutual Security for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes;

H. R. 10187. An act to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to provide for the payment of appraisers', auctioneers', and brokers' fees from the proceeds of disposal of Government surplus real property, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 565. Joint resolution to amend the joint resolution providing for the membership of the United States in the Pan American Institute of Geography and History and authorize appropriations therefor.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED SUBSEQUENT TO SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER announced that pursuant to Senate Concurrent Resolution 109, 83d Congress, that he did on August 23, 1954, sign enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the following titles:

H. R. 951. An act for the relief of the Trust Association of H. Kempner;

H. R. 1107. An act for the relief of the J. A. Vance Co.;

H. R. 1254. An act to provide authorization for certain uses of public lands;

H. R. 2032. An act for the relief of Clarence D. Newland;

H. R. 2233. An act to provide for the acquisition of lands by the United States required for the reservoir created by the construction of Oahe Dam on the Missouri River and for rehabilitation of the Indians of the Cheyenne River Sioux Reservation, S. Dak., and for other purposes;

H. R. 2235. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct the Santa

Maria project, Southern Pacific Basin, Calif.;

H. R. 2236. An act to provide for a Commission to regulate the public transportation of passengers by motor vehicle and street railroad within the metropolitan area of Washington, D. C., and for the establishment of a Metropolitan Washington Commission;

H. R. 2876. An act for the relief of Leo F. Pinder;

H. R. 3300. An act to authorize the State of Illinois and the Sanitary District of Chicago, under the direction of the Secretary of the Army, to help control the lake level of Lake Michigan by diverting water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway;

H. R. 4340. An act for the relief of Charles J. Abarno and others;

H. R. 4638. An act for the relief of David W. Wallace;

H. R. 5420. An act to amend section 161, title 35, United States Code, relating to the patenting of plants;

H. R. 6451. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain public lands in Utah to the occupants of the land;

H. R. 6573. An act to provide for the promotion, precedence, constructive credit, distribution, retention, and elimination of officers of the Reserve components of the Armed Forces of the United States, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6616. An act to amend title 17, United States Code, entitled "Copyrights";

H. R. 6808. An act for the relief of Col. Samuel J. Adams and others;

H. R. 7130. An act to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide for the loss of nationality of persons convicted of certain crimes;

H. R. 7774. An act to increase the rates of compensation of classified, postal, and other employees of the Government, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7840. An act to amend the Railroad Retirement Act, the Railroad Retirement Tax Act, and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act;

H. R. 7886. An act for the relief of Mrs. Cecil Norton Broy;

H. R. 8606. An act for the relief of Neil C. Hemmer and Mildred Hemmer;

H. R. 9366. An act to amend the Social Security Act and the Internal Revenue Code so as to extend coverage under the old-age and survivors insurance program, increase the benefits payable thereunder, preserve the insurance rights of disabled individuals, and increase the amount of earnings permitted without loss of benefits, and for other purposes;

H. R. 9580. An act to revise and extend the laws relating to espionage and sabotage, and for other purposes;

H. R. 9680. An act to provide for greater stability in agriculture; to augment the marketing and disposal of agricultural products; and for other purposes;

H. R. 9728. An act to revise, codify, and enact into law, title 21 of the United States Code, entitled "Food, Drugs, and Cosmetics";

H. R. 9729. An act to revise, codify, and enact into law, title 13 of the United States Code, entitled "Census";

H. R. 9730. An act to amend various statutes and certain titles of the United States Code, for the purpose of correcting obsolete references, and for other purposes;

H. R. 9859. An act authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes;

H. R. 9987. An act to amend certain provisions of title XI of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to facilitate private financing of new-ship construction, and for other purposes;

H. R. 9988. An act for the relief of the Federal Republic of Germany;

H. R. 10051. An act making appropriations for mutual security for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes;

H. R. 10187. An act to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to provide for the payment of appraisers', auctioneers', and brokers' fees from the proceeds of disposal of Government surplus real property, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 565. Joint resolution to amend the joint resolution providing for the membership of the United States in the Pan American Institute of Geography and History and authorize appropriations therefor.

SENATE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The **SPEAKER** announced that pursuant to Senate Concurrent Resolution 109, 83d Congress, that he did on August 23, 1954, sign enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 2862. An act to provide relief for the sheep-raising industry by making special nonquota immigrant visas available to certain skilled alien sheepherders;

S. 3868. An act authorizing the payment of salary to any individual given a recess appointment as Comptroller General of the United States before the beginning of the 84th Congress; and

S. J. Res. 173. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim the week of November 28, 1954, through December 4, 1954, as National Salvation Army Week.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT SUBSEQUENT TO SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE

Mr. **LeCOMPTE**, from the Committee on House Administration, subsequent to the sine die adjournment of the House, reported that that committee did, on the following dates, present to the President for his approval bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

On August 21, 1954:

H. R. 179. An act to amend section 7 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946, as amended;

H. R. 1665. An act for the relief of Carl Plowaty and W. J. Plowaty;

H. R. 3757. An act for the relief of Dorothy Kilmer Nickerson;

H. R. 4017. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain land and improvements to the England Special School District of the State of Arkansas;

H. R. 4813. An act for the relief of Radu Florescu and Nicole Elizabeth Michel Florescu;

H. R. 5499. An act to provide for the construction, maintenance, and operation of the Michaud Flats project for irrigation in the State of Idaho;

H. R. 7785. An act to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, to make permanent the increases in regular annuities provided by the act of July 16, 1952, and to extend such increases to additional annuities purchased by voluntary contributions;

H. R. 7881. An act to validate a conveyance of certain lands by Southern Pacific Railroad Co., and its lessee, Southern Pacific Co., to Morgan Hopkins, Inc.;

H. R. 9709. An act to extend and improve the unemployment compensation program;

H. R. 8498. An act authorizing construction of works to reestablish for the Palo Verde Irrigation District, Calif., a means of diversion of its irrigation water supply from the Colorado River, and for other purposes;

H. R. 9115. An act to provide that contributions received under Public Law 485, 80th Congress, for the construction of a merchant marine chapel shall be invested in Government obligations pending their use for such construction;

H. R. 9756. An act to increase the borrowing power of Commodity Credit Corporation; and

H. R. 9909. An act to prohibit payment of annuities to officers and employees of the United States convicted of certain offenses, and for other purposes.

On August 25, 1954:

H. R. 951. An act for the relief of the Trust Association of H. Kempner;

H. R. 1107. An act for the relief of the J. A. Vance Co.;

H. R. 1254. An act to provide authorization for certain uses of public lands;

H. R. 2032. An act for the relief of Clarence D. Newland;

H. R. 2233. An act to provide for the acquisition of lands by the United States required for the reservoir created by the construction of Oahe Dam on the Missouri River and for rehabilitation of the Indians of the Cheyenne River Sioux Reservation, S. Dak., and for other purposes;

H. R. 2236. An act to provide for a commission to regulate the public transportation of passengers by motor vehicle and street railroad within the metropolitan area of Washington, D. C., and for the establishment of a Metropolitan Washington Commission;

H. R. 2876. An act for the relief of Leo F. Pinder;

H. R. 3300. An act to authorize the State of Illinois and the Sanitary District of Chicago, under the direction of the Secretary of the Army, to help control the lake level of Lake Michigan by diverting water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway;

H. R. 4340. An act for the relief of Charles J. Abarno and others;

H. R. 4638. An act for the relief of David W. Wallace;

H. R. 5420. An act to amend section 161, title 35, United States Code, relating to the patenting of plants;

H. R. 6451. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain public lands in Utah to the occupants of the land;

H. R. 6573. An act to provide for the promotion, precedence, constructive credit, distribution, retention, and elimination of officers of the Reserve components of the Armed Forces of the United States, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6616. An act to amend title 17, United States Code, entitled "Copyrights";

H. R. 6808. An act for the relief of Col. Samuel J. Adams and others;

H. R. 7130. An act to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide for the loss of nationality of persons convicted of certain crimes;

H. R. 7774. An act to increase the rates of compensation of classified, postal, and other employees of the Government, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7840. An act to amend the Railroad Retirement Act, the Railroad Retirement Tax Act, and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act;

H. R. 8606. An act for the relief of Neil C. Hemmer and Mildred Hemmer;

H. R. 7886. An act for the relief of Mrs. Cecil Norton Broy;

H. R. 9366. An act to amend the Social Security Act and the Internal Revenue Code so as to extend coverage under the old-age and survivors' insurance program, increase the benefits payable thereunder, preserve the insurance rights of disabled individuals, and increase the amount of earnings permitted without loss of benefits, and for other purposes;

H. R. 9580. An act to revise and extend the laws relating to espionage and sabotage, and for other purposes;

H. R. 9680. An act to provide for greater stability in agriculture, to augment the marketing and disposal of agricultural products, and for other purposes;

H. R. 9728. An act to revise, codify, and enact into law title 21 of the United States Code, entitled "Food, Drugs, and Cosmetics";

H. R. 9729. An act to revise, codify, and enact into law title 13 of the United States Code, entitled "Census";

H. R. 9730. An act to amend various statutes and certain titles of the United States Code for the purpose of correcting obsolete references, and for other purposes;

H. R. 9859. An act authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes;

H. R. 9987. An act to amend certain provisions of title XI of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to facilitate private financing of new ship construction, and for other purposes;

H. R. 9988. An act for the relief of the Federal Republic of Germany;

H. R. 10051. An act making appropriations for mutual security for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes;

H. R. 10187. An act to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to provide for the payment of appraisers', auctioneers', and brokers' fees from the proceeds of disposal of Government surplus real property, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 565. Joint resolution to amend the joint resolution providing for the membership of the United States in the Pan American Institute of Geography and History and authorized appropriations therefor.

On August 26, 1954:

H. R. 2235. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct the Santa Maria project, Southern Pacific Basin, Calif.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS APPROVED SUBSEQUENT TO SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE

The President of the United States, subsequent to the sine die adjournment of the House, notified the Clerk of the House that, on the following dates, he had approved and signed bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

On August 20, 1954:

H. R. 7486. An act to amend section 1071 of title 18, United States Code, relating to the concealing of persons from arrest, so as to increase the penalties therein provided;

H. R. 8034. An act for the incorporation of the Sons of Union Veterans of the Civil War;

H. R. 8384. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Talent division of the Rogue River Basin reclamation project, Oregon;

H. R. 8658. An act to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide for the punishment of persons who jump bail;

H. R. 8921. An act to establish the rate of compensation for the position of the General Counsel of the Department of Commerce;

H. R. 9888. An act to amend the laws granting education and training benefits to certain veterans to extend the period during which such benefits may be offered; and

H. J. Res. 561. Joint resolution to authorize the quartering in public buildings in the District of Columbia of troops participating in-activities related to the Amercan Legion National Convention of 1954.

On August 21, 1954:

H. R. 686. An act for the relief of Mrs. Erna Gronowski;

H. R. 787. An act for the relief of Israel Ratsprecher and Maryse Ratsprecher;

H. R. 795. An act for the relief of Jean Hollis Vock;

H. R. 1463. An act for the relief of Ilona Elizabeth Carrier;

H. R. 2371. An act for the relief of Mrs. Maria M. Broix;

H. R. 2403. An act for the relief of Laszlo Varga and Nike Varga;

H. R. 2440. An act for the relief of Lidija Cimze;

H. R. 2499. An act for the relief of Adolfo L. Kalb, and his wife, Mrs. Eugenia G. Kalb;

H. R. 2627. An act for the relief of Cecelia Lucy Boyack;

H. R. 2793. An act for the relief of Miyoko Nagare;

H. R. 2901. An act for the relief of Tokuko Kobayashi, and her minor son;

H. R. 3017. An act for the relief of Felix Petrover;

H. R. 3238. An act for the relief of Danica Maria Vavrova;

H. R. 3344. An act for the relief of Carmen Salvador and her daughter, Ruby Salvador;

H. R. 3675. An act for the relief of Herre van der Veen, Mrs. Marie van der Veen, Helen Winifred van der Veen, and Jan Herre van der Veen;

H. R. 3743. An act for the relief of Chaim Szemaja Segal and Icek Hersz Segal;

H. R. 4248. An act for the relief of Albertas Bauras;

H. R. 4330. An act for the relief of Dr. Orlando Artuso and family;

H. R. 6026. An act for the relief of Gertrud O. Heinz;

H. R. 6553. An act for the relief of Esterina Pella Bellucci;

H. R. 6982. An act for the relief of Maria Elizabeth Sanchez Y Moreno;

H. R. 7041. An act for the relief of Waltruade Elsa Solleder;

H. R. 7152. An act for the relief of Jozef Van den broeck.

H. R. 7593. An act for the relief of Theresia Probst Uhl;

H. R. 7629. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ruth Gruschka Krug;

H. R. 7761. An act for the relief of John Lewis Pyles, Jr.;

H. R. 7807. An act for the relief of Heinz Gerhard Rolappe;

H. R. 7924. An act for the relief of Giuseppi Clementi;

H. R. 7925. An act for the relief of Mrs. Dina Mianulle (nee Kratzer);

H. R. 8066. An act for the relief of Mrs. Gertrud Eckerl Strickland;

H. R. 8152. An act to extend to June 30, 1955, the direct home and farmhouse loan authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs under title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, to make additional funds available therefor, and for other purposes;

H. R. 8180. An act to increase the amount of Federal aid to State or Territorial homes for the support of disabled soldiers, sailors, and airmen of the United States;

H. R. 8334. An act for the relief of Helmut Cermak and Hana Cermak;

H. R. 8520. An act to provide for the inclusion of the Ainsworth, Lavaca Flats, Mirage Flats Extension, and O'Neill irrigation developments in the Missouri River Basin project;

H. R. 8694. An act for the relief of Suzanne L'Heureux;

H. R. 9000. An act to integrate the Judge Advocate's promotion list with that of the Army to restore lost seniority and grade, and for other purposes;

H. R. 9336. An act for the relief of Marianne Geymeier;

H. R. 9390. An act to extend certain civilian-internee and prisoner-of-war benefits under the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended, to civilian internees and American prisoners of war captured and held during the hostilities in Korea;

H. R. 9406. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain real property to the town of Beaufort, N. C.;

H. R. 9869. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to execute an amendatory contract with American Falls Reservoir District No. 2, Idaho, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 9996. An act for the relief of Susan Ellen Heiney.

On August 23, 1954:

H. R. 669. An act for the relief of George D. Kyminas;

H. R. 804. An act for the relief of Enrichetta F. C. Meda-Novara;

H. R. 818. An act for the relief of Mrs. Emma Martha Staack;

H. R. 868. An act for the relief of Ciriaco Catino;

H. R. 905. An act for the relief of Franciszek Wolczek;

H. R. 950. An act for the relief of Panoula Panagopoulos.

H. R. 970. An act for the relief of George Economos;

H. R. 977. An act for the relief of Mrs. Aimee Dutour Rovzar;

H. R. 1171. An act for the relief of Mrs. Wai-Jan Low Fong;

H. R. 1324. An act for the relief of Georgina Chinn;

H. R. 1697. An act for the relief of Mrs. Katharina Batke;

H. R. 1897. An act for the relief of Mrs. Betty E. LaMay;

H. R. 1974. An act to amend the third paragraph of section 4, chapter 1, title I, of the act entitled "An act making further provision for a civil government for Alaska, and for other purposes," approved June 6, 1900 (31 Stat. 322; 48 U. S. C., sec. 101), as amended;

H. R. 1976. An act to amend title 28, United States Code, to permit the registration of judgments in or from the District Court for the Territory of Alaska;

H. R. 2051. An act for the relief of Ivo Markulin;

H. R. 2224. An act to amend the Army-Navy Medical Services Corps Act of 1947 (61 Stat. 734), as amended, so as to authorize the appointment of a Chief of the Medical Service Corps of the Navy, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2358. An act for the relief of Dr. Vahram Uluhogian;

H. R. 2359. An act for the relief of Joseph Veich, also known as Guiseppe Veic;

H. R. 2635. An act for the relief of Olga Abitia;

H. R. 2654. An act for the relief of Sisters Linda Salerno, Luigiana C. Cairo, Antonietta Impieri, Anna Impieri, Rosina Scarlato, Iolanda Gaglianone, Maria Assunta Scaramuzzo, Franceschina Cauterucci, and Filomena Lupinacci;

H. R. 2843. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to investigate and report to the Congress on the conservation, development, and utilization of the irrigation and reclamation resources of the Waimanalo, Oahu; Waimea, island of Hawaii; and Molokai projects, Territory of Hawaii;

H. R. 2879. An act to stay deportation proceedings on Juan Onativia;

H. R. 3116. An act for the relief of Dimitra Makhavitzki;

H. R. 3125. An act for the relief of Alexander Hahn and Suzanne Hahn;

H. R. 3144. An act for the relief of Elias Y. Richa;

H. R. 3444. An act for the relief of Toki Yaeko;

H. R. 3616. An act for the relief of Nicoletta Di Donato;

H. R. 3677. An act for the relief of Sister Paolina (Angela Di Franco);

H. R. 3759. An act for the relief of Babette Mueller Esposito;

H. R. 3855. An act for the relief of Sister Agrippina (Agrippina Palermo), Sister Battistina (Franceschina Serpa), Sister Romana (Angela Iolanda Morelli), Sister Franceschina (Maria Caruso), and Sister Bruna (Giuseppina De Caro);

H. R. 4092. An act for the relief of Mira Tellini Napoleone;

H. R. 4371. An act for the relief of June Ann Sakurai;

H. R. 4740. An act for the relief of Kaoru Yoshioka;

H. R. 4881. An act to amend the Canal Zone Code in reference to the survival of things in action;

H. R. 4998. An act for the relief of Paul Frkovich;

H. R. 5072. An act for the relief of Carmen D'Ottavio, also known as Cameron D'Ottavio;

H. R. 5077. An act for the relief of Sophia Nassopoulos;

H. R. 5443. An act for the relief of Eva Lowinger;

H. R. 5639. An act for the relief of Edeltraud Kamberg Douglass;

H. R. 5816. An act for the relief of Mrs. Caridad Rosa Avila Leyva de Ernest;

H. R. 5822. An act for the relief of Evanthia Demetrios Makrozonari;

H. R. 5944. An act for the relief of Alberto Ugo Landry;

H. R. 6280. An act to extend temporarily the rights of priority of nationals of Japan and certain nationals of Germany with respect to applications for patents;

H. R. 6885. An act to amend section 1 of Joint Resolution 12 enacted by the 25th Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, in the regular session of 1949 and approved by the 81st Congress of the United States of America at the 2d session (Public Law 746, ch. 833);

H. R. 7334. An act to authorize certain property transactions in Cocoli, C. Z., and for other purposes;

H. R. 7987. An act for the relief of Roger Feghali;

H. R. 8570. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to dispose of certain uncompleted naval vessels, and for other purposes;

H. J. Res. 356. Joint resolution authorizing the erection of a memorial gift from the people of the Netherlands; and

H. J. Res. 359. Joint resolution designating the period from October 11 to October 16, inclusive, 1954, as National Nurse Week.

On August 24, 1954:

H. R. 5314. An act to extend the coverage of the Servicemen's Indemnity Act to members of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps when ordered to active-training duty for periods in excess of 14 days;

H. R. 5340. An act for the relief of Tibor, Szuzsa (Susanne), and Judith Sauer;

H. R. 5354. An act for the relief of Liborio Guido Rutilio;

H. R. 5832. An act to authorize the commissioner of public lands of the Territory of Hawaii to sell public lands to certain lessees, permittees, and others;

H. R. 5997. An act to enable the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii to authorize the issuance of general obligation bonds, the proceeds thereof to be used for veterans' mortgages;

H. R. 6113. An act to amend title 18 of the United States Code, so as to increase the penalties applicable to the smuggling of goods into the United States;

H. R. 6367. An act for the relief of Nobu Nogawa Nitta;

H. R. 6393. An act granting the consent and approval of Congress to an interstate forest-fire protection compact;

H. R. 6414. An act for the relief of Barbara Pator Allen;

H. R. 6855. An act for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth Metzing Rink;

H. R. 6886. An act to ratify and confirm sections 5 and 6 of Act 254 and Act 280 of the Session Laws of Hawaii 1953 and to authorize the issuance of certain public improvement bonds by the Territory of Hawaii;

H. R. 7051. An act for the relief of Mary George Solomon;

H. R. 7131. An act to repeal a limitation on pay of certain officers of the Navy;

H. R. 7140. An act for the relief of Robert A. Duval;

H. R. 7398. An act to repeal the requirement of section 3921 of the Revised Statutes that postmasters report to the Postmaster General failure to cancel postage stamps;

H. R. 7399. An act to authorize the sale of postage-due stamps for philatelic purposes;

H. R. 7411. An act for the relief of Mrs. Esterlee Hutzler Weinhoeppel;

H. R. 7451. An act for the relief of Erika Jette Lavery;

H. R. 7460. An act to pay Warren P. Hoover for services rendered the Army of the United States;

H. R. 7517. An act to enable the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii to authorize the city and county of Honolulu, a municipal corporation, to issue public improvement bonds;

H. R. 7518. An act to enable the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii to authorize the city and county of Honolulu, a municipal corporation, to issue public improvement bonds;

H. R. 7568. An act to authorize and direct the Farm Loan Board of Hawaii to convey certain land and to ratify and confirm certain acts of said Farm Loan Board;

H. R. 7569. An act to authorize the removal of a restrictive covenant on land patent No. 9628, issued to the board of the Hawaiian Evangelical Association on January 18, 1929, and covering lots 5 and 6 of Waimea townlots, situated in the county of Kauai, T. H.;

H. R. 7584. An act for the relief of Angele Marie Boyer (nee Pieniazeck);

H. R. 7606. An act for the relief of Michael Henry LaFleur;

H. R. 7612. An act for the relief of Enrico Intravaia;

H. R. 7628. An act for the relief of Mrs. Adriana M. Truyers Aretz;

H. R. 7945. An act for the relief of Bart Blaak (formerly Johannes J. M. Gijsbers);

H. R. 8006. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to issue patents for certain lands in Wisconsin bordering upon inland lakes or rivers;

H. R. 8038. An act to authorize the conveyance to the Hot Springs School District and to Garland County, Ark., for school and for other public purposes, of certain land originally donated to the United States and situated in Hot Springs National Park, Ark., and for other purposes;

H. R. 8041. An act to provide benefits under the laws administered by the Veterans' Administration based upon service in the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps under certain conditions;

H. R. 8115. An act for the relief of Tannous Estephan;

H. R. 8146. An act for the relief of Palmina Smarrelli (nee Lattanzio);

H. R. 8239. An act for the relief of Fung Ping Wah (also known as Reginald Ping Wah Fung) and his wife, Fung Wai-Yin Li (also known as Doris Fung);

H. R. 8365. An act to confirm the authority of the Secretary of the Interior to issue patents-in-fee to allotments of lands of the Mission Indians in the State of California prior to the expiration of the trust period specified in the act of January 12, 1891, as amended;

H. R. 8385. An act to amend section 2382 of the Revised Statutes, in order to make the size of townlots conform in size to local standards;

H. R. 8501. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain land in Sumter County, Ga., to the Americus and Sumter County Chamber of Commerce;

H. R. 8736. An act to authorize the issuance of a land patent to certain public lands, situate in the county of Kauai, T. H., for school purposes;

H. R. 8821. An act to authorize the exchange of lands acquired by the United States for the Catoctin recreational demonstration area, Frederick County, Md., for the purpose of consolidating Federal holdings therein;

H. R. 8897. An act to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to transfer 40 acres of land in the northern Cheyenne Indian Reservation, Mont., to school district No. 6, Rosebud County, Mont.;

H. R. 9194. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain land owned by the Federal Government near Vicksburg, Miss., to Vicksburg, Miss.;

H. R. 9236. An act to amend the Federal Credit Union Act, as amended;

H. R. 9582. An act to provide for the disposition of surplus personal property to the Territorial government of Alaska;

H. R. 9630. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to execute an amendatory contract with the Black Canyon Irrigation District, Idaho, and for other purposes;

H. R. 9671. An act for the relief of Dr. Liang Nun Wang and his wife and child, Fa-chi Ling Wang and Eileen Wang;

H. R. 9814. An act for the relief of Alfio Capizzi;

H. R. 9821. An act to amend titles 18 and 28 of the United States Code; and

H. R. 9882. An act to incorporate the Foundation of the Federal Bar Association.

On August 26, 1954:

H. R. 697. An act for the relief of Demetrios Christos Mataraggiotis, and Zoi Demetre Mataraggiotis, his wife, and Christos Mataraggiotis and Constantinos Mataraggiotis, their minor sons;

H. R. 803. An act for the relief of Christakis Modinos;

H. R. 822. An act for the relief of Sister Giuseppina Giaccone;

H. R. 832. An act for the relief of Katharine Balsamo;

H. R. 839. An act for the relief of Sister Mary Gertrude (Mary Gertrude Kelly);

H. R. 877. An act for the relief of Nasser Esphahanian;

H. R. 1627. An act for the relief of Johann Groben;

H. R. 1646. An act for the relief of Arthur Neustadt and Mrs. Emma Neustadt;

H. R. 2393. An act for the relief of Brother Eugene Cumerlato;

H. R. 2480. An act for the relief of Charlotte Margarita Schmidt;

H. R. 2483. An act for the relief of Giacomo Bartolo Vanadia;

H. R. 2500. An act for the relief of Stanislaw Majzner (alias Stanley Maisner);

H. R. 2794. An act for the relief of Mrs. Claire Godreau Daigle;

H. R. 3024. An act for the relief of Sergio Emeric;

H. R. 3388. An act for the relief of Louie Ella Attaway;

H. R. 3447. An act for the relief of Maria Paccione Pica;

H. R. 3520. An act for the relief of Mrs. Erna Rosita Pont (formerly Erna Rosita Michel);

H. R. 3566. An act for the relief of Pimen Maximovitch Sofronov;

H. R. 3665. An act for the relief of Marko Ribic;

H. R. 3869. An act for the relief of Gilbert Elkanah Richards, Adelaide Gertrude Richards, and Anthony Gilbert Richards;

H. R. 3874. An act for the relief of Roberto Johnson;

H. R. 4015. An act for the relief of Josef, Paula, and Kurt Friedberg;

H. R. 4054. An act for the relief of Jorge Sole Massana and Montserrat Thomasa-Sanchez Massana;

H. R. 4426. An act for the relief of Andrea Paulette Quatrehomme and her child;

H. R. 4427. An act for the relief of Mrs. Helena Piasecka;

H. R. 4437. An act for the relief of Louise Rank;

H. R. 4522. An act for the relief of Petrus Van Keer;

H. R. 4620. An act for the relief of Natale Joseph John Ratti;

H. R. 4908. An act for the relief of Pietro Petralia;

H. R. 4959. An act for the relief of Muhittin Schuer;

H. R. 5119. An act for the relief of Augusta Oppacher Bialek;

H. R. 5194. An act for the relief of Pauline Katzmann;

H. R. 5459. An act for the relief of Takeko Ishiki;

H. R. 5749. An act for the relief of Maria Teresa Lubiato;

H. R. 6266. An act for the relief of Frank Robert Gage;

H. R. 6442. An act for the relief of Tamiko Fujiwara;

H. R. 6498. An act for the relief of Elfriede Lina Avitable, nee Roser;

H. R. 6752. An act for the relief of Mrs. Maria Giuseppa De Lisa Quagliano;

H. R. 6858. An act for the relief of Mrs. Efthemia Soteralis;

H. R. 6955. An act for the relief of Margers Nulle-Siecenieks;

H. R. 7033. An act for the relief of Mrs. Anna J. Weigle;

H. R. 7045. An act for the relief of Dr. Marciano Gutierrez, Dr. Amparo G. Joaquin Gutierrez, and their children, Rosenda, Rebecca, and Raymundo, and Mrs. Brigida de Gutierrez;

H. R. 7088. An act for the relief of Antonio Cazzato;

H. R. 7138. An act for the relief of Rosa Marie Adelheid Herok;

H. R. 7150. An act for the relief of Thora June Grumbles;

H. R. 7151. An act for the relief of Mazal Kolman;

H. R. 7581. An act for the relief of Gaetano Conti;

H. R. 7635. An act for the relief of Martti Iimari Timonen, Maj-Lis Timonen, and Marja Timonen;

H. R. 7828. An act for the relief of Mariana George Loizos Kellis;

H. R. 7829. An act for the relief of Shimasoi Michiko;

H. R. 7834. An act for the relief of Erika Schneider Buonasera;

H. R. 7885. An act for the relief of Sohan Singh Rai and Jogindar Kaur Rai;

H. R. 7938. An act for the relief of Miss Martha Heuschele;

H. R. 7947. An act for the relief of Mrs. Erika (Hohenleitner) Stapleton;

H. R. 8065. An act for the relief of Carlos Francisco, Manriqueta Mina, and Roberto Mina Ver;

H. R. 8375. An act for the relief of Ilse Radler Hughes;

H. R. 8424. An act for the relief of Mrs. Else Johnson;

H. R. 8554. An act for the relief of Maria M. Khoe;

H. R. 8557. An act for the relief of Ezio Bertoni;

H. R. 8936. An act for the relief of Dana Evanovich;

H. R. 9029. An act for the relief of Paul James Patrie;

H. R. 9496. An act for the relief of Elisabeth Hoeft;

H. R. 9512. An act for the relief of Mrs. Franziska (Han) Rigau;

H. R. 9678. An act to promote the security and foreign policy of the United States by furnishing assistance to friendly nations, and for other purposes;

H. R. 9936. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 9953. An act for the relief of Mr. Fu-Ho Chan, Mrs. Fu-Ho Chan, and their child, Richard Chan.

On August 27, 1954:

H. R. 1843. An act to increase the retired pay of certain members of the former Lighthouse Service;

H. R. 2015. An act to authorize the sale of certain land in Alaska to Lloyd H. Turner, of Wards Cove, Alaska;

H. R. 2024. An act for the relief of Frank L. Peyton;

H. R. 2815. An act for the relief of Floyd C. Barber;

H. R. 2874. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Mary K. Reynolds, as successor in interest to the Colonial Realty Co.;

H. R. 3419. An act to authorize a $50 per capita payment to members of the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians from the proceeds of the sale of timber and lumber on the Red Lake Reservation.

H. R. 4175. An act for the relief of Charles R. Logan;

H. R. 4213. An act to authorize works for development and furnishing of water supplies for waterfowl management, Central Valley project, California, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4474. An act for the relief of Frederick Joseph Buttaccio and others;

H. R. 4690. An act to provide for the erection of appropriate markers in national cemeteries to honor the memory of members of the Armed Forces missing in action;

H. R. 5092. An act for the relief of Robert Leon Rohr;

H. R. 5553. An act for the relief of Dr. Lu Jen-lung;

H. R. 5986. An act for the relief of Harold E. Wahlberg;

H. R. 6223. An act to amend section 87 of the National Defense Act of June 3, 1916, as amended (32 U. S. C. 47), to relieve the States from accountability and pecuniary liability for property lost, damaged, or destroyed except in cases where it shall appear that the loss, damage, or destruction of the property was due to carelessness or negligence or could have been avoided by the exercise of reasonable care;

H. R. 6658. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain lands by the United States to the county of Cumberland, State of North Carolina, without remuneration;

H. R. 6987. An act for the relief of Gene C. Szuto and Florence C. Szutu;

H. R. 7251. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to transfer to Vernon F. Parry, the right, title, and interest of the United States, in foreign countries, in and to a certain invention;

H. R. 7508. An act for the relief of James Dore, Jr.;

H. R. 8155. An act to continue until the close of June 30, 1955, the suspension of duties and import taxes on metal scrap, and for other purposes;

H. R. 8634. An act to amend section 22 of the Organic Act of Guam; and

H. R. 9584. An act to protect the rights of vessels of the United States on the high seas and in territorial waters of foreign countries.

On August 28, 1954:

H. R. 717. An act for the relief of Henriette Matter;

H. R. 834. An act for the relief of Arthur J. Boucher;

H. R. 1622. An act for the relief of Agustin Mondreal;

H. R. 1904. An act for the relief of Patricia A. Pembroke;

H. R. 1975. An act to amend section 2201 of title 28, United States Code, to extend the Federal Declaratory Judgments Act to the Territory of Alaska;

H. R. 2154. An act authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Leona Hungry;

H. R. 3507. An act for the relief of Maj. Elias M. Tsougranis;

H. R. 4721. An act to provide that the excess-land provisions of the Federal reclamation laws shall not apply to lands in the Owl Creek unit of the Missouri Basin project;

H. R. 4815. An act for the relief of Alexander Petsche;

H. R. 4969. An act for the relief of Basilios Xarhoulacos;

H. R. 5319. An act for the relief of Henry (also known as Heinrich) Schor, Sally (also known as Sali) Schor, and Gita (also known as Gitta Aviva) Schor;

H. R. 5344. An act for the relief of Bob Kan and Fourere Kan;

H. R. 5718. An act to limit the period for collection by the United States of compensation received by officers and employees in violation of the dual compensation laws;

H. R. 6127. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to create a Board for the Condemnation of Insanitary Buildings in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved May 1, 1906, as amended, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6355. An act for the relief of Elena Scarpetti Savelli;

H. R. 6492. An act for the relief of Rodolfo Navarro;

H. R. 6672. An act to provide for a temporary increase in the public-debt limit;

H. R. 6762. An act for the relief of Mrs. Irmgard (Chrapko) Broughman;

H. R. 7031. An act for the relief of Mrs. George A. Meffan;

H. R. 7217. An act for the relief of Astor Vergata;

H. R. 7221. An act for the relief of Anders Taranger;

H. R. 7229. An act to provide for the conveyance to T. M. Pratt and Annita C. Pratt of certain real property in Stevens County, Wash.;

H. R. 7734. An act to amend section 47 of the National Defense Act concerning the requirement for bond covering certain property issued by the United States for use by Reserve Officers' Training Corps units maintained at educational institutions;

H. R. 7762. An act for the relief of M. M. Hess;

H. R. 7813. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to adjust or cancel certain charges on the Milk River project;

H. R. 8205. An act to authorize the conveyance by the Secretary of the Interior to Virginia Electric & Power Co. of a perpetual easement of right-of-way for electric transmission line purposes across lands of the Richmond National Battlefield Park, Va., such easement to be granted in exchange for, and in consideration of, the conveyance for park purposes of approximately 6 acres of land adjoining the park;

H. R. 8244. An act for the relief of Mrs. Dorothy Nell Woolgar Allen;

H. R. 8628. An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1[illegible]0 to insure that crude silicon carbide imported into the United States will continue to be exempt from duty, and with respect to the duties applicable to certain prepared fish;

H. R. 8859. An act to convey the raversionary interest of the United States in certain lands to the city of Pawnee, Okla.;

H. R. 8932. An act to reclassify dictophones in the Tariff Act of 1930.

H. R. 9020. An act to provide increases in the monthly rates of compensation payable to certain veterans and their dependents;

H. R. 9248. An act to amend section 308 (5) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended;

H. R. 9302. An act to permit retired members of the uniformed services to revoke elections made under the Uniformed Services Contingency Option Act of 1953 in certain cases where the elections were made because of mathematical errors or misinformation;

H. R. 9680. An act to provide for greater stability in agriculture; to augment the marketing and disposal of agricultural products; and for other purposes;

H. R. 9790. An act to amend the act of June 30, 1948, so as to extend for 1 year the authority of the Secretary of the Interior to issue patents for certain public lands in Monroe County, Mich., held under color of title;

H. R. 9962. An act to increase by 5 percent the rates of pension payable to veterans and their dependents;

H. J. Res. 257. Joint resolution authorizing the President to invite the States of the Union and foreign countries to participate in the First International Instrument Congress and Exposition to be held in Philadelphia, Pa., from September 13 to September 25, 1954; and

H. J. Res. 585. Joint resolution fixing the time of assembly of the 84th Congress.

On August 30, 1954:

H. R. 1797. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain land to the State of Oklahoma for the use and benefit of the Eastern Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College at Wilburton, Okla., and for other purposes;

H. R. 1980. An act to authorize and direct the construction of bridges over the Potomac River, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2009. An act to authorize the sale of certain land in Alaska to the Ninilchik Hospital Association, of Ninilchik, Alaska, for the use as a hospital site and related purposes;

H. R. 2010. An act to authorize the sale of certain land in Alaska to the Alaska Evangelization Society, of Levelock, Alaska, for missionary purposes;

H. R. 2012. An act to authorize the sale of certain public lands in Alaska to the Alaska Council of Boy Scouts of America for a camp site and other public purposes;

H. R. 2014. An act to authorie the sale of certain public land in Alaska to the Community Club of Chugiak, Alaska;

H. R. 2061. An act for the relief of Regine du Planty;

H. R. 2781. An act for the relief of Nicholas Matook;

H. R. 3384. An act for the relief of John B. Daniel, Inc.;

H. R. 3750. An act for the relief of Inge Beckmann;

H. R. 3854. An act to authorize the sale of certain public land in Alaska to the Turnagain Arm Community Club of Anchorage, Alaska;

H. R. 4118. An act to authorize the preparation of rolls of persons of Indian blood whose ancestors were members of certain tribes or bands in the State of Oregon, and to provide for per capita distribution of funds arising from certain judgments in favor of such tribes or bands;

H. R. 6290. An act to discontinue certain reports now required by law;

H. R. 6959. An act to authorize the sale of certain land in Alaska to the Baptist Mid-Missions, an Ohio nonprofit corporation, for use as a church site;

H. R. 7290. An act to authorize an appropriation for the construction of certain public-school facilities on the Klamath Indian Reservation at Chiloquin, Oreg.;

H. R. 8020. An act authorizing the transfer of certain property of the United States Government (in Klamath County, Oreg.) to the State of Oregon;

H. R. 8183. An act for the relief of Elfriede Ida Geissler;

H. R. 8252. An act for the relief of the city of Fort Smith, Ark.;

H. R. 9712. An act granting the consent of Congress to certain New England States to enter into a compact relating to higher education in the New England States and establishing the New England Board of Higher Education; and

H. R. 9757. An act to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, as amended, and for other purposes.

On August 31, 1954:

H. R. 179. An act to amend section 7 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946, as amended;

H. R. 270. An act to provide for the control and extinguishment of outcrop and underground fires in coal formations, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1461. An act for the relief of Kenneth McRight;

H. R. 1514. An act for the relief of Clint Lewis;

H. R. 2615. An act for the relief of Julio Mercado Toledo;

H. R. 2645. An act for the relief of Donald James Darmody;

H. R. 2791. An act for the relief of Esther E. Ellicott;

H. R. 2876. An act for the relief of Leo F. Pinder;

H. R. 3008. An act for the relief of Esther Smith;

H. R. 3014. An act for the relief of Dr. Alfred L. Smith;

H. R. 3216. An act for the relief of E. C. Mills;

H. R. 3217 An act for the relief of Mrs. Florence D. Grimshaw;

H. R. 3232. An act for the relief of Dennis F. Guthrie;

H. R. 3273. An act for the relief of Edgar A. Belleau, Sr.;

H. R. 3446. An act for the relief of Mrs. Emily Wilhelm;

H. R. 3522. An act for the relief of Arthur S. Rosichan;

H. R. 3732. An act for the relief of Catherine (Cathrina) D. Pilgard;

H. R. 3757. An act for the relief of Dorothy Kilmer Nickerson;

H. R. 3951. An act for the relief of Frank G. Koch;

H. R. 4017. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain land and improvements to the England Special School District of the State of Arkansas;

H. R. 4329. An act for the relief of Huntington, McLaren & Co.;

H. R. 4340. An act for the relief of Charles J. Abarno and others;

H. R. 4531. An act for the relief of Lyman Chalkley;

H. R. 4580. An act for the relief of the Florida State Hospital;

H. R. 5028. An act for the relief of Petra Ruiz Martinez and Mr. and Mrs. Marcelo Maysonet Mirell;

H. R. 5086. An act for the relief of George Eldred Morgan;

H. R. 5093. An act for the relief of the survivors of Melvin Edward Williams;

H. R. 5460. An act for the relief of Chancy C. Newsom and the legal guardian of Susan M. Newsom, a minor;

H. R. 5489. An act for the relief of Rocco Forgione;

H. R. 5499. An act to provide for the construction, maintenance, and operation of the Michaud Flats project for irrigation in the State of Idaho;

H. R. 6332. An act for the relief of James Philip Coyle;

H. R. 6451. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain public lands in Utah to the occupants of the land;

H. R. 6455. An act to create a National Monument Commission, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6562. An act for the relief of Capt. C. R. MacLean;

H. R. 6566. An act for the relief of Daniel D. Poland;

H. R. 6616. An act to amend title 17, United States Code, entitled "Copyrights";

H. R. 6808. An act for the relief of Col. Samuel J. Adams, and others;

H. R. 6814. An act to facilitate the acquisition of non-Federal land within the existing boundaries of any national park, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7413. An act for the relief of Harold J. Davis;

H. R. 7785. An act to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, to make permanent the increases in regular annuities provided by the act of July 16, 1952, and to extend such increases to additional annuities purchased by voluntary contributions;

H. R. 7835. An act for the relief of S. Sgt. Frank C. Maxwell;

H. R. 7840. An act to amend the Railroad Retirement Act, the Railroad Retirement Tax Act, and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act;

H. R. 7853. An act to permit retired policemen and firemen of the District of Columbia to waive all or part of their relief or retirement compensation;

H. R. 7881. An act to validate a conveyance of certain lands by Southern Pacific Railroad Co., and its lessee, Southern Pacific Co., to Morgan Hopkins, Inc.;

H. R. 7886. An act for the relief of Mrs. Cecil Norton Broy;

H. R. 8027. An act to amend the act of March 6, 1952 (66 Stat. 16), to extend the time during which the Secretary of the Interior may enter into amendatory repayment contracts under the Federal reclamation laws, and for other purposes;

H. R. 8128. An act to amend section 1089 of the Code of Law for the District of Columbia relating to attachment proceedings;

H. R. 8193. An act to amend the Refugee Relief Act of 1953;

H. R. 8498. An act authorizing construction of works to reestablish for the Palo Verde Irrigation District, California, a means of diversion of its irrigation water supply from the Colorado River, and for other purposes;

H. R. 8606. An act for the relief of Neil C. Hemmer and Mildred Hemmer;

H. R. 8647. An act to amend Revised Statutes 4426;

H. R. 8915. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to consolidate the police court of the District of Columbia and the municipal court of the District of Columbia, to be known as the municipal court for the District of Columbia, to create the municipal court of appeals for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes";

H. R. 9115. An act to provide that contributions received under Public Law 485, 80th Congress, for the construction of a merchant marine chapel shall be invested in Government obligations pending their use for such construction;

H. R. 9729. An act to revise, codify, and enact into law, title 13 of the United States Code, entitled "Census";

H. R. 9756. An act to increase the borrowing power of Commodity Credit Corporation;

H. R. 9868. An act to amend the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946 to provide for the charter of passenger ships in the domestic trade;

H. R. 9910. An act to amend section 413 (b) of the Foreign Service Act of 1946;

H. R. 9988. An act for the relief of the Federal Republic of Germany;

H. R. 10187. An act to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to provide for the payment of appraisers', auctioneers', and brokers' fees from the proceeds of disposal of Government surplus real property, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 565. Joint resolution to amend the joint resolution providing for the membership of the United States in the Pan American Institute of Geography and History and authorize appropriations therefor.

On September 1, 1954:

H. R. 1912. An act for the relief of Hayik (Jirair) Vartiyan, Annemarie Vartiyan, and Susanig Armenuhi Vartiyan;

H. R. 2263. An act to provide certain employment benefits for employees of the Federal Governmnet, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4813. An act for the relief of Radu Florescu and Nicole Elizabeth Michel Florescu;

H. R. 5461. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the United States Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claim of Wah Chang Corp. against the United States;

H. R. 6287. An act to extend and amend the Renegotiation Act of 1951;

H. R. 8753. An act to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to authorize the Administrator of General Services to establish and operate motor vehicle pools and systems and to provide office furniture and furnishings when agencies are moved to new locations, to direct the Administrator to report the unauthorized use of Government motor vehicles, and to authorize the United States Civil Service Commission to regulate operators of Government-owned motor vehicles, and for other purposes;

H. R. 9366. An act to amend the Social Security Act and the Internal Revenue Code so as to extend coverage under the old-age and survivors insurance program, increase the benefits payable thereunder, preserve the insurance rights of disabled individuals, and increase the amount of earnings permitted without loss of benefits, and for other purposes;

H. R. 9709. An act to extend and improve the unemployment compensation program;

H. R. 9909. An act to prohibit payment of annuities to officers and employees of the United States convicted of certain offenses, and for other purposes;

H. R. 9924. An act to provide for family quarters for personnel of the military departments of the Department of Defense and their dependents, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 10009. An act to provide for the review of customs tariff schedules, to improve procedures for the tariff classification of unenumerated articles, and for other purposes.

On September 3, 1954:

H. R. 1107. An act for the relief of the J. A. Vance Co.;

H. R. 1254. An act to provide authorization for certain uses of public lands;

H. R. 2032. An act for the relief of Clarence D. Newland;

H. R. 2233. An act to provide for the acquisition of lands by the United States required for the reservoir created by the construction of Oahe Dam on the Missouri River and for rehabilitation of the Indians of the Cheyenne River Sioux Reservation, S. Dak., and for other purposes;

H. R. 2235. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct the Santa Maria project, Southern Pacific Basin, Calif.;

H. R. 4638. An act for the relief of David W. Wallace;

H. R. 5420. An act to amend section 161, title 35, United States Code, relating to the patenting of plants;

H. R. 6573. An act to provide for the promotion, precedence, constructive credit, distribution, retention, and elimination of officers of the Reserve components of the Armed Forces of the United States, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7130. An act to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide for the loss of nationality of persons convicted of certain crimes;

H. R. 9580. An act to revise and extend the laws relating to espionage and sabotage, and for other purposes;

H. R. 9730. An act to amend various statutes and certain titles of the United States Code, for the purpose of correcting obsolete references, and for other purposes;

H. R. 9859. An act authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes;

H. R. 9987. An act to amend certain provisions of title XI of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to facilitate private financing of new ship construction, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 10051. An act making appropriations for mutual security for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes.

BILLS DISAPPROVED SUBSEQUENT TO SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE

The President of the United States, subsequent to the sine die adjournment of the House of Representatives, on September 8, 1954, transmitted to the Clerk of the House a list of bills disapproved, together with his reasons for such actions, as follows:

FEDERAL EMPLOYEES COMPENSATION, H. R. 7774

In order that Federal workers may not have to undergo a period of uncertainty as to my action on H. R. 7774, "An act to increase the rates of compensation of classified, postal, and other employees of the Government, and for other purposes," I wish to announce that I shall withhold my approval from this bill.

The American people desire to reward properly, even generously, dedicated and faithful service on the part of their Government career employees. In return for the taxes they pay, they expect to have a civil-service system that is free of partisan politics, encourages efficient operation, rewards merit, and provides steady pay increases as the value of each employee increases with service and experience. I am wholeheartedly in accord with those desires.

Since taking office, this administration has developed a personnel program applying the best practices of progressive employers to the requirements of public service. In furtherance of that program, recommendations were made by this administration to the Congress for reasonable pay increases and adjustments in pay scales. H. R. 7774 is inconsistent with these principles. Unfortunately, the general pay increase proposed by this bill ignores and therefore tends to perpetuate the inequities we must correct.

On February 24, 1954, I approved and promptly submitted to the Congress the program to which I have just referred. It is the broadest and most constructive of its kind ever placed before the Congress. Most of its important provisions were passed at this session and these measures, in themselves, are so important as to constitute a milestone in the improvement of the civil-service system. These provisions include:

1. For the first time an inclusive system of group life insurance and unemployment compensation benefits similar to those enjoyed by workers in private industry, have been provided for Federal employees.

2. Restrictions on permanent promotions and reinstatements of former career employees have been removed.

3. The statutory limit on the number of employees in the executive branch has been adjusted to meet present day needs.

4. The incentive awards programs have been liberalized and made applicable to all employees.

5. Arbitrary restrictions upon the accumulation of annual leave have been repealed.

6. Longevity pay increases have been authorized for all except the three highest classified service grades.

7. An equitable system for overtime pay has been established.

These measures not only will benefit our Federal career system and its employees, but also will improve the sound management of the Federal Government, to whose efficiency this administration is resolutely dedicated. H. R. 7774 is not a part of a progressive and efficient program.

An important part of the administration's program that was not enacted into law involves general pay increases based upon the purposes of correcting inequities, promoting efficiency, and rewarding merit and experience.

In withholding my approval from this bill, I want to make it absolutely clear that the administration is not departing from the principles and purposes which it has hitherto advocated. I shall continue to urge the enactment of the remaining parts of the personnel program which was submitted to this session of Congress so that obvious distortions in the pay scales of both the postal and classified services can be corrected; so that adjustments and more equitable relationships between grades and steps within those grades can be made, and so that a proper and effective relationship between pay and work performed will be established and maintained.

Legislation is obviously unwise that disregards these principles of sound personnel management and ignores the necessity of revenue to pay for salary increases.

This measure, because it ignores the administration's recommendations for postal-rate increases, would add $112 million to the cost of operating the Post Office Department which is operating at a deficit of $400 million this year. It is well to remember that since 1945 the accumulated postal deficit has reached the staggering total of $4 billion. Likewise, this measure would add more than $200 million to civil service pay without providing any revenue to meet it.

My remarks in Washington on June 10 are now particularly pertinent. I then said:

> We hope to uproot the ingrained habit of operating the vast Post Office Department in an extravagantly wasteful and unbusinesslike manner. We cannot permit the deliberate operations of our Postal Department at a gigantic loss because a few are opposed to adequate postal rates. And we must have classification and promotional procedures for postal personnel that will serve the best interest of the Government, the public and the postal workers themselves.

Legislation for pay increases and classification adjustments related to work performed is still vital and urgently needed. The inequities presently existing in pay scales must still be corrected. I shall therefore resubmit to Congress when it convenes in January the recommendations previously made by the administration, together with such additional recommendations as any change in conditions then existing may warrant.

While this bill is limited to civilian personnel, I must observe, parenthetically, that consideration of a complete Federal personnel program must eventually meet certain imperative needs of the members of the Armed Forces. These patriotic men and women, whose morale, skill, and dedication to service are so important to us all, now lack adequate medical care for dependents and reasonable survivorship benefits for their families. It is most important that these needs of Armed Forces personnel, serving their country often in remote corners of the world, engage our serious consideration.

I am confident that the Congress will consider all of these recommendations promptly and that the American people will regard them as fair and just.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *August 23, 1954.*

NINA BERBEROVA, H. R. 692

I am withholding my approval of H. R. 692, for the relief of Nina Makeef, also known as Nina Berberova.

This alien entered the United States as a visitor and has not departed within the time permitted. She is now unlawfully in the United States. The bill would grant her the status of a lawful permanent resident upon payment of the required visa fee. The alien is a native of Russia, 53 years of age, who apparently is stateless. She entered the United States in November 1950. Prior to that entry she had been a long-time resident of France. It appears that she can return to France.

Upon the alien's failure to depart when her period of lawful stay expired, deportation proceedings were instituted. She was accorded a hearing and ordered deported. However, the Board of Immigration Appeals granted the alien the privilege of departing voluntarily from the United States, and alternatively ordered that in the event she failed to depart the order of deportation should be reinstated. She has failed to depart.

This alien has been permitted to remain in the United States beyond the period of time authorized by law and she should be required to depart in accordance with the terms under which she was granted admission to this country. There are many other aliens in foreign countries who are awaiting an opportunity to come to the United States for permanent residence but who are required to follow the regular means of obtaining permanent resident status. There are no facts present in this case justifying the enactment of special legislation granting this alien preferential treatment over others seeking to enter the United States.

The enactment of this bill undoubtedly would encourage other aliens to attempt to enter the United States as visitors for a temporary period and thereafter seek exemption from requirements of the immigration laws through special legislation.

Accordingly, I am constrained to withhold my approval from the bill.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *August 24, 1954.*

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE, FOREIGN QUARANTINE DIVISION, H. R. 6253

I am withholding my approval of H. R. 6253, a bill to amend Public Law 410, 78th Congress, with regard to compensation for overtime, Sunday, and holiday work of employees of the United States Public Health Service, Foreign Quarantine Division.

This bill would amend the Public Health Service Act in two major respects. First, it would establish special rates of overtime, Sunday, and holiday pay for certain quarantine inspection personnel of the Public Health Service comparable to those received by customs inspectors of the Treasury Department and immigrant inspectors of the Department of Justice under special premium pay statutes enacted many years ago. Second, with certain important exceptions, it would require that when night-overtime, Sunday, or holiday inspections are performed at the request of the owner, agent, master, or other shipping company representatives, the requesting party shall reimburse the United States for the extra cost represented by overtime compensation.

It is important to note that no charges would be payable by the carrier for services performed in connection with the inspection of persons arriving by (1) international highways, ferries, bridges, or tunnels, (2) regularly scheduled aircraft or trains, or (3) regularly scheduled Great Lakes vessels or vessels operated between Canadian ports and Puget Sound, or for services in connection with the inspection of the conveyances or vessels in which such persons arrive.

Under existing law, the inspection services are rendered without charge, regardless of the hour at which they are rendered. However, the Surgeon General, under his statutory authority to fix the hours during which quarantine service shall be performed at each quarantine station has—at most places other than airports—fixed the regular hours of quarantine service from 6 a. m. to 6 p. m., 7 days a week (Sundays and holidays included). When a vessel arrives within that time, quarantine service is rendered, and rendered free, even if it extends beyond that time. If the vessel arrives after 6 p. m., service will be rendered only if the vessel is in distress, or there is illness aboard, or there are other emergency conditions; otherwise the vessel is required to anchor at quarantine until the following morning and must await its turn for inspection. The delay incident to this waiting period is expensive to the owner of the vessel—it may run as much as $5,000 per day—and thus the owners are willing, indeed anxious, to pay whatever premium rates for out-of-hours inspection are authorized by law.

Although the bill would require certain reimbursements as indicated above, it would also require all employees performing these inspectional or quarantine services to be paid at the rate of one-half a day's pay for each two hours of overtime (or fraction thereof of at least one hour) between 5 p. m. and 8 a. m., with a limit of two-and-one-half days' pay for the full period from 5 p. m. to 8 a. m. For any Sunday or holiday duty, however brief or fleeting, the employee would be entitled to two "additional" days' pay. If the day falls within the employee's regular tour of duty, this would, apparently, entitle him to three days' pay. This means that the Government must pay the premium rates in all cases regardless of whether reimbursement is later made. The Federal Employees' Pay Act of 1945, as amended, under which these employees are now paid, provides for twice the regular rate of pay only for holiday work (and correspondingly less for less than a day's work), no extra pay for Sunday work (unless performed in excess of 40 hours a week), and overtime pay at the rate of time and one-half for employees whose annual salaries are less than $2,980. Employees at higher salaries are entitled to overtime pay on the basis of a rate schedule which decreases as the basic salary increases until their overtime rates of pay are less than the rates payable for straight time.

The special rates of pay proposed for these employees have been justified on the ground that these rates, and to a large extent the other provisions of the bill, are patterned after similar legislation which has long been in effect for customs and immigration inspectors (19 U. S. C. 267, 1451; 5 U. S. C. 342c), and that, like such inspectors, the irregular, sporadic, and unpredictable nature of their overtime, Sunday, and holiday services is different in character from that to which most other Federal employees are subject and is more burdensome.

These contentions require close examination. The claims of the shipowners for out-of-hours service have merit. The claims of the inspectional employees for equal treatment with other inspectional groups have much merit, but equality of treatment for all inspectional employees is not brought about by this bill. Furthermore, the special pay features of the bill depart from principles of overtime and premium pay set forth in the so-called fringe benefits bill recently enacted by the Congress. This factor and the reimbursement requirement combine to make it impossible for me to give my approval to this bill.

I recognize that the existence of the highly preferential rates of customs and immigration premium pay statutes creates severe administrative problems for the Public Health Service, since quarantine inspectors work in close proximity with these other inspectional services. However, the premium rates for the customs and immigrant inspectors are so far out of line with prevailing industrial and governmental practice that I do not believe extending their use to other groups of Federal employees would be good management. Legislation relating to groups of inspectional employees should seek to improve the overall pattern of premium compensation rather than to attempt to patch the existing uncoordinated pay structure.

In the recently enacted liberalizations of existing law governing overtime and holiday pay there are several special features; for example, provisions for callback time, standby pay in lieu of overtime, and the like, which will make considerably more equitable the premium pay available to these inspectional employees. Overtime compensation at the full rate of time and one-half will be based on regular pay up to an amount equal to the entrance salary of grade GS-9 instead of the present $2,980 limit of the Federal Employees' Pay Act. The large majority of these employees are classified in that grade.

In circumstances such as these, I cannot give my approval to H. R. 6253 even though the problems which the bill seeks to solve are real and pressing. I intend to have these problems further explored as they relate to both domestic and international carriers. I shall also direct further study of effective means to rationalize and coordinate overtime and premium pay for all inspectional service in relation to that for other Federal employees. Upon completion of these studies, I hope to be able to make recommendations to the Congress for necessary legislation.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *August 27, 1954*.

ANNA K. M'QUILKIN, H. R. 3516

I have withheld my approval from H. R. 3516, for the relief of Anna K. McQuilkin.

The bill provides for a direct payment award of $6,125 to Mrs. McQuilkin, who claims that her brother, a World War I veteran who died in the service in 1918, applied for and was issued yearly renewable term insurance in the sum of $10,000 and that she is entitled to the proceeds thereof as the sole beneficiary.

The Veterans' Administration and predecessor agencies have disputed her claim over a number of years, contending that their records and those of the Military Department fail to disclose that the brother made application for insurance. In 1922 the Veterans' Bureau, after careful consideration of the evidence presented in support of the claim, rejected it. Upon this denial, an award of automatic insurance of $25 a month was made to the deceased veteran's father, based on the determination that there had been no application for insurance. A total sum of $3,875 had been paid to the father at the time of his death in 1930. The $6,125 proposed for payment by H. R. 3516 represents the difference between the amount paid to the father and the sum of the insurance for which application was allegedly made.

During the period 1920 to 1932 Mrs. McQuilkin engaged the services of a number of attorneys to prosecute her claim. New counsel in July 1932 instituted suit against the Government in the United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois and secured a judgment in the amount of $12,592.50. The lower court decision, however, was reversed on appeal to the circuit court of appeals on the ground that the statutory period of limitations for filing such a suit had expired.

The Judiciary Committees appear to have accepted the lower court decision against the Government as now conclusive of the merits of Mrs. McQuilkin's claim. This would not seem, however, to be the case in view of the procedural turn of the circuit court of appeals ruling which precluded review of the substantive question of whether there was substantial evidence to support the findings of the district court.

I also agree with the Veterans' Administration that the case does not present any equitable consideration which warrants the direct gratuity award proposed. Unfortunately the procedural reversal by the circuit court of appeals has left the parties in the unsatisfactory position which existed prior to the district court suit. The evidence in this case is complex and controversial. I believe, therefore, that in fairness to Mrs. McQuilkin she is entitled to a day in court for decision of her claim on its merits, and I would be willing to approve a jurisdictional enactment waiving the bar of any statute of limitations.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *August 31, 1954*.

S. H. PRATHER ET AL., H. R. 9357

I have withheld my approval from the bill (H. R. 9357) for the relief of S. H. Prather, Mrs. Florence Prather Penman, S. H. Prather, Jr.

The bill proposed to pay the sums of $5,000 to S. H. Prather, $2,000 to Mrs. Florence Prather Penman, and $1,000 to S. H. Prather, Jr., for personal injuries and property damages sustained at Quitman, Ga., as the result of a collision of their family automobile with a car driven by one Howard Hart, an alleged bootlegger. The committee report on this bill (H. Rept. No. 2208) indicates that the collision occurred on August 6, 1935, when Hart was being pursued by an investigator of the Alcohol Tax Unit, Bureau of Internal Revenue, Treasury Department, and by a State officer. The report of the Treasury Department embodied in the House report states that the officers, while traveling at approximately 70 miles per hour, had pursued the car for a distance of about 2 miles, but had slowed down when Hart turned into a dirt side street of the town of Quitman, picked up speed to 75 miles an hour, and collided with the Prather car, which was proceeding at a lawful rate of 20 to 25 miles per hour. Hart's car contained approximately 43 gallons of illicit whisky at the time.

The officers in this instance were acting in the performance of their official duties in attempting to apprehend persons who were violating the law in their presence. The report of the special investigator of the Alcohol Tax Unit states that Mr. Prather conceded when interviewed that the officers were doing their duty and were without blame, "but that he felt someone should compensate him for the damages suffered," since the violators who had caused the wreck had no financial responsibility.

The misfortune suffered by this family as a result of the automobile accident, for which they were in no manner responsible, is most lamentable. While it is true the accident might not have happened if the law-enforcement officers had not been pursuing the bootleggers, there is nothing in the file to indicate the law-enforcement officers were acting negligently or were doing anything other than their duty. Unfortunately, the culprits legally and morally responsible for the injuries cannot be made to respond in damages. Enactment of the bill would constitute a gratuity and would create a dangerous precedent which might set in motion a chain of endless requests for the payment of damages by the Government arising out of accidents in which law-enforcement officers may have been remotely involved.

Accordingly, I am constrained to withhold my approval from the bill.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *August 31, 1954*.

METROPOLITAN WASHINGTON AREA TRANSPORTATION, H. R. 2236

I have withheld my approval from H. R. 2236, entitled "An act to provide for a Commission to regulate the public transportation of passengers by motor vehicle and street railroad within the metropolitan area of Washington, D. C., and for the establishment of a Metropolitan Washington Commission."

Title I of this enactment would establish a Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Commission to regulate public transportation by bus, streetcar, and taxicab in the District of Columbia and the counties of Montgomery and Prince Georges in the State of Maryland. The bill would grant to the proposed new Commission, in strengthened form, most of the powers now separately exercised in this regard by the Interstate Commerce Commission and the Public Utilities Commissions of the State of Maryland and the District of Columbia.

Title II of the bill would create a temporary Metropolitan Washington Commission to study, investigate, and make recommendations with regard to certain aspects of the Washington metropolitan area transportation problem.

The regulation of public transportation in the greater Washington area must contend with the growth of an integral economic community spreading far beyond the boundaries of the District of Columbia to include Montgomery and Prince Georges Counties in Maryland and Arlington and Fairfax Counties and the cities of Alexandria and Falls Church in Virginia. Within this community, the daily travel of persons back and forth across State lines has reached dimensions with which present facilities cannot cope. Under these circumstances, it is understandable that the present division of responsibility for regulation among four different agencies no longer meets the needs of the area. This division of responsibility has contributed, as it could not help but do, to the development of an inadequate system of public transportation. The situation plainly requires unification of regulatory authorities over public transportation throughout the metropolitan area.

The present enactment, however, falls substantially short of this objective. Its failure to include the Virginia segment of the metropolitan area within the jurisdiction of the proposed Commission is a fundamental deficiency. Through this omission of an integral and important part of the greater economic community, a system of fragmented and divided regulatory authority is continued. What is worse, the Federal Government is placed in the position of treating the carriers and persons within one segment of the area on a different and discriminatory basis from those in the remainder of the area. In the absence of any substantial grounds for this differentiation, the measure is unacceptable even as a temporary expedient.

This bill is also unsatisfactory because it extends, without sufficient safeguards, the authority of the Federal Government to matters that have, hitherto, been considered as primarily the concern of the District of Columbia and of the States. The problem is difficult because the urgency of need and the extent of Federal interest in the Nation's Capital both argue for unification of regulatory authorities under Federal auspices, at least for the time being. However, in any such arrangement means must be found to give adequate recognition to the rights and responsibilities of the District and of the States involved. Specifically, provision should be made to enable the States of Maryland and Virginia and the District of Columbia eventually to make arrangements for the exercise of this function under joint responsibility. In this regard, it would appear desirable to explore the feasibility of utilizing an interstate compact or other cooperative arrangements in which the Federal Government would participate and the Federal interest would be fully protected. In addition, every effort should be made to minimize the impact of any new Commission upon the internal affairs of the District of Columbia.

With respect to title II of the enactment, I agree that further study of metropolitan transportation problems is desirable. The primary mission assigned to the Commission is related directly to highway, bridge, and traffic problems. In emphasizing this role rather than consideration of mass transit problems, the bill unnecessarily complicates relationships with the National Capital Planning Commission and the National Capital Regional Planning Council. I believe that further consideration by the Congress will result in a more orderly allocation of responsibilities between the Commission and these existing planning agencies. Title II also establishes undesirable limitations governing the appointment and qualification of members of the Commission.

I hope that the 84th Congress will promptly enact a measure to unify regulatory authorities over public transportation and provide for a further transit study with adequate coverage and recognition of State and District responsibilities. Since title I of this bill would not have become fully effective until July 1, 1955, there need be no significant loss of time in obtaining its objectives. Similarly, time did not permit the Congress to provide funds for title II before adjournment. Therefore, since an appropriation cannot be made until after the Congress convenes in January, little time, if any, need be lost in the studies which a revised title II would encompass.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *September 3, 1954.*

MRS. ROSALINE SPAGNOLA, H. R. 2881

I have withheld my approval from H. R. 2881, a bill for the relief of Mrs. Rosaline Spagnola.

This enrolled enactment would pay to Mrs. Rosaline Spagnola the sum of $675.50 as additional compensation on account of the accidental death of her son in 1947 at Schofield Barracks, Hawaii.

As a member of the Armed Forces, the beneficiary's son had been convicted of housebreaking by a court-martial, sentenced to 5 years' confinement, and given a suspended dishonorable discharge. While confined in a post stockade he was shot and killed during an abortive jailbreak. It was subsequently determined that the decedent was not involved in the attempted escape in any way, and his death was declared to have occurred in line of duty. On the basis of this determination the beneficiary was paid the usual 6 months' death gratuity.

Earlier in his military career the beneficiary's son had taken out a $10,000 national service life insurance policy, designating his mother as beneficiary, and paying the premiums on his policy by allotments from his pay. However, since he had forfeited all pay and allowances while in confinement his allotment became ineffective, causing the policy to lapse for lack of premium payment. When the beneficiary made application after her son's death for regular monthly payments under the policy, the Veterans' Administration made such payments to her over a period of several years in an aggregate amount of $4,324.50 before discovering that the policy had not actually been in effect at the time of the son's death. Under discretionary authority which it possesses, the Veterans' Administration waived recovery of the amount thus erroneously paid to the beneficiary on the grounds that she had received it in good faith and to require repayment would work an undue hardship on her. In this connection, it may be noted that the award proposed by the present measure is based on the difference between the aggregate amount of the erroneous insurance payments and $5,000, the sum deemed by the Congress to be a reasonable total payment in the light of the circumstances of the case.

It appears that, even if she were dependent upon her son for support, which she was not, the beneficiary is ineligible for survivorship benefits under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration, because such benefits are denied in cases in which the serviceman died while in confinement, regardless of whether or not his death was incurred in line of duty.

The only question presented by this case is whether its special facts warrant the additional relief which the bill would afford the beneficiary. It might be argued that such relief is warranted not only because the beneficiary, apart from the issue of dependency, is ineligible for benefits under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration even though her son died in line of duty but also because neither she nor her son was ever specifically notified by the Veterans' Administration that this insurance had lapsed. Even if such arguments were valid, and I do not consider that they are, I still believe that there would be no justification for the award proposed here. I believe that any equities which might have existed in favor of the beneficiary were more than satisfied when the Veterans' Administration waived recovery of the insurance payments erroneously made to her.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *September 1, 1954.*

RALEIGH HILL, H. R. 6529

I am withholding my approval from the bill, H. R. 6529, 83d Congress, an act for the relief of Raleigh Hill.

The bill would authorize and direct the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to pay the proceeds of national service life insurance of Walter H. Nichols, Jr., to Raleigh Hill, uncle of the insured and designated principal beneficiary of such insurance.

National service life insurance in the amount of $10,000 matured on April 8, 1945, the date of death in service of Walter H. Nichols, Jr. The Veterans' Administration denied the claim of his uncle, Raleigh Hill, the designated principal beneficiary, on the ground that he did not stand in loco parentis to the insured and was therefore not within the permitted classes of beneficiaries, a statutory requirement applicable to national service life insurance maturing prior to August 1, 1946. The correctness of the Veterans' Administration determination under the applicable law is not disputed.

Favorable action appears to have been predicated on a belief that because the restriction concerning the permitted classes of beneficiaries has been removed as to national service life insurance maturing on and after August 1, 1946, payment should be made to an ineligible beneficiary in this case involving insurance which matured prior to August 1, 1946, and further, that the Government failed to advise the insured properly concerning classes of eligible beneficiaries. I am advised that the latter view is not supported by the record. As to the former, a similar view was urged in support of H. R. 3733, 83d Congress, which likewise proposed to pay an ineligible beneficiary the proceeds of a national service life insurance policy. In my message of February 23, 1954, returning the bill without approval, I said that it seemed to me irrelevant and unwise to accept as justification for that bill the fact that the ineligible beneficiary could at the time of the message qualify as a beneficiary under existing law which was not made retroactive. My view has not changed and applies with equal force to the present case.

Furthermore, approval of H. R. 6529 would be discriminatory and precedential. I am advised that of the approximately 3,600 claims for the proceeds of national service life insurance denied by the Veterans' Administration because the claimants were not within the classes of beneficiaries permitted by law, it is estimated that a majority were cases similar to Mr. Hill's, where the claimants had been designated as beneficiaries.

As stated on previous occasions, I am opposed to setting aside the principles and rules of administration prescribed in the general law relating to veterans' benefit programs. Uniformity and equality of treatment to all who are similarly situated must be the steadfast rule if the Federal programs for veterans and their beneficiaries are to be operated successfully. Approval of H. R. 6529 would not be in keeping with these principles.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *September 1, 1954.*

CARL PIOWATY AND W. J. PIOWATY, H. R. 1665

I have withheld my approval from H. R. 1665, for the relief of Carl Piowaty and W. J. Piowaty.

This bill authorizes and directs the Secretary of the Treasury to pay to Carl Piowaty and W. J. Piowaty the sum of $4,450 in full settlement of their claim against the United States for war-crop advances made to them by the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation prior to April 16, 1943.

The claims of the United States against these two persons and their claims against the United States have been adjudicated in the courts where both sides were afforded an opportunity to present all pertinent evidence on the issues involved. The case was tried before a jury in the circuit court of Orange County, Fla., on May 22 and 23, 1947, and a judgment was obtained against both Carl Piowaty and W. J. Piowaty for the full amount they owed. They appealed the verdict to the Supreme Court of Florida where the lower court's judgment was sustained on February 13, 1948. Appeal for a rehearing was thereafter denied.

In 1950, W. J. Piowaty and his wife instituted an action in the circuit court of Orange County, Fla., seeking a declaratory judgment relieving their real property from the lien of the judgment. That suit was dismissed on motion of the United States. In 1951, suit was filed by the United States against Carl Piowaty, W. J. Piowaty, and the Globe Indemnity Co. on the bonds which were posted when the appeal was taken to the Supreme Court of Florida. Carl Piowaty and W. J. Piowaty filed an answer in that suit, but on motion for summary judgment, judgment was rendered against all the defendants in favor of the United States on October 29, 1952.

In the light of this history of repeated judicial review, I cannot agree that Carl Piowaty and W. J. Piowaty should be given the special consideration and relief which the bill would provide.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *September 2, 1954.*

TRUST ASSOCIATION OF H. KEMPNER, H. R. 951

I have withheld my approval from H. R. 951, for the relief of the Trust Association of H. Kempner.

This bill would provide an indirect means for payment of approximately $1 million by the United States for certain peacetime commercial losses of the Kempner Trust Association. To accomplish this purpose the bill would require the Court of Claims to determine the amount that the trust association lost as a result of cotton sales made to certain private business firms in Germany during 1923 and 1924. The bill would then require that the Court of Claims determine how much of the property seized during World War I by the United States from a German firm wholly unconnected with Kempner or the cotton sales, Germann & Co., had been lost through improper administration by the Alien Property Custodian. The determined amount of the loss of the Germann & Co. vested property would be then withdrawn from the war claims fund and used to compensate the Kempner Trust Association to the extent of its loss.

Following World War I the Kempner Trust Association through subsidiary corporations entered into contracts for the sale of cotton with a number of German textile manufacturers for future delivery. A fall in cotton prices before delivery led the German firms to breach their contracts with the association. The amounts payable by the German debtors on account of the breaches of contract, as determined by judgments and negotiated settlements, could not be paid through the subsequent period before World War II because of German foreign exchange controls, and, as a result, the trust association lost money on the transactions. These losses would be paid by the United States if this bill were enacted although it is clear that the United States bears no moral or legal liability for the transactions which resulted in the losses in question.

Moreover, the method of payment proposed by the bill raises serious questions of propriety. The matter involving Germann & Co. has no relationship to the claim which the Kempner Trust Association seeks to have paid. During World War I the Alien Property Custodian had seized the property of Germann & Co., a firm in the Philippines, as enemy property. When the property was returned to Germann & Co., following enactment of legislation authorizing return of seized property after World War I, it was claimed that the firm's assets had been depleted by approximately $1 million during the period of its administration by the Alien Property Custodian through allegedly improper payments. The Treaty of Berlin which terminated World War I between the United States and Germany, however, precludes Germann & Co. from asserting any claim against the United States on account of the seizure of its property or any losses during the period it was held by the United States. There is, therefore, no valid claim to be asserted by Germann & Co. as the basis for the proposed determination by the Court of Claims. Even if such a claim existed, however, the proposed payment of its proceeds to the Kempner Trust Association instead of to Germann & Co. would not appear to be a proper disposition of the rights of the latter company.

Furthermore, the bill confers upon the United States Court of Claims jurisdiction to sit in judgment upon the acts of the former German Government with respect to acts committed in Germany. I am informed that this would be contrary to a well-recognized principle of international law and practice.

For these reasons, the purpose and method of payment would not appear justified. Moreover, enactment of this bill would establish an undesirable precedent for the assumption by the United States for the commercial losses of American citizens, even where no governmental sponsorship of the commercial venture appeared. It would also set an undesirable precedent for the use of the German and Japanese assets vested during World War II for commercial losses suffered during peacetime in lieu of their present use through the war claims fund as the source of payment of the wartime personal injury damages suffered by American nationals.

Accordingly, I am constrained to withhold my approval from the bill.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *September 3, 1954.*

SANITARY DISTRICT OF CHICAGO, H. R. 3300

I have withheld my approval of H. R. 3300, to authorize the State of Illinois and the Sanitary District of Chicago, under the direction of the Secretary of the Army, to help control the lake level of Lake Michigan by diverting water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway.

The bill would authorize the State of Illinois and the Sanitary District of Chicago, under the supervision and direction of the Secretary of the Army, to withdraw from Lake Michigan, in addition to all domestic pumpage, a total annual average of 2,500 cubic feet of water per second into the Illinois Waterway for a period of 3 years. This diversion would be 1,000 cubic feet per second more than is presently permitted under a decree of the Supreme Court of the United States dated April 21, 1930. The bill also would direct the Secretary of the Army to study the effect in the improvement in conditions in the Illinois Waterway by reason of the increased diversion, and to report to the Congress as to the results of the study on or before January 31, 1957, with his recommendations as to continuance of the increased diversion authorized.

The bill specifies that the diversion would be authorized in order to regulate and promote commerce, to protect, improve, and promote navigation in the Illinois Waterway and Mississippi Valley, to help control the lake level, to afford protection to property and shores along the Great Lakes, and to provide for a navigable Illinois Waterway. No mention is made of possible improvement of sanitary conditions or increase in hydroelectric power generation on the waterway.

I am unable to approve the bill because (1) existing diversions are adequate for navigation on the Illinois Waterway and Mississippi River, (2) all methods of control of lake levels and protection of property on the Great Lakes should be considered before arbitrarily proceeding with the proposed increased diversion, (3) the diversions are authorized without reference to negotiations with Canada, and (4) the legitimate interests of other States affected by the diversion may be adversely affected. I wish to comment briefly on each of these points.

I understand that waterborne traffic on the Illinois Waterway has grown in the last 20 years from 200,000 tons to 16 million tons annually. The Corps of Engineers advises, however, that the existing diversions of water are adequate for navigation purposes in the Illinois Waterway and the Mississippi River. Surveys are now underway by the International Joint Commission and the Corps of Engineers to determine the best methods of obtaining improved control of the levels of the Great Lakes and of preventing recurrence of damage along their shores. Reasonable opportunity to complete these surveys should be afforded before legislative action is undertaken.

The diversion of waters into and out of the Great Lakes has historically been the subject of negotiations with Canada.

To proceed unilaterally in the manner proposed in H. R. 3300 is not wise policy. It would be the kind of action to which we would object if taken by one of our neighbors. The Canadian Government protested the proposed authorization when it was under consideration by the Congress, and has continued its objection to this bill in a note to the Department of State dated August 24, 1954. It seems to me that the additional diversion is not of such national importance as to justify action without regard to the views of Canada.

Finally, as is clear from the report of the Senate committee, a major purpose of the proposal to divert additional water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois waterway is to determine whether the increased flow will improve existing adverse sanitation conditions. The waters of Lake Michigan are interstate in character. It would seem to me that a diversion for the purposes of one State alone should be authorized only after general agreement has been reached among all the affected States. Officials of several States adjoining the Great Lakes, other than Illinois, have protested approval of the bill as being contrary to their interests and not in accord with the diversion authorized under the 1930 decree of the Supreme Court. Under all of these circumstances, I have felt that the bill should not be approved.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *September 3, 1954.*

FEDERAL FOOD, DRUG, AND COSMETIC ACT, H. R. 9728

I have withheld my approval from H. R. 9728, to revise, codify, and enact into law, title 21 of the United States Code, entitled "Food, Drugs, and Cosmetics."

The legislative history of this measure indicates that it was enacted in the view that existing law would not be substantially changed by the bill or that no changes in existing law would be made which would not meet with substantially unanimous approval.

Notwithstanding this, the bill makes one very important substantive change and casts serious doubts on the status and interpretation of other statutory provisions. The most important change is the deletion from the multiple seizure powers of the present law the authority which the Food and Drug Administration has had for a number of years to make more than one seizure of food, drugs, and cosmetics, where they bear identical labeling which is believed fraudulent or so materially misleading as to injure or damage the purchaser or consumer. In the cases subject to removal of authority made by the bill, the Food and Drug Administration would be able to seize only one shipment of the articles believed to be so misbranded. Such a limitation would make it possible for fraud and material deception to continue unabated until the validity of the labeling involved in the seizure case is definitely settled by the courts.

The enactment also contains a new substantive provision affecting the administration of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, the meaning of which is very uncertain, namely, that the Administrative Procedure Act "shall continue to apply to all activities of the Food and Drug Administration." The Administrative Procedure Act already applies to both rulemaking and adjudication under this regulatory statute, as it does to other acts of Congress not expressly excepted. The Federal courts, I am informed, have discussed on several occasions the relationship of these two enactments. The new language, unless it should be regarded as mere surplusage, might be held to effect basic changes in existing procedures, thereby placing the Food and Drug Administration under requirements not applicable to any other Federal agency. Such a change in the scope of the Administrative Procedure Act should not be adopted without full consideration.

The interest of the consumer public is the principal objective of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act. I believe that substantive changes which may seriously affect the administration of this law should not be placed in the statute books without extending to the responsible enforcement agency, the great industries affected, and the consumer public, the full opportunities for hearing and discussion afforded by the usual operation of the legislative process both in the committees and in both Houses of the Congress.

Finally, the enactment, through oversight, may nullify the provisions of legislation relating to the importation of animals and poultry into the Virgin Islands, approved on July 22 of this year (Public Law 517). The enrolled measure apparently does not take into consideration the amendments to the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands which were made by that act. Here again the adverse effects would be serious.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *September 3, 1954.*

REGULATION OF LOBBYING ACT

In compliance with Public Law 601, 79th Congress, title III, Regulation of Lobbying Act, section 308 (b), which provides as follows:

> (b) All information required to be filed under the provisions of this section with the Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate shall be compiled by said Clerk and Secretary, acting jointly, as soon as practicable after the close of the calendar quarter with respect to which such information is filed and shall be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate jointly submit their report of the compilation required by said law and have included all registrations and quarterly reports received for the second calendar quarter of 1954.

QUARTERLY REPORTS

The following quarterly reports were submitted for the second calendar quarter 1954:

(NOTE.—The form used for reports is produced below. In the interest of economy questions are not repeated, only the answers are printed and are indicated by their respective letter and number. Also for economy in the RECORD, lengthy answers are abridged.)

File two copies with the Secretary of the Senate and file three copies with the Clerk of the House of Representatives.

This page (page 1) is designed to supply identifying data; and page 2 (on the back of this page) deals with financial data.

Place an "X" below the appropriate letter or figure in the box at the right of the "Report" heading below:

"PRELIMINARY" REPORT ("Registration"): To "register," place an "X" below the letter "P" and fill out page 1 only.

"QUARTERLY" REPORT: To indicate which one of the four calendar quarters is covered by this Report, place an "X" below the appropriate figure. Fill out both page 1 and page 2 and as many additional pages as may be required. The first additional page should be numbered as page "3," and the rest of such pages should be "4," "5," "6," etc. Preparation and filing in accordance with instructions will accomplish compliance with all quarterly reporting requirements of the Act.

Year: 19______

REPORT

PURSUANT TO FEDERAL REGULATION OF LOBBYING ACT

P	QUARTER			
	1st	2d	3d	4th
(Mark one square only)				

NOTE ON ITEM "A".—(a) In General: This "Report" form may be used by either an organization or an individual, as follows:

(i) "Employee".—To file as an "employee," state in Item "B" the name, address, and nature of business of the "employer." (If the "employee" is a firm [such as a law firm or public relations firm], partners and salaried staff members of such firm may join in filing a Report as an "employee.")

(ii) "Employer".—To file as an "employer," write "None" as answer to Item "B."

(b) Separate Reports.—An agent or employee should not attempt to combine his Report with the employer's Report.

(i) Employers subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their agents or employees.

(ii) Employees subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their employers.

A. ORGANIZATION OR INDIVIDUAL FILING.—(1) State name, address, and nature of business; (2) if this Report is for an Employer, list names of agents or employees who will file Reports for this Quarter.

NOTE ON ITEM "B".—*Reports by Agents or Employees.* An employee is to file, each quarter, as many Reports as he has employers; except that: (*a*) If a particular undertaking is jointly financed by a group of employers, the group is to be considered as one employer, but all members of the group are to be named, and the contribution of each member is to be specified; (*b*) if the work is done in the interest of one person but payment therefor is made by another, a single Report—naming both persons as "employers"—is to be filed each quarter.

B. EMPLOYER.—State name, address, and nature of business. If there is no employer, write "None."

NOTE ON ITEM "C".—(*a*) The expression "in connection with legislative interests," as used in this Report, means "in connection with attempting, directly or indirectly, to influence the passage or defeat of legislation." "The term 'legislation' means bills, resolutions, amendments, nominations, and other matters pending or proposed in either House of Congress, and includes any other matter which may be the subject of action by either House"—Section 302 (e).

(*b*) Before undertaking any activities in connection with legislative interests, organizations and individuals subject to the Lobbying Act are required to file a "Preliminary" Report (Registration).

(*c*) After beginning such activities, they must file a "Quarterly" Report at the end of each calendar quarter in which they have either received or expended anything of value in connection with legislative interests.

C. LEGISLATIVE INTERESTS, AND PUBLICATIONS in connection therewith:

☐ 1. State approximately how long legislative interests are to continue. If receipts and expenditures in connection with legislative interests have terminated, place an "X" in the box at the left, so that this Office will no longer expect to receive Reports.

2. State the general legislative interests of the person filing and set forth the *specific* legislative interests by reciting: (*a*) Short titles of statutes and bills; (*b*) House and Senate numbers of bills, where known; (*c*) citations of statutes, where known; (*d*) whether for or against such statutes and bills.

3. In the case of those publications which the person filing has caused to be issued or distributed, in connection with legislative interests, set forth: (*a*) description; (*b*) quantity distributed; (*c*) date of distribution; (*d*) name of printer or publisher (if publications were paid for by person filing) or name of donor (if publications were received as a gift).

(Answer items 1, 2, and 3 in the space below. Attach additional pages if more space is needed.)

4. If this is a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) rather than a "Quarterly" Report, state below what the nature and amount of anticipated expenses will be; and if for an agent or employee, state also what the daily, monthly, or annual rate of compensation is to be. *If this is a "Quarterly" Report, disregard this Item "C 4" and fill out Items "D" and "E" on the back of this page.* Do not attempt to combine a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) with a "Quarterly" Report.

AFFIDAVIT

[Omitted in printing]

PAGE 1

Note on Item "D."—(a) *In General.* The term "contribution" includes *anything of value.* When an organization or individual uses printed or duplicated matter in a campaign attempting to influence legislation, money received by such organization or individual—for such printed or duplicated matter—is a "contribution." "The term 'contribution' includes a gift, subscription, loan, advance, or deposit of money, or anything of value, and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether or not legally enforceable, to make a contribution"—Section 302 (a) of the Lobbying Act.

(b) **If This Report Is for an Employer.**—(i) *In General.* Item "D" is designed for the reporting of all receipts from which expenditures are made, or will be made, in accordance with legislative interests.

(ii) *Receipts of Business Firms and Individuals.*—A business firm (or individual) which is subject to the Lobbying Act by reason of expenditures which it makes in attempting to influence legislation—but which has no funds to expend except those which are available in the ordinary course of operating a business not connected in any way with the influencing of legislation—will have no receipts to report, even though it does have expenditures to report.

(iii) *Receipts of Multipurpose Organizations.*—Some organizations do not receive any funds which are to be expended solely for the purpose of attempting to influence legislation. Such organizations make such expenditures out of a general fund raised by dues, assessments, or other contributions. The percentage of the general fund which is used for such expenditures indicates the percentage of dues, assessments, or other contributions which may be considered to have been paid for that purpose. Therefore, in reporting receipts, such organizations may specify what that percentage is, and report their dues, assessments, and other contributions on that basis. However, each contributor of $500 or more is to be listed, regardless of whether the contribution was made solely for legislative purposes.

(c) **If This Report Is for an Agent or Employee.**—(i) *In General.* In the case of many employees, all receipts will come under Items "D 5" (received for services) and "D 12" (expense money and reimbursements). In the absence of a clear statement to the contrary, it will be presumed that your employer is to reimburse you for all expenditures which you make in connection with legislative interests.

(ii) *Employer as Contributor of $500 or More.*—When your contribution from your employer (in the form of salary, fee, etc.) amounts to $500 or more, it is not necessary to report such contribution under "D 13" and "D 14," since the amount has already been reported under "D 5," and the name of the "employer" has been given under Item "B" on page 1 of this report.

D. Receipts (Including Contributions and Loans):

Fill in every blank. If the answer to any numbered item is "None," write "None" in the space following the number.

Receipts (other than loans)

1. $--------Dues and assessments
2. $--------Gifts of money or anything of value
3. $--------Printed or duplicated matter received as a gift
4. $--------Receipts from sale of printed or duplicated matter
5. $--------Received for services (e. g., salary, fee, etc.)
6. $--------Total for this Quarter (Add items "1" through "5")
7. $--------Received during previous Quarters of calendar year
8. $--------Total from Jan. 1 through this Quarter (Add "6" and "7")

Loans Received

"The term 'contribution' includes a . . . *loan* . . ."—Sec. 302 (a).

9. $--------Total now owed to others on account of loans
10. $--------Borrowed from others during this Quarter
11. $--------Repaid to others during this Quarter

12. $--------"Expense money" and Reimbursements received this Quarter

Contributors of $500 or more
(from Jan. 1 through this Quarter)

13. Have there been such contributors?
Please answer "yes" or "no": --------

14. In the case of each contributor whose contributions (including loans) during the "period" from January 1 through the last days of this Quarter total $500 or more:

Attach hereto plain sheets of paper, approximately the size of this page, tabulate data under the headings "Amount" and "Name and Address of Contributor"; and indicate whether the last day of the period is March 31, June 30, September 30, or December 31. Prepare such tabulation in accordance with the following example:

Amount	*Name and Address of Contributor*
	("*Period*" from Jan. 1 through ----------------, 19----)
$1,500.00	John Doe, 1621 Blank Bldg., New York, N. Y.
$1,785.00	The Roe Corporation, 2511 Doe Bldg., Chicago, Ill.
$3,285.00	Total

Note on Item "E".—(a) *In General.* "The term 'expenditure' includes a payment, distribution, loan, advance, deposit, or gift of money or anything of value, and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether or not legally enforceable, to make an expenditure"—Section 302 (b) of the Lobbying Act.

(b) **If This Report Is for an Agent or Employee.** In the case of many employees, all expenditures will come under telephone and telegraph (Item "E 6") and travel, food, lodging, and entertainment (Item "E 7").

E. Expenditures (Including Loans) in connection with legislative interests:

Fill in every blank. If the answer to any numbered item is "None," write "None" in the spaces following the number.

Expenditures (other than loans)

1. $--------Public relations and advertising services
2. $--------Wages, salaries, fees, commissions (other than item "1")
3. $--------Gifts or contributions made during Quarter
4. $--------Printed or duplicated matter, including distribution cost
5. $--------Office overhead (rent, supplies, utilities, etc.)
6. $--------Telephone and telegraph
7. $--------Travel, food, lodging, and entertainment
8. $--------All other expenditures
9. $--------Total for this Quarter (Add "1" through "8")
10. $--------Expended during previous Quarters of calendar year
11. $--------Total from January 1 through this Quarter (Add "9" and "10")

Loans Made to Others

"The term 'expenditure' includes a . . . *loan* . . ."—Sec. 302 (b).

12. $--------Total now owed to person filing
13. $--------Lent to others during this Quarter
14. $--------Repayment received during this Quarter

15. Recipients of Expenditures of $10 or More

In the case of expenditures made during this Quarter by, or on behalf of the person filing: Attach plain sheets of paper approximately the size of this page and tabulate data as to expenditures under the following heading: "Amount," "Date or Dates," "Name and Address of Recipient," "Purpose." Prepare such tabulation in accordance with the following example:

Amount	*Date or Dates—Name and Address of Recipient—Purpose*
$1,750.00	7-11: Roe Printing Co., 3214 Blank Ave., St. Louis, Mo.—Printing and mailing circulars on the "Marshbanks Bill."
$2,400.00	7-15, 8-15, 9-15: Britten & Blatten, 3127 Gremlin Bldg., Washington, D. C.—Public relations service at $800.00 per month.
$4,150.00	Total

PAGE 2

A. Claris Adams, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Life Convention, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) All existing and prospective legislation which may affect the life insurance business.

D. (6) $1,406.25.

A. J. Carson Adkerson, 976 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) All legislation affecting strategic minerals, including manganese.

D. (6) $250.

E. (4) $10.25; (7) $7.65; (8) $1; (9) $18.90; (11) $18.90.

A. Aircraft Industries Association of America, Inc., 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Generally any legislation which will affect the aircraft industry.

D. (6) $5,046.49.

E. (2) $3,750; (4) $788.79; (7) $507.70; (9) $5,046.49; (10) $4,768.13; (11) $9,814.62.

A. W. L. Allen, 5913 Georgia Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. The Commercial Telegraphers' Union, 5913 Georgia Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Legislation introduced, repealed, or modified which may affect the interests of employer union, or allied and affiliated organizations, or other labor organizations concerned.

A. Allied Wool Industry Committee, 414 Pacific National Life Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.

D. (6) $1,000.

E. (11) $2,000.

A. W. R. Allstetter, 616 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.

B. The National Fertilizer Association, Inc., 616 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Any legislation that might affect the manufacture or distribution of fertilizer or the general agricultural economy.

D. (6) $100.

A. Thomas H. Alphin, M. D., 1523 L Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) All bills (Senate and House) relating to health and welfare.

D. (6) $620.

E. (7) $33.71; (9) $33.71; (10) $27.04; (11) $60.75.

A. Amalgamated Association of Street, Electric Railway and Motor Coach Employes of America, 1214 Griswold Street, Detroit, Mich.

E. (11) $321.40.

A. Joseph Amann, 711 West Lake Street, Minneapolis, Minn.

B. Engineers and Scientists of America, 711 West Lake Street, Minneapolis, Minn.

C. (2) Any legislation affecting the interests of professional engineers and other members of affiliated units.

A. American Cancer Society, 47 Beaver Street, New York City, N. Y.

C. (2) Appropriations for public health.

E. (1) $4,999.98; (7) $1,304.19; (9) $6,304.17; (10) $6,462.35; (11) $12,766.52.

A. American Cotton Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 203-A Liberty Life Building, Charlotte, N. C.

C. (2).[1]

D. (6) $3,321.62.

E. (2) $2,781.77; (4) $46.73; (5) $306.26; (6) $75.86; (7) $111; (9) $3,321.62; (10) $2,098.51; (11) $5,420.13; (15).[1]

A. American Dental Association, 222 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) To protect and further the interests of the public and the dental profession in matters of patents, legislation, and regulations.

D. (6) $14,988.81.

E. (2) $7,850.63; (4) $3,948.09; (6) $950.83; (7) $2,239.26; (9) $14,988.81; (10) $9,897.75; (11) $24,886.56; (15).[1]

A. American Farm Bureau Federation, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill., and 261 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Legislation affecting agriculture. (3) Nation's Agriculture and Newsletter.

D. (6) $33,774.

E. (2) $19,755; (4) $4,422; (5) $2,093; (6) $1,653; (7) $766; (9) $28,689; (10) $26,616; (11) $55,305; (15).[1]

A. American Federation of Labor, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Legislation affecting the interests of working people. (3) American Federationist.

E. (1) $6,734.08; (2) $19,351.24; (4) $3,959.28; (5) $892; (9) $30,936.60; (10) $27,616.65; (11) $58,553.25; (15).[1]

A. American Federation of the Physically Handicapped, Inc., 1370 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) To establish the Federal Agency for Handicapped; tax exemptions for handicapped and for those who support handicapped who cannot care for themselves.

D. (6) $5,000.

E. (2) $1,000; (4) $900; (6) $350; (7) $200; (8) $2,000; (9) $4,450; (10) $2,750; (11) $7,200.

A. American Hospital Association, 18 East Division Street, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) All legislation which may affect the ability of hospitals to render good care or which may affect care for the American people.

D. (6) $13,716.81.

E. (2) $6,793.54; (4) $131; (5) $1,676.05; (6) $541.79; (7) $417.96; (8) $778.97; (9) $10,339.31; (10) $10,543.02; (11) $20,882.33.

A. American Hotel Association, 221 West 57th Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) All bills and statutes of interest to the hotel industry.

D. (6) $130,500.80.

E. (9) $12,995.66.

A. American Legion, National Headquarters, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.

C. (2).[1] (3) American Legion magazine, Legislative Bulletin, Merchant Marine Bulletin, and Air Review.

D. (6) $6,224.83.

E. (2) $10,363.89; (4) $2,774.94; (5) $2,338.92; (6) $421.90; (7) $278.97; (9) $16,178.62; (10) $22,484.38; (11) $38,663.

A. American Life Convention, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) All existing and prospective legislation which may affect the life insurance business.

D. (6) $3,092.98.

E. (2) $2,477.64; (5) $387.09; (6) $203.25; (7) $25; (9) $3,092.98; (10) $8,267.92; (11) $11,360.90; (15).[1]

A. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) The general legislative interest is to advance the science and art of medicine.[1] (3) Information bulletins.

D. (6) $10,000.

E. (2) $6,709.42; (4) $211.86; (5) $1,230.30; (6) $236.40; (7) $425.34; (8) $1,097.66; (9) $9,910.98; (10) $10,130.13; (11) $20,041.11; (15).[1]

A. American National Cattlemen's Association, 515 Cooper Building, Denver, Colo.

C. (2) Supported or opposed legislation affecting cattle industry, including reciprocal trade, support prices, appropriations, etc. (3) The American Cattle Producer.

D. (6) $42,995.23.

E. (2) $5,250; (6) $57.97; (7) $1,936.60; (8) $16.90; (9) $7,261.47; (10) $9,603.15; (11) $16,864.62.

A. American Nurses' Association, Inc., 2 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Any legislation relating to health, nurses, or nursing. (3) Federal Legislation News.

D. (6) $335,029.10.

E. (2) $1,464.61; (4) $24; (5) $339.96; (6) $88.22; (7) $211.48; (8) $1.25; (9) $2,129.52; (10) $2,321.32; (11) $4,450.84.

A. American Osteopathic Association, 212 East Ohio Street, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) Bills affecting the public health.

D. (6) $508.80.

E. (2) $375; (4) $29.41; (5) $69; (6) $35.39; (9) $508.80; (10) $497; (11) $1,005.80.

A. American Paper and Pulp Association, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Legislative interests are those affecting the pulp and paper industry, its operations, properties, and practices.

D. (6) $1,165.

E. (2) $750; (6) $185; (7) $230; (9) $1,165; (10) $895; (11) $2,060.

A. American Parents Committee, Inc., 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C., and 52 Vanderbilt Avenue, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Support of Federal aid for school construction, etc.[1]

D. (6) $1,290.17.

E. (2) $1,147.71; (4) $103.44; (5) $130.26; (6) $61.91; (7) $24.07; (8) $507.41; (9) $1,974.80; (10) $5,144.80; (11) $7,119.60.

A. American Petroleum Institute, 50 West 50th Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Legislation affecting the petroleum industry.

D. (6) $1,240.

E. (2) $6,145; (5) $3,500; (6) $372; (8) $1,022; (9) $11,039; (10) $12,176; (11) $23,215; (15).[1]

A. American Pulpwood Association, 220 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Legislative interests are those affecting the pulpwood industry, its operations, properties, and practices.

A. American Retail Federation, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Registrant is generally interested in all legislation and legislative proposals affecting the retail industry.

D. (6) $49,915.97.

E. (2) $8,750; (4) $226.70; (5) $773.33; (6) $602.54; (7) $310.98; (9) $10,663.55; (10) $10,359.49; (11) $21,023.04.

A. American Short Line Railroad Association, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

D. (6) $3,131.89.

E. (2) $737.50; (3) $500; (5) $375; (6) $85.50; (7) $1,433.89; (9) $3,131.89; (10) $1,965.23; (11) $5,097.12; (15).[1]

A. American Tariff League, Inc., 19 West 44th Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) H. R. 8860, H. R. 9159, H. R. 9474, and H. R. 9476.

D. (6) $17,209.17.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

E. (2) $9,529; (4) $2,449.44; (5) $1,545.86; (6) $254.15; (7) $539.24; (8) $2,414.15; (9) $16,731.86; (10) $29,747.62; (11) $46,479.46; (15).[1]

A. American Textile Machinery Association, 93 Grand Street, Worcester, Mass.

C. (2) The general legislative interests of the association consist of matters affecting the textile machinery industry.

D. (6) $12.98.

A. American Veterans Committee, Inc., 1751 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Legislation affecting the general welfare, especially in the fields of international affairs, civil rights, liberties, and veterans benefits.

D. (6) $762.32.

E. (2) $1,480; (8) $20; (9) $1,500.

A. American Tramp Shipowners Association, Inc., 11 Broadway, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) The association is interested in amending existing shipping legislation in order to extend operating and construction differential subsidies to American-flag vessels engaged in so-called tramp trades.

D. (6) $3,600.

E. (2) $2,062.50; (4) $158.05; (5) $208.34; (6) $105.64; (7) $625.58; (8) $263.05; (9) $3,423.16; (10) $17,485.83; (11) $20,908.99; (15).[1]

A. American Zionist Committee for Public Affairs, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) In favor of the mutual-security program.

D. (6) $1,689.96.

E. (1) $400; (2) $1,004; (5) $208.96; (6) $43.25; (7) $54.60; (9) $1,710.81; (11) $1,710.81; (15)[1].

A. America's Wage Earners' Protective Conference, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Tariff and customs bills.

D. (6) $2,960.

E. (2) $3,028.96; (9) $3,028.90; (10) $3,256.85; (11) $6,285.75.

A. Richard H. Anthony, 19 West 44th Street, New York, N. Y.

B. The American Tariff League, Inc., 19 West 44th Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) H. R. 8860, H. R. 9150, H. R. 9474, and H. R. 9476.

D. (6) $3,375.

E. (7) $355.95; (9) $355.95; (10) $143.73; (11) $499.68.

A. John R. Arent, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.

B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Measures affecting mining, such as income taxation, social security, public lands, stockpiling, monetary policy, etc.

D. (6) $900.

E. (7) $148.60; (9) $148.60; (10) $60.95; (11) $209.55.

A. Hector M. Aring, 826 Woodward Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Johns-Manville Corp., 22 East 40th Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Revenue bill of 1954, social security, housing and reciprocal trade.

D. (6) $1,250.

E. (8) $398.55; (9) $398.55; (10) $624.54; (11) $1,023.09.

A. Arkansas Railroad Committee, 1115 Boyle Building, Little Rock, Ark.

B. Class 1 railroads operating in the State of Arkansas.

C. (2) Generally legislation affecting Arkansas railroads.

D. (6) $3,000.

E. (7) $2,848.47; (9) $2,848.47; (10) $3,363.16; (11) $6,211.63.

A. W. C. Arnold, 200 Colman Building, Seattle, Wash.

B. Alaska Salmon Industry, Inc., 200 Colman Building, Seattle, Wash.

A. Arthritis and Rheumatism Foundation, 23 West 45th Street, New York, N. Y.

C. Appropriations for public health.

E. (1) $900; (7) $234.77; (9) $1,134.77; (10) $1,163.22; (11) $2,297.99.

A. Associated General Contractors of America, Inc., Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2).[1]

A. Associated Third-Class Mail Users, 1406 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) All legislation relating to postal laws and regulations.

D. (6) $1,665.

E. (2) $3,545; (4) $590.64; (5) $280.05; (6) $79.66; (7) $1,138.13; (8) $75; (9) $5,708.48; (10) $7,773.64; (11) $13,482.12; (15).[1]

A. Association of American Physicians & Surgeons, Inc., 360 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) The association concerns itself with only proposed legislation affecting physicians and surgeons in the practice of their profession.

D. (6) $1,500.

E. (4) $1,500; (9) $1,500; (11) $1,500.

A. Association of American Railroads, 929 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Support legislation members believe to be in their interest and in the interest of a sound national transportation policy; oppose legislation which they believe contrary to such interest.[1]

D. (6) $67,632.21.

E. (2) $35,046.90; (3) $22,600; (4) $670.21; (5) $3,977.33; (6) $494.59; (7) $966.66; (8) $3,876.52; (9) $67,632.21; (10) $56,832.14; (11) $124,464.35; (15).[1]

A. Association of American Ship Owners, 90 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Association of Casualty & Surety Companies, 60 John Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Legislation affecting casualty and surety companies. (3) Casualty and Surety Journal.

D. (6) $1,932.48.

E. (2) $1,456.26; (4) $88.94; (5) $132.70; (6) $28.85; (7) $86.77; (8) $194.96; (9) $1,982.48; (10) $2,127.77; (11) $4,110.25.

A. Association of Western Railways, 474 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) All Federal legislative proposals which do or may affect the western railroads.

D. (2) $506.67.

E. (2) $240.31; (7) $266.36; (9) $506.67; (11) $506.67.

A. Edward Atkins, 51 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.

B. National Association of Shoe Chain Stores, Inc., 51 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Legislation regarding labor laws and revenue act.

A. Awalt, Clark & Sparks, 822 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C.

B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) All legislation that might affect member companies as going electric utilities.[1]

D. (6) $1,250.

E. (6) $0.11; (7) $0.82; (9) $0.93; (10) $7.93; (11) $8.86.

A. Charles E. Babcock, Route 4, Box 73, Vienna, Va.

B. Junior Order United American Mechanics, 3027 North Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

C. (2) Control of immigration; improvement of free public schools; and suppression of communism.

D. (6) $179.67.

E. (5) $4; (7) $12.41; (8) $1.25; (9) $17.66; (10) $78.25; (11) $95.91.

A. Gibbs L. Baker, 917 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Mastercraft Linen Fabrics Corp., 1071 Sixth Avenue, New York, N. Y.; Frederick J. Fawcett, Inc., 129 South Street, Boston, Mass.; and Hughes Fawcett, Inc., 115 Franklin Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Introduction and enactment of tariff legislation.

E. (6) $20.42; (7) $69.81; (8) $12.15; (9) $102.38; (10) $117.75; (11) $220.13.

A. John A. Baker, 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Farmers Educational and Cooperative Union of America (National Farmers Union), 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

D. (6) $2,400.

E. (7) $542.58; (9) $542.58; (10) $364.11; (11) $906.69.

A. J. H. Ballew, Nashville, Tenn.

B. Southern States Industrial Council, Stahlman Building, Nashville, Tenn.

C. (2) Support of legislation favorable to free enterprise system and opposition to legislation unfavorable to that system.

D. (6) $2,250.

A. Hartman Barber, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.

B. Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express, and Station Employees, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.

C. (2) Interested in all legislation affecting labor, especially railroad labor.

D. (6) $1,904.19.

E. (6) $111.64; (7) $59.33; (8) $398.25; (9) $569.22; (10) $539.49; (11) $1,108.71.

A. Joel Barlow, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Hudson Bay Mining & Smelting Co., Ltd., 500 Royal Bank Building, Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada, et al.[1]

C. (2) Current revenue revision.

E. (4) $0.60; (6) $7.37; (9) $7.97; (10) $44.34; (11) $52.31.

A. Joel Barlow, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.

B. National Machine Tool Builders' Association, 10525 Carnegie Avenue, Cleveland, Ohio.

C. (2) Any legislation affecting machine tool industry.

A. Arthur R. Barnett, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

D. (6) $742.50.

E. (6) $2.90; (7) $59.43; (8) $6.16; (9) $68.49; (10) $91.34; (11) $159.83.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Irvin L. Barney, Room 412, Railway Labor Building, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.

B. Brotherhood Railway Carmen of America, 4929 Main Street, Kansas City, Mo.

C. (2) H. R. 356, S. 1911, H. R. 7840, S. 2930, and all other legislation of interest to railroad employees and labor in general.

D. (6) $2,424.99.

A. A. K. Barta, 810 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. The Proprietary Association, 810 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Measures affecting the proprietary medicine industry.

E. (7) $125; (9) $125; (10) $125; (11) $250.

A. Ralph E. Becker, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. The National Association of the Legitimate Theatre, Inc., and the League of New York Theatres, Inc.

C. (2) Any legislation affecting the excise tax on admissions to the legitimate theater.

D. (6) $1,250.

E. (5) $317.38; (6) $489.23; (7) $186.39; (9) $993; (10) $4,472.63; (11) $5,465.63.

A. Mrs. Rachel S. Bell, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Legislative Committee of the Committee for a National Trade Policy, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Legislation relating to foreign economic policy.

D. (6) $1,800.

E. (7) $38.08; (9) $38.08; (11) $38.08.

A. Julia D. Bennett, Hotel Congressional, Washington, D. C.

B. American Library Association, 50 East Huron Street, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) Interested in legislation affecting libraries and librarians.

E. (2) $1,511.20; (3) $5; (4) $97.95; (5) $0.65; (7) $23.38; (8) $2; (9) $1,640.23; (10) $1,664.14; (11) $3,304.32.

A. Ernest H. Benson, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.

B. Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees, 12050 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, Mich.

C. (2) All legislation affecting railway employees and labor in general.

D. (6) $4,500.

A. Preston B. Bergin, Room 1121, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Jewelry Industry Tax Committee, Inc., Room 1121, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Repeal of the excise tax on jewelry and jewelry store merchandise.

D. (6) $4,250.

E. (2) $534.68; (5) $634.71; (6) $361.52; (7) $873.80; (9) $2,404.71; (10) $3,217.57; (11) $5,622.28.

A. Sam B. Berrong, 1214 Griswold Street, Detroit, Mich.

B. Amalgamated Association of Street, Electric Railway, and Motor Coach Employees of America, 1214 Griswold Street, Detroit, Mich.

C. (2) Laws, proposed laws, and proposed amendments to laws affecting the interests of the members of the Amalgamated throughout the United States.

E. (10) $321.40; (11) $321.40.

A. J. Raymond Berry, 85 John Street, New York, N. Y.

B. National Board of Fire Underwriters, 85 John Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Legislation affecting stock fire-insurance companies.

D. (6) $700.

E. (5) $882; (7) $132.45; (9) $1,014.45; (10) $153,85; (11) $1,168.30.

A. Joe Betts, 261 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2).[1]

D. (6) $1,365.

E. (7) $132.86; (9) $132.86; (10) $86.39; (11) $219.25.

A. Andrew J. Biemiller, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Federation of Labor, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) All bills affecting the welfare of the country generally, and specifically bills affecting workers.

D. $2,720.

E. (6) $25.75; (7) $266.25; (8) $97; (9) $389; (10) $368; (11) $757.

A. Walter J. Bierwagen, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Amalgamated Association of Street, Electric Railway, and Motor Coach Employees of America, 1214 Griswold Street, Detroit, Mich.

C. (2) Laws, proposed laws, and proposed amendments to laws affecting the interests of the members of the Amalgamated throughout the United States.

A. Bigham, Englar, Jones & Houston, 99 John Street, New York, N. Y., and 932 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.

B. The American Institute of Marine Underwriters, the Association of Marine Underwriters of the United States, American Cargo War Risk Reinsurance Exchange, American Marine Hull Insurance Syndicate.

C. (2) General questions affecting the insurance of ships and their cargoes against marine risks, reparations, subrogation.

E. (5) $58; (6) $5; (7) $30; (9) $93; (10) $93; (11) $186.

A. Henry Bison, Jr., 917 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Association of Retail Grocers, 360 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) Legislation affecting the business enterprises of independent retail grocers.

D. (6) $1,151.67.

E. (5) $90; (6) $20.51; (7) $41.16; (9) $151.67; (10) $133.60; (11) $285.27.

A. John H. Bivins, 50 West 50th Street, New York, N. Y.

B. American Petroleum Institute, 50 West 50th Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Legislation affecting the petroleum industry.

A. James C. Black, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Republic Steel Corp., Republic Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

C. (2) Legislation affecting employer.

D. (6) $600.

E. (7) $500; (9) $500; (10) $500; (11) $1,000.

A. William Rhea Blake, 162 Madison Avenue, Memphis, Tenn.

B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 18, Memphis, Tenn.

C. (2) Legislation affecting the raw-cotton industry as will promote the purposes for which the council is organized.

E. (10) $130.36; (11) $130.36.

A. Blue Cross Commission, 425 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) General interest in legislation for payroll deductions, war damage, economic controls, taxation of fringe benefits, and hospital and health matters.

E. (2) $3,150; (8) $762.62.

A. John N. Bohannon, 75 Macon Avenue, Asheville, N. C., and 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Consolidated Natural Gas Corp., 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N. Y.

D. (6) $4,500.

E. (5) $688.67; (6) $185.81; (7) $879.05; (9) $1,753.53; (10) $1,840.77; (11) $3,594.30.

A. Paul H. Bolton, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Association of Wholesalers, Inc., 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Sanford H. Bolz, 927 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Jewish Congress, 15 East 84th Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) To oppose antisemitism and racism in all its forms and to defend civil rights incident thereto.

D. (6) $187.50.

E. (7) $2; (9) $2; (11) $2.

A. Sanford H. Bolz, 927 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Cigarette Lighter Manufacturers Association, Inc., 303 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Revision of method of collection of manufacturers' excise tax on cigarette lighters.

E. (10) $3.30; (11) $3.30.

A. Joseph L. Borda, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Association of Manufacturers.

A. Robert T. Borth, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. General Electric Co., 570 Lexington Ave., New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Labor relations, wage and hour matters, controls over wages and salaries, and social security. (3) [1].

D. (6) $375.

E. (4) $44; (5) $130; (6) $5; (7) $75; (9) $254; (10) $331.50; (11) $585.50.

A. R. B. Bowden, 100 Merchants' Exchange Building, St. Louis, Mo. and 600 Hibbs Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Grain & Feed Dealers National Association, 100 Merchants' Exchange Building, St. Louis, Mo.

C. (2) General legislation affecting the grain and feed trade.

E. (6) $2; (7) $11.

A. Charles M. Boyer and Justice M. Chambers, 2517 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Reserve Officers Association of the United States, 2517 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Legislation for development of a military policy for the United States which will guarantee adequate national security. (3).[1]

A. Joseph E. Brady, 2347 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.

B. International Union of United Brewery, Flour, Cereal, Soft Drink, and Distillery Workers of America, 2347 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.

C. (2) All legislation involving or in the direction of national prohibition, taxation of alcoholic beverages, etc.

E. (6) $19.70; (7) $264.53; (9) $284.23; (10) $150.70; (11) $434.93.

A. Harold P. Braman, 907 Ring Building, 18th and M Streets NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Nation Savings and Loan League, 907 Ring Building, 18th and M Streets NW., Washington, D. C.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

C. (2) Support of bills to improve facilities of savings and loan associations for encouragement of thrift and home financing. Oppose legislation adverse to savings and loan associations.

D. (6) $1,000.

A. Harry R. Brashear, 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Aircraft Industries Association of America, Inc., 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Any legislation affecting transportation matters in which members of the association are interested.

A. Breed, Abbott & Morgan, 1317 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) S. 1850—a bill for the relief of Dr. John D. MacLennan.

A. James M. Brewbaker, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Association of Manufacturers.

A. David F. Brinegar.

B. Central Arizona Project Association, 510 Goodrich Building, Phoenix, Ariz.

C. (2) Water and soil legislation affecting Arizona.

D. (6) $2,250.

E. (5) $44.80; (7) $191.21; (9) $236.01; (10) $65.22; (11) $301.23.

A. W. S. Bromley, 220 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.

B. American Pulpwood Association, 220 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Legislative interests are those of employer.

A. William F. Brooks, 604 Hibbs Building, Washington, D. C.

B. National Grain Trade Council, 604 Hibbs Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Bills to increase foreign trade in surplus agricultural commodities and proposals relative to basic farm legislation.

A. C. R. Brown, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.

B. Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees, 12050 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, Mich.

C. (2) All bills affecting railway labor and labor in general.

D. (6) $3,186.49.

A. Brown, Lund & Fitzgerald, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American & Foreign Power Co., Inc., 2 Rector Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Revenue Act of 1954.

E. (6) $85.39; (7) $43.50; (8) $30; (9) $158.89; (11) $158.89; (15).[1]

A. Brown, Lund & Fitzgerald, Washington Loan & Trust Building, Washington, D. C.

B. National Association of Electric Companies, Ring Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Any legislation that might affect the members of the NAEC.

D. (6) $5,949.99.

E. (2) $5,477.49; (5) $262.50; (6) $13.39; (8) $30; (9) $5,783.38; (10) $5,771.84; (11) $11,555.22; (15).[1]

A. Paul W. Brown, 925 South Homan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

B. Sears, Roebuck & Co., 925 South Homan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) Postal legislation.

D. (6) $178.23.

E. (6) $1.75; (7) $168.85; (9) $170.60; (10) $375.80; (11) $546.40.

A. Russell B. Brown, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Independent Petroleum Association of America, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Legislation that might affect the petroleum industry and taking such action with respect to such legislation as directed by the association.

E. (8) $25.15; (9) $25.15; (10) $13.85; (11) $39.

A. Thad H. Brown, Jr., 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Legislation, local, State or Federal, which relates to the television broadcasting industry.

A. John M. Brumm, 2212 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Committee for the Nation's Health, 2212 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Interested in all legislation regarding national health insurance.

D. (6) $2,374.98.

E. (8) $19.70; (9) $19.70; (10) $21.85; (11) $41.55.

A. Henry H. Brylawski, 1030 Woodward Building, Washington, D. C.

B. District of Columbia Business Practice Council, 1030 Woodward Building, Washington D. C.

C. (2) All legislation affecting businessmen in the District of Columbia.

D. (6) $225.

E. (6) $16; (10) $20; (11) $36.

A. Henry H. Buckman, 4805 Dorset Avenue Chevy Chase, Md.

B. Florida Inland Navigation District, Citizens Bank Building, Bunnell, Fla.

C. (2) Legislation affecting river and harbor works, flood control, and other water use and conservation, and related subjects.

D. (6) $1,350.

E. (6) $4.23; (8) $15.38; (9) $19.61; (10) $29.11; (11) $48.72.

A. Henry H. Buckman, 4805 Dorset Avenue Chevy Chase, Md.

B. The Vulcan Detinning Co., Sewaren, N. J.

A. George J. Burger, 740 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Burger Tire Consultant Service, 250 West 57th Street, New York, N. Y., and National Federation of Independent Business, 740 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Interested in rubber tires bill, basing point legislation, antitrust law legislation, quantity limit discount case, spare tire monopoly, Senate Resolution 213—all legislation affecting independent small business.

A. Donald T. Burke, 1200 18th Street NW., Suite 510, Ring Building, Washington, D. C.

B. National Association of Electric Cos., 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

D. (6) $391.66.

E. (7) $63; (8) $9.52; (9) $72.52; (10) $83.75; (11) $156.27.

A. Thomas H. Burke, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.

B. United Automobile, Aircraft and Agricultural Implement Workers of America, 8000 East Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich.

C. (2) Support all legislation favorable to the national peace, security, democracy, prosperity and general welfare; oppose legislation detrimental to these objectives.

D. (6) $1,495.

E. (7) $962; (9) $962; (10) $962; (11) $1,924.

A. Burley & Dark Leaf Tobacco Export Association, post-office box 860, Lexington, Ky.

D. (6) $9,855.25.

E. (2) $3,668.32; (5) $393.50; (6) $218; (7) $460.66; (8) $820.55; (9) $5,561.03; (10) $5,062.05; (11) $10,623.08.

A. F. Hugh Burns, 821 Cafritz Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Association, 821 Cafritz Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Any legislation affecting improvements in Great Lakes-St. Lawrence system.

D. (6) $750.

E. (8) $50; (9) $50; (10) $336.80; (11) $386.80.

A. Robert M. Burr, 155 East 44th Street, New York, N. Y.

B. National Electrical Manufacturers Association, 155 East 44th Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Legislation regarding excise taxes on electric refrigerators, electric ranges, electric water heaters, domestic electric appliances, commercial electric cooking equipment, electric fans, and legislation affecting imports of products into the United States.

D. (6) $204.75.

A. Orrin A. Burrows, 1200 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, 1200 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. All legislation dealing with the electrical workers in particular and labor in general, such as annual and sick leave; Federal retirement liberalization; unemployment insurance and severance pay; and other liberal benefits for the workers.

D. (6) $2,874.99.

A. Eugene J. Butler, 1312 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Catholic Welfare Conference, 1312 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) All legislation affecting religious, charitable, and educational institutions and organizations.

D. (6) $2,874.99.

E. (8) $49.75; (9) $49.75; (10) $33.70; (11) $83.45.

A. Lawrence V. Byrnes, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.

B. Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, B. of L. E. Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

C. (2) Legislation affecting labor and transportation.

D. (6) $3,313.50.

A. C. G. Caffrey, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Cotton Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 203-A, Liberty Life Building, Charlotte, N. C.

C. (2) Legislation to promote the advancement and best interest of the cotton textile industry.

D. (6) $760.20.

E. (6) $3; (7) $10; (8) $10; (9) $23; (10) $23; (11) $46.

A. James A. Campbell, room 716, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Federation of Government Employees, room 716, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) All bills of interest to Federal Government employees and District of Columbia government employees.

D. (6) $2,307.66.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

E. (7) $230.76; (9) $230.76; (10) $269.22; (11) $499.98.

A. Canal Zone Central Labor Union & Metal Trades Council, Box 471, Balboa Heights, Canal Zone.

C. (2) Legislation affecting welfare of United States citizens in Canal Zone.

D. (6) $4,696.50.

E. (2) $1,800; (7) $1,800; (9) $3,600; (10) $3,600; (11) $7,200.

A. Julian W. Caplan, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Retail Furniture Association, 666 Lake Shore Drive, Chicago 11, Ill.

C. (2) Legislation that affects retail trades.

A. John L. Carey, 270 Madison Avenue, New York 16, N. Y.

B. American Institute of Accountants, 270 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Legislation affecting certified public accountants.

D. (6) $87.50.

E. (6) $10; (9) $10; (10) $10; (11) $20.

A. James K. Carr, 2101 K Street, Sacramento, Calif.

B. Sacramento Municipal Utility District, 2101 K Street, Sacramento, Calif.

C. (2) Matters pertaining to Central Valley project (Calif.) which affect the interest of the Sacramento Municipal Utility District.

D. (6) $735.28.

E. (7) $33.75; (8) $366.28; (9) $400.03; (10) $266; (11) $666.03.

A. T. C. Carroll, 12050 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, Mich.

C. (2) Legislation of interest to railroad employees.

A. Henderson H. Carson, 600 First National Bank Building, Canton, Ohio.

B. East Ohio Gas Co., 1405 East Sixth Street, Cleveland, Ohio.

C. (2) All legislation of interest to the natural gas industry.

D. (6) $631.50.

E. (1) $163.40; (2) $20; (4) $44; (5) $2.50; (6) $32.40; (7) $96.50; (8) $26.70; (9) $385.50; (10) $631.50; (11) $1,017.

A. Albert E. Carter, 1026 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Pacific Gas & Electric Co., 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

C. (2) Retained to represent the company before administrative agencies and commissions and on legislative matters affecting company's interest.

D. (6) $3,000.

E. (5) $723; (6) $21.70; (7) $12.40; (8) $426.80; (9) $1,183; (10) $1,031.76; (11) $2,215.66.

A. Clarence B. Carter, Post Office Box 798, New Haven, Conn.

B. Railroad Pension Conference, Post Office Box 798, New Haven, Conn.

C. (2) For H. R. 122—to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937.

A. Ralph H. Case, 889 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Sioux Tribe of Indians, Cheyenne River Reservation, South Dakota.

C. (2) S. 695 and H. R. 2233, Oahe Dam project.

D. (6) $2,000

A. Benjamin F. Castle, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Milk Industry Foundation, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Larry Cates, 861 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Clarence N. Sayen, president, Air Line Pilots Association, 55th Street and Cicero Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) Aviation legislation and Railway Labor Act.

D. (6) $2,372.

A. Central Arizona Project Association, 510 Goodrich Building, Phoenix, Ariz.

C. (2) Water and soil legislation affecting Arizona.

D. (6) $10,471.

E. (1) $50; (2) $5,076; (4) $737.22; (5) $1,112.40; (6) $116.76; (7) $823.81; (8) $58.54; (9) $7,974.73; (10) $8,065.83; (11) $16,040.56.

A. Central Electric & Gas Co., 114 South 12th Street, Lincoln, Nebr.

C. (2) Proposing an amendment to the Securities Act of 1933 to increase the exemption for small issues of securities.

E. (9) $1,550; (11) $1,550.

A. Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Justice M. Chambers, 2517 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. M. Golodetz & Co., 120 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.

C. Congressional activity in the development of the strategic stockpiling program of the United States.

D. (6) $625.

A. Walter Chamblin, Jr., 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Association of Manufacturers, 918 16th Street NW, Washington, D. C.

A. Christian Amendment Movement, 804 Penn Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa.

C. (2) Promoting Senate Joint Resolution 87 and House Joint Resolution 289, a proposed Christian Amendment to the Constitution of the United States. (3) The Christian Patriot.

D. (6) $2,797.14.

E. (1) $1,196; (2) $5,600.70; (4) $2,426.84; (5) $205.35; (6) $20; (7) $460.62; (9) $9,909.51; (10) $6,585.43; (11) $16,494.94; (15).[1]

A. Abiah A. Church, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Any legislation which affects the broadcasting industry.

A. Omer W. Clark, 1701 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Disabled American Veterans, 1423 East McMillan Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.

C. (2) Legislation affecting war veterans, their dependents, and survivors of deceased veterans. (3) DAV semimonthly.

D. (6) $2,769.24.

A. Robert M. Clark, 525 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.

B. The Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe Railway Co., 80 East Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) Pending and prospective legislation affecting the interest of the railway company.

D. (6) $5,025.

A. Clear Channel Broadcasting Service, 532 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Opposed to any proposed legislation calling for the duplication of class I–A clear channel frequencies or the limitation of the power of class I–A standard broadcast stations.

E. (7) $18.90; (9) $18.90; (10) $123.41; (11) $142.31.

A. Coal Producers' Committee on Underground Gas Storage Safety, care of W. G. Stevenson, Grant Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.

C. (2) Legislation pertaining to underground storage of gas.

A. Russell Coleman, 616 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.

B. The National Fertilizer Association, 616 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Any legislation that might affect the manufacture or distribution of fertilizer or the general agricultural economy.

D. (6) $125.

A. Howard O. Colgan, Jr., 15 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.

B. New York Stock Exchange, 11 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Proposed Federal tax legislation affecting the interests of the New York Stock Exchange and its members.

D. (6) $350.

E. (7) $6.75; (9) $6.75; (11) $6.75.

A. Colorado Railroad Legislative Committee, 615 C. A. Johnson Building, Denver, Colo.

C. (2) All legislation, both general and special, that affects Colorado railroads.

E. (11) $826.20.

A. Colorado River Association, 306 West Third Street, Los Angeles, Calif.

C. (2) Opposes any legislation jeopardizing California's water rights on the Colorado River.

E. (2) $2,250; (4) $183.93; (5) $601.62; (6) $380.79; (7) $2,083.80; (9) $5,500.14; (10) $4,842.56; (11) $10,342.70; (15).[1]

A. Committee for Defense of the Constitution by Preserving the Treaty Power, 36 West 44th Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Opposing any amendment to the Constitution of the United States which would change the traditional treatymaking power or hamper the President in his constitutional authority to conduct foreign affairs.

D. (6) $95.

E. (2) $43.17; (4) $1,281.07; (5) $16.64; (6) $42.40; (8) '$80.26 (9) $1,463.54; (10) $24,902.09; (11) $26,365.63; (15).[1]

A. Committee on Foreign Trade Education, Inc., 270 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Legislation affecting import and export trade of United States.

D. (6) $415.

E. (4) $130; (5) $116.63; (6) $28.88; (7) $9.27; (8) $6.39; (9) $291.17; (11) $291.17.

A. Committee on Laws, National Board of Fire Underwriters, 85 John Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Legislation affecting stock fire insurance companies.

D. (6) $1,268.

E. (2) $1,150; (4) $250; (5) $1,440; (7) $539; (9) $3,388; (10) $6,145; (11) $9,533.

A. Committee for the Nation's Health, 2212 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Interested in all legislation regarding national health insurance.

D. (6) $12,880.08.

E. (2) $6,754.86; (4) $520.81; (5) $1,425.46; (6) $174.95; (7) $239.99; (8) $75.50; (9) $9,211.57; (10) $11,408.41; (11) $20,614.98; (15).[1]

A. Committee for Pipe Line Companies, 643 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Functions to protect the legitimate interests of petroleum pipelines.

D. (6) $1,017.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

E. (2) $12,315.81; (5) $1,667.58; (6) $150.80; (7) $628.58; (8) $3,061.92; (9) $17,824.69; (10) $9,104.04; (11) $26,928.73; (15).[1]

A. Committee for the Return of Confiscated German and Japanese Property, 1013 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Amendment of the Trading With the Enemy Act to authorize the return of German and Japanese property confiscated by the Government of the United States.

D. (6) $1,743.

E. (2) $142.73; (4) $200; (5) $125; (9) $465,73; (11) $465.73.

A. Arthur D. Condon, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Amana Refrigeration, Inc., Amana, Iowa.

A. Arthur D. Condon, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Independent Advisory Committee to the Trucking Industry, Inc.

A. Arthur D. Gondon, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Salt Producers Association, 726 LaSalle, Wacker Building, Chicago, Ill.

A. Lawrence R. Condon, 165 Broadway, New York, N. Y.

B. Estate of Mary Clark DeBrabant and Katherine C. Williams, 120 Broadway, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Legislative interests relate to a possible revision of section 7 of the Technical Changes Act of 1949 (63 Stat. 895).

E. (10) $2,500.

A. John C. Cone, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Pan American World Airways System, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Supporting or opposing any aviation legislation that might have a bearing on the operation of Pan American World Airways System.

A. Conference for Inland Waterways Dry-Bulk Regulation, 402 Commonwealth Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) The legislative interest is to bring about an amendment of section 303 (b) of the Interstate Commerce Act. (3).[1]

E. (4) $2,909.48; (6) $109.05; (7) $217.45; (8) $528.62; (9) $3,764.60; (10) $10,417.76; (11) $14,182.36; (15).[1]

A. Conference on State Defense, 111 8th Avenue, New York City, N. Y.

C. (2) Opposition to Federal taxation of State and local government bond interest.

D. (6) $1,000.

E. (5) $69.53; (6) $172.69; (9) $243.22; (10) $1,606.25; (11) $1,848.47.

A. Richard J. Congleton, 763 Broad Street, Newark, N. J.

B. Prudential Insurance Company of America, 763 Broad Street, Newark, N. J.

C. (2) General interest in all legislation affecting the business of the company.

E. (7) $2,976.69; (9) $2,976.69; (10) $888.06; (11) $3,864.75.

A. Congress of Industrial Organizations, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Support all legislation favorable to the national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and general welfare; oppose legislation detrimental to those objectives. (3) Report on Congress.

D. (6) $34,935.45.

E. (2) $14,464.90; (3) $485.92; (4) $10,424.28; (5) $1,575.91; (6) $1,034.59; (7) $5,583.12; (8) $1,366.73; (9) $34,935.45; (10) $18,458.36; (11) $53,393.18; (15).[1]

A. Julian D. Conover, Ring Building, Washington, D. C.

B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Measures affecting mining, such as income taxation, social security, public lands, stockpiling, monetary policy, etc.

D. (6) $2,500.

E. (6) $37.03; (7) $74.02; (9) $111.05; (10) $81.35; (11) $192.40.

A. Cooke and Beneman, 1632 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. The J. R. Watkins Co., Winona, Minn.

C. (2) Proposed Revenue Code of 1954 (H. R. 8300), seeking clarification of language regarding specially denatured alcohol.

A. J. Milton Cooper, 505 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.

B. National Association of Amusement Parks, Pools, and Beaches, 203 North Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) H. R. 8224.

A. J. Milton Cooper, 505 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.

B. National Coal Association, Southern Building, 15th and H Streets NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Legislative interests are general in character and those affecting the coal industry.

A. J. Milton Cooper, 505 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Nation-Wide Trailer Rental System, 512 South Market Street, Wichita, Kans.

(C) Excise tax on utility trailers.

A. J. Milton Cooper, 505 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.

B. New York Stock Exchange, 11 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Federal tax legislation affecting the interests of the New York Stock Exchange and its members.

A. J. Milton Cooper, 505 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Sullivan, Bernard, Shea and Kenney, Ring Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) H. R. 8300.

A. Wilmer A. Cooper, 104 C Street NE., Washington, D. C.

B. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 104 C Street NE., Washington, D. C.

C. (2).[1] (3) Washington Newsletter.

D. (6) $1,312.50.

E. (6) $3.38; (7) $116.34; (8) $3.25; (9) $122.97; (10) $96.72; (11) $217.69.

A. J. G. Corona, suite 101, 1405 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Western Union Telegraph Co., 60 Hudson Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) General legislative interests cover any legislative proposals affecting the interests of the telegraph company.

E. (7) $45; (9) $45; (10) $38.50; (11) $83.50.

A. Cotton, Brenner & Wrigley, 225 Broadway, New York, N. Y.

B. Martin Aloysius Madden, 27 West 96th Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) S. 3216, for the relief of Martin Aloysius Madden.

E. (4) $431.84; (6) $103.74; (7) $840.84; (9) $1,376.42; (11) $1,376.42; (15).[1]

A. Cox, Langford, Stoddard & Cutler, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Henry Field, 3551 Main Highway, Coconut Grove, Fla.

C. (2) Private Law 164, 83d Congress (H. R. 786), to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of Yusuf (Uash) Lazar.

D. (6) $779.06.

A. A. M. F. Crass, Jr., 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Manufacturing Chemists' Association, Inc., 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Any legislation affecting the chemical industry.

D. (6) $250.

A. Robert A. Crichton, 1701 K Street, Washington, D. C.

B. American Life Convention, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) All existing and prospective legislation which may affect the life-insurance business.

D. (6) $725.

E. (7) $25; (9) $25; (10) $350.75; (11) $375.75.

A. Edwin L. Crosby, M. D., 18 East Division Street, Chicago, Ill.

B. American Hospital Association, 18 East Division Street, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $625.

E. (7) $52.65; (9) $52.65; (11) $52.65.

A. Edward B. Crosland, 195 Broadway, New York, N. Y., and 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Telephone & Telegraph Co., 195 Broadway, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Matters affecting communications.

D. (6) $6,000.

A. Leo J. Crowley, 540 Equitable Building, Denver, Colo.

B. Colorado Railroad Legislative Committee, 615 C. A. Johnson Building, Denver, Colo.

C. (2) All legislation both general and special that affects the railroads.

E. (10) $826.20.

A. John C. Cuneo, Box 1054, Modesto, Calif.

B. The Townsend Plan, Inc., 6875 Broadway Avenue, Cleveland, Ohio.

C. (2) The Townsend bills in Congress.

D. (6) $2,210.58.

E. (1) $407.30; (5) $547.67; (6) $115.14; (7) $148.98; (8) $163.42; (9) $1,382.51; (10) $1,833.41; (11) $3,215.92.

A. Ralph E. Curtiss, 944 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.

B. National Licensed Beverage Association, 420 Seventh Street, Racine, Wis.

C. (2) Any legislation affecting tavern and restaurant industry.

D. (6) $2,250.

E. (4) $40.45; (6) $0.56; (7) $121.81; (8) $0.90; (9) $163.72; (10) $58.28; (11) $222.

A. Bernard Cushman, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. O. David Zimring, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

A. N. R. Danielian, 821 Cafritz Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Association, 821 Cafritz Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) S. 2150, Participation by United States with Canada in construction of the St. Lawrence seaway; proponent.

D. (6) $2,083.33.

E. (7) $192; (9) $192; (10) $436.59; (11) $628.59.

A. Paul J. Daugherty, Columbus, Ohio.

B. Ohio Chamber of Commerce, 820 Huntington Bank Building, Columbus, Ohio.

C. (2) Matters affecting business and commerce in Ohio.

D. (6) $720.

E. (7) $320.48; (9) $320.48; (11) $320.48.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Joan David, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Committee on Parcel Post Size and Weight Limitations, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) To obtain repeal of Public Law 199, 1st session, 82d Congress.

E. (2) $1,501; (3) $6.72; (5) $3.30; (6) $1.40; (8) $55.70.

A. Charles W. Davis, 1 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

B. Chicago Bridge & Iron Co., 1305 West 105th Street, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) H. R. 8300, the proposed Internal Revenue Code of 1954, relating to the tax treatment of income derived from foreign sources.

E. (6) $5.40; (7) $151.56; (9) $156.96; (11) $156.96.

A. Charles W. Davis, 1 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

B. Clearing Industrial District, Inc., 38 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) Provisions of 1954 revenue revision bill relating to taxation of gains and losses upon sale of real property by dealers.

E. (6) $44.81; (7) $244.97; (9) $289.78; (11) $289.78.

A. Charles W. Davis, 1 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

B. John Stuart, 345 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) Provisions of 1954 revenue revision bill relating to corporate distributions and adjustments.

E. (6) $63.42; (7) $21.51; (9) $84.93; (10) $487.56; (11) $572.49.

A. Sherlock Davis, 1117 Barr Building, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. United States Cuban Sugar Council, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Anything which pertains to sugar or trade with Cuba.

A. T. C. Davis, 230 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.

B. Missouri Pacific Railroad Co., 25 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) S. 978 and any other legislation affecting Missouri Pacific Railroad Co.

A. Donald S. Dawson, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Motor Carriers Leasing Conference, 4195 Central Avenue, Detroit, Mich.

C. (2) For passage of H. R. 3203.

D. (6) $625.

A. M. D. DeTar, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C.

B. National Oil Jobbers Council, Suite 708, Ferguson Building, Springfield, Ill.

C. (2) Legislative matters which would restrict importation of crude oil and hinder petroleum production, and establish a national fuels policy.

E. (2) $10; (4) $135.81; (5) $382.82; (6) $2.10; (9) $530.73; (11) $530.73; (15).[1]

A. R. T. DeVany, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Association of Manufacturers, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Cecil B. Dickson, 1600 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Motion Picture Association of America, Inc., 1600 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Legislation affecting the motion-picture industry.

D. (6) $3,900.

E. (7) $1,300; (9) $1,300; (10) $1,300; (11) $2,600.

A. Timothy V. A. Dillon, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Sacramento-Yolo Port District, 312 Court House, Sacramento, Calif.

C. (2) Legislation in support of the Sacramento River Deep Water Channel project.

D. (6) $2,488.55.

E. (8) $88.55; (9) $88.55; (10) $117.70; (11) $206.25.

A. Disabled American Veterans, 1423 East McMillan Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.

C. (2) All legislation affecting war veterans, their dependents and survivors of deceased veterans. (3) The DAV Semi-Monthly.

E. (2) $6,628.81; (7) $103.09; (9) $6,731.90; (10) $3,197.65; (11) $9,929.55.

A. Disabled Officers Association, 1604 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) All legislation affecting disabled veterans and their dependents, and survivors of deceased veterans.

E. (2) $2,750; (9) $2,750; (10) $2,750; (11) $5,500.

A. Walter L. Disbrow, 900 F Street NW., Room 314, Washington, D. C.

B. Retirement Federation of Civil Service Employees of the United States Government, 900 F Street NW., Room 314, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Retention and improvement of the Civil Service Retirement and United States Employees' Compensation Acts.

D. (6) $1,463.93.

E. (7) $111; (9) $111; (11) $111.

A. Wesley E. Disney, 501 World Center Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Thomas J. Green and Edward Simone, 70 Pine Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) In favor of proposed repeal of tax on preferred stock of banks which have made loans or issued preferred stock to Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

A. Wesley E. Disney, World Center Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, World Center Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) General legislative interests include any matters affecting the natural gas industry.

D. (6) $3,333.32.

E. (6) $8.75; (8) $1.60; (9) $10.35; (11) $10.35.

A. Wesley E. Disney, World Center Building, Washington, D. C.

B. National Building Granite Quarries Association, 1028 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Specific legislation is for percentage depletion in H. R. 8300, relating to granite and other minerals.

D. (6) $900.

E. (6) $4; (8) $2.20; (9) $6.20; (11) $6.20.

A. District Lodge No. 44, International Association of Machinists, 1029 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Supporting or opposing, as the case may be, legislation affecting working conditions of Government employees and incidentally organized labor in general.

D. (6) $16,087.17.

E. (2) $5,348.91; (4) $500; (5) $1,385.01; (6) $297.96; (7) $3,069.25; (8) $3,371.76; (9) $13,992.89; (10) $19,888.81; (11) $33,881.70; (15).[1]

A. Division 241, Amalgamated Association of Street, Electric Railway, and Motor Coach Employees of America, 1608 West Van Buren Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) Legislative interests include laws, proposed laws, and proposed amendments to laws affecting the interests of its members and their families.

A. Doherty, Rumble & Butler, W-1006 First National Bank Building, St. Paul, Minn.

B. Iron Ore Lessors Association, Inc., W-1451 First National Bank Building, St. Paul, Minn.

C. (2) Amendment of Internal Revenue Code.

E. (7) $282.12; (9) $282.12; (10) $224.94; (11) $507.06.

A. William C. Doherty, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Association of Letter Carriers, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) All legislation pertaining to postal and Federal employees.

D. (6) $1,500.

A. W. J. Donald, 155 East 44th Street, New York, N. Y.

B. National Electrical Manufacturers Association, 155 East 44th Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Legislation regarding excise taxes on electric refrigerators, electric ranges, electric water heaters, domestic electric appliances, commercial electric cooking equipment, electric fans, and legislation with respect to amendment of the Labor Management Relations Act.

A. James L. Donnelly, 39 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

B. Illinois Manufacturers' Association, 39 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) All legislation of general interest to manufacturers. (3) Industrial Review and miscellaneous bulletins.

E. (7) $541.39; (9) $541.39; (10) $670.87; (11) $1,212.26.

A. Robert F. Donoghue, 842 Wyatt Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Pacific American Tankship Association, 25 California Street, San Francisco, Calif.

C. (2) Legislation affecting the merchant marine, particularly the tanker division thereof.

D. (6) $1,625.

E. (6) $37.57; (7) $1.60; (9) $39.17; (11) $39.17.

A. James J. Donohue, 610 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.

B. National Electrical Contractors Association, Inc., 610 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Legislation that affects the building construction and electrical industries. (3) Weekly News Letter; monthly magazine, Qualified Contractor.

A. Thomas J. Donovan, 155 East 44th Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Legislation affecting excise tax on alcoholic beverages.

A. J. Dewey Dorsett, 60 John Street, New York, N. Y.

B. Association of Casualty and Surety Companies, 60 John Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Legislation affecting casualty and surety companies.

D. (6) $112.50.

A. C. L. Dorson, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C. (Room 314).

B. Retirement Federation of Civil Service Employees of the United States Government, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

C. (2) Retention and improvement of the Civil Service Retirement and United States Employees' Compensation Acts.

D. (6) $1,372.70.

E. (10) $48.50; (11) $48.50.

A. John E. Dougherty, 211 Southern Building, 15th and R Streets NW., Washington, D. C.

B. The Pennsylvania Railroad Co., 1740 Suburban Station Building, Philadelphia, Pa.

C. (2) Any legislation affecting the interests of the Pennsylvania Railroad Co.

A. Mrs. F. P. Douglas, 1026 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. League of Women Voters of United States, 1026 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

D. (6) $649.98.

E. (7) $22; (9) $22; (10) $20.70; (11) $42.70.

A. James W. Douthat, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Association of Manufacturers.

A. Fayette B. Dow, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Committee for Pipe Line Companies, Tulsa, Okla.

C. (2) The committee is opposed to S. 3075 which if enacted would divorce pipelines; and interested in an appropriation for the Interstate Commerce Commission adequate to enable it to perform its regulatory duties.

A. M. J. Dowd, El Centro, Calif.

B. Imperial Irrigation District, El Centro, Calif.

D. (6) $2,190.

E. (7) $637.83; (9) $637.83; (11) $637.83.

A. Adin M. Downer, 610 Wire Building, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Veterans for Foreign Wars of the United States.

C. (2) Legislation affecting all veterans and their dependents. (3) VFW Magazine and VFW Legislative Newsletter.

D. (6) $1,750.

E. (7) $131.70; (9) $1,331.70; (10) $112.20; (11) $243.90.

A. W. A. Dozier, Jr., 17 Molton Street, Montgomery, Ala.

B. Medical Association of the State of Alabama, 537 Dexter Avenue, Montgomery, Ala.

C. (2) All health matters covered by legislative action. (3) P. R. Notes.

D. (6) $1,800.

E. (4) $225; (9) $225; (10) $225; (11) $450.

A. Read Dunn, Jr., 1832 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 18, Memphis, Tenn.

C. (2) Legislation affecting the raw-cotton industry as will promote the purposes for which the council is organized.

D. (6) $435.

E. (7) $60.26; (9) $60.26; (11) $60.26.

A. Henry I. Dworshak, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.

B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Measures affecting mining, such as income taxation, social security, public lands, stockpiling, monetary policy, etc.

D. (6) $900.

E. (7) $120.45; (9) $120.45; (10) $61.40; (11) $181.45.

A. Joseph L. Dwyer, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Petroleum Institute, 50 West 50th Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Legislation affecting the petroleum industry.

D. (6) $3,276.

E. (7) $500.95; (9) $500.95; (10) $583.28; (11) $1,084.23.

A. Eastern Meat Packers Association, Hotel Statler, New York, N. Y., and 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Matters affecting meatpackers.

D. (6) $80.16.

E. (2) $27.16; (3) $1.59; (4) $1.02; (5) 98 cents; (7) $24.88; (8) 50 cents; (9) $56.13; (10) $29.30; (11) $85.43; (15).[1]

A. George S. Eaton, 907 Public Square Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

B. National Tool and Die Manufacturers Association, 907 Public Square Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

C. (2) Bills especially affecting the interests of contract tool and die shops, which are small businesses, including the extension of the Renegotiation Act, general tax revision, amendment of the Taft-Hartley Act.

D. (6) $125.

A. John W. Edelman, 811 Warner Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Textile Workers Union of America, 99 University Place, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Support of all legislation favorable to the national peace, security, democracy, and general welfare; oppose legislation detrimental to these objectives.

D. (6) $1,934.17.

E. (7) $309.17; (9) $309.17; (10) $224.92; (11) $534.09.

A. Herman Edelsberg, 1003 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Antidefamation League of B'nai B'rith, 212 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Supports legislation which promotes the civil rights of all Americans, and opposes undemocratic discrimination against any Americans.

D. (6) $140.

E. (7) $15; (9) $15; (10) $15; (11) $30.

A. Joseph H. Ehlers, 1026 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Society of Civil Engineers, 33 West 39th Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Legislative interests relate to matters affecting the engineering profession.

E. (4) $25; (5) $50; (9) $75; (10) $65; (11) $140.

A. Bernard H. Ehrlich, 1367 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Association and Council of Business Schools, 418 Homer Building, 13th Street at F NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Legislative interest on all bills relating to the education and training of veterans and all other legislation affecting proprietary schools.

D. (6) $1,050.

E. (4) $15; (6) $35.26; (8) $87.28; (9) $137.54; (10) $103.51; (11) $241.05.

A. Oscar Elder, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Association of Radio & Television Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Registrant is interested in any legislation—local, State, Federal, or international—which affects the broadcasting industry.

A. John Doyle Elliott, 305 Pennsylvania Avenue SE., Washington, D. C.

B. The Townsend Plan, Inc., 6875 Broadway Avenue, Cleveland, Ohio.

C. (2) Enactment into law of H. R. 2446, generally known as the Townsend plan.

D. (6) $910.

A. Otis H. Ellis, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C.

B. National Oil Jobbers Council, 708 Ferguson Building, Springfield, Ill.

C. (2) Affiant is interested in general legislation which might affect the business interests of independent oil jobbers and marketers.

D. (6) $4,500.

A. Newell W. Ellison, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Empire Zinc Division, the New Jersey Zinc Co., Gilman, Colo.

C. (2) Bills to amend the mineral-leasing laws to provide for multiple-mineral development of the same tracts of the public lands, and for other purposes.

E. (6) $25; (8) $5; (9) $30; (11) $30.

A. Newell W. Ellison, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Theodore Roosevelt Association, 28 East 20th Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) General interest is to protect the rights of the Theodore Roosevelt Association under the act of May 21, 1932 (47 Stat. 163).

E. (6) $9.41; (8) $8.46; (9) $17.87; (10) $92.72; (11) $110.59.

A. John H. Else, 302 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.

B. National Retail Lumber Dealers Association, 302 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Housing and labor legislation and all measures affecting retail lumber dealers.

D. (6) $3,050.

E. (7) $286.50; (9) $286.50; (10) $360; (11) $646.50.

A. Northcutt Ely, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.

B. American Public Power Association, 1757 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Legislation affecting public power projects generally.

E. (10) $138.14; (11) $138.14.

A. Northcutt Ely, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Department of Water and Power of the city of Los Angeles, 207 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif.

C. (2) Legislation affecting the city's rights in the Colorado River and related matters, and legislation affecting public power projects.

D. (6) $1,000.

A. Northcutt Ely, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.

B. East Bay Municipal Utility District, 512 16th Street, Oakland, Calif.

C. (2) Interior Department appropriations bill, 1955, and legislation affecting social-security coverage for municipal employees.

D. (6) $2,100.

A. Northcutt Ely, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Imperial Irrigation District, El Centro, Calif.

C. (2) Legislation affecting the district's rights in the Colorado River and related matters.

D. (6) $2,100.

E. (6) $55.05; (8) $12.40; (9) $67.45; (11) $67.45.

A. Northcutt Ely, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Six Agency Committee and Colorado River Board of California, 315 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif.

C. (2) Legislation affecting California's interest in the Colorado River and legislation relating to reclamation and water resources policies.

D. (6) $10,658.26.

E. (4) $15.75; (6) $56.43; (8) $61.08; (9) $133.26; (10) $96.67; (11) $229.93.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Northcutt Ely, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Water Project Authority of the State of California, Sacramento, Calif.

C. (2) Interior Department Appropriations bill, 1954, and legislation affecting the Central Valley Project and Federal reclamation and power policies generally.

A. Northcutt Ely, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Water Resources Board of the State of California, Sacramento, Calif.

C. (2) Army civil functions appropriations bill, 1955, and legislation affecting flood-control projects generally.

A. Emergency Committee on Natural Resources, 709 Wire Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Conservation of natural resources. (3)[1].

D. (6) $345.50.

E. (5) $258.09; (9) $258.09; (11) $258.09.

A. K. Blyth Emmons, 925 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Small Businessmen's Association, Inc., 2834 Central Street, Evanston, Ill.

C. (2) All legislation pertaining to small business, either directly or indirectly. (3) Pulling Together.

D. (6) $2,475.

E. (7) $300.45; (9) $300.45; (10) $388.75; (11) $689.20.

A. Engineers and Scientists of America, 711 West Lake Street, Minneapolis, Minn.

C. (2) Any legislation affecting the interests of professional engineers and other members of affiliated units.

A. Myles W. English, 952 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.

B. National Highway Users Conference, Inc., 952 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Legislation pending before the Congress dealing with Federal grants-in-aid to States for highways, or repeal, modification, or extension of Federal excise taxes on motor vehicles, gasoline, oil, tires, or auto parts.

A. Walter M. Evans, 512 Travelers Building, Richmond, Va.

B. Virginia Associated Businessmen, 512 Travelers Building, Richmond, Va.

C. (2) Legislative activities were conducted with respect to action at this session of Congress to equalize taxes as between the mutuals and the cooperatives and the private business enterprises with which they compete. (3).[1]

A. Edward Falck & Co., 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Southern California Gas Co., 810 South Flower Street, Los Angeles, Calif.

C. (2) All legislation of interest to the natural gas industry.

D. (6) $4,000.

E. (2) $600; (5) $450; (6) $245.53; (7) $373.98; (9) $1,669.51; (10) $4,086.51; (11) $5,756.02; (15) [1].

A. Farmers Educational and Cooperative Union of America (National Farmers Union), 1417 California Street, Denver, Colo., and 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) National Farmers Union is interested in all Federal legislation, bills, resolutions, appropriations and other proceedings affecting American agriculture and farmers, either directly or indirectly.

D. (6) $42,704.37.

E. (2) $10,873.89; (3) $187.50; (4) $264.21; (5) $3,181.34; (6) $1,811.65; (7) $6,879.26; (8) $511.98; (9) $23,709.83; (10) $29,584.90; (11) $53,294.73; (15).[1]

A. Mrs. Albert E. Farwell, Box 204A, Route 2, Vienna, Va.

B. National Congress of Parents and Teachers, 700 North Rush Street, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) Measures which affect the welfare of children and youth in fields of education; social and economic well-being; child labor and environmental situations; Federal research agencies in education, health, juvenile protection and homemaking; world understanding and peace among nations.

A. Joseph G. Feeney, 1209 Whitehall Building, 17 Battery Place, New York, N. Y.

B. National St. Lawrence Project Conference, 814 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Any legislation with reference to the St. Lawrence waterway and power project (opposed).

D. (6) $1,200.

E. (7) $616.62; (9) $616.62; (10) $751.65; (11) $1,368.27.

A. Harold E. Fellows, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Legislation—local, State, Federal, or international—which affects the broadcasting industry.

A. John A. Ferguson, 918 16th Street NW., Suite 501, Washington, D. C.

B. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 918 16th Street NW., Suite 501, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Any legislation pertaining to natural gas.

D. (6) $3,750.

A. John H. Ferguson, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Legislative Committee of the Committee for a National Trade Policy, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Legislation relating to foreign economic policy.

D. (5) $300; (6) $300; (7) $375; (8) $675.

A. Josiah Ferris, 510 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.

B. United States Sugar Corp., Clewiston, Fla.; Fellsmere Sugar Producers Association, Fellsmere, Fla.; American Sugar Cane League, New Orleans, La.

A. Maurice W. Fillius, 703 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.

B. National Association of Alcoholic Beverage Importers, Inc.

C. (2).[1]

D. (6) $375.

A. James Finucane, 1013 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Committee for the Return of Confiscated German and Japanese Property, 1013 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Amendment of the Trading with the Enemy Act to authorize the return of German and Japanese property confiscated by the Government of the United States.

D. (6) $142.73.

A. James Finucane, 1013 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Council for Prevention of War, 1013 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) In support of legislation and legislative policy dealing constructively with foreign affairs.

D. (6) $1,225.

E. (7) $107; (8) $107; (9) $107; (10) $100; (11) $207.

A. Adrian S. Fisher, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Theodore Roosevelt Association, 28 East 20th Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) To prevent any action being taken under H. R. 5471 which is in violation of the act of May 21, 1932.

E. (6) $9.41; (8) $8.46; (9) $17.87; (10) $92.72; (11) $110.59.

A. Bernard M. Fitzgerald, Washington Loan and Trust Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Brown, Lund & Fitzgerald, Washington Loan and Trust Building, Washington, D. C., representing National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Any legislation that might affect the members of the NAEC.

D. (6) $472.50.

A. Stephen Fitzgerald & Co., 502 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.

B. Creole Petroleum Corp., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Support for the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act and, more specifically, to oppose legislation such as the Simpson bill (H. R. 5894).

D. (6) $35,157.76.

E. (1) $12,725; (2) $15,529.85; (4) $6,949; (6) $543.73; (7) $8,158.86; (8) $10,008.19; (9) $53,914.63; (10) $12,482.17; (11) $66,396.80.

A. F. Stuart Fitzpatrick, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Roger Fleming, 261 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2).[1]

D. (6) $1,500.

E. (7) $43.40; (9) $43.40; (10) $58.70; (11) $102.10.

A. Donald G. Fletcher, 745 McKnight Building, Minneapolis, Minn.

B. Rust Prevention Association, 745 McKnight Building, Minneapolis, Minn.

C. (2) Legislation affecting funds for research on plant-disease control and crop improvement.

D. (6) $2,175.

E. (2) $558.33; (4) $18; (5) $272.68; (6) $129.83; (7) $565.64; (9) $1,544.48; (10) $798.09; (11) $2,342.57.

A. Florida Citrus Mutual (Legislative Fund), Lakeland, Fla.

C. (2) Any legislation that affects the citrus industry.

E. (2) $2,499.99; (4) $2.87; (5) $40; (6) $8.46; (7) $386.10; (8) $1.56; (9) $2,938.98; (10) $2,691.73; (11) $5,630.71.

A. Florida Inland Navigation District, Citizens Bank Building, Bunnell, Fla.

C. (2) Potentially interested in all legislation affecting river and harbor works, flood control, and other water use and conservation, and related subjects.

E. (2) $1,350; (8) $19.61; (9) $1,369.61; (10) $1,279.11; (11) $2,748.72.

A. Florida Railroad Association, 404 Midyette-Moor Building, Tallahassee, Fla.

C. (2) Proposed legislation of interest to members of Florida Railroad Association.

D. (6) $2,512.50.

E. (2) $1,875; (6) $3.33; (7) $342.23; (9) $2,220.56; (10) $2,396.69; (11) $4,617.25.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. John J. Flynn, 734 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. International Union of Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers, 734 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Any and all legislation affecting the welfare and security of working men and women and their families.

D. (6) $1,425.

E. (7) $130; (9) $130; (10) $100; (11) $230.

A. Aaron L. Ford, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C., and Plaza Building, Jackson, Miss.

B. Otho F. Hipkins, 4316 Santiago Street, Tampa, Fla.

C. (2) Retained to assist in obtaining passage of a private bill, H. R. 4799.

E. (7) $150; (8) $5; (9) $155.

A. Mrs. J. A. Ford, 305 Pennsylvania Avenue SE., Washington, D. C.

B. Townsend Plan, Inc., 6875 Broadway, Cleveland, Ohio.

C. (2) H. R. 2446 and H. R. 2447.

A. Forest Conservation Society of America, 2144 P Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Forest conservation.

E. (2) $185; (4) $12; (5) $25; (9) $222; (10) $232; (11) $454.

A. Forest Farmers Association Cooperative, Post Office Box 7284, Station C, Atlanta, Ga.

C. (2) 1955 agricultural appropriation bill and general tax revision bill. (3) The Forest Farmer.

E. (4) $52; (6) $150; (7) $333.49; (9) $535.49; (10) $246.35; (11) $781.84.

A. J. Carter Fort, 929 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Legislation affecting transportation.

D. (6) $6,563.34.

E. (7) $179.75; (9) $179.75; (10) $151.48; (11) $331.23.

A. Charles E. Foster, 1701 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Disabled American Veterans, 1423 East McMillan Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.

C. (2) The DAV is interested in all legislation affecting war veterans, their dependents and survivors of deceased veterans. (3) DAV Semimonthly.

D. (6) $1,814.40.

A. Ronald J. Foulis, 195 Broadway, New York, N. Y., and 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Telephone & Telegraph Co., 195 Broadway, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Matters affecting communications.

D. (6) $4,000.

A. Fowler, Leva, Hawes and Symington, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Waterways Council Opposed to Regulation Extension, 21 West Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) S. 3111 and legislation related to extension of regulation to bulk carriers on waterways.

D. (6) $3,500.

E. (4) $4.29; (6) $14.52; (7) $32.12; (9) $50.93; (11) $50.93.

A. L. S. Franklin, Box 401, Greensboro, N. C.

B. National Tax Relief Coalition, Box 401, Greensboro, N. C.

C. (2) Tax limitation.

D. (6) $650.

E. (2) $375; (5) $25; (7) $250; (9) $650; (10) $860; (11) $1,510.

A. Robert Franklin, 2438 Tulare Street, Fresno, Calif.

B. Allied Wool Industry Committee, 414 Pacific National Life Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.

E. (10) $2,000.

A. Robert Franklin, 2438 Tulare Street, Fresno, Calif.

B. National Wool Growers Association, 414 Pacific National Life Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.

C. (2) Legislation affecting wool industry.

E. (10) $3,382.21.

A. Robert W. Frase, 812 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Book Publishers Council, Inc., 2 West 46th Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) General legislative interests include all matters affecting the general book-publishing industry except for postal rates.

D. (6) $1,750.

E. (2) $780; (4) $175; (5) $345; (6) $185; (7) $227.50; (8) $65; (9) $1,777.50; (10) $776.98; (11) $2,554.48; (15).[1]

A. George H. Frates, 1163 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.

B. National Association of Retail Druggists.

C. (2) To oppose legislation detrimental to independent retail druggists and to further legislation favorable to the profession. (3) N. A. R. D. Journal.

D. (6) $2,800.

E. (2) $675; (5) $399; (6) $80; (9) $1,154; (10) $2,396; (11) $3,550.

A. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 104 C Street NE., Washington, D. C.

C. (2).[1] (3) Washington Newsletter.

D. (6) $26,954.56.

E. (2) $10,511.53; (3) $181.86; (4) $1,097.06; (5) $2,059.89; (6) $212.23; (7) $1,006.32; (8) $831.04; (9) $15,899.93; (10) $16,395.12; (11) $32,295.05; (15).[1]

A. George M. Fuller, 1319 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Lumber Manufacturers Association, 1319 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) No particular bills, but any legislation inimical to the interests of the lumber industry, American industry, and free enterprise.

D. (6) $4,299.98.

E. (7) $843.38; (9) $843.38; (10) $989.29; (11) $1,832.67.

A. Wallace H. Fulton, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Association of Securities Dealers, Inc., 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) S. 2846, H. R. 7550, and H. R. 8300.

D. (6) $625.

A. John F. Gale, 616 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.

B. The National Fertilizer Association, Inc., 616 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Any legislation that might affect the manufacture or distribution of fertilizer or the general agricultural economy.

D. (6) $30.

A. Lawrence H. Gall, Suite 501, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Any legislation pertaining to natural gas.

D. (6) $1,450.

A. M. J. Galvin, 207 Union Depot Building, St. Paul, Minn.

B. Minnesota Railroads.[1]

C. (2) Interested in all matters affecting railroads.

D. (6) $500.

E. (7) $1,102.97; (9) $1,102.97; (10) $420.90; (11) $1,523.87.

A. Earl H. Gammons, 1735 De Sales Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Columbia Broadcasting System, Inc., 485 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Legislation applicable to or affecting the radio and/or television industry.

A. Gwynn Garnett, 261 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) Foreign aid.

D. (6) $1,187.50.

E. (7) $78.85; (9) $78.85; (10) $52.75; (11) $131.60.

A. Marion R. Garstang, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Any legislation that may affect milk producers or the cooperatives through which they act together to process and market their milk (3) News for Dairy Co-ops and the Alert.

D. (6) $2,511.96.

E. (8) $12; (9) $12; (10) $111.48; (11) $123.48.

A. Gas Appliance Manufacturers Association, Inc., 60 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) In general, legislation which concerns or affects members of the Gas Appliance Manufacturers Association, Inc., including H. R. 8224 and H. R. 8300.

D. (6) $2,020.52.

E. (2) $1,500; (4) $95.60; (6) $424.92; (9) $2,020.52; (10) $500; (11) $2,520.52.

A. Mrs. Paul Gehbahr, 830 Witherspoon Building, Philadelphia, Pa.

B. The Board of Christian Education of the Presbyterian Church.

A. Gus F. Geissler, 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Farmers Educational and Cooperative Union of America (National Farmers Union) 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

D. (6) $1,000.

E. (7) $125; (9) $125; (11) $125.

A. J. M. George, 165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.

B. The Inter-State Manufacturers Asociation, 163–165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.

C. (2).[1]

D. (6) $1,500.

A. J. M. George, H. K. Brehmer, and C. S. McMahon, 165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.

B. National Association of Direct Selling Cos., 163–165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.

C. (2).[1]

D. (6) $3,000.

A. Leo E. George, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Federation of Post Office Clerks, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) All legislation pertaining to the postal service and the welfare of Postal and Federal employees. (3) Union Postal Clerk.

D. (6) $3,000.

E. (10) $200; (11) $200.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Stanley Gewirtz, 1107 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Air Transport Association of America, 1107 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Legislation affecting welfare of airlines and air transport industry.

E. (7) $51.75; (9) $51.75; (10) $38.65; (11) $90.40.

A. Walter A. Giblin, room 412, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.

B. Brotherhood Railway Carmen of America, 4929 Main Street, Kansas City, Mo.

C. (2) H. R. 356, S. 1911, H. R. 7840, and S. 2930.

D. (6) $2,424.90.

A. Ernest Giddings, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Legislation-Federal Relations Division of the National Education Association of the United States, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Bills pending before the 83d Congress relating to public education.

D. (6) $1,373.25.

E. (7) $104.57; (9) $104.57; (10) $93.35; (11) $197.92.

A. Hugh V. Gittinger, Jr., 312 Wire Building, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Washington Real Estate Board, Inc., 312 Wire Building, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) All local measures affecting the District of Columbia are of interest.

A. Nathaniel H. Goodrich, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Jewish Committee, 386 Fourth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

C. (2).[1]

D. (6) $162.49.

E. (7) $5; (9) $5.

A. Dr. H. T. Gordon, P. O. Box 2214, Washington, D. C.

B. The Townsend Plan, Inc., 6875 Broadway, Cleveland, Ohio.

C. (2) H. R. 2446.

D. (6) $815.10.

E. (7) $367.25.

A. James J. Gormley, 260 St. John Avenue, Staten Island, New York.

B. Amalgamated Association of Street, Electric Railway and Motor Coach Employees of America, 1214 Griswold Street, Detroit, Mich.

A. Philip P. Gott, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

B. National Confectioners' Association of the United States, Inc., 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) Legislative proposals affecting the confectionery industry.

D. (6) $2,000.

E. (8) $794.74.

A. Lawrence L. Gourley, 1757 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Osteopathetic Association, 212 East Ohio Street, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) Bills affecting the public health.

D. (6) $375.

A. Government Employees' Council, American Federation of Labor, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) All legislation that affects Government employees is of interest to this council.

D. (6) $5,168.38.

E. (2) $3,620.96; (4) $318.38; (5) $650; (6) 151.30; (8) $881.86; (9) $5,622.50; (10) $5,518.32; (11) $11,140.82; (15).[1]

A. Grain and Feed Dealers National Association, 100 Merchants Exchange, St. Louis, Mo.

C. (2) Legislation affecting the grain and feed trade.

D. (6) $150.

E. (2) $40; (4) $50; (6) $2; (9) $92; (10) $89.46; (11) $181.46.

A. Grand Lodge of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, 318/418 Keith Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

C. (2) To promote general interests of locomotive firemen and enginemen.

D. (6) $24.50.

E. (2) $4,975.17; (4) $125.78; (5) $699.07; (6) $182.45; (7) $2,627.16; (8) $31.79; (9) $8,641.42; (10) $6,687.03; (11) $15,328.45; (15).[1]

A. S. H. Grauten, 3743 Upton Street, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Recognition of services of civilians employed on construction of Panama Canal by amending act of May 29, 1944 (Public Law 319, 78th Cong.).

E. (4) $27.97; (7) $2.88; (9) $30.85; (10) $53; (11) $83.85.

A. Mrs. Virginia M. Gray, 3501 Williamsburg Lane NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Citizens Committee for UNICEF, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Legislative matters affecting the United Nations Children's Fund.

D. (6) $500.

E. (5) $25.22; (6) $6.80; (7) $17.70; (9) $49.72 (11) $49.72.

A. Mrs. Virginia Gray, 3501 Williamsburg Lane NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Congress of Parents and Teachers, 700 North Rush Street, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2).[1] (3) National Parent-Teacher.

A. Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Association, 821 Cafritz Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) S. 2150, to authorize United States participation with Canada in construction of the St. Lawrence seaway.

D. (6) $6,000.

E. (1) $10,336.71; (2) $4,932.46; (4) $145.31; (5) $714.65; (6) $490.92; (7) $508.63; (8) $382.73; (9) $17,461.41; (10) $64,538.88; (11) $81,995.29; (15).[1]

A. Paul S. Green, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Zionist Committee for Public Affairs, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) In favor of the mutual security program.

D. (6) $400.

E. (7) $22.60; (9) $22.60; (11) $22.60.

A. Ernest W. Greene, 731 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Hawaiian Sugar Planters' Association, Post Office Box 2450, Honolulu, T. H.

A. Francis Thornton Greene, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Merchant Marine Institute, Inc., 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C., and 11 Broadway, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) General legislative interest is to support all legislation favorable to, and to oppose all legislation hostile to, maintenance of the American merchant marine.[1]

D. (6) $2,500.

E. (7) $312.79; (9) $312.79; (10) $379.97; (11) $692.76.

A. Jerry N. Griffin, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.

B. National Coal Association, 15th and H Streets NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Legislative interests are general in character and we are interested in any legislation which affects the coal industry.

D.. (6) $1,200.

A. Weston B. Grimes, 436 Bowen Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Cargill, Inc., 200 Grain Exchange, Minneapolis, Minn.

C. (2).[1]

D. (6) $6,874.98.

E. (7) $7; (9, $7; (10) $1; (11) $8.

A. I. J. Gromfine, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. O. David Zimring, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

A. John J. Gunther, 1341 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Americans for Democratic Action, 1341 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) All bills covered by convention-adopted platform.

D. (6) $1519.96.

E.(7) $479.31; (9) $479.31; (10) $156.88; (11) $636.19.

A. Violet M. Gunther, 1341 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Americans for Democratic Action, 1341 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) All bills covered by convention-adopted platform.

D. (6) $1669.98.

E. (7) $205.31; (9) $205.31; (10) $263; (11) $468.31.

A. Frank E. Haas, 280 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.

B. The Association of Western Railways, 474 Union Station Building.

C. (2) Federal legislative proposals which may or do affect western railroads.

D. (6) $240.31.

E. (7) $266.36; (9) $266.36; (11) $266.36.

A. Hugh F. Hall, 261 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) Revenue revision; agricultural appropriations; ACP payments; REA; appropriation, Agricultural Extension Service and Research; control and eradication of animal and plant diseases and pests; social security, coverage of farmers and farm labor; restricted retirement pensions with premiums tax deductible.

E. (7) $25.44; (9) $25.44; (10) $24.45; (11) $49.89.

A. Radford Hall, 515 Cooper Building, Denver, Colo.

B. American National Cattlemen's Association, 515 Cooper Building, Denver, Colo.

C. (2) Legislation affecting cattle industry.

D. (6) $1,950.

E. (6) $11.73; (7) $148.54; (9) $160.27; (10) $661.89; (11) $822.16.

A. E. C. Hallbeck, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Federation of Post Office Clerks, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) All legislation pertaining to the postal service and the welfare of postal and Federal employees. (3) Federation News Service Bulletin.

D. (6) $2,875.12.

E. (7) $409.05; (9) $409.05; (10) $523.59; (11) $932.64.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Joseph J. Hammer, 26 Broadway, New York, N. Y.

B. Socony-Vacuum Oil Co., Inc., 26 Broadway, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Legislation of interest to the petroleum industry.

D. (6) $1,525.06.

E. (6) $14.48; (7) $365.58; (9) $400.06; (10) $482.61; (11) $882.67.

A. William A. Hanscom, 1700 I Street NW., Suite 4, Washington, D. C.

B. Oil Workers International Union, 1840 California Street, Denver, Colo.

C. (2) Support all legislation favorable to the national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and general welfare—oppose legislation detrimental to those objectives.

D. (6) $2,055.

E. (7) $180; (9) $180; (10) $540; (11) $720.

A. Murray Hanson, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Investment Bankers Association of America, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C., and 33 South Clark Street, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) Tax and other legislation affecting the securities business. (3).[1]

D. (6) $600.

E. (2) $97.50; (4) $39.52; (5) $126.96; (6) $45.35; (7) $104.28; (9) $413.61; (10) $837.42; (11) $1,251.03.

A. Eugene J. Hardy, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Association of Manufacturers.

A. Ralph W. Hardy, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Association of Radio & Television Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Legislation—local, State, Federal, or international—which affects the broadcasting industry.

A. Winder R. Harris, 441 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Shipbuilders Council of America, 21 West Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Maritime matters.

A. Merwin K. Hart, 7501 Empire State Building, New York, N. Y.

B. National Economic Council, Inc., Empire State Building, New York, N. Y.

C.[1]

D. (6) $500.

E. (7) $40.38; (9) $40.38.

A. Stephen H. Hart, 520 Equitable Building, Denver, Colo.

B. National Live Stock Tax Committee, 515 Cooper Building, Denver, Colo.

C. (2) Interested in general livestock tax matters including specifically proposed amendments to the Internal Revenue Code concerning capital gains on sale of breeding livestock and deduction of soil conservation, brush control and other ranching expenditures; and livestock accounting methods.

A. Paul M. Hawkins, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Retail Federation, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. [1]

D. (6) $3.375.

E. (7) $117.05; (9) $117.05; (10) $48.15; (11) $165.20.

A. Edward B. Hayes, room 2500, 135 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

B. A. L. Mechling Barge Lines, Inc., 51 North Desplaines Street, Joliet, Ill.

C. (2) All legislative activities relating to or affecting the transportation of commodities by water.

E. (6) $6.11; (7) $30.35; (8) $74.90; (9) $111.36; (10) $124.52; (11) $235.88; (15).[1]

A. Joseph H. Hays, 280 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.

B. The Association of Western Railways, 474 Union Station Building.

C. (2) Legislative proposals which may or do affect Western railroads.

A. John C. Hazen, 808 Sheraton Building, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Retail Dry Goods Association, 100 West 31st Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2).[1]

E. (7) $104.02; (8) $1.25; (9) $105.27; (10) $21.15; (11) $126.42.

A. Patrick B. Healy, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Legislation that may affect milk producers or the cooperatives through which they act together to process and market their milk. (3) News for Dairy Co-ops and The Alert.

D. (6) $2,070.90.

E. (8) $10.25; (9) $10.25; (11) $10.25.

A. K. W. Heberton, room 101, 1405 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Western Union Telegraph Co., 60 Hudson Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Legislative proposals affecting the interests of the telegraph company.

E. (7) $145.20; (9) $145.20; (10) $188.70; (11) $333.90.

A. George J. Hecht, 52 Vanderbilt Avenue, New York, N. Y.

B. American Parents Committee, Inc., 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Support of Federal aid for school construction, etc.[1]

A. F. Cleveland Hedrick, Jr., 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Bridgeport Brass Co., Bridgeport, Conn.

C. (2) Tax legislation.

A. F. Cleveland Hedrick, Jr., 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C.

B. Radio-Electronics-Television Manufacturers Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Tax legislation.

A. Robert B. Heiney, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Canners Association, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Long-range plans for agriculture and other legislation directly affecting the food-canning industry, and opposition to mandatory marketing orders.

D. (6) $833.33.

E. (7) $347.25; (9) $347.25; (10) $103.46; (11) $450.71.

A. Kenneth G. Heisler, 907 Ring Building, 18th and M Streets NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Savings and Loan League, 907 Ring Building, 18th and M Streets NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Support of bills to improve facilities of savings and loan associations for encouragement of thrift and home financing. Oppose legislation adverse to savings and loan associations.

D. (6) $375.

A. Maurice G. Herndon, 1002 Washington Loan & Trust Building, Washington, D. C.

B. National Association of Insurance Agents, 96 Fulton Street, New York, N. Y., 1002 Washington Loan & Trust Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Any legislation which affects, directly or indirectly, local property insurance agents. (3) The American Agency Bulletin.

D. (6) $104.

E. (7) $104; (9) $104; (10) $142.90; (11) $246.90.

A. Clinton M. Hester, 426 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Boston Wool Trade Association, 263 Summer Street, Boston, Mass.; Philadelphia Wool and Textile Association; National Wool Trade Association.

C. (2) Any and all proposed legislation affecting the wool-trade industry.

D. (6) $400.

E. (6) $11.49; (9) $11.49.

A. Clinton M. Hester, 426 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.

B. National Association of Hot House Vegetable Growers, Post Office Box 659, Terre Haute, Ind.

C. (2) Any and all proposed legislation affecting the hothouse vegetable industry.

A. Clinton M. Hester, 426 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.

B. United States Brewers Foundation, 535 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Any and all proposed legislation affecting the brewing industry.

D. (6) $5,000.

E. $91.42; (9) $91.42.

A. Robert C. Hibben, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D. C.

B. International Association of Ice Cream Manufacturers, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Legislation which may affect the ice-cream industry.

A. W. J. Hickey, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Short Line Railroad Association, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

D. (6) $187.50.

A. Ray C. Hinman, 26 Broadway, New York, N. Y.

B. Socony-Vacuum Oil Co., Inc., 26 Broadway, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Legislation of interest to the petroleum industry.

D. (6) $1,596.90.

E. (6) $20.12; (7) $326.78; (9) $346.90; (11) $346.90.

A. Charles M. Holloway, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Division of Legislation and Federal Relations of the National Education Association of the United States, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Bills pending before the 83d Congress relating to public education.

D. (6) $352.50.

E. (7) $13.50; (9) $13.50; (11) $13.50.

A. Fuller Holloway, 1000 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.

B. The Toilet Goods Association, Inc., 9 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N. Y.

D. (6) $3.450.

E. (6) $23.35; (7) $39.50; (8) $15.66; (9) $78.51; (11) $78.51.

A. Oscar W. Holste, Room 407, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.

B. Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express and Station Employees, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.

C. (2) Interested in all legislation affecting labor and especially railroad labor.

D. (6) $1,640.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. J. M. Hood, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington. D. C.

B. American Short Line Railroad Association, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

D. (6) $300.

—

A. Victor Hood, 4310 Queensbury Road, Riverdale, Md.

B. Journeymen Barbers, Hairdressers, Cosmetologists, and Proprietors International Union, 1141 North Delaware, Indianapolis, Ind.

C. (2) Legislation affecting labor, district barber laws, veterans' education laws, social-security laws, workmen's compensation laws, etc.

D. (6) $2,227.58.

E. (7) $652.58; (9) $652.58; (11) $652.58.

—

A. Samuel H. Horne, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Underwriters Service Corp., Meridian, Miss.

C. (2) Proposed Internal Revenue Code of 1954; H. R. 8300.

—

A. Jesse V. Horton, Post Office Box 2013, Washington, D. C.

B. National Association of Postal Supervisors, Post Office Box 2013, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) All legislation affecting postal employees, including supervisors, and the postal service. (3) Semi-monthly News Letters, and the Postal Supervisor.

D. (6) $2,375.

E. (7) $142.86; (9) $142.86; (10) $173.74; (11) $316.60.

—

A. Mrs. Jency Price Houser, 1420 New York Avenue NW., No. 914, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Housing Act.

D. (6) $2,713.

E. (1) $25.50; (2) $1,560; (3) $20; (4) $125.22; (5) $150; (6) $60; (7) $50; (8) $726.43; (11) $2,717.15.

—

A. S. H. Howard, 1414 Evergreen Avenue, Millvale, Pittsburgh, Pa.

B. Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen of America, 503 Wellington Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) Legislation of interest to railway employees and labor in general.

D. (6) $600.

—

A. Harold K. Howe, Suite C, 2480 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Institute of Laundering, Box 1187, Joliet, Ill.

C. (2) Legislation affecting the laundry industry and the members thereof.

D. (6) $2,649.99.

E. (2) $1,154; (7) $375.97; (9) $1,529.97; (10) $1,662.45; (11) $3,192.42.

—

A. Harold K. Howe, 207 Mills Building, Washington, D. C.

B. The Lawn Mower Institute, Inc., 207 Mills Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) All matters of interest to the lawn mower industry.

D. (6) $1,800.

—

A. Hudson, Creyke, Lipscomb & Gray, 400 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.

—

A. William T. Huff, 806 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C.

B. Trans World Airlines, Inc., 10 Richards Road, Kansas City, Mo.

C. (2) All legislation of interest to air transport operations.

D. (6) $2,319.84.

E. (7) $284; (9) $284.

—

A. Raymond E. Hughes, 85 John Street, New York, N. Y.

B. National Board of Fire Underwriters, 85 John Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Legislation affecting stock fire insurance companies.

D. (6) $450.

E. (5) $567; (7) $406.45; (9) $973.45; (10) $441.78; (11) $1,415.23.

—

A. C. A. Hummel, 122 West Washington Avenue, Madison, Wis.

B. Wisconsin Railroad Association, 122 West Washington Avenue, Madison, Wis.

C. (2) Legislation affecting railroads and transportation generally.

D. (6) $593.30.

E. (7) $524.64; (9) $524.64; (11) $524.64; (15)[1].

—

A. C. E. Huntley, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Short Line Railroad Association, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

D. (6) $250.

—

A. John M. Hurley, 515 Hoge Building, Seattle, Wash.

D. (6) $349.95.

E. (7) $467.91; (9) $467.91; (10) $529.27; (11) $997.18; (15)[1].

—

A. Kenneth N. Hurley, 2700 South 16th Street, Arlington, Va.

C. (2) Tax and finance.

—

A. W. C. Hushing, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Federation of Labor, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) All bills affecting the welfare of the country generally, and specifically bills affecting workers.

D. (6) $3,110.

E. (6) $24.50; (7) $273; (8) $86; (9) $384; (10) $378; (11) $762.

—

A. Illinois Railroad Association, room 1526, 33 South Clark Street, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) Legislation affecting railroads.

E. (2) $825; (9) $825; (10) $825; (11) $1,650.

—

A. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 918 16th Street NW., Suite 501, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Any legislation pertaining to natural gas.

D. (6) $26,930.

E. (2) $7,200; (5) $375; (9) $7,575; (10) $7,575; (11) $15,150; (15)[1].

—

A. Indiana Tax Equality Committee, Inc., 2d Floor, Board of Trade Building, Indianapolis, Ind.

E. (10) $1; (11) $1.

—

A. Ingoldsby & Coles, 813 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.

B. The American Tramp Shipowners Association, Inc., 80 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) The association is interested in amending existing shipping legislation in order to extend operating and construction differential subsidies to American-flag vessels engaged in so-called tramp trades, and in other legislative matters affecting American-flag shipping.

E. (6) $14.25; (7) $115.43; (9) $129.68; (10) $88.47; (11) $218.15; (15).[1]

—

A. Institute of Scrap Iron & Steel, Inc., 1729 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Activity consisted of furnishing information to the House Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations and written and oral presentations to the House and Senate Armed Services subcommittees of the Appropriations Committees on H. R. 8873, Defense Department appropriation bill for fiscal year 1955, with reference to section 715.

D. (6) $350.

—

A. International Association of Machinists, Machinists Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) All legislation affecting the socio-economic and political interests of the American workingman.

D. (6) $2,150.

E. (1) $1,250; (4) $250; (5) $150; (6) $200; (7) $300; (9) $2,150; (10) $2,150; (11) $4,300.

—

A. International Union of Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers, 734 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Legislation affecting the welfare and security of working men and women and their families.

E. (2) $1,425; (7) $130; (9) $1,555; (10) $1,525; (11) $3,080.

—

A. The Inter-State Manufacturers Association, 163–165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.

C. (2) S. R. 49; H. R. 2685; H. R. 8353; H. R. 6052; S. 586; S. 3263; S. 2836; H. R. 8654; H. R. 8300; H. R. 3599; H. R. 7125; H. R. 5860.

D. (6) $3,000.

E. (4) $41.55; (9) $41.55; (10) $20.70; (11) $62.25.

—

A. Investment Trust Lecture Bureau, 1316 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Robert Bruce Edwards, 1316 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Seeking hearings by joint Senate and House Banking and Currency Committees to remove the opposition to mutual funds by stock dealers, bankers, and papers, etc.

D. (6) $200.

E. (1) $500; (2) $600; (3) $50; (4) $200; (6) $2–300; (7) $2,000; (9) $3,650; (10) $5,000; (11) $8,650.

—

A. Iron Ore Lessors Association, Inc., W–1481 First National Bank Building, St. Paul, Minn.

C. (2) Amendments of Internal Revenue Code.

D. (6) $5,030.

E. (2) $1,500; (6) $128.81; (7) $3,452.07; (9) $5,080.88; (10) $11,401.90; (11) $16,482.78; (15).[1]

—

A. Boyd J. Jackson, Klamath Indian Tribe, Klamath Agency, Oreg.

B. Klamath Indian Tribe, Klamath Agency, Oreg.

C. (2) Supporting H. R. 9188; seeking amendments to S. 2745.

—

A. Robert C. Jackson, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Cotton Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 203–A Liberty Life Building, Charlotte, N. C.

C. (2).[1]

D. (6) $737.50.

E. (7) $88; (9) $88; (10) $97.24; (11) $185.24.

—

A. Seward H. Jacobi, 119 Monona Avenue, Madison, Wis.

B. Wisconsin State Chamber of Commerce, 119 Monona Avenue, Madison, Wis.

C. (2) Legislation affecting business and industry.[1]

D. (6) $2,750.

—

A. C. Clinton James, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. District of Columbia Building and Loan League, 1 Thomas Circle, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Federal legislation affecting savings and loan business.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

D. (6) $349.98.
E. (5) $125; (8) $125; (9) $125; (10) $125; (11) $250.

A. Japanese American Citizens League, 1759 Sutter Street, San Francisco, Calif.
C. (2) To promote the welfare of persons of Japanese ancestry in the United States and Hawaii.
D. (6) $375.
E. (2) $300; (11) $600; (15).[1]

A. Ray L. Jenkins, 541 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Societe Internationale, Pour Participations Industrielles Et Commerciales, S. A., Peter Kerianstr, 19 Basle Str., Switzerland.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting the client.

A. Jewelry Industry Tax Committee, Inc., 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) The general legislative interests of the corporation are to obtain repeal of the excise tax on jewelry and jewelry store merchandise.
D. (6) $9,641.
E. (2) $4,518; (4) $216.32; (5) $1,524.17; (6) $371.48; (7) $1,980.21; (8) $1,409.09; (9) $10,019.27; (10) $18,719.36; (11) $28,738.63.

A. William T. Jobe, 810 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Ice Industries, 810 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) General interest in matters affecting ice industry.

A. Peter Dierks Joers, Mountain Pine, Ark.
B. Dierks Lumber & Coal Co., 1006 Grand Avenue, Kansas City, Mo.
C. (2) Flood Control Act of 1945, Millwood Dam, and legislation affecting lumber industry.

A. Johns-Manville Corp., 22 East 40th Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Revenue bill of 1954, social security, housing, and reciprocal trade.
E. (2) $1,250; (8) $398.55; (9) $1,648.55; (10) $1,874.54; (11) $3,523.09.

A. Gilbert R. Johnson, 1208 Terminal Tower, Cleveland, Ohio.
B. Lake Carriers' Association, 305 Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
C. (2) Legislation relating to Great Lakes shipping.
D. (6) $3,750.
E. (7) $104.39; (9) $104.39; (10) $45.17; (11) $149.56.

A. Reuben L. Johnson, Jr., 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Farmers Educational and Cooperative Union of America (National Farmers Union), 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,350.
E. (7) $69.10; (9) $69.10; (11) $69.10.

A. W. D. Johnson, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.
B. Order of Railway Conductors, ORC Building, Cedar Rapids, Iowa.
C. (2) St. Lawrence seaway project and all legislation directly and indirectly affecting the interests of labor generally and employees of carriers under the Railway Labor Act, in particular.

A. Bascom F. Jones, 930 Broadway, Nashville, Tenn.
B. Class I railroads in Tennessee.
C. (2).[1]

A. Charles W. Jones, 1832 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 18, Memphis, Tenn.
C. (2) The National Cotton Council of America favors such action on any legislation affecting the raw-cotton industry as will promote the purposes for which the council is organized.
D. (6) $525.
E. (7) $92.71; (9) $92.71; (10) $46.20; (11) $138.91.

A. Jones, Day, Cockley & Reavis, 1759 Union Commerce Building, Cleveland, Ohio, and 1135 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The M. A. Hanna Co., Leader Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
C. (2) S. 2150 which became Public Law 358, 83d Congress, 2d session.
E. (6) $32.79; (7) $76.32; (9) $109.11; (10) $89.37; (11) $198.48.

A. J. M. Jones, 414 Pacific National Life Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.
B. National Wool Growers Association, 414 Pacific National Life Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.
C. (2) S. 2911, H. R. 7775, S. 2313, S. 2548, H. R. 6787, and S. 2862.
D. (6) $2,500.
E. (6) $284.02; (7) $3,083.81; (8) $588.83; (9) $3,956.66; (10) $2,874.67; (11) $6,831.33.

A. L. Dan Jones, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Independent Petroleum Association of America, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation that might affect the petroleum industry.
E. (8) $24.30; (9) $24.30; (10) $19.38; (11) $43.68.

A. Lyle W. Jones, 501 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The United States Potters Association, East Liverpool, Ohio.
C. (2) Interested in all legislation affecting the pottery industry.
D. (6) $2,500.
E. (5) $262.76; (6) $104.53; (7) $10.78; (8) $102.48; (9) $480.55; (10) $587.78; (11) $1,068.33.

A. Phillip E. Jones, 920 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
B. United States Beet Sugar Association, 920 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Interested in any legislation affecting sugar, particularly the Sugar Act of 1948 and related legislation.
D. (6) $4,250.

A. Rowland Jones, Jr., 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Retail Federation, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Registrant is generally interested in all legislation and legislative proposals affecting the retail industry, including the industry's relations with the Federal Government, with its suppliers, with its employees and with its customers.
D. (6) $3,000.
E. (7) $150.98; (9) $150.98; (10) $209.89; (11) $360.87.

A. Journeymen—Barbers, Hairdressers, Cosmetologists, and Proprietors International Union of America, 1141 North Delaware, Indianapolis, Ind.
C. (2) Legislation affecting labor.
E. (2) $2,227.58; (9) $2,227.58; (11) $2,227.58.

A. Jerome J. Keating, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington D. C.
B. National Association of Letter Carriers, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation pertaining to Postal and Federal employees.
D. (6) $1,374.

A. Francis V. Keesling, Jr., 315 Montgomery Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. City and County of San Francisco, City Hall, San Francisco, Calif.
C. (2) Legislation of interest to the City and County of San Francisco.
D. (6) $3,000.
E. (5) $934; (6) $273.85; (7) $596.66; (8) $51.30; (9) $1,855.81; (10) $1,517.32; (11) $3,373.13.

A. Nathaniel S. Keith, 3212 Macomb Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Redevelopment Builders of New York, 110 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) In support of the Housing Act of 1954, H. R. 7839 and S. 2938.
D. (6) $5,000.
E. (6) $10; (7) $35.70; (9) $45.70; (10) $40.35; (11) $86.05.

A. Miss Elizabeth A. Kendall, 23 West Irving, Chevy Chase, Md.
C. (2) Any legislation related directly or indirectly to the development of the Antarctic Continent.[1]
E. (4) $5; (6) $20; (8) $5; (9) $30; (10) $100; (11) $130.

A. I. L. Kenen, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Zionist Committee for Public Affairs, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) In favor of the mutual security program.
D. (6) $583.33.
E. (7) $32; (9) $32; (11) $32.

A. Harold L. Kennedy, 203 Commonwealth Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The Ohio Oil Co., Findlay, Ohio.
C. (2) Generally interested in all legislative matters that would affect the oil and gas industry.
D. (6) $500.
E. (2) $125; (5) $75; (7) $25; (9) $225; (10) $210; (11) $435.

A. Miles D. Kennedy, 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The American Legion, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
C. (2).[1] (3) American Legion magazine and legislative bulletin.
D. (6) $3,100.
E. (7) $231.65; (8) $116.13; (9) $347.78; (10) $156.15; (11) $503.93; (15).[1]

A. Ronald M. Ketcham, 1757 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce, 1151 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $2,750.
E. (2) $2,750; (9) $2,750; (10) $2,750; (11) $5,500.

A. Omar B. Ketchum, 610 Wire Building, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.
C. (2).[1] (3) VFW magazine and VFW Legislative Newsletter.
D. (6) $3,000.
E. (7) $225; (9) $225; (10) $270; (11) $495.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Jeff Kibre, 930 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union, 150 Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.

C. (2) General interests in legislative matters affecting trade unions and their members and the maritime industry as well.

D. (6) $821.72.

E. (2) $325; (5) $100.15; (6) $68.46; (8) $68.39; (9) $562; (10) $498.33; (11) $1,060.33.

A. John A. Killick, 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Eastern Meat Packers Association, Hotel Statler, New York, N. Y., and 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Matters affecting meat packers.

D. (6) $583.34.

E. (7) $80.87; (9) $80.87; (11) $80.87.

A. John A. Killick, 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. The National Independent Meat Packers Association, 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) S. 2404, posting of bonds for livestock purchasing; Taft-Hartley Act revision; tax law revision, H. R. 8300.

D. (6) $109.76.

E. (7) $42.50; (9) $42.50; (10) $30.74; (11) $73.24.

A. H. Cecil Kilpatrick, 912 American Security Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Minot, DeBlois, and Maddison, 294 Washington Street, Boston, Mass.

C. (2) H. R. 5418 and H. R. 8300, to tax real estate investment trusts like security investment trusts.

E. (4) $185.51; (6) $12.25; (7) $63.66; (8) $1.25; (9) $262.67; 10) $198.48; (11) $461.15.

A. H. Cecil Kilpatrick, 912 American Security Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Estate of Harry C. Trexler (a charitable trust), 1227 Hamilton Street, Allentown, Pa.

C. (2) Amendment of section 421 (c), Internal Revenue Code, to alleviate hardships of tax on income of charities; amendment to section 512 (b) (11) of H. R. 8300, relating to charitable deductions.

E. (4) $7.94; (6) $3.44; (7) $23.63 (8) $1.25; (9) $36.26; (10) $17.08; (11) $53.34.

A. Joseph William Kinghorne, 1365 Iris Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Broiler Association, Inc., 77 West Washington Street, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) Legislation that may tend to affect the production and/or marketing of commercial broilers.

D. (6) $300.

E. (7) $150.59; (9) $150.59; (11) $150.59.

A. Vance N. Kirby, 122 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

B. Central Electric and Gas Co.; 144 South 12th Street, Lincoln, Nebr.

C. (2) Proposing an amendment to the Securities Act of 1933 to increase the exemption for small issues of securities.

D. (6) $1,550.

A. Vance N. Kirby, 122 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

B. The Peoples Gas Light and Coke Co., 122 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) Proposing an amendment to the Internal Revenue Code to provide for adjusted original cost depreciation for income tax purposes.

D. (6) $1,540.

E. (9) $305.67; (10) $536.27; (11) $841.94.

A. Jesse L. Kirk, Klamath Agency, Oregon.

B. Klamath Indian Tribe, Klamath Agency, Oregon.

C. (2) Supporting H. R. 9188; seeking amendments to S. 2745.

A. Clifton Kirkpatrick, 162 Madison Avenue, Memphis, Tenn.

B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 18, Memphis, Tenn.

C. (2) The National Cotton Council of America favors such action on any legislation affecting the raw cotton industry as will promote the purposes for which the council is organized.

D. (6) $360.

E. (7) $28.60; (9) $28.60; (10) $34.52; (11) $63.12.

A. C. W. Kitchen, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. United Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Interested in any legislation affecting the marketing and distribution of fresh fruits and vegetables, directly or indirectly.

E. (2) $85.70; (6) $14.53; (9) $100.23; (11) $100.23.

A. Allan B. Kline, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) Legislation affecting American agriculture.

D. (6) $1,250.

A. Robert E. Kline, Jr., 917 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Palmer-Bee Co., Detroit, Mich.

C. (2) Bill for relief of Palmer-Bee Co.

E. (6) $6.94; (7) $114.87; (8) $16.23; (9) $138.04; (10) $177.59; (11) $315.63.

A. Burt L. Knowles, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.

B. The Associated General Contractors of America, Inc., Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Robert M. Koch, 619 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Agricultural Limestone Institute, Inc., 619 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) All legislation which directly or indirectly affects the interests of agricultural limestone producers.

E. (7) $48.50; (9) $48.50; (10) $68.70; (11) $117.20.

A. John T. Koehler, 1039 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Embassy of Denmark, 2374 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Legislation authorizing final settlement of claims arising from the requisitioning of 40 Danish vessels by the United States in 1941.

A. John Kolanda, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.

B. Railway Employees' Department, A. F. of L., 220 South State Street, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) All legislation of interest to railroad employees and labor in general.

D. (6) $1,999.98.

A. Lake Carriers' Association, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. Horace R. Lamb, 15 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.

B. St. Regis Paper Co., 230 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) To provide information for the preparation of a special act to authorise the execution of a deed conveying certain rights in real property erroneously conveyed to the United States.

E. (10) $10.24.

A. A. M. Lampley, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.

B. Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, 318 Keith Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

C. (2) All legislation affecting labor organizations in general and railroad labor in particular.

D. (6) $2,750.

A. Alfons Landa, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Independent Advisory Committee to the Trucking Industry, Inc.

A. Alfons Landa, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Salt Producers Association, 726 La Salle, Wacker Building, Chicago, Ill.

A. Fritz G. Lanham, 2737 Devonshire Place NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Fair Trade Council, Inc., 1434 West 11th Avenue, Gary, Ind.

D. (6) $500.

A. Fritz G. Lanham, 2737 Devonshire Place NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Patent Council, Inc., 1434 West 11th Avenue, Gary, Ind.

D. (6) $2,000.

A. Fritz G. Lanham, 2737 Devonshire Place NW., Washington, D. C.

B. State Tax Association, Post Office Box 2559, Houston, Tex.

C. (2).[1]

A. Fritz G. Lanham, 2737 Devonshire Place, NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Trinity Improvement Association, Inc., 1308 Commercial Standard Building, Fort Worth, Tex.

D. (6) $1,175.

A. La Roe, Winn, and Moerman, 743 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Eastern Meat Packers Association, Inc., Statler Hotel, New York, N. Y.

C. (2).[1]

D. (6) $1,500.

E. (5) $2,018.51; (7) $117.83; (8) $13; (9) $2,149.34; (10) $2,280.69; (11) $4,430.03.

A. La Roe, Winn, and Moerman, 743 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.

B. The National Independent Meat Packers Association, 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2).[1]

D. (6) $4,500.

E. (5) $2,018.51; (6) $33.01; (7) $444.24; (8) $84.26; (9) $2,580.02; (10) $2,949.28; (11) $5,529.30.

A. J. Austin Latimer, 1420 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Association of Postmasters of the United States, 1111 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Legislation appertaining to the United States Postal Service.

A. John V. Lawrence, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

D. (6) $7,500.

E. (7) $14.10; (9) $14.10; (10) $15.80; (11) $29.90.

A. League of New York Theaters, 234 West 44th Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Any legislation affecting the excise tax on admissions to the legitimate theater.

A. League of Women Voters of the United States, 1026 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2).[1] (3).[1]

D. (6) $1,811.48.

E. (2) $648.98; (4) $2,027.83; (6) $11.39; (9) $2,689.20; (10) $3,547.29; (11) $6,236.49.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. James R. Lee, 1426 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Water Heater Division, Gas Appliance Manufacturers Association, 60 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) In general, legislation which concerns water heater manufacturers, particularly the excise tax.

D. (6) $1,500.

E. (5) $585; (6) $54.12; (7) $186.15; (9) $825.27; (10) $302.34; (11) $1,127.61.

A. Ivy Lee and T. J. Ross, 405 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y.

B. Committee of American Steamship Lines, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Legislation affecting the United States merchant marine. (3).[1]

D. (6) $11,851.30.

E. (2) $2,166.68; (4) $2,273.91; (6) $95.24; (7) $1,035.10; (8) $1,780.37; (9) $7,351.30; (10) $4,275.86; (11) $11,627.16; (15).[1]

A. Ivy Lee and T. J. Ross, 405 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y.

B. United States Cuban Sugar Council, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2).[1] (3).[1]

D. (6) $2,300.73.

E. (4) $2,157.49; (6) $24.46; (8) $118.78; (9) $2,300.73; (10) $2,288.92; (11) $4,589.65; (15).[1]

A. Legislation-Federal Relations Division of the National Education Association of the United States, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Bills pending before the 83d Congress relating to public education. (3).[1]

E. (2) $2,335; (4) $2,038.79; (5) $103.19; (6) $161.12; (7) $1,959.19; (9) $6,677.29; (10) $9,650.38; (11) $16,327.67; (15).[1]

A. Legislative Committee of the Committee for a National Trade Policy, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Legislation relating to foreign economic policy.

D. (7) $4,065.18.

E. (2) $2,700; (4) $545.17; (7) $38.08; (8) $117; (9) $3,400.25; (10) $2,405; (11) $5,805.25.

A. Legislative Committee of Office Equipment Manufacturers Institute, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. G. E. Leighty, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) All legislation of interest to railway employees.

A. Mrs. Newton P. Leonard, 341 Sharon Street, Providence, R. I.

C. (2) The general legislative interests of the National Congress are concerned with measures which affect the welfare of children and youth in the field of education; social and economic well-being; child labor and environmental situations; Federal research agencies in education, health, juvenile protection, and homemaking; world understanding and peace among nations.

A. Dr. William M. Leonard, Railway Progress Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Federation for Railway Progress, Railway Progress Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Transportation legislation.

D. (6) $500.

A. The Liaison Committee of the Mechanical Specialty Contracting Industries, 610 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) All legislation affecting the mechanical specialty contracting industries.

D. (6) $8,213.02.

E. (2) $6,000; (8) $2,313.02; (9) $2,213.02; (10) $8,410.02; (11) $16,623.04; (15).[1]

A. Frederick J. Libby, 1013 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Council for Prevention of War, 1013 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Bills affecting world peace.

D. (6) $1,224.99.

E. (10) $173.42; (11) $173.42.

A. Walter Lichtenstein, 105 West Madison Street, Chicago, Ill.

B. Gardner & Jones, 105 Madison Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York 22, N. Y., and 1701 K Street NW, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Legislation which might affect the welfare of policyholders and annuitants.

D. (6) $8,391.48.

E. (2) $5,934.37; (5) $2,084.03; (6) $249.49; (7) $122.49; (9) $8,391.48; (10) $5,494.45; (11) $13,885.93.

A. Life Insurance Policyholders Protective Association, 116 Nassau Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) General education concerning the effect of inflation on the purchasing power and value of life insurance, as affected by Federal policies or measures which are deemed to be inflationary, or inflationary-retarding, in character. (3).[1]

D. (6) $5,522.65.

E. (2) $1,369.13; (4) $1,044.01; (5) $773.14; (6) $210.71; (7) $413.33; (9) $3,810.32; (10) $6,388.02; (11) $10,198.34; (15).[1]

A. Leo F. Lightner, 717 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Engineers and Scientists of America, 711 West Lake Street, Minneapolis, Minn.

C. (2) Any legislation affecting the interests of professional engineers and other members of affiliated units.

A. L. Blaine Liljenquist, 917 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Western States Meat Packers Association, Inc., 604 Mission Street, San Francisco, Calif.

C. (2) I support or oppose legislation affecting the livestock and meat industry.

D. (6) $3,016.64.

E. (7) $10.17; (9) $10.17; (10) $57.90; (11) $68.07.

A. John W. Lindsey, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Association of Securities Dealers, Inc.

C. (2) S. 2846, H. R. 7550, and H. R. 8300. (3).[1]

D. (6) $375.

A. Esther Lipsen, Railway Progress Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Federation for Railway Progress, Railway Progress Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Transportation legislation.

D. (6) $25.03.

E. (6) $50; (7) $400; (9) $450; (10) $181.59; (11) $631.59.

A. Robert G. Litschert, 1200 18th Street NW., Suite 510, Ring Building, Washington, D. C.

B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2).[1]

D. (6) $495.

E. (6) $4.42; (7) $124.30; (8) $22.40; (9) $151.12; (10) $132.76; (11) $283.88.

A. Walter J. Little, 510 West Sixth Street, Los Angeles, Calif.

B. Major Steam Railroads of California.

C. (2) In opposition to St. Lawrence seaway and repeal of dual benefits under Railroad Retirement Act; in support of repeal of excise transportation taxes and time lag bill.

D. $2,451.12.

E. (6) $33.94; (7) $1,046.35; (8) $265.65; (9) $1,346.44; (10) $1,042.42; (11) $2,388.86 (15).[1]

A. John M. Littlepage, 840 Investment Building, 15th and K Streets NW., Washington, D. C.

B. The American Tobacco Co., Inc., 111 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Any legislation affecting a company engaged in the manufacture and sale of tobacco products.

A. Cordon C. Locke, 643 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Committee for Pipe Line Companies, 35 East Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) Legislation favorable to the pipeline industry.

D. (6) $5,000.

A. Benjamin H. Long, 2746 Penobscot Building, Detroit, Mich.

B. Blue Cross Commission, 425 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) Legislation for payroll deductions, war damage, economic controls, taxation of fringe benefits, and hospital and health matters.

D. (6) $3,150.

E. (6) $100.93; (7) $1,068.24; (8) $74.78; (9) $1,243.95; (10) $619.95; (11) $1,863.90; (15).[1]

A. Leonard Lopez, room 303, Medical Science Building, 1029 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. District No. 44, I. A. of M., Room 303, Medical Science Building, 1029 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Legislation affecting working conditions of Government employees and incidentally organized labor in general.

D. (6) $1,166.66.

E. (7) $10; (9) $10; (11) $10.

A. Lord, Day & Lord, 25 Broadway, New York, N. Y., and 500 Wyatt Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Agency of Canadian Car & Foundry Co., Ltd., 30 Broadway, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Legislation having relation to World War I claims.

A. Lord, Day & Lord, 25 Broadway, New York, N. Y., and 500 Wyatt Building, Washington, D. C.

B. S. A. Healy Co., 61 Westchester Avenue, White Plains, N. Y.

C. (2) S. 1762.

A. Otto Lowe, 820 Woodward Building, Washington, D. C.

B. National Canners Association, 1133 20th Street, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Legislation affecting canning of food products.

D. (6) $1,500.

E. (7) $500; (9) $500; (10) $500; (11) $1,000.

A. James C. Lucas, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B American Retail Federation, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2).[1]

D. (6) $750.

A. Lucas & Thomas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Acacia Mutual Life Insurance Co., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Interested in Federal tax matters affecting life-insurance companies.

D. (6) $750.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Lucas & Thomas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Finance Conference, 176 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) General legislation.

D. (6) $1,250.

A. Lucas & Thomas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Mobile Homes Manufacturers Association, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) General legislation affecting mobile homes.

D. (6) $1,000.

A. Lucas & Thomas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Revere Copper and Brass, Inc., 230 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Legislation providing for continuation of the suspension of certain import taxes on copper.

A. Lucas & Thomas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Adolph von Zedlitz, care of 100 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) S. 155 and H. R. 3594, to amend section 32 of the Trading With the Enemy Act.

A. John C. Lynn, 261 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2).[1]

D. (6) $2,343.75.

E. (7) $94.10; (9) $94.10; (10) $103.90; (11) $198.

A. A. E. Lyon, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Any legislation affecting labor—especially railroad labor.

D. (6) $750.

A. Avery McBee, 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Hill & Knowlton, Inc.

C. (2) Legislation affecting aviation, the steel industry, and other industries which may be clients of Hill & Knowlton. (3).[1]

A. Robert J. McBride, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Regular Common Carrier Conference of American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) The general legislative interest is protection and fostering of the interest of federally regulated motor common carriers of general commodities.

D. (6) $975.

A. John A. McCart, room 716, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Federation of Government Employees, room 716, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) All bills of interest to Federal Government employees and District of Columbia employees.

D. (6) $1,507.69.

E. (7) $27.75; (9) $27.75; (10) $16.90; (11) $44.65.

A. Frank J. McCarthy, 211 Southern Building, 15th and H Streets NW., Washington, D. C.

B. The Pennsylvania Railroad Co., 1740 Suburban Station Building, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. J. L. McCaskill, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Division of Legislation and Federal Relations, National Education Association of the United States, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Bills pending before the 83d Congress relating to public education. (3).[1]

D. (6) $550.

E. (7) $305.27; (9) $305.27; (10) $82.03; (11) $387.30.

A. McClure & Updike, 626 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Iron Ore Lessors Association, Inc., W-1481 First National Bank Building, St. Paul, Minn.

C. (2) Amendments of Internal Revenue Code.

D. (6) $6,000.

E. (4) $15.66; (6) $164.81; (7) $1,222.19; (8) $8.35; (9) $1,411.01; (10) $855.72; (11) $2,266.73; (15).[1]

A. Angus McDonald.

B. Farmers Educational & Cooperative Union of America, 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) [1].

D. (6) $1,500.

E. (7) $268.75; (9) $268.75; (10) $285.07; (11) $501.82.

A. Edwin McElwain, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.

B. National Machine Tool Builders' Association, 10525 Carnegie Avenue, Cleveland, Ohio.

C. (2) Any legislation affecting machine tool industry.

A. Joseph A. McElwain, 500 Main Street, Deer Lodge, Mont.

B. Montana Power Co., Butte, Mont.

C. (2) All legislation affecting Montana Power Co.

D. (6) $1,000.

E. (6) $90; (7) $200; (8) $50; (9) $340; (10) $230; (11) $570.

A. Rev. A. J. McFarland, 126 North 6th, Sterling, Kans.

B. Christian Amendment Movement, 804 Penn Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa.

C. (2) The Christian Amendment Resolution. (3) The Christian Patriot.

D. (6) $810.

E. (7) $350; (9) $350; (10) $250; (11) $600.

A. Ernest W. McFarland, LaSalle Building, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Cable and Radio Corporation; RCA Communications, Inc.; and Western Union Telegraph Co., New York City, N. Y.

D. (6) $7,500.

A. Thomas Edward McGrath, 4012 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Taxpayers, United States of America, 4012 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. M. O. McKercher, 3860 Lindell Boulevard, St. Louis, Mo.

B. The Order of Railroad Telegraphers, O. R. T. Building, St. Louis, Mo.

C. (2) Legislation affecting the welfare of railroad employees.

D. (6) $1,440.

A. Joseph V. McLaughlin, 1503 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Railway Express Agency, Inc., 219 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Legislation in connection with parcel post.

D. (6) $5,000.

E. (7) $742.95; (9) $742.95; (10) $991.56; (11) $1,734.51.

A. W. H. McMains, 1135 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Distilled Spirits Institute, 1135 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Legislation affecting the domestic distilling industry.

A. Ralph J. McNair, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Legislation which might affect the welfare of policyholders and annuitants.

D. (6) $375.

A. Daniel J. McNamara, 1608 West Van Buren Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

B. Division 241, Amalgamated Association of Street Electric Railway and Motor Coach Employees of America, 1608 West Van Buren Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) Laws, proposed laws, and proposed amendments to laws affecting the interests of its members and their families.

A. Joseph P. McSparron, Machinists Building, Washington, D. C.

B. International Association of Machinists, Machinists Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Legislation affecting the socioeconomic and political interests of the American workingman, including all pending legislation dealing with railroad matters.

D. (6) $1,037.50.

E. (7) $960; (9) $960; (10) $240; (11) $1,200.

A. James E. Mack, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Confectioners' Association, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) Any legislative proposals affecting the confectionery industry.

D. (6) $3,000.

E. (8) $573.35.

A. W. Bruce Macnamee, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C., and 11 Broadway, New York, N. Y.

B. American Merchant Marine Institute, Inc., 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C., and 11 Broadway, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Legislation favorable to the maintenance of the American merchant marine.

D. (6) $1,000.

E. (7) $29.58; (9) $29.58; (10) $28.41; (11) $57.99.

A. James B. Madaris, Room 412, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.

B. Brotherhood Railway Carmen of America, 4929 Main Street, Kansas City, Mo.

C. (2) H. R. 356, S. 1911, H. R. 7840, S. 2930.

D. (6) $2,424.99.

A. Carter Manasco, 4201 Chesterbrook Road, Falls Church, Va.

B. National Business Publications, Inc., 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) All legislation affecting the members of the above-named trade association.

D. (6) $2,400.

E. (6) $43.10; (7) $86.90; (9) $130; (10) $167.52; (11) $297.52.

A. Carter Manasco, 4201 Chesterbrook Road, Falls Church, Va.

B. National Coal Association, Southern Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) All legislation affecting the members of the above-named trade association.

D. (6) $2,600.

E. (6) $43.10; (7) $86.90; (9) $130; (10) $167.52; (11) $297.52.

A. Manufacturing Chemists' Association, Inc., 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Legislation affecting the chemical industry. (3)[1].

D. (6) $2,375.

E. (1) $500; (8) $1,875; (9) $2,375; (10) $2,375; (11) $4,750.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Olya Margolin, 1637 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Council of Jewish Women, 1 West 47th Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Not employed specifically to support or oppose any legislation, but for the purpose of securing information to be transmitted to headquarters for the preparation of educational and other material.

D. (6) $1,625.78.

E. (8) $53.84; (9) $53.84; (10) $60.85; (11) $114.69.

A. Winston W. Marsh, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. The National Association of Independent Tire Dealers, Inc., 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2)[1]. (3)[1].

D. (6) $19.

E. (7) $2.50; (9) $2.50; (10) $2.50; (11) $5.

A. Fred T. Marshall, 1112–18 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. The B. F. Goodrich Co., 500 South Main Street, Akron, Ohio.

C. (2) Legislation affecting and of interest to the B. F. Goodrich Co.

A. Edwin G. Martin, 717 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Morton Co., Worcester, Mass.

C. (2) Tariff status of silicon carbide.

D. (6) $2,250.

E. (6) $11.76; (7) $130.71; (9) $142.47; (11) $142.47.

A. Robert F. Martin, 931 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Vitrified China Association, Inc., 931 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Mike M. Masaoka, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Japanese American Citizens League, 1759 Sutter Street, San Francisco, Calif.

C. (2) Legislation affecting persons of Japanese ancestry in the United States and Hawaii.

D. (6) $300.

E. (8) $25; (9) $25; (10) $15; (11) $40.

A. Walter J. Mason, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Federation of Labor, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) All bills affecting the welfare of our country generally, and specifically bills affecting workers.

D. (6) $2,720.

E. (6) $22.65; (7) $271; (8) $92.35; (9) $386; (10) $370; (11) $756.

A. P. H. Mathews, Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Generally to support legislation which the railroads believe to be in their interest and in the interest of a sound national transportation policy, and to oppose legislation which they believe to be contrary to such interest.

D. (6) $4,749.97.

E. (7) $521.66; (9) $521.66; (10) $507.30; (11) $1,028.96.

A. C. V. and R. V. Maudlin, 1111 E Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Association of Waste Material Dealers, Inc., 271 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) All legislation pertaining to or affecting the waste materials industry.

D. (6) $1,800.

E. (4) $68.30; (6) $23.40; (7) $18.20; (9) $109.90; (11) $109.90; (15).[1]

A. Cyrus H. Maxwell, M. D., 1523 L Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) All bills relating to health and welfare. (3) Informational bulletins.

D. (6) $625.

E. (7) $46.96; (9) $46.96; (10) $59.78; (11) $106.74.

A. Medical Association of the State of Alabama, 537 Dexter Avenue, Montgomery, Ala.

C. (2) All health matters covered by legislative action. (3) P. R. Notes.

D. (6) $19,020.

E. (2) $1,800; (4) $225; (9) $2,025; (10) $2,025; (11) $4,050.

A. Medical Society of the District of Columbia, 1718 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Interested in legislation pertaining to the practice of medicine and all related services and that affecting the public health, including extension of social security into the field of the practice of medicine. (3) Medicals Annals of the District of Columbia.

D. (6) $4,497.50.

E. (8) $4,497.50; (9) $4,497.50; (10) $21,650; (11) $26,147.50.

A. Merchants National Bank and Trust Co. of Syracuse, 216 South Warren Street, Syracuse, N. Y.

C. (2) Discontinuance of the Postal Savings System by H. R. 6939.

E. (6) $0.88; (7) $178.94; (9) $179.82; (10) $154.20; (11) $334.02.

A. William R. Merriam, Railway Progress Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Federation for Railway Progress, Railway Progress Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Transportation legislation.

D. (6) $300.

E. (6) $15; (7) $70; (9) $85; (10) $70; (11) $155.

A. James Messer, Jr., 404 Midyette-Moor Building, Tallahassee, Fla.

B. Florida Railroad Association, 404 Midyette-Moor Building, Tallahassee, Fla.

C. (2) Proposed legislation of interest to members of Florida Railroad Association.

D. (6) $1,875.

A. Ross A. Messer, 724 Ninth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Association of Post Office and General Services Maintenance Employees, 724 Ninth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) All beneficial legislation affecting custodial employees of the Post Office and General Services Administration. (3) The Post Office and General Services Maintenance News.

D. (6) $500.

E. (7) $258.60; (8) $302.04; (9) $560.64; (10) $114.86; (11) $675.50.

A. J. T. Metcalf, 1002 L. & N. Building, Louisville, Ky.

E. (7) $322.90; (9) $322.90; (10) $352.57; (11) $675.47.

A. Clarence R. Miles, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Chamber of Commerce of the U. S. A.

A. Harold M. Miles, 65 Market Street, San Franciso, Calif.

B. Southern Pacific Co., 65 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

C. (2) All legislation affecting the interests of the major steam railroads.

A. Milk Industry Foundation, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Benjamin R. Miller, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Dale Miller, Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C.

B. Dallas (Tex.) Chamber of Commerce.

C. (2) General legislation affecting Dallas and Texas, such as appropriations and revenue bills.

D. (6) $1,500.

E. (5) $76.07; (6) $26.17; (7) $728.50; (8) $97.36; (9) $928.10; (10) $900; (11) $1,828.10.

A. Dale Miller, Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C.

B. Intracoastal Canal Association of Louisiana and Texas, Second National Bank Building, Houston, Tex.

C. (2) For adequate river and harbor authorizations and appropriations; H. R. 8367.

D. (6) $2,250.

E. (6) $28.63; (7) $174.34; (9) $202.97; (10) $47.66; (11) $250.63.

A. Dale Miller, Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C.

B. Texas Gulf Sulphur Co., Newgulf, Tex., and New York, N. Y.

C. (2) General legislation affecting sulphur industry.

D. (6) $2,250.

E. (5) $920.05; (6) $172.26; (7) $273.96; (8) $23; (9) $1,389.27; (10) $1,503.85; (11) $2,893.12.

A. Paul I. Miller, 104 C Street NE., Washington, D. C.

B. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 104 C Street NE., Washington, D. C.

C. (2).[1] (3) Washington Newsletter.

D. (6) $1,000.

E. (7) $164.90; (9) $164.90; (10) $25.70; (11) $190.60.

A. John Minadeo, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.

B. Brotherhood Railway Carmen of America, 4929 Main Street, Kansas City, Mo.

C. (2) H. R. 356, H. R. 7840, S. 1911, S. 2930.

D. (6) $2,424.99.

A. Douglas G. Mode, 705 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Bridgeport Brass Co., Bridgeport, Conn.

C. (2) Legislation providing for continuation of the suspension of certain import taxes on copper.

D. (6) $600.

E. (6) $50; (7) $100; (9) $150; (11) $150.

A. Harry L. Moffett, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.

B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Measures affecting mining, such as income taxation, social security, public lands, stockpiling, monetary policy, etc.

D. (6) $1,250.

E. (6) $2; (7) $149.92; (9) $151.92; (10) $17.95; (11) $169.87.

A. Justus R. Moll, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. O. David Zimring.

A. F. E. Mollin, 515 Cooper Building, Denver, Colo.

B. American National Cattlemen's Association, 515 Cooper Building, Denver, Colo.

C. (2) Supported or opposed legislation affecting cattle industry, including reciprocal trade, support prices, appropriations, etc.

D. (6) $3,300.

E. (6) $46.24; (7) $546.68; (8) $16.90; (9) $609.82; (10) 492.29; (11) $1,102.11.

A. Albert H. Monacelli, 161 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.

B. Stockholders of Bessemer Securities Corp., 465 East 57th Street, New York, N. Y.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

C. (2) H. R. 8300 (Internal Revenue Code of 1954).

E. (6) $0.30; (7) $22.14; (9) $22.44.

A. Donald Montgomery, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Hotel Association, 221 West 57th Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Any and all bills and statutes of interest to the hotel industry.

D. (6) $1,875.

E. (7) $146.40; (9) $146.40; (10) $139.45; (11) $285.85.

A. George W. Morgan, 90 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.

B. Association of American Ship Owners, 90 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Legislation with respect to maritime matters and transportation.

A. Morris Plan Corporation of America, 103 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Bank holding company bills and similar legislation.

E. (4) $10,065.67; (7) $946.39; (8) $15; (9) $11,027.06; (11) $11,027.06; (15).[1]

A. Giles Morrow, Suite 610, 1111 E Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Freight Forwarders Institute, Suite 610, 1111 E Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2).[1]

D. (6) $4,374.98.

E. (5) $37.82; (6) $5.59; (7) $40.09; (9) $83.50; (10) $145.04; (11) $228.54.

A. Harold G. Mosier, 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Aircraft Industries Association of America, Inc., 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Any legislation of interest to the aircraft manufacturing industry.

D. (6) $3,750.

E. (4) $3.12; (7) $608.85; (9) $611.97; (10) $880; (11) $1,491.97.

A. William J. Mougey, 802 Cafritz Building, Washington, D. C.

B. General Motors Corp., 3044 West Grand Boulevard, Detroit, Mich.

A. T. H. Mullen, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Paper & Pulp Association, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.

D. (6) $250.

E. (6) $35; (7) $30; (9) $65; (10) $45; (11) $110.

A. Allen P. Mullinnix, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Retired Officers Association, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2)[1]. (3) The Retired Officer.

D. (6) $1,200.

A. Howard E. Munro, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Central Labor Union and Metal Trades Council of the Panama Canal Zone, Post Office Box 471, Balboa Heights, C. Z.

C. (2) All legislation affecting A. F. of L. union members employed on the Canal Zone.

D. (6) $1,800.

E. (3) $196.72; (5) $73.44; (6) $104.39; (7) $768.63; (9) $1,143.18; (10) $1,394.12; (11) $2,537.30.

A. Walter J. Munro, Hotel Washington, Washington, D. C.

B. Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.

C. (2) Advocating favorable labor legislation and opposing unfavorable labor legislation.

A. Dr. Emmett J. Murphy, 5757 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Chiropractic Insurance Co., Webster City, Iowa.

C. (2) Legislative interest of employer is to promote the welfare of its policyholders and prevent discrimination against the chiropractic profession.

D. (6) $300.

E. (8) $300; (9) $300; (10) $300; (11) $600.

A. Ray Murphy, 60 John Street, New York, N. Y.

B. Association of Casualty and Surety Companies, 60 John Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Legislation affecting casualty and surety companies.

D. (6) $112.50.

A. J. Walter Myers, Jr., Post Office Box 7284, Station C, Atlanta, Ga.

B. Forest Farmers Association Cooperative, Post Office Box 7284, Station C, Atlanta, Ga.

C. (2) 1955 Agricultural appropriations bill and general tax revision bill.

E. (6) $50; (7) $333.49; (9) $383.49; (10) $246.35; (11) $629.84.

A. National Agricultural Limestone Institute, Inc., 619 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) All legislation which directly or indirectly affects the interests of agricultural limestone producers.

D. (6) $1,951.02.

E. (2) $1,500; (4) $197.64; (5) $128.38; (6) $76.50; (7) $48.50; (9) $1,951.02; (10) $1,180.45; (11) $3,131.47; (15)[1].

A. National Association and Council of Business Schools, 601 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Legislation concerning education of all kinds, particularly bills relative to GI education for Korean Veterans (Public Law 550).

D. (6) $2,270.11.

E. (2) $1,050; (4) $15; (6) $35.26; (8) $87.28; (9) $1,187.54; (10) $1,178.96; (11) $2,366.50.

A. National Association of Direct Selling Companies, 163–165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.

C. (2).[1]

D. (6) $14,175.

E. (4) $141.67; (8) $5.13 (9) $146.80; (10) $79.50; (11) $226.30

A. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Legislation that might affect members as going electric utilities.[1]

D. (6) $5,671.33.

E. (1) $5,479.80; (2) $16,237.51; (4) $720.22; (5) $1,527.12; (6) $517.24; (7) $1,360.18; (8) $279.27; (9) $26,121.34; (10) $21,528.25; (11) $47,649.59; (15).[1]

A. National Association of Independent Tire Dealers, Inc., 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Statutes or bills which will affect the interests of independent tire dealers.[1] (3) Dealer News.

D. (6) $53.40.

E. (2) $19; (4) $31.90; (7) $2.50; (9) $53.40; (10) $74.78; (11) $128.18.

A. National Association of Insurance Agents, 96 Fulton Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Any legislation which affects, directly or indirectly, local property insurance agents.

D. (6) $3,079.

E. (2) $3,378.48; (5) $495.45; (6) $182.23; (7) 104; (9) $4,160.16; (10) $4,666.17; (11) $8,826.33; (15).[1]

A. National Association of the Legitimate Theatre, Inc., 234 West 44th Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Any legislation affecting the excise tax on admission to the legitimate theater.

E. (2) $1,250; (9) $1,250; (10) $1,350; (11) $2,600.

A. National Association of Letter Carriers, 100 Indiana Avenue, NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) All legislation pertaining to postal and Federal employees.

D. (6) $131,232.11.

E. (1) $7,625.05; (2) $5,000; (4) $2,219.30; (6) $3,113; (7) $12,256.42; (8) $6,700; (9) $36,913.77; (10) $13,425.32; (11) $50,339.09.

A. National Association of Margarine Manufacturers, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.

A. National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, 60 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Supported S. 975, the savings and loan branch bill; H. R. 7839 and S. 2938, the Housing Act of 1954; and S. 76 and S. 118, the bank holding company bills.

D. (6) $506.61.

E. (2) $337.50; (8) $169.11; (9) $506.61; (10) $553.89; (11) $1,060.50; (15).[1]

A. National Association of Post Office and General Services Maintenance Employees, 724 9th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Beneficial legislation affecting postal employees and General Services employees, and Post Office custodial employees and G. S. A. in P. B. S. employees, in particular. (3) The Post Office and General Services Maintenance News.

D. (6) $10,374.22.

E. (2) $680.16; (4) $254.78; (5) $155; (6) $160.55; (7) $258.60; (8) $302.04; (9) $1,811.14; (10) $1,233.36; (11) $3,044.50; (15).[1]

A. National Association of Postal Supervisors, Post Office Box 2013, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) All legislation affecting postal employees, including supervisors, and the postal service. (3) Semimonthly News Letters and the Postal Supervisor.

D. (6) $7,740.69.

E. (2) $2,375; (4) $4,121.26; (5) $300; (6) $22; (7) $142.86; (9) $6,961.12; (10) $5,462.96; (11) $12,424.08.

A. National Association of Postmasters, 1111 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

D. (6) $20,071.99.

E. (2) $1,500; (6) $21.32; (7) $100.46; (9) $1,621.78; (10) $505; (11) $2,126.78.

A. National Association of Retired Civil Employees, 1625 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Association of Retired Civil Employees, 1625 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Legislation affecting retired civil employees. (3) The Annuitant.

D. (6) $275.

E. (2) $275; (9) $275; (10) $275; (11) $550.

A. National Association of Storekeeper-Gaugers, 1218 Locust Avenue, Baltimore, Md.

C. (2) All legislation affecting Federal classified employees, and that in particular which would affect our position—United States storekeeper-gaugers.

D. (6) $645.90.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

E. (2) $500; (9) $500; (10) $500; (11) $1,000.

A. National Association of Travel Organizations, 1424 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Legislation affecting the welfare of the travel industry.

D. (6) $7,979.89.

E. (2) $333.99; (3) $50; (5) $78; (6) $12; (9) $473.99; (10) $473.99; (11) $947.98.

A. National Broiler Association, 77 West Washington Street, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) Legislation that may tend to affect the production and/or marketing of commercial broilers.

D. (6) $300.

E. (2) $300; (6) $12.50; (7) $218.78; (9) $531.28; (10) $162.82; (11) $694.10.

A. National Canners Association, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Long range plans for agriculture and other legislation directly affecting the food canning industry, and opposition to mandatory marketing orders, title IV, S. 3052.

D. (6) $395,716.71.

E. (2) $3,395.49; (4) $1,044.27; (5) $258.59; (7) $6,710.21; (8) $202.04; (9) $11,610.60; (10) $4,663.44; (11) $16,274.04; (15).[1]

A. National Coal Association, 802 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) All measures affecting bituminous-coal industry.

A. National Committee on Parcel Post Size and Weight Limitations, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Public Law 199, H. R. 2685, S. 3263, parcel post size and weight limitations.

D. (6) $1,186.86.

E. (2) $1,534.58; (3) $6.72; (4) $1,141.19; (5) $59.82; (6) $16.85; (8) $62.44; (9) $2,821.60; (10) $3,929.95; (11) $6,751.55; (15).[1]

A. National Committee of Shippers and Receivers, 100 West 31st Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Section 402 (c) of the Interstate Commerce Act.

D. (6) $2,750.

E. (2) $1.89; (5) $2.30; (6) $56.26; (7) $165.49; (8) $6.21; (9) $232.15; (10) $61.85; (11) $294.

A. National Conference for Repeal of Taxes on Transportation, care of D. G. Ward, Mathieson Building, Baltimore, Md.

C. (2) Legislation which will repeal the existing excise taxes on the transportation of persons and property.

D. (6) $2,325.80.

E. (2) $48; (4) $1,371.27; (5) $42.64; (9) $1,401.91; (10) $35.49; (11) $1,497.40; (15).[1]

A. National Cotton Compress and Cotton Warehouse Association, 1085 Shrine Building, Memphis, Tenn.

C. (2) All matters affecting the cotton compress and cotton warehouse industry.

D. (6) $346.13.

E. (2) $201.67; (5) $131.56; (6) $12.90; (9) $346.13; (10) $349.17; (11) $695.30.

A. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 18, Memphis, Tenn.

C. (2) The National Cotton Council of America favors such action on any legislation affecting the raw-cotton industry as will promote the purposes for which the council is organized.

D. (6) $4,788.38.

E. (2) $4,044.70; (4) $24.70; (5) $199.80; (6) $14.80; (7) $504.38; (9) $4,788.38; (10) $3,227.77; (11) $8,016.15; (15).[1]

A. National Council on Business Mail, Inc., 105 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) All legislation relating to the postal service.

D. (6) $1,764.74.

E. (1) $1,500; (6) $9.55; (7) $149.30; (8) $105.89; (9) $1,764.74; (10) $2,027.46; (11) $3,792.20; (15).[1]

A. National Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics, 3027 North Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

C. (2).[1] (3) The Junior American.

E. (2) $183.33; (4) $58.65; (5) $10; (9) $251.98; (10) $322.49; (11) $574.47.

A. National Council for Prevention of War, 1013 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Bills affecting world peace. (3) Peace Action.

D. (6) $8,457.74.

E. (2) $4,843.06; (3) $125; (4) $721.50; (5) $884.85; (6) $121.48; (7) $235.49; (8) $1,289.68; (9) $8,221.06; (10) $9,012.08; (11) $17,233.14; (15) [1].

A. National Economic Council, Inc., Empire State Building, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) [1]. (3) [1].

D. (6) $34,477.18.

E. (2) $17,004.12; (4) $8,569.70; (5) $5,377.15; (6) $1,428.34; (7) $3,124.57; (8) $979.89; (9) $36,983.77; (10) $30,085.54; (11) $67,069.31; (15) [1].

A. National Electrical Contractors Association, Inc., 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) All legislation that affects the building construction and electrical industries. (3) Qualified Contractor.

A. National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc., 1790 Broadway, New York, N. Y.

D. (6) $7,138.52.

E. (2) $2,716.74; (4) $753; (5) $220; (6) $204.15; (8) $104.87; (9) $3,998.76; (10) $5,170.06; (11) $9,168.82; (15) [1].

A. National Federation of Post Office Clerks, Suite 502, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) All legislation pertaining to postal service and the welfare of postal and Federal employees. (3) The Union Postal Clerk.

D. (6) $152,683.62.

E. (2) $7,136.84; (4) $17,354.63; (5) $380; (6) $3,755.96; (7) $1,962.97; (8) $5,844.09; (9) $36,434.49; (10) $21,365.30; (11) $57,799.79; (15) [1].

A. National Food Brokers Association, 527 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.

D. (6) $1,242.43.

E. (2) $1,000; (4) $212.43; (5) $30; (9) $1,242.43; (10) $3,128.77; (11) $4.371.20.

A. National Housing Conference, 1129 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Housing legislation and appropriation measures affecting housing. (3) Building a Citizens Housing Association and the Housing Yearbook—1954.

D. (6) $23,785.20.

E. (2) $8,372.49; (4) $2,608.47; (5) $2,645.18; (6) $455.32; (7) $542.88; (8) $9,983.04; (9) $24,607.36; (10) $16,339.06; (11) $40,946.42; (15) [1].

A. National Independent Meat Packers Association, 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) S. 2404, posting of bonds for livestock purchasing; Taft-Hartley Act revision; tax law revision, H. R. 8300.

D. (6) $3,355.98.

E. (1) $156.27; (2) $556.18; (3) $2.50; (4) $165.50; (5) $48.49; (6) $28.48; (7) $126.29; (8) $78.79; (9) $1,162.50; (10) $837.36; (11) $1,999.86; (15) [1].

A. National Institute of Diaper Services, 67 West 44th Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Legislative interests to secure deduction for income tax purposes for amounts paid for antiseptic diaper service used to cure or prevent skin infection, in accordance with H. R. 5502.

D. (6) $13,314.39.

E. (1) $800.37; (2) $750; (6) $35.77; (8) $67.28; (9) $1,653.42; (10) $2,631.08; (11) $4,284.50.

A. National Labor-Management Council on Foreign Trade Policy, 815 15th Street NW., Room 424, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) To amend the Tariff Act of 1930 and customs simplification bills.

D. (6) $9,225.

E. (2) $3,021.32; (4) $22.34; (5) $618.15; (6) $110.79; (7) $17.25; (8) $1.60; (9) $3,791.45; (10) $4,472.79; (11) $8,264.24; (15).[1]

A. National Live Stock Tax Committee, 515 Cooper Building, Denver, Colo.

D. (6) $447.50.

A. National Lumber Manufacturers Association, 1319 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) All legislation affecting the interests of the lumber manufacturing industry.

D. (6) $2,528.50.

E. (9) $4,288.33; (10) $7,875.45; (11) $12,163.78; (15).[1]

A. National Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Any legislation that may affect milk producers or the cooperatives through which they act together to process and market their milk. (3) News for Dairy Co-ops and the Alert.

D. (6) $63,785.54.

E. (2) $34,713.49; (4) $4,056.12; (5) $9,574.10; (6) $1,465.33; (7) $4,715.27; (8) $2,584.69; (9) $57,099; (10) $83,802.30; (11) $140,901.30; (15).[1]

A. National Multiple Sclerosis Society, 270 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Appropriations for public health.

E. (1) $600; (7) $156.50; (9) $756.50; (10) $775.50; (11) $1,532.

A. National Reclamation Association, 897 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) All statutes relating to water and land conservation measures.

D. (6) $14,907.

E. (2) $5,614.79; (4) $2,493.96; (5) $1,330.72; (6) $284.75; (7) $1,015.09; (8) $825.98; (9) $11,565.29; (10) $10,464.09; (11) $22,029.38; (15).[1]

A. National Retail Dry Goods Association, 100 West 31st Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2).[1] (3).[1]

D. (6) $4,125.

E. (2) $3,375; (4) $2,576.48; (5) $517.60; (6) $59.73; (7) $104.02; (8) $2.50; (9) $6,635.33; (10) $5,895.07; (11) $12,530.40; (15).[1]

A. National Retail Furniture Association, 666 Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) Legislation that affects retail trades.

E. (4) $75; (9) $75; (11) $75.

A. National Rivers and Harbors Congress, 1720 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) All matters pertaining to river and harbor improvement, flood control, navigation, irrigation, reclamation, soil and water conservation, and related subjects.

D. (6) $7,405.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

E. (1) $450; (2) $2,040.99; (4) $652.04; (5) $228.45; (6) $83.85; (7) $525.52; (8) $2,966.57; (9) $6,947.42; (10) $6,716.98; (11) $13,664.40; (15).[1]

A. National St. Lawrence Project Conference, 814 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Any legislation with reference to the St. Lawrence Waterway and power project.

D. (6) $25,910.

E. (1) $8,208.10; (2) $10,125.50; (4) $3,423.68; (5) $1,722.29; (6) $485.86; (7) $1,502.72; (8) $362.81; (9) $25,830.96; (10) $23,291.31; (11) $49,122.27; (15).[1]

A. National Savings and Loan League, 907 Ring Building, 18th and M Streets NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Support of bills to improve facilities of savings and loan associations for encouragement of thrift and home financing. Oppose legislation adverse to savings and loan associations.

D. (6) $6,571.69.

E. (2) $1,375; (4) $412.31; (6) $100; (9) $1.887.31; (10) $1,792.37; (11) $3,679.68; (15).[1]

A. National Small Business Men's Association, 2834 Central Street, Evanston, Ill.

D. (6) $5,009.

E. (2) $4,597.92; (5) $1,524.26; (6) $228.96; (9) $6,351.14; (10) $6,273.80; (11) $2,624.94; (15).[1]

A. National Society of Professional Engineers, 1121 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) All legislation affecting the interests of professional engineers.

D. (6) $102,410.25.

E. (2) $1,183; (4) $473.57; (9) $1,658.57; (10 $1,744.45; (11) $3,403.02; (15).[1]

A. National Tax Equality Association, 231 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) General legislative interests relate to corporate income-tax legislation. (3).[1]

D. (6) $13,103.

E. (1) $1,895.42; (2) $3,189.97; (4) $2,178.83; (5) $497.63; (6) $1,872.31; (7) $3,015.16; (9) $12,649.32; (10) $7,190.73; (11) $19,840.05; (15).[1]

A. The National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, 1730 Chicago Avenue, Evanston, Ill.

D. (6) $4,471.54.

E. (2) $1,100; (5) $406.58; (6) $45.48; (7) $62.79; (8) $14; (9) $1,628.85; (10) $1,428.10; (11) $8,056.95; (15).[1]

A. National Wool Growers Association, 414 Pacific National Life Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.

C. (2) S. 2911, H. R. 7775, S. 2313, S. 2548, H. R. 6787 and S. 2862.

D. (6) $942.

E. (1) $2,000; (2) $2,500; (6) $284.02; (7) $3.083.81; (8) $588.83; (9) $8,456.66; (10) $15,434.81; (11) $23,891.47; (15) [1].

A. Nation-Wide Committee of Industry, Agriculture and Labor on Import-Export Policy, 815 15th Street NW., Room 424, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) To amend the Tariff Act of 1930 and customs simplification bills. (3) [1].

D. (6) $7,945.78.

E. (1) $27,579.38; (2) $9,538.27; (4) $1,871.66; (5) $444.94; (6) $443.88; (7) $613.59; (8) $12.14; (9) $40,503.86; (10) $18,905.35; (11) $59,409.21; (15).[1]

A. William S. Neal, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Association of Manufacturers.

A. Alan M. Nedry, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C.

B. Otis H. Ellis, General Counsel, National Oil Jobbers Council, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) General legislative matters which might affect business interests of independent oil jobbers.

D. (6) $225.

E. (7) $75; (9) $75; (10) $15; (11) $90.

A. Samuel E. Neel, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Mortgage Bankers Association of America, 111 West Washington Street, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) Any legislation affecting the mortgage banking industry. (3) [1].

D. (6) $6,747.75.

E. (2) $240.72; (4) $185.51; (5) $1,592.97; (6) $383.09; (7) $595.46; (9) $2,997.75; (10) 2,407.16; (11) $5,404.91.

A. J. L. Nellis, General Counsel, Midwest Conference on Truck Reciprocity, 908 Colorado Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) H. Res. 407. (3) [1].

E. (1) $1,500; (2) $350; (4) $334.34; (5) $271.12; (6) $200; (7) $125; (8) $95; (11) $3,225.46; (15) [1].

A. G. W. Nelson, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.

B. Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.

C. (2) Advocating legislation favorable to labor and opposing unfavorable legislation.

A. George R. Nelson, Machinists Building, Washington, D. C.

B. International Association of Machinists, Machinists Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) All legislation affecting the socioeconomic and political interests of the American workingmen.

D. (6) $900.

A. Herbert U. Nelson, 22 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill., and 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 22 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill., and 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Any legislation affecting the real estate industry.

D. (6) $1,250.

E. (2) $229.64; (3) $17; (6) $13.42; (7) $2,085.22; (8) $1,089.38; (9) $3,434.66; (10) $1,589.53; (11) $5,024.10; (15).[1]

A. New York Stock Exchange, 11 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Proposed Federal tax legislation affecting the interests of the New York Stock Exchange or its members.

E. (2) $3,350; (7) $137.99; (8) $6.75; (9) $3,494.74; (10) $3,396.38; (11) $6,891.12; (15).[1]

A. Russ Nixon, 930 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. United Electrical, Radio & Machine Workers of America, 11 East 51st Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Support all legislation favorable to national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and the general welfare. Oppose legislation detrimental to these objectives.

D. (6) $1,170.

E. (7) $195; (9) $195; (10) $195; (11) $390.

A. William R. Noble, Suite 509, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Retail Farm Equipment Association, 1014 Locust Street, St. Louis, Mo., and National Retail Hardware Association, 964 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.

C. (2) Inform associations as to pending legislation and furnish interpretations.

D. (6) $3,375.

A. Nordlinger, Riegelman, Benetar & Charney, 420 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y.

B. Webb & Knapp, Inc., 383 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.

C. (2).[1]

D. (6) $6,000.

E. (11) $1,030.29.

A. O. L. Norman, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Association of Electric Cos., 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

D. (6) $582.

E. (7) $13.32; (8) $2.16; (9) $15.48; (10) $5.60; (11) $21.08.

A. Harry E. Northam, 360 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

B. Association of American Physicians and Surgeons, Inc., 360 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2).[1] (3).[1]

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Northern Hemlock & Hardwood Manufacturers Association, Washington Building, Oshkosh, Wis.

C. (2) Legislation affecting the timber industries of Wisconsin and Michigan, taxation, forestry, and labor-management relations.

D. (6) $100.

E. (8) $15; (9) $15; (10) $10; (11) $25.

A. E. M. Norton, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Any legislation that may affect milk producers or the cooperatives through which they act together to process and market their milk. (3) News for Dairy Co-ops and the Alert.

D. (6) $4,962.68.

E. (7) $68.80; (9) $68.80; (10) $109.12; (11) $177.92.

A. Charles E. Noyes, 270 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.

B. American Institute of Accountants, 270 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Legislation affecting certified public accountants.

D. (6) $937.50.

E. (6) $40; (7) $170.88; (9) $210.88; (10) $127.66; (11) $338.54.

A. Donald W. Nyrop, 710 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Conference of Local Airlines, 710 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Support legislation which is in the interest of a sound national air transport policy and oppose legislation contrary to such interests.

D. (6) $449.87.

E. (2) $360; (4) $77.87: (7) $12; (9) $449.87; (10) $308.41; (11) $758.28.

A. John Lord O'Brian, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Theodore Roosevelt Association, 28 East 20th Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) General interest is to protect the rights of the Theodore Roosevelt Association under the act of May 21, 1932 (47 Stat. 163).

E. (6) $9.41; (8) $8.46; (9) $17.87; (10) $92.72; (11) $110.59.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Edward H. O'Connor, 176 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.

B. Insurance Economics Society of America.

C. (2) All bills proposing to amend the Social Security Act. (3).[1]

D. (6) $5,544.

A. Herbert R. O'Conor, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Merchant Marine Institute, Inc., 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C., and 11 Broadway, New York, N. Y.

C, D, and E.[1]

A. Herbert R. O'Conor, Mathieson Building, Baltimore, Md.

B. Worthington Corp., 99 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Tax revenue legislation.

A. Herbert R. O'Conor, Jr., 10 Light Street, Baltimore, Md.

B. National Automobile Dealers Association, 1026 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) S. 3596, in support thereof.

D. (6) $1,250.

E. (6) $10; (7) $44.40; (9) $54.40; (11) $54.40.

A. Eugene O'Dunne, Jr., Southern Building, Washington, D. C.

B. National Association of Wool Manufacturers, 386 Fourth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Legislation having direct or specific impact on the wool textile industry.

D. (6) $2,500.

E. (6) $44.60; (8) $13; (9) $57.60; (10) $130.98; (11) $188.58.

A. Eugene O'Dunne, Jr., Southern Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Wilbur-Ellis Co., Inc., 320 California Street, San Francisco, Calif.

C. (2) Legislation having direct or specific impact on any food products produced or handled by this company.

D. (6) $1,000.

A. Graeme O'Geran, 131 Orvilton Drive, Dewitt, N. Y.

B. Merchants National Bank & Trust Co., 214 South Warren Street, Syracuse, N. Y.

C. (2) Discontinuance of the postal savings system and refund of earnings to member banks of the Federal Reserve System based on the maintenance of reserves requirement of the Federal Reserve System.

E. (6) $0.88; (7) $178.94; (9) $199.82; (10) $154.20; (11) $334.02; (15).[1]

A. W. Raymond Ogg, 261 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) Government credit policies; immigration legislation; increased lending authority for Export-Import Bank; foreign aid; Customs Simplification Act; St. Lawrence seaway; sales of United States surplus farm products for foreign currencies; United States relationships to North Atlantic Treaty nations; extension of Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act; repeal or modification of buy-American legislation.

D. (6) $1,225.

E. (7) $22.93; (9) $22.93; (10) $29.17; (11) $52.10.

A. The Ohio Railroad Association, 16 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.

C. (2) Legislation affecting railroad interests.

E. (7) $422.48; (9) $422.48; (11) $422.48; (15).[1]

A. Fred N. Oliver, 110 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y., and Investment Building, Washington, D. C.

B. National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, 60 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Legislation which the mutual savings banks have an interest in opposing or supporting.

A. Robert Oliver, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Congress of Industrial Organizations, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Support all legislation favorable to the national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and general welfare; oppose legislation detrimental to these objectives.

D. (6) $1,624.98.

E. (7) $1,230.66; (9) $1,230.66; (11) $1,230.66.

A. Clarence H. Olson, 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. The American Legion, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.

C. (2).[1] (3).[1]

D. (6) $2,250.

E. (7) $317.80; (9) $317.80; (10) $12.45; (11) $330.25; (15).[1]

A. Joseph C. O'Mahoney, 236 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Upper Missouri Development Association.

C. (2) Legislation affecting construction of dams and reservoirs on interstate streams including appropriation bills, and in support of S. 1857.

A. Order of Railway Conductors of America, O. R. C. Building, Cedar Rapids, Iowa.

E. (2) $2,125; (5) $1,220.74; (6) $65.55; (9) $3,411.29; (10) $3,275.01; (11) $6,686.30.

A. Morris E. Osburn, Central Trust Building, Jefferson City, Mo.

B. Missouri Railroad Committee.

C. (2) Legislation affecting Missouri railroads.

E. (7) $1,029; (9) $1,029; (10) $690; (11) $1,719; (15).[1]

A. Pacific American Tankship Association, 25 California Street, San Francisco, Calif.

C. (2) Legislation affecting the merchant marine, particularly the tanker division thereof.

D. (6) $200.

E. (2) $1,625; (6) $20.65; (9) $20.65; (10) $1,625; (11) $1,645.65.

A. Robert S. Palmer, 204 State Office Building, Denver, Colo.

B. Colorado Plateau Uranium Committee.

C. (2) Legislation affecting mining in general and uranium in particular.

E. (7) $2,524.01; (9) $2,524.01; (11) $2,524.01.

A. Lovell H. Parker, 611 Colorado Building, Washington, D. C.

B. National Coal Association and National Council of Coal Lessors, Washington, D. C.; Iron Ore Lessors Association, St. Paul, Minn.; Maryland Electronic Manufacturing Corp., College Park, Md.; Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co., Pittsburgh, Pa.; W. A. Shaeffer Pen Co., Fort Madison, Iowa.

C. (2) Tax legislation affecting the bituminous coal industry; the iron ore industry; the pen and pencil industry, the plate glass industry, and legislation dealing with excess profits tax relief in hardship cases.

D. (6) $5,250.

A. Parker, Milliken & Kohlmeier, 620 South Spring Street, Los Angeles, Calif.

B. The Farmers and Merchants National Bank of Los Angeles, as trustee of the Mary Paula Ball Trust, Fourth and Main Streets, Los Angeles, Calif.

C. (2) To establish the value at the date of death of Mary Paula Ball, deceased, as the income tax basis for certain property included in the estate of said decedent for Federal estate tax.

D. (6) $10,000.

E. (6)$44.64; (7) $923.87; (9) $968.51; (11) $968.51.

A. James G. Patton.

B. Farmers Educational and Cooperative Union of America, 1417 California Street, Denver, Colo., and 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2).[1]

D. (6) $1,250.

E. (7) $509.96; (9) $509.96; (11) $509.96.

A. Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison, 1614 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Allstate Insurance Co., 7447 Skokie Boulevard, Skokie, Ill.

C. (2) Elimination of disparities in tax treatment between stock, mutual, and reciprocal fire and casualty insurance companies.

E. (6) $81.79; (8) $3.42; (9) $85.21; (10) $50.35; (11) $135.56.

A. Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison, 1614 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Blue Cross Commission, 420 North Michigan, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) Equitable tax treatment of payments made by employers for employee coverage and benefits received under prepaid hospitalization and medical plans.

E. (4) $35.62; (6) $44.90; (8) $10.23; (9) $88.75; (10) $17.75; (11) $106.50.

A. Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison, 1614 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Estate of Mary Clark de Brabant and Katherine C. Williams, 120 Broadway, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Propose revision of section 7 of the Technical Changes Act of 1949, as amended.

E. (6) $8.80; (7) $1.70; (9) $10.50; (10) $20.10; (11) $30.60.

A. Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison, 1614 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Field Enterprise—Educational division, Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) To obtain equitable tax treatment for taxpayers electing to use the installment method of accounting.

E. (6) $29.70; (7) $432.30; (8) $14.34; (9) $506.34; (11) $506.34.

A. Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison, 1614 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Field Foundation, Inc., 135 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) To obtain amendment in proposed tax law affecting real estate holdings of charitable organizations.

E. (6) $116.24; (7) $191.22; (8) $24.42; (9) $351.88; (11) $331.88.

A. Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison, 1614 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Howard P. Knipp, 3401 South Hanover Street, Baltimore, Md.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

C. (2) Amendment to the partnership provisions of the Internal Revenue Code to provide that a partnership's fiscal year does not terminate upon the death of a partner.

A. Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison, 1614 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. The Sixty Trust, 1109 Hospital Trust Building, Providence, R. I.

C. (2) To obtain amendment in proposed tax law affecting investments of pension and profit-sharing trusts.

E. (6) $8.73; (7) $65.78; (8) $15.27; (9) $89.78; (11) 89.78.

A. Edmund W. Pavenstedt, in care of White & Case, 14 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.

B. International Minerals and Chemicals Corp., 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) To amend section 34 of the Trading With the Enemy Act to protect the interests of domestic corporations owning stock in enemy corporations, assets of which have been seized by the Alien Property Custodian.

E. (7) $62.89; (9) $62.89; (11) $62.89.

A. Albert A. Payne, 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Realtors' Washington Committee of the National Association of Real Estate Boards, 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Any legislation affecting the real estate industry.

D. (6) $2,650.

E. (6) $8.10; (7) $130.60; (8) $45.51; (9) $184.21; (10) $264.17; (11) $468.38.

A. Peoples Gas Light & Coke Co., 122 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) Proposing an amendment to the Internal Revenue Code to provide for adjusted original cost depreciation for income-tax purposes.

E. (9) $1,981.77; (10) $3,570.46; (11) $5,552.23.

A. J. Hardin Peterson, Cochrane Building, Lakeland, Fla.

B. Florida Citrus Mutual, Lakeland, Fla.

C. (2) Interested in any legislation that affects citrus industry.

D. (6) $2,499.99.

E. (4) $2.87; (5) $40; (6) $8.46; (7) $386.10; (8) $1.56; (9) $438.99; (10) $101.34; (11) $540.33.

A. J. Hardin Peterson, Cochrane Building, Lakeland, Fla.

B. West Coast Inland Navigation District, Court House, Brandenton, Fla.

C. (2) Any river and harbor bill affecting the intercoastal waterway from the Caloosahatchee to the Anclote on the west coast of Florida.

D. (6) $200.

E. (5) $10; (6) $5.18; (7) $4.80; (8) $3.50; (9) $23.48; (11) $23.48.

A. Andrew A. Pettis, 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Industrial Union of Marine and Shipbuilding Workers of America, 534 Cooper Street, Camden, N. J.

C. (2) All statutes and bills pertaining to ship construction, ship repair, and all statutes and bills pertaining to labor.

D. (6) $2,192.28.

E. (5) $234.61; (6) $80.97; (7) $1,523.17; (9) $1,838.75; (10) $1,185.44; (11) $3,024.19.

A. Albert T. Pierson, 54 Meadow Street, New Haven, Conn.

B. The New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad Co., 54 Meadow Street, New Haven, Conn.

C. (2) All legislation which might affect the New Haven Railroad and its subsidiaries (the Connecticut Co., New England Transportation Co.).

D. (6) $2,300.

A. Albert Pike, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.

B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Legislation which might affect the welfare of policyholders and annuitants.

D. (6) $115.

E. (7) $42.52; (9) $42.52; (11) $42.52.

A. Rufus G. Poole, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Automobile Dealers Association, 1026 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Amendments to Taft-Hartley act affecting retail automobile and truck dealers.

D. (6) $5,025.

E. (6) $8.64; (8) $14; (9) $22.64; (10) $592.79; (11) $615.43.

A. Poole, Shroyer & Denbo, 1625 K. Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. The American Metal Co., Ltd., 61 Broadway, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Any legislation directly affecting lead or zinc industry.

D. (6) $817.50.

E. (6) $31.34; (8) $15.45; (9) $46.79; (10) $192.65; (11) $239.44.

A. Frank M. Porter, 50 West 50th Street, New York, N. Y.

B. American Petroleum Institute, 50 West 50th Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Stanley I. Posner and Bernard H. Ehrlich, 1367 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Institute of Diaper Services, 67 West 44th Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Legislative interest to secure deduction for income-tax purposes for amounts paid for antiseptic-diaper service—H. R. 5502.

D. (6) $750.

E. (6) $35.77; (8) $67.28; (9) $103.05; (10) $716.98; (11) $820.03.

A. William I. Powell, Ring Building, Washington, D. C.

B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington D. C.

C. (2) Measures affecting mining, such as income taxation, social security, public lands, stockpiling, monetary policy, etc.

D. (6) $1,125.

E. (7) $27.90; (9) $27.90; (10) $16.40; (11) $44.30.

A. Homer V. Prater, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Federation of Government Employees, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) All bills of interest to Federal Government employees and District of Columbia employees.

D. (6) $1,500.

E. (10) $3.50.

A. John H. Pratt, 905 American Security Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Association, 821 Cafritz Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Support of S. 2150 and related legislation.

D. (6) $650.

E. (8) $6.55; (9) $6.55; (10) $30.25; (11) $35.80.

A. William H. Press, 1616 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Washington Board of Trade, 1616 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Legislation affecting the District of Columbia of interest to the Washington Board of Trade.

D. (6) $4,500.

A. Murray Preston, 901 Hibbs Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Association, 821 Cafritz Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Support of S. 2150, to authorize United States participation in construction and operation of a St. Lawrence seaway, enacted into law May 13, 1954.

D. (6) $1,790.50.

E. (7) $28; (9) $28; (11) $28.

A. Allen Pretzman, 50 West Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.

B. Scioto-Sandusky Conservancy District, 50 West Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.

A. Harry E. Proctor, 1110 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.

B. National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, 60 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Savings and loan branch bill, Housing Act of 1954; bank-holding company bills.

D. (6) $337.50.

E. (6) $2.60; (7) $103.38; (9) $105.98; (10) $6.65; (11) $112.63.

A. Proprietary Association, 810 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Measures affecting proprietary medicine industry.

E. (7) $125; (9) $125; (10) $125; (11) $250.

A. Prudential Insurance Company of America, 763 Broad Street, Newark, N. J.

C. (2) General interests in all legislation affecting the business of the company.

E. (2) $6,500; (7) $4,863.12; (9) $11,363.12; (10) $5,305.92; (11) $16,669.04; (15).[1]

A. Ganson Purcell, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Insular Lumber Co., 1406 Locust Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

C. (2) General legislative interests of client are those affecting foreign commerce of the United States, including tax and tariff legislation.

E. (6) $1.76; (8) $9.33; (9) $11.09; (10) $28.19; (11) $39.28.

A. Alexander Purdon, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Committee of American Steamship Lines, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) General legislation in connection with the promotion and advancement of the American merchant marine.

D. (6) $750.

E. (7) $109.93; (9) $109.93; (10) $161.87; (11) $271.80.

A. Edmund R. Purves, 1735 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Institute of Architects, 1735 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Legislation relating to architectural profession.

D. (6) $200.

E. (4) $35; (6) $25; (7) $150; (10) $210; (11) $210.

A. C. J. Putt, 920 Jackson Street, Topeka, Kans.

B. The Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Ry. Co., 920 Jackson Street, Topeka, Kans.

C. (2) General legislative interest in matters affecting railroads.

E. (7) $409.76; (9) $409.76; (10) $339.78; (11) $749.54.

A. Luke C. Quinn, Jr., 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Cancer Society, 47 Beaver Street; United Cerebral Palsy Association, 369 Lexington Avenue; Arthritis and Rheumatism Foundation, 23 West 45th Street; National Multiple Sclerosis Society, 270 Park Avenue, New York City, N. Y.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

C. (2) Public health.

D. (6) $7,499.97.

E. (2) $946; (5) $1,312.65; (6) $301.30; (7) $2,286.59; (9) $4,846.54; (10) $4,647.57; (11) $9,494.11.

A. F. Miles Radigan, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Legislation that might affect going electric utilities.

D. (6) $18.

E. (7) $75.19; (9) $75.19; (10) $139.85; (11) $215.04.

A. Alex Radin, 1757 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Public Power Association, 1757 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Any legislation affecting the generation, transmission and distribution of electrical energy by local publicly owned electric systems, and the management and operation of such systems.

D. (6) $2,500.

A. Railroad Pension Conference, Post Office Box 798, New Haven, Conn.

C. (2) For H. R. 122, to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937.

D. (6) $214.75.

E. (4) $74.30; (5) $195.03; (6) $2.15; (7) $14.35; (8) $9.37; (9) $295.20; (10) $268.27; (11) $563.47.

A. Railway Labor Executives' Association, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Any legislation affecting railroad labor.

A. Alan T. Rains, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. United Fresh Fruit & Vegetable Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Interested in any legislation affecting the marketing and distribution of fresh fruits and vegetables, directly or indirectly.

A. DeWitt C. Ramsey, 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Aircraft Industries Association of America, Inc., 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Any legislation affecting the aviation industry.

A. Donald J. Ramsey, 1612 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Silver Users Association, 1612 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) H. R. 2518 and S. 2555, to repeal certain legislation relating to the purchase of silver, and for other purposes.

D. (6) $4,249.98.

E. (7) $662.74; (9) $662.74; (10) $656.37; (11) $1,319.11.

A. Stanley Rector, Washington Hotel 506, Washington, D. C.

B. Unemployment Benefit Advisors, Inc., Hotel Washington, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) The overall field of social security. (3) The Advisor.

D. (6) $4,999.98.

A. Otie M. Reed, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Creameries Association, 817 New York Building, St. Paul, Minn.

C. (2) Any legislation that may affect milk producers and dairy products manufacturing firms.

D. (6) $1,678.50.

E. (2) $1,687.50; (4) $147.49; (5) $150; (9) $1,984.99; (10) $2,206.17; (11) $4,191.16.

A. Regular Common Carrier Conference of the American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) The general legislative interest is protection and fostering of the interest of federally regulated motor common carriers of general commodities.

D. (6) $3,057.35.

E. (2) $2,533.33; (4) $399.02; (5) $125; (9) $3,057.35; (10) $3,801.07; (11) $6,858.42; (15).[1]

A. Gerard D. Reilly, 1120 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Foremanship Foundation, 512–20 Harries Building, Dayton, Ohio.

C. (2) Supporting provisions relating to supervisors in the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, and opposing bills contemplating modification or repeal.

D. (6) $1,250.01.

A. James Francis Reilly, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Potomac Electric Power Co., 929 E Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) S. 1691 and H. R. 4830, which became Public Law 323.

D. (6) $3,750.

E. (6) $10; (7) $50; (8) $10; (9) $70; (10) $110; (11) $180.

A. Reserve Officers Association of the United States, 2517 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Legislation for development of a military policy for the United States which will guarantee adequate national security. (3) The Reserve Officer.

A. Retired Officers Association, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2).[1] (3) The Retired Officer.

D. (6) $25,121.58.

A. Retirement Federation of Civil Service Employees of the United States Government, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Retention and improvement of the Civil Service Retirement and United States Employees' Compensation Acts.[1]

D. (6) $10,682.59.

E. (2) $3,504.75; (4) $593.40; (5) $364.46; (6) $30.75; (7) $148.91; (8) $1,776.65; (9) $6,418.92; (10) $5,094.80; (11) $11,513.72; (15).[1]

A. Andrew E. Rice, 1751 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Veterans Committee, Inc., 1751 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Legislation affecting the general welfare, especially in the fields of international affairs, civil rights and liberties, and veterans benefits.

D. (6) $1,480.

E. (7) $20; (9) $20.

A. Roland Rice, 618 Perpetual Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Regular Common Carrier Conference of the American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) The general legislative interest of registrant is the protection and fostering of the interests of federally regulated motor common carriers of general commodities.

D. (6) $900.

A. Siert F. Riepma, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.

B. National Association of Margarine Manufacturers, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.

A. George D. Riley, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Federation of Labor, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) All bills affecting the welfare of the country generally and specifically bills affecting workers.

D. (6) $2,720.

E. (6) $25.85; (7) $263; (8) $94.15; (9) $383.

A. E. W. Rising, 1215 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Water Conservation Conference, 341 Suburban Station Building, Philadelphia, Pa.

C. (2) All legislation relative to development, utilization, and conservation of natural resources, including bills to authorize projects, and appropriations for construction of projects.

E. (2) $193.73; (4) $185.41; (5) $135; (6) $19.89; (7) $2.40; (9) $536.43; (10) $620.95; (11) $1,157.38.

A. E. W. Rising, 1215 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Western Beet Growers Association, Post Office Box 742, Great Falls, Mont.

C. (2) Legislation that may affect or limit the right of the American farmer to grow and market sugar beets.

D. (6) $450.

E. (2) $46.15; (4) $13.10; (5) $31.35; (6) $25.34; (7) $183.73; (9) $299.67; (10) $347.44; (11) $647.11.

A. Paul H. Robbins, 1121 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Society of Professional Engineers, 1121 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) All legislation affecting the interests of professional engineers.

D. (6) $250.

A. Edward O. Rodgers, 1107 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Air Transport Association of America, 1107 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) General legislative interests for the proper advancement of the airline industry.[1]

D. (6) $1,250.

E. (7) $451; (9) $451; (10) $470.77; (11) $921.77.

A. Frank W. Rogers, Suite 801, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Western Oil and Gas Association, 510 West Sixth Street, Los Angeles, Calif.

C. (2) Federal legislation affecting the petroleum industry in Washington, Oregon, California, Arizona, and Nevada.

D. (6) $3,000.

A. Watson Rogers, 527 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.

B. National Food Brokers Association, 527 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2).[1]

D. (6) $1,000.

A. W. Crosby Roper, Jr., 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Empire Zinc Division, the New Jersey Zinc Co., Gilman, Colo.

C. (2) S. 3344 and H. R. 8896, bills to amend the mineral leasing laws to provide for multiple mineral development of the same tracts of the public lands, and for other purposes.

E. (6) $25; (8) $5; (9) $30; (11) $30.

A. George B. Roscoe, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Electrical Contractors Association, Inc., 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

C. (2) Legislation that affects the building construction and electrical industries.

A. Ross-Meehan Foundries, Chattanooga, Tenn.
E. (2) $4,325; (7) $3,251; (9) $7,576.

A. Delbert L. Rucker, 616 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The National Fertilizer Association, Inc., 616 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation that might affect the manufacture or distribution of fertilizer or the general agricultural economy.
D. (6) $25.

A. Albert R. Russell, 162 Madison Avenue, Memphis, Tenn.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 18, Memphis, Tenn.
C. (2) The National Cotton Council of America favors such action on any legislation affecting the raw cotton industry as will promote the purposes for which the council is organized.
D. (6) $277.20.
E. (7) $120.70; (9) $120.70; (10) $48; (11) $168.70.

A. Francis M. Russell, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Broadcasting Co., Inc., 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting National Broadcasting Co., Inc., and/or affiliated companies.
E. (7) $117; (9) $117; (10) $58.75; (11) $175.75.

A. Horace Russell, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. United States Savings and Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Legislation directly or indirectly affecting the savings and loan business.
D. (6) $3,750.
E. (7) $104.19; (9) $104.19; (10) $131.50; (11) $235.69.

A. M. O. Ryan, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Hotel Association, 221 West 57th Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Any and all bills and statutes of interest to the hotel industry.
D. (6) $3,750.
E. (7) $375.61; (9) $376.61; (10) $508.30; (11) $883.91.

A. William H. Ryan, 1029 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. District Lodge No. 44, International Association of Machinists, 1029 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting working conditions of Government employees and, incidentally, organized labor in general.
D. (6) $2,083.33.
E. (7) $50; (9) $50; (10) $15; (11) $65.

A. Robert A. Saltstein, 777 14th Street N W., Washington, D. C.
B. Smaller Magazines Postal Committee, 305 East 46th Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Interested in matters affecting second-class postal rates.
D. (6) $1,250.
E. (2) $17.63; (4) $27.13; (6) $30.86; (7) $77.56; (9) $153.18; (10) $221.54; (11) $374.72.

A. Charles E. Sands, 4211 Second Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Hotel and Restaurant Employee and Bartenders International Union, 525 Walnut Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
C. (2) Labor and social legislation.
D. (7) $1,600.
E. (5) $111.25; (9) $111.25; (11) $222.50.

A. John T. Sapienza, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Fulton Land & Timber Co., 711 Orchard Road, Hagerstown, Md.
C. (2) Current revenue proposals.

A. John T. Sapienza, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Lessees of B. V. Hedrick Gravel & Sand Co., Lilesville, N. C.
C. (2) Depletion legislation, and in particular, the depletion provisions of H. R. 8300.

A. John T. Sapienza, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Hudson Bay Mining & Smelting Co., Ltd., et al.,[1] 500 Royal Bank Building, Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada.
C. (2) Revenue revision.
E. (4) $0.60; (6) $7.37; (9) $7.97; (10) $44.34; (11) $52.31.

A. Harrison Sasscer, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Division of Legislation and Federal Relations of the National Education Association of the United States, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Bills pending before the 83d Congress relating to public education.
D. (6) $59.25.
E. (7) $12.50; (9) $12.50; (10) $5; (11) $17.50.

A. Satterlee, Warfield & Stephens, 49 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.
B. American Nurses' Association, 2 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation relating to nurses, nursing, or health.
D. (6) $3,200.
E. (7) $126.62; (9) $126.62; (11) $126.62.

A. Henry P. Schmidt, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.
B. Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express and Station Employees, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
C. (2) Interested in all legislation affecting labor and especially railroad labor.
D. (6) $1,540.

A. Schoene & Kramer, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Railway Labor Executives Association, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Against H. R. 356; for S. 2930 and H. R. 7840.
E. (6) $14.02; (9) $14.02; (11) $14.02.

A. Ed D. Schorr, 33 North High Street, Columbus, Ohio.
B. The Coal Producers' Committee on Underground Gas Storage Safety, care of W. G. Stevenson, Grant Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.
C. (2) Interest is in legislation pertaining to underground storage of gas.
E. (2) $60; (4) $144; (5) $315.64; (7) $678.68; (9) $1,198.32; (11) $1,198.32.

A. Mildred Scott, 1370 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Federation of the Physically Handicapped, Inc., 1370 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) To establish the Federal Agency for Handicapped, etc.[1]
D. (6) $300.
E. (7) $50; (9) $50; (10) $25; (11) $75.

A. Durward Seals, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United Fresh Fruit & Vegetable Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Interested in any legislation affecting the marketing and distribution of fresh fruits and vegetables, directly or indirectly.

A. Hollis M. Seavey, 532 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Clear Channel Broadcasting Service, 532 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Opposed to any proposed legislation calling for the duplication of class I–A clear channel frequencies or the limitation of the power of class I–A standard broadcast stations.
E. (7) $18.90; (9) $18.90; (10) $123.41; (11) $142.31.

A. Harry See, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.
B. Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.
C. (2) Advocating favorable labor legislation and opposing unfavorable labor legislation.
E. (7) $42.96; (9) $42.96; (10) $31.35; (11) $74.31.

A. P. L. Shackelford, Room 413, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington. D. C.
B. Sheet Metal Workers' International Association, 642 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) H. R. 356, S. 1911, H. R. 7840, and S. 2930.
D. (6) $2,250.

A. A. Manning Shaw, Washington Loan and Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
Brown, Lund & Fitzgerald, Washington Loan and Trust Building, Washington, D. C., for National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation that might effect the members of the N. A. E. C.
D. (6) $3,793.99.

A. Mark R. Shaw, 114 Trenton Street, Melrose, Mass.
B. National Council for Prevention of War, 1013 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Favor economic aid to Europe and Asia, etc.[1] (3) Peace Action.
E. (7) $62.01; (9) $62.01; (10) $41.50; (11) $103.51.

A. Leander I. Shelley, 30 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.
B. American Association of Port Authorities, Washington, D. C., and Airport Operators Council, Washington, D. C.
C.[1]
D. (6) $375.
E. (9) $356.01; (10) $356.01; (11) $712.02.

A. Bruce E. Shepherd, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation which might affect the welfare of policyholders and annuitants.
D. (6) $120.

A. Robert H. Shields, 920 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
B. United States Beet Sugar Association, 920 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Interested in any legislation affecting sugar, particularly the Sugar Act of 1948 and related legislation.
D. (6) $10,000.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Earl C. Shively, 16 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.

B. The Ohio Railroad Association, 16 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.

C. (2) Legislation affecting railroad interests.[1]

D. (6) $422.48.

E. (7) $422.48; (9) $422.48; (11) $422.48.

A. Silver Users Association, 1612 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Legislation regarding silver.

D. (6) $795.

E. (2) $6,246.98; (3) $5; (5) $966.51; (6) $342.94; (7) $662.74; (8) $413.95; (9) $8,638.12; (10) $9,266.68; (11) $17,904.60.

A. Six Agency Committee, 315 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif.

C. (2) Legislation affecting California's interest in the Colorado River, etc.[1]

E. (2) $6,305; (8) $133.26; (9) $6,438.26; (10) $3,096.67; (11) $9,534.93; (15).[1]

A. Stephen Slipher, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. United States Savings & Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) Interested in legislation affecting savings and loan associations, housing, home financing, thrift, and financial institutions. (3) Washington Notes.

D. (6) $1,600.

E. (7) $27.75; (9) $27.75; (10) $39.70; (11) $67.45.

A. Smaller Magazines Postal Committee, Room 301, 305 East 46th Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Postal rate legislation.

D. (6) $1,061.

E. (2) $1,580.67; (4) $250; (5) $4.50; (6) $68.83; (7) $211.34; (8) $42.65; (9) $2,157.99; (10) $1,885.38; (11) $4,043.37; (15).[1]

A. Miss Elizabeth A. Smart, 138 Constitution Avenue NE., Washington, D. C.

B. National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, 1730 Chicago Avenue, Evanston, Ill.

C. (2) Legislation dealing with alcohol, narcotics, international relations, women and children.[1]

D. (6) $606.12.

E. (5) $110.25; (6) $55.48; (9) $165.73; (10) $723.32; (11) $889.05.

A. Anthony W. Smith, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Congress of Industrial Organizations, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Regional development, resource conservation, labor relations.

D. (6) $30.

A. Carl K. Smith, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.

B. International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, 330 South Wells Street, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) H. R. 356, S. 1911; H. R. 7840 and S. 2930.

D. (6) $1,323.

A. Fred Smith & Co., Inc., 161 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.

B. Edward Mallinckrodt, 16 West Moreland Place, St. Louis, Mo.

C. (2) Legislation involving conservation principles, including modification of S. 1555 and H. R. 4449 to protect Dinosaur National Monument.

D. (6) $3,000.

E. (2) $1,250; (4) $1,024; (5) $472.30; (6) $236.72; (7) $1,069.10; (8) $709.55; (9) $4,761.75; (10) $4,300.75; (11) $9,062.50; (15).[1]

A. James R. Smith, Manager, 719 Omaha National Bank Building, Omaha, Nebr.

B. Mississippi Valley Association, 1978 Railway Exchange Building, St. Louis, Mo.

C. (2) Legislation relating to river and harbor maintenance improvement; the American merchant marine; soil conservation; flood control; regulation of domestic transportation.

D. (6) $2,400.

E. (10) $368.79.

A. Lloyd W. Smith, 416 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Co., 547 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill., and Great Northern Railway Co., 175 East Fourth Street, St. Paul, Minn.

C. (2) Any legislation affecting directly or indirectly the Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Co. and the Great Northern Railway Co.

D. (6) $3,500.

A. Purcell L. Smith, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2).[1]

D. (6) $3,750.

E. (6) $6.93; (7) $190.37; (8) $56.91; (9) $254.21; (10) $328.80; (11) $583.01;

A. Robert E. Smith, 116 Nassau Street, New York, N. Y.

B. Life Insurance Policyholders Protective Association, 116 Nassau Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) General education concerning the effect of inflation on the purchasing power and value of life insurance, as affected by Federal policies or measures which are deemed to be inflationary, or inflationary retarding, in character.

E. (7) $496.20; (9) $496.20; (10) $865.55; (11) $1,361.75.

A. Spencer M. Smith, Jr., 2144 P Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Forest Conservation Society, 2144 P Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Forestry appropriations and conservation.

D. (6) $150.

A. Sylvester C. Smith, Jr., 763 Broad Street, Newark, N. J.

B. Prudential Insurance Company of America, 763 Broad Street, Newark, N. J.

C. (2) General interest in all legislation affecting the business of the company.

A. J. D. Snyder, 1040 La Salle Hotel, Chicago, Ill.

B. Illinois Railroad Association, 33 South Clark Street, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) Legislation affecting railroads.

D. (6) $825.

A. J. Taylor Soop, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.

B. International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, 330 South Wells Street, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) H. R. 7840, H. R. 356, and S. 1911.

D. (6) $585.

A. Southern States Industrial Council, 1103 Stahlman Building, Nashville, Tenn.

C. (2) Support of legislation favorable to free enterprise system and opposition to legislation unfavorable to that system. (3) Southern States Industrial Council Bulletin.

D. (6) $17,209.50.

E. (2) $16,787.50; (4) $4,401.28; (5) $2,018.38; (6) $165.58; (7) $2,265.52; (8) $481.97; (9) $26,120.23; (10) $24,072.16; (11) $50,192.39.

A. Lyndon Spencer, 305 Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

B. Lake Carriers' Association, 305 Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. Spokesmen for Children, Inc., 20 East 93d Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Better laws for maternal and child health and welfare.

D. (6) $631.13.

E. (1) $25; (4) $133.90; (5) $25.21; (6) $29.07; (9) $213.18; (10) $230.05; (11) $443.23.

A. A. L. Spradling, 1214 Griswold Street, Detroit, Mich.

B. Amalgamated Association of Street, Electric Railway and Motor Coach Employees of America, 1214 Griswold Street, Detroit, Mich.

C. (2) Laws, proposed laws, and proposed amendments to laws affecting the interests of the members of the Amalgamated throughout the United States.

A. Thomas G. Stack, 1104 West 104th Place, Chicago, Ill.

B. National Railroad Pension Forum, Inc., 1104 West 104th Place, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) Bills pending before the 83d Congress relative to increasing benefits for all railroad employees covered by the Railroad Retirement Act. (3) Rail Pension News.

D. (6) $1,500.

E. (1) $214.50; (2) $1,500; (4) $1,400; (6) $93; (7) $1,129.67; (9) $4,337.17; (10) $5,190.09; (11) $9,527.26.

A. Howard M. Starling, 837 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Association of Casualty and Surety Companies, 60 John Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Legislation affecting casualty and surety companies.

D. (6) $150.

E. (7) $12.50; (9) $12.50; (10) $8.75; (11) $21.25.

A. Mrs. Nell F. Stephens, Post Office Box 6234, Northwest Station, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Health and nursing care.

A. Mrs. Alexander (Annalee) Stewart, 214 Second Street NE., Washington, D. C.

B. Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, 214 Second Street NE., Washington, D. C.

C. (3) Four Lights and Washington Newsletter.

D. (6) $11,838.20.

E. (2) $7,559.85; (4) $1,177.70; (5) $3,345.30; (6) $300.53; (7) $977.07; (9) $13,360.45; (10) $9,393.35; (11) $22,753.80.

A. Charles T. Stewart, 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 22 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) Any legislation affecting the real-estate industry.

D. (6) $3,650.14.

E. (7) $115.29; (8) $34.85; (9) $150.14; (10) $225.35; (11) $375.49.

A. Erskine Stewart, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Retail Dry Goods Association, 100 West 31st Street, New York, N. Y.

C.[1]

E. (8) $1.25; (9) $1.25; (10) $1.25; (11) $2.50.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Edwin L. Stoll, 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 22 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) Any legislation affecting the real-estate industry.

D. (6) $2,533.46.

E. (8) $33.46; (9) $33.46; (10) $104.19; (11) $137.65.

A. Sterling F. Stoudenmire, Jr., 61 St. Joseph Street, Mobile, Ala.

B. Waterman Steamship Corp., 61 St. Joseph Street, Mobile, Ala.

C. (2) Any legislation affecting the American Merchant Marine and transportation generally.

D. (6) $1,000.

A. Paul A. Strachan, 1370 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.

B. American Federation of the Physically Handicapped, Inc., 1370 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) To establish the Federal agency for handicapped, etc.

D. (6) $700.

E. (7) $150; (9) $150; (10) $75; (11) $225.

A. O. R. Strackbein, executive secretary, America's Wage Earners' Protective Conference, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) To amend Tariff Act of 1930 and customs simplification bills.

D. (6) $3,000.

A. O. R. Strackbein, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C., legislative counsel for International Allied Printing Trades Association, Box 728, Indianapolis, Ind.

C. (2) Copyright convention bills and liquor advertising bills.

D. (6) $625.

A O. R. Strackbein, as chairman of National Labor-Management Council on Foreign Trade Policy, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) To amend Tariff Act of 1930 and customs simplification bills.

D. (6) $1,625.

A. O. R. Strackbein, as chairman for Nationwide Committee of Industry, Agriculture, and Labor on Import-Export Policy, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) To amend Tariff Act of 1930 and customs simplification bills.

D. (6) $7,500.

A. Arthur D. Strong, 1034 Midland Bank Building, Minneapolis, Minn.

B. Upper Mississippi Waterway Association, 1034 Midland Bank Building, Minneapolis, Minn.

C. (2) All legislation relating to the improvement and development of navigable waterways in the upper Mississippi River, etc.[1]

D. (6) $1,332.24.

A Arthur Sturgis, Jr., 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Retail Federation, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Registrant is generally interested in all legislation and legislative proposals affecting the retail industry, including the industry's relations with the Federal Government, with its suppliers, with its employees, and with its customers.[1]

D. (6) $625.

E. (7) $15.50; (9) $15.50; (10) $3; (11) $18.50.

A. J. M. Sturrock, Post Office Box 2084, Capitol Station, Austin, Tex.

B. Texas Water Conservation Association, Post Office Box 2084, Capitol Station, Austin, Tex.

C. (2) Legislation concerning the development, conservation, protection, and utilization of Texas land and water resources through existing State and Federal agencies, etc.[1] (3) Texas water.

D. (6) $1,500.

E. (2) $51.25; (5) $13.95; (6) $54.33; (7) $834.79; (8) $66.05; (9) $1,020.37; (10) $1,105.10; (11) $2,125.47.

A. Sullivan, Bernard, Shea & Kenney, 804 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Brown Co., Berlin, N. H.

C. (2) Modifications of the Clayton and Federal Trade Commission Acts.

A. Sullivan, Bernard, Shea & Kenny, 804 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Charles T. MacDermott, Jr., 34 Mechanic Street, Worcester, Mass., acting as chairman for a group of companies affected by proposed revenue revision.

C. (2) Proposed 1954 revision of the Internal Revenue Code, H. R. 8300.

E. (10) $2,508.94.

A. Sullivan, Bernard, Shea & Kenny, 804 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Southern Pacific Co., 65 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

C. (2) Proposed 1954 revisions of the Internal Revenue Code.

A. Sullivan, Bernard, Shea & Kenny, 804 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Standard Fruit & Steamship Co., 944 St. Charles Avenue at Lee Circle, New Orleans, La.

C. (2) Proposed 1954 revisions of the Internal Revenue Code.

A. Noble J. Swearingen, 1790 Broadway, New York, N. Y.

B. National Tuberculosis Association, 1790 Broadway, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Legislation affecting general public health, tuberculosis in particular.

D. (6) $865.60.

E. (4) $122.16; (6) $30.84; (7) $446.54; (9) $599.54; (10) $292.97; (11) $892.51; (15).[1]

A. Charles P. Taft, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Legislative Committee of the Committee for a National Trade Policy, 1023 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Legislation relating to foreign economic policy (Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act).

D. (6) $600.

A. Tax Equality Committee of Kentucky, 310 Commerce Building, Lousville, Ky.

C. (2) Advocating revision of section 101, IRC.

D. (6) $513.

E. (2) $146.25; (4) $23.50; (8) $135; (8) $11.69; (9) $316.44; (10) $1,565.59; (11) $1,882.03; (15).[1]

A. Dwight D. Taylor, Jr., Room 400, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Airlines, Inc., Room 400, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Legislation affecting civil aviation.

D. (6) $1,150.

E. (7) $152; (9) $152; (10) $317; (11) $469.

A. Edward D. Taylor, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Manufacturers Institute, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Jay Taylor, 712 First National Bank Building, Amarillo, Tex.

B. American National Cattlemen's Association, 515 Cooper Building, Denver, Colo.

C. (2) Legislation affecting cattle industry.

A. Tyre Taylor, 917 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Southern States Industrial Council, Stahlman Building, Nashville, Tenn.

C. (2) Legislation favorable to the maintenance of a free enterprise system.

D. (5) $3,000.

E. (5) $235.12; (6) $65.85; (7) $141.10; (9) $442.07; (10) $392.71; (11) $834.78; (15) [1].

A. Marjorie L. Temple, Room 200, 1917 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc., 1790 Broadway, New York, N. Y.

C. (2)[1]. (3)[1].

A. John U. Terrell, 424 Wyatt Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Colorado River Association, 306 West Third Street, Los Angeles, Calif.

C. H. R. 4449, S. 1555, S. 964, and H. R. 236.

D. (6) $3,000.

A. Texas Water Conservation Association, 207 West 15th Street, Post Office Box 2084, Capitol Station, Austin, Tex.

C. (2) Legislation concerning the development, conservation, protection, and utilization of Texas' land and water resources through existing State and Federal agencies, (3) Texas Water.

D. (6) $4,227.18.

E. (1) $568.80; (2) $1,908.60; (4) $1,056.92; (5) $826.84; (6) $170.12; (7) $671.42; (8) $844.10; (9) $1,046.80; (10) $6,316.82; (11) $12,363.62; (15)[1].

A. Oliver A. Thomas, 43 Sierra Street, Reno, Nev.

B. Nevada Railroad Association, 43 Sierra Street, Reno, Nev.

C. (2) Legislation affecting the interests of Nevada railroads.

D. (6) $675.

E. (6) $24.70; (7) $693.40; (9) $718.10; (10) $549.23; (11) $1,267.33; (15).[1]

A. Chester C. Thompson, 1319 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. The American Waterways Operators, Inc., 1319 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) All matters affecting barge and towing vessel industry and water transportation.

D. (6) $6,500.

E. (7) $165.30; (9) $165.30; (10) $274.85; (11) $440.15.

A. Julia C. Thompson, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Nurses' Association, Inc., 2 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.

C. (2).[1] (3).[1]

D. (6) $1,464.61.

A. Eugene M. Thoré, 1701 K Street, Washington, D. C.

B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Legislation which might affect the welfare of policyholders and annuitants.

D. (6) $3,000.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

E. (7) $79.97; (9) $79.97; (10) $21.41; (11) $101.38.

A. G. D. Tilghman, 1604 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Disabled Officers Association, 1604 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Legislation pertaining to the pay of military personnel.

D. (6) $2,750.

E. (10) $48.50; (11) $48.50.

A. E. W. Tinker, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.

B. American Paper & Pulp Association, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Legislative interests are those of employer.

D. (6) $500.

E. (6) $150; (7) $200; (9) $350; (10) $350; (11) $700.

A. William H. Tinney, 211 Southern Building, 15th and H Streets NW., Washington, D. C.

B. The Pennsylvania Railroad Co., 1740 Suburban Station Building, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. H. Willis Tobler, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Any legislation that may affect milk producers or the cooperatives through which they act together to process and market their milk. (3) News for Dairy Co-ops and the Alert.

D. (6) $2,481.40.

E. (5) $73.95; (6) $10.62; (7) $21.85; (9) $106.42; (10) $589.80; (11) $696.22.

A. John H. Todd, 1085 Shrine Building, Memphis, Tenn.

B. National Cotton Compress & Cotton Warehouse Association, 1085 Shrine Building, Memphis, Tenn.

C. (2) Legislation affecting the cotton compress and cotton warehouse industry.

D. (6) $166.67.

A. Bernard Topkis, 1316 New Hampshire Avenue, Washington, D. C.

B. Hickory Handle Association, Jonesboro, Ark.

C. (2) Improve trade legislation.

A. Wallace Townsend, 306 Commercial National Bank Building, Little Rock, Ark.

B. Southwestern Gas & Electric Co., Shreveport, La.

C. (2) Appropriation for the Southwestern Power Administration.

D. (6) $600.

A. Estate of Harry C. Trexler, 1227 Hamilton Street, Allentown, Pa.

C. (2) Seeking amendment to Internal Revenue Code.

A. Harold J. Turner, Henry Building, Portland, Oreg.

B. Spokane, Portland & Seattle Railway Co., Southern Pacific Co., and Union Pacific Railroad Co., Henry Building, Portland, Oreg.

C. (2) All bills which directly affect railroads of Oregon.

A. Unemployed Service Association, 623 Third Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Various proposals for unemployed.

A. United Cerebral Palsy Associations, Inc., 369 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Appropriations for public health.

E. (1) $999.99; (7) $260.84; (9) $1,260.83; (10) $2,625.83; (11) $3,886.66.

A. United States Cuban Sugar Council, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2).[1] (3).[1]

D. (6) $49,078.59.

E. (1) $3,794.56; (2) $1,239.50; (4) $2,076.96; (5) $205.24; (6) $56.53; (9) $7,372.79; (10) $4,405.76; (11) $11,778.55; (15).[1]

A. United States Savings & Loan League, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2).[1] (3).[1]

D.[1]

E. (2) $4,820.60; (4) $9,504.42; (5) $700.37; (6) $584.27; (7) $193.13; (8) $430.10; (9) $16,232.89; (10) $19,416.40; (11) $35,649.29; (15).[1]

A. Arvin E. Upton, 1826 Jefferson Place NW., Washington, D. C.

B. St. Regis Paper Co., 230 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Legislation to authorize the Secretary of Defense, on behalf of the United States, to execute and deliver a deed to St. Regis Paper Co. conveying to said company certain rights in real property located in Jefferson County, N. Y., erroneously conveyed to the United States by said paper company in a deed dated October 6, 1941, as a part of the lands acquired by the Government for Pine Camp Military Reservation, now known as Camp Drum.

E. (6) $3.13; (8) $1.48; (9) $4.61; (10) $7.65; (11) $12.26.

A. A. L. Viles, 444 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.

B. The Rubber Manufacturers Association, Inc., 444 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y., and 1832 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Virginia Associated Businessmen, 512 Travelers Building, Richmond, Va.

C. (2) Legislation to equalize income taxes of the mutuals, the cooperatives, and similar organizations with their taxpaying competitors. (3).[1]

D. (6) $1,191.

E. (2) $1,000; (4) $964.57; (5) $300; (6) $2.78; (7) $127.37; (8) $143.62; (9) $2,538.34; (10) $2,910.60; (11) $5,248.94; (15).[1]

A. Vitrified China Association, Inc., 931 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.

A. The Vulcan Detinning Co., Sewaren, N. J.

A. Paul H. Walker, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Legislation which might affect the welfare of policyholders and annuitants.

D. (6) $50.

A. Stephen M. Walter, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

D. (6) $2,091.24.

E. (7) $97.47; (8) $16.76; (9) $114.23; (10) $62.12; (11) $176.35.

A. Thomas G. Walters, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Room 509, Washington, D. C.

B. Government Employees' Council, Room 509, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Duties are to represent the member unions and the Government Employees' Council on matters affecting them before the Congress.

D. (6) $2,625.

A. Quaife M. Ward, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Retail Federation, 1625 I Street N. W., Washington, D. C.

C. (2).[1]

D. (6) $1,000.

E. (7) $27.45; (9) $27.45; (11) $27.45.

A. Milo J. Warner, 904 Nicholas Building, Toledo, Ohio.

B. The Prudential Insurance Company of America, Newark, N. J.

C. (2) Legislation which may affect the interests of the mutual policyholders of the Prudential Insurance Company of America.

D. (6) $10,500.

E. (5) $1,886.43; (7) $1,886.43; (8) $417.86; (9) $2,304.29.

A. Washington Board of Trade, 1616 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Legislation affecting the District of Columbia, of interest to the Washington Board of Trade.

A. Washington Home Rule Committee, Inc., 1717 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) S. 2413, a bill to provide local self-government for the District of Columbia.

D. (6) $4,842.73.

E. (2) $1,963.04; (4) $389.58; (5) $937.11; (6) $157.18; (8) $856.26; (9) $4,303.17; (10) $4,200.08; (11) $8,503.25; (15).[1]

A. Washington Real Estate Board, Inc., 312 Wire Building, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) All local measures affecting the District of Columbia.

A. Vincent T. Wasilewski, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Registrant is interested in any legislation—local, State, Federal, or international—which affects the broadcasting industry.

A. Waterways Council Opposed to Regulation Extension, Room 1610, 21 West Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) S. 3111. (3) Pamphlet entitled "A Danger to American Industry and to the Public."

D. (6) $25,450.

E. (2) $5,548.93; (4) $1,355.93; (5) $261.81; (6) $53.75; (8) $150; (9) $7,370.42; (11) $7,370.42; (15).[1]

A. J. R. Watson, Room 1, I. C. R. R. Passenger Station, Jackson, Miss.

B. Mississippi Railroad Association, Room 1, I. C. R. R. Passenger Station, Jackson, Miss.

C. (2) Legislation affecting railroads in Mississippi.

A. William H. Webb, 1720 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Rivers and Harbors Congress, 1720 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) All matters pertaining to river and harbor improvement, flood control, navigation, irrigation, reclamation, soil and water conservation, and related subjects.

D. (6) $2,148.93.

E. (4) $122; (7) $235.26; (8), $306; (9) $663.26; (10) $568.55; (11) $1,231.61; (15).[1]

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. E. E. Webster, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.

B. Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees, 12050 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, Mich.

C. (2) All bills affecting railroad employees and labor in general.

D. (6) $3158.69.

A. Wayne M. Weishaar, 1115 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Aeronautical Training Society, 1115 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Registrants is generally interested in legislation affecting aviation training or contract overhaul of aircraft and supports in principle increased use of civil aviation know-how by the armed services through use of the contract principle.

D. (6) $3,300.

E. (3) $2.30; (4) $6.38; (7) $2; (9) $0.68; (10) $1; (11) $11.68.

A. Bernard Weitzer, 3147 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America, 1712 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2).[1]

D. (6) $2,499.96.

E. (5) $121.73; (6) $24.20; (7) $266.93; (8) $16.84; (9) $429.70; (10) $489.49; (11) $919.19.

A. Don Welch, Post Office Box 231, Madill, Okla.

C. (2) The interests of the railroad industry generally.

D. $2,866.81.

E. (7) $1,388.49; (9) $1,388.49; (10) $568.40; (11) $1,952.89; (15).[1]

A. William E. Welsh, 897 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.

B. National Reclamation Association, 897 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Reclamation Act, 1902, and all amendatory and supplementary acts thereto; all other statutes relating to water and land conservation measures.

D. (6) $3,249.99.

E. (7) $439.11; (8) $94.89; (9) $534; (10) $518.47; (11) $1,052.47.

A. Wenchel, Schulman & Manning, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Estate of Mary Clark deBrabant and Katherine C. Williams, 120 Broadway, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Legislative interests relate to a possible revision of section 7 of the Technical Changes Act of 1949 (63 Stat. 895).

E. (6) $46.73 (9) $46.73; (11) $46.73.

A. Charles F. West, Machinists Building, Washington, D. C.

B. International Association of Machinists, Machinists Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Interested in substantially all legislation affecting the socio-economic and political interests of the American workingman, including all pending legislation dealing with social security, national health, aid to physically handicapped, labor relations, displaced persons, etc.

D. (6) $500.

A. West Coast Inland Navigation District, Court House, Bradenton, Fla.

C. (2) Any river and harbor bill affecting the intercoastal waterway from the Caloosahatchee to the Anclete on the west coast of Florida, its rights-of-way and appropriations therefor, for authorization of alternate route and appropriation therefor.

E. (2) $200; (6) $5.18; (7) $4.80; (8) $3.50; (9) $213.48; (11) $213.48.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. A. L. Wheeler, 911 Sheraton Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Marvin Small, 53 Park Place, New York City, and J. George Spitzer, 923 Old Nepperhan Avenue, Yonkers, N. Y.

C. (2) Section 1235 of H. R. 8300 only.

D. (6) $1,000.

E. (6) $19.03; (7) $86.28 (9) $105.31; (11) $105.31.

A. George Y. Wheeler 2d, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Broadcasting Co., Inc., 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Legislation affecting National Broadcasting Co., Inc. and/or its affiliated companies.

E. (7) $15.70; (9) $15.70; (10) $11.50; (11) $27.20.

A. Wheeler & Wheeler, 704 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Missouri Pacific Railroad Co., 25 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Legislative counsel for the above-named organization on any legislation affecting it.

E. (6) $30; (7) $35; (8) $20; (9) $85; (10) $75; (11) $160.

A. John C. White, 838 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.

B. American Cotton Shippers Association, Cotton Exchange Building, Memphis, Tenn.

C. (2) Legislation affecting cotton and foreign trade.

D. (5) $500.

E. (6) $15.73.

A. Richard P. White, 635 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.

B. American Association of Nurserymen, Inc., 635 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Any legislation affecting the nursery industry directly.

D. (6) $3,125.02.

E. (2) $31.25; (4) $11.42; (5) $16.01; (6) $4.89; (7) $4.06; (9) $67.63; (10) $84.74; (11) $152.37.

A. H. Leigh Whitelaw, 60 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.

B. Gas Appliance Manufacturers Association, Inc., 60 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Legislation particularly affecting the interests of manufacturers of gas appliances and equipment.

A. Louis E. Whyte, Suite 501, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, Suite 501, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Any legislation pertaining to natural gas.

D. (6) $750.

A. Elizabeth Wickenden, 544 East 86th Street, New York, N. Y.

B. American Association of Social Workers, 1 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Social security and related welfare legislation. (3) Public Social Policy Bulletins.

D. (6) $475.

A. John J. Wicker, Jr., 501 Mutual Building, Richmond, Va.

B. Mutual Insurance Committee on Federal Taxation, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) All measures affecting taxation of mutual fire and casualty insurance.

D. (6) $2,298.64.

E. (2) $1,550; (5) $487.85; (6) $12.93; (7) $247.86; (9) $2,298.64; (10) $1,790.72; (11) $4,089.36.

A. A. E. Wilkinson, 1511 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Anaconda Copper Mining Co., 616 Hennessy Building, Butte, Mont.

C. (2) In favor of legislation to suspend excise import tax on imported copper.

D. (6) $750.

E. (6) $38.75; (7) $116; (8) $73; (9) $227.75; (10) $184.51; (11) $412.26.

A. Wilkinson, Boyden, Cragun & Barker, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Arapahoe Indian Tribe, Wind River Reservation, Fort Washakie, Wyo.

C. (2) All legislation affecting Indians or Indians tribes.

A. Wilkinson, Boyden, Cragun & Barker, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Indians of California, care of Clyde F. Thompson, Post Office Box 901, Redding, Calif.

C. (2) Registrants are seeking authorization to use funds to the credit of the Indians of California for prosecution of the case entitled *Indians of California* v. *United States*, Docket No. 31, before the Indian Claims Commission, and possible related legislation.

A. Wilkinson, Boyden, Cragun & Barker, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Klamath Indian Tribe, Klamath Agency, Oreg.

C. (2) Supporting H. R. 9188; seeking amendments to S. 2745.

E. (9) $7.90.

A. Wilkinson, Boyden, Cragun & Barker, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Menominee Tribe of Indians, Menominee Indian Agency, Neopit, Wis.

C. (2) All legislation relating to Indian tribes.

E. (6) $16.39; (7) $22.30; (8) $3.23; (9) $41.92; (10) $229.99; (11) $271.91.

A. Wilkinson, Boyden, Cragun & Barker, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Northern Cheyenne Tribe of Indians, Tongue River Reservation, Lame Deer, Mont.

C. (2) All legislation affecting Indians or Indian tribes.

A. Wilkinson, Boyden, Cragun & Barker, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Shoshone-Bannock Tribes of the Fort Hall Reservation, Idaho.

C. (2) Interested in all legislation affecting Indians or Indian tribes or groups.

E. (9) $7.30.

A. Wilkinson, Boyden, Cragun & Barker, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Southern Ute Tribe of the Southern Ute Reservation, Colo.; Consolidated Ute Agency, Ignacio, Colo.

C. (2) Supported legislation to authorize rehabilitation program from tribal funds of the Southern Ute Tribe of Indians in Colorado.

E. (4) $4.75; (7) $14.20; (8) $7.44; (9) $26.39.

A. Franz O. Willenbucher, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Retired Officers Association, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2).[1] (3) The Retired Officer.

D. (6) $1,800.

A. Leon W. Williams, 2 Gouverneur Place, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) H. R. 4108.

D. (6) $1.25.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

E. (4) $16.11; (8) $6.11; (9) $27.73; (10) $33.84.

A. C. J. S. Williamson, 839 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.

B. California State Chamber of Commerce, 350 Bush Street, San Francisco, Calif.

C. (2) Legislation and specific bills or regulations of interest to California economy.

D. (6) $2,952.

E. (2) $2,325; (7) $627; (9) $2,952.

A. Hugh S. Williamson, 1621 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Association of American Ship Owners, 90 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Legislation with respect to maritime matters including river and harbor improvements.

A. James M. Williamson, 1000 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.

B. The J. R. Watkins Co., Winona, Minn.

C. (2) Proposed Revenue Code of 1954 (H. R. 8300).

A. John C. Williamson, 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Realtors' Washington Committee of the National Association of Real Estate Boards, 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Any legislation affecting the real-estate industry.

D. (6) $4,800.

E. (6) $16.50; (7) $1,038.78; (8) $12.50; (9) $1,067.78; (10) $477.62; (11) $1,545.40.

A. Kenneth Williamson, Mills Building, 17th and Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Hospital Association, 18 East Division Street, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $2,566.87.

E. (9) $322.56; (10) $119.99; (11) $442.55.

A. James L. Wilmeth, 3027 North Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

B. The National Council of the Junior Order of United American Mechanics of the United States of North America, Inc.

C. (2) S. 3191 and H. R. 8363, to make unlawful to affiliate with Communist Party; H. R. 8193 and H. R. 8499, revise laws relating to immigration, etc. (3) Junior American.

D. (6) $68.65.

E. (4) $58.65; (5) $10; (9) $68.65; (10) $72.50; (11) $141.

A. E. Raymond Wilson, 104 C Street NE., Washington, D. C.

B. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 104 C Street NE., Washington, D. C.

C. (2).[1] (3) Washington Newsletter.

D. (6) $1,875.

E. (6) $7.87; (7) $271.09; (9) $278.96; (10) $395.14; (11) $674.10.

A. Frank E. Wilson, M. D., 1523 L Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) All bills relating to health and welfare.

D. (6) $900.

E. (7) $321.55; (9) $321.55; (10) $298.10; (11) $619.65.

A. Everett T. Winter, 1978 Railway Exchange Building, St. Louis, Mo.

B. Mississippi Valley Association, 1978 Railway Exchange Building, St. Louis, Mo.

C. (2) Legislation relating to river and harbor maintenance and improvement; the American Merchant Marine; soil conservation; flood control; regulation of domestic transportation.

D. (6) $3,750.

E. (7) $558.04; (9) $558.04; (10) $482.32; (11) $1,040.36.

A. Theodore Wiprud, 1718 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. The Medical Society of the District of Columbia, 1718 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Legislation pertaining to the practice of medicine and all related services and that affecting the public health, including extension of social security into the field of the practice of medicine. (3) Medical Annals of the District of Columbia.

A. Wisconsin Railroad Association, 122 West Washington Avenue, Madison, Wis.

C. (2) Legislation affecting railroads and transportation generally.

D. (6) $1,117.94.

E. (2) $593.30; (7) $524.64; (9) $1,117.94; (11) $1,117.94.

A. Walter F. Woodul, Chronicle Building, Houston, Tex.

B. Angelina & Neches River Railroad Co., Keltys, Tex., et al.[1]

C. (2) Generally legislation affecting Texas railroads.

D. (6) $6,663.23.

E. (6) $147.73; (7) $1,700.78; (9) $1,848.51; (10) $1,519.83; (11) $3,368.34; (15).[1]

A. Walter F. Woodul, Chronicle Building, Houston, Tex.

B. Humble Oil & Refining Co., Houston, Tex.

C. (2) Legislation that may affect the oil and gas industry.

D. (6) $873.46.

E. (6) $73.87; (7) $850.39; (9) $924.26; (10) $759.91; (11) $1,684.17; (15).[1]

A. Albert Young Woodward, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Signal Oil & Gas Co., 811 West Seventh Street, Los Angeles, Calif.

C. (2) Legislation introduced in the Congress affecting the Signal Oil & Gas Co. and its operations and interests.

E. (2) $526.10; (6) $223.48; (7) $1,587.79; (8) $499.21; (9) $2,836.58; (11) $2,836.58; (15).[1]

A. Frank K. Woolley, 261 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) Legislation affecting agriculture.[1]

D. (6) $2,250.

E. (7) $80.25; (9) $80.25; (10) $101.04; (11) $181.29.

A. Edward W. Wootton, 900 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Wine Institute, 717 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

C. (2) Legislation affecting California wine and brandy industry.[1]

A. Donald A. Young, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Chamber of Commerce of the U. S. A.

A. J. Banks Young, 1832 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 18, Memphis, Tenn.

C. (2) The National Cotton Council of America favors such action on any legislation affecting the raw cotton industry as will promote the purposes for which the council is organized.

D. (6) $1,800.

E. (7) $40; (9) $40; (11) $40.

A. O. David Zimring, 11 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill., and 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Railroad labor organizations.

E. (6) $27.22; (9) $27.22; (10) $1,196.83; (11) $1,223.55.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

REGISTRATIONS

The following registrations were submitted for the second calendar quarter 1954:

(NOTE.—The form used for registration is reproduced below. In the interest of economy, questions are not repeated, only the answers are printed, and are indicated by their respective letter and number. Also for economy in the RECORD, lengthy answers are abridged.)

FILE TWO COPIES WITH THE SECRETARY OF THE SENATE AND FILE THREE COPIES WITH THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:

This page (page 1) is designed to supply identifying data; and page 2 (on the back of this page) deals with financial data.

PLACE AN "X" BELOW THE APPROPRIATE LETTER OR FIGURE IN THE BOX AT THE RIGHT OF THE "REPORT" HEADING BELOW:

"PRELIMINARY" REPORT ("Registration"): To "register," place an "X" below the letter "P" and fill out page 1 only.

"QUARTERLY" REPORT: To indicate which one of the four calendar quarters is covered by this Report, place an "X" below the appropriate figure. Fill out both page 1 and page 2 and as many additional pages as may be required. The first additional page should be numbered as page "3," and the rest of such pages should be "4," "5," "6," etc. Preparation and filing in accordance with instructions will accomplish compliance with all quarterly reporting requirements of the Act.

Year: 19______ ◀

REPORT

PURSUANT TO FEDERAL REGULATION OF LOBBYING ACT

P	QUARTER			
	1st	2d	3d	4th
(Mark one square only.)				

NOTE ON ITEM "A".—(a) IN GENERAL. This "Report" form may be used by either an organization or an individual, as follows:

(i) "Employee".—To file as an "employee", state (in Item "B") the name, address, and nature of business of the "employer". (If the "employee" is a firm [such as a law firm or public relations firm], partners and salaried staff members of such firm may join in filing a Report as an "employee".)

(ii) "Employer".—To file as an "employer", write "None" in answer to Item "B".

(b) SEPARATE REPORTS. An agent or employee should not attempt to combine his Report with the employer's Report:

(i) Employers subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their agents or employees.

(ii) Employees subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their employers.

A. ORGANIZATION OR INDIVIDUAL FILING:

1. State name, address, and nature of business.

2. If this Report is for an Employer, list names or agents or employees who will file Reports for this Quarter.

NOTE ON ITEM "B".—*Reports by Agents or Employees.* An employee is to file, each quarter, as many Reports as he has employers, except that: (*a*) If a particular undertaking is jointly financed by a group of employers, the group is to be considered as one employer, but all members of the group are to be named, and the contribution of each member is to be specified; (*b*) if the work is done in the interest of one person but payment therefor is made by another, a single Report—naming both persons as "employers"—is to be filed each quarter.

B. EMPLOYER.—State name, address, and nature of business. If there is no employer, write "None."

NOTE ON ITEM "C".—(*a*) The expression "in connection with legislative interests," as used in this Report, means "in connection with attempting, directly or indirectly, to influence the passage or defeat of legislation." "The term 'legislation' means bills, resolutions, amendments, nominations, and other matters pending or proposed in either House of Congress, and includes any other matter which may be the subject of action by either House"—§ 302 (e).

(*b*) Before undertaking any activities in connection with legislative interests, organizations and individuals subject to the Lobbying Act are required to file a "Preliminary" Report (Registration).

(*c*) After beginning such activities, they must file a "Quarterly" Report at the end of each calendar quarter in which they have either received or expended anything of value in connection with legislative interests.

C. LEGISLATIVE INTERESTS, AND PUBLICATIONS in connection therewith:

1. State approximately how long legislative interests are to continue. If receipts and expenditures in connection with legislative interests have terminated, ☐ place an "X" in the box at the left, so that this Office will no longer expect to receive Reports.

2. State the general legislative interests of the person filing and set forth the *specific* legislative interests by reciting: (*a*) Short titles of statutes and bills; (*b*) House and Senate numbers of bills, where known; (*c*) citations of statutes, where known; (*d*) whether for or against such statutes and bills.

3. In the case of those publications which the person filing has caused to be issued or distributed, in connection with legislative interests, set forth: (*a*) Description, (*b*) quantity distributed; (*c*) date of distribution, (*d*) name of printer or publisher (if publications were paid for by person filing) or name of donor (if publications were received as a gift).

(Answer items 1, 2, and 3 in the space below. Attach additional pages if more space is needed)

4. If this is a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) rather than a "Quarterly" Report, state below what the nature and amount of anticipated expenses will be; and if for an agent or employee, state also what the daily, monthly, or annual rate of compensation is to be. If this is a "Quarterly" Report, disregard this item "C4" and fill out item "D" and "E" on the back of this page. Do not attempt to combine a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) with a "Quarterly" Report.◀

AFFIDAVIT

[Omitted in printing]

PAGE 1◀

A. American Superphosphate Institute, Post Office Box 905, Alexandria, Va.

C. (2) Legislation which will affect the broad phases of agriculture and the well-being of the superphosphate industry. (4) Agents' salary, $8,000 per annum; anticipated expenses not to exceed $800.

A. American Zionist Committee for Public Affairs, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) The mutual-security program. (4) Salaries and publications estimated at $10,000.

A. Joel Barlow, Walter Slowinski, and Walker Winter, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Eastern Corp., Bangor, Maine.

C. (2) The general legislative interests concern the current revenue revision.

A. F. W. H. Beauchamp, 26 O'Farrell Street, San Francisco, Calif.

B. Transportation Association of America, 130 North Wells Street, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) Legislation having anything to do with transportation. (4) $12,000 yearly salary and expenses incurred in connection with association business.

A. Fleming Bomar and Robert J. Bird, 306 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Community Services, Inc., Graniteville, S. C.

C. (2) H. R. 9388.

A. Richard Fyfe Boyce, Route 1, Box 284, Alexandria, Va.

B. Diplomatic and consular officers, retired, 3816 Huntington Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Legislation affecting the foreign service and its active and retired personnel.

A. Boykin & DeFrancis, Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Studiengesellscraft fur Privatrechtliche Auslandsinteressen E. V., Contrescarpe 46, Bremen, Germany.

C. (2) Interested in all bills affecting the Trading With the Enemy Act.

A. Homer L. Brinkley, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (4) Annual rate of compensation, $20,000.

A. Derek Brooks, 5709 Franklin Avenue, Falls Church, Va.

B. New York Board of Trade, International Trade Section, 291 Broadway, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Guaranties against the risk of nonpayment by foreign debtors due to currency inconvertibility, exchange transfer block, and other noncommercial hazards. (4) $42.50 per diem, plus expenses.

A. Brown, Lund & Fitzgerald, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American and Foreign Power Co., Inc., 2 Rector Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Revenue Act of 1954.

A. Henry H. Brylawski, 1109 Woodward Building, Washington, D. C.

B. District of Columbia Business Practices Council, 1109 Woodward Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) All legislation affecting businessmen in the District of Columbia. (4) Ordinary office expenses; compensation, $200 per month.

A. Francis J. Buckley, 2423 West Second Street, Chester, Pa.

B. Ross-Meehan Foundries, 1601 Carter Street, Chattanooga, Tenn.

C. (2) Continuation of broad production base policy for defense materiel. (4) Approximately $1,000.

A. Justice M. Chambers, 2517 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. M. Golodetz & Co., 120 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Congressional activity in the development of the strategic stockpiling program of the United States.

A. Warren A. Clohisy, 1500 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Mail Order Association of America, 1500 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Postal legislation bills affecting the mail-order business, both as to mail-order companies and their customers.

A. Committee for Collective Security, 90 John Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2).[1] (3).[1] (4) approximately $1,000.

A. Committee on Foreign Trade Education, Inc., Building A, Room 801, 270 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Legislation affecting import and export trade of United States. (3) COFTE News. (4) Anticipated expenses would be $167 per month.

A. Committee for the Return of Confiscated German and Japanese Property, 1013 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) It is the purpose of this committee to support the sanctity of private property in international relations, and hence it is promoting the amendment of the Trading With the Enemy Act to authorize the return of German and Japanese property confiscated by the Government of the United States. (4) $1,300 per month.

A. Conference on State Defense, 111 Eighth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Opposition to Federal taxation of State and local government bond interest. (4) $1,000 per annum.

A. Cotton, Brenner & Wrigley, 225 Broadway, New York, N. Y.

B. Martin Aloysius Madden, 27 West 96th Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) For the relief of Martin Aloysius Madden.

A. Dr. Edwin L. Crosby, 18 East Division Street, Chicago, Ill.

B. American Hospital Association, 18 East Division Street, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) Legislation affecting hospitals. (4) Annual rate of salary, $30,000.

A. Charles W. Davis, 1 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

B. Chicago Bridge & Iron Co., 1305 West 105th Street, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) Proposed Internal Revenue Code of 1954, relating to the tax treatment of income derived from foreign sources.

A. Charles W. Davis, 1 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

B. The Copley Press, Inc., 428 Downer Place, Aurora, Ill.

C. (2) Provisions of 1954 revenue revision bill relating to corporate distributions and adjustments, including corporate liquidations.

A. Charles W. Davis, 1 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

B. The Singer Manufacturing Co., 149 Broadway, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Proposed Internal Revenue Code of 1954, relating to the tax treatment of income derived from foreign sources.

A. Waters S. Davis, Jr., League City, Tex.

B. The National Association of Soil Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.

C. (2) Legislative interests will be exclusively those of my employer as stated in its preliminary report. (4) Anticipated travel expenses for legislative purposes, $650.

A. M. DeTar, Suite 1121, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Oil Jobbers Council, Suite 708, Ferguson Building, Springfield, Ill.

C. (2) Legislation which would restrict importation of crude oil and/or petroleum products, and establish a national fuels policy. (4) Expenses estimated at $1,500.

A. District of Columbia Business Practices Council, 1109 Woodward Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Legislation affecting businessmen in the District of Columbia. (4) Salary of executive secretary and expenses.

A. Eastern Corp., Bangor, Maine.

C. (2) Legislative interests concern the current revenue revision.

A. A. J. Edgar, 1601 Carter Street, Chattanooga, Tenn.

B. Ross-Meehan Foundries, 1601 Carter Street, Chattanooga, Tenn.

C. (2) Continuation of broad production base policy for defense materiel. (4) Approximately $1,000.

A. Newell W. Ellison, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Empire Zinc Division, the New Jersey Zinc Co., Gilman, Colo.

C. (2) S. 3344 and H. R. 8896—bills to amend the mineral leasing laws to provide for multiple mineral development of the same tracts of the public lands, and for other purposes.

A. Emergency Committee on Natural Resources, 709 Wire Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Conservation of natural resources.

A. Charles J. Fain, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Legislation affecting rural electrification programs. (4) $10,000 annual salary.

A. Forest Conservation Society of America, 2144 P Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Forest conservation.

A. Fowler, Leva, Hawes & Symington, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Waterways Council Opposed to Regulation Extension, 21 West Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Legislation related to extension of regulation to bulk carriers on waterways. (4) Compensation based on time spent, minimum $3,500, maximum $10,000 and expenses.

A. Nolen J. Fuqua, Duncan, Okla.

B. The National Association of Soil Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.

C. (2) Legislative interests will be exclusively those of my employer as stated in its preliminary report. (4) Anticipated travel expenses for legislative purposes, $550.

A. Daniel B. Goldberg, 111 Eighth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

B. Conference on State Defense, 111 Eighth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Opposition to Federal taxation of State and local government bond interest.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Charles A. Grant, 1450 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
B. Silk and Rayon Printers and Dyers Association of America, Inc., 1450 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Seeks legislation creating a regulatory commission. (4) Regular salary and expenses.

A. Paul S. Green, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Zionist Committee for Public Affairs, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) The mutual security program. (4) Compensation at the rate of $800 a month.

A. John H. Gunn, Boatmen's Bank Building, St. Louis, Mo.
B. Transportation Association of America, 130 North Wells Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Legislation having anything to do with transportation. (4) $7,800 yearly salary and reimbursement of actual expenses incurred.

A. Hardboard Association, 30 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Legislation that would change the classification of hardboard tariffwise, protection against dumping and increased imports. (4) Estimated expenses $2,000.

A. Bernard C. Harter, 5402 Albemarle Street, Washington, D. C.
B. Dr. A. B. Baker, chairman, the Committee for Research in Neurological Disorders, University Hospital, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn.
C. (2) Appropriation bills in House and Senate on neurological research. (4) Annual compensation, $7,500 and travel expenses.

A. Patrick B. Healy, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation that may affect milk producers or the cooperatives through which they act together to process and market their milk. (4) Salary of $10,000 per annum and expenses.

A. George R. Heidrich, Charles Town, W. Va.
B. The National Associaiton of Soil Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.
C. (2) Legislative interests will be exclusively those of my employer as stated in its preliminary report. (4) Anticipated travel expenses for legislative purposes, $400.

A. Samuel H. Horne, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Chicago Bridge & Iron Co., 1305 West 105th Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

A. Samuel H. Horne, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The Singer Manufacturing Co., 149 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

A. Samuel H. Horne, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Underwriters Service Corp., Meridian, Miss.
C. (2) Proposed Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

A. Kenneth N. Hurley, 2700 16th Street South, Arlington, Va.
C. (2) Tax and finance.

A. Whitney W. Orons, Post Office Box 46, Seabrook, Md.
C. (2) Any legislation which may affect, directly or indirectly, the value of my personal investment in railroad securities.

A. Frank G. Johnson, 823 Dupont Circle Building, Washington, D. C., and Kake, Alaska.
B. National Congress of American Indians, 823 Dupont Circle Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting Indians, Indian tribes, bands, or groups in the United States and Alaska. (3) The Washington Bulletin. (4) $65 per week.

A. Reuben L. Johnson, Jr.
B. Farmers Educational and Cooperative Union of America, 1417 California Street, Denver, Colo., and 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation on matters of interest to the National Farmers Union. (4) $5,400 per annum, all expenses incurred by me are paid by the National Farmers Union.

A. Phillip E. Jones, 1001 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
B. United States Beet Sugar Association, 1001 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Interested in any legislation affecting sugar. (4) $17,000 annual salary plus expenses.

A. James P. Kem, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Conference for Inland Waterways Dry-Bulk Regulation, 402 Commonwealth Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislative interest is to bring about an amendment of section 303 (b) of the Interstate Commerce Act.

A. James P. Kem, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Field Enterprises—Educational Division, Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) To obtain change in tax treatment for taxpayers electing to use the installment method of accounting.

A. James P. Kem, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Field Foundation, Inc., 135 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) To obtain amendment in proposed tax law affecting real-estate holdings of charitable organizations.

A. James P. Kem, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Johnston, Lemon & Co., Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) The legislative interest is opposition to H. R. 3998.

A. I. L. Kenen, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Zionist Committee for Public Affairs, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) The mutual security program. (4) $1,166.66 a month.

A. John A. Killick, Hotel Statler, New York, N. Y., and 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Eastern Meat Packers Association, Hotel Statler, New York, N. Y., and 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) General interest in legislation affecting meat-packing industry. (4) $35, estimated for legislature purposes.

A. Joseph William Kinghorne, 1365 Iris Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Broiler Association, Inc., 77 West Washington Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Legislation that may tend to affect the production and/or marketing of commercial broilers. (4) Annual salary is $1,200 plus incidental office expense.

A. Rowland F. Kirks, 1026 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Automobile Dealers Association, 1026 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting retail automobile and truck dealers.

A. Edith C. Krogh, 130 North Wells Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Transportation Association of America, 130 North Wells Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Legislation having anything to do with transportation. (4) $9,200 yearly salary; reimbursement of actual expenses incurred.

A. Dillard B. Lasseter, Chevy Chase Club, Chevy Chase, Md.
B. Organization of Professional Employees of the United States Department of Agriculture, Post Office Box 381, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation to enable Federal employees to qualify for United States civil service retirement service credit for time formerly spent working in Federal-State programs, such as H. R. 1553. (4) $500, to include all expenses incurred by me.

A. Leon B. Lent, 14th and F Streets NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Federal Retirement Protective Association, room 1147, National Press Building, 14th and F Streets NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting retirement interests of Federal employees. (3) $200 per month.

A. Walter Lichtenstein, 105 West Madison Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Gardner & Jones, 105 West Madison Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Norman M. Littell, 1826 Jefferson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Wade Crawford and 11 associated Klamath Indians.[1]
C. (2) H. R. 7320 and S. 2745. (4) Compensation $1,100 plus expenses.

A. Leonard Lopez, 1029 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. District Lodge No. 44, International Association of Machinists, 1029 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Lucas & Thomas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Mobile Homes Manufacturers Association, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) General legislation affecting mobile homes. (4) Compensation $1,000 per quarter and $200 expenses.

A. Roy M. Lynnes, 77 West Washington Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. National Broiler Association, Inc., 77 West Washington Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Interested in any legislation that may tend to affect the production and/or marketing of commercial broilers. (4) Annual salary $1,200.

A. Charles T. McGavin, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Parking Association, Inc., 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Opposed to encroachment of Government into field of private enterprise. (4) $4 per hour.

A. Ellis W. Manning, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Shell Oil Co., 50 West 50th Street, New York, N. Y.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

C. (2) Proposed revision of section 501 (e) of H. R. 8300.

A. Ellis W. Manning, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Shell Oil Co., 50 West 50th Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Proposed Senate amendment to section 403 (c) (3) of H. R. 8300.

A. Ellis W. Manning, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. General Motors Corp., Detroit, Mich.

C. (2) Proposed revision of section 861 (a) (1) of H. R. 8300.

A. Ellis W. Manning, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. General Motors Corp., Detroit, Mich.

C. (2) Proposed revision of section 1035 of H. R. 8300.

A. Miller & Chevalier, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C.

B. Affiliated Gas Equipment, Inc., 17877 St. Clair Avenue, Cleveland, Ohio.

C. (2) Affiliated is interested in provisions of H. R. 8300 having to do with restricted stock options.

A. Miller & Chevalier, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C.

B. Sears, Roebuck & Co., Homan & Arthington, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) H. R. 8300, having to do with pension and profit-sharing trusts, deduction for dividends received, and income from retail establishments in foreign countries.

A. Miller & Chevalier, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C.

B. Young & Rubicam, Inc., 285 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Interest is in the enactment of H. R. 6339, a bill to amend section 459 (d) of the Internal Revenue Code.

A. Miller & Chevalier, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C.

B. Sierra Talc & Clay Co., Post Office Box 390, South Pasadena, Calif.

C. (2) H. R. 8300, covering percentage depletion.

A. Joseph L. Miller, 1025 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) All Federal legislation of concern to the northern textile industry. (4) $1,500 fees; $150 expenses.

A. Seymour S. Mintz, William T. Plumb, Jr., and Robert K. Eifler, 810 Colorado Building, Washington, D. C.

B. John H. Davis et al., Seattle, Wash.

C. (2) Revision of the proposed Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (H. R. 8300).

A. Seymour S. Mintz, William T. Plumb, Jr., and Robert K. Eifler, 810 Colorado Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Hughes Tool Co., Houston, Tex.

C. (2) Revision of proposed Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (H. R. 8300).

A. Mobile Homes Manufacturers Association, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) Housing Act of 1954, as well as all legislative measures affecting mobile homes. (4) anticipated expenses $5,000.

A. Douglas G. Mode, 705 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Bridgeport Brass Co., Bridgeport, Conn.

C. (2) Legislation providing for continuation of the suspension of certain import taxes on copper; (4) annual compensation and expenses $3,000.

A. Albert H. Monacelli, 161 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.

B. Stockholders of Bessemer Securities Corp., 465 East 57th Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) H. R. 8300 (Internal Revenue Code of 1954).

A. Francis A. Mulhern, 111 8th Avenue, New York City, N. Y.

B. Conference on State Defense, 111 8th Avenue, New York City, N. Y.

C. (2) Opposition to Federal taxation of State and local bond interest.

A. Andrew P. Murphy, Jr., 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Association of Home Builders of the United States, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Generally interested in legislation affecting construction and housing. (4) Annual salary $9,000, expenses about $20 per month.

A. National Association of Soil Conservation District, League City, Tex.

C. (2) National legislation relating to the soil resources of the Nation.

A. National Congress of American Indians, Dupont Circle Building, Room 823, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) This association is interested in all legislation affecting Indians, Indian tribes, bands, or groups in the United States and Alaska. (3) The Washington Bulletin.

A. National Council of Salesmen's Organizations, Inc., 80 West 40th Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) General legislation of interest to wholesale salesmen including Federal income tax, Jenkins-Keogh bill, H. R. 6483. (4) $500 per year.

A. National Federation of Post Office Motor Vehicle Employees, 412 5th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) All legislation of interest to post office motor vehicle employees.

A. National Wool Growers Association, 414 Pacific National Life Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.

C. (2) S. 2911 and H. R. 7775, Wool Act; S. 2313, to include grease wool under the Commodity Exchange Act; S. 2548 and H. R. 6787, grazing bill; S. 2862, McCarran labor bill.

A. Nordlinger, Riegelman, Benetar & Charney, 420 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y.

B. Silk and Rayon Printers and Dyers Association of America, Inc., 1450 Broadway, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Enactment of a law creating regulatory commission.

A. Nordlinger, Riegelman, Benetar & Charney, 420 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y.

B. Webb & Knapp, Inc., 383 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Redevelopment of southwest section of Washington, D. C.

A. Frank Norton, Mercantile Securities Building, Dallas, Tex.

B. Transportation Association of America, 130 North Wells Street, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) I am interested in all legislation having anything to do with transportation. (4) $9,600 yearly salary.

A. James L. Oakes, 139 Main Street, Brattleboro, Vt.

B. Edgar C. Salvesen, 2 Country Hill, Brattleboro, Vt.

C. (2) To prevent prejudice to persons currently receiving social security benefits who are now in noncovered employment. (4) Total compensation not in excess of $100.

A. Herbert R. O'Conor, Mathieson Building, Baltimore, Md.

B. Worthington Corporation, 2 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) H. R. 8300, tax revision legislation.

A. Herbert R. O'Conor, Jr., 10 Light Street, Baltimore, Md.

B. National Automobile Dealers Association, 1026 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Any legislation aimed at enabling automobile manufacturers and their authorized dealers to enter into legal agreements prohibiting the sale of new motor vehicles by authorized dealers to unauthorized persons for resale to customers and include in their selling agreements with their authorized dealers legally enforceable exclusive representation provisions. (4) $1,250 per quarter.

A. Alvin E. Oliver, 600 Ribbs Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Grain and Feed Dealers National Association, 100 Merchants Exchange Building, St. Louis, Mo.

C. (2) Legislation affecting the grain and feed trade.

A. Robert Oliver, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Congress of Industrial Organizations, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Support all legislation favorable to the national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and general welfare; oppose legislation detrimental to these objectives.

A. Robert S. Palmer, 203 State Office Building, Denver, Colo.

B. Colorado Plateau Uranium Committee.

C. (2) Legislation affecting mining in general and uranium in particular.

A. Lovell H. Parker, Colorado Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Tax legislation with respect to excise tax on automobile accessories.

A. Parker, Milliken & Kohlmeier, 650 South Spring Street, Los Angeles, Calif.

B. The Farmers & Merchants National Bank of Los Angeles, as trustee of the Mary Paula Ball Trust, Fourth and Main Streets, Los Angeles, Calif.

C. (2) To establish the value at the date of death of Mary Paula Ball, deceased, as the income-tax basis for certain property included in the estate of said decedent for Federal estate tax. (4) $10,000 compensation, plus $1,000 estimated expenses.

A. Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison, 1614 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Field Enterprises—Educational Division, Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) To obtain change in tax treatment for taxpayers electing to use the installment method of accounting.

A. Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison, 1614 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Field Foundation, Inc., 135 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) To obtain amendment in proposed tax law affecting real-estate holdings of charitable organizations.

A. Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison, 575 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.

B. Fifty Broadway Building, Inc., 50 Broadway, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Representation in connection with obtaining an amendment to proposed provisions in H. R. 8300 with respect to corporate liquidation.

A. Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison, 1614 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. The Sixty Trust, 1109 Hospital Trust Building, Providence, R. I.

C. (2) To obtain amendment in proposed tax law affecting investments of pension and profit-sharing trusts.

A. Catherine A. Pearce, 130 North Wells Street, Chicago, Ill.

B. Transportation Association of America, 130 North Wells Street, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) Legislation having anything to do with transportation. (4) $5,100 yearly salary, plus actual expenses.

A. Mrs. Helen L. Peterson, 823 Dupont Circle Building, Washington, D. C.

B. National Congress of American Indians, 823 Dupont Circle Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) I am interested in all legislation affecting Indians, Indian tribes, bands, or groups in the United States and Alaska. (3) The Washington Bulletin. (4) $600 per month.

A. J. Hardin Peterson, Lakeland, Fla.

B. Tomoka Land Co., 8-10 West Center Street, Sebring, Fla.

C. (2) For modification of section 1237, H. R. 8300, making same applicable to corporations on lands held more than 10 years and for similar legislation. (4) $500 retainer, plus expenses.

A. J. Hardin Peterson, Cochrane Building, Lakeland, Fla.

B. West Coast Inland Navigation District, Court House, Bradenton, Fla.

C. (2) Any river and harbor bill affecting the Intercoastal West Coast Waterway, its right-of-ways, and appropriations therefor; for authorization of alternate route and for appropriations therefor. (4) $200 per month.

A. Percy W. Phillips and Robert J. Bird, 306 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.

B. The Minot Mercantile Corp., care of Equitable Trust Co., Wilmington, Del.

C. (2) H. R. 8300.

A. Radner, Zito, Kominers & Fort, 520 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Pacific Far East Line, Inc., 141 Battery Street, San Francisco, Calif.

C. (2) Legislation authorizing Federal Maritime Board to reprice and sell certain Government-owned vessels.

A. Redevelopment Builders of New York, 110 East 42d Street, New York City, N. Y.

C. (2) In favor of certain redevelopment housing legislation. (4) Total fee $10,000.

A. James Francis Reilly, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Potomac Electric Power Co., 929 E Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) S. 3387, S. 1403, and H. R. 3898.

A. Harry Rieck, Preston, Md.

B. The National Association of Soil Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.

A. Frank M. Robbins, 1601 Carter Street, Chattanooga, Tenn.

B. Ross-Meehan Foundries, 1601 Carter Street, Chattanooga, Tenn.

C. (2) Continuation of broad production base policy for defense material. (4) Approximately $2,000.

A. G. A. Robinson, 1520 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Clay Pipe Manufacturers, Inc., 1520 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) All legislation affecting business, particularly public health and sanitation. (4) Expenses of less than $200 a month.

A. Robert Emmet Rodes, 34 West 65th Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Enforcement of United States treaties with Morocco.

A. W. Crosby Roper, Jr., 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Empire Zinc Division, the New Jersey Zinc Co., Gilman, Colo.

C. (2) S. 3344 and H. R. 8896, bills to amend the mineral leasing laws.

A. Ross-Meehan Foundries, Chattanooga, Tenn.

C. (2) Continuation of broad production base policy for defense materiel. (4) Approximately $5,000.

A. Jack Garrett Scott, 839 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Association of Motor Bus Operators.

C. (2) All proposed legislation which would affect the intercity motorbus industry.

A. Salvage, Lee & Chase, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. New York Coffee and Sugar Exchange, 113 Pearl Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) All legislation affecting the New York Coffee and Sugar Exchange.

A. Silk & Rayon Printers & Dyers Association of America, Inc., 1450 Broadway, New York, N. Y.

(C) (2) Seeks enactment of law creating regulatory commission.

A. Russell Singer, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Fleming Bomar & Robert J. Bird, 306 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.

B. American Automobile Association.

C. (2) H. R. 8300.

A. Fred Smith & Co., Inc., 161 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.

B. Edward Mallinckrodt, 16 West Moreland Place, St. Louis, Mo.

C. (2) Legislation involving conservation principles, including modification of S. 1555 and H. R. 4449, to protect Dinosaur National Monument. (4) $3,000 per quarter, plus expenses.

A. Spencer M. Smith, Jr., 2144 P Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Forest Conservation Society, 2144 P Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Forest Conservaton.

A. Samuel Elliot Stavisky, 9307 Singleton Drive, Bethesda, Md.

B. United States Cuban Sugar Council, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) All legislation pertaining to sugar and Cuban trade. (4) $15,000 annually, plus expenses.

A. D. M. Strickland, 1520 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Clay Pipe Manufacturers, Inc., 1520 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) All legislation affecting business, particularly public health and sanitation.

A. Sullivan, Bernard, Shea & Kenney, 804 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Brown Co., Berlin, N. H.

C. (2) Modifications of the Clayton and Federal Trade Commission Acts.

A. Sullivan, Bernard, Shea & Kenney, 804 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Southern Pacific Co., 65 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

C. (2) Proposed 1954 revisions of the Internal Revenue Code.

A. Sullivan, Bernard, Shea & Kenney, 804 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Standard Fruit and Steamship Co., 944 St. Charles Avenue at Lee Circle, New Orleans, La.

C. (2) Proposed 1954 revisions of the Internal Revenue Code.

A. Maude M. Taylor, 220 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.

B. Transportation Association of America, 130 North Wells Street, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) All legislation having anything to do with transportation. (4) $8,400 per year and actual expenses.

A. Ruth H. Tegtmeyer, Statler Office Building, Boston, Mass.

B. Transportation Association of America, 130 North Wells Street, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) All legislation having anything to do with transportation. (4) $9,600 per year and expenses incurred.

A. Austin J. Tobin, 111 8th Avenue, New York City, N. Y.

B. Conference on State Defense, 111 8th Avenue, New York City, N. Y.

C. (2) Opposition to Federal taxation of State and local government bond interest.

A. H. Willis Tobler, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Any legislation that may affect milk producers or the cooperatives through which they act together to process and market their milk. $10,000 per annum, plus expenses.

A. Tomoka Land Co., 8-10 West Center Street, Sebring, Fla.

C. (2) For modification of section 1237, H. R. 8300, making same applicable to corporations on lands held more than 10 years, and for similar legislation. $500 fee and approximately $400 expenses.

A. Steve Toney, 600 57th Avenue, Capitol Heights, Md.

C. (2) Work for the reduction of taxes and raising exemptions.

A. H. F. Torok, 1601 Carter Street, Chattanooga, Tenn.

B. Ross-Meehan Foundries, 1601 Carter Street, Chattanooga, Tenn.

C. (2) Continuation of broad production base policy for defense material. (4) Approximately $1,000.

A. Noel T. Tweet, Town House, Kansas City, Kans.

B. Missouri-Arkansas Basins Flood Control Association, Town House, Kansas City, Kans.

C. (2) Legislation pertaining to flood control and soil conservation. (4) $8,400 per year and $1,000 expenses.

A. Vegetable Growers Association of America, Inc., 528 Mills Building, 17th and Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Vegetable Growers Association of America, Inc., 528 Mills Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Agricultural interests pertaining to the vegetable industry. (4) $7,500 annually.

A. Paul H. Walker, 1000 Vermont Avenue, Washington, D. C.

B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Legislation which might affect the welfare of policyholders and annuitants. (4) $10,000 per annum.

A. Frank J. Waters, 727 West 7th Street, Los Angeles, Calif.

B. Hughes Tool Co., Houston, Tex.

C. (2) Revision of proposed Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (H. R. 8300).

A. Thomes Watters, Jr., 161 William Street, New York, N. Y., and Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Bigham, Englar, Jones & Houston, 99 John Street, New York, N. Y., and Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Matters affecting marine insurance companies as subrogees of property owners whose property was damaged or destroyed by the enemy during World War II.

A. West Coast Inland Navigation District, Governmental Corporation Court House, Brandenton, Fla.

C. (2) Any river and harbor bill affecting the International West Coast Waterway, its right-of-ways and appropriations therefor for authorization of alternate route and for appropriation therefor.

A. A. L. Wheeler, 911 Sheraton Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Marvin Small, 53 Park Place, New York City, N. Y. and J. George Spitzer, 923 Old Nepperhan Avenue, Yonkers, N. Y.

C. (2) Section 1235 of H. R. 8300 only.

A. Joseph F. Wildebush, 7 Church Street, Paterson, N. J.

B. Silk & Rayon Printers & Dyers Association of America, Inc., 1450 Broadway, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Seeks legislation creating a regulatory commission for printers dyers, and finishers of silk and manmade fibers.

A. W. E. Wilkinson, Glenn Building, Atlanta, Ga.

B. Transportation Association of America, 130 North Wells Street, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) Legislation having anything to do with transportation. (4) $7,800 yearly salary; reimbursement of actual expenses incurred.

A. Wilkinson, Boyden, Cragun & Barker, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Indians of California, care of Clyde F. Thompson, Post-Office Box 901, Redding, Calif.

C. (2) Registrants are seeking authorization to use funds to the credit of the Indians of California for prosecution of the case entitled "Indians of California v. United States," Docket No. 31, before the Indian Claims Commission, and possible related legislation.

A. Wilkinson, Boyden, Cragun & Barker, 744 Jackson Place, Washington, D. C.

B. Klamath Tribe of Indians, Klamath Agency, Oreg.

C. (2) Supporting H. R. 9188; seeking amendments to S. 3532. (4) Expenses not to exceed $1,000.

A. Wilkinson, Boyden, Cragun & Barker, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Shoshone-Bannock Tribes of the Fort Hall Reservation, Idaho.

C. (2) Legislation affecting Indians or Indian tribes or groups. (4) Annual compensation of $5,000.

A. Wilkinson, Boyden, Cragun & Barker, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Southern Ute Tribe of the Southern Ute Reservation, Consolidated Ute Agency, Ignacio, Colo.

C. (2) Support legislation to authorize a rehabilitation program from tribal funds of the Southern Ute Tribe of Indians in Colorado. (4) Expenses not expected to exceed $100.

A. Leon W. Williams, 2 Gouverneur Place, Bronx, N. Y.

C. (2) A bill for the relief of Leon W. Williams. (4) Expenses about $100 per year.

A. Williams, Myers & Quiggle, 817 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Bristol Laboratories, 630 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Internal Revenue Code of 1954. (4) Compensation—$1,000 retainer, plus $30 per hour.

A. Edward L. Wilson, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.

B. Mobile Homes Manufacturers Association.

C. (2) Specific interest relative to the current Housing Act of 1954—H. R. 7839 and S. 1472—as well as all legislative measures affecting mobile homes. (4) Salary $150 per month. Expenses estimated quarterly including transportation $1,000.

A. Harry E. Zwinggi, Clark Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.

B. Transportation Association of America, 130 North Wells Street, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) Legislation having anything to do with transportation. (4) $10,000 yearly salary; reimbursement of actual expenses incurred.

, 1258A, Regular

en, 1292A, Regu-

1346A, Regular

adhurst, 1350A,

rn, 1363A, Regu-

er, 1343A, Regu-

0A, Regular Air

1478A, Regular

1509A, Regular

r, 1543A, Regu-

1551A, Regular

n, Jr., 1655A,

ank, Jr., 1741A,

, 1768A, Regu-

enand, 1945A,

C

H

N TH

Mr
sk t
n th
o 19
he c

Th
was
as fo

"THR
NIS

Th
mitte
follov

"D
mout
No c
in al
with
and
of th

"T
Com
of th

[Fro

Ar

Th
unar
of t
can

It
spee
exis
war-
touc
peop

H
Den
tryi
the
the
afte
the

B
sord
ten
vote
Sen
tion
cen

F
to
reb
the
int

[Fr

Re
Jo
sir
inp
Se
su
al
er

Appendix

Communist Party Line on Senator McCarthy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY

OF WISCONSIN

N THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, November 8, 1954

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I sk unanimous consent to have printed n the Appendix of the Record pages 1 o 19 of of the booklet I now send to he desk.

There being no objection, the booklet was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

"Throw the Bum Out"—Official Communist Party Line on Senator McCarthy

The House Un-American Activities Committee officially cites the Daily Worker as follows:

"Daily Worker: The chief journalistic mouthpiece of the Communist Party * * *. No other paper or publication of any kind in all American history has ever been loaded with such a volume of subversive, seditious, and treasonable utterance as has this organ of the American Communists."

"Telegraph agency of instructions to all Communists." (Louis Budenz, former editor of the Daily Worker.)

[From the Daily Worker, New York, N. Y., of September 28, 1954]

THROW THE BUM OUT

America is catching up with McCarthy. The six-man Senate committee has voted unanimously in favor of a Senate censure of the arch-conspirator against the American Constitution.

It is good news for America—for its free speech, its right to speak out for peace, coexistence, and the abolition of H-bomb war—that McCarthyism is no longer the untouchable sacred cow. The good sense of the people has won this important achievement.

However, the GOP, backed in this by the Democratic Party leader in the Senate, is trying to sweep the McCarthy issue under the rug for the elections. They have ordered the postponement of any Senate action till after the elections. They thus hope to keep the issue quiet.

But the country has seen enough of the sordid McCarthy conspiracy not to be content with this trick. In the first place, the voters should insist to their Senators on a Senate meeting before the November elections. They should insist on a swift vote of censure before November.

Following that, the country has every right to expect that the Senate will not merely rebuke McCarthy for overstepping some of the rules, but will waste no time in digging into his whole shabby career.

[From the Daily Worker, New York, N. Y., of July 14, 1954]

AID SENATE FIGHT ON McCARTHY

The effort of Senator Ralph Flanders, Republican, of Vermont, to strip Senator Joseph McCarthy, Republican, of Wisconsin, of his committee chairmanships is gaining ground in the United States Senate. Several Republicans have already indicated support. While a number of Democrats are also for it, the Senate Tory Democratic leadership has tried to evade the struggle by maintaining McCarthy is a "Republican problem."

Among Republicans who have not yet lined up behind the Flanders resolution is Senator Irving M. Ives, of New York.

We urge all New Yorkers to write to Ives insisting he support the Flanders resolution.

We urge New Yorkers to write to Senator Herbert Lehman suggesting he put the heat on the Democratic Senate leadership to line-up behind the resolution.

We urge readers everywhere to take similar action in connection with their Senators.

[From the Daily Worker, New York, N. Y., of July 29, 1954]

WRITE YOUR SENATORS

Tell the two Senators from your State to support the Flanders censure resolution. Urge the organizations to which you belong, to do likewise.

In New York, Senator Lehman says he will support the censure; Republican Irving M. Ives has been silent.

Many are also writing to Senator Flanders giving him their support in this move.

[From the Daily Worker, New York, N. Y.]

STILL TIME TO CENSURE

The next few days will tell whether McCarthy can still blackmail the country. A shower of wires, letters, and calls will go a long way toward giving the Senators an indication of the feelings at home. They should be told no adjournment until Senator McCarthy is severely censured.

[From the Daily Worker, New York, N. Y., of July 16, 1954]

ACT NOW

We urge all readers to write at once to their Senators, insisting they vote for the Flanders resolution.

We urge all readers to reach their fellow-workers and neighbors and the leaders of the unions and other organizations they might belong to—urging them to take similar action.

They should also make their will known to Senator Lyndon Johnson, Democratic Senate leader, who is dodging the issue on the excuse that this is an inner Republican squabble.

[From the Daily Worker, New York, N. Y., of March 17, 1954]

STAMP OUT McCARTHYISM

(By William Z. Foster)

During the past 10 days Senator McCarthy has received a number of resounding belts in the jaw. These came from Adlai Stevenson, E. R. Murrow, Senator Flanders, the Army leadership, broadcasting companies. Even Eisenhower himself had to give McCarthy a slap on the wrist. This sudden outburst of anti-McCarthy sentiment reflects the growing indignation of the American people at the outrageous manner in which the Wisconsin political thug has been intimidating the country.

This active anti-McCarthyism is all to the good, and it is to be hoped that the gathering attack against McCarthy will be developed to the full. McCarthy should not only be discredited politically, but he should also be fired from the Senate and put in jail where he belongs. Such an outcome would constitute a real victory for democracy and would be hailed as such all over the world.

With McCarthy discomfited, already social democrats like Max Lerner and Arthur Schlessinger in the New York Post act as if McCarthyism were dead. They make it appear as though McCarthyism is the work of but a few malevolent individuals, who are now being deflated. But this is a gross underestimation of the danger of McCarthyism, which is American fascism.

McCarthy as an individual reactionary is obviously dangerous, but the reality of the dangers personalized by him are the powerful figures behind him—the wealthy bankers and industrialists and big military tycoons, with their aggressive programs of facism and war. These are the elements who are chiefly responsibile for such power as McCarthy possesses.

Should their darling McCarthy be knocked out, however, in the present brawl, they will not be long in developing another political front. If they could so blow up a blockhead like McCarthy, they will not be long in finding replacements.

It is not enough to fight McCarthy regarding his methods, on the assumption that he represents only a small clique of irresponsibles. He must instead be fought on the grounds of his pro-Fascist objectives and in the realization that he is the outstanding figure of the American Fascist tendency.

What is wanted is not more carefully managed thought control or more gentlemanly red-baiting and Soviet hating as so many in labor and political circles have been doing. This line only feeds McCarthyism. The whole program of warmongering must be knocked out and the country embarked upon a realistic policy of peaceful coexistence between the United States and the Soviet Union. This alone can basically end the menace of McCarthyism.

The Eisenhower administration is figuring on using what they hope will be a more sensible McCarthy as their chief hatchetman in the November elections. That is why Vice President Nixon gave him such gentle handling in his Saturday night speech.

McCarthy will have many other powerful supporters. But the President and his Wall Street backers should not be allowed to get away with this shameful imposition upon the American people. McCarthy must be driven out of American public life completely. That would be an appetizer to a real head-on attack upon the main body of the threatening Fascist movement in this country.

In the coming November elections the labor and progressive forces should defeat every McCarthyite who appears on any ticket and elect strong anti-McCarthy candidates.

William Foster is under indictment for Communist activities in violation of the Smith Act.

UNITY CAN DEFEAT McCARTHYISM

(By Philip Frankfeld, chairman of the Communist Party of Maryland)

(Pamphlet issued by Communist Party)

From the above pamphlet:

"But at all times, remember the fact that the main enemy is pro-Fascist McCarthyism and all of its workings and directing our main fight against it."

"The camp of McCarthyism remains united and follows a common policy directed by a unified command. It operates with deadly effectiveness."

Philip Frankfeld has been convicted for his Communist activities.

The national secretary of the Communist Party sent the following message to all Communist Party members through the Daily Worker of May 4, 1950:

"I urge all Communist Party members, and all anti-Fascists, to yield second place to none in the fight to rid our country of the Fascist poison of McCarthyism."

[From the Daily Worker, New York, N. Y., of May 7, 1953]

INVESTIGATE THE INVESTIGATORS

We New Yorkers are getting a good closeup look at what Senator HERBERT LEHMAN called the other day "creeping McCarthyism."

We are getting "creeping McCarthyism," and McCarthyite creeps, in the invasion of New York by the shoddy bunch of headline-hunters known as the Un-American Committee. This is headed by an ex-FBI cop whose great specialty was to have been the frameup of Steve Nelson as "an atomic spy" working with a "Scientist X." This shabby frameup—very much like the Rosenberg frameup—collapsed completely when even a fear-ridden Washington jury threw the whole mess out of court several weeks ago.

Velde's qualifications for hounding New York teachers, editors, artists, actors, and writers are given by his notorious contempt for education, which he expressed as follows:

"The basis of all communism and socialistic influence is education of the people. * * * If we say that we are opposed to socialism in America, as we all say we are, then we must oppose this bill (to create traveling libraries)." (March 9, 1950, House of Representatives.)

Such is the gent who now drags decent and patriotic Americans up in front of his roadshow in order to get them to become informers by "naming names" of other Americans who have dared to exercise their rights of free speech, free press, and the right of association to advocate ideas.

No wonder Senator LEHMAN cried out in dismay before 1,000 Democratic Party workers last week:

"Already, we tolerate subpenaing novelists, essayists, magazine and newspaper editors, scholars and school administrators to inquire into their political backgrounds and personal habits back to their youth and childhood. * * * The investigators, who might better be called the inquisitors, have taken over."

Senator LEHMAN's justified alarm shows that many Americans are aware of the fact that the smokescreen of "probing subversion" covers up a vicious McCarran-McCarthy assault on New Dealers, Democrats, Negro and Jewish organizations, trade unions, churches, etc. The Un-American Committee peddles the big lie about communism in order to attack all progresive ideas.

These committees will never haul up before them a Ku Kluxer, an anti-Semite, a warmonger, or a union hater. No landlord gouging his tenants or politician rooking the city will ever be called up to "name names" by these hacks. After all, their own previous chairman, the smelly J. Parnell Thomas, was found out to be a crook.

It is with pride that New York can watch these courageous "noncooperating" witnesses give these thought-controllers some elementary lessions in American history. George Washington and Jefferson were also "noncooperating" with reference to thought-control tyranny.

[From Political Affairs of December 1953]

UNITY CAN ROUT MCCARTHYISM

(By national committee, Communist Party, United States of America)

On November 21, 1953, the national committee of the Communist Party of the United States issued a statement signed by William Z. Foster, Elizabeth Gurley Flynn, and Pettis Perry, dealing with the Brownell-Eisenhower assault upon the loyalty of ex-President Truman. The text of the statement follows:

"The situation is ripe for organized labor and its allies, by a united smash, to rout the McCarthyite pro-Fascists and warmongers, and to score a great political victory. This opportunity must not be missed. The working masses must not allow themselves to be politically deceived and blinded by the poison gas of the redbaiters, warmongers, and witchhunters.

"An organic part of the fight against McCarthyism is the fight to defend the Communists now being indicted and tried under the Smith, McCarran, and sedition laws, and to free Gene Dennis, Ben Davis, and the many others imprisoned under these laws."

The House Un-American Activities Committee officially cited Political Affairs as "an official Communist Party monthly theoretical organ. * * * A magazine devoted to the theory

[From

DEMAN
McC
"No.

ATHE
Meyer,
Senato
fascist,
against
Browne
interve
tary ag
"If t
safety
tion wi
devised
conque
In a
the An
fessors
the N
prosec
institu
Mrs.
appare
Brown
White,
official.
"The
are bei
husba
board
gressio
expres
educat
subject
She
ting i
tors, a
tion o

Mrs. Meyer declared MCCARTHY would surely be thrown out of the Senate if the Republican National Committee disclosed the disgraceful facts about his record.

[From the Daily Worker, New York, N. Y., of March 12, 1954]

EISENHOWER FEELS THE PRESSURE

President Eisenhower said he agrees with Senator FLANDERS a little bit. The Vermont GOP Senator had charged the imitation-Hitler with trying to split the GOP, and capture it.

These are all signs—"straws," the New York Times calls them—that it is no longer tantamount to treason in Washington to criticize the leader of the pro-Fascist conspiracy in the United States. This means that the groundswell of popular patriotic hatred against bullying, lying, Fascist McCarthyism has already made itself very much felt in Washington and in the GOP.

When Adlai Stevenson charged the GOP with being "half MCCARTHY, half Eisenhower" he clearly stung the GOP, which had learned that the brand of Fascist McCarthyism is no longer the pure asset which GOP Chairman Hall proudly called it.

We have seen in America in the past few days such things as the terrific anti-MCCARTHY response to the CBS broadcast by Edward Murrow; the lashing out at MCCARTHY as a Hitler by the railroad brotherhood organ, Labor, etc.

This should be of the greatest encouragement to the patriotic crusade to resist, curb, and destroy this vile Fascist plot to debase America into a new form of Hitlerism at home and Hitlerite war with all the tricks borrowed from the anti-Communist fakeries of the Nazis.

But it is obvious that the trembling criticism of this Fascist conspiracy forced on the White House must be replaced by something far more direct and tougher. MCCARTHY knows that Eisenhower's "feather" criticism cannot stop him. He insolently sneered back at the President's criticism

and said this would "let MCCARTHY claim they oppose the investigation of communism."

Amazing how this MCCARTHY trick still has power to drug and paralyze his victims even when they start to fight back.

But the country, we are sure, wants the United States Senate to pass the Flanders motion to censure MCCARTHY on July 30 when his motion comes up.

Millions of voters want MCCARTHY forced to testify under oath on his spy rings, his weird financial deals with the corporations, and his defense of the Nazi murderers of helpless American GI prisoners.

At the very least, they want the Democrats to lead the fight to censure MCCARTHY, the goon who has branded them as responsible for "20 years of treason."

The voters, especially in the trade unions, are telling their United States Senators they want MCCARTHY censured on July 30 as the very first step, and they are telling Senator FLANDERS they approve what he is doing.

[From the Daily Worker, New York, N. Y., of July 19, 1954]

MCCARTHY A WOULD-BE HITLER, SAYS FLANDERS

WASHINGTON, July 18.—Senator RALPH E. FLANDERS (Republican, of Vermont) today charged that Senator JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY was the would-be Hitler of America. Detailing the methods whereby Hitler rose to power in Germany, FLANDERS called on fellow Republicans to back his Tuesday move to censure MCCARTHY. FLANDERS withdrew his original motion to oust MCCARTHY from his

TIGH
BOU

chairmanships under pressure from the GOP leadership in the Senate.

In releasing his speech today, **Flanders** said he "took his unusual step" because otherwise there would be no chance for the Senate or the public to consider his arguments against **McCarthy**. He claimed considerable Senate support for his resolution, including more than 12 Republicans.

Senate Republican leader **William F. Knowland** refused to disclose his strategy on

but is expected to try to

HTLY

UND

already being exhorted by electioneering candidates.

The very fact that the Senate was forced to schedule a debate on the Flanders motion and that the leaders of both parties have been unable so far to avoid action this session indicates the tremendous power of the anti-McCarthyism sentiment in the country. The Senate debate, despite the limited scope of the Flanders motion and the rush for adjournment, has served to still further expose the Fascist and corrupt nature of McCarthyism.

Like a cornered beast, **McCarthy** was only able to resort to the usual growl that served him so well in the past. He called the many Senators who voiced charges against him consummate liars and warned them they will indict themselves for perjury if they voice those charges before the Senate's committee.

The Senator's bullying tactics were successful on some occasions against some weak-kneed liberals or others without moral or self-respect, although **McCarthy** has been rebuffed by most honest witnesses. It now remains to be seen whether the whole Senate will be bullied successfully by the junior Senator from Wisconsin.

And we are still to hear from President Eisenhower on this most important question before Congress. The White House has been conspicuously silent while the storm rages and the administration's leaders are steering toward a whitewash of **McCarthy**. The voters will not absolve the administration of its full responsibility in this sordid business.

The next few days will tell whether **McCarthy** can still blackmail the country. A shower of wires, letters, and calls will go a long way toward giving the Senators an indication of the feelings at home. They should be told no adjournment until Senator **McCarthy** is severely censured.

[From Political Affairs of May 1954]

May Day, 1954: What Faces Us?

VI. THE ROLE OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY

the party and the left

nain-

nent.

gram

f the

the

on of

nd of

art of

is an

n the

con-

Daily

uggle.

gainst

It and

course

tion is

same

CARTHY

nonths

unities

n stop

Com-

as "an

oretical

he the-

n."

Y. of

SURE

of April

powerful

t has he

as in his

What is

that big lie?

The big lie is that the United States of America faces a Communist menace both from the Socialist states, and from the Communist Party here in the United States of America.

The big lie which **McCarthy** rides for all it is worth is that Communists—that is Americans with Marxist ideas on peace, democracy, and socialism—are out to be spies.

Once a country swallows this fake—as Nazi Germany swallowed it—it is sunk. It is ready to be taken over by Fascist conspirators who are laughing up their sleeves at their victims.

There is no such thing as the Communist menace.

This is what every thinking American must retort to the warmongers and hysteria makers who are out to seize control of these United States.

There is such a thing as the social ideas of the Communists.

There is such a thing as the antiwar, antidepression activities of the Socialist-minded men and women who make up the Communist movement.

But there is absolutely no such thing as the conspiracy or the menace of which Fascist McCarthyism shrieks every day.

The Communist menace and the spy menace is a fake.

According to the FBI political boss, J. Edgar Hoover, the Communist conspiracy is out to get the following things:

"Settlement of the Korea war; recall of all American GI's from abroad; a five-power peace pact with China included; resumption of trade with the Communist countries; repeal of Taft-Hartley law, as well as the Smith and McCarran Acts."

Are these things bad for the United States?

No. Millions of Americans already agree with most of them, especially with the ideas of world peace and putting an end to the cold war.

McCarthyite fascism has never exposed a spy, as the conservative columnist, Walter Lipmann, notes. This is because he is not looking for spies at all but for Americans whose ideas are liberal, progressive, or Marxist.

McCarthyism starts with the fraud about the aims of the Communists. Then it moves up and starts lying about Roosevelt and the New Deal. It calls them treason.

McCarthyism calls the organization of the CIO a Communist plot. McCarthyism brands all peace as treason and appeasement. It is ready even to brand the Eisenhowers as traitors if the White House does not succeed in keeping war going in Asia.

The one thing McCarthyism is most afraid of is peace and trade with China and the Soviet Union. But peace means trade and jobs—without slaughter of our boys.

Some people say they oppose McCarthyite methods but favor its goals.

But this is absurd; McCarthyism's goal is police state and war.

Can there be nice methods for getting fascism and war?

McCarthyism's goal is fascism, and so are its methods.

The two cannot be separated.

If the Communists are robbed of their democratic right to advocate their opinions, no one else has any freedom left.

All you have to do to kill an idea—like job protection, or peace—is brand it "Communist." That will finish it, as long as McCarthyite fascism is allowed to get away with its big lie.

Communism is not the issue in the United States. The issue is jobs, peace, and democratic liberty.

Don't be fooled any more by the fake of the Communist menace. The menace is McCarthyite police state and its war conspiracies.

[From the Worker, New York, N. Y., of April 4, 1954]

"Investigations of Senators Joseph R. McCarthy and William Benton Pursuant to Senate Resolution 187 and Senate Resolution 304

"(Report of the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections to the Committee on Rules and Administration)

"(U. S. Government Printing Office, Washington, 1952)"

This official Senate report on **McCarthy**'s shady finances was submitted in January 1952. Neither the Senate nor the Department of Justice has acted on it. J. Edgar Hoover who was supposed to investigate the charges uncovered by the Senate Committee instead praised **McCarthy**.

Unfit for the Senate

Inside: Four full pages on Senator **Joe** "Low-Blow" **McCarthy**, his record and what you can do about him. See pages 7, 8, 9, and 10.

What You Can Do

Here is what you can do to help America against McCarthyism.

1. Tell your United States Senators that the probe of the Schine-Cohn-McCarthy scandal must be taken out of the **McCarthy** committee's hands. The Senate itself must probe this **McCarthy** scandal.

[From the Daily Worker, New York, N. Y., of May 7, 1953]

INVESTIGATE THE INVESTIGATORS

We New Yorkers are getting a good close-up look at what Senator Herbert Lehman called the other day "creeping McCarthyism."

We are getting "creeping McCarthyism," and McCarthyite creeps, in the invasion of New York by the shoddy bunch of headline-hunters known as the Un-American Committee. This is headed by an ex-FBI cop whose great specialty was to have been the frameup of Steve Nelson as "an atomic spy" working with a "Scientist X." This shabby frameup—very much like the Rosenberg frameup—collapsed completely when even a fear-ridden Washington jury threw the whole mess out of court several weeks ago.

Velde's qualifications for hounding New York teachers, editors, artists, actors, and writers are given by his notorious contempt for education, which he expressed as follows:

"The basis of all communism and socialistic influence is education of the people. * * * If we say that we are opposed to socialism in America, as we all say we are, then we must oppose this bill (to create traveling libraries)." (March 9, 1950, House of Representatives.)

Such is the gent who now drags decent and patriotic Americans up in front of his roadshow in order to get them to become informers by "naming names" of other Americans who have dared to exercise their rights of free speech, free press, and the right of association to advocate ideas.

No wonder Senator Lehman cried out in dismay before 1,000 Democratic Party workers last week:

"Already, we tolerate subpenaing novelists, essayists, magazine and newspaper editors, scholars and school administrators to inquire into their political backgrounds and personal habits back to their youth and childhood. * * * The investigators, who might better be called the inquisitors, have taken over."

Senator Lehman's justified alarm shows that many Americans are aware of the fact that the smokescreen of "probing subversion" covers up a vicious McCarran-McCarthy assault on New Dealers, Democrats, Negro and Jewish organizations, trade unions, churches, etc. The Un-American Committee peddles the big lie about communism in order to attack all progresive ideas.

These committees will never haul up before them a Ku Kluxer, an anti-Semite, a warmonger, or a union hater. No landlord gouging his tenants or politician rooking the city will ever be called up to "name names" by these hacks. After all, their own previous chairman, the smelly J. Parnell Thomas, was found out to be a crook.

It is with pride that New York can watch these courageous "noncooperating" witnesses give these thought-controllers some elementary lessions in American history. George Washington and Jefferson were also "noncooperating" with reference to thought-control tyranny.

[From Political Affairs of December 1953]

UNITY CAN ROUT MCCARTHYISM

(By national committee, Communist Party, United States of America)

On November 21, 1953, the national committee of the Communist Party of the United States issued a statement signed by William Z. Foster, Elizabeth Gurley Flynn, and Pettis Perry, dealing with the Brownell-Eisenhower assault upon the loyalty of ex-President Truman. The text of the statement follows:

"The situation is ripe for organized labor and its allies, by a united smash, to rout the McCarthyite pro-Fascists and warmongers, and to score a great political victory. This opportunity must not be missed. The working masses must not allow themselves to be politically deceived and blinded by the poison gas of the redbaiters, warmongers, and witchhunters.

"An organic part of the fight against McCarthyism is the fight to defend the Communists now being indicted and tried under the Smith, McCarran, and sedition laws, and to free Gene Dennis, Ben Davis, and the many others imprisoned under these laws."

The House Un-American Activities Committee officially cited Political Affairs as "an official Communist Party monthly theoretical organ. * * * A magazine devoted to the theory and practice of Marxist-Leninism."

[From the Daily Worker, New York, N. Y., of March 1, 1954]

DEMANDS GROWING: ACT NOW AGAINST MCCARTHY—ASKS BROWNELL ACT AGAINST "NO. 1 FASCIST"

ATHENS, OHIO, February 28.—Mrs. Agnes E. Meyer, educator and writer, yesterday called Senator Joseph R. McCarthy our No. 1 fascist, suggested legal action be instituted against him by Attorney General Herbert Brownell, Jr., and called on the President to intervene to protect the honor of the military against McCarthy's insults.

"If the President does not," she said, "the safety of every citizen and of our whole Nation will be undermined. For McCarthy has devised sinister methods by which force can conquer this country without overt violence."

In a speech before the Ohio chapter of the American Association of University Professors, Mrs. Meyer said, "Brownell would do the Nation a greater service if, instead of prosecuting a dead Communist, he would institute proceedings against McCarthy."

Mrs. Meyer, in her own Red-baiting phrase, apparently alluded to a recent speech by Brownell attacking the late Harry Dexter White, New Dealer and former Treasury official.

"There is no doubt all our freedoms today are being threatened," said Mrs. Meyer, whose husband is Eugene Meyer, chairman of the board of the Washington Post. "Our congression investigators are seeking to curb all expression of opinion. The Nation's entire education system," she charged, "is being subjected to repression and intimidation.

She charged that the uneducated are sitting in judgment on education and educators, and called for a fairminded investigation of your unfairminded investigators.

Mrs. Meyer declared McCarthy would surely be thrown out of the Senate if the Republican National Committee disclosed the disgraceful facts about his record.

[From the Daily Worker, New York, N. Y., of March 12, 1954]

EISENHOWER FEELS THE PRESSURE

President Eisenhower said he agrees with Senator Flanders a little bit. The Vermont GOP Senator had charged the imitation-Hitler with trying to split the GOP, and capture it.

These are all signs—"straws," the New York Times calls them—that it is no longer tantamount to treason in Washington to criticize the leader of the pro-Fascist conspiracy in the United States. This means that the groundswell of popular patriotic hatred against bullying, lying, Fascist McCarthyism has already made itself very much felt in Washington and in the GOP.

When Adlai Stevenson charged the GOP with being "half McCarthy, half Eisenhower" he clearly stung the GOP, which had learned that the brand of Fascist McCarthyism is no longer the pure asset which GOP Chairman Hall proudly called it.

We have seen in America in the past few days such things as the terrific anti-McCarthy response to the CBS broadcast by Edward Murrow; the lashing out at McCarthy as a Hitler by the railroad brotherhood organ, Labor, etc.

This should be of the greatest encouragement to the patriotic crusade to resist, curb, and destroy this vile Fascist plot to debase America into a new form of Hitlerism at home and Hitlerite war with all the tricks borrowed from the anti-Communist fakeries of the Nazis.

But it is obvious that the trembling criticism of this Fascist conspiracy forced on the White House must be replaced by something far more direct and tougher. McCarthy knows that Eisenhower's "feather" criticism cannot stop him. He insolently sneered back at the President's criticism. He charged that all the GOP leaders who fear he is smearing them too heavily with the Fascist brush are "trying to curry favor with the leftwing press." McCarthy is here following the Fascist script down to the last letter.

It is good that the GOP is afraid of the McCarthyite label now.

It is up to the country to insist on more from anyone in public life who says he prefers America to Fascist McCarthyism. McCarthyism's financial dealings must be probed by the Senate. His star-chamber hearings and terrorizations must be stopped. Above all the fight has to be waged on the basic issues—peace and East-West trade against his inevitable war; the Bill of Rights against his spy fakeries and witch hunts of Communists; and more New Deal measures against the GOP's creeping socialism line.

[From the Worker, New York, N. Y., of July 25, 1954]

THE DEMOCRATS AND MCCARTHY

Senator Flanders, of Vermont, warned the GOP that if it follows the leadership of McCarthy it is sunk.

For the country will know how to recognize the guilt of the party which helps McCarthy try to Hitlerize the United States of America.

But the Democrats in Washington can't seem to grasp this yet, and they haven't been told in firm language that such is the case. .

For example, the three Democrats on the McCarthy committee—Symington, Jackson, and McClellan—who tangled with McCarthy during the recent hearings suddenly were afraid to join with GOP Senator Potter to fire the sneaky ex-FBI Francis Carr.

Potter was ready to defy McCarthy on this issue, but the Democrats began to waver and said this would "let McCarthy claim they oppose the investigation of communism."

Amazing how this McCarthy trick still has power to drug and paralyze his victims even when they start to fight back.

But the country, we are sure, wants the United States Senate to pass the Flanders motion to censure McCarthy on July 30 when his motion comes up.

Millions of voters want McCarthy forced to testify under oath on his spy rings, his weird financial deals with the corporations, and his defense of the Nazi murderers of helpless American GI prisoners.

At the very least, they want the Democrats to lead the fight to censure McCarthy, the goon who has branded them as responsible for "20 years of treason."

The voters, especially in the trade unions, are telling their United States Senators they want McCarthy censured on July 30 as the very first step, and they are telling Senator Flanders they approve what he is doing.

[From the Daily Worker, New York, N. Y., of July 19, 1954]

MCCARTHY A WOULD-BE HITLER, SAYS FLANDERS

WASHINGTON, July 18.—Senator Ralph E. Flanders (Republican, of Vermont) today charged that Senator Joseph R. McCarthy was the would-be Hitler of America. Detailing the methods whereby Hitler rose to power in Germany, Flanders called on fellow Republicans to back his Tuesday move to censure McCarthy. Flanders withdrew his original motion to oust McCarthy from his chairmanships under pressure from the GOP leadership in the Senate.

In releasing his speech today, Flanders said he "took his unusual step" because otherwise there would be no chance for the Senate or the public to consider his arguments against McCarthy. He claimed considerable Senate support for his resolution, including more than 12 Republicans.

Senate Republican leader William F. Knowland refused to disclose his strategy on the Flanders move, but is expected to try to kill the resolution either by moving to table it or by sending it to a Senate rules committee pigeonhole.

Before the resolution itself can be brought to vote, the Senate must approve Flanders' request for immediate consideration and it was possible the showdown will come then.

The tactic of comparing with Hitler anyone who fought communism was originated years ago by the Communists. Congressman Dies, Congressman Harold Velde, Senator McCarran, and Senator Jenner have been similarly attacked by the Communists.

[From the Daily Worker, New York, N. Y.]

Still Time To Censure

The decision of the Senate to shift the McCarthy censure motion to a six-member committee raises the serious danger that another whitewash of the reactionary Wisconsin Senator is in the making.

There is still hope, however, that some form of censure is possible this session. The Senators, cognizant of the tremendous popular pressure for some action on McCarthy, and hardly willing to face charges at home that the Flanders motion was killed by adjournment, voted to act on the committee's recommendation before the mid-August adjournment.

The committee, which Vice President Nixon will appoint, however, can bring in a recommendation on the eve of adjournment for no action or postponement of action to the next session. Senate Majority Leader Knowland and Minority Leader Johnson, who have joined hands on the maneuver to save McCarthy, are apparently continuing on a rush-for-home stampede to get approval of what amounts to no action. Whether they will succeed depends in large measure on the response from those who are already being exhorted by electioneering candidates.

The very fact that the Senate was forced to schedule a debate on the Flanders motion and that the leaders of both parties have been unable so far to avoid action this session indicates the tremendous power of the anti-McCarthyism sentiment in the country. The Senate debate, despite the limited scope of the Flanders motion and the rush for adjournment, has served to still further expose the Fascist and corrupt nature of McCarthyism.

Like a cornered beast, McCarthy was only able to resort to the usual growl that served him so well in the past. He called the many Senators who voiced charges against him consummate liars and warned them they will indict themselves for perjury if they voice those charges before the Senate's committee.

The Senator's bullying tactics were successful on some occasions against some weak-kneed liberals or others without moral or self-respect, although McCarthy has been rebuffed by most honest witnesses. It now remains to be seen whether the whole Senate will be bullied successfully by the junior Senator from Wisconsin.

And we are still to hear from President Eisenhower on this most important question before Congress. The White House has been conspicuously silent while the storm rages and the administration's leaders are steering toward a whitewash of McCarthy. The voters will not absolve the administration of its full responsibility in this sordid business.

The next few days will tell whether McCarthy can still blackmail the country. A shower of wires, letters, and calls will go a long way toward giving the Senators an indication of the feelings at home. They should be told no adjournment until Senator McCarthy is severely censured.

[From Political Affairs of May 1954]

May Day, 1954: What Faces Us?

VI. THE ROLE OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY

In the past period the party and the left have played a more active role in the mainstream of the anti-McCarthy movement. They are learning to influence the program and to bolster the fighting capacity of the movement as loyal participants in the struggle.

The campaign to build the circulation of the Daily Worker and the Worker and of the Morning Freiheit is an integral part of the fight against McCarthyism. It is an integral part of the effort to strengthen the role of the left in the coalition. The continuous attack by McCarthy on the Daily Worker is proof of its vitality in the struggle. The Daily Worker is the best fighter against McCarthyism.

The future struggle will be difficult and sharp. No one can predict its exact course or guarantee its outcome. The situation is fraught with great danger. At the same time, the advance of the anti-McCarthy movement beyond expectations of 6 months or a year ago reveals the great opportunities for building a movement which can stop McCarthyism in time.

The House Un-American Activities Committee officially cited Political Affairs as "an official Communist Party monthly theoretical organ * * * a magazine devoted to the theory and practice of Marxist Leninism."

[From the Worker, New York, N. Y. of October 3, 1954]

Action Now Urged on McC. Censure

[From the Worker, New York, N. Y., of April 4, 1954]

The Big Lie Tactic

What has made McCarthy so powerful within the space of 5 years? What has he got? The answer is simple. He has in his hands the power of the big lie. What is that big lie?

The big lie is that the United States of America faces a Communist menace both from the Socialist states, and from the Communist Party here in the United States of America.

The big lie which McCarthy rides for all it is worth is that Communists—that is Americans with Marxist ideas on peace, democracy, and socialism—are out to be spies.

Once a country swallows this fake—as Nazi Germany swallowed it—it is sunk. It is ready to be taken over by Fascist conspirators who are laughing up their sleeves at their victims.

There is no such thing as the Communist menace.

This is what every thinking American must retort to the warmongers and hysteria makers who are out to seize control of these United States.

There is such a thing as the social ideas of the Communists.

There is such a thing as the antiwar, antidepression activities of the Socialist-minded men and women who make up the Communist movement.

But there is absolutely no such thing as the conspiracy or the menace of which Fascist McCarthyism shrieks every day.

The Communist menace and the spy menace is a fake.

According to the FBI political boss, J. Edgar Hoover, the Communist conspiracy is out to get the following things:

"Settlement of the Korea war; recall of all American GI's from abroad; a five-power peace pact with China included; resumption of trade with the Communist countries; repeal of Taft-Hartley law, as well as the Smith and McCarran Acts."

Are these things bad for the United States?

No. Millions of Americans already agree with most of them, especially with the ideas of world peace and putting an end to the cold war.

McCarthyite fascism has never exposed a spy, as the conservative columnist, Walter Lipmann, notes. This is because he is not looking for spies at all but for Americans whose ideas are liberal, progressive, or Marxist.

McCarthyism starts with the fraud about the aims of the Communists. Then it moves up and starts lying about Roosevelt and the New Deal. It calls them treason.

McCarthyism calls the organization of the CIO a Communist plot. McCarthyism brands all peace as treason and appeasement. It is ready even to brand the Eisenhowers as traitors if the White House does not succeed in keeping war going in Asia.

The one thing McCarthyism is most afraid of is peace and trade with China and the Soviet Union. But peace means trade and jobs—without slaughter of our boys.

Some people say they oppose McCarthyite methods but favor its goals.

But this is absurd; McCarthyism's goal is police state and war.

Can there be nice methods for getting fascism and war?

McCarthyism's goal is fascism, and so are its methods.

The two cannot be separated.

If the Communists are robbed of their democratic right to advocate their opinions, no one else has any freedom left.

All you have to do to kill an idea—like job protection, or peace—is brand it "Communist." That will finish it, as long as McCarthyite fascism is allowed to get away with its big lie.

Communism is not the issue in the United States. The issue is jobs, peace, and democratic liberty.

Don't be fooled any more by the fake of the Communist menace. The menace is McCarthyite police state and its war conspiracies.

[From the Worker, New York, N. Y., of April 4, 1954]

"Investigations of Senators Joseph R. McCarthy and William Benton Pursuant to Senate Resolution 187 and Senate Resolution 304

"(Report of the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections to the Committee on Rules and Administration)

"(U. S. Government Printing Office, Washington, 1952)"

This official Senate report on McCarthy's shady finances was submitted in January 1952. Neither the Senate nor the Department of Justice has acted on it. J. Edgar Hoover who was supposed to investigate the charges uncovered by the Senate Committee instead praised McCarthy.

Unfit for the Senate

Inside: Four full pages on Senator Joe "Low-Blow" McCarthy, his record and what you can do about him. See pages 7, 8, 9, and 10.

What You Can Do

Here is what you can do to help America against McCarthyism.

1. Tell your United States Senators that the probe of the Schine-Cohn-McCarthy scandal must be taken out of the McCarthy committee's hands. The Senate itself must probe this McCarthy scandal.

2. Insist that the United States Senate reopen the probe of McCarthy's weird financial deals which he refused to answer when Senator Benton charged him with deceit. Tell this to your Senators.

3. Refuse to let any Red scare tactic rob you of your rights to say what you please about peace, East-West trade, union rights, or any other social issue. Defend the rights of all Americans under the fifth amendment. They are your rights, too.

4. Stand up for the rights of all Americans, Communists as well as non-Communists, to say what they think without fear of punishment for subversion or disloyalty.

5. Urge the abolition of the viciously Un-American Committee on Un-American Activities and all such groups, like the Senate Committee on Internal Security.

6. Urge the repeal of all thought-control laws like the Smith Act, the McCarran Internal Security Act, and the McCarran-Walter Act.

7. Urge the end of the cold war, and its replacement with a policy of peaceful negotiation, East-West trade, and the outlawing of all atomic and H-bomb war.

8. McCarthyism hates peace. Every move to ease world tension is a blow against prowar McCarthyism. Join with your neighbors in urging a peace policy in Washington, with reduced armaments, lower taxes, more schools, and a real antidepression program.

—

"McCarthyism has become the new religion of the modern day witch hunters. In their book you have to embrace McCarthyism or stand convicted of treason."—David Herman, president, local, AFL Hotel and Restaurant Workers Union, March 1954.

—

McCARTHY, ANTI-NEGRO RACIST

Senator McCarthy's anti-Negro bias came out clearly in the disgraceful campaign he organized against Senator Tydings in Maryland in 1950.

At the direction of the McCarthy-picked campaign manager 75,000 pamphlets entitled "Back to Good Old Dixie" were distributed in Baltimore. The cover of the pamphlet showed four prominent Negro spokesmen of Baltimore quoting them as supporting McCarthy's man against Tydings.

The Senate committee which investigated the Tydings campaign found that the McCarthyites had used the names and pictures of the Negro leaders without their knowledge. In an article by Charles R. Allen, in the Baltimore Afro-American, it is justly said: "Certainly such a device was nothing less than a byproduct of a twisted racist mentality."

The whole nation was shocked by McCarthy's persecution of Mrs. Annie Lee Moss which brought about her suspension from her Army job. On Edward R. Murrow's TV program Americans saw how McCarthy and his stooge Cohn worked. They tried to destroy this Negro woman by the unsupported use of dirty FBI slander and gossip files and the words of perjured stoolpigeons like Mary Stalcup Markward.

Senator McCarthy took special pains to eliminate from every overseas library anything written by Walter White of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People and any book or publication which in any way supported the doctrine of racial equality.

Among books which McCarthy had burned was Gunner Myrdal's scholarly work on the American Negro, An American Dilemma.

The Baltimore Afro-American observed: "As far as Senator Joseph McCarthy is concerned, all books expose America's racial discrimination can be burned and the sooner the better."

Following McCarthy's dastardly attack on Mrs. Eslanda Robeson, the Afro-American wrote:

"The insidious purpose of Senator McCarthy's latest junket into the darkened cave of the book-burners is becoming increasingly clear. His aim is to create the impression that authors who dare expose or protest American racial shortcomings are "following the Communist line and therefor what they write must be subversive.

—

If you wish more information on McCarthyism, or have any opinions you would like to express on this subject, please write to Sunday Worker, 35 East 12th Street, New York City, for the pamphlet, McCarthyism and the Big Lie, by Milton Howard, associate editor. We will be glad to send it to you free.

—

[From the Worker, New York, N. Y., of April 4, 1954]

UNFIT FOR THE UNITED STATES SENATE

If you are an average American, Joe McCarthy is your enemy. The United States Army papers showed that McCarthy and his stooge, Roy Cohn, tried to blackmail special privileges for their boy David Schine. The Army papers showed a gang of power-hungry operators using the racket of the Communist menace to gain dictatorial power. They want to command America. Anyone who doesn't obey them will be charged with being a Communist or helping the Communists.

America is waking up to this realization—

McCarthyism is a conspiracy to destroy the Constitution of the United States.

It is conspiracy to destroy democracy and America's chance for peace, under the mask of saving the country from communism.

McCarthy is unfit to sit in the United States Senate. The Army exposure in the McCarthy-Schine case proved that. Other vital facts prove it.

For example:

McCarthy is violating his oath as a Senator by refusing to answer questions on the following:

How did you bank $172,000 in cash in 4 years when your salary was about $50,000?

McCarthy was charged by Senator Benton, of Connecticut, with deceit, trickery, and falsehood—but McCarthy refused to answer on the witness stand.

This makes him unfit to sit in the Senate.

McCarthy violated his oath when he refused to tell a Senate committee how come he took $10,000 from the Lustron Corp. as a fee when he was on the Banking Committee which was handing out millions of Government money to the bankrupt Lustron Corp.? (see p. 2).

McCarthy violated his oath when he refused an answer to the Senate committee's question how come an agent of Pepsi-Cola Corp. guaranteed his private loan of $25,000 just when McCarthy was acting on sugar quotas that the Pepsi-Cola Corp. was interested in? (see p. 2).

McCarthy is violating his oath to uphold the United States Constitution by his deliberate plot to destroy the fifth amendment.

The fifth amendment was put into the Constitution by the Founding Fathers to protect the innocent. They did not want America to repeat the crimes of the anti-Catholic Royalist, persecution of the 17th century.

In the 17th century, star-chamber inquisitors hunting un-British activities insisted that Englishmen admit that they were Catholics.

If they refused to discuss their religion with the prosecuting witchhunters, their silence proved them guilty.

America wanted to end this tyranny over men's minds.

The fifth amendment gives every American the right to the sacred privacy of his religious or political views.

McCarthy wants to destroy the fifth amendment. He says that silence is guilt. Guilt of what? Of having religious, social, or political views different from his own.

McCarthy calls all Americans who refuse to surrender to him their constitutional right to political and religious privacy fifth amendment Communists, or spies.

McCarthyism demands conformity to its prowar, labor-hating, anti-Semitic views, and charges all others with treason.

This makes McCarthyism itself treason to the United States.

McCarthy's plot against the fifth amendment and our democratic laws makes him unfit for the United States Senate.

—

PRESS QUOTES

"The Wisconsin Senator has succeeded in creating a situation in which anyone who doesn't like him, anyone who doesn't say what Mr. McCarthy wants him to say, anyone who is even mildly liberal, one might almost say anyone who is normally intelligent and can read, is under suspicion." (New York Times, February 1954.)

"Dwight D. Eisenhower still is President under the Constitution but he is not in full command of the Department of the Army today. Control of that vital element of our national defense system has passed in part at least from the White House to the unscrupulous hands of Senator McCarthy. No matter what he does, no matter what he says, no matter whom he attacks, the White House apparently will avoid a break with the wild man from Wisconsin." (St. Louis Post-Dispatch, February 1954.)

—

WHAT IS McCARTHYISM?

"McCarthyism is the corruption of truth, the abandonment of our historical devotion to fair play. It is the abandonment of the due process of law. It is the use of the big lie and the unfounded accusation against any citizen in the name of Americanism or security. It is the rise to power of the demagog who lives on untruth; it is the spread of fear and the destruction of faith in every level of our society. * * *

"This horrible cancer is eating at the vitals of America and it can destroy the great edifice of freedom." (Harry S. Truman, ex-President of the United States.)

"McCarthy is our No. 1 Fascist." (Mrs. Agnes E. Meyer, educator and writer, February 1954.)

"He is a political hoodlum." (Former Assistant Secretary of State Edward W. Barrett.)

"McCarthy, if allowed to go unbridled, can also destroy freedom." (Walter White, secretary, NAACP.)

"The efforts of McCarthyites are being made to defame Negro leaders." (Bishop William Walls.)

"A reign of mental terror has been unloosed over our land * * * a whole great political party has been labeled as traitorous. Treason is the ultimate indictment against a man's honor. And the Senator has applied this black term in effect to more than 27 million Americans who voted for the Democratic Presidential candidate in 1952." (Gov. Robert Meyner, of New Jersey, March 1954.)

"His assault on the Army was a supreme test of the ability of men in high office to meet a threat which in other parts of the world has been fatal to liberty itself. They have failed to meet that test. When will the occasion be presented again in terms so plain that virtually the whole people can see it and understand its meaning." (New York Herald Tribune, February 1954.)

"If we love our liberties and if we wish our children to live in a free world, we must repudiate and reject these political monsters and troglodytes who hate progress, who lust for power and trample into the earth individual rights and human dignity." (The Advance, national organ, Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, CIO.)

is guilt.
social, or
n.
o refuse
nal right
amend-

y to its
ews, and

eason to

amend-
tes him

eded in
ne who
n't say
y, any-
might
intelli-
(New

esident
in full
Army
of our
n part
ne un-
Y. No
hat he
White
with
Louis

truth,
votion
of the
he big
gainst
sm or
f the
s the
ith in

vitals
edi-
, ex-

(Mrs.
Feb-

rmer
Bar-

, can
sec-

eing
shop

un-
reat
tor-
nent
has
nore
the
52."
rch

me
to
the
ney
the
ain
it
ork

ur
re-
ers
ist
li-
d-
h-

An

N T

M
na
he
dd
Stri
per
Ame
nua
Am
Oct
T
was
as f
A
(Ad
at
m
o
th
b
E
F
a
I
spe
obj
Bro
1
of
2
sar
be
T
ou
mo
I
wh
an
(
ca
Ev
mi
ne
of
fu
ag

re
th
la
st
th
th

ti
re
th
w
st
c
t
b
c
s
a
I

Appendix

American Cancer Society's Objectives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

N THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, November 9, 1954

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask nanimous consent to have printed in he Appendix of the RECORD an excellent ddress delivered by Mr. George E. Stringfellow, director at large and member of the executive committee of the American Cancer Society, before the annual meeting of the Florida Division, American Cancer Society, Orlando, Fla., October 10, 1954.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN CANCER SOCIETY'S OBJECTIVES

(Address by George E. Stringfellow, director at large and member of executive committee of the American Cancer Society; one of the founders and first president of the New Jersey division and long time business associate of the late Thomas Alva Edison, before the annual meeting of the Florida Division, American Cancer Society, at Orlando, Fla., October 10, 1954)

I am highly complimented to be asked to speak to this your annual meeting about the objectives of the American Cancer Society. Broadly speaking, our society has two:

1. A long range objective to find the cause of cancer; and

2. A short range objective to save thousands of lives annually that would otherwise be lost.

Those are the two primary objectives of our society. No organization could have a more worthy purpose than ours.

I should now like to outline the means by which we hope to achieve these two broad and basic objectives.

Only through research can the cause of cancer be found and completely vanquished. Even before the final victory, research yields minor conquests—saves lives by developing new surgical techniques and new triumphs of diagnosis. All research is costly, and fundamental research, such as this war against cancer requires, is especially costly.

May I give you an example of the cost of research. The Manhattan project involved the expenditure of two thousand million dollars to develop the atomic bomb, notwithstanding the fact that scientists possessed the necessary fundamental knowledge before the project was started.

The cancer project poses greater difficulties than the atomic bomb for the simple reason that the scientists do not possess all the necessary fundamental knowledge with which to find the cause of cancer. While success and even the approximate date and cost of success were a matter of virtual certainty at the outset of the bomb project, both the date and the cost of success in conquering cancer are matters of the widest speculation. Even the eventual outcome is a matter of faith, but we do have the faith. If faith will move mountains, faith supported by intelligent effort and well financed, will certainly find the cause of cancer. Our faith in our ability to attain ultimately our objectives is not without tangible encouragement. The electronic microscope has so enormously enlarged enlargement that a small portion of the surface of a single human cell is now blown up to cover a screen 10 inches by 10 inches. For the first time man can say of a single human cell—not merely of a segment of human tissue—"This is a normal cell" or "that is a cell that has gone wild."

Organic substances have already been found for which both types of cell have a hunger and which are more noxious to the malignant cell than to the normal cell.

The profound mystery is not so much why some cells fail to do the complicated things that are expected of them, but the mystery is how any of them know enough to obey the command to stop growing when, for example, they have reached the end of their usefulness. The mystery is really the mystery of normal disciplined growth. When we solve the puzzle of undisciplined growth, we will have solved the problem of cancer and we will soon have it under control.

Those things are for the research men to worry about. Our job is to raise the money. So, we organize and raise money for cancer research, devoting a substantial part of it to our long-range objective, winning encouraging minor skirmishes as we advance.

During the 6 years ending August 31, 1954, our society raised $2,513,806, and here is how it was spent:

	Percent
Research	28.4
Education	26.8
Service to cancer patients	26.3
Administration	9.2
Fund raising	12.0

Our society is the first national voluntary organization to publish combined statements providing a complete accounting of the financial activities of the entire society—national headquarters and the chartered divisions. One of the reasons we command the respect and confidence of the people to the extent we do is that ever since its inception the cancer society has conducted its affairs in a gold fish bowl, as it should. These funds given to us with which to fight cancer are looked upon by us as sacred funds and every penny must be intelligently spent and clearly and honestly reported to the public.

That brings me to our second primary objective which is a short-range objective—saving lives today by timely warning. In other words: our education program—and that costs money, too.

It is believed that most cancer is curable through surgery, X-ray, or a combination of those means, provided, first, that it is discovered in time; and, second, that it is treated in time. With our present knowledge it is not possible to discover every single cancer at the curable stage. But methods of diagnosing, which means discovery, are improving each year and a substantial percentage of cancers can, with our present knowledge, be discovered in time to effect a permanent cure, if measures be taken promptly. That is where the American Cancer Society comes in. That is its second primary objective. This is an objective on which we can and do show immediate results. We are saving lives, thousands of lives annually, that would otherwise be lost.

Even a person who is fully aware of the seven danger signals can have his life saved by being reminded of those signals. He may be blissfully unaware that he is one of the unfortunates who is doomed unless he investigates and acts promptly.

There are about 160 million people in the United States. More than 32 million of them, under present conditions, will develop cancer—in other words 1 in 5 will likely be a cancer victim. One-third need not die. We can save them by a mere reminder and we have done so in innumerable cases and many of these cases have been reported to us by physicians and potential cancer victims.

May I quote a couple of typical cases. "My patient," one doctor tells us, "came to my office with a small breast lump that would not have been discovered until it was too late, if she had not witnessed one of your society's educational films."

A wife tells us, "You saved my husband's life when your solicitor came around with the seven danger signals. He was seemingly in perfect health but he recognized danger signal No. 7 before it was too late. He went to the doctor and had a successful operation in the nick of time. He is now one of your biggest boosters."

And so the lifesaving story repeats itself. By early diagnosis and treatment, about one-third of the 230,000 cancer victims of last year could have been saved. By our efforts we can save about 75,000 lives this year.

Perhaps I can save the life of some human being in this audience, perhaps someone who already knows the seven danger signals but needs to be reminded. Here they are:

1. Any sore that does not heal.
2. Any painless lump or thickness, especially in the breast, lip, or tongue.
3. Bleeding from any natural body opening.
4. Progressive change in the color or size of a wart, mole, or birthmark.
5. Persistent indigestion.
6. Persistent hoarseness, unexplained cough, or difficulty in swallowing.
7. Any change in normal bowel habits.

We of the cancer society are engaged in a noble cause and as we work intelligently together we save lives by the thousands. We alleviate suffering as we approach, through research, the day when cancer will be no more. That is our objective. Let us pull together and attain it.

The Case of John P. Davies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, November 9, 1954

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, a few days ago the gentleman who now heads the State Department, after being retired from the Senate by the people of the State of New York, discharged Mr. John P. Davies, a career Foreign Service official with some 23 years of service in the Government.

In last Sunday's Washington Star, there appeared an editorial entitled "Disgraceful," which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record.

In last Sunday's Washington Post there appeared an editorial entitled "Thrown to the Wolves," which I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington Sunday Star of November 7, 1954]

DISGRACEFUL

In a thoroughly admirable statement, Foreign Service Officer John Paton Davies, Jr., has said that he will not contest his dismissal as a security risk, and that he must be content "to let history be my judge."

The Star thinks, however, that a contemporary judgment is in order. And that judgment is that the dismissal of Mr. Davies, coming after 23 years of service and 9 investigations, is a disgraceful result of a shameful procedure.

Since this lamentable case at last is closed, there is little to be gained by a detailed review. But there is one point which ought to be made, since its significance lies more in the future than in the past.

Mr. Davies had been cleared and cleared and cleared again. He had been absolved of disloyalty, of Communist sympathies, and an attempt to build a perjury case against him had collapsed. Then, on May 27, 1953, the rules of the game were changed. No doubt this was done with the best of intentions. But the harsh fact is that a new Executive order bearing on security risks went into effect. New and different tests of suitability for Government employees were laid down. And under this change in the rules, a ninth investigation of Mr. Davies was launched. Now, on the same facts on which he had been cleared before, he is found to be disqualified. There was no new evidence—just a finding, under new rules, that the things which had not disqualified him in the past would disqualify him in the future.

The Star does not believe for a moment that malice entered into the adverse finding by the hearing board and Secretary Dulles. They were victims of the system, no less than Mr. Davies. But it must be said that the system is permeated with injustice.

It was the kind of result reached in the Davies case which Dr. John Von Neumann, recently appointed to the Atomic Energy Commission, had in mind when he testified last summer before a congressional committee. He said that the uncertainty and apprehension which result from changes in the rules constitute the most dangerous aspect of our security system. Pointing out that the need for security procedures is going to be with us for a long time, Dr. Von Neumann declared: "I think it ought to be possible to have legislation which defines quite rigidly * * * what the criteria of security are, under what conditions past behavior before the enactment of these laws will be evaluated [criteria] which set the relationship to the principle of not passing ex post facto laws and of avoiding double jeopardy."

Certainly the wretched outcome of the John Paton Davies case is a most persuasive endorsement of these views.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of November 7, 1954]

THROWN TO THE WOLVES

Without a full review of matters which are still kept secret, it is impossible to know precisely what led Secretary Dulles to fire John P. Davies. It is possible, however, to assess some of the tragic consequences of this brutal and summary end to a diplomatic career of 23 years. Like the Oppenheimer decision, the effect is to proclaim a rigid conformity, and to cast into the severest doubt the criteria by which discretion is judged these days.

Mr. Davies had been investigated and cleared eight times previously. His dismissal on the ninth go-round—in the face of testimonials by the highest career men in the Service as to his great discretion, integrity, and competence—leaves the indelible impression that his detractors were permitted to keep sniping until they got him. The security board specifically recognized his right to report as his conscience dictated, but it damned him for making known "his dissent from established policy outside of privileged boundaries." The clear implication is that Foreign Service officers had better not have outside friends and that they had better keep their opinions, when they have any, to themselves.

The Davies case was widely regarded as the touchstone of Secretary Dulles' attitude toward the Foreign Service and the inroads made upon it, particularly over China policy. No matter how much Mr. Dulles may seek to reassure the Foreign Service, officers henceforth have been warned. Only a few days ago President Eisenhower sought to impress upon State Department employes "the glorious opportunity ahead of us" and the need for "the highest morale based firmly in its own convictions as to the importance of its work." To many employees the dismissal of Mr. Davies will make mincemeat of these fine words.

Finally, the decision will be regarded as a sacrifice on the altar of McCarthyism, since McCarthy demanded Davies' scalp when he declared open war on the Eisenhower administration. This gift of a new club to McCarthy is the more dumfounding and shameful on the eve of the censure vote, and it is a melancholy demonstration that the effect of the ism lives on after the man is on the run. Something is terribly wrong with the kind of security judgments that make it progressively more impossible for men of originality and brilliance to serve their country.

The Behind-Scenes Struggle Over Yalta Papers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. BRICKER

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, November 9, 1954

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an article entitled "The Behind-Scenes Struggle Over Yalta Papers," published in Newsweek for November 1, 1954. This follows up the request made on the floor of the Senate by several Members of this body for a full publication of the facts with regard to the Yalta, Potsdam, and Teheran Conferences.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

THE BEHIND-SCENES STRUGGLE OVER YALTA PAPERS

Probably the most controversial story behind the scenes today in Washington centers on the Yalta documents—the official papers bearing on the fateful 1945 meeting of President Roosevelt, Marshal Stalin, and Prime Minister Churchill.

Many Republicans feel the publication of these papers would enhance their chances in next week's election. Other sources insist the documents contain nothing new.

As matters stand now, the State Department has been working on the Yalta record for a year and publication has been postponed until December.

Here is a report on the struggle over the timing of publication, excerpts from some of the important documents, and examples of material that may be deleted from the official record:

In March 1950 G. Bernard Noble, then, as now, Chief of the Division of Historical Policy Research, sent a memorandum to the then Secretary of State, Dean Acheson. Noble advised against publication of the Yalta documents on the ground that this would embarrass officials of the Democratic administration and would lead to demands for publication of the minutes of other conferences.

This memorandum foreshadowed the partisan debate which has since developed over the Yalta record. The Democrats in general seem to have opposed publication, or at least to have insisted on highly selective publication as was ordered in the case of the China white paper. For example, Representative John J. Rooney, of New York, has fought against the appropriation of funds for the publication of historical documents. Rooney is ranking minority member of the Subcommittee on Appropriations, which deals with the State, Commerce, and Justice Departments. (A Democratic victory next week would make Rooney chairman of the subcommittee.)

Many felt that with the Republican victory this work would be speeded. In May 1953 the State Department informed the Senate that all papers on wartime conferences among the heads of state would be ready for publication by June 30, 1954. Nonetheless, work on the Yalta papers is about 6 months behind. The papers on the Cairo and Potsdam Conferences—some of them more explosive than anything contained in the Yalta collection—have not even been set up in galley proofs.

From time to time no less than eight of the most important Republican Senators have pressed for speedy publication of the Yalta documents—all to no avail. One reason for the slowness of the work seems to be continued reluctance at the working level within the State Department itself to publication of the documents. Many Republicans attribute this delaying action to officials brought in during the Truman administration and retained in the Department.

For example, the Assistant Secretary for European Affairs, Livingston Merchant, sent a memorandum to John Foster Dulles just before the Secretary's departure for the Manila conference last month. Merchant objected in general to publication of the Yalta documents and cited a number of specific items he thought should be deleted in any event.

Dulles took the galley proofs with him to Manila. The Secretary then ruled against Merchant but apparently decided to hold up publication of the documents until after the November elections. Dulles also overruled Merchant in general on the specific deletions he had recommended. The Secretary's ruling is now being interpreted on the working level. Did he mean that none of the deletions were to be allowed or were the departmental officers to use their own judgment in general?

State Department officers can give as one reason for the delay the difficulty in clearing and obtaining documents. Literally dozens of officials must pass on the papers and hundreds have seen them. A great many papers also are being cleared with the British Government. Another complication lies in the fact that the experts who preside over the secret codes subject to the release within less than 10 years of material that has been transmitted by code.

There are many individually held records that could be of value in supplementing the official records now in possession of the State Department. Gov. James Byrnes, of South Carolina, has the stenographic notes he took at the conference as special adviser to the President. These notes are sometimes fuller than the official transcript. The widow of the late Secretary of State, Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., has so far declined to make available all the documents contained in the 36 filing cases amassed by her husband.

DARK CORNERS

Officials claim that the Yalta documents contain no surprises; that everything of significance has long since appeared in the numerous books written about the conference. Others who have seen the documents, however, say that the cumulative effect constitutes a devastating indictment of the American diplomacy of the time and that the full official accounts reveal important details individuals have chosen to conceal or skim over.

Whatever the argument, the official accounts do let the light into a good many dark corners of history. Some of the more startling examples:

FEBRUARY 10, 1945

This was the decisive day of the conference—the day Roosevelt promised Stalin the Japanese territories of the Kurile Islands and southern Sakhalin, plus concessions in China, such as joint operation of the Manchurian railways and a long-term lease on Port Arthur. Proposals to this effect had been discussed at a meeting on February 8 of Roosevelt, Stalin, and Averell Harriman, then United States Ambassador to Moscow. The United States at that time put forward a program outlined in a number of points. One of these—the third point—was a United States proposal to get Chiang Kai-shek to agree to the concessions that would have to be made by China. Molotov complained that Stalin didn't understand this. Therefore, a meeting was arranged on February 10 between the marshal and the President (Churchill was not present). The result was Roosevelt's undertaking to obtain Chiang's consent to the concessions.

Defenders of American policy at this time point to the wartime atmosphere of friendliness toward Russia and the demands by the military for Soviet entrance into the war against Japan at almost any price. Critics, on the other hand, point out that the United States had been dickering for some time with the Russians on Soviet materiel needs for a Far Eastern campaign—an indication, according to these critics, that Stalin would enter the war regardless of concessions. The critics also cite a British document showing that Stettinius had been told before the conference that no concessions would be necessary to bring Russia into the Far Eastern war.

HISS' ROLE

Although the documents dealing with the actual meeting itself contain little of more than routine interest so far as Alger Hiss is concerned, an unpublished diary kept by Stettinius—part of the Yalta papers although the section dealing with the conference is missing—does seem to dispose of the claim that Roosevelt didn't even know Hiss before Yalta. After a visit to the White House, Stettinius records that the President was vague as to the make-up of the American delegation but that the one person "he" was sure had to be included was Hiss. The "he" in question might have been either Secretary Stettinius or President Roosevelt. But apparently Hiss was discussed by the two men.

HURLEY'S MESSAGE

Before the Yalta conference Gen. Patrick Hurley, Roosevelt's personal representative in China, sent the President an eyes-only telegram as guidance for Yalta. This telegram was omitted in the China white paper but it is now part of the Yalta documents. In his book I Was There, Adm. William D. Leahy gives a paraphrase of this telegram without actually saying it was the one that Hurley had addressed to the President. Leahy tells how in this telegram Hurley reported that negotiations to bring the Communists and Chiang Kai-shek together were endangered because of "an attempt by some officers of General Wedemeyer's command (in Wedemeyer's absence according to the Hurley message) to bypass Chiang's National Government and deal directly with Washington." The Hurley telegram in effect reported, Admiral Leahy's book went on, "that these officers had formulated a plan to put American paratroopers in the Communist-held area. These paratroopers were to be used in leading Communist bands in guerrilla warfare. American supplies were to be furnished directly to the Communists and the dissident troops would be placed under command of an American officer. If the Communists could succeed in making such an arrangement with the United States Army, it would be futile for us to try to save Chiang's National Government.

"Hurley understood that his directive was to support the National Government and sustain the leadership of Chiang. He had some inkling of this plot to bypass the Generalissimo, but it did not become clear to him until General Wedemeyer was asked to secure passage to Washington for Mao Tse-tung and Chou En-lai, the top Chinese Communist leaders, for conferences with the President."

THE RED PENCIL

The galley proofs of the Yalta documents—more than a dozen are circulating at top Government levels—are splashed with red pencil marks. These are suggestions for deletions, along the following lines:

Prime Minister Churchill has been consulted as to the publication of the Yalta documents, but he has asked for practically no deletions in matters concerning him. The ones he did request concerned remarks about personalities, both British and foreign.

In the margin of one galley proof, Walter Bedell Smith, former Under Secretary of State wrote, "Delete this. It is not pertinent history." Smith's reference was to a remark made by Roosevelt during the plenary meeting of February 10. This remark was a presumably jocular reply to a question by Stalin as to whether the President intended to make any concessions to King Ibn Saud of Saudi Arabia. According to the record. "The President replied that there was only one concession he thought he might offer and that was to give him [Ibn Saud] the 6 million Jews in the United States."

The British have asked for the deletion of matters pertaining to the functioning of the Combined Chiefs of Staff during the war. The inference: Such information might be of considerable value to the Soviet Union in estimating how the Anglo-American alliance would operate during a future conflict.

The Pentagon has probably requested more deletions than any other source. The Joint Chiefs of Staff appear unusually sensitive about the suggestion of a land corridor to Berlin.

A reference to a report that Harriman had cleared the Yalta declaration with Generals Marshall and Kuter and Admiral King is scheduled to be deleted—for no very apparent reason.

Another almost certain deletion will be made from Stettinius' rough notes on various matters. This is a mention of a recommendation that Joseph Lash—Mrs. Roosevelt's protégé—in addition to Dean Virginia Gildersleeve, of Barnard, be recommended as members of the United States delegation to the Yalta Conference.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Printing and binding for Congress, when recommended to be done by the Committee on Printing of either House, shall be so recommended in a report containing an approximate estimate of the cost thereof, together with a statement from the Public Printer of estimated approximate cost of work previously ordered by Congress within the fiscal year (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 145, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on Printing, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided,* That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized book dealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by book dealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

PRINTING DOCUMENTS AND REPORTS

Documents and reports of committees with the evidence and papers submitted therewith, or any part thereof ordered printed by Congress, may be reprinted by the Public Printer on order of any Member of Congress or Delegate, on prepayment of the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 162, p. 1940).

PRICE OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

The Public Printer is authorized to furnish to subscribers the daily RECORD at $1.50 per month, payable in advance.

Remit by money order payable to Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C.

Ad
c
a

F

IN T

M
ask
in t
I ma
the
Den

Th
was
as fo

Mr
Amer
tain
Since
World
natio
In Ja
200 r
Iron
are o

Pea
policy
tainly
any p
stood
securi
Krem
tions

If
relatio
attent
States
fort o

Whe
loving
and i
there

But
that a
a cate
freedo
contin
keep o

We
lyzed
in Eur
Iron C
find o
dom i

Und
culties
of a c
we wo
politic
abled
small c
board
most p
ally th

The
ing adv
the nev
take si
and by

Appendix

Address by Hon. William F. Knowland, of California, Before 95th Annual Session of American Dental Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, November 10, 1954

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record a speech I made last night at Miami, Fla., before the 95th annual session of the American Dental Association.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, members and guests of the American Dental Association, there are certain basic facts which we dare not ignore. Since the year 1945, which saw the end of World War II in Europe and in Asia, international communism has made great strides. In January of that year there were less than 200 million people behind the Communist Iron Curtain. Today, 9 years later, there are over 800 million.

Peace with honor is and should be the policy of the American people. This is certainly far different from a policy of "peace at any price." Unless this is thoroughly understood, we could be lured into a sense of false security by the words of the men in the Kremlin which do not conform to their actions or their policies.

If we pointed to our ultimate ideal of relationships between nations we would call attention to the situation along the United States Canadian boundary where there is no fort or military post for border defense.

Where there are two civilized and peace-loving nations interested in human freedom and in preserving the peace of the world there can be such a relationship.

But if we are prudent we must recognize that all nations in the world are not in such a category. Like those who gave us our freedom and developed the West we should continue to hope and pray for peace but keep our powder dry.

We and the free world must not be paralyzed while nation after nation in Asia and in Europe is brought behind the Communist Iron Curtain. In such an event we might find ourselves as an isolated island of freedom in an otherwise totalitarian world.

Under such conditions, though the difficulties would be great, we might exist as sort of a continental Dien Bien Phu. However, we would not be able to maintain the same political or economic system which has enabled this country of ours to grow from a small colony of 3 million on the Atlantic seaboard to a world power of 162 million, the most productive industrially and agriculturally the world has ever known.

The doctrine of peaceful coexistence is being advanced by the men in the Kremlin, by the neutralist nations which do not desire to take sides as between freedom and slavery, and by some of our people who have not necessarily followed the full implications of what the Communists mean by "peaceful coexistence."

Their basic policy is and has been that they would permit a nation to peacefully coexist for such a time as suited the Kremlin's convenience and until they could either be subverted by communism from within or taken over by Communist aggression from without.

You can coexist with a tiger in his cage right after the beast has had a full meal and has a need to digest it, but once the tiger is hungry, the individual in the cage becomes the obvious next meal. Right now the Communist tiger is digesting a very full meal in Indochina.

We must never lose sight of the fact that communism is the most brutal, Godless tyranny the world has ever known. As a temporary expedient they may change their day-to-day tactics, but their long-term strategy remains the same under Malenkov as it was under Lenin and Stalin. That strategy is that communism will dominate the world, and free institutions and enterprise as we know them will be destroyed.

Those who lose sight of this basic fact endanger the freedom of this Republic and the hope of having a free world of free men. You could, of course, always buy temporary respite by a policy of appeasement, but the world should have learned at the time of Munich that the road to appeasement is not the road to peace. It is only surrender on the installment plan.

Lincoln in his time pointed out that this Nation could not continue half slave and half free. In our time it is doubtful that the world can long continue half slave and half free when the record is clear that the ultimate objective of communism remains the destruction of human freedom everywhere.

The United Nations Charter in article 1, section 1, states that the purposes of the United Nations are: "To maintain international peace and security, and to that end: To take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace, and for the suppression of acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace, and to bring about by peaceful means, and in conformity with the principles of justice and international law, adjustment or settlement of international disputes or situations which might lead to a breach of the peace."

Despite the fact that the Soviet Union was a charter member of the United Nations and subscribed to the Charter, the representative of that government admitted that the Soviet Union had given both material and moral support to the Chinese and North Korean Communist aggressors in Korea. Those nations acted in violation of the resolutions of the United Nations and made war upon the United Nations and its members which were helping to resist the aggression pursuant to the resolution and were assisting the victim, the Republic of Korea. If there had been any real fortitude shown, on this basis alone, the Soviet Union should have been expelled from the United Nations. Now we find the Kremlin spokesmen using the United Nations as a forum to have this country declared an aggressor because we have been unwilling to see the nine and one-half people of the Republic of China on Formosa sold down the river into Communist slavery.

On the day the men in the Kremlin celebrated their 37th anniversary of the Bolshevik Revolution and Mr. Malenkov is reported to have sent word that the Soviet Union wants to be friends with America, their MIG planes had already shot down another plane belonging to the United States Armed Forces with the loss of one more American. This plane like the others was where it had every right to be.

I have always felt that when we asked Americans wearing their country's uniform to carry out assignments for this Government, they are entitled to the full protection of the Government and the people of this country who send them there.

On September 5, just 2 months ago, another American plane was shot down. On September 5 I sent the following wire to President Eisenhower:

"Just another note from our State Department to the Kremlin hierarchy will not impress these uncivilized rulers nor the Russian people, who were the first victims of Communist tyranny, that this new attack upon an American plane confirms Communist arrogance and aggressiveness to a point where the breaking of diplomatic relations is justified. I strongly urge that the Soviet Ambassador and his staff be sent home which will at least eliminate one center of Communist espionage in the United States. Our own Ambassador should be recalled from Moscow as notice to the Russian people that so long as the present Communist dictatorship rules them their country can no longer be treated as a member of the family of peace-loving nations of the world or entitled to the respect of the free nations."

Though the executive branch of the Government, which has the primary responsibility for our foreign policy, did not, for reasons which they believe valid, agree with this point of view, I respectfully do not concur in the decision. I think this audience may be interested in some extracts from one of our servicemen who was then situated in Japan.

"September 9, 1954.

"Dear Senator: It is requested that you keep this letter confidential until about the 1st of October, at which time I will be off duty.

"Your recent suggestion that we sever diplomatic relations with Russia makes me indeed proud that you represent us. * * *

"Next Saturday we hold memorial services here at Atsugi for Lieutenant Reed, our navigator, who never got out of the plane that the Communists pulled their sneak attack upon. It was a sneak attack for two reasons: One was that it was a type of Neptune that had one-third the armament the others carry. The other reason was that tracers were going by before anyone knew their whereabouts. One plane was below, another above. * * * Again let me express my appreciation for your intelligent thinking on the Russian subject. It is hard to serve knowing one has no backing."

There are some people who have mistakenly believed that the breaking of relations would necessarily be a prelude to conflict.

It is my personal belief that such action would only restore the situation between the Soviet Union and the United States to precisely the same position it was under Presidents Woodrow Wilson, Warren Harding, Calvin Coolidge, and Herbert Hoover.

To be sure, we would lose a limited value of having an Ambassador at Moscow, but the Soviet Union would lose a much greater advantage of having their embassy and consulates in this country where they serve as centers of espionage and where their representatives have always had much more freedom of travel in our country than our diplomatic staff has had in the Soviet Union.

It would also clearly indicate to the people of Russia, who were the first victims of Communist tyranny, that the Communist hierarchy of lawless, godless men no longer was entitled to recognition in at least this free nation of the world. It would serve the same purpose among the satellite nations, who through no fault of their own have been the victims of Communist aggression.

Since April 1, 1950, we have now had our ninth plane attacked and our sixth plane shot down. After each incident we have sent a note and made demands, none of which have been complied with, and all of our notes have been rejected or ignored.

I do not believe we either maintain our own self-respect or gain theirs under such conditions

The action of Ambassador Lodge and the American delegation at the United Nations in refusing to attend the Soviet's birthday celebration is to be commended. I am deeply shocked that Ambassador Bohlen did not follow the same course at Moscow.

Unless I am greatly mistaken, the American people will be far more interested in how the men in the Kremlin are to be effectively censured by our Government to prevent further attacks on our aircraft than they will be on a censure of one Member of the Senate.

The lives of Americans are involved in the former which to me has priority over any other business important or routine.

The United Nations, which came into being with the hopes and the prayers of free people everywhere that this organization might be able to help establish a system of international law and order that would preserve the peace of the world for ourselves and our children, has been seriously challenged by the aggressive forces of communism and only a minority of the members responded to resist that aggression.

In the entire period of the Korean war, out of the 60 members of the United Nations, only 17 of them contributed a single soldier, sailor, or airman to the resistance of aggression in Korea. Outside of the United States the other 16 contributed a total force of only 45,000. The United States of America alone contributed more than 450,000 at one time, and we rotated more than a million men through Korea during the 3-year period of the Korean war.

The Republic of Korea, which was the victim of Communist aggression, contributed more than 600,000 and suffered heavy casualties both among its military and civilian population.

This means that all the other members of the United Nations supplied only 10 percent of the forces made available by that organization for the resistance of aggression and less than 5 percent of the forces made available by the United States of America and the Republic of Korea alone.

No reasonable person, in or out of the United Nations, can claim that this is an effective collective security system in action. It may be unpleasant at times to face realities, but the record cannot be disputed that insofar as the United Nations is concerned in the Korean conflict their resolutions were not backed by effective force and the multiplicity of counsel and the veto exercised by our associates seriously handicapped our commanders in the field and prevented anything but a stalemated finish to this first overt aggression to challenge the peace of the world.

When World War II ended this Nation stood preeminent in military power and we commanded the respect of our allies, the neutrals and our enemies as well. We had the largest Air Force and Navy the world had ever known and while our ground force was not the largest it was probably the greatest fighting machine that had existed up until that time. We also were the exclusive possessor of the atomic weapon.

If there was ever a time when it might have been feasible to sit down and negotiate a peace with honor with the Soviet Union that would not have been at the expense of small nations and would not have resulted in the enslavement of once-free people, that was the time.

Yet, by a series of agreements at Yalta, Tehran and Potsdam, the foundation was laid for events which have resulted in Czechoslovakia, Poland, Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, continental China, and North Korea passing into the Communist orbit.

One of the great mistakes made in the governments of the world was that too little attention was paid to the writings of Adolf Hitler in Mein Kampf. In those writings he spelled out the course of events he ultimately followed after he had come to power. Because of divided counsel, procrastination, paralysis caused by fear or appeasement the world was drawn into World War II.

Many competent historians and observers today believe that had the League of Nations and the free world taken effective steps to block the Japanese move into Manchuria, to stand firm against Mussolini's aggression against Ethiopia, to resist Hitler's march into the Rhine made in violation of the Versailles Treaty, to have been willing to uphold Austria when she became the first victim of Hitler's aggression or to have been prepared to resist the appeasement at Munich we might have been saved "the blood, the sweat, and tears" of World War II, but these were opportunities lost never to be regained.

We must refrain from being oversold on any panacea. From 1945 until the outbreak of the Korean war in June of 1950 the American people had been oversold on the United Nations. Many had come to naively believe that since the Soviet Union was a member of that organization it was pledged to support its charter and would abide by its actions. We found that merely passing a resolution in the United Nations did not stop the ruthless aggression of either North Korea or the Chinese Communists. The record is clear by the statements of the Soviet's United Nations representative who told the other members of the United Nations to their faces that the Soviet Union had supplied the arms and ammunition and had given moral support to the aggressor and defied them to do anything about it. There was never a clearer cut case warranting expulsion for a violation of the terms of the charter. This was the time that action should have been taken. Another opportunity was lost.

To somewhat of a similar extent over a period of 3 years we placed too much reliance upon the concept of a European defense command under the North Atlantic Alliance. This concept which was advanced by France was repudiated by the nation which had fathered it. An effective alternative had to be found in order that a free Western Germany could be brought into the defense of Western Europe. Without Western Germany's contribution it is highly dubious that there can be an adequate defense in the event the Soviet forces start moving across the Elbe. This loss of 3 years due to the procrastination of France has been a severe blow to the defense of Europe.

At Geneva the Communist world won another victory. The defeat of the French and associate forces in Vietnam resulted in the loss of the entire Tonkin Delta, one of the great rice bowls of the world and some 10 million free people in north Vietnam. A chain reaction has been created. This additional Communist victory added to the stalemate in Korea and the Communists taking over of China on the continent may make it difficult to prevent additional Communist aggression.

Recently at Manila, in order to create a counterbalance to these Communist successes a southeast Asian pact was entered into. It is a step in the right direction, but in and of itself without implementation it will not prevent further Communist successes.

Three nations were eliminated whose support would be necessary for effective resistance to communism in that area of the world. The Republic of Korea has an armed force of approximately 600,000, and the Republic of China, now on Formosa, has about 500,000. These two small nations alone with 1,100,000 in their armed forces have several times the number of men in their army, navy, and air force than do the combined forces of all the rest of the nations situated in southeast Asia including Australia and New Zealand. In addition, Japan with her 80 million industrious people, but with a very small defense force, is also excluded from the Manila pact. These exclusions under the circumstances hardly seem realistic to me.

For 30 years the Far East has been a major objective of the Soviet Union and international communism. It was best expressed by Lenin when he said that "the road to Paris is through Peking." Many years later Stalin said that "with Japan the Soviet Union would be invincible." It is my firm belief that the long-term Soviet strategy is to first consolidate its position in Asia and then to be prepared to turn with the overwhelming strength of manpower and resources against the West.

Even among a few of the nations we have assisted with military and economic aid there has been a growing neutralism. This has been an inevitable result of Communist military and diplomatic victories which has led to the paralysis that has seized some of our allies. It was their fear of the Soviet Union and the possible Chinese Communist reactions against Hong Kong and southeast Asia that led to the veto of the recommendations of our military commanders, MacArthur, Van Fleet, and Clark.

In making our reappraisal we have a right to ask ourselves will these nations be able to stand up against Communist threats and international blackmail any better when the Soviet Union has had 3 to 5 years more to stockpile the atomic and the hydrogen weapons which they are now manufacturing.

What will be their powers of resistance if at some future unspecified time the Soviet Ambassador calls on the foreign minister and hands him an ultimatum with a 5-hour time limit saying in effect unless that nation gives the guaranty to the Soviet Union that no American bomber will be allowed to take off from any of its bases their capital city will be wiped out. Is there any reason to believe that they will be better able to stand up then than they are today? I think not.

Yet, both among our allies and among the neutrals, there must be at least an intuitive understanding that if our Nation was destroyed and our will to resist was crushed that their hope of survival would vanish for there would then be left in the world no power sufficient to hold in check the ruthless, godless men in the Kremlin. For our own survival as well as for theirs we must keep strong, alert, and courageous. Weakness in the face of the bully, be he the schoolyard or the international variety, merely encourages new affronts and increased physical violence.

At the September session of the United Nations General Assembly the opening phases of an effort to bring Communist China into the United Nations took place. With our Government taking the lead in opposition the initial effort was defeated.

To bring Communist China into the United Nations would undermine the moral foundation upon which the United Nations is supposed to rest. It would be a betrayal of the 35,000 Americans who lost their lives in the defense of the plan of collective security. It would be a betrayal of the million civilian and military casualties of the little Republic of Korea which was the victim of the aggression and which has itself been kept out of the United Nations organization by a Soviet veto. It would be placing a premium on aggression for the Korean war is only halted by a shaky armistice and no treaty of peace has yet been entered into. The objective of the United Nations of a free and united Korea expressed both before, during, and subsequent to the Korean war has not been achieved.

It would be giving priority to a nation which has been the aggressor in Korea and has been declared the aggressor in Korea by the United Nations over 14 nations which have not been aggressors against the world organization. These nations are Austria, Ceylon, Finland, Ireland, Italy, Jordan, the Republic of Korea, Nepal, Portugal, Libya, Japan, Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia.

As long as I have a voice and a vote in the Senate of the United States I shall oppose the admission of Communist China into the United Nations.

Communist China would never be satisfied with admission into the General Assembly alone. Both Red China and the Soviet Union would insist that it be given the place of the Republic of China on the Security Council and still the Communists would not be satisfied. Using those two advantage points they would disrupt the United Nations Organization until out of sheer exhaustion it was agreed that they should be able to take over the island of Formosa with its 9 million free Chinese.

Formosa is not some small island like Catalina off our coast, but its population today is larger than a majority of the nations constituting the United Nations and its armed forces are the sixth largest in the world.

The shocking proposal of Clement Attlee to turn over Formosa to the Chinese Communists is nothing more than a proposal for a far-eastern Munich. It should be overwhelmingly rejected by the free nations of the world. Passage of Formosa into Communist hands would in the opinion of our defense chiefs drive a wedge into the middle of our defense position which runs from Japan through our great air base at Okinawa, to Formosa, the Philippines, and Australia.

Once having pierced that defense line both flanks could then be more easily turned and ultimately our defense position would move back to the Pacific Coast States of Oregon, Washington, and California.

There are certain basic principles to which I believe as free men we can subscribe:

1. Communist aggression against nations with whom we have treaty obligations should be met with all the force at our command. There must be no more Yalu River sanctuaries behind which the enemy can rearm and regroup his forces.

2. Allies who expect assistance must be prepared to render assistance in the common defense. Mutual aid and collective security must no longer be a one-way street whereby we shoulder 90 percent of the manpower and resources and have our operational hands tied by those who want to veto our winning a victory, but are themselves unwilling to carry their fair share of the load toward that objective.

3. As a nation we must not barter away the freedom of other nations, large or small, at international conferences, nor place our stamp of approval upon their enslavement if others undertake to negotiate new Munich-type agreements.

4. We should not enter into any treaty, pact, or agreement with the Soviet Union which would directly or indirectly condemn to perpetual slavery behind the Iron Curtain the peoples of Poland, Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, Eastern Germany, North Korea, or China.

5. We shall continue to strive for peace with honor. We shall continue to work for a system of international law and order which will preserve the peace for ourselves and our children. We shall continue to reiterate that we have only the feeling of friendship and sympathy for the great mass of people in Russia, in China, and in the satellite states who temporarily find themselves enslaved under tyrannical Communist government.

6. I was pleased to see that the President, in conformity with a congressional resolution, through the Voice of America called on all people of the world to join in a day of prayer for peace. We might also have a day for prayer for the freedom of the enslaved people of the world. The people behind the Iron Curtain in the Soviet Union, China, and the satellite nations of Eastern Europe should be asked to silently join in the great common effort for both peace and freedom.

Even the rulers of the Kremlin would not know whether their own bodyguards were joining in the prayer for freedom as well as for peace.

There will be no real peace except that which comes from men and women recognizing spiritual values, who also respect each other as human beings and not as mere cogs in a godless totalitarian regime determined to bend freemen to their will.

If we continue to show the same courage and common sense that motivated the men who sat in Philadelphia and under divine inspiration gave us first the Declaration of Independence and then the Constitution of the United States, there are none of our domestic problems we cannot solve and there is no foreign foe we need ever fear.

Address by Hon. Alexander Wiley, of Wisconsin, at Meeting of Japan Society in New York, Friday, November 5

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, November 10, 1954

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on Friday, November 5, 1954, it was my pleasure to deliver an address before the Japan Society at the Hotel Waldorf-Astoria in New York.

The occasion was in honor of the visit to the United States of His Excellency, Shigeru Yoshida, Prime Minister of Japan.

Premier Yoshida's address was, I believe, a historic reaffirmation of the intentions of his great country to continue to progress within the free family of nations toward the horizons of greater prosperity, freedom, and security.

Presiding at the historic occasion was Mr. John D. Rockefeller III.

I believe that the Japan Society, of which Mr. Rockefeller is the president, an organization founded, I may say, in 1907, is to be commended for its efforts in spearheading ever closer cooperation between the Japanese and the American people in cultural, economic, political, scientific, and other ways.

I send to the desk now the text of the address which it was my privilege to deliver that night, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

A Six-Point Program of Japanese-United States Cooperation

It is a source of deepest pleasure to be here tonight. And it is a privilege to express the sincere respect of myself and my colleagues in the United States Congress for one of the outstanding statesmen from one of our most valued associate nations in the free world—the Honorable Shigeru Yoshida, Prime Minister of Japan.

I. WELCOME TO OUR SHORES

It is a true privilege to welcome him back to America's shores after the negotiation of the 1954 mutual defense assistance agreement with our Nation and a prior peace treaty with 47 other nations in 1951.

These postwar acts of courage and resoluteness have reestablished Japan as one of the most important of the free nations of the world. How thoroughly Prime Minister Yoshida's sound judgment, and that of the Japanese people, has been vindicated by the subsequent record of peaceful, democratic achievement in postwar Japan.

II. JAPAN'S POSTWAR ACHIEVEMENTS

For, in a brief period of but 9 years, Japan has accomplished much. She has tailored democracy to her unique and valued traditions. She has rehabilitated her economy to gain a standard of living for her peoples equal to that of the prewar era.

And, most important of all, Japan has stood, with fortitude and courage, firm in the ranks of the free world against threats of Communist aggression and subversion.

These achievements have entitled Japan to the friendship and confidence of freemen throughout the globe. They have at the same time placed upon her new responsibilities for cooperation and leadership among the free peoples of Asia.

III. TWO DANGERS CONFRONTING JAPAN AND FREE WORLD

For today, a clear and present danger confronts Japan, as well as every other member of the free world—from Asia, to the Middle East, to Europe, to our own Western Hemisphere. It is a two-headed danger which must not be avoided or overlooked.

1. First danger: communism

First, there is the danger of Communist aggression and subversion. Here, a godless, materialist, aggressor movement has extended its all-destructive tentacles to enslave one-third of the land area and one-quarter of the peoples of the globe.

In China, as but one example, the Communist myth of a people's paradise has been turned into a blood bath of terror for millions. On the basis of the scant and fragmentary figures available, it is estimated that several million Chinese have been executed; some ten to twenty million have been imprisoned or forced into slave labor; perhaps $2½ billion worth of property has been confiscated; and by next year, according to the Chinese Communists themselves, 1 out of 10 independent Chinese farmers will be driven into state-controlled cooperatives.

The danger stems equally from the more than 325 Communist divisions and more than 1,500 military aircraft. These forces, at this very moment, are available to further Communist aggression in Asia and elsewhere, as was so clearly demonstrated in both Korea and Indochina.

(a) Japan and Communism

Yet today—with Communist forces poised, with the Communist record blackened with aggression; with Communist hands red with the blood of their citizens—nevertheless the Communists would sing the siren song of peace and trade in Asia. Until communism has purged itself of a hundred years of lies and enslavement, its luring promises can lead but to the destruction of all that you have so rightly preserved in free democratic Japan, Mr. Prime Minister.

You have not only fearlessly guided your nation in the path of truth and right, but you have warned clearly of the continued Communist threat to Japanese freedom and democracy. I remember full well the conclusion of the San Francisco Peace Conference in 1951 when you so correctly stated that:

"The sinister forces of totalitarian aggression and tyranny operate still throughout the globe. The forces are sweeping over half the Asiatic Continent—sowing seeds of dissension, spreading unrest and confusion, and breaking out into open aggression here and there—indeed at the very doors of Japan.

"* * * It is clear as day that this tide of aggression may beat down upon our shores. * * * It is imperative for the sake of our very existence that we take adequate security measures."

2. Second danger: Free world social and economic oversight

But there is a second danger which confronts Japan, America, and the other states of the free world. It is the danger of economic collapse. This danger may arise if the free world were to overlook the vital importance of helping free people who are willing to help themselves in furthering their economic and social welfare.

In this connection, the American people are fully aware and deeply grateful for the great efforts, sacrifices, and courage which have been demonstrated by the Japanese people. The Japanese people have inundertaken to insure their own security and to accept the heavy responsibilities of association with the free world. We fully realize that this vital role depends upon the continued stability and future development of the Japanese economy, and upon the social and economic welfare of the Japanese people.

(a) Japan and the Free World Economy

Japan—supporting a population of 87 million souls in an area the size of California, devoid of exportable resources and dependent upon imports for 20 percent of its food and most of its industrial raw materials—must trade to live. Japan's heroic measures have raised her balance of payments from a deficit of $200 million last year to a positive figure these past 4 months. But, somehow, the free world must expand its markets to absorb the 75 percent increase in Japanese exports, to compensate for the further decline in Japanese earnings as American forces are withdrawn.

To this end, Japan may well be one of the many countries which would benefit greatly by cooperating in the President's plan for international peacetime development of atomic energy.

III. UNITED STATES-JAPANESE PAST ACHIEVEMENTS IN CONFRONTING THE TWO DANGERS

Today, we take pride in the fact that Japan has played a vital role in confronting both of the threats to our free world.

With respect to the threat of Communist aggression and subversion, Japan fearlessly negotiated both the Security and the Mutual Defense Treaties to which I have referred. Under these 1951 and 1954 agreements, we are making available the equipment, materials, and services to arm her defense forces for the preservation of Japanese security and of global peace.

In confronting the social and economic danger, the great industrial and commercial nation of Japan has again assumed the responsibilities of free world association and leadership. She has correctly seen that her economic welfare depends upon the welfare and development of her less industrialized trading partners of free Asia to her south. As the only highly industrialized nation of this area, Japan has recently become a contributing member of the Colombo plan, along with Thailand and the Philippines. Her Foreign Minister has pledged her moral support to the Southeast Asian Treaty Organization and to the security and well-being of this great trading area.

At the same time, the United States has seized the initiative in reviewing its own trading policies. For our Nation, which has been supplying about one-third of Japan's total imports, has been buying in return from Japan only one-third as much as it has sold. This problem calls for wisdom and judgment that will redound to the mutual advantage of both nations.

IV. UNITED STATES-JAPANESE FUTURE ROLE IN CONFRONTING THE TWO DANGERS

The priceless values of human freedom and welfare, today threatened at every hand, do not allow either the United States or Japan to rest upon past achievements. Nor do the sustained Communist threats to world peace allow us the luxury of relaxation.

But 6 days from now, Mr. Prime Minister, my nation will celebrate the end of the first great war of this century. We will mourn the 30 million souls from all nations crippled or destroyed in that first conflict. Your nation, too, has known the unspeakable horrors of war. Perhaps no two nations in the world today are more aware of the total horror of total modern war, are more dedicated to preventing its recurrence than yours and mine.

Let us then reassure the world that we are together determined to preserve both peace, freedom, and democracy—through unity and through strength.

And as the United State's share in this joint reassurance, let me urge most strongly the following six-point program to govern our relations with your nation and with the loyal peoples of free Asia:

1. Proposed six-point United States program

1. That the United States continue to aid Japan in ensuring her own security through continued mutual defense allocations, through technical assistance, and through feasible military and civilian offshore procurement.

2. That the United States negotiate liberalized trade agreements with Japan on items of mutual advantage, and that the United States seek for Japan full membership within a liberalized General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade.

3. That the United States take the initiative, both within and without the Manila Pact and Colombo organizations, to aid all free Asian states to develop their economies and to expand their trade.

4. That the United States support with all the weight of its authority the application of such qualified Far Eastern nations as Japan, Korea, Laos, Cambodia, and the State of Vietnam for membership in the United Nations Organization, wherein they can more adequately fulfill their objective of peaceful international cooperation.

5. That the United States further develop, in cooperation with its Asian and European associates, a comprehensive and integrated program of technical assistance and economic development to assure the welfare and freedom of the peoples of Asia. And in this connection, that the United States extend to its highly industrialized associate, Japan, the technical know-how to rehabilitate and remodernize portions of Japan's industrial plant.

6. That the people of the United States join wholeheartedly with the people of Japan, even as with the people of West Germany, as equal, respected, and needed associates in the common task of serving human freedom, peace, and welfare throughout the globe.

V. CONCLUSION

It is my conclusion this evening that the United States and its free-world associates must adopt a positive, creative, and dynamic program which will counter the two dangers confronting our free world.

For, on our present globe, shrunken by jet transportation and atomic progress, every nation has come into every other nation's backyard. All free nations must in the end agree that their freedom and welfare depend in a large measure upon the freedom and welfare of their neighbors, but a few air-hours away. And, in the case of America, we must agree that we value, even as our own, the freedom and welfare of our historic neighbor Japan, which has accepted the courageous role of association with us in preserving a free and peaceful world for all.

A Challenge for Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES O. EASTLAND
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, November 10, 1954

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "A Challenge for Agriculture," delivered by J. Walter Hammond, of Tye, Tex., president of the Texas Farm Bureau, at Pleasure Pier, Galveston, Tex., on November 9, 1954.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A CHALLENGE FOR AGRICULTURE

This is always a great occasion for every year. This annual meeting of Farm Bureau members from all over the State is the big event of the year for our organization, and it is altogether fitting that we should meet like this once a year, for these conventions provide an opportunity for members to meet in council for the purpose of keeping agriculture geared to changing conditions.

I think it is appropriate for us to look back briefly at the road we have traveled and the milestones we have erected. I think it is generally accepted that since Farm Bureau was organized in this country agriculture has had more protection—more equality—than ever before in our history.

We have had on the books since 1938 a national farm program that guarantees a certain amount of security—a security that is rightfully ours. The farm program has been amended many times since it was first written, and undoubtedly it will be changed many times in the future, for it is not perfect and times do change. But we in Farm Bureau are resolved that it shall be as perfect as man can make it. This is one of our most important goals.

In the field of foreign trade we have many successes, but we still have a long way to go. Just recently we moved forward with legislation that authorizes the exchange of agricultural surpluses for foreign currencies.

We have built a farm-credit system that assures more adequate financial assistance.

Under the protection of Farm Bureau, our cooperatives are flourishing as never before. The REA alone has performed miracles.

Nine out of ten farms in this Nation are now electrified. We will continue to stand by the REA until every farm has an opportunity to get electricity. We are experiencing serious difficulties in the process of organizing rural telephone co-ops. This stems from the lack of cooperation on the part of established telephone companies, which because of circumstances, are monopolies. But you need not worry. We are now in the process of negotiating, we hope, an agreement with the telephone companies which will be mutually beneficial to both parties. If we fail in this friendly conference, there are other methods that may be a bit more rugged. But, be assured that we will not hesitate to follow through as the Farm Bureau is a rugged outfit.

We were able to get a drought-relief program started early 2 years ago that has helped alleviate the financial hardship caused by our long and costly drought. Just recently the Texas Farm Bureau was represented at a drought-relief meeting in Amarillo. Other participants in the meeting included private lending institutions, borrowers, and Government lending agencies. An agreement was reached which will enable borrowers to satisfy previous commitments in negotiating new loans.

Through research and education, we have improved our productive capacity and efficiency to a very great extent.

In the field of taxation, we have been instrumental in equalizing the tax load.

We have brought about many improvements in our laws pertaining to insect control, animal-disease eradication, and seed and herbicide regulations.

Within the organization itself, we have expanded and improved our services to take care of a growing membership. Incidentally, I am happy to report that we have the largest membership in our history—55,670 farm and ranch families in Texas. This represents an increase of 2,475 over last year. What's more, we only had 11 months in which to do the job this year due to a change in our by-laws at the last convention. The end of the fiscal year was changed from November 30 to October 31.

Now, I have been reviewing the past, and the only justification for looking back is to learn how to handle the problems of today and tomorrow.

Despite all the progress that has been made in securing a higher standard of living on the farm and ranch, the main job is still ahead. So far, we have only taken care of the minor and the temporary issues. We have not solved the age-old problem of finding enough markets to insure stability in our price structure.

Our main problem in agriculture is not overproduction. There is a need somewhere in this world for all the goods we can produce on our farms and ranches. The earth has a population of some 2½ billion people. Tonight 2 billion of them will go to bed hungry. Thus, our major goal is to improve our system of distribution; we need to improve the system in this country; but what we need even more is to exchange our goods and services with other countries. By doing that, the hungry and ill-clad people in more backward countries would have dollars with which to buy our commodities.

The barriers to a free interchange of goods and services between nations are many and complex. Our whole economic system in this country has been built on the false idea that we should always export and never import.

The United States has enjoyed the highest standard of living in the world because there have been no trade barriers between the States. In this country, specialization is encouraged. People in Pennsylvania do not try to grow cotton, and they do not erect a protective tariff to keep cotton goods out. Instead, they specialize in the production of iron and steel which they trade for cotton grown in Texas. We have the climate and growing season for cotton and they do not. They have access to coal and iron deposits which we lack. Therefore, we specialize in the growing of cotton and they specialize in the making of steel. We grow cotton cheaper than they could ever hope to, and they can make steel much more economically than we could. So Pennsylvania and Texas exchange their products, and both profit from the transaction. This is possible because we have free trade in the United States.

Agriculture is not the only segment of the American economy that would benefit from free trade with the rest of the world. Industry and labor would also benefit. Of course, there would have to be a shifting of productions, and many factories would have to close and many workers would be laid off. But, they can do it if agriculture can. We have lost some of our markets for wheat and cotton, and we have shifted production. But, this shutdown in industry would be temporary.

Unfettered trade would mean that many of the imported goods would be cheaper, and thus the American consuming public would have more money left over to spend on other goods and services. In addition, the foreign countries that would sell to us would have more dollars with which to buy American goods. The net effect of all this would be to stimulate production. There would be an increased need for our labor and capital.

The shutdown factories and idle workers would be engaged in producing goods that would sell on a free market, not like the present when they are producing for a protected and limited market. There is not a legitimate excuse, except for defense needs, for tariffs and other barriers that protect goods produced in this country. The trade barriers were erected when our industries were small and needed protection to get started. But that need has long since passed, for our industrial machine is now the largest in the world.

This expansion of markets through free trade is the major goal which we in agriculture should strive for. Because of the nature of agricultural production, and because we are denied markets throughout the world for our products, we in agriculture have suffered most from trade restrictions.

At the present the farmer's share of the consumer's dollar is 42 percent, or the lowest it has been since World War II. Our surpluses have continued to pile up in many commodities. Because of this, we are faced with the problem of diverted acres and Government controls of all kinds. With costs still mounting and prices on the decline we are caught in a cost-price squeeze.

From 1947 to 1950, the farmers' dollar dropped 26 percent, their purchasing power 29 percent. In 1951, farmers' dollar incomes recovered about half of the previous drop, but their purchasing power regained only about a fifth of its previous decline. Although prices paid by farmers for family living items have remained fairly stable since 1951, further declines in net dollar incomes have reduced farmers' purchasing power to a new postwar low, approximately equal to its 1941 level.

In agriculture, it has been traditional to produce as much as possible. We know that units of production times price, less expenses, gives us our net income. So we have followed the line of thinking that the best way to have a high net income is to produce all we could, sometimes regardless of demand. Unfortunately, when prices have declined, we have increased production to offset a lower income. Actually, what we are doing is to depress prices even more while still laboring under fixed costs.

In industry, it is different. When demand falls off for industrial products, the manufactures do not step up production. Instead, they curtail their output and lay off workers to cut costs. They produce only what the market will absorb. This is the economy of scarcity.

We in agriculture believe in the philosophy of full production. Full production means more wealth for everyone. When production is cut, the amount of wealth in the Nation is reduced in direct proportion.

The important thing is that the two kinds of economic thinking—the full production philosophy and the economy of scarcity—cannot exist side by side. There can be no coexistence. One of the two will have to fail. In this instance, it is agriculture which cannot survive. The reason is obvious: full production means producing more for lower and lower prices while still bearing the burden of high operating costs. The things we have to buy are kept high by an economy of scarcity.

Now, we in agriculture constitute only about 13½ percent of the total production of this country. If we cannot persuade the other 86½ percent of the population to accept our philosophy, our only alternative is to copy their methods.

Keeping our production in line with demand, as you well know, is a seemingly impossible problem. We know that it will not work satisfactorily on a volunteer basis. In contrast to other industries, there are literally millions of manufacturers in agriculture. Their investment is geared to full production. They cannot cut costs substantially because their overhead remains high.

Nor can we expect the present method of acreage allotments to work. At the present, we are attempting to control individual commodities. We have seen the inequities of this procedure. Producers of certain commodities are discriminated against. And in addition to that, producers of nonbasic crops are complaining, and rightfully so, that the practice of planting acres diverted from basic crops (wheat, cotton, corn, peanuts, tobacco and rice) to non-basic crops is destroying the markets for the nonbasics.

The problem has become so serious that something must and will be done to relieve the situation. Farmers themselves can provide the best solution. If they do not, then the Department of Agriculture will. This year, the Department, in an effort to control diverted acres in 1955, planned to make a total soil-depleting allotment for all farms with more than 10 diverted acres. The planned method of determining the total soil-depleting acres for individual farms would have resulted, in extreme cases, in some farms receiving a total soil-depleting allotment equal to the total cultivated acres in the farm which could have been planted in price-supported crops. On the other hand, there would have been some farms which would have been required to divert one half of their land from production.

Here, in a nutshell, is our problem. We are simply producing more agricultural commodities than we can sell at reasonable prices.

We in Texas think we have the answer to that problem. We think we have a plan that will be fair to all concerned with a minimum of cost to the Government. What's more, we think it will work if it is administered properly.

First, I want to make it perfectly clear that the proposed plan will not alter in anyway the farm program now provided for the six basic crops.

Since 1949, the Texas Farm Bureau has had a position favoring an overall acreage retirement plan, or soil fertility bank as it is sometimes called. This plan has been altered some, but the original idea remains the same. For 5 years we have advocated this plan. It wasn't easy to sell during the Korean war when all-out production was called for. But, we have made progress. Several other States have adopted the philosophy of the plan. In fact, we were even able to get the idea included in the Agricultural Act of 1954 which was passed by the 83d Congress.

Here, briefly, is how the plan would work: Instead of attempting to put the basic of control on the individual commodity, the Texas plan would be set up on the basis of total farm-acreage control; that is, the number of retired acres over the Nation would be determined by the total overproduction of all farm commodities.

The first step would be to determine from statistics and experience the total overproduction that can be expected from all crops. The next step would be to determine the number of acres responsible for this overproduction. Carrying it a step further, we could determine the percentage of total cultivated acreage responsible for this overproduction. From the best estimates available, this overproduction runs anywhere from 5 to 15 percent of the total acres in cultivation.

To bring the production of agricultural commodities in line with estimated domestic consumption, plus exports, it would be necessary to require every farmer to reduce his acreage by that percent. As an illustration, let us suppose that there was an overproduction of 10 percent of all crops. Then every farmer would be required to take 10 percent of his land out of production. He could not produce any crops on this retired land that might contribute to overproduction. Instead, the farmer would use his idle land—the 10 percent—for soil building and conserving practices. And this would be the only requirement to make the farmer eligible for support prices for his commodities. He would be able to plant the other 90 percent of his acres to crops of his own choosing.

If farmers, in following this procedure, overplanted any one crop, that crop would go down automatically in price. But since there would be only enough acres in production to produce all crops necessary, some other crop would be underplanted, resulting in a price for this underplanted crop of more than a 100 percent of parity. In this case, the farmer would shift production from the overproduced crop to the one that was underproduced and bringing high prices. Prior to 1933, before any farm program was enacted, the farmers of this country kept a balance of production as between the different crops.

Under this system, it would be desirable to establish a variable support price to encourage this shifting of production.

In a few years this program would, by using the modernized parity formula as provided in the present law, develop a true concept of the cost of production of the different commodities. This would eliminate the criticism that some crops are supported too high when modern methods of production and harvesting are considered.

If there were danger of continued overplanting of the basic commodities, it could be eliminated by continuing the present program for those crops with the provision that the producers of those crops first would have to comply with the overall program before being eligible to participate in the basic commodities program.

Under the existing system, the most difficult problems are the distribution of allotments fairly to producers and in alloting acreage to new growers. The Texas plan would eliminate these problems.

Our plan would simplify administration. It would eliminate the necessity of having committeemen measure different crops on the same farm, and the farmer wouldn't have to worry about whether or not he had all his different crops within the acres allotted to him. The only requirement of the committees would be to determine whether or not each farmer had his correct percentage of land retired from production. They would not be concerned with what the farmer had planted on the remainder of his land.

Under this system, a support price could be provided for all storable commodities, including nonbasics, at a minimum cost to the Government. If a crop was overproduced and there was a support price, we will say, of 80 percent of parity, then the Government would come into possession of the crop at that price. In the next season, when the producers switched from overproduced crops, it would bring the overproduced commodity in line with needs. At the same time the price of the commodity would advance to parity, which would give the Government a profit rather than a loss if the producer did not redeem the commodity.

The success of this plan is, of course, dependent upon good administration that would strive to keep the acres in production down to a level that would produce only the needed supplies for domestic consumption and export. The plan would provide a system under which farmers might bring supplies of all commodities in line with demand. It would limit Government regimentation to a minimum.

Agriculture is ill and there is no prospect for recovery in the immediate future. We are gathered here this week because we are concerned about agriculture and because we have a responsibility to our industry and to the Nation.

Agriculture is a basic industry. Each year new wealth is created on the land. Only a few of our other industries are occupied with the creation of new wealth. Most of our labor force is engaged in processing, finishing, and changing this new wealth into goods ready for consumption. When an industry that is creating new wealth is ill, it can have an adverse effect on the whole economy.

We have already seen how that lower farm incomes have affected the rest of the economy. Manufacturers who make farm equipment and even family living items have had to curtail production because the farmer cannot buy the things that he once did. This has resulted in workers in these plants being laid off. If the unemployment begins to snowball, as it can easly do, we will have a downward spiral toward a depression.

Depressions have a tendency to follow wars. Many of you here today can remember the situation after World War I. The war brought a great demand for agricultural commodities and farm prices reached a peak shortly after the war. Then, suddenly in 1920, the bubble of farm prosperity burst, and the farmer found himself in a major economic disaster.

The industry rallied some during the twenties, but had never fully recovered when the great depression of the thirties came along and plunged the entire economy into chaos.

During World War II the economy of the Nation followed the same inflationary trend that it had in all previous wars. When controls were relaxed shortly after the war, farm prices shot up to new highs. However, within 3 years, the outlook was vastly different. Farm prices started down, and surpluses started piling up. The Korean war temporarily bailed the farmer out of this predicament. But, after 1951, farm income began that familiar decline.

I don't have to tell you that agriculture is a sick industry. If it fails, it could very well drag the rest of the economy into a depression. Since the welfare of agriculture has a direct effect upon the rest of the country, we owe it to ourselves as well to the Nation to honestly seek a solution to our problems. It can be done and it must be done. For we cannot afford to place our hopes for prosperity on inflated wartime prices. I do not want prosperity if it must be bought with the lifeblood of eager, hopeful American boys.

We are gathered here to try to find the best possible solutions to our problems. It is a great opportunity to serve our industry and our Nation. It is a solemn occasion, for the decisions we reach here could very well decide the future course for agriculture. I hope that we can erect a high standard for all agriculture. In casting our votes tomorrow, I hope that each one of us will be guided by these words: "God grant me the serenity to accept the things I cannot change; the courage to change the things I can; and the wisdom to know the difference."

Communists Are Not the Only Saboteurs of the American Way of Doing Things

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH E. FLANDERS

OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, November 10, 1954

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Communists Are Not the Only Saboteurs of the American Way of Doing Things," written by Gus Turbeville, president of Northland College, of Ashland, Wis.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Saturday Evening Post of May 8, 1954]

COMMUNISTS ARE NOT THE ONLY SABOTEURS OF THE AMERICAN WAY OF DOING THINGS

(By Gus Turbeville)

Subversives are infiltrating everywhere in our country today. They are found in our schools, in labor unions, farm groups, professional groups, churches, and even business. Each day all of us come into contact with literally dozens of subversives. The subversives are very dangerous individuals because, unless we are on guard, they will destroy America as we know it today.

The subversives I am talking about adopt ingenious disguises. They are hard to spot because they so often pose as 100 percent Americans. Many of them even belong to patriotic organizations. In these organizations they constantly discuss the lack of loyalty in others.

It is possible, however, for a careful observer to spot these subversives. One good clue is that they look upon the American way as being one way—their way. This one way may be the way of the Republicans, or the Democrats, or businessmen, or farmers, or laboring men. In any event, the subversives feel that their way of looking at America is the only safe way and that all other ways are dangerous and should be crushed.

Actually, the American way is a number of ways. Historians are agreed that in any list of great Americans the following names are eminently eligible for inclusion: George Washington, Benjamin Franklin, Thomas Paine, Thomas Jefferson, Andrew Jackson, Abraham Lincoln, and Woodrow Wilson. Also added could be the names of such modern people as Herbert Hoover and Franklin Roosevelt. Although no one could doubt the patriotism of any of the men mentioned, they represent many different political philosophies. Several of them, while in public life, were strongly opposed by large segments of the population. It would be very difficult, though, to say that some of these men stood for the American way and that others did not. In truth, they all stood for the American way.

During the last 200 years the world has been in a constant state of flux. Countries which have been adaptable to change have progressed whereas countries which refused to change because of a rigid authoritarianism have declined. Paradoxically, at this moment, when we have the greatest need for flexibility, there is a strong movement in this country for absolute conformity. In schools this movement has been especially felt. Various pressure groups and individuals become incensed when a teacher holds some idea at variance with their own.

Every school administrator that I know personally has received numerous complaints about various members of his faculty. Some of these complaints have been justified, for it must be admitted that there have been instances of Communists infiltrating into our college faculties. But frequently the complaints merely reflect the complainant's lack of understanding of what an educational institution is.

This movement for conformity is a formidable barrier to new ideas. In our schools in particular there must be free interchange of ideas—even unpopular ones. It is necessary that our young people be taught to think. How will they do any real thinking unless they are confronted with differences? Institutions which are really free are of more help to various factions than are subservient organizations.

A factor of the utmost importance must be mentioned, and that is that free institutions cannot tolerate those groups which would overthrow freedom by force. One of the contradictions of freedom is that there must be a lack of freedom to overthrow freedom by force. Liberals have frequently been trapped by this dilemma and have not been sufficiently vigilant against groups which threaten our liberty by force. In some educational institutions certain self-styled liberals have not been above tyrannizing over their conservative colleagues.

Yes, we must watch out for subversives, because they pervade all aspects of American life today. We must protect ourselves from those who would adopt the methods of our enemies to vanquish our enemies, and in the process become as our enemies were. We have the most priceless heritage of individual freedom of any nation on earth, and we would do well to heed the advice of Benjamin Franklin, who said: "They that can give up essential liberty to obtain a little temporary safety deserve neither liberty nor safety."

PRICE OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

The Public Printer is authorized to furnish to subscribers the daily Record at $1.50 per month, payable in advance.

Remit by money order payable to Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the Record.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. The money derived from such sales shall be paid into the Treasury and accounted for in his annual report to Congress, and no sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided,* That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the RECORD with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the official reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix, but this rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Appendix the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed.

10. *Official reporters.*—The official reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this restriction shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. The Public Printer or the official reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Illustrations.*—Pursuant to section 182b, title 44, United States Code (as shown above), requests for authority to insert an illustration in the RECORD should be submitted to the Joint Committee on Printing through the chairman of the Committee on Printing of the respective House in which the speech desired to be illustrated may be delivered. Illustrations shall not exceed in size a page of the RECORD and shall be linecuts only. Copy for illustrations must be furnished to the Public Printer not later than 12:30 o'clock p. m. of the day preceding publication.

13. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

I

IN

I
un
the
ent
me
the
tio
tio
bu
T
was
as f
"

(Ad
LE
tic
so
Pa

As
still
who
stro
the
chan
gero
A
appr
essen
Th
adeq
think
vigor
Th
arm
Th
Marin
nizin
I. S
Unite
of 19
firmly
requi
build
But
tive b
notab
issue
the b
presc
has n
Tho
been
Res
repudi
chant
Thr
with s
to pr
privat
tional
Fro
clearly
It is
to the
people

Appendix

The Merchant Marine, Investment or Expense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, November 11, 1954

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "The Merchant Marine, Investment or Expense," delivered by me at the ninth annual convention of the National Defense Transportation Association, at the Hotel William Penn, in Pittsburgh, Pa., on October 26.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MERCHANT MARINE, INVESTMENT OR EXPENSE

(Address by Senator JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER, of Maryland, ninth annual convention, National Defense Transportation Association, Hotel William Penn, Pittsburgh, Pa., Tuesday, October 26, 1954)

As incredibly as it might seem, there are still too many—far too many—Americans who fail to appreciate the soundness of a strong merchant marine policy. In spite of the sorrowful history of the American merchant marine in two world wars, this dangerous attitude persists.

A realistic merchant marine policy—plus appropriate ships in sufficient numbers—is essential to national security.

The United States without a living and adequate merchant marine is almost as unthinkable as the United States without a vigorous Army, Navy, or Air Force.

The merchant marine is truly the fourth arm of our defense.

The 66th Congress enacted the Merchant Marine Act of 1920 as an answer to the agonizing lessons and deficiencies of World War I. Sixteen years later the Congress of the United States in the Merchant Marine Act of 1936—and in the succeeding act of 1946—firmly imbedded in the law of the land the requisites of a strong maritime and shipbuilding industry.

But both the legislative and administrative branches of our Government, with some notable exceptions, have failed to meet the issue squarely. As a regretable consequence, the bounden policy of the United States, prescribed in the statutory law of the land, has not been adequately implemented.

Though officially declared, this policy has been consistently ignored.

Responsible Government has frequently repudiated its function insofar as this merchant marine policy is concerned.

Through the years the Congress—again with some few exceptions—has been loathe to provide the cost of participation with private industry in establishing this national policy.

From the standpoint of shipping, we are clearly courting catastrophe.

It is an unconscionable neglect that goes to the very heart of our survival as a free people.

It is unconscionable since twice before—in two world wars—we went through the same agony. Twice we suffered the torturing consequences of loss of life and loss of treasure.

Each time we were suddenly confronted with the extreme necessity for creating a shipbuilding industry overnight. Alien ships were hired at exhorbitant prices. We found ourselves teetering as a Nation on the brink of disaster.

Desperately—almost hysterically—in a panic and at fearful cost, under the pressure of all-out war, we assumed such a burden.

It was a ghastly penalty—twice inflicted—for neglect; it would be criminal to permit this lunacy to occur a third time.

I plead today for security—the very security of this great country of ours. All that is asked is life, not death, for our sailors on the high seas in time of war, and provisions and materiel and transportation for our fighting and defense forces. That requires a working merchant marine policy now. It means a policy that will move steadily, year by year, not an eccentric stop-and-go policy, but a policy following and fulfilling a planned program. It means a policy so activated that it will be sufficient to the task in peace today and tomorrow, and effective in time of emergency in the uncertain future. It must be on a scale commensurate with the probability of foreseeable events.

We dare not be blind to the national defense in an hour when an unpredictable oligarchy in the Kremlin may or may not switch from murdering one another to murdering the world. This blindness to our own need is a threat more dangerous than outright sabotage by the enemy. Sabotage is overt and violent and arouses counteraction. But neglect is passive and ignored and keeps slowly bringing us nearer to a perilous failure. It is a failure which in the next world war we may not be able to overcome. Atomic war greatly condenses the timetable of preparation for defense to minutes—if it allows us even that.

Our enemies would, of course, prefer to have us helpless, with a slow, lame, and rusted merchant fleet. But 21 Presidents of the United States, from Washington to Eisenhower, have pleaded for a strong American merchant marine. Both Washington and Eisenhower spoke with a special understanding of the subject for both were commanders in chief in war and in peace. "I recommend to your serious reflections," George Washington told Congress, "how far and in what mode it may be expedient to guard against embarrassments from these contingencies by such encouragement to our own navigation as will render our commerce and agriculture less dependent on foreign bottoms." That was in the 18th century. In the 20th century President Eisenhower told the American people: "We were caught flatflooted in both world wars because we relied too much upon foreign-owned and operated shipping to carry our cargoes abroad and to bring critically needed supplies to this country. America's industrial prosperity and military security both demand that we maintain a privately operated merchant marine adequate in size and of modern design to insure that our lines of supply for either peace or war will be safe.

"I consider the merchant marine to be our fourth arm of defense and vital to the stability and expansion of our foreign trade."

The seven seas are strewn with the sunken ships and the dead men who paid the awful price for the neglect of our merchant marine strength. Foreign soil bears the gravestones of many an American who died because of delayed grand strategy, and a prolonged war—prolonged by reason of inadequate shipping and impoverished shipbuilding yards in the hour of strategic need. It would serve no particular purpose now to comb through the documents of discussion in the Congress and elsewhere to determine whose voice it was, what were the forces, from where did the counsel come that made possible this weakening of the American merchant marine.

However, we can be certain that the policy of neglect in our time is music to the ears of the Kremlin. And, no doubt, the Communist organization in the United States gives its applause. But it would be farfetched indeed to blame this slow obliteration of the Nation's fourth arm of defense on communism, either the imported or the homegrown variety.

Two schools of thought, in large measure, have generated much of the unfortunate propaganda which has accounted for the neglect of our merchant marine.

One school has been capably discredited and is without weight or respectability. But it was powerful in its day. It was the type of thinking which was fashionable in the middle thirties and is best exemplified in the words and the personality of Henry A. Wallace.

As a member of the Cabinet of the President of the United States, his words commanded attention. His was the voice that set itself in conflict with the accumulated wisdom on the subject since George Washington—to say nothing of the known and sensational tragedy of World War I—and gave our Congress baleful advice. Put in a single sentence, Wallace urged the superficially plausible recommendation that the United States should ship its foreign trade in vessels that would carry it at the lowest immediate dollar cost.

This was the Wallace advice that played its role in helping to deprive the Nation during the first years of World War II of an effective merchant marine.

The other facet of opinion which is far more respectable and to which I have given my most earnest study emanates from such erudite and patriotic groups as are represented by the Commission on Foreign Economic Policy, popularly known as the Randall Commission. Thinking along kindred lines, if not quite identical, is offered also, by another distinguished body known as the Public Advisory Board for Mutual Security.

In reporting to the President of the United States in February 1953, the Public Advisory Board for Mutual Security, recommended that "cargo preference, by which 50 percent of the cargo on aid and loan shipments is reserved to domestic carriers, not be applied to countries that let American shippers compete on a fair basis." Like the Wallace argument for shipping our materials abroad by whatever ships cost the least, this is plausible, too. The Board urges that the cargo preference be not applied against countries that compete with us on a fair basis. But the inherent nature of the shipping industry at home and abroad makes it basically impossible for any country to compete with us on a fair basis.

The premise is impossible—and contradictory.

How possibly can any foreign country compete with us fairly if we pay our seamen $248.81 a month, Sweden pays $84.43 a month, Great Britain $61.60, and Italy $34.30? I repeat: For every $248.41 we pay our seaman, Italy pays hers $34.30. The argument about fair competition is basically untenable. In the realistic light of the facts it is clearly idealistic in the extreme. Foreign shipping interests cannot compete with us fairly even if they would. But it sounds noble.

The same general wage and cost differentials apply also in the ship-building industry as between the United States and foreign nations, for we have an unequalled standard of living to uphold. It is this fundamental fact which renders utterly absurd any premise that foreign shipbuilders or foreign shipowners can compete with us on what, by any definition, could be described as a "fair" basis.

United States exports constitute nearly 20 percent and imports about 15 percent of the total trade of the free world. The Public Advisory Board argues that this trade is "now threatened by the inability of other countries to earn enough dollars to pay for their imports." Here we come to the Board's line of reasoning that approaches the position of the Randall Commission. This is the argument which says—it seems to me clearly enough—let America sacrifice her merchant marine so that foreign powers can obtain American dollars.

Under Merchant Marine Policy on page 68 of the report of the Randall Commission on Foreign Economic Policy to the President of the United States and the Congress, in January of 1954, there is this advice. I quote:

"The Commission recommends that the determination of the active merchant fleet requirements of the United States for the purpose of the Merchant Marine Shipping Act of 1936 take account of the availability of foreign vessels and of the importance to the balance of payments of foreign maritime nations of their dollar earnings from shipping services.

"At present, aside from the subsidies under the Merchant Marine Shipping Act, the United States merchant fleet enjoys the benefit of statutory preferences in the shipment of Government-owned and Government-financed cargo, which in effect give it the exclusive carriage of shipments by the defense agencies for American forces and of at least half of the other shipments financed by other United States Government agencies, including those arising from economic aid programs and Export-Import Bank loans. The effect is to compel countries receiving dollar assistance to spend a part of it on freight services which they could render to themselves if permitted to do so. This diverts a part of our economic aid from the purpose intended. * * *

"The Commission recommends that the statutory provisions requiring use of United States vessels for shipments financed by loans or grants of the United States Government and its agencies be repealed and that support sufficient to maintain a merchant marine adequate to our national requirements to be provided by direct means." I ask you, what more direct form of aid could be given the merchant marine than cargoes. And it is this form of aid, cargoes, which the 50-50 bill, recently enacted by the Congress, all too long aborning does supply.

To me the most significant argument not only in the phase of the report dealing with merchant marine policy—but in the whole report—is the line of dissent which reads: "In view of present world conditions I do not believe that the statement should be interpreted to mean that we should place less reliance upon the maintenance of a strong merchant marine than that authorized by the Merchant Marine Shipping Act of 1936." Faith in this dissenting statement bears the names of Commission members Jesse W. Tapp, of San Francisco, its author; John Hay Whitney, of New York; and Senator Harry F. Byrd, of Virginia. In his statement to the overall report, as one of the members of the Commission, Senator EUGENE D. MILLIKIN, of Colorado, says what it seems to me I would have said, were I in his place, and I would have been delighted had I had the acumen to use his words which are: "There is opportunity for measurable and sensible objectives to help our friends abroad without getting off into misty and extravagant do-goodism on a global scale."

David J. McDonald, of Pittsburgh, another member of the Commission, departs from the majority position as follows: "It is not disputed that the United States should have an adequate merchant marine for the national defense and to develop and maintain its foreign and domestic commerce. * * * The history of our maritime industry from the First World War to the present confirms the fact that this industry has been inadequate to meet the needs for the development of our foreign trade and for the defense of our Nation during times when we were at war.

"In the determination of the requirements for a United States merchant fleet we should not put substantial reliance on the merchant ships of our allies. Our experience over the past four or five decades confirms this conclusion. * * * At the outbreak of two world wars, the United States has been caught short of sufficient ship bottoms to meet its requirements."

There you have it: The Randall Commission disagreeing with itself. The dissents making an infinitely more powerful case, it seems to me, than the position which would weaken our fourth arm of defense, in order—possibly—to help nations abroad.

Now what are the facts behind the policy of a weakened American merchant marine against which Senator Millikin, Senator Byrd, Mr. Tapp, and Mr. Whitney set themselves and which Mr. McDonald discusses so wisely.

I cannot find it in my heart to be restrained when I inveigh against a policy of demonstrable folly that twice cost us needless loss of life and treasure.

For I believe these two schools of thought—the Henry A. Wallace school and the Randall Commission school—point the path to unforgivable repetition of an unpardonable mistake.

It is advice that reeks with the prophecy of misfortune.

It would assure a depressed seafaring industry for us.

It would dictate the abdication of the control of our shipping to foreign powers.

It would place us financially, and in terms of needed ships and a needed shipbuilding industry, at the mercy of maritime interests abroad, who might not, if another war comes, be as friendly as they are today.

These foreign shipping interests have either refused us outright their cooperation in time of need—sometimes because of their own desperation—or given it to us stintingly at exorbitant prices. In war, our back to the wall, we were frequently victimized as a nation by operators in the foreign shipping industry.

This is as good a place as any to give you some of the arithmetic of extoriton invited by the fact that at the outbreak of World War I and World War II we had neither ships nor shipyards sufficient to meet the emergency.

When World War I struck the United States we were carrying only 9 percent of our export and import trade.

We lacked the ships for our basic needs.

Our allies whose shipping we had advanced by neglecting our own gave us little help.

Even before we were catapulted into World War I we lacked the ships to deliver our cotton. Our cotton exports dropped from 257,172 bales in August 1913 to 21,219 bales only a year later. The price of cotton dropped from $62.50 a bale in July 1914 to $36.25 in December of the same year.

The figures spelled bankruptcy for the American planter.

Then the foreign shipping interests that had fattened on our neglect of our own merchant marine readily leaped to capitalize fully on the emergency.

Shipping rates for us went up as much as 700 percent even before the matter of transporting munitions came materially into the picture.

When our shipping needs at the height of war were downright desperate, ocean-transportation rates zoomed to 2,000 percent for our cargoes.

These figures are not fanciful. They are derived from the final report of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, in the 81st Congress, 2d session. This report, known as the Merchant Marine Study and Investigation, is an incontrovertible record of history.

It seems incomprehensible that after this World War I experience we would substantially repeat the same error in World War II. And there again our allies lacked the ships to supply our needs or even their own.

Our economy, dangerously disturbed by urgent war needs, was further burdened by the necessity of providing a basic fleet of 5,000 ships.

What did we have as a result of the dreamworld thinking then so much in vogue regarding the merchant marine?

On September 1, 1939, the United States merchant fleet consisted of less than 1,400 seaworthy ships grossing 1,000 tons and over.

It was argued then, as before World War I and as some even argue today, that we could rely on the merchant fleets of our allies.

So the official estimate was that we would need only 1,200 ships.

The need proved to be far in excess of 6,200 ships.

It was a maritime miscalculation that cost us dearly.

The spectacular and sensational repetition of the World War I mistake gave our World War II enemies a tremendous advantage. And it cost the enemy nothing. Never in the history of human conflict did lack of reasonable foresight give the enemy so much for so little.

The success of the Axis on the high seas, possible because of this American lack, was so great that at one time it looked as if they were about to win total victory in the battle of the Atlantic.

Bringing the problem down almost to the present, let us ask ourselves what we would have done at the outbreak of Korean hostilities without the ships of the merchant marine and the Reserve fleet. Let us ask ourselves where we would have found experienced officers and men to man those ships. We would have been caught again in another frustrating net of helplessness. We would again have been obliged to start from scratch.

Consider the elementary logistics:

For every soldier we sent to Korea, every marine, every sailor, every flyer, we had to ship 5 tons of supplies.

For every day that he was there it took another 64 pounds of supplies and equipment.

The figures show that 5 million passengers were shipped to the Korean theater—5 million.

And 22 million tons of petroleum products.

Fifty-two million tons of dry cargo—of which our merchant shipping carried 80 percent.

The figures I have just given you come from Secretary of the Navy Charles S. Thomas.

Secretary Thomas very recently said this:

"In this age of supersonic speed and atomic power, there are many Americans who wonder why the United States needs a strong and adequate merchant marine. As Secretary of the Navy, I would like to make it emphatic and clear that we of the Navy regard the merchant marine as an indispensable element of our defense, fully as important and vital as the Army, Navy, or Air Force."

In fact, without a merchant marine, our Air Force would be severely crippled.

Not only in war but in peace as well a strong merchant marine is indispensable. For, among other reasons, with no shipping to sustain them, our shipbuilding and ship-repair facilities would not furnish the employment, direct and indirect, upon which so many port areas depend. Nor would these facilities be available in time of great need.

The cost of building a merchant marine under the stress and strain of war in a climate of limited manpower and fantastic inflation tells its own story.

Our World War I shipbuilding program cost almost $3 billion.

This same number of ships before the war, built on an orderly continuing plan such as I am now recommending for the future, would have cost about $840 million.

But there was another cost besides the mere money cost. Many of the hastily war-built ships could not take the heavy-duty abuse of war and proved ill-suited to their purpose.

Most of them appeared too late and never got into the war at all.

That's just the money side, apart from the loss of life and the desperation.

The World War II story on a grander scale is little better. It was an instance of doubling in stupidity.

The United States built more than 54 million deadweight tons of merchant shipping for this war.

The cost was $12½ billion.

If the construction had been done before the war on an annual, orderly basis, the cost for a 40-million deadweight-ton fleet would have been $4 billion. And think what a contribution it would have made to the employment situation in that period of national and human distress. If, instead of make-work projects, leaf raking, portrait painting, and the thousand and one other dubious ways of distributing billions to the needy then devised, we had programed a long-range ship-construction project, the saving of lives and wealth in World War II would have been incalculable.

The dollar saving in World War II by a sound maritime policy would have been $8½ billion.

With such a saving we could today at current high operating costs keep a fleet of 2,000 vessels trafficking on the high seas for more than a quarter of a century.

That's the bookkeeping, as told in two world wars, resulting from a maritime policy that shames American history.

That's what we can avoid for the future. The answer for the future is a firm, positive, national policy favorable to American shipping. It calls for an immediate, adequate, and continuing program of new cargo ship construction on an annual basis.

The Pentagon, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the experts in logistics, are all agreed on the soundness of such a program. They consider a powerful, well-balanced, immediately available merchant marine and a stable shipbuilding and repair industry to support it, as absolute essentials to security, and to the proper and successful functioning of the military in periods of emergency.

It would be a tragedy of the greatest moment and the deepest consequence if we failed to see the handwriting on the wall.

If anything has been proven by the events of the past it is the simple truth that a realistic merchant marine policy is essential to national security. That we repeated the mistakes of World War I and World War II—the identical errors—thereby inviting and barely escaping disaster, is a story of incredible folly. But that we are now in danger of being foolhardy enough to commit this same mistake for the third time, must, I submit, baffle the historians to the end of time.

We have the experience, we have the technology, we have the best and the wisest counsel, we have the means, and we know the danger that hovers over us and the free world. If we face the facts—and the challenge—with traditional American courage, and chart a true course, I see on the horizon a magnificent line of ships that will assure the security of our future; a strong and well-balanced American merchant marine.

Senator Wiley's Address: The American Tradition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, November 11, 1954

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an editorial which commends our colleague the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Wiley] for an address he delivered not long ago in his State. The editorial appeared in the Sheboygan (Wis.) Press.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The American Tradition

United States Senator Alexander Wiley, of Wisconsin, reviewed salient features of the American tradition in an address at Beloit a few nights ago. His remarks deserve more than passing attention in this age in which these traditions are being challenged, both at home and abroad.

The Senator asserted that the diversity of our life and our thoughts is one of the most valued characteristics of the American tradition. It is the very core of this tradition, he said, to accept diversity and disagreement as inevitable and as a positive good. It is through the free interchange of ideas, the debate of the market place, that we sort the good from the bad and the hard core of objective truth is revealed. Senator Wiley contended that the right to disagree is one of the cornerstones of our republican form of government and one of the keystones to our continued progress.

Distrust of power is another important element of the American tradition, the Senator said. He added that we do not even trust the power of the majority, because the majority could and has on occasion in the past been wrong in the short run.

"The power of the majority cannot be allowed to eliminate opposition," Senator Wiley said. "Our Founding Fathers wisely foresaw this danger. They sought to limit untrammeled power by subjecting it to a system of constitutional checks and balances. No one individual, regardless of his stature, could have preeminent authority over his fellow men. The danger of dictators who might rise to power by supposed democratic processes is alien to the American tradition."

Dynamism was given by Senator Wiley as another important element of the American tradition. He said:

"We live on continuous growth, self-help and a creativity that is unrivaled the world over. Americans do not seek security from cradle to the grave. We seek instead, opportunity for free development and for the continuous creation of the new. We are pragmatists in this Nation—accepting that which will best work in the present and striving continuously to improve for the future. We are not chained to any unalterable course or way. From the garage mechanic tinkering with motors after work, to the industrial leaders staking their financial future on atomic development, ours is indeed the land of constant growth.

"Continuous growth is the law of life. We do not value change in and of itself, but only as it leads to the greater fulfillment of our basic progressive and Christian values. The traditions of political and religious growth extend deep into the American past.

"From the Puritans of the *Mayflower*, the Dutch of New York, the Poles of the last century, the German liberals of 1948, the Scandinavians and others, to the European DP's of the present—America has again and again been the land of freedom for the individual. Our Government of checks and balances—the servant of the people—has preserved human freedom."

In contrast, Senator Wiley said that the Communist tradition is totalitarian. Communists the world over liquidate the opposition and wipe out the very thoughts or words which disagree. They regard economic freedom as exploitation, and resort to slave-labor and police terror to drive the wheels of misery in their collectivized economy. They view the individual as the expendable pawn of the godless state.

Senator Wiley expressed the hope that the day will never come when America loses confidence in itself. He said that history shows what we can do. We fully agree with Senator Wiley that there will be no reason to fear for the future as long as we remain loyal to the American tradition he has so ably portrayed.

The Conestoga Centennial Celebration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, November 11, 1954

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an address I delivered on September 22, 1954, at the Conestoga Wagon Centennial Celebration.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Remarks Delivered by Senator Martin on the Steps of the Washington County (Pa.) Courthouse, on Wednesday, September 22, 1954, at Noon, on the Arrival of the Conestoga Wagon Tour Sponsored by the Lancaster County Committee, as a Part of the Conestoga Centennial Celebration

Transportation has developed America.

The romantic story of water, trails, and roads is found in the description of commerce, military campaigns, and pioneer adventures.

In early colonial days the stealing of a horse or a boat was one of the worst crimes.

General Washington by reason of both his commercial and military work knew the importance of both road and water transportation.

Our colonial fathers studied government and the abiding truth of religion. Preservation of life made it necessary for them to invent and create.

The Conestoga wagon was created in order to take care of transportation problems.

The Conestoga wagon gave permanency to transportation.

The wagon had engineering features of balance now used in the construction of automobiles and trucks.

It was the first built on the assembly plan.

Use of the Conestoga developed roads.

The historic National Road is now Route 40. The Forbes Road is now Route 30. The Glades Trail is now Route 31. They were all a part of that early development.

Just about 125 years ago the transportation art of wagoning was at its height.

Mighty fleets of great white topped wagons traveled the Conestoga trail—the road from Philadelphia to Pittsburgh.

Old records tell us there were 3,000 of these magnificent freight carriers daily on the Conestoga trail, somewhere along its route.

Pennsylvania was the great gateway to the West. From Philadelphia to Harris Ferry on the Susquehanna, across the Alleghanies to Pittsburgh, on the Ohio.

Westward into the sun moved this great freight cargo system, making its indispensable contribution to winning the West and building the abundant empire of the United States.

These wagons, so numerous in their time that they were taken for granted, were Conestoga wagons—another superb achievement of Pennsylvania's skilled craftsmen.

There are many who think vaguely that the Conestoga wagon was just another covered wagon—but it wasn't. The Conestoga wagon was the sound, sufficient, and sturdy freight carrier which was the forerunner of all other westbound covered wagons.

Freight and passenger wagons of all sizes followed the Conestoga wagon but none ever exceeded—or even equaled—the magnificent performance of the Conestoga, which all the rest copied in one way or another.

The Conestoga is as typically Pennsylvania as our rolling hills, our productive farms, our well-stocked red barns, the long rifle, scrapple, pepper pot, ice cream, sticky cinnamon buns, or busy market squares.

Among Pennsylvania's countless other epochmaking contributions to the progress of mankind in agriculture, commerce, transportation, industry, and business, the Conestoga is most symbolic.

It is a treasure, in the finest spirit of Pennsylvania tradition.

Even today—a day of atom engines and jet-propelled airflight—the fine old Conestoga stands splendid and impressive.

Drawn by six great, sleek horses, their chiming bells ringing clear in the crisp air, the Conestoga represents a great chapter in the history of Pennsylvania. It was all Pennsylvania.

The wagons were so famous that they weren't even called wagons—just Conestogas. Their excellence won them the name of the valley in which they were originally designed and built—the Conestoga Valley in Lancaster County.

Every bit of the work was, of course, done by hand. The metal work was ironed out by the village blacksmith and the wood was the finest oak, hickory, locust, gum, and poplar.

The graceful boat-shape of the Conestoga caused it to be frequently described as "the ship of inland commerce." When the 6-horse team was pulling this freight carrier, the whole unit of horses and wagon stretched out to 60 feet on the road.

In America today, automobile drivers accept, as a matter of fact, controlling their vehicle from the left side.

The Conestoga wagoner was the one who produced this innovation. All other vehicles of his day were driven from the right side. He changed it all.

I want to take this opportunity to congratulate the Conestoga Centennial Committee for the wonderful celebration now being staged. It commemorates the contribution to the history of our State and Nation which was made by the designers, builders, and drivers of the Conestoga.

It is a most worthy celebration and one which makes us all so proud. I am so happy that our own community has taken its rightful place in this celebration because it is in the very finest Pennsylvania tradition.

We now need in our country a proper coordination of our water, road, railway, and air transportation. Each has its job to do.

These things give us an appreciation of the past and inspiration for future development.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Printing and binding for Congress, when recommended to be done by the Committee on Printing of either House, shall be so recommended in a report containing an approximate estimate of the cost thereof, together with a statement from the Public Printer of estimated approximate cost of work previously ordered by Congress within the fiscal year (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 145, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on Printing, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. The money derived from such sales shall be paid into the Treasury and accounted for in his annual report to Congress, and no sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized book dealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by book dealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

DISTRIBUTION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

To the Vice President and each Senator 100 copies; to the Secretary and Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, each, 25 copies; to the Secretary, for official use, not to exceed 35 copies; to the Sergeant at Arms, for use on the floor of the Senate, not to exceed 50 copies; to each Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress, 68 copies; to the Clerk, Sergeant at Arms, and Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives, each, 25 copies; to the Clerk, for official use, not to exceed 50 copies; and to the Doorkeeper, for use on the floor of the House of Representatives, not to exceed 75 copies; to the Vice President and each Senator, Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress there shall also be furnished (and shall not be transferable), 3 copies of the daily RECORD, of which 1 shall be delivered at his residence, 1 at his office, and 1 at the Capitol.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Frank Brodie is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

PRICE OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

The Public Printer is authorized to furnish to subscribers the daily RECORD at $1.50 per month, payable in advance.

Remit by money order payable to Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C.

PRINTING DOCUMENTS AND REPORTS

Documents and reports of committees with the evidence and papers submitted therewith, or any part thereof ordered printed by Congress, may be reprinted by the Public Printer on order of any Member of Congress or Delegate, on prepayment of the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 162, p. 1940).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

IN T

M
tobe
anni
the

Th
Unit
the s
ed th
of th

It
ber o
side
week

I s
addre
Unite
Chica
unani
the A
be pr
Amer
to th
Unite
are t
effort
splen

The
addre
RECOR

UN

More
Thoma
man;
Franci
Heffelf
Donne
delphi
ton, D
Calif.,
mond,
treasu
Miss O
executi
Eichelb
Golden
rad Hi
Hughes
Johnso
George
Nason;
terson;
W. Pitt
ler, III;
Anna L
L. Weil

THE U

It is
did ga
deeply
to the

Appendix

Observance of United Nations Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, November 12, 1954

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on October 24, America celebrated the ninth anniversary of the coming into force of the United Nations Charter.

The United States Committee for the United Nations is to be congratulated for the superlative way in which it conducted the nationwide program in observance of this anniversary.

It was my pleasure to deliver a number of United Nations addresses, both inside and outside my State, during the week preceding the celebration.

I send now to the desk the text of an address which I delivered before the United Nations Association for Greater Chicago on Sunday, October 24. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the Record, and that it be preceded by a list of the distinguished Americans who have given their services to the United States Committee for the United Nations. These noted Americans are to be commended for the time and effort which they have given to this splendid objective.

There being no objection, the list and address were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

United States Committee for United Nations, Washington, D. C.

Morehead Patterson, chairman, 1954; Thomas J. Watson, Jr., immediate past chairman; John M. Fox, New York, N. Y., W. H. Francis, Jr., Houston, Tex.; Mrs. F. Peavey Heffelfinger, Minneapolis, Minn.; J. S. McDonnell, St. Louis, Mo.; Edgar Scott, Philadelphia, Pa.; Mrs. Arthur Woods, Washington, D. C.; J. D. Zellerbach, San Francisco, Calif., regional vice chairmen; Paul Hammond, treasurer; Robert H. Reid, assistant treasurer; C. Lloyd Bailey, executive director; Miss Olga B. Gechas, assistant to director; executive committee: Harold L. Curtis; Clark Eichelberger; Frank Frederick; Clinton Golden; Henry T. Heald; Ray T. Hickok; Conrad Hilton; Paul Hoffman; Judge Sarah T. Hughes; Dr. Charles S. Johnson; Joseph E. Johnson; Read Lewis; John A. McCone; George Meany; Bradshaw Mintener; John Nason; Walter P. Paepcke; Frederick D. Patterson; Richard C. Patterson, Jr.; Dr. Louis W. Pitt; Walter Reuther; John D. Rockefeller, III; Philip Schiff; Robert G. Storey; Miss Anna Lord Strauss; Fenton B. Turck; Frank L. Weil; Ward Wheelock.

The U. N. and Its Role in the Atomic Age

(Address by Senator Wiley)

It is a great privilege to address this splendid gathering of public-spirited citizens, deeply interested in America's contribution to the cause of world peace.

As you know so well, we celebrate today the ninth anniversary of the coming into force of the history-making United Nations Charter.

We have come together to consider how far we have come and how much distance we must still go—toward the great objective of world peace and prosperity.

NINE YEARS OF CHALLENGE AND CRISIS

I think that those in this audience who are parents can particularly understand when I point out this fact: These first 9 years of the infant United Nations have probably been the hardest, but they will be, by no means, the only hard years.

After all, infancy has its problems, but so does adolescence. For all of life is challenge; all of life is change; and this is particularly true of the first few years of life.

Already the young United Nations has had more than its share of crises. It has overcome most of them quite successfully. But it faces still more in time to come.

I am glad to say that it is you and your public-spirited friends throughout our land who will help the U. N. to meet these challenges effectively. And for this, I pay sincere tribute to you.

HEARTLAND THINKING FOR PEACE

I want to say now that it is particularly appropriate that you and I should come together at this, the center of what is the heartland of the North American Continent.

You of Illinois and we of Wisconsin have long and rightly prided ourselves that we symbolize the grassroots thinking of America.

In time past, in the preatomic age, we of the Midwest, in particular, have prided ourselves on concentrating on our own American affairs. We had sought to avoid—what were then unnecessary—foreign entanglements.

But, then, a new age dawned. When? It was when the explosive mushroom cloud soared to the sky over Hiroshima and Nagasaki. It was when jet propulsion dawned and when space and time were shattered by man's inventiveness and ingenuity.

So, the concepts of bygone days have had to be shelved in order that we might survive.

THE NEW THINKING OF THE MIDWEST

And so I say, it is thrilling to me to see you of Chicago and surrounding areas demonstrate the new thinking of the State of Illinois and the State of Wisconsin and of the United States as a whole.

It is a new thinking which holds fast, of course, to the ancient landmarks of love of country and allegiance to flag.

But it is a thinking which recognizes our wider responsibilities. I refer to the responsibility of keeping America at peace by helping to keep the world at peace. I refer to the responsibility of making sure that our own Stars and Stripes shall never be replaced by the Red flag, by helping other national banners to keep flying—safe and secure—from Red aggression.

Here, in this heartland of America, you in this audience are giving the 20th century answer—in word and deed—to those of our countrymen who are still daydreaming in the 19th, in the 18th, and the 17th centuries.

You give the true answer to those backward-dreamers who still mistakingly think that we can or should ignore the realities of the atomic-hydrogen age; to those who mistakingly think we can isolate ourselves from the dangerous trends of our times; to those who mistakingly think we could live in a misnamed "Fortress America" all by ourselves, ignoring the fate of mankind.

THE NEW REALITIES OF THE ATOMIC AGE

It is strange indeed to hear these daydreamers speak about the United States as allegedly surviving in isolation. These people seem to have completely forgotten the basic speed and other facts of the atomic age.

They seem to have forgotten that the city of Chicago is but 10 hours bomber time from Moscow, if a plane merely flies at the rate of 500 miles an hour. (And let us remember that airplanes can already fly far faster than that—faster than the speed of sound.)

These people seem to have forgotten that the United States desperately needs overseas bases—air and other bases—on which, in particular to locate elements of our Strategic Air Command. For our long-range bomber force—widely dispersed for security—and possessing its great atomic-hydrogen power, represents, as Winston Churchill well pointed out: the principal deterrent to war today.

The daydreamers seem to forget that the United States is directly dependent upon foreign raw materials from overseas. We must import 100 percent of our tin; 92 percent of our cobalt; 60 percent of our tungsten, and so on down the line.

To make a single M-47 tank—a single United States tank—we need 1,900 pounds of chromium, of which 100 percent is imported; we need 950 pounds of manganese, of which 93 percent is imported; 520 pounds of nickel, of which 99 percent is imported, and similar high percentages with regard to bauxite, copper, and other strategic products.

How, we ask, do the isolationists think we are going to make our M-47 tanks and our bombers and our tankers and our machineguns if we do not have these foreign raw materials?

How do they think we could resist the Soviet Union if it could outproduce us—if it possessed the factories of Western Europe and the skilled manpower, and thus outweighed us on the crucial industrial scale?

No, the opponents of our present foreign policy have not thought out the answer to that and related questions.

But you, my friends, in the audience this afternoon—you know these problems—these realities—and that is why you are striving so earnestly in support of United States good partnership in the United Nations.

That is why you wisely support our participation in regional organizations for security—whether they are in Western Europe, the Western Hemisphere, or southeast Asia—but always within the framework of article 51 of the U. N. Charter.

I wish that time were available for me to comment on all of the many phases of the problems of the United Nations, which truly merit review at this time.

THREE PRINCIPAL PHASES TO BE REVIEWED

Let me, however, confine my remarks to three principal points.

Let us, first, see some of the principal issues looming before us—in terms of possible improvement of the United Nations Charter.

Let us, second, see why, even without these changes, it is so essential that we defend the United Nations against those who would recklessly attack it.

And, third, let us see what horizons face the United Nations, in particular, in connection with the famous atoms-for-peace proposal of President Dwight D. Eisenhower.

IMPORTANCE OF CHARTER REVIEW

Now, first, my friends, I want to refer to the very important challenge facing us—of weighing proposed changes in the U. N. Charter.

You are all familiar with the fact that, as chairman of a Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee on the U. N. Charter Revision, I have been holding hearings across our Nation on the subject of possible charter changes.

We have heard splendid testimony from citizens like yourselves in cities—large and small—across America. We have heard proposals for such changes as—

1. More effective armament control;
2. Altering of the present veto power which has so often paralyzed the Security Council;
3. Weighted voting in the General Assembly; that is, changing the present "1 nation, 1 vote" formula;
4. Making more universal the membership in the U. N. (which is today limited to but 60 nations because, principally, of the Soviet veto).

It is still too early to say what formal recommendations which my colleagues and I will make next year to the United States Senate.

And it is still too early to predict what proposals our United States State Department will ultimately recommend through the United States mission to the United Nations. It is already clear, however, that, as Secretary of State Dulles wisely pointed out, the United States will definitely favor the holding of a review conference to evaluate changes in the charter.

This review conference will give us a golden opportunity—10 years after the founding of the United Nations Charter—to take stock of the changed situation. It will give us an opportunity to see how we can overcome shortcomings which have arisen, and how we can prevent the Soviet Union from throwing a further monkey wrench into the United Nations.

SPIRIT COUNTS MORE THAN LETTER

But whatever proposals we of the United States may strive for, I urge you, my friends, to remember that it is the spirit of the United Nations which will count far more than the letter of the U. N. Charter.

The charter, even with its present limitations, could succeed if the right spirit is present, if there is a true will, intent, and purpose among the nations to achieve peace.

Let us not become so preoccupied with the mechanism of peace that we forget that the important feature is the spirit among the nations.

Our own spirit is still strong for peace.

Our enthusiasm has not flagged. Every public opinion poll demonstrates that fact. The latest Gallup poll, for example, shows that more than 76 percent of the American people approve of the United Nations.

This, then, is the basis on which we approach the proposed review conference. And I say, let it come. We welcome it. We will not allow ourselves to be paralyzed by fear of a possible Soviet veto of charter changes.

DEFEND U. N. AGAINST ITS ATTACKERS

But second, my friends, I want to turn to a still more immediate task: the task of defending the United Nations against those who would defame it; those who would attempt to smear it or its affiliated agencies, whether it be the United Nations Education, Scientific and Cultural Organization or the International Labor Organization or any other group represented in the U. N. system.

I say to you, my friends, that now is the time to rededicate ourselves to the defense of the U. N.

Why? Because in defending it, we defend the United States; we defend the unified foreign policy which has been carried on by the leaders of the American people, irrespective of political party. It is the foreign policy dedicated to America's fulfillment of its role in the shrunken world of the atomic-hydrogen age.

I need not tell you that from many quarters, mud is being thrown at the United Nations, that attempts are being made to ridicule it and to destroy it.

It is not for me to question the good faith in which these criticisms are hurled, but I can state that each of the attacks must be answered calmly and reasonably—with the hard facts.

We cannot be silent in the face of these attacks. It has been wisely stated that "all that evil needs to triumph is that good men be silent."

Let us not be silent now, therefore in answering the principal unfair criticisms which have been hurled at the U. N.

What are some of those criticisms?

THREE OF THE UNFAIR CRITICISMS AGAINST THE U. N.

1. First, it is charged that the United Nations is a do-nothing organization. This is absolutely false.

It was the U. N. which caused the withdrawal of Soviet forces in Iran, which mobilized world opinion on behalf of the United States and to Greece against the Communists. It was the U. N. which helped bring peace in the Holy Land. It was the United Nations which, for the first time in recorded history, in June 1950, mobilized the armed forces of 16 nations in defense of Korea—an innocent victim—of Red aggression.

In that struggle, in addition to our own heavy sacrifices in blood and treasure, other U. N. members—aside from Korea itself—suffered 17,000 casualties, including 3,000 honored dead.

And the aggression was stopped, although not in total victory for our side.

And I point out, too, that in nonmilitary phases, the U. N. is far from a do-nothing organization.

The United Nations is giving indispensable technical assistance to the underdeveloped nations of the world: It's giving milk to starving babies and to pregnant mothers; medical care, financial aid, and other necessary assistance.

So, to contend that the United Nations is a do-nothing organization is a base mistruth.

U. N. DOES NOT ENDANGER OUR SOVEREIGNTY

2. Second, it is charged that the United Nations is a danger to American sovereignty.

That is absolutely false. The United Nations Charter specifically prohibits intervention in the domestic affairs of any of the countries. No international instrument made inside or outside of the United Nations is binding upon us unless we choose to ratify it.

You and I know that part of this attack against the United Nations is represented in the universal movement for a constitutional amendment to limit treatymaking power under the United States Constitution.

This is the so-called Bricker amendment which, in the final days of the second session of the present Congress, was reintroduced in slightly amended form.

Time does not permit me to analyze in detail what I regard as the serious dangers in this amendment. Suffice it to say that the President of the United States rightly remains steadfastly opposed to this or any other amendment which would (a) jeopardize the historic prerogatives of the Chief Executive, or which would (b) endanger the traditional checks and balances under the United States Constitution.

I am glad to report that the tide has turned against the Bricker amendment. For example, recently the Oregon State Bar Association had the opportunity to cast its vote on it, and the amendment was overwhelmingly rejected by a vote of better than 5 to 1. This is but a symbol of the fact that the American people are waking up to the dangers in this amendment, and that they are not going to fall prey to constitutional panic or hysteria.

They know that the tried-and-true United States Constitution must not be lightly amended. I point out to you that it is a strange fact that in over a century and three-quarters we have found sufficient and adequate the original Constitution and 22 amendments. But in this latest Congress alone more than 5 times that number of constitutional amendments have been loosely proposed.

Why all this amendment frenzy? Why change a document which has worked so well for us? Why abandon the landmarks of the past? Why replace faith with fear and reason with hysteria?

U. N. COSTS LITTLE

3. We come now to a third charge. It is charged that the United Nations is costly, that it is a financial rathole. That is absurd, too.

The United Nations itself costs the citizens of America—on the average—around 16 cents per year. That is less than the cost of a package of cigarettes. Do you think that it is worth a package of cigarettes to save world peace?

Do you know how much we were spending during World War II? We were blowing up $275 million per day. I repeat, $275 million per day, in order to kill Germans and Japanese.

Do you think it is worth spending 16 cents per year in order to avoid some day having to kill Russian boys and having American soldiers and civilians die in the same conflagration? Of course you know the answer to that question.

The U. N. is definitely worth every cent we contribute to it.

Now, there are other charges which have been hurled against the U. N.—like charges of disloyalty of certain United States personnel there. But this is a matter which, by and large, has long been adequately disposed of by our effective United States Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge.

But now time is growing short, and I want to turn from the past and present to the future.

THE ATOMS-FOR-PEACE PLAN

I should like to refer now in some length to the great proposal which was made by the President of the United States in his atoms-for-peace suggestion to the U. N.

On December 8 of last year President Eisenhower sought a way out of the tragic record of failure that had marred the efforts of the United Nations to control mass destruction weapons. That date may yet become one of the most notable in man's history. For, on that day, our President laid before the General Assembly of the United Nations his bold new proposal.

Unlike all previous negative efforts to try to reduce or eliminate atomic materials for military purposes, this was a positive, constructive approach along a new avenue toward peace.

Very simply, it extended an invitation to the governments principally involved to begin making joint contributions from their stockpiles of normal uranium and fissionable materials to an International Atomic Energy Agency. It would create a kind of nuclear bank.

Here was the most realistic attack yet made upon the almost hopelessly snarled problem of international atomic control. For the first time, it offered a promising, though modest, plan whereby fissionable material could be allocated to serve the peaceful pursuits of mankind. It was a call to mobilize experts in the application of atomic energy to the needs of agriculture, medicine, and other peaceful activities.

One of its primary functions would be to furnish adequate electrical energy in those areas of the world which are desperately starved for power. And it proclaimed the intention of the United States to dedicate its strength to serving the needs of mankind. It offered the possibility of demonstrating to the peoples of the world that the great powers were, after all, intensely concerned with human aspirations rather than producing implements of warfare. Man's greatest fear could become, overnight, a source of his greatest blessings.

But President Eisenhower's proposal was not just a project for the scientific peacetime allocation of atomic energy. If that had been its only purpose, we need not have advanced it through the United Nations at all. No, my friends, its great and historic promise was something far more inspiring.

PAST EFFORTS AT ATOM CONTROL

All prior negotiations for the control of atomic armaments had been sterile. A demoralizing impasse had been reached on the entire subject of disarmament.

For 8 years we, and the Soviet Union, had failed to agree on the basic principle which should govern either the reduction and regulation of atomic weapons, or the limitation of conventional armaments. Only a few days ago, this impasse was again underscored when Ambassador Wadsworth of the United States delegation told the United Nations Main Political Committee that the Soviet Union still did not seem prepared to take the same steps to reassure the world, which we have been prepared to take.

As far back as 1946 we had gone a long way to show our good faith. Why, less than a year after the war potential of the atom was discovered, we presented to the United Nations a plan which would have made possible an effective international control of this new force, and encouraged its use by all nations for peaceful purposes. This plan received the overwhelming endorsement of the Assembly in 1948. It has been stalled ever since.

In the Atomic Energy Commission, the Soviet Union flatly rejected its control features. In the Conventional Armaments Commission, the U. S. S. R. rejected the proposals for a system of disclosure and verification of armed forces and armament because it did not include atomic armaments. And so, we tried again. We proposed in 1951 that the work of these two Commissions be merged, and a new commission was created.

We repeatedly joined with France and the United Kingdom in submitting proposals which would place numerical ceilings on the armed forces of the U. S. S. R., China, the United States, the United Kingdom, and France. The Soviet representative gave them scant consideration and denounced them as cynical and hypocritical.

So far as atomic weapons were concerned, as you all know, the Soviet Union from the very beginning has deceptively insisted upon a prior outlawing and abolition of these weapons before the creation of satisfactory controls and inspection procedures could be assured.

We, for our part, still held fresh in our minds the memory of the 1921 Naval Conference at Washington. We were not and are not going to be taken in again by a plan to destroy our own arms in reliance upon some other government's paper promise.

This is why we have insisted upon and will continue to demand, legal control and inspection procedures by an international agency, as a condition to any reduction or prohibition of atomic weapons.

There you had it: a complete stalemate. And the hopes of mankind shrank in direct ratio as the stockpile and destructiveness of man's latest scourge increased.

Into this bleak and disheartening picture was injected the dramatic proposal of President Eisenhower last year. It carried the electrifying hope that the marshaling of atoms for peace, even on a small scale, might reverse the trend toward a fearful military buildup.

It was inspired by the belief that if the Soviet Union would join with the United States and other nations possessing atomic material and know-how this act of cooperation could be the beginning of a new pattern of understanding.

The plan was one that could not possibly injure any government. And its greatest virtue was that it avoided the suspicions and irritations which had accompanied proposals for worldwide inspection and control. Yet, it, too was rejected by the Soviet Government.

And that Government said, in effect, that before they join in any peacetime effort to develop atomic science for the benefit of mankind, the free nations of the world must renounce all military use of nuclear weapons. Of course, you and I know there is no logical relationship between these two things. And we are not going to throw down our strongest shield against aggression without an adequate safeguard for the security of the free world.

But we definitely do not propose to let President Eisenhower's plan die. Instead, Secretary of State Dulles recently informed the United Nations of our intention to press on with our desire to enlist this new force into the service of human progress.

To explore the possibilities of peaceful uses of atomic energy, we will direct our efforts toward the convening of an international scientific congress to meet under the auspices of the United Nations next year.

The program outlined by Secretary Dulles envisages the opening in the United States, next year, of a reactor training school where students from abroad may learn the working principles of the peaceful use of atomic energy. Medical and surgical experts from abroad would be invited to participate in the work of our cancer hospitals. This, of course, would only be the beginning.

We are saddened that the Soviets have thus far missed a great opportunity to contribute to a relaxation of the world tension which this simple gesture of cooperation would have inspired.

But they know that the door will always be open to their participation. Our Government does not intend to overlook any avenue of negotiation which offers prospects, no matter how slight, of enlisting the cooperation of the Soviet Union in a program which could end the deplorable waste of economic wealth in military requirements.

Whether the Soviets come forward or not, we are resolved that the President's program shall become a living symbol of hope or a better way of life to millions of mankind.

In conclusion, may I say that it has been a great pleasure to be with you here this afternoon. I have not of course attempted to cover all or even part of the many phases of the United Nations.

I commend to you a further study of this great organization and in particular of proposed charter changes. I urge you to keep your faith high in the U. N. because it merits that faith.

I urge that you give it your best, because in so doing, you will be giving your own beloved country your best. You will be helping your country to lead a war-weary mankind into a permanent path of peace and justice.

This is the call today—to you and to me on this, the ninth anniversary of the United Nations Charter.

To Stop the Communists, We Must Be Willing To Fight Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, November 12, 1954

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article written by me, which appeared in Collier's of October 1.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TO STOP THE COMMUNISTS, WE MUST BE WILLING TO FIGHT NOW

(By WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND, majority leader of the U. S. Senate)

The most ominous fact in the world today is the growing strength of the Communists. The free world must face up to this grim threat now, for tomorrow may be too late. The abandonment of north Vietnam to the Reds, and the collapse of the Korean peace talks at Geneva leave us with these alternatives—to halt the Communists where they are, or to surrender first southeast Asia, then all the rest of the continent and nearby islands to the Reds, giving them such a heavy preponderance of power that they would be ready to move in Europe.

I can see but one course open to the free nations. We and our allies must, as quickly as possible, draw a line in Asia and notify the Communists that if they cross it, they must fight. When I say fight, I don't mean fight in another little war. The free nations should let Red China know that if she invades—directly as in Korea, or indirectly as in Indochina—any territory we have undertaken to defend, she must take the consequences not only on the violated land, but on her own mainland.

Such a decision would involve risk, but there is no course we can follow without risk. To avoid a Communist world, we of the United States and other free nations must be willing to fight—now, if necessary. Whatever the cost to save our freedom, we must be willing to pay the price. Hard, sane courage is the quality most likely to save us from war, or from defeat if war comes.

There is no easy solution for the unpleasant facts of today. There is no cheap solution. There is no solution that will guarantee safety—with normal conditions of trade, travel, and tranquillity as the world once knew them—so long as the menace of international communism exists. Don't let anybody fool you with talk that the Russians have had a change of heart, that the free nations and the Communist powers can live side by side in security and peace. The brutal zealots who drive the hundreds of millions of people in Russia, China, and the satellite states are subject to no restraints of morality, compassion, or friendship. Whenever and wherever they offer a hand and smile, they have some scheme of their own in mind.

The Communist objective always has been, and still is, domination of the world. It will no more change than a leopard's spots. In my opinion, the best chance—if not the only chance—we have for peace now and over the long stretch is to stop communism in its tracks. If we do nothing, the Reds will merely follow their own program for involving us in war and, they hope, crushing defeat.

I am sorry as any of you that these conditions exist, but it is my duty to tell my fellow countrymen the facts as they appear to me. The truth is that never before have we had an enemy so close to grasping the overwhelming balance of power from the side of freedom.

It will not be easy to draw a so-far-and-no-farther line against the Communists in Asia, but we must try to do so. On our side of that line might be Japan, South Korea, Formosa, the Philippine Republic, Thailand, Burma, Malaya, Indonesia, Australia, New Zealand, Pakistan, and what remains free in Indochina—southern Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos.

The United States already has defense treaties with Japan, South Korea, the Philippines, Australia, and New Zealand, and a military assistance agreement with Pakistan. In addition, we have made commitments to defend Formosa against Red attack. President Eisenhower recently warned the Chinese Communists that they'll have to run over the United States 7th Fleet if they try to take Formosa. But much remains to be done to coordinate the defense plans of these countries with our own and with one another's. As I write this article, eight nations either in or with interests in the area—the United States, Britain, France, Australia, New Zealand, Thailand, the Philippines, and Pakistan—have announced plans to convene in the Philippines in September to discuss the establishment of a collective security arrangement for southeast Asia.

It's possible other countries may join in the talks at a later stage. I was encouraged to read recently that thousands of Vietnamese nationalists were parading and protesting against the Communist takeover in the northern part of their country. (They also protested against colonialism, but that no longer threatens them from the West.) The equally threatened 6,000,000 people of Cambodia and Laos also may seek protection—provided the terms of the agreement reached by France and the Indochinese Reds at Geneva leave them free to do so.

But whatever the initial defensive lineup in southeast Asia, and even if it proves less strong in numbers than we'd like, we should press on with a new organization to stop the Communist flood. Once we show determination to hold a line there, other nations may join. But the longer we delay, the weaker our position will be in the undecided nations of southeast Asia. They will conclude that the initiative is to remain with the Communists, and make the best terms with the Reds they can.

I hope it will be possible, before too long, to form a Pacific-southeast Asia alliance—stretching from Japan in the northeast to Pakistan in the southwest—of such strength that the Communists will think thrice before trying another aggression in that part of the world, or indeed anywhere else. Eventually, I'd like to see a sort of far eastern defense organization roughly patterned on the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

The present grave crisis in Asia has grown from a long string of Communist victories, stretching from Yalta through Panmunjom to Geneva.

At the Big Three conference in Yalta in 1945, the West gave Russia many dominant rights in Manchuria—part of China—without even consulting the then government of China. The West was preoccupied with bringing Russia—unnecessarily, we now know—into the military war against Japan, with no appreciation for the future political consequences. Then, after the war, the West failed to understand the full significance of the growth of Communist strength in China; communism there was mistaken for reform and liberalism.

IF SOUTHERN CHINA HAD BEEN SAVED

Later, after all northern China was taken by the Communists, the West failed to save the country's southern provinces. I think southern China could have been saved. Had it been, the Reds of Indochina would not have had a common frontier with Red China and thus no sanctuary into which they could retreat when pressed, no contiguous area for supplies when they advanced.

Next came our great error of accepting stalemate in Korea and, finally, the French surrender in Indochina—another blow to American prestige, for we had helped the French enough for the Red Asians to say we were in the war. Both Korea and Indochina cost us face.

Our failure to win the Korean war may turn out to have been one of the great mistakes of history. Had that war been won—as it could have been—the situation in southeast Asia would not be as grave as it is today. In effect, the Communists were suing for peace in 1951 when they first suggested a cease-fire in Korea; yet by the time the Panmunjom truce-negotiations talkathon ended 2 years later they had a victory. It was not a total victory for the Reds, but it was enough to give support in Asian countries to their claims that the capitalist world had been defeated. The prestige of the Chinese Communists rose immediately, and respect for the free nations, especially the United States, sank to lower levels all over Asia. The immense stature we had won by our complete victory over Japan only a few years earlier was lost.

At the Asian political conference in Geneva this summer, Red China's foreign Minister, Chou En-lai, spoke as a confident conqueror. Strip diplomatic language from his speech and this is what he said, specifically to the United States: "You can have peace in the Pacific provided you are prepared to denounce your mutual-assistance pact with Korea, remove your forces and training missions from that country, get your troops out of Japan and renounce your security-treaty agreement with her, abandon your airbase on Okinawa, stop your military-training program on Formosa, get out of the Philippines and forget about giving military assistance to any nation in southeast Asia. Under these conditions, Asia will be for the Asians and you will have peace." He neglected to add that under such conditions he and his like would have Asia for the Communists.

"Asia for the Asians" the Communist euphemism with a plausible sound. What the Reds have in mind—and are on the way toward gaining—is control of all Asian manpower and resources. This basic Communist policy has been made plain at numerous international Communist congresses and in the writings of Lenin and Stalin. However, it is difficult for nations of good intent to believe what dictators say, even when they talk plainly.

For years some of us have been pointing out the dangers of the Communist advance in Asia. Yet even today, in the very face of the surrender in Indochina and the consequent Communist celebrations, men stop me and ask, "Well, Senator, what's it to us if they do get Asia? What business have we over there, anyway?"

I think it important for our present safety and future survival as a free country to answer such questions seriously and patiently. If all Asia should pass to Communist control, the world balance of power would be upset and the chance to stop Communist aggression in Europe would be critically handicapped, if not rendered impossible. Conquest of Asia would give the Communists a heavy majority of the world's manpower and most of its natural resources. To the Reds, unlimited manpower means a chance to take any country they can reach; they are indifferent to losses.

Thirty years ago Lenin said, in effect, that the road to Paris was through Peking. He meant that once the Reds controlled the 500 million people of China—which they now do—it would be only a question of time and Communist strategy before they got Korea, Indochina and the island nations of Japan, the Philippines and Indonesia. With this aggregate of nations under their banner, the Communists would then measure their chances of winning an all-out struggle with the rest of the world.

Briefly, therefore, the main reason why Asia is so important to us here in the United States is that if the free world does not hold important parts of the Far East, war becomes more likely and defeat a possibility.

What are we doing in Asia? We are protecting our families, our homes and our civilization. I am not indulging in scare oratory when I say so; I am stating a basic fact of what is known as geopolitics. If a warlike nation, dominated by the philosophy of Communist violence, gains the heavy balance of power, anyone can imagine the consequences to the rest of the world.

The free West has the edge in industrial productivity at the moment. We have a temporary advantage in atomic weapons and the means to deliver them. But let us always remember that the advantage is only temporary. The Communist world has made rapid progress in the atomic field. In manpower and in natural resources, the Reds already have the lead—unless we count the neutralist nations on our side, which seems to me a risky thing to do.

Moreover, if the West allows the Communists to dominate the whole continent of Asia, Japan will be caught in a vast entrapment and probably lost to the West. This development would be an incalculable calamity. In 1925, Joseph Stalin, speaking of the revolutionary movement in the East, said: "A union of the Japanese people with the people of the Soviet Union * * * would be invincible."

Today the Communist imperialists want Japan more than ever before because it is an industrial nation with 87 million industrious people. Fighting alone, the Japanese gave us a tough time in the Pacific during World War II. They drove the Chinese Government from all the coast line. They drove the British from Malaya, the French from Indochina and us from the Philippines. The cunning Communists know that if they could add the Japanese to their Asian subjects, they would be able to equip the limitless manpower of Asia with Japanese made modern arms and machines.

FOOD AND TRADE LURES FOR JAPAN

The Japanese, like the British, must trade in order to live. Eighty-seven million people cannot live solely on what they grow on islands of less area than my State of California, and less productive in food. They must depend on the outside world for part of their food, for raw materials to keep their people working and for export markets. Indochina has been a major source of rice for Japan. Suppose the Communists put the squeeze on the Japanese by threatening to cut them off from this and other sources? At this very moment, they are offering food and trade lures to Japan.

Within a short time the most important struggle in the Orient may be for Japan. The Japanese, I am convinced, want to remain free and on our side. But if all the rest of the Asian continent should go Communist and the nearby Pacific island nations appeared doomed how could the Japanese live? Inevitably, it seems, the Japanese would have to come to some arrangement with the Reds.

Great Britain has appeared reluctant to join heartily with us in developing an Asian line beyond which there will be no retreat, no experiments with peaceful coexistence, no attempt at coalition with the Communists. No doubt Britain is influenced by neutral India, which, in turn, is influenced by the Communists. Thus, if we should drop our Asian defense plans because of British objections, we might be yielding indirectly to the Communists. However, I do not say or wish to imply that Britain at present is neutralist or will ever become pro-Communist. If and when there is a showdown with the Reds, I believe that Britain—under its present leadership or that of the moderate wing of the Labor Party—will be on the side of freedom and will give her moral support, at least, to the United States.

The British seem to hope that they can stay in Malaya and in Hong Kong without having to face the hard facts I have stated about Communist intentions. But how can they actually believe the Communists will let them alone any longer than it is to the Reds' advantage to do so? Naturally, the Communists will make a show of friendliness toward the British, or toward any other free nation, if they think there is a chance to separate that nation even slightly from the United States. Any major drive by the Soviet Union may be expected to encourage our allies to become neutrals, in the false hope that they will be allowed to survive even though we might perish.

From this day forward, we must face reality and not base our defense on theories or paper alliances. If further aggression takes place, all nations—our dependable allies, the doubtful ones, the neutrals and the Soviet bloc—should know that we will take such action as our national interests require, and no foreign power will be permitted to exercise any veto rights.

This policy is not go it alone. It is go with dependable allies, but don't be shackled by frustrated or paralyzed ones. Indeed, the time has come for a renewed American declaration of independence.

The urgency of the situation in Asia is suggested by news dispatches in which Red China speaks of her plans to "liberate" Formosa and warns the United States to be careful. Again this is the voice of a bold nation, confident because of previous successes.

My long and earnest support of Formosa is well known, but my reasons are not always taken into account by those who would write off this great island as though it were merely the estate of Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek. I certainly have never maintained that the Chinese Nationalist Government has been or is without fault. That Government must share heavily in responsibility for the loss of mainland China. But we of the United States also share in that responsibility.

The Chinese Nationalists served as loyal allies throughout World War II. The Japanese offered them favorable peace terms, but Chiange and his Government refused to stop fighting. Had they stopped, several million Japanese troops would have been freed for use elsewhere against us. I'm not one to forget the services of a friendly people who suffered in order to remain with us.

Chiang is not the issue. The efficiency of the Nationalist Government is not the issue. The issue is whether we are to abandon a government friendly to us and potentially of vast use to us in case of war. Our choice is not between Chiang and his crowd or something better. It is between a free republic of China on Formosa, with its present and potential value, or nothing at all.

About 9 million people are living on Formosa. That makes this island republic larger than many countries now in the United Nations. Of the 9 million, perhaps half a million can be counted as actual or potential fighting men. Their mere presence on the island forces Red China to keep a large army on the mainland coast opposite Formosa—just as the Republic of Korea Army of 600,000 men nails down a million or more Chinese to the north.

OUR OBLIGATION TO DEFEND FORMOSA

For reasons of both strategy and honor, we must defend Formosa. How can there be a moral as well as a substantial foundation for an Asian defense pact if we let our friends of longest standing fall into the hands of the Communists?

Perhaps you say there is no pressure on us to withdraw from Formosa, and in a sense that is right. But a movement is building up that could result in the forsaking of Formosa and a final and calamitous appeasement of Red China. This movement seeks to admit the government of Red China to the United Nations.

I have said that should Red China be admitted to membership in the United Nations, I would resign my position as majority leader of the Senate and fight to have the United States withdraw from the U. N. The admission of Red China would destroy the moral basis for the U. N. I would not want my country to sanction any such development by remaining in the organization.

I know of the heated criticism that was directed at me when I made my announcement, but I have not changed my mind. If the free world gives in on this question, the Communists would be on the very threshold of gaining all Asia for themselves. Glowing with triumph, they would turn their eager eyes toward Europe with no need to worry about an attack from the Asian rear. Give Red China this diplomatic victory, and the people of the United States will be much nearer war than they are now, and much nearer to defeat than they have ever been.

I beg you to look at the Asian problem as a whole—not as some faroff involvement that somehow we got into, but as a problem of home defense. There can be no security for the West unless we keep the Communists insecure in the East.

Freedom of Expression

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, November 12, 1954

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record certain correspondence from Mr. Asher B. Wilson, of Twin Falls, Idaho.

There being no objection, the correspondence was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Twin Falls, Idaho, *August 24, 1954.*

Senator Harley M. Kilgore,
United States Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator: Herewith I hand you copy of a Drew Pearson article appearing in the Evening Statesman, of Boise, Idaho, on July 15, and the Statesman's editorial of same date entitled, "Mr. Pearson's Deception"; and too, I hand you a letter I prepared on July 27, 1954, directed to Mrs. Ailshie, editor and owner of the Statesman, letting her know my feelings concerning her editorial.

It seems that the papers out this way restrict, more and more, any comment adverse to their line of thinking, which keeps us readers in suspense as to what the opposite viewpoints are.

You have my permission to use my letter, a copy of which I enclose herewith, in the matter of bringing to the attention of the people of the United States generally, the necessity of freedom of expression of viewpoints in our publications and on our radios.

Sincerely,

Asher B. Wilson.

Twin Falls, Idaho, *July 27, 1954.*

Mrs. Margaret Cobb Ailshie,
Owner and Publisher, the Idaho Statesman, Boise, Idaho.

My Dear Mrs. Ailshie: Please pardon my addressing you relative to editorial in Evening Statesman July 15, 1954, headed "Mr. Pearson's Deception," and opposite thereto "Pearson's comments of the day."

Your editorial occurs to me to be a diatribe on Drew Pearson, by one who has become intensely angry at his statement.

I am shocked and deeply hurt to learn that you, with your wonderful background of education and newspaper publishing, would become so upset as to print such venom editorially.

We newspaper readers want our publications to give all sides of important questions and issues; and have good reasons to expect the Statesman to follow such rules; however, unless you see fit to recant your editorial statement, your action has foreclosed, in my mind, the possibility of our expecting both sides of the issues as they present themselves being presented in your daily and Sunday Statesman.

I, personally, have been a reader of the Statesman for 40 years, and a defender of your right to present editorially and otherwise your views, although I sometimes have held different beliefs.

Please recant. Let Drew Pearson tell his version. Your comment on his version fine, but do not foreclose us, your subscribers, from getting the viewpoints which may be opposite to your views. Please continue to serve all the people with all sides of the issues. Do not narrow the greatness of your paper, noted for three-quarters of a century for its unswering stand on what you have believed to be right; and presented to us, your readers.

What is wrong about letting your readers know that big business gets subsidies as well as the agriculture interests. It is all true, and you enjoy a postage subsidy which you should not be ashamed of.

Yours for free speech in a truthful manner.

Sincerely,

Asher B. Wilson.

Defense Status of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, November 12, 1954

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, recently Mr. James Free, Washington correspondent of the Birmingham (Ala.) News, wrote a series of seven articles dealing with the defense status of this country. Those articles were syndicated by the North American Newspaper Alliance.

I ask unanimous consent at this time to have printed in the Appendix of the Record the first four of the articles, and I hope at a later date to offer the other three.

Mr. President, in that connection, the Birmingham News printed a brief sketch of Mr. Free under the heading "Correspondent Free Ideal Man To Report United States Defense Picture," and I ask that it be included with the first article.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW LOOK DEFENSE AIMED AT MORE BANG FOR A BUCK

(By James Free)

(Correspondent Free ideal man to report United States defense picture: A Washington correspondent since 1939, Mr. Free has an exceptional background for reporting on national defense. He has served in the National Guard, the Reserve Officers' Training Corps, and on active duty in World War II in both the Army and the Navy. He now has the rank of commander in the Naval Reserve. This article is the first of a series.)

WASHINGTON, October 27.—The New Look in defense is a misleading term. It is a magnified misnomer. It is really only the defense part of the "Eisenhower look" in Government.

It is not a new discovery in military science or economics. It is simply the Pentagon phrase for the Republican reappraisal of our defense program since January 1953.

And it is a phrase that President Eisenhower himself does not like, as he told a press conference recently. He said that to him it is just a question of trying to keep up with the times.

Since Mr. Eisenhower became Commander in Chief, he has put neither more nor less emphasis on defense spending in relation to other Government spending. He has advocated spending less for Federal functions all along the line. Proof of this lies in the first two annual budgets the Eisenhower administration turned out.

About 68 percent of the total budgets in each instance went for defense—the armed services, Atomic Energy Commission, foreign aid (mostly military), and stockpiling of strategic materials. Significantly, this was almost exactly the same proportion as in the last Truman administration budget.

Defense, therefore, is getting about the same percentage of a national budget total that has been going down.

It is a matter of record that the New Look in defense was cut to the policy pattern set by the President and the National Security Council (only 1 of 6 NSC members is from the Defense Department).

This was spelled out by Secretary of State John Foster Dulles in his now-famous speech of January 12, 1954. That was the one in which he said our defense will be based primarily on a great capacity to retaliate when and how we choose. Mr. Dulles explained how this crucial decision was reached.

"Before military planning could be changed," he said, "the President and his advisers in the National Security Council had to make some basic policy decisions. This has been done."

One of these basic decisions was indicated by President Eisenhower in his first budget message. "We cannot afford," said he, "to build military strength by sacrificing economic strength."

The President and his advisers concluded, too, that for the next few years peace is more likely than a big war. To a leader with General Eisenhower's military background, this latter conclusion, or assumption, was supremely important.

So, after the end of the Korean war in July 1953 the New Look in defense was geared to preparations for the long pull at a pace that would not overstrain the economy.

The Truman administration, caught in an almost worldwide fear that the Korean fighting might be a prelude to world war III, had rushed our defense efforts to get ready for the year of estimated maximum danger. That year was supposed to be 1954, when it was figured the Soviets would be ready to launch a long-range atomic war.

Another key change has been Defense Secretary Charles E. Wilson's reversal of the move by his two immediate predecessors to build up a broad production base. Mr. Wilson preferred the single efficient producer to several dispersed and smaller producers. While this saves money, it does give our enemise more concentrated bombing targets.

Confident that our great capacity to hit back will deter the initial enemy punch, we are arming at a more moderate pace.

All told, defense planners have reduced uniformed personnel by more than 210,000 since January 1953. At the same time they cut United States civilian personnel by 185,000 and foreign nationals employed overseas by 100,000.

With these manpower curtailments, Secretary Wilson and his top aides insist they have increased the combat effectiveness of the armed services. Their claim is based on the easy-to-move, ready-to-go principle.

And, under this principle, the reduced forces are made possible and practical by two key supports:

1. More potent striking power—the bigger bang for a buck.

And (2), creation of a better trained and more quickly available Reserves.

Some critics charge that the changes are at the expense of defense muscle as well as fat. But arguments over preparations for war are never settled until war comes or is for certain, averted.

RESERVE PROGRAM UNSETTLED — SECOND, EQUALLY VITAL HALF OF DEFENSE MANPOWER, STILL IN AIR

(By James Free)

(Second of a series)

WASHINGTON, October 28.—The other shoe in the New Look program for defense manpower is yet to be dropped.

The first shoe was reduction of the armed services by more than 210,000 men since January 1953, plus a start toward more mobile forces equipped with more powerful weapons.

This smaller full-time defense organization is supposed to be backed by an equally large ready-to-go Reserve. The two forces, as planned, would each be about 3 million strong. And the reserves would be better trained and more readily available than at present.

The missing shoe is the program for this kind of Reserve.

And people are asking: "Where is it?"

For almost 2 years the plan has been in the making. Study groups in the Pentagon, the Office of Defense Mobilization, plus the National Security Training Commission set up by the President, have passed on recommendations that the National Security Council is now considering. NSC soon may come up with what President Eisenhower says will be a No. 1 item on the must list of legislation for the 84th Congress.

Details of the New Look for Reserves have not yet been made public. But early signs indicate that the new proposals labor under the same kind of handicap that has blocked approval of an adequate program for Reserves before. This handicap since the end of World War II has been tie-in selling by the Pentagon.

Defense planners too often have offered a "tie in" sale which meant: To get a satisfactory reserve, Congress would have to buy the less appetizing universal military training.

It is at last clear that Congress cannot be expected to pass UMT in peacetime. Yet a minority at the Pentagon still insists that UMT is the only way to provide enough personnel for reserves as well as regular services.

While the Eisenhower defense team might like to get UMT, it, reportedly, is ready to urge a substitute—a new law compelling draftness to serve in the reserve after their 2-year tours of active duty.

(Congress and the Pentagon played a game of passing-the-buck on this question in the present law. As a result, when draftees are separated from service they can be "assigned" to Reserve or National Guard units. But there is no specified penalty if the assignment is ignored. Under this loosely written legislation only 2 or 3 out of a hundred actually choose to honor their "on paper" obligation to serve in the Reserve. And our trained and ready for quick mobilization reserves are not even one-third the way along to the 3 million goal.)

There is no doubt that Congress will approve a new law that would compel a man completing 2 years of selective service to join in reserve or guard part-time training for another 3 to 6 years.

Congress surely would reject, too, a proposal that some defense manpower experts are known to be backing. They want to combine the Army and Air Force reserves with the Army and Air National Guard—and then put this consolidated guard under Federal rather than State control in peacetime.

There is still another plan. This one has won fair support from the American Legion, the Guard, and the Pentagon. It would be compulsory for young men who are not called under selective service for 2 years. They would be called in for 6 months' basic training.

On completion of that half year they would be given a choice: either serve another 18 months, making a total of 24 months, or elect to serve part time in the Guard or Reserve for 3 to 6 years.

Any young men who failed to carry out their pledge to serve in the Reserve or Guard could be recalled to complete the remaining 18 months of active duty authorized in the draft law.

This is admittedly a variation of the selective-service law. But it would have the virtue of allowing service in the Reserve by choice. And it would not require Congress to pass a new law with specific legal penalties.

With full support, this plan ought to have a good chance for approval. Yet it may never get off the ground. Defense Secretary Charles E. Wilson is against it. He says it would amount to two draft programs, and that we do not have enough manpower for that.

Tough as the Reserve manpower is, it must be tackled soon. The draft law expires next June 30. And our need for strong, well-trained Reserves grows as Regular services are trimmed down. So a showdown on this vital matter is not far away.

WILSON ISN'T RUSHING THINGS—BETTING AGAINST WAR, DEFENSE ON INDUSTRIAL FRONT GOES SLOW

(By James Free)

(Third of a series)

WASHINGTON, OCTOBER 29.—In two world wars the United States has started on the underdog side—and won. We had the time and the ability—after the shooting began—to convert our industrial might to war production.

If another big war comes, would we have either the time or the ability to do it again?

Now that our potential enemy has nuclear bombs and faster-than-sound airplanes to deliver them, the answer would seem to be "No." It is the common belief that the next world war will be shorter and more devastating.

Perhaps this explains why our New Look defense planners are taking their time on long-range industrial mobilization.

This may account for the fact that all through fiscal 1953–54 the Defense Department did not use any of the $250 million fund available for purchase of reserve machine tools, etcetra, for such planning.

This year an impatient Congress lopped off $150 million of the fund. A program for use of the remaining $100 million is about ready, having been in the works for months.

Why this let's-not-be-in-a-rush-about-it attitude?

Analysis of testimony to congressional committees and other source material leads to these conclusions:

1. Our top Pentagon policymakers are confident there will be no large-scale war for the next year or so at least.

2. Thanks to the Korean war buildup, our heavy industries are better prepared to change to war production than at any other time in our peacetime history.

We are in pretty fair shape, unless a quicker-than-expected war brings enemy air attacks that destroy some of our key industrial centers. For this would also mean destruction of many of our onetime war plants that have been closed or shifted to other manufacturing with their war tools put in "mothballs."

We have done very little to acquire and disperse reserve machine-tool stockpiles outside major target areas. Defense Secretary Charles E. Wilson has reversed the efforts of two of his predecessors to build up a broad base program by spreading contracts to keep smaller companies operating.

Critics of this Wilson policy admit that the broad base program was more expensive, but they insist that this was nuclear war insurance well worth the price.

Soon after he took office, Mr. Wilson disagreed in public with the broad production base ideas of Defense Secretaries George C. Marshall and Robert A. Lovett.

They felt it was safer to have, say, 2 or 3 aircraft factories on dispersed sites than to have a single bigger plant.

Mr. Wilson told the Senate Appropriations Committee on May 19, 1953:

"If I had been doing it (directing the defense buildup) for the last 3 years I would have built more production and less mobilization base."

And he has openly favored the single efficient producer.

Mr. Wilson's policies have saved money, lots of it. And his belief that we will have to rely mostly on what we have on hand, come D-day, may be correct.

We do have good reserve stocks of "hardware" like 105 millimeter shells, mortars, tanks, and many types of atomic explosives.

The odds do appear to be against any big war in the immediate future.

Yet there is clearly an element of risk in our eggs in one basket defense plant policy. Also in our slow-paced planning for getting and safely storing reserve tools to replace some of those knocked out by enemy attacks.

Only future historians can say for sure whether Mr. Wilson and the New Look in defense production has been wise or foolish.

So far, so good.

MAY TAKE ROLE FROM AIR FORCE—GUIDED MISSILE MAY BE TOP DOG

(By James Free)

WASHINGTON, October 30.—The New Look in defense has widened the Air Force margin as top dog on the armed services team.

But, curiously, further progress in factors that brought the Air Force to supremacy may greatly reduce its role in the years ahead. These factors are faster air travel speeds and more potent explosives. They give promise of dealy combination between guided missile and the nuclear bomb warhead. When this comes, as is predicted by many authorities, the piloted airplane may become almost obsolete as a combat weapon.

Until accurate supermissiles are a reality, however, the Strategic Air Command of the Air Force will continue to be our Sunday punch in the event of all-out war. When administration leaders speak today of our massive retaliation, they have in mind mostly SAC and its capacity to deliver A-bombs and H-bombs in long-range planes.

OUT FRONT

In this first full fiscal year of Defense Department budgeting under the Eisenhower Chiefs of Staff, the Air Force is even further out front than it was in the last pre-Korean war year under President Truman. Air Force share of the fiscal 1954–55 defense appropriation is $11.5 billion, as compared with $9.7 billion for the Navy and Marines and $7.6 billion for the Army.

Only the Air Force is authorized to build up its manpower this year, while other services are trimming down. Its goal of 970,000 by next June 30 is only slightly above its present strength of just over 960,000. But at least it's not a cut.

Much more drastic by way of New Look change was the shift in Air Force goals from the Truman aim of 143 air wings by June 1956 to the Eisenhower aim of 137 wings by a year later. (The six wings eliminated were troop carriers. As this will hurt Army mobility, the Army is protesting much louder than the Air Force.)

UNITED STATES LAGGING

Defense Secretary Charles E. Wilson and other policymakers explained the earlier goal of 143 wings by June 1956 was impractical and unattainable. Senator STUART SYMINGTON, Democrat, of Missouri, former Air Force Secretary, disputes this. He charges that we are lagging behind the Russians not only in number of combat planes in operation, but in our rate of conversion to jets. He says the Russians already have 50 percent jets—a level that our Air Force will not reach until June 1957.

Whoever is right, there is no doubt that our present planners feel that their predecessors were trying to reach maximum goals too fast. The Truman administration concept of preparing for an estimated time of greatest danger has been dropped. The purpose now is to have a program we can live with, one that will ready us for the long pull with less strain on the economy.

BIGGER ARSENAL

This is an acceleration of the course the former administration was taking under Defense Secretary Louis Johnson until the Korean war came along. But there are at least two important differences:

1. We now have a bigger and more versatile arsenal of nuclear weapons. Then we could rely only on our big bombers to deliver our knockout blows. Now lighter and faster planes can perform many nuclear attack missions.

2. No longer do top defense planners discount the Navy's need for larger aircraft carriers to handle jets and superweapons.

These developments are pointed up by a statement of Gen. Nathan A. Twining, Air Force Chief of Staff. He says:

"It is our objective to equip every offensive fighter and bomber aircraft of our tactical forces to deliver nuclear weapons."

AIR DEFENSE

In addition to its massive-retaliation mission, the Air Force has less publicized but vital missions of teaming with ground forces to combat enemy armies and in air defense of the United States.

These major missions make the Air Force, in effect, our air artillery. That is why its place in the defense picture could be affected more vitally than either the Army or Navy by development of accurate guided missiles of greater range, for missiles are, after all, another forward step in artillery.

GUIDED MISSILES

By next June the armed services will have spent $1.2 billion on guided missiles, and they have authority to spend another $1.7 billion and we are just getting started. Unless missiles can replace something else in our arsenal of the future, defense costs will truly soar. That is another reason guided missiles loom as logical replacements for manned warplanes. Which will it be, and when?

With effective guided missiles, the Army will need less air support. And the Army antiaircraft (for antimissile) units would require less fighter-plane cooperation in air defense. This would affect the naval air arm and the Air Force. But the Navy would still have its mission of keeping sea lanes open for cargo ships and troop ships—and combating enemy submarines and warships. The Navy might also have big ships for launching guided missiles and for offshore air defense.

IBM FACTOR

In short, the Army and Navy would still have a lot to do without the use of manned warplanes. But a big Air Force without piloted planes is difficult to visualize.

Perhaps the IBM, if and when it arrives, would be enough to sustain SAC's position of eminence. The IBM is the intercontinental ballistics missile. Or other new developments could keep the Air Force on top in the defense team.

In the meanwhile, the Air Force has a wary eye on those missiles.

(Next: The Navy and Marines.)

Sermon by Bishop Robert J. Dwyer at the Funeral Service for Senator McCarran

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, November 12, 1954

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the funeral sermon for my distinguished late colleague, the Honorable Patrick A. McCarran, by Bishop Robert J. Dwyer, of the Reno diocese, which I should have liked to have had included with the memorial tributes on Tuesday, November 9, but which did not reach me in time for that purpose.

There being no objection, the sermon was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SERMON OF BISHOP ROBERT J. DWYER, RENO DIOCESE

"And let Nehemias be a long time remembered, who raised up for us our walls that were cast down, and set up the gates and the bars, who rebuilt our houses." (Ecclesiasticus, ii, 15.)

In the solemnity of this hour, here before the altar of God, we have offered the eternal sacrifice of the mass for a Christian soul. It is here that the whole divine democracy of the church is manifest. She performs this same identical office for all her children as they pass from time to eternity, from this world to the unending hereafter. For poor and rich alike, for the famous and the obscure, her prayer is the same, her essential offering is the same. For in death, which has been described as the great leveller, we are all one in our need.

Our need is salvation. Children of Adam as we are, heirs of his primal fault, we cannot find that salvation in ourselves or in the imperfect work of our hands. At life's end we are as helpless and as utterly impoverished as we were at our entrance into it. Nay more, as we face the judgment seat of Divine Justice Himself, we are acutely conscious of the crushing truth of that phrase of the liturgy: "In Thy sight, O Lord, shall no man be justified, unless through Thee he find forgiveness for his sins."

Our hope of salvation is in Christ Jesus our Lord. He it is, the Second Adam, who by his incarnation and his death on the cross has made it possible for us to fulfill the original purpose of our creation. For we were not fashioned by the hand of God to live our brief span and then to die; we were created that we might live forever with God. We were not placed here on earth to suffer fortune's outrageous slings and arrows as an end in itself, as though God were some omnipotent sadist rejoicing in our misery. We are here, instead, in order to avail ourselves of that salvation our Divine Lord purchased for us at so great a cost.

Salvation is the joint work of God and the individual soul. Because He has made us free, God will not force His grace upon us. He shows us the way, He provides us with the map of life, He offers us His supernatural help, and then He leaves the decision up to us. The ordinary way of salvation for the Christian is the church our Lord established here on earth, with His divine guaranty that the gates of hell should not pervail against her. The map of life is His revelation taught us by that church, the things we are to believe in order to know the truth, the things we are to do in order to live the truth. And His supernatural help is our sharing of His own divine life communicated to us by sanctifying grace.

The business of living the Christian life here below is what is required of us. "These things, O man, have I required of thee, that thou do justice and judgment, and that thou walk solicitously with thy God." But the problem of the Christian life is the temptations with which it is beset. They come from the world around us, which would have us forget God and think only of this life and its passing triumphs and pleasures; from our own wounded human nature, which would substitute passion and self-indulgence for God's law, and from those powers of evil which are forever warring to destroy the image of God in man.

So it is that the life of any individual Christian is of necessity a constant warfare. We are called by God to be saints; we are called by the world, the flesh, and the devil to be the very opposite, to throw away our hope of salvation for the tinsel satisfaction of the moment, for love of gain or love of power or love of that which is forbidden by the eternal wisdom. Left to ourselves we should surely fail. But we are not left alone. Christ our Lord fights our battle with us and for us. His word of encouragement to the Apostle Paul is our glorious assurance: "My grace is enough for thee; my strength finds its full scope in thy weakness."

The Christian, moreover, as a member of that mystical body of Christ which is the church, shares, by means of divine grace, the communion of saints. As a soldier of the church militant here on earth he fights shoulder to shoulder with the Blessed Mother of God and with all those who have won the final victory. Even death itself brings no interruption to that communion, but rather its fulfillment. If the end of life's journey finds the soul not yet prepared for the fullness of the blessed vision of God, which is the essential joy of heaven, that communion is its solace and strength through its season of ultimate purgation. It is not in vain then that we pray for the dead, that we offer for the souls of the faithful departed the sacrifice of the mass. It is, rather, as communicating to one another the ineffable mystery of God's loving kindness and infinite mercy.

This is our office here today. The finger of God has reached out and touched one of ours, a fellow Christian, a member of the church militant, a sharer of the commuion of saints. In our sorrow we mourn not as those who have no hope, but immediately we set about doing for him quite individually what the church teaches us to do for all the faithful departed. We have brought Christ down upon our altar to renew His sacrifice of the cross in expiation of his sins, for the speedy remission of whatever punishment may remain for him, so that at God's own appointed hour he may enter into the bliss of heaven, there to reign with Christ forever.

And this, my dear people, is all that really matters. It is of little moment now to the soul of Patrick McCarran that we should praise or blame his life's achievement. The words of Francis Thompson on the dead Cardinal of Westminster come to mind:

> "I will not perturbate thy paradisal state
> with praise of thy dead days;
> To the new-heavened say, 'Spirit, thou wert
> fine clay': This do thy praise who
> knew."

From the further shore now his hands are stretched to us his brethren in Christ, beseeching, not praise, but prayers. "Be mindful of me, at least you my friends, for the hand of the Lord hath touched me."

Yet it is worth noting, not for his sake but for ours, that our commonwealth and nation are the poorer for his passing. Through long years of public service he labored hard and zealously for the things he valued, and it is significant that time is demonstrating ever more emphatically how right he was on most of the issues of his political career. No man is omniscient, no man of himself infallible. But some men are given the opportunity of using their gifts wisely and well. He was of that number, and our country, at this grim crisis of her experience, can ill afford to spare his counsel.

He was not unlike that Nehemias of ancient Israel, who sought to rebuild the shattered kingdom. In an area of economic chaos, followed by devastating war, and marked by the emergence of strange threats and heresies which would destroy our Christian civilization, he sought to lift up the walls of the citadel and to put the city in state of defense. He was one of the first of our statesmen to sense the peril and to sound the tocsin. For this, surely, he will be long remembered, remembered as a great American.

Inevitably, I suppose, we recall Griffith's famous description of Wolsey:

> "He was a scholar, and a ripe and good one;
> Exceeding wise, fair-spoken, and persuading;
> Lofty and sour to them that lov'd him not,
> But to those men that sought him sweet as
> summer."

There are those for whom the memory of his sweetness is transfigured by their love. To you of his family and his household, who knew him best and therefore loved him best, our sympathy in this hour of bitter pain. May yours be the comfort of all good Christians who trust in the everlasting mercy, and through their tears look meekly up to Christ, the God of all consolation. Patrick McCarran will be long remembered by us, but never forgotten by his Mother the Church. Until time shall be no more she will number him among those countless souls for whom she prays unceasingly: Eternal rest grant unto them, O Lord, and let the light perpetual shine on them. May his soul and the souls of all the faithful departed rest in peace. Amen.

George Maurice Morris

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, November 12, 1954

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a tribute paid to the late George Maurice Morris, past president of the American Bar Association, by Heber H. Rice, past national president of the Federal Bar Association.

There being no objection, the tribute was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE GEORGE MAURICE MORRIS

(By Heber H. Rice, past national president of the Federal Bar Association)

The dedication of the new American bar center in Chicago on the afternoon of August 19, 1954, was an important event, at which the Chief Justice of the United States, Hon. Earl Warren, delivered the principal address, and the American Bar Association's past president, George Maurice Morris, was given special recognition as chairman of the finance committee which raised the funds to erect this significant structure. After marching in the judicial and academic costumed procession, and still in my cap and gown, it was my privilege and pleasure to converse with the Chief Justice and Mr. Morris as we stood together near this new edifice; but little did I then surmise that upon the night of the following day George Morris would be summoned before the Supreme Master, with the welcome, "Well done."

To his memory I recall the summer of 1943, when George Maurice Morris, then president of the American Bar Association, was attending the Alabama State Bar Convention at Birmingham, and was sponsoring, at that time, the American bar's important legal assistance program for giving gratuitous assistance to the servicemen at war and to their dependents. Being then the staff judge advocate and legal assistance officer at Huntsville Arsenal, Ala., I addressed the convention upon this subject and extended special praise to Mr. Morris, in words which appear fitting to repeat here, as follows:

"It has been emphasized by Judge Robert Patterson, the Under Secretary of War, that the American lawyer may play an important role in this great war. Created under joint sponsorship with the Judge Advocate General of the Army, the gratuitous legal advice and assistance given to servicemen at war, and to their dependents at home hopefully awaiting their return, bespeak for the great American bar its outstanding loyalty and patriotic devotion to our country. For this fine spirit of organized cooperation, I pay to President Morris, of the American Bar Association, my high and sustained tribute. * * * If you will permit, there will be made to Mr. Morris, who is here on the platform today, a personal reference. It has been my honor during a score of years at the Nation's Capital to see, contact, and to know many of America's distinguished sons and citizens. One of them is George Morris. We are all proud of him. During my recent administration as president of the Federal Bar Association in Washington, I always cherished the presence of this eminent scholar and lawyer at the functions of that association as one to whom we could always look for support of those lofty standards which make for success of bar associations. I saw in him a lawyer of great ability and statesmanship, and one gifted and qualified to become the head of the American bar, where he had already gained distinction as chairman of the section of taxation. He has now reached the coveted goal of the American lawyer as president of the American Bar Association. George Morris' friendship and association has been to me an inspiration as we traveled the legal paths together. I am proud to see him at this legal summit, presiding there today. I trust that in future years, while journeying upon the glowing sunset slopes of his triumphant career, he will still permit my comradeship and continued friendship and admiration for him, as expressed in the lines of Robert Burns:

"'John Anderson my jo, John,
We clamb the hill thegither
And monie a canty day, John,
We've had wi' ane anither;
When we maun totter down, John,
Then hand in hand we'll go,
And sleep thegither at the foot,
John Anderson my jo.'"

Excerpts From Address Delivered by Hon. Prescott Bush, of Connecticut, at Naturalization Ceremonies in Bridgeport, Conn.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PRESCOTT BUSH

OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, November 12, 1954

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD excerpts from the remarks which I made last night in Bridgeport, Conn., at naturalization ceremonies conducted by the Immigration and Naturalization Service.

The Immigration and Naturalization Service is to be heartily commended for the arrangements they made yesterday in many places in the United States for induction of new citizens. If the ceremonies elsewhere were as impressive as those in Bridgeport, I am sure the new citizens, as well as all persons who observed the ceremonies, must have been deeply impressed.

I believe that coupling these ceremonies with ceremonies observing Armistice Day, which is now called Veterans' Day, is an excellent procedure.

Therefore, I take pleasure in expressing my gratitude and approval to the Immigration and Naturalization Service for the very splendid manner in which such ceremonies have been arranged at various places throughout the country.

There being no objection, the excerpts from the address were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS FROM REMARKS DELIVERED BY UNITED STATES SENATOR PRESCOTT BUSH AT NATURALIZATION CEREMONIES IN KLEIN MEMORIAL, BRIDGEPORT, CONN., NOVEMBER 11, 1954

The thoughts that stirred within me in coming up from Washington give me a very warm and special feeling of intimacy with you, my new fellow citizens. This ceremony makes us, as of this hour, members of a common society living under the same flag and enjoying its protection and its prestige.

There are no aliens in this room. Vast gulfs of nationality, of geography, of ethnic differences have been absorbed—if not quite lost—absorbed into the powerful strength and great vastness of all we mean when we say the United States of America. Your new loyalties will be strengthened, not weakened, by your old cultural roots.

My feelings were moved as I thought of the deep and abiding contract with this country into which you enter today. I believe I understand what it must mean to each of you individually, because I know what it means to our Nation of which you are now a part. Like any good and sound contract, there are advantages on both sides.

So it was that in coming here I wondered to myself what I would like to hear if I today were to take my oath as a citizen of the United States. For, as we all know, this is a very particular ceremony that can happen only once in a lifetime—and in many tens of millions of lifetimes all over this earth it can never happen at all.

No one knows better than yourselves that you have been selected to join the fellowship of American citizens under a process of choice and elimination more careful than this country has probably ever before employed.

It occurred to me, therefore, that if I were one of you I would perhaps like to be reminded of my duties and responsibilities which my new citizenship put upon me. And I should like to feel the thrill that must come to one hearing of his rights as an American in this Nation of 163 million free men.

I'd say the first duty of American citizenship is:

Know your country. Know the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution which gave it life. To know the United States and its history inspires loyalty as a matter of course. To be loyal to the United States is to want to defend it, and be ready to fight for it.

The second duty of citizenship is to use it. That means to exercise the power and the right that has been given you to participate in the government of which you are a part; to vote; to make yourself heard; to participate in organization and political party life; in short, to act according to your lights and your talents as a free American.

The third duty of citizenship is—in your case—to adjust to your new country. Be tolerant of your neighbors.

Think in American terms; and be not fooled into assuming that a narrow racial or partisan clannishness ever really works out to the best interests of yourself, your particular group, or your country.

Let yourself melt and dissolve into the American stream. You can never separate your interests as a group from the main body of Americans. And by seeking preferred treatment you will not really benefit yourself in the long run.

And so, vote for a Governor, or a President, or a Congressman, not because he happens to be of your racial or ethnic strain, but because you feel that he will make a good public servant and bring credit to you and your country. That is the American way.

Within these three precepts of citizenship are to be found all other precepts: Knowledge, performance, patriotism.

Ours is a government of laws, not of men. Under our system, limited powers and definitely limited terms of office are basic. We teach these facts in grammar school. We reteach them and lecture upon them, and we repeat them because they are at the core of our science of government.

Limited power and tenure is the most important principle in a democracy. It means that we have a Nation of laws and not of men; and that government here is by the consent of the governed—your consent.

All of us Americans are immigrants, or the descendants of immigrants. And isn't it impressive that a nation of immigrants, coming in the past from the same parts of the earth from which you come, make this democracy work?

Alfred E. Smith once said:

"Always have in your minds that the Constitution and the first 10 amendments to it were drafted by refugees and by sons of refugees, by men with bitter memories of European oppression and hardship, by men who brought to this country and handed down to their descendants an abiding fear of arbitrary centralized government and autocracy.

"And all the bitterness and all the hatred of the Old World was distilled in our Constitution into the purest democracy that the world has ever known."

What would impress me, standing in your place, is that this Nation, conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal, is a fabulous and an unexampled success.

If today I were to take my oath as an American citizen, I would be enormously moved at having become part of a country that forged to greatness through government of the people, by the people, for the people.

I would feel a certain awe, a certain humility, a certain pride from the demonstrable fact that in my citizenship I am, before the law, the equal of any elected official.

Should you ever visit Washington in the District of Columbia, I commend to you the words engraved in marble on the facade of the Supreme Court: "Equal justice under law."

Ours is a government of laws, not of men.

It is considerations like these I would reflect upon if today I received my certificate of citizenship.

But I believe more than ever that I would join all Americans in the depth of my gratitude for what has been wrought in the way of human liberty on this soil: The right to vote; to worship God as I please; to speak my mind; the right of habeas corpus; of trial by jury; the right to be secure in my person, in my home, my papers, my effects. The right not to be a witness against myself; my right that no State may abridge my privileges or immunities as a citizen.

All these, and more, are the basic fabric of the law of this land.

They are to be found in the Constitution of the United States. They are the staff of life to the everyday American.

Without these, we cannot live. Without these, we do not wish to live.

With them, we have become the greatest and the most powerful nation of all time. If our history proves anything, it proves that freedom built on faith in God, and on equal justice under law makes for toughness and endurance in a nation.

You will note that I spoke of freedom built on faith in God. The most important limitation on governmental power in the minds of the founders of our American Republic was their conviction that a divine power had created rights in man which no government could take away.

America's founders wrote in the Declaration of Independence: "We hold these truths to be self-evident: That all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed."

If we read the Constitution in the spirit of the Declaration of Independence—as we must read it if we are to understand it—we realize that America is more than a federation of 48 States on the continent of North America. Our American Republic is an idea with a moral basis. It is a system of government grounded on belief in God.

Communism, ruthless and godless, has spread since World War II until it holds in restive bondage half of the world's people. Irreligious in concept, it has paradoxically created a political faith akin to religious fanaticism which has impelled some of its followers to betray their own countries. That fanaticism must be met, not by superior force alone, but by a fervent belief in the rightness of our cause.

We need to recapture, in these times of cold war more than ever, the faith of the founders of our Republic. We need to reaffirm in our daily lives their conviction that moral law must be the basis of our Government. We need to rededicate ourselves to the principles enshrined in the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution.

A

IN

una
the
I d
tin
195
T
wa
as
Spe
N
st
Cr
Th
sou
ever
In
Unit
trac
trial
hist
Th
had
ligio
W
a va
enor
habi
Th
to f
cross
plain
and
shou
every
Th
as f
and
them
taug
Ou
gene
all h
and
ly to
Inc
nece
fens
them
gram
tion
Co
fit c
The
dust
A
it b
ties
rail
hea
A
had

Appendix

Address by Hon. Edward Martin, of Pennsylvania, at Dedication of Martins Creek Plant of Pennsylvania Power & Light Co.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, November 15, 1954

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address I delivered at the dedication of the Martins Creek powerplant, on October 12, 1954.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEECH OF SENATOR MARTIN AT DEDICATION OF NEW MARTINS CREEK PLANT OF THE PENNSYLVANIA POWER & LIGHT CO., AT MARTINS CREEK, PA., OCTOBER 12, 1954

The development of America's natural resources is one of the most romantic stories ever told.

In less than 200 years, the area of the United States has been converted from a trackless wilderness to the greatest industrial, cultural, and spiritual empire of all history.

The different groups settling in America had great ideals. They possessed deep religious convictions.

When they arrived in America they found a vast wilderness, wide unexplored prairies, enormous mountains, and a savage race of inhabitants.

Their only methods of transportation were to follow trails and streams. The story of crossing the Allegheny Mountains, the broad plains, the rushing rivers, the sturdy Rockies and the wide Pacific slope is a story that should be proudly read again and again by every American.

The discovery of our natural resources such as fuel, ore, timber, stone, clay, and soil and the dangers encountered in developing them is another story which should be taught to every American.

Our fight for freedom, generation after generation, is the greatest military story of all history. That story of individual heroism and fighting organizations should be proudly told.

Individuals first took care of their bare necessities of food, clothing, shelter, and defense. There was no government to help them; no social security; no housing program; no free food; no provision for education; no protection from the Indians.

Communities were organized for the benefit of the people in each particular section. These included utilities, transportation, industry, education, and religion.

As our people advanced, it was found that it bettered the condition of all if communities were bound together. This resulted in railroad systems, plans for communications, heat, water, and powerplants.

All these things went forward because we had great leaders—inventors, financiers, workers, farmers, educators, and preachers who were willing to give of their abilities that conditions might be improved.

A few weeks ago a great American, and probably the outstanding world figure, President Herbert Hoover, celebrated his 80th birthday. He said, in his brief remarks, that so much in the United States depends upon the uncommon man.

The uncommon man in America is the one who works long hours, who possesses an idea and has faith to work until that idea is perfected.

They have included a Ford, a Firestone, a McCormack, an Edison, a Franklin, a Washington, a Lincoln, a Muhlenberg, a Webster, and so many thousands more who have done so much to make the America we take for granted.

Many Americans have invented things because of necessity. The Pennsylvania rifle came because the Pennsylvania Germans required it to secure food and to defend themselves. The Conestoga, that great covered wagon, was invented to meet heavy transportation requirements.

The creative genius of America is essentially the product of freemen, striving in a free land, in an atmosphere of free enterprise, and working toward the greater dignity of man.

Our great Nation is the product of inspired ideas and ideals.

Our American form of government is based upon freedom of the individual.

The profound statesmen who founded our Government were men of deep religious conviction. They recognized God in all their actions. They truthfully believed that the freedom and dignity of the individual are God's greatest gifts to mankind.

They knew that government cannot give freedom, because that is God's gift. The protection of that freedom is the duty of government.

There are now in the world two principal plans of government. In the one, the Communist, they advocate an all-powerful state. In the other, the republic, we believe that government is to maintain freedom and liberty for the individual.

The Communist hates religion, because it takes man away from the love of state.

Soviet Russia is gambling on the belief that most men of the world do not appreciate freedom—that they are not interested in the freedom that God has offered them, and that they do not care for spiritual realities.

We are meeting here today to dedicate a great powerplant which, in itself, depicts the continuing growth and development of America.

It stands as a symbol of enterprise, ingenuity, industry, invention, and America's faith in the future.

This dedication comes during a celebration marking one of civilized man's most forward steps out of darkness and of bondage.

This is light's diamond jubilee celebration, commemorating the development of the first practical electric light by Thomas Alva Edison. It is recognized, too, as the birth of our gigantic electric industry.

The inventions of Edison and others, under America's free enterprise system, have given our country unparalleled benefit.

Their work in the last 75 years has made working and living conditions more efficient, more convenient, and more comfortable.

Every home, every industry and every walk of life has been improved. Our inventors have had so much to do with our country's productivity, and in giving us the highest living standard ever known in the world.

Today electric power is the life blood of our Nation. Yet, it is such a small item in the average houehold budgeting. It is also such a small part of the operating cost of a business. The United States has only 7 percent of the world's population, yet we use nearly 40 percent of all the electricity generated in the world.

Today we can hardly realize that three generations ago the world was without electricity. Homes and offices were illuminated by gas or kerosene lamps. Machinery was run by steam or waterpower. Cooking was done on wood or coal stoves. Food was kept in ice boxes or spring houses.

There were no motion pictures, radios, television, vacuum cleaners, washing machines or other conveniences we now take for granted. Our people worked long hours—physical strength was one of man's greatest assets.

How did this great development come about? As with other industrial growth and progress this achievement comes from the American free enterprise system.

Under our system the individual is given the fruit of his toil, faith and inventive genius. Progress has been made by individuals who had initiative, did not fear competition, possessed the American know-how, and were stimulated with the thought that some day the worker in the shop might become the head of the plant.

The growth and development of electric power has caused new industries to spring up, employing millions.

Since World War II the electric industry has embarked on a huge program of expansion. This expansion gives America an additional productivity that stands as a bulwark against those who would undermine and destroy the God-loving nations of the free world.

The increase in the use of electric power is phenomenal. Let us make some comparisons:

In 25 years the number of employees in the United States has increased 31 percent.

In the same time the value of industrial production has risen 110 percent or more than 3 times the increase in employment.

In the same time use of electricity in terms of kilowatt hours has increased 342 percent.

This has increased production and decreased working hours, eliminating much of the drudgery in homes, plants, mines, and transportation.

The Pennsylvania Power & Light Co. has played an important part in this noteworthy national achievement. At this point I would like to pay my respects to your Charley Oakes.

He represents the electric industry well. No man appearing before the Senate Finance Committee made a better impression. His clear understanding of the American way of life has been highly complimented by members of the committee.

Foresight and planning have characterized the electric industry throughout its history. Here at Martins Creek today we see evidence that these qualities are still in full flower.

Since the end of World War II, Pennsylvania Power & Light has been engaged in an extensive development program costing, in the past 8 years, nearly $247 million. I am told that in the 5-year period ending in 1958, another $147 million will have been spent.

This is an encouraging sign for the people of Pensylvania. It measures the progress which is taking place on the farms, and in the business and industry of our State and the areas served by Pennsylvania Power & Light.

But more than this, it shows the confidence of this important company in the future. If further proof of faith in the future is needed, we have ample evidence right here. As we today dedicate the first electric generator at the Martins Creek plant, we see work going ahead rapidly on a second generator.

I think we may say that the electric power future of our State is in good hands.

I have had the privilege of watching the progress of Pennsylvania Power & Light and the interest it has displayed in promoting the welfare of the communities it serves. Its policies have been directed consistently toward this end.

The company and its people contribute importantly to the economy of the area served. The steel at this Martins Creek plant came from Bethelehem Steel, cement from nearby companies, local merchants furnished other materials, much of the work was contracted to local concerns and done by local people.

In 1953, through the Pennsylvania Power & Light Co.'s policy of purchasing from local firms whenever possible, through wages, through local and State taxes, and through dividends paid local investors, nearly $60 million went back into the area served by the company. This is certainly a substantial contribution toward the further economic progress of these communities.

The power coming from this generator becomes a part of our national heritage. In dedicating this plant we recognize it as the utilization of a great natural resource, perhaps the greatest of them all. It will bring comfort to our homes, lighten the tasks on our farms, add to the productivity of business and industry.

But today, it seems to me, we do more than dedicate this plant which stands on the historic Delaware River. We do honor to thousands of men and women who have played their parts in the development of this company and the electric industry from its simple beginning to its present place as a national institution.

I like the words which symbolize this past 75 years of achievement: "Light for freedom—Power for progress."

We rejoice in our freedom and progress but we, too, must be mindful to preserve our national security, which makes all this possible.

During a great event like this it seems to me that we should give some attention to the dangers confronting us as a country.

Edmund Burke said: "All that is necessary for the triumph of evil is that good men do nothing."

We have so many blessings for which we should be thankful, but we have some shortcomings. What are they?

We have too much government. Federal Government in 25 years increased employees from less than 500,000 to more than 2 million. The annual cost of Government increased from $4 billion to $91 billion. Fortunately, however, in the last 2 years the cost of Government has been cut more than $64 billion.

We have too much debt. Public debt in 25 years increased from $16 billion to about $275 billion.

Aggregate net debt, public and private, at the end of 1952 amounted to $552.7 billion—more than half a trillion dollars.

This is an all-time high, more than 2½ times the figure when the United States entered World War II and $146.3 billion above the total at the end of the war.

The most serious aspects of the debt problem today are to be found in the nature of the debt and in prevailing trends and attitudes with respect to it.

The outstanding change in the debt picture during the last 25 years has been the great increase in public as against private debt. At the end of 1929, public debt—Federal, State, and local—accounted for less than 16 percent of the total, and private debt for more than 84 percent.

In 1952 public debt amounted to about 45 percent of the total and private debt to 55 percent.

Government is too much in business. The Federal Government has invested in business about $30 billion. The United States Government is operating about 100 different kinds of business enterprise.

The Government runs the Nation's largest insurance operation. It is the largest electric-power producer. It is the largest moneylender. It is the largest shipowner and warehouse operator. It is in almost every conceivable business you can imagine—including roasting coffee, recapping tires, and making brooms.

Taxes are entirely too high. Taking 30 cents from every dollar earned is destroying incentive, and is using so much of the money of the people which they should be permitted to spend as they see fit.

We have too many people depending upon Government. Twenty-five million checks go out from the Federal Government for some kind of subsidy or grant every month. We have too much law evasion. Too many are taking short cuts. Law evaders should be shunned. They have no place in our great country.

We have too many who do not appreciate the glories of America.

We have too many who are not fully loyal to our Nation and our form of government. America is no place for people with divided allegiance.

There are also many people in our country who want a partially or completely socialized economy. They must be taught their serious and dangerous error.

A lot of low demagogs now talk of giveaway programs. They were heard it length on the tidelands-oil bill, and again when the new atomic-energy law was being enacted. This new law opens the door to private development of atomic energy.

Through the competition, ingenuity, and know-how of private enterprise, the development of atomic power now may go ahead for the benefit of people in the ways of peace.

Many of those who cry the loudest, because the law loosens the Government monopoly, are the same ones who claim the law doesn't go far enough in sharing atomic secrets and resources with foreign countries.

Recently at the dedication of the McNary Dam President Eisenhower quoted Lincoln's well-known views:

"The legitimate object of government is to do for a community of people whatever they need to have done, but cannot do at all, or cannot so well do for themselves."

"But," President Eisenhower continued, "here let us draw our line as Lincoln himself did, when he went on to say this: 'In all that the people can individually do for themselves, government ought not to interfere.' "

President Eisenhower further said:

"It is not properly a Federal responsibility to try to supply all the power needs of our people. The Federal Government should no more attempt to do so than it should assume responsibility for supplying all their drinking water, their food, their housing, and their transportation."

Now in conclusion let the record speak for itself. We have less than 7 percent of the world's population and less than 6 percent of the world's area, yet we have produced more new wealth than all the rest of the world combined.

The benefits of that wealth have been more widely distributed than those of any other country any time in history.

As a result of our accomplishments we have more churches, schools, libraries, and hospitals than any other land.

We are a people of good will. We promptly respond to any rumor of distress any place in the world. All of this is based on the ideals of freedom and opportunity. The Americans who have made good as artisans, farmers, professional men, investors, educators, financiers, and industrialists never asked for a substitute for faith, thrift, self-reliance, effort, decency, and pride in country.

I congratulate the Pennsylvania Power & Light Co., our Commonwealth and our country—and thank God that we are Americans.

The Late Senator Hugh Butler, of Nebraska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN L. HRUSKA

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, November 12, 1954

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, there have been made available to me some editorials appearing in Nebraska newspapers immediately following the recent death of Senator Hugh Butler, and I ask unanimous consent to have them printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Cambridge (Nebr.) Clarion of July 8, 1954]

He Was Never Too Busy To Help

Although Senator Hugh Butler was busier than many Senators much younger in years, still, he was never too busy to help, when asked to do so. Many people of this area, and of Cambridge especially, can personally verify this statement.

Many times he was asked for help in matters so small they no doubt appeared infinitesimal to a man of his position, on whose decision matters of great importance to the Nation weighed—but his response was as prompt, and as good natured, as if they were of great significance.

He rose from a small beginning to a man of great wealth and importance—by hard work and initiative. Therefore, he realized how important little things can be to little people.

He was accommodating, because he loved people, and is quoted as saying: "I feel that everyone is my friend." The Saviour said: "Inasmuch as ye have done it for the least of these, ye have done it for Me."

Therefor, he has surely earned the reward of which the psalmist speaks when he says: "Because he hath set his love upon Me, therefor will I deliver him. I will set him on high, because he hath known My name. With long life will I satisfy him, and show him My salvation."

Cambridge is indeed proud to be called the home of this great statesman, who has done so much for this part of Nebraska, as well as the State and Nation.

We can truthfully say: "The world was made better because Hugh Butler lived."

[From the Omaha World-Herald of July 3, 1954]

Hugh Alfred Butler

Hugh Butler was not a brilliant public speaker. Although successful in politics, he was not a spectacular operator in that field. His friends and admirers did not refer to him as a "great statesman." He was not one of the more colorful figures of the Senate.

But to those negatives should be added one positive of such mountainous importance that it overshadows and dwarfs them all.

He was a fine American. Fellow-Nebraskans who watched his career knew that in his mind and heart, America would always come first. No foreign influence, either of friend or foe, had any effect upon his actions as a Senator of the United States.

Hugh Butler was a prodigious and tireless worker. In a quiet way, without any attempt at showmanship, he was a leader in the Senate.

When Nebraska's late Senator Kenneth Wherry was Republican floor leader, he relied heavily on the counsel of his senior colleague. When the late Senator Griswold replaced Senator Wherry, he too looked to Hugh Butler for guidance. So, likewise, did a great number of Senators from other States, both Republicans and Democrats.

Hugh Butler came to the Senate by the political route—that is, by serving the Republican Party over a long period of years and becoming known as Nebraska's own Mr. Republican. Yet his closest ally and perhaps best friend in the Senate was a Democrat—HARRY F. BYRD, of Virginia. Between them there was a sort of interparty alliance, an unspoken understanding based wholly upon the fact that each regarded the other as a true believer in America and the American way.

Most good Americans are also good citizens of their home town and home State. That goes doubled and redoubled for Hugh Butler. He was never too busy to talk about some local problem, or to handle a matter of local importance in Washington. He wasn't the kind of Senator who traded votes in order to get projects for his home State, but so long as he was in Washington the legitimate interests of his people were well protected.

His devotion to Doane College tells a great deal about Hugh Butler. He received his degree from that Nebraska school back in 1900, and never ceased to esteem it an honor and a privilege to be a Doane man. It is in no small measure due to his efforts that Doane grew in stature and prestige at a time when many colleges of similar size were drying up.

Two years ago Hugh Butler ran for reelection, against the advice of many friends and probably against the counsel of doctors. He was warned that to continue to follow the fast Washington pace might take years off his life. He answered that he loved to serve his country and his fellow Nebraskans, and that he wished in that way to use whatever remaining years might be permitted to him.

We rather surmise that if he had known that his busy career would lead him to an appointment with death this week, that knowledge would not have caused him to change his course by one iota.

[From the Lincoln Evening Journal and Nebraska State Journal of July 2, 1954]

"Mr. Republican" Is Gone

In the death of Senator Hugh Butler the State has lost a strong advocate, a man of extraordinary consistency and firmness. He never wavered from his chosen position, never conceded an inch to anything but facts. Typical was one of his most recent decisions on a national matter, the admission of Hawaii as a State. Opposed to it for years because of apprehension that communism was boring in, Senator Butler characteristically went to Hawaii 2 years ago to see for himself. Since then he had consistently favored statehood for the islands. Nothing less than firsthand observation would have overcome his scruples—and no preconception was allowed to color the views growing out of that observation.

Conservative to a degree, Mr. Butler was charged from time to time with isolationism, and in a crisis refused to be moved from his stand. Whoever disagreed with him had to admit that he was his own man, forming his own opinions on such evidence as he himself saw, and not to be moved by opposition or criticism. How well this pleased his constituency is shown by the regularity with which he was returned to high office.

Never a personality of the type called colorful, the gentleman from Nebraska was a distinguished alumnus and generous patron of Doane College, not content with writing checks but visiting the campus when he could (as on his last trip home in April) and effective in making and keeping the liberal arts curriculum strong and widely known. He himself had entered Doane on a scholarship, done odd jobs during the school year and taken to the harvest field in summer, and a few years after graduation entered the grain business that made him wealthy. A Republican by inheritance and temperament he began in 1936 the political career that eventually took him to the United States Senate and made him third highest in his party in seniority. Death cut off 4 years of his third term there. He died full of honors and universally respected, a strong man, a devoted Nebraskan.

[From the Scottsbluff (Nebr.) Daily Star-Herald of July 3, 1954]

Outstanding Leader Lost

For the third time in 3 years, and for the second time in a little more than 2 months, the State of Nebraska is mourning the loss of a United States Senator.

The death of Hugh Butler, of Omaha, after 14 years of distinguished service to the State and Nation, removed one of its finest citizens, and left the State with the important responsibility of finding for replacement a man of comparably high principles and ability.

A midwesterner by birth and choice, Senator Butler took with him to Washington a deep understanding of the State he represented together with an unshakable belief in the American system and the moral courage to support convictions and beliefs as basic as the prairies where he was born.

His position as a senior member of that group, and as a member of important Senate committees, makes the problem of replacement doubly difficult, if the State is to maintain its traditionally high quality of representation.

The death toll of Nebraska Senators has been almost continuous for the past 3 years, starting with the passing of the late Kenneth Wherry in November 1951, and followed this year with the death of Dwight Griswold, a neighbor in Scottsbluff and Gering, and with the death of Senator Butler Thursday night.

Address of Justice C. Vernon Spratley at Dedication of Bust of George Wythe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, November 15, 1954

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address by Mr. Justice C. Vernon Spratley, of the Supreme Court of Appeals of Virginia, delivered at the dedication of a bust of George Wythe, at William and Mary College, Williamsburg, Va., on September 25, 1954.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

An Address Delivered at the Dedication of a Bust of George Wythe at William and Mary College, Williamsburg, Va., on September 25, 1954, by Justice C. Vernon Spratley, of the Supreme Court of Appeals of Virginia

These commemorative exercises take us back to a period which marked not only a crisis in American history; but, perhaps, the turning point in world civilization. It was an era that produced a gallant band of patriots, who dared to risk their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor in defense of the right of men to govern themselves. Here, in Virginia, a training ground for the leaders of the American Revolution, a host of remarkable men arose, including Patrick Henry, whose matchless oratory stirred the mind and will to independence; George Mason, author of that immortal document, the Virginia Declaration of Rights; George Washington, soldier and statesman, the sword of the Revolution; Thomas Jefferson, author of the Declaration of Independence; John Marshall, interpreter of the Constitution; and George Wythe, whom we honor today, lawyer, teacher, statesman, and jurist, who planted the seed from which have grown our system of representative constitutional government.

On this occasion we cannot enter upon an extended narrative of the life of Wythe. We shall only attempt to trace the development of his remarkable personality, and present some of his leading achievements. He was born in 1726, in the county of Elizabeth City, Va., now the city of Hampton, not far removed from the spot where we now stand. At the age of 14, he entered the College of William and Mary. Upon completing his course there, he began the study of law in the office of a relative.

An apt and diligent student, Wythe acquired sufficient proficiency to be admitted to practice law at the age of 20. His ability, industry, and honesty soon gained for him a profitable practice. In those pre-Revolutionary days, he took an active interest in the political activities of the colony, and with an inheritance of courage and an imperishable love of liberty, warmly espoused the cause of the colonists.

In 1754, Wythe entered upon the career of public service, which lasted until his death. In that year he served as attorney general of the colony during the absence of the incumbent, Peyton Randolph, in England. In the same year, he began a period of service in the lower branch of Virginia's legislative body, which continued with a few brief interruptions through the year 1778. Sometimes he served as a delegate from Williamsburg; sometimes as a delegate from the College of William and Mary; and sometimes as a delegate from his native county of Elizabeth City. During those stirring and heroic days, his ability, integrity, and sound judgment were recognized, and he became a leader and one of the master spirits in a company of brilliant men.

In 1776, Wythe, together with Jefferson, Pendleton, and George Mason, revised the laws of Virginia, consistent with the political upheaval produced by the Revolution. Much of that revision forms the basis of our statute law to this day. He also found time to serve as mayor of Williamsburg in 1768; clerk of the house of burgesses from 1769 to 1775; and in the session of 1777–78, the second following the separation from England, he was speaker of the house of delegates, the successor to the house of burgesses.

In the meantime, in addition to his activities in the legislative halls of Virginia, he was a member of the Continental Congress in 1775, and again in 1776, when he warmly supported Richard Henry Lee's resolution for independence, and became the first Virginia signer of the Declaration of Independence. He was a member of the convention which met in 1787, to frame a Federal Constitution. In the following year, as chairman of the committee of the whole, he presided over the convention which met in Richmond to consider the ratification of the Constitution of the United States. A bitter controversy arose as to the extent of powers which should be conferred on the Federal Government. An ardent advocate of approval, Wythe proposed a resolution of ratification. In spite of powerful opposition, represented by Patrick Henry, George Mason, and James Monroe, the argument of Wythe, Marshall, and Edmund Pendleton finally triumphed, and resulted in the acceptance of the Constitution by Virginia by the very barest of margins. So important was that decision that it has been frequently said by historians that had Virginia not ratified the Constitution as it stood, the entire course of American history would have been materially changed.

The high distinction which marked the career of Wythe, as lawyer and statesman, was a prelude to his services as teacher and jurist. In 1777, the High Court of Chancery of Virginia was created and George Wythe, together with Edmund Pendleton and Robert Carter Nicholas were elected as judges. They were also ex-officio judges of the court of appeals, where they were entitled to precedence.

In 1788, upon the reorganization of the high court, Wythe was made sole high chancellor, which office he held until his death.

In 1779, the board of visitors of the College of William and Mary led by Jefferson, then Governor of Virginia, and a member of the college board, reorganized the college on the plan of a university. A professorship of law and police was established, and Wythe, the preceptor of Jefferson, immediately became the occupant of that chair, the first chair of law in an American college.

Wythe brought to his new work the intelligence, industry, and efficiency that marked his conduct in every relation of his life. His mind was alert and vigorous. He regarded and taught the fundamental principles of law as a part of the science of government rather than as something to be employed only in the trial of cases. He used Sir William Blackstone's Commentaries as a textbook, and in lectures contrasted English and Virginia law. To afford practical experience, he supplemented the course with a moot court and a model legislature. Among his students (before, at, and after he became a member of the faculty of William and Mary College) were Thomas Jefferson, James Monroe, John Marshall, Edmund Randolph, Henry Clay, and many others; men who were the architects of our American way of life.

Wythe's connection with the college ended in 1789, when, as high chancellor, his duties required him to move to Richmond, then the capital city of the State. In 1790, in recognition of his ability, character, and services, the College of William and Mary conferred upon him the honorary degree of LL. D. As a result of the War Between the States, and the general poverty and distress which ensued during reconstruction days in Virginia, the chair of law became dormant, and 60 years elapsed before its revival.

There are those who deem the services of Wythe in the field of jurisprudence as his greatest contribution to our Nation. They point to the celegrated case of *Commonwealth* v. *Caton, et als.* (4 Call, (8 Va.) p. 5) sometimes referred to as the Case of the Prisoners, decided in 1782. One of the important questions in that case was whether an act passed by the house of delegates conformed to the requirements of the constitution of Virginia governing the subject of pardons. Chancellor Wythe, writing the main opinion, asserted the right and duty of the courts to rule upon the constitutionality of the laws.

When this bold decision was rendered, the United States was just emerging from the Revolution. There had been no clear-cut explanation of the new laws which governed the country, nor any clear-cut definition of the powers of the executive, legislative, and judicial departments. Citizens were divided in opinion, and many of the more prominent were critical of the views of the court.

In 1803, 21 years later, the principles which Wythe planted bore fruit in the opinion rendered by John Marshall, Chief Justice, in the historic case of *Marbury* v. *Madison* (1 Cranch 137, 2d L. Ed. 60). Marshall's adoption of Wythe's theory made the latter's contribution complete, and gave to the doctrine itself the vigor and strength with which it has survived attack for a century and a half. Perhaps the greatest single source of the Supreme Court's prestige, it has been termed the cornerstone of constitutional law and the rock upon which this Nation has been built.[1]

The private life of Wythe was exemplary in manner, morals, and principal. A man of the highest integrity, kindly in mind and heart, he was greatly beloved by his fellow citizens. He had a deep and abiding faith in the tenets of Christianity. Like Thomas Jefferson, and a number of other leading Virginians of his day, he favored the emancipation of slaves. He liberated several of his servants, and by his will provided for their maintenance and support.

As an attorney, he observed professional ethics to the highest degree. He refused unjust cases and abandoned cases regarding which he had been misled. He deemed the lawyer an instrumentality of justice. As a statesman and jurist, he foresaw with greater clarity than some of his colleagues, in 1788, the necessity for a strong Central Government, controlled by rules asserting and securing the basic principles of liberty and justice.

In a brief memoir printed in the contemporaneous reports of the decisions of the court of appeals (4 Call (8 Va.) 623), this is said:

"Chancellor Wythe was one of the most eminent of the great statesmen and jurists among his contemporaries. His mind was uncommonly vigorous and rapid in its perceptions, his knowledge of law profound, his uprightness and impartiality preeminent, and his patriotism ardent. He was unambitious of wealth, plain and frugal in his method of life, and condescending and amiable in his manners."

Wythe's former pupil, intimate and affectionate friend, Thomas Jefferson, said: "His virtue was of the purest kind; his integrity inflexible and his justice exact; of warm patriotism and devoted as he was to liberty and the natural and equal rights of men he might truly be called the Cato of his country without the avarice of the Roman, for a more disinterested person never lived. Temperance and regularity in all of his habits gave him general good health, and his unaffected modesty and suavity of manners endeared him to everyone."

Wythe died on June 8, 1806, in the 81st year of his life. On June 10, the day of his funeral, the Richmond Inquirer paid him this tribute:

"Kings may require mausoleums to consecrate their memory; saints may claim the privilege of a canonization; but the venerable George Wythe needs no other monument than the services rendered to his country, and the universal sorrow which that country sheds over his grave."

The continuation of the first chair of law in the United States as the Marshall-Wythe School of Law is a more appropriate tribute to the memory of Wythe than any monument of cold stone or granite. This school of law, reestablished in 1921, by the board of visitors of the College of William and Mary, serves as a memorial of usefulness, alive and vibrant with American youth, who would learn the principles of liberty and justice, who would learn how to frame constitutions and statutes, and who would seek to model their characters after that of the founders of American jurisprudence.

I do not deem it inappropriate here to recall that foremost in the revival of the school of law were Dr. J. A. C. Chandler, then president of the college, and the Honorable O. L. Shewmake, a distinguished alumnus, and a member of its board. Judge Shewmake, an experienced teacher, an able and successful practitioner of law, an efficient public servant, and an ardent admirer of Chancellor Wythe, was elected as 1 of the 2 professors of law. Thus equipped by training and experience, and possessed of that rare combination of scholarship, versatility of mind, and sparkling wit, Judge Shewmake, during his tenure of office, inspired his students with a love of the law, its reason, and its philosophy. Subsequently, the late Theodore S. Cox, a distinguished legal scholar and teacher, succeeded in consolidating the law school and in making it fully accredited. Under the present guidance and leadership of Dean Dudley W. Woodbridge, whose gracious personality and scholarly attainments have won him the respect and admiration of the bench, bar, and students, the school now flourishes with great vigor and strength. To meet the challenges of the continued transition of this growing and developing country, new and devoted teachers have been employed and new courses added to its curriculum, including, as you will be told today, a course in the law of taxation, leading to a degree of master of the law of taxation.

No spot could be more fitting in which to honor the memory of George Wythe than the old capital of the colony of Virginia, where he spent the earlier period of his life as student and practitioner of law, and the latter period as legislator and teacher. No occasion could be more appropriate than that selected to inaugurate the beginning of a year-long celebration of the 200th anniversary of John Marshall's birth and the 175th year of the establishment of the first chair of law in the United States. No company could more fittingly join in these ceremonies than those who would preserve the pattern of liberty, the pattern of governance, and the ideals of jurisprudence bequeathed to us by Wythe and Marshall, and those who followed in their lead.

It is a great privilege to unveil the bust of George Wythe. We thank the gifted artist who has carved, and the friends who have given, this likeness of the great chancellor to the College of William and Mary. If anyone has a title to a bust at this college, it is Wythe, for it was here that he conceived and taught the principles of liberty and self-government upon which our Republic is founded. It will hereafter adorn and hallow the halls of this college and serve to recall to memory the virtues and achievements of one of Virginia's greatest jurists.

---

[1] Supreme Court and Supreme Law, edited by Edmond Cahn, p. 115.

Reds Ordered To Join Antiwar Organization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, November 15, 1954

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "The Red Underground—Reds Ordered To Join Antiwar Organization," written by Herbert A. Philbrick and published yesterday in the New York Herald Tribune.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE RED UNDERGROUND—REDS ORDERED TO JOIN ANTIWAR ORGANIZATION

(By Herbert A. Philbrick)

Highly trained and skilled underground Communist Party agents, members of the progroup section in district 1 of the party (Massachusetts, Rhode Island, New Hampshire, Maine, and Vermont) have received orders from their Red bosses to move into a meeting of the Fellowship of Reconciliation this Friday evening. The dinner meeting celebrates the 40th anniversary of the organization and will be held at Christ Church, Harvard Square, Cambridge, Mass.

The Fellowship of Reconciliation is a pacifist and antiwar organization of long standing. Its ranks include many loyal and sincere individuals who feel that pacifism and nonviolence is a policy which would be good for the United States Government and people.

CAMPAIGN FOR GULLIBLE

However, the foreign policy of the Soviet Union—a dictatorship which believes in waging war to obtain its ultimate objective of domination and control of the world—is based on a campaign to sell gullible individuals the theme of coexistence. According to current Communist propaganda for public consumption, coexistence is supposed to mean that capitalism and communism can exist together peaceably.

It so happens, however, that inside secret cell meetings today Communist Party members are being told by their leaders that communism and capitalism cannot coexist for any long period. Earl Browder, the former leader and hero of the Communists in this country, was kicked out of the party for the deviationist crime of urging coexistence. Comrade Browder's mistake was that he tried to sell the propaganda to his own Red followers.

TARGET FOR INFILTRATION

Communist Party members have been instructed to use every device to promote appeasement and a neutral attitude toward the imperialist policies of the Soviet Union. They have also been told that pacifist and world peace organizations can be very useful and helpful in the current propaganda campaign, and they have been instructed to use pacifist organizations as transmission belts to sell the Communist line under the guise of sincere pacifism.

The Fellowship of Reconciliation has been selected as one of its victims and as a target for infiltration by secret Communists who are doctors, lawyers, teachers, professors, businessmen, and cultural leaders in the New England community.

The propaganda line which the Communists have been ordered to foist upon the members of Fellowship of Reconciliation is: (1) Recognition of Red China; (2) admission of Red China into the United Nations; (3) appeasement and acceptance of Communist aggression; (4) subtle opposition to Radio Free Europe, the Crusade for Freedom, Radio Liberation, and the Voice of America; (5) attacking the United States as an imperialist and warmongering nation, while picturing the Soviet Union as a peaceseeking democracy; (6) insinuation that war is necessary for the maintenance of capitalism; (7) promotion of fear of the possibility of atomic warfare, and that there is no alternative to a policy of coexistence, the only guaranty of a lasting peace; (8) banning the use of the atomic bomb by the United States, without similar action by the Soviet Union, and barring the right of U. N. teams to inspect Soviet atomic production.

EXAMINE THE RECORD

The bonafide pacifists and members of the Fellowship of Reconciliation would be wise to examine the public record and former affiliations of any new members.

Are they or have they ever been sponsors and supporters of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade, the American Friends of Spanish Democracy, or other organizations which tried to involve this country in the Spanish civil war and recruited American youths to go to Spain to fight for the Red-led Loyalists?

Are they or have they ever been members, supporters or sponsors of American Youth for Democracy and the National Council for American-Soviet Friendship, who sponsored appearances throughout the United States of a group of Russian sharpshooters including women, whose fame was determined by the number of the people they had killed?

ANOTHER COMMITTEE

Have they been members of or supported the American Committee for Indonesian Independence, which urged support of violence and bloodshed in the Dutch East Indies?

A Communist is an ideological shyster who will pose as a pacifist only when it serves his Soviet dictators.

Remove Not the Ancient Landmark

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, November 15, 1954

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address by Judge David A. Pine, of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, delivered at the Marshall-Wythe-Blackstone celebration at the College of William and Mary, Williamsburg, Va., on September 25, 1954.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMOVE NOT THE ANCIENT LANDMARK

(Address by Associate Justice David A. Pine)

You have been surfeited with speeches. Words. Words. More words. And if words be tyrants, you have indeed become their liege subjects by remaining throughout the day, although in a slightly modified sense from that intended by the author of that expression, or my recollection of it. But perhaps it is good training, and designed to put you in condition so to speak, for President Chandler has informed me that today's proceedings are but a prelude to a series of programs during the ensuing year, rededicating the bench and bar to the traditions of representative constitutional government. Indeed, he has asked me to select a topic bearing some relation to that general theme, and one which might serve as a basis for further discussion. That would seem to give me wide latitude, but I take it he means a discussion on the Constitution.

And I am happy that he asked me to speak on the Constitution, because that is a speaker's paradise. Although innumerable volumes have been written and countless words have been spoken concerning it, the Constitution seems never to pall and, I am glad to say, insures audience interest, regardless of the speaker. Small wonder that I accepted your kind invitation with such eagerness, as I was provided, so to speak, with a captive audience. And there is another reason—a secret reason. Lawyers and judges are peculiarly susceptible to the temptation of a discourse on the Constitution.

Of course, one has to be selective in a discussion of the Constitution, because even that great document has a limit to its antidotal capacity to resist audience boredom; and selection generally presents difficulties on account of its many fascinating possibilities.

But here I have an added burden. Admiral Chandler has also stipulated that my topic must be of "broad interest to the layman as well as to * * * the legal profession." Apparently the layman comes first, but my topic must be suitable for both. And that presents an almost insuperable obstacle, for no lawyer worthy of the name, at least none of my acquaintance, certainly no member of the faculty or graduate of this institution, would admit to a status beneath that of an expert on the Constitution, in court or out. The lawyer generally acquires that distinction at graduation, or shortly before, and never questions his title. How, then, may I say anything of interest to a man of his scholarship which would be within the meager understanding of the layman? And by the same token, how may I say anything of interest to the layman which would be other than commonplace to my learned former brother at the bar? I have no answer to these questions, and the two conditions seem to be mutually exclusive, but I have not allowed the obstacle to stand in my way and have come before you nevertheless, in the hope, perhaps born of optimism, that what I shall say will be of some interest to the layman and not too shallow for polite attention of the expert.

And in casting about in my mind for some phase of the general subject which perhaps is not too shopworn, it occurred to me that you might be interested in an analysis of the mental state of the men who assembled in Philadelphia to salvage something from the wreckage of the Articles of Confederation—a sort of psychoanalysis without therapy or need for therapy, if I can use the term in that nontechnical manner, for Heaven knows that those giants needed no therapy. In other words, what emotions gripped them? What dominated their thinking and their actions? What were their compulsions?

Of course, such an analysis will have to be based on what they said and what they did in the light of their background and surrounding circumstances. It cannot be comprehensive, as such an inquiry would add another volume to the sagging shelves, and indeed I know that you will be glad to hear that I am not prepared for any such undertaking. My text, therefore, if I need one, might be, "By their fruits, ye shall know them," and at the end I shall be orthodox and point a moral, if you will permit.

These men will have to be considered collectively, and not individually, as their achievement was collective, and individual consideration would be beyond the scope of my remarks. Indeed, what I have to say might not be wholly applicable to each one and might be more applicable to one than to another. With a few exceptions, notably Jefferson, John Adams, and Patrick Henry, who were absent, they constituted the leading citizens of the erstwhile Colonies. Lawyers predominated, although there were a number of doctors, educators, bankers, merchants, and others in attendance. There were some who had served as soldiers in the Revolution, and a number who had signed the Declaration of Independence. Six were Members of the Continental Congress of 1774. Six were signers of the Articles of Confederation, one of whom had drawn it, 43 had been Members of the Continental Congress, and 2 had been presidents of the Congress.

They were men of deep learning, scholarly attainments, and wide experience in statecraft. They had been brought together under a resolution passed by the expiring Congress under the Articles of Confederation, for the purpose of revising the articles. The Government established by it had utterly failed, because of its weakness. The country was in a desperate condition. Radical measures were being agitated. The French revolution was just around the corner, and its spirit was in the air. The currency was of uncertain value. Credit was practically nil. Life, liberty, and property were not safe. Chaos was imminent.

With their background and under those circumstances, I have no hesitancy in saying that fear dominated them, and that the object of their fear was first a lack of government. Before them loomed disunion, disorder, and anarchy, which in my evaluation produced profound fear in their hearts. This would seem to be obvious.

On the other hand, I think the record shows that they had a competing fear, equally consuming and tending to counteract the other. They knew that to remove the fear of lack of government, it was necessary to establish one of sufficient strength to cope with the situation, and that equated strength on a national scale which was far from palatable. They were devoted to their local self-governments, and they had distrust and hatred for absentee authority. The list of grievances in the Declaration of Independence is ample evidence of this, and they were fearful that a strong Federal Government might, in time, produce a conuterpart for that which the sacrifices of the Revolution had sought to destroy. They feared it would be an instrument of tyranny, despotism, and oppression; and my conclusion that they were possessed by this fear can be found, as I shall later show, in the Constitution of the United States, without looking elsewhere.

And so, when they assembled in Philadelphia, as they later said, "to form a more perfect union," ignoring the mandate of the resolution appointing them to revise the Articles of Confederation, which incidentally could not be amended except by unanimous vote of all the States, it is my view that collectively they were controlled by fear, or more accurately, two competing, incompatible fears: A fear of government and a fear of a lack of government. Nevertheless, with such dismaying premise, and actuated by such warring emotions, a miracle was performed, and by a strange and unique adventure in the science of government they did the impossible—they reconciled the irreconcilable, they squared the circle. In the oft-repeated words of Gladstone, they forged "the most wonderful work ever struck off at a given time by the brain and purpose of man." They found a formula by which the hard-won freedom of the people and the sovereignty of the States could be preserved and at the same time a national government of sufficient strength to provide order and security and perform national functions could be created.

In their plan of government, they took the totality of sovereign power residing in the people, a theory on which there was no disagreement, and vested a portion of it in the United States, reserving the remainder to the States and the people, a distribution, but not an equal distribution, of sovereign power. They made the United States supreme in its national sphere, without detracting from the supremacy of the States within their respective State spheres, except for the imposition of several restraints deemed necessary in the national interest for the protection of individual or property rights, for example, the restraint upon the States against the passing of any bill of attainder, ex post facto law, or law impairing the obligation of contract. They thereby formed a duality of sovereignty within the same orbit, a device, I believe, without exact historical precedent.

They created the United States as a sovereignty, and granted it those powers considered necessary for the proper conduct of national functions, but they granted no more than necessary, and thereby lessened its capacity for harm to the States and the people whose powers were only diminished to the extent of those granted away or prohibited. And then, to make assurance doubly sure, the people, when it came to ratification, apparently entertaining the same fear, but probably more fervently than that which actuated the delegates to the convention, insisted on the incorporation of the 9th and 10th amendments, which provided that the enumeration of powers in the Constitution were not to be construed to deny or disparage the others retained by the people, and that the powers not delegated or prohibited were reserved to the States or to the people.

Next, as shown the fear of tyranny and despotism incident to the creation of a strong central government, I cite to you the first eight amendments to the Constitution. As you know, they guarantee freedom of religion, speech, and press; secure the people against unreasonable searches and seizures; require indictment in felony cases; forbid a person to be compelled to be a witness against himself; and prohibit the deprivation of life, liberty, or property without due process of law, along with the other restraints for the protection of rights inherent in freemen. These are all restraints placed upon the Federal Government, not upon the States. Could anything more eloquently demonstrate the fear alluded to than these amendments which were so uppermost in the minds of the people that it was necessary to agree to add them formally to the Constitution in order to be sure of its ratification? And if this fear was in the minds of the people, is it not reasonable to presume that it was in the minds of the delegates who represented them, but who felt that the amendments were unnecessary because the Constitution itself was so scrupulously careful to enumerate and delimit the granted powers?

Next, fearful of wrongful or excessive exercise of such powers as were necessarily granted to the Federal Government, the founders diluted their strength by distributing them among three departments of government: the legislative, executive, and judicial. In this they were probably influenced by the teachings of Locke and Montesquieu, particularly the latter, who advocated some separation of powers as a measure of safety, and also by the historical excesses of monarchs and parliaments when powers were concentrated in one. They therefore granted the powers because of necessity, but weakened their exercise by distribution; and as a further safeguard, in certain categories they set up a system of additional checks by one branch of the government against another. For example, the treatymaking power of the Executive is conditioned on the concurrence of two-thirds of the Senate present; the appointive power of the Executive in specified cases requires the consent of the Senate; the lawmaking power of the legislative is subject to the veto of the Executive, which again is subject to circumvention by two-thirds of the votes of both Houses, and although not expressly provided therein, implicit in the language granting the judicial power is its power to nullify acts of either of the other branches and of the States which go beyond or are in contravention of the constitutional authority. This was made certain by the historical opinions of Chief Justice Marshall, to whose memory we do honor today. Even within the legislative branch alone, there is a similar check in the creation of two Houses of Congress, which convincingly shows the fear of government, including a fear of government by an unbridled democracy as well as a fear of king or parliament.

There are many other road blocks, some express and some implicit in the practical operation of government, growing out of this fear of government because of tyranny and despotism always inherent therein unless curbed. But I shall not elaborate the point further, and shall pass on to several quotations on the subject.

The first is from Washington's Farewell Address, in which he said: "The spirit of encroachment tends to consolidate the powers of all governments in one, and thus to create, whatever the form of government, a real despotism."

The second is from the 47th paper of the Federalist, written by Madison, where he stated: "The accumulation of all powers, legislative, executive, and judicial, in the same hands, whether of one, a few, or many, whether hereditary, self-appointed, or elective, may justly be pronounced the very definition of tyranny."

The third is from John Adams, who was not a delegate to the Convention because of his absence abroad as envoy to Great Britain, but whose views can surely be considered as a reflection of those who were present. In volume I of his works, at page 186, he wrote: "It is by balancing 1 of these 3 powers against the other 2 that the efforts in human nature toward tyranny can alone be checked and restrained and any degree of freedom preserved."

I shall not call other witnesses, although many more are available, but rest on what I have said to to establish that fears of the kind I have described dominated the delegates. The marvel is that this experiment in government, novel in so many respects, has worked so efficiently that this Nation is now the envy of the rest of the world. Starting as a weak, struggling, uncertain group of States calling themselves a Union, it has been transferred into the most powerful of all nations. Instead of 13 debt-ridden colonies emerging into statehood after a devastating war for independence, there are now 48 sovereignties, strong and robust, some virtually empires in themselves, 2 Territories, the District of Columbia, and possessions beyond the seas. Instead of a population of 4 million inhabitants, there are now 40 times that number. Instead of a national wealth too insignificant to evaluate, it is now estimated at close to a thousand billion dollars; and the legal basis for this phenomenal accomplishment, and the legal basis for the protection of your most priceless possessions—your life, your liberty, and your property—is that single parchment document containing some 4,000 words emanating from those inspired men who assembled in Philadelphia in the summer of 1787.

Now, what is the moral to which I said I would point before concluding my remarks? It is this: Follow the example of the Founding Fathers and be as alertly fearful as were hey of usurpation of power, the forerunner of tyranny and despotism. Oh, you might say, that is seeing ghosts, the Constitution stands in the way, it is in no jeopardy, and is held in such high esteem and reverence as to be immune from destruction. I agree, if you refer to frontal attack; but what I ask you to fear are attacks on the flanks, made in the cause of expediency and supported by vast popular demand of the moment. The technique will be the argument that the Constitution is a living thing and therefore susceptible of growth, and must be adaptable and flexible enough to meet changes in the social and economic life of the country.

There can be no doubt as to the validity of that argument when properly applied, but I ask you to take heed when its application would be destructive in fact, but not in name, of the very foundations and pillars of our constitutional government.

In recent years there has been a trend toward enhancement of the powers of the Federal Government. This has been accomplished by the expansion of what was formerly believed to be the limits of the interstate commerce power and the taxing and spending powers, and the Federal Government has thereby taken over the control of great fields of activities formerly considered the province of the States.

There has also been a disposition in the Federal Government itself toward encroachment by one department upon the powers of another, particularly the executive upon the legislative and judicial. This is not to say that the legislative has not cast covetous eyes toward the executive, nor that the judicial has been demurely free from flirtations with the legislative powers, but, at the moment, as I see it, the executive advances predominate.

I could cite many examples, but time will not permit. Suffice it to say that any encroachment by one department upon the powers of another gives added power to the trespasser and diminishes the balance accordingly.

Take heed that the barriers so carefully constructed are not eroded by subtle means, sometimes not immediately discernible, but, to my mind, more dangerous than a direct attack.

If conditions require a change in the Constitution in its basic provisions, let it be done by amendment in the manner provided therein, and stand out against the plausible but insidious argument of flexibility induced by expediency or the pressures or rewards of the moment.

I am aware that the view I express has vocal opponents, but on consideration of their utterances, I detect, beneath their reasoning, a predisposition to authoritarian government, hidden by a facade of constitutional form. So often such people are willing to exchange liberty for efficiency, and freedom for temporary security or reward.

And as I read the opinions of the great Chief Justice, the incomparable John Marshall, to whom we pay tribute today, he would not, as they sometimes contend, support their point of view, but would challenge it with every ounce of his unconquerable spirit and persuasion. To be sure, he is known as the great nationalist, the anti-States-rights exponent, the liberal expounder of the Constitution, but these appellations came at a time when the pendulum was swinging toward its nullification. They were applied to the man who bravely stood foremost in opposition to theories which would have vitiated the plain purpose of the Constitution to establish a National Government supreme within its sphere, theories which would have reduced it to the same state of impotency as had descended upon the Articles of Confederation which it supplanted. Now, when the pendulum is pointing the other way, it is useful to recall his words in *McCulloch* v. *Maryland*, that "no political dreamer was ever wild enough to think of breaking down the lines which separate the States and of compounding the American people into one common mass." And I believe Marshall, also known as the Guardian of the Constitution, today would be equally fervent in opposing a nationalism or liberalism in construction which would imperil duality of sovereignty or separation of powers, or both, because that in the long run would be as destructive of his cherished Constitution as was the narrow, debilitating States-rights doctrine of his day. The latter spelled national dissolution and chaos; the former, if pursued to its logical end, spells totalitarianism and tyranny.

"Remove not the ancient landmark, which thy fathers have set." (Proverbs 22: 28.)

The Demand for Nixon's Scalp

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRY M. GOLDWATER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, November 15, 1954

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an editorial entitled "The Demand for Nixon's Scalp," published in the Los Angeles Times of November 9.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

THE DEMAND FOR NIXON'S SCALP

The strange spectacle of Democratic leaders proclaiming loyalty to President Eisenhower and promising cooperation with him, while at the same time demanding that the President scalp Vice President Nixon and present the gory trophy to the Democrats as a peace offering, needs an explanation.

CAMPAIGN ECHOES

It probably is to be found in the fact that a hot campaign is still echoing in memory. There are at least two reasons why President Eisenhower won't accede to the demand. One is personal, the other political. The President and the Vice President get along well together, so well that the President has trusted his understudy with more authority and responsibility than any Vice President has had in the Nation's history. And it is a fact that in the States where Nixon campaigned the Republicans came nearer to holding their ground than they did elsewhere.

As they do with Senator McCarthy, the Democrats misquote and misrepresent the Vice President. It is not true that Nixon accused the Democrats of treason or connivance with Communists. What he did accuse them of was failing to take energetic measures against the traitors and pro-Communists in the Government.

THE SERIOUS CHARGES

President Truman with his "red herring" remark, Secretary of State Acheson with his "I will not turn my back on Alger Hiss" and those who refused even to investigate such serious charges as the FBI report on Harry Dexter White are examples of what Nixon was critizing.

No one supposes that Harry S. Truman was anything by a patriotic American, according to his lights. But the carelessness which he, and his Attorney General, displayed in the White case was the sort of blundering which is worse than crime. The facts were on paper, and before them, but the papers evidently never were read.

Hence, Nixon has nothing to take back and the President has no reason to repudiate him. The Democrats are mad at Nixon not because he accused them falsely but because he accused them truly and made the charges stick. In a political campaign it is not the falsehoods and exaggerations that hurt, but the proved truths.

The current session of the Senate should not be confused with the election results. The election changed a few of the Senators now sitting in Washington, but only those who are filling out unexpired terms, and of these only the ones that can get their election certificates in time to attend the session. Election certificates depend on official counts, which are not yet completed.

For the most part the Senators assembled in Washington are the same Senators who have been with us since early 1953 when the 83d Congress began its first session.

M'CARTHY'S CASE

They have not yet started to consider the censure resolutions proposed by a special committee which investigated some acts of Senator McCarthy. And while such consideration is supposed to be the purpose of the meeting—the Senate, after appointing the investigating committee, recessed in order to reconvene and hear its report—there may be other matters which will receive greater attention.

For there are other matters which deserve more attention. The fact is the charges against the Wisconsin Senator are trivial; and if the Senate votes censure on their account it will, in large part, be voting on a basis of personal dislike.

Some Democrats are unable to forgive Senator McCarthy for using the unfortunate and exaggerated phrase "20 years of treason" in referring to the Roosevelt-Truman administrations. And some Republicans hate him for his attacks on such friends of President Eisenhower as Gen. George C. Marshall.

The Senate could do the country a service if it forgot the McCarthy affair and spent its time considering Presidential appointments and the treaties that may be submitted.

DISTRIBUTION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

To the Vice President and each Senator 100 copies; to the Secretary and Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, each, 25 copies; to the Secretary, for official use, not to exceed 35 copies; to the Sergeant at Arms, for use on the floor of the Senate, not to exceed 50 copies; to each Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress, 68 copies; to the Clerk, Sergeant at Arms, and Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives, each, 25 copies; to the Clerk, for official use, not to exceed 50 copies; and to the Doorkeeper, for use on the floor of the House of Representatives, not to exceed 75 copies; to the Vice President and each Senator, Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress there shall also be furnished (and shall not be transferable), 3 copies of the daily Record, of which 1 shall be delivered at his residence, 1 at his office, and 1 at the Capitol.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. The money derived from such sales shall be paid into the Treasury and accounted for in his annual report to Congress, and no sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

Co

m

u
th
a
m
a
N
c
g

v
a
C

(

Appendix

Community Development and Economic Growth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, November 16, 1954

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of an address by Dr. Gabriel Hauge, administrative assistant to the President, at a luncheon at the Mayflower Hotel, November 15, 1954, on the subject of community development and economic growth.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AND ECONOMIC GROWTH

(Address by Dr. Gabriel Hauge, administrative assistant to the President, at ACTION luncheon, November 15, 1954)

Few of today's problems in the American economy bear directly on the lives and welfare of a larger number of people than the problem of deterioration in the physical conditions of our cities and metropolitan areas. Few tasks are more challenging than that of improving our cities as places in which to live and to work. People on the farms of America as well as those who reside in the urban centers themselves have an obvious interest in better cities, and all of us are intimately affected by the social and health hazards, as well as the hazards of substandard citizenship, that have their principal roots in the decay of urban neighborhoods and whole sectors of metropolitan areas.

These are familiar observations and there is no need to dwell on them before a group of this kind. You would not be here today, embarking on the exciting and promising ACTION project, if you did not have a full and vital understanding of them and of the critical importance of finding practical means of stopping the spread of urban blight.

There is a paradoxical quality in the position of the American city of today which I am sure has not escaped you. Our great cities are preeminently the product of technological progress, exemplifying in a multitude of ways the technical advances in which we take so much and such merited satisfaction. Yet we have been embarrassingly backward in applying to the improvement of our cities themselves the technological and organizational efficiency that has brought such rich rewards in industrial and agricultural production.

But in this paradox lies the challenge that makes the formation of ACTION the exciting event that it is. We may be sure that there will be no slackening in the growth of our great cities and metropolitan areas, and equally sure that there will be no lessening in their importance as the nerve centers of our economic life. The economic progress which we can see before us—and the prospect of further advance was never brighter than it is today—will inevitably produce these consequences. It is only in applying to the task of improving our cities the same technical and organizing skills that have brought progress in all other aspects of our economy that we can make real headway in the fight against urban blight and neighborhood decay.

President Eisenhower from the beginning has sought to improve and make more efficient the Government's discharge of its responsibility in the field of homes for our people. Early in 1953 the President appointed an Advisory Committee on Housing. Its recommendation for a broad-scale housing program formed a basis for the President's message to the Congress on housing in January of this year. In contrast to the previous patchwork of assorted housing laws, the Housing Act of 1954 provides for a single, integrated, and coordinated housing program. In keeping with the Eisenhower approach, the new law places heavy emphasis on local and private initiative. It is designed to stimulate and support local community action, rather than to weaken or replace it.

It was precisely with the object of stimulating efforts to this end that the Housing Act of 1954 included provisions designed to aid State and municipal governments, firms, groups of citizens and individuals to repair and modernize individual structures and to undertake far-reaching projects of urban rehabilitation. But the task of preventing the further spread of urban blight, and of permanently reversing its course, is not one that can be accomplished by legislative action alone. It is essentially a work of partnership in which the resources of the Federal Government play a supporting and supplementing role, but in which the initiative must be taken by the cities and States, by groups of individuals determined to improve their own neighborhoods and by individual property owners. The formation of your group is, therefore, a major step forward in the program of urban renewal which was called for in the President's housing message of 1954 and which was offered new and important encouragements in the Housing Act of 1954.

There is, of course, a sound economic basis to the design of this legislation. Its object is the same as earlier legislation—to improve the housing conditions of the American people. But, whereas earlier laws had sought to do this almost wholly by stimulating the construction of new homes, the 1954 act deliberately seeks to improve housing standards also by upgrading the existing stock of houses.

This is not being done at the expense of new building, as you well know. Contrary to the forecasts of a number of Cassandras, new construction continued through 1953 and 1954 at levels exceeded only in the extraordinary wartime boom of 1950 and under the terms of the Housing Act of 1954 applications for loan insurance and guaranties on new structures have been at record levels.

But important as is the level of new construction and the additions gained thereby to the stock of housing, we cannot hope to make satisfactory progress in the solution of our perennial housing problem unless we can somehow master the problem of the aging structure and the declining neighborhood. In these pockets of decay we can easily lose all or more than what we gain by new construction in our fight for better homes for our people.

Quite apart from what an imaginative and courageous program of urban renewal can do to improve the living standards of American city dwellers, it has a crucial bearing also on the working efficiency of our whole economy.

The goods and services which all of us consume, wherever we live, are produced largely in cities. The community is as essential a part of our productive equipment as our factories. The community provides the labor supply, the housing to shelter it, the utilities, streets, transportation systems, police, and other public facilities and services without which production cannot be carried on. In our justified admiration for the capacity of American industry and labor to increase its efficiency, we are prone to overlook the tremendous potential for economic growth which can be achieved by modernizing our cities.

Among the basic problems are congestion and inflexibility of land use. Industry is attracted to urban areas by accessibility to markets and labor supply, by the availability of public and other facilities and services, and by the transportation network through which it obtains its raw materials and distributes its product. Yet it often finds there a shortage of suitable sites accessible to essential services, high transportation costs imposed by everincreasing traffic congestion, and an unattractive environment.

To operate efficiently, modern industry needs, among other things, plenty of space, obtainable without undue problems of land assembly, well located and with good community facilities and services. Through lack of foresight, inadequate zoning protection and other understandable faults, we have failed to provide adequately for these needs, a failure which we can and must now remedy.

Maximum efficiency of our economy also requires that we modernize our central business districts so that they can perform effectively the functions for which they are best suited, without strangulation by congestion of both space and traffic; that we conserve or rehabilitate many of our older outlying shopping areas and that we avoid premature obsolescence of private and public facilities through the decline of neighborhoods and the failure of our urban structure to keep pace with technological change.

Most urban dwellers live in metropolitan areas and most urban production and distribution of goods and services take place in metropolitan areas. In such areas, if our objective is a decent living environment and an efficient economic environment, we must plan on metropolitan basis with the objective of attaining an integrated physical structure and public services, fairly financed, for the entire area.

We anticipate that new nonfarm residential starts this year will be very close to 1.2 million, close to the record year of 1950; 1955 should be another good year. At the same time we must keep an eye on the trend of household formation, which is downward and will probably continue downward until at least 1960. Looking further ahead, it may be 1975 or later before the annual rate of new household formation will again be at or above the 1952–53 level.

This downward trend in household formation, and its possible effect on residential construction, may be regarded as a challenge and an opportunity. For most of the time since the end of World War II, the housing industry has been straining to meet backlog requirements and unprecedented current increases in housing needs. We now have an opportunity to turn such resources as may be available to the task of replacing and modernizing the immense obsolete parts of our present housing stock.

The job of renewing our cities is no ordinary one. It is one of the great challenges of our time. We can meet it only if we keep constantly before us a vision of the city as it can be—as a proper environment for living and as an efficient center for the production and distribution of goods and services. Many of the great enterprises represented here today were built by men who had great dreams and the courage, perseverance, and practical knowledge to make them come true. I am confident that you can bring these magnificent and needed qualities to the inspiring task which lies ahead.

The Critical Race Between Soviet and United States Engineers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, November 16, 1954

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on several occasions I have commented regarding the critical race in which the United States finds itself in relation to Soviet mass graduation of technicians and engineers.

The fact of the matter is that, according to every reliable report, we are falling behind in expanding the reservoir of skilled personnel capable of spearheading technical operations in United States industry and defense.

I was pleased, therefore, to receive from Mr. John Gammell, the director of graduate training of one of the great manufacturing corporations of my State—the Allis-Chalmers Co., of Milwaukee—the text of a paper prepared for the convention of the American Society of Mechanical Engineers by Dr. M. H. Trytten, director of the office of scientific personnel of the National Research Council, here in Washington.

Dr. Trytten's observations are, I believe, of tremendous significance to government and industry alike, and I should like to present them now, albeit necessarily in somewhat abridged form. I may say they supplement an article which I noted in the July 2, 1954, issue of Science magazine, entitled "Professional and Scientific Personnel in the U. S. S. R." written by Nicholas DeWitt, of the Russian research center of Harvard University, in Cambridge, Mass.

I should like to urge the appropriate officials in the Pentagon and in the Office of Defense Mobilization to give their deep consideration to this overall problem. I am glad to note that President Eisenhower has already indicated his own awareness of this problem.

I may say, too, that I have been in correspondence with Dr. Joseph Hierschfelder, Director of the Naval Research Laboratory, at Madison, Wis., regarding a somewhat parallel problem of better use of scientific talent by the armed services themselves.

I send Dr. Trytten's paper to the desk, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the paper was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ENGINEERING EDUCATION IN RUSSIA

(By M. H. Trytten, director, office of scientific personnel, National Research Council, Washington, D. C., and consultant to the Engineering Manpower Commission of Engineers Joint Council, presented before the fall meeting of the American Society of Mechanical Engineers, September 10, 1954, Hotel Schroeder, Milwaukee, Wis.)

It is indeed fitting at this time in a meeting called to consider professional matters to give attention to the state of education in the specialized lines of study in Russia.

It has long been a copybook maxim that knowledge is power. Perhaps we have always held that this is so. But it has remained for the recent years to demonstrate the crushing force of this truth. As mankind has gained more knoweldge of nature and its secrets, the power at his disposal by manipulating the secrets of nature has increased by geometrical proportions. That power, like all power, we have learned, can be metamorphosed by simple means from one kind to another, from physical power to technological power, to economic power and finally to political or military power or both, as never before in the history of the world.

It was the United States that demonstrated dramatically the truth of this statement in World War II. Prior to 1941 the United States was the least military of all the great powers. Our Military Establishment was pitifully small in the years after demobilization immediately following World War I. In the year or two prior to Pearl Harbor, when we were again mobilizing, our Ground Forces were small, practically without equipment, and we had done very little to bring up to date what we had. We were, in fact, a peace-minded country caught with very little preparedness for war and yet faced with the greatest of all wars.

In the ensuing 6 years this Nation built and equipped the greatest military force in history and brought to bear a technological power which created and produced in quantity the most devastating military equipment ever known, by a large factor. All of this was done by the use of technology produced and developed for peacetime uses but readily adaptable to military needs. The secret weapon of this phenomenal performance was quite simply a corps of scientists, engineers, management experts, and other specialists whose knowledge was the Nation's power in time of need. The Nation triumphed because of its highly trained personnel.

It is, of course, not necessarily true that history will again repeat itself in the same way in any future emergency. But there seems little reason to suppose that in any power formula for the future the role and function of highly trained manpower will not again be of the highest importance. The strength of a nation is not measurable by corps, divisions, or battleships in any dominant sense. Its technological power is and will be of the greatest importance. And this is only to say that its corps of specialists, and its means of training more, will be as significant in measuring its power potential as any factor, and more important than almost any other factor.

It is particularly appropriate that this subject be one of concern to a great professional society in this country, since we as a Nation do not have a central national agency to create educational policy and to provide for its implementation. Education has been traditionally decentralized to a high degree. It is locally administered and is responsive to local control and local attitudes. Thus it is of the greatest importance that local understanding of the plan of education in the national life and in the national interest be disseminated by groups who are in a position to appreciate it.

This local control of education may have been our greatest strength in the past. It may, however, become our great weakness in the future unless greater awareness of the importance of education is developed at the local level.

It may have been our greatest strength in the past because education in America has always been a response to a peculiar deep-seated desire on the part of the American people. Perhaps it was part of the reactions of the immigrants who came to a country limitless in resources and vibrant with high hopes of the future, to think in terms of better educational advantages for their young. Perhaps it was part of the concept of democracy that each individual should have the opportunity to better his station in life and realize his highest potentialities. At any rate, whether it was a private school dependent on free will giving or tax-supported public institutions dependent on the will of the people through their representatives, our schools have fared well and have grown strong.

As a result, probably not consciously anticipated fully in the minds of most people, the Nation itself has grown strong. The flow of young people through the professional schools has given to the Nation a powerful annual transfusion of trained minds who have found their places in our great industrial and other organizations to help create and develop the technological civilization we enjoy.

However, the boons of the past cannot be taken as guaranties of the future. If a locally controlled and locally responsive educational system is to serve national needs in a modern world, local attitudes and local considerations will not be enough. Much has happened to our educational system in the last few decades. The great increase in school enrollments and the consequent concern for the students who do not intend to go on to college has had its effects in focusing attention on the needs of terminal students. Local needs and local influences have been increasingly felt. There is grave concern that in so doing our schools have been increasingly neglectful of those who plan to go further into college and the professions. There is growing concern that fewer of our high-school graduates are prepared to go on to the rigorous curricula of the specialized branches. The national interest may have suffered. In a world where power is a matter of greater and greater moment to the United States, the power that resides in our technology and hence in our national resources of trained personnel must be a concern of all who are influential in shaping our educational effort.

It is considerations of this kind which make more significant an examination of the Russian effort in technological education. In Russia the role of technology and of technological education as the basis of economic and military power have never failed to be consciously understood. Furthermore, the Russian state has been in a position to implement this point of view from the top down. In contrast to our system where our motivation in the support of education has been the benefit of the individual, there it has been for the state and for the purposes of the state alone.

It is this contrast which stands out in the consideration of the two educational systems. The American tradition is one of deep concern for education because of the opportunities it gives to the individual to realize his own best potentialities. The national needs for the products of the system have been less consciously motivating. Our highly trained personnel has come about almost as a byproduct. In Russia the interest has been consciously national and has arisen from the realization that education and training are necessary to the growth of their power position. The benefits to the individual have been byproducts.

* * * * *

The purpose of higher education is expressed in the Soviet encyclopedia as follows: "To prepare highly qualified politically trained engineering personnel with well-rounded education, cultured, whole-heartedly devoted to the motherland and to the course of Lenin-Stalin, capable of completely mastering and using the newest accomplishments of advanced science and technology and of merging scientific theory with the practical work of building a Communist society."

That the emphasis is on the state and its needs is clear. In a recent publication in Russia the remark is made that "The nature of the state determines the aims and purposes of Russian education," and quotes a remark by Stalin that "Education is an instrument whose effect depends on who wields it."

A remark by the eminent physicist, Peter Kapitza, is of particular interest. Speaking in 1943 to the Praesidium of the Russian Academy of Sciences he said in commenting on the central emphasis on science and technology in Soviet planning: "This is mainly conditioned by the special place allotted to science in our Socialist country. Of course, it is well known and generally accepted in other countries, too, that science plays a great part in the development of culture and technology. It has been allotted the leading part in the development of our technology and economic life. Therefore, the organization of science in our country must be more systematic and conscious of its aims than it is in capitalistic countries where it is rather left to chance and has a spontaneous character. In our country the bonds between science and life must be closer and deeper."

Soviet education as an instrument of the state is also strongly supported by the state. About 14 percent of the annual budget is set aside for so-called cultural-educational expenditures, and although the share of educational expenditures as such is uncertain, the high degree of support is undoubtedly evident.

* * * * *

Perhaps some general statistics may give a concept of the increase in the Russian educational effort during the last two and a half decades. While in 1926 the enrollment in primary and secondary schools was about 10 million out of a population of 147 million, or about 7 percent, in 1950 it was 33 million out of an estimated population of about 193 million, or about 17 percent. It should be borne in mind that this includes a 10-year education, not 12, as in America. In the United States, in 1950, the enrollment in the primary and secondary schools was 30,470,000 out of a population of about 152 million, or 20 percent. Soviet upper-grade enrollment (grades 8–10 of the 10-year school) during the last 5 years increased fourfold and in 1953–54 was about 4.6 million, which is only about one-third smaller than our 4-year high-school enrollment. This increase has taken place while our own upper-grade enrollment has been experiencing the results of a low birthrate in the thirties. Graduations this summer were about 760,000 as compared with virtually none in the middle thirties. It should be remembered that these graduates were required to have rigorous preparation in the sciences, while perhaps only 20 percent of our graduates had general science courses and only 6 to 8 percent had any physics and chemistry.

In higher education in Russia the enrollment in 1951–52 was 916,000, a 50-percent increase over the enrollment of 620,000 in 1939–40. In the United States the enrollment was 2,100,000, a 55-percent increase over the enrollment of 1,364,000 in 1939. However, it must be borne in mind here that a large percentage of American college students are not in training as specialists but are in college for a general education without fixed vocational goals. This is especially true of women.

Those who do not enter the secondary schools may enter the technical schools or technikums. These are 3- or 4-year schools of a highly practical type intended to train technicians in a variety of subjects, including engineering, agriculture, medicine, law, and pedagogy. The products of these schools are what may be called semiprofessional and are an important factor in the Soviet economy. These trained semi-professionals represent the core of the Soviet supporting and intermediate level technical personnel, which in America we must supply through out technical institutes, junior colleges, and even through the regular 4-year colleges as well. Their training, while short of professional training, is probably beyond that of technical institutes in the United States. The courses are about 40-percent theoretical, and in engineering include mathematics through the calculus. In engineering alone these schools probably graduate over 50,000 technicians per year. Since a part of their training has been on the job in industry they are prepared to enter at once into the industrial labor force. While technikum students are trained directly for work at the technician level and do not have much prospect of aspiring to higher levels, the door is not closed entirely in that about 5 percent are selected because of superior accomplishment and promise for further study at the universities. There were in Russia 3,543 technikums in 1952 with enrollments of about 1 million students. Graduates numbered about 350,000 per year. Of these about one-seventh are engineering technicians indicating the figure of about 50,000 used above.

* * * * *

Higher education in Russia has had, because of its origin and because of the practical goals of the Government, a very pragmatic development. There is little of the American notion of liberal arts education, education for cultural values, or education to develop the capacity for valid value judgments. On the contrary, emphasis has been spent on the training of specialists even in the fields of linguistics, social sciences, or humanities. The emphasis on science and the practical arts has been heavy.

Higher educational institutions in Russia fall into three classes. There are the traditional universities which to a large extent reflect the European pattern and are even yet strongly influenced by the heritage of Russian scholarship from prerevolution years. These are not many in number. They do, however, supply a large part of the flow of scientists who go into research in all types of laboratories and of the teachers in the secondary schools and universities, as well as in other types of schools.

Those of the second type are the specialized higher educational establishments which were originated in the late twenties and early thirties by the ministries with technical responsibilities. They have since been placed under the aegis of the ministry of education but retain their special relationship to a particular area of technology represented by the ministry under which they were organized. It is in these institutions that the large majority of the engineers are trained. The curricula in these institutions are built around the industrial field of application rather than around the traditional subject matter divisions. These are communications engineers, mining engineers, agricultural engineers, construction engineers, transportation engineers, and so forth, rather than electrical, mechanical, or civil engineers, as in our system.

Engineering training lasts 5 to 5½ years, and is based on about 5,000 hours of lectures, classroom and laboratory instruction, attendance at which is mandatory. An engineering student spends about 65 percent of his time on general sciences and general engineering subjects; about 28 percent of his time is devoted to narrow specialization and only about 7 percent to what are called socio-economic studies, which are mostly political indoctrination subjects. The training is supplemented with periods of practical work in industry. This narrow specialization on top of some basic engineering training is responsible for the breakup of traditional divisions.

In 1939 in Russia there were about 750 higher educational establishments which rose to about 900 in 1951–52, a 20 percent increase. This would not correspond to our 1,700 institutions of higher education because of the large number of junior colleges and other types of institutions which would not figure largely in the training of specialists. Probably the number of American institutions in this field with 4-year courses and substantial specialization along professional lines would not greatly differ from the 900—more or less.

In the matter of numbers of graduates, the history of the Russian effort indicates the changing emphasis on numbers and quality. While the number of graduates in all fields in the late twenties was as many as 30,000 per year, the quality of instruction and the solidity of the training left much to be desired. Consequently, in 1930 and the following years, a drastic shakeup in higher educational institutions occurred which tightened standards and resulted in a temporary setback to the expansion of training. At the same time, however, there is evidence of much more attention to the selection of qualified faculties and effective instruction, as well as a rise in numbers graduating until by 1940 over 100,000 graduates, with almost 30,000 engineers, were emerging from training. The war greatly reduced the numbers in training and graduating, although this resulted more from the destruction of institutions by the German invasion than by policies of the government with regard to exemption of students. After the war there was an immediate national effort to rebuild the destroyed higher educational establishments, particularly in the Ukraine. By 1947, 156 of the 162 higher educational establishments in the Ukraine were again functioning. The remaining six were so completely demolished as to require complete replacement. In 1944 only 2,200 students graduated from the higher educational establishments of the Ukraine, but by 1946 this number had risen to 15,200 in all fields.

The number of graduates in the sciences is difficult to judge because of the differences in specialization and reporting. In engineering, however, the record is clearer. After the war the numbers of engineering graduates rapidly increased to about 29,000 from all Russian schools in 1948 to 30,000 or more in 1951, to probably about 40,000 in 1953, and to over 50,000 in 1954, according to late indications. This may be compared to about 19,000 from engineering curricula, unaccredited as well as accredited in American colleges and universities in 1954. It seems probable that the total number of trained engineers in Russia today is closely comparable to the number in the United States.

In the field of the sciences, advanced work is to a large extent done in the many establishments of the Russian Academy of Sciences which is a major factor in Russian science. There are two advanced levels of recognition, neither of which is directly comparable with the American system of degrees. The first of these is that of "aspirant" or "kandidat" and is given after approximately 3 years of study and research. While this level of accomplishment may approximate the doctorate in some fields, in others it may be more nearly the level of the master's degree. It seems probable, however, that in general, and especially in applied sciences and engineering, it should be rated well above the master's degree if not in all cases equivalent to a doctorate. In 1952 there were about 5,500 "kandidat" degrees granted, not substantially different from our own rate of production of doctorates.

The second level of recognition is the degree of doctor of sciences. This degree is granted only after many years of research and substantial recognition by scientific colleagues. In 1951 there were about 531 such degrees granted.

In summary, it seems possible to conclude that the whole effort in science and technology is a serious one, with full support by the Government, which is realistically conscious of the vital role of science and technology in the furtherance of Russian aspirations, be they economic, military, or political. There is evidence of substantial accomplishment, to the degree that Russian technology must be taken very seriously.

One further item may be mentioned. Prior to the recent war, military service was obligatory and the duration of individual responsibility was 2 years. Up to the end of the Stalingrad episode in 1943 students were called into military service. However, in 1943 a law was passed which had the effect of returning many to the universities and retaining students in their courses of training. According to this law, students in about 80 schools of technology were exempted from military service until graduation. Thereafter they were assigned for a period to specified posts in their specialties. As far as can be determined, this law is still in operation.

Thus Russia has apparently solved the vexing problem of the role of the technical specialist in a very direct manner, and in line with its realistic policy of considering scientific and technical personnel as merely another factor, but a most important one, in the total national military potential.

We do not have to make an attempt to abandon our principles of liberal and broad general education, but this should not prevent us from realizing the challenge which we face. Improving the teaching of science at the high school level; expanding the training of scientists and engineers; and the adoption of a consistent policy for the preservation of professional manpower, especially engineering and scientific personnel—all these are measures which are long overdue.

Address by Hon. Albert M. Cole Before American Council to Improve Neighborhoods

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, November 16, 1954

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record the text of an address delivered by the Honorable Albert M. Cole, Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Administration, at the opening conference of the American Council To Improve Our Neighborhoods—ACTION—at the Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C., on November 15, 1954.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Address by Albert M. Cole, Housing and Home Finance Administrator, to the Opening Conference of the American Council To Improve Our Neighborhoods (ACTION) at the Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C., November 15, 1954

A year ago this month a group of 23 men and myself were seated around a large conference table over in the Lafayette Building.

The weather was cool, but we were in something of a sweat.

The group was the President's Advisory Committee on Housing. The job they were sweating over was the job given them by the President to identify the proper role of the Federal Government in the housing field and to formulate a more economical and effective means for improving the housing conditions of our people.

Less than a year ago the committee reported to the President. The President in turn recommended a new program to the Congress and the Congress enacted it in the Housing Act of 1954.

What the committee concluded, what the President proposed, and what the Congress enacted was not just another blind stab at the problems of housing, slums, and blight.

Instead, the Nation was given for the first time a program for a comprehensive attack on all the basic problems of housing and sound community development.

This new program is significant because it undertakes to deal with the many different and interdependent aspects of this field, not singly and separately but as a related whole, and to make coordinate and simultaneous use of the many different and interrelated resources that can be brought to bear on this task.

As the President's committee phrased it: "These recommendations are a part of a comprehensive program, and no single one, nor even an exclusive grouping of these recommendations, can serve to accomplish the aims of this committee."

Under the strong, broad legislation enacted by Congress, Federal help was to be made available and effective on a broad front. But the Federal Government's role was to be supplementary, to assist and facilitate the efforts and decisions of the private industry, the community, and the citizen.

Within this new framework, with its vastly expanded horizons, private industry has already begun to respond in vigorous and positive fashion, and American communities are taking a broader, closer look at their own problems and responsibilities.

Now this new, promising citizen organization, ACTION, has joined the other private and public forces in the arena of national effort to stimulate and assist community leadership in the improvement of our homes and neighborhoods, in stamping out the causes of blight, and in advancing the quality and standard of American community life.

ACTION's stated objectives represent a vital part of the job to be done under the comprehensive program that the President's committee envisioned. It is in line with the committee's own proposal for a broadly representative private organization to mobilize public support for community action and to carry out the broad urban renewal proposals embraced in its total program.

The success that has attended the organization of this group is itself indicative of the leadership interest and the serious national concern that exists about our urban and housing future.

You have enlisted some of the ablest, most public-spirited citizens for this cause. In Gen. Frederick A. Irving, you have obtained a distinguished and dynamic leader to activate your work. You have developed your organization through private effort, and financed it with private funds.

As Housing Administrator, with a sobering responsibility for seeing that these new Federal instruments are put to work to produce tangible benefits for the American people, I welcome ACTION as a significant new resource and a new ally in this common cause.

In the field of community action, I would like to tell you what I feel constitutes the core of community responsibility under this new program * * * some of the things that we must achieve if the total program is to succeed and our new Federal aids are to be made really productive.

In order for citizen action to play its full and essential role, there are three considerations—three types of responsibility, as I see them, that we all need to promote.

First, communities and citizens must understand what is at stake—why their time and concerted efforts are necessary. We want to sound the alarm throughout the country that will bring people running to the defense of their cities.

Second, communities will need guidance and assistance from all of us to do a full-scale job that will achieve permanent results—and not be content with halfway or half-hearted measures.

Third, communities must see that improvement and preservation of our cities and neighborhoods is carried out as an effective and key part of the broader task, in which all resources are engaged—the task of building as well as rebuilding, of planning for the future as well as replanning the past.

As to the first consideration, why should it be necessary to arouse citizen concern about this problem? Surely we don't have to urge Americans to fight back when their homes are threatened and their cities despoiled.

The trouble is that slums and blight are not like invasions or hurricanes. They stealthily edge us out of our good homes and neighborhoods. They burrow silently underneath the foundations of our communities. They work slowly, but just as surely as any violent force of man or nature.

Most of us are apt to think of slums as something that has already happened—not as something that is happening to us today. We drive through the littered streets, see the sinister alleys and tired old firetraps teeming with people. We know the slums are there, but by the time we reach home, slums and blight are as far out of mind as they are out of sight. We have escaped from them again quite successfully.

But have we escaped? Do we keep moving out farther from the center of the city because we like to travel? What is happening to that business area we left downtown—that shrinking island of congestion cut off from the rest of the city by slums and blight?

We have figured there's not much that we can do about it as citizens. The lack of a powerful, sweeping plan of attack has left us helpless and hopeless.

But now we have the program—the means for a large-scale fighting attack on this problem. The citizen can do something. He must do something, in concert with his fellow citizens. All of us can join to stir him into action, to guide him into soundly planned movements which, with the public and private help now available, can overthrow the rule of blight in our cities.

Now as to the second phase of community responsibility—that of defining in large enough terms the community job that needs to be done.

We've tried a lot of simple remedies at various times. We've tried treating separate symptoms individually. We've tried solving the low-income problem with public housing. We've tried paint-up, fix-up campaigns to make our run-down areas more present-able. But none of these alone have brought a halt to the spread of slums and blight.

A lot of houses, of course, need painting and repairing. But paint and patch-up alone can only hide a slum—they can't get rid of it. They can change the looks on the outside, but not the living conditions on the inside. They cannot correct the inherent defects of bad neighborhoods that often produce the bad houses.

Giving sedatives to ease the pain will not kill the infection. In order to renew our cities, communities will have to do a full-scale job of permanent slum-proofing.

Slum-proofing is serious business. It means sealing up the leaks that let blight seep through as well as cutting out rot and decay.

Slum-proofing means finding solutions for the problems of people. To remove slums, we must have decent new and rehabilitated homes for low-income families to move to, provided to the fullest extent possible through private enterprise. We can't just sweep these people under the rug.

If we get rid of the blighted areas where the larger part of our minority families live, we are going to have to take down some of those no trespassing signs in wholesome areas and enable these families to live in good homes and healthful neighborhoods.

Slum-proofing means major surgery in some cases. You can't just pretty-up a real, for-sure slum. If areas are to be made impervious to future blight, we will have to kill off the roots of blight and make these areas adapatable to our urban needs and growth.

Once a community understands what slum-proofing requires, it can intelligently plan what to do. It can decide what Federal assistance may be necessary, and what additional private and local effort is required. With the new means that we have today, a lot of things have become possible that seemed impossible a year ago.

That leaves the third phase of community responsibility—the responsibility for comprehending the relationship of urban renewal and neighborhood improvement to the larger framework in which it is set. Dr. Hauge has described that larger framework in his concept of the city as a living, growing organism, as a nerve center of our economic life, and a source bed of our social and cultural progress.

Too much of our past planning has been to resist change. Now we must plan to meet the change that comes with growth.

It is not enough to restore and freeze an old area in its past pattern. We need more elbowroom in our cities—elbowroom for industrial and business expansion, for public and community facilities, for the traffic, the public services, and the recreational and cultural requirements of our development and growth.

It is to this broad objective that the President's new housing and community development program is geared. Urban renewal is one of a related set of Federal aids in the new Housing act to implement the efforts of industry and the community in meeting future growth requirements—as well as renewing and replanning the wornout areas of the past.

The new act's liberalized FHA provisions are planned to stimulate both the expansion of new homes and the improvement, maintenance, and freer exchange of our basic supply of existing housing. The urban-renewal provisions embrace not only clearance and rehabilitation, but also replanning and redevelopment, and the relocation and rehousing of affected families.

FHA is now able to participate in rehabilitation and reconstruction in renewal areas, and to provide special mortgage insurance for low-cost new or rehabilitated homes for displaced lower-income families. Additional public housing is authorized for the needs of low-income families displaced by urban renewal and similar activities.

The most significant provision in the new act, however, is the requirement that, to benefit from the various renewal aids, the community must first develop an overall workable plan for its renewal activities, and must gear its area programs to a master plan for the community's future growth and development.

This represents a new opportunity—our first real opportunity—of going about community development with our eyes open, of looking ahead to see where we are going before we set out. Workable community plans that are broad in approach and forward looking in concept are fundamental to the Federal program and the community interest.

The three responsibilities I have outlined in the field of community action seem to me to represent important, decisive factors in developing the quality and scope of citizen enterprise that is required by the program envisioned by the President's Committee a year ago and implemented by the Congress.

What the community accomplishes will depend in part on the concurrent breadth and effectiveness of the efforts of industry, of government, and of public and national leadership, such as you have brought together here under the banner of ACTION.

But without success at the community level, most of our other endeavors will fall short of the mark. Unless we reverse the spread of blight, unless we annihilate the causes of slums, other lines of progress in time will wind up in dead ends—in the dead end of dwindling markets for housing and home investment, the dead end of mounting city deficits, the dead end of more and more government-subsidized housing, and the deadest end of all—the deadly slums themselves.

ACTION has entered into this great movement of renewal and rebirth of our urban economy at a strategic moment. Never has the city and the citizen had so important a responsibility in determining their own future. Never has so great an opportunity been opened up to make our cities healthy, clean, and workable, and to see that they will become inspiring places for all Americans to work and live in the future.

ACTION can play a dynamic role in bringing that promise to fulfillment. The caliber of the men and women who have enlisted in this undertaking leaves no doubt that its potential vitality and vision is great—and that it can become one of the strong moving forces in this drive for a better America.

You have joined in a highly important mission—a mission that has the determined support and backing of the President and the Federal Government—a mission that I am positive will receive a wholehearted response from the people of this country.

Foreign Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. ALEXANDER SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, November 16, 1954

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I have always been interested in young people, especially those of college and school age, and am particularly interested in having them keep up with current affairs.

As a matter of encouragement to the young friends of mine who today are at Hotchkiss School, I now ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD what I consider to be a very well thought-out editorial entitled "Foreign Report," which appeared in the Hotchkiss Record of October 14, 1954. It gives a summary, as they see it, of developments in our foreign policy.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOREIGN REPORT

The fundamental objectives of the new administration in regard to foreign policy when it took office were to end the "hot" wars in Asia and then establish a system of alliances that would deter future aggressions and maintain peace.

Twenty-one months ago there was an atmosphere of tension and unstability in the free world. France, the so-called "sick man of Europe," was engaged in a disheartening and financially devastating colonial war in Indochina. The French were also fearful of German rearmament as urged by the United States through EDC.

Great Britain at this time was supporting a costly war in Malaya. In Iran oil was no longer flowing, and Premier Mossadegh was attempting a unique diplomatic blackmail. Finally, the old problem of British occupation of the Suez was coming to a head following the coup of General Naguib in Egypt.

There were many other problems which faced the free world. In Europe the problem of Trieste continued to block friendly economic and military relations between Italy and Yugoslavia. In the Middle East constant incidents between Israel and the Arab States prevented a lessening of tension. Moreover, the forces of the United Nations were engaged in the Korean war.

Today the situation in Europe is quite different from what it was almost 2 years ago. France is no longer drifting aimlessly from one crisis to another. There is good reason to believe that Pierre Mendes-France, their premier, is going to furnish a badly needed leadership. His decision to abandon Northern Vietnam to the Communists at Geneva was a hard one to make, but it was certainly realistic. Similarly his decision not to promote EDC after the Brussels conference was probably best for France, for he realized that a discontented France in EDC was practically useless to the free world. At the recent London conference, he has shown himself to be firmly on the side of the West in their quest for a strong alliance.

Great Britain with able assistance from the United States has settled its major difficulties with Iran and Egypt. The Iranian settlement works to mutually help Iran and Britain. The agreement over the Suez Canal paves the way for a possible inclusion of Egypt in a Middle East defense arrangement. Also, the Malayan war has all but come to a standstill because of the successful measures taken in that country to root out Communist agitators.

The recent Trieste settlement was a tribute to the decisions made by the British and American foreign offices.

The ending of the Korean and Indochinese wars was instrumental in the creation of the recent defense organization, SEATO, which stands ready to meet any future Communist aggression in Asia.

Naturally there are still tensions in the world. The most important thing to note about the first 2 years or so of the new administration, however, is that it has a positive foreign policy which is really accomplishing things.

The Fight Against Cancer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES E. POTTER

OF MICHIGAN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, November 16, 1954

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, the cancer editorial contest sponsored by the New Jersey Division, American Cancer Society, was established by George E. Stringfellow, West Orange industrialist, in 1947, when he was the State division's first president; and he still offers the two plaques, awarded annually, for a daily and weekly newspaper.

Limited at first to original editorials appearing during April, the traditional cancer crusade month, the contest period now extends from March 15 to May 31, so as to include campaigns necessarily delayed. The competition is approved annually by the New Jersey Press Association, with awards being made at one of its sessions. Out-of-State judges decide the winners.

Besides enlisting the creative expression of the competing editors to give most meaning to the Society's message, it has also succeeded in making all State editors much more conscious of the cancer campaigns.

Because of the importance of this work and the necessity for universal action to conquer cancer, I ask unanimous consent to have the two winning editorials of 1954 inserted in the Appendix to the RECORD. One of the editorials, entitled "In Memoriam," was written by Rita Robertson Fuller, and was published in the Blairstown Press. The other editorial, entitled "What Can One Man Do?" was written by William R. Caldwell, and was published in the Bergen Evening Record.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Blairstown (N. J.) Press]

IN MEMORIAM

(By Rita Robertson Fuller)

A great man died the other day. But you never heard of him. No flags hung at half mast, no long funeral procession accompanied him on that last lonely journey. Still, to those who knew him best, to his family, he was a great man.

He was that rare sort of person to whom honesty and loyalty were not words but a way of life. Religion to him was not an hour spent in church on Sunday but a 24-hour-a-day thing, just as Brotherhood Week came 52 times a year for him. He was my father.

But cancer, being no respecter of person, attacks with equal fury the kind and the good, the drunk and the crook. Look around our own small part of the world. How many other people, important people, even if so only to their families, can you count whom cancer has torn from children who needed their mother, wives whose lives are empty because no one comes home at 5 o'clock any more, husbands whose homes are no longer anything but houses?

Yet it needn't be this way. Of the 9,000 men, women, and children scheduled to die of cancer in New Jersey this year, many can be saved if enough people care enough to give enough so that cancer's greatest enemy—research—is armed to defend us all. Just as surely as Governor Meyner has the power to commute sentence of a criminal, you have the far greater power to commute the death sentence hanging over an innocent person—and who knows who he is—one of your family? You?

"Of all sad words of tongue and pen, the saddest are these—it might have been," Whittier said. And certainly it is a sad thought, and a frightening one, if, as the experts believe, all that prevents finding the cause and so the cure for cancer is enough money for research. In other words, many of those who have died need not if you and I had given more generously during the previous years' cancer drives.

Well, it is too late for my father, too late for the women whose little children have already forgotten the mothering that is childhood's most precious possession, too late for a lot of others whose names you remember but whose faces are gone forever from Main Street. But perhaps it isn't too late for you, your children, your father, or your mother, all those you hold most dear. April has been named Cancer Control Month in New Jersey this year. If you will join with those of us who have a special reason for caring, we can make this year's drive one that will really help to save more of these great men and women and children, too, for the families who love and need them.

[From the Bergen (N. J.) Evening Record]

WHAT CAN ONE MAN DO?

(By William A. Caldwell)

Late the afternoon it started to snow this week we saw George Howard, minister of the Hackensack Unitarian Church, and he was asking what makes, and we said we were about to go to a dinner meeting and get inspired. "Oh," said Mr. Howard, perhaps more seriously than the small glumness warranted. Well, we said, it seemed to us that it must be unnecessary to inspire a man who is already doing his best. This was a dinner at Newark to get underway the April campaign of the American Cancer Society. We'd go down there in the snow and pay for some indifferent grub and listen to 5 or 6 speeches—why? Our being in the society speaks for itself. Either the work we do speaks for itself, or it doesn't. What can a man do inspired that he can't do eating dinner at home with the kids?

Mr. Howard is a wise and patient man.

"No," he said. "I know what you mean: The corny jokes, the labored anecdotes. But—"

But then, he said (and we think it is one of the things we shall remember), there are two kinds of crowd spirit and crowd action. We are familiar with the bad kind, we call it the mob spirit, and we recognize its power. We are not so often exposed to the good kind, but there is one, and it has a gigantic power of its own. As the evil in people can be multiplied when it is fused, so can the decency and humanity in them become somehow more than the sum of its parts.

George Howard crushed out his cigar, and turned abruptly, as he always does. "You'll see," he said.

It was a standard-brand campaign dinner, and the jokes were corny and we got stuck in a corner and the roads were greasy on the way home.

But something occurred to us, at some point during the business of the meeting, which we ought to tell you about.

Up at the speaker's table were two men about as dissimilar as men can get, granted the white collar in common.

One is named Charley Buesing. He's an insurance executive in New York, but also he's campaign manager for our New Jersey State division of American Cancer Society.

He has a thin young face and gray hair and a little black mustache; talks with the easy assurance of a bird who has to address conventions pretty often; goes pretty far out of his way to avoid giving you the impression you're being inspired.

It's this way with Charley Buesing: he got into the fight on cancer, which for so many of us is a private little grudge fight, years and years ago—before there was any New Jersey division, before American Cancer Society had gone into research and education and service, when it was mainly a few doctors trying desperately to establish some stable front on which man could take a stand against this wicked and insane monster.

He lives in Morris County. Out this way there was only one cancer-fighting agency with which a man could make commonsense. So Charley Buesing rang doorbells in Morris County as a member of what in those days was called the Women's Field Army.

They didn't raise much money in those days—these people who are the real heroes of any cause, any community. But Charley did his bit, and he sent the cash along to national, and—

A LONG WAY OFF

And another man at the speaker's table is a lawyer named Ed Reid, who practices in Andulusia, Covington County, Ala. He's a cured cancer case, and he told us that night how it feels to sit there looking cancer in the face and to lick it—and to find that out of adversity, which is apt to be real even when you don't die, a man can snatch his soul and know it's there for the first time in his life. We'll get to him later.

Charley Buesing's money from Morristown went one fall, 12 years ago, into a printing of pamphlets listing the seven cancer danger signals. There weren't many of them that year. But one of those pamphlets, possibly even one bought with Charley Buesing's returns, somehow drifted into the hands of Ed Reid's wife.

And one night she said to him that he was going to see a specialist. He had 3 of the 7—an unnatural bleeding from a natural body opening, a change in the routine of his bowel habits, and persistent indigestion.

He told her reasonable Southern women don't even use such language. She nagged him. He told her he was hale, a onetime Mississippi University football star, a college graduate indeed; couldn't possibly have cancer. She badgered him. He went. He had a cancer of the colon. It was a close shave, but he made it. He made it because of some blunt little words on a measly little oblong of paper. He made it because of Charley Buesing and Charley's wanting to do the job simply because it has to be done.

George Howard was right. "Inspired" is a word debased, till we don't know what it means. We're not inspired. We know we and 8,000 or 9,000 other people in this country of ours, are saving lives—somebody's, somewhere, someday. And the grub wasn't a bit bad.

The Resolution to Censure Senator McCarthy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, November 16, 1954

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the lead editorial, entitled "Time To Study the Angles," published in the Indianapolis Star of November 11, 1954.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Time to Study the Angles

Senator Capehart has had the courage to make to the Senate the wise proposal that it postpone until January its debate and action on the move to censure Senator McCarthy. Since Senator Capehart had already announced frankly that he would oppose the censure motion, his proposal for delay naturally has been interpreted as a maneuver to save Senator McCarthy. Senators who are really concerned about their responsibilities ought to see the suggested delay as a maneuver by which the whole Senate could save itself from a most awkward situation.

The Senate is all wrapped up now in the emotional reactions to the controversy about Senator McCarthy as a personal figure. But the action it is debating would, if voted, set a far-reaching precedent of destruction by the Senate of some of its own prerogatives, and of intrusion by the Senate into the province of the States, their right to make a free choice of their own representatives. What the Senate is asked to decide in the censure move is that McCarthy has not been a desirable Senator. And 2 of the 3 charges against him are based on actions which occurred and were reported in his prior term, before the people of Wisconsin reelected him in 1952. The people of Wisconsin are the judges of McCarthy's desirability as a Senator.

Censure of McCarthy now on those two charges would amount to a finding that in the opinion of the Senate the Wisconsin electorate did not make a wise choice in 1952. The Senators could use a little more time to mull this point over. Would censure on this basis loosen some bricks in the structure of States rights? That question is cause for long hesitation. States rights are far more important than the censure of an individual Senator.

Those Senators who are sincerely concerned with the issue of Senator McCarthy's investigative methods, and are perhaps anxious to cast a vote of repudiation of those methods, also ought to consider very carefully the probable effect of a vote of censure. The issue of those methods does not really appear in the charges now before the Senate, except obliquely in the single instance of the charge that Senator McCarthy unjustly denounced General Zwicker. Yet it is understood by all that this issue underlies the whole proceeding. A vote of censure, however, will not remove Senator McCarthy and his methods from the scene. It will merely make him a martyr, and establish him firmly as the leader of a group of Americans who look to him as the only militant fighter against communism on the national scene.

In the midst of all this upheaval, Senator Capehart counsels a course of moderation, and we commend him for it. A delay until the next regular session would give tempers and emotions on both sides a chance to cool, and would allow the Members of the Senate time to consider more thoughtfully the significance of the proposal before them.

The Defense of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, November 16, 1954

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, a few days ago I obtained permission to insert in the Appendix of the Record four articles dealing with our national defense, written by James Free and published in the Birmingham News. Mr. Free is the Washington correspondent of the Birmingham News. At that time I said the series consisted of seven articles. Today I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record the fifth, sixth, and seventh articles in that series.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

While United States Cutting Sea Might Red Navy Zooms From Obscurity to World Power, Still Growing

(By James Free)

(Fifth of a series)

Washington, October 31.—The biggest margin of armed force advantage the United States has held over Russia—its naval supremacy—is fading fast.

In less than a decade the Soviet navy has zoomed from obscurity among world sea powers to a position second only to the United States. And the Red navy is still expanding, while ours is shrinking in number of vessels in operation.

Yet there has been a common tendency to underrate the Russian threat to our control of the sea lanes between the United States and its allies. Why? Perhaps because the Soviets have no aircraft carriers. Or perhaps because they are still weaker than the United States in surface-fighting ships. But overoptimism on these counts is dangerous. For Communist salt-water strategy does not call for these types of challenge.

Russia is building up its navy with two key aims, in event of war with the United States:

1. To outdo German submarine efforts that nearly won World War I and World War II. Aided by captured German scientists and equipment, the Reds have created a submarine fleet of some 375 vessels—in operation. This is double the number of United States subs, and seven times as many as the Germans had at the start of World War II.

2. To gain control of the sea in limited, offshore areas with their relatively small surface fleet backed by powerful land-based air forces and huge submarine packs.

If this concept is valid, the Communists could dominate the straits between Formosa and the Chinese mainland long enough to conduct a big amphibious assault. Or they could control an ample slice of the English Channel for an amphibious attack on Great Britain, if the Reds should gobble up Western Europe as did the hordes of Adolf Hitler.

The United States Navy has been building some new combat vessels, of course. It has been given the green light for a fourth, new *Forrestal* class aircraft carrier, a third atomic-powered sub, and for development of an atom engine for carriers or guided missile ships. But Adm. Robert Carney, chief of naval operations, warns that new, modern ships are not being constructed fast enough to keep up with obsolescence. That is the Navy term for depreciation, or just plain getting out of date.

Most of our warships were built in World War II. And their effective life averages 20 years. Which means, says Carney, that "one-half of the life of most of our ships has now been reached." Navy funds for new ships have been roughly about $1 billion a year. This fiscal year it is $1.2 billion. Yet Vice Adm. Robert Briscoe, deputy chief of naval operations, warns that we would have to build new ships at the rate of $2.8 billion a year for the next 10 years—if we are to meet worldwide commitments and meet competition of potential enemy fleets.

Our mothball fleet of preserved World War II fighting and merchant ships is a tremendous asset. But nine-tenths of the dry-cargo ships in the merchant reserve fleet have speeds of 11 knots or less, which makes them prime submarine bait. Our mothballed combat ships are more modern by comparison, yet they, too, are becoming outmoded by new developments.

This year the Navy will operate 1,080 ships. This is a reduction of 50, including 2 escort carriers, from last year. It will continue to modernize airpower by stepping up the proportion of jets—as will Air Force and Marine air wings.

Both Navy and Marines are trimming manpower under the New Look. An 18-month curtailment will bring the Navy from 765,400 to 689,000 and the Marines from 243,800 to 215,000 by June 30, 1955.

Due to a 1952 act of Congress, the Marines must be kept at 3 divisions and 3 combat air wings. With fewer men, though, there will be fewer trained replacements for emergencies. The same 1952 law provided that the Marine Corps Commandant sit in with the Joint Chiefs of Staff as a coequal on matters of direct concern to the Leathernecks. In the past year this brought the top Marine to 20 percent of the sessions. And the Marines are well pleased with this arrangement.

One recent Navy development is worth special note in this atomic age. Successful tests with sprinkler systems rigged on top of combat ships have shown that A-bomb and H-bomb hazards from fallout can be dealt with better at sea than on land.

The Navy is making progress, also, in ability to deliver nuclear attacks by carrier aircraft and by missile-firing ships and submarines.

All of which helps explain why the Navy's shipbuilding program, and its future prospects generally, are looking up.

Target of Economizers—Army, Long Low Man on Totem Pole, About To Make Comeback

(By James Free)

(Sixth of a series)

Washington, November 2.—The Army has been low man on the totem pole so far in New Look defense planning. But there are signs that it is about to hit the comeback trail.

The Army was easily the No. 1 target of economizers and top defense planners earlier this year.

It wound up with a whopping cut of more than $5 billion in appropriations, as compared with last year. Army is getting $7,600,000,000 to Navy's $9,700,000,000 and Air Force's $11,500,000,000.

There were plans at the Pentagon after the Korean war truce in July 1953, to trim the Army from 20 divisions down to 19 or even 17 divisions. Our threat of massive retaliation would prevent "brush wars," it was argued, and a smaller and more mobile Army would suffice.

Then a series of Communist shockers changed the outlook.

The Russians set off their first thermonuclear explosion. To round out the display of muscle, the Russians flew some new jet bombers over Moscow for the benefit of our military observers. And in the wilds of Indochina French forces at Dien Bien Phu were overwhelmed by Red foot soldiers. This proved there can be localized ground fighting in which it is unsound, if not impossible, to bring in enough air power to offset a larger enemy army.

These events played a part in reversal of plans to keep on reducing the United States Army until mid-1957. Now the shrinkage will stop 2 years earlier, on June 30, 1955. By that time the Army expects to be down to 1,173,000 men. It now has about 1,400,000.

As manpower goes down, the Army is under orders to increase its number of combat divisions from 19 to 24. That's 5 more divisions with 225,000 fewer men. How is it to be done?

Two methods of getting more divisions with less men have been announced. One slashes support, or noncombat, elements. The other changes the designation of seven divisions from training divisions to combat divisions and calls for giving them more combat equipment.

These seven divisions still will be used mainly for training new soldiers. Maybe that's why the Army prefers to describe them as future "combat equipped" divisions rather than "combat" divisions. The difference is important.

Gen. Matthew Ridgway, Army Chief of Staff, points out that the revised program would leave us with only 17 divisions, more or less, ready for combat.

Eleven of the 24 proposed divisions would be outside the United States, with 3 in the Far East, 5 in Germany, and 1 each with headquarters in Hawaii, the Canal Zone, and Alaska. Of the 13 stateside divisions, only 3 would be in a high state of combat readiness—as is the case at present.

This spread may be sound as to cost and immediate defense needs. But will it provide the hard-hitting, fast-moving, ready-to-go Army envisioned in the New Look long-range program?

General Ridgway makes no secret of the fact that he is worried about the Army's ability to meet its worldwide commitments. He has said in public and more than once that to fight an atomic war, the United States will need more, not fewer, foot soldiers.

"Although combat units will be smaller, more mobile and compact," explains Ridgway, "there will be a corresponding increase in depth of the battlefield. More units of smaller size are required to perform the mission of fewer units of larger size."

Since the Army has been directed to make itself more mobile, General Ridgway has protested the cutting out of six troop carrier wings from the Air Force build up. This is one time when an Air Force slash hurts the Army even more.

In spite of its new atomic cannon and its paratroopers, the Army has not been able to lure volunteers to the extent that its sister services have. One big handicap, of course, is that the Korean war advertised all over again the hardships and hazards of the foot soldier.

The Army has hopes that its new schedule of rotating divisions overseas will add glamor. For combined with this is the new plan for having many of the draftees spend 18 of their 24 months of active duty overseas.

Perhaps the upcoming era of guided missiles will give the Army a Buck Rogers might as well as a youth appeal that will solve a lot of problems. For accurate missiles should make the Army less dependent on air support from the Air Force and the Navy. But such missiles are not yet on hand in sufficient number.

The Army seems to have reached the bottom of its post World War II downswing, and to be headed for a comeback.

In the meanwhile, it remains our toughest problem both on manpower and morale.

SECRETARY WILSON DROPPING HINTS—DEFENSE BUDGET TRIM-DOWN ABOUT OVER, MAY SWING UP AGAIN

(By James Free)

(Last of a series)

WASHINGTON, November 3.—The trim-down on our defense budget under the New Look is about over.

For the next year or two our armed services cannot be expected to cost much less than the $29½ billion appropriated for the year ending June 30, 1955. And only miracle management can stop the Defense Department budget from going back up several billion dollars.

It is significant that talk of more defense for less money has faded away at the Pentagon in recent weeks. Top policymakers will speak of getting more combat effectiveness out of men and materiel. But if there have been any predictions by these gentlemen lately that there will be more drastic cuts in their total budget this reporter has failed to hear or read about them.

Every sign points the other way.

There is repeated comment about how hard it will be to keep in a range of $30 billion a year.

(Don't let that $29,500,000,000 appropriation for fiscal 1954–55 fool you. The fiscal year has 8 more months to go, and the upcoming Congress surely will be asked to approve one or more deficiency appropriations for defense. In fact, Defense Secretary Charles E. Wilson himself has dropped hints that an additional appropriation of $2 to $3 billion dollars may be sought early in 1955.)

Civilian leaders of the armed services are swinging behind an appeal for a pay raise of at least 8 percent for men in uniform. And they favor other morale-building moves that will cost money.

Gen. Nathan Twining says the Air Force needs right now the 137 wings it is due to have by mid 1957. That means he favors a faster buildup.

Adm. Robert B. Carney says the Navy ought to be getting more new modern ships to keep the fleet from getting overage and out of date.

Gen. Matthew Ridgway says the Army needs more, not fewer, men to fight an atomic war.

And the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Adm. Arthur W. Radford, warns that we must speed up aviation developments to meet the Communist challenge.

All of these things would add to defense expenses.

And the fixed costs of the armed services from year to year are getting tougher and tougher to hold in check.

There is, for example, the item of feeding, transporting, clothing, and paying about 3 million persons in uniform. This runs to about $10 billion a year. Until a few months ago, there was a move to reduce the armed services to 2.8 million men, but recently the long-range goal is up again to 3.1 million. They now have close to 3.3 million.

Then it costs another $10 billion or more to operate and keep in repair the Military Establishment—housing, fuel for ships, tanks, planes, and vehicles.

Add $1 billion more for civilian employees. The present trend is toward hiring more of them to replace servicemen in noncombat jobs, particularly overseas.

Add another $1 billion to $1,500,000 for research and development. And half a billion for retirement pay.

Put together, these items run to around $23 billion. And that does not include "hardware" prices. That is the cost of guns, planes, ships, tanks, guided missles, and so on. They usually cost at least $6 billion to $8 billion a year. And the strategy planners insist that we ought to be producing $10 billion to $11 billion and up in new "hardware" to be on the safe side.

That is why it will be hard going for the New Look defense team to hold the line on the $29,500,000,000 Defense Department budget for the current fiscal year. Or for the next year either. Or the year after that.

The picture in the Pentagon crystal ball is rather optimistic, as to prospects for peace in 1955 or 1956. But these prospects depend on preparations-for-war factors that threaten to cost more and more.

Our best hope is that this same picture of rising military costs will discourage our enemies also. And that somehow, before it is too late, we can turn our efforts and our dollars toward preparation for peace.

Memorial to Justus H. Cline, Conservationist

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, November 16, 1954

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the memorial, assembled by Mr. Berkley Williams, of Richmond, Va., to Justus H. Cline, of Stuarts Draft, Va., one of the Nation's outstanding conservationists, who died on July 26, 1954.

There being no objection, the memorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Waynesboro News-Virginian of July 26, 1954]

JUSTUS CLINE, CONSERVATION LEADER, DIES EARLY TODAY—BURIAL SET WEDNESDAY FOR FATHER OF BIG LEVELS GAME REFUGE

Justus Henry Cline, 78, of Stuarts Draft, retired geologist, college and university professor, and father of Big Levels Game Refuge in the George Washington National Forest, died at 7:50 a. m. today at the King's Daughters' Hospital, Staunton.

Nationally known as a leader in conservation practices and director-at-large of the National Wildlife Federation, Dr. Cline was rewarded for his many years of efforts on July 1, 1935, when President Franklin D. Roosevelt signed a proclamation establishing the Big Levels Wildlife Refuge. The area contains approximately 30,000 acres of land within the national forest.

Dr. Cline served as a professor at various colleges and universities in addition to years of work as a leading geologist.

Born in Timberville on October 14, 1875, Dr. Cline was the son of the late John P. and Mary Ann Spitler Cline. He received his preparatory education in private and public schools of the area, having moved to Augusta County in early childhood.

Dr. Cline received his bachelor of art degree from Bridgewater College in 1899 and masters' degree from Northwestern University in 1910. He completed his work for his Ph. D. degree in geology at the University of Virginia, while serving there as assistant State geologist and adjunct professor of geology. From 1899 to 1901 he taught Latin and Creek at LaVerne College, Calif.

In 1917 Dr. Cline left the University of Virginia to enter professional work in geology. In 1919 he was employed by the Royal Dutch Shell Oil Co. as exploration party chief in the Rocky Mountain States including Wyoming, western Colorado, and Utah.

After 4 years in the area, Dr. Cline was engaged to organize a geology department for the Derby Oil Co. and continued to serve it as chief geologist, working in Kansas, Oklahoma, Texas, Colorado, and New Mexico.

On account of ill health, Dr. Cline retired in 1929 and returned to his home in Stuarts Draft.

The work carried out by Dr. Cline necessitated wide travel, including Alaska, Canada, and Mexico, both in the capacity of geologist and during retirement as a conservationist.

Dr. Cline wrote and had published many papers on the geology of Virginia which are listed in the Bibliography of Virginia Geology by Rogers. He was also author of many other papers and addresses, and also Conservation Sermonettes first published by the News-Virginian and later copied by many journals throughout the United States. Two editions of the Sermonettes were published in booklet form.

During the years Dr. Cline was named to many fraternal orders and bestowed with many honors. He was member of the Virginia Academy of Science, Raven Society, Society of Sigma Xi, American Association of Mining Engineers, American Association of Petroleum Geologists, and was given the honorary degree of doctor at Bridgewater College.

He was an active member of the Mount Vernon Church of the Brethren.

The survivors include his wife, the former Miss Grace Snively of Lanark, Ill., whom he married in 1902; three sisters, Mrs. Floyd Leonard and Mrs. Alda Bicknell, both of Bridgewater, and Mrs. W. R. Hooker, Chosen, Fla.; and a number of nieces and nephews.

The body will remain at the Etter Funeral Home until 1 hour prior to the funeral service when it will be placed in the Mount Vernon Church of the Brethren. The casket will not be opened at the church. Funeral services will be held at 3 p. m. Wednesday at the church, conducted by Dr. Warren Bowman, president of Bridgewater College assisted by the Reverend Guy Stump.

Interment will be in the church cemetery.

[From the Waynesboro News-Virginian of July 27, 1954]

Justus Cline's 30,000-Acre Monument

Few men have died whose monument to posterity has been so great and so lasting. Justus H. Cline, beloved philosopher and conservationist of Stuarts Draft, who died yesterday, will ever have his memory perpetuated by the existence of 30,000-acre Big Levels Game Sanctuary, which he envisioned and fathered in the Blue Ridge near his home.

Framed on the wall of his study is the message received on the day of the dedication of Big Levels from Jay N. Darling, better known as the famous cartoonist "Ding" Darling, who was for many years president of the National Wildlife Federation. It reads:

"No management project like this one you are dedicating today is ever born or grows to maturity without some inspired individual back of it whose vision and persistence make its accomplishment possible. On this day of celebration I want to raise a cheer for our good friend, Judd Cline, who more than any single individual has, from the first inception of the idea to its final completion, fed the fires with his burning enthusiasm. Long after all of us have ceased to enjoy this splendid wildlife haven may it be a monument to his vision and leadership. All hail Justus Cline and his sturdy, rebellious soul."

And monument it has become. And men for generations will utter a quiet prayer for the peace of the doughty individual who insisted that wildlife in the Blue Ridge should be conserved.

We could write thousands of words on the life and accomplishments of Judd Cline. His genuineness, his humility, his friendliness, his wise counsel, his devotion to conservation, his breadth of vision, his singleness of purpose. But it would be tinkling brass and sounding cymbal beside the story of his life as his living of it wrote it.

He loved nature and he loved man. What finer tribute could be engraved upon the tomb of a man whose departure from life is so universally mourned in his community, his State, and his Nation?

As early as 1929 Judd succeeded in getting the Virginia Commission of Game and Inland Fisheries to approve establishment of a game sanctuary containing 3,000 acres near Stuarts Draft. He was persistent in his efforts to expand the project from State to national level; he preached the gospel of conservation everywhere; he wrote letters, articles, and perhaps most widely distributed of all, the famed "conservation sermonettes," published first in the News-Virginian and then reprinted and distributed far and wide over the Nation.

On July 1, 1935, his unflagging efforts bore fruit. President Franklin D. Roosevelt signed a proclamation establishing the Big Levels Wildlife Refuge embracing 30,000 acres or more, within the George Washington National Forest.

We can visualize the peace and joy that emblazoned his soul as he sat quietly on the porch of his home near Stuarts Draft and saw the dream he had dreamed become a reality. Because it was from this porch that his eyes, his mind, and his heart carved out this wildlife sanctuary on the mountains he loved and to which he raised his soul in prayer each day.

A brilliant and a scholarly man he won distinction as a geologist and as a scientist. He earned many academic degrees and just recently was accorded an honorary degree by his early alma mater—Bridgewater. He was a powerful factor in the establishment of the South River water supply system. But his major monument will be Big Levels and the deer, the turkey, the bear, the beaver, and all the other native wildlife that were well nigh extinct before he took up the cudgel in their behalf.

To the scientist, the scholar, the writer, the conservationist, and the civic leader we pay homage today, but most of all we bow in reverent tribute to the man—and friend. Surley he has been welcomed in Heaven where his busy mind and big heart are no doubt already at work planning refuges for those unable to protect themselves. (Louis Spilman.)

[From the Waynesboro News-Virginian of July 27, 1954]

Senator Robertson Sends Regrets at Cline Death—Cites Conservation Efforts of Draft Man

United States Senator A. Willis Robertson, in a telegram today to the News-Virginian, expressed words of condolence on the death of Justus Henry Cline, 78, of Stuarts Draft, a retired geologist, college, and university professor, and "father" of Big Levels Game Refuge.

Mr. Cline died yesterday in the King's Daughters' Hospital, Staunton,

Senator Robertson's telegram today was as follows:

"I am distressed over the news of the death of my good friend Judd Cline. He was one of nature's noblemen who dedicated his life to the service of his fellow man. When I was chairman of the Commission of Game and Inland Fisheries I had no more valued supporter in our efforts to conserve and develop our natural resources. He assisted me in the establishment of the Big Levels Game Refuge and later in the establishment of the Sherando Park. Careless of monument by the grave he built it in the world—a monument by which men might be taught to remember not where he died but where he lived. I share the grief of his many friends in Waynesboro, Stuarts Draft, and throughout the State over his passing and regret that legislative duties will prevent me from attending his funeral."

The body will remain at the Etter Funeral Home until 1 hour prior to the funeral service when it will be placed in the Mount Vernon Church of the Brethren. The casket will not be opened at the church. Funeral service will be held at 3 p. m. Wednesday at the church, conducted by Dr. Warren Bowman, president of Bridgewater College, assisted by the Reverend Guy Stump.

Interment will be in the church cemetery.

Active pallbearers will be Melvin Eavers, John Kindig, A. H. Anderson, Raymond Grove, Francis R. Loth, and Orville Flory.

Honorary bearers will be Dr. H. J. Morton, W. A. Bussey, Earl Kindig, Frank Irvine, Griffith Huff, O. R. Engleman, John Forrer, Clifton Forbes, Moffett Black, Charles Keyt, and Charles Kindig.

It was an altogether fortunate succession of events that began with Justus H. Cline's leaving the life of farmer and orchardist, then distinguishing himself as a petroleum geologist and concluding with his returning to his home State to become one of our Nation's outstanding conservationists.

Agriculturist by inheritance, as his forefathers in the Shenandoah Valley for generations had been, his first business and excuse for living was farming, but Judd was a scientist by inclination and disposition so "obeying that impulse" he became a scientist the hard way by scholarships, inspiration, and persperiation. Graduating as geologist he became adjunct professor of geology at the University of Virginia. Teaching geology for love and farming for a living, he became impressed by the degree to which the world's progress was geared to the production of oil and the danger which at that time threatened our economy inherent to an inadequate supply. Patriotically and characteristically, therefore, he determined to lend a helping hand and made petroleum geology his special study.

It was in the same spirit that later on, when danger of inadequate supply of petroleum had passed, he determined to lend his helping hand to the conservation and development of wild life.

Leaving his farm and professorship with conviction of responsibility, his petroleum studies led him through Kentucky, Midwest, California, Alaska, and Mexican oil fields examining scientifically the occurrences of oil and the geological formations favorable to its accumulation until he felt competent to apply his scientific knowledge successfully for the good of the cause.

Then he offered his services to a subsidiary company of Shell and was assigned to the Rocky Mountain States of Wyoming and Utah, States that had never been tested for oil, where petroleum geology was practically unknown and no "prospects" had ever been observed.

His work was strictly pioneer of the first order, with all its hardships. He was in the open in Rocky Mountain wildwest weather without a roof for months at a time.

But success attended his activities and he located and caused the development of a number of oil pools.

The records of Cline, the pioneer, are outstanding.

Famous Cline Anticline, one of the first results of his exploratory efforts, stands a monument to its discoverer and a beacon signaling the Uinta Basin Utah, which is now recognized as harboring one of the outstanding undeveloped oil reserves of the country. Exploration men are now pouring into that territory.

His independent geological interpretations, sound scientific analyses, and clear conclusions have stood the test of time and are held in high respect by giants in the industry.

Leaving his exhausting pioneer work in the Rockies, he became chief geologist of Derby Oil, and remained in Kansas until the desire to return to his native State, plus a more or less precarious condition of health, brought him back to old Virginia and Galilee, as he called Stuarts Draft.

Such is a brief and inadequate tribute to his accomplishments as a petroleum geologist.

Homage to his brilliant and unforgettable accomplishments as a conservationist, humanitarian, and civic leader has been paid by others.

No tribute to Judd's achievements would be complete without a tribute to his wife, Mrs. Judd, for her assistance by long years of self sacrifice and devotion.

Though not conspicuous as a churchgoer, he wore the helmet of salvation and the sword of the Spirit which is the word of God.

Requiem alternam dona eis, Domine, et lux perpetua luceat eis.

Grant to him eternal rest, O Lord, and let perpetual light shine upon him.

BERKELEY WILLIAMS.

Tribute by Eric Sevareid to Speaker Rayburn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, November 16, 1954

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I wish to call to the attention of the people of the United States the appropriate and well-deserved tribute to the great record of SAM RAYBURN, who will be Speaker of the 84th Congress when the House convenes on January 5, 1955.

Mr. RAYBURN's service as Speaker of the House exceeds that of any other man in American history. The extent of this service, however, is only a part of a truly great record which has been made by him for all of the people of America.

Eric Sevareid, the noted radio and television commentator, clearly expressed this recently in one of his broadcasts, the text of which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the broadcast was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY ERIC SEVAREID, CBS RADIO NEWS ANALYST, NOVEMBER 5, 1954

Good evening. After January the American Congress will continue to be very evenly divided; no strong philosophy can dominate; but strong personalities can. There is no longer a Taft or a Vandenberg in the Senate, and after January, most surely, the single most dominating personality in the Congress will be Mister SAM, Mr. SAM RAYBURN, once again Speaker of the House, who has already broken Henry Clay's record of tenure in that powerful office. If anyone around the Congress feels any regret at the reaccession of Mister SAM, it will be only because Speaker JOE MARTIN must step down—a man so much like RAYBURN, not only in his bachelorhood, but in his plain, old-fashioned honesty, as unpretentious as the leather and horsehair furniture of his office.

The people and page 1 will be getting reacquainted with Mister SAM, and if those not yet acquainted wonder what it is in this small, stocky Texan with the strong, sad face that has made him an institution in our parliament, I can do no better, perhaps, than to repeat some former words on this welcome subject:

It comes down to the ultimate test, which politics, like all forms of social life, makes in the end—the test of character. A few men have learned to love SAM RAYBURN, many to like him; all have learned to respect him. They respect him for his absolute fairness, his patience, his mastery of his job. But there is more to it than that—when they come to know him even a little, they sense in this homespun man a deep, inexpressible faith in other men, an unarticulated love of his country, in its past and its present and a natural, unquestioning belief in its future. Most men are a little bit lost, most men of present politics are confused, in this time of high-pressure techniques, of showmanship, of fear and witty disbelief, and they sense in this man RAYBURN something firm and clear, something that one can cling to.

It occurs to no one to call RAYBURN a conservative or a liberal. He meets the test of no handy label, because he is not a man of political theory and doctrine at all. He follows the facts, wherever they may lead. But because he feels that too many men live too meager a life, the facts generally lead him to conclusions that are liberal, in the best, the moral sense of that word.

His friend, David Cohn, once wrote of Mister SAM: "When pressed to define his political and economic convictions, this small man with the sad, shrewd face is likely to say, without any touch of fraudulent piety, 'Well, a little applied Christianity wouldn't hurt anybody.'" Cohn describes a gathering in which somebody complained that hard-up farmers were riding around in cars. RAYBURN said, "Many a time when I was a child and lived way out in the country, I'd sit on the fence and wish to God that somebody would drive by in a buggy—just anything to relieve my loneliness. Loneliness consumes people. It kills 'em eventually. God help the lonely. I'm glad to see farmers have cars and use 'em."

RAYBURN was lonely and wretchedly poor, and he has not forgotten what that is like. And if anybody called his attitude New Dealism or socialism or do-goodism, he wouldn't know what they were talking about. As Cohn wrote, "RAYBURN was born on the farm in the prepackaging era, when folks got their cheese off the big round and their crackers out of the barrel and so he clings to the outmoded concept that the contents are more important than the package. His voice doesn't quaver when he speaks about the people," said Cohn. "He doesn't bait labor or capital, quote the Bible or call the farmer nature's nobleman. He doesn't think that a man is a saint because he wears overalls and chews Brown's Mule, or that another is a devil because he is tailored by Savile Row and smokes Coronas."

If SAM RAYBURN shares none of the contemporary hypocrisy about classes of men, it may be because, as a man, he is in a kind of a class by himself.

This is Eric Sevareid in Washington.

Senator Holland for President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES O. EASTLAND

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, November 16, 1954

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter written by John Donaldson, of Avon Park, Fla., to the editor of the Tampa Morning Tribune. The letter appeared in that newspaper on Saturday, August 21, 1954.

Let me say that I personally endorse the views of the writer of the letter that the distinguished senior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] would make a great President, and that the country could unite behind him.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR HOLLAND FOR PRESIDENT

AVON PARK.—It is none too soon to think of 1956, especially since press statements indicate that Mr. Eisenhower will not run again.

Permit me to propose a movement for "HOLLAND in 1956." I am not a politician, but merely a long-time Democratic voter in Florida. My claim to express myself is simply that I have spent a lifetime studying and teaching political science (Johns Hopkins, Ph. D., 1914) and observing public events.

At one time the South produced many statesmen who became President, but not since the War Between the States has it been represented in the White House. In 1952 many southern statesmen were considered, but none was selected. In my opinion, all such men (from Virginia on south) would be well advised to unite behind HOLLAND.

All who follow national affairs are familiar with his many achievements, such as his successful sponsorship of the Tidelands Act, and his recent victory in debate on the farm bill. All who know him, including his colleagues in the Senate and his innumerable friends in his State and elsewhere, respect SPESSARD HOLLAND for his great wisdom, and admire him for his unfailing courage and his sweet modesty.

He does not know that I am writing this letter, and I earnestly hope he will forgive my intrusion and will understand my eager enthusiasm.

JOHN DONALDSON.

Observance of United States-France Alliance in Revolutionary War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, November 16, 1954

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD the attached item from the Daily Press, Newport News-Hampton-Warwick, Va., October 20, 1954, entitled "France, United States Reaffirm Alliance Dating to Revolutionary War in Annual Observance at Yorktown."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FRANCE, UNITED STATES REAFFIRM ALLIANCE DATING TO REVOLUTIONARY WAR IN ANNUAL OBSERVANCE AT YORKTOWN

(By Don Knight)

YORKTOWN, October 19.—A French Ambassador and a United States Marine general, standing before the flags of both nations on a bleak windswept Revolutionary battlefield here this afternoon, have reiterated the ideals of a 176-year alliance—a friendship described by the former as a "permanent force in a world threatened by many perils in spite of the numerous sacrifices."

The declarations for continued good will between France and the United States were heard in the last hour of a midday tribute dedicated to the French role in the winning of American independence at the site October 19, 1781.

Speaking on behalf of both nations were Gen. Lemuel C. Shepherd, Commandant and lone four-star general of the Marine Corps, and Henri Bonnet, French Ambassador to the United States.

Earlier in today's Yorktown Day program, both men presided at solemn ceremonies in remote regions of the Colonial National Historical Park—brief programs acknowledging the role of French General Rochambeau and the unknown dead in his army of 1781.

At the monument, moments after the U. S. S. *Roanoke* fired a 19-gun salute from its anchorage below the York River bluff, Bonnet declared the ceremony at the French graveside symbolic of the solidarity of our two nations which has long been sealed by the sacrifices made by our youth in the common cause.

HAILS UNVEILING

He hailed the unveiling of the Rochambeau plaque, a permanent marker deep in the forest below Yorktown on the French headquarters site, a recollection of the victorious end of joint Franco-American efforts on the field of this decisive battle and of the coordinated strategy which led the French expeditionary force along the 756 miles from Newport through eight States.

"It is representatives of these States that I am happy to salute here," Bonnet said, "and I wish to thank you for having invited me to Yorktown to recall with you the memories which are associated with this date."

Bonnet, speaking from the flag bedecked base of the Yorktown monument and to a gathering of nearly 1,000 visitors including delegations of patriotic organizations from Virginia and the East Coast as well as members of the Interstate Rochambeau Commission, noted that since 1781 the forces of both nations have been called upon to coordinate anew their alliance.

"It is enthusiasm for common ideals which best explains the fruitful character of this alliance," Bonnet said. "It is based on similar objectives in the international field."

"The hope that law would be supreme internationally under the form of a universal agreement for collective security has not been realized. In the absence of a global entente it is by means of a balance of forces that security must be assured—as long as the Communist bloc * * * will not renounce it's expansion plans."

Bonnet traced the development of various mutual agreements, including the Marshall plan, the Atlantic Pact and the recent London agreements.

FRANCE IS WILLING

Bonnet said the French Parliament had shown by the latter that "France is willing, in the interests of her alliances and the defense of the free world, to overcome the doubts inspired by the prospect of German rearmament."

Shifting to Franco-American relations in the Far East, Bonnet noted that in this area both countries face the same threats—"ones even more pressing than in Europe"—and noted that French forces numbering over 150,000 men still are on guard as an indispensable guarantee against a recurrence of aggression in southeast Asia.

"We are in accord with your Government," he said, "on the various aspects of this problem and on the necessity of giving economic assistance jointly with you to Cambodia, Laos, and South Vietnam."

Bonnet said the increase in production permitting wage rises without provoking inflation in France has proved the best means of reducing "Communist votes"—votes which he said mostly express a basic discontent rather than an allegiance to Moscow.

The Ambassador reminded that democratic virtues, although difficult to practice, must be preserved, and said he felt the history of the two nations demonstrates they are equal to the task.

MUTUAL FRIENDSHIP

"The fidelity with which you have maintained the memory of Lafayette and Rochambeau and the manner in which the name of Washington is venerated in France are the best measures of confidence and mutual friendship between our two countries."

Earlier on the program General Shepherd hailed, in a manner typical of this veteran of two world wars, "those magnificent contributions to our cause, without which the issue of independence of this Nation would remained in doubt."

General Shepherd said he was proud to speak, not only as a representative of the Armed Forces of the United States but as a native Virginian "whose ancestors came to this tidewater country 300 years ago."

"Today we assemble to pay tribute to Rochambeau, to France, and to the gallant men of that great nation, a friend at our birth and our friend today," Shepherd said.

Shepherd said that France and America will continue to produce men who value freedom for their Nation above life itself. "From Rochambeau and Lafayette to the indomitable De Castries at Dien Bien Phu, France has been the mother of valiant fighting men."

In reviewing the details of the French role in the Revolution, Shepherd said that "we can now understand what a decisive contribution France and Rochambeau made to the independence of the United States. This man, who has never received full accord due him, is symbolic to us of the indomitable spirit of France."

FLEW FROM WASHINGTON

Both Bonnet and Shepherd flew from Washington early today to take part in the program here, sponsored this year by the Interstate Rochambeau Commission of the United States and its chairman, Charles Parmer, of Alexandria.

At 11 a. m. they gathered at the secluded site of a French Revolutionary War burial ground and were met by the sound of drums and bugles played by a 35-man Marine unit from Washington.

At this point a wreath of wild onion flower, taken from the Yorktown battlefield, was handed to Bonnet by J. S. deNeufville, 84-year-old French descendant of a Rochambeau soldier.

Bonnet placed the wreath at a lone white cross, backed a few steps, and stood erect while Marine Pfc. Phillip Horner sounded taps. Echo taps followed from Cpl. H. J. Robinson, unseen in the woods nearby.

Other wreaths were placed by Mrs. C. Bernard Bailey, State regent of the DAR from Charlottesville; Mrs. Maurice B. Tonkin, vice regent of the DAR from Warwick, and Mrs. James Pharr, of Denbigh, regent of the Comte deGrasse Chapter, DAR, of Yorktown.

A few moments later and a quarter of a mile farther down the historic tour road, General Shepherd dedicated a replica of a permanent marker on the wooded site of Rochambeau's 1781 headquarters.

The plaque, to be cast in bronze, will show a map outlining the Rochambeau victory route and is decorated with the 13 stars of the Original States and the 2 nations' flags.

Here, standing in a cleared area on this tract, the Marine musicians gave their rendition of the Rochambeau march The Huron.

McCarthy Censure Resolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, November 16, 1954

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an editorial entitled "Test of the Senate," published in the New York Herald Tribune, a great Republican newspaper, on November 15, 1952.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Test of the Senate

The debate on the McCarthy censure resolution was brought back at the week's end to the simple, basic issue which underlies it. That issue is whether the conduct of this Wisconsin Senator has been at odds with the traditions, the standards, and the prestige of the Senate of the United States.

The Watkins committee, composed of men as impartial and judicial, as respectable and conservative as the roster of the Senate provides, found unanimously that on two counts Senator McCarthy's conduct deserves censure. Republicans and Democrats voted alike, and their reasoning was embodied in a report cutting across emotional or ideological ties as cleanly as a surgeon's knife.

Several considerations tending to becloud the issue have been brought in since the debate started.

Senator McCarthy, in the speech which he released to the press but never delivered, claimed that the fundamental question was whether the Communists would draw satisfaction from an affirmative Senate vote. This is a plain diversion. The Senate has a duty to perform, a case to decide lucidly and objectively; it can hardly let its action be determined by what the Communists, in this country or elsewhere, may happen to prefer.

Senator McCarthy actually went much further, asserting that the Communist Party has now "extended its tentacles * * * to the United States Senate," making the Watkins committee its "unwilling handmaiden." Such an argument hardly needs to be answered, though it may be questioned in passing whether so mortal an insult has ever been leveled by a United States Senator against his colleagues.

More subtly diversionary are the considerations hinted at in the talk of a compromise or a watered-down resolution. The men who are reported to be working behind the scenes toward such an end are playing with fire, for they are risking putting the whole Senate in an ambiguous and weak position. If they think that in this way they can foster harmony in the Republican Party they are surely mistaken. Such a tactic will not only divide Republicans from Republicans; it will divide Republicans from the people, leaving an ineradicable scar when the campaign of 1956 comes around.

There is only one way to secure unity, and that is for the whole Senate and for both parties to look at the facts as they have been set forth by the Watkins committee report and to determine on that basis whether Senator McCarthy merits the recommended vote of censure.

The unity thus won will be that which exists among men who have done a job maturely and responsibly, facing up to an unpleasant situation with a conviction that history is watching them.

The test before the Senate is not one involving party politics or intraparty differences. It is a test of upholding the Senate's own dignity. Fortunately, the Watkins committee has disentangled the big issues from the secondary ones and has pointed a way for action.

Nothing now should be allowed to confuse counsel or to blur the decision.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the Record.

Appendix

Address Delivered by Hon. Edward Martin, of Pennsylvania, Before the Fifth Annual Military Medical-Dental Symposium

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, November 17, 1954

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an address which I delivered before the Fifth Annual Military Medical-Dental Symposium, on October 18, 1954, at Philadelphia, Pa.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

It is a great honor to speak before this patriotic symposium.

You are military men, but you pray for peace.

Soldiers, knowing the horrors and disappointments of war, seek ways to prevent armed conflict.

You are preparing for defense because the well prepared nation is seldom attacked. The United States will not attack because we are a peace-loving nation.

We have never been an aggressor. We always extend a helping hand whenever and wherever there is a rumor of disaster or hunger any place in the world.

The history of progress in the world is the history of great events. The printing press, the wheel, the Pennsylvania rifle, the discovery of oil, and the invention of the electric light have all been mileposts in man's progress.

The progress of civilization has been an uphill fight. It has not been easy.

Its road is marked by headstones to courageous men and women making the supreme sacrifice that future generations might have a better chance to enjoy the great blessings God has given to His people.

Our Nation is the envy of the world. With less than one-sixth of the world's area and less than one-seventh of the world's population we produce more than one-half of the world's goods.

In less than 200 years an uncharted wilderness has been converted into the world's greatest workshop of diversified industry. The broad valleys and wide plains are the world's reserve food supply.

Our rivers and harbors, railroads, highways, air transportation, communication systems, and power lines bring a rich continent together so that our natural resources may be developed for the benefit of all people.

The result has been the finest living standards and the highest cultural and spiritual attainments of all history.

The defense of America, the maintenance of peace, and the preservation of the American way of life are the most pressing problems confronting our Nation today. They also mean so much to the peace-loving and God-fearing nations of the world.

We are not a warlike people, and for that reason we are slow to even plan for defense.

We do not seek to impose our will upon the people of other nations.

America's historic mission is to be an influence for peace and good will among the nations of the earth.

I believe that the most powerful agency for peace and security is a program of national defense so strong that it will discourage war.

That does not mean we should depend upon military strength alone in planning our national defense.

We must build permanent security upon patriotic love of country and undivided allegiance to the ideals of Americanism.

We must establish a solid foundation of unity among all our people with devotion to the principles of liberty, equal justice, equal rights, equal opportunities, and equal responsibility.

Nothing is more important to our national well-being than complete recognition by every citizen of his individual obligation to our country.

All must share in safeguarding the rights and privileges that we enjoy through the courage and sacrifice of American heroes in every generation.

The world must know the truth. While we are years ahead of Russia in progress, we are years behind in propaganda.

As an example, for every dollar we spend to tell the truth about our great country and its objectives, our enemies—and that means Russia, her satellites and communistic sympathizers—spend $45 to spread lies, hatred, dishonesty, and half truths.

Our enemies are using false propaganda to confuse and divide our friends. To prevent this, the truth must be taught in our schools, explained in the courts, preached from the pulpit, and beamed to the world.

As Americans we will all be proud of our heritage if we understand it.

As an example of lies, the Reds charged that our forces used germ warfare in Korea. Our own officials promptly denounced this untruth. But how many people all over the world probably still think that it is the truth§

Let us tell the situation in Russia. Malenkov has made great promises of more consumer goods. He has not been able to make his promises good, because, if he did, it would mean less military material.

A totalitarian form of government always exists on some kind of a crisis.

You cannot keep up a great military organization indefinitely without using it against an enemy.

Russia has never been strong except in its own territory.

Let us give the world the truth.

Personally, I do not fear Russian bombs. I do fear complacency in our country.

We all realize that our national and international responsibilities have been enormously expanded, but there is too little understanding in our country of the danger of poor fiscal policies.

The financial picture of our Government is alarming.

When the books were closed in Washington for the fiscal year ending June 30, we were $9½ billion in the red. In other words, we had spent $9½ billion more than all the Government revenues from all sources—yet the Eisenhower administration has already cut appropriations by more than $64 billion.

Our debt is now about $275 billion.

In view of that condition, and with future demands upon our resources clouded in uncertainty, how can we escape the conclusion that the strictest economy in Government is vital to our national existence?

There is a disposition on the part of some of our people to take the debt lightly—as something for future generations to worry about.

But I assure you that the danger is here—now—with all the explosive potential of the atomic bomb.

Debt destroys the value of the dollar more ruthlessly than any other factor in our financial setup.

World history back to the ancient days is a record of great nations brought to destruction by debt, taxes and inflation.

When I plead for economy in Government, I have in mind every function, at every level of Government, including defense, foreign aid and all forms of domestic spending.

It should be a mark of patriotism to fight increased cost of Government. The greatest cause of inflation is Government deficit financing. Let us keep the dollar sound by keeping our fiscal policies in proper order.

What are the steps we need to defend ourselves?

1. We need great production of food and materials.

2. We need a moral reawakening. Americans must be a people who love their Government and who willingly obey its laws with deep and abiding religious conviction and faith.

3. There should be an organization of nations who believe that God's greatest gift to mankind is freedom of the individual, and that they are willing to fight and die to preserve that freedom.

4. Adopt universal military training.

Now let us look at our defense situation from the military side and consider some fundamental principles.

A free republic, such as ours, cannot rely entirely on a professional army.

Universal military training is American in origin, principle and character. It calls for equal service with equal opportunity. It distributes equal responsibility for our Nation's defense among all classes and creeds, the rich and poor alike.

It will instill in the hearts and minds of our young men a better understanding of what America stands for and a deeper appreciation of the American way of life. In addition to the work of a soldier, universal military training will teach the proper way to live and proper conduct under conditions of hardship and danger.

It will teach the value of organization, teamwork, and disciplne.

Universal military training follows the principles laid down by George Washington who said, and I quote:

"Every citizen who enjoys the protection of free government owes not only a portion of his property but even of his personal service in defense of it."

Back in 1790 President Washington placed before the first Congress a defense plan which called for every able-bodied young man to be trained to defend his country.

Unfortunately, Washington's plan was not adopted. As a result, every war emergency has found us unprepared, with terrible sacrifices and losses.

In both World Wars we went into action before we were ready. The same thing happened when Communist aggression shattered the peace of the world in Korea.

Thousands of American boys paid with their lives because they did not have the training or the equipment to do the job to which they were called in a time of national peril.

No American boy should be sent into battle who is not adequately trained.

That is so fundamental that it is not even a debatable question.

Shall we now wait until an enemy attacks before we begin training our young men?

Or shall we begin now, while there is still time, to build up a constantly growing reserve of trained manpower as the backbone of our national defense?

Our most dangerous weakness is our lack of reserves trained in the skills required by the many technical services of modern warfare.

The vast changes that have taken place in military science have not altered the basic principle that properly trained personnel, ably led and directed, is the decisive factor between victory and defeat.

In the new military strategy only thoroughly trained men are qualified for combat service. We must have a great reserve of trained manpower, backed by high morale and the will to defend our ideals.

It is my firm belief that basic military training for every young man, excepting only those physically disabled, is the foundation of any plan for building the defensive strength of the American Republic.

To my mind the following are requisites for an American soldier: Willingness, reliability, courage, ability. They are given in that order. If a soldier possesses some ability and has the first three requisites he will be an asset to his country. He will have willingness if he is properly trained because his mind will be imbued with the great ideals of America.

Universal military training should be given by the Regular Army, assisted by civilian soldiers, both National Guard and Reserves, at a place in the trainee's own State, if possible. After completion of basic training the trainee should have the choice of certain services.

These choices could be 2 years in the Regular Army, 4 years in the National Guard, or 6 years in the United States Army Reserve, for example.

Certain trainees, selected by the officers in charge, should be sent to schools in order to train them to be officers and technicians.

All trainees would be subject to call for 8 years, unless they discharged their obligation in the Regular Army, National Guard, or Reserve. After that time they would be called only for a declared emergency.

In planning the military defense of our Republic, I believe we should have a highly trained Regular Army of modest size, based here at home.

It should have the finest and most modern weapons and equipment.

It should have the greatest mobility and the greatest fire power the world has ever known.

It should be completely motorized and prepared to move by air and sea to any place where it might be needed.

Our National Guard should be under the control of the States until called into Federal service. It should be trained by the best and most patriotic brains of the Regular Army.

We should have a great Reserve Corps of citizens willing to continue their military training and they must also be under the supervision of the best the Army can provide.

I have always felt that some Regular Army officers should have command in the National Guard and the Reserve.

Instead of maintaining a huge standing ground force at tremendous cost, I advocate building an air force so big and so powerful that we could have complete supremacy in the air and enough planes to carry our ground troops to any part of the world.

With such an air force, American jet fighters and bombers, in the event we are attacked, could speedily demolish the Communist lines of communication and destroy the heart of the Communist military production.

We should build up the world's most powerful navy so that we and our allies will have complete command of the sea. We should create the world's strongest merchant marine in readiness for the transportation of men and the material with which to fight.

The worldwide struggle between human liberty and tyranny will not be decided by military power alone.

We cannot defeat communism by force alone, even though we gain military victory.

It is a great mistake to measure our strength by the amount of money we pour into military appropriations if we ignore the more important elements of patriotism and the spiritual strength that comes from faith in God.

To reach a high level of spiritual power, we need a new awakening of civic morality, uniting all faiths in obedience to the laws of God and man.

The worldwide struggle for the minds and souls of men does not end with the signing of official documents.

Human dignity and freedom of the individual are still precious to the hearts of freemen.

Progress of humanity toward a better civilization, based on mutual understanding and helpfulness, is still the goal of all men of good will.

The sacred teachings of our religious faith point out God's conditions for peace.

The Ten Commandments, the Golden Rule, and the Sermon on the Mount are unfailing guides for the conduct of nations as well as individuals.

Our great bulwark in time of peril is not our wealth, not our military might, not our industrial superiority, but the moral and spiritual power of a clean, thrifty, hardworking, decent, God-fearing people, strong in patriotism and strong in love of our country and our flag.

Coexistence: Cause for Alarm

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, November 17, 1954

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an article entitled "Coexistence: Cause for Alarm," written by Constantine Brown, and published in the Washington Evening Star of November 17, 1954.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

COEXISTENCE: CAUSE FOR ALARM—SENATOR KNOWLAND FEARS EISENHOWER ADMINISTRATION IS READY TO TAKE BITE AT LATEST SOVIET BAIT OFFERING

(By Constantine Brown)

Official resentment against Premier Mendes-France for torpedoing the EDC has disappeared and he will receive the full treatment given prime ministers of friendly nations.

Last August when the French leader first mentioned his intention to visit the United States to make a speech before the United Nations in New York, he received a casual invitation from the White House to come to lunch if he visited Washington. Later, after the signing of the agreements in Paris, an official invitation for an official visit was issued.

The most important subject which Mr. Mendes-France will tackle in his discussion of a variety of topics with President Eisenhower and Secretary of State Dulles is the question of coexistence which the shrewd Soviet diplomats have raised officially since Stalin's death.

Coexistence, or peaceful coexistence as it has been dubbed more recently by the Communist propagandists, is being gobbled up like hotcakes on a winter morning in Europe. European statesmen, taken in before by appeasement, say they can't withstand the waves of popular demand to end the tension by accepting coexistence.

Neutralism, the forerunner of peaceful coexistence in Europe, paid only limited dividends. It was popular among the British and French masses, but the governments in office were reluctant to endorse it, principally because it would have meant the end of the flow of dollars from the United States.

The Moscow schemers, knowing that they might be defeated despite their numerical superiority if they started new aggressions, contrived to sell the idea of peaceful coexistence to the peace-hungry peoples of the West. They found many more takers than they had hoped for even among some of the heretofore stouthearted policymakers in the present administration.

There are a number of indications that several White House advisers take kindly to this Soviet bait. These include particularly General Eisenhower's unofficial but highly influential counselors: Milton Eisenhower, president of Pennsylvania State College; Lucius Clay, president of American Can Co.; and John McCloy, chairman of the board of the Chase National Bank.

This knowledge prompted Senate Majority Leader William Knowland to sound the alarm in a speech in the Senate last Monday. He demanded a review by the Senate of our foreign and defense policies in the light of the present coexistence threat. The short speech was not a diversion in the McCarthy censure debate. It was a shot across the bow, fired because of fear, which many of his Republican and Democratic colleagues share, that some commitments may be made by the executive branch to Mr. Mendes-France which would place us in a diplomatic straitjacket.

We have tried coexistence with the U. S. S. R. in the past. But the men in the Kremlin have invariably gone back on their solemn pledges. Mr. Roosevelt extended this country's recognition to the Soviets in 1933 and signed a number of political and economic agreements. None was fulfilled.

The Muscovites pledged formally to refrain from any propaganda in this country. Yet it was in that period before the outbreak of World War II that they infiltrated deeply our Government and private institutions with subversive agents, both Americans and foreigners. This was continued during the war when the U. S. S. R. was our ally.

The Soviet agents indulged shamelessly in espionage and theft of our most important military secrets. The worked almost in the open and American authorities often had to shut their eyes because it was considered unwise to offend the Kremlin whose armies were killing Germans.

Never in the history of this country was our military and diplomatic security more like a sieve than during those years of close coexistence with the U. S. S. R. For the sake of political coexistence, we surrendered all of Eastern Europe and the Republic of China to the Soviet leaders.

Premier Malenkov is now bringing a new element into the picture. It is economic coexistence, which he declares will set up a political honeymoon in which the present international tensions will subside.

The economic angle is, however, the most appealing to our allies in the new appeasement. Their new factories, built with American dollars, are producing effectively now. They need new markets and believe sincerely that the U. S. S. R. and the People's Republic of China can offer them. To obtain commercial outlets among some 850 million people lacking consumers' goods, our principal western allies are willing to accept appeasement under the new name of coexistence.

America is, however, in a different position. The survival of our democratic institutions and the physical security of this Nation is by far more important than the possibility of picking up a few hundred million dollars a year by direct or indirect trade with an enemy whose avowed intention is the destruction of this last rampart of freedom.

We are under constant pressure from Paris and London to "get off the high horse" and join them in a policy of coexistence which our allies hope will help them. It is this pressure which has made some impression in the executive branch of the Government that worries Senate leaders.

International Scientific Cooperation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, November 17, 1954

Mr. **WILEY**. Mr. President, science has shattered the barriers of space and time in this atomic age. Here in this country, the overwhelming proportion of our scientific effort is devoted to creating a better, more prosperous, more fruitful life for our people and the peoples of the world. Some of our scientific effort is necessarily devoted to the needs of our own national defense. But much effort is also expended, in cooperation with the scientists of other nations, in exploring the phenomena of this planet—the physical aspects of the sky, of the waters, and of the ground.

I send to the desk a summary statement describing United States cooperation with the forces of international science. It points out, incidentally, that—

> Each of the fields in the * * * international program (for example, meteorology, oceanography, ionospheric, physics and cosmic rays) is characterized by its global nature—

I emphasize "its global nature"—

> and its relation to solar energy and disturbances.

I point out incidentally that our forthcoming expedition to the Antarctic is a part of our program of national scientific exploration, as well as of international cooperation.

I ask unanimous consent that this scientific summary be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUMMARY ON INTERNATIONAL SCIENTIFIC COOPERATION

The international geophysical year designates a major research effort to be conducted cooperatively by many nations: 29 are now participants and others are expected to join.

This program encompasses a many-faceted investigation of our planet: the surface and core of the earth, the oceans and their depths, the atmosphere.

These features of our environment, particularly the atmosphere and the oceans, affect the daily lives of all individuals, the transactions of commerce and industry, the safe conduct of land, sea, and air travel and transportation, and the range and reliability of all radio communication and navigation systems. This environment controls, in these and many other ways, both the civilian and defense welfare of the Nation.

Our knowledge of most of these fields is presently inadequate. In large measure this stems from the worldwide nature of geophysical events.

Storms forming off the east coast of Asia may cause a cold wave to surge over the United States a week later, which may in turn create a new storm in the mid-Atlantic and subsequent floods and snow avalanches in Europe. Solar flares create magnetic disturbances and may cause failure of all radio communications over an appreciable region of the earth. Each of the fields in the proposed international program (for example, meteorology, oceanography, ionospheric physics, and cosmic rays) is characterized by its global nature and its relation to solar energy and disturbances. To advance in these fields accordingly requires measurements and observations all over the world. These measurements, for maximum results with minimum effort, must be made simultaneously by all nations so that the worldwide pattern in each field can be established and so that the relationships between fields can be determined. These technical considerations led to the proposal of the International Geophysical Year, and the period of time chosen for this intensive research program, 1957–58, was chosen largely because it coincides with a period of maximum sun-spot activity.

The program of the United States was formulated by the United States National Committee for the International Geophysical Year. This committee was established by the National Academy of Sciences—National Research Council as the adhereing body of the United States to the International Council of Scientific Unions. The committee was assisted in its plans by leading scientists of the Nation in private laboratories, universities, and such Federal agencies as the Departments of Defense and Commerce. The United States program is a national program, based on our Nation's needs. It encompasses work under eight major categories: astro-geophysical measurements, meteorology, oceanography, and glaciology, ionospheric physics, aurora and airglow, geomagnetism, cosmic rays, and rocket exploration of the upper atmosphere. The researches will be conducted in four major geographical regions of importance to our national interests: (1) Arctic and sub-Arctic; (2) middle latitudes of the Northern and Southern Hemispheres (including the United States, Central America, South America, and adjacent parts of the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans); (3) the equatorial Pacific (largely the Micronesia group of island possessions and trust territories of the United States); and (4) the Antarctic and sub-Antarctic.

This program of basic research in the earth sciences will add appreciably to our knowledge and understanding of the several fields. It will also, because geophysical data have immediate value in such fields as weather and radio-frequency forecasting, provide technical information of immediate practical value. The interest of the Nation in both these areas has been carefully considered by many scientists, by the United States national committee, and by the National Academy of Sciences. It has been reviewed and approved by the National Science Board.

The interests of the Government in the program are exceedingly great. The several agencies having responsibilities in various areas involving or depending upon geophysical phenomena are acquainted with the program. Members of several of their staffs have assisted in the formulation of the program. The Bureau of the Budget requested reviews by the Departments of State, Defense and Commerce, the Office of Defense Mobilization, and the Atomic Energy Commission. The National Science Foundation and the National Academy of Sciences have also consulted these agencies. Their letters of endorsement have been received.

The budget for the scientific program to be undertaken by the various nations is estimated to total approximately $100 million. Each nation provides for its own funds; no pooling of funds or subsidies are involved. The United States scientific program calls for total expenditures of $13 million. Of this, $2.5 million are required during fiscal year 1955 for the procurement of scientific equipment and instrumentation—e. g., upper atmosphere rockets and automatic ionospheric recorders—having a 2-year lead time; the remaining funds will be needed in fiscal year 1956. The program will largely be conducted by grants to private research institutions and universities; existing Federal facilities, where unique experience exists, will be utilized for the economic procurement of major items of specialized equipment.

The Davies Ouster

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, November 17, 1954

Mr. **FULBRIGHT**. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter addressed to the New York Times by Louis J. Halle, of Charlottesville, Va., dated November 10, 1954.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DAVIES' OUSTER QUESTIONED—IMPAIRMENT OF OUR FOREIGN SERVICE FEARED IN DRIVE FOR CONFORMITY

(The writer of the following letter was a member of the Policy Planning Staff in the office of the Secretary of State until his resignation last August.)

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

The dismissal of John Paton Davies from the Foreign Service has implications for the public welfare that not all private persons are in a position to appreciate. One who after 13 years has now resigned from the State Department (of his own accord, on good terms with its administration and not under a cloud) may be permitted some comment on it.

Secretary Dulles concurred in the finding of a security hearing board that Mr. Davies had "demonstrated a lack of judgment, discretion, and reliability." Judging another man's "judgment" is never more uncertain than when the chief test is the judge's own judgment.

One of the findings of the board was that the policy recommendations of Mr. Davies "were not in accordance with the standard required of Foreign Service officers, and show a definite lack of judgment."

COMPOSITION OF BOARD

Mr. Davies is one of the most experienced men in this country in matters of foreign policy. It is proper to inquire, therefore, into the qualifications of those who found his policy recommendations faulty. They were the Inspector General of the Army, the deputy to the Director for Plans and Readiness of the Office of Defense Mobilization, a legal assistant of the Federal Communications Commission, an assistant to the Director of the Foreign Operations Administration, and the Director of the Office of Procurement and Technical Assistance of the Small Business Administration.

These men disagree with Mr. Davies' recommendations on Far Eastern policy and advocated his punishment.

One can imagine what the verdict of such a board as this might have been on the judgment displayed by a man who in 1950 recommended that "if the Communist government of China in fact proves its ability to govern China without serious domestic resistance, then it, too, should be admitted to the United Nations." Might it not have found this man's judgment below standard? Yet this was the recommendation made by Mr. Dulles in his book War or Peace. I do not say this in criticism of Mr. Dulles' judgment any more than I take the like situation to reflect on Mr. Davies' judgment. In both cases, the actual and the hypothetical, we have the spectacle of ignorance sitting in judgment on wisdom.

RELATIONS WITH PRESS

The other charge on which Mr. Davies has been judged guilty, that of expressing his views indiscreetly to the press, could also be sustained against a large number of Government servants, more so than ever since the administration has urged its employees to be more open with the press.

Few things can be more dangerous in their implications for a society than a law, however good in itself, that is invoked only against selected individuals in a political situation.

Most of us would agree that the official whose job it is to get rid of security risks in the State Department must be above suspicion of exercising his functions in the interests of any faction or party. Any partisan bias might well prevent the effective administration of security, which must be impartial, and thereby raise a doubt whether his continued employment in that capacity was "clearly consistent with the interests of the national security."

Why, then, should not the procedure applied to Mr. Davies have been applied to the director of the Department's Bureau of Security after he had referred in a public address to the legal obstacles that made it difficult to replace an individual whose viewpoint does not coincide with that of the Republican Party? Was tnis not poor judgment, lack of discretion, and unreliability? How can one avoid suspecting that the difference has to do with the fact that Mr. Davies has been an object of attack by Senator McCarthy while Mr. McLeod is the Senator's publicly avowed friend and admirer?

The occasion of this letter is the injury to the public service. In his statement Mr. Davies says he has informed the Secretary that he would welcome publication of the whole record of his case, including my 1950 recommendations that we seek a preventive showdown with the Soviet Union.

RECOMMENDATIONS ON RUSSIA

The implication here is eloquent. Any recommendation that we seek a preventive showdown with the Soviet Union is at least as much at odds with our actual foreign policy as were the recommendations that Mr. Davies made so many years ago on our relations in the Far East. But from the point of view of the police-mind looking for security risks any error, in this case, is on the right side.

In the year and a half since the personnel of the State Department and Foreign Service were placed under the control of police officials like Mr. McLeod the temptation to buy job security by making policy recommendations of this sort has been too great for some to resist. Those with the character to resist have in many cases left the Government service, although many others still carry on.

I am aware of my moral responsibility in saying, as one who has been on the inside until recently, that by these indirect methods the policemen have gained some control over American foreign policy, a field in which they have no competence.

The Secretary has, in a few instances at least, been given dangerous advice that he would not have been given if these pressures had not existed. More often it has been thought unsafe to give him the advice that he should be given. Security officers read the memoranda and make their own judgments.

Now an example has been made of an officer whom most of us know to be of fine character, loyal, courageous and intelligent, and who has been subjected to public dismissal and punishment for lack of judgment, discretion, and reliability. I say punishment because, in addition to being publicly sacked as a security risk, he has been deprived of the pension that he had earned by 23 years of faithful service. It will now be even clearer than before that the reporting and advice of the Service had better conform to the policy views of the security officers.

One hopes that the American public will see at last that the word "security" has become a euphemism. It covers the primitive political drive of the last 5 years to eliminate intellectual and moral distinction from the Government service, and to staff the Government instead with political good fellows who cannot be suspected of superiority. Under the reorganized Foreign Service, for example, educational standards for admission are being avowedly lowered. It is as if the mediocrity of the mindless had become the ideal.

The impediment to good government in many countries has been that government service does not attract to itself the best elements in the national population. A generation ago one heard that complaint commonly about our own Government. When it is again made in the years to come we should remember, among others, the case of John Paton Davies.

LOUIS J. HALLE.

CHARLOTTESVILLE, VA., *November 10, 1954.*

The Dixon-Yates Contract

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, November 17, 1954

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, there has been much discussion about the Dixon-Yates contract. One of the best editorials on the subject has been published in the Cleveland Press, a Scripps-Howard newspaper. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GET OFF THE HOOK, IKE

Mr. President, that Dixon-Yates contract already has caused your administration a lot of trouble and embarrassment.

But you ain't see nothin' yet. Unless you step in and straighten out the mess.

You've got coming up a rambunctious Democratic Congress, and those fellows are preparing to paw over that contract from hell to breakfast, make every political advantage of it and torment your next 2 years in the White House.

The Democrats made it a big issue in the campaign. Although many of the things they said about Dixon-Yates were untrue, enough was true to give the deal an unpleasanot odor the public does not like—and an odor that ought not be associated with your administration.

YOU HAD A GOOD IDEA

You were absolutely sound on your approach to a problem. The taxpayer-subsidized TVA was peddling electricty at rates which couldn't be approached where consumers are charged what electricity actually costs when interest and taxes enter into costs. TVA had started out as a big valley conservation and development program, and the Government financed it to conserve the soil in the Tennessee watershed, control floods, promote navigation, and produce electric power. TVA was authorized to sell the the hydroelectric byproduct to get some of the Government's bait back.

Today TVA is producing almost as much electricity by steam generation as by waterpower. That was caused largely by the fact that the Atomic Energy Commission was gobbling up huge quantities of TVA's electric output.

So you were completely right, in our opinion, Mr. President, in deciding that TVA ought not be permitted to expand further beyond its natural boundaries at general taxpayer expense; that AEC should buy its additional electricity requirements from privately built steam plants which paid interest on investment and taxes on profits.

You were right when you recommended in your budget message that AEC get private power so it could relinquish to TVA part of the power TVA is supplying to it. Under your plan, TVA and AEC would both do directly what they were intended to do.

You wanted to stop the rapid growth of the public debt, and this was one way to stop it. However, then your idea was perverted.

Your AEC Chairman, Admiral Strauss, and your Budget Director, Howland Hughes, are men of limited experience in public affairs, and apparently less experienced in dealing with the complex power problem, either private or public.

The big producers of private electric power in the area where TVA's power shortage was threatened were a couple of companies headed up by a couple of fellows named Dixon and Yates.

The AEC negotiated a contract with Messrs. Dixon and Yates to supply 600,000 kilowatts of power, a contract which your General Accounting Office says is legal, and at rates it says are reasonable, but containing provisions which your GAO plainly believes do not make sense from the Government's side of the table.

In our view, the most senseless aspect is that AEC has been pitched into the role of "power broker" for TVA. AEC has much more important things to do. It should be able to buy directly all the power it needs for its own vital work.

Your original idea was good. It has been perverted. These are some of the things the Democrats are gnawing on.

A major reason they gnaw so ravenously is that Messrs. Strauss and Hughes, dealing with Messrs. Dixon and Yates, never asked for competitive bids.

And that's your out. Government business ought always be conducted on that basis. The Government wants so much electricity delivered at a certain point, beginning at a certain date and continuing for so many years. The contract should go to the lowest competent bidder.

The thing to do with this Dixon-Yates contract, Mr. President, is to toss it into the ashcan. Then offer to buy the electric power we need from whomsoever makes the lowest bid.

Even Democrats don't know how to make a better deal than that. It will deprive them of an issue, and it will settle your problem.

The Problem of Smog

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS H. KUCHEL

OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, November 17, 1954

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, the problem of smog is a grave one in America. In fact, there is a growing belief in all sections of the country where there is a great amount of smog that the problem of pollution of the air must be solved.

In the 83d Congress the distinguished senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] and I joined in introducing proposed legislation by which the Federal Government would be enlisted in a continuing fight to clear the air of pollution. The Senate, during the 83d Congress, accepted the position which we took on two occasions and adopted legislation which we advocated. I regret very much that the House of Representatives failed to take similar action.

Mr. President, in the local Evening Star, last weekend, there appeared a rather interesting article which called attention to the fact that the smog problem has been found to be acute in the city of Cleveland, Ohio. In asking unanimous consent that this article be reprinted in the Appendix of the RECORD, I do so in the hope that there will be an awareness during the sessions of the 84th Congress of the growing problem of smog conditions over the cities and towns of America, and that Congress will see the necessity of enlisting the power of the Federal Government in finally wiping out this grave menace which affects the health of the Nation.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REALTORS FIND SMOG PROBLEM IN CLEVELAND—PALL SO ODOROUS IT AWAKENS MANY DELEGATES IN NIGHT

(By Robert J. Lewis)

CLEVELAND, November 13.—This week's visit to Cleveland has left the Nation's realtors with at least one reemphasized conviction—that smog is one of the growing national problems.

A combination of fog, fumes, and smoke lowered the boom on delegates about 2 a. m. Tuesday, waking many in their hotel rooms almost as if a giant gong had sounded.

From that point on, none of the activities of the 47th annual convention of the National Association of Real Estate Boards could quite be separated from the pervasive odor that clung to Cleveland.

"Is that smog?" one delegate asked. "It smells like coal gas to me."

THOUGHT HOTEL AFIRE

Another delegate, awakened by the odor as it sank to the level of the city, thought his hotel was afire.

A Cleveland reporter said he got his most impressive quote of the week when he persuaded Mayor Norris Poulson, of Los Angeles, to call Cleveland's smog lighter than that in Los Angeles.

"I'm an expert on smog," said the Los Angeles mayor.

But to Washington delegates all such distinctions were academic. The whole town had an odor as if 50 million youngsters had madly dumped together the contents of every vial and container of 50 million chemistry sets and then spread the resultant mixture into every nook and cranny of the city.

Howard Scott, chief of Cleveland's 40-man air pollution control division, said his agency foresaw this thing coming but couldn't very well do anything about it.

ONCE IN 700 YEARS

"Our meteorologist told us a combination of weather conditions that would occur similarly only about once in every 700 years was partly responsible," he told the Star.

Chiefly responsible, apparently, was Cleveland's highly concentrated complex of refineries, steel mills, chemical plants, and other industrial enterprises.

Mr. Scott has a tough job that has become considerably tougher since it was held by Kenneth Kugel, who, Mr. Scott said, now heads Washington's smoke-abatement program.

"With a man like Ken Kugel at the head of your program, you'll never have any problem in Washington like we have in Cleveland," Mr. Scott said.

He conceded that Washington's lack of heavy industry might be a big help, too.

"I could have tripled the 40-man staff I have here now and still have a job to do," he said.

PROPOSALS PASSED

Winding up their sessions, delegates passed a series of resolutions hewing to the association's program favoring greater power for State and local government and decentralization of Federal powers.

Among proposals favored:

1. Amendment of State constitutions to limit the amount of real-estate taxes that can be levied by local and State governments.

2. Stricter State limitations upon those wanting to enter the real-estate business.

3. State and local liquidation of existing public housing properties.

4. Sale of Federal property to private ownership when it is not essential to the functions of Government.

5. A ban of Federal controls over wages, rents, prices, and conditions of work.

"Our Federal Government has become too highly centralized, has undertaken many activities not contemplated by our Constitution, and has invaded the rights and functions of State and local governments, as well as those of individuals," the association said.

"Government functions should be restored to a local level, thus relieving the Federal Government of all matters which can be properly carried forward by State and local governments."

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Printing and binding for Congress, when recommended to be done by the Committee on Printing of either House, shall be so recommended in a report containing an approximate estimate of the cost thereof, together with a statement from the Public Printer of estimated approximate cost of work previously ordered by Congress within the fiscal year (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 145, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on Printing, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized book dealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by book dealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Frank Brodie is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

PRICE OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

The Public Printer is authorized to furnish to subscribers the daily RECORD at $1.50 per month, payable in advance.

Remit by money order payable to Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. The money derived from such sales shall be paid into the Treasury and accounted for in his annual report to Congress, and no sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

Appendix

Commencement of Work on St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, November 18, 1954

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the Nation welcomes the initial steps which have been undertaken on both sides of the Canadian-United States border toward completion of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway project.

I have in my hand the text of two initial releases of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation describing some of the first decisions on this side of the border relative to the seaway construction.

I ask unanimous consent that the releases be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, and that they be followed by a fine address delivered by the Administrator of the Seaway Corporation, Mr. Lewis G. Castle, at Buffalo, N. Y.

I am deeply pleased in the fine start which has been made by the Corporation under the Wiley law, Public Law 358, of the 83d Congress.

There being no objection, the press release and address were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY
DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION,
INFORMATION DIVISION,
Novembe 3, 1954.

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY CONSTRUCTION TO BEGIN WITH EXCAVATION OF LONG SAULT CANAL

Administrator Lewis G. Castle, of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, announced today that the first steps have been taken to begin work on the seaway.

"When spring opens on the St. Lawrence, the first shoveful of earth to be taken from the project will be scooped out on the site of the new Long Sault Canal, just 4 miles northeast of Massena, N. Y.," Mr. Castle said.

The action taken today is the placing of advertisements for bids on the first contract to be awarded on the St. Lawrence seaway, which eventually will make it possible for larger oceangoing ships to ply the St. Lawrence and the Great Lakes.

The work consists of furnishing all plant, labor and materials and equipment and performing all work required for the construction of 10,000 linear feet of canal. The bottom elevation of the canal is to be above the official high watermark as recorded at Richards Landing gage in the vicinity of the work.

The contractor will be required to excavate approximately 3.9 million cubic yards of materials comprising glacial tills and clays. The glacial till is mostly sand and clay interspersed with boulders and stones. The clay varies in intensity from firm to soft. Foundation explorations indicate that bedrock is a considerable distance below final canal grade, and should not be encountered during excavation.

Advertisement for bids, the furnishing of drawings and specifications, the detailing of contract terms, and the award of the contract are services being performed by the Corps of Engineers, United States Army, under the supervision of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation.

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY
DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION,
DIVISION OF INFORMATION,
November 15, 1954.

Administrator Lewis G. Castle, of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, today announced the issuance of an order directing the United States Army Corps of Engineers to design all locks on the seaway in conformity with the minimum dimensions provided in Public Law 358.

Public Law 358 says that the Corporation is authorized and directed to construct in United States territory, deepwater navigation works with "locks at least 800 feet long, 80 feet wide, and 30 feet over the sills."

On September 2, 1954, Administrator Castle announced that the Corporation had designated the United States Corps of Engineers, under the Corporation's supervision, to prepare designs and specifications pursuant to section 8 of the Wiley Act permitting the Corporation's use of the services of other agencies of the Federal Government.

Accordingly, today's action directs the Corps of Engineers to design one proposed lock in the Point Rockway Canal opposite Iroquois, Ontario, and the proposed Grass River and Robinson Bay locks in the Long Sault Canal near Massena, N. Y., to be 800 feet long, 80 feet wide, and 30 feet over the sills.

These dimensions, besides conforming to the apparent intention of Congress, are in conformity with the dimensions of the locks on the Welland Canal, and of proposed locks on the Canadian portion of the seaway, between Montreal and Massena.

"Careful consideration also has been given to the various recommendations made that locks be constructed with larger dimensions. However, the Corporation is limited to the authorized expenditure of $105 million, and increasing the size of the locks places a doubt upon the possibility of our operating within our financial limitations," Mr. Castle pointed out.

It is estimated that approximately 75 percent of all prospective tonnage on the new seaway will be by lake carrier. Thus only 25 percent of the tonnage is subject to movement by seagoing ships, and the majority of general cargo seagoing ships will be able to ply the seaway when it is completed.

NORTHWEST PASSAGE RECLAIMED

(Address by Lewis G. Castle, Administrator, St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, Buffalo, N. Y., October 27, 1954)

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, four centuries ago, in 1534, when the intrepid French explorer, Jacques Cartier, first discovered the St. Lawrence, he thought he had found the famed Northwest Passage whereby French ships could sail westward to Cathay and the far Indies. As a matter of fact, Cartier thought he had reached China.

When the St. Lawrence seaway is opened in 1959, the 400-year-old dream will be more than realized—the Northwest Passage will be reclaimed. First, the St. Lawrence will open up a region of a richness far beyond the wildest fancies and hopes of profit of those early explorers; second, from that region one will, indeed, be able to sail away into the far-off isles of the south seas.

Therefore, the fact that Buffalo is situated midway between the mouth of the St. Lawrence River and the headwaters of the Great Lakes Basin certainly should develop in your hearts a great sense of comfort and confidence concerning the future stability of your community.

Within 10 years it is expected that the Federal, State, and Canadian Governments will spend substantial sums on navigation, power, and port and harbor facilities on the St. Lawrence and in the Great Lakes Basin.

It is expected that next month we shall be prepared to let our first contract, under competitive bidding, which will insure commencement at an early time of the initial navigation work on the St. Lawrence River. Ontario Hydroelectric Power Commission and the New York Power Authority have already commenced their projects.

I am sure that this audience will be pleased to know that we have decided to locate a branch office in Buffalo, staffed with engineers under the direction of Deputy Administrator Oettershagen to collaborate closely with the Office of the Corps of Engineers. We will also establish a second branch office in Massena, N. Y.

Our program of construction on the seaway contemplates completion of all navigation work in the fall of 1958. Thus, we should have shipping facilities beginning with the spring season of 1959.

This St. Lawrence seaway construction program is unique in that it requires the cooperation of four governmental units in developing navigation facilities and the generation of electrical power—Canada, the United States, Ontario, and New York State.

The New York State Power Authority in conjunction with Ontario Hydroelectric Power Commission will invest $600 million in the construction of control dams and powerhouses. The St. Lawrence Seaway Authority of Canada, together with the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation of the United States, will work harmoniously in dredging channels, and building locks over 182 miles from the end of Lake Ontario to Montreal. This gigantic construction job to be produced cooperatively is an example to the world of how two nations can work harmoniously together in a joint enterprise—two friendly nations separated only by a line on a map.

The nearly 4,000 miles of boundary between the United States and Canada is the longest unfortified international boundary in the world. The work on the seaway by the United States and Canada will be done in an atmosphere of understanding and confidence, and we are delighted with this prospect of working together with our friendly neighbors of the north.

Nothing has fired the imagination of the American people so emphatically as the prospects of the navigation project contemplated on the St. Lawrence River.

The opening of the St. Lawrence seaway to the ocean highways of the world will put America on the threshold of an unequaled expansion of the population and wealth.

After the Allegheny and the Blue Ridge Mountains were crossed by Daniel Boone and other pioneers, and after the east and west coasts were linked by rail, it was said that America's great West had been opened. The completion of the seaway will witness the real opening of all 3 million square miles of America from coast to coast and border to border, which is far from being wholly settled and developed. It is clearly obvious that the utilization of a new artery of water transportation which will extend more than 2,400 miles into the heartland of the United States can only develop tremendous benefits.

For the first time in nearly 100 years, the United States faces the challenge of a frontier, when the promise is fulfilled of cheap bulk transportation to its string of Great Lakes ports. The magnificent potential of that coastline is easily seen. It is farther from Duluth to the Atlantic Ocean than it is from Gibraltar to Port Said at the far end of the Mediterranean Sea. The total United States shoreline of the Great Lakes is nearly 600 miles longer than the combined general coastline of the east and west coasts.

When the seaway opens, both the United States citizens and Canadian citizens will begin the development of a new empire. Axes will ring in the forests with renewed vigor; the ore mines, metal mills, and factories will pour forth their products to develop new resources and industries. New villages and great cities will be founded, and older towns and cities will increase in size and importance.

In the building of the seaway, perhaps as many as half a million people will within 10 years migrate to its shores from other cities in America, and several hundred thousands of Canadians will make their living on the other side of the border in similar occupations.

Conservatively, the influx of workers in the Ogdensburg-Massena area may reach a peak of 100,000 individuals who will build the navigation and power facilities, and who will operate supporting construction, retail, and service industries. This figure does not include persons who will be employed in expanded local government activities, such as police and fire departments, and new schools and hospitals.

The increase in wealth and population following the fruition of this great endeavor is not to be confined to the Great Lakes States and their immediate neighboring provinces in Canada, but the benefits will extend into all the vast reaches of undeveloped and unpopulated country of both nations.

The flow of population that followed the original opening of the West, that made this country into the greatest world power, is to be duplicated within another 50 years. The frontier is to bolster America's greatness for many years into the future. The building of the seaway will spell benefits for every kind of human enterprise.

To speak of a more immediate problem, we have recently developed an economic study and in quoting from it I can state that on a very conservative estimate it is anticipated that in the first year of traffic operation there will pass through the St. Lawrence River channels and locks a total cargo tonnage of over 36 million tons. Projecting those figures further, we arrive in 1965 with an estimated increase in cargo tonnage to 52 million tons. This tonnage applied to a reasonable toll rate assures adequate revenue to retire this investment within a reasonable number of years. Tolls should be low enough to invite traffic, and high enough to retire the cost of this investment in Canada and the United States. I am confident that between the St. Lawrence Seaway Authority of Canada and our own Corporation, as we near the completion of this great project, we will arrive at a toll rate that will be satisfactory to all shipping interests.

There are many people who doubted the wisdom of the creation of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation which is now empowered to construct the navigation facilities on the St. Lawrence River. I do not discount the sincerity of those who questioned the wisdom of this vast enterprise, but I venture to say that within 10 years from now those doubting Thomases of yesterday will join with the optimistic believers of today, and will rejoice in the beneficial results that will accrue to the industrial life of our country. This project on the St. Lawrence River was just as inevitable as was the Suez or Panama Canals.

Sectionalism is a natural American political trait. Undoubtedly, the original United States ports looked with jaundiced eyes on other new seaports as they came into being, grew, and became commercially important. There were dire predictions made then, about how economic distress would settle on the older ports and drive them to ruin, but somehow the greatness of an expanding America dissipated those fears. Those bad things never happened, and for the same reasons the anxieties of established ports today will tomorrow likewise slip quietly into the meaningless past of useless worry.

As a result of the opening of the St. Lawrence seaway, the Iron Horse is not to follow the real horse into relative disuse as the live animal did upon the advent of the automobile. I have every confidence that the virile and powerful railroad industry of the United States will perform its vital functions to the same degree as it does today, and just as profitably, for hundreds of years after the St. Lawrence is opened to the Atlantic Ocean. This will not be the first time the Nation's railroad managements have met the competition of other forms of transportation and survived, and I am sure they will continue to do so, as long as there is a United States.

Let me say in conclusion that Buffalo is strategically located in connection with this project, and I know that we can count upon the citizens of this community to cooperate with us in arriving at a successful goal of construction and the greater goal of navigation achievements. The St. Lawrence River is a common boundary, and should be developed as a common responsibility by the two countries involved.

We look forward with great anticipation to this friendly association with the Canadian people, and I am confident that we will produce transportation to cities that will benefit all and harm none. I thank you for being a very attentive audience.

Middle East Oil

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN WELKER

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, November 18, 1954

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, while we are preoccupied with the censure of one of our Members, events of great importance, which concern us deeply, are taking place throughout the world. We might better be devoting our attention, for example, to what has been termed "a time bomb ticking away in the Middle East" which concerns the oil transportation agreement between Saudi Arabia and the shipping magnate, A. S. Onassis.

Mr. Onassis, together with a number of other individuals, is under indictment in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, on a charge of conspiracy to violate sections 371 and 1001 of title 18, the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946.

The Government of Peru this week seized certain vessels which belonged to Onassis. His operations are also a subject of concern to the State Department of the United States and of the British Government with respect to the contract he has signed with the King of Saudi Arabia.

The explosive possibilities of this arrangement have been set forth in Newsweek magazine, issue of November 15, 1954, and in an article appearing in the New York Journal of Commerce, November 12, 1954.

So that Senators may study the subject, I ask unanimous consent that the two articles be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Newsweek of November 15, 1954]

MIDDLE EASTS FABULOUS ONASSIS AND OIL

(A man and events: For months United States officials have kept their fingers crossed while a time bomb ticked away in the Middle East. This bomb was the oil transportation agreement between Saudi Arabia and the shipping magnate A. S. Onassis. Here is the story of the agreement—the explosive situation it created, how it seems likely to turn out, and the man behind it.)

As clear as the evening summons of the muezzin to Allah's faithful, sounds of trouble were heard last week throughout the Arab world, from the rough hills of Algeria to the narrow valley of the Jordan. The French were surprised by a sudden spread of terrorism from Tunisia to hitherto peaceful Algeria Jordon-Israeli relations took a quick and ominous turn for the worse.

But the most immediate and perhaps the gravest crisis concerned Saudi Arabia and the international oil industry. Up until now this crisis has not made headlines, although at one point American and British policymakers feared it might follow the course of the Iranian oil dispute. Now confidential advices from abroad indicate that King Saud has taken a hand and that a decisive and probably hopeful turning point may be reached shortly because of his efforts.

BAFFLING ARI

The central figure is a fabulous Greek—Aristotle Socrates Onassis, owner of a worldwide tanker empire, of a dominant share in Monte Carlo's chief enterprises, and of one of the world's most luxurious yachts. Onassis (Ari to his friends) is not the mysterious and ruthless character that newspapers and magazines portray. Nonetheless, the role he set for himself in the Arabian oil industry has produced baffling and as yet largely undisclosed intrigues.

The crisis began when an agreement was completed on January 20, 1954, between Saudi Arabia, represented by the Finance and Economics Minister, Sheik Abdullah el Sulaiman, and Onassis, represented by Shiek Mohammed Abdullah Ali Ridha. The chief terms:

1. The formation of a company called the Saudi Arabian Maritime Tanker Co., Ltd., with at least 500,000 tons of tankers.

2. Shipment of all Saudi oil exports in tankers of the company, except that first preference would go to tankers owned by companies with concessions in Saudi Arabia—but under severe restrictions.

3. The shipment of oil at a predetermined minimum rate.

The Onassis contract was immediately interpreted by the major oil companies as a worldwide threat to the industry. Aramco, which holds the concession for Saudi Arabian oil, bitterly opposed the arrangement as contrary to the terms of its own concession. Aramco officials claimed that under the contract Saudi Arabia would be obliged immediately to ship 50 percent of its oil in Onassis tankers, while other companies gradually would be cut out completely.

TRADE THROTTLE

In a speech in Los Angeles on September 29, B. Brewster Jennings, president of the Socony-Vacuum Oil Co., said: "The proposal has extraordinarily far-reaching dangers. It is completely contrary to the specific terms of the Aramco concession, but even that is perhaps less important than what it could do to world trade. Obviously, if a given country with an exportable commodity could require that all of that export be carried in its own ships, an importing country could with equal logic require that all its imports be carried in its own ships. Thus, if all countries were to follow the Onassis plan, there would be no international trade at all."

Onassis issued a counterblast on October 4. He charged that "since the end of the war country after country" has enacted "preferential and discriminatory legislation" in order to create its own merchant marine and that "the United States has gone far beyond any other nation." (Onassis is under indictment in the United States in connection with a shipping deal.) He defended his contract as an "inevitable" development and claimed that his transportation charges would be "somewhat lower" than those of the big shipping companies—which were now engaged in a "most unholy persecution of me."

By August affairs had reached a point where Aramco officials privately said they would abandon the concession if the Onassis contract was put into effect. There were reports that Onassis planned to force a decision by sending the largest tanker in the world to Saudi Arabia to load oil. This ship, the 47,000-ton Al Malik Saud al Awal (King Saud I), was constructed for Onassis in Hamburg. As of last week it had undergone trials but Onassis had not yet accepted delivery.

WEIGHTY THREAT

As things moved toward a showdown, weightier forces intervened, principally King Saud himself and the United States Government. The possibility of Saudi Arabia developing into another Iran represented a terrible threat to American policy in the Middle East. The United States is, therefore, through diplomatic channels, cooperating with the King in finding a solution to the problem.

Ibn Saud was regarded as perhaps the outstanding Arab leader of this era, and since his death the present King has emulated his father by carving a place for himself as one of the busiest and most important statesmen in the Middle East. He has focused his major attention on the problems of the region as a whole. The oil negotiations were handled by the King's functionaries. Now, however, Shiek Sulaiman, who negotiated the Onassis contract, has retired to live in Beirut, while Saud has informed United States Ambassador George Wadsworth that the agreement is being reexamined. If it conflicts with the Aramco concession, proper steps must be taken to eliminate such conflicts. There are some reports that the contract may be tested in a Saudi court or referred to the World Court. At any rate, Washington professes confidence in a satisfactory settlement now that the facts are coming before the king.

Onassis was reported last week in Jidda. On the way to Saudia Arabia in his yacht, the *Christina*, he stopped off in Beirut. A Newsweek correspondent reported from there that Onassis "hinted he had made some very big advances to various Saudi personalities in exchange for their cooperation in getting the deal through." The Paris paper, L'Aurore, recently reported the oil companies "now claim they have documents proving that Ari, to get the treaty, made financial gifts to various ministers." Other sources abroad, particularly in Rome, say the oil companies are still trying to obtain the documents.

AND WHO IS ONASSIS?

"Mr. Aristotle Socrates Onassis, of Greek birth and Argentine nationality, whose permanent residence is in Montevideo, and whose elected domicile is in Paris at 88 Rue Foche."

Thus the party of the second part describes himself in the text of the oil agreement with the Saudi Arabian Government. But this statement only begins to hint at the complex operations of the stocky, dapper 48-year-old cosmopolitan businessman. Onassis operates through some 30 corporations. His fleet of 100 ships includes a complete whaling flotilla and dry-cargo bottoms as well as 1,080,000 tons of tankers. He travels 100,000 miles a year on business. He speaks English, Spanish, French, Italian, and Turkish as well as Greek.

His homes ranges from a 4-story New York town house at 16 Sutton Square to the columned Chateau de la Croe, on 25 landscaped acres at the tip of Cap d'Antibes. From his Riviera residence, Onassis commutes by speedboat to his best-known office—the 3-story headquarters of the Olympic Maritime in the newly air-conditioned building of the old Winter Sporting Club at Monte Carlo.

RAGS TO RICHES

Onassis has made a number of fortunes during a spectacular career that began in the 1920's when he landed in Buenos Aires—16 years old, $60 to his name, and carrying a Nansen passport as a stateless person. The family—Greek tobacco merchants living in Smyrna (now Izmir)—had been ruined by the Greek-Turkish war. Onassis rapidly went from tobacco importing, to hides and grains, to shipping. By the outbreak of the Second World War, he was already in tankers on a successful but small scale. Onassis came out of the war worth a reputed $30 million.

The secret of his postwar success was his shrewd analysis of prospects in the world tanker business. First, he believed that, contrary to the predictions of most experts, world petroleum consumption would increase at a fast pace. Second, he knew that the big oil companies, while expanding their capital facilities, were chary of overextending themselves by building too many tankers. Third, he discovered that supertankers could cut costs considerably below prevailing rates and still make a profit. Banking on these three interlocking factors, Onassis plunged into a large-scale program of tanker construction. He found liberal financing in New York, particularly from one of the biggest banks and one of the largest insurance companies.

LAVISH BOSS

Onassis prefers to build most of his ships in West German yards, man them with largely German crews, and sail them usually under the flags of Panama, Honduras, Costa Rica, or Liberia. He thus avoids high construction costs and wage scales, and union regulations, but he boasts that he pays his seamen well above the going rates. The captain of his newest tanker in regular service, the 45,000-ton Tinna Onassis, is said to be the highest paid merchant seaman in the world, with the exception of the commodore of the Cunard Line.

The Onassis Monte Carlo headquarters has the unromantic, practical advantage of the fact that the tiny principality of Monaco levies no income taxes. Onassis' acquisition of the Société des Bains de Mer et Cercle des Etrangers, which runs the resort, is a revealing example of his methods. When the former directors of the company refused to rent him office space, he quietly—and under four assumed names—began to buy up stock until he had a controlling interest. Now he plans to follow up his investment by spending more money to restore Monte Carlo to popularity with such touches as smooth concrete paving on the pebbly beach, air conditioning in the casino, and helicopter service from Nice.

PARTY GIVER

Onassis conducts personal affairs on an equally grand scale. He regularly breaks in a new tanker with a series of spectacular parties on board. When he first brought the *Tinna Onassis* to Britain, he hired a fleet of limousines to transport his guests from London to Purfleet, halfway to the mouth of the Thames. Once he flew a group of New York businessmen to Peru, where a helicopter waited to shuttle them out to his whaling fleet for 2 weeks' fishing.

In December 1946, Onassis married Athina Livanos, the pretty dark-haired daughter of Stavros Livanos, the doyen of Greek shipping magnates. Educated at Rosemary Hall in Connecticut and Miss Hewitt's Classes, Mrs. Onassis, now 24, is a naturalized United States citizen. Their children, Alexander, 7, and Christina, 5, also are United States citizens.

Onassis spends much time on his 303-foot yacht *Christina*, converted from a Canadian destroyer escort at a cost of $2.5 million. Its appointments include a lapis lazuli fireplace, and a marble swimming pool with a bottom that rises to become a dance floor. For sport he skis, plays water polo, or water skis behind a seaplane. His choice of friends often astounds staid business acquaintances. For instance, in Hamburg, while he was having the *Al Malik* built at the Howaldt shipyard, his closest crony was a Greek piano player at the night club Die Insel.

Although he is now the owner of Monte Carlo, Onassis boasts that he has never gambled there. In general, his business risks are carefully considered. But now Onassis is deep in what many of his shipping associates consider a spectacular gamble. Of his 1,080,000 tons of tankers, 120,000 is comfortably tied up with United States companies until 1961. Another 330,000 is covered by a deal with Shell Tankers which expires in 1956. Few think this will be renewed. And he has an estimated $75 million outstanding in American loans. Thus the Saudi Arabian contract may be vital to Onassis.

[From the Journal of Commerce of November 12, 1954]

ONE MILLION DOLLAR MELON FOR SHIP DEAL—ONASSIS CONTRACT PAYMENTS BARED

(By Edward P. Tastrom)

Aristotle Socrates Onassis, Greek born shipping titan, who negotiated an oil transport treaty with the King of Saudi Arabia early this year, which has drawn world-wide protests, is reported to have paid approximately $1 million to Government officials through an intermediary to help close the deal, according to a deposition, sworn to by one of the negotiators before the acting British consul general on September 27 in Nice, France.

The deposition and exhibits, copies of which have come into the possession of the Journal of Commerce, claim these sums were distributed as follows:

1. One hundred and twenty-five thousand pounds ($350,000) to Mohamed Abdullah Alireza, now Minister of State, for bringing about signing of the contract.

2. One hundred thousand pounds ($280,000) paid to Alireza but intended for the Minister of Finance to exempt Onassis' shipping company from taxes.

3. Two hundred thousand dollars to be distributed to palace officials who were close to the King.

OTHER DETAILS

The deposition says that in addition, Alireza is to get £75,000 ($210,000) after the first ship loads her first cargo of oil under the contract, as well as other benefits.

The statement further declares that the payments were made by drafts drawn on a Zurich, Switzerland, bank.

The final transaction was reported closed April 7, 1954, 2 days before the treaty was signed by the King and made public.

The oil transport pact, which has been protested by the United States, United Kingdom and six other leading maritime nations, gives Mr. Onassis, in exchange for putting at least 500,000 tons of shipping under the Saudi Arabia flag, and other considerations, priority in the ocean movement of oil from the lush Middle East field.

The contract runs for 30 years and sets up an involved formula of existing tonnage replacement by Onassis ships, which has been interpreted to mean that eventually Mr. Onassis will handle the bulk of Saudi oil at rates which could be considerably above world tanker charter prices.

MAJOR PRODUCER

The major concessionnaire and developer of the rich field is Arabian American Oil Co. (Aramco). This is an American-financed producing company which does not engage directly in ocean transport of the oil but sells to buyers who provide their own tonnage.

The company has claimed that the Onassis deal violates the pact which it holds with the nation, negotiated nearly 20 years ago with Ibn Saud (deceased), father of the present King.

It was reported earlier this week that Mr. Onassis was in communication with the King and that a few alterations would be made in the contract to calm international fears. A spokesman for the shipowner added:-"There is no question of revising the entire agreement."

Other considerations, according to the deposition, to be given Alireza personally, once Onassis ships start moving the oil, are a royalty payment of sixpense per ton of oil moved, with a guaranteed minimum of £50,000 ($140,000) free and transferable sterling a year for duration of the pact, and sole agency for Onassis vessels in all Saudi Arabia ports at a fixed agency fee of £100 ($280) per vessel.

The covering letter provides that in case of Alireza's death before expiration of the treaty the sums will continue to be paid to his heirs.

At the time news of the treaty became known there were rumors that Mr. Onassis had posted a bond of $1 million to guarantee performance under the pact.

The deposition declares that Mr. Onassis insisted on no penalty clause for nonperformance be incorporated in his agreement. He is also reported to have informed the Minister of Finance not to inform Aramco of the pact until he (Onassis) had an opportunity to discuss it with the company directly. This strategy, it was reported, was based on the possibility of getting some concessions from Aramco in return for canceling the pact with the King.

A somewhat similar situation was disclosed in Saudi Arabia recently involving the German engineering firm, Govenco. King Saud held the company's 140 employees prisoners for 7 weeks.

All were subsequently released, except four who were held as hostages to secure a favorable windup of the company's contract.

The scandal led to the resignation of Abdullah Suleiman, who quit office for reasons of delicate health.

It is reported that the disclosure of payments to effect the oil transport deal have been placed before the King. Whether he will take action and force revision or cancellation of the contract is now a matter for speculation.

Address by Averell Harriman Before Metropolitan Area Committee of Ukrainian Congress Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, November 18, 1954

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, Prof. Lev E. Dobriansky, of Georgetown University, president of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, has brought to my special attention an excellent speech delivered on Sunday, September 19, by the Governor-elect of New York, Mr. Averell Harriman.

Mr. Harriman delivered this speech before the metropolitan area committee of the Ukrainian Congress Committee, which was presided over by Mr. Stephen J. Jarema, the present executive secretary of this outstanding organization.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Harriman's speech, together with a declaration which was unanimously adopted by the 3,000 individuals assembled at this meeting, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address and declaration were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY AVERELL HARRIMAN BEFORE THE METROPOLITAN AREA COMMITTEE OF THE UKRANIAN CONGRESS COMMITTEE, MANHATTAN CENTER, NEW YORK, N. Y., SEPTEMBER 19, 1954

I am happy to be with you today at this meeting of the Ukrainian Congress Committee. It is appropriate that your gathering is being held on Citizenship Day, when all of us—from whatever lands our fathers and grandfathers came—are pausing to give thought to our obligation as American citizens. Our greatest obligation, I believe, is to dedicate ourselves to the defense of freedom—with the determination to preserve freedom for ourselves and for all free men, and to help in the struggle to achieve freedom for the peoples who are now enslaved.

To me, freedom is the very essence of America. Everything that has gone into the building of our great Nation has contributed toward making the word "American" synonymous with freedom. Not just freedom from a foreign yoke, but freedom from tyrannical forces within. And not just freedom for those who live upon these shores, but freedom for all men. For it took all kinds of men to plant and bring to fruition the seed of freedom on American soil—the pilgrims who escaped religious persecution, the colonists who fought against economic and political injustice, and the countless millions from the Old World who poured into this new land seeking relief from oppression in many forms.

I am deeply sensitive to the sacrifices that immigrant groups like the Ukranians have made in establishing themselves in America. It is a land of opportunity, and we wish to keep it so. I am happy to see the great contribution made by these immigrants, and the increasingly important positions their children are taking in all walks of American life. And today it will take all kinds—men of all national origins and religious beliefs, of all races and creeds—to keep America free and to expand the frontiers of freedom over the globe.

This dominant tendency that runs throughout our history—the unflagging struggle of our people to be free and to remain free—runs also throughout the history of mankind in general. Since earliest times man has struggled to free himself from all forms of tyranny, and his struggle has known no geographical or political boundaries. Because there is this intimate connection between freedom in America and freedom in the world. Americans have always felt a special kinship for peoples whose will to be free and independent is unbroken, and have always extended a hand to help them. I am mindful, as I say these words, that few other peoples have fought as long and as stubbornly for freedom as the Ukrainian people.

Indeed, the entire history of the Ukrainian people—even as the history of the American people—is one long story of the struggle to be free. It is a struggle that goes back further than America's, to the beginning of the Middle Ages, when first the Russians and then the Mongols invaded Ukrainian territory and imposed their rule upon the Ukrainian people.

This year, 1954, marks the 300th anniversary of an historic event that we can well study now, because it set a pattern for much that has happened in our own time.

In 1654—300 years ago—the Ukrainian nation, sorely pressed for military assistance, turned for help to the Tsar of Moscow, who seems to have had much in common with the men who now rule in the Kremlin. A treaty was entered into at Pereyaslav for a military alliance. As the Ukrainians understood it, the treaty provided only for a military alliance against a common enemy, and contained no threat to the independence or sovereignty of the Ukraine.

The real intention of Moscow, however, was of an opposite nature. There the treaty was interpreted as an act of submission, rather than as an alliance among equals. Russian garrisons, which were permitted in the Ukraine under the guise of military allies, became the instruments and focal points for enforcing upon the people the protection of the "big brother" in Moscow.

The guaranty of sovereignty of the Ukraine in respect to religious beliefs and national freedom and independence were violated by Moscow in the execution of Ukrainian leaders, the arrest and execution of scholars, the liquidation of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church, and the ultimate assimilation of the Ukraine as a part of Great Russia.

Many other independent nations, in eastern Europe and in Asia, have since disappeared into the embrace of the "big brother," under strikingly similar circumstances.

In 1917 and 1918 a free and independent Ukraine was reestablished, but regrettably its life was short indeed. The Ukraine once again, and again by the sword, became a part of the Russian empire—a new empire based on Godless communism, and ruled by the materialistic concept that the state is all and the individual is nothing.

Just as in 1654, the nations where the Kremlin's military power was established after World War II were relentlessly gathered under the Kremlin's protection—among them Poland, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, and Lithuania.

Today these oppressed people behind the Iron Curtain are denied the right to worship God in their own way, and are deprived of freedom of speech, freedom of the press, and the enjoyment of human rights.

In the Ukraine live 42 million people, 91 percent of them non-Russian. They represent 20 percent of the total population of the U. S. S. R. and are the largest non-Russian nation within the Soviet Union. A great many of these 42 million Ukrainians speak their own language in everyday affairs—a language that has been molded by such great national poets as Taras Shevchenko.

There is also in the Ukraine a fine literature, art, and music. I well remember the beautiful songs of the Ukraine which I heard when I was there, and I also remember the friendly spirit of the Ukrainian people.

While I was the United States Ambassador to Moscow I went to Poltava when we established American Air Force bases for use in the shuttle bombing of Germany. The Ukrainian people became so friendly with our Air Forces that the iron hand of the MKVD clamped down and sought to prevent this natural friendship.

I must confess my concern over recent events. When I returned from Moscow in 1945, I warned of the dangers we would face from Kremlin aggression and subversion. But since then our Nation has taken bold initiative in building situations of strength to meet that danger.

With our aid, Greece suppressed the Communist revolt. Turkey was assisted against the threat of armed aggression. Increased strength and confidence grew from the operation of the Marshall plan, the Berlin airlift, the North Atlantic Alliance, and the unified NATO buildup in Europe. Our position was further strengthened by the Pacific pacts, and by our stopping and throwing back Communist aggression in Korea, with the support of the United Nations. The point 4 program gave new hope for life and freedom to the people of underdeveloped areas of the world plagued by hunger and misery.

Two years ago the free nations were becoming more and more united in spirit, purpose, and action. Morale in the west was high. Confidence in our leadership was growing.

The Kremlin was showing concern, which was accentuated by Stalin's death. There were growing difficulties behind the Iron Curtain, as we vividly saw in the uprisings in East Germany.

Unhappily, we now see that much of the unity and strength of purpose that had been built up so painstakingly has slipped away. We have lost ground in the past 2 years.

It is a sobering truth, but one that we cannot avoid, that the foundation of free world security—unity of spirit, purpose, and action with our allies—no longer seems as firm and unshakeable as it did two short years ago. Yet the maintenance of that unity is the most crucial task of our foreign policy.

It is not my purpose today to try to apportion the blame. The policies of our own State Department and other high officials have been confusing and uncertain. In too many cases bold statements have been followed by weak retreats. We have held rigidly to publicly announced policies long after it became apparent that flexibility was required to reach adequate solutions with our allies. The way in which our highest officials talked about a military new look and massive retaliation frightened our friends, but not our enemies. Furthermore, some of the brash words that were spoken gave Soviet propaganda the opportunity which it has skillfully exploited—to picture us falsely as hydrogen-bomb warmongers.

We cannot any longer afford a foreign policy that is based on wishful thinking and conducted with advertising slogans. We must be done with boast, bluster, and bluff—with diplomacy by press conferences.

I welcomed President Eisenhower's recent statement when he said: "To follow the path of isolation would surrender most of the free world to Communist despotism and ultimately forfeit our own security. Deliberately to choose the road to war would suddenly place in jeopardy the civilization which we are determined to preserve."

We all certainly agree in the President's further statement that we need genuine bipartisanship in our foreign affairs. We can hope that he will take steps to this end similar to the course that President Truman followed when he worked so closely with the late Republican Senator Vandenberg, with consultation in advance. Thereby Senator Vandenberg and his Republican colleagues helped to formulate our programs and we then had what Vandenberg liked to call an "un-partisan foreign policy."

Behind that approach to foreign policy we can weld the unity in this country that is essential to our safety. We can unite without partisanship on realistic policies based on the recognition that security for the United States lies in our own strength and in the strength and unity of our friends and allies.

I repeat what I have said many times before, that I have never thought that another world war is inevitable. International affairs are now conducted in the new and awful frame of hydrogen bombs. Given the inevitability of retaliation, there can clearly be no winners, and the men in the Kremlin are coldly calculating men, not madmen. In my opinion, the threat of mutually destructive nuclear warfare injects a degree—and it is cold comfort—a minor degree of stability into the situation, providing, of course, we continue to build our nuclear power and develop continuously the means of delivery and maintain necessary world-wide bases. Our enemies know strength when they see it.

And so I believe that we can avoid the disasters of another world war and at the same time advance the cause of freedom. If we have the wisdom and leadership to use properly our great power and moral force, I am convinced that with growing strength and unity of the free nations, pressures—which we know already exist—will increase behind the Iron Curtain. It will be increasingly difficult for the Kremlin to keep the people within the Russian Empire and the people of the satellite nations in subjugation. We must, for our part, be alert to take advantage of every opportunity to undermine the Kremlin and strengthen the forces of freedom.

I believe that the clear guide for American policy was laid down a generation ago by a great American President, whose name is revered by peoples the world over, Woodrow Wilson.

Let me remind you of his words: "We believe these fundamental things:

"First, that every people have a right to choose the sovereignty under which they shall live; second, that the small states of the world have a right to enjoy the same respect for their sovereignty and for their territorial integrity that great and powerful nations expect and insist upon."

Woodrow Wilson also conceived the League of Nations, but unfortunately the United States did not live up to his sound idealism. If we had, and if we had actively participated in the League of Nations, World War II might well never have occurred.

The United States is still called to give leadership in the world for the cause of freedom, and the challenge is even greater in 1954 than it was a generation ago in Wilson's day.

To meet that challenge of leadership of the great alliance of free men will require wisdom, courage, adherence to moral principles, sensitivity to the psychology and aspirations of others, flexibility and the willingness to compose differences.

These are high qualities, but they are not too high for us Americans to achieve—we who have brought together in one land the traditions of religious faith, courage, and love of freedom from every part of the globe.

With that heritage, with God's help, we will come through these troubled times into a better day for all mankind.

Declaration of Ukrainian Americans in New York City and Environs on the Pereyaslav Treaty and the 300-Year Struggle of the Ukrainian People Against Moscow Imperialism and the Enslavement of Ukraine

Red Moscow continuing the imperialistic aggrandizing policies of the czars in the seizure of other lands and the enslavement and exploitation of other peoples has called for a large-scale celebration of the 300th anniversary of the Pereyaslav Treaty. It has used this occasion as a propaganda weapon by presenting the treaty in a false light, maintaining that 300 years ago the Ukrainian people cemented an indissolvable tie with Russia and forever united with the Muscovite people in a single Russian state. The treaty, according to the Kremlin, symbolizes the eternal friendship of the two slavic peoples and is of great importance to the Ukrainians, who, supposedly, through the help of the Muscovites, avoided national catastrophe, realized enormous accomplishments during the czarist era, and are now reaching their highest development in the Soviet Union.

The Ukrainian people, enslaved but indestructable, are not able to express what they know to be historical truth while they remain under the Bolshevik yoke. Therefore, we Ukrainian Americans, some having come to the free land of George Washington many decades ago, others having been born in this country of Ukrainian parents, and still others having arrived here only recently, before the Almighty Creator who created all peoples and gave them the right to live free lives in their own lands, and before the entire freedom-loving world hereby declare:

1. It is not true that the Ukrainian people united with the Muscovite people in one Russian state through the Pereyaslav Treaty, and in so doing forefeited their independence and statehood, because (a) the Pereyaslav Treaty was nothing more than a military defense pact concluded between the independent Ukrainian nation and the Moscow czar as equals, which was to provide for reciprocal military aid. The Moscow Czar specifically obliged himself, in return for a large monetary compensation to aid Ukraine in its war with its western enemy, Poland, with which the Ukrainians had been fighting for many years to liberate western Ukrainian territories; (b) the Pereyaslav Treaty in no way affected the sovereignty of the Ukrainian state, and least of all provided for its liquidation. The Ukrainian people after the conclusion of the treaty remained the sovereign people they had been. Ukraine, after the treaty, remained separate from Russia and continued to be a free and independent nation with its own ruler—a Hetman—its own government, courts, army, financial system, and its own foreign policy, and finally its own separate religious and cultural life. Ukraine and Muscovy continued to abide within their own national borders.

2. The truth is that Moscow did not honor the Pereyaslav Treaty. Through deception and force she broke the treaty to the detriment of the Ukrainian people and brought them under enslavement.

Moscow falsified the official and authentic text of the treaty. Contrary to this pact, Moscow proceeded to bring about the incorporation of Ukraine into Russia, and to make it an ordinary province of the Russian state. In accordance with the points of the treaty, the Muscovite army moved into Ukraine ostensibly to help the Ukranians gain key positions in the war with Poland. In open contradistinction to the pact Moscow in 1656 made an agreement with Poland in Vilna, in 1667 in Anrusov, and in 1668 made final the so-called "eternal peace." Finally after a series of other breaches in the 17th century, the 18th century saw Czarina Catherine II in 1764 negating the final agreement of 1654. She forced the Hetman of Ukraine, Kyrillo Rozumovsky to resign from the hetmancy, and brought about the final incorporation of Ukraine into Russia.

3. It is also true that the Ukrainian people never agreed and will never agree to any kind of common life with the Muscovites in the framework of a single state, regardless of whether this would be a czarist state, the

present Soviet Union, or an imperialistic Russia set up according to the plans of the imperialists of Muscovy or the Muscovite emigration, because such a union with a so-called older Muscovite brother is nothing more, as the ages have witnessed, than an exploitation of Ukraine by Moscow which will compel the Ukrainians to live in their own rich land like beggars and paupers. Such a union would mean complete suppression of Ukraine with all its material and cultural treasures. It would mean only prisons, hangmen, deportations, executions, murders, and mass extermination of the Ukrainian people.

The 300th anniversary of the Pereyaslav Treaty is also the 300th anniversary of the unceasing opposition and struggle of the Ukrainian people against Moscow. Several years after the conclusion of the treaty armed conflict sprang up between Ukraine and Moscow. The 17th and 18th centuries were the scene of constant armed opposition to Moscow and its attempts to enslave Ukraine. After the struggles of Hetman Ivan Vyhovsky, successor to the great hetman, Bohdan Khmelnytsky who defeated the Muscovite army in 1659, after the military offensive in the time of Peter Doroshenko in which Muscovite garrisons were ruined in 1666, and after the Ukrainian-Muscovite war during the rule of Hetman Ivan Mazeppa, the struggle with Moscow continued in armed or other forms until the moment when, after World War I, Ukraine renewed its independence and statehood. And when once again after long attempts during 1917–20 Moscow was able to destroy the reborn Ukrainian state and to incorporate Ukraine into the Soviet Union, the struggle was resumed. And it will not cease. Today, the Ukrainian people carry on open warfare with Muscovite Bolshevik tyranny—the enemy of all mankind. It carries on its opposition under the leadership of the famous, heroic Ukranian Insurgent Army.

Just as once White Moscow was not able to break the spirit of the Ukrainian people, so today, Red Moscow will not succeed. The Ukrainian people will continue their struggle against Moscow until their will is realized in a free community of nations, in a united, free, and independent Ukrainian nation from the Carpathians to the Caucasus.

So help us God.

The Room for Prayer and Meditation in the Capitol

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, November 18, 1954

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, in the 82d and 83d Congresses I associated myself with the Honorable Brooks Hays, Representative from the State of Arkansas, in introducing and pressing for passage the bill creating a room for prayer and meditation in the Capitol for the exclusive use of Members of the House and the Senate.

Representative Hays did an outstanding job in securing the passage of the bill in the House, and assisted materially in having it passed in the Senate as well.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the Record an excellent article, published in the Arkansas Democrat of November 7, setting forth the purposes and the reasons behind the creation of the room of prayer and meditation in our Capitol.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Church and State: Separate but Related

(By Margaret Frick)

"*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring)*, That the Architect of the Capitol is hereby authorized and directed to make available a room with facilities for prayer and meditation for the use of Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives. The Architect shall maintain the prayer room for individual use rather than assemblies and he shall provide appropriate symbols of religious unity and freedom of worship."—House Concurrent Resolution 60.

This resolution, setting aside a place for moments of personal prayer by Members of Congress, grew from a thoughtful question addressed by a man to his friend as they left a meeting where the relationship of religion to the processes of government had been discussed.

"Don't you think it would be a good thing for us to have a place at the Capitol where we might meditate and pray, where the mood of prayer could be encouraged?" This was the question Senator A. S. Mike Monroney, Democrat, of Oklahoma, put to Representative Brooks Hays, Democrat, of Arkansas. That was January 18, 1952.

"The next day," Mr. Hays related to fellow Members of the House in a July 17, 1953, session, "these short, simple resolutions (one in the House and another in the Senate) were introduced." The proposed legislation died on the calendar, however, and under the law had to be reintroduced at the beginning of the 83d Congress and called up later for action.

The bill, or more properly, House Concurrent Resolution 60, was sent through appropriate committees into both Houses. The Senate unanimously approved it May 4, 1954, but it was August before the final approval was received in the House. Meanwhile, supporters were not idle. Proper channels were followed to assure its financial support from contingent funds of Congress' current appropriations. In addition, a special committee was named by House Speaker Joseph W. Martin, Republican, of Massachusetts. It went into action securing space for the project and resolving the fears of the room's privacy being invaded by the public and the press, and of offending some faiths by using symbols. As if to prove the nonpartisan objectives embodied in the Members' project, Speaker Martin, in naming Mr. Hays chairman of the special committee, commented that Mr. Hays was the only Democratic chairman of a Republican commitee. (It is customary for the chairmanship of any congressional committee to go to a ranking member of the party in power.)

The committee is composed of Mrs. Katharine St. George, Republican, of New York; Karl M. LeCompte, Republican, of Iowa, and Mr. Hays.

In reintroducing the measure last year, Mr. LeCompte stressed its value in these words: "Mr. Speaker, I think this is a very important action. This is an historic moment * * * I believe that the people of America want every Member of this House to approach his duties in a serious frame of mind and have the opportunity * * * for silent mediation."

Fellow Congressmen must have agreed with the Iowa Representative, for the project went forward. In fact, its dedication is to be a part of the opening-day ceremonies when the 84th Congress convenes. Mr. Hays said short ceremonies were being planned now with the chaplains and congressional officers.

Some of the progress in developing the project was described in August by Mr. Hays for his colleagues. "The Congress of the United States had never done anything like this before," he began.

"But I want to confess to my colleagues that after it was done I was amazed at the complex problems that arose in connection with the establishment of the room for our personal use. I found on examination that it involved a keener understanding of our pattern of government and the relation of religion to politics. The two are indeed related."

The Arkansan then told of a British statesman who was to address an audience but was told to speak of anything except politics and religion. The Britisher later reported: "Finding that I was not permitted to speak on the two subjects of most importance to mankind, I promptly left the meeting."

"I believe people might be surprised," continued Mr. Hays, "at the number of times men in these seats have prayed silently for themselves. I know that I have been inspired on occasions by an intimate opening of the mind of a colleague in reverently insisting that prayer is needed.

"At first, one member expressed reluctance about the room. 'We are taught in personal petitions,' he said, 'to seek a secret place.' If that were taken literally, there would be no prayer in formal church services. It should not be taken literally, but, in effect, it (the prayer room) is a secret place. Privacy will be afforded. It is not a prominent room.

"This resolution does not authorize the use of the chapel for religious assemblies. It is exclusively for individual prayer and meditation," the Congressman stated, adding: "And I certainly would not assume that all the praying we do will be done in the prayer room of the Capitol any more than all our eating would be done in the Capitol Building.

"Still, just as we make provision for food, we should provide a place of retreat as an encouragement to prayer, particularly in this period in which it is sorely needed.

"I would have preferred, Mr. Speaker, that the sponsorship might have been anonymous, that the approval of a prayer room might come as a spontaneous action of the House. I am not an expert on prayer, and there are scores of Members who are just as interested in this proposal as I have been. * * * Many other Members have maintained a constant interest in it."

In still another discussion of the project before fellow Members, Mr. Hays told of his personal need for such a retreat. "I expect to use this room to pray for forgiveness when I irritate my colleagues, and I know there are occasions when I do."

Shortly after the announcement that room P–65, on the same floor level as the House and Senate Chambers, had been made available, a description of the furnishing was given.

The central feature of the small room will be a stained-glass window in subdued colors. It will be a gift from California's 21st district. According to the Republican Representative there, Edgar W. Hiestand, the skilled workmen who are preparing the window in off-duty hours asked permission to donate their labor.

The window will contain the only symbolism of the room, other than the Nation's flag and a large Bible, which will represent this country's freedom of worship. There are to be three scenes in the window. The top one will depict a candle, symbolizing light; the center scene will have a scroll, representing the Sermon on the Mount, and the lower panel will picture an open book, symbolizing the book of the law.

Before the window will be a table, holding the Bible and a vase of flowers. In front of the table will be an ecclesiastical kneeling bench. Chairs are to be grouped facing the stained-glass window, with extra chairs lining the wall.

A screen at the entranceway will serve to eliminate distractions of coming and going in the corridor for the members in meditation. The room, measuring about 300 square feet, is to be decorated simply in subdued blues and grays.

The space, formerly used as the Republican whip room and more recently assigned to the Speaker of the House, is located about 50 feet west of the Capitol's rotunda on the principal floor of the center building.

Widely known for his active interest in the Baptist Church, Mr. Hays takes pride in keeping church activities outside the political realm.

"Not that I lack conviction," he hastened to add. "We are just as interested in what the prophet says to the politician as we are in what the politician says to the prophet. But for centuries, beginning with Nathan's pointing his finger of condemnation at King David, the right of moralists to question their rulers has been safeguarded by society. * * * I fear there is some superficiality in our utterances about the highly complex, but highly important, problem of faith in its political experiences."

The Congressman has taught the Brooks Hays Bible class at the Second Baptist Church in Little Rock for the past 30 years, whenever he was in Little Rock. A nationally known Christian leader, Mr. Hays appeared this summer on a television network show from New York that was sandwiched among speaking engagements in several major eastern cities before industrial and religious organizations.

Mr. Hays, Arkansas, Fifth District Representative, likes to tell of the adventures of his maternal grandfather who served sparsely settled Paris and Logan Counties as a combination country doctor and ordained minister.

"He would take care of their bodies on weekdays and look after their souls on Sundays," said the proud grandson.

One of 38 House Members with 6 consecutive terms in office, Mr. Hays began his congressional career January 3, 1943, after winning the November 3, 1942, election.

In discussing the resolution, Mr. Hays said: "We are devoted to the American doctrine of separation of church and state, whatever our religious affiliation. And this distinctive doctrine does not conflict with the idea that politics and religion may be combined in the life of a man or woman, for if we are lacking in spiritual resources we will not do our work well."

He revealed that he regarded religion as a personal matter "and I never discuss it without the fear of intrusion." However, he explained that the founders of the Government recognized the fact that "our governmental foundations are essentially spiritual."

The author of Resolution 60 stated that there was ample precedent for his proposal. "In the early days of the Republic, services were held in the Capitol Building because churches were not available. In the early part of our history there was little fear that constitutional principles would be violated in the recognition of religion."

He explained that in the Constitutional Convention, Benjamin Franklin, in the midst of a difficult debate, had stood when feelings were ruffled and had suggested that the delegates pray.

The Arkansan then quoted Franklin's words: "I have lived, sir, a long time, and the longer I live, the more convincing proofs I see of this truth—that God governs in the affairs of men. * * * And if a sparrow cannot fall to the ground without His notice, is it probable that an empire can rise without His aid?"

A Democratic Representative from New York, Abraham J. Multer, called the prayer room "one of the finest things that this Congress has done." He continued: "The results * * * will be a lasting monument, not only to this Congress but to this Government, * * * which has ever been in the forefront of the fight for human liberties."

Representative Richard H. Poff, Republican, of Virginia, said: "The sanctuary * * * will not be * * * a large assembly hall through which demagogs and hypocrits can parade their religion; rather, it will be a small, simple, sanctified retreat * * * to which the elected representatives of the people, in the discharge of their sometimes awesome and bewildering responsibilities, may repair for meditation and prayer."

Representative Eugene J. McCarthy, Democrat, of Minnesota, pointed out that this is not the first time Congress has given emphasis to the importance of religion, and he mentioned several daily reminders of "things of the spirit." Every session of both the House and Senate is opened with a prayer. The motto on the coins of the United States is a public affirmation of religious truth.

"Religion and morality have long been recognized as good and necessary in themselves," Mr. McCarthy stated, "but also as essential to the working of a democratic political system."

Government's "special and open concern" in its citizens' religious life is demonstrated in several manners. Religious publications are given special consideration under postal-rate laws and regulations. Chaplains and chapels are provided for men and women in the armed services.

He summed up the attitude of Congressmen with his hope that the prayer room "will serve not only to symbolize the diversity within unity that characterizes the United States but that it will serve also as an instrument for the advancement of understanding, of tolerance, and of truth."

Policies of the Secretary of Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. THYE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, November 18, 1954

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, in the Minneapolis Star of Monday, November 15, there appeared a letter to the editor written by Mr. H. D. Smalley, of Perham, Minn., which I believe to be of great interest, and for that reason I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the letter to the editor was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Minneapolis Star of November 15, 1954]

LETTER TO THE EDITOR

BENSON'S POLICIES LOST NINTH DISTRICT FOR GOP

(Editor's Note.—The writer of the following letter is editor and publisher of the Perham (Minn.) Enterprise-Bulletin.)

To the Editor: I have just read, with considerable disturbance, the article (November 8) by Roscoe Drummond entitled "The Real Winner: Ezra Benson." I have in the past accepted Drummond's pronouncements as studied and reasonable explanations of the fact, probably because he is a topnotcher, and I had no firsthand information to contradict what he said.

Now I discover that he is not fully in possession of the facts, or someone really sold him a bill of goods. (The Republicans lost only one Congressman—ironically, one of the Republicans who voted against the Benson policies, Representative Harold C. Hagen, of Minnesota.)

If Drummond will take a look at the voting he will discover that Harold Hagen ran well ahead of the Republican ticket in the Ninth Congressional District, despite a tremendous door-to-door campaign by Mrs. Knutson. Hagen blamed his defeat and Mrs. Coya Knutson claimed her victory on the basis of Ezra Benson's policies.

I believe both are right. The ninth district farmers, who depend to a large degree on the price of eggs and poultry for their margin of profit, were scuttled by the Benson policy of supporting feed grains and refusing to support the price of products produced by farmers who fed the feed. These farmers voted Democratic.

In Iowa, corn loans held up farm income, which with good pork prices led to a Republican victory. In Kansas, the wheat price made for a Republican victory in a normally Republican State. They voted for what they had now. So did the ninth district.

What I am afraid of is, with your newspaper and Roscoe Drummond "whistling past the graveyard," that by 1956 at least Iowans will have realized and Kansans will begin to see that they are next—and go the way of the Ninth District.

I am disturbed because I am what many would call a hidebound Republican who has served as precinct chairman and as a member of the Otter Tail County committee.

I see both some good sense and lack of humanity in Benson's program. I see nothing to be gained by beclouding the obvious and glossing over the lesson of the ninth district as did Drummond.

When the farmers in this county—half of whose income is from poultry and eggs, according to the United States Department of Agriculture—pay 36 cents for a day-old chick, feed it all spring, summer, and part of the fall, and have to sell that pullet for 22 cents to 25 cents for the whole bird, they are not going to vote for Ezra Taft Benson. They didn't, and the only reason that Hagen came pretty close to winning was that he wasn't for Benson.

I am no full parity boy by any stretch of the imagination. I admit I do not know all the answers, although I do have a farm program of my own. All I am telling you is that if you think that Benson didn't lose the Ninth District for the Republicans, you and Drummond are both nuts.

H. D. Smalley, Jr.

Perham, Minn.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized book dealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by book dealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

Appendix

Addresses by Earl Warren, Chief Justice of the United States, and William C. Walsh, Former Attorney General of Maryland, at Dedication of New Monument to Former Chief Justice Taney

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. GLENN BEALL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, November 29, 1954

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, on October 24, 1954, Maryland honored one of its most distinguished and illustrious sons, Roger Brooke Taney. The Honorable Earl Warren, Chief Justice of the United States, spoke at the dedication of a new monument to the former Chief Justice Taney, and the Honorable William C. Walsh, former attorney general of Maryland, delivered the introduction. The ceremonies were sponsored by the Chief Justice Taney General Assembly, Fourth Degree Knights of Columbus, of Cumberland, and were held at the grave of the late Chief Justice in Frederick.

Participating in the ceremonies were Father John U. Lyness, faithful friar, Taney Assembly; Sir Knight J. Donald Murray, faithful navigator, Taney Assembly; Sir Knight Charles B. Humelsine, master fourth degree, Maryland District; Sir Knight John P. Bauernschub, State deputy of the Knights of Columbus, Maryland; Sir Knight William J. Mulligan, supreme master fourth degree, Knights of Columbus, Hartford, Conn.; Hon. Morris A. Soper, judge, United States Court of Appeals; Hon. Theodore R. McKeldin, Governor of Maryland; Hon. Frederick W. Brune, chief judge, Maryland Court of Appeals; Hon. John A. Derr, mayor of Frederick; and the Honorable Sir Knight Herbert R. O'Connor, former United States Senator.

At the cemetery Father James M. Hogan, pastor of St. John's Church, blessed the new monument; and wreaths were placed by Sir Knight J. Donald Murray, faithful navigator, representing the Chief Justice Taney Assembly, and Governor McKeldin.

Mr. President, I request unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the addresses by the Honorable William C. Walsh, and the Honorable Earl Warren, Chief Justice of the United States.

There being no objection, the addresses were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF WILLIAM C. WALSH

Reverend fathers, distinguished guests, members of the fourth degree Knights of Columbus, ladies and gentlemen, 90 years ago, the mortal remains of Roger Brooke Taney, fifth Chief Justice of the United States, were laid to rest beside his mother in this cemetery where we stand today. In 1914, just half a century later, an assembly of the fourth degree Knights of Columbus was organized in Cumberland, Md., and took the name of Chief Justice Taney General Assembly in memory of that great Chief Justice.

Several years ago, Mr. Frank A. Wolfhope, of Cumberland, a former faithful navigator of the assembly, and one of the outstanding Knights of Columbus in Maryland, learned that the Taney lot needed care. He called this matter to the attention of the assembly, a committee with former Faithful Navigator Arthur F. Young, of Cumberland, as chairman, was appointed, and, after consultation with the Frederick Knights of Columbus, the Cumberland assembly just a year ago had the present curbing placed around the lot and planted new shrubbery.

It was also decided to erect a new monument on the grave, and under the leadership of Sir Knight Arthur F. Young and his committee, and with the aid of the present Faithful Navigator J. Donald Murray, and the fourth-degree Knights of Columbus throughout Maryland, Chief Justice Taney General Assembly of Cumberland provided the monument which is now to be dedicated.

As Knights of Columbus, as Marylanders, and as American citizens, we deem it a great honor that this dedication is to be made by the present Chief Justice of the United States. In a way, the event symbolizes the history of our country. Chief Justice Taney was born on a tobacco farm in Calvert County, Md., shortly after the start of the Revolution, when America consisted of 13 colonies strung along the Atlantic seaboard. One hundred and seventy-seven years later, the present Chief Justice of our Nation of 48 States, a son of the great State of California on the Pacific coast, is here to commemorate the achievements of his illustrious predecessor. The entire growth and development of the United States since the War for Independence lies between the two events, and the coming here of one Chief Justice from the Far West to pay honor to a departed Chief Justice of different political faith from the East is evidence of America's basic unity, and a happy omen of her continued strength and progress.

We are delighted to have the Chief Justice with us, and it is a great personal pleasure and privilege for me to present to you Hon. Earl Warren, Chief Justice of the United States.

ADDRESS OF EARL WARREN, CHIEF JUSTICE OF THE UNITED STATES

Through your gracious invitation, it has become my privilege to join you in this pilgrimage to historic Frederick. This community has a secure place in American annals. It was here that Francis Scott Key spent his youth and early manhood. It was here that Barbara Fritchie—immortalized by Whittier's poem—dramatized her devotion to the cause of national unity. And, above all, it was here that Roger Brooke Taney—son of a Calvert County tobacco planter—laid the foundation of one of the most distinguished careers in the Nation's history.

His life began a year after the Declaration of Independence; his life ended a few months before Appromattox. During that span of 87 years, this Nation was founded; a Constitution was established and its central doctrines were expounded; 13 colonies grew to a Union of 36 States, and that Union was nearly torn asunder. In 1796, at the age of 19, Tanney began his study of law in the office of Judge Jeremiah T. Chase in Annapolis. Three years later he was admitted to the bar and was elected to the Maryland Legislature from Calvert County. In 1801—the year that John Marshall assumed his duties as Chief Justice—Taney commenced the practice of law here in Frederick. He came at the urging of Francis Scott Key, a dear friend and fellow attorney, and later married Key's sister Anne. Success in the law came to him quickly, and he was soon recognized as a leader of the Maryland bar. For 22 years, here in Frederick, he pursued the law diligently and set the stage for his future greatness.

While Marshall was expounding the Constitution through his enduring decisions, Taney appeared before the bar expounding his legal philosophy and his vision for the Union. It was here that he attained his maturity and stature in the law, and when he moved to Baltimore in 1823, he was ready for the high offices he was destined to hold and for the tempestuous times through which he was to play such a dynamic part for more than 40 years. First as attorney general of Maryland, and then as Attorney General of the United States in the Cabinet of President Andrew Jackson, he became one of the great lawyers of his time. More or less by political fate, he later became Secretary of the Treasury, but because of his role in the violent controversy stimulated by Jackson's attack on the United States Bank, his appointment to the Treasury was never confirmed by the Senate. A similar fate awaited his appointment in 1935 as Associate Justice of the Supreme Court. These were indeed turbulent times. But Jackson persisted and, only 9 months later, sent his name to the Senate as successor to John Marshall. This time, after a bitter struggle, confirmation was obtained. On March 28, 1836, Taney appeared before the United States district court in Baltimore and in the presence of the distinguished Maryland bar took the oath of office as the fifth Chief Justice of the United States. He commenced his judicial duties 10 days later on the circuit by presiding over the United States circuit court in Baltimore. Thus began a judicial career that was to last 28 years—a tenure as Chief Justice exceeded only by Marshall. During this turbulent period—roughly coterminous with the era from Jackson to Lincoln—he was to give the oath of office to seven Presidents, lead the Supreme Court through the most critical period of the Nation's history, and serve as an able successor to Marshall as an expounder of the Constitution.

We meet today to honor his memory and to express in this monument our enduring admiration for him. It is fitting that we should do this. His services to State and Nation, his exemplary Christian life—these alone would provide ample justification. But there is yet an additional reason. In a manner of speaking, today's tribute helps redress an old wrong—helps erase the calumny which Taney's enemies had hurled at him during his lifetime and which superficial historians preserved as gospel truth for a time after his death. Few men in American life—and surely no Justice of the Supreme Court—have been so grossly misrepresented as Taney. Until recent years, he was all too frequently characterized as the doctrinal enemy of his predecessor Marshall, as the exponent of narrow provincial interests, as a stalwart defender of the institution of slavery. But, by and large, with the passing of time, and the cooling of passions, that characterization has been discredited and the true Taney has emerged. We know him today as a needed balance to Marshall's conservative nationalism; as one who personally detested slavery but who detested even more the prospect of violent disunion. We know him today as a great Chief Justice.

Taney's differences with Marshall have been strongly emphasized; their similarities have been largely ignored. Each had been a Federalist, a leader of the bar of his State, and a Cabinet member prior to appointment as Chief Justice. And, although Taney had left the declining Federalist Party to support Andrew Jackson, it is reported that Marshall favored the nomination of Taney as Associate Justice. Marshall's approval of Taney was not misplaced, for their actually was no sharp break in constitutional interpretation between the opinions of the Court in the Marshall era and those after 1835. One reason, to be sure, was that there remained on the Court men, like Justices Story and McLean, who shared Marshall's strongly nationalistic views. But, in any event, there is little evidence to suggest that Taney ever desired any wholesale reversal of Marshall's doctrines. It is true that Taney differed with Marshall's interpretation of the commerce clause. To Marshall, the clause itself—granting to Congress the power to regulate interstate commerce—deprived the States of such power. To Taney, States could be deprived of this power only by appropriate legislation by Congress and then only if the State action was in irreconcilable conflict with the Federal legislation. But, it should be noted, Taney did not dispute the supremacy of the national Government in the field of commerce; he merely insisted that Congress must make its will explicit if State action is to be invalidated under the commerce clause. Similarly, in dealing with the impairment of contract clause, he did not dispute the immunity of State-granted corporate charters from retroactive State legislation; he merely insisted that, in the public interest, such charters should be strictly construed.

These views undoubtedly reflected Taney's deep concern over undue infringement of the power of the States to enact legislation necessary to the welfare of their citizens. Because of this concern, Taney is rightly regarded as a vigorous champion of so-called State police powers. To Taney, as he declared in one of his most famous opinions:

"The object and end of all government is to promote the happiness and prosperity of the community by which it is established; and it can never be assumed that the Government intended to diminish its power of accomplishing the end for which it was created."

This statement bears a striking similarity to Marshall's famous dictum:

"Let the end be legitimate, let it be within the scope of the Constitution, and all means which are appropriate, which are plainly adapted to that end, which are not prohibited, but consist with the letter and spirit of the Constitution, are constitutional."

Both men thus rejected the thesis that government is at best a necessary evil. They disagreed with each other only as to the proper apportionment of governmental powers in our Federal system between the National Government and the State governments. And on many issues of Federal versus State power there was not even this difference of opinion—for example, as to the exclusive power of the National Government in conducting foreign relations. Indeed, with respect to the admiralty jurisdiction of the Federal courts, the positions of the two men were reversed; in this field Taney conceded greater power to the National Government than Marshall was ever willing to claim. These apparent inconsistencies are understandable only in terms of Taney's philosophy of the Supreme Court's function. Unlike Marshall, who viewed the Court as primarily an organ of the National Government, Taney conceived of the Court as an independent agency outside of and above both the National Government and the States. In a notable opinion proclaiming the unqualified power of the National Government to enforce its laws without State interference, Taney declared:

"This judicial power was justly regarded as indispensable, not merely to maintain the supremacy of the laws of the United States but also to guard the States from any encroachment upon their reserved rights by the General Government. * * * So long * * * as this Constitution shall endure, this tribunal must exist with it, deciding in the peaceful forms of judicial proceeding the angry and irritating controversies between sovereignties, which in other countries have been determined by the arbitrament of force."

Throughout his long judicial career, Taney earnestly sought to steer this middle course. In his view, the Court's function was to serve as arbiter—subject, of course—to constitutional limitations—between the competing interests within our Federal system. In large measure, that continues to be the Court's function a century later.

A necessary corollary of Taney's judicial philosophy was the principle of judicial self-restraint. In opinion after opinion, he reiterated his belief that the Court should not intrude itself into political controversies, that the Court was not concerned with questions of motive but only with questions of power, that other branches of the Government should be permitted the maximum degree of freedom consistent with the express commands of the Constitution, that hence judges should stick closely to the constitutional text. With but one tragic exception, his decisions accurately reflected this philosophy, and today the motives of that exception are not questioned. That instance, as we all know, occurred when he was 80 years old, and the avalanche of criticism that descended upon him obscured for many years his other constructive work on the Court. With the courage that was characteric of him, he philosophized:

"At my time of life when my end must be near I should have enjoyed to find that the irritating strifes of this world were over, and that I was about to depart in peace with all men and all men in peace with me. Yet perhaps it is best as it is. The mind is less apt to feel the torpor of age when it is thus forced into action by public duties."

And well he might long to "find that the irritating strifes of this world were over," for no man in our public life has ever suffered so many years of bad health and without complaint. From his youth, he was ill most of the time, and at no time during his long life was he expected to live more than a very few years. Only his indomitable courage, his devotion to family and nation, and his faith in God sustained him.

Seven years later, when he was 87 years of age, still serving his country, "the irritating strifes of this world were over" at last for Roger Brooke Taney. On the morning of Columbus Day, 90 years ago this month, he perceived that the end was near and asked to receive the last rites of his faith. That evening, according to his eldest daughter, "he suddenly raised his head, all trace of suffering gone, his eyes bright and clear, said 'Lord Jesus receive my spirit,' and never spoke again." After a quiet ceremony in Washington, a special train carried his body to Frederick, where in St. John's Catholic Church—a church that Taney himself had helped build—requiem services were held. And here he rests today—free finally of the controversy he had known throughout his stormy career—surrounded at last by the peace which had so long eluded him.

Like some other great men, the passions of the age in which he lived eclipsed his greatness for many years, but even at the time of his passing there were those who recognized his true worth and who did not hesitate to express their belief. Three days after his death, on October 15, 1864, at a meeting of the Boston bar, former Associate Justice B. R. Curtis of the Supreme Court, who had not always seen eye to eye with him, concluded a beautiful tribute to the departed Chief Justice in these words:

"It is one of the favors which the providence of God has bestowed on our once happy country, that for the period of 63 years this great office has been filled by only two persons, each of whom has retained to extreme old age his great and useful qualities and powers. The stability, uniformity, and completeness of our national jurisprudence are in no small degree attributable to this fact. The last of them has now gone. God grant that there may be found a successor true to the Constitution, able to expound, and willing to apply it to the portentous questions which the passions of men have made."

Ninety years later Americans in all parts of the Nation think of him in these same terms, and I am happy to join with you today in honoring his memory.

The Communists and Their Collaborators

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN WELKER

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, November 29, 1954

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record a very profound address delivered by the distinguished Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], chairman of the Subcommittee on Internal Security of the Committee on the Judiciary. This address was delivered by him before the Sons of the American Revolution at Cincinnati, Ohio, on the 15th of October 1954. I commend it to the reading of my colleagues.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

THE COMMUNISTS AND THEIR COLLABORATORS

It is a pleasure for me to come here to Cincinnati as the guest of the Sons of the American Revolution to meet so many devoted patriots from the heartland of our country. It is an honor for me to be asked to speak to you, who are yourselves leaders in the conflict with the Communist forces seeking to destroy our country.

You are well informed on the facts of Communist penetration. You know the substance of congressional reports on communism. I will not attempt to tell you what you already know. You want me to tell you what you do not know: What can we do to halt, and then hurl back, the Communist invasion of our country and end the nightmare which keeps the world in fear?

In a recent hearing in Washington on the strategy and tactics of communism Mr. Louis Budenz told our subcommittee that the Communist conspiracy is stronger than ever in the United States. He says only what you and other good fighters in the cause have been saying. The realization is widespread that the power of the Communists over American life is increasing, and increasing at a frightening pace.

Why is the power of the Communist conspiracy growing? What can we do to stop it?

You want to know how it is possible that a dentist in the United States Army is promoted, and suddenly given an honorable discharge, when he refuses to tell of his Communists connections to a Senate committee, while an American officer who spent long, cruel months in a Chinese prison camp, watching American soldiers starving and dying in a Manchurian cave, is given a dishonorable discharge.

You want to know how it is possible that a Senator from a sovereign State of the Union, following the mandate of his constituents to tear communism out by the roots is recommended for censure by a committee of the Senate while men who follow the same policy as the Communists are praised by the press.

But let us get one thing straight. Senator McCarthy is not hunting down dentists. He is hunting for men high in our Army who protected a Communist officer in American uniform. The most destructive of all wars may be unleashed at any moment. But what good are our most heroic efforts to protect our country if the enemy is working secretly within our Defense Establishment? Even one traitor in authority over our military forces presents a mortal danger. We cannot take one useful step to safeguard America from Communists in Europe or Asia unless we can find and remove every Communist agent and every Communist collaborator from every position of trust within our gates.

I am not interested in the wringing of hands. You can get a thousand speakers to view with alarm. It is too late for that.

Let us pass over the dramatics, the oratory, the appeal to emotions. They are a luxury Americans cannot afford today. A group of medical doctors called together in conference to meet a mysterious invasion of bubonic plague would not spend their time telling each other horror stories about wicked germs. Military officers called together to meet invasion by secret legions of the enemy, dressed like travelers but trained to plant atomic bombs, would not spend a precious minute denouncing the nation which reverts to such horrors.

You are not the audience at a movie show on communism. You are the trained and experienced officers of the American resistance. You and I must meet the Communist threat. You and I must meet it today and not tomorrow. You and I must help our fellow citizens to meet it.

IF WE DO NOT WAKE UP WE MAY LIVE TO SEE THE SOVIET CONQUEST OF OUR COUNTRY

I say to you, my friends, that unless we quickly see the present shape of the Communist invasion, unless we quickly work out the right counterattack, then—and I say this most solemnly—you and I will live to see the Soviet conquest of the United States. We will live to see thousands of young Americans carried off to Communist prison camps here on American soil, tortured by brainwashing experts as barbarous as any our men faced in Manchurian prison camps. We shall see old men and women left to starve. We shall see the hard core of true American leadership in politics, in government, in the press, in the churches, led out to die with a bandage on their eyes, while hysterical mobs of frightened men and women are herded together by bayonets to watch the spectacle.

I said you and I will live to see it. Communist conquest is not something planned for 50 years from now. We are the leaders who will be shot or clubbed to death. Our parents are the people who will be left to starve. Our sons are the youth who will march to prison camps on our sacred soil, brainwashed till they are servile slaves of Red slave drivers, or their corpses are heaped in caves and shallow dugouts.

I say to you that we must avoid emotion, and then I paint a picture of an America debased by hordes of Red Chinese under Soviet Russian masters. Is that fair? Yes, my friends. It is fair, because our first step is to accept the shocking fact that we have no time.

We cannot fight communism tomorrow. There is only today. Do we in this country have our minds focused on what the Communist general staff is doing today? Do we know precisely who are the real Communists, who are the true anti-Communists, and which pretended anti-Communists are really the most powerful supporters of Soviet power? Are we ready today to win the war the Communist general staff is waging against us today?

I say to you, my friends, we are not ready. We are, like Lot's wife, looking over our shoulders to what is gone. We are falling into the classical military error of going all-out to win the last war, the war that is not there any more. We are dreamily gazing at old pictures of an earlier war with communism. We are reading stories of old battles, shaking our fists at old outrages, while we have no time.

Dwelling on the past is a luxury of peacetime. In war, you live in the present or die. and we are at war. The Communist high command is waging war on us today by new and subtle tools of destruction. Once gunpowder was a new kind of war. Once airplanes were a new kind of war. Once poison gas was a new kind of war. Today, political destruction is a new kind of war. The aim of war is destruction of the vital power of the enemy. The aim of Communist political subversion and psychological manipulation is to destroy the vital powers of their most hated enemy, the United States.

The Communists are at war with us. We are not at war with them.

The Communist strategists are improving the techniques of political war as brilliantly as we improved our military techniques in World War II. We have made no improvements in our political counterattack.

Once again I must be superficially inconsistent. In order to clarify the present, I must turn back to the past—but only for a lessen in strategy, not for an emotional binge.

IN 1933 CONGRESS TOOK THE LEAD IN EXPOSING COMMUNISM

Martin Dies, Representative from Texas, appeared recently before the Senate Rules Committee, of which I am also chairman, and told us something of the early years of the House Un-American Activities Committee.

Dies and his committee began their investigations of Communist penetration about 1938. An earlier congressional committee, headed by Hamilton Fish, had seen the danger and tried to meet it. Many individual Members of Congress fought stanchly to warn our people. United States Attorney General Mitchell Palmer and our Secretaries of State, in the twenties, kept up a continuous attack on the Communist conspiracy.

We have been fighting communism in this country for 34 years. What is wrong with our methods?

American resistance to Soviet invasion, which had been so effective in the twenties, received a bad setback in 1933, when President Roosevelt yielded to a carefully plotted campaign for recognition of the Soviet Union. Congress had to take the lead in opposing the Communist sweep.

Through research and sworn testimony, the House Committee on Un-American Propaganda, gave the American people an up-to-the-moment picture of Communist operations on American soil. It defined the modus operandi of the conspiracy, just as the police would define the modus operandi of a gang of crooks.

The committee described to the American people the new political weapons, like the Communist fronts, the fellow-travelers, and the transmission belts. They showed how a small body of expert political saboteurs, whom we call card-carrying Communists, multipled their influence a thousandfold by manufacturing fronts, such as the American League against War and Fascism, later the American League for Peace and Democracy. By means of the fronts, a handful of trained Communist agents could surround themselves with a ring of fellow-travelers, then a larger ring of innocent but talkative dupes, and a still larger mass of members attracted by the well-known names the Communists had collected. A little inner circle steered the whole organization, on direct orders from Moscow.

That is how a handful of Communists in the thirties came to exert an amazing influence on our Government, on Congress, on the press, on our schools and colleges, on labor and industry, finance, and public housing.

Congress, through its investigating committees, had served as the Military Intelligence, the G2, of the American people in their war against an enemy which had honey-combed our national life with organizations obeying, with military precision, every order from the Soviet high command.

Gone was the old cliche of a Communist as a black-bearded foreigner in New York, dressed in torn, smelly clothes, with a bomb hidden in his pants pockets. That childish notion was replaced by working drawings of the real Communist invasion.

The Communists were still a minor power in American life in 1940. The anti-Communists, led by the investigating committees of Congress, were a major power in American life. Why then did we fail?

IN WARTIME THE COMMUNISTS REGAINED THE UPPER HAND

Superficially, the answer is the war. Actually, the war was a cover a smoke screen, which the Communists cleverly used to build up their real power while their control of propaganda kept the American people from blocking what was going on.

The war years, from 1940 to today, are a political blank, so far as Americans are concerned. We put all our physical and mental efforts into fighting, producing the weapons, and carrying the world on our back. We thought we had no time to safeguard America from the danger within. A few courageous anti-Communists fought on, but no one heard them through the din.

Under cover of the dramatic Hitler-Stalin Pact, the defense program, Pearl Harbor and its aftermath, the Communists stepped up their war against us.

It was so easy. How did they do it?

In wartime, the number of Federal Government employees increased from under a million to 3,500,000. Government spending increased from $9 billions to $99 billions. This was their dish. The vast, new, shapeless, undirected Executive power, thrown together by the New Deal, increased 10 times in size, a thousandfold in power. Directives from a Commander in Chief replaced the orderly restraints of law. Secrecy was in order. The American people, deprived of all honest information, were fed a diet of lies. Everything the Communists could have asked for was theirs without asking. Do you blame them for taking over?

While we were flexing our muscles at the enemy, wasting our energies in the demand for unconditional surrender, the Communists were capturing the commanding heights of our political, economic, and industrial life. Fronts were now small stuff, useful but not of first importance. Like the tentacles of a giant octopus, the Communist fifth columns wound themselves about normal American life, slowly crushing it.

I cannot in a few minutes give you the unwritten history of the war decade, the betrayal of America from within, while our youth were fighting and dying to destroy the two enemies the Kremlin feared most. A few high points tell the story.

The Communists made every effort to take over the political parties.

Underneath the drama of the war, the Communists worked every waking hour to force Congress toward the left. They used three methods. They defeated or smeared the patriotic who fought the Communist time-table for our destruction. They nominated and publicly acclaimed the venal, who were willing to go along with the Communist plot, for a handful of votes. They brainwashed the middle-of-the-roaders, the timid, who did not like to be touched by anything controversial.

Once Congress had been softened up, it was easy for the Communists to intimidate employees of the Federal Government. They put into executive agencies, Communist and pro-Communist lawyers, economists, press agents, and obliging so-called scholars. This is why Harold Glasser and Nathan Gregory Silvermaster and Irving Kaplan moved up. This is why Alger Hiss and Harry D. White were lifted to high places by levers manipulated far from Washington. This is why Lauchlin Currie could be made into a China expert and sent to advise Chiang Kai-shek.

The identical process was at work in the press, publishing, magazines, radio, theater, television, and the movies.

It was this constant erosion of the pro-Americans in Congress and the executive agencies, and in communications, and their replacement by soft-headed pro-Communists, stupid dupes, or greedy powerseekers, which explain the loss of China, the stripping of Korean defenses, the surrender of Poland, East Germany, Hungary, the Balkans, and later Czechoslovakia, the withering away of our magnificent Military Establishment, the waste of our wealth in international boondoggling, and the prevailing mood of enervation, hopelessness, almost despair.

Here we are back in 1954. Ahead is 1955—perhaps the year of decision.

What must we do?

The Communists alone could never have silenced congressional committees. They could never have peopled our Government agencies with Communists, pro-Communists, and dupes. They could never have exercised the dominant influence in shaping American war policies, postwar foreign policy, postwar military policy, and postwar domestic policy.

The Communists had allies.

THE COMMUNIST GANGSTERS BUY PROTECTION

When criminals and gangsters start a new kind of racket, they are outlaws, beyond the pale, working against society, like wolves outside a walled settlement. Then comes a second stage where, if they have succeeded, they have money enough to buy respectability. They try to buy the political parties, the police, the press, businessmen, unions, banks. Some people can always be bought. With each success their power grows at geometric rates, because they are a conspiracy, all working together from a single point of control.

Communism in the United States today has bought its way into respectability. It has protection. It has a covering of well-known public men in respectable institutions, who would never have been rebels or revolutionists or agitators or gangsters, but who have been persuaded to cooperate with the Communists for filthy gain—for votes, for office, for war orders, for publicity, or from fear of reprisal.

You would be deeply shocked if I were to tell you the name of one man, in a position of great responsibility in our national life, who was talking with a friend of his, a Member of Congress. The friend had been a New Dealer, and then reverted to being an old-fashioned Democrat. This prominent man said to his friend, "Don't you know socialism is here to stay? Why don't you get on the gravy train, and ride it for all its worth?" They use "socialism" as a pretty name for communism.

I have not been able to substantiate this story and many others like it, by formal legal proof. But the reports come to me from most reliable sources. Remember this, however, conspirators, attempting to get secret control of our political parties, do not make affidavits of their intentions, or call in witnesses to their deals. This is war, and time is everything. In war, you get the best evidence you can get of the enemy's movements, to avoid costly mistakes, but you must use whatever evidence you can get in time, or the foe has won.

Political, economic, financial, educational institutions are all under secret attack at this moment. We must have a counter-strategy—now.

THE MYSTERY OF THE FOUNDATIONS

Let us take the case of the foundations, which have held an honored place in American higher education and welfare.

Louis Budenz testified before the Cox committee that the Communist leaders in the early thirties set out to divert the funds of the foundations to Communist writers and research workers, for use in Communist conspiratorial work, and that they had succeeded. Then the work of the Cox committee came suddenly to an end.

This year Congressman REECE, of Tennessee, undertook another investigation. Suddenly that began to slow down.

Who wants to prevent congressional investigation of those foundations which finance political revolutions against us? Foundations whose work is clearly educational will gain in public confidence. Who could be afraid but those who have dallied with the Communists.

Everything you can imagine was done to slow down the Reece investigation. Minority Leader SAM RAYBURN appointed two bitter opponents of the investigation to represent the Democratic Party. Why? Congressman HAYS of Ohio kept up a running attack on witnesses who brought in evidence that some foundations might be propagandizing for collectivism. According to Chairman REECE, HAYS alone interrupted witnesses 246 times in 3 hours.

If you watch, over the next few months, you will see a carefully distributed outcropping of articles in our magazines subtly belittling the cultural barbarians who want an investigation of these tax-dodging propagandists. Who are the masterminds of this smear campaign? Why?

To accept this shocking picture, we must remember one thing. Soviet communism is not a party and not an ideology. It is not a left-wing political movement. It is an army, trained and drilled and officered by Moscow.

Every member of the Communist apparatus in the United States, every supporter, every dupe, and every collaborator, is part of the Soviet military apparatus operating within our borders, parallel with our own Government, and working to destroy it.

Every bit of support the Communists can muster—from party members and dupes and collaborators—they use, as an army uses a bridgehead for new advances. Today their gains are not measured by front organizations of Communist manufacture. They are measured by penetration to the top of every tried and true American institution. With every gain, resistance becomes more costly for those who hold out.

This is where we have missed out. While we were looking for the card-carrying Communists, that is, the gangsters and their stupid henchmen, we missed the fact that the Communists had brought protection from the rich and the powerful—for value received.

I say to you that the Communists could never have won the power they now wield over our country if it were not for the collaborators, the respectable men and women in our executive agencies, in Congress, in the parties, in business and labor and communications who were willing to go along with the Communists because it paid them well.

I say to you the gravediggers of America are the trusted leaders in high position who do not believe in communism but who want to protect their vested interests more than they want to save their country.

I say they are helping to set up on American soil a military power ruled by the same men in the Kremlin who ruled the prison camps in Manchuria.

I say they are traitors. What do you say?

You see now why our anti-Communist efforts seem so fruitless. You see why we make no progress with help to free China, free Korea, or the subject people of Europe. You see why Congress cannot learn the truth about who in our Defense Department protected Peress.

Does that mean we are lost? Yes—if we do not wake up. No—if we learn to fight today's political war with today's political weapons. Politically, we are fighting Soviet hydrogen bombs with antiquated machine guns. Perhaps we are still exhausted, drugged with propaganda, shell-shocked from the wars. Whatever the reason, it is time to wake up.

I believe our only need is to wake up. If the American people will put their innate courage and intelligence to the task of driving out the collaborators with communism, we can be rid of communism itself in short order.

THE HEART OF AMERICA IS SOUND

The heart of America is sound, whatever corruption may be found at the top.

Recently, I have been holding hearings in Washington on the activities of one John Powell, son of a famous American editor in Shanghai, a Japanese war prisoner. Every time young Powell was asked about his Communist connections, he invoked the fifth amendment. We had sworn testimony and visual proof of how he had perverted his father's time-honored Shanghai English language paper to help the Red Chinese.

We had as witnesses, several American fighting men who had been POW's in Red Chinese prisons. They told us how each issue of Powell's China Review was given to them, together with the Daily Worker and Masses and Mainstream. Imagine American soldiers were compelled to read this traitor's magazine and repeat to their monitor what was in it, or they would get no food or medicine. One young widow told us how her husband died as a result of the punishment.

If your faith in America has ever wavered, I say to you—go talk to our returned prisoners of war, who spent, some of them, nearly 3 years under Red tormentors. Listen to the young corporal, Page Thomas Baylor, who was put in the hole time and again, without food or water. When he came out of the hole he knew his mind was giving way. He cut his nails down to the quick, and scraped them in the sand as hard as he could. He scraped and scraped, and the pain slowly brought him back to the outside world. When doubt creeps up on you, think of this young Negro corporal far from home and family, scraping his raw and bleeding fingers in the sand, so the pain would keep him from slipping into madness.

There was a young Air Force officer from my own State of Indiana, Capt. Waldron Berry. He became morale officer for his unit. Think of it—a young man of 25 carrying the burden of upholding prisoners in Red Chinese hands. He told us how the Americans, to keep up their spirits, planned a "crazy week," when they had bridge games without any cards, a basketball game without any ball.

Another time they found a dead mouse in the road and someone said, "Here's more proof of germ warfare." So they took the mouse, made a uniform for it, and even shoulder patches, and put it up in a tree. The Chinese guards were agog. They sent for a Chinese surgeon. He came in white gown, boots, and gauze mask. He took a pair of chop sticks, and a paper bag, deposited the mouse in his bag, and carried it back to the laboratory to examine it for deadly American germs.

Another American told his captors that he was the last of the Mohicans, and if the Communist jailors did not treat him right, he was going to report them for genocide.

Have no fear.

The heart of America is sound. Only the overprivileged are corrupted.

WE MUST IDENTIFY THE COLLABORATORS AT THE TOP

We must stop the Communist conspiracy where it is strongest—at the top. We must have a description of the modus operandi of the Communists today as clear and precise as the description we had of the fronts and transmission belts which were their mainstay in the thirties. Only Congress can give it.

In the thirties, when we needed precise definitions, we used "card-carrying Communists," as a mark of those under Soviet discipline. But that tag is now obstructing us. Louis Budenz said he had not seen over a half dozen party cards in his life.

We must learn the means of identifying those who collaborate with Moscow, whether they are party members or not. We must follow the search wherever it may lead.

We must trace every single step in the methods by which Communists intimidate the weak and bribe the greedy. We must uncover every method by which they abuse American political power, police power, and public opinion.

We need as full and accurate a list of collaborators in high places as we have in appendix IX of the people who lent their names to Communist fronts.

We must insist that not a single Communist agent or Communist collaborator is left in a position of trust anywhere in the United States. We must pin the scarlet letter T on every man who sold his soul and betrayed his country to save his skin.

You know, as I do, that this task cannot be left to your Government alone. The FBI and the Department of Justice have to work with legal evidence. That is the American way. They can catch spies and saboteurs. They cannot deal with a corporation president or a magazine publisher or a politician who has made a deal with the Communists in a smoke-filled room.

This task cannot be left wholly to your Congress, even though they are the military intelligence division in your war on treason.

You need a committee on internal security in every State legislature in the Union. Have you ever wondered why we have so few? Have you wondered why New York State has no such committee? The New York State Legislature twice did excellent work. Why was it stopped? Why has the California committee had such a stormy career? Why did the Illinois committee come to a sudden end?

We also need a committee on internal security in every private organization in the country. I for one will never help to extend the power of the Federal Government over our great self-governing institutions—the colleges, the churches, the free enterprises, the unions serving our workingmen. I want our self-governing institutions to clean their own houses in their own way.

We know that as soon as such committees are set up, the Communists will seek to penetrate them, or build up a propaganda to discredit them. But we shall never win unless we are as smart as they are.

Every American is a sentinel on guard. Every crossroad of American life is a battleground where we must take our stand and say, "They shall not pass."

You will say, we do not want to spend all our time hunting subversives and distrusting each other. But I say, there is no need to do so.

Here we come to the hope and the vision.

WE MUST DEMOLISH BIG GOVERNMENT

I told you the Communists made their great gains in our Government in the thirties. They found easy money, loose organization, personal government, confusion, and greed. Without the New Deal they could never have made their first entry.

In the war climate, from 1940 to today, they found more easy money, even looser organization, more personal government, confusion, and greed. Without the Fair Deal they could never have penetrated our private agencies. But don't be misled. They will penetrate the Republican administration as they did the Democrats, to the same degree, if we let them keep the same easy money and loose organization to feed on.

One essential step in fighting communism is to dismantle that wholly un-American big government which they like best. Every time we cut taxes, tighten up statute law, reduce the area of government by directives, limit executive treatymaking, or strengthen States' rights, we are cutting off the feeding grounds on which the Communists have grown so great.

Why have so many businessmen, lawyers, editors, bowed their necks to the Communist yoke? Because they live by Government handouts, because the Government controls their orders, their costs, their overhead, their taxes, their means of communication.

Our task is a pincers movement against communism, an American Inchon. One arm of the pincers will be the system of many nets, manned by wise and patriotic Americans, to detect and catch the Communists and their collaborators at the inner heart of our Nation. The other arm of the pincers will be the steps by which we rebuild our country according to the grand design of our Founding Fathers. We must learn again to carry our own burdens and demolish the governmental pyramids from which Communists extend their regimentation of our people.

Let me return to our starting point. The danger is clear. But we have no time. The enemy is silently pressing deeper into our vitals. Every day the collaborators are gaining in power over the patriots. When the men of Moscow are sure, they will strike—in Formosa, in Korea, or over the Arctic Circle.

We have no time.

FREEDOM IS WORTH WHAT IT COSTS

You and I believe there is something special about America. I will not describe it because I cannot.

You know the story from the Latin, "What is freedom worth? Go ask the slave who has lost it. He knows freedom is worth all it costs, even life itself."

The prisoners of war who testified before us knew what America meant. Perhaps they, too, could not explain. But you saw it in their faces. Far from America, in the hands of cruel tormentors, with none of the material comforts foreigners think we value most, they possessed the idea of America. It kept them alive.

What is America worth? What would it mean to you if the beauty of America, the meaning of America, were to be wiped from the earth? If America were today a conquered nation, with Red Chinese slave drivers forcing our people to work, and Red jailers, under Soviet masters, were torturing our fighting men and clubbing our leaders to death, what price would you pay to win back our country's freedom?

Give only half what you would give, or a quarter of it, or a tenth of it, but give it every day, no matter what the temptation to forget.

If each of us will give a tithe of his time and strength and resources to safeguard America today, we can look forward to the happy hour when the black cloud of Communist barbarity will be lifted from the earth and America will shine forth again before the world as the symbol of liberty in a world where all men can be free.

The Vested Interest in Error

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRY M. GOLDWATER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, November 29, 1954

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "The Vested Interest in Error," delivered by our colleague, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] before the National Exchange Club at Louisville, Ky., on September 30, 1954.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE VESTED INTEREST IN ERROR

About a year ago, our Subcommittee on Internal Security published the now famous report on interlocking subversion in Government departments. This report showed how Communist conspirators had gained entrance to Government, how they rose in Government, what they did in Government. It showed how they were protected and promoted even after their treasonable activities had been revealed to the chief officials of the administration in office.

The report was a devastating document. For a while, it silenced the strident voices of those who keep assuring us that they, too, are against Communists, but they do not like the methods of congressional committees.

Then, last November, Attorney General Brownell selected a piece out of the pattern sketched by our report, and made a speech, bringing out more information. He told how President Truman had appointed the late Harry White as America's representative on the International Monetary Fund, although the information that Harry White was a Communist spy had been delivered personally to Mr. Truman and his top advisers.

Bedlam broke loose. Left-wing columnists and commentators bared their fangs. Mr. Truman issued a denial, and then a denial of his denial, and then a denial of his denial of his denial.

What happened then? Our subcommittee went right on doing its duty, as it has always done under both Democratic and Republican chairmen. And what did we find?

We found that there had not been just one FBI report on the Communist underground activities of Harry White. There had been seven.

There had not been just one report on the Communist underground activities of William Ludwig Ullmann. There had been eight.

There had not been just one report on Victor Perlo, Frank Coe, Harold Glasser, Solomon Adler, Irving Kaplan, and Nathan Gregory Silvermaster. There had been 10 on Perlo, 13 on Coe, 18 on Glasser, 21 on Adler, 24 on Kaplan, and 28 on Silvermaster. These reports did not rest upon the unsubstantiated story of a single informant. They assembled information from over 30 sources. They were checked and supported by documents, and by actual, physical surveillance carried on year after year by agents of the FBI.

Now, here is something to think about. There is no parallel for this shocking story—thank God—in the whole history of the United States. Yet, the American people would never have learned one word of the truth if it had not been brought to them by a congressional investigating committee.

Why, then, did the fight against congressional committees redouble in fury after the people had been told the truth that had been hidden so long? Do you really believe it was because the leaders of this fight against us object only to the methods of congressional investigations? Or do you think that they fear the results?

That well-known Democratic statesman, Mr. Bernard M. Baruch, once said that the trouble with the Truman administration was that it had a vested interest in error. Is that the real clue? Is this uproar from the left motivated only by a high-minded concern for the conduct of investigations?

Or is it motivated also by a vested interest in error, a dread of what congressional committees may find?

Let's take, first, the case of Mr. Elmer Davis, who recently made a broadside attack on congressional committees in a book called But We Were Born Free. On page 86, in discussing our report on interlocking subversion, he purports to give an example of our unfairness. Here is what he says: "More curious is the case of a man mentioned not only in this report but in a supplement issued 3 weeks later. If you believe Elizabeth Bentley, he was a very evil man, indeed about the worst of the lot. But he is a peaceful Republican businessman now—out of the Government, and he got out of his own accord."

In this passage from Davis' book you will note that he does not name the individual who was allegedly discussed in our report. You will note that he does not give the page where the material appears. If you read his whole book you will observe that this trick of avoiding page references, of avoiding proper names, turns up again and again. Elmer Davis, I am told, is a former Rhodes scholar. He knows the need for citations and quotations and page references, in any respectable book dealing with a controversial subject. Why does he withhold them in his own work?

Well, ladies and gentlemen, I can give you the answer to that question, as far as the passage I have just read is concerned. Elmer Davis did not give the page reference to the record of this "peaceful Republican businessman" because he does not dare let the American people check that record. He did not name the individual he writes about because he does not dare let the American people look at the record behind that name. I challenge Elmer Davis to name the "peaceful Republican businessman" he mentioned. I challenge Elmer Davis to cite the proof that that individual is a "peaceful Republican businessman."

Davis' book was a best seller, all across the United States. He, himself, states it is a compilation of speeches made to the men and women students of Vassar, Yale, Princeton, the University of Minnesota, and Harvard—at Harvard, incidentally, he gave the Phi Beta Kappa oration. Parts of the book had previously been printed in the Saturday Review of Literature, the Atlantic, and Harpers magazines (those are the magazines which refer to themselves unctuously as the quality group). Just recently Elmer Davis got himself a new job. He is a consultant to the Fund for the Republic. That's the outfit, backed with the infinite millions of the Ford Foundation, which is going to bring the American people the truth about congressional committees. You can imagine how much truth you will get from the kind of people who hire and consult with individuals like Elmer Davis. How many millions of honest Americans have been mislead into opposing congressional committees, and how many more millions will be mislead in the future by the Elmer Davises of the radio, the press, the lecture platform and TV?

Why is this man Davis so hysterically opposed to congressional exposure of communism that he stoops to tricks like this? Does he oppose congressional committees because of the ugly facts they have uncovered in the past, and may uncover in the future?

During World War II, Elmer Davis was Director of the Office of War Information. OWI was repeatedly charged with hiring Communist or pro-Communist personnel. In those self-righteous tones he still employs, Davis indignantly denied the charge.

Well, who were some of these people at the top of OWI? Davis' deputy director for Pacific Operations was Owen Lattimore. His deputy director for Atlantic Operations was Joseph Barnes. The person in charge of OWI's daily cable file to Moscow was Julia Older.

Alexander Barmine, a former high official of Soviet military intelligence, swore before our subcommittee that Lattimore and Barnes were known in Soviet intelligence circles as "our men." Meaning their men. Meaning underground agents of Joseph Stalin.

Lattimore is presently awaiting trial on a charge that he perjured himself at least five times, when our subcommittee questioned him about his pro-Communist activity. In the OWI days, he never bothered to conceal his procommunism. He had written openly in the magazine Pacific Affairs that Stalin's bestial purge trials were a "triumph for democracy," which gave "the ordinary citizen more courage to protest."

Joseph Barnes never bothered to conceal his procommunism, either. He even wrote an article—in the superrespectable Atlantic Monthly, if you please—in which he brazenly characterized communism as "the American dream." This was the man Davis put on OWI's so-called security committee to screen out undesirable personnel.

As for Julia Older—now Mrs. Julia Older Bazer—she had a record studded with Communist activity long before she went on Davis' OWI payroll. She had even worked for a Russian Communist newspaper, the Moscow News. Our subcommittee found her recently in the Secretariat of the United Nations. When we put her on the witness stand, she hid behind the fifth amendment on all questions about her Communist past.

When you think about all this, you can readily understand that Elmer Davis has a "vested interest in error." He has a "vested interest" in silencing congressional committees, or at least in trying to make honest Americans believe that these committees do not come forward with the truth.

There has been a revival recently of an old dispute between Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt and Representative MARTIN DIES, who was the founder and first chairman of the House Committee on Un-American Activities. Let me remind you that Mr. DIES was, and still is, a Democrat. He did his pioneer work in a Democratic Congress, during a Democratic administration. Let me remind you that the Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security, of which I am presently chairman, was also founded in a Democratic Congress during a Democratic administration. Its founder and first chairman was one of America's greatest Democrats, the Honorable Pat McCarran, of Nevada. There should be no partisan politics in congressional committees which are exposing the Communist conspiracy. As far as I am concerned, there never will be.

The Mrs. Roosevelt-Dies dispute involves the question of whether White House influence was used on behalf of Communist agitators. Let's take a look as far as William Hinckley is concerned. Hinckley took the stand in 1950 before the House Committee on Un-American Activities and gave the following testimony:

Question: "You recall, do you not, when you testified before this committee on April 2, 1939, you denied having been a member of the Communist Party? * * * When you denied under oath that you were a member of the Communist Party, did you tell the truth?"

Answer: "I refuse to answer that question, Mr. Chairman, on the ground that my answer might tend to incriminate me."

Question: "Did you become acquainted with Lee Pressman?"

Answer: "I met Mr. Pressman socially at a number of gatherings. One was * * * at the White House."

Question: "Did you know Lee Pressman as a member of the Communist Party?"

Answer: "I refuse to answer that question." (Pressman, himself, has admitted he was a Communist.)

Question: "Did you become acquainted with Lauchlin Currie?"

Answer: "I met Mr. Currie once; yes. * * * It was at the White House. Mr. Currie had returned from China, and Mrs. Roosevelt had invited some of her friends in for an evening's discussion, led by Mr. Currie * * * and he talked about this trip to China."

Question: "Did you know Mr. Currie as a member of the Communist Party?"

Answer: "Mr. Chairman, I refuse to answer that question, on the ground my answer might tend to incriminate me."

Lauchlin Currie, executive assistant to the President of the United States, was at the very top of this traitorous conspiracy during all the years that it was closing its fingers around America's windpipe.

In 1940, Hinckley applied for a position with the United States Office of Education. Senator McCARRAN lodged the strongest protest, because of the applicant's visibly pro-Communist record. Nevertheless, Hinckley got the job.

A year later, he sought employment with the Railroad Retirement Board under one Abraham George Silverman, another key figure in the Communist underground. In his application, Hinckley wrote the following name as a character reference: "Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt, the White House, Washington."

When our subcommittee studied his employment file, we found a document dated November 7, 1941, entitled "Qualifications of William Hinckley." Silverman's initials appear on it. It contains these paragraphs:

"Mr. Hinckley's record indicates an arrest in 1937, and that the charge was dropped. At the time, Mr. Hinckley was the chairman of the American Youth Congress and was arrested because he participated in an American Youth parade. Mr. Hinckley explains that the President asked Mr. Aubrey Williams to look into the matter with the result that the charge was dropped.

"Inasmuch as Mr. Hinckley is a good choice for the position of field supervisor, I recommend his appointment."

He got that job, too.

There is one more document which does more than any other to give the true picture of what was going on in Washington when the Communist Party was at the very height of fashion. This is a letter written by the late John J. O'Connor on September 19, 1949. You will find it on page 800 of the printed record of the hearings of the Senate Immigration Subcommittee, 81st Congress, first session.

It is highly important to recall that Mr. O'Connor was not only a leading Democratic Member of Congress in the 1930's, but was also the brother of President Roosevelt's former law partner. Here is what Mr. O'Connor said:

"During the years 1933–39, when I often visited the White House, as a Member of Congress and later as chairman of the Rules Committee, I saw Browder there on several occasions. (This, of course, refers to Earl Browder, who was then head of the Communist Party, U. S. A.)

"In fact, during the President's 'purge' of 1938, Browder directed purge operations from the White House, from which he telephoned instructions from time to time.

"The visitors' records might well not show him as a caller, for the reason that he could enter the White House, at any time, and through any door and without any invitation. Such an open-door policy toward him was often the subject of comment among Democratic congressional, and other leaders, who were obliged to make an appointment in order to see the President."

One of the severest critics of the methods of congressional committees is Adlai Stevenson. Does he come into court with clean hands on this matter? Or does he seek to discredit congressional investigations because there are some soft spots in his own record? There is another document, long buried in Navy files, which suggests the answer.

A few days after Pearl Harbor, Congress passed Public Act 351, which made it unlawful for any American merchant vessel to employ as radio operator anyone whose employment was disapproved by the Secretary of the Navy. The act was administered by a board headed by a true blue old sea-dog named Admiral Adolphus Staton. His board made it a practice to order the discharge of all Communist radio operators in the merchant marine.

At that time, there was a young fellow working in the office of the Secretary of the Navy named Adlai Stevenson. Admiral Staton told our subcommittee, under oath, that Stevenson once said to him:

"Admiral, I don't think we ought to be too hard on the Commies." But Admiral Staton continued to do his duty. So, Mr. Stevenson decided to force the issue. He wrote a memorandum, dated April 30, 1942, which said:

"Many of the members of the American Communications Association (CIO), including the president, vice president, and possibly other officers, have been, or may be discharged. The total number of radio operators on the ONI (Office of Naval Intelligence) suspect list is about 600, and about 500 of them are Communist suspects.

"The problem presented by the present method of administration of Public 351 is whether identification with communism, even if sufficiently proven, is sufficient grounds to disqualify a man without some other evidence of incompetence or unreliability in his job as a radio operator on a merchant ship. In other words, in view of the present military alignments, political considerations and shortage of qualified radio operators, should we discharge operators because of their political opinions only? Or should we say that hostile political opinions is only one element of fitness and a man must not be discharged whose record in his job is in all other respects satisfactory."

The Stevenson memorandum went upward to the President's desk. What happenend then? Stevenson was sustained. They stopped firing Communist radio operators and put those who had already been fired back on the job. Somebody got fired, though. Who was it?

ADMIRAL STATON AND HIS BOARD

In the light of these facts, do you think it is just possible that Adlai Stevenson, too, may have a vested interest in error?

Keep that thought in the back of your minds, ladies and gentlemen, as you follow this whole debate on the exposure of the Communist underground by committees of your Congress. Keep in mind, that nearly everything the people learned about the actual working of the Communist conspiracy has been brought to them by these committees. Keep in mind that these committees have been under fire throughout their whole existence by the very same powerful leaders of American opinion who are fighting them today. And keep asking yourselves these questions, as you watch the fight:

"Why is Mr. X against the committees? Why is Mrs. Y against them? Do they really oppose the methods the committees use? Did they ever oppose other committees, which used the same methods to investigate matters that had nothing to do with communism? Are they opposing any such committee now?"

There is your acid test, ladies and gentlemen.

If you apply it, you will find, I think, that the number of people who honestly oppose our Communist-fighters simply because of the methods they use, is very small indeed.

Count Rochambeau

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, November 18, 1954

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Rochambeau: A Man To Remember," published in the Richmond Times-Dispatch of October 10, 1954.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ROCHAMBEAU: A MAN TO REMEMBER

Ask almost any American to name the commanding general of the French Army in the American Revolution, and the chances are the answer you get will be "Lafayette." And the answer will be wrong.

The correct answer is: Jean Baptiste Donatien de Vimeur Comte de Rochambeau.

Rochambeau seems to be the forgotten man of the Revolution. But, thanks largely to the efforts of a Washington radioman named Charles Parmer, something is being done this month to pay tribute to the memory of this French military leader who made such an important contribution to the American cause in the Colonies' struggle for independence.

Rochambeau Day will be celebrated at Yorktown on October 19. Gen. Lemuel Shepherd, Marine Corps Commandant, and Henri Bonnet, French Ambassador to the United States, will be the speakers, and various State and National dignitaries are scheduled to be present.

Mr. Parmer, who heads the official State commission planning the October 19 event, emphasizes that there is no desire whatever to take away any of Lafayette's glory. The idea is to elevate Rochambeau, not to lower Lafayette.

Lafayette's contribution in the revolution was tremendous, of course. He was instrumental in persuading his nation to send military assistance to the Americans. It is said that he had hoped to secure command of the expeditionary army but that he cheerfully acquiesced in the appointment of Rochambeau to the position.

The French troops arrived and anchored off Rhode Island on July 11, 1780. Rochambeau wanted to sit tight to await the arrival of additional French troops which he thought would be forthcoming, but it appears that Lafayette was urging him to attack New York. The Dictionary of American Biography says that during this period, "Rochambeau's position as commander of the French forces was complicated by the interference of Lafayette."

The anticipated French reinforcements were never sent, and the attack on New York was not made. Instead, Rochambeau urged that operations be undertaken against Cornwallis in Virginia. That strategy was agreed upon.

In August 1781 Rochambeau led his army southward from Rhode Island. They rendezvoused with the Americans under Washington near Hobbs Ferry on the Hudson, and the two armies made the long trek to Williamsburg, where in mid-September they joined the American troops led by Lafayette. The ensuing battle at Yorktown, ending with the surrender of Cornwallis' British Army on October 19, 1781, is familiar history to nearly all Americans.

Rochambeau was not completely forgotten in America, of course. An American naval vessel was named after him, and a statue of him, along with one of Lafayette, stands in Lafayette Park, across the street from the White House in Washington.

But why has so much more attention been directed toward Lafayette? Mr. Parmer gives this explanation, in part:

"Lafayette was dashing and young, the perfect picture of the cavalier. He spoke excellent English and commanded American troops. Naturally, they wrote home what a fine leader he was. And Lafayette returned to this country twice after the war and was given a tremendous reception each time."

On the other hand, Rochambeau was middle-aged when he came to America, couldn't speak a word of English, did not lead American troops, and after the war never returned to this country.

We don't know whether it's on the program or not, but it would seem appropriate on October 19 for some American general to say to the spirit of the French commanding officer at Yorktown:

"Rochambeau, we were there—twice."

The Administration and Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, November 29, 1954

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a short statement made recently by Mr. George

J. Burger, vice president, National Federation of Independent Business, concerning the attitude of the present administration toward small business.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL FEDERATION OF
INDEPENDENT BUSINESS,
Washington, D. C., November 5, 1954.

For months we have been receiving alarming reports from the grassroots, our members, as to their feelings on the present administration. Their concern is as to the do-nothing policy to give consideration to small business. Small producers were alarmed as to Government action with prime contractors. The present trend in mergers with no vigorous action on enforcement of the antitrust laws is alarming to all small business. We have had innumerable complaints from small business as to excessive importation of foreign goods at prices with which the small business of this Nation cannot compete. So the results of the election, says George J. Burger, vice president of the National Federation of Independent Business, come as no great surprise. He concludes that the overall action in the present election should be a definite warning to the incoming Congress that small business in the Nation today is watching the overall actions of the Congress and the administration to act effectively in behalf of small business.

Senator-Elect Richard L. Neuberger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, November 29, 1954

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, every Senator is keenly interested in the recent election and the reasons for the change in majority in both the House and the Senate.

In no State was the change more striking and more significant than in Oregon, where, for the first time in 40 years, a Democrat was elected to the United States Senate. Therefore, I am certain that all the Members of both Houses will be interested in the penetrating analysis of the election issues in Oregon which I send forward for publication in the Appendix of the RECORD. This analysis was published in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of Sunday, November 14, and was written by the man qualified above all others to analyze the issues, United States Senator-elect RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, the successful candidate himself.

Senator-elect NEUBERGER is a nationally known writer on conservation and political matters. His article in the Post-Dispatch is worthy of his high standards of writing craftsmanship. But more important it is a clear, objective statement of one of the most fundamental and most momentous issues before the American people, that of the proper utilization and conservation of our natural resources for the benefit of all the people of all of the country.

I earnestly commend to the Members of the Congress and the American people the article written by Senator-elect NEUBERGER.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEUBERGER TELLS HOW HE TOOK ISSUES TO PEOPLE, WON CONSERVATION FIGHT—"I BELIEVE THE GREAT HELLS CANYON POWER SITE HAS BEEN RESCUED," SAYS OREGON SENATOR-ELECT—FORMER HEAD OF UNITED STATES FOREST SERVICE ORGANIZED A CONSERVATIONISTS FOR NEUBERGER CAMPAIGN

(By RICHARD L. NEUBERGER)

(About the writer: Author of the accompanying article, written for the Post-Dispatch, was elected to the United States Senate on the Democratic ticket in Oregon November 2. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER is the first Democratic Senator from Oregon in 40 years, and his election gave his party control of the Senate. NEUBERGER is a free-lance writer, the author of many magazine articles and of six books. His articles have appeared frequently in the Post-Dispatch.

He is 41 years old. He has served three terms in the Oregon State Legislature, and has been prominent in the national conservation movement.)

PORTLAND, OREG., November 13.—On election day the voters of Oregon saved for the people of the United States the finest natural hydroelectric-power site remaining on the North American Continent. This is the significance of the first victory in 40 years for a Democratic senatorial candidate in our State.

I say this not because I am that Democratic nominee. It would have been true of any candidate running with the same set of issues that characterized my campaign.

I believe the great Hells Canyon powersite has been rescued from a monopolistic raid, because the Oregon electorate defied tradition and habit to announce at the polls that they wanted it rescued.

Let me make clear the setting of the election.

In Hells Canyon, the Snake River foams through the deepest chasm in the Nation. With a roar like massed artillery the river claws at rock walls with white-capped talons. In their famous 308 report, which is the master plan for development of the Columbia River Basin, the Army engineers have disclosed that a high multipurpose Federal dam in Hells Canyon could produce 850,000 kilowatts of power. Furthermore, Hells Canyon Dam might add another 1,122,000 kilowatts to the capacity of projects downstream, by releasing impounded water during periods when most of the melting snow is gone from the high mountains.

Despite these assets of Hells Canyon, Secretary of the Interior Douglas McKay announced in May of 1953 that he was relinquishing the canyon to the Idaho Power Co.—provided the Federal Power Commission approved the abandonment. GUY CORDON, senior Senator from Oregon, immediately issued a statement backing up this decision by McKay, who had resigned as Oregon's Governor to enter the Eisenhower Cabinet.

Farm, labor, and public-power groups in the Northwest managed to collect enough funds to delay a final decision by the FPC. Thus the fate of Hells Canyon was alive as an election issue when the campaign began between Senator CORDON and myself.

Other phases of the power question also were at stake—the sale to utility companies of key Bonneville transmission lines, an attack by CORDON and McKay on the public-power preference clause, the gutting of the Bonneville engineering staffs, favoritism to power companies and discrimination against rural electric co-ops in the sale of Columbia's River energy, the proposed partnership between the Government and utility corporations in the construction of future dams.

Yet Hells Canyon remained the crucial issue.

People understood this issue clearly. The dramatic name of the gorge, the fact that it was deeper than the Grand Canyon of the Colorado, historic episodes linking Hells Canyon to Meriwether Lewis and William Clark and to the ill-fated Astor expedition of 1811—all these things combined to make Hells Canyon vivid to the average citizen.

Early in the campaign a remarkable man rallied to my side. He was Lyle F. Watts, 64, ex-Chief of the United States Forest Service, now living in retirement in Oregon. I do not know to this day whether he is a Democrat or a Republican, for he had been a career official of the Forest Service for 39 years. He became chairman of Conservationists for NEUBERGER, a group of over 10,000 people primarily interested in preserving for future generations the water, timber, oil, mining, and scenic resources of the Northwest.

Watts induced me to carry on my travels a book, Breaking New Grounds. It was the autobiography of his old leader and hero, Gifford Pinchot, founder of our national forest system. Watts called particular attention to a passage in the book describing how Pinchot and Theodore Roosevelt had used subterfuge to retain for the public some of the magnificent power sites on the mountain rivers of the Western States.

In 1907 no adequate legislation had existed to prevent utility monopolies from grabbing off choice locations for their own power projects. Roosevelt and Pinchot watched in alarm as power companies had a field day in this lushest part of the public domain. Then, Pinchot remembered that the President did have the authority to set aside places within the new forest reserves for the creation of ranger stations—and the forest reserves encompassed some of the West's principal power waterways.

"Some of these ranger stations," wrote Gifford Pinchot, "We located deliberately on water-power sites, in order to ensure some form of Government control."

At Watt's suggestion, I told this story to literally hundreds of Oregon audiences. It made a profound impression. The contrast could not be ignored.

McKay and CORDON, who was chairman of the Senate Interior Subcommittee, were refusing to use the ample legal tools at their disposal to defend Hells Canyon the finest power site ever to touch the State of Oregon. By comparison, two such faithful and devoted public servants as Teddy Roosevelt and Gifford Pinchot had relied upon an admitted bit of deviousness to safeguard power sites in the era before the old frontier was completely closed.

This contrast had its impact. It was obvious to my audiences that the man who organized the Rough Riders and the man who established our system of National Forests probably never would have abandoned Hells Canyon to the Idaho Power Co., an absentee-dominated corporation which holds its annual meetings 2,800 miles from Hells Canyon, in Augusta, Maine.

Baker, Union, Wallowa, Umatilla, Wasco, Multomah, Clackamas, Columbia, and Clatsop are strategic Oregon counties which lie in a vast arc from Hells Canyon to salt water. They nestle in an immense geographic elbow formed by the Columbia and Snake Rivers, two of the mightiest hydroelectric streams on earth—streams which leap and lash at rocky prisons during their furious downhill descent from the Canadian Rockies and the Grand Tetons.

I carried all these counties, with a total unofficial vote of 155,825 as against 132,530 for Senator CORDON.

To appreciate the startling nature of this political revolution in Oregon, one must go back 6 years, to 1948. In that election CORDON swept all except 1 of these 9 river counties when he opposed an outstanding Democratic adversary, the late State Senator Manley J. Wilson. Cordon's total was 143,992 and that of Wilson 113,735.

A complete spin of the political wheel had occurred in the interval. The difference, in my opinion, was Hells Canyon in particular and the entire conservation issue in general.

I doubt if Hells Canyon alone could have made the whole difference. But, combined with the rest of the conservation question, it tilted the balance in Oregon, a State which did not even elect a Democrat to the United States Senate when Franklin D. Roosevelt was winning Oregon's electoral votes on four successive occasions. Indeed, Oregon—along with Maine and Vermont—was unique in the Nation, in that it neither elected a Democrat nor a third-party member as a Senator during F. D. R.'s tenure in the White House.

What were the other conservation issues? They were these:

1. Cordon was cosponsor of a timber-exchange bill which would have permitted the largest lumber companies to take over choice acreage inside the national forests. Dr. Ira N. Gabrielson, a lifelong Republican and ex-Chief of the Fish and Wildlife Service, had called this measure one of the crudest attempted land grabs in recent years.

2. Cordon had voted for the Hope-Aiken bill, which proposed to convert into vested rights the present permissive status of stockmen in the national forests. Approximately 44 percent of these forests are grazing lands. The Hope-Aiken bill, as I saw it, would have curtailed the ability of United States forest rangers to make herd reductions in the interest of preventing erosion of key watersheds. Such groups as the Izaak Walton League and the Audubon Society took a similar position.

3. Cordon had managed the bill which gave to just four coastal States—Texas, California, Louisiana, and Florida—the rich offshore oil reserves. He also had led the opposition to the Hill oil-for-education amendment which proposed, instead, to use the revenue from these oil deposits for the support of schools in all 48 States.

4. The Al Serena Mining Co., an Alabama corporation, had just secured possession of the timber growing on 15 controverted mining claims in the Rogue River National Forest of Oregon. Secretary McKay had made this decision favorable to the company, and Senator Cordon had defended it. Forest rangers and minerals examiners of the Government had opposed the decision.

5. At many levels in the Federal service, career conservationists had been replaced with what Dr. Gabrielson described as "political hacks." In addition, Cordon's Interior Subcommittee had agreed to the diversion to general administration of $662,000 in duck-stamp funds—breaching an implied pact with hunters that these funds should be used exclusively for the improvement and management of wildfowl refuges along the Pacific and Atlantic flyways.

All of these situations totaled up to a program which seemed ominous to thousands of Oregon people who were concerned about the future. Each episode, taken by itself, might not have been serious. But, added together, the policies of the Republican administration appeared to imperil nearly all Western resources, from waterpower sites to Canadian geese on the wing.

Our campaign stressed the entire conservation picture.

Instead of giving out the usual campaign matches, we distributed little packages of grass seed for hunters, hikers, and fishermen to carry into the wilderness and to use in reseeding the public range.

This altafescue seed had to be poured into little cellophane sacks and stapled to the printed covers. It was a laborious task but not without advantages. Many families, with Boy Scouts and Campfire Girls among their children, put the youngsters to work preparing the grass seed which was distributed by conservationists for Neuberger. This was a conservation lesson in and of itself. A great man in the realm of conservation—Lyle Watts—was in charge. Throughout the State, old and young talked about Neuberger's grass seed. The packages were a popular handout at every county fair.

I also discovered that natural resources had a deep spiritual significance to many people. Leading clergymen rallied to my cause. They responded to a quotation from Pinchot: "The earth and its resources belong of right to its people. * * * The rightful use and purpose of our natural resources is to make all the people strong and well, able and wise, well-taught, well-fed, well-clothed, well-housed, full of knowledge and initiative, with equal opportunity for all and special privilege for none."

A Catholic priest in Portland told me that he believed the Cordon-McKay program of bestowing resources upon private monopoly was contrary to the encyclicals of his church. In the lumber town of Springfield, a gray-haired Episcopal minister said that his congregation was deeply stirred when he announced that the retention of forests and rivers for future generations was far more of a moral and religious issue than simply a political question.

Besides Lyle Watts, other people participated in the campaign who were symbols of the conservation movement. Oscar L. Chapman, ex-Secretary of the Interior, came from Washington, D. C., to speak. Senator Wayne Morse made at least 80 addresses, predominantly on the power question. Ex-Assistant Interior Secretary C. Girard (Jebbie) Davidson, now living in Portland, took many of the speaking engagements which I was unable to fill myself. And, when Senator Cordon denounced Mr. Watts as "one of the worst foes of conservation," Dr. Gabrielson sent a glowing message from across the land testifying to Watts' great contributions in the fields of forestry and wildlife.

The Democrats who came to Oregon during the campaign were men who had been associated with public power in their own localities. These included Senators Estes Kefauver and Albert Gore, of Tennessee; Mike Mansfield, of Montana; and Henry M. Jackson and Warren G. Magnuson, of the State of Washington. They also were predominantly young men and afforded a favorable contrast to the old-guard isolationists who came to Oregon to campaign for my opponent.

It is particularly significant that this first Oregon victory for a Democrat in four decades was accomplished against a nearly solid phalanx of newspaper opposition. Three daily papers in comparatively small communities backed me—the Medford Mail-Tribune, Pendleton East-Oregonian, and Coos Bay Times. The other 18 dailies in the State opposed me bitterly, including the 2 statewide papers in Portland, the Oregonian, and the Journal. Indeed, the Oregonian even refused to publish a letter from so prominent a citizen as James T. Marr, secretary of the State federation of labor, setting forth Senator Cordon's voting record on major legislation.

The fact that I was able to win, despite this type of newspaper opposition, demonstrates the depth to which the conservation issue tapped public sentiment.

I also believe I was helped by the general issue of "time for a change." Our speeches emphasized the fact that Oregon had not had a Democratic Senator for 40 years. We frequently quoted from Dwight Eisenhower's 1952 speeches which pointed out that "political health is endangered when one party, by whatever means, becomes permanently or too long entrenched in power." The applicability of Mr. Eisenhower's precepts to Oregon did not require detailed explaining.

In the bulk of my speeches I pointed out that the timber and water of the West had been handed down to us from the time of Lewis and Clark. This had two significant connections. I had written a book entitled "The Lewis and Clark Expedition," and my wife, Maurine, and I were among the few people who had covered the entire Lewis and Clark Trail, even in its wilderness sections. Furthermore, the year 1954 marked the 150th anniversary of the start of Lewis and Clark from St. Louis on their epic trek to Oregon. This theme helped to dramatize our issue.

My wife suggested that we use only Lewis and Clark commemorative stamps on the mail sent out from our headquarters. This attracted attention to our envelopes. People everywhere in Oregon came to look for Neuberger mailings with Lewis and Clark postage stamps. Maurine and I spoke at every college in the State and at no fewer than 60 high schools and grade schools.

Few people in Oregon were unaware of the conservation issue by November 2, 1954. The result, as I see it, was an affirmation of what the historian and Pultizer-prize winner Bernard DeVoto told Maurine and me when he was our house guest back in January. He stood on the porch of our old home in the fir-matted hills west of Portland. I had just told him of my plans to run for the Senate, in spite of the fact that Oregon had not elected a Democratic Senator since 1914.

"Be of good cheer, my friend," said DeVoto to me. "Whenever there has been a clear and sharp issue in the West between monopoly and public control of natural resources, the people have voted to keep these resources for themselves. You draw the issue sharply enough and the people will decide in your favor—even in Republican Oregon."

Then DeVoto hurried down the steps and got into a waiting taxicab. I recalled his words when the votes began to turn in my favor on the evening after election day. Lyle Watts looked at me and said, "Dick, Hells Canyon belongs to the public again."

Dixon-Yates Contract

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, November 29, 1954

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an editorial from the Florence (Ala.) Herald entitled "More About Dixon-Yates."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

More About Dixon-Yates

An interesting view of the Dixon-Yates contract was presented recently by the Christian Science Monitor which states in effect that the Eisenhower administration is in serious trouble over the deal. It is not because there is anything inherently improper in the Government making such a contract or anything dishonest in its efforts to have TVA's expansion limited on the ground that the agency is intended to be a yardstick for measuring the efficiency of privately owned power utilities and should be contained within certain boundaries.

The Monitor maintains that the administration failed to make its case valid when it attempted to defend its action on the ground that the Dixon-Yates contract would relieve the taxpayer of a burden, and it got still further into political hot water when it argued that private enterprise would benefit.

Says the Monitor:

"On both of the above grounds the case for the defense is being sharply questioned.

"There is no doubt that the cost to the taxpayer of securing the desired extra power via Dixon-Yates or by any other company will be greater than had the Government built the plant through TVA. It will be built, whichever way it is, with borrowed money. The Government can borrow money at a lower interest rate—according to Budget Director Rowland Hughes the difference is between 2½ percent for Government money and 3¾ percent for utility money. Add that under the Dixon-Yates contract the Government will pay for the power it uses not only at a higher rate, due to the higher interest rate, but also will pay the taxes on the Dixon-Yates operation. This can be defended as the necessary price for containing what the President calls creeping socialism. But it is certainly open to question as a saving to the taxpayer.

"Any argument that the contract will itself further the cause of private enterprise is equally likely to keep the administration in political trouble.

"Although it is customary to refer to a licensed and regulated power utility as a private enterprise, it is not an illustration of true private-enterprise capitalism. When one of the great Detroit automobile companies ventures $100 million of its own capital on a new model it is engaging in true competitive private enterprise. It can miscalculate, and go bankrupt. Its market is not guaranteed, nor are its profits.

"The risks that Dixon-Yates takes under its contract with the Government are negligible. It possesses a regulated monopoly in the area. It obtains a guaranteed market for its product under the contract. It is compensated for its taxes if it makes a profit, and obtains the tax money even if it should happen to earn no profit; in which case the tax money becomes its profit.

"This is neither risk capitalism nor real private-enterprise capitalism. What it amounts to is a concession by the Government to a chosen instrument. There are ample precedents for doing this in the American system. It is analogous to a city council letting a concession for the selling of popcorn and soda in the public parks to a chosen individual, with a guaranteed market for his popcorn and soda. But it is not free enterprise in the real sense, nor is there any competitive risk enterprise involved. This is an allocation by the Government to a selected individual of an almost guaranteed chance to earn up to 9 percent, plus tax compensation, on money which it will borrow at 3¾ percent.

"The Dixon-Yates contract cannot be defended effectively as saving the taxpayer money, or as increasing the opportunities for true capitalist enterprise in the United States. It can be defended as a device for containing the area of state capitalism."

The Only Door to Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER F. GEORGE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, November 29, 1954

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "The Only Door to Peace," written by Henry J. Taylor, and published in This Week magazine of September 26, 1954. The article was therefore prepared and published before the London Conference or the Paris Conference. I ask Senators to note, in connection with the article, the date of its preparation and publication.

Mr. Taylor is a well-known author, writer, world traveler, observer, and economist. The article which I am offering for the RECORD is well worth while. The attitude taken by Mr. Taylor in this article is thoroughly realistic. He may somewhat overemphasize the massive-retaliation theory, and some of his remarks regarding India may be unfortunate, but on the whole it is a very forceful, forthright, worthwhile article.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ONLY DOOR TO PEACE

(By Henry J. Taylor)

In spite of the widespread gloomy forebodings, I believe that world events are forcing America into a stronger position than ever before. Instead of despair there is great hope in the now-obvious collapse of our postwar united front; for realism is at last required.

Realism becomes the first step in the so-called agonizing reappraisal of our position. And this reappraisal need not represent agony, but instead, an enormous step forward.

We inherited the fundamentals of our foreign policy from the year 1945. Our 1945 thinking is the dreg left over in the cup. Today these 1945 postulates, and the peace structures built on them, are as out of date as the Queen of Sheba's camel, and very nearly as worthless in the power race of 1954. What's good about recent events is that they helped wake us up to some fundamental fallacies of 1945 thinking:

FALLACY 1: PERMANENT ALLIES

History and habit have had us by the neck. History shows that, just as generals usually prepare to fight a next war the way the last war was won, diplomats erect their peace plans in terms of alliances that existed during the fighting. On this assumption we built the U. N. as our cornerstone for world security in 1945. Yet all nations, allies in one war, seldom are allies in the next. Witness the fact that our two largest allies in the last war are today our two largest enemies: Russian and Red China. And we are now depending on our three erstwhile enemies to be our military friends: Germany, Italy, and Japan.

FALLACY 2: COLLECTIVE SECURITY

Russia, the closed land, was given full powers on the Security Council. This was unavoidable at the time. But as a result we are now surrounded by vetoes within the very body we built for our self-protection, and are the victim of a deadly comedy. Germany, Italy, and Japan, in turn, remain excluded from membership and cannot speak at our side even if they wished to.

As for Asia and Africa, at a secret meeting held recently within the U. N., when 13 Asian and African nations were called upon to vote on an issue involving the United States and the Soviet Union, only one—the Philippines—voted in favor of the United States.

Accordingly, our now antiquated collective-security program evaporates. We do not have collective security. We have collective insecurity. The Russians have been feeding on the 1945 mistakes. And whatever good the U. N. may do it is certainly evident we cannot depend on it to protect America and defend world peace, as intended.

FALLACY 3: LAST-WAR STRATEGY

Next, our 1945 recollections automatically impress us with the decisive importance of a military front on the ground in Western Europe as in the last war. Then England was a staging area; France, the avenue of attack. By using England as an "unsinkable aircraft carrier" and a springboard for Allied infantry, we invaded Germany across the territory of our French ally. Accordingly, our minds still picture our English and French alliances as having the same utility and necessity all over again, and a frustration, if not a despair, arises within us when we see the Franco-British vacillations. Is their isolationism isolating us? That question brings us to the heart of the fallacy. For, if war comes, what is the actual combat potential of these areas, now that Russia has the atom bomb?

Here we are in for a shock, because we have not been thinking as the British think.

The British leaders assume that in event of war with the Soviet Union there will be no England. Prime Minister Churchill has stated, and a British marshal echoed the same statement to me, that should Britain join America in a war against Russia the first thing Soviet Russia would do would be to "drop several atom bombs on our small island, and there would be no England."

For verification, British leaders refer you to the report of General Eisenhower, as Supreme Commander, published at the end of the war, wherein it is stated that had the Nazis developed their V–1 and V–2 missiles 6 months earlier and applied them against troop concentrations in British ports, we could not have staged the Normandy crossing.

Yet in these intervening years the destructive power of present equivalents to the 1945 V–1's and V–2's, with atomic warheads, is as a cannon to a crossbow. And the Red Army already stands, even today, at an aiming distance only 93 miles east of the Rhine.

"Our Commonwealth positions, yes," said the British marshal to me, "but why ask what England itself will do in the war? There will not be an England in combat after the first few hours.

"A military machine has lost its purpose," he said, "when it can no longer protect the people. The British Army, even should it repel invasion, can no longer protect our island inhabitants from extermination. No one can question England's honor and civic courage. But the central fact is that missiles, enjoying rocket-like passage through the sky over one's head, can be as disastrous to one's country as the country's occupation by physical force—actually, more so."

The same assumption, that there will be no France in the war, likewise saturates the French official mind. Furthermore, say the French, strategic air bases in France are easy atom targets—making them useless, yet inviting attack on France. All this moves France, like England, to masterful inactivity, except in the direction of appeasement.

Yet in realizing all this, no new disaster to our position has been added. We are only seeing now, out in the open, the reality which has existed ever since Russia was revealed to possess the atom bomb.

So, where do we go from here?

Of course, we could take the same viewpoint as our English and French friends. We are not as completely vulnerable as they are, nor as quickly. But the time difference is only a few hours, and we, too, are vulnerable enough to question, if we wished, just how America could recover from the first blow.

However, our leaders are not thinking that way and our policy is not governed by that thought, whereas this English and French concept of their own immediate elimination from any useful part in the combat, as well as the unspeakable horrors involved, absolutely dominates English and French policy.

Accordingly, as demonstrated in Korea, in Indochina and elsewhere, it is proving impossible for us to achieve the wider outlook among our allies which would make unity with America their prime policy.

The Soviet Union is congratulating itself, as Napoleon did when he said: "Give me a coalition to fight against."

KOREA AND INDOCHINA

Fully aware of this opportunity for bloodless expansion, the Soviet Union continues to hammer away at the big lie that America is the aggressor, warmonger country.

It preaches that if America's allies will ignore America, a peaceful coexistence with communism is possible.

And at the same time that Russia hides behind this benevolent false face, it uses its own satellites to perform the dirty work of conquest—as in Korea and Indochina.

Within a single year the hitherto sleeping giant, China, under Communist rule, fought the great United States to a stalemate in Korea and won a second war in Indochina against France. Thus, two of the world's three great Western powers were handled successfully on the battlefields and their military intentions overcome by a Communist nation that has been in power only 4 years, because Russia was behind her.

We come, then, to the need for the reappraisal of our position with our allies to which Secretary of State Dulles has referred. We are forced to it. But what direction will it take? What must be done?

1. Understand our friends: In this reappraisal our first task is to understand the views of our more exposed friends abroad, even if we do not share their views. Certainly there is no "agony" in such a first step. It can be taken without rancor and meanness and spite and pettiness.

This does not mean scrapping our allies. We must bind them to us as best we can. As President Eisenhower recently said, we must regard them as friendly partners, and we must make out of the U. N. what we can. But it does mean proceeding without undue reliance upon our allies, at least not beyond their wish to be relied upon; and thus we will be utterly realistic for the first time since 1945. For as Italian philosopher Pietro once wrote: "We would all be wiser if we spent more time analyzing how people are rather than how we would wish them to be." And surely there is no more serious blunder in peace or war than to rely on allies who themselves do not see how they can be relied upon.

2. Undermine our enemies: We must also bring to bear unremitting exploitation of Russia's inner weaknesses, by vastly more dynamic use of psychological warfare and every other means. But as for propaganda, it is up to us to remember that our policy actions abroad speak louder than the Voice of America, and that good propaganda is good policy performance made known.

3. Be practical: Next, in our reappraisal we must realize that our world plans will not be less "lofty" simply because they are practical. In fact, the label of "lofty" is small compensation for the failure of vast schemes that collapse of their own weight and die in a spasm of confusion and despair.

4. Help your friends: Further, we must recognize that while we may help our allies when help is requested (provided we think it wise), we must stop trying to lead them when they refuse to be led. We should continue some material aid to the free world when it is earnestly sought, but we should stop lying awake thinking up new ways to assist others and new pleas by which to urge them to accept.

5. Expect results: We should stop trying to buy—with money and handouts—those United States allies, like India, who accept everything, give nothing, cooperate with us not at all, and are committed to peace at any price. We only demean ourselves, deplete our resources, and improve the anti-Communist front not one jot. If there is ever a basis for coopertaion they will not neglect to let us know it, nor will they fail to come to us for it. Our largess should await that time.

6. Stay strong: Our military lines are not stronger than our industrial lines behind them. We should do all that can be done to encourage, strengthen, and expand the American economy. Although we have been constantly told about preserving the industrial capacity and will to work of Europe, and have delivered some $20 billion worth of our substance for that purpose, this makes no sense whatever unless we preserve American productivity here in the United States.

7. Forget 1945 concepts: We should decide that any attempt to make war on the Communist mass by land invasion through Western Europe is merely a remnant of our 1945 concepts and is today sheer folly. In World War II numbers were on our side. The Russians and Chinese were on our side. Now the numbers are reversed. In World War II the United States raised less than 100 ground combat divisions. How many would we have to raise this time? And as for local or limited wars, the Communist commanders can safely reinforce their attacks until they win the fight; for us local or limited wars are not a practical policy.

8. Maintain peace outposts: We must continue to contribute to NATO as a stabilizing force, and man such vigilant outposts as Formosa, Okinawa, South Korea, etc., as long as necessary and possible.

In the face of the nervousness that would arise without such stabilizing forces, several countries in the affected areas—over the long haul—could easily fall into the Soviet orbit, one by one, through internal coups or otherwise, without Russia firing a shot. For the same reason, where we have solid and healthy allies we should be prepared to back and defend them when they really intend to fight.

But once we commit our country to the fight we cannot stop short of victory, or assume that if to win means risking war with a big power we will falter and flop, as in Korea. This is the risk we must consider before we start, not afterward. Otherwise we should not commit our men and our Nation in the first place; as if to say, "America will fight if it looks easy, but not if it gets rough." Nothing is so costly to our authority in the world, and therefore to peace.

9. Be ready: Consequently, our striking arms in the form of very long range jet bombers and guided missiles, land-based and Navy sea-based, should—and will—get a new beefing up, and the theory of massive retaliation as our chief reliance against all-out war by the Soviet Union will become crystallized as our main national policy.

And there is no agony in that. Actually, this has been the chief deterrent to war for a long time.

10. "Don't tread on me": And, finally, we must recognize that our security depends not on money handouts to others or paper treaties, or even our standby armaments, but on our inner moral worth and spirit.

If we truly feel, think, and act like Americans we will be respected like Americans. In short, it is up to us to show some good old-fashioned American guts. This is the simplest and truest of all facts which often seems to get lost in the shuffle of debate.

We cannot survive unless we meet our menace in the spirit of the eagle instead of the rabbit. Hunters know that rabbits freeze in the face of danger, and often die of terror. The relatively peaceful eagle fights to the last ounce of his strength if molested. Mankind's total experience cries out to us now to emulate our own national emblem. For the traits and performances of rabbit and eagle typify the relative security of the appeaser and the valiant in facing the bullies in today's international jungle.

War in any form is a horrible and dreadful thing to contemplate. But are we right to dwell solely on its horrors, when to fear war too much is the surest way to invite it?

I am not talking about our starting a so-called preventive war. That whole idea is preposterous. A preventive war does not prevent war. It is war. But we cannot survive if we behave like a fighter who flees from the ring the moment his opponent doubles his fists.

This is unthinkable for a great people like us, the greatest nation on the face of the earth; we, whose first flag carried the legend "Don't Tread on Me," and who were born under the slogan "Liberty or Death."

Let our faith and our contempt of fear live up to our heritage. It must be no less, and it need be no more.

Aggressor nations choose their victims among the craven, not among those with stout hearts, great productivity, high ideals and an absolute determination to fight if they are trod upon. It is this determination which we must feel, and make known; clear-cut, positive, unmistakable. To do otherwise is like the victim baiting his own trap.

OUR ENEMY: FEAR

Men died for what we have. We are their heirs; they have no other heirs but ourselves. Our heroes cared for this country, and unless we care for it we will lose it.

"My son, that which I bequeath to you, you must own anew if you would keep it," says a Concord graveyard epitaph.

We must never be afraid to fight for life and honor against all the might and fury of the vicious, disciplined, and ruthless enemies of the United States. Above all, let us banish forever from our hearts fear and defeatism. Once we do this I believe that our allies will stand by us, our enemies will respect us.

By not being afraid of war, we will have opened the only door to peace.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized book dealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by book dealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the Record.

PRICE OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

The Public Printer is authorized to furnish to subscribers the daily Record at $1.50 per month, payable in advance.

Remit by money order payable to Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C.

Appendix

Development of a Strong Transportation System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON
OF COLORADO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, November 30, 1954

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, our dynamic economy is characterized by a continuing growth in population and production. It is of prime importance that we sensibly and vigorously move forward with the development of a sound overall system of transportation.

During my years in the Senate, and especially in that period when I was chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, there were many leaders in the various forms of transportation whose recommendations were received with thoughtful study. One of these individuals was J. H. Carmichael, who has had an outstanding record of achievement as the executive head of Capital Airlines. A broad-gage approach to the problems of all transportation and communication has characterized "Slim" Carmichael's thinking and activity. He is currently chairman of the transportation and communication committee of the United States Chamber of Commerce, and is also a director of that organization.

There has just come to my attention a recent address entitled "Twentieth Century Unlimited," which Mr. Carmichael delivered before an audience of 1,200 railroad executives in Buffalo, N. Y. I commend this speech to a careful reading by my colleagues, and I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TWENTIETH CENTURY UNLIMITED

(An address by J. H. Carmichael, president of Capital Airlines, at the 66th annual dinner of the Central Railway Club of Buffalo, Statler Hotel, Buffalo, N. Y., October 21, 1954)

If any of you have ever wondered how you might feel as a lone railroad man at an airline convention, I think that right now I could give you a reasonably good idea. When I arrived here, I felt like the proverbial skunk at a garden party. As a matter of fact, many of my colleagues back in Washington were understandably puzzled when I announced that I had accepted an invitation to speak tonight. They looked at me as if to ask, "Don't you have enough headaches without looking for more?"

Nevertheless, I was certainly interested in meeting with such a large number of leading railroad executives and officials. This is the first chance I have ever had to speak to such a group. It is, perhaps, the last chance I shall have.

In any event it seemed to me that the invitation offered an unusual opportunity, almost a challenge in fact and after the reception you have given me tonight, I am delighted that I have accepted.

This is not my first contact with the railway industry. As you may know, I am rather active as a director of the United States Chamber of Commerce and as chairman of its transportation committee.

In this position, and in day-to-day business, I am constantly reminded that I am not associated exclusively with the airline industry, but that I am part of the complete field of transportation—a huge undertaking composed of five basic components on which rests the economy and well-being of this country.

This is one industry—the transportation industry. And it is made up of railroads, airlines, highways, waterways, and pipelines. Naturally, each of these segments overlaps and is highly competitive, and the relationship seldom reaches anything approaching a harmonious plane. In fact, I might even say that when we use the word "competition" we use a polite tea-party way of describing the actual dog-eat-dog association which has identified the overall industry for the past 30 years.

During this period we've scrapped and grappled and gone after one another's scalps with abandon. We've had slight sympathy for the other's problems, but rather have taken a "serves them right" attitude. Traditionally, we are enemies who have never taken any step toward signing a cease-fire pact.

But there has been no slaughter. The enemies are still in good shape and carry no scars. Which might suggest that all this fighting has been futile.

I don't want to recommend that from now on we hold hands and live together as one happy family. I seriously doubt that even a shotgun wedding would unite us peacefully under one roof. That would be an unhealthy arrangement, anyway, since as businessmen we recognize that groups which are competitive can't waste much love on one another and that competition is the strength of our industry.

AREAS OF AGREEMENT ARE PRACTICAL

I would suggest, however, that there are certain areas of agreement and even disagreement in which we might well attempt to cooperate. This transportation industry is undoubtedly one of America's largest industries from almost any point of view. It is certainly one of the most important—indispensable and one of the prime reasons that the productivity of the Nation is unlimited. To continue to take potshots at one another, to ignore the fact that there are many issues on which we stand on common grounds is to interfere with normal progress. We keep the transportation industry at loose ends, fragmentary and impair its overall efficiency.

There are many good reasons why we can't afford to allow this situation to exist in its present state of conflict. To begin with, we are hurting ourselves. We are overlooking an advantage which is rightfully ours; the railroads, the airlines, trucks, buses, waterborne carriers, and pipelines. That advantage is the right to compete.

Consider for example, the outmoded and restrictive regulations which have hog-tied the railroads for years; the timelag problem in rate and abandonment proceedings, for example. These restrictions are applied today to correct a monopoly that passed into history when Henry Ford introduced his model T or when Lindbergh crossed the Atlantic. Don Quixote in charging windmills fought no more an imaginary menace than do these regulations today.

Perhaps you might wonder why I should take objection to these regulations. After all, it's quite a convenience to have an outside source restrict the activities of a very potent competitor.

I agree that a certain amount of regulation is necessary to insure an effective public service. But my economics are of the old-fashioned sort; I feel that any corporation is entitled to a fair profit. And I'm convinced that too much regulation can squelch that profit. Like the wild honeysuckle, regulation has a popular appeal but it's insidious and is destructive if allowed to spread.

And these restrictive regulations can spread. It is logical to assume that if they work against the railroads, they will work against the airlines or the trucks.

No industry in America can function properly unless it is granted the privilege of free enterprise regulated in the public interest. No industry can develop if it is restrained by redtape regulations. No industry can offer the public a good product if it is denied the right of competition.

We are playing on the same grounds. But each team is playing under different rules. Some teams are never penalized and are ignored by the umpires. They are the gypsy truckers who compete against all of us without ever hearing the whistle for off-sides or clipping or unnecessary roughness. There are the nonscheduled air carriers who can stop your game or our game by taking the ball home with them.

These carriers which are allowed to run free do all of us harm because our regulations prevent us from giving them a fair battle. Regulations are the concern of all of us, not just the railroads, and I believe that there would be mutual benefits to the organization of a common front in combating these regulations.

There are other points on which together we can take a reasonably forceful position. The excise tax and pyramiding State taxes for example. There is no one here tonight who is not acquainted with the inequity of the excise tax; a wartime measure designed to reduce consumption is now serving improperly as a revenue-producing means.

Taxes become overly burdensome when they are pyramided, when each State seeks a way of making assesments on transportation facilities serving its area. Allowed to grow, such taxes can be and, in some instances, are a hindrance to a public service.

GOVERNMENT OPERATION NOT NEEDED

And we should get the Government out of private business. When the Federal Government operates its own transportation agencies, all of us, the entire transportation industry, suffer from the resultant loss of traffic. The Government is then performing a service which is competing directly with you and with us. Our transportation industry is qualified to handle this busines. It is big enough and strong enough so that it does not need supplementary help from the the Government or from any other outside source. This business should go to us because we can handle it at less cost to the taxpayer far more efficiently than it is now managed. When the day comes that our facilities are not adequate to cope with the demands made upon us, then we may ask for outside assistance. But until that time, the Government should stay out of the transportation industry.

These then are three major points on which I think we can agree; regulations, excise taxes, and Government interference. Certainly, through such agencies as the Transportation Association of America we have ironed out many differences and have taken a big step toward cooperative effort.

In the meantime, we will continue to be highly competitive. We don't underestimate you. We don't look upon you as a 19th century relic, a museum piece. All the other segments of the transportation industry combined could not replace the service you provide.

We know that you are a modern industry. You have dieselized your equipment and are even now experimenting with gas turbines. New damage-free freight cars are increasing in number. You have introduced new safety devices and have adopted electronics and up-to-date communications systems. You have incredible block-signal systems, automatic sorting of freight cars, and even radar and television.

The progress you have chalked up in the face of insurmountable odds is a tribute to American ingenuity and initiative. It is the story of achievement and determination and faith in the future.

This is the first time in our history that one country could afford to support five basic types of transportation. And we have not yet reached the saturation point. Our expanding economy, industrial growth, and increasing population will spread the scope and the size of our passenger and shipping markets. This is the 20th century unlimited. There is and there will be room for all of us.

The airlines have taken a lot of that room, of course. Air travel is big business. It is the Nation's newest billion-dollar industry. It has made a big impact on our economy. It has influenced our travel habits.

We have been particularly fortunate in developing our business because we are blessed with a remarkable machine, a vehicle which is versatile and unrestricted in operation. The airplane is one of man's greatest scientific contributions to civilization. But the airlines have invested much time, energy, and millions of dollars in nurturing this machine. We are competing with your progress and we haven't stopped.

Perhaps you have recently read that Capital Airlines has purchased 40 Viscount airplanes at a total cost of $45 million. These will be the first gas turbine powered transport planes to fly on domestic schedules in the United States. These turboprop airplanes will represent a major step forward in aviation development because it will bring to the public a new concept of travel by providing greater speeds, eliminating vibration and by reducing interior noise level.

And every day we introduce new and better operating methods, stronger safety measures, and higher standards of service. We, too, are tough competitors, and like you, we will do all we can to meet our destiny.

COMPETITION IS WHOLESOME

It may be that this intensified competition, this race to do a better job than the other fellow is a contributing factor to the sharp disagreements on certain problems facing the transportation industry. There are many such problems it is true, but there are basically just a few which are major sources of contention. And I'd like to throw a lot of pepper in the pot by talking about these disagreements and meeting them head-on just as I discussed those on which we agree.

There is first the sore subject of first-class mail. It is probably needless to remind you that the Post Office Department is rapidly expanding its initial experiment begun last year of moving first-class mail by air. I think you will agree that this endeavor will be broadened further and that eventually all first-class mail will be transported by the airlines. At any rate, that is the trend right now.

This has been a traditional source of revenue to you and it may have appeared as a direct invasion when the Government launched this experiment. It isn't as huge a piece of revenue as many are led to believe it to be. I am told—and I speak only of first-class mail—that it represents two-fifths of 1 percent of your operating revenues. But no one likes having business, no matter how small, rudely snatched from his hands by a competitor.

In the final analysis, however, it is proper that the airlines take over this phase of postal operation. They have the carrying capacity, they can move it faster than any other form of transportation. This is in accordance with the dictates of Post Office policy.

The early post roads were built primarily to expedite the mails. The pony express was inaugurated because transportation by stagecoach or Conestoga wagon was too slow—too time consuming. When the railroad tracks were stretched westward beyond the Mississippi River, the pony express gave way to a faster form of mail transportation. The railroads have transported the mails since that time which is as it should have been. There was no better way of carrying first-class mail until the airlines reached a point in their growth which enabled them to do a still better job.

To move the mails in the fastest possible manner is the Post Office Department's responsibility to the American public. It is the concept which has directed and guided their operation historically and one which they are obligated to follow.

Considering operating schedules on both railroads and airlines to be as they are now, it is only right, according to this principle, that the airlines should carry first-class mail.

Subsidy has different meanings to different groups. I don't know your definition of subsidy. But, assuming the foregoing to be a fair conclusion, it would seem to me that where the public interest is served by expedited mail the railroads, by asking to retain first-class mail at a slower rate of movement in order to support certain passenger services, are, in effect, asking for a subsidy.

Subsidy is another bitter point of discord. I've had a lot of personal experience wth subsidy, and I don't like any part of it. No successful airline operator does. This is not shadow boxing. I feel very strongly on the subject.

The airline industry was developed with the aid of Federal subsidy. In fact, all forms of transportation have been subsidized directly or indirectly during their early stages of growth. Who can question the wisdom of this policy which first united the Thirteen Colonies and then knitted this country into one nation despite overwhelming geographical barriers?

Historically, it is the same philosophy which justified the early airline subsidy; aviation is important to our national defense and should be given every opportunity to expand to its proper proportions. But once the airlines had reached a point of self-sufficiency, subsidy should be withdrawn. And it has been withdrawn. Hence, direct airline subsidy is a matter with which the railroads need not be concerned, since 90 percent of their air competition is with airlines which do not receive it.

But, it is argued, we receive indirect subsidy through the use of airways, airports, and navigational and weather facilities. We should be forced to pay a user-charge.

AIRLINES SHOULD PAY FAIR SHARE

On that point we agree. But, to begin with, it must be remembered that airways and airports exist not solely for the airlines but for the public service. Obviously, we should pay no more in user-charges than our fair share. The burden of expense should be equally carried by other aviation groups utilizing these facilities—the military, charter carriers, corporation operators, and private flyers. On the average, the airlines represent but 30 percent of all air traffic.

Can you imagine the Twentieth Century Limited arriving in New York 10 minutes late because it was held up by a privately owned handcar which had the right-of-way? That sounds ridiculous, but our nonstop flight from Chicago has on occasion pulled up to the Washington terminal late because it was delayed on the approach path by a small single-engine airplane which had equal rights to the airport with us, a common carrier.

It would therefore seem unreasonable to expect the airlines to pay in user charges more than their rightful share of maintenance costs—or absorb the expenses of other operators. Our studies indicate that the amount we pay in gasoline taxes alone is a fair charge for our use of the airways. Landing fees, rentals, and other charges more than pay for our use of airports.

We want to pay our fair share of all costs. We don't want to be a drain on the taxpayer. To perform a public service at a reasonable rate of return has been our goal, just as it has been yours. It is the goal of the entire transportation industry.

The differences I have discussed tonight are serious differences. But they are not so serious that they should split the transportation industry into widely separated opposing camps. Each segment has a specialized type of transportation to offer. Each has a unique service for shippers and passengers. It is a versatile industry capable of keeping the trade and commerce of America in a preeminent position throughout the world.

You are leaders in this venture. Last year you handled more than 600 billion ton-miles of freight, 32 billion passenger miles. These figures decidedly prove that you are the major segment of the transportation industry. But despite size, all of us are interdependent to a degree and need to ease our differences if transportation is to achieve its full mission.

But more important, these differences must be ironed out before M-day. This is the time that the transportation industry must present a united front. In World War II, you carried 90 percent of all the freight moved in this country. If I were an enemy, I would attempt to cripple this country not by bombing cities—but by bombing railroads. America's productivity capacity would then be nullified.

During World War II, the railroads kept the industrial gears from stripping. The airlines provided that new requirement in military logistics; mobility. In a war that knew no trenches—no established fortifications, the airlines were able to distribute supplies and troops to any threatening point on the globe in the fastest possible time on a moment's notice. And the ships and the trucks were also working to full capacity to help maintain an unbroken line of supply from the factories and the farms to the fighting fronts. It was a cooperative venture.

We don't ask for another M-day, we don't expect it—but we must prepare for it. We should make the transportation industry ready for it. Each of us have an obligation in this respect. We can start by seeking solutions which will be mutually satisfactory on the problems I have discussed.

Please don't misunderstand me. I have no illusions about you and I don't want you to have any illusions about me. I know that you are going to take from us every dollar of business you can. We are going to take from you as much as we can get. Competition between us will always be keen. I don't expect a utopian friendship nor do I offer a challenge. I only suggest that in this struggle for traffic we don't let the infighting detract us from the real job ahead.

The Tennessee Valley Authority and the Dixon-Yates Contract

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, November 29, 1954

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial appearing in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of November 14, 1954, entitled "Firm on the Wrong Side."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows.

FIRM ON THE WRONG SIDE

During his 2 years in the White House President Eisenhower has wavered on some issues, but on two great national questions he has stood very firm. One was the give-away of the offshore oil resources to the States. The other is the Dixon-Yates power contract. When the Republicans on the Atomic Energy Committee voted yesterday to permit a go-ahead on the contract without waiting for the new Congress, they were responding to the President's strong intervention earlier in the week.

On both of these issues, in our opinion, the President has been tragically mistaken. In both cases, we were initially inclined to believe that he was the victim of poor advice. Candor now compels us to admit that in each instance the President made his final decision after he had been given every possible opportunity to obtain good advice; after he had been fully alerted to the dangers of the course he chose; after enough serious questions had been raised by responsible citizens to justify at the very least a postponement of final action.

As to oil and as to TVA, the balance of forces was such that the President himself could determine the issue. In each case he chose to throw his great prestige and all the power of his office on the side of private interests. He identified himself personally and intimately with oil and private power, two of the most predatory influences in the whole history of the exploitation of America's natural resources.

The basic issue at stake in the Dixon-Yates contract has not been affected by the last-minute changes intended to help ram it through while the Republicans still control Congress. At bottom the issue is one of broad political philosophy.

This all began with a search for ways to relieve TVA of a part of its commitments to supply power to the Atomic Energy Commission. The AEC is now TVA's biggest customer. Faced with a steady growth of demand from its other customers—the cities, towns, factories, and farms of the region—TVA must either find new sources of power, or find a new supplier for the AEC. Since waterpower sites in the valley have already been fully developed, any new sources of power will have to be steam-generating plants.

To avoid building a new TVA steam-generating plant, the administration last January announced that arrangements would be made to relieve TVA of part of its AEC load. Had this intention been carried out, there could have been no serious objection. It is not primarily TVA's business to generate power for making atomic bombs. If the AEC can get its power elsewhere, why not? And if private suppliers cannot meet its demand, the AEC might well be justified in generating its own.

The Dixon-Yates contract is often presented as a method of supplying power to the AEC, but in fact it is a method of supplying power to the TVA. Private utility companies were not interested in building another generating plant at Paducah, where the AEC needs the power. They insisted on building it near Memphis, where the AEC cannot use it.

The theory is, of course, that the power delivered to TVA at Memphis will replace power delivered to AEC by TVA at Paducah.

But the replacement is more fictional than real. TVA will not, in fact, be relieved of any of its present commitments to AEC. Rather it will be relieved of its future market in Memphis. Its generating capacity will be frozen at the present level, and as the region goes on growing, new power needs will have to be met by buying more high-cost private power. In time, the TVA would lose its reason for being.

This, then, is the basic issue: Shall the TVA be permitted to grow as its market grows, or shall it be condemned to a lingering death?

Even if the Dixon-Yates contract were stripped of all its windfall profits, all its subsidies and guaranties; even if the promoters were required to put up 50 percent instead of an indecent 5 percent of the cost; even if the Government did not undertake in effect to pay taxes to itself—this would still be a bad deal for the people because it would still be a deal to stultify the Tennessee Valley Authority.

The Dixon-Yates Contract

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, November 30, 1954

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter written by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] which was published in the November 26, 1954, edition of the Washington Star.

The letter presents a thorough analysis of the Dixon-Yates contract and the part the Atomic Energy Commission has played in negotiations for power with that group and other private-power companies.

The letter goes a long way toward giving a very factual account of why the Dixon-Yates contract has generated so much opposition to it in the Senate.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LETTERS TO THE STAR

MORE ON DIXON-YATES

Your editorial of November 16 on the Dixon-Yates contract betrays such a basic misunderstanding of the ground for opposition to the contract that I feel an obligation to write you to set the record straight.

To support your conclusion that hostility to the contract is only a matter of partisan politics you refer to a previous contract between Atomic Energy Commission and Electric Energy, Inc., a combination of private utilities formed to supply power to AEC's installations at Paducah, and you state that the Dixon-Yates contract differs from the EEI contract only in that one was negotiated when a Democrat was President of the United States and another under a Republican administration.

The differences between the AEC's contract with EEI and the proposed contract with Dixon-Yates are great. True, the EEI contract has turned out to be wasteful and extravagant for the Government, which may forecast one similarity with Dixon-Yates. Nevertheless, it was negotiated by AEC for the purchase of power for use in AEC's installation at Paducah. The decision to accept EEI as a power supplier may have been a bad one, but it was clearly within the scope of AEC's authority.

The Dixon-Yates contract has a wholly different origin. In this case AEC did not require additional power at Paducah. The commissioners of AEC did not undertake this negotiation as a function of their clear responsibility. AEC was ordered, over the protest of a majority of the Commission, to contract with the Dixon-Yates combine in order to provide power for the TVA service area. This White House order to one independent agency to assume the responsibilities of another is a dangerous political innovation, which, if not repudiated, would threaten the integrity of our Federal agencies.

Your editorial likewise reveals some misapprehensions about the TVA power system. The taxpayers do not foot the bill for the power produced by TVA and purchased for use in the area. The Government owns the TVA power system and the Treasury advances the money for capital investment. But the consumers of power provide funds which are adequate to pay all the costs of the operation, including depreciation, make in-lieu tax payments to State and local governments, and in addition, provide a rate of return which has averaged over 4 percent on the investment during TVA's life. By any definition such an operation is not subsidized. Modest profits are realized, a portion reinvested in the system a part returned in cash to the Federal Treasury, in amounts which must repay the Federal investment in every project over a 40-year period.

There have been national benefits from TVA in addition to these cash payments to the Treasury, over and above the national benefits of a sounder economy in this important region. One of these national benefits has been a reduction in the power bills of the Federal Government itself. In the case of AEC such savings amount to many millions every year, and they should be considered when any appraisal of TVA is undertaken. For the taxpayer pays the cost of power to AEC.

In the case of Dixon-Yates the taxpayer will pay in AEC's power bills all the costs of constructing and operating the plant, if the plant is ever built. The taxpayer will provide the funds for State, local, and even the Federal taxes to be paid by the company. The taxpayer will in the end provide about twice as much money under the Dixon-Yates arrangement as he would have provided if TVA had been permitted to build the Fulton plant, for which this remarkably extravagant substitute is proposed by the administration.

Your editorial reveals an incomplete understanding of the background of TVA. It is true that TVA is now the sole source of power supply for its service area, a monopoly position which is likewise characteristic of private power systems. The act of Congress which authorized TVA to purchase the generating facilities of certain power companies then serving the area settled that question. It is true, of course, that more steam-generated power is coming on the TVA system. That is in large part due to the expansion of AEC facilities in the area. But the purposes and achievements under the TVA statute are not altered by the use of coal to provide energy for the people. There has been steam generation on the TVA system from the beginning.

I hope you understand that many of us who care deeply about the future of TVA are likewise concerned about responsible government. We deplore a situation in which it appears that AEC has been diverted from its important responsibilities to be thrust into a position of acting as an agent for the private power industry which has fought TVA since its inception, and which now hopes, backed by the great prestige of AEC, to make its first recapture of the territory it lost many years ago when the people exercised their franchise to terminate their service.

JOHN SPARKMAN,
Senator From Alabama.

Enforcement of Price Discrimination Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROBERT C. HENDRICKSON

OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, November 30, 1954

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, on May 21, 1954, I presided as chairman of a subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee during public hearings on Senate bill 175, commonly known as the rubber-tires bill. At that time I expressed great interest in this subject, both in the hearings and on the floor of the Senate.

I have in my hand at this time a statement prepared by Mr. George J. Burger, vice president, National Federation of Independent Business, together with a letter from him dated November 22, 1954. I ask unanimous consent that the letter and the statement, which is a very carefully prepared statement, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL FEDERATION OF
INDEPENDENT BUSINESS,
Washington, D. C., November 22, 1954.

Hon. ROBERT HENDRICKSON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: In view of your splendid action during the hearings at which you presided as chairman of the Subcommittee of Senate Judiciary on May 21, 1954, during the public hearings on S. 175, commonly known as the rubber-tires bill, you expressed at that time considerable interest in the problem as the action applied to the overall destructive actions plaguing independent business in the automotive field in your State of New Jersey.

Today's mail brings me a publication, published in St. Louis, Mo., Service Station News, and one of their lead articles states:

"FTC SHYING FROM PROBES OF PRICE WARS

"The Federal Trade Commission seems to be avoiding the idea of investigations of retail gasoline price wars."

The story continues that the same situation is prevailing in Pennsylvania and other States.

I trust that you will find it convenient to have the attached press statement appear in an early issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Thanking you for your usual splendid cooperation, and with high regards,

Sincerely yours,
GEORGE J. BURGER,
Vice President.

NATIONAL FEDERATION OF
INDEPENDENT BUSINESS,
Washington, D. C., November 21, 1954.

The action of the State of New Jersey, as reported in the press today, ordering 12 major oil companies to defend discrimination in gasoline prices to service-station dealers or face suspension or revocation of their licenses to distribute motor fuels in the State comes with no surprise, says George J. Burger, vice president, National Federation of Independent Business, Inc. He added: "The federation has been deluged with complaints from independent retailers all over the Nation, not alone from gasoline dealers, but all leading up to one thing—that big industries must be taking it for granted that they can expect no real vigorous action upon the part of Federal agencies who are entrusted with enforcement of the Price Discrimination Act, namely, the Robinson-Patman law."

He also added that independent business throughout the Nation is well aware of the so-called study groups in antitrust agencies, and the concern of small business as to these study groups is, "Will these study groups find that there has been no real enforcement of the antitrust laws, including the Price Discrimination Act?" which one high Government official told a Senate committee in 1947, "That for 35 years or more the administrations had merely given lip service to the enforcement of the laws."

"We find no different action today," says Burger. "Otherwise there would have been no need for the State of New Jersey to take such action to protect independent business in the gasoline field in their State."

In a public hearing before the subcommittee of Senate Judiciary Committee on May 21, 1954, at which time legislation was being considered to prohibit the rubber-tire manufacturers owning and operating retail stores in direct unfair competition with independent retailers in the rubber-tire industry, in which independent gasoline dealers are also included, the following statements and questions were put by Senator ROBERT HENDRICKSON, Republican, of New Jersey, who was presiding:

Senator HENDRICKSON: "I am very much interested, Mr. Burger, in your comment 'Major tieup with leading oil companies.' To what extent do they exist?"

Mr. BURGER: "Senator, in most instances the big oil companies have tie ups with the rubber companies."

Senator HENDRICKSON: "Would the books of the oil companies sustain that charge?"

Mr. BURGER: "No question at all."

Senator HENDRICKSON, still pursuing the questioning of the witness as to the charge of unfair competition faced by independent tire retailers due to the rubber companies operating retail stores, asked: "Are not the gasoline dealers pretty much in the same fix?"

Mr. BURGER: "Exactly."

Senator HENDRICKSON: "As you probably know in my own State, New Jersey, we are having rather drastic price wars."

The witness answered: "Yes, not alone in your State but spreading all over the Nation."

Responsible independent gasoline dealers who have spent practically their entire business life in the gasoline industry state that they can see their life savings being wiped out through these deliberately planned price wars instituted, as they say, in many instances through the big oil companies owned and operated retail setup, or through their so-called controlled independent outlet.

Burger concluded: "It is to be noted in the press story that some lawyers hold that there is a serious question whether the present law in the State of New Jersey (the baby Robinson-Patman law) would be in conflict with the Federal law (Robinson-Patman Act) that has been on the statute book since 1936."

The big question now with small business is: "When will the FTC take all-out action that will bring relief through the law that would protect independent business at the local level where the transactions are in interstate commerce? Holding to this view, we have repeatedly urged the Small Business Committees of the Congress to thoroughly explore the enforcement of the Price Discrimination Act by the FTC, and we have demanded that these committees put all emphasis on that action as the No. 1 item in the 84th Congress. What a deplorable situation that the State is compelled to move in to save independent business within the confines of their State where it appears Federal agencies are sitting 'twiddling their thumbs'."

Report on Israel by Mortimer May

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, November 30, 1954

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, Mr. Mortimer May, a distinguished citizen of Nashville, Tenn., is president of the Zionist Organization of America. A large dinner honoring him was held in New York City on November 18, 1954.

Mr. May is a forward-looking American, who has contributed much to the progress of this Nation. In addition to this, he has spent considerable time in behalf of the courageous little State of Israel. His work in the Zionist movement and interpreting the American democracy to Jews throughout the world is outstanding. At the dinner in honor of Mr. May, he delivered a thoughtful address on the progress and continuing problems of the State of Israel. I ask unanimous consent to have the address printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A REPORT ON ISRAEL

Our dinner tonight, at which we are honored by the presence of two distinguished United States Senators, illustrates once more the bipartisan support that our movement has always received; one can well say that we have consistently enjoyed the solid backing of America.

The reasons for this run deep in the common heritage of the American and the Jew. The early arrivals in our own country were largely motivated by considerations of their faith and of the precepts of the Bible, so that the sacred history of Palestine was in a real sense as close to them as that of the lands in which they had lived and would become part of the environment of the new land, our own America. One can point out too so many kinds of parallelism in the history of the United States, and the new State of Israel.

In the first place, both were pioneering ventures and appealed to men of extraordinary courage and vision. In particular, the urge was toward leaving an older civilization, which restricted and confined the thinking of men or their religious observance; and to go to a new land for conscience sake and to found a better and freer way of life. The motivation in both was not material gain. The pioneers in our own United States had to face a wilderness primeval; and in the case of Israel to wrestle with a waste and desolation made so by man's improvidence and neglect. Only the resolute would be attracted to situations of this character.

In the second place, both were confronted with native elements which presented grave problems and further tested the mettla of the colonists. There are some very salient differences but the similarity, nonetheless, is quite real in the psychological and moral situations involved.

Thirdly, each was to gain final freedom by the arbitrament of the sword and against odds that were overwhelmingly heavy.

Fourthly, each had to contend with capital shortages, as is usually the case in new lands. Perhaps in this situation the lot of America was somewhat easier because of the large area involved, and, particularly, the unlimited extent of virgin soil. Israel with a small land relatively thickly settled has borne a greater brunt of economic insufficiency and the necessity of financial help from the outside, although in the case of our own Colonists loans from abroad were part of their experience for almost three centuries.

Fifthly, it should be pointed out that both grew very rapidly and had all the problems that a rapid expansion produced. Here once more, the rate of increase of the little State of Israel has outrun that of our own United States in its early days, but, again, parallelism prevails.

Then finally, and in this we almost return to the idea thrown out in the very beginning, the lands were settled by people whose spiritual, ideological, and moral backgrounds held much in common. The Bible was their common heritage; democracy was their way of life; rigorous religious devotion and observance had been part of their inheritanee for many generations. They came close to sharing the sacred tongue, which both venerated and respected. We need only recall that the study of Hebrew in the earliest colleges founded in the Colonies ranked on a level with that of Latin and Greek, and one can note that in the seals of several of our oldest institutions of learning, Hebrew mottos are included. Indeed in one of the Continental Congresses, when antipathy toward Great Britain and even its language ran high, a motion was introduced that the language of the new nation about to come into being should be that of Hebrew.

All of this must be regarded as basic in any interpretation of the American friendship and support which, throughout the years, has come to the Zionist movement and to the State of Israel. There have been times when official policy has departed from this line but it has always proved to be transitory. Frankly, recent events have caused us great concern, and we have manifested that concern in a number of directions; but I am of the overwhelming conviction that this is but for the moment. It is but a small eddy in a great stream which has moved consistently in one direction and toward one common purpose because of an identity of thinking, interests, and background that dominate in both people.

If we look a little bit ahead we may catch glimpses of other reasons why our American scene remains steadfast in its affection for the new state. In the first place, we have in Israel an outpost of the West in a vast area of what we sometimes call the unchanging East. Here a little country is setting an example in introducing for the weal of the people modern technology and medicine and western way of doing things. It is not only in the material but it is providing an example likewise in the interpretation of great moral concepts. Here in Israel is a democracy that its neighbors may observe. Basic are the ideals of universal suffrage and the right of your vote to be properly cast and counted. Universal and free education in Israel stands out prominently in an area where illiteracy runs into unbelievably high figures. The rights of labor and a living wage is but again another western interpretation presented to neighboring lands where abject poverty is the constant lot of the overwhelming majority of the people. It might be pointed out in addition, that the State of Israel has given to women a status of equality unknown in that segment of the world. All these, both the practical and the philosophical are but the ways of the West—almost identical in operation and in interpretation with what we would find in our own United States.

Secondly, and still looking ahead, America realizes that the State of Israel represents a very strong force for a better world order. For the Jew is the veteran of history; his experience goes back to its dim beginnings, and as it has been long, so it has been broad; extending to nearly all the great civilizations both ancient and modern. No people have known more suffering from world disorder than has the Jew. Here in Israel are gathered Jews from so many backgrounds and experiences and racial origins, that though it be a small land, visions extend far beyond its frontiers and there is and should be a strong sense that something must be done to bring law and order and organization into the world community; lest we all perish for its failure to be instituted.

Third and finally, we share as Americans and Jews, the unforgettable memory that this is the Holy Land. Of yore there came forth the three great faiths that have dominated our Western thinking and our Western way of life. There is the knowledge that the ancient State of Israel, while it never attained military or economic might, exercised its influence through the spiritual, moral, ethical, and religious values that it gave to mankind. All of us here—all of us everywhere realize the great strides that man has made in the recent past in the mechanical, the material, and the scientific, but we are affrighted when we realize that these may be used for our destruction and not for our salvation. May we not turn our hearts, hopes, and thoughts to the new State of Israel and may we not believe, and believing affirm, that this new state has not come into being by historical accident, but that it represents the will of Providence; that in our own day and our own time new spiritual and moral messages may come from this land that will be for our blessing and will enable us to use the great gains we have made in the material for our salvation, not for our destruction.

Yes; Israel is a secular state with all the economic and political and social problems that beset others. It has, however, a history and a memory and a tradition like no other. Here we were told that no word of the Lord returns void unless it shall have accomplished that which He intended. Thus we as Jews and Zionists and with the help of our America shall resolutely maintain our courage and our faith and our conviction that great moral, spiritual, and ethical truths are going to come from this land in the days that lie ahead.

Scripture asserts: "The Lord was passing by and a great and mighty wind was rending the mountains and shattering the rocks, but the Lord was not in the wind but in the sound of a still small voice." May we not believe that this small voice, the voice of the Lord, shall in our own day and our own time be heard coming from Jerusalem. The world awaits this voice; it will surely hear it when it comes forth. Let us then rededicate ourselves to all the various material tasks involved; let us too believe that Israel will once again in good character vindicate the ways of God to man.

DISTRIBUTION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

To the Vice President and each Senator 100 copies; to the Secretary and Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, each, 25 copies; to the Secretary, for official use, not to exceed 35 copies; to the Sergeant at Arms, for use on the floor of the Senate, not to exceed 50 copies; to each Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress, 68 copies; to the Clerk, Sergeant at Arms, and Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives, each, 25 copies; to the Clerk, for official use, not to exceed 50 copies; and to the Doorkeeper, for use on the floor of the House of Representatives, not to exceed 75 copies; to the Vice President and each Senator, Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress there shall also be furnished (and shall not be transferable), 3 copies of the daily Record, of which 1 shall be delivered at his residence, 1 at his office, and 1 at the Capitol.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Printing and binding for Congress, when recommended to be done by the Committee on Printing of either House, shall be so recommended in a report containing an approximate estimate of the cost thereof, together with a statement from the Public Printer of estimated approximate cost of work previously ordered by Congress within the fiscal year (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 145, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on Printing, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. The money derived from such sales shall be paid into the Treasury and accounted for in his annual report to Congress, and no sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

Appendix

Address Delivered by Hon. Edward Martin, of Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, December 1, 1954

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record the text of an address which I delivered before the City Business Club of Philadelphia on October 29, 1954.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Remarks of United States Senator Edward Martin, of Pennsylvania, Before the Meeting of the City Business Club of Philadelphia, Where He Was Presented With a Civic Achievement Award, at the Bellevue-Stratford Hotel, Philadelphia, Friday, October 29, 1954

It is always a pleasure to come to Philadelphia.

Philadelphia, under the leadership of William Penn, Benjamin Franklin, and other great leaders and patriots, became a community of diversified industry and high cultural and spiritual attainments early in the fortunes of the Colonies and the young Republic.

Philadelphia has maintained its inspiring leadership since that time.

You have asked me to make a 10-minute speech of a nonpolitical character.

In Philadelphia, the birthplace of American freedom; the place of adoption of that soul-stirring document, the Declaration of Independence; the place of the framing of the greatest governmental document in all history, the Constitution of the Republic of the United States; it is difficult not to talk politically because the right kind of politics is good government in action.

Today I would like to talk a little bit about transportation. Transportation in our country has always been a political subject.

The expansion of transportation in the United States is a most fascinating, interesting, and romantic subject.

Transportation traces our national progress from the earliest pioneer days and outlines the magnificent achievements that made us the greatest nation of all history.

First and foremost, in attributing the success of the American Republic, I would place our system of government, based on God's greatest gift to mankind, freedom of the individual.

Second, I would place the sturdy courage and faith of our people—the American character based upon hard work, thrift, tolerance, love of liberty, and love of God.

Third, the interest that so many fine citizens have always taken in politics and good government.

These priceless endowments are the foundation stones upon which American initiative, energy, and know-how, combined with sound transportation, created the vast empire of industrial and agricultural production that twice in a third of a century has saved the world from dictatorship.

From the days of the earliest settlements along the Atlantic seaboard, waterway transportation and ports have been one of the most important factors in the development of commercial activity.

I wonder how many of our citizens realize that with one exception every city in the United States of over 100,000 population is located on a major stream? Sixty of our largest cities are located on navigable water. Thirty-six cities in the United States have a population of over 300,000, and of these only 5 are not on navigable waterways.

I think those figures are most impressive. They reflect the importance of water transportation in the economic life of our country and its tremendous influence on industrial growth and prosperity.

In our own State of Pennsylvania we are fully conscious of the importance of our great waterways.

We are fortunate in having within the boundaries of our Commonwealth three great ports which give access to the sea lanes of the world. We are the only State in the Union possessing this advantage.

The great port of Philadelphia is the most highly developed center of ocean-borne commerce, serving one of the greatest concentrations of industry in the world.

In southwestern Pennsylvania, the Monongahela and the Allegheny Rivers join to form the mighty Ohio, giving access to the Mississippi waterways and the Gulf of Mexico.

These vital water routes carry millions of tons of freight traffic to and from the great diversified industries that line their banks in the Pittsburgh area. There is more tonnage on the Monongahela River alone than through the Panama Canal and it is increasing every year.

The splendid harbor at Erie is one of the busy ports of the Great Lakes.

Now let us consider the present situation in our great port of Philadelphia where waterfront industrial expansion of unprecedented proportions is presently underway.

I need not remind you that the Delaware River has been one of the most important arteries of waterborne commerce since the earliest settlement along the Atlantic seaboard. In all our history, it has been a powerful factor in the industrial development and economic progress of our Nation.

The Delaware River has helped to make our Nation great and strong. It will continue to do so in greater measure when our new channel depths, suitable for modern oceangoing vessels, are provided. Its strategic location, reaching inland for a navigable distance of 135 miles, gives it great potential value to the defense of the United States.

One-seventh of the Nation's population lives within a circle of 100-mile radius, with Philadelphia as its center. Extending the radius to 300 miles will embrace one-third of the population of the United States. This area is the northeastern industrial quadrant, the vital heart of the Nation's productive and transportation capacity.

In recent years expansion along the Delaware River has become the most spectacular industrial development of our time.

A survey of capital investment along the Delaware River indicates that by 1955, over a 10-year period, a total of approximately $3 billion will have been expended for new and enlarged industrial works.

From Trenton to the sea, the river passes more than 8,000 manufacturing plants, large and small, demonstrating its importance to national prosperity. No one can question the value of the Delaware River as a national asset which should be maintained at its maximum usefulness as an international highway for ocean traffic.

Many have asked me why I became so much interested in stream clearance in Pennsylvania when I was governor.

In the first place, abundance of pure water and rich soil are the foundation stones for the structure of high living standards and diversity of industry.

During the war I visited as many installations as possible which were doing war work. Among these was the port of embarkation at New York, through which so many of our Pennsylvania boys passed, and through which so much of our goods was shipped.

My old soldier friend, Gen. Homer Groniger was in command. He was doing a magnificent job.

I asked him why some of this great work was not being done in the port of Philadelphia. He said, "Why don't you go down to Philadelphia and see your friend Adm. Milo Draemel."

I did so, and found that the horrible condition of the water, by reason of the pollution in the streams emptying into the port, was largely responsible.

It was then and there that I decided to clean up the streams. It has now been done.

The next job is the widening and deepening of the Delaware Channel.

I will not burden you with figures of depths, widths, and costs.

We now have the authorization, which Congress has passed and the President has signed.

To get the job finished, a lot of hard, persistent and intelligent work still remains to be done.

We must now convince the United States Army engineers, the Director of the Budget, and the Congress of the vital importance of the speedy completion of this project. There must be no delay.

Words of mine cannot express my appreciation of the honor you have done me by making this award. Thank you very much.

Death of Dr. Kenneth C. M. Sills, President Emeritus of Bowdoin College

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FREDERICK G. PAYNE
OF MAINE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, December 1, 1954

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record a brief statement prepared by me and five editorials on the death, on November 15, 1954, of Dr. Kenneth C. M. Sills, who was president emeritus of Bowdoin College and one of the foremost citizens of the State of Maine.

There being no objection, the statement and editorials were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Statement on Kenneth C. M. Sills by Senator Payne

In the death of Kenneth Charles Morton Sills, Maine and the Nation have lost an outstanding citizen. Born in Halifax, Nova Scotia, on December 5, 1879, his parents moved to Portland, Maine, while he was still an infant when his father became dean of the Protestant Episcopal Cathedral in Portland. He graduated from Bowdoin in 1901 and returned in 1903 as an instructor in classics and English. In 1910 he became dean of the college, was named acting president in 1917, and was formally elected president in 1918.

He was a member of the Board of Visitors of the United States Naval Academy in 1917–21, 1934—35, serving as president of the Board 1920–21 and 1935. He was trustee of 6 colleges and schools and a deputy to 10 general conventions of the Protestant Episcopal Church and a delegate to the Protestant Episcopal World Conference at Lausanne in 1927 and Edinburgh in 1937. He received honorary degrees from the University of Maine (1916), Bates College (1918), Dartmouth College (1918), Colby College (1920), Williams College (1927), Bowdoin College (1934), Dalhousie University (1939), Yale University (1941), Tufts College (1947), Boston University (1949), and Amherst College (1952).

A lifelong Democrat, Dr. Sills was an unsuccessful candidate in 1916 on the Democratic ticket in Maine for the United States Senate. He served as the public member of the New England Regional War Labor Board, 1943–45. He gave freely of his time and energies as an active participant in the civic life of his community and State.

In the field of education, Dr. Sills considered himself primarily as a teacher and continued to serve as an active classics and literature professor the 35 years he served as president of Bowdoin. Many generations of the college's alumni learned Latin from Dr. Sills, who was affectionately known as Casey. During his long tenure as head of Bowdoin, Dr. Sills maintained that college's long tradition as a compact personal school with a first-class faculty. He once said, in this connection, "excellent teaching in wooden halls is much better than wooden teaching in marble halls."

Dr. Sills summed up his philosophy of life as follows: "I think the Christian religion which regards everyone as a child of God, and democracy which regards the individual as worthy of dignity, are my two guiding stars."

As president of Bowdoin College he inspired all who came in contact with him. The young men he sent forth from Bowdoin have been wiser men and better citizens because of his influence. They have achieved distinction in all walks of life. Kenneth Sills was a Christian gentleman of the first order with that genuine humility which denotes true greatness. He was a man of the highest integrity—devoted to his beloved college, his church, the State of Maine, and the Nation. The world has been a better place because of him.

[From the Portland (Maine) Press Herald, of November 17, 1954]

Dr. Kenneth Sills

Dr. Kenneth Sills was a great man, great in heart and mind and in contributions to his countrymen.

His greatness grew not alone from exceptional talent or high office: It was the product of integrity, a word meaning the state or quality of being whole. Dr. Sills had a rare capacity for living a whole, complete life, filled with many interests and many good deeds.

Dr. Sills was a scholar, learned in the classics. He was a teacher, devoted to the challenge of awakening young minds. From purely professorial duties at Bowdoin College he went on to become the coordinator of his college's entire teaching program, first as dean and then as president.

Dr. Sills was a politician, lending dignity and stature to a much abused term. He believed that every citizen should give a part of himself to the community and throughout his life he wasn't afraid to remain an active participant in politics. He was a devout churchman, a truly fine Christian whose last chore before his death Monday night was attendance at a committee meeting of the Episcopal diocese of Maine.

Other men have had these talents and these opportunities without bringing to them, as did "Casey" Sills, a real humility, a genuine warmth of heart and a deep respect for the worth of his fellow man. He was a man of integrity, of whole living, as few men are.

We are all the richer for his having been so long with us.

[From the Bangor (Maine) Daily News of November 17, 1954]

Kenneth Charles Morton Sills

Monday witnessed the passing of one of the world's ranking classicists and the recognized authority on Virgil—Kenneth Charles Morton Sills, president emeritus of Bowdoin College.

Though Dr. Sills could have rested on his international reputation as a scholar and possibly enhanced it through frequent publications, he devoted his entire efforts to college administration and instruction during his 34 years as president and to more teaching while Latin professor and dean for 15 years before his elevation.

Dissatisfied with personal acquaintance of only a handful of freshmen he would normally meet in one first-year Latin class, what with the decline of the classics, Dr. Sills wrote an entirely new course for upperclassmen in comparative literature. To it from the beginning in 1918 flocked an overflow of juniors and seniors, and thus was born "Casey's Lit," a course synonymous with the president and popular up to the time of his retirement 2 years ago. Probably some 5,000 alumni came and went during his presidential incumbency, with at least a third of this number coming at one stage and another under his classroom guidance.

During his long and scholarly career Dr. Sills received many honors in his chosen field, and additional recognition from the Navy and Episcopal Church, of which he was a devout member.

As a fledgling president in 1919—he was acting president during the 1918 collegiate year—Dr. Sills found himself in the unenviable position of having to fill the more than adequate shoes of former President William deWitt Hyde who had died during the summer of 1918. President Sills was equal to the monumental task, and during his 34 years at the helm Bowdoin College became one of the wealthiest colleges per capita in the country, its scholastic standing internationally known.

In retirement, Dr. Sills was active to the end. Last November 6 he was conspicuous at the Bowdoin-Maine football game, and even as late as Veterans' Day, November 11, he spoke to 91 naturalized citizens in Judge Clifford's United States district court in Portland.

His death will be mourned by classical scholars throughout the country, perhaps in separated corners of the world. He will be particularly missed in his adopted State, where Sills of Bowdoin had become a legend.

[From the Lewiston (Maine) Journal of November 16, 1954]

He Was All Maine

For 53 years, the life of Kenneth C. M. Sills was linked with that of Bowdoin College, undergraduate, teacher, and president.

When he retired from the college 2 years ago, he had been president and teacher for 35 years.

Teacher, he always considered himself. Latin and English literature classes were conducted by him throughout most of his years as president.

Not only was he a progressive educator but a devoted Christian, a practicing Democrat, and sage counselor to men and the State.

He was "An All Maine," in every respect of high citizenship and public interest.

His last visit to Lewiston-Auburn was last month when he was one of the speakers at the centennial celebration dinner of Trinity Episcopal Church. He was Maine's ranking Episcopal layman and stood high in the councils of the National Episcopal Church.

He was unafraid of politics—a good Democrat of the old school.

Last night at 75 years of age, he died at his home in Portland. He will be buried in his beloved Brunswick. He will be mourned for a long time—his unusual place in the society of thoughtful men and women hard to fill.

[From the Lewiston (Maine) Sun of November 17, 1954]

Kenneth C. M. Sills

Dr. Kenneth C. M. Sills, former president of Bowdoin College, whose death Monday night at the age of 75 came only 2 years after his retirement, was an outstanding educator and good citizen of his adopted State.

Born in Nova Scotia, the family moved to Maine nearly three-quarters of a century ago, and 2 years after young Sills graduated from Bowdoin he became an instructor there. From that point on, his life was a part of the college, and even after becoming president—a post which he occupied for more than three decades—he carried on Latin classes.

The cloistered halls, however, never held his full attention. He ran for the Senate in 1916 as a Democrat, he was an Episcopalian layman of renown, and engaged throughout his lifetime in innumerable civic duties. Nearly a dozen colleges honored him with doctorates of law.

Such men, in any State, are rare and he leaves a void not easy to fill. Maine is proud of him, and thankful that for so long she benefited from his wisdom and leadership.

[From the Rockland (Maine) Courier-Gazette of November 18, 1954]

"Life's Work Well Done"

(Written by request by E. Carl Moran, Jr.)

Such a man as Kenneth Charles Morton Sills, affectionately known as Casey by all Bowdoin men, does not die; instead, he lives on, in the memory of everyone who knew him.

Very few men build their own monuments while they still live, but Casey did. One of them is in Brunswick, Maine, where the man who held the office of president of Bowdoin College longer than any of his illustrious predecessors gave practically his whole life to Bowdoin College. Another monument is the memory of this truly great man in the heart of every Bowdoin man, scattered today all over the world.

Somehow, I feel that this quiet, dignified, public-spirited, idealistic, and deeply religious man would not want glowing eulogy today; instead, he would continue to say "Do it for God, do it for country, do it for Maine, and do it for Bowdoin."

Excerpts From the Washington Atomic Energy Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. STENNIS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, November 30, 1954

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record excerpts from a recent issue of the Washington Atomic Energy Report, which is edited by Mr. Harry R. Stringer, a veteran Washington newspaperman. These excerpts deal pertinently with a very timely subject.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

War Baby Becomes a Titan—Some Vital Statistics

In the space of less than 10 years, the atom has emerged from the physicist's laboratory to rule an industrial empire.

Of sinister conception, the empire has produced the A-bomb, the H-bomb, and an arsenal of atomic weapons. The new A-bomb has 25 times the destructive forces of the first one, but compared with the H-bomb it is only a firecracker.

The atom bomb ended one great war. American superiority in its development has since preserved an uneasy world peace.

That superiority must be maintained in gearing this new and fabulous source of energy to peacetime uses. In averting future wars, atomic industrial reactors may prove more powerful than atomic weapons.

The American people to date have invested a total of $14 billion in this mammoth business. The capital investment alone has reached $5.7 billion. It will rise to $8.5 billion under the present construction program.

The industry's current annual budget is over $1.2 billion.

The industry employs 147,000 people directly; probably a million indirectly. It has over 900 firms under contract. Thousands more are associated with it.

Operating partners of this Government in this gigantic undertaking are some of the country's great industrial corporations.

These firms and individuals who have been closely identified with atomic research, engineering, and production programs, possess priceless assets in experience and know-how. They have a tremendous headstart in peacetime development.

The industry is a big customer. It is the largest single user of electricity. Its plants consume more power than the five States of Ohio, Michigan, Texas, Connecticut, and Georgia combined.

The industry is the world's biggest and busiest prospector and miner. Its hunt for uranium extends all over the world. It operates eight big processing mills, and is planning more. It is extracting uranium from phosphate rock in four Florida plants, and it is looking for additional facilities for this purpose.

In the past year, domestic production of uranium ore and uranium concentrates attained record levels. Soon, the industry will be no longer dependent on foreign sources of supply.

AEC installations this year will spend millions of dollars for equipment, exclusive of construction. They provide a market for a multitude of items.

CONGRESS OPENS THE DOOR

In the new Atomic Energy Act, Congress has opened the door to the swift peacetime development of the atom, although the weapons program already has made immense contributions of incalculable value to its progress.

A tangible contribution of underlying importance is the stockpile of atomic materials that has been built up under the weapons program. These materials can be used interchangeably for the purpose of war or peace. They are imperishable. This great stockpile of atomic materials together with the scientific and engineering knowledge acquired in their discovery and production and in their safe and effective use, constitutes the cornerstone of the peacetime venture.

In the words of Chairman Lewis L. Strauss, of the AEC: "We are not yet at high noon of the atomic age—only at the first glimmer of its dawning."

ELECTRIC POWER IS THE BIG PRIZE

Greatest peacetime use of the atom will be in the production of electricity. A nuclear reactor has been producing power on a small scale since 1951.

Reactor performance, and other AEC experiments and studies have convinced scientists and engineers that large-scale commercial operations soon will be practical; that eventually atomic energy will supplant ordinary fuels and falling water in producing power.

Two hundred million dollars has been budgeted by the AEC in a building and testing program covering five different industrial reactors selected to determine the type best adapted to producing plentiful and cheap power, counting all cost factors. Eighty-seven million dollars will be spent on the program this year.

Because of the high plant investment required, and inadequate depletion and obsolescence data, authorities concede that at the moment an atomic plant could not produce electric power on a competitive cost basis with conventional plants, but they regard the margin as small.

Right now, they insist that atomic power could be laid down on a competitive cost basis, if not actually cheaper, in mountain and desert regions, and such areas as New England, which are remote from fuel sources and where high rates prevail because of fuel transportation costs. Enough atomic fuel to light and heat all of New England could be transported in a single truck.

WHO WILL DEVELOP ATOMIC POWER?

The new Atomic Energy Act reaffirms the policy of the original 1946 act that the development, use, and control of atomic energy shall be directed to "strengthen free competition in private enterprise."

Proceeding on this policy, the AEC has initiated its commercial power on the basis of participation, and eventual operation by private enterprise.

The first civilian atomic powerplant under the AEC industrial reactor program, will be constructed and operated by the Duquesne Light Co., near Pittsburgh. The plant will have a 65,000-kilowatt capacity sufficient to light and heat a small city. Its cost is estimated at $52 million with the Government putting up most of the money because it is classified essentially as an experimental project. Westinghouse Electric Corp. which built the powerplant for the *Nautilus* is now completing the development and engineering work on the new plant which is scheduled to be finished in 1957.

Of the other 5 reactors, North American Aviation, Inc., is building 1 type; 3 others are being built in AEC's own installations, and the Commission has asked bids on the remaining 1—a mobile powerplant.

One reactor project covers the construction and operation of a breeder atomic powerplant with a generating capacity of 15,000 kilowatts. A breeder reactor virtually replenishes its nuclear fuel as it consumes it. A small breeder reactor now operating in Idaho has demonstrated that the principle is feasible. This reactor which makes it possible to "eat your cake and have it too" perhaps holds the greatest promise for the atomic age.

In addition to the industrial nuclear power program, 16 private industry study groups are engaged in surveys and studies of the technology and economics of atomic power.

On their part, private power interests are fully alert to the opportunities of atomic power, although they were not expecting its advent so soon. Their shortsightedness and blunders let TVA, REA and the great hydroelectric projects of the West slip from their grasp. They do not now want the greatest prize of all to get away.

RISKS STAGGERING

But while the pot is rich, the stakes are big and the risks staggering. Some of the stanchest advocates of free competition and private enterprise are inclined to flinch at the prospect. And across the table are the public-power groups prepared to resist to the end the exploitation of the people's multibillion-dollar investment in atomic energy by private power interests.

To win, the private power industry among other things must overcome its own habitual weakness of making mistakes at crucial moments. The utility industry probably spends more money on public relations and political guidance, and it probably makes more blunders. The Dixon-Yates contract is an example. It almost wrecked the new Atomic Energy Act. The congressional power hearings of the twenties should be required reading for all private utility executives.

Training in Christian Colleges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, December 1, 1954

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an address by Dr. Walter Pope Binns, president of the William Jewell College, Liberty, Mo., at the meeting of the Virginia Baptist General Association in Norfolk, Va., November 16–17, 1954.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Speech Delivered by Dr. Walter Pope Binns at the Virginia Baptist General Association in Norfolk, Va., November 16–17, 1954

The first college chapel building I ever saw was at the University of Georgia, the oldest State university in America. I was a very small child when my father took me with him for a visit to his alma mater. We followed the shaded walkways of that historic campus and my father pointed out the buildings where he attended classes. He called the names of honored teachers who had influenced his life. At last we paused in front of the chapel and he spoke the words that came back in memory years later when I read:

"This, my son, is the chapel.
Here your father thought the thoughts of youth
And heard the words that one by one
The touch of life has turned to truth."

That building was on the campus of a tax-supported State institution, yet it was the integrating center of all the branches of study in the university. The chancellor of the university was P. H. Mell, who was also president of the Southern Baptist Convention. He spoke regularly in that chapel, and he spoke essentially the same message that was being spoken in Christian colleges in Georgia and Virginia.

That was also the message of the great independent universities of America in their earlier days when the founders of Harvard College did not hesitate to say that their purpose in establishing the college was "to advance learning and perpetuate it to posterity: dreading to leave an illiterate ministry to the churches, when our ministers shall lie in the dust"—when, 65 years later, 10 congregational ministers, all but one of them Harvard graduates, wrote into the charter of Yale College their intention that its students should be so educated that they might be "fitted for public employment both in church and civil state." Religion and education walked hand in hand when the congregation of the First Baptist Church of Providence, R. I., home of Brown University, placed the plaque on the wall of the meeting house, "For the publick worship of Almighty God and to hold commencement in."

The passing years have brought changes which may be described in three words—expansion, specialization, and secularization. The State college of my father's student days has grown into the university with its thousands of students and its expanded curriculum with all manner of specialized courses. Secularization has come by no formal decree, but ivy has overgrown the chapel door.

We have no quarrel with the tax-supported institution and no quarrel with the large university with its varied curriculum. Specialized education has made progress, real and valuable progress. Science has performed miracles and transformed the physical world in which we live. The social sciences have made corresponding progress. The student entering the modern college or university is greeted with a wealth of opportunity, wonderful in its richness and variety. But this very wealth presents a problem. Where can the student find the integrating principle, the philosophy of life which will enable him to relate the various branches of learning?

The dilemma is this, that we have made such progress in the mastery of the scientific means by which we live, and have not made corresponding progress in understanding the ends for which we live. Wise men of our day are saying that the need of modern education is integration. Hence the call for a new emphasis upon liberal arts education.

What do we mean by liberal education? The expression has its origin in the days of the Roman Empire when there were two types of education, one for slaves and one for freemen. Slaves did the work of the world. They not only performed the tasks of drudgery, but they were trained in the skills and crafts that enabled them to earn a living for themselves and their masters. It was beneath the dignity of freemen to earn a living. They were trained in the art of living. They were trained in literature, art, poetry, government, the science of war. It was theirs to govern, to interpret life, to be the custodians and arbiters of culture. The very term "liberal arts education" meant education suited to free, liberal men.

The situation has greatly changed in modern times. Slavery is gone. The simple training in craftsmanship of the Roman slave has developed into the technology of the modern age, with complicated machinery, electricity, atomic energy, and all the marvels of chemistry and physics. It is no longer beneath the dignity of a free man to do his part of the world's practical work. The laborer has come into a new sense of dignity in his right to order his own life and to share in the responsibilities of government.

The education suited to our time must encompass the two purposes—teaching men how to earn a living and teaching them how to live. This is the twofold task of Christian education.

CHRISTIAN EDUCATION

What do we mean by Christian education? Negatively stated, we do not mean a protest against scientific knowledge. Let us have no nonsense about an alleged conflict between science and religion or about a rivalry between knowledge and faith. Knowledge must always be a major concern of education. It is futile to complain about the emphasis which is placed upon knowledge—even the emphasis placed upon scientific knowledge. With all of the learning of the scientific age, we are discovering that modern man has only touched the surface of all there is to know about the physical universe. We live in the dawn of a whole new day of chemistry and physics; not only in the physical sciences, but in history, philosophy, literature, and the arts, our knowledge must grow from more to more. We must doubt not that—

"Through the ages one increasing purpose runs,
And the thoughts of men are widen'd with the process of the suns."

Stated negatively again, we do not mean the substitution of piety for education. If our Christian schools are to serve their day and generation by the will of God, they must maintain the highest educational standards. Our brightest Christian young people will demand this of us. We have no right to seek their patronage upon a mere appeal to Baptist loyalty or Christian loyalty. They are entitled to the best in education, and if our own schools fail to furnish it, they will seek it elsewhere.

I have said that the function of education was twofold, to teach men how to earn a living and to teach them how to live. I would add a third, to inspire in youth the love of learning.

One Saturday afternoon, in the year 1763, Dr. Samuel Johnson and his friend, James Boswell, were riding in a rowboat down the Thames River near London. To make conversation, Boswell asked Dr. Johnson, "Is it important for a man to know the Greek and Roman languages?" That question was right down Dr. Johnson's alley. He said, "Certainly, sir, the man who knows the Greek and Roman languages has every advantage." To keep Dr. Johnson talking, Boswell pursued with a further question, "But do you not think that a man might get along very well and look after his ordinary business without a knowledge of these languages?" "Of course," said Dr. Johnson, "if a man's business is entirely unrelated to the study of these languages, it is possible that he might get along without such knowledge." Turning to the boy who was rowing the boat, he said, "That boy, for instance, can row his boat just as well as if he never heard the song which Orpheus sang to the Argonauts." Then Dr. Johnson, in his usual pompous style, addressed the boy, "Sir, what would you give to know about the Argonauts?" Leaning upon his oar, and with an eager look in his eye, the boy said, "Sir, I would give what I have." Dr. Johnson was delighted, and you and I will agree that it was a great reply. "What would you give to know?" I would like to ask that question of every freshman upon the day of his entry into college. There is the cynical utilitarian who says it does not matter, that one does not need to know. He will tell you that he has made a success in life without education and culture, that not only can he row his boat, but that he owns a whole fleet of ships of many times the value of the little boat in which the friends were riding down the Thames on a Saturday afternoon. We will not controvert his claims, but again we will ask, "But what would you give to know—to know the romance of song and story that is revealed in the language and culture of the Greeks and Romans, the story of the Argonauts and the song of Orpheus?" Yes; I believe that is still a part of the function of education, to inspire in youth the love of learning, the desire to know.

What are the distinguishing marks of a good Christian college?

Even at the cost of repetition, we would say that a good Christian college should be a good college, maintaining high educational standards. We have no right to appeal for patronage and support upon the basis of denominational loyalty unless we can offer to the students educational advantages equal to those offered by other institutions. The offering of a Christian college should be an over-plus added to the best that can be offered by secular education, A college that fails to command the respect of educational standardizing agencies cannot face unashamed the ambitious Baptist student who seeks and deserves the best preparation for life.

A good Christian college should have a Christian president and faculty. In addition to their efficiency as administrators and teachers, it is required of the president and faculty that they be positive and outspoken in their Christian character and influence.

A good Christian college should have the Bible course at the center of its curriculum. Although the Bible is conceded to be the greatest literature in the world, it is not enough merely to teach the Bible as literature. Indeed, such treatment of the Bible is of doubtful value. The Bible is the authoritative book of true religion. The Christian college is free to teach the whole message of the Bible without apology or embarrassment. It is a highly debatable question whether such teaching has any place in a tax-supported school, but there is nothing debatable about the opportunity and obligation of Bible teaching in the Christian college.

A good Christian college should have the chapel service at the center of its program. Many colleges are troubled over the problem of compulsory chapel attendance. I would not be dogmatic about this question, but I would cite our experience where chapel attendance is no more voluntary than attendance upon classes and where we try to make it no less interesting than attendance at meal time. There is no virtue in making chapel speeches dull. Here the student who is seeking the integration of all the knowledge learned in the classroom should find himself and find God and truth and the guiding principles of successful living. He should learn that the fear of the Lord is the beginning of knowledge. Here knowledge can be transformed into wisdom.

If the chapel is to perform this high service, its program must be honest, sincere and intellectually respectable. The chapel is no place for narrow dogmatism, and certainly it should never serve as a false front to impress the outside constituency with a show of piety. We will serve no good purpose by setting it over against classroom instruction. Open the chapel doors that all truth may enter boldly and unembarrassed. Let science and philosophy and literature and religion all speak here. Let the room itself be a place of light, merciless light. Then let it be understood that nothing should be taught in any classroom on the campus that cannot stand this light. That is the essential meaning of integration, that every branch of learning shall make its contribution and that all learning together shall help the student attain to the full stature of knowledge and wisdom.

A good Christian college should encourage student participation in Christian activity upon a voluntary basis. Of course the ministerial students will be active in their ministerial association and the members of the Baptist Student Union will participate in all of the activities that will lead toward their standard of excellence, but it would not be to their interest to limit the student enrollment to their kind. The monastery does not furnish the best atmosphere for training them in their life work. If their message is true, then it should meet the test of daily contact with the most brilliant unbeliever in the scientific laboratory and the star halfback on the football team. Indeed, it is a wholesome sign when occasionally the ministerial student himself is carrying the ball across the goal line and the leader of the Christian organization is performing the difficult experiment in the laboratory.

A good Christian college should be actively identified with the denomination to which it belongs. True Christian education and true Christian evangelism should not be considered as vastly different. There was nothing strange or unusual in the atmosphere of our church on a recent Sunday morning when a well-known member of the college football team came down the aisle and announced to the pastor that he was coming from a Roman Catholic home and background to confess his personal faith in Christ and ask for membership in our Baptist Church. The pastor turned from him to take the hand of a high school senior football player who came to make the same confession of faith. The church at the same time voted favorably upon the request of a young Arab, native of Nazareth, who was a fellow student in college with the Catholic youth. The radical change which had come in the lives of the two college students was no sudden thing. They had watched with critical minds and with great deliberation the daily conduct of Christian students on the campus and in the classroom. They were the results of evangelism. Yes, but it was the evangelism of Christian education in a college that would consider it shameful to violate one's intellectual integrity. An evangelism that cannot function in such an atmosphere is a spurious thing—and it is equally true that a Christian education which has no evangelistic appeal has lost its soul and is no more worthy of the name of Christian.

If we believe in Christian education, and I assume that we do, what then shall we do about it? I would like to make some practical suggestions.

1. Let all of us in the churches and in the denomination cultivate a more intelligent and sympathetic attitude toward the Christian college. Let the different departments of our Christian endeavor learn to trust each other. That means that we should have done with this denominational indoor sport of sniping at the colleges. If you should ask me what is the one greatest need of the Christian college, my immediate reply would be the good will, love, and confidence of the denomination, the realization on the part of us all that the Christian college is a vital and integral part of our whole program of missions, education, and benevolence.

If this ideal is to be attained, the college must realize that it also has obligations. It must assume the responsibility of intellectual leadership, resisting all pressure that would compromise its intellectual integrity and at the same time maintaining the humility of spirit which would bring every thought into captivity to the obedience of Christ.

2. Let us recognize the dependence of the denominations upon the Christian college for the training of its ministers and other Christian leaders. We are grateful for every ministerial student who comes from a State school. There are some. I can never forget that my father came as a ministerial student from the State university. But let us not deceive ourselves. The Christian college is the source of supply. Take out of Virginia the contribution of the University of Richmond, Bluefield College, Intermont, Averitt, Fork Union, Hargrave, Oak Hill, omit the graduates of the Baptist colleges in each of the other States, and the writing of our Baptist history would be a sad story.

Simply to glance at this record is to convince us that we have no more important task than to equip these colleges for the best service of which they are capable. It is an expensive business. All modern higher education worthy of the name is expensive. We cannot think in terms of the financial support given in past decades. These colleges are involved in educational competition which demands expensive equipment and teachers who have the highest training. It is foolish to set Christian standards over against educational standards as if the two were opposed. We will get nowhere by complaining at educational standardizing agencies. We should rather demand that the colleges that are training our ministers shall be fully supplied in physical equipment and in personnel to meet the most exacting educational standards.

3. Let us recognize that in this age in which we live the training of Christian laymen is not of far less importance than even the training of ministers. The hands of the minister will be weakened unless he has the support of strong intelligent laymen who have shared with him the vision and inspiration of the Christian college. Maj. Maple T. Harl, Chairman of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation in Washington, is a brilliant graduate of William Jewell College. The other day he sent me a copy of the speech which your Senator ROBERTSON made at the dedication of a new bridge at Lynchburg. The Senator paid tribute to the great Virginian in whose honor the bridge was named, and then he launched into his chosen theme, Bridges of the Spirit. He stirred nostalgic memories as he told of his boyhood days in the home of his father, an honored Baptist minister, his later training at the University of Richmond, and the visions that came to him across the bridges of life that lead to fields of achievement and service.

"They have builded magnificent bridges
Where the Nation's highways go;
O'er the perilous mountain ridges
And where a great rivers flow.
Wherever a link was needed
Between the new and the known,
They have left their marks of progress,
In iron and steel and stone.

"There was never a land too distant,
Nor ever a way too wide,
But some man's mind, insistent,
Reached out to the other side.
They cleared the way, those heroes,
For the march of the future years,
The march was civilization—
And they were its pioneers."

Those two friends of mine in Washington, both sons of Baptist ministers and products of Baptist colleges, are representative of the type of Christian laymen who are building the bridges that lead to the world's path of progress. Dr. Orin Cornett reminds us in the latest issue of the Southern Baptist Educator that of 33,788 college men listed in the current issue of Who's Who in America 2,835 came from independent and 11,943 from tax-supported schools.

I do not know whether Who's Who has the complete and accurate record of relative achievement and service, but I will venture the opinion that whoever writes of true success for the future of America will be telling the story of the men and women who are training the Christian colleges of this country. In the century that is past, these colleges have made a contribution out of all proportion to their size. We have no right to plan for them a future less fruitful.

Official Secrecy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL HAYDEN
OF ARIZONA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, December 1, 1954

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, from time to time demand is made that all congressional committee sessions be open to the public. The subject of freedom of information has been discussed on numerous occasions and is still controversial. I have in my hand a very sensible and well-written statement on that issue by Mr William R. Mathews, editor and publisher of the Arizona Daily Star, which was published in the bulletin of the American Society of Newspaper Editors on November 1, 1954, and I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW BEST TO FIGHT OFFICIAL SECRECY—"MODERATION WILL ACCOMPLISH MUCH MORE FOR FREEDOM OF INFORMATION THAN AN EVANGELICAL CAMPAIGN MAKING EXTREME DEMANDS"

(By William R. Mathews, editor and publisher, Arizona Daily Star)

We all believe in freedom of information; we are all opposed to undue secrecy. The issue I raise in this freedom of information controversy is solely one of recommending moderation in contrast to an extremism that may defeat greater progress that could be made by a more reasonable attitude.

As an editor who has seen many reforms founder on the rocks of the demand for perfection, and who has participated in just such crusades, I have learned that better results can be had by proceeding step by step. As I see it, the issue is one of making progress, as distinguished from an attempt to bring about a millennium.

In the case of prohibition, we saw how its absolutism brought on a reaction that not only defeated it as a movement, but generated an opposite extreme. During that same period, Canada followed the course of moderation, and moderation still prevails in Canada.

ALIENATING SUPPORT

A sane, sensible program for freedom of information will keep pushing for the opening of the records of Government to all news media. When we demand that all the meetings of committees of Congress and other legislative bodies must be open to the public, we will alienate the support such bodies can give to our cause, because most legislators will resent such extreme demands.

Once, when I was much younger, I staged a great crusade to deny our city councilmen the right to hold executive sessions previous to their open meetings. Executive sessions were abolished for a while at the city hall, but they went on in the homes of the council members. Surely a mayor, councilman, legislator, or governor may invite his coworkers to his home or his hotel room for conference. Our city council now follows the sensible plan of holding off-the-record sessions, to which reporters are invited, provided they treat what is said and done as off the record. That arrangement works, and we have had good, clean city government for many years.

THE RIGHT TO THINK ALOUD

I have seen enough of the work of legislative committees to know that if I were a legislator I would insist upon closed sessions part of the time at least, so as to be able to think aloud and get work done. When committees take firm action, we, as a newspaper, demand the right to know what that action is.

My experiences in Washington with Congress have been limited, but I have seen enough of the work of Congress to be appalled at the enormous volume of detail it involves. To demand that the Appropriations Committees of the House and Senate, for instance, hold open meetings at all times, when so much detail work has to be done, goes beyond the bounds of reason. It makes us look like blind reformers who in demanding perfection make fools of themselves.

Rather than go off on such a wild-goose chase, it seems to me that we can make progress by collective and individual action in demanding that the public records be opened to all news media.

GAINS IN ARIZONA

Back in the 1930's, when we were denied the list of the AAA and Soil Conservation payments for our part of the State, I telegraphed Steve Early in the White House and within 24 hours those records were made available to us. In the 1940's when we were again denied that information, I wired Charlie Ross in the White House and within 24 hours we had the desired figures. When we wanted to see the list of loans made by the RFC in Arizona, I wrote to one of our Senators. He got the list and sent it to us.

When the Governor of Arizona refused to make public the report of a publicly asked for investigation of the office of our State land commissioner, I brought suit. At the end of 3 years a decision of our supreme court gave us the right to inspect the report and publish its contents.

I cite these experiences to emphasize that our struggle is a continuous one.

FEDERAL LAW SUGGESTED

The duty of newspapers and other news media is to guard against the abuse of such legislative or administrative practices. There will be times when newspapers should blast secret sessions of committees. There are times when they should do the same thing to get at official records. The job of a newspaper is to try to keep things in balance.

As a practical step in making progress, I suggest that we ask Congress to pass a law ordering that public records, other than such things as income tax returns and necessarily secret material affecting directly the safety of our country, be open to public inspection by responsible parties. Arizona has such a statute, but there is no such Federal statute.

If it had not been for the Arizona law, I would probably have lost my case against the Governor, judging from the questions asked by 1 or 2 of the justices. As a matter of getting such a law through Congress, should we threaten that body by demanding that all committee meetings be open?

UNFRIENDLY COURTS

Let me caution that the courts throughout the land are hostile to any extreme program. In my case, I had to show (1) that there was such a State law, to counteract the precedent that no similar Federal law existed; and (2) that the report of the investigation was in completed form and was, therefore, an official record. Preliminary reports, correspondence between the governor and other State officers on official matters, are not recognized by the courts as official records. Decisions reveal that courts are not friendly to freedom of information.

Despite my profound respect for our distinguished Casey Jones, I cannot go along with him in his plea for the introduction of television and radio in the courtroom. He makes out a powerful case for this innovation, but how many of us would like to come to trial in a tight law suit or criminal case involving deep emotions, in a courtroom before the glare of television cameras and radio microphones?

JUDGE MEDINA QUOTED

No judge in America is deserving of greater respect than the Honorable Harold Medina. He stands as a living symbol of impartial justice. Yet, he cautions against the entry of TV and radio coverage in courtrooms. He believes they impose an almost insurmountable psychological barrier to the presentation of the facts in a fair and impartial manner. The courtroom is not a stage, and a trial is not a drama. Justice might well be adversely affected by the abilities of witnesses and attorneys to act. The temptation to play to a vast audience could cause serious miscarriages of justice and do untold harm to people by bringing out false testimony, which can be stricken from a court record, but not from a television camera or radio microphone. Judge Medina saw no danger in the normal coverage by the press, because it does not interfere unduly in a fair and impartial presentation of the case. Justice in our courts should come ahead of every other consideration.

Moderation, in my opinion, will accomplish much more for freedom of information than an evangelical campaign making extreme demands.

A Mission Well Done

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, December 1, 1954

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I wish to say a word of commendation for a mission that seems to have been splendidly carried out. In August of this year the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] as chairman of the Appropriations Committee, and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], as chairman of the Subcommittee on Armed Services, appointed Brig. Gen. Julius Klein as a nonpaid consultant to make certain studies of conditions in Europe. I wish to compliment these distinguished Senators upon this appointment.

The purpose at that time was to make a study in Europe of matters pertaining to our foreign installations, especially military establishments. However, preceding his sailing, the sudden collapse of EDC upon its rejection by the French Chamber of Deputies enlarged his mission so as to consider the effect of the action of France in connection with our part in plans for the military defense of Western Europe.

I visited Europe recently and had occasion to observe first-hand the effectiveness in which General Klein conducted his mission. He got facts which I am sure will be of great use to these committees of the Senate and to others interested in the problem when his report is released. Some information about his findings has already been suggested, and it indicates that he will point out ways whereby much money can be saved in our economic and aid programs without substantially diminishing their effectiveness. Among other things, it is understood that he will recommend a permanent watchdog staff in connection with American spending in Europe. Other tentative proposals are outlined in the Chicago Daily News of October 25.

While General Klein and I have divergent political affiliations, he being a Republican and a close associate of the late Senator Taft, and while many of us may disagree with some of his conclusions, I am sure that his views will be of interest and of assistance to all of us.

The Chicago American of September 4 complimented his selection for this important mission.

I ask unanimous consent that the tentative proposals as outlined in the article of the Chicago Daily News and the editorial of the Chicago American be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the tentative proposals and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Chicago Daily News of October 25, 1954]

In his report the general is said to be stressing the following points:

1. The Senate appropriations committee should end political propaganda in Europe. Propaganda has outlived its time, as European countries are either under Moscow's grip, verging toward communism or fascism or want their own brand of democratic propaganda.

The emphasis of American activities should be put even more than it is today on the economy factor both within Europe and within the States.

It appears to be the general's conviction that only a prosperous economy with a better standard of living for the poor can save such countries as France or Italy from communism. Helping only to increase production conveys the risk that any further dollar spent in Europe might come back and haunt America's own economy.

2. There are too many American missions in Europe and their number should soon be drastically reduced. As a first immediate measure Klein will propose that Army purchasing agencies in Europe be put under General Services Administration, the United States housekeeping agency.

3. American soldiers should be spared, and Europe should be imposed on to organize promptly its own defensive forces. All available soldiers in Europe should be used.

Klein suggests that a free Polish army be constituted out of the remains of General Sikorski's and General Anders' wartime troops.

They would be reinforced by the many young Poles who have fled from their Russian-occupied native country and are willing to enlist. Such an army, the general thinks, could be established in Spain.

QUESTIONS DULLES TRIPS TO EUROPE

4. American foreign policy is not taken too seriously in Europe. There has been too much meddling with local governments and not enough clear-cut lines drawn.

Now that America has done more than its share in Europe, the countries should start selling themselves.

The general was quoted as admiring Secretary of State Dulles' moral and physical courage, but had some doubts about the value of his many trips to Europe. European leaders should now find their way to Washington when they have problems.

By coming too frequently to Europe, Dulles, in the eyes of Klein, is making the same mistake that Woodrow Wilson, Franklin Roosevelt, or Dean Acheson made before him—discrediting United States foreign policy with comparatively little results in exchange.

Klein apparently has found that Europeans view America with neither the gratitude they should nor with the admiration it deserves for its democratic institutions and economic realizations.

Europeans yell as soon as they don't get what they want from the United States, and Uncle Sam starts brandishing his stick at them.

American diplomats in Europe are too inclined to take the side of public opinion instead of defending American points of view.

Americans are 100 percent popular in only one country in Europe—Spain, and Spain is under a Fascist regime.

France is fast undergoing a thorough and necessary change. Premier Mendes-France is already a popular leader and his program of economic and social reforms may save France from communism, if opposition parties and the big powers do not interfere.

Britain is to be blamed as much as France because the EDC treaty did not come into existence.

Britain could have put it through if only it had given it half of the support it gave later to the Brussels Pact.

The United States, while insisting that the French ratify, should have put pressure on Britain to associate itself to the European institutions it outlined, as it did later on.

PRAISES MILITARY OVER DIPLOMATS

6. The American military in Europe is far superior to American diplomats. However, there are still too many duplications, too little coordination.

7. Instead of paying so much attention to European institutions, United States diplomacy should do its best to strengthen the United Nations.

The United Nations should, in the general's eyes, be the bulwark of peace and the center of the free world's peaceful and defensive institutions.

Germany should get into the United Nations as soon as possible. As for Red China, it is there already, through the Soviets.

[From the Chicago American of September 4, 1954]

GENERAL KLEIN'S MISSION

Selection of Gen. Julius Klein to conduct a study of American military establishments in Europe for the Senate Appropriations Committee is a great honor to General Klein and a nice compliment to Chicago and Illinois.

General Klein has been appointed a special consultant to the armed services subcommittee by its chairman, Senator Ferguson, of Michigan, and Senator Bridges, of New Hampshire, chairman of the Appropriations Committee.

He sailed for Europe yesterday to study our military installations and he will report his findings to the subcommittee before the 84th Congress meets in January.

Because of his peculiar experiences, General Klein is especially well equipped to appraise our military forces in Europe and their needs.

He is an officer of the Illinois National Guard with a fine record of active service. In World War II he served in the Pacific and the Philippines. He was complimented for distinguished service by General MacArthur.

The general is experienced in politics. He is a public relations man and a former newspaperman, so he possesses a profound understanding of political values and a full appreciation of the need for an informed public opinion.

He is acquainted with all the ramifications of military organization, having served as a special assistant to War Secretary Patterson in framing the unification program out of which the Defense Department was created.

General Klein has been promised the full cooperation of the Defense and State Departments, and he is a personal friend of Gen. Alfred M. Gruenther, commander of NATO, so he will have access to all the facts. And the record of his life—his military service, his leadership in the activities of the American Legion and his forthright stand on every occasion for Americanism and against communism—insures that his appraisal of the facts will be made entirely in the interests of the United States.

It is a grave responsibility that Senator Bridges and Senator Ferguson have placed on General Klein. In accepting it, he demonstrates again the spirit of service that has shaped the course of his life.

Letter From Hon. John J. O'Connor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, December 1, 1954

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I was deeply distressed to learn that, in referring recently to how Representative John J. O'Connor was "purged" in 1938, I inadvertently referred to him as if he had passed away.

I ask unanimous consent to have reprinted in the Appendix of the Record Mr. O'Connor's very courteous letter telling me of my mistake.

I hope this unfortunate slip will have the indirect benefit that through it Mr. O'Connor will return to the arena and give us the benefit of his invaluable knowledge of Communist penetration into our political system.

I commend the reading of this letter to every Member of the Senate.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Washington, *November 17, 1954.*

Re My Demise.

Hon. William E. Jenner,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

My Dear Senator: Two days ago, in the Congressional Record of Monday, November 15, 1954, on page 14867, you refer to me in several instances, and as to certain information "Representative O'Connor told us before he died."

I can assure you that, at latest report, I am very much alive—disappointing as that may be in certain circles.

As Mark Twain once said:

"The report of my death is greatly exaggerated."

Euripides inquired:

"Who knows but that this life is really death."

I am willing to wait on my epitaphs until the turn of the century.

It was very interesting to me, however, that I could still read your fine speech—in which you "speak me fair in death"—on the ramifications of the Communists and their entourage—the fellow travelers, the pinks, the liberals, the radicals, and many of the New Dealers.

You personally have done great work in turning over the rocks and driving the termites out into luminous publicity, so that our American people could see, if they only would, what has been growing in, and on, and under, our fair land, during the last 20 years, since that unlawful recognition of Communist Russia. That sudden unconstitutional action was in line with the same source bringing Trotsky into Mexico to lead, from there, the Communist infiltration in the United States. That branch of the campaign did not pan out, however.

In May 1938, as chairman of the Rules Committee, I personally brought onto the floor of the House of Representatives the resolution which, when passed, resulted in the creation of the Committee To Investigate Un-American Activities, of which Representative Martin Dies, of Texas, a member of the Rules Committee, became chairman and the resulting object of attacks—such as are going on today from all outposts of the anti-American movement—from the White House down to the Communist cells here and abroad.

When news got out that I would bring in that resolution, for passage, I was specifically warned by the leaders of certain societies, groups, and prominent newspaper heads, that I would live to regret my contemplated action, which would expose certain groups in the United States. In that fall of 1938, I was the sole victim of the "Purge," under the leadership of the President, but actually accomplished—votewise—by turning into my East Side, New York District, all the Communist groups that could be marshaled in New York, and as far west as Chicago, with hundreds of thousands of dollars to purchase the votes. I only lost by a few hundred.

That was one of the campaigns, to which you refer, as having been managed by Earl Browder, the then Communist head, and chief hatchet man—lately pardoned from prison by the then President. As you state, his campaign headquarters were the White House, to which—to my own knowledge—he had open sesame, as I have often pointed out.

The drive against me was not due alone to my nationwide radio attacks on the "Menace of Communism," starting back in 1935. There was also charged against me my leadership in defeating the plan of the President to "reorganize" the Government, with himself as Dictator, and also my opposition to his Supreme Court packing plan. In the "reorganization bill" he insisted on retaining one provision, to possess power to change the title of his office, as he might see fit.

In the midthirties, some of us were making speeches naming the very subversives, whose identies have since been disclosed, as open adherents of the Communist cause—such as Hiss, Pressman and many of the other exposed termites, named in your speech.

We pioneers received little encouragement, then, from persons high in Government or in church. We were merely disturbing "voices crying in the wilderness."

As for Dr. William Wirt, your statements in reference to the treatment accorded him are substantially accurate. He became a like victim because he exposed the cell of New Deal Communists, which conspired in "the little green house on K Street" to make the President "the new Kerensky" of the coming American "revolution." It is not entirely fair to me, however, to state that in reference to my publicly expressed regret at my participation in the harassment of the learned educator, that I "served (my) prince," if you mean the then royal President. From his throne, and within that self-designed great braided mantle, with which he enveloped himself, he would have told you the opposite—that, from about 1936, when he first started on his spree of power delirium, that there were few of his imported, leftist schemes with which I agreed, and that I openly told him so, including, for instance, my frankness—or lese majesty—in pointing out to him (without result)—and on the best police authority—that the very stenographer in the White House, who took the President's most confidential dictation, carried a card in the Communist Party.

Some of us oldtimers, however, who have been carrying on the fight against these Americans turned traitors, feel disheartened, at times, at the twist of events, and wonder whether or not the cards have been stacked, and that those patriots who would defend and preserve their country are not about to be smeared to the bottom of the heap and the subversives land safely on top.

While I do not know, nor have I ever met, Senator Joseph R. McCarthy, I do know well many of those—practically all of one ilk—who are leading the mob, bent on lynching the Senator from Wisconsin.

To me that plot is all a sector of the pattern, which I have been observing in my own long experience, but it sure is a dread culmination of the long-fought battle to preserve what was handed down to us, natives and immigrants.

As an active participant in, and an observer of politics for over 40 years, may I say, as a Democrat, but not really contentiously, that your Republican Party suffered certain losses in the recent election, for the sole reason that many of your leaders pussyfooted—like in the old "wet and dry" days—carried water on both shoulders—instead of taking a definite stand in support, at least, of what Senator McCarthy had accomplished in exposing the greatest enemy which ever threatened our country.

Please, you Senator, keep up the good fight.

Sincerely,

John J. O'Connor.

Southern Baptists in America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN L. McCLELLAN

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, December 1, 1954

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an article entitled "Southern Baptists in America," by Dr. George S. Reuter, Jr.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Southern Baptists in America

(By Dr. George S. Reuter, Jr.)

Southern Baptists have a proud heritage. Their program is going ahead with great speed, but there are some serious issues that could cause difficulties in the years ahead, as seen by the writer, an humble Southern Baptist deacon. Some of these danger points are:

1. Relationship with the American Baptist Convention. This is the former Northern Baptist Convention. A number of convention leaders have continued to give close consideration to this body instead of the conservative Baptists, yet the American Baptist Convention represents to a large extent "the modernists" in theology, while the conservative Baptists are practically like the southern Baptists in theology. A step is needed to unite the southern Baptists and the conservative Baptists.

2. Moving church membership to local community.

(a) This has been taught for many years and is found in many church covenants, yet there is a present danger spot. Dr. Billy Graham, of Montreat, N. C., didn't have a local Baptist church, hence he joined the First Baptist Church of Dallas, Tex. Dr. John R. Rice, of Wheaton, Ill., found the local Baptist church to be directed toward cooperation with the modernist group at Wheaton, Ill., and his membership is the Highland Park Baptist Church, Chattanooga, Tenn. Both of these southern Baptist ministers have thus stated conditions where the principles of moving the membership to a local situation is undesirable; namely, Dr. Graham doesn't desire to join another local denomination and Dr. Rice doesn't desire to contribute to those who favor the social gospel.

(b) There are some Baptist churches that are "closed shops." This union principle can be found at work in some Baptist churches so that a person is prevented from serving God through the local church until he has been there a lifetime. Franklin D. Roosevelt and Dan McCarty were senior wardens in New York and Florida, and they considered the opportunity of service to be the most important phase of life, yet some of our Baptist churches will not recognize ordained Baptist deacons. There is never a case of a waiting period for the minister, but there may be for the deacon. Why the difference? Both are called for service and both are ordained. The principle of full faith and credit should enter in here. Patrick Henry's "taxation without representation" is another comparison.

3. Definition of the Christian educational institution. There have been several serious criticisms of Baptist colleges. The record is clear that Baptists have some of the finest Christian schools, but others are in the "doubtful zone" in some areas. Dr. W. O. Vaught, of Little Rock, Ark., recently told of such a place. A Baptist should be expected to support only those educational institutions that are sound from the standpoint of doctrine and theology. There is a place also for interdenominational institutions that are New Testament, too, such as Moody Bible Institute, Wheaton College, and Bob Jones University. Our main interest here is to approve all educational institutions that foster the cause of Jesus Christ.

4. The majority rule idea.

Mr. Justice Holmes has had much to say concerning this issue. We must avoid becoming a tyrannical majority, yet the Baptists believe in democratic church government, hence our steps should be well chosen. The Rocky Mount Baptist court case is to be regretted for several reasons. Baptists should attempt to solve their own trouble in the local church. The majority in that church should have been recognized and there would have been no case for non-Baptists to rule on in court. The majority might have been wrong, but the minority through peaceful educational processes should have taught them the facts and prayed for them.

The local church is all powerful and should have the power to join or withdraw from the Southern Baptist Convention by majority vote. Contempt develops when you are in an organization and cannot withdraw. The famous Roosevelt bank holiday proved how to restore faith. Then it is unwise to keep a church in the convention by force that doesn't want to be there.

5. Individual rights. The recent action by the Presbyterian denomination in barring their ministers from teaching at famed Bible Institute of Los Angeles and Fuller Theological Seminary in Pasadena is a serious error. It favors the modernist, but also makes the minister "a slave of the church," yet we find many Baptists agreeing with this outrageous action.

6. Emphasizing enrollment instead of attendance in church activities.

Dr. Earl Harding, now executive secretary, Missouri Baptist General Association, taught the writer years ago the principle of a changing enrollment each time the person is absent three times. Thus it would require a person to be in attendance 3 weeks in a row to be enrolled and to begin anew each time he is absent three times in a row. The modern trend in some Baptist churches is to enroll a person the first time he is present and to keep him on the roll until he dies or leaves the community. Dr. A. G. Hause, pastor, Bales Baptist Church, Kansas City, Mo., has proved the error of this system.

Public schools no longer receive the State funds on the basis of enrollment. Average daily attendance has been found a better method. Baptist churches should take note.

7. A silent church. Some Baptist ministers are talking in terms of harmony to such an extent that it is nonsense. They teach when the preacher has spoken the membership must not take exception. This is a step toward the Roman Catholic idea. Issues should be soundly debated and the minister should not make each issue a "vote of confidence" for himself.

8. A political minister. Ministers should vote in all elections and should feel free to express an opinion outside the pulpit. They should not preach election sermons, as this is combining church and state and is undesirable.

9. A visiting minister. The local minister should visit each member of his congregation regularly. This is one of his most important duties. A visiting minister is often the pastor of a great church. People enjoy to have the minister in their homes.

I am proud to be a Southern Baptist and I hope I will always be able to say this. If we prevent difficulties before they occur, we will have made a positive contribution. We don't want our denomination to become like others have. Dr. Bob Jones, Sr., is a Methodist, but Dr. Bob Jones, Jr., didn't follow the same pattern because of "modernist" tendencies in that direction. Dr. Jack Shuler recently left his denomination to become a Baptist for about the same reason. Let's keep the Southern Baptist churches sound New Testament ones.

Address by Hon. Thor C. Tollefson, of Washington, Before American Pilots' Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, December 1, 1954

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an excellent address concerning the problems of the American merchant marine. The address was delivered by the Honorable Thor C. Tollefson, Representative from the State of Washington, before the 37th Biennial Convention of the American Pilots' Association, in Seattle, Wash., on October 2, 1954.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Toastmaster, ladies and gentlemen, friends of the American merchant marine, it is indeed an honor to have been invited to speak to you on this occasion.

Notwithstanding the fact that I am, in a sense, an amateur speaking to the experts, I am glad to be with you, in the hope that together we might throw a little light upon an important subject concerning which there has been so much "foggy" thinking amongst many in our Government in past years.

Actually, the problem which we seek to solve can be stated in a simple question—"Do we or do we not, want an adequate American merchant marine?"

If we do not—then that is the end of the whole matter. Let us not concern ourselves about it any longer.

But if we do want an American merchant marine, then let us do something about it—and quick.

One would think our people, in and out of Government, could have only one answer, and that it would be the same as yours, namely "yes, we do want an American merchant marine." But that is not the case. There are those who have no ideas at all in the matter, and consequently do nothing, then there are those who say "No; we do not need a merchant marine. We can rely upon the ships of foreign nations, especially our friends and allies, to carry our passengers and cargoes—and in time of war to carry our troops and materials."

You do not believe that it is true? I am afraid that it is. I know that it is. As recently as this month, I have talked to Members of Congress who have said, "Why don't these American ships operate under foreign flags?"

One of the great tragedies of history is that its lessons are never learned. And one of the costliest lessons—costly in terms of American lives lost, American wealth destroyed, American grand strategy delayed, and wars prolonged—derives directly from the fact that we have not heeded the lesson of the great need of an adequate merchant marine in times of peace, as well as in times of war

Great merchant fleets have been the making of strong empires in the past, just as the lack of them, or their neglect, have been the downfall of empires. The peak of glory in Phoenicia, Spain, and England coincides with the greatness of their merchant marine.

But those whose thinking runs against the providence of history tell us today that we do not need an adequate merchant fleet, and in the event of war, we can rely upon foreign merchant marines.

And I say to you that we can depend as much upon foreign merchant fleets in time of war as we can depend upon foreign navies in time of war.

No nation as proud and able as we are, with our enormous coastline, should ever permit itself to say that it will depend upon foreign fleets for its defense.

Such policy is an insult to American pride and American self-reliance. Have you forgotten the days of the Yankee Clipper?

What does our own history tell us?

World War I was infinitely more costly because we failed at the time to have an adequate merchant fleet in being.

World War II, for the second time in a single generation, beat the fact of the indispensability of an adequate American merchant marine into our reluctant minds with frightful consequences.

Yet there are those of us in Congress who have to stand up and beg for a strong merchant fleet as if it were some sort of boondoggling or pork-barrel legislation.

Historians may say, and do say, that our lack of a merchant fleet of any consequence was an encouragement to our enemies to make war upon us. Germany and Japan may have followed a different course had we possessed a strong merchant fleet.

We came within inches—so to speak—of losing World War I and World War II because we did not have the merchant marine which the situations called for. In both cases we waited for the emergency to come upon us before we acted, and then we had to act in a state of desperation. We were lucky in those emergencies.

Now we seem to be following the same course—and there is grave doubt that we can get away with it again. The time factor is shorter, because the enemy has the means of moving faster.

If there's a war to be fought we want it to be fought elsewhere, not here. In order to make that possible we must have ships to convey men and materials across the seas. If we don't have the ships we just can't move men and supplies fast enough.

Just prior to World War I we so neglected our merchant marine that our ships were carrying only 9 percent of our export-import trade. When the war finally broke out and while we were still in a neutral position we did not have ships to meet even our basic needs. Our foreign trade was paralyzed because the nations of the world would not let us use their ships. Cargoes piled up on our docks. British and neutral shipowners seized upon our high seas misery and gouged the American businessman. Shipping rates went up 700 percent and when the war was going full blast they went up 2,000 percent. For general cargo the average was 1,117 percent.

Before the war you could charter a ship for a dollar a ton. Within 2 months after hostilities broke out this jumped to $13.88 a ton outside the war zone and $20 a ton inside the zone. One voyage often paid for a ship.

Of course you could buy a ship if you could find one. Before the war the cost was $60 a ton—during the war it jumped to $600 per ton.

On July 1, 1915, the American flag flew over 523,000 tons of shipping. By 1917 this had increased to a mere 650,000 tons.

When World War I ended the United States had a fleet of 2,547 ships of some 14,705,281 deadweight tons.

The cost of that fleet, the acquisition of which was imperative for the Nation's survival, was $3,042,000,000, and we paid $90 million on a year in interest on the bill. This appalling figure should silence forever the critics of an adequate merchant marine.

These ships were not supplied by foreign nations. Our Government had to construct 2,316 of them. Only 231 were acquired elsewhere, and some of these from departments of government or through purchase from private enterprise.

These ships could have been built for $840 million before the war—a savings of over $2 billion.

And what about the shortening of the war and the saving of lives, as a consequence thereof? Many of you can still remember the doughboys in our Army camps and the material stacked up in warehouses because we didn't have enough ships to carry them to the war front.

Out of the experiences of World War I the 66th Congress enacted the Merchant Marine Act of 1920. Let me read a portion of the preamble:

"That it is necessary for the national defense and for the proper growth of its foreign and domestic commerce that the United States shall have a merchant marine of the best equipped and most suitable types of vessels sufficient to carry the greater portion of its commerce and serve as a naval or military auxiliary in time of war or national emergency, ultimately to be owned and operated privately by citizens of the United States and it is hereby declared to be the policy of the United States to do whatever may be necessary to develop and encourage the maintenance of such a merchant marine."

What Congress said in 1920 it repeated even more strongly in the Merchant Marine Act of 1936. Let me read the preamble to it:

"It is necessary for the national defense and development of its foreign and domestic commerce that the United States shall have a merchant marine (a) sufficient to carry its domestic waterborne and a substantial portion of the waterborne export and import foreign commerce of the United States and to provide shipping service on all routes essential for maintaining the flow of such domestic and foreign waterborne commerce at all times, (b) capable of serving as a naval and military auxiliary in time of war or national emergency, (c) owned and operated under the United States flag by citizens of the United States insofar as may be practicable, and (d) composed of the best equipped, safest, and most suitable types of vessels, constructed in the United States and manned with a trained and efficient citizen personnel. It is hereby declared to be the policy of the United States to foster the development and encourage the maintenance of such a merchant marine."

But neither the mistakes of World War I, nor the acts of Congress served to silence those who saw little point to a strong merchant fleet—and who kept saying that other nations, allied with us, had all the fleets we needed and that we could safely depend upon them.

And when World War II broke out, we repeated most of the agony of World War I.

Our allies could not furnish us their shipping.

The United States in the midst of the war, with its enormous energies needed critically for the production of airplanes, munitions, and other war material, found itself confronted with the additional emergency need of a basic fleet of 5,000 ships to fill the shipping wants of our own forces and those of our allies fighting the Axis Powers.

But on September 1, 1939, the United States had only 1,379 seaworthy ships grossing 1,000 tons or over.

Our not having an adequate merchant marine meant that our enemies had won one of the major battles of World War II without having had to spend a nickel or losing a single soldier.

What it cost us in lives and treasure is incalculable.

The Axis knew the situation and exploited it. The very inadequacy of our fleet suggested the possibility to them of total victory in this phase of the war. With so little to destroy perhaps they could destroy it all. This they tried to do. During the course of the war they sank 6,609,000 deadweight tons of American ships. The total allied ships sent to the bottom amounted to 36,000,000 deadweight tons. German submarines appeared like hornets in the west Atlantic, the Gulf of Mexico, and the Caribbean. Americans standing on our shores saw our submarine-struck ships sink.

Did our allies furnish us the ships which we needed in World War II? No. As a matter of fact, all our allies supplied us with only 715,000 gross tons of ships. Against that we delivered to them 5,500,000 gross tons—8 times as many as they gave to us. Between 1941 and 1945 we built 54,224,000 tons of ships.

But they cost us approximately $14,000,000,000. Ships of the same cargo carrying capacity could have been built before the war for $4,000,000,000—a savings of about $10,000,000,000 to say nothing of the $400,000,000 a year interest we are still paying.

And what about other losses caused by our neglect of our merchant marine? What about grand strategy delayed, war prolonged and life and treasure lost? That cost was incalculable.

Just the other day I heard an official refer to the week after week and month after month of waiting during the torch operation (invasion of north Africa) and the invasion of the Continent—waiting for the ships that were needed to do the job. A foreign official told me just last Sunday that we came, as he put it, within 50 or 60 ships of losing the war. The race to build ships was just that close.

Fleet Adm. Ernest King, in charge of United States naval operations, said in a letter to Admiral Land on November 2, 1945:

"During the past 3½ years, the Navy has been dependent upon the merchant marine to supply our farflung fleet and bases. Without this support, the Navy could not have accomplished its mission. Consequently, it is fitting that the Merchant Marine share in our success as it shared in our trials.

"The merchant marine is a strong bulwark of national defense in peace and war, and a buttress to sound national economy. A large merchant marine is not only an important national resource; it is, in being, an integral part of our country's armed might during time of crisis. During World War II, this precept has been proven."

With the experiences of two world wars behind us there are still those who believe we need have no concern about having an adequate merchant fleet. Some of them point to our reserve fleet and say "We have a sufficient reserve to meet an emergency." As if our potential enemy had laid up in his reserve fleet the old submarines of World War II. As if he were not producing new, better, and faster ones. As if he were not producing other implements to sink the almost obsolete slow-traveling, desperately constructed ships of World War II. As if all the other maritime nations of the world were not producing modern, fast ships which we have greater and greater difficulty competing with.

Will these people never learn? Will they never heed the lessons of the past? Will they never listen to those in authority, and others, who are concerned?

I have mentioned the policy of earlier Congresses in connection with the Merchant Marine Acts of 1920 and 1936.

Here is what President Wilson said in 1915:

"It is high time we repaired our mistake and resumed our commercial independence on the seas. For it is a question of independence. If other nations go to war or seek to hamper each other's commerce, our merchants, it seems are at their mercy, to do with as they please. We must use their ships, and use them as they determine. We have not ships enough of our own. We cannot handle our own commerce on the seas. Our independence is provincial and is only on land and within our own borders."

Presidents Wilson, Roosevelt, Truman, and Eisenhower have all recognized the need for an adequate American merchant marine, and have made policy statements in support thereof.

Let me call your attention to an astounding statement made to our committee a few weeks ago by Adm. W. D. Leggett, Chief of Navy's Bureau of Ships. He said "The shipbuilding industry promises to become the most vulnerable area in our preparedness program."

He did not say we were vulnerable because we lacked battleships, or airplanes, or tanks, or guns. He referred to the plight of our commercial shipyards. Why the shipyards? Because that's where we will build the ships which we now don't have, but which we will need so desperately in the event of an emergency.

What's happening in our commercial shipyards? There were no cargo ships built for private account in 1953. Our yards have no orders on their books as of this month. In 1955 there will only be two ships on the ways in our yards (unless we do something soon).

What has happened since World War II? From the end of the war to 1953 there has been constructed in the world 12 million tons of new ships. Of this amount our nation completed 2 percent; the United Kingdom 30 percent; Norway 12 percent; France 8 percent; and other nations built the balance. Today there are 6½ million tons on order or under construction. But none in our yards.

Our yards face closure. No wonder Admiral Leggett is concerned. No wonder he says that our most vulnerable defense area promises to be our shipyards.

Charles Thomas, Secretary of the Navy, recently told members of our committee that the Government should immediately initiate a program for the construction of at least 20 ships annually to keep our yards active and in readiness for an emergency. He, too, recognizes the need for ships in event of war.

A short time ago, Under Secretary of Commerce for Transportation, Robert Murray, in a comprehensive report said that "the objectives of our maritime policy are so fundamental to the national interest that their attainment should be given primary consideration at all time." He recommended a construction program of 60 oceangoing vessels a year.

Gen. Paul Yount, Army's Chief of Transportation, just last Tuesday, told us that the American merchant marine was the "fourth arm of our defense"; and that it carried the bulk of men and materials to the war front.

These men are concerned about the need for ships in the event of war. But they understand that in order to obtain them for war, we must have them during peacetime. They know we must have a nucleus fleet; they know we must have trained seamen; they know we must have shipyards and skilled shipbuilders— all ready to be used if war breaks out.

Pending in this Congress are two bills designed to induce the construction of some new fast tankers.

There are some bills authorizing a study of our shipyard situation, and designed to be a step in the direction of preserving our shipbuilding skills and our shipbuilding facilities.

There will be some measures soon introduced to provide for the construction of passenger and dry-cargo vessels.

All will have difficulty in obtaining congressional approval unless we can convince those in public and those in Congress, who are critical of our merchant-marine needs that it is in the interest of our national defense to immediately act upon them.

I have approached this subject from the angle of national defense. But having an adequate merchant marine is also in the interests of our domestic economy.

There are real benefits to be had from our merchant fleet operations by the American worker, the farmer, the businessman, the banker, the ship supplier, and the insurance man. Foreign-flag ships purchase all their needs elsewhere. American-flag ships do not. For instance, in 1953 the American subsidized lines alone purchased $100 million worth of food supplies in the United States. They paid American seamen $100 million in wages, upon which $23 million in taxes was returned to the Government. How many more hundreds of millions of dollars were used to purchase general ship supplies, insurance, etc., I do not know. American subsidized ships are built and repaired in American yards which employ many thousands of skilled workers.

So our whole economy benefits by the maintenance of an American fleet.

I have stressed the national defense factor because it is so vital right now. Our merchant fleet faces block obsolescence within the next few years. Our shipyards are running out of work. If they do, they will close down. The yards will deteriorate. The shipbuilding skills will be lost because the men must find employment elsewhere. We would, indeed, be most vulnerable in the event of an emergency.

We must not permit such a situation to come about. You and others like you across the length and breadth of this Nation will not sit idly by to see it happen. You will fight to preserve our merchant marine. And we, in Congress, who share your views will fight right along with you.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Printing and binding for Congress, when recommended to be done by the Committee on Printing of either House, shall be so recommended in a report containing an approximate estimate of the cost thereof, together with a statement from the Public Printer of estimated approximate cost of work previously ordered by Congress within the fiscal year (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 145, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on Printing, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. The money derived from such sales shall be paid into the Treasury and accounted for in his annual report to Congress, and no sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Frank Brodie is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Award

E

IN THE

2

Mr.
unanin
the Ap
by the
and his
25, 195
ing to
James
Nationa
a nonp
founded
to prov
an acce
experie
introdu
gatheri
of the
preside
America
There
was ord
as follow

INTRODUC
OF

Mr. P
gentlem
to partic
the Jam
Chief E
During
tune to
Mr. Forr
of the N
a man c
to duty.
He wa
vital im
lationshi
tween ou
had an
achieved
an airpl
July 194
We we
of the S
the plan
John G
Blandy.
war, yet
the futu
As I re
"When
ican bus
ices. I h
organiza
contact
In this w
both the
ing to th
The very
nature o
It is imp
our coun
tionship

Appendix

Award to President Eisenhower of James Forrestal Memorial Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, December 2, 1954

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address by the President of the United States, and his introduction, delivered October 25, 1954. The occasion was the awarding to the Chief Executive of the first James Forrestal Memorial Award by the National Security Industrial Association, a nonprofit, nonpolitical organization founded a decade ago by James Forrestal to provide for the Defense Department an access to America's pool of industrial experience. President Eisenhower was introduced to a distinguished dinner gathering by Frank M. Folsom, chairman of the NSIA Awards Committee and president of the Radio Corporation of America.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTRODUCTION BY FRANK M. FOLSOM, CHAIRMAN OF THE NSIA AWARDS COMMITTEE

Mr. President, honored guests, ladies and gentlemen, it is an honor and a privilege to participate tonight in this first award of the James Forrestal Memorial Medal to our Chief Executive.

During the last war, it was my good fortune to have been closely associated with Mr. Forrestal when he was Under Secretary of the Navy. I knew him as a friend, and as a man of high ideals and intense devotion to duty.

He was among the first to recognize the vital importance of continuing the fine relationship established during the war between our military forces and industry. He had an idea about how this goal could be achieved, and he told me about it during an airplane flight to the South Pacific in July 1942.

We were on the way to the headquarters of the South Pacific Fleet, and with us in the plane were Adm. Lewis Strauss, Adm. John Gingrich, and Adm. William H. P. Blandy. It was a very critical time in the war, yet James Forrestal was thinking of the future as well as the present.

As I remember his words, he said:

"When this war is over, I hope that American business will remain close to the services. I hope that some sort of nonpolitical organization can be set up that will stay in contact with the Military Establishments. In this way, the valuable contributions that both the military and industry are now making to the Nation's welfare will not be lost. The very nature of the military and the very nature of business cause constant change. It is important, therefore, for the good of our country that we maintain the close relationship that now exists."

Had he lived, I am sure that Mr. Forrestal would have been highly gratified by the success of NSIA—the organization born of his idea.

I know that he would have been happy, indeed, that you, Mr. President, have been selected as the first recipient of the medal named in his honor.

Your career fulfills in the highest measure the ideals that are symbolized by this award. In war and in peace, your example of understanding and cooperation inspires all of us to greater effort and brighter hope. We admire and salute the service you have rendered to our country.

CITATION

The National Security Industrial Association, Inc., awards the James Forrestal Memorial Medal to Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States:

"Dwight D. Eisenhower, soldier, educator, and statesman, whose life has been dedicated to the promotion of national and world peace, has continually provided outstanding leadership in encouraging effective cooperation and harmonious relationships between government and industry.

"The progressive policies fostered by President Eisenhower have contributed immeasurably to the creation of a high standard of achievement in the vital area of national security.

"As a military leader and as Chief Executive of our Nation, he has demonstrated an appreciation of the problems of both industry and government in these challenging times. His personal interest and guidance in developing the fullest utilization of the Nation's resources have been vital factors in keeping America safe and strong. The peace of the world is at stake; as our national leader, his wisdom and accomplishments have brought us, as a nation, nearer to the goal of enduring peace and world understanding."

Ladies and gentlemen, the President of the United States.

ADDRESS OF PRESIDENT EISENHOWER

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Folsom, Mr. Chief Justice, my fellow Americans, it is indeed a high honor that you pay me, I am touched by the terminology in which you have seen fit to commend me and though I shall be somewhat embarrassed each time I read it, I assure you that my pride will be equal to my embarrassment and I'll read it often.

Moreover, to receive an award bearing the name of James Forrestal is indeed a great distinction. I am deeply grateful to all of you and to the National Security Industrial Association.

I was privileged to be associated closely with James Forrestal during the final years of his life. He was devoted to the public good. There has been no stancher patriot nor anyone more far-sighted in perceiving the evil designs of Communist imperialism. At my first meeting with him, during World War II, he expressed his grave fear that Communist Russia would emerge from the war as a threat to individual liberty and freedom. To these he was completely dedicated.

Central among the many concerns of his sweeping mind was the great free economy of America. He knew that in peace and war, this economy is the source of our military strength. He knew that unless this economy were kept healthy, strong, and expanding, there would be for the free world neither victory in war nor security in peace.

In the vitality of this system, James Forrestal had complete faith. He did not mistakenly think of our economy merely in terms of broad acres and mighty industries, of railroads and ships and mines and factories. Though all these we have, he clearly saw that it is America's people—farmers, teachers, shipbuilders, scientists, executives, machinists, truck drivers, all living under a system that encourages individualism—who are directly responsible for the near miracle of our great productivity.

Faith in America noted

Consequently, he was skeptical of excessive governmental interference with our economy in times of peace. He well recognized the need for the Government to prevent or correct monopolistic concentrations, as well as unemployment and agricultural dislocations. Yet he saw just as clearly the evils of regimentation.

His faith in America was rooted in his conviction that, by and large, and over the long pull, we could and would cooperate, one with another, for the benefits of all. He believed that in an America at peace, a combination of private citizen and local and Federal Government, operating together under wise regulatory laws and accepted practices, would sustain our priceless liberties and rights, while producing for each of us an ever-rising prosperity and standard of living.

Of this economy that so engaged the study and interest of James Forrestal, I shall speak tonight. More specifically, I shall speak of certain functions that, I believe, our Government must perform to keep our economy growing, stable, and strong.

It has been truly said that the state of economy is largely a national state of mind.

For 20 long years somewhere in the world there has been war—up until a few months ago. Thus, for almost a generation, tragedy and happiness—waste and plenty—foxholes and jobs—have been tightly joined together in people's minds. Many came to believe that these had to live together or not at all—that, without war, without the mountainous demands of the battlefield, modern industrial America would always overproduce, forcing unemployment and a downward economic spiral and ultimately cascading all of us into the terrible pit of depression.

As war year succeeded war year, this attitude toward our Nation's economy exacted a heavy toll. It stunted growth. It warped economic behavior. It blighted confidence and discouraged needed investments that thrive on confidence. Many of our people were frightened into grasping more for security and protection than for new opportunity and a fuller life.

But, in the past 2 years, there have been heartening events. They should release tremendous economic energies and, for all of us, open the door to a happier future. For, in 2 years, we have again demonstrated that America's prosperity does not necessarily depend on war's sacrifices,

Economy level cited

Without war our economy is working at near record levels. Over 62 million people have jobs. The number is steadily increasing. The hours of work are getting longer. Consumers are spending at a higher rate than ever before. Construction records are being broken month by month. Wage rates are at their all-time peak. Weekly earnings in manufacturing are again on the rise. Our people have more personal income, after taxes, than ever before. Our national production surpasses even the war peak of 1944. It is far above the levels of 1945 through 1952.

We know that, if we act wisely, before us is continuing expansion, with a steady rise in the living standards of all of our people.

To foster this expanding economy must be our Government's domestic goal.

In so conducting our affairs we must never lose sight of the fundamental fact that our economy succeeds only as our people succeed. On the release of the treasure house of energy, brains, and confidence of all 163 million of our people depends our economic future.

Drawing on the richly varied abilities of our entire citizenry, we can foresee that in less than a decade the national output will increase from today's $356 billion to $500 billion. This would equal an average increase of more than $3,000 for every American family of today. And these can be real dollars—dollars of stable buying power, not simply more dollars of cheapened value.

And while our people in their daily tasks are bringing this about, Government must intelligently and vigorously do its part.

Government must work to stabilize the buying power of the dollar, else the value of the pension, the insurance policy, and the savings bond is eroded away.

Government, through social security and by fostering applicable insurance plans, must help protect the individual against hardship and help free his mind from anxiety.

Government must use its full powers to protect its citizens from depression, unemployment, and economic distress.

Government, my friends, must have a heart as well as a head. It must encourage, guide, backstop, and supplement—but never dominate or attempt to regiment our people.

Events of recent months provide lessons we must not ignore.

A year ago, inflation was halted. Defense expenditures were being reduced. Wartime economic stilts that many thought were essential props for business were being cut down. New floods of automobiles, appliances and other products had swept away civilian market shortages. We were shifting from the shortage economy of war to the plenty of peace.

And why wasn't the result chaos and economic despair, as many feared?

First, because taxes were cut.

Citizens could devote fewer hours to meeting governmental obligations and more to their own living requirements. Seven billion four hundred million tax dollars are being left with our people to spend at a time when their buying power needed to be sustained. This saving is evident every time a citizen opens a pay envelope, goes to the movies, takes a train or a bus trip, buys a refrigerator. For all of our citizens—from working mothers with dependents in their homes, to wage earners with heavy medical bills, to businesses needing to expand and thereby to create more jobs—the tax burden has been reduced. Thus our national adjustment from wartime to peacetime was eased. And our economy was given added strength.

Economic picture drawn

Now, secondly, Government powers over money and credit were used to stabilize the buying power of the dollar. They were used in January 1953, to stop the spiraling inflation which could have resulted in serious unemployment and depression. Later, as this risk diminished, the process was gradually reversed to ease credit markets and encourage economic expansion. This helped people to buy homes, automobiles, and household appliances. It encouraged them to construct new plants, manufacture equipment, build new shopping centers. It stimulated State and local public works. In these ways, our Nation avoided liquidations which in the past brought on panics, widespread unemployment, and despair.

The objective of these measures, I repeat, was to release individual enterprise and iniative—to maintain confidence among consumers and investors, among businessmen and working people.

Other measures also have helped to sustain our economic strength.

Social security was extended to 1,400,000 more people, including for the first time more than 5 million farmers. Thus, hundreds of millions a year were added to the buying power of our elderly people.

The protection of unemployment insurance was extended to some 4 million workers not previously covered.

A new housing law helped our people acquire new homes and encouraged building throughout the country.

In carrying out farm laws still in effect, basic crops were supported by loans and purchases amounting to $1,646,000,000 in the current fiscal year. At the same time, a new farm program was carefully evolved to attack the problems of markets, production, and surpluses which, for 7 years, have forced a steady decline in farm income.

Strategic materials, essential to our military strength, are being purchased in an amount of $900 million.

A new multimillion-dollar program of shipbuilding and repair is keeping in operation needed shipbuilding facilities and creating many jobs.

In these and many other ways, Government has helped to keep our Nation's economy on an even keel. And the result? This year 1954 is our most prosperous peacetime year in all our history.

This picture is marred, of course, by the fact that in certain industries and localities some unemployment still exists as the aftermath of war and inflation. It is a matter of deep concern to all of us when people, looking for work, cannot find it. Unemployment figures are far more than statistics. They reflect heartache—anxiety—hardship—and, ultimately, loss of confidence in our country's future. It is not only in the interests of the jobless workmen but for the benefit of all of us that the problem be solved.

It is essential to create more jobs and to ease these warborn hardships. Good progress is being made. Since last spring unemployment has been steadily declining. Still more progress is needed. There is certainly no comfort for us in the mere fact that the unemployment level is much lower today than during the recession of 1949 and 1950, or in fact that unemployment today is less than one-third its level in the years 1933 to 1940, when as many as 10 million Americans were out of jobs and couldn't find them.

I should like to interrupt myself here to give you a report that reached me just late this afternoon. It came from the Secretary of Commerce and the Secretary of Labor jointly. It is the latest report on unemployment. In this month it has been reduced by 400,000 jobs.

Drop in unemployment

In that period, unemployment has fallen from 3,100,000 to 2,700,000. I have asked the Secretary of Labor, incidentally, in a nationwide telecast tomorrow night to give to the public all of the facts that we have on this employment and unemployment situation.

Incidentally, I might remark as I look at this head table, this seems to me, or feels to me, like the second Cabinet meeting I've had since 7 o'clock this evening. I sincerely hope that most, if not all of you, got to hear the report from Secretary Dulles, a report that carries for all of us so much of promise because of its evidence of growing strength in Western Europe.

I repeat that a central reason for our overall economic growth is confidence that the American economy will meet the tests of peace.

I believe that it is high time, in this great, growing, productive land of ours, to put behind us the rash of fears that for so long have haunted some among us—fear of war, fear of unemployment, fear of ourselves—fear of the future. Certainly, we know now that one such fear—the fear of paralyzing depression—can be safely laid away.

But we must not rest. In our economy, to stand still is to fall behind. Our labor force is growing. Productivity is rising. We must do more than simply to plan against trouble or accept unemployment at its present level. Rather, we must advance toward and beyond the goal I mentioned earlier—within 10 years, a national production of $500 billion.

This means that we must do a number of things.

First, we must develop a foreign economic program that will expand trade, encourage investment, help bring about currency convertibility, and reduce the need for direct aid to other countries. This program will expand markets for our goods abroad. It will help improve our standard of living, as well as the security and solidarity of the entire free world. Our economy can grow only as part, though a vastly important part, of a growing free world economy. Just as there is no security for America in isolation neither is there durable prosperity.

Second, we must continue to reduce the cost of Government, so we can have more tax cuts. Already in 2 years we have cut Federal costs by $11 billion. To the limit that national security will permit, we must make more savings and return them, in the form of lower taxes, to the American people. Tax cuts will add still more to private income and expenditure. They will stimulate the continued growth of the economy. For every dollar cut down on Federal expenditures, I believe we can, with reasonable assurance, expect a $2 expansion in our private economy.

Third, we must give America a modern highway system. In addition to easing the Nation's traffic problems, we will, by this great program, powerfully stimulate healthy economic growth and strengthen the Nation's security.

Fourth, we must continue to improve our farm program. As the American farmer keeps on increasing his productivity—already the highest in the world—he must be helped to gain his fair share of the steady increase in our national income.

Fifth, we must speed the conversion of the atom to the peacemul service of mankind. Incidentally a program on which we never give up for 1 minute. We proceed with all of our friends in working out ways and means for doing it.

Better schools urged

Sixth, we must work for more and better schools and homes. We must improve opportunities for teachers. We must further improve our social-security system. We must provide better protection against the hardships of old age, ill health, poverty, and unemployment.

Seventh, in the partnership with States, local communities, and private citizens, we must develop the water, power, and soil resources of our great river valleys.

In these and other ways, we shall continue economic progress for all America in a world at peace. Thus we shall assure every citizen a maximum opportunity to enjoy good health and a good job, a good home, and a good education, and a rising standard of living.

Three basic facts are important in this forecast.

First, of course, is our free way of life.

Second is our rapidly growing population.

Third is the amazing variety of new products of our technology.

Our population grows at a rate of five new Americans every minute. We have grown by 20 million in the past 10 years. By 1970 we will number 200 million souls. Simply to keep up with our needs for homes, factories, schools, roads, and goods for these additional Americans will powerfully stimulate expansion of our economy. And, to provide us a higher standard of living, it must expand even more.

This expansion is entirely within our power. Doubters need only to look at some of the new frontiers science opens to us almost daily—in plastics, new metals, peacetime atomic developments, antibiotics, television, aeronautics. Today more than twice as many of our people work in research and development as were so working a dozen years ago. America now invests $4 billion a year in scientific research and development. No money is better invested in our Nation's future.

Future good envisioned

In my own lifetime, from my boyhood in Kansas to this day, I have seen automobiles, radio, television, telephones, electricity, tractors, power machinery, new insecticides, fertilizers, good roads, and modern schools all come to rural America. If in this time because I am not so awful old, so much could be done, I know that America's tomorrow will be still more exciting, still more productive, filled with more and better things for all of our people.

We must, therefore, encourage our economy along the ways of healthy expansion and be vigilant to keep it vigorous and free.

My friends, there remains one thought, the most important of all, that I must leave with you. It is that only when we win the struggle for permanent peace can we devote the full power of this mighty country of ours to the advancement of human happiness.

America's greatest hope and opportunity is to make strong and lasting the present uneasy peace that has so lately come to the world. With our great economic strength clearly before us, we have no reason for fear. If we exercise wisdom, if we maintain our faith in the genius and energy of our people, if we avoid the centralization that is the refuge of fear, our economy will remain healthy and growing and strong.

With this strength, with this confidence, our Nation will be fortified in its quest for world peace—a quest that must never cease, never slacken, until the final goal has been attained.

This, our deepest aspiration, a precious dream that was shared by James Forrestal, will, with God's help, one day be realized, then the true road to enduring happiness and prosperity will open to us and to all the world.

My friends, again permit me to express my very great pride in this award and in the compliment that I've been paid by this entire gathering. Thank you.

Communism and the Counterattack

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, December 1, 1954

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, an address was delivered on November 16 at the Goodwyn Institute in Memphis, Tenn., by our respected former colleague, Harry P. Cain, of Washington State, presently a member of Subversive Activities Control Board.

The address deals with domestic communism and our Government's counterattack upon it, as carried forward by the SACB. In his exposition of this agency's important work our former colleague demonstrates that the Communist conspiracy can and is being exposed and defeated through means and procedures which keep the requirements of our Nation's security and its freedoms in steady balance. I would urge that every Senator and every citizen read this address and reflect upon its content. A widened knowledge and deepened understanding of the work of the SACB will allay unnecessary fears and afford the confidence and encouragement needed in our struggle with the Communist enemy.

I am informed by the Public Printer that the address will make approximately $2\frac{2}{3}$ pages, at a cost of $214.

I regard the article as of great importance, and I believe that Senators and many other persons will desire to read it, so I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMUNISM AND THE COUNTERATTACK

(Address by Harry P. Cain, member of the Subversive Activities Control Board, at the Goodwyn Institute, Memphis, Tenn., November 16, 1954)

I am grateful for the opportunity given me by the learned director of the Goodwyn Institute, Dr. George, to discuss with you the progress your Federal Government has achieved in exterminating the Communist evil which menaces our free Republic.

We have just completed a basic process in keeping our Government free, the election of a new Congress by free choice.

President Eisenhower, as long ago as last April, ventured a guess that communism would not figure in the election campaign, and yet, when the new 84th Congress assembles, familiar faces will be missing and new ones present, this in consequence of the impact on the campaign of the issue of hardness or softness toward communism.

Of my own friends in Congress who were up for reelection—and a former Member of the Senate always finds scores of his friends in that predicament—I can recall not one who, during the campaign admitted that the Communist peril left him undisturbed. To the contrary, most, if not all, of my friends among the officeseekers proclaimed their deep concern over that godless movement and its inroads upon our security.

The attitude of the candidates formed as good an index as any within my knowledge of how the American people view communism, in this the 10th year of the cold war.

One candidate, neither a friend of mine nor a Member of Congress but a contender for the seat of the 24th Congressional District of the Bronx, New York City, was not merely soft on communism but a forthright apologist for communism and its masters in Moscow.

Elizabeth Gurley Flynn, an old-line Communist, out on bail pending a decision on her appeal from conviction by a Federal jury for conspiring to advocate forcible overthrow of the Republic, stood as the Communist Party candidate for that New York seat in the lawmaking body of the Government she would destroy.

I needn't tell you that the good citizens of the Bronx rained down a blizzard of ballots which put this strange candidate's ambitions in the deep freeze.

Yet, notwithstanding President Eisenhower's indication that communism would not figure in the campaign, that issue did emerge and the new Congress will have a somewhat different complexion than its predecessor.

Did the President then misjudge the country's temper and the importance of the Communist issue to you? I am sure he did not.

As one with longer if not deeper experience in politics than the President, one who now, as his appointee to the Subversive Activities Control Board, stands at the very center of Federal operations against the Communist octopus, I can assure you that he has measured the menace accurately and knows precisely how it has aroused you.

What the President actually said as to the emergence of the issue in the election was that, if Congress added to the existing anti-Communist laws the new weapons he had requested to neutralize this evil conspiracy, public anxiety would be abated.

Let me say at once that the 83d Congress, acting in a bipatrisan, patriotic spirit, armed him with the instruments he requested and that, under laws enacted by that Congress, the administration can and will now hack off arms and sucking caps of the Soviet-nurtured octopus which could not be touched.

Heretofore, when called upon by lawfully constituted agencies to reveal the activities of their coconspirators, Communists could and did avoid answering by the simple pleading of the fifth amendment, claiming that their answers might incriminate them.

As Miss Flynn's candidacy tells us, Communists, so far as Federal law is concerned, have, until now, enjoyed full citizenship rights.

Beyond that, Communists who jumped bail, and there have been a number who did so, could be prosecuted only for a misdemeanor and not for a crime. Moreover, Communists who harbored other Communists fugitives could be punished by no more than a fine of $1,000 and a 6 months' jail sentence.

Well, in response to the President's appeal, readily granted by a large bipartisan majority of Congress, these chinks in our Republic's armor against communism have been closed.

Hereafter, in consequence of action by the 83d Congress, anyone pleading the 5th amendment to protect himself from incrimination, can, on order of a Federal court, be granted immunity, which saves him from prosecution for his own crimes but leaves him subject to prosecution if it be others he is trying to shield. The penalty for harboring fugitives has been increased fivefold and anyone jumping bail on a Federal offense can be prosecuted for a crime.

Last and perhaps most important of these new protective measures is the one under which, once a Communist action organization has registered with the Attorney General by order of the Subversive Activities Control Board, all members of the registered organization are automatically disfranchised. Since the Board has already ordered the Communist Party to register, enforcement of the order against it will end such scandalous spectacles as the congressional candidacy of Miss Flynn.

Yet, with these new weapons provided and the administration hastening to use them, the control of communism arose as an issue in the campaign. Why?

The explanation, I venture to assert, may be found in the public's unawareness that besides all these weapons now provided, the administration already possessed one which, given court judgments upholding its legality, will not only lop off arms and tentacles of the internal Communist octopus, but crush its hideous head. This is the registration process administered by the Board.

Were the voters in the last campaign to have known of the Board's work, as intimately as the President knows and follows it, then, indeed, anxiety would have been allayed and communism would have appeared only as a minor issue in the campaign if it figured at all.

I welcome the opportunity to discuss with you the operation of the Subversive Activities Control Board, a small, Presidentially appointed body set up as far back as 1950 by the 81st Congress and charged specifically with the control of Communist organizations, while also maintaining freedom.

Directed at internal communism, the Board's work, though probably the least known of that conducted by any agency in this field, gives promise of striking effectiveness.

Indeed, if the Communist Party is to be believed, the registration order issued by this Board against it over a year and a half ago may compel the party to commit suicide.

I do not say that in this instance the party is not to be believed, for though Communists may not be notable for their respect for truths, they may, in this case, have been truthful. It is highly probable that if upheld by the courts, the SACB order requiring the Communist Party to register all its members may compel that party to dissolve.

Occupied with the cases of alleged Communist organizations since it ordered the party to register, the Board, by action of the last Congress, now has jurisdiction over Communist-infiltrated labor unions.

The Board's cases, moving like parts along a production line, are now approaching the assembly point. A Supreme Court decision affirming the legality of its work will launch a powerful new engine against communism.

But, while operating in the strictest fashion to maintain security, the Board also upholds freedom, freedom for all, including even Communists, so long as they stay within the law and operate in the open.

The explanation for this apparent paradox, maintaining freedom for the enemies of freedom, may be found, of course, in the Federal Constitution. Thomas Jefferson, thinking on the shape our Republic should take, swore eternal enmity against any who would tyrannize over the minds of men and the Founding Fathers, in writing the Constitution, adopted that same attitude.

If the Communists seek to impose that tyranny which Jefferson hated, and they do, the more reason why we should not let them provoke us into adopting the weapons of tyranny which, though intended to be used only against Communists, might later be turned against ourselves also.

We must keep this land of ours secure, but we must also try to maintain each and all of our constitutional freedoms intact. To abate our vigilance in this regard might set us on a course which would find us in the end cowering, as the wretched Russians do, before a secret police or shrinking from the threat of death before the firing squad.

Some of you may have heard of the law under which the Board operates—the Internal Security Act of 1950—and what you heard may not have been entirely creditable either to the Board or to the Congress which created it.

You may have been told that this law was designed to destroy domestic communism, but beyond that, through the Board, to harass God-fearing, law-abiding organizations having nothing to do with communism.

Labor unions, learned societies, even religious groups, stood in danger of being injured by the Board through this law, according to the complaints of our harsher critics at the time the law was enacted; they said we would not be defenders of freedom but medieval inquisitors, set up to stamp out liberal ideas as heresy and to enthrone a rigid orthodoxy as the ruling force.

In his own approach to this Communist problem, the President takes the middle way, and we of the Board, Presidential appointees, do likewise, following a middle way, maintaining freedom and security in balance.

We take our guidance and our doctrine from the Constitution, the original of which is enshrined in the Archives Building in Washington, a charter which requires our Board to respect freedom of speech, press, and assembly, which forbids the Board to interfere with the lives, the liberty, or the property of you, our fellow citizens, except for good reasons and by lawful means, and requires the Board to give equal justice to everyone.

Having solemnly sworn to uphold the Constitution, I can assure you that we of the Board take the maintenance of its guaranties as a sacred trust. For myself, when confronted by skeptics or scoffers, and the Communists do scoff at the Board's effort to maintain freedom and security, I invite their attention to a pair of inscriptions carved on the pedestal below two statues flanking the entrance to the Archives Building where the Constitution is enshrined.

"What is past is prologue," says the first inscription, and the second counsels a practice often applied in the lectures here: "Study the past."

Let us, then, at the outset of our study of the Board's work, look more closely at this Internal Security Act, which, for the first time in history, applied the powers of your Government to a free political activity toward its possible control. That was a grave decision for which you might have expected the act to give an explanation as, indeed, it does, in language sharply clear.

The act finds that there exists in the Nation a movement, political in appearance but actually directed and dominated by a hostile foreign government, operating as part of a worldwide conspiracy. This conspiracy, the act says, employs deceit, treachery, sabotage, espionage, and other unlawful means to overthrow our Government, as it has already overthrown other governments, and strives to impose a dictatorship in its place.

Organizations and their members who, directly or indirectly, serve the conspiracy shall be controlled, says the law, because, as it explains the conspiracy marks a clear and present danger to the national security.

Right there, in these findings set down in the Internal Security Act, the Communist Party detects the first evidence of an intention by Congress to destroy the party. Communists deny that they engage in illegal conspiracies but say that, under this act, no one will believe them because, so they assert, the act was "tailored to fit the party" and was padded out with a "built-in verdict of guilt."

In thus trying to demonstrate their innocence, it might be argued that the Communists are subconsciously confessing themselves guilty; for when a person says a suit is tailored to fit him, he's admitting that the cloth measures to his frame.

But the fact is that the finding by Congress that communism is a worldwide conspiracy carries no more legal weight as regards the party than would a report by one of you if, having discovered mischief afoot in this building, you reported to the police.

Let's suppose that Memphis had suffered a series of explosions in its public buildings, that you had found dynamite, fuses, and caps concealed in the locker room of this one, and that your report to the authorities included information that some of your acquaintances had been running around with the gang implicated in the blasts.

Would that report be considered as "tailored" to fit your errant acquaintances? Would it be considered a "built-in verdict of guilt"?

Certainly not.

As we know, the police would determine who placed the hidden dynamite and, if it were there unlawfully, bring the prosecuting attorney into the case. There might or might not be a prosecution depending on the prosecutor's judgment. If there were, the court, after a fair and open trial, would determine who, if anyone, had plotted an explosion here.

So, too, in proceedings under the Internal Security Act there is a report, police investigation, and trial. This act ascribes no guilt to the Communist Party and, in fact, does not mention the party as such. Rather it provides that when the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the police agency, finds an organization to be operating directly or indirectly in the service of the worldwide Communist conspiracy it submits its evidence to the Attorney General, who is the the prosecutor; if he thinks the evidence sufficient, he brings a case before the Board.

The Board, an independent body appointed by the President, operates as a court, judge and jury for the Nation in cases of Communist subversion and we reach no decision until we have fairly and impartially heard both sides. In every case coming before us, and we have had 13 of them, the Attorney General and the cited organization have been given precisely the same rights.

But in law, as at the dinner table, the proof of the pudding is in the eating. So then, sampling the evidence from a few of these 13 cases, let us chew it over and see whether the organizations were given fair and impartial justice or whether the grit and gravel of "built-in guilty verdicts" were forced down their throats.

Of the 13 organizations cited before us, the first was the Communist Party which the Attorney General believed to be the center of the conspiracy in this country, operating under the Soviet Union's direct control.

In a plain little room in the RFC Building in Washington, the Board heard most, though not all, of the witnesses in the Communist Party case, 22 for the Attorney General and 3 for the party.

Given that line-up of witnesses, you might suppose that the volume of evidence was heavily weighted in the Attorney General's favor, but if this was so, it was through no fault of the Board's

Except for the Board's help to the party, the party's witnesses might have been reduced to one.

Of the three witnesses the party called, the first, John Gates, editor of the Daily Worker, was, at the time of his summons, immobilized. Convicted by a regular jury of conspiring for the violent overthrow of the Government, he was serving his sentence in the Federal penitentiary at Atlanta; and the party's second witness, that same Elizabeth Curley Flynn, who has since run for Congress, was hardly any more free to move about.

Though not yet then convicted, Miss Flynn was, at the time, on trial before a Federal court in New York City on the same criminal charge for which Gates was sentenced and the court had forbidden her to leave New York; she is free now on appeal.

Did the party by this odd choice of witnesses erect a test of the Board's willingness to give it equal justice? Certainly the party knew that Gates and Miss Flynn could only be heard with cooperation from the Board. Did it expect the Board to anticipate public misunderstanding and charges that it was collaborating with the party, and flinch from this test?

I do not know, of course, but if, in its choice of witnesses, the party did set up such a test of fairness, the Board met the test head-on.

By order of the Board, the Superintendent of Prisons produced Gates in our hearing room where he testified for 6 days under guard. And then, on a motion of the party, which the Board granted, a hearing panel journeyed at considerable public expense to New York City where, for many more days, it heard Miss Flynn.

With the presentation of its third witness, Herbert Aptheker, a Communist and a Marxist historian, the party, having no more witnesses to offer, rested its defense.

But Communists, as I have learned to know them, prefer the aggressive role to a defensive one and that was true here. From my study of the record in the Communist Party case, I would say that, lengthy as was the testimony of the party's three witnesses, the party spent more than twice the time and effort attacking the Attorney General's witnesses—"professional informers" as it angrily called them—than it spent in presenting its own.

It's true that these witnesses of the Attorney General's were mostly either ex-Communists, who testified from bitter disillusionment, or else were intelligence agents placed in the party by the FBI. But the prime test as to the truth of their testimony was, not its motives, but its authenticity. A number of these ex-Communists, having held high stations in the party, had access to its innermost secrets, secrets which the evidence showed actually to be plots.

It is true that the conspiracy to which they testified did not throw our country into revolutional convulsions, such as twisted many once-free nations of Eastern Europe and of Asia into Soviet-type dictatorships, but that was not because the Communists didn't try.

A number of the Attorney General's ex-Communist witnesses testified to sharing in numerous schemes hatched in Moscow to hasten a revolution here. In substance their testimony showed that from its beginnings 30 years ago in Bridgman, Mich., the Communists worked unceasingly to subject you and me to a Soviet dictatorship under them.

Let's look at a few of these witnesses and consider the party's behavior as their testimony showed it to be.

Joseph Kornfeder joined the party as far back as 1921 and, in 1927, having risen to high position, was sent by the party to Moscow for enrollment in the Lenin Institute, a school for professional revolutionaries. This school offered, among other courses, instruction in guerilla warfare, espionage, and sabotage, and Kornfeder wasn't the only student the party sent there. But, returning to this country, Kornfeder put his new skills to work mainly in developing a Communist labor organization to be used by the party as a shock force in crippling industry, as indeed, some plants were crippled by strikes.

Benjamin Gitlow had likewise risen to high office in the party. In 1924 and again in 1928 it ran him as its candidate for vice president in team with William Z. Foster, its presidential candidate, and its top leader then as he remains today.

If Gitlow believed the party to be independent of Moscow, and he seems to have had that notion, the year 1929 taught him otherwise. A difference arose between him and Foster over tactics and the quarrel was referred to Moscow. Josef Stalin personally reviewed the issues and ruled in Foster's favor. The party expelled Gitlow in disgrace.

A third witness, Louis Budenz, testified that all party higher-ups were required to swear loyalty to Stalin. A fourth, Paul Crouch, revealed that at secret party meetings the hammer and sickle was displayed beside the Stars and Stripes. William Odell Nowell, a fifth witness, was trained in and attempted to induce our loyal Negro citizens of the South to set up a black republic here.

So, if there was no general explosion it was not for lack of political dynamite. The party had planted explosive charges at points where they expected the most damage could be done, and the fuses, in most instances, led straight back to Moscow from which so many actual revolutions have been directed since the end of World War II.

On the basis of all the evidence, presented in public and weighed fairly, the Board then found the party to be dominated by the Soviet Union and working for dictatorship here. In orders issued on April 20, 1953, the Board ordered the party to submit to control.

But back when Congress was first considering control legislation, Comrade Foster had announced that the party would never submit to it and the party has strongly resisted control. At the outset of the Board hearing, the party appealed to a 3-judge Federal court in Washington asking it to forbid the proceeding as unconstitutional. With that appeal rejected, the hearing went forward, but now that the finding and order have been entered, the party is once more appealing, this time to a higher Federal court, asking it to outlaw the act and the Board.

Once again, then, we hear the claim of a "built-in guilty verdict" but this time with less emphasis; for the party now professes to be worried not alone about itself but about other groups, pro-Communist and non-Communist, which, it says, may be suppressed also if they are controlled.

We may wonder if this concern is genuine. Once it is controlled, the party pictures Board hearings springing up, mushroom-like, first on Communist fronts and then on other non-Communist groups until, like toadstools, these hearings hide the meadows of freedom from the sun. Any group which at any time sponsored a program which the Communist Party also favored becomes subject to control under the Internal Security Act, so the party argues. This is a serious charge.

For, although the FBI counts the party's own membership at less than 25,000, it estimates that membership of Communist fronts at 10 times that number, a pro-Communist force of about 275,000 in all. If, in addition to this force, the Board orders could be applied to groups which in one way or another have been embarrassed by the Communists riding on their coattails, the healthy grass of freedom would indeed be smothered. Millions of citizens would be liable to control.

From you who have been taught to cherish freedom, both the controls and the limitation to which they can be used deserve closest study. If freedom is in such grave danger, a defense should be organized.

But what is past in the Board's work is the prologue of its future, so let us study the hearings which have been held.

First, we should bear in mind that neither the Communist Party nor any of the alleged fronts cited for hearing have been charged with any crime and none is subject to punishment for any conduct disclosed before the Board. Should any organization be ordered controlled and its members defy the order, punishment may follow; the penalty for evasion is a $10,000 fine or 5 years in prison, or both.

But the controls themselves inflict no punishment, for Congress recognized that not all of the thousands of followers of the world Communist conspiracy amongst us are themselves conspirators. It designed the controls only to bring the conspiracy into the open so that all, including those duped by it, might understand its nature.

Bringing the conspiracy above ground and keeping it there is the sole purpose of the controls. What, then, do they provide? In the Communist Party case, once the courts have upheld the Board's order, the party must register each and all of its officers and members once a year with the Attorney General and must submit to him an annual financial report. It must label all its publications as Communist and disclose the origin of its broadcasts. And, lest these registered Communists make mischief, none may travel abroad on an American passport, take employment in a defense plant or in the Government. The same controls apply to fronts, but with one important exception. Knowing that many front members were innocent dupes of the party, Congress limited the registration in the case of fronts to officers. Members need not disclose their names.

Do these controls suppress freedom? Do they not, rather maintain freedom, first for those who cherish it and then also even for those who hate and despise it, asking of these last no more than that they openly show the colors of the cause they secretly promote? Where is the suppression of freedom? Is it in the Board's process? Are we of the Board the inquisitors or are they the masters of communism in Moscow?

Were the Communists to prevail here, what would become of freedom? Would this free land of ours not become, as the Soviet Union is, the land of the political terror, the party purge and the firing squad? Why do the Communists find the controls unendurable? Is it because they truly cherish freedom for all or because, with their ties to Moscow broken, their finances exposed, and their membership bared they cannot longer function?

Will freedom be helped or injured should the Board order drive the party to suicide?

I think you know the answers.

Granting that the suicide of domestic communism would be no loss to freedom, will the method of inducing its disappearance set a precedent for suppression of other groups? Another look at the prologue of the Board's past may shed light on that question. Of the 12 alleged fronts whose cases are now before the Board, not one is a labor organization, not one a learned society, not one a religious group.

As it happens, all 12, before being cited before the Board, had for years been carried by the Attorney General on his list of subversive organizations, placed there because he believed them to be Communist controlled.

The Board does not hold this against them for its interest goes, not to what the Attorney General thinks or does, but to what he can prove, and not all the evidence in these cases is in.

The fact is, however, that unless he believed and had evidence that these organizations were Communist controlled, he'd have been wasting time in bringing them before us. The Internal Security Act provides that Communist-connected organizations and only these can be controlled, and the standards of judgment are precise and strict.

The target of the act then is the internal elements of the world Communist conspiracy and these alone, but all groups summoned before us are judged fairly and impartially and given opportunity to present a full and free defense. Yet, even those organizations which are found to be part of the conspiracy, promoting the Soviet interest, may still offer their ideas in the market place, just as it should be in any free land.

Since most Americans regard communism as a poison, the controlled organizations may decide to go out of business but if so, liberty will not have been impaired. The Constitution, which guarantees equal justice to all, will stand intact, strengthened by the Board's decisions and keeping this the land of the free.

The Outlook for Uranium Mining

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY M. JACKSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, December 1, 1954

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an address delivered recently by Mr. Jesse C. Johnson, Director of the Raw Materials Division of the Atomic Energy Commission.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Address by Jesse C. Johnson, Director, Division of Raw Materials, United States Atomic Energy Commission, Before the American Mining Congress, San Francisco, Calif., September 22, 1954, on the Outlook for Uranium Mining

I have been asked to speak on the outlook for uranium mining, an industry which really began only 6 years ago. Before the war uranium was mined primarily as a source of radium, and the world's requirement for radium was supplied easily by partial operation of the rich Shinkolobwe mine in the Belgian Congo. However, the Eldorado mine on the shore of Great Bear Lake in Arctic Canada, with its rich pitchblende ore, shared the market following its discovery in 1930.

During the period when the atomic bomb was being developed, the closest secrecy surrounded all uranium activities, and unlike other strategic metals, uranium was not the object of a general search. All explorations were conducted quietly by a small staff. Even these undercover investigations had practically ceased by 1947 when the Commission became responsible for the atomic energy program.

Before the end of 1947 prospects for a leasurely development of a peacetime atomic energy program had faded. The attempt in 1946 to establish international control over the manufacture of atomic weapons had failed. Communist Russia's postwar policy of aggression was becoming clearly evident. Russia was pouring slave labor into the uranium mines of Czechoslovakia and East Germany and was working feverishly on atomic plants far behind the Iron Curtain.

Although we still had a monopoly on the atomic bomb, it was not for long—the time was shorter than estimated by most experts. Atomic weapons suddenly had become a dominant factor in our military strength and aggressive action was called for to hold our lead.

The drive to build up uranium production began early in 1948 when we had billion-dollar wartime plants to produce fissionable material but an adequate supply of the basic raw material—uranium.

A survey by the newly formed Atomic Energy Commission indicated that lack of uranium might be the bottleneck, both in meeting essential military requirements and in the future development of nuclear power for industrial use.

Large increases in military requirements followed in rapid succession after the disclosure that Russia had succeeded in making the A-bomb, the development of our H-bomb, the outbreak of the Korean war, and the steady deterioration of world peace. In 1952 Congress authorized approximately $4 billion for construction of additional facilities to produce fissionable material. This major expansion followed previous expansions which at the time also appeared to be major.

The uranium to feed these plants had to come from new sources. It was necessary to find and bring into production new mines and to develop processes for recovering uranium from low-grade sources, such as the South African gold ores and domestic phosphates. Increased production was needed immediately and what normally are long-range developments became short-term projects.

In 1947 practically all of our uranium came from 2 relatively small mines—1 in Arctic Canada and the other in central Belgian Congo. The Congo was the most important and with all the developments which since have taken place throughout the world it continues to be a leading source of supply. Mine and mill facilities there have been greatly expanded. The Congo's uranium contribution, first to the war program, and now to the defense program, has been, and continues to be, most important to the preservation of the free world.

Canada's Eldorado mine on Great Bear Lake had but limited possibilities for expansion except for retreatment of tailings from earlier operations. However, the Canadian Government undertook aggressive exploration and established incentives for private development. These programs have paid off. The government-owned Eldorado Mining & Refining Co. developed an important uranium deposit on Lake Athabaska where a new mill began production early in 1953.

Private industry is actively exploring in the same area with a number of deposits under development. Only recently the Gunnar Mines obtained $19,500,000 from private bankers to finance mine development and mill construction. This will be one of the largest uranium operations in North America.

The Blind River area, about 90 miles west of Sudbury, Ontario, promises to be another major uranium source. Extensive uranium deposits are being found in old conglomerate beds. These deposits are somewhat similar geologically to the South African gold-bearing reefs. Plans already are well advanced for 1 or 2 operations in the thousand-ton-a-day class.

Just as Canada and the United States worked closely on the wartime atomic bomb project, they have cooperated fully in expanding uranium production.

In the development and purchase of uranium from overseas sources the United States and the United Kingdom have been partners. These purchases are made through the Combined Development Agency, a joint buying agency set up early in World War II by President Roosevelt and Winston Churchill.

South Africa will be one of the world's largest uranium producers. Its gold mines contain large uranium reserves and undoubtedly there are many reefs yet to be developed. Even known reserves assure production for 30 years and more. Here the problem was not one of discovery, but rather of sampling to determine the uranium content of the many mines of the Transvaal and Orange Free State, which annually produce approximately 60 million tons of gold ore.

A process had to be developed to recover economically the small quantity of uranium in the tailings from the cyanide mills. The decision to undertake uranium production was made in December 1950. The first of fifteen large uranium recovery plants went into production in October 1952. The total cost of these plants upon completion of the program will exceed $150 million. The construction record has been outstanding considering the size of the plants and the dependence upon overseas sources for structural steel and equipment.

Australia was added to the list of uranium producing countries this month with the start of the Rum Jungle mill, near Darwin. The Port Pirie plant in South Australia is expected to begin treating ore from the Radium Hill mine early in 1955. These two operations are Government-controlled but private prospecting is now active. Many uranium occurrences are being found in widely separated areas and Australia promises to become an important producer.

Portugal has been producing uranium for several years and its production undoubtedly could be expanded. France is obtaining uranium for its atomic energy program from pitchblende veins near Limoges. Uranium has also been found in other European countries outside the Iron Curtain.

South America is virtually unprospected for uranium although several occurrences are known. Elsewhere throughout the world there are vast areas which have not been examined except possibly for brief reconnaissance surveys.

In the review of uranium sources, I have left our domestic operations until the last. They are the most important from the standpoint of national interest. They are of greatest interest to this audience. Their development has been the most spectacular. In 6 years, starting with nothing but uncertain prospects, the United States has become one of the world's leading uranium producers. We shall be competing for first place and part of the time be in first place. Russia, of course, is an unknown. However, there is little chance that Russian production is equal to that of the free world, or even to that of the free world's leading producer.

Our principal hope for domestic production was from the Colorado plateau. The Colorado carnotite deposits were first mined for uranium around the turn of the century. After the discovery of the rich Congo deposits in 1918, vanadium became the sole interest and uranium went into the tailings. Even during the war, when uranium was secretly recovered from mill tailings, the mines were allowed to close when vanadium production no longer was required.

At the beginning of 1948 there was practically no uranium mining or prospecting. Known ore reserves were limited. Ore deposits were scattered and small, usually a few hundred to a few thousand tons, and in the entire history of the area, only 2 or 3 had been found which contained 100,000 tons or more.

Today probably more people are looking for uranium in the United States than for all other metallic minerals combined. Many discoveries are being made. There are now a dozen or more 100,000-ton ore bodies, as compared with the 2 or 3 found in the previous 50 years. We also have some million-ton deposits.

Exploration and production have extended far beyond the original Colorado plateau area with important developments now taking place in South Dakota and Wyoming. Exploration is also active in California and Nevada. Ore production has been doubling every 18 months and even greater expansion is just ahead. New mills are being built and old mills are being expanded.

Because of the market provided under the Commission's program, ore begins to move to a buying station almost as soon as a deposit is found, and long before development has determined the reserves. This has made it difficult to plan and provide milling facilities to keep pace.

It is impossible to measure the dollar value of all the prospecting and exploration activities but when this is added to the expenditures for production and construction, we have in the United States at least a $100 million a year uranium industry.

However, to maintain high production there must be a high discovery rate. Even though some relatively large ore deposits have been found, they will be mined out in a few years. For example, if prospecting and exploration were to stop today, by 1962, we would be back where we were in 1947. There would remain practically no developed ore reserves and probably few known deposits awaiting development. Again there would have to be the slow process of finding and developing new deposits before production could be brought back to present levels.

To maintain continuing production from Colorado-type deposits, there must be an assured government or commercial market. As long as it is solely, or even largely, a Government market, the Government's commitments must be guaranteed for a considerable period. That period should be long enough to cover at least several years for exploration and 5 years for production. For the type of exploratory and mining operations now taking place, a guaranteed uranium market of 7 or more years is desirable.

The results of the domestic uranium program further confirm the view of the mining industry that the way to develop mineral production is to provide a market with adequate profit incentives and let private industry go to work.

This brings us to the market for uranium. The present demand is entirely for defense. The long-term market depends upon the use of nuclear fuel for production of industrial power.

First, let us consider the defense program. The importance of atomic weapons in military planning is recognized and accepted by everyone. The awful destructive power of these weapons is such that there should never be another world war. At present the best insurance against such a catastrophe is strength. As long as world conditions remain as they are, it is safe to assume that the development and production of atomic weapons will not be curtailed or cut back until the United States reaches full strength. What that is and when it will be reached, I do not know.

I do know that the huge expansion authorized by Congress in 1952 has not yet been completed. Uranium requirements to feed these plants continue to rise.

Our domestic uranium ore buying schedule is guaranteed through March 31, 1962. This does not necessarily indicate an end date. This program has had earlier termination dates—first in 1951, then extended to 1954, then to 1958, and now to 1962. While no definite commitment can be given, there well may be further extensions of the guaranteed market under the defense program.

Now let us take a look at the prospect for a commercial market.

The use of nuclear energy to produce electricity involves merely a matter of transferring reactor heat to a steam boiler and using the steam in a turbine connected with a generator. This has been demonstrated and there is no question about building large power units on the basis of present technology. Just this month construction was started on an AEC sponsored 60,000 kilowatt experimental plant which will use a reactor developed by Westinghouse. Duquesne Light Co. of Pittsburgh, Pa., is participating financially and will feed the electricity generated into its distribution system. The problem of industrial application is one of economics—of producing power at a cost comparable with that generated from conventional fuels.

Studies by the Commission, and by large industrial firms working on the problem, indicate that within 10 years nuclear power will be competitive, at least in high-cost power areas. Information and experience in constructing and operating the first plants soon should lead to improved design and technology and lower capital and production costs.

Plants built after 1965 may produce power at costs in the range of 5 to 7 mills per kilowatt-hour—at least that is the target of the companies engaged on development work. If this goal is achieved, nuclear energy will become an important factor in the production of electricity and uranium will be the fuel for many future generating plants.

The mining industry is interested in knowing how much uranium will be required by the power industry and when the demand is likely to become important. The industries concerned with nuclear-power development are interested in knowing whether there will be an adequate supply of uranium and at what cost.

The long-range atomic power program now under development eventually will require the investment of billions of dollars in plants. Otherwise, there would be no point in spending tens of millions for development and construction of experimental power reactors. For such a program there should be reserves of nuclear fuel sufficient for at least 100 years.

In considering this program from the standpoint of a market for uranium, it might be well to begin with the power industry. Installed generating capacity in the United States is now approximately 100 million kilowatts of electricity. Europe, outside Iron Curtain countries, has about the same capacity. The rest of the world may have 50 million kilowatts, of which 12 million are in Canada. The total capacity being considered is, therefore, about 250 million kilowatts.

According to the power industry and other authorities, power consumption in the United States is expected to double about every 15 years. This also applies to Europe and probably to the rest of the world. How long such a rate of growth will continue is a question. Growth over the last 30 years has been at an even higher rate. For the last 4 years new generating capacity in the United States has averaged about 8 million kilowatts per year.

According to these figures, by 1970 the annual increase throughout the free world may be 20 to 30 million kilowatts. Beginning in 1965, or perhaps earlier, nuclear equipment is expected to be used for some of the new commercial powerplants. In examining the outlook for nuclear power, a study made for the Commission assumes that nuclear power capacity in the United States may be 12 million kilowatts by 1970, 42 million by 1980, and 100 million by 1990. If these figures are reasonable for the United States, they should be doubled or tripled to arrive at world capacity.

What would this mean in terms of a uranium requirement? The inventory requirement for 1 million kilowatts of electrical capacity is estimated at 600 tons of uranium. This uranium would fill the reactors and provide the material in chemical processing and fuel-fabrication plants, and in the pipelines between them.

If we assume that the uranium will have to be discarded when only 2 percent has fissioned, or burned up, to operate the 1 million kilowatts of electrical capacity would require about 50 tons of uranium annually as replacement. With a 3-percent burn-up, the annual replacement would be 33 tons; with 10-percent burn-up only 10 tons of uranium would be required; and if the burn-up could be increased to 20 percent the annual requirement would be only 5 tons. The 2-percent figure may be too pessimistic, but the high fuel efficiencies may be many years ago. The material required for inventory, however, is not likely to be reduced, but may be increased, depending upon the type of reactor.

When nuclear capacity reaches a total of 100 million kilowatts, which for the free world may be near 1980, about 5,000 tons of uranium will be required annually for replacement on the basis of 2-percent burn-up By that time, if new capacity is being added at the rate of 15 million kilowatts per year, annual uranium requirements for reactor inventory will be 9,000 tons. These assumptions indicate a world commercial market for uranium metal of about 14,000 tons a year by 1980.

However, these assumptions make no allowance for the possibility that nuclear plants might replace existing steam plants using high-cost coal. This is a definite possibility in Europe, and even in some areas of the United States. Most European industrial countries are short of conventional fuels. Coal costs as much as $15 a ton, as compared with an average of $6.50 per ton to the power industry in the United States.

A million kilowatts of electrical capacity consumes about 2,500,000 tons of coal a year. This is the job that may be done with 50 tons of uranium and, eventually, with much less.

Furthermore, we have been considering only central generating plants and the pattern of past power development. Nuclear power will soon operate a submarine. It may eventually be used on many ships, naval and commercial. It is within the realm of possibility to build for certain special uses a powerplant, with sealed-in nuclear fuel, that will need no refueling for the life of a ship.

In the past, industrial development has been influenced by availability of cheap power. Cheap power has been available only in areas tributary to low-cost fuel or near hydroelectric projects.

If nuclear powerplants can produce cheap power, they can produce cheap power anywhere water is available for condensers. Nuclear fuel can be transported by air to any part of the world and the transportation costs would have no measurable effect on the cost of the power. We can only speculate upon the revolutionary changes which may accompany the development of this new industry.

It has been the history of all major developments that early forecasts of growth and importance have been too conservative. This may be true for nuclear power. I have indicated that the industrial market for uranium metal might be about 14,000 tons a year by 1980. As a market forecast this may be too pessimistic. Once power costs can be brought near 5 mills per kilowatt-hour, the industry should grow rapidly. The experimental reactors to be completed within the next 4 or 5 years under the Atomic Energy Commission's industrial-power program are expected to provide some of the answers.

Assuming that the nuclear-power industry will require 14,000 tons of uranium metal a year by 1975 or 1980, what is the outlook for meeting this requirement, and at what price? Fourteen thousand tons of uranium metal is roughly equivalent to 17,000 tons of uranium oxide, U_3O_8.

On the basis of our present knowledge of free-world uranium resources, a production rate of 17,000 tons, or even more, should be available at a price of not more than $10 a pound. This would be the price in terms of today's dollar for uranium oxide in a high-grade concentrate. Much of this production might be sold profitably at less than $10. Under the defense program, contracts for uranium concentrates are negotiated on the basis of production costs, including amortization, plus a reasonable profit.

Sources of the type now supplying the defense program might support a production rate of 17,000 tons or more for many years. This assumes that new deposits will be found to replace those mined out. The development of other new large producing areas, areas like the Colorado Plateau or the South African Rand, would add greatly to the production potential.

For the more distant future there are vast uranium reserves in low-grade phosphate and shale deposits. Byproduct uranium production from the phosphate industry, which already has commenced, will grow in importance. However, if low-grade phosphate and shale deposits are worked primarily for uranium, the cost of the uranium may be from $30 to $50 per pound. By the time this material is needed burn-up efficiency and "breeding" may have improved the utilization of nuclear fuel so that 10 tons of uranium, or even 5, will be doing the work of 50 tons. Thorium also may become an important nuclear fuel.

There is no doubt about having sufficient nuclear fuel for the future power industry.

The first production of commercial power from nuclear fuel is expected between 1960 and 1965. However, the uranium requirement for these operations will not be important. If uranium production is to be maintained at the defense program level, it will be necessary to continue defense buying at a relatively high rate or to stockpile until 1975 or 1980, or even longer. Either or both of these programs are possibilities.

Defense requirements have continually expanded. In addition to atomic weapons, nuclear powerplants are being developed for naval vessels, airplanes, and for Arctic bases. Stockpiling of any surplus uranium production certainly should be considered in view of its military and industrial importance.

The immediate need is to carry out the defense program. This requires the support and cooperation of the mining industry. Uranium production under the defense program can be a profitable business. The growth of the mining and milling operations, and the private capital that is being invested in these operations, are ample proof of that statement. Not only can normal mining profits and return of capital be obtained during the defense program, but these operations undertaken for defense will have the opportunity to furnish the fuel for a new power industry. There is no doubt about the future importance of this new industry—only its timetable is still uncertain.

Address by Attorney General Herbert Brownell, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, December 2, 1954

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an address delivered by the Honorable Herbert Brownell, Jr., Attorney General of the United States, before the 20th triennial general congress of the General Society of Mayflower Descendents, in the First Parish Church, Plymouth, Mass., on Monday, September 13, 1954.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Address of Attorney General Herbert Brownell, Jr., at the 20th Triennial Congress of the General Society of Mayflower Descendants, Plymouth, Mass., September 13, 1954

Americans everywhere ask what they can do, as individuals, to preserve our wonderful heritage of freedom. Naturally, they want to do all they can to make our way of life secure for themselves and for our children.

Some ponder the matter in deep thought. Some worry. A few express fear for the future. A handful even strike out hysterically at anything which resembles any threat to our safety.

The great and visible threat, of course, is from the international Communist conspiracy. It is directed by a group of ruthless men who would enslave the entire world. It is founded on violence. It has an utter disregard for every shred of human dignity. It will stop at nothing—and its leaders will stoop to any decadent device to gain their ends.

Wherever they have been successful, the steady progress of civilization has been not only altered, but reversed. People under the heel of the Communists live in the same fear and distrust which was the evil symbol of the Dark Ages. A small minority rules a great majority with an iron fist.

Behind the Iron Curtain we find dictatorship—tyranny at its evil worst. The greatest enemy of that dictatorship is, as we all know, the spirit of freedom which men everywhere always have nurtured in their hearts.

Our land, as it has since our ancestors on *The Mayflower* first came to these very shores, stands as the greatest symbol of that spirit of freedom. As a result, the Red leaders look upon us as the greatest threat to the success of their diabolical plans. As long as freedom lives anywhere, they know that they are in danger. They have said repeatedly that the United States must be overcome before they can complete their plan of world conquest.

They have said this because the United States stands as the symbol of everything they are trying to destroy—and stands not only as an ideological symbol but as a source of moral and physical strength for all the free world.

With our store of atomic weapons, we possess fearsome retaliatory power, poised to counter any attack. We have shown that we will stand for freedom's cause. Our international policy is geared to buttressing the efforts of freemen everywhere to help themselves. We are an arsenal for all lands of liberty.

The great factories and the small shops which have flourished under our system of free enterprise pour forth a continual supply of goods for the nations of the free world. The men in the Kremlin know that our production lines can step up that flow at any time—and still produce enough goods to maintain our own civilian economy. They saw us do it during World War I, World War II, and the Korean war.

They see this great capacity for production, then, as a visible threat to their greedy schemes.

Consequently, the leaders of the international conspiracy are doing everything they can to weaken us. They will continue to do so. They seize on every bit of discord at home or with our allies and magnify it in a constant effort to create more discord. They fan any spark of fear and doubt and confusion that arises among us. We have seen them, for example, seek to increase the rebellious spirits of children against constituted authority. We have seen them endeavor to plant spies in the highest circles of our Government, to place saboteurs in our defense facilities.

Their program of stealth is subversion in its worst form. The present administration recognizes it for the evil that it is.

We recognize that the Communist Party, so-called, is merely a tool of foreign conspirators. That basic fact has been stated by all three branches of our Government. Congress restated it just a month ago. The President and administrative leaders have said it over and over. The Subversive Activities Control Board, after extensive hearings, held the Communist Party to be nothing more than an organization dominated by an international conspiracy and aimed at the violent overthrow of our Government. The courts have made the same finding in case after case.

Within the framework of our Constitution, our Bill of Rights, and our laws under those great documents, this administration is dedicated to striking the Communists at every opportunity. We believe that the most successful attack against a conspiracy is to destroy its leadership. This we are doing. The success of our prosecutions has been a serious blow to the Communist conspiracy. It is off balance. Like any common gang of criminals, its members are haunted by the fear of not knowing where our legal weapons will be used next. This fear, we know, has reduced their effectiveness. But we cannot relax. We must ever be vigilant to meet any move they make. To this your FBI and Department of Justice are dedicated.

To date, 81 leaders of the Communist conspiracy have been convicted—50 of them in the past year and a half. They have been convicted of violating the Smith Act which makes it a crime to conspire to teach or advocate the violent overthrow of the Government. Others are awaiting trial. And I might point out that any Communist leaders hereafter convicted under the Smith Act will, by terms of a new law, not only be subject to a jail sentence but also be deemed to have forfeited their American citizenship. They will be treated, for all practical purposes, as undesirable aliens.

In recent months, there have been weeded from the Government payroll several thousand employees who were security risks. The Government has designated 62 additional subversive groups as Communist fronts so that all may know and recognize them for what they are. It has stopped the entry of many foreign Communist agents into this country by vigorous use of the immigration laws. It has deported 112 alien subversives. It has moved to revoke the naturalization of 43 other Communists who have violated their oath of allegiance to this Nation by working for its downfall or who lied about such activity when they sought citizenship.

This program will be continued vigorously. In fact, with new lays now made available to us by Congress, the tempo will be increased.

Certain of the new laws which we proposed, of course are aimed at deterring or punishing Communists or those who would help them. The Expatriation Act which I have mentioned is one of them. Others increase the penalties for jumping bail or for harboring fugitives such as the Communist leaders who hid out, with help, in the California mountains. Pensions will be denied Government workers who commit certain felonies, including crimes of subversion. The sabotage laws have been modernized to include chemical, bacteriological, and radiological weapons and facilities. The espionage law has been fitted to the world in which we live. Spying in peacetime, as well as wartime, now is a capital offense, and there is no time limit for the prosecution of spies.

Another new law is the so-called immunity law. This was requested by the administration in order to prevent persons from making a sham of the fifth amendment privilege against self-incrimination. Those persons—subversives, their sympathizers, or misguided persons—have been using the fifth amendment in order to shield persons they knew to be part and parcel of the Communist conspiracy.

The principle of immunity is not new. Some States have similar laws which have proved highly effective in obtaining evidence to break up illegal conspiracies. Immunity also has been an important part of many of our Federal, quasi-judicial proceedings.

The immunity will be granted under the new law only on questions regarding espionage, treason, and other crimes of subversion. It can only be extended to reluctant witnesses before congressional committees and Federal courts and grand juries—and only after they have been apprised fully of their rights and have refused to answer specific questions. The immunity will extend only to that line of questioning and no other. It will be granted by a Federal district judge, after advice from the Attorney General, upon petition of a United States attorney or a Representative of Congress. It will be accompanied by a court order to the witness to answer the questions. Failure to answer will be subject to contempt action before the court, with whatever penalties the court deems necessary. Failure to answer fully and truthfully, of course, will be subject to prosecution for perjury.

As a matter of fact, the new immunity law may serve another purpose. We know of persons enmeshed in the toils of the Communist conspiracy who have wanted to break with that conspiracy once they learned its real purposes. These persons have wanted desperately to resume their normal place in society.

But they have been under the impression that if they went to the FBI and told their story they themselves inevitably would be subject to prosecution for the role they had played in the conspiracy.

Now, you and I know that this has not been the case. The mental torture they must go through in changing their entire outlook, their entire way of living, has been considered punishment enough by most of us. The part such persons play in helping the Government uncover and destroy the Communist apparatus has helped them redeem themselves in the eyes of sincere patriots.

But fear of prosecution has lingered among others. Needless to say, the Communist leaders have done everything they can to foster this fear. They do so to forestall further defections from their own ranks and to impose silence upon others who have broken with the party but have not resumed the full duties of a good citizen.

The new immunity law should go far to overcome this fear. It offers new hope to those who would rejoin decent society. Here is an added inducement to bring to the Government new disclosures by persons who, from their own personal knowledge and with their own words, can testify against the criminal leaders of the subversive conspiracy.

Just before leaving Washington I talked about this with Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, our esteemed Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. Mr. Hoover said he agreed, and added:

"The telephone number of an FBI office appears on the cover of each telephone book in the Nation. Any persons willing to come forward and tell what they know about the conspiracy and its leaders need only to telephone the nearest office, or they can contact me in Washington."

Mr. Hoover put the problem this way:

"The Communists themselves assert that the world is divided into two fundamentally different and opposing camps. Only one, they maintain, will survive. With American freedom and the lives of American citizens at stake, the individual who has been drawn into the Communist net cannot be neutral. He is either for or against his country.

"If he breaks from the Communist conspiracy and yet maintains silence about activities detrimental to his country, he still is aiding the enemy. The moral obligation involved cannot be met by silence. There is only one choice and that is to help the United States. The man who does this is preserving freedom under law. He is protecting the American way of life for freemen and women—including his family and himself.

"Now is the time for those who love America to step forward and be counted. Now is the time for those who erred and who realized they erred to declare themselves."

Now, we also are preparing to use another new law. It bars Communists from holding offices in labor unions or representing either side in bargaining before the National Labor Relations Board, as well as to bar them from passports, from jobs in Government, and from jobs on strategic defense contracts. The amending law also creates a new category of Communist-dominated organizations. The new type to be subjected to the act is the Communist-infiltrated organization. We now can utilize machinery of the Subversive Activities Control Board to determine if Communists have subverted a business or labor organization and to enable loyal members of such an organization to free themselves from such Communist domination.

This new law also carries a congressional finding that the Communist Party U. S. A. is not a political party at all but merely a tool of international conspiracy; denying to that subversive group all the legal rights and privileges normally enjoyed by legal organizations, and stating again that knowing members are subject to all provisions and penalties of the Internal Security Act.

In carrying out these new laws, I can pledge that due process of law will be respected scrupulously. Everyone of our constitutional rights and privileges will be protected. These are the woof and warp of the fabric of our way of life. Destroy anyone of them and you have taken a step toward the destruction of our heritage of freedom—toward a goal of the Communists.

Let me recall to you part of what President Eisenhower told the American Legion just 2 weeks ago today:

"The Communist dictatorship * * * uses propaganda * * * which emphatically requires from us new and aggressive counter measures. * * * We must preach, demonstrate, and tirelessly sell the vitality and value of freedom. * * * We must reaffirm to the oppressed masses of the earth the great truth that the God who gave life to humanity at the same time gave the right of liberty to man. * * * From the resources of the free world must be developed the many kinds of strength required to oppose successfully the broad front of Communist pressure. We and our friends must be strong spiritually and intellectually, so that neither fear, nor ignorance, nor lack of determination can lead into defeat."

President Eisenhower, in his every word and deed, is setting a wonderful spiritual and intellectual example for all of us and for all free men everywhere. Certainly, there is no lack of determination courageously to protect our internal and external security in the finest traditions of our forefathers.

Our work in rooting out subversion is defensive just as our basic military policy is one of defense. Both are jobs for the properly designated Government agencies.

If we all were doing everything we could as individuals to practice our way of life, to spread the infection of liberty by day-to-day examples, then I don't believe we would find so many individuals wondering what they could do to protect and strengthen our heritage.

An example of what I am thinking about was described in an article in a Sunday newspaper recently. It told of interviews with churchmen who came here from all over the world to attend a religious conference. They literally were amazed that the United States is essentially a religious nation. They said movies and newspaper accounts of American glamor and American gangsters had led them to believe there was little place for religion in our lives. Yet they learned here for themselves that the church has a firm place in our society; that it is a great influence in our everyday life. One visitor reported with amazement that she thought Americans were more spiritual in many ways than the people of her own deeply religious land.

Perhaps as individuals we have failed to show people of other lands how we really live. Perhaps as individuals we could do more to encourage our own church people—and others—to carry the story of our spiritual life to other lands.

We all have read books and articles too numerous to count telling us that America really is disliked by all other lands; that we have lost their respect; that we have tried and failed to buy good will and have offered nothing other than bribes in order to retain our allies. Yet, Americans who have left the political capitals and gone along the byways of other nations have been overwhelmed with the friendship, the interest, and the cheerfulness with which they are greeted by the farmers, the shopkeepers, or the workers of those lands.

Here is the reservoir of good will. This is the reservoir we must keep filled with friendly deeds, with the simple kindness of one human to another. Individuals who travel to other lands; organizations which have affiliates overseas; Americans who correspond with relatives abroad—all can do much to keep alive the friendship we have with all freemen.

Our leaders in all walks of life must prove to all peoples—those of Asia and Africa particularly—that we have no desire to colonize or exploit them, as the Communists constantly tell them we have. We must continually reaffirm that we respect the right of all people to choose freely the form of government under which they would live.

It is not enough that we should be against communism. We must be for freedom—in our every work and deed.

The escapee program of our Government is one vital phase of this agressive freedom. It is designed to provide assistance to those men and women who escape from behind the Iron Curtain.

Inspired by a yearning for liberty, many persons overcome the guns, the wires, and the guards that make up the Iron Curtain. They make their way west in Europe to freedom. But they must have food, clothing, shelter, and medical care. They need help in finding a new home and starting a new life.

Our Government lends them vital assistance through the escapee program. Close to 30,000 have been aided in the 2 years the program has been underway. About one-third of those have been resettled in Australia, Canada, South America, and in the United States. The others are receiving assistance pending final resettlement.

As individuals we can aid in similar work, helping refugees who seek a life of liberty, particularly in this country. We can ease the way for them; help them find jobs, make new friends, become accustomed to our ways; join in our civic and social life; help them above all to become good Americans.

Individuals can strengthen our rights and privileges by exercising those rights and privileges. We can vote. We willingly can accept public office or jury duty. We can lend support to improving schools or clearing slums or combatting juvenile delinquency. We can take an active role in community affairs.

At heart, America is stronger today than ever before. Our freedoms, our opportunities, our basic protection against the powers of tyranny are greater than ever before.

We are moving closer and closer to the ideals of liberty which brought the good people of the Mayflower to this land in search of a better life. I am sure each of us will continue to work to attain that better life in our time.

Denationalization of the Synthetic Rubber Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALLACE F. BENNETT
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, December 2, 1954

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the complete text of an address delivered by Holman D. Pettibone, Chairman of the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Commission, at the annual meeting of the Rubber Manufacturers Association at the Waldorf Astoria Hotel in New York, Thursday, November 18, 1954.

This is one of the most significant public statements issued by the Commission. It portrays not only the status of negotiations for sale of the plants, but also sets forth some of the problems encountered by the Commission.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Viles, members of the Rubber Manufacturers Association, and distinguished guests, just a year ago yesterday, the late Representative Paul Shafer addressed this association on the prospect and responsibilities of denationalizing the synthetic-rubber industry. We pay tribute today to his memory. I know all of you join in that tribute. We of the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Commission have lost a stanch ally, and you have lost a valued counselor.

Mr. Shafer was conditionally optimistic when he spoke to you about the disposal program. We were privileged to have a good visit with him just before he appeared here. We have cherished the confidence he manifested in the Commission, from the outset until his untimely death.

It is an honor for my colleagues and me to meet with you today. Back in July, when Mr. Viles extended your kind invitation, the Commissioners got together to consider it. One of them looked up at the ceiling and mused: "I wonder where we'll be by November 18 on disposal." Somebody else observed: "Well, we'll be someplace. Let's give them our altitude, ground speed, and weather conditions." So that's what we're here to do.

You men direct the destinies of three of the basic industries—rubber, petroleum, and chemical, each having an important part in the production of synthetic rubber. And what a job you have done. You are important guardians of our national security and hold keys to our ever-expanding national economy. Your research, your engineering, your production, and your sales genius combine to bring new products, better products, at lower cost to more and more people. You represent an indispenable part of America's answer to any threat of world domination from abroad.

Our Commission is having an inspiring experience. You know, Public Law 205 which provides for the disposal program says a lot of things. For one thing it says no member of the Commission could have any previous record of dabbling around in your businesses. Well, the President signed the legislation on August 7, 1953. After a 2 months' search for 3 men, he oddly enough found 2 men on the same day—Commissioner Rounds, a retired banker from Maine, and Commissioner Cook, a cotton merchant from Memphis. I wasn't uncovered until a month later, November 2, 1953. Rounds and Cook pooled their votes for the junior member, and I was made chairman.

We undertook this assignment because we believed in its objective—transfer of an essential, going, profitable business from Government to private operation. We believed then and believe now that Congress formulated a workable disposal law. It is designed to give due regard to the defense and financial interests of Government and at the same time permit industry to buy these facilities on fair terms. We formally got into business on November 10, 1953, 1 year and 1 week ago.

The law delineates three calendar phases of our responsibility. They are:

1. The 6 months' period of receiving bids. That was from November 27, 1953, to May 27, 1954.

2. The period of negotiations with bidders lying between May 28 and December 27, 1954.

3. The 60 legislative day period in which Congress has an opportunity to review a recommended sales program. Our report to Congress must be made no later than next January 27. Sometime next April this review can culminate in the sale of the properties in whole or in part, if the part is capable of producing at least 500,000 long tons of GR–S rubber and 43,000 long tons of butyl rubber annually. Or the review can result in rejection of the entire program, thus continuing the Government in the rubber business.

These provisions are all in the law, and I know that most of you gentlemen have already worn out several copies of that document, as I have.

In February, we began a tour of all the plants, meeting the operating personnel, inspecting the facilities, and getting firsthand knowledge of the properties. The plants are located in eight States from Connecticut to California and from Ohio to Texas.

After we visited the plants, we made, on March 16, an interim report to the Congress on our impressions. Among other things, we said:

"1. The plants are well maintained and in good operating condition.

"2. There is optimism in your industries over the long-term outlook for increased demand and expanding markets for synthetic rubber.

"3. We were impressed by the sincerity displayed by industrial executives to do their part in putting the plants into private hands. They seemed to feel their responsibility in making this possible."

That was last March 16. Today, on November 18, we feel exactly the same way. We have not changed fundamental concepts of our job.

Prior to the bidding period, the RFC Office of Synthetic Rubber, prepared, at our request, technical data on the 27 plants, that every prospective bidder could have all available information on any facility that might interest him. Engineering data, cost figures, technical descriptions were included. Issuance of such information was designed to place every bidder on as nearly an equal basis as possible. In addition, we authorized plant inspection trips to any property a prospective bidder desired to visit.

As a result of these activities, you will be interested to know that 6,652 copies of brochures were distributed to 217 representatives of prospective bidders, in the 6 months' bidding period. In the same period, we authorized 49 plant inspection visits by prospective bidders. You will appreciate the fact that this total of inspection visits does not include companies operating facilities for which they are bidding. They were already thoroughly familiar with such facilities. We held 129 conferences with representatives of 59 companies. All of this represented our sales promotion efforts to stir the widest possible interest in the disposal program from the maximum number of companies.

On the stroke of 12 midnight on May 27, the Commission opened the proposals of bidders. Only the Commission and two of its staff members were present. The five of us today remain the only ones who know the original prices bid for all facilities, and the changes that have occurred during negotiations.

We received bids from 35 companies. They submitted 56 proposals for the facilities and 19 alternate proposals—a total of 75 proposals as the basis for negotiation. Bidders represented have their home offices in 21 States.

We spent several days checking the eligibility of the bids from all standpoints, and on June 11, 1954, we announced that all bidders were eligible to negotiate. Negotiations started next day. They are still continuing.

Now I'd like to touch on these negotiations from the Commission's viewpoint. Once in a while, a story has appeared in a newspaper or magazine implying a bogged-down program. Nothing was happening, we heard. Our executive director, Mr. Eugene Holland, was described as a sphinx, a charge his wife immediately denied.

The Disposal Act imposes important conditions. Congress attached first importance to national security. If there is war again, synthetic rubber must be available. The Commission, with the cooperation of other departments of Government and with bidders has prepared a national security clause which will require every buyer to maintain his plant in condition to produce a specified tonnage of synthetic rubber or its componones for a period of 10 years. For this reason, buyers must have technical competence.

The next item mentioned in the disposal law is with respect to the development within the United States of a free synthetic rubber industry. In this connection, the program must be designed to afford small-business enterprises and users the opportunity to obtain a fair share of synthetic rubber produced by the facilities sold and at fair prices. The sales pattern must not permit any person to possess unreasonable control over the manufacture of synthetic rubber or its component materials. Another requirement of the law is that plants are to be sold at full, fair value.

You should bear in mind that the Attorney General must pass on the antitrust and competitive aspects of our program.

We have negotiated simultaneously on all criteria of the act. We first called in high bidders and asked specific questions on how they had arrived at original bid prices. We asked what cost factors were involved, how they were computed, what rate of return on investment is contemplated, and so on. And, gentlemen, the cooperation we got was fine. Bidders came back at us with a great deal of information. All of this took time and that accounts for the long periods of silence from the negotiating rooms in Washington. We could not run to the press, to Congress, or anyone with anything that might handicap negotiations. Contrary to some reports, we have not been conducting a slow auction. It has been rather negotiations conducted in an atmosphere of interpreting technical information, economic aspects, and all the provisions of the disposal law in an effort to create a program. That is entirely different from either a slow or a fast auction.

The Commission has conducted negotiations with great care in an effort to be fair to all bidders. We have not identified bidders for any facility. We have not disclosed the bid of any bidder. Nor have we attempted to exercise control over disclosure by any bidder. That has been left entirely to each bidder's judgment. We have welcomed exchanges of view with every bidder. We have endeavored to consider carefully every bidder's questions and suggestions. This has been our policy throughout the period for proposals and also during the period of negotiation.

Permit me to speak now particularly concerning two of the criteria of the disposal law: (1) The establishment of a free competitive synthetic-rubber industry in a program which does not permit any person to possess unreasonable control over the manufacture or sale of synthetic rubber or its component materials; and (2) obtaining for the Government full fair value for the facilities to be sold.

The disposal law reflects concern of the Congress for adequate provision for the rubber fabricator who does not own and operate a copolymer plant. In accordance with the law and the Commission's instructions, each bidder has declared his intention to make some specified portion of his production of synthetic rubber available to small-business enterprises. The Commission believes that the disposal program now shaping up can provide an adequate supply of noncaptive synthetic rubber to meet the needs of the smaller rubber fabricators who do not buy plants.

Every facility with one exception now offered for sale is closely identified in its physical location either with its source of raw materials or its end-product market. The one exception is the copolymer plant at Institute, W. Va. It is not operating, and for it as yet we have no bid. Under Government direction and for Government account, every facility now in operation is operated by a private company which is either directly or indirectly a producer of raw materials for or a consumer of the products of Government-owned manufacturing plants. You private company operators helped to create this whole industry, you have helped to improve and operate it, and some of you have bid for the facilities with which you have been identified. Now come bidders who have not operated the synthetic-rubber facility for which a bid is submitted. The Commission has encouraged these newcomers by supplying all available information. This policy is consistent with the purpose of creating competition.

The Commission believes that competitive elements can exist as between individual facilities or groups of facilities in different geographical locations, once these facilities are owned by different companies under the type of disposal program which we would recommend to the Congress.

What is "full, fair value"? Who is to determine it? Three parties are involved—bidders, the Disposal Commission, and the Congress. I shall speak only on the Commission's approach to the problem.

We have had access to all Government accounts concerning the construction and operation of the facilities. We have had the help of the Washington staff of the Office of Synthetic Rubber headed up by our friend, E. D. Kelly.

We have had before us a complete appraisal report prepared for the Administrator of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation prior to the time of the appointment of this Commission. We have been supplied with quantities of information by bidders either in response to our questions or volunteered. In our study of all of this material the Commission has been assisted by engineers, lawyers, economists, and accountants specially retained for that purpose. Finally, and very important, we have before us the bids of all bidders.

We gave attention to many factors, including original cost, depreciation as set up in the Government accounts, cost of replacement, estimates of cost of building entirely new facilities with different techniques of manufacture. Keeping all these factors in mind, we have placed emphasis on potential earning power of each facility in the hands of private owners and operators.

We do not presume to say that we have hit upon a scientific or exact mathematical formula for determining value which is so accurate as to be conclusive, but having all this data before us, we have been able to form opinions as to appropriate prices for purposes of comparison and negotiation. We have had enough confirmation from various bidders to indicate that our method of approach to the question of value is sound for the sale of a going business.

Permit me to share with you an important secret: Several bidders have informed us quite fully about the defects of the particular facility for which a bid was submitted. That is a rather human trait which we understand—sympathetically. In addition, several bidders have been at some pains to mention superior advantages of a competitive facility not in their bid. We have listened respectfully to the catalog of defects. We have been even more interested in the advantages assigned a competitive plant. It has seemed to us to be appropriate to mention those advantages to the bidder for the other plant.

There is another item in which we have been interested. As novices in the business, we are sometimes confused by statistics which deal with thousands of long or short tons of production capacity of a plant but at the same time refer to cents per pound of cost of feedstocks or cents per pound of end products. To one unfamiliar with a slide rule, the arithmetic becomes very complex. One cent a gallon in the cost of butylenes could mean a difference of around $200,000 annually in earnings of a single plant after 50 percent Federal income tax. Capitalize that at a modest 10 percent and we seem to arrive at a difference of $2 million in the capital value of the plant. Maybe you prefer to talk about a price of 23 cents per pound for the synthetic rubber known as GR–S. Suppose we increase that figure to 24 cents on 600,000 long tons of production. Would you believe it—that comes out at $13,440,000. Suppose we assume Federal income taxes at 50 percent and capitalize at 10 percent. My word, the value of all the GR–S plants would be increased by over $50 million. At that point, we sign off. The sale price might be 22 cents a pound instead of 24 cents.

It is logical to assume that sales prices of plants having the same product must bear a relationship to each other. If this were not true, Congress next January might examine the recommended program submitted by the Commission and arch an eyebrow on whether a free, competitive industry was being established. Congress can hardly tolerate a bargain to one bidder, while another is paying a full, fair value. Such a course doesn't appear to start free enterprise off on an even race.

May I summarize the Commission's present position by stating:

1. As of this date, neither the Commission nor any bidder has signed a final definitive contract of sale. These are now in course of preparation with every bidder whose bid is regarded by the Commission as representing full, fair value. We propose to execute these contracts as soon as, in our judgment, there is in the making a program we can recommend to the Congress. This does not necessarily mean a contract covering every facility. If a facility is not sold or leased, it is to be put in standby for 3 years so that it will not compete with buyers of other facilities. Neither a bidder nor the Commission is bound until the formal contract is signed by both.

2. Concern is being expressed in various quarters over the short time left to complete a disposal program. The Commission shares this concern.

Here is the situation as it stands today. Bidders for some of the facilities and the Commission have been unable to find a meeting place on the purchase price. While we members of the Commission cannot match the long experience of many bidders with these particular facilities, we do have one great advantage—we have all the bids before us, and with skilled technical advice available to us we can form reasonably accurate judgments as to relative value of comparable plants. Unless wide divergencies, where they exist between certain bids, can be explained thoroughly and justified, some facilities may not be sold.

3. The Commission remains optimistic that a program can be recommended to the Congress.

In conclusion, I want to say a word of appreciation of the magnificent job done by industry in cooperating with Government in building up this synthetic-rubber business. By willingness to pool not only your patents, but also your know-how, there was built and placed in operation within the space of a few short months an industry capable of supplying, if need be, substantially all of the rubber needed in this entire country.

Taken all together, it is one of the finest examples of Government and industry cooperation. Now that the need for Government in this industry no longer exists, we approach the time when Government may withdraw, knowing that industry will carry on from here fully capable of meeting every challenge. We of the Commission are grateful for the opportunity of playing our part in effecting this change.

We also appreciate greatly the cooperation and assistance given us by all—both within and without the rubber industry. Without this cooperation the job could not have advanced this far, nor can it be completed without your continued cooperation. Thank you.

Indiana Technical College

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, December 2, 1954

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, 24 years ago Indiana Technical College was founded in Fort Wayne, Ind. During the short span of years it has become one of the outstanding and fastest growing engineering schools in the United States. It has grown from the time of its inception in 1930 from a handful of men to an enrollment of more than 1,100 engineering students from every State in the Union and 39 foreign countries, provinces, and territories. It offers a bachelor of science degree on an accelerated program in six fields of engineering—that is, aeronautical, chemical, civil, electrical, electronic, and mechanical—and caters to capable mature students with limited finances. Seventy percent of its students work part time for their college expenses.

On July 1, 1956, Indiana Technical College plans to move from its present crowded, downtown building to its new location—a campus of 20 acres and 20 buildings, recently purchased from Concordia College.

Imperial Sir Frank S. Land, imperial potentate of the Shrine of North America, delivered an interesting and challenging commencement address on November 21, 1954. He was presented to the audience by Dr. George E. Stringfellow, vice chairman of the board of directors of the college, senior vice president of Thomas A. Edison, Inc., long time business associate of the great inventor, and imperial high priest and prophet of the Shrine of North America.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the commencement address delivered by Mr. Land, the introductory remarks by Dr. Stringfellow, and the citation of Mr. Land by the president of the college.

There being no objection, the remarks and the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Introduction of Frank S. Land at the Commencement Exercises of Indiana Technical College, by George E. Stringfellow, November 21, 1954

President Keene, members of the board of directors, members of the faculty, members of the graduating class, distinguished guests and friends, it is a privilege to present Hon. Frank S. Land, 33d degree Mason, member of Ararat Temple, imperial potentate of the Ancient Arabic Order of Nobles of the Mystic Shrine, member of the board of trustees of the Shriners Hospitals for Crippled Children, and founder and general secretary of the grand council of the Order of DeMolay.

As imperial potentate, Noble Land heads an organization whose membership exceeds three-quarters of a million men who are dedicated to better citizenship and to aiding the less fortunate. He helps to administer the affairs of the 17 shriners hospitals for crippled children through which almost 300,000 crippled children have passed. Those little tots, whose bodies when admitted to these temples of mercy were twisted and their limbs were deformed, all of them left these institutions either completely cured or greatly helped.

Noble Land provides constructive leadership for the Order of DeMolay, to which he has dedicated his life. This is an organization of more than 200,000 active young men. Its senior members exceed more than a million and a half. There are more than 1,700 chapters in the United States and foreign countries. This is an organization that is dedicated essentially to building good character and constructive leaders.

Ralph Waldo Emerson must have had such a person as Noble Land in mind when he said, "I consider him a great man who inhabits a higher sphere of thought into which other men rise with difficulty and labor." Noble Land, a symbol of civic virtue, has for years been an exemplary citizen and as such has elevated the thinking of those who have been privileged to be associated with him. Noble Land will address you on the subject New Horizons.

I present Noble Frank S. Land.

New Horizons

(Address by Hon. Frank S. Land, imperial potentate of the Ancient Arabic Order of Nobles of the Mystic Shrine)

I know that all of your look forward to careers and probably feel that the measure of success you attain in life will be gaged by your financial gain. But let me assure you that this goal alone will not give you that inner satisfaction or security that is your God-given heritage. There is no worthwhile possession that does not need to be constantly won and rewon. The moment that you get your alphabet learned—one of the greatest of all intellectual achievements, you possess the whole of the English literature. As soon as you can count, you possess the whole of the equipment of a Sir Isaac Newton or an Einstein. But it is quite another matter to possess your possessions.

The same thing is true of conscience. It cannot be transmitted from father to son or from mother to daughter. If a person is ever to have a living conscience, he must first possess it himself and then keep it alive and alert in the current of the social streams of his time. We seek to possess ourselves but this possession is constantly disputed and challenged. All ideals are possessions which belong only to those who win them.

Our civilization today is on a fast march. The problems which face you and me today are not those that can be settled by a president, an election, or the passing of laws or legislation for political purposes. The whole universe of man is going through a revolutionary change and we of this generation are riding the torrent to where we do not know.

Our world is changing more rapidly today than it did in the thousand years before the Crusades. It now is changing more rapidly in 1 year than it did in the whole century after the American and French Revolutions. A new order is aborning. One marvels at the amazing mental mood of man today in his ability to accept the change and maintain his balance in adapting himself to complete new surroundings almost daily. Yes, a whole universe is cracking up and fading away and a new one is coming into being.

Our age has been built upon the quicksands of material things. We have made a fetish of our great wealth, our imposing buildings, our giant plants of industry, and networks of transportation. Yet, with all these resources, we find our civilization crumbling about us. I ask you and myself: Can we continue to build our lives upon such foundations and what is left to build this new civilization that is aborning?

I will enumerate some of the things I believe we must build our future on. I cannot pick them up with my hands as I would a piece of paper, a book, or a glass of water. They are imponderable things—like the sunlight—they slip through your fingers, or the air that brushes so close to you but which you never see. I like to call them the invisible things of life; the things our mothers taught us from the time we first knelt at her knee—honesty, integrity, truth, beauty, freedom, goodness, clean thinking, love of God, love of home, and love of country. You cannot pick any of these virtues up and hide them from the eyes of men and women. They are free to everyone who accepts them. They are the anchors to which we must tie if we are to live beauteous and righteous lives.

By now, you realize that I am not talking about technology to you graduates of this great engineering school. All my life has been devoted to the building and importance of character. I like the motto from one of our great boy's schools, Phillips Andover. In Latin, its literal translation is: "The way you begin is the way you end." The point made, of course, is that an individual may be highly skilled in engineering, chemistry, or any other activity, but unless he or she has behind that the essential ingredient of character, he cannot go anywhere for long. Character is a personal thing, as personal as a toothbrush.

As valuable as science has been, it has not yet been able to give us a formula for the evaluation of the human being. Men and women are the product of change and they reflect the interplay of environment and heredity in a swiftly moving world. Human talents are constantly being reshaped to meet new challenges. Because the quality of men cannot be measured by mathematics or isolated in a test tube. American leaders have learned that in the selection of men and women they must rely on three stable factors—ability, personality, and character.

Ability is a badge not lightly won. It is an attribute gained by personal demonstration. Personality is the light by which ability makes its way. It is a spark engineered by personal contact and on occasion it may be fanned into that high white flame that we sometimes associate with hypnotic power. Lacking it, a man of ability may linger in obscurity, unsought and untried.

But the greatest of all of these qualities is character. Ability and personality may open doors, but it is character that keeps them open. Character is a priceless possession and one that is not built overnight. It is built on the strength of a slow, steady, continuous growth. No matter what you do, you must have character to endure, even as you must have ability and personality to achieve. As you contribute character it flows back to you in strength and inspiration. Since our character exists only in the estimation of others, it must be constantly guarded and fostered and not allowed to waste itself in thoughtlessness, or selfishness, or avarice.

I ask you to analyze the life of any outstanding leader, an individual whom others follow. You will see that he learned first to serve those who follow him. He respects others as he demands respect for himself. He knows that if he is true to himself, he cannot be false to others. A man with character has gentle dignity, reasonable kindness, strength without hypocrisy, and humble wisdom. A man's greatest asset is his character. In business or in his profession, in politics, or among his friends, it carries with it an obligation. It puts a man on a spot to live up to it. It's hard to earn a reputation for character and just as hard to keep it. You must try each day to do a lot better than the day before. And keep in mind that a man who has a reputation for character is not excused or forgiven transgressions as are some lesser folks.

One time, in some kind of a talk somewhere, I said that "in the life of each young person there stretch a hundred beckoning paths. The followers of the Prophet Mohammed believe that for the individual only one of these can lead him to the proper fulfillment of his destiny. This the Mohammedans call Al Sirat, or the correct or proper way. They believe that the basic problem of youth is his search for his own Al Sirat. Mohammedan philosophers cautioned the young not to take the path that looked most attractive at first glance, but to test one path after another until they are sure."

Then I remember reading once that Benjamin Franklin said in 1772: "We must not in the course of public life expect immediate grateful acknowledgment of our services. But let us persevere through abuse and even injury. The internal satisfaction of a good conscience is always present and time will do justice in the minds of the people, even of those at present the most prejudiced against us."

When Thoreau saw the woodman's ax destroying the forest, he exclaimed, "Thank God, they cannot cut down the clouds." There are invisible things, eternal things, that all the powers of men in all their fury cannot destroy. To even contemplate these things is to achieve an inward quiet and peace even in this war-torn and topsy-turvy world that you and I now live in.

There are indestructible qualities of human spirit. Mother love is immortal and, though crushed to earth, rises again. Courage, sacrifice, peace of mind, love, truth, love of home and family, love of country, and love of God, all glow with a new light in the midst of the blackouts of hope. Faith gallantly and victoriously rides the whirlwind. No, my friends, you cannot cut down the clouds. The spirit of man cannot be destroyed. The finest things of life are invisible and immortal; they will survive.

In one of the letters of Marcus Aurelius when, as a young man, he was traveling, he tells his teacher that as his party went through the gate of the old Tower of Anagni, they saw on each side the inscription: "Priest, put on thy Sum-en-tum." Marcus inquired and was told that the Sum-en-tum was a bit of skin taken from a sacrificed goat or sheep which the priest put on his cap when he entered the city. It was a badge of distinction. It set the wearer apart from fellow men. It was his reminder of his role in life.

Today, as you receive your diplomas, as you receive your engineering degrees, you are receiving your Sum-en-tum, august and inexorable. It should remind you always of that day of highest inspiration when you selected your highway of life. Each day as you pass through the gate of the morning and don your Sum-en-tum, it should give you new courage, new hope, new faith.

Isn't it odd that the invisible things of God seem so very, very far away to many of us when, in reality, we have only to reach out and take Him by the hand? So may I offer this one thought: What doth it profit a man if he gain the whole world and lose his spiritual sense—loses the narrow path that leads to the footstool of God?

CITATION

INDIANA TECHNICAL COLLEGE,
Fort Wayne, Ind.

Mr. Land, in recognition of your contribution as a leader of men and boys, a contribution based on humility, so that all men are your brothers to be served; a contribution based on sincerity, so that the high ideals you speak of are reflected truly in your life; a contribution based on dedication to your work, so that you have given your time, your talents, and indeed much of your personal wealth and life to this labor of love; and a contribution based on knowledge and understanding particularly of boys, so that you have been able to touch the lives of more than a million and a half men over the world, making them better men, Indiana Technical College upon the approval of its board of directors is honored to pay tribute to you and through the authority in it vested by the State of Indiana confers upon you the degree doctor of humanities (honoris causa) with all of the rights, titles, privileges, and obligations appertaining thereto.

President KEENE.

Citizens for the Census of McCarthy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, December 2, 1954

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I have been very heartened by the deep public interest aroused in almost every group of our population concerning McCarthyism and the methods and acts of the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY]. This reaction has come from the grassroots—from among all those who cherish the transcendental values enshrined in the Bill of Rights. Movements have started up in colleges and, without any kind of organizational superstructure or concerted effort, have resulted in the expressions of opinion by thousands and thousands of our fellow citizens.

One such movement was started at Harvard University by a fine young student, Mr. J. C. Peter Richardson, who was born in England, but who, having come to this country found the methods of the junior Senator from Wisconsin affecting the wellsprings even of college life. He undertook, on his own initiative, to circulate a petition for censure among his fellow students. I have a copy of that that petition. Subsequent to the circulation of that petition at Harvard, two students wrote a letter to the editor of the Harvard Crimson, the Harvard University daily, explaining why they did not sign the petition. Young Mr. Richardson wrote a reply to that letter. Copies of these two letters to the editor have been supplied to me. I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the Harvard University petition and the two letters to the editor of the Harvard Crimson, referred to above, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

I ask unanimous consent, also, Mr. President, to insert into the Appendix of the RECORD in connection with the same matter an article which appeared in the New York Times of Saturday, November 27, describing the activities of Mr. Richardson and consisting of an interview between himself and the New York Times.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This petition is circulated by Citizens for the Censure of MCCARTHY.

We, the undersigned citizens, respectfully request that the United States Senate censure Senator JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY. We feel that his conduct as chairman of the Senate Permanent Subcommittee, Committee on Government Operations, has been irresponsible, undignified, and, in the true sense of the word, un-American. In utter disregard of the true purposes of his committee, he has attempted to establish guilt by accusation and to conduct trials by inquisition.

Furthermore, we regret that his disrespect for the American people, their Government, and their ideals has greatly undermined our self-respect at home and our reputation abroad. This petition will, we hope, add strength to the mounting protests against Senator MCCARTHY's dictatorial methods.

(Signatures.)

[From the Harvard Crimson]

THE MAIL

CLIMATE OF FEAR?

To the Editors of the Crimson:

This afternoon my roommate and I were asked to sign a petition advocating the censure of Senator JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY. We both refused. And yet, we both hope that the censure motion is adopted.

Discussing our actions, we came to the conclusion that we did not sign because we were afraid that sometime in the future MCCARTHY will point to us as having signed the petition, and, as he has done to others, question our loyalty.

We are afraid that of the thousands of petition signers, one will be proved a Communist, and as a result, MCCARTHY, or someone like him, will say, because we were both cosigners and classmates of the Communist, that we, too, are Reds.

The fact that two college students and others like us will not sign a petition for fear of reprisal indicates only too clearly that our democracy is in danger. It is clear that MCCARTHY is suppressing free speech and free actions by thrusting fear into the hearts of innocent citizens.

Let us hope that the Senators of the United States are not victims of the same fear that has infected us.

K. W. L., '58.
M. F. G., '58.

NOVEMBER 24, 1954.

To the Editors of the Harvard Crimson.

DEAR SIRS: The letter sent to you by two Harvard students and published yesterday can safely be said to represent the viewpoint of about one-half of those who did not sign the anti-McCarthy petition.

The position taken by the authors is common and understandable, but it is by no means justifiable. In a free society, when opinions become unpopular and dangerous, it is most important that they be expressed. To yield to the climate of fear, to become a scared liberal, is to strengthen the very forces which one opposes. Courage must complement conviction, for otherwise each man will become a rubberstamp, content to spend the rest of his life echoing popular beliefs, never daring to dissent, never having enough courage to say what he thinks, and never living as an individual, but only as part of the crowd.

Yes, our democracy is in danger, but as long as men are not afraid to express their view in spite of the consequences, it shall flourish. Only when fear is allowed to limit dissention does democracy falter.

The blame for America's present intellectual intolerance rests as heavily on those who have bowed to it as it does on those who encourage it.

Sincerely,

J. C. PETER RICHARDSON.

[From the New York Times of November 27, 1954]

CENSURE PETITIONS BEGUN IN HARVARD—STUDENTS INITIATE MOVEMENT AGAINST MCCARTHY—OTHER COLLEGES URGED TO JOIN

A nationwide movement for petitions urging the Senate to censure Senator JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY has been started by a group of Harvard students.

J. C. Peter Richardson, a 20-year-old junior at Harvard, said here last night that between 200 and 300 letters had been sent to other universities and colleges urging students to cooperate in the drive.

Other letters, Mr. Richardson said, are being sent by the thousand to private citizens in the Boston area. Mr. Richardson and his associates expect groups at other universities to try to reach private citizens in their areas.

The movement, Mr. Richardson said, is designed to counter the Ten Million for MCCARTHY drive, which seeks to collect signatures from those opposing the Senate motion to censure the Wisconsin Republican.

Mr. Richardson said his group was "the product of a few nonprofessional students rather than of highly specialized political organizers or retired generals."

The reference was to the fact that a number of retired general officers and admirals are on the executive board of the pro-MCCARTHY group. This group is headed by Rear Adm. John Crommelin, retired.

Mr. Richardson, whose New York home is at 2 East 67th Street, said that his his movement, which was begun last week, would work on three levels, at Harvard, where 2,500 signatures have been collected, in other colleges and universities, and among citizens across the Nation.

The Harvard drive, he said, is based on the premise that the censure of Mr. MCCARTHY by the Senate should have grassroots support to avoid possible charges that the censure action resulted from the efforts of a few "pink tinged" Senators.

The procensure petitions, Mr. Richardson added, may help to establish such a backing.

Mr. Richardson reported that a number of Harvard students who said they agreed with the spirit of the drive had refused to sign because of fear of reprisals.

He cited a letter from two students published in Wednesday's issue of the Harvard Crimson, the university daily, asserting that they did not sign the petitions "because we were afraid that sometime in the future MCCARTHY will point to us as having signed the petition, and, as he had done to others, question our loyalty."

"Let us hope that the Senators of the United States are not victims of the same fear that has affected us," the letter said.

Meanwhile, another movement to gather petitions in favor of the censure was said to be gaining momentum in Palmer, Mass. The Palmer movement is headed by Mrs. Winfred Swanson, who said yesterday that she had received thousands of requests for the petition blanks.

Each blank has space for 50 names. Mrs. Swanson's goal is 20 million signatures.

The Antarctic Continent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR V. WATKINS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, December 2, 1954

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, a subject of major concern to this body during the forthcoming sessions of the 84th Congress will be our interests in the Antarctic Continent and international activities in that huge and essentially unexplored domain.

This renewed interest in the Antarctic is now being reflected in articles and editorials in newspapers and periodicals throughout the country. It is being reflected also in mail from our constituents and in grass roots comment as reported in the readers' columns in newspapers.

To give Members of this body a sampling of this grass roots comment, I present a few representative samples of such letters to editors, and ask unanimous consent that they may be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the article, and letters were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Christian Science Monitor of September 17, 1954]

The Antarctic

To the Christian Science Monitor:

In a Congressional Record Appendix (June 7), Congressman Marshall, of Minnesota, inserted a letter reprinted from your paper which dealt with the subject of United States leadership. The writer noted that in the first chapter of Genesis mankind is admonished to have dominion over all the earth. It was pointed out that the Antarctic Continent, 10 percent of the earth's land surface, lies unused. That writer thought that the United States, as a leader, should develop Antarctic resources, and so forth.

As I read the letter I thought it more or less ridiculous and farfetched, because the Antarctic certainly seems impossible of exploitation today. Recently, however, I have been reading a good deal about the so-called land reforms carried on by Communists in a number of satellite countries—taking land from large landowners and distributing it to small famers. I begin to see some point to the aforementioned letter. The so-called land reform of the Communists in a mere reshuffling. There is nothing inspiring especially, nor worthy of leadership, about it. On the other hand, the Antarctic idea takes on new meaning.

Opening up a new continent is the sort of thing that would show initiative and prowess. I am not sure that the difficulties, such as coldness, remoteness, expense of establishing bases, etc., necessarily mean that such a project needs to be postponed or shrugged aside. Perhaps our concepts of leadership and psychological warfare need redirection. As far as expense it concerned, it would seem that, of all generations, ours certainly would be the one to consider any expense short of the millions-per-hour wars as justified layout money.

I believe the idea of opening up Antarctica fits in with the world's needs of today. It can be used to spark our psychological warfare and overseas propaganda of all kinds. The newness and freshness of the idea could work wonders.

Sidney Kasmir.

Washington.

[From the Washington Star of September 4, 1954]

Occupy Antarctic?

I have not yet finished reading Finn Ronne's Antarctic book, but I certainly want to go on record as joining the ranks of what might be called the amateur Antarctic enthusiasts. My friends have told me of seeing letters to local newspapers covering different phases of the Antarctic question since about 1950, when the Ronne book came out. I have seen slides and photographs of the 1946–47 expedition led by Cruzen and Byrd and have heard that pictures taken on an earlier trip by Ronne and Black are excellent. Only last spring one of the local theaters had a short in technicolor of the British-Swedish-Norwegian Antarctic camp, although no Americans took part, I believe.

It seems to me that there is very little substantial reason for the United States delay in having another Antarctic expedition. If such a powerful and sensible body of Senators as the Senate Armed Services Committee comes out favoring an early expedition, it must be a wise thing to consider. I do not, however, feel that merely another American expedition such as planned by Finn Ronne and announced in his statement before the committee July 1 would be sufficient. We have had expeditions enough go to the Antarctic and come home, leaving no actually tangible foundation there for an American claim to territory. Other nations set up bases and keep men in them on rotation plan, thereby satisfying the international idea that occupation counts when territory is to be claimed. It really seems as if we could do that without hurting the national pocketbook.

Stuart C. Belfield.

[From the Washington Star of September 6, 1954]

Antarctic Expedition

It was a pleasure to read the recent letter of E. A. Kendall in the Star concerning your editorial on the Antarctic expedition. Since this matter appeared in the Congressional Record I have failed to note any other interest in this grave international subject.

Both Senators Case and Wiley are to be congratulated for their foresightedness, also your newspaper.

I had the pleasure of introducing the Jaycee resolution mentioned.

It is apparent that urgent and expeditious action is desirable on the part of every Congressman. We must become a Nation of anticipators in matters of world peace, as well as national security. We in Jaycee, with our energetic and sometime impetuous methods, have a far more deeprooted investment in our America and her security than the average Member of Congress. Ours is the generation to cope with the decisions generated by these lawmakers. We have voiced, through this resolution, a firm belief in a project that can mean success or failure for our democratic way of life.

With the recess of Congress it behooves every editor to embark upon an education program that will focus attention upon this needed expedition to Antarctica by Captain Ronne.

Roland G. Hebb,
President, Maryland Junior Chamber of Commerce.

[From the Washington Star of September 9, 1954]

Expediter

I would like to see an expedition for the Antarctic leave as soon as possible, one such as Finn Ronne has planned, which would aid the United States establish her claims to portions of the Antarctic that have been informally claimed by the United States over the past 100 years.

The small cost of expeditions today contrasted to possibly having to buy land there later would seem to make an expedition this year a sensible move.

Edna Belfield.

[From the Washington Star of September 9, 1954]

America's Mark at the Pole

With considerable interest I have noted recent editorials and letters regarding the Antarctic Continent and a possible expedition down there to be headed by Capt. Finn Ronne, of nearby Maryland. Although the name of Captain Ronne is not perhaps so well known as that of Adm. Richard E. Byrd in regard to the Antarctic, still it is of interest that the name Ronne appears prominently twice on the maps of the south polar regions.

One of the most accurate recent maps of the Antarctic is that produced by Rand McNally appearing in World Book Encyclopedia. It shows the general areas of the parts of the continent named by leading United States expeditions. Marie Byrd Land is on the west of the portion of the continent extending into the Western Hemisphere. Ellsworth Highland is to the north. (Palmer Peninsula of course extends almost to South America and is named for an American.) And last but not least in extent is Edith Ronne Land to the east, inland from the Weddell Sea. This huge tract was named for Finn Ronne's wife, who accompanied the expedition he led in 1947–48, the last one from the United States so far.

The other Antarctic feature bearing the name of Ronne is that bay to the west of Palmer Peninsula, a large indentation between the continent proper and Alexander First island. Ronne Bay was named for the father of Finn Ronne, who accompanied Admiral Byrd to the Antarctic.

Newspapers, on the whole, have carried few maps of Antarctica, and perhaps the general public does not realize that this great continent is almost as large as South America, because the two are rarely shown in the same scale. Not long ago an Associated Press news feature article had with it a fairly good map of Antarctica, although interesting names were omitted.

F. M. Zimmers.

[From the Washington Star of October 12, 1954]

Dissatisfied With Antarctic Plans

At last the United States has awakened partially from its 7-year hibernation in respect to the Antarctic regions and there will be another expedition. Undoubtedly the October 2 White House statement provoked much interest in the younger generation—those young persons who have reached maturity with almost never a sight of the word Antarctica crossing their reading horizon.

The White House announcement, however, if complete on October 2, is bound to leave many mature citizens deeply disappointed. It is well known among thinking taxpayers that grassroots interest has been growing relative to the desirability of this country's formulating a forthright, progressive, unilateral, and up-to-date policy regarding the Antarctic. Such policy would involve two points that the White House says are not being considered at this time, namely, establishment of permanent bases and claiming of rightful United States territory in the Antarctic.

Therefore, the planned December 1 expedition with an icebreaker to skirt the edges of the continent and planned participation in the 1957–58 international geophysical year's program, while excellent scientific undertakings as far as they go, certainly do not add anything to the stature territorially or psychologically of the United States, and obviously can do no military or economic good as no United States rights will be asserted or sponsored. As no United States territory is involved, this work will be more or less an extension of point 4 and foreign military aid. Such scientific short trips can do little to satisfy the hopes of Capt. Finn Ronne and others who have been working extensively for several years to the end that we not lose the continent by default. Neither can such short trips add much to weather-data values because weather data must be accumulated over a very long period of time, and 2 months' summer data offshore and/or 1 year's data from the pole itself can have little meaning in overall weather work. These trips, thus, will be good chiefly for satisfying curiosity and can undoubtedly provide many interesting stories for home consumption and will be worth the price in that way. Hundreds of Americans probably would like to go along—including certainly this writer. However, today, when other nations are not stopping with mere scientific trips but are going forward with land claims and occupation, then taxpayers hereabouts may begin to wonder why the United States cannot do the same.

A flood of public expressions directed to the President and Members of Congress might well result in bringing forward a plan, not only to include the scientific work set out in the October 2 release, but to include the highly desirable 2-year Weddell Sea exploration outlined by Captain Ronne, and, last but not least, to include a sensible up-to-the-minute territorial policy that does not make this country seem timid nor yet overambitious.

E. A. Kendall.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of December 2, 1954]

UNITED STATES SHIP OFF ON ANTARCTIC EXPLORATION

Boston, December 1.—The U. S. S. *Atka*, nicknamed the "snowplow of the north," headed south today to explore the frozen 6-million-square-mile Antarctic Continent.

The *Atka*, which has been in service as an icebreaker in the far North, is the first United States naval ship to sail for the bottom of the world in 7 years. She will do reconnaissance work for a major expedition planned for 1956.

The ship and its 269-man crew, including 35 civilians, will be gone 5 months and will dig out Little America, the snow-buried camp of explorer Adm. Richard E. Byrd. Byrd, himself, was on the dock to make the official farewell speech for the Secretary of the Navy.

The *Atka*, whose skipper is Comdr. Glen Jacobsen, of Seattle, Wash., also is expected to study cosmic rays and hunt uranium and oil.

The *Atka* will sail through the Panama Canal and stop at Wellington, New Zealand, January 1–7, before making the final dash south for 54 days in the Antarctic area.

Supplies aboard included 100 tons of food, 3 helicopters, and a weasel truck, especially designed for snow.

New Look at the Finnegan Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, December 2, 1954

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an editorial entitled "New Look at the Finnegan Case," published in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of November 29, 1954.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

NEW LOOK AT THE FINNEGAN CASE

The Justice Department's new investigation of the Finnegan tax scandal recalls dramatic events of 1951 and 1952 and a general reluctance to investigate at that time.

Assistant Attorney General Warren Olney has sent agents to Omaha to question Frank W. Lohn, one of the first investigators of the Finnegan case. Mr. Lohn is reported to have resigned.

Certainly the whole record of procrastination if not attempted suppression in the Truman administration's handling of the case ought to be brought to light. Only the courage and diligence of Chief United States District Judge George H. Moore brought about the successful prosecution of James P. Finnegan, then collector of internal revenue here.

First Theron Lamar Caudle and Ellis Slack, two Assistant Attorneys General of that period, took a brief look at the Finnegan affair and insisted a grand jury inquiry was not necessary. Then Attorney General J. Howard McGrath himself was so reluctant to order an inquiry that Judge Moore gave him an ultimatum. Mr. McGrath finally capitulated, but not before he had been obliged to apologize publicly to Judge Moore for calling "damnable lies" the judge's report of earlier demands for action.

In view of that amazing history, the Finnegan conviction could hardly be described as a satisfactory ending to the matter. The Justice Department is well advised to take another look at it in 1954.

Award of Medal of Honor Posthumously to Cpl. Charles L. Gilliland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, December 2, 1954

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record a statement relating to the award posthumously of the Medal of Honor to Cpl. Charles L. Gilliland, an 18-year-old infantryman, from Yellville, Ark. This courageous boy from my State distinguished himself in defending a position in a severe engagement in Korea, during which he lost his life.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

ARMY INFANTRYMAN FROM ARKANSAS AWARDED MEDAL OF HONOR POSTHUMOUSLY

An 18-year-old Army infantryman from Yellville, Ark., who refused to leave his position despite a savage enemy attack in Korea, has been awarded the Medal of Honor posthumously, the Department of the Army announced today.

Cpl. Charles L. Gilliland won the Nation's highest award for valor in combat by his outstanding courage in defending a narrow defile at Tongmang-ni, Korea, against a numerically superior force. He was killed during the attack.

The young Arkansas soldier was a member of Company I, 7th Infantry Regimental Combat Team of the 3d Infantry Division when his unit became the focal point of a heavy assault by Chinese Communist Forces at about 2:30 a. m., on April 25, 1951. The fighting was on treacherous, rocky terrain under a full moon which lighted up the entire area.

From the start, the brunt of the enemy's attack seemed directed up a defile covered by Corporal (then Private First Class) Gilliland with his automatic rifle. His unit was soon subjected to a slashing barrage of small arms, automatic weapons, mortar and artillery fire. An assistant to Corporal Gilliland was killed, but the youthful infantryman, facing the full force of the assault, poured a steady fire into the attacking forces and eventually halted them.

Two of the enemy soldiers who had escaped Corporal Gilliland's raking fire managed to penetrate the platoon perimeter. Sfc. Edward G. Bunn, of 2916 Senton Road, Flint, Mich., described what happened.

"When two members of the Chinese Communist Forces penetrated the platoon perimeter," he declared, "Private First Class Gilliland left his position to pursue them and killed both of the enemy after a hand-to-hand battle. During the struggle he was armed only with his caliber .45 pistol. As he was returning to his automatic rifle position, he was wounded in the head."

Disregarding his wound, and refusing medical aid, Corporal Gilliland asked to be permitted to continue at his automatic rifle position even though his unit had been ordered back to new defensive positions. After having been given permission, he resumed his heroic defense of the vital pass and covered the withdrawal of other troops. His actions prevented the enemy from completely overrunning the platoon.

Corporal Gilliland was the son of Mr. and Mrs. Leon C. Gilliland of route D, Yellville, Ark. He was born May 24, 1933, at Mountain Home, Ark., and enlisted in the Army at the age of 17 with his parents' permission.

His Medal of Honor is the 73d which the Army has announced for conspicuous gallantry by its officers and men in the Korean fighting.

Details of the ceremony at which Corporal Gilliland's family will be presented the Medal of Honor awarded to him will be announced later.

The citation accompanying the award follows:

"Corporal (then Private First Class) Gilliland, Infantry, United States Army, a member of Company I, 7th Infantry Regiment, 3d Infantry Division, distinguished himself by conspicuous gallantry and outstanding courage above and beyond the call of duty in action against the enemy near Tongmang-ni, Korea, on April 25, 1951. A numerically superior hostile force launched a coordinated assault against his company perimeter, the brunt of which was directed up a defile covered by his automatic rifle. His assistant was killed by enemy fire but Corporal Gilliland, facing the full force of the assault, poured a steady fire into the foe which stemmed the onslaught. When two soldiers escaped his raking fire and infiltrated the sector, he leaped from his foxhole, overtook and killed them both with his pistol. Sustaining a serious head wound in this daring exploit, he refused medical attention and returned to his emplacement to continue his defense of the vital defile. His unit was ordered back to new defensive positions but Corporal Gilliland volunteered to remain to cover the withdrawal and hold the enemy at bay. His heroic actions and indomitable devotion to duty prevented the enemy from completely overrunning his company positions. Corporal Gilliland's incredible valor and supreme sacrifice reflect lasting glory upon himself and are in keeping with the honored traditions of the military service."

The Prices of Butter, Eggs, and Farm Products

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, December 2, 1954

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in in the Appendix of the Record letters which I have received from various farmers dealing with the prices of eggs, butter, and other farm products.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Oppy's Hatchery and Produce,
Wyndmere, N. Dak., October 26, 1954.
Senator William Langer,
Bismarck, N. Dak.

Dear Mr. Langer: Enclosed is a copy of a letter that I wrote to Mr. Benson. I think that the letter speaks for itself.

Now, Mr. Langer, what are you trying to do about it? I do hope you will try and get some action for our egg and poultry farmer, as he is taking a beating on the present prices. Today's egg prices are as follows: A grade, large, 30 cents; medium A grade, large, 15 cents; B grade, large, 15 cents; pullets, 11 cents; C grade, 9 cents. Also the consumer is paying twice as much for these eggs.

The Eastern States are receiving more than the above prices, and they are hurting too.

We also wonder why the egg prices jump 13 cents one week and drop 10 cents the following week. There is something wrong here.

Mr. Langer, will you kindly look into the above matter and see what can be done about this. Mr. Egg Farmer needs help now, not next year.

Yours truly,
Lloyd A. Opperud.

Wyndmere, N. Dak., *November 9, 1954.*
Senator Langer.

Dear Sir: Am sending you a copy of letter put out by our hatchery and produce man. The situation is very serious. Couldn't something be done about this? It has always been that when action was needed, you always do your best, so am hoping for a betterment in the poultry industry of this Midwest.

Yours truly,
Mr. and Mrs. Lynn Springer.

An Open Letter by "Oppy" to Secretary of Agriculture, Washington, D. C.

Oppy's Hatchery and Produce,
Wyndmere, N. Dak., *October 21, 1954.*
Hon. Ezra T. Benson,
Secretary of Agriculture,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Benson: I am writing you about the serious plight of the poultry and egg farmer in the Midwest.

Prices at the farm today all over the great Central States on poultry and eggs are so far below cost of production and, in fact, are at ruinous levels as far as the farmer is concerned. Values at the farm are below the disaster level. They are, comparatively speaking, even lower than the depression prices of 1932, and apparently no more is being done about it today than was at that time.

In my 15 years in this great industry I have never seen conditions worse for the poultry and egg farmer than they are today. Markets on medium-size and small eggs are especially depressed at this time due to seasonal heavy production of these grades.

It is my suggestion these fine quality medium-size eggs to be purchased for school lunches during the season they are in such heavy supply. In addition we suggest the Army pay for mediums on the basis of their true value instead of the unjust differentials they are now using. For example, grade A mediums weigh only 5 pounds per case less than grade A large. It is obvious at present levels this grade based on the actual is worth within 5 cents per dozen of large eggs. Yet the Army is paying currently 20 cents per dozen less for mediums than for large eggs.

This means the farmer is receiving $4.50 per case less than actual worth for these eggs. I consider it very unjust that a department of our Government would take advantage of our farmers in this way.

Prices on hens in the Midwest today range from 8 to 10 cents per pound. These prices are ridiculous. A large percentage of the hens sold move to market during October and November, or when the farmer is making room for his new crop of layers.

I suggest Government purchases of dressed fowl during this period to eliminate the glut on the market. This fowl to be stored and sold in the season to stabilize prices.

The Midwest poultry and egg farmer feels he is the forgotten man in agriculture. Action is needed not next month or next year, but today. It is my candid opinion that if proper action had been taken just a few months ago this deplorable condition would not now exist.

No one expects a handout, but if business can be protected by tariffs and subsidies, labor by a guaranteed minimum wage, surely the poultry and egg farmer is entitled to some consideration in his present serious situation.

Yours truly,
Oppy's Hatchery and Produce,
Lloyd A. Opperud.

Geneseo, N. Dak., *October 14, 1954.*

Senator Langer: I have been intending to write for some time but have neglected doing so.

My purpose is to show someone in Washington what we farmers' wives in North Dakota are actually getting for our eggs. Also what feed (concentrate) prices are.

We have fed these pullets since we bought them the 5th of April. They have been laying since the latter part of August.

Now with egg prices what they are, the hens can't lay enough to pay for the concentrate to say nothing about paying for the oats they are fed and all other expenses.

With egg prices this low why isn't the person in town able to buy them more cheaply but they still seem to have to pay high prices.

Some people in town ask us: Is it really true pullet eggs are only 6 cents a dozen? It seems to me something could be done about this great difference in selling and buying prices.

Something must be done soon or the farmer will be forced to sell his poultry flock. Maybe that's what some would like to have happen but not the average farmer who depends on the egg check for groceries. If farmers are forced to sell the flocks it won't be long until we will hear "increase production."

I am hoping you will show these to Secretary of Agriculture Benson and see if he still thinks these are fair prices. Everyone in this community have egg slips with these same low prices.

One lady took 11½ dozen eggs to town and couldn't buy a pound of coffee for the amount she received from the eggs.

Hoping something can be done about these low prices.

Sincerely,
Mrs. Rollof Lee.

History of AMVETS

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES E. POTTER

OF MICHIGAN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, December 2, 1954

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record a history of the great veterans' organization, the AMVETS.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

AMVETS' First 10 Years—An Outline of History

AMVETS was founded Decembjer 10, 1944, when representatives of nine independnt veterans' organizations, introduced through Walter Davenport's article in Collier's magazine, got together in Kansas City and merged into a single national veterans' organization which they called American Veterans of World War II.

This is a long name, and its length caused newspaper headline writers to fuss and fume. One of them coined the nickname "AMVETS." It stuck and has become part of the AMVETS' official title.

Obviously the veterans of World War II wanted their own organization, and they wanted their organization to be energetic and forthright. These were from the beginning the attributes of AMVETS—and AMVETS grew fast, rapidly outstripping all other groups of World War II veterans.

The first national convention was held in Chicago in 1945. Just 2 years later AMVETS received the congressional and Presidential nod of approval. On July 23, 1947, Congress passed unanimously a bill (introduced by Congressman Francis E. Walter, of Pennsylvania) granting a Federal charter to AMVETS. President Truman, who signed the bill, said:

"Were I a veteran of this war, I would prefer to have a veteran of World War II looking after my affairs than a veteran of some other war."

AMVETS is the only organization exclusively for World War II (and now Korea) veterans to receive a Federal charter. In 1950 AMVETS requested Congress to amend its charter to admit veterans of the Korean conflict to AMVETS membership. This request was granted and as a result AMVETS continue to represent all veterans of recent military service.

AMVETS' 10-year history reflects the organization's primary purpose and interest—to serve the veteran and his dependents. And history shows that this service had taken two basic directions:

1. Assistance to veterans and their dependents in receiving the benefits to which they are entitled; and
2. Representation of World War II and Korea veterans before Congress and governmental agencies.

The twain often meet.

AMVETS handle approximately 100,000 cases a year, in which the AMVETS national service officials seek to secure benefits for veterans and dependents—benefits provided by law but often difficult for individual claimees to obtain. These cases involve hospitalization, disability compensation, educational benefits, and other considerations for disabled veterans, widows, and orphans.

AMVETS testify many times during every session of Congress, presenting AMVETS' views on pending, existing, or needed legislation. These views are based on national-convention mandates. (Every year congressional committees, individual Members of Congress, governmental administrative agencies, and various nongovernmental organizations request AMVETS' mandates for study.)

During the past 10 years AMVETS have steadily advocated the following:

A second-to-none Veterans' Administration medical program: The veterans' medical program, which was established to render top-notch medical service, has many times during the past few years been in danger of dissolution. AMVETS have done everything in their power to avoid this * * * and to bring the program back to its peak standard when it has slipped. AMVETS have been especially anxious to keep the VA medical program off the appropriations chopping block—away from ill-conceived, false economy measures. However, AMVETS have not been unrealistic about budget problems; instead, this veterans' organization has proposed measures whereby expenses could be cut without impairing basic service. AMVETS created quite a stir in 1953 by advocating certain curtailments of the VA service—an unusual stand perhaps for a veterans' organization to take. These curtailments, however, cut the "fats and frills" out of the VA without harming the medical program. Many of AMVETS' recommendations are now VA policy, brought about either by legislation or administrative rulings. AMVETS have been told that their suggestions are destined to save the Federal Government between 50 and 100 million dollars annually. They include:

Revision of the dental program.

Corrective action to eliminate the free VA treatment of non-service-connected ailments where the veterans can afford to pay it.

Consolidation of VA district offices from 13 to 3.

Streamlining insurance procedures.

While the veterans' medical program has, throughout AMVETS' 10 years, commanded the organization's greatest attention, there are many other issues of concern to veterans and the Nation which AMVETS have studied. And from the study by AMVETS committees come the national convention mandates. Some of these are listed below. (No priority should be inferred from the order of listing, because virtually equivalent stress has been given to all of them.)

Rehabilitation of veterans, including provisions for adequate compensation to disabled veterans (and widows and orphans), educational benefits, GI home loan rights, reemployment rights, adequate veterans' housing. (In 1946 AMVETS went to bat for Bruce Campbell, former Washington Senators' baseball player who returned from service to find his job was no longer open. AMVETS succeeded in restoring Campbell's job and considerable back pay as well. This case set the precedent for reemployment rights of baseball players.)

Code of military justice.

Domestic issues—apart from veterans' benefits—including improved working conditions for Federal employees, lowered minimum age for voting, improved housing.

National defense and foreign relations, including universal military training, military defenses to avoid repetition of a Pearl Harbor, strong Atlantic and Pacific pacts (as early as 1950 AMVETS advocated Pacific alliances—now being effectuated by the State Department), support of the United Nations as the best existing instrument for world peace, the World Veterans Federation which is dedicated to rehabilitation of the world's disabled veterans and active opposition to communism. The former executive director of AMVETS, Mr. Elliott H. Newcomb, is now secretary-general of the World Veterans Federation. John Foster Dulles recently said:

"I want to particularly congratulate the members and the leaders of AMVETS in the active role which you are playing to help organize and support the World Veterans Federation."

AMVETS take a lot of pride in the fact that they are frequently complimented by congressional committees and other Government leaders on an unusually realistic approach to the Nation's problems. This approach—often a startling departure from that usually held by veterans' organizations—come from the AMVETS' determination to treat issues in the light of surrounding circumstances, aiming to develop workable proposals to benefit the country as a whole. AMVETS operate on the assumption that the veteran will ultimately benefit from any measure that benefits the Nation and, conversely, any program not good for the country as a whole cannot be good for the veteran.

AMVETS are especially proud of the role they played in the development and enactment of the Korean GI bill of rights. AMVETS did a great deal of work on this bill, including devising methods to administer it to save the Government money without reducing the benefits. AMVETS was the only organization to advocate every measure of the bill as it exists in law today. Congressman OLIN TEAGUE, of Texas, now ranking member of the House Veterans Affairs Committee, said:

"AMVETS had more to do with this bill than any other organization."

AMVETS have also contributed substantially to the work of the Hoover Commission (technical name: Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government.) AMVETS was the first major veterans' organization to endorse many of the Commission's recommendations and was highly commended for its courageous stand.

In the past 10 years AMVETS have conducted many national service programs in conjunction with the local posts. A few are listed below:

AMVETS memorial scholarship program: The AMVETS National Service Foundation provides $2,000 college scholarships to children of deceased or totally disabled veterans of World War II or Korea.

Christmas orphanage program: The AMVETS National Service Foundation annually plays Santa to thousands of children who know no homes—save orphanages. Television sets and individual presents for the youngsters are sent to nonendowed orphanages throughout the country.

Worchids: AMVETS adopt the children of servicemen who did not return. The AMVETS try to compensate—in some small measure—for the youngsters' deceased fathers by taking the children to ball games and circuses, on fishing and camping trips. The AMVETS also make sure that the children and their mothers are receiving all of the dependents' benefits to which they are entitled.

Carillon: In 1949 the AMVETS National Service Foundation presented to the Nation a memorial carillon, an unusual electronic instrument which is housed in the amphitheater at Arlington National Cemetery. A living memorial of World War II, the carillon plays twice daily and for various memorial ceremonies. President Truman accepted the gift on behalf of the American people, describing it as a "most fitting gift."

Pearl Harbor Day: Annually AMVETS sponsor rights in Arlington National Cemetery on December 7 to pay tribute to the servicemen who died during World War II and to remind all Americans of the necessity for preparedness. Concurrently local posts conduct similar rites in their own communities.

AMVETS posts all over the country participate in these national programs and have many programs of their own, too. Most posts have local memorials and welfare programs in which they render outstanding community service. Many posts adopt veterans' hospitals, to which they give television sets, tape recorders, surgical and prosthetic equipment, and/or individual gifts. Posts often adopt orphanages or schools for handicapped children. And there are hundreds of little league baseball teams and other junior sports groups throughout the country which are sponsored by AMVET posts. Essay contests, summer camps, junior rifle teams are a few more ways in which AMVETS attempt to prepare today's youngsters for responsible citizenship in the future.

Many outstanding Americans are on the membership rolls of AMVETS. A few of them are: President Dwight D. Eisenhower, a life member; Val Peterson, Federal Civil Defense Administrator; Gen. Douglas MacArthur; Dean Rusk, who for several years headed AMVETS' international affairs division; Edmund S. Muskie, Governor of Maine, who served as AMVETS executive director for a period of time; Congressmen Teague, Javits, Ayres, Secrest; Harold Russell, for 2 years AMVETS national commander.

These are just a few examples. There are many, many more in all fields of national leadership.

In April 1952 AMVETS purchased their headquarters building in Washington, D. C., President Truman dedicated the building, and AMVETS felt they had come a long way since the early days when crates served as chairs. The going has not always been easy, but the organization has grown fast in a short span.

These, very briefly, are some of the high points of AMVETS' first 10 years.

AMVETS are greatly indebted to Collier's magazine, which brought together the veterans who organized AMVETS. The organization humbly believes that, in the 10 years that have ensued, AMVETS have made real contributions to veterans, to the Nation, and to the world.

We feel that the following article from Collier's magazine speaks for itself:

"A few months after the invasion of Normandy in 1944, an article in Collier's by our own Walter Davenport, described a number of struggling little veterans' groups that were forming from the ranks of discharged World War II servicemen. If their members advanced any one idea, Davenport said, it is this: they want their own national organization, as veterans of all wars have had their own.

"Learning of one another through the Collier's report, nine of the groups met a short time later and decided to merge. They called their new organization the American Veterans of World War II—AMVETS.

"Since then, AMVETS has grown into the largest and most successful of the new veterans' organizations. Congress issued it a charter in 1947. President Truman dedicated a newly purchased AMVETS headquarters building in Washington in 1952. Today, AMVETS lists 125,000 World War II and Korean Veterans on its active membership roster.

"But an organization cannot be measured by size and official recognition alone. AMVETS annually helps some 100,000 veterans and their dependents to receive the Government benefits to which they are entitled. It played a major role in pushing through the legislation which has become the Korean GI bill of rights. Its philanthropic activities include a memorial scholarship program for children of deceased or totally disabled veterans, and a Christmas orphanage program in which gifts are sent to youngsters in nonendowed orphan homes during the yule season.

"Some observers once foresaw a veterans' group emerging from World War II that would overshadow the American Legion and the Veterans of Foreign Wars. Instead, the older organizations grew even larger and stronger than before as they used intelligent, aggressive recruiting methods to attract new veterans. But now AMVETS marks its 10th birthday marching side by side with the others; a spirited partner in the fight for veterans' rights and a better community for all. Collier's is proud to have had a part in AMVETS history."

Procurement Policy of the United States Air Force

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROMAN L. HRUSKA
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, December 2, 1954

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I ask unanimoous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "USAF Buying Test: Proved Performance," published in Aviation Week of November 15, 1954. The article has to do with the procurement policy of the United States Air Force as it presently exists, and contains a little history of the evolution of that policy in past years, and since formation of the Air Force as a separate organization.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

USAF BUYING TEST: PROVED PERFORMANCE—MATERIEL SECRETARY ASKS FOR BIG TECHNICAL JUMPS—AIRCRAFT INDUSTRY FACES TOUGHER COMPETITION

(By Robert Hotz)

Air Force is looking for rapid new technical developments and aircraft industry management with courage to push them hard during the next phase of USAF procurement, Roger Lewis, Assistant USAF Secretary for Materiel, told Aviation Week in an interview.

Tougher competition for USAF business, more emphasis on proved performance of new equipment before large orders are placed, tighter contracting procedures, and heavier emphasis on individual aircraft firm's past performance in evaluating their future procurement awards also are among the trends in USAF-industry relations, according to Lewis.

Way to superiority: "We are now in sight of the end of the USAF inventory-buildup stage," Lewis said. "And we are soon to be faced with a new and perhaps more important problem: The consolidation and maintenance of our airpower superiority in a time of fluid and rapidly advancing aerial technology coincident wtih a determined and successful effort on the part of the Soviet Union to narrow the margin of our technical superiority."

Lewis said the following policies would be emphasized during the next phase of USAF procurement aimed at the maintenance of both numerical strength and a significant margin of technical superiority:

Large and rapid technical advances: USAF no longer can afford to buy small technical improvements or modifications in new equipment. It must shoot for big and rapid technological improvements and is being forced to find methods of cutting down normal development cycles on new equipment to stay ahead of its foreign competition.

Tougher industry competition: Lewis warned that the days of buying everything from everybody, as in the Korean-crash program, definitely are over. USAF will buy only products whose performance has been proved superior in actual demonstrations rather than in fancy sales brochures.

Tighter contracting procedures: Lewis said follow-on contracts for equipment already in production had been carefully scheduled throughout fiscal 1955 to be placed at the exact time they are necessary to insure proper lead time. This will give industry and USAF more time to negotiate firm and clearer contracts for these orders with much greater detail on what is required from both buyer and seller.

Trend is toward more fixed-price contracts, with cost-plus-fixed-fee contracts being reserved for research and development items. Letters of intent still will be used when necessary to get new projects under way but now are being used sparingly.

Weapons system development: "We are in the aerial-weapons business," Lewis said, "not the airplane business. Development and production of complete aerial-weapon systems is an absolute must." He indicated USAF had begun sorting out the problems between prime contractors, subsystem developers, and equipment producers and would exercise more control over these relations than originally planned.

Industry management performance: USAF has been screening its existing procurement program for 18 months, evaluating actual performance of aircraft and equipment manufacturers against their promised performance. A management character factor based on this evaluation will guide future USAF procurement awards and evaluation of competitive proposals.

Delivery of combat-ready equipment: USAF no longer can afford to withdraw large quantities of aircraft from combat units for retroactive modifications or to ground them for lack of essential equipment. USAF will be more critical of industry on weapons system combat readiness.

Dynamic industrial mobilization: Traditional concepts of industrial mobilization used for World War II and Korea are outmoded by current requirements for a system that will provide equipment for both a short intense atomic war and limited fringe wars of longer duration. USAF barely has tackled this critical problem, but it is convinced that a dynamic type of mobilization planning—subject to constant revision in light of technical changes—is necessary to replace present concepts.

Lewis told Aviation Week that USAF faces three principal problems as it begins shifting from the inventory buildup phase of procurement to the maintenance of air superiority for the foreseeable future:

1. Maintaining USAF combat units in a high degree of combat readiness for an indefinite period of time into the future.

2. Developing a technically and financially sound equipment replenishment program for a USAF inventory that will avoid future obsolescence.

3. Reorienting industrial mobilization potential to meet the new problems of atomic war.

COMBAT-READY FORCE

"The Air Force we now have must be maintained in an extremely high and continuous state of combat readiness," Lewis said. "This is quite different from the way we maintained our airpower before World War II and Korea, and it may come as a surprise to some members of industry who wonder why we don't pull aircraft out of service to incorporate modifications or why we aren't more adventurous in depending on a new piece of equipment before it is actually tested and determined ready for combat units.

"The fact is we can no longer pull large numbers of aircraft out of combat units for modification programs because it would leave critical gaps in our combat-ready Air Force in being. We will continue to crank 'state-of-the-art' improvements into combat aircraft types to prolong their useful life as first-line planes, but this will have to be done in an orderly, well-planned program that will coincide with normal maintenance cycles and not disturb the fighting strength of combat units.

"An airplane on the ground because it lacks spare parts or electronic gear that is not operational or the machine that is unflyable because of technical problems is just as much a loss to the Air Force as if it were shot down in combat. We are going to be increasingly critical of weapons readiness in our relations with the industry that supplies us.

"The reliability and degree to which industry supports its products are taking their places alongside the sales brochure and the pious promise and will increasingly dominate the thinking of our procurement specialists."

Long-pull defense: Lewis said the job of applying the concept of equipment replenishment into USAF procurement and operational planning now constitutes a major effort of materiel personnel.

"We must have an orderly and rapid equipment replenishment program," he said. "Perhaps one of the most important contributions President Eisenhower has made to date is his firm establishment of the 'age of peril' concept and the policy of building our defense in sufficient strength for a long pull rather than to meet an immediate crisis. Without this concept we would have had an obsolete Air Force in a few years.

"Despite the rapid and spreading technological progress already seen for the future, it is possible to predict and plan on the reduction of these developments to usable hardware and their incorporation into the USAF weapons inventory. Some of these development cycles are long and we must plan at any given time for a series of improvements. But the absolute necessity of keeping the quality of our weapon systems at their maximum in performance and availability is such that we have no alternative but to devote the best minds of science, industry, and the military to this job."

Russian competition: Lewis emphasized that the competition from Russia in this technological race had never been stronger.

He said USAF would have to spend its money on major technical improvements in weapon systems and is looking for industry management with the courage to tackle these admittedly tough development problems rather than pursuing what has been a more certain course of prolonging standard production items with minor improvements.

He predicted that major USAF weapon systems procurement will go to the strong technical-management industrial teams combining technical skill with courageous management.

MOBILIZATION PHILOSOPHY

On industrial mobilization Lewis said:

"The long range airplane and thermonuclear weapons have raised the possibility of a short, big war but have not removed the possibility of either long or small wars. As a result of our efforts of the past 4 years we have a great industrial structure for the production of current types of aircraft engines and equipment. But like the airplanes themselves, these structures have a tendency to get out of hand if they are not looked after.

"We now have the problem of making certain we have an industrial structure which is not only responsive to our needs in the 'age of peril' but one which is of the size and composition to react properly and with the kinds of weapons required at the moment of crisis.

"Not only must we keep that structure at the size and in the degree of health we need but we must also be sure that its composition will change with our developing technology, that new products and industries are welcomed into it and that the old and useless are moved aside.

"This is admittedly a difficult problem and we are just beginning to really come to grips with it.

"One aspect of the mobilization base which we feel needs particular attention is that of dispersal. It is vital to the security of the country that our industrial airpower potential is distributed as much as possible across the country."

NEW COMPETITION

Lewis warned the industry that tougher competition for USAF business lies ahead and voiced his belief that this will produce better aerial weapon systems faster and more economically than the crash-type program of "buying everything from everybody."

"The prime assets of the United States, as the spiritual and economic leader of the nations embraced in western civilization, spring from our personal freedom, our free enterprise and competitive system," Lewis said. "It is these things that permit us to make the most of the great scientific and technical assets of our age and give us the swift industrial responsiveness to meet the challenge of aggressors.

"If we are to make the most of these assets, the commitment of public funds for airpower must be based on policies of competition, opportunity, and firmness which make the most of them. Under certain conditions such as the buildup to World War II and the Korean crash program, it is necessary to buy everything from everybody. For even though there may be doubts about our ability to do this or to get that in time or at the price promised, it is more important to get the work than to argue.

"But this should not be our standard operating policy once we have the size and type of weapons inventory we feel we must have. Desirable as such crash programs may be under certain circumstances, carried beyond them they are vicious and destructive to the freedom and competitiveness which is our prime national asset."

Faulty thinking: He noted three types of industrial thinking that are regrettable:

"Unfortunately, there is already a tendency in some places to consider that on the basis of pure size there is an obligation on the part of the Government to buy whether the product is useful or not.

"Already there is a tendency in some places toward satisfaction and complacency—a failure to remember that under our system it is often harder to stay on top than to get there.

"In other places there is a tendency to use blinders—a failure to recognize the great broadening and acceleration of our technological base—a tendency to feel that slight improvements and reshoeing old horses will keep us superior.

"There is probably no single sure way of making certain that all the great resources of the West can be translated into weapons without delay but those of us responsible for materiel in the Air Force are convinced that until some certain way comes along the application of established American principles is the best system yet devised."

Address by Hon. Louis Johnson Before Insurance Underwriters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, December 2, 1954

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Hon. Louis Johnson, former Secretary of Defense, before the Connecticut Chapter of the Society of Chartered Property and Casualty Underwriters, at Hartford, Conn., on December 2, 1954.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am delighted to be here in Hartford—in the house of my friends.

I am honored to be here, in this "heartland of insurance," on this 10th anniversary industry luncheon of the education movement of the Society of Chartered Property and Casualty Underwriters. It is inspiring to learn of the high standards you have created for the underwriting profession and to see some of the splendid men and women (now thousands in number) who have undergone the educational discipline of your organization, accepted your orientation and training, and who declare publicly their acceptance of your code of ethical conduct.

Of course, a lawyer is really not an outsider to the world of insurance. In the field of insurance, law and the science of economics come more closely together than they do in almost any other form of enterprise. The profession of the law extends a hearty welcome to this new profession which you have been so carefully and laboriously creating—the profession of underwriter.

The creation of this profession is, in itself, a sign of the times. Our business life is constantly growing more complex, and specialized education is necessary for those who would operate in it successfully. And as our business life grows, it becomes more and more influenced by the ideals of social service. Responsibility to the community as a whole and adherence to moral standards are the outstanding characteristics of business life in the second half of the 20th century. Your code of ethics magnificently expresses these ideals for a segment of the business world.

You are concerned with insurance, and it is unnecessary for me to tell you how the concept of insurance, the protection against foreseeable risks, has emerged as one of the most powerful factors in our economy. Indeed, without insurance our most impressive economic and social achievements would be impossible. But I do not propose to talk to you about your own business, important as it is. My theme today is Insuring America, but I shall be talking about a kind of insurance that lies outside and beyond the insurance business.

There are two things in my opinion that do most to insure America. They are the inward insurance of the American character, and the outward insurance of our national defense. If we are careless about these two kinds of insurance, our national edifice will crumble.

This is a time of troubles throughout the world, and our country has suddenly rocketed to a position of decisive importance and power. We stand on a pinnacle of influence above all other nations. Other countries look to us for leadership, for hope, for liberation, and for peace.

We did not seek this preeminence. We had no desire to get involved in the troubles of other nations. On the whole we were perfectly content to go on with our own business in our own country, and lead our own private lives. But we had no choice in this matter. The responsibility was thrust upon us. We were given the responsibility because we had the power. And we have the power because of the staggering, historically unprecedented, success with which we have managed our own affairs, economic and political, here at home.

Some among us would like to shelve these international burdens and go back to our old ways. Some of us do not understand why we should not tell the rest of the world to take care of its own troubles, and devote ourselves exclusively to our own welfare and prosperity. These people do not perceive that we have to shoulder these new international responsibilities in our own interest. It is exactly because we are so prosperous and successful that we have to be concerned about our neighbors in the world. Because there never was a prize more tempting to the international outlaw than the United States is today. If there was ever a country worth conquering and pillaging it is ours. And until we have an international police system we shall have to protect ourselves against robbers.

I do not wish, today, to get into a discussion of foreign policy. I shall assume that we all agree that our country stands at a peak of power in the international community, that there is no way to evade the consequences of that position, and that we cannot leave the world alone, because the world will not leave us alone. What interests me now is: how did we get that way, and how can we keep our country that way?

The great prosperity, the wealth and output of this country, rests on an intangible basis—the basis of character. Of course we are greatly blessed by God in our land and our resources, and our geographical location, but these are not the secret of our greatness. That secret lies in the inner lives of the people who made this country. It lies in the character of our ancestors and ourselves. That character has formed our institutions and our civic life and has made us capable of developing the riches of this land for the good of all.

What is that character? What are its essential elements? What is the nature of this thing which I regard as the basic insurance, the fundamental underwritnig of our way of life?

To these questions the first answer we think of is the word "freedom." We are freemen in a free country. The secret of our success is freedom.

But to my mind this is an incomplete answer—a dangerously incomplete answer. The freedom that makes us great is not unlimited freedom. It is not freedom from all restraint. Indeed, that kind of freedom is anarchy.

If you look closely at our society, you will see that no part of it is entirely free. The Government is not free to do as it wishes; the corporations and the labor unions are not free to do whatever they desire; the citizen himself is not free to follow the unfettered prompting of his own wishes. All parts of our community are held together by duties and responsibilities. They are held together under the discipline of the law. We can have freedom, true freedom, only if we have discipline. And what distinguishes us from the totalitarians is that this discipline is not imposed on us from above but organized and freely accepted from below. The discipline of freedom is self-discipline.

I think that an example from ancient history will help to explain what I mean. Many of our political ideas go back to the Greeks, and it is from the Greeks that I wish to take my illustration.

In the fourth century before Christ a division of Greek soldiers, 10,000 men, hired themselves out as mercenaries to an oriental prince and marched into the heart of Persia to do battle with the armies of the great King Cyrus. In those days the Greeks were the foremost soldiers in the world. They were the first to discipline and drill their armies and to organize them by small units capable of performing battlefield maneuvers. This particular division of Greeks, therefore, had no difficulties when they encountered the huge mobs of armed slaves that constituted the Persian Army. They cut through the oriental masses like a knife through butter. At the end of the fight, however, they discovered that their employer had been killed, and then their generals were murdered through treachery.

In this predicament, surrounded by enemies, in the heart of a hostile country, and 2,000 miles from home, this group of well-drilled soldiers did a significant thing.

They held a meeting. At that meeting they elected new officers by majority vote and democratically decided how they would go home. Then they resumed their discipline, and overcoming tremendous odds, marched and fought 1,500 miles back to their own land.

In this little episode from ancient times we see the freeman of western civilization, as we understand him, taking his place on the stage of history. This freeman submits to discipline for the good of the group, but he participates in the great decisions that affect his life, and he abides by the democratically determined result. As a consequence, he is usually unbeatable.

This concept of the freeman comes down to us from the literature of Greece and the Roman Republic. It takes on a new burst of life in the growth of British institutions. It is the pattern around which the Founding Fathers of our country framed our Constitution and our form of government. This is what we mean when we use the word "freeman."

If we did not have this kind of citizen, we could not have our kind of government. We could not have our kind of economic life. We could not have the most prosperous and dynamic country in the world.

Just think a moment about the day-to-day attitudes of our kind of freeman.

Our freeman pays his bills. It is not simply that he is made to pay his bills. The fact is that he considers he has a moral duty to do so. And on that unquestioned moral duty our whole fabric of credit and banking is erected. But this moral duty, this element of personal character, did not always exist. In some parts of the world it does not exist yet. It is the product of centuries of training—the end result of the self-discipline of freemen.

Take another example. Our freeman pays his taxes. He may complain about them, of course, he may try to pay as little as possible, but he does not question that he has a moral duty to pay them. If we were all tax dodgers, the Government couldn't collect taxes at all. In fact, in some European countries, down to recent years, it was impossible to levy a graduated income tax because almost no one could be expected to report his income truthfully. On this moral duty the whole structure of our modern government is based. Without it, we would have to go back to the kind of government that prevailed in the middle ages.

Incidentally, while we are on this point, I think we may be doing a lot of harm to our national character by our incessant political propaganda against taxes. So many taxes on an egg, for example. The idea has been spread abroad that all taxes are sinful and wasteful—that the only good public policy is less taxes, or no taxes at all. Of course, we have a right to grumble about taxes, and to try to reduce them, just as we have a right to grumble about the high price of milk, but, dollar for dollar, a man gets better value out of his taxes than almost anything else he spends. With his tax dollar he buys law and order, health, safety, national security—civilization itself. I don't know of a better buy, and I think there ought to be some propaganda on this side of the issue pointing out all the benefits that come from taxes, instead of attacking them as an invasion of private property.

Another characteristic of the free man as we know him is that he works hard. He acknowledges an obligation to work and to do a good job. This, too, is the result of long centuries of the self-discipline of freedom.

There is a deep difference between the work of free men and the labor of slaves. The slave works because he is driven by the fear of the lash or the fear of starvation. The freeman works because he has hope, hope of better things for himself and his children. It used to be thought, even in this country, that the threat of poverty and insecurity were valuable if not necessary incentives to work. High wages, cheaper goods, social security, it was said, would undermine the morale of the working force and make labor soft, lazy, and unproductive. If you want an answer to that argument, just take a trip around this country. Foreign manufacturers, brought over by our Government to take a look at our industry, have been amazed by the productivity of our highly paid, socially insured labor force. It far surpasses the output of labor in countries where the old rule of low wages and minimum benefits prevails. The blind, back-breaking toil of men on the edge of starvation and despair—of the coolies of China, for instance, or the peasants of India, or the underpaid Communist-led factory workers of some European countries, is no match for the energy and ingenuity of freemen whose futures are secure, whose hopes are high, whose daily lives share in the good things of life.

Our freeman has another important characteristic. He acknowledges the obligation of military service. This duty also comes down to us through centuries of self-discipline. In the early days of our Republic it was perhaps more willingly accepted than it is now. In the colonial New England towns, for example, all the male citizens met once a year for the inspection of their weapons, and for drill and military organization. Today, because military science is more complicated and difficult, military service is a greater burden, taking a year or more out of the lives of our young men, but it is even more necessary to our survival.

It is in his political life, however, that the freeman best displays the self-discipline of freedom. Here, as nowhere else, success depends on following the rules. And it is not just the big rules, such as bowing to the will of the majority, which must be observed—it is the whole moral tone of the business of self-government. For the freeman political power is not an end in itself, and loyalty to party is inferior to the greater loyalties—to country, to ethical conduct, to God. Standards of truth and morality extend to politics as to other spheres of life. These are our bulwarks against revolution and tyranny.

When we use the word freedom we unconsciously imply all those other things—this network of duties and responsibilities—this self-discipline of the individual—that go along with freedom as we experience it. Unfortunately many of the people to whom we are spreading the gospel of freedom these days do not have our understanding of the word. They have no historical experience, as we have, of the discipline of freedom, and they do not know what we are talking about. They have suffered under the unrestrained freedom of landlords and warlords to extort and plunder as they wish. They are suffering today under the freedom of totalitarian governments to coerce and liquidate whomever they please. These downtrodden masses are not inspired by the word "freedom." They are more greatly attracted by words like "land" or "bread" or "security"—not realizing that men can enjoy those blessings only through that counterbalancing of rights and duties under the rule of law that we summarize in our use of the word "freedom."

Freedom is a good word, but in our propaganda against communism we should make clear what we mean by it. We should not misrepresent ourselves and our country as an undisciplined mob of ruthless individualists. That is the one thing we are not, but our propaganda about ourselves often creates that impression, and plays into the hands of the Communist foe.

At home, we should make sure that we do not undermine and weaken the self-discipline of freedom. The freeman of our civilization has taken centuries of effort and struggle to create. But he can be destroyed in a generation.

Our homes and our schools and our churches shape our children and young people in the pattern of freemen. Through these institutions we pass on the torch of freedom from one generation to the next. If these institutions are weakened, if they fail to do a good job, we are in real trouble.

We should realize, moreover, that our children and young people are more exposed today than they have ever been before to influences from other parts of our society. Our young people are consumers, with money of their own to spend. They are part of the mass audience of television and radio. They are the innocent spectators of our political controversies. And they imitate what they read and see and hear.

New dangers to the self-discipline of freedom are arising from this situation. There have always been people willing to gratify the lowest appetites of others in order to make a quick dollar. Today these people are finding profitable opportunities in the so-called horror comic books and the crime programs. Lurid picture books of sadism and corruption, glorifying violence and crime, are being vomited out by the million, and sold to our children for a few cents each. These disgusting things are just as dangerous as narcotic drugs. They undermine the true values of life and create, for the impressionable child mind, a world of evil dreams, where cruelty and violence reign supreme. I do not have to wait for a statistical survey to show me that there is a connection between this kind of mental poison and the increase of juvenile delinquency.

There is no reason whatever for allowing a few unscrupulous men to make money by debauching the minds of our children. There is no freedom that justifies this commercially minded assault on the roots of freedom.

Or take the so-called crime programs. These are not so base and degrading as the horror comics, but I invite you to sit down before your TV set some day and tally the number of murders, killings, torturings, and savage fights that are depicted in all their details in the programs for children. This sort of program is cheap and easy to put out, but it is flooding the minds of our young people, and drowning out what they ought to be learning about their wonderful country and its way of life.

These dangers are slight, perhaps, compared to the savage and divisive tone that is creeping into our political life. What are our young people to make of adults who slander and vilify their opponents, spreading wild accusations of corruption and treason up and down the land? If their elders can do this sort of thing, and still enjoy high positions, why should they submit to the disciplines of self-restraint, mutual respect, and decency?

If the demagog is excused by the claim that his end justifies his means, what is there to choose, on moral grounds, between our way of life and communism? For, don't forget, this is the great lie of communism—that a good end justifies evil means—and if we adopt that principle of political life we will be destroying the underlying moral basis of freedom. This is a time of great fears and apparently insoluble problems, and many people are looking for a short cut to safety. But there is no safety for us in moral error.

We should take a long, hard look, my friends, at these and other influences that are shaping the lives of the oncoming generation. We should ask ourselves whether we are doing all we can to cherish and pass on unimpaired the concept of freedom—the ideal of the self-disciplined free man. For if we fail in this, we fail utterly.

The self-discipline of freedom is the foundation of this towering political and economic structure which we have erected on this continent. It is the insurance of the future of the whole American enterprise.

Men who do not understand what our kind of freedom means will be rudderless and lost in the storms that beset us. They will be unable to use the great institutions that have been left to us—the great trilogy of a democratic government, a democratic society, and a democratic economic life. In all three, the secret of success lies in the character of the citizen—the character that accepts discipline for the good of the group, that accepts a moral order in all things, and that assumes a responsibility in political decisions on the basis of truth, mutual trust, and respect for others.

In retrospect, I fear this may have sounded like a college graduation address. Indeed it might be.

My congratulations to this grand group who, having successfully completed the courses and passed a series of comprehensive examinations on insurance, economics, government, law, accounting, and business management, have had conferred on them today the professional designation "CPCU," and have accepted in this ceremony your strict code of ethical conduct.

It's good to have been with you.

Addresses by Hon. Edward J. Thye, of Minnesota, and Robert I. Rogin at United Cerebral Palsy Fifth Annual Convention.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. THYE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, December 2, 1954

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record addresses delivered by Robert I. Rogin, vice president of the United Cerebral Palsy Association, and myself, at the fifth annual convention of the association on Saturday evening, November 20, 1954.

There being no objection, the addresses were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Addresses of Robert I. Rogin, United Cerebral Palsy Vice President, and United States Senator Edward J. Thye, of Minnesota, at United Cerebral Palsy Fifth Annual Convention, Saturday, November 20, 1954

ADDRESS OF MR. ROGIN

Both Mr. Goldenson, in his report to the convention last night, and Mr. Hausman, in his address to you, have stressed the team approach to cerebral palsy. Mr. Goldenson emphasized the enlarged size of this team and the intensity of its work on behalf of our cerebral palsied population.

There is, of course, a perfectly good reason for this team approach. No one profession nor one individual alone, in fact no one group by itself can possibly do all the things necessary to provide our cerebral palsied with a better or more normal way of life. All of us are needed—physicians, therapists, teachers, social and recreational workers, psychologists, a whole battery of professional personnel, and the dedicated parents and volunteers whose devotion and drive have spearheaded our activities. An integral part of this team is the legislator—local, State, and Federal.

The legislative aspects of our work have been close to me for many years. I was the chairman of our first legislative committee, and I am presently the UCP's vice president in charge of legal and legislative matters. The financial burden of caring for the cerebral palsied is a staggering one, far beyond the capacity of private funds to carry alone. Thus, I feel very strongly that if the cerebral palsied are to be given the chance to take their rightful places in society, they must look to local, State, and Federal legislation for support. In that area is the key to educational opportunities, medical aid, research, transportation, vocational facilities, and other forms of service which otherwise would not be possible. Such legislation has a sound economic basis. To restore a person to self-sufficiency is to create a self-supporting citizen who, in the long run, becomes an asset and not a public and private liability.

With this in mind, we have established our legislative committee and the legislative staff at the national headquarters. The men and women who compose this legislative committee and the legislative department—staff members and volunteers alike—have helped greatly to bring the plight of the cerebral palsied to the attention of local and State legislatures and to our Federal public servants here in Washington. But they have done more—they have helped to translate the public's increasing concern about the physically handicapped into legislative action. Our legislative committee and department have been a reservoir of information and effective guidance to our affiliates.

Let me list briefly some of their activities:

1. A complete set of all the laws affecting the handicapped in their respective States was sent to the members of the national legislative committee of each State, the State presidents and the executive directors of each State.

2. Legislative suggestions for 1955 covering the separate legislative sessions of each State were prepared. A booklet called In Our Town and in Our State, for distribution by States to educate their legislators, was distributed.

3. A new simplified chart containing analysis of the State laws concerning the handicapped was distributed to all affiliates and committees.

4. Legislative bulletins in connection with legislation affecting the handicapped were issued semimonthly.

5. The legislative department arranged for and prepared testimony for the health inquiry before the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the Senate Subcommittee on Health on the subject of vocational rehabilitation, and the Senate Committee on Finance on the subject of child care, as a result of which the age limit of aid to parents of mentally retarded and physically handicapped persons was removed.

6. Our legislative director attended 3 fall regional conventions and 12 1954 regional conventions in various parts of the country for the purpose of informing the delegates as to the most recent developments affecting legislation.

If I had to single out any piece of legislation as an outstanding example of Federal action in the field affecting cerebral palsy, it would be the 70-percent increase in congressional appropriations for the National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Blindness of the United States Public Health Service.

To help obtain these increases—from $4.5 million last year to $7.6 million this year—the national committee for research in neurological disorders testified in their support. United Cerebral Palsy (represented by Medical Director Glidden L. Brooks and Legislative Director Harry Lyons) has been an active member of the national committee, along with representatives of other national voluntary health agencies.

But, of course, no amount of testimony by itself produces legislation. In the end, legislation is the business of the legislators themselves. Final authority over legislation such as I just described rests with the Senate Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations and a like committee in the House of Representatives. The chairman of this Senate subcommittee is with us here tonight. The Honorable Edward J. Thye is senior Senator from the State of Minnesota. Before his election to the United States Senate in November of 1946 and before his reelection in 1952, Senator Thye was Governor and Lieutenant Governor of his State of Minnesota.

If today more scientists are working on research projects concerned with the central nervous system—and it is damage to the central nervous system which causes cerebral palsy—if today more institutes and universities are conducting more research projects than ever before, this is in no small measure due to the pioneering work of Chairman Thye, of this Senate subcommittee. Thus we all owe a very great and very deep debt of gratitude to Senator Thye. As a small token of our appreciation we thought it fitting to present Senator Thye with a plaque. Thus I should like to give to Senator Thye our distinguished service award.

Ladies and gentlemen, it is my great honor and privilege to present to you Senator Edward J. Thye.

ADDRESS OF SENATOR THYE

It is fitting and appropriate that Washington, the Nation's Capital, should be the scene for this fifth annual convention of your organization, not only because United Cerebral Palsy is today national in scope but because your presence here typifies a partnership between Government and private effort in the fight against disease.

You are now organized in all 48 States and the District of Columbia.

This is truly a national convention and in a very real sense yours is now a national health agency.

The partnership of the Federal Government and private groups like yours is revealed by the fact that your scientific sessions took place at one of our National Institutes of Health and that scientists are on your program who received medical research grants either from the national institute or from United Cerebral Palsy.

It takes the cooperation of all of our people to combat and conquer such an enemy as cerebral palsy.

No group of citizens, no one voluntary health agency, not even the Federal Government alone, can carry on and win this fight.

Your organization has done much to alert and inform the people of this country about cerebral palsy.

Not only the general public buy your officials here in Washington, and in the various State legislatures, have benefitted from the pioneering work you have done.

As chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, I know of the many occasions when your staff members and volunteers appearing under your auspices have given useful testimony at congressional hearings.

From the evidence presented in those hearings I have learned much about the good work that has been accomplished and the tremendous and rapid growth of your movement.

I have learned recently about the programs United Cerebral Palsy is conducting in my own home State of Minnesota.

United Cerebral Palsy was first organized in St. Paul about 2 years ago.

Now, as an indication of your overall growth, there are five local affiliates and a State office.

The Minneapolis group recently acquired a large building to house a school program for children and a sheltered workshop for adults who are seeking rehabilitation from the effects of the disease.

In St. Cloud, the State Teachers College has agreed to donate a classroom for school-age children within a six-county area.

What has happened in Minnesota is a good example of developments in other parts of the country.

The aim everywhere is the same: to give treatment, schooling, recreation, and employment to the Nation's half million people who are stricken with this disease.

This health enemy, cerebral palsy, must be fought where its crippling effects are most severe.

The work must be done in the local communities as well as in the great research centers.

We must—and I know you have done this—survey the damage and salvage what we can through education, physical rehabilitation, and good counseling services.

If more of the cerebral palsied can now walk and talk, stand and sit, work and relax, this is in no small measure due to the excellent work that is going forward in your clinics and treatment centers.

Thus, rehabilitation is the task of the citizens, but there is a significant part that government at all levels can do also.

We are today surveying our educational needs.

State conferences on education, for which the 83d Congress appropriated $700,000, have been initiated.

Paralleling these meetings, I am told that you have called a conference of health agencies later this month to discuss a common approach to problems of special education and that you will seek to define the needs and goals of private, social, and health agencies in this area of education.

Education and rehabilitation are vital but we must never lose sight of the basic fact that to prevent cerebral palsy from striking down its victims from the outset is the real goal we must seek for the future.

Only research can help us in this endeavor for only by means of research can the cause of the disease become known and prevention and cure be evolved.

Such investment in research, whether sponsored federally or privately, will ultimately pay the largest dividends in the relief of suffering and the rehabilitation of the handicapped to become vigorous citizens contributing to our economy and our common life, and sharing in their benefits.

The Senate Committee on Appropriations each year considers appropriation for research along with the funds to carry on the other functions of our Federal Government.

Matters of national security, atomic energy, and foreign policy have to be balanced with measures relating to our peacetime economy, development of national resources, and public welfare.

Without question they are all vital to our well-being and even our national existence.

Yet, of all the many billions appropriated by the Federal Government the money that holds the greatest promise for future generations of Americans is that being spent for federally sponsored research.

This amount is a relatively small percentage of our total budget but it may mean protecting our children and future generations from the ravages of crippling and killing diseases and of sparing our country the human and economic loss they cause.

We had been providing funds in medical categories for a number of years since the close of World War II, but it was only 4 years ago that we initiated appropriations for research in the diseases of the central nervous system, including cerebral palsy.

We made only a modest start 4 years ago, but we have moved ahead vigorously since that time and our progress up to now has been rewarding.

The National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Blindness was established by an act of Congress in August 1950, and about the same time a proposal was made for a budget for 1 year of $5,200,000 to initiate a full-scale program of research and training.

However, as the history of all the institutes of the Public Health Service bears out, it was impossible to provide funds in the first year because the institute was new and its problems needed study before an acceptable program could be evaluated and action taken on it by the Congress in terms of funds.

In 1951, $1.2 million was appropriated for the Institute of Neurology for the fiscal year beginning in July.

These funds were barely enough to plan a program of research and they fell far short of enough to put the institute on an operational basis.

In the following year $1.9 million was appropriated for the institute and it was found impossible to do much more than the year before because so little money was available for grants to research projects in the universities and medical schools throughout the country.

Analyzing the problem it became clear that to do justice to the Neurological Institute a change would have to be made in the budgetary framework in which its request for funds was cast.

In those first 2 fiscal years of 1952 and 1953 the appropriation for neurology was included in a category called Operating expenses, National Institutes of Health.

In other words, it was lumped together with a number of miscellaneous items which had no direct medical relationship to it.

Therefore, as a practical matter it was impossible for Dr. Pearce Bailey, the Chief of the Institute, to make an adequate presentation of his problem to the Appropriations Committees and it was difficult for the voluntary witnesses who came before these committees to present their requests with the force and effect that was necessary.

We therefore made a request of the Bureau of the Budget to give the institute an identity of its own and an opportunity to stand on its own feet, and defend the merits of its own cause just as cancer, heart disease and mental health were being treated at that time.

In 1954 the Institute of Neurological Diseases and Blindness, for the first time, came before the committees of the House and Senate as a separate budget item.

The soundness of this step was obvious at once for in the fiscal year 1954, when Congress had a chance to hear witnesses from the Institute itself and the witnesses which organizations like yours sent to Washington, $4.5 million was provided.

This more than doubled the figure for the year prior.

Early this year we again held hearings and once again witnesses came before us from the Institute and from the private organizations.

The testimony was excellent.

It impressed the membership of the House and Senate committees so much that both committees again voted to increase the appropriation for this purpose.

The House of Representatives in its appropriations bill provided $6,913,000, and my own Appropriations Committee in the Senate voted $8,413,000 for the Institute of Neurology and Blindness, including its work on cerebral palsy.

Our conference committee came together and weighing the House and Senate figures, arrived at a final total of $7,600,500 for the present fiscal year.

Thus we have seen an increase in Federal appropriations for research in this field from $1.2 million for the fiscal year 1952 to $7.6 million for the fiscal year 1955.

Rewarding as this progress is in reaching this level in research and training, I had hoped that in addition to the funds provided for these purposes we might also find it possible to provide money for the construction of research facilities.

There is a strong case for funds for the construction of research facilities because lack of space in which to conduct experimental work in laboratories has been about as serious a problem as we have in this field.

I am convinced from the testimony of physicians who appeared before us that until we find the cause of cerebral palsy and other such diseases we can neither cure them nor can we lessen the damage they do.

To carry on the research necessary to discover the causes of these diseases, we must have the necessary laboratory space in which the research workers can do their work.

This problem of laboratory facilities extends throughout the entire Nation and we have been told that the immediate need of funds for the whole country is $33 million.

I can see why this would be so because in my own State of Minnesota, Dr. Harold S. Diehl, dean of the Medical School of the University of Minnesota, has sat down and talked with me at length about the situation there.

It is his estimate that the University of Minnesota alone needs between three and four million dollars for the construction of facilities for laboratory space to properly complete the research already in progress.

This same situation exists in other centers, and I am convinced that until we take affirmative action to solve it, the research program as a whole will be slowed up and the conclusions we are striving to reach will be delayed.

Therefore, I intend in the next Congress to again make an effort to have funds provided for construction, in addition to adequate funds for research and training.

Government-sponsored research alone is not enought to get the job done.

To achieve success in this crusade to conquer disease, we also need to have research and training programs sponsored and undertaken by voluntary organizations.

A voluntary health agency such as United Cerebral Palsy is eminently qualified to access research needs and to develope a specific research plan coordinated with that of the Federal Government so that both of them move in the same direction at the same time and both strive for the common objective.

Your own program which now amounts to half a million dollars a year gives eloquent testimony to this valuable effort.

We have seen in the case of polio how the money spent for research over more than a decade has resulted in development of a most promising vaccine.

This financial investment was very great indeed but the rewards growing out of it cannot be measured in terms of dollars and cents.

The rewards can only be measured in terms of human happiness and human lives saved.

The aim in the fight against cerebral palsy must be the same: to put to work the best scientists in the country to learn the cause of the disease and from the cause to discover the cure or the relief.

True enough, we have not made much medical progress yet, but we have created the necessary foundation for medical progress to take place.

To be fully effective, to reap the most promising benefits, such a program of research must be and is now being financed not only by the taxpayers' dollars but also by dollar donations given voluntarily to such organizations as United Cerebral Palsy.

I hope that your organization will have an even more successful fund-raising campaign next year and that you will thereby be enabled to broaden the scope of your research activities as well as your education and training programs.

For the Congress I can say this: Research in matters of public health has always been a bipartisan program which political considerations have never touched.

I can tell you here tonight that Members of Congress will do everything in their power to increase these funds for medical research as we have during the past few years.

We will make this effort because we are confident that the mysteries of nervous afflictions can be solved if we use well the medical potential of our Nation and we recognize the vital part Government must take by encouragement of research to bring to an end the terror of crippling and disabling disease.

Washington and Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, December 2, 1954

Mr. **BRIDGES.** Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an article entitled "Washington and Small Business" by C. Wilson Harder, and is the current small-business column sponsored by the Federation of Independent Business.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Washington and Small Business

(By C. Wilson Harder)

Among many items unfinished by last Congress, was report filed by Paul Kamerick, chief investigator for Senate Appropriations Committee, headed by Senator Styles Bridges.

This report, charges that through foreign-aid programs, United States taxpayer is giving British aircraft industry a great competitive edge advantage over domestic industry.

Seriousness of charge is best judged by fact economy of many American cities, such as Seattle, Baltimore, Wichita, Los Angeles depends largely on aircraft industry, not to mention already hard hit New England industrial area.

The Senate committee report states in 1042 while still engaged in war, British Government sponsored and subsidized development of jet aircraft. This was done, it is stated, because British realized American designing and engineering had captured world market for type of commercial planes then in use, and that to get this market, British would have to lead in development of commercial jet airliners.

In 1951 ECA stripped the then short American supply of 3,800 machine tools valued at $75 million giving them to Britain where they are being used both for military and commercial aviation.

The report further charges that in 1953, the year British reduced their income tax, United States gave them $409 million to be used primarily to modernize Royal Air Force.

Yet, while British get United States funds on grounds they cannot afford to finance their air defense, undisputed estimates are British Government by end of 1950 had granted subsidies of around $400 million for development of commercial jet aircraft. Subsidies continue to be paid.

It seems well established Britain sold Russia some time after war, jet aircraft engines that were presumably forerunners of present day Soviet jet engines.

Perhaps these engines were outcome of developments in commercial aviation, or perhaps developments in military aviation.

But fact seems to loom large that aircraft industry geared to turn out large numbers of jet engines, is in fine position whether it be military or commercial orders.

Thus, British aircraft industry, which already has orders from United States airlines, occupies an unusually fine competitive position being subsidized both by its own and United States taxpayers.

This report could trigger probe of entire United States foreign aid program structure. Although report deals only with the building up of the foreign aircraft business to a competitive disadvantage to United States industry, the same result is being created in practically all fields in which American commerce and employment depends.

This partly explains drive to knock down American protective tariff system by both European interests and United States firms with plants in Europe.

Due to taxes paid by American business and labor the productive capacity of Europe has been built up by foreign-aid programs to a point where European industry, with lower tax and labor rates, could if permitted, flood this Nation with goods to wreck entire American economy.

A National Fuels Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, December 2, 1954

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, the National Coal Association convention, on November 17 and 18, 1954, was of such great significance that it merits the attention of every Member of Congress. The meeting was held in Pittsburgh, Pa., birthplace of the organization.

As in the cases of the original meeting in 1917 and the convention's return to Pittsburgh in 1937, this year's event took place in an atmosphere of tension created by international crisis. The 1917 convention took place when the United States was involved in World War I. When the association came to Pittsburgh again two decades later the Sino-Japanese conflict was taking place in Asia and war clouds were gathering over Europe.

Now, in 1954, aggression once more stalks the earth. The United States must be prepared for any emergency. Our industrial as well as our military might must be maintained in top condition so long as any danger persists.

The importance of the coal industry in a mobilization program has finally been established to the satisfaction, I believe, of most Government officials. We who represent coal-producing States have for a long time emphasized coal's vital role in a war economy, and in recent weeks I have been encouraged by indications that our efforts are beginning to bear fruit. The executive branch of the Government has apparently been brought to realize that America's coal industry must remain strong at all times. Whether or not the White House will take any steps to correct conditions responsible for the present deterioration in the industry remains to be seen, but at least studies are being made by responsible groups and recommendations to the President by the Cabinet Committee are expected within a fortnight.

Meanwhile, however, it is the responsibility of Congress to indemnify our national security by taking whatever legislative means are necessary to see that the coal industry is reinvigorated as quickly as possible.

A number of highly important recommendations in this direction were made by officials of the National Coal Association at its convention in Pittsburgh—one at least of which should be pondered by members of the Senate with a view toward taking action immediately after the convening of the 84th Congress. I refer to the suggestion by Mr. L. C. Campbell, vice president, Eastern Gas & Fuel Associates, and president of the National Coal Association regarding the establishment of a national fuels policy. Mr. Campbell's company has important mining operations in the State of West Virginia, and he is wholly familiar with conditions in mining communities of our State as well as in other areas where coal is produced. Like all officials of coal industry management and of the United Mine Workers of America, Mr. Campbell is deeply concerned with the thousands upon thousands of families who are impoverished as a result of the decline in coal production; he also realizes that the industry could not be reactivated as quickly as would be required in a war emergency unless present conditions are improved.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record the text of Mr. Campbell's address to the National Coal Association. I wish that Members of Congress would peruse it carefully. I think it is necessary for everyone to understand coal's situation so that he will be properly informed when we take up positive remedial legislation in the new Congress.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Coal's Place in Our National Economy

(Address by L. C. Campbell, president, National Coal Association)

Coal's Place in Our National Economy is the theme of this, the 37th anniversary convention of the National Coal Association. The United States is blessed with an abundance of coal for heating, industrial power, metallurgical reduction, and chemical processes. Can there be doubt in the mind of any man that our national economy has been built on coal; that it depends upon coal today, and will continue to depend upon coal to expand its industrial greatness. By reason of an abundance of coal we Americans can afford the myriad of materials and services which it provides. Coal is the difference in peace, in defense preparation, and in war between those who have it and those who do not have it as an abundant natural resource.

The National Coal Association, organized in 1917, held its first general meeting in Pittsburgh, here in the William Penn Hotel on October 23 of that year, and the accounts in the Pittsburgh newspapers describe it as the largest meeting of coal producers ever held in the United States.

W. K. Field, first president of the National Coal Association, who was president of the Pittsburgh Coal Co., presided.

We were in the midst of World War I. The Federal Fuel Director, Dr. H. A. Garfield, speaking at that convention, said he expected our industry "to produce all the coal that we have a right to expect * * * and more," for the Nation's wartime needs.

That has been the plea in every time of war or national emergency and coal producers have never yet failed to meet the challenge.

Our association met here again in October 1937. J. P. Williams, Jr., of Pittsburgh, then president of the Koppers Coal Co., was president of the National Coal Association, and George H. Love, now president of Pittsburgh Consolidation Coal Co., served as chairman of the Pittsburgh convention committee.

Nineteen hundred and thirty-seven was not a golden year for the coal industry, nor for the United States. Everyone had discovered that national recovery from a depth of depression was a slow proposition, despite all the pump priming; and the preliminary rumblings of the Second World War were already audible.

When we met here in 1937, coalmen had their own special problems arising from the efforts of the Government to establish minimum prices for coal, as required by the terms of the Guffey Act.

This year, on our association's 37th anniversary, we are meeting again in Pittsburgh in the very heart of industrial America. We are returning, so to speak, to the place of our birth. We come back for renewed vigor. The Pittsburgh renaissance, visible on all sides, is, indeed, a challenge to the coal industry for such invigoration.

Coal, our country's No. 1 energy resource, and a foundation stone of the Nation's economy, is presently beset with many difficulties. We are in the throes of a changing fuel economy. There exists a tremendous conflict of application of the energy supply available from coal, oil, natural gas, and electricity. There needs to be a national fuel policy to correct the blind, destructive, uneconomic condition which is destroying the Nation's fuel birthright. Future generations cannot be expected to applaud the present-day spectacle of misapplication of oil and gas when reserves of those essential fuels are gone, and coal remains the only enduring bulwark of our fuel needs.

In spite of all of this, the long-range future of coal was never brighter; its field of national usefulness never before so great. The slogan of this convention, "Coal's place in our national economy," is borne out by the fact that coal has, indeed, been the keystone of our industrial progress.

The record of progress in the coal industry in the past 37 years since the National Coal Association was founded is one of which we are rightfully proud. Our gains in improved methods of mining and the preparation of coal have been prodigious. These gains have also been matched by increased efficiencies and economies in the use of coal.

The gains have been achieved by skillful engineering and constant research and mine mechanization in underground mining, on a scale of which the mine operators of an earlier day never dreamed. These gains have been achieved by expenditures of hundreds of millions of dollars for new plants and new equipment. There has also been a tremendous modernization of old mining plants. In addition, production gains have been achieved by the introduction of surface mining, until its expansion of plant and equipment accounts for roundly one-quarter of the total annual output of coal.

In 1917, the year of our first meeting, the mine output of bituminous coal was 551 million tons. To get this out of the ground and onto railroad cars required a labor force of 600,000 men. The miners put in 8 hours of actual working time, and the per man-day output averaged 3.77 tons.

Twenty years later in 1937, when we met here again, mine output was 445 million tons and the total labor force that year, as reported by the United States Bureau of Mines, was not quite 500,000. In 1937, the miners worked 7 hours per day and the per man-day output was reported as 4.69 tons.

Last year we mined 453 million tons of bituminous coal with a labor force of roundly 300,000, a little more coal last year than in 1937, and produced with 40 percent fewer men. It should be noted also that although paid on an 8-hour basis, the productive working time in the underground mines at present is usually not more than 6½ hours. The man-duty output for all bituminous mines last year, surface and underground figured together, averaged 8 tons. These figures represent a gain in operating efficiency unmatched in so short a span of years.

Let me underscore, also, the fact that these gains in productivity have been accompanied by even more striking gains in mine safety. Measured in terms of the frequency of injury per million tons, today's bituminous coal miner's job is 5 times safer than his father's job 40 years ago, and twice as safe as it was 15 years ago.

Engineering for safety, with new knowledge and new equipment for the industry, coupled with education against the peril of carelessness, will help the industry set ever higher standards of safe mining.

To reduce the per ton cost of mining coal, and to increase the heat and power per unit of coal burned, are the objectives of an unending search by coal producers and coal users.

The electric utilities, which today are coal's largest customer, afford a striking example of the gain in efficiency in the use of coal. In 1920, electric utilities were burning 3 pounds of coal to obtain 1 kilowatt-hour of electricity. That was the average rate. In the early 1930's, it was 1½ pounds of coal per kilowatt-hour. This year the national average figure is down to 1 pound per kilowatt-hour.

That means that 1 ton of coal today in electric power generation does the work that not many years ago required 3 tons. It means that at the 1920 efficiency rate the electric utilities would have required almost 350 million tons to obtain the 218 billion kilowatt-hours of electricity which were generated with coal last year. The actual amount of coal burned under electric boilers last year was 116 million tons, a new all-time high.

The 1-to-1 ratio pounds of coal to kilowatt-hours is due to go much lower. Further gains in efficiency are already in sight. Some of the newly built electric generating plants are burning coal with results far below the average pounds per kilowatt-hour.

You will hear from other speakers at this convention discussion of the part coal seems destined to play in the field of electric energy in the years ahead. Let me merely remind you that coal at present accounts for one-half of the entire electric output, and if we exclude waterpower and consider only the mineral fuels, coal accounts for two-thirds of the total. The consensus is that the share of coal in total power generated is not likely to diminish as far ahead as can be seen; indeed, its share may increase. The share of hydroelectric power in the total output of electric energy is steadily declining. The prophecy is that electric power required will be many times that of the present.

A population of 190 million will be served by electric utilities burning an estimated 350 million tons of coal in 1975. We shall be sending more and more coal into industrial plants and into homes over electric wires instead of by train and truck. The British thermal units—13,000 to 14,000 of them per pound of coal—will indeed be king in an ever-expanding national power load.

The leaders in the field of atomic power all stress the thought that the day is a long way off when atomic electric power will be competitive with electricity produced by conventional fuels; that the nuclear power plants now projected cannot be expected to supply more than a tiny fraction of the expected total of electricity required.

Our immediate concern is not with what unquestionably appears to be a bright future, but with the present predicament of the coal industry's curtailed output and vanished profits. There will be much discussion of the contributing causes in these two convention days. I would like to mention briefly only some of them.

The workmen who mine the coal are paid the highest daily earnings of any industry group in the country, while the earnings of coal-producing companies are the lowest of any of our basic industries, and even those earnings for a great many companies almost drop out of sight. The tragedy of displaced workmen at the same time stalks every coalfield in the country. Many producers are attempting to pay not only these high wages for a limited productive workday but also fringe benefits, out of losses. The chances of being able to continue to do that are remote for a great many producers. The chances of recapturing markets appear to be even more remote. Those markets are currently being served by a large tonnage which reaches the customer without fringe costs and high labor rates. There needs to be a reappraisal of this situation by all concerned in the interests of jobs for workmen and competitive business standards for the industry.

The transportation costs of coal as applied by the carriers and sanctioned by Government have been built into a nonrealistic freight-rate structure. The simple fact appears to be that coal is being called upon to bear more than its fair share of the total cost of railroad operations. Efforts to hold business for coal in highly competitive markets accordingly suffer, as it is the delivered price of coal that counts. The freight cost is very often in excess of the at-the-mine cost of the coal. There also needs to be a reappraisal of this situation by all concerned.

Coal has been hurt by the unrestricted importation of cheap residual fuel oil which has poured into the Atlantic and gulf ports, principally from Venezuela and found its way under industrial boilers, displacing coal. It is now appearing on the Pacific coast as a threat to domestic produced fuel oil. This does nothing to help the domestic oil industry. It is of no lasting benefit to any class of United States fuel users. Its importation tends to encourage dependence on a foreign fuel supply that would be almost instantly cut off in the event of war. It profits no one but the foreign refineries and traders seeking an outlet for the leftovers of the refining processes. Here again there needs to be a reappraisal of what this situation is doing, not only to coal but to domestic oil trade.

It is regrettable that efforts to obtain from Congress needful legislation to restrict these imports have not yet met with success. The coal industry should continue to seek remedial action. The executive branch will have this problem for consideration, along with others pertaining to the overall fuel economy of the country. This needs affirmative action from the executive and legislative branches.

Natural gas now reaches into virtually every State. Only one, Vermont, does not yet have natural-gas service, either on an existing or on an authorized and imminent basis. It is a formidable competitor to coal in some areas, and is part of the pattern of the changing fuel economy.

Natural-gas resources are so limited, when measured in terms of our total energy resources and our total energy requirements, that we have contended that this gas ought not to be wasted under industrial boilers where coal would do as well or better. It ought to be confined to the superior uses for which it is best adapted in the interest of the national economy. It should receive a price in the market place commensurate with its true worth, in the interest of those in whose land the gas originates.

We have objected in the past to having a Government agency in Washington fix prices which the owners of gas at the well should be permitted to obtain for their product. We have opposed the importation in the United States of natural gas from Canada.

In my remarks at our convention a year ago, I expressed the view that our greatest need was a better realization ourselves, on the part of our customers, and Federal and State authorities, of the simple fact that the coal industry must ask and must receive a fair price for its product if it is to remain healthy. Surely events of the past 12 months have given added pertinence and force to that observation. We have seen the consequence of failing to obtain—and in many cases, I fear, failing to ask—a fair price for coal.

Our customers, the press, Government agencies, and the Congress all give lip service to the proposition that the coal industry is one of the great defense bastions of the Nation and must be preserved in good operating condition; that to do less is to trifle with disaster. There has been little disposition to match talk with actions until recently. It is gratifying to see signs of action on the part of the Government and an increasing awareness of what it would mean to the Nation to continue the dismantling of a great industry by reason of unfair competition and profitless production. There are encouraging signs and action in many quarters, and I should not pass on without mentioning some of that.

We have today a governors' fuel conference, the sequel to a meeting of the governors of the coal States called last spring by Governor Fine, of Pennsylvania, to consider ways and means for helping coal. Real progress has been made in the conferences which have been held and a program of action is outlined for future meetings.

The White House, too, is taking a hand. Conferences with President Eisenhower in the late spring resulted in the appointment of an interdepartmental six-member committee headed by Dr. Arthur S. Flemming, Director of Mobilization, to examine the plight of the coal industry and the various proposals that are within the area of governmental action.

A further step that we hope may prove helpful was the appointment by the President of a committee at Cabinet level to deal with the overall question of public policy respecting energy supplies and resources—that is to say, our energy resources of all kinds and the production facilities of all kinds.

These various conferences, councils, committees, and inquiries did not just happen. They were the outcome of the concerted efforts of those who have the interest of coal at heart; mine management and mine labor, Members of Congress in coal-mining districts, businessmen, railroad men, bankers, and many others.

Never before have responsible executives in our industry manifested so great concern and sought so wholeheartedly to awaken governmental policymarkers to the facts concerning the production, distribution, and consumption of coal; to awaken governmental policymakers to the severity of the industry's present difficulties, and the fact that many of these difficulties are caused by things beyond the industry's control, and that some of these difficulties are directly attributable to unwise governmental action or lack of action.

It takes governmental action to halt imports of residual oil, to change railroad rates, to restore a prudent balance in the distribution of natural gas.

The Government should take a new look at its fuel-purchase policies which are proving so destructive to coal in a variety of ways; sometimes by buying coal on a basis that raises havoc with existing coal producing facilities; sometimes buying other fuels when coal could be made to serve as well or better, and when it is in the public interest to preserve the greatest possible number of outlets for coal.

We have raised the question of whether the Government, as a matter of national policy, should use coal in all Government buildings and installations both in continental United States and overseas, where readily available.

We believe that our Government should do all that it can to induce European governments to remove restrictions which discriminate against the importation of coal from the United States.

We are dealing with the question of what part the Government shall play in the field of research and the development of facilities for the production of synthetic fuels.

Bituminous coal research is closely allied to the National Coal Association and has many research projects underway. We have only a few producers with resources large enough to support extensive research on their individual account, but those that are able are doing notable work in the research field. The manufacturers of machinery and equipment useful in mining, as well as the manufacturers of equipment in which coal is burned, are doing much and with conspicuous success.

Research in the field of coal chemistry and synthetic fuels is going on at a good rate. The Government, which had a considerable part in this program, has recently withdrawn from much of it. There needs to be a reexamination of the part that Government should continue to take in coal research, in the interest of maintaining a healthy industry and assisting this basic raw material to find additional markets in coal chemistry.

The National Coal Association is taking an important part in all of the various efforts to strengthen the position of coal in competitive markets, and to gain for coal the treatment from the agencies of Government which coal merits and must have if it is to prosper.

It has ably represented the industry before congressional committees and the executive departments.

The program of market promotion which the National Coal Association has been carrying on for some years, and which is continuing in new channels that promise even greater usefulness, will be fully described by other speakers.

There never was a time when the need was greater for concerted efforts to meet competitive fuels on more even terms, and to obtain for coal a fairer share of the total fuel market. There never was a time when the industry's need was greater for the services which our national association is in a position to render and which, I am glad to report, it is rendering in full measure.

It is well that we come together in these annual meetings for realistic examination of our problems, and for a roundtable discussion and exchange of views.

My hearty thanks and appreciation to the many committees which have worked on the problems of coal through the years, and to the entire staff working for National Coal Association who have rendered excellent service on every occasion. The program committee and all of its members likewise deserve a full measure of appreciation of the job which it did in putting together an excellent program for these few days. I am confident that this meeting will generate new ideas.

Although beset with so many difficulties, we face the future with a stout heart and conviction that better days for coal are ahead, and that the American coal industry will continue to maintain its world leadership in the output of a primary natural resource as vital to modern civilization as air and water.

Some of the things on which that conviction is based, and some of the things which coal and industries closely related to coal are doing to bring these better days, will be told in the reports which are to be presented here today and tomorrow and by the speakers listed on the program.

Let's face up to the fact that with a full recognition of these problems the men and management of the coal industry can and will, with such aid as the Government has to afford, preserve a dependable fuel economy for the Nation in time of peace and war.

Address by Joseph P. McMurray, Housing Executive for the City of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, December 2, 1954

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Mr. Joseph P. McMurray, housing executive for the city of New York, given before the Potomac Chapter of the National Association of Housing Officials, Washington, D. C., on December 1, 1954.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SECURING EFFECTIVE HOUSING LEGISLATION—PROBLEMS OF OBTAINING GOOD HOUSING LEGISLATION AS SEEN FROM THE HILL

(Address of Joseph P. McMurray)

I have found through the years, especially on Capitol Hill, the importance of reason, knowledge, and truth. Most people believe that Members of the Congress, Senators, vote because of the pressures of numbers, dollars, or politics.

It is true, to some extent, that representatives of large organizations do have an effective influence. Of course, large financial interests having a great stake in a particular or general economic situation do have influence. It is also true that political considerations do play a part in decisions made on Capitol Hill, but day in and day out on the many amendments to both large and small bills, the decisions on these amendments are made, in most cases on the basis of who has the best argument, the best reasons, and the best information.

Senators often knowingly vote contrary to what is considered their own political interests and what is generally supposed to be their political philosophy.

I have seen on many occasions so-called friends of the real-estate industry vote contrary to what the real-estate industry wanted when they were convinced it was not in line with the general welfare and on numerous occasions I have seen conservatives vote liberal on particular amendments and liberals vote conservative.

It is true, as could be expected, that people who represent large numbers of people or large financial interests, or important political segments in our life have easier access to Members of Congress and to other important people in the administration. The fact that they do will mean little or nothing if they do not have good reason, good information, or a persuasive cause. Now, I am not so idealistic or naive to believe or expect you to believe that sometimes on important issues the contrary is not, and has not been, true, but the only thing I want to point out by way of emphasis is that much more frequently than people would ever believe who are not close to the situation, is the way Congress is actually influenced in their determination on legislation.

Much of what the average citizen knows about the Congress comes from the newspapers. The newspapers, necessarily, cannot give a complete story on any bill, on any hearing, or any committee session. Newspapers are looking for the dramatic. The agreement or compromise is not the thing that is dramatic and so you hear very little of that. You read only about the clash of views, disagreements, the controversy, and when you read of a clash of views, you frequently do not read of the ameliorating phases, or discussions that may surround what appears to be a straight-line split or clash in views.

Congress, in a way, is a screener of information. It is a stopper and a filter of ideas and knowledge. When you stop to consider it, the average chairman of a committee, a Member of Congress, for years receives in capsule form some of the most expert opinion on all sides of every question. I know much fun is made about the intelligence of Congressmen and Senators, but, take it from me, they are a pretty well informed and intelligent group of men. Perhaps you, as an expert in a particular field, will be able to find fault with some of their thinking or knowledge of your field, but I am sure you are often surprised with their knowledge, and this is only one out of a whole host of subjects they must act upon.

Congress is as frequently ahead of the people—not, as it is generally believed, behind the people. At least this is true, in my opinion, in a number of fields in which I have worked. In the field of housing you only have to read the declaration of policy in the Housing Act of 1949 to see how far Congress has advanced in this field insofar as the overall approach is concerned. This declaration of policy was given rather careful consideration during the deliberations of the Housing Act of 1954, and the declaration was reaffirmed. An effort to amend it was not agreed to because it was believed that that policy so well stated the position of the Congress with respect to the whole housing question.

It is my opinion that, in the field of public housing, Congress has shown itself to be ahead of the people. It is true that there appears to be a great deal of support for public housing, but to some extent it is the support for better housing rather than support of a specific program. It is true the public housing program has been drastically cut, but we should not forget that in spite of all the propaganda to the contrary, the Congress has consistently voted in support of the basic principle that there has to be some Government subsidy for low-rent housing. And many of the Senators I know personally who supported this public housing program did so not because of political self-interest; quite the contrary, they honestly felt, after careful study, that it was in the general welfare. Incidentally, I have known many Senators who have voted for such things as price control and rent control legislation when it was unpopular in their own States and with their own political supporters, but they did it because they believed it was the right and patriotic thing to do.

With respect to the urban redevelopment program, which has been not only continued but, in my opinion, been improved, I think Congress is far ahead of the average person in recognizing the need for this type of program. There has been no real opposition to this program in the Congress, yet go into any community with an urban redevelopment program and see how much opposition there is from the people who have a vested interest in the project area, or who feel that things should be left as they are.

In the field of housing research, Congress in the 1949 act and before that, in the act of 1948, has shown its interest in the need for doing some penetrating study in housing. The research provisions of the act were not carried out largely because, I believe, the job was not started off as well as it might have been and because of the lack of support by industry. I believe industry should, and finally did, support some segments of the program, but by then it was too late. I believe that, with a little bit of concerted effort, this program can be reinstated in our Federal housing program. No one can give a good reason why an agency that has billions of dollars tied up in this business of housing, that has recognized the vital stake that housing has in the development of our country, should be without a group of people who do some concentrated thinking, studying, and research on the numerous problems in the increasingly more complicated housing field. I think the fact that the National Association of Home Builders has recently enlarged its research staff is recognition by one industry group of the importance of housing research. In other countries of the world they have recognized its importance and I recall the part it played in Holland, Sweden, and other countries I had an opportunity to visit in 1949.

Congress has also been one of the first to recognize the importance of middle-income housing problem and we are likely to forget that. In 1950, the Senate Banking Committee reported out a middle-income housing bill. It failed in the Senate by close vote after being favorably reported by the Senate Banking and Currency Committee. But the important thing to recognize is that there was and is a strong belief in Congress that something must be done in this field of housing.

I might also point out that in regard to providing some sort of machinery for secondary mortgage financing, that the Congress here again has been ahead of the industry. Throughout the years that I was with the banking committee many members of the committee had manifested great concern about the lack of mortgage funds in the distant areas of our country, and advocated that some machinery should be designed to meet that difficult problem.

In connection with the FHA housing scandal, there again the Congress was ahead of the agency and the people in recognizing the possibility of some irregularity occurring in connection with the administration of FHA. In 1947 an amendment was adopted which was intended to protect against the so-called windfalls; that is, to bring FHA valuations in line with actual costs, rather than estimated costs. In 1950 Senator Long spent a considerable amount of time trying to elicit from the FHA the fact that there could be, and actually were, enormous profits being made in the 608 program. In a number of reports, in hearings, and in Senate debates, Congress expressed its concern over and over again about this problem. The middle-income housing act of 1950, to which I referred earlier, was designed against the background of the 608 program. You only have to read the debate and the report on that bill to be aware of the fact that it was an attempt to make use of the knowledge, the know-how, the techniques, that were created as a result of the experience with the 608 program, and reshape and redirect them so as to provide better and more adequate housing at less cost to the consumer.

In 1951 the Congress applied the cost certification amendment to the FHA title VIII and title IX program. The 1951 cost certification amendments, as you recall, required that if the actual cost was less than the mortgage amount, the difference had to be used to reduce the amount of the mortgage. This amendment was fought by the industry and the agency concerned was not happy about it, but Congress stuck to its guns and the amendment was finally adopted. Mind you, this was a Congress which was supposed to know less than those in the agency and those in the industry.

In the recent act of 1954, in connection with the urban renewal title, the amendments that were finally agreed to by the Congress after the bill was introduced made it workable and practical. It is true that the agency finally recommended many of them, but what you might not know was that it was not by virtue of the agency's initiative. To a large extent the amendments were those which NAHRO brought to Congress, were referred back to the agency, and finally sent back to the Congress in a somewhat revised form. But it was Congress that thought that these amendments should be incorporated in the bill if the act were to be workable and practical.

I, as were most people who were acquainted with the good the FHA accomplished, was sorry about the FHA scandal. I did not like to see people get hurt. I do not like to see people suffer. I do not think I am different from almost anybody else, but personal feelings in a Government as large as ours have to be disregarded. As long as there has been a scandal and as long as there has been an investigation—and there had to be one—I think we who are interested in housing and we who are interested in the welfare of our country today and in the future ought to be able to find much good in it all.

First of all, it focused attention on the problem of housing. One of the things that has bothered me in these recent years is that it has been too hard to get people and the Congress as sufficiently interested in the problem as they should be. It has been one of those programs that has been going along without too much thought or consideration being given to it. After all, economically, it is one of the most important segments of our economy. Right today we would be in a depression or a bad recession anyway, if we did not have the rate of residential construction we now have.

In terms of the welfare of millions of human individuals, I do not know of a more important contributing factor than housing. In terms of employment, in terms of savings, in terms of financing, in terms of the money market, in terms of the shifts in our population, in terms of the economic development of our country, there is no single more important factor than our housing program.

There is little more important, in my opinion, in the solution of some of our most difficult domestic problems—the problem of juvenile delinquency, the education of our people, good marital relations, the proper development of our people, our health. I also think that in terms of our spiritual development it plays a very important influence.

The FHA scandal should cause us to examine the whole housing problem. The whole housing problem needs reexamination. We have to look at every one of our housing programs to see if they are really doing the job that needs to be done.

In New York City today we are doing that very thing, and Mayor Wagner set up a Committee of One Hundred on Better Housing, of which I have the honor of being the executive secretary. To show you exactly how comprehensive and realistic the study of that committee will be, let me merely read to you the list of proposed subcommittees and the problems to which they will direct their attention:

1. Subcommittee on low rent public housing financed by tax and/or cash subsidies by the Federal, State, and city governments, with a review of its actual or potential scope and policies.

2. Subcommittee on middle-income housing with special emphasis on the proper use of tax concessions and State or city credit for cooperatives and limited dividend projects.

3. Subcommittee to review the proper role of private enterprise in the middle-income housing field, and what can be done to encourage private building.

4. Subcommittee on urban redevelopment and FHA-insured projects.

5. Subcommittee on tenant relocation.

6. Subcommittee on slum clearance, from the point of view of proper areas, the time schedule, etc.

7. Subcommittee on neighborhood conservation and rehabilitation.

8. Subcommittee on community facilities, such as transportation, shopping, schools, etc., as related to housing programs.

9. Subcommittee on housing in relation to the future of the city in connection with population trends, large-scale planning, migration, and income groups.

10. Subcommittee on special problems, such as housing for the aged, discrimination, and large families. We are going to look at what has been done and what needs to be done in New York City in the field of housing by every group and every program.

The President last year appointed his Presidential Advisory Committee on Housing. I think that, as far as it went, it did well. The biggest criticism I had of it was that it did not have a sufficient amount of time to do the job and it did not follow through on a number of the problems it began to investigate. I think it would be in order if the President would again appcint a committee that would sit at least for a full year, to be composed of a group of experts in the housing field, and nonpartisan experts, and include some Members of Congress on it who would thoroughly analyze what is, or is not being done, and what more can be done to solve our housing problem.

It has been my experience from sitting up on the Hill where I have had the opportunity to meet all groups who were interested in the housing field and to know intimately Members of Congress who represented all sides of the question, that there was a good deal more understanding and a good deal more agreement on objectives in the field of housing than most people would suppose. I think there is a good deal more agreement on many details of housing program than most people believe possible. Furthermore, I found that, with little education and more information, disagreements decrease. I think there is enough good will and enough self-interest, if you wish, in a sound housing program to cause all people and their representatives in Congress to agree and work out their differences in connection with the housing problem—that is, if we in the field of housing do our job properly.

PROBLEM AHEAD

What is the problem ahead of us? Most of you are professional housers so I don't need to spend any time telling you that the extent of the problem is such that none of us will ever see its solution. In New York, where we are probably doing more in clearing out slums and building up whole new areas, it is reliably estimated that it will take from 150 to 200 years to take care of our present problems at the rate we are going, and, in the meantime, we will have new slums.

Our housing problem is not merely a question of clearing out slums. It is a matter of providing more adequate and comfortable dwellings for the people who are entitled to the standards we boast of so much in America, and about which we have a right to be proud. We need more low-rent housing, more middle- and moderate-rent housing, more sales housing, more high-rental and high-sales housing.

By 1962 we will again be confronted by a tremendous increase in the number of families that will enter the housing market. Our post-World War II babies will be getting married and starting to have their families. We also have the problem of the continuous dispersion of our population within the existing metropolitan areas and throughout the Nation. How the atomic era will influence this problem—your imagination is as good as mine—but I am certain it will have a very important and far-reaching effect.

One of the most important problems ahead for us in the field of housing is what has always been with us—the high cost of housing. We know that wages will continue to increase. Wages and prices will probably go up 20 to 30 percent in the next decade. We know that people will continue to demand more and better facilities in their homes and will demand more of what we may call luxuries today. These all cost money. Yet we know that housing costs today are out of line with the income of most people.

What to do about this is a problem for all groups—the industry, the public interests groups, Government experts and the Congress. There are many answers being developed and many which will be developed. I do not intend to talk about any of them, but I am satisfied there are ways of making great progress toward their solution already at hand.

I believe that if sufficient efforts are made to get Congress to listen, they can and will be educated to go along with a practical and forward looking housing program. It is not enough that 1 or 2 people testify about what may be a good program, or about a good amendment, or a good bill. It requires a steady, concentrated program of educating the key people in Congress and the administration by many people and many groups. Remember, Congress does listen to reason and acts on it. But it requires a lot more people than there are presently interested in good housing to do the job.

I also would advise the use of existing machinery—public and private—like the FHA, FNMA, existing private mortgage financing institutions, and private builders to the extent that they can be used in connection with any new program for middle income housing. The job of selling the program is that much easier; you minimize the opposition and are likely to gain some important support for a program that would otherwise never see the light of the Senate and House Chambers. Some not very complicated amendments to existing law could go a long way in providing a fairly good program of middle income housing.

One other last word. Do not think you have a monopoly on good intentions, or good ideas, or good objectives in the field of housing. I have found them among all groups and in both political parties.

Assume good intentions and worthy objectives on the part of the other fellow. Assume also that he, like Congress, responds a lot more to reason and knowledge than you might have assumed. If you do so, you will be surprised how much further you will get along with a good housing program.

Historical Background of Self-Incrimination

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, December 2, 1954

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, during the past year the University of Virginia Law Weekly has published a valuable series of articles on the general subject of The Limits of Constitutional Protection with Respect to Self-Incrimination. A number of distinguished members of the bar and authorities in their fields have contributed to the series, among them Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, Representative HUGH D. SCOTT, the Honorable J. Edgar Hoover, Frederick D. G. Ribble, dean of the University of Virginia Law School, and many others. The series has now been collected as volume 5 of the Virginia Law Weekly Dicta.

I ask unanimous consent to include in the Appendix of the RECORD, from that collection, a valuable and scholarly discussion of the historical background of the subject by Henry H. Glassie, a member of the firm of Weaver & Glassie, of Washington, D. C. While I do not necessarily concur in any conclusions of the article, I have found it of much interest and I believe that it will be of interest to other Members of the Senate.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SELF-INCRIMINATION: ESSENTIAL NATURE

(By Henry H. Glassie)

Much of the current discussion of the privilege against self-incrimination and the several proposals (one passed by the Senate and now pending in the House)[1] to abolish the privilege of witneses before congressional hearings by the device of granting immunity, appears to lose sight of the essential nature and purpose of the privilege. Many of the articles in Dicta and elsewhere treat it as a rule intended to apply to criminal trials "extended" to apply to congressional inquiries. From the standpoint of its underlying purpose, nothing could be further from the truth. In this I am not concerned with the mere matter of historic or scholastic accuracy but a frightening failure to give respect to one of the fundamental concepts of civil rights. It is particularly distressing that the American Bar Association has not taken into consideration that the proper invocation of the privilege before congressional committees is necessary to protect the constitutional guarantites of our system of criminal justice.

When the London apprentice, John Lilburne, was called before the star chamber to answer questions relating to his dissemination of certain Puritan tracts (1637), his refusal to answer was not based on the concept that he could not be compelled to testify against himself in a trial at common law. It was based upon his belief and contention that if he was suspected of a crime he should be indicted by a grand jury and tried in the regular criminal court under the common law protection constitutionally available, and not forced to indict himself by answering inquiries in an ex officio proceeding. His statement was: "I see you are about this examination to ensnare me. * * * If you will not ask me about the things laid to my charge I shall answer no more. As to other things concerning other men, to ensnare me, and get further matter against me, I am not bound to answer such things as they do not belong to me. * * * If I had been proceeded against by bill I would have answered." He was primarily concerned with the nature of the court and its procedures.

---

[1] Since enacted into law.

Criminal procedure in common law courts was accusatory; the accused was charged with a specific crime; he was confronted by his accusers; he was tried by a jury of his peers; he was innocent until proven guilty. Moreover, if we may trust Coke, Sir Thomas Smith, Sir John Fortescue, or the decision in Felton's case (1628), torture to obtain confession (as distinct from peine forte et dure to compel a plea of guilty or not guilty) had never been a part of the procedure of the common law courts of England. It was employed to secure confessions in England on direct prerogative of the Crown or council, notably in the cases of Anne Askew, Campion, Guy Fawkes, and Peachum, but this was always an extraordinary and extrajudicial process of an irregular tribunal not bound by the rules of the common law, such as the Courts of Star Chamber and High Commission, which adopted the then current inquisitorial procedure of the courts of the Roman Church and did not use common law procedures. Jardine (on the Use of Torture in the Criminal Law of England) states that in only two cases did a royal warrant to torture ever go to a common-law judge. (In those cases it was illegal.) The use of torture by the inquisitional courts on order of the Crown or council commenced in the 16th century, increased through the reigns of Henry VIII, Mary, and Elizabeth, and became quite common in the reigns of James I and Charles I.

John Lilburne had not been threatened with torture by the star chamber, however, and was more concerned with the other differences in procedure. Most important, the court of star chamber proceeded upon oath ex-officio, that is, on the motion of the court itself, or cum provamente, which meant upon testimony taken in secret by the court in such a manner that the accused was not given a copy of the accusation or the identity of his accuser. There was no formal charge or accusation. There was no right to jury trial or counsel. The star chamber in 1637 was primarily interested in stamping out heresies, religious or political, and suppressing all opposition or criticism of Charles I. It was not limited as the court of high commission to ecclesiastical matters. It customarily inquired into the most intimate details of men's private lives without the necessity to confine itself to matters relevant to a particular charge. Particularly it indulged in compelling witnesses to be informers on their coreligionists, associates, and members of their families, thus accomplishing an investigatory purpose virtually impossible under common-law procedures.

Following Lilburne's example, dozens of Puritans and others opposed to the Crown refused to be sworn by inquisitional courts, or if sworn, refused to answer despite the command of Charles I to the high commission that: "These refractory people should be brought before them to be enjoined to take their corporal oaths and by virtue thereof to answer to such articles and interrogations as there shall be objected against them."

It should be noted that at this time a large body of citizens, in their private opinions, were arrayed against the purposes and intents of the inquisitional courts and the King. They were outraged by the star chamber treatment of Prynne, Burton, Bastwick, Leighton and others. They considered themselves persecuted by power and authority and were concerned with the freedom to believe contrary to established authority and the right not to disclose personal beliefs or involve their families or associates before inquisitional bodies. This notion of civil rights was not new in England. Sir John Elliott, Selden, Halles, Long, Valentine, Stroole and other members of Parliament had refused to answer on jurisdictional grounds in 1629. Indeed protest against trial by inquisition rather than by a common law court after indictment was violent from the time Archbishop Whitcrift ascended the court of high commission (1583). Udall for example, had refused to answer before the high commission in 1591 but made no claim to the right to remain silent when indicted. The doctrine had particular appeal to dissenters because of the parallel in the trial of Jesus. Pilate asked him whether he was the Son of God and adjured Him to say whether he was or not. Jesus answered, "Thou sayest it" in other words, you must accuse me and prove it. And the notion became firmly imbedded in the fundamental constitutional law through Lilburne and the dissenters who followed his example. So much so, that Charles I in his attempted arrest of five members felt it necessary to advise Parliament that upon apprehension they would be tried (for treason) only under common law procedure. Paradoxically enough, when Charles I himself refused to take oath or testify in his own trial on the theory that the regicide judges and the specially set up court had no jurisdiction to try him, Macaulay relates that his manful refusal made him popular and a martyr to many who before had held him in mistrust and contempt.

Both the declaration of the Army (1647) and the humble petition of many thousands (1647) demanded that Parliament "permit no authority whatever to compel any person or persons to answer any questions against themselves or their nearest relations." Actually, Parliament passed no law forbidding compulsory self-incrimination as such. It solved the matter by abolishing (1641) the courts of star chamber and high commission and the numerous other "irregular" courts then operating by royal prerogative under an inquisitional procedure. This left no inquisitional body to examine people touching suspected crimes, ex officio or without indictment or formal charge. Taswell-Langmead suggests there was an automatic reversion to the constitution as it existed under the Plantagenets. Macaulay takes the position it was unnecessary to make provision for such an obvious right in the bill of rights (1689).

The notion that in a criminal trial a duly indicted and accused defendant should not be compelled to testify against himself is a comparatively minor concept that infiltrated the criminal law of England in the middle or the latter part of the 17th century by analogy to the larger constitutional issue and because of the Puritan belief that cross-examination under oath was a form of torture. It was first claimed in the Twelve Bishop's Trial (1641) and became a recognized common law rule through Scroop's Trial (1660), Crook's Trial (1662), Penn and Meade's Trial (1670), Jenke's Trial (1676), Readings Trial (1679), and other landmark cases. Wigmore states that the privilege against self-incrimination, first asserted only before inquisitorial or irregular courts, crept "by indirection into the common law criminal system."

Of course, the desirability of such a privilege was not as readily perceived with regard to the acts or beliefs unpopular with all citizens and at least as late as 1673 compulsory self-incrimination was required of an accused spy, and the Prince of Orange and Parliament thought it appropriate expressly to provide by statute in 1695 that the privilege should apply to persons charged with treason. This act, incidentally, contained other specific privileges for treason cases, such as the necessity of corroboration, a strict 3-year statute of limitations, and the right to have two counsel of the prisoner's choice paid for by the state. The philosophy of these protections is in some contrast with that behind the current more liberal use of the word "treason."

In New England, where the Puritans and Dissenters were no longer a minority group but in complete power and authority the right not to accuse or indict oneself and to be tried under the restrictions of a common-law criminal court if indicted did not retain its public appeal. While some lipservice was paid to the condemnation of ex officio oath proceedings, as a practical matter, most of the 17th century trials in Puritan New England involved a most brutal form of compulsory self-incrimination through cross-examination and badgering the accused, sometimes lasting for weeks. The Puritan concept of cross-examination under oath as a form of torture is better understood from the details of the typical trial of one George Spencer of New Haven (1642) charged with siring a one-eyed monster by a sow belonging to John Wakeman.

The evidence was that the creature had one eye. As George Spencer himself had only one eye, this was very convincing in itself. The trial consisted of subjecting the accused to a merciless cross-examination, including full discourse on the torture he would undergo in the after world if he didn't confess his sin and crime. Time and time again (at least seven times) he denied the charge, only to break under the questioning and admit that he did do it, and explain his prior denials by averring that he only did not remember doing it or did not know that he had done it. Even on the scaffold he was forced by questioning to admit his guilt after his final protest of innocence:

"Mr. Goodyeare asked him what he thought of the monster wch had been shewed him, whether he did not take notice of something in itt like him, the prisonr after a little pause asked the magistrate whose sow itt was, who replyed, he knew best himselfe, att wch the prisonr was againe silent, the magistrate apprehending in the prisoner some relenting, as a preparatio to confession, remembred him at thatt place of scripture, he thatt hideth his sin shall not prosper, butt he yt confesseth and forsaketh his sins shall finde mercie, and asked him if he were nott sory he had denyed the fact wch seemed to be witnessed from heaven agst him. The prsonr answered he was sory and confessed he had done itt, but as Mr. Goodyeare was going away, the prsonr tolde Sam: Martin what he had confessed to Mr. Goodyeare was for fauor, thereupon Sam: Martin called Mr. Goodyeare back * * * and he impudently and wth desperate imprecations against himselfe denyed all thatt he had formerly confessed, whereupon the form perticulars were fully testified in open Court to the prsonrs face by the persons before menconed respectively, * * * and John Clarke asked him againe, butt did you doe itt, he answered, I did doe itt; againe John Clarke asked him, butt did you doe itt, he answered the third time, he did doe itt. * * * then John Clarke asked him, why he had denyed itt to the magistrates, the prsonr answered thatt he had nott denyed itt to the magistrates, butt onely said he did nott know thatt he did itt. John Clarke asked him why he did now confess itt, he answered because he did doe itt."

For those interested in poetic justice it might be mentioned that the sow was also put to death. The same semi-inquisitional system was used in most of the witchcraft trials. A majority of the accused witches confessed their crime. It must be admitted that they did get rid of a great many witches.

Public reaction from the Salem excesses (1692) and the general realization that "There, but for the grace of God, go I" could apply even to a Puritan, firmly engrafted the privilege against self-incrimination in the law of Massachusetts and surrounding Colonies. The wording in Massachusetts is "compelled to accuse or furnish evidence against himself."

In the southern Colonies it appears clear that the privilege against self-incrimination was recognized as a rule of criminal law as early as 1677 (Virginia) but as in the mother country it was a political issue only in connection with royal courts of inquiry. Royal Governors and their councils in Virginia, Pennsylvania, Massachusetts, and other Colonies from time to time acted as prerogative courts and held inquisitional hearings where they put colonial citizens under oath on suspicion to procure evidence of religious or political agitation, to unravel possible associations and conspiracies, and expressly to force confessions which might later be used to secure criminal convictions before a jury. This procedure was used not only by the notorious Governor Berkeley during and after Bacon's Rebellion, but by Governor Andros, Governor Blackwell, Governor Cornbury, Lieutenant Governor Nicholson, and others. On the very eve of the Revolution the device of an inquisitional court was used by Governor Dunmore to investigate charges of forgery and the Virginia House of Burgesses found it appropriate to advise him formally that if any Virginia citizens were accused of crime they had the right to jury trial in their local jurisdiction. It was very largely the same members who passed Mason's bill of rights. Other colonial examples are given in Mr. Carter Pittman's excellent article in the Virginia Law Review.

Again, this was a case of the people arrayed against authority. Our colonial ancestors did honor the privilege with respect to Tories and Loyalists when their own time came but not without substantial objection, and qualification in the constitutional terminology in some States.

Though it was primarily aimed at the five intolerable acts and the unconstitutional extension of the jurisdiction of the admiralty and vice admiralty (prerogative) courts, it is pertinent to refer to the fact that the Declaration of Independence charged George III with "depriving us in many cases of the benefits of trial by jury." At the risk of being captious, I should also like to make a more complete quotation from the fifth amendment than is usual and to suggest that it should be read as a whole and with the sixth amendment as to the rights of an accused, as well as with the fourth:

> "No person shall be held to answer for a capital, or otherwise infamous crime, unless on presentment or indictment of a grand jury. * * * nor shall be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself."

In times of stress and danger, the timid are very apt to pin their faith on State action contrary to their own civil rights. We have had the example of the Alien and Sedition Acts (1798) and, of course, more recent examples in wartime, including the forced removal of citizens of Japanese extraction.

Today, the privilege against self-incrimination is under attack. This attack is not concerned with its use in criminal trials. While there is some reason to question its validity as a rule of criminal law there has been little criticism of the rule or its method of application in such cases. But in this era of ever-expanding congressional inquiry there are many who feel it is unsafe to allow this protection to a witness questioned by a congressional committee. Without suggesting any conclusions, it might be pointed out that a witness before a congressional committee is normally put under oath, ex officio or on the basis of undisclosed testimony from an unknown witness. There are no specific charges. There are no practical limits on the relevancy of questions, the length of the interrogation, or the number of interrogators. The pressure and confusion are intense. Frequently it is the announced intention to secure an admission of criminal activity on the part of the witness or his family and associates and to secure convictions on the basis of the information elicited or for perjury. The pressure is not lessened by the atmosphere, the heat, the noise, the crowds, the lights, the cameras, the television.

If we look at this problem only from the standpoint of committees attempting to unravel the tortuous web of the underground Communist Party or of syndicated crime, the American people are apt to have little sympathy with the witnesses. But it may be worthwhile to consider whether substitution of a doubtful immunity for the right not to submit to trial by inquisition may not affect us all, and for a long time. Times and circumstances change. It is not impossible to envision the Government of the United States or the effective control of powerful legislative committees in the hands of those from whom an extension of the right to not answer self-accusatory questions before a congressional committee—even if coupled with immunity from criminal sentence—might have to be bought by the martyrdom of a future John Lilburne. Admittedly, if immunity were granted this would be an extension of the right, but we are not now dealing with what the law is but what it should be. Perhaps the much criticized dissent of Justice Field (*Brown* v. *Walker* (161 U. S. 591)) on the grounds that a man should not be compelled to humiliate or degrade himself regardless of immunity, has some validity with reference to a witness before a committee on a fishing expedition.

The privilege before legislative committees is now (in practice) broader than that allowed in criminal court because there is no effective way to test whether it is properly claimed. It does impede the type of investigation in which the committees are in search of guilt—not legislation—where they are proceeding to try witness for suspected crimes by ex officio methods outside the protections of criminal procedure and the limits of the sixth amendment. Perhaps the greatest value of the fifth amendment is that it does impede this type of investigation.

To return to practicalities, and begging the question whether congressional inquires do succeed in uncovering more evidence of subversion than they suppress, if we truly want more responsive answers without endangering civil liberties, this situation might, to a large extent, be remedied by making inapplicable to congressional investigations the limitations of the rules of waiver of privilege which actually have no logical relation to congressional investigation. This is now causing witnesses to scream before they are hurt.

If it is necessary to abridge this important political right, we might go even further in the name of efficiency and defense. We could add questions to the Federal income tax form as to whether the taxpayer has committed any crimes, or was a member of the Communist Party, or associated with subversives in the applicable fiscal year, with details to be submitted on schedule M and furnished in duplicate to an appropriate congressional committee.

German Policy of Moderation and Cooperation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, December 2, 1954

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the Ambassador of the Federal Republic of Germany to the United States, Heinz Krekeler, delivered an address on the radio program Ten Minutes of Politics broadcast by the Northwest German Radio on November 11, 1954. The title of the address was "The Basis of German-American Friendship—The German People Support a Policy of Moderation and Cooperation."

In view of the thoughtfulness and understanding exhibited in this particular address by the German Ambassador to the United States, I ask unanimous consent that the address by printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, so that Members of the Senate may study it.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE BASIS OF GERMAN-AMERICAN FRIENDSHIP—THE GERMAN PEOPLE SUPPORT A POLICY OF MODERATION AND COOPERATION

A few days ago I returned home for a brief visit, and now I am preparing for my return flight to the United States. When my friends asked me what decisive impression I have gained in the United States recently my answer was this: the acknowledgment which Americans have accorded the friendship between the American people and ours. It was first expressed at the time of the Federal Chancellor's visit to the United States a year and a half ago. In recent weeks it has been heard again and again from the most responsible persons; for example, on the occasion of the signing of the treaty of commerce and friendship and of the payment of $300,000, the proceeds from the sale of the former German embassy building, for the construction of a new one.

Many friends here have asked what is the nature of this friendship. Is it based only on pleasant but actually superficial and meaningless gestures? Or is it really of practical and political importance? Cynics will be ready at once with an answer. They will say that such gestures and such words mean little in international relations governed by hard realities.

Only sober consideration of our relations with other peoples will provide an answer to this question. Before I go into this, however, I should like to express a conviction, and that is this: That every human being needs friendship in order to make his way through life. It is always more difficult for him who goes alone. As with individuals, so it is with entire peoples as well. In this world threatened by dangers and filled with problems all peoples stand in need of friendship to assure their future existence. We especially need it, because we have to bear the heavy burden resulting from the division of our country.

In my opinion, therefore, it is particularly valuable for us and for our future to be able to assure ourselves of the friendship of other peoples. I understand by this friendship the same thing that we know in private life: namely, to understand one's friend when he is faced with difficulties and to stand by him in adversity. Such a friendship as this does not come about by chance. And it is also much more than just an alliance between two peoples clothed in the form of a treaty, because the essence of a friendship such as this is but little affected by the currents of events.

The United States has such friendship with many countries. I want to mention two of them now: the French and the English. Even the most naive political observer cannot but see that these friendships are of weighty and solid stuff. Misunderstandings have put them to many a test and they have not yet been shaken. To have a friendship like this with such a powerful and at the same time amiable people as the Americans would be a priceless blessing for us.

What we have had up to now, what is expressed by the words which I have cited, is a beginning, a declaration of readiness to enter into a lasting relationship of this kind with us. That is a great deal, especially if we look upon this development from the vantage point of 1945. It involves the obligation, I think, to cultivate this friendship in order to give it the firm foundation and the broad base which are necessary if it is to be permanent.

How did this offer of friendship come about? I believe there are two reasons for it. One is the respect and admiration for the Federal Chancellor; the first time that a contemporary German has been so honored in the United States. Whoever has driven through the streets of Washington with him, as I have, and has seen how people gather there to greet him with genuine affection, know how great is the esteem and how unique the position which he has won with the American people. Moreover, this respect is accorded him by all sections of the population, by the Government, and equally by members of the opposition, as is proved, for example, by a statement made just a few days ago by the well-known Democratic Senator Mansfield.

The Chancellor owes this position, above all, to the fact that he has represented a policy of moderation and cautiousness. In his person an entirely new type of German has come before the American public. Part of this is indeed a respect for the systematic and methodical manner with which he conducts the affairs of the Government. But I have a definite impression that these other qualities, those of moderation and cautiousness which I have mentioned, are of much greater importance in this regard than the latter. And secondly, we owe this offer of friendship to the unconcealed respect of the American public for the German will to live, as manifested in what we have accomplished in the way of reconstruction, and to the unshakable determination to be free, which the Berliners have shown.

What can we do now to provide this friendship with a foundation? I believe the answer is very simple: we must make every effort to get to know one another better. And then we must convince the Americans that all the German people support this policy of moderation and cautiousness and that they are prepared for the kind of cooperation which forms the basis of confidence.

The German people alone can do this. Only they can offer proof of their own intentions and desires. Those of us who are abroad can support this attitude only by our own conduct. But in the matter of getting to know one another better a special task falls upon the German representative abroad.

In this respect—and let me say this in all frankness—one thing is necessary, namely, that we give the American people the opportunity of seeing firsthand the cultural achievements of the German people. Especially in this field the events of the national Socialist period—everything which Hitler and his accomplices did—caused tremendous damage. Their barbaric behavior and the effect of putting up a wall between the present and German cultural achievements acknowledged in the past. Constant and tireless work is needed—believe me—in order to make credible the fact that this period was only a brief and tragic interlude, that the ability of the Germans of old to make a contribution, and indeed a great contribution, to the cultural life of our world has not been destroyed.

An event which also occurred during the Chancellor's visit is of special significance in this connection. I refer to the letter of Mr. McCloy in which seven outstanding Americans stated that they were prepared to form a board of trustees for a German institute in the United States. A German cultural center is to be set up first in New York and then perhaps later in other cities.

As I mentioned at the outset—and permit me to say it again in closing—we need friends, last but not least, to have them stand at our side when we are in distress. Our distress is the suffering of our 18 million brothers and sisters who live in the Soviet zone. Their enslavement is a matter of profound concern to us. I am convinced that the friendship with the American people—who are so alert to the rights of the individual to dignity and independence—will make the greatest contribution—besides the one we ourselves have to make—towards the goal of returning their human rights by peaceful means to these 18 million of our compatriots and at the same time uniting them with us.

In this respect German-American friendship will make an especial contribution. It will also be the most important contribution—and I am convinced of this—to the solution of the worldwide problem which faces our entire generation: that of the preservation of peace in this troubled age of the atom. If it does happen that peace and the dignity of man are safeguarded by this friendship, then each one of us will be called upon to assure by his own behavior that it be stable and lasting.

No More Brotherhood?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, December 2, 1954

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an excellent editorial published in this morning's issue of the Washington Post.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

No More Brotherhood?

Even brotherhood seems now to be considered a dirty word by the McCarthymen who have debased so many of the great symbols and values of American life. Senator Jenner's insensate attack on Senator Flanders in the Senate on Tuesday is an apt illustration of what Senator Fulbright called "a great sickness among our people." Indeed, it perfectly points up the validity of Mr. Fulbright's observation, made on the same day, that "the Senator from Wisconsin, by his reckless charges, has so preyed upon the fears and hatred of uninformed and credulous people that he has started a prairie fire which neither he nor anyone else may be able to control." The pistol-packing theatricalism which attended the presentation of McCarthy petitions yesterday symbolized the recklessness of the whole McCarthy movement.

The pretext for Mr. Jenner's outburst was a Thanksgiving Day appeal by Mr. Flanders—broadcast by request of the Voice of America—to the Soviet people for world disarmament. The full text of it appears elsewhere on this page today. Readers may judge for themselves whether it is subversive or traitorous or un-Christian. An appeal to the Soviet people which denounced them as "tyrants" and "murderers"—to use Mr. Jenner's characterizations of them—would be little likely to persuade them to disarm or to inspire faith in America's peaceful purposes. The United States Government has always—and quite properly—observed a distinction between the tyrannical Soviet Government and the Russian people who have been its pawns. The United States Senate, for example, on June 18, 1951, passed without a single objection (even from Mr. Jenner) a concurrent resolution already adopted by the House which read in part as follows:

"That the American people deeply regret the artificial barriers which separate them from the peoples of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and which keep the Soviet peoples from learning of the desires of the American people to live in friendship with all other peoples, and to work with them in advancing the idea of human brotherhood."

The root of this matter is a simple issue of Christian ethics. The doctrine of universal brotherhood, the concept that all men have kinship through the common fatherhood of God, is a doctrine too central to Christianity, to western civilization, and to American democracy to be jettisoned at the behest of the McCarthyites. The contrast between Mr. Flanders' view and Mr. Jenner's view is a most illuminating one. We think it goes to the very heart of the issue before the Senate today. The censure of Senator McCarthy is a censure of the moral nihilism of which he has become the exemplar.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized book dealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by book dealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the Record.

PRICE OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

The Public Printer is authorized to furnish to subscribers the daily Record at $1.50 per month, payable in advance.

Remit by money order payable to Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C.

SEN

OFFIC

[Streets

Abel, Mr
Aiken,
Anderso
N. M
Barrett,
Beall, J.
Bennett
Bible, Al
Bricker,
Bridges,
Brown,
Burke, T
Bush, P
Butler,
Byrd, H
Capehar
Carlson,
Case, Fr
Chavez,

Clemen
Cooper,
Cordon,
Cotton,
Daniel,
Daniel,
Dirksen,
Douglas
Duff, Ja
Dworsh
Eastlan
Ellender
Ervin, S
Fergusо
Flander
Frear, J.
Fulbrigh
George,
Gillette,
Goldwa
Gore, Al
Green, T
R. I.
Hayden,
Hendric
N. J.
Henning
Mo.
Hickenl
Iowa.

Hill, Lis
Holland,
Hruska,
Humphr
Minn.
Ives, Irv
Jackson,
Jenner,
Johnson
Johnson
Johnsto
Kefauve
Kennedy
Kerr; Ro
Kilgore,
Knowlan
Calif.
Kuchel,
Langer,
Lehman,
Long, Ru
McCarth
McClella
Magnuso
Wash.
Malone,
Mansfiel
Martin,
Millikin,
Monrone
Okla.
Morse, W
Mundt, K

Murray,
Neely, Ma

Unite

E

HON.

IN THE

T

Mr.
vember
privileg
Foreign
on the
Trade
therefo
have th
the App
There
was ord
as follo
UNITE

(Address
of Mar
eign
Hotel,
At the
do not
trade.
interest
cial inte
marine.
certain
and rela
policies.
As the
must rec
is one of
I am fi
people, h
success t
have a st
centage
At the
cannot r
open the
unless w
us with
As we
riers that
nations—
between
subject t
following
This tre
advantag
I belie
ductive g
am entir
restrictio
picture,
foreign
the Unit
I said
appreciat
goods ca
most un
our econ
have inju
unfavora
affected
Natura
considera

Appendix

United States Foreign Trade and Our Merchant Marine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, December 2, 1954

Mr. **BUTLER**. Mr. President, on November 15, 1954, it was my very great privilege to address the 41st National Foreign Trade Convention in New York on the subject of United States Foreign Trade and Our Merchant Marine. I, therefore, ask unanimous consent to have the text of this speech printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES FOREIGN TRADE AND OUR MERCHANT MARINE

(Address by Senator JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER, of Maryland, before the 41st National Foreign Trade Convention, Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, New York, N. Y., November 15, 1954)

At the outset, permit me to state that I do not profess to be an expert on foreign trade. However, I have always taken a keen interest in one phase of our economy of special interest to all of you—our merchant marine. I will, therefore, give you briefly certain of my impressions on foreign trade, and relate these to our merchant marine policies.

As the greatest trading nation on earth, we must recognize that our merchant marine is one of our best ambassadors of good will.

I am firmly convinced that we cannot, as a people, have that "extra measure" of business success that spells true prosperity unless we have a steady, continuous and generous percentage of world sales.

At the same time, it is axiomatic that we cannot reasonably expect foreign nations to open their doors freely to our merchandise unless we allow them to sell their goods to us with a minimum of obstruction.

As we view the multitudinous trade barriers that restrict trade—even among friendly nations—one is disposed to hope that trade between nations may become steadily less subject to restraints. European nations are following our lead in lowering trade barriers. This trend will, I am confident, be to the advantage of all.

I believe so completely in America's productive genius and business initiative that I am entirely optimistic that these lessened restrictions in world trade will, in the overall picture, result automatically in expanded foreign trade and increased prosperity for the United States.

I said "in the overall picture" because I appreciate full well that excessive imports of goods can result, and in fact have resulted, most unfavorably for certain segments of our economy. Stepped up imports not only have injured certain domestic industries but unfavorable repercussions have necessarily affected still other segments of our economy.

Naturally, each such situation requires consideration on its own merits and in the light of the particular circumstances attendant upon it. Certainly it is obvious that if a large segment of our economy is subject to depression every reasonable effort should be made to prevent it. In like manner, we should accept as a fact that certain foreign goods will have a high competitive effect on similar types of goods produced here, just as certain goods produced in some sections of our great country possess competitive advantages over like goods produced in other sections.

When excessive importation of any type of merchandise adversely affects domestic industries producing like goods, it is reasonable to expect that demands will arise for a reappraisal of our trade agreements covering such articles, or for a study as to why such articles suddenly flood our markets. You are, of course, fully conversant with the recent vigorous protests made by the watch industry and bicycle manufacturers against large-scale imports. Competitive relief has been demanded from the Tariff Commission.

Currently great areas of the world are awakening to the possibilities of a better life and a higher standard of living. Who can supply their newly awakened desires for conveniences and modern industrial needs better than we with our proven low-cost mass-production methods? Certainly we should look forward to supplying a large share of these new demands. If we, therefore, increase our trade in these areas, it seems only reasonable that we be willing to give and take—to let these other countries export to us even if we have to suffer temporarily in spots.

This is stated as a general principle. But you and I know that industries in areas of the United States affected adversely by increasing imports will not accept such a situation without vigorous protests, accompanied by demands for more tariff protection. Equally true it is that should such demands become insistent both the Tariff Commission and the White House will afford such demands thoughtful consideration.

This, then, is the dilemma in which we find ourselves: On the one hand, there is the insistent desire for a greater and increasing share of world exports; on the other, there is the anguished cry from injured domestic producers against competitive imports.

We must accept the fact that in the realm of world-trade policy any change by the United States could have widespread repercussions on the trading policies of other nations. Certainly no administration will permit an essential industry or industrial area in this country to be destroyed by foreign competition without taking prompt steps to find a remedy. It is no solace to our fishing industry, for instance, that Japan and Norway are increasing their purchases of manufactured American items through use of dollars earned here by selling us their foreign fish products. Our fishermen and fish processors and their families must prosper to survive. This they cannot do if foreign fish products take away their domestic markets.

A basic consideration in such cases is the necessity or essentiality of the industry to our national economy and to our security in case of war. Of course, there are other important criteria.

First. Has the industry the resources, know-how, and initiative to cope with its foreign competition, taking into consideration wage levels, tariffs, quality of product, and so on? What are the possibilities of modernizing productive processes, or even of switching to new products in order to hold present, or gain new, markets?

Second. Does the product of the industry directly affect or control the prosperity of an area?

I would like to turn now to the proposition that as the world's greatest trading Nation, the United States must maintain an adequate merchant marine.

In the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, Congress established, as national policy, the necessity for development and maintenance of a strong merchant marine. Ten years later, in the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946, this policy was reaffirmed, and the requisites for, and I quote, "an efficient and adequate American-owned merchant marine," were firmly imbedded in the law of the land.

Your council is on record as supporting this national policy to the fullest extent and for this I salute you most heartily. May your support be continued and vocal during the 84th Congress. Much has been done, but much more must be accomplished if we are to be assured of a merchant marine adequate to carry a substantial portion of the water-borne commerce which your combined efforts will develop in the years ahead.

There are all too many persons of influence, in Congress and elsewhere, who fail to comprehend the urgent need for immediate attention to our national shipping needs.

Some believe we could, and should, save money by entrusting our commerce to ships of foreign nations. They are unaware that, except in the tramp trades, rates are the same for shipments in foreign bottoms as in the United States-flag vessels.

Others would favor the use of foreign vessels to permit dollar earnings by the respective foreign countries.

Still others, equally unappreciative of the realities of the situation, consider our present available shipping as adequate. They overlook the age, the lack of speed, the low competitive value of our merchant fleet, most of which was hurriedly built during the war.

However wrong, though, they all may be, these critics are influential and determined. They can and will continue to impede all plans to stabilize and modernize our merchant shipping unless all of us who believe in the national shipping policy as now on the statute books are ready to lend vigorous support to efforts to implement this policy.

Much stress has been placed upon the function of American shipping as an auxiliary to the military in time of war or national emergency. You can appreciate far better than most of our citizenry the value of an adequate merchant marine in its primary function as distributor throughout the world of the product of America's fields and factories, and as insurance against exorbitant rates for ocean transportation when shipping is tight.

Today slightly more than 10 million tons of American shipping are engaged in foreign trade and 6 million tons in domestic trade. Yet, considering that our quantum of world trade is 10 times larger than in 1939, it is incomprehensible that our total merchant tonnage is scarcely 3 times larger than in prewar years. The inescapable conclusion is that too large a share of our world trade is carried in foreign ships.

Great merchant fleets have been the making of mighty empires, just as the lack of them, or their neglect, has been the undoing of whole civilizations. History has established that fact time and again since the days of the ancient Phoenicians. Neglect of their merchant marine meant the loss of their prestige to ancient nations, particularly Greece.

The story of the great merchant fleet down through the ages is the story of the great maritime nations—the story of prosperity; the story of enlightenment; the story of world leadership and world power.

In Spain, in Portugal, as well as in England, the peak of their glory coincided with the supremacy of their merchant marine, with their ships traveling to the furthermost corners of the earth. Yet, today, men in our country say that a merchant fleet is needed only in time of war and that in time of peace we can forget about it.

It seems to me that one of the great tragedies of history is that its lessons are never learned—or at least heeded. As I mentioned earlier, many of our people in high places have not yet learned the lesson that an adequate merchant marine is part of the very lifeblood of our Nation.

To suggest that in the event of war we should rely upon foreign merchant ships to carry our vital supplies overseas infested by submarines is to invite disaster. I think you will agree with me that no nation as powerful as we are, with our enormous coastlines, should ever permit itself to feel that it could, or should, depend upon foreign merchant fleets for its defense to carry its wartime ocean cargoes.

Allow me to draw a few inferences from the story of our inadequate merchant marine in World War I and World War II. Time and again those of us who want to see our Nation powerful on all seas stand up in Congress and plead for a strong merchant fleet only to be rejected. Historians of the future may well imply that our lack of a merchant fleet of any consequence was an encouragement to our enemies to make war upon us in both world wars.

Both wars proved that we need ships not only as a means of conveying supplies to our fighting men and to our allies, but for returning costly and indispensable defense materials and thus avoiding the exhorbitant rates which we have been compelled to pay in the past for the use of ships of other nations.

The United States so neglected its merchant marine just before World War I that our ships were carrying only 9 percent of our export and import trade. When war finally struck there were not enough available ships for our basic needs. Other nations would not permit us the use of their ships. Our country's foreign trade was paralyzed; goods and materials piled high on our docks. In the case of cotton, our exports fell from nearly a quarter of a million bales a year in 1913, to less than 20,000 bales in 1914.

At the same time, rates increased alarmingly; finally skyrocketing more than 2,000 percent. Even for general cargo the average rate jumped more than 1,000 percent. The normal price for chartering a ship before World War I was $1 a ton; within a few months after the outbreak of hostilities the price had jumped to more than $20 a ton.

So desperate was the need for shipping that in spite of exhorbitant prices ranging from $60 to $300 a ton, the United States spent more than $3 billion in procuring foreign ships by direct acquisition. At the same time the Government itself constructed 2,316 ships at a cost of just under $3 billion so that the war ended with the United States having a merchant fleet of 2,547 ships of some 15 million deadweight tons. Sad to say, most of these were finished too late to be of significant use in the war effort.

Out of the study and agitation that followed World War I, Congress probed the problems and the possible function in peace and in war of an American merchant marine. There resulted the Merchant Marine Act of 1920 as the answer of the time to the idea that we could rely upon foreign-flag ships and that we did not need to maintain a merchant fleet of our own.

In 1936 the Merchant Marine Act was enacted. It visualized a merchant marine able to carry "a substantial portion of the waterborne export and import foreign commerce of the United States * * * at all times."

In November 1937 the United States Maritime Commission estimated that the total merchant shipping needs of this country in time of war would be 1,200 ships. Events proved that the Commission had grossly underestimated the necessary size American merchant fleet.

At the outbreak of war in 1939, there were 80 million deadweight tons of shipping in the world. Of this amount France and Britain controlled 27 million, with neutral shipping available mostly to the Allies. During the first 27 months of war, even before the United States got into the war, the Axis sank 16 million deadweight tons, while the total replacement factor was 5 million tons.

Approximately 12 million tons flew the American flag. During the course of the entire war United States losses amounted to nearly 7 million tons, which means that the American loss was more than half the tonnage of our whole merchant marine before the war.

Due to American ingenuity in shipbuilding, the United States shipyards turned out, between 1941 and 1945, 5,280 oceangoing ships aggregating 54 million tons.

One fact is clearly evident from these statistics—the United States cannot rely on its allies for merchant shipping in time of war. Another fact is certain—total cargo lifts during war are so stupendous that even if our allies are willing to assist us their total shipping will be insufficient.

Consider the peacetime cargo lift of our import and export trade for only 1 year. The United States Corps of Engineers reported that during 1952 we imported and exported nearly 250 billion tons of waterborne cargo. Surely, it would be to our advantage to have our own merchant marine transport these raw materials, foodstuffs, and manufactured items instead of paying substantial sums to other nations to do it for us.

Our own sea transportation services are known for their dependability, accessibility, speed, and economy. The merchant marines of other nations serve their own national needs first and last. Surely, our own needs should be met first by our own merchant marine, manned by our own men, using our own strategically placed ports to strengthen our own peacetime economy.

Fleet Adm. Ernest King, in charge of United States naval operations in World War II, has stated: "The merchant marine is a strong bulwark of national defense in peace and war and a buttress to sound national economy—it is an integral part of our country's armed might during time of crisis."

As has been demonstrated fully in the past three or four decades, our merchant marine is an indispensable arm of defense. Proof of its usefulness in times of peace is self-evident as well. Those who framed the national shipping policy were wise, indeed, to provide that American privately owned shipping should carry a substantial portion of our foreign commerce.

While American vessels in the tramp trades were being withdrawn from the sealanes for lack of cargoes, American tax dollars were being used by Government agencies to carry Government cargoes in foreign bottoms, to and from this country, or in the cross trades, because of the reduced rates of the low-wage shipping of foreign nations.

Fortunately, the Senate Water Transportation Subcommittee, of which I had the honor to serve as chairman, was instrumental in advancing the enactment of a bill to require use of American-flag vessels for the carriage of at least 50 percent of all Government cargoes of this nature. We took the position that American shipping has a right to such cargo preference—that its very survival against foreign competition would be much enhanced through such cargo-preference aid. Cargoes are what our shipping needs—and wants—now. More cargoes are the best possible aid we could give our shipping.

Let me assure you, in closing, that it is a pleasure, indeed to join with groups like yours in promoting the merchant marine. I am positive you share my belief that the job still before us is not an easy one.

A great deal remains to be done—in your field as well as in the Congress, before American shipping is firmly established as a valuable adjunct of our economy, and as an effective arm of defense.

With all such interested groups working together, I am confident that the goal can be achieved. But we could fail again, as we have so many times before, unless we all do our full part to enlist the interest of both citizenry and Congress.

Marxist Economic Jujitsu

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. MALONE

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, December 2, 1954

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article titled "Marxist Economic Jujitsu," published in the September 24, 1954, issue of the magazine U. S. A., noting renewed efforts to create what the author, Newton H. Fulbright, refers to as a "universal socialist state" as disclosed in the report of the Minerals, Materials and Fuels Economic Subcommittee of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARXIST ECONOMIC JUJITSU

(By Newton H. Fulbright)

Webster's New International Dictionary defines the Japanese art of jujitsu as depending "largely upon the principle of making use of an opponent's strength and weight to disable or injure him and by applying pressure so that his opposing movement will throw him out of balance."

The principle of jujitsu in economics has been applied against the United States since World War II. Its result has been to disrupt and dislocate our national economy to an extent little realized by the American people.

The story of how this was accomplished, together with a disturbing survey of the results, is contained in the 380-page report of the subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, headed by Senator GEORGE W. MALONE, Republican, of Nevada, which recently concluded a 10-month study of our raw-materials resources.

To begin with, the investigators found that the State Department had acquired power under the 1934 Trade Agreement Act to negotiate trade treaties and adjust tariffs without consent of Congress. This permitted second- and third-echelon planners to open our ports to a flood of cheap foreign materials on the theory that we are a have-not Nation, that our once bountiful supply of mineral wealth and raw materials has been exhausted. The investigators found that Harry Dexter White, the Communist agent, had sold this theory through a memorandum dated March 7, 1944, which he addressed to former Secretary of the Treasury Henry Morgenthau, Jr.

On the heels of this the subcommittee discovered a four-point program for international allocation of commodities and price controls that was drawn up in the State Department, largely by Alger Hiss. This program became the basis for various international and United Nations conferences looking to the creation of an International Trade Organization, which Congress vetoed in May 1948.

The International Materials Conference was then launched without congressional approval by the State Department in 1950. It operated throughout the Korean war and resulted in the withholding of military supplies from this country at a critical time and threw into unemployment thousands of American workingmen in industries that were unable to secure the necessary raw materials to remain in production.

The Senate investigators, questioning miners, engineers, industrialists, and experts in government, asserted that the have-not theory was false. They showed how the program, making us a part of an international Marxist-backed cartel for the allocation of the world's supply of raw materials at prices which nations with a lower standard of living than ours can afford, had done much harm to this Nation in time of war.

U. N. FOLLOWS LEAD

Observing that the International Materials Conference has been discontinued, the investigators warned that a new effort to establish a similar organization is currently in progress in the United Nations Economic and Social Council, which promises to tax the wealth of this country to bring about our own destruction.

The subcommittee report states that last January a committee of experts appointed by the U. N. Secretary General presented a study entitled "Commodity Trade and Economic Development." This study had been authorized in December 1952, under Resolution 623 of the Seventh Session of the General Assembly of the U. N., on a motion introduced by the United States delegation. On the basis of this study, the U. N. Economic and Social Council voted a resolution last April 30 to establish a permanent Advisory Commission on International Trade, which, in the words of the subcommittee report, would reestablish the International Trade Organization that was killed by Congress in 1948.

The Senators noted with approval that the present United States delegate to the Economic and Social Council, Preston Hotchkis, had voted against the proposal. Nevertheless, it was adopted, 12 to 5 with 1 abstention.

The investigators, questioning engineers, mining experts, industrialists and authorities in Government, concluded such an international organization, "setting up controls over the distribution of the production and consumption of the world's goods, could inhibit our going-concern industries."

The report added: "It is important to realize that many of the countries who were furthering this resolution (including the U. S. S. R.) wished to establish a world system of parity prices for raw materials under the auspices of the U. N., and also wished to discourage the production of synthetic rubber and synthetic fibers in the United States which might displace natural products."

OBJECTION OVERRULED

The subcommittee noted that the opposition of Mr. Hotchkis indicated a change of attitude in the State Department—on the surface, at least—in regard to Marxist-backed international controls. Samuel C. Waugh, Assistant Secretary of State, told the Senators that the present Government was opposed to such trade agreements and that he did not feel that the United States would be morally bound by any commitment entered into by the United Nations.

That remains to be seen.

Providing ready propaganda for those who would have us continue on the road to world allocations and price controls is the report of the President's Materials Policy Commission, which was appointed in 1951, by former President Truman with William S. Paley, chairman of the Board of CBS, as its chairman.

The Senate subcommittee report states that "in view of the use of this document as an authentic authoritative source of information on all resource problems by so many organizations, the subcommittee made a staff study of the entire report."

It added: "The report of this commission (submitted in December 1952), popularly known as the Paley report, has * * * been widely quoted by economists, conservationists and social scientists. It has been referred to in international meetings and in the discussions at the United Nations as an authoritative text.

"In fact, it has even been used as the theme for the textbook dealing with natural resources now used at the United States Military Academy at West Point. It has had a profound influence on the policies of many government agencies dealing with the production of critical materials."

PUNCTURING PALEY

The investigators discovered that "many persons interested in promoting the one-world theory of trade controls have attempted to use the report of the Paley Commission to show that the United States is in imminent danger of becoming a have-not nation."

They found that Edward S. Mason, an important member of the Commission, had played a key role in forming State Department economic policies during the early months of 1945 when Alger Hiss was issuing his four-point program for the control of world trade. They found that Mr. Mason had written a book, Controlling World Trade, which was published in 1946 by the Committee for Economic Development. The book dealt with commodity stabilization proposals which were later embodied in chapter VI of the Habana Charter, which was rejected by Congress but was later incorporated in the International Materials Conference to our disadvantage during the Korean war.

The Paley report fully endorsed this principle. On page 87, volume 1, in discussing the Habana Charter, it had this to say:

"The United States has not ratified the treaty, but under a resolution of the United Nations Economic and Social Council is bound with other nations to recognize chapter VI as a general guide."

In questioning Mr. Paley, the subcommittee found he strongly supported the Commission's recommenadtion that our tariffs be lowered still further and that the Buy American Act be repealed. On the other hand, evidence given by mining engineers, industrialists, and many Government employees with engineering backgrounds, failed to support Mr. Paley's views on this subject.

The subcommittee found that some members of the Commission itself expressed "some doubts about the wisdom of the recommendations" contained in the report, and claimed their original words "have been picked up by others and are used to embarrass the United States in international negotiations."

One of the chief criticisms leveled at the Paley report was that the Commission staff was not composed of "men experienced or well grounded in the field of production of minerals or other materials." The investigators found the Commission "woefully lacking" in skilled engineers, geologists, and men with industrial backgrounds. "Its report is a compendium," the subcommittee said, "worked out by economists and theorists based upon statistical assumptions of questionable validity."

PROJECTIONS AND PREDICTIONS

The subcommittee looked carefully into the techniques used by the Paley Commission in making certain long-range projections quoted by many prominent groups to indicate that this country will have exhausted its mineral supply by 1975. When questioned, both Mr. Paley and Mr. Mason stressed that these projections should not be taken as predictions. Mr. Paley said:

"I would like to emphasize that we made no prophecies about the amount of materials the United States might be consuming by 1975. Nobody can prophesy a thing like that."

Mr. Mason testified:

"I think you will find if you look at this report that the Commission nowhere predicts. What it does do is to project requirements on the basis of certain assumptions. If these assumptions are correct then the projection might turn out to be a good prediction, but the projection is only as good as the assumption on which it is based and nowhere does the Commission, so far as I remember, make any predictions as to what our requirements are going to be."

The subcommittee report comments that "this statement is noteworthy as the general public may have interpreted the report of the President's Materials Policy Commission as a scientific study predicting supply and demand relationships for numerous commodities during the decade 1970 to 1980."

In a dogged effort to explore the meaning behind the Paley report and the real significance back of the State Department's free-trade policy, the Malone committee called in expert witnesses for their views on the subject.

It was found that Adam Smith, father of the free-trade theory, recognized two limitations which are applicable today. He conceded that "it will generally be advantageous to lay some burden (tariff) upon foreign imports for the encouragement of domestic industry, when some tax is imposed at home upon the production of produce of the latter. In this case it seems reasonable that an equal tax should be imposed upon the like produce of the former"—or the country shipping such produce into the United States in competition with our own labor.

HOW TO GO BROKE

Federal taxes, along with wages, increase the cost of our domestic production. A large proportion of these taxes collected on United States business and industry have gone to finance the capital cost of foreign producers—much of it outright Government gifts. The Senate subcommittee therefore suggested that taxes, as a cost item, be given special consideration in the settlement of our future tariff policy.

Adam Smith realized that opulence, the objective of his theory, must give way in a world beset by animosities. The subcommittee observed that many textbooks on foreign trade now circulated in our colleges develop the theory of free trade in terms of welfare economics in a world at peace. It is ridiculous to pretend to view the current situation in terms of a world at peace. Therefore, the theory of free trade, as envisioned by Adam Smith, is impossible of present attainment.

Impossible, that is, unless the objective is deliberate destruction of the economy of this country. And the subcommittee had to face the grim fact that the same second and third echelon planners are still at work in the State Department, their aims pursued as deviously under a Republican as under a Democratic administration.

The investigators examined in detail the results of our free-trade policy. A few examples will illustrate the general pattern of their findings:

The world's largest and richest known reserves of antimony are in China. Should Red China be seated in the U. N. and subsequently recognized by the State Department, peace would return and exports would again start flowing into this country. The subcommittee observed that in such an event "our domestic mineral industries could be wrecked under our inadequate tariff system as it is operated by the State Department under the Trade Agreement Act of 1934." Witnesses pointed out that mineral producers in the United States and the Western Hemisphere obviously cannot exist in competition with labor that is "virtually slave labor under one of the lowest standards of living in the world."

OUR POLICY BOOMERANGS

The subcommittee found our domestic producers paying the necessary wages to support the American standard of living. But they found the industry also paying taxes into the Economic Cooperation Administration and the Mutual Security Agency, which have advanced hundreds of millions of dollars to European nations to buy copper, lead, and zinc.

England, in a 3-year period, was given $124 million to purchase copper; $64 million to purchase zinc, and $34 million to purchase lead. This financing and drain on American industry, doled out in accordance with the "entitlement of consumption" formula of the International Materials Conference of the Korean war, enabled Britain and other foreign nations to purchase immense quantities of minerals they did not need.

The subcommittee observed that Great Britain "acquired so much lead, zinc, and copper that late in 1952 she dumped lead and zinc on the open United States market in such quantities that the market price completely broke, and a large number of lead and zinc mines in the United States closed down."

The investigators examined the argument that the United States can get materials cheaper abroad than at home—an argument advanced by many who talk out of the opposite side of their mouth about improving the wage of American labor. But the Senators said: "Examination of the Government purchase for the military stockpile shows that in the great majority of cases the contracts call for payment of the American market price delivered in New York or at any other United States port."

Their report adds: "What was even more astonishing was the testimony received from the General Services Administration and the Emergency Procurement Service officials in their recent appearance before the committee when they testified that higher prices had been paid in many instances to foreign producers of strategic and critical materials than to domestic suppliers."

So there it is: a peep into a chamber of horrors.

The subcommittee report offers suggestions for a system of possible incentives to our domestic producers. They are (1) incentive taxation with depletion allowances similar to those in the oil industry which would permit new exploration; (2) adequate prices, and (3) an adequate market.

WHAT DO YOU THINK?

The Senators, in concluding, might well have asked the American people: "What are you going to do about it?" And the American people might well reply to the Senators: "We elected you to look after the welfare of this country." Then there might take place a futile shaking of heads among members of the subcommittee. Because the tragedy of our day is the fact that Congress has been largely eliminated as a force in the control of the destiny of this country.

The amorphous and vicious force that has replaced Congress seems oriented toward one objective: the universal socialist state. It is to be achieved through a jujitsu struggle using the strength and weight of the United States economy against itself.

A Ringside Report on Two Domestic Revolutions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN

OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, December 2, 1954

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "A Ringside Report on Two Domestic Revolutions," delivered by Mr. Charles G. Mortimer, president of the General Foods Corp., before the National Press Club in Washington, D. C., on November 18, 1954.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A RINGSIDE REPORT ON TWO DOMESTIC REVOLUTIONS

(Speech by Charles G. Mortimer, president, General Foods Corp., before the National Press Club, Washington, D. C., November 18, 1954)

The ground we shall cover today is quite different from that covered by your recent speakers—and from what you shall be hearing about tomorrow, I suspect. My subject is considerably more homely than the provocative ideas Mr. Toynbee left with you and not nearly so exciting as what Monsieur Mendes-France will have for your tomorrow. Perhaps you had better think of my offering as the meat-and-potatoes course between a stimulating aperitif and a fascinating dessert.

For I am here to talk to you about food. About the food that makes the United States the best fed nation. And what lies behind it in the way of technology, economics, and human ingenuity. Today's topic is homely, indeed. But it has a powerful universality of interests; it literally concerns every one of us. For we all must eat, and we all must pay for it. How we eat and what we pay for our food today are the questions I want to analyze with you. In their answer lies the story of two sweeping domestic revolutions. It's a story that fascinates me. I hope you will find it interesting.

One of these revolutions is taking place in the American kitchen and the other on the American farm. Both are progressing so quietly that most of us are not consciously aware of them. Both are astonishingly far-reaching although they have taken place in just the last 2 to 3 decades. They are inseparably related to our high standards of living and, to a considerable extent, responsible for it.

Let's look first at the revolution in the kitchen. This one is easy for all of us to grasp because nearly everybody here, I suspect, carries a mental image of his mother spending most of her waking hours in the kitchen, either preparing the next meal or cleaning up from the last. That kind of drudgery fortunately, is no longer necessary in order to serve appetizing, nutritious meals. Today the American housewife spends on the average about 90 minutes a day in preparing three meals. Her emancipation is the result of this revolution I shall describe, and she should get the lion's share of the credit for it. She is the one who revolted. She wanted freedom to live a fuller life—and she got the collaboration of the food industry, the appliance manufacturers, the soap and detergent makers, the women's editors, the university home economists, and other accomplices.

Consider for a moment the drastic change in food-buying habits that has been a vital campaign in this benign rebellion. Today's homemaker will have none of her predecessor's chores of washing, peeling, shelling, plucking, and blanching; much of the food she puts on the table comes ready to serve or nearly so. She uses 12 times as many frozen vegetables as she did 15 years ago. She feeds her youngsters 15 times more canned baby food than she did then. Today one serving of coffee out of three in America's homes is instant coffee made in the cup; 6 years ago it was one in 16. Frozen orange concentrate is perhaps the most spectacular of the prepared foods in terms of increased use; 50 times as much is sold today as was sold 8 years ago.

These convenience foods not only save the housewife time in preparation; they offer other important values too. They contain real built-in extra qualities or, as one of my colleagues calls it, "built-in maid service." For when the homemaker buys a package of frozen beans instead of hulling the Ford Hooks herself or a box of cake mix instead of making a cake from the ground up, she is buying these extras:

1. Extra service—cleaning, peeling, cutting up, measuring, and mixing.
2. Extra time saving—precooking and portioning.
3. Extra quality—superior grades, freshness, and uniformity of result.
4. Extra nutrition—retention of vitamins, minerals, and other nutrients as well as flavor.
5. Extra convenience—easy storing and serving thanks to modern, handy packages.

These added values have been, we might say, blended into her recipe by the food technologists who developed them through research and the processing plant employees who put up the packages.

In food as in other things, extra quality costs more money. So does the added service and convenience we are putting into our packages. Two questions, it seems to me, are implicit in this development.

1. Are consumers willing to pay the additional cost?
2. Are they getting their money's worth?

The answer to the first question is obvious from the record. We still have complete freedom of choice in America's food stores, and homemakers would not buy convenience foods if they did not want to. The figures indicate they are buying them voluntarily, willingly, almost eagerly. The average supermarket today stocks about 5,000 different packaged food items as compared with about 1,500 twenty years ago. America's food bill this year will be $64 billion, or just over 25 percent of our disposable income. Prior to World War II we were spending 23 percent of our disposable income for food, but if we were buying the same food today in the same quantities at present prices, our food basket would take only 17 percent of our disposable income.

The cost of getting our food from the farm gate to the dinner table will be about $24 billion this year. That includes the expenses of storing, transporting, processing, wholesaling, retailing, and merchandising.

In buying these processing and marketing services, is the consumer getting her money's worth? The Department of Agriculture has obligingly provided the answer to this question. It made a test recently which showed that meals comprised of ready-to-serve foods costs about one-third more money but require three-fourths less time than meals prepared from scratch in the kitchen. By computing the relative costs of the two types of meals versus the time spent by the housewife, the Department found she could earn 45 cents an hour if she used no processed or precooked foods. My oldest married son pays a teen-age baby sitter more than that.

There are other implications in this kitchen revolution beyond its economics. Those who look only upon the cost in dollars and the savings in women's time miss its real significance. So also do those who view packaged cake mixes, precooked foods, and instant beverages only as ingenious conveniences which make the housewife's lot an easier one. Our homemakers have not swung to processed foods only as a means of reducing work but rather to gain time for other important things. This dramatic shift in homemaking practices represents a new phenomenon in our social system as revolutionary as the assembly line and the use of replaceable parts have been in our industrial system. Indeed, you might say that American women today are adopting—or would it be adapting?—the principles worked out by our industrial pioneers to the age-old routine of housekeeping. Instead of spending long hours in the preparation of each meal by tedious, time-consuming hand methods, they are—quite sensibly—devoting their efforts, first, to "designing" appetizing, well-balanced meals for their families and then to "assembling" them from processed or ready-to-serve packaged foods. As the "finishing" touch, they add an expert pinch of seasoning, perhaps an egg, or an apprporiate topping. Thus they have copied the industrialist's technique and gone him one better. For they assemble their products from mass-produced parts and yet come out with a custom model, suited to their families' needs and palates. It may well be that the young husband of tomorrow will boast, not of the dishes mother used to make, but of the dishes mother used to serve.

And the end of this heartening change is not yet in sight. We of General Foods believe that the homemakers of America are today seeing only the beginning of their emancipation from the tediousness and drudgery of old-style hand-labor housekeeping. We believe the homemakers of tomorrow will—and rightly should—have many more free hours and much unspent energy to devote to their children; to doing things and going places with their husbands; to the enjoyment of art, music, and literature; to engaging in worthwhile community activities; and to playing the important role women must play in the affairs of this confused and troubled world if we are ever to get it back onto a sane and peaceful basis.

Suppose we leave the kitchen revolution now and take a look at the other—the one on the farm. This one is, if anything, even less understood and appreciated than the one in the kitchen. Perhaps it is because all of us have had first-hand experience with kitchens, but only a minority of Americans today have personal acquaintance with farming. Or because it is the more complex of the two. Or—and this is most likely—because it has taken place so recently—principally in the last 15 years and largely since the war.

As newspapermen you are surely familiar with the picture that is most frequently drawn of the American farmer—spare, lean, independent character in patched blue jeans with an overworked wife, 1 cow, 4 pigs, 30 chickens, 6 kids, and a big mortgage. He gets up at 4 a. m. to milk by kerosene lamp and to scratch at 40 stony acres with a horse-drawn plow. This is a colorful picture, but it has a major flaw: it simply isn't true. It may portray the average farmer of 75 or 100 years ago or the little dirt farmer of today. But it is as remote from the agriculturalist of today as the streamlined 1954 kitchen is from the one in which your grandmother labored.

Today's scientific farmers are masters of efficiency in production. They rival industrialists when it comes to mechanization, lowered labor costs per unit, and increased output per man-hour. Technical advances on the Nation's farms in the last 15 years have permitted them to increase their total crop output by 40 percent with 20 percent less workers. Production per man-hour of farm labor is two-thirds larger today than it was in 1939, and that is just about double the rate of increase in manufacturing productivity during the same period. This has come about through developing better seed strains, wider use of fertilizer, and an astounding increase in the use of farm machinery. From 1941 to 1953, for example, the number of tractors on American farms increased 263 percent. The use of motor trucks increased 228 percent, of grain combines, 418 percent, and of corn pickers, 529 percent. And in this same period, the number of horses and mules has declined 60 percent.

This remarkable increase in efficiency and this heavy investment in capital equipment certainly transform the American farmer into a businessman and a capitalist—as contrasted with the rugged figure in the faded blue jeans. In many respects, he is as much a businessman as any industrialist. In his animal husbandry and agronomy, he utilizes the fruits of research, just as industry does. To finance his equipment, he turns to the banks. He watches the fluctuation of market prices and calculates inventory values and anticipated revenues. He must keep careful cost and tax records, and he thinks of his income in terms of return on money invested.

Considering farming as big business, let's look for a moment at the American farmer's balance sheet. Total farm assets in the United States at the beginning of this year were about $160 million, an increase of $20 billion in the preceding 5 years. In that same period total farm liabilities—that is, mortgages and other borrowings—increased from about $12 billion to $17 billion, or $5 billion as compared to the $20 billion growth in assets. By industry's standards, this is pretty healthy. One of our balance sheet yardsticks is the asset-to-debt ratio—meaning what you have versus what you owe. A bit of quick arithmetic shows that the farmer's asset-to-debt ratio, $160 billion to $17 billion, is a little better than 9 to 1. In the food processing industry it is only about 2½ to 1.

I do not intend to create the impression here that I think farming is an easy life or that all farmers are getting rich all over the United States. Nor do I mean to imply that these national statistics on ratios increases, and averages apply to all types of farming, in all regions, or for all crops. I am under no illusions about the problems of the farmer and the importance of beating the averages if you want to succeed. For more than 20 years, I have operated a farm, and I breed Holstein cattle and Morgan horses. On my farm I have a herd which yields 2½ times the national average milk production. As a farmer with a business experience, I'll tell you frankly that I am unwilling to pay for the luxury of bovine companionship—which is about all you get from an average cow.

Speaking of averages the farmer today receives an average of 44 cents from every dollar the consumer spends for food. His share, to be sure, varies for individual products from as much as 70 cents to as little as 15 cents. However, that 44-cent average has been the subject of considerable sharp discussion lately, particularly during our recent biennial political catharsis. It has dropped about 6 cents since the immediate post-war period, when farm prices were abnormally high because of an unusual demand situation. But 44 cents is as large a share as the farmer got in any year from 1920 to 1939 and equal to the long-term average from 1920 through 1953.

To those who are bemoaning the farmer's 44-cent share of the food dollar, I would point out several things. First I would insist that nobody is more eager to see the farmer get his just dues than we in the food industry. As businessmen we know that the Nation's prosperity is materially affected by the farmer's prosperity, and for that reason we want to see agriculture prosper. More than that, as food processors we are in a sense the farmers' partners. And we desire a sound farm economy as a means of insuring dependable sources of supply for our raw products.

Next I would point out that, because of the kitchen revolution, the housewife is buying far more than raw food in her market basket today and that the extra, built-in values cost money, as I noted earlier. It takes wages to pay for the cleaning, freezing, precooking, and packaging that the housewife now expects, and those wages, too, come out of the consumer's food dollar. Thus, the labor involved in processing and selling accounts for nearly 31 cents of the food dollar today instead of the 23½ cents it cost in 1947. In other words, the increase in the worker's share has more than offset the decrease in the farmer's.

And if not only the primary wages but the secopdary and tertiary are included in the reckoning—such as pay to the miners of the nitrates in the fertilizer, wages of mechanics on the tin-can lines and the lumberjacks who fell the pulpwood for the packages—I dare say a portion of the food dollar more like 80 or 90 percent goes to pay for people—and pay better than they got in 1947. Obviously the change in food habits is putting more money into circulation and creating more jobs and is thus a factor in general national prosperity.

Also, I would suggest that no producer of goods gages his profit in terms of his share of his customer's gross receipts. We certainly don't do it in business; our profit on a product is the difference between our costs and our selling price. The central question, then, it would seem, is not how much of the Nation's food expenditures winds up in the farmer's pocketbook but how do his production costs compare with his selling prices. And in this the improved efficiency which is the outstanding result of the revolution on the farm would be a major factor.

We processors of packaged, convenience foods occupy ringside seats, you might say, at both of these revolutions. That is why I feel reasonably qualified to comment on them here today, although I am not a spokesman for the entire food industry. In fact, General Foods' total output represents only about 2 percent of the food volume in the United States. But since many of our raw ingredients are purchased from American farmers, we are close observers of the revolution on the farm.

As for the revolution in the kitchen, I can speak with more authority since we produce five of the six convenience foods which lead the parade today in terms of volume—soluble coffee, frozen poultry, prepared cake mixes, frozen fruits and juices, and frozen vegetables. (The sixth, to appease your curiosity, is canned baby foods.) Some of our products illustrate by sharp contrast the full extent of the change in food preparation. To show you what I mean, let me quote briefly from the page of the Fannie

Farmer Cook Book which brides of 50 years ago referred to when they wanted to clean a fish:

"To clean fish: This is done by drawing a knife over fish, beginning at tail and working toward head, occasionally wiping knife and scales from fish. Incline knife slightly toward you to prevent scales from flying. The largest number of scales will be found on the flank. Wipe thoroughly inside and out with cloth wrung out of cold water, removing any clotted blood which may be found adhering to the backbone. * * * To skin fish: With sharp knife remove skin along the back and cut off a narrow strip of skin the entire length of back. Loosen skin on one side from bony part of gills, and being once started if fish is fresh it may be readily drawn off; if flesh is soft, don't work too quickly, as it will be badly torn."

And so on and on, through still more complicated and somewhat gruesome procedures which became even more laborious if the fish was to be boned and filleted. All this before the housewife of 1905 could start to burn her fingers in the hot grease or fill her kitchen with clouds of fish-laden smoke.

Compare that with the directions on the package of Birds Eye Fish Sticks like those served as canapes at the bar here today. This is substantially what it says:

"Heat and serve." Period.

This incident of the kitchen revolution also illustrates in a way our philosophy of the grocery business as it is today. We view it in terms of coffee without the pot, cake without the muss and fuss, fish without the cooking smell, and now salad dressing in an envelope.

Perhaps a couple of brief chapters from General Foods' history will serve to illustrate the complexity and the sometimes tough economics of the processed food industry. The frozen food story is a good one. You perhaps know how it begins—how a fur trader named Clarence Birdseye conceived the idea from his experiences in the arctic regions. During the twenties he perfected his techniques and formed a small company to process and sell quick-frozen fish, fruits, and vegetables. But he met a stone wall of consumer resistance. In 1929, our company acquired his business, patents, and about a million and a half pounds of frozen foods that hadn't sold. It was an enormous gamble. Not only was the depression setting in, but there was endless pioneer work to be done—a whole new food technology to develop, distribution problems to solve, and expensive promotion to be undertaken that would educate consumers to new habits and new attitudes. To make a long and costly story short, Birds Eye ran in the red for a number of years while General Foods poured millions of dollars into the launching of this new industry. Today, of course, the gamble is paying off—though not excessively handsomely for us or any other processor. For it is a fiercely competitive business, with more than 1,200 companies in the field.

The frozen food story is a corollary of the kitchen revolution. Our market 20 years ago was the people who like strawberries in December and ocean fish in the hinterland. Today it includes all of the emancipated homemakers who want to serve their family a good beef pie without spending hours putting it together or spinach, cleaned and stemmed and with the sand washed out.

This story is also a corollary of the farm revolution—or at least a parallel historical development. Consider its effect on agriculture. Quick-freezing has broadened and stabilized the markets for fresh fruits, vegetables, and poultry by overcoming storage and shipping obstacles that formerly placed both seasonal and geographical restrictions on the sale of many perishable crops. In Florida, for example, the orange growers were formerly plagued with highly seasonal market swings and troublesome surpluses. Now more than half the Florida orange crop is sold for frozen concentrates.

Today's lunch, I think, makes the point even better than I can. The Birds Eye chicken was grown, cleaned, and frozen on Maryland's Eastern Shore, where poultry growing has brought new prosperity in the last decade. The minute rice was grown somewhere in the South and cooked in Houston. The asparagus grew in Washington State and was cleaned, trimmed, and frozen in Yakima. The wheat for the flour in the devil's food cake was grown in the Middle West, and the mix was blended in Evansville, Ind. The fish in the canapes was probably caught off the Grand Banks of Newfoundland, cleaned and frozen in Maine, and cooked and packed in Massachusetts. And the instant coffee, whose original ingredients came from several other lands, was brewed, dehydrated, and packaged in Hoboken, N. J.

Speaking of instant coffee, that story too is, in a way, typical of what is involved in launching and selling a new convenience food. Our original Maxwell House soluble coffee product, produced first for the military, was marketed soon after the war. It was a good product for its time, but it did not achieve the success we expected despite the selling power of the famous brand it bore. Our labs then went to work to develop a fine-flavored soluble coffee with high consumer acceptance. And they achieved it. When we had a product we could place our confidence in, our marketing people began the hard and costly job of winning customers. We invested substantial sums of money in promotion of the product before it began to pay its own way. Now, of course, it is well established, and the investment is paying dividends.

This story, in my opinion, points up the importance of advertising as an element in these two revolutions. Too often these days the validity of expenditures for advertising as part of food distribution is questioned. Those who raise this question lose sight of the fact that advertising, which is an economical form of selling, is needed to bring product and market together—especially in these times of self-service food stores. Technologists may perfect the product, and the public may be subconsciously ready for it. But without advertising to create appetites and stimulate conscious demand, the rapid growth of new products—with its accompanying benefits for farmers, processors, and consumers—would not take place.

I think I have said enough to give you an idea of how the food industry is meeting the twin challenge of the revolutions on the farm and in the kitchen. Now, what about the future? Your president, Tony Vaccaro, asked me to gaze into the crystal ball and discuss some of the developments which might be expected. His first question was, "Will kitchens be necessary in the future?" I can't answer that one yes or no, but I can promise you they'll be different, as different from today's kitchen as that is from grandmother's with her wood stove and her flour bin. I'm sure it will contain more freezer space and larger packing shelves, and I suspect the cooking range will be smaller. I suspect also that the meat grinder and the pressure canner will disappear, as will the other accoutrements of the homemade, hand-built meal.

Whatever the shape of things to come as far as the food industry is concerned, it will be determined in large measure by the work that is being done today in America's modern food-research centers, both in industry, in Government agencies, and on university campuses. In our plans for the future, we place heavy emphasis on research. Since the end of World War II, we have invested more than $20 million in scientific research. Last year the figure was $4.2 million, and this year we have allocated something more than $5 million. We have also outgrown our present laboratory facilities in Hoboken, N. J., and we are even now, as you may have noted, in the process of acquiring land in Tarrytown, N. Y., where we plan to erect one of the Nation's outstanding food-research centers.

It would be presumptuous for me to try to assess the combined scientific efforts of private and public research. But it may be interesting to indicate some of the directions which research is taking in the food field.

One possibility is irradiating foods, exposing vegetables, meats, and other foods to mild gamma radiation which eliminates bacteria and thereby greatly increases shelf life. The Army and the Atomic Energy Commission has already demonstrated that, through the use of waste fission materials, the shelf life of prepackaged meat products can be increased from 3 to nearly 21 days at very low cost. Testing to date has indicated that the radiation is not absorbed by the food and that the process will be harmless.

Another fundamental problem on which many food scientists are at work is increasing the efficiency with which we produce and utilize protein. Remarkable things have been done, as you know, in the fields of vitamins, minerals, and carbohydrates. But our mastery of proteins is not so far advanced as is our management of those other important nutrients. One of the ambitious research projects in this connection, as you have probably read, is the attempt to utilize algae from the sea as livestock feed.

A fascinating aspect of food research is its complexity and diversity. On the one hand it embraces the very foundations of the life process, as in the two problems we have just examined. On the other, it involves such highly refined and subjective questions as the vagaries of flavor and human taste preference. As an example of the work in this area I might mention the problem of aroma in instant coffee. It is no trade secret that in the process of producing instant coffee some of the aroma is lost. This in turn affects people's acceptance of the product because of the complicated relationship between the senses of taste and smell. In General Foods' Laboratories scientists have studied this problem for some time. One of their findings—and an indication of the scope of the problem—is that the substance which produces the aroma constitutes only 10 parts per million in brewed coffee, yet it is composed of more than 50 identifiable compounds. You can readily appreciate what we are up against in trying to do something about this small but critical problem.

To turn again, in closing, to the question of what's ahead in food, I would say simply this: When you stand midstream in a revolution, who can tell what will come of it? Who knows with any degree of certainty what brave new world will evolve from the efforts of people to better their conditions in any field? I think as I said earlier, that we are still in the early stages of the revolutions on the farm and in the kitchen. I think that the combined labor of farmers, food scientists, Government officials, university faculties, food processors, appliance manufacturers, and America's homemakers—especially the homemakers—will lead to undreamed of improvements in the feeding of this great Nation and of the rest of the world. And from that certain progress, the inevitable result will be, of course, a better life for everybody.

Thank you.

Bravery of Army Engineer From Idaho Brings Posthumous Medal of Honor Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY C. DWORSHAK

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, December 2, 1954

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a Department of Defense release citing an Army engineer from Idaho for a posthumous Medal of Honor award.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BRAVERY OF ARMY ENGINEER FROM IDAHO BRINGS POSTHUMOUS MEDAL OF HONOR AWARD

Cpl. Dan. D. Schoonover, an Army engineer from Boise, Idaho, has been awarded the Medal of Honor for 2 days of sustained bravery that cost him his life in fierce fighting near Sokkogae, Korea, in July 1953, Secretary of the Army Robert T. Stevens announced today.

Only 19 years old, Corporal Schoonover was a squad leader in Company A, 13th Engineer Combat Battalion of the Seventh Infantry Division, when he and his men were attached to Company G, 17th Infantry Regiment of the same division. The engineers were to act as demolition teams in Company G's counterattack against the enemy on "Pork Chop Hill" during the evening of July 8, 1953, an an effort to regain previously lost vital positions.

Due to intense enemy fire, the engineers could not perform their appointed mission, so Corporal Schoonover immediately organized his squad to fight as riflemen. Later, when an infantry squad leader became a battle casualty, the Idaho engineer took command of the rifle squad and led it like a "seasoned infantry noncommissioned officer," according to reports from the battlefield. He repeatedly disregarded his own safety in order to better direct his men and to be in a position to radio for artillery fire upon the onrushing foe. On occasion he singlehandedly attacked enemy bunker positions and either killed or captured the bunker occupants.

After Company G was relieved by another infantry company, Corporal Schoonover voluntarily remained with the new unit and continued to fight as a rifleman. On the morning of July 10, 1953, while pouring devastating automatic rifle fire into hostile positions, he was hit by enemy mortar fire and died at his post.

Through his courageous actions and expert leadership, Corporal Schoonover saved the lives of many of his comrades, personally accounted for hundreds of enemy casualties, and rendered immeasurable aid to the infantry units in completing their mission.

An eyewitness description of some of the Idaho engineer's heoric actions is provided by Pvt. William D. Cummins, of Somerset, Ky., who was a member of Corporal Schoonover's engineer squad. Private Cummins is still serving in the Far East command.

"I was a member of Corporal Schoonover's engineer squad and was usually within 5 or 10 feet of him until we went up the hill. During the time we were on the hill I was in a trench on Outpost Pork Chop and had an excellent view of Corporal Schoonover's actions as he was usually within a 100-yard radius of me. On the morning of July 9, 1953, he was on a hill manning a machine gun for about 4 hours. He was one of a group of men who volunteered to go up the hill and take some bunkers. Corporal Schoonover remained there most of the morning. He made several trips up the hill on the afternoon of the same day. With a Browning automatic rifle he moved into close contact with the enemy on many occasions and was responsible for a great many Chinese casualties.

"He did not seem to have any fear at all as he sood in the open, exposed to enemy mortar and intense artillery fire in order to direct rifle fire of his men. He called in artillery fire on the enemy also, while he remained exposed to the heavy fire. It would be impossible to give an accurate account of the large number of enemy casualties that resulted from Corporal Schoonover's actions.

"The bravery displayed by Corporal Schoonover far exceeded anything that was expected of him. The fact that he was an engineer soldier, and not normally required to fight as he did, make his actions more outstanding. His leadership and courage served as an inspiration to all who knew him."

The 71st Medal of Honor winner to be announced by the Army for the fighting in Korea, Corporal Schoonover resided with his mother, Mrs. Velda A. Hess, of 1702 Leadville Street, Boise, Idaho, when he enlisted in the Regular Army in January 1951, for 3 years. After training in the United States, he was assigned to the Far East command in July 1951. Corporal Schoonover was born in Boise on Actober 8, 1933.

Details of the presentation ceremony will be announced later.

Text of the Medal of Honor citation follows:

"Cpl. Dan D. Schoonover, Corps of Engineers, United States Army, a member of Company A, 13th Engineer Combat Battalion, Seventh Infantry Division, distinguished himself by conspicuous gallantry and outstanding courage above and beyond the call of duty in action against the enemy near Sokkogae, Korea, from July 8 to 10, 1953. He was in charge of an engineer demolition squad attached to an infantry company which was committed to dislodge the enemy from a vital hill. Realizing that the heavy fighting and intense enemy fire made it impossible to carry out his mission, he voluntarily employed his unit as a rifle squad and, forging up the steep, barren slope, participated in the assault on hostile positions. When an artillery round exploded on the roof of an enemy bunker, he courageously ran forward and leaped into the position, killing one hostile infantryman and taking another prisoner. Later in the action, when friendly forces were pinned down by vicious fire from another enemy bunker, he dashed through the hail of fire, hurled grenades in the nearest aperture, then ran to the doorway and emptied his pistol, killing the remainder of the enemy. His brave action neutralized the position and enabled friendly troops to continue their advance to the crest of the hill. When the enemy counterattacked he constantly exposed himself to the heavy bombardment to direct the fire of his men and to call in an effective artillery barrage on hostile forces. Although the company was relieved early the following morning, he voluntarily remained in the area, manned a machine gun for several hours, and subsequently joined another assault on enemy emplacements. When last seen he was operating an automatic rifle with devastating effect until mortally wounded by artillery fire. Corporal Schoonover's heroic leadership during 2 days of heavy fighting, superb personal bravery and willing self-sacrifice inspired his comrades and saved many lives, reflecting lasting glory upon himself and upholding the honored traditions of the military service."

St. Ignatius Indian Mission Centennial Celebration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, December 2, 1954

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, on September 24 of this year 8,000 citizens of Montana and other States of the Nation assembled on the site of the historic Indian Mission of St. Ignatius to celebrate its centennial anniversary. The celebration took place under the canopy of blue Montana skies on a typical Indian summer day, when all nature seemed to combine to make the scene appropriate to the occasion. It was a memorable event and was flittingly celebrated by a pontifical mass and a series of Indian pageants signifying the history of that early period in the growth and development of the great Northwest.

There was the traditional procession of the Flathead Indians, dramatizing and portraying the burial of Christ. There were other memorable events in connection with this centennial celebration, including the display of 1,400 museum items centering around the restoration of that 100-year-old log building in which the first missionaries to Montana's Indians lived and carried on their missionary programs with the Flathead Indians. All these matters, Mr. President, singly and collectively, made the centennial celebration of the St. Ignatius Indian Mission one of the most interesting events occurring in our country.

Distinguished members of the Catholic clergy from distant sections of the country came to Montana to participate in this celebration. Francis Cardinal Spellman, archbishop of New York, delivered the sermon which followed the solemn pontifical high mass, celebrated by the Most Reverend Joseph M. Gilmore, D. D., bishop of Helena. Cardinal Spellman's sermon rang out over the crowd in two languages—white-haired Father Louis Taelman translated the sermon afterward, giving it in the language of the Salish Indians. Cardinal Spellman also delivered the major address at the luncheon which followed. It was an address of such importance that I wish to call it to the attention of my colleagues in the Senate. It was a patriotic address which moved the feelings of all who heard it.

The cardinal's description of what the American flag meant to him as he saw it flying over American encampments in many sections of the world in the course of his recent travels, his contrast of the meaning of that flag of ours as compared with the Red flag of tyranny, symbol of serfdom and pagan oppression, was most impressive.

So, too, was the cardinal's interpretation of the real meaning of liberty as the true guide to America's future. And, Mr. President, nothing could be more apropos here in the Senate just 2 months after Cardinal Spellman spoke at St.

Ignatius than two lines from the closing words of his address, lines which read as follows:

> For not to those who hate, but to those who love belongs the future.

Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that the address of His Eminence, Francis Cardinal Spellman, be set forth in the Appendix of the Record, and I sincerely hope that it will be read with the full attention it deserves by every Member of this body.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

ADDRESS OF HIS EMINENCE, FRANCIS CARDINAL SPELLMAN, AT THE CIVIC LUNCHEON FOLLOWING THE SOLEMN PONTIFICAL MASS OF THANKSGIVING, COMMEMORATING THE CENTENARY OF THE FOUNDING OF ST. IGNATIUS MISSION, MONTANA, SEPTEMBER 24, 1954

With great happiness I accepted the gracius invitation of Bishop Gilmore to come to Montana to unite with the clergy, religious and laity of the diocese of Helena in a Mass of Thanksgiving commemorating the observance of the centenary of St. Ignatius Mission. Surely no people of any other State have more valid reasons for thanksgiving, for, within our mighty and majestic Nation there is none of greater grandeur than your vast and beautiful State of Montana. "Treasure State" of our beloved United States, Montana has been blest by abundant natural glories, blest too by a faithful, stalwart people, and by devoted missionaries who, inspired and stimulated by nature's wonder works, have accomplished great and humane works for God as they labored in His Holy name, helping, teaching, guarding, and spiritually guiding America's Indians.

On this memorable and joyous occasion, as fervently I thank Almighty God for the manifold splendors with which He has gifted Montana, begging His blessing upon all her people, I beseech of Him especial graces for our soldier sons, who down through the years of our Nation's life, have valiantly fought to protect our treasured heritage of faith and freedom. For, while God has graced America with multiple beauties and wonders, more priceless and wondrous still are the glories symbolized by our flag, which joyously and proudly, I have seen flying aloft in all corners of the world, the flag of freedom that symbolizes justice and love of man for God and his fellowman, stark contradiction to the red flag of tyranny, symbol of serfdom and pagan oppression. I have seen our American flag in wartime and in peacetime; and, as a loyal son of America, I give testimony to the truth that, even in time of war, the message of that flag is peace. With rapt heart I recall the sight of our flag at the masthead of a ship, weaving bright colors above the turbulent waters, beneath a sullen grey sky, which seemed to reflect the world of today, grey with the accumulated clouds of evils and errors of the past, dark with forebodings of disasters yet to come.

Suddenly a gust of wind enfolds the listless standard at the masthead, and, there, challenging the somber colorings of the sky, streams Old Glory: Red with charity for all men and all nations of good will—red, too, with courage to achieve the liberties of man by personal sufferings and sacrifice; white for the basic righteousness of our national purpose; blue for our trust and confidence in God, our Heavenly Father, and, for those who are Catholic, blue, too, with love for the mother of God, to whom our forebears long ago consecrated this land of loveliness, which, by the providence of Almighty God, is the last unfailing hope of embattled humanity struggling for survival against the menace of atheistic communism that would desecrate and destroy both the flesh of man and man's spirit.

As once again publicly I profess my love for our blessed and beloved country, I avow that I would make any sacrifice, as would everyone of you, to help shield her from the least harm inflicted upon her by enemies from within or outside her borders. Upon this love and loyalty do I rest the right to take to task those who are guilty of contributing, not to the goodness and glories of our Nation, but to her sins and shame.

For, now the time has come—God willing it be not too late—for all of us living beneath the protection of America's flag, to bestir ourselves, recollect and recount the blessings of our land, cast off the old and wrinkled skin of timorousness and apathy, and analyze the grandeur of America in the truth-telling light of time. We must take stock of ourselves, of our gains and our losses, and see what can be salvaged from the storehouse of our sons' sacrifice and toil. What we garner from their giving is the grave responsibility of each of us. Each will have a part in the fruitage—unity in a world wherein our children shall learn in liberty to live the love of God and on neighbor, or, disunity in a land wherein our children shall be slaves in a godless world itself enchained.

Which shall it be?

Whither we are being led?

There is, dear friends, one path to peace, one way which can lead men and nations to salvation, and even in these perilous times and at this late day save civilization from destruction. That way, my fellow Americans, is the fearless practice of our faith—faith which is the heartbeat of men, the lifeblood of nations, the blessing of grace that binds men to God.

Faith in our Creator must rise unchallengeable above all else. A multitude of valiant soldiers for God and country bear testimony to this truth. Had Cardinal Mindszenty, Cardinal Stepinac, Bishop Beran, Bishop Ordaz, and a host of other martyred men played traitor to their faith, they would not have become slaves to those shameless, soulless men who planned their destruction. Though their bodies are imprisoned and enslaved, their faithful, selfless souls are free, and the satanicminded men who plotted their living deaths only molded the models of new martyrs.

In memory of our martyred dead, I pray that all Americans may cherish and live their heritage of faith, seeking devoutly to spend themselves for God, their country, and their neighbor. Thus will be prepared within our souls a fertile field in which the seeds of faith and freedom can take firm root and grow. Within my own heart I carry a constant prayer for America's mighty dead who, down through the years have made our country the great and God-blessed Nation that she is today. I say her "mighty dead" with deliberate purpose, and I beg Americans of every faith to strive to keep the sacred promise of Abraham Lincoln, America's greatest martyred son, repledging their plighted word with mine—that our honored dead shall not have died in vain.

Belief in God is the common bond uniting each one of us to the other as we this day observe the centenary of the establishment of St. Ignatius Mission and give thanks for all God's gifts to Montana and to our motherland—America—sanctuary of liberty, democracy, and faith. Standing here among you, I am inspired with great confidence that righteousness shall walk again among the sons of men, and that the world's greatest experiment in self-government can and shall survive amid the changing, perilous tides of our times, as free, loyal Americans, we strive to achieve the peaceful solution of our problems in the light of those ideals of liberty and justice which millions of our sons have fought to save.

It was in December of last year that I left my own New York to fly 8,000 miles to the fighting fronts of Korea to share my third Christmastide with America's soldier sons. The vast distances seemed short, for I followed the path of my heart whose beats paced with the hum of the plane on my way to our boys—some of them your friends and brothers—sacrificing and struggling, suffering and dying in the frozen war-torn lands of the Pacific. Once again I was one with our soldiers, as during the past 12 years I have been one with them on every battlefront of the warring world. Once again, I saw their brave but sad, tired, young faces, as their friendly hands clasped mine. And once again together we prayed.

My longing to be with our soldiers was outmeasured only by the yearning of their loved ones at home, as, privileged by virtue of my ministry, I went humbly in their stead, bringing to dearest sons their mothers' deep devotion, their fathers' blessing, the love of faithful wives and cherished children, and from all I brought fervent prayers and pledges to work together to be worthy of the peace that others of America's precious sons have gained for us. And I dared hope then, as I do now, that all at home, inspired by our soldiers' heroic giving of themselves for us, might better understand the true meaning of peace on earth and more strongly unite to preserve God's peace and the freedoms that He bequeathed to us.

The selfless giving, the sublime sacrifice of mothers' sons in emulation of that first mother's Son who suffered and died that all men might learn to live together in justice and charity and peace exemplifies the true meaning of giving, for no greater gift the human heart can give than life itself. This is the gift our heroic soldiers of the past have made to their beloved America, the priceless gift of service and of self. Our sons had grown in God's good sight in free and loving homes, becoming men, not in the Nazi-Communist mold but in the way America, with dreams, ideals, ambitions stirring in their youthful hearts. Then dawned for them the fateful day of country's call. Strong-hearted, stern-faced, from out a thousand towns and city blocks, from factories and fields of our fair land, they went to meet the challenge of brute force on foreign soil and battlefields, to fight in bitter barbaric war, to safeguard the principles for which our flag and our country stand—"one nation, indivisible, with liberty and justice here for all."

Into the inferno of war that others lighted, America's courageous men arrayed themselves against the dreadful foes of humanity. Gallant and prayerful they coursed through the sky, hurtled o'er the sea, struggled on foot across vast distances, to free fettered peoples and to protect America from the merciless clutch of faithless, hating men. But brighter than inferno's flames of hate burns the flame of love; stronger than chains of slaves are the bonds of freedom, and America's fair dream of liberty for all mankind can still come true if men heed the lesson of our soldiers' giving, the lesson which if learned, would end the bitter quarrels that have ever spilled man's common blood in fruitless waste, the lesson that man must return to God if civilization is to survive. There is no other path to peace for the lone soul or for the mighty nations of the earth.

Dear brother priests and fellow Americans, I pray you to unite your prayers with mine as together we beseech God to implant within the souls of all Americans the faith, love and loyalty that will inspire them willingly to make every sacrifice to help protect our Nation from her enemies. Thus shall we win spiritual triumphs for ourselves and help America to stand strong and united against all perils endangering her liberties—for liberty is America's beacon flaming from every hill and spire and school, declaring man's imperishable urge to exercise those rights under God with full freedom and security. Liberty is America's pledge to peoples yet unborn both near and far, to pass on God's torch of freedom, its light undimmed by the mock light of atheist minds. Liberty is America's glory, for, in this land liberty was born; in this land freedom to exercise God-given rights was won; in this land hunted minorities found haven and homes; in this land enterprise and labor have prospered. Liberty is God's gift to America and faith in God is America's might.

On this memorable occasion of Thanksgiving, as with deathless faith in God we rededicate ourselves to the sacred task of diligently defending our country and our faith, united let us pray:

O blessed Prince of Peace
Who rulest by love and love alone,
We consecrate ourselves to Thee;
With faith and hope and love
We follow Thee,
For not to those who hate, but to those who
love
Belongs the future.
Reign Thou, O God, in the kingdom of Thy
love
And grant, through Thee that men may learn
to live
In happiness and liberty and peace.

Budget Must Be Balanced in Peacetime

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY C. DWORSHAK
OF IDAHO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, December 2, 1954

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD my own remarks, and to include therewith a letter from the Director of the Budget Bureau and a letter from the Commissioner of the United States Civil Service Commission.

There being no objection, the matters referred to were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President, during the campaign of 1952, the Republicans made a solemn pledge to curtail Federal spending and balance the budget as quickly as possible. Although our national preparedness requires spending far in excess of normal requirements, we are not engaged in hot or cold war, and therefore, should be operating the Federal Government under peacetime conditions. Business and employment have been unusually good for the past 2 years, and there is no emergency which justifies abnormal procedures or policies at this time.

Notwithstanding these conditions, the Federal budget has not been balanced. Now, spokesmen for the administration, including Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey, declare they anticipate the budget will be unbalanced during the next fiscal year. The estimated deficit for this fiscal year is $4.7 billion, which exceeds the approximately $3 billion deficit during the preceding fiscal year.

Mr. President, it was generally believed during the past year that both military and economic foreign aid could be reduced materially. Now we hear reports that there is under consideration a proposal to initiate a 10-year so-called Marshall plan for Asiatic countries. Federal spending abroad has maintained high levels during the past 8 years, until now the United States has the largest per capita Federal debt, while the beneficiary countries everywhere have been reducing taxes and cutting down on their indebtedness.

While traveling throughout the State of Idaho the past fall, the most frequent inquiry was directed to the need of balancing the Federal budget under peacetime conditions. Naturally, there is some public support for continued and expanded Federal spending, but in most cases, there is an insistent demand for further economy and efficiency in the operation of the Federal Government.

Upon my recent return to the Capital, I felt compelled to write to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget to emphasize the essential need of effecting greater economy and cutting down on Federal expenditures. It is the responsibility of the administration and the Congress to meet this challenge by actually placing the Federal budget in balance so that fiscal and economic preparedness will be a vital segment of our national defense program. To do otherwise is to break faith with the American people.

Under unanimous consent granted to me, I am inserting a letter dealing with this subject which I received on December 1 from Rowland Hughes, Director of the Bureau of the Budget:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D. C., December 1, 1954.
Hon. HENRY DWORSHAK,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR DWORSHAK: Thank you very much for your letter of November 16. Your support last year as a member of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, and your offer of continued cooperation during the next session of Congress, are greatly appreciated.

As you know, the goal of our fiscal and budgetary policies has been a reduction in Government spending and taxes, and the achievement of a balanced budget. With the cooperation of the Congress we have thus far been able to make substantial progress toward this goal. Expenditures this year are estimated at nearly $14 billion below the estimate for last year made by the previous administration. Tax reductions made during 1954 will total $7.4 billion in the first full year after they are all in effect. The current estimate of the 1955 deficit is $4.7 billion compared with $9.4 billion in 1953.

Sharp cuts have been made in both appropriations and unexpended balances—the two barometers of future spending. Furthermore, instructions have recently been sent to the executive departments and agencies directing that they continue their efforts further to reduce their expenditures within the general budgetary objectives of fiscal soundness, military and economic strength, and the increased welfare of the country. With the continued support of the Congress and of an enlightened public opinion, we are determined to continue our unremitting emphasis on efficiency and economy, and on the elimination of nonessentials from the budget.

We remain fixed in our resolve to reduce Government expenditures as rapidly as our national security and well-being permit and thus to move toward our ultimate goal of a balanced budget. Your expression of support in this task is, indeed, heartening.

Sincerely yours,
ROWLAND HUGHES,
Director.

Mr. President, in the year following the outbreak of fighting in Korea in 1950, more than 600,000 civilian employees were added to the Federal payroll. This administration, since the end of hostilities, has eliminated about one-third of these employees from the payroll, and there has been a consistent downward trend. On October 31, the total civilian personnel in the executive branch was 2,323,029, a reduction of 280,429 from the peak of the Korean campaign on July 31, 1952, when the total figure was 2,603,458. However, the October civilian employment was 361,679 higher than on June 30, 1950, when the hostilities started in Korea.

It is apparent, therefore, that while considerable curtailment has already taken place, the civilian employment is far in excess of the prevailing level just prior to the outbreak of the Korean war. At that time, the total civilian payroll for the preceding fiscal year, 1950, was $6,670,760,884, while for fiscal year 1954, the payroll amounted to $9,465,236,239, or an increase of about 42 percent. It is significant that during that 4-year period, the payroll increased 42 percent in dollars as compared with an 18 percent increase numerically.

Under permission granted me, I am inserting a letter which I received on November 27 from Chairman Philip Young, of the United States Civil Service Commission, as follows:

UNITED STATES
CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., November 26, 1954.
Hon. HENRY DWORSHAK,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR DWORSHAK: I am glad to furnish the information on Federal employment which you requested in your letter of November 16, 1954.

The following table shows the number of Federal employees reported just before Korea, at the peak of the Korean campaign, and the latest available totals:

	All areas	Continental United States	Washington, D. C., metropolitan area
June 30, 1950	1, 961, 350	1, 814, 312	222, 488
July 31, 1952	2, 603, 458	2, 418, 062	260, 763
Sept. 30, 1954	2, 329, 181	2, 141, 147	224, 528

Federal employment increased by 642,108 during the first 2 years of the Korean campaign. Of this increase, 38,275 occurred in the Washington area. Since the downturn in August 1952, the total has declined by 274,277, 36,235 of which occurred in Washington. Federal employment in the Washington area is now only 2,040 higher than it was before Korea, while the total in all areas remains 367,831 higher. Almost 41,000 of this net increase occurred outside the continental United States.

Federal payrolls reported for fiscal years 1954 and 1950 were:

	All areas	Continental United States	Washington, D. C., metropolitan area
1954	$9, 465, 236, 239	$8, 879, 610, 308	$1, 064, 484, 625
1950	6, 670, 760, 884	6, 228, 411, 920	876, 205, 343

You will note that payrolls have increased relatively more than employment, 42 percent versus 18 percent. This is to be expected since pay legislation increased the rates of both Classication Act employees and postal employees in 1951 by about 10 percent and wage-board employees receive wage adjustments at intervals to conform to rates in private industry. More than half of the increase in employment since 1950 occurred among employees paid at prevailing rates. The average (mean) salary rate for this group is 31 percent higher in 1954 than it was in 1950.

If any further information is needed, I shall be glad to supply it.

Sincerely yours,
PHILIP YOUNG,
Chairman.

An Invitation to Slavery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. BRICKER

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, December 2, 1954

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the Appendix of the Record an editorial entitled "An Invitation to Slavery" that appeared in the Cleveland Plain Dealer of November 14, 1954.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

AN INVITATION TO SLAVERY

We have been asked by the United States National Commission for UNESCO (United Nations Economic, Social, and Cultural Organization) to promote the observance of Human Rights Day on December 10, the sixth anniversary of the adoption by the General Assembly of the United Nations of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

We shall do nothing of the kind. Not because we are opposed to human rights. Quite the contrary. Our belief in human rights is deep and fervent. But we oppose the universal declaration because that is an invitation to the people of all the world to vote themselves into slavery—the kind of slavery that would make them the chattels of their governments or perhaps of a world government.

Naturally, there is nothing of this in the declaration. But upon reading it we were reminded of an observation made by the late George Orwell in his essay on Politics and the English Language. He said:

"Political language—and with variations this is true of all political parties, from conservatives to anarchists—is designed to make lies sound truthful and murder respectable, and to give an appearance of solidity to pure wind."

We are opposed to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights for two reasons:

The first is that it is more than a declaration of rights such as are found in the Bill of Rights in the United States Constitution. It is also a declaration of wants and desires which, it claims, is the obligation of governments to satisfy.

Now, it would be wonderful if we could live in some utopia where everyone had all the rest and leisure he wanted, where everybody could pick the kind of a job he wanted and be well paid for it, where everyone lived "an existence worthy of human dignity," and where everyone enjoyed "a standard of living adequate for the health and well-being of himself and of his family, including food, clothing, housing, medical care, and necessary social services" (what are they?).

But when we say that it is the duty of governments to provide these things, and many others, we are inviting government to control our lives and surrendering individual initiative.

Thus, anyone who subscribes to the declaration is asking some government to dominate his life.

Our second reason for opposing the declaration is that if it met with widespread approval there would be renewed demands that the United States Senate ratify the International Covenant on Human Rights, a different document which contains even greater dangers to liberty.

For example, the covenant proclaims the rights to freedom of thought, conscience, and religion, but adds that this right is subject to "such limitations as are pursuant to law and are reasonable and necessary to protect public safety, order, health, or morale or the fundamental rights and freedoms of others."

Likewise, the covenant proclaims the rights of free speech, freedom of the press and other media of communication and of peaceful assembly, but these rights are similarly subject to the limitations enumerated above.

Under the covenant, which some constitutional authorities say would supersede the American Bill of Rights if it were ratified, who would decide when protection of the public safety, order, health, or morale required that these rights be suspended?

The government, of course.

Thus, if we were to ratify the covenant, we would be giving legal sanction to the suppression of human rights by dictator governments, and we would possibly be opening the way for the suppression of those rights in our own country.

These are the reasons, friends, why we shall not take part in the observance of human rights day.

Maintenance of an Adequate American Merchant Marine Urged by American Legion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, December 2, 1954

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, in its farsighted and continuing concern for the security of our Nation, the American Legion has been a most consistent advocate of a sound, long-range national policy with reference to the American merchant marine.

Its national security commission and its merchant marine committee have done invaluable work in assembling and disseminating to Legion membership throughout the country a wealth of information regarding the merchant marine and its vast contribution over the years to the prosperity and the security of these United States.

Impressed as I am with the necessity for a fuller understanding by all our people of matters relating to the maritime phases of our economy, I gratefully acknowledge the excellent work that has been done by the Legion in spreading the knowledge of merchant marine matters.

At its national convention here in Washington last September, the American Legion adopted resolutions pertaining to the merchant marine that reflect a deep understanding of the realities of the situation in which American shipping, through force of circumstances largely beyond its control, now finds itself. I ask unanimous consent that these resolutions be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

MERCHANT MARINE RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY THE 36TH NATIONAL CONVENTION OF THE AMERICAN LEGION, AT WASHINGTON, D. C., SEPTEMBER 2, 1954

Whereas modern seapower attack is making World War II merchant ships obsolete and the future requires a modern fleet of fast ships in being and ready at the instant of an overt nuclear explosion; and

Whereas the maintenance of an adequate American merchant marine is sound national policy, absolutely essential to our national security and contributes substantially to our economic welfare; and

Whereas past experience clearly demonstrates that reliance upon the merchant fleets of foreign nations not only is inadequate and costly but dangerous to our national security; and

Whereas the threat of intercontinental warfare to the security of the free world and our widespread global commitments have indefinitely increased our need for added naval power and ocean transportation; and

Whereas the United States depends on foreign overseas sources for many strategic raw materials essential to our domestic industrial production and defense requirements; and

Whereas maintaining of ship-construction potential and providing the indispensable minimum of ready-for-action merchant ships as deemed necessary by the Department of Defense is dependent upon the continuous availability of shipyards, plant know-how, and a nucleus of skilled workers, dispersed along the coasts of the United States; and

Whereas the Department of Commerce has recommended a stepped-up construction program of oceangoing vessels; and

Whereas the American Legion has long recognized that a strong American-flag merchant fleet is essential to the defensive strength of the Nation and to the prosperity of our country: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the American Legion reaffirms its 36-year support of a strong, privately owned and operated American merchant marine, and urges the adoption of such policies and procedures as will:

1. More fully implement the sound principles and procedures in the Merchant Marine Act of 1936.

2. Develop workable and consistent formulas for Government aid and liberal mortgage guaranties to encourage private investment capital to finance construction of Amercan ships.

3. Establish a long-range ship-construction program to provide replacements and avoid block obsolescence of our aging merchant ships.

4. Restore our American coastwise fleet, the hard core of merchant shipping, so that it will again be available for any emergency.

5. Encourage intercoastal shipping by revising tolls on United States ships for passage through the Panama Canal to provide that such tolls should be adequate to pay the costs actually attributable to the operation of the waterway but should not defray the overall cost of maintaining the Canal Zone.

6. Continue the statutory requirements that at least 50 percent of all cargoes financed directly or indirectly by the United States move on American-flag vessels.

7. Reactivate the Merchant Marine Naval Reserve as an effective component of the United States Naval Reserve.

8. Encourage construction, repair, and overhaul of ships by private industry.

9. Withdraw ships operated by Government agencies from services where private ships can provide adequate ocean transportation.

10. Seek to remove existing discriminatory practices of foreign nations against American shipping.

11. Maintain the United States Merchant Marine Academy at Kings Point, N. Y., as a permanent institution comparable to the service academies and to continue to encourage and support the maritime academies in Maine, Massachusetts, California, and New York.

Whereas the American Legion has adopted and intends to continue a program of direct action for a strong American merchant marine; and

Whereas in order to implement the broad and extensive information and educational campaign by the American Legion on behalf of a strong American merchant marine for our national security: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Director of the National Security Commission and the chairman of the merchant marine committee of the American Legion are hereby directed to continue to seek and obtain from all possible sources such information and assistance as will insure the effectiveness of the mandates of this convention concerning the American merchant marine; and to encourage public relations officers of the various departments of the American Legion to arrange meetings and forum discussions on maritime affairs and recommend that the department commanders invite informed speakers on such subjects to appear before their annual department conventions; and, further, that the director and the chairman of the merchant marine committee be, and are hereby authorized to participate in all hearings affecting said program; and be it further

Resolved, That the American Legion at its 36th annual national convention, assembled in Washington, D. C., August 30–September 2, 1954, instructs the national headquarters of the American Legion to prepare and to conduct an extensive informational and educational program about the American merchant marine as "our fourth arm" of national security.

Preservation of the American Way of Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR.

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, December 2, 1954

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, in connection with the observance of the first Veterans' Day, November 11, 1954, a distinguished Missourian, the Honorable Laurance M. Hyde, judge of the Missouri Supreme Court, and a founder of the American Legion, addressed the Legion at St. Louis on the subject of democracy and the American way of life.

So sound is his analysis of the threats to our free institutions and so eloquent his plea that we all assume our full share of the responsibility to preserve our heritage of justice, freedom, and democracy, that I commend his words of wisdom to all of my colleagues.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to insert in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of Judge Hyde's speech.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRESERVATION OF THE AMERICAN WAY OF LIFE

(Veterans' Day address to the American Legion at St. Louis, Mo., November 11, 1954, by Laurance M. Hyde, judge, Missouri Supreme Court and a founder of the American Legion)

This is the first Veterans' Day. It is indeed fitting that Congress has now made this a day for recognition of the patriotic services of all veterans of all wars. All of our veterans' organizations can join in celebrating it with pride in what they and their members have done, both in war and in peace, to preserve our American way of life, which we call democracy. The ideals of the founders of this Nation were justice, freedom, and democracy. There was very little of either in the world in which they lived but they established a form of government and a way of life, which has ever since been an inspiration to all mankind. It has been a challenge to each succeeding generation to preserve this heritage and broaden its scope and benefits. We all know that it is seriously threatened in the world today. We have seen the lamps of justice grow dim and become entirely extinguished in many parts of this troubled world; it is our task to keep them shining brightly here.

Thirty-five years ago, the American Legion was founded in St. Louis to safeguard the principles of our American way of life. The preamble to its constitution reflects this thought in stating the following purposes of the Legion: "To uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States," and "to safeguard and transmit to posterity the principles of justice, freedom, and democracy." Let us now consider together these principles and the obligations they impose on us. At the founding convention of the American Legion, Col. Theodore Roosevelt, Jr., made a statement we should never forget, when he said: "Our purpose is to put something into our Government, not just to get something out of it." Veterans have put much into our Government since then, but our responsibility to our country has not ended. It is greater than ever. Many of our comrades of 1918 and their sons and daughters have fought again in every corner of the globe to save our country from the menace of war-mad dictators whose lust for power knew no bounds. From Bastogne to Iwo Jima, we demonstrated the strength of a free people who do not wish to enslave others and will not be enslaved. The atomic bomb did not win that war. It was won by men and women who knew the meaning of the American way of life and dared to do whatever was necessary to maintain it. Our wars were won because we had men whose will to preserve our America was tougher than the steel walls of their tanks and ships.

We are now menaced by a great communistic dictatorship, threatening us both by subversive influences from within and by force from without. But what have we, in free America, to fear in the world of today? Let me give you a prophecy—I have written it out. I shall read it to you:

"At what point shall we expect the approach of danger? By what means shall we fortify against it? Shall we expect some transatlantic giant to step the ocean and crush us at one blow? Never. All the armies of Europe, Asia, and Africa combined * * * could not, by force, take one drink from the Ohio River or make a single track on the Blue Ridge. Not in a trial of a thousand years. At what point then is the approach of danger to be expected? I answer, if it ever reaches us, it must spring up amongst us; it cannot come from abroad. If destruction be our lot, we must ourselves be its author and finisher. As a nation of free men we must live through all time or die by suicide. How shall we fortify against it? The answer is simple. * * * As the patriots of 1776 did to support the Declaration of Independence, so to support the Constitution (and the rights its guarantees to us all) let every American pledge his life, his property, and his sacret honor."

This is not my prophecy, but I agree with it. It was made by a young man 28 years old, who was serving his first term in the Illinois Legislature. He made it on January 27, 1837; 117 years ago. His name was Abraham Lincoln.

If we will heed Lincoln's advice and remain united and strong in support of our heritage of justice, freedom, and democracy, we need not fear even atomic bombs. Many of our revered comrades have given all for these ideals and it is for us to carry on. Our country looks to all of us now to maintain for future generations the way of life we fought to preserve. America is the world's last line of defense for justice, freedom, and democracy. We cannot tell what changes may result from the atomic age we are entering. But we can be sure of one thing; that is, human nature will not change. Therefore, there must be government because human nature is such that some people would impose on others if without restraint of law. However, there can be only two kinds of government in this world, either a government of laws or a government of men. A government of laws, made by consent of the governed and equally applicable to all citizens, means a free nation. A government of men, ruling others by force imposed by those in control, means a dictatorship—police state. We have surely learned through the agony of 2 world wars in 1 generation what a government of men, ruling by force, can mean to this world. The world's greatest dictatorship is making this clear to us again by ominous recent events.

Our forefathers took their stand for a government of laws made by consent of the people. They stated the fundamental principles of this kind of government in the Declaration of Independence when they said that all men are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights and that the very purpose of government is to secure these rights. Mark you. They did not say men were granted these rights by government, or by any king or dictator. They said that men had those rights without asking anyone for them and that not even the state could lawfully take them away. They established our Constitution to protect them. If we uphold and maintain this Constitution, we need not fear a foreign foe. We are endangered most by those who would weaken the essential safeguards of individual liberty adopted by our forefathers in the Constitution and its Bill of Rights. Any success they have will weaken this Nation as termites would weaken the supporting timbers of your house.

Citizens have great obligations in a self-governing republic which we, as veterans, should take most seriously. The first principle of self-government is government of self. The first principle of law enforcement is law obedience. This was the ideal set up by the passengers on the *Mayflower*, who signed a solemn compact binding themselves not only to make wise and just laws but also to obey them themselves. This is the basic principle of our Constitution. Thus all citizens have an obligation to take part in government. We call it taking part in politics, but politics is the science of government. Every citizen born in America is born into politics, because government is part of his responsibility. It is also the duty of all of us to see that no citizen is deprived of his right to participate in our government; to see that our law in action is the same as the law in the books.

The trouble is that people are too inclined to check everything to government. When they provide for government to do anything they feel they are through with it. But the best form of government that men can devise will not run itself. You can make the world's finest automobile and put it in the best possible mechanical condition, but it will not have any more sense than its driver has. Likewise, the best governmental machine will require constant intelligent cooperation of citizens to make it work.

Remember that we, the people, must preserve our free institutions; no one will do it for us. The only substitute, for the interest and individual effort of citizens in government, is dictatorship. The idea of a benevolent government which plans everything for its people may at first sound attractive. But that idea requires belief that the planners will be angels or all-wise supermen without passion or prejudice. It also requires a dictatorship to make it work; and history shows that ultimately war is the planned activity of a dictator. This is true because a dictator must finally lead the people into danger in order to keep them convinced that they need a dictator. War is the easiest activity to plan for a whole nation, and war creates excitement which aids to enforce regimentation and to cover up failure of other planned activities to work. So war is what dictatorship finally brings. The surest preventative of dictatorship and war is the active participation of all citizens in government.

Democracy is more than a form of government; it is a way of life. It is a way of tolerance and respect for the rights of others. It must be based upon recognition of the fact that no person can ultimately have any greater rights than he is willing to respect and to help to preserve for all others. Thus, the true welfare of all is a part of the welfare of each. True democracy also recognizes that no person (in government or out of it) knows enough to be permitted to set any limits upon what any other person may be or may become. Democracy means freedom for everyone to do or to be (so long as it is honest) whatever he desires and has the ability to do or to be. In final analysis, democracy is based upon the Christian concept of the worthwhile value and dignity of every human being. But democracy, like Christianity, cannot be imposed on other people by force. It must grow from within. It can be sperad only by example. To be a true disciple of either Christianity or democracy, you must practice what you preach. The best way for this Nation to make our example effective to the world is to strive always to make justice, freedom, and democracy real here at home. Everyone of us can do something about that.

There must be no selfish seeking for unfair advantage in America in these critical times. Disregard for the rights of others, or for the welfare of the whole Nation, must not be tolerated now. As Lincoln prophesied, only that could undermine the foundation of this Nation. What is the foundation of a nation? I will give the answer in the words of a poet:

"What constitutes a state?
Not high-raised battlement or labor'd mound,
Thick wall or moated gate;
Not cities proud with spires and turrets crown'd;
Not ships and broad-armed ports,
No! Men, high-minded patriotic men,
Men, who their duties know
But know their rights, and knowing, dare maintain;
These constitute a state."

We all know that, to prevent war we must be strong. We require guns, tanks, planes, and ships. But there is a more essential need. Men, high-minded, patriotic men. Men who know the meaning of our American way of life and dare to do whatever be necessary to maintain it. When our country has been in danger in the past, we have always had such men and women. It is our great responsibility to preserve our heritage of justice, freedom, and democracy. We must meet the challenge of adverse conditions both at home and abroad. In the immortal words of Lincoln's Gettysburg Address, let us, on this first Veterans' Day, "be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us * * * that this Nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom, and that government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth."

Are We Being Hijacked Into New World Commodity Trade Scheme?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. MALONE

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, December 2, 1954

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, the report of the Subcommittee on Minerals, Materials, and Fuels Economics condemned United States participation in the United Nations Permanent Advisory Commission on International Commodity Trade. This recommendation was based on exhaustive hearings which are found in part 5 of the proceedings of our committee.

On Tuesday, November 23, the United States was elected to membership in this new organization which is scheduled to meet for the first time on Monday, January 17, 1955, at the U. N. Headquarters in New York. It is my understanding that the United States voted against itself to serve as a member of this Commission. We were elected, nevertheless, in a 17-to-1 vote. Following the election, our representative indicated that there was still some question as to whether the United States would participate.

The findings of our committee are supported by the official statement of the United States Government to the Secretariat of the United Nations which was published on June 30, 1954, in United Nations Document E/2623. Nothing has transpired to change the views contained in this statement, and it is my fervent hope that we will not participate in this Commission when it convenes in January.

So that my colleagues may be familiar with the position of the State Department on this most important matter, I am making its reply to the United Nations Secretariat a part of my remarks:

PERMANENT ADVISORY COMMISSION ON INTERNATIONAL COMMODITY TRADE

Economic and Social Council Resolution 512 (XVII), of April 30, 1954, invites member states to transmit to the Economic and Social Council (ESOSOC) their comments on the proposed Permanent Advisory Commission on International Commodity Trade. The United States Government takes this opportunity to restate the views expressed on this matter by the United States delegation to the 17th session of the ECOSOC, so that there may be no misunderstanding of the reasons for its opposition to the Commission.

By way of preface, the United States would like to emphasise its recognition of the problems posed for the steady expansion of the world economy by excessive instability in primary commodity markets. While these problems are of concern to all countries, they are of particular importance to countries undergoing development, whose economies are often dependent on the production and trade of a few basic commodities. The United States shares the hope that effective and constructive solutions can be found for the problems of price instability.

The expert's report, Commodity Trade and Economic Development, recommended that an intergovernmental commission, referred to as the Trade Stabilization Commission, be established to consider and make recommendations to the ECOSOC on general proposals for stabilization.

The proposal for a Permanent Advisory Commission on International Commodity Trade, which the council has approved, was inspired by this recommendation of the experts, but is not consistent with it. In particular, it departs from what the experts had in mind by assigning to the Commission responsibility for examining and recommending measures to maintain administratively whatever price relationships between primary products and manufactured goods might be considered just and equitable. The experts had concluded that any attempt to regulate price relationships in this way would not be practicable nor, indeed, desirable. They clearly did not intend their recommendation of a Trade Stabilization Commission to be interpreted as a proposal for the creation of a body to deal directly with such price relationships.

The United States was opposed to the establishment of a commission even with functions confined to those proposed by the experts. It could not see that the creation of a new intergovernmental body to deal with general stabilization proposals was necessary or likely to contribute significantly to the achievement of greater price stability. In the opinion of the United States, no evidence has been adduced to indicate that there would be useful work for such a commission to do. The proposals put forward by the experts as meriting further study, which relate to such things as multicommodity agreements and an international "commodity reserve currency," are not within the realm of practical possibility, whether or not they may have some appeal in theory. The technical problems inherent in such proposals would be, in the view of the United States, virtually insuperable. Moreover, this Government would not be prepared to concur in the widespread interference with production and trade which such proposals would entail.

In the view of the United States, it is doubtful that other general proposals of a more practical nature are likely to be put forward. The prospect of this seems much too dim to justify the creation of a new permanent commission to review proposals of this type. If promising substantive proposals concerning general stabilization techniques can be advanced by governments, they can be effectively considered by the ECOSOC itself, or, if deemed desirable, can be referred for special study to some ad hoc body. It is not necessary to establish a permanent advisory commission to assure that proposals of this nature receive adequate attention.

Moreover, if the Council were to maintain a standing subordinate body to discuss the general problems of economic instability and the policies which might be followed to remedy them, a repetition of its experience with the Economic and Employment Commission could be expected. This demonstrated that the establishment of an advisory commission to consider the same broad questions of economic policy as are considered in ECOSOC simply leads to a repetition of debate, first in the Commission, then in the Council itself.

These are the reasons why the United States Government was opposed to a Trade Stabilization Commission of the sort contemplated by the experts. There are additional reasons why the United States opposed the proposed Permanent Advisory Commission for International Commodity Trade.

The terms of reference suggested in the resolution of the 17th session for this commission would appear to give it certain responsibilities for action on individual commodities. Adequate and effective machinery for consultation and action upon individual commodities already exists. There are standing intergovernmental bodies for those commodities in which there is particular international interest and there are effective procedures for the creation of new commodity study groups as the need arises, and for the convening of commodity conferences. The establishment of additional machinery with overlapping responsibilities could only lead to waste and confusion. As has been frequently pointed out, it is not the absence of appropriate machinery that has limited the number of international stabilization agreements developed to date, but the absence of any actual desire for an agreement in the case of many commodities, and the practical difficulties of devising a workable and acceptable agreement in others.

The terms of reference of the proposed advisory commission would also put on it the responsibility for exploring the problem of maintaining just and equitable price relationships, and recommending measures to this end.

As stated earlier, the United States Government believes that it is neither feasible nor desirable to attempt administratively to maintain a given relationship between the prices of primary commodities and the prices of manufactured goods moving in international trade. The reasons behind this position have often been stated but deserve to be set down again, since they are relevant to any evaluation of the wisdom of proceeding with the establishment of the proposed commission.

1. A country's terms of trade represent but one of the many factors bearing upon its economic well-being and upon its ability to finance its economic development. The rigidities that would be introduced into the world economy by attempts to regulate price relationships could easily prove more harmful to the economies of countries undergoing development than the changes in their terms of trade. For these and other reasons, the artificial fixing of price relationships between primary commodities and manufactured goods would not necessarily be of benefit to countries undergoing development.

2. An attempt to establish an international parity system would give rise to a series of complex technical problems, which it would be exceedingly difficult to resolve. It would also require the establishment and enforcement of comprehensive economic controls, on both the national and international level. A system of this sort would involve a degree of sacrifice of national sovereignty that few governments would be prepared to accept. Moreover, it is not likely that agreement could be reached on any basis for determining administratively what is a just and equitable relationship between the prices of primary commodities and manufactured goods moving in international trade. For these reasons, an attempt to stabilize price relationships would not appear to be remotely practicable.

Bingham: Missouri's Fighting Artist

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR.

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, December 2, 1954

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, more than 130 years ago, in 1821, when Missouri became a part of the Union, a young boy was growing up in that pioneer area—a boy who, in later years, was to have a profound influence upon the history of our State.

George Caleb Bingham achieved national recognition as an artist and is best known and honored today for his paintings which depict with such warmth and vitality, and yet with such deep sensitivity, the frontier activities of that period. I have always had a great admiration for his work and I am proud to have a number of fine Bingham prints hanging in my office.

But Bingham's career was also marked by his years of public service. As a young man he became interested in politics and served as a member of the Missouri Legislature, as State treasurer, and as adjutant general of Missouri. But he devoted himself most ardently to fighting against slavery, many years before the Civil War and at a time when Missouri was violently and bitterly divided on the issue, and later he became a leader in the fight in Missouri against secession.

This turbulent period in our Nation's history, and Bingham's important role in the stirring events of his day have now been compiled in a brilliant and carefully documented biography entitled, "Bingham: Fighting Artist," by a distinguished newspaperman, my good friend Lew Larkin, Jefferson City correspondent of the Kansas City Star, after 7 years of the most painstaking research.

For any of my colleagues or others who are interested in gaining a better perspective and a richer understanding of that critical period in our national life, I unhesitatingly recommend Mr. Larkin's new book.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a review of the book which appeared in the Kansas City Star on November 13.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BINGHAM, MISSOURI'S FIGHTING ARTIST—LEW LARKIN'S COMPREHENSIVE BIOGRAPHY TELLS FULL STORY BACK OF FAMOUS PAINTING, "ORDER NO. 11"

(Bingham: Fighting artist, by Lew Larkin (350 pages; Burton Publishing Co., Kansas City.)

Missouri produced many a noted character in her formative years and "Bingham: Fighting Artist" pictures one of the best to be rediscovered in a modern biography of a famous personality of the yesteryears.

Recent domestic political dramas are both limmed and given their counterparts in the era and career of George Caleb Bingham, a man who believed, like Aristotle, that there are a thousand ways to be wrong but only one way to be right.

He was a boy of 10 at historic old Franklin in 1821 when Missouri came into the Union, and from early manhood until his death at Kansas City in 1879 he was in the forefront of public affairs, particularly during the Civil War and directly related events.

National recognition as an artist, which he achieved at 30, continues today, but the fascinating story behind the highly prized Binghams, especially "Order No. 11," probably never has been so extensively compiled as in this study by Lew Larkin, the Star's Jefferson City correspondent. It represents 7 years of research, including a study of State Historical Society of Missouri files, especially the 135 Bingham letters to Maj. James S. Rollins, edited by his son, the late Curtis B. Rollins. Major Rollins, "the father" of the University of Missouri, was a lifelong friend of the artist.

There are liberal quotations from other private letters of Bingham, his public letters and speeches, accounts in various newspapers of the period, and data from Bingham family letters and other correspondence.

A DRAMATIC FIGURE

From these and other sources Larkin presents Bingham, the man, in a life story that encompasses experiences and events worthy of Hall of Fame or other TV treatment.

He was a handsome and highly sensitive man, scrupulously honest, normally gentle and polished, and an authority on the Bible. But he could and did turn tiger when aroused by some turn in public affairs. On such occasions he could employ the language of the rugged river boatmen of his day as well as Scripture and the best of English.

Bingham loved life in all its forms. He was alert, and he thrilled to everything in the lush landscape of pioneer Missouri and its teeming frontier activities. In Virginia, where the family lived before coming to Missouri in 1819, he was deeply shocked when he first saw slaves being whipped on a neighboring plantation. It was an incident never forgotten; such punishment was not permitted on the Bingham lands.

"I have read the Good Book a number of times and find nothing in it that calls for one man to beat another," Grandfather George Bingham told the disturbed and questioning boy.

The grandfather made three demands on his slaves. They must do their required amount of work, must be loyal, and must attend church every Sunday in the plantation chapel where he preached. Young George also often heard his grandfather preach.

DRAWINGS ON BARNS

Bingham displayed artistic talents at the age of 6 in drawings he made on barns and other buildings on his father's plantation. But as a young man he found himself in conflict among the urges of art, the ministry, and law. He sometimes preached as a substitute for a Boonville cabinetmaker, who also was a minister. George was an apprentice in his shop. Always seeking books to read, he won the attention and friendship of lawyers and other leading citizens, whose counseling and activities inspired him. But with his mother's help he finally decided on art.

His first real taste of politics, which became a big part of his life and the inspiration for some of his best paintings, was the Whig convention at Rocheport in 1840. The speech of Abraham Lincoln, then 31, deeply impressed the artist, who was 29.

"Sounds like he knows what he is talking about," Bingham remarked to a friend.

Several years later, as a member of the State legislature and its committee on Federal-State relations, he tossed out a few words which he was to amplify again and again years later.

"Come what may," he said, "whether prosperity or adversity, weal or woe, this State should and must stand by the Union. The slavery agitation is too convenient an instrument in the hands of demagogs. Those who seek to make slavery a national practice are not motivated by patriotism but by selfish feelings. I insist that Missouri's place, whatever happens, is by the flag of the United States."

LONG BEFORE THE WAR

That was in 1849, a long time before the Civil War, when Missouri was so sharply divided on the question that no public official dared to speak out so openly.

The fateful year of 1861 marked the real turning point in Bingham's life. He was 50 and at the height of his professional career but in the Civil War he emerged as a statesman and defender of the masses against what he believed was one of the greatest injustices to humanity.

He was a leader in the fight in Missouri against secession.

"If Missourians follow their hearts they will go with the South, but if they follow their heads they will stay in the Union," he said.

"I am conditionally for man, though unconditionally for the Union," was a phrase from the artist repeated around the State.

But the Missouri-Kansas border warfare brought forth Bingham as its most persistent foe, and his campaign against Gen. Thomas Ewing, who issued order No. 11, continued even after the artist's death. Ewing might have been President except for Bingham's unrelenting fight.

The almost unbelievable blood and terror story of the border raids in both Missouri and Kansas is told in great detail by Larkin, including the fate and experiences of many towns and persons.

Bingham investigated this warfare personally and protested again and again to authorities. He declared that grave injustice had been committed and if the depredations continued they would do more than anything else to drive Missouri into the Confederacy.

BINGHAM IS AROUSED

After Quantrill sacked Lawrence and order No. 11 was issued as a means of stopping all the border warfare, Bingham sprang into action. In a dramatic meeting in Kansas City with General Ewing, he tried to have him rescind the order. The session ended in a bitter clash. The artist told the general: "If you persist in this order, I shall make you infamous with my pen and brush insofar as I am able.

Order No. 11 went through and became a national issue. Some 20,000 persons were evacuated in 3½ Missouri border counties south of Kansas City. It became known as the Burnt district because of the hundreds of fires set in the pillaging that followed. Bingham afterward kept it a burning issue against Ewing every time the Ohioan came forward in politics.

Larkin gives a stirring and extensive account of order No. 11 events, the same as on the raids that preceded it. He also presents statements from principals involved in the action and the long controversy.

The most dramatic inning of the long Bingham-Ewing feud came in 1879. Ewing ran for governor of Ohio and it was generally believed he would be certain presidential timber if elected. But the Bingham nemesis appeared again.

This time B. Gratz Brown, former Missouri governor and senator, criticized the artist for renewing the order No. 11 controversy. Bingham wrote a long letter in reply; it was virtually finished when he was seized with an illness that quickly proved fatal.

VOICE FROM THE TOMB

After the funeral in Kansas City, Rollins Bingham, the artist's son, released the reply to Brown to the press. Some newspapers headlined it "A voice from the tomb." In Ohio, where the campaign had been going well for Ewing, it had a devastating effect. Ewing lost in a close race, and the Bingham letter was considered a major factor in his defeat, which sealed his political fate.

"I suppose my military order changed the lives of a lot of people. It changed mine, I know," Ewing once told Curtis B. Rollins.

"It would please me," he added, "if you would tell the people back in Missouri that I hold no hatred in my heart for Bingham. He was a man of high ideals, but he had so little understanding of the necessities of war that before he would commandeer a mule or a load of hay from a farmer in the line of march he would first have to consult the Constitution to see that he was within the law."

The two men laughed; it was a rather apt description. But even so, during the border raids Bingham declared: "It must go down to posterity, teaching the important lesson that constitution and laws, however carefully framed, are no guaranty of the rights of the people when their public affairs are committed to the hands of unworthy and treacherous agents."

Bingham was a Whig throughout most of his life, and although he supported Lincoln, he never joined the Republican Party. Early in 1866 he became a Democrat.

Ewing, originally a Democrat and the son of an Ohio statesman and cabinet member, became a Republican in Kansas and the first chief justice of its supreme court. After the war he became a Democrat again in Ohio.

The tory of Bingham brings to the fore the many-sided conflicts in the Civil War, and certainly in Missouri, especially along the western border, there were involvements aplenty.

CHESTER A. BRADLEY.

Two Views on International Trade and Our Economic Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. MALONE

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, December 2, 1954

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, the Subcomittee on Minerals, Materials, and Fuels Economics has condemned the United Nations Commission on International Commodity Trade which was established at the 17th session of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations in New York last April. Our condemnation was based on the fact that the United Nations has been rapidly moving to control the economies of the world through devices such as this new Commission on International Commodity Trade.

Adolph A. Berle, Jr., wrote an article which appears in the Reporter of December 2, 1954, entitled "Our Best Guarantee of National Security," which deals with the United Nations. His views on one-world economics are worthy of close attention. They show what our State Department would endorse should a Democratic administration once again be in a position to make our foreign economic policy.

Fortunately, business groups throughout the country are beginning to see the light, and the final declaration of the 41st national foreign trade convention, conducted under the auspices of the National Foreign Trade Council, condemned United Nations efforts to alter our basic American free-enterprise economic principles.

For the benefit of my colleagues, I ask unanimous consent to include in the Appendix of the RECORD the section of Mr. Berle's article which deals with economics and the resolutions from the final declaration of the 41st national foreign trade convention referring to the United Nations.

There being no objection, article and resolution were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Reporter of December 2, 1954]

FROM "OUR BEST GUARANTEE OF NATIONAL SECURITY"

(By A. A. Berle, Jr.)

Not less spectacular than the problem of disarmament is that of international economics. If anything is clear, it is that the Nation-State by itself is no longer an operational economic unit. Prof. Arnold Toynbee has proclaimed the passing of the Nation-State on philosophical grounds, but we can rest here on the more earthy base of trade, exchange, commerce, and supply. Even the largest countries must trade with much of the world for essential supplies. Smaller States must have access to the larger ones for markets and for simple necessities. The penalty of interruption is at best unemployment, at worst starvation.

Populations are already rebelling at an international economic system of violent price movements that make them rich today and sentence them to beggary tomorrow. There is increasing quarrel with the hazards of a set of national currency systems, disorder in any one of which may wreck the orderly life of entire regions. The United States is dimly aware of this now, and will find it a pressing problem as rejuvenated European production expands. Like it or not, we shall be thinking within a few years, not simply of Marshall plans but of wide international pools where supply and demand, production and need, can be brought together, with finance used primarily as a means of assuring production, transport, and consumption. (South America is putting that problem forcefully to the United States now at the current Economic Conference of American States in Rio de Janeiro.)

Americans who fret today at "giveaway" programs are more likely to be concerned tomorrow about how to assure supplies of material and to pay for them by overseas export.

America, like the Soviet Union, has a relatively favorable place in the economic struggle—a highly developed technology in a large land area where there is not too great a population. The catch is that the American position increasingly depends on crucial supplies from outside the American area, just as the German economy depended on such supplies and proved vulnerable in two world wars.

Conversely, whole populations outside the United States depend on our consumption and prices. As regional groupings grow, they will pool their economic trump cards—the Soviet Union is pooling the cards of the Communist world at this moment. Collective use of the economic power to refuse to supply or refuse to buy—or to barter here and withhold there—was a card the Nazi economists played with terrible effect. Add the resources of southeast Asia—rice, rubber, tin, etc.—to one or another of the regional combinations now in formation, and the world economic balance may be wholly upset. Almost of necessity, world pools or clearing unions will be the serious business of international economics a generation from now—unless, of course, the United States and the Soviet Union are prepared to shoulder indefinitely the job of equating the balances in their respective worlds. But this job increases in size each year; the capacity of either to pick up the international check is not unlimited, and it is a poor expedient at best.

These are gigantic problems. They are capable of solution only by organizing the economic affairs of great areas, if not of the entire planet. Where, in the present world, can all the claims be balanced except at the United Nations?

Resolution From the Final Declaration of the 41st National Foreign Trade Convention

UNITED NATIONS

It is imperative, in the interests of maintaining a sound and dynamic foreign economic policy, that our membership in the United Nations, and our support of any of its affiliated or dependent agencies, should not result in the loss of our economic independence, or lead to the imposition upon us of any economic doctrines or practices which we would not ourselves voluntarily adopt.

In seeking the advantages which membership in the United Nations can bring, we must not resort to compromise or expediency; we must not, whether by misguided action or through default, infringe or jeopardize our inherent right of economic self-determination.

COMMISSION ON INTERNATIONAL COMMODITY TRADE, U. N.

The convention affirms its wholehearted support of the position taken by the National Foreign Trade Council and by previous conventions against participation by the United States in intergovernmental commodity agreements. The opposition voiced by the 1952 convention to the International Materials Conference, and by the 1953 convention to the attempted effectuation of the commodity provisions of chapter VI of the Habana Charter, in face of Congress' refusal to countenance the charter itself, is reiterated now in the strongest terms in the particular instance of the proposed permanent Advisory Commission on International Commodity Trade within the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations.

Whatever guise they may take, and whatever high sponsorship they may have, agreements which are designed to establish controls over the production, distribution or prices of commodities moving in international trade violate the principle of freedom of the marketplace, and should find neither support nor toleration from the government of a nation which is dedicated, as the United States is dedicated, to the free, private, competitive enterprise system. The solution of the problem of either overproduction or underproduction, in a private enterprise economy, is to be found in the operation of the law of supply and demand, and the convention holds that disregard of the principles implicit in that law would serve to aggravate, rather than to solve, the very problem with which it seeks to deal.

The specifications defining the functions of the proposed United Nations Permanent Advisory Commission on International Commodity Trade give particular cause for alarm. Not only would the Commission be authorized to instigate rigorous and restrictive barriers against the movement of the commodities falling within its immediate purview, but there would also be presented, by reason of the Commission's responsibility for seeking just and equitable price relations between primary products and manufactured goods, a continuing invitation to regimentation and price-fixing extending over the whole range of the economies of its member nations. The implications of this latter power are such as to make the proposed organization even more obnoxious, by American standards, than the abortive organizations previously condemned.

The convention urges that our Government maintain the stand it has rightly taken in the United Nations by refusing, under any circumstances, to participate in the activities of the proposed Permanent Advisory Commission on International Commodity Trade. It also urges, and for the same reasons, that our Government take an equally strong stand against any similar or related proposals which may be advanced at the forthcoming meeting in Rio de Janeiro of the Ministers of Finance or Economy of the American Republics looking toward a system of commodity agreements and price-fixing arrangements within the Western Hemisphere.

AD HOC COMMITTEE ON RESTRICTIVE BUSINESS PRACTICES, U. N.

The convention is opposed to the establishment of a specialized agency of the United Nations to act on complaints of restrictive business practices, as recommended in the report dated March 30, 1953, of the Ad Hoc Committee on Resetrictive Business Practices of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations.

Pressure Increases To Make American Claims to Antarctic Lands Official

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, December 2, 1954

Mr. SPARKMAN. I ask unanimous consent to include in the Appendix of the Record an article by Sigrid Arne, entitled "Pressure Increases To Make American Claims to Antarctic Lands Official," which appeared in the Houston (Tex.) Post of August 22, 1954.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Pressure Increases To Make American Claims to Antarctic Lands Official

(By Sigrid Arne)

As far as the record goes the first living human to spot the Antarctic continent was Nathaniel Palmer, American captain of a whaling ship, sailing out of Stonington, Conn., in 1820.

A peninsula reaching up out of the big, white southernmost part of the world toward Argentina is named after Palmer. Three nations claim that peninsula—Chila, Britain, and Argentina. Palmer was an American, but the United States has made no formal claim on the land.

West of Palmer Peninsula lies a huge pie-slice—between 90 and 150 degrees west—which has been visited and flown over and photographed by many later Americans, most importantly by Rear Adm. Richard E. Byrd.

But not one single pebble of that huge slice of land is claimed by the United States Government either.

At this point almost all the rest of the Antarctic is claimed by one of seven nations: Britain, Australia, New Zealand, Norway, France, Argentina, and Chile.

Australia has a permanent base on the white continent. Britain, Chile, and Argentina have bases on fringe islands. France has attempted to set up one. But the United States has never attempted to keep a permanent base on the land of the penguin.

Lack of action on the part of the United States goes back to 1924, when the State Department stated to other nations that claims to the 6 million square miles of the Antarctic continent should be established only by accupation. Mere discovery—by vessels sailing by a shoreline—the State Department said, was not enough.

The United States has notified other nations that perhaps settlement could be accomplished by a meeting of the eight nations which now feel they have some claim to the Antarctic. There have been other suggestions that the International Court of Justice listen to the claims and allocate the lands.

This reluctance on the part of the United States has led to some impatience on the part of American explorers and some Members of Congress. Two attempts are pending before Congress to make certain that the United States keep a big toehold in the Antarctic.

Senator Case, Republican, South Dakota, and Representative Tollefson, Republican, Washington, have a twin bill before the Senate and the House. They would like to set aside up to $200,000 to finance a new expedition to the Antarctic between next December and May 31, 1958.

This expedition would try to nail American claims, ferret out mineral resources, put out geodetic control points and take aerial photos.

The bill would turn over both the money and a good deal of Government equipment—such as ships, food, cameras, housing, and communications equipment—to an 8-year-old organization called the American Anarctic Association, headed by Naval Capt. Finn Ronne, who directed an Antarctic expedition in 1947–48.

Admiral Byrd announced recently, in a Cleveland speech, that he also hopes to return to the Antarctic.

Another bill before Congress is sponsored by Senator Flanders, Republican, of Vermont. Flanders asks that the United States lay formal claim to the area between 90 and 150 degrees west and that the American rights be reserved on other portions of the Antarctic Americans have explored.

The State Department has on record 10 trips made to the Antarctic by Americans:

1820: Captain Palmer.

1840: Charles Wilkes, in command of an official United States exploring expedition, skirted over 1,500 miles of coastline in the Eastern Hemisphere.

1928: Sir Hubert Wilkins, Australian, was the first man to see the Antarctic from an airplane, on a flight financed by American citizens.

1929: Byrd established a base at Little America and flew over the South Pole on a privately financed expedition.

1933–39: Lincoln Ellsworth made four privately backed trips, flying inland over great areas in both hemispheres.

1933–35: Byrd led his second private expedition.

1939–41: Byrd was in charge of an official United States expedition which established two bases.

1946–47: Rear Adm. Richard H. Cruzen was task force commander of the Navy's Antarctic development project, with Byrd in local technical control. This included 13 ships, 21 planes, and 4,000 men.

1947–48: Ronne led an expedition, privately financed but using some Government equipment.

1946: Comdr. Gerald L. Ketchum headed a Government expedition.

Why now all this interest in what seems an icy wasteland?

Byrd says that after his four trips he is convinced "the bottom of the world is actually a treasure house of fabulous riches."

He points out that, unlike the North Pole, Antarctica is no mass of floating ice but an actual continent almost as big as the United States and Europe combined.

He recounts:

"It was on the side of one mountain range in the Queen Maude Mountains, 180 nautical miles from the pole, that I saw a vein filled with enough coal to supply the whole world.

"Other explorers and I have brought back to America evidence that invaluable deposits of oil, copper, silver, molybdenum, iron, gold, and even uranium lie beneath the age-old ice."

Byrd also claims military importance for the continent. If the Panama Canal should be knocked out in another world war, ships traveling between Atlantic and Pacific would have to go around the southernmost tip of South America. At present the United States has no defenses in the area, and American ships could fall easy prey to enemy jets and submarines which might be based in the Antarctic.

Minerals and Western Hemisphere Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE W. MALONE
OF NEVADA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, December 2, 1954

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from my pen, published in the September issue of the American Mining Congress Journal, reviewing accomplishments of the 83d Congress intended to aid and strengthen the American mining industry, and pointing to further legislation necessary to assure stability to the industry and security to the Nation.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MINERALS AND WESTERN HEMISPHERE DEFENSE—' CHAMPION OF DOMESTIC MINING TAKES A REALISTIC LOOK AT A VITAL PROBLEM

(By Hon. GEORGE W. MALONE, United States Senator from Nevada)

American mining received what the New York Journal of Commerce truthfully declared a tremendous shot in the arm when the 83d Congress approved two measures that halted what might be termed the ebb tide of mining. Those two outstandingly important measures were the granting of depletion allowances of 23 percent to 32 critical minerals, and the killing of a provision for sponsoring mineral exploration and development in foreign countries by the Foreign Operations Administration.

Both those steps were the result of the findings of the Senate Minerals, Materials, and Fuels Economic Subcommittee, which completely disproved a long-current theory that the United States is a have-not nation as regards critical materials.

In its findings the committee demonstrated:

1. The Western Hemisphere can be defended and will be the only dependable source to the United States of critical raw materials in the event of a third all-out war.

2. During the last quarter century established procurement policies have dangerously increased our dependance for critical materials on nations across major oceans. Such dependence on overseas suppliers must be avoided.

3. Less than 1 percent of the area of this Nation has been included in geological investigations; only 12.7 percent has been geologically mapped, and 31.1 percent topographically mapped by the United States Geological Survey.

4. Federal tax laws definitely retard the production of critical materials in this Nation.

Given reasonable depletion allowance, such as the new code provides, and a tariff or duty based on fair and reasonable competition, private industry will explore, discover, and develop our natural critical and strategic mineral resources, to the extent that they may profitably do so in competition with producers in low-wage, low-tax foreign and remote areas of the world.

But one step further must be taken to assure our complete national self-sufficiency that would safeguard us in time of war.

The workingmen and investors in our critical and strategic minerals industries must have equal access to our own markets, stockpiles, defense plants, and arsenals with the minerals and materials of other nations. Such equal access is denied them now through the 1934 Trade Agreements Act—the so-called reciprocal trade.

They do not have such access because neither tariffs nor duties on imports of such minerals and materials equalize the difference in costs of production between this Nation and the foreign producers competing for our markets against American producers and American products.

Foreign producers in the past, 25 years have not had to compete with American producers in reality. They have had the benefit of millions of dollars in American foreign aid, coupled with reduced duties or tariffs, to give them a preferential right-of-way into the American markets. The American subsidies and reductions in duties they have received more than counterbalance any transportation costs in shipping materials to the United States.

They have been given funds with which to explore and develop foreign properties. They have been given expert technological advice at the expense of American taxpayers on how to exploit these foreign properties. They have been given equipment to operate these properties, and great electric projects, financed at American taxpayers' expense, have been built to provide these foreign interests with the electric energy necessary to operate the equipment we have given them.

It was that international mining boondoggle which was stricken out of the foreign aid bill as a step toward ending discrimination against our own producers.

The provision for depletion allowance was another step, and the third and final step will come when the Congress returns to the United States Constitution, article I, section 8, and levies tariffs on imports of foreign minerals and materials based on fair and reasonable competition equalizing the difference in low wage and low tax rates in foreign countries and high wage and tax rates in the United States.

The American mining industry finances its own exploration. It finances its own development. It finances its own research. It risks its own money, and often in huge amounts, instead of asking for handouts from the Foreign Operations Administration or Mr. Stassen at the expense of American taxpayers, as do their foreign competitors.

The American mining industry pays the highest wages for comparable work in the world, while the foreign producers who have benefited most from American aid pay the lowest wages in the world.

The American mining industry, heretofore starved between wars, has come to the rescue of the United States in two world wars, supplying our needs for critical minerals and materials when the rest of the world was cut off by the enemy.

The mining industry of the Western or American Hemisphere—North, South, and Central America—can and will supply our full needs for critical and strategic minerals, materials, and fuels in the event of another all-out war if given free and equal treatment with the rest of the world.

And in the event of such an all-our war, only that mineral wealth lying within the American hemisphere will be immediately accessible for our war needs.

The Fiscal Climate in Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, December 2, 1954

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "The Fiscal Climate in Washington," delivered by me before the southeastern group, Investment Bankers Association of America, at Hot Springs, Va., on September 25, 1954.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FISCAL CLIMATE IN WASHINGTON

(Address by Senator JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER, Republican, of Maryland, before southeastern group, Investment Bankers' Association of America, at Hot Springs, Va., September 25, 1954)

Without intending to exercise any note of partisanship, I should like to review briefly the fiscal climate which now prevails in the Nation's Capital. Pure, cold logic, rather than a political philosophy, has composed these remarks.

In simple truth, I must admit that there are many persons in this distinguished audience more qualified to speak on this subject than I—persons who could draw on a depth of practical experience and a breadth of specialized knowledge which I cannot claim.

But as one who has been privileged to serve his Government in a special way, perhaps I can best characterize these remarks as the thoughts of a legislator when called upon to consider financial and budgetary matters.

You, as businessmen and bankers in the past two decades, have been particularly aware of the evolution of our national economy from a sound, freely competitive, private-enterprise system to one dangerously undermined by deficit financing and shackled by Government controls.

You have observed the emasculation of the Federal Reserve System until its intended function has been obscured by the balloon of inflation and an umbrella of ruinous economic theories and contrived crises. You have no doubt noted with alarm the debilitating influence of cheap money. Time and again you and your associates have probably been severely disturbed by the improvident utterances of Lord Keynes and other economic soothsayers.

You have witnessed the changing phenomena of the peaceful calm, the gathering clouds, the winds of hurricane velocity, and the raging storms. Little imagination is needed to equate these meteorological terms with the precipitous road of inflation and an increasingly controlled economy which we have been traveling for more than 20 years. But after every storm, as the sun returns to the horizon, destruction and confusion must be replaced by construction and order.

In viewing the fiscal picture in Washington today, one is immediately impressed by the constructive and orderly policies which have been established. I am very happy to state that these policies have much bipartisan appeal and support. But more important is the fact that they are designed to restore the tattered fabric of our economy.

The Honorable George M. Humphrey, Secretary of the Treasury, for whom I hold the highest regard, cleared the hazy atmosphere when he stated that the objective of these policies was: "To give the American people honest American money, the kind of dollar that buys a dollar's worth of goods." This transition cannot be made by oratory or magic. It must be accomplished, if at all, by tireless attention to detailed reduction of expense in every department of the Government. Secretary Humphrey states further that: "Sound money is based upon a proper budget policy, a properly functioning Federal Reserve System, and proper debt management."

So, in the meteorological sense, the forecast might be clearing and promising.

By way of background, let us recall that the Federal debt prior to World War I was about $1 billion, and that at the end of President Hoover's administration it was about $21 billion. Contrasted with the present national debt of more than $275 billion, one can understand the gravity of the existing situation.

The genesis of our astronomical debt can, in large measure, be attributed to the gigantic cost of two devastating wars, and obligations resulting from our emergence as an unequaled world power. The deficit which accrued from World War I, World War II, and the Korean war accounts for approximately 60 percent of the present national debt.

Also, it is amazing to note that many World War I loans—about $17 billion—are still outstanding. More than 15 of the countries that have enjoyed our bounty are delinquent in paying these loans. Finland alone is making payments on her debt. As a further illustration of the components of our national debt, the people of the United States have donated approximately $50 billion in foreign-aid funds to many of these same countries, as well as others, since July 1, 1945.

In the sense that you are frequently called upon to approve or disapprove certain financial loans or transactions, I have never been able to rationalize the inconsistency of granting additional funds to unreliable debtors of long standing.

Again, by way of contrast, 12 European countries, all of which have been the recipients of our generosity, have a combined debt of some $120 billion. Yet our national debt is more than twice as much. In a world divided not merely by geographical boundaries but also by antagonistic philosophies, all free nations must devote equal attention to the preservation of their economic solvency as well as their national security—lest they lose both.

In the closing days of the recent session of the Congress, the Federal debt ceiling was raised on a temporary basis only. Simple arithmetic dictated this action. Otherwise, before the end of calendar year 1954, the Department of the Treasury would be unable to pay the bills of the various departments and agencies of the Government which had previously been authorized by the Congress.

One of the acknowledged experts in the Congress on financial and budgetary problems is Senator BYRD. My good friend from Virginia had this to say about raising the debt limit: "In a government grown callous to deficit financing, to increase the permanent debt limit would be regarded by every bureaucrat as license to increase his demands for higher expenditures. The lid would be off."

This strong expression of dissatisfaction with the remarkably uninhibited fiscal and budgetary policies of the recent past is shared by most authorities in the Congress and in the business community. Among this group should be included Senator MILLIKIN, of Colorado, chairman of the Senate Committee on Finance, who rejected a permanent increase in our national-debt limit. He was, however, forced by the unfortunate realities of an inherited situation, to accede to a limited temporary increase, which he explained in these words:

"The aggressions of communism in Korea and elsewhere compelled our country to undertake a great arms program. It was the only way of safeguarding our country and other free nations from the deliberate plan of communism to dominate the whole world.

"Our huge defense program made necessary large appropriations. When the present administration took office there were about $80 billion of accumulated authorizations for expenditures, largely in connection with this program, in addition to requirements for current appropriations.

"The Congress and the Executive, working together, have pared this program and other Government programs down to bare essentials. A deficit of $9½ billion in fiscal 1952–53 was reduced in the past year to $3 billion, despite the fact that taxes were reduced. Authorizations for new spending have been subjected to the closest scrutiny, and are being reduced each year by the Congress and the Executive."

The legal debt limit for the Federal Government was thus raised by $6 billion to $281 billion—but only until June 30, 1955, at which time the debt limit will automatically revert to the $275 billion ceiling set by law in 1946.

On only 3 occasions in the past 24 years has our Government lived within its income. In other words, we operated in the red for 21 years. Such a course can only lead to eventual disaster. Depreciation of our currency has already seriously hurt millions of Americans. Continued cheapening of the dollar might finally result in the collapse of our entire economic system. History records that from ancient Rome to date, nations have been wrecked by unsound fiscal policies and the slow deterioration of their moral values.

In early 1953 almost $80 billion in unpaid bills were inherited, and at that time the national debt was in excess of $265 billion. Close to $5 billion cash was available in the Treasury. Would you be amazed to learn that the resulting $75 billion of indebtedness in unpaid bills was more than the cost of World War I?

How to approach the management and reduction of such a staggering debt and responsibility? That is the question which will confound us for many years to come. It has long been fashionable to believe that this country will never be insolvent as long as we owe no one other than ourselves. The truth of such economic sleight-of-hand has never been demonstrated and, indeed, it never can be for there is simply no truth in it.

Problems of such complexity and magnitude are not solved easily. They cannot be wished away—nor can they be cured by economic charletans. On the other hand, in Washington, a great deal of conscious effort surrounding the encouragement of economic growth and improvement is now evident on every hand. Much progress has been made—much more remains to be accomplished but it shall be done, always with the goal of greater efficiency and economy.

The task of cleaning up a Federal budget that has been out of control for more than a decade is not a short-range proposition. But an auspicious start has been made. More economies and more tax cuts can be expected.

In the 2 short years since 1952, through the application of sound business and management principles, and the resurgence of moral and ethical standards, the operation of our Government has been essentially revitalized by a climate of greater effectiveness and greater efficiency. At the same time, considerable monetary savings have accrued to the people of our Nation.

Through the elimination of wasteful, duplicating, and often ridiculous policies, it has been possible to cut Federal spending by $7 billion in the fiscal year ended June 30, 1954. Next year, it is estimated that an additional $3½ billion will be saved. Some 215,000 unnecessary jobs have been eliminated, reducing the Federal payroll over $850 million a year.

Despite deliberate smokescreens of purely partisan motivation, the Defense budget has been carefully and intelligently pruned by many billions of dollars. This reduction has been made without endangering our national security. In fact, so unrealistic was the previous approach to our defense requirements that out of $200 billion authorized during the period of the Korean War, more than $10 billion were unexpended. Great as our industrial capacity is, our factories and arsenals can produce only so much in a specified period of time, regardless of the vast amounts of money available. I might also say at this point that it is unwise spending to purchase equipment in great quantities which will, before delivery, become obsolete.

In late 1952, the Federal Government owned or had a stake in $130 billion worth of factories, railroads, ships, and countless other enterprises. It was engaged in more than 100 business-type activities. This gradual, piecemeal encroachment of Federal bureaucracy upon the preserves of private enterprise had made the Government this country's largest insurer, its larger lender, its largest tenant, its largest holder of grazing land, its largest grain operator, its largest warehouse operator, its largest truck fleet operator, to mention but a few.

Fortunately, the further expansion of this Government-in-business has been curtailed. Disposal of many of these activities, which are in direct competition with private enterprise, is now underway. You and I can thus gather renewed faith and reawakened confidence in the traditional concepts of our American economy—free competition and private enterprise.

Another recent innovation has halted the past practice of making needless and extravagant purchases in the final days of each fiscal year simply to ensure that no unexpended appropriations would revert to the Treasury. Now, when purchases in the closing days of a fiscal year exceed the level of the preceding months, the excess buying is charged to the guilty agencies appropriation for the succeeding year.

These are but a few of the improvements which are being made. A multitude of others can be found in practically every Federal department and agency. By way of an aside, I have often felt that our Government should give proper recognition to those administrators, officials, and supervisors who, through their own initiative, wisdom, and energies, are able to reduce the cost of operation within their own agency, department, or subdivision. In referring to the cost of operation, I would most certainly include their ability to create greater efficiency through the optimum utilization of personnel and talents. Most assuredly, Government must adopt many of the incentive policies and programs which have been so successfully demonstrated by private enterprise as a means of raising the level of efficiency and economy.

The answers to our fiscal problems, however, do not lie solely in the establishment of housekeeping economies and a propitious reduction of taxes. The cure must be more fundamental. There is a direct and undeniable correlation between receipts and expenditures, and it is this correlation, or the proper balance between the two, which controls the destiny of all fiscal and economic systems. It shows us that taxation and the cost of Government cannot be separated, for they are but opposite sides of the same coin. To my mind, the answer resides in constructive, orderly, long-range fiscal and debt-management policies from which we should not be deterred except for the most foreboding calamity threatening our very existence.

The continuing burden or legacy from the past 20 years, if you like, in the form of a debt in excess of $275 billion, demands these constructive, orderly—yes, even courageous—policies. For all practical purposes, we, as a nation, are now mortgaged to the hilt. Every few months billions of this debt matures and must be refinanced. In 5 years a total of $175 billion must be refunded, repaid, or otherwise treated so that our fiscal affairs will not become more hopelessly fouled or disrupted.

Now, I am not going to tell you, ladies and gentlemen, that we can completely eradicate this tremendous debt in a few years or, indeed, in our lifetime. It is going to be a long, difficult, and trying journey. But, as an ancient sage once remarked, "The longest journey begins with a single step." It is my firm conviction, ladies and gentlemen, that we have taken that first step.

But, in these and all other aspects, Government officials and Members of the Congress, vitally need the thorough cooperation and experienced counsel of the banking and investment profession. As the pendelum swings from a controlled economy and approaches the free economy, in which you and I so fervently believe, government and business must keep hands joined in preserving the American way of life—a vision of freedom and prosperity that has been shadowed by economic deterioration for too many years. May I suggest that you continue to combine the many talents and resources of your great profession in this worthy endeavor? Parenthetically, I would emphasize that there are some groups in this country who seek to subvert the American system of limited government, free enterprise and democracy, and to replace it with a system hostile and alien to our traditions as a Nation. Needless to say, the spokesmen for these groups, operating as they do, behind a cloak of respectability, are very vocal in their subtle denouncements of our cherished freedoms and proven way of life.

I know, on the authority of Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey, that many of you already have given valuable support to the Treasury Department by taking advantage of your opportunities to explain to the public—particularly to buyers of United States savings bonds—the significance of what the Government is doing to achieve sound money and economic stability in our Nation.

I have the privilege and pleasure of bringing you the Secretary's personal thanks for this fine, double-barreled cooperation with the Treasury—cooperation in aiding good debt management by participating in the savings bonds program, and cooperation in spreading information as to why sound money is of importance to all Americans. It is his earnest hope that you will continue this good work.

With your help, and God's blessing, we can face the future with continued optimism—with even greater determination in providing honest government, better government, and more economical government to the people of our Nation.

Subversion by Treaty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE W. MALONE
OF NEVADA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, December 2, 1954

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the appendix of the RECORD an article titled "Subversion by Treaty," published in the September 10, 1954, issue of the magazine U. S. A., and reviewing part 4 of hearings conducted by the Minerals, Materials, and Fuels Economic Subcommittee of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

There being no objection the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUBVERSION BY TREATY

(By Newton H. Fulbright)

If Americans knew about how the State Department's extra-legal International Materials Conference operated during the Korean war, they would shake their heads in shocked disbelief.

It has been charged that young Americans were sacrificed in Korea because the International Materials Conference, an extralegal creation of the State Department, withheld strategic raw materials from American industry. Disturbing questions asked about the IMC in Congress were never answered.

Now a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, headed by Senator GEORGE W. MALONE, Republican, Nevada, has delved into the matter in connection with its 10-month study of raw materials.

The resulting 380-page report, Accessibility of Strategic and Critical Materials to the United States in Time of War and For Our Expanding Economy, condemns "second and third echelon planners" who have done serious harm to the American economy, either through stupidity or calculated subversion.

Witnesses testified that the IMC, implemented without congressional approval in the fall of 1950, was the brain child of Alger Hiss, Harry Dexter White, Frank Coe, and others who were later to appear before congressional committees investigating communism and subversion.

It was charged that the IMC's Marxist program of international price fixing and allocation of raw materials had deprived us of these materials at a critical time—that it authorized foreign raids on our military stockpile, and that materials that should have gone into armament were diverted to luxury goods and sold in competition with our home industry.

One witness, Representative THOMAS E. MARTIN, Republican, Iowa, a long time member of the House Committee on Military Affairs, said the 1946 Stockpile Act, which he helped to write and which former President Truman reluctantly signed into law because it contained a "buy American" provision, had been flagrantly subverted.

Representative MARTIN added that if the Korean war had become a general conflagration "the defense of this country would have been in a precarious position" because of unauthorized interference with the authority of the Munitions Board, now the Office of Defense Mobilization.

HEAVY BLAME

The International Materials Conference not only interfered with our stockpile accumulation, he said, but "may have been responsible for the shortage of ammunition at the front in Korea which was reported by General Van Fleet upon his return to this country."

While the Korean war was in progress, on March 9, 1952, House Republican Leader JOSEPH MARTIN, JR., charged that the International Materials Conference was responsible for much of the Nation's unemployment. He said the organization, without benefit of any legal stand whatsoever, held a life and death grip over countless lives and jobs.

What was the International Materials Conference? How did we get into it?

The Senate investigators struck the first mention of such an organization in a State Department press release, dated January 12, 1951. It said the United States, the United Kingdom, and France were establishing an organization to deal with materials in short supply. Other countries, it added, would be asked to join; and eventually 25 more did come in.

It was noted that this announcement came close on the heels of Marxist Prime Minister Attlee's visit during which he pleaded for an increased share of the world's materials at prices Britain could afford.

Secretary of State Dean Acheson, in a press release on February 21, 1951, said an international organization of committees was being put together to control scarce commodities.

On February 24 the State Department issued the following:

"This new organization will bear the collective title 'International Materials Conference' and the first committee to meet will be called the Copper, Zinc, and Lead Committee of the International Materials Conference (IMC)."

Retracing Marxist intrigue, the investigating Senators uncovered a trail of international planning and conferring that went back at least 5 years, to November 1945. At this time the State Department began circulating a paper prepared by Hiss and others, containing four proposals for "expansion of world trade and employment."

FOUR STEPS TO DOOM

The subcommittee summarized and interpreted these propsals as follows:

1. Rlease from restrictions imposed by governments. This meant abolition of all tariffs.

2. Rlease from restrictions imposed by private combines and cartels. This meant setting aside our antitrust laws and subordinating them to the United Nations body.

3. Release from fear of disorder in the markets for certain primary commodities. This meant intergovernment commodity agreements (or international price fixing).

4. Release from irregularity and fear of irregularity in production and employment. This meant world full employment planned by the U. N. body.

With these proposals before them, the Senators took a new look at Mr. Truman's reluctance to sign the 1946 stockpile act because of the objectionable "buy American" provision. They marked his language.

"It is the policy of this Government to work for international action to reduce trade barriers. We have proposed to other countries a set of principles governing trade, and look forward to the successful conclusion of broad international agreements embodying the essential principles of these proposals. Pending the conclusion of such agreements, it is the policy of this Government to avoid taking measures that will raise barriers to trade or prejudice the objectives of the forthcoming discussions."

What objectives? What forthcoming discussions?

Representative MARTIN told the investigators that few Congressmen in 1946 knew what Mr. Truman was talking about.

The Iowa Representative, producing documents, said he found it significant that while World War II was still being fought, second- and third-string policymakers in the State Department were busy planning the postwar world in which the United States was to underwrite the economies "of every other nation on the globe." Among these policymakers he named Alger Hiss in the State Department and Harry Dexter White and Frank Coe in the Treasury Department.

Tracing a series of international trade conferences, the subcommittee found that on February 18, 1946, the U. N. Economic and Social Council, advised by the British Marxist David Owen, had agreed to sponsor an international conference on trade and employment in London. The agenda included the four State Department proposals with one added topic: International Agreement Relating to Industrial Production.

Out of it came the Marshall plan, devised chiefly by Hiss and Clark M. Eichelberger, the U. N. propagandist and espouser of left-wing causes, and Mr. Truman's point 4 program.

The State Department report stated the British Socialist Sir Stafford Cripps opened the conference by saying: "It will be necessary for nations to give up some of their sovereignty in the economic field; that, in the opinion of the United Kingdom, the fundamental idea in this field was that it must be both the polity and the duty of each separate nation to provide for full employment and to avoid the exporting of unemployment; and finally, that although risks must be taken in the field of international trade, it would not be possible to divert trade from its old channels unless there was some assurance that new channels would be created."

Representative Martin, an on-the-scenes observer, interpreted this doubletalk as meaning the Labor Party believed we should give up our economic sovereignty, and that we should not protect American workers in their wages and jobs through tariffs, as such action would export unemployment. But the Socialists would not give up the British Empire preference system unless we created new channels of trade.

An International Trade Organization was proposed and a meeting held in New York, under auspices of the U. N., from January 20 to February 25, 1947. Next, in Geneva, in the spring and summer, came a preparatory Conference on Trade and Employment. The same delegates, with Mr. David Owen representing the U. N., then met in Habana, Cuba, on November 21, 1947, and deliberated through March 24, 1948.

Out of it came the so-called Habana Charter for an International Trade Organization, which Mr. Truman recommended to Congress. Mr. Acheson put in a personal appearance to urge ratification. But on May 12 the House Committee on Foreign Affairs turned thumbs down on the measure.

NO BY YOUR LEAVE

The record indicates that Mr. Acheson and the State Department thereafter declined to consult Congress on trade agreements. Together with the U. N., they simply acted, and the Congress learned about it later. The policy is still in operation, with Mr. Harold Stassen as the current front man.

The investigating subcommittee was a little surprised to learn from the State Department record that the British Socialists, during discussions that preceded the International Materials Conference formation, believed "that international allocation would penalize rather than help the United States and the United Kingdom" in the Korean war. But, despite these British misgivings, international allocations were agreed to, and the State Department submitted the following to the President:

"In reducing civilian consumption, minimum requirements essential to the operation of civilian economies here and abroad must be met. With respect to less essential civilian needs, the principle of equality of sacrifice, as among the United States and other free-world nations, should prevail. As the United States is now operating at higher levels of civilian consumption than a number of other Western European countries, this may mean greater cutbacks in this country than in certain other countries."

DOWN TO THEIR LEVEL

This Marxist planning in the State Department to cut back United States living standards to a level with that in less-prosperous countries—a continuing U. N. policy—was further revealed in a supplementary document:

"On cutting back civilian consumption, the minimum requirements essential to the operation of civilian economies must be met, and the principle of equality of sacrifice in relatively less essential activities should prevail. The United States can better afford to eliminate certain civilian uses of raw materials than can most of our allies, because the United States has a higher standard of living, more adequate supplies of consumer goods, and a wider range of use of raw materials in less essential fields.

"Nearly all our allies have been experiencing severe shortages of convertible currencies ever since World War II, and have been operating their economies in many respects on a minimum requirement basis, especially where raw materials from hard-currency areas are concerned."

The document containing the above was submitted to other of our Government agencies for comment. The Munition Board's staff, occupied with our war effort, commented as follows:

"The term 'equality of sacrifice' as applied to the United States in relation to other nations can be a most damaging application on the United States economy. Since the United States will be bearing most of the financial burden, if past patterns are a guide, we must also protect the United States economy. It is just as essential, if not more so, that the United States economy not be reduced or disturbed too severely."

While the State Department went ahead to implement the "equality of sacrifice" principle against American industry, the Munitions Board remained concerned over the possibility that the United States should be required to take materials from our stockpile and offer them on the international market. These fears seemed justified, since the International Materials Conference agreement had placed stockpiling on a lower priority than many civilian requirements in the United Kingdom and other countries. The Board remarked:

"Agreement should be sought from the United Kingdom that raw materials which are made available for development of export trade will be controlled so that nonessential luxury goods using scarce materials are eliminated or cut to a minimum. Also exports to Eastern Europe should not include scarce materials or end items containing such materials. Examples are molybdenum and export of graphic crucibles using scarce Madagascar flake graphite.

"Defense needs should be predominant. It should be recognized that the United States is currently imposing controls on short-supply materials. Stockpiling is a United States and allied defense requirement and should take precedence over United Kingdom normal business producing efforts."

The Senate subcommittee report observes that "After the International Materials Conference became effective, the normal civilian business of other countries, including the United Kingdom, did take precedence over our stockpile, and the so-called principle of sacrifice was adopted.

How did it work? The International Materials Conference was the title applied to seven commodity committees, a central group and a staff. The committees were copper-lead-zinc; cotton-cotton linters; manganese-nickel-cobalt; pulp-paper; sulfur; tungsten-molybdenum, and wool.

The first allocations of nonferrous metals, called entitlement for consumption, were issued on September 28, 1951. These allocations were designed to limit the amount of copper and zinc which the United States would be allowed to consume. The allocation and price-control powers of the Defense Production Act were used to enforce these regulations. The Congress had granted these powers to the Defense Production Administration but never suspected they would be delegated to an extralegal international agency.

FATAL FAIT ACCOMPLI

On September 30, 2 days after the International Materials Conference had issued its "entitlements for consumption" for copper and zinc, the Office of Defense Mobilization was obliged to announce ceiling price regulations on lead and zinc. It observed that international allocations had already been accepted for zinc, and added:

"The establishment of a ceiling which is somewhat below current world prices involves the calculated risk of some decrease in imports. * * * This action will tend to reduce the pressure of United States demands on free world supplies, ease the problems of friendly consuming countries, and make any international allocation arrangement more effective."

Mind you, this was while we were fighting a war in Korea.

As a result of this action, the investigating subcommittee found that by February 1, 1952, zinc was being taken out of our stockpile. Mr. Charles E. Wilson, the unhappy Defense Mobilizer of the time, was quoted in the New York Times as saying:

"Failure of zinc imports to reach normal volume was given * * * as the reason for diversion of the metal."

The subcommittee report states that "Actually, the failure of imports to reach normal volume was not a surprise—it had been planned that way."

Read into the record was the following from the IMC's report on operations for 1951–52:

"In developing plans of distribution for the metals it was necessary for the committees to consider what policy should be followed in allowing materials for stockpiling purposes during the period of scarcity. * * * The Copper-Zinc-Lead Committee on the Magnesium-Nickel-Cobalt Committee decided, in connection with their fourth quarter allocations, to recognize, in principle, the requirements for strategic stockpile purposes; but, in view of the tight supply, they recommended a special allowance for such requirements in the plans for copper, zinc, and cobalt, only to the extent of a small percentage of consumption during a given base period.

"In the case of commodities where the shortage was more acute (nickel, tungsten, and molybdenum) the committees were unable to recommend any special allowance for stockpiling.

"In the allocation plans for the first quarter of 1952 the Copper-Zinc-Lead and Manganese-Nickel-Cobalt Committee found it inadvisable to provide any special allowance for stockpile purpose."

The investigating subcommittee learned that an informal group of "second-and-third echelon personnel" in the State Department, "operating without a charter or bylaws, decided to set aside the stockpile program authorized by Congress and for which appropriations were made."

The subcommittee examined an exhibit, marked International Materials Conference Memorandum No. 61. It was a letter dated May 1, 1951, from J. H. Critchett, of the National Production Authority, to E. T. Gibson, Acting Administrator of the Defense Production Administration and United States representative on the central group of IMC. It listed a United States requirement of 200,000 pounds of tungsten per month for heavy armor-piercing shells, but added:

"We need about 60 percent of all free world tungsten, a percentage we probably will not be able to obtain but certainly will not even approach under the present purchasing conditions."

WE FEEL THE BITE

Considerable light on these purchasing conditions is found in a speech delivered in the Senate, February 18, 1952, by Senator Homer Ferguson, Republican, Michigan, who had become aroused over widespread unemployment in the automotive industry. He said in part:

"I have before me an offer from a copper broker in New York, to supply as much as 1,000 tons of copper from Japan at 45 cents a pound, free on board Japan, with an indication that an additional 7,000 tons is available. There is nothing unique about this offer. There is copepr in the world market. Employers in the United States are willing to pay the higher price, but they are prohibited from using this copper by the Defense Production Administration. The Defense Production Administration must prohibit the use of this copper because our Government is bound by a voluntary agreement to restrict our copper usage to the amount allocated by the International Materials Conference.

"If the American companies were to buy the Japanese copper, it might mean that other countries would be unable to get all the copper allocated to them by the International Materials Conference. For example, India is not a member of NATO, and has frequently voted against the United States on crucial issues in the United Nations. India is also a country which is not producing one gun or one tank, but it has been given a very liberal entitlement for consumption which is more than twice its 1947 actual consumption.

"All of this copper for India is for the production of civilian goods designed to raise the standard of living of the natives of India. I want to help the Indian people raise their standard of living, but not at the expense of the American workingman, and not at the expense of war production here at home."

You can't put it much plainer than that—or more in contrast with the Marxist philosophy that guides the State Department and its International Materials Conference.

Our domestic ceiling on copper at the time was 30½ cents a pound while the world market fluctuated at from 40 to 50 cents a pound. As a commentary, the subcommittee produced the following from the State Department files:

"It also can be argued on the basis of the attached table that we are receiving a smaller percentage of the free world's supply of tungsten (52 percent) under IMC than we did in 1950 (73 percent) or in 1949 (55 percent). Most agencies having an interest in the question are convinced that if there were no IMC and if the United States were to bring its full purchasing power to bear it would easily out-bid all other countries for the lion's share of the free world's tungsten production."

The Senate subcommittee commented: "The amount of tungsten that we obtained in 1950 without the IMC, contrasted with what we obtained under the IMC when we were shouldering most of the defense responsibilities of the free world, is a shocking indictment of United States participation in this unauthorized international cartel."

Additional comment seems unnecessary, except to remark that the handwriting of Alger Hiss looms large on the ledger of our betrayal.

The Struggle of Asia in the Search of Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR V. WATKINS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, December 2, 1954

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, the distinguished Ambassador of Pakistan, the Honorable Syed Amjad Ali, made an outstanding address at the bicentennial dinner of the Washington area alumni of Columbia University at the Statler Hotel on December 2. The title of his address was "The Struggle of Asia in the Search of Democracy."

As a graduate of the school of law at Columbia University, I attended the dinner and was greatly impressed by the sincerity and fluency of the Pakistan Ambassador, and by his demonstrated knowledge of the fundamental problems faced by the Asian peoples and their governments.

In view of the great importance of this problem to this country, and of the increasing stature of the great nation of Pakistan as a spokesman and defender of democratic principles in the Far East, I hereby request unanimous consent for the reproduction of the text of Ambassador Ali's address in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

THE STRUGGLE OF ASIA IN THE SEARCH OF DEMOCRACY

(Address of Ambassador Syed Amjad Ali, of Pakistan)

It is a great honor and privilege to be asked to speak to you on such a unique occasion as this bicentennial dinner of the Columbia University. In most of our world people are participating in these celebrations, paying their homage to knowledge, reiterating their right to knowledge, and stressing their belief in the free use of knowledge. There could not have been a better theme chosen than "Man's Right to Knowledge and the Free Use Thereof," because it vividly brings to the mind of men the eternal truth which was preached, forgotten, preached, and again forgotten, through centuries of our civilized existence.

The teachings of Islam on this subject readily come to my mind. We Muslims believe that from the very dawn of civilization God imparted knowledge to His peoples through His prophets so that man fully understood himself, his society, and the universe.

The basic teaching of Islam is that God created man and the universe with a purpose, that the universe is governed by laws designed to aid and further that purpose, that acceptance of these laws is faith, and that conformity to one's conduct to these laws is righteous living. The Holy Quran teaches that the object of man's creation is to achieve full communion with God or, in other words, so to develop his faculties and capacities as to become a manifestation of divine attributes. It is stated again and again that man has been given dominion over the created universe, that everything in creation is subservient to man and operates in aid of the achievement of the purpose of life. Islam thus throws wide open the gates of knowledge, observation, study, and scientific research.

It is significant that the very first revelation vouchsafed to the Prophet Muhammad was: "Read in the name of the Lord who creates; * * *. Read and thy Lord is most gracious, who taught by the pen, taught man what he knew not." God's graciousness here manifested itself in the bestowal of the means of acquiring knowledge. Subsequent revelations continued to emphasize man's need of knowledge and his duty to acquire it. The sayings of the prophet also contained many similar injunctions. "The pursuit of knowledge," said the Prophet Muhammad, "is a duty imposed upon every man and woman." On another occasion he remarked: "Go forth in search of knowledge even unto China"—i. e., the ends of the earth.

I felt the need of giving the Muslim conception of man and the universe, the various injunctions to seek knowledge so as to enable a better understanding of the faith the Muslims profess. Numbering over 400 million they form a very important sector of the peoples of Africa and Asia, where today the application of this eternal truth, "Man's right to knowledge and the free use thereof," is of great urgency and far-reaching consequence.

The ideal faith, the ideal democracy and the ideal society gives mankind the freedom to seek knowledge and to freely make use of that knowledge. This is as it should be, because if knowledge is not restricted the vast majority of mankind would be able to discriminate between right and wrong, truth and falsehood.

On the other hand if knowledge is controlled then the recipients of that restricted knowledge know only what they have been told. Such knowledge has always been dangerous. It has caused great upheavals throughout history. The beaming of certain aspects of knowledge, to the exclusion of free wave-lengths of knowledge, is therefore a matter of serious concern for all free thinking and freedom-loving peoples of this world.

A problem of even greater magnitude is the lack of knowledge. The illiteracy and poverty of the hundreds of millions of the peoples of Asia stares at the better-living face of the free world. These hungry and teeming millions of today are the heirs to great civilizations. Almost all of the great religions originated in these lands and most of pre-Greek philosophies were enunciated by the early Asians. Even after the fall of Greek and Roman Empires the Chinese, Japanese, Arabs, and Moghul Empires continued to play a great role in the promotion and diffusion of learning.

The libraries of Cordoba, the Moorish philosophers Ibni Rushid and Inbi Arabi, the Moslem architecture of the Middle East, the Taj Mahal of the Moghuls, the epic of Firdausi, the fabulous court of Kublai Kahn, are all monuments to the stature of these peoples.

From the 18th century onwards the Asia of the peacock throne, the wonderland of Marco Polo, the Arabian Nights of Harun Rashid started to lose its freedom, its wealth, and its position. The great loss of Asia through the last three centuries was the great gain of Europe during the same period.

The universities, colleges, schools, and scholars of the local people slowly went out of use because the rulers spoke a different language, had a different system, a different culture, and a different code. The new educational system and institutions of learning, and the new language took a long time to get going. The new rulers had come to gather the fruits of empire and were not overly keen to propagate knowledge. The people of Asia also did not take readily to the alien culture thrust upon them. The natural result of these tendencies was that the old literacy died out without being replaced by the new. It was only gradually and through a realization of the material benefits of the new scientific learning that the Asian people began to cultivate it. The process has been slow and to remedy the lag of centuries requires resources in personnel and finances that the countries of Asia cannot produce at the moment. Despite its most strenuous efforts, Pakistan has been able to achieve only a small increase in literacy in 4 years, from 15 to 19 percent. The belief in man's right to knowledge is a concept which is most worthy of realization but if the translation of that concept into reality is not possible then the faith in the concept itself starts to weaken.

We know that an informed electorate is the basis of modern democracy. The peoples of Asia with their close association through the last three centuries with the Europeans, whom they knew either as rulers or as commercial satraps, were inducted into the concept of modern democracy. They say the advantages because many of their religions believes in a democratic way of life, and, therefore, they were eager to adopt that form of government for the welfare and progress of their peoples. Islam, for instance, believes that between men there are no classes and no privilege. Mankind has been divided into tribes, nations, and races for the greater facility of human intercourse and for the purpose of fostering cooperation between different sections so that the ultimate purpose of creation may be the more easily and more readily achieved. In the sight of God the noblest are those who are the most religious in the sense of being forthright and just. That is the only patent of nobility. This belief, therefore, is in full conformity with the basic thinking of modern democracy. Similarly many of the religions of Asia, believing in social justice, were again in line with the basis of modern democracy. Having accepted this form as the way of life many of the Asiatic countries have, during recent years, set up democratic forms of government. The outward forms of democracy have been adopted but economic and social progress has failed to keep pace with either the needs of the situation or the expectations of the peoples. This failure to achieve or reach perfect democracy is due, very largely to illiteracy coupled with the low living standards. Under such conditions the democratic processes can easily be distorted and in the absence of popular vigilance, true representation might cease to exist. That is why in Pakistan, as elsewhere in Asia, the greatest stress is being laid on expanding educational facilities. But the limitations imposed by our means have already been stated and they represent a great peril.

Even in an elightened democracy, the political leadership comes to rest in a highly informed minority. Such a minority there does exist in the new countries of Asia. This minority has been nurtured on the western concepts of personal liberty and parliamentary representation. Roundabout this nucleus, however, is a mass that is not only illiterate but uncertain about the value of democracy. Asia, the oldest inhabited continent, is today overcrowded. The introduction of modern medicine and sanitation has, as in Europe, led to a tremendous increase in population. To cite an example, Pakistan and India together had less than 300 million people at the turn of the century. Today the total population is close to 450 million and it continues to increase at the rate of over 5 million a year. Unlike Europe, however, this spectacular increase in manpower has not been accompanied by a corresponding increase in production, nor are there any avenues of migration to new colonies. Hence the population, which is already desperately poor, is tending to get poorer. The problem of democracy is to give these people something to struggle for, to give their life a dignity out of which will come a desire to preserve individual freedom. An empty freedom under which poverty and disease prevail cannot stand up to the lure of economic betterment even if its promise is accompanied by political slavery. The deep religious faith of the people is certainly a bulwark against a godless economic creed, but how long can it withstand the pressures exerted by starvation and disease? Here is the crux of the struggle of Asia toward democracy. The key word is development. But development at a pace unprecedented in history. Democracy in Asia is up against a race against time. Every year the tempo of this race increases. Millions more mouths to feed, millions more children to educate, are one aspect of the problem; raising the living standard is another. The natural blessings of this great country and of the countries of Western Europe are being realized by the multitudes of Asia. They also seek a better life in which they can taste the comforts that science and industry provide. From Japan to the Middle East there is economic discontent. The resources of Asia are vast but undeveloped. The stimulus, the quickening, has to come from the countries that have reached a high stage of development. Among these, the United States has resources, both in know-how and in production that are unrivaled today or ever before.

What has been done so far to put in the investment so that the colossal potential of Asia can be utilized? Despite signs of a beginning, the answer would be, in terms of facts—very little. Out of more than $46 billion spent by the United States on foreign aid since 1945, only $600 million have gone to south Asia. One-fourth of mankind, and perhaps the most underdeveloped part, has received only 1.3 percent of the investment of the American people in the free world. During all these years, the governments of Asian countries have struggled hard to achieve some degree of social and economic progress within their limited means. They are up against a lag of centuries, however, and must be helped to help themselves. Stepped-up technical assistance coupled with vastly increased investment is the only means of ensuring their survival as democratic nations.

As of today the economic foundations of the countries of Asia are far from stable. As producers of raw materials, they are still dependent upon trade with industrialized nations. The prices of their staple products are set by the demand of the advanced countries that utilize them. Seldom do these go to the advantage of the primary producers. Furthermore, these prices are subject to sharp fluctuations. Pakistan depends upon two main crops—cotton and jute—to earn 85 percent of its foreign exchange. In 1951, the country earned more than $800 million and was able to launch a vigorous 6-year development plan. In 2 years the conditions in the international commodities market changed so much to Pakistan's disadvantage that in 1953 the earnings were down to about $400 million. As a result a drastic curtailment of the development program had to be effected. Still more serious was the economic discontent in the country which expressed itself in political terms, thus rendering the task of the leadership even more difficult. Ceylon, Burma, Indonesia, and other producers of raw materials were equally hard hit by this trade recession. I cannot give a more striking illustration of the interrelation between economic prosperity and healthy democracy. Such being the case the struggle of Asia for democracy can best be described as a struggle for literacy and economic development. Security is important and must, naturally, be safeguarded. But the only lasting security for democracy and for free enterprise will come from people who have something to fight for and who understand the value of liberty.

Today the battle is joined in Asia in the minds of men between what western democracy and communism have to offer. Democracy is more congenial to the vast majority of Asians because it is akin to the faiths they profess and also because it appeals to the fundamental dignity of the individual. But faced with social and economic problems of titanic proportions, they must be given the helping hand of their better-endowed fellow nations if they are not to sink into disillusionment and despair. Western Europe was saved immediately after the last war. A greater peril looms in Asia.

Two hundred years ago a torch was kindled in the University of Columbia which provided a flame of learning to the few millions who were struggling for a foothold on the eastern seaboard of this great country. This feeble flame, in the course of 2 centuries, has blazened into a great light shedding its rays far and wide in the 6 continents of this world. The light from this great seat of learning will, I hope, help the thinking of the developed democracies to assist in dispelling the darkness of illiteracy and poverty which surrounds the peoples of Asia.

The Policy That Wrecked the American Mining Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. MALONE

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, December 2, 1954

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Are We a Have-Not Nation?" by Newton H. Fulbright, published in the magazine U. S. A., August 27, 1954, and dealing with Senate Report No. 1627 of the Minerals, Materials, and Fuels Economic Subcommittee of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ARE WE A HAVE-NOT NATION?

(By Newton H. Fulbright)

Is our industry dependent on foreign imports? Has our rich supply of critical raw materials played out? Are we a have-not nation?

Many Americans would be surprised to learn that much of our foreign policy is based on the assumption that we cannot produce the raw materials for our civilian or wartime needs.

It is not generally known that the State Department, under the 1934 Trade Agreement Act, has entered into agreements with and extended financial aid to foreign countries for the development and production of strategic minerals which are ostensibly on short supply in this country. We extended $594,126,000 from July 1, 1950, through March 1, 1953, to this foreign minerals expansion program. But during the same period, we spent only $64 million for domestic expansion.

Was this policy justified? Was it necessary to turn to foreign sources or can we get everything we need within the Western Hemisphere?

Finally, have we been sold on the assumption that we are dependent on foreign nations as part of the Communist strategy concocted by the Harry Dexter White and Alger Hiss groups of subversives in the Government?

These questions are posed with some disturbing answers by the Minerals, Materials, and Fuels Economic Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, headed by Senator GEORGE W. MALONE, Republican, of Nevada. The subcommittee, after an extensive study, has offered a highly informative report: "Accessibility of Strategic and Critical Materials to the United States in Time of War and for Our Expanding Economy."

It contains information that every voter should have in mental store when he casts his ballot in the congressional elections this November.

MINES FOR THE ASKING

Obviously, the availability of critical and strategic materials is a basic necessity. Our national survival in time of war depends on an ample and uninterrupted supply of some 77 critical materials. The subcommittee, basing its conclusions on the testimony of 360 witnesses heard in 56 hearings in Seattle, Los Angeles, and Washington, D. C., states without equivocation that this country and the Western Hemisphere can supply all our needs. It is disturbed to learn, however, that we are doing nothing to develop our mines.

Indeed, the subcommittee found that our policy, dictated by "second and third echelon" elements in the State Department, has effectively hamstrung our domestic mining industry.

"At a moment when the United States is using the greatest amount of lead and zinc in its history," the report states, "our lead and zinc mines are closing down, unable to meet in our domestic market the competition provided by foreign competitors. * * *

"An example in another direction is mercury, in which we are said to be singularly deficient and on which we rely principally on Spain and Italy for our source of supply.

"There is plenty of mercury on this continent. When World War II ended, the price was reduced to $80 per flask through European competition, and when our own producers were forced out the price climbed to $270 per flask." The subcommittee found that when a mine is closed, it requires from 3 to 6 years to get it opened again and back into production.

How did we get this way? What are the facts behind this foreign materials program?

After our experience in World War I, military and industrial experts concluded that an adequate defense required the accumulation of a reserve supply of strategic and critical materials. Congress, recognizing the necessity for stockpiling and the need for stimulation of domestic production, enacted Public Law 117 in 1939. The act provided for—

1. Acquisition and retention of stocks of strategic and critical materials;

2. Encouragement of conservation and development of the sources of these strategic and critical materials within the United States and thereby decrease and prevent wherever possible the dangerous and costly dependence of the United States upon foreign nations for the supplies of these materials in times of national emergency;

3. The act further provides for the creation of an industry advisory committee and designated the Secretaries of War, Navy and Department of the Interior to purchase and acquire these stockpiles. (The functions of the Cabinet Secretaries were later delegated to the Munitions Board, now the Office of Defense Mobilization.)

4. The act further provided that we buy American.

The subcommittee observes that Congress, in this latter provision, was deeply aware that the success of the stockpiling effort depended as much, if not more, on the stimulation of a healthy going-concern mining industry as it did on the accumulation of materials. The Stockpile Act stated emphatically that it was necessary to stimulate and encourage the development of sources of strategic materials within the United States. But testimony before the subcommittee showed that "a drive has been made, evidently sponsored by the State Department, to eliminate the buy-American feature of the Stockpile Act."

BITING OUR OWN HAND

It asserts that former President Truman, "when he signed the 1946 Stockpile Act, issued a statement in which he said it was only because of the overriding importance of the act that he was able to overcome his reluctance in signing a bill with the buy-American provision." Mr. Truman was quoted in these words:

"Those provisions will * * * tend to defeat the conservation and strategic objectives of the bill by further depleting our already inadequate underground reserves of strategic materials. Furthermore, there can be a serious conflict between those provisions and the foreign economic policy which this Government is actively pursuing.

"This provision clearly indicates that the stockpiling program should not be used as a means of generally subsidizing those domestic producers who otherwise could not compete successfully with other domestic or foreign producers.

"It is the policy of this Government to work for international action to reduce trade barriers. * * *

"Encouragement of unnecessary domestic production and unjustified preferential treatment to domestic producers destroys trade and so undermines our national economic strength."

Who thought up this policy, the reader might well ask, with its implicit dire threat to the jobs and the wages of American miners? Who put these words in Mr. Truman's mouth?

The subcommittee claims to have found a clue in a Harry Dexter White memorandum dated March 7, 1944, which it obtained from the Princeton University Library and the files of the Treasury Department. It states that White, then Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, wrote a memorandum to Secretary of the Treasury Henry Morgenthau, Jr., setting forth a table of the United States domestic reserves of strategic materials as follows:

	Years' supply	
	Based on 1939 domestic consumption	Based on 1943 domestic consumption
Petroleum	16	13
Manganese	9	3
Tungsten	23	3
Zinc	17	8
Lead	7	6
Chrome	(1)	—1
Mercury	3	

[1] No record.

From this data he drew the theory:

"Although our domestic reserves of petroleum, tungsten, and zinc may suffice to meet consumption requirements for the next decade, they will be almost entirely dissipated by the end of that period, meaning the year 1954 or thereabouts."

Assistant Secretary White then concluded:

"The necessity of growing United States dependence on foreign sources of supply in order to satisfy anticipated postwar industrial requirements and to maintain adequate security reserves is inescapable."

Secretary Morgenthau, duly impressed, forwarded to the President on January 10, 1945, Mr. White's table of alleged reserves and stated:

"I suggest consideration be given to a financial arrangement with the U. S. S. R. to provide * * * repayment to us chiefly in strategic raw materials which are in short supply in the United States.

"An important feature of this proposal is that we will be conserving our depleted natural resources by drawing on Russia's huge reserves."

The subcommittee, after hearing testimony from 360 witnesses, states that, "In retrospect it is shown that White's conclusions, assumptions, theories, and policies, which made the United States dependent upon offshore foreign areas, principally Russia, for strategic materials, were false and untrue.

"White's use of these statistical tables was either the result of gross ignorance or part of the machinations of an insidious, subversive policy to make this Nation dependent upon Russia and other offshore areas for the sources of our strategic and critical raw materials without which we could not fight a war."

PROVEN ERROR

The subcommittee report then states:

"It is interesting to note that in 1947 William Remington (since jailed for perjury) was chairman of the so-called secret ad hoc committee which was regulating the exports of strategic and critical materials from the United States, who when questioned concerning his reasons for approving certain strategic materials going to Russian satellite countries, explained that it was a quid pro quo with Russia whereby she was delivering to us manganese without which we could not make any steel.

"Testimony before this committee has established that we have all of the manganese we can use in the foreseeable future in the Western Hemisphere."

So much for Communist agent White and his statistics. Time has proved them utterly false, but his recommendations still guide our foreign policy.

Witnesses told the subcommittee that the Buy-American feature of the Stockpile Act—a feature that has been on the statute books, in one form or another, since March 3, 1933—has been attacked by former President Truman and by both the Paley commission and the Bell report dealing with strategic materials. It received the criticism of President Eisenhower last March 30. Bills were introduced in the 83d Congress to have it repealed. Henry Ford II, in an address before the Inland Daily Press Association in Chicago, in February 1953, said we should abandon the Buy-American Act because it forced American manufacturers to spend more money for domestic materials than they would have to spend for foreign materials.

The subcommittee found, however, that the Buy-American Act has been subtly thwarted. It reports that "80.1 percent of the present stockpile inventory was secured from foreign sources, largely at the expense of domestic production."

The report adds "This policy of saving our domestic sources and becoming dependent upon foreign materials evidently emanated from and is carried on through the lower echelons of the State and other departments who have controlled our foreign-trade policies.

"It was also found that generally foreign low-wage area producers were paid as much and often more per unit for such critical materials than was paid or offered domestic producers paying several times more in wages and taxes."

EXPLODED THEORY

But what about the supply of minerals and strategic materials here at home and in the Western Hemisphere?

The subcommittee seems to have gone thoroughly into the matter. It heard from top experts in the Bureau of Mines, the Departments of Agriculture, Defense and Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission and other Government agencies, and from operators of mines and related industries.

"These experts," the report states, "exploded the have-not theories, and they prove that this country can materially increase its economic production—often double, treble or quadruple; its supplies of critical materials; and that the Western Hemisphere can become self-sufficient. Each of the 77 strategic and critical materials has been separately studied and evaluated as to availability to the United States in the Western Hemisphere."

The Senate investigators found that industrial diamond was the only mineral that might have to be stockpiled from outside the Western Hemisphere. But they found that research and experimentation are developing substitutes for diamond in industrial drilling and grinding.

They also found that modern prospecting is uncovering immense new treasures of mineral wealth. "Until recently," the report states, "the discovery of mineral deposits was based entirely on surface showings or underground information gained from mines working in the same area. Most of the world's great mines were discovered in this fashion. But in recent years, new scientific principles have been developed making possible discoveries of mineral deposits far beneath the surface of the earth."

Many witnesses found a deplorable lag in basic geological mapping of our potential mineral reserves. The report found "Although the United States Geological Survey has been conducting mapping services since 1880, less than 1 percent of the area of the Nation has been included in geological investigations; 12.7 percent of the Nation's surface has been geologically mapped, and 31.1 percent topographically mapped." The subcommittee urged that this work be pushed with all possible speed.

To revive a healthy going-concern mining industry, it urged that the power to formulate trade agreements be taken away from "a group of little known persons of the second and third echelon in the State Department * * * and placed in the hands of men who have an intimate knowledge of our strategic and critical raw material needs."

The subcommittee states that a major step in the Communist conspiracy to destroy this Nation is economic. The first full-length stride in this direction, it believes, was the 1934 Trade Agreement Act which transferred the constitutional responsibility for regulating foreign trade from the legislative to the executive branch of government.

These conclusions seem self-evident: closed mines mean unemployment. Closed mines mean dependence on foreign countries. They mean loss of independence and are a serious threat to our security in the likely event of an open war with Red communism.

It is something for Americans to think about.

Senator MALONE stated in a letter to this writer: "I came to the Senate to do the job represented by this report. I was in my eighth year before I could become chairman of a committee and arrange the proper setup for the work. I did not come here to just be another Senator.

"I think we have for 22 years dissipated our wealth and our resources and are slowly becoming dependent upon foreign nations across major oceans, and are in their power."

It is something for Americans to think about.

Imprisonment by the Red Chinese of 13 American Citizens on Fictitious Charges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, December 2, 1954

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD my press release of November 24, 1954, which relates to the imprisonment by the Red Chinese of 13 American citizens on fictitious charges.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The shocking news that 13 American citizens have been sentenced on fictitious charges to various prison terms by the Red Chinese accentuates a feeling shared by many people throughout the entire free world that there can be no trust or faith whatsoever in the pawns of the Kremlin. The mythical nature of the charges against these servicemen again illustrates the Communists' complete disregard of the inalienable rights of the individual.

To learn that a fellow Marylander, Col. John Knox Arnold, Jr., of the Air Force, who resides in Silver Spring, along with 12 other captured airmen, has thus been sentenced is more than disturbing to me. It is repugnant and outrageous.

In January 1954, at the time of the so-called Korean armistice agreement, I delivered a speech in the Senate of the United States calling attention to the report that some 700 to 900 American boys allegedly had not been returned along with the 22,000 U. N. soldiers who had been held prisoner by the Communist forces I pointed out that if these boys had not been returned, then the Communists were violating the so-called armistice agreement which required that all prisoners be returned. I demanded that our Government take action to bring these boys home.

"In our proper joy over the return of these 22,000 U. N. prisoners," I said, "let us not allow the more than 700 Americans who are still prisoners of the Red slave-labor camps to become the 'forgotten men' of our day, the symbols of a betrayed trust, a callous indifference, and a national dishonor which will blacken the pages of world history from here to eternity."

Repeatedly, I then contacted the Defense and State Departments, requesting them to share with me any information which they might have concerning the above report, and also what steps, if any, had been taken or were contemplated to secure the return of American boys who were allegedly still being held prisoner by the Communists. The Defense Department replied, in part, as follows:

"It is confirmed that there were 944 of our men concerning whom reports were received which indicated that the Communists possessed knowledge about their fate. Information concerning them originated, among other sources, from prisoner-of-war interrogations, statements of repatriated personnel, Communist radio broadcasts and news reports, and personal letters. An initial demand for an accounting for these men was prestend to the Military Armistice Commission on September 9. The Communist reply of September 21 was regarded by the United Nations command as totally unsatisfactory and unacceptable; and subsequently—on September 25, November 23, December 10, and January 18—further demands were made. The Communist responses have been uniformly unacceptable.

"In many cases, the reported information concerning the men was scanty and inconclusive. It has never been believed, or intended to be implied, that all 944 men were living. The demands presented to the Military Armistice Commission were not for a return of 944 men, but for an accounting for them—to include, of course, the return of all who might still be living. Our Government, through the Military Armistice Commission, will continue its negotiations to obtain information which would clarify the status of all the men; and will continue to investigate all sources of information and explore all feasible courses of action."

Subsequently, officials of the Department of State and the Department of Defense have consistently pleaded with me to withhold any public criticism of, or statement pertaining to, existing policies so as to enable unrestrained approaches through normal diplomatic channels. The complete impotence of these policies is now clearly evident and American servicemen will rot and perish at the mercy of the Communists.

Even the utilization of the United Nations in this matter has been outstandingly ineffective. Where human lives and freedom are concerned, it occurs to me that we can no longer rely upon diplomatic measures.

The people of this country have a right to demand that these 13 men, and any others, now held behind the Iron Curtain, be freed immediately from the bondage of slavery and imprisonment. The type of vigorous action to be taken must be precisely decided by our Government without delay, without compromise, and without piecemeal appeasement.

We are hearing much these days about coexistence—peaceful and otherwise. I am sure that no American wants coexistence at the price of 1 unjustly imprisoned countryman—let alone 13, or 944, or whatever the terrible actual figures, in truth, might be.

Mrs. Harriet McCarran Expresses Heartfelt Thanks to Senate for Tributes to Late Husband

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. MALONE

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, December 2, 1954

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, on November 9, of this year, when the Senate of the United States held memorial services for departed Senators, leaders, and distinguished members of both parties joined in eulogies to our late, great colleague from Nevada, Senator Patrick A. McCarran.

Mrs. Harriet McCarran, his devoted wife and helpmate for more than half a century, has written me expressing her heartfelt thanks to all of us who participated in this solemn Senate tribute.

Every Member of the Senate, I am sure, will be lifted by the knowledge that our eulogies to Nevada's famous champion of Americanism brought a measure of comfort and consolation to his sorrowing widow and family.

I ask unanimous consent that Mrs. McCarran's letter, sent to me from her home in Reno, Nev., be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, Mrs. McCarran's letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEAR SENATOR: I have just received from you the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Tuesday, November 9, containing the eulogies to my dear, beloved husband, Pat McCarran.

I have read and reread each and every one of the wonderful tributes with a sad heart, but grateful and happy in the knowledge that he had the affection and esteem of such wonderful men as are in our United States Senate. Wonderful and beautiful were their words and my heartfelt thanks goes to each and every one of them.

The children and I cherish very deeply the fine expressions testifying to the respect, appreciation, and affection in which the Senate of the United States holds the memory of our loving husband and father.

Kindest regards and my heartfelt thanks to you and Ruth.

Sincerely,

HARRIET McCARRAN
(Mrs. Pat).

Utahans "Invent" County Agents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR V. WATKINS
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, December 2, 1954

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, several weeks ago Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson spoke to the National Association of County Agricultural Agents in Salt Lake City, Utah. He concluded his remarks by pointing out that the dissemination of agricultural research information to farmers through State extension services "can do more for the farmer in helping him do a better job on his farm than can Congress."

By this remark, the Secretary meant in effect that State and local governments are in a much better position to solve many local problems than are agencies of the Federal Government. With this philosophy I am in complete agreement.

Typical of such an approach to the solving of local agricultural problems is that exemplified by the Utah State Extension Service of which the people of Utah are justly proud. The initiative, resourcefulness, and spirit of public service which has characterized the extension service from its establishment is well illustrated by an article entitled "Utahans 'Invent' County Agents," which appeared in the Salt Lake Tribune, October 10, 1954. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UTAHANS "INVENT" COUNTY AGENTS

(By Robert K. Ottum)

When America's county agricultural agents sit down together Monday in Salt Lake City, there'll be two men among them who maybe ought to lean back, hook thumbs in their suspenders, and wait.

And when the talk swings around to farming problems, they can say, "Fellas, you just don't know what real trouble is."

Meet Robert H. Stewart, Brigham City. He was a county farm agent at least 1 year before there even was such a thing. That was back in 1913.

And in 1911, young L. M. Winsor (1202 E. Crystal Avenue, Salt Lake City), stepped out of a leather-sprung stagecoach in Vernal and said, "I'm here to help out with the irrigation."

There wasn't a name for it then, either.

Winsor got off to a mean start by telling the farmers they were doing it all wrong; so did Stewart.

Turned out they were both right. And since Monday brings the Nation's county agents together for a convention, it is a good time to look backward down that long trail of successes.

They started out like a cowboy movie ends—riding down that dusty trail on horseback. Stewart rode into Carbon and Emery Counties. Winsor rode the Uintah Basin country.

Winsor ran smack into trouble. The homesteaders were pouring water on land that wouldn't soak it up. They were irrigating every 5 days or oftener; the subsoil was dry and hard.

Mark up success No. 1: Winsor, who has since become one of the world's noted experts on water and what it's going to do, told the farmers what to do. Apply the water late in the fall and early in the spring; run those ditches into groups and work out a system of delivery.

When they ran a soil bore in the area the following spring, water which once soaked down to 15 inches at the most was penetrating down to depths of 10 feet.

"Results were revolutionary," L. M. says now. "And there were no more crop failures for lack of water."

Meanwhile, over in Carbon-Emery, young Stewart was chopping down prejudices, doing as much buttonholing and campaigning as he was farm advising. He became an overnight front-step public speaker against false farming practices.

In less than 1 year he fast-talked eastern Utah into staging its first county fair.

He organized the first mass tour into a neighboring county, leading 156 farmers and their wives on a 3-day jaunt into Sevier, where they looked to see if the grass was any greener on that side of the fence. (Such farm tours have long since become commonplace. Stewart invented it.)

Stewart turned to campaigning while sitting on a corral fence. The result: He taught cattlemen to trade their stock before selling and then to sell it cooperatively; local purses got a little fatter through his help.

He sandwiched in another pet idea of his—irrigate less and cultivate more. Farms became less waterlogged.

His checkerboard career all began fitting together. Stewart lined up a string of solid friends all across his territory and farming began to pay off better and be a lot less work.

Winsor also was running up a pillar-of-the-community reputation in his district. He did such a good job it caught up with him. In 1912, L. M. Winsor was transferred to the 5 counties of San Luis Valley, Colo., as one of the first 4 county agents in that State, and he had a tag in those days—expert in irrigation.

He might as well have left it at home. When he hit the valley Winsor found an outbreak of hog cholera killing stock by the tens of thousands. In 1, 2, 3 order, he shipped in a veterinarian with a suitcase full of needles; organized the farmers to pay a full-time vet for 1 year; then went to Denver and demanded legislation to protect farmers from such imported diseases. The law now provides for quarantine and proper cleaning of stock cars in which hogs are shipped.

In 1913 he became specialist in irrigation for USAC Extension Service, a post which held him until 1934. But he never got to put his feet on the USAC desk.

Recognized enough to be called a special consultant, Winsor went to Chile in 1918 to perform magic. He designed a plan to bring water from the east side of the Andes into a waterless valley.

The years following were true salad days. In 1919 he was back in Utah as a flood-control expert. By 1933 this touch was evident all around the State. (And while it wasn't in his line, he cured the mysterious "duck sickness" of 1926 by building a 32-mile dike around Bear River delta, a boon for migratory game birds.)

Across the way, still hustling, was Robert Stewart. He took over Box Elder County in December 1916 at 10° below zero. He warmed it up by organizing community farm bureaus, then a county farm bureau. Successful with these, he ranched out, organized a unit of Utah Poultry Association at Brigham City and Tremonton, set up units of Weber Dairy Association, organized two cattlegrower associations, and a Production Credit Association, plus branches of the Federal land bank.

Campaigner Stewart sold the farmers on better seed wheat, barley, oats, and corn. Result: It stamped out smut which had been jacking up costs. He asked for and got crop rotation, boosted sugarbeet acreage, and set up Northern Utah Soil Conservation District.

Led by Stewart, farmers raised funds and put electric power and lights into every outlying community of Box Elder County.

In 1936, Stewart did the job that later was to throw the national spotlight on him. He organized the Wellsville Mountain Area Project Corp. to stop erosion and save the culinary water supplies of 16 communities in Box Elder and Cache Counties. With the help of the United States Forest Service, he funneled more than $50,000 into the project and put grass over an entire mountain.

The project now is a world model of how to do it.

Stewart turned in his title June 30, 1949, and retired from the job he had held since June 13, 1913. Now, after 5 years of official retirement, he's still sought after. He's president of the Wellsville project he set up; chairman of the Cache National Forest Service advisory board; and chairman of the Box Elder-Weber watershed protective finance committee.

L. M. Winsor also is sitting on the top of the ladder.

The flood-control works at the Garfield smelter of American Smelting & Refining Co. are considered among the most elaborate in the world. More of Winsor's work. In 1934, by order of the President, he helped solve erosion problems on the Navaho Reservation and it won him the post of chief engineer with the newly formed Office of Erosion Control in the United States Department of Agriculture.

Winsor held the purse strings on $6 million for a project in North Dakota; then spread out to work irrigation and water tricks across the country. In 1941, he went to Iran as a specialist, returning in February 1946.

Like Stewart, Winsor still doesn't have much of a chance to put his feet on the desk. He's now chief drainage and flood engineer, Utah State Road Commission.

He sums it up this way: "Well, I never applied for a job."

For every convention, there ought to be a special kind of badge, maybe gold edged, for such pioneers. And the small print on it should maybe read, "Son, you don't know what real trouble is."

Report by CED Committee Challenged: Errors Cited and Dissents Noted

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE W. MALONE
OF NEVADA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, December 2, 1954

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, within the past few days a statement on United States tariff policy was released by the Research and Policy Committee of the Committee for Economic Development. Many of the newspapers, in their coverage of this statement, attributed it to the board of trustees which includes numerous leaders of American industry who, I am sure, are not in complete accord with this statement.

The report by CED's Research and Policy Committee differs so materially from the announced position of some of the CED trustees that I believe it is important that the public clearly understand the distinction between a report by this committee and a report by the trustees themselves.

The Research and Policy Committee includes 33 individuals. Two of the 33, Mr. Harlow H. Curtice, president of General Motors Corp., and Mr. Philip D. Reed, chairman of the board of General Electric Co., have taken no position with respect to this policy statement, because of their absence from the country.

Two other members of the Research and Policy Committee, Mr. John D. Biggers, chairman of the board of Libbey-Owens-Ford Glass Co., and Mr. Ernest Kanzler, vice chairman of the board of the Universal CIT Credit Corp. have dissented from the recommendations. The report also gives the impression that other members were among the minority who disapproved of its recommendations.

The dissent by Mr. Biggers and Mr. Kanzler reads as follows, and I quote:

Dissent by John D. Biggers, Chairman of the Board, Libbey-Owens-Ford Glass Co., Toledo, Ohio, and Ernest Kanzler, Vice Chairman of the Board, Universal CIT Credit Corp.

We are opposed to the CED's recommendations with respect to United States tariff policies. We consider them contrary to our national interest and based on academic theories rather than on actual conditions in the world today.

1. The United States is already a low-tariff country. Of the 43 countries reporting to the International Monetary Fund, the United Nations, and other official sources, 35 have a higher percentage ratio of customs duties collected to total value of imports than the United States; only 7 countries have lower ratios.

2. We should test the effects of adjustments already made before going further. The tariff reductions embodied in the so-called reciprocal trade agreements which have been made since 1934 have not been thoroughly tested under normal world conditions. Only during recent months has our economy been relatively free of abnormal or artificial stimulants, and already the ill effects of tariff reductions made during the past 20 years are being felt by a number of our industries in many communities and by thousands of unemployed workers.

3. Other nations are pursuing nationalistic policies in their own self-interest. The committee's recommendations might be effective if we were living in an unselfish world, but such is not the case. Others are glad to invade our markets, but reluctant to have us share in theirs. They have erected tariff barriers, exchange regulations, import quotas, and even embargoes to protect their markets. We have received very few benefits in return for our large tariff reductions during the past 20 years.

4. Our allies do not need additional tariff aids. Their industrial production has risen to levels 31 to 73 percent above those prevailing in 1938, and they have made further gains during the current year.

5. We cannot permanently divert world commerce from its natural channels. Our allies are resisting and even ignoring our efforts to exclude them from their normal markets in Eastern Europe and Asia.

6. We cannot buy support for our policies. We have not succeeded by giving outright aid nor can we by offering easy business on a platter.

7. Further tariff reductions might boomerang. American communities, companies, and workers seriously injured by foreign imports would demand Government protection, and we might swing the pendulum too far in the direction of increased tariffs. This would be unfortunate.

8. The sound policy seems to be to test the effects and consequences of the tariff reductions made during the past 20 years before making further unwarranted, unnecessary, and dangerous experiments.

CONFLICTS BETWEEN CED REPORT AND SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE'S FINDINGS CITED

Mr. President, the report on United States tariff policy to which Mr. Biggers and Mr. Kanzler dissent is diametrically opposed to the findings and recommendations of the Subcommittee on Minerals, Materials, and Fuels Economics of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

As chairman of the subcommittee and for the information of my colleagues, I shall analyze the CED group's report, point by point, basing my comments on the Senate subcommittee's own findings during an investigation and study of the problem over a period of 18 months.

The references I cite will be from the report of CED's research and policy group, each followed by my own comments and findings of the Subcommittee on Minerals, Materials, and Fuels Economics.

Statements in CED Report and Comments by Senior Senator From Nevada

Reference, page 1, line 8:

Report reads: "In the years before 1860 the American economy was still predominantly agricultural and tariffs were generally low."

Comment: During the 25 years, 1791 to 1815, less than 5 percent of all imports were on the free list, average rate of duty was 12.6 percent. In 1830, average rate of duty on all imports, including duty-free products, was 45 percent. The Walker Tariff Act of 1846 classified imports into four schedules: luxuries, including intoxicating beverages, 100 percent; semiluxuries, 40 percent; commercial products from 30 to 5 percent; average duty on all dutiable imports, 1848-1857, 26 percent. In 1953, the average tariff rates on free and dutiable goods was 5.3 percent, and on dutiable imports, only 12.2 percent.

Reference, page 3, line 13:

Report reads: "We enjoy higher real wage levels and living standards with foreign trade than would be possible if we relied solely on supplies and markets within our own borders."

Comment: This is only true if there is full use of our resources both in terms of capital and labor. If there is any substantial amount of unemployment or of idle capital in this country, we obviously are not enjoying higher living standards by receiving imports and supporting the displaced resources in idleness.

Reference, page 3, line 16:

Report reads: "The economic advantage of foreign trade is very clear when we buy abroad things which we don't produce at all at home—coffee, bananas, and tin."

Comment: No one has ever challenged this statement. That is why the United States free list has always included those products which cannot be produced in this country.

Reference, page 4, line 13:

Report reads: "All trading nations benefit in this way from an expanding world trade."

Comment: This is only true if all of the displaced resources throughout the world have been reemployed in a manner so as to maximize their comparative advantage. This is most unlikely in the real world in contrast with the world of the theoretical 19th Century classical economists.

SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE URGED ENDING DEPENDENCY ON DISTANT AREAS

Reference, page 4, line 17:

Report reads: "The health of key defense industries is likely to be the foremost example of a situation where overall economic efficiency becomes of secondary importance."

Comment: The Subcommittee on Minerals, Materials, and Fuels Economics, of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, in recommendation number 3 said: "We recommend eliminating our Nation's present dependency upon remote and possibly unfriendly or neutral areas of the world for critical materials without which we cannot conduct a war." The report also said:

"Strategic considerations today make it imperative that we maintain going-concern industries in the production of basic materials and manufactured goods essential to our security in the event of war.

"This automatically requires that those domestic industries which would be displaced by foreign industries enjoying a greater comparative advantage must be protected until the peace of the world is assured and strategic considerations can give way to welfare economics.

"Should world war III engulf this country, in addition to having a stockpile of strategic and critical materials, we should have a going-concern industry which could be expanded so as to meet the needs of any emergency.

"If we are dependent upon foreign producers whose governments may be unfriendly, unstable, or may even be displaced by Communist governments, as has happened already in Czechoslovakia, we are gambling with our own security.

"Even if foreign producers are able to produce materials, we still have the problem of getting them to our own shores. This requires convoy operations which are costly and will be even more difficult in world war III with the new modern submarines and atom bombs available to our enemies to destroy ports and industrial operations far from our shores.

"While the Navy may well be able to defend long sea lanes, no one could argue that the same commitment of manpower, surface ships, and aircraft could not be used more effectively in fighting the enemy if such convoy operations were not necessary.

"In all strategic considerations we are justified in increasing our dependence on Canadian and Mexican producers and to a less extent on the other countries of the Western Hemisphere, as such sources will be more easily defended rather than those located in Africa and the Far East across major oceans" (pp. 300–301).

FREE MOVEMENT OF CAPITAL AND PEOPLE IMPERATIVE TO FREE TRADE

Reference: Page 4, line 19.

Report reads: "The welfare of a particular domestic group might also on occasion be of overriding importance."

Comment: The theory of free trade contemplates unrestricted movement of people and capital so that all resources may be used to their maximum advantage. The report of the Subcommittee on Minerals, Materials, and Fuels Economics of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs said:

"Implicit in the adoption of the free-trade philosophy is the specialization of each country and region in those products in which its comparative advantage is greatest.

"If the United States is to remove protection from those industries within its borders having a low comparative advantage, such action must simultaneously be accompanied by the removal of tariff barriers, quota systems, and manipulation of currency systems for trade advantage in all other countries.

"This obviously requires that Europe become a single economic unit as the barriers to trade between the countries of Europe are far more restrictive than those of the United States with the rest of the world. Furthermore, tariffs are only one form of restriction. Subsidies and other Government assistance to industries having a low comparative advantage are equally obnoxious" (p. 301).

"The forces which generate and create migrations of workers from one part of the country to another, as the very theory of free trade contemplates, are extremely painful while they are operative. Even assuming that after everyone had been relocated they would all be much happier, during the process great hardships would have to be endured. Ghost towns would develop.

"Schoolteachers, firemen, and other municipal workers in these areas would face great difficulties as the local tax base to support them would be destroyed. It is inconceivable that such a trend could develop to any great extent in this country as the people affected would demand relief.

"This relief could be a tariff or duty protection for the affected industry, or subsidies or grants-in-aid to the affected community. In this case, the Federal Government pays the local expenses of the community made necessary by the destruction of its tax base" (pp. 306–307).

EXCHANGE AND CURRENCY BARRIERS THE RULE IN MOST FOREIGN COUNTRIES, NOT IN UNITED STATES

Reference, page 4, line 21:

Report reads: "Then there are limitations to the general rule that expanded international trade serves the economic advantage of trading nations. For example, if the prices of imports are made artificially low for a time by foreign subsidies or dumping, the rules does not hold."

Comment: Almost all countries with the exception of the United States and Canada have inconvertible currencies, blocked exchanges, and multiple exchange rates which depend upon the purpose for which foreign exchange is to used. These multiple currencies are a method of subsidizing a country's exports and discouraging imports. Furthermore, there have been countless outright devaluations. The most recent example is Mexico, which devalued its currency early in 1954. This had the effect of lowering the price of lead and zinc in terms of the American market. These practices have a far greater effect on the volume of international trade than any possible change in the present level of American tariffs.

ALL FOREIGN COUNTRIES EXCEPT CANADA CONTROL DOLLAR EXCHANGE

Reference, page 5, line 1:

Report reads: "Tariffs inhibit the growth of American exports. Because our typical industrial and agricultural exports are the products of some of the most efficient producers in the world, other countries are anxious to buy more from us. But they are limited by their dollar earnings. Increasing the effective demand for United States exports depends upon increasing the supply of dollars abroad. The main way of doing this is by increasing United States imports.[1] Trade is a two-way proposition. While some dollars spent abroad may at times go into other countries' reserves, the vast demand for American products abroad assures that most dollars spent in other countries will come back here in one way or another in the form of increased orders for United States exports."

Comment: This development is superficial as it assumes that a country earning dollars will release those dollars to its nationals to purchase American goods which they desire in a free market. With the exception of Canada, all foreign countries control the dollar exchange earned by their nationals, and this exchange is then used by the government. Importers in foreign countries must secure import licenses and permission to pay out United States dollars before a transaction can be completed. Some types of goods are granted import licenses. Many are completely prohibited. Dollar and gold reserves outside the United States have increased substantially during the past 2 years. This would indicate that there is no real shortage of dollars on current account. The concept of free trade was developed in a multilateral trading world. The report of the Subcommittee on Minerals, Materials, and Fuels Economics of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs said:

"Obviously the United States, as one country in the so-called free world, cannot by unilateral action overcome all of the impediments to free trade which exist in the world today.

"Certainly if comparative advantage is to be accepted as the criteria and the United States is to sacrifice those industries in which its comparative advantage is low, it must expect that the underdeveloped countries will not subsidize industrialization and will continue in the role of raw material suppliers where their comparative advantage is high.

"Much of the difficulty in maintaining multilateral trading today can be traced to the fact that triangular trade between the Latin American and Indonesian areas with the Continent of Europe has been broken by the actions of the governments of these underdeveloped areas.

"Imports from Brazil to the United States are under no restrictions, and their volume has been high, providing the Brazilian economy with an ample flow of dollars. Formerly these dollars were spent in Europe, which enabled Europe to settle its adverse dollar balance with the United States. Today Brazil, in spite of our purchases, has had great difficulty in settling its own commercial dollar transactions with the United States and it has been unable to furnish the market it formerly provided to Great Britain and the Continent of Europe.

"It employs import controls and many restrictive devices at the present time. Foreign investment is discouraged as Brazil has reaffirmed its position that no foreign capital would be welcome in developing her potential petroleum resources.

"Brazil's insistence on virtually nationalizing the development of her natural resources has resulted in the ridiculous situation where the rationing of oil supplies is receiving serious consideration, as railroads are being converted to diesel power and automobile imports are increasing" (pp. 303–304).

TARIFFS APPLY TO ONLY FRACTION OF UNITED STATES IMPORTS

Reference, page 6, line 5:

Report reads: "Only a part of our imports are subject to tariffs or other import restrictions. * * * Only about $3 billion were subject to import quotas or to tariffs sufficiently high to have an appreciable effect on the volume of imports. This $3 billion consisted for the most part of agricultural products and finished manufactures."

Comment: It is difficult to see how the reduction of tariffs on this small portion of our total imports could balance our trade with the rest of the world. If these particular imports were freed of all restrictions, a few supplying areas would secure an increased market in the United States at the expense of hardship in certain areas of the United States economy where the dislocations would be concentrated. It is quite unlikely that the particular recipients of the benefits of our tariff reductions would purchase American goods with the dollars earned that would completely compensate for our own dislocations. Over the short run, it is certain that this would not be the case. Over the long run, it could only be accomplished if all other countries simultaneously reduced their own tariff barriers so that the dollars could come back to us through an involved series of multilateral exchanges.

OVER HALF OF WORLD'S TRADE SUBJECT TO FOREIGN IMPORT QUOTAS

Reference, page 6, line 16:

Report reads: "The economies of most other countries of the free world—particularly of our major allies—are considerably more dependent than our own on foreign trade. For example, Britain's imports are equal to about 22 percent of its gross national product, as compared with 3 percent for the United States. The corresponding figure for Holland is 38 percent; for Belgium, 30 percent; for Western Germany, 13 percent for Italy, 14 percent; for Japan, 10 percent; and for France, 7 percent. Because of this dependency on foreign trade, the future economic growth and health of many countries depend, in considerable part, on whether they have a sufficient opportunity to expand their trade with each other and with us. In this sense, tariffs have greater economic importance for our friends and allies than they do for our own economy. This is not to say that there is not considerable scope for more efficient use of resources within the United States by increasing our foreign trade."

Comment: The report of the Subcommittee on Minerals, Materials, and Fuels Economics of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs dealt with this subject as follows:

"Most discussions of America's foreign economic policy are in terms of changes in United States tariff laws. It should be pointed out that the United States, under the Constitution, can lay no taxes or other imposts on exports. The only restrictions on exports today are those exercised under the Export Control Act to prevent the flow of strategic materials to Iron Curtain countries.

"The United States does not use import quotas except for a few agricultural commodities where the maintenance of domestic price supports makes such action mandatory.

"More than half of the world's trade is subject to import quotas. Businessmen can adjust to fixed tariffs, but they never know how licenses will be issued to implement a quota. Under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, the 33 signatories are not supposed to maintain such restrictions. However, in 1952 of the $56 billion imported into the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade countries $38 billion was under import quota restrictions. At the present time, unrestricted dollar imports are not permitted by any signatory country to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade outside the dollar area. Almost all of the countries who are members of the Organization for European Economic Cooperation employ import quotas and other restrictions. The Organization for European Economic Cooperation has set a goal whereby 75 percent of the imports are to be free of quotas. In December 1953 Great Britain's percentage of quota-free imports was only 58 percent.

"The United States has no currency restrictions. It applies the most-favored-nation clause in all its trade agreements. It makes no distinction between luxuries and essential goods in its import policy.

"This should be contrasted with the British Empire preferential rates and the colonial preferences prevalent in the French colonial trading area.

"Blocked currencies are characteristic of most of the countries of Europe and in many cases in South America as well. Special preference for essential goods as determined by Government officials over luxury imports is prevalent in most of the so-called free-world countries today.

---

[1] Increasing imports is not the only way to enable foreigners to buy more of our products and services. To some extent, and for a time, exports can be increased by expanding the flow of American investment abroad. Increasing expenditures abroad by American tourists also helps expand our exports. Foreign aid, too, is a method of maintaining or increasing our exports, although it is not one on which we or other countries wish to rely indefinitely (p. 5).

"Problems presented before the last meeting of the countries signatory to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade illustrate the obstacles in achieving free trade. Britain was granted a waiver to increase duties to assist fruit and vegetable growers hurt by removal of quotas under the Organization for European Economic Cooperation plan to liberalize intra-European trade.

"Great Britain was also granted a restricted waiver on the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade rule forbidding increases in imperial preferences. Apparently Britain plans shortly to liberalize her trade with Western Europe and move away from import quotas. This action is to be coupled with tariff increases where necessary to protect local British industries, as well as the British balance of payments.

"Britain does not wish to increase the tariffs on Commonwealth imports when the rates are raised on West European goods. Australia at the start of the session appealed for modification of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade clause which prevents an increase in Empire preferences. She even threatened to withdraw from the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade unless Empire preferences were broadened. Japan was finally admitted to a limited participation in the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade; however, Britain and most of the Commonwealth countries voted against Japanese participation and will not give her goods the right to most-favored-nation treatment" (pp. 301–303).

The United Kingdom has been the leading advocate of United States tariff reductions and is responsible for the slogan "Trade, not aid." A new York Times dispatch from London dated August 18, 1954, said:

"The president of Britain's Board of Trade is touring the Lancashire cotton-textile industry to look into fears expressed there about Japanese and Indian competition.

"Peter Thorneycroft met today with chamber of commerce members in Manchester, Britain's textile capital. Afterward, an official said they discussed the serious implications to the Lancashire textile industry of the possibility of Japan's admission to the general agreement on trade and tariffs (GATT). Japan's admission would restrict the erection of tariffs against Japanese goods.

"The source said complaints also were aired about alleged infringement of British textile designs by Japanese traders.

"Rumblings about alleged Japanese undercutting in traditional British Commonwealth textile markets have been growing louder of late.

"'Meanwhile, London shipping quarters were turning their attention to the scheduled arrival on Friday of the Japanese cargo liner *Asakasan Maru*, opening a monthly freight service between Britain and Japan.'

"The Manchester Guardian said it marked the start of a new freight-rate war on the United Kingdom-Far East run and was causing some concern in London shipping circles."

STRENGTHENING ALLIES ALSO REQUIRES THAT WE NOT WEAKEN SELVES

Reference, page 7, line 6:

Report reads: "Our tariff policy affects the economic strength of our allies. Their economic strength affects their military strength and their political stability—in short, their value as free-world allies. Thus our tariff policy has a significant bearing on our own security, as CED has pointed out in earlier statements.

"Our tariff policy affects our ability to win allies and to keep them. It has become to our allies an important indicator and symbol of our attitude toward their economic problems. What we do about the tariff has significant psychological and political effects in strengthening or weakening our alliances. Low tariffs will help to strengthen the community of economic and political interest between our allies and ourselves—to increase their sense of solidarity with the United States."

Comment: Our tariff policy affects our own strength as well as the strength of our allies. The findings of the Subcommittee on Minerals, Materials, and Fuels Economics said:

"During the last more than a quarter of a century established procurement practices have dangerously increased our dependence for the critical materials upon nations across major oceans without which this Nation cannot survive.

"We must avoid dependence upon overseas suppliers to the extent that these suppliers could suddenly render us impotent by withdrawing supplies of critical materials during a world conflict, or could use such dependence as a political or economic bargaining lever.

"Testimony is abundant that our domestic and foreign policies have been based on the false assumption that the United States is a have-not nation insofar as the supply of critical raw materials necessary to this Nation in wartime is concerned.

"This testimony also shows that in many instances the United States has expended enormous sums of money to underwrite foreign fiscal systems and world policies of nations whose friendship is deemed of great importance because of their control and possession of raw materials" (pp. 5–6).

The assumption is implicit that American tariffs are the one barrier to the expansion of world trade. Studies by the United States Tariff Commission show that during the past 20 years our tariff rates have been lowered by almost 50 percent. We have received little credit for our leadership. It is doubtful whether anyone can buy allies by continually making additional concessions.

CED CONCEDES TARIFFS GIVE DEGREE OF PROTECTION TO UNITED STATES PRODUCTION

Reference, page 7, line 18:

Report reads: "Our tariffs to some extent protect productive capacity essential to national defense. A general and substantial lowering of tariffs might expose some essential defense capacity to damaging import competition, but exactly which industries are essential to national security and how much damage might result from tariff cuts can only be judged after careful examination of particular situations."

Comment: The State Department charged with the negotiation of tariff reductions is not in a position to judge the military potential which is sacrificed by a specific tariff reduction.

Reference, page 7, line 24:

Report reads: "In some respects, however, the tariff may be harmful to our defense production potential. Some tariffs protect industries making goods which are not essential in wartime. The labor, capital, the management in those industries would make a greater contribution to our security if, for example, they were employed in our major capital goods industries, many of which would expand if export opportunities increased."

Comment: This presupposes an orderly reemployment of the labor, capital, and the management in these industries by the major capital goods industries. There is no evidence whatsoever that this could be accomplished. The physical facilities would probably have no value. They may be badly located. The personnel would not have the requisite skills, and may also have to be moved to a new locality. If these resources were unemployed the country would be weaker, not stronger. Furthermore, many of these industries in time of war would provide the civilian goods which we could import in time of peace but which would not be available under wartime conditions and which may be badly needed to contribute to the morale and well being of our own people.

Reference, page 8, line 12:

Report reads: "Tariff protection may reduce the incentive to engage in research by sheltering domestic industries from foreign competition."

Comment: This statement presupposes a domestic monopoly in a particular industry with no competition between producers of the same product, and no competition by substitute products within the American market. These are completely unrealistic suppositions. Tariff protection only shields the domestic industry from the competitive advantage given a foreign producer through lower wages and taxes in his own country. A tariff does not shelter any domestic producer from competition within his own industry or from other domestic industries who are seeking the consumer's dollar.

"HAVE-NOT" FALLACY OF EXHAUSTED RESOURCES ADOPTED BY CED

Reference, page 8, line 19:

Report reads: "Tariffs or other restrictions on imports of such commodities (lead, zinc, and some refined petroleum products) may result in speeding up the exhaustion of scarce domestic supplies, thus cutting down our reserves for an emergency and thereby tending to impair our national security."

Comment: A going concern industry is the basis of our national security where the production of minerals is concerned. Proved reserves represent only a very small part of our potential reserves of any mineral product. A prosperous domestic industry insures the necessary exploration and development activities to expand our proved reserves. Materials in the ground, which have not been located or discovered, are valueless when war strikes. Trained personnel and equipment will not be available to find these materials and to produce them in a usable form without an industry in being.

The Subcommittee on Minerals, Materials, and Fuels Economics of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs devoted a large portion of its investigation to this specific problem. The following is taken from the findings of the subcommittee:

"This misconception that we are a have-not nation has found wide acceptance by the public through confusion between the statistical and engineering terms 'proved commercial reserves' and 'potential and latent resources," which include developed ore, probable ore, possible or inferred ore to designate supplies of ore in various states of development.

"This confusion has led to predictions over the past two decades that we would soon exhaust our supplies of petroleum, iron ore, copper, lead, zinc, tungsten, mercury, and other critical materials. Expert testimony before this subcommittee made it crystal clear that there were more known commercial reserves of critical materials in the United States than ever before in the history of this Nation.

"In the meantime we have consumed more than the total quantity of proven commercial reserves of two decades ago.

"The potential latent resources or reserves are more than ever susceptible to discovery today by modern techniques and exploration methods, requiring only a financial incentive to be found.

"Evidence was presented which showed that this country was led into the mistaken conclusion that, according to the known reserves of critical materials, including petroleum, tungsten, manganese, zinc, lead, and other minerals, we would exhaust our supplies and they would be virtually depleted within 2 to 12 years.

"Documents were introduced into evidence which stated that in 1944 the Government was advised to conserve its minerals and that it should purchase some critical materials from foreign countries, including

Russia. It was testified that this advice played a part in the subsequent increase in United States dependence on foreign nations for critical materials which are available in this Nation and in the other areas of the Western Hemisphere" (p. 6).

"SUBSIDY" VIEWS IN CED REPORT CHALLENGED

Reference, page 8, line 23:

Report reads: "Protective tariffs are a form of subsidy for industry and tax on consumers. Our tariffs give an indirect subsidy to domestic producers by raising the domestic price of competing imported products. Thus, the tariff allows some domestic output to be sold at higher prices or in larger quantities than would be possible without tariff protection. At the same time, tariffs tax consumers of certain imported goods in order to discourage importation of these goods."

Comment: The Subcommittee on Minerals, Materials, and Fuels Economics of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs said:

"A proposal to provide direct subsidies from the Federal Treasury to those industries now enjoying or needing tariff protection in lieu of that tariff has been advanced by some exponents of free trade. This suggestion requires critical examination. In the first place, tariff revenues increase Government receipts and the payment of subsidies involves a direct drain on the Treasury.

"Inasmuch as the budget is already unbalanced unless cuts in the foreign-aid program could cover the loss of tariff revenue and the payment of subsidies, we would be confronted with the necessity of imposing additional taxes on our own people.

"The present tax burden is admittedly too high and this is not a happy prospect. Furthermore, it is essential that sufficient savings be developed to permit a recasting of the entire tax structure so as to restore incentive to our own producers.

"Additional Government obligations, accompanied by loss of Government revenues, make it more difficult to correct admitted inequities in the present tax structure" (p. 307).

CED REPORT DEFENDS LOW FOREIGN WAGE RATES

Reference, page 9, line 11, through page 11, line 19:

Report reads: "The fact that wages are lower in other countries does not mean that some American products cannot compete on even or better than even terms with foreign products. This is true because the price at which a product can be profitably sold depends not on wage rates but on unit cost of production.

"Unit cost of production, in turn, is determined by many factors in addition to wages—by the amount and character of capital investment that stands behind each worker, by managerial skill, by the prices of raw materials and power, by the quality of labor, and by the volume of output. The combination of these elements largely determines what is called productivity. In general, the high productivity of United States industries accounts for the low unit cost of many American products.

"The differences in average productivity between European and American industry are of roughly the same order as the differences in wage and social welfare payments per employee. It is the higher average productivity in this country that makes it possible for the average American worker to earn a higher wage than his counterpart in Europe. Conversely, lower European wage levels are conditioned by lower productivity in European industry. Many specific industries, of course, are exceptions to this general rule.

"Productivity varies widely as among individual American industries, while differences in wage rates tend to be less marked. For this reason, those American industries in which productivity is highest are likely to have the lowest unit costs and therefore the strongest competitive position in both the domestic market and overseas.

"Our highly mechanized mass-production industries are good examples of competitive advantage based on productivity. At home, the products of these industries have little to fear from foreign competition; abroad they have proved to be strongly competitive. In these industries, the combination of high capital investment per employee, relatively low raw material costs, American managerial skill and volume runs based on mass markets combine to produce an efficiency so much greater than in other countries that our production can be sold profitably at prices fully competitive with foreign prices, despite the much higher wages prevailing here.

"United States industries may be at a competitive disadvantage with foreign producers in lines where the American producer has no special advantage in raw-material costs or volume of output, and where production techniques are about the same here and abroad. This could be true, for example, of products which are manufactured both here and abroad by much the same kind of machinery, and with about the same input of labor for each unit of production. In these cases American products are subject to foreign competition resulting in large part from lower wage rates prevailing abroad. Competition would be increased if tariffs were lowered. Products which appear to fall into this category include heavy electrical equipment, watches, woolen and worsted textiles, flat glass, rayon staple fiber, bicycles, some chemicals, and some machine tools.

"Another group of American industries subject to import competition includes handicrafts and other consumer goods industries where production is not highly mechanized and where there is a very high labor content—for example, leather goods, felt hats, and handblown glassware. In industries of this kind, American producers, paying higher wages, are at a disadvantage in competition with foreign producers, and, in general, the products of these industries have high tariff protection."

Comment: The Subcommittee on Minerals, Materials, and Fuels Economics of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs dealt with this specific problem. It said:

"In a world operating under free trade, wages are established by those industries having the highest comparative advantage who would bid for labor in a free labor market so as to obtain a labor force sufficient to their needs. In this country unions attempt through collective bargaining to negotiate wage agreements which raise wages in industries having a low comparative advantage to the level of those paid in our more efficient industries. For example, the automobile industry has always been a high-wage industry—long before the days of union organization.

"Unions in other industries, such as in textiles, have attempted to secure similar wages for their members. As long as a tariff was present this was possible. The abandonment of the tariff would require the abolition of union efforts to secure a uniform American wage based on a so-called American standard of living" (p. 306).

"It might also be questioned whether we might not give some consideration in adjusting tariffs to the great increase in our corporate income taxes, as well as the imposition of social security taxes, since 1934 when we started to reduce tariffs under the 1934 Trade Agreements Act.

"These increases in Federal taxes have increased the costs of the domestic producer. Inasmuch as a large portion of the taxes collected on United States corporations was used to finance the capital cost of foreign producers by direct Government gift, these United States taxes as a cost item should be given special consideration in the setting of future tariff policy" (pp. 299-300).

In the United States the capital investment per employee is a cost to the business enterprise as it has been contributed by private individuals who expect a return on their investment. Much of the capital employed by foreign producers has been supplied as a gift by the United States taxpayer. The American producer, in addition to having to charge depreciation on his plant and a reasonable profit as a part of his selling price, has been forced to include taxes to pay for the plant of his foreign competitor.

CED THINKS FARMERS WOULD FIND READY MARKETS ABROAD IF SUPPORTS REMOVED

Reference, page 11. line 20:

Report reads: "In the absence of price supports and other controls now in effect for many farm products, most of American agriculture would have a decisive competitive advantage over its counterparts abroad. The bulk of American agricultural production is of commodities such as wheat, corn, cotton, tobacco, and dairy products for which our plentiful supply of land can be used to best advantage, in combination with mechanized equipment, extensive use of fertilizer, and continual improvements in crop varieties. We produce large surpluses of most of such commodities. For a few agricultural products, reduction of the United States tariff would result in a substantial increase in imports—examples are apparel, wool, oats, cigar tobacco, and edible nuts. The great bulk of American agricultural imports, however, are of such commodities as coffee, jute, cocoa, raw rubber, sugar, tea, and bananas, which we either do not produce in sufficient quantity to satisfy our own market, or do not produce at all."

SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE DIFFERS

Comment: The report of the Subcommittee on Minerals, Materials, and Fuels Economics of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs dealt with this specific problem as follows:

"In the United States, agriculture is a way of life as well as an economic institution. Both major political parties are pledged to assuring the continued existence of an agricultural economy within the United States.

"In fact, the entire farm program including price supports was designed to permit those farmers to remain on the land, who without these aids would have been forced to leave the farm and migrate into the cities and secure industrial employment in those fields where this country does enjoy a high comparative advantage.

"Obviously if we adopt free trade we should abandon our entire price-support program. If we did not do this, we would be attempting to support farm prices all over the world at the expense of the American taxpayer. As soon as we accept acreage limitation and other similar devices in the farm program, we have departed from free trade" (p. 306).

Reference, page 13, line 10:

Report reads: "Competitive adjustments of the sort that might result from changes in the tariff are basically no different, and have ordinarily been far less severe, than those which are continually taking place within our competitive domestic economy. Competitive adjustments of this kind are part of the growth of our productive efficiency and of the growth of our standard of living."

Comment: Competitive adjustments resulting from changes in the tariff are different from those which are continually taking place within our competitive domestic economy. Domestic competitors pay the same wages, are subject to the same laws and taxes. When one firm secures a larger share of the market under these conditions, it reflects real productive efficiency. When the Government, through arbitrary change in the tariff, changes the competitive position of an entire industry, there is not necessarily any gain in productive efficiency. This is particularly true if the imported products are produced with lower paid labor and under a less onerous tax burden than the domestic product. It is difficult to see how our standard of living is enhanced by displacing workers and reducing the Government revenues through lowered taxes on these workers and employers. This becomes an absurdity if we then have to find a way to subsidize these same formerly productive members of society at public expense.

HARDSHIP TO WORKERS AND COMMUNITIES ADMITTED WHEN TARIFFS CUT

Reference, page 13, line 16:

Report reads: "Nevertheless such adjustments involve social and economic costs. The costs may be of different kinds: Workers may lose their employment and have difficulty in finding new work. Labor skills acquired over long periods can be rendered obsolete by new competition. Plant and equipment made idle by new competition which cannot be converted to other uses becomes valueless. Local communities heavily dependent on a particular industry whose output and employment have been reduced can become chronically depressed. These economic and social costs of tariff liberalization cannot be overlooked. In making tariff policy they should be carefully weighed against the political and economic advantages to the United States of reducing tariffs."

Comment: This paragraph supplies abundant reasons for proceeding cautiously in lowering tariffs.

Reference, page 14, line 1:

Report reads: "American tariffs have been considerably lowered since the 1930's. About half of this reduction has been due to reciprocal trade agreements entered into with other countries and the other half to the effect of rising prices of imported merchandise on specific tariff duties. There are opposing views on the question of how much this reduction has reduced the general restrictiveness of the tariff. It is clear, however, that tariff rates on many products are still restrictive, in the sense that reduction of those rates would increase imports substantially—for example, the tariffs on woolens and worsted, apparel wool, cigar wrapper tobacco, sewing machines, optical instruments, fish fillets, edible nuts, and toys, among others."

Comment: Many American tariffs are levied at a specific rate rather than on an ad valorem basis. Many of these tariffs are no longer restrictive because of the rise in the price level since the Tariff Act of 1930. President Eisenhower, in rejecting the recommendations of the Tariff Commission to increase the duty on lead and zinc this summer, was influenced by the fact that any increase he was authorized to impose under existing law would be insufficient. The present stockpiling program for lead and zinc temporarily affords relief for the industry and raises the world price of these minerals. It cannot be continued indefinitely without incurring all of the problems which now confront us with agricultural surpluses. The CED say: "Reductions in tariffs would have only a small effect on our total imports, but would have a serious effect insofar as they were effective in substantially increasing the tariffs on woolens and worsteds, apparel, wool, cigar wrapper tobacco, sewing machines, optical instruments, fish fillets, and edible nuts." Each of these products is produced in an area which has become largely dependent upon its production for the employment and well-being of the community. A 2-percent increase in our total imports could very well result in a loss of 50 percent of the employment in some New England textile communities. It is difficult to reconcile the advantages of this proposed reduction with the political and social upheaval which would result in the affected areas.

CED REPORT CALLS BUY AMERICAN STATUTE RESTRICTIVE

Reference, page 14, line 12:

Report reads: "Tariffs are not the only restrictive feature of American commercial policy. The Buy American legislation and our shipping policies also restrict imports of goods and services. Import quotas may well be as important in their effect on the overall volume of our imports as the tariff. Direct quantitative restrictions, such as those imposed on imports of wheat, cotton, sugar, butter, and cheese, are more important than tariffs in restricting imports of agricultural products."[2]

Comment: The United States must maintain a merchant marine in order to again have a necessary industry in being should it be required in time of war. The American taxpayer is making a substantial contribution to building and operating the United States merchant marine. So-called restrictive shipping policies tend to limit the burden which the American taxpayer would otherwise have to assume to maintain this industry. The Buy American Act is necessary to implement the Walsh-Healey and Bacon-Davis Acts. The report of the Subcommittee on Minerals, Materials, and Fuels Economics of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs dealt with the Buy American Act as follows:

"Government contractors furnishing equipment and material to the United States are governed by the Walsh-Healey Act, which enables the Secretary of Labor to establish minimum wages and other conditions of employment for anyone working on a Government contract, including subcontractors.

"The minimum wages established under the Walsh-Healey Act may be far higher than those specified in the Fair Labor Standards Act. In fact, within wide limits they may be set at almost any point which the Secretary of Labor finds proper.

"If this act is continued and the Buy American Act is repealed, American producers would be at a serious disadvantage competing with foreign bidders. Without the Buy American Act Government contracting officers would be required to accept the lowest bona fide bid.

"This would have serious repercussions on certain domestic producers. For example, it is difficult to see how the New England textile industry could hope to secure business from the Quartermaster Corps in competition with European textiles without a Buy American Act, if the Walsh-Healey Act remains on the books. Unless the Buy American Act and the Walsh-Healey Act are considered together, it is difficult to see how anything but chaos can result.

"Bills have been introduced in the 82d and 83d Congress to amend the Defense Production Act which would require the Secretary of Defense to give special preferences in the awarding of contracts to labor-surplus areas. If the Buy American Act is repealed, the sponsors of such measures must realize that no consideration could be afforded to labor surplus areas.

"The Congress, in establishing the Small Business Administration, has directed that it assure small business its proper share of Government procurement. Special consideration for small business has been ordered in many Federal laws. If Government contracting officers are to be asked to purchase materials from the lowest bidder anywhere in the world, it is difficult to see how any special consideration for any particular class of American producer may be maintained.

"Another conflict which would arise if the Buy American Act is repealed comes from the provisions of Public Law 520, 79th Congress, which provides for the acquisition of a military stockpile. A buy American clause was written in this law for the express purpose of developing and maintaining a going concern mining industry so that our dependence on foreign supplies could be lessened. If we are to continue in a world where strategic considerations are to be given first priority, it is again difficult to reconcile a repeal of the Buy American Act with the objectives set forth in Public Law 520" (pp. 160–161).

CED CONDONES TRADE BARRIERS OF FOREIGN COUNTRIES

Reference, page 15, line 8:

Report reads: "Other countries' import barriers, which are generally higher than our own, also severely restrict foreign trade. These import barriers exist to protect domestic industries, to bolster a weak balance of payments, to safeguard certain social policies, and for other reasons. Many countries' restrictions on imports of American products are in part made necessary by their inability to earn enough dollars to pay for all the goods and services they want to buy from us. Lowering our barriers to imports would therefore make it possible for other countries to lower their import barriers. It would give us a basis and a justification for pressing them to do so. Our own willingness to lower our tariffs and other barriers to imports is affected—and properly so—by the willingness of other countries to liberalize their import policies. Thus, liberalizing the American tariff can be an effective means to expand world trade, provided other countries will also lower trade barriers."

Comment: The United States has consistently lowered its tariffs for the past 20 years. It has contributed billions of dollars in foreign aid, and it has provided a large part of the capital of the International Monetary Fund and of the World Bank. Despite this leadership, there is little evidence that other countries are ready to proceed with the abolishment of nonconvertible currencies, to lower their own tariffs to the level of ours, or to eliminate their other restrictive measures which impede the development of world trade.

UNCLE SAM MUST BE DOCTOR TO ENTIRE FREE WORLD, CED IMPLIES

Reference, page 20, line 7:

Report reads: "The survival of freedom and of western civilization depends in considerable part on whether this country is able to keep strong allies willing to work with us in strengthening the free world and resisting Communist subversion and aggression. A major aim of American foreign policy is therefore to strengthen the political and economic health of friendly foreign countries and to tighten the bonds of mutual interest and community of purpose which tie our allies to us and us to them. Our foreign economic policy and our tariff policy are intimately involved in this task. Trade among nations is a powerful force making for unity."

Comment: This presupposes that changes in our tariff policy "strengthen the political and economic health of friendly foreign countries." A complete reduction in our tariffs would still leave most of the countries of the world with very serious problems. We would have distress here in those industries which were affected by the reductions—

---

[2] In principle, the committee feels that quantitative import restrictions are an undesirable method of controlling imports but the question what to do about our agricultural import quotas is inseparable from the problem of domestic agricultural policy. CED's Research and Policy Committee now has in preparation a policy statement on farm policy which will treat this subject, hence it is not discussed further here (p. 13).

but we would probably survive. It will take a great deal more than changes in American tariffs to establish a proper economic climate in most of the friendly foreign countries with which we are concerned. American foreign investment could play an important part in many countries if it were welcomed on a nondiscriminatory basis and with assurance that it would not later be subject to expropriation. More stable governments and the adoption of measures to expand their own domestic markets can have a far more pervasive effect on their economic health than anything the United States can do for them.

CED WOULD BIND FUTURE CONGRESSES TO LONG-RANGE FREE TRADE POLICY

Reference, page 21, line 11:

Report reads: "Although it is doubtful that lower tariffs would increase our trade with these countries greatly in the next few years, the longer run effects could be important if our tariff policy could be put on a stable basis so as to minimize uncertainty."

Comment: The problems confronting friendly foreign countries are acute. Remedies which will only be effective at some distant date can hardly be advanced as a solution to their current difficulties. The suggestion that our tariff policy be put on a stable basis so as to minimize uncertainty is totally unrealistic in that it is predicated upon having the present Congress bind future Congresses to a specified course of action. All businessmen desire stability in their economic environment. This desire is not confined to tariffs. It includes the entire field of legislation comprising taxes, labor, farm policy, etc. No one has seriously suggested that such stability was an attainable objective. American producers would also like assurances that foreign countries will not be taken over by Socialist governments who will then nationalize their properties.

CED WOULD SACRIFICE UNITED STATES JOBS, INDUSTRIES, TO WORLD "PSYCHOLOGY"

Reference, page [illegible], line 7:

Report reads: "Moreover, the psychological and political effects of our tariff policy should not be underestimated. Adoption of a clear-cut policy of tariff liberalization would be signal evidence of our concern for the economic welfare of other free nations. It would therefore help to strengthen our alliances at a time when they badly need strengthening. Conversely, a reversal of our tariff policy would be interpreted by the rest of the world as a retreat from our present foreign policy."

Comment: This statement accepts all of the emotional connotations which surround the tariff issue. It advocates ruthlessly sacrificing American industries and their workers so that foreign countries will not assume that we are reverting to an isolationist approach toward the world. Foreign countries have not hesitated to protect their own nationals. It is difficult to see how we will establish respect for our point of view by accepting unsound premises merely in order to create the correct psychological atmosphere.

Reference, page 22, line 17:

Report reads: "Tariff liberalization, by increasing imports, will permit other countries to buy more from us, particularly in the longer run. Our major export industries—for example, those producing earth-moving machinery, tractors, textile machinery, printing machinery, sewing machines, typewriters, refrigerators, diesel engines, motor vehicles, and agricultural machinery—are, in general, those with the highest relative productivity. As their output is increased and is exchanged for more import, the overall efficiency of the American economy tends to increase. In general increased imports at costs and prices below those involved in domestic production raise our standard of living. Increased imports add to the variety of our consumption. They stimulate American industry to desirable innovations."

Comment: Increased imports will not necessarily expand our exports unless there is a universal reduction of barriers between all other countries. The adjustment in any case would take a considerable period of time and if it resulted in idleness for American resources during the interim, the adjustment would lower our standard of living and not raise it.

REPORT PREFERS SLOW SUICIDE TO SUDDEN DEATH FOR HURT INDUSTRIES

Reference, page 23, line 3:

Report reads: "We favor a gradual approach to tariff reduction. We have pointed out the impossibility of forecasting accurately the effect of tariff cuts on imports and on the domestic economy. Because of that difficulty, it is essential to reduce tariff rates gradually and selectively. The speed at which they are reduced should be subject to adjustment in the light of experience."

Comment: A protected industry confronted with a constantly declining level of tariff protection will probably be an industry that will have difficulty in attracting capital and recruiting young personnel so as to improve its competitive position. A gradual reduction in tariff means an eventual curtailment of the industry's employment potential. This places the power of life and death over entire communities in the hands of those who select the industries to be subjected to a gradual lowering of their tariff protection. During the past 20 years this power has been lodged in the State Department, who have no domestic constituency.

IMPACT OF TARIFF CUTS ON SOME FARM AND FACTORY PRODUCTS CONCEDED

Reference, page 24, line 14:

Report reads: "The competitive impact of even moderate tariff reductions might be more serious on some other products of industry and agriculture, particularly on products of the handicraft type and on a few agricultural commodities. In these cases it is doubly necessary to proceed cautiously and gradually with tariff reductions. Furthermore, there should be opportunity to correct errors in making tariff reductions on appeal by interested parties. In cases where an industry is already declining absolutely, tariff reductions should ordinarily be avoided until the orderly transfer of labor and other resources to other uses is reasonably assured."

Comment: The suggestion that errors in making tariff reductions should be corrected by appeal by interested parties conflicts with the plea for stability in our tariff structure so that the foreign producer can make his plans regarding the American market. The approach implicit in this paragraph is one involving a degree of economic planning by Government officials, totally incompatible with our accepted concepts of a competitive private enterprise economy.

FLIGHT OF "DISPLACED WORKERS" VIEWED BY CED THROUGH ROSE-COLORED SPECTACLES

Reference, page 25, line 11:

Report reads: "The American economy has demonstrated many times in recent years its flexibility and adaptability in adjusting to changes greater than have been occasioned by tariff reduction. Though these adjustments may at times be painful, they are one of the sources of the dynamism of the American economy. Their final effect is not to reduce average American wages but to increase them. For after the adjustments have been made and the displaced workers have obtained employment in more efficient industries, our productivity will be increased. As a result, real wages will be, on the average, higher than before."

Comment: This paragraph again presupposes an orderly reemployment of the resources of the entire world so as to maximize their comparative advantage. There is little likelihood of an orderly transition, and it is far more likely that pools of unemployed labor and capital would result. They may remain with us for many years. This proposal is based on hope and suggests that this country make the grand gesture and accept the painful consequences so that our example will motivate others to take similar steps. If all nations ultimately follow this course the millennium might arrive. The statement made then might have some validity.

REPORT WOULD LIGHTEN BLOW TO SOME BY "GRADUAL" TARIFF CUTS

Reference, page 26, line 2:

Report reads: "Where tariff cuts result in a substantial reduction in output and employment and where alternative employment is not available for the manpower and facilities made idle, real hardship has been caused. The rule governing tariff liberalization should be to avoid making labor and facilities idle on a substantial scale in situations where they canont be reemployed within a reasonable time. This criterion can be satisfied in the great majority of cases if tariffs are reduced gradually.

"Situations of hardship can be anticipated and avoided in most cases if tariff reductions are preceded by a careful examination of the possible results, product by product and industry by industry. Where reduction of domestic output would be substantial and where alternative employment opportunities take time to develop, a gradual approach to tariff legislation will, in most cases, allow sufficient time for the necessary adjustments. Adjustments which would involve serious hardship if they had to be made in 2 or 3 years might well be accomplished with little or no hardship in a longer period."

Comment: The executive branch of the Government would require sweeping powers to implement these criteria. "Idle on a substantial scale," "reemployed within a reasonable time," "gradual approach to tariff legislation" are all phrases which are meaningless until they are defined by an individual whose definition carries the powers of life and death to industries and the communities in which they are located.

PLANNERS WOULD RALLY GOVERNMENT AGENCIES TO AID OF STRICKEN INDUSTRIES, WORKERS

Reference, page 27, line 19:

Report reads: "Fortunately, there exist alternatives to compensation which avoid these difficulties. Much help by local, State, and Federal bodies is already available to facilitate conversion or readjustment to more promising activities for firms, communities, and workers affected by increasing competition. * * *

"State and Federal aid in various forms is already available for communities or firms that need it to diversify. A number of State governments have established industrial development or credit corporations which can assist firms and local communities. At the Federal level, the Department of Labor takes a special interest in depressed communities and advises them in the establishment of diversification programs. State and Federal employment services assist displaced workers through their retraining and placement facilities. The Defense Department is required by Executive order to give special attention to labor-surplus areas in placing procurement contracts. The Federal Government may grant accelerated tax amortization privileges for the expansion in labor-surplus areas of industrial facilities necessary for defense. Finally, the Small Business Administration, established in 1953, has authority to make or to participate with private institutions in making loans to small concerns. These loans, which may range up to $150,000, are made in order that small businesses unable to obtain credit elsewhere on reasonable terms may finance plant construction, conversion, or expansion."

Comment: These proposals endorse further Government intervention in the domestic economy. They propose alternatives for tariffs which involve far more interference with the economy than the tariff. The CED refers to the fact that the "Defense Department is required by Executive order to give special attention to labor surplus areas in placing procurement contracts." This Executive order is only possible because of the presence of the Buy American Act. Were it not for this legislation, the Defense Department would be required to award contracts to the lowest bidder, regardless of nationality and the Executive order could not be enforced. Howard S. Piquet considers the question of subsidies in his book entitled "Aid, Trade, and the Tariff." He said:

"One device that immediately comes to mind is direct subsidy. The idea of substituting direct subsidy for restrictive import tariffs has been a favorite with tariff reformers for a long time, but it needs to be considered with extreme caution. The theory has been that once the existence of special favors is brought into the open, such favors will fall of their own weight because of an aroused public opinion. The fact is that the country has so widened the use of subsidies that in many quarters outright subsidies might be viewed as a logical supplement to existing subsidies in other fields. It is not at all certain, therefore, that the substitution of direct subsidies for indirect subsidies in the form of restrictive tariffs, would lead to the elimination of restrictions, as such.

"It is conceivable that in a few exceptional cases where industrial adjustment is impossible the Federal Government might directly assume the burden of liquidation indemnities. Such indemnities should not be confused with continuing operating subsidies. Financial payments made in the form of continuing subsidy would tend to perpetuate resistance to adjustment. 'Adjustment subsidies,' on the other hand, could continue for a stated period, say 5 years, and probably should be made reducible in amount during this period. Their purpose would be to facilitate exit from a certain line of production rather than continuance in that line. Adjustment subsidies would thus be the antithesis of operating subsidies.

"Against this approach to the problem of injury occasioned by increased imports it might be argued that indemnification of individuals, firms, or industries for losses sustained because of tariff action on the part of the Federal Government would set a dangerous precedent. Workers and capital displaced by improvements in technology or adversely affected by Government decisions in many fields might be able to show that their difficulties also were brought about in the larger national interest" (p. 58).

The Subcommittee on Minerals, Materials, and Fuels Economics of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs said:

"Perhaps the most advantageous feature of a tariff lies in the fact that it requires the minimum of Government personnel and interference with the market mechanism to provide a given level of protection.

"It is certainly superior to quotas and similar devices which arbitrarily restrict trade. Direct subsidies are difficult to administer, are subject to abuse, and establish a trend which is difficult to check. Certainly few people are pleased with the operation of those subsidies already in effect" (pp. 307–308).

DEFENSE DEPARTMENT VIEWED IN CED REPORT AS BIG RELIEF AGENCY

Reference, page 30, line 10:

Report reads: "For example, in the case of military end-products, a standby military contract calling for modest current deliveries would allow facilities to be maintained and key personnel to be kept together. The contract could also provide for continuing research on product design and production methods."

Comment: The Defense Department and the Office of Defense Mobilization are charged with determining the necessary mobilization base. Their planning is based not only on maintaining facilities, but in converting organizations from civilian production to an expanded program of military production. The tariff protection afforded the chemical industry made it possible for that industry to maintain research laboratories and facilities available to the Government to produce a hydrogen bomb when the emergency arose. The Government could not have given the chemical industry a contract for continuing research with provisions to maintain key personnel which would have been as effective as the tariff protection the industry received. Under this encouragement it assembled from 1920 to 1940 the personnel and facilities for producing the many varied products our normal economy demands. These facilities were at the disposal of the Government when it became necessary to build an A-bomb in World War II. The suggestions in the CED proposals again involve widespread Government planning.

DIRECT SUBSIDIES EXTOLLED IN REPORT—CHALLENGED IN COMMENT AS SOCIALISM

Reference, page 30, line 14:

Report reads: "In other cases, a Government subsidy of some kind may be appropriate. A tariff is, of course, a form of subsidy. As a method of maintaining industrial capacity essential to defense, however, a direct subsidy may sometimes have the advantage over a tariff that its nature and purpose are clear and that its continuation from year to year would probably be subject to review in the light of changing circumstances. Subsidies are now used to protect from foreign competition some economic activities essential to national security, notably our merchant marine. A subsidy need not take the form of a cash payment. It might involve, for example, Government financing of certain capital equipment."

Comment: Many faults have been attributed to the tariff but it has never been charged that it led to socialism. Government subsidies and "Government financing of certain capital equipment," are the sure road toward socialism.

CED ADVOCATES "BUY FOREIGN" POLICY ON ESSENTIAL RAW MATERIALS

Reference, page 30, line 24:

Report reads: "In the case of essential raw materials whose output at necessary levels is threatened by tariff reduction, Government stockpiling at times of reduced demand may be preferable to continued tariff protection. In general, a liberal policy for imports of commodities which substitute for scarce, exhaustible domestic natural resources is especially in the national interest. Since the future rate of discovery of domestic reserves exploitable at reasonable costs is always in doubt, we ought, in time of peace, to use foreign sources of supply to meet a large part of our current needs for these commodities, safeguarding our reserves for future use in the event of an emergency. There may, however, be cases where for military or technical reasons the domestic output of basic raw materials, scare or plentiful, should be maintained at a level higher than would be possible if the tariff were lowered. In cases of this kind purchasers of domestic output for the military stockpile or subsidies might be preferable to maintaining tariff protection indefinitely."

Comment: The CED has fallen into the trap which discredited the Paley Commission that "we ought in time of peace, to use foreign sources of supply to meet a large part of our current needs for these commodities, safeguarding our reserves for future use in the event of an emergency." Our reserves will never be discovered unless an industry in being is there to do it. They cannot be discovered, much less developed, under mobilization conditions. The stockpile goal is predicated upon supplementing a going concern industry in this country. To the extent that such an industry exists the amount of the stockpile can be reduced at a great savings to the taxpayers. The CED realizes that there may be cases where a going concern industry should be maintained. They suggest subsidies or stockpile purchases in lieu of tariff protection. Subsidies are subject to all of the criticisms previously advanced. Expensive stockpile buying is to be avoided as it is costly, wasteful and must ultimately collapse of its own weight. The CED assumes that reliance may be placed on foreign sources for critical materials and that the prices will be reasonable, even though we are no longer important producers here. This is wishful thinking. The price history of materials for which we were largely dependent on foreign sources proves otherwise. Rubber, sugar, quinine, potash, copper, mercury, and tin are classic examples. Once the domestic competition is no longer effective in controlling prices, the foreign price is raised immediately. During World War II, the United States was an important producer of mercury. After the war the European mercury cartel lowered its price until the domestic producers were forced out of business. The price was then raised far beyond previous levels. Lower prices would have been obtained if the domestic mercury industry had been kept in production. During the Korean emergency, Chile demanded and received a premium of as much as 12 cents a pound on copper over the United States controlled prices when copper was purchased by European countries with dollars furnished by ECA. We inevitably pay more than the price required to sustain the domestic industry, once the competitive control of domestic production has been destroyed.

Once closed down, mines take years of time and tremendous sums to reopen. This Nation could not disarm more effectively than to lose its power to produce metals in an emergency. With workers and staff gone, machinery liquidated, mine openings caved, much of the once available ore lost, we would be in sorry shape if we depended almost wholly on foreign imports and 90 percent of such shipments were torpedoed—as occurred in World War II. Harry Dexter White showed how well Russia appreciated this fact, by proposing at the end of World War II, that:

"The United States conserve its raw-material resources for the next two generations and import from Russia to meet domestic needs." (Time magazine, Nov. 23, 1953.)

UNITED STATES, AS ALWAYS, ASKED TO TAKE INITIATIVE IN TRADE CONCESSIONS

Reference, page 31, line 18:

Report reads: "The effectiveness of our efforts to expand world trade is not, of course, dependent on our policies alone. How other countries respond to our lead is equally important, and their response should condition the course of our tariff policy. We believe, however, that the case for our taking the initiative now is very strong."

Comment: One of the most important tenets of the United States foreign economic policy is the "most favored nation" clause, by which we extend any benefits granted one nation to all nations with which we have friendly relations. The suggestion that we should condition our tariff policy to the response of other countries could only be implemented by an abandonment of this historic policy. The United States would have to place itself in a position of favoring those nations who accepted our leadership as opposed to those who did not. There is no evidence whatsoever that we are prepared to accept the consequences of such actions.

Reference, page 32, line 8:

Report reads: "The best way to create greater certainty about American tariff policy would be to extend the President's trade-agreements authority for a period of years. We favor extension for at least 5 years; consideration should be given to extension for a longer period. Business at home and abroad should not be subject to the uncertainties which have resulted in recent years from annual debate over the renewal of this authority."

Comment: This authority is meaningless as no Congress can bind a successor and legislation could be introduced at any time subject to veto to rescind this authority. If this country experienced any substantial amount of distress which could be attributed to imports, there would be no relief from the debate in the Congress concerning the President's authority to lower tariffs.

UNITED STATES NEAR BOTTOM OF THE BARREL ON TRADE GIVEAWAYS

Reference, page 33, line 5:

Report reads: "The President should be authorized to exchange tartiff reductions for other kinds of benefits to the United States than tariff reductions abroad. The present law requires that tariff concessions by other countries on American products be received in exchange for any reductions of American tariffs. In the committee's opinion, it is questionable whether tariff concessions from other countries are always the best return we can get in exchange for liberalizing our own tariff. Among other things, American exports are frequently more limited by other countries' import quotas than by their tariffs.

"Reductions in our tariff, for example, might be exchanged for liberalization or elimination of other countries' import quotas on American goods, or on the goods of third countries. American tariff reductions might also be exchanged for concessions to American investors abroad—effective guaranties that American firms and investors would enjoy the same rights and privileges as local firms and investors; effective assurance against nationalization without compensation; or permission to withdraw profits and capital. Agreements of this kind could be helpful in increasing American private investment abroad.

"We recognize that practical difficulties will be encountered in carrying out this broadened concept of reciprocity. Some countries may resist extending the scope of negotiations about tariffs to include nontariff questions. Nevertheless, we feel that the advantages to the United States of being able to use tariff negotiation as a broader and more flexible tool of policy warrant a careful search for ways around these practical difficulties."

Comment: The United States has already liberalized its tariffs to such a point that further concessions are hard to make. In view of the vast expenditures this country is making for foreign aid, it would seem that the other concessions we are rightfully seeking could be negotiated through treaties and that foreign aid assistance should be conditioned on their acceptance. The CED approach has assumed that tariff reductions were the only benefit we could offer friendly countries in exchange for following our leadership in removing their own restrictive barriers. Far more use could be made of the bargaining power implicit in our foreign-aid programs, particularly those portions of the program dealing with technical assistance and economic aid as contrasted with purely military aid.

Any attempt to "use tariff regulations as a broader and more flexible tool of policy" requires abandonment of the most-favored-nation principle. This principle has been the keystone of United States foreign economic policy for the last 50 years. It cannot and should not be abolished without a great deal of thought and consideration.

Reference, page 34, line 10:

Report reads: "The present standards of procedures for valuation of dutiable merchandise should be revised. In particular, export value should be made the preferred, initial standard of valuation.

"In addition, a study should be made of the feasibility of making greater use of the actual invoice price of imported goods for valuation purposes."[3]

Comment: The recommendation of the Commission on Foreign Economic Policy, as well as the suggestion by the CED, is sound providing all countries operated under free enterprise and no one received subsidies to stimulate exports. The only reason that foreign value was used in the determination of duties is to assist in the prevention of dumping. Neither the Randall Commission nor the CED have provided any effective remedy for this practice.

CED WOULD GRANT LIFE OR DEATH POWERS OVER EACH INDUSTRY TO CHIEF EXECUTIVE

Reference, page 35, line 21, and page 36, line 21:

Report reads: "The peril-point and escape-clause provisions of the Trade Agreements Act in their present form are serious limitations on the President's ability to lower tariff rates.

"If there is to be effective liberalization of the tariff, the peril-point and escape-clause provisions of the Trade Agreements Act need to be modified. In their present form they are inconsistent with effective tariff liberalization.

"The President has asked that these provisions be retained. He has, however, stated his intention to base his decision on Tariff Commission recommendations on grounds broader than the Commission is empowered to consider. We agree that the President should be free to set aside Tariff Commission recommendations when he finds that the national interest requires it."

Comment: It was intended that these provisions of the act would act as a deterrent in the removal of tariff barriers. Unless we wish to lower these barriers, regardless of any potential damage to domestic producers, these provisions are necessary and should be retained.

The CED recommends that the President should have unfettered authority to destroy a domestic industry "when he finds that the national interest requires it." This philosophy of government is not in consonance with accepted American ideals and practices.

---

[3] Under present tariff legislation, the value of imported merchandise for duty purposes is normally based on foreign value or export value, whichever is higher. The foreign value is the price at which similar merchandise is offered for sale for home consumption in the exporting country. The export value is the price at which the merchandise is offered for sale to American importers. Foreign value represents neither the price paid for the goods nor the price for which they are sold in the United States. The determination of foreign value is costly and time consuming. Neither importers nor customs officials know the foreign value without investigation in the country of origin. Elimination of foreign value as a standard of valuation would thus greatly reduce uncertainty about duty to be paid and delay in determining it. The use of the actual invoice price for valuation would further simplify and expedite valuation (p. 34).

Statement of Hon. Herbert H. Lehman, of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, December 2, 1954

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I had intended this morning to make some remarks about our former Senator William Benton, of Connecticut, and the part he played in the effort which today arrived at its conclusion. I did not find time to make these remarks, however, and now ask unanimous consent that the remarks I had prepared be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President, before final action is taken on Senate Resolution 301 I should like to point out the pioneering role played in this Senate action by former Senator William Benton, of Connecticut.

Senator Benton was the first Member of this body to make formal proposal of disciplinary action against the Senator from Wisconsin.

The action we are about to take has a direct relation to that first proposal by Senator Benton, his Senate Resolution 187 introduced in the 83d Congress on August 6, 1951. Although more than 3 years have elapsed since then, and the path of action between that day and this has taken many detours, the Benton resolution was the first step on the long road.

The first part of our Senate Resolution 301 condemns the junior Senator from Wisconsin for his failure to cooperate with, his abuse of, and his obstructive conduct toward the subcommittee which investigated Senator Benton's charges. The second part of Senate Resolution 301 deals with the conduct of the junior Senator from Wisconsin toward the select committee which was studying his conduct with respect to that subcommittee.

I count Senator Benton as a friend. I know that, in taking that first and crucial step, back in 1951, he placed the public good above consideration of his own political interest. He took it in the full foreknowledge that such action would make him the target for personal abuse and attack.

Senator Benton is personally convinced that his defeat in the election of 1952 was not attributable to the McCarthy controversy; and the statisics seem to bear this out. But I know him well enough to say that, out of his high sense of duty, I am sure he would have gone forward with his resolution even though he believed it meant the end of his political life.

But it cannot be said that Senator Benton emerged unscarred. More than a few Members of the Senate have now felt the retaliatory wrath of the junior Senator from Wisconsin. But none other has had to endure a reprisal in the form of a counterresolution. By contrast with the carefully prepared and temperately presented evidence on which Senator Benton based his charges, the countercharges against him were an ill-assorted, hastily concocted, and improbable collection of accusations such as could have been assembled or invented about almost any man in public life out of newspaper files. Yet the subcommittee to which they were referred treated them judiciously and solemnly, in the interest of evenhanded justice.

Nor has any other Senator who has criticized the junior Senator from Wisconsin faced a $2 million libel suit. Senator Benton waived his congressional immunity, in order to get an opportunity to prove his charges in court. The suit was ultimately withdrawn by Senator McCarthy under conditions which provided that he bear the court costs, but we may be sure that the preparation of his defense was very costly to Senator Benton.

Senator Benton will take no pleasure in today's action by the Senate. He is not that type. It was never a feud—as some newspapers described it—to Benton. It was a distasteful duty.

Three years ago Senator Benton asserted that the course pursued by the Senator from Wisconsin was bringing dishonor on the Senate and creating tragic division among the American people. He said that this division would become more menacing as time went on. Events since then have justified his judgment.

The course taken by former Senator Benton paved the way for this Senate action today, and he richly deserves our tribute. I wish to insert the following excerpts from recent editorials into the Congressional Record:

From the Christian Century, October 13, 1954:

"Amid the praise for the 6 Senators on the Watkins committee and the 3 others who were mainly instrumental in having the committee formed—Flanders, Fulbright, and Morse—almost no recognition is being given the man who really started the Wisconsin Senator down the political skids. That man was Senator William Benton, of Connecticut, with his 1951 resolution for McCarthy's expulsion which brought into being the Hennings committee of which, says the Watkins report, McCarthy was 'contemptuous, contumacious, and obstructive.' Senator Benton threw away his own political career by daring to stand up to McCarthy when others quailed. But his courage set in motion the train of events which have now brought the Watkins report."

From Moses Berkman, columnist for the Hartford Times, October 2, 1954:

"Forgotten in the plaudits being generously bestowed among those who have succeeded in forcing a Senate showdown on the McCarthy issue is former Senator William Benton. The praise of anti-McCarthy forces and of others who once were his political allies has gone to the Watkins committee for its forthright handling of an explosive situation. But were it not for Connecticut's former Senator, McCarthy might have delayed much longer the inevitable decision of a fully accredited Senate committee to importune the Senate to restore its lost dignity and prestige by passing judgment on the Wisconsin Senator's conduct."

From the Bridgeport Herald, October 3, 1954:

"The Connecticut battler who didn't compromise on Senator McCarthy was and is former Senator William Benton.

"Senator Benton has been the forgotten man of the early anti-McCarthy partisan forces in revolt against demagogery and disgrace.

"It was he who brought the first serious, provable charges against the Wisconsin Senator, calling for a Senate Elections Subcommittee investigation of many of his questionable affairs and private financial operations."

From Life magazine, March 22, 1954:

"Not written, but unwritten rules are the kind McCarthy features. To really curb him the Senate would have to abolish his committee. There are good technical arguments for doing this, but to do it the Senators would have to develop just as much anger as they would need to expel him from the Senate.

"There are good technical reasons for doing that, too. Senator Benton's effort to press them in 1951 fell awfully flat, but perhaps Benton was less quixotic than premature."

There Is No Precedent for Dixon-Yates Deal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, December 2, 1954

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, during recent weeks I have noted many instances in which the defense of the Dixon-Yates deal has revolved around the proposition that there really is nothing unusual about it—that it is just exactly like contracts previously entered into by the Atomic Energy Commission under other administrations, particularly at Portsmouth and Paducah.

I noticed that the Wall Street Journal adopted this fallacy in an editorial critical of my actions. Accordingly, I wrote the editor of the Journal, who very fairly published my letter. I ask unanimous consent to have this letter printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

SENATOR KEFAUVER'S VIEW

EDITOR, THE WALL STREET JOURNAL:

I have read your editorial captioned "The Power of Negative Thinking" (November 22) in which you view my opposition to the two new nominees to the Atomic Energy Commission as typical of the intellectual level of the whole opposition to the so-called Dixon-Yates contract.

I was particularly interested in the editorial because it adopts as its own the public relations justification for the contract—namely, that the AEC has previously entered into contracts at Portsmouth and at Paducah with private power and that these contracts are no different in essence from the proposed Dixon-Yates contract.

I just wish you had time from your busy schedule to make an independent examination into this contract, for I believe that such an independent action on your part would lead you to agree that there is a vast difference between the proposed Dixon-Yates contract and the previous contracts entered into by AEC for power.

Under the Dixon-Yates deal the Atomic Energy Commission would enter into a contract for 25 years with renewal clauses up to 40 years for power not 1 kilowatt of which would it use for itself. Instead, the power is entirely for the TVA and the TVA must depend upon this power for its own loads, must accept it throughout that period of time and redistribute it to its customers in the Memphis area. TVA, however, would have no contractual rights or authority insofar as the producers of the power, the Dixon-Yates combine, are concerned. Their only contractual obligation is to the AEC. The AEC, therefore, under this contract, becomes not a power user but a power broker.

Frankly now, don't you agree with me that this is an administrative nightmare? Leaving aside entirely the question of the additional cost to the Government, between $92 and $140 million, over the life of the contract, don't you really agree that it is wrong for the Government to use the contracting authority of one agency to make a contract for another agency, behind that agency's back and in a field in which the second agency is preeminent?

I believe, as a matter of fact, that you would find a little research on the Electric Energy, Inc., contract enlightening in itself. You know it is a fact that when Mr. Dixon and his associates secured that contract they immediately launched a considerable hubbub about the fact that at long last they would have the opportunity to prove their superiority over TVA, since they were building a plant right across the river from the TVA Shawnee plant, both of which were to serve the AEC installation. These plants were started during the time when there were still controls on steel and other materials and the EEI plant was scheduled to come in first. Because of that schedule EEI was granted priority on steel and other materials over TVA. Therefore you might say that if it was to be a race it was a rigged race, with TVA carrying all of the handicaps. Nevertheless, I believe you will discover that smoke was pouring from the TVA stacks while the boilers of EEI were still cold, and that the TVA built its plant below its estimate of $145 per kilowatt installed capacity, while the last figures I saw on EEI showed they were now within the neighborhood of $200 per kilowatt.

Therefore, even if the Dixon-Yates contract were similar to EEI, which it is not, I hardly think EEI is an example worth emulation.

ESTES KEFAUVER,
United States Senator from Tennessee.
WASHINGTON, D. C.

Using the Splendid Abilities of the Junior Senator from Kentucky, Mr. Cooper

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, December 2, 1954

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the fortunes of politics are such that when we convene in January, there will be absent from our Senate ranks one of the most outstanding Members who has graced this body. He is a man young in years, but old in splendid experience, a man who has won the admiration of his colleagues on both sides of the aisle as a battler for decency, for integrity, for forwardlooking statesmanship.

I refer to our associate, the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Cooper].

It has been my pleasure to know John Sherman Cooper for many years. When I was chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee in the 80th Congress, there was no Senator who worked longer, more conscientiously, more constructively on that committee than the gentleman from Somerset, Ky. I have known too his excellent work in the United Nations.

John Cooper is still a young man and I am certain that his career as a public servant has hardly just begun. I feel sure that his outstanding talents and abilities will be utilized by this administration in some fine new capacity.

His own State of Kentucky would, I am sure, welcome his appointment to high position. As was said in Kentucky during the last election, two good men were running against one another. One good man had to lose. The former Vice President of the United States is an outstanding leader. He returns to the Senate to succeed another outstanding leader.

I send to the desk now three of the many editorials which appeared in the newspapers of our land referring to the Kentucky race and to the need for a worthy new post for John Cooper.

I ask unanimous consent that these editorials be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the New York Herald Tribune of November 4, 1954]

Mr. Cooper and Mr. Barkley

John Sherman Cooper, Republican Senator from Kentucky, waged a hard, clean fight to retain his seat, but he lost. Whatever reasons may be adduced to explain his defeat, one stands paramount—he was opposed by Alben W. Barkley, the former Vice President of the United States, who commands such popular affection that anyone running against him faces considerable odds, particularly in Kentucky, which usually votes Democratic.

But Mr. Cooper's defeat, regrettable as it is, surely does not mean that his days of service to his country are over. In his short stay in the Senate he had established himself as one of the Nation's outstanding legislators, with a clear understanding of international and domestic affairs alike. Both the Republican Party and the Nation at large can take pride in the kind of thinking and voting he consistently brought to the great issues of the day. There are many posts, diplomatic, executive, advisory, in which he could put his unusual talents to work, and we are sure that the administration will lose no time in assigning him to the task for which he is most needed.

[From the New York Times of November 3, 1954]

Mr. Barkley Returns

Alben W. Barkley proved his vigor and toughness during the campaign; now he has proved once again—if proof was necessary—that he still has irresistible voting appeal. Any senatorial candidate on the Democratic ticket in the Bluegrass State has an enormous advantage because Kentucky is, of course, normally Democratic. And when that candidate happens to be the popular first citizen of Kentucky, named Alben W. Barkley, the result is a foregone conclusion.

Nevertheless, we cannot let this occasion pass without expressing regret over the loss to the Senate of the services of another distinguished Kentuckian, Mr. Barkley's Republican opponent, John Sherman Cooper. A clear-headed internationalist and a liberal thinker, Mr. Cooper is an outstanding member of his party in the upper House, and he will be sorely missed. Under the circumstances of this election, the political odds were too heavy against him. But he made a good fight, which against any opponent less formidable than Mr. Barkley might well have been successful. Though Mr. Cooper now must leave the Senate, we are confident that the administration will not be long in putting his experience and abilities once again to excellent use.

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of November 3, 1954]

The Veep Comes Back

The hardest race in all the country for the independent voter was that in Kentucky, where former Vice President Barkley won over Republican Senator John Sherman Cooper. Both men deserved to win. And probably the Republicans needed the rugged character of the still young Mr. Cooper more than the Democrats needed the Veep, who is already full of both honors and years. Senator Cooper's defeat was less of an adverse judgment on the able, progressive Republican than a testimonial of bluegrass good will for the man who has kept Kentucky on the political map for so many years.

If President Eisenhower wants a splendidly qualified man for an important Federal post in diplomacy or administration, he will be quick to make use of the talents and ability of John Sherman Cooper.

Christian Faith and Christian Leadership Are Necessary for Solution of World's Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN S. COOPER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, December 2, 1954

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the Appendix of the Record my message at the general association of Baptists in Kentucky at Owensboro, Ky., on November 18, 1953.

There being no objection, the message was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Message at the General Association of Baptists in Kentucky at Owensboro, Ky., on November 18, 1953, by Hon. John Sherman Cooper, of Kentucky

It has been difficult for me to choose a subject that I thought I could discuss with any value to this body. It is natural for an individual to think in terms of his own work and experience. I have thought that I could appropriately speak to you about some questions which have developed in my mind during my experience of the past 4 or 5 years. The reason which gives me courage to speak of them is my conviction that Christian faith and Christian leadership are necessary for the solution of these questions. They are concerned with the present conflict between the Christian and Communist worlds.

We have spent 7 of the past 12 years in war. Even in the years of uneasy peace, we have been conscious always of the threat of war. Since 1946, our policies and action have been influenced by the aggressive power of Russia which we recognize as the only real threat to peace.

It is an actual and continuing threat. Since the close of World War II, Russia has fastened itself upon 10 of the 20 countries of Europe, the ancient community of China with its 460 million people, and has brought under its control one-third of the peoples of the world. And now, projecting into the future, there falls the shadow of the atom bomb, with all its unknown potential of aggression and mass destruction. Two thousand years after the death of Christ, we are face to face with the stark problem of physical survival. It is not limited to the problem of your or my survival, but of masses of people and perhaps of civilization itself. For as of this moment, there exist no means or assurance of the control of atomic weapons except the morality and spirituality of man himself.

To meet this physical threat, it has been our aim to assure security by building military and economic strength at home and with our allies. This building of power has been necessary, and even imperative. Our purpose has been peace—to dissuade aggression, and to survive and win if we should be attacked. It has had notable success in repelling aggression in Korea. Our action there may turn out to be a decisive step in preventing new aggressions. It is my own view that the Communist forces and the forces of freedom have reached for a time a stalemate, a balance of equilibrium, and we will for a time have an uneasy peace.

I do not doubt that by continuing hard effort and sacrifice, we can protect ourselves. But all of us search earnestly for a true and permanent peace. In this time of stalemate, of uneasy equilibrium, it is time to inquire into every means by which true peace, and the Christian world, and, more important, its institutions and the faith for which it stands can be protected.

Specifically, we inquire if military strength alone can resolve the impasse between Russia and the Western World. It is an unfortunate fact that power and even the resistance of aggression in Korea has not yet produced any sign of any firm settlement or even temporary adjustment of the differences between the Communist and democratic forces.

I do not want to be pessimistic, but from my experience of the last few years, I do have grave doubts that a permanent peace or even an adjustment of conflicting aims can be brought about upon the basis of military power alone.

It is this conclusion that has led me to speak of these matters to you today, for I am sure that the only hope of any true resolution of this terrible situation lies in moral and spiritual forces, led by the Christian churches.

My view stems from the contradiction of communistic belief, with Christian faith. It is absolutely essential that Christians recognize this contradiction.

In 1949, 1950, and 1951, I had the opportunity to serve as a member of the United States delegation to the General Assembly of the United Nations. I remember my optimistic belief at the beginning of my service, that there was surely some means that could be taken that could pave the way for agreement with Russia. I am sorry to say that it did not take much time to become convinced that there was little, if any, possibility of agreement with that country. The actions of their representatives was a reflection of their world policy. Their representatives, such as Vyshinsky, Malik, and Gromyko, use the forum of the United Nations only for propaganda and division. Everyday they pour out bitter, vindictive hatred against the United States and other democratic nations. The most fearsome fact that presents itself is the immoral and unmoral distortion of truth. We can only understand this callousness when we remember that the communistic system has no concept of moral, ethical, or spiritual values.

I remember that on one occasion General Osborne, who was at that time our representative on the Atomic Control Committee, told me that for 3 years he had dealt with the Russian representatives without making the slightest substantial progress. At the same time he was appreciative of the confidence and understanding manifested by representatives of other countries on the Commission. He was so impressed that he was led to say to one of the representatives, "I cannot talk to the Russians. But it is strange that we who differ in race, color, and background can understand each other." The representative replied: "We do differ in these things, but they are superficial. We are alike in the interests that are fundamental. You and I believe in a system of law to which we must relate our actions. We may have different religions and believe in different gods, but both of us believe that there is a moral order superior to ourselves. It is because we believe in these fundamental things that we understand each other."

Mr. Osborne said that he was made to realize more clearly than ever before the difficulty of his task, for as the Soviet's representative did not respect spiritual concepts, there was really no common ground of reference upon which honest agreement and moral adjustments could be made.

These facts point to the conclusion that the ultimate danger does not lie in the differences of detail, but because of the differences in principles and beliefs.

There is no question that peace and the security of nations are endangered by the physical power and might of Russia.

But the danger which I want to emphasize today—a danger which is more deadly than power and even war—is the propagation and the acceptance by many peoples of their unmoral and irreligious philosophy.

It is the opposite of Christian doctrine and faith. It will not accept or compromise with any tenet of the Christian faith. To the contrary, it is its avowed purpose to overthrow not only conflicting political and economic systems but to extinguish the most profound bases of our faith.

Stalin in his writings and utterances made it clear that he approached the possibility of peaceful coexistence as a matter of temporary tactical expediency, and not an end desirable in the interest of humanity. "The existence of the Soviet Republic side by side with imperialist states for a long time," he declared categorically in one of his outbursts of impatience, "is unthinkable. One or the other must triumph in the end. And before that end comes, a series of frightful clashes between the Soviet Republic and the bourgeois states is inevitable."

I do not pretend to any exhaustive understanding of communistic belief. I do know that its essence is materialism. It exalts the claims of the body—food, clothing, and shelter. To assure these economic needs, the communistic system makes the state supreme, and gives to it the control of all means of production and distribution.

Individual man will never willingly submit to conformity. Communism has established its dictatorship to stamp out or bring under control the enemies of conformity—the eternal sources of criticism, light, and freedom. They are the church, the school, the home, and the mind and soul of individual man. If communism should prevail there would remain only a nameless mass, where individual man with all his faith and spirit would have no place.

It is the negation of natural law, of the Christian ideal of the worth of every individual soul and his equality in the sight of God.

If we agree that advancing communism is a contradiction and a threat to Christian faith, then it seems clear to me that the matter presents the greatest challenge of all time to Christians and Christian leadership.

I have always been proud that the Christian faith is a missionary faith, an evangelistic faith, and that it believes the imperative of "go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature."

The threat of communism and the sealing off of great areas and people, would prevent the dissemination of truth and Christian evangelism.

There has always been controversy and differences of opinion in this country, as to whether in its policy we should "go it alone" or assume greater obligations throughout the world. This question has been urged chiefly upon the basis of our economic ability to enlarge our influence and whether it would strengthen or weaken our national security.

These are essential questions, but I believe that there are other considerations which a Christian must take into account in the choice of policy.

We may want to believe easily that communism is making advances, solely through the military aggression of Russia, or through its worldwide conspiracy to subvert internally democratic countries. This is not always true. In the underdeveloped countries of the world, where one-third of the peoples of the world live, there are local conditions which enhance and promote the appeal of communism. The peoples of those lands have lived for centuries in hunger, disease, and in stratified social classes. They are marked by immense differences in levels of living and opportunity. They blame their colonial experience, an experience under democratic countries, with responsibility for their unfortunate position, and believe easily that national independence will reverse their history. Unfortunately, they have found that a change of governments cannot cure immediately conditions of misery, and with disillusionment a rich field for communism is opened. The promise of immediate social justice, of equal opportunity, where each shall have according to his need, holds appeal. And so communism finds acceptance.

The United States is the most powerful non-Communist country in the world, and certainly the richest. If we do not act to assist these undeveloped countries to correct these conditions which encourage communism, there is little possibility that any effective action can be taken to stop its advance in the underdeveloped countries of the world.

From the Christian viewpoint, I cannot believe that we are willing that these areas shall be swallowed up and sealed off and prevent and delay the mission of the church. From the standpoint of Christian character and faith, I do not believe that we can, like the Pharisee, be smug in our own good fortune and turn our backs on less fortunate human beings.

I present this idea to you, not as something new, but as a part of the challenge which communism presents to Christians.

The countries and the people of the world watch us. It is not enough to declare that we are the repository of freedom. Freedom must be an actuality, and it must grow.

With all the criticism that bitter people pour out on our system, there can be no question that the measure of freedom and opportunity afforded by our country is the greatest in all the world and in all history.

But we are at once a shining example of freedom and the subject of criticism.

Any hard and objective analysis can only reveal that there are areas of American life, there are peoples and races in our country, who do not enjoy the full freedom for which the individual must always hunger.

We make steady progress in the correction of these faults, but this too presents a challenge.

This is, I believe, a test and a challenge of Christian leadership, for we proclaim above all others the individual worth and value of the individual and his soul before God.

There is another characteristic of communistic thought which we must recognize. It is not a rational belief for all—it has become a faith and a religion to many—and men die for it.

It is difficult for us to understand how individuals can consider as a faith, a system which considers untruthfulness, deception, even conspiracy as justified, which considers that immoral methods validate their ends.

It is difficult to understand how individuals can embrace a faith, a system which seeks the destruction of the significance of the church, and of the individual.

And yet it is true that millions have done so—with hope that they will improve their own wretched condition, with grander ideas of social justice, out of hatred and bitterness.

We cannot in the very nature of Christian faith accept the thesis that this evil can ultimately prevail. Man may have bread, clothing, shelter, the pomp and authority of a governmental system, but without spiritual life, the soul hungers and dies.

It is the record of history that man will not long remain submissive to domination of his soul.

I have talked too long. But the real point that I want to make today is that the strength of military power, the practical methods we may use to counter the economic reasons for acceptance of the Communist idea, are not enough.

The great necessity is to bring again to man, with greater vigor and enthusiasm, the greatest faith—Christianity.

The worst thing that could happen in our own land would be for us to succumb unconsciously to the root of communism, which is materialism. It seems unfortunately to occupy our minds in increasing measure.

The true and ultimate answer to materialism at home, and to evil systems in the world, and to the deepest hopes of man, is a profounder acceptance of the will and teaching of Christ by Christians, and its extension throughout the world.

"Not by might, nor by power, but by my spirit sayeth the Lord of hosts."

Tribute to Senator Hendrickson's Work on Juvenile Delinquency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, December 2, 1954

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record a statement by me in tribute to the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Hendrickson].

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

I want to pay a deserving tribute to the work of our colleague, Senator Robert B. Hendrickson, during the past session of Congress in heading the Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee.

During the early days of the 83d Congress, Senator Hendrickson and I filed identical resolutions calling for an investigation into the subject of juvenile delinquency. Eventually our resolutions were combined in committee and adopted by the Senate. Senator Hendrickson was named as chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. President, he has done an outstanding job in conducting judicious hearings designed to shed light on a situation which needs our best thoughts. I should like to outline just some of the work that has been accomplished.

To date the subcommittee has examined more than 500 witnesses, many of whom are themselves experts in the fields of juvenile delinquency and have given us the benefit of their knowledge and years of experience. It has conducted firsthand investigations of both local and interstate problems. Community hearings have been conducted in many major cities throughout the Nation. We have examined the effects of comic books and of television on the youthful mind.

In our work Senator HENDRICKSON has been our tireless leader, devoting himself to a cause which he held to be most important. Although he is leaving the Senate, he has recommended that the committee be continued, for he realizes that its work is not yet done. In this I join Senator HENDRICKSON wholeheartedly. The field is so large and the problem so complex that it was impossible to complete our task in the time allotted. I hope that the next Senate will approve Senator HENDRICKSON's recommendation at the closing session of this one that we continue the work which he pioneered so effectively.

Radio Address by Hon. Alexander Wiley, of Wisconsin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, December 2, 1954

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I send to the desk the text of a radio address which I delivered over the radio stations of my State.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of this address be printed in the final edition of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the radio address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR WILEY PREVIEWS 1955 LEGISLATION AFFECTING WISCONSIN—STRESSES UPPER LAKES CHANNELS

This is your Senator, ALEX WILEY, speaking to you from our Nation's Capital.

In the next quarter of an hour, I would like to chat with you about some of the many matters coming up in the new Congress in January that affect our State and our Nation.

Let's take a look at some of the key subjects that affect you, too, as an individual—that affect your family, your home, your welfare, your standard of living, your taxes.

I am going to list some of the bills which I intend to introduce shortly in your behalf. And, friends, I want to cordially invite your reactions to my legislative program. Let me have the benefit of your own thinking as to what you feel should be done here in Washington for Wisconsin.

Now, we will start off with the first question about my plans for the 84th Congress.

ST. LAWRENCE CHANNELS

Question. First, Senator WILEY, how do we stand with regard to the St. Lawrence seaway? What about the problem of deepening the channels in the upper Great Lakes so as to complete the seaway project?

Answer. I'm glad to start off with this vital seaway subject. As a matter of fact, my No. 1 priority in the new Congress is to complete the St. Lawrense seaway—on which, incidentally, the construction process has already begun on the Canadian side of the border.

To fulfill our American part, there must still be appropriated some $100 million. This money will be used to make sure that deep-water shipping—with drafts of up to 27 feet—can travel the full 2,400 miles from the Atlantic Ocean to Superior-Duluth, and to all the other harbors in between.

In other words, the $100 million will complete this deep-water lifeline into the heart of the North American Continent.

And, so, on the very first legislative day of the new Congress, I will be dropping in a bill to authorize these necessary funds to complete the seaway.

Question. Senator WILEY, while we are on the subject of future improvements, are there any other fields where you feel the Congress should take action to meet modern conditions?

Answer. Yes, indeed. The fact of the matter is that the more closely one looks at Wisconsin's and America's facilities the more one sees the need to serve our expanding population.

Four million babies have been born in 1954. Our population is going to increase further next year and in the years to come. That means that we have got to take a new look at the adequacy of our Wisconsin hospitals, our schools, our playgrounds, our roads, our parks, our water systems.

Now, of course, this is to a very large extent, basically a statewide matter. It will be handled by our Governor and by our State legislature at Madison. But Uncle Sam, too, has important responsibilities, and it is my job to help him fulfill those responsibilities.

ROAD NETWORK

Question. What, specifically, do you have in mind, Senator?

Answer. Well, take the issue of roads. Wisconsin, as you well know, is a great tourist State. Our highway system is essential for more and more transporting of farm goods and industrial goods. But modern Badger highways are absolutely essential for increased tourist travel as well. We have a fine road system in our State—one of the best in our Nation—but it could stand considerable improvement. So I am going to do my part to expand the Federal highway-aid program for Wisconsin.

AIRPORT IMPROVEMENT

Question. How about other fields of internal improvement?

Answer. Well, take air travel. Wisconsin has always pioneered in aviation since the days of Billy Mitchell. We have 200 airports in our State. Many of them need new facilities, larger runways, new technical aids, in order to be absolutely modern and so as to handle the tremendous increase in air traffic safely and efficiently. That means increased airport construction and expansion in Wisconsin—carefully planned and soundly executed, in cooperation with our State aeronautics commission.

Question. Are there any other improvements you have in mind?

WISCONSIN ATOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Answer. Yes, indeed. I am thinking now of one particularly crucial field—atomic development. I refer to use of the atom for peaceful, commercial purposes—for inexpensive fuel for industry, for homes, for rural cooperatives. I am going to do all that I can to make sure that Wisconsin keeps pace in the race for atomic development. Why? Because it means jobs; it means income; it means a higher standard of living for the 3½ million people of our State.

PROTECTING CONSUMER

Question. Turning to fuel, Senator, what is the picture as regards rates on natural gas—a subject on which you've been fighting to protect the consumer for years and years?

Answer. Well, as many of my listeners probably know, the natural gas lobby is going all out to jack up natural-gas rates still more. That would mean a bigger fuel bill for you, Mr. and Mrs. Homeowner and for you Mr. Businessman. Now, I'm for fair rates and a fair return on investment; but I'm against allowing the gas companies or anyone else taking the consumer for a ride. I'm against the effort of the natural-gas lobby trying to overthrow a recent significant Supreme Court decision. That decision held that gas rates by independent suppliers should definitely be subject to Federal regulation. I say that the consumer must be protected and I'm going to continue to fight in his behalf.

Question. Speaking of protection, how about the problem of taxes? What sort of protection can the average man expect in that regard?

TAX JUSTICE

Answer. Well, he can expect that his senior Senator will fight for further review of our present tax system. Unfortunately, there are still many inequities in the Nation's tax laws—injustices affecting both individuals and businesses. It will be my task to try to help remove these injustices. For example, I think that taxes on very small businesses are much too severe.

These taxes should be revised, and the burden should be eased. In suggesting this, I am not simply thinking of the small businessman who is being heavily taxed. I am thinking of the employees whom the little businessman will employ and the payrolls he will pay provided that taxes are fair and equitable instead of being discriminatory and burdensome.

Question. Would you give another example, Senator of how you feel the tax laws can be changed?

Answer. Well, take taxes as they affect a great many women in Wisconsin—working mothers. These working mothers have to spend a considerable amount of money for baby sitters. This is a perfectly legitimate expense which should be fully deductible for tax purposes. Yet, right now only a comparatively small number of working mothers are permitted to list these baby sitter costs when they fill out their income tax returns. I feel, therefore, that this provision in the tax law should be liberalized too.

And there are other tax features which could stand improvement. For example, taxes should be used to encourage rather than discourage industrial research because research means more jobs, more income for America. Then, too, taxes vitally affect the great outdoor heritage of Wisconsin—our fields and streams.

ANTIPOLLUTION WORKS

Question. How does that work out, Senator?

Answer. Well, I need not tell my listeners that pollution is one of the big problems faced throughout our State—pollution of our streams and rivers.

Pollution destroys fish and wildlife. It prevents swimming. It ruins recreational features.

What we need, therefore, are new plants which can treat industrial sewage so that it is not dumped into streams and rivers, resulting in more and more pollution. These treatment plants cost lots of money. What is essential, therefore, is that we ease our tax laws so that we encourage the building of more and more antipollution works. In that way, we help many Wisconsin companies facing the troublesome problem of how to handle industrial waste. We help the great Wisconsin conservation movement. We help everyone who wants to enjoy our outdoor heritage.

FARM PARITY

Question. Well, Senator WILEY, while we are on this problem of the outdoors, what about the men who spend almost all their time in outdoor work, the farmers of Wisconsin? What do you contemplate for the great agricultural segment of Wisconsin's population?

Answer. I have a whole series of bills which I think will help improve the conditions of our farmers. By doing so, I know that we can strengthen the State of Wisconsin, as a whole. Why? Because, when the farmer has purchasing power, when he buys an auto, a refrigerator, a tractor, a washing machine, a home appliance, his purchases help to generate economic health in every community in our State.

Now the biggest problem of the farmer is a fair price on his products. And, so, one of my major purposes in the new Congress will be to restore dairy parity to the level of the parity on the 6 basic commodities. In other words, I do not want the dairyman discriminated against, in relation to the producers of corn, wheat, or, in particular, the case of Southern crops like cotton or tobacco.

SCHOOL LUNCHES

Question. Well, if farm parity is taken care of, how about other farm problems?

Answer. Well, I plan to advance legislation to expand the Nation's school lunch program and the use of milk in that program. Wisconsin is way ahead of other States of the Union in its use of milk in this program. My information is that, if all the other States used as much milk as we do in feeding youngsters in our schools, more than a billion additional pounds of milk would be consumed. Just think of it—a billion pounds of milk. That would certainly help greatly in meeting the present dairy surplus problem.

Now, I also have plans to strengthen dairy research—research into new means of processing and packaging, research into dairy nutrition, research into lowering the costs of distributing the milk from the farm to the consumer's doorstep, as well as other types of research.

SOCIAL SECURITY

Question. Well, Senator, you have discussed improvements of Wisconsin's outdoor heritage and its agriculture, now how about some other fields? What about social security?

Answer. This is truly one of the most important fields affecting the people of our State. I feel that the old age and survivors insurance system is one of the great safeguards of America. It is a safeguard against depression. It is a safeguard against personal insecurity in one's later years.

I feel that still more Americans ought to be included under the old age pension system. Many groups like lawyers and now excluded. I feel that any group which wants coverage under the old age insurance system should be brought into that system, provided the necessary administrative and financial arrangements can be made. And too, I feel that the system should be liberalized. For example, a widow aged 60 should be able to draw her widow's pension instead of having to eke out an existence until she reaches the age of 65.

ANTICRIME

Question. That's certainly an important point, Senator.

Now, you have been active in a great many other legislative fields and perhaps we can run down a few of them briefly in the remaining time. For example, you have been in the forefront of the battle against crime. Do you have plans in that respect?

Answer. By all means. I plan to reintroduce a whole series of anticrime bills which our Kefauver Crime Committee had originally recommended to the Congress.

I plan to try to extend the life of the juvenile delinquency subcommittee. You know, it is an alarming fact that more than a million youngsters are getting into trouble with the law. That means we have got to find new remedies against crime among our Nation's young people. This calls for better cooperation between Federal, State, and local governments. But most of all, it calls for improved teamwork between the three great champions of youth—the home, the church, and the school.

Question. Any other active phases of the crime problem?

Answer. Yes, I'm going to carry on my battle against objectionable literature on the Nation's newstands and in the mailboxes—the kind of filthy literature which poisons the morals of youngsters.

And let me say, too, before I leave the crime problem that I am going to reintroduce laws to tighten up penalties against another terrible evil—dope peddling. I say that the narcotics situation in our country is a national disgrace; further strong action must be taken against it in cooperation with our excellent United States Narcotics Bureau.

Question. Still another field in which you have been active is legislation for our exservicemen. Do you have any further plans in that respect?

Answer. Very definitely, yes. I plan to strengthen the system of farm loans for Wisconsin veterans, and I plan once more to sponsor legislation to set up a Senate Veterans Affairs Committee.

THE FIGHT FOR PEACE

Question. Last but not least, we come to the area in which you have worked most significantly of all, and that is the subject of preventing world war III, of maintaining the peace. As ranking Republican on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, do you have plans for the new year in this regard?

Answer. Definitely, yes. Preservation of the peace remains our No. 1 goal of all. None of the bright possibilities which I have mentioned in this broadcast thus far can come about unless we can keep the peace. We can't possibly have peaceful application of atomic energy or an ever higher standard of living in this country; we can't enjoy greater leisure, greater recreation, higher real income unless there is peace in the world.

And so, I will continue to concentrate, my friends, in support of our great President, Dwight D. Eisenhower, in strengthening the free world alliance against communism, strengthening NATO, and SEATO, and the Organization of American States as well as the entire system of bilateral and unilateral treaties. You and I know that the Reds only respect strength. Weakness invites aggression. Disunity in the free world tempts the Communist tyrants to commit new crimes.

ANTIRED BILLS

Question. While we are on that subject, communism, do you plan further action against the Communist menace here at home?

Answer. Of course; you can't adequately combat communism abroad unless your homefront is sufficiently strong. That is why I will introduce important new anti-Communist bills. I'll seek to plug certain loopholes which now exist in our Nation's security laws. That is why, too, I will urge continued strong investigation of communism here at home by legislative investigating committees.

Meanwhile, I will do my part to help combat the Communist menace wherever we find it in the world—in our own backyard, in Latin America, in Western Europe, in Asia, or elsewhere—but with methods of peace, not of war. I stress peaceful means. That is the policy of our President, and it is my policy. I am for strong defense; for eternal vigilance. But I am against warlike threats or ultimatums.

Question. Senator WILEY, you have covered a wide range of legislative interests during this brief period. You have described various new fields in which you have interested yourself.

I know that if time permitted you would set forth your plans with regard to many other issues in the State—issues like Post Office Department service, civil defense, unemployment compensation, justice for men in the military reserve, expanded housing, health insurance, and a great many other tasks.

But, I think that your comments today on the St. Lawrence seaway, on road improvement, aviation expansion, atomic development, antipollution, anticrime, veterans' welfare, and social-security laws have been of deep interest to our listening audience.

Answer. I truly hope so, and I sincerely invite my listeners' comment on them.

I hope that you will write to me, conveying your own thoughts, your own reactions on these and other important issues of our time. I am here in Washington to serve you. And so your viewpoint will always be appreciated. Let me hear from you.

This is ALEX WILEY, your senior Senator signing off from Washington.

Tribute to Our Former Colleagues

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. ALEXANDER SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, December 2, 1954

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by me in tribute to our colleagues who are leaving the Senate.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

With the close of the 83d Congress, I feel it is appropriate to say a word of appreciation of those Members of the Senate who have been with us during these past years and who will not continue in the 84th Congress as our colleagues.

On the Republican side, I am thinking especially of Senator HOMER FERGUSON, of Michigan, and GUY CORDON, of Oregon, who were in the Senate with me during the entire time I have been here, and also of JOHN COOPER, of Kentucky, and ROBERT UPTON, of New Hampshire. I am also, of course, thinking of my close and intimate friend of many years, BOB HENDRICKSON, who has been with me here during the past 6 years.

All these outstanding Republican colleagues have meant much to me during my time in the Senate and both Mrs. Smith and I will miss them sorely, as well as their wives whom we have come to know so well.

On the Democratic side, I think of ED JOHNSON and GUY GILLETTE, who have both been intimate friends of mine. Because of my earlier years in Colorado I feel a special relationship with ED who is going back to be Governor of that great State. I have known GUY GILLETTE as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, and as a companion on some of the trips I have taken abroad in connection with the activities of that committee.

I also desire to mention the names of those who have been with us for a short time this year. This list includes Senators Abel, Bowring, Brown, Burke, Daniel, Lennon, and Reynolds.

All these colleagues I have valued, not only as fellow Senators for whom I had the highest respect, but also as warm personal friends.

I am absolutely confident that in the case of all these men, there are many years of important service for their country lying ahead of them, and they are all men who will uphold the honor and tradition of this great body in which we had the privilege of being members together.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE SENATE SUBSEQUENT TO ADJOURNMENT

REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON MAIL COVER OF SENATORS

Under authority of the order of December 2, 1954, and pursuant to Senate Resolution 332, submitted on December 1, 1954, by Mr. Knowland (for himself and Mr. Johnson of Texas), Mr. Ferguson and Mr. George, as the special committee to investigate the cover of mail of Senators, on December 3, 1954, submitted a report (No. 2510) thereon, which was printed.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Printing and binding for Congress, when recommended to be done by the Committee on Printing of either House, shall be so recommended in a report containing an approximate estimate of the cost thereof, together with a statement from the Public Printer of estimated approximate cost of work previously ordered by Congress within the fiscal year (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 145, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on Printing, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the Congressional Record is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Frank Brodie is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the Record at $1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. The money derived from such sales shall be paid into the Treasury and accounted for in his annual report to Congress, and no sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

Code of Laws of the United States

Title 44, Section 181. Congressional Record; arrangement, style, contents, and indexes.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the Congressional Record, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the Congressional Record semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

Title 44, Section 182b. Same; illustrations, maps, diagrams.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the Record without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the Congressional Record the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily Record as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided*, That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the Record with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the official reporters of the Congressional Record, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the Record shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the Record issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the Record for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the Record of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the Record shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the Record style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the Record.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the Congressional Record any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided*, That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix, but this rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided*, That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the Congressional Record.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the Congressional Record Appendix the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed.

10. *Official reporters.*—The official reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the Congressional Record by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this restriction shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. The Public Printer or the official reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the Congressional Record which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Illustrations.*—Pursuant to section 182b, title 44, United States Code (as shown above), requests for authority to insert an illustration in the Record should be submitted to the Joint Committee on Printing through the chairman of the Committee on Printing of the respective House in which the speech desired to be illustrated may be delivered. Illustrations shall not exceed in size a page of the Record and shall be linecuts only. Copy for illustrations must be furnished to the Public Printer not later than 12:30 o'clock p. m. of the day preceding publication.

13. *Corrections.*—The permanent Record is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided*, That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further*, That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.